

# Aspects of Artificial Intelligence: Transforming Machine Learning Systems Naturally

Xiuzhan Guo\*

## Abstract

In this paper, we study the machine learning elements which we are interested in together as a machine learning system, consisting of a collection of machine learning elements and a collection of relations between the elements. The relations we concern are algebraic operations, binary relations, and binary relations with composition that can be reasoned categorically. A machine learning system transformation between two systems is a map between the systems, which preserves the relations we concern. The system transformations given by quotient or clustering, representable functor, and Yoneda embedding are highlighted and discussed by machine learning examples. An adjunction between machine learning systems, a special machine learning system transformation loop, provides the optimal way of solving problems. Machine learning system transformations are linked and compared by their maps at 2-cell, natural transformations. New insights and structures can be obtained from universal properties and algebraic structures given by monads, which are generated from adjunctions.

**Keywords** – Machine Learning, Machine Learning System, Machine Learning System Transformation, Binary Relation, Directed Graph, Category, Functor, Transformation, Quotient, Adjunction, Monad, Descent, Yoneda Embedding

Let's begin with the following sentences:

- Observed bird nests in trees enduring heavy winds during my morning walking;
- My cats dash straight to me at the moment they see me taking their lickable treats from the box, without worrying about the optimal path;
- We steer our cars instinctively, without calculating or measuring the exact degrees to turn the steering wheel;
- Some people enjoy solving their problems by defining objective functions, constraints, and searching for the optimal solutions;
- ... .

People might have different feelings and thoughts after reading the words in these sentences and combining the meanings of words together. The collection  $W_0$  of the words in the sentences is discrete. We connect the words by their interconnections in the sentences to obtain a directed graph  $W_1$  and then understand the meanings and insights of these sentences by transforming  $W_1$  from one state to another.

---

\*xiuzhan@gmail.com

Assume that machine learning (ML) aims to learn from data, grow, and perform a class of tasks without explicit instructions. ML involves a complex and connected collection of ML elements, such as, data, algorithms, models, evaluation metrics, monitoring and maintenance, etc. The objective of this paper is to study ML elements together as an *ML system* and map ML systems by *ML system transformations*.

## 1 Introduction

In the age of artificial intelligence, data is from various platforms with multiple formats, noisy, and keeps changing continuously, which results in tremendous potential for dynamic relationships. Data is not static but dynamic. Machine learning (ML) elements and systems, driven by data, producing new data, must be robust enough to capture the changes.

Natural numbers are not isolated but connected by their mathematical operations, e.g.,  $+$ ,  $-$ ,  $\times$ , and  $\div$ , so that, natural numbers can be used not only to count but also to solve real life problems. The set of all natural numbers, along with the operations, forms an algebraic system and so one can study numbers and their relations together by their properties and extend the system to more complex system and solve more complex problems naturally. Hence the relations (operations) between natural numbers and their properties make more sense than the isolated numbers.

In ML, algorithms learn from the data one inputs and can only learn effectively if the data is in the format required, clean and complete. ML models are driven by data and on the other hand, ML models generate data usually. Real world datasets are usually with multiple formats, from multiple silos. These datasets are prepared and transformed to train their ML models. Therefore, not only are data and ML models connected but also are there relations among datasets and between ML models. Hence ML elements are not isolated but connected together with certain structures, e.g., operations, relations, and compositional relations. These relations make more sense than the isolated ML elements, similar to the natural numbers.

Data changes constantly. ML models, driven by data, are tested and retrained to ensure they remain accurate, relevant, and effective during data changing. So all elements and their relations in an ML system must be modified together coherently. All ML elements and the relations between the elements, which we concern, must be viewed together to form an *ML system*.

Real world problems can be solved by modelling them mathematically and implementing the models into computational tools. Some problems are challenges in one mathematical area but can be solved through mapping them to another mathematical environment, e.g., mapping topological problems and number theory problems to algebraic settings. Similarly, some problems might be easier to be solved in one ML system than another. To find a reliable ML system for certain class of problems, we need to compare some ML systems and map one system to another system without breaking the existing relations. Therefore, we also consider how to map one ML system to another.

In Section 2, we first consider the collection  $\mathbf{M}$  of all ML elements and a collection  $R$  of their relations we concern together as an *ML system*  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$ . Then we link and compare ML systems using relations preserving maps, *ML system transformations*. In this section, the ML element relations we are interested in are binary algebraic operation, directed graph, directed graph with identities and composition. Clustering aims to group a class of objects in such a way that objects in the same cluster are more similar to each other. Clustering amounts to partitioning or an equivalent relation on the class of objects or a surjective map from the class to the quotient space of the equivalent relation. If clustering is *compatible* with the relations of an ML system, then we have a quotient ML system by identifying elements in the same cluster and a quotient ML system transformation from the original ML system to its quotient ML system functorially.

Sets are concrete mathematical objects. Given an ML system  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  and an ML element  $M \in \mathbf{M}$ , we have a map  $\text{hom}(-, M)$  from  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  to  $\mathbf{Set}$ , sending  $X \in \mathbf{M}$  to the set of all edges from  $X$  to  $M$ . The corresponding, sending  $M$  to  $\text{hom}(-, M)$ , is called *Yoneda embedding*. The  $\text{hom}(-, M)$  is set valued and determined totally by  $M$ , called *representable* functor/transformation when  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  has composition and identities. These representable functors/transformation, e.g.,  $\text{hom}(-, M)$ , provide the optimal ways to

understand elements, e.g.,  $M$  of ML system  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$ , by their representable functors in the category of all set valued functors (presheaves), through Yoneda embedding. We shall show that Yoneda embedding, along with Yoneda lemma, plays a crucial role in ML system transformation and representation.

An ML system can be transformed by different ways. Let's collect all ML system transformations between two ML systems together. Now it is natural to ask what the relations are between these transformations and how to compare these transformations. In Section 3, the questions are answered categorically: The structure-preserving maps between ML system transformations are categorical natural transformations and these natural transformations are flattened to a preorder on ML system transformations.

ML intends to understand and summarize the existing knowledge from data to grow, predict, and create (new) insights from data. We employ category theory to format and reason ML systems and ML system transformations naturally. An ML system transformation maps problems from one ML system to another where the problems mapped are easier to solve and then the solutions are mapped back to the original system. Hence an ML transformation loop is needed. Categorical concept "adjunction" describes the most efficient solution to problems involving transforming problems and solutions naturally. A monad  $T$  on an ML system  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$ , is an endo system transformation  $T : (\mathbf{M}, R) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}, R)$  with monoid like structure.  $T$  acts on  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  and outputs algebraic structures,  $T$ -algebras, to  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  and so  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  obtains algebraic structures through  $T$ . An adjunction gives rise to a monad and every monad arises in this way. Also, adjunctions can be defined by the universal property that confirms the existence and uniqueness of the gap map/link, which can be used to link ML elements. In Section 4, the adjunctions between ML systems we highlight include Yoneda embedding, monad algebras, free structures, change of base functors.

Finally, we complete the paper with our concluding remarks in Section 5.

## 2 Machine Learning Systems and Transformations

ML elements are the foundational components and blocks that can be used to build ML systems. Essential ML elements include data, features, algorithms, models, performance metrics, validation, testing, deployment, outputs, etc. Let  $\mathbf{M}$  be a collection of ML elements one concerns. The elements in  $\mathbf{M}$  are not isolated but connected by the collection of relations between the elements. For instance, the collection of relations can be specified by algebraic operations, certain dependencies and relations on  $\mathbf{M}$  so that the elements work together to enable the ML systems to learn, grow, and perform tasks. A collection  $\mathbf{M}$  of ML elements and a collection of relations we concern form an *ML system*.

Data is flowing. The elements and the relations in an ML system, driven by data, must be updated and transformed to fit the present setting dynamically. The map, preserving the relations concerned, between ML systems is an *ML system transformation*.

**Definition 2.1.** (*Machine learning system and transformation*)

1. An ML system  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  consists of a collection  $\mathbf{M}$  of ML elements and a collection  $R$  of relations between the elements. Write  $e_1 R e_2$  or  $(e_1, e_2) \in R$  or  $e_1 \rightarrow e_2$  if  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are related by  $R$ , for  $e_1, e_2 \in \mathbf{M}$ .
2. Let  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  be ML systems. An ML system transformation  $T$  from  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  to  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  is a function  $T : \mathbf{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_2$  that preserves the collection  $R_1$  of relations:  $e_1 R_1 e_2$  implies  $T(e_1) R_2 T(e_2)$ , denoted by  $T : (\mathbf{M}_1, R_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$ .

**Remark 2.2.** Let  $T : (\mathbf{M}_1, R_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  be an ML system transformation.

1. If  $R_1$  is given a (partial) binary operation, e.g., table join on a collection of data tables, then  $R_1$  can be viewed as a ternary relation. Assume that  $R_1$  is given by a (partial) binary operation  $\circ$  and  $R_2$  by  $\star$  respectively,  $T : (\mathbf{M}_1, R_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  can be considered as a homomorphism, a structure preserving function  $T : \mathbf{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_2$ , namely,  $T(e_1 \circ e_2) = T(e_1) \star T(e_2)$ .

