

LANDSCAPES OF DATA SETS AND FUNCTORIALITY OF PERSISTENT HOMOLOGY

W. CHACHÓLSKI, A. DE GREGORIO, N. QUERCIOLO, AND F. TOMBARI

ABSTRACT. Paraphrasing Gunnar Carlsson [3]: for obtaining qualitative information and reducing dependence on measures and distances, “we are forced to make functorial geometric constructions and analyze their behaviour on maps even to obtain information about single point clouds”. We share this view that functorial properties of persistent homology is fundamental in topological data analysis.

The aim of this article is to describe a new perspective on functoriality of persistent homology and explain its intrinsic symmetry that is often overlooked. To describe and encode this symmetry, we study various category structures on data sets. A data set for us is a finite collection of functions, called measurements, with a finite domain. Such a data set has a lot of internal symmetries which are effectively captured by the action of a set of the domain endomorphisms. Different choices of the set of endomorphisms encode different symmetries of the data set. This flexibility is important in applications. For example in data sets that represent images, we might need to focus on rotational symmetries and ignore translational symmetries. In this article we describe various category structures on such enriched data sets and prove some of their properties such as decompositions and morphism formations. We also describe a data structure, based on coloured directed graphs, which is convenient to encode the mentioned enrichment.

Our fundamental discovery presented in this paper is that persistent homology preserves only some aspects of these landscapes of enriched data sets however not all. In other words persistent homology is not a functor on the entire category of enriched data sets. Nevertheless we show that persistent homology is functorial locally. We use the concept of equivariant operators, recently introduced by Frosini et al. [1, 2], to capture some of the information missed by persistent homology.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this article we give an answer to the question: what is persistent homology a functor of?

Data sets considered in this article are given by finite sets of functions on a finite set X with real values. There are several important consequences of data sets having this form. For example, it endows X with a pseudometric, enabling us to extract non-trivial homological information in form of persistent homology, the key invariant studied in this article. A single measurement does not contain any higher non-trivial homological information. Sets of measurements however do. Thus it is essential that measurements, on a given set X , are grouped together to form various

Mathematics, KTH, S-10044 Stockholm, Sweden .

Politecnico di Torino, Dipartimento di Scienze Matematiche, 10129, Torino, Italy .

University of Bologna, Departement of Mathematics, 40126, Bologna, Italy .

Mathematics, KTH, S-10044 Stockholm, Sweden .

data sets. In this case persistent homology becomes a non-expansive (1-Lipschitz) function $PH_d^\Phi: \Phi \rightarrow \text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$, assigning to each measurement in the data set Φ a tame vector spaces parametrized by $[0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}$.

The persistent homology is not simply a function. A data set Φ is equipped with an action of the monoid of its operations $\text{End}_\Phi(X)$. This action gives the set Φ a structure of Grothendieck graph. Persistent homology turns out to be a functor indexed by this graph. Thus not only persistent homology can be assigned to individual measurements in a data, but operations can be used to compare persistent homologies of different measurements. That is what we call local functorial properties of persistent homology.

Persistent homology has also certain global functorial properties. There are various ways of representing data in form of sets of measurements, we might choose different units or different parametrizations of a domain of measurements, or we might need to focus only on certain operations such as rotations. Furthermore, same measurements might be part of different data sets. These are some of the reasons why it is essential to be able to compare data sets equipped with different structures. For that purpose we introduce the notion of incarnations of data sets to encode different actions, and SEOs to compare incarnations. If a SEO is geometric, then there is a comparison map between persistent homologies of the incarnations connected by the SEO. However if a SEO is not geometric, such as the change of units SEO, there is no direct comparison of persistent homologies of the involved incarnations. Such SEOs therefore exhibit diverse homological features of data sets.

2. DATA SETS

For us a data set, which we regard as a point in the data landscape, is given by a finite set of real valued measurements on some finite set X :

$$\Phi = \{\phi_i: X \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \mid i = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

The most fundamental aspect of a data set Φ is that it is a set. All such data sets, for all different sets X , form a category with functions as morphisms. This is the most primitive landscape of data sets. The nature of our data sets however can be used to impose more intricate structures and more meaningful landscapes. This is reminiscent of the case of groups. The most fundamental aspect of a group is that it is a set. However the category whose morphisms are group homomorphism is a much more meaningful landscape in which to study relations between groups. To understand relations between topological groups, the category with continuous group homomorphisms provides an even more meaningful landscape.

In this most primitive landscape however we can already perform products and coproducts. Let $\phi: X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $\psi: Y \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be functions. Define $\phi + \psi: X \coprod Y \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ to be the function that maps x in X to $\phi(x)$ and y in Y to $\psi(y)$. The **coproduct** of two data sets Φ and Ψ , denoted by $\Phi \coprod \Psi$, is defined to be the data set given by the measurements $\{\phi + 0 \mid \phi \in \Phi\} \cup \{0 + \psi \mid \psi \in \Psi\}$ on $X \coprod Y$. Their **product**, denoted by $\Phi \times \Psi$, is defined to be the data set given by the measurements

$\{\phi + \psi \mid \phi \in \Phi \text{ and } \psi \in \Psi\}$. The functions:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \xrightarrow[\text{pr}_\Phi]{\phi + \psi \mapsto \phi} & \Phi \\
 \Phi \times \Psi & & \xrightarrow[\text{in}_\Phi]{\phi \mapsto \phi + 0} \\
 & \xrightarrow[\text{pr}_\Psi]{\phi + \psi \mapsto \psi} & \Psi \\
 & & \xrightarrow[\text{in}_\Psi]{\psi \mapsto 0 + \psi} \\
 & & \Phi \amalg \Psi
 \end{array}$$

satisfy the following universal properties, which justify the names coproduct and product:

- for any data set Π , and any two functions $\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Pi$ and $\beta: \Psi \rightarrow \Pi$, there is a unique function $\mu: \Phi \amalg \Psi \rightarrow \Pi$ for which $\mu \text{in}_\Phi = \alpha$ and $\mu \text{in}_\Psi = \beta$;
- for any data set Π , and any two functions $\alpha: \Pi \rightarrow \Phi$ and $\beta: \Pi \rightarrow \Psi$, there is a unique function $\mu: \Pi \rightarrow \Phi \times \Psi$ for which $\text{pr}_\Phi \mu = \alpha$ and $\text{pr}_\Psi \mu = \beta$.

Let $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. By composing with f , a data set Φ is transformed into a new data set $f\Phi := \{f\phi \mid \phi \in \Phi\}$ called **change of units** along f . The symbol $f-: \Phi \rightarrow f\Phi$ denotes the function mapping ϕ to $f\phi$. For example let $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ map $\{r \in \mathbf{R} \mid r < 0\}$ to -1 and $\{r \in \mathbf{R} \mid r \geq 0\}$ to 1 . Consider $X = \{x_1, x_2\}$, two data sets $\{1, 2\}$ and $\{-1, 1\}$ given by the constant functions $-1, 1, 2: X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, and a function $\alpha: \{1, 2\} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ mapping 1 to -1 and 2 to 1 . Then $f\{1, 2\} = \{1\}$ and $f-: \{-1, 1\} \rightarrow f\{-1, 1\}$ is the identity. Thus there is no function $f\{1, 2\} \rightarrow f\{-1, 1\}$ making the following diagram commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \{1, 2\} & \xrightarrow{f-} & f\{1, 2\} = \{1\} \\
 \alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \{-1, 1\} & \xrightarrow{f-\text{id}} & f\{-1, 1\} = \{-1, 1\}
 \end{array}$$

Consequently, for that f there is no functor assigning to a data set Φ its change of units $f\Phi$ along f for which $f-: \Phi \rightarrow f\Phi$ is a natural transformation. If f is invertible, then $f-: \Phi \rightarrow f\Phi$ is a bijection whose inverse is given by $f^{-1}-$. The association $(\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Psi) \mapsto ((f-)\alpha(f^{-1}-): f\Phi \rightarrow f\Psi)$ is a functor for which $f-: \Psi \rightarrow f\Phi$ is a natural transformation. Changing the units along any function preserves products and coproducts i.e., $f(\Phi \amalg \Psi)$ is isomorphic to $f(\Phi) \amalg f(\Psi)$, and $f(\Phi \times \Psi)$ is isomorphic to $f(\Phi) \times f(\Psi)$.

Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a function. By composing f with measurements in a data set Φ , we obtain a new data set $\Phi f := \{\phi f \mid \phi \in \Phi\}$ called **domain change** along f . The symbol $-f: \Phi \rightarrow \Phi f$ denotes the function that maps ϕ to ϕf . It preserves products and coproducts.

3. METRICS AND PERSISTENT HOMOLOGY

We can think about a data set Φ as a subset $\Phi \subset \mathbf{R}^{|X|}$. Via this inclusion Φ inherits a metric induced by the infinity norm $\|v\|_\infty = \max\{|v_i|\}$ on $\mathbf{R}^{|X|}$. We use the symbol $\|\phi - \psi\|_\infty$ to denote the distance between ϕ and ψ in Φ . The considered data sets are not just sets anymore but metric spaces. Therefore non-expansive (1-Lipschitz) functions between data sets play a special role. For example, let $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. If f is non-expansive, then so is the change of units along f , $f-: \Phi \rightarrow f\Phi$, that maps ϕ to $f\phi$. The domain change $-h: \Phi \rightarrow \Phi h$ is non-expansive along any h .

By taking all the measurements of Φ together, we get a function $[\phi_1 \cdots \phi_m]: X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^m$. Via this function X inherits a pseudometric d_Φ induced by the infinity norm on \mathbf{R}^m . Explicitly $d_\Phi(x, y) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} |\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(y)|$. This metric plays a fundamental role as it permits us to extract persistent homologies (see [4, 7]). In this article, **persistent homology** of a data set Φ with coefficients in a field and in a given degree d assigns a vector space $PH_d^\Phi(\phi)_{r,s}$ to each measurement ϕ in Φ , for every (r, s) in $[0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}$, and it is defined as:

$$PH_d^\Phi(\phi)_{r,s} := H_d(\text{VR}_r(\phi \leq s, d_\Phi)), \text{ where:}$$

- $\phi \leq s := \phi^{-1}(-\infty, s]$;
- $\text{VR}_r(\phi \leq s, d_\Phi)$ is the **Vietoris-Rips** complex whose simplices are given by the subsets $\sigma \subset (\phi \leq s)$ of diameter not exceeding r with respect to d_Φ ;
- H_d is the homology in degree d with coefficients in a given field.

If $s \leq s'$ and $r \leq r'$, then $(\phi \leq s) \subset (\phi \leq s')$, and hence $\text{VR}_r(\phi \leq s) \subset \text{VR}_{r'}(\phi \leq s')$. The linear function induced on homology by this inclusion is denoted by:

$$PH_d^\Phi(\phi)_{(r,s) \leq (r',s')} : PH_d^\Phi(\phi)_{r,s} \rightarrow PH_d^\Phi(\phi)_{r',s'}.$$

These functions form a functor $PH_d^\Phi(\phi)$ indexed by the poset $[0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}$ with values in the category of vector spaces. Since X is finite, $PH_d^\Phi(\phi)$ is **tame** (see [10]). This means that values of $PH_d^\Phi(\phi)$ are finite dimensional, and there are two finite sequences $0 = r_0 < r_1 < \cdots < r_m$ in $[0, \infty)$ and $s_0 < s_1 < \cdots < s_l = \infty$ in \mathbf{R} such that $PH_d^\Phi(\phi)$, restricted to subposets of the form $[r_i, r_{i+1}) \times (s_0, s_1) \subset [0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}$ and $[r_i, r_{i+1}) \times [s_j, s_{j+1}) \subset [0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}$, is constant. The category of such functors is denoted by $\text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$. Thus a data set Φ leads to a function assigning to each measurement ϕ its persistent homology in a given degree:

$$PH_d^\Phi : \Phi \rightarrow \text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect}).$$

Next, recall a definition of a so called **interleaving metric** in the direction of the vector $(0, 1)$ on $\text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$ (see [8]). Let P and Q be in $\text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$.

- P and Q are ϵ -**interleaved** if, for all (r, s) in $[0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}$, there are linear functions $f_{s,r} : P_{r,s} \rightarrow Q_{r,s+\epsilon}$ and $g_{s,r} : Q_{r,s} \rightarrow P_{r,s+\epsilon}$ making the following diagram commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & P_{r,s} & \xrightarrow{P_{(r,s) < (r,s+2\epsilon)}} & P_{r,s+2\epsilon} & & \\ & g_{r,s-\epsilon} \nearrow & & \searrow f_{s,r} & & \nearrow g_{r,s+\epsilon} & \\ & & Q_{r,s-\epsilon} & \xrightarrow{Q_{(r,s-\epsilon) < (r,s+\epsilon)}} & Q_{r,s+\epsilon} & \xrightarrow{Q_{(r,s+\epsilon) < (r,s+3\epsilon)}} & Q_{r,s+3\epsilon} \\ & & & & & \searrow f_{r,s+2\epsilon} & \end{array}$$

- $d_{\bowtie}(P, Q) := \inf\{\epsilon \in [0, \infty) \mid P \text{ and } Q \text{ are } \epsilon\text{-interleaved}\}$.

The function $P, Q \mapsto d_{\bowtie}(P, Q)$ is an extended (∞ is allowed) metric on $\text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$ called interleaving metric in the direction of the vector $(0, 1)$.

3.1. Proposition. *The persistent homology function $PH_d^\Phi : \Phi \rightarrow \text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$ is non-expansive if Φ is equipped with ∞ -norm metric $\|\phi - \psi\|_\infty$ and $\text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$ is equipped with the interleaving metric in the direction of the vector $(0, 1)$.*


Proof. Let $\phi, \psi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be measurements in Φ and $\epsilon = \|\phi - \psi\|_\infty$. For every s in \mathbf{R} , the sublevel set $\phi \leq s$ is a subset of $\psi \leq s + \epsilon$, and $\psi \leq s$ is a subset of

$\phi \leq s + \epsilon$. This translates into inclusions $\text{VR}_r(\phi \leq s, d_\Phi) \subset \text{VR}_r(\psi \leq s + \epsilon, d_\Phi)$ and $\text{VR}_r(\psi \leq s, d_\Phi) \subset \text{VR}_r(\phi \leq s + \epsilon, d_\Phi)$. We can then consider the functions $f_{s,r}: PH_d^\Phi(\phi)_{r,s} \rightarrow PH_d^\Phi(\psi)_{r,s+\epsilon}$ and $g_{s,r}: PH_d^\Phi(\psi)_{r,s} \rightarrow PH_d^\Phi(\phi)_{r,s+\epsilon}$ induced by these inclusions, to conclude that $PH_d^\Phi(\phi)$ and $PH_d^\Phi(\psi)$ are ϵ -interleaved. This gives the desired inequality $\|\phi - \psi\|_\infty \geq d_{\infty}(PH_d^\Phi(\phi), PH_d^\Phi(\psi))$. \square

