

COLIMITS IN 2-DIMENSIONAL SLICES

LUCA MESITI

ABSTRACT. We generalize to dimension 2 the well-known fact that a colimit in a 1-dimensional slice is precisely the map from the colimit of the domains which is induced by the universal property. We show two different approaches to this; a more intuitive one, based on the reduction of the weighted 2-colimits to oplax normal conical ones, and a more abstract one, based on an original concept of colim-fibration and on an extension of the Grothendieck construction.

We find the need to consider lax slices, and prove results of preservation, reflection and lifting of 2-colimits for the domain 2-functor from a lax slice. The preservation result is shown by proving a general theorem of \mathcal{F} -category theory, which states that a lax left adjoint preserves appropriate colimits if the adjunction is strict on one side and is suitably \mathcal{F} -categorical.

Finally, we apply this theorem of preservation of 2-colimits to the 2-functor of change of base along a split Grothendieck opfibration between lax slices, after showing that it is such a left adjoint by laxifying the proof that Conduché functors are exponentiable. We conclude extending the result of preservation of 2-colimits for the change of base 2-functor to any finitely complete 2-category with a dense generator.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Colimits in 2-dimensional slices	5
3. \mathcal{F} -categories and a lifting result for the domain 2-functor	15
4. Lax \mathcal{F} -adjoints and preservation of colimits	18
5. Change of base between lax slices	29
References	38

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well-known that, in dimension 1, a colimit in a slice is precisely the map from the colimit of the domains which is induced by the universal property of the colimit. This fact, together with the results of preservation, reflection and lifting of all colimits for the domain functor from a slice, gives a complete calculus of colimits in 1-dimensional slices (see Theorem 1.1). And such a calculus has been proven useful in myriads of applications, in particular in the context of locally cartesian closed categories or for general exponentiability of morphisms, in categorical logic, algebraic geometry and topos theory. Indeed, an exponentiable morphism $f : E \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} , that is an exponentiable object in \mathcal{C}/B , can be characterized as a morphism which admits all pullbacks along it and is such that the change of base functor $f^* : \mathcal{C}/B \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/E$ has a right adjoint. The latter condition implies, and by adjoint functor theorems is often implied by, preservation of all

Date: May 1, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 18N10, 18A30, 18A40, 18D30, 18D15.

Key words and phrases. 2-categories, slice, colimits, lax adjoints, \mathcal{F} -categories, change of base.

colimits for f^* . The calculus of colimits in 1-dimensional slices is what allows to apply the exponentiability of a morphism to colimits in the slice that come from colimits in the category \mathcal{C} , i.e. the ones that we have in practice.

The main result of this paper is a generalization to dimension 2 of this fruitful 1-dimensional calculus, including results of preservation, reflection and lifting of 2-colimits for the domain 2-functor from a lax slice. Theorems on suitable change of base 2-functors between lax slices are presented as well. The lax slice is indeed the appropriate 2-dimensional slice to consider in order to achieve such generalization, as we justify with two different approaches.

These results, in combination with our [11], will then be applied in forthcoming papers on 2-dimensional subobject classifiers and elementary 2-toposes; a subject firstly introduced by Weber in [16] to generalize the corresponding 1-dimensional fundamental concepts.

The following theorem condenses the calculus of colimits in 1-dimensional slices.

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a category and let $M \in \mathcal{C}$. The domain functor $\text{dom}: \mathcal{C}/M \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves, reflects and lifts uniquely all colimits (and so it creates all colimits).*

Moreover, for every diagram $D: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ with \mathcal{A} small that admits a colimit in \mathcal{C} , every morphism $q: \text{colim}_A D(A) \rightarrow M$ in \mathcal{C} is the colimit of a diagram in \mathcal{C}/M . More precisely,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{colim}_A D(A) & & D(A) \\ \downarrow q & = \text{colim}_A & \downarrow q \circ i_A \\ M & & M \end{array} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{C}/M, \quad (1)$$

where the $i_A: D(A) \rightarrow \text{colim}_A D(A)$ are the inclusions that form the universal cocone.

Notice that this theorem recovers the property we mentioned above, that a colimit in \mathcal{C}/M is precisely the map from the colimit of the domains which is induced by the universal property. Indeed, half of this fact is captured by the preservation of colimits for $\text{dom}: \mathcal{C}/M \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, whereas the other half, that is harder to capture, is represented by equation (1). In dimension 1, the latter special property holds because a cocone on M is the same thing as a diagram in the slice over M . But in dimension 2, we need weighted 2-colimits and then weighted 2-cocylinders rather than cocones. This makes it then harder to establish a bijection with diagrams in a 2-dimensional slice, as such diagrams still have a conical shape.

In this paper, we first focus on generalizing the special property of equation (1) to dimension 2 (Theorem 2.20), extracting from a now weighted 2-cocylinder a diagram in a 2-dimensional slice that works. We show two different approaches to this. The first approach (Construction 2.1) is more intuitive, based on the reduction of the weighted 2-colimits to essentially conical ones, namely oplax normal conical ones. We have described such reduction in detail in our [11] with new more elementary proofs, but the idea goes back to Street's [14]. Remember that conical colimits do not suffice anymore in dimension 2, basically because functors from $\mathbf{1}$ to a category \mathcal{C} cannot capture the whole of \mathcal{C} , but just the objects. The philosophy behind weighted 2-colimits is to capture the whole of \mathcal{C} with functors from every possible category (or actually just $\mathbf{2}$) to it. But another solution is given by considering functors from $\mathbf{1}$ to \mathcal{C} together with natural transformations between them. This brings to oplax normal conical 2-colimits, that are as expressive as weighted 2-colimits, but offer substantial advantages in certain situations. Indeed there is sometimes the need, as in this paper, to use essentially conical shapes. The price to pay is to have (coherent) 2-cells inside the cones, but this is something that can often be handled. The

reduction of weighted 2-colimits to oplax normal conical ones is allowed and regulated by what we call the 2-*Set*-enriched Grothendieck construction. Such construction is an extension of the usual Grothendieck construction that admits 2-functors $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ from a 2-category \mathcal{A} (rather than just a 1-category). This is studied in detail in our [11], both from an elementary and an abstract perspective.

The second approach, culminating with Theorem 2.20, is instead more abstract, based on an apparently original concept of colim-fibration, that we give both in dimension 1 (Definition 2.3) and dimension 2 (Definition 2.14), as well as on the 2-*Set*-enriched Grothendieck construction. Both the approaches show the need to consider lax slices in order to generalize the special property of equation (1) to dimension 2. In the first one, for example, this corresponds to only being able to essentially conicalize weighted 2-colimits, rather than to strictly conicalize them.

A result of reflection of 2-colimits for the domain 2-functor $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ from a lax slice is the main part of Theorem 2.20, as reflection is part of the concept of 2-colim-fibration. Further than reflecting (appropriate) 2-colimits, a 2-colim-fibration is in particular a 2-*Set*-fibration, that is, what is classified by the 2-*Set*-enriched Grothendieck construction. The notion of 2-*Set*-fibration is described both in our [11] and in Lambert’s [10] (with the name “discrete 2-fibration”).

We then show a result of lifting of 2-colimits for $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ in Proposition 3.5. This is based on a generalization to dimension 2 of the bijective correspondence between cocones on M and diagrams in the slice over M (Proposition 3.1). The 2-dimensional correspondence is captured and justified by \mathcal{F} -category theory, also called enhanced 2-category theory and introduced in Lack and Shulman’s [9]. Roughly, the idea is to consider 2-categories, whose morphisms we think as loose, with a selected subclass of morphisms that we call tight. We then ask 2-functors to preserve the tightness of morphisms. A more thorough recall is in Recall 3.3.

\mathcal{F} -category theory is then crucial in establishing a result of preservation of 2-colimits for $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ (Theorem 4.13). Indeed we guarantee preservation of 2-colimits by an original theorem (Theorem 4.11) that states that a lax left adjoint (Definition 4.1) preserves appropriate colimits (Definition 4.6) if the adjunction is strict on one side and is suitably \mathcal{F} -categorical (see the partly original Definition 4.5). Lax adjoints have been firstly introduced in Gray’s [6], and the idea is to admit unit and counit to only be lax natural. At the level of hom-categories, such laxness translates as having an adjunction between them rather than an isomorphism (or an equivalence as for a biadjunction); see Recall 4.2. We need such adjunctions because the suitable right adjoint to the domain 2-functor $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is still $M \times -$ (as in dimension 1), but the unit is now only lax natural. Taking then the tight part of a lax slice to be the strict slice (see Remark 3.4), we open the way to find a lax \mathcal{F} -categorical adjunction. \mathcal{F} -categorical adjunctions appear also in Walker’s [15]; and another potential source of examples is Bourke’s [2].

The idea behind our general \mathcal{F} -categorical Theorem 4.11 on the preservation of colimits is to move back and forth between the two 2-categories taking advantage of the strictness of the lax adjunction on one side. In this way, we can recover again the data we started from with new information gathered in the other 2-category. The condition of having a suitably \mathcal{F} -categorical lax adjunction ensures that this idea works, guaranteeing that certain structure 2-cells of lax natural transformations are identities. Interestingly, a loose such lax \mathcal{F} -adjunction, that does not necessarily have tight unit and counit, is still enough to imply the preservation of a big class of 2-colimits. Remember that, despite the preservation result is expressed in an \mathcal{F} -categorical language in order to neatly state the

needed assumptions, it is always possible to start from a weighted 2-colimit and view it in this context, after reducing it to an oplax normal conical one.

Finally, we apply the general \mathcal{F} -categorical theorem of preservation of 2-colimits to the 2-functor of change of base along a split Grothendieck opfibration between lax slices (see Proposition 5.2). In dimension 1, the concept of change of base between slices is definitely helpful, and it is well known that the pullback perfectly realizes such a job. For \mathcal{CAT} , given a functor $\tau: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, it is still a good idea to consider the pullback 2-functor $\tau^*: \mathcal{CAT}/\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}/\mathcal{E}$ between strict slices. And it is well known that such change of base 2-functor has a right adjoint τ_* (and automatically a right 2-adjoint) precisely when τ is a Conduché functor (as the latter functors are the exponentiable morphisms in \mathcal{CAT}). This is proved in Conduché's [4], with the ideas already present in Giraud's [5]. So that when τ is Conduché then τ^* is nicely behaved, preserving all the weighted 2-colimits. However, in order to generalize the calculus of colimits in 1-dimensional slices to dimension 2, we find the need to consider lax slices. And it is then helpful to have a change of base 2-functor between lax slices of a finitely complete 2-category. We believe that the most natural way to achieve this is by calculating comma objects rather than pullbacks. This is also connected to the construction of the category of elements, as we have described in our [11], but also, in general, to the concept of 2-dimensional elementary topos (see Weber's [16]). Equivalently to calculating comma objects, we can take pullbacks along split Grothendieck opfibrations, that serve as a kind of fibrant replacement (see Proposition 5.1). Such a point of view is preferable for us since Grothendieck opfibrations in \mathcal{CAT} are always Conduché and we can generalize the ideas for finding a right adjoint to the pullback functor $\tau^*: \mathcal{CAT}/\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}/\mathcal{E}$ (from Conduché's [4]) to lax slices. Notice that considering lax slices we are fixing a direction and we then need to take opfibrations, while Conduché functors are now too unbiased.

We prove that $\tau^*: \mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$ has a loose \mathcal{F} -categorical right lax adjoint that is strict on one side, in Theorem 5.3. This generalizes also Palmgren's [12], that proved a similar result for pseudoslices of groupoids, from the comma objects point of view. Our theorem then implies the preservation of appropriate 2-colimits for the 2-functor τ^* between lax slices.

We also show that the 2-functor of change of base along a split Grothendieck opfibration between lax slices makes sense in a general 2-category rather than just in \mathcal{CAT} (Proposition 5.2, taking from Street's [13] and Weber's [16] the needed general notion of opfibration). We conclude proving that the 2-functor τ^* between lax slices preserves appropriate 2-colimits also in the case of prestacks (Proposition 5.6) and more in general of finitely complete 2-categories with a dense generator (Theorem 5.8). In the latter general context (for which we take Kelly's [8] as main reference) we indeed prove that τ^* preserves all the relatively absolute 2-colimits that make sense from the \mathcal{F} -categorical point of view. Remember also that any object of the 2-category can be expressed as a relatively absolute 2-colimit of dense generators, so that our assumption is not much restrictive in practice.

Outline of the paper. In Section 2, we present the calculus of colimits in 2-dimensional slices (Theorem 2.20), firstly via reducing weighted 2-colimits to oplax normal conical ones (Construction 2.1) and then via 2-colim-fibrations (Definition 2.14). This includes a result of reflection of 2-colimits for $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$.

In Section 3, we generalize to dimension 2 the bijective correspondence between cocones on M and diagrams in the slice over M (Proposition 3.1). This result will be justified

by \mathcal{F} -category theory, that we recall in Recall 3.3. We then show a result of lifting of 2-colimits for $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ (Proposition 3.5).

In Section 4, we prove a result of preservation of 2-colimits for the domain 2-functor from a lax slice (Theorem 4.13). This is shown by proving a general theorem of \mathcal{F} -category theory (Theorem 4.11), which states that a lax left adjoint (Recall 4.2) preserves appropriate colimits if the adjunction is strict on one side and is suitably \mathcal{F} -categorical.

In Section 5, we apply this theorem of preservation of 2-colimits to the 2-functor of change of base along a split Grothendieck opfibration between lax slices (Theorem 5.3), laxifying the proof that Conduché functors are exponentiable. We conclude extending such result to prestacks (Proposition 5.6) and then to any finitely complete 2-category with a dense generator (Theorem 5.8).

2. COLIMITS IN 2-DIMENSIONAL SLICES

We aim at generalizing to dimension 2 the well-known 1-dimensional result that a colimit in a slice corresponds to the map from the colimit of the domains which is induced by the universal property. Half of such result will be captured by preservation of 2-colimits for the domain 2-functor from a lax slice, that we will address in Section 4. In this section, we focus on the other half, that is the generalization to dimension 2 of the special property of equation (1) (of Theorem 1.1). Namely, we want to prove that a morphism from a 2-colimit to some M can be expressed as a 2-colimit in a 2-dimensional slice over M .

We show two different approaches to this, that lead to the same result (compare Construction 2.1 with Theorem 2.20). The first one is more intuitive, based on the reduction of the weighted 2-colimits to oplax normal conical ones. Such reduction is explored in detail in our [11] with new more elementary proofs and before that in Street's [14]. The second approach is more abstract, based on an original concept of *colim-fibration* (Definition 2.3 in dimension 1 and Definition 2.14 in dimension 2). This will offer a shorter and more elegant proof, in Theorem 2.20. Both the approaches show the need to consider lax slices. In the first one, for example, this corresponds to only being able to essentially conicalize weighted 2-colimits, rather than to strictly conicalize them.

This section also contains a result of reflection of 2-colimits for the domain 2-functor $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ from a lax slice. Indeed the concept of *2-colim-fibration* involves reflecting (appropriate) 2-colimits, together with being a *2-Set*-fibration. The latter notion is described both in our [11] and in Lambert's [10] (with the name "discrete 2-fibration").

We now begin exploring the first approach to the generalization to dimension 2 of equation (1) (of Theorem 1.1).

Construction 2.1. Let \mathcal{E} be a 2-category and let $M \in \mathcal{E}$. Consider a 2-diagram $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ with \mathcal{A} small and a weight $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ such that the colimit $\text{colim}^W F$ of F weighted by W exists in \mathcal{E} . Take then a morphism $q: \text{colim}^W F \rightarrow M$, or equivalently the corresponding weighted 2-cocylinder

$$\nu^q: W \rightrightarrows \mathcal{E}(F(-), M).$$

We would like to express q as a 2-colimit in a 2-dimensional slice of \mathcal{E} over M . So we need to construct from ν^q a 2-diagram in a 2-dimensional slice. In dimension 1, equation (1) (of Theorem 1.1) is based on the fact that a cocone on M coincides with a diagram in \mathcal{C}/M . But here, in dimension 2, we have a weighted 2-cocylinder ν^q instead of a strict cocone, and thus it is not clear how to directly find a corresponding diagram in a slice. We notice that this is essentially a matter of selecting a cocone out of the bunch of cocones that

form the weighted 2-cocylinder ν^q . And then we obtain a great help from the reduction of weighted 2-colimits to oplax normal conical ones.

As described in our [11], while it is not possible to represent ν^q with a selected strict cocone, it is possible to reduce ν^q to an oplax normal 2-cocone. Indeed

$$\operatorname{colim}^W F \cong \operatorname{op lax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1}(F \circ \mathcal{G}(W))$$

where $\mathcal{G}(W) : \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is the 2-*Set*-enriched Grothendieck construction of W . And ν^q corresponds to an oplax normal 2-cocone

$$\lambda^q : \Delta^1 \xrightarrow[\operatorname{op lax}^n]{} \mathcal{E}((F \circ \mathcal{G}(W))(-), M) : \left(\int W\right)^{\operatorname{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}.$$

We recall from our [11] and Street's [14] that the 2-*Set*-enriched Grothendieck construction is a natural extension of the usual Grothendieck construction to admit 2-presheaves with domain a 2-category. An oplax normal natural transformation is an oplax one such that the structure 2-cells on the morphisms of the kind (f, id) in $(\int W)^{\operatorname{op}}$ are identities. This is a particular case of more general transformations introduced in Gray's [6]. The normality condition is what encodes the strict naturality of weighted 2-cocylinders.

