



QUOTIENTS, INDUCTIVE TYPES, & QUOTIENT INDUCTIVE TYPES

MARCELO P. FIORE , ANDREW M. PITTS , AND S. C. STEENKAMP^(✉) 

Department of Computer Science and Technology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
e-mail address: marcelo.fiore@cl.cam.ac.uk

Same as Author 1
e-mail address: andrew.pitts@cl.cam.ac.uk

Same as Author 1
e-mail address: s.c.steenkamp@cl.cam.ac.uk

ABSTRACT. This paper introduces an expressive class of indexed quotient-inductive types, called QWI types, within the framework of constructive type theory. They are initial algebras for indexed families of equational theories with possibly infinitary operators and equations. We prove that QWI types can be derived from quotient types and inductive types in the type theory of toposes with natural number object and universes, provided those universes satisfy the Weakly Initial Set of Covers (WISC) axiom. We do so by constructing QWI types as colimits of a family of approximations to them defined by well-founded recursion over a suitable notion of size, whose definition involves the WISC axiom. We developed the proof and checked it using the Agda theorem prover.

1. INTRODUCTION

Inductive types are an essential feature of many type theories and the proof assistants and programming languages that are based upon them. Homotopy Type Theory [Uni13] introduces a powerful extension to the notion of inductive type: higher inductive types (HITs). To define an ordinary inductive type one declares the ways in which its elements are constructed, and these constructions may depend inductively on smaller elements. To define a HIT one not only declares element constructors, but also declares equality constructors valued in identity types (possibly iterated ones), specifying how the element constructors (and possibly the equality constructors) are related. In the language of homotopy theory, these correspond to points, paths, surfaces, and so on.

In this paper, rather than using HoTT, we work in the simpler setting of Extensional Type Theory [Mar82], where any propositional equality is reflected as a definitional equality. However, our results also hold for an intensional type theory with the uniqueness of identity proofs axiom (UIP), as demonstrated by our Agda development which can be found at [FPS21]. In either case identity types are trivial in dimensions higher than one, so that any two proofs

Key words and phrases: dependent type theory, higher inductive types, quotient types, well-founded relation, weakly initial set of covers, topos theory.

of identity are equal. Nevertheless, as Altenkirch and Kaposi [AK16] point out, HITs are still useful in such a one-dimensional setting. They introduced the term *quotient inductive type* (QIT) for this truncated form of HIT.

One specific advantage of QITs over inductive types is that they provide a natural way to study universal algebra in type theory, since in general algebraic theories cannot be represented in an equation-free way just using inductive notions [MM16]. As an example, the free commutative monoid on carrier X is given by the quotient inductive type of finite multisets¹, $\mathbf{Bag} X$, with constructors:

$$\begin{aligned} & [] : \mathbf{Bag} X \\ & _::_ : X \rightarrow \mathbf{Bag} X \rightarrow \mathbf{Bag} X \\ & \mathbf{swap} : \prod_{x,y:X} \prod_{zs:\mathbf{Bag} X} x :: y :: zs = y :: x :: zs \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

This can be seen as the element constructors for lists ($[]$ and $::$), along with an equality constructor \mathbf{swap} that allows all reorderings of a list to be identified. Notice that the \mathbf{swap} constructor lands in the identity type on $\mathbf{Bag} X$ (just written as $_=_$), making it an *equation* constructor, compared to the *element* constructors, $[]$ and $_::_$, which are familiar from ordinary inductive type definitions.

An alternative presentation of multisets, whose equalities can be easier to work with, is:

$$\begin{aligned} & [] : \mathbf{Bag}' X \\ & _::_ : X \rightarrow \mathbf{Bag}' X \rightarrow \mathbf{Bag}' X \\ & \mathbf{comm} : \prod_{x,y:X} \prod_{as,bs,cs:\mathbf{Bag}' X} as = y :: cs \rightarrow x :: cs = bs \rightarrow x :: as = y :: bs \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Notice that the \mathbf{comm} equality constructor is *conditional* on two equations, $as = y :: cs$ and $x :: cs = bs$, in order to deduce the final equation $x :: as = y :: bs$. The QWI-types introduced in this paper are not able to encode such conditional QITs (at least, not obviously so); see the discussion in the Conclusion.

Given the parameter X , the types $\mathbf{Bag} X$ and $\mathbf{Bag}' X$ are single quotient-inductive types, rather than indexed families defined quotient-inductively. As an example of the latter, consider the go-to example of an inductively defined family, the vector type (length-indexed lists). This has a commutative variant, $\mathbf{AbVec} X n$ for $n : \mathbb{N}$, which makes it an example of an indexed QIT. It has constructors:

$$\begin{aligned} & [] : \mathbf{AbVec} X 0 \\ & _::_ : X \rightarrow \prod_{i:\mathbb{N}} \mathbf{AbVec} X i \rightarrow \mathbf{AbVec} X (\mathbf{suc} i) \\ & \mathbf{swap} : \prod_{x,y:X} \prod_{i:\mathbb{N}} \prod_{zs:\mathbf{AbVec} X i} x :: y :: zs = y :: x :: zs \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

¹Other presentations of multisets are available, aside from the two presentations given here. Incidentally, the mono-sorted algebra of monoids has an equation-free presentation – the multi-sorted algebra of Lists – and this is why no equation for associativity is needed in either definition of multisets.

Our final example of a QIT is unordered countably-branching trees over X , called $\omega\text{Tree } X$, with constructors:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{leaf} : \omega\text{Tree } X \\
 & \text{node} : X \rightarrow (\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \omega\text{Tree } X) \rightarrow \omega\text{Tree } X \\
 & \text{perm} : \prod_{x:X} \prod_{b:\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}} \prod_{b':\text{isIso } b} \prod_{f:\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \omega\text{Tree } X} \text{node } x \ f = \text{node } x \ (f \circ b)
 \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where elements of $\text{isIso } b$ witness that b is a bijection. (As with AbVec , one could similarly consider a depth-indexed variant of ωTree .) The significance of this example is that the $\text{node } x _$ and $\text{perm } x \ b \ b' _$ constructors have infinite arity, making this an example of an *infinitary* QIT. This type is one of the original motivations for considering QITs [AK16], since they can enable constructive versions of structures that classically use non-constructive choice principles, as we explain next.

The examples of QITs in (1.1)–(1.3) only involve element constructors of *finite* arity. For example in (1.1), $[\]$ is nullary and for each $x, y : X$, $x :: _$ and $\text{swap } x \ y _$ are unary. Consequently $\text{Bag } X$ is isomorphic to the type obtained from the ordinary inductive type of finite lists over X by quotienting by the congruence generated by swap . By contrast, (1.4) involves element and equality constructors with countably infinite arity. So if one first forms the ordinary inductive type of *ordered* countably-branching trees (by dropping the equality constructor perm from the declaration) and then quotients by a suitable relation to get the equalities specified by perm , one appears to need the axiom of countable choice to be able to lift the node element constructor to the quotient [AK16, Section 2.2]. The construction of the Cauchy reals as a higher inductive-inductive type [Uni13, Section 11.3] provides a similar, but more complicated example where use of countable choice is avoided. So it seems that without some form of choice principle, quotient inductive types are strictly more expressive than the combination of ordinary inductive types with quotient types. Indeed, Lumsdaine and Shulman [LS19, Section 9] turn an infinitary equational theory due to Blass [Bla83, Section 9] into a higher-inductive type that cannot be proved to exist in ZF set theory without the Axiom of Choice. In this paper we show that in fact a much weaker and constructively acceptable form of choice is sufficient for constructing indexed quotient inductive types. This is the *Weakly Initial Set of Covers* (WISC) axiom, originally called the ‘‘Axiom of Multiple Choice’’ by van den Berg and Moerdijk [vdBM14]. WISC is constructively acceptable in that it holds in the internal logic of a very wide range of toposes [Joh02] (for example, all Grothendieck and all realizability toposes over the topos of classical sets), including those commonly used in the semantics of Type Theory. Section 4 reviews WISC and our motivation for using it herein.

Thus we make two contributions:

- First we define a class of indexed quotient inductive types called *QWI-types* and give elimination and computation rules for them (Section 3). The usual W-types of Martin-Löf [Mar82] are inductive types giving the algebraic terms over a possibly infinitary signature. One specifies a QWI-type by giving a family of equations between such terms. So such types give initial algebras for (families of) possibly infinitary algebraic theories. As we indicate in Section 7, they can encode a very wide range of examples of possibly infinitary, indexed quotient inductive types. In classical set theory with the Axiom of Choice, QWI-types can be constructed simply as Quotients of the underlying Indexed W-type—hence the name.

- Secondly, our main result (Theorem 6.1) is that with only WISC it is still possible to construct QWI-types from inductive types and quotients in the constructive type theory of toposes, but not simply by quotienting a W-type. Instead, quotienting is interleaved with an inductive construction. To make sense of this and prove that the resulting type has the required universal property, we construct the type as the colimit of a family of approximations to it defined by well-founded recursion over a suitable notion of *size* (a constructive version of what classically would be accomplished with a sequence of transfinite ordinal length). Our notion of size is developed in Section 5. Sizes are elements of a W-type equipped with the *plump* [Tay96] well-founded order; and WISC allows us to make the W-type big enough that a given polynomial endofunctor preserves size-indexed colimits (Corollary 5.9). This fact is then applied in Section 6 to form QWI-types as size-indexed colimits.

Note. This paper is a greatly revised and expanded version of our earlier paper [FPS20], which introduced QW-types (the non-indexed version of Definition 3.2). Here, as well as considering the more expressive indexed form, we put their construction from inductive and quotient types on a firm semantic footing using a well-founded notion of size and WISC. In the previous work we instead used *sized types* [Abe12] as they are implemented in the Agda theorem prover [Agd20]. Unfortunately, in the current version of Agda sized types are logically unsound (github.com/agda/agda/issues/3026); however, the Agda development from [FPS20] does type check in Agda v2.5.2, which is not known to have unsoundness bugs. The Agda development for the results in this paper, avoiding sized types, is available at [FPS21].

2. TYPE THEORY

The results in this paper are proved in a version of Extensional Type Theory [Mar82] which is an internal language for toposes [Joh02] with natural number object and universes. We use this type theory in an informal way, in the style of the HoTT book [Uni13] and in particular use its notation for type theory. Thus dependent function types are written $\prod_{x:A} Bx$ and non-dependent ones as either $A \rightarrow B$ or B^A . Dependent product types are written $\sum_{x:A} Bx$ and non-dependent ones as $A \times B$. Coproduct types are written $A + B$ (with injections $\iota_1 : A \rightarrow A + B$ and $\iota_2 : B \rightarrow A + B$); and finite types are written 0 (with no elements), 1 (with a single element 0), 2 (with two elements $0, 1$), etc. The identity type for $x : A$ and $y : A$ is $x =_A y$, or just $x = y$ when the type A is known from the context. When we need to refer to the judgement that x and y are definitionally equal, we write $x \equiv y$. Unlike in [Uni13], the type $x = y$ is an extensional identity type and so it is inhabited iff $x \equiv y$ holds. In particular, proofs of identity are unique when they exist and so it makes sense to use McBride’s heterogeneous form of identity type [McB99] wherever possible. Given $x : A$ and $y : B$, we denote the heterogeneous identity type by $x = y$; thus this type is inhabited iff $A \equiv B$ and $x \equiv y$.

The type theory has universes of types, $\mathcal{U}_0 : \mathcal{U}_1 : \mathcal{U}_2, \dots$ which we write just as \mathcal{U} when the universe level is immaterial. We use Russell-style universes (there is no syntactic distinction between an element $A : \mathcal{U}$ and the corresponding type of its elements). Influenced by Agda (see below) and unlike the HoTT Book [Uni13], we do not assume universes are cumulative, but instead use Agda-style closure under \prod -types: if $A : \mathcal{U}_i$ and $B : A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_j$, then $\prod_{x:A} Bx : \mathcal{U}_{\max ij}$. Since we only consider toposes with natural number object, we can

- Given $A : \mathcal{U}$ and $R : A \rightarrow A \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$, we have:
 $A/R : \mathcal{U}$
 $[_]_R : A \rightarrow A/R$
 $\text{qeq}_R : \forall (x, y : A). R x y \rightarrow [x]_R = [y]_R$
- Furthermore, given $B : A/R \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and $f : \prod_{x:A} B([x]_R)$, we have:
 $\text{qelim}_R B f : (\forall (x, y : A). R x y \rightarrow f x == f y) \rightarrow \prod_{z:A/R} B z$
 $\text{qcomp}_R B f : (\forall (x, y : A). R x y \rightarrow f x == f y) \rightarrow \forall (x : A). \text{qelim}_R B f [x]_R = f x$
- Quotients of equivalence relations are effective: writing ER_R for the proposition that R is reflexive, symmetric and transitive, we have:
 $\text{qeff}_R : \text{ER}_R \rightarrow \forall (x, y : A). [x]_R = [y]_R \rightarrow R x y$

Figure 1: Quotient types

assume the universes are closed under forming not just W-types [MP00, Proposition 3.6], but also all inductively defined indexed families of types [GH04]. Indexed W-types are considered in more detail in the next section.

The lowest universe contains an impredicative universe \mathbf{Prop} of propositions, corresponding to the subobject classifier in a topos. \mathbf{Prop} contains the identity types, is closed under intuitionistic connectives (\wedge , \vee , \rightarrow , \leftrightarrow , etc.) and quantifiers ($\forall (x : A). \phi$ and $\exists (x : A). \phi$, for A in any universe), and satisfies propositional extensionality:

$$\text{propext} : \forall (p, q : \mathbf{Prop}). (p \leftrightarrow q) \rightarrow p = q \quad (2.1)$$

Being an extensional type theory, we also have function extensionality:

$$\text{funext} : \forall \left(f, g : \prod_{x:A} B x \right). (\forall (x : A). f x = g x) \rightarrow f = g \quad (2.2)$$

Note that like the universes \mathcal{U}_i , \mathbf{Prop} is also a Russell-style universe, in that we do not make a notational distinction between a proposition $p : \mathbf{Prop}$ and the type of its proofs. Given $A : \mathcal{U}$ and $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$, we regard the comprehension type $\{x : A \mid \phi x\}$ in \mathcal{U} as synonymous with the dependent product $\sum_{x:A} \phi x$.

Toposes have coequalizers and effective epimorphisms [Joh02, A2.4]. Correspondingly the type theory contains quotient types, with notation as in Figure 1 (recall that $==$ stands for heterogeneous identity). These can be constructed in the usual way via equivalence classes, using \mathbf{Prop} 's impredicative quantifiers and the fact that toposes satisfy unique choice:

$$\text{uniquechoice} : (\exists (x : A). \forall (y : A). x = y) \rightarrow A \quad (2.3)$$

Thus uniquechoice is a function mapping proofs that A has exactly one element to a name for that one element.

