

On the Diagram of Thought

Yifan Zhang¹ Yang Yuan^{1,2} Andrew Chi-Chih Yao^{1,2}

¹IIS, Tsinghua University

²Shanghai Qi Zhi Institute

Abstract

Current large language models (LLMs) demonstrate impressive capabilities but struggle with complex, multi-step reasoning tasks. Existing methods often tackle this by requiring external control mechanisms or multi-model orchestration, which introduces system complexity and typically lacks formal guarantees of reasoning soundness. We introduce the **Diagram of Thought (DoT)**, a framework wherein a *single* auto-regressive LLM internally constructs and navigates a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG). This DAG represents the iterative reasoning process, encompassing steps like proposing ideas, critiquing them, refining based on feedback, and synthesizing conclusions. This self-orchestrated, self-contained process is guided by learned role-specific tokens (e.g., `<proposer>`, `<critic>`, `<summarizer>`) embedded within the standard generation loop, thereby eliminating external dependencies. Crucially, we establish a rigorous mathematical foundation for DoT using **Topos Theory**. We formalize the reasoning DAG as a diagram $D : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ within a suitable topos \mathcal{E} and prove that the final synthesis step, aggregating validated information, corresponds semantically to computing the colimit ($\text{colim } D$) of the relevant sub-diagram. This formalization provides theoretical guarantees concerning the logical consistency and robustness of the synthesized outcome. DoT thus offers a unified, self-contained, interpretable, efficient, and formally grounded approach designed to significantly advance the complex reasoning capabilities of LLMs.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) (Brown et al., 2020; Touvron et al., 2023) have exhibited remarkable proficiency across a spectrum of natural language tasks. However, achieving robust performance on complex reasoning problems that necessitate structured exploration, iterative refinement, backtracking, and self-correction remains a formidable challenge (Huang & Chang, 2022). Initial prompting strategies, such as Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022), encourage step-by-step reasoning by eliciting intermediate steps. While beneficial, the inherent linearity of CoT struggles to capture the dynamic, non-sequential nature of sophisticated problem-solving, which often involves generating parallel hypotheses, critical evaluation, and synthesis—processes ill-suited to a strictly linear progression.

Recognizing these limitations, subsequent research has explored more complex reasoning structures. Frameworks like Tree-of-Thought (ToT) (Yao et al., 2023) utilize tree structures to manage multiple reasoning paths, while Graph-of-Thought (GoT) (Besta et al., 2024) generalizes this to arbitrary graphs, enabling more flexible representations. Other approaches, such as Cumulative Reasoning (CR) (Zhang et al., 2023), leverage multi-agent paradigms with specialized roles interacting iteratively. Despite their advancements, these methods frequently introduce significant

architectural complexity. They often rely on external controllers to manage search algorithms, sophisticated graph management systems separate from the core LLM, or the intricate orchestration of multiple distinct models or specialized prompts. This can lead to communication bottlenecks, challenges in maintaining a consistent reasoning state, and difficulties in training and deployment.




Figure 1: High-level illustration of the Diagram of Thought (DoT) process. A single LLM generates a Directed Acyclic Graph representing iterative reasoning steps: proposing ideas (circles), critiquing them (rectangles), refining or verifying propositions, and finally synthesizing results (ellipse).

In this paper, we introduce the **Diagram of Thought (DoT)** framework, a paradigm designed to overcome these limitations by internalizing complex, iterative reasoning within a *single, unmodified auto-regressive language model*. DoT conceptualizes the reasoning process as the construction of a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG), as depicted in Figure 1. Nodes within this DAG represent distinct cognitive units—such as propositions, critiques, refinements, or verified statements—while directed edges capture the logical and procedural dependencies between them. This internal graph structure allows the LLM to autonomously explore diverse reasoning pathways, backtrack

upon identifying flaws via self-generated critiques, and consolidate validated intermediate results toward a final conclusion.

A cornerstone of the DoT framework is its operationalization through **role-specific tokens** (e.g., `<proposer>`, `<critic>`, `<summarizer>`). These tokens are integrated directly into the LLM’s vocabulary and generation process. By learning to predict and condition on these tokens, the model seamlessly transitions between different cognitive roles—generating hypotheses, evaluating them critically, refining based on feedback, and synthesizing results—all within its standard auto-regressive sequence generation loop. This self-contained mechanism obviates the need for external control structures, multi-agent coordination, or complex graph management systems, thereby unifying the entire reasoning process within a single model.

Crucially, we establish a rigorous mathematical foundation for DoT using Topos Theory (MacLane & Moerdijk, 2012; Johnstone, 2002; Lambek & Scott, 1988). Topos theory, a branch of category theory, provides powerful tools for modeling logic, computation, and evolving contexts, making it exceptionally well-suited for formalizing the dynamic, evidence-aggregating nature of DoT. We formalize the evolving reasoning process as the construction of a diagram $D : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ within an appropriate topos \mathcal{E} (e.g., a presheaf topos $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}$), where \mathcal{J} is an index category derived from the reasoning DAG. We then prove a central result: the final synthesis step, enacted under the `<summarizer>` role, corresponds semantically to computing the colimit ($\text{colim } D$) of the sub-diagram representing validated reasoning steps. This categorical formalization not only imparts precise semantics to the DoT process but, more importantly, provides formal guarantees regarding the logical consistency and robustness of the synthesized result, grounded in the rich internal logic of the topos.

Our main contributions are therefore:

1. We introduce the Diagram of Thought (DoT) framework, enabling complex iterative reasoning via internal DAG construction within a *single* auto-regressive LLM, enhancing autonomy and simplifying system architecture.
2. We propose the use of learned role-specific tokens (`<proposer>`, `<critic>`, and `<summarizer>`, etc.) to achieve self-orchestrated transitions between distinct reasoning phases during standard sequence generation.
3. We provide a rigorous Topos-Theoretic formalization, modeling the reasoning process as a diagram $D : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ and proving that the synthesis operation corresponds to computing its colimit ($\text{colim } D$). This formalization establishes theoretical guarantees for the logical consistency and robustness of the reasoning outcome, grounding the framework in established mathematical principles.
4. The unified DoT approach enhances the interpretability of the reasoning process through the explicit DAG structure represented in the generated output while maintaining efficiency compared to multi-component systems.

This work offers a synthesis of practical LLM mechanisms and formal mathematical structures, paving the way for more reliable, interpretable, and theoretically grounded complex reasoning with language models.

Which one is larger, 9.11 or 9.8?



<proposer> To determine which number is larger between 9.11 and 9.8, we can compare their decimal places.

- The first digits before the decimal point are the same: 9.
- After the decimal point, we compare the numbers digit by digit.
 - In 9.11, the first digit after the decimal is 1.
 - In 9.8, the first digit after the decimal is 8.

Since 8 is greater than 1, we can conclude that 9.8 is larger than 9.11.

Therefore, 9.8 is larger. </proposer>

<critic> The proposer's comparison process is mostly correct, but a slight clarification is necessary. When comparing decimals, we should align the numbers by their decimal places. So instead of directly comparing 9.11 with 9.8, we should think of 9.8 as 9.80. This way, it becomes clear that 9.80 (9.8) is greater than 9.11.

The final conclusion remains correct: 9.8 is larger than 9.11, but it's better to write 9.80 for clarity during comparison. </critic>

<summarizer> When comparing 9.11 and 9.8 (or 9.80 for easier comparison), we find that 9.80 is larger than 9.11. Therefore, the correct answer is that 9.8 is larger than 9.11. </summarizer>

Figure 2: Illustrative example: Applying DoT reasoning steps to compare numerical values. Critiques might identify incorrect digit comparisons.

2 Related Work

The pursuit of robust reasoning within Large Language Models (LLMs) has driven considerable research beyond basic input-output functionality. Initial breakthroughs like Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting (Wei et al., 2022; Kojima et al., 2022) demonstrated that eliciting intermediate reasoning steps significantly improves performance on complex tasks. CoT effectively linearizes reasoning, enhancing transparency but suffering from rigidity; its sequential nature hinders exploration of alternatives or recovery from early errors without restarting. Methods like Self-consistency (Wang et al., 2022) mitigate this by sampling multiple reasoning paths and selecting the majority answer, implicitly acknowledging path diversity but lacking explicit refinement mechanisms.

Recognizing the constraints of linearity, subsequent work explored more complex structures. Tree-of-Thought (ToT) (Yao et al., 2023) introduced tree structures where nodes represent partial solutions and edges denote reasoning operators. ToT utilizes search algorithms (e.g., BFS, DFS) guided by heuristic evaluations (often LLM-based) to explore possibilities, enabling systematic search and backtracking. However, ToT generally necessitates an external controller for search management and pruning. Graph-of-Thought (GoT) (Besta et al., 2024) extends this to arbitrary graphs, allowing for more intricate dependency modeling, such as merging reasoning paths, but

How many 'r's in the word 'strawberry'?