It is now easy to check that an oplax normal 2-cocone on M can be reorganized as a 2-diagram in the lax slice $\mathcal{E}/_{\operatorname{lax}} M$ on M (we will see the complete correspondence in Proposition 3.1), where a 1-cell in the lax slice from $E \xrightarrow{g} M$ to $E' \xrightarrow{g'} M$ is a filled triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{\hat{\gamma}} & E' \\ & \searrow g & \swarrow g' \\ & & M \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \hat{\gamma} \\ \xrightarrow{\gamma} \end{array}$$

More precisely, we can reorganize λ^q as the 2-diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L^q : & \int W & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}/_{\operatorname{lax}} M \\ & (A, X) & \mapsto & F(A) \xrightarrow{F(f)} F(B) \\ & \downarrow (f, \alpha) & \mapsto & \lambda_{f, \alpha}^q \\ & (B, X') & \mapsto & \begin{array}{ccc} & \swarrow \lambda_{(A, X)}^q & \nwarrow \lambda_{(B, X')}^q \\ & & M \end{array} \\ & \delta & \mapsto & F(\delta) \end{array}$$

In Theorem 2.20, we will prove that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{colim}^W F & = & \operatorname{op lax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1}(F \circ \mathcal{G}(W)) \\ \downarrow q & & \downarrow q \\ M & & M \end{array} = \operatorname{op lax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1} L^q$$

in the lax slice $\mathcal{E}/_{\operatorname{lax}} M$. Of course, one could prove this directly, but our proof will be shorter and more abstract, in Theorem 2.20, based on the *colim-fibrations* point of view (that is, the second approach named above).

Remark 2.2. Despite weighted 2-colimits cannot be conicalized, we can almost conicalize them reducing them to oplax normal conical 2-colimits. The price to pay is to have 2-cells inside the cocones. And this then translates as the need to consider lax slices in order to generalize the 1-dimensional Theorem 1.1 to dimension 2.

Such need is further justified by the second approach (see Remark 2.19), that we now present. The idea is to capture Theorem 1.1 from a more abstract point of view, in a

way that resembles the property of being a discrete fibration. We will then proceed to generalize such approach to dimension 2, arriving to Theorem 2.20.

The following definition does not seem to appear in the literature.

Definition 2.3. A functor $p: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a **colim-fibration** if for every object $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and every universal cocone μ that exhibits $p(S)$ as the colimit of some diagram $D: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ with \mathcal{A} small, there exists a unique pair $(\overline{D}, \overline{\mu})$ with $\overline{D}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ a diagram and $\overline{\mu}$ a universal cocone that exhibits $S = \text{colim } \overline{D}$ such that $p \circ \overline{D} = D$ and $p \circ \overline{\mu} = \mu$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \overline{D}(A) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\mu}_A} & S \\
 \overline{D}(f) \searrow & & \nearrow \\
 & \overline{D}(B) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\mu}_B} \\
 \downarrow p & & \downarrow p \\
 D(A) & \xrightarrow{\mu_A} & p(S) \\
 D(f) \searrow & & \nearrow \\
 & D(B) & \xrightarrow{\mu_B}
 \end{array} \tag{2}$$

Remark 2.4. This is actually stronger than the property written in equation (1) of Theorem 1.1, but it will be clear after Proposition 2.10 that $\text{dom}: \mathcal{C}/M \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is also a colim-fibration. The following propositions shed more light on what it means to be a colim-fibration.

Proposition 2.5. *Every colim-fibration is a discrete fibration.*

Proof. Let $p: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a colim-fibration. We firstly show that only identities can be over identities with respect to p . So suppose $v: S' \rightarrow S$ is a morphism in \mathcal{S} such that $p(v) = \text{id}_{p(S)}$. We have that $p(S)$ is trivially the colimit of the diagram $D: \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ given by the arrow $\text{id}_{p(S)}$, with universal cocone given by just identities. But then both the arrows v and id_S give a diagram $\overline{D}: \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ with a universal cocone that exhibits $S = \text{colim } \overline{D}$ such that it is over the universal cocone given by the identities of $p(S)$. And we conclude that $v = \text{id}_S$.

Take now $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $u: C \rightarrow p(S)$ a morphism in \mathcal{C} . We want to show that there is a unique lifting of u to S . Consider then the diagram $D: \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ given by the arrow u in \mathcal{C} . Then the colimit of D exists trivially and is $p(S)$, with universal cocone

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C & & \\
 u \downarrow & \searrow u & \\
 p(S) & \equiv & p(S)
 \end{array}$$

As p is a colim-fibration, there exist a unique diagram $\overline{D}: \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ and a unique universal cocone $\overline{\mu}$ that exhibits $S = \text{colim } \overline{D}$ with $p \circ \overline{D} = D$ and $p \circ \overline{\mu} = \mu$. But then we need to have $\overline{D}(1) = S$ and $\overline{\mu}_1 = \text{id}_S$ by the argument above, whence \overline{D} is the unique lifting of u to S . \square

Corollary 2.6. *Let $p: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a functor. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) p is a colim-fibration;
- (ii) for every object $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and every universal cocone μ that exhibits $p(S)$ as the colimit of some diagram $D: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ with \mathcal{A} small, there exists a unique pair $(\overline{D}, \overline{\mu})$ with

$\overline{D}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ a diagram and a $\overline{\mu}$ a cocone for \overline{D} on S such that $p \circ \overline{D} = D$ and $p \circ \overline{\mu} = \mu$; moreover $\overline{\mu}$ is a universal cocone that exhibits $S = \text{colim } \overline{D}$.

Remark 2.7. Corollary 2.6 shows that, for a colim-fibration, the liftings $\overline{\mu}$ of universal cocones μ are unique as mere cocone over μ on the starting $S \in \mathcal{S}$.

We notice that the definition of creating colimits (see for example Adámek, Herrlich and Strecker's [1]) and condition (ii) of Corollary 2.6 for being a colim-fibration are actually pretty similar, but somehow dual to each other. Indeed, looking at the diagram in equation (2), creation of colimits starts from a diagram \overline{D} and produces a colimit S for it, while being a colim-fibration starts from some S and produces a diagram \overline{D} with colimit S .

To further clarify the connection between these two, we recall the following proposition from Adámek, Herrlich and Strecker's [1] (Proposition 13.34).

Proposition 2.8. *For a functor F , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) F preserves and lifts [uniquely] all the colimits;
- (ii) F preserves and detects all the colimits, and moreover it is a [discrete] iso-fibration.

Remark 2.9. By Proposition 2.5, a colim-fibration is always a discrete fibration and so always a discrete iso-fibration. But we still have to clarify the connection between being a colim-fibration and reflecting colimits.

Proposition 2.10. *Let $p: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a functor. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) p is a colim-fibration;
- (ii) p is a discrete fibration that reflects all the colimits.

Proof. We prove “(ii) \Rightarrow (i)”. Take $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and a universal cocone μ that exhibits $p(S)$ as the colimit of some diagram $D: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ with \mathcal{A} small. Since p is a discrete fibration, there exists a unique pair $(\overline{D}, \overline{\mu})$ with $\overline{D}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ a diagram and $\overline{\mu}$ a cocone for \overline{D} on S such that $p \circ \overline{D} = D$ and $p \circ \overline{\mu} = \mu$. Indeed, for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, we can define $\overline{D}(A)$ and $\overline{\mu}_A$ by taking the unique lifting of μ_A to S , and, for every $f: A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{A} , define $\overline{D}(f)$ to be the unique lifting of $D(f)$ to $\overline{D}(B)$, whose domain needs to be $\overline{D}(A)$ since any discrete fibration is split. Moreover $\overline{\mu}$ needs to be universal since p reflects all the colimits and $p \circ \overline{\mu} = \mu$ is universal.

We now prove “(i) \Rightarrow (ii)”. So let p be a colim-fibration. After Proposition 2.5, we just need to prove that p reflects all the colimits. Take a diagram $H: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ with \mathcal{A} small and a cocone ζ for H on some object $S \in \mathcal{S}$; assume then that $p \circ \zeta$ is a universal cocone, exhibiting $p(S) = \text{colim } (p \circ H)$. By Corollary 2.6, we know that there exist a unique pair $(\overline{p \circ H}, \overline{p \circ \zeta})$ with $\overline{p \circ H}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ a diagram and $\overline{p \circ \zeta}$ a cocone for $\overline{p \circ H}$ on S such that $p \circ \overline{p \circ H} = p \circ H$ and $p \circ \overline{p \circ \zeta} = p \circ \zeta$, and that moreover $\overline{p \circ \zeta}$ is a universal cocone that exhibits $S = \text{colim } \overline{p \circ H}$. But then we need to have that $\overline{p \circ H} = H$ and $\overline{p \circ \zeta} = \zeta$, whence we conclude. \square

Corollary 2.11. *Let $p: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a colim-fibration that preserves and detects all the colimits. Then p (preserves and) creates all the colimits.*

Proof. Clear combining Proposition 2.8 and Proposition 2.10, since creating all the colimits is equivalent to lifting uniquely and reflecting all the colimits (see for example Adámek, Herrlich and Strecker's [1]). \square

Remark 2.12. We can now rewrite Theorem 1.1 by saying that $\text{dom}: \mathcal{C}/M \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a colim-fibration that preserves and detects all the colimits. This is actually stronger than

Theorem 1.1, but we see that dom does satisfy this as it can be expressed as the category of elements of the representable $y(M) : \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ and is thus a discrete fibration. The explicit formula in equation (1) then comes from the explicit liftings of dom .

Construction 2.13. At this point, we are ready to generalize the concept of colimit-fibration to dimension 2. As described in our [11], what we think most naturally generalizes discrete fibrations to dimension 2 are the 2-Set -fibrations. The latter are what gets classified by the 2-Set -Grothendieck construction. Precisely they are an extension of the usual Grothendieck fibrations that are, locally, discrete opfibrations. Hence they correspond to a locally discrete version of Hermida's 2-fibrations; see Lambert's [10] and also Hermida's [7]. Being, locally, discrete opfibrations, they are able to uniquely lift 2-cells to a fixed domain 1-cell. Be careful, though, that it would now be much harder to directly generalize Definition 2.3 in a way that implies being a 2-Set -fibration. So we think it is most concise to just ask having a 2-Set -fibration.

We then need to use a 2-categorical concept of cocone. While weighted 2-cocylinders would be hard to handle, we notice that a 2-Set -fibration has the ability to lift oplax normal 2-cocones. Indeed, let $p : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be a cloven 2-Set -fibration. Consider then $S \in \mathcal{S}$, a marking $W : \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ with \mathcal{A} small, a 2-diagram $D : \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ and an oplax normal 2-cocone

$$\theta : \Delta 1 \xrightarrow{\text{oplax}^n} \mathcal{E}(D(-), p(S))$$

for D on $p(S)$. Then p lifts (D, θ) to a pair $(\bar{D}, \bar{\theta})$ with $\bar{D} : \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ a 2-diagram and $\bar{\theta}$ an oplax normal 2-cocone for \bar{D} on S such that $p \circ \bar{D} = D$ and $p \circ \bar{\theta} = \theta$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \bar{D}(A, X) & \xrightarrow{\bar{\theta}_{(A, X)}} & S \\
 \bar{D}(f, \alpha) \searrow & \Downarrow \bar{\theta}_{f, \alpha} & \nearrow \\
 \bar{D}(B, X') & \xrightarrow{\bar{\theta}_{(B, X')}} & S \\
 \downarrow p & & \downarrow p \\
 D(A, X) & \xrightarrow{\theta_{(A, X)}} & p(S) \\
 D(f, \alpha) \searrow & \Downarrow \theta_{f, \alpha} & \nearrow \\
 D(B, X') & \xrightarrow{\theta_{(B, X')}} & p(S)
 \end{array} \tag{3}$$

For every $(A, X) \in \int W$, we define $\bar{D}(A, X)$ and $\bar{\theta}_{(A, X)}$ by taking the chosen cartesian lifting of $\theta_{(A, X)}$ to S . For every $(f, \alpha) : (A, X) \rightarrow (B, X')$ in $\int W$, we then define $\bar{\theta}_{f, \alpha} : \bar{\theta}_{(A, X)} \rightarrow \xi$ to be the unique lifting of $\theta_{f, \alpha}$ to $\bar{\theta}_{(A, X)}$. Since $\bar{\theta}_{(B, X')}$ is cartesian, ξ factors through $\bar{\theta}_{(B, X')}$; we define $\bar{D}(f, \alpha)$ to be the unique factoring morphism $\bar{D}(A, X) \rightarrow \bar{D}(B, X')$, so that $\bar{\theta}_{f, \alpha} : \bar{\theta}_{(A, X)} \rightarrow \bar{\theta}_{(B, X')} \circ \bar{D}(f, \alpha)$. It remains to define \bar{D} on 2-cells. Given $\delta : (f, \alpha) \Rightarrow (g, \beta) : (A, X) \rightarrow (B, X')$ in $\int W$, we define $\bar{D}(\delta)$ to be the unique lifting of $D(\delta)$ to $\bar{D}(f, \alpha)$. The codomain of $\bar{D}(\delta)$ is $\bar{D}(g, \beta)$ because of the uniqueness of the lifting of

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 D(A, X) & \xrightarrow{\theta_{(A, X)}} & p(S) \\
 \downarrow D(\delta) & \searrow D(f, \alpha) & \Downarrow \theta_{f, \alpha} \\
 D(B, X') & \xrightarrow{\theta_{(B, X')}} & p(S) \\
 \downarrow D(g, \beta) & & \\
 & &
 \end{array}$$

which coincides with $\theta_{g,\beta}$, to $\bar{\theta}_{(A,X)}$, and the cartesianity of $\bar{\theta}_{(B,X')}$. This argument also proves the 2-dimensional property of the oplax naturality of $\bar{\theta}$. It is straightforward to check that \bar{D} is a 2-functor and that $\bar{\theta}$ is oplax normal natural, using the cartesianity of the $\bar{\theta}_{(A,X)}$'s and the uniqueness of the liftings of a 2-cell to a fixed domain 1-cell (with arguments similar to the above one).

Clearly, the $\bar{\theta}_{(A,X)}$'s are not unique above the $\theta_{(A,X)}$, but cartesian. Having fixed them, however, the rest of the oplax normal cocone $\bar{\theta}$ is uniquely defined. It is also true that, given another pair $(\tilde{D}, \tilde{\theta})$ that lifts (D, θ) , the unique vertical morphisms $\tilde{D}(A, X) \rightarrow \bar{D}(A, X)$ that produce the factorization of the $\tilde{\theta}_{(A,X)}$'s through the cartesian $\bar{\theta}_{(A,X)}$'s form a unique vertical 2-natural transformation $j: \tilde{D} \rightarrow \bar{D}$ such that $\tilde{\theta} = (- \circ j) \circ \bar{\theta}$. This can be checked using the uniqueness of the liftings of a 2-cell to a fixed domain 1-cell and the cartesianity of the $\bar{\theta}_{(A,X)}$'s.

The following definition is original.

Definition 2.14. A 2-functor $p: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is a **2-colim-fibration** if it is a cloven 2-*Set*-fibration such that, for every $S \in \mathcal{S}$, marking $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ with \mathcal{A} small, 2-diagram $D: \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ and universal oplax normal 2-cocone

$$\theta: \Delta 1 \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{=} \mathcal{E}(D(-), p(S))$$

that exhibits $p(S) = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta 1} D$, the pair $(\bar{D}, \bar{\theta})$ obtained by lifting (D, θ) through p to S as in Construction 2.13 exhibits

$$S = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta 1} \bar{D}.$$

Remark 2.15. Remember that every weighted 2-colimit can be reduced to an oplax normal conical one, so the property of being a 2-colim-fibration can as well be applied to any universal weighted 2-cocylinder

$$\mu: W \rightrightarrows \mathcal{E}(F(-), p(S))$$

for some 2-diagram $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, after reducing it to a universal oplax normal 2-cocone.

We would now like to generalize Proposition 2.10 to dimension 2. We see, however, that a 2-colim-fibration does not necessarily reflect all the (oplax normal conical) 2-colimits, because the lifting $(\bar{D}, \bar{\theta})$ of Construction 2.13 is not unique anymore. Indeed, if we start from an oplax normal 2-cocone above (at the level of \mathcal{S}), project it down and lift, we do not find in general the starting oplax normal 2-cocone. We almost find the same, however, if we start from an oplax normal 2-cocone that we call *cartesian*, and now define. This will bring to Proposition 2.18.

Definition 2.16. Let $p: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be a 2-*Set*-fibration. Consider then $S \in \mathcal{S}$, a marking $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ with \mathcal{A} small and a 2-diagram $H: \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$. An oplax normal 2-cocone

$$\zeta: \Delta 1 \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{=} \mathcal{S}(H(-), S)$$

is **cartesian** if for every $(A, X) \in \int W$ the component $\zeta_{(A,X)}$ (seen as a morphism in \mathcal{S}) is cartesian with respect to p .

We say that p **reflects all the cartesian** (oplax normal conical) **2-colimits** if it reflects the universality of cartesian oplax normal 2-cocones.

Example 2.17. Let \mathcal{E} be a 2-category and $M \in \mathcal{E}$. The cartesian morphisms in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ with respect to $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ are precisely the triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{\hat{\gamma}} & E' \\ & \searrow g & \swarrow g' \\ & & M \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \cong \\ \gamma \end{array}$$

with the 2-cell γ an isomorphism. So the cartesian oplax normal 2-cocones in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ are the ones with components triangles filled with isomorphisms.

