

**GOOD COVERINGS OF PROXIMAL ALEXANDROV SPACES.
HOMOTOPIC CYCLES IN JORDAN CURVE THEOREM
EXTENSION.**

J.F. PETERS AND T. VERGILI

Dedicated to Camille Jordan

ABSTRACT. This paper introduces proximal homotopic cycles, which lead to the main results in this paper, namely, extensions of the Mitsuishi-Yamaguchi Good Covering Theorem with different forms of Tanaka good cover of an Alexandrov space equipped with a proximity relation and extensions of the Jordan curve theorem. An application of these results is also given.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	2
2.1. Proximally Continuous Maps and Gluing Lemma	2
2.2. Descriptive Proximity spaces	4
3. Proximal Homotopy	5
3.1. Homotopy between descriptive proximally continuous maps	6
3.2. Paths in proximity spaces	7
4. Homotopic Cycles	10
5. Good coverings and Jordan Curve Theorem extension	12
6. Application	15
Appendix A. Čech Proximity	17
Appendix B. Descriptive Proximity	18
References	18

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper introduces proximal homotopic cycles considered in terms of a Tanaka good covering of an Alexandrov space [21], leading to extensions of the Mitsuishi-Yamaguchi Good Covering Theorem [7] as well as extensions of the Jordan Curve Theorem [6].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54E05; 55P57.

Key words and phrases. Good Cover, Homotopy, Nerve, Path, Proximity.

The research has been supported by the Natural Sciences & Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) discovery grant 185986 and Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM) Francesco Severi, Gruppo Nazionale per le Strutture Algebriche, Geometriche e Loro Applicazioni grant 9 920160 000362, n.prot U 2016/000036 and Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) Scientific Human Resources Development (BİDEB) under grant no: 2221-1059B211301223.

This paper considers the homotopy of paths [20, §2.1,p.11] in Čech proximity spaces [22, §2.5,p 439] in which nonvoid sets are spatially close provided the sets have nonempty intersection and in descriptive proximity spaces [14] in which nonvoid sets are descriptively close, provided the sets have the same descriptions. A biproduct of this work is the extension of recent forms of good coverings of topological spaces [21] [7] as well as a fivefold extension of the Jordan curve theorem [6].

The main results of this paper are

Theorem(*cf.* Theorem 6). For every descriptive proximity space M on a finite collection of intersecting homotopic cycles,

- (1): M has a good cover.
- (2): The nerve of M and the union of the sets in M have the same homotopy type.

Theorem(*cf.* Theorem 8). Every finite collection of intersecting homotopic cycles in a proximity space M satisfies the Jordan curve theorem.

2. PRELIMINARIES

This section introduces notation and basic concepts underlying proximal homotopy.

Let $I = [0, 1]$, the unit interval. A **path** in a space X is a continuous map $h : I \rightarrow X$ with endpoints $h(0) = x_0$ and $h(1) = x_1$ [20, §2.1,p.11]. A **homotopy of paths** $h, h' : I \rightarrow X$ with fixed end points (denoted by $h \sim h'$), is a relation between h and h' defined by an associated continuous map $H : I \times I \rightarrow X$, where $H(s, t) = h_t(s)$ with $H(s, 0) = h(s)$ and $H(s, 1) = h'(s)$. In effect, in a homotopy of paths h, h' , path h is continuously transformed into path h' . For $h \sim h'$, paths h, h' are said to be **homotopic paths**.

From the Čech proximity δ in A , we can consider the closeness of homotopy classes in a proximity space (X, δ) .

2.1. Proximally Continuous Maps and Gluing Lemma. This section introduces gluing lemma for proximity spaces, defined via proximally continuous maps over a pair of Čech proximity spaces defined in terms of the proximity δ (see A).

Definition 1. [Proximally continuous map] [18, p. 5],[2].

A map $f : (X, \delta_1) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_2)$ between two proximity spaces is *proximally continuous*, provided f preserves proximity, i.e., $A \delta_1 B$ implies $f(A) \delta_2 f(B)$ for $A, B \in 2^X$.

■

Remark 1. *Proximally continuous maps were introduced by V.A. Efremovič [2] and Yu. M. Smirnov [18, 19] in 1952 and elaborated by S.A. Naimpally and B.D. Warrack [10] in 1970.* ■

Lemma 1 shows that the composition of two proximally continuous maps is proximally continuous but it is also true for any types of proximally continuous maps.

Lemma 1. *Composition of two proximally continuous maps is proximally continuous.*

Proof. Let $f : (X, \delta_1) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_2)$ and $g : (Y, \delta_2) \rightarrow (Z, \delta_3)$ be proximally continuous maps and $A \delta_1 B$ in X . Then $f(A) \delta_2 f(B)$ since f is proximally continuous and $g \circ f(A) \delta_3 g \circ f(B)$, since g is proximally continuous. \square




FIGURE 1. Gluing diagram for Proximity Spaces. Here, the black arrows represent inclusion maps and all triangles in the diagram commute.

