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Abstract

Optics are a data representation for compositional data access, with lenses as a popular special case. Hedges has presented a diagrammatic calculus for lenses, but in a way that does not generalize to other classes of optic. We present a calculus that works for all optics, not just lenses; this is done by embedding optics into their presheaf category, which naturally features string diagrams. We apply our calculus to the common case of lenses, and explore how the laws of optics manifest in this setting.

1 Introduction

Optics are a versatile categorical structure. Their best-known special case, lenses, have found uses in a variety of contexts, from machine learning to game theory [Hed18]. Their more general instantiations have been studied in the context of bidirectional data transformations [Ril18]. In all cases, their main feature of interest is their composability and their peculiar bidirectional information flow.

In the interest of making them easier to represent and manipulate, authors often spontaneously use diagrams to construct instances of optics [PGW17; Ril18]. These diagrams are usually informal, with one notable exception in the work of Hedges [Hed17] on diagrams for lenses. Hedges’ diagrammatic calculus however assumes a lot of structure on the underlying categories, in a way that doesn’t extend to more general optics.

Here we propose instead a different approach that embeds optics into a larger space (namely its presheaf category) that naturally has string diagrams. Not only does this work for the most general optics, but all the diagrammatic gadgets follow naturally from the embedding, and it even allows for useful diagrams that would not be expressible in the category Optic alone.

2 Background

We fix a monoidal category \((M, \otimes, I, \lambda, \mu, a)\) throughout the paper.
We assume readers are familiar with coends. For an introduction to the material relevant to the study of optics, see [Rom20, Chapter 2].

Note: We will prefer diagrammatic order for composition, using the symbol \(\fatsemi\).

### 2.1 \(M\)-actegories

**Definition 2.1 (\([nLa]\))**. An \(M\)-actegory is a category \(C\) equipped with a functor \(\otimes_C : M \times C \to C\) (the “action”) and two natural structure isomorphisms \(\lambda_x : I \otimes_C x \sim x\) and \(a_{m,n,x} : (m \otimes n) \otimes_C x \sim m \otimes_C (n \otimes_C x)\) that satisfy compatibility axioms with the monoidal structure of \(M\).

We will drop the subscripts when the relevant actegory is clear from context.

The naming of the structure morphisms clashes with those of \(M\) on purpose:

**Proposition 2.2.** \(M\) has canonically the structure of an \(M\)-actegory, with \(\otimes_M = \otimes\), and \(\lambda\) and \(a\) as the actegory structure morphisms.

In what follows, when we use \(M\) as an \(M\)-actegory, we assume this canonical structure.

### 2.2 Optics

**Definition 2.3 (\([Rom20, Proposition 3.1.1]\))**. Given two \(M\)-actegories \(C\) and \(D\), we construct the category \(\text{Optic}_{C,D}\) as follows: objects are pairs \((x, u)\) where \(x : C\) and \(u : D\), and arrows are elements of the set

\[
\text{Optic}_{C,D}((x, u), (y, v)) := \int^{m : M} C(x, m \otimes_C y) \times D(m \otimes_D v, u).
\]

Given \(\alpha : C(x, m \otimes_C y)\) and \(\beta : D(m \otimes_D v, u)\), we will denote the corresponding arrow by \(\langle \alpha \| \beta \rangle_m\). Composition and identities are defined componentwise in the expected way; see [Rom20] for more details.

**Note 2.4.** Expanding the definition of coends in \(\text{Set}\), we get that the coend above denotes the set of pairs \(\langle \alpha \| \beta \rangle_m\) with \(\alpha : C(x, m \otimes_C y)\) and \(\beta : D(m \otimes_D v, u)\), quotiented by the equation \(\langle \alpha_!(f \otimes_C y) \| \beta \rangle_m = \langle \alpha \| (f \otimes_D v) \cdot \beta \rangle_n\) for \(f : M(n, m)\).

In this full generality, this category is not monoidal. This prevents us from having string diagrams in the usual way. We will see how to work around this limitation in the rest of the paper.