<proposer> To determine how many 'r's are in the word "strawberry," we can simply count the occurrences of the letter 'r' in the word.

- The word "strawberry" contains 10 letters.
- By examining each letter: s, t, r, a, w, b, e, r, r, y
 - We find three occurrences of the letter 'r'.

Thus, there are 3 'r's in the word "strawberry." </proposer>

<critic> The proposer's approach is correct. The letters in "strawberry" are accurately listed, and the count of 'r's is correct. There are indeed 3 'r's in the word. </critic> <summarizer> The word "strawberry" contains 3 occurrences of the letter 'r.' </summarizer>

Figure 3: Illustrative example: A character-counting task where intermediate steps (identifying 'r's) and potential critiques (missed counts, double counts) could form a DoT graph.

often requiring more sophisticated external graph management systems.

Collaborative and iterative refinement approaches offer another perspective. Cumulative Reasoning (CR) (Zhang et al., 2023) employs multiple LLM instances (or prompts) assigned specific roles (e.g., proposer, verifier), interacting iteratively. While modular, this introduces coordination overhead. Self-Refine (Madaan et al., 2023) focuses on iterative improvement where an LLM critiques and refines its own output, though typically applied to the entire output rather than intermediate reasoning steps within a structured process.

From a foundational perspective, Yuan (2023) uses category theory to analyze the inherent capabilities and limitations of LLMs. This work proves that prompt-based tuning is restricted to “representable” tasks within the pretext task category, potentially explaining the limitations of simpler methods like CoT. Conversely, the theory suggests fine-tuning offers broader potential, theoretically enabling a sufficiently powerful model to solve any task within that category given adequate resources. This supports the idea that more complex structures or adaptations, potentially like those in ToT, GoT, or DoT, may be needed to surpass the limitations of basic prompting.

Diagram of Thought (DoT) builds upon these diverse approaches while offering key distinctions. Like ToT and GoT, DoT utilizes non-linear structures (DAGs) for reasoning. However, it distinctively internalizes the graph construction and navigation within a *single* auto-regressive model via role tokens, minimizing external control dependencies. This contrasts with the external orchestration often required by ToT and GoT. DoT employs explicit cognitive roles (propose, critique, summarize), similar to CR, but integrates them seamlessly within one model through conditional generation, avoiding multi-agent coordination complexities. The use of rich natural language critiques potentially offers more nuanced feedback than the simple heuristic scores sometimes used in ToT. Importantly, by grounding the reasoning process in Topos Theory, DoT aims for a level of formal rigor and consistency guarantees, distinguishing it from purely heuristic methods and resonating with the structural analysis provided by works like Yuan (2023). DoT thus presents a unified, self-contained, interpretable, and formally-grounded approach to advance

complex reasoning in LLMs.

3 The Diagram of Thought Framework

In this section, we formally define the Diagram of Thought (DoT) framework. DoT operationalizes complex, iterative reasoning as the dynamic construction and traversal of a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) $G = (V, E)$ entirely within a single auto-regressive language model LM. This internal graph structure allows the model to manage parallel lines of thought, critique intermediate steps, refine ideas based on feedback, and synthesize validated conclusions.

Definition 3.1 (DoT Graph Components). The DoT graph $G = (V, E)$ is composed of:

- **Nodes** $v \in V$: Each node represents a semantic unit or reasoning step. Every node v is associated with:
 - A specific role $\text{role}(v) \in R = \{\text{Problem}, \text{Proposer}, \text{Critic}, \text{Summarizer}\}$.
 - Textual content $\text{content}(v)$, generated by the LLM LM while assuming the role $\text{role}(v)$.
 - Optionally, an internal state $\text{state}(v) \in \{\text{active}, \text{validated}, \text{invalidated}, \text{initial}\}$. For example, a ‘Proposer’ node might start as ‘active’, become ‘validated’ after a positive critique, or ‘invalidated’ after a negative critique.
- **Edges** $(u, v) \in E$: A directed edge from node u to node v signifies a dependency relationship. This can represent:
 - Logical dependency (e.g., proposition v builds upon premise u).
 - Procedural dependency (e.g., critique v evaluates proposition u , refinement v addresses critique u).
 - Contextual dependency (e.g., summarization v synthesizes information from validated nodes including u).

The graph structure is inherently constrained to be acyclic (G is a DAG), reflecting the forward progression of reasoning steps, even with backtracking and refinement.

The construction of this graph is implicitly managed by the LLM’s standard auto-regressive generation process, strategically guided by special role tokens.

3.1 Roles and Auto-Regressive Generation with Role Tokens

A core mechanism of DoT involves augmenting the LLM’s vocabulary \mathcal{V} with a distinct set of role-specific tokens:

$$T_{\text{roles}} = \{\langle \text{problem} \rangle, \langle \text{proposer} \rangle, \langle \text{critic} \rangle, \langle \text{summarizer} \rangle\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{V}' = \mathcal{V} \cup T_{\text{roles}}$ be the augmented vocabulary. The LLM LM operates by predicting the next token $w_t \in \mathcal{V}'$ based on the preceding sequence (history) $H_{t-1} = w_1, \dots, w_{t-1}$:

$$P(w_t | H_{t-1}; \theta) = \text{LM}(H_{t-1}),$$

where θ denotes the model parameters. The generated sequence $H_T = w_1, \dots, w_T$ represents a serialized traversal and construction of the DoT graph G .

The role tokens function as control signals, prompting the LLM to adopt a specific cognitive function for the subsequent text generation, thereby determining the role and content of the next node(s) in the graph:

- **<problem>**: Typically precedes the initial problem statement \mathcal{P} . This establishes the root node $v_{\text{start}} \in V$ with $\text{role}(v)_{\text{start}} = \text{Problem}$ and $\text{content}(v)_{\text{start}} = \mathcal{P}$. $\text{state}(v)_{\text{start}} = \text{initial}$.
- **<proposer>**: Signals the LLM to generate a hypothesis, intermediate reasoning step, or potential solution fragment P_i . This creates a new node v_{P_i} with $\text{role}(v)_{P_i} = \text{Proposer}$ and $\text{content}(v)_{P_i} = P_i$. Edges are implicitly added from contextually relevant precursor nodes u (e.g., $(v_{\text{start}}, v_{P_1})$ or (v_{C_j}, v_{P_k}) if P_k is a refinement responding to critique C_j , or $(v_{P'_j}, v_{P_k})$ if P_k builds on a previously validated proposition P'_j). The new node typically starts with $\text{state}(v)_{P_i} = \text{active}$.
- **<critic>**: Instructs the LLM to evaluate a specific preceding 'Proposer' node v_{P_j} (identified implicitly from the context H_{t-1}). The LLM generates a critique C_j , assessing P_j 's validity, identifying flaws, or suggesting improvements. This creates a node v_{C_j} with $\text{role}(v)_{C_j} = \text{Critic}$, $\text{content}(v)_{C_j} = C_j$, and an edge (v_{P_j}, v_{C_j}) . The content C_j determines the state update for v_{P_j} :
 - If C_j confirms validity (e.g., "This step is correct."), then $\text{state}(v)_{P_j}$ transitions to 'validated'.
 - If C_j identifies flaws (e.g., "This assumption is incorrect because..."), then $\text{state}(v)_{P_j}$ transitions to 'invalidated'.
- **<summarizer>**: Prompts the LLM to synthesize a final answer or consolidated conclusion based on the reasoning process so far. The LLM implicitly identifies relevant nodes with $\text{state} = \text{'validated'}$ from the history H_{t-1} , performs a conceptual aggregation respecting their dependencies (akin to accessing a relevant subgraph), and generates the summary text S . This creates a final node v_S with $\text{role}(v)_S = \text{Summarizer}$, $\text{content}(v)_S = S$. Edges $(v_{P'_k}, v_S)$ are implicitly added from the validated proposition nodes $v_{P'_k}$ that contributed to the summary. Generation often terminates after this step.

The LLM learns to predict appropriate role token transitions based on the entire preceding history H_{t-1} , effectively learning to navigate and structure the reasoning process. For instance, after generating a proposition via **<proposer>**, the model learns it's often appropriate to predict **<critic>**. Following a critical critique (**<critic>** leading to state 'invalidated'), the model might predict **<proposer>** again to generate a refinement, or explore an alternative branch.