2. If ML systems  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  have only some general relations, e.g., dependencies, similarities, implications, etc., between their elements, then these ML systems can be modelled by (multi)directed graphs and so the ML transformations between the ML systems are given by directed graph homomorphisms, namely, a function  $T : \mathbf{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_2$  that takes each edge (relation)  $e_1 \rightarrow e_2$  in  $\mathbf{M}_1$  to an edge (relation)  $T(e_1) \rightarrow T(e_2)$  in  $\mathbf{M}_2$ .
3. If ML systems  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  have the transitive and associative relations and identity relations, then both  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  can be modelled by directed graphs with identities and composition, which are *categories*, a general mathematical structure. An ML system transformation  $T : (\mathbf{M}_1, R_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  is a *functor*. Hence ML systems can be reasoned categorically. See Appendix for the basic notations, concepts, and results of relation, directed graph, and category theory.

Algebraic or graph transformation between ML systems that have algebraic operations or binary relations, can be factored as a surjective to a quotient space, followed by an injective transformation by the similar process in [10] at the set level. An ML system that has a compositional relation and forms a category can be quotiented by either a congruence equivalence relation on its hom sets or an equivalence relation on objects. See Subsection B.4 for the quotient category details.

Let  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  be an ML system and  $\rho$  an equivalence relation on  $\mathbf{M}$ .  $\rho$  is *compatible* with  $R$  if  $R$  can be induced to the equivalence relation  $R_\rho$  on  $\mathbf{M}/\rho$ , namely,  $e_1 R e_2 \Rightarrow [e_1]_\rho R_\rho [e_2]_\rho$  is well-defined.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  be an ML system and  $\rho$  an equivalence relation on  $\mathbf{M}_1$ . Suppose that  $\rho$  is compatible with  $R_1$ .*

1. *ML system  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  is transformed to its quotient ML system  $(\mathbf{M}_1/\rho, R_{1\rho})$  by the obvious canonical ML system transformation*

$$Q_\rho : \mathbf{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_1/\rho$$

*sending  $f : e_1 \rightarrow e_2$  to  $[f]_\rho : [e_1]_\rho \rightarrow [e_2]_\rho$ .*

2. *If  $\sigma$  is an equivalence relation on  $\mathbf{M}_1$  and compatible with  $R_1$  such that  $\rho \subseteq \sigma$ , then there is a unique surjective ML system transformation  $(\rho \leq \sigma)^* : \mathbf{M}_1/\rho \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_1/\sigma$  such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbf{M}_1 & \\ Q_\rho \swarrow & & \searrow Q_\sigma \\ \mathbf{M}_1/\rho & \xrightarrow{(\rho \leq \sigma)^*} & \mathbf{M}_1/\sigma \end{array}$$

*commutes.*

3. *Each ML system transformation  $T : (\mathbf{M}_1, R_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$ , which preserves the congruence equivalence relation  $\rho$ , that is,  $(f, g) \in \rho$  implies  $T(f) = T(g)$ , factors through  $Q_\rho$ , followed by a unique induced ML system transformation  $T_\rho : \mathbf{M}_1/\rho \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_2$*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{M}_1 & \xrightarrow{T} & \mathbf{M}_2 \\ Q_\rho \searrow & & \nearrow T_\rho \\ & \mathbf{M}_1/\rho & \end{array}$$

4. *If  $T(\rho) \subseteq \sigma$ , then there is a unique ML system transformation  $T^* : \mathbf{M}_1/\rho \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_2/\sigma$  such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{M}_1 & \xrightarrow{T} & \mathbf{M}_2 \\ Q_\rho \downarrow & & \downarrow Q_\sigma \\ \mathbf{M}_1/\rho & \xrightarrow{T^*} & \mathbf{M}_2/\sigma \end{array}$$

commutes. If  $T$  is surjective and so is  $T^*$ .

**Example 2.4.** *Cluster and represent ML elements from multiple points of view:* Duplicates or similar ML elements in an ML system are often clustered and quotiented to a new ML system. After transforming an ML system by the clusters, we want to represent each equivalence class (cluster) by an ML element on each cluster.

For example, given a sequence

$$S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n \text{ of temporal transaction records}\},$$

to increase the predictability of the next record or a few next records, one may group the records and compute the average of each cluster, for instance, monthly cluster. Hence the equivalence relation  $\rho$  on  $S$  is given by:

$$(s_i, s_j) \in \rho \Leftrightarrow s_i \text{ and } s_j \text{ were transacted at the same month.}$$

The representation function on clusters, e.g., the average  $avg_\rho$  can be chosen to represent each cluster. Therefore we have:

$$S \xrightarrow{Q_\rho} S/\rho \xrightarrow{avg_\rho} (\mathbf{R}, \preceq),$$

where  $\preceq$  is a partial order on  $\mathbf{R}$  and compatible with the represent function  $avg$  to induce  $avg_\rho$ .

The uncertainty/randomness of an ML element can be viewed from different points of view by clustering and representing. The outcomes of a variable, e.g., coin flip, can be either any point from  $\{\text{head, tail}\}$  at the point level or a certain set  $\{\text{head, tail}\}$  at the distribution level.

Let  $\Omega$  be a sample space of a random variable  $X$  and  $bin$  an equivalence relation on  $\Omega$ .  $bin$  clusters  $\Omega$  to a family of disjoint subsets. If  $dist : \Omega \rightarrow V$  is a function that is compatible with  $bin$  and represents the clusters of  $bin$ , then there is a transformation:

$$\Omega \xrightarrow{Q_{bin}} \Omega/bin \xrightarrow{dist} V.$$

Since equivalence relations (clustering or surjective maps) have the partial order  $\leq$  given by  $\subseteq$ , we have the following commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \xrightarrow{Q_\rho} & S/\rho \\ \parallel & & \downarrow (\rho \leq \sigma)^* \\ S & \xrightarrow{Q_\sigma} & S/\sigma \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega & \xrightarrow{Q_\rho} & \Omega/\rho \\ \parallel & & \downarrow (\rho \leq \sigma)^* \\ \Omega & \xrightarrow{Q_\sigma} & \Omega/\sigma \end{array}$$

**Example 2.5.** *Word2vec, Word2fun:* Word embedding intends to map all words in a large corpus to a vector space, with the relations between words, e.g., semantic similarity, syntactic similarity, contextual similarity, analogical relationships, etc., being preserved. Word2vec [16, 17] is a popular machine learning technique for learning word embeddings from a large text corpus. Let  $\mathbf{W}_0$  be the set of all words in a corpus. Applying Word2vec to  $\mathbf{W}_0$ , one obtains a function  $w2v_0 : \mathbf{W}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ . Since there exist the relations, e.g., similar meaning, between the words in  $\mathbf{W}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_0$  is enriched to a directed graph  $\mathbf{W}_1$  and  $w2v_0$  is lifted to  $w2v : \mathbf{W}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ , where  $n$  is a natural number and  $\mathbf{R}^n$  is ordered partially by the *closeness* (neighbourhood). If the words that have similar meaning are closer in the real vector space  $\mathbf{R}^n$ , then one has an ML system transformation:

$$w2v : \mathbf{W}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$$


and so NLP problems in  $\mathbf{W}_1$  might be solved in a vector space  $\mathbf{R}^n$  using the structures and properties of  $\mathbf{R}^n$  through the transformation  $w2v$ . For example, Jiang et al. [11] showed that the semantic independence structure of language are naturally represented by *partial orthogonality* in vector space  $\mathbf{R}^n$ . Since  $\mathbf{R}^n$  is a *linear* vector space and  $\mathbf{W}_1$  might have more complex word relations that are difficult to represent in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ , Mani [14] introduced multi-vectors and geometric algebra to embed words in  $\mathbf{W}_1$ .

Sets are among the most fundamental objects in mathematics and many structures, e.g., graphs, algebras, topologies, geometries, can associate with them. Yuan [21] considered set valued (representable) functors as tasks. Assume that  $\mathbf{W}_1$  is a directed graph. We first transform  $\mathbf{W}_1$  using *path* functor to form a category  $path(\mathbf{W}_1)$  and transform  $path(\mathbf{W}_1)$  to representable functors in the category of presheaves using Yoneda embedding:


$$\mathbf{W}_1 \xrightarrow{path} path(\mathbf{W}_1) \xrightarrow{Q \sim} path(\mathbf{W}_1)/\sim \xrightarrow{Y} \mathbf{Set}^{(path(\mathbf{W}_1)/\sim)^{op}}$$

where  $wordchain_1 \sim wordchain_2$  if both have the similar meaning. See B.5 for the descriptions of presheaves, representable functors, and Yoneda embedding.


