

NO-ITERATION PSEUDODISTRIBUTIVE LAWS

CHARLES WALKER

ABSTRACT. By considering pseudodistributive laws in which the involved pseudomonads are presented in no-iteration form, we deduce a number of alternative presentations of pseudodistributive laws including a “decagon” form, a pseudoalgebra form, and a no-iteration form. As an application, we show that five coherence axioms suffice in the usual monoidal definition of a pseudodistributive law.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Structure of the paper	4
2. Acknowledgments	5
3. Pseudomonads	5
3.1. Pseudomonads in pseudomonoidal and no-iteration form	5
4. Presentations of pseudodistributive laws	8
4.1. Pseudomonoidal definition of pseudodistributive laws	8
4.2. Decagon definition of pseudodistributive laws	12
4.3. Pseudoalgebra definition of pseudodistributive laws	14
4.4. No-iteration definition of pseudodistributive laws	15
5. Equivalence of presentations of pseudodistributive laws	17
5.1. Equivalence of pseudomonoidal and decagon definitions	18
5.2. Decagons to pseudoalgebras to no-iteration forms	19
5.3. Equivalence of decagon and pseudoalgebra forms	20
5.4. Equivalence of pseudoalgebra and no-iteration forms	21
5.5. Explanation of redundant coherence axioms	21
References	22

1. INTRODUCTION

Monads are one of the fundamental constructions in category theory, and in recent years have also become more prevalent in computer science [2, 20, 6]. Typically, a monad on a category \mathcal{C} is defined as an endofunctor $T: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ along with natural transformations $u: 1_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow T$ and $m: T^2 \rightarrow T$ satisfying three coherence conditions.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 18C15, 18N15.

Key words and phrases. pseudodistributive laws, no-iteration, pseudomonads.

This work was supported by the Operational Programme Research, Development and Education Project “Postdoc@MUNI” (No. CZ.02.2.69/0.0/0.0/18_053/0016952).

Distributive laws of monads were introduced by Beck [1] and give a concise description of the data and coherence conditions needed to compose two monads (T, u, m) and (P, η, μ) . More precisely, Beck defines a distributive law of monads as a natural transformation $\lambda: TP \rightarrow PT$ such that the below two triangles and two pentagons commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT \\
 \swarrow uP & & \searrow Pu \\
 & P &
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT \\
 \swarrow T\eta & & \searrow \eta T \\
 & T &
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 T^2P & \xrightarrow{T\lambda} & TP^2 & \xrightarrow{\lambda T} & PTT \\
 mP \downarrow & & & & \downarrow Pm \\
 TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT & &
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccccc}
 TP^2 & \xrightarrow{\lambda P} & PTP & \xrightarrow{P\lambda} & P^2T \\
 T\mu \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \mu T \\
 TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT & &
 \end{array}$$

It is not hard to arrive at this set of four axioms. Indeed, given a $\lambda: TP \rightarrow PT$ if one works out what is required to extend the monad (T, u, m) to a monad

$$(\tilde{T}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{m}) : \mathbf{Kl}(P, \eta, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbf{Kl}(P, \eta, \mu)$$

on the Kleisli category of P , they arrive at two of these axioms from the nullary and binary functoriality conditions of \tilde{T} , and the other two from naturality of \tilde{u} and \tilde{m} .

It turns out that one may take a different approach to distributive laws, based on the “extensive” (also called “no-iteration” or “Kleisli triple”) presentation of monads as studied by Manes [12], which in fact dates back to early work of Walters [22]. In this extensive form, a monad on a category \mathcal{C} is defined as an assignation on objects $T: \mathcal{C}_{\text{ob}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{ob}}$ with a family of arrows $u_X: X \rightarrow TX$ and functions $\mathcal{C}(X, TY) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(TX, TY)$ typically called “pasting operators”. This data is then required to satisfy three different coherence axioms. It is an interesting fact that the functoriality and naturality conditions automatically follow these three conditions. This simplification which happens in **Cat** when monads are presented extensively is explained in detail by Marmolejo [17], as a consequence of any functor having a right adjoint in the bicategory of profunctors **Prof**.

If one works out what is needed to extend the monad (T, u, m) the Kleisli category of P , with this extension now defined in extensive form, they will naturally arrive at three coherence conditions for distributive laws corresponding to the three axioms for a monad in extensive form. These three axioms are the two triangles from earlier, but with the two pentagons replaced by a single decagon condition

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 TPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\lambda T} & TP^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{TP^2m} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{T\mu T} & TPT \\
 \lambda TPT \downarrow & & & & & & \downarrow \lambda T \\
 PT^2PT & & & & & & PT^2 \\
 PmPT \downarrow & & & & & & \downarrow Pm \\
 PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\lambda T} & P^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{P^2m} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} & PT
 \end{array}$$

In one dimension, the difference between these two definitions of distributive law is rather trivial. However, in two dimensions the difference becomes significant, as this means pseudodistributive laws can be naturally defined taking three modifications as the basic data rather than the usual four [14]. Moreover, the reduction in the

data makes the coherence conditions for pseudodistributive laws much easier to understand conceptually. Interestingly (though perhaps expected given work Street and Lack [11]), one recovers a variant of the triangle and pentagon axioms for monoidal categories.

It is this understanding, along with Kelly's results concerning coherence for monoidal categories [7], that allow us to deduce that three of Marmolejo and Wood's eight coherence axioms for pseudodistributive laws [16] are redundant in the sense that they follow from the other five.

However, the goal of this paper is not just to reduce the coherence axioms of pseudodistributive laws, but to give other presentations of them. For instance, the reader will notice the composites $\lambda T \cdot Pm : TPT \rightarrow PT$ appearing in the decagon, so that denoting this composite by α , the decagon may be seen as the hexagon axiom

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} TPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\alpha} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{T\mu T} & TPT \\ \alpha PT \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \alpha \\ PTP & \xrightarrow{P\alpha} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} & PT \end{array}$$

These morphisms $\alpha : TPT \rightarrow PT$ (or morphisms $PTP \rightarrow PT$ in the dual situation¹) should be familiar to the reader, appearing in the characterization of distributive laws in terms of Kleisli and Eilenberg-Moore objects [15]. Indeed, such characterizations are often useful for considering distributive laws when Kleisli and Eilenberg-Moore objects do not exist [15].

Interestingly, this hexagon axiom leads to a simpler version of these characterizations. It turns out that distributive laws λ are in bijection with morphisms $\alpha : TPT \rightarrow PT$ rendering commutative the diagrams

(1.1)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} TPT & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & PT & & T & \xrightarrow{Tu} & T^2 & & TPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\alpha} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{T\mu T} & TPT \\ \uparrow uPT & \nearrow \text{id} & & & \downarrow \eta T & & \downarrow T\eta T & & \downarrow \alpha PT & & & & \downarrow \alpha \\ PT & & & & PT & \xleftarrow{\alpha} & TPT & & PTP & \xrightarrow{P\alpha} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} & PT \end{array}$$

which we refer to as the algebra definition (as the T -algebra axioms on α follow from the above conditions). This definition is closely connected to a definition of distributive laws in terms of pasting operators $(-)^{\lambda}$ due to Marmolejo and Wood [17, Theorem 6.2]. Indeed, we get a simplification of their result, finding that with the monad P defined extensively, a distributive law is an pasting operator $(-)^{\lambda} : \mathcal{C}(-, PT-) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(T-, PT-)$ such that all $f : X \rightarrow PTY$ and $g : Y \rightarrow PTZ$

¹One might denote such morphisms by $\text{res}_{T\eta} : PTP \rightarrow PT$ as they exhibit $T\eta$ as a P -embedding, using the “admissibility” point of view [21]. In [21] the dual problem of extending to pseudo-algebras extensively was considered, though in the simpler lax-idempotent case [23, 10], and the decagon conditions were not recognized.

render commutative the three diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & PTY \\ uX \downarrow & & \downarrow f^\lambda \\ TX & \xrightarrow{f^\lambda} & PTY \end{array} & \begin{array}{ccc} TX & & PTX \\ \eta TX \swarrow & & \searrow (\eta TX \cdot uX)^\lambda \\ & TX & \end{array} & \begin{array}{ccc} TX & \xrightarrow{((g^\lambda)^P f)^\lambda} & PTZ \\ f^\lambda \downarrow & & \downarrow (g^\lambda)^P \\ PTY & \xrightarrow{(g^\lambda)^P} & PTZ \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

In this paper we will consider the more general 2-dimensional “pseudo” versions of the above to better understand pseudodistributive laws. In the case of these pseudodistributive laws, there a number of problems which have not been practical to solve until now. Indeed, the definition of a pseudodistributive law in terms of pasting operators $(-)^{\lambda}$ would normally be impractical due to the coherence conditions involved. However, using the pseudo version of (1.1), which is already closely related to presentations in terms of pasting operators $(-)^{\lambda}$, we are able to find such a definition. This is especially useful in the setting of relative pseudomonads [4], where one is forced to use pasting operators.

