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Abstract
We give simple characterizations of the category \( \text{PAsm}(\mathcal{A}) \) of partitioned assemblies, and of the realizability topos \( \text{RT}(\mathcal{A}) \) over a partial combinatory algebra \( \mathcal{A} \). This answers the question for an ‘extensional characterization’ of realizability toposes.

1 Introduction
Realizability toposes \( \text{RT}(\mathcal{A}, \cdot) \) over partial combinatory algebras (PCAs) \( (\mathcal{A}, \cdot) \) were introduced in 1980 by Hyland, Johnstone and Pitts [HJP80] as categories of internal partial equivalence relations in certain indexed preorders which they called triposes. In 1990, Robinson and Rosolini [RR90] showed that Hyland’s effective topos \( \text{RT}(\mathcal{K}_1, \cdot) \) [Hyl82] — the most well known realizability topos, constructed from the PCA \( (\mathcal{K}_1, \cdot) \) known as first Kleene algebra — is the exact completion [CC82] of the category \( \text{PAsm}(\mathcal{K}_1, \cdot) \) of partitioned assemblies over \( (\mathcal{K}_1, \cdot) \), a result that easily generalizes to realizability toposes over arbitrary PCAs.

The present article gives an extensional characterization of categories of partitioned assemblies over PCAs (Theorem 3.8, Corollary 3.9), which by means of (the generalization of) Robinson and Rosolini’s result yields a characterization of realizability toposes over PCAs (Proposition 4.3, Theorem 4.6), and on the other hand justifies the definition of PCA by reconstructing it from abstract concepts. The notion of PCA that drops out of our reconstruction is a bit more general than the classical notion used e.g. in [HJP80, vO08], but seems to have been adapted as standard in more recent literature [Ste13, Joh13, FvO14, FvO16]. For the purpose of characterizing partitioned assemblies and realizability toposes the distinction is immaterial by a result of Faber and van Oosten which says that any PCA in the more general sense can be ‘strictified’ [FvO16, Theorem 5.8].

For the characterization of partitioned assemblies we adapt techniques from Hofstra’s analysis of ordered partial combinatory algebras (OPCAs) in terms of his basic combinatory objects (BCOs), which are partial orders equipped with a class of partial endofunctions subject to certain axioms. Every OPCA gives rise to a BCO, and Hofstra characterizes (inclusions of) OPCAs among BCOs [Hof06, Propositions 6.5, 6.6]. Moreover he gives a new perspective on partitioned assemblies by embedding BCOs into indexed preorders in such a way that the total category of the indexed preorder associated to a BCO arising from an OPCA is precisely the category of partitioned assemblies over the OPCA.

Since we are only interested in non-ordered PCAs we adapt Hofstra’s analysis by restricting attention to non-ordered BCOs, which we call discrete combinatory objects
(DCOs). This way we obtain a characterization of PCAs among DCOs in analogy to Hofstra’s characterization of OPCAs among BCOs (Corollary 2.15), and moreover there is an easy description of the indexed preorders arising from DCOs (Proposition 2.4), so that in combination we can identify PCAs with a class of indexed preorders. To obtain a characterization of categories of partitioned assemblies it remains to characterize the total categories of these indexed preorders, which we do by identifying certain properties of these total categories which allow to reconstruct the indexed preorders, and thus the PCAs.

A crucial insight here is that whereas indexed preorders can generally not be reconstructed from their total categories, those which arise from PCAs can, since in this case the forgetful functor from the total category (which is the necessary additional datum to reconstruct the indexed preorder) coincides with the global sections functor. To capture this phenomenon we introduce the notions of shallow indexed preorder (Section 2.1) and local category (Section 3).

1.1 Related work

The present work, and Hofstra’s analysis of OPCAs in terms of BCOs, fit into a line of work whose general theme is to first generalize the construction of realizability models (triposes, toposes, assemblies) from PCAs to a more general class of ‘combinatory structures’ and then to identify conditions on these structures which ensure certain logical properties of the model [LS02, Bir00, RR01]. In particular, Robinson and Rosolini [RR01, Corollary 2] give necessary and sufficient conditions for the realizability categories over a specific type of categories of partial maps to be locally cartesian closed, and Lietz and Streicher [LS02, Theorem 4.2] – and in a similar form Birkedal [Bir00, Corollary 5.3] – show that realizability categories over certain typed combinatory structures are toposes if and only if the structures have a ‘universal type’.

The main novelty of the present work is the reconstruction of the combinatory structure from the realizability category, which allows an intrinsic characterization without reference to the combinatory structure. This in turn leads to concepts related to Menni’s axiomatic approach [Men03, Men02] to the study of realizability-like exact completions, see Remark 3.4-4.

2 Discrete combinatory objects

As pointed out above, DCOs are the trivially ordered special case of Hofstra’s BCOs. In the following (before Definition 2.3) we recall basic definitions and results, which simplify considerably in the absence of ordering. We refer to Hofstra for proofs, but the arguments are straightforward and the readers are encouraged to reconstruct them themselves. Proposition 2.4 is new, the author is not aware of an analogous result for BCOs. Before introducing DCOs we establish some conventions concerning partial functions.

Conventions 2.1 (Partial functions and partial terms) Throughout the rest of the article we perform calculations with partial functions both unapplied/compositionally, and applied/applicatively.

In the unapplied form we view partial functions as represented by their graphs, which we compare via subset inclusion and compose like functions and relations. The cartesian product of sets and functions extends to a tensor product on partial functions by setting

\[ f \times g = \{(a, b, c, d) \mid (a, c) \in f, (b, d) \in g\} : A \times B \to C \times D \]
for \( f : A \to C \) and \( g : B \to D \). The pairing operation \((\cdot, \cdot)\), given by
\[
(f, h) = (f \times h) \circ \delta_A \quad \text{for} \quad f : A \to B \quad \text{and} \quad h : A \to C,
\]
satisfies the usual equations \((k \times l) \circ (f, h) = (k \circ f, l \circ h)\) and 
\((f, h) \circ m = \langle f \circ m, h \circ m \rangle\), as well as the inclusions \(\pi_1 \circ (f, h) \subseteq f\) and \(\pi_2 \circ (f, h) \subseteq h\), which become equalities whenever the eliminated term is total.