A diagram for the gluing Lemma 2 for proximity spaces is given in Fig. 1. This Lemma provides a basis for the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 2. [Gluing Lemma for proximity spaces]

Suppose (X, δ_1) and (Y, δ_2) are proximity spaces and A and B are closed subsets of X such that $A \cup B = X$. If $f : (A, \delta_1) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_2)$ and $g : (B, \delta_1) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_2)$ are proximally continuous maps such that $f(x) = g(x)$ for all $x \in A \cap B$, then the map $h : (X, \delta_1) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_2)$ defined by

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & x \in A, \\ g(x), & x \in B \end{cases}$$

is also proximally continuous.

Proof. Let C, D be subsets of X such that $C \delta_1 D$ so that these two sets are near. That is, there exist $c \in C$ and $d \in D$ that are either equal $c = d$ or near to each other $\{c\} \delta_1 \{d\}$. If $c = d$, then we are done.

Assume $\{c\} \delta_1 \{d\}$. Note that $c \in A (\in B)$ implies $d \in A (\in B)$, since $A (B)$ is closed. Therefore we have the following three cases.

Case 1: $c, d \in A$.

In that case, we have $h(\{c\}) = f(\{c\}) \delta_2 h(\{d\}) = f(\{d\})$ so that $h(C) \delta_2 h(D)$.

Case 2: $c, d \in B$.

In that case, we have $h(\{c\}) = g(\{c\}) \delta_2 h(\{d\}) = g(\{d\})$ so that $h(C) \delta_2 h(D)$.

Case 3: $c, d \in A \cap B$.

In that case, we have $h(\{c\}) = f(\{c\}) = g(\{c\}) \delta_2 h(\{d\}) = f(\{d\}) = g(\{d\})$ so that $h(C) \delta_2 h(D)$.

In all cases, h satisfies the proximal continuity property. \square

2.2. Descriptive Proximity spaces.

Let (X, δ_Φ) be a descriptive proximity space (see Appendix B). Then the *descriptive closure* of $A \subset X$ (denoted by $cl_\Phi A$) is the set of all points in X descriptively near to A , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} cl_\Phi A &= \{x \in X : x \delta_\Phi A\} \\ &= \{x \in X : \Phi(x) \in \Phi(A)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that A is *descriptively closed*, provided $cl_\Phi A = A$.

The following corollary is straightforward.

Corollary 1. *Suppose A is a descriptively closed subset of a descriptive proximity space (X, δ_Φ) . Then*

$$x \in A \Leftrightarrow \Phi(x) \in \Phi(A).$$

■

Definition 2. [Descriptive intersection] [11]

The *descriptive intersection* $A \underset{\Phi}{\cap} B$ of two nonempty subsets A and B of a descriptive proximity space (X, δ_Φ) , is the set of all points in $A \cup B$ such that $\Phi(A)$ and $\Phi(B)$ have common descriptions, i.e.

$$A \underset{\Phi}{\cap} B = \{x \in A \cup B : \Phi(x) \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B)\}.$$

■

Definition 3. [Descriptive proximally continuous maps]

A map $f : (X, \delta_{\Phi_1}) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_{\Phi_2})$ is *descriptive proximally continuous (dpc)*, provided $A \delta_{\Phi_1} B$ implies $f(A) \delta_{\Phi_2} f(B)$ for $A, B \subset X$. ■

Theorem 1. *Composition of two dpc maps is dpc.*

Proof. Let $f : (X, \delta_{\Phi_1}) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_{\Phi_2})$ and $g : (Y, \delta_{\Phi_2}) \rightarrow (Z, \delta_{\Phi_3})$ be dpc maps and $A \delta_{\Phi_1} B$ in X . Then $f(A) \delta_{\Phi_2} f(B)$, since f dpc and $g \circ f(A) \delta_{\Phi_3} g \circ f(B)$ since g is dpc. □




FIGURE 2. Gluing diagram for Descriptive Proximity Spaces. Here, the black arrows represent inclusion maps and all triangles in the diagram commute.

We adapt the gluing Lemma 2 for descriptive proximally continuous maps.

Theorem 2. [Descriptive Gluing]

Let (X, δ_{Φ_1}) and (Y, δ_{Φ_2}) be two descriptive proximity spaces and let A and B be two descriptively closed subsets of X with $A \cup B = X$. If $f : (A, \delta_{\Phi_1}) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_{\Phi_2})$ and $g : (B, \delta_{\Phi_1}) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_{\Phi_2})$ are dpc maps such that $f(x) = g(x)$ for all $x \in A \cap B$, then the map $h : (X, \delta_{\Phi_1}) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_{\Phi_2})$ is defined by

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & \Phi_1(x) \in \Phi_1(A) \quad (\equiv x \in A \text{ by Corollary 1}), \\ g(x), & \Phi_1(x) \in \Phi_1(B) \quad (\equiv x \in B \text{ by Corollary 1}) \end{cases}$$

is also dpc.

Proof. Let C, D be subsets of X such that $C \delta_{\Phi_1} D$ (so, these two sets are descriptively near). That is, there exist $c \in C$ and $d \in D$ that are either equal $c = d$ or descriptively near to each other $\{c\} \delta_{\Phi_1} \{d\}$. If $c = d$, then we are done.

Assume $\{c\} \delta_{\Phi_1} \{d\}$. Note that $c \in A$ ($\in B$) implies $d \in A$ ($\in B$) since A (B) is descriptively closed. Therefore we have the following three cases.

Case 1: $c, d \in A$.

