

ALGEBRAIC QUANTUM FIELD THEORY: A HOMOTOPICAL VIEW

Victor Carmona*

October 11, 2021

Abstract

In this paper we define and compare several new Quillen model structures which present the homotopy theory of algebraic quantum field theories. In this way, we expand foundational work of Benini et al. [7] by providing a richer framework to detect and treat homotopical phenomena in quantum field theory. Our main technical tool is a new *extension model* structure on operadic algebras which is constructed via (right) Bousfield localization. We expect that this tool is useful in other contexts.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Algebraic quantum field theories	4
2.1	Definition and examples	4
2.2	Operadic presentation in a nutshell	6
3	Time-slice localization	9
3.1	Strict time-slice axiom	9
3.2	Weak time-slice axiom	11

*The author was partially supported by the Spanish Ministry of Economy under the grant MTM2016-76453-C2-1-P (AEI/FEDER, UE) and by the Andalusian Ministry of Economy and Knowledge and the Operational Program FEDER 2014-2020 under the grant US-1263032. He was also partly supported by Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities, grant FPU17/01871.

4	Extension model structure	16
5	Local-to-global cellularization	23
5.1	The extension model on AQFTs	23
5.2	Mixing localization and cellularization	24
6	Comparison of homotopy theories	29

1 Introduction

The problem of applying quantum mechanical principles to classical systems of fields was the foundational idea which motivates the emersion of Quantum Field Theories. However, a general formulation of what is precisely a Quantum Field Theory seems to be rather elusive. This fact gave rise to the appearance of a broad variety of competing definitions to deal with Quantum Field Theories formally. A very rough classification of such candidates could be: perturbative models, which use the knowledge about simpler free models ([26]); functorial approaches, which are centered on the study of spaces of fields ([23, 30]); and algebraic formulations, which deal with the possible algebraic structures that the collection of observables may carry ([20]). In this work, we focus on the algebraic picture, i.e. on the formal study of algebras of observables.

A recent development in the field of Algebraic Quantum Field Theories (usually denoted by AQFTs) has been undertaken in the program of Benini and collaborators [4, 5, 8, 9, 10]. Their fundamental contribution was to identify operadic constructions, and their importance, on previous axiomatics and foundations, e.g. interpret Haag-Kastler axioms and recognize generalizations [33] or justify the Fredenhagen’s local-to-global principle [14], as well as detecting its weakness. Reasonably, a good deal of new questions arises by the introduction of operad theory into the branch of AQFTs, as addressed in the survey [7].

Operad theory [24] has been proven to be a fruitful mathematical machinery to deal with algebraic structures. Its importance in mathematics is doubtless due to its multidisciplinary, as it appears in homotopy theory, algebraic topology, geometry, category theory, mathematical physics or mathematical programming. For instance, this theory has also been a valuable tool in Kontsevich’s work on quantisation of Poisson manifolds [22] or Costello-Gwilliam’s factorization algebras in perturbative field theories [17].

One of the main advantages of working with operads is the possibility of manipulate the homotopy theory of AQFTs quite explicitly, as observed in [9]. On the one hand, embracing homotopical mathematics permits a better understanding of non discrete phenomena such as gauge symmetries or the presence of anti-fields

and anti-ghosts in the BV-BRST formalism (e.g. [6, 8]). These facts motivate a deeper immersion into the homotopy theory of AQFTs. On the other hand, the presence of a Quillen model structure brings to our disposal an assorted toolkit to understand a particular homotopy theory.

In [10, 13], the algebraic structure of an AQFT is encoded via a naturally defined operad, and so it is reasonable to define the homotopy theory of AQFTs as a canonical homotopy theory of operadic algebras [32]. However, such approximation is not well suited to introduce further axioms on AQFTs which are not structural. For example, it does not take into account dynamic axioms properly (time-slice axiom, Definitions 3.1 and 3.6), as noted in [7, Open Problem 4.14], or local-to-global principles (Definition 5.1). The present work exploits the operadic description of AQFTs one step further to find more advanced homotopy theories of Algebraic Quantum Field Theories which fix these problems.

Our main results are the construction and comparisons of several model category structures summarized in Section 6. First, we propose two different model structures to deal with AQFTs satisfying a homotopy meaningful time-slice axiom (Definition 3.6) which turn out to be equivalent. This can be summarized in the following theorem (see Subsection 3.2).

Theorem A (Propositions 3.11, 3.14 and Theorem 3.15). *Let C^\perp be an orthogonal category (Definition 2.1) and S a set of maps in C . Then, the homotopy theory of algebraic quantum field theories over C^\perp satisfying the weak S -time-slice axiom is presented by the Quillen equivalent model structures $\mathcal{QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp)$ and $L_S \mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$.*

Both models provide different aspects of the homotopy theory of AQFTs satisfying such dynamical axiom. In fact, below Theorem 3.15 we expand on this to answer [7, Open Problem 4.14].

The local-to-global principle (Definition 5.1) is incorporated in a new model structure that is an instance of a general construction explained in Section 4 which culminates in Theorem 4.9.

Theorem B (Theorem 5.3). *Let $C_\diamond^\perp \hookrightarrow C^\perp$ be an inclusion of a full orthogonal subcategory. Then, the homotopy theory of algebraic quantum field theories over C^\perp which satisfy the C_\diamond -local-to-global principle is modelled by $\mathcal{QFT}^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$.*

Finally, for the combination of both axioms, time-slice plus local-to-global, we find again two model structures presenting the associated homotopy theory which are equivalent as expected.

Theorem C (Theorems 5.9, 5.11, 5.13). *Let $C_\diamond^\perp \hookrightarrow C^\perp$ be an inclusion of a full orthogonal subcategory and S a suitable set of maps in C . Then, the homotopy theory of algebraic quantum field theories over C^\perp satisfying the weak S -time-slice*

axiom and the C_\diamond -local-to-global principle is presented by the Quillen equivalent model structures $QFT_{\mathfrak{wS}}^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ and $L_S QFT^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$.

Coming back to the general construction of Section 4, it is mandatory to comment that it has its own importance in abstract homotopy theory and so several applications are expected. Indeed, in [16], the homotopy theory of factorization algebras is investigated by these means.

It is worth noting that most of the results in this work are valid for a closed symmetric monoidal model category \mathcal{V} satisfying some general requirements consisting on a combination of hypothesis appearing in Section 4 and in [15] (or [16, Section 6]). However, we have chosen to state them for chain-complex valued algebraic field theories over a (commutative) ring R which contains the rationals for simplicity and due to connections with the existing literature. This restriction is not made explicit in order to enforce the cited generality. For instance, Sections 2 and 4 are written for a general \mathcal{V} , whereas the rest of the sections should be interpreted under the assumption $\mathcal{V} = \text{Ch}(R)$.

Outline: We include a brief summary of the contents of this work. Section 2 presents basic definitions in the theory of AQFTs and a straightforward construction of the canonical operad developed in [10] and [12]. The rest of the paper is organized depending on which further axiom of AQFTs is under study. Section 3 is devoted to the analysis and discussion of the time-slice axiom and its associated homotopy theories, going from the strict version to the homotopical one, which is seen as part of structure or as a property of AQFTs. The local-to-global principle introduced in the work of Benini and collaborators, and its interaction with the time-slice axiom, is the focus on Section 5. To fully understand the constructions in this last section, the content of Section 4 is necessary. It yields a machine to construct cellularizations of model categories of operadic algebras. Despite this fact, this homotopical discussion can be used as a necessary black box, since it reproduces the local-to-global principle model categorically. At the end, we include a table and a diagram (Section 6) condensing the field theory related material obtained in this paper.

2 Algebraic quantum field theories

2.1 Definition and examples

Algebraic quantum field theory is an axiomatic approach to quantum physics which focuses on the assignation of algebras of observables to spacetime regions.

The fundamental idea of such objects is that the algebraic structure on the observables is supposed to capture quantum information, so it is not commutative in general, although observables coming from “disjoint spacetime regions” do commute. The notion of orthogonal category formalizes the concept of spacetime regions and the relation of being disjoint.

Definition 2.1. [33, Definition 8.2.1] An *orthogonal category* C^\perp is a pair (C, \perp) given by a category C with choices of sets of morphisms

$$\perp = \left(\perp(\{U, W\}; V) \subseteq C(U, V) \times C(W, V) \right)_{U, W, V \in \text{ob } C}$$

which are stable by composition in C and are symmetric in (U, W) . It is said that two C -morphisms f and g are *orthogonal*, denoted $f \perp g$, if they have the same codomain and (f, g) belongs to \perp .

Notation 2.2. In order to maintain the physical motivation, we call *spacetime regions* to the objects of an orthogonal category.

In turn, the assignation of algebras of observables to spacetime regions is captured by the following definition. Let us fix for this section a (bicomplete and closed) symmetric monoidal category \mathcal{V} as a target for field theories.

Definition 2.3. Let C^\perp be an orthogonal category. An *algebraic quantum field theory* over C^\perp is a C -diagram of monoids $A: C \rightarrow \text{Mon}(\mathcal{V})$ such that for any pair of orthogonal maps $(f: U \rightarrow V) \perp (g: W \rightarrow V)$ in C , the following square commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & A(U) \otimes A(W) & \\
 A(f) \otimes A(g) \swarrow & & \searrow A(f) \otimes A(g) \\
 A(V) \otimes A(V) & & A(V) \otimes A(V) \\
 \mu_V \searrow & & \swarrow \mu_V^{\text{op}} \\
 & A(V) &
 \end{array}$$

The full subcategory of algebraic quantum field theories within $[C, \text{Mon}(\mathcal{V})]$ is denoted $\text{QFT}(C^\perp)$.

