

# Metrization of Gromov-Hausdorff-type topologies on boundedly-compact metric spaces

Ryoichiro Noda\*

## Abstract

We present a new general framework for metrization of Gromov-Hausdorff-type topologies on non-compact metric spaces. We also give easy-to-check conditions for separability and completeness and hence the measure theoretic requirements are provided to study convergence of random spaces with additional random objects. In particular, our framework enables us to define a metric inducing a suitable Gromov-Hausdorff-type topology on the space of rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces with laws of stochastic processes and/or random fields, which was not clear how to do in previous frameworks. In addition to general theory, this paper includes several examples of Gromov-Hausdorff-type topologies, verifying that classical examples such as the Gromov-Hausdorff topology and the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prohorov topology are contained within our framework.

## 1 Introduction

The *Gromov-Hausdorff metric* (see (1.1) below) defines a distance between compact metric spaces and was originally introduced by Gromov [17] for group theoretic purposes. However, it has found important applications in probability theory as well since it provides a framework for discussing convergence of random compact metric spaces, such as the scaling limit of critical Galton-Watson trees [26], the critical random graph [3], random planer maps [27] and percolation on some (random) graph [5, 11]. In many examples, one's interest is in not only the geometry of spaces but also additional objects on spaces such as measures [1], compact subsets [29] and heat-kernel-type functions [15]. Moreover, there are many examples of random non-compact metric spaces such as the uniform spanning tree on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  [4, 8], the uniform half-plane quadrangulation [18] and the incipient infinite cluster of the critical percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  [9]. In consideration of such metric spaces and additional objects on them, various generalizations of the Gromov-Hausdorff metric have been introduced and studied in the literature [1, 6]. Recently, in [23], Khezeli proposed a general method for defining a Gromov-Hausdorff-type metric. However, its applicability is limited because one needs to check complicated conditions to verify that the defined function is indeed a metric and yields a proper topological space for probability theory (i.e., a Polish space). In this paper, we introduce a new method, which is more straightforward to implement. It includes all the examples in Khezeli's framework and enables a wider range of examples to be handled. Indeed, our framework provides a new topological setting for discussing convergence of random spaces equipped with random objects such as stochastic processes.

Before presenting our main results, in Section 1.1, we recall the Gromov-Hausdorff metric and the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prohorov (vague) metric, which are commonly used in the study of random measured metric spaces in probability theory. In Section 1.2, we then explain how those metrics are generalized in our framework and describe the contributions of the present paper in more detail. For the purposes of our discussions, we set  $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$  and  $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$  for  $a, b \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ .

### 1.1 Introduction to Gromov-Hausdorff-type metrics

**The Gromov-Hausdorff metric.** As already introduced, the Gromov-Hausdorff metric defines the distance between compact metric spaces. The idea used to define the distance is to embed different compact metric spaces isometrically into a common compact metric space and measure the distance between them using the Hausdorff metric in the ambient space. (The definition of the Hausdorff metric

---

\*Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto, 606-8502, JAPAN. E-mail: srnldr@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp

is recalled in Section 2.2.1.) More precisely, the distance between two compact metric spaces  $(K_1, d^{K_1})$  and  $(K_2, d^{K_2})$  is defined by

$$d_{GH}((K_1, d^{K_1}), (K_2, d^{K_2})) := \inf_{f_1, f_2, K} d_H^K(f_1(K_1), f_2(K_2)), \quad (1.1)$$

where the infimum is taken over all compact metric spaces  $(K, d^K)$  and distance-preserving maps  $f_i : K_i \rightarrow K$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $d_H^K$  denotes the Hausdorff metric in  $(K, d^K)$ . The Gromov-Hausdorff metric is a separable and complete metric on the collection of isometric equivalence classes of compact metric spaces, and the induced topology is called the *Gromov-Hausdorff topology*. In applications, the following characterization of the topology is often useful: a sequence of compact metric spaces  $(K_n, d^{K_n})$  converges to a compact metric space  $(K, d^K)$  in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology if and only if it is possible to embed  $K_n$  and  $K$  isometrically into a common compact metric space  $(M, d^M)$  in such a way that

$$d_H^M(K_n, K) \rightarrow 0, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $K_n$  and  $K$  are regarded as subsets of  $M$ . In our framework, this characterization is naturally generalized.

**Remark 1.1.** One should note that it is not possible to consider the “set” of compact metric spaces nor isometric equivalence classes of compact metric spaces from the rigorous viewpoint of set theory. Indeed, any two singletons are isometric as compact metric spaces, but the collection of all singletons is not a set. However, as discussed in [12], it is possible to regard the collection of isometric equivalence classes as a legitimate set. This is true even when we consider the collection of non-compact metric spaces equipped with additional objects (see Section 3.2).

**The Gromov-Hausdorff-Prohorov metric.** One generalization of the Gromov-Hausdorff metric is the (*pointed*) *Gromov-Hausdorff-Prohorov metric*  $d_{GHP}$  (see (1.3) below), which gives the distance between two rooted-and-measured compact metric spaces. Note that a *rooted-and-measured compact metric space*  $(K, d^K, \rho, \mu)$  is a compact metric space  $(K, d^K)$  equipped with a distinguished element  $\rho$  called the *root* and a finite Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $K$ . The metric  $d_{GHP}$  was introduced in [1] (and [2]) to study a measured-tree-valued process, and it is defined in the same spirit as the Gromov-Hausdorff metric. In particular, for two rooted-and-measured compact metric spaces  $\mathcal{K}_i = (K_i, d^{K_i}, \rho_i, \mu_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , the distance between them is given by setting

$$d_{GHP}(\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2) := \inf_{f_1, f_2, K} \{d_H^K(f_1(K_1), f_2(K_2)) \vee d_P^K(\mu_1 \circ f_1^{-1}, \mu_2 \circ f_2^{-1}) \vee d^K(f_1(\rho_1), f_2(\rho_2))\}, \quad (1.3)$$

where the infimum is taken over all compact metric spaces  $(K, d^K)$  and distance-preserving maps  $f_i : K_i \rightarrow K$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $d_P^K$  denotes the Prohorov metric between finite Borel measures on  $(K, d^K)$  (see Section 2.2.2 for the definition). Similar to the Gromov-Hausdorff metric, the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prohorov metric is a separable and complete metric on the collection of equivalence classes of measured compact metric spaces, and the induced topology is called the (*pointed*) *Gromov-Hausdorff-Prohorov topology*. Moreover, similarly to (1.2), a characterization of the topology in terms of convergence of objects isometrically embedded into a common metric space holds.

**The local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague metric.** In various applications, it is desirable to relax the assumption of compactness. For that, it is convenient to consider *rooted boundedly-compact* spaces  $(S, d^S, \rho)$ , that is,  $(S, d^S, \rho)$  is a rooted metric space in which every closed ball of finite radius is compact. The *local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague* metric  $d_{GHV}$  (given in (1.4) below) is an extension of the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prohorov metric. It is a metric on the collection of the equivalence classes of rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces equipped with Radon measures (called *rooted-and-measured boundedly-compact metric spaces*), and was first presented in [1]. Although in [1] the focus was on a subclass of boundedly-compact metric spaces called length spaces, in [22] it was verified that the metric  $d_{GHV}$  is well-defined on the full space. The idea behind the definition of  $d_{GHV}$  is that two rooted-and-measured boundedly-compact metric spaces are close if the restrictions of them to balls centered at roots with finite radius are close with respect to the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prohorov metric  $d_{GHP}$  (for Lebesgue almost-all radii). More precisely, for two rooted-and-measured boundedly-compact metric spaces  $\mathcal{X}_i = (X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_i, \mu_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , where  $\rho_i$  is the root and  $\mu_i$  is a Radon measure on  $X_i$ , the distance between  $\mathcal{X}_1$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2$  is given by

$$d_{GHV}(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2) := \int_0^\infty e^{-r} \left(1 \wedge d_{GHP}(\mathcal{X}_1^{(r)}, \mathcal{X}_2^{(r)})\right) dr, \quad (1.4)$$

where we define  $\mathcal{X}_i^{(r)} = (X_i^{(r)}, d^{X_i^{(r)}}, \rho_i^{(r)}, \mu_i^{(r)})$  by setting  $X_i^{(r)}$  to be the closed ball centered at  $\rho_i$  with radius  $r$ ,  $d^{X_i^{(r)}}$  and  $\mu_i^{(r)}$  to be the restrictions of  $d^{X_i}$  and  $\mu_i$  to  $X_i^{(r)}$  respectively, and  $\rho_i^{(r)} := \rho_i$ . In [22], it is proven that  $d_{GHV}$  is a separable and complete metric and we call the induced topology the *local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology*.

**Remark 1.2.** The terms the “local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague metric” and the “local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology” are not in common use and are only used in the present paper as a matter of convenience. Moreover, one should note that the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology is different from the Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology introduced in [6] in that the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology takes into account the metric structure of the entire underlying space while the Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology ignores the metric structure outside the support of the measure.

## 1.2 The contributions of the present paper

As a generalization of the metrics introduced in Section 1.1, our interest is in the metrization of the space consisting of (the equivalence classes of)  $(X, d^X, \rho, a)$  such that  $(X, d^X, \rho)$  is a rooted boundedly-compact metric space and  $a$  is an element of a metric space  $\tau(X)$ , which is determined by  $(X, d^X, \rho)$ . For example, in the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology,  $\tau(X)$  is the set of Radon measures on  $X$  equipped with the vague topology. In this paper, we provide a framework to define a metric on such a space inducing a suitable Gromov-Hausdorff-type topology, meaning that  $(X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_n, a_n)$  converges to  $(X, d^X, \rho, a)$  if and only if it is possible to embed  $X_n$  and  $X$  isometrically into a common rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(M, d^M, \rho_M)$  in such a way that roots are carried into the root  $\rho_M$  by the embedding maps,  $X_n$  converges to  $X$  in the local Hausdorff topology as subsets in  $M$  and  $a_n$  converges to  $a$  as elements of  $\tau(M)$ . (The local Hausdorff topology is introduced in Section 2.2.1.) Moreover, we also provide easy-to-check conditions for separability and completeness, which ensures that the resulting Gromov-Hausdorff-type topology is suitable for probability theory.

We mention that such a general framework was proposed by Khezeli in [23], which follows the philosophy of the formulation given in (1.4). In Khezeli’s framework, one first defines a metric  $d_K^c$  on the collection of  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho, a)$  such that  $(X, d^X)$  is compact. To extend this to non-compact spaces, Khezeli considers restrictions  $\mathcal{X}^{(r)} = (X^{(r)}, d^{X^{(r)}}, \rho^{(r)}, a^{(r)})$  of  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho, a)$ , e.g. in the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague case,  $a^{(r)}$  corresponds to the restricted measure  $\mu^{(r)}$ . He then defines a distance between  $\mathcal{X}_1$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2$  by setting

$$d_K(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2) := \int_0^\infty e^{-r} \left( 1 \wedge d_K^c(\mathcal{X}_1^{(r)}, \mathcal{X}_2^{(r)}) \right) dr. \quad (1.5)$$

The metric  $d_K$  is a natural generalization of the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague metric. An operation such as  $a^{(r)}$  is needed in the case of the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague metric because the Prohorov metric is a metric defined only on the set of finite Borel measures, and it initially seems natural to consider a generalization of this approach to other additional structures. However, in some cases, considering the operation  $a^{(r)}$  is not natural. For example, consider a cadlag function with values in  $X$  as an additional object  $a$ . Since the usual  $J_1$ -Skorohod metric is defined even when  $X$  is non-compact, it seems we should not need to consider the operation  $a^{(r)}$  (although it is possible). A more serious problem is that checking [23, Assumption 3.11], which is a condition regarding the operation  $a^{(r)}$  and ensures that the integral (1.5) is well-defined, does not seem easy in general. Indeed, in the case of cadlag curves, one needs to introduce a metric different to the usual  $J_1$ -Skorohod metric, and checking [23, Assumption 3.11] requires one to understand the effect of the operation  $a^{(r)}$  on the relevant metric, which is far from a trivial exercise (see [23, Example 3.45]). Therefore, it seems that Khezeli’s framework cannot be easily applied when one wants to consider a more complicated additional object such as a probability measure on cadlag curves, which is a natural and important object in the study of scaling limits of stochastic processes.

In contrast, our framework follows the philosophy of the formulation given (1.1) and (1.3). For example, in our framework, a metric for the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology is constructed roughly as follows: firstly, we introduce the local Hausdorff metric (see Section 2.2.1) that can measure the distance between non-compact subsets in a fixed metric space and the vague metric (see Section 2.2.2) that can measure the distance between non-finite Borel measures on a fixed metric space; then, using these metrics, we define a metric on the collection of equivalence classes of rooted-and-measured boundedly-compact metric spaces in a similar way to (1.3). We are able to confirm that the resulting

metric indeed induces the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology (see Theorem 4.13). Moreover, since in our framework there is no need to check complicated conditions such as [23, Assumption 3.11], our approach makes it easy to define a metric on the collection of (the equivalence classes of) rooted(-measured) boundedly-compact metric spaces equipped with laws of stochastic processes and/or random fields (see Section 4.8). This gives a proper topological framework for discussing scaling limits of stochastic processes, as studied in [7, 14] for example. Furthermore, in [31], following the framework in this paper, a Gromov-Hausdorff-type topology is introduced, which enables us to discuss convergence of laws of Markov processes and associated local times living in different spaces. We expect that our framework can be also used in other various studies on random geometry such as the quantum zipper (c.f. [32]). Although our framework is easier to apply than that of [23], it should be noted that some ideas of Khezeli are essential at the point of our arguments where we extend a metric defined only for “compact” objects into a metric for “non-compact” objects. Indeed, we follow his arguments to define the local Hausdorff metric and the vague metric.

The remainder of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define the local Hausdorff metric and the vague metric. We then, in Section 3, establish our main results on metrization of the Gromov-Hausdorff-type topologies. In Section 4, we present some examples of our main results based on topologies used in the literature.

Throughout this article, we use various superscripts:  $A^c$  denotes the complement of a set  $A$ ;  $A^\varepsilon$  denotes the (closed)  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of a set  $A$  defined in (2.11);  $a^{(r)}$  is a restriction of an object  $a$  defined above (2.1).

## 2 The local Hausdorff metric and the vague metric

In Section 2.1, we provide a method for extending a metric defined only for “compact” objects to a metric for “non-compact” objects. This is a generalization of Khezeli’s framework in [23] and we need this to define the local Hausdorff metric (for marked spaces) and the vague metric in Section 2.2. Those who only want to see the definitions of these metrics can skip Section 2.1.

### 2.1 Metric for non-compact objects

Let  $\mathfrak{C}$  be a non-empty set and let  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}$  be an extended metric on  $\mathfrak{C}$ . (NB. An extended metric is a metric that is allowed to take the value  $\infty$ .) We equip  $\mathfrak{C}$  with the topology induced from  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}$ . Fix a set  $\mathfrak{D}$  including  $\mathfrak{C}$ . To extend the metric  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}$  to  $\mathfrak{D}$ , we equip a partial order  $\preceq$  on  $\mathfrak{D}$ . Our aim in this section is to define a metric on  $\mathfrak{D}$ , which induces a natural topology on  $\mathfrak{D}$  generalizing the topology on  $\mathfrak{C}$ , and to study basic properties of the metric. The metric is presented in (2.2) below, and the main results regarding convergence, polishness and precompactness are found in Theorem 2.8, Corollary 2.18 and Theorem 2.20, respectively.

**Example 2.1.** The arguments in this section are very abstract, and so it may be easier to read with a concrete example in mind. For example, one can think  $\mathfrak{C}$  as the set of compact subsets in a rooted boundedly-compact metric space,  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}$  as the Hausdorff metric,  $\mathfrak{D}$  as the set of closed subsets, and  $\preceq$  as the inclusion order. This is the setting considered in Section 2.2.1 and the framework in this section provides a natural generalization of the Hausdorff metric.

We define a restriction system, which describes how elements in  $\mathfrak{D}$  are truncated to elements in  $\mathfrak{C}$ .

**Definition 2.2** (Restriction system). Let  $R_r : \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$  be an order-preserving map for each  $r > 0$ . We call  $(R_r)_{r>0}$  a *restriction system* of  $(\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}, \preceq)$  if it satisfies the following:

(RS1) For each  $r > 0$  and  $a \in \mathfrak{D}$ ,  $R_r(a) \preceq a$ .

(RS2) For any  $s, r > 0$ ,  $R_r \circ R_s = R_{s \wedge r}$ .

(RS3) If  $R_r(a) = R_r(b)$  for all  $r > 0$ , then  $a = b$ .

**Example 2.3.** In the setting of Example 2.1,  $R_r$  is the restriction of a closed subset to the closed ball centered at the root of the space with radius  $r$ . Similarly, in the other examples we see in Section 2.2, restriction systems also depend on the root of the space.

We fix a restriction system  $R = (R_r)_{r>0}$ . We simply write  $R_r(a) = a^{(r)}$ . The following is an immediate consequence of (RS1) and (RS2):

$$a^{(s)} \preceq a^{(r)}, \quad \forall a \in \mathfrak{D}, s \leq r. \quad (2.1)$$

In the same spirit as the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague metric given in (1.4), we define the distance between  $a, b \in \mathfrak{D}$  by setting

$$d_{\mathfrak{D}}(a, b) := \int_0^\infty e^{-r} (1 \wedge d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a^{(r)}, b^{(r)})) dr. \quad (2.2)$$

To ensure that  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$  is a well-defined metric on  $\mathfrak{D}$ , we suppose the following continuity property of the operation  $a^{(r)}$  with respect to  $r$ . The assumption corresponds to [23, Lemma 3.17].

**Assumption 2.4.** *Fix  $a \in \mathfrak{D}$ . Then the map  $(0, \infty) \ni r \mapsto a^{(r)} \in \mathfrak{C}$  is continuous for all but countably many  $r > 0$ .*

**Proposition 2.5.** *Under Assumption 2.4,  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$  is well-defined. Moreover,  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$  is a metric on  $\mathfrak{D}$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $d(c, d) := 1 \wedge d_{\mathfrak{C}}(c, d)$ . Since  $d$  is a metric on  $\mathfrak{C}$ , by the triangle inequality, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| d(a^{(r')}, b^{(r')}) - d(a^{(r)}, b^{(r)}) \right| \\ & \leq \left| d(a^{(r')}, b^{(r')}) - d(b^{(r')}, b^{(r)}) \right| + \left| d(a^{(r')}, b^{(r)}) - d(a^{(r)}, b^{(r)}) \right| \\ & \leq d(b^{(r')}, b^{(r)}) + d(a^{(r')}, a^{(r)}). \end{aligned}$$

This, combined with Assumption 2.4, implies that the map  $r \mapsto 1 \wedge d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a^{(r)}, b^{(r)}) \in \mathbb{R}_+$  is continuous for all but countably many  $r > 0$ . Hence,  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$  is well-defined. Symmetry and the triangle inequality are obvious. If  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}(a, b) = 0$ , then  $a^{(r)} = b^{(r)}$  for Lebesgue-almost every  $r > 0$ . By (RS2) and (RS3), we obtain  $a = b$ .  $\square$

To prove that the metric  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$  induces a natural topology on  $\mathfrak{D}$  and is separable and complete, we suppose the following additional conditions. They correspond to [23, Assumption 3.11 and Lemma 3.20].

**Assumption 2.6.**

(i) *Let  $a, b$  be elements of  $\mathfrak{C}$  and suppose that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a, b) \leq \varepsilon$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Fix  $r \geq s > \varepsilon$  arbitrarily. Then, for any  $a' \in \mathfrak{C}$  with  $a^{(s)} \preceq a' \preceq a^{(r)}$ , there exists  $b' \in \mathfrak{C}$  such that  $b^{(s-\varepsilon)} \preceq b' \preceq b^{(r+\varepsilon)}$  and  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a', b') \leq \varepsilon$ .*

(ii) *Let  $a$  be an element of  $\mathfrak{C}$ . For all but countably many  $r > 0$ , it holds that*

$$\sup\{d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a^{(r)}, a') \mid a' \in \mathfrak{C}, a^{(r-\delta)} \preceq a' \preceq a^{(r+\delta)}\} \xrightarrow{\delta \downarrow 0} 0. \quad (2.3)$$

Henceforth, we assume that the restriction system  $(R_r)_{r>0}$  satisfies Assumption 2.6. Note that Assumption 2.6(ii) implies Assumption 2.4. Thus, under Assumption 2.6,  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$  is a well-defined metric on  $\mathfrak{D}$ .

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $a, a_1, a_2, \dots$  be elements of  $\mathfrak{C}$ . If  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n, a) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r)}, a^{(r)}) \rightarrow 0$  for all but countably many  $r > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $r > 0$  satisfying (2.3) and  $\varepsilon \in (0, r)$ . By Assumption 2.6(ii), there exists  $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$  such that

$$\sup\left\{d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a^{(r)}, a') \mid a' \in \mathfrak{C}, a^{(r-\delta)} \preceq a' \preceq a^{(r+\delta)}\right\} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (2.4)$$

Since we have that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n, a) \leq \delta$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ , by (2.1) and Assumption 2.6(i), we can find  $b_n \in \mathfrak{C}$  such that  $a^{(r-\delta)} \preceq b_n \preceq a^{(r+\delta)}$  and  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r)}, b_n) \leq \delta$ . Using (2.4) and the triangle inequality, we deduce that

$$d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r)}, a^{(r)}) \leq d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r)}, b_n) + d_{\mathfrak{C}}(b_n, a^{(r)}) \leq \delta + \varepsilon < 2\varepsilon,$$

which yields the desired result.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.8** (Convergence with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$ ). *Let  $a, a_1, a_2, \dots$  be elements of  $\mathfrak{D}$ . Then, the following are equivalent.*

- (i) *The elements  $a_n$  converge to  $a$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$ .*
- (ii) *The elements  $a_n^{(r)}$  converge to  $a^{(r)}$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}$  for all but countably many  $r > 0$ .*
- (iii) *There exists an increasing sequence  $(r_k)_k$  with  $r_k \uparrow \infty$  such that  $a_n^{(r_k)}$  converges to  $a^{(r_k)}$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}$  for each  $k$ .*
- (iv) *There exists a non-decreasing sequence  $(r_n)_{n \geq 1}$  with  $r_n \uparrow \infty$  such that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r_n)}, a^{(r_n)}) \rightarrow 0$ .*

*Proof.* The implication (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) is obvious. It is also easy to check that (iii) implies (iv). If (ii) is satisfied, then the dominated convergence theorem yields (i). Lemma 2.7 immediately yields the implication (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). Hence, it suffices to show the implications (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) and (iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). We begin with proving the first implication. Assume that (i) holds. Fix  $r > 0$  such that the convergence (2.3) holds for  $a$ . Then, given  $\varepsilon \in (0, r)$ , we can find  $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$  satisfying

$$\sup \left\{ d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a^{(r)}, a') \mid a' \in \mathfrak{C}, a^{(r-\delta)} \preceq a' \preceq a^{(r+\delta)} \right\} < \varepsilon. \quad (2.5)$$

From (i), for all sufficiently large  $n$ , we have that

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-s} \left( 1 \wedge d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(s)}, a^{(s)}) \right) dr < \delta e^{-r},$$

which implies that for each such  $n$  there exists  $s_n > r$  such that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(s_n)}, a^{(s_n)}) \leq \delta$ . By (2.1) and Assumption 2.6(i), we can find  $b_n \in \mathfrak{C}$  such that  $a^{(r-\delta)} \preceq b_n \preceq a^{(r+\delta)}$  and  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r)}, b_n) \leq \delta$ . This, combined with (2.5), yields that

$$d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r)}, a^{(r)}) \leq d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r)}, b_n) + d_{\mathfrak{C}}(b_n, a^{(r)}) < \delta + \varepsilon < 2\varepsilon.$$

Hence we obtain (ii).

Assume that (iv) holds. Fix  $r > 0$  such that the convergence (2.3) holds for  $a$ . Given  $\varepsilon \in (0, r)$ , we choose  $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$  satisfying (2.5). For all sufficiently large  $n$ , we have that  $r_n > r$  and  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r_n)}, a^{(r_n)}) < \varepsilon$ . Therefore, by a similar argument as above, we obtain that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r)}, a^{(r)}) < 2\varepsilon$ , which implies (ii).  $\square$

The following is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.7 and Theorem 2.8.

**Corollary 2.9.** *The relative topology on  $\mathfrak{C}$  induced from  $\mathfrak{D}$  is coarser than the topology on  $\mathfrak{C}$ . In other words, if  $a_n \in \mathfrak{C}$  converges to  $a \in \mathfrak{C}$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}$ , then  $a_n$  converges to  $a$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$ .*

**Remark 2.10.** In general, the relative topology on  $\mathfrak{C}$  induced from  $\mathfrak{D}$  does not coincide with the topology on  $\mathfrak{C}$ . (See Remark 2.29.)

In general, a restriction system is not unique. We provide a sufficient condition that ensures that two restrictions induce the same topology on  $\mathfrak{D}$ .

**Definition 2.11.** (The distance  $\text{dis}(R, R')$ ) Let  $R = (R_r)_{r>0}$  and  $R' = (R'_r)_{r>0}$  be restriction systems. We define

$$\text{dis}(R, R') := \inf \{ r_* \mid R_s = R_s \circ R'_r, R'_s = R'_s \circ R_r \text{ for all } s, r \text{ such that } s + r_* \leq r \},$$

where we set  $\text{dis}(R, R') := \infty$  if the infimum is taken over the empty set.

**Theorem 2.12.** *Let  $R' = (R'_r)_{r>0}$  be another restriction system satisfying Assumption 2.6. If  $\text{dis}(R, R') < \infty$ , then the topology on  $\mathfrak{D}$  induced from  $R'$  coincides the topology induced from  $R$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$  and  $d'_{\mathfrak{D}}$  for the metric on  $\mathfrak{D}$  determined by  $R$  and  $R'$ , respectively. Choose  $r_* > \text{dis}(R, R')$ . By definition, it holds that  $R_s = R_s \circ R'_r$  and  $R'_s = R'_s \circ R_r$  for all  $s + r_* \leq r$ . Assume that  $a_n$  converges to  $a$  with respect to  $d'_{\mathfrak{D}}$ . Then, for all but countably many  $r > 0$ , it holds that  $R'_r(a_n) \rightarrow R'_r(a)$  in  $\mathfrak{C}$ . For such  $r$ , by Lemma 2.7, we obtain that  $R_s \circ R'_r(a_n) \rightarrow R_s \circ R'_r(a)$  for all but countably many  $s > 0$ . Thus, we can find an increasing sequence  $(s_k)_{k \geq 1}$  with  $s_k \uparrow \infty$  such that  $R_{s_k}(a_n) \rightarrow R_{s_k}(a)$  in  $\mathfrak{C}$ , which implies that  $a_n \rightarrow a$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$ . Similarly, it is proven that if  $a_n \rightarrow a$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$ , then  $a_n \rightarrow a$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.13.** As we mentioned in Example 2.3, in all the examples we see in Section 2.2, the restriction systems depend on the root of the space. However, in each example, one can check that the distance between two restriction systems is bounded above by the distance between roots. Therefore, by Theorem 2.12, it can be verified that the resulting topology on  $\mathfrak{D}$  is independent of the root.

