ON THE EQUIVALENCE OF COLIMITS AND 2-COLIMITS.
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Abstract. We compare the colimit and 2-colimit of strict 2-functors in the 2-category of groupoids, over a certain type of posets. These posets are of special importance, as they correspond to coverings of a topological space. The main result of this paper, Theorem 2.1, gives conditions on the 2-functor \( \mathcal{F} \), for which \( \text{colim} \mathcal{F} \simeq 2\text{colim} \mathcal{F} \). One can easily see that any 2-functor \( \mathcal{F} \) can be deformed to a 2-functor \( \mathcal{F}' \), which satisfied the conditions of the theorem.

Introduction

Let \( X \) be a topological space and \( \mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I} \in \text{Cov}(U) \) an open covering of an open subset \( U \subseteq X \). We have shown in [3] that, under some small assumptions on \( X \), there is an equivalence of categories

\[ \Pi_1(U) \simeq 2\text{colim}_U \Pi_1 \simeq \text{colim}_U \Pi_1. \]

Of course, that \( \Pi_1(U) \) is isomorphic to \( \text{colim}_U \Pi_1 \) is an easy consequence of the famous reformulation of the classical Seifert-van Kampen theorem by Brown [1]. However, showing that \( \Pi_1(U) \) is equivalent to the 2-colimit, rather than the colimit, has some advantages. For one, this allowed us to axiomatise the fundamental groupoid in [3]. Additionally, it enables us to replace the participating groupoids \( \Pi_1(U_i) \) of the 2-colimit with equivalent ones, not just isomorphic ones. This is very helpful for calculations. We can usually replace groupoids with uncountable many objects, with groupoids having only finitely many objects. The downside is that, calculating a 2-colimit is harder than a colimit. The aim of this paper is alleviate this.

Let \( C \) be a boolean lattice associated to an open covering, seen as a 2-category, and \( \mathcal{F} : C \rightarrow \text{Gpd} \) a 2-functor in small groupoids. We will show in Theorem 2.1 that the colimit and 2-colimit of \( C \) are equivalent, if a certain injectivity condition is satisfied. Though this condition seems fairly restrictive, we like to point out that it only requires for certain functors to be injective on objects. It is an obvious and well-known fact that any functor \( \mathcal{F} : G \rightarrow H \) between groupoids (or categories) can easily be replaced with a functor \( \mathcal{F}' : G \rightarrow H' \) that is injective on objects. As such, this is only a theoretical restriction, that will not be a great hindrance in practice.

We will give a few small applications of this result in calculating the fundamental groupoid of a topological space. More applications will soon be demonstrated in an upcoming paper.

Lastly, we will also show that it is possible to truncate the 2-colimit at ‘depth 3’. That is, we can define a new poset \( C' \) from \( C \) which only consists of the elements with codimension at most 3. We have an equivalence of categories

\[ 2\text{colim} \mathcal{F} \simeq 2\text{colim} \mathcal{F}', \]

where \( \mathcal{F}' : C' \rightarrow \text{Gpd} \) is just the restriction of \( \mathcal{F} : C \rightarrow \text{Gpd} \). This result is an analogue of the classical result for colimits, where we can restrict ourselves to codimension at most 2.

1. Limits and 2-limits

1.1. Preliminaries on 2-Category Theory. We will give an abridged overview of the main ideas points of 2-category theory, which we will need for the purposes of this paper. The reader is advised that this only serves to fix notation, and should not be seen as introduction to this subject. Further, it should be pointed out that our terminology might differ from other sources.

A category \( C \), enriched in categories, is called a 2-category. That is to say, \( C \) has

- objects,
- morphisms (also called 1-cells) and
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{2-morphisms} (also called \textit{2-cells}).
\end{itemize}

For any two objects \(A, B \in \mathcal{C}\), \(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(A, B)\) is a category. For any triple \(A, B, C\), we have a \textit{composition functor} \(\varphi : \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(A, B) \times \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(B, C) \to \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(A, C)\), that satisfies a certain compatibility condition. That is, for any quadruple the obvious diagram commutes. We also have identity objects in the \(\text{Hom}\)-s, which we will not address. The 2-morphisms form a set and are functorial. We can also compose functors and 2-functors, which we will not discuss either.

A 2-category is called \textit{strict} if the composition functors \(\varphi : \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(A, B) \times \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(B, C) \to \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(A, C)\) are equivalences.

The main example of a (strict) 2-category is the 2-category of categories. This differs from the category of categories in that we do not forget natural transformations. They are the 2-morphisms.

The 2-categories that we will consider in this paper are all strict.

Let \(\mathcal{C}\) and \(\mathcal{D}\) be 2-categories. A \textit{2-functor} \(\mathfrak{F} : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}\) is a rule that assigns objects to objects, morphisms to morphisms and 2-morphisms to 2-morphisms. Composition of morphisms need not be respected. But for any chain \(A \xrightarrow{i} B \xrightarrow{j} C\), we have a 2-isomorphism \(\tau_{i,j} : \mathfrak{F}(j) \circ \mathfrak{F}(i) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{F}(j \circ i)\), such that obvious diagram commutes for any \(A \xrightarrow{i} B \xrightarrow{j} C \xrightarrow{k} D\). This is sometimes called the \textit{coherent compatibility condition}. The composition of 2-morphisms is respected.

A 2-functor between strict categories is \textit{strict} if the natural isomorphisms \(\tau_{i,j}\) are the identities. Note that we can regard any set as a category, where the morphisms are trivial. Similarly, we can regard any category as a 2-category where the 2-morphisms are trivial. This will always be strict. A functor \(\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}\) can be seen as a 2-functor in a natural way. This will always be strict as well.

