

# CLONING SYSTEMS AND ACTION OPERADS

JAVIER ARAMAYONA, FEDERICO CANTERO MORÁN, VÍCTOR CARMONA,  
AND JAVIER J. GUTIÉRREZ

ABSTRACT. Action operads and cloning systems are, respectively, the main ingredients in Thumann’s and Witzel–Zaremsky’s approaches for axiomatically constructing Thompson-like groups. In this paper, we prove that action operads are equivalent to cloning systems that admit a certain extra structure, and which we call *restricted operadic* cloning systems. In addition, we describe their relation with crossed interval groups and product categories.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The umbrella term *Thompson-like groups* makes reference to a vast family of groups that are in some way reminiscent of one of the classical groups  $F$ ,  $T$  and  $V$  of R. Thompson [CFP96]. Apart from these three groups, prominent examples of Thompson-like groups include Stein’s groups of PL homeomorphisms [Ste92]; Guba–Sapir’s diagram groups [GS97]; Brin’s higher-dimensional Thompson groups [Bri04]; Belk–Forrest’s rearrangement groups of fractals [BF19]; the braided Thompson group of Brin [Bri07] and Dehornoy [Deh06]; Wahl’s ribbon Thompson group [Wah01]; the *asymptotic mapping class groups* of surfaces and higher-dimensional manifolds [FK04, FK08, FK09, AF21, ABF<sup>+</sup>21, GLU22], etc.

As may be appreciated from the above list of examples, Thompson-like groups arise in a variety of different ways. With this motivation, the independent results of Witzel–Zaremsky [WZ18] and Thumann [Thu17] offer unified frameworks for constructing Thompson-like groups. Witzel–Zaremsky achieve this in terms of *cloning systems*, which provide a recipe for “twisting” a direct limit of groups into a Thompson-like group. In turn, Thumann [Thu17] uses the theory of *operads* in order to construct Thompson-like groups, which in this setting arise as the fundamental group of a certain category associated to an operad (cf. [FL10]).

The purpose of this paper is to establish a dictionary between cloning systems and a certain type of operads called *action operads* [Zha11, CG14, Yos18, Yau22], which we consider without constants (see Section 3 for definitions). Our first result is the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Every action operad gives rise to a cloning system.*

---

*Date:* July 14, 2023.

J.A. was supported by grant CEX2019-000904-S funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by grant PGC2018-101179-B-I00. F.C. was supported by grant SI3/PJI/2021-00505 from Comunidad de Madrid. V.C. was partially supported by grants PID2020-117971GB-C21 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033, US-1263032 (US/JUNTA/FEDER, UE), P20 01109 (JUNTA/FEDER, UE) and FPU17/01871. J.J.G. was supported by grants PID2020-117971GB-C22 and CEX2020-001084-M funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and grant 2021-SGR-00697 funded by the Catalan Government.


In fact, we precisely determine to which extent a converse to the above theorem holds; more concretely, we will prove that every action operad comes from a cloning system that admits a certain extra structure, and that we call *restricted operadic cloning system*, see Section 2. We stress that many of the known cloning systems are, in fact, operadic and bilateral; see Section 2 for examples and non-examples. In this language, our main results may be summarized as follows:

**Theorem 1.2.** *There is an explicit bijective correspondence between action operads and restricted operadic cloning systems.*

As will become apparent, our methods actually yield the equivalence of the categories of restricted operadic cloning systems and action operads, respectively.

There is a wider class of cloning systems that yield operads: the *operadic* cloning systems. In fact, operads that arise from these cloning systems comply with all the roles of action operads (i.e., operads that support the equivariance of other operads). These will be defined in Section 3 with the name of *general action operads*.

**Further results.** Action operads have been related to crossed simplicial groups in [Zha11] and to crossed interval groups in [Yos18]. In Section 7, we review this relationship and we extend it to cloning systems. Finally, in Section 8 we introduce a third construction using PROs (*product categories*) which also yields operadic cloning systems. The following diagram summarizes the relation between all of these results:



**Future work.** This is the first of two papers devoted to the relation between operads and Thompson groups. In a forthcoming paper we will show that, if  $A$  is an action operad and  $C$  is its associated cloning system, then the fundamental group of a certain  $A$ -operad is isomorphic to the Thompson group of the cloning system  $C$ .

**Plan of the paper.** In Section 2 we give a brief introduction to cloning systems, and give some examples. Section 3 offers an abridged overview of action operads. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2 in the special case of braid groups. These ideas are then generalized in Sections 5 and 6. Finally, in Sections 7 and 8, we will give further interpretations of our results in terms of crossed interval groups and PROs, respectively.

**Acknowledgements.** This project started with some informal conversations at the *IX Encuentro de Jóvenes Topólogos*, held in Seville in 2021. We are grateful to the organization for their hospitality and support. The second author thanks Aníbal Medina for a very enlightning conversation about Joyal duality.

## 2. CLONING SYSTEMS

In this section we offer a brief introduction to Witzel–Zaremsky’s cloning systems [WZ18], and define their *bilateral* counterparts; we refer the interested reader to [WZ18, Zar18] for a detailed account on cloning systems.

We start with a specific example, which appears as Example 2.9 in [WZ18], and that will serve to establish some notation for the sequel. In what follows,  $\Sigma_n$  stands for the symmetric group on  $n$  elements.

**Example 2.1** (Cloning system for symmetric groups). Let  $\Sigma_\bullet = \{\Sigma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be the family of symmetric groups. For every  $n \geq 1$ , let  $\lambda_n : \Sigma_n \rightarrow \Sigma_{n+1}$  be the injective homomorphism obtained by fixing the last element, that is,

$$\lambda_n(\sigma)(i) = \sigma(i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } \lambda_n(\sigma)(n+1) = n+1,$$

for every  $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$ . For every  $n \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , let  $c_j^n : \Sigma_n \rightarrow \Sigma_{n+1}$  be the injective map given by, thinking about permutations pictorially as strand diagrams, “repeating” the  $j$ -th strand; that is,

$$c_j^n(\sigma)(i) = \begin{cases} \sigma(i) & \text{if } i \leq j \text{ and } \sigma(i) \leq \sigma(j), \\ \sigma(i) + 1 & \text{if } i < j \text{ and } \sigma(i) > \sigma(j), \\ \sigma(i-1) & \text{if } i > j+1 \text{ and } \sigma(i-1) < \sigma(j), \\ \sigma(i-1) + 1 & \text{if } i \geq j+1 \text{ and } \sigma(i-1) \geq \sigma(j), \end{cases}$$

for every  $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$ . As shown in [WZ18, Example 2.9] the families of morphisms  $\lambda$  and  $c$  interact with each other, and satisfy certain obvious compatibility properties, detailed in [WZ18, Proposition 2.6]. The *cloning system* for the family of symmetric groups is the triple  $(\Sigma_\bullet, \lambda, c)$ , subject to these compatibility conditions.

The maps  $c_j$  above are called *cloning maps*, for obvious reasons; note that they are not group homomorphisms. The notion of a cloning system is a generalization of the above example to arbitrary families of groups.

**Definition 2.2.** A *cloning system* is a quadruple  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \kappa, \pi)$ , where

- $\mathbf{G}_\bullet = \{\mathbf{G}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a family of groups,
- $\iota = \{\iota_n : \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n+1}\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a family of injective homomorphisms,
- $\kappa = \{\kappa_j^n : \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n+1}\}_{n \geq 1, 1 \leq j \leq n}$  is a family of maps, called *cloning maps*, and
- $\pi = \{\pi_n : \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a homomorphism,

subject to the following compatibility conditions:

- (i)  $\pi_{n+1} \circ \iota_n = \lambda_n \circ \pi_n$ , for all  $n \geq 1$ ;
- (ii)  $(\pi_{n+1}(\kappa_j^n(g)))(i) = (c_j^n(\pi_n(g)))(i)$ , for all  $n \geq 1$  and all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , all  $i \neq j, j+1$ , all  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$ ;
- (iii)  $\iota_{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n = \kappa_j^{n+1} \circ \iota_n$ , for all  $n \geq 1$  and all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ;
- (iv)  $\kappa_{j+1}^{n+1} \circ \kappa_l^n = \kappa_l^{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n$ , for all  $n$  and all  $l < j \leq n$ ;
- (v)  $\kappa_j^n(g \cdot h) = \kappa_{\pi_n(h)(j)}^n(g) \cdot \kappa_j^n(h)$ , for all  $n$ , all  $g, h \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and all  $j \leq n$ .

**Remark 2.3.** It is important to note some differences between Definition 2.2 and the definition of cloning system of [WZ18, Zar18]. First, we use a functional convention for composition of maps, that is, the composition of two functions  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $g : Y \rightarrow Z$  is denoted by  $g \circ f$ , defined as  $(g \circ f)(x) = g(f(x))$ . Second, the original definition of cloning system in [Zar18] requires injective homomorphisms

$\iota_{n,m}: \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_m$  for every  $m > n \geq 1$ ; however, our Definition 2.2 implies that it suffices to consider injective maps  $\iota_{n,n+1} = \iota_n$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .

Witzel and Zaremsky observe that cloning systems often satisfy the following strengthened version of these axioms.

- (iv+)  $\kappa_{j+1}^{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n = \kappa_j^{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n$ , for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ;
- (vii)  $\iota_{n+1} \circ \iota_n = \kappa_{n+1}^{n+1} \circ \iota_n$ , for all  $n \geq 1$ ;

**Remark 2.4.** Condition (vii) was part of the original definition of cloning system: In [WZ18, Definition 2.18] the cloning maps  $\kappa$  are required to be a *family of cloning maps*, which must satisfy two conditions presented at the beginning of page 18 in that paper. These two conditions correspond to Conditions (iii) and (vii) in this article.

In [WZ18, page 17] (see also [Bri07]) the Hedge monoid  $\mathcal{H}$  is introduced, together with a surjective map  $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  from the monoid of forests to the monoid of hedges. The colimit of the groups in a cloning system comes with an action of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Condition (iv+) in this article is equivalent to require that that action factors through the hedge monoid (which holds for most examples; see Observation 2.11 and paragraph before Observation 2.19 in [WZ18]).

We now introduce the notion of a *bilateral* cloning system. In a nutshell, in the same way that the maps  $\iota$  of Definition 2.2 informally correspond to “adding elements on the right”, a bilateral cloning system comes equipped with a family of “dual” maps  $\zeta$  that correspond to “adding elements on the left”.

We now proceed to formalize this idea. For the family of symmetric groups, we denote by  $\rho_n: \Sigma_n \rightarrow \Sigma_{n+1}$  the injective homomorphism that fixes the first element, that is,

$$\rho_n(\sigma)(i) = \sigma(i-1) + 1 \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq n+1 \text{ and } \rho_n(\sigma)(1) = 1,$$

for every  $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$ .

**Definition 2.5.** A *bilateral cloning system* is a quintuple  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$ , where  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \kappa, \pi)$  is a cloning system satisfying conditions (iv+) and (vii), and  $\zeta = \{\zeta_n: \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_{1+n}\}_{n \geq 1}$  is an additional family of injective homomorphisms satisfying the following conditions:

- (i')  $\pi_{n+1} \circ \zeta_n = \rho_n \circ \pi_n$ , for all  $n \geq 1$ ;
- (iii')  $\zeta_n \circ \kappa_j^n = \kappa_{j+1}^{n+1} \circ \zeta_n$ , for all  $n \geq 1$  and all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ;
- (vi)  $\zeta_{n+1} \circ \iota_n = \iota_{n+1} \circ \zeta_n$ , for all  $n \geq 1$ ;
- (vii')  $\zeta_{n+1} \circ \zeta_n = \kappa_1^{n+1} \circ \zeta_n$ , for all  $n \geq 1$ ;

A bilateral cloning system is called *restricted* if it additionally satisfies the following condition:

- (ii+)  $\pi_{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n = \kappa_j^n \circ \pi_n$ , for all  $n \geq 1$  and all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ;

**Definition 2.6.** A bilateral cloning system is called *operadic* if the following additional conditions are satisfied:

- (viii)  $\kappa_i^n(m)(g) \cdot \nu_i^m(n)(h) = \nu_{\pi(g)(i)}^m(n)(h) \cdot \kappa_i^n(m)(g)$ , for all  $m, n \geq 0$  and all  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and  $h \in \mathbf{G}_m$ ;
- (ix)  $\iota_n(m)(g) \cdot \zeta_m(n)(h) = \zeta_m(n)(h) \cdot \iota_n(m)(g)$ , for all  $m, n \geq 0$  and all  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and  $h \in \mathbf{G}_m$ .

The morphisms  $\iota_n(m)$ ,  $\zeta_m(n)$ ,  $\kappa_j^n(m)$  and  $\nu_j^m(n)$  appearing in conditions (viii) and (ix) are the maps

$$\iota_n(r): \mathbf{G}_n \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n+r}, \quad \kappa_j^n(m): \mathbf{G}_n \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n+m}, \quad \zeta_n(l): \mathbf{G}_n \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}_{l+n},$$

and

$$\nu_j^n(m): \mathbf{G}_n \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n+m-1}$$

defined by  $\iota_n(r) = \iota_{n+r-1} \circ \cdots \circ \iota_n$  for all  $n, r \geq 1$ ;  $\kappa_j^n(m) = \kappa_j^{n+m-2} \circ \cdots \circ \kappa_j^n$  for all  $n, m \geq 1$  and all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ;  $\zeta_n(l) = \zeta_{n+l-1} \circ \cdots \circ \zeta_n$  for all  $n, l \geq 1$ ; and  $\nu_j^n(m) = \zeta_{m+n-j}(j-1) \circ \iota_n(m-j) = \iota_{n+j-1}(m-j) \circ \zeta_n(j-1)$  for all  $j, m, n \geq 1$ . Note that the morphisms  $\zeta_n(l)$  and  $\nu_j^n(m)$  only make sense for bilateral cloning systems.

