

Monoidal Model Structure on \mathbb{K} -Linear ∞ -Local Systems

Hisham Sati^{*,†} Urs Schreiber^{*}

January 14, 2026

Abstract

Parameterized stable homotopy theory organizes local systems of spectra over homotopy types, governed by a “yoga” of six functors. To provide semantics for the recently developed *Linear Homotopy Type Theory* (LHoTT), model categories of these spectra are required, which are monoidal with respect to the external smash product.

In this work, we focus on the case of parameterized $H\mathbb{K}$ -module spectra (∞ -local systems), motivated by applications to topological quantum computing. While traditionally treated via dg-categories, we leverage combinatorial model structures on simplicial chain complexes to construct the first dedicated global model structure for \mathbb{K} -linear ∞ -local systems, which offers better control than existing models for general parameterized spectra. In particular, when restricted to base 1-types, our model structure is monoidal with respect to the external tensor product, making it a candidate target semantics for the multiplicative fragment of LHoTT.

Contents

1	Introduction and Overview	2
2	The Model Structures	3
2.1	Flat ∞ -vector bundles (∞ -local systems)	3
2.2	Parameterization over varying base spaces	15
2.3	The external tensor of flat ∞ -vector bundles	22
2.4	External monoidal model over homotopy 1-types	33
3	Applications and Outlook	39
A	Appendix: Some definitions and facts	41

* Mathematics, Division of Science; and
Center for Quantum and Topological Systems,
NYUAD Research Institute,
New York University Abu Dhabi, UAE.

†The Courant Institute for Mathematical Sciences, NYU, NY

The authors acknowledge the support by *Tamkeen* under the *NYU Abu Dhabi Research Institute grant CG008*.



1 Introduction and Overview

Parameterized stable homotopy theory. The two major branches of homotopy theory, namely the unstable plain homotopy theory of spaces and the stable homotopy theory of spectra, unify in the *parameterized stable homotopy theory of parameterized spectra* over spaces (flat bundles of spectra). The tightness of this unification is witnessed by the remarkable fact (Due to G. Biedermann 2007, cf. [AJ21, §4.2.3]) that the global homotopy theory of parameterized spectra (amalgamated over varying base spaces) is again an ∞ -topos like the plain homotopy theory of spaces — even though each of its fiber homotopy theories of spectra parameterized over a fixed base is stable and as such far from being an ∞ -topos. But in fact, globally parameterized spectra are “doubly closed monoidal”, with the canonical Cartesian product (which is the “external direct sum” of parameterized spectra) now accompanied by the “external smash tensor product” of spectra (the fiberwise smash product after pullback to the Cartesian product of base spaces).

The quest for good models. A powerful tool for accurately dealing with homotopy theories famously is *model category theory* (cf. [Qu67][Ho99][Hi02]), and specifically *monoidal model category theory* if further (tensor) products are involved. However, good global model categories of parameterized spectra, pioneered by May & Sigurdsson [MS06] (see also [HSS20][BM21]), are notoriously hard to deal with. Considerable streamlining was achieved by Malkiewich [Mal19][Mal23], but not quite including the monoidal model property of the external smash product of spectra. Such a monoidal model structure is needed notably for realizing categorical semantics for the recently described *Linear Homotopy Type Theory* (LHoTT, [RFL21][Ri22] following [Sc14, §3]), which promises to be a formal language for parameterized stable homotopy theory in generalization of how plain Homotopy Type Theory (HoTT) is now famously known to be a formal language for plain homotopy theory (cf. [Sh21]).

Specialization to the \mathbb{K} -Linear case. However, in prominent applications of parameterized stable homotopy theory and LHoTT, such as to topological quantum processes (cf. [Sc14][MSS23][SS25a][SS25c, §2.3.1]), one deals only with the comparatively simpler \mathbb{K} -linear case of parameterized $H\mathbb{K}$ -module spectra over some field \mathbb{K} (not necessarily of characteristic zero). Namely, under the *stable Dold-Kan correspondence* which says that $H\mathbb{K}$ -module spectra are equivalently (simplicial) chain complexes of \mathbb{K} -vector spaces,

$$\mathrm{Mod}_{H\mathbb{K}}(\mathrm{Spectra}) \underset{\substack{[\mathrm{Sh}07, \mathrm{Thm.} 1.1] \\ [\mathrm{ScSh}03, \mathrm{Thm.} 5.1.6]}}{\simeq_{\mathrm{Qu}}} \mathrm{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}} \underset{\substack{[\mathrm{RSS}01, \mathrm{p.} 10] \\ \mathrm{Thm.} 2.3}}{\simeq_{\mathrm{Qu}}} \mathrm{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}, \quad (1)$$

the parameterized $H\mathbb{K}$ -module spectra are equivalently identified with homotopically parameterized chain complexes of vector spaces: “flat ∞ -vector bundles” (cf. §2.1 below): These have been studied with the alternative dg-algebraic tools of dg-category theory under the name “ ∞ -local systems” ([RZ20][AMV24] following [BS14]).

Need for a good \mathbb{K} -linear model. What has been missing is a combination of these approaches: A model category theoretic formulation of the homotopy theory of ∞ -local systems, akin to the model structures for parameterized spectra but capitalizing on the relative simplifications that occur after \mathbb{K} -linearization and reducing fiberwise to common dg-algebraic constructions on chain complexes of vector spaces.

Outline of results. To that end, we start in §2.1 by making explicit a good (left proper simplicial combinatorial) model structure on the category $\mathrm{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ of simplicial chain complexes (Thm. 2.3). This readily implies (Prop. 2.6) a combinatorial model structure on each of the simplicial categories $\mathrm{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}$ of ∞ -local systems over any fixed base homotopy type modeled as a simplicial groupoid \mathbf{X} , naturally defined the way one will want to use them in practice (Def. 2.5): as simplicial functors $\mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathrm{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$. The main step then is in §2.2 the verification of the integral model structure on the Grothendieck construction

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} := \int_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathrm{sSet}\text{-}\mathrm{Grpd}_{\mathrm{skl}}} \mathrm{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}, \quad (2)$$

amalgamating all these local model structures as the base homotopy type varies (Thm. 2.23). On this global model structure we discuss in §2.3 aspects of the 6-functor formalism (Grothendieck’s “motivic yoga”) and specifically

of the *external tensor product* of ∞ -local systems (Def. 2.31, covering the Cartesian product of base homotopy types),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} &\xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}. \\ \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^X \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^Y &\longrightarrow \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{X \times Y}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

While this cannot be a Quillen bifunctor (since already the underlying Cartesian product of simplicial groupoids is not) we show in Thm. 2.42 that it comes as close as it gets under these circumstances. In fact, in §2.4 we show that when restricted to base homotopy 1-types, the external tensor product does make a monoidal model category structure (Thm. 2.45).



Conclusion and outlook. Under the equivalence (1), the general form of our result compares favorably with the global model categories for parameterized plain spectra (\mathbb{S} -module spectra) indicated in [Mal23, Rem. 5.4.3]: The analogue for \mathbb{S} -modules of our sub-result (89) in Thm. 2.42 is [Mal23, Rem. 6.1.4], and the analogue of our sub-result (91) is [Mal19, Lem. 6.4.3][Mal23, Lem. 5.4.5], following [MS06], which is referred to there as the “perhaps most convenient category of parameterized spectra”. At the same time, our model makes full use of the simplifications brought about by \mathbb{K} -linearization and will lend itself to applications in this context, some of which we indicate in the concluding §3.

2 The Model Structures

2.1 Flat ∞ -vector bundles (∞ -local systems)

The idea of *flat ∞ -vector bundles* (∞ -local system) over any space X is that

- (i) to any point $x \in X$ is assigned a chain complex V_x (cf. Def. 2.2 below);
- (ii) to any path $p : x \rightsquigarrow y$ is assigned a chain map $\phi_p : V_x \rightarrow V_y$;

(iii) to any path-of-paths  is assigned a chain homotopy 

(In the special case that all chain complexes here are concentrated in degree 0, then these chain homotopies are necessarily identities and the structure reduces to that of an ordinary flat vector bundle.)

(∞) “and so on”...

But the explicit continuation of this pattern is not as straightforward as the previous steps, since there is not *directly* a notion of higher chain homotopy.

On the other hand, in the conceptual perspective of ∞ -category theory it is evident that, abstractly, flat ∞ -vector bundles should equivalently be ∞ -functors from the fundamental ∞ -groupoid of their base space to the ∞ -category of chain complexes:

$$\begin{array}{c} \infty\text{-local systems} \\ \text{base space} \\ \mathbf{LocSys}_{\infty}(X) := \mathbf{Func}_{\infty} \left(\int X, N\mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}[\mathbf{W}_{\text{qi}}^{-1}] \right) \simeq N \left(\mathbf{sFunc} \left(\mathcal{G}(\int X), \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\circ} \right) \right). \end{array} \tag{4}$$

∞ -functors simplicial functors
 fundamental ∞ -groupoid fundamental simplicial groupoid
 chain complexes simplicial model category of chain complexes

A quick but unwieldy way to define such ∞ -functors is as maps from the singular simplicial complex $\int X$ of X into the suitably-defined “homotopy-coherent simplicial nerve” of $\mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ (which is essentially tantamount to defining a simplicial notion of “higher chain homotopy”). Taking this to be the “dg-nerve” [Lu17, §1.3.1.6] of the dg-self-enrichment of $\mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$, this is the approach taken in the existing literature on ∞ -local systems [BS14, §2][RZ20, §5].

However, here we need tighter control over these ∞ -categories of ∞ -local systems, in that we need a good model category presentation by simplicial functors — which had been missing but which we establish now.

Remark 2.1 (Equivalence of models of ∞ -local systems). That our new construction of ∞ -local systems (in Def. 2.5 below) is equivalent, as an ∞ -category, to the existing constructions ([BS14, §2][RZ20, §5]) can be seen via the comparison maps between the dg-nerve and the simplicial nerve established in [Lu17, Prop. 1.3.4.5][GP18, Prop. 5.17].¹

Simplicial model categories. In the following, we make free use of notions and facts of model category theory [Qu67] (textbook accounts include [Ho99][Hi02][FSS23]) in particular as concerns (combinatorial) simplicial model categories (see [Lu09a, §A] and especially the comprehensive introductory account in [Ri14]).

∞ -Vector spaces. We consider a particularly good model category presentation of the ∞ -category of ∞ -vector spaces modeled by chain complexes of vector spaces. While the model category $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ of unbounded chain complexes is fairly familiar (recalled below), in its plain form as an ordinary category it is not a useful ingredient in the construction of flat ∞ -vector bundles (∞ -local systems), since the ordinary functors from 1-groupoids into it only model flat vector bundles over homotopy 1-types. This may be one reason why existing literature on ∞ -local systems has made no use of model category theoretic tools. However, there is a well-known general approach to such situations which does stay within (and hence retains the power of) model category theory: This is to find an enhancement to a *combinatorial simplicial model* category whose underlying ordinary model category is Quillen equivalent to the original one: In this case, the category of simplicial functors with this codomain still presents the desired ∞ -functor ∞ -category but now does inherit a supporting model category structure itself. The fact that $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ does admit such a simplicial enhancement is essentially well-known, though some of the details, such as its compatibility with the monoidal structure, are not explicit in the literature; therefore we spell it out:

Definition 2.2 (Category of simplicial chain complexes²).

For \mathbb{K} a field (not necessarily of characteristic zero), we write:

- (i) $(\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}, \otimes)$ for the category of \mathbb{K} -vector spaces with \mathbb{K} -linear maps between them (which below we frequently think of as the special case of R -modules for $R = \mathbb{K}$ a field, whence the notation), and equipped with the usual closed monoidal category structure given by the ordinary tensor product whose tensor unit is \mathbb{K} . We denote the linear mapping vector space between a pair of vector spaces by angular brackets

$$(-) \otimes (-) : \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} \longrightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}, \quad [-, -] : \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{op}} \times \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} \longrightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} \quad (5)$$

and will successively overload this notation as this category is incrementally generalized in the following. The linear mapping space is of course the *internal hom* for this closed monoidal category, in that we have natural isomorphisms of hom-sets of this form:

$$\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}(T \otimes V, W) \simeq \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}(T, [V, W]). \quad (6)$$

The category $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is complete and cocomplete, in particular it is canonically *tensored* and *powered* over Set

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Set} \times \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} & \xrightarrow{(-) \cdot (-)} & \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}, & \text{Set}^{\text{op}} \times \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} & \xrightarrow{(-)^{(-)}} & \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ (S, V) & \longmapsto & \coprod_{s \in S} V & (S, V) & \longmapsto & \prod_{s \in S} V \end{array} \quad (7)$$

such that there are natural isomorphisms of hom-sets of the following form

$$S \in \text{Set}, V, W \in \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} \quad \vdash \quad \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}(S \cdot V, W) \simeq \text{Set}(S, \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}(V, W)) \simeq \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}(V, W^S). \quad (8)$$

This may also be understood as the natural isomorphism (6) partially restricted along the free \mathbb{K} -module functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{K}[-] : \text{Set} & \longrightarrow & \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ S & \longmapsto & \coprod_{s \in S} \mathbb{K} \end{array}$$

¹We thank Dmitri Pavlov for pointing out this result.

²Beware that some authors say “simplicial chain complex” for the chain complexes that compute singular homology groups. Here we properly mean “simplicial objects in the category of chain complexes” — which is of course not unrelated but different and/or more general.

in that

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{K}[-] \times \text{id}} & \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} \\
 \searrow^{(-) \cdot (-)} & \swarrow_{\sim} & \swarrow_{(-) \otimes (-)} \\
 & \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} &
 \end{array}
 \quad \mathbb{K}[S] \otimes V \simeq S \cdot V. \quad (9)$$

In particular, for $G \in \mathbf{Grp} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ a set equipped with a group structure $\mu : G \times G \rightarrow G$, $e : * \rightarrow G$, whose group algebra is $\mathbb{K}(G) \in \mathbf{Alg}_{\mathbb{K}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}$, a $\mathbb{K}[G]$ -module structure on a vector space may equivalently be thought of as a “tensoring action” via a morphism $\rho : G \cdot V \rightarrow V$ making the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 G \cdot (G \cdot V) \simeq (G \times G) \cdot V & \xrightarrow{\mu \cdot \text{id}} & G \cdot V \\
 \downarrow \text{id} \cdot \rho & & \downarrow \rho \\
 G \cdot V & \xrightarrow{\rho} & V
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 * \cdot \mathcal{V} & \xrightarrow{e \cdot \text{id}} & G \cdot \mathcal{V} \\
 \searrow_{\sim} & & \swarrow_{\rho} \\
 & \mathcal{V} &
 \end{array}$$

- (ii) $(\mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}, \otimes)$ for the category of (unbounded) chain complexes of \mathbb{K} -vector spaces with chain maps between these as morphisms (cf. [We94, §1])

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 V & \equiv & [\dots \xrightarrow{\partial_1^V} V_1 \xrightarrow{\partial_0^V} V_0 \xrightarrow{\partial_{-1}^V} V_{-1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{-2}^V} \dots] \\
 \downarrow \phi & & \dots \quad \downarrow \phi_1 \quad \downarrow \phi_0 \quad \downarrow \phi_{-1} \quad \dots \\
 W & \equiv & [\dots \xrightarrow{\partial_1^W} W_1 \xrightarrow{\partial_0^W} W_0 \xrightarrow{\partial_{-1}^W} W_{-1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{-2}^W} \dots]
 \end{array} \quad (10)$$

and equipped with monoidal category structure given by the usual tensor product of chain complexes (cf. [We94, §2.7]):

$$V \otimes W \equiv \left[\dots \rightarrow \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (V_{n+1} \otimes W_{-n}) \xrightarrow{\begin{smallmatrix} \partial^V \otimes \text{id} - \\ (-1)^n \text{id} \otimes \partial^W \end{smallmatrix}} \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (V_n \otimes W_{-n}) \xrightarrow{\begin{smallmatrix} \partial^V \otimes \text{id} - \\ (-1)^n \text{id} \otimes \partial^W \end{smallmatrix}} \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (V_{n-1} \otimes W_{-n}) \rightarrow \dots \right] \quad (11)$$

whose tensor unit is

$$\mathbb{1} \equiv [\dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \xrightarrow{\text{deg}=0} \mathbb{K} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots], \quad (12)$$

and which is closed with internal-hom (“mapping complex”) given by:

$$[V, W] \equiv \left[\dots \rightarrow \prod_{n \in \mathbb{X}} [V_n, W_{n+1}] \xrightarrow{\begin{smallmatrix} \partial^W \circ (-) - \\ (-1)^n (-) \circ \partial^V \end{smallmatrix}} \prod_{n \in \mathbb{X}} [V_n, W_n] \xrightarrow{\begin{smallmatrix} \partial^W \circ (-) - \\ (-1)^n (-) \circ \partial^V \end{smallmatrix}} \prod_{n \in \mathbb{X}} [V_n, W_{n-1}] \rightarrow \dots \right], \quad (13)$$

where the tensor symbol and the angular brackets on the right denote the corresponding operations (5) on component vector spaces.

This category is (co)complete with (co)limits formed degreewise in $\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}}$; in particular it is (co)tensoried over \mathbf{Set} , degreewise as in (7)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}} & \xrightarrow{(-) \cdot (-)} & \mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}} \\
 (S, V) & \mapsto & \prod_{s \in S} V
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}} & \xrightarrow{(-)^{(-)}} & \mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}} \\
 (S, V) & \mapsto & \prod_{s \in S} V
 \end{array} \quad (14)$$

(iv) $\boxed{\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}}$ for the \mathbf{sSet} -enriched category (“simplicial category”) whose objects are those of $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and whose simplicial hom-sets are⁴

$$\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \quad \vdash \quad \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}) := \left([k] \mapsto \int_{[s] \in \Delta} \mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}(\Delta[k]_s \cdot \mathcal{V}_s, \mathcal{W}_s) \right) \in \mathbf{sSet}, \quad (16)$$

and with (co)tensoring given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{sSet} \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} & \xrightarrow{(-) \cdot (-)} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{V}) & \mapsto & ([k] \mapsto \mathcal{S}_k \cdot \mathcal{V}_k), \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{sSet}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} & \xrightarrow{(-)^{(-)}} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{V}) & \mapsto & \left([k] \mapsto \int_{[s] \in \Delta} (\mathcal{V}_s)^{(\mathcal{S} \times \Delta[k])_s} \right), \end{array} \quad (17)$$

$$\mathcal{S} \in \mathbf{sSet}; \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \quad \vdash \quad \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{S} \cdot \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}) \simeq \mathbf{sSet}(\mathcal{S}, \mathbf{sCh}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W})) \simeq \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}^{\mathcal{S}}) \quad (18)$$

and regarded as an \mathbf{sSet} -enriched monoidal category (Def. A.30) by enhancement of the previous tensor functor to an \mathbf{sSet} -enriched functor with the following components:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}) \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{V}', \mathcal{W}') & \xrightarrow{\otimes_{(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}'), (\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}')}} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{V}', \mathcal{W} \otimes \mathcal{W}') \\ \left((\Delta[k] \cdot \mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{W}), (\Delta[k] \cdot \mathcal{V}' \xrightarrow{\phi'} \mathcal{W}') \right) & \mapsto & \left(\Delta[k] \cdot (\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{V}') \xrightarrow{\text{diag} \cdot (\dots)} (\Delta[k] \cdot \mathcal{V}) \otimes (\Delta[k] \cdot \mathcal{V}') \xrightarrow{\phi \otimes \phi'} \mathcal{W} \otimes \mathcal{W}' \right) \end{array} \quad (19)$$

and dually for the simplicial enhancement of the internal hom-functor:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{op}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}) \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{V}', \mathcal{W}') & \xrightarrow{[-, -]_{(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}'), (\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}')}} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}([\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}'], [\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}']) \\ \left((\Delta[k] \cdot \mathcal{W} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{V}' \xrightarrow{\phi'} (\mathcal{W}')^{\Delta[k]}) \right) & \mapsto & \left([\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}] \xrightarrow{[\phi, \phi']} [\Delta[k] \cdot \mathcal{V}', (\mathcal{W}')^{\Delta[k]}] \xrightarrow{(\dots)^{\text{diag}}} [\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}] \right). \end{array} \quad (20)$$

(v) $\boxed{\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}} & \xrightarrow{\text{const}} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ & \perp & \\ & \xleftarrow{\text{ev}_0} & \end{array}}$ for the pair of strong monoidal adjoint functors, where

- the left adjoint, const , sends a chain complex V to the simplicial chain complex all whose entries are V and all whose simplicial maps are id_V ,
- the right adjoint, ev_0 , sends a simplicial chain complex \mathcal{V} to its 0-component \mathcal{V}_0 (this being the limit over the simplicial diagram),

(vi) $\boxed{\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \xrightarrow{\text{tot}} \mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}}$ for the *total chain complex* functor

$$\text{tot}(\mathcal{V}) := \left[\dots \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{s+t=1} \mathcal{V}_{s,t} \xrightarrow{\partial + \sum_s (-1)^s d^s} \bigoplus_{s+t=0} \mathcal{V}_{s,t} \xrightarrow{\partial + \sum_s (-1)^s d^s} \bigoplus_{s+t=-1} \mathcal{V}_{s,t} \longrightarrow \dots \right]. \quad (21)$$

Theorem 2.3 (Model category of simplicial chain complexes). *The categories of chain complexes of vector spaces from Def. 2.2 carry the following model category structures:*

(i) $\boxed{(\mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}, \otimes)}$ carries a monoidal model category structure with the following properties:

- the model structure has
 - weak equivalences the quasi-isomorphisms (the isomorphisms on chain homology),
 - fibrations the degreewise surjections (in particular all objects are fibrant),
 - cofibrations the degreewise injections (in particular all objects are cofibrant),

⁴This follows using Lem. A.25 for $\mathbf{V} := \mathbf{Set}$, $\mathbf{C} := \mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and $\mathbf{X} := \Delta^{\text{op}}$.

- the model structure is:

- proper,
- combinatorial with sets of generating (acyclic) cofibrations $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbb{K}} := \{i_n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ ($\mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{K}} := \{j_n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$) given by:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbb{S}^{n-1} := [\dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots] & 0 := [\dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots] & \\
\downarrow i_n & \downarrow & \downarrow j_n \\
\mathbb{D}^n := [\dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \mathbb{K} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots] & \mathbb{D}^n := [\dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \mathbb{K} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots] & \\
& \text{deg} = n & \text{deg} = n
\end{array} \quad (22)$$

- (ii) $(\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}, \otimes)$ carries a simplicial monoidal model category structure with the following properties:

- the model structure has
 - weak equivalences the total-quasi-isomorphisms, i.e. the quasi-isos on total chain complexes (21),
 - all objects cofibrant;
- the adjunction $\text{const} : \mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}} \rightleftarrows \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} : \text{ev}_0$ is a monoidal Quillen equivalence;
- the model structure is:
 - left proper,
 - combinatorial,
with sets of generating (acyclic) cofibrations to be denoted

$$\mathbf{sI}_{\mathbb{K}}, \quad \mathbf{sJ}_{\mathbb{K}}. \quad (23)$$

Proof. We discuss the claims successively:

Combinatorial model structure. Generally, for R a commutative ring, the projective model structure on unbounded chain complexes of R -modules (i.e., with weak equivalences the quasi-isomorphisms and fibrations the degreewise surjection) exists as a proper and cofibrantly generated model category by arguments given in [HPS, after Thm. 9.3.1][Ho99, p. 41][ScSh00, p. 7][Fa06, Thm. 3.2]. For the special case that all submodules of free R -modules are themselves free (such as for $R = \mathbb{Z}$ but also in our case where $R = \mathbb{K}$ is a field) an alternative proof is spelled out in [Str20].

That the underlying category is locally presentable, hence that this cofibrantly generated model structure is in fact combinatorial, follows from classical facts: A category of R -modules is a Grothendieck abelian category (e.g. [Jo77, Thm. 8.11]), the category of chain complexes in a Grothendieck abelian category is itself Grothendieck abelian (e.g. [Ho99a, p. 3]) and every Grothendieck abelian category is locally presentable, by [Be00, Prop. 3.10] (cf., e.g., [Kr15, Cor. 5.2]).

Characterization of the cofibrations. Still in the generality of any commutative ground ring R , [Ho99, Prop. 2.3.9] shows that the cofibrations in this projective model structure are the degreewise *split*-injections with cofibrant cokernel, and [Ho99, Lem 2.3.6] shows that at least all bounded-below chain complexes of *projective* modules are cofibrant.

Now to specialize this characterization to our case where R is a field \mathbb{K} , so that the above R -modules become \mathbb{K} -vector spaces: Here, by the basis theorem, every module is free and in particular projective, and every short exact sequence splits. So in this case it follows, first, that at least every bounded-below chain complex is cofibrant and that the cofibrations are the degreewise injections with cofibrant cokernel. So to see that in this case the cofibrations in fact coincide with all degreewise injections it is now sufficient to see that actually every chain complex over a field is projectively cofibrant: Observe that every chain complex V is the colimit over its cotower of k -connective covers $V \simeq \text{colim}(c_{n_0}V \hookrightarrow c_{n_0-1}V \hookrightarrow c_{n_0-2}V \hookrightarrow \dots)$, which, by the remarks just made, is a transfinite composition of cofibrations, so that the cocone $c_{n_0}V \hookrightarrow V$ is itself a cofibration. Since we already know that $c_{n_0}V$ is cofibrant (being bounded below) it follows that also V is.

Monoidal model structure. That the tensor product of chain complexes makes the above model category into a monoidal model category is discussed in [Ho01, Cor. 3.7][Fa06, Thm. 6.1] and in [Str20] (there in the generality

where submodules of free R -modules are themselves free). Explicitly, notice that for checking the pushout-product axiom (132) in a closed tensor product on a cofibrantly generated model category, it is sufficient to check it on generating (acyclic) cofibrations, which in our case (22) is fairly immediate.

Much of the model category structure listed so far, that is not specific to R being a field, is also summarized in [MR19, §1].