Benini and his collaborators proposed this formalization of algebraic quantum field theories in [10] in order to cover several proposals in the literature. We collect

some examples on the following table (see also [33] and references therein).

<i>Underlying category \mathcal{C}</i>	<i>Orthogonality relation \perp</i>	<i>Algebraic quantum field theory</i>
bounded lattice	\wedge -divisors of 0, i.e. $u \perp v \Leftrightarrow u \wedge v = 0$	Quantum field theories on bounded lattice
oriented n -manifolds with orientation-preserving open embeddings	disjoint image, i.e. $f \perp g \Leftrightarrow \text{Im } f \cap \text{Im } g = \emptyset$	Chiral conformal quantum field theories
oriented riemannian n -manifolds with orientation-preserving isometric open embeddings	disjoint image	Euclidean quantum field theories
oriented, time-oriented, globally hyperbolic Lorentzian manifolds with isometric open embeddings preserving orientation and time-orientation whose image is causally compatible	causally disjoint images, i.e. $f \perp g$ if and only if there is no causal curve joining $\text{Im } f$ and $\text{Im } g$	Locally covariant quantum field theories
category of regions for a spacetime with timelike boundary	causally disjoint regions	Algebraic quantum field theories on spacetime with timelike boundary

2.2 Operadic presentation in a nutshell

Given an orthogonal category \mathcal{C}^\perp , there is a functorial construction of an operad $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}^\perp$ whose algebras are algebraic quantum field theories over \mathcal{C}^\perp . More concretely, there is an equivalence of categories

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}^\perp\text{-Alg} \simeq \text{QFT}(\mathcal{C}^\perp).$$

In this section, we recall the definition of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}^\perp$, given originally in [10], with some additional observations which makes such definition more transparent in our view.

First, observe that $\text{QFT}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$ is a full subcategory of $[\mathcal{C}, \text{Mon}(\mathcal{V})]$, which is itself the category of algebras over a certain operad. To find this first operad, note that the category of monoids in \mathcal{V} is equivalent to the category of uAss -algebras in \mathcal{V} , where uAss the operad of associative algebras with unit. Looking at \mathcal{C} as an operad as well, we have the identification

$$[\mathcal{C}, \text{Mon}(\mathcal{V})] \cong \mathcal{C}\text{-Alg}(\text{uAss-Alg}(\mathcal{V})).$$

The Boardman-Vogt tensor product (see [31] or the original source [11, Section II.3]), denoted \otimes_{BV} , combines \mathcal{C} and uAss to obtain another operad, $\mathcal{C} \otimes_{\text{BV}} \text{uAss}$,

which comes with the identification

$$(\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\text{BV}} \text{uAss})\text{-Alg}(\mathcal{V}) \cong \mathbb{C}\text{-Alg}(\text{uAss}\text{-Alg}(\mathcal{V})).$$

In other words, the operad governing \mathbb{C} -diagrams of monoids in \mathcal{V} is just $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\text{BV}} \text{uAss}$.

Within such diagrams, algebraic field theories are those for which certain operations coincide. More precisely, looking at $A \in \text{QFT}(\mathbb{C}^\perp)$ as an algebra over the Boardman-Vogt tensor product, it must satisfy

$$A \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{U} \quad \text{W} \\ \text{f} \quad \text{g} \\ \mu_V \\ \text{V} \end{array} \right\} = A \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{U} \quad \text{W} \\ \text{f} \quad \text{g} \\ \mu_V^{\text{op}} \\ \text{V} \end{array} \right\}$$

for all $f \perp g$ in \mathbb{C} . Therefore, one can present this algebraic structure by constructing a suitable quotient of $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\text{BV}} \text{uAss}$ which identifies those operations. This is done by introducing a free operad $\mathfrak{F}(\mathbb{R}_\perp)$ that select these operations, and coequalizing the corresponding maps

$$\mathfrak{F}(\mathbb{R}_\perp) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mu_\perp} \\ \xrightarrow{\mu_\perp^{\text{op}}} \end{array} \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\text{BV}} \text{uAss} \xrightarrow{\text{coeq}} \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{C}^\perp.$$

The underlying symmetric sequence of the free operad on the left is simply

$$\mathbb{R}_\perp(\{U_1 \dots U_n\}; V) = \begin{cases} \coprod_{\perp(\{U_1, U_2\}; V)} \mathbb{1} & \text{if } n = 2 \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

and by freeness, the map μ_\perp corresponds to choosing the set of operations

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{U} \quad \text{W} \\ \text{f} \quad \text{g} \\ \mu_V \\ \text{V} \end{array} \text{ where } \mu_V \text{ is associated to } \mu_2 \in \text{uAss}(2) \text{ and } f \perp g \text{ are orthogonal in } \mathbb{C} \right\}$$

in $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\text{BV}} \text{uAss}$ (and analogously for μ_\perp^{op} , just replace μ_V by μ_V^{op} above).

The recognition of the Boardman-Vogt tensor product in the construction of $\mathcal{O}_\mathbb{C}^\perp$ is not vacuous. It leads to a broad generalization of the functorial construction

$$\text{OrthCat} \times \text{Operad}_{\{*\}}^{2\text{Pt}}(\mathcal{V}) \longrightarrow \text{Operad}(\mathcal{V}), \quad (\overline{\mathbb{C}}, \mathcal{P}) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{C}^{(r_1, r_2)}$$

discussed at [12, 13]. Now, it can be seen as the composition of:

- the Boardman-Vogt tensor $\otimes_{\text{BV}}: \text{Operad}(\mathcal{V})^{\times 2} \rightarrow \text{Operad}(\mathcal{V})$, to construct the operad $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}} \cong \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\text{BV}} \mathcal{P}$ encoding \mathcal{C} -diagrams of \mathcal{P} -algebras (see [31]);
- a colimit construction to identify operations in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}} \cong \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\text{BV}} \mathcal{P}$ as ruled out by the orthogonal relation in \mathcal{C} .

Hence, it is admissible to consider orthogonal categories enriched in \mathcal{V} and more general quotients than those coming from a monochromatic bipointed operad (following the notation on [13]). For example, the category Loc of globally hyperbolic lorentzian manifolds [20] could be endowed with some topological structure and the bipointed operad could have multiple colors. We expect to exploit this flexibility in subsequent work.

Remark 2.4. The recognition of the Boardman-Vogt tensor product provides a canonical presentation by generators and relations of the operad (see [31]). As expected, it coincides with the presentation by generators and relations of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\perp}$ given in [10].

From now on, operads and algebras are considered in $\mathcal{V} = \text{Ch}(\mathbb{R})$, with $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, unless otherwise specified. This choice also affects our notation, e.g. Set-operads are considered in \mathcal{V} via the strong monoidal functor $\text{Set} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, $X \mapsto \coprod_X \mathbb{1}$, where $\mathbb{1}$ is the monoidal unit of \mathcal{V} .

Remark 2.5. We decided to work on chain complexes over a ring \mathbb{R} containing the rationals mainly for its connection with the foundational work of Benini et al., and because of the simplicity of the homotopy theory of operads and algebras in this context. For instance, the strictification theorem for operadic algebras in $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{R})$ is one of the principal advantages of working within this setting. This theorem asserts that operadic algebras over a colorwise cofibrant operad presents the homotopy theory of their homotopy coherent version, because such operads are automatically Σ -cofibrant by [9, Proposition 2.11] and because weak equivalences of Σ -cofibrant operads induce Quillen equivalences between the corresponding model categories of operadic algebras [9, Theorem 2.10].

Suitable replacements of the operad $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\perp}$ worked out by Yau [33] and Benini-Schenkel-Woike [9] lead to homotopy coherent variants of algebraic quantum field theories, which may have a priori a richer homotopy theory than the strict version explored in this work. Their contribution consists on choosing a weak equivalent operad $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C},\infty}^{\perp} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\perp}$, which has more cofibrancy than the original one in some precise sense, an looking at $\text{QFT}_{\infty}(\mathcal{C}^{\perp}) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C},\infty}^{\perp} - \text{Alg}$. However, the strictification theorem states that no more homotopical information is gained if we work within $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{R})$, since we have the Quillen equivalence

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C},\infty}^{\perp} - \text{Alg} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\perp} - \text{Alg} .$$

Nevertheless, as briefly commented in the introduction, our techniques could be adapted for homotopy coherent algebraic quantum field theories as well, leading to parallel results. The importance of this generalization is that it is possible to replicate our homotopical results in more general contexts, for instance allowing chain-complexes over a general base ring R , some flavour of spectra, etc.

For the record, we highlight the choice commented above.

Assumption 2.6. \mathcal{V} represents the (projective) model category of chain-complexes over a commutative ring R containing the rationals.

This operadic reformulation serves to find a candidate of Quillen model structure to present the homotopy theory of algebraic quantum field theories [9]. The following notation fixes that choice.

Notation 2.7. $QFT(C^\perp)$ denotes the projective model structure on $\mathcal{O}_C^\perp\text{-Alg}$.

3 Time-slice localization

Given an algebraic quantum field theory, a way to introduce dynamics into the picture is via the so called time-slice axiom on the theory (see [7] or [20] for motivation of the concept). Formally, it consists on a choice of maps S in C between space-time regions such that $A \in QFT(C^\perp)$ satisfies that $A(f)$ is an isomorphism for any $f \in S$. Such field theories are said to satisfy the *S-time-slice axiom*. In this section, we propose two methods to study the homotopy theory of algebraic quantum field theories satisfying the time-slice axiom (or its relaxed version, see Definition 3.6).

For internal references, we adopt the following alternative notation.

Definition 3.1. A field theory $A \in QFT(C)$ satisfying the S-time-slice axiom is said to be *S-constant*. The full subcategory of $QFT(C^\perp)$ spanned by S-constant field theories is denoted $QFT_S(C^\perp)$.