Agda development. We have developed and checked a version of the results in this paper using the Agda theorem prover [Agd20]. Being intensional and predicative, the type theory provided by Agda is weaker than the one described above, but can be soundly interpreted in it. One has to work harder to establish the results with Agda, since two expressions that are definitionally equal in Extensional Type Theory may not be so in Agda and hence one has

to produce a term in a corresponding identity type to prove them equal. On the other hand, when a candidate term is given, Agda can decide whether or not it is a correct proof, because validity of the judgements of the type theory it implements is decidable², in contrast with the situation for Extensional Type Theory [Hof95]. Our development is also made easier by extensive use of the predicative universes of proof-irrelevant propositions that feature in recent versions of Agda. Not only are any two proofs of such propositions definitionally equal, but inductively defined propositions (such as the well-founded ordering on sizes used in Section 6) can be eliminated in proofs using dependent pattern matching, which is a very great convenience. We still need these propositions to satisfy the extensionality (2.1) and unique choice (2.3) properties, so we add them as postulates in Agda. Also, the impredicative construction of quotient types is not available, so we get quotients as in Figure 1 by postulating them and using a user-declared rewrite to make their computation rule a definitional equality. Although function extensionality (2.2) is not provable in Agda’s core type theory, it becomes so once one has such quotient types. Our Agda development is available at [FPS21].

3. INDEXED CONTAINERS AND EQUATIONAL SYSTEMS

In this section we introduce a class of indexed quotient inductive types, called QWI-types, which are free algebras for indexed families of possibly infinitary equational theories.

Given a type $I : \mathcal{U}$, when we map between two I -indexed types, say $A : \mathcal{U}^I$ to $B : \mathcal{U}^I$, we will write

$$A \rightarrow B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{k:I} A_k \rightarrow B_k \tag{3.1}$$

for the function type; in the non-indexed case, $A \rightarrow B$ becomes the ordinary function type $A \rightarrow B$. The composition of $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$ will just be written as

$$g \circ f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda i. \lambda x. g_i(f_i x) \tag{3.2}$$

We also often need to define an indexed family of types $B a : \mathcal{U}^I$ which is dependent on some term $a : A_i$ for $A : \mathcal{U}^I$. The type of such families will be written as

$$A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i:I} A_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^I \tag{3.3}$$

This simplifies to $B : A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ in the non-indexed case.

As for ordinary W-types, the indexed version of our QW types gives convenient expressive power (see Section 7). However, the definitions and constructions are easier to understand in the non-indexed case, as in the conference version of this paper [FPS20]. In what follows we often leave indexes implicit when they can be inferred. Thus we invite the reader in the first instance to ignore indexing types I and read each occurrence of \mathcal{U}^I as simply \mathcal{U} ; and similarly any family $\prod_{i:I} \dots$ as a singleton family.

²though not always feasibly so

3.1. Indexed containers. We take our notion of a signature for an indexed W-type to be a particular case of indexed containers [AAG05], namely an element of the type $\sum_{I:\mathcal{U}} \sum_{A:\mathcal{U}^I} \prod_{i:I} A_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^I$, which with the above notational conventions we write as

$$\text{Sig} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{I:\mathcal{U}} \sum_{A:\mathcal{U}^I} A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^I \quad (3.4)$$

We only need indexed containers whose the source and target indexing types are the same, since we only need to consider algebras of endofunctors on the category of I -indexed families in \mathcal{U} . Thus a signature $\Sigma \equiv (I, A, B)$ is a triple that can be thought of as a set of indices I , an I -indexed family of operators A_i , and a function mapping each operator $a : A_i$ to an I -indexed family of arities in \mathcal{U}^I . For instance, the type of vectors over some type D has:

- natural numbers as indices;
- for index 0 a parameter-less operator for the empty vector, and for index $n+1$ an operator parametrised by D for cons; and
- for the operator indexed by 0, a family of empty types for arities, and for operators indexed by $n+1$, a family $\prod_{i:I} \delta_{i,n}$ of arities which is the unit type just in the n th index, and empty otherwise.

Each such signature determines a polynomial endofunctor $S_\Sigma : \mathcal{U}^I \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^I$, which is defined at a family $X : \mathcal{U}^I$ by

$$(S_{I,A,B} X)_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{a:A_i} (B_i a \rightarrow X) \quad (3.5)$$

An S_Σ -algebra is by definition an element of the dependent product

$$\text{Alg}_\Sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{X:\mathcal{U}^I} (S_\Sigma X) \rightarrow X \quad (3.6)$$

S_Σ -algebra morphisms $(X, \alpha) \rightarrow (X', \alpha')$ are given by an I -indexed family of functions $h : X \rightarrow X'$ together with a family of elements in the types

$$(\text{isHom } h)_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{a:A_i} \prod_{b:B_i a \rightarrow X} (\alpha'_i(a, h \circ b) = h_i(\alpha_i(a, b))) \quad (3.7)$$

The WI-type $\text{W}_{a:A_i} B_i a$, or W_Σ , determined by $\Sigma \equiv (I, A, B)$ is the underlying type of an initial S_Σ -algebra. More generally, Dybjer [Dyb97] shows that the initial algebra of any non-nested, strictly positive endofunctor on \mathcal{U} is given by a W-type; and Abbott, Altenkirch, and Ghani [AAG05] extend this to the case with nested uses of W-types as part of their work on containers.

The elements of W_Σ represent an I -indexed family of closed algebraic terms (i.e. well-founded trees) over the signature Σ . From this point of view it is natural to consider not only closed terms solely build up from operations, but also open terms additionally built up with variables drawn from some family $V : \mathcal{U}^I$. Categorically, the type $T_\Sigma V$ of such open terms is the free S_Σ -algebra on V and is another W-type for the signature that is obtained from Σ with the elements of V added as nullary operations. Nevertheless, it is convenient to give a direct inductive definition: the value of $T_\Sigma : \mathcal{U}^I \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^I$ at some some $V : \mathcal{U}^I$, is the inductively defined type with constructors

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &: V \rightarrow T_\Sigma V \\ \sigma &: S_\Sigma(T_\Sigma V) \rightarrow T_\Sigma V \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Given an S_Σ -algebra $(X, \alpha) : \text{Alg}_\Sigma$ and an I -indexed family of functions $f : V \rightarrow X$, the unique morphism of S_Σ -algebras from the free S_Σ -algebra $T_\Sigma V, \sigma$ on V to (X, α) has an

underlying family of functions $T_\Sigma V \rightarrow X$ mapping each $t : (T_\Sigma V)_i$ to the element $t \gg= f$ defined by recursion on the structure of t :

$$\begin{aligned} \eta x \gg= f &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f x \\ \sigma(a, b) \gg= f &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha(a, \lambda x. b x \gg= f) \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

As the notation suggests, $\gg=$ is the Kleisli lifting operation (“bind”) for a monad structure on T_Σ ; indeed, it is the free monad on the endofunctor S_Σ .

3.2. QWI-type. The notion of *QWI-type* that we introduce in this section is obtained from that of a *W-type* by considering not only the algebraic terms over a given structure, but also equations between terms. To code equations we use a type-theoretic, and indexed, rendering of a categorical notion of equational system introduced by Fiore and Hur, referred to as *term equational system* [FH09, Section 2] and as *monadic equational system* [Fio13, Section 5], here instantiated to free monads on signatures.

Definition 3.1. A *system of equations* over a signature $\Sigma : \text{Sig}$ is specified by:

- An I -indexed family of types $E : \mathcal{U}^I$. The elements $e : E_i$ can be thought of as names for each equation.
- For each equation $e : E_i$, an I -indexed family of types $V_i e : \mathcal{U}^I$, where $V_i e$ represents the variables used in the equation e . That is, a function $V : E \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^I$.
- For each equation $e : E_i$, two elements called le and re of type $(T_\Sigma(V_i e))_i$, which is the value at i of the free S_Σ -algebra on the “variables” $V_i e$. So le and re can be thought of as the abstract syntax tree (AST) of a term with some leaves being free variables drawn from $V_i e$.

So systems of equations are elements of the dependent product

$$\text{Syseq}_\Sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{E : \mathcal{U}^I} \sum_{V : E \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^I} \left(\prod_{i : I} \prod_{e : E_i} (T_\Sigma(V_i e))_i \right) \times \left(\prod_{i : I} \prod_{e : E_i} (T_\Sigma(V_i e))_i \right) \quad (3.10)$$

An S_Σ -algebra $\alpha : S_\Sigma X \rightarrow X$ satisfies the system of equations $\varepsilon \equiv (E, V, l, r) : \text{Syseq}_\Sigma$ if for each $i : I$ there is a proof of

$$(\text{Sat}_{\alpha, \varepsilon} X)_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall (e : E_i). \forall (\rho : \prod_{j : I} V_{i,j} e \rightarrow X_j). ((le) \gg= \rho) = ((re) \gg= \rho) \quad (3.11)$$

The category-theoretic view of QWI-types is that they are simply S_Σ -algebras that are initial among those satisfying a given system of equations:

Definition 3.2 (QWI-type). A *QWI-type* for a signature $\Sigma \equiv (I, A, B) : \text{Sig}$ and a system of equations $\varepsilon \equiv (E, V, l, r) : \text{Syseq}_\Sigma$ is given by a type $\text{QW} : \mathcal{U}^I$ equipped with an S_Σ -algebra structure and a proof that it satisfies the equations

$$\text{qwintro} : S_\Sigma \text{QW} \rightarrow \text{QW} \quad (3.12)$$

$$\text{qwequate} : \text{Sat}_{\text{qwintro}, \varepsilon} \text{QW} \quad (3.13)$$

together with functions that witness that it is an initial such algebra:

$$\text{qwrec} : \prod_{X:\mathcal{U}^I} \prod_{\alpha:S_\Sigma X \rightarrow X} (\text{Sat}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(X) \rightarrow (\text{QW} \rightarrow X)) \quad (3.14)$$

$$\text{qwrecom} : \prod_{X:\mathcal{U}^I} \prod_{\alpha:S_\Sigma X \rightarrow X} \prod_{p:\text{Sat}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(X)} \text{isHom}(\text{qwrec } X \alpha p) \quad (3.15)$$

$$\text{qwuniq} : \prod_{X:\mathcal{U}^I} \prod_{\alpha:S_\Sigma X \rightarrow X} \prod_{p:\text{Sat}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(X)} \prod_{f:\text{QW} \rightarrow X} \text{isHom } f \rightarrow \text{qwrec } X \alpha p = f \quad (3.16)$$

Remark 3.3 (QW-type). The special case of Definition 3.1 when $I = \mathbb{1}$ is a one-element type is equivalent to the notion of *system of equations* from our conference paper [FPS20, Definition 1]: Σ is given by $A : \mathcal{U}$ and $B : A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$; and ε by $E : \mathcal{U}$, $V : E \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and $l, r : \prod_{e:E} T_\Sigma(V_e)$. Thus *QW-types* [FPS20, Definition 2] are the $I = \mathbb{1}$ special case of QWI-types.

Remark 3.4 (Free algebras). Definition 3.2 defines QWI-types as *initial* algebras for systems of equations ε over signatures Σ . More generally, the *free* (Σ, ε) -algebra on a family $X : \mathcal{U}^I$ is a family $F_{\Sigma,\varepsilon} X : \mathcal{U}^I$ equipped with an S_Σ -algebra structure $S_\Sigma(F_{\Sigma,\varepsilon} X) \rightarrow F_{\Sigma,\varepsilon} X$ satisfying the system of equations ε and an inclusion of generators $\eta_X : X \rightarrow F_{\Sigma,\varepsilon} X$ which is universal among such data. Initial algebras are the $X = \mathbb{0}$ special case of free algebras. But once one has them, one also has free algebras, by change of signature: $F_{\Sigma,\varepsilon} X$ is the QWI-type for the signature Σ_X and system of equations ε_X defined as follows. If $\Sigma = (I, A, B)$, then $\Sigma_X = (I, \lambda i. X_i + A_i, B_X)$ where $B_X : \prod_{i:I} (X_i + A_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^I)$ satisfies $(B_X)_i(\iota_1 x) = \lambda j. \mathbb{0}$ and $(B_X)_i(\iota_2 a) = B_i a$. And if $\varepsilon = (E, V, l, r)$, then $\varepsilon_X = (E, V, l_X, r_X)$ where for each $i : I$ and $e : E_i$, $l_X e = (l e \gg \eta)$ and $r_X e = (r e \gg \eta)$ (using the S_Σ -algebra structure s on $T_\Sigma(V_i e)$ given by $s(a, b) = \sigma(\iota_2 a, b)$).

The definition of S_Σ in (3.5) and $\text{Sat}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$ in (3.11) are suggestive that a QWI-type is an instance of the indexed version of the notion of quotient-inductive type [AK16], with `qwintro` as the element constructor and `qwequate` as the equality constructor. To show that QWI-types are indeed an instance of indexed quotient-inductive types, they need to have the requisite dependently-typed elimination and computation³ properties for these elements and equality constructors. We show that these follow from (3.14)–(3.16) and function extensionality. To state this proposition we need a dependent version of the bind operation (3.9). This is because the free variables of a dependently-typed abstract syntax tree require substitutions of terms that include the dependency – a Σ -type.

For each motive P and induction step p ,

$$\begin{aligned} P &: \prod_{i:I} \text{QW}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \\ p &: \prod_{i:I} \prod_{a:A_i} \prod_{b:B_i} \prod_{a \rightarrow \text{QW}} \left(\prod_{j:I} \prod_{x:(B_i a)_j} P_j(b_j x) \right) \rightarrow P_i(\text{qwintro}_i(a, b)) \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

³In this paper we work with extensional type theory, so the computation property, (3.20), is also a definitional equality. In our Agda development we work in intentional type theory, thus therein we only establish the computation property up to propositional equality; so, using the terminology of Shulman [Shu18], those are *typal* indexed quotient-inductive types.

as well as family $X : \mathcal{U}^I$, an I -indexed substitution $\rho : (X \rightarrow \sum_{x:\mathbf{QW}} P x)$, and term $t : (T X)_j$ for $j : I$, we have an element of $\mathbf{lift}_{P,X} p \rho t : P (t \gg \pi_1 \circ \rho)$ defined by recursion on the structure of t :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{lift}_{P,X} p \rho (\eta x) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \pi_2 (\rho x) \\ \mathbf{lift}_{P,X} p \rho (\sigma (a, b)) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p_j a (\lambda x . b x \gg (\pi_1 \circ \rho)) ((\mathbf{lift}_{P,X} p \rho) \circ b) \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Note that the substitution ρ gives terms in the “dependent telescope” $\sum_{x:\mathbf{QW}_i} P_i x$, which will be written as P' .

Proposition 3.5. *For a QWI-type as defined above, given P and p as in (3.17), and a term p_{resp} of type*

$$\prod_{i:I} \prod_{e:E_i} \prod_{\rho:V_i e \rightarrow \sum_{x:\mathbf{QW}} P x} \mathbf{lift}_{P,X} p \rho (l e) == \mathbf{lift}_{P,X} p \rho (r e) \quad (3.19)$$

there are elimination and computation terms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{qwelim} &: \prod_{i:I} \prod_{x:\mathbf{QW}_i} P_i x \\ \mathbf{qwcomp} &: \prod_{i:I} \prod_{a:A_i} \prod_{b:B_i} \prod_{a \rightarrow \mathbf{QW}} \mathbf{qwelim} (\mathbf{qwintro} (a, b)) = p_i a b (\lambda j . \mathbf{qwelim}_j \circ b_j) \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

(Note that (3.19) uses heterogeneous identity $==$, because $\mathbf{lift}_{P,X} p \rho (l e)$ and $\mathbf{lift}_{P,X} p \rho (r e)$ inhabit different types, namely $P (l e \gg \pi_1 \circ \rho)$ and $P (r e \gg \pi_1 \circ \rho)$ respectively.)

