

ON EFFECTIVE DESCENT \mathcal{V} -FUNCTORS AND FAMILIAL DESCENT MORPHISMS

RUI PREZADO

ABSTRACT. We study effective descent \mathcal{V} -functors for cartesian monoidal categories \mathcal{V} with finite limits. This study is carried out via the properties enjoyed by the 2-functor $\mathcal{V} \mapsto \mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$, results about effective descent of bilimits of categories, and the fact that the enrichment 2-functor preserves certain bilimits. Since these results rely on an understanding of (effective) descent morphisms in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$, we carefully study these morphisms in free coproduct completions. Finally, we provide refined conditions when \mathcal{V} is a regular category.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Preliminaries	3
2. Preservation of bilimits and descent	5
3. Descent for cartesian enriched categories	7
4. Familial descent morphisms	8
5. Enrichment in cartesian monoidal categories	13
6. Future work	15
References	16

INTRODUCTION

Let \mathcal{C} be a category with pullbacks. For each morphism $p: x \rightarrow y$, we have a change-of-base functor along p :

$$p^*: \mathcal{C}/y \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/x$$

Via these functors, we are able to provide a description of the *basic bifibration* of \mathcal{C} . Thanks to the Bénabou-Roubaud theorem [4] (see also [21, p. 258] or [29, Theorems 7.4 and 8.5] for generalisations), the *descent category* for p with respect to the basic bifibration, denoted $\mathbf{Desc}(p)$, is equivalent to the Eilenberg-Moore category for the monad induced by the adjunction $p! \dashv p^*$. This allows us to say that the morphism p is *effective for descent* if the comparison functor \mathcal{K}^p in the Eilenberg-Moore factorisation (1)

$$(1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}/y & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}^p} & \mathbf{Desc}(p) \\ & \searrow p^* & \swarrow \mathcal{U}^p \\ & \mathcal{C}/x & \end{array}$$

is an equivalence of categories; here, \mathcal{U}^p is the functor which forgets descent data.

Janelidze-Galois theory [5] and Grothendieck descent theory [22, 29] feature the use of effective descent morphisms, requiring the knowledge of some (or all) such morphisms in the category of interest, and are the main motivation to undertake the study of finding sufficient conditions or even characterising effective descent morphisms; see [20, 21] for introductions to the subject.

Date: May 06, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 18N10, 18F20, 18D20, 18B50, 18A25, 18A35.

Key words and phrases. effective descent morphisms, enriched category, pseudopullback, Grothendieck descent theory.

This research was partially supported by the Centre for Mathematics of the University of Coimbra - UIDB/00324/2020, funded by the Portuguese Government through FCT/MCTES, and by the grant PD/BD/150461/2019 funded by Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT).

As an example, if \mathcal{C} is a locally cartesian closed category, or an exact category (in the sense of Barr [1]), the effective descent morphisms are precisely the regular epimorphisms. However, the characterisation of effective descent morphisms in a given category \mathcal{C} is a notoriously difficult problem in general; for instance, see the characterisation in [33] and a subsequent reformulation [10] for the case $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Top}$.

Motivated by this reformulation, [8, 7, 9, 11] study this characterisation problem for more general notions of *spaces*: these works provide various results about effective descent in (T, \mathcal{V}) -categories (originally defined in [13]). Due to their concerns with topological results, the study was restricted to the case in which the enriching category \mathcal{V} is a quantale.

From the perspective of internal structures, we have the work of Le Creurer [25], in which he studies the problem of effective descent morphisms for essentially algebraic structures internal to a category \mathcal{B} with finite limits. In particular, the author provides sufficient conditions for effective descent morphisms in $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Cat}(\mathcal{B})$, and confirms that these conditions provide a complete characterisation with the added requirement that \mathcal{B} is extensive and has a (regular epi, mono)-factorization system. Generalisations of these results to internal *multicategories* were studied in [32].

Let $- \cdot 1: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ be the ‘‘copower with the terminal object’’ functor, defined on objects by $X \mapsto X \cdot 1 = \sum_{x \in X} 1$. Making use of Le Creurer’s results, Lucatelli Nunes, via his study on effective descent morphisms for bilimits of categories, provides sufficient conditions for effective descent morphisms in $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$ via the following pseudopullback (see [29, Lemma 9.10, Theorem 9.11]):

$$(2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Cat}(\mathcal{V}) \\ \text{ob} \downarrow & & \downarrow (-)_0 \\ \mathbf{Set} & \xrightarrow{- \cdot 1} & \mathcal{V} \end{array}$$

for suitable lextensive categories \mathcal{V} , with the *cartesian* monoidal structure.

The central contribution of this paper is to extend [29, Theorem 9.11] to all cartesian monoidal categories \mathcal{V} with finite limits, in Theorem 3.3. We highlight the use of the following three tools, used in the proof of Lemma 3.1, which are the skeleton of the argument: the properties of familial 2-functors, in particular, of the endo-2-functor $\mathbf{Fam}: \mathbf{CAT} \rightarrow \mathbf{CAT}$ studied in [37]; results about effective descent morphisms in bilimits of categories (see [29, Theorem 9.2 and Corollary 9.5]); and preservation of pseudopullbacks via enrichment (Theorem 2.1).

Since Theorem 3.3 relies on understanding (effective) descent morphisms in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$, it naturally raises the problem of studying these classes of epimorphisms in the free coproduct completion of \mathcal{V} . Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 4.3 provide a couple of improvements, which we first illustrate in Theorem 4.7 for \mathcal{V} a (co)complete Heyting lattice (a new proof for one implication of [8, Theorem 5.4]), and then we apply it to obtain the more general Theorem 4.9, providing a refinement of Theorem 3.3 for regular categories \mathcal{V} .

In Section 1, we recall the notion of pseudopullback in the restricted context of the 2-categories \mathbf{Cat} and \mathbf{MndCat} , we fix some terminology and notation for (strong) monoidal functors, used in the proofs of the results in Section 2, and we recall a couple of results from [29] and [37], restated in a convenient form, which are part of our toolkit in Section 3.

Section 2 is devoted to establishing some technical results on preservation of pseudopullbacks (Theorem 2.1), full faithfulness (Lemma 2.2) by the 2-functor $(-)\text{-Cat}: \mathbf{MndCat} \rightarrow \mathbf{CAT}$, and in the preservation of descent morphisms by suitable functors (Lemma 2.3), which complete our toolkit.

As mentioned earlier, we establish our main result in Section 3, in Theorem 3.3. We restate the main ideas here: if \mathcal{V} is a cartesian monoidal category, the following composite of functors

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Cat}(\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V}))$$

reflects effective descent morphisms. If F is a \mathcal{V} -functor, we let \tilde{F} be the value of (3) at F . Then, if we denote by \tilde{F}^n the underlying morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ on the objects of n -tuples of composable morphisms, we have that if

- \tilde{F}^1 is an effective descent morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$,
- \tilde{F}^2 is a descent morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$,
- \tilde{F}^3 is an almost descent morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$,

then \tilde{F} is an effective descent morphism in $\mathbf{Cat}(\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V}))$ by [25, Proposition 3.3], and by reflection, F is an effective descent morphism in $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$.

Indeed, these conditions on F are statements about (effective) (almost) descent morphisms in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$, leading us to studying such morphisms in the coproduct completion of \mathcal{V} . We devote Section 4 to provide tractable descriptions of these classes of epimorphisms, with an illustrative application to categories enriched in (co)complete Heyting lattices. We obtain Theorem 4.9, which refines Theorem 3.3 for regular categories, with further simplifications for infinitary coherent categories, exact categories or locally cartesian closed categories.

In Section 5, we provide some brief remarks regarding categories enriched in cartesian monoidal categories. We instantiate our results when the enriching category \mathcal{V} is

- the category \mathbf{CHaus} of compact Hausdorff spaces,
- the category \mathbf{Stn} of Stone spaces,
- a (Grothendieck) topos.

Finally, we have a couple of concluding remarks in Section 6, where we sketch some possible lines of future research, with regard to extending the result to all symmetric monoidal categories, or to generalized multicategories.

Acknowledgments. The author is deeply grateful to Fernando Lucatelli Nunes and Maria Manuel Clementino for their helpful comments regarding this work. The valuable comments of the anonymous referee were also very appreciated.

1. PRELIMINARIES

The purpose of this section is to give a concise summary of the terminology and notation used for our main results. We begin by reviewing the notion of *pseudopullbacks*, as our treatment of effective descent morphisms employs the techniques of [29] on commutativity of bilimits. Then, we recall the notion of *free coproduct completion* of a category, an important tool for our main insight. Finally, we fix some notation regarding *monoidal* and *enriched* categories.