**Theorem 2.14** (Separability of  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$ ). *If  $(\mathfrak{C}, d_{\mathfrak{C}})$  is separable, then so is  $(\mathfrak{D}, d_{\mathfrak{D}})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $D$  be a dense subset in  $(\mathfrak{C}, d_{\mathfrak{C}})$ . By Corollary 2.9,  $D$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{C}$  with the relative topology induced from  $\mathfrak{D}$ . It is easy to check that  $a^{(r)} \rightarrow a$  for any  $a \in \mathfrak{D}$ . Hence  $D$  is dense in  $(\mathfrak{D}, d_{\mathfrak{D}})$ .  $\square$

To prove that  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$  is complete, we assume a condition to ensure that  $\mathfrak{D}$  contains sufficiently many elements.

**Definition 2.15** (Complete restriction system). Let  $(a_k)_{k \geq 1}$  be a sequence in  $\mathfrak{C}$  and  $(r_k)_{k \geq 1}$  be a non-decreasing sequence of non-negative numbers with  $r_k \uparrow \infty$ . A sequence  $(a_k, r_k)_{k \geq 1}$  is said to be a *compatible sequence* if and only if  $a_k = a_{k'}^{(r_k)}$  for all  $k \leq k'$ . A restriction system  $(R_r)_{r > 0}$  is said to be *complete* if it satisfies the following:

(RS4) For every compatible sequence  $(a_k, r_k)_{k \geq 1}$ , there exists  $a \in \mathfrak{D}$  such that  $a_k = a^{(r_k)}$ .

**Lemma 2.16.** *Suppose that  $(R_r)_{r > 0}$  is complete. Let  $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence in  $\mathfrak{C}$ . Assume that there exist a non-decreasing sequence  $(r_k)_{k \geq 1}$  of positive numbers with  $r_k \uparrow \infty$  and a sequence  $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 1}$  in  $\mathfrak{C}$  such that*

$$d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r_k)}, \alpha_k) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

*Then the sequence  $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$  converges to an element  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{D}$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$ .*

*Proof.* If necessary, by choosing a subsequence, we may assume that  $(r_k)_{k \geq 1}$  is strictly increasing. By Lemma 2.7, for all but countably many  $r > 0$ , it holds that

$$d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r_k \wedge r)}, \alpha_k^{(r)}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (2.6)$$

Choose  $s_l \in (r_{l-1}, r_l)$  so that (2.6) holds with  $r = s_l$ , i.e.,

$$d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r_k \wedge s_l)}, \alpha_k^{(s_l)}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \forall k, l \geq 1. \quad (2.7)$$

For  $k' \geq k$ , by substituting  $l = k$  (and  $k'$ ) in (2.7), we obtain that

$$d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(s_k)}, \alpha_k^{(s_k)}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(s_k)}, \alpha_{k'}^{(s_k)}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad (2.8)$$

which implies that  $\alpha_k^{(s_k)} = \alpha_{k'}^{(s_k)}$  if  $k' \geq k$ . Therefore,  $(\alpha_k^{(s_k)}, s_k)_{k \geq 1}$  is a compatible sequence. Since the restriction system is complete, we can find  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{D}$  such that  $\alpha^{(s_k)} = \alpha_k^{(s_k)}$ . By (2.8), it holds that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(s_k)}, \alpha^{(s_k)}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $k \geq 1$ . From Theorem 2.8, it follows that  $a_n \rightarrow \alpha$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.17** (Completeness of  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$ ). *If  $(\mathfrak{C}, d_{\mathfrak{C}})$  is complete and the restriction system  $(R_r)_{r > 0}$  is complete, then the metric  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$  is complete.*

*Proof.* Fix a Cauchy sequence  $a_n$  in  $\mathfrak{D}$ . If necessary, by choosing a subsequence, we may assume that  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}(a_n, a_{n+1}) < 2^{-n}e^{-2^n}$ . By the definition of  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$  (see (2.2)), for some  $q_n > 2^n$ , we have  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(q_n)}, a_{n+1}^{(q_n)}) < 2^{-n}$ . For each  $m \geq 1$ , set  $a_{m,m} := a_m^{(2^m)}$ . Since we have  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_m^{(q_m)}, a_{m+1}^{(q_m)}) < 2^{-m}$  with  $q_m > 2^m$ , by Assumption 2.6(i), there exists  $a_{m+1,m} \in \mathfrak{C}$  such that

$$a_{m+1}^{(2^m - 2^{-m})} \preceq a_{m+1,m} \preceq a_{m+1}^{(2^m + 2^{-m})}, \quad d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_{m,m}, a_{m+1,m}) < 2^{-m}.$$

Since we have  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_{m+1}^{(q_{m+1})}, a_{m+2}^{(q_{m+1})}) < 2^{-m-1}$  with  $q_{m+1} > 2^{m+1}$ , by using Assumption 2.6(i) again, we can find  $a_{m+2,m} \in \mathfrak{C}$  such that

$$a_{m+2}^{(2^m - 2^{-m} - 2^{-m-1})} \preceq a_{m+2,m} \preceq a_{m+2}^{(2^m + 2^{-m} + 2^{-m-1})}, \quad d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_{m+1,m}, a_{m+2,m}) < 2^{-m-1}.$$

Inductively, we obtain a sequence  $(a_{n,m})_{n \geq m}$  in  $\mathfrak{C}$  such that, for each  $n \geq m$ ,

$$a_n^{(2^m - 2^{-m+1})} \preceq a_{n,m} \preceq a_n^{(2^m + 2^{-m+1})}, \quad d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_{n,m}, a_{n+1,m}) < 2^{-n}. \quad (2.9)$$

In particular,  $(a_{n,m})_{n \geq m}$  is a Cauchy sequence  $(\mathfrak{C}, d_{\mathfrak{C}})$ , and hence there exists  $\alpha_m \in \mathfrak{C}$  such that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_{n,m}, \alpha_m) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $m \geq 1$ . By Lemma 2.7, for all but countably many  $r > 0$ , it holds that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_{n,m}^{(r)}, \alpha_m^{(r)}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $m \geq 1$ . Fix an increasing sequence  $(r_m)_{m \geq 1}$  with  $r_m \uparrow \infty$  and  $r_m < 2^m - 2^{-m+1}$  such that

$$d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_{n,m}^{(r_m)}, \alpha_m^{(r_m)}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \forall m \geq 1. \quad (2.10)$$

By (2.9) and (RS2), we have that  $a_n^{(r_m)} \preceq a_{n,m}^{(r_m)} \preceq a_n^{(r_m)}$  for all  $n \geq m$ , which implies  $a_n^{(r_m)} = a_n^{(r_m)}$  for all  $n \geq m$ . From (2.10), it follows that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_n^{(r_m)}, \alpha_m^{(r_m)}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $m \geq 1$ . Applying Lemma 2.16, we deduce that  $a_n$  converges to an element of  $\mathfrak{D}$ .  $\square$

We provide a summary of the results so far.

**Corollary 2.18.** *Assume that  $(\mathfrak{C}, d_{\mathfrak{C}})$  is a complete, separable metric space. Let  $R$  be a restriction system satisfying Assumption 2.6. Then, the function  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$  given in (2.2) is a well-defined metric on  $\mathfrak{D}$  and the metric space  $(\mathfrak{D}, d_{\mathfrak{D}})$  is complete and separable. Moreover, if  $R'$  is another restriction system satisfying Assumption 2.6 and  $\text{dis}(R, R') < \infty$ , then the topologies on  $\mathfrak{D}$  induced from  $R$  and  $R'$  are the same.*

In all the examples we see in Section 2.2, the following condition is satisfied, which plays an important role in the discussion of precompactness. It corresponds to [23, Assumption 3.17].

**Assumption 2.19.** *For every  $a \in \mathfrak{C}$ , the set  $\{b \in \mathfrak{C} \mid b \preceq a\}$  is compact in  $(\mathfrak{C}, d_{\mathfrak{C}})$ .*

**Theorem 2.20** (Precompactness in  $\mathfrak{D}$ ). *Suppose that the restriction system  $(R_r)_{r>0}$  satisfies Assumption 2.6 and is complete. Fix a non-empty subset  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}$ . Write  $\mathcal{A}^{(r)} := \{a^{(r)} \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$  for each  $r > 0$ . Consider the following statements.*

- (i) *The set  $\mathcal{A}^{(r)}$  is precompact in  $(\mathfrak{C}, d_{\mathfrak{C}})$  for all  $r > 0$ .*
- (ii) *There exists an increasing sequence  $(r_k)_{k \geq 1}$  with  $r_k \uparrow \infty$  such that  $\mathcal{A}^{(r_k)}$  is precompact in  $(\mathfrak{C}, d_{\mathfrak{C}})$ .*
- (iii) *The set  $\mathcal{A}$  is precompact in  $(\mathfrak{D}, d_{\mathfrak{D}})$ .*

*Then, it holds that (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii). Moreover, if Assumption 2.19 is satisfied, then (i), (ii) and (iii) are equivalent.*

*Proof.* The implication (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) is obvious. Assume that (ii) holds. Fix a sequence  $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . By a diagonal argument, one can find a subsequence  $(a_{n_m})_{m \geq 1}$  and a sequence  $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 1}$  in  $\mathfrak{C}$  such that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_{n_m}^{(r_k)}, \alpha_k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $k \geq 1$ . By Lemma 2.16 we deduce that  $(a_{n_m})_{m \geq 1}$  is a convergent sequence in  $\mathfrak{D}$ , which implies (iii).

Suppose that (iii) holds and Assumption 2.19 is satisfied. Fix  $r > 0$  and a sequence  $(a_n^{(r)})_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\mathcal{A}^{(r)}$ . Choose a subsequence  $(n_m)_{m \geq 1}$  such that  $(a_{n_m})_{m \geq 1}$  converges to  $a \in \mathfrak{D}$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}$ . If necessary, by choosing a further subsequence, we may assume that  $d_{\mathfrak{D}}(a_{n_m}, a) < 2^{-m} e^{-m}$ . Then, there exists  $s_m > m$  such that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_{n_m}^{(s_m)}, a^{(s_m)}) < 2^{-m}$ . We consider a sufficiently large  $m$  satisfying  $s_m > r$ . By Assumption 2.6(i), there exists  $a^{(r-2^{-m})} \preceq b_m \preceq a^{(r+2^{-m})}$  such that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(a_{n_m}^{(r)}, b_m) < 2^{-m}$ . Using Assumption 2.19, we can find a further subsequence  $(n_{m_k})_{k \geq 1}$  such that  $b_{m_k}$  converges to some  $b$  in  $\mathfrak{C}$ . It then follows that  $a_{n_{m_k}}^{(r)}$  converges to  $b$  in  $\mathfrak{C}$ , which implies (i).  $\square$

## 2.2 Examples

In this section, we apply the framework developed in Section 2.1 to examples, and introduce the local Hausdorff metric, the vague metric and the local Hausdorff metric for marked spaces.

Henceforth, given a metric space  $(S, d^S)$ , we set

$$B_S(x, r) := \{y \in S \mid d^S(x, y) < r\}, \quad D_S(x, r) := \{y \in S \mid d^S(x, y) \leq r\},$$

and denote the closure of a subset  $A$  by  $\text{cl}(A)$ . We recall that  $(S, d^S)$  is said to be *boundedly compact* if and only if  $D_S(x, r)$  is compact for any  $x \in S$  and  $r > 0$ . Given maps  $f : A \rightarrow B$  and  $g : A' \rightarrow B'$ , we write

$$(f \times f')(x, y) := (f(x), f'(y)), \quad (x, y) \in A \times A'.$$

For a set  $A$ , we denote the identity map from  $A$  to itself by  $\text{id}_A$ .

### 2.2.1 The local Hausdorff metric

In this section, We introduce the local Hausdorff metric and the local Hausdorff topology, which are suitable for discussing convergence of non-compact subsets in a fixed metric space.

Let  $(S, d^S, \rho)$  be a *rooted boundedly-compact metric space*, that is,  $(S, d^S)$  is a boundedly-compact metric space and  $\rho$  is a distinguished element of  $S$  called the *root*.

**Definition 2.21** (The space  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{C}(S)$ ). We define  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  to be the set of closed subsets in  $S$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S)$  the subset of  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  consisting of compact subsets.

A commonly used metric on  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S)$  is the Hausdorff metric. To recall it, we define the (*closed*)  $\varepsilon$ -*neighborhood* of a subset  $A$  in  $S$  by setting

$$A^\varepsilon := \{x \in S \mid \exists y \in A \text{ such that } d^S(x, y) \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (2.11)$$

**Definition 2.22** (The Hausdorff metric  $d_H^S$  and the Hausdorff topology). The *Hausdorff metric*  $d_H^S$  on  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S)$  is defined by setting

$$d_H^S(A, B) := \inf\{\varepsilon \geq 0 \mid A \subseteq B^\varepsilon, B \subseteq A^\varepsilon\},$$

where we set the infimum over the empty set to be  $\infty$ . The function  $d_H^S$  is indeed an extended metric on  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S)$ . (Note that the distance between the empty set and a non-empty set is always infinite.) We call the topology on  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S)$  induced by the Hausdorff metric the *Hausdorff topology*. It is known that the Hausdorff topology is separable and  $d_H^S$  is complete. (See [12] for details)

We equip  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  with the inclusion order  $\subseteq$ . We now define a restriction system of  $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S), \mathcal{C}(S), \subseteq)$ .

**Definition 2.23** (The restriction system of  $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S), \mathcal{C}(S), \subseteq)$ ). We define a restriction system  $R = (R_r)_{r>0}$  by setting

$$R_r(A) = A^{(r)} := A \cap D_S(\rho, r), \quad r > 0, A \in \mathcal{C}(S).$$

**Lemma 2.24.** *The restriction system  $R$  of  $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S), \mathcal{C}(S), \subseteq)$  is complete and satisfies Assumption 2.6. Moreover, if  $R'$  is a restriction system associated with another root  $\rho'$  of  $S$ , then  $\text{dis}(R, R') \leq d^S(\rho, \rho')$ .*

*Proof.* We only give a sketch of the proof. If  $(r_k, A_k)_{k \geq 1}$  is a compatible sequence, the closed subset  $A := \bigcup_{k \geq 1} A_k$  satisfies  $A^{(r_k)} = A_k$ , which shows that  $R$  is complete. Suppose that  $d_H(A, B) \leq \varepsilon$  for some  $A, B \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S)$ . Fix  $r > s > \varepsilon$  and  $A^{(s)} \subseteq A' \subseteq A^{(r)}$ . We define

$$B' := \{x \in S \mid d^S(x, y) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for some } y \in A'\}.$$

It is then the case that  $B^{(s-\varepsilon)} \subseteq B' \subseteq B^{(r+\varepsilon)}$  and  $d_H^S(A', B') \leq \varepsilon$ , which yields Assumption 2.6(i). It is not difficult to show that, for each  $A \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S)$ , the map  $(0, \infty) \ni r \mapsto A^{(r)} \in (\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S), d_H^S)$  is cadlag. Let  $r > 0$  be a continuity point of the map. Then, one can check that

$$\sup\{d_H^S(A^{(r)}, A') \mid A' \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S), A^{(r-\delta)} \subseteq A' \subseteq A^{(r+\delta)}\} \xrightarrow{\delta \downarrow 0} 0,$$

which implies Assumption 2.6(ii). Since we have that, for all  $s, r > 0$  with  $s + d^S(\rho, \rho') \leq r$ ,

$$D_S(\rho, s) \cap D_S(\rho', r) = D_S(\rho, s), \quad D_S(\rho', s) \cap D_S(\rho, r) = D_S(\rho', s),$$

we deduce that  $\text{dis}(R, R') \leq d^S(\rho, \rho')$ . □

**Remark 2.25.** There is another natural restriction system  $\tilde{R}$  of  $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S), \mathcal{C}(S), \subseteq)$  defined by setting  $\tilde{R}_r(A)$  to be the closure of  $A \cap B_S(\rho, r)$ . One can check the same result as Lemma 2.48.

By Corollary 2.18 and Lemma 2.24, we obtain a complete, separable metric on  $\mathcal{C}(S)$ . Define

$$d_{\tilde{H}}^{S, \rho}(A, B) := \int_0^\infty e^{-r} (1 \wedge d_{\tilde{H}}^S(A^{(r)}, B^{(r)})) dr, \quad A, B \in \mathcal{C}(S). \quad (2.12)$$

**Theorem 2.26.** *The function  $d_{\tilde{H}}^{S, \rho}$  is a well-defined metric on  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  and the metric space  $(\mathcal{C}(S), d_{\tilde{H}}^{S, \rho})$  is complete and separable. Moreover, the topology on  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  induced from  $d_{\tilde{H}}^{S, \rho}$  is independent of the root  $\rho$ .*

**Definition 2.27** (The local Hausdorff metric and the local Hausdorff topology). We call  $d_H^{S,\rho}$  given by (2.14) the *local Hausdorff metric (with root  $\rho$ )* and the induced topology on  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  the *local Hausdorff topology*.

By Theorem 2.8, we obtain a characterization of the local Hausdorff topology in terms of convergence.

**Theorem 2.28** (Convergence in the local Hausdorff topology). *Let  $A, A_1, A_2, \dots$  be elements of  $\mathcal{C}(S)$ . Then, the following are equivalent.*

- (i) *The sets  $A_n$  converge to  $A$  in the local Hausdorff topology.*
- (ii) *The sets  $A_n^{(r)}$  converge to  $A^{(r)}$  in the Hausdorff topology for all but countably many  $r > 0$ .*
- (iii) *There exists an increasing sequence  $(r_k)_k$  with  $r_k \uparrow \infty$  such that  $A_n^{(r_k)}$  converges to  $A^{(r_k)}$  in the Hausdorff topology for each  $k$ .*

**Remark 2.29.** The relative topology on  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S)$  induced from the local Hausdorff topology on  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  is strictly coarser than the Hausdorff topology. For example, consider the case  $(S, d^S, \rho) = (\mathbb{R}, d^{\mathbb{R}}, 0)$ , where  $(\mathbb{R}, d^{\mathbb{R}})$  is the one-dimensional Euclidean metric space, and the sequence  $A_n := [n, n+1]$ . Then,  $A_n$  converges to the empty set in the local Hausdorff topology but does not converge in the Hausdorff topology.

The following is an easy application of Theorem 2.20.

**Theorem 2.30.** *The space  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  equipped with the local Hausdorff topology is compact.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.20, it suffices to show that, for each  $r > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{C}(S)^{(r)} = \{A^{(r)} \mid A \in \mathcal{C}(S)\}$  is compact in the Hausdorff topology. This follows from [12, Theorem 7.3.8] and the fact that  $\mathcal{C}(S)^{(r)}$  is the set of closed subsets in the compact set  $S^{(r)}$ .  $\square$

We next proceed to show that the local Hausdorff metric inherits the property that the Hausdorff distance between sets is preserved when the sets are carried into a different space by a distance-preserving map. This is important when we establish a framework for metrization of Gromov-Hausdorff-type topologies in Section 3.2.

**Lemma 2.31.** *Let  $(S_i, d^{S_i})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  be boundedly-compact metric spaces and  $f : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$  be a distance-preserving map. Then the map  $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S_1), d_H^{S_1}) \ni A \mapsto f(A) \in (\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S_2), d_H^{S_2})$  is distance-preserving.*

*Proof.* Since  $f$  is distance-preserving, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A) \cap f(B)^\varepsilon &= \{f(x) \in S_2 \mid x \in A, \exists y \in B \text{ such that } d^{S_2}(f(x), f(y)) \leq \varepsilon\} \\ &= \{f(x) \in S_2 \mid x \in A, \exists y \in B \text{ such that } d^{S_1}(x, y) \leq \varepsilon\} \\ &= \{f(x) \in S_2 \mid x \in A \cap B^\varepsilon\} \\ &= f(A \cap B^\varepsilon) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly  $f(B) \cap f(A)^\varepsilon = f(B \cap A^\varepsilon)$ . Hence, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d_H^{S_2}(f(A), f(B)) &= \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 \mid f(A) = f(A) \cap f(B)^\varepsilon, f(B) = f(B) \cap f(A)^\varepsilon\} \\ &= \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 \mid A = A \cap B^\varepsilon, B = B \cap A^\varepsilon\} \\ &= d_H^{S_1}(A, B). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Proposition 2.32.** *Let  $(S_i, d^{S_i}, \rho_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  be rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces and  $f : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$  be root-and-distance-preserving map. Then the map  $(\mathcal{C}(S_1), d_H^{S_1, \rho_1}) \ni A \mapsto f(A) \in (\mathcal{C}(S_2), d_H^{S_2, \rho_2})$  is distance-preserving.*

*Proof.* Fix  $A, B \in \mathcal{C}(S_1)$ . Since  $f(\rho_1) = \rho_2$  and  $f$  is distance-preserving, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)^{(r)} &= \{f(x) \in S_2 \mid d^{S_2}(\rho_2, f(x)) \leq r\} \\ &= \{f(x) \in S_2 \mid d^{S_1}(\rho_1, x) \leq r\} \\ &= f(A^{(r)}) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly  $f(B)^{(r)} = f(B^{(r)})$ . Thus, by Lemma 2.31, we deduce that

$$d_H^{S_2}(f(A)^{(r)}, f(B)^{(r)}) = d_H^{S_2}(f(A^{(r)}), f(B^{(r)})) = d_H^{S_1}(A^{(r)}, B^{(r)}).$$

Now the desired result is straightforward.  $\square$

### 2.2.2 The vague metric

There are various versions of metrics inducing the vague topology (e.g. [16, Section A2.6] and [20, Section 4.1]). In this section, we define one such metric in a similar way to the local Hausdorff metric.

Let  $(S, d^S, \rho)$  be a rooted boundedly-compact metric space. We first introduce the space of measures.

**Definition 2.33** (The space  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{M}(S)$ ). We define  $\mathcal{M}(S)$  to be the set of Radon measures  $\mu$  on  $S$ , that is,  $\mu$  is a Borel measure on  $S$  such that  $\mu(K) < \infty$  for every compact subset  $K$ . We denote the subset of  $\mathcal{M}(S)$  consisting of finite Borel measures by  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S)$

A commonly used metric on  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S)$  is the Prohorov metric.

**Definition 2.34** (The Prohorov metric and the weak topology). For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S)$ , we define

$$d_P^S(\mu, \nu) := \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \mu(A) \leq \nu(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon, \nu(A) \leq \mu(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \text{ for all closed subsets } A \subseteq S\}.$$

The function  $d_P^S$  is a separable and complete metric on  $\mathcal{M}(S)$  and is called the *Prohorov metric*. The topology on  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S)$  induced by  $d_P^S$  coincides with the topology of weak convergence and is called the *weak topology*. (See [16, Section A2.5] for details.)

Let  $\leq$  be a partial order on  $\mathcal{M}(S)$  given by

$$\mu \leq \nu \Leftrightarrow \mu(A) \leq \nu(A), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(S),$$

where  $\mathcal{B}(S)$  denotes the set of Borel sets. We then define a restriction system of  $(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S), \mathcal{M}(S), \leq)$ .

**Definition 2.35** (The restriction system of  $(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S), \mathcal{M}(S), \leq)$ ). We define a restriction system  $R = (R_r)_{r>0}$  by setting

$$R_r(\mu)(A) = \mu^{(r)}(A) := \mu(A \cap S^{(r)}), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(S).$$

The following result is basically proven in a similar way to the proof of Lemma 2.24. However, Assumption 2.6(i) is not straightforward to check, and so we give a proof in Appendix A.

**Lemma 2.36.** *The restriction system  $R$  of  $(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S), \mathcal{M}(S), \leq)$  is complete and satisfies Assumption 2.6. Moreover, if  $R'$  is a restriction system associated with another root  $\rho'$  of  $S$ , then  $\text{dis}(R, R') \leq d^S(\rho, \rho')$ .*

By Corollary 2.18 and Lemma 2.24, we obtain a complete, separable metric on  $\mathcal{M}(S)$ . Define

$$d_V^{S;\rho}(\mu, \nu) := \int_0^\infty e^{-r} (1 \wedge d_P^S(\mu^{(r)}, \nu^{(r)})) dr, \quad \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(S). \quad (2.13)$$

**Theorem 2.37.** *The function  $d_V^{S;\rho}$  is a well-defined metric on  $\mathcal{M}(S)$  and the metric space  $(\mathcal{M}(S), d_V^{S;\rho})$  is complete and separable. Moreover, the topology on  $\mathcal{M}(S)$  induced from  $d_V^{S;\rho}$  is independent of the root  $\rho$ .*

**Definition 2.38** (The vague metric). We call  $d_V^{S;\rho}$  given by (2.13) the *vague metric (with root  $\rho$ )*.

The next result shows that the topology on  $\mathcal{M}(S)$  induced from  $d_V^{S;\rho}$  is indeed the vague topology.

**Theorem 2.39** (Convergence with respect to  $d_V^{S;\rho}$ ). *Let  $\mu, \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots$  be elements of  $\mathcal{M}(S)$ . Then, the following are equivalent.*

- (i) *The measures  $\mu_n$  converges to  $\mu$  with respect to  $d_V^{S;\rho}$ .*
- (ii) *The measures  $\mu_n^{(r)}$  converges to  $\mu^{(r)}$  weakly for all but countably many  $r > 0$ .*

(iii) There exists an increasing sequence  $(r_k)_k$  with  $r_k \uparrow \infty$  such that  $\mu_n^{(r_k)}$  converges to  $\mu^{(r_k)}$  weakly for each  $k$ .

(iv) The measures  $\mu_n$  converges to  $\mu$  vaguely, that is, it holds that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S f(x) \mu_n(dx) = \int_S f(x) \mu(dx)$$

for all continuous functions  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with compact support.

*Proof.* The equivalence of (i), (ii) and (iii) follows from Theorem 2.8. It is easy to check that (ii) implies (iv). Assume that (iv) is satisfied. Let  $r > 0$  be such that  $\mu(\{x \mid d^S(\rho, x) = r\}) = 0$ . Then, by [20, Lemma 4.1], we have that  $\mu_n(S^{(r)}) \rightarrow \mu(S^{(r)})$ . Let  $A$  be a closed subset in  $S$ . It follows from [20, Lemma 4.1] that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n^{(r)}(C) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(C \cap S^{(r)}) \leq \mu(C \cap S^{(r)}) = \mu^{(r)}(C).$$

Therefore, by [16, Theorem A.2.3.II], we obtain that  $\mu_n^{(r)}$  converges to  $\mu^{(r)}$  weakly.  $\square$

Similar to the local Hausdorff metric, the vague metric inherits the property that the Prohorov distance between measures is preserved when the measures are carried into a different space by a distance-preserving map.

