

Simplification for Graph-like Objects

Will Grilliette

ABSTRACT. This paper constructs an operation for a comma category, which generalizes the simplification operations for various types of graphs. In studying the categories of simple graphs, the category of undirected graphs is both a reflective and a coreflective subcategory of the category of directed graphs. Moreover, the simplification can be dualized, creating a “cosimplification” of graphs. Depending on the morphisms of the category, cosimplification can manifest as removal of isolated vertices or as traditional removal of parallel edges.

CONTENTS


1. Introduction	1
2. Simple Objects & Simplification	4
3. Relationship to Structured Categories	7
4. Examples	8
4.1. Quivers & Digraphs	8
4.2. Set-System Hypergraphs & Set Systems	9
4.3. Incidence Hypergraphs & Incidence Structures	10
5. Simple Graphs & Symmetric Digraphs	12
6. Cosimple Objects & Cosimplification	14
7. Set-System Hypergraphs with Antihomomorphisms	17
References	18

1. Introduction

The paper [9] developed a categorical perspective of graph theory, slotting familiar graph-theoretic objects and operations into a diagram of categories and functors. Thus far, the work has considered the following structures: the category \mathcal{Q} of quivers (i.e. directed multigraphs), the category \mathcal{H} of set-system hypergraphs, the category \mathcal{M} of (undirected) multigraphs, and the category \mathcal{R} of incidence hypergraphs. In other works, set systems have been


2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C20, 05C65, 18A25, 18A40, 18D35.

Key words and phrases. digraph, set system, hypergraph, incidence structure, simple graph, antihomomorphism .

FIGURE 1.1. Functorial diagram for \mathbf{Digra} , \mathbf{SSys} , & \mathbf{Gra}

considered with antihomomorphisms [11, p. 60], which are a natural extension from both continuous functions of topological spaces and measurable functions of measurable functions.


The present work aims to extend the portrait of graph theory to include the various types of simple graphs and antihomomorphisms. To accomplish this goal, a unified simplification operation is realized as a universal construction for a comma category. Simplification naturally gives rise to the following structures: the category \mathbf{Digra} of simple directed graphs, the category \mathbf{SSys} of set systems, the category \mathbf{Gra} of simple (undirected) graphs, and the category \mathbf{Istr} of incidence structures. Also, the common graph-theoretic technique [10, p. 123] of replacing an undirected edge with a directed 2-cycle is shown to be a categorical isomorphism between \mathbf{Gra} and the category $\mathbf{SymDigra}$ of symmetric digraphs.



Including these categories completes the diagram begun in [9], giving Figure 1.1.

On the other hand, this work creates a category \mathfrak{P} of set-system hypergraphs with antihomomorphisms, which allow for parallel edges. The category \mathfrak{P} generalizes the category \mathbf{Anti} of set systems with antihomomorphisms, as well as categories \mathbf{Top} of topological spaces and \mathbf{Meas} of measurable spaces. These categories are pictured in Figure 1.2. The existence of the category \mathfrak{P} motivates questions about “multi-edge” versions of \mathbf{Top} or \mathbf{Meas} , and what applications could involve either.

Please be aware that “simple” in this paper will be allowing loops. Without loops, the respective irreflexive categories will not have a terminal object [3, p. 7]. Moreover, the right adjoint to the vertex functor creates a complete

FIGURE 1.2. Functorial diagram for \mathfrak{P} , **Anti**, **Top**, & **Meas**

graph with loops [9, p. 4, 6]. As these universal objects have loops, loops and 1-edges will be allowed in “simple” graphs.

However, in studying these categories and the functors connecting them, some surprising results appear. First, the simplification manifests as a left adjoint, making the category of simple objects is a reflective subcategory. Hence, all limit processes for simple graphs can be performed by moving to the parent category and then applying the simplification to remove parallelisms. Pedagogically, this relationship informs how products and quotients of simple graphs can be developed from the natural componentwise operations of the parent categories.

Second, simple graphs categorically act more like directed graphs than they do set systems. As mentioned above, **Gra** is isomorphic to **SymDigra** as categories. While **Gra** is a coreflective subcategory of **SSys**, just as \mathfrak{M} is a coreflective subcategory of \mathfrak{S} , **SymDigra** is both a reflective and a coreflective subcategory of **Digra**. Therefore, the categorical structure of **SymDigra**, and **Gra** by extension, is more deeply related to **Digra** than to **SSys**. This relationship gives a well-founded understanding, and a categorical reason, for why moving simple graphs to directed graphs is so canonical.

Please be aware that this behavior appears to be a feature of simplicity, considering that the analogous relationship does not hold between \mathfrak{Q} and \mathfrak{M} [9, Lemma 2.38].

Third, simplification has a natural dual notion, a “cosimplification”. With simplification represented as a left adjoint, dualizing the process yields a right adjoint. When applied to \mathfrak{Q} and \mathfrak{R} , cosimplification removes isolated vertices and loose edges. However, if one uses antihomomorphisms, cosimplification becomes traditional simplification. Thus, the characterization of cosimplification depends on the morphisms being used. This highlights the effect that a change of morphisms can have, and the importance on clearly stating what morphisms are in play.

Section 2 defines a *simple* object of a comma category and devises the generalized simplification process. Section 3 intertwines the full category of

simple objects with functor-structured categories in [1, 12, 15, 17], which are closer to the traditional definitions of simple graphs.

Section 4 applies these constructions to \mathfrak{Q} , \mathfrak{H} , and \mathfrak{R} , demonstrating how simplification manifests for each. Section 5 addresses the connection between **Digra**, **SymDigra**, **Gra**, and **SSys**.

Section 6 briefly defines a *cosimple* object of a comma category and summarizes the cosimplification process, before applying it to \mathfrak{Q} and \mathfrak{R} . Section 7 defines \mathfrak{P} before applying the cosimplification process.

2. Simple Objects & Simplification

Throughout this section, let $\mathfrak{A} \xrightarrow{F} \mathfrak{C} \xleftarrow{G} \mathfrak{B}$ be functors, $\mathfrak{G} := (F \downarrow G)$ be the comma category, and $\mathfrak{A} \xleftarrow{P} \mathfrak{G} \xrightarrow{Q} \mathfrak{B}$ be the canonical projections. In graph theory [5, Theorem 1], a graph is *simple* if it has no parallel edges, i.e. if the incidence function is one-to-one. In a general comma category, the following definition is taken for a “simple” object.

Definition 2.1 (Simple object). An object $(A, f, B) \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{G})$ is *simple* if f is monic in \mathfrak{C} . Let $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$ be the full subcategory of \mathfrak{G} consisting of simple objects, and let $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} \mathfrak{G}$ be the inclusion functor. A routine check shows that $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$ is a replete subcategory of \mathfrak{G} .