For example, the discrete subset  $W_0 = \{\text{apples, eat, i, like, love}\} \subseteq \mathbf{W}_0$  is a set of isolated words but can be directed graph enriched by the sentences of a corpus:



Applying *path* to  $W_1$ , we have the path edges from I to apples:




Quotienting out duplicates, we have:



Clustering/Quotient provides multiple points of view on chains of words at different layers. For instance,

the following quotient system transformations given by  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ :



show how the chains of words are aggregated by clustering/ equivalence relations  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ , functorially.

$\mathbf{Set}^{(\text{path}(\mathbf{W}_1)/\sim)^{\text{op}}}$  (the category of presheaves) has more complicated structure than  $\mathbf{R}^n$  and behaves like sets. Given two representable functors  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , represented by words  $w_1, w_2$  in  $\mathbf{W}_1$ , respectively, by Yoneda Lemma  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are the same up to isomorphism if and only if  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are the same. The process of representing words into their presentable functors, is functorial: for each word corresponding  $f : \mathbf{W}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{W}_2$ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \mathbf{W}_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{path}} & \text{path}(\mathbf{W}_1) & \xrightarrow{Q_\sim} & \text{path}(\mathbf{W}_1)/\sim & \xrightarrow{Y} & \mathbf{Set}^{(\text{path}(\mathbf{W}_1)/\sim)^{\text{op}}} \\
 \downarrow f & & \downarrow \text{path}(f) & & \downarrow \text{path}(f)^* & & \downarrow Y(\text{path}(f)^*) \\
 \mathbf{W}_2 & \xrightarrow{\text{path}} & \text{path}(\mathbf{W}_2) & \xrightarrow{Q_\sim} & \text{path}(\mathbf{W}_2)/\sim & \xrightarrow{Y} & \mathbf{Set}^{(\text{path}(\mathbf{W}_2)/\sim)^{\text{op}}}
 \end{array}$$

is commutative, forgetting the categorical composition. Therefore NLP problems in  $\mathbf{W}_1$  can be transformed to the category of presheaves naturally, where word relations are enriched by set set valued functors functorially.

**Example 2.6.** *Data and model loop:* Assume that ML models are driven by data. Given a data  $d$ , one applies ML system transformations, e.g., clustering or quotienting, summarizing, aggregating, etc., on the data  $d$  to learn an ML model  $m$ , which builds the relations between inputs and outputs, represents data  $d$  and behaves like a mathematical function. On the other hand, given an ML model  $m$ , it can be thought as a colimit of representable functors and produces new data by inputting data, modelling the relations between inputs and outputs. Let **Data** be a collection of data sets and **Model** a collection of ML models. Then one has maps

$$M : \mathbf{Data} \rightarrow \mathbf{Model}$$

and

$$P : \mathbf{Model} \rightarrow \mathbf{Data}.$$

**Data** has a collection of data relations

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_D = \{ & \text{join, combine, select, merge, join conditions,} \\
 & \text{match, similarity, } \dots \}
 \end{aligned}$$

and **Model** a collection of model relations

$$R_M = \{\text{compose, combine, match, similarity, } \dots\},$$

respectively. Choose proper operations or relations  $R_d \in R_D$  and  $R_m \in R_M$ , based on the problem one wants to solve, so that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & P & \\ \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowleft \\ (\mathbf{Data}, R_d) & & (\mathbf{Model}, R_m) \\ \curvearrowleft & & \curvearrowright \\ & M & \end{array}$$

becomes an ML system transformation loop. We shall study when the loop becomes an adjunction and generates new structures in Subsection 4.1.

ML systems and transformations arise everywhere. More examples of ML systems and transformations are listed in the following Example 2.7.

**Example 2.7.** 1. *ML entity match and merge:* Assume that  $\mathbf{E}$  is a set of ML entity records, e.g., data sets, data workflows, etc. An ML entity resolution system  $(\mathbf{E}, \approx, \langle \rangle)$  [3, 9] consists of a set of ML entity records  $\mathbf{E}$ , a *match* function  $\approx: \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{E} \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ , where  $\approx(e_1, e_2) = \text{true}$  means that  $e_1$  matches  $e_2$ , modelling match relations. For instance,  $e_1$  is similar to  $e_2$  if  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  have an overlap.  $\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle$  combines  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  together by identifying their overlap when  $e_1$  matches  $e_2$ . Then  $(\mathbf{E}, \approx, \langle \rangle)$  gives rise to an algebraic system, a partial groupoid  $(\mathbf{E}, \circ)$ , where  $e_1 \circ e_2 = \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle$  when  $\approx(e_1, e_2) = \text{true}$  and undefined, otherwise. Clearly, an ML entity resolution system  $(\mathbf{E}, \approx, \langle \rangle)$  leads to an ML system  $(\mathbf{E}, \circ)$  with a partial algebraic operation  $\circ$ .

2. *Zoom data provenance by clustering:* Recall that data provenance aims to provide a historical record of data origins and transformations associated with data. Data provenance knowledge can be represented as a collection  $\mathbf{D}$  of data elements and a collection of relations  $L$  between the elements [1] and so it forms an ML system  $(\mathbf{D}, L)$ . Data element relations can be rolled up or down according to the data hierarchy, by using equivalence relations  $\tau$  and so data provenance is zoomed, aggregated, queried, and visualized at multiple levels driven by  $\tau$ :

$$(\mathbf{D}, L) \xrightarrow{Q_\tau} (\mathbf{D}/\tau, L/\tau) \xrightarrow{\text{query}} \mathbf{D}.$$

3. *World2vec, World2fun:* Not only are words connected but also is everything in the World linked, interactive and dynamic. Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be the collection of elements (things) in the World and  $\mathcal{R}$  the collection of relations one concerns, between the things. Similar to Word2vec, some subsets of  $\mathcal{W}$ , e.g., graph, ontology, were represented into vector spaces [4, 18]. Since  $\mathcal{W}$  may have more complex relations than vector spaces, by the similar processes in Example 2.5, we transform  $\mathcal{W}$  to representable functors in the category of presheaves using Yoneda embedding:

$$\mathcal{W} \xrightarrow{\text{path}} \text{path}(\mathcal{W}) \xrightarrow{Q_\sim} \text{path}(\mathcal{W})/\sim \xrightarrow{Y} \mathbf{Set}^{(\text{path}(\mathcal{W})/\sim)^{\text{op}}}$$

4. *Slice ML system, coslice ML system:* Let  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  be an ML system that is a category (directed graph with identities and composition) and  $N$  an ML element in  $\mathbf{M}$ . Define  $(\mathbf{M}/N, R/N)$  by

- $\mathbf{M}/N = \{x : X \rightarrow N \mid x \in R\}$ ,
- a relation from  $x : X \rightarrow N$  to  $y : Y \rightarrow N$  in  $R/N$  is a relation  $e : X \rightarrow Y$  in  $R$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{e} & Y \\ & \searrow x & \swarrow y \\ & & N \end{array}$$



commutes. Then  $(\mathbf{M}/N, R/N)$  is the *slice* ML system of  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  over  $N$ .

If  $e : N_1 \rightarrow N_2$  is a relation in  $\mathbf{R}$ , there are ML system transformations

$$e_! : (\mathbf{M}/N_1, R/N_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}/N_2, R/N_2)$$

and

$$e^* : (\mathbf{M}/N_2, R/N_2) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}/N_1, R/N_1)$$

given by composition and pullback, respectively. Dually, one defines coslice ML systems and their adjunctions. We shall see the details of the change of base functors in C.3.

5. *Optimal search*: An optimal search  $(\mathbf{C}, \text{ob})$  over  $\mathbf{R}^n$ , consisting of a feasible space  $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$  and an objective function  $\text{Ob} : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ , aims to search the best element(s) in the feasible space  $\mathbf{C}$ , with respect to certain criteria. One of mathematical optimization problems is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f_0(x) \\ & \text{subject to} && f_i(x) \leq b_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{aligned}$$

where  $f_j : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}, j = 0, 1, \dots, n$  are functions and  $b_i \in \mathbf{R}, i = 1, \dots, n$ . It amounts to the optimal search  $(\mathbf{C}, \text{Ob})$ , where  $\mathbf{C} = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid f_i(x) \leq b_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$  and  $\text{Ob} : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is defined by  $f_0$ . Optimal search variables from a feasible space, can be discrete, categorical, or continuous. An objective function may have its *optimal type*, e.g., minimum, maximum, inflection points on the function.

Let  $\mathbf{OptS}$  be a collection of optimal searches over  $\mathbf{R}^n$ . Since  $2^{\mathbf{R}^n}$  is a poset with  $\subseteq$  and objective functions can be compared point wise.  $\mathbf{OptS}$  is a poset and so an ML system. An ML system transformation  $T : \mathbf{OptS}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{OptS}_2$  is a poset homomorphism (monotone function) .