Simplicial model structure. Again in the generality of any commutative ground ring, [RSS01, p. 10] show that a simplicial enhancement of the projective model structure on unbounded chain complexes is given by the Reedy model structure on $s\text{Ch}_R$ left Bousfield-localized at the total-quasi-isomorphisms, making the adjoint pair $\text{const} \dashv \text{ev}_0$ a Quillen equivalence.

For us, it remains to see that over a ground field $R = \mathbb{K}$ all objects in this simplicial model structure are cofibrant. But since left Bousfield localization does not change the class of cofibrations, and since we already saw above that all objects in $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ are cofibrant, it is sufficient to see that:⁵

Every simplicial diagram in a model category with underlying abelian category and all whose objects are cofibrant is itself Reedy cofibrant. This follows by appeal to the Dold-Kan correspondence, which exhibits any such simplicial object degreewise as a direct sum of objects of degenerate and of non-degenerate simplices. Inspection shows that these summands of degenerate simplices are isomorphically the “latching objects” appearing in the definition of the Reedy model structure, which implies that a simplicial diagram in the given case is Reedy cofibrant as soon as the degreewise sub-objects of non-degenerate simplices are cofibrant.

Monoidal simplicial model structure. First, the plain Reedy model structure on simplicial objects in a symmetric monoidal model category is itself monoidal model under the degree-wise tensor product, by [Ba10, Thm. 3.51]. To check that this monoidal model structure is preserved by left Bousfield localization at the total-quasi-isomorphisms we check the sufficient criterion given in [Ba10, Thm. 3.51]⁶. Indeed, observing that:

- every object $\mathcal{V} \in s\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is a homotopy colimit of simplicially constant objects $\text{const}(V)$ (since these are Reedy cofibrant, by the above, so that $\text{hocolim}_{[k] \in \Delta} \text{const}(\mathcal{V}_k)$ is computed by the coend $\int^{[k] \in \Delta} \Delta[k] \cdot \text{const}(\mathcal{V})_k$, which is \mathcal{V}),
- for a Reedy fibrant object \mathcal{W} to be local in $s\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ with respect to total-quasi-isomorphisms means [RSS01] to be *homotopically constant* in that all the simplicial maps $d_i : \mathcal{W}_{i+i} \longrightarrow \mathcal{W}_i$ and $s_i : \mathcal{W}_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{W}_{i+1}$ are quasi-isomorphisms,

this criterion says it is sufficient to check that for \mathcal{W} homotopically constant, also the internal hom $[\text{const}(V), \mathcal{W}]$ (15) is homotopically constant. Now for constant domain, the internal hom reduces (essentially by an incarnation of the Yoneda Lemma) to

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{const}(V), \mathcal{W}] : [k] &\longmapsto \int_{[s] \in \Delta} [(\Delta[k] \cdot \text{const}(V))_s, \mathcal{W}_s] && \simeq \int_{[s] \in \Delta} [\Delta[k]_s \cdot V, \mathcal{W}_s] \\ &&& \simeq \int_{[s] \in \Delta} [V, (\mathcal{W}_s)^{\Delta[k]_s}] \\ &&& \simeq [V, \int_{[s] \in \Delta} (\mathcal{W}_s)^{\Delta[k]_s}] \\ &&& \simeq [V, \mathcal{W}_k]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it is sufficient now to observe that $[V, -] : \text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}} \longrightarrow \text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ preserves all quasi-isomorphisms. But this is the case because, by the above discussion, (1.) all objects in $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$, such as V here, are cofibrant so that $[V, -]$ is a right Quillen functor by the pullback-power axioms satisfied in the monoidal model category, and (2.) all objects, such as the \mathcal{W}_k here, are also fibrant, so that weak equivalences between them are preserved by right Quillen functors, according to Ken Brown’s lemma A.19.

It just remains to observe that the Quillen equivalence $\text{const} \dashv \text{ev}_0$ is a monoidal Quillen adjunction (according to [Ho99, Def. 4.2.16]), which is immediate since const is already a strong monoidal functor and since the tensor unit is cofibrant (like all objects).

⁵This argument was pointed out by Charles Rezk, and we thank Dmitri Pavlov for further discussion. The details may be found spelled out at: ncatlab.org/nlab/show/Reedy+model+structure#WithValuesInAnAbelianCategory.

⁶We thank Dmitri Pavlov for pointing out this result.

Left proper combinatorial simplicial model structure. Finally, that this model structure on $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is left proper and combinatorial follows by general results from the above fact that $\mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is so:

1. Any Reedy model category with coefficients in a locally presentable model category (with small domains of generating cofibrations) is itself locally presentable, by [Hi02, Thm. 15.6.27].
2. Any functor category out of a small category into a locally presentable category is itself locally presentable [AR94, Cor. 1.54].
3. Any Reedy model category with coefficients in a left (or right) proper model category is itself left (or right) proper [Hi02, Thm. 15.3.4 (2)].
4. Any left Bousfield localization of a left proper combinatorial model category is itself left proper combinatorial [Ba10, Thm. 4.7]. \square

The upshot of Theorem 2.3 is that the simplicial monoidal model category $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is a good model category theoretic enhancement of the coefficient ∞ -category needed to define flat ∞ -vector bundles. Beyond giving a good handle on ∞ -local systems over fixed base space, we use this below to construct the global theory of flat ∞ -vector bundles over *varying* parameter spaces (Thm. 2.23 below), on which the \boxtimes -tensor product will exist as a decently homotopical functor (Thm. 2.42 below).

Remark 2.4 (Fibrant replacement). Since every object of $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is cofibrant, the notion of higher chain homotopy encoded by this model category is all given by Reedy *fibrant* replacement of chain complexes $V \in \mathbf{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}} \xrightarrow{\text{const}} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$.

Linear ∞ -representations of ∞ -categories. Specifically, we can now invoke the following general constructions:

Definition 2.5 (Category of simplicial local systems). Given $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Cat}$ a small simplicial category, we write

$\left(\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} := \mathbf{sFunc}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}), \otimes_{\mathbf{X}} \right)$ for the closed monoidal simplicial category whose ⁷

- objects are \mathbf{sSet} -enriched functors from \mathbf{X} to $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ (Def. 2.2), to be denoted

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} : \mathbf{X} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ x & \longmapsto & \mathcal{V}_x \end{array}$$

- hom-complexes are

$$\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{X}}) := \int_{x \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{sCh}(\mathcal{V}_x, \mathcal{W}_x) \in \mathbf{sSet},$$

and⁸

- equipped with the cup-tensor product induced from the tensor product carried by $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} & \xrightarrow{\otimes_{\mathbf{X}}} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \\ (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{V}'_{\mathbf{X}}) & \longmapsto & \mathbf{X} \xrightarrow{\text{diag}} \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \times \mathcal{V}'_{\mathbf{X}}} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \xrightarrow{\otimes} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \end{array} \quad (24)$$

- and similarly with the following cup-tensoring

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{sSet}^{\mathbf{X}} \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} & \xrightarrow{(-) \cdot_{\mathbf{X}} (-)} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \\ (S_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}) & \longmapsto & \mathbf{X} \xrightarrow{\text{diag}} \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X} \xrightarrow{S_{\mathbf{X}} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}} \mathbf{sSet} \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \xrightarrow{(-) \cdot (-)} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \end{array} \quad (25)$$

- whose corresponding internal hom is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}})^{\text{op}} \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} & \xrightarrow{[-, -]_{\mathbf{X}}} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \\ (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{X}}) & \longmapsto & \left(x \mapsto \int_{x' \in \mathbf{X}} [\mathbf{X}(x', x) \cdot \mathcal{V}_{x'}, \mathcal{W}_{x'}] \right) \end{array} \quad (26)$$

⁷This uses Lem. A.25 for $\mathbf{V} := \mathbf{sSet}$, $\mathbf{C} := \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and the given \mathbf{X} .

⁸Now using Lem. A.25 for $\mathbf{V} := \mathbf{C} := \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and \mathbf{X} regarded as a $\mathbf{sSet} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{K}[-]} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ -enriched category.

$$\mathcal{V} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \quad \dashv \quad \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V} \otimes_{\mathbf{X}} (-)} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{[\mathcal{V}, -]_{\mathbf{X}}} \end{array} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}. \quad (27)$$

Proposition 2.6 (Model category of simplicial local systems over a fixed base space).

For $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Cat}$ a small simplicial category, the monoidal simplicial functor category (Def. 2.5)

$\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}$ carries a model category structure with the following properties:

- (i) the model structure has
 - weak equivalences the \mathbf{X} -objectwise weak equivalences in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$,
 - fibrations the \mathbf{X} -objectwise fibrations in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ (both according to Prop. 2.3);
- (ii) the model structure is
 - combinatorial
 - with sets of generating (acyclic) cofibrations those of (23) tensored to representables:

$$\mathbf{sI}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} := \{ \mathbf{X}(x, -) \cdot i \mid x \in \mathbf{X}, i \in \mathbf{sI}_{\mathbb{K}} \}, \quad \mathbf{sJ}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} := \{ \mathbf{X}(x, -) \cdot j \mid x \in \mathbf{X}, j \in \mathbf{sJ}_{\mathbb{K}} \}. \quad (28)$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is simplicial combinatorial, by Prop. 2.3, this is the existence statement of the projective model structure on enriched functors, see for instance [Lu09a, Prop. A.3.3.2]. \square

Remark 2.7 (Base change between model structures of simplicial local systems). For $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}'$ a morphism of simplicial groupoids, the induced pair of adjoint functors (124)

$$\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_!} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\mathbf{f}^*} \end{array} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}'}$$

is a Quillen adjunction with respect to the model structure from Prop. 2.6 (since the right adjoint \mathbf{f}^* , which acts by precomposition, clearly preserves the objectwise defined weak equivalences and fibrations).

Remark 2.8 (Linear ∞ -category-representations). In the following, we focus on the specialization of Prop. 2.6 to domains \mathcal{X} which model ∞ -groupoids. But it is clear that Prop. 2.6 is relevant more generally.

For example, already in one of the simplest examples of a small (simplicial) category \mathcal{X} which is not a (simplicial) groupoid, namely the category $\mathbf{FinSet}_{\text{inj}}$ of finite sets and *injective* maps between them, Prop. 2.6 provides the homotopy-coherent enhancement of the notion of *FI-modules* (known to have deep relation to braid group representations and hence to topological quantum computation, see eg. [Wi23] for pointers). A dedicated discussion of such homotopical FI-modules has recently appeared in [Ar23].

∞ -Group representations. With this in hand and by the fact that every ∞ -group is presented by a simplicial group, we immediately obtain a model category of “ \mathbb{K} -linear ∞ -representations of ∞ -groups”, identified with ∞ -local systems over a delooping ∞ -groupoid:

Definition 2.9 (Simplicial delooping groupoids). For a simplicial group $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{Grp}(\mathbf{sSet})$ we write

$$\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd} \longleftrightarrow \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Cat}$$

for the simplicial groupoid which has

- a single object,
- single hom-object identified with the simplicial group, whose composition operation and identity element is given by the group operation and the neutral element on \mathcal{G} .

Remark 2.10 (Simplicial functors between $\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}$ s are simplicial group homomorphisms).

The \mathbf{sSet} -enriched functors between simplicial delooping groupoids (Def. 2.9) correspond naturally to homomorphisms between the corresponding simplicial groups

$$\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}(\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}') \simeq \mathbf{sGrp}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}').$$

Remark 2.11 (Simplicial local systems on $\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}$ are simplicial group representations).

By the (co)tensoring adjunctions, a simplicial functor $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}}$ on the simplicial delooping groupoid $\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}$ (Def. 2.9) is equivalently a simplicial \mathcal{G} -action $\rho_{\mathcal{V}}$ on some object $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{G}\text{Act}(\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}) \\ \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} & \mapsto & (\mathcal{V}, \rho_{\mathcal{V}}) \end{array} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{G} \cdot \mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\rho_{\mathcal{V}}} \mathcal{V} \\ \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} : \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}) \end{array}}{\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\bar{\rho}_{\mathcal{V}}} \mathcal{V}^{\mathcal{G}}} \quad (29)$$

Proposition 2.12 (Closed monoidal structure of simplicial local systems over simplicial delooping groupoids).

Over a simplicial delooping groupoid, the monoidal structure from Def. 2.5 has

(i) tensor product given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} : \mathcal{G} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W}) \\ (\Delta[k] \xrightarrow{g} \mathcal{G}) & \mapsto & \left(\Delta[k] \cdot \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W} \xrightarrow{\text{diag} \cdot \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W}} (\Delta[k] \cdot \mathcal{V}) \otimes (\Delta[k] \cdot \mathcal{W}) \xrightarrow{\bar{\rho}_{\mathcal{V}} \otimes \bar{\rho}_{\mathcal{W}}} (\mathcal{G} \cdot \mathcal{V}) \otimes (\mathcal{G} \cdot \mathcal{W}) \xrightarrow{g \otimes g} \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W} \right) \end{array}$$

(ii) and internal hom given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}}] : \mathcal{G} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}([\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}], [\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}]) \\ (\Delta[k] \xrightarrow{g} \mathcal{G}) & \mapsto & \left([\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}] \xrightarrow{[\rho_{\mathcal{V}}, \bar{\rho}_{\mathcal{W}}]} [\mathcal{G} \cdot \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}^{\mathcal{G}}] \xrightarrow{[g^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}^{\mathcal{G}}]} [\Delta[k] \cdot \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}^{\Delta[k]}] \xrightarrow{[\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}]^{\text{diag}}} [\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}]^{\Delta[k]} \right). \end{array}$$

Proof. The first statement follows readily by unwinding the definitions. This makes the adjunction property of the second formula essentially manifest. \square

Skeletal simplicial groupoids. Intermediate between general sSet-enriched groupoids in Prop. 2.6 and simplicial delooping groupoids in Rem. 2.11 are skeletal simplicial groupoids.

Definition 2.13 (Skeletal simplicial groupoids). (i) A simplicial groupoid $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ is *skeletal* if its only non-empty hom-complexes are those from a given object to itself. In other words, if and only if it is isomorphic to a disjoint union of simplicial delooping groupoids (Def. 2.9):

$$\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd} \quad \vdash \quad \mathbf{X} \text{ is skeletal} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{X} \underset{\text{iso}}{\simeq} \coprod_{[x] \in \pi_0(\mathbf{X})} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}(x, x)). \quad (30)$$

(ii) We denote the full subcategory of skeletal simplicial groupoids by

$$\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}_{\text{skl}} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}. \quad (31)$$

Given any $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ we say that a *skeleton* of \mathbf{X} is a full inclusion (hence a Dwyer-Kan equivalence) out of a skeletal groupoid (30)

$$\mathbf{X}_{\text{skl}} \underset{\in \text{W}_{\text{DK}}}{\hookrightarrow} \mathbf{X}. \quad (32)$$

Lemma 2.14 (Skeletal implies fibrant). *Every skeletal simplicial groupoid (Def. 2.13) is fibrant.*

Proof. Unwinding the definitions, this is tantamount to saying that underlying any simplicial group is a Kan-fibrant simplicial set. This is the case by Moore's theorem [Mo54, Thm. 3, p. 18-04][Qu67, §II 3.8]. \square

The following Lemmas 2.15, 2.17, which are standard arguments, use the Axiom of Choice in the underlying category of sets, which we assume throughout, as usual.

Lemma 2.15 (Skeletization of simplicial groupoids). *Every $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ admits an adjoint equivalence and deformation retraction onto a skeleton (32).*

Proof. If \mathbf{X} is empty then the statement is trivial. So assume \mathbf{X} is inhabited, whence it is the disjoint union of its inhabited connected components

$$\mathbf{X} \underset{\text{iso}}{\simeq} \coprod_{i \in \pi_0(\mathbf{X})} \mathbf{X}_i.$$

Choosing a base-point in each component

$$i \in \pi_0(\mathbf{X}) \quad \vdash \quad x_i \in \text{Obj}(\mathbf{X}_i)$$

induces a sSet-enriched full inclusion

$$\iota : \coprod_{i \in \pi_0(\mathbf{X})} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}(x_i, x_i)) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{X}$$

and choosing a 1-morphism from each object to this basepoint:

$$x \in \text{Obj}(\mathbf{X}) \quad \vdash \quad \gamma_x : * \rightarrow \mathbf{X}(x_{[x]}, x)$$

(where by $[x] \in \pi_0(\mathbf{X})$ we denote the connected component of the given object x) induces a reverse enriched functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{X} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}} & \coprod_{i \in \pi_0(\mathbf{X})} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}(x_i, x_i)) \\ \mathbf{X}(x, y) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}_{x,y}} & \mathbf{X}(x_{[x]}, x_{[y]}) \\ \downarrow \wr & & \uparrow \circ \\ * \times \mathbf{X}(x, y) \times * & \xrightarrow{(\gamma_y)^{-1} \times \text{id} \times \gamma_x} & \mathbf{X}(y, x_{[y]}) \times \mathbf{X}(x, y) \times \mathbf{X}(x_{[x]}, x) \end{array}$$

such that the γ_x serve as components of an sSet-enriched natural transformation $\gamma : \iota \circ \mathbf{p} \rightarrow \text{id}_{\mathbf{X}}$.

Similarly, the inverse components define a converse transformation, but if we choose, as we may, $\gamma_{[x]} = \text{id}_{[x]}$, then there is already an equality $\mathbf{p} \circ \iota = \text{id}$. This means that we have a *deformation retraction* of \mathbf{X} into its skeleton

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{X}_{\text{sk}} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \mathbf{X} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{X}_{\text{skl}}, & \mathbf{X} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{X}_{\text{skl}} \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathbf{X} \\ & & & \downarrow \gamma \\ & & & \text{id} \end{array} \quad (33)$$

manifestly satisfying

$$\mathbf{p}(\gamma_x) = \text{id}_x \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{\mathbf{p}(x)} = \text{id}_{\mathbf{p}(x)}$$

and thus exhibiting ι as the left adjoint in an enriched adjoint equivalence. \square

Lemma 2.16 (Bifibrant resolution by skeletal simplicial groupoids). *Every $\mathbf{X} \in \text{sSet-Grpd}$ (Prop. 2.21) admits a bifibrant replacement by a skeletal simplicial groupoid (Def. 2.13).*

Proof. By the existence of the model structure, all objects of sSet-Grpd admit some cofibrant resolution, and by Lem. 2.15 this in turn admits a deformation retraction along a weak equivalence onto a skeletal object. The latter is still cofibrant since cofibrations are closed under retractions, and it is fibrant by Lem. 2.14. \square

Lemma 2.17 (Skeletalization of simplicial local systems).

Given $\mathbf{X} \in \text{sSet-Grpd}$, with skeleton $\mathbf{X}_{\text{skl}} \in \text{sSet-Grpd}_{\text{skl}}$, $\mathbf{X}_{\text{skl}} \xrightarrow[\in \text{W}_{\text{DK}}]{\iota} \mathbf{X}$ (32):

(i) *We have an adjoint equivalence of categories of local systems*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}_{\text{skl}}} & \xrightarrow{\iota_!} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \\ & \perp_{\simeq} & \\ & \xleftarrow{\iota^*} & \end{array} \quad (34)$$

which is a Quillen equivalence with respect to the projective model structures (from Prop. 2.6).

(ii) Moreover, given a morphism $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{X}' \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$ then these equivalences may be chosen such as to make a square of adjunctions commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}'_{\text{skl}}} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_!} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}_{\text{skl}}} \\
\uparrow \scriptstyle (t')^* \dashv \scriptstyle (t')_! & \xleftarrow{\mathbf{f}^*} & \uparrow \scriptstyle t^* \dashv \scriptstyle t_! \\
\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}'} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_!} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \\
& \xleftarrow{\mathbf{f}^*} &
\end{array} \quad (35)$$

Proof. The adjoint equivalence from the proof of Lem. 2.15 induces the claimed adjoint equivalence on local systems with $t_! = \mathbf{p}^*$

$$(\mathbf{p}^* t^* \mathcal{V})_x \simeq \mathcal{V}_{t_{\text{op}}(x)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V}_\gamma} \mathcal{V}_x.$$

Moreover, with $t_! \dashv t^*$ being an adjoint equivalence so is $t^* \dashv t_!$ and since the projective model structure on $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}_{\text{skl}}}$ is evidently right-transferred along $t_! = \mathbf{p}^*$ from that of $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}$ it follows (Prop. A.20) that $(t^* \dashv \mathbf{p}^*)$ is a Quillen equivalence, whence also $(\mathbf{p}^* \dashv t^*) \simeq (t_! \dashv t^*)$ is a Quillen equivalence:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} & \xleftarrow{\mathbf{p}^*} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}_{\text{sk}}} & \xleftarrow{t^*} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \\
& \xrightarrow{t^*} \simeq_{\text{Qu}} & & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}^*} \simeq_{\text{Qu}} &
\end{array} \quad (36)$$

While this construction is far from natural, due to the choices of x_i involved, these choices can be made consistently with respect to a single map $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{X}' \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$, by choosing $x'_i \in \mathbf{f}^{-1}(\{x_i\})$ for $i \in [\mathbf{f}]^{-1}(\{i\})$, thereby producing commuting diagrams of this form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}'(x'_i, x'_i)) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{f}_{x'_i, x'_i})} & \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}(x_i, x_i)) \\
\downarrow \scriptstyle t'_! & & \downarrow \scriptstyle t_! \\
\mathbf{X}' & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}} & \mathbf{X}.
\end{array}$$

This is enough to obtain the diagram (35) commuting up to enriched natural isomorphism. But furthermore we may choose $\gamma'_x \in \mathbf{f}^{-1}(\{\gamma_x\})$ for $x' \in f^{-1}(\{x\})$, which makes the diagram commute strictly. \square

Simplicial local systems over skeletal simplicial groupoids.

Remark 2.18 (Simplicial local systems on skeletal groupoids). Over a skeletal simplicial groupoid (Def. 2.13), the model category of simplicial local systems (Prop. 2.6) is the product model structure on the product of categories of simplicial local systems on the connected components:

$$\mathbf{X} \simeq \prod_{s \in S} \mathbf{B}^{\mathcal{G}_s} \quad \vdash \quad \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \simeq \prod_{s \in S} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}^{\mathcal{G}_s}} \in \text{ModCat}.$$

This is immediate from the fact that $\mathbf{Func}(\prod_s \mathbf{D}_s, \mathbf{C}) \simeq \prod_s \mathbf{Func}(\mathbf{D}_s, \mathbf{C})$ and since the weak equivalences and fibrations in the projective model structure on functors are defined objectwise.

Proposition 2.19 (Monoidal model structure on simplicial local systems). *For $\mathbf{X} \in \text{sSet-Grpd}$, the simplicial model structure $(\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}, \otimes_{\mathbf{X}})$ from Prop. 2.6 is monoidal model (with respect to the monoidal structure from Prop. 2.5).*

Proof. By the equivalences of categories (34) it is sufficient to show this for skeletal \mathbf{X} (Def. 2.13). Moreover, by Rem. 2.18 and since the tensor product is defined objectwise, the simplicial local systems over skeletal \mathbf{X} form a product model category equipped factorwise with the closed monoidal structure from Prop. 2.12:

$$(\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}, \otimes_{\mathbf{X}}) \simeq \prod_{i \in I} (\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}^{\mathcal{G}_i}}, \otimes_{\mathbf{B}^{\mathcal{G}_i}}).$$

Therefore, it is in fact sufficient to check that a model category of simplicial local systems over a simplicial delooping groupoid $(\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}}, \otimes_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}})$ is monoidal as a model category.

This follows by [BM06, p. 6]. For the record, we spell out the argument. The point is that over a delooping groupoid $\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}$ the generating (acyclic) cofibrations (23) are given by tensoring a generating (acyclic) cofibration of $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ with \mathcal{G} equipped with its own multiplication action:

$$\mathbf{sI}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} = \{\mathcal{G} \cdot i \mid i \in \mathbf{sI}_{\mathbb{K}}\}, \quad \mathbf{sJ}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} = \{\mathcal{G} \cdot j \mid j \in \mathbf{sJ}_{\mathbb{K}}\}. \quad (37)$$

This happens to coincide with the free construction (forming simplicial “regular representations”) which is left adjoint to the functor undrl that forgets the \mathcal{G} -action (29):

$$\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} \simeq \mathcal{G}\text{Act}(\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}) \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\mathcal{G} \cdot \mathcal{V} \leftarrow \mathcal{V}} \\ \xrightarrow{\perp_{\text{undrl}}} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{undrl}} \end{array} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \quad (38)$$

Another conclusion from (37) is that the underlying functor is also *left Quillen*

$$\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} \simeq \mathcal{G}\text{Act}(\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{undrl}} \\ \xrightarrow{\perp_{\text{Qu}}} \\ \xleftarrow{(* \rightarrow \mathbf{B}\mathcal{G})_*} \end{array} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \quad (39)$$

since $\mathcal{G} \cdot i$ (resp. $\mathcal{G} \cdot j$) are still (acyclic) cofibrations in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ due to its \mathbf{sSet} -enriched model structure (Prop. 2.3).