A common practice in the study of simple graphs is to regard homomorphisms as functions between the vertex sets [11, p. 53], as the map of edges is uniquely determined. This fact carries over to simple objects in a general comma category, provided the functor F is faithful.

Proposition 2.2 (Maps into a simple object). *Assume F is faithful. If*

$$(A, f, B) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{(\phi, \psi)} \\ \xrightarrow{(\varphi, \chi)} \end{array} (A', f', B') \in \mathfrak{G} \text{ satisfy that } G(\psi) = G(\chi) \text{ and } (A', f', B') \text{ is simple, then } \phi = \varphi.$$

Proof. Notice that $f' \circ F(\phi) = G(\psi) \circ f = G(\chi) \circ f = f' \circ F(\varphi)$. As f' is monic, $F(\phi) = F(\varphi)$. As F is faithful, $\phi = \varphi$. \square

Corollary 2.3 (Morphisms in $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$). *Assume F is faithful. A morphism*

$$(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{(\phi, \psi)} (A', f', B') \in \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G} \text{ is uniquely determined by } \psi.$$

In order to “simplify” an object of a comma category to a simple object, motivation is taken again from graph theory. In [4, 5], the simplification process is achieved by a quotient operation, tacetly using the image factorization. A simple graph itself can be regarded as a subgraph of a complete graph [14, p. 316].

The complete graph is realized through a right adjoint to the vertex functor, and this right adjoint Q^* is guaranteed to exist in a general comma

category when F admits a right adjoint [9, Definition 1.11]. To embed into such a “complete” object, \mathfrak{A} is assumed to be regular to ensure an image factorization. Under the above conditions, a “simplified” object can be constructed.

Definition 2.4 (Simplification). Assume that \mathfrak{A} is regular, and that F admits a right adjoint F^* with counit $FF^* \xrightarrow{\theta} id_{\mathfrak{C}}$. For $(A, f, B) \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{G})$, there is a unique $A \xrightarrow{\hat{f}} F^*G(B) \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $\theta_{G(B)} \circ F(\hat{f}) = f$. Let $A \xrightarrow{e_{\hat{f}}} \text{ran}(\hat{f}) \xrightarrow{m_{\hat{f}}} F^*G(B) \in \mathfrak{A}$ be an image factorization of \hat{f} . Define

$$\mathcal{S}(A, f, B) := \left(\text{ran}(\hat{f}), \theta_{G(B)} \circ F(m_{\hat{f}}), B \right)$$

and $\eta_{(A, f, B)} := (e_{\hat{f}}, id_B)$. By the commutative diagram below, $\eta_{(A, f, B)}$ is an epimorphism in \mathfrak{G} from (A, f, B) onto $\mathcal{S}(A, f, B)$, and $(m_{\hat{f}}, id_B)$ is a monomorphism in \mathfrak{G} from $\mathcal{S}(A, f, B)$ into $Q^*(B) = (F^*G(B), \theta_{G(B)}, B)$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 F(A) & \xrightarrow{F(e_{\hat{f}})} & F(\text{ran}(\hat{f})) & \xrightarrow{F(m_{\hat{f}})} & FF^*G(B) \\
 \downarrow f & \searrow F(\hat{f}) & \downarrow F(m_{\hat{f}}) & & \downarrow \theta_{G(B)} \\
 & & FF^*G(B) & & \\
 & & \downarrow \theta_{G(B)} & & \\
 G(B) & \xrightarrow{G(id_B)} & G(B) & \xrightarrow{G(id_B)} & G(B)
 \end{array}$$

By standard results, $m_{\hat{f}}$ is monic in \mathfrak{A} , so preservation of monomorphisms by F and monic θ are sufficient to ensure that both $\mathcal{S}(A, f, B)$ and $Q^*(B)$ are always simple.

Lemma 2.5 (Conditions for simplicity). *Let \mathfrak{A} be regular, and assume that F preserves monomorphisms and admits a right adjoint F^* with a monic counit $FF^* \xrightarrow{\theta} id_{\mathfrak{C}}$. Then, $\mathcal{S}(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{(m_{\hat{f}}, id_B)} Q^*(B) \in \mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{G}$ for all $(A, f, B) \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{G})$.*

As one would expect, the simplification of a simple object is trivial under the condition that F is faithful.

Lemma 2.6 (Simplification of simple). *Let \mathfrak{A} be regular, and assume that F is faithful and admits a right adjoint with counit $FF^* \xrightarrow{\theta} id_{\mathfrak{C}}$. If $(A, f, B) \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{G})$, then $\eta_{(A, f, B)}$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. As $\theta_{G(B)} \circ F(\hat{f}) = f$ is monic, $F(\hat{f})$ is monic. As F is faithful, \hat{f} is monic. As $m_{\hat{f}} \circ e_{\hat{f}} = \hat{f}$, $e_{\hat{f}}$ is monic. As $e_{\hat{f}}$ is a regular epimorphism and monic, it is an isomorphism. \square

Moreover, the faithful condition yields a universal property: any map into a simple object factors through the simplification. With the conditions in Lemma 2.5, $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$ is a reflective subcategory of \mathfrak{G} .

Theorem 2.7 (Universal property of \mathcal{S}). *Let \mathfrak{A} be regular, and assume that F is faithful and admits a right adjoint with counit $FF^* \xrightarrow{\theta} id_{\mathfrak{G}}$. If*

$(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{(\phi, \psi)} \mathcal{N}(A', f', B') \in \mathfrak{G}$, there is a unique $\mathcal{S}(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\psi})} (A', f', B') \in \mathfrak{G}$ such that $(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\psi}) \circ \eta_{(A, f, B)} = (\phi, \psi)$.

Proof. Let $A \xleftarrow{p_1} R \xrightarrow{p_2} A \in \mathfrak{A}$ be a kernel pair of \hat{f} , and $A \xrightarrow{e_{\hat{f}}} \text{ran}(\hat{f}) \in \mathfrak{A}$ be a coequalizer of p_1 and p_2 . As $\hat{f} \circ p_1 = \hat{f} \circ p_2$, there is a unique $\text{ran}(\hat{f}) \xrightarrow{m_{\hat{f}}} F^*G(B) \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $m_{\hat{f}} \circ e_{\hat{f}} = \hat{f}$. For $n = 1, 2$, observe that

$$f' \circ F(\phi \circ p_n) = G(\psi) \circ f \circ F(p_n) = G(\psi) \circ \theta_{G(B)} \circ F(\hat{f} \circ p_n).$$