Remark 3.2. In the sequel, we will make an extensive use of localization for operads and model categories, and hence of its associated terminology. For an introductory survey which is full of ideas see [18] and for a condensed model categorical treatment see [2].

3.1 Strict time-slice axiom

Let us begin with a brief remainder of the time-slice axiom discussion in [7, 9, 10]. There, it is noticed that looking at an algebraic field theory as a diagram

A: $C \rightarrow \text{Mon}(\mathcal{V})$, S -constancy can be expressed by saying that the diagram factors uniquely through the localization of C at S , denoted $C \rightarrow C_S$. Indeed, the localization C_S can be endowed with a canonical orthogonal relation, the so called pushforward orthogonal relation \perp_S ; it is constructed in [10, Lemma 3.19]. The importance of $C_S^{\perp S}$ is that it encodes the algebraic structure of S -constant field theories. More precisely, in [10, Lemma 3.20, Proposition 4.4], it is showed that the induced morphism $\ell: \mathcal{O}_C^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_S}^{\perp S}$ yields an equivalence of categories of algebraic field theories

$$\ell^*: \text{QFT}(C_S^{\perp S}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{QFT}_S(C^{\perp}).$$

Thus, a change of orthogonal category permits the recognition of S -constancy as structure and not as a property on field theories. Consequently, the homotopy theory of S -constant field theories may be presented by the projective model structure over $\mathcal{O}_{C_S}^{\perp S} - \text{Alg} \simeq \text{QFT}(C_S^{\perp S})$ (see [9, Theorems 3.8 and 3.10]).

Notation 3.3. $\mathcal{QFT}_S(C^{\perp})$ denotes the projective model structure on $\mathcal{O}_{C_S}^{\perp S} - \text{Alg}$.

Observe that this homotopy theory only deals with field theories satisfying the S -time-slice axiom strictly, as introduced above, and this fact excludes algebraic field theories coming from gauge theory (see [7, Section 3.4]). The way to include such examples will be a relaxation of the strict S -time-slice axiom. In order to do so, we will need a more canonical description of $\mathcal{O}_{C_S}^{\perp S}$, motivated by the algebraic field theories that it classifies.

Proposition 3.4. *Let C^{\perp} be an orthogonal category and $C_S^{\perp S}$ its localization at S . Then, the canonical morphism $\mathcal{O}_C^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_S}^{\perp S}$ induces an equivalence of operads*

$$(\mathcal{O}_C^{\perp})_S \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{C_S}^{\perp S},$$

where the left-hand side denotes the Set-localization of the operad \mathcal{O}_C^{\perp} at S .

Proof. The claim follows from the following chain of isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Operad}(\mathcal{O}_{C_S}^{\perp S}, \mathcal{P}) &\stackrel{(i)}{\cong} \text{equalizer} \left[\text{Operad}(C_S \otimes_{\text{BV}} \text{uAss}, \mathcal{P}) \rightrightarrows \text{Operad}(\mathfrak{F}(R_{\perp_S}), \mathcal{P}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\cong} \text{equalizer} \left[\text{Operad}(C_S, \mathcal{P}^{\text{uAss}}) \rightrightarrows \text{Operad}(\mathfrak{F}(R_{\perp_S}), \mathcal{P}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\cong} \text{equalizer} \left[\text{Operad}_S(C, \mathcal{P}^{\text{uAss}}) \rightrightarrows \text{Operad}(\mathfrak{F}(R_{\perp}), \mathcal{P}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{\cong} \text{equalizer} \left[\text{Operad}_S(C \otimes_{\text{BV}} \text{uAss}, \mathcal{P}) \rightrightarrows \text{Operad}(\mathfrak{F}(R_{\perp}), \mathcal{P}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(v)}{\cong} \text{Operad}_S(\mathcal{O}_C^{\perp}, \mathcal{P}). \end{aligned}$$

We have used: (i) description of the operad \mathcal{O}_C^\perp as a quotient of the Boardman-Vogt tensor product; (ii) Boardman-Vogt tensor product is left-adjoint to internal hom in Operad; (iii) universal property of the localization C_S on the first factor of the equalizer. On the second factor, we apply that the orthogonal relation \perp_S is generated by \perp . That is, by the explicit description for the pushforward orthogonal relation of [10, Lemmas 3.19] and the proof of [10, Lemma 3.20], we see that the equalizer requiring \perp -commutativity is the same as the one that requires \perp_S -commutativity; (iv) same adjunction than (ii); (v) universal property of localization together with (i). \square

Remark 3.5. Proposition 3.4 reproves that the morphism $\ell: \mathcal{O}_C^\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_S}^{\perp_S}$ induces an equivalence of categories $\ell^*: \text{QFT}(C_S^{\perp_S}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{QFT}_S(C^\perp)$. See the beginning of this section.

3.2 Weak time-slice axiom

Motivated by toy models explained in [7], it is natural to relax the S-time-slice axiom to a homotopical variant.

Definition 3.6. An algebraic quantum field theory $A \in \text{QFT}(C^\perp)$ satisfies the *weak S-time-slice axiom*, or equivalently it is *weakly S-constant*, if $A(f)$ is a weak equivalence whenever $f \in S$. We denote by $\text{QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp)$ the full subcategory of $\text{QFT}(C^\perp)$ spanned by weakly S-constant field theories.

We propose two approaches to study the homotopy theory of these algebraic quantum field theories and we show that these two approaches are equivalent in a precise sense.

Structural approach: It consists on enhancing the operad \mathcal{O}_C^\perp to encode the structure that turns the maps in S to weak equivalences. Due to Proposition 3.4, the idea is similar to the one used in [10] to study S-constant field theories.

We will use the following operad, whose construction is explained in [15].

Notation 3.7. The operad $\mathcal{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$ denotes the *homotopical localization* of \mathcal{O}_C^\perp at the set of unary operations S .

Its fundamental property is given by the following result.

Proposition 3.8. *There is a canonical equivalence*

$$\text{Ho QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp) \simeq \text{Ho}(\mathcal{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp - \text{Alg}).$$

The operad $\mathcal{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$ satisfies a homotopical universal property, so it is unique up to equivalence. Several candidates of homotopical localizations for operads can be given, but since we do not need any particular presentation, we prefer to state our results making no reference to specific models for $\mathcal{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$.

Remark 3.9. The existence of $\mathcal{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$ can be also proved with a good deal of homotopy theory of operads in spaces, i.e. by the use of a formal procedure to invert unary operations of ∞ -operads in the sense of Lurie.

Remark 3.10. The localization $\mathcal{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$ is performed directly at the level of operads, in contrast to the strict case, where the localization is done for the orthogonal category $C_S^{\perp s}$, see Subsection 3.1. With this observation, we want to stress that the orthogonal relation on C does not need to be pushed forward, and that a generalization of orthogonal relations to enriched categories is not yet required.

Since weakly S -constant field theories are presented as algebras over the operad $\mathcal{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$, the projective model structure on these algebras, which we denote appealingly by $\mathcal{QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp)$, presents the homotopy theory of those field theories. We collect these facts in the following result.

Proposition 3.11. *The homotopy theory of $\mathcal{QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp)$ is presented by the Quillen model structure $\mathcal{QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp)$, characterized by having weak equivalences and fibrations defined pointwise.*

Remark 3.12. Recall that a map of algebraic quantum field theories $A \rightarrow B$ is said to be pointwise in some class of maps if $A(U) \rightarrow B(U)$ belongs to this class for any space-time region $U \in C$.

Let us now explain the second alternative.

Property-based approach: Field theories in $\mathcal{QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp)$ have underlying algebraic structure encoded by $\mathcal{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$. Now we want to relax the algebraic structure by providing a model structure on $\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ which also presents the homotopy theory of weakly S -constant field theories. For this purpose, we use left Bousfield localization [2] for a suitable set of maps.

A suitable choice of a localizing set of maps in $\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ is given in [15]. A summary of the construction can be also found in [16, Section 6]. Using the same methods, it is possible to construct a set of maps \mathcal{S} in $\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ representing $S \subseteq C$ in such a way that the following result holds by the same arguments.

Proposition 3.13. *An algebraic field theory $A \in \mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ is \mathcal{S} -local if and only if it is weakly S -constant.*

Proof. See [15] or [16, Theorem 6.5]. □

We are now ready to give the second model structure to present the homotopy theory of weakly S -constant field theories.

Proposition 3.14. *The model structure $\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ admits the left Bousfield localization at \mathcal{S} , denoted $L_S \mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$, whose fibrant objects are fibrant objects in $\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ that satisfy the weak S -time-slice axiom.*

Proof. The existence of the left Bousfield localization is ensured by [2, Theorem 4.7] since the projective model on operadic algebras valued in $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{R})$ is left proper; this fact is proved in Proposition 4.13. The characterization of fibrant objects is the content of Proposition 3.13. \square

A comparison with the model $\mathcal{QFT}_{\text{ws}}(\mathbb{C}^\perp)$ (Proposition 3.11) is now in order.

Theorem 3.15. *The localization morphism $\ell: \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{C}^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_S \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{C}^\perp$ induces a Quillen equivalence $\mathbb{L}_S \mathcal{QFT}(\mathbb{C}^\perp) \rightleftarrows \mathcal{QFT}_{\text{ws}}(\mathbb{C}^\perp)$.*

Proof. We have to show that the Quillen pair $\mathcal{QFT}(\mathbb{C}^\perp) \rightleftarrows \mathcal{QFT}_{\text{ws}}(\mathbb{C}^\perp)$ induced by ℓ descends to the localization and that such descent gives rise to an equivalence at the level of homotopy categories.