### 2.3 Tambara modules

**Definition 2.5 (\([Rom20, Proposition 5.1.1]\))**. Given two \(M\)-actegories \(C\) and \(D\), we construct the category \(\text{Tamb}_{C,D}\) as follows: objects are \((\text{pro})\)functors \(P : C^{\text{op}} \times D \to \text{Set}\) equipped with a natural transformation
strength : \int_{m:M} P(a, b) \to P(m \circ_C a, m \circ_D b) \text{ compatible with the actegory structures; arrows are strength-preserving natural transformations.}

This generalizes the usual notion of strength for a profunctor.

**Definition 2.6.** We construct the (weak) 2-category Tamb as follows: objects are \(M\)-actegories; Hom-categories are the categories Tamb\(_{C,D}\).

It inherits its 2-categorical structure from the 2-category Prof of profunctors: the identities are the hom-profunctors \(C(\cdot, \cdot)\), and the tensor (horizontal composition) is profunctor composition, defined as usual as follows:

\[(P \otimes Q)(a, c) = \int^b P(a, b) \times Q(b, c)\]

**Note 2.7.** It is out of the scope of this paper to study the precise relationship between Prof and Tamb, but initial investigation suggests it is very close: it would appear that in many ways Tamb is to actegories what Prof is to categories.

Our interest in Tambara modules comes from the following strong relationship with optics:

**Theorem 2.8** ([Rom20, Proposition 5.5.2]). \(\text{[Optic}_{C,D}^{op}, Set] \cong \text{Tamb}_{C,D}\)

**Proof.** The proof can be found in [Rom20, Proposition 5.5.2], but initially comes from [PS07, Proposition 6.1] in a less general setting, along with more results on the structure of both of those categories.

\[\square\]

## 3 Diagrams for Tambara modules

### 3.1 Basics

As in any 2-category, cells in Tamb can be represented as diagrams, as follows:

A 0-cell (an \(M\)-actegory) is represented as a planar region delimited by the other types of cells. For technical reasons we will not represent them in what follows, but it should be kept in mind that 1-cells can only be composed if their types match.

A 1-cell \(P : \text{Tamb}_{C,D}\) is represented as a wire, with \(C\) above and \(D\) below:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P} \\
\hline
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]

Tensoring (1-cell composition) is vertical juxtaposition (for \(P : \text{Tamb}_{C,D}\) and \(Q : \text{Tamb}_{D,E}\)): 
A 2-cell $\alpha : P \to Q$ (for $P, Q : \text{Tamb}_{C,D}$) is represented as:

$$P \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q$$

Composition is horizontal juxtaposition:

$$P \xrightarrow{\alpha \downarrow \beta} R = P \xrightarrow{\alpha} \beta R$$

and tensoring is vertical juxtaposition:

$$P \otimes R \xrightarrow{\alpha \otimes \beta} Q \otimes S = P \xrightarrow{\alpha} \beta S$$

For example, one could represent the following complex composition of cells diagrammatically:

$$P \xrightarrow{\alpha \downarrow \beta \downarrow \epsilon} Q$$

The axioms of 2-categories ensure that we can interchange boxes like we do in string diagrams for monoidal categories.

### 3.2 Oriented wires

So far, this was common to any 2-category. We can now investigate gadgets specific to $\text{Tamb}$.

Let us fix an $M$-actegory $C$.

**Definition 3.1.** Given $x : C$, let us define two profunctors $R_x := C(-, = \otimes_C x)$ and $L_x := C(- \otimes_C x, =)$.

**Proposition 3.2.** $R_x$ is in $\text{Tamb}_{C,M}$ and $L_x$ is in $\text{Tamb}_{M,C}$, where $M$ is taken with its canonical $M$-actegory structure.
Proof. \( R_x \) is a profunctor \( C^{op} \times M \to \text{Set} \). The action of the \((m \circ_C -)\) functor provides it with a strength. The same works for \( L_x \).

\[ \square \]

**Proposition 3.3.** \( R_x \) extends to a functor \( R : C \to \text{Tamb}_{C,M} \), and \( L_x \) extends to a functor \( L : C^{op} \to \text{Tamb}_{M,C} \).

Proof. Straightforward from their definitions.

\[ \square \]

**Proposition 3.4.** \( R \) and \( L \) respect the actegory structures: \( R_I \cong L_I \cong M(-,=) \), \( R_x \otimes R_m \cong R_{m \circ_x} \), and \( L_m \otimes L_x \cong L_{m \circ x} \).