As explained in Examples 2.5 and 2.7, we have

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  be an ML system. Then there are ML system transformations given by the compositions of the following ML system transformations:*

$$\text{path}(\mathbf{M}, R) \xrightarrow{Q_{\sim}} \text{path}(\mathbf{M}, R)/\sim \xrightarrow{Y} \mathbf{Set}^{(\text{path}(\mathbf{M}, R)/\sim)^{op}}$$

and

$$(\mathbf{M}, R) \xrightarrow{\text{path}} U\text{path}(\mathbf{M}, R) \xrightarrow{UQ_{\sim}} U(\text{path}(\mathbf{M}, R)/\sim) \xrightarrow{UY} U(\mathbf{Set}^{(\text{path}(\mathbf{M}, R)/\sim)^{op}})$$

where  $U : \mathbf{Cat} \rightarrow \mathbf{Grph}$  is the forgetful functor, forgetting categorical composition and identity edges.

Mathematical objects are determined by-and understood by-the network of relationships they enjoy with all the other objects of their species [15]. Yoneda embedding represents each ML element  $E$  to its hom set system transformation  $\text{hom}(-, E)$  which maps each element  $X$  to the set  $\text{hom}(X, E)$  of all relations between  $X$  and  $E$ . Hence we use ML element relations to study ML elements by Yoneda embedding.

### 3 Transforming and Comparing ML System Transformations

In this section and Section 4, we assume that ML systems are categories: directed graphs with identities and composition so that categorical results are applicable. Hence ML system transformations between ML systems are functors and relations/maps between functors are natural transformations categorically. See B.3 for the details of functors and natural transformations.

Let  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  be two ML systems and let  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)^{(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)}$  be specified by

- objects: the collection of ML system transformations from  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  to  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$ ,
- relations: the collection of natural transformations between ML system transformations.

Then  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)^{(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)}$  is an ML system.

Recall that a preorder is a reflexive and transitive binary relation. ML system transformations are preordered naturally by flattening natural transformations between two ML system transformation.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  be two ML systems.*

1.  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)^{(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)}$  is a category and so an ML system.
2. All ML transformations from  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  to  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  have a preorder  $\preceq$ , defined by  $T_1 \preceq T_2$  if there is a natural transformation  $\alpha : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ .

## 4 Adjunctions between ML Systems

Recall that an adjunction between two categories  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$  is given by a pair of functors  $F : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$  and  $G : \mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  and forms a functor loop, corresponding to a *weak form* of equivalence between  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$ , such that for  $C \in \mathbf{C}_0$  and  $B \in \mathbf{B}_0$

$$\frac{C \rightarrow GB}{FC \rightarrow B}$$

which is natural in  $C$  and  $B$ . Adjunction can be defined by universal arrows (See C.1 for the details).

Throughout this section,  $\langle F, G, \varphi \rangle : (\mathbf{M}_1, R_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  is an adjunction between two ML systems  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$ .

### 4.1 Solve Problems Optimally by Adjunctions

An ML system transformation  $T : (\mathbf{M}_1, R_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  transforms problems in ML system  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  to  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  as the problems transformed might be easier to solve in  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$ . After the transformed problems being solved in  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$ , one needs to transform the solutions back to  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$ , with the structures used for the solutions being preserved, so that the original problems are solved in  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$ . Hence an ML system transformation  $S : (\mathbf{M}_2, R_2) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  is needed. If  $T$  and  $S$  are mutually inverse to each other (isomorphism) or inverse to each other up to natural isomorphism of functors (equivalence), then  $T$  and  $S$  are just “relabelling” bijectively or adding more copies of objects up to isomorphism and so it is hard to reduce the complexity of the problems by using the ML transformations  $T$  and  $S$  as an isomorphism could not reduce the complexity of the problem. Categorical concept adjunction, a functor loop, provides a pipeline of transforming problems between ML systems  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  in optimal ways.

Since adjunction  $\langle F, G, \varphi \rangle : (\mathbf{M}_1, R_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  provides a loop and  $F$  and  $G$  determine each other uniquely and naturally,  $F$  produces the most efficient solutions to the problem posed by  $G$ . Hence we use adjunctions to transform ML systems and obtain optimal ways to solve ML problems.

**Example 4.1.** 1. Yoneda embedding forms part of adjunction generally. Recall that a *total* category is a small category whose Yoneda embedding has a left adjoint. Totality of a category was studied very extensively [20, 19, 12, 5]. Many classes of categories are total, including any category which is monadic over **Set**, Grothendieck toposes, locally presentable categories and so are **Grph** and **Top**. Hence Yoneda embedding of an ML system  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  has a left adjoint. To calculate the left adjoint  $F$  of  $Y$ , we consider

$$\frac{X \rightarrow YM}{FX \rightarrow M},$$

where  $X : \mathbf{M}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is a set valued functor. Since each presheaf is a colimit of representable set valued functors, one assumes  $X$  is representable and  $FX$  is the representing object of  $X$ . Hence  $F$  is defined by the colimit of these representing objects.

2. A *forgetful functor* is a functor, defined by *forgetting* some structure, such that, forgetting composition and identities of a category to get a directed graph, forgetting algebraic structures, e.g., monoid, group, module, to obtain a set, etc. The left adjoint of such a forgetful functor is called *free* functor, such as, free category functor, free monoid functor, free group functor, and free module functor.
3. A monad and its  $T$ -algebras leads to an adjunction (see C.2) and so an optimal way to solve problems with algebraic structures.
4. Recall that Word2vec transformation  $w2v : \mathbf{W}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$  discussed in Example 2.5. If  $w2v$  has a left (or right) adjoint  $L$  and so it is part of an adjunction to solve the word representation problem, then for each  $w \in \mathbf{W}$  and each  $v \in \mathbf{R}^n$ ,

$$\frac{v \rightarrow w2v(w)}{Lv \rightarrow w},$$

which is natural in  $w$  and  $v$ . Similarly, the ML system transformation loop

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & P & \\ \text{(Data, } R_d) & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \text{(Model, } R_m) \\ & M & \end{array}$$

discussed in Example 2.6 forms an adjunction if and only if for  $d \in \mathbf{Data}$  and  $m \in \mathbf{Model}$

$$\frac{m \rightarrow Md}{Pm \rightarrow d},$$

which is natural in  $d$  and  $m$  or

$$\frac{d \rightarrow Pm}{Md \rightarrow m},$$

which is natural in  $d$  and  $m$ .

5. Let  $e : N_1 \rightarrow N_2$  be a relation in an ML system  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  which has pullbacks. Then we have the following adjoint pair:


$$(\mathbf{M}, R)/N_2 \xrightleftharpoons[e^*]{e_1} (\mathbf{M}, R)/N_1$$

where  $(\mathbf{M}, R)/N_2$  is the slice ML system over  $N_2$  with all relations to  $N_2$  being objects,  $e_1(D, s) = es$ ,  $e^*(C, r) = \pi_1$  which is given by the following pullback:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N_1 \times_{N_2} C & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & C \\ \pi_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow r \\ N_1 & \xrightarrow{e} & N_2 \end{array}$$

The unit and counit of  $e_1 \dashv e^*$  is given by  $\eta(s : D \rightarrow N_1) = \langle s, 1_C \rangle : C \rightarrow N_1 \times_{N_2} C$  and  $\varepsilon(r : C \rightarrow$

$N_2) = \pi_2$ , where  $\pi_2$  is defined by the last pullback and  $\langle s, 1_C \rangle$  by the following pullback:



## 4.2 Extend Machine Learning Systems by Adding Algebra Structures

ML systems and system transformations were formatted and reasoned categorically. ML objects and pipelines can have other formations other than the categorical way. However, ML aims to not only understand and summarize the existing knowledge from data but also grow and create insights.

Recall that a monad on a category is an endo functor with monoid-like structure. Monads and their  $T$ -algebras can provide algebraic structures to the category. An adjunction gives rise to a monad and every monad arises this way (see C.2 for the details).

**Definition 4.2.** A monad  $T = \langle T, \eta, \mu \rangle$  on an ML system  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$  is an ML system transformation  $T : (\mathbf{M}, R) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}, R)$  and two natural transformations

$$\eta : I \rightarrow T, \mu : T^2 \rightarrow T$$

such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^3 & \xrightarrow{T\mu} & T^2 \\ \mu T \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu \\ T^2 & \xrightarrow{\mu} & T \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} IT & \xrightarrow{\eta T} & T^2 & \xleftarrow{T\eta} & TI \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \mu & \swarrow & \\ & 1 & T & 1 & \end{array}$$

are commutative, where  $I : (\mathbf{M}, R) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}, R)$  is the identity functor, sending  $e : X \rightarrow Y$  to  $e : X \rightarrow Y$ .

Each adjunction  $\langle F, G, \varphi \rangle : (\mathbf{M}_1, R_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}_2, R_2)$  between ML systems gives rise to a monad  $\langle GF, \eta, G\varepsilon F \rangle$  on  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  and every monad on  $(\mathbf{M}_1, R_1)$  arises this way.

A monad  $T : (\mathbf{M}, R) \rightarrow (\mathbf{M}, R)$  generates algebraic structures to  $(\mathbf{M}, R)$ .

## 4.3 Link Machine Learning Objects by Universal Properties

Universal property characterizes objects by their relations or links to other objects uniquely up to isomorphism. Adjunctions, free objects, limits/colimits, and representable functors are the examples that are determined by their universal property. Universal property confirms the existence and uniqueness of a relation or map to fill in. By the universal property the relation filled in is a best or most efficient solution. Hence ML objects can be linked by universal property naturally.