For a 2-functor \(\mathfrak{F} : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}\), we can talk about 2-limits and 2-colimits. They are defined in much the same way as limits and colimits are defined for a functor. However, the associated diagrams are all 2-commutative. That is to say, they commute up to compatible natural isomorphisms. If the 2-functor \(\mathfrak{F}\) is strict, however, we can also talk about the limit and colimit of \(\mathfrak{F}\). The main idea of this paper is to compare the colimit and 2-colimit of a special type of strict 2-functors. Namely, when \(\mathcal{C}\) is coming from a post, induced by an open covering of a topological space, and \(\mathcal{D}\) is the 2-category of small groupoids. Though this is a very restrictive setting, it is also a very important one.

Given an open covering \(U := \{U_i\} \in I\) of a topological space, the fundamental groupoid \(\Pi_1\), seen as a groupoid, is going to be such a 2-functor. We have shown in [3] that \(\Pi_1 : \mathfrak{D}f(X) \to \mathbf{Gpd} U \mapsto \Pi_1(U)\) is a costack. That is to say, it satisfies a slightly reformulated version of the Seifert-van Kamen theorem, where \(\Pi_1(U) \simeq \lim_{\mathbf{U}} \Pi_1\) is an equivalence of groupoids. As such, being able to reduce the calculation of the 2-colimit to the colimit in such a case can be rather helpful.

\subsection{Limits and Colimits in Categories}

Let \(I\) be a poset, regarded as a category and let \(\Phi : I^{\text{op}} \to \text{Sets}\) a contravariant functor to the category of sets. For \(i \leq j\), let \(\phi_{ij} : \Phi(j) \to \Phi(i)\) be the induced map.

We can construct an important set \(\lim_i \Phi(i)\), called the \textit{limit} of \(\Phi\). Elements of \(\lim_i \Phi(i)\) (or simply \(\lim \Phi\)) are families \((x_i)\), where \(x_i \in \Phi(i)\), and for any \(i \leq j\) one has \(\phi_{ij}(x_j) = x_i\).

More generally, if \(\mathcal{C}\) is a category and \(\Phi : I^{\text{op}} \to \mathcal{C}\) a contravariant functor, we can consider the functor \(\mathcal{C} \to \text{Sets}\) given by

\[X \mapsto \lim_i \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(X, \Phi(i)).\]

If this functor is representable, the representable object is called the \textit{limit} of \(\Phi\). It is denoted by \(\lim_i \Phi(i)\). Thus,

\[\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(X, \lim_i \Phi(i)) = \lim_i \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(X, \Phi(i)).\]

It is a straightforward exercise to check that the set \(\lim \Phi\) we constructed is indeed the limit with this definition as well.

Dually, if \(\Phi : I \to \mathcal{C}\) is a covariant functor, we can consider the functor \(\mathcal{C} \to \text{Sets}\) given by

\[X \mapsto \lim_i \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\Phi(i), X).\]
If this functor is representable, the representable object is called the colimit of \( \Phi \) and is denoted by \( \text{colim}_i \Phi(i) \). Thus,

\[
\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\text{colim}_i \Phi(i), X) = \lim_{i} \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\Phi(i), X).
\]

1.3. 2-Limits and 2-Colimits of Categories. Analogously to the above, we can talk about 2-limits and 2-colimits of a 2-functor \( \Phi : I \to \text{Gpd} \). Naturally, this can be done in a much more general setting, where \( I \) and \( \text{Gpd} \) are arbitrary 2-categories. However, we will restrict ourselves to this setting as it is sufficient for our discussion. Indeed, we are primarily interested in the case when \( \Phi \) is strict. As such, unless otherwise stated, a 2-functor will be assumed to be strict.

1.3.1. Construction of limits in \( \text{Gpd} \). It is well-known [2], that the category \( \text{Gpd} \) has limits and colimits, as well as 2-limits and 2-colimits. For example, objects of the groupoid \( \lim_i \Phi \) (or simply \( \lim \Phi \)) are families \( \{x_i\} \), such that \( \phi_{ij}(x_j) = x_i \) for any \( i \leq j \). Here, \( x_i \) is an object of the category \( \Phi(i) \). A morphism \( \{x_i\} \to \{y_i\} \) is a family \( \{f_i\} \), such that \( \phi_{ij}(f_j) = f_i \) for any \( i \leq j \). Here, \( f_i : x_i \to y_i \) is a morphism of \( \Phi(i) \).

1.3.2. Construction of colimits in \( \text{Gpd} \). A sketch of the construction of \( \text{colim}_i \Phi(i) \) for a functor \( \Phi : I \to \text{Gpd} \) is given as follows: (see [2, pp.4-5, p.11]). The set of objects of the groupoid \( \text{colim}_i \Phi(i) \) is the colimit of \( i \mapsto \text{Ob}(\Phi(i)) \) in the category of sets. Here, \( \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}) \) denotes the set of objects of the category \( \mathcal{C} \). Next, we take again the colimit in the category of sets of \( i \mapsto \text{Mor}(\Phi(i)) \), where \( \text{Mor}(\mathcal{C}) \) denotes the set of morphisms of the category \( \mathcal{C} \). The domain and codomain functions \( \text{Mor}(\Phi(i)) \mapsto \text{Ob}(\Phi(i)) \) induce maps in colimits

\[
\text{colim}_i \text{Mor}(\Psi(i)) \mapsto \text{colim}_i \text{Ob}(\Phi(i)).
\]

This yields a directed graph (diagram scheme in the terminology of [2]). Denote this directed graph by \( X \) and let \( \text{Pa}(X) \) be the free category generated by \( X \). The category \( \text{colim}_i \Phi(i) \) is the maximal quotient category, for which the composite

\[
\Phi(i) \to \text{Pa}(X) \to \text{colim}_i \Phi(i)
\]

is a functor for all \( i \in I \). It can be checked that the category \( \text{colim}_i \Phi(i) \) is a groupoid, which is the colimit of \( \Phi(i) \) in the category \( \text{Gpd} \).