**Remark 2.7.** Although in Definition 2.2 and Definition 2.5 we require the maps  $\iota$  and  $\zeta$  to be injective, this is not essential for the comparison of bilateral cloning system and action operads, as we will see in the next section.

In order to get a grip on the intuition behind the definitions above, we next describe perhaps the primordial example of a (bilateral) cloning system, namely that of braid groups; we refer the reader to [WZ18] for details.

**Example 2.8** (Braid groups). Let  $\text{Br}_n$  denote the braid group on  $n$  strands. For every  $n \geq 1$  there is a canonical surjective group homomorphism  $\pi_n: \text{Br}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n$  by sending each braid to its underlying permutation. We also have inclusion maps  $\iota_n: \text{Br}_n \rightarrow \text{Br}_{n+1}$  corresponding to “adding one strand on the right”, and cloning maps

$$\kappa_j^n: \text{Br}_n \longrightarrow \text{Br}_{n+1}$$

given by duplicating the  $j$ -th strand into two parallel strands; see Figure 1 for an example, and [Zar18, Example 3.3] for details.




FIGURE 1. Cloning map  $\kappa_2^4$  on  $\text{Br}_4$ .

Together, the three families of maps defined above endow the collection of all braid groups  $\text{Br}_\bullet = \{\text{Br}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  with the cloning system structure  $\text{Br} = (\text{Br}_\bullet, \iota, \kappa, \pi)$ , see [WZ18] for a proof.

Moreover, in analogy with the maps  $\iota_n$ , we can also define inclusion maps  $\zeta_n: \text{Br}_n \rightarrow \text{Br}_{n+1}$  that informally correspond to “adding one strand on the left”. Equipped with these maps, one readily checks that  $\text{Br} = (\text{Br}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$  is a bilateral cloning system. For illustrative purposes, Figures 2 to 5 depict particular instances of some of the conditions of the bilateral cloning system structure of  $\text{Br}_\bullet$ .

Other examples of bilateral cloning systems are the *mock symmetric groups* and the *loop braid groups* (also known as *symmetric automorphisms of free groups*); see [WZ18]; as well as the *signed symmetric groups* and the *twisted braid groups* [Zar18]. The latter two bilateral cloning systems are not restricted.

Next, we discuss two examples of (bilateral) cloning systems from [WZ18] and [Zar18] which, as we will see, are not operadic.




FIGURE 2. Condition (vii),  $\kappa_3^3 \circ \iota = \iota \circ \iota$ .FIGURE 3. Condition (vi),  $\iota \circ \zeta = \zeta \circ \iota$ .

FIGURE 4. Condition (viii).




FIGURE 5. Condition (ix).

**Example 2.9** (Direct powers). Let  $G$  be a group and denote by  $G^n$  the  $n$ -fold direct product of  $G$  with itself. Write  $\iota_n : G^n \rightarrow G^{n+1}$  for the map that adds the identity (in  $G$ ) as last entry, let  $\pi_n : G^n \rightarrow \Sigma_n$  the trivial homomorphism, and consider the map  $\kappa_j^n : G^n \rightarrow G^{n+1}$  that duplicates the  $j$ -th entry. Then, the quadruple  $(\{G^n\}_{n \geq 1}, \iota, \pi, \kappa)$  is a cloning system on the set of direct powers of  $G$ .

Despite the fact that there is an obvious map  $\zeta_n : G^n \rightarrow G^{n+1}$  that adds the identity (in  $G$ ) as first entry, one may check that the maps  $\kappa$  and  $\zeta$  do not satisfy condition (viii) of the definition of an operadic bilateral cloning system.

**Example 2.10** (Upper triangular matrices). Let  $U_n$  denote the group of invertible  $n \times n$  upper triangular matrices with real coefficients. Consider the obvious inclusion map  $\iota_n : U_n \rightarrow U_{n+1}$  given by adding a 1 as the lowermost element on the diagonal.

There are cloning maps  $\kappa_j^n : U_n \rightarrow U_{n+1}$  that informally correspond to a certain duplication of the  $j$ -th column that preserves the upper triangular structure of the matrix, and which becomes apparent just by giving the following particular example; see [Zar18] for details:

$$\kappa_2^3 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 4 & 5 \\ 0 & 0 & 6 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 & 5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$$

Setting  $\pi_n : U_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n$  to be the trivial homomorphism, the set  $U_\bullet = \{U_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  acquires the cloning system structure  $U = (U_\bullet, \iota, \kappa, \pi)$ .

Observe that one could define another inclusion map  $\zeta_n : U_n \rightarrow U_{n+1}$  by adding a 1 as the uppermost element of the diagonal; however, as in the previous example, the interaction of the maps  $\zeta$  and  $\kappa$  does not satisfy condition (viii) of the definition of a bilateral cloning system.

### 3. ACTION OPERADS

We start this section recalling the classical notion of an *operad*:

**Definition 3.1.** A *symmetric operad*  $E$  on sets is a triple  $(E, \{\circ_i\}_i, \text{id})$ , where

- $E = \{E(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a family of sets, and each  $E(n)$  is equipped with a right  $\Sigma_n$ -action, for every  $n \geq 1$ ,
- $\text{id} \in E(1)$  is called the *unit* of the operad, and
- $\{\circ_i\}_i$  is a family of maps

$$\circ_i : E(n) \times E(m) \rightarrow E(n + m - 1) \quad \text{for all } n, m \geq 1 \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

called  $\circ_i$ -operations or *partial composition products*, such that  $\text{id} \circ_i y = y$  and  $x \circ_i \text{id} = x$  for every  $x, y \in E(n)$ . Moreover, these  $\circ_i$ -operations satisfy certain associativity and equivariance axioms, which are spelled out in, for example, [Mar08, Definition 11].

A *morphism of operads*  $f : E \rightarrow P$  consists of maps  $f_n : E(n) \rightarrow P(n)$  for  $n \geq 1$ , that are compatible with the unit and  $\circ_i$ -operations of  $E$  and  $P$ . If we forget about all the symmetric group actions on the sets  $E(n)$ , we have the notion of a *non-symmetric operad*.

**Remark 3.2.** Note that Definition 3.1 avoids nullary operations in an operad, i.e. there is no  $E(0)$  in  $E$ . In this work, we will only consider operads without nullary operations, or in other words, without constants. This choice is not essential, but it is made to have a clearer connection between action operads and cloning systems.

**Example 3.3** (Symmetric groups). The family of symmetric groups  $\Sigma_\bullet = \{\Sigma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  has the structure of a non-symmetric operad in sets, with  $\text{id} \in \Sigma_1$  the trivial permutation of  $\Sigma_1$ . The partial composition products  $\circ_i : \Sigma_n \times \Sigma_m \rightarrow \Sigma_{m+n-1}$  are defined as follows: if  $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$  and  $\tau \in \Sigma_m$ , then  $\sigma \circ_i \tau$  is the permutation of  $\Sigma_{m+n-1}$  obtained by “inserting”  $\tau$  in  $\sigma$  at the  $i$ -th place as a block and rearranging the indices accordingly. Figure 6 shows an example of the composition product  $\circ_2 : \Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_2 \rightarrow \Sigma_4$ .




FIGURE 6.  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 3 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \circ_2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 4 & 3 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$

**3.1. Action operads.** We now introduce the concept of an *action operad*, which essentially is a family of groups satisfying certain properties that allow to define operads with equivariance relative to this family; the reader is referred to [CG14] for a detailed treatment of action operads and their properties. They have been also studied under the name *group operads* [Zha11, Yos18, Yau22]

**Definition 3.4.** An *action operad without constants*  $\mathbf{G}$ , or simply an *action operad*, is a quadruple  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \pi, \{\circ_i\}_i, \text{id})$ , where

- (1)  $\mathbf{G}_\bullet = \{\mathbf{G}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a family of groups, and  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \{\circ_i\}_i, \text{id})$  is a non-symmetric operad on sets, where  $\{\circ_i\}_i$  are the partial composition products of the operad and  $\text{id} \in \mathbf{G}_1$  is the unit. The associativity of the partial composition products yields that if  $f \in \mathbf{G}_n$ ,  $g \in \mathbf{G}_m$  and  $h \in \mathbf{G}_l$ , then we have that

$$(f \circ_i g) \circ_j h = \begin{cases} (f \circ_j h) \circ_{i+l-1} g & \text{if } j < i, \\ (f \circ_{j-m+1} h) \circ_i g & \text{if } j \geq i+m, \\ f \circ_i (g \circ_{j-i+1} h) & \text{if } j = i, \dots, i+m-1, \end{cases}$$

$$f \circ_i \text{id} = f,$$

$$\text{id} \circ_1 g = g;$$

- (2)  $\pi : \mathbf{G}_\bullet \rightarrow \Sigma_\bullet$  is a map of operads which is also a levelwise group homomorphism, that is,  $\pi_n : \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n$  is a homomorphism for all  $n \geq 1$ ;
- (3) For every  $f, f' \in \mathbf{G}_n$ ,  $g, g' \in \mathbf{G}_m$ , we have that

$$(f \cdot f') \circ_i (g \cdot g') = (f \circ_{\pi(f')(i)} g) \cdot (f' \circ_i g'),$$

with the multiplication taking place in the group  $\mathbf{G}_{n+m-1}$ .

Note that the partial composition products  $\circ_i$  are not group homomorphisms in general, that action operads are not assumed to be symmetric operads, and that they have no nullary operations. It follows from the axioms that the unit element  $\text{id} \in \mathbf{G}_1$  of the operad  $\mathbf{G}_\bullet$  is precisely the unit  $e_1$  of the group  $\mathbf{G}_1$ .

Observe that, both in a cloning system and in an action operad, the group  $\mathbf{G}_n$  acts on the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  via the homomorphism  $\pi_n$  for every  $n$ . If these maps  $\pi$  are understood from the context, for  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  we will write  $g(i)$  instead of  $\pi_n(g)(i)$ .

Finally, note that an action operad with trivial  $\pi$  is the same thing as a non-symmetric operad on groups.



**3.2. General action operads.** Inspired by the definition of cloning system, we relax as follows the definition of action operad. Note that this relaxation does not diminish the hability of such an operad to hold the equivariance of other operads. In fact, we believe that this should be the adequate definition of action operad.

**Definition 3.5.** A *general action operad*  $\mathbf{G}$  is a tuple  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \pi, \{\circ_i\}_i, \text{id})$  satisfying Conditions (1) and (3) together with the following:

- (2')  $\pi_n: \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n$  is a levelwise group homomorphism for each  $n \geq 1$  such that if  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and  $h \in \mathbf{G}_m$ , then the action of the symmetric group elements  $\pi(g) \circ_i \pi(h)$  and  $\pi(g \circ_i h)$  coincide on

$$\{1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+m, i+m+1, \dots, n+m-1\}.$$

Here is an example of general action operad that is not an action operad. It corresponds to the cloning system of signed symmetric groups or to the hyperoctahedral inert demi-interval group (see Section 7).

The group  $\Sigma_n^\pm$  is the signed symmetric group, that consist on permutations  $g$  of the set  $\{1, -1, 2, -2, \dots, n, -n\}$  such that  $g(i) = -g(-i)$ . The composition  $g \circ_i h$  is defined as follows: if  $g(+i)$  is positive, then  $g \circ_i h$  is obtained by cabling the signed symmetry  $h$  in the  $i$ -th strand of the permutation  $g$ . If  $g(+i)$  is negative, then  $g \circ_i h$  is obtained by cabling the signed symmetry  $h'$  in the  $i$ -th strand of  $g$ , where  $h'(j) = -h(n-j+1)$  for a positive  $j$ . A signed permutation  $g$  is determined by the pair  $(\sigma, A)$ , where  $\sigma$  is the underlying permutation and  $A$  is the set of  $i$ 's such that  $g(+i)$  is negative. With this notation, the composition of  $(g, A)$  and  $(g', A')$  is  $(g \circ g', g'(A) \triangle A')$ , where the symbol  $\triangle$  denotes symmetric difference.

From the classification of inert crossed interval groups and the relation between action operads and crossed interval groups, it is reasonable to think that the signed symmetric general action operad is final in the category of general action operads. This allows to simplify as follows the definition of general action operad:

**Lemma 3.6.** *If we require that the target of the map  $\pi$  is the signed symmetric group instead of the symmetric group, then Condition (2') in the definition of general action operad can be replaced by the following:*

- (2'')  $\pi: \mathbf{G}_\bullet \rightarrow \Sigma_\bullet^\pm$  is a map of operads and a levelwise group homomorphism.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\pi: \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n$  is a family of maps satisfying Condition (2'). We will define a family of maps  $\pi': \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n^\pm$  satisfying Condition (2'').

We first define the map  $\pi'_n: \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n^\pm$ . If  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$ , define  $\pi'(g) = (\pi(g), A)$  with  $A = \{j \mid \pi(g \circ_2 e_2) \neq \pi(g) \circ_2 e_2\}$ . To check that  $\pi'$  is a group homomorphism, we have that, if  $g, h \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and  $\pi'(g) = (\sigma, A)$  and  $\pi'(h) = (\sigma', A')$ , and  $\pi'(g \cdot h) = (\sigma'', A'')$ , then  $\sigma'' = \sigma \cdot \sigma'$  and

$$(g \cdot h) \circ_j e_2 = (g \cdot h) \circ_j (e_2 \cdot e_2) = (g \circ_{\sigma'(j)} e_2) \cdot (g \circ_2 e_2)$$

The product  $\pi((g \cdot h) \circ_j e_2)$  is either equal to  $\pi(g \cdot h) \circ_j e_2$  or differs from it by a twist of the entries  $\{j, j+1\}$ . Inspection shows that  $A'' = g'(A) \triangle A'$ .

