

Equivalence Hypergraphs: E-Graphs for Monoidal Theories

CHRIS BARRETT, University of Oxford, United Kingdom

ALEKSEI TIURIN, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom

DAN R. GHICA, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom

The technique of equipping graphs with an equivalence relation, called equality saturation, has recently proved both powerful and practical in program optimisation, particularly for satisfiability modulo theory solvers. We give a categorical semantics to these structures, called e-graphs, in terms of Cartesian categories enriched over a semilattice. We show how this semantics can be generalised to monoidal categories, which opens the door to new applications of e-graph techniques, from algebraic to monoidal theories. Finally, we present a sound and complete combinatorial representation of morphisms in such a category, based on a generalisation of hypergraphs which we call e-hypergraphs. They have the usual advantage that many of their structural equations are absorbed into a general notion of isomorphism.

CCS Concepts: • **Theory of computation** → *Categorical semantics; Data structures design and analysis; Equational logic and rewriting*; • **Mathematics of computing** → *Hypergraphs*.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: e-graphs, categorical semantics, enriched category theory, hypergraph rewriting, DPO rewriting.

1 INTRODUCTION

Rewrite-driven program optimisation consists of the application of a sequence of semantics-preserving rewrites which may improve the cost of execution, such as time or space (memory). Because the application of some rewrites can either enable or block the subsequent application of others, the choice of application order significantly impacts the quality of the resulting optimisation. This long-standing issue is known as the *phase-ordering problem*, with a *phase* referring to a particular set of rewrites. Typical approaches to this problem use heuristics to determine an ordering.

A recently proposed, alternative solution is *equality saturation* [34]: instead of maintaining a *single*, putatively optimised program which is rewritten *destructively* at each step, a *set* of equivalent programs is maintained instead, whereas each rewrite step *non-destructively* grows the set. Upon reaching a fixed point (*saturation*), a *globally* optimal program can then be extracted from this set. A naive approach is clearly unfeasible, since the size of this set grows exponentially with the number of rewrites. However, *equality graphs* (*e-graphs*) [36] are a data structure that can represent this set compactly, thus making the set tractable in practical applications.

Although equality saturation is already a state-of-the-art algorithmic optimisation technique, there is an opportunity to better understand its mathematical foundations. We propose to address this issue via a categorical axiomatisation for e-graphs and their rewriting. Considering programs as represented by terms of an arbitrary algebraic theory, we demonstrate a correspondence between e-graphs and (string diagrams for) simple *semilattice-enriched* Cartesian categories. The approach we take is guided by the established methodology of creating a correspondence between string diagrams and graph rewriting, as encountered in a large body of research. The starting innovation of our approach is the semilattice-enrichment. The *join* operator lifts the formalism so that it can now operate with (non-empty) *sets* of terms (string diagrams, morphisms); the rest of the paper is about working out the mathematical implications of introducing this enrichment to string diagrams and their concrete combinatorial representation.

Although our primary interest is theoretical, we believe that phrasing e-graphs in the more general language of category theory will open the door to new potential domains of applications that now use string diagrams and which require the application of optimisation techniques [29, 32]. This may include areas as diverse as digital [20] and quantum circuits [9, 13], functional




Fig. 1. Example translation of acyclic e-graphs into string diagrams for semilattice enriched Cartesian categories.

programs [17], or computational linguistics [10, 35]. However, in this work we offer little to the e-graph practitioner, as we focus exclusively on foundational aspects, introducing no new applications or improved e-graph algorithmics.

A final contribution of this work is giving a concrete combinatorial representation of enriched string diagrams in terms of (hierarchical) hypergraphs, which we call *e-hypergraphs*. We also give a specification of e-hypergraph rewriting via a suitable extension of the double pushout (DPO) rewriting framework [3–5, 26], proving the representation *sound and complete* with respect to our categorical semantics. As a corollary, this also provides a formalisation of the rewriting theory of e-graphs as encountered in the literature.

1.1 E-graphs

E-graphs are a data structure which can efficiently represent many equivalent terms of an algebraic theory. They generalise the typical DAG representation of terms to include equivalence classes. The key concepts of e-graphs can be intuitively grasped from some simple (but non-trivial) examples, as shown in Figure 1. This example is a ‘Hello world!’ of e-graphs, presented first in [36].

Each column represents a term (or term rewrite rule), the conventional e-graph representation, and the equivalent e-string diagram representation, an e-hypergraph. The initial term, $(a * 2)/2$, is already represented efficiently in the e-graph by sharing the node 2. The string diagram version is slightly different than conventional e-graphs by representing the sharing of the node 2 explicitly, using a sharing (contraction) node Υ .

Nodes are encapsulated in dashed boxes indicating equivalence classes of nodes, or, more generally, of subgraphs. Initially each equivalence class has a single node. The first rewrite rule, replacing multiplication by the more efficient *shift-left* operator creates the first non-unitary equivalence class, which includes the multiplication ($*$) and shift-left (\ll) operator nodes, with a new sharing, that of node a . This second e-graph illustrates the other difference, besides sharing, between conventional e-graphs and e-hypergraphs, namely the fact that in the former edges connect directly to nodes inside the equivalence class, whereas in the latter edges connect to the equivalence class itself. Explicit discarding (weakening) nodes, depicted with black dots with a single wire inside the




Fig. 2. String diagrams for semilattice enriched symmetric monoidal categories.

dashed boxes \uparrow , indicate which of the class-level edges are connected to which nodes inside the class.

The other steps, (c) to (e), represent further elaborations of the e-graph, or e-hypergraph, via the application of more rules. If we were to apply another rule, $x * 1 \rightarrow x$, we would identify the e-class of a with the top-level e-class of the e-graph which would require a cycle to be introduced: the left argument of node $*$ would be the same e-class that $*$ belongs to. This would result into a possibility of extracting the optimal term consisting of only the node a , discarding everything else. To support such cycles we need a richer structure for our e-string diagrams. While equipping the e-string diagrams with such structure is straightforward, it is out of the scope of this work, and thus we limit ourselves to acyclic e-graphs and e-string diagrams for the purposes of presentation. Note that while the transformations of the e-graph are guided by the algorithm, the transformations of the e-string diagrammatic version is guided by the equations of the underlying theory. A step-by-step application of such equations for the rewrite rule from (a) to (b) and (b) to (c) can be seen in Figure 12 and Figure 11 respectively. The equations applied are the ones from Figure 3 and naturality of delete and copy. One can note that the size of the eventual e-string diagram is comparable to the size of the corresponding e-graph.

1.2 Semilattice Enriched Categories

Recalling the correspondence between DAG representations of algebraic terms and string-diagrams for morphisms of a suitable Cartesian category makes perspicuous the correspondence between (acyclic) e-graphs and morphisms of a suitably enriched Cartesian category, taken as string diagrams [24, 28, 32]. We extend the usual vocabulary of string diagrams for symmetric monoidal categories with the additional generator


$$\frac{\{f_i : A \rightarrow B\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}}{f_1 + \dots + f_n : A \rightarrow B}$$

The ability to take formal (non-empty) joins of morphisms is used to model the equivalence class structure of e-graphs.

String diagrams are read from bottom-to-top; we consider additional generators for the duplication and deletion transformations of a Cartesian category. Note, further, that in the Cartesian case we can restrict to generating morphisms c to have a single output, without loss of generality, by applying the universal properties of the Cartesian product. This means the (informal) translation given below is fully general for acyclic e-graphs.

The translation from e-graphs to enriched string diagrams is illustrated informally below, noting how the typing constraints of the $+$ constructor are satisfied in the image of the translation by

discarding in each component all unnecessary inputs.




The figure on the right above is slightly simplified: if we denote the arity of each c_i as a_{c_i} , then the dashed box on the right contains $\sum_i a_{c_i}$ inputs and each component c_j has $\sum_{i \neq j} a_{c_i}$ weakening nodes inside. Examples of this translation are given in the second row of Figure 1.

Note that the motivating example of our work, e-graphs, requires the Cartesian structure. However, we will see how all the core of the theory of e-hypergraph rewriting only requires the monoidal structure. Thus we can readily generalise e-graphs from algebraic to monoidal theories, giving rise to a host of new potential applications, which we briefly outline in the conclusion of this paper.

1.3 Combinatorial Representation of Enriched String Diagrams

In order to *implement* generalised e-graphs, rewriting must be performed on concrete representations of the corresponding string diagrams. String diagrams can be considered equivalently as either topological objects (*i.e.*, taken modulo “connectivity”) or as a 2-dimensional syntax quotiented by the equations of a *symmetric monoidal category (SMC)*. For example, we have the following equivalences between diagrams.



This representation makes string diagrams unamenable to efficient implementation due to the difficulty of calculating the quotient. A large body of research work shows how this issue can be solved by taking a different approach, representing string diagrams as hypergraphs [3–5]. Here, the generators c_i become hyper-edges, and wires become vertices. Thus the expected quotient becomes simply hypergraph isomorphism. With appropriate restrictions on the form these hypergraphs can take, this approach can be used to *characterise* the free symmetric monoidal category generated by some c_i .

We are interested not only in the free SMC over a set of generators, but also in (*symmetric*) *monoidal theories* with extra equations such as, for instance, the rewrite rules (b)–(d) of Figure 1. These can be seen as equations between string diagrams, and thus rewrites of their hypergraph representations. Because the generating equations can be applied in any context, we are led to the notion of (*hyper*)*graph rewriting*: given an equation $l = r$, we require some way to identify (a sub-hypergraph corresponding to) l within a hypergraph and replace it with (a sub-hypergraph corresponding to) r . The standard methodology to giving specifications of such graph rewriting, known as *double pushout (DPO) rewriting* [5, 26] is still applicable. However, these concepts must be now generalised from hypergraphs to *e-hypergraphs*, hypergraphs with two additional relations denoting the hierarchical structure introduced by so-called *e-boxes*: the generator for semilattice enrichment, and the separation of the components of each e-box. Giving the appropriate definitions turns out to be a technical matter of some complexity, and constitutes the main body of the paper.

1.4 Soundness and Completeness

The main technical result of the paper is a proof of soundness and completeness of this representation. This extends the results of [4] for plain SMCs. While the structural equalities of SMCs are factored out in the representation, those arising from the enrichment (see the equations of Figure 3) are not, and should not be. They represent the un/sharing of subdiagrams with respect to the e-box structure, which is precisely what allows for the compact representation of equivalence classes. Instead, we consider DPO-rewrites implementing both the structural equalities for enrichment (which involve the e-box structure) and the equalities arising from the generating monoidal theory (which do not).

Precisely, our soundness and completeness result is the statement that morphisms in an appropriate free semilattice-enriched SMC are equal if and only if there exists a sequence of DPO-rewrites — each induced by a structural equality or the monoidal theory — between their combinatorial representations. In the particular case of a monoidal signature including natural copy and delete maps, we thus recover a sound and complete representation of semilattice-enriched Cartesian categories, with the translation described earlier in the introduction justifying our claim of developing a mathematical theory of e-graphs.

1.5 Related Work

Although e-graphs were first developed in the 80s [30], there has recently been an explosion of interest in them for the purpose of building program optimisers and synthesisers, especially due to recent work on the equality saturation technique [14, 23, 34, 36]. This includes interest in various extensions of the e-graph formalism, for example to account for conditional rewriting [33], to reason about rewriting for the λ -calculus [25], and to combine techniques of e-graphs and database queries (“relational e-matching”) [37]. We are hopeful that our novel perspective on e-graphs can be extended to give uniform foundations to these investigations. Some further avenues for investigation, including potential applications, are given in the conclusion of this paper.

Our use of string diagrams is also central to the intuition behind our work [24, 32]. There is a breadth of work on similar string diagrammatic formalisms, including hierarchical string diagrams [17] and functorial boxes [28], proof nets for compact closed categories with biproducts [12], and recent work on tape diagrams for rig categories with biproducts [6]. Hierarchical (hyper-)graphs are also a well-studied area of research [7, 8, 11, 22, 31]. Our work builds heavily on string diagram rewrite theory as developed in [3–5].

2 CATEGORICAL SEMANTICS OF E-GRAPHS

In this section, we introduce the required preliminaries on semilattice enriched symmetric monoidal categories generated by monoidal theories, and the string diagrammatic formalism we will use to represent them.

Given a category \mathbb{C} with objects $A, B \in \mathbb{C}$ we denote by $\mathbb{C}(A, B)$ the corresponding hom-set. We write the identity morphism on A as id_A , or simply A . We commonly write $f; g$ for composition in diagram order. Composition in the usual order is written $g \circ f$. We denote the tensor product of an SMC \mathbb{C} by \otimes , its unit by I and its symmetry natural transformation as sym [27]. We adopt the convention that \otimes binds more tightly than $(;)$. We elide all associativity and unit isomorphisms associated with monoidal categories, and often omit subscripts on identities and natural transformations where it can be inferred. We denote by SLatt the category of semilattices.

2.1 Symmetric Monoidal Theories and PROPs.

A presentation of an algebraic theory is traditionally given by a *signature* of n -ary operations and a set of *equations*—formally, pairs of terms freely generated over the signature. We are interested here in symmetric monoidal theories, which are generalisations of algebraic theories where the operations of the signature may have arbitrary *co-arities*. First, we generalise the notion of a signature.

Definition 2.1 (Monoidal signature). A (monoidal) signature Σ is given by a set of generators $c : n \rightarrow m$, with arity n and co-arity m .

A categorical presentation of a monoidal signature is given by a freely generated products and permutations category.

Definition 2.2 (Products and permutations category). A products and permutations category (PROP) is a strict symmetric monoidal category with natural numbers as objects, and such that $n \otimes m = n + m$. A PROP functor is a strict SMC-functor which is additionally identity-on-objects. We denote the free products and permutations category over a monoidal signature Σ by $\mathbf{PROP}(\Sigma)$.

The free category $\mathbf{PROP}(\Sigma)$ can be syntactically constructed from taking (typed) categorical combinator terms freely constructed from generators $c \in \Sigma$, id_1 , $\text{sym}_{1,1}$, $(;)$ and \otimes , quotiented by the axioms of a symmetric monoidal category.

An equation associated with a monoidal signature is a pair of parallel morphisms of the form above, leading to the following definition of a symmetric monoidal theory.

Definition 2.3 (Symmetric Monoidal Theory). A presentation of a symmetric monoidal theory (Σ, \mathcal{E}) is given by a pair of a monoidal signature Σ and a set \mathcal{E} of pairs of parallel morphisms $f, g : n \rightarrow m$ of $\mathbf{PROP}(\Sigma)$. A symmetric monoidal theory $\mathbf{SMT}(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$ generated by a presentation (Σ, \mathcal{E}) is given by $\mathbf{PROP}(\Sigma)$ quotiented by the least congruence including \mathcal{E} .

It will often be convenient to give presentations of SMTs in terms of string diagrams.

Example 2.4. The SMT of commutative comonoids is given by the following generators, $\Delta, !$, depicted in string diagrammatic form:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Y-shaped diagram with a dot at the top} \\ \Delta : 1 \rightarrow 2 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Vertical line with a dot at the top} \\ ! : 1 \rightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

together with the following associativity, commutativity and unitality equations, again given in terms of string diagrams.

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Associativity diagram} \\ \text{Commutativity diagram} \\ \text{Unitality diagram} \end{array}$$

The Cartesian SMT is given by a set of generators Σ_C which additionally contains the generators of commutative comonoids, together with the equations of the SMT of commutative comonoids, and the following additional naturality equations, for every $c \in \Sigma_C$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Naturality equation 1} \\ \text{Naturality equation 2} \end{array}$$

By Fox's Theorem [16], $\mathbf{SMT}(\Sigma_C, \mathcal{E}_C)$ is equivalent to the free Cartesian category over Σ_C .

2.2 Free Semilattice Enrichment: Formal Joins

We will use enrichment to axiomatize the e-box structure as the “join” of two morphisms $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ as $f+g : A \rightarrow B$. Note, in particular, that semilattices do not require a unit for $+$. This is important, since, in any commutative monoid enriched category, if there exists a categorical product, then it must be a categorical biproduct [27]—a degeneracy we wish to avoid. More precisely our hom-sets will be given the structure of a semilattice. Generally, we may define a category *enriched* in any other monoidal category M (e.g., **SLatt**). In this case, hom-sets are generalised to hom-objects of M (e.g., a semilattice) and composition

$$\circ : \text{Hom}(B, C) \otimes \text{Hom}(A, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(A, C)$$

is defined as an M -morphism. In other words, composition must respect the additional structure on hom-sets. In our case, the category we wish to enrich is also monoidal, so we additionally ask that the monoidal structure also respects this structure. Technically, this amounts to asking that the tensor product is an enriched functor. We omit further details of the general case of enrichment here, and instead work with the following more concrete definition, where $M = \mathbf{SLatt}$.

Definition 2.5 (Semilattice-enriched SMC). A semilattice enriched strict SMC \mathbb{C} is given by an SMC $(\mathbb{C}, \otimes, 1, +)$ where every hom-set additionally has the structure of a semilattice $(\mathbb{C}(A, B), +)$ – that is, a set equipped with an associative, commutative, and idempotent operation – which respects the composition and tensor product in the following ways, for all appropriately typed morphisms.

$$\begin{aligned} f; (g+h) &= f; g+f; h & (f+g); h &= f; h+g; h \\ f \otimes (g+h) &= f \otimes g+f \otimes h & (f+g) \otimes h &= f \otimes h+g \otimes h \end{aligned}$$

Note, we take $(;)$ and \otimes to bind more tightly than $+$. A semilattice enriched strict SMC functor $F : (\mathbb{C}, \otimes, 1, +) \rightarrow (\mathbb{D}, \otimes, 1, +)$ is given by a strict SMC functor on the underlying SMCs which additionally satisfies $F(f+g) = F(f)+F(g)$. All definitions extend to *PROP* when the manipulated categories are *PROPs* rather than SMCs. We denote the *freely enriched PROP (SMT)* over a monoidal signature Σ as $\mathbf{PROP}^+(\Sigma)$ ($\mathbf{SMT}^+(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$), respectively).

The free category $\mathbf{PROP}^+(\Sigma)$ can be syntactically constructed from taking (typed) Σ^+ -terms – namely, those freely constructed from generators $c \in \Sigma$, id_1 , $\text{sym}1$, 1 , $(;)$ and \otimes (and $f+g$, respectively) – quotiented by the axioms of an enriched symmetric monoidal category.

To aid reasoning, we introduce a new language of string diagrams for semilattice enriched SMCs, using a hierarchical “box” structure to capture the join operation on morphisms. It was already discussed in the introduction how this is used in the translation of equivalence classes from the e-graph to the string diagrammatic setting.

Figure 2 displays the generators of this language and Figure 3 displays the additional equations which these diagrams satisfy, in addition to the standard SMC equations. The first four equations are those displayed in Definition 2.5, while the final four axiomatize $+$ as an n -ary associative, commutative and idempotent operation. We overload the binary notation $+$ for our n -ary notation. We use string diagrams informally in this paper, but it is intuitively clear that these diagrams are sound and complete with respect to their intended categorical semantics. Indeed, similar diagrammatic languages using boxes to express choice have been used before [12].