When reasoning applicatively – i.e. with partially defined terms – the statement \(t \downarrow\)
asserts that the term \(t\) is defined, and \(s = t\) states that both \(s\) and \(t\) are defined and equal. Equality of graphs is represented by the expression \(s \equiv t\) which is a shorthand for \(s \downarrow \lor t \downarrow \Rightarrow s = t\), and inclusion of graphs is expressed as \(s \subseteq t\), which is a shorthand for \(s \downarrow \Rightarrow s = t\).

\[\Box\]

**Definition 2.2**  1. A **discrete combinatorial object** (DCO) is a pair \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) where \(A\) is a set and \(\mathcal{F}_A\) is a set of partial endofunctions on \(A\) which contains \(\text{id}_A\), and such that for all \(\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{F}_A\) there exists a \(\gamma \in \mathcal{F}_A\) with \(\beta \circ \alpha \subseteq \gamma\).  
2. A **DCO morphism** from \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) to \((B, \mathcal{F}_B)\) is a function \(f : A \to B\) such that for all \(\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_A\) there exists a \(\beta \in \mathcal{F}_B\) with \(f \circ \alpha \subseteq \beta \circ f\).  
3. For DCO morphisms \(f, g : (A, \mathcal{F}_A) \to (B, \mathcal{F}_B)\), we define \(f \leq g\) if there exists a \(\beta \in \mathcal{F}_B\) with \(\beta \circ f = g\). In this case, we call \(\beta\) a realizer of the inequality \(f \leq g\).

It is easy to see that DCO morphisms compose, and that the relation defined in 3 is reflexive and transitive and preserved by composition on both sides. Thus, DCOs form a locally ordered category \(\text{DCO}\), which furthermore has a terminal object \(1 = (1, \{\text{id}\})\) and binary 2-products given by
\[
(A, \mathcal{F}_A) \times (B, \mathcal{F}_B) = (A \times B, \mathcal{F}_A \otimes \mathcal{F}_B)
\]
where \(\mathcal{F}_A \otimes \mathcal{F}_B = \{\alpha \times \beta \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{F}_A, \beta \in \mathcal{F}_B\}\).

Analogous statements for BCOs can be found in [Hof06, Section 2].

Given a DCO \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) and a set \(I\), we define a preorder on functions \(\varphi, \psi : I \to A\) by setting \(\varphi \leq \psi\) if there exists an \(\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_A\) with \(\alpha \circ \varphi = \psi\). Again, we call \(\alpha\) a realizer of the inequality in this situation. The construction is contravariantly functorial in \(I\) and thus gives rise to a **split indexed preorder**, i.e. a contravariant functor
\[
\text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A) : \text{Set}^{\text{op}} \to \text{Ord}, \quad I \mapsto (A^I, \leq)
\]
from \(\text{Set}\) into the locally ordered category \(\text{Ord}\) of preorders and monotone maps. We call \(\text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) the **family fibration** of \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\). The assignment \((A, \mathcal{F}_A) \mapsto \text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) extends to a 2-functor
\[
\text{fam}(\cdot) : \text{DCO} \to \text{IOrd}
\]
into the locally ordered category \(\text{IOrd}\) of indexed preorders and pseudo-natural transformations. This 2-functor is a local equivalence\(^1\) – as Hofstra shows for BCOs [Hof06, Proposition 3.1] – and is easily seen to preserve finite 2-products. Moreover, there is a straightforward characterization of the essential image of \(\text{fam}(\cdot)\), using the following definition.

**Definition 2.3** Let \(\mathcal{P} : \text{Set}^{\text{op}} \to \text{Ord}\), \(A \in \text{Set}\), and \(\mu \in \mathcal{P}(A)\).

\(^1\)I.e. the monotone map \(\text{DCO}((A, \mathcal{F}_A), (B, \mathcal{F}_B)) \to \text{IOrd}(\text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A), \text{fam}(B, \mathcal{F}_B))\) is an equivalence of preorders for all DCOs \((A, \mathcal{F}_A), (B, \mathcal{F}_B)\).
1. $\mu$ is called discrete, if for any span $I \leftarrow J \rightarrow A$ of functions with $e$ surjective, and any $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(I)$ such that $e^*\varphi \leq f^*\mu$, there exists a (necessarily unique) $h : I \rightarrow A$ such that $he = f$ and $\varphi \leq h^*\mu$.

2. $\mu$ is called a generic predicate, if for any set $I$ and any $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(I)$ there exists a (not necessarily unique) function $f : I \rightarrow A$ with $\varphi \cong f^*\mu$. $\diamond$

**Proposition 2.4** An indexed preorder $\mathcal{P}$ is in the essential image of $\text{fam}(-)$ if and only if it has a discrete generic predicate.

**Proof.** First, let $(A, \mathcal{F}_A)$ be a DCO. The identity map $\text{id}_A \in A^A$ is a generic predicate of $\text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A)$ since every predicate $\varphi : I \rightarrow A$ can be represented as $\varphi^*(\text{id}_A) = \text{id}_A \circ \varphi$.

To show that $\text{id}_A$ is discrete, assume that $e^*(\varphi) \leq f^*(\text{id}_A)$ for a span $I \leftarrow J \rightarrow A$ with surjective $e$. By definition of the order on $A^I$, there exists an $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_A$ with $\alpha \circ \varphi \circ e = f$, and the required mediator $g : I \rightarrow A$ is given by $\alpha \circ \varphi$.

Conversely, let $\mathcal{P}$ be an indexed preorder with discrete generic predicate $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(A)$. Every partial function $\alpha \subseteq A \times A$ gives rise to a span $A \leftarrow \alpha \rightarrow A$, and the partial functions $\alpha$ satisfying $d^*(\mu) \leq a^*(\mu)$ form a DCO structure $\mathcal{F}_A$ on $A$. The assignment $(f : I \rightarrow A) \mapsto f^*(\mu)$ defines an indexed monotone map $\Phi : \text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, which is essentially surjective since $\mathcal{P}$ has a generic predicate. To show that $\Phi$ is fiberwise order-reflecting, let $f, g : I \rightarrow A$ such that $f^*(\mu) \leq g^*(\mu)$ and consider the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{f} & I \\
\downarrow{m} & & \downarrow{e} \\
U & \xleftarrow{h} & A
\end{array}
\]

where $m \circ e$ is a surjective/injective factorization of $f$. Since $e^*(m^*\mu) \leq g^*\mu$ and $\mu$ is discrete, there exists an $h : U \rightarrow A$ with $he = g$ and $m^*\mu \leq h^*\mu$. The span $(m, h)$ constitutes a partial function in $\mathcal{F}_A$ witnessing the inequality $f \leq g$ in $\text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A)$. $\blacksquare$