**Example 4.3.** 1. Let  $A, B, X$  be tables/neural networks related and  $\langle A, B \rangle$  the join/merge of  $A$  and  $B$ . If there are the relations  $f : X \rightarrow A$  and  $g : X \rightarrow B$  then there is a unique relation  $\langle f, g \rangle : X \rightarrow \langle A, B \rangle$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & X & \\
 f \swarrow & \vdots & \searrow g \\
 & \langle f, g \rangle & \\
 \pi_1 \swarrow & \downarrow & \searrow \pi_2 \\
 A & \langle A, B \rangle & B
 \end{array}$$

commutes, where  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  are projections.

2. Given a representable functor  $F : \mathbf{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ , if  $F$  is represented by  $X$  and  $Y$ , then there are relations  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $g : Y \rightarrow X$  such that  $gf = 1_X$  and  $fg = 1_Y$ .
3. The adjunctions given by Yoneda embedding (see B.5) and change of base (see C.3) are characterized by their universal properties, which can be used to fill out the gap relations between ML elements, e.g., words and chains of words in a corpus.

Let  $\mathbf{W}_0$  be the collection of all words from a set of large corpora and  $\mathbf{W}_1$  the directed graph by linking words in  $\mathbf{W}_0$  using the ordered pairs of words appearing in the large corpora. Applying  $path$  to  $\mathbf{W}_1$ , one has a directed graph with composition (category)  $path(\mathbf{W}_1)$ . So categorical notions and results are applicable to  $path(\mathbf{W}_1)$ . For example, special maps, e.g., epics and monics, are discussed as follows.

A word chain  $e : w_1 \rightarrow w_2$  in  $path(\mathbf{W}_1)$  is *epic* if  $c_1 e = c_2 e$  implies  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  have the same meaning. Dually, a word chain  $e : w_1 \rightarrow w_2$  in  $path(\mathbf{W}_1)$  is *monic* if  $ec_1 = ec_2$  implies  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  have the same meaning.

$e =$  “The meaning of this sentence is defined by the succeeding chain of words”

and

$m =$  “The meaning of this sentence is determined by the preceding chain of words”

are clearly epic and monic, respectively if these words are in  $\mathbf{W}_0$ .  $s =$  “I love fruits” is neither epic nor monic since

$$t_1 s = t_2 s, s t_1 = s t_2, t_1 \neq t_2$$

up to meaning, where  $t_1 =$  “I love apples” and  $t_1 =$  “I love oranges”. Reasoning  $path(\mathbf{W}_1)$  categorically holds independent interest, is beyond the scope of the current paper, and will be addressed separately.

Since  $path(\mathbf{W}_1)$ , we have the Yoneda embedding

$$Y : path(\mathbf{W}_1) \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{(path(\mathbf{W}_1))^{\text{op}}}.$$

The left adjoint  $L$  of  $Y$  is calculated by representing a presheaf as a colimit of presentable functors.

When  $path(\mathbf{W}_1)$  has pullbacks, for each chain of word  $p : w_1 \rightarrow w_2$ , we have an adjunction:

$$path(\mathbf{W}_1)/w_2 \xrightleftharpoons[p^*]{p!} path(\mathbf{W}_1)/w_1$$

where  $p!(D, s) = ps$ ,  $p^*(C, r) = \pi_1$  which is given by the following pullback:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 w_1 \times_{w_2} C & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & C \\
 \pi_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow r \\
 w_1 & \xrightarrow{p} & w_2
 \end{array}$$

## 5 Conclusions

Data is from various platforms with multiple formats, noisy, and changes constantly. ML elements and systems, driven by data and outputting new data, must be robust to the changes. The relations between ML elements make more sense than the isolated ML elements. We studied the ML elements that we are interested in together as an ML system. The relations between ML elements we concerned are algebraic operations, binary relations, and binary relations with composition that can be reasoned categorically. An ML system transformation between two systems is a map between the systems, which preserves the relations we concerned. The ML system transformations given by quotient or clustering, representable functor and Yoneda embedding were highlighted and discussed by ML examples. ML elements were embedded to set valued functors which provide multiple relation perspectives for each ML element. ML system transformations were linked and compared by their maps at 2-cell, natural transformations. ML transformations lead to fresh perspectives and uncover new insights. Special ML system transformation loops, adjunctions between ML systems, offered the optimal way of solving ML problems. New ML insights and structures can be obtained from universal properties and algebraic structures given by monads, which are generated from adjunctions.

## References

- [1] Umut A. Acar, Peter Buneman, James Cheney, Jan Van den Bussche, Natalia Kwasnikowska, and Stijn Vansummeren, *A graph model of data and workflow provenance*, TAPP'10: Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on the Theory and Practice of Provenance 2010.
- [2] Jirí Adámek, Horst Herrlich, and George E. Strecker, *Abstract and Concrete Categories: The Joy of Cats*, Dover Publications 2009.
- [3] O. Benjelloun, D. Garcia-Molina, D. Menestrina, Q. Su, S.E. Wang and J. Widom, *Swoosh: A generic approach to entity resolution*, VLDB J., 18 (1) (2009), 255-276.
- [4] Chen, J., Hu, P., Jimenez-Ruiz, E., Holter, O. M., Antonyrajah, D., and Horrocks, I., *Owl2vec\*: Embedding of owl ontologies*, Machine Learning, 110(7)(2021), 1813-1845.
- [5] Brian Day, *Further criteria for totality*, Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques, 28(1)(1987), 77-78.
- [6] B. Fong and D. I. Spivak, *Seven Sketches in Compositionality: An Invitation to Applied Category Theory*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05316, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1803.05316>, 2018.
- [7] A. Grothendieck, *Technique de descente et théorèmes d'existence en géométrie algébrique, I. Généralités. Descente par morphismes fidèlement plats*, Séminaire Bourbaki 190, 1959.
- [8] A. Grothendieck, *Catégories fibrées et descente, Exposé VI, in: Revêtements Etales et Groupe Fondamental (SGA1)*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 224, Springer (Berlin), 1971, 145-194.
- [9] Xiuzhan Guo, Arthur Berrill, Ajinkya Kulkarni, Kostya Belezko, and Min Luo, *Another generic setting for entity resolution: basic theory*, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2303.06629>, 2023.
- [10] Xiuzhan Guo, Wei Huang, Min Luo, and Priya Rangarajan, *Transforming geospatial ontologies by homomorphisms*. Vol. 3637, CEUR-WS.org. <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3637/paper8.pdf>. Proceedings of the Joint Ontology Workshops 2023.
- [11] Yibo Jiang, Bryon Aragam, and Victor Veitch, *Uncovering meanings of embeddings via partial orthogonality*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36 (NeurIPS 2023) , 31988-32005.

- [12] Max Kelly, *A survey of totality for enriched and ordinary categories*, Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques, 27(2)(1986), 109-132
- [13] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, Springer, the Second Edition, 1998.
- [14] A. Mani, Representing words in a geometric algebra, [www.pacm.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/pacm\\_arjunman2023](http://www.pacm.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/pacm_arjunman2023).
- [15] B. Mazur, *When is one thing equal to some other thing?*, Proof and other dilemmas: Mathematics and philosophy, 2008, 221-241.
- [16] Mikolov, Tomas, Chen, Kai, Corrado, Greg, Dean, Jeffrey, *Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space*, arXiv:1301.3781 [cs.CL], <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1301.3781>, 2013.
- [17] T. Mikolov, I. Sutskever, K. Chen, G. Corrado, J. Dean, *Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality*, CoRR, abs/1310.4546, 2013. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems.
- [18] Narayanan, A., Chandramohan, M., Venkatesan, R., Chen, L., Liu, Y., and Jaiswal, S., *graph2vec: Learning distributed representations of graphs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.05005, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1707.05005>, 2017.
- [19] Ross Street, *The family approach to total cocompleteness and toposes*, Trans. A. M. S. 284 (1984) pp.355-369.
- [20] Walter Tholen, *Note on total categories*, Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society 21(2)(1980), 169-173.
- [21] Yang Yuan, *On the power of foundation models*, Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning ICML23, 40519 - 40530.

The minimum requirements of the relation, directed graph, and category theory for the paper include: binary relation, equivalence relation, equivalence class, quotient, category, homomorphism, isomorphism, coproduct, pullback, pushout, monic, epic, injection, initial object, functor, natural transformation, Yoneda lemma and embedding, adjunction, monad,  $T$ -algebra. For the related notions, notations, results, and a systematic introduction, the reader may consult, for instance, [13, 2, 6].