As $\hat{f} \circ p_1 = \hat{f} \circ p_2$, the equalities above yield $f' \circ F(\phi \circ p_1) = f' \circ F(\phi \circ p_2)$. As f' is monic, $F(\phi \circ p_1) = F(\phi \circ p_2)$. As F is faithful, $\phi \circ p_1 = \phi \circ p_2$. By the universal property of $\text{ran}(\hat{f})$, there is a unique $\text{ran}(\hat{f}) \xrightarrow{\hat{\phi}} A' \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $\hat{\phi} \circ e_{\hat{f}} = \phi$. Consider the diagram below.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 F(A) & \xrightarrow{F(e_{\hat{f}})} & F(\text{ran}(\hat{f})) & \xrightarrow{F(\hat{\phi})} & F(A') \\
 \downarrow f & \searrow F(\hat{f}) & \downarrow F(m_{\hat{f}}) & & \downarrow f' \\
 & & FF^*G(B) & & \\
 & & \downarrow \theta_{G(B)} & & \\
 G(B) & \xrightarrow{G(id_B)} & G(B) & \xrightarrow{G(\psi)} & G(B')
 \end{array}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
 f' \circ F(\hat{\phi}) \circ F(e_{\hat{f}}) &= f' \circ F(\phi) = G(\psi) \circ f = G(\psi) \circ \theta_{G(B)} \circ F(\hat{f}) \\
 &= G(\psi) \circ (\theta_{G(B)} \circ F(m_{\hat{f}})) \circ F(e_{\hat{f}}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $e_{\hat{f}}$ is epic and F is cocontinuous, $F(e_{\hat{f}})$ is epic, giving that $f' \circ F(\hat{\phi}) = G(\psi) \circ (\theta_{G(B)} \circ F(m_{\hat{f}}))$. Thus, $(\hat{\phi}, \psi)$ is a morphism in \mathfrak{G} from $\mathcal{S}(A, f, B)$ to (A', f', B') . By construction, $(\hat{\phi}, \psi) \circ \eta_{(A, f, B)} = (\phi, \psi)$, and uniqueness follows from Proposition 2.2. \square

Corollary 2.8 (Reflective subcategory). *Let \mathfrak{A} be regular, and assume that F is faithful, preserves monomorphisms, and admits a right adjoint with a monic counit $FF^* \xrightarrow{\theta} id_{\mathfrak{C}}$. If $(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{(\phi, \psi)} \mathcal{N}(A', f', B') \in \mathfrak{G}$, there is a unique $\mathcal{S}(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\psi})} (A', f', B') \in \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$ such that $\mathcal{N}(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\psi}) \circ \eta_{(A, f, B)} = (\phi, \psi)$. Consequently, $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$ is a reflective subcategory of \mathfrak{G} .*

3. Relationship to Structured Categories

Consider the case when $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{C}$ and $F = id_{\mathfrak{A}}$. Letting $\mathfrak{B} \xrightarrow{G} \mathfrak{A}$ be any functor, the comma category $\mathfrak{G} := (id_{\mathfrak{A}} \downarrow G)$ would consist of objects (A, f, B) , where $A \xrightarrow{f} G(B) \in \mathfrak{A}$, like a generalized coalgebra as in [16].

If (A, f, B) is in the full subcategory $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$ of \mathfrak{G} consisting of simple objects, then (A, f) represents a subobject of $G(B)$ in \mathfrak{A} . Moreover, as $id_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is faithful, Corollary 2.3 shows that a morphism in $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$ is determined uniquely by its \mathfrak{B} -coordinate. Indeed, $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$ seems to generalize the functor-structured categories discussed in [1, 12, 15, 17], a connection which will be made explicit.

With the notation above, let $\mathfrak{A} = \mathbf{Set}$ be the category of sets with functions. Letting $\mathbf{Spa}(G)$ be the category of G -spaces with G -maps, the following pair of functors are defined to form an equivalence between $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$ and $\mathbf{Spa}(G)$.

Definition 3.1 (Comma & space functors). For $(B, \alpha) \xrightarrow{\psi} (B', \alpha') \in \mathbf{Spa}(G)$, define $\text{Com}(B, \alpha) \xrightarrow{\text{Com}(\psi)} \text{Com}(B', \alpha') \in \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$ by

- $\text{Com}(B, \alpha) := (\alpha, \iota_{\alpha}, B)$, where ι_{α} is the inclusion map of α into $G(B)$;
- $\text{Com}(\psi) := (\tilde{\psi}, \psi)$, where $\tilde{\psi}(x) := G(\psi)(x)$.

For $(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{(\phi, \psi)} (A', f', B') \in \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}$, define $\text{Sp}(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{\text{Sp}(\phi, \psi)} \text{Sp}(A', f', B') \in \mathbf{Spa}(G)$ by

- $\text{Sp}(A, f, B) := (B, \alpha_f)$, where α_f is the set-theoretic range of f ;
- $\text{Sp}(\phi, \psi) := \psi$.

Routine calculations show that both Com and Sp define functors, and that $\text{Sp Com} = id_{\mathbf{Spa}(G)}$. All that remains is to demonstrate a natural isomorphism between Com Sp and $id_{\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}}$, which is constructed below using the set-theoretic image factorization.

Definition 3.2 (Comma-space isomorphism). Given $(A, f, B) \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G})$, define $q_f : A \rightarrow \alpha_f$ by $q_f(x) := f(x)$, and let $\zeta_{(A,f,B)} := (q_f, id_B)$ and $\zeta := (\zeta_{(A,f,B)})_{(A,f,B) \in \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}}$.

A quick check shows that ζ is a natural transformation from $id_{\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G}}$ to Com Sp . Since f is one-to-one for $(A, f, B) \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{G})$, q_f is bijective, showing that $\zeta_{(A,f,B)}$ is an isomorphism. Moreover, note that \mathbf{Set} is regular and that $id_{\mathbf{Set}}$ satisfies the conditions of Corollary 2.8, giving the result below.

Theorem 3.3 (Spaces within commas). *Let $\mathfrak{B} \xrightarrow{G} \mathbf{Set}$ be a functor. Then, $\mathbf{Spa}(G)$ is equivalent to the reflective subcategory of simple objects within $(id_{\mathbf{Set}} \downarrow G)$.*

4. Examples

4.1. Quivers & Digraphs. Let \mathfrak{C} be the finite category drawn below.

$$1 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{s} \\ \xleftarrow{t} \end{array} 0$$

The category $\mathfrak{Q} := \mathbf{Set}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ is the category of directed multigraphs, or quivers, as seen in [4, p. 2]. Let $\Delta : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set}$ be the diagonal functor with its right adjoint Δ^* . The category $\mathfrak{Q}_1 := (id_{\mathbf{Set}} \downarrow \Delta^* \Delta)$ is the category of quivers as seen in [2, 13]. The isomorphism between \mathfrak{Q} and \mathfrak{Q}_1 follows from the universal property of the product in \mathbf{Set} within the diagram below for each $Q = (\vec{V}(Q), \vec{E}(Q), \sigma_Q, \tau_Q) \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{Q})$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \vec{E}(Q) & & \\ & \swarrow \sigma_Q & \vdots \exists! \vec{e}_Q & \searrow \tau_Q & \\ \vec{V}(Q) & \longleftarrow \vec{V}(Q) \times \vec{V}(Q) & & \vec{V}(Q) & \\ & \xleftarrow{\pi_{\vec{V}(Q)}^1} & & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\vec{V}(Q)}^2} & \end{array}$$