**Remark 2.5 (Saturation)** Calling a DCO $(A, \mathcal{F}_A)$ saturated if $\mathcal{F}_A$ is a lower set in $\mathcal{P}(A \times A)$, it is easy to see that every DCO is isomorphic to a saturated one—its saturation—obtained by down-closing $\mathcal{F}_A$ in $\mathcal{P}(A \times A)$. While the second condition in Definition 2.2-1 can be read as a weak closure under composition of $\mathcal{F}_A$, it turns out that if $(A, \mathcal{F}_A)$ is saturated then $\mathcal{F}_A$ is even closed under composition in the strong sense. The DCOS constructed from indexed preorders in the proof of Proposition 2.4 are always saturated, but the DCOS defined from PCAs below in Definition 2.8 are not, and saturation is not preserved by the product operation given after Definition 2.2 (though a saturated product can of course be obtained by down-closing). $\diamond$

### 2.1 Shallow and cartesian DCOS

We call an indexed preorder $\mathcal{C} : \text{Set}^{op} \rightarrow \text{Ord}$ shallow if $\mathcal{C}(1) \simeq 1$, i.e. the fiber over the singleton is equivalent to the terminal preorder. A DCO $(A, \mathcal{F}_A)$ is called shallow, if $\text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A)$ is a shallow indexed preorder.

A cartesian DCO is a cartesian object in the locally ordered category DCO, i.e. a DCO $(A, \mathcal{F}_A)$ such that the maps

$$!_A : (A, \mathcal{F}_A) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_A : (A, \mathcal{F}_A) \rightarrow (A, \mathcal{F}_A) \times (A, \mathcal{F}_A)$$
have right adjoints

\[ \top : 1 \to (A, \mathcal{F}_A) \quad \text{and} \quad \land : (A, \mathcal{F}_A) \times (A, \mathcal{F}_A) \to (A, \mathcal{F}_A). \]

Since \( \text{fam}(\neg) \) is a local equivalence and preserves finite 2-products, \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) is a cartesian DCO if and only if \( \text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A) \) is a cartesian DCO if and only if \( \text{fam}(\text{stable under reindexing}) \) which is in turn equivalent to \( \text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A) \) having fiberwise finite meets which are stable under reindexing. In particular, given a cartesian DCO \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) and a set \( I \), binary meets and a greatest element in \( \text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A)(I) = (A^I, \leq) \) are given by

\[ \top_I = (I \to 1 \to A) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi \land_I \psi = (I \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle \to A \times A \xrightarrow{\land} A) \quad \text{for} \ \varphi, \psi : I \to A. \]

The following lemma characterizes shallow cartesian DCOs.

**Lemma 2.6** A DCO \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) is shallow and cartesian if and only if

1. \( A \) is inhabited and \( \mathcal{F}_A \) contains all constant functions \( c_a \) for \( a \in A \), and
2. there exists a function \( \land : A \times A \to A \) and \( \lambda, \rho \in \mathcal{F}_A \) such that
   (a) for all \( a, b \in A \) we have \( \lambda(a \land b) = a \) and \( \rho(a \land b) = b \), and
   (b) for all \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{F}_A \) there exists a \( \gamma \in \mathcal{F}_A \) with \( \land \circ (\alpha, \beta) \subseteq \gamma \).

**Proof.** Condition 1 is easily seen to be equivalent to \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) being shallow and \((A, \mathcal{F}_A) \to 1\) having a right adjoint. In the following we show that 2 is equivalent to the existence of a right adjoint to \( \delta_A : (A, \mathcal{F}_A) \to (A, \mathcal{F}_A) \times (A, \mathcal{F}_A) \).

Given a right adjoint \( \land \) to \( \delta_A \), we take \( \lambda \) and \( \rho \) to be realizers of \( \land \leq \pi_1 \) and \( \land \leq \pi_2 \), respectively, so that (a) is satisfied. Given \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{F}_A \), let \( U \subseteq A \) be the intersection of the domains of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) (which is precisely the domain of \( \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \)), and let \( \iota, \varphi, \psi : U \to A \) be respectively the inclusion and the restrictions of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) to \( U \). Then \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) realize \( \iota \leq \varphi \) and \( \iota \leq \psi \), and for \( \gamma \) a realizer of \( \iota \leq \varphi \wedge \psi \) we have \( \gamma \circ \iota = \varphi \wedge \psi \). The claim follows since \( \gamma \circ \iota \subseteq \gamma \) and \( \varphi \wedge \psi = \land \circ (\alpha, \beta) \).

Conversely assume that (a) and (b) hold. We show that for any set \( I \) and \( \varphi, \psi : I \to A \) the function \( \land \circ \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle \) is a meet of \( \varphi \) and \( \psi \) in \( \text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A)(I) \). The partial functions \( \lambda \) and \( \rho \) realize \( \land \circ \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle \leq \varphi \) and \( \land \circ \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle \leq \psi \). Let \( \theta : I \to A \) and let \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) be realizers of \( \theta \leq \varphi \) and \( \theta \leq \psi \). Let \( \gamma \in \mathcal{F}_A \) such that \( \gamma \supseteq \land \circ (\alpha, \beta) \). Precomposing with \( \theta \) on both sides gives \( \gamma \circ \theta \supseteq \land \circ (\alpha \circ \theta, \beta \circ \theta) = \land \circ \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle \) and since the right hand side is total, the two are equal.

An easy consequence of the lemma is that every non-trivial cartesian DCO is infinite, since \( \land \) and \( \langle \lambda, \rho \rangle \) exhibit \( A \times A \) as a retract of \( A \).