## A Binary Relations and Directed Graphs

### A.1 Binary Relations

Recall that a *binary relation* on a nonempty set  $S$  is a subset  $\rho \subseteq S \times S$ , where  $S \times S = \{(s_1, s_2) \mid s_1, s_2 \in S\}$  is the *Cartesian product* of  $S$  and  $S$ . A binary relation  $\rho$  on  $S$  is *reflexive* if  $(s, s) \in \rho$  for all  $s \in S$ , *symmetric* if  $(s_1, s_2) \in \rho$  implies  $(s_2, s_1) \in \rho$ , *transitive* if  $(s_1, s_2) \in \rho$  and  $(s_2, s_3) \in \rho$  imply  $(s_1, s_3) \in \rho$ , and *antisymmetric* if  $(s_1, s_2) \in \rho$  and  $(s_2, s_1) \in \rho$  imply  $s_1 = s_2$ .

A *poset*  $(P, \leq)$  consists of a nonempty set  $P$  and a reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive binary relation  $\leq$  on  $P$ .

An *equivalence relation* on  $S$  is a reflexive, symmetric, and transitive binary relation on  $S$ . Let  $\rho$  be an equivalence relation on  $S$  and  $s \in S$ . The *equivalence class* of  $s$  is  $\{x \in S \mid (x, s) \in \rho\}$ , denoted by  $[s]_\rho$ .

*Clustering* aims to group a set of the objects in such a way that objects in the same cluster are more similar to each other. In a nonempty set  $S$ , clustering the objects (elements) of  $S$  amounts to grouping or partitioning them, which turns out to be an equivalence relation on  $S$ .

### A.2 Directed Graphs

Recall that a *(multi)directed graph*  $(N, E)$  consists of a collection  $N$  of *nodes* (or *vertices*), a collection  $E$  of *edges*, and two functions

$$E \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{from}} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{to}} \end{array} N$$

that specify “from” node and “to” node of each edge  $f \in E$ . Write  $f \in E$  by  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , where  $X = \text{from}(f)$ ,  $Y = \text{to}(f)$ .

## B Categories, Functors, and Natural Transformations

### B.1 Categories

A *category*  $\mathbf{C}$  is a directed graph  $(N, E)$  with identities and associative composition, which are two functions:

$$\text{id} : N \rightarrow E \text{ and } \text{comp} : E \times_N E \rightarrow E,$$

where  $E \times_N E = \{(f, g) \mid \text{to}(f) = \text{from}(g)\} \subseteq E \times E$  collects all *composable* pairs of edges, such that

- for all edge  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $1_Y f = f 1_X = f$ , where  $1_X = \text{id}(X)$ ,
- for all  $f : A \rightarrow B$ ,  $g : B \rightarrow C$ ,  $h : C \rightarrow D$ ,  $h(gf) = (hg)f$ , where  $gf = \text{comp}(f, g)$  for each composable

As a category  $\mathbf{C}$  is a directed graph, write the set of nodes and the set of edges of  $\mathbf{C}$  by  $\mathbf{C}_0$  and  $\mathbf{C}_1$ , respectively. Nodes and edges in a category are also called *objects* and *maps* of the category, respectively.

Given a category  $\mathbf{C}$ , if we flip the directions of all maps in  $\mathbf{C}$  then we obtain its *dual category*, denoted by  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{op}}$ . Clearly,  $(\mathbf{C}^{\text{op}})^{\text{op}} = \mathbf{C}$ .



Given objects  $X, Y \in \mathbf{C}_0$ , write

$$\text{hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(X, Y) = \{f \in \mathbf{C}_1 \mid \text{from}(f) = X \text{ and } \text{to}(f) = Y\}.$$

A *subcategory*  $\mathbf{C}'$  of a category  $\mathbf{C}$  is given by any subcollections of the objects and maps of  $\mathbf{C}$ , which is a category under the from, to, composition, and identity operations of  $\mathbf{C}$ .

Given a directed graph  $G = (N, E)$  and two nodes  $a, b \in N$ , a *path* from  $a$  to  $b$  is a sequence of composable edges  $[e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k]$  such that

$$\text{from}(e_1) = a, \dots, \text{to}(e_i) = \text{from}(e_{i+1}), \dots, \text{to}(e_k) = b, i = 1, \dots, k - 1.$$

Each node has an empty path  $[\ ]$ . Each directed graph  $G = (N, E)$  generates a category

$$\text{Path}(G) = \text{Path}(N, E) = (N, \{\text{all paths in } G\}),$$

by considering all paths as edges, empty path as identity, path concatenation as composition. Call  $\text{Path}(G)$  the *free category* on directed graph  $G$ .

On the other hand, given a category  $\mathbf{C}$ , one has a directed graph  $F(\mathbf{C})$  by forgetting identity edges and edge composition.

Some examples of categories are listed below.

1. Each poset  $(P, \leq)$  is a category with the elements of  $P$  as its objects and  $\leq$  as maps.
2. All sets and functions between sets form a category **Set**.
3. All directed graphs and graph homomorphisms between graphs form a category **Grph**.
4. All categories and functors between categories form a category **Cat**.

## B.2 Limits and Colimits


Limits and colimits are an example of universals. Given a category  $\mathbf{C}$ , an  $\mathbf{I}$ -indexed *diagram* in  $\mathbf{C}$  is a functor  $D : \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ , where the category  $\mathbf{I}$  is thought of as index category. A *D-cone* is a natural transformation  $\phi : L \rightarrow D$ , where  $L : \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is a constant functor that sends each  $\mathbf{I}$ -map  $f : I \rightarrow J$  to a constant  $1_L : L \rightarrow L$  in  $\mathbf{C}_1$ . Each *D-cone* can be specified by a  $\mathbf{C}$ -object  $L$  together with a family of  $\mathbf{C}_1$  elements  $(\phi_I : L \rightarrow DI)_{I \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{I})}$  such that  $Df\phi_I = \phi_J$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & L & \\ \phi_I \swarrow & & \searrow \phi_J \\ DI & \xrightarrow{Df} & DJ \end{array}$$

for each  $\mathbf{I}$ -map  $f : I \rightarrow J$ . A *limit* of the diagram  $D : \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is a *D-cone*  $(L, \phi)$  such that for each other *D-cone*  $(J, \psi)$  there is a unique  $\mathbf{C}_1$  element  $u : J \rightarrow L$  making the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & J & \\ & \vdots & \\ & \psi_I & \\ & \searrow & \\ & & DI \\ & \nearrow & \\ & \phi_I & \\ & \vdots & \\ & L & \\ & u & \end{array}$$


commute for each  $\mathbf{I}$ -object  $I$ . If  $\mathbf{I}$  is specified by the following graphs



then the limit of  $D : \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is called a *terminal object*, an *equalizer*, a *pullback (square)* in  $\mathbf{C}$ , respectively.


Explicitly, a  $\mathbf{C}$ -object  $1$  is a *terminal object* provided for each  $\mathbf{C}$ -object  $X$  there is a unique  $\mathbf{C}$ -map  $!_X : X \rightarrow 1$ .

A commutative square




in  $\mathbf{C}$  is called a *pullback (square)* provided given any  $\mathbf{C}$ -maps  $w_1 : W \rightarrow X$  and  $w_2 : W \rightarrow Y$  with  $fw_1 = gw_2$  there is a unique  $\mathbf{C}$ -map  $w : W \rightarrow P$  such that

$$p_1w = w_1 \text{ and } p_2w = w_2 :$$



For two parallel  $\mathbf{C}$ -maps  $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$ , the *equalizer* of  $f$  and  $g$  is a  $\mathbf{C}$ -map  $e : E \rightarrow X$  such that  $fe = ge$  and  $e$  is unique with this property: if a  $\mathbf{C}$ -map  $z : Z \rightarrow X$  is such that  $fz = gz$  then there is a unique  $\mathbf{C}$ -map  $d : Z \rightarrow E$  such that  $ed = z$ :



If maps between  $D$ -cones are defined properly, then limits can be characterized as terminal objects in the category of all  $D$ -cones.

The dual notions of cone, limit, terminal object, pullback (square), equalizer are *cocone*, *colimit*, *initial object*, *pushout (square)*, and *coequalizer*, respectively.

### B.3 Functors and Natural Transformations

Let  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$  be categories. A *functor*  $F : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  is a structure preserving function  $F$  between  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$ , which maps  $\mathbf{C}_i$  to  $\mathbf{D}_i$ :  $F\mathbf{C}_i \subseteq \mathbf{D}_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ , such that

1. for each  $X \in \mathbf{C}_0$ ,  $F1_X = 1_{FX}$ ;
2. for each composable edge pair  $(f, g)$  in  $\mathbf{C}_1$ ,  $(Ff, Fg)$  is a composable pair and  $F(gf) = FgFf$ .

A functor  $F : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  is *full (faithful)* if each function

$$F : \text{hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(X, Y) \rightarrow \text{hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(FX, FY),$$

sending  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  to  $Ff : FX \rightarrow FY$ , is surjective (injective) for all  $X, Y \in \mathbf{C}_0$ .

