BROWN REPRESENTABILITY FOR DIRECTED GRAPHS
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ABSTRACT. We prove that any contravariant functor from the homotopy category of finite directed graphs to abelian groups satisfying the additivity axiom and the Mayer-Vietoris axiom is representable.

1. INTRODUCTION

The homotopy theory of directed graphs is a discrete analogue of homotopy theory in algebraic topology. In topology, a homotopy between two continuous maps is defined by an interpolating family of continuous maps parametrized by a closed interval \([0,1]\). Its discrete analogue we study uses a directed line graph keeping track of a discrete change of directed graph maps. See for example Grigor’yan, Lin, Muranov, and Yau [9]. Efforts towards a homotopy theory for graphs extends back to the 1970’s and 1980’s with some results by Gianella [7] and Malle [17]. However, the most recent variant of graph homotopy theory appears to have taken off with a paper by Beifang, Yau, and Yeh from 2001 [2], before culminating in the 2014 work of Grigor’yan, Lin, Muranov, and Yau [9]. Recently, there is increased interest in this new notion of homotopy for directed graphs because it was shown by Grigor’yan, Jimenez, Muranov, and Yau in [8] that the path-space homology theory of directed graphs is invariant under this version of graph homotopy.

The path-space homology and cohomology theories for directed graphs were studied by Grigor’yan, Lin, Muranov, and Yau [10] and by Grigor’yan, Muranov, and Yau in [11] and [12]. The homology theory developed in the references above is quite natural, computable, and can be non-trivial for degrees greater than one, depending on the lengths of admissible, \(\partial\)-invariant paths in a directed graph. Thus, the fact that this homology is invariant under this notion of homotopy for directed graphs suggests that both are the appropriate notions for the category of directed graphs. Furthermore, this notion of homotopy is of interest because counting the essential types of cycles in a directed graph is of interest anywhere one finds directed graphs that model a particular phenomenon, for example nerves of categories, quivers, neural nets, electrical circuits, etc.

In this paper, we prove the Brown representability theorem for the category of directed graphs by modifying some constructions of Adams [1] for connected CW complexes with base point. More specifically, we prove that any contravariant functor from the homotopy category of finite directed graphs to the category of abelian groups is representable. It should be noted that simply attempting to verify Brown’s axioms [4] for the category of directed graphs is insufficient as we shall show later in Section 2.4.
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The Brown representability theorem is a classical theorem in algebraic topology first proved by Edgar H. Brown [3]. It states that, given a \textbf{Set-valued} functor on the homotopy category of based CW complexes satisfying the wedge axiom and the Mayer-Vietoris axiom, that functor is representable. Brown went further in [4] by replacing the homotopy category of based CW complexes into an arbitrary category satisfying a list of proposed axioms, and this result has been further generalized in triangulated categories by Neeman [18], closed model categories in Jardine [14, Theorem 19], and homotopy categories of $\infty$-categories in Lurie [16, Section 1.4.1]. The gist of these generalizations is that Brown representability is more of a category-theoretic feature than topological. However the idea behind the classical theorem of J. H. C. Whitehead that every CW complex is formed by attaching spheres is essential, whereas an analogue of such in the homotopy category of directed graphs is not well-understood yet. A more fundamental issue in here is that the homotopy extension property fails in the category of directed graphs (see Section 2.4). This is why the approach and proof of Adams [1] is more relevant for our purpose in that the investigation of representability of functors defined on finite complexes therein leads us to guess that contravariant functors on the homotopy category of \textit{finite} directed graphs are representable.

The main technical innovation in this paper is in our constructions 2.30, 2.35, and 2.36 which mimic the topological setting by inserting a middle slice that preserves the directed graph and its homotopy type. One cannot say that the proof of Adams we are using gives the result \textit{mutatis mutandis} in that the proof will fail with a use of the cofibering therein. One has to notice that the homotopy category of directed graphs are in some respects drastically different from the homotopy category of CW complexes and at times category-theoretically correct constructions are no longer relevant for directed graph homotopy theory.

Therefore, a Brown representability theorem for directed graphs is worth pursuing not only because of the importance of Brown’s representability theorem being one of the pillars in stable homotopy theory, but also it is a good starting point to study the homotopy theory of directed graphs in depth.

Since we prove the representability for Brown functors on finite directed graphs, an interesting future direction would be investigating the same statement for both finite and infinite directed graphs. As mentioned earlier, this question is basically asking what is the discrete analogue of attaching cells in a CW complex, and is tightly connected to understanding higher homotopy groups of a directed graphs. (Compare Section 4.6 of Grigor’yan, Lin, Muranov, and Yau [9].)

The Brown representability theorem in topology requires the domain category of the functors to be the category of connected CW complexes with a base point. When the domain category is either the category of not-necessarily-connected CW complexes or the category of unbased CW complexes then there exist well-known counterexamples. See for example Heller [13] and Freyd and Heller [6]. The category of directed graphs is not as rich as the category of topological spaces and the Freyd-Heller counterexample is not likely to occur. Formally addressing such an aspect is of interest to the authors.

Since the topic of homotopy for directed graphs is a blend of algebraic topology and the geometry of directed graphs, we tried to write this paper as a self-contained account that audiences from both areas would find readable. We also tried to minimize deviating from Adams’ exposition [1] so that readers would find it easy to compare where and how the proof deviates from the one in topology. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 consists of background on digraph homotopy theory and constructions therein. It serves the two-fold purpose of establishing notations and conventions, and providing constructions which underpin our arguments and the main result in later sections.
Section 3 defines a Brown functor and discusses its properties. Section 4 gives a construction of the classifying digraph of a Brown functor.
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2. Homotopy theory for directed graphs

In this section, we shall give a brief review of directed graph homotopy theory as well as relevant constructions. A good reference on digraph homotopy theory is Grigor’yan, Lin, Muranov, and Yau [9] which has a broader account. Several constructions we give in this section are the technical core of this paper. See 2.30, 2.35, and 2.36. We also discuss a failure of homotopy extension property in the category of directed graphs.

2.1. The category of directed graphs.

Definition 2.1. A directed graph (or digraph for short) $\vec{G}$ is a pair $(V, E)$ consisting of a set $V$ specifying labeled points called vertices and another set $E$ of ordered pairs of distinct vertices in $V$ called edges. If both $(x, y) \in E$ and $(y, x) \in E$, we say that the edge is undirected.

Having an edge $(x, y) \in E$ means that there is a directed arrow from $x$ to $y$ and graphically one draws $\bullet_x \rightarrow \bullet_y$. Note that from the definition above, loop-edges are excluded from consideration and since $E$ is a set $(x, y)$ occurs at most once. We will sometimes write $x \rightarrow y$, if $x, y \in V$ and $(x, y) \in E$, i.e. $\bullet_x \rightarrow \bullet_y$ appears in $\vec{G}$.

Definition 2.2. A point is a digraph consisting of only one vertex and no edges.

Definition 2.3. An $n$-step line digraph, $n > 0$, is a sequence of vertices, $\bullet_0, \bullet_1, \bullet_2, \ldots, \bullet_n$, such that either $(i - 1, i)$ or $(i, i - 1)$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, is an edge (but not both) and there are no other edges.

Such a directed graph forms a line with $n$ arbitrarily oriented edges between each of the $n + 1$ vertices. When $n = 1$, there are two possible line digraphs, $I^+ := \bullet_0 \rightarrow \bullet_1$ and $I^- := \bullet_0 \leftarrow \bullet_1$. There is a third possibility when the edge is undirected, $I^\pm := \bullet_0 \leftrightarrow \bullet_1$, however, we do not consider this to be a line digraph as defined above.

Notation 2.4. We will denote an arbitrary $n$-step line digraph as $I_n$ for short and let $\mathcal{J}_n$ represent the set of all possible $n$-step line digraphs. The set of all line digraphs of any length $n$ will be denoted $\mathcal{J} := \bigcup_n \mathcal{J}_n$ and we will refer to an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{J}$ as a line digraph $I$, dropping the reference to the number of steps.

Definition 2.5. A digraph map, $f : \vec{G} \rightarrow \vec{H}$, is a function from the vertex set of $\vec{G}$ to the vertex set of $\vec{H}$ such that whenever $(x, y)$ is an edge in $\vec{G}$ either $f(x) = f(y)$ in $\vec{H}$ or $\bullet f(x) \rightarrow \bullet f(y)$ is an edge in $\vec{H}$.

If for some edge $(x, y)$, $f(x) = f(y)$ in $\vec{H}$, then we will say that this edge has been collapsed and if $(f(x), f(y)) \in E_{\vec{H}}$, then we say that the edge has been preserved. Note that, since a digraph map must be a function on the discrete set of vertices, the image of a digraph map has at most as many vertices as the domain.
Remark 2.16. Given a fixed vertex \( \alpha \in \mathcal{D} \), and the morphisms are digraph maps, \( f : \vec{G} \rightarrow \vec{H} \).

Definition 2.17. A graph \( \vec{G} = (V, E) \) is finite if the vertex set \( V \) is finite.

Notation 2.8. We will use the notation \( \mathcal{D}_0 \) to denote the category whose objects are finite digraphs and morphisms are digraph maps. The category \( \mathcal{D}_0 \) is a subcategory of \( \mathcal{D} \).

2.2. Operations in directed graphs.

Definition 2.9. A sub-digraph \( \vec{X} \) of a digraph \( \vec{G} \) denoted symbolically \( \vec{X} \subseteq \vec{G} \) is a digraph for which \( V_{\vec{X}} \subseteq V_{\vec{G}} \) and \( E_{\vec{X}} \subseteq E_{\vec{G}} \).

Note that even if \( u, v \in V_{\vec{X}} \) and \( (u, v) \in E_{\vec{G}} \), it is not necessarily the case that \( (u, v) \in E_{\vec{X}} \).

