Abstract. This paper introduces the notion of n-morphisms between two \( A_\infty \)-algebras, such that 0-morphisms correspond to standard \( A_\infty \)-morphisms and 1-morphisms correspond to \( A_\infty \)-homotopies between \( A_\infty \)-morphisms. The set of higher morphisms between two \( A_\infty \)-algebras then defines a simplicial set which has the property of being an algebraic \( \infty \)-category. The operadic structure of \( n - A_\infty \)-morphisms is also encoded by new families of polytopes, which we call the \( n \)-multiplihedra and which generalize the standard multiplihedra. These are constructed from the standard simplices and multiplihedra by lifting the Alexander-Whitney map to the level of simplices. Rich combinatorics arise in this context, as conveniently described in terms of overlapping partitions. Shifting from the \( A_\infty \) to the \( \Omega BAs \) framework, we define the analogous notion of n-morphisms between \( \Omega BAs \)-algebras, which are again encoded by the \( n \)-multiplihedra, endowed with a thinner cell decomposition by stable gauged ribbon tree type. We then realize this higher algebra of \( A_\infty \) and \( \Omega BAs \)-algebras in Morse theory. Given two Morse functions \( f \) and \( g \), we construct \( n - \Omega BAs \)-morphisms between their respective Morse cochain complexes endowed with their \( \Omega BAs \)-algebra structures, by counting perturbed Morse gradient trees associated to an admissible simplex of perturbation data. We moreover show that any inner horn of higher morphisms arising from a count of perturbed Morse gradient trees can always be filled, not only algebraically but also geometrically.
... and its $\Omega BAs$-cell decomposition
Introduction

Summary and results of article I. This article is the direct sequel to [Maz21]. We thus begin by summarizing our first article, after which we outline the main results and constructions carried out in the present paper.

The structure of strong homotopy associative algebra, or equivalently $A_\infty$-algebra, was introduced in the seminal paper of Stasheff [Sta63]. It provides an operadic model for the notion of differential graded algebra whose product is associative up to homotopy. It is defined as the datum of a set of operations $\{m_m : A^{\otimes m} \to A\}_{m \geq 2}$ of degree $2 - m$ on a dg-$\mathbb{Z}$-module $(A, \partial)$, which satisfy the sequence of equations

$$[\partial, m_m] = \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m, 2 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq m-1} \pm m_{i_1+1+i_3} (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes m_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}).$$

The first two equations respectively ensure that $m_2$ is compatible with $\partial$ and that it is associative up to the homotopy $m_3$. This algebraic structure is encoded by an operad in dg-$\mathbb{Z}$-modules, called the operad $A_\infty$. As shown in [MTTV19], this operad stems in fact from an operad in the category of polytopes, whose arity $m$ space of operations is defined to be the $(m-2)$-dimensional associahedron $K_m$.

Similarly, the notion of $A_\infty$-morphism between two $A_\infty$-algebras $A$ and $B$ offers an operadic model for the notion of morphism of strong homotopy associative algebras which preserves the product up to homotopy. It is defined as the datum of a set of operations $\{f_m : A^{\otimes m} \to B\}_{m \geq 1}$ of degree $1 - m$ which satisfy the sequence of equations

$$[\partial, f_m] = \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m, i_2 \geq 2} \pm f_{i_1+1+i_3} (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes m_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}) + \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m, s \geq 2} \pm m_s (f_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{i_s}).$$

The first two equations show this time that $f_1$ commutes with the differentials and that it preserves the product up to the homotopy $f_2$. From the point of view of operadic algebra, $A_\infty$-morphisms are encoded by an operadic bimodule in dg-$\mathbb{Z}$-modules : the operadic bimodule $A_\infty - \text{Morph}$. It occurs from an operadic bimodule in polytopes, whose arity $m$ space of operations is the $(m-1)$-dimensional multiplihedron $J_m$ as shown in [MV].

$A_\infty$-algebras and $A_\infty$-morphisms between them provide a satisfactory framework for homotopy theory. The most famous instance of this statement is the homotopy transfer theorem: given $(A, \partial_A)$ and $(H, \partial_H)$ two cochain complexes and a homotopy retract diagram

$$h \xrightarrow{\sim} (A, d_A) \xrightarrow{p} (H, d_H),$$

if $(A, \partial_A)$ is endowed with an associative dg-algebra structure, then $H$ can be made into an $A_\infty$-algebra such that $i$ and $p$ extend to $A_\infty$-morphisms. A more general statement of this theorem can be found in [Mar06]. See also [Val20] and [LH02] for an extensive study on the homotopy theory of $A_\infty$-algebras.
The associahedra and multiplihedra, respectively encoding the operad $A_{\infty}$ and the operadic bimodule $A_{\infty} - \text{Morph}$, can in fact be both realized as moduli spaces of metric trees. The associahedron $K_m$ is isomorphic as a CW-complex to the compactified moduli space of stable metric ribbon trees $\mathcal{T}^*_m$ as first pointed out in [BV73]. The multiplihedron $J_m$ is isomorphic as a CW-complex to the compactified moduli space of stable gauged metric ribbon trees $\mathcal{C}^*_m$ as shown in [For08] and [MW10]. These moduli spaces come in fact with thinner cell decompositions, called their $\Omega BAs$-cell decompositions: the cell decomposition by stable ribbon tree type for $\mathcal{T}^*_m$, and the cell decomposition by stable gauged ribbon tree type for $\mathcal{C}^*_m$. These thinner decompositions provide another operadic model for strong homotopy associative algebras with morphisms preserving the product up to homotopy between them: the standard operad $\Omega BAs$ and the operadic bimodule $\Omega BAs - \text{Morph}$ introduced in [Maz21]. We show moreover in [Maz21] that one can naturally shift from the $\Omega BAs$ to the $A_{\infty}$ framework via a morphism of operads $A_{\infty} \to \Omega BAs$ and a morphism of operadic bimodules $A_{\infty} - \text{Morph} \to \Omega BAs - \text{Morph}$.

Consider now a Morse function $f$ on a closed oriented Riemannian manifold $M$ together with a Morse-Smale metric. Following [Hut08], the Morse cochain complex $C^*(f)$ is a homotopy retract of the singular cochain complex $C^*_{\text{sing}}(M)$ which is a dg-algebra with respect to the standard cup product. The dg-algebra structure on $C^*_{\text{sing}}(M)$ can thus be transferred to an $A_{\infty}$-algebra structure on $C^*(f)$ using the homotopy transfer theorem. In fact, one can directly define an $\Omega BAs$-algebra structure on the Morse cochains $C^*(f)$ by realizing the moduli spaces of stable metric ribbon trees $\mathcal{T}^*_m$ in Morse theory. Given a choice of perturbation data $\{x_m\}_{m\geq 2}$ on the moduli spaces $\mathcal{T}^*_m$ as introduced by Abouzaid in [Abo11] and further studied by Mescher in [Mes18], we define the moduli spaces of perturbed Morse gradient trees modeled on a stable ribbon tree type $t$ and connecting the critical points $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in \text{Crit}(f)$ to the critical point $y \in \text{Crit}(f)$, denoted $\mathcal{T}^*_t(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$. We prove in [Maz21] that under generic assumptions on the choice of perturbation data, these moduli spaces are in fact orientable manifolds of finite dimension. If they have dimension 1, they can moreover be compactified to 1-dimensional manifolds with boundary, whose boundary is modeled on the top dimensional strata in the boundary of the compactified moduli space $\mathcal{T}^*_m$. The $\Omega BAs$-algebra structure on the Morse cochains $C^*(f)$ is finally defined by counting the points of the 0-dimensional moduli spaces $\mathcal{T}^*_t(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$.

Consider now two Morse functions $f$ and $g$ on $M$ together with generic choices of perturbation data $x_f$ and $x_g$. Endow the Morse cochains $C^*(f)$ and $C^*(g)$ with their associated $\Omega BAs$-algebra structures. We prove in [Maz21] that one can adapt the construction of the previous paragraph, to define an $\Omega BAs$-morphism from the $\Omega BAs$-algebra $C^*(f)$ to the $\Omega BAs$-algebra $C^*(g)$. We count this time 0-dimensional moduli spaces of perturbed Morse stable gauged trees modeled on a stable gauged ribbon tree type $t_g$ and connecting the critical points $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in \text{Crit}(f)$ to the critical point $y \in \text{Crit}(g)$, denoted $\mathcal{C}^*_t(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, after making a generic choice of perturbation data $Y$ on the moduli spaces $\mathcal{C}^*_m$.

**Motivational question.** Let $Y$ and $Y'$ be two choices of perturbations data on the moduli spaces $\mathcal{C}^*_m$. Writing $\mu^Y$ resp. $\mu^{Y'}$ for the $\Omega BAs$-morphisms they define, the question which motivates this paper is to know whether $\mu^Y$ and $\mu^{Y'}$ are always homotopic or not:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
C^*(f) & \xrightarrow{\mu^Y} & C^*(g) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
C^*(f) & \xrightarrow{\mu^{Y'}} & C^*(g)
\end{array}
\]
In particular, one needs to determine what the correct notion of an homotopy between two $\Omega BAs$-morphisms is.

**Outline of the present paper and main results.** The first step towards answering this problem is carried on the algebraic side in part [4] where we define the notion of $n$-morphisms between $A_\infty$-algebras and $n$-morphisms between $\Omega BAs$-algebras. In section 1, we recall at first the suspended bar construction point of view on $A_\infty$-algebras and the definition of an $A_\infty$-homotopy between $A_\infty$-morphisms from [LH02]. After introducing the cosimplicial dg-coalgebra $\Delta^n$ together with the language of overlapping partitions, we can finally define a $n$-morphism between $A_\infty$-algebras $A$ and $B$:

**Definition [7]** Let $A$ and $B$ be two $A_\infty$-algebras. A $n$-morphism from $A$ to $B$ is defined to be a collection of maps $f^{(m)}_I: A \otimes m \to B$ of degree $1 - m - \dim(I)$ for $I \subset \Delta^n$ and $m \geq 1$, that satisfy

$$
\partial f^{(m)}_I = \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j f^{(m)}_{I \setminus j} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + \ldots = m, i_k \geq 2} \pm f^{(i_1 + i_2 + \ldots)}_I (\id \otimes m_{i_2} \otimes \id) + \sum_{I_1 \ldots I_s = I, s \geq 3} \pm m_s f^{(i_1)}_{I_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes f^{(i_s)}_{I_s}.
$$

The set of higher morphisms between $A$ and $B$ form a simplicial set $\text{HOM}_{A_{\infty}} \cdot \text{alg}(A, B)$. After recalling the basic definitions on $\infty$-categories, which are simplicial sets satisfying the inner horn filling property, we prove the following theorem in section 2:

**Theorem [1]** For $A$ and $B$ two $A_\infty$-algebras, the simplicial set $\text{HOM}_{A_{\infty}} \cdot \text{alg}(A, B)$ is an $\infty$-category.

This $\infty$-category is in fact an algebraic $\infty$-category as explained in proposition [2]. However, the $\text{HOM}$-simplicial sets $\text{HOM}_{A_{\infty}} \cdot \text{alg}(A, B)$ fall short of defining a natural simplicial enrichment of the category $A_{\infty} \cdot \text{alg}$: the composition of $A_{\infty}$-morphisms cannot be naturally lifted to define a composition between $n - A_{\infty}$-morphisms. While the operad $A_{\infty}$ stems from the associahedra $K_m$ and the operadic bimodule $A_{\infty} \cdot \text{Morph}$ stems from the multiplihedra $J_m$, we introduce in section 3 a family of polytopes encoding the $A_{\infty}$-equations for $n$-morphisms: the $n$-multiplihedra $n - J_m$. In this regard, we begin by introducing a lifting of the Alexander-Whitney coproduct $\text{AW}$ at the level of the polytopes $\Delta^n$, following [MTTV19]. The map $\text{AW}^{\otimes s} := (\id \otimes (s - 1) \times \text{AW}) \circ \cdots \circ (\id \times \text{AW}) \circ \text{AW}$ then induces a thinner polytopal subdivision of $\Delta^n$, whose higher dimensional cells can be labeled by all overlapping $(s + 1)$-partitions of $\Delta^n$. Using these thinner subdivisions of the $\Delta^n$, we can construct a thinner polytopal subdivision of the polytopes $\Delta^n \times J_m$:

**Definition [12]** The polytopes $\Delta^n \times J_m$ endowed with the polytopal subdivisions induced by the maps $\text{AW}^{\otimes s}$ will be called the $n$-multiplihedra and denoted $n - J_m$.

The boundary of the $n$-multiplihedra $n - J_m$ yield the $n - A_{\infty}$-equations:

**Proposition [7]** The boundary of the top dimensional cell $[n - J_m]$ of the $n$-multiplihedron $n - J_m$ is given by

$$
\partial_{\text{sing}} [n - J_m] \cup \bigcup_{h+k=m+1, 1 \leq i \leq k, h \geq 2} [n - J_k] \times [K_h] \cup \bigcup_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m, I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n} [K_s] \times [\dim(I_1) - J_{i_1}] \times \cdots \times [\dim(I_s) - J_{i_s}],
$$

where $I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n$ is an overlapping partition of $\Delta^n$.
We then show in section 4 that these constructions can be transported from the $A_\infty$ to the $\Omega BAs$ realm. We define $n$-morphisms between $\Omega BAs$-algebras as follows:

**Definition 13.** $n - \Omega BAs$-morphisms are the higher morphisms between $\Omega BAs$-algebras encoded by the quasi-free operadic bimodule generated by all pairs (face $I \subset \Delta^n$, two-colored stable ribbon tree),

$$n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph} := \mathcal{F}^{\Omega BAs, \Omega BAs}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}, \cdots, (I, sCRT_n), \cdots ; I \subset \Delta^n).$$

An operation $t_{I,g} := (I, t_g)$, whose underlying stable ribbon tree $t$ has $e(t)$ inner edges, and such that its gauge crosses $j$ vertices of $t$, is defined to have degree $|t_{I,g}| := j - 1 - e(t) - \dim(I) = |I| + |t_g|$. The differential of $t_{I,g}$ is given by the rule prescribed by the top dimensional strata in the boundary of $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{T}_m(t_g)$ combined with the algebraic combinatorics of overlapping partitions, added to the simplicial differential of $I$, i.e.

$$\partial t_{I,g} = t_{\partial^{\text{sing}} I, g} + \pm (\partial^{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{T}_m} t_g) I.$$

We show that the $n - \Omega BAs$-equations are also encoded by the $n$-multiplihedra, endowed this time with a thinner cell decomposition taking the $\Omega BAs$-decomposition of the multiplihedra $J_m$ into account. What’s more, a $n$-morphism between $\Omega BAs$-algebras naturally yields a $n$-morphism between $A_\infty$-algebras:

**Proposition 8.** There exists a morphism of $(A_\infty, A_\infty)$-operadic bimodules $n - A_\infty - \text{Morph} \to n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph}$.

Using the same tools as in [Maz21], we finally unravel all sign conventions in section 5.

In part 2 we illustrate how $n$-morphisms naturally arise in geometry, here in the context of Morse theory, solving our motivational question at the same time. In section 1 we detail the construction of $n$-morphisms between $\Omega BAs$-algebras in Morse theory. Given two Morse functions $f$ and $g$ on a closed oriented manifold $M$, endow their Morse cochains with their $\Omega BAs$-algebra structure coming from a choice of perturbation data on the moduli spaces $\mathcal{T}_m$. A $n$-morphism between $C^\ast(f)$ and $C^\ast(g)$ can be constructed by adapting the techniques of [Abo11] and [Mes18] that we used in [Maz21] for moduli spaces of perturbed Morse gradient trees. We define to this extent the notion of $n$-simplices of perturbation data $Y_{\Delta^n}$:

**Definition 22.** A $n$-simplex of perturbation data for a gauged metric stable ribbon tree $T_g$ is defined to be a choice of perturbation data $Y_{\Delta^n, t_g}$ for every $\delta \in \Delta^n$.

Given a smooth $n$-simplex of perturbation data $Y_{\Delta^n, t_g}$ on the moduli space $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{T}_m(t_g)$, we introduce the following moduli spaces of perturbed Morse gradient trees:

**Definition 24.** Let $y \in \text{Crit}(g)$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in \text{Crit}(f)$, we define the moduli spaces

$$\mathcal{C}\mathcal{T}_{\Delta^n, t_g}^Y(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m) := \bigcup_{\delta \in \Delta^n} \mathcal{C}\mathcal{T}_{t_g}^{Y_{\Delta^n, t_g}}(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m).$$

As in [Maz21], these moduli spaces are orientable manifolds under some generic transversality assumptions on the perturbation data:
Theorems 3 and 4. Under some generic assumptions on the choice of perturbation data \((Y_{I,m})_{I \subseteq \Delta^n}^{m \geq 1}\), the moduli spaces \(CT_{I,t,g}(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)\) are orientable manifolds. If they have dimension 0 they are moreover compact. If they have dimension 1 they can be compactified to 1-dimensional manifolds with boundary, whose boundary is modeled on the boundary of the \(n\)-multiplihedron \(n-J_m\) endowed with its \(\Omega BAs\) -cell decomposition.

Perturbation data \((Y_{I,m})_{I \subseteq \Delta^n}^{m \geq 1}\) satisfying the generic assumptions under which theorems 3 and 4 hold will be called admissible. Given admissible choices of perturbation data \(X^f\) and \(X^g\), we construct a \(n - \Omega BAs\)-morphism between the \(\Omega BAs\)-algebras \(C^*(f)\) and \(C^*(g)\) by counting 0-dimensional moduli spaces of Morse gradient trees:

**Theorem 5.** Let \((Y_{I,m})_{I \subseteq \Delta^n}^{m \geq 1}\) be an admissible choice of perturbation data. For every \(m \) and \( t \) \( g \in \text{sCRT}_m \), and every \( I \subseteq \Delta^n\) we define the operation \(\mu_{I,t,g}\) as

\[
\mu_{I,t,g} : C^*(f) \otimes \cdots \otimes C^*(f) \rightarrow C^*(g)
\]

\[
x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_m \mapsto \sum_{|y| = \sum_{i=1}^{m} |x_i| + |t|, g} \#CT_{I,t,g}^Y(y; x_1, \cdots, x_m) \cdot y.
\]

This set of operations then defines a \(n - \Omega BAs\)-morphism \((C^*(f), m^X_f) \rightarrow (C^*(g), m^X_g)\).

This \(n\)-morphism is in fact a twisted \(n\)-morphism as defined in [Maz21]. We subsequently prove a filling theorem for simplicial complexes of perturbation data:

**Theorem 6.** For every admissible choice of perturbation data \(Y_S\) parametrized by a simplicial sub-complex \(S \subseteq \Delta^n\), there exists an admissible \(n\)-simplex of perturbation data \(Y_{\Delta^n}\) extending \(Y_S\).

Consider in particular an inner horn in \(\text{HOM}_{A_\infty - \text{alg}}(C^*(f), C^*(g))\), induced by an inner horn of perturbation data. This inner horn can always be filled algebraically because this HOM-simplicial set is an \(\infty\)-category. Theorem 6 tells us in particular that this inner horn can in fact always be filled geometrically, by directly filling the horn of perturbation data to a \(n\)-simplex of perturbation data. Moreover, the motivational question to this paper is then a simple corollary of theorem 6.

All transversality arguments and sign computations are performed in section 2: they are mere adaptations of the analogous constructions in [Maz21]. We finally recall the second question stated at the end of [Maz21] in section 3 which is going to be tackled in an upcoming article.
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1. \( n - A_\infty \)-morphisms

This section is dedicated to the study of the higher algebra of \( A_\infty \)-algebras. Our starting point is the study of homotopy theory in the category of \( A_\infty \)-algebras. Putting it simply, considering two \( A_\infty \)-morphisms \( F, G \) between \( A_\infty \)-algebras, we would like to determine which notion would give a satisfactory meaning to the sentence "\( F \) and \( G \) are homotopic". This question is solved in section 1.2 following [LH02], where we define the notion of an \( A_\infty \)-homotopy.

Studying higher algebra of \( A_\infty \)-algebras means that we will be concerned with the higher homotopy theory of \( A_\infty \)-algebras. Typically, the questions arising are the following ones. Homotopies being defined, what is now a good notion of a homotopy between homotopies? And of a homotopy between two homotopies between homotopies? And so on. Higher algebra is a general term standing for all problems that involve defining coherent sets of higher homotopies (also called \( n \)-morphisms) when starting from a basic homotopy setting.

The sections following the definition of \( A_\infty \)-homotopies will then be concerned with defining a good notion of \( n \)-morphisms between \( A_\infty \)-algebras, i.e. such that \( A_\infty \)-morphisms correspond to 0-morphisms and \( A_\infty \)-homotopies to 1-morphisms. This will be done using the viewpoint of section 1.1 which defines the category of \( A_\infty \)-algebras as a full subcategory of the category of dg-coalgebras. Sections 1.3 and 1.4 consist in a pedestrian approach to the construction of these \( n \)-morphisms, and section 1.5 sums it all up. We postpone moreover all sign computations to section 5.2.

1.1. Recollections and definitions. Let \( A \) be a graded \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module. We introduce its suspension \( sA \) defined as the graded \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module \((sA)^i := A^{i+1}\). In other words, \(|sa| = |a| - 1\). This is merely a notation that gives a convenient way to handle certain degrees. Note for instance that a degree \( 2 - n \) map \( A^{\otimes n} \to A \) is simply a degree +1 map \((sA)^{\otimes n} \to sA\).

Our main category of interest will be the category whose objects are \( A_\infty \)-algebras and whose morphisms are \( A_\infty \)-morphisms. It will be written as \( A_\infty - \text{alg} \). Recall that a structure of \( A_\infty \)-algebra on a dg-\( \mathbb{Z} \)-module \( A \) can equivalently be defined as a collection of operations \( m_n : A^{\otimes n} \to A \) satisfying the \( A_\infty \)-equations, or as a coderivation \( D_A \) on its shifted bar construction \( \overline{T}(sA) \). Similarly, an \( A_\infty \)-morphism is equivalently defined as a collection of operations \( f_n : A^{\otimes n} \to B \) satisfying the \( A_\infty \)-equations, or as a morphism of dg-coalgebras \((\overline{T}(sA), D_A) \to (\overline{T}(sB), D_B)\). We refer to the first article of this series [Maz21] for a detailed discussion on these results.

As a consequence, the shifted bar construction functor identifies the category \( A_\infty - \text{alg} \) with a full subcategory of the category of dg-coalgebras \( \text{dg} - \text{coalg} \), that is

\[
A_\infty - \text{alg} \subset \text{dg} - \text{coalg} .
\]

This basic idea is the key to our first construction of \( n \)-morphisms in this section. We will perform some natural constructions in the category \( \text{dg} - \text{coalg} \), and then specialize them to the category
$A_{\infty}-\text{alg}$ using the above inclusion. As before, these natural constructions will then admit an interpretation in terms of operations $A^{\otimes n} \to B$, using the universal property of the bar construction.

1.2. $A_{\infty}$-homotopies. The material presented in this section is taken from the thesis of Lefèvre-Hasegawa [LH02].

1.2.1. Homotopies between morphisms of dg-coalgebras.

**Definition 1** ([LH02]). Let $C$ and $C'$ be two dg-coalgebras. Let $F$ and $G$ be morphisms $C \to C'$ of dg-coalgebras. A $(F,G)$-coderivation is defined to be a map $H: C \to C'$ such that

$$\Delta_{C'}H = (F \otimes H + H \otimes G)\Delta_C .$$

The morphisms $F$ and $G$ are then said to be homotopic if there exists a $(F,G)$-coderivation $H$ of degree -1 such that $[\partial, H] = G - F$.

Introduce the dg-coalgebra $\Delta^1 := \mathbb{Z}[0] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[1] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[0 < 1]$.