1.3.3. Construction of 2-limits in \( \text{Gpd} \). We can construct another very important groupoid \( \text{2lim}_i \Phi(i) \), called the 2-limit of \( \Phi \). Objects of \( \text{2lim}_i \Phi(i) \) (or simply \( \text{2lim} \Phi \)) are collections \( \{x_i, \xi_{ij}\} \), where \( x_i \) is an object of \( \Phi(i) \), while \( \xi_{ij} : \phi_{ij}(x_j) \to x_i \) for \( i \leq j \) is an isomorphism of the category \( \Phi(j) \). It satisfies the so called 1-cocycle condition: For any \( i \leq j \leq k \), one has

\[
\xi_{ik} = \xi_{ij} \circ \phi_{ij}(\xi_{jk}).
\]

A morphism from \( \{x_i, \xi_{ij}\} \) to \( \{y_i, \eta_{ij}\} \) is a collection \( \{f_i\} \), where \( f_i : x_i \to y_i \) is a morphism of \( \Phi(i) \). Furthermore, the following

\[
\begin{align*}
\phi_{ij}(x_j) \xrightarrow{\xi_{ij}} x_i \\
\phi_{ij}(f_j) \downarrow \quad f_i \\
\phi_{ij}(y_j) \xrightarrow{\eta_{ij}} y_i
\end{align*}
\]

is a commutative diagram for any \( i \leq j \).

If one compares these constructions, one easily sees that there is a functor

\[
\gamma : \text{lim} \Phi \to \text{2lim} \Phi,
\]

given by

\[
\gamma(x_i) = (x_i, \text{id}_{x_i}).
\]

It is also straightforward to check that \( \gamma \) is full and faithful.
Let $\Phi : I \to \text{Gpd}$ be a strict covariant 2-functor and define the (strict) 2-functor $\text{Gpd} \to \text{Gpd}$, given by

$$\mathcal{G} \mapsto \lim_i \text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(\Phi(i), \mathcal{G}).$$

Here, $\text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ denotes the groupoid of all functors $\mathcal{G}_1 \to \mathcal{G}_2$ and natural transformations between them, where $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$ are groupoids. This 2-functor is 2-representable. The 2-representable object is called the colimit of $\Phi$. It is denoted by $\text{colim}_{i} (\Phi)$ (or $\text{colim} (\Phi)$).

Define the 2-colimit of $\Phi$, denoted by $\text{2colim}_i \Phi(i)$ ($2\text{colim} \Phi$), to be a groupoid which 2-represents the 2-functor

$$\mathcal{G} \mapsto \text{2lim}_i \text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(\Phi(i), \mathcal{G}).$$

Thus, there exists an equivalence of groupoids

$$2\text{lim}_i \text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(\Phi(i), \mathcal{G}) \cong \text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(2\text{colim}_i \Phi, \mathcal{G}).$$

1.3.4. Construction of 2-colimits in $\text{Gpd}$. Let $\Phi : I \to \text{Gpd}$ be a 2-functor. We regard $\text{Gpd}$ as a natural 2-category.

Recall the Grothendieck construction $\int_I \Phi$. Objects of the category $\int_I \Phi$ are pairs $(i, x)$, where $i$ is an object of $I$ and $x$ is an object of $\Phi(i)$. A morphism $(i, x) \to (j, y)$ exists if $i \leq j$. It is given by a morphism $\alpha : \Phi_{i,j}(x) \to y$ of the category $\Phi(j)$. Let $(i, x), (j, y)$ and $(k, z)$ be objects of $\int_I \Phi$. Here $i \leq j \leq k$ with $\alpha : \Phi_{i,j}(x) \to y$ and $\beta : \Phi_{j,k}(y) \to z$ defining the morphisms $(i, x) \to (j, y) \to (k, z)$ in $\int_I \Phi$. The composite morphism $(i, x) \to (k, z)$ is given by

$$\beta \circ \phi_{j,k}(\alpha) : \phi_{i,k}(x) \to z.$$

We fix some additional notations. Let $i \in I$. We define a functor

$$L_i : \Phi(i) \to \int_i \Phi.$$

It sends an object $x \in \text{Ob}(\Phi(i))$ to the pair $(i, x)$ and a morphism $\alpha : x \to y$ of $\Phi(i)$ to the morphism $(i, x) \to (i, y)$ determined by $\alpha$.

Next, let $i \leq j$. There is a natural transformation

$$\lambda_{ij} : L_i \to L_j \circ \Phi_{i,j}$$

defined by $\lambda_{ij}(x) = \text{id}_{\Phi_{ij}(x)}$. Here, $\text{id}_{\Phi_{ij}(x)}$ is considered as a morphism $(i, x) \to (j, \Phi_{ij}(x))$. We observe that one has

$$\lambda_{i,k} = (\lambda_{j,k} \circ \phi_{j,k}) \circ \lambda_{i,j}$$

for any $i \leq j \leq k$. This allows us to define the functor

$$K : \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}}(\int_I \Phi, \mathcal{G}) \to 2\text{lim}_i \text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(\Phi(i), \mathcal{G})$$

for any groupoid $\mathcal{G}$, by

$$K(\theta) = (\theta \circ L_i, \theta \circ \lambda_{ij}).$$

Here, $\text{Cat}$ is the 2-category of small categories and $\theta : \int_I \Phi \to \mathcal{G}$ is a functor. The functor $K$ has an inverse

$$J : 2\text{lim}_i \text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(\Phi(i), \mathcal{G}) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}}(\int_I \Phi, \mathcal{G})$$

which is constructed as follows: Recall that an object of $2\text{lim}_i \text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(\Phi(i), \mathcal{G})$ is a collection $(X_i, A_{ij})$, where $X_i : \Phi(i) \to \mathcal{G}$ is a functor and for $i \leq j$, $A_{ij}$ is a natural transformation $X_i \to X_j \circ \Phi_{i,j}$ satisfying the 1-cocycle condition.