3.2 Iterative Reasoning as DAG Construction

The DoT reasoning process unfolds as the LLM generates the sequence H_T , which simultaneously defines the DAG G :

1. **Initialization**: The process begins with the problem statement, typically formatted as **<problem>** \mathcal{P} . This creates the root node v_{start} .
2. **Proposal**: The LLM predicts **<proposer>** and generates the text for a first proposition P_1 . This adds node v_{P_1} (state: active) and edge $(v_{\text{start}}, v_{P_1})$ to G .
3. **Critique**: The LLM predicts **<critic>** and generates a critique C_1 evaluating P_1 . This adds node v_{C_1} and edge (v_{P_1}, v_{C_1}) . Based on C_1 's content, $\text{state}(v)_{P_1}$ is updated to 'validated' or 'invalidated'.

4. **Continuation (Branching/Refinement/Exploration):** Based on the history (including C_1 and the state of v_{P_1}), the LLM predicts the next role token:
 - If v_{P_1} was validated: The LLM might predict `<proposer>` to generate P_2 building upon P_1 (adding v_{P_2} , edge (v_{P_1}, v_{P_2})), or predict `<summarizer>` if P_1 is sufficient.
 - If v_{P_1} was invalidated by C_1 : The LLM might predict `<proposer>` to generate a refined proposition P'_1 addressing the critique C_1 (adding $v_{P'_1}$, edge $(v_{C_1}, v_{P'_1})$, potentially also a contextual edge like $(v_{P_1}, v_{P'_1})$). Or, it might backtrack and predict `<proposer>` to generate an alternative proposition P_3 stemming from an earlier node (e.g., v_{start}), adding v_{P_3} and edge $(v_{\text{start}}, v_{P_3})$.
5. **Iteration:** Steps 2-4 repeat, progressively extending the DAG with new proposition, critique, and refinement nodes and their connecting edges. The inherent structure of the generation ensures acyclicity: critiques target existing nodes, refinements respond to critiques, and new proposals branch from existing nodes.
6. **Summarization:** Eventually, the LLM predicts `<summarizer>`. It accesses the preceding context H_{t-1} (representing the constructed DAG), identifies the nodes marked 'validated' (e.g., $v_{P'_1}, v_{P_k}, \dots$), implicitly performs a topological aggregation of their content respecting dependencies, and generates the final synthesized output S . This adds the summarizer node v_S and relevant incoming edges (e.g., $(v_{P'_1}, v_S), (v_{P_k}, v_S)$).

This process yields a structured, interpretable trace of the reasoning process, captured within the generated sequence and the implicit DAG structure.

3.3 Algorithmic Sketch and State Representation

Algorithm 1 provides a high-level sketch of the DoT generation process. A crucial aspect is that the state of the reasoning process, including the partially constructed DAG and the status of its nodes (active, validated, invalidated), is not maintained by an external controller but is implicitly encoded within the auto-regressive history $H_t = w_1, \dots, w_t$. The LLM conditions its prediction of the next token w_{t+1} (be it a role token or a content word) on this entire history, effectively using its internal state to represent the current state of the DoT graph traversal and construction.

3.4 Training and Inference

Training: The DoT capability is instilled in the LLM LM through fine-tuning on datasets formatted according to the DoT structure. Such data consists of sequences $H = w_1, \dots, w_T$ containing appropriately interleaved role tokens (T_{roles}) and natural language text segments, representing valid, coherent reasoning DAGs. Potential data sources include:

- Curated examples derived from human step-by-step reasoning traces, augmented with role tokens.
- Synthetically generated examples from structured problem-solving processes (e.g., program execution traces, mathematical proofs).
- Bootstrapped data generated by an initial version of a DoT model, potentially filtered or refined based on correctness or coherence metrics.

Algorithm 1 Diagram of Thought (DoT) Generation Process

```
1: Input: Problem statement  $\mathcal{P}$ 
2: Initialize history  $H \leftarrow \langle \text{problem} \rangle \mathcal{P}$ 
3: Initialize active nodes  $V_{\text{active}} \leftarrow \{v_{\text{start}}\}$  (representing  $\mathcal{P}$ )
4: Initialize validated nodes  $V_{\text{validated}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
5: Initialize DAG  $G = (\{v_{\text{start}}\}, \emptyset)$ 
6: while termination condition not met (e.g., max length,  $\langle \text{summarizer} \rangle$  generated) do
7:   Predict next token role  $r \in T_{\text{roles}}$  based on  $H$ :  $r \sim \text{LM}(H)$ 
8:    $H \leftarrow H \oplus r$ 
9:   if  $r = \langle \text{proposer} \rangle$  then
10:    Select dependency node(s)  $U \subseteq V_{\text{active}} \cup V_{\text{validated}}$  (implicitly chosen by LLM context)
11:    Generate proposition text  $P_i$ :  $P_i \sim \text{LM}(H)$ 
12:     $H \leftarrow H \oplus P_i$ 
13:    Add node  $v_{P_i}$  to  $G$ , add edges  $(u, v_{P_i})$  for  $u \in U$ . Mark  $v_{P_i}$  as active.
14:     $V_{\text{active}} \leftarrow V_{\text{active}} \cup \{v_{P_i}\}$ 
15:   else if  $r = \langle \text{critic} \rangle$  then
16:    Select proposition node  $v_{P_j} \in V_{\text{active}}$  to critique (implicitly chosen by LLM context)
17:    Generate critique text  $C_j$ :  $C_j \sim \text{LM}(H)$ 
18:     $H \leftarrow H \oplus C_j$ 
19:    Add node  $v_{C_j}$  to  $G$ , add edge  $(v_{P_j}, v_{C_j})$ .
20:    if  $C_j$  indicates  $P_j$  is valid then
21:      Mark  $v_{P_j}$  as validated.  $V_{\text{validated}} \leftarrow V_{\text{validated}} \cup \{v_{P_j}\}$ .  $V_{\text{active}} \leftarrow V_{\text{active}} \setminus \{v_{P_j}\}$ .
22:    else  $\{C_j$  indicates  $P_j$  is flawed $\}$ 
23:      Mark  $v_{P_j}$  as invalidated.  $V_{\text{active}} \leftarrow V_{\text{active}} \setminus \{v_{P_j}\}$ . Node  $v_{C_j}$  becomes potential dependency for refinement.
24:    end if
25:   else if  $r = \langle \text{summarizer} \rangle$  then
26:    Select input nodes  $U_{\text{sum}} \subseteq V_{\text{validated}}$  (implicitly chosen by LLM context)
27:    Generate summary text  $S$ :  $S \sim \text{LM}(H)$ 
28:     $H \leftarrow H \oplus S$ 
29:    Add node  $v_S$  to  $G$ , add edges  $(u, v_S)$  for  $u \in U_{\text{sum}}$ .
30:    Set termination condition to true.
31:   end if
32: end while
33: Output: Final text  $S$  from the summarizer node  $v_S$  (or the full history  $H$  representing the DAG).
```

The training objective is the standard auto-regressive language modeling loss (e.g., cross-entropy) applied over the entire sequence, including both the role tokens and the content tokens:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = -\frac{1}{|H|} \sum_{t=1}^{|H|} \log P(w_t | w_1, \dots, w_{t-1}; \theta).$$

This objective trains the model LM to simultaneously learn the reasoning patterns associated with each role (proposing, critiquing, summarizing) and the appropriate transitions between these roles

(predicting the next role token) based on the context, thereby internalizing the ability to construct and navigate the DoT graph structure.

Inference: To solve a new problem \mathcal{P} using DoT, inference proceeds as follows:

1. Initialize the generation history H with the problem statement, e.g., $H = \langle \text{problem} \rangle \mathcal{P}$.
2. Perform auto-regressive generation using the trained LLM LM. At each step t , sample or select the next token $w_t \sim \text{LM}(H_{t-1})$ using a chosen decoding strategy (e.g., greedy decoding, nucleus sampling, beam search).
3. Append the generated token w_t to the history: $H_t = H_{t-1} \oplus w_t$.
4. Repeat step 2 and 3 until a termination condition is met. Common conditions include:
 - Generation of the `<summarizer>` token and its subsequent content.
 - Reaching a predefined maximum sequence length.
 - Generation of a specific end-of-sequence token.

The final output is typically the textual content associated with the `<summarizer>` node, although the complete generated sequence H provides the full reasoning trace (the serialized DoT graph) for interpretability. Notably, this entire process is self-contained within the single LLM LM; no external graph management system or separate controller module is required during inference.

4 Topos-Theoretic Formalization of DoT

While the operational description in Section 3 details the DoT mechanism, establishing its logical soundness and robustness requires a deeper, formal framework. We leverage **Topos Theory** (MacLane & Moerdijk, 2012; Johnstone, 2002; Lambek & Scott, 1988), a branch of category theory providing powerful tools for modeling logic, computation, and varying contexts. Topoi serve as mathematical universes generalizing the category of sets (Set) and possess sufficient internal structure to interpret higher-order intuitionistic logic. This makes them exceptionally suitable for formalizing the dynamic, evidence-aggregating, and context-dependent reasoning inherent in the DoT process.