1.1. Structure of the paper. In Section 3 we recall the monoidal and extensive (no-iteration) definitions of pseudomonads, and their coherence axioms. Then in Section 4 we give four presentations of pseudodistributive laws $\lambda: TP \rightarrow PT$ of pseudomonads; namely:

- (1) the “pseudomonoidal” definition. This is the pseudo version of the usual definition due to Beck [1], involving a pseudonatural $\lambda: TP \rightarrow PT$ and four modifications comprising two pseudocommuting triangles and pentagons satisfying five coherence axioms;
- (2) the “Kleisli-decagon” definition. This involves the decagonal conditions one finds for distributive laws when the involved monads are presented in extensive form and the usual $\lambda: TP \rightarrow PT$ is taken as the data. This version comprises three modifications satisfying two coherence axioms (a version of the triangle and pentagon equations).²
- (3) the “pseudoalgebra” definition in terms of maps $\alpha: TPT \rightarrow PT$. This is a reduced version of the above in which a change of variables leads to a simplification in the axioms. Moreover, this definition may be regarded as a “base case” for definitions of pseudodistributive laws in terms of pasting operators $(-)^{\lambda}$ as one may apply such pasting operators to identities to recover α .
- (4) the “no-iteration” definition in terms of pasting operators

$$(-)^{\lambda} : \mathcal{C}(-, PT-) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(T-, PT-).$$

This no-iteration definition is intended to avoid any iteration of the involved pseudomonads T and P , which is important in the “relative” case [4].

These last two presentations give an improvement of a result of Marmolejo and Wood [17, Theorem 6.2], both simplifying and generalizing from one to two dimensions. In fact, understanding this result was the original motivation for this paper.

²The “Kleisli” prefix refers to the fact the decagon starts with $TPTPT$, as happens when one extends to the Kleisli category extensively. There is also a dual version starting from $PTPTP$.

In Section 5 we justify our four definitions of pseudodistributive law by proving an equivalence with extensions to the Kleisli bicategory of a pseudomonad. In the case of the pseudomonoidal definition, we will also explain how one recovers the three redundant pseudodistributive law axioms from the decagon conditions.

2. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank the members of the Masaryk University Algebra Seminar, CT20-21 conference, and Open House on Category Theory 2021 for their questions and comments.

3. PSEUDOMONADS

We start this section by recalling two equivalent definitions of pseudomonad (namely the monoidal and no-iteration forms), including the three axioms which are known to be redundant in monoidal form results of Kelly [7], and in no-iteration form (also called extensive form) by results of Street and Lack [11].

Later on in Section 5.5 we will use these three redundant pseudomonad axioms to explain why three of the usual pseudodistributive law axioms are redundant.

3.1. Pseudomonads in pseudomonoidal and no-iteration form. In order to define pseudomonads, we first need the notions of pseudonatural transformations and modifications. The notion of pseudonatural transformation is the (weak) 2-categorical version of natural transformation. Modifications, also defined below, take the place of morphisms between pseudonatural transformations.

Definition 3.1.1. A *pseudonatural transformation* between pseudofunctors $t: F \rightarrow G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ where \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are bicategories provides for each 1-cell $f: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ in \mathcal{A} , 1-cells $t_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $t_{\mathcal{B}}$ and an invertible 2-cell t_f in \mathcal{B} as below

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F\mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{Ff} & F\mathcal{B} \\ t_{\mathcal{A}} \downarrow & \xRightarrow{t_f} & \downarrow t_{\mathcal{B}} \\ G\mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{Gf} & G\mathcal{B} \end{array}$$

satisfying coherence conditions outlined in [9, Definition 2.2]. Given two pseudonatural transformations $t, s: F \rightarrow G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ as above, a *modification* $\alpha: s \rightarrow t$ consists of, for every object $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}$, a 2-cell $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}: t_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow s_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that for each 1-cell $f: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ in \mathcal{A} we have the equality $\alpha_{\mathcal{B}} \cdot Ff \cdot t_f = s_f \cdot Gf \cdot \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}$.

By considering pseudomonads as pseudomonoids in a Gray-monoid of endopseudofunctors one naturally arrives at the following definition.

Definition 3.1.2. A *pseudomonad (in pseudomonoidal form)* on a bicategory \mathcal{C} consists of a pseudofunctor equipped with pseudonatural transformations as below

$$T: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}, \quad u: 1_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow T, \quad m: T^2 \rightarrow T$$

along with three invertible modifications

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{uT} & T^2 \\ \searrow \text{id} & \swarrow \alpha & \downarrow m \\ & T & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T^2 & \xleftarrow{Tu} & T \\ \swarrow \beta & \searrow \text{id} & \\ & T & \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^3 & \xrightarrow{Tm} & T^2 \\ mT \downarrow & \swarrow \gamma & \downarrow m \\ T^2 & \xrightarrow{m} & T \end{array}$$

subject to the two coherence axioms

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
T^2 \xrightarrow{TuT} T^3 & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Tm} T^2 \\ \downarrow \gamma \\ \xrightarrow{mT} T^2 \end{array} & \xrightarrow{m} T \\
& & \\
T^4 \xrightarrow{T^2m} T^3 & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Tm} T^3 \\ \downarrow mT^2 \\ \xrightarrow{mT} T^3 \end{array} & \xrightarrow{Tm} T^2 \xrightarrow{m} T
\end{array} = \begin{array}{ccc}
T^2 \xrightarrow{TuT} T^3 & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Tm} T^3 \\ \downarrow T\alpha \\ \xrightarrow{TuT} T^3 \end{array} & \xrightarrow{m} T^2 \xrightarrow{m} T \\
& & \\
T^4 \xrightarrow{T^2m} T^3 & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Tm} T^3 \\ \downarrow mT^2 \\ \xrightarrow{mT} T^3 \end{array} & \xrightarrow{Tm} T^2 \xrightarrow{m} T
\end{array}$$

Remark 3.1.3. One should note here that there are three useful consequences of these pseudomonad axioms [13, Proposition 8.1] originally due to Kelly [7]. These are as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
1_{\mathcal{C}} \xrightarrow{u} T & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{uT} T^2 \\ \downarrow \alpha \\ \xrightarrow{Tu} T^2 \end{array} & \xrightarrow{m} T \\
& & \\
T^2 \xrightarrow{uT^2} T^3 & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Tm} T^2 \\ \downarrow mT \\ \xrightarrow{mT} T^2 \end{array} & \xrightarrow{m} T
\end{array} = \begin{array}{ccc}
1_{\mathcal{C}} \xrightarrow{u} T & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{uT} T \\ \downarrow u_u^{-1} \\ \xrightarrow{Tu} T \end{array} & \xrightarrow{m} T^2 \xrightarrow{m} T \\
& & \\
T^2 \xrightarrow{uT^2} T^3 & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Tm} T^2 \\ \downarrow mT \\ \xrightarrow{mT} T^2 \end{array} & \xrightarrow{m} T
\end{array}$$

We only mention these redundant axioms as they will be important later on. Indeed, a version of these three redundant axioms appear in the coherence conditions for a pseudodistributive law, though in a very convoluted way which is why it was not noticed earlier. As we will later see in Section 5.5, the first appears most directly, whilst the appearance of the other two only becomes apparent when one combines the two pentagons into a decagon.

The definition of a pseudomonad in no-iteration form is due to Marmolejo and Wood [18]. However, it will be more convenient to use the presentation given by Fiore, Gambino, Hyland and Winskel [4] for relative pseudomonads (with the “relative” part taken to be an identity).