**Proposition 1** ([LH02]). There is a one-to-one correspondence between $(F,G)$-coderivations and morphisms of dg-coalgebras $\Delta^1 \otimes C \to C'$.

**Proof.** One checks indeed that :

(i) $F$ and $G$ are the restrictions to the summands $\mathbb{Z}[0] \otimes C$ and $\mathbb{Z}[1] \otimes C$, $H$ is the restriction to the summand $\mathbb{Z}[0 < 1] \otimes C$ ;

(ii) the coderivation relation is given by the compatibility with the coproduct ;

(iii) the homotopy relation is given by the compatibility with the differential.

□

1.2.2. $A_{\infty}$-homotopies. Using the inclusion $A_{\infty}-\text{alg} \subset \text{dg-} \text{coalg}$, this yields a notion of homotopy between two $A_{\infty}$-morphisms, which we call a $A_{\infty}$-homotopy :

**Definition 2** ([LH02]). Let $(T(sA), D_A)$ and $(T(sB), D_B)$ be two $A_{\infty}$-algebras. Given two $A_{\infty}$-morphisms $F,G: (T(sA), D_A) \to (T(sB), D_B)$, an $A_{\infty}$-homotopy from $F$ to $G$ is defined to be a morphism of dg-coalgebras

$$H: \Delta^1 \otimes T(sA) \to T(sB) ,$$

whose restriction to the $[0]$ summand is $F$ and whose restriction to the $[1]$ summand is $G$.

An alternative and equivalent definition ensues then as follows (see subsection 1.4.2 for a more general proof of the equivalence between the two definitions) :
Definition 3 ([LH02]). An $A_\infty$-homotopy between two $A_\infty$-morphisms $(f_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(g_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of $A_\infty$-algebras $A$ and $B$ is defined to be a collection of maps
\[ h_n : A^\otimes n \to B, \]
of degree $-n$, which satisfy the equations
\[ [\partial, h_n] = g_n - f_n + \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m \atop i_2 \geq 2} \pm h_{i_1+1+i_3}(id^\otimes i_1 \otimes m_{i_2} \otimes id^\otimes i_3) \]
\[ + \sum_{\sum i_1 + \cdots + i_r = n \atop s+t \geq 2} \pm m_{s+1+t}(f_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{i_s} \otimes h_{i_+1} \otimes g_{j_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes g_{j_t}). \]

The signs will be made explicit in section 5.2. Using the same symbolic formalism as in [Maz21], this can be represented as
\[ [\partial, [0 < 1]] = [1] - [0] + \sum [0 < 1] + \sum [0], \]
where we denote $[0 < 1]$ and $[0]$ respectively for the $f_n$, the $h_n$ and the $g_n$.

1.2.3. On this notion of homotopy. The relation being $A_\infty$-homotopic on the class of $A_\infty$-morphisms is in fact an equivalence relation. It is moreover stable under composition. These results cannot be proven using naive tools, and are obtained through considerations of model categories. We refer to Lefèvre-Hasegawa [LH02] for the reader interested in the proof of these two results.

1.3. Some definitions.

1.3.1. The cosimplicial dg-coalgebra $\Delta^n$.

Definition 4. Define $\Delta^n$ to be the graded $\mathbb{Z}$-module generated by the faces of the standard $n$-simplex $\Delta^n$,
\[ \Delta^n = \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_k \leq n} \mathbb{Z}[i_1 < \cdots < i_k], \]
where the grading is $|I| := -\dim(I)$ for $I$ a face of $\Delta^n$. We endow this graded $\mathbb{Z}$-module with a dg-coalgebra structure, whose differential is the simplicial differential
\[ \partial_{\Delta^n}(\langle i_1 < \cdots < i_k \rangle) := \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \langle i_1 < \cdots < \hat{i}_j < \cdots < i_k \rangle, \]
and whose coproduct is the Alexander-Whitney coproduct
\[ \Delta_{\Delta^n}(\langle i_1 < \cdots < i_k \rangle) := \sum_{j=1}^k \langle i_1 < \cdots < i_j \rangle \otimes \langle i_j < \cdots < i_k \rangle. \]
These dg-coalgebras are to be seen as the realizations of the simplices $\Delta^n$ in the world of dg-coalgebras. The collection of dg-coalgebras $\Delta^n := \{\Delta^n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is then naturally a cosimplicial dg-coalgebra. The coface map

$$\delta_i : \Delta^{n-1} \rightarrow \Delta^n, 0 \leq i \leq n,$$

is obtained by seeing the simplex $\Delta^{n-1}$ as the $i$-th face of the simplex $\Delta^n$. The codegeneracy map

$$\sigma_i : \Delta^{n+1} \rightarrow \Delta^n, 0 \leq i \leq n,$$

is defined as

$$[j_1 < \cdots < j_r < \hat{i} < j_{r+1} < \cdots < j_s] \mapsto [j_1 < \cdots < j_r < j_{r+1} - 1 < \cdots < j_s - 1],$$

$$[j_1 < \cdots < j_r < \hat{i} + 1 < j_{r+1} < \cdots < j_s] \mapsto [j_1 < \cdots < j_r < j_{r+1} - 1 < \cdots < j_s - 1],$$

$$[j_1 < \cdots < j_s] \mapsto 0 \text{ if } [i < i + 1] \subset [j_1 < \cdots < j_s].$$

In other words, the face $[0 < \cdots < \hat{i} < \cdots < n + 1]$ and its subfaces are identified with $\Delta^n$ and its subfaces. The same goes for $[0 < \cdots < \hat{i} + 1 < \cdots < n + 1]$ and its subfaces. All faces of $\Delta^{n+1}$ that contain $[i < i + 1]$ are taken to 0.

Heuristically, the coface and codegeneracy maps are obtained by applying the functor

$$C^{\text{sing}} : \text{Spaces} \rightarrow \text{dg-coalg}$$

to the cosimplicial space $\Delta^n$, and then quotienting out each $C^{\text{sing}}(\Delta^n)$ by the subcomplex generated by all degenerate singular simplices. For instance, the codegeneracy map $\sigma_i : \Delta^{n+1} \rightarrow \Delta^n$ is obtained by contracting the edge $[i < i + 1]$ of $\Delta^{n+1}$, which yields the above codegeneracy map $\sigma_i : \Delta^{n+1} \rightarrow \Delta^n$. We refer to [GJ09] for more details on the matter.

1.3.2. Overlapping partitions.

**Definition** 5 ([MS03]). Let $I$ be a face of $\Delta^n$. An overlapping partition of $I$ is defined to be a sequence of faces $(I_1)_{1 \leq \ell \leq s}$ of $I$ such that

(i) the union of this sequence of faces is $I$, i.e. $\cup_{1 \leq \ell \leq s} I_\ell = I$;

(ii) for all $1 \leq \ell < s$, max$(I_\ell) = \min(I_{\ell+1})$.

These two requirements then imply in particular that min$(I_1) = \min(I)$ and max$(I_s) = \max(I)$. If the overlapping partition has $s$ components $I_\ell$, we will refer to it as an overlapping s-partition. These sequences of faces are those which naturally arise when applying several times the Alexander-Whitney coproduct to a face $I$. For instance, the Alexander-Whitney coproduct corresponds to the sum of all overlapping 2-partitions of $I$. Iterating $n$ times the Alexander-Whitney coproduct, we get the sum of all overlapping $(n + 1)$-partitions of $I$. An overlapping 6-partition for $[0 < 1 < 2]$ is for instance

$$[0 < 1 < 2] = [0] \cup [0] \cup [0 < 1] \cup [1] \cup [1 < 2] \cup [2].$$

1.4. n-morphisms between $\text{A}_\infty$-algebras. We now want to define a notion of higher homotopies, or $n$-morphisms, between $\text{A}_\infty$-algebras, such that 0-morphisms are $\text{A}_\infty$-morphisms and 1-morphisms are $\text{A}_\infty$-homotopies. Since $\text{A}_\infty$-morphisms correspond to the set

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{dg-cog}}(\overline{T}(sA), \overline{T}(sB))$$
and \(A_\infty\)-homotopies correspond to the set 
\[
\text{Hom}_{\text{dg-cog}}(\Delta^1 \otimes T(sA), T(sB))
\]
a natural candidate for the set of \(n\)-morphisms is 
\[
\text{HOM}_{A_\infty-\text{alg}}(A, B)_n := \text{Hom}_{\text{dg-cog}}(\Delta^n \otimes T(sA), T(sB))
\]

1.4.1. \(n\)-morphisms between \(dg\) coalgebras. We begin by making explicit the \(n\)-simplices of the HOM-simplicial sets 
\[
\text{HOM}_{\text{dg-cog}}(C, C')_n := \text{Hom}_{\text{dg-cog}}(\Delta^n \otimes C, C')
\]
Take a morphism of \(dg\)-coalgebras 
\[
f : \Delta^n \otimes C \rightarrow C'.
\]
Write \(f_{[i_1 < \cdots < i_k]} : C \rightarrow C'\) for its restriction to the \(\mathbb{Z}[i_1 < \cdots < i_k] \otimes C\) summand. Then the property that \(f\) is a morphism of \(dg\)-\(\mathbb{Z}\)-modules is equivalent to the system of equations 
\[
[\partial, f_{[i_1 < \cdots < i_k]}] = \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j f_{[i_1 < \cdots < \hat{i}_j < \cdots < i_k]}
\]
while the property that \(f\) is a morphism of coalgebras is equivalent to the system of equations 
\[
\Delta_C f_{[i_1 < \cdots < i_k]} = \sum_{j=1}^k (f_{[i_1 < \cdots < i_j]} \otimes f_{[i_j < \cdots < i_k]}) \Delta_C.
\]

These two sets of equations of morphisms hence characterize the \(n\)-simplices of the HOM-simplicial sets \(\text{HOM}_{\text{dg-cog}}(C, C')_\bullet\), i.e. the \(n\)-morphisms between the \(dg\)-coalgebras \(C\) and \(C'\).

1.4.2. \(n\)-morphisms between \(A_\infty\)-algebras. We now use the previous characterization of \(n\)-morphisms between \(dg\)-coalgebras to obtain a simpler definition for \(n\)-morphisms between two \(A_\infty\)-algebras. 

**Definition 6.** Let \(A\) and \(B\) be two \(A_\infty\)-algebras. A \(n\)-morphism from \(A\) to \(B\) is defined to be a morphism of \(dg\)-coalgebras 
\[
F : \Delta^n \otimes T(sA) \rightarrow T(sB).
\]

We will write \(b_n\) for the degree +1 maps associated to the \(A_\infty\)-operations \(m_n\), which define the codifferentials on \(T(sA)\) and \(T(sB)\). The property of being a morphism of coalgebras is equivalent to the property of satisfying equations \(1.2\). Using the universal property of the bar construction, this is equivalent to saying that the \(n\)-morphism is given by a collection of maps of degree \(|I|\), 
\[
F^{(m)}_I : (sA)^{\otimes m} \rightarrow sB,
\]
where \(I\) is a face of \(\Delta^n\) and \(m \geq 1\). The restriction of the map \(F_I : T(sA) \rightarrow T(sB)\) to \((sA)^{\otimes m}\) is then given by 
\[
F^{(m)}_I = \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = m} F^{(i_1)}_{I_1} \otimes F^{(i_2)}_{I_2} + \cdots + \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m} F^{(i_1)}_{I_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes F^{(i_s)}_{I_s} + \cdots + \sum_{I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_m = I} F^{(1)}_{I_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes F^{(1)}_{I_m},
\]
where $I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = I$ stands for an overlapping partition of $I$. Corestricting to $B^{\otimes s}$ yields the morphism
\[
\sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m} F_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes F_{I_s}^{(i_s)} : (sA)^{\otimes m} \rightarrow (sB)^{\otimes s}.
\]

The property of being compatible with the differentials is equivalent to the property of satisfying equations [1.1]. This is itself equivalent to the fact that the collection of morphisms $F_I^{(m)}$ satisfies the following family of equations involving morphisms $(sA)^{\otimes m} \rightarrow sB$,
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j F_{\partial_j I}^{(m)} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m} F_I^{(i_1 + 1 + i_3)} (\id^\otimes i_1 \otimes b_{i_2} \otimes \id^\otimes i_3) = \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m} b_s (F_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes F_{I_s}^{(i_s)}) .
\]

We unwind the signs obtained by changing the $b_s$ into the $m_n$ and the degree $|I|$ maps $F_I^{(m)} : (sA)^{\otimes m} \rightarrow sB$ into degree $1 - m + |I|$ maps $f_I^{(m)} : A^{\otimes m} \rightarrow B$ in subsection 5.2.3. The final equations read as
\[
(*) \quad \left[ \partial, f_I^{(m)} \right] = \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j f_{\partial_j I}^{(m)} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m} \pm f_I^{(i_1 + 1 + i_3)} (\id^\otimes i_1 \otimes m_{i_2} \otimes \id^\otimes i_3) \\
+ \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m} \pm m_s (f_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{I_s}^{(i_s)}) ,
\]

or equivalently and more visually,
\[
\left[ \partial, f_I^{(m)} \right] = \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j w_j \otimes \eta_j + \sum_{I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = I} \pm \eta_i + \sum_{I} \pm \eta_i .
\]

**Definition 7.** Let $A$ and $B$ be two $A_{\infty}$-algebras. A $n$-**morphism** from $A$ to $B$ is defined to be a collection of maps $f_I^{(m)} : A^{\otimes m} \rightarrow B$ of degree $1 - m + |I|$ for $I \subset \Delta^n$ and $m \geq 1$, that satisfy equations [\star].

1.5. **Résumé.** Given $A$ and $B$ two $A_{\infty}$-algebras, we define a $n$-**morphism** between $A$ and $B$ to be an element of the simplicial set
\[
\text{HOM}_{A_{\infty}}(A, B)_n := \text{Hom}_{\text{dg-co}}(\Delta^n \otimes T(sA), T(sB)) ,
\]
or equivalently a collection of operations $[\partial, \phi] : A^{\otimes m} \rightarrow B$ of degree $1 - m - \dim(I)$ for all faces $I$ of $\Delta^n$ and all $m \geq 1$, satisfying the $A_{\infty}$-equations
\[
\left[ \partial, \phi \right] = \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \phi_j \otimes \eta_j + \sum_{I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = I} \pm \eta_i + \sum_{I} \pm \eta_i ,
\]
where we refer to subsection 5.2.3 for signs.
2. THE HOM-SIMPLICIAL SETS $\text{HOM}_{A_{\infty} - \text{alg}}(A, B)$

The HOM-simplicial sets $\text{HOM}_{A_{\infty} - \text{alg}}(A, B)$ provide a satisfactory framework to study the higher algebra of $A_{\infty}$-algebras thanks to the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** For $A$ and $B$ two $A_{\infty}$-algebras, the simplicial set $\text{HOM}_{A_{\infty}}(A, B)$ is an $\infty$-category.

This section is cut out as follows. In 2.1, we provide a brief exposition of $\infty$-categories. Theorem 1 is explained in 2.2 and then proven in 2.3. We finally show in section 2.4 how the natural approach to define a simplicial enrichment of the category $A_{\infty} - \text{alg}$ using these HOM-simplicial sets fails.

2.1. $\infty$-categories.

2.1.1. Motivation. The operads $A_{\infty}$ and $\Omega BAs$ provide two equivalent frameworks to study the notion of "dg-algebras which are associative up to homotopy". See section III.2 of [Maz21] for a detailed account on the matter. In fact, the operad $A_{\infty}$ can also be used to define the notion of "dg-categories whose composition is associative up to homotopy"; these categories are called $A_{\infty}$-categories. They are of prime interest in symplectic topology for instance, where they appear as the Fukaya categories of symplectic manifolds. The notion of $\Omega BAs$-categories can be defined similarly, but it has never appeared in the literature to the author's knowledge.

$A_{\infty}$-categories are thus "categories" which are endowed with a collection of operations corresponding to all the higher coherent homotopies arising from the associativity up to homotopy of their composition. They are thus operadic in essence. The notion of $\infty$-category that we are going to define in the following lines, provides another framework to study "categories whose composition is associative up to homotopy" but is, on the other hand, not operadic: it does not come with a specific set of operations encoding rigidly all the higher coherent homotopies.

2.1.2. Intuition. A category can be seen as the data of a set of points, its objects, together with a set of arrows between them, the morphisms. The composition is then simply an operation which produces from two arrows $A \to B$ and $B \to C$ a new arrow $A \to C$.

Part of the data of an $\infty$-category will also consist in a set of objects and arrows between them. The difference will lie in the notion of composition. Given two arrows $u : A \to B$ and $v : B \to C$, an $\infty$-category will have the property that there always exists a new arrow $A \to C$, which can be called a composition of $u$ and $v$. But this arrow is not necessarily unique, and above all, it results from a property of the "category" and is not produced by an operation of composition. It is in this sense that an $\infty$-category is not operadic.

2.1.3. Definition. The correct framework to formulate this paradigm is the one of simplicial sets. We write $\Delta^n$ for the simplicial set naturally realizing the standard $n$-simplex $\Delta^n$, and $\Lambda^n_k$ for the simplicial set realizing the simplicial subcomplex obtained from $\Delta^n$ by removing the faces $[0 < \cdots < n]$ and $[0 < \cdots < k < \cdots < n]$. The simplicial set $\Lambda^n_k$ is called a horn, and if $0 < k < n$ it is called an inner horn.

An $\infty$-category is then defined to be a simplicial set $X$ which has the left-lifting property with respect to all inner horn inclusions $\Lambda^n_k \to \Delta^n$: for each $n \geq 2$ and each $0 < k < n$, every simplicial
map $u : \Lambda^k_n \to X$ extends to a simplicial map $\overline{u} : \Delta^n \to X$ whose restriction to $\Lambda^k_n$ is $u$. This is illustrated in the diagram below.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Lambda^k_n & \xrightarrow{u} & X \\
\downarrow \exists \overline{u} & & \downarrow \\
\Delta^n & & \\
\end{array}
$$

The vertices of $X$ are then to be seen as objects, while its edges correspond to morphisms.

The left-lifting property with respect to $\Lambda^1_2 \to \Delta^2$ ensures that the following diagram can always be filled by the dashed arrows

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \xrightarrow{\sim} & 1 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
2 & & \\
\end{array}
$$

The $[0 < 2]$ edge will represent a composition of the morphisms associated to $[0 < 1]$ and $[1 < 2]$. The intuition of subsection 2.1.2 is thus realized, and comes with a wide range of higher homotopies controlled by the combinatorics of simplicial algebra.

2.1.4. Further properties. The notion of $\infty$-category contains the classical notion of category. There exists a functor $N : \text{Cat} \to \text{sSets}$ called the nerve functor, which associates to every small category $\mathcal{C}$ a simplicial set $N(\mathcal{C})$ which is an $\infty$-category. In fact, an $A_{\infty}$-category also yields an $\infty$-category, through the $A_{\infty}$-nerve functor $N_{A_{\infty}} : A_{\infty} - \text{cat} \to \text{sSets}$ constructed in [Fao17]. Moreover, an $\infty$-category $X$ determines canonically a classical category, called its homotopy category $\text{Ho}(X)$, whose objects are the same as those of $X$, and whose morphisms are the equivalence classes of morphisms of $X$ for the homotopy equivalence relation. For more details we refer to [Lur09].

As a matter of fact, most categorical constructions that hold for classical categories can be carried over to the framework of $\infty$-categories: limits, fiber sequences, cones, terminal and initial objects, to only cite a few. André Joyal refers to them as quasi-categories for this reason.

Finally, we mention that $\infty$-categories are the fibrant-cofibrant objects of the model category of simplicial sets endowed with the Joyal model category structure: in this model category, every object is cofibrant and the fibrant objects are exactly those which admit the left-lifting property with respect to the cofibrations $\Lambda^n_k \to \Delta^n$, $n \geq 2$ and $0 < k < n$. This is thoroughly explained in [Joi].

2.2. $\infty$-categories and the higher algebra of $A_{\infty}$-algebras. As stated in the introduction, the HOM-simplicial sets $\text{HOM}_{A_{\infty} - \text{alg}}(A, B)_\bullet$ provide a satisfactory framework to study higher algebra of $A_{\infty}$-algebras:

**Theorem 1.** For $A$ and $B$ two $A_{\infty}$-algebras, the simplicial set $\text{HOM}_{A_{\infty}}(A, B)_\bullet$ is an $\infty$-category.

Our proof will even show that they are algebraic $\infty$-categories as explained in subsection 2.3.2. One aspect of this construction needs moreover to be clarified. The points of these $\infty$-categories are the $A_{\infty}$-morphisms, and the arrows between them are the $A_{\infty}$-homotopies. This can be misleading at first sight, but the points are the morphisms and NOT the algebras and the arrows are the homotopies and NOT the morphisms.
2.3. Proof that the $\text{HOM}_{A_\infty}(A, B)_\bullet$ are $\infty$-categories. Let $A$ and $B$ be two $A_\infty$-algebras. We now prove that the HOM-simplicial set $\text{HOM}_{A_\infty}(A, B)_\bullet$ is an $\infty$-category, using the shifted bar construction framework, that is by defining an $A_\infty$-algebra to be a set of degree +1 operations $b_n : (sA)^{\otimes n} \to sA$ satisfying equations
\[
\sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = n} b_{i_1 + 1 + i_2}(\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes b_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}) = 0.\]

The proof will mainly consist of easy but tedious combinatorics. We recommend reading it in two steps: first ignoring the signs; then adding them at the second reading stage and referring to section 5.2 for the sign conventions on the shifted $A_\infty$-equations.

2.3.1. Proof. Consider an inner horn $\Lambda^n_k \to \text{HOM}_{A_\infty}(A, B)_\bullet$, where $0 < k < n$. We want to prove that the following diagram can be completed
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Lambda^n_k & \longrightarrow & \text{HOM}_{A_\infty}(A, B)_\bullet \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\Delta^n & & \\
\end{array}
\]

This inner horn corresponds to a collection of degree $-\dim(I)$ morphisms $F^{(m)}_I : (sA)^{\otimes m} \to sB$ for $I \subset \Lambda^n_k$, which satisfy the $A_\infty$-equations
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j F^{(m)}_{\partial_j I} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m} F^{(i_1 + 1 + i_2)}_I (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes b_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}) = \sum_{i_1 + \ldots + i_s = m, I_1 \cup \ldots \cup I_s = I} b_s (F^{(i_1)}_{I_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes F^{(i_s)}_{I_s}).
\]

Filling this horn amounts then to defining a collection of operations $F^{(m)}_{[0 < \ldots < k < \ldots < n]} : (sA)^{\otimes m} \to sB$ and $F^{(m)}_{\Delta^n_k} : (sA)^{\otimes m} \to sB$, of respective degree $-(n-1)$ and $-n$, and respectively satisfying the equations
\[
\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} (-1)^l F^{(m)}_{\partial_l [0 < \ldots < k < \ldots < n]} + (-1)^{n-1} \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m} F^{(i_1 + 1 + i_3)}_{[0 < \ldots < k < \ldots < n]} (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes b_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3})
\]
(i)
\[
= \sum_{i_1 + \ldots + i_s = m, I_1 \cup \ldots \cup I_s = [0 < \ldots < k < \ldots < n]} b_s (F^{(i_1)}_{I_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes F^{(i_s)}_{I_s}),
\]
and
\[
\sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j F^{(m)}_{\partial_j \Delta^n_k} + (-1)^n \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m} F^{(i_1 + 1 + i_3)}_{\Delta^n_k} (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes b_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3})
\]
(ii)
\[
= \sum_{i_1 + \ldots + i_s = m, I_1 \cup \ldots \cup I_s = \Delta^n} b_s (F^{(i_1)}_{I_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes F^{(i_s)}_{I_s}).
\]
We now prove that the following choice of morphisms fills the inner horn:
\[ F^{(m)}_{\Delta^n} := 0 , \]
\[ F^{(m)}_{[0\cdots < \hat{k} \cdots < n]} := (-1)^k \left( \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^{j+1} F^{(m)}_{[0\cdots < \hat{j} \cdots < n]} \right) + \sum_{i_1+\cdots+i_s=m} b_s(F^{(i_1)}_{I_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes F^{(i_s)}_{I_s}) \]  

Note that the \( F^{(m)}_{[0\cdots < \hat{k} \cdots < n]} \) are well-defined as all the morphisms \( F^{(m)}_I \) appearing in their definition correspond to faces of the horn \( \Lambda^n_k \). It is clear that this choice of filler satisfies equations (ii), and we have now to verify that equations (i) are satisfied. In this regard, we will list one by one the terms of the left-hand side and right-hand side of this equality with their signs, and use \( A_\infty \)-equations for the \( b_i \) and the \( F^{(m)}_I \) where \( I \subset \Lambda^n_k \), in order to show that the two sides are indeed equal.