**Lemma 2.40.** *Let  $(S_i, d^{S_i})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  be boundedly-compact metric spaces and  $f : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$  be a distance-preserving map. Then the map  $(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S_1), d_P^{S_1}) \ni \mu \mapsto \mu \circ f^{-1} \in (\mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S_2), d_P^{S_2})$  is distance-preserving.*

*Proof.* Choose  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $d_P^{S_1}(\mu, \nu) \leq \varepsilon$ . Fix a closed subset  $A \subseteq S_2$ . If  $x \in f^{-1}(A)^\varepsilon$ , then there exists  $y \in S_1$  such that  $f(y) \in A$  and  $d^{S_1}(x, y) \leq \varepsilon$ . It is then the case that  $d^{S_2}(f(x), f(y)) \leq \varepsilon$  and hence  $f(x) \in A^\varepsilon$ . Thus,  $f^{-1}(A)^\varepsilon \subseteq f^{-1}(A^\varepsilon)$ . Therefore, we obtain that

$$\mu \circ f^{-1}(A) = \mu(f^{-1}(A)) \leq \nu(f^{-1}(A)^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \leq \nu \circ f^{-1}(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon,$$

and similarly,  $\nu \circ f^{-1}(A) \leq \mu \circ f^{-1}(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ . This yields that  $d_P^{S_2}(\mu \circ f^{-1}, \nu \circ f^{-1}) \leq \varepsilon$ . By letting  $\varepsilon \downarrow d_P^{S_1}(\mu, \nu)$ , we obtain that  $d_P^{S_2}(\mu \circ f^{-1}, \nu \circ f^{-1}) \leq d_P^{S_1}(\mu, \nu)$ . Next, suppose that  $d_P^{S_2}(\mu \circ f^{-1}, \nu \circ f^{-1}) \leq \varepsilon$ . Fix a closed subset  $A \subseteq S_1$ . If  $x \in f(A)^\varepsilon \cap f(S_1)$ , then there exist  $y \in S_1$  and  $z \in A$  such that  $x = f(y)$  and  $d^{S_2}(f(y), f(z)) \leq \varepsilon$ . It is then the case that  $d^{S_1}(y, z) \leq \varepsilon$  and hence  $x \in f(A^\varepsilon)$ . Thus,  $f(A)^\varepsilon \cap f(S_1) \subseteq f(A^\varepsilon)$ . This, combined with  $S_1 = f^{-1}(f(S_1))$ , yields that

$$f^{-1}(f(A)^\varepsilon) = f^{-1}(f(A)^\varepsilon) \cap f^{-1}(f(S_1)) = f^{-1}(f(A)^\varepsilon \cap f(S_1)) \subseteq f^{-1}(f(A^\varepsilon)) = A^\varepsilon.$$

Therefore, we deduce that

$$\mu(A) = \mu \circ f^{-1}(f(A)) \leq \mu \circ f^{-1}(f(A)^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \leq \mu(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon,$$

and similarly  $\nu(A) \leq \mu(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ . Thus, by the same argument as before, we obtain  $d_P^{S_1}(\mu, \nu) \leq d_P^{S_2}(\mu \circ f^{-1}, \nu \circ f^{-1})$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.41.** *Let  $(S_i, d^{S_i}, \rho_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  be rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces and  $f : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$  be a root-and-distance-preserving map. Then the map  $(\mathcal{M}(S_1), d_V^{S_1, \rho_1}) \ni \mu \mapsto \mu \circ f^{-1} \in (\mathcal{M}(S_2), d_V^{S_2, \rho_2})$  is distance-preserving.*

*Proof.* For  $A \in \mathcal{B}(S_2)$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(S_1)$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}(A \cap D_{S_2}(\rho_2, r)) &= \{x \in S_1 \mid f(x) \in A, d^{S_2}(\rho_2, f(x)) \leq r\} \\ &= \{x \in S_1 \mid f(x) \in A, x \in D_{S_1}(\rho_1, r)\} \\ &= f^{-1}(A) \cap D_{S_1}(\rho_1, r). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we deduce that

$$(\mu \circ f^{-1})^{(r)}(A) = \mu(f^{-1}(A) \cap D_{S_1}(\rho_1, r)) = \mu^{(r)}(f^{-1}(A)),$$

which implies that  $(\mu \circ f^{-1})^{(r)} = \mu^{(r)} \circ f^{-1}$ . This, combined with Lemma 2.40, yields that for  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(S_1)$

$$d_P^{S_2} \left( (\mu \circ f^{-1})^{(r)}, (\nu \circ f^{-1})^{(r)} \right) = d_P^{S_1}(\mu^{(r)}, \nu^{(r)}).$$

Therefore, we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

**Remark 2.42.** Another metric inducing the vague topology is found in [20, Lemma 4.6], but it is not clear that the metric satisfies the property of Proposition 2.41. In [16, Section A2.6], a metric defined in a similar way to  $d_V^{S,\rho}$  is proposed. However, as pointed out by [30], there are mistakes in the proofs in [16], which is the reason why we have not simply adopted the metric in that book.

### 2.2.3 The compact-convergence topology with variable domains

We next introduce a topology on a collection of functions with different domains. This topological framework is needed, for example, when one considers the metrization of a Gromov-Hausdorff-type topology on the collection of elements of the form  $(S, d^S, \rho, f)$  such that the additional object  $f$  is an element of  $C(S, \Xi)$ , where  $\Xi$  is a fixed metric space. Note that  $C(S, \Xi)$  denotes the set of continuous functions  $f : X \rightarrow \Xi$  and we equip  $C(S, \Xi)$  with the compact-convergence topology, that is,  $f_n$  converges to  $f$  if and only if  $f_n$  converges to  $f$  uniformly on every compact subset. The difficulty in defining a Gromov-Hausdorff-type metric for such a space is that  $C(S, \Xi)$  cannot be embedded in  $C(S', \Xi)$  in a natural way when  $S$  is a subspace of  $S'$ . The idea for resolving this issue is to consider the set  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  consisting of functions from a subset of  $S$  to  $\Xi$ . Then, we have a natural embedding of  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  into  $\widehat{C}(S', \Xi)$ . With this background, we define a metric on  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  inducing a natural extension of the topology on  $C(S, \Xi)$ .

Fix a non-empty separable and complete metric space  $(\Xi, d^\Xi)$  and a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(S, d^S, \rho)$ .

**Definition 2.43** (The sets  $\widehat{C}_c(S, \Xi)$  and  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$ ). We define

$$\widehat{C}(S, \Xi) := \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{C}(S)} C(X, \Xi).$$

Note that  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  contains the empty map  $\emptyset_\Xi : \emptyset \rightarrow \Xi$ . Write  $\text{dom}(f)$  for the domain of a function  $f$ . We then define  $\widehat{C}_c(S, \Xi)$  to be the subset of  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  consisting of  $f$  such that  $\text{dom}(f)$  is compact in  $S$ .

**Definition 2.44** (The metrics  $d_{\widehat{C}_c, \Xi}^S$  and  $d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}$ ). For  $f, g \in \widehat{C}_c(S, \Xi)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , consider the following condition.

( $\widehat{C}_c$ ) For any  $x \in \text{dom}(f)$ , there exists an element  $y \in \text{dom}(g)$  such that  $d^S(x, y) \vee d^\Xi(f(x), g(y)) \leq \varepsilon$ . Similarly, for any  $y \in \text{dom}(g)$ , there exists an element  $x \in \text{dom}(f)$  such that  $d^S(x, y) \vee d^\Xi(f(x), g(y)) \leq \varepsilon$ .

We define

$$d_{\widehat{C}_c, \Xi}^S(f, g) := \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 \mid \varepsilon \text{ satisfies } (\widehat{C}_c)\},$$

where the infimum over the empty set is defined to be  $\infty$ . For  $f \in \widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$ , write  $f^{(r)} := f|_{\text{dom}(f)^{(r)}}$ , where we recall that  $\text{dom}(f)^{(r)} = \text{dom}(f) \cap S^{(r)}$ . We then define

$$d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}(f, g) := \int_0^\infty e^{-r} \left(1 \wedge d_{\widehat{C}_c, \Xi}^S(f^{(r)}, g^{(r)})\right) dr.$$

**Theorem 2.45.** *The function  $d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}$  is a well-defined metric on  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$ . The space  $(\widehat{C}(S, \Xi), d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^{S, \rho})$  is Polish and the induced topology is independent of the root  $\rho$ .*

To prove Theorem 2.45, we borrow the idea given in [23, Section 4.5]: we identify each function of  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  with its graph, and consider a larger space  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$  introduced below. Note that we equip with  $S \times \Xi$  the *max product metric*  $d^{S \times \Xi}$ , which is a metric given by

$$d^{S \times \Xi}((x, a), (y, b)) := d^S(x, y) \vee d^\Xi(a, b).$$

**Definition 2.46** (The space  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S, \Xi)$  and  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$ ). We define  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$  to be the set of closed subsets  $E \subseteq S \times \Xi$  such that  $E \cap (S^{(r)} \times \Xi)$  is compact for all  $r > 0$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S, \Xi)$  the subset of  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$  consisting of compact subsets of  $S \times \Xi$ .

We equip  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S, \Xi)$  with the Hausdorff metric  $d_H^{S \times \Xi}$  and  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$  with the inclusion order  $\subseteq$ . We then define a restriction system of  $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S, \Xi), \mathcal{C}(S, \Xi), \subseteq)$ .

**Definition 2.47** (The restriction system of  $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S, \Xi), \mathcal{C}(S, \Xi), \subseteq)$ ). We define a restriction system  $R = (R_r)_{r>0}$  by setting

$$R_r(E) = E^{(r,*)} := E \cap (S^{(r)} \times \Xi), \quad r > 0, E \in \mathcal{C}(S, \Xi).$$

Similar to the restriction system of  $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S), \mathcal{C}(S), \subseteq)$  given in Section 2.2.1, the restriction system  $R$  of  $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S, \Xi), \mathcal{C}(S, \Xi), \subseteq)$  is complete and satisfies Assumption 2.6. Since it is proven in the same way as the proof of Lemma 2.24, we omit the proof.

**Lemma 2.48.** *The restriction system  $R$  of  $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(S, \Xi), \mathcal{C}(S, \Xi), \subseteq)$  is complete and satisfies Assumption 2.6. Moreover, if  $R'$  is a restriction system associated with another root  $\rho'$  of  $S$ , then  $\text{dis}(R, R') \leq d^S(\rho, \rho')$ .*

By Corollary 2.18 and Lemma 2.24, we obtain a complete, separable metric on  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$ . Define

$$d_{\bar{H}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}(E, F) := \int_0^\infty e^{-r} (1 \wedge d_H^{S \times \Xi}(E^{(r,*)}, F^{(r,*)})) dr, \quad E, F \in \mathcal{C}(S, \Xi). \quad (2.14)$$

**Theorem 2.49.** *The function  $d_{\bar{H}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}$  is a well-defined metric on  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$  and the metric space  $(\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi), d_{\bar{H}, \Xi}^{S, \rho})$  is complete and separable. Moreover, the topology on  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$  induced from  $d_{\bar{H}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}$  is independent of the root  $\rho$ .*

**Theorem 2.50** (Convergence in  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$ ). *Let  $E, E_1, E_2, \dots$  be elements of  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$ . Then, the following are equivalent.*

- (i) *The elements  $E_n$  converge to  $E$  in  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$ .*
- (ii) *The elements  $E_n^{(r,*)}$  converge to  $E^{(r,*)}$  in the Hausdorff topology for all but countably many  $r > 0$ .*
- (iii) *There exists an increasing sequence  $(r_k)_k$  with  $r_k \uparrow \infty$  such that  $E_n^{(r_k,*)}$  converges to  $E^{(r_k,*)}$  in the Hausdorff topology for each  $k$ .*

**Remark 2.51.** In general, the space  $(\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi), d_{\bar{H}, \Xi}^{S, \rho})$  is not compact even when  $S$  is compact. For example, if  $S = \{\rho\}$  and  $\Xi = \mathbb{R}$  equipped with the Euclidean metric, then a sequence  $E_n := \{(\rho, n)\}$  does not have a convergent subsequence.

Now we are ready to start proving Theorem 2.45.

**Definition 2.52** (The graph map  $\mathfrak{g}$ ). For each function  $f$ , we write  $\mathfrak{g}(f)$  for its graph, i.e.,  $\mathfrak{g}(f) := \{(x, f(x)) \mid x \in \text{dom}(f)\}$ .

The following result is an immediate consequence of the definitions of  $d_{\hat{C}_c, \Xi}^S$  and  $d_{\hat{C}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}$ , and so we omit the proof.

**Proposition 2.53.** *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\hat{C}_c, \Xi}^S(f, g) &= d_H^{S \times \Xi}(\mathfrak{g}(f), \mathfrak{g}(g)), \quad \forall f, g \in \hat{C}_c(S, \Xi), \\ d_{\hat{C}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}(f, g) &= d_{\bar{H}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}(\mathfrak{g}(f), \mathfrak{g}(g)), \quad \forall f, g \in \hat{C}(S, \Xi). \end{aligned}$$

*As a consequence,  $d_{\hat{C}_c, \Xi}^S$  is an extended metric on  $\hat{C}_c(S, \Xi)$  and  $d_{\hat{C}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}$  is a metric on  $\hat{C}(S, \Xi)$ .*

**Corollary 2.54.** *The map  $\mathfrak{g} : (\hat{C}(S, \Xi), d_{\hat{C}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi), d_{\bar{H}, \Xi}^{S, \rho})$  is distance-preserving.*

**Definition 2.55** (The compact-convergence topology with variable domains). We equip  $\hat{C}(S, \Xi)$  with the topology induced from  $d_{\hat{C}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}$ , which we call the *compact-convergence topology with variable domains*.

By using the graph map  $\mathfrak{g}$  of Corollary 2.54, we regard  $\hat{C}(S, \Xi)$  is a subspace of  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$ . To show that  $\hat{C}(S, \Xi)$  is Polish, we define a sequence of subspaces in  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$  converging to  $\hat{C}(S, \Xi)$ .

**Definition 2.56** (The space  $\hat{C}_k(S, \Xi)$ ). Fix  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We define  $\hat{C}_k(S, \Xi)$  to be the collection of  $E \in \mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$  such that there exist  $r = r(E) > k$  and  $\delta_i = \delta_i(E) \in (0, 1/k)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  satisfying the following.

(C) For any  $(x, a), (y, b) \in E^{(r,*)}$ , if  $d^S(x, y) < \delta_1$ , then  $d^\Xi(a, b) < \delta_2$ .

**Lemma 2.57.** *For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\widehat{C}_k(S, \Xi)$  is an open subset of  $\mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $E \in \widehat{C}_k(S, \Xi)$ . Let  $r > k$  and  $\delta_i \in (0, 1/k)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  be constants satisfying (C) for  $E$ . Choose  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  so that

$$r - \varepsilon > k, \quad r < \varepsilon^{-1}, \quad 2\varepsilon < \delta_1, \quad 2\varepsilon + \delta_2 < 1/k.$$

Fix  $F \in \mathcal{C}(S, \Xi)$  such that  $d_{\widehat{H}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}(E, F) < \varepsilon e^{-1/\varepsilon}$ . It is enough to show that  $F \in \widehat{C}_k(S, \Xi)$ . By the definition of  $d_{\widehat{H}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}$ , we can find  $\tilde{r} > 1/\varepsilon$  such that

$$d_H^{S \times \Xi}(E^{(\tilde{r}, *)}, F^{(\tilde{r}, *)}) < \varepsilon. \quad (2.15)$$

Define  $r' > k$  and  $0 < \delta'_i < 1/k$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  by setting

$$r' := r - \varepsilon, \quad \delta'_1 := \delta_1 - 2\varepsilon, \quad \delta'_2 := \delta_2 + 2\varepsilon, \quad (2.16)$$

We will prove that  $r', \delta'_1$  and  $\delta'_2$  satisfy (C) for  $F$ . Fix  $(x, a), (y, b) \in F^{(r',*)}$  satisfying  $d^S(x, y) < \delta'_1$ . By (2.15), there exists  $(x', a'), (y', b') \in E^{(\tilde{r},*)}$  such that

$$d^S(x, x') \vee d^\Xi(a, a') < \varepsilon, \quad d^S(y, y') \vee d^\Xi(b, b') < \varepsilon. \quad (2.17)$$

It is then from (2.16) and (2.17) that  $(x', a'), (y', b') \in E^{(r,*)}$  and  $d^S(x', y') < \delta_1$ . Using (C), we obtain that  $d^\Xi(a', b') < \delta_2$ . This, combined with (2.16) and (2.17), yields that  $d^\Xi(a, b) < \delta'_2$ , which implies that  $F \in \widehat{C}_k(S, \Xi)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.58.** *It holds that  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi) = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \widehat{C}_k(S, \Xi)$ .*

*Proof.* It is easy to check that  $\widehat{C}_k(S, \Xi) \subseteq \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \widehat{C}_k(S, \Xi)$  by using the uniform continuity of  $f \in \widehat{C}_k(S, \Xi)$  on compact subsets. Fix  $E \in \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \widehat{C}_k(S, \Xi)$ . It suffices to construct a function  $f \in \widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  whose graph coincides with  $E$ . Define  $X$  to be the subset of  $S$  consisting of  $x$  such that  $(x, a) \in E$  for some  $a \in \Xi$ . By the definition of  $\widehat{C}_k(S, \Xi)$ , one can check that  $X$  is a closed subset of  $S$ . The condition (C) implies that, for each  $x \in X$ , an element  $a_x \in \Xi$  satisfying  $(x, a_x) \in E$  is uniquely determined. We define  $f : X \rightarrow \Xi$  by setting  $f(x) := a_x$ . Then, using (C) again, we deduce that  $f$  is continuous, which completes the proof.  $\square$

Now, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.45.

*Proof of Theorem 2.45.* We already checked that  $d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^{S, \rho}$  is a metric on  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  by Theorem 2.49 and Proposition 2.53. The Polishness of  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.49, Lemma 2.57 and 2.58.  $\square$

We provide a characterization of convergence in  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$ , which shows that the topology on  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  is a natural extension of the compact-convergence topology.

**Theorem 2.59** (Convergence in  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$ ). *Let  $f, f_1, f_2, \dots$  be elements of  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$ . The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) *The functions  $f_n$  converge to  $f$  in the compact-convergence topology with variable domains.*
- (ii) *For all but countably many  $r > 0$ ,  $f_n^{(r)}$  converges to  $f^{(r)}$  with respect to  $d_{\widehat{C}_c, \Xi}^S$ .*
- (iii) *There exists an increasing sequence  $(r_k)_{k \geq 1}$  with  $r_k \uparrow \infty$  such that  $f_n^{(r_k)}$  converges to  $f^{(r_k)}$  with respect to  $d_{\widehat{C}_c, \Xi}^S$ .*
- (iv) *The sets  $\text{dom}(f_n)$  converge to  $\text{dom}(f)$  in the local Hausdorff topology in  $S$ , and, for all  $r > 0$  (or equivalently,  $r \in I$  with some unbounded subset  $I \subseteq (0, \infty)$ ), it holds that*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x_n \in \text{dom}(f_n)^{(r)}, \\ x \in \text{dom}(f)^{(r)}, \\ d^S(x_n, x) < \delta}} d^\Xi(f_n(x_n), f(x)) = 0. \quad (2.18)$$

(v) The sets  $\text{dom}(f_n)$  converge to  $\text{dom}(f)$  in the local Hausdorff topology in  $S$ , and there exist functions  $g_n, g \in C(S, \Xi)$  such that  $g_n|_{\text{dom}(f_n)} = f_n$ ,  $g|_{\text{dom}(f)} = f$  and  $g_n \rightarrow g$  in the compact-convergence topology.

*Proof.* By definition, we have that  $\mathbf{g}(f)^{(r,*)} = \mathbf{g}(f^{(r)})$  for each  $f \in \widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$ . Thus, we obtain the equivalence of (i), (ii) and (iii) by using Lemma 2.53 and Theorem 2.50. Assume that (ii) holds. Fix  $r > 0$  such that  $f_n^{(r)}$  converges to  $f$  with respect to  $d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^S$ . It is easy to check that  $\text{dom}(f_n)^{(r)}$  converges to  $\text{dom}(f)^{(r)}$  in the Hausdorff topology in  $S$ , which implies that  $\text{dom}(f_n)$  converges to  $\text{dom}(f)$  in the local Hausdorff topology in  $S$ . Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By the uniform continuity of  $f$  on  $\text{dom}(f)^{(r)}$ , we can find  $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$  such that, for  $x, y \in \text{dom}(f)^{(r)}$ ,

$$d^S(x, y) < 2\delta \implies d^{\Xi}(f(x), f(y)) < \varepsilon. \quad (2.19)$$

Choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  so that

$$d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^S(f_n^{(r)}, f^{(r)}) < \delta, \quad \forall n > N. \quad (2.20)$$

Fix  $n > N$  and  $x_n \in \text{dom}(f_n)$ ,  $x \in \text{dom}(f)$  with  $d^S(x_n, x) < \delta$ . By (2.20), there exists  $y \in \text{dom}(f)^{(r)}$  satisfying

$$d^S(x_n, y) \vee d^{\Xi}(f_n(x_n), f(y)) < \delta. \quad (2.21)$$

Since we have that

$$d^S(x, y) \leq d^S(x, x_n) + d^S(x_n, y) < 2\delta,$$

it follows from (2.19) that  $d^{\Xi}(f(x), f(y)) < \varepsilon$ . This, combined with (2.21), yields that

$$d^{\Xi}(f_n(x_n), f(x)) \leq d^{\Xi}(f_n(x_n), f(y)) + d^{\Xi}(f(y), f(x)) < 2\varepsilon.$$

Thus, we obtain (iv).

If (iv) is satisfied, then by the same argument as [13, Proof of Proposition 2.3] we obtain (v). Finally, assume that (v) holds. Let  $r > 0$  be such that  $\text{dom}(f_n)^{(r)} \rightarrow \text{dom}(f)^{(r)}$  in the Hausdorff topology in  $S$ . Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Using the convergence  $g_n \rightarrow g$  and the uniform continuity of  $g$  on  $S^{(r)}$ , we deduce that there exists  $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$  satisfying

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x_n, x \in S^{(r)}, \\ d^S(x_n, x) < \delta}} d^{\Xi}(g_n(x_n), g(x)) < \varepsilon.$$

Then, we can find  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for all  $n > N$ ,

$$d_H^S(\text{dom}(f_n)^{(r)}, \text{dom}(f)^{(r)}) < \delta, \quad \sup_{\substack{x_n \in \text{dom}(f_n)^{(r)}, x \in \text{dom}(f)^{(r)}, \\ d^S(x_n, x) < \delta}} d^{\Xi}(f_n(x_n), f(x)) < \varepsilon.$$

From the above inequalities, it is easy to deduce that  $d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^S(f_n^{(r)}, f^{(r)}) < \varepsilon$  for all  $n > N$ . Therefore, we obtain (iii).  $\square$

**Corollary 2.60.** Fix  $X \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ . Then the map  $C(X, \Xi) \ni f \mapsto f \in \widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  is a homeomorphism onto its image, where we recall that  $C(X, \Xi)$  is equipped with the compact-convergence topology.

**Remark 2.61.** Convergence of functions with different compact domains is considered in [13, Section 2.1]. From Theorem 2.59, one can see that the convergence with variable domains introduced in this section is a natural generalization of the convergence used in that paper.

We provide a precompactness criterion in  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$ , which is a generalization of the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem.

**Theorem 2.62** (Precompactness in  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$ ). A non-empty subset  $\{f_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact in  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.

- (i) For each  $r > 0$ , the set  $\{f_\alpha(x) \mid x \in \text{dom}(f_\alpha)^{(r)}, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact in  $\Xi$ .
- (ii) For each  $r > 0$ , it holds that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{\substack{x, y \in \text{dom}(f_\alpha)^{(r)}, \\ d^S(x, y) < \delta}} d^{\Xi}(f_\alpha(x), f_\alpha(y)) = 0.$$

*Proof.* We suppose that  $\{f_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact. Assume that (i) is not satisfied. Then, for some  $r > 0$ , we can find a sequence  $(\alpha_n, x_n)_{n \geq 1}$  with  $\alpha_n \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $x_n \in \text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n})^{(r)}$  such that  $(f_{\alpha_n}(x_n))_{n \geq 1}$  contains no convergent subsequence. If necessary, by choosing a subsequence, we may assume that  $f_{\alpha_n}$  converges to some  $f \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}(S, \Xi)$ . By Theorem 2.59(iv), if necessary, by choosing a further subsequence, we may also assume that  $x_n$  converges to some  $x \in \text{dom}(f)$  in  $S$ . It then follows from (2.18) that  $f_{\alpha_n}(x_n)$  converges to  $f(x)$  in  $\Xi$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore, we obtain (i). Next, assume that (ii) is not satisfied. Then, for some  $r > 0$ , we can find  $\varepsilon > 0$ , a decreasing sequence  $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 1}$  with  $\delta_n \downarrow 0$ , a sequence  $(\alpha_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , and  $x_n, y_n \in \text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n})^{(r)}$  with  $d^S(x_n, y_n) < \delta_n$  satisfying

$$d^{\Xi}(f_{\alpha_n}(x_n), f_{\alpha_n}(y_n)) > 3\varepsilon, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (2.22)$$

If necessary, by choosing a subsequence, we may assume that  $f_{\alpha_n}$  converges to some  $f \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}(S, \Xi)$ . By Theorem 2.59(iv), there exists  $r' > r$  such that  $\text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n})^{(r')} \rightarrow \text{dom}(f)^{(r')}$  in the Hausdorff topology in  $S$ . By the uniform continuity of  $f$  on  $\text{dom}(f)^{(r')}$ , we can find  $\delta' < \varepsilon$  satisfying, for all  $x, y \in \text{dom}(f)^{(r')}$ ,

$$d^S(x, y) < 3\delta' \implies d^{\Xi}(f(x), f(y)) < \varepsilon. \quad (2.23)$$

By (2.18), if necessary, by replacing  $\delta'$  with a smaller number, we may assume that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x_n \in \text{dom}(f_n)^{(r)}, \\ x \in \text{dom}(f)^{(r)}, \\ d^S(x_n, x) < \delta'}} d^{\Xi}(f_n(x_n), f(x)) < \varepsilon.$$

Then, it is possible to choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  so that, for all  $n > N$ ,

$$\sup \left\{ d^{\Xi}(f_n(x_n), f(x)) \mid x_n \in \text{dom}(f_n)^{(r)}, x \in \text{dom}(f)^{(r)} \text{ with } d^S(x_n, x) < \delta' \right\} < \varepsilon, \quad (2.24)$$

$$d_H^S(\text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n})^{(r')}, \text{dom}(f)^{(r')}) < \delta', \quad (2.25)$$

$$\delta_n < \delta'. \quad (2.26)$$

Fix  $n > N$ . By (2.25), for some  $z, w \in \text{dom}(f)^{(r')}$ , we have that  $d^S(x_n, z) < \delta'$  and  $d^S(y_n, w) < \delta'$ . It then follows from (2.24) and (2.26) that  $d^{\Xi}(f_{\alpha_n}(x_n), f(z)) < \varepsilon$ ,  $d^{\Xi}(f_{\alpha_n}(y_n), f(w)) < \varepsilon$  and

$$d^S(z, w) \leq d^S(z, x_n) + d^S(x_n, y_n) + d^S(y_n, w) \leq \delta' + \delta_n + \delta' < 3\delta'.$$

Since (2.23) yields that  $d^{\Xi}(f(z), f(w)) < \varepsilon$ , we obtain that

$$d^{\Xi}(f_{\alpha_n}(x_n), f_{\alpha_n}(y_n)) \leq d^{\Xi}(f_{\alpha_n}(x_n), f(z)) + d^{\Xi}(f(z), f(w)) + d^{\Xi}(f(w), f_{\alpha_n}(y_n)) < 3\varepsilon,$$

which contradicts (2.22). Therefore, (ii) holds.