Define the functor $J(X_i, A_{ij}) : \int_I \Phi \to \mathcal{G}$ on objects by

$$(i, x) \mapsto X_i(x)$$

and on morphisms by

$$\alpha \mapsto \alpha : X_j(\alpha) \circ A_{ij}(x).$$

Here, $\alpha : (i, x) \to (j, y)$ is a morphism in $\int_I \Phi$, induced by $\alpha : \Phi_{ij}(x_i) \to x_j$. 
Let $\epsilon : \text{Cat} \to \text{Gpd}$ be the left adjoint to the inclusion functor $\text{Gpd} \subseteq \text{Cat}$. Recall that $\epsilon(C)$ is obtained from $C$ by inverting every morphism in $C$ (see, [2, Section 1.5.4]). In the case when $C = \int_i \Phi$, it suffices to invert the morphisms $(i, x) \to (j, \Phi_{ij}(x))$ defined by $Id_{\Phi_{ij}(x)}$. It follows that the groupoid $\epsilon(\int_i \Phi)$ is the 2-colimit of $\Phi$.

1.3.5. Comparison functor. The 2-categorical version of the Yoneda Lemma and the functor $\gamma : \lim \Phi \to \lim \Phi$ defined above, allow us to define a comparison functor

$$\delta : \under{\text{colim}} \Phi \to \text{colim} \Phi.$$ 

This represents the following composition of functors:

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(\text{colim} \Phi, G) \cong \lim \text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(\Phi, G) \Rightarrow \lim \text{colim} \text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(\Phi, G) \cong \text{Hom}_{\text{Gpd}}(\text{2colim} \Phi, G).$$

We wish to understand the following question: Under what conditions on $\Phi$ is $\delta$ an equivalence of groupoids? We will give an answer to this question when $I$ is the poset of proper subsets of a finite set.

2. The Poset $\mathcal{B}(n)$

Let $S$ be a set. We denote by $\mathcal{B}(S)$ the poset of proper subsets of $S$. Of special importance to us is the set

$$n = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}, n \geq 1.$$ 

For $k \leq n$, we identify $\mathcal{B}(k) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(n)$ as the subposet consisting of subsets $X \subseteq n$, such that $k + 1, \ldots, n \not\subseteq X$ and $X \neq \{1, \ldots, k\}$. As such, $\mathcal{B}(n - 1)$ can be identified with the subposet of $\mathcal{B}(n)$ which consists of subsets $X \subseteq n$, such that $n \not\subseteq X$ and $X \neq \{1, \ldots, n - 1\}$. Likewise, $\mathcal{B}(n - 2)$ can be identified with the subposet of $\mathcal{B}(n)$ consisting of subsets $X \subseteq n$, such that $n, n - 1 \not\subseteq X$.

Parallel to this, we consider the subposets $\mathcal{B}'(k)$ of $\mathcal{B}(n)$. Elements of $\mathcal{B}'(k)$ are proper subsets $Y \subseteq n$, such that $k + 1, \ldots, n \not\subseteq Y$. In particular, $\mathcal{B}'(n - 1)$ consists of subsets $Y \in n$, such that $n \in Y$ and $Y \neq \{1, \ldots, n\}$. As another example, $\mathcal{B}'(n - 2)$ is made up of proper subsets $Y \subseteq n$, where both $n \in Y$ and $n - 1 \in Y$.

We have a partition of sets

$$\mathcal{B}(n) = \mathcal{B}(n - 1) \sqcup \mathcal{B}'(n - 1) \sqcup n - 1.$$ 

Obviously, the map $\alpha : \mathcal{B}(n - 1) \to \mathcal{B}'(n - 1)$, given by $X \mapsto X \cup \{n\}$ defines an isomorphism of posets.

Let us fix terminology. Let $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}$ be a functor between small groupoids. This induces a map $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{F}) : \text{Ob}(\mathcal{G}) \to \text{Ob}(\mathcal{H})$ from the set of objects of $\mathcal{G}$ to the set of objects of $\mathcal{H}$. We say that the functor $\mathcal{F}$ is injective on objects if the map $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{F})$ is injective. We can now state our main theorem:

**Theorem 2.1.** Let $n \geq 2$ be a natural number and $\Phi : \mathcal{B}(n) \to \text{Gpd}$ a covariant strict 2-functor. The natural functor

$$\delta_{\mathcal{B}(n)} : \text{colim}_i \Phi(i) \to \text{colim}_i \Phi(i)$$ 

is an equivalence of categories if $\Phi$ satisfies the following three conditions:

i) Let $S$ be a proper subset of $\{2, \ldots, n - 1\}$. The induced functor

$$\Phi(S) \to \Phi(\{1\} \cup S)$$

is injective on objects.

ii) Let $k$ be an integer with $1 \leq k < n$. The induced functor

$$\text{colim} \Phi \to \Phi(k)$$

is injective on objects.
iii) Let $k$ be an integer with $1 \leq k < n - 1$. The induced functor

$$\text{colim}_{B^k} \Phi \to \Phi(k \cup \{n\})$$

is injective on objects.

**Proof.** We proceed by induction. The case $n = 2$ corresponds to Proposition 4.2 of [3]. Assume $n > 2$. Thanks to Corollary 4.2, we have a 2-pushout of groupoids,

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\text{colim}_{B(n-1)} \Phi \\
\downarrow \\
\Phi(n-1) \\
\downarrow \\
\text{colim}_{B(n)} \Phi.
\end{array}
$$

By Corollary 3.2, we have a pushout diagram

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\text{colim}_{B(n-1)} \Phi \\
\downarrow \\
\Phi(n-1) \\
\downarrow \\
\text{colim}_{B(n)} \Phi.
\end{array}
$$

By theorem 2.1, the colimit and 2-colimit of the above diagram coincide. It is easily seen that the colimit consists of two isomorphic objects $a, b$, with $\text{Aut}(a) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$.
Lemma 3.1. The following diagram is a pullback in the category of sets:

\[ \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n)^{\text{op}}} \Phi \]

Here, \( W \) and \( V \) are running through all proper subset of \( n \).