With these preliminaries in hand, we check the pushout-product axiom (132): Consider a pair of generating cofibrations $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ and $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}'$ in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}}$; we need to show that their pushout-product morphism on the far left of the following diagrams is a cofibration, which equivalently means that for any acyclic fibration $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}'$ and commuting diagrams as on the left, there exists a lift as shown by the dashed arrow on the left, and by a standard argument (e.g. [Lu09a, Rem. A.3.1.6]) this exists if and only if a lift in the corresponding diagram on the right exists:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W}') \amalg^{\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W}} (\mathcal{V}' \otimes \mathcal{W}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{R} \\ \downarrow & \dashrightarrow & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{V}' \otimes \mathcal{W}' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{R}' \end{array} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V} & \longrightarrow & [\mathcal{W}', \mathcal{R}] \\ \downarrow & \dashrightarrow & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{V}' & \longrightarrow & [\mathcal{W}', \mathcal{R}'] \amalg_{[\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R}']} [\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R}] \end{array}$$

But by the previous observation, the left morphism in the diagram on the right is in the image of the left adjoint functor (38), which finally means that the dashed lift on the right exists in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}}$ as soon as such exists for the underlying diagram in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$. Now by definition of the projective model structure in Prop. 2.6 the underlying map of $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}'$ is still a fibration, and using that $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is \mathbf{sSet} -enriched model (Prop. 2.3) it follows also that underlying the generating cofibrations (37) are cofibrations in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$, and then that lifting in the diagram on the right above is that of a cofibration against an acyclic fibration in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and hence exists. Verbatim the argument with the evident substitutions shows that the same kind of lifts exist if $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}'$ is actually an acyclic cofibration and $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}'$ is any fibration. In summary this establishes the pushout-product axiom in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}}$. \square

2.2 Parameterization over varying base spaces

We now glue all the model categories of simplicial local systems over fixed base spaces to an integral model structure on simplicial local systems over varying base spaces. First, to recall (references in the following proof, p. 17):

Definition 2.20 (Free maps of simplicial groupoids). A morphism $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}$ of simplicial groupoids (106) is called *free* if it is degreewise injective and there exists a subset $\Gamma \subset \text{Mor}(\mathbf{Y})$ of “freely generating” morphisms (of any degree) such that:

- (1) no identity morphism is in Γ , but Γ is closed under the degeneracy maps of \mathbf{Y} ,

- (2) every non-identity morphism in \mathbf{Y} is *uniquely* the composition of a *reduced* (see below) sequence of composable
- (i) morphisms in Γ and their inverses,
 - (ii) morphisms in the image under \mathbf{f} of non-identity morphisms in \mathbf{X} ,

where *reduced* means that

- (i) no morphism in the sequence is consecutive with its own inverse,
- (ii) no two consecutive morphisms in the sequence are both in the image of \mathbf{f} .

For example, the point inclusion $* \rightarrow \mathbf{BF}(S)$ into the delooping groupoid of a free group, free on a set S , is a free map, in the sense of Def. 2.20, with $\Gamma \equiv S$.

Proposition 2.21 (Dwyer-Kan model structures).

(i) We have the following classical model categories:

(a) The category of simplicial sets

\mathbf{sSet} carries the Kan-Quillen model structure whose

- weak equivalences are the simplicial weak homotopy equivalences,
- fibrations are the Kan fibrations,
- cofibrations are the monomorphisms

(b) The category of (small) \mathbf{sSet} -enriched categories (often known as “simplicial categories”)

$\mathbf{sSet-Cat}$ carries a model structure whose

- weak equivalences are the Dwyer-Kan equivalences, namely the \mathbf{sSet} -functors which on isomorphism classes of objects in the homotopy category are surjective and on all hom-complexes are simplicial weak homotopy equivalences of underlying simplicial sets,
- fibrations are the \mathbf{sSet} -functors which are isofibrations on homotopy categories and on all hom-complexes are Kan fibrations of underlying simplicial sets.

(c) The category of small \mathbf{sSet} -enriched groupoids (often known as “simplicial groupoids”)

$\mathbf{sSet-Grpd}$ carries a model structure whose

- weak equivalences are the Dwyer-Kan equivalences as above,
- fibrations are the maps that admit lifting of 1-morphisms and are Kan fibrations on underlying simplicial sets of all automorphism groups,
- cofibrations are in particular injective on objects and degreewise on all hom-complexes.

(d) The category of simplicial groups

$\mathbf{sGrp} := \mathbf{Grp}(\mathbf{sSet})$ carries a model structure whose

- weak equivalences are the simplicial weak homotopy equivalences of underlying simplicial sets,
- fibrations are the Kan fibrations of underlying simplicial sets,
- cofibrations are the retracts of “almost free” (cf. [GJ99, p. 270]) simplicial group inclusions, in particular all cofibrations are monomorphisms (simplicial subgroup inclusions).

(ii) We have the following functors relating these:

- The canonical full inclusions are compatible with this model structure

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathbf{sGrp} & \hookrightarrow & \mathbf{sSet-Grpd} & \xleftarrow{\text{Loc}} & \mathbf{sSet-Cat} \\
 \mathcal{G} & \longmapsto & \mathbf{B}\mathcal{G} & \xleftarrow[\iota]{\perp_{\text{Qu}}} &
 \end{array} \tag{40}$$

in that

- $\text{Loc} \dashv \iota$ is a Quillen adjunction (here Loc is degreewise the free groupoid construction on or equivalently the full localization of a category);
- $\mathbf{B}(-)$ (Def. 2.9) preserves weak equivalences and fibrations (but has no left adjoint).

- *There is a Quillen equivalence*

$$\text{sSet-Grpd} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\mathbf{G}} \\ \xrightarrow[\overline{\mathbf{W}}]{\simeq_{\text{Qu}}} \end{array} \text{sSet} \quad (41)$$

and a Quillen adjunction

$$\text{sSet-Grpd} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\tilde{\mathbf{G}} := \text{Loc} \circ \mathfrak{C}} \\ \xrightarrow[\widehat{\mathbf{W}} := N \circ \iota]{\perp_{\text{Qu}}} \end{array} \text{sSet} \quad \equiv \quad \text{sSet-Grpd} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\text{Loc}} \\ \xrightarrow[\iota]{\perp_{\text{Qu}}} \end{array} \text{sSet-Cat} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\mathfrak{C}} \\ \xrightarrow[N]{\perp} \end{array} \text{sSet}, \quad (42)$$

such that

- *there exists a natural transformation*

$$\mathcal{X} \in \text{sSet} \quad \vdash \quad \text{Loc} \circ \mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{X}) \xrightarrow[\in \mathbf{W}_{\text{DK}}]{} \mathbf{G}(\mathcal{X}) \quad (43)$$

which is a Dwyer-Kan equivalence,

- *the natural transformation*

$$\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \in \text{sSet} \quad \vdash \quad \mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow[\in \mathbf{W}_{\text{DK}}]{(\mathfrak{C}(\text{pr}_{\mathcal{X}}), \mathfrak{C}(\text{pr}_{\mathcal{Y}}))} \mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{X}) \times \mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{Y}) \quad (44)$$

is a Dwyer-Kan equivalence.

Proof. (i) The Kan-Quillen model structure on sSet is, of course, due to [Qu67, §II.3], see also for instance [GJ99, §I.11]. The model structure on sGrp is due to [Qu67, §II 3.7], see [GJ99, §V].

The model structure on sSet-Grpd is due to [DK84, §2.5]. Their [DK84, §2.4 with §2.3 (i)] asserts that the cofibrations are in particular retracts of degreewise injections of sets (of objects and of morphisms). But since injections of sets are closed under retracts this means that all cofibrations are in particular degreewise injections.

The model structure on sSet-Cat is due to [Be07a], see also [Lu09a, Thm. A.3.2.4].

(ii) From this, it is immediate that the functors in (40) preserve the structure as stated; the Quillen adjunction on the right of (40) is also made explicit in [MRZ23, Prop. 2.8].

The Quillen equivalence $\mathcal{G} \dashv \overline{\mathbf{W}}$ (41) is due to [DK84, Thm. 3.3] reviewed in [GJ99, Thm. 7.8].

The adjunction $\mathfrak{C} \dashv N$ on the right of (42) is actually a Quillen equivalence with respect to the Joyal model structure on simplicial sets [Be07b, Thm. 7.8][Lu09a, Thm. 2.2.5.1]:

$$\text{sSet-Cat} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\mathfrak{C}} \\ \xrightarrow[N]{\perp_{\text{Qu}}} \end{array} \text{sSet}_{\text{Joyal}}. \quad (45)$$

But since the Joyal model structure has the same cofibrations as the Kan-Quillen model structure (the monomorphisms) this implies with (40) that $\tilde{\mathbf{G}} \equiv \text{Loc} \circ \mathfrak{C}$ preserves cofibrations. To see that it also preserves weak equivalences, and hence is a left Quillen functor as claimed on the left of (42), notice that (43) – which is due to [MRZ23, Thm. 1.1] – implies commuting squares

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{X} & \xrightarrow[\in \mathbf{W}]{f} & \mathcal{X}' \\ \tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\mathcal{X}) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(f)} & \tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\mathcal{X}') \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{G}(\mathcal{X}) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{G}(f)} & \mathbf{G}(\mathcal{X}'), \end{array}$$

where the vertical maps are Dwyer-Kan equivalences. But also the bottom map is a Dwyer-Kan equivalence by Ken Brown's Lemma A.19, since \mathbf{G} is a left Quillen functor (41) on a model category all whose objects are cofibrant, whence also $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(f)$ is a weak equivalence, by the 2-out-of-3 property satisfied by weak equivalences.

Finally, the property (44) is due to [Lu09a, Cor. 2.2.5.6], see also [DS11, Prop. 6.2]. \square

Remark 2.22 (Dwyer-Kan simplicial fundamental groupoids). The classical Dwyer-Kan functor $\mathbf{G} : \mathbf{sSet} \rightarrow \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ (41) may be thought of as forming simplicial *fundamental groupoids* of spaces and hence so may be its Dwyer-Kan-equivalent version $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ (42).

The integral model structure on simplicial local systems. Our interest is now in the pseudofunctor assigning model categories (Def. A.21) of simplicial local systems (Prop. 2.6) to simplicial fundamental groupoids $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(-)$ (Rem. 2.22) of simplicial sets, which exists as a bivariate pseudofunctor by Ex. A.18 and with values in \mathbf{ModCat} (Def. A.21) by Rem. 2.7:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathbf{sSet} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{G}} & \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{(-)}} & \mathbf{ModCat} \\
 \mathcal{X} & \mapsto & \mathbf{X} & \mapsto & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \\
 \downarrow f & & \downarrow \mathbf{f} & & \mathbf{f}_! \downarrow \dashv \uparrow \mathbf{f}^* \\
 \mathcal{X}' & \mapsto & \mathbf{X}' & \mapsto & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}'}
 \end{array} \tag{46}$$

Theorem 2.23 (Integral model structure on simplicial local systems over varying bases).

The integral model structures (Def. A.22) on the Grothendieck constructions (Def. A.4) on the pseudofunctors (46) exist and are Quillen equivalent, to be denoted as follows:

$$\boxed{
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{sSet}} := \int_{\mathcal{X} \in \mathbf{sSet}} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{G}(\mathcal{X})} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathbf{G}}} & \int_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} =: \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \\
 & \xleftarrow[\hat{\mathbf{W}}]{\simeq_{\text{Qu}}} &
 \end{array}
 } \tag{47}$$

Proof. First regarding the existence of the model structures, given maps $f : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ in \mathbf{sSet} (resp. $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{X}' \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$ in $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$), we need to show (by Prop. A.23) the following three properties:

1. **If f (resp. \mathbf{f}) is a weak equivalence then $\mathbf{G}(f)_! \dashv \mathbf{G}(f)^*$ (resp. $\mathbf{f}_! \dashv \mathbf{f}^*$) is a Quillen equivalence.**

Since \mathbf{G} preserves weak equivalences (by Ken Brown's lemma A.19, being a left Quillen functor (41) on a category with all objects cofibrant) it is sufficient to see that $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{(-)}$ has this property.

This is a special case of the following general statement, which may be of interest in its own right.

Lemma 2.24. *Let \mathbf{C} be a combinatorial simplicial model category and $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{X}' \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$ a Dwyer-Kan equivalence (Prop. 2.21) of small KanCplx-enriched categories. Then $\mathbf{f}_! : \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}' } \rightleftarrows \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}} : \mathbf{f}^*$ is a Quillen equivalence between the projective model structures on the enriched functor categories.*

Proof of Lemma. We demonstrate this claim by appeal to the ∞ -categories (quasi-categories) [Jo08][Lu09a] presented by the model structure, via the homotopy coherent nerve functor $N : \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \mathbf{sSet}$ (45) applied to full simplicial subcategories $(-)^{\circ}$ of bifibrant objects in simplicial model categories: By [Lu09a, Prop. 4.2.44] there are natural transformations as on the top of the following diagram, which restrict on bifibrant objects to weak equivalences of quasi-categories, as shown at the bottom:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 N(\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}}) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & N(\mathbf{C})^{N(\mathbf{X})} \\
 \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 N((\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}})^{\circ}) & \xrightarrow[\in \mathbf{W}_{\text{Joy}}]{} & N(\mathbf{C}^{\circ})^{N(\mathbf{X})}
 \end{array} \tag{48}$$

Consider then the following diagram of (large) simplicial sets:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
N((\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}})^{\circ}) & \xrightarrow{\in \mathbb{W}_{\text{Joy}}} & N(\mathbf{C}^{\circ})^{N(\mathbf{X})} \\
\downarrow N(\mathbb{R}(\mathbf{f}^*)) & \swarrow & \downarrow N(\mathbf{f}^*) \\
N(\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}}) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & N(\mathbf{C})^{N(\mathbf{X})} \\
\downarrow N(\mathbf{f}^*) & & \downarrow N(\mathbf{f}^*) \\
N(\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}'}) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & N(\mathbf{C})^{N(\mathbf{X}')} \\
\downarrow N(Q) & \searrow \text{id} & \swarrow \\
N(\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}'}) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & N(\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}'}) \\
\downarrow N(Q) & \cong & \downarrow N(Q) \\
N((\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}'})^{\circ}) & \xrightarrow{\in \mathbb{W}_{\text{Joy}}} & N(\mathbf{C}^{\circ})^{N(\mathbf{X}')}
\end{array} \tag{49}$$

where Q denotes a *functorial* cofibrant replacement functor (which exists by [Du01, Prop. 2.3][Ba10, Prop. 2.5] since $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}'}$ is combinatorial) and the double arrow denotes (the image under the right adjoint functor N of) the corresponding natural transformation whose components are the resolution equivalences $Q(-) \xrightarrow{\in \mathbb{W}} (-)$.

In this diagram (49): the top and bottom squares are instances of (48), the middle square commutes by naturality, the right square commutes evidently and the left square commutes by the usual construction of derived functors of right Quillen functors. With this, we have a natural transformation of ∞ -functors filling the full diagram and we observe that this is a natural equivalence: This follows by [Jo08, §5, Thm C (p. 125)] from the fact that its objectwise components are (resolution-)equivalences, by construction of $N(Q)$.

In conclusion, this shows that the right derived functor $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{f}^*$ represents the precomposition ∞ -functor $N(\mathbf{f})^*$ up to natural equivalence; in particular, both coincide on homotopy categories up to natural isomorphism.

But for \mathbf{f} a DK-equivalence between KanCplx-enriched categories the ∞ -functor $N(\mathbf{f})$ is an equivalence of ∞ -categories by [Lu09a, Thm. 2.2.5.1] (with Ken Brown's lemma A.19) and therefore $N(\mathbf{f})^*$ is an equivalence by [Lu09a, Prop. 1.2.7.3 (3)], hence in particular is an equivalence of homotopy categories, whence so is $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{f}^*$, which finally means that $\mathbf{f}_! \dashv \mathbf{f}^*$ is a Quillen equivalence. \square

2. If f (resp. \mathbf{f}) is an acyclic fibration then $\mathbf{G}(f)^*$ (resp. \mathbf{f}^*) preserves weak equivalences.

This is immediate and in fact holds for all maps \mathbf{f} , since \mathbf{f}^* acts by precomposition and weak equivalences are given objectwise.

3. If f (resp. \mathbf{f}) is an acyclic cofibration then $\mathbf{G}(f)_!$ (resp. $\mathbf{f}_!$) preserves weak equivalences.

Since \mathbf{G} , being a left Quillen functor (42), preserves acyclic cofibrations, it is sufficient to show the claim for any acyclic cofibration \mathbf{f} .

We will only need that, thereby:

$$\text{on objects, } \mathbf{f} \text{ is (i) injective and (ii) essentially surjective} \tag{50}$$

(a condition which holds also in the variant situation of Thm. 2.45 that we consider in §2.4).

Namely, to check that $\mathbf{f}_!$ preserves equivalences, which are defined objectwise, means to check that for all objects $x \in \mathbf{X}$ the map $\iota_x^* \circ \mathbf{f}_!$ preserves equivalences, where ι_x is the inclusion of the full subgroupoid $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}(x, x))$ at that point. But in fact, since a morphism of simplicial local systems is a weak equivalence over some x iff it is a weak equivalence over any other object in the same connected component (by functoriality and 2-out-of-3), it is sufficient to check that $\iota_x^* \circ \mathbf{f}_!$ preserves weak equivalences as x ranges over any choice of representatives for each connected component of \mathbf{X} .

Now by the assumption that \mathbf{f} is injective and essentially surjective on objects, we may find such representatives

x such that each has a unique preimage x' , giving rise to a pullback square of this form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}'(x', x')) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_{\{x'\}}} & \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}(x, x)) \\ \downarrow \iota_{x'} & \text{(pb)} & \downarrow \iota_x \\ \mathbf{X}' & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}} & \mathbf{X} \end{array} \quad (51)$$

But to this diagram the Beck-Chevalley condition (2.30) applies and implies that it is now equivalent to check that $(\mathbf{f}_{\{x'\}})_! \circ \iota_{x'}^*$ is a weak equivalence for all objects x' of \mathbf{X}' .

Finally, since ι_x^* preserves all weak equivalences (by the previous item), it is now sufficient to show that push-forward along maps of delooping groupoids

$$\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{B}\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}$$

preserves weak equivalences. This is the case we check now, using the identification of simplicial local systems over simplicial delooping groupoids with simplicial group representations (Rem. 2.11).

On general grounds (reviewed eg. in [SS26b, Lem. 1.1.7]), in this case $\mathbf{f}_!$ acts by forming left-induced representations, namely by

$$\mathbf{f}_! : \mathcal{V} \mapsto \mathcal{G} \cdot_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{V} := (\mathcal{G} \cdot \mathcal{V}) / \mathcal{H} : [n] \mapsto (\mathcal{G}_n \cdot \mathcal{V}_n) / \mathcal{H}_n,$$

where on the right the tensoring $\mathcal{G} \cdot \mathcal{V}$ is equipped with the diagonal \mathcal{H} -action which on \mathcal{G} is given by right inverse multiplication; and we have notationally highlighted that quotients of simplicial objects are computed degreewise.

Now we use that $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{B}\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}$ is simplicial-degreewise a group homomorphism

$$n : \mathbb{N} \quad \vdash \quad \phi_n : \mathcal{H}_n \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_n.$$

Since the weak equivalences in the local model structure $\text{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ (from Thm. 2.3) *include* (either by definition of left Bousfield localization or else by [Hi02, Prop. 3.1.5]) the global Reedy equivalences which are the simplicial-degreewise weak equivalences between objects $\mathcal{V}_n \in \text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$, it is sufficient now to observe that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is even an isomorphism (*not necessarily natural in n , but it does not need to be*) of the form

$$(\mathcal{G}_n \cdot \mathcal{V}_n) / \mathcal{H}_n \simeq (\mathcal{G}_n / \mathcal{H}_n) \cdot \mathcal{V}_n \in \text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}. \quad (52)$$

This concludes the argument, because the tensoring with any set — as on the right of (52) — is a left Quillen functor on $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$, and since all objects in $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ are cofibrant (both by Thm. 2.3) so that this Quillen functor preserves all weak equivalences, by Ken Brown's lemma A.19 (or more concretely: because a direct sum of quasi-isomorphisms is itself a quasi-isomorphism).

For completeness, we spell out the isomorphism (52). Under the identifications (9), this is the familiar statement from representation theory that the tensor product of any group representation V with the regular G -representation is isomorphic to the $\dim(V)$ -fold direct sum of the regular representation with itself; but for the record we make the isomorphism explicit by an elementary argument:

Using the Axiom of Choice in our underlying category Set , we may choose a section as follows (and the arbitrariness in this choice makes the construction be non-natural):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{G}_n \\ & \nearrow \sigma_n & \downarrow [-] \\ \mathcal{G}_n / \mathcal{H}_n & \xlongequal{\quad} & \mathcal{G}_n / \mathcal{H}_n \end{array}$$

which determines a function

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma[-] \setminus (-) : \mathcal{G}_n & \longrightarrow & \phi_n(\mathcal{H}_n) \subset \mathcal{G}_n \\ g & \longmapsto & (\sigma[g])^{-1} \cdot g. \end{array}$$

Using this, the desired isomorphism and its inverse are given by the diagonal morphisms in the following diagram (the top of which shows the coequalizer defining the global quotient, just for context):

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{H}_n \cdot (\mathcal{G}_n \cdot \mathcal{V}_n) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{(h, (g, v)) \mapsto (g, v)} \\ \xrightarrow{(h, (g, v)) \mapsto (g \cdot h^{-1}, h \cdot v)} \end{array} & \mathcal{G}_n \cdot \mathcal{V}_n & \xrightarrow[\text{coeq}]{(g, v) \mapsto [g, v]} & (\mathcal{G}_n \cdot \mathcal{V}_n) / \mathcal{H}_n . \\
& & \downarrow (g, v) \mapsto ([g], \sigma[g] \setminus g \cdot v) & \swarrow [g, v] \mapsto ([g], \sigma[g] \setminus g \cdot v) & \\
& & (\mathcal{G}_n / \mathcal{H}_n) \cdot \mathcal{V}_n & \xleftarrow{([g], v) \mapsto [\sigma[g], v]} &
\end{array}$$

This shows that both integral model structures exist. It remains to see the Quillen equivalence in (47):

The underlying pair of adjoint functors $\widehat{\mathbf{G}} \dashv \widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ is given by Ex. A.8. Furthermore, $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ is clearly a right Quillen functor because (recall Def. A.22) the underlying functor is right Quillen by Prop. 2.21 while the action on component morphisms by pullback is right Quillen by Rem. 2.7. Finally to see that this Quillen adjunction is a Quillen equivalence it is sufficient for cofibrant $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} \in \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{sSet}}$ and fibrant $\mathcal{V}'_{\mathbf{X}'} \in \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$ to check that

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} \xrightarrow{\phi_f} \widehat{R}(\mathcal{V}'_{\mathbf{X}'}) \text{ is a weak equivalence iff its adjunct } \widehat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}) \xrightarrow{\phi_f} \mathcal{V}'_{\mathbf{X}'} \text{ is a weak equivalence}$$

But on underlying morphisms this is the case because $\mathbf{G} \dashv \overline{\mathbf{W}}$ is a Quillen equivalence (41), while on component morphisms both $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}(-)$ (115) as well as $\varepsilon \circ (-)$ (115) are the identity operation, whence so is, on components, the passage $\varepsilon \circ \widehat{\mathbf{G}}(-)$ to adjuncts. \square

Definition 2.25 (Notation for simplicial local systems). We denote the objects and morphisms in the category $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$ (47) of simplicial local systems as follows:

- objects are denoted

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} := \left(\mathbf{X} \in \text{sSet-Grpd}, \mathcal{V} \in \text{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \right) \quad (53)$$

which is suggestively read as “ \mathcal{V} is a simplicial local system over \mathbf{X} ”;

- morphisms are denoted by their components in the underlying *contravariant* pseudofunctor

$$(\phi_{\mathbf{f}} : \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}'_{\mathbf{X}'}) := \left(\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V} & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathbf{f}^* \mathcal{V}' \\ \mathbf{X} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}} & \mathbf{X}' \end{array} \right), \quad (54)$$

as opposed to the adjunct form of the component ϕ , which we indicate by a $\tilde{\phi}$:

$$\frac{\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathbf{f}^* \mathcal{V}'}{\mathbf{f}_! \mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\phi}} \mathcal{W}} \quad (55)$$

Remark 2.26 (Choice of component morphisms). The choice (54) is motivated by the fact that \mathbf{f}^* but not $\mathbf{f}_!$ is a (strong) monoidal functor (Prop. 2.28 below), which means that in the notational convention (54) the external tensor product (Def. 2.31) below is *manifestly* given by the obvious formula. On the other hand, some computation shows (Prop. 2.34 below) that with the other convention, the analogous obvious formula will still hold (even if far from manifestly so) so that in the end the choice in (54) is as arbitrary as one would hope it is.

Example 2.27 (Decomposing group representations). In $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$ (47), every simplicial group representation (Rem. 2.11) decomposes along a homotopy cartesian square of this form

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{G} \in \text{sGrp} \\ \mathcal{V} \in (\text{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}})^{\text{fib}} \end{array} \right\} \vdash \begin{array}{ccc} \text{pt}^* \mathcal{V} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} \\ \downarrow & (\text{pb}) \quad \downarrow \in \text{Fib} & \equiv: \\ 0_{\text{pt}} & \xrightarrow{0_{\text{pt}}} & 0_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} \end{array} \quad \mathcal{V} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V} // \mathcal{G} \quad (56)$$

exhibiting $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}}$ as a homotopy quotient of \mathcal{V}_{pt} by a \mathcal{G} -action.

Proof. First, that the square is Cartesian follows by Prop. A.9:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{pt} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{B}\mathcal{G} \\
\text{id} \downarrow & \text{(pb)} & \downarrow \text{id} \\
\text{pt} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}
\end{array}
\quad \text{and} \quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{pt}^* \mathcal{V} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \text{pt}^* \mathcal{V} \\
0 \downarrow & \text{(pb)} & \downarrow \text{pt}^* 0 \\
0 & \xrightarrow{0} & \text{pt}^* 0
\end{array}$$

Finally, the right vertical map is a fibration since the identity on $\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}$ is a fibration in $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ and since $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow 0$ is a fibration in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}}$ iff it is in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$, which is the case by assumption. \square

2.3 The external tensor of flat ∞ -vector bundles

We discuss here the construction (Def. 2.31) and its homotopical properties (Thm. 2.42) of the external tensor product on $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$ (47), covering the Cartesian product on $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ (Prop. A.2).

Motivic yoga on simplicial local systems. The abstract form of the following structures and conditions was essentially all first formulated and named (“Frobenius reciprocity”, “Beck-Chevalley condition”) in discussion of (categorical semantics for) formal logic/type theory [La70][Se83][Pa91, §1][Pa96], even though the same structures govern what came to be known as *Grothendieck’s yoga of six operations* and as such must have originated at around the same time but have been systematically recorded only much later (notably [FHM03], in whose terminology we are dealing with the *Wirthmüller-form* of the yoga) especially once Grothendieck’s idea of “motives” was felt to be nailed down by “motivic homotopy theory” [CD19, §A.5][Ho17, p. 4].