Definition 3.1.4. [18, 4] A *pseudomonad (in no-iteration form)* on a bicategory \mathcal{C} consists of

- an assignment on objects $\mathcal{C}_{\text{ob}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{ob}}: X \mapsto TX$;
- for each $X \in \mathcal{C}$, a 1-cell $u_X: X \rightarrow TX$;
- for each $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ a functor $(-)^T_{X,Y}: \mathcal{C}(X, TY) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(TX, TY)$;
- for each $f: X \rightarrow TY$, an isomorphism $\phi_f: f \Rightarrow f^T \cdot u_X$ natural in f ;
- for each $X \in \mathcal{C}$, an isomorphism $\theta_X: u_X^T \Rightarrow \text{id}_{TX}$;
- for each $f: X \rightarrow TY$ and $g: Y \rightarrow TZ$, an isomorphism $\delta_{g,f}: (g^T \cdot f)^T \Rightarrow g^T \cdot f^T$ natural in f and g ;

satisfying the two coherence conditions:

- (1) each $f: X \rightarrow TY$ renders commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 f^T & \xrightarrow{\phi_f^T} & (f^T u_X)^T \xrightarrow{\delta_{f,u_X}} f^T u_X^T \\
 & \searrow \text{unitor} & \downarrow f^T \theta_X \\
 & & f^T \cdot \text{id}
 \end{array}$$

- (2) each $f: X \rightarrow TY$, $g: Y \rightarrow TZ$, and $h: Z \rightarrow TV$ renders commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & ((h^T g)^T f)^T & \\
 (\delta_{h,g,f})^T \swarrow & & \searrow \delta_{h^T g, f} \\
 ((h^T g^T) f)^T & & (h^T g)^T f^T \\
 \text{assoc.} \downarrow & & \downarrow \delta_{h,g,f} f^T \\
 (h^T (g^T f))^T & & (h^T g^T) f^T \\
 \delta_{h^T, g^T f} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{assoc.} \\
 h^T (g^T f)^T & \xrightarrow{h^T \delta_{g,f}} & h^T (g^T f^T)
 \end{array}$$

Remark 3.1.5. The three useful consequences of the pseudomonad axioms listed earlier in Remark 3.1.3 now become the assertion [4, Lemma 3.2] which states that any morphisms $f: X \rightarrow TY$ and $g: Y \rightarrow TZ$ render commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 u_X \xrightarrow{\phi_{u_X}} u_X^T u_X & (u_Y^T f)^T \xrightarrow{\delta_{u_Y, f}} u_Y^T f^T & g^T f \xrightarrow{\phi_{g^T f}} (g^T f)^T u_X \\
 \downarrow \theta_X u_X & \downarrow \theta_Y f^T & \downarrow \delta_{g,f} u_X \\
 \text{id} \searrow u_X & (\theta_Y f)^T \searrow f^T & g^T \phi_f \searrow g^T f^T u_X
 \end{array}$$

The redundancy of these pseudomonad axioms in no-iteration form was first noticed by Street and Lack [11].

Given that these two versions of pseudomonads are in equivalence, it is not at all suprising that there are corresponding redundant axioms in the two definitions. What is suprising (and is shown later) is that this causes three of the usual pseudodistributive law axioms to be redundant. It is not at all expected that the redundant three of five pseudomonad axioms should correspond to three of the ten pseudodistributive law axioms (as these are very different looking sets of axioms). In fact, this is the best situation one might hope for. Note that the two necessary pseudomonad axioms *do not* correspond to two pseudodistributive law axioms (they correspond to a set of *five* pseudodistributive law axioms).

Convention: Throughout the remainder of this paper we will suppress the modification data when describing pseudomonads. Thus instead of $(T, u, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ we simply write (T, u, m) or T .

Definition 3.1.6. The *Kleisli bicategory* of a pseudomonad (T, u, m) on a 2-category \mathcal{C} , denoted $\mathbf{Kl}(T)$, is the bicategory with:

- the same objects as \mathcal{C} ;
- a morphism $f: X \rightsquigarrow Y$ in $\mathbf{Kl}(T)$ is a morphism $f: X \rightarrow TY$ in \mathcal{C} ;
- the identity $\text{id}_X: X \rightsquigarrow X$ on an object X is the unit $uX: X \rightarrow TX$;
- for each $f: X \rightsquigarrow Y$ and $g: Y \rightsquigarrow Z$ the composite $g \cdot f: X \rightsquigarrow Z$ is given by

$$X \xrightarrow{f} TY \xrightarrow{Tg} T^2Z \xrightarrow{mZ} TZ.$$

The unitality and associativity laws only hold up to coherent isomorphism, thus giving only a bicategory. The coherence data for these laws is constructed using the modifications comprising the pseudomonad. We omit the details here, as the reader can refer to [3, Definition 4.1].

Remark 3.1.7. The reader will notice the composite above may be written as $g^T \cdot f$ when the pseudomonad is presented in no-iteration form. As this formulation of pseudomonad naturally lends itself to describing the Kleisli bicategory, it is also sometimes called the Kleisli presentation.

4. PRESENTATIONS OF PSEUDODISTRIBUTIVE LAWS

4.1. Pseudomonoidal definition of pseudodistributive laws. Even when dealing with strict 2-monads, it is often the case that one has no strict distributive law between them, but only a *pseudodistributive* law where the usual diagrams (two triangles and two pentagons) only commute up to invertible modifications [3]. Work on these “pseudo” versions of distributive laws started with Kelly [8], who considered the case where the usual axioms held strictly with the exception of one of the pentagons.

Later, pseudodistributive laws were considered in the general case (where all four axioms only hold up to isomorphism) by Marmolejo [14], who imposed nine coherence conditions on the four invertible modifications. It was then later shown by Marmolejo and Wood [16], that one of the original nine axioms, in addition to a tenth axiom introduced by Tanaka [19], are redundant, thus reducing the number of coherence axioms to eight.

We now give another reduction in the coherence axioms, using just five to define a pseudodistributive law.

Remark 4.1.1. Note that the usual ten coherence axioms for a pseudodistributive law come from understanding the structure of a pseudomonad in the Gray category of pseudomonads [5]. From there, it is a matter of working out which are redundant in that they follow from the others³.

Remark 4.1.2. To see why the “pseudo” version of distributive laws should be of interest in the first place, we point the reader to the trivial fact that a strict law is merely a strict monad morphism and opmonad morphism. This fact fails in the weak

³An exception to this is in the lax idempotent setting, where one has a choice of coherence axioms. However, it appears unlikely any choice would be better than the five axioms given here in the general case.

setting, where an extra coherence axiom is required. Hence this weak case motivates us to stop viewing distributive laws as a monad morphism and opmorphism, but rather to think of them as their own structure. The later presentations are examples of this viewpoint.

Definition 4.1.3. A *pseudodistributive law (in pseudomonoidal form)* between pseudomonads (T, u, m) and (P, η, μ) is a pseudonatural transformation $\lambda: TP \rightarrow PT$ and four invertible modifications as below⁴

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT \\
 \swarrow uP & \Downarrow \omega_1 & \nearrow Pu \\
 & P &
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT \\
 \swarrow T\eta & \Downarrow \omega_2 & \nearrow \eta T \\
 & T &
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 T^2P & \xrightarrow{T\lambda} & TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda T} & PTT \\
 mP \downarrow & & \Downarrow \omega_3 & & \downarrow Pm \\
 TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT & &
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccccc}
 TP^2 & \xrightarrow{\lambda P} & PTP & \xrightarrow{P\lambda} & P^2T \\
 T\mu \downarrow & & \Downarrow \omega_4 & & \downarrow \mu T \\
 TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT & &
 \end{array}$$

satisfying the following five coherence axioms. The first two coherence axioms are the unitality axioms of a pseudomonad morphism and pseudomonad opmorphism

(W1)

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{id} \\
 \curvearrowright \\
 TP \xrightarrow{TuP} T^2P \xrightarrow{mP} TP \\
 \text{id} \downarrow \quad T\omega_1 \nearrow \quad T\lambda \downarrow \quad \omega_3 \nearrow \quad \downarrow \lambda \\
 TP \xrightarrow{TPu} TPT \quad \downarrow \lambda T \\
 \lambda \downarrow \quad \downarrow \lambda T \\
 PT \xrightarrow{PTu} PT^2 \xrightarrow{Pm} PT \\
 \curvearrowleft \text{id}
 \end{array}
 = \text{id}_\lambda$$

(W2)

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{id} \\
 \curvearrowright \\
 TP \xrightarrow{T\eta P} TP^2 \xrightarrow{T\mu} TP \\
 \text{id} \downarrow \quad \Downarrow \omega_2 P \quad \lambda P \downarrow \quad \Downarrow \omega_4 \quad \downarrow \lambda \\
 TP \xrightarrow{\eta TP} PTP \quad \downarrow P\lambda \\
 \lambda \downarrow \quad \downarrow P\lambda \\
 PT \xrightarrow{\eta PT} P^2T \xrightarrow{\mu T} PT \\
 \curvearrowleft \text{id}
 \end{array}
 = \text{id}_\lambda$$

⁴The directions of the modifications below are chosen such that they will naturally compose into decagons later on, and such that the directions of the induced pseudomonad modifications will match with that of a no-iteration pseudomonad as in Definition 3.1.4 (which is defined as in [4]). Though these choices of directions do not matter in the sense that these modifications are invertible, it will make the later proofs easier to follow.