In that case, we have $h(\{c\}) = f(\{c\}) \delta_{\Phi_2} h(\{d\}) = f(\{d\})$ so that $h(C) \delta_{\Phi_2} h(D)$.

Case 2: $c, d \in B$.

In that case, we have $h(\{c\}) = g(\{c\}) \delta_{\Phi_2} h(\{d\}) = g(\{d\})$ so that $h(C) \delta_{\Phi_2} h(D)$.

Case 3: $c, d \in A \cap B$.

In that case, we have $h(\{c\}) = f(\{c\}) = g(\{c\}) \delta_{\Phi_2} h(\{d\}) = f(\{d\}) = g(\{d\})$ so that $h(C) \delta_{\Phi_2} h(D)$.

In all cases, h satisfies the descriptive proximal continuity property. \square

3. PROXIMAL HOMOTOPY

For two proximity spaces (X, δ_1) and (Y, δ_2) , let $X \times Y$ denote their product. Then the subsets $A \times B$ and $C \times D$ of $X \times Y$ are near, provided $A \delta_1 C$ and $B \delta_2 D$.

Definition 4. [Proximal Homotopy]

Let (X, δ_1) and (Y, δ_2) be proximity spaces and $f, g : (X, \delta_1) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_2)$ proximally continuous maps. Then we say f and g are proximally homotopic, provided there exists a proximally continuous map $H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ such that $H(x, 0) = f(x)$ and $H(x, 1) = g(x)$. Such a map H is called an proximal homotopy between f and g . In keeping with Hilton's notation [5], we write $f \underset{\delta}{\sim} g$, provided there is a proximal homotopy between them. \blacksquare

Proposition 1. Every proximal homotopy relation is an equivalence relation.

Proof. A check that $\underset{\delta}{\sim}$ is reflexive and symmetric is straightforward.

Now let F and G be proximal homotopies between f and g and between g and h , respectively. Then the function $H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ defined by

$$H(x, t) = \begin{cases} F(x, 2t), & t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \\ G(x, 2t - 1), & t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \end{cases}$$

is proximally continuous by Theorem 2, so that this defines an proximal homotopy between f and h . \square

Definition 5. [Relative proximal Homotopy]

Let (X, δ_1) and (Y, δ_2) be proximity spaces and $A \subset X$. Then two proximally continuous maps $f, g : (X, \delta_1) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_2)$ are said to be proximally homotopic relative to A , provided there exists an proximal homotopy H between f and g such that $H(a, t) = f(a) = g(a)$ for all $a \in A$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. We write $f \underset{\delta}{\sim} g \text{ (rel } A)$, provided there is a proximal homotopy relative to A . ■

Proposition 2. Suppose $f, g : (X, \delta_1) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_2)$ are proximally homotopic. If $h : (Y, \delta_2) \rightarrow (Z, \delta_3)$ is proximally continuous, then the maps $h \circ f$ and $h \circ g$ are also proximally homotopic.

Proof. Let $F : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ be the proximal homotopy between f and g so that $F(x, 0) = f(x)$ and $F(x, 1) = g(x)$. Note that $h \circ f$ and $h \circ g$ are proximally continuous by Lemma 1 and the map $H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ defined by $H(x, t) = h \circ F(x, t)$ is the desired proximal homotopy between them. □

Proposition 3. Suppose $f, g : (X, \delta_1) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_2)$ are proximally homotopic. If $k : (W, \delta_0) \rightarrow (X, \delta_1)$ is proximally continuous, then the maps $f \circ k$ and $g \circ k$ are also proximally homotopic.

Proof. Let $F : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ be the proximal homotopy between f and g so that $F(x, 0) = f(x)$ and $F(x, 1) = g(x)$. Note that $f \circ k$ and $g \circ k$ are proximally continuous by Lemma 1 and the map $K : Z \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ defined by $K(z, t) = F(k(z), t)$ is the desired proximal homotopy between them. □

Definition 6. A proximally continuous map is proximally nullhomotopic, provided it is proximally homotopic to a constant map. ■

Definition 7. A proximity space is proximally contractible, provided the identity map on it is proximally homotopic to a constant map. ■

Definition 8. Two proximity spaces (X, δ_1) and (Y, δ_2) are proximally homotopy equivalent, provided there exist proximally continuous maps $f : (X, \delta_1) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_2)$ and $g : (Y, \delta_2) \rightarrow (X, \delta_1)$ such that $g \circ f$ and $f \circ g$ are proximally homotopic to the identity maps on X and Y , respectively.

3.1. Homotopy between descriptive proximally continuous maps.

The results for pairs of proximity spaces given so far hold for proximity spaces without restrictions.

Proposition 4. The product of descriptive proximity spaces is a descriptive proximity space.

Proof. Let $\{(X_i, \delta_{\Phi_i})\}_{i \in J}$ be a family of descriptive proximity spaces, where J is an index set. Then we can define a descriptive nearness relation δ_{Φ} on the product space $X := \prod_{i \in J} X_i$ with the probe function $\Phi := \prod_{i \in J} \Phi_i$ by declaring that two subsets A, B of X are descriptively near, provided $A \delta_{\Phi} B$ if and only if $\text{pr}_i(A) \delta_{\Phi_i} \text{pr}_i(B)$ for all $i \in J$, where pr_i is the i^{th} projection map of X onto X_i . □

Remark 2. To define the descriptive homotopy between dpc maps, we impose a descriptive nearness relation on the closed interval $[0, 1]$ in the following manner. Two subsets A and B of $[0, 1]$ are descriptively near, provided $D(A, B) = 0$ (that is, the descriptive proximity relation and the (metric) proximity relation coincide). ■

The descriptive nearness relation introduced in Remark 2 leads to descriptive homotopic maps.