### 2.2 PCAs and functionally complete DCOs

**Definition 2.7** 1. A partial applicative structure (PAS) is a set \( \mathcal{A} \) with a partial binary operation

\[ (-, -) : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A} \]

called application. A polynomial over \( \mathcal{A} \) is a term \( t[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \) built up from variables \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \), constants in \( \mathcal{A} \), and application.
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2. A partial combinatory algebra (PCA) is a PAS $\mathcal{A}$ such that for every polynomial $t[x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}]$ there exists an $e \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$e \cdot a_1 \ldots a_n \downarrow \quad \text{and} \quad t[a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}] \preceq e \cdot a_1 \ldots a_{n+1}$$

for all $a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1} \in \mathcal{A}$. ◇

It follows from the definition that every PCA $(\mathcal{A}, \cdot)$ contains elements $k, p, p_0, p_1$ satisfying $k \cdot a \cdot b = a$, $p_0 \cdot (p \cdot a \cdot b) = a$, and $p_1 \cdot (p \cdot a \cdot b) = b$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ (in particular, $k \cdot a$ and $p \cdot a \cdot b$ are always defined, see [vO08, Section 1.1]).

As mentioned in the introduction, the above definition of PCA is more general than the traditional one; the latter is obtained by replacing the symbol $\preceq$ by $\simeq$.

Definition 2.8 Let $(\mathcal{A}, \cdot)$ be a PCA. The set $\mathscr{F}_\mathcal{A}$ of computable functions over $\mathcal{A}$ is the set of partial functions

$$\phi_a : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A} \quad \text{defined by} \quad \phi_a(b) \simeq a \cdot b$$

for $a \in \mathcal{A}$. The pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathscr{F}_\mathcal{A})$ is a DCO which we call the DCO induced by $(\mathcal{A}, \cdot)$. ◇

Lemma 2.9 The DCO $(\mathcal{A}, \mathscr{F}_\mathcal{A})$ is shallow and cartesian for every PCA $(\mathcal{A}, \cdot)$.

Proof. We verify the conditions of Lemma 2.6. We have already seen that $\mathcal{A}$ is inhabited, and constant functions are computable using $k$. The partial functions $\lambda$ and $\rho$ are given by $\phi_{p_0}$ and $\phi_{p_1}$, and $\land$ is given by $a \land b = p \cdot a \cdot b$. It remains to show that for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists a $c \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\land \circ (\phi_a, \phi_b) \subseteq \phi_c$, i.e. $p \cdot (a \cdot x) \cdot (b \cdot x) \preceq c \cdot x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}$. Such a $c$ exists by the definition of PCA. ■

To characterize the shallow cartesian DCOs that arise from PCAs, we introduce the following concept (adapted from [Ho06, Proposition 6.3 (ii)]).

Definition 2.10 A cartesian DCO $(\mathcal{A}, \mathscr{F}_\mathcal{A})$ is called functionally complete, if there exists an $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathscr{F}_\mathcal{A}$ (called the universal function) such that for every $a \in \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ there exists a total $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ satisfying

$$\alpha(a \land b) \preceq \hat{\alpha}(\hat{\alpha}(a) \land b)$$

for all $a, b \in A$. ◇

Remark 2.11 The functional completeness condition above resembles the notion of weak partial evaluation in [RR01, Definition 3], and condition (ii) in [Ho06, Proposition 6.3]. The ‘weak closure’ condition in [Bir00, Definition 2.3] is stronger, since it replaces the inclusion (2.1) of partial functions by an equality. ◇

Lemma 2.12 DCOs $(\mathcal{A}, \mathscr{F}_\mathcal{A})$ induced by PCAs are functionally complete.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a PCA there exists an $e \in \mathcal{A}$ with $(p_0 \cdot a) \cdot (p_1 \cdot a) \preceq e \cdot a$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}$, which implies $a \cdot b \preceq e \cdot (p \cdot a \cdot b)$ for $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. We define the universal function by $\hat{\alpha} = \phi_e$. Now given $r \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists a $\hat{r} \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\hat{r} \cdot a \downarrow$ and $r \cdot (p \cdot a \cdot b) \preceq \hat{r} \cdot a \cdot b$ for $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. This implies $\phi_r(a \land b) \preceq \hat{\alpha}(\phi_r(a) \land b)$. ■

Example 2.13 The set of primitive recursive functions constitutes a shallow cartesian DCO structure on $\mathbb{N}$ which is not functionally complete – the existence of a universal primitive recursive function would lead to a contradiction by diagonalization. ◇
Any functionally complete DCO \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) gives rise to a PAS \((A, \cdot)\) where the partial application is given by
\[
a \cdot b \simeq \oplus(a \land b) \quad \text{for } a, b \in A.
\]

In the following lemma we show that this gives a PCA if \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) is shallow.

**Lemma 2.14** Let \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) be cartesian, shallow, and functionally complete.
1. For any polynomial \(t[x_1, \ldots, x_n]\) over the induced PAS \((A, \cdot)\) there exists an \(\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_A\) with
\[
t[a_1, \ldots, a_n] \simeq \alpha(\top \land a_1 \land \cdots \land a_n)
\]
for \(a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A\) (by convention \(\land\) associates to the left).
2. For any \(\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_A\) and \(n > 0\) there exists an \(e \in A\) such that
\[
e \cdot a_1 \ldots a_{n-1} \downarrow \text{ and } \alpha(\top \land a_1 \land \cdots \land a_n) \simeq e \cdot a_1 \ldots a_n
\]
for \(a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A\).
3. \((A, \cdot)\) is a PCA, and \(id_A\) constitutes an isomorphism between \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) and the induced DCO.

**Proof.** The first claim is shown by induction on the structure of \(t[x_1, \ldots, x_n]\).

If \(t[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \equiv x_i\) then \(\alpha = \rho \circ \lambda^{x_i-1}\). If \(t[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \equiv a\) for \(a \in A\), then \(\alpha\) is given by the constant function \(\zeta_a\).

If \(t[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \equiv u[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \cdot v[x_1, \ldots, x_n]\), then by assumption there exist \(\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{F}_A\) such that \(\alpha(a^*) \succeq u[a_1, \ldots, a_n]\) and \(\beta(a^*) \succeq v[a_1, \ldots, a_n]\) for \(a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A\) and \(a^* = \top \land a_1 \land \cdots \land a_n\). By Lemma 2.6 there exists a \(\gamma \in \mathcal{F}_A\) such that \(\gamma \succeq \bigcirc (\alpha, \beta)\), and the calculation
\[
(\bigcirc \gamma)(a^*) \succeq \bigcirc(\land((\alpha, \beta)(a^*))) \succeq \alpha(a^*) \cdot \beta(a^*) \succeq u[a_1, \ldots, a_n] \cdot v[a_1, \ldots, a_n]
\]
shows that \(\bigcirc \gamma\) has the required property.