Definition 2.10. An induced sub-digraph \( \vec{X} \) of a digraph \( \vec{G} \) denoted \( \vec{X} \subseteq \vec{G} \) is a sub-digraph in which whenever \( u, v \in V_{\vec{X}} \) and \( (u, v) \in E_{\vec{G}} \), then \( (u, v) \in E_{\vec{X}} \) too.

Definition 2.11. The vertex boundary of a sub-digraph \( \vec{X} \subseteq \vec{G} \), denoted \( \partial \vec{X} \), is the subset of vertices in \( V_{\vec{G}} \setminus \vec{X} \) such that either \( (g, x) \in E_{\vec{G}} \) or \( (x, g) \in E_{\vec{G}} \) (both occurring is possible), where \( g \in V_{\vec{G} \setminus \vec{X}} \) and \( x \in V_{\vec{X}} \).

Definition 2.12. The intersection of two digraphs, denoted \( \vec{G} \cap \vec{H} \), is the largest sub-digraph that is simultaneously contained in both \( \vec{G} \) and \( \vec{H} \) with consistently labeled vertices in both \( \vec{G} \) and \( \vec{H} \) comprising the vertex set of \( \vec{G} \cap \vec{H} \).

Note that \( \vec{G} \cap \vec{H} \) is not necessarily an induced subdigraph of either \( \vec{G} \) or \( \vec{H} \).

Definition 2.13. The union of two digraphs, denoted \( \vec{G} \cup \vec{H} \), is the smallest possible digraph that contains both \( \vec{G} \) and \( \vec{H} \) as induced sub-digraphs and in which the subdigraph \( \vec{G} \cap \vec{H} \) of both \( \vec{G} \) and \( \vec{H} \) has been identified, i.e. \( V_{\vec{G} \cup \vec{H}} = V_{\vec{G}} \cup V_{\vec{H}} \) and \( E_{\vec{G} \cup \vec{H}} = E_{\vec{G}} \cup E_{\vec{H}} \).

Definition 2.14. The disjoint union of two digraphs \( \vec{G} \) and \( \vec{H} \) is given by the disjoint union of their respective vertex sets and edge sets, as sets.

Definition 2.15. The graph Cartesian product \( \square \) of two directed graphs \( \vec{G} \) and \( \vec{H} \) is a directed graph \( \vec{G} \square \vec{H} \), where the vertices are all ordered pairs \( (u, v) \) such that \( u \in V_{\vec{G}} \) and \( v \in V_{\vec{H}} \), and \( \bullet_{(u_1, v_1)} \rightarrow \bullet_{(u_2, v_2)} \) is an edge in \( \vec{G} \square \vec{H} \) if either \( u_1 = u_2 \) and \( v_1 \rightarrow v_2 \) in \( \vec{H} \), or \( u_1 \rightarrow u_2 \) in \( \vec{G} \) and \( v_1 = v_2 \).

Remark 2.16. Given a fixed vertex \( v_0 \in V_{\vec{G}} \), we will denote the \( v_0 \)-slice of \( \vec{G} \square \vec{H} \), by \( \vec{G} \square \{v_0\} \) to be the induced sub-digraph where the vertices are all ordered pairs \( (u, v_0) \) such that \( u \in V_{\vec{G}} \) and the edges are those resulting from the edges of \( \vec{G} \).

Lemma 2.17. Let \( \{\vec{G}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A} \) be a countable family of directed graphs in the category \( \mathcal{D} \). Let \( \vec{Q} = \coprod_{\alpha \in A} \vec{G}_\alpha \) and take \( i_\alpha : \vec{G}_\alpha \rightarrow \vec{Q} \) to be the inclusion digraph maps for each component. Then, given any digraph \( \vec{Y} \in \mathcal{D} \) and an indexed family of digraph maps \( f_\alpha : \vec{G}_\alpha \rightarrow \vec{Y} \) for each \( \alpha \in A \), there exists a unique morphism \( \varphi : \vec{Q} \rightarrow \vec{Y} \) such that the diagram commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\vec{Q} & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & \vec{Y} \\
\downarrow i_\alpha & & \\
\vec{G}_\alpha & \xrightarrow{f_\alpha} & \vec{Y}
\end{array}
\]
that
its respective components. Assume that there is to be a map such that whenever
(Definition 2.22. A classes and whose edges are the edges between the representatives of the classes.

Definition 2.21. Let \(\prod\alpha G_\alpha\) be the natural inclusion of \(G_\alpha\) into \(\prod\alpha G_\alpha\) and take \(\varphi\) such that \(\varphi \circ i_\alpha = f_\alpha\). Thus, given \(u \in G_\alpha\), \(\varphi \circ i_\alpha(u) = f_\alpha(u)\) ■

Definition 2.18. The graph tensor product \(\otimes\) of two directed graphs \(G, H\) is a directed graph \(G \otimes H\) with vertex set all ordered pairs of vertices \(\{u, v\} \in V_G \times V_H\) and edges \(((u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2))\) whenever \((u_1, u_2) \in E_G\) and simultaneously \((v_1, v_2) \in E_H\).

Note that the graph tensor product of two connected digraphs is not a connected digraph.

Example 2.19. Consider the digraph \(G_1\) given by the triangle:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  & c & \\
 a & \downarrow & b \\
\end{array}
\]

and \(G_2 = I^+\). The graph tensor product is given then:

\[
G_1 \otimes G_2 = \{(a, 0), (b, 0), (c, 0), (a, 1), (b, 1), (c, 1)\},
\{(a, 0), (b, 1)\}, \{(b, 0), (c, 1)\}, \{(c, 0), (a, 1)\}\}.
\]

However, the graph Cartesian product is:

\[
G_1 \square G_2 = \{(a, 0), (b, 0), (c, 0), (a, 1), (b, 1), (c, 1)\},
\{(a, 0), (b, 0)\}, \{(b, 0), (c, 0)\}, \{(c, 0), (a, 0)\},
\{(a, 1), (b, 1)\}, \{(b, 1), (c, 1)\}, \{(c, 1), (a, 1)\},
\{(a, 0), (a, 1)\}, \{(b, 0), (b, 1)\}, \{(c, 0), (c, 1)\}\}.
\]

Taking \(p_1 : G_1 \square G_2 \to G_1\) such that \(p_1(g_1, g_2) = g_1\) and \(p_2 : G_1 \square G_2 \to G_2\) such that \(p_2(g_1, g_2) = g_2\), we have two digraph maps that project \(G_1 \square G_2\) onto its respective components. Now, take \(f_1 : G_1 \otimes G_2 \to G_1\) such that \(f_1(g_1, g_2) = g_1\) and \(f_2 : G_1 \otimes G_2 \to G_2\) such that \(f_2(g_1, g_2) = g_2\), so that again we have two digraph maps that now project \(G_1 \otimes G_2\) onto its respective components. Assume that there is to be a map \(\varphi : G_1 \otimes G_2 \to G_1 \square G_2\) so that \(p_1 \circ \varphi = f_1\). Considering \(p_1 \circ \varphi = f_1\), one finds that \(\varphi(u, v) = (u, 0)\) or \(\varphi(u, v) = (u, 1)\) for all \((u, v) \in V_{G_1 \otimes G_2}\). Essentially mapping all of \(G_1 \otimes G_2\) into either the 0-slice or the 1-slice of \(G_1 \square G_2\). However, this forces \(p_2 \circ \varphi = f_2\), the same phenomenon occurs just with the roles reversed now. The issue stems from the fact that edges in \(G \otimes H\) have no natural counterparts in \(G \square H\), except for projection onto the slices. Fixing one projection though forces the other to fail, as everything is then mapped to a single point and the diagram does not commute.

Remark 2.20. As we see from Lemma 2.17, \(\prod\) is a coproduct in the category of digraphs \(D\). However, as Example 2.19 shows, neither the graph Cartesian product \(\square\) nor the the graph tensor product (Compare Definition 2.18) is a category-theoretic product in \(D\) even if the latter is known to be the product in the category of undirected graphs. Compare Droz [5, Theorem 2.5, p.267].

Definition 2.21. Let \(G\) and \(H\) be digraphs and \(\sim\) an equivalence relation on vertex sets of \(G\) and \(H\) such that whenever \((g_1, g_2) \in E_G, g_1 \sim h_1,\) and \(g_2 \sim h_2,\) then either \(h_1 = h_2\) or \((h_1, h_2) \in E_H\). The identification digraph formed by \(\sim\) is a digraph \(G \coprod H / \sim\) whose vertices are equivalence classes and whose edges are the edges between the representatives of the classes.

Definition 2.22. A quotient digraph \(G / X\), for \(X \subset G\) and \(X\) not necessarily connected, is an identification digraph \(G \coprod X / \sim\) where \(x \sim \star\) for all \(x \in V_X\).
Definition 2.23. The mapping cylinder of a digraph map \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) is given by
\[
[\vec{G} \square I^- \amalg \vec{H}] / \sim,
\]
where \((g, 0) \sim f(g)\) for all \(g \in V_{\vec{G}}\), i.e. the slice \(\vec{G} \square \{0\}\) and \(\Im(f)\) are identified under the map \(f\). The mapping cylinder of \(f\) will be denoted \(\vec{M}_f\).

Remark 2.24. A digraph map \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) factors through \(\vec{M}_f\). We shall explain later about the equivalence \(\simeq\).

\[
\vec{G} \xrightarrow{f} \vec{H} \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \simeq
\vec{f} \quad \vec{M}_f
\]

Definition 2.25. An extension of a mapping cylinder, \(\vec{M}_f\), for \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) is the digraph \(\vec{E}_f = (V_E, E_E)\), where \(V_E = V_{\vec{G}} \amalg V_{\vec{H}}\) and \((u, v) \in E_E\) if and only if either \(u \in V_{\vec{H}}, v \in V_{\vec{G}}\), and \((u, f(v)) \in E_{\vec{H}}\) or \(u \in V_{\vec{G}}, v \in V_{\vec{H}}\), and \((f(u), v) \in E_{\vec{H}}\).