We would like to have an inductive procedure for studying such limits. Consider the restriction of \( \Phi \) on \( \mathcal{B}(n-1) \) and on \( \mathcal{B}'(n-1) \). By abuse of notation, we denote these functors by \( \Phi \) as well. Consider the limit of \( \Phi \) over these posets. This yields the diagram

\[ \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n-1)} \Phi \]

Here, \( \delta \) sends \( a_{n-1} \in \Phi(n-1) \) to the family \( \{ \Phi_U, n-1(a_{n-1}) \} \), where \( U \) is a proper subset of \( n-1 \).

In order to describe \( \eta \) for a proper subset \( U \subseteq n-1 \), we set

\[ U_+ = \{ n \} \cup U. \]

The functor \( \eta \) sends \( (a_{U_+}) \in \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n-1)} \Phi \) to \( (\psi_U, U_+(a_{U_+})) \in \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n-1)} \Phi \).

**Lemma 3.1.** The following diagram is a pullback in the category of sets:

\[ \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n)} \Phi \]

\[ \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n-1)} \Phi \]

\[ \Phi(n-1) \]

\[ \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n-1)} \Phi \]

**Proof.** Denote the pullback of the diagram

\[ \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n-1)} \Phi \]

by \( P \). By definition elements of \( P \) are pairs \( (b_{n-1}, B) \), satisfying the condition

\[ \delta(b_{n-1}) = \eta(B). \]

By \( b_{n-1} \), we denote an element in \( \Phi(n-1) \), while \( B \in \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n-1)} \Phi \). That is to say, \( B \) is itself a compatible family \( (b_{U_+}) \), where \( U \) is a proper subset of \( n-1 \) and \( b_{U_+} \) is an object of \( \Phi(U_+) \).

These objects satisfy the compatibility condition

\[ \psi_{U_+, V_+}(b_{V_+}) = b_{U_+}, \]

where \( U \subseteq V \) are proper subsets of \( n-1 \). The condition \( \delta(b_{n-1}) = \eta(B) \) means that one has

\[ \psi_U, n-1(b_{n-1}) = \psi_U, U_+(b_{U_+}) \]

for any proper subset \( U \subseteq n-1 \). Define the map \( \xi : \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n)} \Phi \to \Psi \) by

\[ (a_W) \mapsto (b_{n-1}, B); \quad B = (b_{U_+}). \]

Here, \( W \) (resp. \( U \)) is running through the set of proper subset of \( n \) (resp. \( n-1 \)) and

\[ b_{n-1} = a_{n-1}, \quad b_{U_+} = a_{U_+}. \]

We need to show that \( \xi \) is a bijection. To this end, define the inverse map \( \theta : P \to \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n)} \Phi \) by

\[ (b_{n-1}, B) \mapsto (a_W). \]
Here, we denote
\[ a_W = \begin{cases} 
  b_W, & \text{if } W \in \mathcal{B}'(n-1) \\
  b_{n-1}, & \text{if } W = n-1 \\
  \psi_{W,W}^{-1}(b_{W-}), & \text{if } W \subseteq \mathcal{B}(n-1). 
\end{cases} \]

One readily shows that \((a_W) \in \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n)} \Phi\). Thus, \(\theta\) is well-defined and inverse to \(\xi\). \(\square\)

**Corollary 3.2.** Let \(C\) be a category with finite limits (resp. colimits) and let \(\Phi : \mathcal{B}(n)^{op} \to \mathcal{BC}\) (resp. \(\Psi : (n) \to C\)) be a contravariant (resp. covariant) functor. The following is a pullback diagram in the category \(C\):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\lim_{\mathcal{B}(n)} \Phi & \longrightarrow & \lim_{\mathcal{B}'(n-1)} \Phi \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\Phi(n-1) & \longrightarrow & \lim_{\mathcal{B}(n-1)} \Phi.
\end{array}
\]

Likewise, the following is a push-out diagram in the category \(C\):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\colim_{\mathcal{B}(n-1)} \Psi & \longrightarrow & \colim_{\mathcal{B}'(n-1)} \Phi \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\Phi(n-1) & \longrightarrow & \colim_{\mathcal{B}(n)} \Psi.
\end{array}
\]

### 4. Induction principle for 2-colimits

The aim of this section is to prove Corollary 4.2. Let \(\Phi : I^{op} \to \mathbf{Gpd}\) be a contravariant functor from the category \(I\) to the category of groupoids.

Recall the construction of the groupoid \(\mathcal{2}\lim_i \Phi_i\), as discussed in Subsection 1.2. The 2-pullback (which is in particular a 2-limit) of the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{G}_1 \\
\downarrow \alpha \downarrow \beta \\
\mathcal{G}_2 \\
\downarrow f_2 \\
\mathcal{G}_0 \\
\downarrow f_1
\end{array}
\]

is the following groupoid: Objects are triples \((A_1, A_2, \alpha)\) where \(A_i\) is an object of \(\mathcal{G}_i\) and \(\alpha : f(A_1) \to f(A_2)\) is an isomorphism. A morphism \((A_1, A_2, \alpha) \to (B_1, B_2, \beta)\) is a pair \((g_1, g_2)\), where \(g_i : A_i \to B_i\) is a morphism in \(\mathcal{G}_i\), such that the following diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
f_1(A_1) & \longrightarrow & f_2(A_2) \\
\downarrow f_1(g_1) & & \downarrow f_2(g_2) \\
f_1(B_1) & \longrightarrow & f_2(B_2)
\end{array}
\]

