DUOIDAL R-MATRICES

TONY ZORMAN

ABSTRACT. In this note, we define an analogue of R-matrices for bialgebras in the setting of a monad that is opmonoidal over two tensor products. Analogous to the classical case, such structures bijectively correspond to duoidal structures on the Eilenberg–Moore category of the monad. Further, we investigate how a cocommutative version of this lifts the linearly distributive structure of a normal duoidal category.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	2
3. Quasitriangularity	4
3.1. Double opmonoidal monads	4
3.2. R-matrices	6
3.3. From R-matrices to duoidal structures and back	8
4. Linearly distributive monads	12
References	15

1. INTRODUCTION

Monadic *reconstruction* theory—relating additional structure on a monad to structure on its category of algebras—has a long tradition. For example, such results were proved for bimonads¹ in [Moe02, McC02], for Hopf monads in [BV07], for comodule monads in [AC12, HZ24], and for *-autonomous and linearly distributive monads in [PS09, Pas12].

Duoidal categories were introduced in [AM10] under the name of 2-monoidal categories, generalising braided monoidal categories by considering two monoidal structures that are connected by a non-invertible interchange law. They also generalise 2-fold monoidal categories in the sense of [BFSV03], where the two tensor products are assumed to share a unit. The terminology used here is due to [BM12, Definition 3]. These structures have been used to study higher-dimensional Hopf theory [BCZ13, BS13, AHLF18, FV20, Böh21], and have also found applications in various other fields of mathematics; see for example [GLF16, SS22, Rom24, Tor24].

This note generalises a reconstruction-type result for R-matrices on bimonads, [BV07, Proposition 8.5], which in turn generalises the classical theory of R-matrices for bialgebras. The former has the additional advantage of not requiring a braided monoidal base category, as bimonads—in contrast with bialgebras—may be defined on any monoidal category.

As such, we introduce the notion of an R-matrix for a monad T on a preduoidal category—one equipped with two monoidal structures—that is opmonoidal with respect to each one individually.

¹Bimonads are called "Hopf monads" in [Moe02]; we follow the nomenclature of [BV07, BLV11] and reserve that term for monads lifting the rigid or closed structure of their base category.

TONY ZORMAN

In Section 2 we introduce notation and discuss preliminary results on duoidal categories and bimonads. Section 3 first discusses a generalisation of cocommutative bialgebras in the form of the double opmonoidal monads of [AHLF18, Section 7], and then generalises this notion to the non-cocommutative setting by introducing R-matrices over separately opmonoidal monads on preduoidal categories. Our main result is:

Theorem 3.14. Let \mathfrak{D} be a category with monoidal structures \circ and \bullet , and *T* a monad on \mathfrak{D} that has a \circ -opmonoidal and a \bullet -opmonoidal structure. Then quasitriangular structures on *T* are in bijective correspondence with duoidal structures on \mathfrak{D}^T .

Section 4 studies the relationship between normal duoidal and linearly distributive categories from the monadic point of view. In particular, we see non-planar linearly distributive categories \mathcal{L} as an analogue of preduoidal categories, in the sense that the additional structure trivialises in the monoidal case, see Example 4.3. Equipping \mathcal{L} with a planar structure, we can relate double comonoidal monads to linearly distributive monads in the sense of [Pas12].

Acknowledgements. We thank Ulrich Krähmer for many useful comments and suggestions on a first draft of this article, and Marcelo Aguiar for clarifying parts of [AHLF18]. The author is supported by DFG grant KR 5036/2-1.

2. Preliminaries

We refer the reader to [ML98] and [EGNO15] for comprehensive textbook accounts on category theory and monoidal categories.

Definition 2.1. A monad (B, μ, η) on a monoidal category \mathscr{C} is called a *bimonad* if *B* is an opmonoidal functor for which μ and η are opmonoidal natural transformations.

For a monad *T* on a category \mathcal{C} , we denote the *Eilenberg–Moore category* of *T*, also called the category of *T*-algebras or *T*-modules, by \mathcal{C}^T . The following reconstruction result was observed by Moerdijk [Moe02, Theorem 7.1] and McCrudden [McC02, Corollary 3.13].

Proposition 2.2. Let (B, μ, η) be a monad on a monoidal category \mathcal{C} . There exists a bijective correspondence between bimonad structures on B and monoidal structures on \mathcal{C}^{B} such that the canonical forgetful functor U^{B} : $\mathcal{C}^{B} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is strict monoidal.

The next definition first appeared in [AM10, Definition 6.1] under the name 2-monoidal category. We follow the nomenclature of [BM12, Definition 3] and the notation of [BCZ13].