1.1. Pseudopullbacks and 2-pullbacks: Let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ and $G: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be functors. The *pseudopullback* of F, G , denoted by $\text{PsPb}(F, G)$ may be succinctly defined as *the full subcategory* of the comma category $(F \downarrow G)$ whose objects are *isomorphisms*. To be explicit, $\text{PsPb}(F, G)$ has

- objects given by isomorphisms $\xi: Fc \cong Gd$, where $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}$,
- morphisms $(\zeta: Fa \rightarrow Gb) \rightarrow (\xi: Fc \rightarrow Gd)$ given by a pair of morphisms $f: a \rightarrow c$ and $g: b \rightarrow d$ such that $\xi \circ Ff = Gg \circ \zeta$.
- identities and composition given componentwise from \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} .

The *2-pullback* of F, G is simply the ordinary pullback in the underlying category CAT . It may also be seen as the full subcategory of $\text{PsPb}(F, G)$ whose objects are the identity morphisms; these are determined by pairs $c \in \mathcal{C}$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $Fc = Gd$.

We remark that 2-pullbacks and pseudopullbacks are far from being equivalent in general. We consider the following cospan:

$$(4) \quad 1 \xrightarrow{x} (x \cong y) \xleftarrow{y} 1$$

where 1 is the terminal category, and $(x \cong y)$ is a category with two isomorphic, but distinct, objects x, y , identified by the functors $x, y: 1 \rightarrow (x \cong y)$. The 2-pullback is the empty category, since $x \neq y$, while the pseudopullback is the discrete category whose objects are the isomorphisms from x to y in $(x \cong y)$.

Regarding descent theory, we recall the following result of Lucatelli Nunes:

Proposition 1.1 ([29, Corollary 9.6]). *Suppose Diagram (5) below is a pseudopullback of categories with pullbacks and pullback-preserving functors*

$$(5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{B} \\ H \downarrow & & \downarrow K \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

Let f be a morphism in \mathcal{A} . If

- Ff is effective for descent,
- Hf is effective for descent,

– $KFf \cong GHf$ is a descent morphism,

then f is effective for descent.

1.2. Free coproduct completion of a category: Let \mathcal{V} be a category. The *free coproduct completion* of \mathcal{V} , also known as the category of *families of objects in \mathcal{V}* , is denoted by $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$. Its objects are set-indexed families

$$(X_j)_{j \in J}$$

of objects X_j in \mathcal{V} , and a morphism

$$(6) \quad (X_j)_{j \in J} \rightarrow (Y_k)_{k \in K}$$

consists of a pair (f, ϕ) where $f: J \rightarrow K$ is a function on the underlying sets, and

$$(7) \quad \phi = (\phi_j: X_j \rightarrow Y_{fj})_{j \in J}$$

is a set-indexed family of morphisms ϕ_j in \mathcal{V} . We refer to [3, 6, 5] for more thorough introductions to this concept. Here, we simply recall that the “underlying set” functor $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a *fibration*, and that we have a canonical, fully faithful functor $\eta_{\mathcal{V}}: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ identifying the one-element families. More importantly, we recall the following observation of Weber:

Proposition 1.2 ([37, Proposition 5.15]). *The canonical, fully faithful functors $\eta_{\mathcal{V}}: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ form a 2-natural cartesian transformation, that is, for all functors $F: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$, Diagram (8) below is a 2-pullback.*

$$(8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V} & \xrightarrow{\eta_{\mathcal{V}}} & \mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V}) \\ F \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathbf{Fam}(F) \\ \mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow{\eta_{\mathcal{W}}} & \mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{W}) \end{array}$$

A final remark on notation: for a morphism (6) in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ with $K \cong 1$, the function on the underlying sets is uniquely determined. In this case, the underlying family (7) of morphisms in \mathcal{V} is sufficient to determine the morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$. For this reason, we simply denote such morphisms as $\phi: (X_j)_{j \in J} \rightarrow Y$.

1.3. Monoidal categories: Let $\mathcal{V} = (\mathcal{V}, \otimes, I)$ and $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{W}, \otimes, I)$ be monoidal categories, whose coherence isomorphisms we omit, as they play no role in what follows. We recall that a *monoidal functor* $F: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ consists of a functor F between the underlying categories, preserving the unit object and tensor products only up-to-isomorphism. This means that we have

- an isomorphism $e^F: I \rightarrow FI$, the *unit comparison* morphism,
- and an isomorphism $m^F: Fx \otimes Fy \rightarrow F(x \otimes y)$, for each pair x, y of objects, the *tensor comparison* morphism

satisfying naturality and coherence conditions (see [2, p. 1889]).

We denote by \mathbf{MndCat} the 2-category of monoidal categories, monoidal functors, and their natural transformations [14, p. 474]. We further highlight that the forgetful 2-functor $\mathbf{MndCat} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ is pseudomonadic [26, Section 3.1], [28, Remark 4.3], and therefore it creates bilimits. In particular, the underlying category of the pseudopullback of a cospan of monoidal functors is the pseudopullback of the underlying ordinary functors, and fully faithful morphisms in \mathbf{MndCat} are precisely those monoidal functors whose underlying functor is fully faithful in \mathbf{Cat} .

We have a 2-functor $(-)\text{-Cat}: \mathbf{MndCat} \rightarrow \mathbf{CAT}$, mapping each monoidal category \mathcal{V} to the category $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$ of small \mathcal{V} -categories, and for each monoidal functor $F: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$, we have the direct image functor $F_! : \mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}\text{-Cat}$. On a small \mathcal{V} -category \mathcal{C} , the \mathcal{W} -category $F_!\mathcal{C}$ has the same underlying set of objects, and for each pair of objects x, y in \mathcal{C} , $(F_!\mathcal{C})(x, y) = F\mathcal{C}(x, y)$.

Regarding notation, we will denote the *unit and composition morphisms* of a \mathcal{V} -category \mathcal{C} by $u_{\mathcal{C}}: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(x, x)$ for each object x in \mathcal{C} , and $c_{\mathcal{C}}: \mathcal{C}(y, z) \otimes \mathcal{C}(x, y) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(x, z)$ for each triple x, y, z of objects in \mathcal{C} . The unit and composition morphisms for $F_!\mathcal{C}$ are given by

$$u_{F_!\mathcal{C}} = F u_{\mathcal{C}} \circ e^F \quad \text{and} \quad c_{F_!\mathcal{C}} = F c_{\mathcal{C}} \circ m^F.$$

As it will prove to be convenient, we fix the following notation of composable pairs and triples of hom-objects of a \mathcal{V} -category \mathcal{C} :

- $\mathcal{C}(x, y, z) = \mathcal{C}(y, z) \otimes \mathcal{C}(x, y)$,

$$- \mathcal{C}(w, x, y, z) = \mathcal{C}(x, y, z) \otimes \mathcal{C}(w, x).$$

For example, the composition morphism of \mathcal{C} may be written as $c_{\mathcal{C}}: \mathcal{C}(x, y, z) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(x, z)$. We may also write $m^F: (F_! \mathcal{C})(x, y, z) \rightarrow F(\mathcal{C}(x, y, z))$ for the tensor comparison isomorphism when hom-objects are concerned. Analogously, we may define

$$(9) \quad \Phi_{x,y,z} = \Phi_{y,z} \otimes \Phi_{x,y}: \mathcal{C}(x, y, z) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\Phi x, \Phi y, \Phi z)$$

for a \mathcal{V} -functor $\Phi: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$.

2. PRESERVATION OF BILIMITS AND DESCENT

The following result, present in a more general form in [15], is a helpful, labour-saving device in our work with pseudopullbacks:

Theorem 2.1. *The enrichment 2-functor $(-)\text{-Cat}: \text{MndCat} \rightarrow \text{CAT}$ preserves pseudopullbacks.*

Proof. Let $F: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ and $G: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ be monoidal functors between monoidal categories.

We desire to confirm that $\text{PsPb}(F, G)\text{-Cat} \simeq \text{PsPb}(F_!, G_!)$; let $\Phi: F_! \mathcal{B} \cong G_! \mathcal{C}$ be an isomorphism of \mathcal{W} -categories, where \mathcal{B} is a \mathcal{U} -category and \mathcal{C} is a \mathcal{V} -category. We define a $\text{PsPb}(F, G)$ -category \mathcal{D}_{Φ} with

- set of objects given by $\text{ob } \mathcal{D}_{\Phi} = \text{ob } \mathcal{B}$,
- hom-object given by $\mathcal{D}_{\Phi}(x, y) = \Phi_{x,y}: F\mathcal{B}(x, y) \cong G\mathcal{C}(\Phi x, \Phi y)$ at $x, y \in \text{ob } \mathcal{D}_{\Phi}$,
- unit object and composition given by the pairs $(u_{\mathcal{B}}, u_{\mathcal{C}})$, $(c_{\mathcal{B}}, c_{\mathcal{C}})$ of the respective unit objects and compositions from \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} ; these pairs are well-defined morphisms of $\text{PsPb}(F, G)$, since F, G are monoidal functors and Φ is a \mathcal{W} -functor.