3 STRING DIAGRAM REWRITE THEORY

In this section, we recall the fundamental definitions and results of string diagram rewrite theory for symmetric monoidal categories, building to the recapitulation of the correspondence between string diagram rewriting and an appropriate notion of double pushout (DPO) rewriting of certain hypergraphs, as established in [3, 4].




Fig. 3. Equations for a semilattice enriched symmetric monoidal category

First, we fix some notation. Let $(-)^*$ be the free monoid monad over Set . We extend this to the case of relations $R \subseteq V \times V$, so that we denote by $R^* \subseteq V^* \times V^*$ the element-wise extension of ψ to a relation on ordered sequences. We will sometimes use functional notation for relations, so that given $R \subseteq V \times W$ and $v \in V$, $R(v) \subseteq W$. We elide associativity and unit isomorphisms associated with coproducts $(+)$, and denote by $\iota_j : X_j \rightarrow X_1 + \dots + X_j + \dots + X_n$ the j^{th} injection, and $[f, g] : A_1 + A_2 \rightarrow B$ the co-pairing of two morphisms $f : A_1 \rightarrow B$ and $g : A_2 \rightarrow B$. We denote by $A +_{f,g} B$ the pushout of the span $A \xleftarrow{f} C \xrightarrow{g} B$.

3.1 Hypergraphs

In [3], hypergraphs *with interfaces* and their DPO rewriting are shown to be sound and complete for SMTs including a Frobenius algebra. Hypergraphs generalise graphs by allowing edges to have multiple sources and targets. When interpreting string diagrams as hypergraphs, morphisms are interpreted as edges, and wires as vertices. However, there is also a need to specify which vertices are to be considered as *input* and *outputs*, corresponding to the dangling wires at the bottom and top of a string diagram. This gives rise to the definition of a hypergraph with interfaces. Subsequent work [4] builds on this correspondence to give a restriction of hypergraphs with interfaces (called *monogamous directed acyclic*), leading to a correspondence between symmetric monoidal string diagrams and the category of such hypergraphs.

Definition 3.1 (Category of hypergraphs). A hypergraph \mathcal{G} over a signature Σ is a tuple (V, E, s, t, l) , where V is a finite set of vertices, E is a finite set of edges, $s : E \rightarrow V^*$ is a source function, $t : E \rightarrow V^*$ is a target function, and $l : E \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a labelling function that assigns each edge a generator from monoidal signature Σ . The labelling function must respect the typing of the generator: for all edges e , $|s(e)| = m$ and $|t(e)| = n$, where $l(e) : m \rightarrow n$. We call a hypergraph *discrete* if its set of edges is empty. A *hypergraph homomorphism* $\phi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ is given by a pair of functions $\phi_V : V_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow V_{\mathcal{G}}, \phi_E : E_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow E_{\mathcal{G}}$ such that the following hold.

- (1) $\phi_V^*(s_{\mathcal{F}}(e)) = s_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi_E(e))$
- (2) $\phi_V^*(t_{\mathcal{F}}(e)) = t_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi_E(e))$
- (3) $l_{\mathcal{F}}(e) = l_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi_E(e))$

We denote by $\mathbf{Hyp}(\Sigma)$ the category of hypergraphs over Σ and hypergraph homomorphisms.

Note that $\mathbf{Hyp}(\Sigma)$ has all finite colimits and, in particular, the coproduct is given by the disjoint union of hypergraphs. The initial object is given by the empty hypergraph.

Definition 3.2 (Symmetric monoidal category of cospans). Let \mathbb{C} be a category with all finite colimits. A cospan from X to Y is a pair of arrows $X \rightarrow A \leftarrow Y$ in \mathbb{C} . This *category of cospans of \mathbb{C}* , denoted $\mathbf{Csp}(\mathbb{C})$, has as objects those of \mathbb{C} and as arrows isomorphism classes of cospans. Composition of cospans $X \xrightarrow{f} A \xleftarrow{g} Y$ and $Y \xrightarrow{h} B \xleftarrow{i} Z$ is given by pushout: $X \xrightarrow{f} A +_{g,h} B \xleftarrow{i} Z$, with identity given by the cospan of identities. Its monoidal product is given by the coproduct of \mathbb{C} as follows:

$$(A \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{G} \xleftarrow{g} B) \otimes (A' \xrightarrow{f'} \mathcal{G}' \xleftarrow{g'} B') := A + A' \xrightarrow{f+f'} \mathcal{G} + \mathcal{G}' \xleftarrow{g+g'} B + B',$$

and its unit by the initial object of \mathbb{C} . Symmetry is inherited from \mathbb{C} as the coproduct [15].

Then, morphisms of $\mathbf{PROP}(\Sigma)$ can be interpreted as particular cospans of discrete hypergraphs, which we call hypergraphs with interfaces [4].

Definition 3.3 (Hypergraphs with interfaces). Define the category of *hypergraphs with interfaces* $\mathbf{HypI}(\Sigma)$ as the full sub-category of $\mathbf{Csp}(\mathbf{Hyp}(\Sigma))$ with discrete hypergraphs as objects.

In particular, this means that any morphism in $\mathbf{HypI}(\Sigma)$ is of the form $n \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{G} \xleftarrow{g} m$, where n, m are discrete hypergraphs and \mathcal{G} is an arbitrary hypergraph. The morphisms f and g into \mathcal{G} will specify which vertices are to be considered as inputs and outputs, respectively.

Definition 3.4 (Degree, path, acyclic). The *in-degree* of a vertex v in a hypergraph \mathcal{G} is the number of hyperedges $e \in E_{\mathcal{G}}$ such that $v \in t(e)$. Similarly, the *out-degree* of v is the number of edges $e \in E_{\mathcal{G}}$ such that $v \in s(e)$. A *path* from e_0 to e_{n-1} of length n in a hypergraph \mathcal{G} is an ordered sequence of edges $[e_0, e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}] \in E_{\mathcal{G}}^*$ such that for all $i < n - 1$ some vertex $v \in t(e_i)$ is also in $s(e_{i+1})$. A hypergraph is *directed acyclic* if it contains no paths of length $n > 0$ that start and end in the same edge.

In order to represent only morphisms of $\mathbf{PROP}(\Sigma)$, it is necessary to restrict our attention to the following subset of hypergraphs with interfaces.

Definition 3.5 (Category of MDA Hypergraphs with Interfaces). We call a cospan $n \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{G} \xleftarrow{g} m$ in $\mathbf{HypI}(\Sigma)$ *monogamous directed acyclic (MDA)* if:

- (1) \mathcal{G} is a directed acyclic hypergraph;
- (2) f and g are monomorphisms;
- (3) the in-degree and out-degree of every vertex is at most 1;
- (4) vertices with in-degree 0 are precisely the image of f ; and
- (5) vertices with out-degree 0 are precisely the image of g .

We denote by $\mathbf{MHypI}(\Sigma)$ the subcategory of $\mathbf{HypI}(\Sigma)$ of MDA cospans.

Note that $\mathbf{MHypI}(\Sigma)$ remains a symmetric monoidal category with the same equipment as before. We now recall from [4] the following theorem, which says the category $\mathbf{MHypI}(\Sigma)$ is in fact *equivalent* to $\mathbf{PROP}(\Sigma)$.

THEOREM 3.6 (COROLLARY 26 OF [4]). $\mathbf{PROP}(\Sigma) \cong \mathbf{MHypI}(\Sigma)$



Fig. 4. DPO and DPOI squares

3.2 DPOI-Rewriting for Hypergraphs with Interfaces

The correspondence of the previous section means that the symmetric monoidal equations of $\mathbf{SMT}(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$ are absorbed in the hypergraph representation. The equations \mathcal{E} are then to be considered as rewrite rules on string diagrams, which are then modelled as DPO-rewrites on hypergraphs with interfaces. DPO rewriting is a standard technique for formalising graph rewriting categorically. In this section we recall standard results of double-pushout (DPO) rewriting of hypergraphs, as well as the specific notion of DPO rewriting which is sound and complete for arbitrary SMTs, which is called *convex* rewriting.

The intuitive notion of (hyper-)graph rewriting is as expected: given a rewrite rule $\mathcal{L} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{R}$ and a graph \mathcal{G} , we expect to find an occurrence of \mathcal{L} within \mathcal{G} , remove it, and then plug \mathcal{R} into the hole to recover the rewritten graph \mathcal{H} . In DPO rewriting, such a rewrite rule is formalised as a span $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ in some appropriate category of graphs, where \mathcal{K} is some invariant that should be maintained during rewriting. A typical DPO square is depicted in Figure 4 (left).

The morphism $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ is called a *match*, defined whenever there is a corresponding *pushout complement*—the pair of morphisms $\mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ completing the top half of the pushout square defined by $\mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$. When the morphisms involved in the rewrite rule are monomorphisms, as is usually required, constructing \mathcal{L}^\perp can be intuitively understood as finding an occurrence of \mathcal{L} in \mathcal{G} and removing from this occurrence everything that has no pre-image in \mathcal{K} . The final graph \mathcal{H} is then recovered by inserting into the hole everything from \mathcal{R} that has no pre-image in \mathcal{K} —hence the two pushouts: one for deletion and one for insertion. In this case, we say that \mathcal{G} is rewritten into \mathcal{H} via the rewrite rule $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$.

To express the rewriting of (hyper-)graphs with interfaces, *i.e.*, the ones that represent morphisms in $\mathbf{HypI}(\Sigma)$, the DPO formalism has been extended to double-pushout rewriting with *interfaces* (DPOI) as shown in Figure 4 (right). In the case of $\mathbf{Hyp}(\Sigma)$, we wish rewrite rules to be pairs of discrete cospans of hypergraphs with matching interfaces: $n \rightarrow \mathcal{L} \leftarrow m, n \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \leftarrow m$. By noting that a cospan $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{L} \xleftarrow{[f,g]} n+m$ encodes the same data as a cospan $n \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{L} \xleftarrow{g} m$ (Remark 3.14 [3]) we can formulate a rewrite rule as a single span $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow n+m \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$, and we can do similarly for the discrete cospans giving the interface to \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} . We now make this identification throughout without further mention. Thus we reach the following variant of DPO rewriting.

Definition 3.7 (DPOI rewriting). Given a span of morphisms $\mathcal{G} \leftarrow n+m \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ in $\mathbf{Hyp}(\Sigma)$, we say \mathcal{G} *rewrites to* \mathcal{H} *with interface* $n+m$ *via rewrite rule* $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow i+j \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ if there exists an object C and morphisms which complete the rightmost commutative diagram in Figure 4 such that the two marked squares are pushouts.

We need to restrict the notions of pushout complement and of match in order to preserve monogamy and directed acyclicity.

Definition 3.8 (Boundary complement). For MDA cospans $i \xrightarrow{a_1} L \xleftarrow{a_2} j$ and $n \xrightarrow{b_1} \mathcal{G} \xleftarrow{b_2} m$ and mono $f : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$, a pushout complement $i + j \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ as depicted in the square below

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{L} & \xleftarrow{[a_1, a_2]} & i + j \\
 f \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow [c_1, c_2] \\
 \mathcal{G} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{L}^\perp \\
 & \swarrow [b_1, b_2] & \uparrow [d_1, d_2] \\
 & & n + m
 \end{array}$$

is called a boundary complement if $[c_1, c_2]$ is mono and there exist $d_1 : n \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^\perp$ and $d_2 : m \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^\perp$ making the above triangle commute and such that

$$n + j \xrightarrow{[d_1, c_2]} \mathcal{L}^\perp \xleftarrow{[d_2, c_1]} m + i$$

is an MDA cospan.

Intuitively, requiring boundary complements ensures that inputs are glued exclusively to outputs and vice-versa in the two pushout squares.

Definition 3.9 (Convex match). We call a subgraph \mathcal{H} of a hypergraph \mathcal{G} a *convex subgraph* if for all $v_i, v_j \in V_{\mathcal{H}}$ every path from v_i to v_j is also in \mathcal{H} . We call a match $f : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ a *convex match* if it is mono and its image is a convex subgraph of \mathcal{G} .

Definition 3.10 (Convex DPOI rewriting). Let \mathfrak{R} be a set of DPOI rewrite rules. Then, given $\mathcal{G} \leftarrow n + m$ and $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow n + m$ in $\mathbf{Hyp}(\Sigma)$, \mathcal{G} rewrites convexly into \mathcal{H} with interface $n + m$ – notation $(\mathcal{G} \leftarrow n + m) \Rightarrow_{\mathfrak{R}} (\mathcal{H} \leftarrow n + m)$ – if there exist rule $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow i + j \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ in \mathfrak{R} and object \mathcal{L}^\perp and cospan arrows $i + j \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^\perp \leftarrow n + m$ such that the DPOI diagram of Definition 3.7 commutes and its marked squares are pushouts and the following conditions hold

- $f : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ is a convex match;
- $i + j \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ is a boundary complement in the leftmost pushout.

We do not formally recite the main result of [4] here, but the work proves that for any morphisms f and g in $\mathbf{SMT}(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$, we have that $f = g$ if and only if there exist a sequence of DPO rewrites (induced by \mathcal{E}) between the representations of f and g as hypergraphs. In particular, Theorem 3.6 means that the structural SMC equations are factored out in the representation of f and g , and the DPO rewrites necessary are only those induced by \mathcal{E} .

4 E-HYPERGRAPHS

Hierarchical (hyper-)graphs are a well-studied area of research [7, 8, 11, 22, 31]. In this section, we follow analogous steps to those used to achieve a combinatorial representation of $\mathbf{PROP}(\Sigma)$ by $\mathbf{MHypI}(\Sigma)$, but in the semilattice enriched setting. First we define an *e-hypergraph*, which supports a hierarchical notion of “e-box” with distinct components. Then, we extend this notion with interfaces via a generalisation of the cospan construction. Finally, we restrict the morphisms under consideration to those satisfying the MDA condition, as in the previous section. An example diagram representing e-hypergraphs with interfaces can be found in Figure 6.

Note that here, and in the rest of the paper, we will restrict to dealing with signatures Σ such that for all $c_1, c_2 \in \Sigma$, if arity (respectively, co-arity) of c_1 is 0, then co-arity (respectively, arity) of c_2 must be at least 1. This is to ensure we do not have terms of type $0 \rightarrow 0$. This is a restriction

we make in order to avoid complications to the technical development of DPOI rewriting for e-hypergraphs given in the subsequent section, and we explain it further there.

In the following, we elide the obvious injections of V and E into $V + E$.

Definition 4.1 (E-hypergraphs). An *e-hypergraph* \mathcal{G} over a signature Σ is a tuple $(V, E, s, t, l, <, \perp)$, where (V, E, s, t) is an unlabelled hypergraph; $l : E \rightarrow \Sigma + 1$ is a labelling function modified to include an extra value \perp in its codomain; $<$ is a strict partial order on $V + E$ called the *child relation*. We define the following additional notation. For $x \in V + E$, the set of *parents* of x , is denoted as $[x] = \{x' \mid x' < x\}$. We will denote the immediate parent e of x by writing $e <^\mu x$. We call edges e such that $l(e) = \perp$ *hierarchical*, and edges e and vertices v such that $[e] = \emptyset$ and $[v] = \emptyset$ *top-level*. We require that the child relation satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) each parent set contains exclusively hierarchical edges;
- (2) Each x has at most one immediate parent;
- (3) if $v \in s(e)$ then $e' <^\mu e$ iff $e' <^\mu v$ and similarly if $v \in t(e)$.

We additionally define an equivalence relation \simeq_p , called the *consistency relation*, on each set $\{x \in V + E \mid p <^\mu x\}$ of elements which share the same parent. We collect the union of all these equivalence relations into one relation $\simeq = \bigcup_p \simeq_p$, which is defined on a subset of $V + E$. Note that this relation is symmetric and transitive if considered on $V + E$. The consistency relation must additionally satisfy that if $v \in s(e)$ or $v \in t(e)$ and there exists e' such that $e' <^\mu v$ and $e' <^\mu e$ then $v \simeq e$.

Intuitively, the child relation equips the hypergraph with a hierarchical structure: certain edges, labelled with \perp , are meant to interpret the dashed e-boxes of string diagrams. These edges can be designated as "parents" to sub-e-hypergraphs, which interpret the various components of the e-boxes. These components are distinguished by the consistency relation, which partitions the maximal sub-e-hypergraph below the hierarchical edge. Technically, condition (3) on the child relations says that $<^\mu$ respects connectivity of edges and vertices, and similarly for the consistency relation.

Definition 4.2 (E-hypergraph homomorphism). An *e-hypergraph homomorphism* $\phi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ of e-hypergraphs \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} is a pair of functions $\phi_V : V_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow V_{\mathcal{G}}, \phi_E : E_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow E_{\mathcal{G}}$ such that

- (1) ϕ is a hypergraph homomorphism
- (2) for $v \in V_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $e \in E_{\mathcal{F}}$

$$\text{if } e <_{\mathcal{F}}^\mu v \text{ then } \phi(e) <_{\mathcal{G}}^\mu \phi(v)$$

$$\text{and for } e_1, e_2 \in E_{\mathcal{F}} \quad \text{if } e_1 <_{\mathcal{F}}^\mu e_2 \text{ then } \phi(e_1) <_{\mathcal{G}}^\mu \phi(e_2)$$
- (3) for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, $x_1 \simeq_{\mathcal{F}} x_2$ implies $\phi(x_1) \simeq_{\mathcal{G}} \phi(x_2)$.

The conditions on e-hypergraph homomorphisms require to preserve immediate parents and the consistency relation.

Definition 4.3 (Category of e-hypergraphs). The *category of e-hypergraphs*, denoted $\mathbf{EHyp}(\Sigma)$, has e-hypergraphs as objects and e-hypergraph homomorphisms as morphisms.

The category of e-hypergraphs has coproducts, given by the disjoint union of e-hypergraphs, and an initial object given by the empty e-hypergraph. A concrete description of the pushout of two morphisms in this category is given in the Appendix. Generally, the pushout of two e-hypergraph homomorphisms need not exist, but we prove that it does when certain technical conditions are satisfied, including the requirement that the shared domain of the morphisms that form the span for the pushout is a discrete e-hypergraph.

REMARK 1. When we wish to consider $\phi(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ as an e -hypergraph in its own right, we let the immediate parent to be undefined for all x whose immediate parent in \mathcal{G} is outside $\phi(\mathcal{F})$.

When modelling enriched string diagrams using e -hypergraphs, we require to keep track of more than simply the ultimate external inputs and outputs of the diagram: each internal e -box has its own inputs and outputs, which we must also keep track of. Thus, we introduce an *extended* cospan construction. Since the $\mathbf{EHyp}(\Sigma)$ does not have pushouts in general, we skip straight to considering a category of extended cospans of discrete e -hypergraphs (*i.e.*, discrete hypergraphs considered as e -hypergraphs in the obvious way), for which pushouts do exist.

We use the notation $n \setminus m$ to denote the discrete e -hypergraph with $n - m$ vertices, in particular with the vertices of m removed from n when vertices of m is a sub- e -hypergraph of n .