Proposition 2.18. *Let $p: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be a cloven 2-Set-fibration. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) p is a 2-colim-fibration;
- (ii) p reflects all the cartesian 2-colimits.

Proof. We prove “(ii) \Rightarrow (i)”. In the notation of Definition 2.14, the oplax normal 2-cocone $\bar{\theta}$ is cartesian by Construction 2.13. Since p reflects all the cartesian colimits and $p \circ \bar{\theta} = \theta$ is universal, then $\bar{\theta}$ needs to be universal as well, exhibiting $S = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1} \bar{D}$.

We now prove “(i) \Rightarrow (ii)”. So consider $S \in \mathcal{S}$, a marking $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ with \mathcal{A} small, a 2-diagram $H: \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ and a cartesian oplax normal 2-cocone

$$\zeta: \Delta 1 \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{} \mathcal{S}(H(-), S).$$

Assume that $p \circ \zeta$ is universal, exhibiting $p(S) = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1}(p \circ H)$. We prove that ζ is universal as well. Consider the lifting $(\overline{p \circ H}, \overline{p \circ \zeta})$ of $(p \circ H, p \circ \zeta)$ through p to S , as in Construction 2.13. It is straightforward to check that, since cartesian liftings are unique up to a unique vertical isomorphism, there exists a 2-natural isomorphism $j: \overline{H} \cong \overline{p \circ H}$ such that $\zeta = (- \circ j) \circ \overline{p \circ \zeta}$ (see the last part of Construction 2.13). Since $\overline{p \circ \zeta}$ is universal, as p is a 2-colim-fibration, and $(- \circ j)$ is a 2-natural isomorphism, we conclude that ζ is universal. \square

Remark 2.19. We have seen in Remark 2.12 that we can rephrase the 1-dimensional Theorem 1.1 by saying that $\text{dom}: \mathcal{C}/M \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a colim-fibration that preserves and detects all the colimits. And this latter is actually stronger than Theorem 1.1, but true since $\text{dom}: \mathcal{C}/M \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ can be obtained as the category of elements of the representable $y(M): \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$.

As described in our [11], we believe the most natural categorification of the construction of the category of elements is given by the 2-Set-enriched Grothendieck construction. So, to obtain a generalization of Theorem 1.1 (or better, the stronger colim-fibration result) to dimension 2, we consider the 2-Set-enriched Grothendieck construction of a representable $y(M): \mathcal{E}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ (given \mathcal{E} a 2-category and $M \in \mathcal{E}$). This gives the domain functor from the lax slice $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$, further justifying Construction 2.1:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{1} \\ \text{dom} \downarrow & \nearrow \text{lax comma} & \downarrow \mathbf{1} \\ \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{y(M)} & \mathcal{CAT}^{\text{op}} \end{array}$$

We now prove that $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is a 2-colim-fibration (Theorem 2.20). In particular, considering how liftings along dom are calculated, this will also imply the conclusion of Construction 2.1 (first approach) from this abstract point of view. We will then address lifting (that is stronger than detection) of 2-colimits in Proposition 3.5 and preservation of 2-colimits in Section 4, establishing a full 2-categorical generalization of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.20. *Let \mathcal{E} be a 2-category and $M \in \mathcal{E}$. Then the 2-functor $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is a 2-colim-fibration. As a consequence, in the notation of Construction 2.1,*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{colim}^W F & = & \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1}(F \circ \mathcal{G}(W)) & = & \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1} L^q \\ \downarrow q & & \downarrow q & & \\ M & & M & & \end{array}$$

in the lax slice $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$. Here, L^q is the 2-diagram in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ that corresponds to the oplax normal 2-cocone λ^q on M associated to the weighted 2-cocylinder on M that q represents.

Proof. By Remark 2.19, we know that $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ can be obtained as the 2-*Set*-enriched Grothendieck construction of $y(M): \mathcal{E}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$. So dom is a 2-*Set*-fibration with a canonical cleavage (the chosen cartesian lifting of a morphism f is (f, id)).

We prove that the second part of the statement is a consequence of the first one. So assume we have already proved that dom is a 2-colim-fibration. Calling θ the universal oplax normal 2-cocone that exhibits $C = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1}(F \circ \mathcal{G}(W))$, we then obtain that the lifting of $(F \circ \mathcal{G}(W), \theta)$ through dom to q (calculated as in Construction 2.13)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{F \circ \mathcal{G}(W)}(A, X) & \xrightarrow{\quad \bar{\theta}_{(A,X)} \quad} & q \\ \downarrow \overline{F \circ \mathcal{G}(W)}(f, \alpha) & \swarrow \bar{\theta}_{f, \alpha} & \downarrow \bar{\theta}_{(B, X')} \\ \overline{F \circ \mathcal{G}(W)}(B, X') & \xrightarrow{\quad \bar{\theta}_{(B, X')} \quad} & q \\ \downarrow \text{dom} & & \downarrow \text{dom} \\ F(A) & \xrightarrow{\quad \theta_{(A,X)} \quad} & C \\ \downarrow F(f) & \swarrow \theta_{f, \alpha} & \downarrow \theta_{(B, X')} \\ F(B) & \xrightarrow{\quad \theta_{(B, X')} \quad} & C \end{array}$$

exhibits

$$q = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1} \overline{F \circ \mathcal{G}(W)}$$

in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$. And we can calculate $\overline{F \circ \mathcal{G}(W)}$ and $\bar{\theta}$ explicitly, looking at the action of $y(M): \mathcal{E}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ on 1-cells and 2-cells, since $\text{dom} = \mathcal{G}(y(M))$. Given $(A, X) \in \int W$,

$$\overline{F \circ \mathcal{G}(W)}(A, X) = y(M)(\theta_{(A,X)})(q) = q \circ \theta_{(A,X)} = \lambda_{(A,X)}^q = L^q(A, X)$$

$$\bar{\theta}_{(A,X)} = \begin{array}{ccc} F(A) & \xrightarrow{\quad \theta_{(A,X)} \quad} & C \\ & \searrow \lambda_{(A,X)}^q & \swarrow q \\ & & M \end{array}$$

Given $(f, \alpha): (A, X) \rightarrow (B, X')$ in $\int W$,

$$\bar{\theta}_{f, \alpha} = \theta_{f, \alpha}: (\theta_{(A, X)}, \text{id}) \rightarrow (\theta_{(B, X')} \circ F(f), y(M) (\theta_{f, \alpha})_q)$$

whence, since $y(M) (\theta_{f, \alpha})_q = q * \theta_{f, \alpha} = \lambda_{f, \alpha}^q$,

$$\overline{F \circ \mathcal{G}(W)}(f, \alpha) = \begin{array}{ccc} F(A) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(B) \\ & \searrow \lambda_{(A, X)}^q & \swarrow \lambda_{(B, X')}^q \\ & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{f, \alpha}^q} & \\ & M & \end{array} = L^q(f, \alpha).$$

Given $\delta: (f, \alpha) \rightarrow (g, \beta): (A, X) \rightarrow (B, X')$ in $\int W$,

$$\overline{F \circ \mathcal{G}(W)}(\delta) = F(\delta) = L^q(\delta).$$

We now prove that $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E} /_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is a 2-colim-fibration. By Proposition 2.18, it suffices to prove that dom reflects all the cartesian colimits. So take $t: K \rightarrow M$, a marking $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ with \mathcal{A} small and a 2-diagram $H: \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{E} /_{\text{lax}} M$. Consider then a cartesian oplax normal 2-cocone

$$\zeta: \Delta 1 \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{} \mathcal{E} /_{\text{lax}} M (H(-), t)$$

such that $\text{dom} \circ \zeta$ is universal. We prove that ζ is universal as well.

Given $g: E \rightarrow M$ and

$$\sigma: \Delta 1 \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{} \mathcal{E} /_{\text{lax}} M (H(-), g),$$

we need to produce a morphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{\hat{\gamma}} & E \\ & \searrow t & \swarrow g \\ & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & \\ & M & \end{array}$$

in $\mathcal{E} /_{\text{lax}} M$ such that $\sigma = (\gamma \circ -) \circ \zeta$. Then we need

$$\text{dom} \circ \sigma = \text{dom} \circ (\gamma \circ -) \circ \zeta = (\hat{\gamma} \circ -) \circ \text{dom} \circ \zeta,$$

whence $\hat{\gamma}$ needs to be the unique morphism $K \rightarrow E$ in \mathcal{E} induced by $\text{dom} \circ \sigma$ via universality of $\text{dom} \circ \zeta$. We will now produce the inner 2-cell γ in \mathcal{E} via the 2-dimensional universality of $\text{dom} \circ \zeta$. Indeed γ corresponds to a modification

$$\Xi: (t \circ -) \circ \text{dom} \circ \zeta \Longrightarrow (g \circ \hat{\gamma} \circ -) \circ \text{dom} \circ \zeta.$$

Notice that the target of Ξ coincides with $(g \circ -) \circ \text{dom} \circ \sigma$. Given $(A, X) \in \int W$, we will have that $\Xi_{(A, X)} = \widehat{\gamma}_{(A, X)}$, and we want to obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{dom}(H(A, X)) & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\zeta}_{(A, X)}} & K & \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} & E \\ & \searrow H(A, X) & \downarrow t & \swarrow g \\ & & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & \\ & & M & \end{array} = \begin{array}{ccc} \text{dom}(H(A, X)) & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\sigma}_{(A, X)}} & E \\ & \searrow H(A, X) & \swarrow g \\ & & M \end{array}$$

The component $\zeta_{(A,X)}$ is indeed a triangle filled with an isomorphism, by Example 2.17, since ζ is cartesian. Whence we need to take

$$\Xi_{(A,X)} := \begin{array}{ccc} & \text{dom}(H(A,X)) & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\sigma}_{(A,X)}} E \\ & \downarrow H(A,X) & \searrow g \\ \widehat{\zeta}_{(A,X)} & \downarrow \zeta_{(A,X)}^{-1} & \\ K & \xrightarrow{t} M & \end{array}$$

It is straightforward to check that Ξ is a modification between oplax normal 2-cocones. So Ξ induces a unique 2-cell $\gamma: t \rightarrow g \circ \widehat{\gamma}$ in \mathcal{E} such that $(\gamma * -) * (\text{dom} \circ \zeta) = \Xi$. We check that $\sigma = (\gamma \circ -) \circ \zeta$ (as oplax normal natural transformations). It surely holds on object components by construction of Ξ . Given a morphism (f, α) in $(fW)^{\text{op}}$, it suffices to check that

$$\sigma_{f,\alpha} = \widehat{\gamma} * \zeta_{f,\alpha}$$

But this holds by construction of $\widehat{\gamma}$.

We now show the uniqueness of γ . So assume there is some $\gamma': t \rightarrow g$ in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{ lax}} M$ such that $\sigma = (\gamma' \circ -) \circ \zeta$. Then $\widehat{\gamma}' = \widehat{\gamma}$ by the argument above. Since the two 2-cells γ and γ' in \mathcal{E} are then between the same 1-cells, it suffices to prove that

$$(\gamma * -) * (\text{dom} \circ \zeta) = (\gamma' * -) * (\text{dom} \circ \zeta).$$

But this can be checked on components, and $\gamma * \widehat{\zeta}_{(A,X)} = \gamma' * \widehat{\zeta}_{(A,X)}$ holds because

$$(\gamma \circ -) \circ \zeta = \sigma = (\gamma' \circ -) \circ \zeta$$

and ζ is cartesian (essentially, both give the same Ξ).

It remains to prove the 2-dimensional universality of ζ . Given $g: E \rightarrow M$, two morphisms $\gamma, \gamma': t \rightarrow g$ in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{ lax}} M$ and a modification

$$\Sigma: (\gamma \circ -) \circ \zeta \Rightarrow (\gamma' \circ -) \circ \zeta: \Delta 1 \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{} \mathcal{E}/_{\text{ lax}} M(H(-), g),$$

we need to produce a 2-cell $\Gamma: \gamma \rightarrow \gamma'$ in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{ lax}} M$ such that $\Sigma = (\Gamma * -) * \zeta$. But the latter equality is satisfied precisely when it is satisfied after composing with dom . So consider $\text{dom} * \Sigma$; as $\text{dom} \circ \zeta$ is universal, we find a unique $\widehat{\Gamma}: \widehat{\gamma} \Rightarrow \widehat{\gamma}'$ such that

$$\text{dom} * \Sigma = (\widehat{\Gamma} * -) * (\text{dom} \circ \zeta).$$

And then $\widehat{\Gamma}$ gives a 2-cell $\Gamma: \gamma \rightarrow \gamma'$ in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{ lax}} M$. Indeed, we need to prove that $g * \widehat{\Gamma} \circ \gamma = \gamma'$ as 2-cells in \mathcal{E} , and it suffices to show that

$$((g * \widehat{\Gamma} \circ \gamma) * -) * (\text{dom} \circ \zeta) = (\gamma' * -) * (\text{dom} \circ \zeta),$$

by 2-universality of $\text{dom} \circ \zeta$. This can be checked on components, where it is true because it holds after pasting with the components of ζ (that are isomorphisms, because ζ is cartesian), since $\Sigma: (\gamma \circ -) \circ \zeta \Rightarrow (\gamma' \circ -) \circ \zeta$. By construction of Γ , we immediately obtain that $\Sigma = (\Gamma * -) * \zeta$, and our argument has proved the uniqueness of Γ as well. \square

3. \mathcal{F} -CATEGORIES AND A LIFTING RESULT FOR THE DOMAIN 2-FUNCTOR

A main result of this paper will be the complete generalization of the 1-dimensional Theorem 1.1 to dimension 2. After Theorem 2.20, it remains to address preservation (Section 4) and lifting of colimits for $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ (in this section). Remember that we indeed need to consider lax slices (see Remark 2.19).

In dimension 1, the fact that $\text{dom}: \mathcal{C}/_M \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ lifts all the colimits is based on the correspondence between the diagrams in $\mathcal{C}/_M$ and the cocones in \mathcal{C} on M (see also the Introduction). More precisely, while the fact that dom is a colim-fibration is based on the ability to produce a diagram in the slice over M from a cocone on M , the lifting of colimits is based on the converse.

We have already seen in Construction 2.1 (first approach) that, in dimension 2, we can reorganize an oplax normal 2-cocone on M as a 2-diagram in the lax slice $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$. Indeed this was the main idea, together with the reduction of the weighted 2-colimits to oplax normal conical ones, of the first approach to the categorification of the equivalence between colimits in 1-dimensional slices and maps from the colimit of the domains. As we see in the proof of Proposition 3.1, the second approach allows us to capture this reorganization process from a more abstract point of view. Indeed this is close to the first part of the proof of Theorem 2.20, where we proved the equivalence between the two approaches. However, not every 2-diagram in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ can produce an oplax normal 2-cocone on M , as the normality condition may fail.

In this section, we prove a generalization to dimension 2 of the bijective correspondence between cocones on M and diagrams in the slice over M (Proposition 3.1). We then justify this result via \mathcal{F} -category theory, also called enhanced 2-category theory and introduced in Lack and Shulman's [9]. We recall \mathcal{F} -category theory in Recall 3.3. Finally, we show a result of lifting of 2-colimits for $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ in Proposition 3.5. Such result is not about all oplax normal 2-colimits, but this makes sense from an \mathcal{F} -categorical point of view.

Proposition 3.1. *Let \mathcal{E} be a 2-category and $M \in \mathcal{E}$. Consider then a marking $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ with \mathcal{A} small and a 2-diagram $D: \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$. There is a bijection between oplax normal 2-cocones*

$$\lambda: \Delta 1 \underset{\text{oplax}^n}{\rightrightarrows} \mathcal{E}(D(-), M)$$

on M and 2-diagrams $\overline{D}: \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ such that for every morphism (f, id) in $\int W$ the triangle $\overline{D}(f, \text{id})$ is filled with an identity.

Proof. Given λ , since dom is a 2-*Set*-fibration, we can lift (D, λ) to id_M and obtain a pair $(\overline{D}, \overline{\lambda})$ as in Construction 2.13. Exactly as in the first part of the proof of Theorem 2.20, we can calculate \overline{D} explicitly, looking at the action of $y(M): \mathcal{E}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ on 1-cells and 2-cells, since $\text{dom} = \mathcal{G}(y(M))$. We obtain the formulas

$$\overline{D}(f, \alpha) = (D(f, \alpha), \lambda_{f, \alpha}): \lambda_{(A, X)} \rightarrow \lambda_{(B, X')}$$

Starting instead from a 2-diagram \overline{D} , we can reorganize its data as an oplax normal 2-cocone λ for $\text{dom} \circ \overline{D}$ on M , with formulas

$$\lambda_{(A, X)} := \overline{D}(A, X): \text{dom}(\overline{D}(A, X)) \rightarrow M.$$

$$\lambda_{f, \alpha} := \overline{D}(f, \alpha).$$

It is straightforward to check that the 2-functoriality of \overline{D} guarantees that λ is oplax natural. Given (f, id) in $\int W$, we obtain $\lambda_{f, \text{id}} = \overline{D}(f, \text{id}) = \text{id}$, and then λ is also normal.

It is clear that the two constructions we have produced are inverses of each other. \square

Remark 3.2. We believe Proposition 3.1 is best captured by \mathcal{F} -category theory, also called enhanced 2-category theory, for which we take as main reference Lack and Shulman's [9]. We give a quick recall of \mathcal{F} -category theory in Recall 3.3, and rephrase Proposition 3.1 in Remark 3.4. \mathcal{F} -category theory will then be even more useful to us to prove the preservation of (appropriate) 2-colimits for $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E} /_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ in Section 4. We will indeed show that dom preserves a big class of 2-colimits (Theorem 4.13), despite not every 2-colimit, and that this makes a lot of sense from an \mathcal{F} -categorical point of view.

