

# Data-Parallel Algorithms for String Diagrams

Paul Wilson<sup>1</sup> and Fabio Zanasi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Independent

<sup>2</sup>University College London and University of Bologna

We give parallel algorithms for string diagrams represented as *structured cospans of ACSets*. Specifically, we give *linear* (sequential) and *logarithmic* (parallel) time algorithms for composition, tensor product, construction of diagrams from arbitrary  $\Sigma$ -terms, and application of functors to diagrams.

Our datastructure can represent morphisms of both the free symmetric monoidal category over an arbitrary signature as well as those with a chosen Special Frobenius structure. We show how this additional (hypergraph) structure can be used to map diagrams to *diagrams of optics*. This leads to a case study in which we define an algorithm for efficiently computing symbolic representations of gradient-based learners based on reverse derivatives.

The work we present here is intended to be useful as a *general purpose* datastructure. Implementation requires only *integer arrays* and well-known algorithms, and is data-parallel by construction. We therefore expect it to be applicable to a wide variety of settings, including embedded and parallel hardware and low-level languages.

## 1 Introduction

String diagrams are a formal graphical syntax [23] for representing morphisms of monoidal categories which is now widely used (see for example [16, 17, 18, 5]). The purpose of this paper is to make string diagrams not just a convenient notation for algebraic reasoning, but also an efficient general-purpose tool in computing with graphical structures in a compositional manner. To that end, the datastructures and algorithms we define satisfy the following desiderata.

**Fast and data-parallel.** Our algorithms are data-parallel by construction, and have *linear* (sequential) and *logarithmic* (parallel) time complexities.

**Minimal primitives.** Our datastructures are defined in terms of simple integer arrays. Moreover, we assume only a small number of simple, well-known primitive operations (e.g., prefix sum). This makes it possible to implement our algorithms in a wide variety of settings, such as embedded and parallel (i.e., GPU) hardware.

**Simple to implement correctly.** Key parts of our datastructure are defined in terms of the recent construction of *ACSets* [21]. Consequently, implementations are essentially the same as their categorical definitions, making it easier to ensure correctness.

A number of representations of string diagrams have been explored in the literature, such as the wiring diagrams of Catlab.jl [20] and the ‘hypergraph adjacency representations’ of [26]. Our goals most closely align with the latter: we aim to make string diagrams useful as a general purpose ‘scalable combinatorial syntax’. For example, we hope that our implementation serves as an alternative in cases where a programmer would currently use a tree or directed graph.

However, the primary motivating application for our work is in representing gradient-based learners as optics, as described in [11]. In particular, this motivates perhaps the most significant extension to [26]: our datastructures can ‘natively’ represent morphisms of the free symmetric monoidal category over a signature with a chosen Special Frobenius monoid. This equips categories with hypergraph structure, which we show can be used to simulate *diagrams of optics*. In turn, this allows for a large number of applications modelling ‘bidirectional information flow’ based on

optics such as [11, 25, 7]. In our specific example, it allows us to define to an efficient algorithm for taking reverse derivatives [9] and modeling gradient-based learners in general.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- A representation of morphisms of the free symmetric monoidal category over a signature  $\Sigma$  as *structured cospans of ACSets*.
- Proof of correspondence between this representation and free symmetric monoidal category
- Data-parallel algorithms with *linear* (sequential) and *logarithmic* (parallel) time complexity for...
  - Composition and tensor product of diagrams
  - Construction of a diagram from an arbitrary  $\Sigma$ -term
  - Application of functors to diagrams
- An algorithm for mapping diagrams to *diagrams of optics* using hypergraph structure, and consequently an algorithm for taking reverse derivatives of diagrams in linear (sequential) and logarithmic (parallel) time.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we give necessary background, including string diagrams, presentations by generators and equations, structured cospans, and ACSets. We also recall the bipartite graph representation of hypergraphs introduced in [26], and give a detailed account of the representation of finite functions as arrays which is the foundation of our implementation. Our contributions begin in Section 3 where we show how the ‘internal wiring’ of diagrams can be represented using ACSets. This is built upon in Section 4, where we give the main definition of the paper: our datastructure for string diagrams as structured cospans of these wirings. In Section 5 we prove the correspondence between these structured cospans and the free symmetric monoidal category on a given signature plus a chosen Special Frobenius monoid. In Section 6, we translate a combinatorial condition first introduced in [4] to our datastructure, allowing for the representation of morphisms of the free symmetric monoidal category *without* the additional Frobenius structure. Sections 7 and 8 together define an efficient algorithm for constructing diagrams from  $\Sigma$ -terms. Finally, in Section 9 we define an algorithm for applying functors to diagrams, and then in Section 10 show how it can be used to map diagrams to diagrams of optics, leading to an efficient algorithm for taking reverse derivatives. We conclude the paper in Section 11 with some directions for future work. A reference implementation for some of the algorithms described in the paper can be found at <https://yarrow.id>.

## 2 Background

We introduce the necessary background to describe our contributions. Section 2.1 recalls string diagrams, monoidal signatures, and the free symmetric monoidal category presented by a signature. In Section 2.2, we give the details of two isomorphic categories of finite functions, and give the computational complexities of basic algorithms for composition, coproduct, and tensor product. We also list the basic primitive array operations assumed by our implementation. Finally, in Section 2.4 we discuss the combinatorial encoding of string diagrams as hypergraphs introduced in [4], the encoding of hypergraphs as bipartite graphs used in [26], and the definition of ACSets, in terms of which we will define our datastructure.

### 2.1 String Diagrams, Monoidal Signatures, and $\text{Free}_\Sigma$

String diagrams are a two-dimensional graphical syntax for representing morphisms of categories. Informally, this syntax consists of widgets placed on the page, and connected with labeled wires. The example below has wire labels in capital letters, and is constructed from the widgets  $f, g, h, \succ, \prec$ ,

and  $\dashv$ .



The choice of ‘widgets’ and ‘wire labels’ correspond to the *generating morphisms* and *generating objects* of a *monoidal signature*.

**Definition 2.1** (Monoidal Signature). *A monoidal signature  $\Sigma$  consists of*

- $\Sigma_0$  the *generating objects*
- $\Sigma_1$  the *generating morphisms or operations*
- $\Sigma_2$  the *equations*
- A *typing relation*  $\tau : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow (\Sigma_0^* \times \Sigma_0^*)$


**Remark 2.2.** *Note that we include a typing relation in order to allow for ‘polymorphic’ generators. This means that a presentation of a symmetric monoidal category having, for example, a generating morphism  $f : A \rightarrow A$  for all  $A$  can be represented with just a single label in  $\Sigma_1$ . We have already seen an example of where this is useful in (1): the generator  $\dashv$  is pictured as having both the type  $A \rightarrow A \otimes A$  and  $C \rightarrow C \otimes C$ . Although this distinction is useful, we will frequently assume there is a chosen typing for a given generator, and therefore speak of ‘the’ type of a generator.*

Given a presentation—the basic widgets that define a category—we can now define  $\Sigma$ -terms: the ‘syntax trees’ representing diagrams built inductively by tensor and composition of generators.

**Definition 2.3.** *Given a monoidal signature  $\Sigma$ , a  $\Sigma$ -term is a binary tree whose leaves are labeled  $\Sigma_1 \cup \{\text{id}, \sigma\}$ , and whose nodes are labeled either  $\otimes$  or  $\ddot{;}$ .*

Intuitively, a  $\Sigma$ -term is built from building blocks the  $\Sigma_1$ -operations and the ‘structural’ morphisms  $\text{id}$  (identity) and  $\sigma$  (symmetry), composed sequentially ( $\ddot{;}$ ) and in parallel ( $\otimes$ ). We revisit our example string diagram from (1) as a  $\Sigma$ -term in the following example.

**Example 2.4.** *Equation (1) can be represented as the  $\Sigma$ -term  $((\dashv \otimes (\text{id} \otimes \dashv)) \ddot{;} ((f \otimes g) \otimes (h \otimes \text{id}))) \ddot{;} (\dashv \otimes (\text{id} \otimes \dashv))$ , which we render as a binary tree below.*



There are many distinct  $\Sigma$ -terms that represent the diagram in (1). To represent morphisms of the free symmetric monoidal category, we will therefore need to consider isomorphism classes of  $\Sigma$ -terms.

**Definition 2.5** ( $\text{Free}_\Sigma$ ). *Given a monoidal signature  $\Sigma$ , the **strict symmetric monoidal category freely generated by  $\Sigma$**  is denoted  $\text{Free}_\Sigma$ . Its objects are lists of generating objects  $\Sigma_0^*$ , with the unit object the empty list. Morphisms are  $\Sigma$ -terms quotiented by the laws of symmetric monoidal categories (Figure 1). Identities, symmetry, and composition and monoidal product are given by their corresponding  $\Sigma$ -terms.*

Figure 1: Laws of strict symmetric monoidal categories.

Axiom	$\Sigma$ -term	Diagrammatic Syntax
$\otimes$ Functoriality	$(f_1 \otimes g_1) \circledast (f_2 \otimes g_2) = (f_1 \circledast f_2) \otimes (g_1 \circledast g_2)$	
$\otimes$ Functoriality	$\text{id}_A \otimes \text{id}_B = \text{id}_{A \otimes B}$	
$\alpha$ Naturality	$f \otimes (g \otimes h) = (f \otimes g) \otimes h$	
$\rho$ Naturality	$f \otimes \text{id}_I = f$	
$\lambda$ Naturality	$\text{id}_I \otimes f = f$	
$\sigma$ Naturality	$(f \otimes g) \circledast \sigma_{A',B'} = \sigma_{A,B} \circledast (f \otimes g)$	
Unit Coherence	$\sigma_{A,I} = \text{id}_A$	
Symmetry Coherence	$(\sigma_{A,B} \otimes \text{id}_C) \circledast \text{id}_B \otimes \sigma_{A,C} = \sigma_{A,B \otimes C}$	
Inverse Law	$\sigma_{A,B} \circledast \sigma_{B,A} = \text{id}_A \otimes \text{id}_B$	

### 2.1.1 Special Frobenius Monoids and Hypergraph Categories

One monoidal signature particularly important to us is that of Special Frobenius Monoids.

**Definition 2.6** (Special Frobenius Monoids). *The theory of Special Frobenius monoids is denoted  $\mathbf{Frob}$ , and consists of generators*

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad \vdash \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad \dashv \quad \text{---} \quad (2)$$

and equations

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \quad \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \text{---} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \quad \text{---} \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \text{---} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \text{---} & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} & \end{array} \quad (3)$$

A category in which each object is equipped with a special frobenius monoid compatibly with the monoidal product is often called a hypergraph category [13] (also known as a well-supported compact closed category [8]).

**Definition 2.7** (Hypergraph Category). *A **Hypergraph Category** is a symmetric monoidal category in which every object  $A$  is equipped with a Special Frobenius Monoid*

$$A \begin{array}{c} \text{---} A \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \text{---} A \end{array} \quad \vdash \quad A \quad \begin{array}{c} A \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} A \end{array} \quad \dashv \quad A$$

satisfying the equations (3) and compatible with the tensor product, i.e. so that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \otimes B \begin{array}{c} \text{---} A \otimes B \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} A \otimes B \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} A \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ B \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} A \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} B \end{array} & A \otimes B \begin{array}{c} \text{---} A \otimes B \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} A \otimes B \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} A \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ B \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} A \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} B \end{array} \\ \vdash A \otimes B = \begin{array}{c} \vdash A \\ \vdash B \end{array} & A \otimes B \dashv = \begin{array}{c} A \dashv \\ B \dashv \end{array} \end{array}$$

The hypergraph structure will play a special role: it will be used to represent the *wires* of the string diagram. Specifically, it will represent the *wires* of the string diagram. It will therefore be useful to refer to morphisms constructed exclusively from generators in  $\mathbf{Frob}$ . Such morphisms are called *Frobenius spiders*: we define them now.

**Definition 2.8** (Frobenius Spider). *A **Frobenius Spider** in a hypergraph category is any morphism built by tensor and composition of generators in  $\mathbf{Frob}$ , i.e.,*

$$\text{---} \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad \vdash \quad \dashv$$

## 2.2 Finite Functions and their Representations

Because our work is defined in terms of ACSets [21], the datastructures presented in this paper are ultimately all expressed in terms of the category  $\mathbf{FinOrd}$  of *finite sets and functions*. We will need two different (but isomorphic) ‘encodings’ of this category:

- $\mathbf{FreeCMon}$ : a ‘mathematician-friendly’ encoding, freely generated by a signature and equations.
- $\mathbf{FinFun}$ : a ‘programmer-friendly’ encoding, defined in terms of *arrays*.

Even though both of these representations are well-studied (see e.g., [21]), it is useful to record them for future use.

## 2.2.1 Finite Functions in Terms of Commutative Monoids

**Definition 2.9** (Commutative Monoids). *Given a chosen set of generating objects  $\Sigma_0$ , the theory of commutative monoids  $\mathbf{CMon}(\Sigma_0)$  has generating objects  $\Sigma_0$ , and for each  $A \in \Sigma_0$  the generating arrows*

$$\begin{array}{c} A \\ \curvearrowright \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \\ A \end{array} \text{---} A \quad \bullet \text{---} A \quad (4)$$

and equations

$$\begin{array}{c} A \\ \curvearrowright \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \\ A \end{array} \text{---} A = \begin{array}{c} A \\ \curvearrowright \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \\ A \end{array} \text{---} A \quad \begin{array}{c} A \\ \curvearrowright \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \\ \bullet \end{array} \text{---} A = A \text{---} A \quad \begin{array}{c} A \\ \curvearrowright \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \\ A \\ \curvearrowright \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \\ A \end{array} \text{---} A = \begin{array}{c} A \\ \curvearrowright \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \\ A \\ \curvearrowright \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \\ A \end{array} \text{---} A \quad (5)$$

The equations  $\mathbf{CMon}_2$  of the theory of commutative monoids are sufficient to deduce the *naturality* equations (Proposition 2.11 and 2.10). It is important that these equations are *derivable* (and not axioms) in order to relate finite functions to Special Frobenius Monoids in Section 2.1.1.

**Proposition 2.10.** *For all morphisms  $f : A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathbf{CMon}(\Sigma_0)$ ,*

$$\begin{array}{c} A \\ \boxed{f} \\ \bullet \end{array} \text{---} B = \bullet \text{---} B \quad (6)$$

*Proof.* Induction. It is clear that (6) holds for all generators. In the inductive step, assume (6) holds for morphisms  $f_0$  and  $f_1$ , then it is straightforward to derive that (6) holds for  $f_0 \otimes f_1$  and  $f_0 \circ f_1$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.11.** *For all morphisms  $f : A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathbf{CMon}(\Sigma_0)$ ,*

$$\begin{array}{c} A \\ \boxed{f} \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{f} \\ A \end{array} \text{---} B = \begin{array}{c} A \\ \curvearrowright \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \\ A \end{array} \text{---} \boxed{f} \text{---} B \quad (7)$$

*Proof.* Induction as in Proposition 2.10.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.12.** *By Fox's theorem [14], Propositions 2.10 and 2.11 mean that  $\mathbf{CMon}(\Sigma_0)$  has finite coproducts.*

Let us write  $\mathbf{CMon}$  for  $\mathbf{CMon}(\Sigma_0)$  when  $\Sigma_0 = \{\bullet\}$ , ie. there is a single generating object. It is a well-known fact, dating back at least to [6] that  $\mathbf{Free}_{\mathbf{CMon}}$  is isomorphic to the skeletal<sup>1</sup> category  $\mathbf{FinOrd}$  of finite sets and functions.

For our purposes it is important to study a slightly different ‘functional’ representation of  $\mathbf{Free}_{\mathbf{CMon}}$ , called  $\mathbf{FinFun}$ , which refers more explicitly to the way these structures are implementable. To introduce it, we will first need to give necessary background on arrays and models of parallel computation.

## 2.2.2 Finite Functions in Terms of Arrays and Parallel Programs

The main primitive of our implementation is the *array*, so we begin with notation.

**Definition 2.13** (Array). *An **array  $x$  of length  $N$  with elements in  $S$**  is an element of  $N^S$ . The  $i^{\text{th}}$  element of an array  $x$  is denoted  $x_i$ , defined as long as  $x$  has length  $N > i$ .*

*Explicitly, an array  $x$  is an ordered list of  $N$  elements  $\langle x_0, \dots, x_{N-1} \rangle$ . with each  $x_i \in S$ . The empty array is denoted  $\langle \rangle$ ,*

It will also be useful to have dedicated notation for finite sets.

**Definition 2.14** (Finite Set). *Let  $A \in \mathbb{N}$  be a natural number. Then the **finite set**  $\{0, 1, \dots, A-1\}$  is denoted  $\bar{A}$ .*

<sup>1</sup>Skeletal means that we identify isomorphic objects, i.e. sets with the same number of elements.

In the sequential RAM model of computation, a single operation takes a single timestep. For example, reading or writing to a memory location. However, there are a variety of models of *parallel* computation [19]. In this paper, we will use two variants of the Parallel RAM (PRAM) model [19, p.11, p.15]. The first of these is the PRAM CREW (Concurrent Read / Exclusive Write) model, which we will simply write as PRAM. This assumes that, while many processors can read a memory location in parallel, conflicting writes by multiple processors to the same location are forbidden.

A slightly stronger model is the PRAM CRCW (Concurrent Read / Concurrent Write), which allows multiple processors to write to the same memory location in parallel. When conflicting writes occur, an arbitrary processor succeeds. We will need the full power of the PRAM CRCW only rarely. Unless specified explicitly, we hereafter only assume the PRAM CREW model.

The algorithms presented in this paper are all in terms of a small number of primitive integer array operations. We give a table of these with their sequential and PRAM CREW complexities in terms of the size of the input  $n$  below. Note that two operations (**repeat** and **segmented arange**) have complexities in terms of their input *values*, and we use  $|s|$  to denote the size of the array  $s$ .

Primitive	Complexity (Sequential)	Complexity (PRAM)
<b>arange</b>	$O(n)$	$O(1)$
<b>zeros</b>	$O(n)$	$O(1)$
<b>sum</b>	$O(n)$	$O(\log n)$
<b>prefix sum</b>	$O(n)$	$O(\log n)$
<b>dense integer sort</b>	$O(n)$	$O(\log n)$
<b>concatenate</b>	$O(n)$	$O(\log n)$
<b>connected components</b>	$O(n)$	$O(\log n)$ (CRCW)
<b>repeat(x, s)</b>	$O(\text{sum}(s))$	$O(\log  s )$
<b>segmented arange(s)</b>	$O(\text{sum}(s))$	$O(\log  s )$

We include under the banner of **sum** and **prefix sum** other operations like **max** and **all** which can be implemented with parallel scans and folds. For a more in-depth explanation of these primitives, we direct the reader to our implementation, which can be found at <https://yarrow.id>. However, we give a brief overview now. The **dense integer sort** operation refers specifically to the subset of sorting algorithms operating on positive integer arrays of length  $n$  whose largest element is  $O(n)$ . Such sorts can be computed in  $O(n)$  sequential time by counting sort, and in  $O(\log n)$  parallel time by radix sort. The **concatenate** operation simply copies multiple arrays to a single contiguous memory location. There are some subtleties to its use in the parallel case, which we discuss further in Section 9.

The **repeat(x, s)** operation takes two equal-length arrays, and outputs the array whose entries are those of  $x$  repeated a number of times indicated by  $s$ . So for example, **repeat**( $\langle a, b, c \rangle, \langle 0, 1, 2 \rangle$ ) =  $\langle b, c, c \rangle$ . The **arange** primitive outputs a length  $n$  array of indices  $\langle 0, 1, \dots, n-1 \rangle$ , and **segmented arange** computes a concatenation of such arrays whose lengths are specified by the input argument  $s$ . Note also that **segmented arange** can in fact be expressed in terms of the other operations, and so is not required to be a primitive.

Finally, note that the time complexity of most operations is at most  $O(n)$  (sequential) and  $O(\log n)$  (PRAM CRCW). Most of the algorithms we present later will be in terms of a constant number of each of such operations, thus guaranteeing linear (sequential) and logarithmic (parallel) time complexity.

With our model of parallel computation chosen, we can now give basic complexity results for operations on finite functions defined as arrays.

### 2.2.3 FinFun: Finite Functions as Arrays

In addition to the presentation in terms of the category  $\text{Free}_{\text{CMon}}$ , mentioned in Section 2.2.1, finite functions may also be represented as *integer arrays*. This category, which we call **FinFun**, will be central to our implementation. Thus we describe it in detail, including complexity results for several operations.

**Definition 2.15** (FinFun). *The category FinFun has objects the natural numbers  $\mathbb{N}$ . An arrow  $f : A \rightarrow B$  is an element  $f \in \overline{B}^A$ . Explicitly,  $f$  is an array of values  $\langle x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{A-1} \rangle$  where each  $x_i \in \overline{B}$ .*

We can represent an arrow of FinFun by its target (codomain) and a table (array) of elements of its outputs. The source (domain) of an arrow is the length of its element table.

```
class FiniteFunction:
    target: int
    table: array

@property
def source(self):
    return len(self.table)
```

**Proposition 2.16.** *FinFun forms a category with identities and composition as below.*

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{id} : A \rightarrow A & f \circ g : A \rightarrow C \\ \text{id} = \langle 0, 1, \dots, A-1 \rangle & (f \circ g)(i) \mapsto g_{f_i} \end{array}$$

*Proof.* Composition is well-defined:  $g_{f_i}$  is always defined precisely because  $f(i) \in \overline{B}$ . The identity law is satisfied because  $\text{id}_i = i$ , so for an arrow  $f : A \rightarrow B$  we have  $(\text{id}_A \circ f)_i = \text{id}_{f_i} = f_i$  and  $(f \circ \text{id}_B)_i = f_{\text{id}_i} = f_i$  for all  $i$ . Finally, observe that composition is associative: let  $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \xrightarrow{h} D$  be arrows. Then we have  $((f \circ g) \circ h)_i = h_{(f \circ g)_i} = h_{g_{f_i}} = (g \circ h)_{f_i} = (f \circ (g \circ h))_i$   $\square$

The identity morphism and composition of morphisms can be implemented as follows.

```
@staticmethod
def identity(n: int):
    return arange(0, n) # [0, ..., n - 1]

@staticmethod
def compose(f, g):
    assert f.target == g.source
    return FiniteFunction(g.target, g.table[f.table])
```

**Proposition 2.17** (Complexity of composition in FinFun). *Let  $f : A \rightarrow B$  and  $g : B \rightarrow C$  be morphisms of FinFun. Computing the composite  $f \circ g$  has  $O(A)$  sequential and  $O(1)$  PRAM CREW time complexity.*

*Proof.* The composite  $f \circ g : A \rightarrow C$  is an integer array of  $A$  elements in the set  $\overline{C}$ . For each  $i \in \overline{A}$ , Each element  $(f \circ g)_i$  is computed by a single memory lookup, for a total of  $O(A)$  operations. In the parallel (PRAM CREW) setting, each lookup can be performed in parallel, giving  $O(1)$  time complexity.  $\square$

## 2.2.4 FinFun as a strict monoidal category

The category of finite sets and functions has initial objects and coproducts, from which it can be made into a strict symmetric monoidal category.

**Proposition 2.18.** *0 is the initial object in FinFun.*

*Proof.* Let  $B$  be an object in FinFun. Then there is a unique morphism  $? : 0 \rightarrow B$ : the empty array  $\langle \rangle$ .  $\square$

In code, the initial map `initial : 0  $\rightarrow$  B` returns the empty array.

```
@classmethod
def initial(cls, B):
    return FiniteFunction(B, zeros(0))
```

**Proposition 2.19** (Coproducts in FinFun). *Let  $f : A_0 \rightarrow B$  and  $g : A_1 \rightarrow B$  be arrows of FinFun. The coproduct of objects  $A_0$  and  $A_1$  is given by addition  $A_0 + A_1$ , with injections defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_0 : A_0 &\rightarrow A_0 + A_1 & \iota_1 : A_1 &\rightarrow A_0 + A_1 \\ \iota_0 &= \langle 0, 1, \dots, A_0 - 1 \rangle & \iota_1 &= \langle A_0, A_0 + 1, \dots, A_1 - 1 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

*Then the coproduct  $f + g : A_0 + A_1 \rightarrow B$ , denoted  $f + g$ , is given by array concatenation:*

$$f + g = \langle f_0, f_1 \dots f_{A_0-1}, g_0, g_1 \dots g_{A_1-1} \rangle$$

*Proof.* This choice of  $f + g$  commutes with the injections:

$$(\iota_0 \circlearrowleft (f + g))_i = (f + g)_{\iota_0 i} = [f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{A_0-1}]_i = f_i$$

and

$$(\iota_1 \circlearrowleft [f, g])_i = [f, g]_{\iota_1 i} = [g_0, g_1, \dots, g_{A_1-1}]_i = g_i$$

Moreover, this choice must be unique: if even an entry in the array  $f + g$  is not as specified above, then the diagram does not commute.  $\square$

The coproduct  $f + g : A_0 + A_1 \rightarrow B$  of maps  $f : A_0 \rightarrow B$  and  $g : A_1 \rightarrow B$  is implemented as array concatenation.

```
def coproduct(f, g):
    assert f.target == g.target
    target = f.target
    table = concatenate(f.table, g.table)
    return FiniteFunction(target, table)
```

Naturally, since FinOrd is cocomplete and we claimed that  $\text{FinOrd} \cong \text{FinFun}$ , we expect FinFun to have coequalizers making it cocomplete as well. This is indeed the case; a well-known result is below.