Definition 2.26. An extended mapping cylinder for the digraph map \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) is given by the digraph \(\vec{E} \vec{M}_f = \vec{M}_f \cup \vec{E}_f\).

Definition 2.27. The cone over a digraph \(\vec{G}\) is the digraph \([\vec{G} \square I^-] / \sim\), where \((g, 0) \sim \ast\) for all \(g \in V_{\vec{G}}\). The cone over \(\vec{G}\) will be denoted as \(C \vec{G}\).

Definition 2.28. An extension of a cone over a sub-digraph \(\vec{X} \subset \vec{H}\) is the digraph \(\vec{B}_{\vec{X}} = (V_{\vec{B}_{\vec{X}}}, E_{\vec{B}_{\vec{X}}})\) where \(V = \partial \vec{X} \cup \{p\}\), \(p\) is the cone point, and \((p, y) \in E\) if and only if \((x, y) \in E_{\vec{H}}\) for some \(x \in \vec{X}\) and \(y \in \partial \vec{X}\) or \((y, p) \in E\) if and only if \((x, y) \in E_{\vec{H}}\) for some \(x \in \vec{X}\) and \(y \in \partial \vec{X}\).

Definition 2.29. An extended cone over the sub-digraph \(\vec{X}\) in \(\vec{H}\) is \(\vec{C} \vec{X} \cup \vec{B}_{\vec{X}}\).

Definition 2.30. The digraph cofiber \(\vec{C}(f)\) for a map \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) is an extension of a cone over \(\vec{G} \amalg \Im(f)\) unioned with the identification digraph \(\vec{G} \square I^+ \amalg \vec{H} / \sim\) where \((g, 0) \sim f(g)\) and the extension of this reversed mapping cylinder.

The resulting structure in the above definition is a “two-step extended cone” with a middle slice that preserves a copy of \(\vec{G}\). At least for our purpose in this paper, \(\vec{C}(f)\) is the correct cofiber construction in the category of directed graphs. (Compare Definition 2.32 and Remark 2.33.) At this point it is worth mentioning what is the category-theoretic cofiber of a map \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) in the category of directed graphs.

Definition 2.31. A pushout of the diagram \(\vec{H}_2 \xleftarrow{i_2} \vec{G} \xrightarrow{i_1} \vec{H}_1\) in the category of directed graphs is the digraph \((\vec{H}_1 \amalg \vec{H}_2)/ \sim\) such that \(f_1(g) \sim f_2(g)\) for all \(g \in V_{\vec{G}}\).

The pushout defined as above satisfies the universal property. It is the object \(\vec{Z}\) in the diagram below which is universally repelling.

\[
\vec{G} \xrightarrow{f_1} \vec{H}_1 \\
\downarrow f_2 \quad \downarrow i_1 \\
\vec{H}_2 \xrightarrow{i_2} \vec{Z}
\]
Definition 2.32. A cofiber of a digraph map \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) in \( \mathcal{D} \) is the pushout \( \vec{Z} \) in the following diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\vec{G} & \xrightarrow{j_1} & \vec{M}_f \\
j_2 & & \downarrow \\
\bullet & & \vec{Z}
\end{array}
\]

where \( j_1 \) is the inclusion and \( j_2 \) is the constant map. The pushout \( \vec{Z} \) is denoted by \( \vec{H} \cup_f C\vec{G} \) or simply \( \text{cofib}(f) \).

Remark 2.33. Albeit the \( \text{cofib}(f) \) is what we think it is as a category-theoretically correct construction, there are several reasons that it is not what we can use for our purpose in digraph homotopy theory. Even at a glimpse \( \text{cofib}(f) \) is different from the \( \text{cofib}(f) \) of a continuous map \( f : X \to Y \) in the category of topological spaces in that it lacks a slice of the domain digraph \( \vec{G} \). Furthermore, in general any subdigraph \( \vec{K} \subset \Im(f) \) cannot be homotoped to the cone vertex in that there might be edges in \( \vec{H} \) whose source and target are not entirely in \( \Im(f) \).

Definition 2.34. A reduced mapping cylinder for the digraph map \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) is defined to be \( \vec{T}_f := (\vec{G} \boxtimes I^n) / \sim \) where \((g,1) \sim f(g)\). Essentially dropping from the mapping cylinder of \( f \) anything in \( \vec{H} \) coming from the compliment of \( \Im(f) \).

Definition 2.35. A mapping tube between the images of two digraph maps \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) and \( g : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) is given by \( \vec{T}_{f,g} = \vec{T}_f \cup \vec{T}_g \cup \vec{E}_f \cup \vec{E}_g \). Note that \( \vec{T}_f \cap \vec{T}_g = \vec{G} \).

\[\text{Figure 1. A mapping tube between the images of } f \text{ and } g\]

Definition 2.36. A gat for a digraph map \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) is an identification digraph \( \vec{M}_f \amalg \vec{C}(f) / \sim \) where \((g,0) \in \vec{M}_f \) and \((g,0) \in \vec{C}(f) \) are identified by \( \sim \) for all \( g \in V_{\vec{G}} \).

2.3. Homotopy for digraphs.

Definition 2.37. Given two digraph maps \( f,g : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \), we say that \( f \) and \( g \) are homotopic, denoted \( f \simeq g \), if there exists an \( n \geq 1 \) and a digraph map \( F : \vec{G} \boxtimes I_n \to \vec{H} \), for some line digraph \( I_n \in \mathcal{I}_n \) (Recall Notation 2.4), such that \( F \mid_{\vec{G} \times \{0\}} = f \) and \( F \mid_{\vec{G} \times \{n\}} = g \).

For every vertex \( i \in V_{I_n} \), \( F \mid_{\vec{G} \times \{i\}} \) must be a digraph map from \( \vec{G} \) to \( \vec{H} \). Thus, if two digraph maps, \( f \) and \( g \), are homotopic, then there must be a sequence of digraph maps, \( \{f_j\}_{j=0}^n \), where
Brown representability for directed graphs

\[
f_0 = f, \quad f_n = g, \quad \text{and } f_j = F \mid _{\mathcal{G} \cap \{j\}} \text{ for } 0 < j < n.\]

We denote by \([f]\) the set of all digraph maps which are homotopic to \(f\).

**Definition 2.38.** Two digraphs are said to be **homotopically equivalent** (or to be of the same homotopy type) if there exists two digraph maps, \(g : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}\) and \(h : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{G}\), such that \(h \circ g \simeq \text{id}_{\mathcal{G}}\) and \(g \circ h \simeq \text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}\).

We will denote the set of all digraphs which are homotopically equivalent to \(\mathcal{G}\) by \([\mathcal{G}]\) and every element of this set is said to be of the homotopy type of \(\mathcal{G}\).

**Example 2.39.** Let \(f : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}\). The mapping cylinder \(\tilde{M}_f\) and the digraph \(\tilde{H}\) are homotopically equivalent. This can be shown by taking a homotopy \(F : \tilde{M}_f \square I^+ \to \tilde{M}_f\) defined by \(F((g, 0), 0) = (f(g), 1)\) and \(F((f(g), 1), 1) = (f(g), 1)\) for all \(g \in V_\mathcal{G}\).

**Definition 2.40.** A digraph \(\mathcal{G}\) is said to be **contractible** if there exists a homotopy between \(\text{id}_\mathcal{G}\) and a constant digraph map.

The following example gives some simple examples of contractible digraphs.

**Example 2.41.** Consider \(I^+\). To show that \(I^+\) is contractible, one is seeking a digraph map \(F\) such that there is a consistent edge orientation for the red lines in the Figure 3 below, while \(F\mid _{\{0\}} = 3d\) and \(F\mid _{\{1\}} = \ast\). And indeed, taking \(F(0, 1) = F(1, 1) = 0\) and taking \(I = I^+\) will yield the desired digraph map. Note, in the target space, the edge is from vertex 0 to vertex 1. Since \(F(1, 1) = 0\) and \(F(1, 0) = 1\) the edge linking these vertices in the domain should match the edge from 0 to 1 in the codomain. Hence, \(I = I^-\).

In fact, there is a homotopy between \(I^+ \square I^+\) and \(I^+\). See Figure 4. By taking \(F(i, 0) = i\) for \(0 \leq i \leq 3\), \(F(0, 1) = F(3, 1) = 0\), and \(F(1, 1) = F(2, 1) = 1\), one can see that the necessary
edge orientation for $I$ is $I^{-}$ and this completes the homotopy. Thus, by induction, one can show that $I_{1}\Box I_{1}\Box \cdots \Box I_{1}$ is contractible.

**Definition 2.42.** Digraph maps, $f : \vec{G} \rightarrow \vec{H}$ and $g : \vec{G} \rightarrow \vec{H}$, are said to be **weakly homotopic**, denoted $f \simeq_{w} g$, if for every $\vec{K} \in D_{0}$ and every digraph map $h : \vec{K} \rightarrow \vec{G}$, $f \circ h$ and $g \circ h$ are homotopic. Let $[\vec{G}, \vec{H}]_{w}$ denote the set of weak homotopy classes of digraph maps from $\vec{G}$ to $\vec{H}$.

**Remark 2.43.** Note, when $\vec{G}$ is a finite digraph $[\vec{G}, \vec{H}]_{w} = [\vec{G}, \vec{H}]$.

**Definition 2.44.** The **homotopy category of directed graphs**, denoted $HoD$, is a category in which the objects are directed graphs and the morphisms are equivalence classes of digraph maps where $f \simeq g$ whenever $f$ and $g$ are homotopic.

The homotopy category of finite directed graphs $HoD_{0}$ and the weak homotopy category for directed graphs $wHoD$ are defined in the same manner.

**Remark 2.45.** The category $HoD$ is a homotopy category in a category-theoretic sense. It is isomorphic to a category $W^{-1}D$ via a localization of the category $D$ with respect to a collection of morphisms $W$ consisting of digraph maps admitting a homotopy inverse.