Definition 4.4 (Category of e -hypergraphs with interfaces). The category of e -hypergraphs with extended interfaces $\mathbf{EHypI}(\Sigma)$ has discrete ordered e -hypergraphs as objects, with hom-sets $\mathbf{EHypI}(\Sigma)(n, m)$ consisting of isomorphism classes of *extended cospans*, defined as follows:

$$n \xrightarrow{f_{ext}} n' \xrightarrow{f_{int}} \mathcal{G} \xleftarrow{g_{int}} m' \xleftarrow{g_{ext}} m$$

where \mathcal{G} is an e -hypergraph, and n, n', m, m' are discrete ordered e -hypergraphs, f_{ext}, g_{ext} are monomorphisms in $\mathbf{EHyp}(\Sigma)$, and the image of $f_{ext}; f_{int}$ and of $g_{ext}; g_{int}$ consist exclusively of top-level vertices, and such that vertices in the strictly internal interface (defined below) are not top-level. We will sometimes write \mathcal{G} to denote the extended cospan, where it is clear from context \mathcal{G} is equipped with extended interfaces.

We will call n *external input interfaces* and n' *internal input interfaces*. We call $n' \setminus f_{ext}(n)$ the *strictly internal input interfaces*. We do analogously for the *output interfaces*, with respect to m, m' and $m' \setminus g_{ext}(m)$. We occasionally conflate f_{ext} with $f_{ext}; f_{int}$ when it is clear from context, and also conflate n and m with their images in n' and m' , and likewise m, m, n', m' with their images in \mathcal{G} . Given an edge $e \in E_{\mathcal{G}}$ such that $l(e) = \perp$, we call the *inputs of e* the intersection of the strictly internal input interface of \mathcal{G} with the immediate successors of e , and analogously for the *outputs of e* .

Consider a relation $R = \{xRy \text{ if } f_{int}(x) \sim f_{int}(y) \text{ for } x, y \in n'\}$ and let S be its reflexive closure. The latter partitions n' into non-empty subsets $\{p_j\}_{j=1}^k$. We get an analogous partition for m' . An example of an extended cospan can be seen in Figure 5. The cospan represents a morphism that encodes symmetry put into a hierarchical edge. The partition of the interfaces is given with colours. The labels suggest how f_{int}, f_{ext} (respectively, g_{int}, g_{ext}) act on vertices. The ordering of vertices in the interfaces is from left to right.

Two extended cospans are isomorphic if there exist isomorphisms α, β and γ making the following diagram commute and such that α and γ preserve order within each p_i .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & n' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G} & \longleftarrow & m' & \\ & \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \beta & & \downarrow \gamma & \\ n & & & & & & m \\ & n'' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G}' & \longleftarrow & m'' & \end{array}$$

Intuitively, such construction suggests that the position of the image of n within n' relative to the strict internal interface does not matter; and that when considering individual components of hierarchical edges with their respective portions of strict internal input and output interfaces as plain cospans of hypergraphs (by only considering top-level vertices and edges of these components) they should be isomorphic cospans of hypergraphs in the sense from [3]. Examples of isomorphic and non-isomorphic extended cospans can be found in Appendix.





Fig. 5. Extended cospan example

REMARK 2. There is also a faithful identity-on-objects functor $E : \mathbf{HypI}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbf{EHypI}(\Sigma)$ which maps a cospan $n \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{G} \xleftarrow{g} m$ to an extended cospan $n \xrightarrow{f_{ext}} n \xrightarrow{f_{int}} \mathcal{G} \xleftarrow{g_{int}} m \xleftarrow{g_{ext}} m$ such that $f_{ext}; f_{int} = f$ and $g_{ext}; g_{int} = g$.

Composition of two morphisms

$$\begin{array}{c}
 n \xrightarrow{f_{ext}} n' \xrightarrow{f_{int}} \mathcal{F} \xleftarrow{f'_{int}} m' \xleftarrow{f'_{ext}} m \\
 m \xrightarrow{g_{ext}} m'' \xrightarrow{g_{int}} \mathcal{G} \xleftarrow{g'_{int}} k' \xleftarrow{g'_{ext}} k
 \end{array}$$

is computed in two stages. First, \mathcal{H} is computed as the result of the pushout square shown below;



then, the result of composition is defined as follows:

$$n \xrightarrow{f_{ext};t_1} n' + (m'' \setminus m) \xrightarrow{h_1} \mathcal{H} \xleftarrow{h_2} k' + (m' \setminus m) \xleftarrow{g'_{ext};t_1} k$$

where h_i are defined as follows, using $|$ to denote the restriction of a function on a discrete e-hypergraph.

$$h_1 = [f_{int}; p_1, (g_{int}; p_2)|_{m'' \setminus m}] \quad h_2 = [g'_{int}; p_2, (f'_{int}; p_1)|_{m' \setminus m}]$$

The identity of composition is given by the obvious extended cospan of identities. $\mathbf{EHypI}(\Sigma)$ inherits a symmetric monoidal structure from the coproduct (and initial object) structure of $\mathbf{EHyp}(\Sigma)$, analogously to Definition 3.3.

As in the standard cospan construction, it is necessary to consider isomorphism classes of cospans since composition (defined by pushout) is associative only up-to isomorphism (since pushouts are unique only up-to isomorphism). We additionally introduce a notion of *well-typing* of e-hypergraphs, which ensures each component of an e-box has the same number of inputs (outputs) as every other component.

Definition 4.5 (Category of well-typed MDA e-hypergraphs with interfaces). We call an extended cospan in $\mathbf{EHypI}(\Sigma)$, as below, *monogamous directed acyclic (MDA)* if

$$n \xrightarrow{f_{ext}} n' \xrightarrow{f_{int}} \mathcal{G} \xleftarrow{g_{int}} m' \xleftarrow{g_{ext}} m$$

- (1) underlying hypergraph of \mathcal{G} is directed acyclic;
- (2) f_{int}, g_{int} are monomorphisms;
- (3) The in-degree and out-degree of every vertex is at most 1;
- (4) Vertices with in-degree 0 are precisely the image of f_{int} ;
- (5) Vertices with out-degree 0 are precisely the image of g_{int} ;

Further, consider the sets of input and output vertices, I and O respectively, of a hierarchical edge e of an e-hypergraph \mathcal{G} . The consistency relation of \mathcal{G} partitions I and O . We call e *well-typed* if the size of each subset in the partition of I is $|s(e)|$ and the size of each partition of O is $|t(e)|$. We will call an MDA extended-cospan in $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$ *well-typed* if all hierarchical edges in its apex are well-typed.

We denote by $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$ the subcategory of $\mathbf{EHypI}(\Sigma)$ consisting of well-typed MDA extended-cospans.

Note, $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$ is indeed a category, and in fact inherits the symmetric monoidal structure of $\mathbf{EHypI}(\Sigma)$: it is easy to check that identities, the monoidal unit, symmetry, and the composition and tensor product of any two well-typed cospans are all (again) well-typed.

Unlike in the previous section, in order to give an equivalence with $\mathbf{PROP}^+(\Sigma)$, we must first develop the theory of DPOI rewriting for e-hypergraphs. This is because the equations for semilattice enrichment are not intended to be subsumed by the e-hypergraph representation, apart from the commutativity equation which is absorbed by the definition of isomorphic cospans. Instead, we will treat them via rewriting, as we do with equations of the signature. This is because the semilattice equations involve sharing and copying, operations on string diagrams which are not usually quotiented away. An ideal combinatorial representation would factor out the two semilattice equations which *do not* involve sharing and copying (namely, associativity and idempotence) – however, a limitation of the current work is that we do not achieve this. Presently, we will treat these equations via rewriting as well.

5 DPOI-REWRITING FOR E-HYPERGRAPHS

Because extended cospans have a more general notion of interface, including *internal* vertices, DPOI rewriting as presented in Section 3 needs some adjustments. This is the purpose of this section of the paper.

We do not expect internal interfaces to be preserved during rewriting: for example, when the semilattice equations are considered as rewrites. Thus, we wish a rewrite rule to be a pair of *extended* cospans of e-hypergraphs with matching *external* (but not necessarily internal) interfaces,

as follows.

$$n \rightarrow n' \rightarrow \mathcal{L} \leftarrow m' \leftarrow m \quad n \rightarrow n'' \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \leftarrow m'' \leftarrow m$$

Analogous to Section 3, observing that the following extended cospans express the same data

$$0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{L} \leftarrow n' + m'' \leftarrow n + m \quad 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \leftarrow n' + m' \leftarrow n + m$$

allows us to encode rewrite rules as extended cospans of the following form

$$\mathcal{L} \leftarrow n' + m' \leftarrow n + m \rightarrow n'' + m'' \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$$

which will fit into the DPO formalism. We make this identification throughout, without further mention.

REMARK 3. *There is a limitation of extended DPOI rewriting as defined in this section: it is unable to express rewriting for rules whose source or target contain a maximal connected sub-hypergraph with no input and output vertices. While we believe this limitation can be overcome, we find the technical development to be significantly simpler if we simply avoid consideration of such sub-hypergraphs. For this reason, in the remainder of the paper we consider signatures which can not result in construction of terms with type $0 \rightarrow 0$, thus restricting possible e-hypergraphs to those without such problematic edges.*

Before introducing our definition of *extended* DPOI rewriting, we must modify the definition of boundary complement to guarantee that rewriting yields a monogamous directed acyclic e-hypergraph. First, we introduce the notion of a *down-closed* graph, which will be necessary for the subsequent development.

Definition 5.1 (Down-closed subgraph). We call a sub-e-hypergraph \mathcal{G} of \mathcal{H} *down-closed* if for all $e \in E_{\mathcal{G}}$, all children of e are also in \mathcal{G} .

Definition 5.2 (Extended boundary complement). For MDA cospans

$$i \rightarrow i' \rightarrow \mathcal{L} \leftarrow j' \leftarrow j \quad \text{and} \quad n \rightarrow n' \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \leftarrow k' \leftarrow k$$

and mono $m : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ in $\text{EHyp}(\Sigma)$, a pushout complement $i + j \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ as depicted in the square below

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{L} & \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{[f'_{int}, g'_{int}]} i' + j' \xleftarrow{[f'_{ext}, g'_{ext}]} i + j \\ \downarrow [c_1, c_2] \end{array} & \\
 \downarrow m & & \\
 \mathcal{G} & \xleftarrow{l} \mathcal{L}^{\perp} & \\
 & \begin{array}{c} \swarrow [g_{int}, h_{int}] \\ \searrow [g_{ext}, h_{ext}] \end{array} & \\
 & n + k & \\
 & \uparrow [d_1, d_2] &
 \end{array}$$

is a *boundary complement* if

- (1) $m(\mathcal{L})$ is a convex down-closed e-hypergraph;
- (2) $[c_1, c_2]$ is mono;
- (3) for all v, w in \mathcal{G} in the image of $i + j$, v and w share the same set of parents, and either v, w are top-level or else $v \smile w$;
- (4) for all v, w in \mathcal{L}^{\perp} in the image of $i + j$, v and w share the same set of parents, and either v, w are top-level or else $v \smile w$;
- (5) there exist $d_1 : n \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^{\perp}$ and $d_2 : k \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^{\perp}$ making the above triangle commute; and

- (6) if the image of \mathcal{L} 's external interfaces under m consists exclusively of top-level vertices of \mathcal{G} then there exists a *well-typed* extended mda-cospan

$$n + j \xrightarrow{f_1 + id_j} n' \setminus (i' \setminus i) + j \xrightarrow{[g_1, c_2]} \mathcal{L}^\perp \xleftarrow{[g_2, c_1]} k' \setminus (j' \setminus j) + i \xleftarrow{f_2 + id_i} k + i$$

- (7) if the image of \mathcal{L} 's external interfaces under m consists exclusively of not top-level vertices of \mathcal{G} then there exists a *not necessarily well-typed* extended mda-cospan

$$n \xrightarrow{f_1} n' \setminus (i' \setminus i) + j \xrightarrow{[g_1, c_2]} \mathcal{L}^\perp \xleftarrow{[g_2, c_1]} k' \setminus (j' \setminus j) + i \xleftarrow{f_2} k$$

where f_i and g_i are defined as follows. The strictly internal interface $i' \setminus i$ of \mathcal{L} is mapped to the internal interface n' of \mathcal{G} , since \mathcal{L} is a down-closed subgraph of \mathcal{G} , inducing an identification of $i' \setminus i$ in n' . Then map f_1 is given by g_{ext} with its codomain restricted to $n' \setminus (i' \setminus i)$.¹ The map g_1 is derived from the restriction of g_{int} to type $n' \setminus (i' \setminus i) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ by further observing that \mathcal{L}^\perp can be identified within \mathcal{G} – and in particular has the internal interface n' of \mathcal{G} minus $i' \setminus i$. The maps f_2 and g_2 are defined similarly.


Intuitively the above definition means that when the occurrence of \mathcal{L} within \mathcal{G} is top-level then \mathcal{L} 's external interfaces become the part of \mathcal{L}^\perp 's external interfaces and when the occurrence is nested, those interfaces become the part of \mathcal{L}^\perp 's strict internal interfaces. In both cases when removing the occurrence of \mathcal{L} from \mathcal{G} , \mathcal{L} 's strict internal interfaces are removed from strict internal interfaces of \mathcal{G} to form internal interfaces of the corresponding mda-cospans above. The morphisms are then constructed correspondingly to require that inputs (respectively, outputs) of \mathcal{R} are glued to the outputs (respectively, inputs) of \mathcal{L}^\perp .

Note that, in the above definition, the extended cospan

$$n \rightarrow n' \setminus (i' \setminus i) + j \xrightarrow{[g_1, c_2]} \mathcal{L}^\perp \xleftarrow{[g_2, c_1]} k' \setminus (j' \setminus j) + i \leftarrow k$$

is not necessarily well-typed. This is because its input internal interface may contain vertices that previously were a part of the output internal interface and vice versa.

REMARK 4. *The boundary complement conditions, in particular, prohibit finding a match for \mathcal{L} in \mathcal{G} , below.*



We are now ready to define *convex extended DPOI (EDPOI) rewriting* for $\mathbf{EHyp}(\Sigma)$. It is analogous to Definition 3.10, except we must construct internal interfaces explicitly. More precisely, when removing the occurrence of \mathcal{L} from \mathcal{G} , *i.e.*, by computing the pushout complement, the internal interfaces of the resulting e-hypergraph should be modified to *exclude* the vertices corresponding to \mathcal{L} 's strictly internal interfaces (since the vertices they map to have been removed). Then, when gluing \mathcal{R} into the hole, the internal interfaces of the resulting e-hypergraph should be modified to *include* the strictly internal interfaces of \mathcal{R} (since new internal interfaces for them to map to have been added).

¹Noting the image of g_{ext} indeed lies within $n' \setminus (i' \setminus i)$

Definition 5.3 (Convex EDPOI rewriting). Given an extended span of morphisms

$$\mathcal{G} \leftarrow n' + k' \leftarrow n + k \rightarrow n'' + k'' \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$$

in $\mathbf{EHyp}(\Sigma)$, we say \mathcal{G} rewrites (convexly) to \mathcal{H} (with external interface $n + k$ and taking internal interface $n' + k'$ to $n'' + k''$) – denoted by $\mathcal{G} \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ – via a rewrite rule

$$\mathcal{L} \leftarrow i' + j' \leftarrow i + j \rightarrow i'' + j'' \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$$

if there exists an object C and morphisms which complete the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{L} & \leftarrow i' + j' & \leftarrow i + j & \rightarrow i'' + j'' & \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \\
 \downarrow m & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{G} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & C & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{H} \\
 & \swarrow n' + k' & \uparrow n + k & \searrow n'' + k'' & \nearrow [f_1, f_2]
 \end{array}$$

such that the two marked squares are pushouts and the following conditions hold:

- (1) $i + j \rightarrow C \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ is a boundary complement;
- (2) the internal interfaces of \mathcal{H} are such that:

$$n'' = n' \setminus (i' \setminus i) + (i'' \setminus i) \quad k'' = k' \setminus (j' \setminus j) + (j'' \setminus j)$$

- (3) the map $f_1 = [g_1, h_1] : n'' \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ in the diagram above consists of g_1 as defined in Definition 5.2 of boundary complement, and h_1 which is the restriction of the composite $i'' \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ to $i'' \setminus i$, and similarly for the map $f_2 : k'' \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$.

Given a set \mathfrak{R} of EDPOI rewrite rules and e-hypergraphs with extended interfaces \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} , we write $\mathcal{G} \Rightarrow_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{H}$ if there exists a EDPOI rewrite in \mathfrak{R} such that via it \mathcal{G} rewrites to \mathcal{H} , and we write $\mathcal{G} \Rightarrow_{\mathfrak{R}}^* \mathcal{H}$ if there exists a sequence of such rewrites.


With our modified definition of extended DPOI rewriting in hand, we proceed to prove that our combinatorial representation of semilattice-enriched SMCs is sound and complete in an appropriate sense.

6 SOUNDNESS AND COMPLETENESS

This section contains the main technical results of the paper, building on those of [4]. We first construct an interpretation of terms generating $\mathbf{PROP}^+(\Sigma)$ in $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$. As expected, the SMC equations are factored out in our representation of terms in $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$, but the semilattice equations are not. Instead, we implement the semilattice equations via EDPOI rewrites, leading to the following soundness and completeness result: for any morphisms f and g in $\mathbf{SMT}(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$, $f = g$ if and only if there exists a sequence of EDPOI-rewrites – each induced by either a structural semilattice equation or \mathcal{E} – between their combinatorial representations.

Recall from Section 4 that $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$ has a symmetric monoidal structure inherited from the coproduct structure of $\mathbf{EHypI}(\Sigma)$. Recall further that typed Σ^+ -terms are those categorical combinator terms freely constructed from generators $c \in \Sigma$, id_1 , $\sigma_{1,1}$, $(;)$ and \otimes , and $f + g$. We will write $\Sigma^+(n, m)$ for the set of Σ^+ -terms of type $n \rightarrow m$.

We wish to specify a set of EDPOI rewrite rules corresponding to those in Figure 3. In order to do this, we specify a function which maps uninterpreted Σ^+ -terms into $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$ morphisms,

Fig. 6. $+$ of two morphisms in $\mathbf{EHypI}(\Sigma)$

and which also extends the expected interpretation of Σ -terms in $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$ (as given by the free functor from $\mathbf{PROP}(\Sigma)$ induced by the interpretation of Σ as itself, detailed in [4]).

Definition 6.1 (Interpretation function). Let $\llbracket - \rrbracket_{n,m} : \Sigma^+(n, m) \rightarrow \mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)(n, m)$ be the function defined by induction on the type derivation of Σ -terms by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket \text{id} \rrbracket_{n,m} &= \text{id} & \llbracket f; g \rrbracket_{n,m} &= \llbracket f \rrbracket_{n,m}; \llbracket g \rrbracket_{n,m} \\
 \llbracket I \rrbracket_{n,m} &= I & \llbracket f \otimes g \rrbracket_{n,m} &= \llbracket f \rrbracket_{n,m}^+ \otimes \llbracket g \rrbracket_{n,m} \\
 \llbracket \text{sym} \rrbracket_{n,m} &= \text{sym} & \llbracket c \rrbracket_{n,m} &= c \\
 \llbracket f + g \rrbracket_{n,m} &= \llbracket f \rrbracket_{n,m} + \llbracket g \rrbracket_{n,m}
 \end{aligned}$$

where $c \in \Sigma$ and $+$ in $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$ is defined by Figure 6. It uses the notation of dashed boxes for hierarchical edges, with its children drawn inside, and maximally consistent components separated by another dashed line. We will omit the subscripts in $\llbracket - \rrbracket_{n,m}$ where it is clear from context. The definitions of the right-hand sides of the base cases above can be found in [3] that defines the corresponding cospans of hypergraphs. One can then get extended cospans by following 2.