**Proposition 2.20** (Coequalizers in FinFun). *Let  $f, g : A \rightarrow B$  be parallel arrows in FinFun, and  $G$  the graph of  $B$  vertices and edges  $\{(f(i), g(i)) \mid i \in \overline{A}\}$ . If  $Q$  is the number of connected components of  $G$ , and  $q : B \rightarrow Q$  is the function labeling a vertex with its connected component, Then  $q = c(f, g)$  is the coequalizer of  $f, g$*

Coequalizers can be computed directly using the connected components algorithm. For the purposes of implementation, we assume the existence of a primitive function `connected_components` :  $B^A \times B^A \rightarrow Q \times Q^B$ , which computes connected components from a graph encoded as an adjacency list. That is, its two arguments are an array of edge sources and targets, respectively. Then we can implement coequalizers of finite functions as follows.

```
def coequalizer(f, g):
    assert f.source == g.source
    assert f.target == g.target
    Q, q = connected_components(f.table, g.table)
    return FiniteFunction(Q, q)
```

**Proposition 2.21** (Coequalizer Complexity). *Computing the coequalizer of finite functions  $f, g : A \rightarrow B$  has  $O(A + B)$  sequential and  $O(\log(A + B))$  PRAM CRCW time complexity.*

*Proof.* Clearly the complexity of computing coequalizers is the same as computing connected components. In the sequential case, connected components can be labeled in  $O(V + E)$  time for a graph  $G = (V, E)$  (see e.g. [10, Chapter 22]), and  $O(\log V)$  time (see [19, p. 218] or [24]) in the parallel (PRAM CRCW) case. Since the graph  $G$  has  $B$  vertices and  $A$  edges, it then follows that computing the coequalizer of  $f, g : A \rightarrow B$  in FinFun has  $O(A + B)$  sequential time complexity and  $O(\log(A + B))$  parallel (PRAM CRCW) time complexity.  $\square$

Initial objects and coproducts give `FinFun` the structure of a strict monoidal category. For morphisms  $f : A_0 \rightarrow B_0$  and  $g : A_1 \rightarrow B_1$ , the tensor product  $f \otimes g : A_0 \otimes A_1 \rightarrow B_0 \otimes B_1$  is given by  $(f \circledast \iota_0) + (g \circledast \iota_1)$ . However, tensor products can be written more directly.

**Proposition 2.22** (Tensor Product). *Let  $f : A_0 \rightarrow B_0$  and  $g : A_1 \rightarrow B_1$  be morphisms in `FinFun`. The tensor product  $f \otimes g$  is the array  $\langle f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{A_0}, (B_0 + g_0), (B_0 + g_1), \dots, (B_0 + g_{A_1}) \rangle$*

*Proof.* It is straightforward that  $f \circledast \iota_0$  is an array with the same entries as  $f$ , and that  $g \circledast \iota_1$  is an array with entries  $\langle B_0 + g_0, B_0 + g_1, \dots, B_0 + g_{B_1-1} \rangle$ . It is then immediate that the tensor product is the coproduct (concatenation) of these two arrays.  $\square$

The tensor product of morphisms can be implemented as follows, with time complexity the same as for the coproduct.

```
def tensor(f, g):
    table = concatenate([f.table, g.table + f.target])
    return FiniteFunction(f.target + g.target, table)
```

**Proposition 2.23.** *`FinFun` is a strict symmetric monoidal category.*

*Proof.* Symmetry is given in the usual way with  $\sigma := (\iota_1 + \iota_0) = \langle 1, 0 \rangle$ , which is evidently self-inverse. Strictness follows because concatenation of arrays is strictly associative, and concatenation with the empty array is the identity.  $\square$

One can easily show (see e.g., [21]) that there is an isomorphism  $\text{FinFun} \cong \text{FinOrd}$ , which also respects the symmetric monoidal structure of the two categories.

## 2.3 Cospans and Structured Cospans

Cospans (and more recently *structured* cospans [1]) are now commonly used to model ‘open’ systems. In particular, cospans are used in the combinatorial representation of string diagrams introduced in [4], and illustrated in Section 2.4 below. We therefore recall these concepts now.

**Definition 2.24.** *A **cospan** in a category  $\mathcal{C}$  is a pair of morphisms  $X \xrightarrow{s} W \xleftarrow{t} Y$ . We call the maps  $s$  and  $t$  the **legs** of the cospan, the objects  $X$  and  $Y$  the **feet**, and  $W$  the **apex**.*

*Structured* cospans are a recently introduced [1] double-categorical framework for open systems. The work we present here can be interpreted as a re-examination of the combinatorial characterisation of string diagrams in [4] through the lens of this framework.

**Definition 2.25** (from [1]). *Let  $L : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  be a functor, which we call the **structuring functor**. A **structured cospan** is a cospan in  $\mathcal{D}$  of the form  $L(A) \xrightarrow{s} W \xleftarrow{t} L(B)$ .*


We will not require the double-categorical structure of structured cospans here. However, by [1, Corollary 3.11] structured cospans form a symmetric monoidal category when  $L$  is left-adjoint and  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  have finite colimits. Composition in this category is by pushout, and tensor product is the pointwise tensor product of the ‘legs’ of the cospan.

**Remark 2.26.** *Closely related, but not used in this paper, is the construction of decorated cospans [12]. The relationship between decorated and structured cospans is examined in [2].*

## 2.4 Hypergraphs and Bipartite Graphs for String Diagram Representation

The authors of [4] provide the a combinatorial characterisation of string diagrams as cospans of hypergraphs. Although we will not require the technical details in this paper, we now give a quick sketch of the basic idea, which is useful to keep in mind for later developments. A string diagram

(left) and its hypergraph representation (right) are depicted below.




In this representation, *hyperedges* (depicted as white squares) are labeled with generators, and *nodes* (depicted as ■) represent the wires of the string diagram. Importantly, the hyperedges in this representation have *ordered lists* of nodes as their sources and targets. Being a cospan, the representation actually consists of three distinct hypergraphs. The hypergraph in the middle (on grey background) encodes the internal structure of the string diagram. The outermost hypergraphs (on blue background) are discrete, i.e. they only containing nodes. The two morphisms from the outermost hypergraphs to the middle one, whose assignments are indicated with dotted arrows, indicate which nodes constitute the left and the right interface of the hypergraph. This corresponds to the ‘dangling wires’ of the string diagrams, which allow sequential composition on the left and on the right with other string diagrams.

As illustrated in [4], this representation is known to be an isomorphism of categories when the string diagrams come from a hypergraph category — so that there is a Special Frobenius structure on each object. When considering string diagrams in a symmetric monoidal category, without extra structure, then the representation is an isomorphism only if we restrict to so-called *monogamous* cospans. Monogamicity is a requirement on the way interfaces, nodes, and hyperedges interact with each other; we refer to [4] for a full definition, and give an equivalent one in Section 6.

However, in order to work with such hypergraphs on a computer, one must choose how their data should be represented. For example, one might choose to represent each hyperedge as a pair of ordered integer lists. However, in order to define parallel algorithms suitable for e.g., GPUs, we will need a ‘flat’ array representation. The issue of how to *efficiently* encode these hypergraphs is addressed in [26], where the authors show that encoding (monogamous) hypergraphs as bipartite graphs leads to an efficient representation as sparse matrices. However, [26] is limited to the *monogamous* case, and so is only suitable for representing string diagrams of symmetric monoidal categories without the additional Special Frobenius structure. Further, [26] only accounts for categories with a single generating objects, and the representation described does not explicitly represent diagrams as cospans.

Our work generalises the approach of [26] to the case of string diagrams equipped with a chosen Special Frobenius structure. This addition allows us to define in Section 10 an efficient algorithm for taking reverse derivatives of large diagrams, Returning to our running example, the addition of this structure allows for the representation of string diagrams such as the one below left as cospans of bipartite multigraphs (below right).



## 2.5 ACSets

One of our main contributions is to encode the hypergraph structure of [4] in such a way that allows for *parallel* algorithms on the datastructure. This is possible thanks to the construction of ACSets, first described in [21]. Informally, ACSets are a class of category which represent ‘array-based data with attributes’. For example, a graph with node and edge labels has data (the adjacency information of the graph) and attributes (the labels). We now informally recall the ACSets of [21], beginning with the definition of a *schema*.

**Definition 2.27** (Schema [21], Informal). *A **schema** is a finitely presented (small) category  $S$  which is ‘bipartite’: objects of  $S$  are either in  $S_0$  or  $S_1$ , respectively.*

Intuitively, a schema specifies the relationships between data and attributes of a category. Concretely, the objects in  $S_0$  (the data) will map to finite sets, and those in  $S_1$  (the attributes) to some chosen typing.

**Definition 2.28** (ACSets [21]). *Given a schema  $S$  and a typing map  $K : S_1 \rightarrow \text{Set}$ , the category  $\text{ACSet}_K^S$  has objects functors  $F : S \rightarrow \text{Set}$  which restrict to  $F|_{S_1} = K$  and arrows  $\alpha : F_0 \rightarrow F_1$  the natural transformations where  $\alpha|_{S_1} = \text{id}$ .*

The *typing map*  $K$  defines the type of attributes of data. For example, a graph with vertices labeled in  $\mathbb{N}$  might be modeled as an ACSet whose schema has three objects:  $S_0 = \{V, E\}$  and  $S_1 = \{L\}$ , and whose typing map is  $K(L) = \mathbb{N}$ . The requirement that arrows  $\alpha$  must have  $\alpha|_{S_1} = \text{id}$  ensures that morphisms of ACSets cannot arbitrarily modify attribute data.

In this paper, we will only need to consider *finite* ACSets: those for which the objects  $F$  restrict to functors  $F|_{S_0} \rightarrow \text{FinFun}$ . Notice that this means that our datastructure consists of dense integer arrays: this is critical for making our implementation suitable for parallel hardware such as GPUs. In the next section, we will see two examples of ACSets which form the basis of our datastructure.

## 3 Representing Diagram Wirings with ACSets

We can now begin to define our datastructure for representing string diagrams as structured cospans. In this section, we define two categories, **Wires** and **BipartiteMultigraph**, which model the ‘internal wiring’ of a string diagram. These categories are related by an adjunction  $L : \text{Wires} \rightarrow \text{BipartiteMultigraph}$  which will serve as the ‘structuring functor’ when we come to define string diagrams as structured cospans  $L(A) \xrightarrow{s} G \xleftarrow{t} L(B)$  in Section 4. The objects of **Wires** will serve as the feet of the cospan and are analogous to the discrete hypergraphs of [4].

To make the role of the two categories more clear, we begin with examples. Pictured below left is a string diagram, and below right the bipartite multigraph corresponding its ‘internal wiring’.




The bipartite structure means that there are two kinds of node. The  $\blacksquare$ -nodes represent the *wires* of the string diagram, and are labeled with the generating objects of  $\Sigma_0$ . Meanwhile, the  $\circ$ -nodes represent operations, and are labeled in  $\Sigma_1$ .

Edges of the graph are labeled with a natural number: An edge  $\blacksquare \rightarrow \circ$  labeled  $i$  denotes that a given wire connects to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  source port of an operation. Similarly, an edge  $\circ \rightarrow \blacksquare$  denotes that a wire connects to a given *target* port of an operation.

Notice however that this information is missing. Namely, it is not specified which of the  $\blacksquare$ -nodes correspond to the *boundary* of the string diagram; that is, which are the left and right ‘dangling

wires’. This is the purpose of the category **Wires**, whose objects are thought of as labeled finite sets, and whose morphisms are ‘label preserving maps’. Pictured below is an L-structured cospan.




The center grey box depicts the apex of the cospan: a bipartite multigraph. At the edges are two objects of **Wires** in blue boxes. Dashed arrows between them correspond to the legs of the structured cospan, and can be thought of as morphisms of **Wires**.


To formalise this construction, we now give the precise details of the categories **Wires** and **BipartiteMultigraph** as **ACSets**, as well as the structuring functor **L**.

### 3.1 Wires: The Category of Multi-Sorted Finite Functions

We now describe **Wires**, the category of ‘multi-sorted’ finite sets and functions. As with **FinOrd**, these functions are presented by **CMon**( $\Sigma_0$ ). The only difference is that the set of generating objects  $\Sigma_0$  is now arbitrary, instead of being restricted to a single object. For example, given generating objects  $A$  and  $B$ , we can construct morphisms like the one below.



The *cospans* of such morphisms (below right) correspond to string diagrams with generators of **Frob** like the one below left.



Note carefully that the legs of the cospan are now also *label preserving*. That is, the source and target of each dashed arrow have the same label. This property arises by defining **Wires** as a category of **ACSets** where labels are attributes.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\Sigma$  be an arbitrary monoidal signature. The category of ‘labeled wires’ is denoted  $\mathbf{Wires}_\Sigma$  and defined as the category  $\mathbf{ACSet}_{K_\Sigma}^{\mathcal{W}}$  whose schema  $\mathcal{W}$  is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{W} := \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{W}_0 & & \mathcal{W}_1 \\ \boxed{W} & \xrightarrow{w_n} & \boxed{\text{Ob}} \end{array}$$


and whose typing map  $K_\Sigma$  is defined

$$K_\Sigma(\text{Ob}) := \Sigma_0$$


Given a ‘labelling function’  $l : B \rightarrow \Sigma_0$ , we write  $\mathcal{W}(l)$  for the object of **Wires** with  $\mathcal{W}(l)(W) = B$  and  $\mathcal{W}(l)(w_n) = l$ . Given a finite function  $f : A \rightarrow B$  we write  $\mathcal{W}(f, l)$  for the morphism of **Wires**  $f : \mathcal{W}(f \circ l) \rightarrow \mathcal{W}(l)$

**Remark 3.2.** Arrows  $\alpha : F_0 \rightarrow F_1$  in **Wires** are natural transformations with a single component,  $\alpha_W$ . To reduce the notational burden, we will sometimes omit this subscript. However, one should think of these maps as ‘label-preserving finite functions’ between labeled finite sets.

**Example 3.3.** Let  $F$  and  $G$  be objects of  $\mathbf{Wires}_\Sigma$ . Concretely,  $F$  consists of a set  $F(W)$  and a morphism  $F(w_n) : F(W) \rightarrow \Sigma_0$ . Similarly,  $G$  is a set  $G(W)$  and morphism  $G(w_n) : G(W) \rightarrow \Sigma_0$ . A label preserving map  $\alpha$  between  $F$  and  $G$  is a natural transformation with a single non-identity component,  $\alpha_W$ . An example of a label-preserving map for  $F(W) = 3$  and  $G(W) = 3$  is given below.



Note that the finite function  $\alpha_W$  can be depicted formally as the string diagram below, where we have labeled incoming wires according to  $F(w_n)$  and outgoing wires according to  $G(w_n)$ .



This example illustrates how morphisms of  $\mathbf{Wires}$  indeed correspond to the theory of commutative monoids over an arbitrary set of generating objects  $\Sigma_0$ .

We can alternatively think of the objects of  $\mathbf{Wires}$  as being discrete vertex-labeled graphs. When we come to define the structuring functor  $L$ , an object  $A \in \mathbf{Wires}$  will map to the *discrete* bipartite multigraph  $L(A) \in \mathbf{BipartiteMultigraph}$  having only  $\blacksquare$ -nodes.

In fact, morphisms in  $\mathbf{Wires}$  will form the ‘Frobenius Half-Spiders’ in an arbitrary Hypergraph category.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a hypergraph category presented by a signature  $\Sigma$ . There is a unique strict symmetric monoidal identity-on-objects functor  $S : \mathbf{Wires}_\Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  which maps the monoid structure of  $\mathbf{CMon}$  to the monoid structure of  $\mathbf{Frob}$ .

*Proof.* Recall that  $\mathbf{FinOrd}$  is presented by  $\mathbf{CMon}$ , and the morphisms of  $\mathbf{Wires}$  are natural transformations with a single non-identity component in  $\mathbf{FinOrd}$ . It follows that the morphisms of  $\mathbf{Wires}_\Sigma$  are also presented by  $\mathbf{CMon}$  with the set of generating objects  $\Sigma_0$ . Thus, the action of  $S$  is fixed on all generators, composition, and tensor products, and is unique.  $\square$

We call such morphisms ‘Half-Spiders’.

**Definition 3.5** (Half-Spider). Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a hypergraph category presented by a signature  $\Sigma$ . A **Frobenius Half-Spider** in  $\mathcal{C}$  is a morphism in the image of  $S : \mathbf{Wires}_\Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ . We will sometimes write  $S(f)$  for an arrow  $f \in \mathbf{FinFun}$  to mean  $S(\mathcal{W}(f, l))$  when  $l$  is clear from context.

Alternatively, half-spiders are those morphisms in a hypergraph category built by tensor and composition from the generators  $\text{---}$ ,  $\text{X}$ ,  $\text{Y}$ , and  $\text{+}$ . In addition, recall that all hypergraph categories have a dagger [13, Section 1.3.3]. Consequently, there is a second functor mapping morphisms of  $\mathbf{FreeCMon}$  to the *comonoid* structure of a hypergraph category:  $f \mapsto S(f)^\dagger$ . Thus, these ‘dagger half-spiders’ are morphisms built from  $\text{---}$ ,  $\text{X}$ ,  $\text{Y}$ , and  $\text{+}$ .


Putting these two functors together characterises the Frobenius spiders in a Hypergraph category. Namely, Frobenius spiders will be those morphisms of the form  $S(f) \ ; \ S(g)^\dagger$ . This will be stated more formally in Proposition 4.7.

We will now describe bipartite multigraphs, accounting for the additional structure required to represent the *operations* in a string diagram.

## 3.2 Bipartite Multigraphs

Bipartite Multigraphs can be regarded as objects of Wires decorated with additional data. More formally, they are given by the following ACSet.

**Definition 3.6.** A *bipartite multigraph* is an object of the category  $\text{BipartiteMultigraph} := \text{ACSet}_K^S$ , where  $S$  is the schema functor defined below




and the typing map  $K : \mathcal{S}_1 \rightarrow \text{Set}$  is defined as

$$K(\text{Ob}) := \Sigma_0 \quad K(\text{Sig}) := \Sigma_1 \quad K(\text{Port}) := \mathbb{N}$$

Not every bipartite multigraph represents a valid ‘internal wiring’ of a string diagram. Note for example that the schema above does not prevent a bipartite multigraph with a generator having two edges with the same ‘port label’ from a  $\blacksquare$  to a  $\circ$ -node.

**Example 3.7.** The following bipartite multigraph is ‘ill-formed’ for two reasons.



First, there are two  $\blacksquare \rightarrow \circ$  edges labeled 0. This conflicts with the interpretation of edge labels as defining which ‘port’ of a generator is connected to a wire. Secondly, there is no output edge  $\circ \rightarrow \blacksquare$  labeled 0: we need every output port of  $g$  to be accounted for.


In order to rule out objects like the above, we will need to speak of ‘well-formed’ bipartite multigraphs.

**Definition 3.8** (Well-Formed Bipartite Multigraph). A bipartite multigraph  $G$  is **well-formed with respect to a signature**  $\Sigma$  there are chosen typings  $(a : X \rightarrow \Sigma_0^*, b : X \rightarrow \Sigma_0^*)$  so that for each  $x \in G(X)$  so that  $(a(x), b(x)) \in \tau(G(w_n)(x))$ , both  $\langle x_i, \text{port}_i \rangle$  and  $\langle x_o, \text{port}_o \rangle$  are mono, and

$$\forall e \in E_i \quad w_n(w_i(e)) = a(x_i(e))_{\text{port}_i(e)} \quad \forall e \in E_o \quad w_n(w_o(e)) = b(x_o(e))_{\text{port}_o(e)}$$

**Remark 3.9.** A consequence of Definition 3.8 is that in a well-formed bipartite multigraph  $G$ ,  $G(E_i)$  and  $G(E_o)$  equal the total arity and coarity of generators  $G(X)$ , respectively.

**Remark 3.10.** The above definition of well-formedness specifically allows for polymorphic generators. More precisely, since an operation  $g \in \Sigma_1$  has a typing relation, we may have for example a bipartite multigraph like the following.



Notice that there are two  $\circ$ -nodes labeled  $g$  with different types: one  $g : A \rightarrow I$ , and the other  $g : B \otimes C \rightarrow D$ . Such a diagram is considered well-formed as long as both such types exist in the typing relation.

When defining algorithms on structured cospans of well-formed bipartite multigraphs, we will need the following preservation theorem. This will guarantee that composites of structured cospans built from well-formed diagrams are also well-formed.

**Proposition 3.11** (Preservation of Well-Formedness). *If a morphism of bipartite multigraphs  $\alpha : F_0 \rightarrow F_1$  has all components permutations except for  $\alpha_W$ , and  $F_0$  is well-formed, then  $F_1$  is well-formed.*

*Proof.* Observe that the number of edges, generators, and their attribute data is preserved. Moreover, the attributes of  $\blacksquare$ -nodes are also preserved by naturality, so  $F_1$  is well-formed.  $\square$

Finally, before defining string diagrams as structured cospans, we first formalise the relationship between the categories `Wires` and `BipartiteMultigraph` as an adjunction. Observe that `Wires` is a subcategory of `BipartiteMultigraph`, and therefore embeds into it.

**Definition 3.12.** *Denote by  $L : \text{Wires} \rightarrow \text{BipartiteMultigraph}$  the (identity-on-objects) inclusion functor.*

As observed in [21, p.18],  $L$  is left-adjoint to the forgetful functor.

**Proposition 3.13** ( $L$  is left-adjoint). *Let  $R : \text{BipartiteMultigraph} \rightarrow \text{Wires}$  be the forgetful functor mapping a bipartite multigraph to its set of wires and their labels. Then  $L$  is left-adjoint to  $R$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha : L(A) \rightarrow G$  be an arrow in `BipartiteMultigraph`, and let  $\epsilon_G : L(R(G)) \rightarrow G$  be the natural transformation whose components are defined as follows.

$$\epsilon_{G_Y} = \begin{cases} \text{id}_W & \text{if } Y = W \\ ? & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $? = \bullet \dashv$  is the initial map. Then there is a unique  $f$  such that  $L(f) \circ \epsilon_G = \alpha$ . Since composition of morphisms in `BipartiteMultigraph` is pointwise, we must have that  $(L(f) \circ \epsilon_G)_Y = \alpha_Y$  for each component  $Y$ . We therefore must have  $L(f)_W = \alpha_W$ , and  $L(f)_Y = ? : 0 \rightarrow 0$ , and so  $f = \mathcal{W}(\alpha_W, G(w_n))$  by naturality.  $\square$

The left-adjointness of  $L$  says that any morphism of bipartite multigraphs of the form  $\alpha : L(A) \rightarrow G$  is completely determined by its  $W$  component  $\alpha_W : L(A)(W) \rightarrow G(W)$ . When we define string diagrams in Section 4, this fact will allow us to define composition in terms of coequalizers of `FinFun`. In addition, the bipartite multigraphs in the image of  $L$  are particularly important in the next section. We therefore introduce the following notation.

**Definition 3.14** (Discrete Bipartite Multigraph). *Given a labeling  $w : A \rightarrow \Sigma_0$ , the **discrete bipartite multigraph** for  $w$  is denoted  $D(w) := L(\mathcal{W}(w))$ . Given a bipartite multigraph  $G$ , we overload the same notation and write  $D(G) := L(R(G))$ .*

With these definitions in hand, we can finally define string diagrams as structured cospans.

## 4 String Diagrams as Structured Cospans

We can now define our category of string diagrams as structured cospans.

**Definition 4.1** (Diagram). *Fix a monoidal signature  $\Sigma$ . A **diagram** over  $\Sigma$  is an  $L$ -structured cospan  $L(A) \xrightarrow{s} G \xleftarrow{t} L(B)$  where  $G$  is well-formed with respect to  $\Sigma$ . We say the **type** of such a diagram is  $A \rightarrow B$ .*

Note that diagrams form a symmetric monoidal category as described in [1, Corollary 3.11]. This follows because  $L$  is left-adjoint and therefore preserves colimits.

**Definition 4.2.** *The symmetric monoidal category of diagrams is denoted  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}}$  and defined to be the subcategory of  $\text{L}\text{Csp}(\text{BipartiteMultigraph})$  defined in [1, Corollary 3.11] whose objects are those of  $\text{Wires}$ , and whose arrows are isomorphism classes of diagrams.*

In order to define  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}}$  as a subcategory, it is important to verify that composition and tensor product preserve well-formedness of diagrams. This follows from Proposition 3.11, and we give a proof in Corollary 4.19.

Composition of structured cospans is by pushout, and tensor product is pointwise; data-parallel algorithms for both will shortly be given in Propositions 4.16 and 4.11, respectively. In fact, the remainder of this section is dedicated to showing (1) how to represent diagrams efficiently; (2) how to construct ‘primitive’ diagrams like identity and symmetry; and (3) data-parallel algorithms for tensor and composition. In addition, the aim of this section is to serve as a guide to implementing the algorithms described. We therefore include several pseudo-Python code listings in several cases.