The next two axioms are the associativity axioms of a pseudomonad morphism and pseudomonad opmorphism

(W3)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & T^3P & \xrightarrow{T^2\lambda} & T^2PT & \xrightarrow{T\lambda T} & TPT^2 & \xrightarrow{\lambda T^2} & PT^3 \\
 & \downarrow mTP & & \downarrow TmP & \searrow T\omega_3 & \downarrow TPm & \downarrow PTm & \\
 T^2P & \xrightarrow{T^2\lambda} & T^2P & \xrightarrow{T\lambda} & TPT & \xrightarrow{\lambda T} & PT^2 & \\
 & \downarrow mP & & \downarrow mP & \searrow \omega_3 & \downarrow Pm & & \\
 & TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & & PT & & &
 \end{array}$$

=

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & T^3P & \xrightarrow{T^2\lambda} & T^2PT & \xrightarrow{T\lambda T} & TPT^2 & \xrightarrow{\lambda T^2} & PT^3 \\
 & \downarrow mTP & & \downarrow mPT & \searrow \omega_3 T & \downarrow PmT & \searrow PTm & \\
 & T^2P & \xrightarrow{T\lambda} & TPT & \xrightarrow{\lambda T} & PT^2 & & \\
 & \downarrow mP & & \downarrow mP & \searrow \omega_3 & \downarrow Pm & \searrow Pm & \\
 & TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & & PT & & &
 \end{array}$$

(W4)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & TP^3 & \xrightarrow{\lambda P^2} & PTP^2 & \xrightarrow{P\lambda P} & P^2TP & \xrightarrow{P^2\lambda} & P^3T \\
 & \downarrow TP\mu & & \downarrow T\mu P & \searrow \omega_4 P & \downarrow \mu TP & \downarrow \mu PT & \\
 TP^2 & \xrightarrow{\lambda P} & TP^2 & \xrightarrow{\lambda P} & PTP & \xrightarrow{P\lambda} & P^2T & \\
 & \downarrow T\mu & & \downarrow T\mu & \searrow \omega_4 & \downarrow \mu T & & \\
 & TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & & PT & & &
 \end{array}$$

=

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & TP^3 & \xrightarrow{\lambda P^2} & PTP^2 & \xrightarrow{P\lambda P} & P^2TP & \xrightarrow{P^2\lambda} & P^3T \\
 & \downarrow TP\mu & & \downarrow PT\mu & \searrow P\omega_4 & \downarrow P\mu T & \searrow \mu PT & \\
 & TP^2 & \xrightarrow{\lambda P} & PTP & \xrightarrow{P\lambda} & P^2T & & \\
 & \downarrow T\mu & & \downarrow T\mu & \searrow \omega_4 & \downarrow \mu T & \searrow \mu T & \\
 & TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & & PT & & &
 \end{array}$$

The last axiom ensures that the pentagons ω_3 and ω_4 are compatible, and asks

(W5)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & T^2P & \xrightarrow{T\lambda} & TPT & & \\
 & \nearrow T^2\mu & \downarrow T\omega_4 & \nearrow T\mu T & \downarrow \omega_4 T & \nearrow \lambda T & \\
 & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{\lambda PT} & PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\lambda T} & P^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{Pm} & PT \\
 & \nearrow TP\lambda & \downarrow \omega_3 P & \nearrow PT\lambda & \downarrow P\omega_3 & \nearrow P^2m & \nearrow \mu T & \\
 T^2P^2 & \xrightarrow{T\lambda P} & TPTP & \xrightarrow{\lambda TP} & PT^2P & \xrightarrow{PmP} & PTP & \\
 & \searrow mP^2 & & \searrow \lambda P & & & &
 \end{array}$$

is equal to

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & T^2P & \xrightarrow{T\lambda} & TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda T} & PT^2 \\
 & \uparrow T^2\mu & & \downarrow mP & & \downarrow \omega_3 \\
 T^2P^2 & & & TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT \\
 & \downarrow mP^2 & & \uparrow T\mu & & \downarrow \omega_4 \\
 & TP^2 & \xrightarrow{\lambda P} & PTP & \xrightarrow{P\lambda} & P^2T \\
 & & & & & \uparrow \mu T
 \end{array}$$

For convenience and easy reference, we also list the five redundant coherence conditions of a pseudodistributive law. Note the redundancy of the first two is due to Marmolejo and Wood [16].

Theorem 4.1.4. *Given a pseudodistributive law $(\lambda, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4) : TP \rightarrow PT$ in pseudomonoidal form, the following five conditions are derivable.*

(W6)

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{id} \\
 \text{TP} \xrightarrow{uTP} T^2P \xrightarrow{mP} TP \\
 \downarrow \lambda \quad \downarrow T\lambda \quad \downarrow \omega_3 \quad \downarrow \lambda \\
 PT \xrightarrow{uPT} TPT \xrightarrow{\omega_3} PT \\
 \downarrow \text{id} \quad \downarrow \omega_1 T \quad \downarrow \lambda T \quad \downarrow \text{id} \\
 PT \xrightarrow{PuT} PT^2 \xrightarrow{Pm} PT \\
 \text{id}
 \end{array} = \text{id}_\lambda$$

(W7)

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{id} \\
 TP \xrightarrow{TP\eta} TP^2 \xrightarrow{T\mu} TP \\
 \downarrow \lambda \quad \downarrow \lambda P \quad \downarrow \omega_4 \quad \downarrow \lambda \\
 PT \xrightarrow{PT\eta} PTP \xrightarrow{\omega_4} PT \\
 \downarrow \text{id} \quad \downarrow P\omega_2 \quad \downarrow P\lambda \quad \downarrow \text{id} \\
 PT \xrightarrow{P\eta T} P^2T \xrightarrow{\mu T} PT \\
 \text{id}
 \end{array} = \text{id}_\lambda$$

(W8)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{ccccc}
 & T^2P & \xrightarrow{T\lambda} & TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda T} & PT^2 \\
 & \uparrow T^2\eta & & \downarrow mP & & \downarrow \omega_3 \\
 T^2 & & & TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT \\
 & \downarrow m & & \uparrow T\eta & & \downarrow \omega_2 \\
 & T & \xrightarrow{\eta T} & & &
 \end{array}
 & = &
 \begin{array}{ccccc}
 & T^2P & \xrightarrow{T\lambda} & TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda T} & PT^2 \\
 & \uparrow T^2\eta & & \downarrow T\omega_2 & & \downarrow \omega_2 T \\
 T^2 & & & TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT \\
 & \downarrow m & & \uparrow T\eta T & & \downarrow \eta T^2 \\
 & T & \xrightarrow{\eta T} & & &
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

(W9)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& P & \\
\mu \nearrow & & \searrow Pu \\
P^2 & & TP \xrightarrow{\lambda} PT \\
& \searrow uP^2 & \downarrow \omega_1 \\
& TP^2 & \downarrow \omega_4 \\
& \xrightarrow{\lambda P} PTP & \xrightarrow{P\lambda} P^2T \\
& \nearrow T\mu & \nearrow \mu T
\end{array}
=
\begin{array}{ccc}
& P & \\
\mu \nearrow & & \searrow Pu \\
P^2 & & TP^2 \xrightarrow{\lambda P} PTP \xrightarrow{P\lambda} P^2T \\
& \searrow uP^2 & \downarrow \omega_1 P \quad \downarrow P\omega_1 \\
& & PT
\end{array}$$

(W10)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& P & \\
\eta \nearrow & & \searrow Pu \\
1 & & TP \xrightarrow{\lambda} PT \\
& \searrow u & \downarrow \omega_1 \\
& T & \downarrow \omega_2 \\
& \nearrow T\eta & \nearrow \eta T
\end{array}
=
\begin{array}{ccc}
& P & \\
\eta \nearrow & & \searrow Pu \\
1 & & PT \\
& \searrow u & \nearrow \eta T \\
& T &
\end{array}$$

We will leave the explanation of these redundant axioms until Subsection 5.5, as this explanation relies on the later mentioned decagon conditions.

Remark 4.1.5. Note that this is the best that one might hope for, in that only one compatibly axiom is needed between the pseudomonad morphism and opmorphism data. This is why the set of five axioms given here is expected to be minimal. Stated more precisely, this becomes the following result.

Theorem 4.1.6. A pseudodistributive law $(\lambda, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4) : TP \rightarrow PT$ is equivalently a pseudomonad morphism $(\lambda, \omega_1, \omega_3) : T \rightarrow T$ along P , and a pseudomonad opmorphism $(\lambda, \omega_2, \omega_4) : P \rightarrow P$ along T , such that ω_3 and ω_4 satisfy axiom (W5).