Proof. To define the eliminator, we must first use the algebra map on the more general type $P'_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x:\mathbf{QW}_i} P_i x$ for all indexes $i : I$. The algebra map, \mathbf{qwrec} , requires that this type P' has an algebra structure $\beta : S_\Sigma P' \rightarrow P'$, which is given, for each i , by:

$$\beta (a, b) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{qwintro} (a, \pi_1 \circ b), p a (\pi_1 \circ b) (\pi_2 \circ b)) \quad (3.21)$$

Moreover, we must show that the recursor satisfies the equations by giving a proof $s : \mathbf{Sat}_{\beta, \varepsilon} P'$, which we do pointwise on the two elements of the dependent product P' . Taking projections distributes (possibly dependently) over \gg ; so to construct s it suffices that, given any $e : E_i$ and $\rho : V_i e \rightarrow P'$, we have the two terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{qwequate} e \rho &: l e \gg (\pi_1 \circ \rho) = r e \gg (\pi_1 \circ \rho) \\ p_{\text{resp}} e \rho &: \mathbf{lift} p \rho (l e) == \mathbf{lift} p \rho (r e) \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Then the eliminator is defined by taking the second projection of this recursor.

$$\mathbf{qwelim} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \pi_2 \circ r \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \pi_2 \circ \mathbf{qwrec} P' \beta s \quad (3.23)$$

Given an element $(a, b) : (S_\Sigma \mathbf{QW})_i$, we can prove that applying the eliminator to it computes $\mathbf{qwelim} (\mathbf{qwintro} (a, b)) = p_i a b (\mathbf{qwelim} \circ b)$ – as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{qwelim} (\mathbf{qwintro} (a, b)) \\ &== \pi_2 (r (\mathbf{qwintro} (a, b))) && \text{(def. of } \mathbf{qwelim}) \\ &== \pi_2 (\beta_i (a, (r \circ b))) && \text{(using } \mathbf{qwrechom} \text{ against } \mathbf{qwintro} (a, b)) \\ &== p_i a (\pi_1 \circ r \circ b) (\pi_2 \circ r \circ b) && \text{(def. of } \beta) \\ &== p_i a b (\pi_2 \circ r \circ b) && \text{(} r \text{ preserves } \mathbf{QW} \text{ in the first component;} \\ & && \text{follows from } \mathbf{qwrechom} \text{ and } \mathbf{qwuniq}) \\ &== p_i a b (\mathbf{qwelim} \circ b) && \text{(def. of } \mathbf{qwelim}) \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

4. WEAKLY INITIAL SETS OF COVERS

In Section 3 we defined a QWI-type in a topos to be an initial algebra for a given (possibly infinitary) signature and system of equations (Definition 3.2). If one interprets these notions in the topos of sets in classical Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory with the axiom of Choice (ZFC), one regains an indexed version of the usual notion from universal algebra of initial algebras for infinitary equational theories. Thus in ZFC, the QWI-type for a signature $\Sigma = (I, A, B)$ and system of equations $\varepsilon = (E, V, l, r)$ can be constructed by first forming the I -indexed family W_Σ of sets of well-founded trees over Σ and then quotienting by the congruence relation \sim_ε on W_Σ generated by ε . The I -indexed family of quotient sets $(W_\Sigma)/\sim_\varepsilon$ yields the desired initial algebra for (Σ, ε) provided the S_Σ -algebra structure on W_Σ induces one on the quotient sets. It does so, because for each operator in the signature, using the Axiom of Choice (AC) one can pick representatives of the (possibly infinitely many) equivalence classes that are the arguments of the operator, apply the interpretation of the operator in W_Σ and then take the equivalence class of that. So the topos of sets in ZFC has QWI-types.

Is this use of AC really necessary? Blass [Bla83, Section 9] shows that if one drops AC and just works in ZF, then provided a certain large cardinal axiom is consistent with ZFC, it is consistent with ZF that there is an infinitary equational theory with no initial algebra. He shows this by first exhibiting a countably presented equational theory whose initial algebra has to be an uncountable regular cardinal; and secondly appealing to the construction of Gitik [Git80] of a model of ZF with no uncountable regular cardinals (assuming a certain large cardinal axiom). Lumsdaine and Shulman [LS19] turn the infinitary equational theory of Blass into a higher-inductive type that cannot be proved to exist in ZF (and hence cannot be constructed in type theory just using pushouts and the natural numbers). We show in Example 7.7 that this higher inductive type can be presented as a QWI-type.

So one cannot hope to construct QWI-types using a type theory which is interpretable in just ZF. However, the type theory in which we work (Section 2) already requires going beyond ZF to be able to give a classical set-theoretic interpretation of its universes (by assuming the existence of enough strongly inaccessible cardinals, for example). So the above considerations about non-existence of initial algebras for infinitary equational theories in ZF do not necessarily rule out the construction of QWI-types in other toposes with natural number object and universes. In Section 6, we show that a very wide range of toposes have QWI types, namely the ones satisfying the following constructively acceptable form of choice.

Definition 4.1 (WISC). A universe \mathcal{U} has *weakly initial sets of covers* if for every $A : \mathcal{U}$, there is a type $\text{Cov}_A : \mathcal{U}$ and a family of types $\text{Dom}_A : \text{Cov}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ with the property that for all surjective functions $q : B \rightarrow A$ in \mathcal{U} , there exists $c : \text{Cov}_A$ and $e : \text{Dom}_A c \rightarrow B$ for which $q \circ e : \text{Dom}_A c \rightarrow A$ is surjective. We say that a topos with natural number object and universes satisfies WISC if each of its universes has a weakly initial set of covers for every type in the universe.

This axiom was introduced independently by van den Berg and Moerdijk [vdBM14] who express it in constructive set theory CZF and call it the *Axiom of Multiple Choice* (building upon previous work by Moerdijk and Palmgren [MP02]); and by Streicher [Str05], who calls it TTCA_f . We follow <https://ncatlab.org/nlab/show/WISC> in using the “WISC” terminology, which is justified as follows. A *cover* of $A : \mathcal{U}$ is just a surjective function $q : B \rightarrow A$ for some $B : \mathcal{U}$. If $\text{Dom}_A : \text{Cov}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is as in the above definition, then the type

$$\sum_{c : \text{Cov}_A} \sum_{f : \text{Dom}_A c \rightarrow A} \forall (x : A). \exists (y : \text{Dom}_A c). f y = x$$

of all covers of A with domains in $\{\text{Dom}_A c \mid c : \text{Cov}_A\}$ is weakly initial: for every cover $q : B \rightarrow A$ of A in \mathcal{U} , there is a cover in the family which factors through q . Conversely, if

$$p : I \rightarrow \sum_{B:\mathcal{U}} \sum_{f:B \rightarrow A} \forall (x : A). (\exists y : B). f x = y$$

is a weakly initial family of covers (i.e. for every cover $q : B \rightarrow A$, there exists $i : I$ so that the cover $\pi_1(\pi_2(p_i)) : \pi_1(p_i) \rightarrow A$ factors through q), then we can take $\text{Cov}_A = I$ and $\text{Dom}_A = \pi_1 \circ p$ in Definition 4.1.

Note that in classical set theory AC implies WISC: the axiom of choice implies that covers split and so we can take Cov_A to be the type $\mathbb{1}$ with unique element $0 : \mathbb{1}$ and $\text{Dom}_A 0 = A$. WISC is independent of ZF in classical logic [Kar14; Rob15]. In constructive logic it is preserved by many ways of making new toposes from existing ones, in particular by the formation of sheaf toposes and realizability toposes over a given topos [vdBM14]. Thus it holds in all the toposes commonly used for the semantics of Type Theory. It is in this sense that WISC is a constructively acceptable form of the axiom of choice. (Roberts [Rob15] gives examples of toposes which fail to satisfy WISC.)

The following lemma gives a convenient reformulation of WISC:

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that a universe \mathcal{U} has weakly initial sets of covers. If $A : \mathcal{U}$, $B : A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and $\phi : \prod_{x:A} (B x \rightarrow \text{Prop})$ satisfy $\forall (x : A). \exists (y : B x). \phi x y$, then there exist $c : \text{Cov}_A$, a surjection $p : \text{Dom}_A c \rightarrow A$ and a function $q : \prod_{z:\text{Dom}_A c} B(p z)$ satisfying $\forall (z : \text{Dom}_A c). \phi(p z)(q z)$.*

Proof. Consider the type $E \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x:A} \sum_{y:B x} \phi x y$ in \mathcal{U} . By assumption $\pi_1 : E \rightarrow A$ is a surjection, so by WISC there exist $c : \text{Cov}_A$ and $e : \text{Dom}_A c \rightarrow E$ with $\pi_1 \circ e$ a surjection. So we can take $p = \pi_1 \circ e$ and q to be the function mapping each $z : \text{Dom}_A c$ to $\pi_1(\pi_2(z))$; and then $\pi_2(\pi_2(z))$ is a proof that $\phi(p z)(q z)$ holds. \square

5. SIZE

Swan [Swa18] uses WISC to construct *W-types with reductions*, which are a simple special case of QWI-types (see Example 7.5). We will see that in fact WISC implies the existence of all QWI-types, but using a different approach from that of Swan [Swa18]. We show in this section that, starting with a given signature Σ and system of equations ε as in Definition 3.1, using WISC one can construct a well-founded notion of “size” with the property that colimits of size-indexed diagrams are preserved when taking exponents by certain types associated with (Σ, ε) (roughly speaking, any arity, or cover, or cover of a cover of such arities). This will enable us to construct the QWI-type for (Σ, ε) as a sized-indexed colimit in Section 6. Size is here playing a role in the constructive type theory of toposes that in classical set theory would be played by ordinal numbers. The next definition gives the properties of size that we need.

Definition 5.1 (Size). A type $\text{Size} : \mathcal{U}$ will be called a *type of sizes* if it comes equipped with a binary relation $_ < _ : \text{Size} \rightarrow \text{Size} \rightarrow \text{Prop}$ which is transitive

$$\forall i, j, k. i < j \rightarrow j < k \rightarrow i < k \tag{5.1}$$

well-founded

$$\forall (\phi : \text{Size} \rightarrow \text{Prop}). (\forall i. (\forall j. j < i \rightarrow \phi j) \rightarrow \phi i) \rightarrow \forall i. \phi i \tag{5.2}$$

has upper bounds for pairs of elements

$$\forall i, j. \exists k. i < k \wedge j < k \quad (5.3)$$

and has a “successor” operation $\uparrow : \text{Size} \rightarrow \text{Size}$ satisfying

$$\forall i. i < \uparrow i \quad (5.4)$$

$$\forall i, j. i < j \rightarrow \uparrow i < \uparrow j \quad (5.5)$$

Such a type of sizes has many properties of the classic notion of limit ordinal⁴, except that we do not require the order to be total ($\forall i, j. i < j \vee i = j \vee j < i$); that would be too strong in a constructive setting and indeed does not hold in the examples below. Nor do we have any need for an extensionality property ($\forall i, j. (\forall k. k < i \leftrightarrow k < j) \rightarrow i = j$). In the precursor to this paper [FPS20] we made use of Agda’s built in type `Size` and its version of sized types [Abe12]. This shares only some of the properties of the above definition. In particular, it has a greatest size ∞ ; so $\infty < \infty$ holds and hence $<$ is not well-founded.⁵

Notation 5.2 (Bounded quantification over sizes). We write $\prod_{j < i} _$ for $\prod_{j : \downarrow i} _$, where

$$\downarrow i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{j : \text{Size} \mid j < i\} \quad (5.6)$$

is the type of sizes below $i : \text{Size}$. Similarly for other binders involving sizes, such as $\forall j < i. _$ and $\lambda j < i. _$.

In the next section we need the standard fact that well-founded recursion can be reduced to well-founded induction (5.2) by defining the graph of the recursive function and then appealing to unique choice (2.3) and function extensionality (2.2):

Proposition 5.3 (Well-founded recursion). *For any family of types $A : \text{Size} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and function $\alpha : \prod_i ((\prod_{j < i} A j) \rightarrow A i)$, there is a unique function $\text{rec } A \alpha : \prod_i A i$ satisfying*

$$\forall i. \text{rec } A \alpha i = \alpha i (\lambda j < i. \text{rec } A \alpha j) \quad (5.7)$$

Proof. Let $R : \prod_i (A i \rightarrow \text{Prop})$ be the least⁶ family of relations satisfying

$$\forall i. \forall (f : \prod_{j < i} A j). (\forall j < i. R_j (f j)) \rightarrow R_i (\alpha i f) \quad (5.8)$$

Then $\forall i. \exists!(x : A_i). R_i x$ follows applying (5.2) with $\phi i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists! x. R_i x$. So by unique choice there is $r : \prod_i A i$ satisfying $\forall i. R_i (r i)$ and hence by (5.8) also satisfying $\forall i. R_i (\alpha i (\lambda j < i. r j))$. Since for each i there is a unique x with $R_i x$, it follows that $r i = \alpha i (\lambda j < i. r j)$. So we can take $\text{rec } A \alpha$ to be r . If $r' : \prod_i A i$ also satisfies $\forall i. r' i = \alpha i (\lambda j < i. r' j)$, then $\forall i. r' i = r i$ follows from another application of (5.2), so that $r' = r$ by function extensionality (2.2). \square

Example 5.4 (Plump order). Let $\text{Size} : \mathcal{U}$ be the W-type determined by some type $Op : \mathcal{U}$ and family $Ar : Op \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. Thus Size is inductively defined with constructor $\sigma :$

⁴or zero ordinal, since we do not need to require that a type of sizes is actually inhabited

⁵Unfortunately in the current version of Agda (2.6.1) it is possible to prove well-foundedness of $<$ and this leads immediately to logical unsoundness; see github.com/agda/agda/issues/3026. For this reason we avoid the use of Agda’s sized types in the current development.

⁶Instead of the impredicative definition of R (and $<$ and \leq in Example 5.4) as the least relation closed under some rules, in our Agda development such relations are constructed as inductively defined datatypes in the universe `Prop`, allowing one to use dependent pattern-matching to simplify proofs about them.