The left-hand side consists of the following terms:

(A) \((-1)^l F^{(m)}_{\partial I[0\cdots < \hat{k} \cdots < n]} \)

for \( l = 0, \ldots, n-1 \);

(B) \((-1)^{n+k+j} F^{(i_1+1+i_3)}_{[0\cdots < \hat{j} \cdots < n]} (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes b_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}) \)

for \( i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m \) and \( j = 0, \ldots, \hat{k}, \ldots, m \);

(C) \((-1)^{n-1+k} b_s(F^{(j_1)}_{I_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes F^{(j_s)}_{I_s}) (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes b_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}) \)

for \( i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m, j_1 + \cdots + j_s = i_1 + 1 + i_3 \) and \( I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n \) with \( I_u \neq \Delta^n \) for all \( u \).

The right-hand side has the following terms:

(D) \( b_s(F^{(i_1)}_{I_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes F^{(i_s)}_{I_s}) \)

for \( i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \) and \( I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = [0 < \cdots < \hat{k} < \cdots < n] \) with \( I_u \neq [0 < \cdots < \hat{k} < \cdots < n] \) for all \( u \);

(E) \((-1)^k b_s(F^{(i_1)}_{I_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes F^{(i_{t-1})}_{I_{t-1}} \otimes F^{(j_1)}_{I_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes F^{(j_q)}_{I_q} \otimes F^{(i_{t+1})}_{I_{t+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes F^{(i_s)}_{I_s}) \)

where, setting \( I_t = J_1 \cup \cdots \cup J_q \) and \( i_t = j_1 + \cdots + j_q, i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \) and \( I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n \) with \( I_t = \Delta^n \);

(F) \((-1)^{j+k+1} b_s(F^{(i_1)}_{I_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes F^{(i_t)}_{I_t} \otimes \cdots \otimes F^{(i_s)}_{I_s}) \)

for \( j = 0, \ldots, \hat{k}, \ldots, n \), where \( i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \) and \( I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = [0 < \cdots < \hat{j} < \cdots < n] \) with \( I_t = [0 < \cdots < \hat{j} < \cdots < n] \).

Our goal is to prove that \( A + B + C = D + E + F \) or equivalently, that
\[ A + B + C - D - E - F = 0 . \]

Applying the \( A_\infty \)-equations for the \( F^{(m)}_{[0\cdots < \hat{j} \cdots < n]}, j \neq k \), we have that
\[ A + B - F = G , \]
the terms of the sum $G$ being of the form

\[(G) \quad (-1)^{j+k+1}b_s(F_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes F_{I_s}^{(i_s)})\]

where $j = 0, \ldots, k, \ldots, n$, $i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m$ and $I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = [0 < \cdots < \hat{j} < \cdots < n]$ with $I_u \neq [0 < \cdots < \hat{j} < \cdots < n]$ for all $u$.

Applying now the $A_\infty$-equations for the $F_{I_u}^{(i_a)}$, where $I_u \neq \Delta^n$, yields the equality

$$C - D + G = H,$$

the terms of the sum $H$ having the form

\[(H) \quad (-1)^{n-1+k+\sum_{u=1}^{s}|I_u|}b_s(F_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes F_{I_{t-1}}^{(i_{t-1})} \otimes b_q(F_{j_1}^{(j_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes F_{j_q}^{(j_q)}) \otimes F_{I_{t+1}}^{(i_{t+1})} \otimes \cdots \otimes F_{I_s}^{(i_s)})\]

where, setting $I_t = J_1 \cup \cdots \cup J_q$ and $i_t = j_1 + \cdots + j_q$, $i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m$ and $I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n$ with $I_u \neq \Delta^n$ for all $u$.

Finally, applying the $A_\infty$-equations for the $b_i$ proves the equality

$$-E + H = 0,$$

which concludes the proof.

2.3.2. The $\text{HOM}_{A_\infty-\text{alg}}(A, B) \bullet$ are algebraic $\infty$-categories. We constructed in the previous subsection an explicit filler of any inner horn $\Lambda_n^k \rightarrow \text{HOM}_{A_\infty-\text{alg}}(A, B) \bullet$ which was defined as

$$F_{\Delta_n}^{(m)} := 0,$$

$$F_{[0 < \cdots < \hat{k} < \cdots < n]}^{(m)} := (-1)^k \left( \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^{j+1} F_{[0 < \cdots < \hat{j} < \cdots < n]}^{(m)} + \sum_{\substack{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \\ I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n \\ \forall u \ I_u \neq \Delta^n}} b_s(F_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes F_{I_s}^{(i_s)}) \right).$$

As a matter of fact, we check that given any family of maps $\{U^{(m)} : (sA)^{\otimes m} \rightarrow sB\}_{m \geq 1}$ of degree $-n$, the following formulae define a filler of the inner horn $\Lambda_n^k \rightarrow \text{HOM}_{A_\infty-\text{alg}}(A, B) \bullet$:

$$F_{\Delta_n}^{(m)} := U^{(m)},$$

$$F_{[0 < \cdots < \hat{k} < \cdots < n]}^{(m)} := (-1)^k \left( \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^{j+1} F_{[0 < \cdots < \hat{j} < \cdots < n]}^{(m)} + \sum_{\substack{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \\ I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n \forall u \ I_u \neq \Delta^n}} b_s(F_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes F_{I_s}^{(i_s)}) \right),$$

where we have dropped the condition $\forall u I_u \neq \Delta^n$ in the last sum, as we have now $F_{\Delta_n}^{(m)} = U^{(m)}$.

In other words:
Proposition 2. There is a natural one-to-one correspondence

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \text{fillers} \} & \xrightarrow{\Delta^n} \{ \text{families of maps of degree } -n \} \\
\Lambda_n^k & \xrightarrow{HOM_{A_{\infty}}(A, B)_{\bullet}} \{ U^{(m)}: (sA)_{\otimes m} \to sB, \, m \geq 1 \}
\end{align*}
\]

We will say that \(HOM_{A_{\infty} - \text{alg}}(A, B)_{\bullet}\) is an algebraic \(\infty\)-category. This terminology is borrowed from [RNV20].

2.3.3. Remark on the proof. We point out that this proof does not adapt to the more general case of a \(HOM\)-simplicial set \(HOM_{dg - cog}(C, C')_{\bullet}\). Indeed, while we can always solve the equation \([\partial, f\Delta^n] = \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^j f_{[0 < \cdots < \hat{j} \cdots < n]}\), by setting \(f\Delta^n = 0\) and \(f_{[0 < \cdots < \hat{k} \cdots < n]} = (-1)^k \sum_{j=0, \neq k}^{n} (-1)^{j+1} f_{[0 < \cdots < \hat{j} \cdots < n]}\), this choice of morphisms falls short to satisfy the equation \(\Delta^n f_{\Delta^n} = \sum_{I_1 \cup I_2 = \Delta^n} (f_{I_1} \otimes f_{I_2}) \Delta^n\).

2.4. A simplicial enrichment of the category \(A_{\infty} - \text{alg}\)? Given three \(A_{\infty}\)-algebras \(A, B\) and \(C\) together with two \(n\)-morphisms going respectively from \(A\) to \(B\) and from \(B\) to \(C\), we have not yet defined a way to compose them. In other words, we have not defined a simplicial enrichment of the category \(A_{\infty} - \text{alg}\).

2.4.1. Simplicially enriched categories. A simplicially enriched category \(\mathcal{D}\), or simplicial category for short, is the data of

(i) a collection of objects \(\text{Ob}(\mathcal{D})\);
(ii) for every two objects \(A\) and \(B\) a simplicial set of morphisms between \(A\) and \(B\), that we write \(HOM_\mathcal{D}(A, B)_n\); 
(iii) simplicial composition maps

\[
HOM_\mathcal{D}(A, B)_n \times HOM_\mathcal{D}(B, C)_n \longrightarrow HOM_\mathcal{D}(A, C)_n
\]

which satisfy the standard axioms of an ordinary category. Defining a simplicial enrichment of an ordinary category \(\mathcal{C}\) consists then in defining a simplicial category \(\mathcal{C}_\Delta\) having the same objects as \(\mathcal{C}\) and such that the sets of vertices of its HOM-simplicial sets are exactly the sets of morphisms of \(\mathcal{C}\), in other words

\[
HOM_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}(A, B)_0 = \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(A, B) \quad \text{for each } n.
\]

In the particular case of the category \(\mathcal{C} := A_{\infty} - \text{alg}\) we have already constructed the HOM-simplicial sets, and we would now like to define simplicial composition maps

\[
HOM_{A_{\infty} - \text{alg}}(A, B)_n \times HOM_{A_{\infty} - \text{alg}}(B, C)_n \longrightarrow HOM_{A_{\infty} - \text{alg}}(A, C)_n.
\]
It is enough to construct these simplicial maps for $\text{dg-co}_c$, i.e. to define simplicial composition maps

$$\text{HOM}_{\text{dg-co}_c}(A, B)_n \times \text{HOM}_{\text{dg-co}_c}(B, C)_n \to \text{HOM}_{\text{dg-co}_c}(A, C)_n,$$

which are associative, preserve the identity and lift the composition on $\text{HOM}_0 = \text{Hom}$.

**2.4.2. A natural candidate that fails to preserve the coproduct.** Let $F : \Delta^n \otimes C \to C'$ and $G : \Delta^n \otimes C' \to C''$ be two morphisms of dg-coalgebras. The only natural candidate to construct a composition is the Alexander-Whitney coproduct $\Delta \Delta^n$, i.e. we define $G \circ F$ to be the following composite of maps

$$\Delta^n \otimes C \xrightarrow{\Delta \Delta^n \otimes \text{id}_C} \Delta^n \otimes \Delta^n \otimes C \xrightarrow{\text{id} \Delta^n \otimes F} \Delta^n \otimes C' \xrightarrow{G} C''.$$

Note that we use the word "map" and not "morphism" because we have yet to check that this composite is indeed a morphism of dg-coalgebras.

Before moving on, we point out that for the composition of continuous maps of topological spaces $\Delta^n \times X \to Y$ we use the diagonal map of $\Delta^n$,

$$\Delta^n \times X \xrightarrow{\text{diag}_{\Delta^n} \times \text{id}_X} \Delta^n \times \Delta^n \times X \xrightarrow{\text{id} \Delta^n \times F} \Delta^n \times Y \xrightarrow{G} Z.$$

This construction cannot be reproduced in our case, as the diagonal map $\Delta^n \to \Delta^n \otimes \Delta^n$ does not respect the gradings, nor does it respect the differentials.

Set $\Delta^n_1 := \Delta^n$, $\Delta^n_2 := \Delta^n$ and write $\Delta \Delta^n : \Delta^n \to \Delta^n_1 \otimes \Delta^n_2$ for the Alexander-Whitney map seen as a map from the dg-coalgebra $\Delta^n$ to the product dg-coalgebra $\Delta^n_1 \otimes \Delta^n_2$. In the previous composition, it is sufficient to prove that $\Delta \Delta^n : \Delta^n \to \Delta^n_1 \otimes \Delta^n_2$ is a morphism of dg-coalgebras to prove that $G \circ F$ is a morphism of dg-coalgebras. This map does preserve the differential, but it does not preserve the coproduct! Indeed, consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Delta^n & \xrightarrow{\Delta \Delta^n} & \Delta^n_1 \otimes \Delta^n_2 \\
\downarrow{\Delta \Delta^n} & & \downarrow{\text{id} \otimes \text{id}} \\
\Delta^n \otimes \Delta^n & \xrightarrow{\Delta \Delta^n \otimes \Delta \Delta^n} & (\Delta^n_1 \otimes \Delta^n_2) \otimes (\Delta^n_1 \otimes \Delta^n_2)
\end{array}$$

Up to specifying the correct signs, the upper composite path of the square is the map

$$I \mapsto \sum_{I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3 \cup I_4 = I} I_1 \otimes I_3 \otimes I_2 \otimes I_4,$$

where $I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3 \cup I_4$ denotes an overlapping partition of the face $I \subset \Delta^n$, while the lower composite path of the square is the map

$$I \mapsto \sum_{I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3 \cup I_4 = I} I_1 \otimes I_2 \otimes I_3 \otimes I_4.$$

These two maps are not equal, the square does not commute.

The map $G \circ F$ is in particular not a morphism of dg-coalgebras, and as a result does not belong to $\text{HOM}_{\text{dg-co}_c}(A, C)_n$. It ensues that the composition fails to be lifted to higher morphisms with this naive approach.
2.4.3. An open question and a result. We proved in the previous subsection that the natural approach to lift the composition in $A_\infty - \mathfrak{alg}$ to $\text{HOM}_{A_\infty - \mathfrak{alg}}(A, B)$ does not work. Hence, it is still an open question to know whether these HOM-simplicial sets could fit into a simplicial enrichment of the category $A_\infty - \mathfrak{alg}$. This would then endow $A_\infty - \mathfrak{alg}$ with a structure of $(\infty, 2)$-category as explained at p.6 of [Lur09]. In fact, it is unclear to the author why such a statement should be true.

Still, something more can be said about the previous non-commutative square. Again, up to computing the correct signs, the map

$$\Delta^n \longrightarrow (\Delta_1^n \otimes \Delta_2^n) \otimes (\Delta_3^n \otimes \Delta_4^n)$$

$$I \longmapsto \sum_{I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3 \cup I_4 \cup I_5 = I} I_1 \otimes I_3 \otimes (I_2 \cup I_4) \otimes I_5,$$

defines an homotopy between the upper composite path and the lower composite path of the square: it fills the square to make it homotopy-commutative. In the language introduced in [MS03], the upper composite path is equal to 1324, the lower one is equal to 1234, and the filler is equal to 13234. Using the results of [MS03], the author proved in [Maz] that:

**Theorem 2.** The Alexander-Whitney coproduct can be lifted to an $A_\infty$-morphism between the dg-coalgebras $\Delta^n$ and $\Delta_1^n \otimes \Delta_2^n$, whose first higher homotopy is the map 13234.

3. The $n$-multiplihedra

Recall from [Maz21] that, in the language of operadic algebra, $A_\infty$-algebras are governed by the operad $A_\infty$, and $A_\infty$-morphisms are governed by the $(A_\infty, A_\infty)$-operadic bimodule $A_\infty - \text{Morph}$. These two operadic objects actually stem from collections of polytopes. Under the functor $C_{\text{cell}}$ the associahedra $\{K_m\}$ realise the operad $A_\infty$, while the multiplihedra $\{J_m\}$ form a $\{(K_m), (K_m)\}$-operadic bimodule realising $A_\infty - \text{Morph}$.

The first section shows that the operadic bimodule formalism for $A_\infty$-morphisms can be generalised to the setting of $n - A_\infty$-morphisms: for each $n \geq 0$ there exists an $(A_\infty, A_\infty)$-operadic bimodule $n - A_\infty - \text{Morph}$, which encodes $n$-morphisms between $A_\infty$-algebras. In fact, they fit into a cosimplicial operadic bimodule $\{n - A_\infty - \text{Morph}\}_{n \geq 0}$. Reproducing the previous progression, we would like to realise the combinatorics of $n$-morphisms at the level of polytopes. The first step in this direction is performed in section 3.2: we explain how to lift the Alexander-Whitney coproduct to the level of the standard simplices $\Delta^n$ and study the rich combinatorics that arise in this problem. Section 3.3 subsequently introduces the $n$-multiplihedra $n - J_m$, which are the polytopes $\Delta^n \times J_m$ endowed with a thinner polytopal subdivision. These polytopes do not form a $\{(K_m), (K_m)\}$-operadic bimodule, but they suffice to recover all the combinatorics of $n$-morphisms.

3.1. The cosimplicial $(A_\infty, A_\infty)$-operadic bimodule encoding higher morphisms.

3.1.1. The $(A_\infty, A_\infty)$-operadic bimodules $n - A_\infty - \text{Morph}$. The $(A_\infty, A_\infty)$-operadic bimodule encoding $A_\infty$-morphisms is the quasi-free $(A_\infty, A_\infty)$-operadic bimodule generated in arity $n$ by one operation $\uplus$ of degree $1 - n$,

$$A_\infty - \text{Morph} = \mathcal{F}^{A_\infty, A_\infty}(\uplus, \uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \cdots).$$
Representing the generating operations of the operad $A_\infty$ acting on the right in blue $\mathcal{Y}$ and the ones of the operad $A_\infty$ acting on the left in red $\mathcal{Y}$, its differential is defined by

$$\partial(\begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 2 \quad m \\ h \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad h \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} k \\ i_1 + \cdots + i_2 = m \end{array}) = \sum_{h+ k = m+ 1 \atop 1 \leq i \leq k \atop h \geq 2} \pm \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad i_i \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} h \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} k \\ i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \end{array} \pm \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad i_i \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} h \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} k \\ i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \end{array}.$$ 

**Definition 8.** The $(A_\infty, A_\infty)$-operadic bimodule encoding $n - A_\infty$-morphisms is the quasi-free $(A_\infty, A_\infty)$-operadic bimodule generated in arity $m$ by the operations $f_I^{(m)}$ of degree $1 - m + |I|$, for all faces $I$ of $\Delta^n$, and whose differential is defined by

$$\partial(f_I^{(m)}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\dim I} (-1)^j f_I^{(m)} + \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_2 = m} \pm f_{i_1 + i_2} (\text{id}^{i_1} \otimes m_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{i_2}) + \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m} \pm m_s (f_{i_1}^{(m)} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{i_s}^{(m)}).$$

Representing the operations $f_I^{(m)}$ as $\begin{array}{c} I \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \cdots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} I \end{array}$, this can be rewritten as

$$n - A_\infty - \text{Morph} = \mathcal{F}^{A_\infty, A_\infty}(\begin{array}{c} \cdots \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} I \end{array}; \begin{array}{c} I \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \cdots \end{array}; I \subset \Delta^n).$$

where

$$\partial(\begin{array}{c} i \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \cdots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} i \end{array}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\dim I} (-1)^j f_{i}^{(m)} + \sum_{I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = I} \pm \begin{array}{c} i_i \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \cdots \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} i_i \\ \end{array} + \sum_{I} \pm \begin{array}{c} i_i \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \cdots \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} i_i \\ \end{array}.$$ 

The collection of $(A_\infty, A_\infty)$-operadic bimodules $\{n - A_\infty - \text{Morph}\}_{n \geq 0}$ forms a cosimplicial $(A_\infty, A_\infty)$-operadic bimodule whose coface and codegeneracy maps are built out of those of section 1.3. Given two $A_\infty$-algebras $A_\infty \to \text{Hom}(A)$ and $A_\infty \to \text{Hom}(B)$, the set of $n$-morphisms is then simply given by

$$\text{HOM}_{A_\infty - \text{algebras}}(A,B)_n = \text{Hom}_{(A_\infty, A_\infty)-\text{op-bimod}}(n - A_\infty - \text{Morph}, \text{Hom}(A,B)).$$

3.1.2. The two-colored operadic viewpoint. Recall that $A_\infty$-algebras and $A_\infty$-morphisms between them are naturally encoded by the quasi-free two-colored operad

$$A_\infty^2 := \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}, \cdots, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}, \cdots),$$

with differential given by the $A_\infty$-algebra relations on the one-colored operations, and the $A_\infty$-morphism relations on the two-colored operations.

Similarly, $A_\infty$-algebras and $n - A_\infty$-morphisms between them are naturally encoded by the quasi-free two-colored operad

$$n - A_\infty^2 := \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}, \cdots, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}, \cdots),$$

with differential given by the $A_\infty$-algebra relations on the one-colored operations, and the $n - A_\infty$-morphism relations on the two-colored operations. The collection of two-colored operads $\{n - A_\infty^2\}_{n \geq 0}$ constitutes again a cosimplicial two-colored operad.
3.2. Polytopal subdivisions on $\Delta^n$ induced by the Alexander-Whitney coproduct. One way of interpreting the Alexander-Whitney coproduct

$$\Delta_{\Delta^n} : \Delta^n \to \Delta^n \otimes \Delta^n$$

is to say that it is a diagonal on the dg-$\mathbb{Z}$-module $\Delta^n$. The following natural question then arises. Does there exist a diagonal (i.e. a polytopal map that is homotopic to the usual diagonal - the usual diagonal map failing to be polytopal in general) on the standard $n$-simplex $\Delta^n$,

$$\text{AW} : \Delta^n \to \Delta^n \times \Delta^n,$$

such that its image under the functor $C_{\text{cell}}$ is $\text{AW}_* = \Delta_{\Delta^n}$?

The answer to this question is positive, and contains rich combinatorics that we now lay out.

3.2.1. The map $\text{AW}$. We recall in this section the construction of a diagonal on the standard simplices explained in [MTTV19] (example 1 of section 2.3.).

**Definition 9 ([MTTV19]).** Consider the realizations of the standard $n$-simplices

$$\Delta^n := \text{conv}\{(1, \ldots, 1, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n\} = \{(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n|1 \geq z_1 \geq \cdots \geq z_i \geq 1/2 \geq z_{i+1} \geq \cdots \geq z_n \geq 0\}.$$

We define the map $\text{AW}$ by the formula

$$\text{AW}(z_1, \cdots, z_n) = ((2z_1 - 1, \ldots, 2z_i - 1, 0, \ldots, 0), (1, \cdots, 1, 2z_{i+1}, \ldots, 2z_n)),$$

for $1 \geq z_1 \geq \cdots \geq z_i \geq 1/2 \geq z_{i+1} \geq \cdots \geq z_n \geq 0$.

In particular, the map $\text{AW}$ comes with a thinner polytopal subdivision of $\Delta^n$, whose $n+1$ top dimensional strata are given by the subsets

$$\{(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n|1 > z_1 > \cdots > z_i > 1/2 > z_{i+1} > \cdots > z_n > 0\} \subset \Delta^n,$$

and whose $i$-codimensional strata are simply obtained by replacing $i$ symbols "$>$" by a symbol "$=$" in the previous sequence of inequalities. This thinner subdivision is represented on the figures 1, 2 and 3, together with the value of $\text{AW}$ on each stratum of the subdivision.

**Figure 1.** The $\text{AW}$-subdivision of $\Delta^1$ and $\Delta^2$
The polytopal map $AW$ is not coassociative. The Alexander-Whitney coproduct $\Delta_{\Delta^n}$ on dg-$\mathbb{Z}$-modules is coassociative. However, the diagonal map $AW$ is not! This can be checked for the 1-simplex $\Delta^1$:

$$(AW \times \text{id}) \circ AW(2/5) = AW \times \text{id}(0, 4/5) = (0, 0, 4/5)$$

$$(\text{id} \times AW) \circ AW(2/5) = \text{id} \times AW(0, 4/5) = (0, 3/5, 1) .$$

**Proposition 3.** The polytopal map $AW$ is not coassociative.

The polytopal subdivisions that the polytopal maps

$$(AW \times \text{id}) \circ AW : \Delta^n \rightarrow \Delta^n \times \Delta^n \times \Delta^n,$$

$$(\text{id} \times AW) \circ AW : \Delta^n \rightarrow \Delta^n \times \Delta^n \times \Delta^n$$

induce on $\Delta^n$ are also different. See an instance on figure 4.