On the other hand, the original discussion in logic was entirely in *classical* logic, while Grothendieck’s “yoga” that concerns us now always focused on non-cartesian (hence non-classical, i.e.: linear, “quantum”) monoidal categories dependent on classical base spaces — whence here we speak of the “motivic yoga” for short. More recently, essentially the same is referred to as “indexed closed monoidal enriched categories with indexed coproducts” [Sh13], which in its category-theoretic sobriety is again more suggestive (for the cognoscenti) of the logical/computational meaning of such structures: they serve as categorical semantics for the *multiplicative fragment of dependent linear/quantum homotopy type theory* [Sc14, §3.2][Ri22, §2.4][SS25a], for more on this perspective see §3 below.

Recall from (124) that for $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}$ a morphism in $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Cat}$ we have an associated adjoint triple of \mathbf{sSet} -enriched base change functors of simplicial local systems (Def. 2.5):

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_!} & \\
\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} & \xleftarrow{\mathbf{f}^*} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}} \\
& \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_*} &
\end{array}
\quad (57)$$

given by precomposition $\mathbf{f}^* \equiv (-) \circ \mathbf{f}$ and its left $\mathbf{f}_!$ and right \mathbf{f}_* Kan extension, respectively (125); and that for each \mathbf{X} we have symmetric closed monoidal category structure (27):

$$\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}, \mathcal{V} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \quad \vdash \quad \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V} \otimes_{\mathbf{X}} (-)} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{[\mathcal{V}, -]_{\mathbf{X}}} \end{array} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}. \quad (58)$$

Proposition 2.28 (Frobenius reciprocity for simplicial local systems). *Pullback of simplicial local systems along maps of simplicial groupoids*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{X} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}} & \mathbf{Y} \\
\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} & \xleftarrow{\mathbf{f}^*} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}}
\end{array}$$

is:

(i) *strong monoidal, in that there are natural isomorphisms of this form:*

$$\mathbf{f}^*(\mathbb{1}) \simeq \mathbb{1} \quad (59)$$

$$\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}} \quad \vdash \quad \mathbf{f}^*(\mathcal{V} \otimes_{\mathbf{Y}} \mathcal{W}) \simeq (\mathbf{f}^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes_{\mathbf{X}} (\mathbf{f}^* \mathcal{W}) \quad (60)$$

(ii) *strong closed, in that there are natural isomorphisms of this form:*

$$\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}} \quad \vdash \quad \mathbf{f}^*[\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}]_{\mathbf{Y}} \simeq [\mathbf{f}^*\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{f}^*\mathcal{W}]_{\mathbf{X}} \quad (61)$$

(iii) *and satisfies projection, in that there are natural isomorphisms of this form:*

$$\mathcal{R} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{V} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}} \quad \vdash \quad \mathbf{f}_!(\mathcal{R} \otimes_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{f}^*\mathcal{V}) \simeq (\mathbf{f}_!\mathcal{R}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Y}} \mathcal{V}. \quad (62)$$

Proof. By the adjoint equivalences (35) it is sufficient to check this for maps between skeletal simplicial groupoids. That in this case precomposition \mathbf{f}^* is a strong monoidal closed functor is manifest by Prop. 2.12. The projection formula then follows by adjointness (cf. [FHM03]), namely for any $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ we have natural isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{f}_!(\mathcal{R} \otimes_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{f}^*\mathcal{V}), \mathcal{W}) &\simeq \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{R} \otimes_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{f}^*\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{f}^*\mathcal{W}) && \text{by (57)} \\ &\simeq \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{R}, [\mathbf{f}^*\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{f}^*\mathcal{W}]_{\mathbf{X}}) && \text{by (58)} \\ &\simeq \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{f}^*[\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}]_{\mathbf{Y}}) && \text{by (61)} \\ &\simeq \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{f}_!\mathcal{R}, [\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}]_{\mathbf{Y}}) && \text{by (57)} \\ &\simeq \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}}((\mathbf{f}_!\mathcal{R}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Y}} \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}) && \text{by (58),} \end{aligned}$$

and since these are natural in \mathcal{W} , the projection formula (62) follows by the Yoneda Lemma. \square

We will need the Beck-Chevalley condition for simplicial local systems, but it will be sufficient to consider the following very special cases (the first is item (b) in [Se83, p. 511], for $B = *$).

To that end, we denote the projections out of a Cartesian product of simplicial groupoids as follows:

$$\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd} \quad \vdash \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y} & \\ \text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}} \swarrow & & \searrow \text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}} \\ \mathbf{X} & & \mathbf{Y} \end{array}$$

Lemma 2.29 (Beck-Chevalley for simplicial local systems along product projections). *Given a diagram in $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ of the form*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f} \times \text{id}} & \mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y} \\ \downarrow \text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}} & & \downarrow \text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'} \\ \mathbf{X} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}} & \mathbf{Y} \end{array}$$

then the following two ways of pull/push (57) of local systems through this diagram are naturally isomorphic:

$$(f \times \text{id})_! \circ \text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}}^* \simeq \text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'}^* \circ f_! \quad : \quad \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \longrightarrow \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y}}. \quad (63)$$

Proof. By coend calculus (125), we have for $(x', y) \in \mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y}$ the following sequence of natural isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} ((\mathbf{f} \times \text{id})_! \circ \text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}}^* \mathcal{V})_{(x', y)} &\simeq \int^{(x, y_0) \in \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{f}(x), x') \times \mathbf{Y}(\text{id}(y_0), y) \cdot (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}}^* \mathcal{V})_{(x, y_0)} \\ &\simeq \int^{(x, y_0) \in \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{f}(x), x') \times \mathbf{Y}(y_0, y) \cdot \mathcal{V}_x \\ &\simeq \int^{y_0 \in \mathbf{Y}} \int^{x \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{Y}(y_0, y) \times \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{f}(x), x') \cdot \mathcal{V}_x \\ &\simeq \int^{y_0 \in \mathbf{Y}} \mathbf{Y}(y_0, y) \cdot \int^{x \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{f}(x), x') \cdot \mathcal{V}_x \\ &\simeq \int^{y_0 \in \mathbf{Y}} \mathbf{Y}(y_0, y) \cdot (\mathbf{f}_! \mathcal{V})_{x'} \\ &\simeq (\mathbf{f}_! \mathcal{V})_{x'} \\ &\simeq (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'}^*(\mathbf{f}_! \mathcal{V}))_{(x', y)}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 2.30 (Beck-Chevalley for simplicial local systems along embeddings). *Given a diagram in $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ of the form*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{X}' & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}'} & \mathbf{Y}' \\ \downarrow \iota_{\mathbf{X}} & \text{(pb)} & \downarrow \iota_{\mathbf{Y}} \\ \mathbf{X} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}} & \mathbf{Y}, \end{array} \quad (64)$$

where the vertical maps are full simplicial sub-groupoid embedding (injective on objects, fully faithful on hom-objects), then the following two ways of pull/push of simplicial local systems through this diagram (57) are naturally isomorphic:

$$\mathbf{f}'_! \circ \iota_{\mathbf{X}}^* \simeq \iota_{\mathbf{Y}} \circ \mathbf{f}_! : \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} \longrightarrow \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}'}. \quad (65)$$

Proof. It is clear that the statement follows as soon as it holds for \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} replaced by the connected components of the images of $\iota_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\iota_{\mathbf{Y}}$, respectively (this is where the assumption enters that (64) is a pullback, hence that \mathbf{f}' is the corestriction of \mathbf{f} to \mathbf{Y}'). Therefore we may assume, without restriction, that $\iota_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\iota_{\mathbf{Y}}$ are *in addition* also essentially surjective on objects.

In this case, since they are also assumed to be fully faithful, they are in fact equivalences of enriched categories and as such are *final* as enriched functors, meaning that their precomposition preserves weighted colimits such as coends ([Ke82, §4.5], see also [Ca20]):

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{f}'_! \circ \iota_{\mathbf{X}}^*(\mathcal{V}))_{y'} \\ & \simeq \int^{x' \in \mathbf{X}'} \mathbf{Y}'(\mathbf{f}'(x'), y') \cdot (\iota_{\mathbf{X}}^* \mathcal{V})_{x'} & (125) \\ & \simeq \int^{x' \in \mathbf{X}'} \mathbf{Y}(\iota_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{f}'(x')), \iota_{\mathbf{Y}}(y')) \cdot \mathcal{V}_{\iota_{\mathbf{X}}(x')} & \iota_{\mathbf{Y}} \text{ fully faithful} \\ & \simeq \int^{x' \in \mathbf{X}'} \mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{f}(\iota_{\mathbf{X}}(x')), \iota_{\mathbf{Y}}(y')) \cdot \mathcal{V}_{\iota_{\mathbf{X}}(x')} & (64) \\ & \simeq \int^{x \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{f}(x), \iota_{\mathbf{Y}}(y')) \cdot \mathcal{V}_x & \text{finality of } \iota_{\mathbf{X}} \\ & \simeq (\iota_{\mathbf{X}}^* \circ \mathbf{f}_! \mathcal{V})_{y'} & (125). \end{aligned}$$

These natural isomorphisms establish the claim. □

External tensor of simplicial local systems.

Definition 2.31 (External tensor product of simplicial local systems).

The *external tensor product* on the category of simplicial local systems (47) is the following functor:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} & \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}}) & \longmapsto & \left((\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{X}}^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} (\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}}^* \mathcal{W}) \right)_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} \\ (\phi_f, \gamma_g) \downarrow & & \downarrow \left((\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{X}}^* \phi) \otimes_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} (\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}}^* \gamma) \right)_{f \times g} \\ (\mathcal{V}'_{\mathbf{X}'}, \mathcal{W}'_{\mathbf{Y}'}) & \longmapsto & \left((\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'}^* \mathcal{V}') \otimes_{\mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y}'} (\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'}^* \mathcal{W}') \right)_{\mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y}'}, \end{array} \quad (66)$$

where on the right we are leaving the strong monoidal structure isomorphism notationally implicit. In more detail, the component map of the morphism on the right is this composite:

$$\left(\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{X}}^* \mathcal{V} \right) \otimes_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} \left(\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}}^* \mathcal{W} \right) \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{X}}^* \phi) \otimes (\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}}^* \gamma)} \left(\underbrace{\left(\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{X}}^* f^* \mathcal{V}' \right)}_{(f \times g)^* \mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'}} \otimes_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} \underbrace{\left(\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}}^* g^* \mathcal{W}' \right)}_{(f \times g)^* \mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'}} \right) \simeq (f \times g)^* \left(\left(\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'}^* \mathcal{V}' \right) \otimes_{\mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y}'} \left(\mathbf{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'}^* \mathcal{W}' \right) \right),$$

where the under-braces indicate equalities exhibiting the commutativity of this diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{X} & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbf{X}' \\
\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}} \uparrow & & \uparrow \text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'} \\
\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y} & \xrightarrow{f \times g} & \mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y}' \\
\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'} \\
\mathbf{Y} & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathbf{Y}',
\end{array} \tag{67}$$

while the isomorphism “ \simeq ” is the strong monoidal structure of $(f \times g)^*$ (which is in fact still an actual equality, objectwise).

Remark 2.32 (External tensor with a unit system). Since pullback preserves tensor units (59), the pullback of a simplicial local system to a Cartesian product is isomorphic to its external tensor product (66) with the unit system on the other factor:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}} \simeq (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}}^* \mathcal{V})_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}}. \tag{68}$$

In particular, the external tensor product in general may be expressed in terms of external tensoring with tensor units, as:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}} \simeq (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}})_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} \otimes_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} (\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}})_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}}. \tag{69}$$

Lemma 2.33 (Pull/push of external tensors along product maps). *Given maps of simplicial groupoids $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}'$ and $\mathbf{g} : \mathbf{Y} \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}'$ there are natural isomorphisms*⁹

$$(\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{g})^*(\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}) \simeq (\mathbf{f}^* \mathcal{V}) \boxtimes (\mathbf{g}^* \mathcal{W}), \tag{70}$$

$$(\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{g})_!(\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}) \simeq (\mathbf{f}_! \mathcal{V}) \boxtimes (\mathbf{g}_! \mathcal{W}). \tag{71}$$

Proof. The isomorphism (70) may be obtained as the following composite of natural isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{g})^*(\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}) &\simeq (\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{g})^* \left((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}}^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Y} \times \mathbf{Y}'} (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'}^* \mathcal{W}) \right) && \text{by (66)} \\
&\simeq ((\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{g})^* \text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}}^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X}'} ((\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{g})^* \text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'}^* \mathcal{W}) && \text{by (60)} \\
&\simeq (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}}^* \mathbf{f}^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X}'} (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'}^* \mathbf{g}^* \mathcal{W}) && \text{by (67) \& (108)} \\
&\simeq (\mathbf{f}^* \mathcal{V}) \boxtimes (\mathbf{g}^* \mathcal{W}) && \text{by (66)}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second isomorphism (71), first observe the special case

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{f} \times \text{id})_!(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}}) &\simeq \left((\mathbf{f} \times \text{id})_!(\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}}^* \mathcal{V})_{\mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y}'} \right) && \text{by (68)} \\
&\simeq (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}}^* (\mathbf{f}_! \mathcal{V}))_{\mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y}} && \text{by (63)} \\
&\simeq (\mathbf{f}_! \mathcal{V})_{\mathbf{X}'} \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}} && \text{by (68)}
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

from which we obtain the general isomorphism as the following composite:

⁹The isomorphism (70) is a fairly immediate consequence of (59), but (71) is not so immediate, it appears mentioned in generality but without proof in [Sh13, p. 624], while in models for parameterized spectra it appears in [MS06, Rem. 2.5.8, Prop. 13.7.2], [Mal19, Lem. 3.4.1], [Mal23, Lem. 2.5.1].

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{g})_!(\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}) &\simeq (\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{g})_!((\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}}) \otimes (\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W})) && \text{by (69)} \\
&\simeq (\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{g})_!\left(\left((\text{id} \times \mathbf{g})^*(\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}'})\right) \otimes (\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W})\right) && \text{by (70) \& (59)} \\
&\simeq (\mathbf{f} \times \text{id})_!(\text{id} \times \mathbf{g})_!\left(\left((\text{id} \times \mathbf{g})^*(\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}'})\right) \otimes (\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W})\right) && \text{by (108)} \\
&\simeq (\mathbf{f} \times \text{id})_!\left(\left(\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}'}\right) \otimes \left((\text{id} \times \mathbf{g})_!(\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W})\right)\right) && \text{by (62)} \\
&\simeq (\mathbf{f} \times \text{id})_!\left(\left(\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}'}\right) \otimes (\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes (\mathbf{g}_! \mathcal{W}))\right) && \text{by (72)} \\
&\simeq (\mathbf{f} \times \text{id})_!\left(\left(\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}'}\right) \otimes (\mathbf{f} \times \text{id})^*(\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{X}'} \boxtimes (\mathbf{g}_! \mathcal{W}))\right) && \text{by (70) \& (59)} \\
&\simeq \left((\mathbf{f} \times \text{id})_!(\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}'})\right) \otimes (\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{X}'} \boxtimes (\mathbf{g}_! \mathcal{W})) && \text{by (62)} \\
&\simeq (\mathbf{f}_! \mathcal{V}) \boxtimes \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{Y}'} \otimes (\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{X}'} \boxtimes (\mathbf{g}_! \mathcal{W})) && \text{by (72)} \\
&\simeq (\mathbf{f}_! \mathcal{V}) \boxtimes (\mathbf{g}_! \mathcal{W}) && \text{by (69)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

As a direct consequence:

Proposition 2.34 (Pull-push adjunct of external tensor products). *The push/pull adjunct of an external tensor product of morphisms into pullbacks*

$$\phi \boxtimes \gamma : \mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathcal{W} \longrightarrow (\mathbf{f}^* \mathcal{V}') \boxtimes (\mathbf{g}^* \mathcal{W}') \simeq (\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{g})^*(\mathcal{V}' \boxtimes \mathcal{W}')$$

is the external tensor product of the separate adjoints:

$$\widetilde{\phi \boxtimes \gamma} \simeq \widetilde{\phi} \boxtimes \widetilde{\gamma} : (\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{g})_!(\mathcal{V} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}) \simeq (\mathbf{f}_! \mathcal{V}') \boxtimes (\mathbf{g}_! \mathcal{W}') \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}' \boxtimes \mathcal{W}'. \quad (73)$$

Proposition 2.35 (External pushout-product). *The pushout-product (Def. A.26) of the external tensor (Def. 2.31) in $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is given by the following formula:*

$$(\phi_{\mathbf{f}}) \widehat{\boxtimes} (\gamma_{\mathbf{g}}) \simeq \left(\left((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'}^* \widetilde{\phi}) \widehat{\otimes} ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'}^* \widetilde{\gamma})) \right) \right)_{\mathbf{f} \widehat{\boxtimes} \mathbf{g}}.$$

Proof. By the general formula for colimits in Grothendieck constructions (Prop. A.9), the underlying colimit is the Cartesian pushout-product of simplicial groupoids

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y} & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times \mathbf{g}} & \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}' \\
\downarrow \mathbf{f} \times \text{id} & \text{(po)} & \downarrow q_r \\
\mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y} & \xrightarrow{q_l} & \mathbf{f} \widehat{\boxtimes} \mathbf{g} \\
& & \downarrow \text{dashed} \\
& & \mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y}'
\end{array}
\quad (74)$$

and the linear colimiting component map over the dashed morphism is obtained by pushing the separate linear components along the coprojections q_i to form a cospan in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{f} \widehat{\boxtimes} \mathbf{g}}$, whose universal pushout-product morphism, in turn, is the further pushforward of that cocone along the dashed morphism:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathbf{f} \widehat{\times} \mathbf{g})_! \left(\left((q_l)_! \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'})^* \tilde{\phi}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}})^* \text{id}_{\mathcal{W}}) \right) \right) \wedge \left((q_r)_! \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \text{id}_{\mathcal{V}}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'})^* \tilde{\gamma}) \right) \right) \right) && \text{by (73)} \\
& \simeq \left(\left((\mathbf{f} \widehat{\times} \mathbf{g})_! (q_l)_! \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'})^* \tilde{\phi}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}})^* \text{id}_{\mathcal{W}}) \right) \right) \wedge \left((\mathbf{f} \widehat{\times} \mathbf{g})_! (q_r)_! \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \text{id}_{\mathcal{V}}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'})^* \tilde{\gamma}) \right) \right) \right) && \text{by (57)} \\
& \simeq \left(\left((\text{id} \otimes \mathbf{g})_! \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'})^* \tilde{\phi}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}})^* \text{id}_{\mathcal{W}}) \right) \right) \wedge \left((\mathbf{f} \otimes \text{id})_! \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \text{id}_{\mathcal{V}}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'})^* \tilde{\gamma}) \right) \right) \right) && \text{by (74)} \\
& \simeq \left(\left(\left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'})^* \tilde{\phi}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}})^* \text{id}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathcal{W}}) \right) \right) \wedge \left(\left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \text{id}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathcal{V}}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'})^* \tilde{\gamma}) \right) \right) \right) && \text{by (71)} \\
& \simeq ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}'})^* \tilde{\phi}) \widehat{\otimes} ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}'})^* \tilde{\gamma}) && \text{by def. } \square
\end{aligned}$$

External internal hom of simplicial local systems. We discuss the right adjoint to external tensoring with a simplicial local system. Since right adjoints to tensoring functors are called *internal homs* this would by default be named the *external internal hom*, for better or worse.

Proposition 2.36. *The external tensor product (Def. 2.31) with a simplicial local system preserves colimits:*

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}} \in \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}, \\ \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} : I \rightarrow \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \end{array} \right\} \vdash \left(\lim_{i \in I} \mathcal{V}(i)_{\mathbf{X}_i} \right) \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}} \simeq \lim_{i \in I} (\mathcal{V}(i)_{\mathbf{X}_i} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}}). \quad (75)$$

Proof. First notice that the statement holds for the underlying colimit in $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$, since $(-)\times \mathbf{Y}$ is a left adjoint (Prop. A.2):

$$\left(\lim_{j \in I} \mathbf{X}_j \right) \times \mathbf{Y} \simeq \lim_{j \in I} (\mathbf{X}_j \times \mathbf{Y}).$$

Now denoting the coprojections of this underlying colimit by:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{X}_i & \xrightarrow{q^{X_i}} & \lim_{j \in I} \mathbf{X}_j, \\
\mathbf{X}_i \times \mathbf{Y} & \xrightarrow{q^{X_i} \times \text{id}} & \left(\lim_{j \in I} \mathbf{X}_j \right) \times \mathbf{Y} \\
\downarrow \text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}_i} & & \downarrow \text{pr}_{\lim \mathbf{X}} \\
\mathbf{X}_i & \xrightarrow{q^{X_i}} & \left(\lim_{j \in I} \mathbf{X}_j \right)
\end{array} \quad (76)$$

we identify, via Prop. A.9, the full colimit by the following sequence of natural isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\rightarrow} (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}) \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}} & \simeq \left(\lim_{\rightarrow} (q^{\mathbf{X}})_! \mathcal{V} \right)_{\lim \mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}} && \text{by (A.9)} \\
& \simeq \left(\left((\text{pr}_{\lim \mathbf{X}})^* \lim_{\rightarrow} (q^{\mathbf{X}})_! \mathcal{V} \right) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}})^* \mathcal{W}) \right)_{\lim \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} && \text{by def. (2.31)} \\
& \simeq \left(\left(\lim_{\rightarrow} (\text{pr}_{\lim \mathbf{X}})^* (q^{\mathbf{X}})_! \mathcal{V} \right) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}})^* \mathcal{W}) \right)_{\lim \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} && \text{since } (-)^* \text{ is left adjoint (57)} \\
& \simeq \left(\left(\lim_{\rightarrow} (q^{\mathbf{X}} \times \text{id}_{\mathbf{Y}})_! (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V} \right) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}})^* \mathcal{W}) \right)_{\lim \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} && \text{by Beck-Chevalley (63) for (76)} \\
& \simeq \left(\lim_{\rightarrow} \left(\left((q^{\mathbf{X}} \times \text{id}_{\mathbf{Y}})_! (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V} \right) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}})^* \mathcal{W}) \right) \right)_{\lim \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} && \text{since } (-) \otimes \cdots \text{ preserves colimits} \\
& \simeq \left(\lim_{\rightarrow} (q^{\mathbf{X}} \times \text{id}_{\mathbf{Y}})_! \left(\left((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V} \right) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}})^* \mathcal{W}) \right) \right)_{\lim \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} && \text{projection formula (62)} \\
& \simeq \lim_{\rightarrow} \left(\left(\left((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V} \right) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}})^* \mathcal{W}) \right)_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}} \right) && \text{by (A.9)} \\
& \simeq \lim_{\rightarrow} (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}}) && \text{by def. (2.31). } \square
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.37 (Distributive coproducts of simplicial local systems). *Any simplicial local system over a skeletal simplicial groupoid is the coproduct in $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$ of its restrictions to the connected components:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y} \equiv \coprod_{i \in I} \mathbf{Y}_i \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}_{\text{skl}}, & \quad \vdash \quad \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}} \simeq \coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}_i} \in \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

$$\mathcal{W} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$$

and the external tensor product (Def. 2.31) with any $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$ distributes over (these) coproducts:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}_i} \simeq \coprod_{i \in I} (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}_i}). \quad (78)$$

Proof. This is essentially the general phenomenon of free coproduct completion of connected objects (Prop. A.7) only that base sets are now replaced by skeletal simplicial groupoids. For the record, we spell it out. In the following we discuss binary coproducts just for convenience of notation; The argument immediately generalizes to general set-indexed coproducts.

First, observe – readily by adjointness (57), alternatively by the Kan extension formula (125) — that pushforward of simplicial local systems along a coprojection into a coproduct of simplicial groupoids is extension by zero to the other connected component:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2 \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd} \\ \mathcal{V} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}_1}, \mathcal{V}' \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}_2} \end{array} \right\} \vdash \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{X}_1 & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V}} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ q_1 \downarrow & & \uparrow q_2 \\ \mathbf{X}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{X}_2 & \xrightarrow{(q_1)! \mathcal{V}} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ & & \uparrow q_2 \\ \mathbf{X}_2 & \xrightarrow{0} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \end{array} & \text{and} & \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{X}_1 & \xrightarrow{0} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ q_1 \downarrow & & \uparrow q_2 \\ \mathbf{X}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{X}_2 & \xrightarrow{(q_2)! \mathcal{V}'} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ & & \uparrow q_2 \\ \mathbf{X}_2 & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V}'} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \end{array} \end{array}$$

from which it follows that the coproduct of a pair of such push-forwards is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{X}_1 & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V}} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ q_1 \downarrow & & \uparrow q_2 \\ \mathbf{X}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{X}_2 & \xrightarrow{(q_1)! \mathcal{V} \sqcup (q_2)! \mathcal{V}'} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ & & \uparrow q_2 \\ \mathbf{X}_2 & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V}'} & \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}} \end{array}$$

This implies the first formula (78) by the general formula for colimits in Grothendieck constructions (Prop. A.9), which gives that

$$((q_1)! \mathcal{V} \sqcup (q_2)! \mathcal{V}')_{\mathbf{X}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{X}_2} \simeq \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}_1} \amalg \mathcal{V}'_{\mathbf{X}_2} \quad (79)$$

Moreover, in the situation

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}_i & & \\ & \text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}} \swarrow & & \searrow \text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_i} & \\ & & \mathbf{X} \times (\mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{Y}_2) & & \mathbf{Y}_i \\ & \swarrow \text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}} & \swarrow q_i & & \swarrow q_i \\ \mathbf{X} & & \mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{Y}_2 & & \mathbf{Y}_i \\ & \swarrow \text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{Y}_2} & & \searrow q_i & \\ & & \mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{Y}_2 & & \end{array}$$

it follows that the corresponding Beck-Chevalley condition is satisfied

$$(\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{Y}_2})^* \circ (q_i)! \simeq (q_i)! \circ (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_i})^* \quad (80)$$

and that

$$((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes ((q_i)! (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_i})^* \mathcal{W}) \simeq (q_i)! \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_i})^* \mathcal{W}) \right). \quad (81)$$

With this, we establish the second statement:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}_1} \amalg \mathcal{W}'_{\mathbf{Y}_2}) \\
& \simeq \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{Y}_2})^* ((q_1)! \mathcal{W} \sqcup (q_2)! \mathcal{W}') \right)_{\mathbf{X} \times (\mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{Y}_2)} && \text{by (79)} \\
& \simeq \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{Y}_2})^* (q_1)! \mathcal{W}) \sqcup ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{Y}_2})^* (q_2)! \mathcal{W}') \right) \right)_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}_2} && (-)^* \text{ is left adjoint} \\
& \simeq \left(\left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{Y}_2})^* (q_1)! \mathcal{W}) \right) \sqcup \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{Y}_2})^* (q_2)! \mathcal{W}') \right) \right)_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}_2} && \dots \otimes (-) \text{ is left adjoint} \\
& \simeq \left(\left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes ((q_1)! (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_1})^* \mathcal{W}) \right) \sqcup \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes ((q_2)! (\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_2})^* \mathcal{W}') \right) \right)_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}_2} && \text{by (80)} \\
& \simeq \left((q_1)! \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_1})^* \mathcal{W}) \right) \sqcup (q_2)! \left(((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{V}) \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}_2})^* \mathcal{W}') \right) \right)_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}_1 \sqcup \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}_2} && \text{by (81)} \\
& \simeq (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}_1}) \amalg (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}'_{\mathbf{Y}_2}) && \text{by (79)}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.38 (External internal hom of simplicial local systems).