Definition 2.3. A *duoidal* category is a quintuple $(\mathfrak{D}, \circ, \bot, \bullet, 1)$, consisting of

- monoidal categories $(\mathfrak{D}, \bullet, 1)$ and $(\mathfrak{D}, \circ, \bot)$;
- · a not-necessarily invertible natural transformation

 $\zeta_{x,y,a,b} \colon (x \bullet y) \circ (a \bullet b) \Longrightarrow (x \circ a) \bullet (y \circ b),$

called the *middle interchange law*;

• three structure morphisms

 $\nu \colon \bot \longrightarrow \bot \bullet \bot, \qquad \varpi \colon 1 \circ 1 \longrightarrow 1, \qquad \iota \colon \bot \longrightarrow 1;$

such that:

- $(1, \varpi, \iota)$ is a monoid in $(\mathfrak{D}, \circ, \bot)$;
- (\perp, ν, ι) is a comonoid in $(\mathfrak{D}, \bullet, 1)$;

DUOIDAL R-MATRICES

• the following diagrams commute, witnessing *associativity*:

• the following diagrams commute, witnessing *unitality*:

By abuse of notation, we shall often call \mathfrak{D} a duoidal category, leaving the rest of the data implicit.

Definition 2.4. A duoidal category \mathfrak{D} is called *normal* if $\perp \cong 1$.

Note that explicitly requiring the existence of $\iota: \perp \longrightarrow 1$ in Definition 2.3 is not strictly necessary, as it may be derived from the other specified data:

$$\iota: \perp \xrightarrow{\lambda} \perp \circ \perp \xrightarrow{\lambda \circ \rho} (1 \bullet \perp) \circ (\perp \bullet 1) \xrightarrow{\zeta} (1 \circ \perp) \bullet (\perp \circ 1) \xrightarrow{\lambda \circ \rho} 1 \bullet 1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} 1.$$

Example 2.5. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ be a braided monoidal category with braiding σ . By [AM10, Proposition 6.10], $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1, \otimes, 1)$ becomes a duoidal category with structure morphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &\coloneqq (a \otimes b) \otimes (c \otimes d) \cong a \otimes (b \otimes c) \otimes d \xrightarrow{a \otimes \sigma_{b,c} \otimes d} a \otimes (c \otimes b) \otimes d \cong (a \otimes c) \otimes (b \otimes d), \\ \varpi &\coloneqq 1 \otimes 1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} 1, \qquad \qquad \nu \coloneqq 1 \xrightarrow{\lambda^{-1}} 1 \otimes 1, \qquad \qquad \iota \coloneqq 1 \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}_1} 1.^2 \end{aligned}$$

Example 2.6. The converse of Example 2.5 also holds; if \mathfrak{D} is a duoidal category, such that the interchange law and structure morphisms are isomorphisms, then [AM10, Proposition 6.11] yields a braiding on $(\mathfrak{D}, \circ, \bot)$ and $(\mathfrak{D}, \bullet, 1)$, such that they become isomorphic as braided monoidal categories, and the interchange law arises from the braiding.

² Note in particular that $\rho_1 = \lambda_1$.

TONY ZORMAN

Note, however, that there exist non-trivial duoidal structures on a monoidal category $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. For example, the category of (left-left) Yetter–Drinfeld modules over a Hopf algebra *H* with non-invertible antipode is *lax braided*—the Yetter–Drinfeld braiding

 $\sigma \coloneqq \{ \sigma_{M,N} \colon M \otimes N \longrightarrow N \otimes M, \quad m \otimes n \longmapsto m_{(-1)}n \otimes m_{(0)} \}_{M,N \in {}^H_H \mathcal{YD}}$

is a non-invertible natural transformation that satisfies the braid equations. This yields a duoidal structure on $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1, \otimes, 1)$ that is not braided.

There are various equivalent definitions of duoidal categories. For example, as pseudomonoids in the monoidal 2-category of monoidal categories, oplax monoidal functors, and oplax monoidal natural transformations [GLF16, Definition 1]. In particular, this means that • is a lax monoidal and \circ is an oplax monoidal functor; ³ from this characterisation, one may obtain a *coherence* result for these structures.

Proposition 2.7 ([Lew72], [AM10, Section 6.2]). *Any ETC diagram in a duoidal category commutes.*

Loosely speaking, an ETC diagram is a *formal* diagram $F: \mathcal{J} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ in the sense of [MP22, p. 20], comprising of only structure morphisms of the duoidal category, such that for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$ the object Fj is non-isomorphic to any of the two units. We refer to [MP22, Definition 5.8 and Theorem 5.9] for a precise definition and a proof of the result. A counterexample in the case of a formal diagram with parallel arrows $1 \cdot 1 \Rightarrow 1$ is given in [Rom23, Proposition 3.1.6 and Example 3.1.7].

Note that—the tensor product and unit being normal monoidal functors—normal duoidal categories admit an analogue of the well-known coherence result for braided monoidal categories: any formal diagram comprised only of the structure morphisms in a normal duoidal category commutes, see [MP22, Theorem 5.18].

3. QUASITRIANGULARITY

3.1. Double opmonoidal monads.

Definition 3.1 ([AM10, Definition 6.25]). Suppose that \mathfrak{D} is a duoidal category. A *bimonoid* in \mathfrak{D} is a quintuple $(B, \mu, \eta, \Delta, \varepsilon)$, consisting of a monoid (B, μ, η) in $(\mathfrak{D}, \circ, \bot)$, and a comonoid (B, Δ, ε) in $(\mathfrak{D}, \bullet, 1)$, such that the following diagrams commute:



A reconstruction result for bimonoids in duoidal categories is proven in [BS13].