To be more precise on this last point, we note that the following diagrams commute:

$$(10) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & I_{\mathcal{W}} & & \\ & \swarrow e^F & & \searrow e^G & \\ FI_{\mathcal{U}} & & & & GI_{\mathcal{V}} \\ & \searrow F u_{\mathcal{B}} & \swarrow u_{F_! \mathcal{B}} & \swarrow u_{G_! \mathcal{C}} & \searrow G u_{\mathcal{C}} \\ & & F\mathcal{B}(x, x) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{x,x}} & G\mathcal{C}(\Phi x, \Phi x) \end{array}$$

$$(11) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} F(\mathcal{B}(x, y, z)) & \xleftarrow{m^F} & (F_! \mathcal{B})(x, y, z) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{x,y,z}} & (G_! \mathcal{C})(\Phi x, \Phi y, \Phi z) \\ F c_{\mathcal{B}} \downarrow & & \swarrow c_{F_! \mathcal{B}} & & \swarrow c_{G_! \mathcal{C}} & \downarrow m^G \\ F\mathcal{B}(x, z) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{x,z}} & G\mathcal{C}(\Phi x, \Phi z) & \xleftarrow{G c_{\mathcal{C}}} & G(\mathcal{C}(\Phi x, \Phi y, \Phi z)) \end{array}$$

Since identity and associativity laws of \mathcal{D}_{Φ} are precisely those of \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} , it follows that \mathcal{D}_{Φ} is indeed well-defined.

The underlying \mathcal{U} -category of \mathcal{D}_{Φ} is \mathcal{B} itself, while its underlying \mathcal{V} -category is isomorphic to \mathcal{C} : it is given by $\text{ob } \Phi$ on the sets of objects, and identity on the hom-objects.

Moreover, let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} be $\text{PsPb}(F, G)$ -categories, and let $H: \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{U}}$ be a \mathcal{U} -functor and $K: \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{V}}$ be a \mathcal{V} -functor between the underlying \mathcal{U} -categories and \mathcal{V} -categories of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} respectively, such that $\text{ob } H = \text{ob } K$ and

$$(12) \quad GK_{x,y} \circ \mathcal{X}(x, y) = \mathcal{Y}(Hx, Hy) \circ FH_{x,y}.$$

We note that there exists a unique $\text{PsPb}(F, G)$ -functor $\Phi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ with underlying \mathcal{U} -functor and \mathcal{V} -functor given by H and K , respectively. Indeed, $\Phi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is given as follows:

- $\text{ob } \Phi = \text{ob } H$,
- $\Phi_{x,y}$ is given by the pair $H_{x,y}, K_{x,y}$, which is a morphism

$$(\mathcal{X}(x, y): F\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{U}}(x, y) \cong G\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{V}}(x, y)) \rightarrow (\mathcal{Y}(Hx, Hy): F\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{U}}(Hx, Hy) \cong G\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{V}}(Hx, Hy))$$

in $\text{PsPb}(F, G)$, due to (12).

The laws that make Φ into a $\text{PsPb}(F, G)$ -functor are precisely given by the laws that make H into a \mathcal{U} -functor and K into a \mathcal{V} -functor.

If $\Psi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a $\text{PsPb}(F, G)$ -functor with H as underlying \mathcal{U} -functor and K as underlying \mathcal{V} -functor, we necessarily get $\Phi = \Psi$ by comparing their hom-morphisms. \square

Lemma 2.2. *The enrichment 2-functor $(-)\text{-Cat}: \text{MndCat} \rightarrow \text{CAT}$ preserves fully faithful functors.*

Proof. Let $F: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ be a fully faithful monoidal functor. To prove $F_! : \mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}\text{-Cat}$ is fully faithful, let \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} be \mathcal{V} -categories, and let $\Psi: F_! \mathcal{C} \rightarrow F_! \mathcal{D}$ be a \mathcal{W} -functor. It consists of the following data:

- A function $\Psi: \text{ob } \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{ob } \mathcal{D}$,
- A morphism $\Psi_{x,y}: F\mathcal{C}(x, y) \rightarrow F\mathcal{D}(\Psi x, \Psi y)$ for each pair $x, y \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C}$.

Since F is fully faithful, there exists a unique $\Phi_{x,y}: \mathcal{C}(x, y) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\Psi x, \Psi y)$ such that $F\Phi_{x,y} = \Psi_{x,y}$.

With this, we define a \mathcal{V} -functor $\Phi: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ given

- on objects by the function $\Phi = \Psi: \text{ob } \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{ob } \mathcal{D}$,
- on morphisms by $\Phi_{x,y}: \mathcal{C}(x, y) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\Phi x, \Phi y)$ for each pair $x, y \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C}$.

This is a \mathcal{V} -functor: we note that the following diagrams commute

$$(13) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & I & \\ & \downarrow e^F & \\ & FI & \\ \swarrow u & & \searrow u \\ FC(x, y) & \xrightarrow{F\Phi_{x,y}} & FD(\Phi x, \Phi y) \end{array}$$

$$(14) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (F_! \mathcal{C})(x, y, z) & \xrightarrow{(F_! \Phi)_{x,y,z}} & (F_! \mathcal{D})(\Phi x, \Phi y, \Phi z) \\ \downarrow m^F & & \downarrow m^F \\ F(\mathcal{C}(x, y, z)) & \xrightarrow{F\Phi_{x,y,z}} & F(\mathcal{D}(\Phi x, \Phi y, \Phi z)) \\ \downarrow Fc & & \downarrow Fc \\ FC(x, z) & \xrightarrow{F\Phi_{x,z}} & FD(\Phi x, \Phi z) \end{array}$$

so, by the full faithfulness of F , plus invertibility of e^F and m^F , we confirm that Φ is a \mathcal{V} -functor. Moreover, by definition, it is the unique \mathcal{V} -functor such that $F_! \Phi = \Psi$, which concludes our proof. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Given a string of adjoint functors $L \dashv F \dashv R$ between categories with finite limits, if L (and therefore R) is fully faithful, then F preserves descent morphisms.*

Before providing the proof, we recall that descent morphisms in categories with finite limits are precisely the pullback-stable regular epimorphisms (see, for instance, [20, 25]).

Proof. Let $p: x \rightarrow y$ be a descent morphism. Since F is a left adjoint, we may conclude that Fp is a regular epimorphism; we just need to prove that it is stable under pullback.

To do so, let $f: z \rightarrow Fy$ be a morphism, and we consider the following pullback diagram:

$$(15) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} f^*(Fx) & \xrightarrow{f^*(Fp)} & z \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ Fx & \xrightarrow{Fp} & Fy \end{array}$$

We wish to prove that $f^*(Fp)$ is a regular epimorphism. Indeed, we note that $FLf^*(Fp) \cong f^*(Fp)$, and since F reflects pullbacks (via R), we have a pullback

$$(16) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Lf^*(Fx) & \xrightarrow{Lf^*(Fp)} & Lz \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow f^\sharp \\ x & \xrightarrow{p} & y \end{array}$$

so that $Lf^*(Fp) \cong (f^\#)^*(p)$ is a regular epimorphism; which is preserved by F , hence $f^*(Fp)$ must be a regular epimorphism, as desired. \square

Remark 2.4. We highlight one application of Lemma 2.3: for a category \mathcal{B} with finite limits, the underlying object-of-objects functor

$$(-)_0: \text{Cat}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$$

has fully faithful left and right adjoints: these assign to each object b of \mathcal{B} its respective *discrete* and *indiscrete* internal categories with b as the underlying object of objects; see [19, 7.2.6]. Thus, we conclude that $(-)_0$ preserves descent morphisms.

Remark 2.4 can be used to verify that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \text{Cat}(\mathcal{V})$ reflects effective descent morphisms for extensive categories \mathcal{V} with finite limits with $-\cdot 1: \text{Set} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ fully faithful, *without* requiring \mathcal{V} to have a (regular epi, mono)-factorization system, using the same argument as in the proof of [29, Theorem 9.11].

3. DESCENT FOR CARTESIAN ENRICHED CATEGORIES

Throughout this section, fix a cartesian monoidal category \mathcal{V} with finite limits, and consider the canonical embedding $\eta: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$, as given in Subsection 1.2.