In order to phrase our soundness and completeness results categorically, we define the following quotient of $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$ by EDPOI rewrites. This means that soundness is expressed as the extension of $\llbracket - \rrbracket$ to a semilattice-enriched SMC functor from $\mathbf{SMT}^+(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$, and completeness is expressed as the faithfulness of this functor. In fact, we prove that the functor is also full, giving an equivalence of categories.

We define the appropriate notion of quotient by EDPOI rewrites below. Given a set of equations \mathcal{E} of Σ^+ -terms, $\llbracket \mathcal{E} \rrbracket$ is defined as $\{\langle \llbracket l \rrbracket, \llbracket r \rrbracket \rangle \text{ for each } l = r \in \mathcal{E}\} \cup \{\langle \llbracket r \rrbracket, \llbracket l \rrbracket \rangle \text{ for each } l = r \in \mathcal{E}\}$.

Definition 6.2 (Quotient by rewrites). Given a set of equations \mathcal{E} , we denote by $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)/\mathcal{E}$ the category $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$ quotiented by the following relation.

$$f \sim g \quad \text{if} \quad f \cong_{\llbracket \mathcal{E} \rrbracket}^* g.$$

Note that not all pushouts (or pushout complements) in $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$ are guaranteed to exist: however, pushouts (and pushout complements) for rewrites generated from Σ -equations and those generated from the semilattice equations on Σ^+ -terms do exist [B.1](#). Let \mathcal{S} be the set equations of [Figure 3](#), *i.e.*, the semilattice equations over Σ^+ -terms. Then we have the following result.

PROPOSITION 6.3 (SOUNDNESS). *The category $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)/\mathcal{S}$ is a semilattice-enriched PROP.*

Note that the symmetric monoidal equations are absorbed in the hypergraph representation, but the semilattice equations are covered by the fact we have quotiented our representation by certain rewrites.

The reason for calling the previous result *soundness* is that the interpretation function on Σ^+ -terms induces a semilattice-enriched SMC functor $\llbracket - \rrbracket : \mathbf{PROP}^+(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)/\mathcal{S}$, which further induces the following semilattice-enriched SMC functor, for a set of equations \mathcal{E} :

$$\llbracket - \rrbracket_{\mathcal{E}} : \mathbf{SMT}^+(\Sigma, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)/\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}$$

which by uniqueness must be the free semilattice-enriched functor from $\mathbf{SMT}^+(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$ induced by the interpretation of Σ as itself. Unfolding definitions, it follows that

$$f = g \quad \Rightarrow \quad \llbracket f \rrbracket \cong_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}}^* \llbracket g \rrbracket.$$

Note that it is immediate from the previous result that $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)/\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}$ is indeed a semilattice-enriched PROP.

The equations of [Figure 3](#) – excepting the commutativity equation – can all be directed from left to right way to form a terminating rewrite system, which results in a cospan in *weak normal form*.

PROPOSITION 6.4 (WEAK NORMAL FORM). *For each cospan f in $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)/\mathcal{S}$ there is a weak normal form such that*

$$f = f_1 + \dots + f_n$$

such that each f_i contains no hierarchical edges, and for all $i \neq j$ we have $f_i \neq f_j$.

The proof follows the familiar argument (*i.e.*, termination of distributivity rewrites) that Σ^+ -terms can be rewritten via the semilattice-enrichment equations into a similar normal form.

This normal form can be used to prove the main theorem of the paper: the (full) completeness of our combinatorial representation of $\mathbf{SMT}^+(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$.

THEOREM 6.5 (FULL COMPLETENESS). *We have the following equivalence of categories*

$$\mathbf{SMT}^+(\Sigma, \mathcal{E}) \cong \mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)/\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}.$$

PROOF. The equivalence is given by the functor $\llbracket - \rrbracket$. First, note that the functor is surjective on objects, so it suffices to prove the functor is both full and faithful. In each case, the result follows by a normal form argument in combination with relying on the equivalence $(*)$ $\mathbf{SMT}(\Sigma, \mathcal{E}) \cong \mathbf{MHypI}(\Sigma)/\mathcal{E}$ of symmetric monoidal theories and (appropriately quotiented) plain mda-cospans which is given by the obvious restriction of $\llbracket - \rrbracket$ to $\mathbf{SMT}(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$; see [Theorem 35 of \[4\]](#).

To see that the functor is faithful, we prove that $f \neq g$ in $\mathbf{SMT}^+(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$ implies $\llbracket f \rrbracket \neq \llbracket g \rrbracket$. First, calculate weak normal form Σ^+ -terms of f and g as $f_1 + \dots + f_n$ and $g_1 + \dots + g_m$, respectively. Applying the functor $\llbracket - \rrbracket$, we thus have that

$$\llbracket f \rrbracket = \llbracket f_1 \rrbracket + \dots + \llbracket f_n \rrbracket \quad \llbracket g \rrbracket = \llbracket g_1 \rrbracket + \dots + \llbracket g_m \rrbracket.$$

Observe that $\llbracket f_1 \rrbracket + \dots + \llbracket f_n \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket g_1 \rrbracket + \dots + \llbracket g_m \rrbracket$ are weak normal forms. Suppose $n \leq m$ and assume for contradiction that $\llbracket f \rrbracket = \llbracket g \rrbracket$. This implies that for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ there exists a family of $\{j_k\}_i$ such that $\llbracket f_i \rrbracket = \sum_{\{j_k\}_i} \llbracket g_{j_k} \rrbracket$ and such that $\sum_{i=1}^n (\sum_{j_k \in \{j_k\}_i} \llbracket g_{j_k} \rrbracket) = \llbracket g \rrbracket$ and by (*) that

$$f_i = \sum_{\{j_k\}_i} g_{j_k} \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^n f_i = g. \text{ Therefore, } f \neq g \text{ implies } \llbracket f \rrbracket \neq \llbracket g \rrbracket.$$

To see that the functor is full, consider a morphism f in $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$. We can find an equivalent weak normal form $f_1 + \dots + f_n$, where each f_i contains no hierarchical edges. By (*) we can find morphisms g_i in $\mathbf{SMT}(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$ such that $\llbracket g_i \rrbracket = f_i$. Thus, we can construct a morphism $g_1 + \dots + g_n$ such that $\llbracket g_1 + \dots + g_n \rrbracket = \llbracket g_1 \rrbracket + \dots + \llbracket g_n \rrbracket = f_1 + \dots + f_n$, as required. \square

Unfolding the definitions, we can spell out the previous theorem in terms of EDPOI-rewriting.

COROLLARY 6.6 (COMPLETENESS OF REWRITING). *For any $f, g \in \mathbf{SMT}^+(\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$, we have*

$$f = g \iff \llbracket f \rrbracket \cong_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}}^* \llbracket g \rrbracket.$$

Note that in string diagram rewrite theory as developed in [4], some extra steps are taken to prove the claim that $f \rightsquigarrow g$ if and only if $\llbracket f \rrbracket \cong_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}}^* \llbracket g \rrbracket$, for an appropriate definition of Σ -term rewriting \rightsquigarrow . We omit this extra detail for brevity and clarity, dealing with equational theories rather than rewrite theories, but it is straightforward to extend our results to prove an analogous claim.

7 CONCLUSION

We have seen how e-graphs over algebraic theories can be expressed in terms of Cartesian categories enriched over the category of semilattices. In fact, e-graphs are an instance of a more general construction that can account for monoidal theories in terms of SMCs, similarly enriched. Having described a translation of e-graphs into this categorical framework, a combinatorial representation of morphisms in the free category is also provided. As expected, this representation factors out the structural SMC equations, while remaining sensitive to the complexity-relevant equations induced by the enrichment. The design of such a representation and its corresponding rewrite theory proved to be delicate, and, together with its proof of completeness, constitute the main technical contributions of the paper.

In the future, we intend to investigate a number of natural extensions to mathematical treatment of (acyclic) e-graphs developed here. Some of the extensions that can be considered are: support for ‘functorial boxes’ [28] (in addition to e-boxes), which have a variety of applications, including the Cartesian-closure required for the implementation of functional programming languages [17], as sketched in Fig. 7(a); the ‘spiders’ used by the ZX-calculus to model quantum circuits [9, 13], as sketched in Fig. 7(b); or trace [24, 29] which can be used to express feedback in categorical models of digital circuits [18, 20] and, indeed in conventional e-graphs to encode infinite equivalence classes, as sketched in Fig. 8. All these application domains stand to benefit from the use of optimisation techniques, which in turn can take advantage of the appropriate e-graph technique.

In each case above, we aim to combine our combinatorial representation with existing combinatorial representations of the relevant structure. Indeed, the hypergraph representation and DPO-rewriting theory of each case is already well-studied independently of any e-graph structure [1, 19]. Finally, a term calculus (e-terms) can be reverse engineered from the string-diagram notation [2, 21]. Although term calculi are less important in the algorithmics of optimisation, they still play a role in specification and in aiding readability.




Fig. 7. E-(hyper)graphs for functorial boxes and the ZX-calculus




Fig. 8. E-graphs with cycles and e-hypergraphs with trace

REFERENCES

- [1] ALVAREZ-PICALLO, M., GHICA, D. R., SPRUNGER, D., AND ZANASI, F. Functorial string diagrams for reverse-mode automatic differentiation. In *31st EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2023, February 13-16, 2023, Warsaw, Poland (2023)*, B. Klin and E. Pimentel, Eds., vol. 252 of *LIPICs*, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, pp. 6:1–6:20.
- [2] BARRETT, C., HEIJLTJES, W., AND MCCUSKER, G. The functional machine calculus II: semantics. In *31st EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2023, February 13-16, 2023, Warsaw, Poland (2023)*, vol. 252 of *LIPICs*, pp. 10:1–10:18.
- [3] BONCHI, F., GADDUCCI, F., KISSINGER, A., SOBOCINSKI, P., AND ZANASI, F. String diagram rewrite theory i: Rewriting with Frobenius structure. *J. ACM* 69, 2 (mar 2022).
- [4] BONCHI, F., GADDUCCI, F., KISSINGER, A., SOBOCINSKI, P., AND ZANASI, F. String diagram rewrite theory ii: Rewriting with symmetric monoidal structure. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 32, 4 (2022), 511–541.
- [5] BONCHI, F., GADDUCCI, F., KISSINGER, A., SOBOCINSKI, P., AND ZANASI, F. String diagram rewrite theory III: Confluence with and without Frobenius. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* (June 2022), 1–41.
- [6] BONCHI, F., GIORGIO, A. D., AND SANTAMARIA, A. Tape diagrams for rig categories with finite biproducts.
- [7] BRUNI, R., GADDUCCI, F., AND LLUCH-LAFUENTE, A. An algebra of hierarchical graphs and its application to structural encoding. *Sci. Ann. Comput. Sci.* 20 (2010), 53–96.
- [8] COCCIA, M., GADDUCCI, F., AND MONTANARI, U. Gs.lambdas theories: A syntax for higher-order graphs. In *Category Theory and Computer Science, CTCS 2002, Ottawa, Canada, August 15-17, 2002 (2002)*, R. Blute and P. Selinger, Eds., vol. 69 of *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, Elsevier, pp. 83–100.
- [9] COECKE, B., AND DUNCAN, R. Interacting quantum observables: categorical algebra and diagrammatics. *New Journal of Physics* 13, 4 (apr 2011), 043016.
- [10] COECKE, B., GREFENSTETTE, E., AND SADRZADEH, M. Lambek vs. lambek: Functorial vector space semantics and string diagrams for Lambek calculus. *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.* 164, 11 (2013), 1079–1100.
- [11] DREWES, F., HOFFMANN, B., AND PLUMP, D. Hierarchical graph transformation. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 64, 2 (2002), 249–283.
- [12] DUNCAN, R. *Generalised Proof-Nets for Compact Categories with Biproducts*. Cambridge University Press, 2009. Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0903.5154>.

- [13] DUNCAN, R., KISSINGER, A., PERDRIX, S., AND VAN DE WETERING, J. Graph-theoretic Simplification of Quantum Circuits with the ZX-calculus. *Quantum* 4 (June 2020), 279.
- [14] FLATT, O., COWARD, S., WILLSEY, M., TATLOCK, Z., AND PANCHEKHA, P. Small Proofs from Congruence Closure. pp. 75–83. Accepted: 2022-10-12T10:02:40Z.
- [15] FONG, B., AND SPIVAK, D. I. Seven sketches in compositionality: An invitation to applied category theory, 2018.
- [16] FOX, T. Coalgebras and cartesian categories. *Communications in Algebra* 4, 7 (1976), 665–667.
- [17] GHICA, D., AND ZANASI, F. Hierarchical string diagrams and applications, May 2023. arXiv:2305.18945 [cs, math].
- [18] GHICA, D. R., JUNG, A., AND LOPEZ, A. Diagrammatic semantics for digital circuits. In *26th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2017, August 20-24, 2017, Stockholm, Sweden* (2017), V. Goranko and M. Dam, Eds., vol. 82 of *LIPICs*, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, pp. 24:1–24:16.
- [19] GHICA, D. R., AND KAYE, G. Rewriting Modulo Traced Comonoid Structure. In *8th International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction (FSCD 2023)* (Dagstuhl, Germany, 2023), M. Gaboardi and F. van Raamsdonk, Eds., vol. 260 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPICs)*, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, pp. 14:1–14:21. ISSN: 1868-8969.
- [20] GHICA, D. R., KAYE, G., AND SPRUNGER, D. A compositional theory of digital circuits, Feb. 2023. arXiv:2201.10456 [cs, math].
- [21] GHICA, D. R., AND LOPEZ, A. A structural and nominal syntax for diagrams. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 266 (Feb. 2018), 71–83.
- [22] GHICA, D. R., MUROYA, K., AND AMBRIDGE, T. W. Local reasoning for robust observational equivalence. *CoRR abs/1907.01257* (2019).
- [23] GRIGGIO, A., AND RUNGTA, N. Proceedings of the 22nd Conference on Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design – FMCAD 2022. Publisher: TU Wien.
- [24] JOYAL, A., AND STREET, R. The geometry of tensor calculus, I. *Advances in Mathematics* 88, 1 (July 1991), 55–112.
- [25] KOEHLER, T., TRINDER, P., AND STEUWER, M. Sketch-guided equality saturation: Scaling equality saturation to complex optimizations of functional programs, 2022.
- [26] LÖWE, M., CORRADINI, A., MONTANARI, U., ROSSI, F., EHRIG, H., HECKEL, R., AND OWE, M. Algebraic approaches to graph transformation, part i: Basic concepts and double pushout approach. *Handbook of Graph Grammars and Computing by Graph Transformation* 1 (08 1996).
- [27] MACLANE, S. *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5.
- [28] MELLIÈS, P.-A. Functorial Boxes in String Diagrams. In *Computer Science Logic* (Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006), Z. Ésik, Ed., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, pp. 1–30.
- [29] NAKATA, K., AND HASEGAWA, M. Small-step and big-step semantics for call-by-need. *Journal of Functional Programming* 19, 6 (2009), 699–722.
- [30] NELSON, C. G. *Techniques for program verification*. Stanford University, 1980.
- [31] PALACZ, W. Algebraic hierarchical graph transformation. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 68, 3 (2004), 497–520.
- [32] SELINGER, P. *A Survey of Graphical Languages for Monoidal Categories*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010, p. 289–355.
- [33] SINGHER, E., AND ITZHAKY, S. Colored e-graph: Equality reasoning with conditions, 2023.
- [34] TATE, R., STEPP, M., TATLOCK, Z., AND LERNER, S. Equality saturation: A new approach to optimization. *SIGPLAN Not.* 44, 1 (jan 2009), 264–276.
- [35] WAZNI, H., LO, K. I., MCPHEAT, L., AND SADRZADEH, M. A Quantum Natural Language Processing Approach to Pronoun Resolution, Aug. 2022. arXiv:2208.05393 [cs].
- [36] WILLSEY, M., NANDI, C., WANG, Y. R., FLATT, O., TATLOCK, Z., AND PANCHEKHA, P. Egg: Fast and extensible equality saturation. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 5, POPL (jan 2021).
- [37] ZHANG, Y., WANG, Y. R., WILLSEY, M., AND TATLOCK, Z. Relational e-matching. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 6, POPL (Jan. 2022), 1–22.

A PROOFS FOR SECTION 4: E-HYPERGRAPHS

In this section we will define the conditions under which the pushout in $\text{EHyp}(\Sigma)$ exists and we will explicitly construct such a pushout. We will also show the uniqueness of a boundary pushout complement. These condition will play a crucial role in showing that for each enrichment equation in $\text{PROP}^+(\Sigma)$ there is a sequence of rewrites in $\text{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$.

PROPOSITION A.1. Two cospans in $\mathbf{Hyp}(\Sigma)$ (i.e., morphisms in $\mathbf{HypI}(\Sigma)$) $n \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{G} \xleftarrow{g} m$ and $n \xrightarrow{f'} \mathcal{G}' \xleftarrow{g'} m$ are equal if and only if the following two cospans $\mathbf{EHyp}(\Sigma)$ (i.e. morphisms in $\mathbf{EHypI}(\Sigma)$)

$$\begin{array}{c} n \xrightarrow{f_{ext}} n \xrightarrow{f_{int}} \mathcal{G} \xleftarrow{g_{int}} m \xleftarrow{g_{ext}} m \\ n \xrightarrow{f'_{ext}} n \xrightarrow{f'_{int}} \mathcal{G}' \xleftarrow{g'_{int}} m \xleftarrow{g'_{ext}} m \end{array}$$

such that $f = f_{ext}; f_{int}, f' = f'_{ext}; f'_{int}$ (respectively, $g = g_{ext}; g_{int}, g' = g'_{ext}; g'_{int}$) are equal.

This essentially means that $\mathbf{HypI}(\Sigma)$ faithfully embeds into $\mathbf{EHypI}(\Sigma)$.

PROOF. Recall that cospans are equal when they are isomorphic. The proposition means that the following cospans are isomorphic (where α is an isomorphism)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{G} & \\ f \nearrow & \downarrow \alpha & \nwarrow g \\ n & & m \\ f' \searrow & & \swarrow g' \\ & \mathcal{G}' & \end{array}$$

if and only if the following cospans are isomorphic

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & n & \xrightarrow{f_{int}} & \mathcal{G} & \xleftarrow{g_{int}} & m \\ f_{ext} \nearrow & & \downarrow \beta & & \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \gamma \\ n & & & & & & m \\ f'_{ext} \searrow & & n & \xrightarrow{f'_{int}} & \mathcal{G}' & \xleftarrow{g'_{int}} & m \\ & & & & & & \end{array}$$

such that $f = f_{ext}; f_{int}, f' = f'_{ext}; f'_{int}$ (respectively, $g = g_{ext}; g_{int}, g' = g'_{ext}; g'_{int}$). The direction from right to left is straightforward: since the bottom diagram commutes $f; \alpha = f_{int}; f_{ext}; \alpha = f'_{int}; f'_{ext} = f'$ and similarly for g .