Proposition 3.2 ([BS13]). For a monoid b in a duoidal category $(\mathfrak{D}, \circ, \bot, \bullet, 1)$ there is a bijective correspondence between bimonoid structures on b, and bimonad structures on the monad $b \circ - on(\mathfrak{D}, \bullet, 1)$.

³ This extends to normal duoidal categories, in which $\circ: \mathfrak{D} \times \mathfrak{D} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ and $\perp: \mathbb{1} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ are normal oplax monoidal functors, where $\mathbb{1}$ is the terminal category.

Example 3.3. A bimonoid in a braided monoidal category \mathscr{C} is the same as a bimonoid in the duoidal category \mathscr{C} from Example 2.5. In this way one recovers the fact that an object $b \in \mathscr{C}$ is a bimonoid if and only if the induced monad $b \otimes -$ is a bimonad on \mathscr{C} .

Example 3.4. Suppose that k is a commutative ring and A is a commutative k-algebra. In [AM10, Example 6.18] it is shown that the category of A-bimodules is duoidal, with

$$M \bullet N := M \otimes_A N := \stackrel{M \otimes_k N}{\swarrow} (ma \otimes n - m \otimes an),$$

and

$$M \circ N := M \otimes_{A \otimes_k A} N := M \otimes_k N / (amb \otimes n - m \otimes anb)$$

Furthermore, from [AM10, Example 6.44] we know that a bimonoid in this duoidal category is an *A*-bialgebroid in the sense of Ravenel, see [Rav86, Definition A1.1.1]. In this setting, Proposition 3.2 recovers a special case of [Szl03, Theorems 5.1 and 5.4].

Definition 3.5 ([AHLF18, Section 7]). A *double opmonoidal monad* on a duoidal category \mathfrak{D} consists of a monad (T, μ, η) on \mathfrak{D} , together with a bimonad structures $(T, B_2^{\bullet}, B_0^{\bullet})$ on $(\mathfrak{D}, \bullet, 1)$ and $(T, B_2^{\circ}, B_0^{\circ})$ on $(\mathfrak{D}, \circ, \bot)$, such that the following diagrams commute:

$$(3.1) \qquad \begin{array}{c} T(1 \circ 1) \xrightarrow{Ta} T1 & T \perp \xrightarrow{Tv} T(\perp \cdot \perp) & T \perp \xrightarrow{T1} T1 \\ T_{2,1,1}^{*} \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ T_{1} \circ T1 & \downarrow \\ T_{0}^{*} \circ T_{0}^{*} \downarrow & \downarrow \\ T_{0}^{*} \circ T_{0}^{*} \downarrow & \downarrow \\ T_{0}^{*} \circ T_{0}^{*} \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 1 \circ 1 \xrightarrow{\varpi} 1 & \downarrow \\ T_{0}^{*} \circ T_{0}^{*} \downarrow \to \\ T_{0}^{*} \to \\ T_{0}^{*} \circ T_{0}^{*} \to \\ T_{0}$$

Example 3.6. Let $(\mathscr{C}, \otimes, 1)$ be a braided monoidal category with braiding σ , seen as a duoidal category as in Example 2.5. A bimonad *B* on $(\mathscr{C}, \otimes, 1)$ that additionally satisfies the equation $B_2 \circ B\sigma = \sigma \circ B_2$ is a double opmonoidal monad on $(\mathscr{C}, \otimes, 1, \otimes, 1)$, where the two opmonoidal structures are the same, and the commutativity of Diagram (3.1) amounts to the fact that the monoidal structure morphisms of \mathscr{C} lift to the category of *B*-algebras; see Proposition 2.2.

Example 3.7. For a bialgebra *B* in (Vect_k, \otimes , \Bbbk), the endofunctor $B \otimes -$ is a double opmonoidal monad in (Vect_k, \otimes , \Bbbk , \otimes , \Bbbk). For $X, Y, Z, W \in$ Vect_k and $b \in B, x \in X, y \in Y, z \in Z, w \in W$, Diagram (3.2) simplifies to

$$b_{(1)} \otimes x \otimes b_{(3)} \otimes z \otimes b_{(2)} \otimes y \otimes b_{(4)} \otimes w = b_{(1)} \otimes x \otimes b_{(2)} \otimes z \otimes b_{(3)} \otimes y \otimes b_{(4)} \otimes w$$
,
which is equivalent to $b_{(1)} \otimes b_{(2)} = b_{(2)} \otimes b_{(1)}$; i.e., *B* has to be cocommutative.

As in the case of R-matrices for bialgebras and bimonads, requiring that the interchange morphism of a duoidal category D lifts to the category of modules is a strong condition.

Proposition 3.8 ([AHLF18, Theorem 7.2]). Let \mathfrak{D} be a duoidal category and $T: \mathfrak{C} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ a monad. Then the structure morphisms and interchange law of \mathfrak{D} lift to \mathfrak{D}^T if and only if T is a double opmonoidal monad.