For the second claim set \(\alpha_0 = \alpha\) and \(\alpha_{i+1} = \tilde{\alpha}_i\) for \(i \leq n\). Then \(\alpha_i\) is total for \(i > 0\), and we have
\[
\alpha_{i+1}(\top \land a_1 \land \cdots \land a_{n-i}) \cdot a_{n-i} = \alpha_i(\top \land a_1 \land \cdots \land a_{n-i})
\]
for \(0 < i \leq n\), and
\[
\alpha_1(\top \land a_1 \land \cdots \land a_{n-1}) \cdot a_n \succeq \alpha(\top \land a_1 \land \cdots \land a_n).
\]

With \(e = \alpha_n(\top)\) the claim follows by iterating.

Claims 1 and 2 together imply that \((A, \cdot)\) is a PCA. To show that the induced DCO structure is isomorphic to \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\), we show that for every \(\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_A\) there exists an \(e \in A\) with \(\alpha \simeq \phi_e\) and vice versa. For \(\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_A\) and \(a \in A\) we have
\[
\alpha(a) \simeq (\alpha \rho)(\top \land a) \succeq \bigcirc((\alpha \circ \rho)(\top) \land a) \simeq (\alpha \circ \rho)(\top) \cdot a,
\]
thus the required element is given by \((\check{\alpha} \cdot \rho)(\top)\). Conversely, \(\phi_e \in \mathcal{F}_A\) for any \(e \in A\) since it can be represented as \(\bigcirc \cdot (\zeta_e, \text{id})\).  

**Corollary 2.15** Up to isomorphism, the DCOs induced by PCAs are characterized by the fact that they are cartesian, shallow, and functionally complete.
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Proof. Lemmas 2.9 and 2.12 say that the DCOs induced by PCAs are cartesian, shallow and functionally complete. Conversely, Lemma 2.14 establishes that any DCO having the three properties arises up to isomorphism from a PCA structure on the same carrier set. □

Remark 2.16 As shown in [Fre13, Corollary 4.10.7], dropping the shallowness condition in the corollary yields a characterization of DCOs induced by inclusions of PCAs, analogous to Hofstra’s characterization of filtered OPCAs among BCOs [Hof06, Proposition 6.6]. ◊

3 Partitioned assemblies and local categories

Definition 3.1 1. The total category \( \int P \) of an indexed preorder \( P \) has pairs \((I \in \text{Set}, \varphi \in P(I))\) as objects, and functions \( f : I \to J \) satisfying \( \varphi \leq f^* \psi \) as morphisms from \((I, \varphi)\) to \((J, \psi)\).

2. The category \( \text{PAsm}(A, \mathcal{F}_A) \) of partitioned assemblies over a DCO \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) is the total category \( \int \text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A) \) of its family fibration. ◊

This definition of partitioned assemblies generalizes the traditional one in that if \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) is a DCO induced by a PCA, then \( \text{PAsm}(A, \mathcal{F}_A) \) is equal to the category of partitioned assemblies over \((A, \cdot)\) as defined e.g. in [Men02, Definition 2.8] (the original definition [CFS88, before Proposition 2] is slightly different, but is easily seen to be equivalent).

The total category \( \int \mathcal{C} \) of a cartesian indexed preorder \( \mathcal{C} \) has finite limits: binary products and a terminal object are given by

\[
(I, \varphi) \times (J, \psi) = (I \times J, \pi_1^* \varphi \land \pi_2^* \psi) \quad \text{and} \quad 1 = (1, \top),
\]

and an equalizer of \( f, g : (I, \varphi) \to (J, \psi) \) is given by \( m : (U, m^* \varphi) \to (I, \varphi) \) where \( m : U \to I \) is the equalizer of \( f \) and \( g \) in \( \text{Set}^2 \).

Furthermore there is an adjunction

\[
|\cdot| \dashv \nabla : \text{Set} \to \int \mathcal{C} \quad \text{given by} \quad |(I, \varphi)| = I \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla(I) = (I, \top).
\]

The left adjoint \(|\cdot|\) is obviously faithful, and if \( \mathcal{C} \) is shallow it coincides with the global sections functor

\[
\Gamma = (\int \mathcal{C})(1, -) : \int \mathcal{C} \to \text{Set},
\]

which makes \( \int \mathcal{C} \) a well-pointed local category:

Definition 3.2 A local category is a locally small finite-limit category \( \mathcal{C} \) whose global sections functor has a right adjoint \( \nabla \). If \( \Gamma \) is faithful, we call \( \mathcal{C} \) well-pointed local. ◊

The adjunction \( \Gamma \dashv \nabla \) is a reflection for every local category \( \mathcal{C} \), since

\[
\Gamma \nabla I = \mathcal{C}(1, \nabla I) \cong \text{Set}(\Gamma 1, I) \cong \text{Set}(1, I) \cong I
\]

for all sets \( I \). Since both \( \nabla \) and \( \Gamma \) preserve limits, \( \Gamma \dashv \nabla \) is in fact a localization (finite-limit preserving reflection), whence we can make sense of the sheaf theoretic terms dense, closed, and separated:

\[\text{This is an instance of the fact that the total category of a finite-limit fibration over a finite-limit base has finite limits [Str18, Theorem 8.5]}\]
Definition 3.3 Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a local category.
1. An arrow $f : B \to A$ in $\mathcal{C}$ is called
   • dense if $\Gamma f$ is bijective, and
   • closed if $\begin{array}{c} B \\ \downarrow \eta_B \end{array} \xrightarrow{f} \begin{array}{c} A \\ \downarrow \eta_A \end{array}$ is a pullback.
2. An object $G \in \mathcal{C}$ is called
   • separated, if $\eta_G : G \to \nabla \Gamma G$ is monic,
   • generic, if for every $C \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists a closed $f : C \to G$, and
   • discrete, if it is right orthogonal to all closed maps over surjections, i.e. if for any span $\begin{array}{c} C \\ \leftarrow \downarrow \end{array} \xrightarrow{e} \begin{array}{c} D \\ \downarrow f \end{array} \xrightarrow{g} G$ with $e$ closed and $\Gamma e$ surjective there exists a unique $g : C \to G$ with $ge = f$.