Let's show the direction from left to right. Note that f_{ext} and f'_{ext} have inverses since they are injective and surjective (the injection is per the definition and surjection is because domain and codomain are equal). Then we need $f_{ext}; \beta = f'_{ext}$ and we define $\beta = f_{ext}^{-1}; f'_{ext}$. Similarly $\beta^{-1} = f'_{ext}^{-1}; f_{ext}$. We can check that $\beta^{-1}; \beta = f'_{ext}^{-1}; f_{ext}; f_{ext}^{-1}; f'_{ext} = f'_{ext}^{-1}; id; f_{ext} = f'_{ext}^{-1}; f_{ext} = id$. Then we have that $f_{ext}; \beta; f'_{int} = f_{ext}; f_{ext}^{-1}; f'_{ext}; f'_{int} = f'_{ext}; f'_{int} = f' = f; \alpha = f_{ext}; f_{int}; \alpha$. Since f_{ext} is surjective, we have $\beta; f'_{int} = f_{int}; \alpha$. Analogously for β^{-1} and the right-hand sides of the diagrams. \square

A.1 Existence of pushout

In constructing the pushout the functional versions of e-hypergraph relations will be useful.

REMARK 5. Both $<$ and \smile can be considered as (partial) functions defined on $V_{\mathcal{F}} + E_{\mathcal{F}}$, i.e., on the coproduct of vertices and edges. To make things well-typed, we will use corresponding coproduct injections $\iota_V : V_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow V_{\mathcal{F}} + E_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\iota_E : E_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow V_{\mathcal{F}} + E_{\mathcal{F}}$ when passing either a vertex or an edge into these functions. For example, an immediate successor of a vertex x can be written functionally as $<_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_{\mathcal{F}}}(x))$.

REMARK 6. Using functional notation we can reformulate the notion of a homomorphism between two e-hypergraphs in the following way.

Definition A.2. A homomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ of e-hypergraphs \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} is a pair of functions $\phi_V : V_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow V_{\mathcal{G}}, \phi_E : E_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow E_{\mathcal{G}}$ such that

- (1) ϕ is hypergraph homomorphism.
- (2) When x is not a top-level vertex,

$$\phi_E(\langle_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_{\mathcal{F}}}(x))) = \langle_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mu} (\phi_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}(x))$$

and

$$\phi_E(\langle_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu} (\iota_{E_{\mathcal{F}}}(x))) = \langle_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mu} (\phi_E; \iota_{E_{\mathcal{G}}}(x))$$

when x is a not top-level edge.

- (3) When $x \in E_{\mathcal{F}}$

$$[\phi_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}, \phi_E; \iota_{E_{\mathcal{G}}}]^*(\neg_{\mathcal{F}}(\iota_{E_{\mathcal{F}}}(x))) \subseteq \neg_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi_E; \iota_{E_{\mathcal{G}}}(x))$$

where $\phi_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}} : V_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow V_{\mathcal{G}} + E_{\mathcal{G}}$, and similarly for $\phi_E; \iota_{E_{\mathcal{G}}}$ so that $[\phi_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}, \phi_E; \iota_{E_{\mathcal{G}}}] : V_{\mathcal{F}} + E_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow V_{\mathcal{G}} + E_{\mathcal{G}}$.

- (4) When $x \in V_{\mathcal{F}}$

$$[\phi_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}, \phi_E; \iota_{E_{\mathcal{G}}}]^*(\neg_{\mathcal{F}}(\iota_{V_{\mathcal{F}}}(x))) \subseteq \neg_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}(x)).$$

THEOREM A.3 (EXISTENCE OF PUSHOUTS IN \mathbf{EHyp}_{Σ}). Consider the following span in \mathbf{EHyp}_{Σ}

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ g \downarrow & & \\ Y & & \end{array}$$

such that

- (1) Z is a discrete e-hypergraph.
- (2) $[f_V(v_i)] = [f_V(v_j)]$ and $[g_V(v_i)] = [g_V(v_j)]$ for all v_i, v_j in V_Z .
- (3) If $[f_V(v)] \neq \emptyset$ then $[g_V(v)] = \emptyset$ and if $[g_V(v)] \neq \emptyset$ then $[f_V(v)] = \emptyset$.
- (4) $\neg(f_V(v_i)) = \neg(f_V(v_j))$ and $\neg(g_V(v_i)) = \neg(g_V(v_j))$ for all v_i, v_j in V_Z .

then the pushout $X +_{f,g} Y$ exists.

PROOF. Consider the diagram below.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Z & \xrightarrow{f} & X & & \\ g \downarrow & & \downarrow \iota_1 / \sim R & & \\ Y & \xrightarrow{\iota_2 / \sim R} & X + Y / \sim R & & \\ & & \downarrow u & & \\ & & Q & & \end{array}$$

j_1 (curved arrow from X to Q)
 j_2 (curved arrow from Y to Q)

Then, the pushout of e-hypergraphs X and Y is computed in two steps. First, a coproduct of $X + Y$ is computed which is

$$X + Y = \{V_X + V_Y, E_X + E_Y, s_{X+Y}, t_{X+Y}, \neg_{X+Y}, \langle_{X+Y}\}$$

where $s_{X+Y} : E_X + E_Y \rightarrow (V_X + V_Y)^*$ which can be defined as a copairing $[s'_X, s'_Y] : E_X + E_Y \rightarrow (V_X + V_Y)^*$ and $s'_X : E_X \rightarrow (V_X + V_Y)^*$, $s'_Y : E_Y \rightarrow (V_X + V_Y)^*$ defined as $s'_X = s_X; \iota_{1,V}^*$ and $s'_Y = s_Y; \iota_{2,V}^*$ where ι_1, ι_2 are corresponding coproduct injections, similarly for $t_{X+Y}, <_{X+Y}, \smile_{X+Y}$. We will omit labels as they are irrelevant to pushout construction. Consider relations

$$\begin{aligned} S_V &= \{(x_i, y_j) \in (V_X + V_Y) \times (V_X + V_Y) \mid \exists z \in V_Z . x_i = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z) \text{ and} \\ &\quad y_j = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z) \text{ where } x_i \in V_X \text{ and } y_j \in V_Y\} \\ &\cup \{(y_j, x_i) \in (V_X + V_Y) \times (V_X + V_Y) \mid \exists z \in V_Z . x_i = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z) \text{ and} \\ &\quad y_j = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z) \text{ where } x_i \in V_X \text{ and } y_j \in V_Y\} \\ &\cup \{(x, x) \text{ where } x \in V_X + V_Y\} \\ S_E &= \{(x, x) \text{ where } x \in E_X + E_Y\} \end{aligned}$$

and let relations R_V, R_E be their transitive closures respectively.

We then quotient the set vertices and edges in $X + Y$ by R_V and R_E respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} X + Y / \sim_{(R_V, R_E)} &= \{V_X + V_Y / \sim_{(R_V, R_E)}, E_X + E_Y / \sim_{(R_V, R_E)}, s_{X+Y} / \sim_{(R_V, R_E)}, \\ &\quad t_{X,Y} / \sim_{(R_V, R_E)}, \smile_{X+Y} / \sim_{(R_V, R_E)}, <_{X+Y} / \sim_{(R_V, R_E)}\} \end{aligned}$$

We will refer to $\sim_{(R_V, R_E)}$ just as \sim , e.g., by writing $V_X + V_Y / \sim$ and concrete relation will be clear from the context. Where necessary we will refer to S_V and S_R as \sim_S . We have

$$s_{X+Y} / \sim : E_X + E_Y / \sim \rightarrow (V_X + V_Y / \sim)^*$$

and there is an obvious surjective function $[-]_V : (V_X + V_Y) \rightarrow (V_X + V_Y / \sim)$ that maps elements to their equivalence classes and $[-]_V^*$ is its extension to sequences. There is also $[-] : E_X + E_Y \rightarrow E_X + E_Y / \sim$ and we will omit subscripts as the correct type will be clear from the argument. We then define

$$s_{X+Y} / \sim([e]) = s_{X+Y}; [-]^*(e) = [s_{X+Y}(e)]^*$$

We will also use subscripts when it is important to tell if an element of $E_X + E_Y$ has a pre-image in either E_X or E_Y by writing e_x or e_y . Similarly, we will write v_x to refer to a vertex with a pre-image in V_X . Likewise,

$$t_{X+Y} / \sim([e]) = [t_{X+Y}(e)]^*$$

These definitions make $([\]_V, [\]_E)$ automatically a homomorphism with respect to source and target maps. These maps are also automatically well-defined functions since $[e_1] = [e_2]$ implies $e_1 = e_2$ since the mappings for edges are mono.

Recall that $<$ is essentially a transitive closure of $<^\mu$ and hence we can first define

$$<_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{E_X + E_Y} / \sim [e])$$

and

$$<_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X + V_Y} / \sim [u])$$

where t_* are injections into $V_X + V_Y / \sim + E_X + E_Y / \sim$. We will consider several cases. First, assume that u is an element of V_{X+Y} and

- (1) If there exists v such that $<_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X + V_Y}(v))$ is defined and $u \sim v$ we let

$$<_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X + V_Y} / \sim ([u])) = [<_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X + V_Y}(v))]$$

- (2) u has no pre-image in V_Z and $<_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X + V_Y}(u))$ is undefined (i.e., $[u] = \emptyset$). If there exists v such that $<_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X + V_Y}(v)) = e'$ and such that there is an *undirected* path from $[u]$ to $[v]$, then we define

$$<_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X + V_Y} / \sim [u]) = <_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X + V_Y} / \sim [v])$$

Note that the existence of a path in the definition (2) implies that there exists $v' \sim v$ such that there is a path from u to v' and furthermore $v \neq v'$. If $v' = v$ then it would mean that $[u] \neq \emptyset$ since $[v] \neq \emptyset$ and there is a path from u to v . There is no case when u has a pre-image in V_Z and yet $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(u))$ is undefined and there exists v such that $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v)) = e$ and there is a path from $[u]$ to $[v]$. The existence of a path would mean that there is $u' \sim u$ and $v' \sim v$ such that there is a path from u' to v' and since u has a pre-image in V_Z , $u = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z_1)$. $v' \sim v$ means that both v' and v have a pre-image in V_Z (unless $v' = v$ in which case $[u'] \neq \emptyset$ as there is a path from u' to v') and since $u = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z_1)$ and $[u] = \emptyset$ $f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z) = \emptyset$ for all z . Since $[v] \neq \emptyset$ and $v' \sim v$, v is necessarily in the image of $g_V; \iota_{2,V}$ and for all z $[g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z)] \neq \emptyset$ as well as for some z' such that $u'' = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z')$ and $u'' \sim_S u$ which would mean that the case (1) is applicable to u . Similarly, when $u = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z)$.

Otherwise, we leave $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([u]))$ undefined. Now, assume that e is an element of E_{X+Y} . Consider two cases.

(1) $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{E_X+E_Y}(e)) = e'$. Then we define

$$\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{E_X+E_Y}[e]) = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{E_X+E_Y}(e))]$$

(2) $[e] = \emptyset$ and there exists v such that $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v)) = e'$ and such that there is an undirected path from $[e]$ to $[v]$, we define

$$\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{E_X+E_Y}[e]) = \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}[v])$$

Otherwise we leave $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{E_X+E_Y}([e]))$ undefined. Clearly, all the cases above are disjoint.

Let's show that the definition does not depend on a particular choice of v in (1). Suppose there exist v_1 and v_2 such that $v_1 \neq v_2$ and $[v_1] \neq \emptyset$ and $[v_2] \neq \emptyset$ and such that $u \sim v_1$ and $u \sim v_2$. Then, it must be the case that $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1)) = \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v_2))$. Consider cases.

- $u = v_1$ and $u \sim_S v_2$. Then there exists $z \in V_Z$ such that $u = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z) = v_1$ and $v_2 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z)$. Since $[v_1] \neq \emptyset$, it must be the case that $[v_2] = \emptyset$ according to assumption 3 and we get a contraction to $[v_2] \neq \emptyset$.
- $u = v_1$ and $u \sim v_2$. The latter implies that u has a pre-image in V_Z and so does v_2 . For both $[v_1] \neq \emptyset$ and $[v_2] \neq \emptyset$ they should be both in the image of $f_V; \iota_{1,V}$ or $g_V; \iota_{2,V}$ and according to assumption 2 their sets of predecessors must be equal.
- $u \sim_S v_1$ and $u \sim_S v_2$. This implies $u = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z_1) = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z_2)$ and $v_1 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z_1)$ and $v_2 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z_2)$. By assumption 2 it must be the case that $[g_V(z_1)] = [g_V(z_2)]$ which implies that $[v_1] = [v_2]$. The case when $u = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z_1)$ is symmetric.
- $u \sim v_1$ and $u \sim v_2$. Same as above, by assumption 3 both v_1 and v_2 should be in the image of $f_V; \iota_{1,V}$ or $g_V; \iota_{2,V}$ and by assumption 2 $[v_1] = [v_2]$.

Let's show that the definition does not depend on a particular choice of v in (2). Suppose, $[u] = \emptyset$ and there exist v_1 and v_2 such that $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (v_1) = e_1$ and $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (v_2) = e_2$ and $e_1 \neq e_2$ and such that there is a path from $[u]$ to $[v_1]$ and from $[u]$ to $[v_2]$. The existence of a path from $[u]$ to $[v_1]$ means that there is $v'_1 \sim v_1$ such that there is a path from u' to v'_1 and similarly for v_2 and v'_2 . We will proceed by case analysis.

- If $v_1 = v'_1$ or $v_2 = v'_2$ it means that there is a path from u to v_1 or from u to v_2 and since $[v_1] \neq \emptyset$ as well as $[v_2] \neq \emptyset$ it must be the case that $[u] \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts the assumption that $[u] = \emptyset$.
- Suppose $v_1 \sim_S v'_1$ which means there exists $z_1 \in V_Z$ such that $v_1 = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z_1)$ and $v'_1 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z_1)$ and suppose $v_2 \sim_S v'_2$ which further means there exists $z_2 \in V_Z$ such that

$v_2 = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z_2)$ and $v'_2 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z_2)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1)) &= \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (f_V; \iota_{1,V}; \iota_{V_X+V_Y}(z_1)) \\ &= \iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (f_V; \iota_{V_X}(z_1))) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v_2)) &= \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (f_V; \iota_{1,V}; \iota_{V_X+V_Y}(z_2)) \\ &= \iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (f_V; \iota_{V_X}(z_2))) \end{aligned}$$

and $e_1 \neq e_2$ implies $\langle_X^\mu (f_V; \iota_{V_X}(z_1)) \neq \langle_X^\mu (f_V; \iota_{V_X}(z_2))$ which contradicts the assumption 2. The case if $v_2 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z_2)$ and $v_1 = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z_1)$ ultimately contradicts the assumption 3 as it entails that both

$$\langle_X^\mu (f_V; \iota_{V_X}(z_1)) \neq \emptyset$$

and

$$\langle_Y^\mu (g_V; \iota_{V_Y}(z_2)) \neq \emptyset$$

The cases when $v_1 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z_1)$ and $v_2 = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z_2)$, and $v_1 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z_1)$ and $v_2 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z_2)$ are analogous.

- Suppose $v_1 \sim_S v'_1$ and $v_2 \sim v'_2$ via $w = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ such that there is a path from u to v'_1 and from u to $x_n = v'_2$. The mere fact that $v_2 \sim v'_2$ implies that v_2 should have a pre-image in V_Z and the same holds for v_1 . By the same reasoning as above it must be the case that $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1)) = \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v_2))$.
- The case $v_1 \sim v'_1$ via $w = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $v_2 \sim_S v_1$ is symmetric to the above.
- The case when $v_1 \sim v'_1$ and $v_2 \sim v'_2$ is analogous.

Let's check that this is a well-defined function. Suppose v_1, v_2 are vertices and $v_1 \sim v_2$, then $\langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}[v_1]) = \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}[v_2])$.

- If $[v_2] \neq \emptyset$, then, by definition we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}[v_1]) &= [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v_2))] \\ &= \text{as } v_2 \sim v_2 \text{ and } [v_2] \neq \emptyset \\ &= \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}[v_2]) \end{aligned}$$

- The case when $[v_1] \neq \emptyset$ is symmetric.
- If both $[v_2] = \emptyset$ and $[v_1] = \emptyset$ but there exists $[v_3] \neq \emptyset$ such that $v_1 \sim v_3$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}[v_1]) &= [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v_3))] \\ &= \text{as } v_3 \sim v_3 \text{ and } [v_3] \neq \emptyset \\ &= \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}[v_3]) \\ &= \text{as } v_2 \sim v_1 \sim v_3 \\ &= \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}[v_2]) \end{aligned}$$

We do not need to check well-defined-ness for edges as $e_1 \sim e_2$ just implies $e_1 = e_2$ for edges.

We also need to make sure that $([\]_V, [\]_E)$ is homomorphic with respect to \langle^μ . That is, we need to check if $[v] \neq \emptyset$, then $[\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v))] = \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([\]))$. Since $v \sim v$ this is homomorphic by definition. Similarly for edges.

Then $\langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu : V_{X+Y/\sim} + E_{X+Y/\sim} \rightarrow (E_{X+Y/\sim})^*$ is defined as a transitive closure of $\langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu$.

Let's now define $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}$. We can consider the consistency relation from the coproduct as a function

$$\smile_{X+Y} : (V_X + V_Y) + (E_X + E_Y) \rightarrow 2^{(V_X+V_Y)+(E_X+E_Y)}$$

Quotienting the values of the function gives us

$$\smile'_{X+Y} : V_X + V_Y + E_X + E_Y \rightarrow 2^{(V_X + V_Y / \sim + (E_X + E_Y) / \sim)}$$

which is essentially $[[\]_V; \iota_{V_X + V_Y / \sim}, [\]_E; \iota_{E_X + E_Y / \sim}]^*$ (a copairing extended to sequences that we will further denote as $[[\]_V \smile [\]_E]$) applied to the return value of \smile_{X+Y} . We then first define an auxiliary relation $\smile^\#$ similarly to how $\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\mu$ was defined. We begin with defining $\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#$ for vertices.

- (1) If there exists v such that $\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X + V_Y}(v)) \neq \emptyset$ and $u \sim v$, we let

$$\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X + V_Y / \sim}([u])) = [[\]_V \smile [\]_E]^*(\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X + V_Y}(v)))$$

- (2) u has no pre-image in V_Z and $\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X + V_Y}(u)) = \emptyset$ and there exists v such that $\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X + V_Y}(v)) \neq \emptyset$ and such that there is an undirected path from $[u]$ to $[v]$. Then we let

$$\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X + V_Y / \sim}([u])) = \smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X + V_Y / \sim}([v]))$$

Next we define $\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#$ for edges.