In particular, if T is a double opmonoidal monad, then \mathfrak{D}^T is a duoidal category.

3.2. **R-matrices.** Instead of the situation of Proposition 3.8, we are instead interested in studying which additional structure one can impose on *T* such that \mathfrak{D}^T becomes duoidal, where the interchange morphism is instead giving by "twisting" that of \mathfrak{D} . This generalises so-called *R-matrices* for bialgebras and bimonads.

Proposition 3.9 ([BV07, Theorem 8.5]). Let *B* be a bimonad on the monoidal category \mathcal{C} . Then *R*-matrices on *B* are in bijective correspondence with braidings on \mathcal{C}^{B} .

A crucial feature of R-matrices for bimonads—see [BV07, Section 8.2]—is that they can be defined on not necessarily braided monoidal categories. Our definition of duoidal R-matrices incorporates this feature.

Definition 3.10. A category \mathfrak{D} is called *preduoidal* if it is equipped with two monoidal structures (\circ, \bot) and $(\bullet, 1)$.

A monad *T* on a preduoidal category \mathfrak{D} equipped with two bimonad structures over $(\mathfrak{D}, \circ, \bot)$ and $(\mathfrak{D}, \bullet, 1)$ is called a *separately opmonoidal monad* on \mathfrak{D} .

Definition 3.11. Let \mathfrak{D} be a preducidal category and *T* a separately opmonoidal monad on \mathfrak{D} . An *R*-matrix on *T* consists of a natural transformation

$$R := \{ R_{a,b,c,d} \colon (a \bullet b) \circ (c \bullet d) \Longrightarrow (Ta \bullet Tc) \circ (Tb \bullet Td) \}_{a,b,c,d \in \mathfrak{D}},$$

as well as morphisms of T-algebras

$$\nu \colon (\bot, T_0^{\circ}) \longrightarrow (\bot, T_0^{\circ}) \bullet (\bot, T_0^{\circ}), \quad \varpi \colon (1, T_0^{\bullet}) \circ (1, T_0^{\bullet}) \longrightarrow (1, T_0^{\bullet}), \quad \iota \colon (\bot, T_0^{\circ}) \longrightarrow (1, T_0^{\bullet}),$$

such that the tuple $(1, \emptyset, \iota)$ is a monoid in $(\mathfrak{D}^T, \circ, \bot)$; the tuple (\bot, ν, ι) is a comonoid in $(\mathfrak{D}^T, \bullet, 1)$; and the following diagrams commute for all $a, b, c, d, x, y \in \mathfrak{D}$:

If *T* is equipped with an R-matrix, we say it is *quasitriangular*.

Example 3.12. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ be a strict monoidal category, and *B* a bimonad on \mathcal{C} . Suppose that *R* is an R-matrix on *B* in the sense of [BV07, Section 8.2], and let

$$S := \{\eta_a \otimes R_{b,c} \otimes \eta_d \colon a \otimes b \otimes c \otimes d \longrightarrow Ba \otimes Bc \otimes Bb \otimes Bd \}_{a \ b \ c \ d \in \mathscr{C}}$$

Then *S*, together with ν , ϖ , and ι being the identity, is an R-matrix on *B*, seen as a separately opmonoidal monad on the preduoidal category \mathscr{C} .

For example, Diagrams (3.3) and (3.4) commute because $(\beta \otimes \alpha)R_{a,b}$ is a braiding by [BV07, Theorem 8.5]. Diagram (3.5) follows by Figure 1, where

$$B_{3;x,y,z}: B(x \otimes y \otimes z) \longrightarrow Bx \otimes By \otimes Bz$$

denotes the unique natural transformation one obtains by coassociativity of B_2 . The other diagrams follow in a similar fashion.

By [BV07, Example 8.4] we also obtain that every R-matrix on a k-bialgebra *B* yields an R-matrix on $B \otimes -$ in the sense of Definition 3.11.



FIGURE 1. Verification that *S* satisfies Diagram (3.5).

Remark 3.13. Note that the converse of Example 3.12 is not necessarily true. Let \mathscr{C} be a monoidal category seen as a preduoidal category, and assume that *T* is a separately opmonoidal monad on \mathscr{C} where the two opmonoidal structures are the same. Then an R-matrix on *T* does not necessarily yield an R-matrix in the sense of [BV07, Section 8.2], since we do not require *R* to be *-invertible⁴, which by [BV07, Theorem 8.5] corresponds bijectively to the braiding on \mathscr{C}^T being invertible.

By Theorem 3.14 below, the R-matrices of Definition 3.11 correspond to duoidal structures on \mathcal{C}^T . Since the two tensor products on \mathcal{C}^T agree, by arguments analogous to those in [AM10, Section 6.3], this forces the interchange law to come from a lax braiding. However, there is no a priori reason for this morphism to be invertible, see Example 2.6.

3.3. From R-matrices to duoidal structures and back. This section contains our main result, which can be seen as an analogue of [BV07, Theorem 8.5], and a non-cocommutative counterpart to [AHLF18, Theorem 7.2].