Remarks 3.4
1. It is well known [CHK85] that for every localization, the dense and closed maps form a stable reflective factorization system, in particular the dense maps are stable under pullback and satisfy 3-for-2.
2. A morphism $f : (I, \varphi) \to (J, \psi)$ in the total category of a shallow cartesian indexed preorder $\mathcal{C}$ is dense if and only if $f$ is a bijection, and closed precisely if $\varphi \cong f^* \psi$. The object $(I, \varphi)$ is respectively generic or discrete in $\int \mathcal{C}$ precisely if $\varphi$ is so as a predicate in $\mathcal{C}$.
3. As a left adjoint, $\Gamma$ preserves epimorphisms. Conversely, if $f : B \to A$ is closed and $\Gamma f$ is surjective then by the axiom of choice it has a section, which implies that $f$ is split epic since split epimorphisms are stable under arbitrary functors and pullbacks. Thus in presence of choice, discrete objects are precisely those which are right orthogonal to closed epis. In well-pointed local categories this is even true without choice, since faithful functors reflect epis.
4. Local categories are instances of the notion of chaotic situation introduced by Menni in [Men02], from where we also adapted the concept of ‘generic object’. Menni’s article is closely related to the present work in that it is concerned with the relationship between partitioned assemblies and realizability toposes, elaborating on prior (but later published) work [Men03] by the same author.

Lemma 3.5 The following are equivalent for a local category $\mathcal{C}$.
1. $\mathcal{C}$ is well pointed.
2. All dense maps in $\mathcal{C}$ are monos.
3. All objects are separated.
4. (If $\mathcal{C}$ has a generic object $G$) $G$ is separated.

Proof. 1 implies 2 since faithful functors reflect monomorphisms, and 2 implies 3 since the maps $\eta_A : A \to \nabla \Gamma A$ are dense. 3 and 1 are equivalent since the unit of an adjunction is componentwise monic if and only if the left adjoint is faithful [ML98, Theorem IV.3.1]. Finally, if $\mathcal{C}$ has a separated generic object then all objects are separated since monos are stable under pullback.

Proposition 3.6 A category $\mathcal{C}$ is equivalent to partitioned assemblies over a shallow cartesian DCO precisely if it is well-pointed local and has a discrete generic object $G$. 
Proof. Given a shallow cartesian DCO \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\), we have seen that \(\text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) is shallow and cartesian and that \(\mu \in \text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A)(A)\) is discrete and generic. Then the total category \(\int \text{fam}(A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) is well-pointed local by the remarks before Definition 3.2, and \((A, \mu)\) is a discrete generic object by Remark 3.4.

Conversely, assume that \(\mathcal{C}\) is well-pointed local with discrete generic object \(G\). By Proposition 2.4, Remark 3.4, and since \(\text{fam}(\cdot)\) reflects shallowness and cartesianness, it is sufficient to exhibit a shallow and cartesian indexed preorder \(\mathcal{C}\) such that \(\int \mathcal{C} \simeq \mathcal{C}\). Elements of \(\mathcal{C}(I)\) are dense maps \(U \hookrightarrow \nabla I\), ordered by inclusion, and reindexing along \(f\) is given by pullback along \(\nabla f\). It is clear that all \(\mathcal{C}(I)\) have – and all \(f^*\) preserve – finite meets, so to conclude that \(\mathcal{C}\) is a cartesian indexed preorder it remains to verify that all \(\mathcal{C}(I)\) are (essentially) small. To this end we embed \(\mathcal{C}(I)\) into \(\text{Set}(I, \Gamma G)\) by sending every dense \(U \hookrightarrow A\) to \(\chi_u = (I \xrightarrow{c^{-1}} \Gamma \nabla I \xrightarrow{(\Gamma U)^{-1}} \Gamma U \xrightarrow{\Gamma c} \Gamma G)\), where \(c : U \rightarrow G\) is closed. In the commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
U & \xrightarrow{\eta_U} & \nabla I \\
\downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow \\
\nabla \Gamma U & \xrightarrow{\nabla \Gamma c} & \nabla \Gamma G
\end{array}
\]

the outer trapezoid is a pullback since the inner right one is and the two lower left maps are isomorphisms. This shows that \(u \cong (\nabla \chi_u)^* \eta_G\), i.e. we can reconstruct \(u\) up to isomorphism from \(\chi_u\).

To see that \(\mathcal{C}\) is shallow let \(U \rightarrow 1\) be dense. Then \(\Gamma U = 1\), i.e. \(U\) has a point which implies \(1 \cong U\).

Finally we have \(\int \mathcal{C} \simeq \mathcal{C}\) since the assignments \(C \mapsto (\Gamma C, \eta_C)\) and \((I, U \rightarrow \nabla I) \mapsto U\) extend to functors \(J : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \int \mathcal{C}\) and \(K : \int \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\) satisfying \(KJ = \text{id}_\mathcal{C}\) and \(JK \cong \text{id}\int \mathcal{C}\).

Recall from [CR00, Remark 3.2] that a finite-limit category \(\mathcal{C}\) is called weakly locally cartesian closed (w.l.c.c.) if for all arrows \(b : B \rightarrow J\) and \(u : J \rightarrow I\) the presheaf \((\mathcal{C}/J)(u^* - , b) : (\mathcal{C}/I)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}\) is weakly representable (i.e. covered by a representable presheaf). In this case we call any weakly representing object in \(\mathcal{C}/I\) a weak dependent product of \(b\) along \(u\). A weak exponential of \(B, C \in \mathcal{C}\) is an object which weakly represents the presheaf \(\mathcal{C}(- \times B, C)\). W.l.c.c. categories do in particular have weak exponentials, and so do all their slices.

The following result is similar to [RR01, Corollary 2]\(^3\).

**Proposition 3.7** A cartesian DCO \((A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) is functionally complete if and only if the category \(\text{PAsm}(A, \mathcal{F}_A)\) is w.l.c.c.

\(^3\) See also the longer draft version [DMRR] containing full proofs.
Let $@$ be a realizer of $\varepsilon$. We have
$$K = \{(i \in I, f \in \prod_{j \in J_i} B_j, a \in A) \mid \forall j \in J_i : @((a \land \varphi_j) = \psi(fj))\}
$$
and $p(i, f, a) = i(i) \land a$.