4.1 Topoi as Semantic Frameworks for Evolving Knowledge

An elementary topos \mathcal{E} is a category that encapsulates key properties needed for modeling logical systems and computation:

1. **Finite Limits:** \mathcal{E} has a terminal object 1 , binary products $A \times B$, and pullbacks. This allows for combining and constraining information.
2. **Cartesian Closure:** For any objects $A, B \in \mathcal{E}$, there exists an exponential object B^A , representing the internal collection of morphisms $A \rightarrow B$. This enables modeling functions, predicates, and higher-order logic.
3. **Subobject Classifier Ω :** There exists an object Ω and a monomorphism $\top : 1 \hookrightarrow \Omega$ ('true') such that every monomorphism $m : S \hookrightarrow A$ (a subobject, representing a property or subset) corresponds uniquely to a characteristic morphism $\chi_m : A \rightarrow \Omega$ via a pullback diagram. Ω internalizes the logic of the topos, which is generally a Heyting algebra, supporting intuitionistic reasoning. The map $\perp : 0 \rightarrow \Omega$ classifies the initial object 0 , representing 'false' or contradiction.

Crucially for DoT, many relevant topoi, particularly **presheaf topoi** $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}$ (functors from a small category \mathcal{C}^{op} to \mathbf{Set}), possess not only finite limits but *all small colimits*. The category \mathcal{C} can often be interpreted as representing stages, contexts, possible worlds, or information sources, making presheaf topoi ideal for modeling evolving knowledge states. Colimits provide the canonical mechanism for synthesizing or "gluing together" information distributed across different stages or nodes according to their specified relationships.

We propose that the DoT reasoning process corresponds to constructing a diagram within a suitable topos \mathcal{E} , such as a presheaf topos $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}$ where \mathcal{C} captures the temporal or dependency structure of the reasoning steps.

Definition 4.1 (Categorical Semantics of DoT Components). Within a chosen topos \mathcal{E} (e.g., $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}$):

- **Semantic Space (S):** A base object $S \in \mathcal{E}$, representing the universe of discourse or state space relevant to the problem. In a presheaf topos, $S : \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ could assign a set of possible states $S(c)$ to each context $c \in \mathcal{C}$.
- **Propositions (P):** A proposition generated by $\langle \text{proposer} \rangle$ is interpreted semantically as a **subobject** $P \hookrightarrow S$, representing the "extent" within S where the proposition holds. Equivalently, via the subobject classifier, P corresponds to its characteristic map $\chi_P : S \rightarrow \Omega$.
- **Logical Dependency/Entailment:** A dependency where proposition Q logically follows from P is modeled by the requirement that P is a subobject of Q , denoted $P \leq Q$ in the lattice of subobjects of S . Equivalently, this corresponds to $\chi_P \leq \chi_Q$ in the internal Heyting algebra logic of $\text{hom}(S, \Omega)$. This relationship might be represented by a specific morphism in the reasoning diagram.
- **Critique (C):** A critique C of a proposition P involves generating semantic content (represented by an object $D_C(v_C) \in \mathcal{E}$) that assesses P . A successful critique demonstrating P 's invalidity corresponds semantically to establishing that P entails falsity, i.e., $P \leq 0$ (where $0 \hookrightarrow S$ is the initial subobject, characterized by $\perp : S \rightarrow \Omega$). That is, the critique provides evidence or constructs a proof within the topos's logic demonstrating $P \vdash \perp$. Validation of P corresponds to demonstrating its consistency ($P \not\leq 0$) or its entailment from previously validated premises.
- **Refinement ($P \rightsquigarrow P'$):** When a critique C invalidates P , a refinement step generates a new proposition P' (subobject $P' \hookrightarrow S$). Semantically, P' should incorporate the valid aspects of P while respecting the constraints imposed by C . This often involves constructing P' using limit or colimit constructions based on P and the semantic content of C . For example, P' might be a subobject $P' \leq P$ satisfying additional properties derived from C , perhaps constructed via a pullback.

4.2 The Reasoning Diagram and its Synthesis via Colimit

The DoT-DAG $G = (V, E)$ generated during the reasoning process naturally specifies the shape of a diagram within the semantic topos \mathcal{E} .

Definition 4.2 (DoT Index Category \mathcal{J}_G). Given a DoT DAG $G = (V, E)$, its corresponding **index category**, denoted \mathcal{J}_G , is the small category whose objects are the vertices V of G . A morphism $m : u \rightarrow v$ in \mathcal{J}_G exists if and only if there is a directed path from u to v in G . Composition of morphisms is given by path concatenation. The identity morphism $\text{id}_v : v \rightarrow v$ corresponds to the zero-length path at v . Since G is a DAG, \mathcal{J}_G contains no non-trivial cycles.

Theorem 4.3 (DoT Process as Diagram Construction). A DoT reasoning process generating DAG $G = (V, E)$ defines a functor (a diagram) $D_G : \mathcal{J}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, where \mathcal{E} is the semantic topos. This functor maps:

- Each node $v \in (\mathcal{J}_G) = V$ to an object $D_G(v) \in \mathcal{E}$, representing the semantic content of node v as interpreted by Definition 4.1.
- Each edge $(u, v) \in E$, corresponding to a generating morphism $m_{uv} : u \rightarrow v$ in \mathcal{J}_G , to a morphism $D_G(m_{uv}) : D_G(u) \rightarrow D_G(v)$ in \mathcal{E} . This morphism represents the specific semantic dependency (e.g., entailment, refinement source, critique target linkage) between the content of u and v .

The functoriality condition ensures that composite dependencies (paths) are respected semantically: $D_G(m_{vw} \circ m_{uv}) = D_G(m_{vw}) \circ D_G(m_{uv})$.

Proof Sketch. The construction assigns semantic objects $D_G(v)$ to nodes v per Definition 4.1. For each edge (u, v) representing a fundamental dependency, a corresponding morphism $D_G(m_{uv})$ in \mathcal{E} is assigned, capturing that semantic link. For paths $u \rightarrow v \rightarrow w$, the composite morphism $m_{vw} \circ m_{uv}$ is mapped to the composite morphism $D_G(m_{vw}) \circ D_G(m_{uv})$ by definition. Identity paths map to identity morphisms. The structure preservation (functoriality) holds by this construction, ensuring the diagram D_G faithfully reflects the structure of the reasoning graph G in the semantic topos \mathcal{E} . (See Appendix A.1 for the full proof). \square

The `<summarizer>` role aims to aggregate the validated conclusions derived during the reasoning process coherently. In category theory, the **colimit** is the universal construction for such synthesis, combining objects according to the relationships specified by a diagram.

Theorem 4.4 (Summarization as Colimit Construction). Let $D_G : \mathcal{J}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be the diagram representing a DoT process in a topos \mathcal{E} that possesses all small colimits (e.g., $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{Set}^{\text{cop}}$). Let $V_{\text{valid}} \subseteq V$ be the subset of nodes representing validated propositions and reasoning steps intended for synthesis. Let $\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}$ be the full subcategory of \mathcal{J}_G induced by V_{valid} , and let $D_{\text{valid}} : \mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be the restriction of D_G to this subcategory. The semantic content of the ideal synthesized summary corresponds precisely to the **colimit** of this sub-diagram:

$$S_{\text{summary}} := \text{colim } D_{\text{valid}} = \varinjlim_{v \in (\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}})} D_G(v). \quad (4.1)$$

The colimit object $S_{\text{summary}} \in \mathcal{E}$, together with the canonical cocone morphisms $\iota_v : D_G(v) \rightarrow S_{\text{summary}}$ for $v \in V_{\text{valid}}$, represents the universal aggregation of information from the validated nodes, respecting their interdependencies as encoded in the diagram D_{valid} .

Proof Sketch. The colimit S_{summary} is defined by its universal property: it is an object equipped with morphisms $\iota_v : D_G(v) \rightarrow S_{\text{summary}}$ for all $v \in V_{\text{valid}}$, such that these morphisms are compatible with the diagram's structure (i.e., for any $m_{uv} : u \rightarrow v$ in $\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}$, $\iota_v \circ D_G(m_{uv}) = \iota_u$). Furthermore, S_{summary} is the "most efficient" such object: any other object X receiving compatible maps $f_v : D_G(v) \rightarrow X$ must factor uniquely through S_{summary} via a map $h : S_{\text{summary}} \rightarrow X$. This universality precisely captures the essence of summarization: integrating all validated information ($D_G(v)$ via ι_v), preserving consistency by respecting dependencies (commutativity condition), and providing the most concise synthesis (unique factorization). The existence of the colimit is guaranteed in topoi like $\mathbf{Set}^{\text{cop}}$. (See Appendix A.2 for the full proof). \square

4.3 Formal Guarantees: Consistency and Robustness

The topos framework allows for proving formal properties of the DoT process, particularly regarding the logical consistency and robustness of the synthesized result.