3.2.3. $i$-overlapping s-partitions. We defined in subsection 1.3.2 the notion of an overlapping s-partition of a face $I$ of $\Delta^n$. We refine it now:

**Definition 10.** An $i$-overlapping $s$-partition of $I$ is a sequence of faces $(I_\ell)_{1 \leq \ell \leq s}$ of $I$ such that

(i) the union of this sequence of faces is $I$, i.e. $\cup_{1 \leq \ell \leq s} I_\ell = I$;
(ii) there are exactly \( i \) integers \( \ell \) such that \( 1 \leq \ell < s \) and \( \max(I_\ell) = \min(I_{\ell+1}) \).

An overlapping \( s \)-partition as defined in definition 5 is then simply a \((s - 1)\)-overlapping \( s \)-partition. A 1-overlapping 3-partition for \([0 < 1 < 2]\) is for instance
\[
[0 < 1 < 2] = [0] \cup [0] \cup [1 < 2].
\]

3.2.4. Polytopal subdivisions of \( \Delta^n \) induced by iterations of \( AW \).

Definition 11. Define the \( s \)-th right iterate of the map \( AW \) as
\[
AW^{os} := (id^{(s-1)} \times AW) \circ \cdots \circ (id \times AW) \circ AW : \Delta^n \rightarrow (\Delta^n)^{\times s}.
\]

For each \( s \geq 1 \), the map \( AW^{os} \) induces a thinner polytopal subdivision of \( \Delta^n \). These subdivisions will be called the \( AW^{os} \)-subdivisions of \( \Delta^n \). They can be described rather simply. While the \( AW \)-subdivision is obtained by dividing \( \Delta^n \) into pieces with all hyperplanes \( z_i = 1/2 \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), the \( AW^{os} \)-subdivision can be constructed as follows:

Proposition 4. The \( AW^{os} \)-subdivision of \( \Delta^n \) is the subdivision obtained after dividing \( \Delta^n \) by all hyperplanes \( z_i = (1/2)^k \), for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and \( 1 \leq k \leq s \).

The first three subdivisions of \( \Delta^2 \) are represented in figure 5. Note that a different choice for \( AW^{os} \), for instance \( AW^{o2} = (AW \times id) \circ AW \), would have yielded a different subdivision of \( \Delta^n \). Choices have to be made, because \( AW \) is not coassociative.
3.2.5. **Labeling the AW\textsuperscript{os}-subdivisions of \(\Delta^n\).** The image of the map AW\textsuperscript{os} under the functor \(C_{\text{cell}}\) yields the \(s\)-th iterate of the Alexander-Whitney coproduct \(\Delta_\Delta\). Hence, the \(n\)-dimensional strata of the AW\textsuperscript{os}-subdivision of \(\Delta^n\) are in one-to-one correspondence with the overlapping \((s+1)\)-partitions of \(\Delta^n\). The AW and AW\textsuperscript{os}\textsuperscript{2} subdivisions of \(\Delta^2\) are represented in figure 6. We have in fact that:

**Proposition 5.** The codimension \(i\) strata of the AW\textsuperscript{os}-subdivision of \(\Delta^n\) lying in the interior of \(\Delta^n\) are in one-to-one correspondence with the \((s-i)\)-overlapping \((s+1)\)-partitions of \(\Delta^n\). More generally given a face \(I \subset \Delta^n\), the strata of the AW\textsuperscript{os}-subdivision of \(\Delta^n\) which are lying in the interior of \(I\) and have codimension \(i\) w.r.t. to the dimension of \(I\) are in one-to-one correspondence with the \((s-i)\)-overlapping \((s+1)\)-partitions of \(I\).

**Figure 6.** The AW and AW\textsuperscript{os}\textsuperscript{2} subdivisions of \(\Delta^2\)

We finally give a recipe to easily label a stratum from the AW\textsuperscript{os}-subdivision of \(\Delta^n\) using its description as a set of inequalities and equalities. The top dimensional strata of the AW-subdivision of \(\Delta^n\) are given by the sets

\[ C_i := \{(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n | 1 > z_1 > \cdots > z_i > 1/2 > z_{i+1} > \cdots > z_n > 0\} \subset \Delta^n. \]

We check that each stratum \(C_i\) yields the term \([0 < \cdots < i] \otimes [i < \cdots < n]\) under the functor \(C_{\text{cell}}\).

Similarly, the top dimensional strata of the AW\textsuperscript{os}-subdivision of \(\Delta^n\) are defined by the inequalities

\[ \cdots > z_{i_k} > (1/2)^k > z_{i_k+1} > \cdots, \]

for \(1 \leq k \leq s\). We write \(C_{i_1, \ldots, i_s}\) for such a stratum. As before, each stratum \(C_{i_1, \ldots, i_s}\) yields the term \([0 < \cdots < i_1] \otimes [i_1 < \cdots < i_2] \otimes \cdots \otimes [i_s < \cdots < n]\) under the functor \(C_{\text{cell}}\).

**Proposition 6.** Consider a codimension \(i\) stratum of the AW\textsuperscript{os}-subdivision of \(\Delta^n\) which is lying in the interior of \(\Delta^n\). This stratum is defined by \(s - i\) inequalities of the form

\[ \cdots > z_{i_k} > (1/2)^k > z_{i_k+1} > \cdots, \]

and \(i\) equalities of the form

\[ \cdots > z_{i_k} = (1/2)^k > z_{i_k+1} > \cdots. \]
The labeling of this stratum can then be obtained under the following simple transformation rules:
\[ \cdots > z_{i_k} > (1/2)^k > z_{i_k+1} > \cdots \mapsto \cdots < i_k \] \[ \cdots > z_{i_k} = (1/2)^k > z_{i_k+1} > \cdots \mapsto \cdots < i_k - 1 \] This recipe easily carries over to the case of strata lying in the boundary of \( \Delta^n \).

3.3. The \( n \)-multiplihedra \( n - J_m \).

3.3.1. The multiplihedra. The polytopes encoding \( A_{\infty} \)-morphisms between \( A_{\infty} \)-algebras are the multiplihedra \( J_m \), \( m \geq 1 \); they form a collection \( \{ J_m \}_{m \geq 1} \) which is a \((\{ K_m \}, \{ K_m \})\)-operadic bimodule whose image under the functor \( C_{\text{cell}}^* \) is the \((A_{\infty}, A_{\infty})\)-operadic bimodule \( A_{\infty} - \text{Morph} \). The faces of codimension \( i \) of \( J_m \) are labeled by all possible broken two-colored trees obtained by blowing-up \( i \) times the two-colored \( m \)-corolla. See for instance [Maz21] for pictures of the multiplihedra \( J_1 \), \( J_2 \) and \( J_3 \). The multiplihedra \( J_m \) can moreover be realized as the compactifications of moduli spaces of stable two-colored metric ribbon trees \( \overline{CT}_m \), where each \( CT_m \) is seen as the unique \((m - 1)\)-dimensional stratum of \( \overline{CT}_m \).

3.3.2. The \( n \)-multiplihedra \( n - J_m \). Consider the polytope \( \Delta^n \times J_m \) for \( n \geq 0 \) and \( m \geq 1 \). It is the most natural candidate for a polytope encoding \( n \)-morphisms between \( A_{\infty} \)-algebras. However, it does not fulfill that property as it is. Indeed, its faces correspond to the data of a face of \( \Delta^n \), that is of some \( I \subset \Delta^n \), and of a face of \( J_m \), that is of a broken two-colored tree obtained by blowing-up several times the two-colored \( m \)-corolla. This labeling is too coarse, as it does not contain the following trees, that appear in the \( A_{\infty} \)-equations for \( n \)-morphisms

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\bullet \quad \bullet \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
\quad \quad i_i
\end{array}
\]

We resolve this issue by constructing a thinner polytopal subdivision of \( \Delta^n \times J_m \). Consider a face \( F \) of \( J_m \), such that exactly \( s \) unbroken two-colored trees appear in the two-colored broken tree labeling it – see an instance above by forgetting the \( I_i \). We then refine the polytopal subdivision of \( \Delta^n \times F \) into \( \Delta^n_{\text{AW}(s-1)} \times F \), where \( \Delta^n_{\text{AW}(s-1)} \) denotes \( \Delta^n \) endowed with its \( \text{AW}^{(s-1)} \)-subdivision. This refinement process can be done consistently for each face \( F \) of \( J_m \), in order to obtain a new polytopal subdivision of \( \Delta^n \times J_m \).

**Definition 12.** The \( n \)-multiplihedra are defined to be the polytopes \( \Delta^n \times J_m \) endowed with the previous polytopal subdivision. We denote them \( n - J_m \).

See some examples in figures 7, 8 and 9. We illustrate definition 12 with the construction of the 2-multiplihedron \( \Delta^2 \times J_2 \) depicted on figure 8. The polytope \( \Delta^2 \) has one 2-dimensional face labeled by \([0 < 1 < 2]\) and three 1-dimensional faces labeled by \([0 < 1]\), \([1 < 2]\) and \([0 < 2]\). The polytope \( J_2 \) has one 1-dimensional face labeled by \( \bigtriangledown \) and has two 0-dimensional faces labeled by \( \bigtriangledown \) and \( \bigtriangledown \). Consider now the product polytope \( \Delta^2 \times J_2 \). Its has one unique 3-dimensional face labeled by \([0 < 1 < 2] \times \bigtriangledown \) and five 2-dimensional faces. The faces \([0 < 1] \times \bigtriangledown \), \([1 < 2] \times \bigtriangledown \), \([0 < 2] \times \bigtriangledown \) and \([0 < 1 < 2] \times \bigtriangledown \) that are left unchanged under the construction of the previous paragraph, as they each feature only 1 unbroken two-colored tree. They respectively correspond to the faces A, B,
F and G on figure 8. The fifth face is the face \([0 < 1 < 2] \times \bigtriangledown\). It features 2 unbroken two-colored trees: we thus have to refine the polytopal subdivision of \(\Delta^2 \times \bigtriangledown\) into \(\Delta^2_{AW} \times \bigtriangledown\). This refinement produces the strata \([[0] \otimes [0 < 1 < 2]] \times \bigtriangledown\), \([[0 < 1] \otimes [1 < 2]] \times \bigtriangledown\) and \([[0 < 1 < 2] \otimes [2]] \times \bigtriangledown\), which respectively correspond to the labels C, D and E on figure 8. This concludes the construction of the 2-multiplihedron \(\Delta^2 \times J_2\).

\[\text{Figure 7. The 1-multiplihedron } \Delta^1 \times J_2\]

\[\text{Figure 8. The 2-multiplihedron } \Delta^2 \times J_2\]

3.3.3. \textit{The } \(n\)-\textit{multiplihedra encode } \(n-A_\infty\)-\textit{morphisms.} Now in which sense do these polytopes encode \(n-A_\infty\)-morphisms? Note first that the collection \(\{n-J_m\}_{m \geq 1}\) is not a \((\{K_m\}, \{K_m\})\)-operadic bimodule! Indeed, a \((\{K_m\}, \{K_m\})\)-operadic bimodule structure would for instance make appear a
stratum labeled by

where \( I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n \) is an overlapping partition of \( \Delta^n \). This stratum does not appear in the polytopal subdivision of \( n - J_m \). Hence these polytopes do not recover the \((A_\infty,A_\infty)\)-operadic bimodule \( n - A_\infty - \text{Morph} \).

However, the polytopal subdivision of \( n - J_m \) still contains enough combinatorics to recover a \( n \)-morphism. This polytope has a unique \((n+m-1)\)-dimensional cell \([n - J_m] \), which is labeled by \( \Delta^n \). By construction:

**Proposition 7.** The boundary of the cell \([n - J_m] \) is given by

\[
\partial^{\text{sing}}[n - J_m] \cup \bigcup_{h+k=m+1 \atop 1 \leq i \leq k \atop h \geq 2} [n - J_k] \times_i [K_h] \cup \bigcup_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \atop I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n} [K_s] \times [\dim(I_1) - J_{i_1}] \times \cdots \times [\dim(I_s) - J_{i_s}],
\]

where \( I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n \) is an overlapping partition of \( \Delta^n \).

Details on the orientation of the top dimensional strata in this boundary are worked out in section 5.3. Note moreover that the collection \( \{n - J_m\}_{m \geq 0} \) is a cosimplicial polytope. This implies that the image of each cell \([\dim(I) - J_m] \) under the functor \( C_{cell}^{\text{cell}} \) yields an element whose boundary is exactly given by the \( A_\infty \)-equations for \( n \)-morphisms. It is in that sense that the \( n - J_m \) encode \( n \)-morphisms. The previous boundary formula also implies that the \( n - J_m \) will constitute a good parametrizing space for constructing moduli spaces in symplectic topology, whose count should give rise to \( n \)-morphisms between Floer complexes.
4. $n - \Omega BAs$-morphisms

The multiplihedra $J_m$ can be realized by compactifying the moduli spaces of stable two-colored metric ribbon trees $\mathcal{CT}_m$ and come with two cell decompositions. The first one consists in considering each $\mathcal{CT}_m$ as a $(m - 1)$-dimensional stratum and encodes the operadic bimodule $A_\infty - \text{Morph}$. The second one is obtained by considering the stratification of the moduli spaces $\mathcal{CT}_m$ by two-colored stable ribbon tree types, and encodes the operadic bimodule $\Omega BAs - \text{Morph}$. The $\Omega BAs$-cell decomposition is moreover a refinement of the $A_\infty$-cell decomposition. As a consequence, there exists a morphism of operadic bimodules $A_\infty - \text{Morph} \rightarrow \Omega BAs - \text{Morph}$, as shown in [Maz21]. It is hence sufficient to construct an $\Omega BAs$-morphism between $\Omega BAs$-algebras to then naturally get an $A_\infty$-morphism between $A_\infty$-algebras.

We define in this section $n - \Omega BAs$-morphisms between $\Omega BAs$-algebras. Building on the viewpoint of the previous paragraph, we then explain how, by refining the cell decomposition of the polytope $n - J_m$, we get a new cell decomposition encoding $n - \Omega BAs$-morphisms. This construction yields in particular a morphism of operadic bimodules $n - A_\infty - \text{Morph} \rightarrow n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph}$. All sign computations are moreover postponed to section 5.4.

4.1. $n - \Omega BAs$-morphisms.

4.1.1. Recollections on $\Omega BAs$-morphisms. $\Omega BAs$-morphisms are the morphisms between $\Omega BAs$-algebras encoded by the quasi-free operadic bimodule generated by all two-colored stable ribbon trees

$$\Omega BAs - \text{Morph} := F_{\Omega BAs, \Omega BAs}(\uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \cdots, \text{sCRT}_n, \cdots) .$$

A two-colored stable ribbon tree $t_g$ whose underlying stable ribbon tree $t$ has $e(t)$ inner edges, and such that its gauge crosses $j$ vertices of $t$, has degree $|t_g| := j - 1 - e(t)$.

The differential of a two-colored stable ribbon tree $t_g$ is given by the signed sum of all two-colored stable ribbon trees obtained from $t_g$ under the rule prescribed by the top dimensional strata in the boundary of $\mathcal{CT}_n(t_g)$: the gauge moves to cross exactly one additional vertex of the underlying stable ribbon tree (gauge-vertex); an internal edge located above the gauge or intersecting it breaks or, when the gauge is below the root, the outgoing edge breaks between the gauge and the root (above-break); edges (internal or incoming) that are possibly intersecting the gauge, break below it, such that there is exactly one edge breaking in each non-self crossing path from an incoming edge to the root (below-break); an internal edge that does not intersect the gauge collapses (int-collapse).

4.1.2. $n - \Omega BAs$-morphisms.

Definition 13. $n - \Omega BAs$-morphisms are the higher morphisms between $\Omega BAs$-algebras encoded by the quasi-free operadic bimodule generated by all pairs (face $I \subset \Delta^n$, two-colored stable ribbon tree),

$$n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph} := F^{\Omega BAs, \Omega BAs}(\uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \cdots, \text{sCRT}_n, \cdots; I \subset \Delta^n) .$$

An operation $t_{I,g} := (I, t_g)$ is defined to have degree $|t_{I,g}| := |I| + |t_g|$. The differential of $t_{I,g}$ is given by the rule prescribed by the top dimensional strata in the boundary of $\mathcal{CT}_m(t_g)$ combined
with the algebraic combinatorics of overlapping partitions, added to the simplicial differential of $I$, i.e.

$$
\partial t_{I,g} = t_{\partial^{\text{sing}} I,g} + \pm (\partial^{\text{CT}} m t_g) I .
$$

We refer to section 5.4 for a more complete definition and sign conventions. The sign computations are in particular more involved, as we did not describe an ad hoc construction analogous to the shifted bar construction as in the $A_\infty$ case. We also point out that the symbol $I$ used here is the same as the one used for the arity 2 generating operation of $n - A_\infty - \text{Morph}$. It will however be clear from the context what $I$ stands for in the rest of this paper. We moreover compute the differential in the following instance

$$
\partial (\ |_{[0 < 1 < 2]} |) = \pm |_{[1 < 2]} | + \pm |_{[0 < 2]} | + \pm |_{[0 < 1]} |
$$

$$
\pm |_{[0 < 1 < 2]} | + \pm |_{[0 < 1 < 2]} | + \pm |_{[0 < 1 < 2]} | + \pm |_{[0 < 1 < 2]} | .
$$

4.1.3. From $n - \Omega BAs$-morphisms to $n - A_\infty$-morphisms. A $n - \Omega BAs$-morphism between two $\Omega BAs$-algebras naturally yields a $n - A_\infty$-morphism between the induced $A_\infty$-algebras:

**Proposition 8.** There exists a morphism of \((A_\infty, A_\infty)\)-operadic bimodules $n - A_\infty - \text{Morph} \to n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph}$ given on the generating operations of $n - A_\infty - \text{Morph}$ by

$$
 f_{I,m} \mapsto \sum_{t_g \in \text{CBRT}_m} \pm f_{I,t_g} ,
$$

where $\text{CBRT}_m$ denotes the set of two-colored binary ribbon trees of arity $m$.

This proposition is proven in subsection 5.4.7. Note that the collection of operadic bimodules \(\{ n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph} \}_{n \geq 0} \) is once again a cosimplicial operadic bimodule, where the cofaces and codegeneracies are as in subsection 1.3.1. This sequence of morphisms of operadic bimodules defines then in fact a morphism of cosimplicial operadic bimodules

$$
\{ n - A_\infty - \text{Morph} \}_{n \geq 0} \to \{ n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph} \}_{n \geq 0} .
$$

4.1.4. A conjecture on the $\text{HOM}$-simplicial sets $\text{HOM}_{\Omega BAs - \text{alg}}(A,B)_\bullet$. Given $A$ and $B$ two $\Omega BAs$-algebras, we define the $\text{HOM}$-simplicial set

$$
\text{HOM}_{\Omega BAs - \text{alg}}(A,B)_n := \text{Hom}_{\Omega BAs, \Omega BAs} - \text{op.bimod} (n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph}, \text{Hom}(A,B)) .
$$

Drawing from theorem 1 we conjecture the following result:

**Conjecture 1.** The simplicial sets $\text{HOM}_{\Omega BAs - \text{alg}}(A,B)_\bullet$ are $\infty$-categories.

The proof without signs should follow the same lines as the proof without signs of theorem 1 working this time with stable ribbon trees and gauged stable ribbon trees instead of corollae. The sign computations will however be much more complicated, as we did not describe a construction analogous to the shifted bar construction which would yield ad hoc sign conventions.
4.2. The $n$-multiplihedra encode $n - \Omega\text{-}BAs$-morphisms.

4.2.1. The $n - \Omega\text{-}BAs$-cell decomposition of $\Delta^n \times \overline{\mathcal{CT}}_m$. The polytopes encoding $n - A_\infty$-morphisms have been defined to be the polytopes $\Delta^n \times J_m$ endowed with a thinner polytopal subdivision induced by the maps $\text{AW}^{os}$. These thinner subdivisions incorporate the combinatorics of $i$-overlapping $s$-partitions in the boundary of the polytopes $\Delta^n \times J_m$.

Consider now the multiplihedra $J_m = \overline{\mathcal{CT}}_m$ endowed with its $\Omega\text{-}BAs$-cell decomposition, i.e. its cell decomposition by broken stable two-colored ribbon tree type. We define a thinner cell decomposition on the product CW-complex $\Delta^n \times \overline{\mathcal{CT}}_m$ as follows. Consider a stratum $\mathcal{CT}_m(t_{br,g})$ of the moduli space $\mathcal{CT}_m$, such that exactly $s$ unbroken two-colored ribbon trees appear in the broken stable two-colored ribbon tree $t_{br,g}$ labeling it. We refine the cell decomposition of $\Delta^n \times \mathcal{CT}_m(t_{br,g})$ into $\Delta^n_{\text{AW}^{os}(s-1)} \times \mathcal{CT}_m(t_{br,g})$, where $\Delta^n_{\text{AW}^{os}(s-1)}$ denotes $\Delta^n$ endowed with its $\text{AW}^{os}$-subdivision. This refinement process can again be done consistently for each stratum $\mathcal{CT}_m(t_{br,g})$ of $\mathcal{CT}_m$ in order to obtain a thinner cell decomposition of $\Delta^n \times \overline{\mathcal{CT}}_m$.

**Definition 14.** We define the $n - \Omega\text{-}BAs$-cell decomposition of the $n$-multiplihedron $\Delta^n \times \overline{\mathcal{CT}}_m$ to be the cell decomposition described in the previous paragraph.

See some examples in figures 10 and 11. By construction, the $n - \Omega\text{-}BAs$-cell decomposition of $\Delta^n \times \overline{\mathcal{CT}}_m$ is moreover a refinement of the $n - A_\infty$-cell decomposition of $\Delta^n \times \overline{\mathcal{CT}}_m$.

![Figure 10. The 1 - \Omega\text{-}BAs-cell decomposition of \Delta^1 \times \overline{\mathcal{CT}}_2](image)

4.2.2. These CW-complexes encode $n - \Omega\text{-}BAs$-morphisms. Consider the associahedra $K_m = \mathcal{T}_m$ endowed with their $\Omega\text{-}BAs$-cell decompositions. We endow moreover the spaces $\Delta^n \times \overline{\mathcal{CT}}_m$ with their $n - \Omega\text{-}BAs$-cell decompositions. As in the $A_\infty$ case, the collection of CW-complexes $\{\Delta^n \times \overline{\mathcal{CT}}_m\}_{m \geq 1}$ is not a ($\{\mathcal{T}_m\}$, $\{\overline{\mathcal{T}}_m\}$)-operadic bimodule. Carrying over the details of subsection 3.3.3, it contains however enough combinatorics to recover a $n - \Omega\text{-}BAs$-morphism. What’s more, the collection $\{\Delta^n \times \overline{\mathcal{CT}}_m\}_{n \geq 0}$ is again a cosimplicial CW-complex.
4.3. Résumé. The higher homotopies or $n$-morphisms extending the notion of $A_\infty$-morphisms and $A_\infty$-homotopies between $A_\infty$-algebras are defined to be the morphisms of dg-coalgebras

$$\Delta^n \otimes T(sA) \rightarrow T(sB) .$$

From an operadic viewpoint, they are naturally encoded by the operadic bimodule,

$$n - A_\infty - \text{Morph} = \mathcal{F}^{A_\infty, A_\infty}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \cdots; I \subset \Delta^n) .$$

where the differential is defined as

$$[\partial, i] = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (-1)^j \psi_j \cdot \sum_{I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_k = I} \pm \sum_{I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_k = I} \pm \sum_{I}$$

The combinatorics of this differential are encoded by new families of polytopes called the $n$-multipli-hedra, which are the data of the polytopes $\Delta^n \times J_m$ together with a polytopal subdivision induced by the maps $\text{AW}^{o8}$. They will constitute a good parametrizing space for constructing moduli spaces in symplectic topology, whose count should recover a $n$-morphism between Floer complexes.