Conversely, assume that (i) and (ii) are satisfied. Fix a sequence  $(\alpha_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . By Theorem 2.30, if necessary, by choosing a subsequence, we may assume that, for some non-empty  $X \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ ,  $\text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n}) \rightarrow X$  in the local Hausdorff topology in  $S$ . Define  $U$  to be a countable index set such that  $(x_u : u \in U)$  is a dense subset of  $X$ . By the convergence of  $\text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n})$  to  $X$ , for each  $u \in U$ , we can find  $x_u^n \in \text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n})$  such that  $x_u^n \rightarrow x_u$  in  $S$ . From (i) and a diagonal procedure, by choosing a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that  $f_{\alpha_n}(x_u^n)$  converges to some  $f(x_u) \in \Xi$ . For  $x \in X$ , choose a sequence  $(u_k)_{k \geq 1}$  so that  $x_{u_k} \rightarrow x$  in  $S$ . Using (ii), one can check that  $(f(x_{u_k}))_{k \geq 1}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $\Xi$ , and we set  $f(x)$  to be the limit of  $(f(x_{u_k}))_{k \geq 1}$ . The condition (ii) yields that  $f : X \rightarrow \Xi$  is continuous and, for  $x_n \in \text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n})$  and  $x \in X$ ,

$$x_n \rightarrow x \implies f_{\alpha_n}(x_n) \rightarrow f(x). \quad (2.27)$$

Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $r > 0$  such that  $\text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n})^{(r)} \rightarrow X^{(r)}$ . By the uniform continuity of  $f$  on  $X^{(r)}$ , we can find  $\delta > 0$  satisfying, for any  $x, y \in X^{(r)}$ ,

$$d^S(x, y) < \delta \implies d^{\Xi}(f(x), f(y)) < \varepsilon. \quad (2.28)$$

Since we have (ii), if necessary, by resetting  $\delta$  to a smaller value, we may also assume that

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{\substack{x, y \in \text{dom}(f_\alpha)^{(r)}, \\ d^S(x, y) < 3\delta}} d^{\Xi}(f_\alpha(x), f_\alpha(y)) < \varepsilon. \quad (2.29)$$

Choose a finite subset  $(x^{(k)})_{k=1}^l$  of  $X^{(r)}$  so that  $X^{(r)} \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^l B_S(x^{(k)}, \delta)$ . For each  $k$ , by the convergence of  $\text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n})^{(r)}$  to  $X^{(r)}$ , there exists a sequence  $(x_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1}$  with  $x_n^{(k)} \in \text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n})^{(r)}$  convergent to  $x^{(k)}$  in  $S$ . The convergence  $x_n^{(k)} \rightarrow x^{(k)}$  and (2.27) imply the existence of  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$d^S(x^{(k)}, x_n^{(k)}) < \delta, \quad d^{\Xi}(f_{\alpha_n}(x_n^{(k)}), f(x^{(k)})) < \varepsilon, \quad \forall k, n > N.$$

Fix  $n > N$  and  $x_n \in \text{dom}(f_{\alpha_n})^{(r)}$ ,  $x \in X^{(r)}$  with  $d^S(x_n, x) < \delta$ . Choose  $k$  satisfying  $d^S(x^{(k)}, x) < \delta$ . From (2.28), it follows  $d^{\Xi}(f(x^{(k)}), f(x)) < \varepsilon$ . Since we have that

$$d^S(x_n^{(k)}, x_n) \leq d^S(x_n^{(k)}, x^{(k)}) + d^S(x^{(k)}, x) + d^S(x, x_n) < 3\delta,$$

we obtain from (2.29) that  $d^{\Xi}(f_{\alpha_n}(x_n^{(k)}), f_{\alpha_n}(x_n)) < \varepsilon$ . Therefore, we deduce that

$$d^{\Xi}(f(x), f_{\alpha_n}(x_n)) \leq d^{\Xi}(f(x), f(x^{(k)})) + d^{\Xi}(f(x^{(k)}), f_{\alpha_n}(x_n^{(k)})) + d^{\Xi}(f_{\alpha_n}(x_n^{(k)}), f_{\alpha_n}(x_n)) < 3\varepsilon.$$

By applying Theorem 2.59, we establish that  $f_{\alpha_n} \rightarrow f$  in  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$ .  $\square$

The following result is an analog of Proposition 2.32, which is important for the arguments in Section 4.7.

**Proposition 2.63.** *Let  $(S_i, d^{S_i}, \rho_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  be rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces and  $F : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$  be root-and-distance-preserving map. Then the following map is distance-preserving:*

$$(\widehat{C}(S_1, \Xi), d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^{S_1, \rho_1}) \ni f \mapsto f \circ F^{-1} \in (\widehat{C}(S_2, \Xi), d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^{S_2, \rho_2}).$$

*Note that the domain of  $F^{-1}$  is restricted to  $F(\text{dom}(f))$  so that  $f \circ F^{-1}$  is well-defined.*

*Proof.* Fix  $f, g \in \widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$ . We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{g} \left( (f \circ F^{-1})^{(r)} \right) &= \{(y, f \circ F^{-1}(y)) \in S_2 \times \Xi \mid y \in F(\text{dom}(f))^{(r)}\} \\ &= \{(F(x), f(x)) \in S_2 \times \Xi \mid x \in \text{dom}(f)^{(r)}\} \\ &= (F \times \text{id}_{\Xi})(\mathfrak{g}(f^{(r)})), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly  $\mathfrak{g} \left( (g \circ F^{-1})^{(r)} \right) = (F \times \text{id}_{\Xi})(\mathfrak{g}(g^{(r)}))$ . Since  $F \times \text{id}_{\Xi} : S_1 \times \Xi \rightarrow S_2 \times \Xi$  is distance-preserving, it follows from Lemma 2.31 and Proposition 2.53 that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^{S_2} \left( (f \circ F^{-1})^{(r)}, (g \circ F^{-1})^{(r)} \right) &= d_H^{S_2 \times \Xi} \left( \mathfrak{g} \left( (f \circ F^{-1})^{(r)} \right), \mathfrak{g} \left( (g \circ F^{-1})^{(r)} \right) \right) \\ &= d_H^{S_1 \times \Xi} \left( \mathfrak{g}(f^{(r)}), \mathfrak{g}(g^{(r)}) \right) \\ &= d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^{S_1} (f^{(r)}, g^{(r)}) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

## 3 Main results

### 3.1 The local Gromov-Hausdorff metric

In this section, we define the local Gromov-Hausdorff metric on the collection of (equivalence classes of) rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces, which is a natural generalization of the Gromov-Hausdorff metric on the collection of (equivalence classes of) rooted compact metric spaces given in (1.1).

Let  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ$  be the collection of rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X)$ . Note that, from the rigorous point of view of set theory,  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ$  is not a set (c.f. Remark 1.1). Thus, we write  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$  just to declare that  $\mathcal{X}$  is a rooted boundedly-compact metric space. For  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X)$ ,  $\mathcal{Y} = (Y, d^Y, \rho_Y) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , we say that  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are *rooted-isometric* if and only if there exists a root-preserving isometry  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . Note that  $f$  being *root-preserving* means that  $f(\rho_X) = \rho_Y$ , and  $f$  being an *isometry* means that  $f$  is a distance-preserving bijection. As mentioned in Remark 1.1, it is impossible to define the “set” of rooted-isometric equivalence classes of elements in  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ$ . However, it is possible to choose a representative from each equivalence class to obtain a legitimate set, as shown in Proposition 3.1 below. The proof is omitted as we prove a more general result in Proposition 3.17.

**Proposition 3.1.** *There exists a set  $\mathfrak{M}$  satisfying the following.*

- (i) *The set  $\mathfrak{M}$  consists of elements in  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ$ .*
- (ii) *For any  $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , there exists a unique element  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathfrak{M}$  such that  $\mathcal{X}$  is rooted-isometric to  $\mathcal{Y}$ .*

**Definition 3.2** (The set  $\mathfrak{M}$ ). A set  $\mathfrak{M}$  satisfying the properties of Proposition 3.1 is uniquely determined if we identify any two rooted-isometric spaces. Thus, we refer to  $\mathfrak{M}$  as the set of rooted-isometric equivalence classes of elements in  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ$ .

**Definition 3.3** (The metric  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}$ ). For  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X), \mathcal{Y} = (Y, d^Y, \rho_Y) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , we define

$$d_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) := \inf_{f, g, Z} d_{\bar{H}}^{Z, \rho_Z}(f(X), g(Y)), \quad (3.1)$$

where the infimum is taken over all  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z) \in \mathfrak{M}$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f : X \rightarrow Z$  and  $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ . (Recall the local Hausdorff metric  $d_{\bar{H}}^{Z, \rho_Z}$  from Section 2.2.1)

**Remark 3.4.** One needs to check that the infimum in (3.1) is well-defined, that is, it is taken over a non-empty set. We give a sketch of how to check it. Fix  $(X, d^X, \rho_X), (Y, d^Y, \rho_Y) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ . Define  $Z'$  to be the disjoint union  $X \sqcup Y$  and define a pseudometric on  $Z'$  by setting  $d^{Z'}|_{X \times X} := d^X$ ,  $d^{Z'}|_{Y \times Y} := d^Y$  and  $d^{Z'}(x, y) := d^X(x, \rho_X) + d^Y(\rho_Y, y)$  for  $x \in X, y \in Y$ . Then,  $d^{Z'}(\rho_X, \rho_Y) = 0$ . Therefore, by setting  $Z$  to be the quotient space and  $\rho_Z$  to be the equivalence class  $\{\rho_X, \rho_Y\}$ , we obtain a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$ , where  $(X, d^X, \rho_X)$  and  $(Y, d^Y, \rho_Y)$  are naturally embedded.

The function  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}$  is indeed a metric on  $\mathfrak{M}$  and the induced topology is characterized by convergence of spaces embedded into a common metric space as at (1.2), which can be viewed as a natural generalization of the Gromov-Hausdorff topology to non-compact spaces. More precisely, we have the following results. The proofs are omitted because they are the same as corresponding more general results in Section 3.2.

**Theorem 3.5.** *For  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$  if and only if  $\mathcal{X}$  is rooted-isometric to  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Moreover, the function  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}$  is a separable and complete metric on  $\mathfrak{M}$ .*

**Definition 3.6** (The local Gromov-Hausdorff topology). We call the topology on  $\mathfrak{M}$  induced by  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}$  the *local Gromov-Hausdorff topology*.

**Theorem 3.7** (Convergence in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology). *For each  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , let  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n})$  be an element in  $\mathfrak{M}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{X}_n$  converges to  $\mathcal{X}_\infty$  if and only if there exist  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z) \in \mathfrak{M}$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_n : X_n \rightarrow Z$  such that  $f_n(X_n) \rightarrow f_\infty(X_\infty)$  in the local Hausdorff topology in  $Z$ .*

For  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , we define  $\mathcal{X}^{(r)} = (X^{(r)}, d^{X^{(r)}}, \rho_X^{(r)})$  by setting

$$X^{(r)} := D_X(\rho_X, r), \quad d^{X^{(r)}} := d^X|_{X^{(r)} \times X^{(r)}}, \quad \rho_X^{(r)} := \rho_X.$$

The following result ensures that the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology coincides with the generalization of the Gromov-Hausdorff topology to non-compact spaces considered in the literature such as [17], [12] and [22]. In Theorem 4.13, we prove a more general result and thus the proof is omitted here.

**Theorem 3.8.** *For each  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , let  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n})$  be an element of  $\mathfrak{M}$ . Then, the following statements are equivalent.*

- (i)  $\mathcal{X}_n$  converges to  $\mathcal{X}_\infty$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}$ ,
- (ii)  $\mathcal{X}_n^{(r)}$  converges to  $\mathcal{X}_\infty^{(r)}$  in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology for all but countably many  $r > 0$ ,
- (iii) There exist a boundedly-compact metric space  $(Z, d^Z)$  and distance-preserving maps  $f_n : X_n \rightarrow Z$  and  $f_\infty : X_\infty \rightarrow Z$  such that, for all but countably many  $r > 0$ ,  $f_n(\rho_{X_n}^{(r)}) \rightarrow f_\infty(\rho_{X_\infty}^{(r)})$  in  $Z$  and  $f_n(X_n^{(r)}) \rightarrow f_\infty(X_\infty^{(r)})$  in the Hausdorff topology in  $Z$ .

To describe a precompactness criterion in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology, we introduce the notion of an  $\varepsilon$ -covering and metric entropy.

**Definition 3.9** ( $\varepsilon$ -covering, metric entropy). Let  $(S, d^S)$  be a metric space and  $\varepsilon$  be a positive number. A subset  $A \subseteq S$  is called an  $\varepsilon$ -covering of  $S$  if it holds that  $S = \bigcup_{x \in A} D_S(x, \varepsilon)$ . We define

$$N(S, \varepsilon) := \min\{|A| \mid A \text{ is an } \varepsilon\text{-covering of } S\},$$

where  $|\cdot|$  denotes the cardinality of a set. An  $\varepsilon$ -covering  $A$  with  $|A| = N(S, \varepsilon)$  is called a *minimal  $\varepsilon$ -covering* of  $(S, d^S)$ . We call the family  $\{N(S, \varepsilon) \mid \varepsilon > 0\}$  the *metric entropy* of  $(S, d^S)$ .

**Remark 3.10.** In Definition 3.9, we borrow the definition of metric entropy given in [28], but one should note that the metric entropy is defined to be the logarithm of  $N(S, \varepsilon)$  elsewhere in the literature.

Before the result on precompactness in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology, we state a simple property of the metric entropy. The result follows directly from the definition, so we omit the proof.

**Lemma 3.11.** *Let  $(K, d^K)$  be a compact metric space. Then  $N(K, \cdot)$  is right-continuous with left-hand limits. In particular, it has at most countable discontinuity points.*

**Theorem 3.12** (Convergence of metric entropies). *If a sequence of compact metric spaces  $(K_n, d^{K_n})$  converges to a compact metric space  $(K, d^K)$  in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology, then*

$$N(K, \varepsilon) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} N(K_n, \varepsilon),$$

for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and, for all continuity points  $\varepsilon > 0$  of  $N(S, \cdot)$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} N(K_n, \varepsilon) = N(K, \varepsilon)$$

holds. In particular, the above equality holds for all but countably many  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* It is not difficult to check that a characterization of convergence in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology similar to Theorem 3.7 holds. Thus, we may assume that all the spaces  $K_n$  and  $K$  are isometrically embedded into a common compact metric space  $(E, d)$  in such a way that  $d_H(K_n, K) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Set  $N := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} N(K_n, \varepsilon)$ . Then (if needed, by choosing a subsequence,) we may assume that for all sufficiently large  $n$ , we have  $N(K_n, \varepsilon) = N$ . Let  $(x_i^{(n)})_{i=1}^N$  be a minimal  $\varepsilon$ -covering of  $(K_n, d^{K_n})$ . Since  $(E, d)$  is compact, (if needed, by choosing a further subsequence,) we may assume that  $x_i^{(n)} \rightarrow x_i$  for some  $x_i \in E$  for all  $i$ , and one can check that  $x_i \in K$  using the convergence  $K_n \rightarrow K$  and that  $K$  is closed in  $E$ . For  $x \in K$ , choose  $x_n \in K_n$  such that  $d(x, x_n) \leq d_H(K_n, K)$  and then choose  $x_i^{(n)} \in K_n$  such that  $d(x_i^{(n)}, x_n) \leq \varepsilon$ . By the triangle inequality, it holds that

$$d(x, x_i) \leq d(x, x_n) + d(x_n, x_i^{(n)}) + d(x_i^{(n)}, x_i) \leq d_H(K_n, K) + \varepsilon + \max_j d(x_j^{(n)}, x_j),$$

and letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain that  $d(x, x_i) \leq \varepsilon$ . Thus  $(x_i)_{i=1}^N$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -covering of  $(K, d^K)$  and therefore we obtain that  $N(K, \varepsilon) \leq N$ .

Now suppose that  $\varepsilon > 0$  is a continuity point of  $N_{d^K}(K, \cdot)$ . Then we can find an  $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$  satisfying  $N(K, \varepsilon') = N(K, \varepsilon)$ . Set  $N' := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} N(K_n, \varepsilon)$  and assume that  $N' > N(K, \varepsilon)$ . Then (if needed, by choosing a subsequence,) we may assume that for all sufficiently large  $n$ , we have  $N(K_n, \varepsilon) = N'$ . Let  $(x_i)_{i=1}^{N'}$  be a minimal  $\varepsilon'$ -covering of  $(K, d^K)$ . We choose  $x_i^{(n)} \in K_n$  such that  $d(x_i, x_i^{(n)}) \leq d_H(K_n, K)$ . For  $y \in K_n$ , we choose  $x \in K$  such that  $d(y, x) \leq d_H(K_n, K)$  and then we choose  $x_i$  such that  $d(x_i, x) \leq \varepsilon'$ . By the triangle inequality, we obtain that

$$d(y, x_i^{(n)}) \leq d(y, x) + d(x, x_i) + d(x_i, x_i^{(n)}) \leq 2d_H(K_n, K) + \varepsilon'.$$

Since  $K_n \rightarrow K$ , the right-hand side of the above inequality is smaller than  $\varepsilon$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ . Hence  $(x_i^{(n)})_{i=1}^{N'}$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -covering of  $(K_n, d^{K_n})$ , which implies that  $N(K_n, \varepsilon) \leq N(K, \varepsilon') = N(K, \varepsilon)$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ . Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the above inequality yields a contradiction. Therefore it holds that  $N' \leq N(K, \varepsilon)$  and combining this with the first result yields the second assertion.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.13** (Precompactness in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology). *A non-empty subset  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha = (X_\alpha, d^{X_\alpha}, \rho_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology if and only if the following condition is satisfied.*

(i) For every  $r > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , it holds that  $\sup_{\alpha} N(X_{\alpha}^{(r)}, \varepsilon) < \infty$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\{\mathcal{X}_{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact. Assume that (i) does not hold. It is then the case that, for some  $r > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can find a sequence  $(\alpha_n)_{n \geq 1}$  satisfying  $N(X_{\alpha_n}^{(r)}, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ . We choose a subsequence  $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$  such that  $(\mathcal{X}_{\alpha_{n_k}})_{k \geq 1}$  converges to some  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}$ . It then follows from Theorem 3.12 that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N(X_{\alpha_{n_k}}^{(r)}, \varepsilon') = N(X^{(r)}, \varepsilon') < \infty$  for some  $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ . Since  $N(X_{\alpha_{n_k}}^{(r)}, \varepsilon) \leq N(X_{\alpha_{n_k}}^{(r)}, \varepsilon')$ , we obtain that  $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} N(X_{\alpha_{n_k}}^{(r)}, \varepsilon) \leq N(X^{(r)}, \varepsilon') < \infty$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore, (i) holds.

Conversely, suppose that (i) is satisfied. Fix a sequence  $(\alpha_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . For each  $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha_n}$ , we define a rooted-and-measured boundedly-compact metric space  $\mathcal{X}'_{\alpha_n}$  by equipping  $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha_n}$  with the zero measure. Then, by [1, Theorem 2.6] and [22, Theorem 3.28], the sequence  $(\mathcal{X}'_{\alpha_n})_{n \geq 1}$  has a subsequence  $(\mathcal{X}'_{\alpha_{n_k}})_{k \geq 1}$  convergent in the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology. This implies that  $(\mathcal{X}_{\alpha_{n_k}})_{k \geq 1}$  converges in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology (c.f. Corollary 3.25 and Theorem 4.13 below).  $\square$

### 3.2 The local Gromov-Hausdorff metric with an additional structure

In this section, we provide a method for metrization of the Gromov-Hausdorff-type topologies on boundedly-compact spaces equipped with additional objects.

**Definition 3.14** (Functor). We call  $\tau$  a *functor* if it satisfies the following.

- (i) For every  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^{\circ}$ , one has a metric space  $(\tau(X, d^X, \rho_X), d_{\tau}^{X, \rho_X})$  where  $\tau(X, d^X, \rho_X)$  is a set and  $d_{\tau}^{X, \rho_X}$  is a metric on it. We simply write  $\tau(X) := \tau(X, d^X, \rho_X)$ .
- (ii) For every  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , one has a distance-preserving map  $\tau_f : \tau(X_1) \rightarrow \tau(X_2)$ .
- (iii) For any two root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ , it holds that  $\tau_{g \circ f} = \tau_g \circ \tau_f$ .
- (iv) For any  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^{\circ}$ , it holds that  $\tau_{\text{id}_X} = \text{id}_{\tau(X)}$ .

**Remark 3.15.** As explained in [23],  $\tau$  is indeed a functor between the categories of rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces and metric spaces.

**Example 3.16.** A typical example of functors is the functor for measures, which is given by setting  $\tau^m(X) := \mathcal{M}(X)$  equipped with the vague metric (recall it from Section 2.2.2) and  $\tau_f^m(\mu) := \mu \circ f^{-1}$ , i.e., the pushforward of  $\mu$ . This functor yields the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology. (See Section 4.4 for details).

We fix a functor  $\tau$ . Let  $\mathfrak{M}^{\circ}(\tau)$  be the collection of  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X)$  such that  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^{\circ}$  and  $a_X \in \tau(X)$ . We say that  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X)$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = (Y, d^Y, \rho_Y, a_Y)$  are  $\tau$ -equivalent if and only if there exists a root-preserving isometry  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $\tau_f(a_X) = a_Y$ . The following result justifies considering the “set” of  $\tau$ -equivalent classes.

**Proposition 3.17.** *There exists a set  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$  satisfying the following.*

- (i) The set  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$  consists of elements in  $\mathfrak{M}^{\circ}(\tau)$ .
- (ii) For any  $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathfrak{M}^{\circ}(\tau)$ , there exists a unique element  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathfrak{M}(\tau)$  such that  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\tau$ -equivalent to  $\mathcal{Y}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $2^{\mathbb{R}}$  be the set of non-empty subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ . For every  $M \in 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ , we denote by  $D(M)$  the set of functions  $d^M : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $d^M$  is a metric on  $M$  and  $(M, d^M)$  is boundedly-compact. We then define a set  $\mathcal{M}$  by setting

$$\mathcal{M} := \{(M, d^M, \rho_M, a_M) : M \in 2^{\mathbb{R}}, d^M \in D(M), \rho_M \in M, a_M \in \tau(M, d^M, \rho_M)\}.$$

Fix  $\mathcal{Y} = (Y, d^Y, \rho_Y, a_Y) \in \mathfrak{M}^{\circ}(\tau)$ . Since the cardinality of  $Y$  is smaller than or equal to the cardinality of  $\mathbb{R}$ , there exist  $X \in 2^{\mathbb{R}}$  and a bijection  $f : Y \rightarrow X$ . We define a function  $d^X : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  by setting  $d^X(f(x), f(y)) := d^Y(x, y)$ . It is then the case that  $d^X \in D(M)$  and  $f$  is an isometry from  $(Y, d^Y)$  to  $(X, d^X)$ . By setting  $\rho_X := f(\rho_Y)$  and  $a_X := \tau_f(a_Y)$ , we obtain an element  $(X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X) \in \mathcal{M}$  which is  $\tau$ -equivalent to  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Choosing a representative from each  $\tau$ -equivalence class of elements in  $\mathcal{M}$ , we obtain the desired set  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.18** (The set  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$ ). Similarly to  $\mathfrak{M}$ , we refer to a set  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$  satisfying the properties of Proposition 3.17 as the set of  $\tau$ -equivalence classes of elements in  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ(\tau)$ .

**Definition 3.19** (The metric  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau$ ). For  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X), \mathcal{Y} = (Y, d^Y, \rho_Y, a_Y) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ(\tau)$ , we define

$$d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) := \inf_{f, g, Z} \left\{ d_H^{Z, \rho_Z}(f(X), g(Y)) \vee d_\tau^{Z, \rho_Z}(\tau_f(a_X), \tau_g(a_Y)) \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z) \in \mathfrak{M}$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f : X \rightarrow Z$  and  $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ .

We will suppose that the following continuity condition for  $\tau$  holds to show  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau$  is a metric on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$ .

**Assumption 3.20.** Fix  $(X, d^X, \rho_X), (Y, d^Y, \rho_Y) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$  arbitrarily. Let  $f_n : X \rightarrow Y, n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  be root-and-distance-preserving maps. If  $f_n \rightarrow f_\infty$  in the compact-convergence topology, then  $\tau_{f_n}(a) \rightarrow \tau_{f_\infty}(a)$  in  $\tau(Y)$  for all  $a \in \tau(X)$ .

**Definition 3.21** (Continuous functor). We say that a functor  $\tau$  is *continuous* if  $\tau$  satisfies Assumption 3.20.

For example, one can check that the functor  $\tau^m$ , which is briefly introduced in Example 3.16, is continuous by using the dominated convergence theorem.