Theorem 3.14. Let \mathfrak{D} be a preduoidal category and suppose that T is a separately opmonoidal monad on \mathfrak{D} . For all T-algebras (a, α) , (b, β) , (c, γ) , and (d, δ) , a quasitriangular structure on T yields an interchange law

$$\xi := ((\alpha \circ \gamma) \bullet (\beta \circ \delta)) R_{a,b,c,d} \colon (a \bullet b) \circ (c \bullet d) \longrightarrow (a \circ c) \bullet (b \circ d)$$

on \mathcal{C}^T . Conversely, an interchange law ξ on \mathfrak{D}^T gives rise to an *R*-matrix

$$R_{a,b,c,d}: (a \bullet b) \circ (c \bullet d) \xrightarrow{(\eta_a \bullet \eta_b) \circ (\eta_c \bullet \eta_d)} (Ta \bullet Tb) \circ (Tc \bullet Td) \xrightarrow{\xi_{Ta,Tb,Tc,Td}} (Ta \circ Tc) \bullet (Tb \circ Td)$$

on T. These constructions are mutually inverse to each other.

We split up the proof of Theorem 3.14 into two individual results.

Proposition 3.15. Let \mathfrak{D} be a preduoidal category and T a quasitriangular separately opmonoidal monad on \mathfrak{D} with *R*-matrix (R, v, ϖ, ι) . Then \mathfrak{D}^T is a duoidal category, with structure morphisms v, ϖ , and ι , and interchange law

$$\xi := ((\alpha \circ \gamma) \bullet (\beta \circ \delta)) R_{a,b,c,d} \colon (a \bullet b) \circ (c \bullet d) \longrightarrow (a \circ c) \bullet (b \circ d)$$

⁴ A natural transformation $R: \otimes \longrightarrow T \otimes^{\text{op}} T$ is called **-invertible* if there exists an "inverse" natural transformation $R^{-1}: = \otimes - \Longrightarrow T(-) \otimes T(=)$, such that

$$R^{-1} * R := - \otimes = \xrightarrow{R} T(=) \otimes T(-) \xrightarrow{R^{-1}} TT(-) \otimes TT(=) \xrightarrow{\mu \otimes \mu} T(-) \otimes T(=)$$

is equal to $\eta \otimes \eta$, and similarly for $R * R^{-1}$.

for all (a, α) , (b, β) , (c, γ) , and $(d, \delta) \in \mathfrak{D}^T$.

Proof. The claim that $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}^T((a \cdot b) \circ (c \cdot d), (a \circ c) \cdot (b \circ d))$ follows from Diagram (3.5), as seen in Figure 2.



FIGURE 2. Proof that ξ is a morphism of *T*-algebras.

Diagram (2.1) follows by the commutativity of Figure 3, where we have left out the respective associators for readability; see Proposition 2.7. The proof of Diagram (2.2) is analogous.

Diagrams (3.3) and (3.4) immediately imply Diagram (2.3).

Proposition 3.16. Let \mathfrak{D} be a preduoidal category, T a separately opmonoidal monad on \mathfrak{D} , and suppose that \mathfrak{D}^T is a duoidal category with interchange law

$$\xi_{a,b,c,d} \colon (a \bullet b) \circ (c \bullet d) \longrightarrow (a \circ c) \bullet (b \circ d).$$

Then the structure morphisms of \mathfrak{D}^T , together with

$$R_{a,b,c,d} \colon (a \bullet b) \circ (c \bullet d) \xrightarrow{(\eta_a \bullet \eta_b) \circ (\eta_c \bullet \eta_d)} (Ta \bullet Tb) \circ (Tc \bullet Td) \xrightarrow{\xi_{Ta,Tb,Tc,Td}} (Ta \circ Tc) \bullet (Tb \circ Td)$$

yield an *R*-matrix for *T*.

Proof. First, let us verify that *R* satisfies Diagram (3.5). Let $a, b, c, d \in \mathfrak{D}^T$; then the claim follows by the commutativity of Figure 4.

The fact that Diagram (3.6) holds is due to Figure 5, and Diagram (3.7) is similar.

TONY ZORMAN







FIGURE 4. The map R satisfies Diagram (3.5).

It is left to show the commutativity of Diagrams (3.3) and (3.4). For example, the first diagram in the former follows from the commutativity of

$$\begin{array}{c} \bot \circ (a \cdot b) \xrightarrow{\nu \circ \mathrm{id}} (\bot \cdot \bot) \circ (a \cdot b) \xrightarrow{(\eta_{\perp} \cdot \eta_{\perp}) \circ (\eta_{a} \cdot \eta_{b})} (T \bot \circ T \bot) \circ (Ta \cdot Tb) \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ a \cdot b & (\bot \circ a) \bullet (\bot \circ b) \\ \downarrow^{-1} \cdot \lambda^{-1} \downarrow & T \circ \mathrm{bimonad} \xrightarrow{(\eta_{\perp} \circ \eta_{a}) \cdot (\eta_{\perp} \circ \eta_{b})} (T \bot \circ Ta) \bullet (T \bot \circ Tb) \\ (\bot \circ a) \bullet (\bot \circ b) \xleftarrow{(T_{0}^{\circ} \circ \beta)} (T \to \sigma) \bullet (T \bot \circ Tb) \end{array}$$

10



FIGURE 5. The R-matrix satisfies Diagram (3.6).

and the other diagrams are similar.