The universal property of the localization proves the first claim since S goes to equivalences in $\mathfrak{L}_S \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{C}^\perp$ via ℓ .

To check that the Quillen pair establishes an equivalence for homotopy categories, use Propositions 3.11 and 3.14 to obtain the chain of equivalences

$$\text{Ho}(\mathbb{L}_S \mathcal{QFT}(\mathbb{C}^\perp)) \simeq \text{Ho}(\mathcal{QFT}_{\text{ws}}(\mathbb{C}^\perp)) \simeq \text{Ho}(\mathcal{QFT}_{\text{ws}}(\mathbb{C}^\perp)).$$

\square

We close this section by explaining how Theorem 3.15 answers [7, Open Problem 4.14]. First, let us recollect the ingredients and the content of this problem.

In [7, Example 4.13], the authors introduce a new concept in the theory of algebraic field theories, *homotopy S-constancy*. To recall their notion, let us denote $\mathcal{L}: \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{C}^\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_S}^\perp$ the localization map and

$$\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}_\# : \mathcal{QFT}(\mathbb{C}^\perp) \rightleftarrows \mathcal{QFT}_S(\mathbb{C}^\perp) : \mathcal{L}^*$$

its associated derived adjoint pair.

Definition 3.16. A field theory $A \in \mathcal{QFT}(\mathbb{C}^\perp)$ is *homotopy S-constant* if the canonical map $A \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^* \mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}_\# A$ is an equivalence.

Benini and Schenkel wondered if homotopy S-constancy captures weak S-constancy in our sense, as discussed at the end of [7, Section 3.4]. However, it is not even clear if a strict S-constant field theory (Definition 3.1) is homotopy S-constant, whereas strict S-constancy clearly implies weak S-constancy. The main obstruction for this to happen is that the derived counit $\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}_\# \mathcal{L}^* \Rightarrow \text{id}$ is not known to be a natural equivalence. Hence, we can reformulate [7, Open Problem 4.14] as the following list of items:

(Q1) Is homotopy S-constancy equivalent to weak S-constancy?

(Q2) Does strict S-constancy imply homotopy S-constancy?

(Q3) Is the derived counit $\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}_\# \mathcal{L}^* \Rightarrow \text{id}$ a natural equivalence?

We solve these questions by considering weak S-constancy instead of homotopy S-constancy, by virtue of the results discussed in this section. Denoting by $\ell: \mathcal{O}_C^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$ the homotopical localization map and

$$\mathbb{L}\ell_\#: \mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp) \rightleftarrows \mathcal{QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp): \ell^*$$

its associated derived adjoint pair, we now explain how all the complications vanish if one replaces $\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}_\# \dashv \mathcal{L}^*$ by $\mathbb{L}\ell_\# \dashv \ell^*$. Note that the homotopy category $\text{Ho } \mathcal{QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp)$ is by Theorem 3.15 a full reflective subcategory of $\text{Ho } \mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ with reflector $\mathbb{L}\ell_\#$, since $\text{Ho } \mathcal{QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp)$ is presented in Proposition 3.14 as a left Bousfield localization of $\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$. This fact may be reinterpreted as: (i) the derived counit $\mathbb{L}\ell_\# \ell^* \Rightarrow \text{id}$ is a natural equivalence and (ii) $A \in \mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ is weakly S-constant iff $A \rightarrow \ell^* \mathbb{L}\ell_\# A$ is an equivalence. Moreover, strictly S-constant field theories are canonically examples of weakly S-constant field theories.

Now we compare homotopy S-constancy and weak S-constancy. By the universal property of ℓ , there is a canonical factorization of \mathcal{L} through ℓ which yields a factorization of the right Quillen functor \mathcal{L}^*

$$\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp) \xleftarrow{\ell^*} \mathcal{QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp) \longleftarrow \mathcal{QFT}_S(C^\perp): \mathcal{L}^*.$$

The best scenario would be that the right map $\mathcal{QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp) \longleftarrow \mathcal{QFT}_S(C^\perp)$ were part of a Quillen equivalence, since this is equivalent to the statement (Q1): homotopy S-constancy is equivalent to weak S-constancy (because both are properties stable under equivalences for algebraic field theories in $\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$). Thus, the original question (Q1) can be reformulated as an strictification problem from weak S-constancy to strict S-constancy. However, such result in general seems unlikely, as the following example shows.

Example 3.17. Let C^{\perp_0} be an orthogonal category with the initial orthogonal relation. Then, the category of algebraic quantum field theories $\mathcal{QFT}(C^{\perp_0})$ is the category $\text{Fun}(C, \text{Mon}(\mathcal{V}))$ of C-diagrams of monoids. Then, for a set of maps S in C, the Quillen functor $\mathcal{QFT}_{wS}(C^{\perp_0}) \longleftarrow \mathcal{QFT}_S(C^{\perp_0})$ yields a Quillen equivalence if and only if the canonical restriction functor

$$\text{Ho} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{category of functors} \\ \mathfrak{L}_S C \rightarrow \text{Mon}(\mathcal{V}) \end{array} \right\} \longleftarrow \text{Ho} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{category of functors} \\ C_S \rightarrow \text{Mon}(\mathcal{V}) \end{array} \right\} \quad (1)$$

gives rise to an equivalence of categories. From this starting point, our goal is to produce a concrete example which shows that this fact is not always true. Indeed,

it is quite unlikely that the functor (1) is in general an equivalence since $\mathcal{L}_S C$ and C_S can be potentially very different.

Consider that \mathcal{V} is the category of simplicial sets Set_Δ with the Kan-Quillen model structure. Then, on the one hand, the ordinary localization C_S coincides with the category $\pi_0 \mathcal{L}_S C$, obtained from $\mathcal{L}_S C$ by taking connected components of its mapping spaces [19, Corollary 4.2]. On the other hand, any small simplicial category (or if you prefer any small ∞ -category) can be obtained, up to Dwyer-Kan equivalence, as $\mathcal{L}_S C$ for a suitable choice of (C, S) due to [1]. Thus, one can take (C, S) in such a way that $\mathcal{L}_S C$ is a model for the classifying ∞ -groupoid BG of a simply connected topological group G . Under these conditions, the functor (1) becomes the diagonal functor

$$\text{Ho} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{category of functors} \\ BG \rightarrow \text{Mon}(\mathcal{V}) \end{array} \right\} \longleftarrow \text{Ho Mon}(\mathcal{V}),$$

which sends a monoid to the constant functor at that monoid. If we further consider that Set_Δ is endowed with the cocartesian monoidal structure, the category of monoids is just Set_Δ itself. The diagonal functor in this case can be identified with the composite

$$\text{Ho Set}_{\Delta/BG} \xleftarrow{\sim} \text{Ho} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{category of functors} \\ BG \rightarrow \text{Set}_\Delta \end{array} \right\} \longleftarrow \text{Ho Set}_\Delta,$$

defined by sending a space X to the second factor projection $X \times BG \rightarrow BG$, as a consequence of [27, Section 8] (or the references cited therein for the simplicial case). It is clear that this functor cannot be an equivalence for a general G ; that is, the answer to (Q1) is negative. For instance, the universal fibration $EG \rightarrow BG$ does not belong to the essential image of this functor, since this would imply that $H^*(BG)$ can be embedded into $H^*(EG) \cong H^*(\text{pt})$. Moreover, this functor is not fully-faithful in general. One way to see it is by computing the (homotopy) mapping space between images of the functor in $\text{Set}_{\Delta/BG}$ to see that

$$\text{Map}_{BG}(X \times BG, Y \times BG) \simeq \text{Map}(X \times BG, Y).$$

Taking connected components, the map

$$\text{Ho Set}_\Delta(X, Y) \longrightarrow \pi_0 \text{Map}(X \times BG, Y) \cong \text{Ho Set}_{\Delta/BG}(X \times BG, Y \times BG)$$

will not be a bijection in general. In fact, for X contractible, G the Eilenberg-MacLane space $K(\mathbb{Z}, 2)$ and $Y = BG$, the map between connected components becomes $0 \cong \pi_0(Y) \longrightarrow H^3(K(\mathbb{Z}, 3), \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.

Note that the failure of fully-faithfulness above states that

$$\xi^*: \text{Ho QFT}_S(C^\perp) \longrightarrow \text{Ho QFT}_{wS}(C^\perp)$$

is not fully-faithful, or equivalently that the derived counit $\mathbb{L}\xi_{\#}\xi^* \Rightarrow \text{id}$ is not a natural equivalence, where ξ is the remaining factor in the factorization $\mathcal{L} = \xi \cdot \ell$. Observe that one can write the derived counit in (Q3) as the following composition

$$\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}_{\#}\mathcal{L}^* = \mathbb{L}\xi_{\#}\mathbb{L}\ell_{\#}\ell^*\xi^* \Longrightarrow \mathbb{L}\xi_{\#}\xi^* \Longrightarrow \text{id}.$$

The natural transformation on the left is a natural equivalence (apply $\mathbb{L}\xi_{\#}$ to the natural equivalence in (i) above), and thus $\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}_{\#}\mathcal{L}^* \Rightarrow \text{id}$ is a natural equivalence iff $\mathbb{L}\xi_{\#}\xi^* \Rightarrow \text{id}$ is so. Therefore, (Q3) is negative in general.

Remark 3.18. Another source of examples which answer [7, Open Problem 4.14] can be obtained by the use of Sullivan models of (equivariant) rational homotopy theory. In that case, we have to choose an orthogonal category $C^{\perp 1}$ with the final orthogonal relation and $\mathcal{V} = \text{Ch}(\mathbb{Q})$.