One still has to show that  $\pi'$  is an operad map. By the multiplication rule it is enough to check it for the compositions  $g \circ_j e_m$ . Since the latter are iterated compositions of the form  $g \circ_2 e_2$ , it is enough to check it in this last case, in which is true by definition.

Finally, if  $\pi': \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n^\pm$  is a family of maps satisfying Condition (2''), then composing them with the homomorphism  $\Sigma_n^\pm \rightarrow \Sigma_n$  that forgets the signs yields a family of maps satisfying (2').  $\square$

**Remark 3.7.** This lemma has its counterpart in the world of cloning systems: Condition (ii) in the definition of cloning system can be replaced by the following:

(ii')  $\pi_n: \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n^\pm$  is a levelwise group homomorphism such that the identity  $\pi_{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n = c_j^n \circ \pi_n$  holds for all  $n \geq 1$  and all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ,

where  $c_j^n$  are the cloning maps of the signed symmetric cloning system. In order to make sense of axioms (v) and (viii), we are implicitly using the fact that  $\Sigma_n^\pm$  acts on  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  through the homomorphism  $\Sigma_n^\pm \rightarrow \Sigma_n$  that forgets the signs.

**3.3. Fundamental groups of G-operads and unoriented ribbon braids.** Fix an (general) action operad  $\mathbf{G}$ . Then, one may define a  $\mathbf{G}$ -operad as in [CG14, Def. 1.14], [Yau22, Def. 4.2.6, Prop. 4.3.1] or [Zha11, Def. 2.30], i.e., as a non-symmetric operad  $\mathbf{E}$  with an action  $\mathbf{E}(n) \times \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{E}(n)$  such that the composition

$$\mathbf{E}(n) \times (\mathbf{E}(n_1) \times \dots \times \mathbf{E}(n_k)) \longrightarrow \mathbf{E}(n_1 + \dots + n_k)$$

is equivariant with respect to the map

$$\mathbf{G}_n \times (\mathbf{G}_{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbf{G}_{n_k}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n_1 + \dots + n_k}.$$

Alternatively, if one considers operads with identities as we do, one requires the composition  $\circ_i: \mathbf{E}(n) \times \mathbf{E}(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}(n + m - 1)$  to be equivariant with respect to the map  $\circ_i: \mathbf{G}_n \times \mathbf{G}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n+m-1}$ .

Our goal in this subsection is to provide more examples of (general) action operads. For that purpose, we briefly discuss a construction based on fundamental groups of topological  $\mathbf{G}$ -operads that produces (general) action operads over  $\mathbf{G}$ .

First, observe that the forgetful functor from  $\mathbf{G}$ -operads to non-symmetric operads admits a left adjoint which simply adds a free right  $\mathbf{G}$ -action,

$$(-)_{\mathbf{G}}: \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{non-symmetric} \\ \text{operads} \end{array} \right\} \longrightarrow \{ \mathbf{G}\text{-operads} \}, \quad \mathbf{P} \mapsto \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{G}},$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{G}}(n) = \mathbf{P}(n) \times \mathbf{G}_n$  and the operation  $\circ_i$  is defined as the composition

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{G}}(n) \times \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{G}}(m) \\ \cong \downarrow \text{switch} \\ \mathbf{P}(n) \times \mathbf{P}(m) \times \mathbf{G}_n \times \mathbf{G}_m \\ \downarrow \circ_i \times \circ_i \\ \mathbf{P}(n + m - 1) \times \mathbf{G}_{n+m-1} \\ \parallel \\ \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{G}}(n + m - 1) \end{array}.$$

Of course, the same discussion applies to topological operads.

Applying this left adjoint functor to the (non-symmetric) associative operad  $\mathbf{As}$ , characterized by  $\mathbf{As}(n) = *$  for any  $n \geq 1$  (and  $\mathbf{As}(0) = \emptyset$ ), we obtain  $\mathbf{As}_{\mathbf{G}}$ . A map from  $\mathbf{As}_{\mathbf{G}}$  selects basepoints in a coherent way in a  $\mathbf{G}$ -operad. In fact,

**Definition 3.8.** Let  $\mathbf{E}$  be a topological  $\mathbf{G}$ -operad. Then, a *good  $\mathbf{G}$ -basepoint* for  $\mathbf{E}$  is a map of topological  $\mathbf{G}$ -operads  $\eta: \mathbf{As}_{\mathbf{G}}^h \rightarrow \mathbf{E}$ , where  $\mathbf{As}_{\mathbf{G}}^h$  is a topological  $\mathbf{G}$ -operad homotopy equivalent to  $\mathbf{As}_{\mathbf{G}}$ .

We assume without loss of generality that for any  $k \geq 1$  there is a choice of basepoint  $\mu_k \in \text{As}_G^h(k)$  representing the plain  $k$ -ary multiplication, that is, lying in the connected component corresponding to  $(*, e_k) \in \text{As}_G(k)$ . By definition, there are paths  $\mu_n \circ_i \mu_m \simeq \mu_{n+m-1}$  in  $\text{As}_G^h(n+m-1)$  and homotopies relating natural concatenations of those paths. For that reason, we fix basepoints  $\epsilon_k := \eta(\mu_k) \in E(k)$  for paths and loops as [Zha11, Section 3] in the sequel.

Now, assume that the action of  $G_n$  on  $E(n)$  is a covering action (see [Hat02, Section 1.3]) and that  $E(n)$  is path-connected. Then, we have a homotopy fiber sequence  $G_n \hookrightarrow E(n) \twoheadrightarrow E(n)/G_n$ , which induces a short exact sequence of groups

$$(3.1) \quad 1 \longrightarrow \pi_1(E(n), \epsilon_n) \longrightarrow \pi_1(E(n)/G_n, [\epsilon_n]) \xrightarrow{\delta_n} G_n \longrightarrow 1,$$

and an isomorphism of relative homotopy groups

$$(3.2) \quad \pi_1(E(n)/G_n, [\epsilon_n]) \cong \pi_1(E(n); G_n \cdot \epsilon_n, \epsilon_n).$$

The left-hand side in (3.2) has a group structure, while the right-hand side is easily seen to form an operad. Altogether, we have the following generalization of [Zha11, Theorem 3.4]:

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $(G, \pi, \circ_i, \text{id})$  be an (general) action operad,  $E$  be a topological  $G$ -operad without constants so that: (i)  $E$  is equipped with a good  $G$ -basepoint, (ii)  $E(n)$  is path-connected for any  $n \geq 1$ , and (iii)  $G$  acts on  $E$  via covering actions. Then, the sequence of groups  $\pi_1(E(n)/G_n, [\epsilon_n])$  together with the maps*

$$\pi_1(E(n)/G_n, [\epsilon_n]) \xrightarrow{\delta_n} G_n \xrightarrow{\pi} \Sigma_n$$

*conforms an (general) action operad, denoted  $\pi_1(E, G)$ . Moreover,  $\pi_1(E, G)$  lies over  $G$ , i.e. the connecting homomorphisms  $\{\delta_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  in (3.1) yield a morphism  $\delta: \pi_1(E, G) \rightarrow G$  of (general) action operads.*

The next two examples were considered in [Wah01], [Zha11], [CG14] and [Yau22]. The third one is a general action operad, but not an action operad.

**Example 3.10.** Consider the action operad  $G = \Sigma$ , and take  $E$  to be the little 2-discs operad  $D_2$  with its natural right  $G$ -action:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D_2(n) \times \Sigma_n & \longrightarrow & D_2(n) \\ ((x_1, \dots, x_n), g) & \longmapsto & (x_{g(1)}, \dots, x_{g(n)}) \end{array}.$$

Now, observe that the little 1-discs operad  $D_1$  is homotopy equivalent to the symmetric operad  $\text{Ass} = \text{As}_\Sigma$ , and the inclusion  $D_1 \rightarrow D_2$  is a good  $G$ -basepoint. The operad  $\text{Br} = \pi_1(D_2, \Sigma)$  is the action operad of *braid groups*.

**Example 3.11.** The previous example remains valid if we replace the little 2-discs operad  $D_2$  by its framed version  $D_2^{\text{fr}} \simeq D_2 \rtimes \text{SO}(2)$ . The resulting operad  $\text{RBr} = \pi_1(D_2^{\text{fr}}, \Sigma)$  is the action operad of *ribbon braid groups*. Recall that

$$\text{RBr}_k \cong \text{Br}_k \rtimes \mathbb{Z}^{\times k},$$

where  $\mathbb{Z}^{\times k}$  accounts for the number of full twists on each ribbon.

**Example 3.12.** Consider the general action operad  $\mathbf{G} = \Sigma^\pm$ , and take  $\mathbf{E}$  to be the framed little 2-discs operad  $\mathbf{D}_2^{\text{fr}}$  with the following  $\mathbf{G}$ -action:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_2^{\text{fr}}(n) \times \Sigma_n^\pm &\longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_2^{\text{fr}}(n) \\ ((x_1, \dots, x_n), (g, A)) &\longmapsto (x_{g(1)}^A, \dots, x_{g(n)}^A) \end{aligned},$$

where  $x_i^A = x_i$  for any  $i \notin A$  and  $x_i^A$  is the precomposition of the embedding  $x_i: D^2 \rightarrow D^2$  with a  $\pi$ -rotation otherwise. Now, observe that the “unoriented little 1-discs operad”  $\mathbf{D}_1^{\text{un}} \simeq \mathbf{D}_1 \rtimes \mathbf{O}(1)$  is homotopy equivalent to the operad  $\mathbf{As}_{\Sigma^\pm}$  since

$$\mathbf{D}_1^{\text{un}}(k) \simeq \mathbf{D}_1(k) \times \mathbf{O}(1)^{\times k} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{As}_{\Sigma^\pm}(k) \cong \Sigma_k^\pm \cong \Sigma_k \times \{\pm \text{id}\}^{\times k}.$$

Hence, the inclusion  $\mathbf{D}_1^{\text{un}} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}_2^{\text{fr}}$  determined by the inclusion  $\mathbf{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{D}_2$  and the homomorphism  $\mathbf{O}(1) \rightarrow \mathbf{SO}(2)$ ,  $-\text{id} \mapsto e^{i\pi}$ , is a good  $\mathbf{G}$ -basepoint. The operad  $\mathbf{uRBr} = \pi_1(\mathbf{D}_2^{\text{fr}}, \Sigma^\pm)$  is the general action operad of *unoriented ribbon braid groups*. One can identify unoriented ribbon braid groups in a similar manner to the case of plain ribbon braids, i.e.  $\mathbf{uRBr}_k \cong \mathbf{Br}_k \rtimes \mathbb{Z}^{\times k}$ , but now  $\mathbb{Z}^{\times k}$  accounts for the number of half-twists on each ribbon. With such a description, the canonical morphism  $\mathbf{uRBr} \rightarrow \Sigma^\pm$  sends  $(\beta_k; n_1, \dots, n_k)$  to  $(\pi(\beta_k), A_n)$ , where  $\pi(\beta_k)$  is the underlying permutation of the braid  $\beta_k$  and  $A_n$  is given by the set of  $i$ ’s so that  $n_i$  is odd. See Figure 7 for an illustration of the difference between  $\mathbf{RBr}$  and  $\mathbf{uRBr}$ .




FIGURE 7. From left to right, the operation  $\sigma \circ_1 \hat{\tau} = (\sigma; 1, 0)$  in  $\mathbf{RBr}_2$  and the operation  $\sigma \circ_1 \tau = (\sigma; 1, 0)$  in  $\mathbf{uRBr}_2$ .

By construction, there is a commutative diagram of general action operads

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Br} & \dashrightarrow & \mathbf{RBr} \longrightarrow \mathbf{uRBr} \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ & & \Sigma \longrightarrow \Sigma^\pm \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (\beta_k; n_1, \dots, n_k) & \longmapsto & (\beta_k; 2n_1, \dots, 2n_k) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \pi(\beta_k) & \longrightarrow & (\pi(\beta_k), \emptyset) \end{array}.$$

Note that  $\mathbf{RBr}$  is an action operad, while  $\mathbf{uRBr}$  equipped with the obvious projection  $\mathbf{uRBr} \rightarrow \Sigma$ ,  $(\beta_k; n_1, \dots, n_k) \mapsto \pi(\beta_k)$  is just a general action operad since, for example, the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{uRBr}_1 \times \mathbf{uRBr}_2 & \xrightarrow{\circ_1} & \mathbf{uRBr}_2 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2 & \xrightarrow{\circ_1} & \Sigma_2 \end{array}$$

does not commute. For instance, take  $(\tau, e_2) = ((e_1; 1), (e_2; 0, 0)) \in \mathbf{uRBr}_1 \times \mathbf{uRBr}_2$  and follow the two directions to obtain  $e_2 \neq (1, 2)$  in  $\Sigma_2$  (see Figure 8).

**Remark 3.13.** Under the correspondence between general action operads and operadic cloning systems, the unordered ribbon braided operad  $\mathbf{uRBr}$  corresponds to the cloning system of twisted braid groups described in [WZ18, Example 4.2].

In [Thu17, 3.5.3], Thumann introduces the following braided operad  $\mathbf{E}$ : Consider first the free braided operad generated in arity 1 by an operation  $\tau$  and in arity 2 by an operation  $\sigma$ . The operad  $\mathbf{E}$  is defined as the result of quotienting this operad by the relation  $\tau \circ_1 e_2 = (\sigma \circ_1 \tau) \circ_2 \tau$ . This operad is isomorphic to the underlying operad of  $\mathbf{uRBr}$ , and the braid action comes from the maps (3.3): the operation  $\tau$  is the half-twist of a single ribbon, while the operation  $\sigma$  is the generator of the braid group. The relation is depicted in Figure 8.