$(\sum_{a:Op}(Ar a \rightarrow \mathbf{Size})) \rightarrow \mathbf{Size}$. The *plump* ordering [Tay96] on \mathbf{Size} is given by the least relations $_ < _, _ \leq _ : \mathbf{Size} \rightarrow \mathbf{Size} \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$ satisfying for all $a : Op, b : Ar a \rightarrow \mathbf{Size}$ and $i : \mathbf{Size}$

$$(\forall (x : Ar a). bx < i) \rightarrow \sigma ab \leq i \quad (5.9)$$

$$\forall (x : Ar a). i \leq bx \rightarrow i < \sigma ab \quad (5.10)$$

It is not hard to see that the relation $<$ is transitive (5.1) and well-founded (5.2). Furthermore \leq is reflexive and hence from (5.10) we get

$$\forall (x : Ar a). bx < \sigma ab \quad (5.11)$$

so that for each operation $a : Op$, every family of elements of \mathbf{Size} indexed by its arity Ba has an upper bound with respect to $<$. In particular, if the signature (Op, Ar) contains an operation $a_2 : Op$ whose arity is $Ar a_2 = 2$, then an upper bound for any $i, j : \mathbf{Size}$ with respect to $<$ is given by

$$i \sqcup j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma a_2 b_{i,j} \quad (5.12)$$

with $b_{i,j} : 2 \rightarrow \mathbf{Size}$ defined by $b_{i,j} 0 = i$ and $b_{i,j} 1 = j$. So (5.3) is satisfied in this case and furthermore

$$\uparrow i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} i \sqcup i \quad (5.13)$$

gives a successor operation satisfying (5.4) and (5.5). Therefore, we have:

Lemma 5.5. *If the signature $Op : \mathcal{U}, Ar : Op \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ contains a binary operation $(a_2 : A$ with $Ba_2 = 2)$, then the corresponding W -type, equipped with the plump order $<$, is a type of sizes in the sense of Definition 5.1. \square*

Let (Σ, ε) be a signature and system of equations in a topos with natural number object and universes, as in Definition 3.1. Assuming the topos satisfies WISC, in Definition 5.6 below we associate with (Σ, ε) a type of sizes $\mathbf{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ using the plump order $<$ on a suitable W -type. We need $\mathbf{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ to have upper bounds (with respect to $<$) for X -indexed families when X is one of the arities in Σ or ε — more specifically, when $X = \sum_{j:I}(B_i a)_j$, or $X = \sum_{j:I}(V_i e)_j$, where $\Sigma = (I, A, B)$ and $\varepsilon = (E, V, l, r)$, $i : I$, $a : A_i$ and $e : E_i$. We also need upper bounds for $(\text{Dom}_X c)$ -indexed families for any cover $c : \text{Cov}_X$; and also for $(\text{Dom}_Y c)$ -indexed families when Y is aopen qw-journal.pdf certain subtype of one of the types in the set of covers of an arity, for the same reason that Swan uses “2-cover bases” [Swa18, Sect. 3.2.2]. We use the following notation for such 2-covers:

Given $X : \mathcal{U}$, WISC gives us $\text{Cov}_X : \mathcal{U}$ and $\text{Dom}_X : \text{Cov}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. For each cover $c : \text{Cov}_X$ and function $f : \text{Dom}_X c \rightarrow X$, we can form the kernel of f

$$\text{Ker}(c, f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x, x' : \text{Dom}_X c} (f x = f x') \quad (5.14)$$

Since this is a type in \mathcal{U} , we can apply WISC again to get a type $\text{Cov}_{\text{Ker}(c, f)}$ of covers for it. Then we define

$$\text{Cov}_X^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{c : \text{Cov}_X} \sum_{f : \text{Dom}_X c \rightarrow X} \text{Cov}_{\text{Ker}(c, f)} \quad (5.15)$$

$$\text{Dom}_X^2 : \text{Cov}_X^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$$

$$\text{Dom}_X^2(c, f, c') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Dom}_{\text{Ker}(c, f)} c' \quad (5.16)$$

Definition 5.6 (The size of an equational theory). Given an I -indexed signature and system of equations (Σ, ε) (Definition 3.1) in a universe \mathcal{U} in topos satisfying WISC, we define the type of sizes $\mathbf{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon} : \mathcal{U}$ to be given as in Lemma 5.5 with $Op : \mathcal{U}$ and $Ar : Op \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ as follows. Suppose $\Sigma = (I, A, B)$ and $\varepsilon = (E, V, l, r)$; given $i : I$, $a : A_i$ and $e : E_i$, we write $\sum B_i a$ for $\sum_{j:I} (B_i a)_j$ and $\sum V_i e$ for $\sum_{j:I} (V_i e)_j$. Then

$$Op \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{1} + \sum_{i:I} \left(A_i + \sum_{a:A_i} (\text{Cov}_{\Sigma B_i a} + \text{Cov}_{\Sigma^2 B_i a}^2) + E_i + \sum_{e:E_i} (\text{Cov}_{\Sigma V_i e} + \text{Cov}_{\Sigma^2 V_i e}^2) \right)$$

and $Ar : Op \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ maps

- the element $0 : \mathbb{1}$ to 2 (so that there is a binary operation in the signature and hence binary upper bounds (5.12) and an inflationary, monotone successor operation (5.13) for the plump order)
- elements $a : A_i$, $c : \text{Cov}_{\Sigma B_i a}$ and $c' : \text{Cov}_{\Sigma^2 B_i a}^2$ (for each $i : I$) respectively to $\sum B_i a$, $\text{Dom}_{\Sigma B_i a} c$ and $\text{Dom}_{\Sigma^2 B_i a} c'$
- elements $e : E_i$, $c : \text{Cov}_{\Sigma V_i e}$ and $c' : \text{Cov}_{\Sigma^2 V_i e}^2$ (for each $i : I$) respectively to $\sum V_i e$, $\text{Dom}_{\Sigma V_i e} c$ and $\text{Dom}_{\Sigma^2 V_i e} c'$.

With this choice of Op and Ar , not only is $\mathbf{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ a type of sizes in the sense of Definition 5.1, but by virtue of (5.11), we have $<$ -upper bounds for families of sizes in $\mathbf{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ indexed by $\sum B_i a$, $\text{Dom}_{\Sigma B_i a} c$, $\text{Dom}_{\Sigma^2 B_i a} c'$, $\sum V_i e$, $\text{Dom}_{\Sigma V_i e} c$, or $\text{Dom}_{\Sigma^2 V_i e} c'$. This allows us to prove cocontinuity properties (Theorem 5.8 and Corollary 5.9 below) that we apply in Section 6. These cocontinuity properties have to do with colimits of $\mathbf{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ -indexed diagrams in \mathcal{U} . To state them, we first recall some semi-standard⁷ category-theoretic notions to do with diagrams and colimits.

5.1. Colimits of size-indexed diagrams. By definition, given a type of sizes \mathbf{Size} (Definition 5.1), a *Size-indexed diagram* in a universe \mathcal{U} is given by a family of types $D : \mathbf{Size} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ equipped with functions $\delta_{i,j} : D_i \rightarrow D_j$ for all $i, j : \mathbf{Size}$ with $i < j$, satisfying

$$\forall (i, j, k : \mathbf{Size}). i < j < k \rightarrow \delta_{i,k} = \delta_{j,k} \circ \delta_{i,j} \quad (5.17)$$

As usual, the *colimit* of such a diagram is a cocone of functions in \mathcal{U}

$$(\nu_D)_i : D_i \rightarrow \text{colim } D \quad \forall (i, j : \mathbf{Size}). i < j \rightarrow (\nu_D)_i = (\nu_D)_j \circ \delta_{i,j} \quad (5.18)$$

with the universal property that for any other cocone

$$f_i : D_i \rightarrow C \quad \forall (i, j : \mathbf{Size}). i < j \rightarrow f_i = f_j \circ \delta_{i,j}$$

there is a unique function $f : \text{colim } D \rightarrow C$ satisfying $\forall i. f_i = f \circ (\nu_D)_i$.

Colimits can be constructed using quotient types. We define a binary relation \sim on $\sum_i D_i$ by:

$$(i, x) \sim (j, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists (k : \mathbf{Size}). i < k \wedge j < k \wedge \delta_{i,k} x = \delta_{j,k} y \quad (5.19)$$

This is an equivalence relation, because $(\mathbf{Size}, <)$ has properties (5.3) and (5.4). Quotienting by it yields

$$\text{colim } D \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\sum_i D_i) / \sim \quad (5.20)$$

⁷They are only semi-standard, because $<$ is not reflexive (indeed is irreflexive, because of well-foundedness), so that $(\mathbf{Size}, <)$ is only a semi-category.

with the universal cocone functions $(\nu_D)_i$ given by mapping each $x : D_i$ to the equivalence class $[i, x]_{\sim}$.

Notation 5.7. We need to consider **Size**-indexed diagrams and their colimits not only in \mathcal{U} , but also in \mathcal{U}^I for some indexing type $I : \mathcal{U}$. Such diagrams and their colimits are given pointwise by diagrams and colimits in \mathcal{U} . The situation is notationally involved, since there are indexes ranging both over the index type I and over sizes. *In what follows we use \mathbf{i} for a typical element of I and i, j, k, \dots to range over **Size**.*

Given a **Size**-indexed diagram (D, δ) in \mathcal{U}^I and a family $X : \mathcal{U}^I$, we get a *power* diagram (D^X, δ^X) in \mathcal{U} with

$$\begin{aligned} (D^X)_i &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \rightarrow D_i & (i : \text{Size}) \\ \text{ispe}(\delta^X)_{i,j} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda(f : X \rightarrow D_i). \delta_{i,j} \circ f & (i, j : \text{Size}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

Post-composition with $(\nu_D)_i$ gives a cocone under the diagram D^X with vertex $X \rightarrow \text{colim } D$ and this induces a well-defined function

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{D,X} : \text{colim}(D^X) &\rightarrow (X \rightarrow \text{colim } D) \\ \kappa_{D,X} [i, f]_{\sim} &= (\nu_D)_i \circ f \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

One says that *taking a power by $X : \mathcal{U}^I$ preserves **Size**-indexed colimits* if for all **Size**-indexed diagrams (D, δ) in \mathcal{U}^I the function $\kappa_{D,X}$ is an isomorphism.

Theorem 5.8 (Cocontinuity). *Given a signature $\Sigma = (I, A, B)$ and system of equations $\varepsilon = (E, V, l, r)$ (Definition 3.1) in a topos with natural number object and universes satisfying WISC, the type of sizes $\text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ from Definition 5.6 has the property that taking a power by a family $X : \mathcal{U}^I$ preserves $\text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ -indexed colimits when X is one of the arities in (Σ, ε) , that is, of the form $B_{\mathbf{i}} a$ or $V_{\mathbf{i}} e$ with $\mathbf{i} : I$ and $a : A_{\mathbf{i}}$ or $e : E_{\mathbf{i}}$.*

Proof. To see that (5.22) is an isomorphism, it suffices to prove that it is both injective and surjective; for then we can apply unique choice (2.3) to construct a two-sided inverse for $\kappa_{D,X}$. By definition of \sim (5.19), $\kappa_{D,X}$ is injective iff

$$\begin{aligned} \forall (i, j : \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}). \forall (f : X \rightarrow D_i). \forall (f' : X \rightarrow D_j). (\nu_D)_i \circ f = (\nu_D)_j \circ f' \rightarrow \\ \exists (k : \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}). i < k \wedge j < k \wedge \delta_{i,k} \circ f = \delta_{j,k} \circ f' \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

and surjective iff

$$\forall (f : X \rightarrow \text{colim } D). \exists (i : \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}). \exists (f' : X \rightarrow D_i). (\nu_D)_i \circ f' = f \quad (5.24)$$

Proof of (5.23): Suppose we have $f : X \rightarrow D_i$ and $f' : X \rightarrow D_j$ satisfying $(\nu_D)_i \circ f = (\nu_D)_j \circ f'$. So by definition of $\text{colim } D$ (5.20) and writing $\sum X$ for $\sum_{\mathbf{i} : I} X_{\mathbf{i}}$, we have

$$\forall ((\mathbf{i}, x) : \sum X). \exists (k : \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}). i < k \wedge j < k \wedge (\delta_{i,k} \circ f)_{\mathbf{i}} x = (\delta_{j,k} \circ f')_{\mathbf{i}} x$$

Using the formulation of WISC in Lemma 4.2, there is $c : \text{Cov}_{\Sigma X}$, $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c \rightarrow \sum X$ and $s : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c \rightarrow \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ with $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ surjective and satisfying

$$\forall (z : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c). i < s z \wedge j < s z \wedge (\delta_{i, s z} \circ f)_{p_1 z} (p_2 z) = (\delta_{j, s z} \circ f')_{p_1 z} (p_2 z) \quad (5.25)$$

Since X is one of the arities in (Σ, ε) , as mentioned after Definition 5.6 we have that $s : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c \rightarrow \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ has an upper bound, i.e. there is $k : \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ with $\forall (z : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c). s z < k$; and by (5.3) we can assume further that $i < k$ and $j < k$. Furthermore, from (5.25) and (5.17)

we get $\forall(z : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c). (\delta_{i,k} \circ f)_{p_1 z}(p_2 z) = (\delta_{j,k} \circ f')_{p_1 z}(p_2 z)$; but $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ is surjective, so $\delta_{i,k} \circ f = \delta_{j,k} \circ f'$, as required for (5.23).

Proof of (5.24): Suppose we have $f : X \rightarrow \text{colim } D$. Since for each $\mathbf{i} : I$ the quotient function $[_]\sim : \sum_i (D_i)_i \rightarrow \text{colim } D_i$ is surjective, using Lemma 4.2 again, there is $c : \text{Cov}_{\Sigma X}$, $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c \rightarrow \sum X$, $s : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c \rightarrow \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ and $g : \prod_{z : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c} (D_{s z})_{p_1 z}$ with $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ surjective and satisfying $\forall(z : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c). f_{p_1 z}(p_2 z) = [s z, g z]_{\sim}$. As before, we have that $s : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c \rightarrow \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ has an upper bound, i.e. there is $j : \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}^{\text{def}}$ with $\forall(z : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c). s z < j$. So we get a function $g' : \prod_{z : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c} (D_j)_{p_1 z}$ by defining $g' z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\delta_{s z, j})_{p_1 z}(g z)$ and hence

$$f_{p_1 z}(p_2 z) = [s z, g z]_{\sim} = [j, (\delta_{s z, j})_{p_1 z}(g z)]_{\sim} = ((\nu_D)_j)_{p_1 z}(g' z) \quad (5.26)$$

Let $Y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Ker}(c, \langle p_1, p_2 \rangle)$ be the kernel of $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ as in (5.14). Then for any $(z, z') : Y$, since $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle z = \langle p_1, p_2 \rangle z'$, we have $((\nu_D)_j)_{p_1 z}(g' z) = f_{p_1 z}(p_2 z) = f_{p_1 z'}(p_2 z') = ((\nu_D)_j)_{p_1 z'}(g' z')$ and hence $\exists k. j < k \wedge (\delta_{j,k})_{p_1 z}(g' z) = (\delta_{j,k})_{p_1 z'}(g' z')$. So we can apply Lemma 4.2 again to deduce the existence of $c' : \text{Cov}_Y$, $\langle p'_1, p'_2 \rangle : \text{Dom}_Y c' \rightarrow Y$ and $s' : \text{Dom}_Y c' \rightarrow \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ with $\langle p'_1, p'_2 \rangle$ surjective and satisfying

$$\forall(z' : \text{Dom}_Y c'). (\delta_{j, s' z'})_{p_1(p'_1 z')}(g'(p'_1 z')) = (\delta_{j, s' z'})_{p_1(p'_2 z')}(g'(p'_2 z')) \quad (5.27)$$

Note that from (5.16) we have $\text{Dom}_Y c' = \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X}^2(c, \langle p_1, p_2 \rangle, c')$ and so by construction of $\text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$, the family of sizes $s' : \text{Dom}_Y c' \rightarrow \text{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ has an upper bound, i say; and by (5.3) we can assume $j < i$. Let $g'' : \prod_{z : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c} (D_i)_{p_1 z}$ be $\lambda z. (\delta_{j,i})_{p_1 z}(g' z)$. Thus from (5.26) we have

$$f_{p_1 z}(p_2 z) = ((\nu_D)_i)_{p_1 z}(g'' z) \quad (5.28)$$

To complete the proof of (5.24) it suffices to show that for each $\mathbf{i} : I$ the relation $F'_i : X_i \rightarrow (D_i)_i \rightarrow \text{Prop}$ given by

$$F'_i x d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists(z : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c). p_1 z = \mathbf{i} \wedge p_2 z = x \wedge g'' z = d \quad (5.29)$$

is single-valued and total. For then by unique choice (2.3) the F'_i are the graphs of a family of functions $f' : X \rightarrow D_i$ satisfying $(\nu_D)_i \circ f' = f$, because of (5.28), (5.29) and the fact that $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ is surjective.