(i) Forming the external tensor product with a simplicial local system over a discrete space has a right adjoint functor:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbf{Set} & \hookrightarrow & \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}_{\text{skl}} \\
\mathcal{R} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}} & & \vdash
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{Y}} \boxtimes (-)} & \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \\
& \xleftarrow{\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{Y}} \dashv (-)} &
\end{array}
. \quad (82)$$

(ii) This is given by

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Z}} \in \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \quad \vdash \quad \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{Y}} \dashv \square \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Z}} := \left(\prod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} \text{ev}_y^* [(p_{\mathbf{Z}})^* \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, \mathcal{W}] \right)_{\mathbf{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}}, \quad (83)$$

(iii) which is such that over a map $f : \mathbf{Y} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$, hence when restricted along $\{f\} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}$, it is given by

$$\{f\}^* (\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{Y}} \dashv \square \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Z}}) \simeq (p_{\mathbf{Y}})_* [\mathcal{R}, f^* \mathcal{W}]. \quad (84)$$

Proof. First, consider the special case that \mathbf{Y} is a singleton set $\{y\}$. Then we have the following sequence of natural isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Z}}) & \simeq (f \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})) \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{V} \otimes ((\text{pr}_{\{y\}})^* \mathcal{R}), f^* \mathcal{W}) && \text{by (111)} \\
& \simeq (f \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})) \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{V} \otimes ((p_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{R}), f^* \mathcal{W}) && \text{by (86)} \\
& \simeq (f \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})) \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{V}, [(p_{\mathbf{X}})^* \mathcal{R}, f^* \mathcal{W}]) && \text{by (27)} \\
& \simeq (f \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})) \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{V}, [f^* (p_{\mathbf{Z}})^* \mathcal{R}, f^* \mathcal{W}]) && \text{by (86)} \\
& \simeq (f \in \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})) \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{V}, f^* [(p_{\mathbf{Z}})^* \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{W}]) && \text{by (61)} \\
& \simeq \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}, [(p_{\mathbf{Z}})^* \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{W}]_{\mathbf{Z}}) && \text{by (111),}
\end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

where we have made use of notation corresponding to the following commuting diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathbf{X} \times \{y\} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathbf{X} & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbf{Z} \\
\text{pr}_{\{y\}} \downarrow & & p_{\mathbf{X}} \downarrow & & \downarrow p_{\mathbf{Z}} \\
\{y\} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & * & \xlongequal{\quad} & *.
\end{array} \quad (86)$$

From this, we obtain the general statement (83) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{Y}}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Z}}) &\simeq \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}\left(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \left(\coprod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}\right), \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Z}}\right) && \text{by (77)} \\
&\simeq \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}\left(\coprod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}), \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Z}}\right) && \text{by (78)} \\
&\simeq \prod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}\left(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Z}}\right) && \text{hom-functors preserve limits} \\
&\simeq \prod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}\left(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}, [(p_{\mathbf{Z}})^* \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, \mathcal{W}]_{\mathbf{Z}}\right) && \text{by (85)} \\
&\simeq \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}\left(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}, \prod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} \left([(p_{\mathbf{Z}})^* \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, \mathcal{W}]_{\mathbf{Z}}\right)\right) && \text{hom-functors preserve limits} \\
&\simeq \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}\left(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}, \left(\prod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} \text{ev}_y^* [(p_{\mathbf{Z}})^* \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, \mathcal{W}]\right)_{\mathbf{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}}\right) && \text{by Prop. A.9.}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the formula (84) is obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{f\}^* \prod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} \text{ev}_y^* [(p_{\mathbf{Z}})^* \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, \mathcal{W}] &\simeq \prod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} \{f\}^* \text{ev}_y^* [(p_{\mathbf{Z}})^* \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, \mathcal{W}] && \text{since } (-)^* \text{ is right adjoint (57)} \\
&\simeq \prod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} \{f(y)\}^* [(p_{\mathbf{Z}})^* \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, \mathcal{W}] && \text{by (87)} \\
&\simeq \prod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} [\{f(y)\}^* (p_{\mathbf{Z}})^* \mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, \{f(y)\}^* \mathcal{W}] && \text{by (61)} \\
&\simeq \prod_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} [\mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, \mathcal{W}_{\{f(y)\}}] && \text{by (87)} \\
&\simeq \int_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} [\mathcal{R}_{\{y\}}, (f^* \mathcal{W})_{\{y\}}] \\
&\simeq (p_{\mathbf{Y}})_* [\mathcal{R}, f^* \mathcal{W}] && \text{by (125),}
\end{aligned}$$

where we made use of the notation in the following commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\{f\} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathbf{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} \\
& \searrow f(y) & \swarrow \text{ev}_y \\
& & \mathbf{Z} \\
& & \downarrow p_{\mathbf{Z}} \\
& & *
\end{array} \tag{87}$$

Example 2.39 (External internal hom of vector bundles over discrete spaces). In the special case when the local systems in question take values in plain vector spaces

$$\mathcal{R}, f^* \mathcal{W} : \mathbf{Y} \mapsto \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{K}} \hookrightarrow \text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}} \xrightarrow{\text{const}} \text{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$$

then the expression in (84) reduces to the vector space of vector bundle morphisms $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow f^* \mathcal{W}$ over \mathbf{Y} . This way we recover the expression for the \boxtimes -adjoint internal hom given in [SS25a, p. 6] (there denoted “ \dashv ” instead of “ \dashv_{\square} ”).

Proposition 2.40. *The external tensor product preserves the Cartesian squares (56).*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{V}_{\text{pt}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}} \\
\downarrow & \text{(pb)} & \downarrow \\
0_{\text{pt}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}} & \longrightarrow & 0_{\mathbf{B}\mathcal{G}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{Y}}
\end{array}$$

Homotopical properties of the external tensor product. We establish in Thm. 2.42 homotopical properties of the external tensor product \boxtimes of simplicial local systems (from Def. 2.31). The first key point is that \boxtimes preserves all weak equivalences and in this sense already coincides with its derived functor.

Lemma 2.41 (Homotopical properties of Set-tensoring of simplicial groupoids). *The tensoring of sSet-Grpd over sets*

$$(-) \cdot (-) : \text{Set} \times \text{sSet-Grpd} \hookrightarrow \text{sSet-Grpd} \times \text{sSet-Grpd} \xrightarrow{(-) \times (-)} \text{sSet-Grpd}$$

is a restricted Quillen bifunctor in that (recalling from Prop. 2.21 that the cofibrations in sSet-Grpd are in particular injections on sets of objects and weak equivalences are in particular bijections on connected components):

$$X \xrightarrow{f} X' \in \text{Inj}(\text{Set}), Y \xrightarrow{g} Y' \in \text{Cof}(\text{sSet-Grpd}) \quad \vdash \quad f \widehat{\times} g \in \text{Cof}(\text{sSet-Grpd})$$

and the pushout-product on the right is in addition a weak equivalence if g is in addition a weak equivalent or if f is an isomorphism.

In particular, the Cartesian product with a fixed set is a left Quillen functor:

$$S \in \text{Set} \hookrightarrow \text{sSet-Grpd} \quad \vdash \quad \text{sSet-Grpd} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{S \times (-) \simeq \prod_{s \in S} (-)} \\ \perp_{\text{Qu}} \\ \xleftarrow{(-)^S \simeq \prod_{s \in S} (-)} \end{array} \text{sSet-Grpd}. \quad (88)$$

Proof. It is immediate that (88) is a Quillen adjunction, since the class of (acyclic) cofibrations is closed under coproducts in the arrow category. Moreover, the pushout-product diagram in question is of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times Y & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X \times g} & X \times Y' \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X \times Y \amalg (X' \setminus X) \times Y & \longrightarrow & X \times Y' \amalg (X' \setminus X) \times Y \\ & \searrow \text{dashed} & \downarrow \\ & & X \times Y' \amalg (X' \setminus X) \times Y' \end{array}$$

(Note: A curved arrow labeled $f \times \text{id}_{Y'}$ points from $X \times Y'$ to $X \times Y' \amalg (X' \setminus X) \times Y'$, and a curved arrow labeled $\text{id}_X \times g$ points from $X \times Y \amalg (X' \setminus X) \times Y$ to $X \times Y' \amalg (X' \setminus X) \times Y'$.)

showing that the dashed pushout-product morphism is a coproduct (in the arrow category) of $\text{id}_{X \times Y'}$ (which is trivially an acyclic cofibration) with copies of g , hence is itself a cofibration, by the previous comment, and an acyclic cofibration if g is. \square

Theorem 2.42 (Homotopical properties of external tensor product on simplicial local systems). *The external tensor product (Def. 2.31) on the integral model category of simplicial local systems (Prop. 2.23)*

$$\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$$

has the following properties:

(i) It is a homotopical functor, in that it sends weak equivalences in $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$ to weak equivalences in $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$:

$$W \boxtimes W \subset W, \quad (89)$$

hence it passes immediately to its derived functor.

(ii) It is “linear-componentwise a Quillen bifunctor” in that it satisfies the pushout-product axiom (132) on linear component maps:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \phi_f \in \text{Cof}_f, \gamma_g \in \text{Cof}_g & \vdash & (\phi_f) \widehat{\boxtimes} (\gamma_g) \in \text{Cof}_{f \widehat{\times} g} \\ \phi_f \in \text{Cof}_f, \gamma_g \in (\text{Cof} \cap W)_g & \vdash & (\phi_f) \widehat{\boxtimes} (\gamma_g) \in (\text{Cof} \cap W)_{f \widehat{\times} g}. \end{array} \quad (90)$$

In particular, for fixed base objects this means that:

$$X, Y \in \text{sSet-Grpd}_{\text{skl}} \quad \vdash \quad \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^X \times \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^Y \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{X \times Y} \text{ is a Quillen bifunctor.} \quad (91)$$

(iii) It is a left Quillen functor when restricted in one argument to local systems over a discrete space, hence with right Quillen adjoint (82):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{Set} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}, & \vdash & \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \xrightleftharpoons[\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}\text{-}\square(-)]{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}\boxtimes(-)} \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}} & & \end{array}$$

Proof. (i) By symmetry of the external tensor product and definition of product categories, it is sufficient to check that external tensor product $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{X}} \boxtimes (-)$ with a fixed object preserves weak equivalences in the other argument. Now, due to the objectwise definition of the weak equivalences and fibrations in the projective model structure on each $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$, the precomposition functors \mathbf{f}^* preserve fibrant replacements. Therefore a morphism $\phi_{\mathbf{f}} : \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}'}$ is an integral weak equivalence (Def. A.22) iff $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}'$ is a weak equivalence in $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ and $\phi : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{f}^* \mathcal{V}$ is a weak equivalence in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}$. Given such an integral weak equivalence, we need to see that also:

(a) $\mathbf{f} \times \text{id}_{\mathbf{Y}} : \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}' \times \mathbf{Y}$ is a weak equivalence in $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$, hence a Dwyer-Kan equivalence. This is hom-wise the condition that Cartesian product with a simplicial set preserves weak equivalences of simplicial sets, which is the case (for instance by Ken Brown's Lemma A.19 using that \mathbf{sSet} is cartesian monoidal model and all objects are cofibrant).

(Beware that even so $\mathbf{X} \times (-)$ is homotopical, it is far from being left Quillen on $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$.)

(b) $((\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \phi) \otimes \text{id}_{(\text{pr}_{\mathbf{Y}})^* \mathcal{W}}$ is a weak equivalence in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{X}}$.

First, $(\text{pr}_{\mathbf{X}})^* \phi$ itself is a weak equivalence, since these are defined objectwise and hence preserved by the precomposition functors $(-)^*$. Similarly, the tensor product over $\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}$ is a weak equivalence if and only if for all $(x, y) \in \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}$ its component $\phi_x \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{W}_y}$ is a weak equivalence, hence if tensoring $\mathcal{W} \otimes (-)$ preserves weak equivalences in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$. This follows by Ken Brown's Lemma A.19 since $\mathcal{W} \otimes (-)$ is a left Quillen functor on and all objects are cofibrant in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$, by Prop. 2.3.

(ii) By Prop. 2.35, we are immediately reduced to proving the special case (91). For this, it is sufficient to check the pushout-product axiom on generating (acyclic) cofibrations. But for these (23), the relevant diagram (where we are abbreviating representable simplicial copresheaves by $\underline{x} := \mathbf{X}(x, -) : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{sSet}$)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\underline{x} \cdot \mathcal{V}) \boxtimes (\underline{y} \cdot \mathcal{W}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Id} \boxtimes (\text{id} \cdot g)} & (\underline{x} \cdot \mathcal{V}) \boxtimes (\underline{y} \cdot \mathcal{W}') & & \\ (\text{id}_{\underline{x}} \cdot f) \boxtimes \text{Id} \downarrow & \text{(po)} & \downarrow & \searrow & (\text{id}_{\underline{x}} \cdot g) \boxtimes \text{Id} \\ (\underline{x} \cdot \mathcal{V}') \boxtimes (\underline{y} \cdot \mathcal{W}) & \longrightarrow & (\text{id}_{\underline{x}} \cdot f) \widehat{\boxtimes} (\text{id}_{\underline{y}} \cdot g) & \xrightarrow{\text{Id} \boxtimes (\text{id}_{\underline{y}} \cdot g)} & (\underline{x} \cdot \mathcal{V}') \boxtimes (\underline{y} \cdot \mathcal{W}') \end{array}$$

reduces to the tensoring with (x, y) of the analogous diagram for the tensor product in $\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\underline{x}, \underline{y}) \cdot \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \cdot \text{id} \otimes g} & (\underline{x}, \underline{y}) \cdot \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W}' \\ \text{id} \cdot f \otimes \text{id} \downarrow & \text{(po)} & \downarrow \text{id} \cdot f \otimes \text{id} \\ (\underline{x}, \underline{y}) \cdot \mathcal{V}' \otimes \mathcal{W} & \longrightarrow & (\underline{x}, \underline{y}) \cdot (f \widehat{\otimes} g) \\ & \searrow \text{id} \cdot \text{id} \otimes g & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \cdot \text{id} \otimes g} & (\underline{x}, \underline{y}) \cdot \mathcal{V}' \otimes \mathcal{W}' \end{array} = (\underline{x}, \underline{y}) \cdot \left(\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes g} & \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W}' \\ f \otimes \text{id} \downarrow & \text{(po)} & \downarrow f \otimes \text{id} \\ \mathcal{V}' \otimes \mathcal{W} & \longrightarrow & f \widehat{\otimes} g \\ & \searrow \text{id} \otimes g & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes g} & \mathcal{V}' \otimes \mathcal{W}' \end{array} \right).$$

Since $(\mathbf{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}, \otimes)$ is \mathbf{sSet} -enriched monoidal model (by Prop. 2.3), the tensoring $(x, y) \cdot (-)$ on the right is a left Quillen functor and hence the claim follows.

(iii) The previous item (ii) establishes that the only obstacle to \boxtimes being a left Quillen bifunctor is the failure of the underlying Cartesian product being left Quillen bifunctorial in $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$. But restricted in one argument to discrete groupoids (sets) it is by Lem. 2.41, and so claim (iii) follows. \square

Remark 2.43 (Issue of full external monoidal model structure). Beyond Thm. 2.41, one would wish that \boxtimes were a Quillen bifunctor (Def. A.29) so that also its right adjoint internal hom were homotopically well behaved. However, on $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$ this fails in general simply because the underlying category $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ is, while cartesian monoidal as a category, not cartesian monoidal as a *model category*, i.e., the Cartesian product here in general fails the Quillen bifunctor property (already the product of two free simplicial groupoids is in general not itself free).

However, the second item of Thm. 2.42 shows that this is the only problem in that \boxtimes generally satisfies the Quillen bifunctor property on linear components and hence satisfies it genuinely whenever the Cartesian product on $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ does so, which is the case at least when one argument is restricted to simplicial local systems over discrete spaces.¹⁰

Moreover, with a little tweak to the base model structure, we do get full external monoidal model structure over base spaces which are 1-types (meaning: 1-groupoids, i.e. simplicial groupoids whose \mathbf{sSet} -enrichment happens to be in \mathbf{Set}), this we discuss in §2.4, see Thm. 2.45 there.

While less strong than what one might have hoped for, the results of Thm. 2.42 still compare favorably with the state of the art in the literature on parameterized spectra.

2.4 External monoidal model over homotopy 1-types

We now restrict the discussion to ∞ -local systems over just homotopy 1-types, by restricting the base category from simplicial to plain groupoids, keeping the fiber category that of chain complexes. While evidently somewhat more restrictive, notice that this is exactly the infrastructure sufficient for interpreting the formalization of anyonic braid gates in [MSS23] (where the 1-types are those of configuration spaces of points whose \mathbf{BC}^\times -fibered mappings into chain complexes concentrated in degree n constitute anyonic ground state wavefunctions, cf. [MSS23, Thm. 6.8]).

In this special case we may make use of the “canonical” model structure on \mathbf{Grpd} (Def. 2.44) which, in contrast to the structure on $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$, is cartesian monoidal as a model category. This finally makes the external tensor product of ∞ -local systems over 1-types into a monoidal model category structure, in fact equivariantly so (Thm. 2.45).

The upshot is that for every (equivariant) commutative monoid internal to ∞ -local systems over 1-types we obtain a model category of (equivariant ∞ -local systems which are) *modules* over this monoid (Cor. 2.46), thus producing quite a proliferation of, if you will, models of parameterized quantum types, albeit restricted to base 1-types. In particular, taking the equivariant monoid to be the complex numbers regarded as an \mathbb{R} -module equipped with $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -equivariance via complex conjugation, $\mathbb{Z}/2 \curvearrowright \mathbb{C}$, its modules are the “Real” local systems including the (flat) Real vector bundles in the sense of KR-theory (Ex. 2.49). In [SS23b] we explain how this is a good context for interpreting finite-dimensional quantum types not just as linear types but as linear types with Hermitian inner product structure, hence with Hilbert-space structure, see the outlook at the end of §3.

Proposition 2.44 (Canonical model structure on groupoids). *The category \mathbf{Grpd} carries a model category structure where a functor $f \in \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}'$ is*

- *a weak equivalences iff it is an equivalence of categories, hence a homotopy equivalence of groupoids, hence inducing isomorphisms on connected components and on fundamental groups;*

¹⁰For the Quillen equivalent model category $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{sSet}}$ (47) the situation is somewhat complementary: Here the underlying Cartesian product is a Quillen bifunctor but now there is little control over the action on linear components, since the transfer functor $\mathbf{G} : \mathbf{sSet} \rightarrow \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ does not preserve products.

- a fibration iff for every morphism in \mathcal{W}' and every lift of its domain to \mathcal{W} also the morphism itself has a lift with that lifted domain:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{W} & \forall \widehat{w}_1 & \overset{\exists \widehat{\phi}}{\dashrightarrow} w_2 \\ \downarrow f & & \\ \mathcal{W}' & \forall w_1 & \xrightarrow{\phi} w_2 \end{array}$$

- a cofibration iff it is injective on objects.

This model structure is

- (i) proper,
- (ii) combinatorial,
- (iii) cartesian monoidal.¹¹

Since the proof is rather elementary, this model structure (and its analog for categories instead of groupoids) had been folklore before being recorded in publications, whence some authors came to refer to it as the “folk model structure”.

Proof. The existence of the canonical model structure was first noted by [An78, p. 783], published proofs are due to [JT91, Thm. 2][Str00, Thm. 6.7], see also the unpublished note [Re96]. For the record, we spell out the proof of the above three properties. To start with, notice that:

- (1) All objects in the model structure are evidently bifibrant (both cofibrant as well as fibrant).
- (2) The acyclic fibrations are precisely the surjective-on-objects equivalences of categories. (92)
- (3) The acyclic cofibrations are precisely the injective-on-objects equivalences of categories.

What drives the proof of monoidal model structure below is that forming the Cartesian product with a fixed groupoid preserves all equivalences of groupoids. In fact, since all objects are fibrant we have, more generally, that the *fiber product* with a fibration preserves equivalences between fibrations ([Br73, p. 428, 431]):

¹¹Meaning that the Cartesian product is a left Quillen bifunctor, Def. A.29.

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{B} \in \text{Grpd}, \\ p_{\mathcal{X}}, p_{\mathcal{Y}}, p_{\mathcal{Z}} \in (\text{Grpd}/_{\mathcal{B}})^{\text{fib}}, \\ F : \mathcal{Y} \xrightarrow{\text{equiv}} \mathcal{Z} \\ \begin{array}{ccc} & \searrow p_{\mathcal{X}} & \\ & \mathcal{B} & \swarrow p_{\mathcal{Y}} \end{array} \end{array} \right\} \vdash \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{B}} F : \mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{Y} & \xrightarrow{\text{equiv}} & \mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{Z} \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & \mathcal{B} & \end{array} \quad (93)$$

For **(i)**: Since all objects are bifibrant (92), properness follows by [Hi02, Prop. 13.1.2].

For **(ii)**: Since Grpd is the category of models of a limit sketch (this being the diagram shapes for internal groupoids, cf. [ML97, §XII.1]) it is locally presentable (by [AR94, Cor. 1.52]). For the sets of generating cofibrations (I) and generating acyclic cofibrations (J) we may take the following evident functors

$$I := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \emptyset & \longrightarrow \{0\}, \\ \{0\} \sqcup \{1\} & \longrightarrow \{0 \overset{\sim}{\leftarrow} 1\}, \\ \emptyset \overset{\sim}{\rightleftarrows} \mathbb{1} & \longrightarrow \{0 \overset{\sim}{\leftarrow} 1\} \end{array} \right\}, \quad J := \{\{0\} \longrightarrow \{0 \overset{\sim}{\leftarrow} 1\}\}, \quad (94)$$

because the right lifting property against I clearly characterizes the functors which are (a) surjective on objects, (b) full, and (c) faithful, which are exactly the acyclic fibrations (92); while the right lifting property against J characterizes the isofibrations by definition.

For **(iii)**: Given a diagram in Grpd of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} & & \\ & \swarrow F \times \text{Id} & & \searrow \text{Id} \times G & \\ \mathcal{X}' \times \mathcal{Y} & & & & \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}' \\ & \searrow l & & \swarrow r & \\ & & \mathcal{X}' \times \mathcal{Y} \amalg_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}' & & \\ & \swarrow \text{Id} \times G & & \searrow F \times \text{Id} & \\ & & F \widehat{\times} G & & \\ & & \Downarrow & & \\ & & \mathcal{X}' \times \mathcal{Y}' & & \end{array} \quad (95)$$

we need to show (Def. A.29):

- (1) That $F \widehat{\times} G$ is a cofibration if F and G are, hence that $(F \widehat{\times} G)_0$ is an injection of sets of objects if F_0 and G_0 are. But $(-)_0 : \text{Cat} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ preserves limits and colimits, so that we are reduced to checking the pushout-product axiom on sets, which holds by (129).
- (2) That, moreover, $F \widehat{\times} G$ is an equivalence of categories if F is. But with F clearly also $F \times \text{Id}$ is an injective-on-objects equivalence of categories (93), hence an acyclic cofibration. Therefore the model category structure implies that also its pushout r in (95) is an acyclic cofibration, in particular an equivalence, and then — by the 2-out-of-3 property applied to the bottom right triangle — that also $F \widehat{\times} G$ is an equivalence. \square

Theorem 2.45 (External monoidal model structure on simplicial local systems over 1-types). *The integral model structure on*

$$\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}} \equiv \int_{\mathcal{X} \in \text{Grpd}} \text{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathcal{X}} \quad (96)$$

(as in Thm. 2.23 but now based on the canonical model structure on groupoids, Prop. 2.44)

- (i) exists and is
- (ii) combinatorial,
- (iii) monoidal model with respect to the external tensor \boxtimes (as in Def. 2.31).

More generally, for $G \in \text{Grp}(\text{Set})$, these statements generalize to the projective model structure of G -actions in local systems (cf. Rem. 2.11):

$$G\text{Act}(\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}) \equiv \text{Func}(\mathbf{BG}, \text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}). \quad (97)$$

Proof. For **(i)**: Existence of the model structure follows verbatim as in the proof of Thm. 2.23, noticing that:

(a) The condition for weak equivalences is strictly a special case of that in the proof of Thm. 2.23 using that the inclusion $\text{Grpd} \hookrightarrow \text{sSet-Grpd}$ preserves weak equivalences (an ordinary equivalence of ordinary groupoids is a Dwyer-Kan equivalence when regarded in simplicial groupoids).

(b) The condition for acyclic fibrations in the proof of Thm. 2.23 actually holds irrespective of the properties of acyclic fibrations (it only relies on the fact that precomposition always preserves projective equivalences),

(c) The only assumption on acyclic cofibrations in the base category that are actually used in the proof of Thm. 2.23, namely (50), is satisfied also in the canonical model structure on Grpd , by (92).