Lemma 3.1. *The direct image functor $\eta_!: \mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})\text{-Cat}$ reflects effective descent morphisms.*

Proof. By Proposition 1.2, Diagram (17)

$$(17) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V} & \xrightarrow{\eta} & \text{Fam}(\mathcal{V}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 1 & \xrightarrow{\eta} & \text{Set} \end{array}$$

is a 2-pullback. Since $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \text{Set}$ is an (iso)fibration, it follows that Diagram (17) is a pseudopullback, by [34, Theorem 1]. It is preserved by $(-)\text{-Cat}$, as shown in Theorem 2.1, so we obtain the pseudopullback given in (18) below:

$$(18) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} & \xrightarrow{\eta_!} & \text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})\text{-Cat} \\ \text{ob} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Set} & \xrightarrow{\eta_!} & \text{Set-Cat} \end{array}$$

To conclude the proof, we note that since $(-)\text{-Cat}$ is a 2-functor, it preserves adjoints, which, together with Lemma 2.2, guarantees that the functor $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \text{Set-Cat}$ has fully faithful left and right adjoints, thus it preserves descent morphisms by Lemma 2.3. It is well-established that $\eta_!: \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{Set-Cat}$ reflects descent morphisms, and descent morphisms in Set are effective for descent.

This places us under the conditions of Proposition 1.1, so the result follows. \square

Lemma 3.2. *The category $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ is extensive with finite limits, and $-\cdot 1: \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ is fully faithful.*

Proof. We have already confirmed that $-\cdot 1: \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ is fully faithful in Remark 2.4, because \mathcal{V} has a terminal object. Moreover, extensivity of $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ is well-established; see, for instance, [6, Proposition 2.4].

Existence of finite limits is a direct corollary of [16, Proposition 4.1, Theorem 4.2]; we consider the fibration $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \text{Set}$. The base category Set has all (finite) limits, and the fibers \mathcal{V}^J at a set have finite limits as well. The latter are preserved by the change-of-base functors $f^*: \mathcal{V}^K \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^J$ for each function $f: J \rightarrow K$. See also [18, Corollary 4.9], and [5, Sections 6.2, 6.3]. \square

Now, we are ready to prove our main result, Theorem 3.3. We begin by considering the following string of functors:

$$(19) \quad \mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow \text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow \text{Cat}(\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V}))$$

By Lemma 3.1, the functor $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})\text{-Cat}$ reflects effective descent morphisms. We observe that the same holds for the $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \text{Cat}(\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V}))$: indeed, Lemma 3.2 and Remark 2.4 allow us to obtain the conclusion of [29, Theorem 9.11].

Hence, the composite (19) reflects effective descent morphisms, that is, if \tilde{F} is the value of a \mathcal{V} -functor $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ via (19), then F is an effective descent \mathcal{V} -functor whenever \tilde{F} is an effective descent morphism in $\text{Cat}(\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V}))$.

By Le Creurer's [25, Corollary 3.3.1] and [32, Lemma A.3], the problem of confirming \tilde{F} is an effective descent morphism can be reduced to showing that the actions of \tilde{F} on n -tuples of composable morphisms satisfy suitable "surjectivity" conditions for $n = 1, 2, 3$. To be precise, we denote by \tilde{F}^n the morphism in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ given by the action of \tilde{F} on the objects of n -tuples of composable morphisms. For $n = 1, 2, 3$, we have

- (i) $\tilde{F}^1: (\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1))_{x_i \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C}} \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1))_{y_i \in \text{ob } \mathcal{D}}$,
- (ii) $\tilde{F}^2: (\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2))_{x_i \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C}} \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2))_{y_i \in \text{ob } \mathcal{D}}$,
- (iii) $\tilde{F}^3: (\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3))_{x_i \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C}} \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3))_{y_i \in \text{ob } \mathcal{D}}$.

and these are respectively given by the formal coproducts of the following morphisms

$$\begin{aligned} F_{x_0, x_1} &: \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(F x_0, F x_1) \\ F_{x_0, x_1, x_2} &: \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(F x_0, F x_1, F x_2) \\ F_{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3} &: \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(F x_0, F x_1, F x_2, F x_3) \end{aligned}$$

indexed by the underlying functions $F^n: (\text{ob } \mathcal{C})^n \rightarrow (\text{ob } \mathcal{D})^n$, with $x_i \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C}$. Therefore, if

- \tilde{F}^1 is an effective descent morphism,
- \tilde{F}^2 is a descent morphism,
- \tilde{F}^3 is an almost descent morphism,

then \tilde{F} is an effective descent morphism in $\text{Cat}(\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V}))$.

If \mathcal{E} is the class of effective descent morphisms, descent morphisms or almost descent morphisms in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$, then \mathcal{E} is closed under coproducts.

Therefore, if we are given a morphism $(f, \phi): (X_j)_{j \in J} \rightarrow (Y_k)_{k \in K}$, we can prove that $(f, \phi) \in \mathcal{E}$ if its restriction to the fibre at $k \in K$

$$\phi|_k = (!, \phi): (X_j)_{j \in f^*k} \rightarrow Y_k$$

is in \mathcal{E} for all $k \in K$, since (f, ϕ) is the coproduct of $\phi|_k$ indexed by $k \in K$ in the arrow category of $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a \mathcal{V} -functor. If*

- (I) $(F_{x_0, x_1})_{x_i \in F^*y_i}: (\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1))_{x_i \in F^*y_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1)$ is an effective descent morphism in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ for all pairs y_0, y_1 of objects in \mathcal{D} ,
- (II) $(F_{x_0, x_1, x_2})_{x_i \in F^*y_i}: (\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2))_{x_i \in F^*y_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2)$ is a descent morphism in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ for all triples y_0, y_1, y_2 of objects in \mathcal{D} ,
- (III) $(F_{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3})_{x_i \in F^*y_i}: (\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3))_{x_i \in F^*y_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3)$ is an almost descent morphism in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ for all quadruples y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3 of objects in \mathcal{D} ,

then F is an effective descent morphism in $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$.

Proof. By taking the coproducts of the morphisms given in (I), (II) and (III), we conclude that (i), (ii) and (iii) are respectively an effective descent morphism, a descent morphism, and an almost descent morphism. Thus, it follows that \tilde{F} is an effective descent morphism in $\text{Cat}(\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V}))$.

By reflecting along (19), we conclude that F is an effective descent morphism in $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$. \square

4. FAMILIAL DESCENT MORPHISMS

Theorem 3.3 raises the question of understanding (stable) regular epimorphisms and effective descent morphisms in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ for a category \mathcal{V} with finite limits, with the goal of providing more tractable methods to verify conditions (I), (II), (III).

The key ideas for many of the applications are given in the next couple of lemmas. We begin by noting that the kernel pair of a morphism $\phi: (X_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow Y$ in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ is calculated by considering the

pullback

$$(20) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X_i \times_Y X_j & \xrightarrow{\pi_{i,j}^0} & X_j \\ \pi_{i,j}^1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi_j \\ X_i & \xrightarrow{\phi_i} & Y \end{array}$$

for each $i, j \in I$. Then, the kernel pair of ϕ , denoted by $\ker \phi$, is given by

$$(X_i \times_Y X_j)_{i,j \in I \times I} \xrightarrow{\left. \begin{array}{c} (p_1, \pi^1) \\ (p_0, \pi^0) \end{array} \right\}} (X_i)_{i \in I}$$

where $p_n: I \times I \rightarrow I$ for $n = 0, 1$ is the projection which forgets the n th component.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\phi: (X_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$. We consider the diagram $D_\phi: \mathcal{J}_I \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ where*

- $\text{ob } \mathcal{J}_I = (I \times I) + I$,
- for each pair $i, j \in I$, we have two arrows $(i, j) \rightarrow i$ and $(i, j) \rightarrow j$,
- the values of D_ϕ at $(i, j) \rightarrow i$ and $(i, j) \rightarrow j$ are defined to be $\pi_{i,j}^1$ and $\pi_{i,j}^0$, respectively.

ϕ is a (stable) regular epimorphism if and only if D_ϕ has a (stable) colimit and $\text{colim } D_\phi \cong Y$.

Proof. We begin by recalling that a morphism in a category with finite limits is a regular epimorphism if and only if it is the coequalizer of its kernel pair.

The fibration $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a left adjoint functor, hence preserves colimits. In particular, if $\phi: (X_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow Y$ is a regular epimorphism, then

$$(21) \quad I \times I \xrightarrow{\left. \begin{array}{c} p_1 \\ p_0 \end{array} \right\}} I \longrightarrow 1$$

must be a coequalizer, and this is the case only when I is non-empty.

We note that we have a natural isomorphism

$$\text{Nat}(\ker \phi, \Delta_{(Z_k)_{k \in K}}) \cong \sum_{k \in K} \text{Nat}(D_\phi, \Delta_{Z_k}),$$

which is fibered over K : an element from either set is completely determined by an element $k \in K$ and a morphism $\omega: (X_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow Z_k$ in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ satisfying $\omega_i \circ \pi_{i,j}^1 = \omega_j \circ \pi_{i,j}^0$ for all $i, j \in I$. Given such an element, any morphism $(q, \psi): (Z_k)_{k \in K} \rightarrow (W_l)_{l \in L}$ provides an element $qk \in L$ and a morphism $\psi_k \circ \omega: (X_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow W_{qk}$ satisfying $\psi_k \circ \omega_i \circ \pi_{i,j}^1 = \psi_k \circ \omega_j \circ \pi_{i,j}^0$ for all i, j .