A measurement $\phi: X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ can be part of many data sets and its persistent homology depends on what data set this function is part of. For example, let $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ and $\phi, \psi: X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be measurements defined as follows:

$$\frac{\phi(x_1) = -1 \quad \phi(x_2) = \phi(x_3) = 0 \quad \phi(x_4) = 1}{\psi(x_3) = -1 \quad \psi(x_1) = \psi(x_4) = 0 \quad \psi(x_2) = 1}$$

The measurement ϕ is part of two data sets $\Phi = \{\phi\}$ and $\Psi = \{\phi, \psi\}$. The induced pseudometrics d_Φ and d_Ψ on X can be depicted by the following diagrams where the continuous, dashed, and dotted lines indicate distance 0, 1 and 2 respectively:



In this case $PH_1^\Phi(\phi)_{r,s} = 0$ for all r and s , however:

$$\dim PH_1^\Psi(\phi)_{r,s} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 1 \leq s \text{ and } 1 \leq r < 2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

To understand persistent homology, it is therefore paramount to understand how it changes when data sets change and here functoriality plays an essential role.

Let Φ and Ψ be data sets consisting of measurements on X and Y respectively. A function $\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Psi$ is called **geometric** if there is a function $f: Y \rightarrow X$, called a **realization** of α , making the following diagram commutative for every ϕ in Φ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha(\phi)} & \mathbf{R} \\ f \downarrow & \searrow & \nearrow \\ X & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathbf{R} \end{array}$$

For example $-f: \Phi \rightarrow \Psi$ is geometric, as it is realized by f .

The commutativity of the triangle above has two consequences: f is non-expansive with respect to the pseudometrics d_Φ on X and d_Ψ on Y , and for s in \mathbf{R} and ϕ in Φ , the subset $(\alpha(\phi) \leq s) \subset Y$ is mapped via f into $(\phi \leq s) \subset X$, i.e., the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \alpha(\phi) \leq s & \hookrightarrow & Y \\ f \downarrow & & f \downarrow \\ \phi \leq s & \hookrightarrow & X \end{array} \begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{\alpha(\phi)} & \mathbf{R} \\ & \searrow & \nearrow \\ & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathbf{R} \end{array}$$

The realization f induces therefore a map of Vietoris-Rips complexes and their homologies:

$$f_{s,r}: \text{VR}_r(\alpha(\phi) \leq s, d_\Psi) \rightarrow \text{VR}_r(\phi \leq s, d_\Phi);$$

$$PH_d^\Psi(\alpha(\phi))_{r,s} = H_d(\text{VR}_r(\alpha(\phi) \leq s, d_\Psi)) \xrightarrow{H_d(f_{r,s})} H_d(\text{VR}_r(\phi \leq s, d_\Phi)) = PH_d^\Phi(\phi)_{r,s}.$$

If $f, f': Y \rightarrow X$ are two realizations of α , then for y in Y , $d_\Phi(f(y), f'(y)) = 0$, implying $f_{r,s}$ and $f'_{r,s}$ are homotopic for all r and s . Consequently, $H_d(f_{r,s}) = H_d(f'_{r,s})$. The linear function $H_d(f_{r,s})$ depends therefore on α and not on the choice of its realization f . We denote this function by:

$$PH_d^\alpha(\phi)_{r,s}: PH_d^\Psi(\alpha(\phi))_{r,s} \rightarrow PH_d^\Phi(\phi)_{r,s}.$$

These functions are natural in r and s and induce a morphism in $\text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$ between persistent homologies:

$$PH_d^\alpha(\phi): PH_d^\Psi(\alpha(\phi)) \rightarrow PH_d^\Phi(\phi).$$

If $\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Psi$ and $\beta: \Psi \rightarrow \Xi$ are geometric functions realized by $f: Y \rightarrow X$ and $g: Z \rightarrow Y$, then the composition $\beta\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Xi$ is also geometric, and realized by $fg: Z \rightarrow X$. Consequently, for any ϕ in Φ , $PH_d^{\beta\alpha}(\phi) = PH_d^\alpha(\phi)PH_d^\beta(\alpha(\phi))$, that assures the commutativity of:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} PH_d^{\Xi}(\beta\alpha(\phi)) & \xrightarrow{PH_d^\beta(\alpha(\phi))} & PH_d^\Psi(\alpha(\phi)) & \xrightarrow{PH_d^\alpha(\phi)} & PH_d^\Phi(\phi) \\ & & \searrow & \nearrow & \\ & & & PH_d^{\beta\alpha}(\phi) & \end{array}$$

For any $\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Psi$, taking persistent homology leads to two functions on Φ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & PH_d^\Phi & \rightarrow \text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect}) \\ \Phi & \searrow & \\ & \alpha & \rightarrow \Psi \xrightarrow{PH_d^\Psi} \text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect}) \end{array}$$

These functions rarely coincide. However, when α is geometric, we can use the morphisms $PH_d^\alpha(\phi): PH_d^\Psi(\alpha(\phi)) \rightarrow PH_d^\Phi(\phi)$ to compare the values of these two functions on Φ . For non-geometric α , we are not equipped with such comparison morphisms and there is no reason for such a comparison to even exist. For example, consider the unit change along the function $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $f(x) := -x$. Then $f-: \Phi \rightarrow f\Phi$ is an isomorphism. In this case

$$PH_d^\Phi(\phi)_{r,s} := H_d(\text{VR}_r(\phi \leq s, d_\Phi)) \mid (f-)PH_d^{f\Phi}(\phi) = H_d(\text{VR}_r(\phi \geq -s, d_\Phi))$$

Thus PH_d^Φ encodes information about sub-level sets of the measurements in Φ and $(f-)PH_d^{f\Phi}$ encodes information about super-level sets of the measurements. These persistent homologies encode therefore the same information as a so called extended persistence (see [5, 9]).

4. ACTIONS

To describe symmetries of a data set Φ , we consider operations on X that converts measurements into measurements. By definition a **Φ -operation** is a function $g: X \rightarrow X$ such that, for every measurement ϕ in Φ , the composition ϕg also belongs to Φ . If $g: X \rightarrow X$ is such an operation, then, for all ϕ and ψ in Φ :

$$\|\phi - \psi\|_\infty = \max_{x \in X} |\phi(x) - \psi(x)| \geq \max_{x \in \text{im}(g)} |\phi(x) - \psi(x)| = \|\phi_1 g - \phi_2 g\|_\infty.$$

Thus the function $-g: \Phi \rightarrow \Phi$ that maps ϕ to ϕg is non-expansive.

The composition of Φ -operations is again a Φ -operation, and the identity function id_X is also a Φ -operation. In this way the set of Φ -operations with the composition becomes a unitary monoid, called the **structure monoid** of Φ , and denoted by:

$$\text{End}_\Phi(X) = \{g : X \rightarrow X \mid \phi g \in \Phi \text{ for every } \phi \in \Phi\}.$$

A Φ -operation g is invertible if there is a Φ -operation h such that $gh = hg = \text{id}_X$. Since Φ is finite, a Φ -operation is invertible if and only if it is a bijection. Their collection is denoted by

$$\text{Aut}_\Phi(X) = \{g : X \rightarrow X \mid g \text{ is a bijection, and } \phi g \in \Phi \text{ for every } \phi \in \Phi\}.$$

With the composition operation, $\text{Aut}_\Phi(X)$ becomes a group for which the inclusion $\text{Aut}_\Phi(X) \subset \text{End}_\Phi(X)$ is a monoid homomorphism.