Definition 4.1 (Isomorphism of \mathfrak{Q} and \mathfrak{Q}_1). For a set X , let $X \xleftarrow{\pi_X^1} X \times X \xrightarrow{\pi_X^2} X \in \mathbf{Set}$ be the coordinate projections. For $Q \xrightarrow{\phi} Q' \in \mathfrak{Q}$, define $W_{\mathfrak{Q}}(Q) \xrightarrow{W_{\mathfrak{Q}}(\phi)} W_{\mathfrak{Q}}(Q') \in \mathfrak{Q}_1$ by

- $W_{\mathfrak{Q}}(Q) := (\vec{E}(Q), \vec{e}_Q, \vec{V}(Q))$, where $\vec{e}_Q(e) := (\sigma_Q(e), \tau_Q(e))$;
- $W_{\mathfrak{Q}}(\phi) := (\vec{E}(\phi), \vec{V}(\phi))$.

For $Q \xrightarrow{\phi} Q' \in \mathfrak{Q}_1$, define $Z_{\mathfrak{Q}}(Q) \xrightarrow{Z_{\mathfrak{Q}}(\phi)} Z_{\mathfrak{Q}}(Q') \in \mathfrak{Q}$ by

- $Z_{\mathfrak{Q}}(Q) := \left(\vec{V}(Q), \vec{E}(Q), \pi_{\vec{V}(Q)}^1 \circ \vec{\epsilon}_Q, \pi_{\vec{V}(Q)}^2 \circ \vec{\epsilon}_Q \right)$;
- $Z_{\mathfrak{Q}}(\phi) := \left(\vec{V}(\phi), \vec{E}(\phi) \right)$.

Routine calculations show that $W_{\mathfrak{Q}}Z_{\mathfrak{Q}} = id_{\mathfrak{Q}_1}$ and $Z_{\mathfrak{Q}}W_{\mathfrak{Q}} = id_{\mathfrak{Q}}$.

Let $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{Q}_1$ be the full subcategory of \mathfrak{Q}_1 of simple objects, and $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{Q}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{Q}_1}} \mathfrak{Q}_1$ be the inclusion functor. By Corollary 2.8, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{Q}_1}$ admits a left adjoint $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{Q}_1}$ with the following action on objects:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{Q}_1} \left(\vec{E}(Q), \vec{\epsilon}_Q, \vec{V}(Q) \right) = \left(\text{ran}(\vec{\epsilon}_Q), m_{\vec{\epsilon}_Q}, \vec{V}(Q) \right),$$

where $\text{ran}(\vec{\epsilon}_Q) = \left\{ \vec{\epsilon}_Q(e) : e \in \vec{E}(Q) \right\}$ and $m_{\vec{\epsilon}_Q}(v, w) = (v, w)$.

Let $\mathbf{Digra} := \mathbf{Spa}(\Delta^* \Delta)$, which is the category of “directed graphs” and “digraph homomorphisms” from [10, p. 122]. Letting $\mathbf{Digra} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Com}_{\mathfrak{Q}}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Sp}_{\mathfrak{Q}}} \end{array} \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{Q}_1$ be

the functors defined in Definition 3.1, Theorem 3.3 gives an equivalence.

Setting all of the above categories and functors in line together yields the following progression from digraphs as spaces, to directed graphs as objects of a comma category, to quivers as objects of a functor category.

$$\mathbf{Digra} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Com}_{\mathfrak{Q}}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Sp}_{\mathfrak{Q}}} \end{array} \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{Q}_1 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{Q}_1}} \\ \xleftarrow{\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{Q}_1}} \end{array} \mathfrak{Q}_1 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Z_{\mathfrak{Q}}} \\ \xleftarrow{W_{\mathfrak{Q}}} \end{array} \mathfrak{Q}$$

Therefore, the following result is an immediate consequence.

Theorem 4.2 (Digraphs & quivers). *The category \mathbf{Digra} is equivalent to the reflective subcategory of simple quivers within \mathfrak{Q} . Moreover, \mathbf{Digra} is complete and cocomplete with limits performed by passing to \mathfrak{Q} and then applying the simplification.*

To reduce notation, let $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{Q}} := Z_{\mathfrak{Q}}\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{Q}_1}\text{Com}_{\mathfrak{Q}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{Q}} := \text{Sp}_{\mathfrak{Q}}\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{Q}_1}W_{\mathfrak{Q}}$. Figure 4.1 gives an example to illustrate that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{Q}}$ does indeed remove parallelisms in a quiver.

4.2. Set-System Hypergraphs & Set Systems. Let $\mathcal{P} : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ be the covariant power-set functor. The category $\mathfrak{H} := (id_{\mathbf{Set}} \downarrow \mathcal{P})$ is the category of set-system hypergraphs from [5, p. 153-154].

Let $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{H}$ be the full subcategory of \mathfrak{H} of simple objects, and $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{H} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{H}_1}} \mathfrak{H}$ be the inclusion functor. By Corollary 2.8, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{H}_1}$ admits a left adjoint $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{H}_1}$ with the following action on objects:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{H}_1} (E(G), \epsilon_G, V(G)) = (\text{ran}(\epsilon_G), m_{\epsilon_G}, V(G)),$$




FIGURE 4.1. Simplification of a quiver

where $\text{ran}(\epsilon_G) = \{\epsilon_G(e) : e \in E(G)\}$ and $m_{\epsilon_G}(A) = A$.

Let $\mathbf{SSys} := \mathbf{Spa}(\mathcal{P})$. An object G of \mathbf{SSys} consists of a set $V(G)$ and a family of subsets $\beta_G \subseteq \mathcal{P}V(G)$, which is precisely a “set system” or “hypergraph” as defined in [11, p. 53]. A morphism $G \xrightarrow{f} H \in \mathbf{SSys}$ is a “hypergraph homomorphism” as defined in [11, p. 53].

Letting $\mathbf{SSys} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Com}_{\mathfrak{H}}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Sp}_{\mathfrak{H}}} \end{array} \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{H}$

be the functors defined in Definition 3.1, Theorem 3.3 gives an equivalence.