4.2. Decagon definition of pseudodistributive laws. The following is the definition of pseudodistributive law one finds working out the conditions on a pseudonatural transformation $\lambda : TP \rightarrow PT$ needed for extending a pseudomonad (T, u, m) to the Kleisli bicategory of a pseudomonad (P, η, μ) in pseudoextensive form. In practice one would likely not use this definition, but it will be needed for the later proofs and explanation of redundant coherence axioms.

Definition 4.2.1. A pseudodistributive law (in Kleisli-decagon form) between pseudomonads (T, u, m) and (P, η, μ) is a pseudonatural transformation $\lambda : TP \rightarrow PT$ and three invertible modifications comprising the two triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT \\
\omega_1 \swarrow & & \searrow \omega_2 \\
uP & \xrightarrow{P} & Pu \\
& & T
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
TP & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & PT \\
\omega_1 \swarrow & & \searrow \omega_2 \\
T\eta & \xrightarrow{T} & \eta T
\end{array}$$

and the decagon

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
TPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\lambda T} & TP^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{TP^2m} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{T\mu T} & TPT \\
\lambda TPT \downarrow & & & & & & \downarrow \lambda T \\
PT^2PT & & & & & & PT^2 \\
PmPT \downarrow & & \Downarrow \Omega & & & & \downarrow Pm \\
PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\lambda T} & P^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{P^2m} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} & PT
\end{array}$$

$$(D1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & \text{id} & & \\ & & & & \curvearrowright & & \\ TPT & \xrightarrow{T\eta PT} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & TP^2T \xrightarrow{T\mu T} TPT \\ \downarrow Tu^{PT} & & \downarrow TPuPT & & \downarrow TP\omega_1 T & & \downarrow TP^2uT \\ T^2PT & \xrightarrow{T\eta TPT} & TPPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\lambda T} & TP^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{TP^2m} & TP^2T \\ \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow \Downarrow \omega_2 TPT & & & & \downarrow \lambda T \\ T^2PT & \xrightarrow{\eta T^2 PT} & PT^2PT & & \downarrow \Downarrow \Omega & & PT^2 = \text{id}_{Pm \cdot \lambda T} \\ \downarrow mPT & & \downarrow PmPT & & & & \downarrow Pm \\ TPT & \xrightarrow{\eta TPT} & PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\lambda T} & P^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{P^2m} & P^2T \xrightarrow{\mu T} PT \\ \downarrow \lambda T & & \downarrow \eta PT^2 & & \downarrow \eta PT & & \downarrow \text{id} \\ & & PT^2 & \xrightarrow{Pm} & PT & & \end{array}$$

(D2)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
TPTPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\lambda T} & TPTP^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{TP\lambda P^2m} & TPTP^2T & \xrightarrow{TP\lambda\mu T} & TPTPT \\
\lambda TPTPT \downarrow & & \lambda TP^2T^2 \downarrow & & \lambda TP^2T \downarrow & & \lambda TPT \searrow \\
P^2TPTPT & \xrightarrow{P^2TP\lambda T} & P^2T^2P^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{P^2TP^2m} & P^2T^2P^2T & \xrightarrow{P^2T^2\mu T} & P^2T^2PT \\
PmPTPT \downarrow & & PmP^2T^2 \downarrow & & PmP^2T \downarrow & & PmPT \downarrow \\
PTPTPT & \xrightarrow{PTP\lambda T} & PTP^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{PTP^2m} & PTP^2T & \xrightarrow{PT\mu T} & PTPPT \\
P\lambda TPT \downarrow & & \Downarrow P\Omega & & P\lambda T \downarrow & & \Downarrow \Omega \\
P^2T^2PT & & & & P^2T^2 & & \\
P^2mPT \downarrow & & & & P^2m \downarrow & & \\
P^2TPT & \xrightarrow{P^2\lambda T} & P^3T^2 & \xrightarrow{P^3m} & P^3T & \xrightarrow{P\mu T} & P^2T \\
& \searrow \mu TPT & \searrow \mu PT^2 & \searrow \mu PT & \searrow \mu PT & \searrow \mu T & \\
& & PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\lambda T} & P^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{P^2m} & P^2T \xrightarrow{\mu T} PT
\end{array}$$

(D2)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
TPTPTPT & \xrightarrow{TPT\lambda T} & TPTP^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{TPT\mu T} & TPTPT & & \\
\downarrow \lambda TPTPT & \searrow T\lambda TPT & & & \downarrow T P \Omega & \searrow T P \lambda T & \\
PT^2PTPT & & TP^2T^2PT & & & & TP^2T^2 \\
\downarrow P_mPTPT & & \searrow TP^2_mPT & & & & \searrow TP^2_m \\
PTPTPT & & & & TP^2TPT & \xrightarrow{T P^2 \lambda T} & TP^3T^2 & \xrightarrow{TP^3_m} & TP^3T & \xrightarrow{TP_\mu T} & TP^2T \\
\downarrow P \lambda TPT & & \downarrow \Omega PT & & \downarrow T_\mu TPT & & \downarrow T_\mu PT^2 & & \downarrow T_\mu PT & & \downarrow T_\mu T \\
P^2T^2PT & & & & TPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP \lambda T} & TP^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{TP^2_m} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{T_\mu T} & TPT \\
& & & & \downarrow \lambda TPT & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \Omega & & \downarrow \lambda T \\
& & & & PT^2PT & & & & & & PT^2 \\
& & \searrow P^2_mPT & & \downarrow P_mPT & & & & & & \downarrow P_m \\
& & P^2TPT & & & & & & & & PT \\
& & & & \searrow \mu TPT & & & & & & \downarrow \mu T \\
& & & & PTPT & \xrightarrow{P \lambda T} & P^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{P^2_m} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} & PT
\end{array}$$

4.3. Pseudoalgebra definition of pseudodistributive laws. The following is intended to provide a definition of pseudodistributive laws involving a pseudoalgebra structure map α (with the pseudoalgebra data and axioms being derivable from the law). This is in the spirit of Marmolejo, Rosebrugh and Wood [15, Prop. 3.5] who in one dimension considered taking algebra structure maps as the data for a distributive law, though directly assuming the algebra axioms.

Definition 4.3.1. A *pseudodistributive law (in pseudoalgebra form)* between pseudomonads (T, u, m) and (P, η, μ) is a pseudonatural transformation $\alpha: TPT \rightarrow PT$ and three invertible modifications

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 TPT & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & PT & & T \xrightarrow{Tu} T^2 \\
 \uparrow uPT & \nearrow \psi & \uparrow \text{id} & & \downarrow \eta T \\
 PT & & & & PT \xleftarrow{\alpha} TPT \\
 & & & & \downarrow T\eta T \\
 & & & & PTPT \xrightarrow{P\alpha} P^2T \xrightarrow{\mu T} PT
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccccc}
 TPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\alpha} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{T\mu T} & TPT \\
 \downarrow \alpha PT & & \downarrow \Psi & & \downarrow \alpha \\
 PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\alpha} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} & PT
 \end{array}$$

satisfying the two coherence axioms

(M1)

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & \text{id} & & & & \\
 & \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowright & & & \\
 TPT & \xrightarrow{T\eta PT} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{T\mu T} & TPT \\
 & \searrow TuPT & \downarrow TPuPT & \downarrow \Psi TP\psi & \downarrow TP\alpha & \downarrow \Psi & \downarrow \alpha \\
 & T^2PT & \xrightarrow{T\eta TPT} & TPTPT & & & \\
 & \downarrow \Psi \xi PT & \downarrow \alpha PT & & & & \\
 TPT & \xrightarrow{\eta TPT} & PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\alpha} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} & PT \\
 & \searrow \alpha & \searrow \eta PT & \searrow \text{id} & & & \\
 & PT & & & & &
 \end{array}
 \end{array}
 = \text{id}_\alpha$$

and
(M2)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 TPTPTPT & \xrightarrow{TPPT\alpha} & TPTPT^2T & \xrightarrow{TPPT\mu T} & TPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\alpha} & TP^2T \\
 \downarrow \alpha PTPT & & \downarrow \alpha P^2T & & \downarrow \alpha PT & & \downarrow T\mu T \\
 PTPTPT & \xrightarrow{PTP\alpha} & PTPT^2T & \xrightarrow{PT\mu T} & PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\alpha} & TP^2T \\
 & \searrow P\alpha PT & \downarrow \Psi P\Psi & & \searrow P\mu T & \downarrow \Psi & \downarrow \alpha \\
 & P^2TPT & \xrightarrow{P^2\alpha} & P^3T & \xrightarrow{P\mu T} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} PT \\
 & \searrow \mu TPT & \searrow \mu PT & \searrow P\alpha & \searrow \mu T & & \\
 & PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\alpha} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} & PT &
 \end{array}$$

is equal to

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 TPTPTPT & \xrightarrow{TPTP\alpha} & TPTP^2T & \xrightarrow{TPT\mu T} & TPTPT & & \\
 \downarrow \alpha PTPT & \searrow TP\alpha PT & & \downarrow TP\Psi & \searrow TP\alpha & & \\
 & & TP^2TPT & \xrightarrow{TP^2\alpha} & TP^3T & \xrightarrow{TP\mu T} & TP^2T \\
 & & \downarrow \Psi PT & \searrow T\mu TPT & \searrow T\mu PT & & \\
 & & & & TPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\alpha} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{T\mu T} & TPT \\
 & & & & \downarrow \alpha PT & & \downarrow \Psi & & \downarrow \alpha \\
 & & & & PTPPT & \xrightarrow{P\alpha} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} & PT \\
 & & & & \downarrow \mu TPT & & & & \\
 & & & & & & & &
 \end{array}$$