4 Extension model structure

Our goal is to produce the extension model structure for operadic algebras, which, aside its great intrinsic interest, will be crucial in the main results of next section. Given an inclusion of operads, the formal idea of the construction consists on finding a cellularization, also known as right Bousfield localization, of the projective model on algebras for the bigger operad, which is Quillen equivalent to the projective model for the smaller one.

The discussion in this section is more technical, and related to the theory of Quillen model structures. Therefore, it could be skipped in a first lecture and consulted when referred in the sequel.

Let us fix a closed symmetric model category \mathcal{V} (see [21]). We think about such \mathcal{V} as a sufficiently structured homotopical cosmos in which our constructions hold. Several hypotheses must be satisfied for the extension model to exist, and they will be stated in due time, when needed.

Notation 4.1. We say that a functor, between homotopical categories, is homotopical if it preserves equivalences.

Let $\iota: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be a morphism of \mathcal{V} -operads. Then, the induced restriction functor ι^* between algebras admits a left adjoint

$$\iota_{\#}: \text{Alg}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{V}) \rightleftarrows \text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{V}): \iota^*.$$

We want to deal with homotopy theories on these categories, so we assume:

Hypothesis 4.2. \mathcal{V} is cofibrantly generated and \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N} are admissible operads.

Endowing both categories with the projective model, the adjunction $\iota_{\sharp} \dashv \iota^*$ is a Quillen pair with ι^* being homotopical. Fixing a functorial cofibrant replacement (Q, q) on $\text{Alg}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{V})$, we get the derived pair

$$\iota_{\sharp} Q: \text{Alg}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{V}) \rightleftarrows \text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{V}): \iota^*,$$

and the composite endofunctor $\Omega = \iota_{\sharp} Q \iota^*$ on $\text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{V})$ admits an augmentation that should be seen as the derived counit,

$$\epsilon: \Omega = \iota_{\sharp} Q \iota^* \xrightarrow{\iota_{\sharp} q \iota^*} \iota_{\sharp} \iota^* \xrightarrow{\text{counit}} \text{id}.$$

The construction of the extension model is an application of the Bousfield-Friedlander machinery (see [29]) to the augmented endofunctor (Ω, ϵ) . Note that the augmentation is reversed with respect to [29], as Ω is a candidate for cofibrant replacement. This causes no trouble since [28, Theorem 1.1] is completely dualizable.

The Bousfield-Friedlander theorem will produce a new model on $\text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{V})$ (in fact a right Bousfield localization of the projective model), where:

- Weak equivalences are those maps that Ω sends to equivalences.
- Cofibrant objects are proj-cofibrant algebras for which the augmentation ϵ is an equivalence.
- Cofibrations between cofibrant objects are just the proj-cofibrations.

These classes deserve a notation for future reference.

Definition 4.3. We denote by \mathcal{W}_{Ω} the class of maps that Ω sends to equivalences. We say that an \mathcal{N} -algebra is \mathcal{B} -colocal if the augmentation ϵ on it is an equivalence. We write Cof_{Ω}^c for the class of proj-cofibrations between proj-cofibrant algebras which are \mathcal{B} -colocal.

Using this notation, the cited result (see [28, Theorem 1.1]) works if we check the following:

1. Ω is homotopical.
2. ϵ_{Ω} and $\Omega \epsilon$ are equivalences.
3. \mathcal{W}_{Ω} is stable under cobase changes along the class Cof_{Ω}^c .

The statement (1) is immediate since Ω is a composite of homotopical functors. For (2) to hold we need the additional hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4.4. *The unit $\text{id} \rightarrow \iota^* \iota_{\#}$ is an equivalence on proj-cofibrant algebrasⁱ.*

Under this additional constraint, let us see that ϵ_{Ω} is an equivalence. We deduce this fact from the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \epsilon_{\Omega} & & \\
 & & \curvearrowright & & \\
 \iota_{\#} Q \iota^* \iota_{\#} Q \iota^* & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\#} q \iota^* \iota_{\#} Q \iota^*} & \iota_{\#} \iota^* \iota_{\#} Q \iota^* & \xrightarrow{\text{counit} \cdot \iota_{\#} Q \iota^*} & \iota_{\#} Q \iota^* \\
 \uparrow \sim & & \uparrow \sim & & \uparrow \\
 \iota_{\#} Q \cdot \text{unit} \cdot Q \iota^* & & \iota_{\#} \cdot \text{unit} \cdot Q \iota^* & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 \iota_{\#} Q Q \iota^* & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\#} q Q \iota^*} & \iota_{\#} Q \iota^* & & \\
 & & & & \searrow \text{=}
 \end{array}$$

The commutativity comes from the naturality of the unit and the triangular identity of the adjunction $\iota_{\#} \dashv \iota^*$; the conclusion follows from 2 out of 3 for equivalences. The claim for $\Omega \in$ follows from a similar diagram chasing.

The remaining statement (3) is harder and requires further assumptions. We provide its proof in Proposition 4.6 below, but first we present an useful characterization of our candidates for weak equivalences.

Lemma 4.5. *The class \mathcal{W}_{Ω} is the preimage of colorwise-equivalences in $\text{Alg}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{V})$ along ι^* , i.e.*

$$\mathcal{W}_{\Omega} = \left\{ f: A \rightarrow B \text{ such that } f_{\text{ib}}: A(\text{ib}) \xrightarrow{\sim} B(\text{ib}) \quad \forall b \in \text{col}(\mathcal{B}) \right\}.$$

Proof. Let us assume that f belongs to the class on the right hand side. Then, Ωf is an equivalence since it is obtained from the equivalence $\iota^* f$ via the homotopical functor $\iota_{\#} Q$.

Conversely, assume that f belongs to \mathcal{W}_{Ω} , i.e. Ωf is an equivalence. Then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \iota^* \Omega A & \xlongequal{\quad} & \iota^* \iota_{\#} Q \iota^* A & \xleftarrow{\text{unit}} & Q \iota^* A & \xrightarrow{q} & \iota^* A \\
 \downarrow \iota^* \Omega f & & \downarrow \iota^* \iota_{\#} Q \iota^* f & & \downarrow Q \iota^* f & & \downarrow \iota^* f \\
 \iota^* \Omega B & \xlongequal{\quad} & \iota^* \iota_{\#} Q \iota^* B & \xleftarrow{\text{unit}} & Q \iota^* B & \xrightarrow{q} & \iota^* B
 \end{array}$$

which by 2 out of 3, Hypothesis 4.4 and the fact that ι^* is homotopical allows us to conclude the result. \square

ⁱWe interpret this condition as $\iota_{\#}$ being homotopically fully-faithful. It is ensured if ι is fully-faithful in the ordinary operadic sense.

Proposition 4.6. *Let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \downarrow g & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \tilde{A} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & \tilde{B}, \end{array}$$

be a pushout in $\text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{V})$ where $f \in \mathcal{W}_{\Omega}$ and $g \in \text{Cof}_{\Omega}^{\mathcal{C}}$. Then \tilde{f} belongs to \mathcal{W}_{Ω} if the following conditions on the model structure on \mathcal{V} are fulfilled:

- it is left proper.
- sequential colimits of cofibrationsⁱⁱ are homotopical.

Proof. First note that, as \mathcal{W}_{Ω} is closed under retracts, we can consider without loss of generality that g is a cellular proj-cofibration, i.e. g is a transfinite composite of pushouts of generating proj-cofibrations. Recalling that the projective model on $\text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}$ is transferred through the pair

$$\mathcal{N} \circ \star: [\text{col}(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{V}] \rightleftarrows \text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{V}): \text{U},$$

it is clear that each pushout referred above is of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{N} \circ s(j) & \longrightarrow & A_{\alpha} \\ \mathcal{N} \circ j \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow g_{\alpha} \\ \mathcal{N} \circ t(j) & \longrightarrow & A_{\alpha+1}, \end{array}$$

where j is a generating cofibration of \mathcal{V} concentrated in one color. Due to [32, Proposition 4.3.17], g_{α} , when viewed in $[\text{col}(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{V}]$ via the forgetful functor, can be described as a ω -transfinite composite of colorwise cofibrations:

$$g_{\alpha}: A_{\alpha} = A_{\alpha}^0 \xrightarrow{g_{\alpha}^1} A_{\alpha}^1 \xrightarrow{g_{\alpha}^2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\quad} A_{\alpha}^{\omega} = A_{\alpha+1}.$$

Arranging the two filtrations, $\text{U}g$ is described as a transfinite composite of cofibrations in $[\text{col}(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{V}]$. Using this, the initial pushout square is decomposed into

ⁱⁱpossibly starting at a non cofibrant object.

the following commutative diagram in $[\text{col}(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{V}]$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\
\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
A_0^1 & \xrightarrow{f_0^1} & B_0^1 \\
\vdots & & \vdots \\
A_0^\omega & \xrightarrow{f_0^\omega} & B_0^\omega \\
\parallel & & \parallel \\
A_1^0 & \xrightarrow{f_1^0} & B_1^0 \\
\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
A_1^1 & \xrightarrow{f_1^1} & B_1^1 \\
\vdots & & \vdots \\
A_1^\omega & \xrightarrow{f_1^\omega} & B_1^\omega \\
& \ddots & \ddots \\
& \vdots & \vdots \\
& \ddots & \ddots \\
& \tilde{A} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & \tilde{B}
\end{array}$$

We conclude that \tilde{f} belongs to \mathcal{W}_Ω by the following facts: \mathcal{W}_Ω is the class of arrows which are colorwise equivalences on $\iota(\text{col}(\mathcal{B}))$ (Lemma 4.5) and the first step belongs to this class. Iterative steps can be computed colorwise as pushouts in \mathcal{V} , so by left-properness, the property is inherited in iterative steps. Transfinite steps are transfinite composites of cofibrations in \mathcal{V} , so the assumption on sequential colimits ensures that the property is inherited in transfinite steps. \square

In the next statement we collect the needed hypotheses for future reference.