Setting all of the above categories and functors in line together yields the following progression from set systems as spaces to set-system hypergraphs as objects of a comma category. Moreover, the limit properties of \mathbf{SSys} are inherited from \mathfrak{H} .

$$\mathbf{SSys} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Com}_{\mathfrak{H}}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Sp}_{\mathfrak{H}}} \end{array} \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{H} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{H}_1}} \\ \xleftarrow{\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{H}_1}} \end{array} \mathfrak{H}$$

Theorem 4.3 (Set systems & hypergraphs). *The category \mathbf{SSys} is complete and cocomplete with limits performed by passing to \mathfrak{H} and then applying the simplification.*

To reduce notation, let $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{H}} := \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{H}_1} \text{Com}_{\mathfrak{H}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{H}} := \text{Sp}_{\mathfrak{H}} \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{H}_1}$. Figure 4.2 gives an example to illustrate that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{H}}$ does indeed remove parallelisms in a set-system hypergraph.

4.3. Incidence Hypergraphs & Incidence Structures. Let \mathfrak{D} be the finite category drawn below.

$$0 \xleftarrow{y} 2 \xrightarrow{z} 1$$

This category $\mathfrak{A} := \mathbf{Set}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ is the category of incidence hypergraphs from [8, 9]. The category $\mathfrak{A}_1 := (id_{\mathbf{Set}} \downarrow \Delta^*)$ is isomorphic to \mathfrak{A} via the diagram




FIGURE 4.2. Simplification of a set-system hypergraph

below, for each $G = (\check{V}(G), \check{E}(G), I(G), \varsigma_G, \omega_G)$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & I(G) & & \\
 & \swarrow \varsigma_G & \vdots \exists! \iota_G & \searrow \omega_G & \\
 \check{V}(G) & \xleftarrow{\pi_{\check{V}(G)}} & \check{V}(G) \times \check{E}(G) & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\check{E}(G)}} & \check{E}(G)
 \end{array}$$

Definition 4.4 (Isomorphism of \mathfrak{R} and \mathfrak{R}_1). For a sets X and Y , let $X \xleftarrow{\pi_X} X \times Y \xrightarrow{\pi_Y} Y \in \mathbf{Set}$ be the coordinate projections. For $G \xrightarrow{\phi} G' \in \mathfrak{R}$, define $W_{\mathfrak{R}}(G) \xrightarrow{W_{\mathfrak{R}}(\phi)} W_{\mathfrak{R}}(G') \in \mathfrak{R}_1$ by

- $W_{\mathfrak{R}}(G) := (I(G), \iota_G, (\check{V}(G), \check{E}(G)))$, where $\iota_G(i) := (\varsigma_G(i), \omega_G(i))$;
- $W_{\mathfrak{R}}(\phi) := (I(\phi), (\check{V}(\phi), \check{E}(\phi)))$.

For $G \xrightarrow{\phi} G' \in \mathfrak{R}_1$, define $Z_{\mathfrak{R}}(G) \xrightarrow{Z_{\mathfrak{R}}(\phi)} Z_{\mathfrak{R}}(G') \in \mathfrak{R}$ by

- $Z_{\mathfrak{R}}(G) := (\check{V}(G), \check{E}(G), I(G), \pi_{\check{V}(G)} \circ \iota_G, \pi_{\check{E}(G)} \circ \iota_G)$;
- $Z_{\mathfrak{R}}(\phi) := (\check{V}(\phi), \check{E}(\phi), I(\phi))$.

Routine calculations show that $W_{\mathfrak{R}}Z_{\mathfrak{R}} = id_{\mathfrak{R}_1}$ and $Z_{\mathfrak{R}}W_{\mathfrak{R}} = id_{\mathfrak{R}}$.

Let $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{R}_1$ be the full subcategory of \mathfrak{R}_1 of simple objects, and $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{R}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}} \mathfrak{R}_1$ be the inclusion functor. By Corollary 2.8, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}$ admits a left adjoint $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}$ with the following action on objects:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}(I(G), \iota_G, (\check{V}(G), \check{E}(G))) = (\text{ran}(\iota_G), m_{\iota_G}, (\check{V}(G), \check{E}(G))),$$

where $\text{ran}(\iota_G) = \{\iota_G(i) : i \in I(G)\}$ and $m_{\iota_G}(v, e) = (v, e)$.

Let $\mathbf{IStr} := \mathbf{Spa}(\Delta^*)$, which is precisely the category of incidence structures and incidence-preserving homomorphisms from [4, p. 7-8]. Letting

$$\mathbf{IStr} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Com}_{\mathfrak{R}}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Sp}_{\mathfrak{R}}} \end{array} \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{R}_1$$

gives an equivalence.

Setting all of the above categories and functors in line together yields the following progression from incidence structures as spaces, to incidence




FIGURE 4.3. Simplification of an incidence hypergraph

hypergraphs as objects of a comma category, to incidence hypergraphs as objects of a functor category.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & \text{Com}_{\mathfrak{R}} & & \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{R}_1} & & Z_{\mathfrak{R}} \\
 \mathbf{IStr} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{R}_1 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathfrak{R}_1 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathfrak{R} \\
 & \xleftarrow{\simeq} & & \xleftarrow{\tau} & & \xleftarrow{\cong} & \\
 & \text{Sp}_{\mathfrak{R}} & & \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{R}_1} & & W_{\mathfrak{R}} &
 \end{array}$$

Therefore, the following result is an immediate consequence.

Theorem 4.5 (Incidence structures & hypergraphs). *The category \mathbf{IStr} is equivalent to the reflective subcategory of simple incidence hypergraphs within \mathfrak{R} . Moreover, \mathbf{IStr} is complete and cocomplete with limits performed by passing to \mathfrak{R} and then applying the simplification.*

To reduce notation, let $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{R}} := Z_{\mathfrak{R}}\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}\text{Com}_{\mathfrak{R}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{R}} := \text{Sp}_{\mathfrak{R}}\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}W_{\mathfrak{R}}$. Figure 4.3 gives an example to illustrate that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{R}}$ does indeed remove parallelisms in an incidence hypergraph. Please note that unlike \mathcal{S}_{Ω} and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{S}}$, which remove parallel edges, $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{R}}$ removes parallel incidences.

5. Simple Graphs & Symmetric Digraphs

Let \mathbf{Gra} be the full subcategory of \mathbf{SSys} consisting of all conventional graphs, and let $\mathbf{Gra} \xrightarrow{N_{\mathbf{SSys}}} \mathbf{SSys}$ be the inclusion functor. The relationship between \mathbf{Gra} and \mathbf{SSys} is directly analogous to the deletion adjunction from [9, Definition 2.32] and can be directly replicated.

Definition 5.1 (Simple deletion). Given a set system H , define a graph $\text{Del}_{\mathbf{SSys}}(H) := \left(V(H), \beta_{\text{Del}_{\mathbf{SSys}}(H)} \right)$, where

$$\beta_{\text{Del}_{\mathbf{SSys}}(H)} := \{A \in \beta_H : 1 \leq \text{card}(A) \leq 2\}.$$

Let $\text{Del}_{\mathbf{SSys}}(H) \xrightarrow{j_H} H \in \mathbf{SSys}$ be the canonical inclusion homomorphism from $\text{Del}_{\mathbf{SSys}}(H)$ into H .