**Lemma 2.46.** Let $f : \vec{G} \rightarrow \vec{H}$ and let $i : \vec{H} \rightarrow \vec{M}$ be the natural inclusion. Then, $i \circ f \simeq d_{\vec{G}}$.

**Proof.** Note, the domain of $i \circ f$ is $\vec{G}$. Hence, letting $I$ be $I^{+}$, taking $F\mid_{\vec{G}\Box I_{0}} = d_{\vec{G}}$, and $F\mid_{\vec{G}\Box I_{1}} = f$ will yield the required homotopy. \hfill $\blacksquare$
Lemma 2.47. Let \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) and \( g : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) be digraph maps. Let \( \overrightarrow{MT}_{f,g} \) be the mapping tube between the images of \( f \) and \( g \) and let \( i : \vec{H} \to \vec{H} \cup \overrightarrow{MT}_{f,g} \), then \( i \circ f = i \circ g \).

Proof. By the previous lemma, \( i \circ f \simeq \mathbb{I} d \vec{G} \) and \( i \circ g \simeq \mathbb{I} d \vec{G} \). Hence the result follows.

2.4. Homotopy Extension Property in the Category of Digraphs. Albeit the digraph homotopy is a natural analogue of the homotopy in topology, it lacks certain properties available in topology. For example, the homotopy extension property stated as follows does not hold in generality.

Definition 2.48. Let \( \vec{X} \subset \vec{G} \), the pair \((\vec{G}, \vec{X})\) is said to have the homotopy extension property, if given a map \( F_0 : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) and a homotopy \( f_t : \vec{X} \to \vec{H} \) such that \( f_0 = F_0 \mid \vec{X} \), there exists an extension of \( f_t \) to a homotopy \( F_t : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) such that \( F_t \mid \vec{X} = f_t \).

It is well-known that if \( X \) is a CW complex and \( A \) a subcomplex, then the pair \((X, A)\) has the homotopy extension property. As we shall see from the following example, it is not true in general that a pair \((\vec{G}, \vec{X})\) consisting of a digraph \( \vec{G} \) and its (induced) subdigraph \( \vec{X} \) satisfies the homotopy extension property as defined above.

Example 2.49. Let the digraph in Figure 5 be \( \vec{G} \). Take \( \bullet_A \leftarrow \bullet_C \) to be the \( \vec{X} \) subdigraph of \( \vec{G} \) and let \( \vec{H} = \vec{G} \).

![Figure 5. A cycle digraph on three vertices](image)

Take \( F_0 : \vec{G} \to \vec{G} \) such that \( f_0(x) = (x, 0) \) for \( x \in \{A, B, C\} \). As we have seen in Example 2.41, there is a homotopy between the identity map on \( \bullet_A \leftarrow \bullet_C \) and a point. Let \( f_t \) be that homotopy. Thus, \( f_0 \) is the identity map on \( \vec{X} \) and \( f_1 \equiv C \). In order to extend this homotopy to all of \( \vec{G} \), one needs to find a digraph map \( F : \vec{G} \square I_n \to \vec{G} \) such that \( F_0 \mid \vec{X} = f_0 \) and \( F_1 \mid \vec{X} = C \). The extension depends on where \( F_1 \) maps the vertex \((B, 1)\). Note, \( F_1(A, 1) = C, F_1(C, 1) = C \) and the edges \((A, B)\) and \((B, C)\) must be simultaneously respected, and this is impossible. However, the homotopy restricted to \( \vec{X} \) forces an edge orientation for the \( I \) to be \( I^- \). Since, \( F_0(B, 0) = B \), then either \( F_1(B, 1) \) is \( A, B, \) or \( C \). If \( F_1(B, 1) = C \), then the edge \((B, 1), (B, 0))\) isn’t preserved. If \( F_1(B, 1) = A \), then the edge \((B, 1), (C, 1))\) isn’t preserved. Lastly, if \( F_1(B, 1) = B \), then the edge \((A, 1), (B, 1))\) isn’t preserved again. Therefore, there is no possible extension of \( f_t \) to a homotopy on \( \vec{G} \). Hence, it is not generally the case that a digraph pair \((\vec{G}, \vec{X})\) has the homotopy extension property.
2.5. **Generalized inverse limits.** This subsection is identical to Adams [1, Section 2] and there is no originality of ours in this subsection. However, we iterate it by adding omitted proofs in [1] to make this paper more accessible for a broader audience.

**Notation 2.50.** We shall use the following convention of representing objects and morphisms of a category. Let \( C \) be a category. The expression \( X \in C \) means \( X \) is an object of the category \( C \). We will write \( f \in C(X,Y) \) to say \( f \) is a morphism from \( X \) to \( Y \) in \( C \).

In this subsection, a category is always a subcategory of \( \textbf{Set} \), the category of sets.

**Definition 2.51.** The inverse limit of a category \( C \) is a set \( \varprojlim C \) consisting of set maps

\[
    e : C \to \prod_{X \in C} X
\]

\[
    X \mapsto e_X \in X
\]

satisfying that for any \( f \in C(X,Y) \), we have \( e_Y = f(e_X) \).

We shall impose the following two conditions on a category \( C \).

**Axiom 2.52.** (1) For any \( X, Y \in C \), there is at most one element in \( C(X,Y) \).

(2) For any \( X, Y \in C \), there exists \( Z \in C \) and morphisms \( Z \to X \) and \( Z \to Y \).

**Remark 2.53.** The usual definition of an inverse limit uses an inverse system indexed by a poset (Compare Lang [15, p.51]). Such an index set (and hence the indexed family) has to satisfy the antisymmetry: If \( i \leq j \) and \( j \leq i \), then \( i = j \). The inverse limit of Definition 2.51 is more general than the usual inverse limit in that the category \( C \) may have morphisms \( X \to Y \) and \( Y \to X \) but \( X \) and \( Y \) are not required to be equal or isomorphic. When the category \( C \) is an inverse system, then the set \( \varprojlim C \) is the usual inverse limit.

**Definition 2.54.** A subcategory \( C \) of a category \( A \) is cofinal in \( A \) if for every \( X \in A \), there exists \( Y \in C \) and a morphism \( Y \to X \) in \( A \).

**Lemma 2.55.** If \( C \) is cofinal in \( A \), the restriction map \( \text{res} : \varprojlim A \to \varprojlim C \) is an isomorphism of sets.

**Proof.** Let \( E : A \to \coprod_{X \in A} X, X \mapsto E_X \in X \) be an element in \( \varprojlim A \). The map \( E \) restricts \( E \) to its restriction \( e := E|_C : C \to \coprod_{X \in C} X \). We verify that the map \( \text{res} \) is onto. Take any \( e \in \varprojlim C \) and any \( X \in A \). Because \( C \) is cofinal, there exists \( Y \in C \) and a morphism \( Y \xrightarrow{f_Y} X \) in \( A \). We define \( E : A \to \coprod_{X \in A} X \) by \( X \mapsto E_X := f_Y \circ e_Y \). We now verify one-to-one. Take \( E^1, E^2 \in \varprojlim A \) and suppose \( E^1|_C = E^2|_C \). Take any \( X \in A \). Again by cofinality of \( C \), there exists \( Y \in C \) and a morphism \( Y \xrightarrow{f} X \). It follows that \( E^1_X = f \circ E^1_Y = f \circ E^2_Y = E^2_X \). Thus the map \( \text{res} \) is one-to-one.

**Definition 2.56.** A sequence \( S \) is a category whose objects are \( \{X_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} \) and the hom-set \( S(X_n, X_m) \) contains only one element whenever \( n \geq m \).

**Lemma 2.57.** Let \( S \) be a sequence in which the objects are nonempty sets and the morphisms are surjective. Then \( \varprojlim S \) is nonempty.

**Proof.** Take an arbitrary element \( e_{X_1} \in X_1 \) and choose an arbitrary preimage of \( e_{X_1} \) under the map \( X_2 \to X_1 \) and call it \( e_{X_2} \). Repeating the process of taking preimage ad infinitum, we get an assignment \( S \to \coprod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} X_i, X_i \mapsto e_{X_i} \) satisfying \( e_{X_j} = f_{ij} e_{X_i} \) for the map \( f_{ij} : X_i \to X_j \) for any \( i \geq j \).
Lemma 2.58. Let \( \mathcal{C} \) be a category. Suppose the objects of \( \mathcal{C} \) fall into countably many equivalence classes. Then \( \mathcal{C} \) contains a cofinal sequence.

**Proof.** We denote by \( \sigma = \{ \sigma_i \}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \) the family of countably many equivalence classes of objects in \( \mathcal{C} \); i.e. \( \sigma \) is a partition of \( \text{ob}(\mathcal{C}) \), the totality of all objects of \( \mathcal{C} \). We shall find a sequence \( \mathcal{S} \) in \( \mathcal{C} \). Take representatives \( s_1 \in \sigma_1 \) and \( s_2 \in \sigma_2 \). We set \( X_1 := s_1 \). By Axiom 2.52 (2), there exists \( X_2 \) and morphisms \( X_2 \to X_1 \) and \( X_2 \xrightarrow{\exists s_2} s_2 \). Now take a representative \( s_3 \in \sigma_3 \) and apply the same axiom to get an object \( X_3 \) and morphisms \( X_3 \to X_2 \) and \( X_3 \xrightarrow{\exists s_3} s_3 \). Repeating this process of choosing a representative \( s_i \in \sigma_i \) for \( i \geq 3 \) to get an object \( X_i \) and morphisms \( X_i \to X_{i-1} \) and \( X_i \xrightarrow{\exists s_i} s_i \) determines a sequence \( \mathcal{S} \) whose objects are \( \{ X_i \}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \). The sequence \( \mathcal{S} \) is clearly cofinal because any object \( Y \) of \( \mathcal{C} \) belongs to some \( \sigma_i \) and there always exists \( X_i \xrightarrow{\exists s_i} Y \).