Definition 9. [Descriptive proximal Homotopy]

Let (X, δ_{Φ_1}) and (Y, δ_{Φ_2}) be descriptive proximity spaces and $f, g : (X, \delta_{\Phi_1}) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_{\Phi_2})$ dpc maps. Then we say f and g are descriptive proximally homotopic, provided there exists a dpc map $H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ such that $H(x, 0) = f(x)$ and $H(x, 1) = g(x)$. Such a map H is called a descriptive proximal homotopy between f and g . We denote $f \underset{\Phi}{\sim} g$, provided there exists a descriptive proximal homotopy between them. ■

Proposition 5. Every descriptive proximal homotopy relation is an equivalence relation.

Proof. It's easy to check that $\underset{\Phi}{\sim}$ is reflexive and symmetric.

Let F and G are the descriptive proximal homotopies between f and g and between g and h , respectively. Then the function $H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ defined by

$$H(x) = \begin{cases} F(x, 2t), & t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], \\ G(x, 2t - 1), & t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \end{cases}$$

is dpc by Theorem 2, so that this defines a descriptive proximal homotopy between f and h . □

Definition 10. [Descriptive proximal Relative Homotopy]

Let (X, δ_{Φ_1}) and (Y, δ_{Φ_2}) be descriptive proximity spaces and $A \subset X$. Then two dpc maps $f, g : (X, \delta_{\Phi_1}) \rightarrow (Y, \delta_{\Phi_2})$ are said to be descriptive proximally homotopic relative to A , provided there exists a descriptive proximal homotopy H between f and g such that $H(a, t) = f(a) = g(a)$ for all $a \in A$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. We write $f \underset{\Phi}{\sim} g$ (rel A), provided there is a descriptive proximal homotopy relative to A . ■

3.2. Paths in proximity spaces. From Remark 2, we know that the descriptive nearness relation also induces a descriptive proximity relation on $[0, 1]$. This leads to the introduction of (descriptive) proximal paths in a (descriptive) proximity space.

Definition 11. [Proximal Path]

Let (X, δ) be a proximity space and $x_0, x_1 \in X$. Then a **proximal path** between x_0 and x_1 is an proximally continuous map $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ such that $\alpha(0) = x_0$ and $\alpha(1) = x_1$, i.e., for two subsets of A, B in $[0, 1]$, $D(A, B) = 0$ implies $\alpha(A) \delta \alpha(B)$. ■

In this section, we introduce constant proximal paths and their descriptive forms.

Definition 12. [Constant Proximal Path]

For a proximity space (X, δ) , the constant proximal path $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ at $x_0 \in X$ is the proximal path such that $c(t) = x_0$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$. ■

Definition 13. [Descriptive proximal path]

Let (X, δ_Φ) be a descriptive proximity space and $x_0, x_1 \in X$. Then a descriptive proximal path between x_0 and x_1 is a dpc map $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ such that $\alpha(0) = x_0$ and $\alpha(1) = x_1$, i.e., for two subsets of A, B in $[0, 1]$, $D(A, B) = 0$ implies $\alpha(A) \delta_\Phi \alpha(B)$. ■

Descriptive proximally continuous maps were informally introduced in [13], defined here in terms of path descriptions, utilizing the descriptive proximity relation δ_Φ (see B).

Definition 14. [Path description]

Let h, k be proximally homotopic paths in a proximity space X .

$$\Phi(h) = \overbrace{\{\Phi(h(s)) : s \in [0, 1]\}}^{\text{set of feature vectors that describe path } h} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n.$$

descriptively close paths

$$\Phi(h) = \Phi(k) \quad \Leftrightarrow \overbrace{h \delta_\Phi k}.$$

Similarly, for descriptively close homotopy classes $[h], [k]$, we write

$$\Phi([h]) = \Phi([k]) \quad \Leftrightarrow \overbrace{[h] \delta_\Phi [k]}^{\text{descriptively close path classes}}. \quad \blacksquare$$

In other words, the closeness of descriptions of paths (and path classes) is expressed using the descriptive proximity relation δ_Φ .

Definition 15. Let $[h], [k]$ be nonempty classes of paths in a proximity space X . A map $f : (2^X \times I, \delta_\Phi) \rightarrow (2^X \times I, \delta_\Phi)$ is descriptive proximally continuous (dpc), provided

$$[h] \delta_\Phi [k] \text{ implies } f([h]) \delta_\Phi f([k]).$$

Unlike the constant proximal path, descriptive proximal paths (from Def.13) fall into two niches, namely, **(ordinary descriptive) constant paths** and **degenerate descriptive constant paths**, introduced in this section. These proximal paths lead to introduction of descriptive contractibility and an extended form of Tanaka good cover.