For **(ii)**: We need to show local presentability and cofibrant generation:

(a) Local presentability follows by [MP89, Prop. 5.3.1(4)]¹² from the fact that Grpd is locally presentable (by Prop. 2.44), each $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathcal{X}}$ is locally presentable (by [AR94, Cor. 1.54], since $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is locally presentable by Thm. 2.3), and the contravariant functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Grpd}^{\text{op}} & \longrightarrow & \text{Cat} \\ \mathcal{X} & \mapsto & \text{sCh}^{\mathcal{X}} = \text{Cat}(\mathcal{X}, \text{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}) \end{array}$$

(being the hom-functor of the 2-category of categories) sends colimits in Grpd to 2-limits in Cat .

(b) We claim that (acyclic) generating cofibrations are given by covering the generating (acyclic) cofibrations of Grpd (94) with those of $\text{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}$ (which exist by Thm. 2.3, now to be denoted $i : \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_i$ and $j : \mathcal{D}_j \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_j$, respectively) as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} I_{\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}} := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \emptyset & \longrightarrow & \{0\} \end{array} , \quad \begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \{0\} & \longrightarrow & \{0\} \\ \{1\} & \longrightarrow & \{1\} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array} \end{array} \right\} \\ \\ \amalg \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{C}_i \\ \{1\} & \longrightarrow & \{1\} \\ \mathcal{D}_i & \xrightarrow{i} & \mathcal{C}_i \\ \{0\} & \longrightarrow & \{0\} \end{array} \Bigg| \begin{array}{l} i \in I_{\text{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}} \end{array} \end{array} \right\} \\ \\ J_{\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{C}_j \\ & & \{1\} \\ \mathcal{D}_j & \xrightarrow{j} & \mathcal{C}_j \\ \{0\} & \longrightarrow & \{0\} \end{array} \Bigg| \begin{array}{l} j \in J_{\text{sCh}_{\mathbb{K}}} \end{array} \end{array} \right\} \end{array} \quad (98)$$

Namely, by existence of the model structure and local presentability it is now sufficient to show that a morphism on $\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}$ is a fibration (acyclic fibration) iff it has the right lifting property against J (I). It is immediately clear that this is the case on the underlying base morphisms in Grpd . That it also holds for the linear component maps is due to the fact that the codomains of all the generating (acyclic) cofibrations of Grpd are codiscrete groupoids which in (98) are covered by identity morphisms between linear components: Together this implies that the relevant lifts are

¹²Compare MO:102083/381.

For **(iii)**: For the monoidal model structure, we need to check the pushout-product property (Def. A.29). So consider a diagram in $\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}$ of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} & & \\
& \swarrow \phi_f \boxtimes \text{Id} & & \searrow \text{Id} \boxtimes \gamma_g & \\
\mathcal{V}'_{\mathcal{X}'} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} & & & & \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} \otimes \mathcal{W}'_{\mathcal{Y}'} \\
& \searrow \lambda_l & & \swarrow \rho_r & \\
& & \mathcal{V}'_{\mathcal{X}'} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} \amalg \mathcal{V}'_{\mathcal{X}'} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} & & \\
& & \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} & & \\
& & \vdots & & \\
& & \phi_f \boxtimes \gamma_g & & \\
& & \vdots & & \\
& & \mathcal{V}'_{\mathcal{X}'} \boxtimes \mathcal{W}'_{\mathcal{Y}'} & & \\
& \swarrow \text{id} \boxtimes \gamma_g & & \searrow \phi_f \boxtimes \text{id} & \\
& & & &
\end{array}$$

(po)

where ϕ_f and γ_g are integral cofibrations, which means (Def. A.22) that f and g are cofibrations in Grpd , while $\phi : f_!(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ is a cofibration in $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\gamma : g_!(\mathcal{W}) \rightarrow \mathcal{W}'$ is a cofibration in $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathcal{Y}}$. We need to show that $\phi_f \boxtimes \gamma_g$ is a cofibration, which, by the same token and using Prop. A.9, means to show that:

- (a) $f \widehat{\times} g$ is a cofibration in Grpd . This holds by Prop. 2.44, see around (95).
- (b) $((l_! \phi) \otimes \text{id}) \widehat{\otimes} (\text{id} \otimes (r_! \gamma))$ is a cofibration in $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathcal{X}' \times \mathcal{Y}'}$. This follows by Thm. 2.42(ii), since the functors $l_!$ and $r_!$ are left Quillen (by Rem. 2.7) and hence preserve cofibrations.

By the directly analogous argument, it follows that $\phi_f \boxtimes \gamma_g$ is moreover a weak equivalence if ϕ_f or γ_g is.

Finally to see that these statements generalize to G -actions: Existence and cofibrant generation is implied from **(i)** and **(ii)** by general facts [Hi02, Thm. 11.6.1] about the projective model structure on functors, and monoidal model structure is implied from **(iii)** by the argument of [BM06, p. 6] that we already reviewed in the proof of Prop. 2.19, now using just ordinary groups and the default Set -enrichment of $\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}$ (for lack of an established simplicial model structure on $\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}$). \square

Corollary 2.46 (Model structure on modules internal to equivariant local systems). *For a group $G \in \text{Grp}(\text{Set})$ and*

$$G \curvearrowright \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}} \in \text{CMon}(G \text{Act}(\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}))$$

a commutative monoid internal to G -actions on local systems over groupoids (96) whose underlying object is cofibrant, its category of modules

$$\text{Mod}_{G \curvearrowright \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}}} \equiv \text{Mod}_{G \curvearrowright \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}}}(G \text{Act}(\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}})) \quad (99)$$

carries a cofibrantly generated model structure whose fibrations and weak equivalences are those of the underlying integral model structure $\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}$ (2.45), and which is monoidal model with respect to the induced tensor product of modules.

Proof. By the fact that the monoidal model category $G \text{Act}(\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}})$ is cofibrantly generated (Thm. 2.45) this is the statement of [ScSh00, Thm. 3.1(1)(2) & Rem. 3.2]. \square

Example 2.47 (Parameterized dg-modules over homotopy 1-types). A commutative monoid in chain complexes

$$\mathcal{R} \in \text{Mon}(\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}) \hookrightarrow \text{Mon}(\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}) \quad (100)$$

is a graded-commutative dg-algebra over \mathbb{K} , and its modules in $\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}$ are local systems of dg- \mathcal{R} -modules:

$$\text{Loc}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{Grpd}} \simeq \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{R}_*}(\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}). \quad (101)$$

Since the underlying object \mathcal{R}_* in $\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}}$ is always cofibrant (because its base space is the point and since every object of $\text{Ch}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is cofibrant, by Thm. 2.3) the model structure from Cor. 2.46 on (101) exists and presents the homotopy theory of $H\mathcal{R}$ -module spectra (1) parameterized over homotopy 1-types.

Example 2.48 (Equivariant parameterized dg-modules over equivariant parameterized 1-types). More generally, for $G \in \text{Grp}(\text{Set})$ acting on a monoid \mathcal{R} (100) as in Ex. 2.47, the underlying equivariant object $G \dot{\subset} \mathcal{R}_*$ is rarely cofibrant, but a useful cofibrant replacement is given by its tensor product with the normalized chain complex $N_\bullet(-)$ of the degree-wise \mathbb{R} -linear span of the simplicial group $\mathbf{E}G \equiv G^{\times \bullet+1}$:

$$G \dot{\subset} (N_\bullet \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{E}G] \otimes \mathcal{R}_*) \in G \text{Act}(\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}})_{\text{cof}}. \quad (102)$$

and via the Eilenberg-Zilber map on N_\bullet this carries a compatible monoid structure

$$G \dot{\subset} (N_\bullet \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{E}G] \otimes \mathcal{R}_*) \in \text{Mon}\left(G \text{Act}(\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}})\right).$$

Therefore, Cor. 2.46 now provides a model structure on the corresponding category of modules, which presents the homotopy theory of $H\mathcal{R}$ -modules spectra parameterized over 1-types with G -equivariant structure (both on the base space and compatibly on the spectra).

Finally, as a simple but interesting special case of these general examples:

Example 2.49 (The Real local systems). Consider the complex numbers, equipped with their involution by complex conjugation, as a monoid in $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -equivariant \mathbb{R} -chain complexes:

$$\mathbb{Z}/2 \dot{\subset} \mathbb{C} \in \text{Mon}\left(\mathbb{Z}/2 \text{Act}(\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{Grpd}})\right).$$

Its modules are the Real local systems subsuming, as their heart, the flat Real vector bundles [At67, p. 368] (with a capital “ R ”) in the sense of Atiyah. We will discuss these in [SS23b] as good categorical models for finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces (see also the outlook §3).

In this case, the cofibrant replacement (102) has a simple explicit description, thus giving rise to a decent model of the homotopy theory of Real local systems over homotopy 1-types.

3 Applications and Outlook

We close by highlighting some applications of our results to the field of mathematical quantum physics.

∞ -Local systems and Realistic Topological Quantum Field Theory. The seminal understanding of the applicability of homotopy theory to *topological quantum field theory* has been so successful (since [Lu09b]), that among all the abstract mathematical TQFTs considered now it may be easy to miss that much remains to be understood regarding the description of physically realistic TQFTs, for instance describing the experimentally observed *fractional quantum Hall effect* (cf. the algebro-topological discussion in [SS25b]). In these realistic situations (arising notably in condensed matter theory), the *quantum adiabatic theorem* implies (cf. [MSS23, p. 21]) that Hilbert spaces of gapped quantum ground states form local systems over the space of external parameters of a quantum system. Moreover, these Hilbert spaces typically arise under a quantization procedure from ∞ -local systems of chain complexes (jargon: *hypergeometric construction of KZ-connections*, [EFK98]), as made explicit in the main theorem of [MSS23]. Generally, such \mathbb{C} -linear ∞ -local systems appear in the quantization of topological sectors of higher gauge theories ([§2.3.1]SS25-Complete), and are part of extended TQFTs in Lurie’s sense by the results of [St25].

Beyond the dynamics encoded by quantum field theory, also the *quantum information theory* of realistic quantum states (such as notably their measurement processes) is controlled by the 6-functor motivic yoga of parameterized Hilbert spaces ([SS25a]) and quantum circuits modeled on chain complexes of Hilbert spaces have been considered [Zu25].

This motivates the question for a formal quantum programming language which is a formal language for homotopy types the way HoTT is ([Sh21]) but enhanced to parameterized stable homotopy types. Based on our original suggestions along these lines [Sc14], such a *Linear Homotopy Type Theory* (LHoTT) has been developed [RFL21][Ri22] and is now in need of formal “semantics” tying it to the traditional set-theoretic formulation of parameterized stable homotopy theory:

Candidate Categorical Semantics for a Fragment of LHoTT. Broadly speaking, higher categorical semantics for the homotopically-typed quantum programming language LHoTT [RFL21][Ri22] ought to be given by ∞ -categories of parameterized R -module spectra, regarded as equipped with the bireflective sub- ∞ -category of plain homotopy types and as doubly closed monoidal with respect to (external-)cartesian and external R -tensor product. But available notions of formalization of this idea (for pointers see [MSS23, around (107)]) must proceed through suitable model 1-categories which on the one hand present such ∞ -categories under simplicial localization while on the other hand compatibly providing ordinary 1-categorical semantics (the only kind of categorical semantics currently understood) for the type theory.

The model category $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$ constructed in Thm. 2.23 and equipped with the homotopical external tensor product of Thm. 2.42 provides candidate such semantics for the “Motivic Yoga fragment” of LHoTT (cf. p. 22 and [SS25a, Def. 2.17] — essentially the content of [Ri22, §2.4] as envisioned in [Sc14, §3.2]) — and (only) rudimentarily for the remaining classical cartesian fragment (cf. Prop. 2.38). The reason for (both of) these is the use of the model of classical base types by \mathbf{sSet} -enriched groupoids instead of simplicial sets (cf. Rem. 2.43):

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{l} \text{Classical} \\ \text{homotopy types} \\ \text{(Prop. 2.21)} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\perp_{\text{Qu}}} \\ \mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd} \\ \xrightarrow{\perp_{\text{Qu}}} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \text{Classical modality on} \\ \text{parameterized quantum} \\ \text{homotopy types} \end{array} \end{array} & (103)
 \end{array}$$

This choice makes the theory of parameterized linear/quantum homotopy types modeled as simplicial local systems *over* classical homotopy types flow naturally via simplicial model category theory, but the model category $\mathbf{sSet}\text{-Grpd}$ (in contrast to \mathbf{sSet}) is not itself cartesian monoidal model: only its \mathbf{Set} -tensoring remains a Quillen bifunctor. (In the Quillen equivalent model $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{sSet}}$ (47) the situation is complementary: Here the pushout-product axiom holds on the underlying base types, but now it fails for the linear components since the fundamental simplicial groupoid functor $\mathbf{G}(-)$ does not preserve products.)

On the other hand, discrete parameter base spaces are all that traditional quantum information theory has ever used so far (cf. Ex. 2.39), so that the semantics for the homotopically-multiplicative & rudimentarily-classical fragment of LHoTT provided by $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is still a considerable homotopy-theoretic generalization of previously existing models of dependent linear types (such as for the Proto-Quipper language, cf. [RS18][FKS20]).

Beyond that, the variant model structure from §2.4 (Thm. 2.45)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{l} \text{Classical} \\ \text{homotopy 1-types} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\perp_{\text{Qu}}} \\ \mathbf{Grpd} \\ \xrightarrow{\perp_{\text{Qu}}} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Grpd}} \\ \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \text{Classical modality on} \\ \text{parameterized quantum} \\ \text{homotopy types} \\ \text{over classical 1-types} \end{array} \end{array} & (104)
 \end{array}$$

does make the external tensor product into a Quillen bifunctor, now at the cost of restricting the entire model to parameter spaces which are homotopy 1-types. This model category $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Grpd}}$ may hence be thought of as a linear enhancement of the original “groupoid interpretation” [HS94][HS98][LB17] of homotopy type theory.

While again less general than what one might hope for, notice that $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbf{Grpd}}$ provides sufficient infrastructure for interpreting the formalization of topological quantum gates described in [MSS23, Thm. 6.8]: The parameter base spaces there are homotopy types of configurations spaces of points in the plane, which indeed are homotopy 1-types (equivalent to the delooping groupoids of braid groups).

Hilbert space structure. The linear structure of quantum data reflected in fiberwise stable homotopy types is actually only one of the characteristics of quantum data: The other half is what one might call the *metricity* structure, ultimately encoded in the Hermitian inner product on spaces of quantum states (Hilbert spaces). But the natural category-theoretic model for inner products (on finite-dimensional state spaces), namely by tensor self-duality, *fails* when applied naively in the category of complex vector spaces (or complex ∞ -local systems) because here this yields complex bi-linear instead of the required Hermitian sesqui-linear pairings. This subtlety is ultimately the reason why the categorical quantum information community takes recourse to “dagger-category”-structure (cf. e.g. [StSt23]), which however serves more to axiomatize the problem than to provide a reason for why to choose sesquilinear structure.

With our final Corollary 2.46 we get access to a wealth of variant models of local systems, by imposing module structure. In [SS23b] we explain that particularly the “Real modules” of Ex. 2.49 are relevant for quantum information theory: Internal to the resulting model category for Real ∞ -local systems $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{Z}/2} \subset \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{Z}/2 \text{Act}(\text{Loc}_{\mathbb{R}}^{\text{Grpd}}))$ from (99), Hilbert spaces (finite-dimensional) do exist as self-dual objects, and such that the operator (“dagger”-adjoints are subsumed as data of what internally are just orthogonal maps between these.

This way, all the above statements about categorical semantics for quantum programming language may be enhanced from pure states with quantum gates between them to mixed states with quantum channels between them, along the lines of [SS25a, §2.5]. We discuss this further in [SS23b].

A Appendix: Some definitions and facts

For reference, we record some basic facts from the literature and highlight some immediate examples that we use in the main text.

Categories, groupoids and simplicial enrichment. We use basic concepts from category theory (e.g. [ML97]) and enriched category theory (e.g. [Ke82]).

Definition A.1 (Categories and groupoids). With respect to any fixed Grothendieck universe \mathfrak{U} of sets [Schu72, §3.2] of which we assume at least two $\mathfrak{U} < \mathfrak{U}'$, cf. e.g. [Le18, p. 4][Sh08, p. 18]:

(i) We write

$$\text{Grpd} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\text{Loc}} \\ \xrightarrow{\perp} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{core}} \end{array} \text{Cat} \quad (105)$$

for the full inclusion of the 1-category of \mathfrak{U} -small groupoids into the 1-category of \mathfrak{U} -small categories (e.g. [Schu72, §3]), with left adjoint Loc being the *localization*-construction that universally inverts all morphisms [GZ67, §1.5.4].

(The \mathfrak{U}' -small categories are called \mathfrak{U} -large, whence Cat in this case is “very large” [Sh08, p. 18].

(ii) More generally, we write

$$\text{sSet-Grpd} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\text{Loc}} \\ \xrightarrow{\perp} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{core}} \end{array} \text{sSet-Cat} \quad (106)$$

for the categories of \mathcal{V} -enriched categories [Ke82] over [DK80] the category $\mathcal{V} = \text{sSet}$ of simplicial sets [GZ67, §II] (review includes [Ri14]) and for the enriched groupoids [EPR21, §3] among these, traditionally regarded as “simplicial groupoids” with discrete simplicial sets of objects [DK80, §5.5][DK84][GJ99, §V.7][Ja15, §9.3]. Here the three functors in (106) are degreewise those of (105), cf. [MRZ23, Def. 2.7].

Proposition A.2 (Cartesian closure of sSet-enriched groupoids). *Both sSet-Cat and sSet-Grpd are cartesian closed [ML97, §IV.6], with cartesian product given by forming enriched product categories [Ke82, §1.4] and internal hom given by enriched functor categories [Ke82, §2.2].*

Proof. For sSet-Cat this is the statement of [Ke82, §2.3]. One readily checks that both constructions restrict to simplicial groupoids. \square

Pseudofunctors and the Grothendieck construction. Given a “coherent system of categories and functors” – namely a pseudo-functorial diagram of categories, Def. A.3 below – the *Grothendieck construction* (Def. A.4 below) is the natural way of merging this data into a single category whose morphisms subsume those of the individual categories but also transfers from one category to the other along one of the given functors.

Definition A.3 (Pseudofunctor [Gr60, §A.1], cf. [Vi05, Def. 3.10]).

(i) For \mathcal{B} a category, a *covariant pseudofunctor* to Cat

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{C}_{(-)} : & \mathcal{B} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Cat} \\
& X_1 & \longmapsto & \mathbf{C}_{X_1} \\
& \downarrow f & & \downarrow f_! \\
& X_2 & \longmapsto & \mathbf{C}_{X_2}
\end{array} \tag{107}$$

is an assignment that sends

- each object $B \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{B})$ to a category \mathbf{C}_B ,
- each morphism $f : X_0 \rightarrow X_1$ to a functor $f_! : \mathbf{C}_{X_0} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_{X_1}$,
- each pair of composable morphisms $X_0 \xrightarrow{f_{01}} X_1 \xrightarrow{f_{12}} X_2$ to a natural isomorphism $(f_{12})_! \circ (f_{01})_! \Rightarrow (f_{12} \circ f_{01})_!$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\begin{array}{ccc} X_0 & \xrightarrow{f_{01}} & X_1 \\ & \searrow & \nearrow \\ & & X_2 \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{C}_{X_0} & \xrightarrow{(f_{01})_!} & \mathbf{C}_{X_1} \\ & \searrow & \nearrow \\ & & \mathbf{C}_{X_2} \end{array} \\
& & \text{with } \mu_{f_{01}, f_{12}} \text{ and } (f_{02})_! \text{ as in (108)}
\end{array} \tag{108}$$

- and, finally, each identity morphism $\text{id}_X : X \rightarrow X$ to a natural isomorphism $(\text{id}_X)_! \Rightarrow \text{id}_{\mathbf{C}_X}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X} & X & \mapsto & \mathbf{C}_X & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\mathbf{C}_X}} & \mathbf{C}_X \\
& & & & \text{with } (\text{id}_B)_! \text{ and } \Downarrow \lambda \text{ as in (108)}
\end{array}$$

such that these natural isomorphisms satisfy evident associativity and unitality coherences.

(ii) Similarly, a contravariant pseudofunctor is such a pseudofunctor on the opposite category \mathcal{B}^{op} .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{C}_{(-)} : & \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Cat} \\
& X_1 & \longmapsto & \mathbf{C}_{X_1} \\
& \downarrow f & & f^* \uparrow \\
& X_2 & \longmapsto & \mathbf{C}_{X_2}
\end{array} \tag{109}$$

Definition A.4 (Grothendieck construction [Gr71, §VI.8], cf. [Vi05, §3.1.3]).

(i) The *Grothendieck construction* on a covariant pseudofunctor $\mathbf{C}_{(-)} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ (107) is the category $\int_{X \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{C}_X$ whose

- objects \mathcal{V}_X are pairs (X, \mathcal{V}) with $X \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{B})$ and $\mathcal{V} \in \text{Obj}(\mathbf{C}_X)$,
- morphisms $\phi_f : \mathcal{V}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_Y$ are pairs (f, ϕ) with $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathcal{B} and $\boxed{\phi : f_! \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W} \text{ in } \mathbf{C}_Y}$,

hence the hom-sets of the covariant Grothendieck construction are these dependent products:

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{B}} \mathbf{C} \right) (\mathcal{V}_X, \mathcal{W}_Y) \equiv (f \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)) \times \mathbf{C}_Y(f_! \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}). \tag{110}$$

(ii) Dually, the *Grothendieck construction* on a contra-variant pseudofunctor $\mathbf{C}_{(-)} : \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ (109) is the category $\int_{X \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{C}_X$ whose

- objects \mathcal{V}_X are pairs (X, \mathcal{V}) with $X \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{B})$ and $\mathcal{V} \in \text{Obj}(\mathbf{C}_X)$,
- morphisms $\phi_f : \mathcal{V}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_Y$ are pairs (f, ϕ) with $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathcal{B} and $\boxed{\phi : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow f^* \mathcal{W} \text{ in } \mathbf{C}_X}$,

hence the hom-sets of the contravariant Grothendieck construction are these dependent products:

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{B}} \mathbf{C} \right) (\mathcal{V}_X, \mathcal{W}_Y) \equiv (f \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)) \times \mathbf{C}_Y(X, f^* \mathcal{W}). \tag{111}$$

(iii) Finally, composition of morphisms $\mathcal{V}_X \xrightarrow{\phi_f} \mathcal{W}_Y \xrightarrow{\psi_g} \mathcal{R}_Z$ in the Grothendieck construction is defined by using the pseudo-functoriality of $\mathbf{C}_{(-)}$ to coherently push (or pull) morphisms into the codomain or domain category:

$$\psi_g \circ \phi_f := (\psi \circ g_!(\phi) \circ \mu_{f,g}(\mathcal{V}))_{g \circ f} \quad \text{or} \quad \psi_g \circ \phi_f := (\mu_{f,g}(\mathcal{R}) \circ g^*(\psi) \circ \phi)_{g \circ f}.$$

Here one is using the coherence isomorphisms (108) to adjust for the identification of composite functors:

$$(g \circ f)_!(\mathcal{V}) \xrightarrow{\mu_{f,g}} g_!(f_!(\mathcal{V})) \xrightarrow{g_!(\phi)} g_!(\mathcal{W}) \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathcal{R} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\phi} f^*(\mathcal{W}) \xrightarrow{f^*(\psi)} f^*(g^*(\mathcal{R})) \xrightarrow{\mu_{f,g}} (g \circ f)^* \mathcal{R}.$$

Remark A.5 (Grothendieck fibration). A key aspect of the Grothendieck construction is that it is a *fibered category* over the original diagram shape, and as such an equivalent incarnation of the pseudo-functor that induced it. While important, here we do not need this aspect and will regard the Grothendieck construction as a plain category, this being the domain category of the corresponding Grothendieck fibration.

Example A.6 (Categories of indexed sets of objects [Bé85, §3], Free coproduct completion [HT95, §2]).

For \mathcal{C} any category, there is the contravariant pseudofunctor (Def. A.3) on Set which to a set S assigns the S -fold product category of \mathcal{C} with itself:

$$\mathcal{C} \in \text{Cat} \quad \vdash \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Set}^{\text{op}} & \longrightarrow & \text{Cat} \\ S & \longmapsto & \text{Func}(S, \mathcal{C}) \equiv \mathcal{C}^S \simeq \prod_{s \in S} \mathcal{C} \\ \downarrow f & & \uparrow f^* \\ T & \longmapsto & \text{Func}(T, \mathcal{C}) \equiv \mathcal{C}^T \simeq \prod_{t \in T} \mathcal{C}. \end{array} \quad (112)$$

equivalently, the functor category into \mathcal{C} out of the discrete category on S :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Func}(S, \mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \prod_{s \in S} \mathcal{C} \\ (s \mapsto \mathcal{V}_s) & \longmapsto & (\mathcal{V}_s)_{s \in S}, \end{array}$$

and whose base change functors are given by precomposition with, hence re-indexing by, the given map of sets:

$$f : S \longrightarrow T \quad \vdash \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Func}(S, \mathcal{C}) & \xleftarrow{f^*} & \text{Func}(T, \mathcal{C}) \\ (\mathcal{V}_{f(s)})_{s \in S} & \longleftarrow & (\mathcal{V}_t)_{t \in T}. \end{array}$$

Accordingly, the Grothendieck construction (Def. A.4) on this pseudofunctor,

$\int_{S \in \text{Set}} \mathcal{C}^S$ has the following description:

- objects \mathcal{V}_S are dependent pairs consisting of a set $S \in \text{Set}$ and an S -tuple $(\mathcal{V}_s)_{s \in S}$ of objects in \mathcal{C} ,
- morphisms $\phi_f : \mathcal{V}_S \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}_T$ are S -tuples $(\phi_s : \mathcal{V}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{f(s)})_{s \in S}$ of morphisms in \mathcal{C} .

Independently of whether or how \mathcal{C} has co-products, this category has set-indexed coproducts $\coprod_i \mathcal{V}(i)_{S_i}$ with underlying set $\coprod_i S_i$ and components $(\coprod_i \mathcal{V}(i)_{S_i})_{s_j} = \mathcal{V}(j)_{s_j}$ for $s_j \in S_j$.