Each F'_i is total since $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ is surjective: given $x : X_i$, there is some $z : \text{Dom}_{\Sigma X} c$ with $p_1 z = \mathbf{i}$ and $p_2 z = x$, so that $F'_i x d$ holds for $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g'' z$. Single-valuedness of each F'_i holds because if for some x, z_1, z_2, d_1, d_2 we have

$$p_1 z_1 = \mathbf{i} \wedge p_2 z_1 = x \wedge g'' z_1 = d_1 \wedge p_1 z_2 = \mathbf{i} \wedge p_2 z_2 = x \wedge g'' z_2 = d_2$$

then (z_1, z_2) is in the kernel $\text{Ker}(c, \langle p_1, p_2 \rangle)$, i.e. in Y , and so since $\langle p'_1, p'_2 \rangle$ is surjective there is z' with $(p'_1 z', p'_2 z') = (z_1, z_2)$; hence

$$\begin{aligned} d_1 &= g'' z_1 = g''(p'_1 z') && \text{since } p'_1 z' = z_1 \\ &= (\delta_{j,i})_{\mathbf{i}}(g'(p'_1 z')) && \text{since } g'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda z. (\delta_{j,i})_{p_1 z}(g' z) \text{ and } \mathbf{i} = p_1 z_1 = p_1(p'_1 z') \\ &= (\delta_{j,i})_{\mathbf{i}}(g'(p'_2 z')) && \text{by (5.27) and (5.17), since } s' z' < i \\ &= g''(p'_2 z') && \text{since } g'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda z. (\delta_{j,i})_{p_1 z}(g' z) \text{ and } \mathbf{i} = p_1 z_2 = p_1(p'_2 z') \\ &= g'' z_2 = d_2 && \text{since } p'_2 z' = z_2 \end{aligned}$$

So (5.29) does indeed determine single-valued and total relations and so we have completed the proof of (5.24) and hence of Theorem 5.8. \square

If (D, δ) is a **Size**-indexed diagram in \mathcal{U}^I , then we get another such, $(S_\Sigma \circ D, S_\Sigma \circ \delta)$, by composing with the polynomial endofunctor $S_\Sigma : \mathcal{U}^I \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^I$ associated with the signature Σ as in (3.5):

$$\begin{aligned} (S_\Sigma \circ D)_i &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S_\Sigma(D_i) \quad (i : \text{Size}) \\ (S_\Sigma \circ \delta)_{i,j} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S_\Sigma(\delta_{i,j}) \quad (i, j : \text{Size}) \end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

Applying S_Σ to the I -indexed version of (5.18) gives a cocone under $(S_\Sigma \circ D, S_\Sigma \circ \delta)$ with vertex $S_\Sigma(\text{colim } D)$ and this induces a family of functions in \mathcal{U}^I ,

$$\kappa_{D,\Sigma} : \text{colim}(S_\Sigma \circ D) \rightarrow S_\Sigma(\text{colim } D) \tag{5.31}$$

One says that *the polynomial endofunctor S_Σ preserves **Size**-indexed colimits* if $\kappa_{D,\Sigma}$ is a family of isomorphisms, for all diagrams (D, δ) .

Corollary 5.9 (Cocontinuity of S_Σ). *Given a signature $\Sigma = (I, A, B)$ and system of equations $\varepsilon = (E, V, l, r)$ (Definition 3.1) in a topos with natural number object and universes satisfying WISC, the type of sizes $\text{Size}_{\Sigma,\varepsilon}$ from Definition 5.6 has the property that the polynomial endofunctor $S_\Sigma : \mathcal{U}^I \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^I$ preserves $\text{Size}_{\Sigma,\varepsilon}$ -indexed colimits.*

Proof. Given a diagram (D, δ) in \mathcal{U}^I , the I -indexed family of functions (5.31) satisfies for all $\mathbf{i} : I$, $i : \text{Size}_{\Sigma,\varepsilon}$, $a : A_{\mathbf{i}}$ and $b : B_{\mathbf{i}} a \rightarrow D_i$

$$(\kappa_{D,\Sigma})_{\mathbf{i}} [i, (a, b)]_{\sim} = (a, (\nu_D)_i \circ b)$$

$(\kappa_{D,\Sigma})_{\mathbf{i}}$ is injective, because if $(a, (\nu_D)_i \circ b) = (a', (\nu_D)_j \circ b')$, then $a = a'$ and $(\nu_D)_i \circ b = (\nu_D)_j \circ b'$; but then from (5.23) with $X = B_{\mathbf{i}} a = B_{\mathbf{i}} a'$, there is some k with $i, j < k$ and $\delta_{i,k} \circ b = \delta_{j,k} \circ b'$, so that $[i, (a, b)]_{\sim}$ and $[j, (a', b')]_{\sim}$ are equal elements of $(\text{colim}(S_\Sigma \circ D))_{\mathbf{i}}$.

$(\kappa_{D,\Sigma})_{\mathbf{i}}$ is surjective because given $(a, b) : (S_\Sigma(\text{colim } D))_{\mathbf{i}}$, from (5.24) with $X = B_{\mathbf{i}} a$, there exist $i : \text{Size}_{\Sigma,\varepsilon}$ and $b' : B_{\mathbf{i}} a \rightarrow D_i$ with $(\nu_D)_i \circ b' = b$; so $[i, (a, b')]_{\sim}$ in $(\text{colim}(S_\Sigma \circ D))_{\mathbf{i}}$ is mapped by $(\kappa_{D,\Sigma})_{\mathbf{i}}$ to (a, b) .

Since $(\kappa_{D,\Sigma})_{\mathbf{i}}$ is both injective and surjective, we can apply unique choice (2.3) to conclude that it is an isomorphism. \square

6. CONSTRUCTION OF QWI-TYPES

We aim to prove the following theorem about existence of QWI-types (Definition 3.2):

Theorem 6.1. *QWI-types exist in every topos with natural number object and universes satisfying WISC.*

The proof follows from the cocontinuity results of the previous section (Theorem 5.8 and Corollary 5.9). For simplicity, here we only give the proof for QW-types, that is, for the non-indexed $I = \mathbb{1}$ case of signatures. The general case is similar, but notationally more involved since there are indexes ranging both over an index type and over sizes (as in the previous section).

So in this section we fix a signature $\Sigma = (A : \mathcal{U}, B : A \rightarrow \mathcal{U})$ and system of equations $\varepsilon = (E : \mathcal{U}, V : E \rightarrow \mathcal{U}, l, r : \prod_{e:E} T_\Sigma(V e))$ over it, in some universe \mathcal{U} of a topos with natural numbers object and universes satisfying WISC.

```

mutual
  data W :  $\mathcal{U}$  where
     $q\tau : T_\Sigma(W/\sim) \rightarrow W$ 
  data  $\_ \sim \_ : W \rightarrow W \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$  where
     $q\varepsilon : \forall (e : E). \forall (\rho : V e \rightarrow W/\sim). q\tau(T_\Sigma \rho (l e)) \sim q\tau(T_\Sigma \rho (r e))$ 
     $q\eta : \forall (t : T_\Sigma(W/\sim)). q\tau(\eta(q\tau t)) \sim q\tau t$ 
     $q\sigma : \forall (a : A). \forall (b : B a \rightarrow T_\Sigma(W/\sim)). q\tau(\sigma(a, b)) \sim q\tau(\sigma(a, \eta \circ q\tau \circ b))$ 
QW = W/\sim
    
```

Figure 2: First attempt at constructing QW-types

6.1. Motivating the construction. We noted at the start of Section 4 that QW-types can be constructed in the category of ZFC sets as initial algebras for possibly infinitary equational theories by first forming the W-type of terms of the theory and then quotienting that by the congruence relation generated by the equations of the theory. AC is used when constructing the algebra structure of the quotient, because the signature’s arities may be infinite. To avoid this use of AC, instead of forming all terms in one go and then quotienting, we consider interleaving quotient formation with the construction of terms of free algebras for equational systems (cf. the categorical construction by Fiore and Hur [FH09]).

Figure 2 gives the idea, using the constructors η and σ from (3.8) and Agda-like notation for inductive definitions. We would like to construct the QW-type for (Σ, ε) as a quotient $\mathbf{QW} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} W/\sim$, but now the type $W : \mathcal{U}$ and the relation $_ \sim _ : W \rightarrow W \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$ are mutually inductively defined, with constructors as indicated in the figure. Note that whereas the construction in ZFC uses AC to get an S_Σ -algebra structure for QW, here we get one trivially from the constructor $q\tau : T_\Sigma(W/\sim) \rightarrow W$:

$$S_\Sigma(\mathbf{QW}) \equiv S_\Sigma(W/\sim) \xrightarrow{S_\Sigma \eta} S_\Sigma(T_\Sigma(W/\sim)) \xrightarrow{\sigma} T_\Sigma(W/\sim) \xrightarrow{q\tau} W \xrightarrow{[_]\sim} W/\sim \equiv \mathbf{QW}$$

Furthermore the property $q\varepsilon$ of \sim in Figure 2 ensures that the S_Σ -algebra W/\sim satisfies the equational system ε . The use of T_Σ rather than S_Σ in the domain of $q\tau$ seems necessary for this method of construction to go through (once we have fixed up the problems mentioned in the next paragraph); but it does mean that as well as $q\varepsilon$, we have to impose the conditions $q\eta$ and $q\sigma$ to ensure that W/\sim has a T_Σ -algebra structure.

Note that the domain of the constructor $q\tau$ combines $T_\Sigma(_)$ with $_/_$. While the first is unproblematic for inductive definitions, the second is not: if one thinks of the semantics of inductively defined types in terms of initial algebras for endofunctors, it is not clear what endofunctor (in some class known to have initial algebras) is involved here, given that both arguments to $_/_$ are being defined simultaneously. Agda uses a notion of “strict positivity” as a conservative approximation for such a class of functors; and one can instruct Agda to regard quotienting as a strictly positive operation through the use of its **POLARITY** declarations. If one does so, then a definition like the one in Figure 2 is accepted by Agda. The semantic justification for regarding quotients as strictly positive needs further work. We avoid the need for that here and replace the attempt to define W and \sim inductively by a size-indexed version that uses definition by well-founded recursion over the type of sizes developed in the previous section. This also avoids another difficulty with Figure 2: even if one can define W and \sim inductively, one still has to verify that W/\sim has the universal property (3.14)–(3.16) required of a QW-type. In particular, there is an obvious recursive

definition of \mathbf{qwrec} following the shape of the inductive definition in Figure 2, but it is not at all clear why this recursive definition is terminating (i.e. gives a well-defined, total function). Well-founded recursion over sizes will solve this problem as well.

6.2. QW-type via sizes. Let $\mathbf{Size} : \mathcal{U}$ denote the type of sizes $\mathbf{Size}_{\Sigma, \varepsilon}$ associated with the signature (Σ, ε) as in Definition 5.6.

Definition 6.2. A *Size-indexed Σ -algebra* in \mathcal{U} is specified by a family of types $D : \mathbf{Size} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ equipped with functions

$$\tau_{j,i} : T_{\Sigma}(D_j) \rightarrow D_i \quad \text{for all } i, j : \mathbf{Size} \text{ with } j < i$$

Similarly, for each $i : \mathbf{Size}$, a $(\downarrow i)$ -indexed Σ -algebra is the same thing, except with D only defined on $\downarrow i$ (5.6). Clearly, given a \mathbf{Size} -indexed Σ -algebra (D, τ) , for each $i : \mathbf{Size}$ we get a $(\downarrow i)$ -indexed one $(D(\downarrow i), \tau(\downarrow i))$ by restriction.

If $i : \mathbf{Size}$ and (D, τ) is a $(\downarrow i)$ -indexed Σ -algebra, let $\diamond_i D : \mathcal{U}$ be the quotient type

$$\diamond_i D \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\sum_{j < i} T_{\Sigma} D_j \right) / R_i \tag{6.1}$$

with the relation $R_i : (\sum_{j < i} T_{\Sigma} D_j) \rightarrow (\sum_{j < i} T_{\Sigma} D_j) \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$ defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} R_i(j, t)(k, t') &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \\ &(k = j \wedge \exists(e : E). \exists(\rho : V e \rightarrow D_j). t = T_{\Sigma} \rho(l e) \wedge t' = T_{\Sigma} \rho(r e)) \\ &\vee (k < j \wedge t = \eta(\tau_{k,j} t')) \\ &\vee (k < j \wedge \exists(a : A). \exists(b : B a \rightarrow T_{\Sigma} D_k). t = \sigma(a, b) \wedge t' = \sigma(a, \eta \circ \tau_{k,j} \circ b)) \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

(The three clauses in the above definition correspond to the three constructors $q\varepsilon$, $q\eta$ and $q\sigma$ in Figure 2.) We will see that QW-types can be constructed from \mathbf{Size} -indexed Σ -algebras (D, τ) satisfying the following fixed-point property.