Definition 16. [Descriptive constant map]

Let (X, δ_{Φ_1}) and (Y, δ_{Φ_2}) be descriptive proximity spaces. Then a map $d : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be a descriptive constant, provided, $d(x) = y_0$ for all $x \in X$ and for some $y_0 \in Y$. ■

Definition 17. [Descriptively contractible space]

A descriptive proximity space is descriptively proximally contractible, or descriptively contractible for short, provided, the identity map on it is descriptive proximally homotopic to a descriptive constant map. ■




FIGURE 3. The identity map on $H(X)$ is degenerate descriptive constant.

Definition 18. [Degenerate Descriptive Constant Map]

Let (X, δ_{Φ_1}) and (Y, δ_{Φ_2}) be descriptive proximity spaces. Then a map $d : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be a degenerate descriptive constant, provided $\Phi_2(d(x_0)) = \Phi_2(d(x_1))$ for all $x_0, x_1 \in X$.

From Def. 18, observe that the degenerate descriptive constant map need not map every element to a fixed element, but instead it fixes the description. That is $|\text{im } d| \geq 1$ but $|\Phi_2(d(X))| = 1$ so that the image of $\Phi_2 \circ d$ consists of a single element, say $* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (see Figure 4). We say that d is an ordinary descriptive constant map, provided $|\text{im } d| = 1$.

$$X \xrightarrow{d} Y \xrightarrow{\Phi_2} \{*\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

FIGURE 4. $\Phi_2 \circ d$ is a constant map on X , provided d is degenerate descriptive constant.

Example 1. Let $H(X)$ denote the path homotopy classes in X given in Figure 3 and the paths in each of the homotopy class be described in terms of the color of their initial points. Then the identity map $\text{id} : (H(X), \Phi) \rightarrow (H(X), \Phi)$ is a degenerate descriptive constant map since the initial points of all paths are red.

Theorem 3. A degenerate descriptive constant map is a dpc map.

Proof. For two subsets A and B of X , suppose that $A \delta_{\Phi_1} B$. From Def. 18 for a degenerate descriptive constant map, we have $\Phi_2(d(A)) = \Phi_2(d(B))$ so that $d(A) \delta_{\Phi_2} d(B)$, which completes the proof. \square

Definition 19. [Degenerate Descriptively Contractible Space]

A descriptive proximity space is a degenerate descriptively contractible, provided, the identity map on it is descriptive proximally homotopic to a degenerate descriptive constant map.

Proposition 6. *Suppose that (X, δ_Φ) is a descriptive proximity space and c_d is a degenerate descriptive constant map on X with $x_0 \in \text{Im}(c_d)$. Then c_d and the descriptive constant map c_{x_0} at x_0 are descriptively homotopic.*

Proof. The desired homotopy $H : X \times I \rightarrow X$ is a map such that $H(x, t) = x_0$. \square

Since descriptive proximal relation is transitive, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *A degenerate descriptively contractible space is also a descriptively contractible.*




FIGURE 5. Two Forms of Homotopic cycles




FIGURE 6. $|hSysE|$, a homotopic cycle system.

4. HOMOTOPIC CYCLES

This section introduces three forms of homotopic cycles, namely, simple homotopic cycles, multi-homotopic cycles and homotopic cycle systems. Geometrically,

a homotopic cycle has the appearance of the boundary of a Vigolo Hawaiian earring [23]. These homotopic cycles lead to extensions of the Jordan Curve Theorem.

Recall that a path in a space X is a continuous map $h : I \rightarrow X$ [20, §2.1,p.11].

Definition 20. [Simple Homotopic Cycle]

In a space X in the Euclidean plane, let $h : I \rightarrow X$ be a path (briefly, h path). A homotopic cycle E (denoted by $hCycE$) is a collection of h path-connected vertexes attached to each other with no end vertex and $hCycE$ has a nonvoid interior. ■

Example 2. *A geometric realization of a simple homotopic cycle $|hCycE|$ is shown in Fig. 5.1. Each edge in $|hCycE|$ is an h path $|h_i|$, $i \in [0, \dots, n-1[n]$. ■*

An enriched form of a homotopic cycle is derived from the paths in homotopic classes that provide path-connected cycle vertexes.

Definition 21. [Multi-Path Homotopic Cycle]

In a space X in the Euclidean plane, let $[h]$ be a homotopic class containing multiple h paths. A multi-path homotopic cycle E (denoted by $HCycE$) is a collection of homotopic classes containing h paths- connected vertexes attached to each other with no end vertex and $HCycE$ has a nonvoid interior. ■

Example 3. *A geometric realization of a multi-path homotopic cycle $|HCycE|$ is shown in Fig. 5.2. There are multiple homotopic paths between each pair of vertexes in $|HCycE|$. For example, between vertexes $|h_i(0)|$, $|h_i(1)|$, there are multiple h -paths in class $[h]$. ■*

A system of homotopic cycles results from a collection of $HCyc$ -cycles that have nonvoid intersection.

For a space X in the Euclidean plane, let $H(X)$ denote the set of all path homotopy classes $[h]$ in X .