Hypothesis 4.7. *The model structure on \mathcal{V} is left-proper and sequential colimits of cofibrations are homotopical.*

Remark 4.8. Hypothesis 4.7 is slightly more general than assuming that sequential colimits are homotopical since it is implied by \mathcal{V} being tractable or if all objects in \mathcal{V} are cofibrant. On the other hand, sequential colimits are homotopical in a broad range of examples because it suffices to ensure that the model structure is

cofibrantly generated with generating cofibrations that have compact domain and codomain [25, Section 2].

Gathering all arguments above and assuming that Hypotheses 4.2, 4.4 and 4.7 hold, we finally obtain the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.9. *The projective model on $\text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}$ admits a right Bousfield localization, called the extension model structure, which enjoys the following properties:*

- \mathcal{W}_{Ω} is the class of weak equivalences.
- A cofibrant object is a proj-cofibrant algebra which is \mathcal{B} -colocal.
- A cofibration g is a proj-cofibration such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega A & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & A \\ \Omega g \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ \Omega \tilde{A} & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & \tilde{A}, \end{array}$$

is a homotopy pushout in the projective model.

Furthermore, the Quillen pair $\iota_{\sharp} \dashv \iota^*$ descends to a Quillen equivalence between the projective model on $\text{Alg}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{V})$ and the extension model on $\text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{V})$.

Proof. The first part is a direct application of the enhancement of Bousfield-Friedlander theorem in [29] as explained before.

On the other hand, the Quillen pair $\iota_{\sharp} \dashv \iota^*$ descends to a Quillen pair for the extension model since ι^* preserves fibrations and weak equivalences. Moreover, by Hypothesis 4.4 and construction, the derived unit and counit are respectively equivalences, and so we have the desired Quillen equivalence. \square

We close this section by showing two fundamental properties of the extension model that will be useful to localize it.

Proposition 4.10. *The extension model on $\text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{V})$ is cofibrantly generated.*

Proof. Since the fibrations of the extension model are the proj-fibrations, it suffices to take as generating acyclic cofibrations the set J of generating acyclic proj-cofibrations.

In order to find a set of generating cofibrations, note that they should detect acyclic fibrations, which are proj-fibrations that belong to \mathcal{W}_{Ω} . The proj-fibration condition is fulfilled if we simply add J to our generating cofibrations. Being additionally in \mathcal{W}_{Ω} is detected by right lifting property against a set I . Such set I is

just the image along the composite functor $\iota_{\sharp}(\mathcal{B} \circ \star)$ of the set of generating cofibrations in $[\text{col}(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{V}]$, due to Lemma 4.5 and adjunction. Note that the composite functor $\iota_{\sharp}(\mathcal{B} \circ \star)$ fits into the commutative square of left adjoint functors

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [\text{col}(\mathcal{B}), \mathcal{V}] & \xrightarrow{\text{col}(\iota)_{\sharp}} & [\text{col}(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{V}] \\ \mathcal{B} \circ \star \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{N} \circ \star \\ \text{Alg}_{\mathcal{B}} & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\sharp}} & \text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}. \end{array}$$

Summarizing, $(I \sqcup J, J)$ are the candidates for generating (acyclic) cofibrations of the extension model. By the above argument, it suffices to check that $I \sqcup J$ admits a small object argument, but the same reasons given to ensure that generating proj-cofibrations admit Quillen small object argument are valid for the set $I \sqcup J$. \square

For the last property of the extension model, we need more conditions on \mathcal{V} for it to hold.

Hypothesis 4.11. *For any cofibration j in \mathcal{V} and any Σ_r -object \mathcal{G} in \mathcal{V} , the map $\text{id}_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes_{\Sigma_r} j^{\square r}$ is an h -cofibration [3, Definition 1.1], where $j^{\square r}$ denotes the iterated pushout product. That is, equivalences are stable under pushout along $\text{id}_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes_{\Sigma_r} j^{\square r}$.*

Remark 4.12. As we see in Proposition 4.13 below, Hypothesis 4.11 is closely related to left properness of operadic algebras, issue which has been addressed by several authors in the literature. Note that *symmetric h -monoidality* [25, Section 2] implies Hypothesis 4.11, so a great amount of symmetric monoidal model categories satisfy the cited hypothesis.

Proposition 4.13. *The projective and the extension model on $\text{Alg}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{V})$ are left proper whenever \mathcal{V} satisfies Hypothesis 4.11 and if sequential colimits in \mathcal{V} are homotopical.*

Proof. Our proof uses the ω -transfinite colorwise decomposition of cobase changes of generating cofibrations. This filtration is further explained in [32, Proposition 4.3.17]. The sequence $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ there consists of cofibrations whenever $\text{id} \otimes_{\Sigma_n} j^{\square n}$ is a cofibration. This condition requires that A is proj-cofibrant to ensure that the enveloping operad is Σ -cofibrant in general, as explained in [32, Subsection 5.4]. However, under Hypothesis 4.11, g_n is a h -cofibration when j is a cofibration and no further conditions are required on A . Using this, the proof of Proposition 4.6 works for g any proj-cofibration, A any \mathcal{N} -algebra and f any $\text{col}(\mathcal{N})$ -equivalence or any $\text{col}(\mathcal{B})$ -equivalence, and we are done. \square

5 Local-to-global cellularization

This section is devoted to the presentation of a model category structure which encapsulates the homotopy theory of AQFTs that satisfy a natural local-to-global condition, and its interaction with the models defined in Section 3 that deal with the time-slice axiom.

5.1 The extension model on AQFTs

First, we recall this canonical local-to-global condition (see [9, 10]).

Definition 5.1. Let $C_\diamond^\perp \hookrightarrow C^\perp$ be the inclusion of a full orthogonal subcategory and $\iota_\sharp: \mathcal{QFT}(C_\diamond^\perp) \rightleftarrows \mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$: ι^* the induced Quillen adjunction. Then, a field theory $A \in \mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ is said to satisfy the C_\diamond -local-to-global axiom if the canonical map

$$\mathbb{L}\iota_\sharp \iota^* A \rightarrow A$$

is an equivalence, where $\mathbb{L}\iota_\sharp$ denotes the derived functor of ι_\sharp . In the sequel, $\mathcal{QFT}^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ denotes the full subcategory of $\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ spanned by field theories which satisfy the C_\diamond -local-to-global axiom.

Remark 5.2. In [10], the authors proposed the above local-to-global principle as a substitute for Fredenhagen's universal construction [14], which is proven to fail in certain situations because of the violation of Einstein causality, or in other words \perp -commutativity ([10, Section 5]).

Letting aside the homotopical discussion for a moment, it is easy to see that the morphism of operads $\iota: \mathcal{O}_{C_\diamond}^\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$ induces an equivalence of categories

$$\iota_\sharp: \mathcal{QFT}(C_\diamond^\perp) \xrightarrow{\sim} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A \in \mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp) \text{ s.t.} \\ \iota_\sharp \iota^* A \rightarrow A \text{ is an iso} \end{array} \right\},$$

which shows that the algebraic quantum field theories that satisfy the strict version of the C_\diamond -local-to-global principle are completely determined by their restriction to spacetime regions in C_\diamond . This fact clearly justifies the use of the cellularization discussed in Section 4.

The operad inclusion $\iota: \mathcal{O}_{C_\diamond}^\perp \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$ fulfills the requirements to apply Theorem 4.9. Hence, $\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ admits a cellularization, which we denote $\mathcal{QFT}^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$, and whose essential properties are collected in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $C_\diamond^\perp \hookrightarrow C^\perp$ be the inclusion of a full orthogonal subcategory. Then, the model structure $\mathcal{QFT}^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ has:*

- as weak equivalences, morphisms of algebraic quantum field theories which are equivalences when evaluated on spacetime regions within C_\diamond ;
- as cofibrant objects, those cofibrant field theories in $QFT(C^\perp)$ which satisfy the C_\diamond -local-to-global axiom;
- as fibrations, the class of projective fibrations, i.e the fibrations in $QFT(C^\perp)$.

Moreover, $QFT^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ presents the homotopy theory of $QFT^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ and it is Quillen equivalent to $QFT(C_\diamond^\perp)$.

Proof. All the statements are proven in Theorem 4.9 except that $QFT^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ presents the homotopy theory of $QFT^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$. This fact follows from the characterization of cofibrant objects in $QFT^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ by the following chain of equivalences of categories

$$\mathrm{Ho} QFT^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp) \simeq \mathrm{Ho} (QFT^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)_{\mathrm{cofibrant}}) \simeq \mathrm{Ho} QFT^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp).$$

□

Remark 5.4. Somehow not very surprisingly, the Quillen equivalence in Theorem 5.3 between $QFT^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ and $QFT(C_\diamond^\perp)$ implies that, in a homotopical sense, field theories satisfying the C_\diamond -local-to-global axiom are completely characterized by their restriction to spacetime regions in C_\diamond .

5.2 Mixing localization and cellularization

We discuss how the time-slice axiom and the local-to-global principle interact in terms of homotopy theory of AQFTs. We will need to repeat the distinction between the structural and the property-based approach in Section 3. For these purposes, we start with some notation.

Notation 5.5. We denote by $QFT_{wS}^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ the full subcategory of $QFT(C^\perp)$ spanned by weakly S-constant field theories that satisfy the C_\diamond -local-to-global principle.

Structural approach: Our goal is to introduce the C_\diamond -local-to-global principle into the model structure $QFT_{wS}(C^\perp)$ by means of a cellularization as in the preceding section. In this situation, we work with $\mathfrak{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$ as the operad that governs the underlying algebraic structure.