**Corollary 2.59.** Let \( \mathcal{C} \) be a category in which the objects are nonempty sets and the morphisms are surjective. Suppose the objects of \( \mathcal{C} \) fall into countably many equivalence classes. Then \( \lim_{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{C} \) is nonempty.

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.58, there is a cofinal sequence \( \mathcal{S} \) in \( \mathcal{C} \). By Lemma 2.57, \( \lim_{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{S} \) is nonempty. It follows from Lemma 2.55 that the restriction map \( \lim_{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{C} \to \lim_{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{S} \) is bijective. Hence \( \lim_{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{C} \) is nonempty.

In practice we encounter a category \( \mathcal{C} \) whose elements fall into uncountably many equivalence classes. The strategy for such a case is throwing in more morphisms to form a category \( \overline{\mathcal{C}} \) consisting of the same objects so that two objects which are not equivalent in \( \mathcal{C} \) may be equivalent in the category \( \overline{\mathcal{C}} \).

**Definition 2.60.** Let \( \mathcal{C} \) be a category satisfying Axiom 2.52 and every morphism in \( \mathcal{C} \) is onto. The category \( \overline{\mathcal{C}} \) is defined by the following data. Its objects are the same as the objects of \( \mathcal{C} \). The hom-set \( \overline{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y) \) consists of \( f \in \text{Set}(X, Y) \) satisfying that \( f \circ a = b \) for some \( Z \in \mathcal{C} \), \( a \in \mathcal{C}(Z, X) \), and \( b \in \mathcal{C}(Z, Y) \).

**Lemma 2.61.** The above \( \overline{\mathcal{C}} \) is a category satisfying Axiom 2.52 and containing \( \mathcal{C} \) as a cofinal subcategory. The objects of \( \overline{\mathcal{C}} \) are nonempty sets and every morphism of \( \overline{\mathcal{C}} \) is a surjection.

**Proof.** In verifying the axioms that \( \overline{\mathcal{C}} \) is indeed a category, it is worth mentioning the definition of composition. Let \( f \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y) \) with \( a \in \mathcal{C}(W, X) \) and \( b \in \mathcal{C}(W, Y) \) such that \( b = f \circ a \) and \( g \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}(Y, Z) \) with \( c \in \mathcal{C}(U, Y) \) and \( d \in \mathcal{C}(U, Z) \) such that \( d = g \circ c \). We define \( g \circ f \) as a composition of \( f \) followed by \( g \) as morphisms in \( \text{Set} \). The composition \( g \circ f \) is in \( \overline{\mathcal{C}}(X, Z) \) because there are \( \alpha \in \mathcal{C}(T, W) \), \( \beta \in \mathcal{C}(T, U) \), and the fact that \( b \circ \alpha = c \circ \beta \), since \( \mathcal{C}(T, W) \) has at most one element in it.

It is readily seen that every \( f \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y) \) is onto. It is also easy to see that \( \mathcal{C} \) is a subcategory of \( \overline{\mathcal{C}} \).

We verify Axiom 2.52 (1) for the category \( \overline{\mathcal{C}} \) as follows. Suppose \( f, g \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y) \) such that \( a \in \mathcal{C}(Z, X) \), \( b \in \mathcal{C}(Z, Y) \), \( b = f \circ a \), \( c \in \mathcal{C}(W, X) \), \( d \in \mathcal{C}(W, Y) \), and \( d = g \circ c \). By Axiom 2.52 (2) for \( \mathcal{C} \), there exists \( U \in \mathcal{C} \), \( \alpha \in \mathcal{C}(U, Z) \), and \( \beta \in \mathcal{C}(U, W) \). Note that \( f \circ a \circ \alpha = b \circ \alpha = c \circ \beta = g \circ d \circ \beta \). Here the middle equality holds because \( \mathcal{C}(U, Y) \) has at most one element. Since all morphisms in \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \overline{\mathcal{C}} \) are onto, we have \( f = g \). Axiom 2.52 (2) follows from the argument in the preceding paragraph. ■
Corollary 2.62. Suppose that the objects of $\mathcal{C}$ fall into countably many equivalence classes. Then $\varprojlim \mathcal{C}$ is nonempty.

Proof. By Lemma 2.61 and 2.58, $\mathcal{C}$ has a cofinal sequence $\mathcal{S}$. By Lemma 2.57, $\varprojlim \mathcal{S}$ is nonempty. By cofinality of $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathcal{C}$, $\varprojlim \mathcal{C}$ is nonempty by Lemma 2.55 and the cofinality of $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ shows that $\varprojlim \mathcal{C}$ is nonempty. ■

3. BROWN FUNCTORS AND THEIR PROPERTIES

In this Section, we define a Brown functor and verify its properties. We are closely following Adams [1, Section 3]. With regards to Proposition 3.9 and Lemmas 3.6 and 3.10, we are not claiming any originality but we have filled a much needed gap in the literature by adding omitted details for the sake of completeness and readability. Our constructions in 2.30 and 2.36 were created to make Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8 work in the category of directed graphs.

Notation 3.1. Consider a diagram $B \xrightarrow{f} A \xleftarrow{g} C$ in the category of abelian groups Ab. We will use the notation $B \times_A C$ to denote the subset of $B \times C$ defined by $\{(b, c) : f(b) = g(c)\}$.

Definition 3.2. A Brown functor on finite digraphs is a functor $H : HoD_0^{op} \to Ab$ satisfying the following axioms

1. **Additivity Axiom.** $H$ sends coproduct to product. i.e. $H(\coprod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \bar{G}_\alpha) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} H(\bar{G}_\alpha)$ for any family of digraphs $\{\bar{G}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$.

2. **Mayer-Vietoris Axiom.** For any $\bar{G}_1, \bar{G}_2 \in HoD_0$, there exists a surjection $H(\bar{G}_1 \cup \bar{G}_2) \to H(\bar{G}_1) \times_H(\bar{G}_1 \cap \bar{G}_2) H(\bar{G}_2)$.

Recall that a set endowed with a relation is partially ordered if the relation is reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive. A partially ordered set $(\Lambda, \leq)$ is directed if for every $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$, there exists $\gamma \in \Lambda$ such that $\alpha \leq \gamma$ and $\beta \leq \gamma$. A directed system is a family $\{(\bar{G}_\alpha, f_{\alpha\beta})\}_{\alpha,\beta \in \Lambda}$ over a directed set $\Lambda$ if there exists a map $f_{\alpha\beta} : \bar{G}_\alpha \to \bar{G}_\beta$ whenever $\alpha \leq \beta$, $f_{\alpha\alpha} = 1_{\bar{G}_\alpha}$ and $f_{\alpha\gamma} = f_{\beta\gamma} \circ f_{\alpha\beta}$. An inverse system over $\Lambda$ is a directed system over $\Lambda$ with all arrows reversed.

Definition 3.3. Let $\bar{G} \in D$ and $\{\bar{G}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ be a directed system of finite subdigraphs over a directed set $\Lambda$ and $\bar{G} = \cup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \bar{G}_\alpha$. Also let $H : HoD_0^{op} \to Ab$ be a Brown functor. The inverse limit of the inverse system $\{H(\bar{G}_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ over $\Lambda$ is

$$\hat{H}(\bar{G}) := \varprojlim_{\alpha} H(\bar{G}_\alpha).$$

Lemma 3.4. The assignment $\hat{H} : HoD_0^{op} \to Ab$, $\bar{G} \mapsto \varprojlim_{\alpha} H(\bar{G}_\alpha)$ is a functor which is an extension of the functor $H : HoD_0^{op} \to Ab$. Moreover, if $\hat{H} : wHoD_0^{op} \to Ab$ is also a functor that is an extension of the functor $H : HoD_0^{op} \to Ab$.

Lemma 3.5. The functor $\hat{H}$ satisfies the additivity axiom.

Proof. This is readily seen, since $H$ satisfies the additivity axiom. ■
Lemma 3.6 (Compare Adams [1], Lemma 3.4). Let \( \vec{G} \in \mathcal{D} \) and \( \{\vec{G}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \) be any directed system of subdigraphs of \( \vec{G} \) over a directed set \( \Lambda \) whose union is \( \vec{G} \). Then there is a canonical bijection

\[
\Theta : \hat{H}(\vec{G}) \to \varprojlim_{\alpha} \hat{H}(\vec{G}_\alpha)
\]

where \( \iota_\alpha : \vec{G}_\alpha \hookrightarrow \vec{G} \) and \( \iota_\alpha^* = f_{\alpha\beta}^* \circ \iota_\beta^* \) is satisfied for all \( \alpha, \beta \in \Lambda \).

Proof. We sketch the proof for surjectivity. First we write down \( y \in \varprojlim_{\alpha} \hat{H}(\vec{G}_\alpha) \) into components \( (y)_\alpha \) and express each \( y_\alpha \) as an element of \( \varprojlim_{\zeta} H((\vec{G}_\alpha)_\zeta) \), where \( \{(\vec{G}_\alpha)_\zeta\}_{\zeta \in M} \) is a directed system of subdigraphs of \( \vec{G}_\alpha \) over the directed set \( M \) whose union is \( \vec{G}_\alpha \). Then use the Cantor embedding map giving a bijection \( \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \). By looking at which set \( H((\vec{G}_\alpha)_\zeta) \) that each element \( (y_\alpha)_\zeta \) belongs to, we make a choice of a directed system of finite subdigraphs of \( \vec{G} \) whose union is \( \vec{G} \), and then form the inverse limit representing \( \hat{H}(\vec{G}) \). Then the preimage of \( y \) under the map \( \Theta \) is simply a sequence of terms \( (y_\alpha)_\zeta \) along the Cantor embedding map. Injectivity of \( \Theta \) is easy to see.