FIGURE 8. The relation  $\tau \circ_1 e_2 = (\sigma \circ_1 \tau) \circ_2 \tau$  seen in the general action operad  $\mathbf{uRBr}$ .

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2 FOR BRAID GROUPS

Before we embark on the proof of our main theorem in its full generality, we explain the situation with the special case of braid groups. As will become apparent, the general argument is an abstraction of the ideas introduced here, and will be treated in the next two sections.

Recall from Example 2.8 the (bilateral) cloning system  $\mathbf{Br} = (\mathbf{Br}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$  for braid groups, where  $\pi$  is the canonical projection onto the set of symmetric groups, the maps  $\iota$  and  $\zeta$  add one strand on the right or the left, respectively, and  $\kappa$  are the cloning maps given by duplicating a strand.

$\mathbf{Br} = (\mathbf{Br}_\bullet, \pi)$  be the collection of all braid groups equipped with the canonical projection homomorphisms  $\pi_n: \mathbf{Br}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n$ .

Note that the collection  $\mathbf{Br}_\bullet$  can be endowed with an action operad structure with respect to the “substitution maps”  $\circ_j: \mathbf{Br}_{n+1} \times \mathbf{Br}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{Br}_{n+m}$ , which correspond to replacing the  $j$ -th strand of the first braid by the second braid. Figure 12 contains a depiction of this operation; for a more detailed discussion, see [CG14, Definition 1.6 and Example 1.12(2)] for details.

We now explain how to obtain one structure from the other, illustrating the main ideas of the procedure with several pictures.

**4.1. From the action operad to the (bilateral) cloning system.** The morphisms  $\iota$  and the cloning maps  $\kappa$  for the cloning system are obtained by using the identity  $e_2 \in \mathbf{Br}_2$  and the composition products  $\circ_i$ , as explained in Figures 9 and 10, respectively. Thus one obtains the cloning system  $\mathbf{Br}$  described in Example 2.8.

In order to get a bilateral cloning system, the maps  $\zeta$  are defined similarly to the maps  $\iota$ , but replacing the second strand of  $e_2$  instead of the first one, that is, using  $\circ_2$  instead of  $\circ_1$ ; see Figure 11.




FIGURE 9. Constructing the map  $\iota$ . Insert the given braid in the first strand of  $e_2$ .




FIGURE 10. Constructing the map  $\kappa_j$ . Replace the  $j$ th strand of the given braid by  $e_2$ .




FIGURE 11. Constructing the map  $\zeta$ . Insert the given braid in the second strand of  $e_2$ .

#### 4.2. From the (operadic) bilateral cloning system to the action operad.

We now explain how to use the bilateral cloning system structure on  $\mathbf{Br}$  in order to build an action operad structure on  $\mathbf{Br}_\bullet$ . To see how the composition product maps  $\circ_j$  are obtained, we proceed as follows. First, we replicate  $m$  times the  $j$ th strand of the first braid using the cloning maps, where  $m$  is the number of strands of the second braid. Then we add, by using  $\iota$  and  $\zeta$  strands to the right and left, respectively, of the second braid, so that it has the same number of strands as the cloned braid. Finally, we just multiply the two braids obtained this way. Figure 12 shows an example of this construction.




FIGURE 12. Constructing the substitution maps  $\circ_j$  from the cloning system data.




FIGURE 13. First half of the associativity axiom. The colors represent the application of  $\iota$ ,  $\zeta$  and  $\kappa$  in each step.




FIGURE 14. Second half of the associativity axiom.

One can check that the maps  $\circ_j$  built above satisfy all the properties required for endowing  $\mathbf{Br}_\bullet$  with an operad structure in sets. For instance, Figure 13 and Figure 14 show the verification of the associativity axiom.

Finally, a simple computation, depicted in Figure 15, shows that the maps  $\circ_j$  are compatible with the underlying group structure of the braid groups, thus proving that  $(\mathbf{Br}_\bullet, \pi, \{\circ_i\}_i, e_1)$  is indeed an action operad.




FIGURE 15. Compatibility axiom of the action operad.

## 5. FROM ACTION OPERADS TO CLONING SYSTEMS

In this section, we prove one of the implications of Theorem 1.2 in full generality; more concretely, we explain how to obtain a (bilateral) cloning system from an arbitrary action operad.

Let  $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \pi, \{\circ_i\}_i, \text{id})$  be an action operad, and denote by  $e_n \in \mathbf{G}_n$  the identity element of  $G_n$ . If  $g \in G_n$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we denote by  $g(i) = \pi(g)(i)$ . From the action operad structure, one can define the following maps

$$\kappa_j^n, \iota_n, \zeta_n : \mathbf{G}_n \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n+1}$$

by setting

$$\kappa_j^n(g) = g \circ_j e_2, \quad \zeta_n(g) = e_2 \circ_2 g \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_n(g) = e_2 \circ_1 g.$$

The following observation will be useful in what follows:

**Remark 5.1.** Note that in an action operad we always have that  $e_n \circ_i e_m = e_{n+m-1}$  because  $e_n \circ_i e_m = (e_n \cdot e_n) \circ_i (e_m \cdot e_m) = (e_n \circ_i e_m) \cdot (e_n \circ_i e_m)$ . Moreover, the following hold

$$\nu_j^n(m)(g) = e_m \circ_j g \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_j^n(m)(g) = g \circ_j e_m,$$

where  $\kappa_j^n(m)$  and  $\nu_j^n(m)$  are defined as in Definition 2.5.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \pi, \{\circ_i\}_i, \text{id})$  be an action operad. Then, the quintuple  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$ , with  $\iota, \zeta$  and  $\kappa$  as defined above, is a restricted operadic cloning system. If  $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \pi, \{\circ_i\}_i, \text{id})$  is a general action operad, then  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$  is an operadic cloning system.*

*Proof.* We will prove it in several steps. We will make essential use of the fact that  $\mathbf{G}$  is an action operad, the definition of the morphisms  $\iota, \zeta$  and  $\kappa$ , and Remark 5.1. First, we prove that the maps  $\iota$  and  $\zeta$  are homomorphisms; indeed,

$$\iota(f \cdot g) = e_2 \circ_1 (f \cdot g) = (e_2 \cdot e_2) \circ_1 (f \cdot g) = (e_2 \circ_1 f) \cdot (e_2 \circ_1 g) = \iota(f) \cdot \iota(g),$$

$$\zeta(f \cdot g) = e_2 \circ_2 (f \cdot g) = (e_2 \cdot e_2) \circ_2 (f \cdot g) = (e_2 \circ_2 f) \cdot (e_2 \circ_2 g) = \zeta(f) \cdot \zeta(g).$$

We now show that the quadruple  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \kappa, \pi)$  is a cloning system by checking that it satisfies properties (i)–(v) of Definition 2.2.



(i)  $\pi_{n+1} \circ \iota_n = \lambda_n \circ \pi_n$ . For every  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  we have that

$$\pi_{n+1}(\iota_n(g)) = \pi_{n+1}(e_2 \circ_1 g) = \pi_2(e_2) \circ_1 \pi_n(g) = e_2 \circ_1 \pi_n(g) = \lambda_n(\pi_n(g)).$$

(ii+)  $\pi_{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n = c_j^n \circ \pi_n$ . For every  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and all  $1 \leq j \leq n$  we have that

$$\pi_{n+1}(\kappa_j^n(g)) = \pi_{n+1}(g \circ_j e_2) = \pi_n(g) \circ_j \pi_2(e_2) = \pi_n(g) \circ_j e_2 = c_j^n(\pi_n(g)).$$

(iii)  $\iota_{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n = \kappa_j^{n+1} \circ \iota_n$ . For every  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and all  $1 \leq j \leq n$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n(g) &= \iota_{n+1}(g \circ_j e_2) = e_2 \circ_1 (g \circ_j e_2) \\ &= (e_2 \circ_1 g) \circ_j e_2 = \iota_n(g) \circ_j e_2 = \kappa_j^{n+1}(\iota_n(g)). \end{aligned}$$

(iv)  $\kappa_l^{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n = \kappa_{j+1}^{n+1} \circ \kappa_l^n$ . For every  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and all  $l < j \leq n$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_l^{n+1}(\kappa_j^n(g)) &= \kappa_l^{n+1}(g \circ_j e_2) = (g \circ_j e_2) \circ_l e_2 \\ &= (g \circ_l e_2) \circ_{j+1} e_2 = \kappa_l^n(g) \circ_{j+1} e_2 = \kappa_{j+1}^{n+1}(\kappa_l^n(g)). \end{aligned}$$

(v)  $\kappa_j^n(g \cdot h) = \kappa_{h(j)}^n(g) \cdot \kappa_j^n(h)$  for every  $g, h \in \mathbf{G}_n$ . For all  $j \leq n$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_j^n(g \cdot h) &= (g \cdot h) \circ_j e_2 = (g \cdot h) \circ_j (e_2 \cdot e_2) \\ &= (g \circ_{h(j)} e_2) \cdot (h \circ_j e_2) = \kappa_{h(j)}^n(g) \cdot \kappa_j^n(h) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove that  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$  is a bilateral cloning system by checking properties (i'), (iii'), (vi), (vii), (vii'), (iv+), (ix), (x) of Definition 2.5. First, properties (i'), (iii') and (vii') are proved as properties (i), (iii) and (vii) simply by replacing  $\circ_1$  by  $\circ_2$  and  $\iota$  by  $\zeta$ .

(vi)  $\zeta_{n+1} \circ \iota_n = \iota_{n+1} \circ \zeta_n$ . For every  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and all  $n \geq 1$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{n+1}(\iota_n(g)) &= e_2 \circ_2 (e_2 \circ_1 g) = (e_2 \circ_2 e_2) \circ_2 g = e_3 \circ_2 g \\ &= (e_2 \circ_1 e_2) \circ_2 g = e_2 \circ_1 (e_2 \circ_2 g) = \iota_{n+1}(\zeta_n(g)). \end{aligned}$$

(vii)  $\iota_{n+1} \circ \iota_n = \kappa_{n+1}^{n+1} \circ \iota_n$ . For every  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and all  $n \geq 1$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{n+1}(\iota_n(g)) &= e_2 \circ_1 (e_2 \circ_1 g) = (e_2 \circ_1 e_2) \circ_1 g = e_3 \circ_1 g, \\ \kappa_{n+1}^{n+1}(\iota_n(g)) &= (e_2 \circ_1 g) \circ_{n+1} e_2 = (e_2 \circ_2 e_2) \circ_1 g = e_3 \circ_1 g. \end{aligned}$$

(iv+)  $\kappa_{j+1}^{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n = \kappa_j^{n+1} \circ \kappa_j^n$ . For all  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and all  $1 \leq j \leq n$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{j+1}^{n+1}(\kappa_j^n(g)) &= (g \circ_j e_2) \circ_{j+1} e_2 = g \circ_j (e_2 \circ_2 e_2) = g \circ_2 e_3 \\ &= g \circ_j (e_2 \circ_1 e_2) = (g \circ_j e_2) \circ_j e_2 = \kappa_j^{n+1}(\kappa_j^n(g)). \end{aligned}$$

(viii)  $\kappa_j^n(m)(g) \cdot \nu_j^m(n)(h) = \nu_{g(j)}^m(n)(h) \cdot \kappa_j^n(m)(g)$  for every  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and  $h \in \mathbf{G}_m$ . For all  $m, n \geq 0$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_j^n(m)(g) \cdot \nu_j^m(n)(h) &= (g \circ_j e_m) \cdot (e_n \circ_j h) \\ &= (g \cdot e_n) \circ_j (e_m \cdot h) \\ &= (e_n \cdot g) \circ_j (h \cdot e_m) \\ &= (e_n \circ_{g(j)} h) \cdot (g \circ_j e_m) \\ &= \nu_{g(j)}^m(n)(h) \cdot \kappa_j^n(m)(g). \end{aligned}$$

- (ix)  $\iota_n(m)(g) \cdot \zeta_m(n)(h) = \zeta_m(n)(h) \cdot \iota_n(m)(g)$  for every  $g \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and  $h \in \mathbf{G}_m$ .  
For all  $m, n \geq 0$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\iota_n(m)(g) \cdot \zeta_m(n)(h) &= (e_{m+1} \circ_1 g) \cdot (e_{n+1} \circ_{n+1} h) \\
&= (e_{m+1} \circ_1 g) \cdot ((e_2 \circ_1 e_n) \circ_{n+1} h) \\
&= (e_{m+1} \circ_1 g) \cdot ((e_2 \circ_2 h) \circ_1 e_n) \\
&= (e_{m+1} \cdot (e_2 \circ_2 h)) \circ_1 (g \cdot e_n) \\
&= ((e_2 \circ_2 h) \cdot e_{m+1}) \circ_1 (e_n \cdot g) \\
&= ((e_2 \circ_2 h) \cdot (e_2 \circ_2 e_m)) \circ_1 (e_n \cdot g) \\
&= ((e_2 \circ_2 h) \circ_1 e_n) \cdot ((e_2 \circ_2 e_m) \circ_1 g) \\
&= ((e_2 \circ_1 e_n) \circ_{n+1} h) \cdot ((e_{m+1}) \circ_1 g) \\
&= \zeta_m(n)(h) \cdot \iota_n(m)(g).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$  is a restricted operadic cloning system as we wanted to show.