Proof of Theorem 3.14. Combining Propositions 3.15 and 3.16, it is left to prove that the constructions are mutually inverse.

$$\begin{aligned} &((\alpha \circ \gamma) \bullet (\beta \circ \delta))\xi_{Ta,Tb,Tc,Td}((\eta_a \bullet \eta_b) \circ (\eta_c \bullet \eta_d)) \\ &= ((\alpha \circ \gamma) \bullet (\beta \circ \delta))((\eta_a \circ \eta_c) \bullet (\eta_b \circ \eta_d))\xi_{a,b,c,d} & \text{by naturality of } \xi \\ &= ((\alpha \eta_a \circ \gamma \eta_c) \bullet (\beta \eta_b \circ \delta \eta_d))\xi_{a,b,c,d} & \text{by functoriality of } \bullet \text{ and } \circ \\ &= \xi_{a,b,c,d} & \text{by monadicity of } T; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &((\mu_a \circ \mu_c) \bullet (\mu_b \circ \mu_d)) R_{Ta,Tb,Tc,Td} ((\eta_a \bullet \eta_b) \circ (\eta_c \bullet \eta_d)) \\ &= ((\mu_a \circ \mu_c) \bullet (\mu_b \circ \mu_d)) ((\eta_{Ta} \circ \eta_{Tc}) \bullet (\eta_{Tb} \circ \eta_{Td})) R_{a,b,c,d} \\ &= R_{a,b,c,d}. \end{aligned}$$

4. LINEARLY DISTRIBUTIVE MONADS

Normal duoidal categories, see Definition 2.4, have connections to linear logic: in [GLF16, 7] it is shown that every normal duoidal category D has the structure of a *linearly distributive category*; see [CS97]. In that case, the linear distributors are given by

(4.1)
$$\partial_{\ell}^{\ell}: a \circ (b \cdot c) \cong (a \cdot 1) \circ (b \cdot c) \xrightarrow{\zeta} (a \circ b) \cdot (1 \cdot c) \cong (a \circ b) \cdot c,$$
$$\partial_{r}^{\ell}: a \circ (b \cdot c) \cong (1 \cdot a) \circ (b \cdot c) \xrightarrow{\zeta} (1 \circ b) \cdot (a \circ c) \cong b \cdot (a \circ c),$$
$$\partial_{\ell}^{r}: (b \cdot c) \circ a \cong (b \cdot c) \circ (a \cdot 1) \xrightarrow{\zeta} (b \circ a) \cdot (c \circ 1) \cong (b \circ a) \cdot c.$$
$$\partial_{r}^{r}: (b \cdot c) \circ a \cong (b \cdot c) \circ (1 \cdot a) \xrightarrow{\zeta} (b \circ 1) \cdot (c \circ a) \cong b \cdot (c \circ a).$$

Since by [MP22, Theorem 5.18], normal duoidal categories satisfy a much stronger form of coherence, structures on them require fewer axioms to be fully specified. For example, if *T* is a double opmonoidal monad on a normal duoidal category \mathfrak{D} , then the following diagram commutes:



In particular, T_0^{\bullet} and T_0° are conjugate by isomorphisms:

$$(T1 \xrightarrow{T_0^{\circ}} 1)g = (T1 \xrightarrow{T(\cong)} T \bot \xrightarrow{T_0^{\circ}} \bot \xrightarrow{\Xi^{-1}} 1).$$

Further, in the above setting, Diagram (3.1) automatically holds. For simplicity, assume \mathfrak{D} to be strict, and write $T_0 := T_0^{\bullet} = T_0^{\circ}$. Then, for example, we have



The other diagram is similar.

Remark 4.1. Sometimes, one considers only so-called *non-planar* linearly distributive categories, see [CS97, Section 2.1]. These are categories in which only ∂_{ℓ}^{ℓ} and ∂_{r}^{r} of Equation (4.1) exist. What we call a linearly distributive category is referred to as a planar linearly distributive category in *ibid*.

Conditions for a comonad to lift the (non-planar) linear distributive structure of its base category to its category of coalgebras were defined in [Pas12]. For the convenience of the reader, the next proposition expresses this relation in terms of monads.