A data set Φ is equipped with an associative right action:

$$\Phi \times \text{End}_\Phi(X) \rightarrow \Phi, \quad (\phi, g) \mapsto \phi g.$$

Thus Φ is not just a set, but a set with an action of the monoid $\text{End}_\Phi(X)$. To encode the symmetries of Φ induced by this action, we consider its incarnations. An **incarnation** of Φ is a choice of a finite set M and a function $I : M \rightarrow \text{End}_\Phi(X)$ referred to as an action of M on Φ . An incarnation is denoted as a triple (Φ, M, I) , or as a pair (Φ, I) , or (Φ, M) if I is clear from the context. We think about I as an additional structure on Φ . An incarnation of the form (Φ, M, I) is called an M -incarnation. The choice of the action I encodes certain symmetries of Φ . Different choices of I can encode different symmetries. This flexibility is important in applications. For example in data sets that represent images, we might need to focus on rotational symmetries and ignore translational symmetries.

If M is a monoid (all the monoids in this article are assumed to be unitary) and $I : M \rightarrow \text{End}_\Phi(X)$ is a monoid homomorphism, then (Φ, M, I) is called a **monoid incarnation**. The incarnation $(\Phi, \text{id}_{\text{End}_\Phi(X)})$ is an example of a monoid incarnation called universal. For an incarnation (Φ, M, I) , define $\langle I \rangle \subset \text{End}_\Phi(X)$ to be the submonoid generated by the image of I . This submonoid is also denoted by $\langle M \rangle$, if I is clear from the context. Thus any incarnation (Φ, M, I) of Φ , leads to a monoid incarnation $(\Phi, \langle I \rangle \subset \text{End}_\Phi(X))$ of Φ .

A monoid incarnation (Φ, M, I) is called a **group incarnation** if M is a group. The incarnation $(\Phi, \text{id}_{\text{Aut}_\Phi(X)})$ is an example of a group incarnation called universal. Let (Φ, M, I) be an incarnation for which $I(g)$ is a bijection for all g in M . Such incarnations are called **group-like**. In this case the finiteness implies that the monoid $\langle I \rangle$ is in fact a subgroup of $\text{Aut}_\Phi(X)$. Thus any group-like incarnation (Φ, M, I) leads to a group incarnation $(\Phi, \langle I \rangle)$.

Let (Φ, M, I) be an incarnation. For a subset $\Omega \subset \Phi$, the symbol ΩM denotes the set of all the measurements in Φ which either belong to Ω or are of the form $\omega I(g_1) \cdots I(g_k)$, for some ω in Ω and some sequence of elements g_1, \dots, g_k in M . If M is a monoid, then any element in ΩM is of the form $\omega I(g)$ for some ω in Ω and g in M . Note that $\Omega M = \Omega \langle M \rangle$. If $\Omega M = \Phi$, then Ω is said to **generate** the incarnation (Φ, M, I) .

If ψ belongs to $\{\phi\}M$, then ψ is said to be a **deformation** of ϕ . A measurement ψ is a deformation of ϕ in (Φ, M, I) if and only if ψ is a deformation of ϕ in $(\Phi, \langle M \rangle)$. If (Φ, M, I) is a group incarnation, then the relation of being a deformation is an equivalence relation. For a general incarnation however being a deformation can fail to be even a symmetric relation. Two measurements in Φ are said to

be **connected** if they are related by the equivalence relation generated by the relation of being a deformation. The symbol Φ/M denotes the partition of Φ by the equivalence classes of this equivalence relation. We refer to Φ/M as the **quotient** of the incarnation (Φ, M, I) . The partitions Φ/M and $\Phi/\langle M \rangle$ coincide. If (Φ, M, I) is a group incarnation, then Φ/M coincide with the orbit partition of the action I . For a measurement ϕ , the symbol $[\phi]$ denotes the block in Φ/M containing ϕ . Explicitly, $[\phi]$ is the subset of Φ consisting of all the measurements connected to ϕ . We think about the equivalence class $[\phi]$ as a new data set. For all g in M , if ψ is connected to ϕ , then so is $\psi I(g)$. Thus I induces a function which we denote by the symbol $I|_{[\phi]}: M \rightarrow \text{End}_{[\phi]}(X)$. In this way, for any block Ψ in Φ/M , we obtain an M -incarnation $(\Psi, M, I|_{\Psi})$ of Ψ .

An incarnation (Φ, M, I) is called **transitive** if all the elements in Φ are connected to each other. For example, let X be a finite set with an action of a finite monoid M . If g is an element in M , then we use the same symbol $g: X \rightarrow X$ to denote the function that maps an element x to gx . Let $\phi: X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. Define a data set $\phi M := \{\phi g \mid g \in M\}$ to consist of all functions of the form $x \mapsto \phi gx$ for all g in M . Then, for every g in M , the function $g: X \rightarrow X$ is a ϕM -operation. By assigning to an element g in M this operation, we obtain a transitive M -incarnation of ϕM which we denote by $(\phi M, M)$. Any transitive group incarnation is of such a form. For any incarnation (Φ, M, I) and any measurement ϕ , the incarnation $([\phi], M, I)$ is transitive. Any transitive incarnation is of this form.

Let (Φ, M, I) be an incarnation. A subset $\Omega \subset \Phi$ is called **independent** if no element in Ω is a deformation of any other element in Ω , explicitly: $\omega \notin \omega' M$ for all $\omega \neq \omega'$ in Ω . A subset $\Omega \subset \Phi$ is independent with respect to (Φ, M, I) if and only if it is independent with respect to the monoid incarnation $(\Phi, \langle M \rangle)$.

A **basis** of (Φ, M, I) is an independent subset $\Omega \subset \Phi$ such that $\Omega M = \Phi$ (Ω generates (Φ, M, I)). A subset $\Omega \subset \Phi$ is a basis with respect to (Φ, M, I) if and only if it is a basis with respect to the monoid incarnation $(\Phi, \langle M \rangle)$.

Two measurements ψ and ϕ are called **indistinguishable** if ψ is a deformation of ϕ and ϕ is a deformation of ψ . Two measurements are indistinguishable in (Φ, M, I) if and only if they are indistinguishable in $(\Phi, \langle M \rangle)$. If (Φ, M, I) is a group incarnation, then ψ and ϕ are indistinguishable if and only if $\psi = \phi I(g)$ for some g in M , i.e., if ψ is a deformation of ϕ .

4.1. Proposition. (1) *Every incarnation has a basis.*

(2) *Let $\Omega, \Omega' \subset \Phi$ be two bases of an incarnation (Φ, M, I) . Then there is a bijection $\sigma: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega'$ such that ω and $\sigma(\omega)$ are indistinguishable for every ω in Ω .*

Proof. (1): Let (Φ, M, I) be an incarnation. Choose $\Omega \subset \Phi$ to be an independent subset for which ΩM is maximal. Existence of Ω is guaranteed by finiteness of Φ . We claim that $\Omega M = \Phi$ and hence Ω is a basis. If this is not the case, let ψ be in $\Phi \setminus \Omega M$. Define $\Omega' = \{\psi\} \cup \{\omega \in \Omega \mid \omega \notin \{\psi\}M\}$. Then $\Omega' M$ contains Ω and hence ΩM . It also contains ψ . Since Ω' is independent, we would obtain a contradiction to the maximality assumption about ΩM , and thus the claim holds.