Lemma 3.7 (Compare Adams [1], Lemma 3.1). Suppose \( \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) is a map of finite digraphs and \( H \) as above. Consider the sequence \( \vec{G} \xrightarrow{\iota} \vec{H} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \vec{C}(f) \) where the map \( \iota \) is the inclusion. The induced sequence \( H(\vec{G}) \xrightarrow{\iota^*} H(\vec{H}) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon^*} H(\vec{C}(f)) \) is exact.

Proof. Consider the following sequence of digraph maps \( \vec{G} \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{H}(f) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathcal{C}(f) \), where digraph maps \( \iota \) and \( \varepsilon \) are inclusions. Since the composition \( \varepsilon \circ \iota \circ f \) equals to \( \iota \circ f \) and \( \mathcal{C}(f) \) is homotopic to a point, the induced map \( f^* \circ \iota^* \circ \varepsilon^* \) factors through \( 0 \) and therefore \( f^* \circ \iota^* = 0 \). Hence \( \mathcal{H}(f) \subseteq \ker(f^*) \).

Consider the following commutative diagrams:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\vec{G} & \xrightarrow{f} & \vec{H} \\
\downarrow \varepsilon & & \downarrow i \\
\mathcal{C}(f) & \xleftarrow{\iota^*} & \mathcal{H}(\vec{H})
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
H(\vec{G}) & \xleftarrow{\varepsilon^*} & H(\mathcal{C}(f)) \\
\downarrow {\iota^*} & & \downarrow i^* \\
H(\mathcal{C}(f)) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon^*} & H(\mathcal{H}(f))
\end{array}
\]

where \( \varepsilon \) is the map induced by \( \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \). Suppose \( x \in H(\mathcal{H}(f)) \) and \( f^*(x) = 0 \). Since \( \mathcal{C}(\vec{G}) \) is contractible, the group \( H(\mathcal{C}(\vec{G})) \) is trivial. It follows that \( (0, x) \in H(\mathcal{C}(\vec{G})) \times_{H(\vec{H})} H(\mathcal{H}(f)) \). If \( \vec{G} \) is a subdigraph of \( \vec{H} \) through the inclusion \( f \), by the Mayer-Vietoris axiom, there is a surjection \( H(\mathcal{C}(f)) \to H(\mathcal{C}(\vec{G})) \times_{H(\vec{H})} H(\mathcal{H}(f)) \). Post-composing with the projection map onto the second factor, this surjection is the same as the map \( \iota^* \). Hence \( x \in \mathcal{H}(f) \). Now suppose \( f : \vec{G} \to \vec{H} \) is any digraph map. Since the map \( f \) factors through \( \mathcal{M}(f) \), we write \( \vec{G} \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{M}(f) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \vec{H} \). Since \( \mathcal{M}(f) \simeq \vec{H} \) and the \( \text{Gat}(f) := \mathcal{M}(f) \coprod \mathcal{H}(f) \simeq \mathcal{C}(f) \), having a surjection \( H(\text{Gat}(f)) \to H(\mathcal{C}(f)) \times_{H(\vec{H})} H(\mathcal{M}(f)) \) amounts to having a surjection \( H(\mathcal{C}(f)) \to H(\mathcal{C}(f)) \times_{H(\vec{H})} H(\vec{H}) \). Similarly as above, it follows that \( x \in \mathcal{H}(f) \).
Lemma 3.8 (Compare Adams [1], Lemma 3.2). Let $\tilde{G}$ and $\tilde{H}$ be finite digraphs. There is a long exact sequence

$$H(\tilde{G}) \times H(\tilde{H}) \cong H(\tilde{G} \coprod \tilde{H}) \xrightarrow{\ell_{\tilde{H}}} H(\tilde{G} \cup \tilde{H}) \xrightarrow{j^*} H(\tilde{G}(f)) \xrightarrow{h^*} H(\tilde{C}(g)),$$

which is natural in $\tilde{G}$ and $\tilde{H}$.

Proof. Apply Lemma 3.7 to the following digraph cofiber sequence

$$\tilde{G} \coprod \tilde{H} \xrightarrow{\ell} \tilde{G} \cup \tilde{H} \xrightarrow{j} \tilde{C}(f) \xrightarrow{\hat{h}} \tilde{C}(g),$$

we get a long exact sequence

$$H(\tilde{G}) \times H(\tilde{H}) \cong H(\tilde{G} \coprod \tilde{H}) \xrightarrow{\ell_{\tilde{H}}} H(\tilde{G} \cup \tilde{H}) \xrightarrow{j^*} H(\tilde{C}(f)) \xrightarrow{h^*} H(\tilde{C}(g)),$$

where the equivalence on the far-left is by the additivity axiom. Naturality is clear. ■

Proposition 3.9 (Compare Adams [1], Proposition 3.5). Let $\tilde{G}, \tilde{H} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\tilde{G} \cap \tilde{H} \in \mathcal{D}_0$. Then the map $H(\tilde{G} \cup \tilde{H}) \to \tilde{H}(\tilde{G}) \times_{\tilde{H}(\tilde{G} \cap \tilde{H})} \tilde{H}(\tilde{H})$ induced by inclusion maps $\tilde{G} \hookrightarrow \tilde{G} \cup \tilde{H}$ and $\tilde{H} \hookrightarrow \tilde{G} \cup \tilde{H}$ is onto.

Proof. Let $\{\tilde{G}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ be a directed family of subdigraphs whose union is $\tilde{G}$ and $\{\tilde{H}_\beta\}_{\beta \in \Gamma}$ another directed family of subdigraphs whose union is $\tilde{H}$ and every $\tilde{G}_\alpha, \tilde{H}_\beta$ contains $\tilde{G} \cap \tilde{H}$. Take any $(x, y) \in \tilde{H}(\tilde{G}) \times_{\tilde{H}(\tilde{G} \cap \tilde{H})} \tilde{H}(\tilde{H})$. That means for every $\alpha$ we have a $x_\alpha \in H(\tilde{G}_\alpha)$ as a restriction of $x \in H(\tilde{G})$ and for every $\beta$ we have a $y_\beta \in H(\tilde{H}_\beta)$ as a restriction of $y \in H(\tilde{H})$ such that $(x_\alpha, y_\beta) \in H(\tilde{G}_\alpha) \times_{H(\tilde{G} \cap \tilde{H})} H(\tilde{H}_\beta)$. Notice here that $\tilde{G}_\alpha \cap \tilde{H}_\beta \subseteq \tilde{G} \cap \tilde{H}$. We consider the following subcategory $\mathcal{C}$ of Set whose objects are the set $H_{\alpha, \beta}$ of elements $w_{\alpha, \beta} \in H(\tilde{G}_\alpha \cup \tilde{H}_\beta)$ that restricts to $x_\alpha \in H(\tilde{G}_\alpha)$ and $x_\beta \in H(\tilde{H}_\beta)$ so that $(x_\alpha, y_\beta) \in H(\tilde{G}_\alpha) \times_{H(\tilde{G} \cap \tilde{H})} H(\tilde{H}_\beta)$. For any $H_{\alpha, \beta}, H_{\gamma, \delta} \in \mathcal{C}$, the hom-set $\mathcal{C}(H_{\gamma, \delta}, H_{\alpha, \beta})$ is a singleton $\ast$, if there is an obvious inclusion $i : H_{\alpha, \beta} \hookrightarrow H_{\gamma, \delta}$.

We claim that $i^* : H_{\gamma, \delta} \to H_{\alpha, \beta}$ is onto. Note that the group $H(\tilde{C}(f))$ is acting on $H_{\alpha, \beta}$. The action is given by adding an element in the image of the map $g^* : H(\tilde{C}(f)) \to H(\tilde{G} \cup \tilde{H})$. Note that it indeed defines an action on $H_{\alpha, \beta}$ and moreover, it is transitive. To see the latter, consider (1) from Lemma 3.8 and take any $w_1, w_2 \in H_{\alpha, \beta}$. Since $w_1 - w_2$ is in the kernel, there is $h \in H(\tilde{C}(f))$ such that $w_1 - w_2 = g^*(h)$. By naturality of the sequence (1), the transitive action of $H(\tilde{C}(f))$ commutes with $i^*$. Take an element $x \in H_{\gamma, \delta}$ (since it is nonempty). Now any $y \in H_{\alpha, \beta}$ can be written as $i^*(x) + g^*(h)$ for some $h \in H(\tilde{C}(f))$. Since the action commutes with $i^*$, a preimage of $y$ is $x + g^*(h)$.

In $\mathcal{D}_0$ we can consider a countably many set of objects such that each set contains at least one representative of every existing homotopy type in $\mathcal{D}_0$. Now we consider the map $h : \tilde{C}(f) \to \tilde{K}$ in the category $\mathcal{D}_0$. For each $\tilde{K} \in \mathcal{D}_0$ there are only countably many homotopy classes of $h$, and hence the possible image of the induced map $h^* : H(\tilde{K}) \to H(\tilde{C}(f))$ is also countably many.

Now by Lemma 3.10 (2), it follows that the objects of $\mathcal{C}$ fall into countably many equivalence classes. By Corollary 2.62, $\varprojlim \mathcal{C}$ is nonempty. ■

Recall maps $g$ and $h$ in Lemma 3.8.
Lemma 3.10 (Compare Adams [1], Lemma 3.6). (1) The hom-set $\overline{C}(H_{\theta,\varphi}, H_{\alpha,\beta})$ is nonempty if and only if the image of $h_{\theta,\varphi}^*: H(\overline{C}(g_{\theta,\varphi})) \to H(\overline{C}(f))$ is contained in the image of $h_{\alpha,\beta}^*: H(\overline{C}(g_{\alpha,\beta})) \to H(\overline{C}(f))$.

(2) $H_{\theta,\varphi}$ and $H_{\alpha,\beta}$ are equivalent in $\overline{C}$ if and only if $h_{\theta,\varphi}^* = h_{\alpha,\beta}^*$.

Proof. Note that (2) is a consequence of (1). We prove (1).