- (1) If $\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{E_X + E_Y}(e)) \neq \emptyset$, then

$$\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{E_X + E_Y / \sim}([e]_E)) = [[\]_V \smile [\]_E]^*(\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{E_X + E_Y}(e)))$$

- (2) $\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{E_X + E_Y}(e)) = \emptyset$ and there exists v such that $\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X + V_Y}(v)) \neq \emptyset$ and such that there is an undirected path from $[e]$ to $[v]$ then

$$\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{E_X + E_Y / \sim}([e]_E)) = \smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X + V_Y}([v]))$$

The well-definedness of this construction follows by the same argument as the well-definedness of $\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\mu$. Then we define

$$\smile_{X+Y / \sim}(\iota_{V_X + V_Y / \sim}([v])) \quad \text{and} \quad \smile_{X+Y / \sim}(\iota_{E_X + E_Y / \sim}([e]))$$

as closures of $\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#$ as below.

$$(\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{/ \sim}([x])))^c$$

where c denotes a closure and $\iota_{/ \sim}$ is $\iota_{V_X + V_Y / \sim}$ or $\iota_{E_X + E_Y / \sim}$ depending on whether $[x_i]$ comes from $V_X + V_Y$ or $E_X + E_Y$, is the smallest set such that

- $[x] \in (\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{/ \sim}([x])))^c$ if $\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{/ \sim}([x])) \neq \emptyset$
- if $[y] \in \smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{/ \sim}([x]))$ then

$$[x] \in (\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{/ \sim}([y])))^c$$

- for any sequence $([x_1], \dots, [x_n])$ such that

$$[x_i] \in \smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{/ \sim}([x_{i+1}])) \quad \text{or} \quad [x_{i+1}] \in \smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{/ \sim}([x_i]))$$

for $i < n$ both

$$[x_1] \in (\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{/ \sim}([x_n])))^c \quad \text{and} \quad [x_n] \in (\smile_{X+Y / \sim}^\#(\iota_{/ \sim}([x_1])))^c$$

Let's check that $([\]_V, [\]_E)$ is a homomorphism with respect to \smile . We need to check, if

$$[[\]_V; \iota_{V_X + V_Y / \sim}, [\]_E; \iota_{E_X + E_Y / \sim}]^*(\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X + V_Y}(v))) \subseteq \smile_{X+Y / \sim}(\iota_{V_X + V_Y / \sim}([v]))$$

- (1) The first case is when $\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X + V_Y}(v)) = \emptyset$. Then the property trivially holds as the empty set is a subset of any set.

(2) Suppose $\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v)) \neq \emptyset$. Then,

$$\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])) = [[\widetilde{\square}_V], [\widetilde{\square}_E]]^*(\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v)))$$

since $v \sim v$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} [[\widetilde{\square}_V], [\widetilde{\square}_E]]^*(\smile_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v))) &\subseteq \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])) \\ &\subseteq (\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])))^c = \smile_{X+Y/\sim}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])) \end{aligned}$$

by recalling that $[[\widetilde{\square}_V], [\widetilde{\square}_E]] = [[\square_V; \iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}, \square_E; \iota_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}]]$.

The cases for edges are analogous.

So far we have shown that relations $<_{X+Y/\sim}$ and $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}$ are well-defined and $([\square_V], [\square_E])$ is a homomorphism. By the Proposition A.11 the constructed $X+Y/\sim$ is an e-hypergraph. To show that it is a pushout we need to check the universal property. Let $u_V([\iota_{1,V}(x)]) = j_{1,V}(x)$ and $u_V([\iota_{2,V}(y)]) = j_{2,V}(y)$. We will need to check that this a well-defined function as well as that it is indeed a homomorphism.

Let's say that $v_1 \sim v_2$ then we need to show that $u_V([v_1]) = u_V([v_2])$. $v_1 \sim v_2$ means there is a sequence $w = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ such that $v_1 = x_1, v_2 = x_n$ and for all $i < n$ $x_i \sim_S x_{i+1}$. We will proceed by induction on the length of w .

- $|w| = 2$, then $v_1 \sim_S v_2$ and there exists $z \in V_Z$ such that $v_1 = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z)$ and $v_2 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z)$ and we have

$$u_V([v_1]) = u_V([f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z)]) = j_1(f_V(z))$$

and

$$u_V([v_2]) = u_V([g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z)]) = j_2(g_V(z))$$

which are equal by commutativity.

- Assume if $v_1 \sim v_2$ via $w : |w| \leq n$ then $u_V([v_1]) = u_V([v_2])$.
- Suppose $v_1 \sim v_2$ via $w = (x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1})$. By hypothesis, we know that $u_V([v_1]) = u_V([x_1]) = u_V([x_n])$ and that $u_V([x_n]) = u_V([x_{n+1}]) = u_V([v_2])$ and hence $u_V([v_1]) = u_V([v_2])$.

Because $v_1 \sim v_2$, it means that there exists $z \in V_Z$ such that $t_1 = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z)$ and $t_2 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z)$. Then, we have

$$u_V([t_1]) = u_V([f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z)]) = j_1(f_V(z))$$

and

$$u_V([t_2]) = u_V([g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z)]) = j_2(g_V(z))$$

which are equal by commutativity.

Let's show that such (u_V, u_E) is unique. Assume that there is u'_V such that $j_{1,V}(v) = u'_V([\iota_{1,V}(v)])$ and $j_{2,V}(v) = u'_V([\iota_{2,V}(v)])$. Then we have $u_V[\iota_{1,V}(v)] = j_{1,V}(v) = u'_V([\iota_{1,V}(v)])$ for all $v \in V_X$ (similarly for $v \in V_Y$) and hence $u_V = u'_V$. Similarly for u_E .

Let's now check if $u = (u_V, u_E)$ is a homomorphism.

- (1) The first condition to check is if $u_V^*(s_{X+Y/\sim}([e])) = s_Q(u_E([e]))$. By construction of $s_{X+Y/\sim}$ we have

$$u_V^*(s_{X+Y/\sim}([e])) = u_V^*([s_{X+Y}(e)]^*)$$

Suppose $e = \iota_{E_X}(e')$ and then

$$u_V^*([s_{X+Y}(e)]^*) = u_V^*([s_{X+Y}(\iota_{1,E}(e'))]^*) = u_V^*([\iota_{1,V}^*(s_X(e'))]^*)$$

Since j_1 and j_2 are homomorphisms, it must be the case that $s_Q(j_{1,E}(e')) = j_{1,V}^*(s_X(e'))$. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} u_V^*([(\iota_{1,V}^*(s_X(e')))]^*) &= j_{1,V}^*(s_X(e')) \\ &= s_Q(j_{1,E}(e')) \\ &= s_Q(u_E([\iota_{1,E}(e')])) \\ &= s_Q(u_E([e])) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for $e = \iota_{E_Y}(e')$.

- (2) The case for targets is analogous.
(3) The next condition to check is if $[[v]] \neq \emptyset$ then

$$\langle_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_Q}(u_V([v]))) = u_E(\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v])))$$

We need to consider a few cases.

- Suppose $\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v])) = [\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(u))]$ for $u \sim v$. Then assume $u = \iota_{1,V}(u_x)$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} [\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(u))] &= [\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(\iota_{1,V}(u_x)))] \\ &= [\iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X}(u_x)))] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} u_E([\iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X}(u_x)))] &= j_{1,E}(\langle_X^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X}(u_x))) \\ &= \langle_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_Q}(j_{1,V}(u_x))) \\ &= \langle_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_Q}(u([\iota_{1,V}(u_x)]))) \\ &= \langle_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_Q}(u([v]))) \end{aligned}$$

and we have

$$\langle_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_Q}(u_V([v]))) = u_E(\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v])))$$

The case when $u = \iota_{2,V}(u_y)$ is symmetric.

- Suppose $\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v])) = \langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v']))$ such that there is a path from $[v]$ to $[v']$ and v has no pre-image in V_Z . By the argument above, we know that

$$\langle_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_Q}(u_V([v']))) = u_E(\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v'])))$$

and by definition

$$u_E(\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v']))) = u_E(\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v])))$$

since (u_V, u_E) preserves sources and targets and there is a path from $[v]$ to $[v']$, there is a path from $u_V([v])$ to $u_V([v'])$ and because \mathcal{Q} is an e-hypergraph

$$\langle_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_Q}(u_V([v']))) = \langle_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_Q}(u_V([v])))$$

and finally

$$\langle_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_Q}(u_V([v]))) = u_E(\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v])))$$

The cases for edges are analogous.

(4) The last condition to check is if

$$[u_V; \iota_{V_Q}, u_E; \iota_{E_Q}]^*(\neg_{X+Y/\sim}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v]))) \subseteq \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([v]))$$

Recall that

$$\neg_{X+Y/\sim}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])) = (\neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])))^c$$

and first we will check if

$$[u_V; \iota_{V_Q}, u_E; \iota_{E_Q}]^*(\neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v]))) \subseteq \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([v]))$$

Consider cases

- If $\neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])) = \emptyset$ then the inclusion is trivial and hence we assume that

$$\neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])) \neq \emptyset$$

- Suppose $\neg_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(u)) \neq \emptyset$ and $v \sim u$ and then

$$\neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])) = [\boxed{\widetilde{V}}, \boxed{\widetilde{E}}]^*(\neg_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(u)))$$

Assume $u = \iota_{1,V}(u_X)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} [\boxed{\widetilde{V}}, \boxed{\widetilde{E}}]^*(\neg_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(u))) &= [\boxed{\widetilde{V}}, \boxed{\widetilde{E}}]^*(\neg_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(\iota_{1,V}(u_X)))) \\ &= [\iota_{1,V}; \boxed{\widetilde{V}}, \iota_{1,E}; \boxed{\widetilde{E}}]^*(\neg_X(\iota_{V_X}(u_X))) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} [u_V; \iota_{V_Q}, u_E; \iota_{E_Q}]^*(\neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v]))) &= [\iota_{1,V}; \boxed{V}; u_V; \iota_{V_Q}, \iota_{1,E}; \boxed{E}; u_E; \iota_{E_Q}]^*(\neg_X(\iota_{V_X}(u_X))) \\ &= [j_{1,V}; \iota_{V_Q}, j_{1,E}; \iota_{E_Q}]^*(\neg_X(\iota_{V_X}(u_X))) \\ &\subseteq \neg_Q(\iota_{V_Q}(j_{1,V}(u_X))) \\ &= \neg_Q(\iota_{V_Q}(u_V[\iota_{1,V}(u_X)])) \\ &= \neg_Q(\iota_{V_Q}(u_V[u])) \\ &= \neg_Q(\iota_{V_Q}(u_V[v])) \end{aligned}$$

The case when $u = \iota_{2,V}(u_Y)$ is symmetric.

- Suppose that v has no pre-image in V_Z and $\neg_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v)) = \emptyset$ and there exists u such that $\neg_{X+Y}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(u)) \neq \emptyset$ and such that there is an undirected path from $[v]$ to $[u]$ and then

$$\neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])) = \neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([u]))$$

By the argument above it follows that

$$[u_V; \iota_{Q_V}, u_E; \iota_{Q_E}]^*(\neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([u]))) \subseteq \neg_Q(\iota_{V_Q}(u_V([u])))$$

Since (u_V, u_E) preserves paths, there is a path from $u_V([u])$ to $u_V([v])$ and since Q is an e-hypergraph

$$\begin{aligned} \neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])) &= \neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([u])) \\ &\subseteq \neg_Q(\iota_{V_Q}(u_V([u]))) \\ &= \neg_Q(\iota_{V_Q}(u_V([v]))) \end{aligned}$$

So far we have shown that

$$[u_V; \iota_{V_Q}, u_E; \iota_{E_Q}]^*(\neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v]))) \subseteq \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([v]))$$

and

$$[u_V; \iota_{V_Q}, u_E; \iota_{E_Q}]^*(\neg_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(\iota_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e]))) \subseteq \neg_Q(u_E; \iota_{E_Q}([e]))$$

follows by the same argument. Then, to check if

$$[u_V; \iota_{V_Q}, u_E; \iota_{E_Q}]^*(\neg_{x+y/-}(\iota_{v_x+v_y/-}([v]))) \subseteq \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([v]))$$

we need to verify if

- $[u_V; \iota_{V_Q}, u_E; \iota_{E_Q}]^*([v]) \subseteq \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([v]))$. This holds because \neg_Q is reflexive.
- $\iota_{v_x+v_y/-}([u]) \in \neg_{x+y/-}^\#(\iota_{v_x+v_y/-}([v]))$ then

$$[u_V; \iota_{V_Q}, u_E; \iota_{E_Q}]^*([v]) \in \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([u]))$$

The first bit implies that $u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([u]) \in \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([v]))$ and since \neg_Q is symmetric it must be the case that $u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([v]) \in \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([u]))$

- There exists a sequence $w = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ such that

$$\iota_{v_x+v_y/-}([x_i]) \in \neg_{x+y/-}^\#(\iota_{v_x+v_y/-}([x_{i+1}]))$$

or

$$\iota_{v_x+v_y/-}([x_{i+1}]) \in \neg_{x+y/-}^\#(\iota_{v_x+v_y/-}([x_i]))$$

for $i < n$ (or similarly for edges), then $u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([x_1]) \in \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([x_n]))$.

- Base case is when $w = (x_1, x_2)$. Then the statement is trivial as

$$\begin{aligned} & [u_V; \iota_{V_Q}, u_E; \iota_{E_Q}]^*(\neg_{x+y/-}^\#(\iota_{v_x+v_y/-}([x_2]))) \\ & \subseteq \\ & \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([x_2])) \end{aligned}$$

- Suppose the statement is true for all w such that $|w| \leq n$.
- Consider a sequence $w = (x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1})$. By assumption, we know that $u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([x_1]) \in \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([x_n]))$. The fact that $\iota_{v_x+v_y/-}([x_n]) \in \neg_{x+y/-}^\#(\iota_{v_x+v_y/-}([x_{n+1}]))$ (or its symmetric counterpart) implies that $u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([x_n]) \in \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([x_{n+1}]))$ and by the transitivity and symmetry of \neg_Q it follows that

$$u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([x_1]) \in \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([x_{n+1}]))$$

and

$$u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([x_{n+1}]) \in \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([x_1]))$$


Therefore, we have

$$[u_V; \iota_{V_Q}, u_E; \iota_{E_Q}]^*(\neg_{x+y/-}(\iota_{v_x+v_y/-}([v]))) \subseteq \neg_Q(u_V; \iota_{V_Q}([v]))$$

and similarly for edges. Which concludes that (u_V, u_E) is a homomorphism. \square

Example A.4. Consider a diagram in Figure 9 where the subscripts define the corresponding morphisms. E-hypergraph Q is not a pushout as there is no homomorphism u that would complete the diagram. In particular, there is no (u_V, u_E) such that

$$[u_V; \iota_{P_V}, u_E; \iota_{P_E}]^*(\neg_Q(\iota_{V_Q}(q_1))) \subseteq \neg_P(u_V; \iota_{P_V}(q_1))$$

Fig. 9. Pushout in \mathbf{EHyp}_Σ

If we let $u_V(i_{1,V}(v)) = j_{1,V}(v)$ for all $v \in V_X$ and $u_V(i_{2,V}(v)) = j_{2,V}(v)$ and similarly for edges. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& [u_V; \iota_{P_V}, u_E; \iota_{P_E}]^*(\neg_Q(\iota_{V_Q}(q_1))) \\
& = \\
& [u_V; \iota_{P_V}, u_E; \iota_{P_E}]^*({q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4, f, h, g}) \\
& = \\
& [\iota_{P_V}(j_{1,V}(x_1)), \iota_{P_V}(j_{1,V}(x_2)), \iota_{P_V}(j_{1,V}(x_3)), \\
& \quad \iota_{P_V}(j_{1,V}(x_4)), \iota_{P_E}(j_{1,E}(f)), \iota_{P_E}(j_{1,E}(g)), \iota_{P_V}(j_{2,V}(y_1)), \\
& \quad \iota_{P_V}(j_{2,V}(y_2)), \iota_{P_E}(j_{2,E}(h))] \\
& = \\
& [p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, f, h, g] \\
& \not\subseteq \\
& \neg_P(u_V; \iota_{P_V}(q_1)) \\
& = \\
& \neg_P(j_{1,V}; \iota_{P_V}(x_1)) \\
& = \\
& \neg_P(\iota_{P_V}(p_1)) \\
& = \\
& [p_1, f, h, p_2]
\end{aligned}$$

LEMMA A.5. $\prec_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu$ is irreflexive.

PROOF. Suppose there exist $[e]$ such that $[e] = \prec_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu(\iota_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e]))$. Then we have two cases.

- $\prec_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu(\iota_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e])) = [\prec_{X+Y}^\mu(\iota_{E_X+E_Y}(e))] = [e]$ This would mean that $\prec_{X+Y}^\mu(\iota_{E_X+E_Y}(e)) = e$ as $[\]_E$ is injective, which would mean that the relation \prec_{X+Y}^μ is not irreflexive because e is the predecessor of e .

- Suppose $\langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e])) = \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v])) = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v))]$ such that $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v))$ is defined and there is a path from $[e]$ to $[v]$. This implies

$$[e] = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v))]$$

and

$$e = \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v))$$

The existence of a path from $[e]$ to $[v]$ means there is a path from e to v' such that $v' \sim v$.

- If $v' = v$, then there is a path from e to v which contradicts $e = \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v))$
- Consider the case when $v' \sim v$. $e = \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v))$ implies that both e and v are in the image of $(t_{1,V}, t_{1,E})$ or $(t_{2,V}, t_{2,E})$. Suppose $e = t_{1,E}(e_x)$ and $v = t_{1,V}(v_x)$. Since $v' \sim v$, $v_x = f_V(z_1)$. And since there is a path from v' to e , $v' = t_{1,V}(v'_x)$ and $v'_x = f_V(z_2)$. This further implies

$$\begin{aligned} \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v)) &= t_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (t_{V_X}(v_x))) \\ &= t_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (t_{V_X}(f_V(z_1)))) \\ &= t_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (t_{V_X}(f_V(z_2)))) \\ &= t_{1,E}(e_x) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$e_x = \langle_X (t_{V_X}(f_V(z_2))) = \langle_X (t_{V_X}(v'_x))$$

which contradicts that there is a path from e_x to v'_x . The case when $e = t_{2,E}(e_y)$ and $v = t_{2,V}(v_y)$ is symmetric.

We do not need to check this requirement for vertices because a vertex can not be a predecessor. \square

LEMMA A.6. $\langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu$ is asymmetric.

PROOF. Let e_1, e_2 be edges. Then, if $[e_1] = \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e_2]))$ it must not be the case that $[e_2] = \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e_1]))$. For $[e_1] = \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e_2]))$ we have two cases.

•

$$[e_1] = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_2))]$$

which implies $e_1 = \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_2))$. Having at the same time $[e_2] = \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e_1]))$ gives us also two cases.

- $[e_2] = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1))]$ and $e_2 = \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1))$ which implies that e_1 is the predecessor of e_2 and vice versa which contradicts e-hypergraphness of $X + Y$.