If  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi, \text{id})$  were a general action operad, then the proof of Condition (ii+) would restrict instead to a proof of Condition (ii).  $\square$

## 6. FROM CLONING SYSTEMS TO ACTION OPERADS

We now explain how to construct (general) action operads from a subclass of bilateral cloning systems. Let  $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$  be a bilateral cloning system. The following identities can be derived from the identities in the definition of a bilateral cloning system (recall from Definition 2.5 the construction of the maps  $\kappa_i^n(m)$  and  $\nu_i^n(m)$ ):

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_i^{n+m-1}(l) \circ \kappa_j^n(m) &= \begin{cases} \kappa_j^n(m+l-1) & \text{if } j \leq i < j+m, \\ \kappa_{j+l-1}^{n+l-1}(m) \circ \kappa_i^n(l) & \text{if } i < j. \end{cases} \\
\kappa_j^{n+m-1}(l) \circ \nu_i^n(m) &= \begin{cases} \nu_i^{n+l-1}(m) \circ \kappa_{j-i+1}^n(l) & \text{if } i \leq j < i+n, \\ \nu_{i+l-1}^n(m+l-1) & \text{if } j < i, \\ \nu_i^n(m+l-1) & \text{if } j \geq i+n, \end{cases} \\
\nu_j^{n+m-1}(l) \circ \nu_i^n(m) &= \nu_{j+i-1}^n(m+l-1), \\
\kappa_j^n(m)(f \cdot g) &= \kappa_{g(j)}^n(m)(f) \cdot \kappa_j^n(m)(g) \quad \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq n,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nu_j^l(n+m-1)(g) \cdot \nu_{i+l-1}^m(n+l-1)(h) \\
&= \nu_{i+l-1}^m(n+l-1)(h) \cdot \nu_j^l(n+m-1)(g) \quad \text{if } j < i
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\nu_i^n(m)(g)$  acts trivially on all  $j < i$  and all  $j \geq i+m$  and that  $\kappa_i^n(m)(e_n) = e_{n+m-1}$ , because

$$\kappa_i^n(e_n) = \kappa_i^n(e_n \cdot e_n) = \kappa_i^n(e_n) \cdot \kappa_i^n(e_n)$$

and therefore  $\kappa_i^n(e_n) = e_{n+1}$ .

In order to define an action operad structure on  $\mathbf{G}_\bullet$  and since we already have a map  $\pi: \mathbf{G}_\bullet \rightarrow \Sigma_\bullet$ , it is enough to define the partial composition products  $\{\circ_i\}_i$ , which we do it as follows. The map

$$\circ_i: \mathbf{G}_n \times \mathbf{G}_m \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n+m-1}$$

is the following composition

$$\mathbf{G}_n \times \mathbf{G}_m \xrightarrow{\kappa_i^n(m) \times \nu_i^m(n)} \mathbf{G}_{n+m-1} \times \mathbf{G}_{n+m-1} \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n+m-1},$$

that is,  $f \circ_i g = \kappa_i^n(m)(f) \cdot \nu_i^m(n)(g)$ , for every  $f \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and  $g \in \mathbf{G}_m$ . We also set  $\text{id} = e_1 \in \mathbf{G}_1$ .

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$  be an restricted operadic cloning system. Then the quadruple  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \pi, \{\circ_i\}_i, \text{id})$ , with  $\{\circ_i\}_i$  as defined above is an action operad. If the restricted condition is dropped, then we obtain a general action operad.*

*Proof.* First, we check that  $e_1$  is indeed a unit for the partial composition product. For every  $f \in \mathbf{G}_n$  and every  $g \in \mathbf{G}_m$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} f \circ_i e_1 &= \kappa_i^n(1)(f) \cdot \nu_i^1(n)(e_1) = f \cdot e_n = f, \\ e_1 \circ_1 g &= \kappa_1^1(m)(e_1) \cdot \nu_1^m(1)(g) = e_m \cdot g = g. \end{aligned}$$

Second, we show the associativity for the partial composition product. Let  $f \in \mathbf{G}_n$ ,  $g \in \mathbf{G}_m$  and  $h \in \mathbf{G}_l$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & (f \circ_i g) \circ_j h \\ &= (\kappa_i^n(m)(f) \cdot \nu_i^m(n)(g)) \circ_j h \\ &= \kappa_j^{n+m-1}(l) \left( \kappa_i^n(m)(f) \cdot \nu_i^m(n)(g) \right) \cdot \nu_j^l(n+m-1)(h) \\ (6.1) \quad &= \left( \kappa_{g^*(j)}^{n+m-1}(l) (\kappa_i^n(m)(f)) \right) \cdot \left( \kappa_j^{n+m-1}(l) (\nu_i^m(n)(g)) \right) \cdot \left( \nu_j^l(n+m-1)(h) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we denote  $g^* = \nu_i^m(n)(g)$ . Depending on the indexes  $i$  and  $j$ , we have to consider the following three cases.

*Case 1.* Suppose first that  $j < i$ . In this case  $g^*(j) = j$  and we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_j^{n+m-1}(l) \circ \kappa_i^n(m) &= \kappa_{i+l-1}^{n+l-1}(m) \circ \kappa_j^n(l) \quad \text{and} \\ \kappa_j^{n+m-1}(l) \circ \nu_i^m(n) &= \nu_{i+l-1}^m(n+l-1). \end{aligned}$$

Then (6.1) becomes

$$\left( \kappa_{i+l-1}^{n+l-1}(m) (\kappa_j^n(l)(f)) \right) \cdot \left( \nu_{i+l-1}^m(n+l-1)(g) \right) \cdot \left( \nu_j^l(n+m-1)(h) \right).$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & (f \circ_j h) \circ_{i+l-1} g \\ &= (\kappa_j^n(l)(f) \cdot \nu_j^l(n)(h)) \circ_{i+l-1} g \\ &= \kappa_{i+l-1}^{n+l-1}(m) \left( \kappa_j^n(l)(f) \cdot \nu_j^l(n)(h) \right) \cdot \nu_{i+l-1}^m(n+l-1)(g) \\ (6.2) \quad &= \left( \kappa_{h^*(i+l-1)}^{n+l-1}(m) (\kappa_j^n(l)(f)) \right) \cdot \left( \kappa_{i+l-1}^{n+l-1}(m) (\nu_j^l(n)(h)) \right) \cdot \left( \nu_{i+l-1}^m(n+l-1)(g) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $h^* = \nu_j^l(n)(h)$ . Now, (6.1) and (6.2) are equal since

$$\begin{aligned} h^*(i+l-1) &= \nu_j^l(n)(h)(i+l-1) = i+l-1 \quad \text{and} \\ \kappa_{i+l-1}^{n+l-1}(m) (\nu_j^l(n)(h)) &= \nu_j^l(n+m-1)(h). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because  $j < i$  and therefore  $i+l-1 \geq j+l$ .

*Case 2.* Suppose now that  $j \geq i + m$ . Again  $g^*(j) = j$  and we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_j^{n+m-1}(l) \circ \kappa_i^n(m) &= \kappa_i^{n+l-1}(m) \circ \kappa_{j-m+1}^n(l) \quad \text{and} \\ \kappa_j^{n+m-1}(l) \circ \nu_i^m(n) &= \nu_i^m(n+l-1).\end{aligned}$$

The first equality holds because  $j \geq i + m$  and therefore  $i < j - m + 1$ . Then (6.1) becomes

$$\left( \kappa_i^{n+l-1}(m)(\kappa_{j-m+1}^n(l)(f)) \right) \cdot \left( \nu_i^m(n+l-1)(g) \right) \cdot \left( \nu_j^l(n+m-1)(h) \right).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}(f \circ_{j-m+1} h) \circ_i g &= (\kappa_{j-m+1}^n(l)(f) \cdot \nu_{j-m+1}^l(n)(h)) \circ_i g \\ &= \kappa_i^{n+l-1}(m) \left( \kappa_{j-m+1}^n(l)(f) \cdot \nu_{j-m+1}^l(n)(h) \right) \cdot \nu_i^m(n+l-1)(g) \\ (6.3) \quad &= \left( \kappa_{h^*(i)}^{n+l-1}(m)(\kappa_{j-m+1}^n(l)(f)) \right) \cdot \left( \kappa_i^{n+l-1}(m)(\nu_{j-m+1}^l(n)(h)) \right) \cdot \left( \nu_i^m(n+l-1)(g) \right),\end{aligned}$$

where  $h^* = \nu_{j-m+1}^l(n)(h)$ . But (6.1) and (6.3) are equal since  $h^*(i) = i$  and

$$\kappa_i^{n+l-1}(m)(\nu_{j-m+1}^l(n)(h)) = \nu_j^l(n+m-1)(h).$$

The last equality holds because  $j \geq i + m$  and therefore  $i < j - m + 1$ .

*Case 3.* Suppose that  $i \leq j < i + m$ . In this case,  $i \leq g^*(j) < i + m$  and we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{g^*(j)}^{n+m-1}(l) \circ \kappa_i^n(m) &= \kappa_i^n(m+l-1) \quad \text{and} \\ \kappa_j^{n+m-1}(l) \circ \nu_i^m(n) &= \nu_i^{m+l-1}(n) \circ \kappa_{j-i+1}^m(l).\end{aligned}$$

Then (6.1) becomes

$$\left( \kappa_i^n(m+l-1)(f) \right) \cdot \left( \nu_i^{m+l-1}(n)(\kappa_{j-i+1}^m(l)(g)) \right) \cdot \left( \nu_j^l(n+m-1)(h) \right).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}f \circ_i (g \circ_{j-i+1} h) &= f \circ_i (\kappa_{j-i+1}^m(l)(g) \cdot \nu_{j-i+1}^l(m)(h)) \\ &= \kappa_i^n(m+l-1)(f) \cdot \nu_i^{m+l-1}(n) \left( \kappa_{j-i+1}^m(l)(g) \cdot \nu_{j-i+1}^l(m)(h) \right) \\ (6.4) \quad &= \left( \kappa_i^n(m+l-1)(f) \right) \cdot \left( \nu_i^{m+l-1}(n)(\kappa_{j-i+1}^m(l)(g)) \right) \cdot \left( \nu_i^{m+l-1}(n)(\nu_{j-i+1}^l(m)(h)) \right).\end{aligned}$$

Again (6.1) and (6.4) are equal since

$$\nu_i^{m+l-1}(n)(\nu_{j-i+1}^l(m)(h)) = \nu_j^l(n+m-1)(h).$$

Regarding the second condition, it is clear that from axiom (ii) we obtain a levelwise homomorphism  $\pi$  to the family of symmetric groups as in the definition of general action operad. From axiom (ii+) we obtain an operad map  $\pi$  as in the definition of action operad.

Finally, in order to prove the product rule for the action operad, we will use condition (viii) in the definition of a bilateral cloning system. Let  $f, f' \in G_n$  and  $g, g' \in G_m$ . Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (f \circ_{f'(i)} g) \cdot (f' \circ_i g') &= \left( \kappa_{f'(i)}^n(m)(f) \cdot \nu_{f'(i)}^m(n)(g) \right) \cdot \left( \kappa_i^n(m)(f') \cdot \nu_i^m(n)(g') \right) \\
 &= \left( \kappa_{f'(i)}^n(m)(f) \cdot \kappa_i^n(m)(f') \right) \cdot \left( \nu_{f'(i)}^m(n)(g) \cdot \nu_i^m(n)(g') \right) \\
 &= \left( \kappa_i^n(m)(f \cdot f') \right) \cdot \left( \nu_i^m(n)(g \cdot g') \right) \\
 &= (f \cdot f') \circ_i (g \cdot g'). \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 6.2.** *There is an explicit bijective correspondence between action operads and restricted operadic cloning systems. There is an explicit bijective correspondence between general action operads and operadic cloning systems.*

*Proof.* The constructions given in Proposition 5.2 and Proposition 6.1 are inverses of each other. Let  $(G_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$  be a restricted operadic cloning system, and let  $(\hat{G}_\bullet, \hat{\iota}, \hat{\zeta}, \hat{\kappa}, \hat{\pi})$  be the restricted operadic cloning system that arises from the action operad associated to it. It is clear that  $\hat{G}_\bullet = G_\bullet$  and that  $\hat{\pi} = \pi$ . For the maps  $\iota$  we have that

$$\hat{\iota}_n(g) = e_2 \circ_1 g = \kappa_1^2(n)(e_2) \cdot \nu_1^n(2)(g) = e_{n+1} \cdot \iota_n(1)(g) = \iota_n(g),$$

and in the same way, we obtain that  $\hat{\zeta}_n(g) = \zeta_n(g)$ . For the cloning maps, we have that

$$\hat{\kappa}_j^n(g) = g \circ_j e_2 = \kappa_j^n(2)(g) \cdot \nu_j^2(n)(e_2) = \kappa_j^n(2)(g) \cdot e_{n+1} = \kappa_j^n(g).$$

Conversely, let  $(\hat{G}_\bullet, \hat{\pi}, \{\hat{\circ}_i\}_i, \hat{\text{id}})$  be the action operad associated to the restricted operadic cloning system obtained from an action operad  $(G_\bullet, \pi, \{\circ_i\}_i, \text{id})$ . It is clear that  $\hat{G}_\bullet = G_\bullet$ ,  $\hat{\pi} = \pi$  and  $\hat{\text{id}} = \text{id}$ . Regarding the partial composition products, let  $f \in G_n$  and  $g \in G_m$ . Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 f \hat{\circ}_i g &= \kappa_i^n(m)(f) \cdot \nu_i^m(n)(g) \\
 &= (f \circ_i e_m) \cdot (e_n \circ_i g) \\
 &= (f \cdot e_n) \circ_i (e_m \cdot g) \\
 &= f \circ_i g,
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Remark 5.1 for the second equality and the product rule of the action operad for the third.

The second statement is proven analogously.  $\square$

**Remark 6.3.** As mentioned in Section 2, most of the known examples of cloning systems are bilateral and even operadic. Consequently, for all those examples, we have identified a general action operad structure on them. However, a natural question arises: is it possible to interpret the remaining Example 2.9 and Example 2.10, in operadic terms? The answer is yes. Both examples have in common that their structural map  $\pi$  is trivial and that the only condition that fails for them to be operadic bilateral cloning systems is axiom (viii).