Let  $F, G : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  be two functors. A *natural transformation*  $\alpha$  from  $F$  to  $G$ , written as  $\alpha : F \rightarrow G$ , is specified by an operation which assigns each object  $X$  of  $\mathbf{C}$  a map  $\alpha_X : FX \rightarrow GX$  such that for each  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathbf{C}_1$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FX & \xrightarrow{\alpha_X} & GX \\ Ff \downarrow & & \downarrow Gf \\ FY & \xrightarrow{\alpha_Y} & GY \end{array}$$

commutes in  $\mathbf{D}$ . Natural transformations are maps between functors. A natural transformation  $\alpha$  is called a *natural isomorphism*, denoted by  $\alpha : F \cong G$ , if each *component*  $\alpha_X$  is an isomorphism.

An *equivalence* between categories  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$  is a pair of functors  $S : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  and  $T : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  together with natural isomorphisms  $1_{\mathbf{C}} \cong TS$  and  $1_{\mathbf{D}} \cong ST$ .

## B.4 Quotient Categories

Given nonempty category  $\mathbf{C}$ , one may cluster the maps (edges) or objects (nodes) of  $\mathbf{C}$  to obtain the new *quotient category*  $\mathbf{C}/\rho$  with respect to an equivalence relation  $\rho$  on maps or objects such that composition under  $\rho$  is well defined.

Let  $\rho$  be an equivalence relation on  $\mathbf{C}_1$ .  $\rho$  is a *congruence* if for  $f, g \in \text{hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(X, Y)$  such that  $kfh$  and  $kg$  are composable and  $(f, g) \in \rho$  imply  $(kfh, kgh) \in \rho$ . *Quotient category*  $\mathbf{C}/\rho$  is defined by

- $(\mathbf{C}/\rho)_0 = \mathbf{C}_0$ ,
- $(\mathbf{C}/\rho)_1 = \{[f]_{\rho} \mid f \in \mathbf{C}_1, \text{ where } [f]_{\rho} : X \rightarrow Y \text{ as a representative member of the equivalence class of } f : X \rightarrow Y \text{ in } \mathbf{C},$
- **identities:**  $[1_X]_{\rho} : X \rightarrow X$ ,
- **composition:**  $[g]_{\rho}[f]_{\rho} = [gf]_{\rho}$ .

There is an obvious canonical functor

$$Q_{\rho} : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}/\rho$$

sending  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  to  $[f]_{\rho} : X \rightarrow Y$ . Each functor  $F : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ , which preserves the congruence equivalence relation  $\rho$ :  $(f, g) \in \rho$  implies  $Ff = Fg$ , factors through  $Q_{\rho}$ , followed by a unique functor  $F_{\rho} : \mathbf{C}/\rho \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{C} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathbf{D} \\ & \searrow Q_{\rho} & \nearrow F_{\rho} \\ & \mathbf{C}/\rho & \end{array}$$

Clustering the nodes (objects) of  $\mathbf{C}$  by an equivalence relation, can be more complicated since new composition on the equivalence classes of edges (maps) needs to be well defined. However, one may first quotient the directed graph by identifying nodes then add all paths to the quotient directed graph to form a category.

## B.5 Presheaves, Representable Functors, and Yoneda Embedding

A category is *small* if its objects and maps are sets and so it is **Set**-enriched as the maps between each pair  $(X, Y)$  of objects form a hom set  $\text{hom}(X, Y)$ . Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a small category.

A *presheaf* on a small category  $\mathbf{C}$  is a set valued functor  $F : \mathbf{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ .

**Theorem B.1.** *Given a small category  $\mathbf{C}$ , each category of presheaves on  $\mathbf{C}$  is complete and cocomplete and both limits and colimits are computed point wise.*

Since  $\mathbf{Grph} \cong \mathbf{Set}^2$ , one has:

**Corollary B.2.**  *$\mathbf{Grph}$  has both limits and colimits, being computed point wise.*

A set valued functor  $S : \mathbf{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is *representable* or *represented* by  $A \in \mathbf{C}_0$  if it is naturally isomorphic to a hom functor  $\text{hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(-, A)$  for  $A \in \mathbf{C}_0$ .

**Theorem B.3.** *Each presheaf is a colimit of representable set valued functors.*

The Yoneda lemma states that natural transformations from a representable functor  $\text{hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(-, X)$  to a set valued functor  $S : \mathbf{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is in natural bijection with  $SX$ :

**Proposition B.4** (Yoneda Lemma). *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a small category,  $S : \mathbf{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  a functor, and  $X \in \mathbf{C}_0$ . Then there is a natural isomorphism*

$$\{\alpha : \text{hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(-, X) \rightarrow S\} \rightarrow SX.$$

**Proposition B.5** (Yoneda Embedding). *There is a full and faithful embedding*

$$Y : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbf{C}^{\text{op}}},$$

taking  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  to  $\text{hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(-, f) : \text{hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(-, X) \rightarrow \text{hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(-, Y)$ , where  $\text{hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(-, f)(e) = fe$ .

Representing objects of a representable functor are unique up to isomorphism.

**Corollary B.6.**  *$YA \cong YB$  if and only if  $A \cong B$ .*

Morita theory shows that one can study a ring  $R$  by investigating the category of all  $R$ -modules, all module structures associated to  $R$ . Similarly, we study an ML element  $E$  using the relations around  $E$  by Yoneda Lemma.

## C Adjoints and Monads

### C.1 Adjoints

Recall that an *adjunction* from  $\mathbf{C}$  to  $\mathbf{D}$  is a triple  $\langle F, G, \varphi \rangle : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ , where  $F$  and  $G$  are functors:

$$\mathbf{C} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{F} \\ \xleftarrow{G} \end{array} \mathbf{D}$$

and  $\varphi$  is a function which assigns to each pair of objects  $C \in \mathbf{C}, D \in \mathbf{D}$  a bijection of sets

$$\varphi = \varphi_{C,D} : \mathbf{D}(FC, D) \cong \mathbf{C}(C, GD)$$

which is natural in  $C$  and  $D$ :

$$\frac{FC \rightarrow D}{C \rightarrow GD}.$$

If  $F : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  is a functor and  $D \in \mathbf{D}_0$ , a *universal arrow* from  $D$  to  $F$  is a pair  $(C, u)$  with  $C \in \mathbf{C}_0$  and  $u : D \rightarrow FC$  being in  $\mathbf{D}_1$  such that for each pair  $(C', f)$  with  $C' \in \mathbf{C}_0$  and  $f : D \rightarrow FC' \in \mathbf{D}_1$  there is a unique  $f^* : C \rightarrow C'$  in  $\mathbf{C}_1$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D & \xrightarrow{u} & FC \\ & \searrow f & \downarrow Ff^* \\ & & FC' \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} C \\ \vdots \\ f^* \\ \downarrow \\ C' \end{array}$$

commutes. Equivalently,  $u : D \rightarrow FC$  is universal from  $D$  to  $F$  provided that the pair  $(C, u)$  is an initial object in the comma category  $(D \downarrow F)$  that has maps  $D \rightarrow FC$  as its objects.

If  $G : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is a functor and  $C \in \mathbf{C}_0$ , dually, a *universal arrow* from  $G$  to  $C$  is a pair  $(D, v)$  with  $D \in \mathbf{D}_0$  and  $v : GD \rightarrow C$  in  $\mathbf{C}_1$  such that for each pair  $(D', f)$  with  $D' \in \mathbf{D}_0$  and  $f : GD' \rightarrow C \in \mathbf{C}_1$  there is a unique  $f^\# : D' \rightarrow D$  in  $\mathbf{D}_1$  making

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D' & & GD' \\ \vdots & & \downarrow Gf^\# \\ f^\# & & GD \\ \vdots & & \downarrow v \\ D & & C \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & & f \\ & & \searrow \\ & & C \end{array}$$

commute.

By [[13], p.83, Theorem 2], each adjunction  $\langle F, G, \varphi \rangle : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  is completely determined by one of five conditions. Here we only record some of them, which we shall use in this thesis:

(ii) *The functor  $G : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  and for each  $C \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  a  $F_0(C) \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  and a universal arrow  $\eta_C : C \rightarrow GF_0(C)$  from  $C$  to  $G$ . Then the functor  $F$  has object function  $F_0$  and is given by sending  $f : C \rightarrow C'$  to  $GF(f)\eta_C = \eta_{C'}f$ .*

(iv) *The functor  $F : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  and for each  $D \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{D})$  a  $G_0(D) \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  and a universal arrow  $\varepsilon_D : FG_0(D) \rightarrow D$  from  $F$  to  $D$ .*

(v) *Functors  $F, G$  and natural transformations  $\eta : 1_{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow GF$  and  $\varepsilon : FG \rightarrow 1_{\mathbf{D}}$  such that  $G\varepsilon \cdot \eta G = 1_G$  and  $\varepsilon F \cdot F\eta = 1_F$ .*

Hence we often denote the adjunction  $\langle F, G, \varphi \rangle : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  by  $(\eta, \varepsilon) : F \dashv G : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  or by  $\langle F, G, \eta, \varepsilon \rangle : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ . In this case, we say that  $F$  is a *left adjoint* to  $G$  or  $G$  is a *right adjoint* to  $F$  and that  $F$  has a right adjoint  $G$  and  $G$  has a left adjoint  $F$ . We also say that  $F \dashv G$  is an *adjoint pair*.