–

$$[e_2] = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v))]$$

such that $[e_1] = \emptyset$ and there is a path from $[e_1]$ to $[v]$, i.e. a path from e_1 to v' such that $v' \sim v$.

- * $v' \sim v$ and there is a path from e_1 to v' . Suppose $e_2 = t_{1,E}(e_{2,x})$ and $v = t_{1,V}(v_x)$. Since e_1 is the predecessor of e_2 , the former should also be in the image of $t_{1,E}$, i.e. $e_1 = t_{1,E}(e_{1,x})$, and since there is a path from e_1 to v' , $v' = t_{1,V}(v'_x)$. $v' \sim v$

implies $v_x = f_V(z_1)$ and $v'_x = f_V(z_2)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v)) &= \iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (t_{V_X}(v_x))) \\ &= \iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (t_{V_X}(f_V(z_1)))) \\ &= \iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (t_{V_X}(f_V(z_2)))) \\ &= \iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (t_{V_X}(v'_x))) \\ &= \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v')) \\ &= \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1)) \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts $e_1 = \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_2))$. The case when $e_2 = \iota_{2,E}(e_{2,y})$ and $v = \iota_{2,V}(v_y)$ is symmetric.

- The other case is when

$$[e_1] = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1))]$$

such that there is a path from e_2 to v'_1 and $v_1 \sim v'_1$ and $[e_2] = \emptyset$.

- The case when $[e_2] = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1))]$ is analogous to the last case above.
- Suppose

$$[e_2] = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_2))]$$

such that there is a path from e_1 to v'_2 and $v_2 \sim v'_2$ and $[e_1] = \emptyset$. Suppose $e_1 = \iota_{1,E}(e_{1,x})$ and $v_1 = \iota_{1,V}(v_{1,x})$ which implies $v'_2 = \iota_{1,V}(v'_{2,x})$. Since $v_1 \sim v'_1$, $v_{1,x} = f_V(z_1)$ and similarly $v'_{2,x} = f_V(z_2)$.

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 &= \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1)) \\ &= \iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (t_{V_X}(v_{1,x}))) \\ &= \iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (t_{V_X}(f_V(z_1)))) \\ &= \iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (t_{V_X}(f_V(z_2)))) \\ &= \iota_{1,E}(\langle_X^\mu (t_{V_X}(v'_{2,x}))) \\ &= \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v'_2)) \\ &= \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1)) \end{aligned}$$

And we get a contradiction to irreflexivity of \langle_{X+Y}^μ .

Once again, we do not need to check for vertices as a vertex can not be on the left-hand side of the relation. \square

LEMMA A.7. $\langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu$ respects connectivity.

PROOF. We need to show that if $[v] \in s_{X+Y/\sim}([e_1])$ and $[e_2] = \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (t_{E_X+E_Y}([e_1]))$ then $[e_2] = \langle_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}[v])$. We have two cases.

-

$$[e_2] = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(e_1))]$$

By definition, $s_{X+Y/\sim}([e_1]) = [s_{X+Y}(e_1)]^*$ and $[v] \in [s_{X+Y}(e_1)]^*$ means there exists $v' \sim v$ such that $v' \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$.

- $v' = v$ and then $v \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$ and therefore $e_2 = \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v))$ and $[e_2] = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (t_{V_X+V_Y}(v))]$.

– $v' \sim v$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} [e_2] &= [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v')))] \\ &= \langle_{X+Y/-}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/-}([v'])) \\ &= \langle_{X+Y/-}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/-}([v])) \end{aligned}$$

•

$$[e_2] = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1)))]$$

such that there is $v'_1 \sim v_1$ and there is a path from e_1 to v'_1 and $[e_1] = \emptyset$. $[v] \in [s_{X+Y}(e_1)]^*$ means there exists $v' \sim v$ such that $v' \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$.

– $v' = v$ and then $v \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$. Since there is a path from e_1 to v'_1 , there is also a path from v' to v'_1 and by definition

$$\langle_{X+Y/-}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/-}([v])) = \langle_{X+Y/-}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/-}([v_1])) = [e_2]$$

– $v' \sim v$ and then there is a path from v'_1 to v' . Suppose $v_1 = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z_1)$ and since $v'_1 \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$, $[e_1] = \emptyset$, both v'_1 and v' should be in the image of $g_V; \iota_{2,V}$. Since $[v_1] \neq \emptyset$ it must be the case that for all z $[f_V(z)] \neq \emptyset$ as well as for some $v'' \sim v'$ such that $v'' = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z'')$. Clearly such v'' exists. It is either v , if $v = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z'')$, or some x_i in (x_1, \dots, x_n) such that $x_1 = v'$ and $x_n = v$.

$$\begin{aligned} [e_2] &= [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1))] \\ &= [\iota_{1,E}(\langle_X (\iota_{V_X}(f_V(z_1)))))] \\ &= [\iota_{1,E}(\langle_X (\iota_{V_X}(f_V(z''))))] \\ &= [\langle_{X+Y} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z'')))] \\ &= [\langle_{X+Y} (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v'')))] \\ &= \langle_{X+Y/-}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/-}([v''])) \\ &= \langle_{X+Y/-}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/-}([v])) \end{aligned}$$

The case when $v_1 = g_V; \iota_{2,V}(z_1)$ is symmetric.

Finally, we need to check that if $[v] \in s([e_1])$ and $[e_2] = \langle_{X+Y/-}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/-}([v]))$ then $[e_2] = \langle_{X+Y/-}^\mu (\iota_{E_X+E_Y/-}([e_1]))$. Once again, $[v] \in s_{X+Y}([e_1])$ means that there exists $v' \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$ such that $v' \sim v$.

•

$$[e_2] = [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v''))]$$

such that $v'' \sim v$ and $[v''] \neq \emptyset$.

– If $v' = v$ and $v'' = v$ then $v \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$ and since $[v''] = [v] \neq \emptyset$ and $v \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$, it must be the case that $\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1)) = \langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{E_X+E_Y}(v))$ and further

$$\begin{aligned} \langle_{X+Y/-}^\mu (\iota_{E_X+E_Y/-}([e_1])) &= [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1))] \\ &= [\langle_{X+Y}^\mu (\iota_{E_X+E_Y}(v))] \\ &= \langle_{X+Y/-}^\mu (\iota_{V_X+V_Y/-}([v])) \\ &= [e_2] \end{aligned}$$

– If $v' = v$ and $v'' \sim v$ then $v \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$. Suppose $v'' = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z'')$. Consider cases.

* $v = f_V; \iota_{1,V}(z)$, then $f_V(z) = f_V(z'') \neq \emptyset$ and $[e_1] = [v] = [v'']$

- * $v = g_V; t_{2,V}(z)$, then $g_V(z) = \emptyset$ and $[e_1] = \emptyset$. Since there is a path from v to e_1 and $[v''] \neq \emptyset$ and $v'' \sim v$, by definition,

$$\langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{E_X+E_Y}([e_1])) = \langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{V_X+V_Y}([v''])) = [e_2]$$

Case when $v'' = g_V; t_{2,V}(z'')$ is symmetric.

- If $v' \sim v$ and $v'' = v$ then $v' \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$. This implies that $[v] \neq \emptyset$
 - * If $v = f_V; t_{1,V}(z)$ and $v' = f_V; t_{1,V}(z')$ then $[e_1] = [v'] = [v] \neq \emptyset$ since $[f_V(z'')] = [f_V(z)]$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{E_X+E_Y}([e_1])) &= [\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (t_{E_X+E_Y})(e_1)] \\ &= [\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (t_{V_X+V_Y})(v)] \\ &= [\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (t_{V_X+V_Y})(v'')] \\ &= [e_2] \end{aligned}$$

- * $v = f_V; t_{1,V}(z)$ and $v' = g_V; t_{2,V}(z')$ and then $[g_V(z')] = \emptyset$ and $[e_1] = \emptyset$. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{E_X+E_Y}([e_1])) &= \langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{V_X+V_Y}([v])) \\ &= \langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{V_X+V_Y}([v''])) \\ &= [e_2] \end{aligned}$$

The case when $v = g_V; t_{1,V}(z)$ is symmetric.

- If $v' \sim v$ and $v'' \sim v$ then $v' \in s_{X+Y}e_1$, $[v''] \neq \emptyset$ and $v'' \sim v'$.
 - * If $v'' = f_V; t_{1,V}(z'')$ and $v' = f_V; t_{2,V}(z')$ then $[e_1] = [v'] = [v'']$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{E_X+E_Y}([e_1])) &= [\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (t_{E_X+E_Y})(e_1)] \\ &= [\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (t_{V_X+V_Y})(v')] \\ &= [\langle_{X+Y}^{\mu} (t_{V_X+V_Y})(v'')] \\ &= [e_2] \end{aligned}$$

- * If $v'' = f_V; t_{1,V}(z'')$ and $v' = g_V; t_{2,V}(z')$ then $[g_V(z')] = \emptyset$ and $[e_1] = \emptyset$. Then

$$\langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{E_X+E_Y}([e_1])) = \langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{V_X+V_Y}([v''])) = [e_2]$$

The case when $v'' = g_V; t_{2,V}(z'')$ is symmetric.

- Now suppose that

$$[e_2] = \langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{V_X+V_Y}([v'']))$$

such that $[v''] \neq \emptyset$, $[v] = \emptyset$ and there is a path from $[v]$ to $[v'']$, i.e. there is a path from v to v' and $v' \sim v''$. In its turn $[v] \in s_{X+Y}([e_1])$ implies $v_1 \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$ and $v \sim v_1$. As per the comment below 2, necessarily $v = v_1$ as v should not have a pre-image in V_Z . This implies that $v \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$ and that $[e_1] = \emptyset$. As there is a path from v to v' , there is a path from e_1 to v' and by definition, since $v'' \sim v'$ and $[v''] \neq \emptyset$,

$$\langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{E_X+E_Y}([e_1])) = \langle_{X+Y/-}^{\mu} (t_{V_X+V_Y}([v''])) = [e_2]$$

□

LEMMA A.8. If

$$\smile_{X+Y/-}^{\#} (t_{/-}([x_1])) = \smile_{X+Y/-}^{\#} (t_{/-}([x_2]))$$

where $t_{/-}$ is either $t_{V_X+V_Y}$ or $t_{E_X+E_Y}$ depending on whether $[x_i]$ is in $V_X + V_Y$ or $E_X + E_Y$. Then

$$\smile_{X+Y/-} (t_{/-}([x_1])) = \smile_{X+Y/-} (t_{/-}([x_2]))$$

That is, closures of both sides are equal.

PROOF. To check that the sets after closures are equal, we need to check if every element of the set on the left is also in the set on the right and vice versa. Apart from $\smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([x_1]))$ the set on the left also contains

- $[x_1]$ as per the reflexivity. So we need to check if $[x_1] \in \smile_{x+y/-}(\iota_{/-}([x_2]))$. Because

$$\smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([x_1])) = \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([x_2]))$$

there exists some $[y]$ such that

$$[y] \in \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([x_1]))$$

and

$$[y] \in \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([x_2]))$$

that is, we have a sequence $([x_1], [y], [x_2])$ and by transitivity

$$[x_1] \in \smile_{x+y/-}(\iota_{/-}([x_2]))$$

and

$$[x_2] \in \smile_{x+y/-}(\iota_{/-}([x_1]))$$

- $[y]$ for all $[y]$ such that $[x_1] \in \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([y]))$. Let's check if $[y] \in \smile_{x+y/-}(\iota_{/-}([x_2]))$. As above, there exists $[z]$ such that

$$[z] \in \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([x_1]))$$

and

$$[z] \in \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([x_2]))$$

By a sequence $([y], [x_1], [z], [x_2])$ we get that

$$[y] \in \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([x_2]))$$

Similarly for $[y]$ such that $[x_2] \in \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([y]))$.

- For any sequence $([x_1], \dots, [x_n])$ such that $[x_i] \in \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([x_{i+1}]))$ or $[x_{i+1}] \in \smile_{x+y/-}(\iota_{/-}([x_i]))$ for $i < n$ the set on the left contains $[x_n]$. Let's check if $[x_n] \in \smile_{x+y/-}(\iota_{/-}([x_2]))$. Since there exists $[y]$ such that $[y] \in \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([x_1]))$ and $[y] \in \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{/-}([x_2]))$ we can extend the sequence to $([x_2], [y], [x_1], \dots, [x_n])$ and hence $[x_n] \in \smile_{x+y/-}(\iota_{/-}([x_2]))$. Similarly, given a sequence $([x_2], \dots, [x_n])$ and extending it to $([x_1], [y], [x_2], \dots, [x_n])$ we get $[x_n] \in \smile_{x+y/-}(\iota_{/-}([x_1]))$.

□

LEMMA A.9. $\smile_{x+y/-}$ respects connectivity.

PROOF. Suppose $[v_1] \in s_{x+y/-}([e_1])$ and $[[v_1]] = [[e_1]] \neq \emptyset$, then it must be the case that

$$\smile_{x+y/-}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v_1])) = \smile_{x+y/-}(\iota_{E_X+E_Y}([e_1]))$$

By the lemma above, to prove this, it is sufficient to show that

$$\smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v_1])) = \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{E_X+E_Y}([e_1]))$$

$[v_1] \in s_{x+y/-}([e_1])$ means there exists $v'_1 \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$ such that $v_1 \sim v'_1$. We then have two cases.

- $v_1 = v'_1$ and then $v_1 \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$.
 - $\smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}([v_1])) = \smile_{x+y/-}^{\#}(\iota_{V_X+V_Y}(v'_1))$ such that $v'_1 \sim v_1$ and $[v'_1] \neq \emptyset$.

* $v_1'' = v_1$ and then $[v_1] \neq \emptyset$ and $[e_1] \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, necessarily $\smile_{X+Y}(t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1)) = \smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1))$. By applying $([\Box]_V, [\Box]_E)$ we get

by functionality

$$([\Box]_V; t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}, [\Box]_E; t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim})^*(\smile_{X+Y}(t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1))) = ([\Box]_V; t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}, [\Box]_E; t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim})^*(\smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1)))$$

by unfolding the definition

$$\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e_1])) = \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v_1]))$$

* $v_1'' \sim v_1$. If $v_1'' = f_V; t_{1,V}(z_1'')$ and $v_1 = f_V; t_{1,V}(z_1)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v_1])) &= ([\Box]_V^\sim, [\Box]_E^\sim)^*(\smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1''))) \\ &= ([\Box]_V^\sim, [\Box]_E^\sim)^*(\smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(f_V; t_{1,V}(z_1'')))) \\ &= ([\Box]_V^\sim, [\Box]_E^\sim)^*(\smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(f_V; t_{1,V}(z_1)))) \\ &= ([\Box]_V^\sim, [\Box]_E^\sim)^*(\smile_{X+Y}(t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1))) \\ &= \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e_1])) \end{aligned}$$

If $v_1'' = f_V; t_{1,V}(z_1'')$ and $v_1 = g_V; t_{1,V}(z_1)$ then $[v_1] = [e_1] = \emptyset$ and

$$\smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1)) = \smile_{X+Y}(t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1)) = \emptyset$$

$$\begin{aligned} \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e_1])) &= \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v_1''])) \\ &= \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v_1])) \end{aligned}$$

- $\prec_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v_1])) = \prec_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v_2]))$ such that $[v_2] \neq \emptyset$ and there is a path from $[v_1]$ to $[v_2]$. By definition, this implies $[v_1] = \emptyset$ and $[e_1] = \emptyset$. Again, by definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v_1])) &= \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v_2])) \\ &= \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e_1])) \end{aligned}$$

• $v_1 \sim v_1'$ and then $v_1' \in s_{X+Y}(e_1)$.

- $\prec_{X+Y/\sim}^\mu(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v_1])) = [\prec_{X+Y}^\mu(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1'))]$ such that $v_1 \sim v_1'$ and $[v_1'] \neq \emptyset$.

* $v_1 = v_1'$ and then $[v_1] \neq \emptyset$. Suppose $v_1 = f_V; t_{1,V}(z_1)$ and $v_1' = f_V; t_{1,V}(z_1')$. Then $[v_1'] = [e_1] \neq \emptyset$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}[v_1']) &= ([\Box]_V^\#, [\Box]_E^\#)^*(\smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1'))) \\ &= ([\Box]_V^\#, [\Box]_E^\#)^*(\smile_{X+Y}(t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1))) \\ &= \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e_1])) \\ &= \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}[v_1]) \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $v_1' = g_V; t_{2,V}(z_1')$ and then $[v_1'] = [e_1] = \emptyset$. By definition,

$$\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}[v_1']) = ([\Box]_V^\#, [\Box]_E^\#)^*(\smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1)))$$

and since there is a path from e_1 to v_1' and $v_1' \sim v_1$

$$\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^\#(t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}[e_1]) = ([\Box]_V^\#, [\Box]_E^\#)^*(\smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1)))$$

The cases when $v_1 = g_V; t_{2,V}(z_1)$ is symmetric.

* $v_1 \sim v_1''$ and then $v_1' \sim v_1''$. Suppose $v_1'' = f_V; t_{1,V}(z_1'')$. If v_1' is in the image of $f_V; t_{1,V}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1')) &= \smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1'')) \\ &= \smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(e_1')) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}(v_1)) &= \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}(v_1')) \\ &= \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}(e_1)) \end{aligned}$$

If v_1' is in the image of $g_V; t_{2,V}$, then $\smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v_1')) = \smile_{X+Y}(t_{E_X+E_Y}(e_1)) = \emptyset$ and by definition as there is a path from $[e_1]$ to $[v_1']$

$$\begin{aligned} \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{E_X+E_Y/\sim}([e_1])) &= \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v_1''])) \\ &= \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v_1])) \end{aligned}$$

The cases when $v_1'' = g_V; t_{2,V}(z_1'')$ are symmetric.

The case when $[v] \in t([e])$ is symmetric. \square

LEMMA A.10. $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}$ is defined only for vertices and edges that are not top-level.

PROOF. $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}(t_{/\sim}([x])) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\mu}(t_{/\sim}([x]))$ is defined. Let's first show from left to right. $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}(t_{/\sim}([x])) \neq \emptyset$ implies $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{/\sim}([x])) \neq \emptyset$.

- $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{/\sim}([x])) = [[\]_V^{\sim}, [\]_E^{\sim}]^*(t_{\sim}(x'))$ such that $x \sim x'$. By e-hypergraph-ness of $X+Y$ this implies that $[x'] \neq \emptyset$ and hence $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{/\sim}([x'])) = \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{/\sim}([x])) = \smile_{X+Y}^{\mu}(t_{\sim}(x))$
- $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{/\sim}([x])) = \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\#}(t_{V_X+V_Y/\sim}([v]))$ such that there is a path from $[x]$ to $[v]$ and $\smile_{X+Y}(t_{V_X+V_Y}(v)) \neq \emptyset$. This implies that $[v] \neq \emptyset$ and by definition

$$\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\mu}(t_{/\sim}([x])) = \smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\mu}(t_{/\sim}([v]))$$

The right-to-left direction is analogous. \square

PROPOSITION A.11 ($X+Y/\sim$ IS AN E-HYPERGRAPH). For this we need to check that the defined relations $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}$ and $\smile_{X+Y/\sim}^{\mu}$ satisfy all the needed properties as per Definition 4.1.