Theorem 4.5 (Consistency Guarantee via Ideal Critique). Assume the `<critic>` role functions ideally within the DoT process, meaning that if a generated proposition P (corresponding to semantic object $D_G(v)$) is inconsistent within the topos logic (i.e., $D_G(v) \cong 0$, the initial object in \mathcal{E} , representing semantic contradiction), then the critique mechanism ensures that this node v is not included in the set V_{valid} used for synthesis. If the initial problem statement and axioms (represented by the diagram's sources) are consistent, and if V_{valid} is non-empty, then the resulting synthesized summary $S_{\text{summary}} = \text{colim } D_{\text{valid}}$ is also consistent (i.e., $S_{\text{summary}} \not\cong 0$).

Proof Sketch. The proof leverages properties of colimits in topoi, particularly in presheaf topoi $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}$. In such topoi, the initial object 0 is the presheaf assigning the empty set to every context $c \in \mathcal{C}$. Colimits are computed pointwise. The ideal critique ensures all $D_G(v)$ for $v \in V_{\text{valid}}$ are non-initial ($D_G(v) \not\cong 0$). Since V_{valid} is non-empty, there exists $v_0 \in V_{\text{valid}}$. As $D_G(v_0) \not\cong 0$, there exists some context $c_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ where $D_G(v_0)(c_0) \neq \emptyset$. The colimit $S_{\text{summary}}(c_0) = \text{colim}_{v \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}} (D_G(v)(c_0))$ in \mathbf{Set} is taken over a diagram containing at least one non-empty set, indexed by a non-empty category $\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}$. Such a colimit in \mathbf{Set} is non-empty. Since $S_{\text{summary}}(c_0) \neq \emptyset$ for some c_0 , the object S_{summary} is not initial ($S_{\text{summary}} \not\cong 0$). (See Appendix A.3 for the full proof). \square

Remark 4.6 (Internal Logic and Heyting Algebra). The internal logic of the topos \mathcal{E} , captured by the subobject classifier Ω and its associated Heyting algebra structure on $\text{hom}(X, \Omega)$, governs entailment (\leq) and consistency ($\not\cong 0$, or equivalently $\chi_A \neq \perp$). Negation $\neg P$ is defined as $P \implies \perp$. Theorem 4.5 essentially states that if the critique mechanism correctly identifies and excludes nodes v for which $D_G(v) \vdash \perp$ holds internally, the synthesis step (colimit) preserves consistency, inheriting it from the validated (non-contradictory) components.

The universality of the colimit construction also implies robustness: the semantic result of the synthesis should be invariant under superficial variations in the reasoning process that preserve the essential logical structure.

Theorem 4.7 (Robustness via Universality of Colimit). Let $D_{\text{valid},1} : \mathcal{J}_{\text{valid},1} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ and $D_{\text{valid},2} : \mathcal{J}_{\text{valid},2} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be two diagrams representing the validated reasoning steps from potentially different DoT runs (e.g., using different phrasing, exploring slightly different but logically equivalent paths). If these diagrams are naturally isomorphic—meaning there exists an isomorphism of categories $\phi : \mathcal{J}_{\text{valid},1} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{J}_{\text{valid},2}$ and a natural isomorphism $\eta : D_{\text{valid},1} \Rightarrow D_{\text{valid},2} \circ \phi$ relating the functors—then their colimits are isomorphic in \mathcal{E} :

$$\text{colim } D_{\text{valid},1} \cong \text{colim } D_{\text{valid},2}.$$

This implies that the synthesized semantic content S_{summary} depends fundamentally on the abstract structure of the validated reasoning diagram, not on incidental variations that preserve this structure.

Proof Sketch. This is a fundamental property of colimits in category theory. An isomorphism between diagrams (given by ϕ and η) induces a canonical isomorphism between their respective colimits. The proof involves constructing maps $h : \text{colim } D_1 \rightarrow \text{colim } D_2$ and $k : \text{colim } D_2 \rightarrow \text{colim } D_1$

using the universal properties of the colimits and the components of the natural isomorphism η and its inverse. One then shows that $k \circ h$ and $h \circ k$ are identity morphisms, establishing the isomorphism $\text{colim } D_1 \cong \text{colim } D_2$. (See Appendix A.4 for the full proof). \square

4.4 Bridging Formalism and LLM Generation

It is crucial to understand the relationship between this formal topos-theoretic model and the actual behavior of an LLM executing the DoT process. The LLM does not explicitly perform computations within a topos (e.g., calculate colimits algebraically or manipulate subobject lattices). Instead:

- The topos framework provides the **normative semantic model**. It defines what constitutes sound, consistent, and robust reasoning synthesis in this context. Theorems 4.4, 4.5, and 4.7 describe desirable properties of an ideal reasoning and synthesis process modeled this way.
- The LLM, trained on DoT-structured data via the standard auto-regressive objective (Section 3.4), learns to generate text sequences conditioned on role tokens (`<proposer>`, `<critic>`, `<summarizer>`) that **functionally approximate** the roles and operations described by the formalism.
- Specifically, the `<summarizer>` role learns, through exposure to training examples, to generate text that effectively acts like a colimit: it synthesizes information present in validated precursor nodes identified in the context (history), implicitly respects the dependencies encoded therein (the DAG structure), and aims for a coherent, non-redundant aggregation expressed in natural language.
- The fidelity of the LLM’s approximation to these formal operations depends heavily on the quality, quantity, and diversity of the training data, as well as the inherent capacity of the language model architecture. The topos model provides a precise target against which the LLM’s reasoning behavior can be evaluated and potentially improved.

This topos-theoretic formalism, therefore, offers a rigorous language for defining correctness criteria and provides a strong theoretical foundation for the DoT framework’s goals of achieving consistent and robust complex reasoning, even though the practical implementation relies on the learned generative capabilities of LLMs.

5 Conclusion

This paper introduced the Diagram of Thought (DoT), a framework that internalizes complex reasoning as DAG construction within a single auto-regressive LLM, guided by role-specific tokens. We demonstrated how DoT unifies proposition generation, critique, refinement, and summarization into a self-orchestrated process. Furthermore, we established a rigorous formalization using Topos Theory, proving that the synthesis step corresponds to computing the colimit of the underlying reasoning diagram, thereby providing guarantees of logical consistency.

This topos-theoretic perspective provides several key benefits for understanding and grounding the DoT framework:

- **Semantic Precision:** Assigns clear mathematical meaning (objects, subobjects, morphisms, diagrams, colimits in a topos \mathcal{E}) to the components and operations within the DoT process.
- **Consistency Guarantees:** Formalizes the conditions under which the synthesis step preserves logical consistency, relying on effective critique (Theorem 4.5).

- **Robustness Guarantees:** Demonstrates that the semantic outcome of synthesis is invariant under representational variations that preserve the underlying logical structure of the reasoning (Theorem 4.7).
- **Principled Foundation:** Grounds the DoT framework in established, powerful mathematical structures designed for modeling logic, computation, and evolving contexts, moving beyond purely heuristic descriptions.
- **Framework for Analysis and Verification:** Opens potential pathways for analyzing the properties of the reasoning process modeled by the diagram D_G using the rich internal logic and tools available within the topos \mathcal{E} .

The key advantages of DoT thus include its architectural simplicity (eliminating external controllers or multi-agent systems), its enhanced interpretability via the explicit reasoning graph, and crucially, its strong theoretical underpinnings. By embedding DoT within Topos Theory and bridging a practical LLM mechanism with formal mathematical structures, we substantiate its claims of logical coherence and robustness, offering a more principled approach to complex reasoning compared to purely heuristic methods and paving the way for developing more reliable, interpretable, and potentially verifiable complex reasoning capabilities in large language models.

DoT opens several avenues for future research. Exploring different categories \mathcal{C} for the presheaf topos $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}$ could tailor the internal logic to specific reasoning domains. Developing efficient training methodologies specifically for DoT structures, potentially involving reinforcement learning or curated reasoning traces, is crucial for practical deployment. Investigating the scalability of DoT for very deep or broad reasoning graphs warrants attention. Finally, the formal verification potential offered by the topos framework could be exploited in safety-critical applications requiring provable reasoning steps. Diagram of Thought represents a significant step toward building more autonomous, reliable, and verifiable reasoning capabilities directly into the next generation of language models.