On the other side, the natural $n$-morphisms extending the notion of $\Omega BAs$-morphisms are defined by adapting the operadic viewpoint on $n - A_\infty$-morphisms. They are naturally encoded by the operadic bimodule,

$$n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph} = \mathcal{F}^{\Omega BAs, \Omega BAs}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \cdots; (I, sCRT_m), \cdots; I \subset \Delta^n) ,$$

where the differential is again defined as a signed sum prescribed by a rule on two-colored trees combinatorics combined with the algebraic combinatorics of overlapping partitions, added to the simplicial differential. This differential is encoded in the data of the polytopes $\Delta^n \times J_m$ endowed with a thinner cell decomposition induced by two-colored stable ribbon tree types and the maps $\text{AW}^{o8}$. It is moreover sufficient to construct a $n - \Omega BAs$-morphism between $\Omega BAs$-algebras in order to recover a $n - A_\infty$-morphism between the induced $A_\infty$-algebras, thanks to the morphism of operadic bimodules

$$n - A_\infty - \text{Morph} \rightarrow n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph} .$$
We show in part 2 that the previous CW-complexes constitute a good parametrizing space for moduli spaces in Morse theory, whose count will recover a $n - \Omega BAs$-morphism between Morse cochain complexes.

5. Signs for $n$-morphisms

We now work out all the signs left uncomputed in the previous sections of this part. These computations will be done resorting to the basic conventions on signs and orientations that we were already using in [Maz21], and that we briefly recall in the first section. In the next two sections, we display and explain the two natural sign conventions for $n - A_\infty$-morphisms ensuing from the bar construction viewpoint, and then show that one of these conventions is in fact contained in the polytopes $n - J_m$. We finally give a complete definition of the operadic bimodule $n - \Omega BAs - Morph$ and build the morphism of operadic bimodules $n - A_\infty - Morph \to n - \Omega BAs - Morph$ of proposition 8.

5.1. Conventions for signs and orientations.

5.1.1. Koszul sign rule. The formulae in this section will be written using the Koszul sign rule. We will moreover work exclusively with cohomological conventions.

Given $A$ and $B$ two dg $\mathbb{Z}$-modules, the differential on $A \otimes B$ is defined as

$$\partial_{A \otimes B}(a \otimes b) = \partial_A a \otimes b + (-1)^{|a|} a \otimes \partial_B b .$$

Given $A$ and $B$ two dg $\mathbb{Z}$-modules, we consider the graded $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\text{Hom}(A, B)$ whose degree $r$ component is given by all maps $A \to B$ of degree $r$. We endow it with the differential

$$\partial_{\text{Hom}(A, B)}(f) := \partial_B \circ f - (-1)^{|f|} f \circ \partial_A =: [\partial, f] .$$

Given $f : A \to A'$ and $g : B \to B'$ two graded maps between dg-$\mathbb{Z}$-modules, we set

$$(f \otimes g)(a \otimes b) = (-1)^{|g||a|} f(a) \otimes g(b) .$$

Finally, given $f : A \to A'$, $f' : A' \to A''$, $g : B \to B'$ and $g' : B' \to B''$, we define

$$(f' \otimes g')(f \otimes g) = (-1)^{|g'||f|} (f' \circ f) \otimes (g' \circ g) .$$

We check in particular that with this sign rule, the differential on a tensor product $A_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n$ is given by

$$\partial_{A_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n} = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{id}_{A_i} \otimes \cdots \otimes \partial_{A_i} \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{id}_{A_n} .$$

5.1.2. Tensor product of dg-coalgebras. Given $A$ and $B$ two dg $\mathbb{Z}$-modules, define the twist map $\tau : A \otimes B \to B \otimes A$,

$$\tau(a \otimes b) = (-1)^{|a||b|} b \otimes a .$$

Suppose now that $A$ and $B$ are dg-coalgebras, with respective coproducts $\Delta_A$ and $\Delta_B$. The tensor product $A \otimes B$ can then be endowed with a structure of dg-coalgebra whose coproduct is defined as

$$\Delta_{A \otimes B} := A \otimes B \xrightarrow{\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B} A \otimes A \otimes B \otimes B \xrightarrow{id_A \otimes \tau \otimes id_B} (A \otimes B) \otimes (A \otimes B) ,$$

and whose differential is the product differential

$$\partial_{A \otimes B} = \partial_A \otimes id_B + id_A \otimes \partial_B .$$
5.1.3. Orientation of the boundary of a manifold with boundary. Let \((M, \partial M)\) be an oriented \(n\)-manifold with boundary. We choose to orient its boundary \(\partial M\) as follows: given \(x \in \partial M\), a basis \(e_1, \ldots, e_{n-1}\) of \(T_x(\partial M)\), and an outward pointing vector \(\nu \in T_xM\), the basis \(e_1, \ldots, e_{n-1}\) is positively oriented if and only if the basis \(\nu, e_1, \ldots, e_{n-1}\) is a positively oriented basis of \(T_xM\).

Under this convention, given two manifolds with boundary \(K\) and \(L\), the boundary of the product manifold \(K \times L\) is then

\[
\partial(K \times L) = \partial K \times L \cup (-1)^{\dim(K)} K \times \partial L,
\]

where the \((-1)^{\dim(K)}\) sign means that the product orientation of \(K \times \partial L\) differs from its orientation as the boundary of \(K \times L\) by a \((-1)^{\dim(K)}\) sign. This convention also recovers the classical singular and cubical differentials as detailed in [Maz21]:

\[
\partial \Delta^n = \bigcup_{i=0}^n (-1)^i \Delta_i^{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial I^n = \bigcup_{i=1}^n (-1)^i (I_{i,0}^{n-1} \cup -I_{i,1}^{n-1}) .
\]

5.2. Signs for \(n - A_\infty\)-morphisms. We now work out the signs in the \(A_\infty\)-equations for \(n - A_\infty\)-morphisms, thus completing definition [7] More precisely, we will unwind two sign conventions using the bar construction viewpoint. The impatient reader can straightaway jump to subsection 5.2.3 where the signs used in the rest of this paper are made explicit.

5.2.1. Recollections on the bar construction and \(A_\infty\)-algebras. Let \(A\) be a dg-\(\mathbb{Z}\)-module. Define the suspension and desuspension maps

\[
s : A \longrightarrow sA \quad \quad \quad w : sA \rightarrow A
\]

\[
a \longmapsto sa \quad \quad \quad a \longmapsto a,
\]

which are respectively of degree -1 and +1. We verify that with the Koszul sign rule,

\[
w^{\otimes m} \circ s^{\otimes m} = (-1)^{{m \choose 2}} \text{id}_{A^{\otimes m}} .
\]

Then, note for instance that a degree \(2 - m\) map \(m_m : A^{\otimes m} \rightarrow A\) yields a degree +1 map \(b_m := sm_m w^{\otimes m} : (sA)^{\otimes m} \rightarrow sA\).

To the set of operations \(b_m\) one can associate a unique coderivation \(D\) on \(\mathcal{T}(sA)\). We proved in [Maz21] using this viewpoint that the equation \(D^2 = 0\) yields two sign conventions for the \(A_\infty\)-equations

\[
\begin{align*}
(A) \quad [m_1, m_m] &= - \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m} (-1)^{i_1 i_2 + i_3} m_{i_1 + 1 + i_3} (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes m_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}) , \\
(B) \quad [m_1, m_m] &= - \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m} (-1)^{i_1 i_2 + i_3} m_{i_1 + 1 + i_3} (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes m_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}) ,
\end{align*}
\]

and that these conventions are related by a \((-1)^{\binom{m}{2}}\) twist applied to the operation \(m_m\), which comes from the formula \(w^{\otimes m} \circ s^{\otimes m} = (-1)^{\binom{m}{2}} \text{id}_{A^{\otimes m}}\).

We will adopt the exact same approach to work out two sign conventions for \(n - A_\infty\)-morphisms in the following subsection: first by writing \(A_\infty\)-equations without signs using the viewpoint of a
morphism between bar constructions \( F : \Delta^n \otimes T(sA) \to T(sB) \), and secondly by unfolding the signs coming from the suspension and desuspension maps.

### 5.2.2. The two conventions coming from the bar construction

The two conventions for the \( A_{\infty} \)-equations for \( n - A_{\infty} \)-morphisms are

\[
\begin{align*}
(A) \quad [m_1, f_I^{(m)}] &= \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j f_{\partial_j I} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} (-1)^i_1 i_2 + i_3 f_I^{(i_1 + i_1 + i_3)} (\text{id} \otimes \text{id} \otimes \text{id}) \\
&- \sum_{ \substack{i_1+\ldots+i_s=m \\text{I_1} \cup \ldots \cup I_s = I \ \text{s} \geq 2}} (-1)^{\epsilon_A} m_s (f_{I_1^{(i_1)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{I_s^{(i_s)}}),
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(B) \quad [m_1, f_I^{(m)}] &= \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j f_{\partial_j I} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} (-1)^i_1 i_2 + i_3 f_I^{(i_1 + i_1 + i_3)} (\text{id} \otimes \text{id} \otimes \text{id}) \\
&- \sum_{ \substack{i_1+\ldots+i_s=m \\text{I_1} \cup \ldots \cup I_s = I \ \text{s} \geq 2}} (-1)^{\epsilon_B} m_s (f_{I_1^{(i_1)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{I_s^{(i_s)}}),
\end{align*}
\]

which can we rewritten as

\[
\begin{align*}
(A) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j f_{\partial_j I} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} (-1)^i_1 i_2 + i_3 f_I^{(i_1 + i_1 + i_3)} (\text{id} \otimes \text{id} \otimes \text{id}) \\
&= \sum_{ \substack{i_1+\ldots+i_s=m \\text{I_1} \cup \ldots \cup I_s = I \ \text{s} \geq 2}} (-1)^{\epsilon_A} m_s (f_{I_1^{(i_1)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{I_s^{(i_s)}}),
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(B) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j f_{\partial_j I} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} (-1)^i_1 i_2 + i_3 f_I^{(i_1 + i_1 + i_3)} (\text{id} \otimes \text{id} \otimes \text{id}) \\
&= \sum_{ \substack{i_1+\ldots+i_s=m \\text{I_1} \cup \ldots \cup I_s = I \ \text{s} \geq 2}} (-1)^{\epsilon_B} m_s (f_{I_1^{(i_1)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{I_s^{(i_s)}}),
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
\begin{align*}
\epsilon_A &= \sum_{j=1}^{s} (s-j) |I_j| + \sum_{j=1}^{s} i_j \left( \sum_{k=j+1}^{s} (1 - i_k - |I_k|) \right), \\
\epsilon_B &= \sum_{j=1}^{s} \left( \sum_{k=j+1}^{s} |I_k| \right) + \sum_{j=1}^{s} (s-j) (1 - i_j - |I_j|).
\end{align*}
\]

These two sign conventions are equivalent : given a sequence of operations \( m_m \) and \( f_I^{(m)} \) satisfying equations (A), we check that the operations \( m'_m := (-1)^{\binom{s}{2}} m_m \) and \( f_I^{(m)} := (-1)^{\binom{s}{2}} f_I^{(m)} \) satisfy equations (B).
Consider now two dg-$\mathbb{Z}$-modules $A$ and $B$, together with a collection of degree $2 - m$ maps $m_m : A^{\otimes m} \to A$ and $m_m : B^{\otimes m} \to B$ (we use the same notation for sake of readability), and a collection of degree $1 - m + |I|$ maps $f_I^{(m)} : A^{\otimes m} \to B$. We associate to the maps $m_m$ the degree +1 maps $b_m := s m_m w^{\otimes m}$, and also associate to the maps $f_I^{(m)}$ the degree $|I|$ maps $F_I^{(m)} := s f_I^{(m)} w^{\otimes m} : (sA)^{\otimes m} \to sB$. We denote $D_A$ and $D_B$ the unique coderivations coming from the maps $b_m$ acting respectively on $T(sA)$ and $T(sB)$, and $F : \Delta^\ast \otimes T(sA) \to T(sB)$ the unique morphism of coalgebras associated to the maps $F_I^{(m)}$. The equation

$$F(\partial_{\text{sing}} \otimes \text{id}_{T(sA)} + \text{id} \Delta^\ast \otimes D_A) = D_B F$$

is then equivalent to the equations

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j F_{\partial_{\text{sing}}}^{(m)} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} F_{I}^{(i_1+1+i_3)}(\text{id} \otimes_{i_1} b_{i_2} \otimes \text{id} \otimes_{i_3}) = \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m} b_s(F_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes F_{I_s}^{(i_s)})$$

There are now two ways to unravel the signs from these equations, which will lead to conventions (A) and (B).

The first way consists in simply replacing the $b_m$ and the $F_I^{(m)}$ by their definition. It yields sign conventions (A). The left-hand side transforms as

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j F_{\partial_{\text{sing}}}^{(m)} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} F_{I}^{(i_1+1+i_3)}(\text{id} \otimes_{i_1} b_{i_2} \otimes \text{id} \otimes_{i_3}) = \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m} s(m^{i_1} w^{i_2} \otimes w^{i_3})$$

$$= \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j F_{\partial_{\text{sing}}}^{(m)} w^{\otimes m} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} s f_I^{(i_1+1+i_3)} w^{\otimes i_1+1+i_3} (\text{id} \otimes_{i_1} s m_{i_2} w^{i_2} \otimes \text{id} \otimes_{i_3})$$

$$= \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j s f_I^{(m)} w^{\otimes m} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} (-1)^{i_3} s f_I^{(i_1+1+i_3)} w^{\otimes i_1} s m_{i_2} w^{i_2} \otimes w^{i_3}$$

$$= \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j s f_I^{(m)} w^{\otimes m} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} (-1)^{i_1+i_2+i_3} s f_I^{(i_1+1+i_3)} (\text{id} \otimes_{i_1} m_{i_2} \otimes \text{id} \otimes_{i_3})(w^{i_1} \otimes w^{i_2} \otimes w^{i_3})$$

$$= s \left( \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j f_{\partial_{\text{sing}}}^{(m)} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} (-1)^{i_1+i_2+i_3} f_I^{(i_1+1+i_3)} (\text{id} \otimes_{i_1} m_{i_2} \otimes \text{id} \otimes_{i_3}) \right) w^{\otimes m},$$
while the right-hand side transforms as

\[
\sum_{i_1+\cdots+i_s=m \atop I_1\cup\cdots\cup I_s=I} b_s(F_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes F_{I_s}^{(i_s)}) = \sum_{i_1+\cdots+i_s=m \atop I_1\cup\cdots\cup I_s=I} \epsilon A s w^{\otimes s} (sf_{I_1}^{(i_1)} w^\otimes i_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes sf_{I_s}^{(i_s)} w^\otimes i_s) = \sum_{i_1+\cdots+i_s=m \atop I_1\cup\cdots\cup I_s=I} (-1)^{s-j} |I_j| s m_s (wsf_{I_1}^{(i_1)} w^\otimes i_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes wsf_{I_s}^{(i_s)} w^\otimes i_s) = s \left( \sum_{i_1+\cdots+i_s=m \atop I_1\cup\cdots\cup I_s=I} (-1)^{s-j} m_s (f_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{I_s}^{(i_s)}) \right) w^{\otimes m},
\]

where \( \epsilon_A = \sum_{j=1}^s (s-j) |I_j| + \sum_{j=1}^s i_j \left( \sum_{k=j+1}^s (1 - i_k - |I_k|) \right) \).

The second way consists in first composing and post-composing by \( w \) and \( s^{\otimes m} \) and then replacing the \( b_m \) and \( F_I^{(m)} \) by their definition. It yields the (B) sign conventions. We will denote \( m'_m := (-1)^{\binom{m}{2}} m_m \) and \( f_I'^{(m)} := (-1)^{\binom{m}{2}} f_I^{(m)} \). The left-hand side then transforms as

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j w F_{\partial_j I}^{(m)} s^{\otimes m} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} w F_I^{(i_1+1+i_3)} (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes b_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}) s^{\otimes m} = \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j f_{\partial_j I}'^{(m)} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} (-1)^{i_1} f_I^{(i_1+1+i_3)} w^{\otimes i_1+1+i_3} (s^{\otimes i_1} \otimes s m_{i_2} w^{\otimes i_2} s^{\otimes i_2} \otimes s^{\otimes i_3}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j f_{\partial_j I}'^{(m)} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} (-1)^{i_1+i_2+i_3} f_I^{(i_1+1+i_3)} w^{\otimes i_1+1+i_3} s^{\otimes i_1+1+i_3} (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes m'_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j f_{\partial_j I}'^{(m)} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m} (-1)^{i_1+i_2+i_3} f_I^{(i_1+1+i_3)} (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes m'_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}),
\]
while the right-hand side transforms as
\[
\sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \atop I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = I} \epsilon_B m_s w^\otimes s (s f_{I_1}^{(i_1)} w^\otimes i_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes s f_{I_s}^{(i_s)} w^\otimes i_s) s^\otimes m
\]

\[
= \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \atop I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = I} (-1)^{s \otimes j_1} (i_j \sum_{k=j+1}^s |I_k|) m_s w^\otimes s (s f_{I_1}^{(i_1)} w^\otimes i_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes s f_{I_s}^{(i_s)} w^\otimes i_s)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \atop I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = I} (-1)^{s \otimes j_1} m_s w^\otimes s (f_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{I_s}^{(i_s)})
\]

\[
= \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \atop I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = I} (-1)^{s \otimes j_1} m'_s (f_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{I_s}^{(i_s)})
\]

where \(\epsilon_B = \sum_{j=1}^s (i_j \sum_{k=j+1}^s |I_k|) + \sum_{j=1}^s (s-j)(1-i_j-|I_j|)\).

5.2.3. Choice of convention in this paper. We will work in the rest of this paper with the set of conventions (B). The operations \(m_m\) of an \(A_\infty\)-algebra will satisfy equations

\[
[\partial, m_m] = - \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3 = m \atop 2 \leq i_2 \leq n-1} (-1)^{i_1+i_2+i_3} m_{i_1+1+i_2+1+i_3} (id^\otimes i_1 \otimes m_{i_2} \otimes id^\otimes i_3),
\]

and a \(n - A_\infty\)-morphism between two \(A_\infty\)-algebras will satisfy equations

\[
[\partial, f_I^{(m)}] = \sum_{j=0}^{|I|} (-1)^j f_I^{(m)} \partial_I + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3 = n \atop i_2 \geq 2} (-1)^{i_1+i_2+i_3} f_I^{(i_1+i_2+i_3)} (id^\otimes i_1 \otimes m_{i_2} \otimes id^\otimes i_3)
\]

\[
- \sum_{i_1+\cdots+i_s = m \atop I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = I} (-1)^{s \otimes j_1} m_s (f_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{I_s}^{(i_s)})
\]

where \(\epsilon_B = \sum_{j=1}^s (i_j \sum_{k=j+1}^s |I_k|) + \sum_{j=1}^s (s-j)(1-i_j-|I_j|)\).

In [Maz21] we had chosen conventions (B) for \(A_\infty\)-algebras and \(A_\infty\)-morphisms because they were the ones naturally arising in the realizations of the associahedra and the multiplihedra à la Loday. We prove a similar result in the following section: these sign conventions are contained in the polytopes \(n - J_m = \Delta^n \times J_m\) where \(J_m\) is a Forcey-Loday realization of the multiplihedron.

5.3. Signs and the polytopes \(n - J_m\).

5.3.1. Loday associahedra and Forcey-Loday multiplihedra. In [Maz21] we introduced explicit polytopal realizations of the associahedra and the multiplihedra: the weighted Loday realizations \(K_\omega^{\ldots}\).
of the associahedra from [MTTV19] and the weighted Forcey-Loday realizations $J_\omega$ of the multiplihedra from [MV]. We then proved using basic considerations on affine geometry that, under the convention of section 5.1, their boundaries were equal to

$$\partial K_\omega = - \bigcup_{\substack{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = n \\ 2 \leq i_2 \leq n-1}} (-1)^{i_1 + i_2 i_3} K_\varpi \times K_{\bar{\omega}},$$

$$\partial J_\omega = \bigcup_{\substack{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = n \\ i_2 \geq 2}} (-1)^{i_1 + i_2 i_3} J_\varpi \times K_{\bar{\omega}} \cup - \bigcup_{\substack{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m \\ s \geq 2}} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} K_\varpi \times J_{\bar{\omega}_1} \times \cdots \times J_{\bar{\omega}_s},$$

where the weights $\varpi$, $\bar{\omega}$ and $\bar{\omega}_t$ are derived from the weights $\omega$, and

$$\varepsilon_B = \sum_{j=1}^{s} (s - j)(1 - i_j).$$

In particular, these polytopes contain sign conventions (B) for $A_\infty$-algebras and $A_\infty$-morphisms.

5.3.2. The boundary of $n-J_m$. Consider now an $n$-multiplihedron $\Delta^n \times J_\omega$, where $J_\omega$ is a Forcey-Loday realization of the multiplihedron $J_m$. Forgetting for now about its refined polytopal subdivision, its boundary reads as

$$\partial (\Delta^n \times J_\omega) = \partial \Delta^n \times J_\omega \cup (-1)^n \Delta^n \times \partial J_\omega.$$

Note moreover that in the $\text{AW}^{n(s-1)}$-polytopal subdivision of $\Delta^n$, each top dimensional cell labeled by an overlapping partition $I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n$ is in fact isomorphic to the product $I_1 \times \cdots \times I_s$. We write this as

$$\Delta^n_{\text{AW}^{n(s-1)}} = \bigcup_{I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n} I_1 \times \cdots \times I_s.$$

**Proposition 9.** The $n$-multiplihedra $\Delta^n \times J_\omega$ endowed with their $n-A_\infty$-polytopal subdivision contain sign conventions (B) for $n-A_\infty$-morphisms.

**Proof.** The first component of the boundary of $\Delta^n \times J_\omega$ is given by

$$\partial \Delta^n \times J_\omega = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^i \Delta_{i}^{n-1} \times J_\omega.$$

The second, by the first part of the boundary of $\partial J_\omega$,

$$(-1)^n \bigcup_{\substack{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = m \\ i_2 \geq 2}} (-1)^{i_1 + i_2 i_3} (\Delta^n \times J_\varpi) \times K_{\bar{\omega}}.$$
The third and last component transforms as follows:

\[
(-1)^n \Delta^n \times (-1) \bigcup_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m, s \geq 2} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} K_{\bar{\omega}} \times J_{\bar{\omega}_1} \times \cdots \times J_{\bar{\omega}_s} \nabla
\]

\[
= (-1)^{n+1} \bigcup_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m, s \geq 2} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \Delta^n \times K_{\bar{\omega}} \times J_{\bar{\omega}_1} \times \cdots \times J_{\bar{\omega}_s} \nabla
\]

\[
= (-1)^{n+1} \bigcup_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m, s \geq 2} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \bigcup_{I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = \Delta^n} I_1 \times \cdots \times I_s \times K_{\bar{\omega}} \times J_{\bar{\omega}_1} \times \cdots \times J_{\bar{\omega}_s} \nabla
\]

\[
= (-1)^{n+1} \bigcup_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = m, s \geq 2} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B + s \sum_{j=1}^{s} \frac{|I_j|}{I_j} \times (I_1 \times J_{\bar{\omega}_1}) \times \cdots \times (I_s \times J_{\bar{\omega}_s}) \nabla
\]

We then check that \(\varepsilon_B = n + \varepsilon_B + sn + \sum_{j=1}^{s} (ij - 1) \left( \sum_{k=j+1}^{s} |I_k| \right) \left( I_1 \times J_{\bar{\omega}_1} \right) \times \cdots \times \left( I_s \times J_{\bar{\omega}_s} \right) \nabla \) modulo 2. Hence, the polytopes \(n - J_m\) contain indeed sign conventions (B) for \(n - A_\infty\)-morphisms. \(\square\)

5.4. The operadic bimodule \(n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph}\). In [Maz21], we computed the signs for \(\Omega BAs\)-morphisms as follows. Endowing the compactified moduli spaces \(\overline{CT}_m\) with their \(\Omega BAs\)-cell decompositions, we define the operadic bimodule \(\Omega BAs - \text{Morph}\) to be the realization under the functor \(C_{cell}^{\text{op}}\) of the operadic bimodule \(\{\overline{CT}_m\}_{m \geq 1}\). The signs in the differential are then computed as the signs arising in the top dimensional strata in the boundary of the moduli spaces \(\overline{CT}_m(t_g)\). The signs for the action-composition maps are the signs ensuing from the image under the functor \(C_{cell}^{\text{op}}\) of the action-composition maps for the moduli spaces \(\overline{CT}_m(t_g)\).