Consider $\overline{G}_\xi \cup \overline{H}_\xi$ that contains both $\overline{G}_\beta \cup \overline{H}_\varphi$ and $\overline{G}_\alpha \cup \overline{H}_\beta$. We have the following maps:

Recall from the proof of Proposition 3.9 that $i_{\theta,\varphi}^*$ and $i_{\alpha,\beta}^*$ are onto. We will use the same notation $g$ with subindices. Assume $\Im(h_{\theta,\varphi}^*) \subset \Im(h_{\alpha,\beta}^*)$. Take any $x \in H(\overline{C}(f))$ that belongs to $\Im(h_{\alpha,\beta}^*)$ and not $\Im(h_{\theta,\varphi}^*)$. Then an arbitrary element of $H_{\theta,\varphi}$ can be written as $i_{\theta,\varphi}^*g^\xi_\alpha(x) + g^\alpha_\beta(\delta)$ for all $\delta \in H(\overline{C}(f))$. We set up a map $j : H_{\theta,\varphi} \to H_{\alpha,\beta}$ defined by $i_{\theta,\varphi}^*g^\xi_\alpha(x) + g^\alpha_\beta(\delta) \mapsto i_{\alpha,\beta}^*g^\xi_\alpha(x) + g^\alpha_\beta(\delta)$ which satisfies $j \circ i_{\theta,\varphi}^* = i_{\alpha,\beta}^*$. Hence $j \in \overline{C}(H_{\theta,\varphi}, H_{\alpha,\beta})$.

Now assume that there is a map $j : H_{\theta,\varphi} \to H_{\alpha,\beta}$ satisfying $j \circ i_{\theta,\varphi}^* = i_{\alpha,\beta}^*$. Suppose there is $x \in \Im(h_{\theta,\varphi}^*)$ but not in $\Im(h_{\alpha,\beta}^*)$. Take any $y \in H_{\theta,\varphi}$ and act by $x$ via $g^\theta_{\alpha,\beta}$ and then apply $j$. This yields $j(y + g^\alpha_{\theta,\beta}(x)) = j(y) + g^\alpha_\beta(x)$ since $x \in \Im(h_{\theta,\varphi}^*)$ we have $g^\theta_{\alpha,\beta}(x) = 0$ whereas $x \notin \Im(h_{\alpha,\beta}^*)$ implies that $g^\alpha_\beta(x)$ cannot vanish, which is a contradiction. Hence the result. ■

4. Brown’s Method for Directed Graphs

In this section, we construct a classifying object representing a Brown functor on finite digraphs. Arguments in this section parallels those in Brown [3] and Adams [1]. We have added omitted proofs to Lemmas 4.1 and 4.3, and Lemma 4.5 is identical to the one already in [1] but reiterated for the sake of completeness. Notice that our construction in 2.35 is necessary for Lemma 4.4. Our main theorem of this paper is Theorem 4.6.

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the set of homotopy types of finite digraphs in the category of digraphs $\mathcal{D}$ and let $H : \text{Ho}\mathcal{D}_{op} \to \text{Set}$ be a functor. Take $\overline{Y} \in \mathcal{D}$ and consider $[-, \overline{Y}]$, the set of homotopy classes of maps into $\overline{Y}$. Let $T : [-, \overline{Y}] \to H(-)$ such that for any $y \in H(\overline{Y})$ and any $[f] \in [\overline{G}, \overline{Y}]$, define $T_y[f] = H(f)(y) = f^*(y)$. Then, by the Yoneda lemma, $\text{Nat}([-,-], H(-)) \cong H(\overline{Y})$.

Suppose that $H : \text{Ho}\mathcal{D}_0 \to \text{Set}$ is acting on finite digraphs. To extend $H$ to infinite digraphs such that the extension restricts to $H$ on finite digraphs, consider $\overline{Y} \in \mathcal{D}$ and define $H(\overline{Y}) := \text{Nat}([-,-], H(-))$

such that for any $f : \overline{Y} \to \overline{Z}$, $H(f) T = T f^*$, where $T : [-, \overline{Z}] \to H(-)$ and $f^* : [-, \overline{Y}] \to [-, \overline{Z}]$. Given $\{ \overline{Y}_\alpha \}$ a sequence of finite subdigraphs such that whenever $\overline{Y}_\alpha \subset \overline{Y}_\beta$ we have the
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following diagram of inclusions:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\vec{Y}_\alpha & \xrightarrow{i_{\alpha\beta}} & \vec{Y}_\beta \\
i_\alpha & \downarrow & \downarrow i_\beta \\
\vec{Y} & \xrightarrow{\vec{f}} & \vec{Y}_\alpha
\end{array}
\]

Thus, \((H(\vec{Y}_\alpha), H(i_{\alpha\beta}))\) forms an inverse system and since for finite complexes \(\bar{H} = H\),

\[
\bar{H}(i_\alpha) : \bar{H}(\vec{Y}) \rightarrow H(\vec{Y}_\alpha).
\]

**Lemma 4.1** (Compare Brown [3], Lemma 3.3). There is an isomorphism between sets, \(\varphi : H(\vec{Y}) \rightarrow \varprojlim H(\vec{Y}_\alpha)\).

**Proof.** Let \(T_1, T_2 \in \bar{H}(\vec{Y})\), let \(\vec{G} \in \mathbb{D}_0\), and let \([f] \in [\vec{G}, \vec{Y}]\), then there exists a \(\vec{Y}_\alpha\) and a digraph map \(f_\alpha : \vec{G} \rightarrow \vec{Y}_\alpha\) such that the following diagram commutes:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\vec{G} & \xrightarrow{f_\alpha} & \vec{Y}_\alpha \\
\vec{f} & \downarrow & \downarrow f \\
\vec{Y} & & \vec{Y}_\alpha
\end{array}
\]

Suppose that \(\varphi(T_1) = \varphi(T_2)\). Since

\[
\bar{H}(i_\alpha)T_1[f_\alpha] = T_1i_{\alpha\alpha}[f_\alpha] = T_1[f],
\]

and

\[
\bar{H}(i_\alpha)T_2[f_\alpha] = T_2i_{\alpha\alpha}[f_\alpha] = T_2[f],
\]

thus, \(T_1[f] = T_2[f]\) and so \(T_1 = T_2\). Suppose \(y \in \varprojlim H(\vec{Y}_\alpha)\) and take \(T_y[f] = H(f_\alpha)y_\alpha\), where \(y_\alpha\) is the projection of \(y\) into \(H(\vec{Y}_\alpha)\). Then \(T_y \in \bar{H}(\vec{Y})\) and \(\bar{H}(i_\alpha)T_y = y_\alpha\). \(\blacksquare\)

Recall the notion of weak homotopy from Section 2.42. Also \(\bar{H} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \text{Set}\) from Definition 3.3 and \(H : \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \text{Set}\) in Definition 3.2. Given a digraph \(\vec{Y} \in \mathbb{D}\) and an element \(y \in \bar{H}(\vec{Y})\), \(y = (y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_n, \ldots)\), let \(\bar{T} : [\vec{G}, \vec{Y}]_w \rightarrow \bar{H}(\vec{G})\) be a natural transformation between functors such that for any \(f : \vec{G} \rightarrow \vec{Y}\) define \(\bar{T}\) by:

\[
\bar{T} : [\vec{G}, \vec{Y}]_w \rightarrow \bar{H}(\vec{G})
\]

\[f \mapsto f^*y.\] (2)

**Notation 4.2.** We will use the notation \(\text{Nat}(F, G)\) to denote the set of all natural transformations from a functor \(F\) to a functor \(G\).

**Lemma 4.3.** The above construction gives the following bijections which are natural in \(\vec{Y}\).

\[
\bar{H}(\vec{Y}) \cong \text{Nat}(\vec{G}, [\vec{K}, \vec{Y}]_w, \bar{H}(\vec{G})) \cong \text{Nat}(\vec{K}, \vec{Y}, H(\vec{K})),
\]

where the slots filled by \(\vec{G}\) indicates that the functor takes an object from \(\mathbb{D}\) and the slots with \(\vec{K}\) an object from \(\mathbb{D}_0\).

**Proof.** The far-left bijection holds by the Yoneda lemma and the map is given by (2). It follows from Lemma 4.1 and Definition 3.3 that \(\text{Nat}(\vec{K}, \vec{Y}, H(\vec{K})) \rightarrow \bar{H}(\vec{Y})\) is a bijection. The naturality in \(\vec{Y}\) is clear. \(\blacksquare\)
Let the set of homotopy types of finite digraphs be denoted $\mathcal{K}$. By the results at the end of the proof of Proposition 3.9, there are countably many homotopy types for finite directed graphs. Let $\{\tilde{K}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ be a countable collection of representatives taken from each of the homotopy types in $\mathcal{K}$.

**Lemma 4.4.** Suppose $\tilde{Y}_n$ is a digraph with the element $y_n \in \hat{H}(\tilde{Y}_n)$, then there exists a digraph $\tilde{Y}_{n+1}$, an embedding $i : \tilde{Y}_n \to \tilde{Y}_{n+1}$, and an element $y_{n+1} \in \hat{H}(\tilde{Y}_{n+1})$, such that the following holds.

i) $y_{n+1}$ restricts to $y_n \in \hat{H}(\tilde{Y}_n)$, and

ii) for any pair of digraph maps $f, g : \tilde{K} \to \tilde{Y}_n$, $\tilde{K}$ a finite digraph, if $f^*y_n = g^*y_n$ then $i \circ f \simeq i \circ g$ in $\tilde{Y}_{n+1}$.