Definition 6.3. A \mathbf{Size} -indexed Σ -algebra (D, τ) is a \diamond -fixed point if for all $i : \mathbf{Size}$

$$D_i = \diamond_i(D(\downarrow i)) \tag{6.3}$$

and for all $j < i$ and $t : T_{\Sigma} D_j$

$$\tau_{j,i} t == [j, t]_{R_i} \tag{6.4}$$

Suppose that (D, τ) is a \diamond -fixed point. Because of (6.3) and (6.4), for $i, j : \mathbf{Size}$ with $i < j$ the functions

$$\delta_{i,j} : D_i \rightarrow D_j \quad \delta_{i,j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_{i,j} \circ \eta \tag{6.5}$$

satisfy

$$\delta_{i,j}([k, t]_{R_i}) == [k, t]_{R_j} \quad (\text{for all } k < i \text{ and } t : T_{\Sigma} D_k) \tag{6.6}$$

In particular they satisfy (5.17) and so (D, δ) is a \mathbf{Size} -indexed diagram in \mathcal{U} whose colimit we can form as in Section 5.1. We prove that this colimit

$$\mathbf{QW} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{colim } D \tag{6.7}$$

has the structure (3.12)–(3.16) of a QW-type for the signature (Σ, ε) .

qwintro: We claim that the functions

$$S_\Sigma(D_i) \xrightarrow{S_\Sigma \eta} S_\Sigma(T_\Sigma D_i) \xrightarrow{\sigma} T_\Sigma D_i \xrightarrow{\tau_{i,\uparrow i}} D_{\uparrow i} \xrightarrow{(\nu_D)_{\uparrow i}} \text{colim } D \quad (6.8)$$

form a cocone under the diagram $S_\Sigma \circ D$ and hence induce a function $\text{colim}(S_\Sigma \circ D) \rightarrow \text{colim } D$; then we obtain $\text{qwintro} : S_\Sigma(\text{colim } D) \rightarrow \text{colim } D$ by composing this with the isomorphism $S_\Sigma(\text{colim } D) \cong \text{colim}(S_\Sigma \circ D)$ from Corollary 5.9. That the functions in (6.8) form a cocone for $S_\Sigma \circ D$ follows from the fact that the functions in (6.5) satisfy for all sizes $i < j$

$$\forall (t : T_\Sigma(D_i)). \exists (k : \text{Size}). j < k \wedge \tau_{j,k}(T_\Sigma \delta_{i,j}(t)) = \tau_{i,k}(t) \quad (6.9)$$

from which it follows that $(\nu_D)_{\uparrow j} \circ \tau_{j,\uparrow j} \circ T_\Sigma \delta_{i,j} = (\nu_D)_{\uparrow i} \circ \tau_{i,\uparrow i}$ and hence also the cocone property. (6.9) can be proved by induction on the structure of $t : T_\Sigma(D_i)$, with the $t = \sigma(a, b)$ case of (3.8) proved using the fact that **Size** has $<$ -upper bounds for families of sizes indexed by $\Sigma(B_i a)$.

qwequate: Given $e : E$ and $\rho : V e \rightarrow \text{colim } D$, by Theorem 5.8 there exist $i : \text{Size}$ and $\rho' : V e \rightarrow D_i$ with $\rho = (\nu_D)_i \circ \rho'$. Hence by definition of $\gg=$ (3.9) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (l e \gg= \rho) &= (l e \gg= (\nu_D)_i \circ \rho') = (T_\Sigma \rho'(l e) \gg= (\nu_D)_i) \\ (r e \gg= \rho) &= (r e \gg= (\nu_D)_i \circ \rho') = (T_\Sigma \rho'(r e) \gg= (\nu_D)_i) \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of **qwintro** it follows that for any $t : T_\Sigma D_i$, there is a proof of

$$(t \gg= (\nu_D)_i) = (\nu_D)_{\uparrow i}(\tau_{i,\uparrow i} t) \quad (6.10)$$

So from above we have that $(l e \gg= \rho) = (\nu_D)_{\uparrow i}(\tau_{i,\uparrow i}(T_\Sigma \rho'(l e)))$ and $(r e \gg= \rho) = (\nu_D)_{\uparrow i}(\tau_{i,\uparrow i}(T_\Sigma \rho'(r e)))$. Since from (6.4) and the first clause in the definition of R_i (6.2) we also have $\tau_{i,\uparrow i}(T_\Sigma \rho'(l e)) = \tau_{i,\uparrow i}(T_\Sigma \rho'(r e))$, it follows that there is a proof of $(l e \gg= \rho) = (r e \gg= \rho)$.

qwrec: Given an S_Σ -algebra $(X, \alpha) : \Sigma_{X:\mathcal{U}}(S_\Sigma X \rightarrow X)$ satisfying the system of equations ε , the function $\text{qwrec} : \text{QW} = \text{colim } D \rightarrow X$ is induced by a cocone of functions $r : \prod_i (D_i \rightarrow X)$ under the diagram D , defined by well-founded recursion (Proposition 5.3). More precisely, a strengthened ‘‘recursion hypothesis’’ is needed: instead of $\prod_i (D_i \rightarrow X)$ we use $\prod_i F_i$ where

$$F_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f : D_i \rightarrow X \mid \forall j < i. \forall (t : T_\Sigma D_j). (t \gg= (f \circ \delta_{j,i})) == f([j, t]_{R_i})\}$$

(The definition relies on the fact (6.3) that $D_i = \diamond_i(D \downarrow i)$.) For each $i : \text{Size}$, if we have $r_j : F_j$ for all $j < i$, then we get a function $r_i : F_i$ well-defined by

$$r_i([j, t]_{R_i}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} t \gg= r_j \quad \text{for all } j < i \text{ and } t : T_\Sigma D_j \quad (6.11)$$

(The defining property of F_i is needed to see that the right-hand side of this definition respects the relation R_i .) Hence by well-founded recursion (Proposition 5.3) we get an element $r : \prod_i F_i$. One can prove $\forall i. \forall j < i. r_j = r_i \circ \delta_{j,i}$ by well-founded induction (5.2); so r is a cocone and induces a function $\text{qwrec} : \text{colim } D \rightarrow X$.

qwrechom: To prove that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_\Sigma(\text{colim } D) & \xrightarrow{\text{qwintro}} & \text{colim } D \\ S_\Sigma \text{qwrec} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{qwrec} \\ S_\Sigma X & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & X \end{array}$$

commutes, by Corollary 5.9 and the definitions of **qwintro** and **qwrec**, it suffices to prove that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_\Sigma D_i & \xrightarrow{\tau_{i,\uparrow i} \circ \sigma \circ S_\Sigma \eta} & D_{\uparrow i} \\ S_\Sigma r_i \downarrow & & \downarrow r_{\uparrow i} \\ S_\Sigma X & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & X \end{array}$$

does for each $i : \mathbf{Size}$. But each $(a, b) : S_\Sigma D_i$ is mapped by $\tau_{i,\uparrow i} \circ \sigma \circ S_\Sigma \eta$ to $[i, \sigma(a, \eta \circ b)]_{R_{\uparrow i}}$ (using the fact that $D_{\uparrow i} = \diamond_{\uparrow i}(D(\downarrow(\uparrow i)))$); and by (6.11), that is mapped by $r_{\uparrow i}$ to $\sigma(a, \eta \circ b) \gg r_i$, which is indeed equal to $\alpha(S_\Sigma r_i(a, b))$ by definition of \gg (3.18).

qwuniq: If $h : \text{colim } D \rightarrow X$ is a morphism of S_Σ -algebras, then one can prove by well-founded induction for $<$ that $\forall i. h \circ (\nu_D)_i = r_i$ holds: for if we have $h \circ (\nu_D)_j = r_j$ for all $j < i$, then for any $[j, t]_{R_i}$ in $D_i = \diamond_i(D(\downarrow i))$

$$r_i([j, t]_{R_i}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} t \gg r_j \quad (6.11)$$

$$= t \gg (h \circ (\nu_D)_j) \quad \text{by induction hypothesis}$$

$$= h(t \gg (\nu_D)_j) \quad \text{since } h \text{ is a morphism of } S_\Sigma\text{-algebras}$$

$$= h((\nu_D)_{\uparrow j}[j, t]_{R_{\uparrow j}}) \quad \text{by (6.10) and (6.4)}$$

$$= h((\nu_D)_i[j, t]_{R_i}) \quad \text{since by (6.6),}$$

$$\delta_{\uparrow j, \uparrow i}([j, t]_{R_{\uparrow j}}) = [j, t]_{R_{\uparrow i}} = \delta_{i, \uparrow i}([j, t]_{R_i}).$$

So by well-founded induction, $h \circ (\nu_D)_i = r_i$ holds for all $i : \mathbf{Size}$, and hence by definition of **qwrec** and the uniqueness part of the universal property of colimits we have $h = \text{qwrec}$.

Thus we have proved:

Proposition 6.4. *If the \mathbf{Size} -indexed Σ -algebra (D, τ) is a \diamond -fixed point, then $\text{colim } D$ has the structure of a QW -type for the signature (Σ, ε) . \square*

Now we can complete the proof of the main theorem:

Proof of Theorem 6.1. In view of Proposition 6.4, it suffices to construct a \mathbf{Size} -indexed Σ -algebra which is a \diamond -fixed point in the sense of Definition 6.3.

For each $i : \mathbf{Size}$, say that a $(\downarrow i)$ -indexed Σ -algebra (Definition 6.2) is an *upto- i* \diamond -fixed point if

$$\forall j < i. D_j = \diamond_j(D(\downarrow j)) \wedge \forall k < j. \forall t. \tau_{k,j} t == [k, t]_{R_j} \quad (6.12)$$

(cf. (6.3) and (6.4)). Note that:

(A) *Given $j < i$, any upto- i \diamond -fixed point restricts to an upto- j \diamond -fixed point.*

(B) *For all i , any two upto- i \diamond -fixed points are equal* (proof by well-founded induction (5.2)).

Using these two facts, it follows by well-founded recursion (Proposition 5.3) that there is an upto- i \diamond -fixed point for all $i : \mathbf{Size}$. For if $(D^{(j)}, \tau^{(j)})$ is an upto- j \diamond -fixed point for all $j < i$, then we get $D^{(i)} : \downarrow i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ by defining for each $j < i$

$$(D^{(i)})_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \diamond_j(D^{(j)})$$

If $k < j < i$, then by (A) we have that $D^{(j)} \downarrow k$ is an upto- k \diamond -fixed point and hence by (B) that $D^{(j)} \downarrow k = D^{(k)}$. So together with (6.12) this gives:

$$(D^{(i)})_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \diamond_k(D^{(k)}) = \diamond_k(D^{(j)} \downarrow k) = (D^{(j)})_k$$

Hence we can define $(\tau^{(i)})_{k,j} : T_\Sigma((D^{(i)})_k) \rightarrow (D^{(i)})_j$ by $(\tau^{(i)})_{k,j} t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [k, t]_{R_j}$ and this makes $(D^{(i)}, \tau^{(i)})$ into a $(\downarrow i)$ -indexed Σ -algebra which by construction is an upto- i \diamond -fixed point. Thus by well-founded recursion (Proposition 5.3) we have an upto- i \diamond -fixed point $D^{(i)}$ for all $i : \text{Size}$.

Let $D : \text{Size} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ be given by $D_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \diamond_i(D^{(i)})$. If $j < i$, then by (A) and (B) we have $D^{(i)} \downarrow j = D^{(j)}$ and together with (6.12) this gives:

$$D_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \diamond_j(D^{(j)}) = \diamond_i(D^{(i)} \downarrow j) = (D^{(i)})_j$$

So we can define $\tau_{j,i} : T_\Sigma D_j \rightarrow D_i$ by $\tau_{j,i} t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [j, t]_{R_i}$. This makes (D, τ) into a Σ -algebra which by construction is a \diamond -fixed point. \square

7. ENCODING QITs AS QWI-TYPES

The general notion of indexed quotient inductive type (QIT) was discussed by example in the Introduction. We wish to show that a wide variety of QITs can be expressed as QWI-types, namely those which do not use conditional equality constructors (as in the example in (1.2)). We first introduce a schema for such QITs that combines desirable features of ones that occur in the literature.

7.1. General QIT schemas. Basold, Geuvers, and van der Weide [BGvdW17] present a schema for infinitary QITs that do not support conditional path equations. Constructors are defined by arbitrary polynomial endofunctors built up using (non-dependent) products and sums, which means in particular that parameters and arguments can occur in any order; however, they require constructors to be in uncurried form. Dybjer and Moeneclaey [DM18, Sections 3.1 and 3.2] present a schema for finitary QITs that does allow curried constructors (and also supports *conditional* path equations), but requires all parameters to appear before all arguments. This contrasts with the more convenient schema for regular inductive types in Agda, which allows parameters and arguments in any order. Building on these two works, we provide a schema for infinitary, non-conditional QITs combining the arbitrarily ordered parameters and arguments of the former [BGvdW17] with the curried constructors of the latter [DM18].

The following definition should read as an extension of a formalisation of the type theory described in Section 2 in terms of typing contexts (Γ, Δ, \dots) and various judgements-in-context (such as $\Gamma \vdash a : A$, $\Gamma \vdash a \equiv a' : A$, etc.); cf. the HoTT Book [Uni13, Appendix].

Definition 7.1. A (*non-conditional*) *indexed QIT*, X , indexed by I in a context Γ is specified by a list of element constructors $c_1 : C_1, \dots, c_m : C_m$, followed by a list of equality constructors $d_1 : D_1, \dots, d_n : D_n$, with each type C_i derived as $\Gamma \vdash C_i \text{ ElCnstr}$ and each type D_j derived as $\Gamma \vdash D_j \text{ EqCnstr}$ according to the rules in Figure 3.

Given a list of element and equality constructors built up according to these rules, the newly-defined QIT, X , has formation rule

$$\overline{\Gamma \vdash X : I \rightarrow \mathcal{U}}$$

$$\boxed{\Delta \vdash H \text{ ElCnstr}}$$

In the following X and I are fixed, whereas A, K, Δ , etc. are metavariables.

$$\frac{\Delta \vdash i : I}{\Delta \vdash X i \text{ ElCnstr}} \text{ RES} \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash K \text{ StrPos} \quad \Delta, a : K \vdash H \text{ ElCnstr}}{\Delta \vdash \prod_{a:K} H \text{ ElCnstr}} \text{ ARG}$$

$$\boxed{\Delta \vdash K \text{ StrPos}}$$

$$\frac{\Delta \vdash i : I}{\Delta \vdash X i \text{ StrPos}} \text{ INDARG} \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash A : \mathcal{U}}{\Delta \vdash A \text{ StrPos}} \text{ PARAM}$$

$$\frac{\Delta \vdash A \text{ StrPos} \quad \Delta, a : A \vdash K \text{ StrPos}}{\Delta \vdash \sum_{a:A} K \text{ StrPos}} \text{ PROD} \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash A : \mathcal{U} \quad \Delta, a : A \vdash K \text{ StrPos}}{\Delta \vdash \prod_{a:A} K \text{ StrPos}} \text{ STRPOSFUN}$$

Note: At this point $\Delta \vdash X : \mathcal{U}$ is not derivable, so firstly X can never appear in the LHS of a \prod -type (strictly positive), and secondly abstracting with \sum or \prod cannot result in dependencies of X in the codomain. In particular, if X appears in the LHS of a \sum -type, the RHS will not depend on it.

For example, if $I = \mathbb{N}$, then $\prod_{a:(X 0) \times \mathbb{N}} X(\pi_2 a)$ is the type of a constructor containing such a non-dependent Σ -type, and contains only strictly positive occurrences of X in the arguments of the constructor. Whereas $\prod_{x:X 0} X((\lambda y : X 0. 1) x)$ is not a valid type for a constructor since the term $\lambda y : X 0. 1$ cannot be typed as $\Delta \vdash X : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ cannot be derived.

$$\boxed{\Delta \vdash K \text{ EqCnstr}}$$

$$\frac{\Delta \vdash i : I \quad \Delta \vdash x \text{ EqTerm } i \quad \Delta \vdash y \text{ EqTerm } i}{\Delta \vdash x = y \text{ EqCnstr}} \qquad \frac{\Delta, a : A \vdash K \text{ EqCnstr} \quad \Delta \vdash A \text{ StrPos}}{\Delta \vdash \prod_{a:A} K \text{ EqCnstr}}$$

$$\boxed{\Delta \vdash x \text{ EqTerm } i}$$

The introduction rules for the element constructors c_1, \dots, c_m can be used when deriving **EqTerms**. (Compare with the schema by Basold et al. [BGvdW17, Definition 6].)

$$\frac{\Delta \vdash x : X i}{\Delta \vdash x \text{ EqTerm } i} \text{ VAR} \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash c_p : C_p \quad C_p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{a_1:A_1} \prod_{a_2:A_2} \cdots \prod_{a_k:A_k} X f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)}{\Delta \vdash c_p z_1 z_2 \dots z_k \text{ EqTerm } f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k)} \text{ CON}$$

Figure 3: Rules for QIT element and equality constructors.

for the specific context Γ in which it was defined. And it has an introduction rule for each element constructor and each equality constructor:

$$\overline{\Gamma \vdash c_1 : C_1} \quad \cdots \quad \overline{\Gamma \vdash c_m : C_m} \quad \overline{\Gamma \vdash d_1 : D_1} \quad \cdots \quad \overline{\Gamma \vdash d_n : D_n}$$

We show how to derive elimination and computation rules for X from these formation and introduction rules (compare with Basold, Geuvers, and van der Weide [BGvdW17, Definition 10]).