(2): Let ω be in Ω . Since $\Omega M = \Phi = \Omega' M$, there is ω' in Ω' such that $\omega \in \{\omega'\}M$. Let ω_1 in Ω be such that $\omega' \in \{\omega_1\}M$. Then $\omega \in \{\omega'\}M \subset \{\omega_1\}M$, and hence $\omega = \omega_1$ by the independence of Ω . The desired bijection is then given by $\omega \mapsto \omega'$. \square

According to Proposition 4.1, any two bases of an incarnation have the same number of elements. We define the **dimension** of an incarnation to be the cardinality of its bases. For example a transitive group incarnation is of dimension 1. In fact for a transitive group incarnation any single measurement forms a basis. More generally, the dimension of a group incarnation (Φ, M, I) equals the cardinality of Φ/M . In this case $\Omega \subset \Phi$ is a basis if and only if, for every block Ψ in Φ/M , the intersection $\Omega \cap \Psi$ has only one element. Since being a basis depends only on the monoid $\langle M \rangle$, the dimension of a group-like incarnation (Φ, M, I) equals also the cardinality of Φ/M , and similarly a subset $\Omega \subset \Phi$ is a basis if and only if, for every block Ψ in the partition Φ/M , the intersection $\Omega \cap \Psi$ has only one element.

The dimension of a transitive monoid incarnation which is not group-like can be bigger than 1. For example, consider a set $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ and functions $\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3: X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $g_1, g_2, g_3: X \rightarrow X$ defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} \phi_1(x_1) = 2 \quad \left| \quad \phi_2(x_1) = 2 \quad \left| \quad \phi_3(x_1) = 1 \quad \left| \quad g_1(x_1) = x_2 \quad \left| \quad g_2(x_1) = x_2 \quad \left| \quad g_3(x_1) = x_1 \right. \right. \right. \\ \phi_1(x_2) = 2 \quad \left| \quad \phi_2(x_2) = 2 \quad \left| \quad \phi_3(x_2) = 2 \quad \left| \quad g_1(x_2) = x_2 \quad \left| \quad g_2(x_2) = x_2 \quad \left| \quad g_3(x_2) = x_2 \right. \right. \right. \\ \phi_1(x_3) = 3 \quad \left| \quad \phi_2(x_3) = 2 \quad \left| \quad \phi_3(x_3) = 2 \quad \left| \quad g_1(x_3) = x_3 \quad \left| \quad g_2(x_3) = x_2 \quad \left| \quad g_3(x_3) = x_2 \right. \right. \right. \end{array}$$

The compositions $g_i g_j$ and $\phi_i g_j$ are described by the following tables:

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc} & g_1 & g_2 & g_3 \\ \hline g_1 & g_1 & g_2 & g_2 \\ \hline g_2 & g_2 & g_2 & g_2 \\ \hline g_3 & g_2 & g_2 & g_3 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c|ccc} & g_1 & g_2 & g_3 \\ \hline \phi_1 & \phi_1 & \phi_2 & \phi_2 \\ \hline \phi_2 & \phi_2 & \phi_2 & \phi_2 \\ \hline \phi_3 & \phi_2 & \phi_2 & \phi_3 \end{array}$$

Thus the functions g_1, g_2 , and g_3 are $\Phi := \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3\}$ -operations. Furthermore the subset $M := \{\text{id}, g_1, g_2, g_3\} \subset \text{End}_\Phi(X)$ is a submonoid. The incarnation (Φ, M) is a transitive monoid incarnation. Since the set $\{\phi_1, \phi_3\}$ is independent and generates (Φ, M) , it is a basis. Thus (Φ, M) is an example of a transitive monoid incarnation of dimension 2.

5. NIRVANA

To compare incarnations of various data sets we are going to use SEOs (set equivariant operators). Let (Φ, M, I) and (Ψ, N, J) be incarnations. A **SEO** from (Φ, M, I) to (Ψ, N, J) , denoted as $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Psi, N, J)$, is a pair of functions $(\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Psi, T: M \rightarrow N)$ for which the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Phi \times M & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times I} & \Phi \times \text{End}_\Phi(X) & \xrightarrow{\text{action}} & \Phi \\ \alpha \times T \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \alpha \\ \Psi \times N & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times J} & \Psi \times \text{End}_\Psi(Y) & \xrightarrow{\text{action}} & \Psi \end{array}$$

If $(\alpha_0, T_0): (\Phi_0, M_0) \rightarrow (\Phi_1, M_1)$ and $(\alpha_1, T_1): (\Phi_1, M_1) \rightarrow (\Phi_2, M_2)$ are SEOs, then $(\alpha_1 \alpha_0, T_1 T_0)$ is a SEO. Furthermore (id, id) is also a SEO. The composition of SEOs is an associative operation and defines a category structure on the collection of data set incarnations with SEOs as morphisms. This category is called **Nirvana**.

A SEO $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Psi, N, J)$ is an isomorphism if and only if both of the functions α and T are bijections. If $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Psi, N, J)$ is an isomorphism, then a subset $\Omega \subset \Phi$ is independent or a basis if and only if its image $\alpha(\Omega) \subset \Psi$ is independent or a basis. Thus two isomorphic incarnations have the same dimension.

In the category Nirvana the universal incarnations $(\Phi, \text{End}_\Phi(X))$ and $(\Phi, \text{Aut}_\Phi(X))$ are special. For any incarnation (Φ, M, I) , the pair $(\text{id}, I: M \rightarrow \text{End}_\Phi(X))$ defines a SEO $(\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Phi, \text{End}_\Phi(X))$ called **canonical**. If (Φ, M, I) is group-like, then the pair $(\text{id}, I: M \rightarrow \text{Aut}_\Phi(X))$ defines a SEO $(\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Phi, \text{Aut}_\Phi(X))$ also called canonical.

A SEO $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M) \rightarrow (\Psi, N)$ is called a MEO (monoid equivariant operator) if (Φ, M) and (Ψ, N) are monoid incarnations and T is a monoid homomorphism. A MEO between group incarnations is also called a GEO (group equivariant operator).

The rest of this section is devoted to presenting three ways of constructing SEOs.

Change of units. Choose a function $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. For any incarnation (Φ, M, I) , consider the data set $f\Phi$ (see Section 2). If g is a Φ -operation, then it is also a $f\Phi$ operation. Thus there is an inclusion $\text{End}_\Phi(X) \subset \text{End}_{f\Phi}(X)$, which is an equality if f is invertible. The composition $I: M \rightarrow \text{End}_\Phi(X) \subset \text{End}_{f\Phi}(X)$ defines an M -incarnation $(f\Phi, M)$ of $f\Phi$. If (Φ, M) is a monoid or a group incarnation, then so is $(f\Phi, M)$. The pair $(f-, \text{id}_M): (\Phi, M) \rightarrow (f\Phi, M)$ is a SEO called the change of units along f .