Proof. See appendix A.1.

\[ \square \]

This justifies the following notation:

\[ x \quad \overset{f}{\longrightarrow} \quad y := \quad R_x \quad \overset{R_f}{\longrightarrow} \quad R_y \]

and

\[ y \quad \overset{f}{\longleftarrow} \quad x := \quad L_y \quad \overset{L_f}{\longleftarrow} \quad L_x \]

Similarly

\[ x \quad \overset{f}{\longrightarrow} \quad y := \quad R_x \quad \overset{R_f}{\longrightarrow} \quad R_y \]

and

\[ y \quad \overset{f}{\longleftarrow} \quad x := \quad L_y \quad \overset{L_f}{\longleftarrow} \quad L_x \]

**Note 3.5.** This choice of notation could create confusion as to whether a box on an oriented wire is meant to be seen as in the image of \( R/L \) or not. However we will see later that \( R \) and \( L \) are fully faithful, and thus this confusion fades away: all boxes on an oriented wire are arrows in \( C \).

From the propositions above, we see that this notation respects composition in \( C \) as well as the \( M \)-actegory structures (note the inversion that happens when tensoring on a right-oriented wire):
3.6 Note. Note that because of the types of the 1-cells (that are not shown in the diagrams), not all tensorings of the oriented wires are allowed. For example, it could be tempting to think that $R_y \otimes R_y \cong R_y \otimes x$ for $x, y : C$, but not only is $C$ not monoidal in general, the composition doesn’t even type-check since the domain of $R$ here is $\text{Tamb}_{C,M}$.

3.7 Note. When $C$ is chosen to be $M$, both $R$ and $L$ provide a monoidal embedding of $M$ into $\text{Tamb}_{M,M}$; we will see later that it is also fully faithful. This means that the string diagrams in $M$ have two full and faithful embeddings into the string diagrams of $\text{Tamb}$, using the oriented wires.

3.3 Bending wires

**Proposition 3.8.** For a given $x : C$, the modules $R_x$ and $L_x$ are adjoint. Moreover, the structure maps of the adjunction are dinatural in $x$.

**Proof.** $R_x = C(\_ , \_ \otimes x)$ and $L_x = C(\_ \otimes x , \_)$ are clearly adjoint as profunctors. The adjunction lifts to $\text{Tamb}$; see appendix A.2. Dinaturality in $x$ is straightforward from the definition of the unit and counit.

This means that there exist two 2-cells, that we will draw as:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \begin{tikzpicture}[thick, scale=0.5]
    \node (a) at (0,0) {$x$};
    \node (b) at (1,0) {$x$};
    \draw (a) to (b);
  \end{tikzpicture}
\end{align*}
\] and

\[
\begin{align*}
  \begin{tikzpicture}[thick, scale=0.5]
    \node (a) at (0,0) {$x$};
    \node (b) at (0,-1) {$x$};
    \draw (a) to (b);
  \end{tikzpicture}
\end{align*}
\]

that satisfy the so-called “snake equations”:
Those maps are additionally dinatural in $x$, which means we can also slide $C$-arrows around them:

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\xymatrix{
& x \\
& x \\
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
= \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\xymatrix{
& x \\
& x \\
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$

and

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\xymatrix{
& x \\
& x \\
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
= \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\xymatrix{
& x \\
& x \\
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$

We have discovered an additional property of the diagrammatic language: oriented arrows can be bent downwards. Note that bending upwards is not in general possible.

Note 3.9. In the case of set-based lenses (i.e. $C = D = M = \text{Set}$ with the cartesian product), the second of those maps (the “cap”) was featured in the calculus of [Hed17]. The first map (the “cup”) however cannot be expressed in that calculus.

4 Embedding optics

4.1 A representation theorem

We will now use this calculus to express optics. Recall that presheaves on optics are exactly Tambara modules: $[\text{Optic}_{C,D}^{op}, \text{Set}] \cong \text{Tamb}_{C,D}$ [Rom20, Proposition 5.5.2].

Consequently, the Yoneda embedding $Y : \text{Optic}_{C,D} \to [\text{Optic}_{C,D}^{op}, \text{Set}] \cong \text{Tamb}_{C,D}$ provides a fully faithful embedding of optics into $\text{Tamb}$. This is the crucial property that enables our calculus.