Thus, if $\ker \phi$ has a colimit, its underlying set is necessarily a singleton by (21), so we denote it as an object Q of \mathcal{V} . We have

$$\sum_{k \in K} \text{Nat}(D_\phi, \Delta_{Z_k}) \cong \mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})(Q, (Z_k)_{k \in K}) \cong \sum_{k \in K} \mathcal{V}(Q, Z_k),$$

and since this isomorphism is fibered over K , we conclude Q is a colimit of D_ϕ .

Conversely, if Q is a colimit of D_ϕ , then we have

$$\text{Nat}(D_\phi, \Delta_{(Z_k)_{k \in K}}) \cong \sum_{k \in K} \mathcal{V}(Q, Z_k) \cong \mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})(Q, (Z_k)_k)$$

which confirms Q is a colimit of $\ker \phi$.

To verify stability, we begin by assuming ϕ to be a regular epimorphism. Given a morphism $\omega: Z \rightarrow Y$, the colimits of $\ker \omega^*(\phi)$ and $D_{\omega^*(\phi)}$ are isomorphic whenever either exist, so the stability of one colimit is the equivalent to the other. Taking coproducts in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$, we confirm the same holds for any morphism $(Z_k)_{k \in K} \rightarrow Y$. \square

Understanding effective descent morphisms in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ is a more difficult problem, as is to be expected. However, we can reduce the study of the category of descent data of a morphism $\phi: (X_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow Y$ to the full subcategory of *connected* descent data, an idea made precise by the following result.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\phi: (X_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$, with I non-empty. We have an equivalence $\text{Desc}(\phi) \simeq \mathbf{Fam}(\text{Desc}_{\text{conn}}(\phi))$, where $\text{Desc}_{\text{conn}}(\phi)$ is the full subcategory of connected objects of $\text{Desc}(\phi)$.*

Proof. Given descent data (f, γ) , (h, ξ) as in the following diagram

$$(22) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (W_k \times_Y X_j)_{k,j \in K \times I} & \xrightarrow[(p_0, \pi_0)]{(h, \xi)} & (W_k)_{k \in K} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow (f, \gamma) \\ (X_i \times_Y X_j)_{i,j \in I \times I} & \xrightarrow[(p_0, \pi_0)]{(p_1, \pi_1)} & (X_i)_{i \in I} \xrightarrow{\phi} Y \end{array}$$

we obtain descent data (f, h) for the unique morphism $I \rightarrow 1$. Since I is non-empty, this morphism is effective for descent, so that $K \cong J \times I$ for a set J , and we may take $f = p_0: J \times I \rightarrow I$ and $h = p_2: J \times I \times I \rightarrow J \times I$ to be projections (recall p_n forgets the n th component).

Thus, taking the pullback of this descent data along $((j, -), \text{id}): (W_{j,i})_{i \in I} \rightarrow (W_{j,i})_{j,i \in J \times I}$, we obtain the following descent data for ϕ :

$$(23) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (W_{j,i} \times_Y X_k)_{i,k \in I \times I} & \xrightarrow[(p_0, \pi_0)]{(p_1, \xi_{j,-,-})} & (W_{j,i})_{i \in I} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow (\text{id}, \gamma_{j,-}) \\ (X_i \times_Y X_k)_{i,k \in I \times I} & \xrightarrow[(p_0, \pi_0)]{(p_1, \pi_1)} & (X_i)_{i \in I} \xrightarrow{\phi} Y \end{array}$$

for each $j \in J$.

Now, we claim that the descent data of the form

$$(24) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (V_i \times_Y X_j)_{i,j \in I \times I} & \xrightarrow[(p_0, \pi_0)]{(p_1, \zeta)} & (V_i)_{i \in I} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow (f, \gamma) \\ (X_i \times_Y X_j)_{i,j \in I \times I} & \xrightarrow[(p_0, \pi_0)]{(p_1, \pi_1)} & (X_i)_{i \in I} \xrightarrow{\phi} Y \end{array}$$

is connected in $\text{Desc}(\phi)$. More concretely, we wish to prove that any morphism of descent data $(q, \chi): (V_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow (W_{j,i})_{j,i \in J \times I}$ factors through $((j, -), \text{id})$ for some $j \in J$. This gives a morphism of descent data $q: (\text{id}, p_1) \rightarrow (p_0, p_2)$ for the unique morphism $I \rightarrow 1$. We note that q is uniquely determined by a function $j: 1 \rightarrow J$, whose value provides the desired factorization.

Having verified that all descent data is a coproduct of connected descent data, the result follows. \square

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\phi: (X_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) ϕ is effective for descent.
- (b) We have an equivalence $\mathcal{V}/Y \simeq \text{Desc}_{\text{conn}}(\phi)$.

Proof. We note that the full subcategory of connected objects of $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})/Y$ is precisely \mathcal{V}/Y , and any object of $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})/Y$ is a coproduct of such connected objects. Thus, $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})/Y \simeq \text{Fam}(\mathcal{V}/Y)$, and we may conclude (b) \implies (a), since

$$\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})/Y \simeq \text{Fam}(\mathcal{V}/Y) \simeq \text{Fam}(\text{Desc}_{\text{conn}}(\phi)) \simeq \text{Desc}(\phi),$$

by Lemma 4.2.

The converse relies on the fact that the comparison $\mathcal{K}^\phi: \text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})/Y \rightarrow \text{Desc}(\phi)$ is of the form $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{K}_{\text{conn}}^\phi)$ for a functor $\mathcal{K}_{\text{conn}}^\phi: \mathcal{V}/Y \rightarrow \text{Desc}_{\text{conn}}(\phi)$. Since Fam reflects equivalences (because the 2-natural embedding $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Fam}(\mathcal{C})$ is 2-cartesian), we conclude (a) \implies (b). \square

Frames: Effective descent morphisms in $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$ were studied in [8, Section 5], for Heyting lattices \mathcal{V} . As an illustration of our tools, we provide a second proof that *-quotient morphisms in $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$ (that is, surjective-on-objects \mathcal{V} -functors that satisfy condition (26) below for all y_0, y_1, y_2) are effective for descent when \mathcal{V} is a (co)complete Heyting lattice.

Let \mathcal{V} be a thin category (ordered set). A morphism $(X_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow Y$ in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ is simply the assertion “for all $i \in I$, $X_i \leq Y$ ”. Thus, we simply write $(X_i)_{i \in I} \leq Y$ in this context.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $(X_i)_{i \in I} \leq Y$ be a morphism in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$.*

- It is an epimorphism if and only if I is non-empty.
- If it is an epimorphism, it is also stable.
- It is a regular epimorphism if and only if $\bigvee_{i \in I} X_i \cong Y$.

– If it is a regular epimorphism, it is stable if and only if the above join is distributive, that is,

$$(25) \quad Z \wedge \bigvee_{i \in I} X_i \cong \bigvee_{i \in I} Z \wedge X_i$$

for all $Z \leq Y$.

Proof. We note that $(X_i)_{i \in I} \leq Y$ is an epimorphism if and only if the underlying function $I \rightarrow 1$ is surjective, and this is the case exactly when I be non-empty.

So, if I is non-empty, we confirm $(X_i)_{i \in I} \leq Y$ is a stable epimorphism: given $Z \leq Y$ we can produce an epimorphism $(Z \wedge X_i)_{i \in I} \leq Z$, since \mathcal{V} has meets. By taking coproducts, the same holds for all $(Z_j)_{j \in J} \leq Y$.

We immediately deduce from Lemma 4.1, that $(X_i)_{i \in I} \leq Y$ is a regular epimorphism if and only if $\bigvee_{i \in I} X_i \cong Y$, and stability under pullbacks is exactly the condition (25), so there's nothing to verify. \square

We say a thin category \mathcal{V} is a *Heyting semilattice* (also known as an *implicative semilattice* [31] or a *Brouwerian semilattice* [23]) if it has finite limits (has meets and is bounded) and is cartesian closed (has implication). In particular, this means that $a \wedge -$ is a left adjoint functor for each $a \in \mathcal{V}$, which must preserve colimits (joins). As a corollary, we conclude that:

Corollary 4.5. *If \mathcal{V} is a Heyting semi-lattice, regular epimorphisms in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ are stable.*

Proof. Condition (25) is automatically satisfied, by the previous remark. \square

Corollary 4.6. *If \mathcal{V} is a (co)complete Heyting (semi-)lattice, then regular epimorphisms in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ are effective for descent.*

Proof. Let $(X_i)_{i \in I} \leq Y$ be a regular epimorphism. Given connected descent data $\text{id}: (W_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow (X_i)_{i \in I}$, $\pi_2: (W_i \wedge X_j)_{i,j \in I \times I} \rightarrow (W_i)_{i \in I}$, we may define $Z = \bigvee_{i \in I} W_i$.