Assume f is invertible. If $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M) \rightarrow (\Psi, N)$ is a SEO, then the pair of functions $((f-)\alpha(f^{-1}-), T)$ forms a SEO between $(f\Phi, M)$ and $(f\Psi, N)$. The assignment $(\alpha, T) \mapsto ((f-)\alpha(f^{-1}-), T)$ is a self functor of Nirvana also called the change of units along f . It is an equivalence of categories. The SEOs $(f-, \text{id}_M): (\Phi, M) \rightarrow (f\Phi, M)$, for all incarnations (Φ, M) , form a natural transformation between the identity functor on Nirvana and the change of units along f functor.

Domain change. Let (Φ, M, I) and (Ψ, N, J) be incarnations of data sets consisting of measurements on X and Y respectively. A SEO $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Psi, N, J)$ is called **geometric** if there is a function $f: Y \rightarrow X$, called a realization of (α, T) , making the following diagram commutative for every ϕ in Φ and g in M :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{JT(g)} & Y \\ f \downarrow & & f \downarrow \\ X & \xrightarrow{I(g)} & X \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \searrow \alpha(\phi) \\ \nearrow \phi \\ \mathbf{R} \end{array}$$

For example, let (Φ, M, I) be an incarnation of a data set consisting of measurements on X . Then the SEO $(\text{id}, I): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Phi, \text{im}(I) \subset \text{End}_\Phi(X))$ is geometric. The identity function $\text{id}: X \rightarrow X$ is one of its realizations.

Let $Y \subset X$ be M invariant: $I(g)(y)$ belongs to Y for all y in Y and g in M . Consider the data set $\Phi|_Y$ given by the domain change along the inclusion $Y \subset X$. The restriction of $I(g)$ to Y is a $\Phi|_Y$ -operation for every g in M . We use the same symbol $I: M \rightarrow \text{End}_{\Phi|_Y}(Y)$ to denote the function that maps g in M to the restriction of $I(g)$ to Y . The incarnation $(\Phi|_Y, M, I)$ is called the **restriction** of (Φ, M, I) to the invariant subset Y . The pair $(\Phi|_Y \subset \Phi, \text{id}_M)$ forms a geometric SEO. The inclusion $Y \subset X$ is one of its realizations.

Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a bijection. Consider the data set Φf . For any g in M , the function $f^{-1}I(g)f: Y \rightarrow Y$ is a Φf -operation. Define $J: M \rightarrow \text{End}_{\Phi f}(Y)$ to map g in M to $f^{-1}I(g)f$. The incarnation $(\Phi f, M, J)$ is called the domain change of (Φ, M, I) along f . The pair $(-f: \Phi \rightarrow \Phi f, \text{id}_M)$ forms a geometric SEO and $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is one of its realizations.

Extending from a basis. SEOs can be effectively constructed using basis.

5.1. Proposition. *Let (Φ, M, I) and (Ψ, N, J) be incarnations and Ω be a basis of (Φ, M, I) . Then two SEOs $(\alpha, T), (\alpha', T'): (\Phi, M) \rightarrow (\Psi, N)$ are equal if and only if $T = T'$ and $\alpha(\omega) = \alpha'(\omega)$ for any ω in Ω .*

Proof. Assume $T = T'$ and $\alpha(\omega) = \alpha'(\omega)$ for any ω in Ω . Since Ω generates (Φ, M, I) , any element in Φ is of the form $\phi = \omega I(g_1) \cdots I(g_k)$ for some ω in Ω and a sequence g_1, \dots, g_k of elements in M . The assumption and the fact that (α, T) and (α', T) are SEOs, imply:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\phi) &= \alpha(\omega I(g_1) \cdots I(g_k)) = \alpha(\omega) J(T(g_1)) \cdots J(T(g_k)) = \\ &= \alpha'(\omega) J(T(g_1)) \cdots J(T(g_k)) = \alpha'(\omega I(g_1) \cdots I(g_k)) = \alpha'(\phi). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently $\alpha = \alpha'$. □

According to Proposition 5.1, a SEO is determined by what it does on a basis of the domain. This is analogous to a linear map between vector spaces being determined by its values on a basis. However unlike for linear maps, we can not map freely elements of a basis of an incarnation to obtain a SEO. To get a SEO certain relations have to be preserved. Let (Φ, M, I) be an incarnation. A **relation** between measurements ϕ and ψ in Φ is by definition a pair of sequences $((g_1, \dots, g_k), (h_1, \dots, h_l))$ of elements in M for which the following equality holds: $\phi I(g_1) \cdots I(g_k) = \psi I(h_1) \cdots I(h_l)$.

5.2. Proposition. *Let (Φ, M, I) and (Ψ, N, J) be incarnations, Ω be a basis of (Φ, M, I) , and $\alpha: \Omega \rightarrow \Psi$ and $T: M \rightarrow N$ be functions.*

- (1) *Assume that for every relation $((g_1, \dots, g_k), (h_1, \dots, h_l))$ between any two elements ω, ω' in Ω , the pair $((T(g_1), \dots, T(g_k)), (T(h_1), \dots, T(h_l)))$ is a relation between $\alpha(\omega)$ and $\alpha(\omega')$ in Ψ . Under this assumption, there is a unique SEO $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M) \rightarrow (\Psi, N)$ for which the restriction of $\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Psi$ to Ω is α .*
- (2) *Assume (Φ, M, I) and (Ψ, N, J) are monoid incarnations, T is a monoid homomorphism, and if $\omega I(g) = \omega' I(h)$ for some ω, ω' in Ω and g, h in M , then $\alpha(\omega) J(T(g)) = \alpha(\omega') J(T(h))$. Under these assumptions, there is a unique MEO $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M) \rightarrow (\Psi, N)$ for which the restriction of $\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Psi$ to Ω is α .*
- (3) *Assume (Φ, M, I) and (Ψ, N, J) are group incarnations, T is a group homomorphism, and if $\omega = \omega I(g)$, for some ω in Ω and g in M , then $\alpha(\omega) = \alpha(\omega) J(T(g))$. Under these assumptions, there is a unique GEO $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M) \rightarrow (\Psi, N)$ for which the restriction of $\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Psi$ to Ω is α .*

Proof. Since the proofs are analogous, we illustrate only how to show statement (2). For every $\phi \in \Phi$, there exist (not necessarily unique) ω in Ω and g in M such that $\phi = \omega I(g)$. The assumption implies that the expression $\alpha(\omega) J(T(g))$ depends on ϕ and not on the choices of ω and $I(g)$ for which $\phi = \omega I(g)$. Thus by mapping ϕ in Φ to $\alpha(\omega) J(T(g))$ in Ψ , we obtain a well defined function also denoted by $\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Psi$. The pair (α, T) is the desired MEO. The uniqueness is a consequence of Proposition 5.1. □

For example assume (Φ, M, I) is a transitive group incarnation and (Ψ, N, J) is a group incarnation. Choose an element ω in Φ . Recall that any such element is

a basis of (Φ, M, I) . Fix a group homomorphism $T: M \rightarrow N$. Then any GEO $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Psi, N, J)$ is uniquely determined by the element $\alpha(\omega)$ in Ψ . Thus by choosing a basis element ω in Φ , we can identify the collection of GEOs of the form $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Psi, N, J)$ with a subset of Ψ . To describe this subset explicitly, we apply Proposition 5.2.(3). It states that there is a GEO $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Psi, N, J)$ (necessarily unique) such that $\alpha(\omega) = \psi$ if and only if the following implication holds: if $\omega = \omega I(g)$, then $\psi = \psi J(T(g))$. The collection $M_\omega := \{g \in M \mid \omega = \omega I(g)\}$ is the isotropy subgroup of ω consisting of all the elements in M that fix ω . Thus GEOs of the form $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Psi, N, J)$ can be identified with the subset of all the elements in Ψ whose isotropy group contains $T(M_\omega)$.