Theorem 5.2 (Characterization of $\text{Del}_{\mathbf{SSys}}$). *If $N_{\mathbf{SSys}}(G) \xrightarrow{\phi} H \in \mathbf{SSys}$, there is a unique $G \xrightarrow{\hat{\phi}} \text{Del}_{\mathbf{SSys}}(H) \in \mathbf{Gra}$ such that $j_H \circ N_{\mathbf{SSys}}(\hat{\phi}) = \phi$. Thus, \mathbf{Gra} is a coreflective subcategory of \mathbf{SSys} .*

Equivalently, one could repeat the work of Section 4 to show that \mathbf{Gra} is equivalent to the reflective subcategory of simple objects in the category \mathfrak{M} of multigraphs. The details of this argument are omitted for brevity.

On the other hand, [10, p. 123] states that a simple graph can be viewed as a digraph G , where $(v, w) \in \alpha_G$ if and only if $(w, v) \in \alpha_G$, i.e. when α_G is a symmetric relation on $\vec{V}(G)$. Under this definition, simple graphs would be regarded as a subcategory of \mathbf{Digra} . The relationship is directly analogous to the associated digraph adjunction from [9, Definitions 2.35 & 2.36]. Let $\mathbf{SymDigra}$ be the full subcategory of \mathbf{Digra} consisting of all symmetric digraphs, and let $\mathbf{SymDigra} \xrightarrow{N_{\mathbf{Digra}}} \mathbf{Digra}$ be the inclusion functor.

Definition 5.3 (Symmetric closure). Given a digraph G , define $N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^\diamond(G) := \left(\vec{V}(G), \alpha_{N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^\diamond(G)} \right)$, where $\alpha_{N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^\diamond(G)} := \{(v, w) : (v, w) \in \alpha_G \text{ or } (w, v) \in \alpha_G\}$.

Let $G \xrightarrow{\kappa_G} N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^\diamond(G) \in \mathbf{Digra}$ be the canonical inclusion homomorphism of G into $N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^\diamond(G)$.

Theorem 5.4 (Characterization of $N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^\diamond$). *If $G \xrightarrow{\phi} N_{\mathbf{Digra}}(H) \in \mathbf{Digra}$, there is a unique $N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^\diamond(G) \xrightarrow{\hat{\phi}} H \in \mathbf{SymDigra}$ such that $N_{\mathbf{Digra}}(\hat{\phi}) \circ \kappa_G = \phi$. Thus, $\mathbf{SymDigra}$ is a reflective subcategory of \mathbf{Digra} .*

However, $N_{\mathbf{Digra}}$ also admits a right adjoint by swapping the connective “or” to “and”. As the symmetric closure is the smallest symmetric digraph containing a given digraph, this “symmetric interior” is the largest symmetric subdigraph within the given digraph. The universal property is routine to check.

Definition 5.5 (Symmetric interior). Given a digraph G , define $N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^\star(G) := \left(\vec{V}(G), \alpha_{N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^\star(G)} \right)$, where $\alpha_{N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^\star(G)} := \{(v, w) : (v, w) \in \alpha_G \text{ and } (w, v) \in \alpha_G\}$.

Let $N_{\mathbf{Digra}} N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^*(G) \xrightarrow{\nu_G} G \in \mathbf{Digra}$ be the canonical inclusion homomorphism of $N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^*(G)$ into G .

Theorem 5.6 (Characterization of $N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^*$). *If $N_{\mathbf{Digra}}(G) \xrightarrow{\phi} H \in \mathbf{Digra}$, there is a unique $G \xrightarrow{\tilde{\phi}} N_{\mathbf{Digra}}^*(H) \in \mathbf{SymDigra}$ such that $\nu_G \circ N_{\mathbf{Digra}}(\tilde{\phi}) = \phi$. Thus, $\mathbf{SymDigra}$ is a coreflective subcategory of \mathbf{Digra} .*

To reconcile these two viewpoints, one defines the “corresponding symmetric digraph” of an undirected graph by following [10, p. 123], associating (v, w) and (w, v) to $\{v, w\}$. This construction yields a functor, which is an isomorphism between $\mathbf{SymDigra}$ and \mathbf{Gra} .

Definition 5.7 (Isomorphism of \mathbf{Gra} & $\mathbf{SymDigra}$). For $G \xrightarrow{\phi} G' \in \mathbf{SymDigra}$, define $W_{\mathbf{Gra}}(G) \xrightarrow{W_{\mathbf{Gra}}(\phi)} W_{\mathbf{Gra}}(G') \in \mathbf{Gra}$ by

- $W_{\mathbf{Gra}}(G) := (\vec{V}(G), \beta_{W_{\mathbf{Gra}}(G)})$, where $\beta_{W_{\mathbf{Gra}}(G)} := \{\{v, w\} : (v, w) \in \alpha_G\}$;
- $W_{\mathbf{Gra}}(\phi) := \phi$.

For $G \xrightarrow{\phi} G' \in \mathbf{Gra}$, define $Z_{\mathbf{Gra}}(G) \xrightarrow{Z_{\mathbf{Gra}}(\phi)} Z_{\mathbf{Gra}}(G') \in \mathbf{SymDigra}$ by

- $Z_{\mathbf{Gra}}(G) := (V(G), \alpha_{Z_{\mathbf{Gra}}(G)})$, where $\alpha_{Z_{\mathbf{Gra}}(G)} = \{(v, w) : \{v, w\} \in \beta_G\}$;
- $Z_{\mathbf{Gra}}(\phi) := \phi$.

Routine calculations show that $Z_{\mathbf{Gra}} W_{\mathbf{Gra}} = id_{\mathbf{SymDigra}}$ and $W_{\mathbf{Gra}} Z_{\mathbf{Gra}} = id_{\mathbf{Gra}}$.

Consequently, the conventional category of simple graphs exists as a coreflective subcategory of \mathbf{SSys} , but also as a reflective and coreflective subcategory of \mathbf{Digra} . Therefore, both digraphs and set systems can be considered natural extensions of classical graph theory, as can general quivers and set-system hypergraphs. Interestingly, one can quickly show that $N_{\mathbf{SSys}}$ does not preserve products, so it cannot admit a left adjoint. The existence of both right and left adjoints to $N_{\mathbf{Digra}}$ seems to indicate that simple graphs are more closely related to digraphs than to set systems.

The diagram in Figure 1.1 seats these categories and functors together with those discussed in [9], giving a visual representation of these relationships.

6. Cosimple Objects & Cosimplification

All of the definitions and results of Section 2 can be dualized, giving rise to “cosimple” objects and a “cosimplification” operation.