**Lemma 3.22.** Let  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n}, a_{X_n}), n \in \mathbb{N}$  be elements of  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ(\tau)$  such that  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau(\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}_{n+1}) < 2^{-n}e^{-2^n}$ . Then, there exist a rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces  $(Z^*, d^{Z^*}, \rho_{Z^*})$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $h_n : X_n \rightarrow Z^*$  such that

$$d_H^{Z^*, \rho_{Z^*}}(h_n(X_n), h_{n+1}(X_{n+1})) < 2^{-n}e^{-2^n}, \quad d_\tau^{Z^*, \rho_{Z^*}}(\tau_{h_n}(a_{X_n}), \tau_{h_{n+1}}(a_{X_{n+1}})) < 2^{-n}e^{-2^n}.$$

*Proof.* By assumption, for each  $n$ , there exist a boundedly-compact metric space  $(Y_n, d^{Y_n}, \rho_{Y_n})$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_n : X_n \rightarrow Y_n$  and  $g_n : X_{n+1} \rightarrow Y_n$  such that

$$d_H^{Y_n, \rho_{Y_n}}(f_n(X_n), g_n(X_{n+1})) < 2^{-n}e^{-2^n}, \quad d_\tau^{Y_n, \rho_{Y_n}}(\tau_{f_n}(a_{X_n}), \tau_{g_n}(a_{X_{n+1}})) < 2^{-n}e^{-2^n}. \quad (3.2)$$

By restricting the codomains of  $f_n$  and  $g_n$ , we may assume that  $Y_n = f_n(X_n) \cup g_n(X_{n+1})$ . Note that by the definition of the local Hausdorff metric there exists  $s_n > 2^n$  such that

$$d_H^{Y_n}(f_n(X_n^{(s_n)}), g_n(X_{n+1}^{(s_n)})) = d_H^{Y_n}(f_n(X_n)^{(s_n)}, g_n(X_{n+1})^{(s_n)}) < 2^{-n} \quad (3.3)$$

We define a pseudometric  $d^M$  on  $M := \bigsqcup_n X_n$  by setting  $d^M|_{X_n \times X_n} := d^{X_n}$  and

$$d^M(x_n, x_{n+k}) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} d^{Y_{n+l}}(f_{n+l}(x_{n+l}), g_{n+l}(x_{n+l+1})) \mid x_{n+1} \in X_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+k-1} \in X_{n+k-1} \right\}$$

for  $x_n \in X_n, x_{n+k} \in X_{n+k}$  and  $k \geq 1$ . Note that we set  $d^M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = d^{Y_n}(f_n(x_n), g_n(x_{n+1}))$  for  $x_n \in X_n, x_{n+1} \in X_{n+1}$ . We use the equivalence relation  $\sim$  on  $M$  given by

$$x \sim y \Leftrightarrow d^M(x, y) = 0 \quad (3.4)$$

to obtain the quotient space  $Z := M / \sim$ . We denote the equivalence class of  $x \in M$  by  $[x]$ . It is then the case that  $[\rho_{Y_n}] = [\rho_{Y_{n+1}}]$  for all  $n$  and we define the root of  $Z$  by setting  $\rho_Z := [\rho_{Y_n}]$ . We write

$$d^Z([x], [y]) := d^M(x, y),$$

which is well-defined and a metric on  $Z$ .

We show that  $D_Z(\rho_Z, r)$  is totally bounded for every  $r > 0$ . Fix  $r > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Choose  $N$  so that  $\sum_{l=N}^\infty 2^{-l} < \varepsilon$  and  $2^N > r + 1$ . For each  $n \leq N$ , there exists a subset  $\{w_{i,n}\}_{i=1}^{T_n} \subseteq X_n$  such that  $D_{X_n}(\rho_{X_n}, r + 1) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{T_n} D_{X_n}(w_{i,n}, \varepsilon)$ . We set  $W := \{\{w_{i,n}\} \mid n = 1, 2, \dots, N, i = 1, 2, \dots, T_n\} \subseteq Z$ . Fix  $[x_n] \in Z$  satisfying  $d(\rho_Z, [x_n]) \leq r$  and  $x_n \in X_n$ . If  $n \leq N$ , then there exists  $w_{i,n} \in X_n$  such that  $d^{X_n}(x_n, w_{i,n}) \leq \varepsilon$ , which implies that  $d^Z([w_{i,n}], [x_n]) \leq \varepsilon$ . Suppose  $n > N$ . Since  $x_n \in X_n^{(r)} \subseteq X_n^{(s_n)}$ ,

by (3.3), we can find  $x_{n-1} \in X_{n-1}$  satisfying  $d^{Y_{n-1}}(f_{n-1}(x_{n-1}), g_{n-1}(x_n)) < 2^{-n+1}$ . Since it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} d^{X_{n-1}}(\rho_{X_{n-1}}, x_{n-1}) &= d^{Y_{n-1}}(\rho_{Y_{n-1}}, f_{n-1}(x_{n-1})) \\ &\leq d^{Y_{n-1}}(\rho_{Y_{n-1}}, g_{n-1}(x_n)) + d^{Y_{n-1}}(g_{n-1}(x_n), f_{n-1}(x_{n-1})) \\ &\leq d^{X_n}(\rho_{X_n}, x_n) + 2^{-n+1} \\ &\leq r + 2^{-n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

it is the case that  $x_{n-1} \in X_{n-1}^{(r+2^{-n+1})}$ . Inductively, we obtain a sequence  $x_N \in X_N, \dots, x_n \in X_n$  such that  $d^{Y_l}(f_l(x_l), g_l(x_{l+1})) < 2^{-l}$  for each  $l \in \{N, N+1, \dots, n-1\}$  and  $x_N \in X_N^{(r+2^{-N})}$ . We choose  $w_{i,N}$  such that  $d^{X_N}(w_{i,N}, x_N) \leq \varepsilon$ . We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} d^M(w_{i,N}, x_n) &\leq d^M(w_{i,N}, x_N) + d^M(x_N, x_n) \\ &\leq d^{X_N}(w_{i,N}, x_N) + \sum_{l=N}^{n-1} d^{Y_l}(f_l(x_l), g_l(x_{l+1})) \\ &< 2\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $d^Z([w_{i,N}], [x_n]) < 2\varepsilon$ . Therefore,  $D_Z(\rho_Z, r)$  is totally bounded. Let  $(Z^*, d^{Z^*})$  be the completion of  $(Z, d^Z)$ . Then,  $(Z^*, d^{Z^*})$  is boundedly compact and we define the root of  $Z^*$  by setting  $\rho_{Z^*} := \rho_Z$ . Note that we regard  $(Z, d^Z)$  as a subspace of  $(Z^*, d^{Z^*})$ .

Let  $\iota_n : X_n \rightarrow M$  be the inclusion map and  $q : M \rightarrow Z \subseteq Z^*$  be the quotient map (i.e.,  $q(x) := [x]$ ) and define  $h_n : X_n \rightarrow Z^*$  by setting  $h_n := q \circ \iota_n$ . It is easy to check that  $h_n$  is root-and-distance-preserving. Recall that we have  $Y_n = f_n(X_n) \cup g_n(X_{n+1})$ . Define a map  $\xi_n : Y_n \rightarrow Z$  by setting  $\xi_n(f_n(x_n)) = [x_n]$  and  $\xi_n(g_n(x_{n+1})) = [x_{n+1}]$ , which is well-defined by (3.4). It then holds that  $\xi_n \circ f_n = h_n$  and  $\xi_n \circ g_n = h_{n+1}$ . Moreover,  $\xi_n$  is root-and-distance-preserving. Therefore, from Proposition 2.32 and (3.2), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\bar{H}}^{Z^*, \rho_{Z^*}}(h_n(X_n), h_{n+1}(X_{n+1})) &= d_{\bar{H}}^{Z^*, \rho_{Z^*}}(\xi_n \circ f_n(X_n), \xi_n \circ g_n(X_{n+1})) \\ &= d_{\bar{H}}^{Y_n, \rho_{Y_n}}(f_n(X_n), g_n(X_{n+1})) \\ &< 2^{-n} e^{-2^n}, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly  $d_{\bar{H}}^{Z^*, \rho_{Z^*}}(\tau_{h_n}(a_{X_n}), \tau_{h_{n+1}}(a_{X_{n+1}})) < 2^{-n} e^{-2^n}$ . Therefore, we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.23.** *Assume that a functor  $\tau$  is continuous. Then  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$  if and only if  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\tau$ -equivalent to  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Moreover,  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau}$  is a metric on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$ .*

*Proof.* By the definition of  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau}$ , if  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\tau$ -equivalent to  $\mathcal{Y}$ , then  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$ . Conversely, assume that  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$  for  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X)$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = (Y, d^Y, \rho_Y, a_Y)$ . Define  $Z_n = (Z_n, d^{Z_n}, \rho_{Z_n}, a_{Z_n})$  by setting  $Z_{2n-1} = \mathcal{X}$  and  $Z_{2n} = \mathcal{Y}$ . By Lemma 3.22, there exist a rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces  $(W, d^W, \rho_W)$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_n : Z_n \rightarrow W$  such that

$$d_{\bar{H}}^{W, \rho_W}(f_n(Z_n), f_{n+1}(Z_{n+1})) < 2^{-n} e^{-2^n}, \quad d_{\bar{H}}^{W, \rho_W}(\tau_{f_n}(a_{Z_n}), \tau_{f_{n+1}}(a_{Z_{n+1}})) < 2^{-n} e^{-2^n}. \quad (3.5)$$

Since the sequence  $(f_n(Z_n))_n$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $C(W)$ , by Theorem 2.30, there exists a closed subset  $Z \subseteq W$  such that

$$d_{\bar{H}}^{W, \rho_W}(f_n(Z_n), Z) \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Since each  $f_{2n-1} : X \rightarrow W$  is distance-preserving, the family  $(f_{2n-1})_n$  is equicontinuous. Moreover, for every  $x \in X$ , we have that  $\sup_n d^W(\rho_W, f_{2n-1}(x)) = d^X(\rho_X, x)$ . Hence, by the Arzelá-Ascoli theorem,  $(f_{2n-1})_n$  is compact in  $C(X, W)$  equipped with the compact-convergence topology. Similarly,  $(f_{2n})_n$  is compact in  $C(Y, W)$ . Thus, we can choose a subsequence  $(n_k)_k$  such that  $f_{2n_k-1} \rightarrow g$  in  $C(X, W)$  and  $f_{2n_k} \rightarrow h$  in  $C(Y, W)$ . It is easy to check that  $g$  and  $h$  are root-and-distance-preserving. By Assumption 3.20 and (3.5), we obtain that  $d_{\bar{H}}^{W, \rho_W}(\tau_g(a_X), \tau_h(a_Y)) = 0$ , which implies that

$$\tau_g(a_X) = \tau_h(a_Y). \quad (3.7)$$

We show that  $Z = g(X) = h(Y)$ . Fix  $z \in Z$ . Then, by (3.6) and Theorem 2.28, we can find  $r > 0$  and  $(z_{2n_k-1})_n \subseteq Z_{2n_k-1}^{(r)}$  satisfying  $f_{2n_k-1}(z_{2n_k-1}) \rightarrow z$ . Since  $z_{2n_k-1} \in Z_{2n_k-1}^{(r)} = X^{(r)}$ , (if necessary, by choosing a further subsequence) we may assume that  $z_{2n_k-1} \rightarrow x$  for some  $x \in X$ . It is then the case that

$$\begin{aligned} d^W(z, f_{2n_k-1}(x)) &\leq d^W(z, f_{2n_k-1}(z_{2n_k-1})) + d^W(f_{2n_k-1}(z_{2n_k-1}), f_{2n_k-1}(x)) \\ &= d^W(z, f_{2n_k-1}(z_{2n_k-1})) + d^X(z_{2n_k-1}, x), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $f_{2n_k-1}(x) \rightarrow z$ . Thus  $Z \subseteq g(X)$ . Fix  $x \in X$ . Then, by (3.6), we can find a sequence  $(z_{2n_k-1})_k \subseteq Z$  such that  $d^W(f_{2n_k-1}(x), z_{2n_k-1}) \rightarrow 0$ . If necessary, by choosing a subsequence, we may assume that  $z_{2n_k-1} \rightarrow z \in Z$ . This yields that  $g(x) = z \in Z$ . Therefore, we obtain  $Z = g(X)$  and similarly  $Z = h(Y)$ .

We define root-preserving isometries  $g' : X \rightarrow g(X)$  and  $h' : Y \rightarrow h(Y)$  by restricting the codomains of  $g$  and  $h$ . We then obtain the root-preserving isometry  $(h')^{-1} \circ g' : X \rightarrow Y$ . Let  $\iota : Z \rightarrow W$  be the inclusion map. It then holds that  $g = \iota \circ g'$  and  $h = \iota \circ h'$ . Since  $\tau_\iota : \tau(Z) \rightarrow \tau(W)$  is injective, it follows from (3.7) that  $\tau_{g'}(a_X) = \tau_{h'}(a_Y)$ . This yields that  $\tau_{(h')^{-1} \circ g'}(a_X) = a_Y$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\tau$ -equivalent to  $\mathcal{Y}$  (via  $(h')^{-1} \circ g'$ ).

The symmetry of  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau$  is obvious. To prove the triangle inequality, assume that  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2) < r$  and  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau(\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{X}_3) < s$  for  $\mathcal{X}_i = (X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}, a_{X_i})$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . By a similar argument to the proof of Lemma 3.22, it is possible to show that there exist a rooted boundedly compact metric space  $(Y, d^Y, \rho_Y)$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_i : X_i \rightarrow Y$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\overline{H}}^{Y, \rho_Y}(f_1(X_1), f_2(X_2)) &< r, \quad d_{\overline{H}}^{Y, \rho_Y}(f_2(X_2), f_3(X_3)) < s, \\ d_\tau^{Y, \rho_Y}(\tau_{f_1}(a_{X_1}), \tau_{f_2}(a_{X_2})) &< r, \quad d_\tau^{Y, \rho_Y}(\tau_{f_2}(a_{X_2}), \tau_{f_3}(a_{X_3})) < s. \end{aligned}$$

This yields that  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_3) < r + s$ , which implies that  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau$  satisfies the triangle inequality.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.24** (Convergence in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$ ). *Fix a continuous functor  $\tau$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , let  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n}, a_{X_n})$  be an element of  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ(\tau)$ . Then,  $\mathcal{X}_n$  converges to  $\mathcal{X}_\infty$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau$  if and only if there exist  $(Z^*, d^{Z^*}, \rho_{Z^*}) \in \mathfrak{M}$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $h_n : X_n \rightarrow Z^*$  such that*

$$d_{\overline{H}}^{Z^*, \rho_{Z^*}}(h_n(X_n), h_\infty(X_\infty)) \rightarrow 0, \quad d_\tau^{Z^*, \rho_{Z^*}}(\tau_{h_n}(a_{X_n}), \tau_{h_\infty}(a_{X_\infty})) \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.8)$$

*Proof.* If  $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}}$  are embedded into a common rooted boundedly-compact metric space in such a way that (3.8) holds, then it is easy to check that  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau(\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}_\infty) \rightarrow 0$ .

Assume that  $\varepsilon_n := d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau(\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}_\infty) \rightarrow 0$ . Then there exist a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(Y_n, d^{Y_n}, \rho_{Y_n})$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_n : X_n \rightarrow Y_n$  and  $g_n : X_\infty \rightarrow Y_n$  such that

$$d_{\overline{H}}^{Y_n, \rho_{Y_n}}(f_n(X_n), g_n(X_\infty)) < \varepsilon_n + n^{-1}, \quad d_\tau^{Y_n, \rho_{Y_n}}(\tau_{f_n}(a_{X_n}), \tau_{g_n}(a_{X_\infty})) < \varepsilon_n + n^{-1}. \quad (3.9)$$

We define a pseudometric  $d^Z$  on  $Z := \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}} X_n$  by setting  $d^Z|_{X_n \times X_n} := d^{X_n}$ ,

$$d^Z(x_n, x_\infty) := d^{Y_n}(f_n(x_n), g_n(x_\infty))$$

for  $x_n \in X_n$ ,  $x_\infty \in X_\infty$ ,  $n \neq \infty$  and

$$d^Z(x_n, x_m) := \inf\{d^{Y_n}(f_n(x_n), g_n(x_\infty)) + d^{Y_m}(g_m(x_\infty), f_m(x_m)) \mid x_\infty \in X_\infty\}$$

for  $x_n \in X_n$ ,  $x_m \in X_m$ ,  $n \neq m$ ,  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . We use the equivalence relation  $\sim$  on  $Z$  given by

$$x \sim y \Leftrightarrow d^Z(x, y) = 0 \quad (3.10)$$

to obtain the quotient space  $Z^* := Z / \sim$ . Let  $q : Z \rightarrow Z^*$  be the quotient map. The metric  $d^{Z^*}$  is given by  $d^{Z^*}(q(x), q(y)) := d^Z(x, y)$ . It is not difficult to check that  $(Z^*, d^{Z^*})$  is boundedly compact and  $q(\rho_{Y_n}) = q(\rho_{Y_m})$  for all  $n, m$ . We define the root  $\rho_{Z^*}$  of  $Z$  by setting  $\rho_{Z^*} = q(\rho_{Y_1})$ . We write  $\iota_n : X_n \rightarrow Z$  for the inclusion map and set  $h_n := q \circ \iota_n : X_n \rightarrow Z^*$ , which is root-and-distance-preserving. Define a map  $X_n \sqcup X_\infty \rightarrow Y_n$  by setting  $\xi_n|_{X_n} = f_n$ ,  $\xi_n|_{X_\infty} = g_n$ . Then, by the definition of the equivalence relation given in (3.10), we obtain a map  $\xi_n^* : q(X_n \sqcup X_\infty) \rightarrow Y_n$  such that  $\xi_n^* \circ q|_{X_n \sqcup X_\infty} = \xi_n$ . We equip the set  $q(X_n \sqcup X_\infty) \subseteq Z^*$  with the root  $\rho_{Z^*}$  and the metric

obtained by restricting the metric  $d^{Z^*}$ . It is then the case that  $\bar{\xi}_n$  is root-and-distance-preserving. Let  $q_n : X_n \rightarrow q(X_n \sqcup X_\infty)$  and  $q_\infty^n : X_\infty \rightarrow q(X_n \sqcup X_\infty)$  be the corestriction of  $q \circ \iota_n$  and  $q \circ \iota_\infty$ , respectively. In addition, we let  $\kappa_n : q(X_n \sqcup X_\infty) \rightarrow Z$  be the inclusion map. Then, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\tau}^{Z^*, \rho_{Z^*}}(\tau_{h_n}(a_{X_n}), \tau_{h_\infty}(a_{X_\infty})) &= d_{\tau}^{Z^*, \rho_{Z^*}}(\tau_{\kappa_n} \circ \tau_{q_n}(a_{X_n}), \tau_{\kappa_n} \circ \tau_{q_\infty^n}(a_{X_\infty})) \\ &= d_{\tau}^{q(X_n \sqcup X_\infty), \rho_{Z^*}}(\tau_{q_n}(a_{X_n}), \tau_{q_\infty^n}(a_{X_\infty})) \\ &= d_{\tau}^{Y_n, \rho_{Y_n}}(\tau_{\xi_n^*} \circ \tau_{q_n}(a_{X_n}), \tau_{\xi_n^*} \circ \tau_{q_\infty^n}(a_{X_\infty})) \\ &= d_{\tau}^{Y_n, \rho_{Y_n}}(\tau_{f_n}(a_{X_n}), \tau_{f_\infty}(a_{X_\infty})) \\ &< \varepsilon_n + n^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use (3.9) at the last inequality. Similarly, we obtain that

$$d_{\bar{H}}^{Z^*, \rho_{Z^*}}(h_n(X_n), h_\infty(X_\infty)) < \varepsilon_n + n^{-1},$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

The following is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.24.

**Corollary 3.25.** *Fix a continuous functor  $\tau$ . The map  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau) \ni (X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X) \mapsto (X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}$  is continuous.*

For compactness and separability, we consider additional conditions. For  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X)$ ,  $\mathcal{Y} = (Y, d^Y, \rho_Y) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , we write  $\mathcal{X} \preceq \mathcal{Y}$  if and only if  $X \subseteq Y$ ,  $d^Y|_{X \times X} = d^X$  and  $\rho_X = \rho_Y$ .

**Assumption 3.26.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n})$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $\mathcal{Z} = (Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  be elements in  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ$  such that  $\mathcal{X}_n \preceq \mathcal{Z}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $X_n$  converges to  $X$  with respect to  $d_{\bar{H}}^{Z, \rho_Z}$ . We write  $\iota_n : X_n \rightarrow Z$  for the inclusion map.*

(i) *If  $b \in \tau(Z)$  and  $a_n \in \tau(X_n)$  are such that  $d_{\tau}^{Z, \rho_Z}(\tau_{\iota_n}(a_{X_n}), b) \rightarrow 0$ , then there exists  $a \in \tau(X_\infty)$  satisfying  $b = \tau_{\iota_\infty}(a)$ .*

(ii) *For every  $a \in \tau(X_\infty)$ , there exists a sequence  $a_n \in \tau(X_n)$  such that  $\tau_{\iota_n}(a_n) \rightarrow \tau_{\iota_\infty}(a)$ .*

Assumption 3.26(i) and (ii) are related to the completeness and the separability of the metric  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau}$ , respectively. For example, for the functor  $\tau^m$  (recall it from Example 3.16), the condition (i) says that if measures  $\mu_n$  on  $X_n$  converges to a measure  $\mu$  as measures on  $Z$ , then  $\mu$  is supported on  $X$ , and the condition (ii) says that any measure  $\mu$  on  $X$  is approximated by measures on  $X_n$ , where  $X_n$  assumed to converge to  $X$  in the local Hausdorff topology as subsets of  $Z$ . (See Section 4.4 for details.)

**Definition 3.27** (Complete, separable functor). A functor  $\tau$  is said to be *complete* (resp. *separable*) if and only if it satisfies Assumption 3.26(i) (resp. (ii)) and, for each  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , the metric space  $(\tau(X), d_{\tau}^{X, \rho_X})$  is complete (resp. separable).

**Theorem 3.28** (Completeness of  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau}$ ). *Suppose that  $\tau$  is complete and continuous. Then,  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau}$  is a complete metric on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n}, a_{X_n}) \in \mathfrak{M}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$ . We choose a subsequence  $(\mathcal{X}_{n_k})_{k \geq 1}$  satisfying  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau}(\mathcal{X}_{n_k}, \mathcal{X}_{n_{k+1}}) < 2^k e^{-2^k}$ . By Lemma 3.22, there exist a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_k : X_{n_k} \rightarrow Z$  such that

$$d_{\bar{H}}^{Z, \rho_Z}(f_k(X_{n_k}), f_{k+1}(X_{n_{k+1}})) < 2^{-k} e^{-2^k}, \quad d_{\tau}^{Z, \rho_Z}(\tau_{f_k}(a_{X_{n_k}}), \tau_{f_{k+1}}(a_{X_{n_{k+1}}})) < 2^{-k} e^{-2^k}.$$

It is then the case that  $(f_k(X_{n_k}))_{k \geq 1}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathcal{C}(Z)$  and hence  $f_n(X_n)$  converges to a closed subset  $Y \subseteq Z$  in  $\mathcal{C}(Z)$ . Similarly, it follows that  $\tau_{f_k}(a_{X_{n_k}})$  converges to an element  $a \in \tau(Z)$  in  $\tau(Z)$ . We equip  $Y$  with the metric  $d^Y := d^Z|_{Y \times Y}$  and the root  $\rho_Y := \rho_Z$ . Let  $\iota : Y \rightarrow Z$  be the inclusion map. By Assumption 3.26(i), there exists  $a_Y \in \tau(Y)$  satisfying  $\tau_{\iota}(a_Y) = a$ . Therefore, by Theorem 3.24, we obtain that  $\mathcal{X}_{n_k}$  converges to  $(Y, d^Y, \rho_Y, a_Y)$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.29** (Separability of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$ ). *Suppose that  $\tau$  is separable and continuous. Then,  $(\mathfrak{M}(\tau), d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau})$  is separable.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a countable collection of elements in  $\mathfrak{M}$  which is dense in  $\mathfrak{M}$  in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology. For each  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}$ , we choose a countable dense subset  $D(X) \subseteq \tau(X)$ . We write

$$\mathcal{D}^\circ := \{(X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X) \mid (X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathcal{A}, a_X \in D(X)\}.$$

We then define a countable subset  $\mathcal{D}$  by setting

$$\mathcal{D} := \{\mathcal{Y} \in \mathfrak{M}(\tau) \mid \mathcal{Y} \text{ is } \tau\text{-equivalent to some } \mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{D}^\circ\}.$$

Fix  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X) \in \mathfrak{M}(\tau)$ . We choose  $(X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n}) \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $(X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n})$  converges to  $(X, d^X, \rho_X)$  in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology. Then, there exist a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(Y, d^Y, \rho_Y)$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_n : X_n \rightarrow Y$  and  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $f_n(X_n)$  converges to  $f(X)$  in  $\mathcal{C}(Y)$ . By Assumption 3.26(ii), we can find  $a_{X_n} \in \tau(X_n)$  such that  $\tau_{f_n}(a_{X_n})$  converges to  $\tau_f(a_X)$  in  $\tau(Y)$ . Since  $D(X_n)$  is dense in  $\tau(X_n)$ , we may assume that  $a_{X_n}$  is an element of  $D(X_n)$ . By Theorem 3.24, we obtain that  $\mathcal{X}_n := (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n}, a_{X_n}) \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$  converges to  $\mathcal{X}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$  is the collection of  $\tau$ -equivalence classes, there exists  $\mathcal{Y}_n \in \mathfrak{M}(\tau)$  which is  $\tau$ -equivalent to  $\mathcal{X}_n$ . By definition,  $\mathcal{Y}_n$  is an element of  $\mathcal{D}$  and hence  $\mathcal{D}$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$ .  $\square$

The following is a summary of the results so far.

**Corollary 3.30.** *If a functor  $\tau$  is complete, separable and continuous, then  $(\mathfrak{M}(\tau), d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau)$  is a complete, separable metric space.*

We provide a method to compare Gromov-Hausdorff-type topologies via functors.

**Definition 3.31** (Topological subfunctor). Let  $\tilde{\tau}$  and  $\tau$  be functors. We say that  $\tau$  is a *topological subfunctor* of  $\tilde{\tau}$  if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.

- (T1) For every  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , there exists a topological embedding of  $\tau(X)$  into  $\tilde{\tau}(X)$ , that is, there exists a homeomorphism from  $\tau(X)$  to a subset of  $\tilde{\tau}(X)$ . Using this map, we always regard  $\tau(X)$  as a subspace of  $\tilde{\tau}(X)$ .
- (T2) For every  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , it holds that  $\tau_f = \tilde{\tau}_f|_{\tau(X_1)}$ .

The following results are immediate consequences of Definition 3.31 and Theorem 3.24, and hence we omit the proofs.

**Proposition 3.32.** *Let  $\tau$  be a topological subfunctor of  $\tilde{\tau}$ . If  $\tilde{\tau}$  is continuous, then so is  $\tau$ .*

**Proposition 3.33.** *Let  $\tau$  be a topological subfunctor of  $\tilde{\tau}$  and assume that  $\tilde{\tau}$  is continuous. Then, the following map is a homeomorphism onto its image:*

$$\mathfrak{M}(\tau) \ni (X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X) \mapsto (X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X) \in \mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau}).$$

By Proposition 3.32 and Proposition 3.33, we always regard  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$  as a subspace of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau})$  when  $\tau$  is a topological subfunctor of a continuous functor.