Given a directed graph  $G = (N, E)$ , a category  $\mathbf{C}$ , one has

$$\frac{\text{graph homomorphism } G \rightarrow U(\mathbf{C})}{\text{category functor } Path(G) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}}$$

and so there is an adjunction:

$$\mathbf{Grph} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Path} \\ \xleftarrow{U} \end{array} \mathbf{Cat}.$$

## C.2 Monads

In algebra, a *monoid*  $M$  is a semigroup with an identity element. It may be viewed as a set with two operations: unit  $\eta : 1 \rightarrow M$  and composition  $\mu : M \times M \rightarrow M$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \times M \times M & \xrightarrow{1 \times \mu} & M \times M \\ \mu \times 1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu \\ M \times M & \xrightarrow{\mu} & M \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 1 \times M & \xrightarrow{\eta \times 1} & M \times M & \xleftarrow{1 \times \eta} & M \times 1 \\
 & \searrow \pi_2 & \downarrow \mu & \swarrow \pi_1 & \\
 & & M & & 
 \end{array}$$

are commutative, where the object 1 is the one-point set  $\{0\}$ , the morphism 1 is an identity map, and where  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  are projections.

**Definition C.1.** A monad  $T = \langle T, \eta, \mu \rangle$  on a category  $\mathbf{C}$  consists of an endo functor  $T : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  and two natural transformations

$$\eta : I \rightarrow T, \mu : T^2 \rightarrow T$$

such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 T^3 & \xrightarrow{T\mu} & T^2 \\
 \mu T \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu \\
 T^2 & \xrightarrow{\mu} & T
 \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 IT & \xrightarrow{\eta T} & T^2 & \xleftarrow{T\eta} & TI \\
 & \searrow 1 & \downarrow \mu & \swarrow 1 & \\
 & & T & & 
 \end{array}$$

are commutative, where  $I : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is the identity functor.

If  $\langle F, G; \eta, \varepsilon \rangle : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$  is an adjunction, then  $\langle GF, \eta, G\varepsilon F \rangle$  is a monad on  $\mathbf{C}$  (see [13], p.138). In fact, every monad arises this way.

**Definition C.2.** Let  $\langle T, \eta, \mu \rangle$  be a monad on  $\mathbf{C}$ , a  $T$ -algebra  $\langle C, \xi \rangle$  is a pair consisting of an object  $C \in \mathbf{C}$  and a map  $\xi : TC \rightarrow C$  in  $\mathbf{C}$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 T^2C & \xrightarrow{T\xi} & TC \\
 \mu C \downarrow & & \downarrow \xi \\
 TC & \xrightarrow{\xi} & C
 \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C & \xrightarrow{\eta C} & TC \\
 & \searrow 1 & \downarrow \xi \\
 & & C
 \end{array}$$

are commutative. A map  $f : \langle C, \xi \rangle \rightarrow \langle D, \zeta \rangle$  of  $T$ -algebras is a map  $f : C \rightarrow D$  of  $\mathbf{C}$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 TC & \xrightarrow{Tf} & TD \\
 \xi \downarrow & & \downarrow \zeta \\
 C & \xrightarrow{f} & D
 \end{array}$$

commutes.

Every monad is determined by its  $T$ -algebras, as specified by the following theorem:

**Theorem C.3.** If  $\langle T, \eta, \mu \rangle$  is a monad in  $\mathbf{C}$ , then all  $T$ -algebras and their maps form a category  $\mathbf{C}^T$ , called the Eilenberg-Moore category of the monad  $T$  over the category  $\mathbf{C}$ . There is an adjunction

$$\langle F^T, G^T; \eta^T, \varepsilon^T \rangle : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^T,$$

where  $G^T : \mathbf{C}^T \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is the obvious forgetful functor and  $F^T$  is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & \mapsto & \langle T(C), \mu_C \rangle \\ f \downarrow & \mapsto & \downarrow T(f) \\ D & \mapsto & \langle T(D), \mu_D \rangle \end{array}$$

Furthermore,  $\eta^T = \eta$  and  $\varepsilon_{\langle C, \xi \rangle}^T = \xi$  for each  $T$ -algebra  $\langle C, \xi \rangle$ . The monad defined in  $\mathbf{C}$  by this adjunction is  $\langle T, \eta, \mu \rangle$ .

*Proof.* See [13], pp.140-141. □

Some examples  $T$ -algebras are as follows.

**Example C.4.** 1. *Complete Lattices.* The  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebras are free complete lattice:  $(X, \xi : \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow X)$  where  $\xi(S)$  is the supremum of  $S \subseteq X$  and the maps are maps which preserve arbitrary suprema.

2. *Modules.* Let  $R$  be a unital ring. Then

$$T_R(A) = A \otimes R, \eta_A : A \rightarrow A \otimes R : a \mapsto a \otimes 1$$

and

$$\mu_A : (A \otimes R) \otimes R \rightarrow A \otimes R : (a \otimes r_1) \otimes r_2 \mapsto a \otimes (r_1 r_2)$$

for every abelian group  $A$ , give a monad  $(T_R, \eta, \mu)$  on the category  $\mathbf{Ab}$  of all abelian groups, and  $\mathbf{Ab}^{T_R}$  is the category  $\mathbf{Mod}\text{-}R$  of right  $R$ -modules.

3.  $U_{\text{path}} : \mathbf{Grph} \rightarrow \mathbf{Grph}$  is a monad and  $\mathbf{Grph}^{U_{\text{path}}} \cong \mathbf{Cat}$ .

4. *Group Actions.* Let  $G$  be a group. Then  $\mathbf{Set}^{T_G}$  is the category  $\mathbf{Set}^G$  of  $G$ -sets, where the monad  $\langle T_G, \eta, \mu \rangle$  on  $\mathbf{Set}$  is defined by

$$T_G(X) = G \times X, \eta_X : X \rightarrow G \times X : x \mapsto (1_G, x),$$

and

$$\mu_X : G \times (G \times X) \rightarrow G \times X : (g_1, (g_2, x)) \mapsto (g_1 g_2, x).$$

More generally, every variety of universal algebra is the category of  $T$ -algebras over  $\mathbf{Set}$ , where  $TX$  is the underlying set of the free algebras over  $X$ .

**Theorem C.5** (Beck's Theorem, comparison of adjunctions with algebras). Let  $\langle F, G; \eta, \varepsilon \rangle : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$  be an adjunction and  $T = \langle GF, \eta, G\varepsilon F \rangle$  the induced monad. Then there is a unique functor  $K : \mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^T$  given by

$$KB = \langle GB, G\varepsilon_B \rangle, Kf = Gf : \langle GB, G\varepsilon_B \rangle \rightarrow \langle GB', G\varepsilon_{B'} \rangle$$

such that  $G^T K = G$  and  $KF = F^T$  :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{B} & \xrightarrow{K} & \mathbf{C}^T \\ \swarrow G & & \nearrow F^T \\ & & \mathbf{C} \\ \searrow F & & \swarrow G^T \end{array}$$

*Proof.* See [13], pp.142-143. □

**Definition C.6.**  $G$  is monadic (premonadic) if the comparison functor  $K$ , defined in Beck's Theorem, is an equivalence of categories (full and faithful).

### C.3 Descent and Change of Base

Descent theory plays an important role in the development of modern algebraic geometry by Grothendieck [7, 8]. Generally speaking, it deals with the problem of which morphisms in a given “structured” category allow for change of base under minimal loss of information, and how to compensate for the occurring loss, such morphisms are called effective descent morphisms.

Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a category with pullbacks, and let  $p : E \rightarrow B$  be a morphism in  $\mathbf{C}$ . Then we have the following adjoint pair:

$$\mathbf{C}/B \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{p_!} \\ \xrightarrow{p^*} \end{array} \mathbf{C}/E$$

where  $p_!(D, s) = ps$ ,  $p^*(C, r) = \pi_1$  which is given by the following pullback:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E \times_B C & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & C \\ \pi_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow r \\ E & \xrightarrow{p} & B \end{array}$$

The unit and counit of  $p_! \dashv p^*$  is given by  $\eta(s : C \rightarrow E) = \langle s, 1_C \rangle : C \rightarrow E \times_B C$  and  $\varepsilon(r : C \rightarrow B) = \pi_2$ , respectively.

Applying Beck’s Theorem to the adjunction  $p_! \dashv p^* : \mathbf{C}/E \rightarrow \mathbf{C}/B$ , one has the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{C}/B & \xrightarrow{K} & (\mathbf{C}/E)^T \\ \swarrow p^* & & \nearrow (p_!)^T \\ & \mathbf{C}/E & \\ \nwarrow p_! & & \nearrow (p^*)^T \end{array}$$

where  $T = p^*p_!$ .

**Definition C.7.**  $p : E \rightarrow B$  is effective descent (descent) if the comparison functor  $K$ , defined in Beck’s Theorem, is an equivalence of categories (full and faithful).

Dually, one has the dual of the above change of base.