Definition 6.1 (Cosimple object). An object $(A, f, B) \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{G})$ is *cosimple* if f is epic in \mathfrak{C} . Let $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{G}$ be the full subcategory of \mathfrak{G} consisting of cosimple

objects, and let $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{G} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} \mathfrak{G}$ be the inclusion functor. A routine check shows that $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{G}$ is a replete subcategory of \mathfrak{G} .

Definition 6.2 (Cosimplification). Assume that \mathfrak{B} is coregular, and that G admits a left adjoint G° with unit $id_{\mathfrak{C}} \xrightarrow{\delta} GG^\circ$. For $(A, f, B) \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{G})$, there is a unique $G^\circ F(A) \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} B \in \mathfrak{B}$ such that $G(\tilde{f}) \circ \delta_{F(A)} = f$. Let $G^\circ F(A) \xrightarrow{e_{\tilde{f}}} \text{coran}(\tilde{f}) \xrightarrow{m_{\tilde{f}}} B \in \mathfrak{B}$ be a coimage factorization of \tilde{f} . Define

$$\mathcal{T}(A, f, B) := \left(A, G(e_{\tilde{f}}) \circ \delta_{F(A)}, \text{coran}(\tilde{f}) \right)$$

and $\vartheta_{(A, f, B)} := (id_A, m_{\tilde{f}})$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 F(A) & \xrightarrow{F(id_A)} & F(A) & \xrightarrow{F(id_A)} & F(A) \\
 \delta_{F(A)} \downarrow & & \delta_{F(A)} \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\
 & & GG^\circ F(A) & \xrightarrow{G(\tilde{f})} & G(B) \\
 & & G(e_{\tilde{f}}) \downarrow & & \\
 GG^\circ F(A) & \xrightarrow{G(e_{\tilde{f}})} & G(\text{coran}(\tilde{f})) & \xrightarrow{G(m_{\tilde{f}})} & G(B)
 \end{array}$$


Theorem 6.3 (Universal property of \mathcal{T}). Let \mathfrak{B} be coregular, and assume that G is faithful and admits a left adjoint with unit $id_{\mathfrak{C}} \xrightarrow{\delta} GG^\circ$. If

$\mathcal{N}(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{(\phi, \psi)} (A', f', B') \in \mathfrak{G}$, there is a unique $(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{(\tilde{\phi}, \tilde{\psi})} \mathcal{T}(A', f', B') \in \mathfrak{G}$ such that $\vartheta_{(A, f, B)} \circ (\tilde{\phi}, \tilde{\psi}) = (\phi, \psi)$.

Corollary 6.4 (Coreflective subcategory). Let \mathfrak{B} be coregular, and assume that G is faithful, preserves epimorphisms, and admits a left adjoint with an epic unit $id_{\mathfrak{C}} \xrightarrow{\delta} GG^\circ$. If $\mathcal{N}(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{(\phi, \psi)} (A', f', B') \in$

\mathfrak{G} , there is a unique $(A, f, B) \xrightarrow{(\tilde{\phi}, \tilde{\psi})} \mathcal{T}(A', f', B') \in \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{G}$ such that $\vartheta_{(A, f, B)} \circ \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\phi}, \tilde{\psi}) = (\phi, \psi)$. Consequently, $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{G}$ is a coreflective subcategory of \mathfrak{G} .

As the proofs are merely the categorical duals of those found in Section 2, the details will be omitted in favor of examples. Note that **Set** is coregular, that the diagonal functor Δ admits both a left adjoint Δ° and a right adjoint Δ^* , and all three are faithful. Thus, the operator \mathcal{T} can be constructed for

FIGURE 6.1. Action of \mathcal{T}_{Ω_1}

both \mathfrak{Q}_1 and \mathfrak{R}_1 . Unfortunately, the unit of each adjunction is not epic, so \mathcal{T} does not guarantee a cosimple object in either category.


Example 6.5 (Cosimplification of quivers). A cosimple object in \mathfrak{Q}_1 would be a quiver, where there is directed edge for every ordered pair of vertices, i.e. a loaded quiver. Therefore, with the exception of the initial object, a quiver is cosimple in \mathfrak{Q}_1 if and only if it is injective with respect to monomorphisms [7, Proposition 3.2.1]. The functor $\Delta^* \Delta$ admits a left adjoint $\Delta^\diamond \Delta$ with unit $\delta_X : X \rightarrow \Delta^* \Delta \Delta^\diamond \Delta(X)$ by $\delta_X(x) := ((0, x), (1, x))$, which is not epic. For $Q \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{Q}_1)$, the output of \mathcal{T}_{Ω_1} is

- $\vec{V}\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_1}(Q) = \left\{ \sigma_Q(e) : e \in \vec{E}(Q) \right\} \cup \left\{ \tau_Q(e) : e \in \vec{E}(Q) \right\}$,
- $\vec{E}\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_1}(Q) = \vec{E}(Q)$,
- $\vec{e}\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_1}(e) = \vec{e}_Q(e)$.

As seen in Figure 6.1, \mathcal{T}_{Ω_1} has removed all isolated vertices from the quiver. Moreover, $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_1}(Q)$ is not injective, so it is not cosimple in \mathfrak{Q}_1 .

Example 6.6 (Cosimplification of incidence hypergraphs). A cosimple object in \mathfrak{R}_1 would be an incidence hypergraph, where there is an incidence for every vertex-edge pair. Therefore, with the exception of the initial object, an incidence hypergraph is cosimple in \mathfrak{R}_1 if and only if it is injective with respect to monomorphisms [9, Proposition 2.3.2]. The functor Δ^* admits a left adjoint Δ with unit $\delta_X : X \rightarrow \Delta^* \Delta(X)$ by $\delta_X(x) := (x, x)$, which is not epic. For $G \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{R})$, the output of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}$ is

- $\check{V}\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}(G) = \{ \varsigma_G(i) : i \in I(G) \}$,
- $\check{E}\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}(G) = \{ \omega_G(i) : i \in I(G) \}$,
- $I\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}(G) = I(G)$,
- $\iota_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}}(i) = \iota_G(i)$.

FIGURE 6.2. Action of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}$

As seen in Figure 6.2, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}$ has removed all isolated vertices and loose edges from the incidence hypergraph. Moreover, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}(G)$ is not injective, so it is not cosimple in \mathfrak{R}_1 .

7. Set-System Hypergraphs with Antihomomorphisms

Moreover, all of the definitions and results of Section 3 can be dualized, giving rise to the functor-costructured categories of [17, Definition 21]. As the proofs are merely the categorical duals of those found in Section 3, the details will be omitted in favor of an illustrative example.

Let $\mathcal{Q} : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}}$ be the contravariant power-set functor. Define $\mathfrak{P} := (\mathcal{Q} \downarrow id_{\mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}}})$ with domain functor $\hat{V} : \mathfrak{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ and codomain functor $\hat{E} : \mathfrak{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}}$. An object G of \mathfrak{P} consists of two sets, $\hat{E}(G)$ and $\hat{V}(G)$, and a function $\mathcal{Q}\hat{V}(G) \xleftarrow{\epsilon_G} \hat{E}(G)$. Hence, G is a set-system hypergraph as in \mathfrak{H} .