We note that it is enough to prove that $X_i \wedge Z \leq W_i$ for all $i \in I$. Indeed, by distributivity, we have

$$X_i \wedge Z \cong \bigvee_{j \in I} X_i \wedge W_j \leq W_i.$$

Now, Theorem 4.3 and [32, Corollary 2.3] complete our proof. \square

With this, we obtain one direction of [8, Theorem 5.4]:

Theorem 4.7. *Let \mathcal{V} be a (co)complete Heyting (semi-)lattice, and let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a \mathcal{V} -functor. If F is surjective on objects and we have an isomorphism*

$$(26) \quad \bigvee_{x_i \in F^* y_i} \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2) \cong \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2)$$

for all y_0, y_1, y_2 , then F is effective for descent.

Proof. Due to Lemma 4.4, we may conclude that

- condition (III) is satisfied, since F is surjective on objects, and
- condition (II) is given by (26), plus the stability of regular epimorphisms provided by Corollary 4.5.

Condition (I) remains to be verified. Taking $y_1 = y_2$ above, so that $\mathcal{D}(y_1, y_2) \cong 1$, we have

$$\mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1) \cong \bigvee_{x_i \in F^* y_i} \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2) \leq \bigvee_{x_i \in F^* y_i} \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1),$$

and since we have $\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1) \leq \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1)$ for all $x_i \in F^* y_i$, we conclude that $(\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1))_{x_i \in F^* y_i} \leq \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1)$ is a regular epimorphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$, and therefore is effective for descent by Corollary 4.6. \square

Regular categories: The ideas behind the previous results generalize to regular categories \mathcal{V} , via their (regular epi, mono)-factorization system, which allow us to reduce statements about epimorphisms $\phi: (X_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ to families of monomorphisms. The following result makes this precise:

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose \mathcal{V} is a regular category, and let $\phi: (X_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$. For each $i \in I$, consider the following factorization*

$$(27) \quad X_i \xrightarrow{\pi_i} M_i \xrightarrow{\iota_i} Y$$

where π_i is a regular epimorphism and ι_i is a monomorphism for all $i \in I$.

- ϕ is a (stable) epimorphism if and only if ι is a (stable) epimorphism.
- ϕ is a (stable) regular epimorphism if and only if $\bigvee_{i \in I} M_i \cong Y$ (and the join is stable).
- If π_i is an effective descent morphism in \mathcal{V} for all $i \in I$, then ϕ is an effective descent morphism if and only if ι is an effective descent morphism.

Proof. The factorizations (27) for each $i \in I$ give a factorization $\phi = \iota \circ (\text{id}, \pi)$ in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$. We note that (id, π) is a coproduct of stable regular epimorphisms, hence ϕ is a (stable) (regular) epimorphism if and only if ι is a (stable) (regular) epimorphism (see [20, Propositions 1.3, 1.5]).

Moreover, if π_i is effective for descent for all $i \in I$, taking coproducts will guarantee (id, π) is effective for descent as well, meaning that ϕ is effective for descent if and only if ι is effective for descent (because the basic bifibration respects the BED, see [22, Section 4]).

Under this light, the results are immediate consequences of Lemma 4.1. \square

To prove our main result for this section, we let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a \mathcal{V} -functor, and we consider the following (regular epi, mono)-factorizations of the underlying morphisms of the families (I), (II), (III), as in (27):

$$(28) \quad \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1) \xrightarrow{P_{x_0, x_1}} M_{x_0, x_1} \xrightarrow{I_{x_0, x_1}} \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1)$$

$$(29) \quad \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2) \longrightarrow M_{x_0, x_1, x_2} \xrightarrow{I_{x_0, x_1, x_2}} \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2)$$

$$(30) \quad \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) \longrightarrow M_{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3} \xrightarrow{I_{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3}} \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3)$$

respectively, for objects y_i in \mathcal{D} , and $x_i \in F^*y_i$, for $n = 0, 1, 2, 3$.

Theorem 4.9. *Let \mathcal{V} be a regular category, and let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a \mathcal{V} -functor. If*

- (i) P_{x_0, x_1} is an effective descent morphism in \mathcal{V} for each pair of objects x_0, x_1 ,
- (ii) we have an equivalence $\mathcal{V}/\mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1) \simeq \text{DESC}_{\text{conn}}(I)$ for all y_0, y_1 ,
- (iii) the join $\bigvee_{x_i \in F^*y_i} M_{x_0, x_1, x_2}$ exists, is stable and is isomorphic to $\mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2)$ for all y_0, y_1, y_2 ,
- (iv) $I: (M_{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3})_{x_i \in F^*y_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3)$ is an almost descent morphism in $\text{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ for all y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3 ,

then F is effective for descent.

Proof. The goal is to verify that properties (I), (II) and (III) are satisfied, so we can apply Theorem 3.3.

By Theorem 4.3, condition (ii) holds if and only if $I: (M_{x_0, x_1})_{x_i \in F^*y_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1)$ is an effective descent morphism for all objects y_0, y_1 in \mathcal{D} .

Now, by applying Lemma 4.8, we have that

- (I) follows as a consequence of (i) and (ii),
- (II) is a consequence of (iii),
- (III) is a consequence of (iv),

so the result follows. \square

In case \mathcal{V} satisfies further properties, we can simplify the above list:

- If \mathcal{V} is infinitary coherent (has stable, arbitrary unions of subobjects), then the join in (iii) exists and is stable; one only needs to verify if the isomorphism exists.
- If \mathcal{V} is exact, or locally cartesian closed, then (i) is redundant, since regular epimorphisms are effective for descent.

5. ENRICHMENT IN CARTESIAN MONOIDAL CATEGORIES

Theorem 3.3 generalizes Lucatelli's result [29] about effective descent \mathcal{V} -functors, by not requiring \mathcal{V} to be extensive, nor that the induced functor $- \cdot 1: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is fully faithful (if it even exists). Thus, we consider examples of enriching categories \mathcal{V} not satisfying one of those aforementioned properties (excluding examples such as $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Set}, \mathbf{Top}, \mathbf{Cat}$), dedicating this section to the study of such categories $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$.

Thin categories: Thin categories \mathcal{V} with cartesian monoidal structures are (essentially) bounded meet-semilattices, which we have previously discussed in Section 4, as an illustrative example. We only briefly repeat here that the result for (co)complete Heyting lattices \mathcal{V} admits a particularly nice description (Theorem 4.7), which was already provided in [8] using other techniques.

Colax-pointed categories: We consider the colax comma category $1//\mathbf{Cat}$. To be explicit, this has

- objects: pairs (\mathcal{C}, c) where \mathcal{C} is a category and $c \in \mathbf{ob} \mathcal{C}$.
- morphisms $(\mathcal{C}, c) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, d)$: pairs (F, f) where F is a functor and $f: Fc \rightarrow d$ is a morphism in \mathcal{D} .
- identity on (\mathcal{C}, c) : the pair $(\mathbf{id}, \mathbf{id})$.
- composite of $(F, f): (\mathcal{C}, c) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, d)$ with $(G, g): (\mathcal{D}, d) \rightarrow (\mathcal{E}, e)$: the pair $(G \circ F, g \circ Gf)$.


This is the category of strict algebras and colax morphisms for the 2-monad $1 + -$ on \mathbf{Cat} (the dual and codual notion is present in [17, 35, 12]). Hence, by [24, Corollary 4.9], $1//\mathbf{Cat} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ creates products, hence $1//\mathbf{Cat}$ admits a cartesian monoidal structure.

However, $1//\mathbf{Cat}$ is not an extensive category, since it doesn't have an initial object. It doesn't even have coproducts for any pair of objects: let (\mathcal{C}_1, c_1) and (\mathcal{C}_2, c_2) be pointed categories, and we assume this pair has a coproduct $(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}, \tilde{c})$ in $1//\mathbf{Cat}$, with coprojections $(I_i, \iota_i): (\mathcal{C}_i, c_i) \rightarrow (\tilde{\mathcal{C}}, \tilde{c})$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Let $F_i: \mathcal{C}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be functors, and we suppose we have morphisms $f_i: Fc_i \rightarrow d$ for $i = 1, 2$. These define morphisms $(F_i, f_i): (\mathcal{C}_i, c_i) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, d)$ for $i = 1, 2$, so the universal property guarantees there exists a unique morphism $(G, g): (\tilde{\mathcal{C}}, \tilde{c}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, d)$ satisfying $GI_i = F_i$ and $f_i = g \circ G\iota_i$.