6. BURNSIDE-NIRVANA

Throughout this section we are going to fix a set M . Let M -Nirvana denote the subcategory of Nirvana whose objects are M -incarnations of data sets and whose morphisms are SEOs of the form (α, id_M) . An object in this category, given by an incarnation (Φ, M, I) , is simply denoted as Φ , and a morphism, given by a SEO (α, id_M) , as α .

Let Φ and Ψ be data sets. Consider their coproduct $\Phi \coprod \Psi$ and their product $\Phi \times \Psi$ (see Section 2). If $g: X \rightarrow X$ is a Φ -operation and $h: Y \rightarrow Y$ is a Ψ -operation, then the function $g \coprod h: X \coprod Y \rightarrow X \coprod Y$ is both $\Phi \coprod \Psi$ -operation and $\Phi \times \Psi$ -operation. Thus by mapping (g, h) to $g \coprod h$, we obtain two monoid homomorphisms called standard inclusions:

$$\text{End}_{\Phi \coprod \Psi}(X \coprod Y) \longleftarrow \text{End}_{\Phi}(X) \times \text{End}_{\Psi}(Y) \longrightarrow \text{End}_{\Phi \times \Psi}(X \coprod Y).$$

Let Φ and Ψ be M -incarnations given by $I: M \rightarrow \text{End}_{\Phi}(X)$ and $J: M \rightarrow \text{End}_{\Psi}(Y)$. By composing $(I, J): M \rightarrow \text{End}_{\Phi}(X) \times \text{End}_{\Psi}(Y)$ with the standard inclusions above we obtain two M -incarnations $\Phi \coprod \Psi$ and $\Phi \times \Psi$ called respectively the **coproduct** and the **product** of Φ and Ψ . Functions in the following diagram (see Section 2) are morphisms in M -Nirvana:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \Phi & \\ \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\phi + \psi \mapsto \phi} \\ \text{pr}_{\Phi} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\phi \mapsto \phi + 0} \\ \text{in}_{\Phi} \end{array} \\ \Phi \times \Psi & & \Phi \coprod \Psi \\ \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\phi + \psi \mapsto \psi} \\ \text{pr}_{\Psi} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\psi \mapsto 0 + \psi} \\ \text{in}_{\Psi} \end{array} \\ & \Psi & \end{array}$$

These SEOs satisfy the following universal properties:

- for any two morphisms $\alpha: \Phi \rightarrow \Pi$ and $\beta: \Psi \rightarrow \Pi$ in M -Nirvana, there is a unique morphism $\mu: \Phi \coprod \Psi \rightarrow \Pi$ for which $\mu \text{in}_{\Phi} = \alpha$ and $\mu \text{in}_{\Psi} = \beta$;
- for any two morphisms $\alpha: \Pi \rightarrow \Phi$ and $\beta: \Pi \rightarrow \Psi$ in M -Nirvana, there is a unique morphism $\mu: \Pi \rightarrow \Phi \times \Psi$ for which $\text{pr}_{\Phi} \mu = \alpha$ and $\text{pr}_{\Psi} \mu = \beta$.

This means that the forgetful functor, disregarding the action of M and assigning to an object Φ in M -Nirvana the data set Φ , commutes with coproducts and products.

Let Φ be an object in M -Nirvana. Consider its partition Φ/M and the objects in M -Nirvana represented by the transitive M -incarnations of the blocks of the partition Φ/M . For every block Ψ in Φ/M , the inclusion $\Psi \subset \Phi$ is a morphism in M -Nirvana. By the universal property of the coproduct, there is a unique morphism

$\coprod_{\Psi \in \Phi/M} \Psi \rightarrow \Phi$ whose composition with $\text{in}_\Psi: \Psi \rightarrow \coprod_{\Psi \in \Phi/M} \Psi$ is the inclusion $\Psi \subset \Phi$ for every Ψ in Φ/M . Since this function is a bijection, we obtain:

6.1. Proposition. *The SEO $\coprod_{\Psi \in \Phi/M} \Psi \rightarrow \Phi$ is an isomorphism.*

7. GROTHENDIECK GRAPHS

In this section we explain a convenient data structure to encode incarnations of data sets.

A **Grothendieck graph** is a triple (V, M, E) consisting of a finite set V whose elements are called vertices, a finite set M whose elements are called colors or operations, and a subset $E \subset V \times M \times V$ whose elements are called edges, such that, for every vertex v in V , the following composition is a bijection:

$$(\{v\} \times M \times V) \cap E \xrightarrow{\sim} E \xrightarrow{\sim} V \times M \times V \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_M} M.$$

This condition assures that, for every v in V and g in M , there is a unique element in V , denoted by vg , such that (v, g, vg) is an edge in E . For example let (Φ, M, I) be an incarnation of a data set Φ . Define:

$$E_{\Phi, M, I} := \{(\phi, g, \psi) \in \Phi \times M \times \Phi \mid \phi I(g) = \psi\}.$$

Then the triple $(\Phi, M, E_{\Phi, M, I})$ is a Grothendieck graph. We think about this graph as a convenient data structure representing the incarnation (Φ, M, I) .

Grothendieck graphs are also convenient to represent SEOs. Define a **morphism between Grothendieck graphs** (V, M, E) and (W, N, F) to be a pair of functions $\alpha: V \rightarrow W$ and $T: M \rightarrow N$ such that, if (v, g, w) belongs to E , then $(\alpha(v), T(g), \alpha(w))$ belongs to F . Such a morphism is denoted as $(\alpha, T): (V, M, E) \rightarrow (W, N, F)$. Component wise composition defines a category structure on the collection of Grothendieck graphs and we use the symbol GGraph to denote this category. If $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Psi, N, J)$ is a SEO, then $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M, E_{\Phi, M, I}) \rightarrow (\Psi, N, E_{\Psi, N, J})$ is a morphism between the associated Grothendieck graphs. By assigning to a SEO (α, T) the graph morphism given by the same pair (α, T) , we obtain a fully faithful functor from Nirvana to GGraph .

Grothendieck graphs can also be used to encode pseudometric information on incarnations. A pseudometric on a Grothendieck graph (V, M, E) is a pseudometric d on V such that $d(v, w) \geq d(vg, wg)$ for all v and w in V , and g in M . For example, the pseudometric $\|\phi - \psi\|_\infty$ on Φ is a pseudometric on the graph $(\Phi, M, E_{\Phi, M, I})$.

A Grothendieck graph (V, M, E) is said to be compatible with a monoid structure on M if $(v, 1, v)$ is in E , and whenever (v_0, g_0, v_1) and (v_1, g_1, v_2) belong to E , then so does $(v_0, g_1 g_0, v_2)$. In this case the composition operation given by the association $(v_0, g_0, v_1)(v_1, g_1, v_2) \mapsto (v_0, g_1 g_0, v_2)$ defines a category structure, denoted by $\text{Gr}_M V$, with V as the set of objects and E as the set of morphisms. This category is a familiar Grothendieck construction [6, 11]. For example, the Grothendieck graph associated with a monoid incarnation (Φ, M, I) is compatible with the monoid structure on M . We think about $\text{Gr}_M \Phi$ as an additional structure on the data set Φ : objects are the measurements in Φ , morphisms are triples $(\phi, g, \phi I(g))$, where ϕ is in Φ , g is in M , and the composition of $(\phi, g, \phi I(g))$ and $(\phi I(g), h, \phi I(g) I(h))$ is given by $(\phi, gh, \phi I(gh))$.