## 4.1 Representing Diagrams Efficiently

The naive representation of Definition 4.1 would require a full bipartite multigraph for each of the feet of the cospan as well as a complete morphism of bipartite multigraphs for the legs. However, in order to represent large diagrams it is important to be economical with data. We therefore exploit that  $\text{L}$  is left-adjoint in order to show that much of this data is redundant. This will also simplify the definition of several algorithms in the rest of the paper.

**Proposition 4.3.** *There is a bijective correspondence between diagrams and triples  $(s, t, G)$  where  $A \xrightarrow{s} G(W) \xleftarrow{t} B$  is a cospan in  $\text{FinFun}$ .*

*Proof.* We first show that any diagram uniquely defines such a triple. Let  $\text{L}(A) \xrightarrow{\sigma} G \xleftarrow{\tau} \text{L}(B)$  be a diagram. Since  $\text{L}$  is left-adjoint (Proposition 3.13), there are unique morphisms  $s, t$  of  $\text{Wires}_{\Sigma}$  such that  $\text{L}(s) \circ \epsilon_G = \sigma$  and  $\text{L}(t) \circ \epsilon_G = \tau$ . By virtue of being morphisms of  $\text{Wires}_{\Sigma}$ ,  $s$  and  $t$  are natural transformations with a single non-identity component defined on  $W$ . We may therefore think of them as morphisms of  $\text{FinFun}$ .

In the reverse direction, suppose that  $(s, t, G)$  is a triple where  $A \xrightarrow{s} G(W) \xleftarrow{t} B$  is a cospan in  $\text{FinFun}$ . This defines a diagram  $\text{L}(A) \xrightarrow{\sigma} G \xleftarrow{\tau} \text{L}(B)$  in the following way. We must take  $\sigma = \text{L}(\mathcal{W}(s, G((w_n)))) \circ \epsilon_G$  and  $\tau = \text{L}(\mathcal{W}(t, G(w_n))) \circ \epsilon_G$   $\square$

This correspondence means that diagrams can be written in code as the following `Diagram` class.

```
class Diagram:
    s: FiniteFunction
    t: FiniteFunction
    G: BipartiteMultigraph
```

We will now use this alternate representation to define primitive diagrams and algorithms for tensor and composition. Note that in the remainder of this section we take the 2-categorical perspective, and consider specific diagrams (i.e., 1-cells) rather than isomorphism classes of diagrams. This is more natural from the perspective of the programmer working with diagrams, since one typically works with a representative of an isomorphism class instead of the class itself.

## 4.2 Primitive Diagrams

**Proposition 4.4.** *Given an object  $\mathcal{W}(w) \in \text{Wires}$ , The **identity diagram** is represented by the triple  $(\text{id}, \text{id}, \text{D}(w))$  where  $\text{D}(w)$  is the discrete bipartite multigraph (Definition 3.14).*

*Proof.* For an object  $A = \mathcal{W}(w)$  of  $\text{Wires}$ , the identity structured cospan is  $\text{L}(A) \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \text{L}(A) \xleftarrow{\text{id}} \text{L}(A)$ . We must therefore have  $s = t = \text{id}$ , and  $\text{L}(A) = \text{D}(\text{L}(A))$  by definition.  $\square$

In code, the identity diagram is constructed as follows.

```

@classmethod
def identity(cls, wn: FiniteFunction):
    s = FiniteFunction.identity(wn.source)
    t = FiniteFunction.identity(wn.source)
    G = BipartiteMultigraph.discrete(wn)
    return Diagram(s, t, G)

```

The symmetry of  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  as given as follows.

**Proposition 4.5** (Symmetry/Twist Diagram). *Let  $a : A \rightarrow \Sigma_0$  and  $b : B \rightarrow \Sigma_0$  be labelings, then the **symmetry diagram** is given by  $(\text{id}_{A+B}, \sigma_{A,B}, D(a+b))$ .*

*Proof.* The symmetry structured cospan is given by  $L(A+B) \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{A+B}} L(A+B) \xleftarrow{\sigma_{A,B}} L(B+A)$ , and so the result follows as in Proposition 4.4.  $\square$

$\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  is also a Hypergraph category, which means that every object is equipped with a Special Frobenius monoid. This is the reason we denote the category  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$ . In Section 6, we will see how the combinatorial condition of *monogamicity* introduced in [4] allows us to define the category  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma}$ , without this additional structure.

**Proposition 4.6.**  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  is a Hypergraph category

*Proof.*  $L$  is left-adjoint and therefore preserves colimits.  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  is then a hypergraph category by [1, Theorem 3.12]  $\square$

The Frobenius spiders (Definition 2.8) in  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  can be explicitly characterised as those cospans whose apexes are discrete hypergraphs with no operations. That is, diagrams of the form  $(s, t, L(A))$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** A diagram  $d = (s, t, G)$  is a Frobenius spider iff  $G = L(A)$  for some  $A$ .

*Proof.* Deferred to Appendix C  $\square$

In code, we provide a constructor for Frobenius spiders as follows.


```

def spider(s, t, w):
    G = BipartiteMultigraph.discrete(w)
    return Diagram(s, t, G)

```

Being a hypergraph category,  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  is equipped with a dagger in the following way.

**Proposition 4.8.** Hypergraph categories have a dagger given by



*Proof.* See [13, Section 1.3.3].  $\square$

The dagger of diagrams has a particularly convenient form: it swaps the legs of the cospan. That is,  $(s, t, G)^\dagger = (t, s, G)$ . We give a proof of this fact in Proposition C.5, but note here that it leads to the following simple implementation.

```

def dagger(self):
    return Diagram(self.t, self.s, self.G)

```

The final ‘primitive’ diagram we need to define is the *singleton*, representing a single generator of  $\Sigma_1$ .

**Definition 4.9** (Singleton Diagram). *Let  $x : 1 \rightarrow \Sigma_1$  be an operation, and  $a : A \rightarrow \Sigma_0$  and  $b : B \rightarrow \Sigma_0$  a typing of  $x$ . The **singleton** diagram of  $x$  is denoted  $\text{singleton}(a, b, x) := (\iota_0, \iota_1, G)$  where*

$$G(W) = A + B \quad G(E_i) = A \quad G(E_o) = B \quad G(X) = 1$$


and

$$G(w_i) = \iota_0 \quad G(w_o) = \iota_1 \quad G(x_i) = !_A \quad G(x_o) = !_B$$

$$G(\text{port}_i) = \text{id}_A \quad G(\text{port}_o) = \text{id}_B \quad G(w_n) = a + b \quad G(x_n) = x$$

We will sometimes write just `singleton(x)` when a chosen typing is assumed.

**Example 4.10.** Given a generator  $f : A \rightarrow B \otimes C$  represented as the element  $x = \langle f \rangle$ , and typing  $a = \langle A \rangle$  and  $b = \langle B, C \rangle$ , the singleton diagram `singleton(x)` is depicted below.



This definition translates directly to code as follows.

```
@classmethod
def singleton(cls, a: FiniteFunction, b: FiniteFunction, xn: FiniteFunction):
    G = BipartiteMultigraph(
        wi = F.inj0(a.source, b.source),
        wo = F.inj1(a.source, b.source),
        xi = F.terminal(a.source),
        xo = F.terminal(b.source),
        wn = a + b,
        pi = F.identity(a.source),
        po = F.identity(b.source),
        xn = xn)

    return Diagram(
        s=FiniteFunction.inj0(a.source, b.source),
        t=FiniteFunction.inj1(a.source, b.source),
        G=G)
```

### 4.3 Tensor Product of Diagrams

**Proposition 4.11** (Tensor Product of Diagrams). *The tensor product of diagrams  $c_0 := (s_0, t_0, G_0)$  and  $c_1 := (s_1, t_1, G_1)$  is the diagram  $c_0 \otimes c_1 := (s_0 \otimes s_1, t_0 \otimes t_1, G_0 \otimes G_1)$*

*Proof.* Let  $L(A_0) \xrightarrow{\sigma_0} G_0 \xleftarrow{\tau_0} L(B_0)$  and  $L(A_1) \xrightarrow{\sigma_1} G_1 \xleftarrow{\tau_1} L(B_1)$  be the respective structured cospans corresponding to  $c_0$  and  $c_1$  by Proposition 4.3. Then then tensor product  $c_0 \otimes c_1$  is the following structured cospan.

$$L(A_0 \otimes A_1) \xrightarrow{\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_1} G_0 \otimes G_1 \xleftarrow{\tau_0 \otimes \tau_1} L(B_0 \otimes B_1)$$

Since colimits are pointwise, we have  $(\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_1)_W = s_0 \otimes s_1$  and  $(\tau_0 \otimes \tau_1)_W = t_0 \otimes t_1$  and so the representation of the tensor product  $c_0 \otimes c_1$  is given by  $(s_0 \otimes s_1, t_0 \otimes t_1, G_0 \otimes G_1)$   $\square$

Once again, this yields a straightforward implementation:

```
def tensor(c0, c1):
    return Diagram(
        s = c0.s @ c1.s,
        t = c0.t @ c1.t,
        G = c0.G @ c1.G)
```

The sequential time complexity of tensor product is linear (sequential) and logarithmic (parallel) in the diagram components.

**Proposition 4.12.** *Let  $d_i = (s_i, t_i, G_i)$  be diagrams of type  $A_i \rightarrow B_i$  for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Computing the tensor product  $(s, t, G) = d_0 \otimes d_1$  has sequential time complexity*

$$O(A_0(W) + A_1(W)) + O(G(W)) + O(G(E_i)) + O(G(E_o)) + O(G(X)) + O(B_0(W) + B_1(W))$$

and PRAM time complexity  $O(1)$ .

*Proof.* Computing the coproduct of bipartite multigraphs has sequential time complexity  $O(G(W)) + O(G(E_i)) + O(G(E_o)) + O(G(X))$  since one must essentially just concatenate arrays. The PRAM time complexity of the same coproduct is  $O(1)$ . Then computing  $s_0 + s_1$  is  $O(A_0(W) + A_1(W))$  sequential and  $O(1)$  PRAM time complexity, and similarly for  $t_0 + t_1$ .  $\square$

It will later be convenient to have an efficient method of tensoring a large number of operations. In particular, simply repeating the binary tensor operation has poor complexity: quadratic in the sequential case and linear in the parallel case. We therefore give the following theorem, which gives a simpler closed form for the tensor product of  $n$  operations.

**Proposition 4.13.** *Let  $x : N \rightarrow \Sigma_1$  be a list of  $N$  operations, and for each operation  $x(i)$  let  $(a(i), b(i)) \in \tau(x)$  be a chosen typing so that  $a, b : N \rightarrow \Sigma_0^*$ . Let  $|a(i)|$  and  $|b(i)|$  denote the arity and coarity of  $x(i)$  respectively. Then the  $N$ -fold tensor product of operations  $x$  is isomorphic to the diagram  $(\iota_0, \iota_1, G)$ , where*

$$G(W) = K_i + K_o \quad G(E_i) = K_i \quad G(E_o) = K_o \quad G(X) = N$$

and

$$G(w_i) = \iota_0 \quad G(w_o) = \iota_1 \quad G(x_i) = \bigotimes_{i \in N} !_{|a(i)|} \quad G(x_o) = \bigotimes_{i \in N} !_{|b(i)|} \quad (8)$$

$$G(\text{port}_i) = \left( \sum_{i \in N} (\iota_0 : |a(i)| \rightarrow K_i) \right) \circlearrowleft \iota \quad G(\text{port}_i) = \left( \sum_{i \in N} (\iota_0 : |b(i)| \rightarrow K_o) \right) \circlearrowleft \iota$$

$$G(w_n) = \sum_{i \in N} (j \mapsto a(i)_j) + \sum_{i \in N} (j \mapsto b(i)_j) \quad G(x_n) = x$$

where:

- $K_i = \sum_{i \in N} |a(i)|$  is the total arity of all generators
- $K_o = \sum_{i \in N} |b(i)|$  is the total coarity of all generators
- $!_k : k \rightarrow 1$  is the unique terminal map.
- $\iota_0 : A \rightarrow A + B$  is the first injection of the coproduct in  $\text{FinFun}$
- $\iota$  denotes the canonical inclusion of a finite set into  $\mathbb{N}$

*Proof.* Induction. The empty (0-fold) and singleton (1-fold) diagrams are already in the form above, so it remains to check the inductive step.

Let  $c = (\iota_0, \iota_1, G)$  be the  $N$ -fold tensor of singleton diagrams  $x : N \rightarrow \Sigma_1$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $c \cong \bigotimes_{i \in N} \text{singleton}(x(i))$ . Now let  $s = (\iota_0, \iota_1, H)$  be a singleton diagram with the chosen typing  $(a' : 1 \rightarrow \Sigma_0^*, b' : 1 \rightarrow \Sigma_0^*)$ . It suffices to construct an isomorphism of structured cospans  $\alpha : c \otimes s \leftrightarrow d$  where  $d = (\iota_0, \iota_1, J)$  is in the required form.

Defining  $\alpha$  is straightforward. Set  $\alpha_W := \overline{\text{X}}$  with all other components as identities. Then one can compute that the image of  $w_i$  and  $w_o$  are the injections, and further that  $\alpha$  is an isomorphism of structured cospans. For example,

$$\alpha_{E_o} \circlearrowleft (G(w_o) + H(w_o)) \circlearrowleft \alpha_W = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \end{array} \overline{\text{X}} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \end{array} = \underline{\underline{\iota_1}}$$

with the other cases holding similarly.

Finally, we must have by naturality that  $J(w_n) = \alpha_W^{-1} \circ G(w_n) \otimes H(w_n)$ , and so it remains to verify that this morphism is in the desired form.

Observe that both  $G(w_n)$  and  $H(w_n)$  are coproducts of maps: by definition  $H(w_n) = a' + b'$  and  $G(w_n) = g_a + g_b$ , where  $g_a = \sum_{i \in N} (j \mapsto a(i)_j)$  and  $g_b = \sum_{i \in N} (j \mapsto b(i)_j)$ . for some  $a, b : N \rightarrow \Sigma_0^*$ . Then calculate as follows using the associativity and commutativity axioms.

$$G'(w_n) = \alpha_W^{-1} \circ (G(w_n) + H(w_n)) = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{G(w_n)} \\ \boxed{H(w_n)} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{g_a} \\ \boxed{g_b} \\ \boxed{a'} \\ \boxed{b'} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{g_a} \\ \boxed{a'} \\ \boxed{g_b} \\ \boxed{b'} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array}$$

We then have that  $g_a + a' = \sum_{i \in N} (j \mapsto a(i)_j) + (j \mapsto a'(0)_j)$  and  $g_b + b' = \sum_{i \in N} (j \mapsto b(i)_j) + (j \mapsto b'(0)_j)$ , and thus  $J(w_n) = \sum_{i \in N+1} (j \mapsto (a + a')(i)_j) + \sum_{i \in N+1} (j \mapsto (b + b')(i)_j)$ , as required.  $\square$

Computing the  $N$ -fold tensor product of operations can be computed in time linear (sequential) and logarithmic (parallel) in the resulting diagram, as witnessed by the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.14.** *Let  $x : N \rightarrow \Sigma_1$  be operations, and  $d = (\iota_0, \iota_1, G)$  their  $N$ -fold tensor product as defined in Proposition 4.13. The sequential time complexity of computing  $d$  is  $O(G(W)) + O(G(E_i)) + O(G(E_o)) + O(G(X))$  and the PRAM CREW time complexity is  $O(\log G(X))$*


*Proof.* Computing  $\iota_0$  and  $\iota_1$  is  $O(G(E_i))$  and  $O(G(E_o))$  respectively in the sequential case, and constant in the parallel case. Then to compute  $G$  in the sequential case is essentially just concatenation of arrays, and so the complexity is linear with respect to the size of each component, i.e.  $O(G(W)) + O(G(E_i)) + O(G(E_o)) + O(G(X))$ . Note that the  $G(x_n)$  component does not need to be computed, since it is given.

In the parallel case, assuming the data for typings  $a$  and  $b$  is provided as a segmented array, one can compute components using the **repeat** and **segmented arrange** functions, giving  $O(\log N) = O(\log G(X))$  time complexity.  $\square$

#### 4.4 Composition of Diagrams


Before giving the algorithm for composition of diagrams, we first illustrate it with an example. Composition in  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma + \text{Frob}}$  is by pushout, as computed via coequalizer. Concretely, when composing diagrams  $d_0 \circ d_1$ , the basic idea is to first take their tensor product, and then coequalize the wires corresponding to the shared boundary.

**Example 4.15.** *Let  $d_0 = (s_0, t_0, G_0)$  and  $d_1 = (s_1, t_1, G_1)$  be the diagrams illustrated below as cospans.*




The process of composition is illustrated with the following steps. We first tensor  $d_0$  and  $d_1$  (left)

and then identify the ■-nodes connected red arrow between them (right).



Finally, we quotient together all connected components in the graph of ■-nodes, and take the source map of  $d_0$ , and the target of  $d_1$ .



This amounts to coequalizing the maps  $t_0 \circ \iota_0$  and  $s_1 \circ \iota_1$ .

Let us now describe this process formally.

**Proposition 4.16** (Composition of Diagrams). *Let  $d_0 := (s_0, t_0, G_0) : A_0 \rightarrow A_1$  and  $d_1 := (s_1, t_1, G_1) : A_1 \rightarrow A_2$  be diagrams, and denote the coequalizer  $q := c \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{---} t_0 \text{---} \\ \bullet \text{---} \end{array} , \begin{array}{c} \bullet \text{---} \\ \text{---} s_1 \text{---} \end{array} \right)$  so that  $q : G_0(W) + G_1(W) \rightarrow Q$ . Then the composition  $d_0 \circ d_1 = (s, t, G)$  is given by*


$$s = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} s_0 \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array} \rightarrow q \quad t = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{---} t_1 \end{array} \rightarrow q \quad G = \text{target}(\alpha)$$

where  $\alpha : G_0 + G_1 \rightarrow G$  is the ACSet coequalizer whose  $W$  component is  $q$ , and all other components are  $\text{id}$ , so that  $G$  is the functor with the following data

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \Sigma_0 \\
 \uparrow G(w_n) = u \\
 G(W) = Q \\
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 (G_0(w_i) \otimes G_1(w_i)) \circledast q = G(w_i) & & G(w_o) = (G_0(w_o) \otimes G_1(w_o)) \circledast q \\
 \swarrow & & \searrow \\
 G_0(E_i) + G_1(E_i) & & G_0(E_o) + G_1(E_o) \\
 \xleftarrow{G_0(\text{port}_i) + G_1(\text{port}_i)} & & \xrightarrow{G_0(\text{port}_o) + G_1(\text{port}_o)} \mathbb{N} \quad (9) \\
 \swarrow G_0(x_i) \otimes G_1(x_i) = G(x_i) & & \searrow G(x_o) = G_0(x_o) \otimes G_1(x_o) \\
 G(X) = G_0(X) + G_1(X) & & \\
 \downarrow G(x_n) = G_0(x_n) + G_1(x_n) \\
 \Sigma_1
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

and  $G(w_n) = u$  is the canonical morphism of the coequalizer  $q$ , i.e. the unique function defined so that  $u(q(i)) = (G_0(w_n) + G_1(w_n))(i)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $L(A_0) \xrightarrow{\sigma_0} G_0 \xleftarrow{\tau_0} L(A_1)$  and  $L(A_1) \xrightarrow{\sigma_1} G_1 \xleftarrow{\tau_1} L(A_2)$  be the respective structured cospans corresponding to  $d_0$  and  $d_1$  by Proposition 4.3. Composition of cospans  $d := d_0 \circ d_1$  is given by pushout, which we compute by coequalizer  $q = c(\tau_0 \circ \iota_0, \sigma_1 \circ \iota_1)$  as below.




Note that this makes  $G = G_0 +_{L(A_1)} G_1$ . Recall that composition and colimits in ACSets are pointwise [21, Corollary 4], so we can calculate  $\sigma_W = (\sigma_0 \circ \iota_0 \circ \alpha)_W = s_0 \circ \iota_0 \circ c(t_0 \circ \iota_0)$ . Moreover, since  $L$  is left adjoint, we can factor  $\sigma = L(s) \circ \epsilon_G$ , and since  $\epsilon_{G_W} = \text{id}$ , we must have  $s = s_0 \circ \iota_0 \circ c(t_0, s_1)$ . By a similar argument, we have that  $\tau = L(t) \circ \epsilon_G$  with  $t = t_1 \circ \iota_1 \circ c(t_0, s_1)$ . We also see that  $\alpha$  is indeed the coequalizer:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_W &= c(\tau_0 \circ \iota_0, \sigma_1 \circ \iota_1)_W = c(t_0 \circ \iota_0, s_1 \circ \iota_1) = q \\ \alpha_Y &= c(\tau_0 \circ \iota_0, \sigma_1 \circ \iota_1)_Y = \text{id} \end{aligned}$$

The former holds because colimits of ACSets are pointwise, and the latter because for each  $Y \neq W$ , both  $(\tau_0 \circ \iota_0)_Y$  and  $(\sigma_1 \circ \iota_1)_Y$  must equal the initial map by uniqueness, and the coequalizer of initial maps is the identity.

Finally, we must verify that  $u$  is indeed the canonical morphism of the coequalizer (and is thus well-defined). For this to hold, we must have that  $q' = G_0(w_n) + G_1(w_n)$  defines a co-fork:



This equation holds by the counit law and because  $s$  and  $t$  are the  $W$  components of label-preserving natural transformations  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$ , and so  $t_0 \circ \iota_0 \circ G_0(w_n) = A_1(w_n) = s_1 \circ \iota_1 \circ G_1(w_n)$ . It then follows by the universal property that there exists a unique morphism  $u : G(W) \rightarrow \Sigma_0$  such that  $q \circ u = G_0(w_n) + G_1(w_n)$ . Since  $u$  is unique, we are therefore justified in defining it as the function  $u(q(i)) := q'(i)$ . More directly, if  $q(i) = q(j)$ , then by the existence of a unique  $u$  we must have  $q'(i) = q'(j)$ , and so  $u$  is well-defined.  $\square$

**Remark 4.17.** *The above proposition says that in the case of composition, the coequalizer (and therefore pushout) of diagrams can be computed purely by considering their wirings. That is, there is always a choice of coequalizer which only quotients wire nodes of the bipartite graph, leaving other data unchanged.*

Code for computing the composite of diagrams is straightforward,

```
def compose(f, g):
    assert f.type[1] == g.type[0]
    h = f @ g
    q = f.t.inject0(g.G.W).coequalizer(g.s.inject1(f.G.W))

    return Diagram(
        s = f.s.inject0(g.G.W) >> q,
        t = g.t.inject1(f.G.W) >> q,
        G = h.G.coequalize_wires(q))
```

We omit the implementation of `coequalize_wires` above, which is computed as in (9). However, we give an explicit, data-parallel implementation for computing the universal isomorphism  $u$  now.

```

def universal(q: FiniteFunction, f: FiniteFunction):
    u = zeros(q.target)    # preallocate the table of u
    u[q.table] = f.table  # make the table of u such that q ; u = f
    return FiniteFunction(f.target, u)

```

Note that in the above listing, we assume the PRAM CRCW model to achieve  $O(1)$  parallel time complexity. Specifically, the assignment `u[q.table] = f.table` will allow for multiple conflicting writes to the same memory location, with an arbitrary write succeeding. However, note that since both  $q$  and  $f$  must be label-preserving maps, all ‘conflicts’ *must* write the same value, ensuring correctness of the implementation.

As expected, complexity of composition is linear (sequential) and logarithmic (parallel) in the size of the diagram.

**Proposition 4.18.** *Let  $d_i = \mathbb{L}(A_i) \xrightarrow{s_i} G_i \xleftarrow{t_i} \mathbb{L}(A_{i+1})$  be diagrams for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Let  $(s, t, G) = d_0 \otimes d_1$ , then computing the composite  $d_0 \circledast d_1$  has sequential time complexity*

$$O(A_0(W)) + O(A_1(W)) + O(A_2(W)) + O(G(W)) + O(G(E_i)) + O(G(E_o)) + O(G(X))$$

and PRAM CRCW time complexity  $O(\log A_1(W) + G(W))$

*Proof.* Time complexity is that of tensor product, plus the additional cost of computing coequalizers and applying them to  $G$ . In the sequential case, this additional cost is  $O(A_1) + O(G(W))$ . In the PRAM CRCW case, it is  $O(\log A_1(W)) + O(\log G(W))$ .  $\square$

Finally, we verify that the tensor product and composite of diagrams with well-formed apexes are also well-formed. This ensures that  $\mathbf{Diagram}_{\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}}$  indeed forms a (sub)category.

**Corollary 4.19.** *If diagrams  $d_0$  and  $d_1$  have well-formed apexes, then so do tensor products  $d_0 \otimes d_1$  and composites  $d_0 \circledast d_1$ .*

*Proof.* The case of tensor products is immediate since the edge data of both  $d_0$  and  $d_1$  is contained in  $d_0 \otimes d_1$ . In the case of composites  $d_0 \circledast d_1$ , observe that the coequalizer  $\alpha : G_0 + G_1 \rightarrow G$  has all components except  $W$  equal to the identity. Thus by Proposition 3.11, we can conclude that  $G$  is well-formed as well.  $\square$

## 5 Diagrams as Combinatorial Syntax

We now construct an explicit isomorphism  $\mathbf{Diagram}_{\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}} \cong \mathbf{Free}_{\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}}$ . This will justify our claim that the arrows of  $\mathbf{Diagram}_{\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}}$  are string diagrams over the signature  $\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}$ . Concretely, it will guarantee that equivalence classes of  $(\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob})$ -terms are the same as equivalence classes of diagrams. With this isomorphism, we can then think of diagrams as a structure for representing syntax *combinatorially*. In Section 6, we will extend this to an isomorphism  $\mathbf{Diagram}_{\Sigma} \cong \mathbf{Free}_{\Sigma}$  by translating to our setting the notion of *monogamity* originally due to [4].