In fact, we can prove that $G\tilde{c} \cong Fc_1 + Fc_2$: if $h: G\tilde{c} \rightarrow d$ is such that $f_i = h \circ G\iota_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, then $(G, h) \circ (I_i, \iota_i) = (F_i, f_i)$, and by the universal property, $(G, g) = (G, h)$, hence $g = h$.

But there is no reason for \mathcal{D} to have such a coproduct: consider the category \mathcal{D} given by the following graph



and observe that the pair d_1, d_2 does not have a coproduct. Thus, we obtain the desired contradiction by letting $F_i: \mathcal{C}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be the constant functor to d_i , for $i = 1, 2$.

A $(1//\mathbf{Cat})$ -category is a 2-category \mathbb{B} and

- for each x, y , an object $\mathbf{hom}(x, y) \in \mathbb{B}(x, y)$,
- for each x , a morphism $e_x: 1_x \rightarrow \mathbf{hom}(x, x)$,
- for each x, y, z , a morphism $m_{x,y,z}: \mathbf{hom}(y, z) \cdot \mathbf{hom}(x, y) \rightarrow \mathbf{hom}(x, z)$,
- the following diagrams commute for all w, x, y, z :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{hom}(x, y) \cdot 1_x & & 1_y \cdot \mathbf{hom}(x, y) \\
 \mathbf{id} \cdot e_x \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow e_y \cdot \mathbf{id} \\
 \mathbf{hom}(x, y) \cdot \mathbf{hom}(x, x) & \xrightarrow{m_{x,x,y}} & \mathbf{hom}(x, y) & \mathbf{hom}(x, y) & \xleftarrow{m_{x,y,y}} & \mathbf{hom}(y, y) \cdot \mathbf{hom}(x, y)
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& (p_{y,z} \cdot p_{x,y}) \cdot p_{w,x} & \xlongequal{\quad} & p_{y,z} \cdot (p_{x,y} \cdot p_{w,x}) \\
& \swarrow m_{x,y,z} \cdot \text{id} & & \searrow \text{id} \cdot m_{w,x,y} \\
p_{x,z} \cdot p_{w,x} & & & p_{y,z} \cdot p_{w,y} \\
& \searrow m_{w,x,z} & & \swarrow m_{w,y,z} \\
& p_{w,z} & &
\end{array}$$

which is a \mathbb{B} -enriched category on the same set of objects.

A $(1//\text{Cat})$ -functor $(F, \Phi): (\mathbb{B}, \text{hom}_{\mathbb{B}}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, \text{hom}_{\mathbb{C}})$ consists of a 2-functor $F: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and a \mathbb{C} -functor $\Phi: F_! \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, with the same underlying function on objects.

Categories with zero object: Let \mathcal{V} be a category with a zero object, which we denote by 1 . Such categories are usually not extensive, for if the zero object were strict, we would have $\mathcal{V} \simeq 1$.

For a \mathcal{V} -category \mathcal{C} , we write $p_{x,y}: 1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(x, y)$ for the uniquely determined morphism. In particular, this implies $u_x = p_{x,x}$ for all x , and

$$1 \xrightarrow{\langle p_{y,x}, p_{x,y} \rangle} \mathcal{C}(y, x) \times \mathcal{C}(x, y) \xrightarrow{c_{x,y,x}} \mathcal{C}(x, x)$$

must also equal u_x .

With this, we can confirm that all hom-objects must be isomorphic: the isomorphism is given by:

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) \xrightarrow{p_{y,z} \times \text{id} \times p_{w,x}} \mathcal{C}(y, z) \times \mathcal{C}(x, y) \times \mathcal{C}(w, x) \xrightarrow{c_{w,y,z} \circ (\text{id} \times c_{w,x,y})} \mathcal{C}(w, z)$$

Thus, we conclude $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$ has objects the empty \mathcal{V} -category plus pairs (non-empty set, \mathcal{V} -monoid).

Eckmann-Hilton: We suppose \mathcal{V} is the category of unital magmas. By the Eckmann-Hilton argument, a \mathcal{V} -monoid is precisely a commutative monoid. Since \mathcal{V} has a zero object, we conclude $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$ essentially has objects the empty \mathcal{V} -category plus pairs (non-empty set, commutative monoid), in which case the effective descent \mathcal{V} -functors are given by the empty \mathcal{V} -functor on the empty \mathcal{V} -category, and pairs (surjective function, regular epimorphism of monoids).

Coextensive categories: We say a category \mathcal{V} with finite limits

- has *codisjoint* products if \mathcal{V}^{op} has disjoint coproducts,
- has a *strict terminal object* if \mathcal{V}^{op} has a strict initial object,
- is *finitely coextensive* if \mathcal{V}^{op} is finitely extensive.

As expected, finitely coextensive categories \mathcal{V} have codisjoint products and a strict terminal object. This is the case for the categories of commutative R -algebras for a ring R , as a class of examples.

We verify that cartesian monoidal categories \mathcal{V} with codisjoint products and strict terminal object do not provide an interesting enriching base with the cartesian monoidal structure: we shall confirm that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \simeq \text{Set}$. Therefore, the effective descent \mathcal{V} -functors are precisely those that are surjective on objects.

Let \mathcal{C} be a \mathcal{V} -category. For each $x \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C}$, the unit morphism $1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(x, x)$ is an isomorphism, and for each pair $x, y \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C}$, the composition morphism $\mathcal{C}(x, y) \times \mathcal{C}(y, x) \rightarrow 1$ is uniquely determined. Thus, the associativity condition for elements in $\mathcal{C}(x, y, x, y)$ translates to saying that the projections on the first and third component

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) \times \mathcal{C}(y, x) \times \mathcal{C}(x, y) \xrightarrow[\text{!} \times \text{id}]{\text{id} \times \text{!}} \mathcal{C}(x, y)$$

are equal. But since products are codisjoint, we must have $\mathcal{C}(x, y) \cong 1$, for all x, y .

Categories of spaces: Since most varieties of algebras \mathcal{V} seem to have an uninteresting $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$ for the cartesian monoidal structure, we turn our attention to categories of spaces.

We begin by instantiating our results when $\mathcal{V} = \text{CHaus}$ of compact Hausdorff spaces, which is a pretopos [30], and therefore is a Barr-exact category, but it is not infinitary extensive. Let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a CHaus -functor between CHaus -categories, and consider the factorizations (28), (29) and (30) of the hom-morphisms of F . By Theorem 4.9, F is effective for descent if

- $\text{CHaus}/\mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1) \simeq \text{Desc}_{\text{conn}}(I)$ for all objects y_0, y_1 in \mathcal{D} ,
- We have a stable join $\bigvee_{x_0, x_1, x_2} M_{x_0, x_1, x_2} \simeq \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2)$, for all y_0, y_1, y_2 ,

- $I: (M_{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3})_{x_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3)$ is an almost descent morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathbf{CHaus})$ for all y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3 .

Similarly, since the category $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Stn}$ of Stone spaces is a regular category [30], we can also say something about \mathbf{Stn} -functors. Let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a \mathbf{Stn} -functor between \mathbf{Stn} -categories, and we consider the factorizations (28), (29) and (30) of the hom-morphisms of F . Again by Theorem 4.9, F is effective for descent if

- P_{x_0, x_1} is an effective descent morphism in \mathbf{Stn} for each pair x_0, x_1 ,
- $\mathbf{Stn}/\mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1) \simeq \mathbf{Desc}_{\text{conn}}(I)$ for all objects y_0, y_1 in \mathcal{D} ,
- We have a stable join $\bigvee_{x_0, x_1, x_2} M_{x_0, x_1, x_2} \simeq \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2)$, for all y_0, y_1, y_2 ,
- $I: (M_{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3})_{x_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3)$ is an almost descent morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathbf{Stn})$ for all y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3 .

It would be worthwhile to explore whether analogous arguments are fruitful in the more general setting of (monad, frame)-enriched categories. More specifically, we may take \mathcal{V} to be the category of ordered compact Hausdorff spaces [36], or the category of ultrametric compact Hausdorff spaces.