The goal of this section is to completely state definition [13] with explicit signs and formulae. We have however seen in subsection 4.2.2 that there is no operadic bimodule in compactified moduli spaces whose image under the functor \(C_{cell}^{\text{op}}\) could realize the operadic bimodule \(n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph}\). We will still compute the signs for the action-composition maps by introducing some suitable spaces of metric trees, which do not define an operadic bimodule but will however carry enough structure for our computations. The differential will simply be defined by reading the signs arising in the top dimensional strata of the boundary of the CW-complex \(\Delta^n \times \overline{CT}_m\) endowed with its \(n - \Omega BAs\)-cell decomposition.

5.4.1. Notation. As in [Maz21], we choose to use the formalism of orientations on trees to define the operadic bimodule \(n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph}\). Recall that this formalism originates from [MS06].

Definition 15. Given a broken stable ribbon tree \(t_{br}\), an ordering of \(t_{br}\) is defined to be an ordering of its \(i\) finite internal edges \(e_1, \ldots, e_i\). Two orderings are said to be equivalent if one passes from one ordering to the other by an even permutation. An orientation of \(t_{br}\) is then defined to be an equivalence class of orderings, and written \(\omega := e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_i\). Each tree \(t_{br}\) has exactly two orientations. Given an orientation \(\omega\) of \(t_{br}\) we will write \(-\omega\) for the second orientation on \(t_{br}\), called its opposite orientation.
In this section, we write $t_{\text{br},g}$ for a broken gauged stable ribbon tree, and $t_g$ for an unbroken gauged stable ribbon tree.

**Definition 16.** We set $\triangledown$ to be the unique stable gauged tree of arity 1 and call it the *trivial gauged tree*. We define the underlying broken stable ribbon tree $t_{\text{br}}$ of a $t_{\text{br},g}$ to be the ribbon tree obtained by first deleting all the $\triangledown$ in $t_{\text{br},g}$, and then forgetting all the remaining gauges of $t_{\text{br},g}$. We will moreover refer to a gauge in $t_{\text{br},g}$ which is associated to a non-trivial gauged tree, as a *non-trivial gauge* of $t_{\text{br},g}$. An orientation on a broken gauged stable ribbon tree $t_{\text{br},g}$ is then defined to be an orientation $\omega$ on $t_{\text{br}}$.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\triangledown \rightarrow \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \\
\end{array}
\]

An instance of association $t_{\text{br},g} \rightarrow t_{\text{br}}$

**Definition 17.** Consider a gauged tree $t_{\text{br},g}$ which has $b$ gauges, trivial or not. A list $I := (I_1, \ldots, I_b)$ of faces $I_a \subset \Delta^a$ will be called a $\Delta^n$-labeling of $t_{\text{br},g}$. The tree $t_{\text{br},g}$ endowed with its labeling will be written $(I, t_{\text{br},g})$.

We think of $(I, t_{\text{br},g})$ as depicted in the figure below, where trees are represented as corollae for the sake of readability.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
I_1 \quad \cdots \quad I_b \\
\end{array}
\]

5.4.2. *Definition of the spaces of operations.*

**Definition 18** (Spaces of operations). Consider the $\mathbb{Z}$-module freely generated by the pairs $(I, t_{\text{br},g}, \omega)$, where $\omega$ is an orientation on $t_{\text{br},g}$ and $I$ is a $\Delta^n$-labeling of $t_{\text{br},g}$. We define the arity $m$ space of operations $n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph}(m)$, to be the quotient of this $\mathbb{Z}$-module under the relation

\[ (I, t_{\text{br},g}, -\omega) = - (I, t_{\text{br},g}, \omega) . \]

Introducing the notation $|I| := \sum_{a=1}^b |I_a|$, a pair $(I, t_{\text{br},g}, \omega)$ is then defined to have degree

\[ |(I, t_{\text{br},g}, \omega)| := |I| + |t_{\text{br},g}| . \]

5.4.3. *The oriented spaces $\mathcal{C}T_m(I, t_{\text{br},g}, \omega)$.* Consider a $\Delta^n$-labeled gauged tree $(I, t_{\text{br},g})$, together with a choice of orientation $\omega$ on $t_{\text{br},g}$. We define the spaces

\[ \mathcal{C}T_m(I, t_{\text{br},g}, \omega) := I_1 \times \cdots \times I_b \times \mathcal{C}T_m(t_{\text{br},g}, \omega) . \]

An element of $\mathcal{C}T_m(I, t_{\text{br},g}, \omega)$ is thus of the form

\[ (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_b, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_g, l_{e_1}, \ldots, l_{e(t_{\text{br}})}) \in I_1 \times \cdots \times I_b \times \Gamma \times [0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty]^g \times [0, +\infty]^{e(t_{\text{br}})} , \]

where the $\lambda_i$ are the non-trivial gauges of $t_{\text{br},g}$ ordered from left to right, and the $l_{e_i}$ are the lengths of the finite internal edges of $t_{\text{br}}$ ordered according to $\omega$. These spaces are then simply oriented by taking the product orientation of their factors.
5.4.4. Definition of the action-compositions maps. We may now introduce the "action-composition" maps on the spaces $CT_m(\mathbb{I}, t_{br, g})$, that we will use to define the signs of the action-composition maps for $n - \Omega BAs - Morph$. Define the maps

$$O_i : CT(\mathbb{I}, t_{br, g}, \omega) \times T(t'_{br}, \omega') = \mathbb{I} \times CT(t_{br, g}, \omega) \times T(t'_{br}, \omega')$$

$$\longrightarrow \mathbb{I} \times CT(t_{br, g} \circ_i t'_{br}, \omega \wedge \omega') = CT(\mathbb{I}, t_{br, g} \circ_i t'_{br}, \omega \wedge \omega')$$

where $\mathbb{I}$ stands for the product $I_1 \times \cdots \times I_b$, and the arrow corresponds to the action-composition map

$$CT(t_{br, g}, \omega) \times T(t'_{br}, \omega') \longrightarrow CT(t_{br, g} \circ_i t'_{br}, \omega \wedge \omega') ,$$

of the operadic bimodule $\{CT_m\}_{m \geq 1}$. Define also the maps

$$M : T(t_{br}, \omega) \times CT(\mathbb{I}, t'_{br, g}, \omega_1) \times \cdots \times CT(\mathbb{I}, s_{br, g}, \omega_s)$$

$$\longrightarrow \mathbb{I}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{I}_s \times T(t_{br}, \omega) \times CT(t'_{br, g}, \omega_1) \times \cdots \times CT(t'_{br, g}, \omega_s)$$

$$\longrightarrow CT(\mathbb{I}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathbb{I}_s, t_{br, g}^1 \cdots t_{br, g}^s, \omega \wedge \omega_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_s)$$

where the second arrow corresponds to the action-composition map

$$T(t_{br}, \omega) \times CT(t'_{br, g}, \omega_1) \times \cdots \times CT(t'_{br, g}, \omega_s) \longrightarrow CT(\mu(t_{br, g}^1 \cdots t_{br, g}^s), \omega \wedge \omega_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_s) .$$

The maps $O_i$ have sign $+1$. The maps $M$ have sign $(-1)^{\dagger}$, where $\dagger$ is defined as follows. Writing $g_i$ for the number of non-trivial gauges and $j_i$ for the number of gauge-vertex intersections of $t_{br, g}^i$, $i = 1, \ldots, s$, and setting $t_{br}^0 := t_{br}$ and $g_0 = j_0 = \dim(\mathbb{I}_0) = 0$,

$$\dagger := \sum_{i=1}^{s} \left( |t_{br}| + \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} |t_{br, g}^l| \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{s} g_i \left( |t_{br}| + \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} |t_{br}^l| \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{s} j_i \left( |t_{br}| + \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} |t_{br, g}^l| \right) .$$

Definition 19 (Action-composition maps). The action of the operad $\Omega BAs$ on $n - \Omega BAs - Morph$ is defined as

$$(\mathbb{I}, t_{br, g}, \omega) \circ_i (t'_{br}, \omega') = (\mathbb{I}, t_{br, g} \circ_i t'_{br}, \omega \wedge \omega') ,$$

$$\mu((t_{br}, \omega), (\mathbb{I}, t'_{br, g}, \omega_1), \ldots, (\mathbb{I}, s_{br, g}, \omega_s)) = (-1)^{\dagger}(\mathbb{I}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathbb{I}_s, \mu(t_{br, g}^1 \cdots t_{br, g}^s), \omega \wedge \omega_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_s) .$$

Using for instance the maps $O_i$ and $M$, and remembering the Koszul sign rules, we can check that these action-composition maps satisfy indeed all the associativity conditions for an operadic bimodule. What’s more, choosing a distinguished orientation for every gauged stable ribbon tree $t_g \in sCRT$, this definition of the operadic bimodule $n - \Omega BAs - Morph$ amounts to defining it as the free operadic bimodule in graded $\mathbb{Z}$-modules

$$n - \Omega BAs - Morph = \mathcal{F}^{\Omega BAs, \Omega BAs}(\mathbb{I}^+, \mathbb{I}^-, \mathbb{I}^x, \mathbb{I}^y, \cdots, (I, sCRT_m), \cdots ; I \subset \Delta^n) .$$

It remains to define a differential on the generating operations $(I, t_g, \omega)$ to recover definition 13.

5.4.5. The boundary of the compactified moduli spaces $\overline{CT}_m(t_g)$. Before defining the differential on the operadic bimodule $n - \Omega BAs - Morph$, we recall the signs for the top dimensional strata in the boundary of the compactified moduli spaces $\overline{CT}_m(t_g)$ that were computed in section I.5.2 in [Maz21].
We fix for the rest of this subsection a gauged stable ribbon tree \( t_g \) whose gauge intersects \( j \) of its vertices. We also choose an orientation \( e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_i \) on \( t_g \) and order the \( j \) gauge-vertex intersections from left to right:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\overset{\cdots}{v_1} & \rightarrow & \overset{\cdots}{v_j}
\end{array}
\]

The (int-collapse) boundary corresponds to the collapsing of an internal edge that does not intersect the gauge of the tree \( t \). Suppose that it is the \( p \)-th edge \( e_p \) of \( t \) which collapses. Write moreover \((t/e_p)_g\) for the resulting gauged tree and \( \omega_p := e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{e}_p \wedge \cdots \wedge e_i \) for the induced orientation on the edges of \( t/e_p \). The boundary component \( CT_m((t/e_p)_g, \omega_p) \) bears a sign

\[
(-1)^{p+1+j}
\]

in the boundary of \( \overline{CT}_m(t_g, \omega) \).

The (gauge-vertex) boundary corresponds to the gauge crossing exactly one additional vertex of \( t \). We suppose that this intersection takes place between the \( k \)-th and \((k+1)\)-th intersections of \( t_g \) and write \( t^0_g \) for the resulting gauged tree. If the crossing results from a move

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\overset{\cdots}{e^0} & \rightarrow & \overset{\cdots}{e^0}
\end{array}
\]

the boundary component \( CT_m(t^0_g, \omega) \) has sign

\[
(-1)^{j+k}
\]

in the boundary of \( \overline{CT}_m(t_g, \omega) \). If the crossing results from a move

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\overset{\cdots}{e^0} & \rightarrow & \overset{\cdots}{e^0}
\end{array}
\]

the boundary component \( CT_m(t^0_g, \omega) \) has sign

\[
(-1)^{j+k+1}
\]

in the boundary of \( \overline{CT}_m(t_g, \omega) \).

The (above-break) boundary corresponds either to the breaking of an internal edge of \( t \), that is located above the gauge or intersects the gauge, or, when the gauge is below the root, to the outgoing edge breaking between the gauge and the root. Denote \( e_0 \) the outgoing edge of \( t \). Suppose that it is the \( p \)-th edge \( e_p \) of \( t \) which breaks and write moreover \((t_p)_g\) for the resulting broken gauged tree. The boundary component \( CT_m((t_p)_g, \omega_p) \) bears a sign

\[
(-1)^{p+j}
\]

in the boundary of \( \overline{CT}_m(t_g, \omega) \).

The (below-break) boundary corresponds to the breaking of edges of \( t \) that are located below the gauge or intersect it, such that there is exactly one edge breaking in each non-self crossing path from an incoming edge to the root. Write \((t_{br})_g\) for the resulting broken gauged tree. We order from left to right the \( s \) non-trivial unbroken gauged trees \( t_g^1, \ldots, t_g^s \) of \((t_{br})_g\) and denote \( e_{j_1}, \ldots, e_{j_s} \) the internal edges of \( t \) whose breaking produces the trees \( t_g^1, \ldots, t_g^s \). Beware that we do not necessarily have that \( j_1 < \cdots < j_s \). To this extent, we denote \( \varepsilon(j_1, \ldots, j_s; \omega) \) the sign obtained after modifying
ω by moving $e_{j_k}$ to the $k$-th spot in ω. We write $ω_{br}$ for the induced orientation on $(t_{br})_g$, which is obtained by deleting the edges $e_{j_k}$ in ω. The boundary component $\mathcal{CT}_m((t_{br})_g, ω_{br})$ has sign

\[(below\text{-}break)\] 

\[(-1)^{\varepsilon(j_1, \ldots, j_s)} + 1 + j\]

in the boundary of $\mathcal{CT}_m(t_g, ω)$.

5.4.6. Definition of the differential.

**Definition 20** (Differential). The differential of a generating operation $(I, t_g, ω)$ is defined by reading the signs of the top dimensional strata in the boundary of the space $I \times \mathcal{CT}_m(t_g, ω)$, endowed with its dim$(I) - \Omega BAs$ cell decomposition. It reads as

\[\partial(I, t_g, ω) := \sum_{l=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^l (\partial^{\text{sing}} I, t_g, ω) + (-1)^{\|l\|} \sum (-1)^{\Omega BAs}(I, \text{int - collapse}(t_g, ω))\]

\[+ (-1)^{\|l\|} \sum (-1)^{\Omega BAs}(I, \text{gauge - vertex}(t_g, ω)) + (-1)^{\|l\|} \sum (-1)^{\Omega BAs}(I, \text{above - break}(t_g, ω))\]

\[+ (-1)^{\|l\|} \sum_{I_1 \cup \ldots \cup I_b = I} (-1)^{\Omega BAs}((I_1, \ldots, I_b), \text{below - break}(t_g, ω)),\]

where $b$ denotes the number of gauges of below - break$(t_g)$ and the signs $(-1)^{\Omega BAs}$ denote the $\Omega BAs - Morph$ signs listed in the previous subsection.

For instance, choosing the orientation $e_1 \land e_2$ on

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_2 \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

the signs in the computation of subsection 4.1.2 are

\[
\partial \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \land e_2 \\
\end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \land e_2 \\
\end{array} \right) - \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \land e_2 \\
\end{array} \right) + \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \land e_2 \\
\end{array} \right)
\]

\[- \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \land e_2 \\
\end{array} \right) - \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \land e_2 \\
\end{array} \right) + \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \land e_2 \\
\end{array} \right)
\]

\[- \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \land e_2 \\
\end{array} \right) - \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \land e_2 \\
\end{array} \right) + \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \land e_2 \\
\end{array} \right)
\]

\[+ \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \\
\end{array} \right) - \left( \begin{array}{c}
\overbrace{\, e_1 \,}^{	ext{[0 < 1 < 2]}}, \ e_1 \\
\end{array} \right).
\]

This concludes the construction of the operadic bimodule $n - \Omega BAs - Morph$.

5.4.7. The morphism of operadic bimodules $n - \Omega BAs - Morph \to n - \Omega BAs - Morph$. To conclude, it remains to define the morphism of operadic bimodules $n - \Omega BAs - Morph \to n - \Omega BAs - Morph$. It is enough to define this morphism on the generating operations of $n - \Omega BAs - Morph$ and to check that it is compatible with the differentials.

**Proposition 8.** The map $n - \Omega BAs - Morph \to n - \Omega BAs - Morph$ defined on the generating operations of $n - \Omega BAs - Morph$ as

\[f_{I,m} \mapsto \sum_{t_g \in CBRT_m} (I, t_g, ω_{can})\]

is a morphism of $(\Omega BAs, \Omega BAs)$-operadic bimodules.
We refer to section I.5.3 of [Maz21] for the definition of the canonical orientations $\omega_{\text{can}}$. It is easy to check that this map is indeed compatible with the differentials: either making explicit signs computations, or noting that this morphism corresponds to the refinement of the $n - A_\infty$-cell decomposition of $n - J_m$ to its $n - \Omega BAs$-cell decomposition.
Part 2

Geometry

1. \(n\)-morphisms in Morse theory

Let \(M\) be a closed oriented Riemannian manifold endowed with a Morse function \(f\) together with a Morse-Smale metric. In [Maz21], we explored how to realize the moduli spaces of stable metric ribbon trees \(T_m\) and the moduli spaces of stable two-colored metric ribbon trees \(C T_m\) in Morse theory. It was proven that, upon choosing admissible perturbation data \(X^f\) on the moduli spaces \(T_m\) for the function \(f\), the Morse cochains \(C^\ast(f)\) can be endowed with an \(\Omega BAs\)-algebra structure whose operations \(m_t\) for \(t \in sRT_m\) are defined by counting 0-dimensional moduli spaces \(T^X_t(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)\). Similarly, choose an additional Morse function \(g\) together with admissible perturbation data \(X^g\) on the moduli spaces \(T_m\), and admissible perturbation data \(Y\) on the moduli spaces \(C T_m\) which are compatible with \(X^f\) and \(X^g\). We can then define an \(\Omega BAs\)-morphism \(\mu^Y : (C^\ast(f), m^X_t) \to (C^\ast(g), m^X_t)\), whose operations \(\mu_{t_g}\) for \(t_g \in sC R T_m\) are defined by counting the 0-dimensional moduli spaces \(C T^Y_{t_g}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)\).

The goal of this section is to realize the \(n\)-multiplihedra \(n - J_m\) endowed with their \(n - \Omega BAs\)-cell decomposition in Morse theory. We first introduce the notion of \(n\)-simplices of perturbation data on the moduli spaces \(C T_m\) (definitions 22 and 23), generalizing the notion of perturbation data on these moduli spaces defined in [Maz21]. We then use \(n\)-simplices of perturbation data to define the moduli spaces \(C T_{I,t_g}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m), I \subset \Delta^n\). Under generic assumptions on the simplices of perturbation data, these moduli spaces are orientable manifolds (proposition 10). Requiring some additional compatibilities involving the maps \(A W^{\Omega A}\) on the simplices of perturbation data, the 1-dimensional moduli spaces \(C T_{I,t_g}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)\) can be compactified to 1-dimensional manifolds with boundary, whose boundary is modeled on the boundary of \(\Delta^n \times C T_m\) endowed with its \(n - \Omega BAs\)-cell decomposition (theorems 3 and 4). We construct as a result a \(n - \Omega BAs\)-morphism between the Morse cochains \(C^\ast(f)\) and \(C^\ast(g)\) (theorem 5), by counting the signed points of the 0-dimensional oriented manifolds \(C T_{I,t_g}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)\). We finally prove a filling theorem for perturbation data parametrized by a simplicial subcomplex \(S \subset \Delta^n\) (theorem 6), solving as a corollary the question that initially motivated this paper (corollary 1).

1.1. Conventions. We will study Morse theory of the Morse function \(f : M \to \mathbb{R}\) using its negative gradient vector field \(-\nabla f\). Denote \(d\) the dimension of the manifold \(M\) and \(\phi^s\) the flow of \(-\nabla f\). For a critical point \(x\) define its unstable and stable manifolds

\[
W^U(x) := \{ z \in M, \lim_{s \to -\infty} \phi^s(z) = x \}
\]

\[
W^S(x) := \{ z \in M, \lim_{s \to +\infty} \phi^s(z) = x \}.
\]

Their dimensions are such that \(\dim(W^U(x)) + \dim(W^S(x)) = d\). We then define the degree of a critical point \(x\) to be \(|x| := \dim(W^S(x))\). This degree is often referred to as the coindegree of \(x\) in the literature.
We will moreover work with Morse cochains. For two critical point \( x \neq y \), define
\[
\mathcal{T}(y; x) := W^S(y) \cap W^U(x) / \mathbb{R}
\]
to be the moduli space of negative gradient trajectories connecting \( x \) to \( y \). Denote moreover \( \mathcal{T}(x; x) = \emptyset \). Under the Morse-Smale assumption on \( f \) and the Riemannian metric on \( M \), for \( x \neq y \) the moduli space \( \mathcal{T}(y; x) \) has dimension \( \dim(\mathcal{T}(y; x)) = |y| - |x| - 1 \). The Morse differential
\[
\partial_{\text{Morse}} : C^*(f) \to C^*(f)
\]
is then defined to count descending negative gradient trajectories
\[
\partial_{\text{Morse}}(x) := \sum_{|y| = |x| + 1} \# \mathcal{T}(y; x) \cdot y.
\]

1.2. \( n \)-simplices of perturbation data on a stratum \( \mathcal{CT}_m(t_g) \). Fix a gauged stable metric ribbon tree \( T_g = (t_g, \lambda, \{e_t\}_{t \in E(t)}) \). Let \( T_c = (t_c, L_{f_c}) \) be its associated two-colored metric ribbon tree, \( \mathcal{E}(t_c) \) the set of all edges of \( t_c \) and \( E(t_c) \subset \mathcal{E}(t_c) \) the set of internal edges of \( t_c \). We point out that \( L_{f_c} \) is a linear combination of the parameters \( \lambda, \{e_t\}_{t \in E(t)} \) and that we should in fact write \( L_{f_c}(\lambda, \{e_t\}_{t \in E(t)}) \). Recall from [Maz21] that :

**Definition 21** ([Maz21]). A choice of perturbation data on \( T_g \) consists of the following data :

(i) a vector field
\[
[0, L_{f_c}] \times M \xrightarrow{\chi_{f_c}} TM,
\]
that vanishes on \([1, L_{f_c} - 1]\), for every internal edge \( f_c \) of \( t_c \);

(ii) a vector field
\[
[0, +\infty] \times M \xrightarrow{\chi_{f_0}} TM,
\]
that vanishes away from \([0, 1]\), for the outgoing edge \( f_0 \) of \( t_c \);

(iii) a vector field
\[
[-\infty, 0] \times M \xrightarrow{\chi_{f_i}} TM,
\]
that vanishes away from \([-1, 0]\), for every incoming edge \( f_i (1 \leq i \leq n) \) of \( t_c \).

In the rest of the paper, we will moreover write \( D_{f_c} \) for all segments \([0, L_{f_c}]\), as well as for all semi-infinite segments \([-\infty, 0]\) and \([0, +\infty]\).