Our approach to constructing the isomorphism is as follows:

- Define the functor  $\mathcal{S}$  mapping  $\Sigma$ -terms to diagrams.
- Define the ‘Frobenius Decomposition’ of a diagram
- Define a functor  $\mathcal{D}$  using the Frobenius decomposition mapping diagrams to  $\Sigma$ -terms
- Prove that  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  form an isomorphism

Of particular note are the ‘Frobenius decompositions’ which we will shortly define. Such decompositions are not only useful for constructing the isomorphism, but also in applying *functors* to diagrams. We describe an algorithm based on this decomposition in Section 9.

Mapping  $\Sigma$ -terms to diagrams is straightforward. We simply map generators  $\Sigma_1$  to their corresponding singleton diagrams (Definition 4.9), and build the diagram inductively. More formally, we can construct the following functor.

**Definition 5.1** ( $\mathcal{S}$ ).  $\mathcal{S} : \text{Free}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}} \rightarrow \text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}}$  is the identity-on-objects strict symmetric monoidal hypergraph functor defined inductively on operations  $g \in \Sigma_1$  as  $\text{singleton}(g)$ .

Notice that  $\mathcal{S}$  has poor computational complexity. Although individual operations of tensor and composition are linear in the size of the resulting diagram, the inductively-defined functor above has  $O(n^2)$  complexity. This is because we repeatedly ‘append’ a small diagram to an accumulator, which is analogous to constructing a length- $n$  array by repeated appending. We will fix this problem in Section 7. Before that, we first construct an inverse to the functor  $\mathcal{S}$ ; a functor mapping from diagrams to  $\Sigma$ -terms.

## 5.1 Diagrams to $\Sigma$ -terms


We now define the functor  $\mathcal{D} : \text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}} \rightarrow \text{Free}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}}$ , mapping diagrams to  $\Sigma$ -terms. To do so, we first show how each diagram can be factorised into what we call a ‘Frobenius Decomposition’. This composition relies on the *hypergraph category* structure of  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}}$  as witnessed by [1, Theorem 3.12] via Proposition 4.6.

The main idea of the Frobenius decomposition is to separate the structure of wires and generators in a string diagram. To illustrate this, we begin with an example.

**Example 5.2.** Suppose we have a morphism  $f \circ g$  in a hypergraph category.




A **frobenius decomposition** of this morphism is a diagram like the one pictured below.



The idea is to picture all the wires in the diagram at the top as a ‘bus’ whose width is the number of internal wires in the diagram. Wires can then be connected to operations  $g$  by the maps  $e_s$  and  $e_t$ , which respectively map wires to inputs and outputs of operations. Similarly, the  $s$  and  $t$  maps specify which of the ‘internal’ wires appear on the left and right boundaries, respectively.


Note however that this decomposition is not unique. For example, we may permute the order of generators in the center to obtain an isomorphic diagram.



**Remark 5.3.** The purpose of Frobenius decompositions is to separate the elements of a diagram into Frobenius spiders and operations. This makes it easier to define a hypergraph functor, whose action on Frobenius spiders is fixed, and so it will suffice to define its action on the  $g$  part of the decomposition.

In fact, every morphism in an arbitrary Hypergraph Category has a Frobenius decomposition, which we state formally in the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.4** (Frobenius Decomposition). Let  $f : A \rightarrow B$  be a morphism in a hypergraph category. Then there is a factorisation of  $f$  called the **Frobenius Decomposition** of  $f$  with the following form.



where  $\sigma$ ,  $\tau$ ,  $e_s$ , and  $e_t$  are Frobenius spiders, and  $g$  is an  $n$ -fold tensoring of generators.

*Proof.* Induction. See Appendix B.1 for the full proof.  $\square$

Since  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}}$  is a hypergraph category by [1, Theorem 3.12], every morphism must have a Frobenius decomposition. In order to define the functor  $\mathcal{D}$ , it will be useful to give a *specific* Frobenius decomposition in terms of which the functor will be defined. This will also serve to show that  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}}$  is *presented* by the generators of  $\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}$ .

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $d = \mathsf{L}(A) \xrightarrow{\mathsf{L}(s) \circ \epsilon_G} G \xleftarrow{\mathsf{L}(t) \circ \epsilon_G} \mathsf{L}(B)$  be a diagram over the signature  $\Sigma$ . Then the following diagram is a Frobenius decomposition of  $d$*

$$A \text{ --- } \boxed{\mathsf{S}(s)} \text{ --- } W \text{ --- } \left( \boxed{\mathsf{S}(f_i)^\dagger} \text{ --- } E_i \text{ --- } p \text{ --- } E_i \text{ --- } g \text{ --- } E_o \text{ --- } q \text{ --- } E_o \text{ --- } \boxed{\mathsf{S}(f_o)} \right) \text{ --- } W \text{ --- } \boxed{\mathsf{S}(t)^\dagger} \text{ --- } B \quad (10)$$

where:

- $W = \mathcal{W}(w_n)$ ,  $E_i = \mathcal{W}(G(w_i \circ w_n))$ , and  $E_o = \mathcal{W}(G(w_o \circ w_n))$
- $f_i = \mathcal{W}(G(w_i), G(w_n))$  and  $f_o = \mathcal{W}(G(w_o), G(w_n))$
- $p = (\text{sort}_{(G(x_i), G(\text{port}_i))}, \text{id}, \mathsf{L}(E_i))$  and  $q = (\text{sort}_{(G(x_o), G(\text{port}_o))}, \text{id}, \mathsf{L}(E_o))$  (where  $\text{sort}$  is defined in Proposition A.4)
- $g = \bigotimes_i^X x_n(i)$  is the diagram formed by the  $X$ -fold tensor product of singleton diagrams

*Proof.* We defer the full proof to Appendix B.1, but provide a sketch here. It is clear that the composite pictured in (10) is of the correct form:  $\mathsf{S}(s)$  and  $\mathsf{S}(t)^\dagger$  correspond directly to  $s$  and  $t$  in Proposition 5.4, and the composites  $\mathsf{S}(G(w_i))^\dagger \circ p$  and  $q \circ \mathsf{S}(G(w_o))$  to  $e_s^\dagger$  and  $e_t$ . It therefore remains to show that this decomposition is indeed equal to  $(s, t, G)$ . This follows because there is a choice of coequalizer such that  $p \circ g \circ q$  is isomorphic to a tensoring  $g' = (\iota_0, \iota_1, G')$  of the generators in  $G$ . Then replacing  $p \circ g \circ q$  with  $g'$ , one can again choose coequalizers so that the full composite is equal to  $(s, t, G)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.6.** *Note that the sorting permutations  $\text{sort}_{(x_i, \text{port}_i)}$  and  $\text{sort}_{(x_o, \text{port}_o)}$  (Proposition A.4) are unique because their ‘sorting keys’ are monomorphic, which follows because  $G$  is well-formed. In addition, instead of actually computing the sorting permutations using a sorting algorithm, one can compute them through arithmetic in linear (sequential) and constant (parallel) time.*

Frobenius Decompositions allow us to define a functor from diagrams to  $\Sigma$ -terms. We simply need to map each component of the decomposition to a representative  $\Sigma$ -term.

**Proposition 5.7.** *There is a strict symmetric identity-on-objects monoidal hypergraph functor  $\mathcal{D} : \text{Diagram}_{\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}} \rightarrow \text{Free}_{\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}}$  which maps arrows to their Frobenius decompositions.*

*Proof.* In Appendix B.1 we show that  $\mathcal{D}$  is well-defined (Proposition B.3), a functor (Proposition B.4), and strict monoidal (Proposition B.5). Finally, it preserves the symmetry and Special Frobenius monoid structure by definition, since Frobenius spiders are mapped to the corresponding spiders in  $\text{Free}_{\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}}$ .  $\square$

## 5.2 Isomorphism

We can now show that  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  form an isomorphism. We use the ‘Change of Basis’ lemma from [26, B.1], which gives conditions under which two categories are isomorphic. We begin by proving one of these conditions.

**Proposition 5.8.** *Diagrams are generated by the operations of  $\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}$ . That is, every diagram can be constructed by tensor and composition of  $\text{id}$ ,  $\sigma$ , and generators of  $\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 5.5, every diagram has a Frobenius decomposition. Since each element of the decomposition is either a Frobenius spider or a tensoring of operations, the full diagram can be constructed by tensor and composition of generators.  $\square$

We can now give the main result.

**Proposition 5.9.**  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  form an isomorphism.

*Proof.* The change of basis lemma from [26, B.1] says that if the following conditions hold then  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  form an isomorphism.

- $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are strict symmetric monoidal identity-on-objects hypergraph functors (Definition 5.1, Proposition B.5)
- $\text{Free}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  is generated by operations of  $\mathbf{Frob}$  (by definition)
- $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  is generated by singleton diagrams of operations in  $\mathbf{Frob}$  (Proposition 5.8)
- $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S}(g)) \cong g$  for  $g \in \Sigma_1$ .

It therefore suffices to show that  $\mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{S}$  is inverse on generators  $g \in \Sigma_1$ . This is straightforward to derive: let  $\text{singleton}(g) : A \rightarrow B$  be an arbitrary generator, then the result follows by applying the unit and counit axioms of special Frobenius monoids as below.

$$g = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} A \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} B \text{---} \end{array} \quad \square$$

## 6 Symmetric Monoidal Case

We now examine the case of symmetric monoidal categories. Specifically, we will conclude that there is a subcategory  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma}$  of  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  which is isomorphic to  $\text{Free}_{\Sigma}$ .

Our approach is based on that of [4], who characterise string diagrams over  $\Sigma + \mathbf{Frob}$  in terms of hypergraphs. By requiring an additional combinatorial condition—‘monogamous acyclicity’—on their hypergraphs, they recover string diagrams over  $\Sigma$ . That is, *monogamous acyclic* hypergraphs correspond to string diagrams *without the additional hypergraph structure* of  $\mathbf{Frob}$ .

Since the datastructure we describe in Definition 4.1 is essentially an *encoding* of the hypergraphs in [4], we simply translate this condition to our setting now.

**Definition 6.1** (Monogamicity [4]). *A diagram  $d = L(A) \xrightarrow{s} G \xleftarrow{t} L(B)$  is **monogamous** when  $s$  and  $t$  are mono, and the following hold for all  $\blacksquare$ -nodes  $i$ .*

$$\text{indegree}(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \exists j. s(j) = i \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{outdegree}(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \exists j. t(j) = i \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where we write  $\text{indegree}(i) = |G(w_i)^{-1}[i]|$  and  $\text{outdegree}(i) = |G(w_o)^{-1}[i]|$

**Definition 6.2** (Acyclicity). *A bipartite multigraph is acyclic when its underlying graph is acyclic.*

Let us now verify that these condition indeed characterise morphisms of  $\text{Free}_{\Sigma}$ . We begin with a lemma which says that the monogamous acyclic ‘Frobenius spiders’ are simply permutations.

**Proposition 6.3.** *If  $d = (s, t, L(Y))$  is a monogamous acyclic Frobenius spider then  $s$  and  $t$  are permutations.*

*Proof.* By Definition 6.1,  $s$  and  $t$  are monomorphisms (i.e., injective). Then observe that  $L(Y)$  is a discrete graph, so each  $\blacksquare$ -node must have in- and out-degree 0. For this to hold, it must be that each node is in the image of both  $s$  and  $t$ , so they are surjective. It then follows immediately that  $s$  and  $t$  are bijections.  $\square$

Now check that those morphisms of  $\text{Free}_{\Sigma}$  map under  $\text{ToDiagram}$  to monogamous acyclic diagrams.

**Proposition 6.4.** *If  $f$  is a morphism of  $\text{Free}_{\Sigma}$ , then  $\text{ToDiagram}(f)$  is monogamous acyclic.*

*Proof.* Induction.

**Base Case: Generators** By Proposition 6.3 generators  $\text{id}$  and  $\sigma$  are monogamous acyclic. It is then straightforward to verify that singleton diagrams (Definition 4.9) are monogamous acyclic, and so we have for each  $g \in \Sigma_1$  that  $\text{ToDiagram}(g)$  is monogamous acyclic.

**Inductive Step: Tensor Product** Let  $d_i = (s_i, t_i, G_i)$  be monogamous acyclic diagrams for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Then  $(s, t, G) := d_0 \otimes d_1 = (s_0 \otimes s_1, t_0 \otimes t_1, G_0 \otimes G_1)$  by definition.  $G$  is acyclic because it is the disjoint union of acyclic graphs, and  $s$  and  $t$  are mono because  $s_i$  and  $t_i$  are. It then remains to check the in/outdegree conditions. We verify the former and omit the latter for brevity.

Suppose  $i$  is a  $\blacksquare$ -node in  $G_0$ . Then if  $\text{indegree}(i) = 1$ , by assumption  $i$  is not in the image of  $s_0$ , and thus not in the image of  $s_0 \otimes s_1$ . Moreover, if  $\text{indegree}(i) = 0$ , then there is some  $j$  with  $s_0(j) = i$ , and then  $(s_0 \otimes s_1)(j) = i$ .

Now suppose  $i$  is a  $\blacksquare$ -node in  $G_1$ , and write  $m := G_0(W)$ . If  $\text{indegree}(i) = 1$  then by assumption  $i$  is not in the image of  $s_1$ , and  $m + i$  is not in the image of  $s_0 \otimes s_1$ . Further, if  $\text{indegree}(i) = 0$ , then there is some  $j$  with  $s_1(j) = i$ , and then  $(s_0 \otimes s_1)(m + j) = i$ .

**Inductive Step: Composition** Let  $d_i = \mathbb{L}(A_i) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{L}(s_i) \circ \epsilon_{G_i}} G_i \xleftarrow{\mathbb{L}(t_i) \circ \epsilon_{G_i}} \mathbb{L}(A_{i+1})$  be diagrams for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Their composite is given in terms of the coequalizer  $q = \mathbb{c}(t_0 \circ \iota_0, s_1 \circ \iota_1)$ . Since  $t_0 \circ \iota_0$  and  $s_1 \circ \iota_1$  are mono, if  $q(i) = q(j)$  for  $i \neq j$ , then there is some unique  $a \in A_1$  with  $(t_0 \circ \iota_0)(a) = i$  and  $(s_1 \circ \iota_1)(a) = j$  (or vice-versa). But then  $\text{outdegree}(i) = 0$  and  $\text{indegree}(j) = 0$  because  $d_0$  and  $d_1$  are monogamous acyclic, so  $\text{indegree}(q(i)) = \text{indegree}(i)$  and  $\text{outdegree}(q(i)) = \text{outdegree}(j)$ , and the quotiented graph is monogamous as well.

Finally, note that acyclicity is preserved for the same reason: if  $G_0$  and  $G_1$  are acyclic, then only  $\blacksquare$ -nodes in  $G_1$  are reachable from  $q(i)$ , and thus no cycles are possible. □

We now check the reverse: that all monogamous acyclic diagrams correspond to morphisms of  $\text{Free}_\Sigma$ . This fact is first proven in [4], and is thus somewhat expected. Moreover, our argument is essentially the same as [26, Proposition B.3], so we only sketch a proof here.

**Proposition 6.5.** *If  $d$  is a monogamous acyclic diagram, then  $\mathcal{D}(d)$  is isomorphic to a morphism of  $\text{Free}_\Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $d = (s, t, G)$  be a diagram. Using the acyclicity property,  $d$  can be decomposed into the form  $s \circ \mathcal{S} \left( \frac{-}{\square} \right) \circ d'$ . Then, since  $s$  is mono, the result holds by induction on the number of generators  $d$ . □

By these two lemmas, there exists a category of monogamous acyclic diagrams whose morphisms are isomorphic to those of the free symmetric monoidal category over the same signature.

**Proposition 6.6.** *There is a subcategory  $\text{Diagram}_\Sigma$  of  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  whose morphisms are monogamous acyclic diagrams, and  $\text{Diagram}_\Sigma \cong \text{Free}_\Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* The property of monogamous acyclicity is closed under tensor and composition as guaranteed by Propositions 6.4 and 6.5. Moreover, the isomorphism  $\text{Diagram}_\Sigma \cong \text{Free}_\Sigma$  is given by the functors  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  restricted to monogamous acyclic diagrams. □


**Remark 6.7.** *Note that the functor  $\mathcal{D}$  does not directly give a  $\Sigma$ -term, but ‘only’ a  $(\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob})$ -term equivalent to one. If one wishes to recover a bona fide  $\Sigma$ -term from a diagram, it is straightforward to use a decomposition based on e.g., topological sort as described in [26, Proposition B.13].*

## 7 A Faster Functor


In the previous section, we gave algorithms for tensor and composition of diagrams which had  $O(n)$  sequential and  $O(\log n)$  PRAM complexity. This allowed us to define a functor  $\mathcal{S} : \text{Free}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}} \rightarrow \text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$ . However, the complexity of applying this functor naively is  $O(n^2)$ .

We now give a faster functor  $\mathcal{F} : \text{Free}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}} \rightarrow \text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}}$  which computes the resulting diagram directly. Importantly, the algorithm presented here will have linear (sequential) and logarithmic (PRAM CREW) time complexity in the size of the resulting diagram. Given a  $\Sigma$ -term  $t$ , the basic idea is to tensor all the generators of  $t$  and then wire them all together in a single step. We illustrate this process with an example.

**Example 7.1.** Consider the  $\Sigma$ -term below (rendered as a tree) and its corresponding string diagram.



The idea of this section is to build the string diagram on the right by first tensoring all the diagrams  $d_0 \otimes d_1 \otimes d_2$ , and then ‘wiring up’ the diagram in a single step. More visually, we can picture this as the string diagram below, with the target of  $d_0$  ‘wired up’ to the source of  $d_1$ .



## 7.1 A Faster Functor

In order to ‘wire up a diagram in a single step’, we must specify which  $\blacksquare$ -nodes are to be quotiented together, and which will belong on the boundaries. This specification comes in the form of a 4-tuple, which we call the ‘wiring maps’.

**Definition 7.2** (Wiring Maps). Let  $e$  be a binary tree with  $n$  leaves the diagrams  $d_i = (s_i, t_i, G_i)$ , and whose nodes are labeled either  $\dagger$  or  $\otimes$ . The four **wiring maps** of  $e$  have types

$$e_s : A_S \rightarrow G(W) \quad e_t : A_T \rightarrow G(W) \quad e'_s : A_I \rightarrow G(W) \quad e'_t : A_I \rightarrow G(W) \quad (11)$$

where  $G = \bigotimes_{i \in \bar{n}} G_i(W)$ . and  $A_S$ ,  $A_T$ , and  $A_I$  are computed recursively as follows. When  $e$  is a

binary tree consisting of a single leaf  $e = \mathsf{L}(A) \xrightarrow{\mathsf{L}(s)\dagger\epsilon_G} G \xleftarrow{\mathsf{L}(t)\dagger\epsilon_G} \mathsf{L}(B)$ , the wiring maps are the Wires morphisms given below.

$$e_s := A \text{ --- } \boxed{s} \text{ --- } G(W) \quad e_t := B \text{ --- } \boxed{t} \text{ --- } G(W) \quad e'_s := \bullet \text{ --- } G(W) \quad e'_t := \bullet \text{ --- } G(W)$$

The wiring maps of the tree  $e = \bigotimes_{l \ / \ r}$  are given by


$$e_s := \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l_s} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{r_s} \end{array} \quad e_t := \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l_t} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{r_t} \end{array} \quad e'_s := \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l'_s} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{r'_s} \end{array} \quad e'_t := \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l'_t} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{r'_t} \end{array} \quad (12)$$

and those for  $e = \dagger_{l \ / \ r}$  are defined


$$e_s := \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l_s} \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array} \quad e_t := \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{r_t} \end{array} \quad e'_s := \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l'_s} \text{ ---} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{r'_s} \end{array} \quad e'_t := \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l'_t} \text{ ---} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{r'_t} \end{array} \quad (13)$$

The maps  $e'_s$  and  $e'_t$  together serve to identify the internal  $\blacksquare$ -nodes to be quotiented together; the final diagram is given by coequalizing these maps. Meanwhile the maps  $e_s$  and  $e_t$  identify the  $\blacksquare$ -nodes corresponding to the boundaries of the diagram. To illustrate this, we now give the

**Example 7.3.** Recall the example  $\Sigma$ -term and its corresponding string diagram below.



Writing  $s_i$  and  $t_i$  for the source and target maps of  $d_i$ , we have



Notice that coequalizing ‘internal wiring maps’  $e'_s$  and  $e'_t$  will identify the targets of  $d_0$  with the sources of  $d_1$ .

Using the wiring maps, we can now define the ‘fast’ functor  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Definition 7.4.**  $\mathcal{F} : \text{Free}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}} \rightarrow \text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}}$  is the identity-on-objects functor defined on arrows ( $\Sigma$ -terms) as follows. Let  $e$  be the binary tree formed by replacing the leaves of a  $\Sigma$ -term with the corresponding singleton diagrams, and let

$$s : A_S \rightarrow G(W) \quad t : A_T \rightarrow G(W) \quad s' : A_I \rightarrow G(W) \quad t' : A_I \rightarrow G(W)$$

be the wiring maps of  $e$ . Define  $q := c(t', s')$  to be the coequalizer of internal wiring maps.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 Q \\
 \uparrow q \\
 G(W) \\
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 s \nearrow & \begin{array}{c} t' \curvearrowright s' \\ \text{---} \end{array} & \nwarrow t \\
 A_S & A_I & A_T
 \end{array}
 \end{array} \tag{14}$$

As in Proposition 4.16,  $q$  lifts to a coequalizer  $\alpha$  in  $\text{BipartiteMultigraph}$  whose  $W$  component is  $q$  and all other components are  $\text{id}$ .  $\mathcal{F}(e)$  is then the diagram  $(s \ ; \ q, t \ ; \ q, \text{target}(\alpha))$ .

**Remark 7.5.** Notice that not only does  $\mathcal{F}$  define a functor from  $\text{Free}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}}$ , but it can also be used to arbitrarily ‘wire up’ existing diagrams, since it can be applied to any tree whose leaves are diagrams- not just singleton diagrams.

In Proposition 7.7 we will verify that  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  give isomorphic diagrams when applied to the same expression tree. This will also serve to verify the well-definedness of Definition 7.4. A key lemma in this proof will be the functoriality of  $\mathcal{F}$ , which we now prove.

**Proposition 7.6** (Functoriality of  $\mathcal{F}$ ).  $\mathcal{F}(\text{id}) \cong \text{id}$  and  $\mathcal{F} \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{ ; } \\ \text{ / } \backslash \\ \text{ l } \quad \text{ r } \end{array} \right) \cong \mathcal{F}(l) \ ; \ \mathcal{F}(r)$

*Proof.* We have  $\mathcal{F}(\text{id}) = \text{id}$  by definition, so it remains to show that  $\mathcal{F} \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{ ; } \\ \text{ / } \backslash \\ \text{ l } \quad \text{ r } \end{array} \right) \cong \mathcal{F}(l) \ ; \ \mathcal{F}(r)$ . This means checking that  $Q$  in (14) is isomorphic to  $Q'$  in (15), and that this isomorphism extends to

an isomorphism of cospans.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 Q' \\
 \uparrow q' = c(l_t \circlearrowleft c(l'_t, l'_s) \circlearrowleft l_0, r_s \circlearrowleft c(r'_t, r'_s) \circlearrowleft l_1) \\
 Q_l + Q_r \\
 \swarrow l_0 \quad \searrow l_1 \\
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 Q_l & & Q_r \\
 \uparrow q_l = c(l'_t, l'_s) & & \uparrow q_r = c(r'_t, r'_s) \\
 G_l(W) & & G_r(W) \\
 \swarrow l_s \quad \searrow l_t & & \swarrow r_s \quad \searrow r'_t \\
 A_{S_l} & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} l'_t \text{---} \\ \text{---} A_{I_l} \text{---} \\ \text{---} l'_s \text{---} \end{array} & A_{T_l} = A_{S_r} & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} r'_t \text{---} \\ \text{---} A_{I_r} \text{---} \\ \text{---} r'_s \text{---} \end{array} & A_{T_r}
 \end{array}
 \end{array} \tag{15}$$

The proof is in four parts. (1) Construction of the ‘forward’ map  $u : Q \rightarrow Q'$ , (2) the ‘reverse’ map  $u' : Q' \rightarrow Q$ , (3) showing they form an isomorphism, and (4) verifying this extends to a cospan isomorphism.

**(1) Forward** Let us first construct the unique morphism  $u : Q \rightarrow Q'$  by showing the existence of a map  $x : G(W) \rightarrow Q'$  which coequalizes  $s'$  and  $t'$ .