Lemma 4.1. $Y(\frac{f}{u}) = R_x \otimes L_u$

Thus $Y(x)$ has the following nice diagrammatic notation:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Y(x) \quad Y(x) \\
\quad \quad (x) \\
\quad \quad u \\
\quad \quad v \\
\end{array}
\]

From this we deduce the main theorem of this paper:

**Theorem 4.2** (Embedding theorem). Optics \( l : \text{Optic}_{C,D}(x,y) \) are in bijection with arrows in \( \text{Tamb}_{C,D} \) of type:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
x \quad \quad y \\
u \quad \quad v \\
\end{array}
\]

and moreover this bijection respects the categorical structure.

Proof. By fully-faithfulness of the Yoneda embedding.

The consequences of this property need stressing: any diagram of this type represents an optic, *even if it is made of subcomponents that are not themselves optics*. A parallel can be drawn with complex numbers: a complex number with no imaginary part represents a real number, regardless of whether it was constructed (using complex operations like rotation) from complex numbers that were not themselves real numbers. In both cases, we can work in this more general space (complex numbers/Tambara modules) to reason more flexibly about the simpler objects (reals/optics).

For example, the following diagram is a valid optic, even though several of its subcomponents are not optics.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
x \quad \quad y \\
u \quad \quad v \\
\end{array}
\]
4.2 Simple arrows

The simplest optic we can construct is made out of two simple arrows (i.e. arrows in the base \( M \)-actegories). This is sometimes called an \textit{adapter}. Given \( f : C(x, y) \) and \( g : D(v, u) \), we can see from its type that \( R_f \otimes L_g \) is an optic:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
x & \xrightarrow{f} & y \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\!u & \leftarrow & \!v
\end{array}
\]

**Lemma 4.3.** The optic corresponding to this diagram is \(( f \sharp \lambda_y^{-1} | \lambda_v \sharp g )_I \).

**Proof.** By a straightforward calculation; see appendix A.3. \(\square\)

The special case of a single simple arrow is particularly interesting:

**Theorem 4.4.** All morphisms of type

\[
\begin{array}{c}
R_x \xrightarrow{} I & \xleftarrow{} & R_y \\
\end{array}
\]

are of the form

\[
\begin{array}{c}
x \xrightarrow{} f & \xrightarrow{} y \\
\end{array}
\]

for some unique \( f : C(x, y) \).

Similarly for \( L \) and wires going to the left.

**Proof.** Since \( L_I \cong M(-, -) \), we have (using a potentially confusing notation):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
R_x \xrightarrow{} I \xrightarrow{} R_y \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus by the embedding theorem, \( l \) can be seen as an optic in \( \text{Optic}_{C, M}( \langle x \rangle, \langle y \rangle ) \).

We then calculate (see appendix A.4) that \( \text{Optic}_{C, M}( \langle x \rangle, \langle y \rangle ) \cong C(x, y) \), with the reverse direction given by the action of \( R \). The proof for \( L \) is identical. \(\square\)

**Corollary 4.5.** \( R \) and \( L \) are fully faithful.

**Note 4.6.** As pointed out earlier, in the particular case where we choose \( C = D = M \) (as in the case of lenses), then \( R \) and \( L \) both provide a fully-faithful and monoidal embedding of the arrows in \( M \) into diagrams.
4.3 The cap

The cap:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\alpha \\
\beta
\end{array}
\]

is not in general an optic. Indeed it has type \( R_x \otimes L_x \to C(-,=) \), and \( C(-,=) \) cannot in general be expressed as \( Y(Y') \). For \( C = M \) however, it is an optic because \( M(-,=) \cong Y(Y') \).

More generally, for \( x : C, u : D, m : M \), the following cap-like diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
m \\
u
\end{array}
\]

is an optic too.

**Lemma 4.7.** The optic corresponding to this diagram is \( \langle \text{id}_m \circ \alpha \mid \text{id}_m \circ \beta \rangle_m \).

**Proof.** By a straightforward calculation; see appendix A.5.

Note 4.8. Those two basic optics were identified respectively in [Ril18, Proposition 2.0.5] and [Ril18, Example 2.0.2].

4.4 Refining the representation theorem

Together, simple arrows and the cap are enough to represent any optic as a string diagram.