References

- Maciej Besta, Nils Blach, Ales Kubicek, Robert Gerstenberger, Michal Podstawski, Lukas Gianinazzi, Joanna Gajda, Tomasz Lehmann, Hubert Niewiadomski, Piotr Nyczyk, et al. Graph of thoughts: Solving elaborate problems with large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pp. 17682–17690, 2024.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- Jie Huang and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. Towards reasoning in large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10403*, 2022.
- Peter T Johnstone. *Sketches of an Elephant: A Topos Theory Compendium: Volume 2*, volume 2. Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large

- language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 22199–22213, 2022.
- Joachim Lambek and Philip J Scott. *Introduction to higher-order categorical logic*, volume 7. Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Saunders MacLane and Ieke Moerdijk. *Sheaves in geometry and logic: A first introduction to topos theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17651*, 2023.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*, 2022.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11903*, 2022.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10601*, 2023.
- Yang Yuan. On the power of foundation models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 40519–40530. PMLR, 2023.
- Yifan Zhang, Jingqin Yang, Yang Yuan, and Andrew Chi-Chih Yao. Cumulative reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.04371*, 2023.

A Detailed Proofs of Theorems

This appendix provides detailed proofs for the theorems presented in Section 4, establishing the formal connection between the Diagram of Thought framework and Topos Theory. We assume familiarity with basic concepts from category theory and topos theory, as found in standard references like (MacLane & Moerdijk, 2012; Johnstone, 2002). Let \mathcal{E} be an elementary topos, frequently assumed to possess all small colimits (e.g., a presheaf topos $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}$).

A.1 Proof of Theorem 4.3 (DoT Process as Diagram Construction)

Theorem 4.3. *A DoT reasoning process generating DAG $G = (V, E)$ defines a functor (a diagram) $D_G : \mathcal{J}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, where \mathcal{E} is the semantic topos. This functor maps objects $v \in (\mathcal{J}_G)$ to semantic objects $D_G(v) \in \mathcal{E}$ and generating morphisms $m_{uv} : u \rightarrow v$ in \mathcal{J}_G (edges in G) to dependency morphisms $D_G(m_{uv}) : D_G(u) \rightarrow D_G(v)$ in \mathcal{E} .*

Proof. We construct the functor $D_G : \mathcal{J}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ and verify its functoriality.

1. **Index Category \mathcal{J}_G :** As defined in Definition 4.2, the category \mathcal{J}_G has objects $(\mathcal{J}_G) = V$. Morphisms $m : u \rightarrow v$ correspond to directed paths from u to v in the DAG G . Composition is path concatenation, and identity morphisms $\text{id}_v : v \rightarrow v$ are zero-length paths. Since G is a DAG, \mathcal{J}_G is a well-defined small category (assuming V is finite or countably infinite, which is typical).
2. **Action on Objects:** For each object $v \in V = (\mathcal{J}_G)$, we define $D_G(v)$ to be the semantic interpretation of the node v within the topos \mathcal{E} , following the rules specified in Definition 4.1. This assigns a specific object in \mathcal{E} (e.g., a subobject $P \hookrightarrow S$ representing a proposition, or an object embodying the semantic content of a critique) to each node based on its role and generated text content.
3. **Action on Morphisms:** For each edge $(u, v) \in E$, which corresponds to a generating morphism $m_{uv} : u \rightarrow v$ in \mathcal{J}_G , we define $D_G(m_{uv}) : D_G(u) \rightarrow D_G(v)$ as the specific morphism in \mathcal{E} that represents the semantic relationship or dependency established by that edge. Examples include: if v is a proposition logically entailed by u , $D_G(m_{uv})$ could be the monomorphism $D_G(u) \hookrightarrow D_G(v)$ (if interpreting as subobjects); if v is a critique of u , $D_G(m_{uv})$ might be a map relating the proposition object $D_G(u)$ to the critique content object $D_G(v)$. The exact nature of this morphism is determined by the semantic interpretation scheme (Definition 4.1).

For the identity morphism $\text{id}_v : v \rightarrow v$ in \mathcal{J}_G , corresponding to the zero-length path at v , we define $D_G(\text{id}_v) = \text{id}_{D_G(v)}$, the identity morphism on the object $D_G(v)$ in the topos \mathcal{E} .

A general morphism $m : x \rightarrow y$ in \mathcal{J}_G corresponds to a path $x \xrightarrow{e_1} v_1 \xrightarrow{e_2} \dots \xrightarrow{e_k} y$ in G , where each e_i is an edge. This path corresponds to the composition $m = m_{e_k} \circ \dots \circ m_{e_1}$ in \mathcal{J}_G . We define the action of D_G on this composite morphism using composition in the target category \mathcal{E} :

$$D_G(m) := D_G(m_{e_k}) \circ \dots \circ D_G(m_{e_1}).$$

This definition is unambiguous because composition in \mathcal{E} is associative. Since G is a DAG, paths between two nodes are unique in the category \mathcal{J}_G if \mathcal{J}_G is simply the path category. If multiple paths exist, the semantic interpretation should ideally ensure that D_G applied to different paths yields the same composite morphism in \mathcal{E} , though this depends on the specifics of the semantic assignment. For simplicity, we often consider the category freely generated by the DAG.

4. **Verification of Functoriality:** We must check that D_G preserves identities and composition.

By definition (3b), $D_G(\text{id}_v) = \text{id}_{D_G(v)}$. Identities are preserved.

Let $m_1 : u \rightarrow v$ and $m_2 : v \rightarrow w$ be two morphisms (paths) in \mathcal{J}_G . Let $m_1 = m_{e_k} \circ \dots \circ m_{e_1}$ and $m_2 = m_{f_l} \circ \dots \circ m_{f_1}$ be their decomposition into generating edge morphisms. Their composition in \mathcal{J}_G is $m_2 \circ m_1 : u \rightarrow w$, corresponding to the concatenated path, represented as $m_{f_l} \circ \dots \circ m_{f_1} \circ m_{e_k} \circ \dots \circ m_{e_1}$.

Applying D_G according to definition (3c):

$$\begin{aligned} D_G(m_2 \circ m_1) &= D_G(m_{f_l} \circ \dots \circ m_{f_1} \circ m_{e_k} \circ \dots \circ m_{e_1}) \\ &= D_G(m_{f_l}) \circ \dots \circ D_G(m_{f_1}) \circ D_G(m_{e_k}) \circ \dots \circ D_G(m_{e_1}) \\ [\text{Associativity in } \mathcal{E}] \quad &= (D_G(m_{f_l}) \circ \dots \circ D_G(m_{f_1})) \circ (D_G(m_{e_k}) \circ \dots \circ D_G(m_{e_1})) \\ &= D_G(m_2) \circ D_G(m_1) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, D_G preserves composition.

Since D_G maps objects of \mathcal{J}_G to objects of \mathcal{E} and morphisms of \mathcal{J}_G to morphisms of \mathcal{E} while preserving identities and composition, D_G is a functor $D_G : \mathcal{J}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 4.4 (Summarization as Colimit Construction)

Theorem 4.4. Let $D_G : \mathcal{J}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be the diagram for a DoT process in a topos \mathcal{E} with all small colimits. Let $V_{\text{valid}} \subseteq V$ induce the subcategory $\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}$ and sub-diagram $D_{\text{valid}} : \mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$. The semantic content of the ideal synthesized summary corresponds to $S_{\text{summary}} = \text{colim } D_{\text{valid}}$.

Proof. $\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}$ is the full subcategory of \mathcal{J}_G whose objects are the nodes in V_{valid} . Since \mathcal{J}_G is small, $\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}$ is also small. By assumption, the topos \mathcal{E} has all small colimits. Therefore, the colimit $S_{\text{summary}} := \text{colim}_{\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}} D_{\text{valid}}$ exists in \mathcal{E} .

We need to argue that this colimit object, defined by its universal property, captures the essence of ideal summarization or synthesis.


1. The Colimit Definition (Universal Property): The colimit S_{summary} of the diagram $D_{\text{valid}} : \mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ consists of:

- An object $S_{\text{summary}} \in \mathcal{E}$.
- A family of morphisms $\{\iota_v : D_G(v) \rightarrow S_{\text{summary}}\}_{v \in (\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}})}$, called the *cocone* morphisms. These morphisms must satisfy the *cocone condition*: for every morphism $m_{uv} : u \rightarrow v$ in $\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}$, the following diagram must commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D_G(u) & \xrightarrow{D_G(m_{uv})} & D_G(v) \\ & \searrow \iota_u \quad \swarrow \iota_v & \\ & S_{\text{summary}} & \end{array}$$

That is, $\iota_v \circ D_G(m_{uv}) = \iota_u$.

- This cocone $(\{\iota_v\}_v, S_{\text{summary}})$ must be *universal*: for any other object $X \in \mathcal{E}$ equipped with a cocone $\{f_v : D_G(v) \rightarrow X\}_{v \in (\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}})}$ satisfying the same cocone condition ($f_v \circ D_G(m_{uv}) = f_u$), there exists a **unique** morphism $h : S_{\text{summary}} \rightarrow X$ such that $f_v = h \circ \iota_v$ for all $v \in (\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}})$.