Recall 3.3. \mathcal{F} is the cartesian closed full subcategory of \mathcal{CAT}^2 (the category of arrows in \mathcal{CAT}) determined by the functors which are injective on objects and fully faithful (i.e. full embeddings). It is possible to enrich over \mathcal{F} , obtaining \mathcal{F} -category theory. An \mathcal{F} -category \mathcal{S} is then given by a collection of objects, a hom-category $\mathcal{S}(X, Y)_\tau$ of tight morphisms and a second hom-category $\mathcal{S}(X, Y)_\lambda$ of loose morphisms that give 2-category structures (respectively) \mathcal{S}_τ and \mathcal{S}_λ to \mathcal{S} , together with an identity on objects, faithful and locally fully faithful 2-functor $J_\mathcal{S}: \mathcal{S}_\tau \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\lambda$. An \mathcal{F} -functor $F: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ is a 2-functor $F_\lambda: \mathcal{S}_\lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_\lambda$ that restricts to a 2-functor $F_\tau: \mathcal{S}_\tau \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_\tau$ (forming a commutative square); this is equivalent to F_λ preserving tightness. And an \mathcal{F} -natural transformation is a 2-natural transformation α_λ between loose parts that restricts to one between the tight parts; this is equivalent to α_λ having tight components. It is then true that the category \mathcal{F} is enriched over itself, with tight morphisms the morphisms of \mathcal{F} , loose morphisms the functors between loose parts and 2-cells the 2-natural transformations between the latter. And for every \mathcal{F} -category \mathcal{S} and $S \in \mathcal{S}$ we can build a copresheaf $\mathcal{S}(S, -): \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, that sends S' to the full embedding $\mathcal{S}_\tau(S, S') \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\lambda(S, S')$.

Given \mathcal{F} -categories \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} , there is an \mathcal{F} -category $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}]^\mathcal{F}$ of \mathcal{F} -functors from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{T} , where the tight morphisms are the \mathcal{F} -natural transformations, the loose morphisms are the 2-natural transformations between the loose parts and the 2-cells are the modifications between the loose morphisms. But we will need also an (op)lax version $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}]_{(\text{op})\text{lax}}^\mathcal{F}$ of it, which is the \mathcal{F} -category defined as follows:

an object is an \mathcal{F} -functor $G: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$;

a loose morphism $G \xRightarrow[\text{loose}]{} H$ is an (op)lax natural transformation α_λ between the loose parts such that the structure 2-cells on tight morphisms are identities, that precisely means that $\alpha_\lambda * J_\mathcal{S}$ is (strictly) 2-natural; we call them **loose strict/(op)lax**;

a tight morphism $G \Rightarrow H$ is a loose one that restricts to a 2-natural transformation between the tight parts, which is equivalent to a loose morphism with tight components; they are usually called **strict/(op)lax**;

a 2-cell is a modification between the loose morphisms.

We can then apply the definitions above to the case $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{F}$, obtaining two \mathcal{F} -categories of copresheaves on \mathcal{S} . The strict one, $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}]^\mathcal{F}$, can be characterized as follows:

an object is an \mathcal{F} -functor $G: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, that we can identify with a pair of 2-functors $G_\tau: \mathcal{S}_\tau \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ and $G_\lambda: \mathcal{S}_\lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ together with a 2-natural transformation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S}_\tau & \xrightarrow{J_\mathcal{S}} & \mathcal{S}_\lambda \\ & \searrow G_\tau \quad \xrightarrow{j_G} \quad \swarrow G_\lambda & \\ & & \mathcal{CAT} \end{array}$$

whose components are all full embeddings;

a loose morphism $G \xRightarrow[\text{loose}]{=} H$ is a 2-natural transformation $\alpha_\lambda: G_\lambda \Rightarrow H_\lambda: \mathcal{S}_\lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$;

a tight morphism $G \Rightarrow H$ is a loose one with tight components, that precisely means that it induces a 2-natural transformation $\alpha_\tau: G_\tau \Rightarrow H_\tau$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S}_\tau & \xrightarrow{J_S} & \mathcal{S}_\lambda \\ \downarrow G_\tau & \nearrow j_G & \downarrow G_\lambda \\ & \alpha_\lambda & \\ & \Downarrow & \\ & \mathcal{CAT} & \end{array} \quad = \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S}_\tau & \xrightarrow{J_S} & \mathcal{S}_\lambda \\ \downarrow G_\tau & \nearrow \alpha_\tau & \downarrow H_\tau \\ & \Downarrow j_H & \\ & \mathcal{CAT} & \end{array}$$

a 2-cell is a modification between the loose morphisms.

Whereas the oplax version $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}]_{\text{oplax}}^{\mathcal{F}}$ can be characterized as follows:

an object is an object of $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}]^{\mathcal{F}}$, that we keep on viewing as a triangle above (in the description of $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}]^{\mathcal{F}}$);

a loose morphism $G \xRightarrow[\text{loose}]{=} H$ is an oplax natural transformation $\alpha_\lambda: G_\lambda \rightarrow H_\lambda$ that is (strictly) 2-natural on tight morphisms, meaning that $\alpha_\lambda * J_S$ is 2-natural; we call them **oplax normal**;

a tight morphism $G \Rightarrow H$ is a loose one with tight components, that precisely means that it induces a 2-natural transformation $\alpha_\tau: G_\tau \Rightarrow H_\tau$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S}_\tau & \xrightarrow{J_S} & \mathcal{S}_\lambda \\ \downarrow G_\tau & \nearrow j_G & \downarrow G_\lambda \\ & \alpha_\lambda & \\ & \Downarrow & \\ & \mathcal{CAT} & \end{array} \quad = \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S}_\tau & \xrightarrow{J_S} & \mathcal{S}_\lambda \\ \downarrow G_\tau & \nearrow \alpha_\tau & \downarrow H_\tau \\ & \Downarrow j_H & \\ & \mathcal{CAT} & \end{array}$$

a 2-cell is modification between the loose morphisms.

Remark 3.4. The 2-*Set*-enriched Grothendieck construction of a 2-functor $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ has a canonical structure of \mathcal{F} -functor $\mathcal{G}(W): \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. Indeed any 2-category \mathcal{A} can be seen as an \mathcal{F} -category by taking every morphism to be tight. And we can give $\int W$ a natural \mathcal{F} -category structure taking the loose part to be itself (as a 2-category) and as tight morphisms the the morphisms of the kind (f, id) (i.e. the morphisms of the cleavage). Then $[(\int W)^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]_{\text{oplax}^n}$ coincides with the loose part of $[(\int W)^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{F}]_{\text{oplax}}^{\mathcal{F}}$, justifying even more the use of the oplax normal natural transformations to work with the 2-*Set*-enriched (but also the usual) Grothendieck construction.

Since $\mathcal{E} /_{\text{lax}} M = \int y(M)$, we obtain that the lax slice of \mathcal{E} on M has a canonical \mathcal{F} -category structure, with loose morphisms the usual ones and tight morphisms the triangles filled with an identity. That is, the tight part of $\mathcal{E} /_{\text{lax}} M$ is the strict 2-slice \mathcal{E} / M . So we can rephrase Proposition 3.1 by saying that there is a bijection between the loose strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -cocones on M and the \mathcal{F} -diagrams in the lax slice on M .

We can now prove a result of lifting of 2-colimits for $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E} /_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$. Such result is not about all the oplax normal 2-colimits, but this makes sense from an \mathcal{F} -categorical point of view.

Proposition 3.5. *Let \mathcal{E} be a 2-category and let $M \in \mathcal{E}$. Then the 2-colim-fibration $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E} /_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ lifts all the oplax normal 2-colimits of \mathcal{F} -diagrams.*

That is, given a marking $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ with \mathcal{A} small, an \mathcal{F} -diagram $H: \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ and a universal oplax normal 2-cocone

$$\theta: \Delta 1 \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{=} \mathcal{E}((\text{dom} \circ H)(-), C)$$

that exhibits $C = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta 1}(\text{dom} \circ H)$ in \mathcal{E} , there exist $q \in \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ over C and a universal oplax normal 2-cocone

$$\bar{\theta}: \Delta 1 \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{=} \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M(H(-), C)$$

for H on q exhibiting $q = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta 1} H$ in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ such that $\text{dom} \circ \bar{\theta} = \theta$ (i.e. $\bar{\theta}$ is over θ).

Proof. By Proposition 3.1 (together with its proof) and Remark 3.4, the \mathcal{F} -diagram $H: \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ corresponds to an oplax normal 2-cocone λ for $\text{dom} \circ H$ on M . As θ is universal, then λ induces a unique morphism $q: C \rightarrow M$ such that $\lambda = (q \circ -) \circ \theta$.

Consider now the lifting of the pair $(\text{dom} \circ H, \theta)$ through the 2-*Set*-fibration dom to q , as in Construction 2.13. Since dom is a 2-colim-fibration, by Theorem 2.20, the pair $(\overline{\text{dom} \circ H}, \bar{\theta})$ that we obtain over $(\text{dom} \circ H, \theta)$ exhibits

$$q = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta 1} \overline{\text{dom} \circ H}.$$

But we can calculate $\overline{\text{dom} \circ H}$ explicitly, as in the first part of the proof of Theorem 2.20, looking at the action of $y(M): \mathcal{E}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ on 1-cells and 2-cells, since $\text{dom} = \mathcal{G}(y(M))$. Given $\delta: (f, \alpha) \Rightarrow (g, \beta): (A, X) \rightarrow (B, X')$ in $\int W$, using also the proof of Proposition 3.1 we obtain

$$\overline{\text{dom} \circ H}(A, X) = q \circ \theta_{(A, X)} = \lambda_{(A, X)} = H(A, X)$$

$$\overline{\text{dom} \circ H}(f, \alpha) = (\text{dom}(H(f, \alpha)), q * \theta_{f, \alpha}) = (\text{dom}(H(f, \alpha)), \lambda_{f, \alpha}) = H(f, \alpha)$$

$$\overline{\text{dom} \circ H}(\delta) = \text{dom}(H(\delta)) = H(\delta)$$

So $\overline{\text{dom} \circ H} = H$, whence we conclude. \square

4. LAX \mathcal{F} -ADJOINTS AND PRESERVATION OF COLIMITS

Aiming at a full generalization of the 1-dimensional Theorem 1.1 to dimension 2, we would like to prove that $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ preserves 2-colimits. Remember that both Construction 2.1 (first approach) and Remark 2.19 (from the second approach) justified the need to consider lax slices.

To achieve a result of preservation of 2-colimits, we find a lot of help in \mathcal{F} -category theory (Recall 3.3), for which we take as main reference Lack and Shulman's [9]. Our idea is that the 2-dimensional concept of colim-fibration needs to use the 2-*Set*-enriched Grothendieck construction, which is bound up with the oplax normal natural transformations. And the latter are best captured by \mathcal{F} -category theory. We have already seen how this helped justify the lifting result (Proposition 3.5), and we notice that it could also justify more the reflection result (that is the main part of Theorem 2.20).

In dimension 1, the functor $\text{dom}: \mathcal{C}/M \rightarrow M$ preserves colimits because it has a right adjoint, namely $\text{dom} \dashv M \times -$. In dimension 2, the 2-functor $M \times -$ is only a lax right adjoint to $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, and more precisely a right semi-lax right adjoint, as we prove in Theorem 4.13. However, this is not enough for the preservation of 2-colimits.

In this section, we prove (Theorem 4.11) that having a *right semi-lax right \mathcal{F} -adjoint* is enough to guarantee the preservation of all *tight strict/oplax F -colimits* (see Definition 4.6). Furthermore, having only a *right semi-lax loose right \mathcal{F} -adjoint* is enough to guarantee the preservation of a big class of 2-colimits.

We then prove that dom has such a (tight) \mathcal{F} -categorical right adjoint (Theorem 4.13), and thus preserves all *tight strict/oplax F -colimits*, as well as other (more loose) 2-colimits.

In Section 5, we will prove that also the 2-functor of change of base along a split Grothendieck opfibration between lax slices has a suitable \mathcal{F} -categorical right adjoint (so that also such 2-functor preserves a big class of 2-colimits).

We begin recalling the concept of lax adjunction and the universal mapping property that characterizes it, for which we take as references Gray's [6] and Bunge's [3].

Definition 4.1. A lax adjunction is, for us, what Gray calls a strict weak quasi-adjunction in [6]. That is, a ***lax adjunction*** from a 2-functor $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ to a 2-functor $U: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is given by a lax natural unit $\eta: \text{Id} \Rightarrow U \circ F$, a lax natural counit $\varepsilon: F \circ U \Rightarrow \text{Id}$ and modifications

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \xlongequal{\quad} & F \\ F\eta \searrow & \Downarrow s & \nearrow \varepsilon F \\ & F \circ U \circ F & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} & U \circ F \circ U & \\ \eta U \nearrow & \Downarrow t & \searrow U\varepsilon \\ U & \xlongequal{\quad} & U \end{array}$$

that express lax triangular laws, such that both the swallowtail modifications

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{id} & \xrightarrow{\eta} & UF \\ \eta \downarrow & \swarrow \eta_\eta & \downarrow UF\eta \\ UF & \xrightarrow{\eta UF} & UFUF \\ & \Downarrow tF & \nearrow U\varepsilon F \\ & & UF \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} FU & \xlongequal{\quad} & FU \\ F\eta U \searrow & \Downarrow sU & \nearrow \varepsilon FU \\ & FUFU & \\ Ft \swarrow & \downarrow FU\varepsilon & \swarrow \varepsilon\varepsilon \\ FU & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & \text{id} \end{array}$$

are identities.

A ***right semi-lax adjunction*** is a lax adjunction in which the counit ε is strictly 2-natural and the modification s is the identity.

We call a lax adjunction ***strict*** when s and t are both identities, making the triangular laws to hold strictly.

Recall 4.2. Using the lax comma objects, firstly introduced in Gray's [6] and refined in our [11], we can reduce the study of lax adjunctions to ordinary adjunctions between hom-sets. Indeed, according to Gray, a lax adjunction is equivalently given by homomorphic 2-adjoint functors

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{S} & \\ F /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} & \perp & \mathcal{A} /_{\text{lax}} U \\ & \xleftarrow{T} & \end{array}$$

over $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ with unit $\chi: \text{id} \Rightarrow T \circ S$ and counit $\xi: S \circ T \Rightarrow \text{id}$ (that are automatically 2-natural if assumed natural) over $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$. Here S and T homomorphic means that they are given uniquely by lax natural η and ε (it can be defined precisely as in 1.5.10 of Gray's [6], asking for example T to transform precomposition with cells in \mathcal{A} into precomposition with the image through F of those cells; see also below how we produce T from ε).

Strictness corresponds to

$$\chi * i_F = \text{id} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi * i_U = \text{id},$$

where $i_F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow F /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ is the 2-functor induced by the identity on F and analogously for i_U .

Such a 2-adjunction $S \dashv T$ means, in particular, that we have ordinary adjunctions between homsets

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & S & \\ \mathcal{B}(F(A), B) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{A}(A, U(B)) \\ & T & \\ & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \end{array} \quad \perp$$

for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$. And we can rephrase such ordinary adjunctions in terms of having universal units. The global adjunction $S \dashv T$ corresponds, then, to such units satisfying a broader universal property, that captures the possibility of $h: F(A) \rightarrow B$ to vary in the whole lax comma object $F /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ rather than in just $\mathcal{B}(F(A), B)$. This is the idea behind Proposition 4.3, that shows the universal mapping property that characterizes lax adjunctions, except that in general the lax right-adjoint produced is only oplax functorial. In our examples, however, such characterization will produce a strict (right semi-) lax adjunction between 2-functors.

Before that, it is helpful to see explicitly how a lax adjunction $(F, U, \eta, \varepsilon, s, t)$ produces the adjunctions (S, T, χ, ξ) between the homsets on $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$, as we will use this later. S and T are defined as usual as

$$S = (- \circ \eta_A) \circ U$$

$$T = (\varepsilon_B \circ -) \circ F$$

And the lax naturality of η and ε gives χ and ξ ; precisely, given $h: F(A) \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{B} and $k: A \rightarrow U(B)$ in \mathcal{A}

$$\begin{array}{c} \chi_h = \begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & F(A) \\ & & & & \downarrow s_A \\ & & & & \varepsilon_{F(A)} \rightarrow \\ & & & & \downarrow \varepsilon_h \\ & & & & B \\ & & & & \uparrow \varepsilon_B \\ & & & & F(U(B)) \\ & & & & \uparrow F(U(h)) \\ & & & & F(U(F(A))) \\ & & & & \downarrow F(\eta_A) \\ & & & & F(A) \end{array} \\ \\ \xi_k = \begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & U(F(A)) \\ & & & & \downarrow \eta_k \\ & & & & U(F(U(B))) \\ & & & & \downarrow t_B \\ & & & & U(B) \\ & & & & \uparrow \eta_{U(B)} \\ & & & & U(F(k)) \\ & & & & \downarrow U(F(k)) \\ & & & & U(F(U(B))) \\ & & & & \downarrow U(\varepsilon_B) \\ & & & & U(B) \end{array} \end{array}$$

In particular, we see that for a right semi-lax adjunction we obtain $\chi = \text{id}$ and then $T \circ S = \text{Id}$, whence the name comes from.