**Theorem 4.9** (Representation theorem). Given \( \alpha : C(x, m \circ y) \) and \( \beta : D(m \circ v, u) \), the optic \( l := \langle \alpha \mid \beta \rangle_m \) can be represented as follows:
Note 4.10. Recall that the pairs $\langle \alpha \mid \beta \rangle_m$ are defined modulo an equivalence relation. How is this compatible with the diagrammatic notation? The equivalence says that $\langle \alpha ; (f \odot y) \mid \beta \rangle_m = \langle \alpha | (f \odot v) ; \beta \rangle_n$; diagrammatically, this becomes:

Which we already know holds, by sliding $f$ along the bent wire!

5 Applications

We present two examples of applications of the calculus that illustrate its expressivity.

5.1 Lawful optics

One of the most striking consequences of this calculus (and the question that led to its discovery) is the neatness with which it can express optic laws.

Riley defines a notion of lawfulness for optics [Ril18, Section 3], that generalizes very-well-behavedness for lenses [FGM+04] as well as laws for various other sorts of optics. We provide an alternative (and equivalent) definition that is purely diagrammatic:

Definition 5.1. An optic $l : (x^x) \to (y^y)$ is said to be lawful when

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
  x & \xrightarrow{l} & x \\
  x & \xleftarrow{l} & x \\
\end{array}
\quad = \quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
  x & \xrightarrow{l} & x \\
  x & \xleftarrow{l} & x \\
\end{array}
$$

and
Theorem 5.2. This notion of lawfulness is equivalent to the one in [Ril18, Section 3].

Proof. See appendix A.7.

Thus this diagrammatic definition captures properly the useful and very general notion of lawfulness for optics. In the next section we will explore those laws in the special case of lenses.

Note 5.3. We can see that lawful optics are exactly the homomorphisms for the “pair-of-pants” comonoid made from pairs of oriented wires. The property that lawful optics were homomorphisms for some comonoid was noted in [Ril18, Proposition 5.3.1], and now has a beautiful diagrammatic interpretation.

Using this theorem, a lot of properties of lawfulness can be derived purely diagrammatically. As an example, let us reprove [Ril18, Proposition 3.0.4]:

Proposition 5.4 ([Ril18, Proposition 3.0.4]). If α and β are mutual inverses, then the optic \( \langle \alpha \mid \beta \rangle_m \) is lawful.

Proof.
5.2 Cartesian lenses

A very common special case is cartesian lenses, which arises when we restrict ourselves to $C = D = M$ and $M$ is cartesian (i.e. its monoidal product is the cartesian product).

In this setting, we have two important gadgets in $M$: duplication and deletion, corresponding respectively to the diagonal map $M(x, x \times x)$ and the terminal map $M(x, I)$. Diagrammatically, we represent them as follows:
Lemma 5.5. Given \( f : M(X,Y \times Z) \), we have

\[
x \xrightarrow{f} y = x \xrightarrow{f} y
\]

Proof. This corresponds to the well-known fact that \( f = (\text{fst} \circ f, \text{snd} \circ f) \).

Theorem 5.6. A lens \( l : (x_u) \rightarrow (y_v) \) can be expressed as:

\[
x \rightarrow \text{get} \rightarrow y
\]

for some \( \text{get} : C(x,y) \) and \( \text{put} : C(x \times v,u) \).
Proof.

\[ x \xrightarrow{\alpha} y \quad u \xleftarrow{\beta} v \]

which has the required shape.

We have:

\[ x \xrightarrow{\text{get}} y := x \xrightarrow{\alpha} y \]

\[ u \xleftarrow{\text{put}} x := u \xleftarrow{\beta} x \]

Note 5.7. Observe that it is diagrammatically clear that the definition of \text{put} and \text{get} in terms of \langle \alpha \mid \beta \rangle_m respects the equivalence relation induced by the coend.

In this setting, various properties of lenses can be investigated purely diagrammatically. As an example, let us revisit [Ril18, Proposition 3.0.3], which captures the fact that the general notion of lawfulness for optics coincides with the familiar PutGet, GetPut and PutPut laws [FGM+04] in the case of lenses.