**Definition 22.** A \( n \)-simplex of perturbation data for \( T_g \) is defined to be a choice of perturbation data \( \mathcal{Y}_{\delta, T_g} \) for every \( \delta \in \Delta^n \). Equivalently, it is the datum of a vector field
\[
\Delta^n \times D_{f_c} \times M \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Y}_{\Delta^n, T_g, f_c}} TM
\]
for every edge \( f_c \in \mathcal{E}(t_c) \), abiding by the previous vanishing conditions on \( D_{f_c} \). We will denote it as \( \mathcal{Y}_{\Delta^n, T_g} := \{ \mathcal{Y}_{\delta, T_g} \}_{\delta \in \Delta^n} \).

Introduce the cone \( C_{f_c} \subset \mathcal{CT}_m(t_g) \times \mathbb{R} \) defined as

(i) \( \{ (\lambda, \{e_t\}_{t \in E(t)}), s \} \) such that \( (\lambda, \{e_t\}_{t \in E(t)}) \in \mathcal{CT}_m(t_g) \) and \( 0 \leq s \leq L_{f_c} \) if \( f_c \) is an internal edge ;

(ii) \( \{ (\lambda, \{e_t\}_{t \in E(t)}), s \} \) such that \( (\lambda, \{e_t\}_{t \in E(t)}) \in \mathcal{CT}_m(t_g) \) and \( s \leq 0 \) if \( f_c \) is an incoming edge ;

(iii) \( \{ (\lambda, \{e_t\}_{t \in E(t)}), s \} \) such that \( (\lambda, \{e_t\}_{t \in E(t)}) \in \mathcal{CT}_m(t_g) \) and \( s \geq 0 \) if \( f_c \) is the outgoing edge.
Definition 23. A \( n \)-simplex of perturbation data on \( \mathcal{C}T_m(t_g) \), or choice of perturbation data on \( \mathcal{C}T_m(t_g) \) parametrized by \( \Delta^n \), is defined to be the data of a \( n \)-simplex of perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n,T_g} \) for every \( T_g \in \mathcal{C}T_m(t_g) \). A \( n \)-simplex of perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n,T_g} \) defines maps

\[
\mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n,T_g};f_c : \Delta^n \times D_{f_c} \times M \rightarrow TM ,
\]

for every edge \( f_c \) of \( t_c \). It is said to be smooth if all these maps are smooth.

1.3. The moduli spaces \( \mathcal{C}T_{I,t_g}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m) \). Recall from [Maz21] that given an admissible choice of perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y} \) on the moduli spaces \( \mathcal{C}T_m \), the moduli spaces \( \mathcal{C}T_{I,t_g}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m) \) are defined as the inverse image of the thin diagonal \( \Delta \subset M^{\times m+1} \) under the flow map

\[
\phi_{\mathbb{Y}_{t_g}} : \mathcal{C}T_m(t_g) \times W^S(y) \times W^U(x_1) \times \cdots \times W^U(x_m) \rightarrow M^{\times m+1} .
\]

Definition 24. Let \( \mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n,T_g} \) be a smooth \( n \)-simplex of perturbation data on \( \mathcal{C}T_m(t_g) \). Given \( g \in \text{Crit}(g) \) and \( x_1,\ldots,x_m \in \text{Crit}(f) \), we define the moduli spaces

\[
\mathcal{C}T^{\mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n,T_g}}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m) := \bigcup_{\delta \in \Delta^n} \mathcal{C}T^{\mathbb{Y}_{\delta,t_g}}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)
\]

\[
= \left\{ (\delta, \text{two-colored perturbed Morse gradient tree associated to } (T_g, \mathbb{Y}_{\delta,T_g}) \right\}.
\]

![Figure 12. An example of a perturbed two-colored Morse gradient tree associated to the perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_{\delta} \) for a \( \delta \in \Delta^n \). The black segments above the gauge correspond to \( -\nabla f \) and the green ones to \( -\nabla f + \mathbb{Y}_{\delta} \). As for the segments below the gauge, replace \( f \) by \( g \) in these formulae.](image)

An example of a perturbed two-colored Morse gradient tree associated to the perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_{\delta} \) for a \( \delta \in \Delta^n \) is represented on figure 12. Introduce the flow map

\[
\phi_{\mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n,T_g}} : \Delta^n \times \mathcal{C}T_m(t_g) \times W^S(y) \times W^U(x_1) \times \cdots \times W^U(x_m) \rightarrow M^{\times m+1} ,
\]

whose restriction to every \( \delta \in \Delta^n \) is

\[
\phi_{\mathbb{Y}_{\delta,T_g}} : \mathcal{C}T_m(t_g) \times W^S(y) \times W^U(x_1) \times \cdots \times W^U(x_m) \rightarrow M^{\times m+1} .
\]

Proposition 10. (i) The moduli space \( \mathcal{C}T^{\mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n,T_g}}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m) \) can be rewritten as

\[
\mathcal{C}T^{\mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n,T_g}}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m) = \phi_{\mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n,T_g}}^{-1}(\Delta) ,
\]

where \( \Delta \subset M^{\times m+1} \) is the thin diagonal of \( M^{\times m+1} \).
(ii) Given a $n$-simplex of perturbation data $\mathcal{Y}_{\Delta^n,t_g}$ making $\phi_{\mathcal{Y}_{\Delta^n,t_g}}$ transverse to $\Delta$, the moduli space $\mathcal{C}T_{\Delta^n,t_g}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ is an orientable manifold of dimension
\[
\dim (\mathcal{C}T_{\Delta^n,t_g}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)) = -|t_{\Delta^n,g}| + |y| - \sum_{i=1}^m |x_i|.
\]

(iii) $n$-simplices of perturbation data $\mathcal{Y}_{\Delta^n,t_g}$ such that $\phi_{\mathcal{Y}_{\Delta^n,t_g}}$ is transverse to $\Delta$ exist.

Replacing $\Delta^n$ by any face $I \subset \Delta^n$, the moduli spaces $\mathcal{C}T_{Y_{I,t_g}}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ can be defined in the same way and made into orientable manifolds of dimension
\[
\dim (\mathcal{C}T_{Y_{I,t_g}}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)) = -|t_{I,g}| + |y| - \sum_{i=1}^m |x_i|.
\]

We refer to section 2 for the details on transversality and orientability.

1.4. Compactifications.

1.4.1. The compactified moduli spaces $\overline{\mathcal{C}T}_{Y_{I,t_g}}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)$. We now would like to compactify the 1-dimensional moduli spaces $\mathcal{C}T_{Y_{I,t_g}}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ to 1-dimensional manifolds with boundary. They are defined as the inverse image in $\tilde{I} \times \mathcal{C}T_m(t_g) \times W^S(y) \times W^U(x_1) \times \cdots \times W^U(x_m)$ of the thin diagonal $\Delta \subset M \times \mathcal{M}$ under the flow map $\phi_{\mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g}}$. The boundary components in the compactification should come from those of $W^S(y)$, of the $W^U(x_i)$ and of $\tilde{I} \times \mathcal{C}T_m(t_g)$. However, rather than considering the boundary components coming from the separate compactifications of $\tilde{I}$ and $\mathcal{C}T_m(t_g)$, we will consider the $n-\Omega BA$s-decomposition of $\tilde{I} \times \mathcal{C}T_m(t_g)$ and model the remaining boundary components on this decomposition.

Choose admissible perturbation data $\mathcal{X}^f$ and $\mathcal{X}^g$ for the functions $f$ and $g$. Choose moreover smooth simplices of perturbation data $\mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g}$ for all $t_g \in s\mathcal{C}RT_1$, $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $I \subset \Delta^n$. We denote $(\mathcal{Y}_{I,m})_{I \subset \Delta^n} := (\mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g})_{t_g \in s\mathcal{C}RT_m}$, and call it a choice of perturbation data on $\mathcal{C}T_m$ parametrized by $\Delta^n$. Fixing a two-colored stable ribbon tree type $t_g \in s\mathcal{C}RT_m$ and $I \subset \Delta^n$ we want to compactify the moduli space $\mathcal{C}T_{Y_{I,t_g}}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ using the perturbation data $\mathcal{X}^f$, $\mathcal{X}^g$ and $(\mathcal{Y}_{I,k})_{k \leq m}$. The boundary will be described by the following phenomena:

(i) the parameter $\delta \in I$ tends towards the codimension 1 boundary of $I$ ($\partial^{\text{sing}} I$);
(ii) an external edge breaks at a critical point (Morse);
(iii) an internal edge of the tree $t$ collapses (int-collapse):
\[
\mathcal{C}T_{Y_{I,t_g}}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)
\]
where $t_g \in s\mathcal{C}RT_1$ are all the two-colored trees obtained by collapsing exactly one internal edge, which does not cross the gauge;
(iv) the gauge moves to cross exactly one additional vertex of the underlying stable ribbon tree (gauge-vertex):
\[
\mathcal{C}T_{Y_{I,t_g}}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)
\]
where $t_g \in s\mathcal{C}RT_1$ are all the two-colored trees obtained by moving the gauge to cross exactly one additional vertex of $t$;
(v) an internal edge located above the gauge or intersecting it breaks or, when the gauge is below
the root, the outgoing edge breaks between the gauge and the root (above-break):
\[ \mathcal{CT}_{I,t_g^1}(y;x_1, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_m) \times \mathcal{T}_{i+2}^{(i+2)}(z;x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{i+2}) \]
where the tree resulting from grafting the outgoing edge of \( t_g^1 \) to the \( i+1 \)-th incoming edge
of \( t_g \) is \( t_g \);
(vi) edges (internal or incoming) that are possibly intersecting the gauge, break below it, such
that there is exactly one edge breaking in each non-self crossing path from an incoming edge
to the root (below-break); the simplex of perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_{I,t_g} \) then "breaks" according
to the combinatorics of the Alexander-Whitney coproduct:
\[ \mathcal{T}_{\emptyset}^{(\emptyset)}(y; y_1, \ldots, y_s) \times \mathcal{CT}_{I,t_g^1}(y_1; x_1, \ldots) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{CT}_{I,t_g^2}(y_s; \ldots, x_m) \]
where the tree resulting from grafting for each \( r \) the outgoing edge of \( t_g^r \) to the \( r \)-th incoming
edge of \( t^0 \) is \( t_g \), and \( I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_s = I \) is an overlapping partition of \( I \).

Note that the (Morse) boundaries are a simple consequence of the fact that external edges are Morse
trajectories away from a length 1 segment.

1.4.2. Smooth choice of perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_{I \subset \Delta^n,m} \). We begin by tackling the conditions coming
with the \( (g^{\text{sing}}I) \), (int-collapse) and (gauge-vertex) boundaries. Let \( t_g \in sCRT_m \) and denote \( \text{coll} \cup g - v(t_g) \subset sCRT_m \) the set consisting of all stable gauged trees obtained by collapsing internal edges
of \( t \) and/or moving the gauge to cross additional vertices of \( t \). In particular, \( t_g \in \text{coll} \cup g - v(t_g) \).
We define
\[ \mathcal{CT}_m(t_g) := \bigcup_{t'_g \in \text{coll} \cup g - v(t_g)} \mathcal{CT}_m(t'_g) \]
for the stratum \( \mathcal{CT}_m(t_g) \subset \mathcal{CT}_m \) together with its inner boundary components. A choice of pertur-
bage data \( (\mathbb{Y}_{I,t_g})_{t'_g \in \text{coll} \cup g - v(t_g)} \) for a fixed \( I \subset \Delta^n \) corresponds to a \( \dim(I) \)-simplex of perturbation
data on \( \mathcal{CT}_m(t_g) \). Following section 1.2 such a choice of perturbation data is equivalent to a map
\[ \tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_{I,t_g,f_c} : I \times \tilde{C}_{f_c} \times M \to TM \]
for every edge \( f_c \) of \( t_c \), where \( \tilde{C}_{f_c} \subset \mathcal{CT}_m(t_g) \times \mathbb{R} \) is defined in a similar fashion to \( C_{f_c} \).

**Definition 25.** A choice of perturbation data \( (\mathbb{Y}_{I,m})_{I \subset \Delta^n} \) is said to be smooth if all maps
\[ \tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_{\Delta^n,t_g,f_c} : \Delta^n \times \tilde{C}_{f_c} \times M \to TM \]
are smooth, where we extended \( \Delta^n \) to \( \tilde{\Delta}^n \) by defining \( \tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_{\Delta^n,t_g,f_c} := \tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_{I,t_g,f_c} \) on a face \( I \subset \Delta^n \).

1.4.3. The (above-break) boundary. The (above-break) conditions are tackled as in [Maz21]. Write \( t_c \) for the two-colored ribbon tree associated to \( t_g \). The (above-break) boundary corresponds to the
breaking of an internal edge \( f_c \) of \( t_c \) located above the set of colored vertices. Denote \( t_c^1 \) and \( t_c^2 \) the
trees obtained by breaking \( t_c \) at the edge \( f_c \), where \( t_c^2 \) is seen to lie above \( t_c^1 \).
We have to specify for each edge \( e_c \in \mathcal{E}(t_c) \) and each \( \delta \in I \), what happens to the perturbation \( \mathbb{Y}_{\delta,t_c,e_c} \) at the limit.

(i) For \( e_c \in \mathcal{E}(t_c^2) \) and \( \neq f_c \), we require that
\[ \lim \mathbb{Y}_{\delta,t_c,e_c} = \mathbb{X}_{t_c^2}^{(f_c)} \].
(ii) For $e_c \in \mathcal{E}(t^1_c)$ and $\neq f_c$, we require that
\[
\lim_{Y_{\delta,t_c,e_c}} Y_{\delta,t_c,e_c} = Y_{\delta,t^1_c,e_c}.
\]
(iii) For $f_c = e_c$, $Y_{\delta,t_c,f_c}$ yields two parts at the limit : the part corresponding to the outgoing edge of $t^2$ and the part corresponding to the incoming edge of $t^1_c$. We then require that they coincide respectively with the perturbation $X_{t^2}$ and $Y_{\delta,t^1_c}$.

An example of each case is illustrated in figure 13.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\begin{subfigure}[b]{0.5\textwidth}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure13a}
\caption{(above-break) case (i)}
\end{subfigure}
\begin{subfigure}[b]{0.5\textwidth}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure13b}
\caption{(above-break) case (ii)}
\end{subfigure}
\begin{subfigure}[b]{0.5\textwidth}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure13c}
\caption{(above-break) case (iii)}
\end{subfigure}
\caption{Figure 13}
\end{figure}

1.4.4. The (below-break) boundary. Denote $t^1_c, \ldots, t^s_c$ and $t^0$ the trees obtained by breaking $t_c$ below the gauge, where $t^1_c, \ldots, t^s_c$ are seen to lie above $t^0$. Going back to subsection 3.2.4 consider the map $AW^0_{I} : I \rightarrow I^s$. It comes with $s$ maps $pr_r \circ AW^0_{I} : I \rightarrow I$ for $1 \leq r \leq s$ corresponding to the projection on the $r$-th factor of $I^s$. We will simply denote them $pr_r$.

We have to specify for each edge $e_c \in \mathcal{E}(t_c)$ and each $\delta \in I$, what happens to the perturbation $Y_{\delta,t_c,e_c}$ at the limit. The maps $pr_r$ will allow us to produce the overlapping partitions combinatorics on the parameter $\delta$.

(i) For $e_c \in \mathcal{E}(t_c')$ and not among the breaking edges, we require that
\[
\lim_{Y_{\delta,t_c,e_c}} Y_{\delta,t_c,e_c} = Y_{pr_r(\delta),t_c',e_c}.
\]
(ii) For $e_c \in E(t^0)$ and not among the breaking edges, we require that
\[ \lim Y_{\delta,t_c,e_c} = X_{t^0,e_c}. \]

(iii) For $f_c$ among the breaking edges, $Y_{\delta,t_c,f_c}$ yields two parts at the limit: the part corresponding to the outgoing edge of $t^0_c$ and the part corresponding to the incoming edge of $t^0$. We then require that they coincide respectively with the perturbations $Y_{pr_1(\delta),t^1_c,e_c}$ and $X_{t^0,e_c}$.

This is again illustrated in figure 14.

1.4.5. Admissible $n$-simplices of perturbation data.

**Definition 26.** A smooth choice of perturbation data $(Y_{I,m})^{m \geq 1}_{I \subset \Delta^n}$ is said to be *gluing-compatible w.r.t. $X^f$ and $X^g$* if it satisfies the (above-break) and (below-break) conditions described in subsections 1.4.3 and 1.4.4. Smooth and gluing-compatible perturbation data $(Y_{I,m})^{m \geq 1}_{I \subset \Delta^n}$ such that all maps $\phi_{Y_{I,t^g}}$ are transverse to the diagonal $\Delta$ are called *admissible w.r.t. $X^f$ and $X^g$* or simply *admissible*.

**Theorem 3.** Admissible choices of perturbation data $(Y_{I,m})^{m \geq 1}_{I \subset \Delta^n}$ exist.

**Theorem 4.** Let $(Y_{I,m})^{m \geq 1}_{I \subset \Delta^n}$ be an admissible choice of perturbation data. The 0-dimensional moduli spaces $\mathcal{C}T_{I,t^g}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ are compact. The 1-dimensional moduli spaces $\mathcal{C}T_{I,t^g}(y;x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ can
be compactified to 1-dimensional manifolds with boundary $\mathcal{C}T_{1,t_g}(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, whose boundary is described in subsection 1.4.1.

The proof of theorem 3 is postponed to subsection 2.1.1 and will proceed as in [Maz21]. Theorem 4 is a direct consequence of the analysis carried out in chapter 6 of [Mes18]. For this reason, we will not give details of its proof. We only point out that all spaces $\mathcal{C}T_{1,t_g}(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ are 0-dimensional oriented compactified moduli spaces whenever the perturbed Morse trees $T_{1,t_g}^{1,Morse}$, $T_{1,t_g}^{2,Morse}$ and $T_{1,t_g}^{0,Morse}$ respectively lie in a 0-dimensional moduli space, and where notations are as in items (v) and (vi) of subsection 1.4.1. The constructions of explicit gluing maps in subsections II.4.4.3 and II.4.5.4 of [Maz21] in the case of the moduli spaces $\mathcal{C}T_{1,t_g}(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ can be adapted without problems to the present setting.

1.5. $n - \Omega BAs$-morphisms between Morse cochains. Let $X^f$ and $X^g$ be admissible choices of perturbation data for the Morse functions $f$ and $g$. Denote $(C^*(f), m_t^{X^f})$ and $(C^*(g), m_t^{X^g})$ the Morse cochains endowed with their $\Omega BAs$-algebra structures constructed in [Maz21].

**Theorem 5.** Let $(Y_{I,m})_{m \geq 1}^{\leq \Delta^n}$ be a choice of perturbation that is admissible w.r.t. $X^f$ and $X^g$. Defining for every $m$ and $t_g \in s\mathcal{C}RT_m$, and every $I \subset \Delta^n$ the operations $\mu_{1,t_g}$ as

$$\mu_{1,t_g} : C^*(f) \otimes \cdots \otimes C^*(f) \rightarrow C^*(g)$$

$$x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_m \mapsto \sum_{|y|=\sum_{i=1}^{m} |x_i|+|t_{I,g}|} \#\mathcal{C}T_{1,t_g}^{Y_{I,m}}(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m) \cdot y,$$

they fit into a $n - \Omega BAs$-morphism $(C^*(f), m_t^{X^f}) \rightarrow (C^*(g), m_t^{X^g})$.

The proof is postponed to section 2.4. It boils down to counting the boundary points of the 1-dimensional oriented compactified moduli spaces $\mathcal{C}T_{1,t_g}(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ whose boundary is described in the subsection 1.4.1. As a matter of fact, the set of operations $\{\mu_{1,t_g}\}$ does not exactly define a $n - \Omega BAs$-morphism. One of the two differentials $\partial_{Morse}$ in the bracket $[\partial_{Morse}, \mu_{1,t_g}]$ appearing in the $n - \Omega BAs$-equations has to be twisted by a specific sign for the $n - \Omega BAs$-equations to hold. We will speak about a twisted $n - \Omega BAs$-morphism between twisted $\Omega BAs$-algebras. In the case where $M$ is odd-dimensional, this twisted $n - \Omega BAs$-morphism is a standard $n - \Omega BAs$-morphism.

As explained in subsection 4.1.3 of part 1 if we want moreover to go back to the algebraic framework of $A_\infty$-algebras, a $n - A_\infty$-morphism between the induced $A_\infty$-algebra structures on the
Morse cochains can simply be obtained under the morphism of operadic bimodules \( n - A_\infty - \text{Morph} \to n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph} \).

1.6. **Filling inner horns in Morse theory.** Consider an inner horn \( \Lambda^k_n \subset \Delta^n \). Definitions 23 and 26 can be straightforwardly extended to define an admissible \((k, n)\)-inner horn of perturbation data \((\mathbb{Y}_{I,m})_{I \subset \Lambda^k_n}^{m \geq 1}\) on the moduli spaces \(CT_m\). Shifting to the framework of simplicial sets, while an admissible \( n \)-simplex of perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n} \) yields a morphism of simplicial sets

\[
\mu^{\mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n}} : \Delta^n \to HOM_{\Omega BAs}(C^*(f), C^*(g))
\]

an admissible \((k, n)\)-inner horn of perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_{\Lambda^k_n} \) will yield a morphism of simplicial sets

\[
\mu^{\mathbb{Y}_{\Lambda^k_n}} : \Lambda^k_n \to HOM_{\Omega BAs}(C^*(f), C^*(g))
\]

or equivalently a collection of operations \( \mu_{I,I,g} : C^*(f) \to C^*(g) \) for \( I \subset \Lambda^k_n \), which satisfy the \( \Omega BAs \)-equations.

Following proposition 8, the morphism of simplicial sets \( \mu^{\mathbb{Y}_{\Lambda^k_n}} \) induces a morphism of simplicial sets

\[
\mu^{\mathbb{Y}_{\Lambda^k_n}} : \Lambda^k_n \to HOM_{A_\infty}(C^*(f), C^*(g))
\]

As the simplicial set \( HOM_{A_\infty}(C^*(f), C^*(g)) \) is an \( \infty \)-category, the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Lambda^k_n & \xrightarrow{\mu^{\mathbb{Y}_{\Lambda^k_n}}} & HOM_{A_\infty}(C^*(f), C^*(g)) \\
\downarrow & & \\
\Delta^n & & \\
\end{array}
\]

can always be filled algebraically, to obtain a \( n - A_\infty \)-morphism \( \pi \) extending \( \mu^{\mathbb{Y}_{\Lambda^k_n}} \). This diagram can in fact be filled geometrically:

**Proposition 11.** For every admissible \((k, n)\)-inner horn of perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_{\Lambda^k_n} \), there exists an admissible \( n \)-simplex of perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n} \) extending \( \mathbb{Y}_{\Lambda^k_n} \).

A choice of filler \( \mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n} \) then defines a \( n - \Omega BAs \)-morphism \( \mu^{\mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n}} \) filling the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Lambda^k_n & \xrightarrow{\mu^{\mathbb{Y}_{\Lambda^k_n}}} & HOM_{\Omega BAs}(C^*(f), C^*(g)) \\
\downarrow & & \\
\Delta^n & & \\
\end{array}
\]

As a matter of fact, proposition 11 is a corollary to the following theorem, proven in section 2.1:

**Theorem 6.** For every admissible choice of perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_S \) parametrized by a simplicial subcomplex \( S \subset \Delta^n \), there exists an admissible \( n \)-simplex of perturbation data \( \mathbb{Y}_{\Delta^n} \) extending \( \mathbb{Y}_S \).
We restricted ourselves to \((k,n)\)-inner horns of perturbation data at first, in order to illustrate a geometric instance of the fact that the HOM-simplicial set \(\text{HOM}_{A^\infty}(C^*(f),C^*(g))\) is an \(\infty\)-category. We moreover point out that the morphisms \(\mu^{Y_\Delta^a}\) are in fact twisted \(n-\Omega BAs\)-morphisms, as explained in section 2.4 However, the constructions of this section still hold in that context.