By definition,  $G(W) = G_l(W) \otimes G_r(W)$ , and so we can define  $x := \begin{array}{c} \boxed{q_l} \\ \boxed{q_r} \end{array} \rightarrow \boxed{q'}$ . Now we will verify that  $s' \circlearrowleft x = t' \circlearrowleft x$ . First, recall that by Definition 7.2, we have

$$s' = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l'_s} \\ \boxed{r_s} \\ \boxed{r'_s} \end{array} \quad t' = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l'_t} \\ \boxed{l_t} \\ \boxed{r'_t} \end{array}$$

and so we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
 t' \circledast x &= \begin{array}{c} \text{---} l'_t \text{---} \\ \text{---} l_t \text{---} \\ \text{---} r'_t \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \begin{array}{c} q_l \\ q_l \\ q_r \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} q' \text{---} \\ \text{---} q' \text{---} \\ \text{---} q' \text{---} \end{array} \\
 &= \begin{array}{c} \text{---} l'_t \text{---} q_l \text{---} \\ \text{---} l_t \text{---} q_l \text{---} \\ \text{---} r'_t \text{---} q_r \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \begin{array}{c} q' \\ q' \\ q' \end{array} \\
 &= \begin{array}{c} \text{---} l'_t \text{---} q_l \text{---} q' \text{---} \\ \text{---} l_t \text{---} q_l \text{---} q' \text{---} \\ \text{---} r'_t \text{---} q_r \text{---} q' \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \\
 &= \begin{array}{c} \text{---} l'_s \text{---} q_l \text{---} q' \text{---} \\ \text{---} r_s \text{---} q_r \text{---} q' \text{---} \\ \text{---} r'_s \text{---} q_r \text{---} q' \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \\
 &= \begin{array}{c} \text{---} l'_s \text{---} q_l \text{---} q' \text{---} \\ \text{---} r_s \text{---} q_r \text{---} q' \text{---} \\ \text{---} r'_s \text{---} q_r \text{---} q' \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \\
 &= \begin{array}{c} \text{---} l'_s \text{---} \\ \text{---} r_s \text{---} \\ \text{---} r'_s \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} q_l \\ \bullet \\ q_r \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} q' \text{---} \\ \text{---} q' \text{---} \\ \text{---} q' \text{---} \end{array} = s' \circledast x
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus since  $x$  coequalizes  $t'$  and  $s'$ , by the universal property of coequalizers there is a unique morphism  $u : Q \rightarrow Q'$  such that  $q \circledast u = x$ .


- (2) **Reverse** We now construct the reverse morphism  $u' : Q' \rightarrow Q$ . First define maps  $y_l : G_l(W) \rightarrow Q$  and  $y_r : G_r(W) \rightarrow Q$  as follows.

$$y_l := \begin{array}{c} \text{---} q \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array} \quad y_r := \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{---} q \text{---} \end{array}$$

Now calculate that  $y_l$  coequalizes  $l'_t$  and  $l'_s$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 l'_t \circledast y_l &= \begin{array}{c} \text{---} l'_t \text{---} \\ \text{---} l_t \text{---} \\ \text{---} r'_t \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \begin{array}{c} q \\ q \\ q_r \end{array} \\
 &= \begin{array}{c} \text{---} l'_t \text{---} q \\ \text{---} l_t \text{---} q \\ \text{---} r'_t \text{---} q_r \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \\
 &= \begin{array}{c} \text{---} l'_s \text{---} q \\ \text{---} r_s \text{---} q_r \\ \text{---} r'_s \text{---} q_r \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \\
 &= \begin{array}{c} \text{---} l'_s \text{---} \\ \text{---} r_s \text{---} \\ \text{---} r'_s \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} q \\ \bullet \\ q_r \end{array} = l'_s \circledast y_l
 \end{aligned}$$

A similar calculation shows that  $r'_t \circledast y_r = r'_s \circledast y_r$ , and so by the universal property there must exist unique morphisms  $u_l : Q_l \rightarrow Q$  and  $u_r : Q_r \rightarrow Q$  such that  $y_l = q_l \circledast u_l$  and  $y_r = q_r \circledast u_r$ .

Using  $u_l$  and  $u_r$ , we can define  $y :=$    $Q$  and calculate that

$$\begin{aligned}
 l_t \circledast q_l \circledast \iota_0 \circledast y &= \text{Diagram: } l_t \text{ box, } q_l \text{ box, } u_l \text{ box, } u_r \text{ box, } Q \text{ box} \\
 &= \text{Diagram: } l_t \text{ box, } q \text{ box} \\
 &= \text{Diagram: } l'_t \text{ box, } l_t \text{ box, } r_t \text{ box, } q \text{ box} \\
 &= \text{Diagram: } l'_s \text{ box, } r_s \text{ box, } r'_s \text{ box, } q \text{ box} \\
 &= \text{Diagram: } r_s \text{ box, } q \text{ box} \\
 &= \text{Diagram: } r_s \text{ box, } q_r \text{ box, } u_l \text{ box, } u_r \text{ box, } Q \text{ box} = r_s \circledast q_r \circledast \iota_1 \circledast y
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus since  $y$  coequalizes  $l_t \circledast q_l \circledast \iota_0$  and  $r_s \circledast q_r \circledast \iota_1$ , there must exist a unique  $u' : Q' \rightarrow Q$  such that  $y = q' \circledast u'$ .

- (3) **Isomorphism** We have constructed morphisms  $u : Q \rightarrow Q'$  and  $u' : Q' \rightarrow Q$ , so it remains to verify these indeed form an isomorphism. Let us first verify  $u \circledast u' = \text{id}$ . By definition,  $t' \circledast q = s' \circledast q$ . Therefore, by the universal property, there is a unique morphism  $v$  such that  $q \circledast v = q$ . Clearly this holds for  $v = \text{id}$ , so if  $q \circledast u \circledast u' = q$ , then  $u \circledast u' = \text{id}$  by uniqueness. This holds as follows.

$$\text{Diagram: } q \text{ box, } u \text{ box, } u' \text{ box} = \text{Diagram: } q_l \text{ box, } q_r \text{ box, } q' \text{ box, } u' \text{ box} = \text{Diagram: } q_l \text{ box, } q_r \text{ box, } u_l \text{ box, } u_r \text{ box, } Q \text{ box} = \text{Diagram: } q \text{ box, } q \text{ box} = \text{Diagram: } q \text{ box}$$

Similarly, if we can show  $q' \circledast u' \circledast u = q'$ , then  $u' \circledast u = \text{id}$  by uniqueness.

$$\text{Diagram: } q' \text{ box, } u' \text{ box, } u \text{ box} = \text{Diagram: } u_l \text{ box, } u_r \text{ box, } u \text{ box} = \text{Diagram: } u_l \text{ box, } u_r \text{ box, } u \text{ box, } u \text{ box} = \text{Diagram: } q' \text{ box, } q' \text{ box} = \text{Diagram: } q' \text{ box}$$

Note that in the third step, we use that  $u_l \circledast u =$   and  $u_r \circledast u =$  . These follow again by the universal property; we prove the former as follows. Recall that  $q_l$  is the coequalizer of  $l'_t$  and  $l'_s$  by definition, and so clearly  $\text{Diagram: } q_l \text{ box, } q' \text{ box}$  must coequalize them as well. By the universal property, there is a unique morphism  $v$  such that  $q_l \circledast v =$  . It is clear that  $v =$   satisfies this equality, and so if  $q_l \circledast u_l \circledast u =$   then  $u_l \circledast u =$   by uniqueness. Calculamus:

$$\text{Diagram: } q_l \text{ box, } u_l \text{ box, } u \text{ box} = \text{Diagram: } q \text{ box, } u \text{ box} = \text{Diagram: } q_l \text{ box, } q_r \text{ box, } q \text{ box} = \text{Diagram: } q_l \text{ box, } q' \text{ box}$$

And so  $u_l \circledast u = \text{---} \boxed{q'} \text{---}$  as desired. A similar argument yields  $u_r \circledast u = \text{---} \boxed{q} \text{---}$ , completing the proof that  $u$  and  $u'$  form an isomorphism.

- (4) **Cospan Isomorphism** We now show that  $u$  extends to an isomorphism of cospans. The following calculation equates the cospan source legs of (14) and (15) via the universal map  $u$ .

$$\text{---} \boxed{l_s} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \boxed{q} \text{---} \boxed{u} \text{---} = \text{---} \boxed{l_s} \text{---} \boxed{q_l} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \boxed{q_r} \text{---} \boxed{q'} \text{---} = \text{---} \boxed{l_s} \text{---} \boxed{q_l} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \boxed{q'} \text{---}$$

A similar calculation shows the reverse direction and symmetric arguments apply to the target maps, completing the proof. □

We now prove the isomorphism between  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Proposition 7.7.** *Let  $e$  be a  $\Sigma$ -term. Then there is an isomorphism of diagrams  $\mathcal{F}(e) \cong \mathcal{S}(e)$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction. In the base case when  $e \in \{\text{id}, \sigma\} \cup \Sigma_1$  we have  $\mathcal{F}(e) = \mathcal{S}(e)$ . For the inductive step, assume that there are isomorphisms  $u_l : \mathcal{F}(l) \cong \mathcal{S}(l)$  and  $u_r : \mathcal{F}(r) \cong \mathcal{S}(r)$ . We must now show that  $\mathcal{F}(e) \cong \mathcal{S}(e)$  for the cases  $e = \text{---} \overset{\otimes}{\underset{l}{\diagup}} \underset{r}{\diagdown} \text{---}$  and  $e = \text{---} \overset{\circ}{\underset{l}{\diagup}} \underset{r}{\diagdown} \text{---}$ . In the former case, observe that

$$\mathcal{F} \left( \text{---} \overset{\otimes}{\underset{l}{\diagup}} \underset{r}{\diagdown} \text{---} \right) = \mathcal{F}(l) \otimes \mathcal{F}(r) \cong \mathcal{S}(l) \otimes \mathcal{S}(r) = \mathcal{S}(l \otimes r)$$

where the isomorphism  $u_l \otimes u_r$  is given by inductive hypothesis. In the latter case, we derive as follows.

$$\mathcal{F} \left( \text{---} \overset{\circ}{\underset{l}{\diagup}} \underset{r}{\diagdown} \text{---} \right) \cong \mathcal{F}(l) \circledast \mathcal{F}(r) \cong \mathcal{S}(l) \circledast \mathcal{S}(r) = \mathcal{S}(l \circledast r)$$

The first two steps of this derivation use functoriality of  $\mathcal{F}$  (Proposition 7.6) and well-definedness of diagram composition [1, Proposition 3.11]. respectively. □

**Corollary 7.8.** *Let  $e$  be a  $\Sigma$ -term (binary tree) of  $N$  leaves. Computing  $\mathcal{F}(e)$  has  $O(N)$  (sequential) and  $O(\log N)$  (PRAM CRCW) time complexity.*

*Proof.* Since  $\Sigma$  is fixed, we regard the number of wires and edges in the diagram to be proportional to  $N$  (cf. [26, Proposition 6.1, Bounded Sparsity]). The  $N$ -fold tensor product of leaves has the given complexity by Proposition 4.14, and then it remains to compute connected components, which is again  $O(N)$  sequential and  $O(\log N)$  parallel. □

## 8 Fast Wiring

In Section 7 we showed how a diagram can be ‘wired up’ all at once using the coequalizer and wiring maps (Definition 7.2). We now give a parallel algorithm for computing the wiring maps. The algorithm is in two parts. The first part (Section 8.1) reduces the problem of computing wiring maps to that of finding the ‘ancestor maps’. Ancestor maps find, for all nodes in a given  $\Sigma$ -term, a closest ancestor (if any) labeled  $\circledast$ , for which a given node is in a specific (left or right) subtree. The second part of the algorithm (Section 8.2) is a data-parallel method for computing these ancestor maps efficiently.


### 8.1 Reducing the Problem to a Tree Predicate

We now give an alternative, ‘parallel-friendly’ definition of the wiring maps, which is proven equivalent in Proposition 8.5. Efficiently computing the wiring maps in parallel via this alternative definition will depend on computing the ‘ancestor maps’, defined below.

**Definition 8.1** (Left and Right  $\ddagger$ -Ancestors). In a binary tree  $e$ , a node  $i$  has a **right  $\ddagger$ -ancestor** if it is in the left subtree of any node  $j$  labeled  $\ddagger$ . Respectively,  $i$  has a **left  $\ddagger$ -ancestor** if it is in the right subtree of any node  $j$  labeled  $\ddagger$ .

Computing the left/right ancestors of a node determines how to ‘wire up’ the diagram. We illustrate this with the following example.

**Example 8.2.** Pictured below is a  $\Sigma$ -expression rendered as a tree, with the closest left (resp. right)  $\ddagger$ -ancestor of each node listed below, with  $\cdot$  indicating a node has no left (resp. right)  $\ddagger$ -ancestor.



Diagrams (leaves)  $d_0$  and  $d_1$  are ‘bound’ by node 1, indicating that the outputs of  $d_0$  will be ‘connected’ to the inputs of  $d_1$ .

**Definition 8.3** (Ancestor Maps). Let  $e$  be a binary tree of  $n$  leaves and  $n - 1$  (non-leaf) nodes. The **left and right ancestor maps** of  $e$  are the following functions.

$$a_L : n \rightarrow n$$

$$a_L := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \text{ has no left } \ddagger\text{-ancestors} \\ j + 1 & \text{for the largest } j \text{ such that } j \text{ is a left } \ddagger\text{-ancestor of } i \end{cases}$$
  

$$a_R : n \rightarrow n$$

$$a_R := \begin{cases} j & \text{for the smallest } j \text{ such that } j \text{ is a right } \ddagger\text{-ancestor of } i \\ n & \text{if } i \text{ has no right } \ddagger\text{-ancestors} \end{cases}$$

**Remark 8.4.** The left ancestor map  $a_L$  returns the index of the ‘closest’ ancestor for which a given node is in the right subtree- meaning that the ancestor is ‘left’ of the node in an inorder traversal.

We will show how to efficiently compute the ancestor maps in Section 8.2.

**Proposition 8.5** (Wiring Maps Alternative Definition). Let  $e$  be a tree with  $n$  leaves the diagrams

$d_i : A_i \rightarrow B_i$  for  $i \in \bar{n}$ . The wiring maps of  $e$  can be equivalently defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
e_s &= \iota_0^{S,S'} \circledast p_s \circledast \bigotimes_{i \in \bar{n}} s_i = \begin{array}{c} S \text{ --- } \boxed{p_s} \text{ --- } \begin{array}{c} s_0 \text{ --- } G_0(W) \\ \vdots \\ s_{n-1} \text{ --- } G_{n-1}(W) \end{array} \\ \bullet \text{ --- } S' \end{array} \\
e'_s &= \iota_1^{S,S'} \circledast p_s \circledast \bigotimes_{i \in \bar{n}} s_i = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \text{ --- } S \\ S' \text{ --- } \boxed{p_s} \text{ --- } \begin{array}{c} s_0 \text{ --- } G_0(W) \\ \vdots \\ s_{n-1} \text{ --- } G_{n-1}(W) \end{array} \end{array} \\
e_t &= \iota_1^{T',T} \circledast p_t \circledast \bigotimes_{i \in \bar{n}} t_i = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \text{ --- } T' \\ T \text{ --- } \boxed{p_t} \text{ --- } \begin{array}{c} t_0 \text{ --- } G_0(W) \\ \vdots \\ t_{n-1} \text{ --- } G_{n-1}(W) \end{array} \end{array} \\
e'_t &= \iota_0^{T',T} \circledast p_t \circledast \bigotimes_{i \in \bar{n}} t_i = \begin{array}{c} T' \text{ --- } \boxed{p_t} \text{ --- } \begin{array}{c} t_0 \text{ --- } G_0(W) \\ \vdots \\ t_{n-1} \text{ --- } G_{n-1}(W) \end{array} \\ \bullet \text{ --- } T \end{array}
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Where  $p_s$  and  $p_t$  are the natural transformations defined by the stable sorting permutations  $\text{sort}_{\langle a_L, \text{id} \rangle}$  and  $\text{sort}_{\langle a_R, \text{id} \rangle}$ , respectively<sup>2</sup>, and the objects  $S$ ,  $S'$ ,  $T'$ , and  $T$  are defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \bigotimes_{\{i \in \bar{n} \mid a_L(i)=0\}} A_i & S' &= \bigotimes_{\{i \in \bar{n} \mid a_L(i)>0\}} A_i \\
T &= \bigotimes_{\{i \in \bar{n} \mid a_R(i)=n-1\}} B_i & T' &= \bigotimes_{\{i \in \bar{n} \mid a_R(i)<n-1\}} B_i
\end{aligned}$$

**Remark 8.6.** The objects  $S$  and  $S'$  refer to unbound and bound source maps, respectively. The source map of a diagram is ‘unbound’ if it won’t be quotiented with other wires in construction of the diagram. Notice that the objects in the tensor  $S$  are precisely those source objects for which there is no left  $\circledast$ -ancestor. Thus, these source maps will constitute the left dangling wires of the resulting diagram. Meanwhile,  $S'$  represent the source maps which do have a left  $\circledast$ -ancestor, and are therefore part of a composition- these will indicate the  $\blacksquare$ -nodes in the graph which need to be quotiented in the result. Similarly,  $T$  and  $T'$  are the unbound and bound target maps, respectively.

*Proof.* Induction.

**Base Case: Single Leaf** Let  $e$  be a tree consisting of a single leaf, a diagram  $d = (s, t, G)$  of type  $A \rightarrow B$ . Then  $a_L = \text{id}$ , so  $p_s = \text{id}$ , and  $a_R = \text{id}$  so  $p_t = \text{id}$ . Moreover,  $S = A$ ,  $S' = I$ ,  $T = B$ , and  $T' = I$ , and one can calculate as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
e_s &= \iota_0^{A,I} \circledast \text{id} \circledast s = A \text{ --- } \boxed{s} \text{ --- } G(W) \\
e'_s &= \iota_1^{A,I} \circledast \text{id} \circledast s = \bullet \text{ --- } G(W) \\
e_t &= \iota_1^{I,B} \circledast \text{id} \circledast t = B \text{ --- } \boxed{t} \text{ --- } G(W) \\
e'_t &= \iota_0^{I,B} \circledast \text{id} \circledast t = \bullet \text{ --- } G(W)
\end{aligned}$$

**Inductive Step: Tensor** Let  $e = \bigotimes_{l \ / \ r}$  be a tree of  $n = m_0 + m_1$  leaves. By inductive hypothesis,

(16) is equal to Definition 7.2 for  $l$  and  $r$ . Then, using  $a^l$  and  $a^r$  to denote the ancestor

<sup>2</sup>We define ‘stable’ sorts in Definition A.5, and omit subscripts of these natural transformations to reduce notational burden.

maps of  $l$  and  $r$ , we have

$$a_L = \begin{array}{c} m_0 \\ m_1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{a_L^l} \\ \boxed{a_L^r} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ m_0-1 \\ m_1-1 \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad a_R = \begin{array}{c} m_0 \\ m_1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{a_R^l} \\ \boxed{a_R^r} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m_0-1 \\ m_1-1 \\ 1 \end{array}$$

and so

$$p_s = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{p_s^l} \\ \boxed{p_s^r} \end{array} \quad p_t = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{p_t^l} \\ \boxed{p_t^r} \end{array}$$

from which we can derive

$$\begin{array}{c} S \\ \bullet \\ S' \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{p_s} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{p_s} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{s_0} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{s_{n-1}} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} G_0(W) \\ \vdots \\ G_{n-1}(W) \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{p_s^l} \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{p_s^r} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\otimes_{i \in \overline{m_0}} s_i} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{\otimes_{i \in \overline{m_1}} s_{m_0+i}} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l_s} \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{r_s} \end{array} = e_s$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ S \\ S' \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{p_s} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{p_s} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{s_0} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{s_{n-1}} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} G_0(W) \\ \vdots \\ G_{n-1}(W) \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{p_s^r} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\otimes_{i \in \overline{m_0}} s_i} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{\otimes_{i \in \overline{m_1}} s_{m_0+i}} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l'_s} \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{r'_s} \end{array} = e'_s$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ T' \\ T \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{p_t} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{p_t} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{t_0} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{t_{n-1}} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} G_0(W) \\ \vdots \\ G_{n-1}(W) \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{p_t^r} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\otimes_{i \in \overline{m_0}} t_i} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{\otimes_{i \in \overline{m_1}} t_{m_0+i}} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l_t} \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{r_t} \end{array} = e_s$$

$$\begin{array}{c} T' \\ \bullet \\ T \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{p_t} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{p_t} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{t_0} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{t_{n-1}} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} G_0(W) \\ \vdots \\ G_{n-1}(W) \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{p_t^l} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\otimes_{i \in \overline{m_0}} t_i} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{\otimes_{i \in \overline{m_1}} t_{m_0+i}} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{l'_t} \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{r'_t} \end{array} = e_s$$

as required.

**Inductive Step: Composition** Let  $e = \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ x \ / \ y \end{array}$ . By inductive hypothesis, (16) is equal to Definition 7.2 for  $l$  and  $r$ . Then, using  $a^l$  and  $a^r$  to denote the ancestor maps of  $l$  and  $r$ , we have


$$a_L = \begin{array}{c} m \\ n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{a_L^l} \\ \boxed{a_L^r} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ n \end{array} \quad a_R = \begin{array}{c} m \\ n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{a_R^l} \\ \boxed{a_R^r} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \\ 1 \end{array}$$

and so

$$p_s = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{p_s^l} \\ \boxed{p_s^r} \end{array} \quad p_t = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{p_t^l} \\ \boxed{p_t^r} \end{array}$$

from which we can derive

$$\begin{array}{c} S \\ \bullet \\ S' \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{p_s} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{p_s} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{s_0} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{s_{n-1}} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} G_0(W) \\ \vdots \\ G_{n-1}(W) \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{p_s^r} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\otimes_{i \in \overline{m_0}} s_i} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{\otimes_{i \in \overline{m_1}} s_{m_0+i}} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{l_s} \end{array} = e_s$$



completing the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 8.7.** *Let  $e$  be a binary tree of  $n$  nodes, and let  $a_L$  and  $a_R$  denote the ancestor maps of  $e$ . Computing the wiring maps of  $e$  takes  $O(n)$  sequential and  $O(\log n)$  parallel time.*

*Proof.* Assume the ancestor maps  $a_L$  and  $a_R$  are provided. Notice that  $p_s$  and  $p_t$  are obtained by a stable integer sort of the array data of  $a_L$  and  $a_R$ . This has  $O(n)$  sequential and  $O(\log n)$  PRAM time complexity: one can use e.g., counting sort in the sequential case and radix sort in the parallel case. The result then follows by the linear (sequential) and  $O(1)$  (parallel) time complexity of finite function composition.  $\square$

## 8.2 Computing left and right matching ancestors

In Section 8.1, we reduced the problem of computing the wiring maps (Definition 7.2) to a simple function on trees—computing the ‘ancestor maps’ (Definition 8.3). Although in the sequential case there is a straightforward top-down algorithm, it is not easily parallelizable.


In this section, we give a data-parallel algorithm for computing the closest ancestor matching a predicate for which a node is in either the left or right subtree. This is a generalisation of the problem of computing the ancestor maps. Our algorithm has  $O(\log n)$  PRAM CREW time complexity, which we prove in Corollary 8.16.

It is first necessary to represent trees in a ‘parallel friendly’ way. A number of suitable array-based representations of trees exist (e.g., [10, p. 128]) having constant-time operations for computing parent and child indices of a given node. Thus, instead of fixing a specific array-based representation of a tree, we simply assume that the following finite functions can be computed in linear (sequential) and constant (parallel) time.

**Definition 8.8.** *Let  $e$  be a binary tree of size  $n = 2m - 1$  (i.e.,  $e$  has  $m$  leaves and  $m - 1$  nodes.) Denote by  $\text{parent} : n \rightarrow n + 1$  the finite function mapping a node to its parent, or  $n$  if none exists.*

We write  $\text{isRight} : n \rightarrow 2$  for the predicate function returning 1 if a node is the right child of a node, and 0 otherwise. Similarly, write  $\text{isLeft} : n \rightarrow 2$  for the predicate returning 1 if a node is the left child of a node.

**Example 8.9.** The actions of  $\text{parent}$ ,  $\text{isRight}$ , and  $\text{isLeft}$  are illustrated with the following example, in which the nodes of the tree are labeled  $0 \dots 4$ .



Recall that the purpose of the ancestor maps (Definition 8.3) is to compute the closest ancestor labeled  $\$$  for each leaf in the tree. The algorithm presented here solves a slightly more general problem: computing the closest ancestor matching a predicate  $P$  for which a node is in the left or right subtree. Inductive definitions of these functions are given below.

**Definition 8.10** (Left/Right  $P$ -Ancestor Function). Let  $e$  be a binary tree of size  $n$ , and let  $P : n \rightarrow 2$  be a predicate on nodes. The **Left  $P$ -Ancestor** function is denoted  $\text{ancestor}_L$ , and defined below.

$$\text{ancestor}_L : n \rightarrow n + 1$$

$$\text{ancestor}_L(i) = \begin{cases} n & \text{root}(i) \\ \text{parent}(i) & P(\text{parent}(i)) \vee \text{isRight}(i) \\ \text{ancestor}_L(\text{parent}(i)) + \text{isRight}(i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$


Similarly, the **Right  $P$ -Ancestor** function is given by

$$\text{ancestor}_R : n \rightarrow n + 1$$

$$\text{ancestor}_R(i) = \begin{cases} n & \text{root}(i) \\ \text{parent}(i) & P(\text{parent}(i)) \vee \text{isLeft}(i) \\ \text{ancestor}_R(\text{parent}(i)) + \text{isLeft}(i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The following example illustrates the action of the  $\text{ancestor}_L$  map.