**Proposition 5.8** ([Ril18, Proposition 3.0.3]). A lens \( l : (\frac{x}{y}) \to (\frac{y}{y}) \) is lawful iff it verifies the following three laws (respectively called PutGet, GetPut and PutPut):
Proof. Diagrammatically, the fact that a lens is lawful reads:

The first equality is exactly the PutGet law. By following the different paths through the diagrams, one can also intuitively see that the second equality corresponds to both the PutPut and the GetPut laws. Some appropriate applications of the deletion map would complete the proof.
6 Conclusion and future work

We have presented a calculus that flowed naturally from the Yoneda embedding of optics into Tambara modules. We have shown that it was well-suited for expressing common properties of optics and proving useful theorems generally, some of which would otherwise be painful to prove. This work however is only the start: it provides the basis of a calculus, whose expressive power hasn’t yet been explored in the plethora of topics where optics have found a use. In particular, we expect new specific diagrammatic properties like those of lenses to arise for other kinds of optics like prisms or traversals.

Then, the calculus could be linked with related constructions, like the calculus for teleological categories from [Hed17], or the Int construction from [JSV96].

Properties of Tamb as a 2-category also seem worth exploring, in particular its apparent strong similarity with Prof, and the link between the properties of M and those of Tamb.

Finally, diagrams in Tamb with multiple ingoing and outgoing legs seem to relate to combs as in [KU17] and dialogues in the style of [Hed19]; there is potential for using Tamb to provide a basis for general diagrammatic descriptions of those objects.
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Appendices

A Proofs

A.1 Proposition 3.4

Proof (Proposition 3.4).

\[ R_I = M(-, = \odot_M I) \]
\[ = M(-, = \odot I) \]
\[ \cong M(-, =) \]

\[ R_x \otimes R_m = \int^{n:M} C(-, n \odot_C x) \times M(n, = \odot_M m) \]
\[ = \int^{n:M} C(-, n \odot_C x) \times M(n, = \odot m) \]
\[ \cong C(-, (= \odot m) \odot_C x) \]
\[ \cong C(-, = \odot_C (m \odot_C x)) \]
\[ = R_{m \odot_C x} \]

\[ L_I = M(- \odot_M I, =) \]
\[ = M(- \odot I, =) \]
\[ \cong M(-, =) \]

\[ L_m \otimes L_x = \int^{n:M} M(- \odot_M m, n) \times C(n \odot_C x, =) \]
\[ = \int^{n:M} M(- \odot m, n) \times C(n \odot_C x, =) \]
\[ \cong C((- \odot m) \odot_C x, =) \]
\[ \cong C(- \odot_C (m \odot_C x), =) \]
\[ = L_{m \odot_C x} \]

\[ \Box \]

A.2 Proposition 3.8

Proof (Proposition 3.8). The counit \( \varepsilon : R_x \otimes L_x \to C(-, =) \) of the adjunction in \( Prof \) is given by composition in \( C \). We need it to commute with strength:
We inline the definition of \( strength \), and move the coends out by continuity, to get an equivalent square:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\int^b C(a, b \odot x) \otimes C(b \odot x, c) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{I}} & C(a, c) \\
\left\downarrow_{\text{strength}} \right. & & \left\downarrow_{\text{strength}} \\
\int^{b'} C(m \odot a, b' \odot x) \otimes C(b' \odot x, m \odot c) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{I}} & C(m \odot a, m \odot c)
\end{array}
\]

The top square commutes by functoriality of \((m \odot -)\); the bottom one by the fact that \( a^{-1} \triangleright a = id \).

Similarly, the unit also lives in \( T_{amb} \). This is enough for the adjunction to lift from \( Prof \) to \( T_{amb} \).

\[\square\]

### A.3 Lemma 4.3

**Proof (Lemma 4.3).** The diagram corresponds to the 2-cell \( R_f \otimes L_g \).

It has type

\[
R_f \otimes L_g : R_x \otimes L_u \to R_y \otimes L_v \\
= \int_{ab} \left( \int^m R_x(a, m) \times L_u(m, b) \right) \to \left( \int^m R_y(a, m) \times L_v(m, b) \right)
\]

And value

\[
R_f \otimes L_g = \lambda(p \mid q)_m \to \langle R_f(p) \mid L_g(q) \rangle_m \\
= \lambda(p \mid q)_m \to \langle p \triangleright (m \odot f) \mid ((m \odot g) \triangleright q) \rangle_m
\]