**Proof.** Let $\tilde{K}_\alpha \in \{\tilde{K}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ be a representative taken from one of the countable homotopy types and suppose that $[f], [g] : \tilde{K}_\alpha \to \tilde{Y}_n$ are a pair of homotopy classes of maps such that $f^*y_n = g^*y_n$. Take representatives $f_\alpha \in [f]$ and $g_\alpha \in [g]$, and consider the mapping tube between the images of $f_\alpha$ and $g_\alpha$, $MT_{f_\alpha, g_\alpha}$. Define

$$\tilde{Y}_{n+1} := \tilde{Y}_n \cup \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} \overline{MT_{f_\alpha, g_\alpha}}.$$ 

By Lemma 2.47, $i \circ f_\alpha \simeq i \circ g_\alpha$ for each $\alpha \in A$. This proves part ii above.

For the existence of $y_{n+1}$, let $B \in \mathcal{P}(A)$, the power set of $A$, such that there is a $b \in \hat{H}\left(\tilde{Y}_n \cup \bigcup_{\beta \in B} \overline{MT_{f_\beta, g_\beta}}\right)$ which restricts to $y_n \in \hat{H}(\tilde{Y}_n)$. Consider all such pairs, $(B, b)$, and define a partial ordering $\preceq$ where by,

$$(B_i, b_i) \preceq (B_j, b_j) \iff B_i \subset B_j \text{ and } b_j \text{ restricts to } b_i \in \hat{H}\left(\tilde{Y}_n \cup \bigcup_{\beta \in B_i} \overline{MT_{f_\beta, g_\beta}}\right).$$

Let $B_0 = \emptyset$, take $b_0 = y_n$ and so the pair $(\emptyset, y_n)$ trivially satisfies the condition above. Hence, $\{(B, b)\}$ is non-empty. Let $\{(B_k, b_k)\}_k$ be a subset of $\{(B, b)\}$, such that for any $(B_i, b_i), (B_j, b_j) \in \{(B_k, b_k)\}_k$ either $(B_i, b_i) \preceq (B_j, b_j)$ or $(B_j, b_j) \preceq (B_i, b_i)$. Define $B = \bigcup_k B_k$ and let $f_{ij} : B_i \to B_j$ be the natural inclusion map for whenever $B_i \subset B_j$. There is a natural family of maps $f_i : B_i \to B$. Hence, we have the commutative triangles:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
B_i & \xrightarrow{f_{ij}} & B_j \\
\downarrow f_i & & \downarrow f_j \\
B & & B
\end{array}$$

Applying the contravariant functor $\hat{H}$ the following inverse system is obtained:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\hat{H}(B_i) & \xrightarrow{f^*_i} & \hat{H}(B_j) \\
\downarrow f_i^* & & \downarrow f_j^* \\
\hat{H}(B) & & \hat{H}(B)
\end{array}$$

By Lemma 3.6, $\hat{H}(B) \cong \lim \hat{H}(B)$ and so there is a $b \in \hat{H}(B)$ such that $f^*_i(b) = b_i$. Thus, $(B, b)$ is an upper bound for the chain $\{(B_k, b_k)\}_k$. Since the chain was arbitrary, the set of all pairs $\{(B, b)\}$ will, by Zorn’s lemma, have a maximal element, call it $(B', b')$. Assume that $B' \neq A$, recall that $A$ is the full indexing set for the countable collection of representatives of
each homotopy type for finite digraphs, then $\exists \alpha \in A$ such that $\alpha \notin B'$. For simplicity, let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{Y}_n \cup \bigcup_{\beta \in B'} \mathcal{M}_T f_{\beta, g_{\beta}}$ and let $\hat{H} = \mathcal{M}_T f_{\alpha, g_{\alpha}}$. Then one has the following diagram:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
H(\mathcal{G} \cap \hat{H}) & \xrightarrow{j_2} & \hat{H}(\mathcal{G} \cap \hat{H}) \\
| & & | \\
\hat{H}(\mathcal{G} \cap \hat{H}) & \xleftarrow{j_1} & \hat{H}(\mathcal{G} \cup \hat{H})
\end{array}
$$

Applying the Mayer-Vietoris Axiom for $\hat{H}$ as in Proposition 3.9, to the setting where $b \in \hat{H}(\mathcal{G})$, along with some $h \in \hat{H}(\hat{H})$ such that $i_1^*(b) = i_2^*(h)$, then there must exist an extension of $b$ to some $a \in \hat{H}(\mathcal{G} \cup \hat{H})$ such that $j_1^*(a) = b$ and $j_2^*(a) = h$. Hence, any maximal element of $\{(b, b)\}$ must be of the form $(A, a)$ and we define $y_{n+1} = a$. Thus, a $y_{n+1}$ with the required properties exists.

The preceding lemma is the inductive step in the construction of a classifying space for a directed graph. What remains is the base case.

**Lemma 4.5.** Given a digraph $\mathcal{Y}_0$ with an element $y_0 \in \hat{H}(\mathcal{Y}_0)$, there exists a digraph $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}$, an embedding $i : \mathcal{Y}_0 \to \hat{\mathcal{Y}}$, and there is an element $y \in \hat{H}(\hat{\mathcal{Y}})$ such that the following hold:

i) $y$ restricts to $y_0 \in \hat{H}(\mathcal{Y}_0)$, and

ii) the natural transformation $T : [-, \hat{\mathcal{Y}}] \to H(-)$ is an isomorphism whenever the input is a finite digraph.

**Proof.** Let $\bar{K}_\alpha \in \{\bar{K}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ be a representative taken from one of the countable homotopy types and let $\alpha_j \in H(\bar{K}_\alpha)$. Define $\mathcal{Y}_1 \equiv \bigsqcup \left( \bigsqcup_j \bar{K}_\alpha \right)$. Note, for each fixed $\alpha$ this disjoint union will contain $n_\alpha = |H(\bar{K}_\alpha)|$ copies of $\bar{K}_\alpha$, one for each of the possible $\alpha_j \in H(\bar{K}_\alpha)$. Since the additivity axiom holds for $\hat{H}$, then $\hat{H}(\mathcal{Y}_1) = \hat{H}(\mathcal{Y}_0) \times \prod_\alpha \left( \prod_j \hat{H}(\bar{K}_\alpha) \right)$. Take $y_1 \in \hat{H}(\mathcal{Y}_1)$ such that $y_1$ restricts to $y_0 \in \hat{H}(\mathcal{Y}_0)$ and restricts to the $\alpha_j$ element on the $(\bar{K}_\alpha, j)$-th place. By Lemma 4.3,

$$
\hat{H}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \cong \text{Nat} \left( [\bar{K}_\alpha, \mathcal{Y}_1], H(\bar{K}_\alpha) \right).
$$

Therefore, the $y_1$ is associated to some natural transformation,

$$
T_1 : [\bar{K}_\alpha, \mathcal{Y}_1] \to H(\bar{K}_\alpha),
$$

and the $T_1$ associated to $y_1$ is a surjection for all $\bar{K}_\alpha$.

Using lemma 4.4, construct an ascending chain of digraphs:

$$
\mathcal{Y}_1 \sqsubset \mathcal{Y}_2 \sqsubset \mathcal{Y}_3 \sqsubset \cdots \sqsubset \mathcal{Y}_n \sqsubset \cdots
$$

along with elements $y_2 \in \hat{H}(\mathcal{Y}_2)$, $y_3 \in \hat{H}(\mathcal{Y}_3)$, $y_4 \in \hat{H}(\mathcal{Y}_4)$, etc, such that $y_{n+1}$ restricts to $y_n \in \hat{H}(\mathcal{Y}_n)$ for $0 \leq n$. Now, take $\mathcal{Y} = \bigcup_n \mathcal{Y}_n$ along with all the natural inclusions, yielding:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{Y}_n & \xrightarrow{i_m} & \mathcal{Y}_m \\
\downarrow{i_n} & & \downarrow{i_m} \\
\mathcal{Y} & & \mathcal{Y}
\end{array}
$$
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Applying the contravariant functor $\hat{H}$, the following inverse system is obtained:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\hat{H}(\bar{Y}_n) & \xrightarrow{i^*_n} & \hat{H}(\bar{Y}_m) \\
\downarrow{i^*_m} & & \downarrow{i^*_m} \\
\hat{H}(\bar{Y}) & & \hat{H}(\bar{Y})
\end{array}
$$

By lemma 3.6, there is a $y \in \hat{H}(\bar{Y})$ such that $i^*_n(y) = y_n$ for each $n$. Again by Lemma 4.3, there is a natural transformation associated to $y$.

$$
T : [\bar{K}_\alpha, \bar{Y}] \to H(\bar{K}_\alpha),
$$

and this transformation is still surjective for each $\bar{K}_\alpha$.

Let $f_\alpha, g_\alpha : \bar{K}_\alpha \to \bar{Y}$ be any two maps such that $f^*y = g^*y$, i.e. $T(f) = T(g)$. $K_\alpha$ being a finite digraph, there exists an $m$ such that $3m(f) \subset \bar{Y}_m$, $3m(g) \subset \bar{Y}_m$, and $f^*y_m = g^*y_m$. Then, by Lemma 4.4, $f \simeq g$ in $\bar{Y}_{m+1}$. Hence, if given two maps $f, g$ such that $T(f) = T(g)$, then they had to have been equivalent at some finite step long before $\bar{Y}$. Thus, $T$ is also injective and the resulting $T : [-, \bar{Y}] \to H(-)$ is an isomorphism of sets for finite digraphs.

Therefore we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.6.** Let $H : \text{Ho}\mathcal{D}_0^{op} \to \text{Ab}$ be a Brown functor. Then there exists a digraph $\bar{Y}$ and a natural isomorphism $T : [-, \bar{Y}] \to H(-)$.

**Proof.** It was already shown in Lemma 4.5 that $T : [-, \bar{Y}] \to H(-)$ is a natural isomorphism as $\text{Set}$-valued functors. The functor $[-, \bar{Y}] : \text{Ho}\mathcal{D}_0^{op} \to \text{Set}$ lands in the subcategory $\text{Ab}$ by inheriting the group structure of $H(\bar{K})$ for each $\bar{K} \in \mathcal{D}_0$.
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