Repeating the construction of Proposition 6.1 for these examples, and noticing that axiom (viii) is only applied to show the compatibility of the group multiplication with the  $\circ_i$  products, one gets the structure of a non-symmetric operad *in*

sets (see Definition 3.4). The reason why they are not operadic is that an operadic cloning system with  $\pi$  trivial has an associated non-symmetric operad *in groups* via Theorem 6.2.

## 7. CLONING SYSTEMS AS CROSSED GROUPS

Action operads have a close relationship with crossed simplicial groups [Zha11, Yos18]. In this section we review this relationship, and explain the relationship with cloning systems. As we will see, cloning systems satisfying (iv+) can be interpreted as “crossed interval groups”, while cloning systems satisfying (iv+) without maps  $\iota$  are the same as crossed simplicial groups.

Let  $(G_\bullet, \pi, \iota, \kappa)$  be a cloning system. If we forget all the structure except the cloning maps, we can interpret the pair  $(G_\bullet, \kappa)$  as a diagram

$$G_1 \xrightarrow{-\kappa_1} G_2 \xrightarrow[-\kappa_2]{-\kappa_1} G_3 \xrightarrow[-\kappa_3]{-\kappa_2} \cdots$$

which resembles the diagram representing a simplicial set  $X$ , but considering only the degeneracy operations

$$X[0] \xrightarrow{-s_0} X[1] \xrightarrow[-s_1]{-s_0} X[2] \xrightarrow[-s_2]{-s_1} X[3] \xrightarrow[-s_3]{-s_2} X[4] \xrightarrow[-s_4]{-s_3} \cdots$$

Let us formalise this viewpoint. Let  $[n] = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  be the finite ordinal of cardinality  $n + 1$ .

**Definition 7.1.** The *simplicial category*  $\Delta$  has objects the non-empty finite ordinals and morphisms the order-preserving maps between them. There are two distinguished families of morphisms

$$\delta_j^n : [n-1] \longrightarrow [n], \quad \sigma_j^n : [n+1] \longrightarrow [n], \quad 0 \leq j \leq n,$$

called *cofaces* and *codegeneracies*, respectively, and defined as

$$\delta_j^n(i) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } i < j \\ i+1 & \text{if } i \geq j \end{cases} \quad \sigma_j^n(i) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } i \leq j \\ i-1 & \text{if } i > j \end{cases}$$

These morphisms satisfy the following relations, called *cosimplicial identities*

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_j^n \circ \delta_{i+1}^{n-1} &= \delta_i^n \circ \delta_j^{n-1}, & j \leq i, \\ \sigma_{j+1}^n \circ \sigma_i^{n+1} &= \sigma_i^n \circ \sigma_j^{n-1}, & i \leq j, \\ \delta_i^{n+1} \circ \sigma_j^n &= \begin{cases} \sigma_{j-1}^n \circ \delta_i^{n+1} & i < j, \\ \text{id} & i = j, j+1, \\ \sigma_j^n \circ \delta_{i-1}^{n+1} & i > j+1, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and generate all the morphisms in the category in the sense that every morphism can be expressed as a composite of cofaces and codegeneracies.

**Definition 7.2.** Let  $\Delta_{\text{surj}} \subset \Delta$  be the category of non-empty finite ordinals with order-preserving surjections between them. It is the subcategory of  $\Delta$  generated by the maps  $s_j^n$ .

**Definition 7.3.** Let  $\text{Set}$  be the category of sets and functions. A *simplicial set*  $X$  is a functor  $X: \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ . The maps  $X(\delta_i^n)$  are called *faces* and denoted  $d_i^n$  and the maps  $X(\sigma_i^n)$  are called *degeneracies* and denoted  $s_i^n$ . A *demi-simplicial set*<sup>1</sup>  $X$  is a functor  $X: \Delta_{\text{surj}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ .

Faces and degeneracies satisfy the so-called *simplicial identities* which are the dual of the cosimplicial identities mentioned above. In the particular case of the relation involving only degeneracies, we get the identity

$$(7.1) \quad s_i^{n+1} \circ s_{j+1}^n = s_j^{n-1} \circ s_i^n, \quad i \leq j.$$

In what follows, when we refer to conditions in roman numbers, we mean the conditions satisfied by cloning systems and bilateral cloning systems from Definition 2.2 and Definition 2.5.

Observe that (7.1) is exactly the same relation satisfied by the maps  $\kappa_j^n$  with the extra condition (iv+) except that the subindexes are shifted by one (the first map is  $\kappa_1$  not  $\kappa_0$ ). Therefore we have the following consequence.

**Lemma 7.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{G}_\bullet = \{\mathbf{G}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be a family of groups and let  $\kappa = \{\kappa_j^n: \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n+1}\}_{n \geq 1, 1 \leq j \leq n}$  be a family of maps. A pair  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \kappa)$  satisfying conditions (iv) and (iv+) is the same as a demi-simplicial set with values on groups.*  $\square$

**Example 7.5.** Let us build the demi-simplicial set associated to the cloning system of symmetric groups. Note that an order-preserving surjection  $f: [n] \rightarrow [m]$  is completely determined by the cardinality of the preimages  $f^{-1}(0), \dots, f^{-1}(m)$ . Every permutation  $h \in \Sigma_{m+1}$  of  $[m]$  induces a permutation of the preimages  $f^{-1}(0), \dots, f^{-1}(m)$ , and therefore a block permutation on  $[n]$ , that we denote by  $\Phi(f)(h) \in \Sigma_{n+1}$ . This defines a functor  $\Phi: \Delta_{\text{surj}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$  with  $\Phi([n]) = \Sigma_{n+1}$ .

There is an action of  $\Sigma_{m+1}$  on the set of order-preserving surjections from  $[n]$  to  $[m]$ , that sends a permutation  $g$  and a surjection  $f$  to the unique surjection  $h$  such that the cardinality of  $h^{-1}(g(i))$  is equal to the cardinality of  $f^{-1}(i)$ . We denote this surjection  $h$  by  $f_g$ . Observe now that the map  $\Phi(f): \Sigma_{m+1} \rightarrow \Sigma_{n+1}$  is not a group homomorphism but satisfies that

$$\Phi(f)(g \cdot g') = \Phi(f_g')(g) \cdot \Phi(f)(g'),$$

which applied to degeneracies is the same as condition (v) in a cloning system

$$(7.2) \quad \Phi(s_i)(g \cdot g') = \Phi(s_{g'(i)})(g) \cdot \Phi(s_i)(g').$$

The functor  $\Phi$ , defined on order-preserving surjections between ordinals, can be extended to any order-preserving map between ordinals. Indeed, since every map factors as a surjection followed by an injection, it is enough to define it on injections, which we can do as follows. Note that to give an order-preserving injective function  $f: [n] \rightarrow [m]$  is equivalent to specify the complement of the image  $A = [m] \setminus f([n])$ . There is an action of  $\Sigma_{m+1}$  on the set of order-preserving injections from  $[n]$  to  $[m]$ , that sends a permutation  $g$  and an injection  $f$  to the unique injection  $h$  such that  $[m] \setminus h([n]) = [m] \setminus g(f([n]))$ . We denote this injection  $h$  by  $f_g$ . If  $g \in \Sigma_{m+1}$  is a permutation of  $[m]$ , define  $\Phi(f)(g) = f_g^{-1} \circ g \circ f$ . This defines a functor  $\Phi: \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ , and hence a simplicial set.

<sup>1</sup>It seems these objects have not been considered previously in the literature. Since simplicial sets without degeneracies are called *semi-simplicial sets*, we have chosen to replace the prefix *semi-* by its french version *demi-*. Additionally, the first letter of each prefix specifies whether we are removing degeneracies or face maps.

Observe now that the map  $\Phi(f): \Sigma_{m+1} \rightarrow \Sigma_{n+1}$  is not a group homomorphism but satisfies that

$$\Phi(f)(g \cdot g') = \Phi(f_{g'})(g) \cdot \Phi(f)(g').$$

The following definition of crossed simplicial groups is a characterization taken from [FL91, Proposition 1.7], where  $\Phi$  denotes the simplicial set constructed above.

**Definition 7.6.** A *crossed simplicial group* is a simplicial set  $\Psi: \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$  with values on groups together with a levelwise group homomorphism  $\pi: \Psi \rightarrow \Phi$  such that  $\pi(s_i^\Psi(g))[j] = s_i^\Phi(\pi(g))[j]$  for all  $j \neq i, i+1$  and

$$\Psi(s_i)(g \cdot g') = \Psi(s_{\pi(g)(i)})(g') \cdot \Psi(s_i)(g'),$$

$$\Psi(d_i)(g \cdot g') = \Psi(d_{\pi(g)(i)})(g') \cdot \Psi(d_i)(g'),$$

and  $\pi([n]): \Psi([n]) \rightarrow \Sigma_n$  is a group homomorphism. A *crossed demi-simplicial group* is defined in the same way, replacing the category  $\Delta$  by the category  $\Delta_{\text{surj}}$ .

The following result follows immediately from the previous discussion and the definition of crossed demi-simplicial group.

**Lemma 7.7.** Let  $\mathbf{G}_\bullet = \{\mathbf{G}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be a family of groups,  $\pi = \{\pi_n: \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  a family of group homomorphisms and  $\kappa = \{\kappa_j^n: \mathbf{G}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_{n+1}\}_{n \geq 1, 1 \leq j \leq n}$  a family of maps. A triple  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \pi, \kappa)$  satisfying conditions (ii), (iv), (iv+) and (v) is the same as a crossed demi-simplicial group.  $\square$

Now we would like to incorporate the homomorphisms  $\iota$  to the picture. We will incorporate the morphisms  $\zeta$  at the same time.

**Definition 7.8.** For each  $n \geq 1$ , the  $n^{\text{th}}$  interval is the set  $\langle n \rangle = \{-\infty, 1, \dots, n, \infty\}$ . The *interval category*  $\mathbb{I}$  is the category whose objects are all intervals and whose morphisms are order-preserving maps that preserve  $-\infty$  and  $\infty$ . The subcategory  $\mathbb{I}_{\text{surj}}$  has the same objects as  $\mathbb{I}$  and its morphisms are the order-preserving surjective maps that preserve  $-\infty$  and  $\infty$ .

The interval category can be introduced as the Joyal dual of the simplicial category [Joy97] or as the image of the faithful embedding  $\alpha: \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \Delta$  that sends  $\langle n \rangle = \{-\infty, 1, \dots, n, \infty\}$  to  $[n+1] = \{0, 1, \dots, n+1\}$ , and an interval map yields a simplicial map by interpreting  $-\infty$  as 0 and  $\infty$  as  $n+1$ . Here we are interested in the second description, and we will blur the difference between maps in  $\mathbb{I}$  and their images under the embedding  $\alpha$ . Therefore, from now on we will write simply  $\Phi$  for the crossed interval group  $\Phi \circ \alpha$ .

**Definition 7.9.** An *inert crossed interval group* is a presheaf  $\Psi: \mathbb{I}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$  with values on groups together with a levelwise group homomorphism  $\pi_n: \Psi([n]) \rightarrow \Phi([n])$  such that  $\pi(s_i^\Psi(g))[j] = s_i^\Phi(\pi(g))[j]$  for all  $j \neq i, i+1$  and

$$\Psi(s_i)(g \cdot g') = \Psi(s_{\pi(g)(i)})(g') \cdot \Psi(s_i)(g'),$$

$$\Psi(d_i)(g \cdot g') = \Psi(d_{\pi(g)(i)})(g') \cdot \Psi(d_i)(g'),$$

An *inert crossed demi-interval group* is defined in the same way, by replacing  $\mathbb{I}$  by  $\mathbb{I}_{\text{surj}}$ .

Observe now that if  $\Phi$  is an inert crossed interval group, the maps  $\Phi(s_0)$  and  $\Phi(s_{n+1})$  are group homomorphisms. In fact, we can interpret bilateral cloning systems as an inert crossed demi-interval groups by setting  $\kappa_i^n = s_i^{n+1}$ ,  $\zeta_n = s_0^{n+1}$  and  $\iota_n = s_{n+1}^{n+1}$ . Thus, we have the following result.



**Lemma 7.10.** *A quintuple  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \pi, \iota, \zeta, \kappa)$  satisfying all the conditions of a bilateral cloning system is the same as an inert crossed demi-interval group.*

**Remark 7.11.** Since crossed interval groups embed into crossed simplicial groups, every action operad gives rise to a crossed simplicial group. This is carefully developed in [Zha11, 2.4].

**Remark 7.12.** Crossed interval groups have been studied in [BM14] and [Yos18]. The adjective *inert* corresponds to any of the two equivalent properties defined in [Yos18, Lemma 4.3].

In that paper, Yoshida studied the relation between crossed interval groups and action operads. He established that every action operad determines a crossed interval group, and found three properties that characterise the crossed interval groups that come from an operad: operadicness, tameness and “factoring through the symmetric group”. Under the above lemma, tameness corresponds to property (ix), while operadicness corresponds to property (viii) plus being inert and “factoring through the symmetric group” corresponds to (ii+). Yoshida studies action operads with constants (operations of arity 0), while we study action operads without constants. The existence of constants in the action operad corresponds to the injective morphisms in the simplicial or the interval category.

We note that Examples 3.1 and 3.4 in [Zar18], which do not come from an action operad, do come from an inert crossed demi-interval group (with trivial homomorphisms  $\pi$ ).

## 8. CLONING SYSTEMS AND PROs

In this section, we present another viewpoint for cloning systems in terms of PROs (product categories) that will be used in a forthcoming piece of work about the construction of Thompson groups. We begin by recalling the definition of PRO.