Proposition 4.2 ([Pas12, Proposition 2.1]). Let $(\mathfrak{L}, \otimes, \mathfrak{O})$ be a non-planar linearly distributive category, and suppose that the monad T on \mathcal{L} is separately opmonoidal. If the diagrams

$$(4.4) \qquad \begin{array}{c} T(a \otimes (b \odot c)) \xrightarrow{T_{2,a,b \odot c}^{\otimes}} Ta \otimes T(b \odot c) \xrightarrow{Ta \otimes T_{2,b,c}^{\odot}} Ta \otimes (Tb \odot Tc) \\ & & \downarrow_{\partial_{l}} \\ T((a \otimes b) \odot c) \xrightarrow{T_{2,a,b \odot c}^{\odot}} T(a \otimes b) \odot Tc \xrightarrow{T_{2,a,b}^{\otimes} \odot Tc} (Ta \otimes Tb) \odot Tc \\ & & T((b \odot c) \otimes a) \xrightarrow{T_{2,b \circ c,a}^{\otimes}} T(b \odot c) \otimes Ta \xrightarrow{T_{2,b,c}^{\odot} \otimes Ta} (Tb \odot Tc) \otimes Ta \\ (4.5) \qquad T_{\partial_{c}} \end{vmatrix}$$

(4.5)

(4.3)

$$T(b \odot (c \otimes a)) \xrightarrow[T_{c} b \odot a]{T(c \otimes a)} Tb \odot T(c \otimes a) \xrightarrow[T_{b} \odot T_{2,c,a}]{Tb \odot T_{2,c,a}} Tb \odot (Tc \otimes Ta)$$

commute for all T-algebras a, b, and c, then \mathfrak{L}^T is non-planar linearly distributive.

Example 4.3. Every monoidal category \mathscr{C} is a linearly distributive category, setting $\otimes = \odot$. The linear distributors are the associator (and its inverse) of \mathscr{C} . A bimonad (B, B_2, B_0) on (\mathcal{C}, \otimes) therefore satisfies all assumptions of Proposition 4.2. Diagrams (4.4) and (4.5) reduce to the coassociativity of B_2 .

However, lifting the interchange morphism of a normal duoidal category may be more involved than lifting only the non-planar linear distributors, much like lifting the preduoidal structure is much easier than lifting the entire duoidal structure.

Example 4.4. Let \mathscr{C} be a braided monoidal category, which is normal duoidal by Example 2.5. As such, the linear distributor ∂_{ℓ}^{ℓ} is the isomorphism

$$\partial_{\ell}^{\ell}: x \otimes (y \otimes z) \cong x \otimes (1 \otimes y) \otimes z \xrightarrow{x \otimes \sigma_{1,y} \otimes z} x \otimes (y \otimes 1) \otimes z \cong x \otimes (y \otimes z),$$

and ∂_r^r is similar. By Proposition 4.2, this structure lifts to the Eilenberg–Moore category of $B \otimes -$, which is equal to the category of *B*-modules on \mathcal{C} . Analogously to Example 4.3, Diagrams (4.4) and (4.5) reduce to the coassociativity of Δ .

However, it is not true that the modules over an arbitrary bialgebra are braided monoidal; see for example [EGNO15, Example 8.3.5]. In other words, the planar structure

$$\partial_r^{\ell} \colon x \otimes (y \otimes z) \cong 1 \otimes (x \otimes y) \otimes z \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \sigma_{x,y} \otimes z} 1 \otimes (y \otimes x) \otimes z \cong y \otimes (x \otimes z),$$
$$\partial_\ell^{r} \colon (x \otimes y) \otimes z \cong x \otimes (y \otimes z) \otimes 1 \xrightarrow{x \otimes \sigma_{y,z} \otimes 1} x \otimes (z \otimes y) \otimes 1 \cong (x \otimes z) \otimes y,$$

does not lift to B-modules.

As stated in the introduction, planar duoidal categories also capture and generalise the notion of a braiding, much like duoidal categories do—as such, we shall focus on this case from now on. We begin with a straightforward reformulation of Proposition 4.2.

Proposition 4.5. Let $(\mathfrak{L}, \otimes, \odot)$ be a linearly distributive category with a separately opmonoidal monad T on it. If, in addition to Diagrams (4.4) and (4.5), the following diagrams commute for all T-algebras a, b, and c:xs

n − **n**⊙

then \mathfrak{L}^T is linearly distributive.

Example 4.6. Let $B \in \text{Vect}_{\Bbbk}$ be a bialgebra. Focusing on the planar linear distributor ∂_r^{ℓ} , for all $b \in B$, $x \in a$, $y \in b$, and $z \in c$, Diagram (4.6) reduces to the equality

 $b_{(1)} \otimes y \otimes b_{(2)} \otimes x \otimes b_{(3)} \otimes z = b_{(2)} \otimes y \otimes b_{(1)} \otimes x \otimes b_{(3)} \otimes z,$

which is easily seen to be equivalent to $b_{(2)} \otimes b_{(1)} = b_{(1)} \otimes b_{(2)}$.

Thus, linearly distributive monads seem to be connected to the double opmonoidal monads of Section 3.1.

Proposition 4.7. Let $(\mathfrak{D}, \bullet, \circ, 1)$ be a normal duoidal category. Then double opmonoidal monads on \mathfrak{D} are linear distributive bimonads on \mathfrak{D} .