But if the category \mathcal{C} is *extensive*, in that it already has coproducts itself and the coproduct-functors between (products of) slice categories are equivalences

$$S \in \text{Set} \quad \vdash \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \prod_{s \in S} \mathcal{C}/X_s & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{C}/\coprod_s X_s \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} E_s \\ \downarrow \\ X_s \end{array} \right)_{s \in S} & \longmapsto & \left(\begin{array}{c} \coprod_s E_s \\ \downarrow \\ \coprod_s X_s \end{array} \right) \end{array}$$

then the construction yields the category of bundles in \mathcal{C} over sets, the latter understood via the unique coproduct-preserving inclusion $\iota_{\text{Set}} : \text{Set} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$, hence the comma category $(\text{id}_{\mathcal{C}}, \iota_{\text{Set}})$:

$$\mathcal{C} \text{ extensive} \quad \vdash \quad \int_{S \in \text{Set}} \prod_{s \in S} \mathcal{C} \simeq (\text{id}_{\mathcal{C}}, \iota_{\text{Set}})$$

whose morphisms $\phi_f : X_S \longrightarrow Y_T$ are commuting diagrams in \mathcal{C} of this form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \prod_{s \in S} X_s & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \prod_{t \in T} Y_t \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ S & \xrightarrow{f} & T. \end{array}$$

Conversely, if \mathcal{C} is not extensive, then we may understand $\int_{S \in \text{Set}} \mathcal{C}^S$ as the stand-in for the would-be category of “ \mathcal{C} -fiber bundles” over sets.

Proposition A.7 ([CV98, Lem. 4.2]). *A category \mathcal{C} with all set-indexed coproducts each of whose objects is a coproduct of connected objects is the free coproduct completion (Ex. A.6) of its full subcategory of connected objects (i.e., of those objects $X \in \mathcal{C}$ for which $\mathcal{C}(X, -) : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves coproducts).*

Proof. Since, by assumption, every object is already presented by an indexed set of connected objects, it remains to see that also the morphisms $(\coprod_s X_s) \rightarrow (\coprod_t Y_t)$ are in bijection to indexed sets of morphisms of connected objects. This follows by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(\coprod_s X_s, \coprod_t Y_t) &\simeq \prod_s \mathcal{C}(X_s, \coprod_t Y_t) \\ &\simeq \prod_{s \in S} \prod_{t_s \in T} \mathcal{C}(X_s, Y_{t_s}) \\ &\simeq \prod_{f: S \rightarrow T} \prod_{s \in S} \mathcal{C}(X_s, Y_{f(s)}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first bijection is by general properties of Hom-functors and the second is by the assumption that all X_s are connected. \square

Example A.8 (Induced adjunctions between Grothendieck constructions). Given a contravariant pseudofunctor and a left adjoint functor into its domain

$$\mathcal{C} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{L} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{R} \end{array} \mathcal{B} \quad \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{C}(-)} \text{Cat}$$

there is an induced adjunction between the Grothendieck constructions on $\mathbf{C}_{(-)}$ and on $\mathbf{C}_{L(-)}$, covering the given adjunction:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \left(\int_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbf{C}_{L(c)} \right) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\hat{L}} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\hat{R}} \end{array} & \left(\int_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{C}_b \right) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{C} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{L} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{R} \end{array} & \mathcal{B} \end{array} \quad (113)$$

where on components in $\mathbf{C}_{(-)}$ the functor \hat{L} is the identity while \hat{R} is pullback along the underlying adjunction counit $\varepsilon^{L \dashv R} : L \circ R \rightarrow \text{id}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V}_c & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\hat{L}} \\ \downarrow \phi_f \end{array} & \mathcal{V}_{L(c)} & \text{and} & \mathcal{V}_b & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\hat{R}} \\ \downarrow \phi_f \end{array} & \mathcal{V}_{R(b)} \\ & & \downarrow \phi_{L(f)} & & & & \downarrow (\varepsilon_b^{L \dashv R})^* \phi_{L(f)} \\ \mathcal{V}'_{c'} & & \mathcal{V}'_{L(c')} & & \mathcal{V}'_{b'} & & \mathcal{V}'_{R(b')} \end{array} \quad (114)$$

The counit of this adjunction is given by the identity component map covering the underlying counit:

$$\varepsilon_{\mathcal{V}'_x}^{\hat{L} \dashv \hat{R}} : \hat{L} \hat{R}(\mathcal{V}_b) = (\varepsilon_{LR(B)}^{L \dashv R} v). \quad (115)$$

Proposition A.9 (Colimits in a Grothendieck construction [TBG91, §3.2, Thm. 2][HP15, Prop. 2.4.4]).

(i) *The Grothendieck construction $\int_{X \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{C}_X$ (Def. A.4) on a covariant pseudofunctor $\mathbf{C}_{(-)} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \text{Cat}$ (A.3) is cocomplete as soon as the base category \mathcal{B} as well as all the fiber categories \mathbf{C}_X , $X \in \mathcal{B}$ are cocomplete. In this case the colimit of a small diagram*

$$\begin{array}{l} I \longrightarrow \int_{X \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{C}_X \\ i \mapsto \mathcal{V}(i)_{X_i} \end{array}$$

is given by

$$\lim_{i \in I} \mathcal{V}(i)_{X_i} \simeq \left(\lim_{i \in I} (q(i), \mathcal{V}(i)) \right) \lim_{i \in I} X_i \in \int_{X \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{C}_X, \quad (116)$$

where

$$i \in I \quad \vdash \quad q(i) : X_i \longrightarrow \lim_{\longrightarrow i} X_i \in \mathcal{B}$$

denote the coprojections into the underlying colimit in \mathcal{B} .

(ii) The analogous dual statement holds for limits.

Example A.10 (External cartesian product). Given a contravariant pseudofunctor $\mathbf{C}_{(-)} : \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Cat}$ such that both \mathcal{B} as well as all the $\mathbf{C}_{(-)}$ have Cartesian products, then its Gorthendieck construction has cartesian products given by

$$\mathcal{V}_X \times \mathcal{W}_Y \simeq \left(((\text{pr}_X)^* \mathcal{V}) \times ((\text{pr}_Y)^* \mathcal{W}) \right)_{X \times Y}. \quad (117)$$

More explicitly, the components of the external Cartesian product are

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{V}_X \times \mathcal{W}_Y)_{(x,y)} &\simeq \{(x,y)\}^* \left(((\text{pr}_X)^* \mathcal{V}) \times ((\text{pr}_Y)^* \mathcal{W}) \right) \\ &\simeq \left((\{(x,y)\}^* (\text{pr}_X)^* \mathcal{V}) \times (\{(x,y)\}^* (\text{pr}_Y)^* \mathcal{W}) \right) \\ &\simeq (\{x\}^* \mathcal{V}) \times (\{y\}^* \mathcal{W}) \\ &\simeq \mathcal{V}_x \times \mathcal{W}_y \end{aligned} \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \{x\} & \xleftarrow{\sim} & \{(x,y)\} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \{y\} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X & \xleftarrow{\text{pr}_X} & X \times Y & \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_Y} & Y \end{array}$$

This gives the following elementary fact, which is crucial in the main text:

Proposition A.11 (Free coproduct completion). *If a category \mathcal{C} has Cartesian products, then its free coproduct completion (Ex. A.17) also has Cartesian products and those distribute over the coproducts.*

The 2-category of categories with adjoint functors between them. We extract the gist of the discussion in [ML97, p. 97-103].

Definition A.12 (Conjugate transformation of adjoints [ML97, p. 98]). Given a pair of pairs of adjoint functors between the same categories

$$\mathcal{C} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{L_i} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{R_i} \end{array} \mathcal{D} \quad i \in \{1, 2\},$$

then a *conjugate transformation* between them

$$(\lambda, \rho) : (L_1 \dashv R_1) \Longrightarrow (L_2 \dashv R_2)$$

is a pair of natural transformations of the form

$$\lambda : L_1 \Rightarrow L_2, \quad \rho : R_2 \Rightarrow R_1$$

such that they make the following square of natural transformations of hom-sets commute, where the horizontal maps refer to the given hom-isomorphisms:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(L_2(-), -) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{D}(-, R_2(-)) \\ \mathcal{C}(\lambda_{(-), \text{id}(-)}) \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{D}(\text{id}(-), \rho_{(-)}) \\ \mathcal{C}(L_1(-), -) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{D}(-, R_1(-)) \end{array} \quad (118)$$

Such conjugate transformations compose via composition of their components (λ, ρ) , yielding a category of adjoint functors with conjugate transformations between them, which we denote as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \in \text{Cat} \quad \vdash \quad \text{Cat}_{\text{adj}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \in \text{Cat}. \quad (119)$$

Proposition A.13 (Uniqueness of conjugate transformations [ML97, p. 98]). *Given $L_i \dashv R_i : \mathcal{C} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{D}$ and λ in Def. A.12, there is a unique ρ that completes this data to a conjugate transformation. In other words, the forgetful functor from (119) to the functor category is a fully faithful sub-category inclusion:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \in \text{Cat} & \vdash & \text{Cat}_{\text{adj}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \hookrightarrow \text{Cat}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \\ (L_1 \dashv R_1) & \mapsto & L_1 \\ \downarrow (\lambda, \rho) & & \downarrow \lambda \\ (L_2 \dashv R_2) & \mapsto & L_2. \end{array} \quad (120)$$

Proposition A.14 (Horizontal composition of conjugate transformations [ML97, p. 102]). *The horizontal composition $(-)\cdot(-)$ of the underlying natural transformations of a pair of conjugate transformations Def. A.12 is itself a conjugate transformation, so that the composition functor on functor categories restricts along the inclusions (120):*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} \in \text{Cat} & \vdash & \text{Cat}_{\text{adj}}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}) \times \text{Cat}_{\text{adj}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \longrightarrow \text{Cat}_{\text{adj}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}) \\ & & ((\lambda, \rho), (\lambda', \rho')) \longmapsto (\lambda' \cdot \lambda, \rho \cdot \rho'). \end{array}$$

Via Prop. A.14, we have:

Definition A.15 (2-category of categories, adjoint functors and conjugate transformations [ML97, p. 102]). Write

$$\text{Cat}_{\text{adj}} \longrightarrow \text{Cat} \quad (121)$$

for the (very large) locally full sub-2-category of Cat whose

- objects are categories,
- hom-categories are those (119) of adjoint functors with conjugate transformations between them.

Proposition A.16 (Bivariant pseudofunctors, cf. [Ja98, Lem. 9.1.2][HP15, Prop. 2.2.1][CM20, pp. 10]). *Given a covariant pseudofunctor $\mathbf{C}_{(-)}$ (Def. A.3) such that each component functor $f_! : \mathbf{C}_X \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}_Y$ has a right adjoint*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{C}_{(-)} : & \mathcal{B} & \longrightarrow \text{Cat} \\ & X_1 & \longmapsto \mathbf{C}_{X_1} \\ & \downarrow f & \quad \quad \quad f_! \downarrow \dashv \uparrow f^* \\ & X_2 & \longmapsto \mathbf{C}_{X_2} \end{array} \quad (122)$$

then:

- (i) *it factors essentially uniquely through Cat_{adj} (121),*
- (ii) *hence it induces a contravariant pseudofunctor with component functors f^* ,*
- (iii) *such that the Grothendieck construction (Def. A.4) on the covariant pseudofunctor is equivalent to that on the corresponding contravariant pseudofunctor via the functor that is the identity on objects and on morphisms is the hom-isomorphism of the given adjoint pairs:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f_! \mathcal{V} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\phi}} & \mathcal{W} \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \end{array} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V} & \xrightarrow{\phi} & f^* \mathcal{W} \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y. \end{array}$$

Therefore, both construction are still unambiguously denoted by $\int_{X \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{C}_X$.

Proof. The first statement is a direct consequence of Prop. A.13, the second then follows by Prop. A.14 and finally the third by the property (118) in Def. A.12. \square

In refinement of Ex. A.6, we have:

Example A.17 (Categories of indexed sets of objects with coproducts). If a category \mathcal{C} already has all coproducts, then the pseudofunctor (112) of its product categories has left adjoint component functors given by forming coproducts over fibers of base maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f : S \longrightarrow T & \vdash & \begin{array}{ccc} (\mathcal{V}_s)_{s \in S} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \left(\coprod_{s \in f^{-1}(\{t\})} \mathcal{V}_s \right)_{t \in T} \\ \text{Func}(S, \mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{f_!} & \text{Func}(T, \mathcal{C}) \\ & \xleftarrow{f^*} & \\ (\mathcal{V}_{f(s)})_{s \in S} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & (\mathcal{V}_t)_{t \in T} \end{array} \end{array} \quad (123)$$

Consequently, here Prop. A.16 says that we have in fact a bivariant pseudofunctor:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Set} & \longrightarrow & \text{Cat}_{\text{adj}} \\
S & \longmapsto & \text{Func}(S, \mathcal{C}) \simeq \prod_{s \in S} \mathcal{C} \\
\downarrow f & & f_! \downarrow \dashv \uparrow f^* \\
T & \longmapsto & \text{Func}(T, \mathcal{C}) \simeq \prod_{t \in T} \mathcal{C}.
\end{array}$$

More generally:

Example A.18 (Systems of enriched functor categories). Let \mathbf{C} be an sSet -enriched bicomplete and sSet -(co)tensoring category. Then for every sSet -enriched functor $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}$ between small sSet -enriched categories the precomposition functors \mathbf{f}^* between the sSet -enriched functor categories into \mathbf{C}

$$\mathbf{C}^{(-)} := \mathbf{sFunc}(-, \mathbf{C}),$$

has a left adjoint $\mathbf{f}_!$ and a right adjoint \mathbf{f}_* :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_!} & \\
\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}} & \xleftarrow{\mathbf{f}^*} & \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{Y}} \\
& \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_*} &
\end{array} \quad (124)$$

given by enriched left and right Kan extension, respectively, expressed by the following (co)end formulas [Ke82, (4.24), (4.25)]:

$$\mathcal{V} \in \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}} \quad \vdash \quad \begin{cases} (f_! \mathcal{V}) : y \mapsto \int^{x \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{f}(x), y) \cdot \mathcal{V}_x \\ (\mathbf{f}_* \mathcal{V}) : y \mapsto \int_{x \in \mathbf{X}} (\mathcal{V}_x)^{\mathbf{Y}(y, \mathbf{f}(x))} \end{cases} \quad (125)$$

In particular, this gives a bivariant pseudo-functor on small sSet -enriched categories:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{C}^{(-)} : \text{sSet-Cat}_{\text{sm}} & \longrightarrow & \text{Cat}_{\text{adj}} \\
\mathbf{X} & \longmapsto & \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}} \\
\downarrow \mathbf{f} & & f_! \downarrow \dashv \uparrow f^* \\
\mathbf{Y} & \longmapsto & \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{Y}}
\end{array}$$

Model category theory.

Lemma A.19 (Ken Brown's Lemma [Ho99, Lem. 1.1.12], based on [Br73, p. 421]). *Let $F : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a functor between (underlying categories of) model categories. Then:*

- (i) *If F sends acyclic fibrations to weak equivalences then it sends all weak equivalences between fibrant objects to weak equivalences.*
- (ii) *If F sends acyclic cofibrations to weak equivalences then it sends all weak equivalences between cofibrant objects to weak equivalences.*

As a simple but important special case of right transfer:

Proposition A.20 (Model structure transfer along adjoint equivalence). *Given an adjoint equivalence of categories*

$\mathcal{D} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{L} \\ \dashv \\ \xrightarrow{R} \end{array} \mathcal{C}$ *and a model structure on \mathcal{C} , then \mathcal{D} becomes a model category and the adjunction becomes a Quillen equivalence by setting $\mathbf{W}(\mathcal{D}) \equiv R^{-1}(\mathbf{W}(\mathcal{C}))$, $\mathbf{Fib}(\mathcal{D}) \equiv R^{-1}(\mathbf{Fib}(\mathcal{C}))$, $\mathbf{Cof}(\mathcal{D}) \equiv R^{-1}(\mathbf{Cof}(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Model category structures on Grothendieck constructions. We recall the main point of [HP15][CM20], which goes back to [Ro94][St12].

Definition A.21 (2-category of model categories [Ho99, p. 24], cf. [HP15, Def. 2.5.3]). Write

$$\text{ModCat} \longrightarrow \text{Cat}_{\text{adj}} \longrightarrow \text{Cat} \quad (126)$$

for the (very large) 2-category whose

- objects are model categories,
- 1-morphisms are Quillen adjunctions regarded in the direction of the left adjoint,
- 2-morphisms are conjugate transformations (Def. A.12) between the underlying adjoint functors, equipped with its forgetful 2-functor to Cat_{adj} (Def. A.15).

Definition A.22 (Integral model structure [HP15, Def. 3.0.4]). Given a model category \mathcal{B} and a pseudofunctor (Def. A.3) on \mathcal{B} with values in model categories (Def. A.21)

$$\mathbf{C}_{(-)} : \mathcal{B} \longrightarrow \text{ModCat} \longrightarrow \text{Cat}_{\text{adj}}$$

then we call a morphism

$$\phi_f : \mathcal{V}_X \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}'_{X'} \quad \in \int_{X \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{C}_X$$

in its Grothendieck construction (Def. A.4):

(i) an *integral weak equivalence* if

(a) $f : X \longrightarrow X'$ is a weak equivalence in \mathcal{B} ,

(b) $f_!(\mathcal{V}^{\text{cof}}) \xrightarrow{f_!(p)} f_!(\mathcal{V}) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\phi}} \mathcal{V}'$ is a weak equivalence in $\mathbf{C}_{X'}$, for $p : \mathcal{V}^{\text{cof}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ a cofibrant replacement in \mathbf{C}_X ,

(b̄) which, when $f_! \dashv f^*$ is a Quillen equivalence, is equivalent to:

$\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\phi} f^*(\mathcal{V}') \xrightarrow{f^*(q)} f^*(\mathcal{V}'_{\text{fib}})$ is a weak equivalence in \mathbf{C}_X , for $q : \mathcal{V}' \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'_{\text{fib}}$ a fibrant replacement in $\mathbf{C}_{X'}$;

(ii) an *integral fibration* if

(a) $f : X \longrightarrow X'$ is a fibration in \mathcal{B} ;

(b) $\phi : \mathcal{V} \longrightarrow f^*(\mathcal{V}')$ is a fibration in \mathbf{C}_X ,

(iii) an *integral cofibration* if

(a) $f : X \longrightarrow X'$ is a cofibration in \mathcal{B} ,

(b) $\tilde{\phi} : f_!(\mathcal{V}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ is a cofibration in $\mathbf{C}_{X'}$.

Proposition A.23 (Existence of integral model structures [HP15, Thm. 3.0.12]). *The classes of morphisms in Def. A.22 constitute a model category structure if, given $f : X \rightarrow X'$ in \mathcal{B} , the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i) *if f is a weak equivalence then $f_! \dashv f^* : \mathbf{C}_X \rightleftarrows \mathbf{C}_{X'}$ is a Quillen equivalence,*

(ii) *if f is an acyclic fibration then $f^* : \mathbf{C}_{X'} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_X$ preserves weak equivalences,*

(iii) *if f is an acyclic cofibration then $f_! : \mathbf{C}_X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_{X'}$ preserves weak equivalences.*

Example A.24 (Integral model structure over trivial model structure). In the case that the base category \mathcal{B} in Def. A.22 is the “trivial” model structure on a bicomplete category – whose weak equivalences are just the isomorphisms and all whose morphisms are fibrations and cofibrations – then the conditions in Prop. A.23 are satisfied, and hence the integral model structure on any pseudofunctor $\mathbf{C}_{(-)} : \mathcal{B} \longrightarrow \text{ModCat}$ exists.

Lemma A.25 (Enhanced enrichment of functor categories). *Consider*

- \mathbf{V} a bicomplete symmetric closed monoidal category, regarded as canonically enriched over itself via its internal hom $[-, -]$;
- (\mathbf{C}, \otimes) a complete \mathbf{V} -enriched category that is also \mathbf{V} -(co)tensoring;
- \mathbf{X} a small \mathbf{V} -enriched category.

(i) *Then the enriched functor category $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{X}} := \text{Func}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V})$ carries symmetric closed monoidal category structure with respect to the \mathbf{X} -objectwise tensor product*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{X}} \quad \vdash \quad \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{X}} \otimes \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}} := (x \mapsto \mathcal{S}_x \otimes \mathcal{T}_x) \in \mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{T}},$$

whose corresponding internal hom is given by

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{X}} \quad \vdash \quad [\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}] := \left(x \mapsto \int_{x' \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{X}(x, x') \otimes \mathcal{S}_{x'}, \mathcal{T}_{x'}) \right) \in \mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{T}}.$$

(ii) Furthermore, $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}} := \text{Func}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{C})$ becomes $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{X}}$ -enriched, -tensored and -cotensored via the following end-formulas, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}} &\vdash \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{X}}) := \left(x \mapsto \int_{x' \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{X}(x, x') \cdot \mathcal{V}_{x'}, \mathcal{W}_{x'}) \right) \in \mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{X}} \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}} &\vdash \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{X}} \cdot \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}} := (x \mapsto \mathcal{S}_x \cdot \mathcal{V}_x) \in \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}} \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}} &\vdash (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}})^{\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{X}}} := \left(x \mapsto \int_{x' \in \mathbf{X}} (\mathcal{W}_{x'})^{\mathbf{X}(x, x') \cdot \mathcal{S}_{x'}} \right) \in \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}}. \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

Proof. This follows by standard manipulations and may be folklore but hard to cite from the literature; we have spelled out the details at: ncatlab.org/nlab/show/enriched+functor+category#EnhancedEnrichment. \square

Monoidal and enriched model categories. A monoidal category with a model category structure is a *monoidal model category* (e.g. [Ho99, §4][ScSh00, §2][Lu09a, §A.3.1.2]) and an enriched category with a model structure is an *enriched model category* ([Qu67, §II.2]) if¹³ the tensor product or tensoring, respectively, is a left Quillen bifunctor (Def. A.29 below):

Definition A.26 (Pushout-product). Given a bifunctor $\otimes : \mathcal{D}_1 \times \mathcal{D}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ into a category with pushouts, then the corresponding *pushout-product* of a pair of morphisms $f : X \rightarrow X'$ in \mathcal{D}_1 and $g : Y \rightarrow Y'$ in \mathcal{D}_2 is the universal dashed map in \mathcal{C} given by the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \otimes Y & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes g} & X \otimes Y' \\ \downarrow f \otimes \text{id} & \text{(po)} & \downarrow q_r \\ X' \otimes Y & \xrightarrow{q_l} & X' \otimes Y \amalg_{X \otimes Y} X \otimes Y' \\ & \searrow \text{id} \otimes g & \downarrow f \hat{\otimes} g \\ & & X' \otimes Y' \end{array} \quad (128)$$

Example A.27 (Cartesian pushout-products of sets). In the category Set with respect to the Cartesian product $\text{Set} \times \text{Set} \xrightarrow{\times} \text{Set}$, the pushout of $\text{id} \times g$ along $f \times \text{id}$ is the quotient set

$$f \hat{\times} g \simeq \{(x, y'), (x', y)\} / ((f(x), y) \sim (x, g(y)))$$

(where all variables range over the sets denoted by the corresponding capital letters) whose equivalence classes we denote by $[x, y']$ and $[x', y]$, on which the pushout-product map (128) is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f \hat{\times} g & \dashrightarrow & X' \times Y' \\ [x, y'] & \mapsto & [f(x), y'] \\ [x', y] & \mapsto & [x', g(y)] \end{array}$$

whose fibers are as follows:

$$(f \hat{\times} g)_{(x', y')} \simeq \begin{cases} * & | (x', y') \in \text{im}(f) \times \text{im}(g) \\ f^{-1}(\{x'\}) \simeq \{[x, y'] \mid x \in f^{-1}(\{x'\})\} & | y' \in Y' \setminus \text{im}(g) \\ g^{-1}(\{y'\}) \simeq \{[x', y] \mid y \in g^{-1}(\{y'\})\} & | x' \in X' \setminus \text{im}(f). \end{cases} \quad (129)$$

¹³For a monoidal model category one requires in addition a “unit axiom” on the tensor unit. But this axiom is automatically satisfied as soon as the tensor unit is a cofibrant object, which is the case in all cases in the main text.

Example A.28 (Pushout-product with an identity). With respect to any bifunctor $(-) \otimes (-)$, forming the pushout-product (Def. A.26) with an identity morphism yields the identity morphism on the codomain:

$$f \widehat{\otimes} \text{id}_Y \simeq \text{id}_{X' \otimes Y} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{id} \widehat{\otimes} g \simeq \text{id}_{X \otimes Y'}. \quad (130)$$

Moreover, if \mathcal{C} has initial objects \emptyset and the bifunctor preserves the initial object in each argument separately, then the pushout-product with an initial morphism is given by \otimes :

$$(\emptyset \rightarrow X') \widehat{\otimes} g \simeq \text{id}_{X'} \otimes g \quad \text{and} \quad f \widehat{\otimes} (\emptyset \rightarrow Y') \simeq f \otimes \text{id}_{Y'}. \quad (131)$$

Definition A.29 (Left Quillen bifunctor). Given model categories $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$ and \mathcal{C} a functor of the form

$$\otimes : \mathcal{D}_1 \times \mathcal{D}_2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

is called a (left) *Quillen bifunctor* if

- (i) (*two-variable cocontinuity*): \otimes preserves colimits in each argument separately;
- (ii) (*pushout-product axiom*): given a pair of cofibrations, their \otimes -pushout product is also a cofibration

$$\begin{array}{l} f \in \text{Cof}(\mathcal{D}_1) \cap \text{W}(\mathcal{D}_1) \\ g \in \text{Cof}(\mathcal{D}_2) \cap \text{W}(\mathcal{D}_2) \end{array} \quad \vdash \quad f \widehat{\otimes} g \in \text{Cof}(\mathcal{C}) \cap \text{W}(\mathcal{C}) \quad (132)$$

and if, *moreover*, either is a weak equivalence, then so is the pushout product.

sSet-Enriched categories (aka: simplicial categories). Most of what we say here applies to enriched categories over more general symmetric monoidal enriching categories than just sSet, but we focus on this case for brevity of notation, since this is what we use in the main text.