**Example 8.11.** Pictured below is a tree in which each node  $i$  is drawn in black if  $P(i) = 1$  and white otherwise, and the value of  $\text{ancestor}_L(i)$  is shown for each node.



Our approach to efficiently computing  $\text{ancestor}_L$  and  $\text{ancestor}_R$  is ‘bottom-up’. We first transform the tree of size  $n$  to a functional graph with  $2n + 1$  nodes, and then iterate its adjacency function until the result converges. We illustrate this process with the example below.

**Example 8.12.** Pictured below is a tree with  $n = 5$  nodes, and its ‘left ancestor graph’, with

$2n + 1 = 11$  nodes.



For each node  $i$  in the tree there are two nodes in the graph,  $2i$  and  $2i + 1$ . The edges of the graph represent the parent relation, split into two distinct cases: when a child is a left or right child of its parents. Left children of the node  $i$  are adjacent to the graph node  $2i$ , while right children are adjacent to  $2i + 1$ . When a  $P(i)$ , its corresponding graph node  $2i + 1$  points to itself instead of to its parent. Thus, when iterating the adjacency relation, eventually all right-descendants are ‘captured’ by their closest left-ancestor.

This graph is defined more formally below.

**Definition 8.13** (Ancestor Graph). Let  $e$  be a tree with  $m$  leaves and  $n = 2m - 1$  nodes, and  $P : n \rightarrow 2$  a predicate on nodes. The **Left Ancestor Graph** of  $e$  has  $2n + 1$  vertices, and edges given by the following adjacency function.

$$r_L : 2n + 1 \rightarrow 2n + 1$$

$$r_L(j) = \begin{cases} j & j = 2n \\ j & \text{odd}(j) \wedge P(\lfloor \frac{j}{2} \rfloor) \\ 2 \cdot \text{parent}(\lfloor \frac{j}{2} \rfloor) + \text{isRight}(\lfloor \frac{j}{2} \rfloor) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Symmetrically, the **Right Ancestor Graph** has adjacency relation

$$r_R : 2n + 1 \rightarrow 2n + 1$$

$$r_R(j) = \begin{cases} j & j = 2n \\ j & \text{even}(j) \wedge P(\lfloor \frac{j}{2} \rfloor) \\ 2 \cdot \text{parent}(\lfloor \frac{j}{2} \rfloor) + \text{isRight}(\lfloor \frac{j}{2} \rfloor) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We can now relate the ancestor graph and the functions  $\text{ancestor}_L$  and  $\text{ancestor}_R$ .

**Proposition 8.14.** For all nodes  $i$  of depth  $\text{depth}(i)$  in a tree  $e$

$$\text{ancestor}_L(i) = \left\lfloor \frac{r_L^k(2i)}{2} \right\rfloor \qquad \text{ancestor}_R(i) = \left\lfloor \frac{r_R^k(2i)}{2} \right\rfloor$$

for  $k > \text{depth}(i)$  where  $r$  is the adjacency function of the ancestor graph.

*Proof.* Top-down induction by depth. We write  $r$  for  $r_L$  and prove only the former case, omitting the symmetric proof for the  $\text{ancestor}_R$  function.

**Base Case** Suppose  $\text{root}(i)$  so  $\text{depth}(i) = 0$ . We have  $r(2i) = 2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + \text{isRight}(i) = 2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) = 2n$ , and so

$$\left\lfloor \frac{r(2i)}{2} \right\rfloor = n = \text{ancestor}_L(i)$$

Moreover,  $2n$  is a fixed point for  $r$ , so this holds for any  $r^k$  where  $k \geq 1$ .

**Inductive Case 1** In the second case, we have  $P(\text{parent}(i)) \wedge \text{isRight}(i)$ . Suppose  $\text{depth}(i) = m$ , where  $m \geq 1$  because  $i$  is not the root node. We have

$$r(2i) = 2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + \text{isRight}(i) = 2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + 1$$

Now let  $k \geq 1$  so that  $m + k > \text{depth}(i)$ . Then

$$\left\lfloor \frac{r^{m+k}(2i)}{2} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{r^{m+k-1}(2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + 1)}{2} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + 1}{2} \right\rfloor = \text{parent}(i) = \text{ancestor}_L(i)$$

as required.

**Inductive Case 2** In the final case, let  $i$  be a node, and let  $k > \text{depth}(i)$  so that  $k - 1 > \text{depth}(\text{parent}(i))$  and the inductive hypothesis is as below.

$$\left\lfloor \frac{r^{k-1}(2 \cdot \text{parent}(i))}{2} \right\rfloor = \text{ancestor}_L(\text{parent}(i))$$

Now split into two further cases: (a) when  $\neg \text{isRight}(i)$  and (b) when  $\neg P(\text{parent}(i)) \wedge \text{isRight}(i)$ .

**Case (a)** Observe that  $r(2i) = 2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + \text{isRight}(i) = 2 \cdot \text{parent}(i)$ . Then

$$r^k(2i) = r^{k-1}(r(2i)) = r^{k-1}(2 \cdot \text{parent}(i))$$

from which we can derive

$$\left\lfloor \frac{r^k(2i)}{2} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{r^{k-1}(2 \cdot \text{parent}(i))}{2} \right\rfloor = \text{ancestor}_L(\text{parent}(i)) = \text{ancestor}_L(i)$$

**Case (b)** When  $\neg P(\text{parent}(i)) \wedge \text{isRight}(i)$ , we have  $r(2i) = 2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + \text{isRight}(i) = 2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} r(2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + 1) &= 2 \cdot \text{parent} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + 1}{2} \right\rfloor \right) + \text{isRight} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + 1}{2} \right\rfloor \right) \\ &= 2 \cdot \text{parent}(\text{parent}(i)) + \text{isRight}(\text{parent}(i)) \\ &= r(2 \cdot \text{parent}(i)) \end{aligned}$$

where we use that  $\neg P(\text{parent}(i))$  in the first step. One can then derive the result immediately as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \left\lfloor \frac{r^k(2i)}{2} \right\rfloor &= \left\lfloor \frac{r^{k-1}(2 \cdot \text{parent}(i) + 1)}{2} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{r^{k-1}(2 \cdot \text{parent}(i))}{2} \right\rfloor = \text{ancestor}_L(\text{parent}(i)) \\ &= \text{ancestor}_L(i) \end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary 8.15.** *Let  $e$  be a tree of size  $n$ . Then*

$$\text{ancestor}_L(i) = \left\lfloor \frac{r^n(2i)}{2} \right\rfloor$$

*Proof.* The maximum depth of a leaf in a tree of  $n$  nodes is  $n - 1$ . Thus  $n > \text{depth}(i)$  for all nodes  $i$ , and so the equality holds by Proposition 8.14. □

**Corollary 8.16.** *Let  $e$  be a tree of size  $n$ . Computing the finite functions  $\text{ancestor}_L$  and  $\text{ancestor}_R$  for  $e$  has  $O(\log n)$  PRAM CREW time complexity.*

*Proof.* Let  $r$  denote either  $r_L$  or  $r_R$ . Computing  $r$  is  $O(1)$  because each entry of the underlying array can be computed in parallel in constant time. A composition  $r \circ r$  is constant PRAM CREW time because each entry of the resulting array is a single lookup, with each entry computed in parallel on  $O(2n + 1)$  processors. Thus computing  $r^n$  is  $O(\log n)$  by ‘repeated squaring’. That is, let  $f^0 = r$ ,  $f^{n+1} = f^n \circ f^n$ , then  $f^{\log n} = r^n$ . □

**Remark 8.17.** *The technique of ‘repeated squaring’ a functional graph is known as ‘pointer jumping’ in the parallel computing literature. See for example [19, 2.2]. Note also that while its time complexity is logarithmic, the algorithm given here is not work-efficient and requires  $O(n \log n)$  operations. We expect this can be improved to  $O(n)$ , but leave this to future work.*


Finally, note that the ancestor maps  $a_L$  and  $a_R$  of Definition 8.3 are not exactly the same functions as those in Definition 8.10. However, it is a straightforward matter of elementwise arithmetic to transform between the two finite functions, and so we omit the details.

## 9 Applying Functors to Diagrams

We now give an efficient, parallel algorithm for applying strict symmetric monoidal hypergraph functors to diagrams. We will hereafter just say ‘functor’ and assume the strict symmetric monoidal hypergraph structure. Note that in what follows, we assume arbitrary signatures  $\Sigma$  and  $\Omega$ , which optionally include the chosen Special Frobenius structure **Frob**.

The algorithm given here is defined *without* having to first decompose a diagram into a  $\Sigma$ -term. The example below illustrates the importance of this for the case of diagrams in  $\text{Diagram}_\Sigma$  which are not equipped with hypergraph structure.

**Example 9.1.** *Suppose we are working in the category  $\text{Free}_{\text{CMon}}$ . The terminal map  $!_N : N \rightarrow 1$  is represented as the following string diagram.*



*Represented combinatorially as a diagram, this has  $O(N)$  internal wires, generators, and edges. However, suppose we decompose it by taking ‘vertical slices’, then the number of terms in the decomposition is  $O(N^2)$ . The first ‘slice’ is  $\begin{matrix} A \\ \text{A} \end{matrix} \bullet \text{A} \otimes \text{id} \otimes \dots \otimes \text{id}$ , having  $N - 2$  copies of the identity. The second ‘slice’ has  $N - 3$  copies, and so on, so the average size of each slice is  $N/2$  for  $N$  slices.*

Thus, by naively decomposing a term into a  $\Sigma$ -term, it is possible to incur a quadratic penalty in the representation size. Our approach is to avoid this conversion altogether. That is, we apply functors directly to diagrams, without ‘roundtripping’ through  $\Sigma$ -terms. As a bonus, in Section 10, we will show how this can be used to give a fast algorithm for taking reverse derivatives (and more generally exploiting hypergraph structure to map diagrams to diagrams of *optics*.)

Our algorithm is based on the Frobenius decompositions defined in Proposition 5.4. These decompositions put each morphism into a form consisting of Frobenius spiders and a tensoring of generators. Given a strict symmetric monoidal hypergraph functor between categories of diagrams  $F : \text{Diagram}_\Sigma \rightarrow \text{Diagram}_\Omega$ , our approach is to map Frobenius decompositions in  $\text{Diagram}_\Sigma$  to Frobenius decompositions in  $\text{Diagram}_\Omega$ . Thus, in order to give an algorithm for the action of  $F$ , it suffices to define two things (1) the action on spiders, and (2) the action on (a tensoring of) generators.

The section is structured as follows. In Section 9.1 we define an auxiliary datastructure (the ‘segmented finite function’). We use this to encode the object map of  $F$  and give an algorithm for applying  $F$  Frobenius spiders of  $\text{Diagram}_\Sigma$ . In Section 9.2 we then show how the same datastructure can be used to encode the *arrow* map of  $F$ , and similarly give an algorithm applying  $F$  to a tensoring of generators. We conclude by showing that applying an encoded functor  $F$  has linear (sequential) and logarithmic (parallel) time complexity.

### 9.1 Objects, (Half-)Spiders, and Segmented Finite Functions

Given signatures  $\Sigma$  and  $\Omega$  and a functor  $F : \text{Diagram}_\Sigma \rightarrow \text{Diagram}_\Omega$ , we must encode the data of  $F$  in a way that allows us its application to diagrams to be parallelised. We make two simplifying assumptions: (1) that signatures  $\Sigma$  and  $\Omega$  are finite, and (2) that the typing relation of both is a

function. (This latter assumption is somewhat more restrictive than required; we discuss a weaker condition in Section 11.)

A functor  $F : \mathbf{Diagram}_\Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{Diagram}_\Omega$  consists of two maps. A function on *objects*  $F_0 : \Sigma_0^* \rightarrow \Omega_0^*$  and a function on *arrows*  $F_1 : \mathbf{Diagram}_\Sigma(A, B) \rightarrow \mathbf{Diagram}_\Omega(F(A), F(B))$ . In this section, we introduce an auxiliary data structure, the ‘segmented finite function’, which will allow us to encode these maps in a manner suitable for parallel application.

To motivate this, consider the object map  $F_0$ . Since  $F$  is a *strict* symmetric monoidal hypergraph functor between categories of diagrams, we have the following.

$$F_0 \left( \sum_{i \in N} A_i \right) = \sum_{i \in N} F_0(A_i)$$

We may therefore consider the object map of  $F$  to have the type  $F_0 : \Sigma_0 \rightarrow \Omega^*$  since (by strictness) it is completely defined by its action on generating objects. Similarly, we think of the map on arrows as having the type  $F_1 : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{Diagram}_\Omega$ .<sup>3</sup>

Now, for each  $i \in \Sigma_0$ , we can think of  $F_0(i) : \Omega_0^*$  as a finite function  $F_0(i) : s(i) \rightarrow \Omega_0$  where  $s : \Sigma_0 \rightarrow K$  is a function denoting the length (source) of each list  $s(i) = |F_0(i)|$ , and  $K$  is the maximum such length. Encoding the object map  $F_0$  will mean storing the data of these finite functions in a ‘flat’ array structure, with the array  $s$  encoding their sources.

**Definition 9.2.** Let  $f_i : A_i \rightarrow B_i$  be a collection of  $N$  finite functions. A **segmented finite function** encodes their sources, targets, and array data as the following three maps.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sources} : N &\rightarrow \max_{i \in N} \text{source}(f_i) & \text{targets} : N &\rightarrow \max_{i \in N} \text{target}(f_i) \\ \text{sources}(i) &= \text{source}(f_i) & \text{targets}(i) &= \text{target}(f_i) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{values} &: \sum_{i \in N} \text{sources}(i) \rightarrow \max_{i \in N} \text{target}(f_i) \\ \text{values} &= \sum_{i \in N} (f_i \circ \iota_0) \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 9.3.** In parallel programming terminology, *values* is a segmented array with segment sizes are given by *sources*. Note that we also store the *targets* of each morphism, which will be necessary to take tensor products.

Now, given an indexing function, we can then take arbitrarily ordered coproducts of the functions  $f_i$  as follows.

**Proposition 9.4.** Let  $f_i : A_i \rightarrow B$  be a collection of  $N$  finite functions sharing a codomain, and  $x : X \rightarrow N$  a finite function. Then the  $x$ -indexed coproduct is calculated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in X} f_{x(i)} &: \sum_{i \in X} A_{x(i)} \rightarrow B \\ \sum_{i \in X} f_{x(i)} &= \left( \sum_{i \in X} \iota_{f(i)} \right) \circ \text{values} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We may calculate  $(\sum_{i \in X} \iota_{x(i)}) \circ \text{values} = \sum_{i \in X} f_{x(i)} \circ \iota_0 = \sum_{i \in X} f_{x(i)}$  because  $\iota_0 = \text{id}$  since targets of all  $f_i$  are equal. Note also that the source  $\sum_{i \in X} A_{x(i)}$  can be computed by the sum of entries of the array  $\square$

This kind of indexed coproduct is precisely what we need to apply the object map  $F_0$  of a functor to *Frobenius spiders*. We begin by defining precisely how the object map is encoded.

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that strictly speaking morphisms of  $\mathbf{Diagram}_\Omega$  are equivalence classes, but the map  $F_1$  maps a generator to specific diagram. We gloss over this detail to avoid introducing new notation.

**Definition 9.5.** Given finite signatures  $\Sigma$  and  $\Omega$  and a strict symmetric monoidal hypergraph functor  $F : \text{Diagram}_\Sigma \rightarrow \text{Diagram}_\Omega$ , the **object map encoding** of  $F$  is the segmented finite function with sources  $= s$ , values  $= v$ , and targets( $i$ )  $= \Omega$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} s : \Sigma_0 &\rightarrow K & v &: \sum_{i \in \Sigma_0} s(i) \rightarrow \Omega_0 \\ s(i) &= |F_0(i)| & v &= \sum_{i \in \Sigma_0} F_0(i) \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the injections of the coproduct  $\text{source}(v) = \sum_{i \in \Sigma_0} s(i)$  have the type  $\iota_x : s(x) \rightarrow \sum_{i \in \Sigma_0} s(i)$ . By definition of the coproduct, we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_x \circledast v &: s(x) \rightarrow \Omega_0 \\ \iota_x \circledast v &= F_0(x) \end{aligned}$$

In other words, precomposing the segmented array of values with an injection amounts to taking a slice of the array corresponding to a specific ‘segment’.

With the object map  $F_0$  suitably represented, we can now show how to map the data of a Frobenius spider  $f = (s, t, L(B))$  in  $\text{Diagram}_\Sigma$  to its corresponding spider in  $\text{Diagram}_\Omega$ . Recall that any Frobenius spider can be regarded as the composite of two *half-spiders* (Definition 3.5):  $f = (s, \text{id}, L(B)) \circledast (\text{id}, t, L(B))$ . It therefore suffices to determine the action of  $F$  on half-spiders.

Since half-spiders are in the image of the functor  $S$ , we may regard them simply as morphisms of Wires. The action of  $F$  on such morphisms is as follows.

**Proposition 9.6.** Let  $f : A \rightarrow B$  be a morphism of Wires, and suppose  $F$  is a strict symmetric monoidal hypergraph functor whose object encoding is the segmented finite function with sources  $= s$  and values  $= v$ . Then  $F(S(f)) = S(f') : A' \rightarrow B'$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} B'(w_n) &: \sum_{b \in B(W)} s(B(w_n)(b)) \rightarrow \Omega_0 & f' &: \sum_{a \in A(W)} s(A(w_n)(a)) \rightarrow \sum_{b \in B(W)} s(B(w_n)(b)) \\ B'(w_n) &:= \left( \sum_{b \in B(W)} \iota_{B(w_n)(b)} \right) \circledast v & f' &:= \sum_{a \in A(W)} \iota_{f_W(a)} \end{aligned}$$

and  $A'(w_n) = f' \circledast B'(w_n)$  is fixed by naturality.

*Proof.* The definition of  $B'$  is required by the strictness assumption. We must then verify that  $A'(w_n) = f' \circledast B'(w_n)$ , which follows by naturality of  $f$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f'_W \circledast B'(w_n) &: \sum_{a \in A(w_n)} s(A(w_n)(a)) \rightarrow \Omega_0 \\ &: \sum_{a \in A(w_n)} s(B(w_n)(f(a))) \rightarrow \Omega_0 \\ f'_W \circledast B'(w_n) &= \left( \sum_{a \in A(W)} \iota_{f_W(a)} \right) \circledast \left( \sum_{b \in B(W)} \iota_{B(w_n)(b)} \right) \circledast v \\ &= \left( \sum_{a \in A(W)} \iota_{B(w_n)(f(a))} \right) \circledast v \\ &= \left( \sum_{a \in A(W)} \iota_{A(w_n)(a)} \right) \circledast v \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, we must check that the hypergraph structure is preserved, and that  $F$  satisfies the functor laws. This is done by induction: in the base case, it is straightforward to verify that the definition holds for generating operations in the image of  $S$ . The inductive step for tensor product is similarly

straightforward. One can verify the case for composition as follows. Suppose  $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$  are morphisms of Wires. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f' \circledast g' &: \sum_{a \in A(W)} s(B(w_n)(f(a))) \rightarrow \sum_{c \in C(W)} s(C(w_n)(c)) \\ f' \circledast g' &= \left( \sum_{a \in A(W)} \iota_{f(a)} \right) \circledast \left( \sum_{b \in B(W)} \iota_{g(b)} \right) = \sum_{a \in A(W)} \iota_{g(f(a))} = (f' \circledast g')' \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since  $F$  is a hypergraph functor, we have  $F(S(f)) = S(f')$  by uniqueness of  $S$ .  $\square$

**Remark 9.7.** *Note carefully that the injections in the definition of  $B'$  and  $f'$  above are not the same. The indices of injections used in the definition of  $B'$  range over the segments of  $v$ , whereas those in the definition of  $f'$  range over elements of  $B(W)$ .*

The object  $B'(w_n)$  of the mapped spider is precisely a  $B(w_n)$ -indexed coproduct of the values table. Similarly, the value of  $f'$  is given by ‘indexed injections’. In order to compute both, we use the following algorithm. Given a finite function  $s : N \rightarrow K$  and a map  $x : X \rightarrow N$  thought of as an array of indices, `injections(s, x)` computes a coproduct of injections  $\iota_{x(0)} \dots \iota_{x(A-1)}$ .

```
def injections(s, x):
    p = prefix_sum(s)
    r = segmented_arange(x >> s)
    return FiniteFunction(sum(s), r.table + repeat(x >> p, x >> s).table)
```

Note carefully that the  $+$  operation in the above algorithm denotes pointwise sum of integer arrays, not the coproduct. Given the object map encoding of  $F$ , one can then compute  $f' = \text{injections}(s, f \gg B(w_n))$  and  $B'(w_n) = \text{injections}(s, B(w_n)) \gg v$ .

**Proposition 9.8.** *Let  $s : N \rightarrow K$  and  $x : X \rightarrow N$  be finite functions. The sequential time complexity of computing `injections` is  $O(N) + O(X) + O(\text{sum}(x \circledast s))$  and its PRAM CREW complexity is  $O(\log N) + O(\log X)$ .*

*Proof.* In the sequential case, both function compositions are  $O(X)$ , prefix sum is  $O(N)$ , and remaining operations are  $O(\text{sum}(x \circledast s))$ . In the parallel case, the same operations are  $O(\log N)$ ,  $O(1)$ , and  $O(\log X)$ .  $\square$

Note that when computing  $f'$  and  $B'(w_n)$  using the `injections` function,  $\text{sum}(x \circledast s)$  is proportional to  $B'(W)$ , and so the computing spiders is linear (sequential) in the size of the result.

## 9.2 Mapping Tensorings of Generators

Having defined the action of  $F$  on the *spiders* of a Frobenius decomposition, it now remains to define its action on a *tensoring of generators*. Such a tensoring is a diagram of the form  $g = (\iota_0, \iota_1, G)$  whose data is defined up to isomorphism by the list  $G(x_n) : G(X) \rightarrow \Sigma_1$ . In other words, the isomorphism class of diagrams represented by  $g$  is in the image of the  $\Sigma$ -term  $\bigotimes_{i \in G(X)} G(x_n)(i)$  under  $F$ , and so by strictness it is required that  $F(g) \cong \bigotimes_{i \in G(X)} F_1(G(x_n)(i))$ .

As with the object map, the action of  $F$  on arrows is then completely defined by its action on operations  $\Sigma_1$ . We can therefore consider it to have the type  $F_1 : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \text{Diagram}_\Omega$ . This leads to a straightforward implementation in the sequential case. Encode the data of  $F_1$  as a list of length  $|\Sigma_1|$  whose  $i^{\text{th}}$  entry is the diagram  $F_1(i)$ , then in pseudocode, we might write

```
def apply_func(F1: List[Diagram], g: Diagram):
    diagrams = [ F1[g.Xn(i)] for i in range(0, g.X) ]
    Diagram.tensor_list(diagrams)
```

The  $N$ -fold tensor of diagrams is then a straightforward extension of the binary case. Recall that a diagram is essentially a collection of finite maps, upon which coproducts and tensor products are pointwise. Thus, taking the tensor product of a list of diagrams amounts to taking *finite*

coproducts instead of binary coproducts. The parallel case is ‘morally’ the same, but obtaining a proper logarithmic time algorithm takes special care: computing the finite tensor product of a list of finite functions does not immediately translate to the parallel case. Consider the following naive implementation.

```
def coproduct_list(fs: List[FiniteFunction]):
    return FiniteFunction(fs[0].cod, concatenate([f.table for f in fs]))
```

The problem is that constructing the argument to `concatenate` takes time linear in the size of `fs`. Since the length of `fs` equals  $G(X)$ , this takes time linear in the number of operations in the diagram, and therefore does not enjoy a speedup in the parallel case. The same problem exists for the tensor product of finite maps.

The solution is to encode the data of  $F_1$  not as a list of diagrams, but as a ‘diagram of lists’. More precisely, we instead encode each diagram component as a separate segmented finite function. From this representation we will be able to extract arbitrary coproducts and tensors of the ‘segments’ to construct the result.

The encoding of  $F_1$  is a collection of segmented finite functions: one for each of the source and target maps, and one for each of the components  $G(f)$  for  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ .

**Definition 9.9.** Let  $\Sigma$  and  $\Omega$  be finite signatures, and  $F : \text{Diagram}_\Sigma \rightarrow \text{Diagram}_\Omega$  a strict symmetric monoidal hypergraph functor, and denote by  $d_i = (s_i, t_i, G_i)$  the collection of diagrams  $d_i = F_1(i)$  for  $i \in \Sigma_1$ . The **arrow map encoding** of  $F$  consists of segmented finite functions for  $s_i, t_i$ , and  $G_i(f)$  for each component  $f$  in the schema  $\mathcal{S}$ .