We want to make use again of the results of Section 4, so we must select a suitable map of operads $\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$. It is quite natural to consider the morphism

$\iota_S: \mathfrak{L}_{S_\diamond} \mathcal{O}_{C_\diamond}^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$, where S_\diamond represents the intersection of S with C_\diamond . One reason is because it fits into the following commutative square of operads

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_C^\perp & \xrightarrow{\ell} & \mathfrak{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp \\ \uparrow \iota & \nearrow \phi & \uparrow \iota_S \\ \mathcal{O}_{C_\diamond}^\perp & \xrightarrow{\ell_\diamond} & \mathfrak{L}_{S_\diamond} \mathcal{O}_{C_\diamond}^\perp, \end{array} \quad (2)$$

which yields the following motivational result.

Proposition 5.6. *The following conditions are equivalent for $A \in \text{QFT}_{\text{wS}}(C^\perp)$.*

- $\mathbb{L}_{\iota_S \# \iota_S^*} A \rightarrow A$ is an equivalence.
- $\mathbb{L}_{\phi \# \phi^*} A \rightarrow A$ is an equivalence.

Proof. The commutative square (2) induces the commutative diagram of adjoints pairs between categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Ho } \mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \end{array} & \text{Ho } \mathcal{QFT}_{\text{wS}}(C^\perp) \\ \uparrow \downarrow & & \uparrow \downarrow \\ \text{Ho } \mathcal{QFT}(C_\diamond^\perp) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \end{array} & \text{Ho } \mathcal{QFT}_{\text{wS}_\diamond}(C_\diamond^\perp). \end{array}$$

Therefore, with appropriate compositions of adjoints there, we obtain a commutative diagram in $\text{Ho } \mathcal{QFT}_{\text{wS}}(C^\perp)$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbb{L}_{\phi \# \phi^*} A & \\ & \nearrow (i) & \searrow (iii) \\ \mathbb{L}_{\iota_S \# \iota_S^*} \cdot \mathbb{L}_{\ell_\diamond \# \ell_\diamond^*} \cdot \iota_S^* A & & A. \\ & \searrow (ii) & \nearrow (iv) \\ & \mathbb{L}_{\iota_S \# \iota_S^*} A & \end{array}$$

On the one hand, (i) is an equivalence (iso in the homotopy category) by the commutativity of the above diagram. On the other hand, (ii) is an equivalence because, by Theorem 3.15, the adjunction $\mathbb{L}_{\ell_\diamond \# \ell_\diamond^*}: \text{Ho } \mathcal{QFT}(C_\diamond^\perp) \rightleftarrows \text{Ho } \mathcal{QFT}_{\text{wS}_\diamond}(C_\diamond^\perp): \ell_\diamond^*$ is a reflection. Thus, (iii) is an equivalence iff (iv) is so. \square

Remark 5.7. Proposition 5.6 should be understood as a check that $\mathfrak{L}_{S_\diamond} \mathcal{O}_{C_\diamond}^\perp$ -colocal algebras (see Section 4) satisfy in some sense the C_\diamond -local-to-global principle, because they are reconstructed from its restriction to spacetime regions in C_\diamond .

However, regardless the canonicity of ι_S , a technical assumption is required on S in order to make Theorem 4.9 work. Instead of finding general conditions for these purposes, we consider a quite restrictive hypothesis which makes all arguments work. For more information, see Remarks 5.10 and 5.15.

Hypothesis 5.8. *The set of maps S belongs completely to the full subcategory C_\diamond .*

Theorem 5.9. *Assume that $C_\diamond^\perp \hookrightarrow C^\perp$ is a full orthogonal subcategory and S a set of morphisms in C satisfying Hypothesis 5.8. Then, there exists a Quillen model structure $QFT_{wS}^{C_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ on the category of $QFT_{wS}(C^\perp)$ that satisfies:*

- *the weak equivalences are the maps that are equivalences when evaluated on spacetime regions within C_\diamond ;*
- *the fibrations are the projective fibrations;*
- *it is Quillen equivalent to $QFT_{wS_\diamond}(C_\diamond^\perp)$;*
- *the cofibrant objects are the cofibrant objects in $QFT_{wS}(C^\perp)$ which satisfy the appropriate C_\diamond -local-to-global principle.*

Proof. Hypothesis 5.8 implies that the map $\mathfrak{L}_{S_\diamond} \mathcal{O}_{C_\diamond}^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$ satisfies Hypothesis 4.4. Hence, Theorem 4.9 applies, giving the desired model structure. The characterization of the weak equivalences follows from Proposition 5.6 and a variation of Lemma 4.5. The appropriate C_\diamond -local-to-global principle just asserts that $A \in QFT_{wS}(C^\perp)$ satisfies that the canonical map $\mathbb{L}\phi_\# \phi^* A \rightarrow A$ is an equivalence, where ϕ is the map of operads appearing in the square (2). Thus, the recognition of cofibrant objects is a consequence of Proposition 5.6. □

Remark 5.10. It is not true that $\mathfrak{L}_{S_\diamond} \mathcal{O}_{C_\diamond}^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$ satisfies Hypothesis 4.4 in general, so Theorem 4.9 could not be applicable. We expect that conditions such as

$$\mathfrak{L}_{S_\diamond} C_\diamond(U, V) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{L}_S C(U, V)$$

being an equivalence $\forall U, V \in C_\diamond$ (homotopical fully-faithfulness) are sufficient for these purposes, although some more work will be needed. Furthermore, even a manageable condition on S that ensures this requirement seems to be hard to find, so we prefer to avoid this problematic in here.

Property-based approach: Now, the underlying algebraic structure is considered to be parametrized by the operad \mathcal{O}_C^\perp , i.e. the underlying category will be $\text{QFT}(C^\perp) \simeq \mathcal{O}_C^\perp\text{-Alg}$ despite $\text{QFT}_{\text{wS}}(C^\perp) \simeq \mathfrak{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp\text{-Alg}$. In order to present the homotopy theory of weakly S-constant field theories that satisfy the local-to-global principle, we need to perform two Bousfield localizations of the model structure $\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$; each one deals with one axiom independently.

We perform the cellularization described in Theorem 5.3 to get the model structure $\mathcal{QFT}^{\text{C}_\diamond}(C^\perp)$. Because of Propositions 4.10 and 4.13, the model structure $\mathcal{QFT}^{\text{C}_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ admits the localization at the set of maps \mathcal{S} that appears in Proposition 3.14. Let us denote such localized model by $\text{L}_S \mathcal{QFT}^{\text{C}_\diamond}(C^\perp)$.

The fundamental result is the recognition of the bifibrant objects in this model.

Theorem 5.11. *The bifibrant objects in $\text{L}_S \mathcal{QFT}^{\text{C}_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ are those bifibrant objects in $\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp)$ which satisfy the weak S-time-slice axiom and the C_\diamond -local-to-global principle.*

Proof. The cellularization does not change the class of fibrations, and hence of fibrant objects, whereas the localization does not change the class of cofibrations. Thus, the result follows from Proposition 3.14 and Theorem 5.3. \square

Corollary 5.12. *The model structure $\text{L}_S \mathcal{QFT}^{\text{C}_\diamond}(C^\perp)$ presents the homotopy theory of $\text{QFT}_{\text{wS}}^{\text{C}_\diamond}(C^\perp)$, i.e. algebraic field theories which satisfy the weak S-time-slice axiom and the C_\diamond -local-to-global principle.*

Proof. This follows from the equivalences of categories

$$\text{Ho } \text{L}_S \mathcal{QFT}^{\text{C}_\diamond}(C^\perp) \simeq \text{Ho} \left(\text{L}_S \mathcal{QFT}^{\text{C}_\diamond}(C^\perp)_{\text{bifibrant}} \right) \simeq \text{Ho } \text{QFT}_{\text{wS}}^{\text{C}_\diamond}(C^\perp).$$

\square

We finish by comparing the two approaches.

Theorem 5.13. *The localization morphism of operads $\ell: \mathcal{O}_C^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$ induces a Quillen equivalence of model categories*

$$\ell_\# : \text{L}_S \mathcal{QFT}^{\text{C}_\diamond}(C^\perp) \rightleftarrows \mathcal{QFT}_{\text{wS}}^{\text{C}_\diamond}(C^\perp) : \ell^*.$$

Proof. By definition of $\mathcal{QFT}_{\text{wS}}(C^\perp)$, we already have a Quillen pair

$$\mathcal{QFT}(C^\perp) \rightleftarrows \mathcal{QFT}_{\text{wS}}(C^\perp)$$

induced by ℓ . The idea is to prove that this pair descends to the cellularizations and the localization.

By Lemma 4.5, the functor $\ell^*: \mathcal{QFT}_{\mathcal{W}\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) \rightarrow \mathcal{QFT}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$ preserves the class of equivalences in Theorem 4.9. Hence, we have the corresponding Quillen pair between cellularizations, $\mathcal{QFT}^{\mathcal{C}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) \rightleftarrows \mathcal{QFT}_{\mathcal{W}\mathcal{S}}^{\mathcal{C}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$.

Taking account of the universal property of the localization, it remains to check that the set \mathcal{S} is sent to equivalences in $\mathcal{QFT}_{\mathcal{W}\mathcal{S}}^{\mathcal{C}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$. The same argument given in Theorem 3.15 shows that this is the case.