4.4. No-iteration definition of pseudodistributive laws. The following defines a pseudodistributive law in terms of 2-pasting operators $(-)^{\lambda}_{X,Y}$, which are families of functors $\mathcal{C}(X, PTY) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(TX, PTY)$ induced by pasting with a diagram of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \mathcal{C} & \\
 PT \nearrow & \Downarrow \alpha & \searrow T \\
 \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{PT} & \mathcal{C}
 \end{array}$$

Equivalently, one may define a 2-pasting operator using a (strict) 2 dimensional version of [17, Definition 2.1]. Such a definition is useful in that it more readily generalizes to the relative case [4].

Definition 4.4.1. A 2-pasting operator in a tricategory \mathcal{K} ,

$$(-)^{\#} : \mathcal{K}(C, D)(1_C, s) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(C, E)(t, u)$$

is a family of functors

$$(-)^{\#}_{f,g} : \mathcal{K}(C, D)(f, sg) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(C, E)(tf, ug)$$

such that for all $\vartheta: f \Rightarrow sg$,

- (1) (whiskering axiom) we have $\vartheta^{\#}h = (\vartheta h)^{\#}$ for all $h: A \rightarrow C$;
- (2) (blistering axiom) we have $\vartheta^{\#}t\xi = (\vartheta\xi)^{\#}$ for all $\xi: p \Rightarrow f$.

Remark 4.4.2. For simplicity, we will avoid considering “pseudo”-pasting operators where the above equations only hold up to invertible 3-cells.

We can now give the no-iteration definition of a pseudodistributive law, which involves no iteration of the pseudomonads T and P . The reader will note the implicit use of the blistering axiom of Definition 4.4.1 in the following definition.

Definition 4.4.3. A pseudodistributive law (in no-iteration form) between pseudomonads (T, u, m) and $(P, \eta, (-)^P)$ on a 2-category \mathcal{C} is a 2-pasting operator

$$(-)^{\lambda}_{X,Y} : \mathcal{C}(X, PTY) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(TX, PTY), \quad X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$$

along with for all $f: X \rightarrow PTY$ and $g: Y \rightarrow PTZ$ a family of invertible 2-cells

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{f} & PTY & & TX & \xrightarrow{((g^\lambda)^P f)^\lambda} & PTZ \\
 uX \downarrow & \Downarrow \psi^f & & \eta TX \left(\begin{array}{c} TX \\ \xleftarrow{\xi^X} \\ PTX \end{array} \right) (\eta TX \cdot uX)^\lambda & & f^\lambda \downarrow & \Downarrow \Psi^{g,f} \\
 TX & \xrightarrow{f^\lambda} & PTY & & PTY & \xrightarrow{(g^\lambda)^P} & PTZ
 \end{array}$$

natural in f and g , such that for all $g: X \rightarrow PTY$ we have

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{(I1)} \quad \begin{array}{ccccc}
 TX & \xrightarrow{g^\lambda} & PTY & & \\
 \parallel & \Downarrow (\psi^g)^\lambda & \parallel & & \\
 TX & \xrightarrow{(g^\lambda uX)^\lambda} & PTY & & \\
 \parallel & \Downarrow ((g^\lambda)^P \cdot \eta TX \cdot uX)^\lambda & \parallel & & \\
 TX & \xrightarrow{((g^\lambda)^P \cdot \eta TX \cdot uX)^\lambda} & PTY & = & id_{g^\lambda} \\
 \parallel & \Downarrow \Psi^{g, \eta TX \cdot uX} & \parallel & & \\
 TX & \xrightarrow{(\eta TX \cdot uX)^\lambda} PTX \xrightarrow{(g^\lambda)^P} & PTY & & \\
 \parallel & \Downarrow \xi^X & \parallel & & \\
 TX & \xrightarrow{\eta TX} PTX \xrightarrow{(g^\lambda)^P} & PTY & & \\
 & \searrow g^\lambda & & &
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

and for all $f: X \rightarrow PTY$, $g: Y \rightarrow PTZ$ and $h: Z \rightarrow PTW$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{(I2)} \quad \begin{array}{ccccc}
 TX & \xrightarrow{(((((h^\lambda)^P g)^\lambda)^P f)^\lambda)} & PTW & & \\
 \parallel & \Downarrow (\Psi^{(h^\lambda)^P g, f})^P & \parallel & & \\
 TX & \xrightarrow{f^\lambda} PTY \xrightarrow{((h^\lambda)^P g)^\lambda} & PTW & & \\
 \parallel & \parallel & \parallel & & \\
 TX & \xrightarrow{f^\lambda} PTY \xrightarrow{((h^\lambda)^P g)^\lambda} & PTW & & \\
 \parallel & \parallel & \parallel & & \\
 TX & \xrightarrow{f^\lambda} PTY \xrightarrow{(g^\lambda)^P} PTZ \xrightarrow{(h^\lambda)^P} & PTW & &
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

is equal to

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
TX & \xrightarrow{\left(\left(\left((h^\lambda)^P g\right)^\lambda\right)^P f\right)^\lambda} & PTW \\
\parallel & \Downarrow (\Psi^{h,g})^P f^\lambda & \parallel \\
TX & \xrightarrow{\left(\left((h^\lambda)^P g^\lambda\right)^P f\right)^\lambda} & PTW \\
\parallel & & \parallel \\
TX & \xrightarrow{\left((h^\lambda)^P (g^\lambda)^P f\right)^\lambda} & PTW \\
\parallel & \Downarrow \Psi^{h,(g^\lambda)^P f} & \parallel \\
TX & \xrightarrow{\left((g^\lambda)^P f\right)} PTZ \xrightarrow{(h^\lambda)^P} & PTW \\
\parallel & \Downarrow \Psi^{g,f} & \parallel \\
TX & \xrightarrow{f^\lambda} PTY \xrightarrow{(g^\lambda)^P} PTZ \xrightarrow{(h^\lambda)^P} & PTW
\end{array}$$

5. EQUIVALENCE OF PRESENTATIONS OF PSEUDODISTRIBUTIVE LAWS

As all four of our definitions of pseudodistributive laws are new, we must justify them by showing they are equivalent to a pseudodistributive law in the sense of Marmolejo [14]. This is the reason for proving the following theorem, which makes use of the equivalence between Marmolejo's definition of pseudodistributive law and extensions of a pseudomonad to the Kleisli bicategory shown in [3].

Theorem 5.0.1. *Given two pseudomonads (T, u, m) and (P, η, μ) on a 2-category \mathcal{C} , the following are in equivalence:*

- (1) *a pseudodistributive law $\lambda: TP \rightarrow PT$ in pseudomonoidal form;*
- (2) *a pseudodistributive law $\lambda: TP \rightarrow PT$ in Kleisli-decagon form;*
- (3) *a pseudodistributive law $\alpha: TPT \rightarrow PT$ in pseudoalgebra form;*
- (4) *a pseudodistributive law $(-)^{\lambda}: \mathcal{C}(-, PT-) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(T-, PT-)$ in no-iteration form;*
- (5) *an extension of (T, u, m) to a pseudomonad on the Kleisli bicategory of (P, η, μ) .*

We will give a sketch proof of this theorem by constructing functors as in the below diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
(5.1) & \lambda-8 & \xrightarrow{(i)} & \lambda-5 & \xrightarrow{(ii)} & \lambda\text{-dec} \\
& \uparrow \text{equiv} & & & & \downarrow (iii) \\
& & & & & \alpha \xrightarrow{(iv)} (-)^{\lambda} \\
& & & & & \downarrow (v) \\
& \tilde{T} \text{ monoidal} & \xrightarrow{\text{equiv}} & \tilde{T} \text{ no-iteration} & &
\end{array}$$

and explaining why these are all equivalences. The top row lists Marmolejo and Wood's 8-axiom presentation, our 5-axiom reduction and the decagon presentation. The α denotes the pseudoalgebra presentation and $(-)^{\lambda}$ the no-iteration version. The bottom row references extensions of T to the Kleisli bicategory of P , presented

in monoidal or no-iteration form. We label by 'equiv' those functors which are well known to be equivalences by results of Marmolejo and Wood [16, 18], and (i) to (v) the remaining functors we must define and show are equivalences.