In order to compute tensor products of diagrams, it will be necessary to compute indexed tensor products from segmented finite functions.

**Proposition 9.10.** Let  $f_i : A_i \rightarrow B_i$  be a collection of  $N$  finite functions, and  $x : X \rightarrow N$  a finite function indexing the collection. Then the indexed tensor product is given by the array

$$\begin{aligned} \bigotimes_{i \in X} f_{x(i)} &: \sum_{i \in X} A_{x(i)} \rightarrow \sum_{i \in X} B_{x(i)} \\ &= \sum_{i \in X} f_{x(i)} \oplus \text{repeat}(x \ ; \ \text{sources}, p) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\oplus$  denotes elementwise addition of natural numbers and  $p$  denotes the partial sums of codomains  $p(i) = \sum_{j \in \bar{i}} \text{targets}(x(j))$ .

*Proof.* Recall that the tensor product can be written in terms of the coproduct as below.

$$\bigotimes_{i \in X} f_{x(i)} = \sum_{i \in X} (f_{x(i)} \ ; \ \iota_i)$$

Here, each injection has type  $\iota_i : B_{x(i)} \rightarrow \sum_{j \in X} B_{x(j)}$  with array data given by  $\langle p(i), p(i) + 1, \dots, p(i) + B_i - 1 \rangle$ . The array data of the composition  $f_{x(i)} \ ; \ \iota_i$  is therefore that of  $f_{x(i)}$  plus the constant  $p(i)$ , which we may rewrite as below

$$\sum_{i \in X} (f_{x(i)} \ ; \ \iota_i) = \sum_{i \in X} f_{x(i)} \oplus \text{repeat}(x \ ; \ \text{sources}, p)$$

□

Computing  $F(h)$  for a tensoring  $h = (\iota_0, \iota_1, H)$  is then straightforward. Since coproducts and tensor products are pointwise, each finite function con the data of  $F(h)$  is the  $H(x_n)$ -indexed coproduct (or tensor product) of its corresponding segmented finite function.

**Proposition 9.11.** Complexity of applying the arrow map to an  $N$ -fold tensoring of generators  $(\iota_0, \iota_1, g)$  is  $O(N)$  (sequential) and  $O(\log N)$  (PRAM) in the number of operations of  $g$ .

*Proof.* As in Corollary 7.8, the number of wires and edges in the diagram is proportional to  $N$ . Applying  $F_1$  consists of computing the  $G(x_n)$ -indexed co- and tensor products for each component morphism of  $G$ , and so complexity is the same as these operations, which are  $O(N)$  (sequential) and  $O(\log N)$  (PRAM) by Proposition 9.8.  $\square$

**Corollary 9.12.** *Let  $F : \text{Diagram}_\Sigma \rightarrow \text{Diagram}_\Omega$  be a strict symmetric monoidal hypergraph functor, and  $d = (s, t, G)$  be a diagram in  $\text{Diagram}_\Sigma$  of type  $d : A \rightarrow B$ . Given object and arrow map encodings, the sequential time complexity of computing  $F(d)$  is linear in the number of wires  $G(W)$ , edges  $G(E_i)$  and  $G(E_o)$ , operations  $G(X)$ , and boundaries  $A(W)$  and  $B(W)$  of  $d$ . The parallel time complexity is logarithmic in the same.*

## 10 Optic Composition using Frobenius Structure

We now show how the Hypergraph structure of  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}}$  can be used to encode *optics*. Our approach is inspired by the string diagrams of [3] and [15]. Along with the parallel algorithm for functor application described in section 9, this allows us to define an algorithm for mapping diagrams into diagrams of optics. In general, this allows for modelling systems with bidirectional information flow. An example of such systems are neural networks [11] viewed as morphisms in categories with *reverse derivatives* [9]. We explore this example specifically, and define a scalable method for taking reverse derivatives of large diagrams. Moreover, this addresses an efficiency issue with the naive approach to taking reverse derivatives as pointed out in [15].

As in Section 9, we assume arbitrary signatures  $\Sigma$  and  $\Omega$ , which are now assumed to include the additional chosen Special Frobenius structure. We begin by informally recalling optics.

**Definition 10.1** (Informal, [15, 22]). *An **optic** of type  $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} \vec{A} \\ \overleftarrow{A} \end{smallmatrix}\right) \rightarrow \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \vec{B} \\ \overleftarrow{B} \end{smallmatrix}\right)$  is a triple*

$$M \in \mathcal{C} \quad \vec{f} : \vec{A} \rightarrow \vec{B} \otimes M \quad \overleftarrow{f} : M \otimes \overleftarrow{B} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{A}$$

where we call  $\vec{f}$  and  $\overleftarrow{f}$  the **forward** and **reverse** map, respectively.

The whole optic is considered as a system modelling forward and backward information flow. The  $\vec{f}$  morphism captures the ‘forward’ information flow of the model, mapping data  $\vec{A}$  to  $\vec{B}$ . The object  $M$  is some ‘memory’ of the input  $\vec{A}$ , which is passed to the ‘reverse’ map  $\overleftarrow{f}$ , which maps ‘output-like’ data and *memory* back into ‘input-like’ data. In the specific case of reverse derivatives (see Section 10.1), ‘input-like’ and ‘output-like’ will mean *changes* in input and output, respectively.

Note that, strictly speaking, morphisms in categories of optics are *equivalence classes* of triples  $(M, f, f')$ . This will not concern us. Instead, the focus of this section is on how representatives of such classes—specific triples  $(M, f, f')$ —can be encoded as diagrams. The main contribution of this section is to recognise that optic composition can be ‘simulated’ using the hypergraph structure present in  $\text{Diagram}_{\Sigma+\text{Frob}}$ . In order to state this formally, it is first necessary to define the *interleave* morphism.

**Definition 10.2.** *Assume for each generator  $X \in \Sigma_0$  a pair of objects  $\vec{X} \in \Omega_0^*$  and  $\overleftarrow{X} \in \Omega_0^*$ . Then let  $A = A_0 \otimes A_1 \otimes \dots \otimes A_{N-1}$  be a tensoring of generating objects in  $\Sigma_0$ . The **interleaving** at  $A$  is the permutation with the following type.*

$$\text{interleave}_A : \bigotimes_{i \in N} \vec{A}_i \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in N} \overleftarrow{A}_i \longrightarrow \bigotimes_{i \in N} (\vec{A}_i \otimes \overleftarrow{A}_i)$$

Given a chosen forward and reverse map for each generating operation  $f : A \rightarrow B$ , this interleaving makes it possible to define a strict monoidal functor taking each  $f$  to its chosen optic.


**Definition 10.3.** *Let  $\Sigma$  and  $\Omega$  be monoidal signatures, and assume the following data is given.*

- For each generating object  $A \in \Sigma_0$ , a pair of objects (lists)  $\vec{A} \in \Omega_0^*$  and  $\overleftarrow{A} \in \Omega_0^*$


- For each generating operation  $f : \otimes_{i \in N_0} A_i \rightarrow \otimes_{i \in N_1} B_i$  in  $\Sigma_1$ , a pair of morphisms

$$\begin{aligned} - \vec{f} &: \otimes_{i \in N_0} \vec{A}_i \longrightarrow \left( \otimes_{i \in N_1} \vec{B}_i \right) \otimes M, \\ - \overleftarrow{f} &: M \otimes \left( \otimes_{i \in N_1} \overleftarrow{B}_i \right) \longrightarrow \otimes_{i \in N_0} \overleftarrow{A}_i \end{aligned}$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{O} : \text{Diagram}_\Sigma \rightarrow \text{Diagram}_\Omega$  the strict symmetric monoidal hypergraph functor defined inductively whose action on generating objects is  $F(A) = \vec{A} \otimes \overleftarrow{A}$  and on arrows is given below.




Note that diagrams in the image of  $\mathcal{O}$  compose in the same way as optics.




Intuitively, the ‘flow of information’ in wires labeled  $\overleftarrow{A}$  and  $\overleftarrow{B}$  is right-to-left: the output of  $\overleftarrow{g}$  is connected to the input of  $\overleftarrow{f}$ , which itself connects to the left boundary.

Compare this to the graphical syntax of [3], wherein the author gives a diagrammatic language for Tambara modules using oriented wires. *Optics* are then diagrams in this language having the following type.




These diagrams then compose analogously as below.



Diagrams in the image of  $\mathcal{O}$  are not in general of this type, but it is straightforward to adapt them by pre- and post-composing with *interleave*.

This is useful because for a given  $d : A \rightarrow B$  the diagram  $\mathcal{O}(d)$  is *not* monogamous acyclic (Definitions 6.1 and 6.2), since the *outputs* of each  $\overleftarrow{f}$  connect to the *left* boundary. However, if for all  $f \in \Sigma_1$ , every  $\vec{f}$  and  $\overleftarrow{f}$  is monogamous acyclic, then the resulting diagram can be converted to a monogamous acyclic one using the *interleave* morphism as below.



This will be important to our case study because it means that we can extract a morphism which can be interpreted in a *symmetric monoidal* category. This means it can be regarded as a *function* which simultaneously computes the forward and reverse maps of reverse derivatives regarded as optics.



this can be added with little effort, it may be the case that alternative representations of internal diagram wiring affect the efficiency of evaluation algorithms. For instance, we currently store the operations of a diagram in a single array  $G(x_n) : G(X) \rightarrow \Sigma_1$ . However, it may be advantageous for performance reasons to store *multiple* such arrays so that applying operations in parallel on GPU hardware is more performant.

It may also be possible to weaken the assumption of the PRAM CRCW model assumed in the paper. Since in most cases the CREW model is sufficient, this should require only a few modifications. For example, the algorithm to compute the universal morphism of coequalizers requires the CRCW assumption, but it may be possible to obtain a PRAM CREW algorithm by replacing concurrent writes with an integer sort. In addition, we may also be able to improve the work-efficiency of some of the parallel algorithms presented here, in particular the ancestor maps (Corollary 8.16).

Finally, when defining algorithms to apply a functor  $F$  to a diagram in Section 9, we required that the typing relation  $\tau$  be a function. However, one of the advantages of our representation is in allowing for *polymorphic* generators. Thus, a natural extension is to allow functors between categories with polymorphic generators. To do so would require using *type* information when mapping a given operation, since there is no longer a unique diagram  $F(g)$  which can be determined simply from an operation label  $g \in \Sigma_1$ .

## References

- [1] John C. Baez and Kenny Courser. Structured cospans. 2019. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.1911.04630](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1911.04630). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.04630>.
- [2] John C. Baez, Kenny Courser, and Christina Vasilakopoulou. Structured versus decorated cospans. *Compositionality*, 4:3, sep 2022. DOI: [10.32408/compositionality-4-3](https://doi.org/10.32408/compositionality-4-3). URL <https://doi.org/10.32408%2Fcompositionality-4-3>.
- [3] Guillaume Boisseau. String diagrams for optics, 2020.
- [4] Filippo Bonchi, Fabio Gadducci, Aleks Kissinger, Paweł Sobociński, and Fabio Zanasi. Rewriting modulo symmetric monoidal structure. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. ACM, jul 2016. DOI: [10.1145/2933575.2935316](https://doi.org/10.1145/2933575.2935316). URL <https://doi.org/10.1145%2F2933575.2935316>.
- [5] Filippo Bonchi, Paweł Sobociński, and Fabio Zanasi. A Survey of Compositional Signal Flow Theory. In *Advancing Research in Information and Communication Technology*, volume AICT-600, pages 29–56. 2021. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-030-81701-5\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81701-5_2). URL <https://hal.inria.fr/hal-03325995>. part : TC 1: Foundations of Computer Science.
- [6] Albert Burroni. Higher-dimensional word problems with applications to equational logic. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 115(1):43–62, 1993.
- [7] Matteo Capucci, Neil Ghani, Jé rémy Ledent, and Fredrik Nordvall Forsberg. Translating extensive form games to open games with agency. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, 372:221–234, nov 2022. DOI: [10.4204/eptcs.372.16](https://doi.org/10.4204/eptcs.372.16). URL <https://doi.org/10.4204%2Feptcs.372.16>.
- [8] A. Carboni and R.F.C. Walters. Cartesian bicategories i. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 49(1):11–32, 1987. ISSN 0022-4049. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049\(87\)90121-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049(87)90121-6). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022404987901216>.
- [9] Robin Cockett, Geoffrey Cruttwell, Jonathan Gallagher, Jean-Simon Pacaud Lemay, Benjamin MacAdam, Gordon Plotkin, and Dorette Pronk. Reverse derivative categories, 2019.
- [10] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, fourth edition*. The MIT Press, hardcover edition, 4 2022. ISBN 978-0262046305.
- [11] G. S. H. Cruttwell, Bruno Gavranović, Neil Ghani, Paul Wilson, and Fabio Zanasi. Categorical foundations of gradient-based learning, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.01931>.
- [12] Brendan Fong. Decorated cospans, 2015.
- [13] Brendan Fong. The algebra of open and interconnected systems, 2016. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.05382>.
- [14] Thomas Fox. Coalgebras and cartesian categories, Jan 1976. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00927877608822127>.

- [15] Bruno Gavranović. Space-time tradeoffs of lenses and optics via higher category theory, 2022.
- [16] Fabrizio Genovese and Jelle Herold. A categorical semantics for hierarchical petri nets, 2021.
- [17] Fabrizio Romano Genovese, Fosco Loregian, and Daniele Palombi. Nets with mana: A framework for chemical reaction modelling, 2021.
- [18] Dan R. Ghica, George Kaye, and David Sprunger. A compositional theory of digital circuits, 2022.
- [19] Joseph JaJa. *Introduction to parallel algorithms*. Addison Wesley, Boston, MA, March 1992.
- [20] Evan Patterson and other contributors. Algebraicjulia/catlab.jl: v0.12.2, May 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4736069>.
- [21] Evan Patterson, Owen Lynch, and James Fairbanks. Categorical data structures for technical computing. *Compositionality*, 4:5, dec 2022. DOI: [10.32408/compositionality-4-5](https://doi.org/10.32408/compositionality-4-5). URL <https://doi.org/10.32408%2Fcompositionality-4-5>.
- [22] Mitchell Riley. Categories of optics, 2018.
- [23] P. Selinger. A survey of graphical languages for monoidal categories. In *New Structures for Physics*, pages 289–355. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-12821-9\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-12821-9_4). URL [https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-3-642-12821-9\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-3-642-12821-9_4).
- [24] Yossi Shiloach and Uzi Vishkin. An  $o(\log n)$  parallel connectivity algorithm. *Journal of Algorithms*, 3(1):57–67, 1982. ISSN 0196-6774. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0196-6774\(82\)90008-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0196-6774(82)90008-6). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0196677482900086>.
- [25] Toby St. Clere Smithe. Bayesian updates compose optically, 2020.
- [26] Paul Wilson and Fabio Zanasi. The cost of compositionality: A high-performance implementation of string diagram composition. 2021. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.2105.09257](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2105.09257). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.09257>.

## Appendix

### A Sorting Permutations

**Proposition A.1.**  $p : A \rightarrow A$  is an isomorphism in  $\text{FinFun}$  if and only if  $p$  is a permutation.

*Proof.* If  $p$  is a permutation it is certainly an isomorphism since it has an inverse. It therefore suffices to show that if  $p$  is an isomorphism, then it is a permutation. Since  $p$  is an isomorphism, it must be a bijection, and thus a permutation.  $\square$

**Definition A.2.** Let  $f : A \rightarrow B$  be a function. An isomorphism  $s : A \rightarrow A$  is said to **sort**  $A$  by  $f$  if  $s \circ f$  is non-decreasing, i.e. for all  $i, j \in A$ ,  $i < j \implies f(s(i)) \leq f(s(j))$

**Proposition A.3.** Suppose  $f : A \rightarrow B$  is mono, and  $s : A \rightarrow A$  sorts by  $f$ . Then  $s \circ f$  is strictly increasing, i.e.,  $i < j \iff f(s(i)) < f(s(j))$ .

*Proof.* We have  $i < j \implies f(s(i)) \leq f(s(j))$  by definition. We prove two cases.


$i < j \implies f(s(i)) < f(s(j))$  (**Case 1**) In the first case, we have  $i < j \implies f(s(i)) \leq f(s(j))$  because  $s$  sorts by  $f$ . Then suppose that  $f(s(i)) = f(s(j))$ . Both  $f$  and  $s$  are monomorphisms, so their composition is as well. We can therefore use that  $i \neq j \implies f(s(i)) \neq f(s(j))$  to conclude that  $i < j \implies f(s(i)) < f(s(j))$ .

$f(s(i)) < f(s(j)) \implies i < j$  (**Case 2**) In the second case, we prove the contrapositive:  $i \geq j \implies f(s(i)) \geq f(s(j))$  which we can rewrite as  $j \leq i \implies f(s(j)) \leq f(s(i))$ . This holds because when  $j = i$ , we have  $f(s(j)) = f(s(i))$ , and when  $j < i$ , the hypothesis applies.  $\square$


**Proposition A.4.** Let  $N$  be a finite set, and  $f : N \rightarrow B$  a monomorphism. There is a unique isomorphism  $\text{sort}_f : N \rightarrow N$  that sorts by  $f$ .



**Inductive Step: Tensor**  $f_0 \otimes f_1$  Let  $f_0$  and  $f_1$  be morphisms having a Frobenius decomposition. Then  $f_0 \otimes f_1$  has a Frobenius decomposition.




**Inductive Step: Composition**  $f_0 \circ f_1$  Let  $f_0$  and  $f_1$  be morphisms having a Frobenius decomposition. Then  $f_0 \circ f_1$  has a Frobenius decomposition.



We now complete the proof sketch of Proposition 5.5, verifying that the Frobenius decomposition given is indeed isomorphic to the original diagram. To do so relies on the following lemma which shows that a diagram can be immediately factorised into ‘almost-Frobenius’ form.


**Proposition B.1** (Almost-Frobenius Decomposition). *Let  $(s, t, G)$  be a diagram. Then there is a choice of coequalizer so that the following ‘almost Frobenius’ decomposition is isomorphic to  $(s, t, G)$ .*



where

$$\hat{s} = S(s) \quad \hat{t} = S(t) \quad e_s = S(G(w_i)) \quad e_t = S(G(w_o)) \quad h = (\iota_0, \iota_1, H)$$

are the half-spiders with the labeling  $G(w_n)$  and  $H$  is defined in terms of  $G$  as follows.



*Proof.* The proof is by direct calculation of the composite with suitable chosen coequalizers. We will first focus on the inner part of the diagram, ignoring  $\hat{s}$  and  $\hat{t}$  until the end of the proof.

We first compute the diagrams corresponding to following composites.

$$x = \left( \text{---}, \boxed{e_s^\dagger} \right) \quad y = \boxed{h} \quad z = \left( \text{---}, \boxed{e_t} \right)$$

Now,  $e_s^\dagger = (\text{id}, G(w_i), D(G))$  by Proposition C.5, and then Proposition C.4 gives  $x = \left( \text{---}, \boxed{G(w_i)} \bullet, D(G) \right)$ .

The same propositions also yield that  $z = \left( \boxed{G(w_o)} \bullet, \text{---}, D(G) \right)$ . Finally, it is straightforward by Proposition 4.11 that  $y = \left( \text{---}, \text{---}, D(G) \otimes H \right)$ .

We now compute the composite  $(x \circledast y) \circledast z$ , in the order indicated by bracketing. The composite

$$(x \circledast y) = \left( \text{---}, \boxed{t} \bullet, D(G) \right) \circledast \left( \text{---}, \text{---}, D(G) \otimes H \right)$$

can be computed by choosing the following coequalizer.

$$c \left( \left( \boxed{G(w_i)} \bullet, \text{---} \right), \left( \text{---}, \text{---} \right) \right) = \left( \text{---}, \boxed{G(w_i)} \bullet \right)$$

This yields a cospan with the source map  $\iota_0$  and target map  $\text{id} \otimes \text{id}$ .

Next, we compute  $(x \circledast y) \circledast z$  using the following choice of coequalizer.

$$c \left( \left( \text{---}, \text{---} \right), \left( \text{---}, \boxed{G(w_o)} \bullet \right) \right) = \left( \boxed{G(w_o)} \bullet, \text{---} \right)$$

This yields source and target maps  $s = \text{id}$  and  $t = \text{id}$ , respectively, with the apex of the cospan evaluating to  $G$ .

It then remains to show that pre- and post-composing with  $\hat{s}$  and  $\hat{t}^\dagger$  yields the diagram  $(s, t, G)$ . Since the source and target maps of  $(x \circledast y) \circledast z$  are identities, this follows by Proposition C.1, completing the proof.  $\square$

**Remark B.2.** Note that the above is not yet a Frobenius decomposition because  $h$  is not a tensoring of generators: its boundaries are not necessarily in the desired ordering. Obtaining a Frobenius decomposition will simply be a matter of decomposing  $h'$  into the form  $p \circledast h \circledast q$ , where  $h$  is a tensoring of generators and  $p$  and  $q$  are permutations.

From this proposition follows the proof that the specific Frobenius decomposition given in Proposition 5.5 indeed composes to recover the original morphism.

*Proof of Proposition 5.5.* First decompose the diagram  $(s, t, G)$  into the ‘almost-Frobenius’ form  $(\hat{s}, e_s^\dagger, h', e_t, \hat{t}^\dagger)$  described in Proposition B.1. To obtain a true Frobenius decomposition, it then suffices to factor the diagram  $h' = (\iota_0, \iota_1, H')$  into the composite  $p \circledast g \circledast q$ , where  $p$  and  $q$  are permutations, and  $g$  is a diagram isomorphic to the  $n$ -fold tensor product of generators.

To obtain  $g$ , we will simply permute the wires of  $h'$  to obtain a diagram  $(p, q, h)$ , where  $h$  is a tensoring of generators. More concretely, we first construct an isomorphism of structured cospans  $\alpha : h' \rightarrow h$ , whose components are defined as follows.

$$\alpha_W = \text{sort}_{k_i}^{-1} \otimes \text{sort}_{k_o}^{-1} \quad \alpha_{E_i} = \text{sort}_{k_i}^{-1} \quad \alpha_{E_o} = \text{sort}_{k_o}^{-1} \quad \alpha_X = \text{id}$$

Here,  $\text{sort}_f$  denotes the unique permutation sorting by a monomorphism  $f$  (see Appendix A) while  $k_i = \langle G(x_i), G(\text{port}_i) \rangle : X \times \mathbb{N}$  and  $k_o = \langle G(x_o), G(\text{port}_o) \rangle : X \times \mathbb{N}$  are the ‘sorting key’ functions. Note that  $k_i$  and  $k_o$  are monomorphisms by well-formedness of  $H'$ .

The target of  $\alpha$  is the structured cospan  $h = (\text{sort}_{k_i} \circledast \iota_0, \text{sort}_{k_o} \circledast \iota_1, H)$ , which by Corollary C.7 factors as  $p \circledast g \circledast q$ , where

- $g = (\iota_0, \iota_1, H)$
- $p = (\text{sort}_{k_i}, \text{id}, D(H))$
- $q = (\text{id}, \text{sort}_{k_o}, D(H))$

It therefore remains to show that  $g$  is isomorphic to the  $n$ -fold tensor product of generators. To do so, we appeal to Proposition 4.13, from which it is immediate that the legs of  $g$  are already  $\iota_0$  and  $\iota_1$  as required. It then suffices to verify that  $H$  is of the form given in (8).

On objects,  $H$  is given by

$$H(W) = G(E_i) + G(E_o) \quad H(E_i) = G(E_i) \quad H(E_o) = G(E_o) \quad H(X) = G(X)$$

and on morphisms, we must have the following by naturality of  $\alpha$ .

$$\begin{aligned} H(w_i) &= \iota_0 & H(w_o) &= \iota_1 & H(x_i) &= \text{sort}_{k_i} \circledast G(x_i) & H(x_o) &= \text{sort}_{k_o} \circledast G(x_o) \\ H(\text{port}_i) &= \text{sort}_{k_i} \circledast G(\text{port}_i) & H(\text{port}_o) &= \text{sort}_{k_o} \circledast G(\text{port}_o) & H(x_n) &= G(x_n) \end{aligned}$$

$$H(w_n) = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \boxed{\text{sort}_{k_i}} \text{---} \boxed{G(w_i)} \\ \text{---} \boxed{\text{sort}_{k_o}} \text{---} \boxed{G(w_o)} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array} \text{---} \boxed{G(w_n)} \text{---}$$

First observe that  $H(w_i) = \iota_0$ ,  $H(w_o) = \iota_1$ , and  $H(x_n) = G(x_n)$  as in (8). Write  $a : H(x_n) \rightarrow \Sigma_0^*$  and  $b : H(x_n) \rightarrow \Sigma_0^*$  for the chosen typings of generators in  $H$ , respectively. Now regard the remaining morphisms in the image of  $H$  as finite arrays.  $H(x_i) = \text{sort}_{k_i} \circledast G(x_i) = \text{sort}_{k_i} \circledast \langle G(x_i), G(\text{port}_i) \rangle \circledast \pi_0$  is a non-decreasing array of the form  $0^{|a(0)|} 1^{|a(1)|} 1, \dots$  and is therefore equal to

$$\bigotimes_{i \in G(X)} !_{|a(i)|}$$

as required. A similar equality holds for  $H(x_o)$ . In a similar way,  $H(\text{port}_i)$  is ‘piecewise increasing’, i.e. a concatenation of arrays

$$\langle 0, 1, \dots, |a(0)| - 1 \rangle + \langle 0, 1, \dots, |a(1)| - 1 \rangle + \dots + \langle 0, 1, \dots, |a(G(X) - 1)| - 1 \rangle$$

which is clearly in the form described in (8). Similar reasoning applies to  $H(\text{port}_o)$ .