We next provide a method to check the Polishness of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$  for a functor  $\tau$  that is not necessarily complete. This method will be used in Section 4.7.

**Definition 3.34** (Polish functor). We say that a functor  $\tau$  is *Polish* if there exist a functor  $\tilde{\tau}$  and, for each  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , a sequence  $(\tilde{\tau}_k(X))_{k=1}^\infty$  of open subsets in  $\tilde{\tau}(X)$  satisfying the following conditions.

- (P1) The functor  $\tilde{\tau}$  is complete, separable and continuous.
- (P2) The functor  $\tau$  is a topological subfunctor of  $\tilde{\tau}$ .
- (P3) For every  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , it holds that  $\tau(X) = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \tilde{\tau}_k(X)$ .
- (P4) Let  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  be a root-and-distance-preserving map between  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Then,  $\tilde{\tau}_f^{-1}(\tilde{\tau}_k(X_2)) = \tilde{\tau}_k(X_1)$  for each  $k \geq 1$ . In particular,  $\tilde{\tau}_f^{-1}(\tau(X_2)) = \tau(X_1)$ .

We call  $(\tilde{\tau}, (\tilde{\tau}_k)_{k \geq 0})$  a *Polish system* of  $\tau$ .

The intuition for the above conditions is as follows: (P1) and (P2) say that the space  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$  is topologically embedded into a Polish space  $\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau})$ ; (P3) implies that  $\tau(X)$  is Polish; (P4) is a condition on the consistency of  $\tilde{\tau}_k(X)$  with respect to morphisms of  $\tilde{\tau}$ .

**Remark 3.35.** When  $(\tilde{\tau}, (\tilde{\tau}_k)_{k \geq 0})$  of  $\tau$  is a Polish system, then by setting  $\sigma_k(X) := \bigcap_{l=1}^k \tilde{\tau}(X)$  for each  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , we obtain another Polish system  $(\tilde{\tau}, (\sigma_k)_{k \geq 1})$  of  $\tau$ . Thus, we can always assume that  $(\tilde{\tau}_k(X))_{k \geq 1}$  is a decreasing sequence.

**Theorem 3.36.** *If  $\tau$  is a Polish functor, then the topology on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau)$  is Polish. (N.B. The metric  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau$  is not necessarily a complete metric.)*

*Proof.* Define

$$\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau}_k) := \{(X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X) \in \mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau}) \mid a_X \in \tilde{\tau}_k(X)\}.$$

Then, we have that  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau) = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau}_k)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau})$  is Polish by Corollary 3.30 and (P1), it suffices to show that  $\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau}_k)$  is open in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau})$ . Let  $((X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_n, a_{X_n}))_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau}_k)^c$  converging to some  $(X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X)$  in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau})$ , where we recall that  $\cdot^c$  denotes the complement. By Theorem 3.24, there exist a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_n : X_n \rightarrow Z$  and  $f : X \rightarrow Z$  such that  $f_n(X_n) \rightarrow f(X)$  in  $\mathcal{C}(Z)$  and  $\tilde{\tau}_{f_n}(a_{X_n}) \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}_f(a_X)$  in  $\tilde{\tau}(Z)$ . By (P4), we have that  $\tilde{\tau}_{f_n}(a_{X_n}) \in \tilde{\tau}_k(Z)^c$ . Since  $\tilde{\tau}_k(Z)^c$  is closed, we obtain that  $\tilde{\tau}_f(a_X) \in \tilde{\tau}_k(Z)^c$ . Using (P4) again, we deduce that  $a_X \notin \tilde{\tau}_k(X)$ , which implies that  $(X, d^X, \rho_X, a_X) \in \mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau}_k)^c$ . Hence,  $\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\tau}_k)$  is open.  $\square$

In this framework, it is fairly easy to consider multiple objects.

**Definition 3.37** (The product functor). Fix  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Let  $(\tau^{(k)})_{k=1}^N$  be a sequence of functors. The *product functor*  $\tau = \prod_{k=1}^N \tau^{(k)}$  is defined as follows:

- (i) For every  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , we set  $\tau(X) := \prod_{k=1}^N \tau^{(k)}(X)$ . If  $N < \infty$ , then we equip  $\tau(X)$  with the max product metric. Otherwise, we equip  $\tau(X)$  with the metric given by

$$d_\tau^{X, \rho_X}((a_k)_{k=1}^\infty, (b_k)_{k=1}^\infty) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-k} (1 \wedge d_{\tau^{(k)}}^{X, \rho_X}(a_k, b_k)).$$

- (ii) For every  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , we set  $\tau_f := \prod_{k=1}^N \tau_f^{(k)}$ , that is,  $\tau_f : \tau(X_1) \rightarrow \tau(X_2)$  is a distance-preserving map given by

$$\tau_f((a_k)_{k=1}^N) := (\tau_f^{(k)}(a_k))_{k=1}^N.$$

The following results are straightforward, so we omit the proof.

**Proposition 3.38.** *Fix  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Let  $(\tau^{(k)})_{k=1}^N$  be a sequence of functors. If each  $\tau^{(k)}$  is continuous (resp. complete, separable, Polish), then so does the product functor  $\prod_{k=1}^N \tau^{(k)}$ .*

**Proposition 3.39.** *Fix  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Let  $(\tau^{(k)})_{k=1}^N, (\tilde{\tau}^{(k)})_{k=1}^N$  be functors such that  $\tau^{(k)}$  is a topological subfunctor of  $\tilde{\tau}^{(k)}$  for each  $k$ . Then,  $\prod_{k=1}^N \tau^{(k)}$  is a topological subfunctor of  $\prod_{k=1}^N \tilde{\tau}^{(k)}$ .*

## 4 Examples of functors

Recall the definitions of a functor  $\tau$  and the resulting metric space  $(\mathfrak{M}(\tau), d_{\mathfrak{M}}^\tau)$  from Section 3.2. In this section, we give examples of functors  $\tau$  by defining a metric space  $(\tau(X), d_\tau^{X, \rho_X})$  for each  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , and defining a distance-preserving map  $\tau_f : \tau(X_1) \rightarrow \tau(X_2)$  for each  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , where we recall that  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ$  is the collection of rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces.

## 4.1 The functor for a fixed structure

We begin with a very simple example, which is perhaps not interesting by itself, but it enables us to consider a rich variety of additional structures through product functors or the functor introduced in Section 4.8.

Fix a complete, separable metric space  $(\Xi, d^\Xi)$ . Define a functor  $\tau^\Xi$  as follows.

- For  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , set  $\tau^\Xi(X) := \Xi$  and  $d_{\tau^\Xi}^{X, \rho_X} := d^\Xi$ .
- For each  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , set  $\tau_f^\Xi := \text{id}_\Xi$ .

The following result is straightforward and thus we omit the proof.

**Proposition 4.1.** *The functor  $\tau^\Xi$  is continuous, complete and separable.*

**Corollary 4.2.** *The function  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau^\Xi}$  is a complete, separable metric on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^\Xi)$ .*

*Proof.* This is an immediate consequence of Corollary 3.30. □

The following result provides a precompactness criterion for  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^\Xi)$ . Since it is proven easily by using Theorem 3.24, we omit the proof (c.f. the proof of Theorem 4.6 below).

**Theorem 4.3** (Precompactness in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^\Xi)$ ). *A non-empty subset  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha = (X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha, \xi_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^\Xi)$  is precompact if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

- The subset  $\{(X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology.*
- The set  $\{\xi_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact in  $\Xi$ .*

## 4.2 The functor for points

In [14, Section 8.3], a Gromov-Hausdorff-type topology was introduced on a set of equivalence classes of measured compact metric spaces equipped with points. The topology is useful for discussing convergence of glued spaces (e.g. [3, Section 4]) and fused spaces (e.g. [14, Section 8.3]). In this section, we provide a functor that gives a natural generalization of that topology.

Define a functor  $\tau^{\text{pt}}$  as follows.

- For  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , set  $\tau^{\text{pt}}(X) := X$  and  $d_{\tau^{\text{pt}}}^{X, \rho_X} := d^X$ .
- For each  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , set  $\tau_f^{\text{pt}}(x) := f(x)$ .

The following result is straightforward and thus we omit the proof.

**Proposition 4.4.** *The functor  $\tau^{\text{pt}}$  is continuous, complete and separable.*

**Corollary 4.5.** *The function  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau^{\text{pt}}}$  is a complete, separable metric on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{\text{pt}})$ .*

**Theorem 4.6** (Precompactness in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{\text{pt}})$ ). *A non-empty subset  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha = (X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha, v_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{\text{pt}})$  is precompact if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

- The subset  $\{(X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology.*
- For some  $r > 0$ , it holds that  $v_\alpha \in X_\alpha^{(r)}$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact. From Corollary 3.25, we obtain (i). If (ii) is not satisfied, we can find an increasing  $(r_n)_{n \geq 1}$  with  $r_n \uparrow \infty$  and a sequence  $(v_{\alpha_n})_{n \geq 1}$  with  $v_{\alpha_n} \in X_{\alpha_n}^{(r_n)}$  such that  $v_{\alpha_n} \notin X_{\alpha_n}^{(r_n)}$  for all  $n$ . If necessary, by choosing a subsequence, we may assume that  $(X_{\alpha_n}, d^{\alpha_n}, \rho_{\alpha_n}, v_{\alpha_n})$  converges to some  $(X, d^X, \rho_X, v_X) \in \mathfrak{M}(\tau^{\text{pt}})$ . By Theorem 3.24, there exist a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_n : X_{\alpha_n} \rightarrow Z$  and  $f : X \rightarrow Z$  such that  $f_n(X_{\alpha_n}) \rightarrow f(X)$  in the local Hausdorff topology in  $Z$  and  $f_n(v_{\alpha_n}) \rightarrow f(v_X)$  in  $Z$ . It is then the case that, for some  $r > 0$ ,  $v_{\alpha_n} \in X_{\alpha_n}^{(r)}$  for all  $n$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore, we obtain (ii).

Conversely, assume that (i) and (ii) are satisfied. From Theorem 3.24, it is easily proven that any sequence in  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  has a convergent subsequence, which implies that  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact. □

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define  $\tau^{n,\text{pts}}$  to be the  $n$ -product functor of  $\tau^{\text{pt}}$ . Then,  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{n,\text{pts}})$  is the collection of equivalence classes of rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces equipped with additional  $n$  points and the metric  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{n,\text{pts}}$  induces a suitable topology on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{n,\text{pts}})$ .

### 4.3 The functor for subsets

In [29, Section 6.4], a Gromov-Hausdorff-type topology was introduced on a set of equivalence classes of measured compact metric spaces equipped with subsets. In this section, we provide a functor that gives a natural generalization of that topology. Recall from Section 2.2.1 that, for each  $(S, d^S, \rho) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  denotes the collection of closed subsets in  $S$  and  $d_{\bar{H}}^{S,\rho}$  denotes the local Hausdorff metric on  $\mathcal{C}(S)$ .

Define a functor  $\tau^{\text{st}}$  as follows.

- For  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , set  $\tau^{\text{st}}(X) := \mathcal{C}(X)$  and  $d_{\tau^{\text{st}}}^{X,\rho_X} := d_{\bar{H}}^{X,\rho_X}$ .
- For each  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , set  $\tau_f^{\text{st}}(A) := f(A)$ .

The following results are straightforward and thus we omit the proofs.

**Proposition 4.7.** *The functor  $\tau^{\text{st}}$  is continuous, complete and separable.*

**Corollary 4.8.** *The function  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau^{\text{st}}}$  is a complete, separable metric on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{\text{st}})$ .*

**Theorem 4.9** (Precompactness in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{\text{st}})$ ). *A non-empty subset  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha = (X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha, A_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{\text{st}})$  is precompact if and only if the subset  $\{(X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology.*

*Proof.* Using Theorem 3.24 and Theorem 2.30, one can prove the desired result in a similar way to the proof of Theorem 4.6.  $\square$

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define  $\tau^{n,\text{sts}}$  to be the  $n$ -product functor of  $\tau^{\text{st}}$ . Then,  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{n,\text{sts}})$  is the collection of equivalence classes of rooted boundedly-compact metric spaces equipped with  $n$  boundedly-compact subsets and the metric  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{n,\text{sts}}$  induces a suitable topology on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{n,\text{sts}})$ .

**Remark 4.10.** If one wants to consider spaces equipped with compact subsets (not closed subsets), using the Hausdorff metric instead of the local Hausdorff metric, one obtains a suitable functor.

### 4.4 The functor for measures

The local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology (recall it from Section 1.1) is commonly used for studying random measured spaces. In this section, we recover this topology by introducing a functor for measures. Recall from Section 2.2.2 that, for each  $(S, d^S, \rho) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(S)$  denotes the set of Radon measure on  $S$  and  $d_V^{S,\rho}$  denotes the vague metric on  $\mathcal{M}(S)$ .

Define a functor  $\tau^m$  as follows.

- For  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , set  $\tau^m(X) := \mathcal{M}(X)$  and  $d_{\tau^m}^{X,\rho_X} := d_V^{X,\rho_X}$ .
- For each  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , set  $\tau_f^m(\mu) := \mu \circ f^{-1}$ .

**Proposition 4.11.** *The functor  $\tau^m$  is complete, separable and continuous.*

*Proof.* The continuity follows immediately from the definition of the vague topology and the dominated convergence theorem. Let  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n})$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $\mathcal{Z} = (Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  be elements in  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ$  such that  $\mathcal{X}_n \preceq \mathcal{Z}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $X_n$  converges to  $X$  with respect to  $d_{\bar{H}}^{Z,\rho_Z}$ . Let  $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}(X_n)$  be such that  $\mu_n$  converges to some  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(Z)$  with respect to  $d_V^{Z,\rho_Z}$ . Fix  $x \in Z \setminus X$ . Since  $Z \setminus X$  is open, there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B_Z(x, \varepsilon) \cap X = \emptyset$ . Choose  $r > 0$  such that  $B_Z(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq D_Z(\rho_Z, r)$ ,  $X_n^{(r)} \rightarrow X^{(r)}$  with respect to  $d_{\bar{H}}^Z$  and  $\mu_n^{(r)} \rightarrow \mu^{(r)}$  with respect to  $d_p^Z$ . Then,  $X_n \cap B_Z(x, \varepsilon) = \emptyset$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ , and so we obtain

$$\mu(B_Z(x, \varepsilon)) = \mu^{(r)}(B_Z(x, \varepsilon)) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n^{(r)}(B_Z(x, \varepsilon)) = 0,$$

which implies  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq X$ . This proves that  $\tau^m$  is complete. Next, let  $\mu$  be a finite measure with finite atoms in  $X$ . By approximating the atoms by atoms in  $X_n$ , it is not difficult to construct a finite measure  $\mu_n$  with atoms in  $X_n$  such that  $\mu_n$  converges to  $\mu$  in the vague topology. Since such measures  $\mu$  are dense in the set of measures with support in  $X$ , we obtain the separability of  $\tau^m$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.12.** *The function  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau^m}$  is a complete, separable metric on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^m)$ .*

We check that the topology on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^m)$  coincides with the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology introduced in [1, 22]. Recall that, for  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X, \mu_X) \in \mathfrak{M}(\tau^m)$  and  $r > 0$ , we define  $\mathcal{X}^{(r)} = (X^{(r)}, d^{X^{(r)}}, \rho_{X^{(r)}}, \mu_{X^{(r)}})$  by setting

$$X^{(r)} := D_X(\rho_X, r), \quad d^{X^{(r)}} := d^X|_{X^{(r)} \times X^{(r)}}, \quad \rho_{X^{(r)}} := \rho_X, \quad \mu_{X^{(r)}}(\cdot) := \mu_X(\cdot \cap X^{(r)}).$$

**Theorem 4.13.** *For each  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . let  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n}, \mu_{X_n})$  be an element of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^m)$ . The following statements are equivalent.*

- (i) *The elements  $\mathcal{X}_n$  converge to  $\mathcal{X}_\infty$  with respect to  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau^m}$ ,*
- (ii) *The elements  $\mathcal{X}_n$  converge to  $\mathcal{X}_\infty$  in the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology,*
- (iii) *The elements  $\mathcal{X}_n^{(r)}$  converge to  $\mathcal{X}_\infty^{(r)}$  in the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prohorov topology for all but countably many  $r > 0$ .*
- (iv) *There exist a boundedly-compact metric space  $(Z, d^Z)$  and distance-preserving maps  $f_n : X_n \rightarrow Z$  and  $f_\infty : X_\infty \rightarrow Z$  such that, for all but countably many  $r > 0$ ,  $f_n(\rho_{X_n}^{(r)}) \rightarrow f_\infty(\rho_{X_\infty}^{(r)})$  in  $Z$ ,  $f_n(X_n^{(r)}) \rightarrow f_\infty(X_\infty^{(r)})$  in the Hausdorff topology in  $Z$  and  $\mu_{X_n}^{(r)} \circ f_n^{-1} \rightarrow \mu_{X_\infty}^{(r)} \circ f_\infty^{-1}$  weakly as measures on  $Z$ .*

*Proof.* See Appendix A.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.14** (Precompactness in the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology). *A non-empty subset  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha = (X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha, \mu_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^m)$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

- (i) *The set  $\{(X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology.*
- (ii) *For every  $r > 0$ , it holds that  $\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mu_\alpha(X_\alpha^{(r)}) < \infty$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  satisfies (i) and (ii), then by Theorem 3.13, [1, Theorem 2.6] and [22, Theorem 3.28],  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology. Conversely, assume that  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology. Then, by Corollary 3.25 and Theorem 4.13, (i) holds. Assume that (ii) is not satisfied. Then, for some  $r > 0$ , there exists a sequence  $(\alpha_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mu_{\alpha_n}(X_{\alpha_n}^{(r)}) \rightarrow \infty$ . Choose a subsequence  $(\alpha_{n_k})_{k \geq 1}$  so that  $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha_{n_k}}$  converges to some  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X, \mu_X) \in \mathfrak{M}(\tau^m)$ . By Theorem 3.24, it is possible to embed  $X_{\alpha_{n_k}}$  and  $X$  rooted-isometrically into a common rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  in such a way that  $\mu_{X_{\alpha_{n_k}}} \rightarrow \mu$  vaguely as measures on  $Z$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore, we obtain (ii).  $\square$

## 4.5 The functor for cadlag curves

A stochastic process with cadlag paths is a random cadlag curve and is a fundamental object of interest in probability theory. In this section, we define a functor for cadlag curves. This functor, combined with a functor introduced in Section 4.8, gives a suitable topological setting for studying stochastic processes living on different spaces.

Given a separable complete metric space  $(S, d^S)$ , we denote by  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, S)$  the set of cadlag functions  $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow S$ . We equip  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, S)$  with the usual  $J_1$ -Skorohod topology and write  $d_{J_1}^S$  for a complete, separable metric inducing the usual  $J_1$ -Skorohod topology (see [10] or [33] for such metrics).

Define a functor  $\tau^{J_1}$  as follows.

- For  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , set  $\tau^{J_1}(X) := D(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$  and  $d_{\tau^{J_1}}^{X, \rho_X} := d_{J_1}^X$ .
- For each  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , set  $\tau_f^{J_1}(\xi) := f \circ \xi$ .

**Proposition 4.15.** *The functor  $\tau^{J_1}$  is complete, separable and continuous.*

*Proof.* Checking the continuity is straightforward. Let  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n})$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $\mathcal{Z} = (Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  be elements in  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ$  such that  $\mathcal{X}_n \preceq \mathcal{Z}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $X_n$  converges to  $X$  with respect to  $d_{\bar{H}}^{Z, \rho_Z}$ . Let  $\xi_n \in D(\mathbb{R}_+, X_n)$  be such that  $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi$  in the usual  $J_1$ -Skorohod topology for some  $\xi \in D(\mathbb{R}_+, Z)$ . Then, for each  $t \geq 0$ , there exists  $t_n \geq 0$  such that  $\xi_n(t_n) \rightarrow \xi(t)$  in  $Z$ . Choose  $r > 0$  so that  $\xi_n(t_n) \in Z^{(r)}$  for all  $n$  and  $d_{\bar{H}}^Z(X_n^{(r)}, X^{(r)}) \rightarrow 0$ . Then, one can check that  $\xi(t) \in X^{(r)}$ . Therefore, we obtain that  $\xi \in D(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$ , which implies the completeness of  $\tau^{J_1}$ . To obtain the separability, note that every function in  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$  is approximated by a sequence of step functions, where a step function is a function that can be written in the following form:

$$\xi(t) = \begin{cases} a_k & t \in [t_{k-1}, t_k) \\ a_{m+1} & t \in [t_m, \infty) \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

for some  $a_k \in X$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, m+1$  and  $0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m < \infty$ . Using the convergence  $d_{\bar{H}}^{Z, \rho_Z}(X_n, X) \rightarrow 0$ , for every step function  $\xi$  in  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$ , one can construct step functions in  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, X_n)$  approximating  $\xi$ . Therefore,  $\tau^{J_1}$  is separable.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.16.** *The function  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau^{J_1}}$  is a complete, separable metric on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{J_1})$ .*

Let us prepare to describe a precompactness criterion. For  $\xi \in D(\mathbb{R}_+, S)$ , where  $(S, d^S)$  is a metric space, we define

$$\tilde{w}_S(\xi, h, t) := \inf_{(I_k) \in \Pi_t} \max_k \sup_{r, s \in I_k} d^S(\xi(r), \xi(s)), \quad t, h > 0,$$

where  $\Pi_t$  denotes the set of partitions of the interval  $[0, t]$  into subintervals  $I_k = [u, v)$  with  $v - u \geq h$  when  $v < t$ . We recall a precompactness criterion on the usual  $J_1$ -Skorohod topology.

**Lemma 4.17** ([21, Theorem A5.4]). *Let  $(S, d^S, \rho_S)$  be a rooted boundedly-compact metric space. Fix a dense set  $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ . A subset  $\{\xi_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, S)$  is precompact in the usual  $J_1$ -Skorohod topology if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

- (i) *For each  $t \in T$ , there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $\xi_\alpha(t) \in S^{(r)}$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ .*
- (ii) *It holds that  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{w}_S(\xi_\alpha, h, t) = 0$  for all  $t > 0$ .*

*In that case, it follows that  $\{\xi_\alpha(s) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}, s \leq t\}$  is precompact in  $S$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .*

It is easy to obtain a precompactness criterion for the topology on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{J_1})$  from Lemma 4.17.

**Theorem 4.18** (Precompactness in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{J_1})$ ). *Fix a dense set  $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ . A non-empty subset  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha = (X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha, \xi_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{J_1})$  is precompact if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

- (i) *The set  $\{(X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology.*
- (ii) *For each  $t \in T$ , there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $\xi_\alpha(t) \in X_\alpha^{(r)}$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ .*
- (iii) *It holds that  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{w}_{X_\alpha}(\xi_\alpha, h, t) = 0$  for all  $t > 0$ .*

*In that case, the following result stronger than (ii) holds.*

- (iv) *For each  $t \geq 0$ , there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $\xi_\alpha(s) \in X_\alpha^{(r)}$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $s \leq t$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that (i), (ii) and (iii) are satisfied. Fix a sequence  $(\alpha_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . By (i), if necessary, by choosing a subsequence, we may assume that  $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha_n}$  converges to some  $(X, d^X, \rho_X, \xi_X)$  in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology. By Theorem 3.24, there exist a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_n : X_{\alpha_n} \rightarrow Z$  and  $f : X \rightarrow Z$  satisfying  $d_{\bar{H}}^{Z, \rho_Z}(f_n(X_{\alpha_n}), f(X)) \rightarrow 0$ . It follows from (ii), (iii) and Lemma 4.17 that, for some subsequence  $(\alpha_{n_k})_{k \geq 1}$ , the sequence  $(f_{n_k} \circ \xi_{\alpha_{n_k}})_{k \geq 1}$  converges to some  $\xi \in D(\mathbb{R}_+, Z)$  in the usual  $J_1$ -Skorohod topology. Since  $\tau^{J_1}$  satisfies Assumption 3.26(i), we can find  $\xi_X \in D(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$  such that  $f \circ \xi_X = \xi$ . Therefore, we deduce that  $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha_{n_k}}$  converges to  $(X, d^X, \rho_X, \xi_X)$  in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{J_1})$ , which completes the proof.

Conversely, assume that  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is precompact in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{J_1})$ . From Corollary 3.25, we obtain (i). If (iv) is not satisfied, then we can find  $t \geq 0$ , an increasing sequence  $(r_n)_{n \geq 1}$  with  $r_n \uparrow \infty$ , a

sequence  $(\alpha_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , and a sequence  $(s_n)_{n \geq 1}$  with  $s_n \leq t$  such that  $\xi_{\alpha_n}(s_n) \notin X_{\alpha_n}^{(r_n)}$  for all  $n$ . If necessary, by choosing a subsequence, we may assume that  $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha_n}$  converges to some  $(X, d^X, \rho_X, \xi_X)$  in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology. By Theorem 3.24, there exist a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_n : X_{\alpha_n} \rightarrow Z$  and  $f : X \rightarrow Z$  such that  $f_n(X_{\alpha_n}) \rightarrow f(X)$  in the local Hausdorff topology in  $Z$  and  $f_n \circ \xi_{\alpha_n} \rightarrow f \circ \xi_X$  in the usual  $J_1$ -Skorohod topology. By Lemma 4.17, it is the case that  $\{f_n \circ \xi_{\alpha_n}(s) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, s \leq t\}$  is precompact in  $Z$ . Therefore, for some  $r > 0$ , we have that  $f_n \circ \xi_{\alpha_n}(s_n) \in Z^{(r)}$  for all  $n$ . This yields that  $\xi_{\alpha_n}(s_n) \in X_{\alpha_n}^{(r)}$  for all  $n$ , which is a contradiction. Hence, we obtain (iv). By a similar argument, we also obtain (iii).  $\square$

## 4.6 The functor for continuous curves

In [18], a Gromov-Hausdorff-type topology on a set of equivalence classes of metric spaces equipped with continuous curves was introduced, where a continuous curve is used to capture the boundary of a space. However, the focus was on length spaces for technical reasons. In this section, we define a functor which gives a natural generalization of that topology.

Fix a non-empty boundedly-compact metric space  $(T, d^T)$ . Recall that, for another boundedly-compact metric space  $(S, d^S)$ , we denote by  $C(T, S)$  the set of continuous functions  $\xi : T \rightarrow S$  equipped with the compact-convergence topology. It is known that  $C(T, S)$  is Polish (see [21, Lemma A5.1]), and one can construct a complete metric  $d_{C(T)}^S$  on  $C(T, S)$  as follows: choose an increasing sequence  $(K_n)_{n \geq 1}$  of compact subsets in  $T$  such that  $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} K_n = T$ ; we then define

$$d_{C(T)}^S(\xi, \eta) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} (1 \wedge \sup_{t \in K_n} d^S(\xi(t), \eta(t))), \quad \forall \xi, \eta \in C(T, S).$$

Define a functor  $\tau^{C(T)}$  as follows.