commutes. Thus, objects of the groupoid \(\mathcal{2}\lim_i \Phi\) are collections

\[(a_U, \alpha_{U,V} : \psi_{U,V}(a_V) \to a_U),\]

where \(U\) and \(V\) are proper subsets of \(n\) with \(U \subseteq V\). Moreover, \(a_U\) (resp. \(\alpha_{U,V}\)) is an object (resp. isomorphism) of \(\Phi(U)\). One requires that for all \(U \subseteq V \subseteq W\) the following diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\psi_{U,W}(a_W) & \longrightarrow & \psi_{U,V}(a_V) \\
\alpha_{U,W} & & \alpha_{U,V} \\
\end{array}
\]

commutes.
commutes. A morphism \((a_U, \alpha_U, V) \to (b_U, \beta_U, V')\) is a collection \((g_U)\), where \(U\) is a proper subset of \(n\) and \(g_U : a_U \to b_U\) is a morphism of \(\Phi(U)\). Further, for all proper subsets \(U \subseteq V\) the following diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\psi_{U,V}(a_V) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{U,V}} & a_U \\
\psi_{U,V}(g_V) \downarrow & & \downarrow g_V \\
\psi_{U,V}(b_V) & \xrightarrow{\beta_{U,V}} & b_U
\end{array}
\]
has to commute. Let us denote by \(P\) the 2-pullback of the diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Phi(n-1) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \mathcal{B}(n-1) \\
\downarrow \eta & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{B}(n-1) & \xrightarrow{\Phi(n-1)} & \mathcal{B}(n-1)
\end{array}
\]
The functor \(\delta\) sends an object \(a_{n-1}\) of the category \(\Phi(n-1)\) to the collection \((a_U, \alpha_U, V)\), where \(U \subseteq V\) are proper subsets of \(n-1\), \(a_U = \psi_{U,n-1}(a_{n-1})\) and \(\alpha_U = Id_{a_U}\). The functor \(\eta\) sends the collection \((a_U, \alpha_U, V)\) to the collection \((\psi_{U,U}(a_U), \psi_{U,U}(a_U, V)\)). Here \(U \subseteq V\) are proper subsets of \(n-1\).

Thus, objects of \(P\) are triples \((b_{n-1}, B, \zeta : \eta(B) \to \delta(a_{n-1}))\). Here, \(B = (b_{U,+}, \beta_{U,+}, V)\) is an object of \(\mathcal{B}(n-1)\), \(b_{n-1}\) is an object of \(\Phi(n-1)\) and \(\zeta\) is a morphism of the category \(\Phi(n-1)\).

In more details, the objects of \(P\) are collections
\[
(b_{n-1} \in Ob(\Phi(n-1)), \quad b_{U,+} \in Ob(\Phi(U,+)), \quad \beta_{U,+}, V, \quad \zeta_U),
\]
where \(U \subseteq V\) is a proper subset of \(n-1\), \(\beta_{U,+} : \psi_{U,+,V}(b_{V,+}) \to b_{U,+}\) is a morphism of the category \(\Phi(U,+), \) while
\[
\zeta_U : \psi_{U,n-1}(b_{n-1}) \to \psi_{U,U,+}(b_{U,+})
\]
is a morphism of the category \(\Phi(U)\). All these must satisfy two compatibility conditions. The first conditions says that for any proper subsets \(U \subseteq V \subseteq W\) of \(n-1\), one has
\[
\beta_{U,+} = \beta_{U,+} \circ \psi_{U,+,V}(\beta_{V,+}).
\]
The second condition is that for any proper subsets \(U \subseteq V \subseteq W\) of \(n-1\), the diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\psi_{U,n-1}(b_{n-1}) & \xrightarrow{\psi_{U,V}(\zeta_U)} & \psi_{U,V}(b_{V,+}) \\
\downarrow \zeta_U & & \downarrow \psi_{U,U,+}(\beta_{U,+}) \\
\psi_{U,U,+}(b_{U,+}) & & \psi_{U,U,+}(b_{U,+})
\end{array}
\]
commutes.

We are now in a position to construct the functors
\[
\Gamma : \mathcal{B}(n) \to P \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta : P \to \mathcal{B}(n).
\]
The functor \(\Gamma\) simply forgets some data. More precisely, take an object \((a_S, \alpha_{S,T})\) of the category \(\mathcal{B}(n)\), where \(S \subseteq T\) are proper subsets of \(n\). Then, \(\Gamma\) sends this object to the collection
\[
(b_{n-1} \in Ob(\Phi(n-1)), \quad b_{U,+} \in Ob(\Phi(U,+)), \quad \beta_{U,+}, V, \quad \zeta_U),
\]
where \(b_{n-1} = a_{n-1}\), \(b_{U,+} = a_{U,+}\), \(\beta_{U,+} = a_{U,+}\), \(\alpha_{U,+}, V\) and \(\zeta_U = \alpha_{U,U,+} \circ a_{U,n-1}\). Here, \(U \subseteq V\) are proper subsets of \(n-1\).

The functor \(\Delta\) is defined by
\[
\Delta(b_{n-1}, b_{U,+}, \beta_{U,+} V, \zeta_U) = (a_S, \alpha_{S,T}),
\]
Observe that

\[ a_s = \begin{cases} 
  b_{n-1}, & \text{if } S = n - 1, \\
  b_S, & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{B}'(n - 1), \\
  \psi_{S,n-1}(b_{n-1}), & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{B}(n - 1)
\end{cases} \]

and

\[ \alpha_{S,T} = \begin{cases} 
  \beta_{S,T}, & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{B}'(n - 1) \\
  \Id, & \text{if } T \in \mathcal{B}(n - 1) \\
  \Id, & \text{if } T = n - 1 \\
  \zeta_S^{-1} \circ \psi_{S,T}(\beta_{S,T}), & \text{if } T \in \mathcal{B}'(n - 1) & S \in \mathcal{B}(n - 1).
\end{cases} \]

We have used the fact that there are exactly four different cases if \( U \subseteq T \) are proper subsets of \( n \).