Remark 5.0.2. We will not burden this paper with the definitions of morphisms of pseudodistributive laws, as these are simply modifications $\lambda \Rightarrow \lambda'$ or $\alpha \Rightarrow \alpha'$ such that the obvious pasting diagrams agree.

5.1. Equivalence of pseudomonoidal and decagon definitions. In order to show the equivalence (ii) of the monoidal and decagon definitions, we define the assignment (ii) and its inverse (ii)*.

Lemma 5.1.1. *For a given λ , the data $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4)$ with axioms (W1) and (W2) is in bijection with the data $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \Omega)$ with axiom (D1).*

Proof. From the modifications comprising the pentagons ω_3 and ω_4 , the decagon Ω is constructed as the pasting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 TPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\lambda T} & TP^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{TP^2m} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{T\mu T} & TPT \\
 \lambda TPT \downarrow & & \lambda PT^2 \downarrow & & \lambda PT \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 PT^2PT & \xrightarrow{PT\lambda T} & PTPT^2 & \xrightarrow{PTPm} & PTPT & \Downarrow_{\omega_4 T} & \downarrow \lambda T \\
 PmPT \downarrow & & P\lambda T^2 \downarrow & & P\lambda T \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & \Downarrow_{P\omega_3 T} & P^2T^3 & \xrightarrow{P^2Tm} & P^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{\mu T^2} & PT^2 \\
 & P^2mT \downarrow & P^2m \downarrow & & P^2m \downarrow & & \downarrow Pm \\
 PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\lambda T} & P^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{P^2m} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} & PT
 \end{array}$$

Conversely, given the decagon Ω one recovers the pentagon ω_4 as

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & T\mu & & \\
 & & & & \text{id} & & \\
 & & & & \text{TP} & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow TPu & & \lambda \\
 TP^2 & \xrightarrow{TP^2u} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{TPuPT} & TPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\lambda T} & TP^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{TP^2m} & TP^2T & \xrightarrow{T\mu T} & TPT & & PT \\
 \lambda P \downarrow & & \lambda PT \downarrow & & \lambda TPT \downarrow & & & & & & \downarrow \lambda T & & \downarrow PTu \\
 PTP & \xrightarrow{PTPu} & PTPT & \xrightarrow{PTuPT} & PT^2PT & & & & & & PT^2 & & PT \\
 P\lambda \searrow & & PmPT \downarrow & & \text{id} & & & & & & \downarrow Pm & & \text{id} \\
 & & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\lambda T} & P^2T^2 & \xrightarrow{P^2m} & P^2T & \xrightarrow{\mu T} & PT & & \\
 & & P^2Tu \searrow & & \text{id} & & & & & & & & \\
 & & & & & & & & & & & &
 \end{array}$$

\Downarrow_{Ω}

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & \text{id} & & & & \\
& & \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowright & & \\
& TPT & \xrightarrow{TPTu} & TPT^2 & \xrightarrow{TPm} & TPT & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \\
& \nearrow T\lambda & & \nearrow T\lambda T & \searrow T\eta PT^2 & \searrow T\eta PT & \\
T^2P & \xrightarrow{T^2Pu} & T^2PT & \xrightarrow{T\eta TPT} & TPTPT & \xrightarrow{TP\lambda T} & TP^2T^2 \xrightarrow{TP^2m} TP^2T \xrightarrow{T\mu T} TPT \\
\downarrow mP & & \downarrow mPT & \searrow \Downarrow \omega_2 TPT & \downarrow \lambda TPT & & \downarrow \lambda T \\
& & & & PT^2PT & & \\
& & & & \downarrow PmPT & & \Downarrow \Omega \\
TP & \xrightarrow{TPu} & TPT & & & & PT^2 \\
\downarrow \lambda & & \downarrow \lambda T & \searrow \eta TPT & & & \downarrow Pm \\
PT & \xrightarrow{PTu} & PT^2 & \xrightarrow{Pm} & PTPT & \xrightarrow{P\lambda T} & P^2T^2 \xrightarrow{P^2m} P^2T \xrightarrow{\mu T} PT \\
& \searrow \text{id} & \searrow Pm & \searrow \eta PT^2 & \searrow \eta PT & \searrow \text{id} & \\
& & & & PT & &
\end{array}$$

Proof. We need only note the fact that axiom (D2) involves only the decagons (which are constructed from only the pentagons), and so it is routine to check that (D2) follows from the axioms (W3), (W4), (W5) which concern the coherence conditions of only pentagons. The converse verification of the coherence axioms is a standard argument, following from the fact that in the presence of MacLane's triangle and pentagon equations 'all diagrams commute'. \square

In fact because 'all diagrams commute' we know all eight (or even ten) coherence axioms are derivable from these triangle and pentagon equations, thus we also have the following corollary.

5.2. Decagons to pseudoalgebras to no-iteration forms. We now define (iii) and (v), and show these are equivalences. The construction (iii) is the following simple rewriting.

Proof. Given a $\lambda: TP \rightarrow PT$ the resulting $\alpha: TPT \rightarrow PT$ is given as the composite

$$TPT \xrightarrow{\lambda T} PT^2 \xrightarrow{Pm} PT$$

With this rewriting, it is clear how one constructs modifications ψ_1, ψ_2, Ψ from the given data $\omega_1, \omega_2, \Omega$. \square

We now see how a pseudodistributive law $(\alpha, \psi_1, \psi_2, \Psi)$ in pseudoalgebra form gives rise to a pseudomonad on the Kleisli bicategory, defining (v) .

Proposition 5.2.2. *A pseudodistributive law $(\alpha, \psi_1, \psi_2, \Psi)$ in pseudoalgebra form gives rise to a pseudomonad \tilde{T} extending T to the Kleisli bicategory of P .*

Proof. Suppose we are given a pseudodistributive law $\alpha: TPT \rightarrow PT$ in pseudoalgebra form. We will define a pseudomonad \tilde{T} in pseudoextensive form (as in Definition 3.1.4) on the Kleisli bicategory of (P, η, μ) . We define \tilde{T} to have the same action on objects as T . For each $X \in \mathbf{Kl}(P)$, we take our unit $\tilde{u}_X: X \rightsquigarrow TX$ to be the composite

$$X \xrightarrow{u_X} TX \xrightarrow{\eta_{TX}} PTX$$

Each functor $\mathbf{Kl}(P)(X, TY) \rightarrow \mathbf{Kl}(P)(TX, TY)$, that is $\mathcal{C}(X, PTY) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(TX, PTY)$, is defined by sending an $f: X \rightarrow PTY$ to $\alpha Y \cdot Tf: TX \rightarrow PTY$. For each $f: X \rightarrow PTY$ we take the 2-cell $\phi_f: f \Rightarrow f^{\tilde{T}} \cdot \tilde{u}_X$ as the pasting

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & PTY & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & PTY & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & PTY \\ & \searrow u_X & \downarrow u_{PTY} & \Downarrow \psi_Y & \downarrow \eta_{PTY} & \searrow \mu_{PTY} & \\ & TX & \xrightarrow{Tf} & TPTY & \xrightarrow{\eta_{TPTY}} & P^2TY & \\ & \searrow \eta_{TX} & \downarrow \eta_{TPTY} & \searrow P\alpha_Y & \downarrow P\alpha_Y & & \\ & PTX & \xrightarrow{PTf} & PTPTY & \xrightarrow{P\alpha_Y} & P^2TY & \end{array}$$

for each X we take the 2-cell $\theta_X: (\tilde{u}_X)^{\tilde{T}} \Rightarrow \text{id}_{TX}$ to be ξX and for all $f: X \rightarrow PTY$ and $g: Y \rightarrow PTZ$ we take $\delta_{g,f}: (g^{\tilde{T}} \cdot f)^{\tilde{T}} \Rightarrow g^{\tilde{T}} \cdot f^{\tilde{T}}$ to be