2. Matching the Universal Property to Summarization Goals: We argue that this definition precisely formalizes the requirements of an ideal synthesis (summarization) of the validated information represented by the diagram D_{valid} .

The existence of the morphisms $\iota_v : D_G(v) \rightarrow S_{\text{summary}}$ for every validated node v ensures that the information content of each $D_G(v)$ is mapped into, or contributes to, the synthesized object S_{summary} . No validated piece is ignored.

The cocone condition $\iota_v \circ D_G(m_{uv}) = \iota_u$ is crucial. It guarantees that the way information from u and v is integrated into S_{summary} respects the semantic dependency $D_G(m_{uv})$ between them. If v depends on u , the contribution of u to the summary (ι_u) must be consistent with the contribution of v (ι_v) when viewed through the lens of their dependency $D_G(m_{uv})$. This prevents contradictions arising from inconsistent merging and ensures the summary reflects the logical structure of the validated reasoning steps.

The universal property ensures that S_{summary} is the "best" possible synthesis in a precise sense. It contains exactly the information required to represent the coherent fusion of all $D_G(v)$'s according to the diagram structure, and no more. Any other object X that also achieves coherent integration (i.e., admits a cocone $\{f_v\}$) must necessarily contain the structure present in S_{summary} , as evidenced by the unique factorization map $h : S_{\text{summary}} \rightarrow X$. The colimit avoids redundancy by "gluing" the objects $D_G(v)$ together along their shared dependencies (as specified by the morphisms $D_G(m_{uv})$). It represents the most general, yet consistent, conclusion derivable from the validated premises $D_G(v)$ and their relationships.

In conclusion, the colimit $\text{colim } D_{\text{valid}}$ provides the canonical categorical construction that perfectly embodies the requirements of synthesizing distributed, interdependent, validated units of information ($D_G(v)$ for $v \in V_{\text{valid}}$) into a single, coherent, and optimally concise result (S_{summary}), respecting all the structural relationships encoded in the diagram D_{valid} . It serves as the formal semantic target for the operation performed by the `<summarizer>` role in the DoT framework. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 4.5 (Consistency Guarantee via Ideal Critique)

Theorem 4.5. Assume ideal critique excludes inconsistent nodes v (where $D_G(v) \cong 0$) from V_{valid} . If V_{valid} is non-empty and the base assumptions (sources of the diagram D_{valid}) are consistent, then $S_{\text{summary}} = \text{colim } D_{\text{valid}}$ is consistent ($S_{\text{summary}} \not\cong 0$).

Proof. Let \mathcal{E} be the semantic topos, assumed to have all small colimits and an initial object 0 . An object $A \in \mathcal{E}$ is *inconsistent* if $A \cong 0$, and *consistent* otherwise ($A \not\cong 0$).

The assumptions are: 1. Ideal Critique: For all $v \in V_{\text{valid}}$, $D_G(v) \not\cong 0$. 2. Non-empty Basis: $V_{\text{valid}} \neq \emptyset$. 3. We aim to show $S_{\text{summary}} = \text{colim}_{\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}} D_{\text{valid}} \not\cong 0$.

We utilize the property that colimits interact well with the initial object. Specifically, the functor $\text{hom}(0, -) : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ preserves colimits (as 0 is initial, $\text{hom}(0, X)$ is always a singleton set $\{!\}$, where $!$ is the unique map $0 \rightarrow X$, provided $X \not\cong 0$. If $X \cong 0$, $\text{hom}(0, 0)$ contains id_0 . For $X \not\cong 0$, $\text{hom}(0, X)$ is non-empty). A more direct argument, especially useful in presheaf topoi, is often clearer.

Let's work within a presheaf topos $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}$, which is a standard choice where existence of colimits is guaranteed and their computation is well-understood.

- The initial object $0 \in \mathcal{E}$ is the constant presheaf mapping every object $c \in \mathcal{C}$ to the empty set $\emptyset \in \mathbf{Set}$.
- An object $F \in \mathcal{E}$ is initial ($F \cong 0$) if and only if $F(c) = \emptyset$ for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$.
- Colimits in $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}$ are computed pointwise. That is, for any diagram $D : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, the colimit object $(\text{colim}_{\mathcal{J}} D) \in \mathcal{E}$ is the presheaf defined by:

$$(\text{colim}_{\mathcal{J}} D)(c) := \text{colim}_{\mathcal{J}} (D(-)(c)) \quad \text{for each } c \in \mathcal{C}$$

where the colimit on the right-hand side is taken in the category of Sets (\mathbf{Set}) over the diagram of sets $v \mapsto D(v)(c)$.

Now, let's apply this to $S_{\text{summary}} = \text{colim } D_{\text{valid}}$. We want to show $S_{\text{summary}} \not\cong 0$. This means we need to show that there exists at least one $c \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $S_{\text{summary}}(c) \neq \emptyset$.

By assumption (2), V_{valid} is non-empty. Let $v_0 \in V_{\text{valid}}$. By assumption (1), $D_G(v_0) \not\cong 0$. Since $D_G(v_0)$ is a presheaf (an object in $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}$), this non-initiality implies that there must exist at least one object $c_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that the set $D_G(v_0)(c_0)$ is non-empty.

Now, consider the computation of the colimit S_{summary} evaluated at this specific context c_0 :

$$S_{\text{summary}}(c_0) = (\text{colim}_{\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}} D_{\text{valid}})(c_0) = \text{colim}_{v \in (\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}})} (D_G(v)(c_0))$$

This right-hand side is a colimit in the category \mathbf{Set} . The diagram over which this colimit is taken is $v \mapsto D_G(v)(c_0)$ for $v \in (\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}})$, with morphisms induced by $D_G(m_{uv})(c_0)$.

We know the following about this diagram in \mathbf{Set} :

- The indexing category $\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}$ is non-empty (since V_{valid} is non-empty).
- The diagram contains at least one non-empty set, namely $D_G(v_0)(c_0) \neq \emptyset$.

A colimit in \mathbf{Set} of a diagram indexed by a non-empty category is constructed as a quotient of the disjoint union of all sets in the diagram:

$$\text{colim}_{v \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}} (D_G(v)(c_0)) = \left(\coprod_{v \in V_{\text{valid}}} D_G(v)(c_0) \right) / \sim$$

where \sim is the equivalence relation generated by identifying $x \in D_G(u)(c_0)$ with $D_G(m_{uv})(c_0)(x) \in D_G(v)(c_0)$ for all morphisms m_{uv} in $\mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}$.

Since the disjoint union $\coprod_{v \in V_{\text{valid}}} D_G(v)(c_0)$ contains the non-empty set $D_G(v_0)(c_0)$, the disjoint union itself is non-empty. The colimit, being a quotient of a non-empty set, is also non-empty. (The only way for the quotient to be empty is if the original set was empty).

Therefore, $S_{\text{summary}}(c_0) = \text{colim}_{v \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{valid}}} (D_G(v)(c_0))$ is a non-empty set.

Since we found a context $c_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ for which $S_{\text{summary}}(c_0) \neq \emptyset$, the presheaf S_{summary} is not the initial object 0. Thus, $S_{\text{summary}} \not\cong 0$, meaning the synthesized summary is consistent.

Note: The argument implicitly assumes that the base context category \mathcal{C} is non-empty. The consistency of “base assumptions” translates to the sources of the diagram D_{valid} being non-initial objects. The ideal critique ensures that inconsistency ($D_G(v) \cong 0$) detected at any node v prevents it from participating in the colimit calculation. \square

A.4 Proof of Theorem 4.7 (Robustness via Universality of Colimit)

Theorem 4.7. *Let $D_1 : \mathcal{J}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ and $D_2 : \mathcal{J}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be two diagrams (where $\mathcal{J}_1 = \mathcal{J}_{\text{valid},1}$, etc.). If there is an isomorphism of diagrams, consisting of an isomorphism of categories $\phi : \mathcal{J}_1 \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{J}_2$ and a natural isomorphism $\eta : D_1 \Rightarrow D_2 \circ \phi$, then their colimits are isomorphic: $\text{colim } D_1 \cong \text{colim } D_2$.*

Proof. This is a standard result demonstrating that colimits depend only on the diagram up to isomorphism. Let $L_1 = \text{colim } D_1$ with its universal cocone $\{\iota_v^{(1)} : D_1(v) \rightarrow L_1\}_{v \in (\mathcal{J}_1)}$. Let $L_2 = \text{colim } D_2$ with its universal cocone $\{\iota_w^{(2)} : D_2(w) \rightarrow L_2\}_{w \in (\mathcal{J}_2)}$.

We need to construct an isomorphism $h : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$. We do this by constructing maps $h : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ and $k : L_2 \rightarrow L_1$ using the universal properties and showing they are inverses.