Conversely assume that $\mathbf{PAsm}(A, fA)$ is w.l.c.c., let $E = \{(\alpha, a, b) \mid \alpha : A \to A, f(a) = b\}$, and let $F = (A \to A)$ be the set of partial endofunctions on $A$. Define $\varphi, \psi : A \to A$ by $\varphi(a, a, b) = a$ and $\psi(a, a, b) = b$, respectively. Let $e_1 : (E, \varphi) \to \nabla F$ and $e_2 : (E, \psi) \to \nabla F$ be defined by $e_1(a, a, b) = e_2(a, a, b) = \alpha$. Let $f_X : (X, \xi) \to \nabla F$ together with $\varepsilon : (X, \xi) \times \nabla F (E, \varphi) \to (E, \psi)$ be a weak exponential of $e_1$ and $e_2$ in $\text{fam}(A, fA)/\nabla F$, where

$$(X, \xi) \times \nabla F (E, \varphi) = (X \times_F E, \xi \land_F \varphi) \quad \text{with}
\quad (\xi \land_F \varphi)(x, c) = \xi(x) \land \varphi(c).$$

Let $@$ be a realizer of $\varepsilon$, so that $\psi \circ \varepsilon = @ \circ (\xi \land_F \varphi)$. To show that $@$ is a universal function let $\alpha \in fA$ and define $f : (A, id) \to \nabla F$ by $f(a) = \alpha(a \land \neg \cdot)$. A pullback of $f$ and $e_1$ is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(S, \theta) & \overset{k}{\longrightarrow} & (E, \varphi) \\
\lambda \downarrow & & \downarrow e_1 \\
(A, id) & \overset{f}{\longrightarrow} & \nabla F
\end{array}
$$

where $h$ and $k$ are realized by $\lambda$ and $\rho$, respectively. Define $g : (S, \theta) \to (E, \psi)$ with the same underlying function as $k$. Then $g$ is realized by $\alpha$. Let $\tilde{g} : (A, id) \to (X, \xi)$ be a weak exponential transpose, and let $\tilde{\alpha}$ be a realizer of $\tilde{g}$. The relevant data is summarized in the following diagram over $\nabla F$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(A, id) & \overset{\tilde{g}}{\longrightarrow} & (X, \xi) \\
\lambda \downarrow & & \tau_1 \downarrow \\
(S, \theta) & \overset{\tilde{g} \times_F id}{\longrightarrow} & (X \times_F E, \xi \land_F \varphi) \\
\rho \downarrow & & \tau_2 \downarrow \\
(E, \varphi) & \overset{id}{\longrightarrow} & (E, \varphi)
\end{array}
$$

where the left/upper labels of arrows are functions, and the right/lower labels are their realizers. We have

$$\psi \circ g = \psi \circ \varepsilon \circ (\tilde{g} \times_F id)
= @ \circ (\xi \land_F \varphi) \circ (\tilde{g} \times_F id)
= @ \circ \land \circ (\xi \circ \tilde{g} \circ h, \varphi \circ k)$$

and hence

$$c = \psi(g(a, b, c)) = @((\xi \circ \tilde{g} \circ h)(a, b, c) \land (\varphi \circ k)(a, b, c)) = @((\tilde{\alpha}(a) \land b))$$

for $(a, b, c) \in S$, which means precisely that $\alpha(a \land b) \leq \tilde{\alpha}(a) \land b$ for $a, b \in A$. $\blacksquare$
Combining the previous results, we get the following.

**Theorem 3.8** A category is equivalent to partitioned assemblies over a PCA if and only if it is w.l.c.c. and well-pointed local, and has a discrete generic object.

**Proof.** By Lemmas 2.12 and 2.14, PCAs can be identified with functionally complete shallow cartesian DCOs. Proposition 3.6 establishes a correspondence between shallow cartesian DCOs and well-pointed local categories with discrete generic objects, and by Proposition 3.7 a shallow cartesian DCO is functionally complete if and only if the corresponding local category is w.l.c.c. ■

Lemma 3.5 gives the following reformulation.

**Corollary 3.9** A category is equivalent to partitioned assemblies over a PCA if and only if it is w.l.c.c. and local, and has a separated discrete generic object. ■

## 4 Characterizing realizability toposes

In this section we derive a characterization of realizability toposes from Corollary 3.9 and the fact that realizability toposes are exact completions of partitioned assemblies. We start by recalling relevant facts about exact completion.

An exact category is a finite-limit category with pullback-stable regular-epi/mono factorizations, in which every equivalence relation is a kernel pair. Exact categories form a 2-category $\text{Ex}$ (1-cells are functors preserving finite limits and regular epis), and the inclusion functor $\text{Ex} \hookrightarrow \text{Lex}$ from exact into finite-limit (‘left exact’) categories has a left biadjoint known as exact completion $[\text{CC82}].$

An object $P$ in an exact category $X$ is called (regular) projective if for every regular epimorphism $e : Y \rightarrow X$ and every $f : P \rightarrow X$ there exists a $g : P \rightarrow Y$ with $eg = f$

![Diagram](image)

(we will drop the ‘regular’ and simply say ‘projective’). Using this concept, we can characterize exact completions$^4$.

**Theorem 4.1** 1. For any finite-limit category $\mathcal{C}$, the unit functor $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{ex}}$ is full and faithful, and its essential image coincides with the full subcategory $\text{Proj}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{ex}})$ of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{ex}}$ on projective objects.

2. An exact category $\mathcal{X}$ is (equivalent to) an exact completion if and only if it has enough projectives (i.e. every object $X$ can be covered by a projective $P$ via a regular epi $P \rightarrow X$), and $\text{Proj}(\mathcal{X})$ is closed under finite limits in $\mathcal{X}$. ■

$^4$The first reference that I could find for Theorem 4.1 is Robinson and Rosolini’s [RR90, Proposition 4.1]. There it is attributed to Joyal, Carboni, and Celia-Magno, but on my inquiry Rosolini told me that they discovered it themselves and learned later from Carboni that he already knew.
We observe that being an exact completion of a finite-limit category is a property of an exact category rather than additional structure. In particular, realizability toposes are exact completions:

**Theorem 4.2** The realizability topos $\text{RT}(A, \cdot)$ over a PCA $(A, \cdot)$ is equivalent to the exact completion of the category $\text{PAsm}(A, \cdot)$ of partitioned assemblies over $(A, \cdot)$. ■

This result depends on the axiom of choice. As mentioned in the introduction it was shown by Robinson and Rosolini [RR90, 2.2 and 4.2] for the effective topos. The generalization to arbitrary PCAs is straightforward; the statement can be found e.g. in [HvO03, Section 2.3] in even greater generality for OPCAs.