The arguments of a constructor, written $\text{Arg}(C_j)$, is the list of all strictly positive types introduced with the rule ARG. For the constructor $c_j : C_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Arg}(C_j) \rightarrow X i$, the index is a term $\Gamma, \text{Arg}(C_j) \dots \vdash i : I$, and can also be seen as a function from the constructor arguments $\Gamma \vdash \text{Ind}_{C_j} : \text{Arg}(C_j) \rightarrow I$.

Given a QIT defined by constructors $c_1, \dots, c_m, d_1, \dots, d_n$ as above, the *underlying inductive type* $[X]$ is the indexed inductive type defined by only the element constructors c_1, \dots, c_m , ignoring the equalities; and then the *underlying WI-type* is the indexed W-type that encodes this indexed inductive type. (Recall that every strictly positive description of an endofunctor gives rise to a W-type with the same initial algebra; see Dybjer [Dyb97] and Altenkirch et al. [AGHMM15] for the more general indexed and nested case.)

In order to define the elimination and computation rules we must first define the induction hypothesis. First, given a motive $\Gamma \vdash P : \prod_{i:I} X i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$, define the type $P' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i:I} \sum_{x:X i} P_i x$.

Now given a strictly positive argument A , define the type A' by induction on the structure of A , replacing each occurrence of $X i$ (INDARG) with P'_i .

Define *leaf application* on a strictly positive term $a : A$ for a function $f : \prod_{i:I} \prod_{p:P'_i} Q p$ into some type Q , written $f \$ a$ by induction on the StrPos structure:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{INDARG} & f \$ x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f x \\ \text{PARAM} & f \$ b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b \\ \text{PROD} & f \$ (a, b) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (f \$ a, f \$ b) \\ \text{STRPOSFUN} & f \$ g \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (f \$ _) \circ g \end{array} \tag{7.1}$$

To find the induction hypothesis \widehat{C}_j for each element constructor $c_j : C_j$, replace each of the strictly positive arguments $\prod_{a_1:A_1} \cdots \prod_{a_p:A_p}$ with $\prod_{a_1:A'_1} \cdots \prod_{a_p:A'_p}$, as defined above, and replace the target $X i$, for some i , of the constructor with $P_i (c_j (\pi_1 \$ a_1) \cdots (\pi_p \$ a_p))$.

The induction hypotheses for the element constructors are then $h_1 : \widehat{C}_1, \dots, h_m : \widehat{C}_m$, and these provide an eliminator $\text{elim } h_1 \cdots h_m$ for the underlying inductive type $[X]$.

Given h_1, \dots, h_m , define \widehat{D}'_k , for each equality constructor $d_k : D_k$, in the same way. Replace the endpoints l, r of the equality inductively with \widehat{l}, \widehat{r} :

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{VAR} & \widehat{x} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x : P'_i \\ \text{CON} & \widehat{c_j a_1 \cdots a_p} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h_j \widehat{a_1} \cdots \widehat{a_p} \end{array} \tag{7.2}$$

The elimination rule is then:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \vdash P : \prod_{i:I} X i \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \\ \Gamma \vdash h_1 : \widehat{C}_1 \quad \dots \quad \Gamma \vdash h_m : \widehat{C}_m \\ \Gamma \vdash p_1 : \widehat{D}_1 \quad \dots \quad \Gamma \vdash p_n : \widehat{D}_n \end{array}}{\text{qitelim } h_1 \cdots h_m p_1 \cdots p_n : \prod_{i:I} \prod_{x:X i} P_i x}$$

Finally the computation rules are, for each element constructor $c_i : C_i$,

$$\frac{\text{same hypotheses as qitelim} \quad \Gamma \vdash a_1, \dots, a_p : \mathbf{Arg}(C_i)}{\text{qitelim } h_1 \cdots h_m p_1 \cdots p_n (\mathbf{Ind}x_i (a_1, \dots, a_p)) (c_i a_1 \cdots a_p)} \\ =_{P_i (c_i a_1 \cdots a_p)} h_i ((\mathbf{id} \times (\text{qitelim } \cdots)) \$ a_1) \cdots ((\mathbf{id} \times (\text{qitelim } \cdots)) \$ a_p)$$

7.2. From QIT to QWI-type. We claim that any indexed QIT X in the sense of Definition 7.1 can be constructed as the QWI-type for a signature Σ and equational system ε derived from the declaration of the QIT. That is, QWI-types are universal for non-conditional QITs in the same sense that W-types are for inductive types in a sufficiently extensional type theory.

We saw above that the data $c_1 : C_1, \dots, c_m : C_m$ in Definition 7.1 gives rise to an underlying indexed inductive type $[X]$ and hence to a WI-type [AGHMM15], with signature $\Sigma = (I, A, B)$. The parameters and arguments of the equality constructors $d_1 : D_1, \dots, d_n : D_n$ are also encoded in the same way by a signature (I, E, V) . Then the endpoints of the equality constructors can be encoded by the l and r arguments of an equational system $\varepsilon = (I, E, V, l, r)$ in the sense of Definition 3.1; the encoding follows the structure of \mathbf{EqTerm} judgements in Figure 3, using the η constructor of T_Σ (3.8) for VAR and the σ constructor CON. We illustrate the encoding by example, beginning with the three examples from the Introduction.

Example 7.2 (Finite multisets). The element constructors of the QIT, $\mathbf{Bag} X$, of finite multisets over $X : \mathcal{U}$ in (1.1) are encoded exactly as the W-type for List over X : we take $A : \mathcal{U}$ to be $\mathbb{1} + X$, where $\iota_1 0$ corresponds to $[\]$ and $\iota_2 x$ corresponds to $x :: _$ for each $x : X$. The arity of $[\]$ is zero, and the arity of each $x :: _$ is one; so we take $B : A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ to be the function mapping $\iota_1 0$ to $\mathbb{0}$ and each $\iota_2 x$ to $\mathbb{1}$. The \mathbf{swap} equality constructor is parametrised by elements of $E \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \times X$ and for each $(x, y) : E$, $\mathbf{swap}(x, y)$ yields an equation involving a single free variable (called $zs : \mathbf{Bag} X$ in (1.1)); so we define $V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda _ . \mathbb{1} : E \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. Each side of the equation named by $\mathbf{swap}(x, y)$ is coded by an element of $T_\Sigma(V(x, y)) = T_\Sigma \mathbb{1}$. Recalling the definition of T_Σ from (3.9), the single free variable, zs , corresponds to $\eta 0 : T_\Sigma \mathbb{1}$. Then the left-hand side of the equation, $x :: y :: zs$, is encoded as $\sigma(\iota_2 x, (\lambda _ . \sigma(\iota_2 y, (\lambda _ . \eta 0))))$, and similarly the right-hand side, $y :: x :: zs$, is encoded as $\sigma(\iota_2 y, (\lambda _ . \sigma(\iota_2 x, (\lambda _ . \eta 0))))$.

So altogether, the encoding of $\mathbf{Bag} X$ as a QW-type uses the non-indexed signature $\Sigma = (A, B)$ and equational system $\varepsilon = (E, V, l, r)$, where:

$$\begin{aligned} A &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{1} + X & E &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \times X \\ B(\iota_1 0) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{0} & V(x, y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{1} \\ B(\iota_2 x) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{1} & l(x, y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(\iota_2 x, (\lambda _ . \sigma(\iota_2 y, (\lambda _ . \eta 0)))) \\ & & r(x, y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(\iota_2 y, (\lambda _ . \sigma(\iota_2 x, (\lambda _ . \eta 0)))) \end{aligned}$$

Example 7.3 (Length-indexed multisets). The QWI-type encoding the QIT $\mathbf{AbVec} X$ of length-indexed multisets in (1.3) is an indexed version of the previous example, using the index type $I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{N}$. The indexed signature $\Sigma = (\mathbb{N}, A, B)$ has $A : \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $B : \prod_{i:\mathbb{N}} (A_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{N}})$ given by:

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{1} \\ A_{i+1} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \\ B_0 0 j &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{0} \\ B_{i+1} x j &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (i = j) \end{aligned}$$

The system of equations $\varepsilon = (E, V, l, r)$ over Σ has $E : \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $V : \prod_{i:\mathbb{N}}(E_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{N}})$ and $l, r : \prod_{i:\mathbb{N}} \prod_{e:E_i}(T_{\Sigma}(V_i e))_i$ given by:

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0 \\ E_1 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0 \\ E_{i+2} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \times X \\ V_{i+2}(x, y) j &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (i = j) \\ l_{i+2}(x, y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma_{i+2}(x, \lambda _ . \lambda \text{ refl} . \sigma_{i+1}(y, \lambda _ . \lambda \text{ refl} . \eta_i \text{ refl})) \\ r_{i+2}(x, y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma_{i+2}(y, \lambda _ . \lambda \text{ refl} . \sigma_{i+1}(x, \lambda _ . \lambda \text{ refl} . \eta_i \text{ refl})) \end{aligned}$$

(We have used dependent pattern matching [Coq92] to simplify the formulation of the above definitions; $\text{refl} : x = x$ denotes the proof of reflexivity.)

Example 7.4 (Unordered countably-branching trees). The parameters of the leaf and node constructors for the QIT in (1.4) look like those for **Bag**, except that the arity of **node** is \mathbb{N} rather than $\mathbb{1}$. So we use the non-indexed signature $\Sigma = (A, B)$ with $A : \mathcal{U}$ and $B : A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ given by:

$$\begin{aligned} A &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{1} + X \\ B(\iota_1 0) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0 \\ B(\iota_2 x) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{N} \end{aligned}$$

The **perm** equality constructor is parameterised by elements of $X \times \sum_{b:\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}} \text{isIso } b$. For each element (x, b, b') of that type, **perm** (x, b, b') yields an equation involving an \mathbb{N} -indexed family of variables (called $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \omega \text{Tree } X$ in (1.4)); so we take $V : E \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ to be $\lambda _ . \mathbb{N}$. Each side of the equation named by **perm** (x, b, b') is coded by an element of $T_{\Sigma}(V(x, b, b')) = T_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{N})$. The \mathbb{N} -indexed family of variables is represented by the function $\eta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow T_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{N})$ and its permuted version by $\eta \circ b$. Thus the left- and right-hand sides of the equation named by **perm** (x, b, b') are coded respectively by the elements $\sigma(\iota_2 x, \eta)$ and $\sigma(\iota_2 x, \eta \circ b)$. Thus the non-indexed system of equations over Σ for the QW-type corresponding to the QIT in (1.4) is $\varepsilon = (E, V, l, r)$ with:

$$\begin{aligned} E &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \times \sum_{b:\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}} \text{isIso } b \\ V(x, b, b') &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{N} \\ l(x, b, b') &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(\iota_2 x, \eta) \\ r(x, b, b') &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(\iota_2 x, \eta \circ b) \end{aligned}$$

This example is significant since, prior to the introduction of QW-types [FPS20], none of the constructions in the existing literature on subclasses of QITs [Soj15; Swa18; DM18] or QIITs [Dij17; KKA19] supported infinitary QITs.

Example 7.5 (W-suspensions [Soj15]). These are also instances of QW-types. The data for a W-suspension is: a type $A' : \mathcal{U}$ and a type family $B' : A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$, (that is, the same data as a W-type), together with a type $C' : \mathcal{U}$ and functions $l', r' : C' \rightarrow A'$ that express a restricted subset of equalities. The equivalent QW-type is:

$$\begin{aligned} A &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A' & E &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C' & l &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda c . \sigma(l' c, \eta) \\ B &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B' & V &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda c . B'(l' c) \times B'(r' c) & r &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda c . \sigma(r' c, \eta) \end{aligned}$$

Example 7.6 (W-types with reductions [Swa18]). These are further instances of QWI-types. The data of such a type, using our notational conventions, is: $Z : \mathcal{U}, Y : \mathcal{U}^Z, X : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$, together with, for all $z : Z$ a reindexing map $R_z : \prod_{y:Y_z} (X_z y)_z$. The reindexing map identifies a term $\sigma(y, \alpha)$ in index z with one of the arguments that was used to construct that term, namely $\alpha_z(R_z y)$. The equivalent QWI-type is given by:

$$\begin{array}{llll} I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z & A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y & E \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y & l \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda z . \lambda y . \sigma_z(y, \eta) \\ & B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X & V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X & r \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda z . \lambda y . \eta_z(R_z y) \end{array}$$

Example 7.7 (Blass, Lumsdaine and Shulman's HIT [LS19]). As discussed in Section 4, Blass [Bla83, Section 9] shows that, provided a certain large cardinal axiom is consistent with ZFC, then there is an infinitary equational theory with no initial algebra in ZF. Lumsdaine and Shulman [LS19, Section 9] adapt this theory into a higher-inductive type, called F , that that cannot be proved to exist in ZF, and hence cannot be constructed in type theory just using pushouts and natural numbers. Nevertheless it can be constructed in the type theory of Section 2 plus WISC, because of Theorem 6.1 and the fact that F can be expressed as a QWI-type.

The type F can be thought of as a set of notations for countable ordinals. Its definition requires some setup.

Fix the bijection $[\text{even}, \text{odd}] : \mathbb{N} + \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with inverse par . Fix another bijection $\text{pair} : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with inverse $\langle \text{fst}, \text{snd} \rangle$. Given $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$, write $f \cup g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$ for the composite $[f, g] \circ \text{par}$; given $a : A$, write $\{a\} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$ for the constant function at a .