**Corollary 1.** Let \(Y\) and \(Y'\) be two admissible choices of perturbation data on the moduli spaces \(CT_m\). The \(\Omega BAs\)-morphisms \(\mu^{Y}\) and \(\mu^{Y'}\) are then \(\Omega BAs\)-homotopic

\[
C^*(f) \xrightarrow{\mu^{Y}} C^*(g) \xleftarrow{\mu^{Y'}}.
\]

**Proof.** Indeed, these two choices of perturbation data correspond to a choice of perturbation data parametrized by the simplicial subcomplex of \(\Delta^1\) consisting of its two vertices. This simplicial subcomplex can then be filled thanks to theorem 6 and yields as a consequence an \(\Omega BAs\)-homotopy between the \(\Omega BAs\)-morphisms \(\mu^{Y}\) and \(\mu^{Y'}\). \(\square\)

## 2. Transversality, signs and orientations


2.1.1. **Proof of theorem [3]** We detailed in section II.3. of [Maz21] how to build an admissible choice of perturbation data \((X_n)_{n \geq 2}\) on the moduli spaces \(T_m\). Drawing from this construction, we provide a sketch of the proof of theorem [3] in this subsection : admissible \(n\)-simplices of perturbation data \((Y_{l,m})_{I \subseteq \Delta^m}^{m \geq 1}\) on the moduli spaces \(CT(t_g)\) exist. The proof proceeds again by induction on the integer \(N = \dim(CT(t_g)) + \dim(I)\).

If \(N = 0, \dim(I) = 0\) and the gauged tree \(t_g\) is a corolla whose gauge intersects its root. Let \(y \in \text{Crit}(g)\) and \(x_1, \ldots, x_m \in \text{Crit}(f)\) and fix an integer \(l\) such that

\[
l \geq \max \left(1, |y| - \sum_{i=1}^{m} |x_i| + 1\right).
\]

Define the parametrization space

\[
\mathcal{X}^{l}_{t_g} := \{ C^l\text{-perturbation data } Y_{t_g} \text{ on } CT_m(t_g) \},
\]

and introduce the \(C^l\)-map

\[
\phi_{t_g} : \mathcal{X}^{l}_{t_g} \times CT_m(t_g) \times W^S(y) \times W^U(x_1) \times \cdots \times W^U(x_m) \to M^{\times m + 1},
\]

such that for every \(Y_{t_g} \in \mathcal{X}^{l}_{t_g}, \phi_{t_g}(Y_{t_g}, \cdot) = \phi_{Y_{t_g}}\). Note that we should in fact write \(\phi^{y,x_1,\ldots,x_n}_{t_g}\) as the domain of \(\phi_{t_g}\) depends on \(y, x_1, \ldots, x_n\). The space \(\mathcal{X}^{l}_{t_g}\) is then a Banach space and the map \(\phi_{t_g}\) is a submersion. The map \(\phi_{t_g}\) is in particular transverse to the diagonal \(\Delta \subset M^{\times m + 1}\). The parametric transversality lemma implies that there exists a subset \(\mathcal{Y}^{l}_{t_g} \subset \mathcal{X}^{l}_{t_g}\) which is residual in the sense of Baire, and such that for every choice of perturbation data \(Y_{t_g} \in \mathcal{Y}^{l}_{t_g}\) the map \(\phi_{Y_{t_g}}\)
is transverse to the diagonal \( \Delta \subset M^{x_{m+1}} \). Any \( \mathcal{Y}_{t_g} \) in the intersection

\[
\mathcal{Y}_{t_g}^l := \bigcap_{y,x_1,\ldots,x_m} \mathcal{Y}_{t_g}^{l,y,x_1\ldots x_m} \subset \mathcal{X}_{t_g}
\]

then yields a \( C^l \)-choice of perturbation data on \( CT(t_g) \) such that all maps \( \phi_{\mathcal{Y}_{t_g}} \) are transverse to the diagonal \( \Delta \subset M^{x_{m+1}} \). Using an argument à la Taubes we prove that one can in fact construct a residual set \( \mathcal{Y}_{t_g} \subset \mathcal{X}_{t_g} \), where \( \mathcal{X}_{t_g} \) is the Fréchet space defined by replacing "\( C^l \)" by "smooth" in the definition of \( \mathcal{X}_{t_g}^l \), and such that any \( \mathcal{Y}_{t_g} \in \mathcal{Y}_{t_g} \) yields a smooth choice of perturbation data such that all maps \( \phi_{\mathcal{Y}_{t_g}} \) are transverse to the diagonal \( \Delta \subset M^{x_{m+1}} \). See subsection II.3.2.2 of [Maz21] for more details on that last point. This wraps up the first step of the induction.

Let \( N \geq 0 \) and suppose that we have constructed an admissible choice of perturbation data \( (\mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g})_I \), where \( I \subset \Delta^n \) and \( t_g \in sCRT_m \) are such that \( \dim(CT(t_g)) + \dim(I) \leq N \). Let \( I \subset \Delta^n \) and \( t_g \in sCRT_m \) be such that \( \dim(CT(t_g)) + \dim(I) = N + 1 \). Let \( y \in \text{Crit}(g) \) and \( x_1, \ldots, x_m \in \text{Crit}(f) \) and fix an integer \( l \) such that

\[
l \geq \max \left( 1, |y| - \sum_{i=1}^m |x_i| - |t_{I,g}| + 1 \right).
\]

We introduce the parametrization space

\[
\mathcal{X}_{I,t_g}^l := \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{dim}(I)\text{-simplices of perturbation data } \mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g} \text{ on } CT_m(t_g) \text{ such that the perturbation data } \{\mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g}\}_{t_g} \text{ are of class } C^l \text{ in the sense of definition 25,} \\
\text{and such that } \mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g} \text{ is gluing-compatible w.r.t. the perturbation data } (\mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g}^0)\end{array} \right\}.
\]

This parametrization space is a Banach affine space. Define again the \( C^l \)-map

\[
\phi_{I,t_g} : \mathcal{X}_{I,t_g}^l \times I \times CT_m(t_g) \times W^S(y) \times W^U(x_1) \times \cdots \times W^U(x_m) \rightarrow M^{x_{m+1}}.
\]

The map \( \phi_{I,t_g} \) is then transverse to the diagonal \( \Delta \subset M^{x_{m+1}} \). Applying the parametric transversality theorem and proceeding as in the case \( N = 0 \), there exists a residual set \( \mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g}^l \subset \mathcal{X}_{I,t_g}^l \) such that for every choice of perturbation data \( \mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g} \in \mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g}^l \) the map \( \phi_{\mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g}} \) is transverse to the diagonal \( \Delta \subset M^{x_{m+1}} \). Resorting again to an argument à la Taubes, we can prove the same statement in the smooth context. By definition of the parametrization spaces \( \mathcal{X}_{I,t_g}^l \), this construction yields an admissible choice of perturbation data \( (\mathcal{Y}_{I,t_g})_I \), where the indices \( I \) and \( t_g \) are such that \( \dim(CT(t_g)) + \dim(I) \leq N + 1 \). This concludes the proof of theorem \( 3 \) by induction.

2.1.2. Proof of theorem \( 6 \). The proof of theorem \( 6 \) proceeds exactly as the previous proof, by replacing the requirements in the definition of \( \mathcal{X}_{I,t_g}^l \) by the conditions prescribed by the simplicial subcomplex \( S \subset \Delta^n \).

2.2. Orientation and transversality.
2.2.1. Signed short exact sequences. Consider a short exact sequence of vector spaces

\[ 0 \to V_2 \to W \to V_1 \to 0. \]

It induces a direct sum decomposition \( W = V_1 \oplus V_2 \). Suppose that the vector spaces \( W, V_1 \) and \( V_2 \) are oriented. We denote \((-1)^\varepsilon\) the sign obtained by comparing the orientation on \( W \) to the one induced by the direct sum \( V_1 \oplus V_2 \). We will then say that the short exact sequence has sign \((-1)^\varepsilon\).

In particular, when \((-1)^\varepsilon = 1\), we will say that the short exact sequence is positive.

2.2.2. Orientation and transversality. Given now two manifolds \( M, N \), a codimension \( k \) submanifold \( S \subset N \) and a smooth map

\[ \phi : M \to N \]

which is transverse to \( S \), the inverse image \( \phi^{-1}(S) \) is a codimension \( k \) submanifold of \( M \). Moreover, choosing a complementary \( \nu_S \) to \( TS \), the transversality assumption yields the following short exact sequence of vector bundles

\[ 0 \to T\phi^{-1}(S) \to TM|_{\phi^{-1}(S)} \xrightarrow{d\phi} \nu_S \to 0. \]

Suppose now that \( M, N \) and \( S \) are oriented. The orientations on \( N \) and \( S \) induce an orientation on \( \nu_S \). The submanifold \( \phi^{-1}(S) \) is then oriented by requiring that the previous short exact sequence be positive. We will refer to this choice of orientation as the natural orientation on \( \phi^{-1}(S) \).

For instance, the moduli space \( T^\times(t; y_1, \ldots, y_m) \) is defined as the inverse image of the diagonal \( \Delta \subset M^{\times m+1} \) under the map

\[ \phi_{xt}: T_m(t) \times W^S(y) \times W^U(x_1) \times \cdots \times W^U(x_m) \to M^{\times m+1}. \]

Orienting the domain and codomain of \( \phi_{xt} \) by taking the product orientation, and orienting the diagonal \( \Delta \subset M^{\times m+1} \) as \( M \), defines a natural orientation on \( T_t(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m) \).

2.3. Algebraic preliminaries.

2.3.1. Reformulating the \( n - \Omega BAs \)-equations. We set for the rest of this section an orientation \( \omega \) for each \( t_g \in sCRT_n \), which endows each moduli space \( CT_n(t_g) \) with an orientation. We write moreover \( \mu_{I,t_g} \) for the operations \((I, t_g, \omega)\) of \( n - \Omega BAs - \text{Morph} \). The \( \Omega BAs \)-equations for a \( n - \Omega BAs \)-morphism then read as

\[
\begin{aligned}
[\partial, \mu_{I,t_g}] &= \sum_{l=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^l \mu_{\partial^l t_g}^{\text{ing} I, t_g} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{\begin{subarray}{c}
v^0 \#(t^0_{\partial^l \cap I}) = t_g \\
I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_3 = I
\end{subarray}} (-1)^{\Omega BAs \cdot m_{t^0} \circ (\mu_{I_1,t_g} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_{I_3,t_g}^*)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{t_g' \in \text{coll}(t_g)} (-1)^{\Omega BAs \cdot \mu_{I,t_g}} + \sum_{t_g' \in \text{vert}(t_g)} (-1)^{\Omega BAs \cdot \mu_{I,t_g}} + \sum_{t_g' \neq t^2 = t_g} (-1)^{\Omega BAs \cdot \mu_{I,t_g}^{\circ i} m_{t^2}}
\end{aligned}
\]

The signs \((-1)^{\Omega BAs} \) need not be made explicit, but can be computed as in section I.5.2 of [Maz21].
2.3.2. Twisted \(n-A_\infty\)-morphisms and twisted \(n-\Omega BAs\)-morphisms.

**Definition 27.**

(i) A twisted \(A_\infty\)-algebra is a dg-Z-module \(A\) endowed with two different differentials \(\partial_1\) and \(\partial_2\), and a collection of degree \(2-m\) operations \(m_m : A^{\otimes m} \to A\) such that

\[
[\partial, m_m] = - \sum_{i_2 + i_3 = m} (-1)^{i_1 + i_2 + i_3} m_{i_1 + 1 + i_3} (\text{id}^{\otimes i_1} \otimes m_{i_2} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes i_3}),
\]

where \([\partial, \cdot]\) denotes the bracket for the maps \((A^{\otimes m}, \partial_1) \to (A, \partial_2)\).

(ii) Let \((A, \partial_1, \partial_2, m_m)\) and \((B, \partial_1, \partial_2, m_m)\) be two twisted \(A_\infty\)-algebras. A twisted \(n-A_\infty\)-morphism from \(A\) to \(B\) is defined to be a sequence of degree \(1-m+|I|\) operations \(f_I^{(m)} : A^{\otimes m} \to B\) such that

\[
\left[\partial, f_I^{(m)} \right] = \sum_{j=0}^{\dim(I)} (-1)^j f_{\partial_j I}^{(m)} + (-1)^{|I|} \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = m, i_2 \geq 2} (-1)^{i_1 + i_2} f_I^{(i_1)} \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_s = |I|} (-1)^{i_2} m_s (f_{I_1}^{(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{I_s}^{(i_s)}) ,
\]

where \([\partial, \cdot]\) denotes the bracket for the maps \((A^{\otimes m}, \partial_1) \to (B, \partial_2)\).

(iii) A twisted \(\Omega BAs\)-algebra and a twisted \(n-\Omega BAs\)-morphism between twisted \(\Omega BAs\)-algebras are defined similarly.

The explicit formulae obtained by evaluating the \(n-\Omega BAs\)-equations of a twisted \(n-\Omega BAs\)-morphism on \(A^{\otimes m}\) then read as follows:

\[
- \partial_2 \mu_{I, t_g} (a_1, \ldots, a_m) + (-1)^{|I|+|t_g|+\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} |a_j|} \mu_{I, t_g} (a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, \partial_1 a_i, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_m) \\
+ \sum_{t'_g \# t = t} (-1)^{|I|+|\Omega BAs|+|t'_g|} \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} |a_j| \mu_{I, t'_g} (a_1, \ldots, a_i, m_2 (a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{i+j}), a_{i+j+1}, \ldots, a_m) \\
+ \sum_{t'_g \# (t'_g, \ldots, t'_g) = t_g} (-1)^{|I|+|\Omega BAs|+\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} |a_j|+i_{Koszul}} \mu_{I, t'_g} (a_1, \ldots, a_i, \ldots, a_{i-1}, i_{Koszul} + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} |a_j|+m_2 (a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{i+j}) \ldots, a_m) \\
+ \sum_{t'_g \in \text{coll}(t_g)} (-1)^{|I|+|\Omega BAs|} \mu_{I, t'_g} (a_1, \ldots, a_m) + \sum_{t'_g \in \text{vert}(t_g)} (-1)^{|I|+|\Omega BAs|} \mu_{I, t'_g} (a_1, \ldots, a_m) \\
+ \sum_{I=0}^\dim(I) (-1)^{|I|} \mu_{\partial_j^{posing} I, t_g} (a_1, \ldots, a_m) = 0,
\]

where

\[
\hat{\cdot}_{Koszul} = \sum_{r=1}^{|I|} \left( |I_r| + |t'_g| \right) \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} |a_{i+1} + \cdots + a_{i+j}| \right).
\]

As explained in [Maz21], these definitions cannot be phrased using an operadic viewpoint. However, a twisted \(n-\Omega BAs\)-morphism between twisted \(\Omega BAs\)-algebras still always descends to a twisted \(n-A_\infty\)-morphism between twisted \(A_\infty\)-algebras.
2.4. Proof of theorem 5

2.4.1. Recollections on twisted $\Omega$BAs-algebra structures on the Morse cochains. We prove in [Maz21] that given a Morse function $f$ and an admissible choice of perturbation data $X$ on the moduli spaces $T_m$, the Morse cochains $C^*(f)$ can be endowed with a twisted $\Omega$BAs-algebra structure by counting the 0-dimensional moduli spaces $T_0^X(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$.

We twist to this end the natural orientation on the moduli spaces $T_t^X(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ defined in subsection 2.2.2 by a sign of parity

$$\sigma(t; y; x_1, \ldots, x_m) := dm(1 + |y| + |t|) + |t||y| + d \sum_{i=1}^m |x_i|(m - i)$$

and the orientation on the moduli spaces $T(y; x)$ by a sign of parity

$$\sigma(y; x) := 1,$$

where $d$ denotes the dimension of the manifold $M$. The moduli spaces $T_t^X(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and $T(y; x)$ endowed with these new orientations are then respectively written $\tilde{T}_t^X(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and $\tilde{T}(y; x)$.

The operations $m_t$ and the differential on $C^*(f)$ are then defined as

$$m_t(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \sum_{|y| = \sum_{i=1}^m |x_i| + |t|} \# T_t^X(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m) \cdot y,$$

$$\partial_{\text{Morse}}(x) = \sum_{|y| = |x| + 1} \# \tilde{T}(y; x) \cdot y.$$

Counting the signed points in the boundary of the oriented 1-dimensional manifolds $\tilde{T}_t(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ proves that the operations $m_t$ define a twisted $\Omega$BAs-algebra structure on $(C^*(f), \partial_{\text{Morse}}, \partial_{\text{Morse}})$, where

$$(\partial_{\text{Morse}})^k = (-1)^{(d+1)k} \partial_{\text{Morse}}^k.$$

In particular, either working with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}/2$, or with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$ and an odd-dimensional manifold $M$, the operations $m_t$ define an $\Omega$BAs-algebra structure on the Morse cochains.

2.4.2. Twisted $n - \Omega$BAs-morphisms between the Morse cochains. Let $\mathbb{X}^f$ and $\mathbb{X}^g$ be admissible choices of perturbation data for the Morse functions $f$ and $g$. Denote $(C^*(f), m_t^X^f)$ and $(C^*(g), m_t^X^g)$ the Morse cochains endowed with their $\Omega$BAs-algebra structures. Given an admissible $n$-simplex of perturbation data $(\mathbb{X}_{I,m})_{I \subseteq \Delta_n}^m$, we now construct a twisted $n - \Omega$BAs-morphism

$$\mu_{I,t_g} : (C^*(f), \partial_{\text{Morse}}^T, \partial_{\text{Morse}}) \longrightarrow (C^*(g), \partial_{\text{Morse}}^T, \partial_{\text{Morse}}), \ I \subseteq \Delta_n, \ t_g \in s\text{CRT},$$

which completes the proof of theorem 5.

The moduli space $C T_{I,t_g}^X(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is defined as the inverse image of the diagonal $\Delta \subset M^{\times m+1}$ under the map

$$\phi_{\mathbb{X}_{I,t_g}} : \tilde{T} \times C T_{m}(t_g) \times W^S(y) \times W^U(x_1) \times \cdots \times W^U(x_m) \longrightarrow M^{\times m+1}.$$

Orienting the domain and codomain of $\phi_{\mathbb{X}_{I,t_g}}$ with the product orientation, and orienting the diagonal $\Delta \subset M^{\times m+1}$ as $M$, defines a natural orientation on $C T_{I,t_g}^X(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ as explained in subsection 2.2.2.
Definition 28. We define $\tilde{C}^{\mathcal{Y}_{I,g}}_I(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ to be the oriented manifold $C^{\mathcal{Y}_{I,g}}_I(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ whose natural orientation has been twisted by a sign of parity

$$\sigma(t_{I,g}; y; x_1, \ldots, x_m) := dm(1 + |y| + |t_{I,g}|) + |t_{I,g}| |y| + d \sum_{i=1}^{m} |x_i|(m - i).$$

Proposition 12. If the moduli space $\tilde{C}^{\mathcal{Y}_{I,g}}_I(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is 1-dimensional, its boundary decomposes as the disjoint union of the following components

(i) $(-1)^{|y| + |I| + \hat{\Omega}_{BA} + |\mathcal{T}|} \sum_{i=1}^{m} |x_i| \tilde{C}^{\mathcal{Y}_{I,g}}(y; x_1, \ldots, x_i, z, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_m) \times \tilde{T}_I^2(z; x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{i+2});$

(ii) $(-1)^{|y| + |I| + \hat{\Omega}_{BA} + \hat{T}_0} \tilde{T}_I^0(y; y_1, \ldots, y_s) \times \tilde{C}^{\mathcal{Y}_{I,g}}_I(y_1; x_1, \ldots, x_m) \times \tilde{C}^{\mathcal{Y}_{I,g}}_I(y_2; x_1, \ldots, x_m);$

(iii) $(-1)^{|y| + |I| + \hat{\Omega}_{BA} + \hat{T}_0} \tilde{T}_I^0(y; y_1, \ldots, x_m) \times \tilde{C}^{\mathcal{Y}_{I,g}}_I(y; x_1, \ldots, z, \ldots, x_m) \times \tilde{T}(z; x_i)$ where we have set $\hat{T}_I^0 = |I| + |t_g| + \sum_{j=1}^{m} |x_j|;$

(iv) $(-1)^{|y| + |I| + \hat{\Omega}_{BA} + \hat{T}_0} \tilde{T}_I^0(y; z) \times \tilde{C}^{\mathcal{Y}_{I,g}}_I(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m);$

(vi) $(-1)^{|y| + |I| + \hat{\Omega}_{BA} + \hat{T}_0} \tilde{T}_I^0(y; z) \times \tilde{C}^{\mathcal{Y}_{I,g}}_I(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m).$

Define the operations $\mu_{I,g}: C^*(f)^{\otimes m} \to C^*(g)$ as

$$\mu_{I,g}(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \sum_{|y| = \sum_{i=1}^{m} |x_i| + |t_{I,g}|} \#\tilde{C}^{\mathcal{Y}_{I,g}}(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m) \cdot y.$$

Counting the points in the boundary of the oriented 1-dimensional manifolds $\tilde{C}^{\mathcal{Y}_{I,g}}_I(y; x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ finally proves that:

Theorem 5. The operations $\mu_{I,g}$ define a twisted $n - \Omega BA$-morphism between the Morse cochains $(C^*(f), \partial_{\mathcal{M}orse}, \partial_{\mathcal{M}orse})$ and $(C^*(g), \partial_{\mathcal{M}orse}, \partial_{\mathcal{M}orse}).$

We send the reader back to [Maz21] for the complete check of signs in the case of the operations $m_I$, which easily transports to the case of the operations $\mu_{I,g}$. Again, either working with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}/2$, or with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$ and an odd-dimensional manifold $M$, the operations $\mu_{I,g}$ fit into a standard $n - \Omega BA$-morphism between $\Omega BA$-algebras.

3. Towards the problem of the composition

At the end of [Maz21] we stated two main questions. The first was the motivational question solved in this article and the second one came as follows:

Problem 2. Given three Morse functions $f_0, f_1, f_2$, choices of perturbation data $\mathcal{X}^i$, and choices of perturbation data $\mathcal{Y}^j$ defining morphisms

$$\mu^{\mathcal{X}_0} : (C^*(f_0), m_t^{\mathcal{X}_0}) \to (C^*(f_1), m_t^{\mathcal{X}_1}),$$

$$\mu^{\mathcal{X}_1} : (C^*(f_1), m_t^{\mathcal{X}_1}) \to (C^*(f_2), m_t^{\mathcal{X}_2}),$$

$$\mu^{\mathcal{X}_2} : (C^*(f_0), m_t^{\mathcal{X}_0}) \to (C^*(f_2), m_t^{\mathcal{X}_2}),$$

where
can we construct an $\Omega BAs$-homotopy such that $\mu^{\gamma_1}\circ \mu^{\gamma_0} \simeq \mu^{\gamma_2}$ through this homotopy? That is, can the following cone be filled in the $\Omega BAs$ realm

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
C^*(f_0) & \xrightarrow{\mu^{\gamma_0}} & C^*(f_1) \\
& \searrow & \downarrow \\
& \mu^{\gamma_2} & \mu^{\gamma_1}
\end{array}
$$

The author plans to prove in an upcoming article that the answer to this question is positive. This simple problem will in fact again generalize to a wider range of constructions in Morse theory, involving the $n$-morphisms introduced in this article as well as some new interesting combinatorics.
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