Definition 22. [Homotopic Cycle System]

In a space X in the Euclidean plane, a homotopic cycle system E (denoted by $hSysE$) is a collection of $HCyc$ -cycles such that

$$hSysE = \left\{ HCycE \in 2^{H(X)} : \bigcap HCycE = \text{vertex } v \in H(X) \right\}. \quad \blacksquare$$

Example 4. *A geometric realization of a homotopic cycle system $|hSysE|$ is shown in Fig. 6. This system contains a pair of multi-homotopic cycles $HCycE$, $HCycE'$ attached to each other, i.e., we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_i &\in [\ell] \in HCycE, \\ k'_j &\in [k] \in HCycE', \\ hSysE &= \{HCycE, HCycE'\} \\ HCycE \cap HCycE' &= \ell_i(0) = k'_j(1). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

5. GOOD COVERINGS AND JORDAN CURVE THEOREM EXTENSION

This section introduces good coverings of descriptive proximity spaces and an extension of the Jordan Curve Theorem in terms of the boundary of a homotopic cycle.

Definition 23. [Closure in a Hausdorff metric space]

Let $A \in 2^X$ (nonvoid subset A in a Hausdorff metric space [3, 4] X) and $D(x, A) = \inf \{|x - a| : a \in A\}$ be the Hausdorff distance between a point $x \in X$ and subset A [4, §22,p. 128]. The closure of A [12, §1.18,p. 40] is defined by

$$cl(A) = \{x \in X : D(x, A) = 0\}. \quad \blacksquare$$

Definition 24. For a Hausdorff metric space $X, A \in 2^X$, let clA be the closure of A . Then the boundary of A (denoted by $bdyA$) is the set of all points on the border of clA and not in the complement of clA (denoted by ∂clA). Also, the interior of A (denoted by $intA$) is the set of all points in clA and not on the boundary of A , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial(clA) &= X \setminus clA, \text{ all points in } X \text{ and not in } clA. \\ int(A) &= \{E \in 2^X : E \subset clA \text{ and } E \cap bdyA = \emptyset\}. \\ bdy(A) &= X \setminus (intA \cup \partial clA). \\ clA &= bdy(A) \cup int(A). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3. Geometrically, a homotopic cycle system is a necklace. The clasp of the necklace is the vertex in the intersection of the system cycles. This is the case in Fig. 6. \blacksquare

Recall that a **cover** of a space X is a collection of subsets $E \in 2^X$ such that $X = \bigcup E$ [24, §15.9,p. 104].

Definition 25. [21, §4,p. 12].

A cover of a space X is a **good cover**, provided, X has a collection of subsets $E \in 2^X$ such that $X = \bigcup E$ and $\bigcap_{\text{finite}} E \neq \emptyset$ is contractible, i.e., all nonvoid

intersections of the finitely many subsets $E \in 2^X$ are contractible. \blacksquare

Example 5. For a space X in the Euclidean plane, let $hSysE = \{HCycE, HCycE'\}$ a system of homotopic cycles in X with nonempty intersection such that a geometric realization $|hSysE|$ is shown in Fig. 6. This is an example of planar Tanaka good cover of a $H(X)$, since

$$\begin{aligned} H(X) &= HCycE \cup HCycE', \text{ and} \\ HCycE \cap HCycE' &= \ell_i(0). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Definition 26. [Descriptively good cover]

Let X be a descriptive proximity space with a probe function $\Phi : 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. A descriptively good cover of (X, Φ) is a collection of subsets $E \in 2^X$ such that $X =$

$\bigcup E$ and $\bigcap_{\Phi, \text{finite}} E \neq \emptyset$, i.e., all nonvoid descriptive intersections of the finitely many subsets $E \in 2^X$ are descriptively contractible. ■

Definition 27. [Degenerate Descriptively good cover]

Let X be a descriptive proximity space with a probe function $\Phi : 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. A degenerate descriptively good cover of (X, Φ) is a collection of subsets $E \in 2^X$ such that $X = \bigcup E$ and $\bigcap_{\Phi, \text{finite}} E \neq \emptyset$ is degenerate descriptively contractible, i.e., all nonvoid descriptive intersections of the finitely many subsets $E \in 2^X$ are degenerate descriptively contractible. ■

Proposition 7. For a space X in the Euclidean plane, $\text{hSys}E$ is a good cover of $H(X)$.

Proof. Observe that each element $\text{HCyc}E$ in $\text{hSys}E$ is a subset of $H(X)$ and by the nature of $\text{hSys}E$, $H(X) = \bigcup \text{HCyc}E$ and $\bigcap \text{HCyc}E$ is a single vertex so that it is contractible. □

Theorem 4. [1, §III.2,p. 59].

Let F be a finite collection of closed, convex sets in Euclidean space. Then the nerve of F and union of the sets in F have the same homotopy type.

Let $\angle_{\kappa} bac$ denote the inner angle of a geodesic triangle of length $|ab|, |bc|, |ca|$, at the vertex with opposite side of length $|bc|$, in a simply connected complete surface of curvature κ .

A geodesic complete metric space M is an **Alexandrov space** (of curvature bounded locally from below) [7, §2.1,p. 3], provided, for each $p \in M$, there exist an $r > 0$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for any distinct four points $a_i \in B(p, r), i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ with $\max_{1 \leq i < j \leq 3} \{|a_0 a_i| + |a_0 a_j| + |a_i a_j|\} < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{\kappa}}$, if $\kappa > 0$, we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 3} \angle_{\kappa} a_i a_0 a_j \leq 2\pi.$$

Proposition 8. For a closed subset X in the Euclidean plane with a probe function Φ , the descriptive proximity space (X, δ_{Φ}) is an Alexandrov space.