Combining Corollary 3.9 with the preceding theorems immediately gives us the following.

**Proposition 4.3** An exact category $X$ is equivalent to a realizability topos over a PCA precisely if it has enough projectives, projective objects are closed under finite limits in $X$, and $\text{Proj}(X)$ is a w.l.c.c. local category with a separated discrete generic object.

**Proof.** Realizability toposes $\text{RT}(A, \cdot)$ are exact completions of $\text{PAsm}(A, \cdot)$ by Theorem 4.2, and hence have enough projectives which are closed under finite limits by Theorem 4.1-2. By Theorem 4.1-1 we have $\text{Proj}(\mathbb{X}) \simeq \text{PAsm}(A, \cdot)$, and the latter category is w.l.c.c. local and has a separated discrete generic object by Corollary 3.9.

Conversely, assume that $X$ is exact, has enough projectives which are closed under finite limits, and $\text{Proj}(X)$ is w.l.c.c. local with separated discrete generic object. Then $\text{Proj}(X)$ is a category of partitioned assemblies by Corollary 3.9; $X$ is its exact completion by Theorem 4.1, and is thus equivalent to $\text{RT}(A, \cdot)$ by Theorem 4.2. ■

In the following we give a more elementary rephrasing of this result, by reformulating the conditions on $\text{Proj}(X)$ directly as conditions on $X$. For this we need the following lemma on exact completion of local categories.

**Lemma 4.4** If $X$ is an exact completion and $\text{Proj}(X)$ is local, then $X$ is local as well and the right adjoint to $\text{Proj}(X)(1, -)$ is given the right adjoint to $\text{Proj}(X)(1, -)$ composed with the inclusion $\text{Proj}(X) \hookrightarrow X$.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Set} & \xrightarrow{\Gamma} & \text{Proj}(X) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{Set} & \xrightarrow{1} & X \\
\end{array}
\]

**Proof.** Exact completion preserves local smallness since every hom-set $X(X, Y)$ can be presented as subquotient of $X(P, Q)$ for projective covers $P$ and $Q$ of $X$ and $Y$, respectively.

To see that $X(1, -)$ has the claimed right adjoint, let $X \in X$ and let $P \twoheadrightarrow X$ be a projective cover of $X$. Covering the kernel of $e$ by another projective $Q$ we can represent $X$ as a coequalizer

\[
Q \xrightarrow{f} P \twoheadrightarrow X.
\]

The functor $\Gamma : X \to \text{Set}$ is regular since $1$ is projective in $X$, hence

\[
\Gamma Q \xrightarrow{\Gamma f} \Gamma P \xrightarrow{\Gamma e} \Gamma X.
\]
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is a coequalizer as well. For $I \in \text{Set}$ we have

$$\mathbb{X}(X, \nabla I) \cong \{ h : P \to \nabla I \mid h \circ f = h \circ g \}$$

$$\cong \{ k : \Gamma P \to I \mid k \circ \Gamma f = k \circ \Gamma g \} \cong \text{Set}(\Gamma X, I)$$

which means that $\text{Set}(\Gamma - , I) : \mathbb{X}^{\text{op}} \to \text{Set}$ is represented by $\nabla I$.

Thus, if $\mathbb{X}$ is an exact completion of a local category then the localization on $\text{Proj}(\mathbb{X})$ is the restriction of the localization on $\mathbb{X}$, which means in particular that morphisms/objects in $\text{Proj}(\mathbb{X})$ are closed/dense/separated in $\text{Proj}(\mathbb{X})$ if and only if they are so in $\mathbb{X}$. The next lemma establishes the same fact for discreteness.

**Lemma 4.5** Let $\mathbb{X}$ be an exact completion of a local category. A projective object $D$ is discrete in $\mathbb{X}$ if and only if it is discrete in $\text{Proj}(\mathbb{X})$.

**Proof.** Clearly $D$ is discrete in $\text{Proj}(\mathbb{X})$ whenever it is in $\mathbb{X}$. Conversely assume that $D$ is discrete in $\text{Proj}(\mathbb{X})$, and let $u : Y \twoheadrightarrow X$ in $\mathbb{X}$ be closed with $\Gamma u$ surjective. Then $\Gamma u$ splits by the axiom of choice, and $u$ splits since split epics are stable under functors and pullbacks. Thus $u$ is in particular regular epic. Let $e : P \twoheadrightarrow X$ be a projective cover of $X$, and consider the following diagram.

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
Q & \xrightarrow{p} & Y \\
\downarrow v & & \downarrow \nabla \Gamma u \\
P & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & X \\
\end{array}\]

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
q & \xrightarrow{\eta_X} & \nabla \Gamma X \\
\end{array}\]

The square $(\ast)$ is the pullback of $u$ and $e$, and since both are regular epis it is also a pushout (easy exercise in regular categories, compare and contrast with the fact that a pullback square in an *abelian* category is a pushout already if one of the legs is an epi [Fre03, Section 2.5]). $Q$ is projective as pullback of the outer square, and $v$ is closed with surjective $\Gamma v$ since the same is true for $u$. Now let $f : Y \to D$. By discreteness of $D$ in projectives there exists a $g : P \to D$ with $fp = gv$, and since $(\ast)$ is a pushout there exists an $h : X \to D$ with $hu = f$ and $he = g$.

The preceding lemmas together with Carboni and Rosolini’s result [CR00] that an exact completion $\mathbb{X}$ is locally cartesian closed precisely if $\text{Proj}(\mathbb{X})$ is w.l.c.c. yield the following reformulation of Proposition 4.3.

**Theorem 4.6** A locally small category $\mathbb{X}$ is equivalent to a realizability topos over a PCA precisely if

1. $\mathbb{X}$ is exact and locally cartesian closed,
2. $\mathbb{X}$ has enough projectives and projective objects are closed under finite limits in $\mathbb{X}$,
3. $\Gamma : \mathbb{X} \to \text{Set}$ has a right adjoint factoring through $\text{Proj}(\mathbb{X}) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{X}$, and
4. there is a discrete and separated projective object $G$ admitting a closed map from any other projective.
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