PROOF. This proposition then follows by applying the lemmas above. \square

We will then discuss the uniqueness of the corresponding pushout complement.

PROPOSITION A.12. The boundary complement in 5.2 when exists is unique.

PROOF. The pushout in 5.2 satisfies the assumptions in Definition A.3 (note that since $i \rightarrow i' \rightarrow \mathcal{L} \leftarrow j' \leftarrow j$ is an MDA cospan the image of $i+j$ in \mathcal{L} consists of top-level vertices only) and therefore is isomorphic to the pushout constructed in A.3 and by construction should also be a pushout on the underlying sets of vertices and hyperedges. In particular,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_{\mathcal{L}} & \xleftarrow{h_{V,int}} i' + j' & \xleftarrow{h_{V,ext}} i + j \\ m_V \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ V_{\mathcal{G}} & \xleftarrow{g_V} & V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
E_{\mathcal{L}} & \xleftarrow{h_{E,int}} & 0 & \xleftarrow{h_{E,ext}} & 0 \\
\downarrow m_E & & & & \downarrow \\
E_{\mathcal{G}} & \xleftarrow{g_E} & & & E_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}
\end{array}$$

where V s and E s are sets of vertices and hyperedges respectively, marked squares are pushouts and \mathcal{L}^\perp s are pushout complements. Because $i+j$ is discrete, $E_{\mathcal{G}}$ is the disjoint union of $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $E_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}$ and hence $E_{\mathcal{L}^\perp} = E_{\mathcal{G}} \setminus E_{\mathcal{L}}$. Then, since m and $[c_1, c_2]$ are monos, the first square can be rewritten as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
a+x+y & \xleftarrow{h_{V,int}} & i+j+x & \xleftarrow{h_{V,ext}} & i+j \\
\downarrow m_V & & & & \downarrow c \\
a+x+y+z & \xleftarrow{g_V} & & & i+j+w \\
& & & & \cong \\
& & & & i+j+z
\end{array}$$

Because $a+x+y+w$ also yields a pushout it must be the case that $a+x+y+w \cong a+x+y+z$ and therefore $w \cong z$ and pushout complement for vertices is $i+j+z$ up to isomorphism. One can further observe that $g_V = h_{V,ext}; h_{V,int} + id_n$ and that $h_{V,ext}$ is mono and $h_{V,int} = [h_1, h_2]$ where h_1, h_2 are mono. The above shows that edges and vertices in the pushout complement are uniquely determined. To show that pushout complement is unique we next need to show that source and target maps are unique. Because g is a homomorphism, it must be the case that $g_V^*(s_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}(e)) = s_{\mathcal{G}}(g_E(e))$ and $s_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}(e) \subseteq (g_V^{-1})^*(s_{\mathcal{G}}(g_E(e)))$. Since $g_V = h_{V,ext}; [h_1, h_2] + id_n$ the inverse image of g_V contains at most two elements: one with the pre-image in i and another with the pre-image in j . If g_V identified more than two vertices it would mean that $[h_1, h_2]$ identified more than two vertices which would mean that two of them come both either from i or j which would imply that either h_1 or h_2 is not mono. If the inverse image contains exactly one vertex then the $s_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}(e)$ is uniquely fixed, otherwise suppose it contains $\{v_1, v_2\}$ such that $v_1 \in i$ and $v_2 \in j$. However, v_1 can not be in $s_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}(e)$ as per the (6) and (7) conditions of the boundary complement 5.2 the image of j in \mathcal{L}^\perp should consist of vertices of in-degree 0.

Similarly for $t_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}$. We also need to show that $<$ and \smile are unique. Suppose that there exist


$$\mathcal{L}_1^\perp = (V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}, E_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}, s, t, <_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_2^\perp = (V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}, E_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}, s, t, <_2)$$

Because g is homomorphism, it must be the case that

$$g_E(<_1(\iota_{V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}}(v))) = <_{\mathcal{G}}(\iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}(g_V(v))) = g_E(<_2(\iota_{V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}}(v)))$$

which implies $<_2(\iota_{V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}}(v)) = <_1(\iota_{V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}}(v))$ for all v such that $[v] \neq \emptyset$ since g_E is mono. Similarly for edges. We now show that if $[v] = \emptyset$ for $v \in V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}$ then necessarily $[g_V(v)] = \emptyset$. Suppose $[v] = \emptyset$ and $<_{\mathcal{G}}(\iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}(g_V(v))) = e$ and there is a connected component that contains v and such that for all v' and e' in this component $[v'] = \emptyset = [e']$. Consider \mathcal{G}' which is obtained from \mathcal{G} by making $[g_V(v')] = [g_E(e')] = \emptyset$ for v', e' above. Clearly there is a morphism from \mathcal{L}^\perp to \mathcal{G}' , i.e. the morphism $g' = (g_V, g_E)$ that has the same action on edges and vertices as the morphism g does, because v' such that $[v'] \neq \emptyset$ can be mapped to $g_V(v')$ such that $[g_V(v')] \neq \emptyset$. The only case when such a morphism may not exist is when $[v''] \neq \emptyset$, $[v'] = \emptyset$ and $g_V(v'') = g_V(v')$. This implies that both v'' and v' have a pre-image in $i+j$ and according to the definition of a boundary

complement it must be $[[c_1, c_2](z_1)] = [[c_1, c_2](z_2)]$ for all $z_1, z_2 \in V_{i+j}$. For the same reason there is also a morphism from \mathcal{L} to \mathcal{G}' . The only case when such a morphism may not exist is when $v'' \in V_{\mathcal{L}}$ such that $[v''] \neq \emptyset$ is mapped to $m_V(v'') = g_V(v')$ such that $[v'] = \emptyset$ which implies v' and v'' share a pre-image in $i + j$. This leads to a contradiction as the image of $i + j$ in \mathcal{L} should consist of top-level vertices exclusively. This construction results in a commutative diagram below



that further results in a contradiction since there is no morphism from \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{G}' because for any such morphism u it must be the case that $[u_V(g_V(v'))] \neq \emptyset = [g'_V(v')] = \emptyset$ which would mean that \mathcal{G} is not a pushout. This means that either both $<_1 (t_*(x))$ and $<_2 (t_*(x))$ are undefined for a given x or $<_1 (t_*(x)) = <_2 (t_*(x))$ which concludes that the relations are equal and $\mathcal{L}_1^\perp = \mathcal{L}_2^\perp$.

Finally, let's suppose there exist

$$\mathcal{L}_1^\perp = (V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}, E_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}, s, t, <, \smile_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_2^\perp = (V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}, V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}, s, t, <, \smile_2)$$

Because g is a homomorphism, we have

$$[g_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}, g_E; \iota_{E_{\mathcal{G}}}]^*(\smile_{\mathcal{L}_1^\perp}(\iota_{V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}}(v))) \subseteq \smile_{\mathcal{G}}(g_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}(v))$$

$$[g_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}, g_E; \iota_{E_{\mathcal{G}}}]^*(\smile_{\mathcal{L}_2^\perp}(\iota_{V_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}}(v))) \subseteq \smile_{\mathcal{G}}(g_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}(v))$$

- If $\smile_{\mathcal{G}}(g_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}(v)) = \emptyset$ then both left-hand sides should be \emptyset and therefore the relations are equal.
- Suppose that $\smile_{\mathcal{G}}(g_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}(v)) \neq \emptyset$ which further means that $[g_V; \iota_{V_{\mathcal{G}}}(v)] \neq \emptyset$. $\smile_1 \neq \smile_2$ implies there exist $v, v' \in \mathcal{L}^\perp$ such that $v \smile_1 v'$ and $v \not\smile_2 v'$ for $[v] = [v'] \neq \emptyset$. Then there are connected components C_1, C_2 in \mathcal{L}_2^\perp such that for all $x \in C_1$ and $y \in C_2$ $x \not\smile_2 y$ and $v \in C_1, v' \in C_2$. Consider $g_2 = (g_V, g_E) : \mathcal{L}_2^\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ and construct \mathcal{G}' that is obtained from \mathcal{G} by making $g(x) \not\smile g(y)$ for $x \in C_1$ and $y \in C_2$. There is a morphism $g'_2 = g_2 : \mathcal{L}_2^\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$. Like above, the only case when such morphism may not exist is when for $v' \not\smile v$ $g_V(v) = g_V(v')$. This implies v, v' have a pre-image in $i + j$ and by definition it must be $v' \smile v$. Similarly, there is a morphism $m' : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$. The only case when it may not exist is when for $v_1, v'_1 \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $v_1 \smile v'_1$, $m_V(v_1) = g_V(v_2)$ and $m_V(v'_1) = g_V(v'_2)$ where $v_2 \in C_1$ and $v'_2 \in C_2$. It implies v_1, v'_1 have pre-image in $i + j$ and by definition of a boundary-complement the image of $i + j$ should consist of top-level vertices exclusively. This results in the diagram below there is no morphism $u : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$, as the existence of such a morphism implies $u(g(x)) = u(g'(x))$, $u(g(y)) = u(g'(y))$ for $x \in C_1$ and $y \in C_2$ and $u(g(x)) \smile u(g(y))$ and $u(g'(x)) \not\smile u(g'(y))$. This contradicts the fact that \mathcal{G} is a pushout. Hence, $\smile_1 = \smile_2$ and $\mathcal{L}_2^\perp = \mathcal{L}_1^\perp$.

Ultimately, we have shown that \mathcal{L}^\perp is unique up to isomorphism. \square

Practically, the above proposition means that for any given match m there is only one possible result of rewriting.




Fig. 10. String diagrammatic contexts

B PROOFS FOR SECTION 6: SOUNDNESS AND COMPLETENESS

In this section we will elaborate on soundness of our translation $\llbracket - \rrbracket : \mathbf{PROP}^+(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)/\mathcal{S}$.

REMARK 7. *The construction in Figure 6 naturally extends to k operands. Given a join of k cospans of e -hypographs*

$$\begin{array}{c}
 n_1 \rightarrow n'_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1 \leftarrow m'_1 \leftarrow m_1 \\
 + \\
 \vdots \\
 + \\
 n_k \rightarrow n'_k \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_k \leftarrow m'_k \leftarrow m_k
 \end{array}$$

we will denote the carrier of the resulting cospan as

$$\mathcal{F}_1 \hat{+} \dots \hat{+} \mathcal{F}_k$$

to distinguish it from the coproduct.


PROPOSITION B.1 (PROPOSITION 6.3 RESTATEMENT). *The category $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)/\mathcal{S}$ is a semilattice-enriched PROP.*

PROOF. To prove this statement we essentially need to show that the functor $\llbracket - \rrbracket$ is well-defined, i.e., if $f = g$ in $\mathbf{PROP}^+(\Sigma)$ then $\llbracket f \rrbracket = \llbracket g \rrbracket$ in $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)/\mathcal{S}$ or $\llbracket f \rrbracket \cong_{\mathcal{S}}^* \llbracket g \rrbracket$ in $\mathbf{MEHypI}(\Sigma)$. $f = g$ implies that either

- $f = C[l] = g$ for some morphism $l \in \mathbf{PROP}^+(\Sigma)$.
- $f = C[l]$ and $g = C[r]$ where $l = r$ or $r = l$ is from \mathcal{S} .
- There is a sequence $w = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ such that $x_1 = f$ and $x_n = g$ and $x_i = x_{i+1}$ or $x_{i+1} = x_i$ in the sense above for $i < n$.


where C is a context defined as per the Figure 10 and $C[l]$ is defined by replacing the occurrence of \square in C with a string diagram l . Let's prove the statement by induction on C when $|w| = 2$.

- If C is empty, then either $f = g$ syntactically and $\llbracket f \rrbracket = \llbracket g \rrbracket$ or $f = l = r = g$ for some $l = r$ or $r = l$ in \mathcal{S} . The latter trivially yields the E-DPO diagram below




where $i \rightarrow i' \rightarrow \mathcal{L} \leftarrow j' \leftarrow j = \llbracket l \rrbracket = \llbracket f \rrbracket$ and $i \rightarrow i'' \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \leftarrow j'' \leftarrow j = \llbracket r \rrbracket = \llbracket g \rrbracket$ and $i + j \rightarrow i + j \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ is a boundary complement as per 5.2. Hence, $\llbracket f \rrbracket \cong \langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \rangle \llbracket g \rrbracket$.

- Suppose



and by inductive hypothesis $\llbracket C[l] \rrbracket \cong \llbracket C[r] \rrbracket$ which results in the top half of the diagram below.



Clearly the occurrence of $\llbracket C[l] \rrbracket$ in $\llbracket f \rrbracket$ is convex and down-closed and by following the argument in Theorem 35 [4], there exists $n_1 + m_1 \rightarrow n_1 + m_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2^\perp \leftarrow n_3 + m_3 \leftarrow n_2 + m_2$

such that

$$\llbracket f \rrbracket = (0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \llbracket C[l] \rrbracket \leftarrow n'_1 + m'_1 \leftarrow n_1 + m_1); (n_1 + m_1 \rightarrow n_1 + m_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2^\perp \leftarrow n_3 + m_3 \leftarrow n_2 + m_2)$$

$$\llbracket g \rrbracket = (0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \llbracket C[r] \rrbracket \leftarrow n'_1 + m'_1 \leftarrow n_1 + m_1); (n_1 + m_1 \rightarrow n_1 + m_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2^\perp \leftarrow n_3 + m_3 \leftarrow n_2 + m_2)$$

and

$$n'_2 = n_3 + (n'_1 \setminus n_1) \quad m'_2 = m_3 + (m'_1 \setminus m_1)$$

and

$$n_2 + m_1 \rightarrow n'_2 \setminus (n'_1 \setminus n_1) + m_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2^\perp \leftarrow m'_2 \setminus (m'_1 \setminus m_1) + n_1 \leftarrow m_2 + n_1$$

is an MDA e-hypergraph. By denoting the pushout of $\mathcal{L}_1^\perp \leftarrow n_1 + m_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2^\perp$ with \mathcal{L}_3^\perp , one can observe that $\llbracket f \rrbracket$ is the pushout object of $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow i + j \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ as per the diagram below

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & n_1 + m_1 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{L}_2^\perp \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ i + j & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{L}_1^\perp & \xrightarrow{\quad \ulcorner \quad} & \mathcal{L}_3^\perp \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{L} & \longrightarrow & C[l] & \xrightarrow{\quad \ulcorner \quad} & \llbracket f \rrbracket \end{array}$$

The corestriction of $n_1 + m_1 \xrightarrow{[f_1, f_2]} \mathcal{L}_1^\perp$ to the image of $i + j \xrightarrow{[g_1, g_2]} \mathcal{L}_1^\perp$ is mono: suppose it is not mono, then there exist z_1, z_2, z_3 such that $f_1(z_1) = f_2(z_2) = g_1(z_3)$, then $[f_2, g_1]$ would not be mono, similarly if $f_1(z_1) = f_2(z_2) = g_2(z_3)$. By construction of the pushout the restriction of $\mathcal{L}_1^\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_3^\perp$ is mono and hence the arrow $i + j \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_3^\perp$ is mono. This implies that $\llbracket f \rrbracket \cong_{\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \rangle} \llbracket g \rrbracket$.

- Consider the case when

$$f = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \circ \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_1} \quad \dots \quad \boxed{C[l]} \quad \dots \quad \boxed{f_n} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \circ \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} \quad g = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \circ \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f_1} \quad \dots \quad \boxed{C[r]} \quad \dots \quad \boxed{f_n} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \circ \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$$

By hypothesis, there exists a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{L} & \longleftarrow & i' + j' & \longleftarrow & i + j & \longrightarrow & i'' + j'' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{R} \\ \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \\ \llbracket C[l] \rrbracket & \longleftarrow & & & \mathcal{L}_1^\perp & \longrightarrow & & & \llbracket C[r] \rrbracket \\ & \swarrow & n' + m' & \swarrow & \uparrow & \searrow & n'' + m'' & \searrow & \\ & & & & n + m & & & & \end{array}$$

which implies the existence of the following diagram where both squares are pushouts by construction and the matching is convex and down-closed.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{L} & \xleftarrow{i'+j} & & \xrightarrow{i+j} & \mathcal{R} \\
 \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \\
 \llbracket f_1 \rrbracket \dot{+} \dots \dot{+} \llbracket C[l] \rrbracket \dot{+} \dots \dot{+} \llbracket f_n \rrbracket & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \llbracket f_1 \rrbracket \dot{+} \dots \dot{+} \mathcal{L} \dot{+} \dots \dot{+} \llbracket f_n \rrbracket & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \llbracket f_1 \rrbracket \dot{+} \dots \dot{+} \llbracket C[r] \rrbracket \dot{+} \dots \dot{+} \llbracket f_n \rrbracket \\
 & \nwarrow^{n'_1+m'_1} & \uparrow^{n+m} & \nearrow_{n'_1+m'_1} & \\
 & & n+m & &
 \end{array}$$

and hence we have $\llbracket f \rrbracket \cong_{\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \rangle} \llbracket g \rrbracket$

The rest of the argument follows by induction on the length of w and ultimately we have shown that if $f = g$ then $\llbracket f \rrbracket = \llbracket g \rrbracket$ in $\text{MEHypI}(\Sigma)(\Sigma)/\mathcal{S}$. \square

C ADDITIONAL FIGURES FOR SECTION 1:INTRODUCTION

This section contains the figures with more elaborate transformation of e-string diagrams from the Figure 1.

D ADDITIONAL FIGURES FOR SECTION 4: E-HYPERGRAPHS

Example D.1. Consider cospans from Figure 13(a) where the f_{int}, f_{ext} (respectively, g_{int}, g_{ext}) maps are shown with red arrows. The left cospan represents a symmetry placed inside a hierarchical edge while the right one depicts a tensor product of two identities put inside the hierarchical edge. The colours of the vertices show the induced partition of the interfaces. We will try to build an isomorphism step-by-step. To make the diagram commute, clearly, it must be the case that $u_0 \mapsto u_0$ and $u_1 \mapsto u_1$. Then, because the isomorphism should preserve the order within the subset of green vertices, it must be the case that $u_2 \mapsto u_2$ and $u_3 \mapsto u_3$. Similarly for the output interfaces. To further make the diagram commute, we need to map $v_2 \mapsto v_3$ and $v_3 \mapsto v_2$. This, however, contradicts the requirement that $g_{int}; \gamma(w_2) = g_{int}(w_2)$. Hence, the two cospans are not isomorphic.

Example D.2. Now consider the cospans from Figure 13(b). Notice how the position of external input interface relative to strict internal interface is different in the second cospan. The isomorphism would map $u_0 \mapsto u_2, u_1 \mapsto u_1, u_2 \mapsto u_0, u_3 \mapsto u_3$. The other mappings are identities. One can check that the corresponding diagram commutes.




Fig. 11. Example translation from (a) to (b).




Fig. 12. Example translation from (a) to (b).




Fig. 13. Non-isomorphic cospans (a) and isomorphic cospans (b)