**Definition 8.1.** A *PRO*  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a quadruple  $(\mathfrak{D}, \odot, \otimes, \text{id})$  where:

- $\mathfrak{D}$  is a collection of sets  $\left(\mathfrak{D} \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ m \end{smallmatrix} \right)_{n,m \geq 1}$ ,
- $\odot$  is an associative product (*vertical product*) with two-sided unit  $\text{id}$

$$\odot: \mathfrak{D} \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ t \end{smallmatrix} \times \mathfrak{D} \begin{smallmatrix} s \\ n \end{smallmatrix} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{D} \begin{smallmatrix} s \\ t \end{smallmatrix}, \quad \text{id}_n \in \mathfrak{D} \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ n \end{smallmatrix},$$

- $\otimes$  is an associative product (*horizontal product*)

$$\otimes: \mathfrak{D} \begin{smallmatrix} n_1 \\ m_1 \end{smallmatrix} \times \mathfrak{D} \begin{smallmatrix} n_2 \\ m_2 \end{smallmatrix} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{D} \begin{smallmatrix} n_1 + n_2 \\ m_1 + m_2 \end{smallmatrix}.$$

Moreover, the vertical and horizontal product are required to satisfy the *interchange law*

$$(f \otimes g) \odot (p \otimes q) = (f \odot p) \otimes (g \odot q),$$

whenever it makes sense, and  $\text{id}_n \otimes \text{id}_m = \text{id}_{n+m}$  for all  $n, m \geq 1$ .

More abstractly, a *PRO*  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a strict (non unital) monoidal category equipped with a strict monoidal functor  $(\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}, +) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{D}, \otimes)$  which is an isomorphism on objects. We do not consider monoidal units, that is, units for  $\otimes$ , because they will create nullary operations that we are avoiding.

**Example 8.2** (Symmetric groups). The family of symmetric groups  $\{\Sigma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  yields a very simple PRO by setting

$$\Sigma \begin{bmatrix} n \\ m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{cases} \Sigma_n & \text{if } n = m, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } n \neq m. \end{cases}$$

The vertical product  $\odot$  is just the group structure of the symmetric groups and the horizontal product  $\otimes$  is the block product of permutations (see Figure 16). We denote by  $\Sigma$  the PRO of symmetric groups. Additionally, we consider that  $\Sigma$



FIGURE 16. Block product of  $(1\ 4)(2\ 3)$  and  $(1\ 2\ 3)$ .

is equipped with *cloning maps* for any  $n$ -tuple of positive integers  $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ ,  $c(m_1, \dots, m_n): \Sigma \begin{bmatrix} n \\ n \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \Sigma \begin{bmatrix} m_1 + \dots + m_n \\ m_1 + \dots + m_n \end{bmatrix}$ , obtained by replacing the  $i$ -th strand by  $m_i$  strands for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

**Example 8.3** (Signed symmetric groups). The family of signed symmetric groups  $\{\Sigma_n^\pm\}_{n \geq 1}$  provides a slightly more complicated PRO. First, define

$$\Sigma^\pm \begin{bmatrix} n \\ m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{cases} \Sigma_n^\pm & \text{if } n = m, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } n \neq m. \end{cases}$$

The vertical product  $\odot$  is just the group structure of the signed symmetric groups and the horizontal product  $\otimes$  is the block product of signed permutations, which is defined analogously to the block product of ordinary permutations. We denote by  $\Sigma^\pm$  the PRO of signed symmetric groups. Additionally, we consider that  $\Sigma^\pm$  is equipped with *cloning maps* for any  $n$ -tuple of positive integers  $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ ,  $c(m_1, \dots, m_n): \Sigma^\pm \begin{bmatrix} n \\ n \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \Sigma^\pm \begin{bmatrix} m_1 + \dots + m_n \\ m_1 + \dots + m_n \end{bmatrix}$ , obtained by “plumbing”  $m_i$  strands in the  $i$ -th component for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  subject to the rules:

- if  $g(+i)$  is positive, the new  $m_i$  strands are plumbed with the identity permutation;
- if  $g(+i)$  is negative, the new  $m_i$  strands are plumbed with the permutation

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & m_i - 1 & m_i \\ m_i & m_i - 1 & \cdots & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$




FIGURE 17. Cloning map on  $\Sigma^\pm$ .

We will also need the concept of a *morphism of PROs*  $f: \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}'$ , which consists of maps  $f_{n,m}: \mathfrak{D} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ m \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}' \begin{bmatrix} n \\ m \end{bmatrix}$  for every  $n, m \geq 1$  that preserve the PRO structure.

Next, we define two special types of PROs, by adding some extra structure, which will turn out to be equivalent to operadic cloning systems and their restricted counterparts.

**Definition 8.4.** A *cloning PRO* consists of the following data:

- a PRO  $(\mathbf{G}, \odot, \otimes, \text{id})$  such that the vertical product on  $\mathbf{G} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ n \end{bmatrix}$  admits inverses, that is,  $\mathbf{G} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ n \end{bmatrix}$  is a group for every  $n$ , and  $\mathbf{G} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ m \end{bmatrix} = \emptyset$  if  $n \neq m$ ,
- a morphism of PROs  $\pi: \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \Sigma^\pm$ ,
- cloning maps  $\kappa(\underline{m}): \mathbf{G} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ n \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbf{G} \begin{bmatrix} m_1 + \dots + m_n \\ m_1 + \dots + m_n \end{bmatrix}$  for every  $n \geq 1$  and every  $n$ -tuple  $\underline{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$  with  $m_i \geq 1$ , satisfying  $\kappa(1, \dots, 1) = \text{id}_{\mathbf{G}_n}$ , and the associativity condition

$$\kappa(\underline{r}^1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \underline{r}^n) \circ \kappa(\underline{m}) = \kappa\left(\sum_{j_1} \underline{r}_{j_1}^1, \dots, \sum_{j_n} \underline{r}_{j_n}^n\right),$$

where  $\underline{r}^i = (r_1^i, \dots, r_{m_i}^i)$  and  $\underline{r}^1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \underline{r}^n = (r_1^1, \dots, r_{m_1}^1, \dots, r_1^n, \dots, r_{m_n}^n)$ .

Moreover, the PRO structure is compatible with  $\pi$  and  $\kappa$  as stated by the following conditions:

- (1)  $\pi$  commutes with  $\kappa$ :  $\pi \circ \kappa(\underline{m}) = c(\underline{m}) \circ \pi$ .
- (2) Identities and  $\kappa$ :  $\kappa(\underline{m})(\text{id}_n) = \text{id}_{m_1 + \dots + m_n}$ .
- (3) Horizontal composition and  $\kappa$ :

$$\kappa(\underline{m})(f) \otimes \kappa(\underline{n})(g) = \kappa(\underline{m} \sqcup \underline{n})(f \otimes g).$$

- (4) Vertical composition and  $\kappa$ :

$$\kappa(\underline{m})(h \odot g) = \kappa(\underline{m}_{\pi(g)})(h) \odot \kappa(\underline{m})(g),$$

where  $\underline{m}_{\pi(g)} = (m_{\pi(g)(1)}, \dots, m_{\pi(g)(n)})$ .

- (★) Twisted interchange law:

$$\kappa(\underline{m})(f) \odot (g_1 \otimes \dots \otimes g_n) = (g_{\pi(f)(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes g_{\pi(f)(n)}) \odot \kappa(\underline{m})(f).$$

**Definition 8.5.** A cloning PRO  $(\mathbf{G}, \odot, \otimes, \text{id}, \pi, \kappa)$  is said to be *restricted* if the morphism of PROs  $\pi: \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \Sigma^\pm$  factors through the PRO of symmetric groups  $\Sigma$ .

After these definitions, we prove that every (restricted) operadic cloning system gives rise to a (restricted) cloning PRO. More concretely:

**Proposition 8.6.** A (restricted) operadic cloning system  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$  defines a (restricted) cloning PRO  $(\mathbf{G}, \odot, \otimes, \text{id}, \pi, \kappa)$  in a functorial way.

*Proof.* Set  $\mathbf{G} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ n \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{G}_n$ , the vertical product  $\odot$  to be the group multiplication and  $\text{id}_n = e_n$ . Define the cloning maps

$$\kappa(\underline{m}) = \kappa(m_1, \dots, m_n) = \kappa_1(m_1) \circ \dots \circ \kappa_n(m_n),$$

and the horizontal product  $\otimes$

$$\otimes: \mathbf{G} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ n \end{bmatrix} \times \mathbf{G} \begin{bmatrix} m \\ m \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\iota(m) \times \zeta(n)} \mathbf{G} \begin{bmatrix} n+m \\ n+m \end{bmatrix} \times \mathbf{G} \begin{bmatrix} n+m \\ n+m \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\cdot} \mathbf{G} \begin{bmatrix} n+m \\ n+m \end{bmatrix}.$$

We now check that  $(\mathbf{G}, \odot, \otimes, \text{id}, \pi, \kappa)$  is a (restricted) cloning PRO by verifying all the axioms. Let  $f \in \mathbf{G}_n$ ,  $g \in \mathbf{G}_m$  and  $h \in \mathbf{G}_r$ .

- Associativity of  $\otimes$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (f \otimes g) \otimes h &= \iota(r)(\iota(m)(f) \cdot \zeta(n)(g)) \cdot \zeta(n+m)(h) \\ &= \iota(r+m)(f) \cdot \iota(r)(\zeta(n)(g)) \cdot \zeta(n+m)(h) \\ &= f \otimes (g \otimes h), \end{aligned}$$

by condition (vi) of bilateral cloning systems and since  $\iota$  and  $\zeta$  are homomorphisms.

- Interchange law for  $\odot$  and  $\otimes$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (f \otimes g) \odot (p \otimes q) &= \left( \iota(m)(f) \cdot \zeta(n)(g) \right) \cdot \left( \iota(m)(p) \cdot \zeta(n)(q) \right) \\ &= \iota(m)(f) \cdot \iota(m)(p) \cdot \zeta(n)(g) \cdot \zeta(n)(q) \\ &= (f \odot p) \otimes (g \odot q), \end{aligned}$$

by condition (ix) and since  $\iota$  and  $\zeta$  are homomorphisms.

- $\pi: \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \Sigma^\pm$  (resp.  $\pi: \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \Sigma$ ) is a morphism of PROs, since  $\pi$  commutes with  $\iota, \kappa, \zeta$  and it consists of group homomorphisms.
- Associativity conditions for  $\kappa$  hold by conditions (iv) and (iv+) (axioms for compositions of  $\kappa$ 's for operadic/bilateral cloning systems).
- Commutation of  $\kappa$  and  $\pi$  holds by the analogous axiom for (restricted) operadic cloning systems, i.e. (ii') (resp. (ii+)).
- $\kappa$  acting on identities. Since

$$\kappa_j(r)(e_m) = \kappa_j(r)(e_m) \cdot \kappa_j(r)(e_m),$$

it follows that  $\kappa_j(r)(e_m) = e_{m+r-1}$ .

- Relation between  $\kappa$  and  $\odot$ . By iterating condition (v) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(\underline{m})(f \odot p) &= \kappa_1(m_1) \odot \cdots \odot \kappa_n(m_n)(f \cdot p) \\ &= \left( \kappa_{p(1)}(m_1) \odot \cdots \odot \kappa_{p(n)}(m_n)(f) \right) \cdot \left( \kappa_1(m_1) \odot \cdots \odot \kappa_n(m_n)(p) \right) \\ &= \kappa(\underline{m}_p)(f) \odot \kappa(\underline{m})(p). \end{aligned}$$

- Relation between  $\kappa$  and  $\otimes$ . Let us analyze what happens for  $\kappa_j(r)$  instead of a general  $\kappa(\underline{m}^1 \sqcup \underline{m}^2)$ , because the general case will follow by combining these simple cases by conditions (iv) and (iv+).

**Case 1:** ( $1 \leq j \leq n$ ).

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_j(r)(f \otimes g) &= \kappa_j(r)(\iota(m)(f) \cdot \zeta(n)(g)) \\ &= \kappa_{\zeta(n)(g)(j)}(r)(\iota(m)(f)) \cdot \kappa_j(r)(\zeta(n)(g)) \\ &= \kappa_j(r)(\iota(m)(f)) \cdot \kappa_j(r)(\zeta(n)(g)) \\ &= \iota(m)(\kappa_j(r)(f)) \cdot \zeta(r+n)(g) \\ &= \kappa_j(r)(f) \otimes g. \end{aligned}$$

We have applied conditions (v), (iii), (vii') and that  $\zeta(n)(g)$  is constant over  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ .

**Case 2:** ( $n < j \leq m+n$ ).

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_j(r)(f \otimes g) &= \kappa_{n+g(j)}(r)(\iota(m)(f)) \cdot \kappa_j(r)(\zeta(n)(g)) \\ &= \iota(m+r)(f) \cdot \zeta(n)(\kappa_j(r)(g)) \\ &= f \otimes \kappa_j(r)(g). \end{aligned}$$

We have applied conditions (v), (iii'), (vii) and that  $\zeta(n)(g)(j)$  in this case is  $n+g(j)$  which is strictly bigger than  $n$  (recall that we are always assuming that elements in  $\mathbf{G}_m$  or  $\Sigma_m^\pm$  act on  $\{1, \dots, m\}$  through their canonical map into  $\Sigma_m$ ).

- Twisted interchange law. Let us just check the case  $f \in \mathbf{G}_2$  ( $n = 2$ ) and  $g_i \in \mathbf{G}_{m_i}$ , since the general case follows from the same ideas.