Proposition 4.3 (dual of Gray's Proposition I,7.8.2 in [6] and of Theorem 4.1 in Bunge's [3]).
Let $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a 2-functor. Suppose that for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ there is an object $U(B) \in \mathcal{A}$

and a morphism $\varepsilon_B: F(U(B)) \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{B} that is universal in the following sense: for every $h: F(A) \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{B} there is an $\bar{h}: A \rightarrow U(B)$ in \mathcal{A} and a 2-cell

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(A) & \xrightarrow{h} & B \\ F(\bar{h}) \downarrow & \swarrow \lambda_h & \\ F(U(B)) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_B} & B \end{array}$$

in \mathcal{B} such that, given any other $g: A \rightarrow U(B)$ and $\sigma: h \Rightarrow \varepsilon_B \circ F(g)$, there is a unique $\delta: \bar{h} \Rightarrow g$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(A) & \xrightarrow{h} & B \\ F(g) \downarrow & \swarrow \lambda_h & \\ F(U(B)) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_B} & B \end{array} \quad = \quad \begin{array}{ccc} F(A) & \xrightarrow{h} & B \\ F(\bar{h}) \downarrow & \swarrow \lambda_h & \\ F(U(B)) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_B} & B \end{array}$$

Assume then that, for every $h: F(A) \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{B} , we have $\bar{h} = \overline{h \circ \varepsilon_{F(A)}} \circ \overline{\text{id}_{F(A)}}$ and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(A) & \xrightarrow{h} & B \\ F(\overline{\text{id}_{F(A)}}) \downarrow & \swarrow \lambda_{\overline{\text{id}_{F(A)}}} & \\ F(U(F(A))) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_{F(A)}} & F(A) \\ F(\overline{h \circ \varepsilon_{F(A)}}) \downarrow & \swarrow \lambda_{\overline{h \circ \varepsilon_{F(A)}}} & \\ F(U(B)) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_B} & B \end{array} \quad = \quad \begin{array}{ccc} F(A) & \xrightarrow{h} & B \\ F(\bar{h}) \downarrow & \swarrow \lambda_h & \\ F(U(B)) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_B} & B \end{array} \quad (4)$$

and also that, for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $\overline{\varepsilon_B} = \text{id}$ and $\lambda_{\varepsilon_B} = \text{id}$.

Then U extends to an oplax functor, ε extends to a lax natural transformation and there exist a lax natural transformation η and modifications s, t such that U is a lax right-adjoint to F , except that in general U is only an oplax functor (and the swallowtail identities need to be slightly modified accordingly).

In particular, if $\lambda_h = \text{id}$ for every $h: F(A) \rightarrow B$, we obtain a right semi-lax adjunction.

Proof (constructions). Given $g: B \rightarrow B'$ in \mathcal{B} , define $U(g) := \overline{g \circ \varepsilon_B}$ and $\varepsilon_g := \lambda_{g \circ \varepsilon_B}$. Given a 2-cell $\mu: g \Rightarrow g'$ in \mathcal{B} , define $U(\mu)$ as the unique 2-cell induced by $\varepsilon_{g'} \circ \mu \varepsilon_B$. Given composable morphisms g and g' in \mathcal{B} , pasting ε_g and $\varepsilon_{g'}$ induces a unique coassociator for U , while the identity 2-cell induces a unique counitor.

We then define $\eta_A := \overline{\text{id}_{F(A)}}$ and $s_A := \lambda_{\overline{\text{id}_{F(A)}}}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(A) & \xrightarrow{h} & B \\ F(\eta_A) \downarrow & \swarrow s_A & \\ F(U(F(A))) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_{F(A)}} & F(A) \end{array}$$

And for every $f: A \rightarrow A'$ in \mathcal{A} we take η_f to be the unique 2-cell that is induced from

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 F(A) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & F(A) \\
 F(\eta_A) \downarrow & \swarrow s_A & \searrow \\
 F(U(F(A))) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_{F(A)}} & F(A) \\
 F(U(F(f))) \downarrow & \swarrow \varepsilon_{F(f)} & \downarrow F(f) \\
 F(U(F(A'))) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_{F(A')}} & F(A')
 \end{array}$$

considering $s_{A'} * F(f)$, thanks to the assumption in equation (4). Finally, for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$, we induce t_B from the identity 2-cell on ε_B , using again the assumption in equation (4), with $h = \varepsilon_B$. \square

Remark 4.4. In our two examples, i.e. with F equal to $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ (Theorem 4.13) and to the 2-functor of pullback along a split Grothendieck opfibration between lax slices of \mathcal{CAT} (Theorem 5.3), Proposition 4.3 will produce a strict right semi-lax adjunction between 2-functors. But this would not be enough to guarantee preservation of colimits. It is enough if the right semi-lax adjunction is \mathcal{F} -categorical, as we prove in Theorem 4.11. But we have to restrict the attention to the (*tight*) *strict/oplax* \mathcal{F} -colimits, defined in Definition 4.6 (that we believe are the suitable colimits to consider in this context). It might be helpful to look at Recall 3.3 (recall about \mathcal{F} -category theory).

The concept of lax \mathcal{F} -adjunction appears in Walker's [15], but in a pseudo/lax version and with the stronger request that s and t are isomorphisms. Moreover, only what for us is the tight version is considered there, asking the unit η and the counit ε to be (*tight*) pseudo/oplax \mathcal{F} -natural rather than loose ones. The latter request means that η and ε are tight morphisms in some $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}]_{\text{oplax}}^{\mathcal{F}}$ of Recall 3.3 rather than loose ones. Such request is not necessary to guarantee the preservation of the “loose part” of tight strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -colimits. Moreover, it is not satisfied by our example of change of base along a split Grothendieck opfibration between lax slices.

Definition 4.5. A *loose lax \mathcal{F} -adjunction* is a lax adjunction $(F, U, \eta, \varepsilon, s, t)$ between the loose parts in which F and U are \mathcal{F} -functors and η and ε are loose strict/lax \mathcal{F} -natural transformations (i.e. loose morphisms in $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}]_{\text{lax}}^{\mathcal{F}}$ of Recall 3.3 for suitable \mathcal{S}).

A (*tight*) *lax \mathcal{F} -adjunction* is a loose one such that η and ε are (*tight*) strict/lax \mathcal{F} -natural transformations (that is, have tight components).

A *right semi-lax loose \mathcal{F} -adjunction* is a loose lax \mathcal{F} -adjunction such that ε is strictly 2-natural (i.e. a loose morphism in $[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}]^{\mathcal{F}}$ of Recall 3.3) and s is the identity.

We call a loose lax \mathcal{F} -adjunction *strict* if both s and t are identities.

Definition 4.6. Let \mathcal{A} be a small \mathcal{F} -category and consider \mathcal{F} -functors $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ (the weight) and $H: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ (the \mathcal{F} -diagram). The *strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -colimit of H weighted by W* , denoted as $\text{oplax}^{\mathcal{F}}\text{-colim}^W H$, is (if it exists) an object $C \in \mathcal{S}$ together with an isomorphism in \mathcal{F}

$$\mathcal{S}(C, Q) \cong [\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{F}]_{\text{oplax}}^{\mathcal{F}}(W, \mathcal{S}(H(-), Q))$$

\mathcal{F} -natural in $Q \in \mathcal{S}$, where $[\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{F}]_{\text{oplax}}^{\mathcal{F}}$ is the \mathcal{F} -category defined in Recall 3.3.

Remark 4.7. The natural isomorphism of Definition 4.6 is equivalently a 2-natural isomorphism between the loose parts, that is,

$$\mathcal{S}_\lambda(C, Q) \cong [\mathcal{A}_\lambda^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]_{\text{oplax}^n}(W_\lambda, \mathcal{S}_\lambda(H_\lambda(-), Q)) \quad (5)$$

which restricts to a 2-natural isomorphism between the tight parts. Such tight parts are respectively $\mathcal{S}_\tau(C, Q)$ and those oplax normal natural transformations α_λ that restrict to 2-natural ones $\alpha_\tau: W_\tau \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\tau(H_\tau(-), Q)$, i.e. those forming a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_\tau(A) & \xrightarrow{(\alpha_\tau)_A} & \mathcal{S}_\tau(H_\tau(A), Q) \\ (j_W)_A \downarrow & & \downarrow (J_S * H_\tau)_A \\ W_\lambda(A) & \xrightarrow{(\alpha_\lambda)_A} & \mathcal{S}_\lambda(H_\lambda(A), Q) \end{array}$$

for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ (where $J_S: \mathcal{S}_\tau(-, Q) \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\lambda(-, Q) \circ J_S$)

Remember that identities are always tight and tight morphisms are closed under composition. So the request that the 2-natural isomorphism of equation (5) restricts to one between the tight parts equivalently means that the universal oplax normal 2-cocylinder μ^λ (corresponding to id_C) satisfies the following two conditions. For every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $X \in W_\tau(A)$, the morphism

$$\mu_A^\lambda(X): H(A) \rightarrow C$$

is tight, and, for every $q: C \rightarrow Q$ in \mathcal{S} , if $q \circ \mu_A^\lambda(X)$ is tight for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $X \in W_\tau(A)$ then q needs to be tight. We say that the (**cocylinder**) τ -**components** $\mu_A^\lambda(X)$'s are tight and **jointly detect tightness**.

Proposition 4.8. *Let \mathcal{A} be a small \mathcal{F} -category and consider \mathcal{F} -functors $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ (the weight) and $H: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ (the \mathcal{F} -diagram). The strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -colimit of H weighted by W is, equivalently, an object $C \in \mathcal{S}$ together with an oplax normal 2-cocylinder*

$$\mu^\lambda: W_\lambda \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{\Longrightarrow} \mathcal{S}_\lambda(H_\lambda(-), C)$$

that is universal in the 2-categorical sense, giving a 2-natural isomorphism

$$\mathcal{S}_\lambda(C, Q) \cong [\mathcal{A}_\lambda^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]_{\text{oplax}^n}(W_\lambda, \mathcal{S}_\lambda(H_\lambda(-), Q)),$$

and has τ -components that are tight and jointly detect tightness.

Proof. The proof is clear after Remark 4.7. Since the loose limit is 2-categorical, it can indeed be characterized as having a universal oplax normal 2-cocylinder. \square

Definition 4.9. We call a strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -colimit **tight** if it is exhibited by an oplax normal 2-cocylinder μ^λ as in Proposition 4.8 such that all **cocylinder** λ -**components** $\mu_A^\lambda(X)$, for $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $X \in W_\lambda(A)$, are tight. Notice that this condition is automatic in the case of oplax normal 2-cocones, that is the one we are mostly interested in (as every weighted 2-cocylinder can be reduced to one of this form).

Remark 4.10. We are now ready to prove that having a right semi-lax right \mathcal{F} -adjoint guarantees the preservation of all tight strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -colimits. We will actually see that the property of the universal oplax normal 2-cocylinder to have τ -components that jointly detect tightness is preserved when we have a right semi-lax (tight) left \mathcal{F} -adjoint, but not necessary to prove the preservation of the rest of the structure, for which a loose adjunction is enough.

The following theorem does not seem to appear in the literature.

Theorem 4.11. *Right semi-lax loose left \mathcal{F} -adjoints preserve all the universal oplax normal 2-cocylinders for an \mathcal{F} -diagram which have tight λ -components (i.e. in some sense the “loose part” of all the tight strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -colimits, even if the τ -components do not jointly detect tightness).*

Right semi-lax (tight) left \mathcal{F} -adjoints preserve all tight strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -colimits.

Proof. Let $(F, U, \eta, \varepsilon, s, t)$ be a right semi-lax loose \mathcal{F} -adjunction between \mathcal{F} -categories \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{E} . That is, a lax adjunction between the loose parts where F and U are \mathcal{F} -functors, η is a loose strict/lax \mathcal{F} -natural transformation, ε is strictly 2-natural and s is the identity. Let then \mathcal{A} be a small \mathcal{F} -category and consider \mathcal{F} -functors $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ and $H: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ such that the strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -colimit of H weighted by W exists in \mathcal{S} and is tight. Call C such colimit; we want to show that F preserves it. By Proposition 4.8, it suffices to consider the universal oplax normal 2-cocylinder

$$\mu^\lambda: W_\lambda \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^\lambda]{} \mathcal{S}_\lambda(H_\lambda(-), C)$$

with tight λ -components that exhibits $C = \text{oplax}^\mathcal{F}\text{-colim}^W H$ and the oplax normal 2-cocylinder

$$W_\lambda \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^\lambda]{} \mathcal{S}_\lambda(H_\lambda(-), C) \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{E}_\lambda((F_\lambda \circ H_\lambda)(-), F(C))$$

obtained applying F to the former.

We prove that $F \circ \mu^\lambda$ is universal in the 2-categorical sense and such that the $F(\mu_A^\lambda(X))$'s, for $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $X \in W_\lambda(A)$, are all tight, without using that the τ -components jointly detect tightness. Moreover, we show that if η and ε have tight components, giving a right semi-lax (tight) \mathcal{F} -adjunction, then having τ -components that jointly detect tightness is preserved as well.

Since a right semi-lax loose \mathcal{F} -adjunction is in particular a right semi-lax adjunction between the loose parts, we know by Recall 4.2 that $(F, U, \eta, \varepsilon, \text{id}, t)$ induces an adjunction between homsets

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & S_{Y,Z} & \\ & \curvearrowright & \\ \mathcal{E}_\lambda(F_\lambda(Y), Z) & \perp & \mathcal{S}_\lambda(Y, U_\lambda(Z)) \\ & \curvearrowleft & \\ & T_{Y,Z} & \end{array}$$

for every $Y \in \mathcal{S}$ and $Z \in \mathcal{E}$ with unit the identity, showing $T \circ S = \text{Id}$, and counit $\xi: S \circ T \Rightarrow \text{id}$. The strategy will be to make use of the equality $T \circ S = \text{Id}$ to move back and forth between \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{S} , recovering, after $T \circ S$, the original starting data of \mathcal{E} but with new information gathered in \mathcal{S} .

The λ -components $F(\mu_A^\lambda(X))$'s are surely tight, since F is an \mathcal{F} -functor. Take then $q: F(C) \rightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{E} such that $q \circ F(\mu_A^\lambda(X))$ is tight for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and every $X \in W_\tau(A)$. We show that if η and ε have tight components, then q needs to be tight as well. Notice that $S_{-,Z}$ is oplax normal natural in $Y \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda^{\text{op}}$, with structure 2-cell on $y: Y \leftarrow Y'$ in \mathcal{S}_λ given by $(- * \eta_y) * U$, since η is loose strict/lax \mathcal{F} -natural. Moreover, if η has tight components then $S_{-,Z}$ is tight as well, since U is an \mathcal{F} -functor. Since $\mu_A^\lambda(X): H(A) \rightarrow C$

is tight, we obtain $S_{\mu_A^\lambda(X), Z} = \text{id}$ and hence

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E}_\lambda(F_\lambda(C), Z) & \xrightarrow{S_{C,Z}} & \mathcal{S}_\lambda(C, U_\lambda(Z)) \\ \downarrow -\circ F_\lambda(\mu_A^\lambda(X)) & & \downarrow -\circ \mu_A^\lambda(X) \\ \mathcal{E}_\lambda(F_\lambda(H(A)), Z) & \xrightarrow{S_{H(A),Z}} & \mathcal{S}_\lambda(H(A), U_\lambda(Z)) \\ & & S_{H(A),Z}(q \circ F(\mu_A^\lambda(X))) = S_{C,Z}(q) \circ \mu_A^\lambda(X) \end{array}$$

So if η is tight then the left hand side of the equality here above is tight, and since the $\mu_A^\lambda(X)$'s jointly detect tightness we obtain that $S_{C,Z}(q)$ is tight. If we also assume that ε is tight, then $T_{C,Z}$ is tight, whence $q = T(S(q))$ is tight.