Proof. X is complete since it is a closed subset of the Euclidean plane. For an element $p \in X$, consider the unit ball $B(p, 1)$ and take the points a_1, a_2, a_3 on the boundary of $B(p, 1)$ and let $\kappa = 1$ (the curvature of $B(p, 1)$, the reciprocal of the radius) Then $|pa_1| + |pa_2| + |pa_3| = 3 \leq \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{1}}$ and we have $\angle_{\kappa} a_1 p a_2 + \angle_{\kappa} a_1 p a_3 + \angle_{\kappa} a_2 p a_3 = 2\pi$. □

A main result in this paper is a extension of the Mitsuishi-Yamaguchi Theorem 5.

Theorem 5. [7, Theorem 1.1(2),p. 8108].

Every open covering γ of an Alexandrov space M has the same homotopy type as the nerve of any good covering of M .

Proposition 9. *Every descriptive proximity space (X, δ_Φ) with a probe function $\Phi : 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ in the Euclidean plane has an open covering.*

Proof. For $x \in X$ and positive number $\varepsilon > 0$, define the descriptive ε neighborhood of x by letting $B_\Phi(x, \varepsilon) = \{y \in X : d(\Phi(x), \Phi(y)) < \varepsilon\}$ where d is a Euclidean distance on \mathbb{R}^n . Observe that $B_\Phi(x, \varepsilon)$ is open in X , since, for an element $y \in X$, we have $B_\Phi(y, r) \subseteq B_\Phi(x, \varepsilon)$, where $r = \varepsilon - d(\Phi(x), \Phi(y))$. Then the collection of open sets $\{B_\Phi(x, \varepsilon) : x \in X, \varepsilon > 0\}$ is an open covering of X . \square

Theorem 6. *Let X be a descriptive proximity space in the Euclidean plane with an open covering and with a probe function $\Phi : 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. Also, let $H(X)$ be the collection of all homotopy classes covering space X and $X = H(X)$.*

- 1^o *If nerve of $E \in 2^{H(X)}$ in space X is descriptively contractible, then X has a descriptively good cover.*
- 2^o *If nerve of $E \in 2^{H(X)}$ in space X is degenerate descriptively contractible, then X has a descriptively good cover.*
- 3^o *If $H(X)$ is an Alexandrov space with an open covering, then the nerve of $H(X)$ and the union of sets in $H(X)$ have the same homotopy type.*
- 4^o *If $H(X)$ is a finite collection of closed, convex sets in Euclidean space. Then the nerve of $H(X)$ and union of the sets in $H(X)$ have the same homotopy type.*

Proof. 1^o: For $E \in 2^{H(X)}$ in (X, δ_Φ) , we have $X = \bigcup E$, since $X = H(X)$. We also know that all nonvoid descriptive intersections of finitely many subsets $E \in 2^{H(X)}$ are descriptively contractible. Hence, from Def. 26, $H(X)$ is a descriptively good cover of X .

2^o: For $E \in 2^{H(X)}$ in (X, δ_Φ) , we have $X = \bigcup E$, since $X = H(X)$. We also know that all nonvoid descriptive intersections of finitely many subsets $E \in 2^{H(X)}$ are degenerate descriptively contractible. Hence, from Def. 27, $H(X)$ is a degenerate descriptively good cover of X .

3^o: From Prop. 8, X is an Alexandrov space. If X has an open covering, then from Theorem 5, the desired result follows.

4^o: If $H(X)$ is a finite collection of closed, convex sets, then the desired result follows from Theorem 4. \square

Another main result in this paper is a fivefold extension of the Jordan curve theorem.

Theorem 7. [Jordan Curve Theorem [6]].

A simple closed curve lying on the plane divides the plane into two regions and forms their common boundary.

Theorem 8. *Let $hCycE$ (simple homotopic cycle), $HCycE$ (multi-homotopic cycle), $hSysE$ (homotopic cycle system) be in the Euclidean plane. Then*

- 1^o *The boundary $\text{bdy}(cl(hCycE))$ satisfies the Jordan Curve Theorem.*
- 2^o *The boundary $\text{bdy}(cl(HCycE))$ satisfies the Jordan Curve Theorem.*
- 3^o *The boundary $\text{bdy}(cl(hSysE))$ satisfies the Jordan Curve Theorem.*
- 4^o *If $X = H(X)$ in (X, δ_Φ) has a descriptively good cover, then $\text{bdy}(cl_\Phi(H(X)))$ satisfies the Jordan Curve Theorem.*
- 5^o *If $X = H(X)$ in (X, δ_Φ) has a degenerate descriptively good cover, then $\text{bdy}(cl_\Phi(H(X)))$ satisfies the Jordan Curve Theorem.*


Proof. 1°: The boundary $\text{bdy}(\text{cl}(\text{hCyc}E))$ is a sequence of paths on a curve that is simple (no loops) and closed (the sequence begins and ends with the same vertex). Hence, by Theorem 7, $\text{bdy}(\text{cl}(\text{hCyc}E))$ divides the plane into two regions and forms their common boundary.

2°: Replace $\text{bdy}(\text{cl}(\text{hCyc}E))$ in 1° with $\text{bdy}(\text{cl}(\text{HCyc}E))$ and the proof is symmetric with the proof of 1°.