Now F is defined by the three point constructors,

$$0 : F$$

$$S : F \rightarrow F$$

$$\text{sup} : (\mathbb{N} \rightarrow F) \rightarrow F$$

and the five path constructors,

$$\text{sup} \{0\} = 0$$

$$\prod_{f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}} \prod_{h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow F} \left(\prod_{n : \mathbb{N}} \left(\sum_{m : \mathbb{N}} f(m) = n \right) \leftrightarrow \left(\sum_{m : \mathbb{N}} g(m) = n \right) \right) \rightarrow \text{sup}(h \circ f) = \text{sup}(h \circ g)$$

$$\prod_{f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow F} \text{sup}(f \cup \{\text{sup}(f \cup g)\}) = \text{sup}(f \cup g)$$

$$\prod_{f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow F} \text{sup}(f \cup \{S(\text{sup}(f \cup g))\}) = S(\text{sup}(f \cup g))$$

$$\prod_{b, c : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}} \prod_{L : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}} \prod_{h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow F} (\text{JS } b c \rightarrow \text{Lrel } L b c \rightarrow \text{Lrel } L c b \rightarrow \text{sup}(\text{iter } h b) = \text{sup}(\text{iter } h c))$$

where

$\text{JS } b c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{the type of proofs that } b \text{ and } c \text{ are jointly surjective}$

$$\text{Lrel } L x y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{n : \mathbb{N}} \sum_{m, l : \mathbb{N}} (L(x m) l = y n)$$

$$\text{iter } h p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda n . h_{(\text{fst } n)}(p(\text{snd } n))$$

$$h_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h$$

$$h_{(x+1)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda y . \text{sup}(h_x \circ (L y))$$

This can be expressed as a QW-type as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 A &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{3} \\
 B &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [0, \mathbb{1}, \mathbb{N}] \\
 E &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{1} + (\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N})^2 + \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} + \sum_{b,c:\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}} \sum_{L:\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}} (\text{JS } b c \times \text{Lrel } L b c \times \text{Lrel } L c b) \\
 V &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [0, \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N} + \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N} + \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}] \\
 l(\iota_1 _) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(2, \lambda _ . \sigma(0, !)) \\
 r(\iota_1 _) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(0, !) \\
 l(\iota_2 f g) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(2, (\eta \circ f)) \\
 r(\iota_2 f g) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(2, (\eta \circ g)) \\
 l(\iota_3 _) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(2, ((\eta \circ \iota_1) \cup \lambda _ . \sigma(((\eta \circ \iota_1) \cup (\eta \circ \iota_2)))))) \\
 r(\iota_3 _) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(2, ((\eta \circ \iota_1) \cup (\eta \circ \iota_2))) \\
 l(\iota_4 _) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(2, ((\eta \circ \iota_1) \cup \lambda _ . \sigma(1, \lambda _ . \sigma(((\eta \circ \iota_1) \cup (\eta \circ \iota_2)))))) \\
 r(\iota_4 _) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(1, \lambda _ . \sigma(2, ((\eta \circ \iota_1) \cup (\eta \circ \iota_2)))) \\
 l(\iota_5 b c L _ _ _) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(2, \lambda n . k L (\text{fst } n) (b(\text{snd } n))) \\
 r(\iota_5 b c L _ _ _) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(2, \lambda n . k L (\text{fst } n) (c(\text{snd } n)))
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 k L 0 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \eta \\
 k L (x + 1) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda y . \sigma(2, ((k L x) \circ (L y)))
 \end{aligned}$$

8. CONCLUSION

QWI-types are a general form of indexed quotient inductive type that capture many examples, including simple 1-cell complexes and non-recursive QITs [BGvdW17], non-structural QITs [Soj15], W-types with reductions [Swa18] and also infinitary QITs (e.g. unordered infinitely branching trees [AK16] and the F-type of Lumsdaine and Shulman [LS19]). We have shown that it is possible to construct any QWI-type, even infinitary ones, in the extensional type theory of toposes with natural number objects and universes satisfying the WISC Axiom.

We conclude by mentioning related work and some possible directions for future work.

Reduction of QWI to QW. WI-types (indexed W-types) can be constructed from W-types: see [GH04, Theorem 12] and [AGHMM15, Section 7.1]. Our main Theorem 6.1 implies indirectly that in the presence of WISC, QWI-types can be constructed from QW-types (since quotients and W-types are instances of the latter). We do not know whether there is a direct reduction of QWI to QW without any further axioms, extending the reduction of WI to W.

Conditional path equations. In Section 7.1 we mentioned the fact that Dybjer and Moeneclaey [DM18] give a schema for finitary 1-HITs and 2-HITs in which constructors are allowed to take arguments involving the identity type of the datatype being declared. To cover this case, one could consider generalising QWI-types by replacing the role played by infinitary equational theories by theories whose axioms are infinitary Horn clauses, that is, equations conditioned by (possibly infinite) conjunctions of equations. It seems likely that Theorem 6.1 could be extended to cover this case.

Quotients of monads. Theorem 6.1 gives a construction of initial algebras for equational systems on the *free* monad T_Σ generated by a signature Σ . By a suitable change of signature (see Remark 3.4) this extends to a construction of free algebras, rather than just initial ones. One can show that the construction works for an arbitrary strictly positive monad and not just for free ones. Given such a construction one gets a quotient monad morphism from the base monad to the quotient monad. This contravariantly induces a forgetful functor from the algebras of the latter to those of the former. Using the adjoint triangle theorem, one should be able to construct a left adjoint. This would then cover examples such as the free group over a monoid, free ring over a group, etc.

Quotient inductive-inductive types. We do not know whether our analysis of QITs using quotients, inductive types and a well-founded notion of size can be extended to cover the notion of *quotient inductive-inductive* type (QIIT) [ACDKN18; KKA19]. Dijkstra [Dij17] studies such types in depth and in Chapter 6 of his thesis gives a construction for finitary ones in terms of countable colimits, and hence in terms of countable coproducts and quotients. One could hope to pass to the infinitary case by using well-founded sizes as we have done, provided an analogue for QIITs can be found of the construction in Section 6 for our class of QITs, the QWI-types. Kaposi, Kovács, and Altenkirch [KKA19] give a specification of finitary QIITs using a domain-specific type theory called the *theory of signatures* and prove existence of QIITs matching this specification. It might be possible to encode their theory of signatures using QWI-types (it can already be encoded as a QIIT), or to extend QWI-types making this possible. This would allow infinitary QIITs.

Homotopy Type Theory (HoTT). In this paper we have used an extensional type theory. Our Agda development is more intensional, but nevertheless makes use of the Uniqueness of Identity Proofs (UIP) axiom, which is well-known to be incompatible with the Univalence Axiom [Uni13, Example 3.1.9]. Given the interest in HoTT, it is certainly worth investigating whether an analogue of Theorem 6.1 holds in some model of univalent foundations.

Pattern matching for QITs and HITs. Our reduction of QITs to quotients and inductive types in the presence of WISC is of foundational interest. For applications, one could wish for direct support in systems like Agda, Lean and Coq for the very useful notion of quotient inductive type, or more generally, for higher inductive types. Even having better support for the special case of quotient types would be welcome. It is not hard to envisage the addition of a general schema for declaring QITs; but when it comes to defining functions on them, having to do that with eliminator forms rapidly becomes cumbersome (for example, for functions of several QIT arguments). Some extension of dependently-typed pattern matching to cover equality constructors as well as element constructors is needed. In this context it is worth

mentioning that the `cubical` features of recent versions of Agda give access to cubical type theory [VMA19]. This allows for easy declaration of HITs and hence in particular QITs and a certain amount of pattern matching when it comes to defining functions on them: the value of a function on a path constructor can be specified by using generic elements of the interval type in point-level patterns; but currently the user is given little mechanised assistance to solve the definitional equality constraints on end-points of paths that are generated by this method.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to acknowledge the contribution Ian Orton made to the initial development of the work described here; he and the first author supervised the third author’s Master’s thesis in which the notion of a QW-type was first introduced. The second author would also like to thank Andrew Swan for discussions about the role of WISC in constructive proofs of cocontinuity for polynomial endofunctors (Corollary 5.9).

REFERENCES

- [AAG05] M. Abbott, T. Altenkirch, and N. Ghani. “Containers: Constructing Strictly Positive Types”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science vol. 342.1* (2005), pp. 3–27.
- [Abe12] A. Abel. “Type-Based Termination, Inflationary Fixed-Points, and Mixed Inductive-Coinductive Types”. In: *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science vol. 77* (2012), pp. 1–11. DOI: 10.4204/EPTCS.77.1.
- [ACDKN18] Thorsten Altenkirch, Paolo Capriotti, Gabe Dijkstra, Nicolai Kraus, and Fredrik Nordvall Forsberg. “Quotient Inductive-Inductive Types”. In: *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures, FoSSaCS 2018*. Ed. by Christel Baier and Ugo Dal Lago. Vol. 10803. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 293–310.
- [Agd20] Agda v2.6.1. <https://agda.readthedocs.io/en/v2.6.1.1/index.html>. 2020.
- [AGHMM15] Thorsten Altenkirch, Neil Ghani, Peter Hancock, Conor McBride, and Peter Morris. “Indexed Containers”. In: *Journal of Functional Programming vol. 25* (2015), e5. DOI: 10.1017/S095679681500009X.
- [AK16] T. Altenkirch and A. Kaposi. “Type Theory in Type Theory Using Quotient Inductive Types”. In: *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages - POPL 2016*. The 43rd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium. St. Petersburg, FL, USA: ACM Press, 2016, pp. 18–29. DOI: 10.1145/2837614.2837638.
- [BGvdW17] Henning Basold, Herman Geuvers, and Niels van der Weide. “Higher Inductive Types in Programming”. In: *Journal of Universal Computer Science vol. 23.1* (2017), p. 27. DOI: 10.3217/jucs-023-01-0063.
- [Bla83] A. Blass. “Words, Free Algebras, and Coequalizers”. In: *Fundamenta Mathematicae vol. 117.2* (1983), pp. 117–160.
- [Coq92] T. Coquand. “Pattern Matching with Dependent Types”. In: *Proceedings of the 1992 Workshop on Types for Proofs and Programs, Båstad, Sweden*. Ed. by B. Nordström, K. Petersson, and G. D. Plotkin. June 1992, pp. 66–79.

- [Dij17] Gabe Dijkstra. “Quotient Inductive-Inductive Definitions”. PhD thesis. United Kingdom: University of Nottingham, 14th Dec. 2017. URL: <http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/42317/1/thesis.pdf> (visited on 14/10/2019).
- [DM18] Peter Dybjer and Hugo Moeneclaey. “Finitary Higher Inductive Types in the Groupoid Model”. In: *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science vol. 336* (Apr. 2018), pp. 119–134. DOI: 10.1016/j.entcs.2018.03.019.
- [Dyb97] P. Dybjer. “Representing Inductively Defined Sets by Wellorderings in Martin-Löf’s Type Theory”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science vol. 176.1-2* (1997), pp. 329–335. DOI: 10.1016/S0304-3975(96)00145-4.
- [FH09] M. P. Fiore and C.-K. Hur. “On the Construction of Free Algebras for Equational Systems”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science vol. 410.18* (Apr. 2009), pp. 1704–1729.
- [Fio13] M. P. Fiore. “An Equational Metalogic for Monadic Equational Systems”. In: *Theory and Applications of Categories vol. 27.18* (2013), pp. 464–492. URL: <http://emis.ams.org/journals/TAC/volumes/27/18/27-18.pdf> (visited on 10/09/2019).
- [FPS20] M. P. Fiore, A. M. Pitts, and S. C. Steenkamp. “Constructing Infinitary Quotient-Inductive Types”. In: *23rd International Conference on Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures (FoSSaCS 2020)*. Ed. by J. Goubault-Larrecq and B. König. Vol. 12077. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2020, pp. 257–276. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-45231-5_14.
- [FPS21] M. P. Fiore, A. M. Pitts, and S. C. Steenkamp. *Agda Code Accompanying “Quotients, Inductive Types, and Quotient Inductive Types”*. 2021. URL: <https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~scs62/2021/qwi-types-agda.zip>.
- [GH04] N. Gambino and M. Hyland. “Wellfounded Trees and Dependent Polynomial Functors”. In: *Types for Proofs and Programs*. Ed. by S. Berardi, M. Coppo, and F. Damiani. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004, pp. 210–225.
- [Git80] M. Gitik. “All Uncountable Cardinals Can Be Singular”. In: *Israel J. Math. vol. 35.1-2* (1980), pp. 61–88.
- [Hof95] M. Hofmann. “Extensional Concepts in Intensional Type Theory”. PhD thesis. University of Edinburgh, 1995.
- [Joh02] P. T. Johnstone. *Sketches of an Elephant, A Topos Theory Compendium, Volumes 1 and 2*. Oxford Logic Guides 43–44. Oxford University Press, 2002.
- [Kar14] A. Karagila. “Embedding Orders into Cardinals with DC_κ ”. In: *Fundamenta Mathematicae vol. 226* (2014), pp. 143–156.
- [KKA19] Ambrus Kaposi, András Kovács, and Thorsten Altenkirch. “Constructing Quotient Inductive-Inductive Types”. In: *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages vol. 3* (POPL 2nd Jan. 2019), 2:1–2:24. DOI: 10.1145/3290315.
- [LS19] P. L. Lumsdaine and M. Shulman. “Semantics of Higher Inductive Types”. In: *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* (17th June 2019), pp. 1–50. DOI: 10.1017/S030500411900015X.
- [Mar82] P. Martin-Löf. “Constructive Mathematics and Computer Programming”. In: *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. Ed. by Laurence Jonathan Cohen, Jerzy Łoś, Helmut Pfeiffer, and Klaus-Peter Podewski. vol. 104. Elsevier, 1982, pp. 153–175. DOI: 10.1016/S0049-237X(09)70189-2.

- [McB99] C. McBride. “Dependently Typed Functional Programs and Their Proofs”. PhD thesis. Edinburgh , Scotland, United Kingdom: University of Edinburgh, 1999. 263 pp. URL: <https://era.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/374> (visited on 09/07/2020).
- [MM16] Philippe Malbos and Samuel Mimram. “Homological Computations for Term Rewriting Systems”. In: *1st International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction (FSCD 2016)*. Vol. 52. Porto, Portugal, June 2016, 27:1–27:17. URL: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01678175>.
- [MP00] I. Moerdijk and E. Palmgren. “Wellfounded Trees in Categories”. In: *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic vol. 104.1* (2000), pp. 189–218. DOI: 10.1016/S0168-0072(00)00012-9.
- [MP02] I. Moerdijk and E. Palmgren. “Type theories, Toposes and Constructive Set Theory: Predicative Aspects of AST”. In: *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic vol. 114.1* (2002), pp. 155–201.
- [Rob15] D. M. Roberts. “The Weak Choice Principle WISC may Fail in the Category of Sets”. In: *Studia Logica vol. 103* (2015), pp. 1005–1017.
- [Shu18] M. Shulman. “Brouwer’s Fixed-Point Theorem in Real-Cohesive Homotopy Type Theory”. In: *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science vol. 28.6* (June 2018), pp. 856–941. DOI: 10.1017/S0960129517000147.
- [Soj15] Kristina Sojakova. “Higher Inductive Types as Homotopy-Initial Algebras”. In: *Principles of Programming Languages*. Proceedings of the 42nd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium. Mumbai, India: ACM Press, 2015, pp. 31–42. DOI: 10.1145/2676726.2676983.
- [Str05] T. Streicher. “Realizability Models for $CZF + \neg Pow$ ”. <http://www2.mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de/~streicher/CIZF/rmczfnp.pdf>. 2005.
- [Swa18] A. Swan. “W-Types with Reductions and the Small Object Argument”. In: (21st Feb. 2018). arXiv: 1802.07588 [math].
- [Tay96] P. Taylor. “Intuitionistic Sets and Ordinals”. In: *Journal of Symbolic Logic vol. 61* (1996), pp. 705–744.
- [Uni13] The Univalent Foundations Program. *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations for Mathematics*. Institute for Advanced Study: <http://homotopytypetheory.org/book>, 2013.
- [vdBM14] B. van den Berg and I. Moerdijk. “The Axiom of Multiple Choice and Models for Constructive Set Theory”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Logic vol. 14.01* (June 2014), p. 1450005. DOI: 10.1142/S0219061314500056.
- [VMA19] Andrea Vezzosi, Anders Mörtberg, and Andreas Abel. “Cubical Agda: A Dependently Typed Programming Language with Univalence and Higher Inductive Types”. In: *Proc. ACM Program. Lang. vol. 3.ICFP* (July 2019), 87:1–87:29. DOI: 10.1145/3341691.