A **contravariant functor** indexed by a Grothendieck graph (V, M, E) with values in a category \mathcal{C} , denoted as $P: (V, M, E) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, is by definition a sequence of objects $\{P(v) \mid v \in V\}$ and morphisms $\{P(v_0, g, v_1): P(v_1) \rightarrow P(v_0) \mid (v_0, g, v_1) \in$

$E\}$ in \mathcal{C} subject to: if (v_0, g_0, v_1) , (v_1, g_1, v_2) , and (v_0, h, v_2) are edges in E , then $P(v_2, h, v_0) = P(v_2, g_1, v_1)P(v_1, g_0, v_0)$. If (V, M, E) is compatible with a monoid structure on M , then a contravariant functor indexed by (V, M, E) is simply a contravariant functor indexed by the category $\text{Gr}_M V$.

Let (Φ, M, I) be an incarnation of a data set Φ consisting of measurements on X , and $(\Phi, M, E_{\Phi, M, I})$ be the associated Grothendieck graph. For every g in M , the function $-I(g): \Phi \rightarrow \Phi$, mapping ϕ to $\phi I(g)$, is geometric and realized by $I(g): X \rightarrow X$ (see Section 3). Persistent homology leads therefore to the following collections of objects and morphisms in $\text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$ as explained in Section 3:

$$\{PH_d^\Phi(\phi) \mid \phi \in \Phi\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{PH_d^{-I(g)}(\phi): PH_d^\Phi(\phi I(g)) \rightarrow PH_d^\Phi(\phi) \mid (\phi, g, \phi I(g))\}.$$

These sequences form a functor $PH_d^\Phi: (\Phi, M, E_{\Phi, M, I}) \rightarrow \text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$ also referred to as the persistent homology functor of the incarnation (Φ, M, I) .

Let $(\alpha, T): (W, N, F) \rightarrow (V, M, E)$ be a morphism and $P: (V, M, E) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a functor. The following sequences of objects and morphisms in \mathcal{C} form a contravariant functor denoted by $P(\alpha, T): (W, N, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and called the **composition** of (α, T) with P :

$$\{P(\alpha(v)) \mid v \in V\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{P(w_0, g, w_1): P(\alpha(w_1)) \rightarrow P(\alpha(w_0)) \mid (w_0, g, w_1) \in F\}.$$

For example, consider the tautological SEO $(\text{id}_\Phi, I): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Phi, \text{End}_\Phi(X))$. Let $(\text{id}_\Phi, I): (\Phi, M, E_{\Phi, M, I}) \rightarrow (\Phi, \text{End}_\Phi(X), E_{\Phi, \text{End}_\Phi(X)})$ be the induced morphism of the associated Grothendieck graphs. Its composition with the persistent homology of the universal incarnation $PH_d^\Phi: (\Phi, \text{End}_\Phi(X), E_{\Phi, \text{End}_\Phi(X)}) \rightarrow \text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$ coincides with the persistent homology $PH_d^\Phi: (\Phi, M, E_{\Phi, M, I}) \rightarrow \text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect})$ of the incarnation (Φ, M, I) , which can be illustrated graphically in a form of a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\Phi, M, E_{\Phi, M, I}) & \xrightarrow{(\text{id}_\Phi, I)} & (\Phi, \text{End}_\Phi(X), E_{\Phi, \text{End}_\Phi(X)}) & \xrightarrow{PH_d^\Phi} & \text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect}) \\ & \searrow & \xrightarrow{PH_d^\Phi} & \searrow & \\ & & & & \end{array}$$

Such a commutativity does not hold for arbitrary SEOs. Let $(\alpha, T): (\Phi, M, I) \rightarrow (\Psi, N, J)$ be a SEO. We can form two functors indexed by the graph $(\Phi, M, E_{\Phi, M, I})$:


$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{PH_d^\Phi} & \text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect}) \\ (\Phi, M, E_{\Phi, M, I}) & \searrow \alpha & \\ & \xrightarrow{PH_d^\Psi} & \text{Tame}([0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}, \text{Vect}) \end{array}$$

These functors rarely coincide. However, in the case (α, T) is geometric, the morphisms $PH_d^\alpha(\phi): PH_d^\Psi(\alpha(\phi)) \rightarrow PH_d^\Phi(\phi)$ (see Section 3), for all ϕ in Φ , form a natural transformation.

8. CONCLUSIONS

In the following figure we give a graphical representation of some of the concepts introduced in this article. Data sets can be equipped with three structures: a pseudometric, an incarnation describing an action, and a Grothendieck graph.

We imagine Nirvana as the landscape of all possible incarnations of data sets, represented by the shaded region below. Each point in Nirvana has a lot internal structure allowing the extraction of persistent homology. In this landscape the black arrows represent geometric SEOs and the grey ones non-geometric SEOs. Recall that geometric SEOs enable us to compare relevant persistent homology. Non-geometric SEOs contain complementary information.



Acknowledgments. F. Tombari was supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous System and Software Program (WASP) funded by Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation. W. Chachólski was partially supported by VR and WASP. Alessandro De Gregorio was supported by the SmartData@PoliTO center on Big Data and Data Science. Nicola Quercioli was partially supported by GNSAGA-INdAM (Italy).

REFERENCES

[1] M. G. Bergomi, P. Frosini, D. Giorgi, and N. Quercioli. Towards a topological-geometrical theory of group equivariant non-expansive operators for data analysis and machine learning. *CoRR*, abs/1812.11832, 2018.

- [2] M. G. Bergomi, P. Frosini, D. Giorgi, and N. Quercioli. Towards a topological–geometrical theory of group equivariant non-expansive operators for data analysis and machine learning. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9):423–433, 2019.
- [3] G. Carlsson. Topology and data. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 46(2):255–308, 2009.
- [4] G. Carlsson and A. Zomorodian. The theory of multidimensional persistence. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 42(1):71–93, 2009.
- [5] D. Cohen-Steiner, H. Edelsbrunner, and J. Harer. Extending persistence using Poincaré and Lefschetz duality. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 9(1):79–103, 2009.
- [6] W. G. Dwyer and H.-W. Henn. *Homotopy theoretic methods in group cohomology*. Advanced Courses in Mathematics. CRM Barcelona. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2001.
- [7] H. Edelsbrunner and J. Harer. Persistent homology—a survey. In *Surveys on discrete and computational geometry*, volume 453 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 257–282. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008.
- [8] M. Lesnick. The theory of the interleaving distance on multidimensional persistence modules. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 15(3):613–650, 2015.
- [9] S. Y. Oudot. *Persistence theory: from quiver representations to data analysis*, volume 209 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [10] M. Scalamiero, W. Chachólski, A. Lundman, R. Ramanujam, and S. Öberg. Multidimensional persistence and noise. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 17(6):1367–1406, 2017.
- [11] R. W. Thomason. Homotopy colimits in the category of small categories. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 85(1):91–109, 1979.

E-mail address: wojtek@kth.se

E-mail address: alessandro.degregorio@polito.it

E-mail address: nicola.quercioli2@unibo.it

E-mail address: tombari@kth.se