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} TX & \xrightarrow{Tf} & TPTY & \xrightarrow{TPTg} & TPTPTZ & \xrightarrow{TP\alpha_Z} & TP^2TZ & \xrightarrow{T\mu_{TZ}} & TPTZ \\ & & \downarrow \alpha_Y & & \downarrow \alpha_{PTZ} & & \Downarrow \Psi_Z & & \downarrow \alpha_Z \\ & & PTY & \xrightarrow{PTg} & PTPTZ & \xrightarrow{P\alpha_Z} & P^2TZ & \xrightarrow{\mu_{TZ}} & PTZ \end{array}$$

Note that technically there is no real choice of the pseudomonad data of \tilde{T} here, as it is forced by the compatibility conditions required for an extension to the Kleisli bicategory. Naturality is clear in the above definitions. Moreover, the two axioms (M1) and (M2) ensure the two coherence conditions of a pseudomonad in no-iteration form are satisfied. \square

5.3. Equivalence of decagon and pseudoalgebra forms.

Corollary 5.3.1. *The functor (iii) and thus also (v) define equivalences.*

Proof. Note that the diagram (5.1) pseudocommutes, and so the composite

$$\lambda \text{ dec} \xrightarrow{(iii)} \alpha \longrightarrow \lambda \text{ dec}$$

is isomorphic to the identity, where the second arrow denotes (v) composed with the other equivalences. The more complex part is checking that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\longrightarrow \lambda \text{ dec} \xrightarrow{(iii)} \alpha \\ \alpha &\longmapsto \alpha \cdot TPu \longmapsto Pm \cdot (\alpha \cdot TPu) T \end{aligned}$$

is also isomorphic to the identity. It is clear that this identification rests on the pseudocommutativity of the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} TPT^2 & \xrightarrow{\alpha T} & PT^2 \\ T P m \downarrow & & \downarrow P m \\ TPT & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & PT \end{array}$$

but this is not directly clear from the axioms on α . To see this square pseudocommutes we note α gives rise to a pseudomonad \tilde{T} , and this pseudomonad necessarily arises from some pseudodistributive law $\lambda': TP \rightarrow PT$. By identifying the pseudomonads arising from α and λ' , we see α is isomorphic to $Pm \cdot \lambda' T$, and the pseudocommutativity of the above square is clear when written in terms of λ' . \square

5.4. Equivalence of pseudoalgebra and no-iteration forms. We now finish the proof of Theorem 5.0.1, by giving the isomorphism (iv) of the pseudoalgebra and no-iteration formulations of a pseudodistributive law. Note if we used the weaker “pseudo”-pasting operators this would only be an equivalence.

Proposition 5.4.1. *The pseudoalgebra and no-iteration formulations of a pseudodistributive law are in isomorphism.*

Proof. Firstly, note that given a no-iteration pseudodistributive law $(-)^{\lambda}$ we may take f and g to be identities. From this the data and coherence conditions of the pseudoalgebra version are recovered. Note also that ψ_1 , ψ_2 and Ψ become modifications by a similar argument to [18, Prop. 3.4 and 3.5].

Conversely, given the pseudoalgebra version one will recover the no-iteration version by defining the pasting operator $(-)^{\lambda} : \mathcal{C}(-, PT-) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(T-, PT-)$ to send an $f : X \rightarrow PTY$ to the composite

$$TX \xrightarrow{Tf} TPTY \xrightarrow{\alpha Y} PTY$$

It is then easy to construct ψ_1^f from ψ_1 , ξ^X from ξ , and $\Psi_{f,g}$ from Ψ . The coherence conditions are straightforward but tedious to verify. That these processes are inverse to each other is ultimately an application of the 2-dimensional version of [17, Lemma 2.2]. \square

5.5. Explanation of redundant coherence axioms. Let us now consider the redundant axioms of a pseudomonad in no-iteration form as in Remark 3.1.5. If one works through the above proof, they will see that the leftmost axiom of Remark 3.1.5, which asks that a ϕ (constructed from a ψ and thus a ω_1) followed by a θ (constructed from a ψ and thus a ω_2) is the identity, is equivalent to the condition (W10).

Moreover, it is not hard to see the remaining two axioms of Remark 3.1.5 are respectively equivalent to the two conditions (W8) and (W9), if one replaces the

pentagons ω_3 and ω_4 by their definitions in terms of the decagon Ω (which may be identified with the hexagon Ψ) as in Lemma 5.1.1.

Finally, the redundancy of (W6) and (W7) is shown directly by Marmolejo and Wood [16]. However, this result can be seen more easily by noting that pseudomonad morphisms can be seen as instances of pseudoalgebras (as is well known in one dimension [15, 17]), and that one of the unitality axioms for a pseudoalgebra is redundant [13, Lemma 9.1]. Curiously the methods of this paper give another proof of the redundancy, though this proof would be less strong as it uses additional pseudodistributive law axioms.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. BECK, *Distributive laws*, in Sem. on Triples and Categorical Homology Theory (ETH, Zürich, 1966/67), Springer, Berlin, 1969, pp. 119–140.
- [2] G. L. CATTANI AND G. WINSKEL, *Profunctors, open maps and bisimulation*, Math. Structures Comput. Sci., 15 (2005), pp. 553–614.
- [3] E. CHENG, M. HYLAND, AND J. POWER, *Pseudo-distributive laws*, Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, 83 (2003).
- [4] M. FIORE, N. GAMBINO, M. HYLAND, AND G. WINSKEL, *Relative pseudomonads, Kleisli bicategories, and substitution monoidal structures*, Selecta Math. (N.S.), 24 (2018), pp. 2791–2830.
- [5] N. GAMBINO AND G. LOBBIA, *On the formal theory of pseudomonads and pseudodistributive laws*, Theory Appl. Categ., 37 (2021), pp. No. 2, 14–56.
- [6] M. HYLAND, G. PLOTKIN, AND J. POWER, *Combining Computational Effects: Commutativity and Sum*, Springer US, Boston, MA, 2002, pp. 474–484.
- [7] G. M. KELLY, *On MacLane’s conditions for coherence of natural associativities, commutativities, etc.*, J. Algebra, 1 (1964), pp. 397–402.
- [8] ———, *Coherence theorems for lax algebras and for distributive laws*, in Category Seminar (Proc. Sem., Sydney, 1972/1973), 1974, pp. 281–375. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 420.
- [9] ———, *On clubs and doctrines*, in Category Seminar (Proc. Sem., Sydney, 1972/1973), Springer, Berlin, 1974, pp. 181–256. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 420.
- [10] A. KOCK, *Monads for which structures are adjoint to units*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 104 (1995), pp. 41–59.
- [11] S. LACK AND R. STREET, *On monads and warpings*, Cah. Topol. Géom. Différ. Catég., 55 (2014), pp. 244–266.
- [12] E. G. MANES, *Algebraic theories*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1976. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 26.
- [13] F. MARMOLEJO, *Doctrines whose structure forms a fully faithful adjoint string*, Theory Appl. Categ., 3 (1997), pp. No. 2, 24–44.
- [14] ———, *Distributive laws for pseudomonads*, Theory Appl. Categ., 5 (1999), pp. No. 5, 91–147.
- [15] F. MARMOLEJO, R. D. ROSEBRUGH, AND R. J. WOOD, *A basic distributive law*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 168 (2002), pp. 209–226. Category theory 1999 (Coimbra).
- [16] F. MARMOLEJO AND R. J. WOOD, *Coherence for pseudodistributive laws revisited*, Theory Appl. Categ., 20 (2008), pp. No. 5, 74–84.
- [17] ———, *Monads as extension systems—no iteration is necessary*, Theory Appl. Categ., 24 (2010), pp. No. 4, 84–113.
- [18] ———, *No-iteration pseudomonads*, Theory Appl. Categ., 28 (2013), pp. No. 14, 371–402.
- [19] M. TANAKA, *Pseudo-Distributive Laws and a Unified Framework for Variable Binding*, PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2004.
- [20] M. TANAKA AND J. POWER, *Pseudo-distributive laws and axiomatics for variable binding*, Higher-Order and Symbolic Computation, 19 (2006).
- [21] C. WALKER, *Distributive laws via admissibility*, Appl. Categ. Structures, 27 (2019), pp. 567–617.
- [22] R. F. C. WALTERS, *A categorical approach to universal algebra*, PhD thesis, Australian National University, 1970.
- [23] V. ZÖBERLEIN, *Doctrines on 2-categories*, Math. Z., 148 (1976), pp. 267–279.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MASARYK UNIVERSITY, KOTLÁŘSKÁ 2, BRNO
61137, CZECH REPUBLIC

Email address: `charles.walker.math@gmail.com`