The composite \( \Gamma \circ \Delta \) is the identity functor. On the other hand, the composite \( \Delta \circ \Gamma \) sends the collection \((a_S, \alpha_{S,T})\) to the collection \((\tilde{a}_S, \tilde{\alpha}_{S,T})\). Here,

\[ \tilde{a}_S = \begin{cases} 
  a_S, & \text{if } S = n - 1, \\
  \Id, & \text{if } T = n - 1, \\
  \Id & \text{if } T \in \mathcal{B}(n - 1)
\end{cases} \]

and

\[ \tilde{\alpha}_{S,T} = \begin{cases} 
  \alpha_{S,T}, & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{B}'(n - 1), \\
  \Id, & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{B}'(n - 1), \\
  \Id, & \text{if } T = n - 1, \\
  \Id, & \text{if } T \in \mathcal{B}'(n - 1) & S \in \mathcal{B}(n - 1).
\end{cases} \]

Observe that

\[ \xi_S = \begin{cases} 
  \Id, & \text{if } S = n - 1 \\
  \Id, & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{B}'(n - 1) \\
  \alpha_{S,n-1}, & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{B}(n - 1)
\end{cases} \]

defines a natural transformation \( \Delta \circ \Gamma \to \Id \). This implies the following proposition:

**Proposition 4.1.** The following is a 2-pullback diagram in the 2-category of groupoids:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
2\lim_{\mathcal{B}(n)} \Phi & \rightarrow & 2\lim_{\mathcal{B}'(n-1)} \Phi \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\Phi(n-1) & \rightarrow & 2\lim_{\mathcal{B}(n-1)} \Phi
\end{array}
\]

Yoneda’s lemma yields the following statement for 2-colimits:

**Corollary 4.2.** The following is a 2-push-out diagram of groupoids

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
2\text{colim}_{\mathcal{B}(n-1)} \Phi & \rightarrow & 2\text{colim}_{\mathcal{B}'(n-1)} \Phi \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\Phi(n-1) & \rightarrow & 2\text{colim}_{\mathcal{B}(n)} \Phi
\end{array}
\]

5. 2-LIMITS ON SUBSETS WITH CODIMENSION 3

Let \( 0 \leq k < n \) be a natural number. Denote by \( \mathcal{B}(n,k) \) the subset of \( \mathcal{B}(n) \) which is formed by subset \( S \) for which \( |S| \geq k \).

We can consider the restriction of any functor \( \Phi : \mathcal{B}^{op} \to \text{Gpd} \) to \( \mathcal{B}(n,k) \), which will again be denoted by \( \Phi \).

**Proposition 5.1.** Consider the obvious forgetful functor

\[ \gamma_k : 2\lim_{\mathcal{B}(n)} \Phi \to 2\lim_{\mathcal{B}(n,k)} \Phi. \]

(5.1)
i) The functor $\gamma_k$ is faithful.

ii) The functor $\gamma_k$ is full and faithful if $k \leq n - 2$.

iii) The functor $\gamma_k$ is an equivalence of categories if $k \leq n - 3$.

Proof. i) Take two objects $A = (a_S, a_{ST})$ and $B = (b_S, b_{ST})$ of $2\lim \Phi$, where $S \subseteq T$ are proper subsets of $n$. Assume $(f_U)$ and $(f'_U)$ are two morphisms $A \to B$, such that $f_S = f'_S$ if $|S| = n - 1$. We have to show that $f_U = f'_U$ for all proper subsets $U \subseteq n$. For a given $U$, choose an $S$ such that $U \subseteq S$ and $|S| = n - 1$. We have a commutative diagram

$$
\phi_U,S(a_S) \xrightarrow{\alpha_U,S} a_U \\
\phi_U,S(f_S) \xrightarrow{f_U} f_U \\
\phi_U,S(b_S) \xrightarrow{\beta_U,S} b_U.
$$

This implies that $f_U = \beta_U,S \circ \phi_U,S(f_S)\alpha_U^{-1,S}$. Likewise, we have $f'_U = \beta_U,S \circ \phi_U,S(f'_S)\alpha_U^{-1,S}$. Since $f_S = f'_S$, we obtain $f_U = f'_U$.

ii) By i) we need to show that $\gamma_k$ is full. We keep the notation as in i). Take a morphism $\gamma_k(A) \to \gamma_k(B)$. It is given by a collection of morphisms $f_S : a_S \to b_S$, where $|S| \geq k$. Moreover, if $S \subseteq T$ are two such subsets, we have a commutative diagram

$$
\phi_{S,T}(a_S) \xrightarrow{\alpha_{S,T}} a_S \\
\phi_{S,T}(f_T) \xrightarrow{f_S} f_S \\
\phi_{S,T}(b_T) \xrightarrow{\beta_{S,T}} b_S.
$$

We have to extend the definition of $f_S$ to include subsets $S \subseteq n$ with $|S| < k$, in such a way that the corresponding diagram still commutes for all $S \subseteq T$. This is done by induction on $i$, where $i = k - |S|$. If $i = 0$, we already have such maps.