Definition A.30 (sSet-enriched monoidal category [BM12, Def. 1][MP19, Def. 2.1][Lu17, §1.6]).

A *sSet-enriched monoidal category* (\mathbf{C}, \otimes) is an sSet-enriched category equipped with a tensor product given by an sSet-enriched functor

$$X, X', Y, Y' \in \text{Obj}(\mathbf{C}) \quad \vdash \quad \mathbf{C}(X, Y) \times \mathbf{C}(X', Y') \xrightarrow{\otimes_{X \otimes X', Y \otimes Y'}} \mathbf{C}(X \otimes X', Y \otimes Y')$$

satisfying its coherence laws by sSet-enriched natural isomorphisms.

Rigidification of quasi-categories.

Definition A.31 (Rigidification of quasi-categories). We write, as usual,

$$\text{sSet-Cat} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\mathfrak{C}} \\ \perp \\ \xrightarrow{N} \end{array} \text{sSet} \quad (133)$$

for the *homotopy coherent nerve* N of simplicial categories and its left adjoint \mathfrak{C} [Lu09a, §1.1.5, §2.2], which on quasi-categories $\text{QCat} \hookrightarrow \text{sSet}$ may be understood as *rigidification* [DS11].

Proposition A.32 (Rigidification preserves products up to DK-equivalence [Lu09a, Cor. 2.2.5.6][DS11, Prop. 6.2]). *For $S, S' \in \text{sSet}$ there is a natural isomorphism from the rigidification (133) of their Cartesian product to the product sSet-categories of their rigidifications*

$$\mathfrak{C}(S \times S') \longrightarrow \mathfrak{C}(S) \times \mathfrak{C}(S')$$

which is a Dwyer-Kan equivalence (Prop. 2.21).

Proposition A.33 (Comparing rigidification to Dwyer-Kan fundamental groupoids [MRZ23, Thm. 1.1]). *For $S \in \text{sSet}$ there is a natural transformation from the localization (105) of the rigidification (133) to the Dwyer-Kan fundamental simplicial groupoid*

$$\text{Loc} \circ \mathfrak{C}(S) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}(S)$$

which is a Dwyer-Kan equivalence (Prop. 2.21).

References

- [AMV24] C. A. Abad, S. P. Montoya, A. Q. Velez, *Chern-Weil theory for ∞ -local systems*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **377** (2024) 3129-3171 [arXiv:2105.00461] [doi:10.1093/imrn/rnw258].
- [AR94] J. Adámek and J. Rosický, *Locally presentable and accessible categories*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series **189**, Cambridge University Press (1994), [doi:10.1017/CB09780511600579].
- [An78] D. W. Anderson, *Fibrations and geometric realization*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **84** 5 (1978), 765-788, [euclid.bams:1183541139].
- [AJ21] M. Anel and A. Joyal, *Topologie*, in: *New Spaces for Mathematics and Physics*, Cambridge University Press (2021) 155-257 [doi:10.1017/9781108854429.007].
- [Ar23] K. Arro, *FI-Calculus and Representation Stability* (2023), [arXiv:2306.13597].
- [At67] M. Atiyah, *K-theory*, Harvard Lecture 1964 (notes by D. W. Anderson), Benjamin, Amsterdam (1967), [ncatlab.org/nlab/files/AtiyahKTheory.pdf]
- [Ba10] C. Barwick, *On left and right model categories and left and right Bousfield localizations*, Homology, Homotopy Appl. **12** (2010), 245–320, [doi:10.4310/hha.2010.v12.n2.a9], [arXiv:0708.2067] and [arXiv:0708.2832].
- [Ba95] H. J. Baues, *Homotopy Types in Handbook of Algebraic Topology*, I. M. James (ed.), North Holland, Amsterdam (1995), 1-72, [doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-81779-2.X5000-7].
- [BJT97] H.-J. Baues, M. Jibladze, and A. Tonks, *Cohomology of monoids in monoidal categories*, in: *Operads: Proceedings of Renaissance Conferences*, Contemporary Mathematics **202**, AMS (1997), 137-166, [doi:10.1090/conm/202], [archive.mpim-bonn.mpg.de/id/eprint/1484/1/preprint_1995_121.pdf]
- [BM12] M. Batanin and M. Markl, *Centers and homotopy centers in enriched monoidal categories*, Adv. Math. **230** (2012), 1811-1858, [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2012.04.011], [arXiv:1109.4084].
- [Be00] T. Beke, *Sheafifiable homotopy model categories*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philosophical Soc. **129** (2000), 447-475, [doi:10.1017/S0305004100004722], [arXiv:math/0102087].
- [Bé85] J. Bénabou, *Fibered Categories and the Foundations of Naive Category Theory*, J. Symbolic Logic **50** (1985), 10-37, [doi:10.2307/2273784].
- [BM06] C. Berger and I. Moerdijk, *The Boardman-Vogt resolution of operads in monoidal model categories*, Topology **45** (2006), 807-849, [doi:10.1016/j.top.2006.05.001], [arXiv:math/0502155].
- [Be07a] J. Bergner, *A model category structure on the category of simplicial categories*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **359** (2007), 2043-2058, [doi:10.1090/S0002-9947-06-03987-0], [arXiv:math/0406507].
- [Be07b] J. Bergner, *A survey of $(\infty, 1)$ -categories*, in: *Towards Higher Categories*, The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications **152**, Springer, New York (2007), [doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-1524-5_2], [arXiv:math/0610239].
- [BS14] J. Block and A. M. Smith, *The higher Riemann–Hilbert correspondence*, Adv. Math. **252** (2014), 382-405, [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2013.11.001], [arXiv:0908.2843].
- [Bo69] R. Bott, *Lectures on $K(X)$* , Benjamin, Amsterdam (1969), [ncatlab.org/nlab/files/Bott-KTheory.pdf]
- [BM21] V. Braunack-Mayer, *Combinatorial parametrised spectra*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **21** (2021) 801-891 [arXiv:1907.08496], [doi:10.2140/agt.2021.21.801].
- [Br73] K. Brown, *Abstract Homotopy Theory and Generalized Sheaf Cohomology*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **186** (1973), 419-458, [jstor:1996573].
- [CM20] P. Cagne and P.-A. Melliès, *On bifibrations of model categories*, Adv. Math. **370** (2020) 107205, [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2020.107205], [arXiv:1709.10484].
- [Ca20] T. Champion, *Cofinality for coends*, MathOverflow post (2020), [MO:a/354097].
- [CV98] A. Carboni and E. Vitale, *Regular and exact completions*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **125** (1998), 79-116, [doi:10.1016/S0022-4049(96)00115-6].

- [CD19] D.-C. Cisinski and F. Déglise, *Triangulated categories of mixed motives*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, NY (2019), [doi:10.1007/978-3-030-33242-6], [arXiv:0912.2110].
- [De70] P. Deligne, *Equations différentielles à points singuliers réguliers*, Lecture Notes Math. **163**, Springer, Berlin (1970), [publications.ias.edu/node/355].
- [Di04] A. Dimca, *Sheaves in Topology*, Springer, Berlin (2004), [doi:10.1007/978-3-642-18868-8].
- [Du01] D. Dugger, *Combinatorial model categories have presentations*, Adv. Math. **164** (2001) 177-201, [doi:10.1006/aima.2001.2015], [arXiv:math/0007068].
- [DS11] D. Dugger and D. Spivak, *Rigidification of quasi-categories*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **11** (2011), 225-261, [doi:10.2140/agt.2011.11.225], [arXiv:0910.0814].
- [DK80] W. Dwyer and D. Kan, *Simplicial localizations of categories*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **17** 3 (1980), 267-284, [doi:10.1016/0022-4049(80)90049-3].
- [DK84] W. Dwyer and D. Kan, *Homotopy theory and simplicial groupoids*, Indagationes Math. (Proceedings) **87** (1984), 379-385, [doi:10.1016/1385-7258(84)90038-6].
- [EFK98] P. Etingof, I. Frenkel and A. Kirillov: *Lectures on Representation Theory and Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov Equations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **58**, American Mathematical Society (1998) [ISBN:978-1-4704-1285-2, review pdf]
- [EPR21] J. Emmenegger, F. Pasquali, and G. Rosolini, *Elementary fibrations of enriched groupoids*, Mathematical Structures in Computer Science **31** 9 (2021), 958-978, [doi:10.1017/S096012952100030X].
- [Fa06] H. Fausk, *T-model structures on chain complexes of presheaves*, [arXiv:math/0612414].
- [FHM03] H. Fausk, P. Hu and P. May, *Isomorphisms between left and right adjoints*, Theory Appl. Categories **11** (2003), 107-131, [tac:11-04].
- [FSS23] D. Fiorenza, H. Sati, and U. Schreiber: *The Character map in Nonabelian Cohomology: Twisted, Differential and Generalized*, World Scientific, Singapore (2023), [doi:10.1142/13422], [arXiv:2009.11909], [ncatlab.org/schreiber/show/The+Character+Map],
- [FKS20] P. Fu, K. Kishida, and P. Selinger, *Linear Dependent Type Theory for Quantum Programming Languages*, LICS (2020), 440-453, [doi:10.1145/3373718.3394765], [arXiv:2004.13472].
- [FH91] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation Theory: a First Course*, Springer, Berlin (1991), [doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-0979-9].
- [GZ67] P. Gabriel and M. Zisman, *Calculus of fractions and homotopy theory*, Springer, Berlin (1967), [doi:10.1007/978-3-642-85844-4].
- [GJ99] P. Goerss and J. F. Jardine, *Simplicial homotopy theory*, Progress in Mathematics, Birkhäuser (2009), [doi:10.1007/978-3-0346-0189-4].
- [Gr60] A. Grothendieck, *Technique de descente et théorèmes d'existence en géométrie algébrique. I. Généralités. Descente par morphismes fidèlement plats*, Séminaire N. Bourbaki **190** (1960), 299-327, [numdam:SB_1958-1960__5__299_0].
- [Gr71] A. Grothendieck, *Revêtements Étales et Groupe Fondamental – Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1960/61*, LNM **224**, Springer, Berlin (1971); updated by M. Raynaud in [arXiv:math/0206203].
- [GP18] O. Gwilliam and D. Pavlov, *Enhancing the filtered derived category*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **222** (2018), 3621-3674, [doi:10.1016/j.jpaa.2018.01.004], [arXiv:1602.01515].
- [HP15] Y. Harpaz and M. Prasma, *The Grothendieck construction for model categories*, Adv. Math. **281** (2015), 1306-1363, [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2015.03.031], [arXiv:1404.1852].
- [HSS20] F. Hebestreit, S. Sagave, and C. Schlichtkrull, *Multiplicative parametrized homotopy theory via symmetric spectra in retractive spaces*, Forum Math. Sigma **8** (2020) e16, [doi:10.1017/fms.2020.11], [arXiv:1904.01824].
- [Hi02] P. Hirschhorn, *Model Categories and Their Localizations*, Math. Survey and Monographs **99**, Amer. Math. Soc. (2002), [ams:surv-99-s].

- [HS94] M. Hofmann and T. Streicher, *The groupoid model refutes uniqueness of identity proofs*, Proceedings Ninth Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (1994), [doi:10.1109/LICS.1994.316071].
- [HS98] M. Hofmann and T. Streicher, *The groupoid interpretation of type theory*, in: *Twenty-five years of constructive type theory*, Oxford Logic Guides **36**, Clarendon Press (1998), 83-111, [ISBN:9780198501275], [ncatlab.org/nlab/files/HofmannStreicherGroupoidInterpretation.pdf]
- [Hol08] S. Hollander, *A homotopy theory for stacks*, Israel J. Math. **163** 1 (2008), 93-124, [doi:10.1007/s11856-008-0006-5], [arXiv:math/0110247].
- [Ho99] M. Hovey, *Model Categories*, Math. Surv. & Monogr. **63**, Amer. Math. Soc. (1999), [doi:10.1090/surv/063].
- [Ho99a] M. Hovey, *Model category structures on chain complexes of sheaves* (1999), [K-theory:0366], [ncatlab.org/nlab/files/Hovey-SheavesOfChainComplexesPreprint.pdf]
- [Ho01] M. Hovey, *Model category structures on chain complexes of sheaves*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), 2441-2457, [doi:10.1090/S0002-9947-01-02721-0].
- [HPS] M. Hovey, J. Palmieri, and N. Strickland, *Axiomatic stable homotopy theory*, Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc. **610** (1997), [ams:memo-128-610].
- [Ho17] M. Hoyois, *The six operations in equivariant motivic homotopy theory*, Adv. Math. **305** (2017), 197-279, [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2016.09.031], [arXiv:1509.02145].
- [HT95] H. Hu and W. Tholen, *Limits in free coproduct completions*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **105** (1995), 277-291, [doi:10.1016/0022-4049(94)00153-7].
- [Ja98] B. Jacobs, *Categorical Logic and Type Theory*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics **141**, Elsevier (1998), [ISBN:978-0-444-50170-7].
- [Ja15] J. F. Jardine, *Local homotopy theory*, Springer, New York (2015), [doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-2300-7].
- [Jo77] P. Johnstone, *Topos Theory*, Academic Press (1977), Dover reprint (2014), [archive:topostheory].
- [Jo08] A. Joyal, *The Theory of Quasi-Categories and its Applications*, lectures at *Advanced Course on Simplicial Methods in Higher Categories*, CRM (2008) [ncatlab.org/nlab/files/JoyalTheoryOfQuasiCategories.pdf]
- [JT91] A. Joyal and M. Tierney, *Strong stacks and classifying spaces*, in: *Category Theory*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1488**, Springer (1991) 213-236 [doi:10.1007/BFb0084222]
- [Ka78] M. Karoubi, *K-Theory – An introduction*, Grundlehren der math. Wiss. **226**, Springer, Berlin (1978), [doi:10.1007/978-3-540-79890-3].
- [Ke82] M. Kelly, *Basic concepts of enriched category theory*, London Math. Soc. Lec. Note Series **64**, Cambridge Univ. Press (1982), [ISBN:9780521287029]; Reprints in *Theory Appl. Categ.* **10** (2005), 1-136, [tac:tr10].
- [Kr15] H. Krause, *Deriving Auslander’s formula*, Documenta Math. **20** (2015), 669-688, [arXiv:1409.7051], [documenta/vol-20/18].
- [KT06] A. Kono and D. Tamaki, *Generalized Cohomology*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (2006), [ams:mmono-230].
- [La03] A. Labella, *Categories with sums and right distributive tensor product*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **178** (2003), 273-296, [doi:10.1016/S0022-4049(02)00169-X].
- [La70] W. Lawvere, *Equality in hyperdoctrines and comprehension schema as an adjoint functor*, Proceedings of the AMS Symposium on Pure Mathematics XVII (1970), 1-14, [ncatlab.org/nlab/files/LawvereComprehension.pdf]
- [Le18] P. B. Levy, *Formulating Categorical Concepts using Classes*, [arXiv:1801.08528].
- [LB17] E. Lewis and M. Bohnet, *The groupoid model of type theory*, seminar notes (2017), [ncatlab.org/nlab/files/LewisBohnet.GroupoidModelOfTT.pdf]

- [Lu09a] J. Lurie, *Higher Topos Theory*, Annals of Mathematics Studies **170**, Princeton University Press (2009), [pup:8957].
- [Lu09b] J. Lurie, *On the Classification of Topological Field Theories* Current Developments in Mathematics **2008** (2009) 129-280 [arXiv:0905.0465], [doi:10.4310/CDM.2008.v2008.n1.a3].
- [Lu17] J. Lurie, *Higher Algebra* (2017), [www.math.ias.edu/~lurie/papers/HA.pdf]
- [Ly01] V. Lyubashenko, *External tensor product of categories of perverse sheaves*, Ukr. Math. J. **53** 3 (2001), 311-322, [arXiv:math/9911207].
- [ML97] S. MacLane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin (2nd ed. 1997), [doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-4721-8].
- [MP89] M. Makkai and R. Paré, *Accessible categories: The foundations of categorical model theory*, Contemporary Mathematics **104**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1989), [ams:comm-104].
- [Mal19] C. Malkiewich, *Parametrized spectra, a low-tech approach*, [arXiv:1906.04773].
- [Mal23] C. Malkiewich, *A convenient category of parametrized spectra*, [arXiv:2305.15327].
- [Ma67] P. May, *Simplicial objects in algebraic topology*, Univ. Chicago Press (1967), [ISBN:9780226511818].
- [MS06] P. May and J. Sigurdsson, *Parametrized Homotopy Theory*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **132**, AMS (2006), [ISBN:978-0-8218-3922-5], [arXiv:math/0411656].
- [MRZ23] E. Minichiello, M. Rivera, and M. Zeinalian, *Categorical models for path spaces*, Adv. Math. **415** (2023) 108898, [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2023.108898], [arXiv:2201.03046].
- [Mo54] J. Moore, *Homotopie des complexes monoïdeaux, I*, Seminaire Henri Cartan (1954-55), [numdam:SHC_1954-1955__7_2_A8_0].
- [MP19] S. Morrison and D. Penneys, *Monoidal Categories Enriched in Braided Monoidal Categories*, Intern. Math. Res. Notices **2019** (2019), 3527–3579, [doi:10.1093/imrn/rnx217], [arXiv:1701.00567].
- [MR19] F. Muro and C. Roitzheim, *Homotopy Theory of Bicomplexes*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **223** (2019), 1913–1939, [doi:10.1016/j.jpaa.2018.08.007], [arXiv:1802.07610].
- [MSS23] D. J. Myers, H. Sati, and U. Schreiber, *Topological Quantum Gates in Homotopy Type Theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **405** 172 (2024) (2024) [arXiv:2303.02382], [doi:10.1007/s00220-024-05020-8].
- [Pa91] D. Pavlović, *Categorical interpolation: Descent and the Beck-Chevalley condition without direct images*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1488**, Springer, Berlin (1991), [doi:10.1007/BFb0084229].
- [Pa96] D. Pavlović, *Maps II: Chasing Diagrams in Categorical Proof Theory*, Logic J. IGPL **4** 2 (1996), 159–194, [doi:10.1093/jigpal/4.2.159].
- [PW05] P. Polesello and I. Waschkes, *Higher monodromy*, Homology, Homotopy and Applications **7** (2005), 109-150, [dml:51918], [arXiv:math/0407507].
- [Pr92] V. Pratt, *Linear logic for generalized quantum mechanics*, in: Proceedings of Workshop on Physics and Computation (PhysComp'92) (1992), 166-180, [doi:10.1109/PHYCMP.1992.615518].
- [Py02] D. Pym, *The Semantics and Proof Theory of the Logic of Bunched Implications*, Applied Logic Series **26**, Springer, Berlin (2002), [doi:10.1007/978-94-017-0091-7].
- [Py08] D. Pym, *Errata and Remarks for “The Semantics and Proof Theory of the Logic of Bunched Implications (2008)”*, [www.cantab.net/users/david.pym/BI-monograph-errata.pdf]
- [Qu67] D. Quillen, *Homotopical Algebra* Lecture Notes in Mathematics **43**, Springer, Berlin (1967), [doi:10.1007/BFb0097438].
- [Re96] C. Rezk, *A model category for categories*, preprint (1996), [ncatlab.org/nlab/files/Rezk_ModelCategoryForCategories.pdf]
- [RSS01] C. Rezk, S. Schwede, and B. Shipley, *Simplicial structures on model categories and functors*, Amer. J. Math. **123** (2001), 551-575, [jstor:25099071], [arXiv:math/0101162].
- [Ric20] B. Richter, *From categories to homotopy theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **188**, Cambridge University Press (2020), [arXiv:10.1017/9781108855891].

- [Ri14] E. Riehl, *Categorical Homotopy Theory*, Cambridge University Press (2014), [doi:10.1017/CB09781107261457].
- [Ri22] M. Riley, *Linear Homotopy Type Theory*, talk at: *HoTTTEST Event for Junior Researchers 2022* (Jan 2022) [ncatlab.org/nlab/files/Riley-LHoTT-talk.pdf], [youtu.be/o2oWhHabjdM].
based on: *A Bunched Homotopy Type Theory for Synthetic Stable Homotopy Theory*, PhD Thesis, Wesleyan University (2022) [doi:10.14418/wes01.3.139].
- [RFL21] M. Riley, E. Finster, and D. R. Licata, *Synthetic Spectra via a Monadic and Comonadic Modality*, [arXiv:2102.04099].
- [RS18] F. Rios and P. Selinger, *A Categorical Model for a Quantum Circuit Description Language*, EPTCS **266** (2018), 164-178, [doi:10.4204/EPTCS.266.11], [arXiv:1706.02630].
- [RZ20] M. Rivera and M. Zeinalian, *The colimit of an ∞ -local system as a twisted tensor product*, Higher Structures **4** (2020), 33-56, [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2013.11.001], [arXiv:1805.01264].
- [Ro94] A. Roig, *Model category structures in bifibred categories*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **95** (1994), 203–223, [doi:10.1016/0022-4049(94)90074-4].
- [SS23b] H. Sati and U. Schreiber, *Quantum and Reality* [arXiv:2311.11035].
- [SS25a] H. Sati and U. Schreiber, *The Quantum Monadology*, Quantum Studies: Mathematics and Foundations, **12** 25 (2025) [arXiv:2310.15735] [doi:10.1007/s40509-025-00368-5].
- [SS25b] H. Sati and U. Schreiber: *Fractional Quantum Hall Anyons via the Algebraic Topology of exotic Flux Quanta* [arXiv:2505.22144].
- [SS25c] H. Sati and U. Schreiber, *Complete Topological Quantization of Higher Gauge Fields*, lecture notes, ICSM Edinburgh (2025) [arXiv:2512.12431].
- [SS26b] H. Sati and U. Schreiber, *Equivariant Principal ∞ -Bundles*, Cambridge University Press (2026, in press) [ncatlab.org/schreiber/show/Equivariant+Principal+infinity-Bundles].
- [Sc13] U. Schreiber, *Differential cohomology in a cohesive ∞ -topos*, [arXiv:1310.85930].
- [Sc14] U. Schreiber, *Quantization via Linear homotopy types*, [arXiv:1402.7041].
- [SW09] U. Schreiber and K. Waldorf, *Parallel Transport and Functors*, J. Homotopy Relat. Struct. **4** (2009), 187-244, [arXiv:0705.0452].
- [Schu72] H. Schubert, *Categories*, Springer, Berlin (1972), [doi:10.1007/978-3-642-65364-3].
- [ScSh00] S. Schwede and B. Shipley, *Algebras and modules in monoidal model categories*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **80** (2000), 491-511, [doi:10.1112/S002461150001220X], [arXiv:math/9801082].
- [ScSh03] S. Schwede and B. Shipley, *Stable model categories are categories of modules*, Topology **42** (2003) 103-153 [doi:10.1016/S0040-9383(02)00006-X]
- [Se83] R. A. G. Seely, *Hypercdoctrines, Natural Deduction and the Beck Condition*, Mathematical Logic Quarterly **29** (1983), 505-542, [doi:10.1002/malq.19830291005].
- [Sh07] B. Shipley, *$H\mathbb{Z}$ -algebra spectra are differential graded algebras*, Amer. J. Math. **129** (2007), 351-379, [jstor:40068065], [arXiv:math/0209215].
- [Sh08] M. Shulman, *Set theory for category theory*, [arXiv:0810.1279].
- [Sh13] M. Shulman, *Enriched indexed categories*, Theory Appl. Categ. **28** (2013), 616-695, [arXiv:1212.3914], [tac:28-21].
- [Sh21] M. Shulman, *Homotopy type theory: the logic of space*, in: *New Spaces for Mathematics and Physics*, Cambridge University Press (2021) 322–404 [arXiv:1703.03007], [doi:10.1017/9781108854429.009].
- [St12] A. E. Stanculescu, *Bifibrations and weak factorisation systems*, Applied Categorical Structures **20** (2012), 19–30, [doi:10.1007/s10485-009-9214-3].
- [StSt23] L. Stehouwer and J. Steinebrunner, *Dagger categories via anti-involutions and positivity*, [arXiv:2304.02928].

- [St25] G. Stefanich, *Categorification of sheaf theory* [arXiv:2511.09553].
- [Str00] N. Strickland, *$K(n)$ -local duality for finite groups and groupoids*, *Topology* **39** 4 (2000), 733-772, [doi:10.1016/S0040-9383(99)00031-2], [arXiv:math/0011109].
- [Str20] N. Strickland, *The model structure for chain complexes*, [arXiv:2001.08955].
- [TBG91] A. Tarlecki, R. M. Burstall, and J. A. Goguen, *Some fundamental algebraic tools for the semantics of computation: Part 3. Indexed categories*, *Theoretical Computer Science* **91** (1991), 239-264, [doi:10.1016/0304-3975(91)90085-G].
- [To02] B. Toën, *Vers une interprétation galoisienne de la théorie de l'homotopie*, *Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques* **43** (2002), 257-312, [numdam:CTGDC_2002__43_4_257_0].
- [TV05] B. Toën and G. Vezzosi, *Topos theory*, *Adv. Math.* **193** (2005), 257-372, [arXiv:math/0207028], [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2004.05.004].
- [Vi05] A. Vistoli, *Grothendieck topologies, fibered categories and descent theory*, in: *Fundamental algebraic geometry*, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs* **123**, Amer. Math. Soc. (2005), 1-104, [ams:surv-123-s], [arXiv:math/0412512].
- [We94] C. Weibel, *An Introduction to Homological Algebra* Cambridge University Press (1994), [doi:10.1017/CB09781139644136].
- [Wi23] J. Wilson, *Stability patterns for braid groups and configuration spaces*, talk at CQTS (Apr 2023), [ncatlab.org/nlab/files/Wilson-CQTS-Apr-2023.pdf], [youtu.be/u02CFY7h51o].
- [Zu25] R. Zucchini, *A new quantum computational set-up for algebraic topology via simplicial sets*, *Journal of Applied Math* **3** 4 (2025) [arXiv:2309.11304], [doi:10.59400/jam3011].