Finally, we may consider a topos \mathcal{V} , so that the effective descent morphisms are exactly the epimorphisms. It is not always the case that there exists a functor $-\cdot 1: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, and when it does, it is not always fully faithful¹, so we can use Theorem 3.3 expand our knowledge of effective descent \mathcal{V} -functors to all toposes \mathcal{V} . Let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a \mathcal{V} -functor between \mathcal{V} -categories. If

- $(F_{x_0, x_1})_{x_i \in F^*y_i}: (\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1))_{x_i \in F^*y_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1)$ is an effective descent morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ for all pairs y_0, y_1 of objects in \mathcal{D} ,
- $(F_{x_0, x_1, x_2})_{x_i \in F^*y_i}: (\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2))_{x_i \in F^*y_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2)$ is a descent morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ for all triples y_0, y_1, y_2 of objects in \mathcal{D} ,
- $(F_{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3})_{x_i \in F^*y_i}: (\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3))_{x_i \in F^*y_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3)$ is an almost descent morphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ for all quadruples y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3 of objects in \mathcal{D} ,

then F is an effective descent \mathcal{V} -functor. While these conditions can be refined in general with Theorem 4.9, if \mathcal{V} is a Grothendieck topos, then we can take advantage of the fact that $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V}) \simeq \mathcal{V} \downarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a Grothendieck topos as well, in which case F is an effective descent functor whenever

$$(F_{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3})_{x_i \in F^*y_i}: (\mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3))_{x_i \in F^*y_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3)$$

is an epimorphism in $\mathbf{Fam}(\mathcal{V})$ for all y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3 .

6. FUTURE WORK

Having established sufficient conditions for effective descent in $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$ for cartesian monoidal categories \mathcal{V} , an obvious continuation would be to extend this result to suitable monoidal categories \mathcal{V} . We describe a strategy which would rely on the present work; we denote $\mathbf{CartCat}$ and $\mathbf{SymMndCat}$ for the 2-categories of cartesian (monoidal) categories and symmetrical monoidal categories.

Provided $\mathbf{CartCat}$ has needed (strict) codescent objects, the left 2-adjoint (biadjoint) (pseudo)functor of the forgetful 2-functor $\mathbf{CartCat} \rightarrow \mathbf{SymMndCat}$ exists; the existence and an explicit description of such a left 2-adjoint (biadjoint) would be provided via the biadjoint triangle theorem [27, Theorem 4.4] (see also [28, Theorem 2.3]):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{CartCat} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathbf{SymMndCat} \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & \mathbf{Cat} & \end{array}$$

where every 2-functor is forgetful. Both functors to \mathbf{Cat} have left 2-adjoints which are easy to describe.

So, if the existence of the left biadjoint $F: \mathbf{SymMndCat} \rightarrow \mathbf{CartCat}$ is guaranteed, we need to study the following questions:

- What conditions on \mathcal{V} guarantee existence of pullbacks in $F\mathcal{V}$?
- Is the unit $\eta: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow F\mathcal{V}$ fully faithful?

After obtaining solutions to the above questions, we could then study the functor

$$\eta!: \mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \rightarrow F\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat},$$

¹Grothendieck toposes satisfying this property are said to be *hyperconnected*.

which raises the ultimate question: does it reflect effective descent morphisms? An affirmative answer would provide a string of functors

$$\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow F\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow \text{Fam}(F\mathcal{V})\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow \text{Cat}(\text{Fam}(F\mathcal{V}))$$

that reflect effective descent. Then, since $F\mathcal{V}$ is hypothetically a cartesian monoidal category with finite limits, we obtain a more general result via Theorem 3.3. Combined with an adequate study of effective descent morphisms in $F\mathcal{V}$, these results can be applied in the study of effective descent morphisms in $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$ for any symmetrical monoidal category \mathcal{V} .

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Barr. Exact categories. In *Exact Categories and Categories of Sheaves*, volume 236 of *Lecture Notes in Math.* Pp. 1–120. Springer, 1971.
- [2] J. Bénabou. Catégories avec multiplication. *C. R. Acad. Sci.*, 256:1887–1890, 1963.
- [3] J. Bénabou. Fibered categories and the foundations of naive category theory. *J. Symb. Log.*, 50(1):10–37, 1985.
- [4] J. Bénabou and J. Roubaud. Monades et descente. *C. R. Acad. Sci. A*, 270:96–98, 1970.
- [5] F. Borceux and G. Janelidze. *Galois Theories*, number 72 in Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [6] A. Carboni, S. Lack, and R.F.C. Walters. Introduction to extensive and distributive categories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 94:145–158, 1993.
- [7] M. M. Clementino and D. Hofmann. Descent morphisms and a van Kampen theorem in categories of lax algebras. *Topol. Appl.*, 159:2310–2319, 2012.
- [8] M. M. Clementino and D. Hofmann. Effective descent morphisms in categories of lax algebras. *Appl. Categ. Struct.*, 12(5):413–425, 2004.
- [9] M. M. Clementino and D. Hofmann. The rise and fall of V -functors. *Fuzzy Sets and Syst.*, 321:29–49, 2017.
- [10] M. M. Clementino and D. Hofmann. Triquotient maps via ultrafilter convergence. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 130(11):3423–3431, 2002.
- [11] M. M. Clementino and G. Janelidze. A note on effective descent morphisms of topological spaces and relational algebras. *Topol. Appl.*, 158:2431–2436, 2011.
- [12] M. M. Clementino and F. Lucatelli Nunes. Lax comma 2-categories and admissible 2-functors. *Theory Appl. Categ. (to appear)*, 2024.
- [13] M. M. Clementino and W. Tholen. Metric, topology and multicategory – a common approach. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 179:13–47, 2003.
- [14] S. Eilenberg and G. M. Kelly. Closed categories. In S. Eilenberg, D. K. Harrison, H. Rörl, and S. Mac Lane, editors, *Proceedings of the Conference on Categorical Algebra*, pp. 421–562. Springer, 1966.
- [15] S. Fujii and S. Lack. The oplax limit of an enriched category. *Theory Appl. Categ. (to appear)*, 2024.
- [16] J. W. Gray. Fibred and cofibred categories. In S. Eilenberg, D. K. Harrison, H. Rörl, and S. Mac Lane, editors, *Proceedings of the Conference on Categorical Algebra*, pp. 21–83. Springer, 1966.
- [17] J. W. Gray. *Formal category theory: adjointness for 2-categories*, volume 391 of *Lecture Notes in Math.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1974.
- [18] C. Hermida. Some properties of Fib as a fibred 2-category. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 134:83–109, 1999.
- [19] B. Jacobs. *Categorical Logic and Type Theory*, volume 141 of *Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics.* Elsevier, 1999.
- [20] G. Janelidze, M. Sobral, and W. Tholen. *Beyond Barr exactness: effective descent morphisms.* In *Categorical Foundations: Special Topics in Order, Topology, Algebra and Sheaf Theory.* Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 359–406.
- [21] G. Janelidze and W. Tholen. Facets of descent, I. *Appl. Categ. Struct.*, 2(3):245–281, 1994.
- [22] G. Janelidze and W. Tholen. Facets of descent, II. *Appl. Categ. Struct.*, 5(3):229–248, 1997.
- [23] P. Köhler. Brouwerian semilattices. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 268:103–126, 1981.
- [24] S. Lack. Limits for lax morphisms. *Appl. Categ. Struct.*, 13:189–203, 2005.

- [25] I. Le Creurer. *Descent of Internal Categories*. PhD thesis, Université Catholique de Louvain, 1999.
- [26] T. Leinster. *Higher Operads, Higher Categories*, number 298 in London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [27] F. Lucatelli Nunes. On biadjoint triangles. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 31(9):217–256, 2016.
- [28] F. Lucatelli Nunes. On lifting of biadjoints and lax algebras. *Categ. Gen. Algebr. Struct. Appl.*, 9(1):29–58, 2018.
- [29] F. Lucatelli Nunes. Pseudo-Kan extensions and descent theory. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 33(15):390–448, 2018.
- [30] V. Marra and L. Reggio. A characterization of the category of compact Hausdorff spaces. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 35(51):1871–1906, 2020.
- [31] W.C. Nemitz. Implicative semi-lattices. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 117:128–142, 1965.
- [32] R. Prezado and F. Lucatelli Nunes. Descent for internal multicategory functors. *Appl. Categor. Struct.*, 31(11):1–18, 2023.
- [33] J. Reiterman and W. Tholen. Effective descent maps of topological spaces. *Topol. Appl.*, 57:53–69, 1994.
- [34] R. Street and A. Joyal. Pullbacks equivalent to pseudopullbacks. *Cah. Topol. Géom. Différ. Catég.*, 34(2):153–156, 1993.
- [35] R. Street, W. Tholen, M. Wischnewsky, and H. Wolff. Semitopological functors. III. Lifting of monads and adjoint functors. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 16(3):299–314, 1980.
- [36] W. Tholen. Ordered topological structures. *Topology Appl.*, 156:2148–2157, 2009. DOI: 10.1016/j.topol.2009.04.011
- [37] M. Weber. Familial 2-functors and parametric right adjoints. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 18(22):665–732, 2007.

(1) UNIVERSITY OF COIMBRA, CMUC, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PORTUGAL
Email address, 1: `ruiz.prezado@student.uc.pt`