However, the morphisms of \mathfrak{P} are quite different from those in \mathfrak{H} . A homomorphism $G \xrightarrow{\varphi} G' \in \mathfrak{P}$ consists of two functions, $\hat{V}(\varphi) : \hat{V}(G) \rightarrow \hat{V}(G')$ and $\hat{E}(\varphi) : \hat{E}(G') \rightarrow \hat{E}(G)$, such that $\epsilon_G \circ \hat{E}(\varphi) = \mathcal{Q}\hat{V}(\varphi) \circ \epsilon_{G'}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{Q}\hat{V}(G) & \xleftarrow{\mathcal{Q}\hat{V}(\varphi)} & \mathcal{Q}\hat{V}(G') \\
 \epsilon_G \uparrow & & \epsilon_{G'} \uparrow \\
 \hat{E}(G) & \xleftarrow{\hat{E}(\varphi)} & \hat{E}(G')
 \end{array}$$

Indeed, $\hat{E}(\varphi)$ maps edges of G' to edges of G , rather than the reverse in \mathfrak{H} . A morphism of \mathfrak{P} will be termed an *antihomomorphism* of set-system hypergraphs for reasons that will be illuminated shortly.

Let $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{B}$ be the full subcategory of \mathfrak{B} of cosimple objects, and $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{B} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{B}_1}} \mathfrak{B}$ be the inclusion functor. By Corollary 6.4, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{B}_1}$ admits a right adjoint $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{B}_1}$ with the following action on objects:


$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{B}_1} \left(\hat{V}(G), \epsilon_G, \hat{E}(G) \right) = \left(\hat{V}(G), e_{\epsilon_G}, \text{coran}(\epsilon_G) \right),$$

where $\text{coran}(\epsilon_G) = \left\{ \epsilon_G(f) : f \in \hat{E}(G) \right\}$ and $e_{\epsilon_G}(A) = A$. Thus, cosimplification in \mathfrak{B} removes parallelisms, like simplification in \mathfrak{H} .

Let $\mathbf{Anti} := \mathbf{Cospa}(\mathcal{Q})$. An object G of \mathbf{Anti} consists of a set $\hat{V}(G)$ and a family of subsets $\beta_G \subseteq \mathcal{Q}\hat{V}(G)$, a set system. A morphism $G \xrightarrow{f} G' \in \mathbf{Anti}$ is a function $f : \hat{V}(G) \rightarrow \hat{V}(G')$ such that $f^{-1}(A) \in \beta_G$ for all $A \in \beta_{G'}$, which is an ‘‘antihomomorphism’’ of set systems as defined in [11, p. 60]. As such, the category \mathbf{Top} of topological spaces and the category \mathbf{Meas} of measurable spaces are both replete subcategories of \mathbf{Anti} .

Letting $\mathbf{Anti} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{CoCom}_{\mathfrak{B}}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{CoSp}_{\mathfrak{B}}} \end{array} \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{B}$ be the functors defined in the dual of Definition

3.1, the dual of Theorem 3.3 gives an equivalence. If $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{Top}}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{Meas}}$ are the inclusion functors of \mathbf{Top} and \mathbf{Meas} into \mathbf{Anti} , respectively, each admits a right adjoint given by generating a topology or σ -algebra from the set system [6, Propositions 2.1 & 4.9]. Let Γ and Σ be the functors from \mathbf{Anti} to \mathbf{Top} and \mathbf{Meas} , respectively, which generate the appropriate structure. Setting all of the above functors and categories in line together yields the following progression from topological and measurable spaces, to set systems as spaces, to set-system hypergraphs with antihomomorphisms. Moreover, the creation of the Borel σ -algebra can be represented with the composite functor $\Sigma\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{Top}}$.



References

- [1] J. ADÁMEK AND V. KOUBEK, *Cartesian closed functor-structured categories*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin., 21 (1980), pp. 573–590.
- [2] J. A. BONDY AND U. S. R. MURTY, *Graph theory*, vol. 244 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2008.
- [3] R. BROWN, I. MORRIS, J. SHRIMPSON, AND C. D. WENSLEY, *Graphs of morphisms of graphs*, Electron. J. Combin., 15 (2008), pp. Article 1, 28.

- [4] R. T. BUMBY AND D. M. LATCH, *Categorical constructions in graph theory*, Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci., 9 (1986), pp. 1–16.
- [5] W. DÖRFLER, *Set-systems and their automorphisms*, in Recent advances in graph theory (Proc. Second Czechoslovak Sympos., Prague, 1974), 1975, pp. 153–166.
- [6] G. B. FOLLAND, *Real analysis*, Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York), John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second ed., 1999. Modern techniques and their applications, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [7] W. GRILLIETTE, *Injective envelopes and projective covers of quivers*, Electron. J. Combin., 19 (2012), pp. Paper 39, 15.
- [8] W. GRILLIETTE, J. REYNES, AND L. J. RUSNAK, *Incidence hypergraphs: Injectivity, uniformity, and matrix-tree theorems*, 2020.
- [9] W. GRILLIETTE AND L. J. RUSNAK, *Incidence hypergraphs: The categorical inconsistency of set-systems and a characterization of quiver exponentials*, 2019.
- [10] P. HELL, *An introduction to the category of graphs*, in Topics in graph theory (New York, 1977), vol. 328 of Ann. New York Acad. Sci., New York Acad. Sci., New York, 1979, pp. 120–136.
- [11] P. HELL AND J. NEŠETŘIL, *Cohomomorphisms of graphs and hypergraphs*, Math. Nachr., 87 (1979), pp. 53–61.
- [12] M. KATĚTOV, *Allgemeine Stetigkeitsstrukturen*, in Proc. Internat. Congr. Mathematicians (Stockholm, 1962), Inst. Mittag-Leffler, Djursholm, 1963, pp. 473–479.
- [13] U. KNAUER, *Algebraic graph theory*, vol. 41 of De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2011. Morphisms, monoids and matrices.
- [14] J. P. S. KUNG, *A geometric condition for a hyperplane arrangement to be free*, Adv. Math., 135 (1998), pp. 303–329.
- [15] L. KUČERA AND A. PULTR, *On a mechanism of defining morphisms in concrete categories*, Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle, 13 (1972), pp. 397–410, 443.
- [16] J. J. M. M. RUTTEN, *Universal coalgebra: a theory of systems*, vol. 249, 2000, pp. 3–80. Modern algebra and its applications (Nashville, TN, 1996).
- [17] S. A. SOLOVYOV, *Categorically algebraic topology versus universal topology*, Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 227 (2013), pp. 25–45.

w.b.grilliette@gmail.com