Proof. Let *B* be a double opmonoidal monad on \mathfrak{D} . Then the left-left linear distributor ∂_{ℓ}^{ℓ} is given by

$$a \circ (b \bullet c) \cong (a \bullet 1) \circ (b \bullet c) \xrightarrow{\zeta} (a \circ b) \bullet (1 \circ c) \cong (a \circ b) \bullet c.$$

Now, Diagram (4.4) is satisfied by the commutativity of Figure 6; Diagram (4.5) is similar.

Diagram (4.6) is satisfied by Figure 7—where we have assumed the normal duoidal structure to be strict for ease of readability—and Diagram (4.7) follows similarly. \Box



FIGURE 6. The left-left linear distributor satisfies Diagram (4.4).



FIGURE 7. The right-left linear distributor satisfies Diagram (4.6).

References

- [AC12] Marcelo Aguiar and Stephen U. Chase. Generalized Hopf modules for bimonads. Theory and Applications of Categories, 27:263-326, 2012.
- [AHLF18] Marcelo Aguiar, Mariana Haim, and Ignacio López Franco. Monads on higher monoidal categories. Appl. Categ. Struct., 26(3):413-458, 2018.
 - [AM10] Marcelo Aguiar and Swapneel Mahajan. Monoidal functors, species and Hopf algebras, volume 29 of CRM Monograph Series. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. With forewords by Kenneth Brown and Stephen Chase and André Joval.
- [BCZ13] Gabriella Böhm, Yuanyuan Chen, and Liangyun Zhang. On Hopf monoids in duoidal categories. J. Algebra, 394:139-172, 2013.
- [BFSV03] C. Balteanu, Z. Fiedorowicz, R. Schwänzl, and R. Vogt. Iterated monoidal categories. Adv. Math., 176(2):277-349, 2003.
- [BLV11] Alain Bruguières, Steve Lack, and Alexis Virelizier. Hopf monads on monoidal categories. Advances in Mathematics, 227(2):745-800, 2011.
- [BM12] Michael Batanin and Martin Markl. Centers and homotopy centers in enriched monoidal categories. Adv. Math., 230(4-6):1811-1858, 2012.

- [Böh21] Gabriella Böhm. Maschke type theorems for Hopf monoids. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 36:9–47, 2021.
- [BS13] Thomas Booker and Ross Street. Tannaka duality and convolution for duoidal categories. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 28:166–205, 2013.
- [BV07] Alain Bruguières and Alexis Virelizier. Hopf monads. *Advances in Mathematics*, 215(2):679–733, 2007.
- [CS97] J. R. B. Cockett and R. A. G. Seely. Weakly distributive categories. J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 114(2):133–173, 1997.
- [EGNO15] Pavel Etingof, Shlomo Gelaki, Dmitri Nikshych, and Victor Ostrik. Tensor categories, volume 205 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
 - [FV20] IgnacioLópez Franco and Christina Vasilakopoulou. Duoidal categories, measuring comonoids and enrichment. *arXiv e-prints*, 2020.
 - [GLF16] Richard Garner and Ignacio López Franco. Commutativity. J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 220(5):1707–1751, 2016.
 - [HZ24] Sebastian Halbig and Tony Zorman. Pivotality, twisted centres, and the anti-double of a Hopf monad. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 41:86–149, 2024.
 - [Lew72] Geoffrey Lewis. Coherence for a closed functor. Coherence in Categories, Lect. Notes Math. 281, 148-195 (1972)., 1972.
 - [McC02] Paddy McCrudden. Opmonoidal monads. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 10:No. 19, 469–485, 2002.
 - [ML98] Saunders Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*, volume 5 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.
 - [Moe02] Ieke Moerdijk. Monads on tensor categories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 168(2-3):189–208, 2002. Category theory 1999 (Coimbra).
 - [MP22] Cary Malkiewich and Kate Ponto. Coherence for bicategories, lax functors, and shadows. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 38:328–373, 2022.
 - [Pas12] Craig Pastro. Note on star-autonomous comonads. Theory Appl. Categ., 26:194–203, 2012.
 - [PS09] Craig Pastro and Ross Street. Closed categories, star-autonomy, and monoidal comonads. *J. Algebra*, 321(11):3494–3520, 2009.
 - [Rav86] Douglas C. Ravenel. Complex cobordism and stable homotopy groups of spheres, volume 121 of Pure Appl. Math., Academic Press. Academic Press, New York, NY, 1986.
 - [Rom23] Mario Román. Monoidal Context Theory. PhD thesis, Tallinn University of Technology, 2023.
 - [Rom24] Mario Román. String Diagrams for Physical Duoidal Categories. *arXiv e-prints*, 2024.
 - [SS22] BrandonT. Shapiro and DavidI. Spivak. Duoidal Structures for Compositional Dependence. *arXiv e-prints*, 2022.
 - [Szl03] Kornél Szlachányi. The monoidal Eilenberg-Moore construction and bialgebroids. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 182(2-3):287–315, 2003.
 - [Tor24] Takeshi Torii. Map monoidales and duoidal ∞-categories. *arXiv e-prints*, 2024.

TU Dresden, Institut für Geometrie, Zellescher Weg 12–14, 01062 Dresden, Germany *Email address*: tony.zorman@tu-dresden.de