Finally, since  $H'$  is well-formed, we have

$$\forall e \in E_i \quad w_n(w_i(e)) = a(x_i(e))_{\text{port}_i(e)} \quad \forall e \in E_o \quad w_n(w_o(e)) = b(x_o(e))_{\text{port}_o(e)}$$

and since  $\text{sort}_{k_i}$  is a bijection, in  $H$  we have

$$\forall e \in E_i \quad G(w_n)(G(w_i)(\text{sort}_{k_i}(e))) = a(G(x_i)(\text{sort}_{k_i}(e)))_{G(\text{port}_i)(\text{sort}_{k_i}(e))}$$

and

$$\forall e \in E_o \quad G(w_n)(G(w_o)(\text{sort}_{k_o}(e))) = b(G(x_o)(\text{sort}_{k_o}(e)))_{G(\text{port}_o)(\text{sort}_{k_o}(e))}$$

so we may think of the function  $H(w_n) = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \boxed{\text{sort}_{k_i}} \text{---} \boxed{G(w_i)} \\ \text{---} \boxed{\text{sort}_{k_o}} \text{---} \boxed{G(w_o)} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array} \text{---} \boxed{G(w_n)} \text{---}$  as the concatenation of finite arrays  $a(0) + a(1) + \dots + a(G(X) - 1) + b(0) + b(1) + \dots + b(G(X) - 1)$  as required by Proposition 4.13.  $\square$

We can now use Frobenius decompositions to define the functor  $\mathcal{D} : \text{Diagram}_{\Sigma + \text{Frob}} \rightarrow \text{Free}_{\Sigma + \text{Frob}}$ .

**Proposition B.3.**  $\mathcal{D}$  is well-defined.

*Proof.* Let  $d_i = (s_i, t_i, G_i)$  be diagrams for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , and  $\alpha : d_0 \rightarrow d_1$  an isomorphism of diagrams. Assume that the ‘Almost-Frobenius’ decomposition (Proposition B.1) of  $d_0$  and  $d_1$  is a bona fide Frobenius decomposition. As witnessed by the proof of Proposition 5.5, this assumption is without loss of generality, since any diagram is isomorphic to one of the desired form. We may therefore regard  $\mathcal{D}$  as being defined on these representatives. Then we can calculate as below, where we write  $x$  in place of  $\mathbf{S}(x)$  to avoid notational burden. However, the reader should be clear that these diagrams represent morphisms in the category  $\mathbf{Free}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{---} \boxed{s_1} \text{---} & \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \text{---} \boxed{e_{s_1}} \text{---} \boxed{g_1} \text{---} \boxed{e_{t_1}} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \end{array} \boxed{t_1^\dagger} \text{---} & = & \text{---} \boxed{s_1} \text{---} \boxed{\alpha_W} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \text{---} \boxed{\alpha_W^{-1}} \text{---} \boxed{e_{s_0}^\dagger} \text{---} \boxed{\alpha_{E_i}} \text{---} \boxed{g_1} \text{---} \boxed{\alpha_{E_o}^{-1}} \text{---} \boxed{e_{t_0}} \text{---} \boxed{\alpha_W} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \end{array} \boxed{\alpha_W^{-1}} \text{---} \boxed{t_1^\dagger} \text{---} \\
& & = & \text{---} \boxed{s_1} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \text{---} \boxed{e_{s_0}^\dagger} \text{---} \boxed{\alpha_{E_i}} \text{---} \boxed{g_1} \text{---} \boxed{\alpha_{E_o}^{-1}} \text{---} \boxed{e_{t_0}} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \end{array} \boxed{t_1^\dagger} \text{---} \\
& & = & \text{---} \boxed{s_0} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \text{---} \boxed{e_{s_0}} \text{---} \boxed{g_0} \text{---} \boxed{e_{t_0}} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \end{array} \boxed{t_0^\dagger} \text{---}
\end{aligned}$$

In the first step of the calculation, we use the isomorphism  $\alpha$  to express components of  $d_1$  in terms of  $d_0$ . The second step follows by Proposition D.2. The final step is to show that  $\alpha_{E_i} \circ g_1 \circ \alpha_{E_i}^{-1} = g_0$ . Since  $d_0$  and  $d_1$  are isomorphic, and  $g_0$  and  $g_1$  are simply a tensoring of generators, there must be a permutation  $\pi$  such that  $g_1 = \pi \circ g_0 \circ \pi^{-1}$  and  $\pi$  is ‘blockwise’, i.e. natural in the input types of generators  $g_0$ . It then suffices to show that  $\alpha_{E_i}^{-1} \circ \pi = \text{id}$ , and therefore  $\alpha_{E_i}^{-1} = \pi$ . This follows from well-formedness. Observe that by naturality  $G_1(x_i) = \alpha_{E_i}^{-1} \circ G_0(x_i) \circ \alpha_X$ , which we may rewrite as  $G_1(x_i) = \alpha_{E_i}^{-1} \circ \pi \circ G_0(x_i)$ . Since  $G_1(x_i)$  and  $G_0(x_i)$  are both monotonic, it must be that  $\alpha_{E_i} \circ \pi = (p_0 \otimes p_1 \otimes \dots \otimes p_X)$  is a tensoring of permutations. That is, each  $p_i$  permutes the order of inputs wires for a single generator. We now show that each  $p_i = \text{id}$ . By naturality, we can write  $G_1(\text{port}_i) = \alpha_{E_i}^{-1} \circ \pi \circ \pi^{-1} \circ G_0(\text{port}_i)$ . Since we know that  $\alpha_{E_i}^{-1} \circ \pi$  is a tensoring of permutations and  $\pi$  is blockwise, we must have that  $G_1(\text{port}_i) = (p_0 \circ \iota_0) + \dots + (p_X \circ \iota_0)$ . Finally, we can use that  $(f + g) = (\text{id} + h) \implies f = \text{id}$  to conclude that every  $p_i = \text{id}$ , and so  $\alpha_{E_i} = \pi^{-1}$ .

By similar reasoning one can check that  $\alpha_{E_o}$  corresponds to the blockwise permutation of generator outputs, and so  $g_1 = \alpha_{E_i}^{-1} \circ g_0 \circ \alpha_{E_i}$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition B.4.**  $\mathcal{D}$  is a functor.


*Proof.*  $\mathcal{D}(\text{id}) = \text{id}$  by definition, so it remains to show that  $\mathcal{D}(f \circ g) = \mathcal{D}(f) \circ \mathcal{D}(g)$ .

Let  $d_i = (s_i, t_i, G_i)$  be diagrams for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , and let  $(s_i, e_{s_i}, g_i, e_{t_i}, t_i)$  be the Frobenius decomposition of  $d_i$  specified in Proposition 5.5. For  $\mathcal{D}$  to be a hypergraph functor, Frobenius spiders must be preserved, and moreover we will map the tensoring of generators  $g_0$  and  $g_1$  to a corresponding tensoring in  $\mathbf{Free}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$ . We therefore must show the following holds in  $\mathbf{Free}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  where  $q = \mathbf{c}(t_0 \circ \iota_0, s_1 \circ \iota_1)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(d_0) \circ \mathcal{D}(d_1) & \cong \text{---} \boxed{s_0} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \text{---} \boxed{e_{s_0}^\dagger} \text{---} \boxed{g_0} \text{---} \boxed{e_{t_0}} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \end{array} \boxed{t_0^\dagger} \text{---} \boxed{s_1} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \text{---} \boxed{e_{s_1}^\dagger} \text{---} \boxed{g_1} \text{---} \boxed{e_{t_1}} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \end{array} \boxed{t_1} \text{---} \\
& \cong \text{---} \boxed{s_0} \text{---} \boxed{q} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \text{---} \boxed{q^\dagger} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \boxed{e_{s_0}^\dagger} \text{---} \boxed{g_0} \text{---} \boxed{e_{t_0}} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \boxed{e_{s_1}^\dagger} \text{---} \boxed{g_1} \text{---} \boxed{e_{t_1}} \text{---} \end{array} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \end{array} \boxed{q} \text{---} \boxed{q^\dagger} \text{---} \boxed{t_1} \text{---} \\
& \cong \mathcal{D}(d_0 \circ d_1)
\end{aligned}$$

By [13, Theorem 1.2], we have that  $\text{---} \boxed{q} \text{---} \boxed{q^\dagger} \text{---} \cong \text{---} \boxed{t_0^\dagger} \text{---} \boxed{s_1} \text{---}$ . Moreover, since  $q$  is a co-equalizer, it is a surjective function, meaning that its corresponding morphism in  $\mathbf{Free}_{\Sigma+\mathbf{Frob}}$  is constructed by tensor and composition from the generators  $\text{---} \text{---}$ ,  $\text{---} \text{---}$ , and  $\text{---} \text{---}$ . We can therefore

prove the following lemma for arbitrary arrows  $f_0$  and  $f_1$ .



which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition B.5.**  $\mathcal{D}$  is a strict monoidal functor

*Proof.* We must show that  $\mathcal{D}(c_0 \otimes c_1) = \mathcal{D}(c_0) \otimes \mathcal{D}(c_1)$ . This follows as in the inductive step for the proof of Proposition 5.4.  $\square$

## C Frobenius Spiders as Cospans

We can now prove the correspondence between diagrams representing Frobenius Spiders and those whose apexes lie in the image of  $\mathbf{L}$ . Note that the proof relies on Proposition C.5, which is given in Appendix C.1.

*Proof of Proposition 4.7.* We first show that every diagram of the form  $d = (s, t, \mathbf{L}(Y))$ . is a Frobenius spider. We have  $d = (s, \text{id}, \mathbf{L}(Y)) \circ (\text{id}, t, \mathbf{L}(Y)) = \mathbf{S}(s) \circ \mathbf{S}(t)^\dagger$  by Proposition C.5. Then by Definition 3.5,  $\mathbf{S}(s)$  and  $\mathbf{S}(t)$  are constructed by tensor and composition from generators  $\text{---}$ ,  $\text{---}$ ,  $\text{---}$ , and  $\text{---}$ .

We now verify that every Frobenius spider is a diagram of the form  $(s, t, \mathbf{L}(Y))$ . The generators of Special Frobenius monoids are the structured cospans as given in [1, Theorem 3.12], from which it is immediate that each generator has an apex of the form  $\mathbf{L}(Y)$ . The apexes of tensor products also have this form, since  $\mathbf{L}$  preserves colimits, so so it remains to check that the apex of a composite  $(s_0, t_0, \mathbf{L}(Y_0)) \circ (s_1, t_1, \mathbf{L}(Y_1))$  is also in the image of  $\mathbf{L}$ . Composites are computed by coequalizer. Let  $q = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{L}(t_0) \circ \iota_0, \mathbf{L}(s_1) \circ \iota_1)$ . Then  $q = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{L}(t_0 \circ \iota_0), \mathbf{L}(s_1 \circ \iota_1))$  because colimits of ACsets are pointwise. For the same reason, we have  $q_W = \mathbf{c}(t_0 \circ \iota_0, s_1 \circ \iota_1)$  and for components  $Z \neq W$  we have  $\mathbf{L}(x)_Z = ? : 0 \rightarrow 0$  and thus  $q_Z = ? : 0 \rightarrow 0$ . We can then see that  $q = \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{c}(t_0 \circ \iota_0, s_1 \circ \iota_1))$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

## C.1 Daggers of Cospans

We now prove that the dagger of a diagram swaps the ‘legs’ of the cospan, so  $(s, t, G)^\dagger = (t, s, G)$ . We state this formally in Proposition C.5. To do so requires several lemmas which we first prove.

Note that the proofs in this section are general statements about cospans in categories having finite colimits and coequalizers (and thus all finite colimits).

**Proposition C.1.**  $c(f, f) = \text{id}$

*Proof.* It is immediate that  $f \circ \text{id} = f \circ \text{id}$ , and then all  $g$  make co-forks  $f \circ g$  with the universal morphism  $u = g$ .  $\square$

**Proposition C.2.** Let  $f = A \xrightarrow{s} G \xleftarrow{t} B$  be a cospan. Then there is a choice of coequalizer so that

$$\boxed{f} = A \xrightarrow{\bullet} G \xleftarrow{\boxed{t}} B$$

*Proof.* First, observe that  $\boxed{s} \bullet$  is the coequalizer  $c\left(\begin{array}{c} \boxed{s} \\ \bullet \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \boxed{s} \end{array}\right)$ . It is immediate by the counit axiom that this makes the co-fork commute, then given some  $q$  which also makes the co-fork commute, one can check that  $u = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \boxed{q} \end{array}$  is the universal morphism.  $\square$

**Proposition C.3.** Let  $f = A \xrightarrow{s} G \xleftarrow{t} B$  be a cospan. Then there is a choice of coequalizer so that

$$\boxed{f} = A \xrightarrow{\boxed{s}} G \xleftarrow{\bullet} B$$

*Proof.* As in Proposition C.2.  $\square$

**Proposition C.4.** Let  $f = A \xrightarrow{s} G \xleftarrow{t} B$  be a cospan. Then there is a choice of coequalizer so that

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f} \end{array} = A \xrightarrow{\boxed{s}} G \xleftarrow{\begin{array}{c} \boxed{s} \\ \boxed{t} \end{array}} A + B$$

*Proof.* Factor the cospan into the composite  $(\text{---}, \begin{array}{c} A \\ A \end{array}) \circ (\text{---}, \begin{array}{c} \boxed{s} \\ \boxed{t} \end{array}, G)$ . Now choose  $c\left(\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \boxed{s} \\ \boxed{s} \end{array}\right) = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{s} \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{s} \end{array}$ , which commutes by the unit axiom. Then given some  $q$  which also makes the co-fork commute, one can check that there is a unique  $u = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \boxed{q} \end{array}$ . The result then follows again by the unit axiom.  $\square$

Finally, we can prove the main proposition.

**Proposition C.5.** Let  $f = A \xrightarrow{s} G \xleftarrow{t} B$  be a cospan. Then there is a choice of coequalizer so that

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = B \xrightarrow{t} G \xleftarrow{s} A$$

*Proof.* By Propositions C.2 and C.4 we have that

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = 0 \xrightarrow{\bullet} G \xleftarrow{\begin{array}{c} \boxed{s} \\ \boxed{t} \end{array}} A + B$$

and so by definition of tensor product we obtain the following.

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \\ \text{---} \end{array} \boxed{f} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} = B \xrightarrow{\bullet} G + B \xleftarrow{\bullet} A + B + B$$


Similarly, we have

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} = A + B + B \xrightarrow{\bullet} A + B \xleftarrow{\bullet} A$$

so it remains to find a coequalizer for the following composite.

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \\ \text{---} \end{array} \boxed{f} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad ; \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \diagup \\ \text{---} \end{array}$$

Such a coequalizer is given by



and the result then follows by the unit axiom. □

## C.2 Frobenius Spiders and Permutations

Diagrams whose legs are composites with permutations can be factored into a composite with a spider. We state this formally with the following pair of propositions.

**Proposition C.6.** *Let  $c_0 := (s_0, t_0, L(B)) : A \rightarrow B$  and  $c_1 := (s_1, t_1, G) : B \rightarrow C$  be diagrams where  $t_0$  is an isomorphism. Then there is a choice of coequalizer such that*

$$c_0 \circ c_1 = (s_0 \circ t_0^{-1} \circ s_1, t_1, G)$$

Similarly, if  $c_2 := (s_2, t_2, L(C)) : C \rightarrow D$  and  $s_2$  is an isomorphism, then

$$c_1 \circ c_2 = (s_1, t_2 \circ s_2^{-1} \circ t_1, G)$$

*Proof.* We show the first case, when  $t_0$  is an isomorphism, and rely on an symmetric argument for the second case, which is omitted. We begin by showing that the relevant coequalizer has the following closed form.

$$c(t_0 \circ t_0, s_1 \circ t_1) = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{t_0^{-1}} \quad \boxed{s_1} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \bullet$$

Observe that the co-fork commutes:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{t_0} \quad \boxed{t_0^{-1}} \quad \boxed{s_1} \\ \bullet \end{array} \bullet = s_1 = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{s_1} \end{array} \bullet$$


Now suppose there is some  $q'$  such that

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{t_0} \\ \bullet \end{array} \boxed{q'} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{s_1} \end{array} \boxed{q'}$$

There exists a  $u$  such that

$$\boxed{q'} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{t_0^{-1}} \quad \boxed{s_1} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \bullet \boxed{u}$$


which we may calculate as follows:



So we have

$$u := \bullet \text{---} \boxed{q'} \text{---}$$

and moreover this  $u$  is unique. Suppose there is some  $v$  with



Then we can derive

$$u = \bullet \text{---} \boxed{q'} \text{---} = \bullet \text{---} \boxed{t_0^{-1}} \text{---} \boxed{s_1} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \boxed{v} \text{---} = v$$

Finally, we must also show that the apex of the composite is equal to  $G$ . By Proposition 4.16, the coequalizer  $q : \mathbf{L}(B) + G \rightarrow G'$  is the ACSet morphism whose components are id except for  $q_W = \mathbf{c}(t_0 \circledast \iota_0, s_1 \circledast \iota_1)$ . On objects, we have  $G'(Y) = G(Y)$  which can be checked in two cases. First,  $(\mathbf{L}(B) + G)(Y) = G(Y) = G'(Y)$  for objects  $Y \neq W$ , in which case  $q_Y$  is the identity. Second, observe that the codomain of  $q_W$  is  $G(W)$ , and so  $G'(W) = G(W)$ . On morphisms, it suffices to check only those morphisms having source or target  $G'(W)$ , since other all morphisms must be immediately equal by naturality. We begin with  $G'(w_i)$ . By naturality, we must have  $G'(w_i) = (\mathbf{L}(B)(w_i) \otimes G(w_i)) \circledast q$ , and since  $\mathbf{L}(B) = 0$ , we also have  $\mathbf{L}(B)(w_i) = \mathbf{L}(B)(w_o) = \bullet \text{---}$ . We can then calculate

$$\begin{aligned} G'(w_i) &= \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \boxed{\mathbf{L}(B)(w_i)} \text{---} \boxed{t_0^{-1}} \text{---} \boxed{s_1} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \\ \text{---} \boxed{G(w_i)} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \end{array} \\ &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \text{---} \boxed{t_0^{-1}} \text{---} \boxed{s_1} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \\ \text{---} \boxed{G(w_i)} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \end{array} \\ &= G(w_i) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have  $G'(w_o) = G(w_o)$ . Lastly, we use that  $G'(w_n)$  is the canonical morphism of the coequalizer to calculate that

$$G'(w_n) = \bullet \text{---} \boxed{\mathbf{L}(B)(w_n)} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} = G(w_n)$$

and so  $G' = G$ . □

**Corollary C.7.** *Let  $c := \mathbb{L}(A) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{L}(p \circ s_0) \circ \epsilon_G} G \xleftarrow{\mathbb{L}(q \circ t_0) \circ \epsilon_G} \mathbb{L}(B)$  be a diagram. Then  $c = \hat{p} \circ c \circ \hat{q}$  where  $\hat{p} = (p, \text{id}, \mathbb{L}(A))$ ,  $\hat{q} = (\text{id}, q, \mathbb{L}(B))$ , and  $c = (s_0, t_0, G)$ .*

## D Frobenius Spider Lemmas

The following lemmas are generic to any hypergraph category. We use them in particular to prove functoriality of  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Proposition D.1** (Bialgebra).

$$\text{Spider} = \text{Crossing}$$

*Proof.* Immediate by [13, Theorem 1.2]. One can also derive this equality directly using the associativity, commutativity, and snake axioms. □

**Proposition D.2** (Partial Naturality). *Let  $f : A \rightarrow B$  be a morphism constructed by tensor and composition from the generators  $\text{---}$ ,  $\text{X}$ ,  $\text{---}$ , and  $\text{---}$ . Then*

$$f \circ \text{Crossing} = \text{Crossing} \circ f \quad (18)$$

*Proof.* We prove the first equation by induction, with the second case following in a symmetric way. Let  $f$  be a morphism constructed by tensor and composition from the generators given. We first check the base case of the induction.

**Base Case  $f = \text{id}$**  Immediate:  $\text{---} = \text{---}$

**Base Case  $f = \text{X}$**

$$\text{Crossing} = \text{Crossing}$$

**Base Case  $f = \text{---}$**

$$\text{Line with Crossing} = \text{Crossing of Lines}$$

**Base Case  $f = \text{---}$**  Immediate by Proposition D.1,

$$\text{Spider} = \text{Crossing}$$

**Inductive Step** Now assume  $f_0$  and  $f_1$  satisfy (18). Then their tensor product does too:

$$f_0 \otimes f_1 \circ \text{Crossing} = \text{Crossing} \circ (f_0 \otimes f_1)$$

And so does their composite:

$$\boxed{f_0} \boxed{f_1} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} = \boxed{f_0} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_1} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0} \boxed{f_1} \\ \boxed{f_0} \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \quad \square$$

**Proposition D.3.** *Let  $f$  be a morphism formed by tensor and composition from the generators  $\text{---}$ ,  $\text{X}$ ,  $\text{+}$ , and  $\text{>}$ . Then we have the following equalities.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \end{array} \quad (19)$$

*Proof.* We first prove the top left equation of (19) by induction. As in Proposition D.2, one can derive base cases directly, or observe that they hold via [13, Theorem 1.2]. Then the inductive step holds as follows. Assume  $f_0$  and  $f_1$  satisfy the top-left equation of (19). Then

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_0} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0^\dagger} \\ \boxed{f_1^\dagger} \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_0} \boxed{f_1} \end{array} = \boxed{f_0} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0^\dagger} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} = \boxed{f_0} \boxed{f_1} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_1^\dagger} \boxed{f_0^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \end{array}$$

as required. We can now show the remaining equations hold as well. The top right equation holds by commutativity

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \end{array}$$

the bottom left equation is simply the dagger of the top left:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f^\dagger} \end{array} = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f} \end{array} \right]^\dagger = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right]^\dagger = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f^\dagger} \end{array}$$

and the bottom right equation holds by commutativity as in the proof of the top right equation.  $\square$

**Proposition D.4.**

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_0} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array}$$

*Proof.* Follows by [13, Theorem 1.2].  $\square$

**Proposition D.5.** *Let  $q = S(f)$  for some surjective  $f$ , so that  $q$  is constructed by tensor and composition from generators  $\text{---}$ ,  $\text{X}$ , and  $\text{>}$ . Then  $q^\dagger \circledast q = \text{id}$ .*

*Proof.* Induction. In the base case, it is easy to see that the equation holds when  $q = \text{---}$  or  $q = \text{X}$ . Further,  $\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \text{---}$  holds as an axiom. It therefore remains to prove the inductive step. Let  $q_0$  and  $q_1$  be morphisms such that  $q_i^\dagger \circledast q_i = \text{id}$  for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Then the equation holds for their tensor product

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{q_0} \\ \boxed{q_1} \end{array} = \text{---}$$

and also for their composite.

$$\boxed{q_1^\dagger} \boxed{q} = \boxed{q_1^\dagger} \boxed{q_0^\dagger} \boxed{q_0} \boxed{q_1} = \boxed{q_1^\dagger} \boxed{q_1} = \text{---} \quad \square$$

Note that in the theory of *Extra* Special Frobenius Monoids, Proposition D.5 holds for *any* morphism in the image of  $\mathcal{S}$ ; the surjectivity requirement is dropped. This is due to the presence of the additional axiom

$$\vdash \circlearrowleft \dashv = \boxed{\phantom{\circlearrowleft}}$$

which proves the remaining base case.

**Proposition D.6.**

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_1} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_0} \end{array} \quad (20)$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \text{---} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_1} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_0} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_1} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_0} \end{array} \quad \square$$

The final lemma forms a key step in the proof that  $\mathcal{D}$  is functorial. However, its derivation is somewhat fiddly, so we omit it from the main part of the proof.

**Proposition D.7.** *Let  $f_0$  and  $f_1$  be arbitrary morphisms, and suppose  $q = \mathcal{S}(q')$  for some surjective function  $q'$ . That is, assume  $q$  is constructed by tensor and composition from generators  $\text{---}$ ,  $\text{X}$ , and  $\text{---}$ . Then*

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{q} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{q^\dagger} \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \text{---} \boxed{q} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{q} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{q^\dagger} \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \text{---} \boxed{q}$$

*Proof.* We derive as follows.

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{q} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{q^\dagger} \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \text{---} \boxed{q} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{q} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{q^\dagger} \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \text{---} \boxed{q} \\ = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{q} \quad \boxed{q^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \\ = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{q} \quad \boxed{q^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \\ = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{q} \quad \boxed{q^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{q^\dagger} \quad \boxed{q} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \\ = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{q} \quad \boxed{q^\dagger} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \\ = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{q} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{q^\dagger} \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{f_1} \end{array} \text{---} \boxed{q}$$

In the above, the first step uses Proposition D.6, the penultimate step uses Proposition D.5, and all other steps use Proposition D.3.  $\square$