- For  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , set  $\tau^{C(T)}(X) := C(T, X)$  and  $d_{\tau^{C(T)}}^{X, \rho_X} := d_{C(T)}^X$ .
- For every root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  between  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , set  $\tau_f^{C(T)}(\xi) := f \circ \xi$ .

By a similar argument to the proof of Proposition 4.15, one can check that the functor  $\tau^{C(T)}$  is continuous and complete. However, the separability cannot be proven similarly because in general there is no natural discretization of continuous functions as in the way we have step functions for cadlag functions (see (4.1)). To prove that the topology on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{C(T)})$  is separable, we introduce a larger functor  $\tau^{\mathcal{C}(T)}$  defined below. Note that we fix an element  $o \in T$ , which we set to be the root of  $T$ .

- For  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , set  $\tau^{\mathcal{C}(T)}(X) := \mathcal{C}(T, X)$  and  $d_{\tau^{\mathcal{C}(T)}}^{X, \rho_X} := d_{\mathcal{C}(T)}^{T, o}$ .
- For every root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  between  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , set  $\tau_f^{\mathcal{C}(T)}(E) := (\text{id}_T \times f)(E)$ .

**Proposition 4.19.** *The functor  $\tau^{C(T)}$  is continuous and complete, and the functor  $\tau^{\mathcal{C}(T)}$  is complete, separable and continuous. Moreover,  $\tau^{C(T)}$  is a topological subfunctor of  $\tau^{\mathcal{C}(T)}$ .*

*Proof.* As we mentioned, one can check that  $\tau^{C(T)}$  is continuous and complete in a similar way to the proof of Proposition 4.15. It is not difficult to obtain the continuity of  $\tau^{\mathcal{C}(T)}$  by using Theorem 2.50. Let  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n})$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $\mathcal{Z} = (Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  be elements in  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ$  such that  $\mathcal{X}_n \preceq \mathcal{Z}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $X_n$  converges to  $X$  with respect to  $d_{\mathcal{H}}^{Z, \rho_Z}$ . Let  $E_n \in \mathcal{C}(T, X_n)$  be such that  $E_n \rightarrow E$  with respect to  $d_{\mathcal{H}, Z}^{T, o}$  for some  $E \in \mathcal{C}(T, Z)$ . Fix  $(t, x) \in E \subseteq T \times Z$  and choose  $(t_n, x_n) \in E_n$  such that  $(t_n, x_n) \rightarrow (t, x)$ . Using the convergence  $X_n \rightarrow X$ , we deduce that  $x \in X$ . Thus, it follows that  $E \in \mathcal{C}(T, X)$ , which implies the completeness of  $\tau^{\mathcal{C}(T)}$ . Let  $D$  be a countable dense subset in  $T \times X$ . Using the convergence  $X_n \rightarrow X$ , one can check that every finite subset in  $D$  is approximated by a sequence of finite subsets in  $T \times X_n$ . Since the set of finite points in  $D$  is dense in  $\mathcal{C}(T, X)$ , we deduce that  $\tau^{\mathcal{C}(T)}$  is separable. By Corollary 2.54 and Corollary 2.60, the map  $\mathfrak{g} : \tau^{C(T)}(X) \rightarrow \tau^{\mathcal{C}(T)}(X)$ , which carries a function to its graph, is a topological embedding. Hence, we deduce that  $\tau^{C(T)}$  is a topological subfunctor of  $\tau^{\mathcal{C}(T)}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.20.** *The metric  $d_{\mathfrak{M}}^{c(T)}$  is a complete, separable metric on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{C(T)})$ .*

*Proof.* By Corollary 3.30, Proposition 3.33 and Proposition 4.19, we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

Let us prepare to describe a precompactness criterion. For  $\xi \in C(T, S)$ , where  $(S, d^S)$  is a metric space, we define

$$w_S(\xi, h, K) := \sup\{d^S(\xi(s), \xi(r)) \mid r, s \in K \text{ such that } d^T(r, s) \leq h\}, \quad K \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(T), \quad h > 0,$$

where we recall that  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(T)$  denotes the set of compact subsets in  $(T, d^T)$ .

**Theorem 4.21.** *(Precompactness in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{C(T)})$ ) Fix a dense set  $T' \subseteq T$ . A non-empty subset  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha = (X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha, \xi_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{C(T)})$  is precompact if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

- (i) *The subset  $\{(X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology.*
- (ii) *For each  $t \in T'$ , there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $\xi_\alpha(t) \in X_\alpha^{(r)}$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ .*
- (iii) *It holds that  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} w_{X_\alpha}(\xi_\alpha, h, K) = 0$  for all  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(T)$ .*

*Proof.* Using a precompactness criterion for the compact-convergence topology (see [21, Theorem A5.2] for example), one can prove the desired result in a similar way to the proof of Theorem 4.18.  $\square$

**Remark 4.22.** When  $T$  is a connected subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , by chaining arguments, one can check that the condition (ii) is implied by (iii) and the following condition (c.f. [10, Theorem 7.2]).

- (ii') For some  $t_0 \in T$ , there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $\xi_\alpha(t_0) \in X_\alpha^{(r)}$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ .

It is known that the restriction of the usual  $J_1$ -Skorohod topology to the set of continuous functions is the compact-convergence topology (c.f. [19, Chapter VI. Proposition 1.17]). The following result is a generalization of this fact.

**Proposition 4.23.** *In the above setting, define  $T := \mathbb{R}_+$  (equipped with the Euclidean metric). Then, the functor  $\tau^{C(\mathbb{R}_+)}$  is a topological subfunctor of  $\tau^{J_1}$  defined in Section 4.5. As a consequence, the following map is a topological embedding:*

$$\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{C(\mathbb{R}_+)}) \ni (X, d^X, \rho_X, \xi_X) \mapsto (X, d^X, \rho_X, \xi_X) \in \mathfrak{M}(\tau^{J_1}).$$

*Proof.* Fix  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ . By [19, Chapter VI. Proposition 1.17], the inclusion map from  $\tau^{C(\mathbb{R}_+)} = C(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$  to  $\tau^{J_1}(X) = D(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$  is a topological embedding. Therefore, we deduce that  $\tau^{C(\mathbb{R}_+)}$  is a topological subfunctor of  $\tau^{J_1}$ . The last assertion immediately follows from Proposition 3.33.  $\square$

**Example 4.24.** In the setting of [18],  $T$  is the one-dimensional Euclidean metric space  $(\mathbb{R}, d^{\mathbb{R}})$ . If one sets  $T := [0, 1] / \{0, 1\}$ , then  $C(T, S)$  is a set of loops in  $S$ . By taking the countably many products of copies of  $\tau^{C(T)}$ , one obtains a functor for spaces equipped with countably many loops, which might be useful for studying random loop soups (e.g. [25]).

## 4.7 The functor for space-domain continuous maps

In [15], a Gromov-Hausdorff-type topology on a set of equivalence classes of compact metric spaces  $X$  equipped with heat-kernel-type functions was introduced, where a heat-kernel-type function  $f$  means a continuous function  $f : I \times X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with a fixed compact interval  $I \subseteq (0, \infty)$ . In [8, 4], a Gromov-Hausdorff-type topology on a set of equivalence classes of real trees  $X$  equipped with embedding maps, where an embedding map means a continuous map from  $X$  to some fixed metric space. In this section, we define a functor for space-domain continuous maps, which include the above-mentioned examples. Moreover, the functor, combined with a functor introduced in Section 4.8, gives a suitable topological setting for studying local times of stochastic processes living on different spaces, which is in used in [31].

For  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define  $(X^k, d^{X^k}, \rho_{X^k}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$  by setting  $(X^k, d^{X^k})$  be the product space equipped with the max product metric and  $\rho_{X^k} := (\rho_X, \dots, \rho_X) \in X^k$ . Note that  $X^k$  is **not** the  $k$ -neighborhood of  $X$ . Although this is abuse of notation, there is no confusion as we never use the notion of  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood in this section. Given a map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , we simply write  $f^k$  for the  $k$ -product function  $f \times \dots \times f : X^k \rightarrow Y^k$ . We remark the following basic property of the local Hausdorff metric. The proof is omitted as it is an easy exercise regarding the Hausdorff metric.

**Lemma 4.25.** Fix  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ . Then, for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} d_H^Z(A, B) &= d_H^{Z^k}(A^k, B^k), \quad \forall A, B \in C_{\text{cpt}}(Z), \\ d_H^{Z, \rho_Z}(X, Y) &= d_H^{Z^k, \rho_{Z^k}}(X^k, Y^k), \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{C}(Z). \end{aligned}$$

Fix a separable and complete metric space  $(\Xi, d^\Xi)$  and a natural number  $k$ . Define a functor  $\tau^{k, \Xi}$  as follows.

- For  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}$ , set  $\tau^{k, \Xi}(\mathcal{X}) := \widehat{C}(X^k, \Xi)$  and  $d_{\tau^{k, \Xi}}^{X, \rho_X} := d_{\widehat{C}, \Xi}^{X^k, \rho_{X^k}}$ .
- For each  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , set  $\tau_f^{k, \Xi}(g) := g \circ (f^k)^{-1}$ .

To prove that  $\tau^{k, \Xi}$  is Polish, we define a Polish system  $(\tilde{\tau}, (\tilde{\tau}_l)_{l \geq 1})$ .

- For  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}$ , set  $\tilde{\tau}(\mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{C}(X^k, \Xi)$  and  $d_{\tilde{\tau}}^{X, \rho_X} := d_{\widehat{H}, \Xi}^{X^k, \rho_{X^k}}$ .
- For each  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , set  $\tilde{\tau}_f(E) := (f^k \times \text{id}_\Xi)(E)$ .
- For  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}$  and  $l \geq 1$ , set  $\tilde{\tau}_l(\mathcal{X}) := \widehat{C}_l(X^k, \Xi)$ .

**Lemma 4.26.** The functor  $\tilde{\tau}$  is complete, separable and continuous.

*Proof.* It is not difficult to check the continuity of  $\tilde{\tau}$  by using Theorem 2.50. Let  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^{X_n}, \rho_{X_n})$  with  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $\mathcal{Z} = (Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  be elements in  $\mathfrak{M}^\circ$  such that  $\mathcal{X}_n \preceq \mathcal{Z}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $X_n$  converges to  $X$  with respect to  $d_H^{Z, \rho_Z}$ . From Lemma 4.25, it follows that  $X_n^k \rightarrow X^k$  in the local Hausdorff topology in  $Z^k$ . Let  $E_n \in \mathcal{C}(X_n^k, \Xi)$  be such that  $E_n \rightarrow E$  with respect to  $d_{\widehat{H}, \Xi}^{Z^k, \rho_{Z^k}}$  for some  $E \in \mathcal{C}(X^k, \Xi)$ . Fix  $(x, a) \in E \subset Z^k \times \Xi$  and choose  $(x_n, a_n) \in E_n$  such that  $(x_n, a_n) \rightarrow (x, a)$ . By the convergence  $X_n^k \rightarrow X^k$ , we deduce that  $x \in X^k$ . Thus, it follows that  $E \in \mathcal{C}(X^k, \Xi)$ , which implies the completeness of  $\tilde{\tau}$ . Let  $D$  be a countable dense subset in  $X^k \times \Xi$ . Using the convergence  $X_n^k \rightarrow X^k$ , one can check that every finite subset in  $D$  is approximated by a sequence of finite subsets in  $X_n^k \times E$ . Since the set of finite points in  $D$  is dense in  $\mathcal{C}(X^k, \Xi)$ , we deduce that  $\tilde{\tau}$  is separable.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.27.** The functor  $\tau^{k, \Xi}$  is a Polish functor with a Polish system  $(\tilde{\tau}, (\tilde{\tau}_l)_{l \geq 1})$  defined above.

*Proof.* The conditions (P1) and (P2) are immediate from Lemma 4.26 and the definition of  $\tau^{k, \Xi}$  and  $\tilde{\tau}$ , respectively. The condition (P3) is also immediate from Lemma 2.57 and Lemma 2.58. One can check (P4) by Definition 2.56.  $\square$

Proposition 4.27, combined with Theorem 3.36, immediately yields the following result.

**Corollary 4.28.** The topology on  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{k, \Xi})$  is Polish.

**Remark 4.29.** To consider spaces  $X$  equipped with heat-kernel-type functions, we identify a continuous function  $f : (0, \infty) \times X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with a continuous function  $X \times X \ni (x, y) \mapsto f(\cdot, x, y) \in C((0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ . Then, by setting  $k := 2$  and  $\Xi := C((0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ , the metric space  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{k, \Xi})$  becomes a proper space for studying spaces equipped with heat-kernel-type functions.

**Theorem 4.30** (Precompactness in  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{k, \Xi})$ ). A non-empty subset  $\{\mathcal{X}_\alpha = (X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha, f_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tau^{k, \Xi})$  is precompact if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.

- (i) The subset  $\{(X_\alpha, d^\alpha, \rho_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{M}$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology.
- (ii) For every  $r > 0$ ,  $\{f_\alpha(x) \mid x \in \text{dom}(f_\alpha)^{(r)}, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is relatively compact in  $\Xi$ .
- (iii) For every  $r > 0$ ,

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{\substack{x, y \in \text{dom}(f_\alpha)^{(r)} \\ d^\alpha(x, y) \leq \delta}} d^\Xi(f_\alpha(x), f_\alpha(y)) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Basically, using the precompactness criterion in  $\widehat{C}(S, \Xi)$  given by Theorem 2.62, one can prove the desired result in a similar way to the proof of Theorem 4.18. However, the part where we use Assumption 3.26(i) in that proof needs a slight modification because the functor  $\tau^{k, \Xi}$  is not complete. Therefore, we explain how to modify that part. Assume that (i), (ii) and (iii) are satisfied. Fix a sequence  $(\alpha_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then, one can show that there exist a subsequence  $(\alpha_{n_l})_{l \geq 1}$ , a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$ , and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $F_l : X_{\alpha_{n_l}} \rightarrow Z$  and  $F : X \rightarrow Z$  such that  $f_{\alpha_l} \circ (F_l^k)^{-1}$  converges to some  $f \in \widehat{C}(Z^k, \Xi)$ . Since the functor  $\tilde{\tau}$  satisfies Assumption 3.26(i), we can find  $f_X \in \mathcal{C}(X^k, \Xi)$  satisfying  $f = \tilde{\tau}_F(f_X)$ . Using (P4), we deduce that  $f_X \in \widehat{C}(X^k, \Xi)$ . The remaining part can be proved by following the proof of Theorem 4.18.  $\square$

## 4.8 The functor for laws of additional structures

In this section, we define a functor which provides a topological setting suitable for studying random objects in different spaces.

Let  $\tau$  be a functor. Define a functor  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}$  as follows.

- For  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ , set  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}(\mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{P}(\tau(\mathcal{X}))$  and  $d_{\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}}^{X, \rho_X} = d_P^{\tau(X), \rho_X}$  to be the Prohorov metric on  $\mathcal{P}(\tau(\mathcal{X}))$  defined by the metric  $d_\tau^{X, \rho_X}$  on  $\tau(\mathcal{X})$ .
- For each  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and root-and-distance-preserving map  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , set  $\sigma_f^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}(P) := P \circ \tau_f^{-1}$ , that is,  $\sigma_f^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}(P)$  is the pushforward measure of  $P$  by the distance-preserving map  $\tau_f : \tau(X_1) \rightarrow \tau(X_2)$ .

**Theorem 4.31.** *Let  $\tau$  be a separable functor. Then, the functor  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}$  is also separable. In addition to the separability of  $\tau$ , if  $\tau$  is continuous (resp. complete), then so is  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}$ .*

*Proof.* Note that, since  $\tau$  is assumed to be separable, the metric space  $(\tau(X), d_\tau^{X, \rho_X})$  is separable for each  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ .

Suppose that  $\tau$  is continuous. Let  $f_n : X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  be root-and-distance-preserving maps. If  $f_n \rightarrow f_\infty$  in the compact-convergence topology, then we have that  $\tau_{f_n}(a) \rightarrow \tau_f(a)$  in  $\tau(Y)$  for all  $a \in \tau(X)$ . Using the dominated convergence theorem, one can see that  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}$  is continuous.

Fix  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z) \in \mathfrak{M}$ . Assume that closed subsets  $X_n \subseteq Z$  converge to a closed subset  $X \subseteq Z$  in the metric  $d_H^{Z, \rho_Z}$ . Let  $P_n$  be a probability measure with  $\text{supp}(P_n) \subseteq \tau(X_n)$  such that  $P_n$  converges to some probability measure  $P$  on  $\tau(Z)$  with respect to  $d_P^{\tau(Z), \rho_Z}$ . By the Skorohod representation theorem, there exists a probability measure space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, Q)$  and random elements  $\xi_n$  of  $\tau(X_n)$  and  $\xi$  of  $\tau(Z)$  such that  $Q(\xi_n \in \cdot) = P_n$ ,  $Q(\xi \in \cdot) = P$  and  $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi$  in  $(\tau(Z), d_\tau^{Z, \rho_Z})$  almost-surely. Assume that  $\tau$  is complete. Then we have that  $\xi \in \tau(X)$  almost-surely. This yields that  $\text{supp}(P) \subseteq \tau(X)$ . Moreover, since  $d_\tau^{Z, \rho_Z}$  is a complete, separable metric on  $\tau(Z)$ , we deduce that  $d_P^{\tau(Z), \rho_Z}$  is complete and separable. Hence,  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}$  is complete. Finally, we prove that  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}$  is separable. Let  $P$  be a probability measure with finite atoms in  $\tau(X)$ . By the separability of  $\tau$ , such atoms are approximated by points in  $\tau(X_n)$ , and thus one can construct probability measures with support in  $\tau(X_n)$  which converges to  $P$ . Since such probability measures  $P$  are dense in the set of probability measures with support in  $\tau(X)$ , the separability of  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}$  is verified.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.32.** *If  $\tau$  is a Polish functor, then so is  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(\tilde{\tau}, (\tilde{\tau}_k)_{k \geq 1})$  be a Polish system of the Polish functor  $\tau$ . Set a functor  $\tilde{\sigma} := \sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\tau})}$ , which is a complete, separable continuous functor by Theorem 4.31. For each  $k \geq 1$ , we define  $\tilde{\sigma}_k$  by setting, for each  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,

$$\tilde{\sigma}_k(X) := \{P \in \tilde{\sigma}(X) \mid P(\tilde{\tau}_k(X)) > 1 - k^{-1}\}.$$

We will show that  $(\tilde{\sigma}, (\tilde{\sigma}_k)_{k \geq 1})$  is a Polish system of  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}$ . Firstly, we check that  $\tilde{\sigma}_k(X)$  is open in  $\tilde{\sigma}(X)$ . Suppose that a sequence  $(P_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\tilde{\sigma}_k(X)^c$  converges to  $P \in \tilde{\sigma}(X)$ . Since  $\tilde{\tau}_k(X)$  is open in  $\tilde{\tau}(X)$ , we deduce that

$$P(\tilde{\tau}_k(X)) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\tilde{\tau}_k(X)) \leq 1 - k^{-1},$$

which implies that  $P \in \tilde{\sigma}_k(X)^c$ . Hence,  $\tilde{\sigma}_k(X)$  is open in  $\tilde{\sigma}(X)$ . Let  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  be a root-and-distance-preserving map between  $(X_i, d^{X_i}, \rho_{X_i}) \in \mathfrak{M}^\circ$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . For any  $P \in \tilde{\sigma}(X)$ , we have that

$$\tilde{\sigma}_f(P)(\tilde{\tau}_k(Y)) = P \circ \tilde{\tau}_f^{-1}(\tilde{\tau}_k(Y)) = P(\tilde{\tau}_k(X)),$$

which implies that  $\tilde{\sigma}_f^{-1}(\tilde{\sigma}_k(Y)) = \tilde{\sigma}_k(X)$ . Fix  $P \in \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \tilde{\sigma}_k(X)$ . Since we may assume that  $\tilde{\tau}_k(X)$  is decreasing to  $\tau(X)$  (see Remark 3.35), it follows that  $P(\tau(X)) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P(\tilde{\tau}_k(X)) = 1$ , which implies that  $P \in \sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}(X)$ . Therefore, we deduce that  $\bigcap_{k \geq 1} \tilde{\sigma}_k(X) = \sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}(X)$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.33.** *Let  $\tau$  and  $\tilde{\tau}$  be functors such that  $\tau$  is a topological subfunctor of  $\tilde{\tau}$ . Then, the functor  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}$  is a topological subfunctor of  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\tau})}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $(X, d^X, \rho_X) \in \mathfrak{M}$ . Let  $\iota : \tau(X) \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}(X)$  be the associated topological embedding that appears in (T1). Then, we have a topological embedding  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)}(X) \ni P \mapsto P \circ \iota^{-1} \in \sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\tau})}(X)$ . One can check that this embedding satisfies (T2), and therefore we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.34.** *Let  $\tau$  be any one of the functors defined from Section 4.1 to 4.7. Then, the space  $\mathfrak{M}(\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)})$  is Polish.*

**Remark 4.35.** It is possible to define a functor  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}(\tau)}$  for Radon measures on additional structure, that is,  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}(\tau)}$  is given by setting  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}(\tau)}(X) := \mathcal{M}(\tau(X))$  equipped with the vague metric and  $\sigma_f^{\mathcal{M}(\tau)}(\mu) := \mu \circ \tau_f^{-1}$ . In this case, one can establish the same results as above in a similar way (with slight modification to the parts where we use properties of the weak convergence). For example, one can use this functor to obtain a topological setting for studying spaces  $X$  equipped with a measure on  $X \times I$  with some fixed complete, separable metric space, which is considered in [24]. (Note that the topology introduced in [24] focuses on the metric structure of the supports of measures, while our topology takes into account the entire underlying spaces.)

If one has a nice tightness criterion for random elements of  $\tau(X)$ , then it is not difficult to obtain a precompactness criterion for  $\mathfrak{M}(\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau)})$ . We demonstrate how to do it in the case  $\tau = \tau^{J_1}$ . Firstly, we recall a tightness criterion for probability measures on cadlag functions. Note that given a random element we denote by  $P$  its underlying probability measure.

**Lemma 4.36** (Tightness in  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, S)$ , [21, Theorem 23.4]). *Fix a dense set  $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$  and a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(S, d^S, \rho_S)$ . A sequence  $(\xi_n)_{n \geq 1}$  of random elements of  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, S)$  is tight if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

- (i) For each  $t \in T$ , it holds that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\xi_n(t) \notin S^{(r)}) = 0$ .
- (ii) For each  $t > 0$ , it holds that, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\tilde{w}_S(\xi_n, h, t) > \varepsilon) = 0$ .

In that case, the following result stronger than (i) holds.

- (iii) For each  $t \geq 0$ , it holds that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\xi_n(s) \notin S^{(r)}, \forall s \leq t) = 0$ .

**Theorem 4.37** (Precompactness in  $\mathfrak{M}(\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau^{J_1})})$ ). *Fix a dense set  $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ . Let  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence in  $\mathfrak{M}(\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau^{J_1})})$ . Write  $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, d^n, \rho_n, P_n)$ . For each  $n$ , we set  $\xi_n$  to be a random element whose law coincides with  $P_n$ . Then, the sequence  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is precompact if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

- (i) The sequence  $(X_n, d^n, \rho_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\mathfrak{M}$  is precompact in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology.
- (ii) For each  $t \in T$ , it holds that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\xi_n(t) \notin X_n^{(r)}) = 0$ .
- (iii) For each  $t > 0$ , it holds that, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\tilde{w}_{X_n}(\xi_n, h, t) > \varepsilon) = 0$

In that case, the following result stronger than (ii) holds.

- (iv) For each  $t \geq 0$ , it holds that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\xi_n(s) \in X_n^{(r)}, \forall s \leq t) = 0$ .

*Proof.* Assume that (i), (ii) and (iii) are satisfied. Fix a sequence  $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$ . From (i), if necessary, by choosing a subsequence, we may assume that  $\mathcal{X}_{n_k}$  converges to some  $(X, d^X, \rho_X, \xi_X)$  in the local Gromov-Hausdorff topology. By Theorem 3.24, there exist a rooted boundedly-compact metric space  $(Z, d^Z, \rho_Z)$  and root-and-distance-preserving maps  $f_k : X_{n_k} \rightarrow Z$  and  $f : X \rightarrow Z$  satisfying

$d_{\overline{H}}^{Z, \rho_Z}(f_k(X_{n_k}), f(X)) \rightarrow 0$ . It follows from (ii), (iii) and Lemma 4.36 that, for some subsequence  $(n_{k(l)})_{l \geq 1}$ , the sequence  $(f_{k(l)} \circ \xi_{n_{k(l)}})_{l \geq 1}$  converges to some random element  $\xi$  of  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, Z)$  in distribution. By Proposition 4.15 and Theorem 4.31, the functor  $\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau^{J_1})}$  satisfies Assumption 3.26(i), which implies that there exists a random element  $\xi_X$  of  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$  such that  $\xi \stackrel{d}{=} f \circ \xi_X$ . Therefore, we deduce that  $\mathcal{X}_{n_{k(l)}}$  converges to  $(X, d^X, \rho_X, P(\xi_X \in \cdot))$  in  $\mathfrak{M}(\sigma^{\mathcal{P}(\tau^{J_1})})$ . One can prove the reverse direction in the same way as the proof of Theorem 4.18, using Lemma 4.36.  $\square$

## Appendix

### A Omitted proofs

#### A.1 Lemma 2.36

In this appendix, we prove that the restriction system introduced in Definition 2.35 satisfies Assumption 2.6(i), which is a part of Lemma 2.36.

Recall that we fix a rooted boundedly compact metric space  $(S, d^S, \rho)$ . We prepare some notation. For a set  $A \subseteq S$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we write

$$A^{-\varepsilon} := \{x \in A \mid d^S(x, y) \leq \varepsilon \implies y \in A, \quad \forall y \in S\}.$$

Note that

$$(A^{-\varepsilon})^\varepsilon \subseteq A.$$

For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S)$ , we define the *total variation distance* of them by setting

$$\|\mu - \nu\| := \sup\{|\mu(A) - \nu(A)| \mid A \in \mathcal{B}(S)\},$$

where  $\mathcal{B}(S)$  denotes the set of Borel sets in  $S$ .