We now prove that $F \circ \mu^\lambda$ is universal, assuming only a right semi-lax loose \mathcal{F} -adjunction and never using that the τ -components $\mu_A^\lambda(X)$ jointly detect tightness. Everything below will be loose, so we abuse the notation dropping the loose subscripts. The following figure condenses the strategy.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} W & \xrightarrow{\mu} & \mathcal{S}(H(-), C) & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{E}((F \circ H)(-), F(C)) \\ \sigma \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \gamma \circ - & & \Downarrow T(\gamma) \circ - \\ \mathcal{E}((F \circ H)(-), Z) & \xrightarrow{S} & \mathcal{S}(H(-), U(Z)) & \xrightarrow{T} & \mathcal{E}((F \circ H)(-), Z) \end{array} \quad (6)$$

Given an oplax normal 2-cocylinder

$$\sigma: W \xrightarrow{\text{oplax}^n} \mathcal{E}((F \circ H)(-), Z),$$

we want to prove that there is a unique $\delta: F(C) \rightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{E} such that

$$(\delta \circ -) \circ F \circ \mu = \sigma.$$

Postcomposing σ with $S_{H(-), Z}$, we obtain an oplax normal 2-cocylinder for H . Indeed $S_{H(-), Z}$ is oplax normal natural in $A \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}$ with structure 2-cell on $a: A \leftarrow A'$ in \mathcal{A} given by $(- * \eta_{H(a)}) * U$, since η is loose strict/lax \mathcal{F} -natural and H is an \mathcal{F} -functor. So, by universality of μ , $S \circ \sigma$ induces a unique $\gamma: C \rightarrow U(Z)$ in \mathcal{S} such that

$$(\gamma \circ -) \circ \mu = S \circ \sigma.$$

Notice then that the right square of the figure in equation (6) is commutative, since it is equivalent to

$$(\varepsilon_Z \circ F(\gamma)) \circ F(-) = \varepsilon_Z \circ F(\gamma \circ -),$$

that holds since F is a 2-functor. So $\delta := T(\gamma)$ in \mathcal{E} is such that

$$(\delta \circ -) \circ F \circ \mu = T \circ (\gamma \circ -) \circ \mu = T \circ S \circ \sigma = \sigma.$$

We now show the uniqueness of δ . So consider another $\delta': F(C) \rightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{E} such that $(\delta' \circ -) \circ F \circ \mu = \sigma$. Postcomposing with S we obtain

$$S \circ (\delta' \circ -) \circ F \circ \mu = S \circ \sigma.$$

But we notice that

$$S \circ (\delta' \circ -) \circ F \circ \mu = (S(\delta') \circ -) \circ \mu$$

as oplax normal natural transformations. Indeed, given $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\alpha: X \rightarrow X'$ in $W(A)$,

$$(S \circ (\delta' \circ -) \circ F \circ \mu)_A(X) = U(\delta' \circ F(\mu_A(X))) \circ \eta_{H(A)} = U(\delta') \circ U(F(\mu_A(X))) \circ \eta_{H(A)}.$$

Since $\mu_A(X)$ is tight and η is loose strict/lax \mathcal{F} -natural, $\eta_{\mu_A(X)} = \text{id}$ and hence

$$U(\delta') \circ U(F(\mu_A(X))) \circ \eta_{H(A)} = U(\delta') \circ \eta_C \circ \mu_A(X) = S(\delta') \circ \mu_A(X).$$

And it works similarly for the images on α , using the 2-dimensional property of η being oplax natural. Given $a: A \leftarrow A'$ in \mathcal{A} and $X \in W(A)$,

$$(S \circ (\delta' \circ -) \circ F \circ \mu)_{a,X} = U(\delta' \circ F(\mu_A(X))) * \eta_{H(a)} \circ U(\delta' * F(\mu_{a,X})) * \eta_{H(A')}.$$

Considering $\mu_{a,X}: \mu_{A'}(W(a)(X)) \Rightarrow \mu_A(X) \circ H(a)$ in \mathcal{S} , since η is loose strict/lax \mathcal{F} -natural and both $\mu_A(X)$ and $\mu_{A'}(W(a)(X))$ are tight, we obtain

$$U(F(\mu_A(X))) * \eta_{H(a)} \circ U(F(\mu_{a,X})) * \eta_{H(A')} = \eta_C * \mu_{a,X},$$

whence we conclude that

$$S \circ (\delta' \circ -) \circ F \circ \mu = (S(\delta') \circ -) \circ \mu$$

Therefore, we have

$$(S(\delta') \circ -) \circ \mu = S \circ \sigma = (\gamma \circ -) \circ \mu,$$

and by universality of μ we conclude that $S(\delta') = \gamma$, whence

$$\delta' = T(S(\delta')) = T(\gamma) = \delta.$$

It only remains to prove the 2-dimensional universal property of $F \circ \mu$. Given a modification

$$\Sigma: \sigma \Rightarrow \sigma': W \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{} \mathcal{E}((F \circ H)(-), Z),$$

we want to prove that there is a unique $\Delta: \delta \Rightarrow \delta': F(C) \rightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{E} such that

$$(\Delta * -) * (F \circ \mu) = \Sigma.$$

By universality of μ , whiskering Σ with S on the right induces a unique $\Gamma: \gamma \Rightarrow \gamma'$ in \mathcal{S} such that

$$(\Gamma * -) * \mu = S * \Sigma.$$

Notice then that

$$T * (\Gamma * -) = (T(\Gamma) * -) * F$$

because F is a 2-functor, and thus $\Delta := T(\Gamma)$ in \mathcal{E} is such that

$$(\Delta * -) * (F \circ \mu) = T * (\Gamma * -) * \mu = T * S * \Sigma = \Sigma.$$

To show the uniqueness of Δ , take another Δ' such that $(\Delta' * -) * (F \circ \mu) = \Sigma$. Whiskering with S on the right, we obtain

$$S * (\Delta' * -) * (F \circ \mu) = S * \Sigma.$$

But notice that

$$S * (\Delta' * -) * (F \circ \mu) = (S(\Delta') * -) * \mu$$

Indeed it suffices to check it on components, where it holds since $\mu_A(X)$ is tight and hence $\eta_{\mu_A(X)} = \text{id}$ (analogously to what we have shown for the 1-dimensional universal property). So

$$(S(\Delta') * -) * \mu = S * \Sigma = (\Gamma * -) * \mu,$$

whence $S(\Delta') = \Gamma$ by universality of μ and thus

$$\Delta' = T(S(\Delta')) = T(\Gamma) = \Delta.$$

Therefore $F \circ \mu$ is universal in the 2-categorical sense. \square

Remark 4.12. We can now conclude the generalization of the 1-dimensional Theorem 1.1 to dimension 2, by showing that $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ has a strict right semi-lax (tight) right \mathcal{F} -adjoint (Theorem 4.13) and hence preserves all tight strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -colimits. More importantly in the context of this paper, Theorem 4.11 then also guarantees that dom preserves all the universal oplax normal 2-cocones for an \mathcal{F} -diagram which have tight components, where normal is with respect to the Grothendieck construction. Remember that any weighted 2-colimit can be reduced to an oplax normal conical one.

So after Theorem 4.13 we will have proved that, considering a marking $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ with \mathcal{A} small and an \mathcal{F} -diagram $H: \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ (that is, a 2-functor that sends every morphism of the kind (f, id) to a triangle filled with an identity), if

$$\zeta: \Delta 1 \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{=} \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M(H(-), C)$$

is a universal oplax normal 2-cocone for H on $q \in \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ exhibiting $q = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta 1} H$ such that $\zeta_{(A, X)}$ is a tight morphism for every $(A, X) \in \int W$ (which means that it is a triangle filled with an identity), then $\text{dom} \circ \zeta$ is universal as well, exhibiting

$$\text{dom}(q) = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta 1}(\text{dom} \circ H).$$

Theorem 4.13. *Let \mathcal{E} be a 2-category and let $M \in \mathcal{E}$. Then the 2-colim-fibration $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ has a strict right semi-lax (tight) right \mathcal{F} -adjoint.*

As a consequence, by Theorem 4.11, dom preserves all tight strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -colimits, but also all the universal oplax normal 2-cocylinders for an \mathcal{F} -diagram which have tight λ -components (see Remark 4.12 for what this means explicitly in practice).

Proof. First of all, notice that dom is surely an \mathcal{F} -functor, as every morphism of \mathcal{E} is tight (see Remark 3.4). We use the universal mapping property Proposition 4.3 that characterizes a lax adjunction to build a right semi-lax right adjoint U to $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$. For every $E \in \mathcal{E}$, we define $U(E) := (M \times E \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} E)$ and $\varepsilon_E: M \times E \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} E$, that is tight in \mathcal{E} , remembering that in dimension 1 the domain functor from \mathcal{C}/M is left adjoint to $M \times -$.

We show that such counit is universal in the lax sense. Given $h: \text{dom}(K \xrightarrow{t} M) \rightarrow E$ in \mathcal{E} , take $\bar{h} := ((t, h), \text{id}): (K \xrightarrow{t} M) \rightarrow (M \times E \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} M)$, which is tight in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ (see Remark 3.4), and $\lambda_h := \text{id}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{dom}(K \xrightarrow{t} M) & & \\ \text{dom}((t, h), \text{id}) \downarrow & \searrow \scriptstyle h & \\ \text{dom}(M \times E \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} M) & \xrightarrow[\text{pr}_2]{} & E \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \scriptstyle \cong \\ \scriptstyle \lambda_h \end{array}$$

This guarantees that we will find a right semi-lax adjunction in the end (see Proposition 4.3). Given then another morphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{\hat{\gamma}} & M \times E \\ & \searrow \scriptstyle t & \swarrow \scriptstyle \text{pr}_1 \\ & & M \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \scriptstyle \cong \\ \scriptstyle \gamma \end{array}$$

in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ and another $\sigma: h \Rightarrow \text{pr}_2 \circ \widehat{\gamma}$ in \mathcal{E} , there is a unique $\delta: ((t, h), \text{id}) \Rightarrow (\widehat{\gamma}, \gamma)$ in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{dom}(K \xrightarrow{t} M) & \xrightarrow{h} & E \\ \text{dom}(\widehat{\gamma}, \gamma) \left(\begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\delta} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right) \text{dom}((t, h), \text{id}) & \xrightarrow{\lambda_h} & \text{dom}(M \times E \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} M) \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} E \\ & = & \text{dom}(\widehat{\gamma}, \gamma) \downarrow \quad \xleftarrow{\sigma} \quad \text{dom}(M \times E \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} M) \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} E \end{array}$$

Indeed δ is determined by

$$\text{dom}(\delta) = K \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{(t, h)} \\ \Downarrow \delta \\ \xrightarrow{\widehat{\gamma}} \end{array} M \times E,$$

that needs to satisfy $\text{pr}_1 * \delta = \gamma$ in order to be a 2-cell $((t, h), \text{id}) \Rightarrow (\widehat{\gamma}, \gamma)$ and $\text{pr}_2 * \delta = \sigma$ by the condition above. So δ needs to be (γ, σ) , and this works.

We then see that, for every $E \in \mathcal{E}$, $\overline{\varepsilon_E} = \text{id}$ since in this case $(t, h) = (\text{pr}_1, \text{pr}_2) = \text{id}$ (and λ is always the identity). Moreover, for every $h: \text{dom}(K \xrightarrow{t} M) \rightarrow E$ in \mathcal{E} ,

$$\overline{h \circ \varepsilon_{F(A)}} \circ \overline{\text{id}_{F(A)}} = ((\text{pr}_1, h \circ \text{pr}_2), \text{id}) \circ ((t, \text{id}), \text{id}) = ((t, h), \text{id}) = \overline{h},$$

making the assumption of equation (4) (of Proposition 4.3) hold.

By Proposition 4.3, as λ_h is always the identity, U extends to an oplax functor, ε extends to a 2-natural transformation and there exist a lax natural transformation η and a modification t such that U is a right semi-lax right adjoint to $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$. But it is easy to see, following the explicit construction of Proposition 4.3, that U is the (strict) 2-functor

$$\begin{array}{lcl} M \times - : & \mathcal{E} & \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \\ & E & \mapsto (M \times E \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} E) \\ E \xrightarrow{e} E' & \mapsto & (\text{id} \times e, \text{id}) \\ e \xrightarrow{\beta} e' & \mapsto & \text{id} \times \beta \end{array}$$

Then, for every $(K \xrightarrow{t} M) \in \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$,

$$\eta_t = \begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{(t, \text{id})} & M \times K \\ & \searrow t \quad \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \quad \swarrow \text{pr}_1 & \\ & & M \end{array}$$

The fact that \overline{h} is always tight implies that $U = M \times -$ is an \mathcal{F} -functor and that η has tight components (both also immediate to check directly). Given a morphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\gamma}} & K' \\ & \searrow t \quad \xrightarrow{\gamma} \quad \swarrow t' & \\ & & M \end{array}$$

in $\mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M$, we find that

$$\eta_{(\hat{\gamma}, \gamma)} = \begin{array}{ccc} & M \times K & \\ (t, \text{id}) \nearrow & & \searrow \text{id} \times \hat{\gamma} \\ K & & M \times K' \\ & \Downarrow (\gamma, \text{id}) & \\ & K' & \nearrow (t', \text{id}) \\ & \hat{\gamma} & \end{array}$$

whence it is clear that η is (tight) strict/lax \mathcal{F} -natural (since $\eta_{(\hat{\gamma}, \text{id})} = \text{id}$). Finally, $t = \text{id}$, giving a strict right semi-lax adjunction.

We have also already checked that $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ and $M \times -$ are \mathcal{F} -functors, η is (tight) strict/lax \mathcal{F} -natural and ε has tight components, giving a strict right semi-lax (tight) \mathcal{F} -adjunction. \square

Remark 4.14. We can actually obtain a sharper result of preservation of 2-colimits for $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, as we show in Proposition 4.15. Namely, we can omit the assumption that the universal oplax normal 2-cocones for an \mathcal{F} -diagram have tight λ -components. Indeed, in the proof of Theorem 4.11, the preservation of the universal oplax normal 2-cocone uses the assumption that the $\mu_A^\lambda(X)$'s are tight only to guarantee the uniqueness part of the 1- and 2-universal property. But we can prove both uniqueness results in another way, taking advantage of the simple description of the strict right semi-lax right \mathcal{F} -adjoint $U = M \times -$ of dom .

Proposition 4.15. *Let \mathcal{E} be a 2-category and let $M \in \mathcal{E}$. Then $\text{dom}: \mathcal{E}/_{\text{lax}} M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ preserves all the universal oplax normal 2-cocones for an \mathcal{F} -diagram (without assuming them to have tight λ -components”).*

Proof. We only need to prove the uniqueness part of the 1- and 2-dimensional universal property, by Remark 4.14. Following the proof of Theorem 4.11 with $F = \text{dom}$ and considering $\delta': \text{dom}(K \xrightarrow{t} M) \rightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{E} such that $(\delta' \circ -) \circ \text{dom} \circ \mu = \sigma$, rather than considering $S(\delta') = ((t, \delta'), \text{id})$, we define

$$\gamma' := \begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{(\text{pr}_1 \circ \text{dom}(\gamma), \delta')} & M \times Z \\ & \searrow t \quad \xrightarrow{\gamma} \quad \swarrow \text{pr}_1 & \\ & M & \end{array}$$

Then γ' satisfies $(\gamma' \circ -) \circ \mu = S \circ \sigma$, by the universal property of the product, since γ satisfies the analogous equation and $(\delta' \circ -) \circ \text{dom} \circ \mu = \sigma$. By the uniqueness of γ , we obtain that $\gamma' = \gamma$ and hence $\delta' = \text{pr}_2 \circ \text{dom}(\gamma) = T(\gamma) = \delta$.

Analogously, we can prove also the uniqueness of the 2-dimensional universal property, producing from Δ' the 2-cell $(\text{pr}_1 * \text{dom}(\Gamma), \Delta')$ between the two suitable triangles γ' here above. We indeed obtain $\Delta' = \text{pr}_2 * \text{dom}(\Gamma) = T(\Gamma) = \Delta$. \square

5. CHANGE OF BASE BETWEEN LAX SLICES

In dimension 1, the concept of change of base between slices is definitely helpful. And it is well known that the pullback perfectly realizes such a job. For \mathcal{CAT} , given a functor $\tau: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, it is still a good idea to consider the pullback 2-functor $\tau^*: \mathcal{CAT}/_{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}/_{\mathcal{E}}$ between strict slices. And it is well known that such change of base functor has a right adjoint τ_* (and automatically a right 2-adjoint) precisely when τ is a Conduché

functor (as the latter functors are the exponentiable morphisms in \mathcal{CAT}). So that when τ is Conduché then τ^* is nicely behaved, preserving all the weighted 2-colimits.

However, Section 2 showed that, in order to generalize the calculus of colimits in 1-dimensional slices to dimension 2, one needs to consider lax slices. And it is then helpful to have a change of base 2-functor between lax slices of a finitely complete 2-category. We believe that the most natural way to achieve this is by calculating comma objects rather than pullbacks. This is also connected to the construction of the category of elements, as we have described in our [11], but also, in general, to the concept of 2-dimensional elementary topos (see Weber's [16]). Equivalently to calculating comma objects, we can take pullbacks along split Grothendieck opfibrations (that serve as a kind of fibrant replacement), see Proposition 5.1. Such a point of view is preferable in the context of this section, since Grothendieck opfibrations in \mathcal{CAT} are always Conduché and we can generalize the ideas for finding a right adjoint to the pullback functor $\tau^*: \mathcal{CAT}/\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}/\mathcal{E}$ (see Conduché's [4]) to lax slices.

We take Street's [13] and Weber's [16] as main references for Grothendieck opfibrations in a general 2-category. We prove that if $\tau: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a split Grothendieck opfibration in a 2-category \mathcal{K} , then pulling back along τ extends to a 2-functor $\tau^*: \mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$.

Furthermore, we prove that when $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{CAT}$, the 2-functor

$$\tau^*: \mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$$

has a strict right semi-lax loose right \mathcal{F} -adjoint. This generalizes Palmgren's [12], that proved a similar result for pseudoslices of groupoids, from the comma objects point of view. As a consequence to such adjunction result, by Theorem 4.11, $\tau^*: \mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$ preserves all the universal oplax normal 2-cocylinders for an \mathcal{F} -diagram which have tight λ -components. Remember that the general context of universal oplax normal 2-cocylinders includes the one of weighted 2-colimits, after reducing them to oplax normal conical ones (where this latter normal refers to the Grothendieck construction), as we saw in Remark 4.12.

We then extend this result of preservation of 2-colimits for τ^* to more general 2-categories other than \mathcal{CAT} : firstly to prestacks (Proposition 5.6) and then to any finitely complete 2-category with a dense generator (Theorem 5.8).

