## Barcodes in persistence Jānis Lazovskis

UIC Grovesloquium 2018-11-14

## 0.1 Motivation

Main TDA product is the *barcode*, a simple visual rep of the persistent homology of a space. **Example:** Barcode of finite subset of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Dim 0 and dim 1. This is just rank of homology groups. Note how some merge, some die.

We study not just objects, but functions between objects. What is a function between barcodes? Pipeline:

| finite metric<br>space | $\begin{array}{c} \text{SCs from nerve} \\ & &$ | <b>R</b> -indexed<br>sequence of<br>topological spaces | $\xrightarrow{\text{homology}} \rightarrow$ | <b>R</b> -indexed<br>sequence of<br>homology groups | $\xrightarrow{\text{rank}}$ | barcode |
|------------------------|---|--|---|---|-----------------------------|---------|
| (X, d)                 |   | $F \colon (\mathbf{R}, \leqslant) \to SC$              |   | $F\colon (\mathbf{R},\leqslant) \to Grp$            |                             | ?       |

## 0.2 Formalizing barcodes

What do we want a morphism of barcodes to be? **Example. Definition:** A multiset is set where the elements may repeat (a pair  $\{S \in Set, m: S \to \mathbf{N}\}$ ). Let  $Int := \{[a, b] \subseteq \mathbf{R} : a < b\}$  be the set of intervals of  $\mathbf{R}$ . **Definition:** A barcode is a multiset  $B \subseteq Int$ . **Theorem:** The barcode of the TDA pipeline is uniquely determined.

**Definition:** A matching from a set A to a set B, written  $\sigma: A \to B$ , is a bijection  $\sigma: A' \to B'$ , for some  $A' \subseteq A$  and  $B' \subseteq B$ .

Hope is that morphisms earlier in the pipeline can be interpreted as matchings. **Problem:** Even with slight shift, functoriality in step 3 would say we can't match "obvious" bars .

Solution 1: Define metrics on ambient spaces, "induced matching" for barcodes within  $\epsilon$  of each other Solution 2: Go back earlier in pipeline to induce "obvious" matching based on topological changes. Pro 1: Stable under small perturbations. Con 1: May not reflect underlying changes. Pro 2: Precisely reflects topological changes. Con 2: Carries too much information.

**Example:** Points at (0,0), (2,0), moving from  $(2,\sqrt{3})$  to  $(0,\sqrt{3})$ 

**Definition:** For  $\delta \ge 0$  and  $B \subseteq Int$ , let  $B^{\epsilon} = \{I \in B : [t, t + \delta] \subseteq I \text{ for some } t \in \mathbf{R}\}$ . Note that  $B^0 = B$  and  $B^{\delta \gg 0} = \emptyset$ .

**Definition:** For  $\delta \ge 0$ , a  $\delta$ -matching from B to C is a matching  $\sigma \colon B \nrightarrow C$  such that

- $B^{2\delta} \subseteq B'$ ,
- $C^{2\delta} \subseteq C'$ ,

• if  $\sigma[a,b] = [x,y]$ , then  $[a,b] \subseteq [x-\delta,y+\delta]$  and  $[x,y] \subseteq [a-\delta,b+\delta]$ .

## Example:



persitent homology of finite metric spaces

persistence module as a functor

maps between persistence modules as natty trans

category of barcodes

difficulty of barcode morphism, ways around by injectivity

reasons why fails: class can merge or die, barcode does not keep track solutions: Reeb graph, merge tree. but these require knowing more partial solution: what if know path between point samples?