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $\mu, \nu$  be elements of  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S)$ . Suppose that  $d_P^S(\mu, \nu) \leq \varepsilon$ . Fix  $r \geq s > \varepsilon$  arbitrarily. Then for any  $\mu' \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S)$  with  $\mu^{(s)} \leq \mu' \leq \mu^{(r)}$ , there exists  $\nu' \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fin}}(S)$  such that  $\nu^{(s-\varepsilon)} \leq \nu' \leq \nu^{(r+\varepsilon)}$  and  $d_P^S(\mu', \nu') \leq \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $E := \{(x, y) \in S \times S \mid d^S(x, y) > \varepsilon\}$ . By [22, Theorem 2.1], there exists a finite Borel measure  $\alpha$  on  $S \times S$  such that

$$\|\mu - \pi_{1*}\alpha\| + \|\nu - \pi_{2*}\alpha\| + \alpha(E) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \pi_{1*}\alpha \leq \mu, \quad \pi_{2*}\alpha \leq \nu, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $\pi_i : S \times S \rightarrow S$  is the projection of the  $i$ -th coordinate and  $\pi_{i*}\alpha$  is the pushforward of  $\alpha$ . Set

$$f(x) := \frac{d\mu'}{d\mu}, \quad g(x) := \frac{d(\pi_{1*}\alpha)}{d\mu}.$$

Write

$$F := \{x \in S \mid g(x) \leq f(x)\}, \quad F_{>0} := \{x \in S \mid f(x) > 0\}, \quad G := \{x \in S \mid g(x) > f(x)\}.$$

Observe that

$$G^\varepsilon \subseteq (F^{-\varepsilon})^c, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where  $\cdot^c$  denotes the complement of a set. Since we have that  $\mu^{(s)} \leq \mu' \leq \mu^{(r)}$ , we may assume that  $1_{S^{(s)}} \leq f \leq 1_{S^{(r)}}$ . By (A.1), we may assume that  $0 \leq g \leq 1$ . It is then the case that

$$S^{(s)} \subseteq F, \quad S^{(s)} \subseteq F_{>0} \subseteq S^{(r)}.$$

Thus, it follows that

$$S^{(s-\varepsilon)} \subseteq F^{-\varepsilon}, \quad S^{(s+\varepsilon)} \subseteq F_{>0}^\varepsilon \subseteq S^{(r+\varepsilon)}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Set

$$h(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & x \in F, \\ f(x)/g(x), & x \in G. \end{cases}$$

We then define

$$\nu'(A) = \nu(A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap F^{-\varepsilon}) + \int_{S \times (A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c)} h(x) \alpha(dxdy),$$

From (A.3), we have that  $\nu^{(s-\varepsilon)} \leq \nu'$ . Moreover, (A.3) and (A.1) yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu'(A) &\leq \nu(A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap F^{-\varepsilon}) + \int_{S \times (A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c)} \alpha(dxdy) \\ &\leq \nu(A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap F^{-\varepsilon}) + \nu(A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c) \\ &\leq \nu(A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon) \\ &\leq \nu^{(r+\varepsilon)}(A). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it holds that  $\nu^{(s-\varepsilon)} \leq \nu' \leq \nu^{(r+\varepsilon)}$ . Fix a Borel set  $A \subseteq S$ . We deduce from (A.1) and (A.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu'(A) &= \int_A f(x) \mu(dx) \\ &= \int_{A \cap G \cap F_{>0}} h(x) g(x) \mu(dx) + \int_{A \cap F \cap F_{>0}} f(x) \mu(dx) \\ &\leq \int_{A \cap G \cap F_{>0}} h(x) \pi_{1*} \alpha(dx) + \mu(A \cap F \cap F_{>0}) \\ &\leq \int_{(A \cap G \cap F_{>0}) \times S} h(x) \alpha(dxdy) + \int_{(A \cap F \cap F_{>0}) \times S} \alpha(dxdy) + \|\mu - \pi_{1*} \alpha\| \\ &\leq \int_{(A \cap G \cap F_{>0}) \times (A^\varepsilon \cap G^\varepsilon \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon)} h(x) \alpha(dxdy) + \int_{(A \cap F \cap F_{>0}) \times (A^\varepsilon \cap F^\varepsilon \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon)} \alpha(dxdy) \\ &\quad + \|\mu - \pi_{1*} \alpha\| + \alpha(E) \\ &\leq \int_{(A \cap G) \times (A^\varepsilon \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c)} h(x) \alpha(dxdy) + \int_{(A \cap F) \times (A^\varepsilon \cap F^\varepsilon \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c)} \alpha(dxdy) \\ &\quad + \int_{(A \cap F) \times (A^\varepsilon \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap F^{-\varepsilon})} \alpha(dxdy) + \varepsilon \\ &\leq \int_{G \times (A^\varepsilon \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c)} h(x) \alpha(dxdy) + \int_{F \times (A^\varepsilon \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c)} h(x) \alpha(dxdy) \\ &\quad + \int_{S \times (A^\varepsilon \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap F^{-\varepsilon})} \alpha(dxdy) + \varepsilon \\ &\leq \int_{S \times (A^\varepsilon \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c)} h(x) \alpha(dxdy) + \pi_{2*} \alpha(A^\varepsilon \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap F^{-\varepsilon}) + \varepsilon \\ &\leq \nu'(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu'(A) &= \nu(A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap F^{-\varepsilon}) + \int_{S \times (A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c)} h(x) \alpha(dxdy) \\ &\leq \|\pi_{2*} \alpha - \nu\| + \int_{S \times (A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap F^{-\varepsilon})} \alpha(dxdy) + \int_{S \times (A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c)} h(x) \alpha(dxdy) \\ &\leq \|\pi_{2*} \alpha - \nu\| + \alpha(E) + \int_{(A^\varepsilon \cap F) \times (A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap F^{-\varepsilon})} \alpha(dxdy) + \int_{A^\varepsilon \times (A \cap F_{>0}^\varepsilon \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c)} h(x) \alpha(dxdy) \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \int_{(A^\varepsilon \cap F) \times (A \cap F^{-\varepsilon})} h(x) \alpha(dxdy) + \int_{A^\varepsilon \times (A \cap (F^{-\varepsilon})^c)} h(x) \alpha(dxdy) \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \int_{A^\varepsilon} h(x) \pi_{1*} \alpha(dx) \\ &= \varepsilon + \int_{A^\varepsilon} h(x) g(x) \mu(dx) \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \int_{A^\varepsilon} f(x) \mu(dx) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \varepsilon + \mu'(A^\varepsilon).$$

Therefore, we obtain that  $d_P^S(\mu', \nu') \leq \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

## A.2 Theorem 4.13

In this appendix, we provide a proof of Theorem 4.13. We first prove a general result about restriction systems. Recall the setting of Section 2.1. The following result gives a characterization of convergence of a sequence in  $\mathfrak{D}$  in terms of convergence of a sequence restricted by a sequence of restriction systems. The result can be viewed as a generalization of [23, Theorem 3.19] (see also Theorem 4.13).

**Proposition A.2.** *For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $R^{(n)} = (R_r^{(n)})_{r>0}$  be a restriction system. Assume that  $\text{dis}(R^{(n)}, R) \rightarrow 0$ . We equip  $\mathfrak{D}$  with the topology induced from  $R$ . (Note that the topology coincides with the topology induced from  $R^{(n)}$  by Theorem 2.12.) For elements  $a, a_1, a_2, \dots$  of  $\mathfrak{D}$ , the following statements are equivalent.*

- (i) *The elements  $a_n$  converge to  $a$  in  $\mathfrak{D}$ .*
- (ii) *It holds that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_r^{(n)}(a_n), R_r(a)) \rightarrow 0$  for all but countably many  $r > 0$ .*
- (iii) *There exists a non-decreasing sequence  $(r_n)_{n \geq 1}$  with  $r_n \rightarrow \infty$  satisfying  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_{r_n}^{(n)}(a_n), R_{r_n}(a)) \rightarrow 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq (0, \infty)$  be the collection of  $r > 0$  satisfying

$$\inf\{d_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_r(a), a') \mid R_{r-\delta}(a) \preceq a' \preceq R_{r+\delta}(a)\} \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Note that  $(0, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{R}$  is countable by Assumption 2.6(ii). Assume that (i) holds. Fix  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Choose  $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$  satisfying

$$\inf\{d_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_r(a), a') \mid R_{r-\delta}(a) \preceq a' \preceq R_{r+\delta}(a)\} < \varepsilon. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Choose  $r' \in \mathcal{R}$  with  $r' > r + \delta$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for all  $n > N$ , it holds that

$$\text{dis}(R^{(n)}, R) < \delta/2, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$d_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_{r'}(a_n), R_{r'}(a)) < \delta/2. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Since  $R^{(n)}$  satisfies Assumption 2.6(i), (A.6) implies that there exists  $a' \in \mathfrak{C}$  such that

$$R_{r-\delta/2}^{(n)} \circ R_{r'}(a) \preceq a' \preceq R_{r+\delta/2}^{(n)} \circ R_{r'}(a), \quad d_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_r^{(n)} \circ R_{r'}(a_n), a') < \delta/2. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

By (RS1), (RS2) and (A.5), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} R_r^{(n)} \circ R_{r'} &= R_{r'}^{(n)}(a_n), \\ R_{r-\delta/2}^{(n)} \circ R_{r'}(a) &\succeq R_{r-\delta} \circ R_{r-\delta/2}^{(n)} \circ R_{r'}(a) = R_{r-\delta} \circ R_{r'}(a) = R_{r-\delta}(a), \\ R_{r+\delta/2}^{(n)} \circ R_{r'}(a) &= R_{r+\delta/2}^{(n)} \circ R_{r+\delta} \circ R_{r'}(a) \preceq R_{r+\delta} \circ R_{r'}(a) = R_{r+\delta}(a). \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from (A.8) that

$$R_{r-\delta}(a) \preceq a' \preceq R_{r+\delta}(a), \quad d_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_r^{(n)}(a_n), a') < \delta/2.$$

Therefore, the triangle inequality and (A.4) yield that  $d_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_r^{(n)}(a_n), R_r(a)) < 2\varepsilon$  for all  $n > N$ , which implies (ii).

It is not difficult to check that (ii) implies (iii). Thus, it remains to prove the implication (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i). We assume that (iii) holds. Fix  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We choose  $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$  satisfying (A.8). Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that, for all  $n > N$ , it holds that

$$r_n > r + \delta, \quad \text{dis}(R^{(n)}, R) < \delta, \quad d_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_{r_n}^{(n)}(a_n), R_{r_n}(a)) < \delta.$$

Since  $R$  satisfies Assumption 2.6(i), there exists  $a' \in \mathfrak{C}$  such that

$$R_{r-\delta} \circ R_{r_n}(a) \preceq a' \preceq R_{r+\delta} \circ R_{r_n}(a), \quad d_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_r \circ R_{r_n}^{(n)}(a_n), a') < \delta. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

By a similar argument as before, we obtain that

$$R_{r-\delta}(a) \preceq a' \preceq R_{r+\delta}(a), \quad d_{\mathcal{C}}(R_r(a_n), a') < \delta.$$

Thus, we deduce that, for all  $n > N$ ,

$$d_{\mathcal{C}}(R_r(a_n), R_r(a)) \leq d_{\mathcal{C}}(R_r(a_n), a') + d_{\mathcal{C}}(a', R_r(a)) < 2\varepsilon,$$

which implies (i).  $\square$

Now, it is possible to prove Theorem 4.13. Recall the setting of Section 4.4.

*Proof of Theorem 4.13.* By [22, Theorem 3.24], (ii) and (iii) are equivalent. The implications (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) and (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv) are easily obtained from Theorem 3.24. Thus, it suffices to show the implications (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv) and (iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (i). We begin with proving the first implication. Assume that (iii) holds. Choose a non-decreasing sequence  $(r_n)_{n \geq 1}$  satisfying  $r_n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon_n := d_{GHP}(\mathcal{X}_n^{(r_n)}, \mathcal{X}_\infty^{(r_n)}) \rightarrow 0$ . By the definition of the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prohorov metric (see (1.3)), we can find a compact metric space  $(Z_n, d^{Z_n})$  and distance-preserving maps  $g_n : X_n^{(r_n)} \rightarrow Z_n$ ,  $h_n : X_\infty^{(r_n)} \rightarrow Z_n$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & d_H^{Z_n}(g_n(X_n^{(r_n)}), h_n(X_\infty^{(r_n)})) \vee d_P^{Z_n}(\mu_{X_n}^{(r_n)} \circ g_n^{-1}, \mu_{X_\infty}^{(r_n)} \circ h_n^{-1}) \vee d^{Z_n}(g_n(\rho_{X_n}^{(r_n)}), h_n(\rho_{X_\infty}^{(r_n)})) \quad (\text{A.9}) \\ & < \varepsilon_n + n^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We may assume that  $Z_n = g_n(X_n^{(r_n)}) \cup h_n(X_\infty^{(r_n)})$ . Let  $d^n$  be a pseudometric on the disjoint union  $X_n \sqcup X_\infty$  satisfying  $d^n|_{X_n \times X_n} = d^{X_n}$ ,  $d^n|_{X_\infty \times X_\infty} = d^{X_\infty}$  and

$$d^n(x_n, x_\infty) = d^{Z_n}(g_n(x_n), h_n(x_\infty))$$

for all  $x_n \in X_n^{(r_n)}$ ,  $x_\infty \in X_\infty^{(r_n)}$ . We then define a pseudometric  $d^Z$  on  $Z := \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}} X_n$  that extends every  $d^n$  by setting

$$d^Z(x_m, x_n) := \inf\{d^m(x_m, x_\infty) + d^n(x_\infty, x_n) \mid x_\infty \in X_\infty\}$$

for all  $x_m \in X_m$ ,  $x_n \in X_n$  with  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $n \neq m$ . We use the equivalence relation  $\sim$  on  $Z$  given by

$$x \sim y \Leftrightarrow d^Z(x, y) = 0 \quad (\text{A.10})$$

to obtain the quotient space  $Z^* := Z / \sim$ . Let  $q : Z \rightarrow Z^*$  be the quotient map. The metric  $d^{Z^*}$  is given by  $d^{Z^*}(q(x), q(y)) := d^Z(x, y)$ . It is not difficult to check that  $(Z^*, d^{Z^*})$  is boundedly compact. For each  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , we let  $\iota_n : X_n \rightarrow Z$  be the inclusion map and  $f_n : X_n \rightarrow Z^*$  be the distance-preserving map given by  $f_n := q \circ \iota_n$ . By the definition of  $d^Z$  and the equivalence relation (A.10), there exist a (unique) distance-preserving map  $\xi_n : Z_n \rightarrow Z^*$  satisfying  $\xi_n \circ g_n = f_n|_{X_n^{(r_n)}}$  and  $\xi_n \circ h_n = f_\infty|_{X_\infty^{(r_n)}}$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.31, Lemma 2.40 and (A.9), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & d_H^{Z^*}(f_n(X_n^{(r_n)}), f_\infty(X_\infty^{(r_n)})) \vee d_P^{Z^*}(\mu_{X_n}^{(r_n)} \circ f_n^{-1}, \mu_{X_\infty}^{(r_n)} \circ f_\infty^{-1}) \vee d^{Z^*}(f_n(\rho_{X_n}^{(r_n)}), f_\infty(\rho_{X_\infty}^{(r_n)})) \\ & < \varepsilon_n + n^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

We define a restriction system  $R^{(n)}$  of  $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cpt}}(Z^*), \mathcal{C}(Z^*), \subseteq)$  by setting

$$R_r^{(n)}(A) := A \cap D_{Z^*}(f_n(\rho_{X_n}), r).$$

It is then the case that

$$f_n(X_n^{(r)}) = R_r^{(n)}(f_n(X_n)), \quad f_\infty(X_\infty^{(r)}) = R_r^{(\infty)}(f_\infty(X_\infty)).$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\text{dis}(R^{(n)}, R^{(\infty)}) \leq d^{Z^*}(f_n(\rho_{X_n}), f_\infty(\rho_{X_\infty})).$$

These, combined with Proposition A.2 and (A.11), yield that  $d_H^{Z^*}(f_n(X_n^{(r)}), f_\infty(X_\infty^{(r)})) \rightarrow 0$  for all but countably many  $r > 0$ . By a similar argument, we also deduce that  $d_P^{Z^*}(\mu_{X_n}^{(r)} \circ f_n^{-1}, \mu_{X_\infty}^{(r)} \circ f_\infty^{-1}) \rightarrow 0$ . Thus, we obtain (iv).

Assume that (iv) holds. Define a metric  $d^M$  on  $M := \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}} X_n$  by setting  $d|_{X_n \times X_n} := d^{X_n}$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and

$$d(x_n, x_m) := d^Z(f_n(\rho_{X_n}), f_m(\rho_{X_m})) + d^Z(f_n(x_n), f_m(x_m))$$

for each  $x_n \in X_n, x_m \in X_m$  with  $n \neq m$ . Let  $\iota_n : X_n \rightarrow M$  be the inclusion map. Then, one can check that, for every  $r > 0$ ,

$$d_H(\iota_n(X_n^{(r)}), \iota_\infty(X_\infty^{(r)})) \leq d_H^Z(f_n(X_n^{(r)}), f_\infty(X_\infty^{(r)})) + d^Z(f_n(\rho_{X_n}), f_\infty(\rho_{X_\infty})), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$d_P(\mu_{X_n}^{(r)} \circ \iota_n^{-1}, \mu_{X_\infty}^{(r)} \circ \iota_\infty^{-1}) \leq d_P^Z(\mu_{X_n}^{(r)} \circ f_n^{-1}, \mu_{X_\infty}^{(r)} \circ f_\infty^{-1}) + d^Z(f_n(\rho_{X_n}), f_\infty(\rho_{X_\infty})). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

We define a pseudometric  $d^M$  on  $M$  by setting

$$d^M(x, y) := \inf\{d(x, \rho_{X_{n_1}}) + d(\rho_{X_{n_2}}, \rho_{X_{n_3}}) + \cdots + d(\rho_{X_{n_{k-2}}}, \rho_{X_{n_{k-1}}}) + d(\rho_{X_{n_k}}, y)\}, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where the infimum is taken over all finite sequence  $(n_i)_{i=1}^k$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  including the empty sequence, which corresponds to  $d(x, y)$ . Since we have that, for  $m \neq n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_n, \rho_{X_m}) &= d^Z(f_n(\rho_{X_n}), f_m(\rho_{X_m})) + d^Z(f_n(x_n), f_m(\rho_{X_m})) \\ &\geq d^Z(f_n(x_n), f_n(\rho_{X_n})) = d(x_n, \rho_{X_n}), \end{aligned}$$

we deduce that  $d^M|_{X_n \times X_n} = d^{X_n}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . We use the equivalence relation  $\sim$  on  $M$  given by

$$x \sim y \Leftrightarrow d^M(x, y) = 0 \quad (\text{A.15})$$

to obtain the quotient space  $M^* := M / \sim$ . We write  $q : M \rightarrow M^*$  for the quotient map and  $d^{M^*}$  for the associated metric on  $M^*$ . It is not difficult to check that  $(M^*, d^{M^*})$  is boundedly compact. We define the root  $\rho_{M^*}$  of  $M^*$  by setting  $\rho_{M^*} := q(\rho_{X_n})$ , which is independent of  $n$  by (A.14) and (A.15). Set  $g_n := q \circ \iota_n$ . Note that  $g_n$  is a root-and-distance-preserving map from  $X_n$  to  $M^*$ . By the definition of  $d^M$ , it is obvious that  $d^{M^*}(q(x_n), q(x_\infty)) \leq d(x_n, x_\infty)$  for all  $x_n \in X_n, x_\infty \in X_\infty$ . This, combined with (A.12) and (A.13), yields that, for every  $r > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d_H^{M^*}(g_n(X_n^{(r)}), g_\infty(X_\infty^{(r)})) &\leq d_H^Z(f_n(X_n^{(r)}), f_\infty(X_\infty^{(r)})) + d^Z(f_n(\rho_{X_n}), f_\infty(\rho_{X_\infty})), \\ d_P^{M^*}(\mu_{X_n}^{(r)} \circ g_n^{-1}, \mu_{X_\infty}^{(r)} \circ g_\infty^{-1}) &\leq d_P^Z(\mu_{X_n}^{(r)} \circ f_n^{-1}, \mu_{X_\infty}^{(r)} \circ f_\infty^{-1}) + d^Z(f_n(\rho_{X_n}), f_\infty(\rho_{X_\infty})). \end{aligned}$$

From these inequalities and (iv), it follows that

$$d_H^{M^*}(g_n(X_n^{(r)}), g_\infty(X_\infty^{(r)})) \rightarrow 0, \quad d_P^{M^*}(\mu_{X_n}^{(r)} \circ g_n^{-1}, \mu_{X_\infty}^{(r)} \circ g_\infty^{-1}) \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

for all but countably many  $r > 0$ . Since  $g_n : X_n \rightarrow M^*$  is root-and-distance-preserving, it holds that  $g_n(X_n^{(r)}) = g_n(X_n)^{(r)}$  and  $\mu_{X_n}^{(r)} \circ g_n^{-1} = (\mu_{X_n} \circ g_n^{-1})^{(r)}$ . Therefore, from (A.16), Theorem 2.28 and Theorem 2.39, we deduce that  $g_n(X_n)$  converges to  $g_\infty(X_\infty)$  in the local Hausdorff topology and  $\mu_{X_n} \circ g_n^{-1}$  converges to  $\mu_{X_\infty} \circ g_\infty^{-1}$  in the vague topology, which implies (i).  $\square$

## Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr David Croydon for his support and fruitful discussions. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP 24KJ1447 and the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, an International Joint Usage/Research Center located in Kyoto University.

## References

- [1] R. Abraham, J.-F. Delmas, and P. Hoscheit, *A note on the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov distance between (locally) compact metric measure spaces*, Electron. J. Probab. **18** (2013), no. 14, 21. MR 3035742
- [2] ———, *Exit times for an increasing Lévy tree-valued process*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **159** (2014), no. 1-2, 357–403. MR 3201925

- [3] L. Addario-Berry, N. Broutin, and C. Goldschmidt, *The continuum limit of critical random graphs*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **152** (2012), no. 3-4, 367–406. MR 2892951
- [4] O. Angel, D. A. Croydon, S. Hernandez-Torres, and D. Shiraishi, *Scaling limits of the three-dimensional uniform spanning tree and associated random walk*, Ann. Probab. **49** (2021), no. 6, 3032–3105. MR 4348685
- [5] E. Archer and D. A. Croydon, *Scaling limit of critical percolation clusters on hyperbolic random half-planar triangulations and the associated random walks*, 2023, Preprint. Available at arXiv:2311.11993.
- [6] S. Athreya, W. Löhr, and A. Winter, *The gap between Gromov-vague and Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **126** (2016), no. 9, 2527–2553. MR 3522292
- [7] ———, *Invariance principle for variable speed random walks on trees*, Ann. Probab. **45** (2017), no. 2, 625–667. MR 3630284
- [8] M. T. Barlow, D. A. Croydon, and T. Kumagai, *Subsequential scaling limits of simple random walk on the two-dimensional uniform spanning tree*, Ann. Probab. **45** (2017), no. 1, 4–55. MR 3601644
- [9] G. Ben Arous, M. Cabezas, and A. Fribergh, *Scaling limit for the ant in high-dimensional labyrinths*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **72** (2019), no. 4, 669–763. MR 3914881
- [10] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of probability measures*, second ed., Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1999, A Wiley-Interscience Publication. MR 1700749
- [11] A. Blanc-Renaudie, N. Broutin, and A. Nachmias, *The scaling limit of critical hypercube percolation*, 2024, Preprint. Available at arXiv:2401.16365.
- [12] D. Burago, Y. Burago, and S. Ivanov, *A course in metric geometry*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 33, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001. MR 1835418
- [13] S. Cao, *Convergence of energy forms on Sierpinski gaskets with added rotated triangle*, Potential Anal. **59** (2023), no. 4, 1793–1825. MR 4684376
- [14] D. A. Croydon, *Scaling limits of stochastic processes associated with resistance forms*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. **54** (2018), no. 4, 1939–1968. MR 3865663
- [15] D. A. Croydon, B. M. Hambly, and T. Kumagai, *Convergence of mixing times for sequences of random walks on finite graphs*, Electron. J. Probab. **17** (2012), no. 3, 32. MR 2869250
- [16] D. J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones, *An introduction to the theory of point processes. Vol. I*, second ed., Probability and its Applications (New York), Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003, Elementary theory and methods. MR 1950431
- [17] M. Gromov, *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, english ed., Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2007, Based on the 1981 French original, With appendices by M. Katz, P. Pansu and S. Semmes, Translated from the French by Sean Michael Bates. MR 2307192
- [18] E. Gwynne and J. Miller, *Scaling limit of the uniform infinite half-plane quadrangulation in the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov-uniform topology*, Electron. J. Probab. **22** (2017), Paper No. 84, 47. MR 3718712
- [19] J. Jacod and A. N. Shiryaev, *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*, second ed., Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 288, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. MR 1943877
- [20] O. Kallenberg, *Random measures, theory and applications*, Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling, vol. 77, Springer, Cham, 2017. MR 3642325

- [21] ———, *Foundations of modern probability*, third ed., Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling, vol. 99, Springer, Cham, [2021] ©2021. MR 4226142
- [22] A. Khezeli, *Metrization of the Gromov-Hausdorff (-Prokhorov) topology for boundedly-compact metric spaces*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **130** (2020), no. 6, 3842–3864. MR 4092421
- [23] ———, *A unified framework for generalizing the Gromov-Hausdorff metric*, Probab. Surv. **20** (2023), 837–896. MR 4671147
- [24] S. Kliem and W. Löhr, *Existence of mark functions in marked metric measure spaces*, Electron. J. Probab. **20** (2015), no. 73, 24. MR 3371432
- [25] G. F. Lawler and W. Werner, *The Brownian loop soup*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **128** (2004), no. 4, 565–588. MR 2045953
- [26] J.-F. Le Gall, *Random real trees*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) **15** (2006), no. 1, 35–62. MR 2225746
- [27] J.-F. Le Gall and G. Miermont, *Scaling limits of random trees and planar maps*, Probability and statistical physics in two and more dimensions, Clay Math. Proc., vol. 15, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012, pp. 155–211. MR 3025391
- [28] M. B. Marcus and J. Rosen, *Markov processes, Gaussian processes, and local times*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 100, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006. MR 2250510
- [29] G. Miermont, *Tessellations of random maps of arbitrary genus*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **42** (2009), no. 5, 725–781. MR 2571957
- [30] M. Morariu-Patrichi, *On the weak-hash metric for boundedly finite integer-valued measures*, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. **98** (2018), no. 2, 265–276. MR 3849587
- [31] R. Noda, *Convergence of local times of stochastic processes associated with resistance forms*, Preprint. Available at arXiv:2305.13224.
- [32] S. Sheffield, *Conformal weldings of random surfaces: SLE and the quantum gravity zipper*, Ann. Probab. **44** (2016), no. 5, 3474–3545. MR 3551203
- [33] W. Whitt, *Some useful functions for functional limit theorems*, Math. Oper. Res. **5** (1980), no. 1, 67–85. MR 561155