Proposition 5.1. *Let \mathcal{K} be a finitely complete 2-category and let $\rho: \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a morphism in \mathcal{K} . Then taking comma objects along ρ is equivalent to taking (strict 2-)pullbacks along the free Grothendieck opfibration $\partial_1: \rho/\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ on ρ , which is split.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J} \\ \downarrow & \swarrow \text{comma} & \downarrow \rho \\ \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{B} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{\partial_1^* F} & \rho/\mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{\partial_0} & \mathcal{J} \\ \downarrow F^* \partial_1 & \lrcorner & \downarrow \partial_1 & \swarrow \text{comma} & \downarrow \rho \\ \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{B} & \xlongequal{\quad} & \mathcal{B} \end{array}$$

Proof. It suffices to check that the diagram on the right above has the universal property of the comma object on the left, for every $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ in \mathcal{K} . It is known that ∂_1 is the free Grothendieck opfibration on ρ and that it is split, see Street's [13]. \square

Proposition 5.2. *Let \mathcal{K} be a 2-category with pullbacks and fix a choice of all pullbacks; let then $\tau: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a split Grothendieck opfibration in \mathcal{K} . Then pulling back along τ extends to a 2-functor*

$$\tau^*: \mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}.$$

Moreover, considering the canonical \mathcal{F} -category structure on the lax slice described in Remark 3.4 (that is, the loose part of the lax slice is itself and its tight part is given by the strict slice), τ^* is an \mathcal{F} -functor.

Proof. Given a morphism $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ in \mathcal{K} , we define τ^*F as the upper morphism of the chosen pullback square in \mathcal{K} on the left below. Given then a morphism in $\mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ as in the middle below, we can lift the 2-cell in \mathcal{K} on the right below

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{\tau^*F} & \mathcal{E} \\
 F^*\tau \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \tau \\
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{B}
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\alpha}} & \mathcal{A}' \\
 F \searrow & \xRightarrow{\alpha} & \swarrow F' \\
 & \mathcal{B} &
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{\tau^*F} & \mathcal{E} \\
 F^*\tau \downarrow & & \downarrow \tau \\
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \searrow \widehat{\alpha} & \Downarrow \alpha & \swarrow F' \\
 & \mathcal{A}' &
 \end{array}$$

along the Grothendieck opfibration τ , producing the chosen cartesian 2-cell $\tau^*\alpha: \tau^*F \Rightarrow V: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ (in the cleavage) with $\tau \circ V = F' \circ \widehat{\alpha} \circ F^*\tau$ and $\tau * \tau^*\alpha = \alpha * F^*\tau$. Using then the universal property of the pullback \mathcal{P}' of τ and F' we can factorize V through τ^*F' , obtaining a morphism $\widehat{\tau^*\alpha}: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}'$. We define $\tau^*\alpha$ to be the upper triangle in the following commutative solid:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{P} & & \xrightarrow{\tau^*F} & & \mathcal{E} \\
 \downarrow F^*\tau & \searrow \widehat{\tau^*\alpha} & \Downarrow \tau^*\alpha & \searrow \tau^*F' & \downarrow \tau \\
 \mathcal{A} & & \mathcal{P}' & \xrightarrow{\tau^*F'} & \mathcal{E} \\
 \downarrow \widehat{\alpha} & \searrow (F')^*\tau & \downarrow (F')^*\tau & \searrow F & \downarrow \tau \\
 \mathcal{A}' & & \mathcal{A}' & \xrightarrow{F'} & \mathcal{B} \\
 & & \Downarrow \alpha & &
 \end{array}$$

It is straightforward to check that τ^* is functorial, since τ is a split Grothendieck opfibration. For this, remember that a cleavage is the choice of a left adjoint to $\eta_\tau: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \tau/\mathcal{B}$, where the latter is the morphism induced by the identity 2-cell on τ . Such a choice then determines the liftings of the Grothendieck opfibrations $(\tau \circ -): \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$ in \mathcal{CAT} that we have for every $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{K}$, by using the universal property of τ/\mathcal{B} (to factorize the 2-cells we want to lift). So notice that taking $(\widehat{\alpha}, \alpha): F \rightarrow F'$ as above and $(\widehat{\beta}, \beta): F' \rightarrow F''$ in $\mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ we have that the chosen cartesian lifting of $\beta * (\widehat{\alpha} \circ F^*\tau) = (\beta * (F')^*\tau) * \widehat{\tau^*\alpha}$ needs to coincide with $\tau^*\beta * \widehat{\tau^*\alpha}$.

Given a 2-cell $\delta: (\widehat{\alpha}, \alpha) \rightarrow (\widehat{\beta}, \beta): F \rightarrow F'$ in $\mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$, we define $\tau^*\delta$ to be the chosen cartesian lifting of the 2-cell $\delta * F^*\tau$ along the Grothendieck opfibration $(F')^*\tau$, where the latter has the cleavage induced by the cleavage of τ . Using then that τ is split, together with the definition of 2-cell in $\mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ and the universal property of the pullback \mathcal{P}' , we obtain that the codomain of $\tau^*\delta$ is indeed $\widehat{\tau^*\beta}$ and that $\tau^*\delta$ is a 2-cell in $\mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$ from $\tau^*\alpha$ to $\tau^*\beta$. It is then straightforward to check that τ^* is a 2-functor, using that $(F')^*\tau$ is split.

Finally, consider on both $\mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$ the canonical \mathcal{F} -category structure described in Remark 3.4. Since the lifting of an identity 2-cell through a split Grothendieck opfibration is always an identity, then τ^* is an \mathcal{F} -functor. \square

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\tau: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a split Grothendieck opfibration in \mathcal{CAT} . Then the \mathcal{F} -functor*

$$\tau^*: \mathcal{CAT} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$$

has a strict right semi-lax loose right \mathcal{F} -adjoint.

As a consequence, by Theorem 4.11, τ^ preserves all the universal oplax normal 2-cocylinders for an \mathcal{F} -diagram which have tight λ -components.*

Proof. We use Proposition 4.3 (universal mapping property that characterizes a lax adjunction) to build a right semi-lax right adjoint $\tau_*: \mathcal{CAT} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ to τ^* . We will generalize the ideas of the construction of a right adjoint to the pullback between strict slices (see Conduché's [4] and Palmgren's [12]), using that τ is Conduché (being a Grothendieck opfibration). To suit the lax context, we will fill the relevant triangles with general 2-cells.

So, given a morphism $f: X \rightarrow X'$ in \mathcal{B} , we will need to consider the following pullbacks in \mathcal{CAT}

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \tau^{-1}(X) & \xrightarrow{U} & \mathcal{E} & & \tau^{-1}(f) & \xrightarrow{V} & \mathcal{E} & & \tau^{-1}(X) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{0}} & \tau^{-1}(f) & \xrightarrow{V} & \mathcal{E} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \tau & & \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \tau & & \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \tau \\ 1 & \xrightarrow{X} & \mathcal{B} & & 2 & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{B} & & 1 & \xrightarrow{0} & 2 & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{B} \end{array}$$

Notice that $\tau^{-1}(X)$ is the fibre of τ over X . Whereas $\tau^{-1}(f)$ has three kinds of morphisms, namely the morphisms in \mathcal{E} over id_X , those over $\text{id}_{X'}$ and those over $f: X \rightarrow X'$.

Given a functor $H: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, we define τ_*H as the projection on the first component $\text{pr}_1: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, where the category \mathcal{H} is defined as follows:

an object is a pair $(X, (\hat{\alpha}, \alpha))$ with $X \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(\hat{\alpha}, \alpha)$ a morphism in $\mathcal{CAT} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau^{-1}(X) & \xrightarrow{\hat{\alpha}} & \mathcal{D} \\ & \searrow U & \swarrow H \\ & \mathcal{E} & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \\ \Rightarrow \end{array}$$

a morphism $(X, (\hat{\alpha}, \alpha)) \rightarrow (X', (\hat{\beta}, \beta))$ is a pair $(f, (\hat{\Phi}, \Phi))$ with $f: X \rightarrow X'$ in \mathcal{B} and $(\hat{\Phi}, \Phi)$ a morphism in $\mathcal{CAT} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$ as on the left below such that $\Phi * \tilde{0} = \alpha$ and $\Phi * \tilde{1} = \beta$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau^{-1}(f) & \xrightarrow{\hat{\Phi}} & \mathcal{D} \\ & \searrow V & \swarrow H \\ & \mathcal{E} & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Phi} \\ \Rightarrow \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{\hat{\alpha}} & \mathcal{D} \\ \tau^{-1}(X) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{0}} & \tau^{-1}(f) & \xrightarrow{\hat{\Phi}} & \mathcal{D} \\ & \searrow U & \searrow V & \swarrow H \\ & \mathcal{E} & \mathcal{E} & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Phi} \\ \Rightarrow \end{array}$$

So the only data of $(\hat{\Phi}, \Phi)$ that are not already determined by its domain and its codomain are the assignments of $\hat{\Phi}$ on the morphisms of $\tau^{-1}(f)$ that correspond to morphisms $g: E \rightarrow E'$ in \mathcal{E} over $f: X \rightarrow X'$, and we have that such assignments produce a morphism in \mathcal{H} precisely when they organize into a functor $\hat{\Phi}$ such that

for every $g: E \rightarrow E'$ in \mathcal{E} over $f: X \rightarrow X'$ the following square is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{\alpha_E} & H(\widehat{\alpha}(E)) \\ g \downarrow & & \downarrow H(\widehat{\Phi}(0 \rightarrow 1, g)) \\ E' & \xrightarrow{\beta_{E'}} & H(\widehat{\beta}(E')) \end{array}$$

the identity on $(X, (\widehat{\alpha}, \alpha))$ is the pair $(\text{id}_X, (\text{id}_{\widehat{\alpha}}, \text{id}_{\alpha}))$ determined by

$$\widehat{\text{id}}_{\alpha}(0 \rightarrow 1, g) = \widehat{\alpha}(g);$$

the composition of $(f, (\widehat{\Phi}, \Phi))$ and $(f', (\widehat{\Phi}', \Phi'))$ has first component $f' \circ f$ and second component determined by sending $g: E \rightarrow E'$ over $X \xrightarrow{f} X' \xrightarrow{f'} X''$ to

$$\widehat{\Phi}'(1 \rightarrow 2, g_2) \circ \widehat{\Phi}(0 \rightarrow 1, g_1)$$

where $E \xrightarrow{g_1} Z \xrightarrow{g_2} E'$ is a factorization of g over $X \xrightarrow{f} X' \xrightarrow{f'} X''$ obtained by the fact that τ is a Conduché functor. Notice that such assignment is independent from the choice of the factorization because $\widehat{\Phi}$ and $\widehat{\Phi}'$ need to agree on any morphism $(1 = 1, h)$, since the codomain of the former, that equals the domain of the latter, determines their images. Moreover it is immediate to check that this gives a morphism in \mathcal{H} , pasting the two commutative squares for g_1 and g_2 .

It is straightforward to check that \mathcal{H} is a category, and $\tau_* H$ is then surely a functor.

We define the counit ε on H as the morphism in $\mathcal{CAT} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{N} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\varepsilon}_H} & \mathcal{D} \\ \tau^* \tau_* H \searrow & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_H} & \swarrow H \\ & \mathcal{E} & \end{array}$$

given by the evaluation, as follows. An object of \mathcal{N} is a pair $((X, (\widehat{\alpha}, \alpha)), E)$ with $(X, (\widehat{\alpha}, \alpha)) \in \mathcal{H}$ and $E \in \tau^{-1}(X)$, whereas a morphism in \mathcal{N} is a pair $((f, (\widehat{\Phi}, \Phi)), g)$ with $(f, (\widehat{\Phi}, \Phi))$ a morphism in \mathcal{H} and $g: E \rightarrow E'$ in \mathcal{E} over f . We define

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\varepsilon}_H((X, (\widehat{\alpha}, \alpha)), E) &:= \widehat{\alpha}(E) \\ \widehat{\varepsilon}_H((f, (\widehat{\Phi}, \Phi)), g) &:= \widehat{\Phi}(0 \rightarrow 1, g) \\ (\varepsilon_H)_{((X, (\widehat{\alpha}, \alpha)), E)} &:= \alpha_E \end{aligned}$$

Then $\widehat{\varepsilon}_H$ is readily seen to be a functor, and ε_H is a natural transformation thanks to the commutative square that a morphism in \mathcal{H} needs to satisfy. Notice, however, that ε_H is not tight, so that we can only hope to obtain a loose adjunction.

We prove that ε_H is universal in the lax sense. So take a functor $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and a morphism in $\mathcal{CAT} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\gamma}} & \mathcal{D} \\ \tau^* F \searrow & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & \swarrow H \\ & \mathcal{E} & \end{array}$$

Wishing to obtain a right semi-lax loose \mathcal{F} -adjunction, we search for a tight morphism in $\mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ as on the left below that satisfies the equality of diagrams on the right

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\gamma}} & \mathcal{H} \\
 \searrow F & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\gamma}} & \swarrow \tau_* H \\
 & \mathcal{B} &
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{\tau^* \widehat{\gamma}} & \mathcal{N} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\varepsilon}_H} & \mathcal{D} \\
 \searrow \tau^* F & \Downarrow & \downarrow \tau^* \tau_* H & \nearrow \varepsilon_H & \swarrow H \\
 & & \mathcal{E} & &
 \end{array}
 =
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\gamma}} & \mathcal{D} \\
 \searrow \tau^* F & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & \swarrow H \\
 & \mathcal{E} &
 \end{array}
 \quad (7)$$

so that we can take $\lambda_{(\widehat{\gamma}, \gamma)} = \text{id}$. Given $a: A \rightarrow A'$ in \mathcal{A} , we have $\widehat{\gamma}(A) = (F(A), (\widehat{\alpha}, \alpha))$ and $\widehat{\gamma}(a) = (F(a), (\widehat{\Phi}, \Phi))$ with

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \tau^{-1}(F(A)) & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\alpha}} & \mathcal{D} \\
 \searrow U & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \swarrow H \\
 & \mathcal{E} &
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \tau^{-1}(F(a)) & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\Phi}} & \mathcal{D} \\
 \searrow V & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \swarrow H \\
 & \mathcal{E} &
 \end{array}$$

And given $g: E \rightarrow E'$ in \mathcal{E} over $F(a): F(A) \rightarrow F(A')$, then $(a, g): (A, E) \rightarrow (A', E')$ is a morphism in \mathcal{P} . So we want to define

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widehat{\alpha}(E) &= \widehat{\varepsilon}_H(\widehat{\gamma}(A), E) = \widehat{\varepsilon}_H(\tau^* \widehat{\gamma}(A, E)) = \widehat{\gamma}(A, E) \\
 \widehat{\Phi}(0 \rightarrow 1, g) &= \widehat{\varepsilon}_H(\widehat{\gamma}(a), g) = \widehat{\varepsilon}_H(\tau^* \widehat{\gamma}(a, g)) = \widehat{\gamma}(a, g) \\
 \alpha_E &= (\varepsilon_H)_{(\widehat{\gamma}(A), E)} = (\varepsilon_H)_{(\tau^* \widehat{\gamma}(A, E))} = \gamma_{(A, E)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Taking a morphism $g': E \rightarrow E'$ in $\tau^{-1}(F(A))$,

$$\widehat{\alpha}(g') = \widehat{\text{id}}_{\alpha}(0 \rightarrow 1, g') = \widehat{\varepsilon}_H(\widehat{\gamma}(\text{id}_A), g') = \widehat{\varepsilon}_H(\tau^* \widehat{\gamma}(\text{id}_A, g')) = \widehat{\gamma}(\text{id}_A, g')$$

It is straightforward to check that this defines a functor $\widehat{\gamma}$ as in the left part of equation (7); $\widehat{\gamma}$ satisfies the equality in the right part of the same equation by construction. Take then $\lambda_{(\widehat{\gamma}, \gamma)} = \text{id}$.

Given another morphism in $\mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\xi}} & \mathcal{H} \\
 \searrow F & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\xi}} & \swarrow \tau_* H \\
 & \mathcal{B} &
 \end{array}$$

and a 2-cell $\Xi: (\widehat{\gamma}, \gamma) \Rightarrow (\widehat{\varepsilon}_H, \varepsilon_H) \circ (\tau^* \widehat{\xi}, \tau^* \xi)$ in $\mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$, we prove that there is a unique 2-cell $\delta: (\widehat{\gamma}, \text{id}) \Rightarrow (\widehat{\xi}, \xi)$ in $\mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$(\widehat{\varepsilon}_H, \varepsilon_H) * \tau^* \delta \circ \text{id} = \Xi. \quad (8)$$

In order for δ to be a 2-cell $(\widehat{\gamma}, \text{id}) \Rightarrow (\widehat{\xi}, \xi)$,

$$\tau_* H * \delta = \xi.$$

Whereas the request of equation (8) translates as

$$\widehat{\varepsilon}_H * \tau^* \delta = \Xi.$$

So, for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the component $\delta_A: \widehat{\gamma}(A) \rightarrow \widehat{\xi}(A)$ needs to be the morphism in \mathcal{H} with first component ξ_A and second component

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau^{-1}(\xi_A) & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\delta}_A} & \mathcal{D} \\ & \searrow V & \swarrow H \\ & & \mathcal{E} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\delta_A} \\ \xrightarrow{\delta_A} \end{array}$$

given as follows. For every $g: E \rightarrow E'$ over ξ_A , factorizing g as the cartesian morphism $\text{Cart}(\xi_A, E)$ in the cleavage of the Grothendieck opfibration τ over ξ_A to E followed by the unique induced vertical morphism g_{vert} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\delta}_A(0 \rightarrow 1, g) &= \widehat{\delta}_A(1 = 1, g_{\text{vert}}) \circ \widehat{\delta}_A(0 \rightarrow 1, \text{Cart}(\xi_A, E)) = \\ &= \widehat{\xi}(A)(g_{\text{vert}}) \circ \widehat{\varepsilon}_H(\delta_A, \text{Cart}(\xi_A, E)) = \widehat{\xi}(A)(g_{\text{vert}}) \circ \widehat{\varepsilon}_H((\tau^*\delta)_{A,E}) = \\ &= \widehat{\xi}(A)(g_{\text{vert}}) \circ \Xi_{A,E} \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to prove that δ_A is a morphism in \mathcal{H} and that δ is a natural transformation, using the uniqueness of the morphisms induced by cartesian liftings. δ is then a 2-cell in $\mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$(\widehat{\varepsilon}_H, \varepsilon_H) * \tau^*\delta \circ \text{id} = \Xi$$

by construction.