Once constructed the Quillen pair of the statement, proving that it is a Quillen equivalence boils down to showing that it induces an equivalence of homotopy categories. This follows from the equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Ho} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{QFT}^{\mathcal{C}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) &\stackrel{(i)}{\simeq} \mathrm{Ho} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_\diamond} \mathcal{QFT}^{\mathcal{C}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\simeq} \mathrm{Ho} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_\diamond} \mathcal{QFT}(\mathcal{C}_\diamond^\perp) \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\simeq} \mathrm{Ho} \mathcal{QFT}_{\mathcal{W}\mathcal{S}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}_\diamond^\perp) \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{\simeq} \mathrm{Ho} \mathcal{QFT}_{\mathcal{W}\mathcal{S}}^{\mathcal{C}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}^\perp). \end{aligned}$$

(i) is ensured by Hypothesis 5.8; (ii) is immediate since we are localizing Quillen equivalent model structures at the same set of maps; (iii) is a particular instance of Theorem 3.15; and (iv) is the third item in Theorem 5.9. \square

Corollary 5.14. *The model structure $\mathcal{QFT}_{\mathcal{W}\mathcal{S}}^{\mathcal{C}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$ presents the homotopy theory of $\mathcal{QFT}_{\mathcal{W}\mathcal{S}}^{\mathcal{C}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$, i.e. algebraic field theories which satisfy the weak \mathcal{S} -time-slice axiom and the \mathcal{C}_\diamond -local-to-global principle.*

Remark 5.15. As explained in the structural approach to the homotopy theory of weakly \mathcal{S} -constant field theories satisfying \mathcal{C}_\diamond -local-to-global principle, we restrict ourselves to sets \mathcal{S} fulfilling Hypothesis 5.8. Observe that this restriction is fundamental for the comparison between the structural and the property-based approach and even to see that $\mathcal{QFT}_{\mathcal{W}\mathcal{S}}^{\mathcal{C}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$ presents the homotopy theory of $\mathcal{QFT}_{\mathcal{W}\mathcal{S}}^{\mathcal{C}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$. Nevertheless, we hope that those results hold under weaker hypothesis. Note that the essential step where we need the restriction is the equivalence of categories

$$\mathrm{Ho} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{QFT}^{\mathcal{C}_\diamond}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) \simeq \mathrm{Ho} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_\diamond} \mathcal{QFT}(\mathcal{C}_\diamond^\perp).$$


6 Comparison of homotopy theories

This section contains a table summarizing all the model structures discussed in this work and a diagram that represents the relations between them.

<i>Homotopy theory of</i>	<i>Quillen model structure</i>	<i>Underlying algebraic structure</i>
algebraic field theories	$QFT(C^\perp)$ (Notation 2.7)	algebras over \mathcal{O}_C^\perp
strictly S-constant field theories	$QFT_S(C^\perp)$ (Notation 3.3)	algebras over $\mathcal{O}_{C_S}^{\perp_S}$
weakly S-constant field theories	$QFT_{wS}(C^\perp)$ (Proposition 3.11)	algebras over $\mathcal{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$
weakly S-constant field theories	$L_S QFT(C^\perp)$ (Proposition 3.14)	algebras over \mathcal{O}_C^\perp
algebraic field theories satisfying local-to-global principle	$QFT^{C_\circ}(C^\perp)$ (Theorem 5.3)	algebras over \mathcal{O}_C^\perp
weakly S-constant field theories satisfying local-to-global principle	$QFT_{wS}^{C_\circ}(C^\perp)$ (Theorem 5.9)	algebras over $\mathcal{L}_S \mathcal{O}_C^\perp$
weakly S-constant field theories satisfying local-to-global principle	$L_S QFT^{C_\circ}(C^\perp)$ (Theorem 5.11)	algebras over \mathcal{O}_C^\perp

In the following diagram are displayed these Quillen model categories with

Quillen adjunctions between them, oriented by their left adjoints.



Acknowledgments The author would like to thank his advisors, Ramon Flores and Fernando Muro, for their support. Talking about contributions, Example 3.17 was the consequence of an enjoyable discussion with Fernando Muro. Carlos Maestro Pérez also deserves recognition; his help with LaTeX matters is of unquestionable value.

References

- [1] C. Barwick and D. M. Kan. Relative categories: another model for the homotopy theory of homotopy theories. *Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen. Indagationes Mathematicae. New Series*, 23(1-2):42–68, 2012.
- [2] Clark Barwick. On left and right model categories and left and right Bousfield localizations. *Homology, Homotopy and Applications*, 12(2):245–320, 2010.

- [3] M. A. Batanin and C. Berger. Homotopy theory for algebras over polynomial monads. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 32:Paper No. 6, 148–253, 2017.
- [4] Marco Benini, Simen Bruinsma, and Alexander Schenkel. Linear Yang-Mills theory as a homotopy AQFT. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 378(1):185–218, 2020.
- [5] Marco Benini, Claudio Dappiaggi, and Alexander Schenkel. Algebraic quantum field theory on spacetimes with timelike boundary. *Annales Henri Poincaré. A Journal of Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*, 19(8):2401–2433, 2018.
- [6] Marco Benini and Alexander Schenkel. Quantum field theories on categories fibered in groupoids. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 356(1):19–64, 2017.
- [7] Marco Benini and Alexander Schenkel. Higher structures in algebraic quantum field theory. *Fortschritte der Physik. Progress of Physics*, 67(8-9, Special issue: Proceedings of the LMS/EPSRC Durham Symposium on Higher Structures in M-Theory):1910015, 24, 2019.
- [8] Marco Benini, Alexander Schenkel, and Richard J. Szabo. Homotopy colimits and global observables in abelian gauge theory. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 105(9):1193–1222, 2015.
- [9] Marco Benini, Alexander Schenkel, and Lukas Woike. Homotopy theory of algebraic quantum field theories. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 109(7):1487–1532, 2019.
- [10] Marco Benini, Alexander Schenkel, and Lukas Woike. Operads for algebraic quantum field theory. *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, 23(2):2050007, 39, 2021.
- [11] J. M. Boardman and R. M. Vogt. *Homotopy Invariant Algebraic Structures on Topological Spaces*, volume 347 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1973.
- [12] Simen Bruinsma. Coloring Operads for Algebraic Field Theory. *arXiv:1903.02863 [hep-th]*, March 2019. arXiv: 1903.02863.
- [13] Simen Bruinsma and Alexander Schenkel. Algebraic field theory operads and linear quantization. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 109(11):2531–2570, November 2019. arXiv: 1809.05319.

- [14] Romeo Brunetti, Klaus Fredenhagen, and Rainer Verch. The generally covariant locality principle – A new paradigm for local quantum physics. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 237(1):31–68, June 2003. arXiv: math-ph/0112041.
- [15] Victor Carmona, Ramon Flores, and Fernando Muro. Localization of (pr)operads. *work in progress*, 2021.
- [16] Victor Carmona, Ramon Flores, and Fernando Muro. A model structure for locally constant factorization algebras. *arXiv:2107.14174 [math]*, July 2021. arXiv: 2107.14174.
- [17] Kevin Costello and Owen Gwilliam. *Factorization algebras in quantum field theory. Vol. 1*, volume 31 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017.
- [18] W. G. Dwyer. Localizations. In *Axiomatic, enriched and motivic homotopy theory*, volume 131 of *NATO Sci. Ser. II Math. Phys. Chem.*, pages 3–28. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2004.
- [19] W. G. Dwyer and D. M. Kan. Function complexes in homotopical algebra. *Topology. An International Journal of Mathematics*, 19(4):427–440, 1980.
- [20] Christopher J. Fewster and Rainer Verch. Algebraic quantum field theory in curved spacetimes. *arXiv:1504.00586 [math-ph]*, April 2015. arXiv: 1504.00586.
- [21] Benoit Fresse. *Homotopy of operads and Grothendieck-Teichmüller groups. Part 2*, volume 217 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017.
- [22] Maxim Kontsevich. Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 66(3):157–216, 2003.
- [23] Jacob Lurie. On the classification of topological field theories. In *Current developments in mathematics, 2008*, pages 129–280. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2009.
- [24] Martin Markl, Steve Shnider, and Jim Stasheff. *Operads in algebra, topology and physics*, volume 96 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.
- [25] Dmitri Pavlov and Jakob Scholbach. Admissibility and rectification of colored symmetric operads. *Journal of Topology*, 11(3):559–601, 2018.

- [26] Kasia Rejzner. *Perturbative algebraic quantum field theory*. Mathematical Physics Studies. Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [27] Michael A. Shulman. Parametrized spaces model locally constant homotopy sheaves. *Topology and its Applications*, 155(5):412–432, 2008.
- [28] Alexandru E. Stanculescu. Note on a theorem of Bousfield and Friedlander. *Topology and its Applications*, 155(13):1434–1438, 2008.
- [29] Alexandru E. Stanculescu. Erratum to: Note on a theorem of Bousfield and Friedlander [Topology Appl. 155 (13) (2008) 1434–1438] [MR2427416]. *Topology and its Applications*, 156(3):661, 2009.
- [30] Stephan Stolz and Peter Teichner. Supersymmetric field theories and generalized cohomology. In *Mathematical foundations of quantum field theory and perturbative string theory*, volume 83 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 279–340. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011.
- [31] Ittay Weiss. From operads to dendroidal sets. In *Mathematical foundations of quantum field theory and perturbative string theory*, volume 83 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 31–70. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011.
- [32] David White and Donald Yau. Bousfield localization and algebras over colored operads. *Applied Categorical Structures. A Journal Devoted to Applications of Categorical Methods in Algebra, Analysis, Order, Topology and Computer Science*, 26(1):153–203, 2018.
- [33] Donald Yau. Homotopical Quantum Field Theory. *arXiv:1802.08101 [math-ph]*, November 2019. arXiv: 1802.08101.

UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA, FACULTAD DE MATEMÁTICAS, DEPARTAMENTO DE ÁLGEBRA-IMUS, AVDA. REINA MERCEDES S/N, 41012 SEVILLA, SPAIN
Email address: vcarmona1@us.es
url: <http://personal.us.es/vcarmona1>