Let $i > 0$ and $U$ be a subset with $|U| = |S| + 1$. Then $f_U$ is already defined by the induction assumption. We claim that the map

$$
\beta_{S,U} \circ \phi_{S,U}(f_U) \circ \alpha_{S,U}^{-1} : a_S \to b_S
$$

is independent on the choice of $U$. Assume $V$ is another subset of $n$, such that $|V| = |S| + 1$, $S \subseteq V$ and $V \neq U$. Take $W = V \cup U$. We have $|W| = |S| + 2 \leq n - 1$. By the induction assumption, we have a commutative diagram

$$
\phi_{U,W}(a_W) \xrightarrow{\alpha_{U,W}} a_U \\
\phi_{U,W}(f_W) \xrightarrow{f_U} f_U \\
\phi_{U,W}(b_W) \xrightarrow{\beta_{U,W}} b_U.
$$

It follows that

$$
\beta_{S,U} \circ \phi_{S,U}(f_U) \circ \alpha_{S,U}^{-1} = \beta_{S,U} \circ \phi_{S,U}(\beta_{U,W} \phi_{U,W}(f_W) \alpha_{U,W}^{-1}) \alpha_{S,U}^{-1} = \beta_{S,U} \circ \phi_{S,U}(\phi_{U,W}(f_W) \alpha_{U,W}^{-1}) \alpha_{S,U}^{-1} = \beta_{S,U} \circ \phi_{S,W}(f_W) \alpha_{S,W}^{-1}.
$$

Quite similarly, we obtain

$$
\beta_{S,V} \circ \phi_{S,V}(f_V) \circ \alpha_{S,V}^{-1} = \beta_{S,V} \circ \phi_{S,W}(f_W) \alpha_{S,W}^{-1}
$$

and the claim follows.

It remains to show that the appropriate diagram commutes for $S \subseteq T$. Choose $U$ such that $S \subseteq U \subseteq T$ and $|U| = |S| + 1$. The corresponding diagram commutes for $U \subseteq T$ by the induction assumption. On the other hand, we also have a commutative diagram for the pair $S \subseteq U$. This is
by the definition of \( f_S \). We obtain a commutative diagram for the pair \( S \subseteq T \) by gluing the two diagrams we just discussed.

iii) By ii) we only need to show that \( \gamma_k \) is essentially surjective. Take an object \( B \) of \( 2\text{lim}_n \Phi \).

By definition, \( B \) is a collection \( \langle b_S, \beta_{S,T} \rangle \), where \(|S|, |T| \geq k \) and \( S \subseteq T \). These data satisfy the compatibility condition, which means that an appropriate diagram commutes, see the diagram in i). The task is to define an object \( A = (a_S, \alpha_{S,T}) \) of \( 2\text{lim}_n \Phi \), such that \( \gamma_k(A) = B \).

If \(|S| \geq k \), we set \( a_S = b_S \) and \( \alpha_{S,T} = \beta_{S,T} \). Let \(|S| < k \). We may assume that the object \( A_U \) is already defined for all \( U \) with \(|U| > |S| \). Choose \( i \in \text{n} \) such that \( i \not\in S \). We write \( S \cup i \) instead of \( S \cup \{i\} \) and set

\[
a_S := \phi_{S,S \cup i}(a_{S \cup i}).
\]

We wish to define the morphisms \( \alpha_{S,T} : \phi_{S,T}(\alpha_T) \to a_S \). There are several cases to consider.

- Let \( T = S \). We put \( a_S := \text{Id} \). We are left with \(|T| > |S| \).
- Let \( i \in T \). We define \( \alpha_{S,T} := \phi_{S,S \cup i}(\alpha_{S \cup i,T}) \).
- Assume \( T \not= \text{n} \setminus \{i\} \). Then \( T \cup i \) is also a proper subset and we can put

\[
\alpha_{S,T} = \phi_{S,S \cup i}(\alpha_{S,S \cup i,T}) \circ \phi_{T,T}(\alpha_{T,T \cup i})^{-1}.
\]

This is equivalent to saying that the following diagram commutes:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\phi_{S,T}(a_T) & \xrightarrow{\phi_{S,T}(\alpha_{T,T \cup i})} & \phi_{S,T}(a_T) \\
\phi_{S,S \cup i}(\alpha_{S,S \cup i,T}) & \downarrow & \alpha_{S,T} \\
\phi_{S,S \cup i}(a_{S \cup i}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Id}} & a_S \\
\end{array}
\]

\bullet It remains to consider the case \( T = \text{n} \setminus \{i\} \). Choose \( j \in T \) such that \( j \not\in S \). We set

\[
\alpha_{S,T} = \alpha_{S,S \cup j} \circ \phi_{S,S \cup j}(\alpha_{S,S \cup j,T}).
\]

One gets the following commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\phi_{S,T}(a_T) & \xrightarrow{\phi_{S,S \cup j}(\alpha_{S,S \cup j,T})} & \phi_{S,T}(a_T) \\
\phi_{S,S \cup j}(\alpha_{S,S \cup j,T}) & \downarrow & \alpha_{S,T} \\
\phi_{S,S \cup j}(a_{S \cup j}) & \xrightarrow{\phi_{S,S \cup j}(\alpha_{S,S \cup j})} & \phi_{S,S \cup j}(a_{S \cup j}) \\
\phi_{S,S \cup j}(a_{S \cup j}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Id}} & a_S \\
\end{array}
\]

from the definition of \( \alpha_{S,S \cup j} \). This definition is independent on the choice of \( j \). In fact, chose \( k \) instead of \( j \). The set \( S \cup i \cup j \cup k \) is still a proper subset of \( \text{n} \) (since \(|S| < k \leq n - 3 \)). One easily sees that both definitions of \( \alpha_{ST} \) equal the composite

\[
\phi_{S,S \cup i,j}(\phi(a_T)) \circ \phi_{S,S \cup i,j}(\alpha_{S \cup i,S \cup j}) \to a_{S \cup i,j}.
\]

This finishes the definition of \( A \). Obviously \( \gamma_k(A) = B \) and the result follows. \( \square \)
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