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa(m_1, m_2)(f) \odot (g_1 \otimes g_2) &= (\kappa_1(m_1) \circ \kappa_2(m_2))(f) \cdot (\iota(m_2)(g_1) \cdot \zeta(m_1)(g_2)) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} (\kappa_1(m_1)(\kappa_2(m_2)(f)) \cdot \nu_1(m_2)(g_1)) \cdot \zeta(m_1)(g_2) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} (\nu_{f(1)}(m_2)(g_1) \cdot \kappa_1(m_1)(\kappa_2(m_2)(f))) \cdot \zeta(m_1)(g_2) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} \nu_{f(1)}(m_2)(g_1) \cdot \kappa_1(m_1)(\kappa_2(m_2)(f) \cdot \nu_2(1)(g_2)) \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{=} \nu_{f(1)}(m_2)(g_1) \cdot \kappa_1(m_1)(\nu_{f(2)}(1)(g_2) \cdot \kappa_2(m_2)(f)) \\
&\stackrel{(e)}{=} \nu_{f(1)}(m_2)(g_1) \cdot \nu_{f(2)}(m_1)(g_2) \cdot \kappa(m_1, m_2)(f) \\
&= (g_{f(1)} \otimes g_{f(2)}) \odot \kappa(m_1, m_2)(f).
\end{aligned}$$

In the above equalities, we have applied: (a) definition of  $\nu$ ; (b) condition (viii); (c) condition (vii') and definition of  $\nu$ ; (d) condition (viii); and (e) conditions (vii) and (iv+).  $\square$

Next, we prove that (restricted) operadic cloning systems come from (restricted) cloning PROs:

**Proposition 8.7.** *A (restricted) cloning PRO  $(\mathbf{G}, \odot, \otimes, \text{id}, \pi, \kappa)$  determines a (restricted) operadic cloning system  $(\mathbf{G}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$  in a functorial way.*

*Proof.* Set  $\mathbf{G}_n = \mathbf{G} \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ n \end{smallmatrix} \right]$ , the product  $\cdot = \odot$  and  $e_n = \text{id}_n$ . Define

$$\kappa_j(m) = \kappa(1, \dots, 1, m^{(j)}, 1, \dots, 1), \quad \iota(f) = f \otimes \text{id} \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta(f) = \text{id} \otimes f.$$

The only non straightforward axioms to check are the following:

- $\iota$  is a homomorphism of groups. We have that,

$$\iota(m)(f \cdot g) = (f \odot g) \otimes \text{id}_m = (f \otimes \text{id}_m) \odot (g \otimes \text{id}_m) = \iota(m)(f) \cdot \iota(m)(g)$$

by the interchange law and since  $\text{id}_m$  is idempotent. A similar argument proves that  $\zeta$  is also a homomorphism of groups.

- Axioms (iii) and (vii). We have that

$$\kappa_j(r)\iota(m)(f) = \begin{cases} \kappa_j(r)(f) \otimes \text{id}_m = \iota(m)\kappa_j(r)(f) & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq n, \\ f \otimes \text{id}_{m+r-1} = \iota(m+r-1)(f) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $f \in \mathbf{G} \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ n \end{smallmatrix} \right]$ . The corresponding conditions (iii') and (vii') for  $\zeta$  can be deduced in the same way.

- Axiom (vi). We have that

$$\zeta(m)\iota(n)(f) = \text{id}_m \otimes f \otimes \text{id}_n = \iota(n)\zeta(m)(f)$$

by the associativity of the horizontal product  $\otimes$ .

- Axiom (viii). We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_j(m)(f) \cdot \nu_j(n)(g) &= \kappa(1, \dots, m^{(j)}, \dots, 1)(f) \odot (\text{id}_{j-1} \otimes g \otimes \text{id}_{n-j+1}) \\ &= (\text{id}_{f(j)-1} \otimes g \otimes \text{id}_{n-f(j)+1}) \odot \kappa(1, \dots, m^{(j)}, \dots, 1)(f) \\ &= \nu_{f(j)}(n)(g) \cdot \kappa_j(m)(f),\end{aligned}$$

by the twisted interchange law and the identity  $\text{id}_r \otimes \text{id}_s = \text{id}_{r+s}$ .

- Axiom (ix). We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\iota(m)(f) \cdot \zeta(n)(g) &= (f \otimes \text{id}_m) \odot (\text{id}_n \otimes g) \\ &= (f \odot \text{id}_n) \otimes (\text{id}_m \odot g) \\ &= (\text{id}_n \odot f) \otimes (g \odot \text{id}_m) \\ &= (\text{id}_n \otimes g) \odot (f \otimes \text{id}_m) \\ &= \zeta(n)(g) \cdot \iota(m)(f),\end{aligned}$$

by the interchange law and since  $\text{id}_r$  is an identity for  $(\mathbb{G} \begin{bmatrix} r \\ r \end{bmatrix}, \odot)$ .  $\square$

Finally, we have the following theorem, which ties together the results in this section:

**Theorem 8.8.** *The functorial constructions of Propositions 8.6 and 8.7 induce isomorphisms of categories*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{(restricted) operadic} \\ \text{cloning systems} \end{array} \right\} \cong \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{(restricted)} \\ \text{cloning PROs} \end{array} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Let us first check that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{(restricted) operadic} \\ \text{cloning systems} \end{array} \right\} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{(restricted)} \\ \text{cloning PROs} \end{array} \right\} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{(restricted) operadic} \\ \text{cloning systems} \end{array} \right\}.$$

is the identity. Let  $(\mathbb{G}_\bullet, \iota, \zeta, \kappa, \pi)$  be a (restricted) operadic cloning system, and let  $(\hat{\mathbb{G}}_\bullet, \hat{\iota}, \hat{\zeta}, \hat{\kappa}, \hat{\pi})$  be the image of the previous (restricted) operadic cloning system under the composition of functors. By definition  $\hat{\mathbb{G}} = \mathbb{G}$  as groups and  $\hat{\pi} = \pi$ . For  $\hat{\iota}$ , we have that

$$\hat{\iota}(g) = g \otimes \text{id} = \iota(1)(g) \cdot \zeta(n)(e_1) = \iota(g) \cdot e_{n+1} = \iota(g).$$

The maps  $\zeta$  behave similarly, and

$$\hat{\kappa}_j(g) = \kappa(1, \dots, 2^{(j)}, \dots, 1)(g) = (\kappa_1(1) \circ \dots \circ \kappa_j(2) \circ \dots \circ \kappa_n(1))(g) = \kappa_j(g).$$

Conversely, let  $(\mathbb{G}, \odot, \otimes, \text{id}, \pi, \kappa)$  be a (restricted) cloning PRO and let the tuple  $(\hat{\mathbb{G}}, \hat{\odot}, \hat{\otimes}, \hat{\text{id}}, \hat{\pi}, \hat{\kappa})$  denote the image of it under the other composition of functors. It is clear that  $\hat{\mathbb{G}} = \mathbb{G}$ ,  $\hat{\odot} = \odot$ ,  $\hat{\text{id}} = \text{id}$ ,  $\hat{\pi} = \pi$  and  $\hat{\kappa} = \kappa$ . Finally, regarding the horizontal product we have that

$$\begin{aligned}f \hat{\otimes} g &= \iota(m)(f) \cdot \zeta(n)(g) = (f \otimes \text{id}_m) \odot (\text{id}_n \otimes g) \\ &= (f \odot \text{id}_n) \otimes (\text{id}_m \odot g) = f \otimes g.\end{aligned} \quad \square$$

## REFERENCES

- [ABF<sup>+</sup>21] J. ARAMAYONA, K.-U. BUX, J. FLECHSIG, N. PETROSYAN, and X. WU, *Asymptotic mapping class groups of Cantor manifolds and their finiteness properties*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.05318>, 2021.
- [AF21] J. ARAMAYONA and L. FUNAR, Asymptotic mapping class groups of closed surfaces punctured along Cantor sets, *Mosc. Math. J.* **21** no. 1 (2021), 1–29. MR 4219034. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1609-4514-2021-21-1-1-29>.
- [BM14] M. BATANIN and M. MARKL, Crossed interval groups and operations on the Hochschild cohomology, *J. Noncommut. Geom.* **8** no. 3 (2014), 655–693 (English). <https://doi.org/10.4171/JNCG/167>.
- [BF19] J. BELK and B. FORREST, Rearrangement groups of fractals, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **372** no. 7 (2019), 4509–4552. MR 4009393. <https://doi.org/10.1090/tran/7386>.
- [Bri04] M. G. BRIN, Higher dimensional Thompson groups, *Geom. Dedicata* **108** (2004), 163–192. MR 2112673. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10711-004-8122-9>.
- [Bri07] M. G. BRIN, The algebra of strand splitting. I. A braided version of Thompson’s group  $V$ , *J. Group Theory* **10** no. 6 (2007), 757–788. MR 2364825. <https://doi.org/10.1515/JGT.2007.055>.
- [CFP96] J. W. CANNON, W. J. FLOYD, and W. R. PARRY, Introductory notes on Richard Thompson’s groups, *Enseign. Math. (2)* **42** no. 3-4 (1996), 215–256. MR 1426438.
- [CG14] A. CORNER and N. GURSKI, Operads with general groups of equivariance, and some 2-categorical aspects of operads in cat, *arXiv:1312.5910 [math.CT]* (2014).
- [Deh06] P. DEHORNOY, The group of parenthesized braids, *Adv. Math.* **205** no. 2 (2006), 354–409. MR 2258261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2005.07.012>.
- [FL91] Z. FIEDOROWICZ and J.-L. LODAY, Crossed simplicial groups and their associated homology, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **326** no. 1 (1991), 57–87 (English). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2001855>.
- [FL10] M. FIORE and T. LEINSTER, An abstract characterization of Thompson’s group  $F$ ., *Semigroup Forum* **80** no. 2 (2010), 325–340 (English). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00233-010-9209-2>.
- [FK04] L. FUNAR and C. KAPOUDJIAN, On a universal mapping class group of genus zero, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **14** no. 5 (2004), 965–1012. MR 2105950. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00039-004-0480-9>.
- [FK08] L. FUNAR and C. KAPOUDJIAN, The braided Ptolemy-Thompson group is finitely presented, *Geom. Topol.* **12** no. 1 (2008), 475–530. MR 2390352. <https://doi.org/10.2140/gt.2008.12.475>.
- [FK09] L. FUNAR and C. KAPOUDJIAN, An infinite genus mapping class group and stable cohomology, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **287** no. 3 (2009), 784–804. MR 2486661. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-009-0728-1>.
- [GLU22] A. GENEVOIS, A. LONJOU, and C. URECH, Asymptotically rigid mapping class groups, I: Finiteness properties of braided Thompson’s and Houghton’s groups, *Geom. Topol.* **26** no. 3 (2022), 1385–1434. MR 4466651. <https://doi.org/10.2140/gt.2022.26.1385>.
- [GS97] V. GUBA and M. SAPIR, Diagram groups, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **130** no. 620 (1997), viii+117. MR 1396957. <https://doi.org/10.1090/memo/0620>.
- [Hat02] A. HATCHER, *Algebraic topology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002. MR 1867354.
- [Joy97] A. JOYAL, *Disks, duality and  $\theta$ -categories*, <https://ncatlab.org/nlab/files/JoyalThetaCategories.pdf>, 1997.
- [Mar08] M. MARKL, Operads and PROPs, in *Handbook of algebra. Vol. 5, Handb. Algebr.* **5**, Elsevier/North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2008, pp. 87–140. MR 2523450. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1570-7954\(07\)05002-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1570-7954(07)05002-4).
- [Ste92] M. STEIN, Groups of piecewise linear homeomorphisms, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **332** no. 2 (1992), 477–514. MR 1094555. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2154179>.
- [Thu17] W. THUMANN, Operad groups and their finiteness properties, *Adv. Math.* **307** (2017), 417–487. MR 3590523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2016.11.022>.
- [Wah01] N. WAHL, *Ribbon Braids and related operads*, *Ph.D. Thesis*, <https://web.math.ku.dk/~wahl/>, 2001.

- [WZ18] S. WITZEL and M. C. B. ZAREMSKY, Thompson groups for systems of groups, and their finiteness properties, *Groups Geom. Dyn.* **12** no. 1 (2018), 289–358. MR 3781423. <https://doi.org/10.4171/GGD/444>.
- [Yau22] D. YAU, *Infinity operads and monoidal categories with group equivariance*, Singapore: World Scientific, 2022 (English). <https://doi.org/10.1142/12687>.
- [Yos18] J. YOSHIDA, Group operads as crossed interval groups, 2018, arXiv.1806.03012v1. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1806.03012>.
- [Zar18] M. C. B. ZAREMSKY, A user’s guide to cloning systems, *Topology Proc.* **52** (2018), 13–33. MR 3661656.
- [Zha11] W. ZHANG, *Group Operads and Homotopy Theory*, arXiv.1111.7090, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1111.7090>.

JAVIER ARAMAYONA: INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS (ICMAT). NICOLÁS CABRERA, 13–15. 28049, MADRID, SPAIN

*Email address:* [javier.aramayona@icmat.es](mailto:javier.aramayona@icmat.es)

FEDERICO CANTERO MORÁN: DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID & ICMAT. CALLE FRANCISCO TOMÁS Y VALIENTE, 7. 28049, MADRID, SPAIN

*Email address:* [federico.cantero@uam.es](mailto:federico.cantero@uam.es)

VÍCTOR CARMONA: DEPARTAMENTO DE ÁLGEBRA & IMUS, UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA. AVDA REINA MERCEDES, S/N, 41012, SEVILLA, SPAIN

*Email address:* [vcarmona1@us.es](mailto:vcarmona1@us.es)

JAVIER J. GUTIÉRREZ: DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES I INFORMÀTICA, UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA. GRAN VIA DE LES CORTS CATALANES 585. 08007, BARCELONA, SPAIN

*Email address:* [javier.gutierrez@ub.edu](mailto:javier.gutierrez@ub.edu)