1. **Construction of $h : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$:** For each object $v \in (\mathcal{J}_1)$, consider the object $w = \phi(v) \in (\mathcal{J}_2)$. The natural isomorphism $\eta : D_1 \Rightarrow D_2 \circ \phi$ provides component isomorphisms $\eta_v : D_1(v) \xrightarrow{\cong} D_2(\phi(v))$. Define a family of morphisms $\{f_v : D_1(v) \rightarrow L_2\}_{v \in (\mathcal{J}_1)}$ by composing η_v with the cocone map for L_2 at the corresponding object:

$$f_v := \iota_{\phi(v)}^{(2)} \circ \eta_v : D_1(v) \rightarrow D_2(\phi(v)) \rightarrow L_2$$

We must verify that this family $\{f_v\}$ constitutes a cocone for the diagram D_1 over the object L_2 . Let $m_{uv} : u \rightarrow v$ be any morphism in \mathcal{J}_1 . We need to show that $f_v \circ D_1(m_{uv}) = f_u$.

$$\begin{aligned} f_v \circ D_1(m_{uv}) &= (\iota_{\phi(v)}^{(2)} \circ \eta_v) \circ D_1(m_{uv}) \\ &= \iota_{\phi(v)}^{(2)} \circ (\eta_v \circ D_1(m_{uv})) && \text{[Associativity in } \mathcal{E}] \\ &= \iota_{\phi(v)}^{(2)} \circ (D_2(\phi(m_{uv})) \circ \eta_u) && \text{[Naturality square for } \eta \text{ at } m_{uv}] \\ &= (\iota_{\phi(v)}^{(2)} \circ D_2(\phi(m_{uv}))) \circ \eta_u && \text{[Associativity in } \mathcal{E}] \\ &= \iota_{\phi(u)}^{(2)} \circ \eta_u && \text{[Cocone property for } \iota^{(2)}] \\ &= f_u && \text{[Definition of } f_u] \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{f_v\}$ forms a valid cocone for D_1 over L_2 , the universal property of $L_1 = \text{colim } D_1$ guarantees the existence of a **unique** morphism $h : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ such that $f_v = h \circ \iota_v^{(1)}$ for all $v \in (\mathcal{J}_1)$.

2. **Construction of $k : L_2 \rightarrow L_1$:** We proceed symmetrically. Since $\phi : \mathcal{J}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_2$ is an isomorphism of categories, it has an inverse $\phi^{-1} : \mathcal{J}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_1$. Since $\eta : D_1 \Rightarrow D_2 \circ \phi$ is a natural isomorphism, it has an inverse natural isomorphism $\eta^{-1} : D_2 \circ \phi \Rightarrow D_1$. More usefully, we can consider the natural isomorphism $\eta' : D_2 \Rightarrow D_1 \circ \phi^{-1}$, whose component at $w \in (\mathcal{J}_2)$ is

$\eta'_w = (\eta_{\phi^{-1}(w)})^{-1} : D_2(w) \rightarrow D_1(\phi^{-1}(w))$. Define a family of morphisms $\{g_w : D_2(w) \rightarrow L_1\}_{w \in (\mathcal{J}_2)}$ by:

$$g_w := \iota_{\phi^{-1}(w)}^{(1)} \circ \eta'_w : D_2(w) \rightarrow D_1(\phi^{-1}(w)) \rightarrow L_1$$

We verify that $\{g_w\}$ is a cocone for D_2 over L_1 . Let $m'_{uw} : u \rightarrow w$ be a morphism in \mathcal{J}_2 . We need $g_w \circ D_2(m'_{uw}) = g_u$.

$$\begin{aligned} g_w \circ D_2(m'_{uw}) &= (\iota_{\phi^{-1}(w)}^{(1)} \circ \eta'_w) \circ D_2(m'_{uw}) \\ &= \iota_{\phi^{-1}(w)}^{(1)} \circ (\eta'_w \circ D_2(m'_{uw})) \\ &= \iota_{\phi^{-1}(w)}^{(1)} \circ (D_1(\phi^{-1}(m'_{uw})) \circ \eta'_u) && [\text{Naturality square for } \eta' \text{ at } m'_{uw}] \\ &= (\iota_{\phi^{-1}(w)}^{(1)} \circ D_1(\phi^{-1}(m'_{uw}))) \circ \eta'_u \\ &= \iota_{\phi^{-1}(u)}^{(1)} \circ \eta'_u && [\text{Cocone property for } \iota^{(1)}] \\ &= g_u && [\text{Definition of } g_u] \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{g_w\}$ forms a valid cocone for D_2 over L_1 , the universal property of $L_2 = \text{colim } D_2$ guarantees the existence of a **unique** morphism $k : L_2 \rightarrow L_1$ such that $g_w = k \circ \iota_w^{(2)}$ for all $w \in (\mathcal{J}_2)$.

3. Verification that h and k are Inverses: We need to show $k \circ h = \text{id}_{L_1}$ and $h \circ k = \text{id}_{L_2}$. We use the uniqueness part of the universal property.

Consider $k \circ h : L_1 \rightarrow L_1$. For any $v \in (\mathcal{J}_1)$, let $w = \phi(v)$.

$$\begin{aligned} (k \circ h) \circ \iota_v^{(1)} &= k \circ (h \circ \iota_v^{(1)}) \\ &= k \circ f_v && [\text{Definition of } h] \\ &= k \circ (\iota_{\phi(v)}^{(2)} \circ \eta_v) \\ &= (k \circ \iota_{\phi(v)}^{(2)}) \circ \eta_v \\ &= g_{\phi(v)} \circ \eta_v && [\text{Definition of } k, \text{ using } w = \phi(v)] \\ &= (\iota_{\phi^{-1}(\phi(v))}^{(1)} \circ \eta'_{\phi(v)}) \circ \eta_v && [\text{Definition of } g] \\ &= (\iota_v^{(1)} \circ (\eta_{\phi^{-1}(\phi(v))})^{-1}) \circ \eta_v && [\text{Since } \phi^{-1}(\phi(v)) = v \text{ and using def of } \eta'] \\ &= (\iota_v^{(1)} \circ (\eta_v)^{-1}) \circ \eta_v \\ &= \iota_v^{(1)} \circ ((\eta_v)^{-1} \circ \eta_v) \\ &= \iota_v^{(1)} \circ \text{id}_{D_1(v)} \\ &= \iota_v^{(1)} \end{aligned}$$

So, $(k \circ h) \circ \iota_v^{(1)} = \iota_v^{(1)} = \text{id}_{L_1} \circ \iota_v^{(1)}$ for all v . By the uniqueness of the map from the colimit L_1 satisfying this property, we must have $k \circ h = \text{id}_{L_1}$.

Similarly, consider $h \circ k : L_2 \rightarrow L_2$. For any $w \in (\mathcal{J}_2)$, let $v = \phi^{-1}(w)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
(h \circ k) \circ \iota_w^{(2)} &= h \circ (k \circ \iota_w^{(2)}) \\
&= h \circ g_w && \text{[Definition of } k\text{]} \\
&= h \circ (\iota_{\phi^{-1}(w)}^{(1)} \circ \eta'_w) \\
&= (h \circ \iota_{\phi^{-1}(w)}^{(1)}) \circ \eta'_w \\
&= f_{\phi^{-1}(w)} \circ \eta'_w && \text{[Definition of } h, \text{ using } v = \phi^{-1}(w)\text{]} \\
&= (\iota_{\phi(\phi^{-1}(w))}^{(2)} \circ \eta_{\phi^{-1}(w)}) \circ \eta'_w && \text{[Definition of } f\text{]} \\
&= (\iota_w^{(2)} \circ \eta_{\phi^{-1}(w)}) \circ (\eta_{\phi^{-1}(w)})^{-1} && \text{[Since } \phi(\phi^{-1}(w)) = w \text{ and using def of } \eta'\text{]} \\
&= \iota_w^{(2)} \circ (\eta_{\phi^{-1}(w)} \circ (\eta_{\phi^{-1}(w)})^{-1}) \\
&= \iota_w^{(2)} \circ \text{id}_{D_2(w)} \\
&= \iota_w^{(2)}
\end{aligned}$$

So, $(h \circ k) \circ \iota_w^{(2)} = \iota_w^{(2)} = \text{id}_{L_2} \circ \iota_w^{(2)}$ for all w . By the uniqueness of the map from the colimit L_2 , we must have $h \circ k = \text{id}_{L_2}$.

Since $k \circ h = \text{id}_{L_1}$ and $h \circ k = \text{id}_{L_2}$, the morphism $h : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ is an isomorphism, with k as its inverse. Therefore, $\text{colim } D_1 \cong \text{colim } D_2$. \square