To get the preimage through \( Y \), we apply this map to the identity optic.
\[(R_f \otimes L_g)(id_x) = (R_f \otimes L_g)((\lambda_x^{-1} | \lambda_u)_I)\]
\[= \langle \lambda_x^{-1} \cdot (I \circ f) \cdot (I \circ g) \cdot \lambda_u \rangle_I\]
\[= \langle f \cdot \lambda_y^{-1} \cdot \lambda_u \cdot g \rangle_I\]

\[\Box\]

### A.4 Theorem 4.4

**Proof (Theorem 4.4).** We calculate:

\[Optic_{C,M}((\varphi), (\psi))\]
\[= \int^m C(x, m \circ_C y) \times M(m \circ_M I, I)\]
\[= \int^m C(x, m \circ_C y) \times M(m \circ I, I)\]
\[\cong \int^m C(x, m \circ_C y) \times M(m, I)\]
\[\cong C(x, I \circ_C y)\]
\[\cong C(x, y)\]

By following the isomorphisms, we get that the reverse direction is the function
\[\lambda(f : C(x, y)) \rightarrow \langle f \cdot \lambda_y^{-1} \cdot \lambda_I \rangle_I,\]
which as we saw previously corresponds to
\[\lambda_f \rightarrow \iota(f, id_I) = R_f \otimes L_{id_I} = R_f.\]

\[\Box\]

### A.5 Lemma 4.7

**Proof (Lemma 4.7).** Let us name the map corresponding to this diagram \(\Lambda_{x,m,u}\).

Knowing the action of the cap \(\varepsilon\), we obtain by a tedious calculation that we will omit here:

\[\Lambda_{x,m,u} : Y \left( \frac{m \circ x}{m \circ u} \right) \rightarrow Y \left( \frac{x}{u} \right)\]
\[= \lambda(\alpha \mid \beta)_n \rightarrow \langle \alpha \cdot \lambda_y^{-1} \cdot \lambda_u \cdot \beta \rangle_n \otimes m\]
Thus the corresponding optic is:

\[
\Lambda_{x,m,u}(id_{m \odot x}) = \Lambda_{x,m,u}(\lambda_{m \odot x}^{-1} | \lambda_{m \odot u})
\]

\[
= (\lambda_{m \odot x}^{-1} \circ a_{I,m,x} | a_{I,m,u} \circ \lambda_{m \odot u})_{I \odot m}
\]

\[
= (\lambda_{m}^{-1} \circ x | \lambda_{m} \circ u)_{I \odot m}
\]

\[
= ((\lambda_{m}^{-1} \circ \lambda_{m}) \circ x | id_{m \odot u})_{m}
\]

\[
= \langle id_{m \odot x} | id_{m \odot u} \rangle_{m}
\]

\[\square\]

### A.6 Theorem 4.9

**Proof (Theorem 4.9).** The right-hand-side diagram is the composition of two optics of which we know the value: the left-hand-side is \(\langle \alpha \; \lambda_{y}^{-1} \circ \beta \rangle_{I} \); the right-hand-side is \(\langle id_{m \odot y} \circ id_{m \odot v} \rangle_{m}\).

The resulting optic is thus their composition:

\[
\langle \alpha \; \lambda_{y}^{-1} \circ \beta \rangle_{I} \circ \langle id_{m \odot y} \circ id_{m \odot v} \rangle_{m}
\]

\[
= \langle \alpha \; \lambda_{y}^{-1} \circ (I \odot id_{m \odot y}) \circ \lambda_{m, I} \circ \beta \rangle_{I \odot m}
\]

\[
= \langle \alpha \; \lambda_{y}^{-1} \circ \lambda_{m, I} \circ \beta \rangle_{I \odot m}
\]

\[
= \langle \alpha \; (\lambda_{I}^{-1} \circ y) \circ (\lambda_{I} \circ v) \circ \beta \rangle_{I \odot m}
\]

\[
= \langle \alpha \; (\lambda_{I}^{-1} \circ y) \circ \beta \rangle_{m}
\]

\[\square\]

### A.7 Theorem 5.2

Lawfulness in [Ril18, Section 3] is based on three maps named outside, once, and twice (see [Ril18] for details).

**Lemma A.1.** Given an optic \(l : (\cdot \to \cdot)\), the maps outside \(l\), once \(l\), and twice \(l\) from correspond respectively to the three diagrams:
Proof. Straightforward by unpacking the definitions.

Proof (Theorem 5.2). Trivial from the lemma above and the definition of lawfulness.