Considering $(\widehat{\gamma}, \gamma) = (\widehat{\varepsilon}_H, \varepsilon_H)$, we immediately see that we obtain $\widehat{\varepsilon}_H = \text{id}$, because $(\widehat{\varepsilon}_H, \varepsilon_H)$ is the evaluation.

Moreover, for every functor $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and morphism in $\mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\gamma}} & \mathcal{D} \\ & \searrow \tau^*F & \swarrow H \\ & & \mathcal{E} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\gamma} \\ \xrightarrow{\gamma} \end{array}$$

we prove that

$$\overline{((\widehat{\gamma}, \gamma) \circ (\widehat{\varepsilon}_H, \varepsilon_H))} \circ \overline{\text{id}_{\tau^*F}} = \overline{(\widehat{\gamma}, \gamma)}. \quad (9)$$

$\overline{\text{id}_{\tau^*F}} = (\widehat{\eta}_F, \text{id})$, that will be the unit η_F , is such that, for every $a: A \rightarrow A'$ in \mathcal{A} , morphism g' in $\tau^{-1}(F(A'))$ and $g: E \rightarrow E'$ in \mathcal{E} over $F(a): F(A) \rightarrow F(A')$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\eta}_F(A)(E) &= (A, E) & \widehat{\eta}_F(A)(g') &= (\text{id}_A, g') \\ \widehat{\eta}_F(a)(0 \rightarrow 1, g) &= (a, g) & \widehat{\eta}_F(A)_E &= \text{id} \end{aligned}$$

Whereas for a general $(\widehat{\psi}, \psi): G \rightarrow H$ in $\mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$, the morphism

$$\overline{((\widehat{\psi}, \psi) \circ (\widehat{\varepsilon}_H, \varepsilon_H))} = (\tau_*\widehat{\psi}, \text{id})$$

will be the action of τ_* on the morphism $(\widehat{\psi}, \psi)$, and is such that $\tau_*\widehat{\psi}$ acts by postcomposing the triangles with $(\widehat{\psi}, \psi)$. Thus equation (9) holds.

By Proposition 4.3, as λ is always the identity, then τ_* extends to an oplax functor, that can be easily checked to be a 2-functor (it acts by postcomposition), ε extends to a 2-natural transformation, η extends to a lax natural transformation and there exists a

modification t such that τ_* is a right semi-lax right adjoint to τ^* . It is easy to check that t is the identity.

Since $(\widehat{\gamma}, \gamma)$ is always tight, then τ_* is an \mathcal{F} -functor and η has tight components. It remains to show that η is loose strict/lax \mathcal{F} -natural. Given a morphism in $\mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\sigma}} & \mathcal{A}' \\ & \searrow F & \swarrow F' \\ & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \\ & \swarrow & \searrow \\ & \mathcal{B} & \end{array}$$

the component on $A \in \mathcal{A}$ of the structure 2-cell $\eta_{(\widehat{\sigma}, \sigma)}$ is the morphism in the domain of $\tau_* \tau^* F'$ with first component $\sigma_A: F(A) \rightarrow F'(\widehat{\sigma}(A))$ in \mathcal{B} and second component given by

$$\widehat{\eta_{(\widehat{\sigma}, \sigma), A}}(0 \rightarrow 1, g) = \widehat{\eta_{F'}}(\widehat{\sigma}(A))(g_{\text{vert}}) = (\text{id}_{\widehat{\sigma}(A)}, g_{\text{vert}}).$$

When $(\widehat{\sigma}, \sigma)$ is tight, so when the 2-cell σ is the identity, then $g = g_{\text{vert}}$ because τ has a normal cleavage, and we find $\eta_{(\widehat{\sigma}, \sigma)} = \text{id}$. Thus η is strict/lax \mathcal{F} -natural. We conclude that τ_* is a strict right semi-lax loose right \mathcal{F} -adjoint to τ^* . \square

Remark 5.4. We have actually proved in Theorem 5.3 that τ_* sends every morphism in $\mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$ to a tight one in $\mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$. So $\tau_*: \mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ is still an \mathcal{F} -functor if we take the trivial \mathcal{F} -category structure on the domain, i.e. taking everything to be tight, and the canonical one in the codomain. Of course, with such a choice of \mathcal{F} -category structures, τ^* remains an \mathcal{F} -functor and η remains with tight components. But ε becomes tight, having now tight components trivially.

So we find a strict right semi-lax (tight) \mathcal{F} -adjunction between τ^* and τ_* . But Theorem 4.11 does not add anything to the preservation of 2-colimits we have already proved in Theorem 5.3, since it would consider strict/oplax \mathcal{F} -colimits in an \mathcal{F} -category with trivial \mathcal{F} -category structure.

Remark 5.5. We now extend the result of preservation of 2-colimits that we have proved for the 2-functor

$$\tau^*: \mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$$

when $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{CAT}$ (Theorem 5.3) to $\mathcal{K} = [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]$ a 2-category of 2-dimensional presheaves. Remember that any weighted 2-colimit can be reduced to an oplax normal conical one.

Proposition 5.6. *Let \mathcal{L} be a small 2-category and let $\tau: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a split Grothendieck opfibration in $[\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]$. Then the \mathcal{F} -functor*

$$\tau^*: [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$$

(which is such by Proposition 5.2) preserves all the universal oplax normal 2-cocones for an \mathcal{F} -diagram which have tight components, where normal is with respect to the Grothendieck construction.

Proof. Consider a marking $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ with \mathcal{A} a small 2-category and an \mathcal{F} -diagram $H: \int W \rightarrow [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$ (that is, a 2-functor that sends every morphism of the kind (f, id) to a triangle filled with an identity). Let then

$$\zeta: \Delta 1 \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{} [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}(H(-), C)$$

be a universal oplax normal 2-cocone that exhibits $C = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta 1} H$ such that $\zeta_{(A, X)}$ is tight for every $(A, X) \in \int W$ (which means that it is a triangle filled with

an identity). We want to prove that $\tau^* \circ \zeta$ is universal as well, exhibiting $\tau^*(C) = \text{oplax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1}(\tau^* \circ H)$.

Since the $\zeta_{(A,X)}$'s are all cartesian, as they are tight, and τ^* is an \mathcal{F} -functor, by Theorem 2.20 (the domain 2-functor from a lax slice is a 2-colim-fibration), we know that $\text{dom}: [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}] /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]$ reflects the universality of $\tau^* \circ \zeta$. But the 2-functors $(-)(L): [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}] \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ of evaluation on $L \in \mathcal{L}$ are jointly reflective (2-colimits in 2-presheaves are calculated pointwise). Therefore, in order to prove that $\tau^* \circ \zeta$ is universal, it suffices to show that, for every $L \in \mathcal{L}$, the oplax normal 2-cocone $(-)(L) \circ \text{dom} \circ \tau^* \circ \zeta$ is universal. Notice now that the diagram of 2-functors

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}] /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{\tau^*} & [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}] /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{\text{dom}} & [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}] \\ \downarrow (-)_L & & \downarrow (-)_L & & \downarrow (-)_L \\ \mathcal{CAT} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}(L) & \xrightarrow{(\tau_L)^*} & \mathcal{CAT} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}(L) & \xrightarrow{\text{dom}} & \mathcal{CAT} \end{array}$$

is commutative, where $(-)_L$ is the \mathcal{F} -functor that takes components on L , because pullbacks in $[\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]$ are calculated pointwise and the components of the liftings along τ are the liftings of the components of τ . Indeed every component τ_L of τ is a split Grothendieck opfibration in \mathcal{CAT} because $\tau \circ -: [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}](y(L), \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}](y(L), \mathcal{B})$ is so, taking on the former the cleavage induced by the latter. And since a cleavage for τ is the choice of a left adjoint to $\eta_\tau: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \tau / \mathcal{B}$ (where the latter is the morphism induced by the identity 2-cell on τ), the cleavages determined on the Grothendieck opfibrations $(\tau \circ -): [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}](\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}](\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$ in \mathcal{CAT} (by applying the universal property of τ / \mathcal{B}) are compatible.

We prove that $\text{dom} \circ (\tau_L)^* \circ (-)_L \circ \zeta$ is universal. We have that $(-)_L \circ \zeta$ is universal because it suffices to check that $\text{dom} \circ (-)_L \circ \zeta = (-)(L) \circ \text{dom} \circ \zeta$ is so, by Theorem 2.20, as ζ has tight components and $(-)_L$ is an \mathcal{F} -functor. And dom preserves the universality of ζ by Theorem 4.13 (thanks to the hypothesis), while $(-)(L)$ preserves every 2-colimit. Then $\text{dom} \circ (\tau_L)^* \circ (-)_L \circ \zeta$ is universal applying Theorem 5.3 and Theorem 4.13, thanks to the hypothesis and to the fact that both $(-)_L$ and $(\tau_L)^*$ are \mathcal{F} -functors. \square

Remark 5.7. We conclude extending again the result of preservation of 2-colimits for $\tau^*: \mathcal{K} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{K} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$, to \mathcal{K} any finitely complete 2-category with a dense generator. For this, we will need to restrict to relatively absolute 2-colimits. But remember that any object of \mathcal{K} can be expressed as a relatively absolute 2-colimit of dense generators, so that our assumption is not much restrictive in practice. We take Kelly's [8] as the main reference for dense functors.

Theorem 5.8. *Let \mathcal{K} be a finitely complete 2-category and let $J: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ be a fully faithful dense 2-functor. Consider $\tau: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ a split Grothendieck opfibration in \mathcal{K} . Then the \mathcal{F} -functor*

$$\tau^*: \mathcal{K} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{K} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E}$$

(which is such by Proposition 5.2) preserves all the universal oplax normal 2-cocones for an \mathcal{F} -diagram which have tight components and whose domain is J -absolute, where normal is with respect to the Grothendieck construction.

Proof. Let \mathcal{A} be a small 2-category and consider a marking $W: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ and an \mathcal{F} -diagram $H: \int W \rightarrow \mathcal{K} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}$. Let then

$$\zeta: \Delta 1 \xrightarrow[\text{oplax}^n]{} \mathcal{K} /_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B}(H(-), C)$$

be a universal oplax normal 2-cocone that exhibits $C = \text{op lax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1} H$ such that $\zeta_{(A,X)}$ is tight for every $(A, X) \in \int W$. Assume also that $\text{dom} \circ \zeta$ is J -absolute, i.e. preserved by $\tilde{J}: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]$. Notice that $\text{dom} \circ \zeta$ is indeed universal by Theorem 4.13. We want to prove that $\tau^* \circ \zeta$ is universal as well, exhibiting $\tau^*(C) = \text{op lax}^n\text{-colim}^{\Delta^1} (\tau^* \circ H)$.

Since the $\zeta_{(A,X)}$'s are all cartesian (as they are tight) and τ^* is an \mathcal{F} -functor, by Theorem 2.20, we know that $\text{dom}: \mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ reflects the universality of $\tau^* \circ \zeta$. Moreover, by definition of dense functor, \tilde{J} is fully faithful and hence reflects any 2-colimit; and the 2-functors $(-)(L): [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}] \rightarrow \mathcal{CAT}$ of evaluation on $L \in \mathcal{L}$ are jointly reflective. Therefore, in order to prove that $\tau^* \circ \zeta$ is universal, it suffices to show that, for every $L \in \mathcal{L}$, the oplax normal 2-cocone $(-)(L) \circ \tilde{J} \circ \text{dom} \circ \tau^* \circ \zeta$ is universal.

Notice now that the diagram of 2-functors

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{\tau^*} & \mathcal{K}/_{\text{lax}} \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{\text{dom}} & \mathcal{K} \\
\downarrow \tilde{J}/_{\text{lax}} & & \downarrow \tilde{J}/_{\text{lax}} & & \downarrow \tilde{J} \\
[\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]/_{\text{lax}} \tilde{J}(\mathcal{B}) & & [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}]/_{\text{lax}} \tilde{J}(\mathcal{E}) & \xrightarrow{\text{dom}} & [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}] \\
\downarrow (-)_L & & \downarrow (-)_L & & \downarrow (-)_L \\
\mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \tilde{J}(\mathcal{B})(L) & \xrightarrow{(\tau \circ -)^*} & \mathcal{CAT}/_{\text{lax}} \tilde{J}(\mathcal{E})(L) & \xrightarrow{\text{dom}} & \mathcal{CAT}
\end{array}$$

is commutative, where $\tilde{J}/_{\text{lax}}$ is the \mathcal{F} -functor that applies \tilde{J} on morphisms and triangles. Indeed $\mathcal{K}(J(L), -)$ preserves pullbacks, and since a cleavage for τ is the choice of a left adjoint to $\eta_\tau: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \tau/\mathcal{B}$, the cleavages determined on the Grothendieck opfibrations $(\tau \circ -): [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}](\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow [\mathcal{L}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{CAT}](\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$ in \mathcal{CAT} (by applying the universal property of τ/\mathcal{B}) are compatible.

We prove that $\text{dom} \circ (\tau \circ -)^* \circ (-)_L \circ \tilde{J}/_{\text{lax}} \circ \zeta$ is universal. We have that $\tilde{J}/_{\text{lax}} \circ \zeta$ is universal, since it suffices to check that $\text{dom} \circ \tilde{J}/_{\text{lax}} \circ \zeta$ is so, by Theorem 2.20, as ζ has tight components and $\tilde{J}/_{\text{lax}}$ is an \mathcal{F} -functor. And $\text{dom} \circ \tilde{J}/_{\text{lax}} \circ \zeta = \tilde{J} \circ \text{dom} \circ \zeta$ is universal because $\text{dom} \circ \zeta$ is J -absolute by hypothesis. Then $(-)_L$ preserves the universality of $\tilde{J}/_{\text{lax}} \circ \zeta$ because $\text{dom} \circ (-)_L = (-)(L) \circ \text{dom}$ does so. Finally, we obtain that $\text{dom} \circ (\tau \circ -)^* \circ (-)_L \circ \tilde{J}/_{\text{lax}} \circ \zeta$ is universal applying Theorem 5.3 and Theorem 4.13, thanks to the hypothesis and to the fact that $\tilde{J}/_{\text{lax}}$, $(-)_L$ and $(\tau \circ -)^*$ are all \mathcal{F} -functors. \square

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Charles Walker for suggesting the possible use of \mathcal{F} -categorical techniques to justify my work. Part of this research has been conducted while visiting the University of Manchester.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Adámek, H. Herrlich, and G. E. Strecker. Abstract and concrete categories: the joy of cats. *Repr. Theory Appl. Categ.*, 2006(17):1–507, 2006.
- [2] J. Bourke. Two-dimensional monadicity. *Adv. Math.*, 252:708–747, 2014.
- [3] M. C. Bunge. Coherent extensions and relational algebras. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 197:355–390, 1974.
- [4] F. Conduché. Au sujet de l'existence d'adjoints à droite aux foncteurs "image reciproque" dans la catégorie des catégories. *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Sér. A*, 275:891–894, 1972.
- [5] J. Giraud. Méthode de la descente. *Bull. Soc. Math. Fr., Suppl., Mém.*, 2:115, 1964.

- [6] J. W. Gray. *Formal category theory: Adjointness for 2-categories*, volume 391 of *Lect. Notes Math.* Springer, 1974.
- [7] C. Hermida. Some properties of Fib as a fibred 2-category. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 134(1):83–109, 1999.
- [8] G. M. Kelly. Basic concepts of enriched category theory. *Repr. Theory Appl. Categ.*, 2005(10):1–136, 2005.
- [9] S. Lack and M. Shulman. Enhanced 2-categories and limits for lax morphisms. *Adv. Math.*, 229(1):294–356, 2012.
- [10] M. Lambert. Discrete 2-fibrations. *arXiv: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.11477>*, 2020.
- [11] L. Mesiti. The 2-Set-enriched Grothendieck construction and the lax normal conical 2-limits. *arXiv: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.04566>*, 2023.
- [12] E. Palmgren. Groupoids and local cartesian closure. *Preprint: <http://www2.math.uu.se/~palmgren/gpdlcc.pdf>*, 2003.
- [13] R. Street. Fibrations and Yoneda’s Lemma in a 2-category. *Category Sem., Proc., Sydney 1972/1973*, *Lect. Notes Math.* 420, 104-133, Springer, 1974.
- [14] R. Street. Limits indexed by category-valued 2-functors. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 8:149–181, 1976.
- [15] C. Walker. Lax familial representability and lax generic factorizations. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 35:1424–1475, 2020.
- [16] M. Weber. Yoneda structures from 2-toposes. *Appl. Categ. Struct.*, 15(3):259–323, 2007.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
Email address: `mmlme@leeds.ac.uk`