3°: Replace $\text{bdy}(\text{cl}(\text{hCyc}E))$ in 1° with $\text{bdy}(\text{cl}(\text{hSys}E))$ and observe that curve on each boundary $\text{HCyc}E \in \text{hSys}E$ is a simple, closed curve attached to the other homotopic cycle boundaries by a single vertex. Then curve on the boundary continues along the curves of the other cycle boundaries, forming an elongated curve that is both simple and closed. Hence, the boundary $\text{bdy}(\text{cl}(\text{hSys}E))$ satisfies Theorem 7

4°: Observe that if $E \in 2^{H(X)}$ is an element in a descriptively good covering of $H(X)$, then it is descriptively contractible. This is equivalent to saying that E contains a sequence of paths on a curve that is simple and closed so that it constitutes a multi-path homotopic cycle E , namely, $\text{HCyc}E$, and the descriptively good covering is also a homotopic cycle system, $\text{hSys}E$. Then the proof follows from 3°.

5°: Observe that if $E \in 2^{H(X)}$ is an element in a degenerate descriptively good covering of $H(X)$, then it is degenerate descriptively contractible and hence it is descriptively contractible by Corollary 2. Then the proof follows from 4°. \square



7.1: Vigolo Hawaiian butterfly $\text{Hb}E_{t.00}$ in video frame space $(\text{fr}E, \delta_\Phi)$ at time t at the beginning of a temporal interval $[t, t + 05\text{sec}]$, Betti no. $\beta(\text{Hb}E_{t.00}) = 3$, $\text{Hb}E_{t.00} \delta_\Phi \text{Hb}E_{t.01}$

7.2: Vigolo Hawaiian butterfly $\text{Hb}E_{t.01}$ in video frame space $(\text{fr}E', \delta_\Phi)$ at time $t + 0.1\text{sec}$ in temporal interval $[t, t + 05\text{sec}]$, Betti no. $\beta(\text{Hb}E_{t.01}) = 3$, $\text{Hb}E_{t.00} \delta_\Phi \text{Hb}E_{t.01}$

FIGURE 7. Persistent butterfly shapes [16] in a pair of video frame descriptive proximity spaces

6. APPLICATION

This section briefly introduces an application of descriptively proximal nerves in a topology of data approach to detecting close good covers of video frame shapes

that appear, disappear and sometimes reappear in a sequence of video frames. The basic approach is to track the persistence of descriptively proximal video frame shapes that have homotopic nerve presentations.

Definition 28. *A homotopic nerve is a collection of homotopic cycles that have nonempty intersection.* ■

Recall that a group G with binary operation $+$ is free, provided G has a basis \mathcal{B} so that every member $v \in G$ can be written as a finite sum $v = \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{Z} \\ g \in \mathcal{B}}} kg$ [8, §1.4,p.

21].

Definition 29. [Homotopic Nerve Presentation]

Let $\mathcal{B} = \{g_1, \dots\}$ be the basis for a free group G . Also let $H(X) = \{hCycE\}$, a collection of homotopy cycles $hCycE$ with nonvoid intersection in a planar space X . A **homotopic nerve presentation** is a continuous mapping

$$f : H(X) \rightarrow G \left(v = \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{Z} \\ g \in \mathcal{B}}} kg : v \in hCycE \right) \\ \rightarrow G(\mathcal{B}, +),$$

from $H(X)$ to a corresponding free group G .

Theorem 9. [15] *Every homotopic nerve in Euclidean space has a free group presentation.*

Recall that a Betti number is a count of the number generators in a free group [8, §4,p. 24].

Theorem 10. [16] *Every free group presentation of nested 1-cycles nerve has a Betti number.*

The result from Theorem 10 provides a stepping stone to tracking the persistence of good covers of video frame shapes. A frame shape persists, provided it continues to appear over a sequence of consecutive video frames.

Example 6. *A pair of descriptively contractible nerves in two video frames, each identified with a descriptive proximity space, is shown in Fig. 7. For each frame X , let the descriptive proximity space $X = H(X)$. From Theorem 6.1°, each frame has a descriptively good cover. In that case, from Theorem 8.4°, the $\text{bdy}(cl_{\Phi}(H(X)))$ satisfies the Jordan Curve Theorem.*

In this example, a nerve is a collection of time-constrained Hawaiian butterfly homotopic cycles (denoted by HbE_t at time t) with nonvoid intersection such as those in Fig. 7. Let δ_{Φ} be defined in terms of the Betti number of the free groups derived from each nerve, i.e.,

$$\Phi(HbE_t) = \mathcal{B}(HbE_t)$$

Since the free group presentations $hCyc$ cycles of the Hawaiian butterflies in Fig. 7 have the same Betti number, namely,

$$\mathcal{B}(HbE_{t.00}) = \mathcal{B}(HbE_{t.1}) = 3,$$

then we have

$$HbE_{t,0.0} \delta_{\Phi} HbE_{t,1}.$$

Hence, the persistence of a particular butterfly over a sequence of video frames can be tracked in terms of its Betti number. In this example, the butterfly represented in Fig. 7 persists for a 10th of a second. ■

The motivation for considering free group presentations of polytopes (e.g., nested cycles with nonvoid intersection) covering frame shapes is that we can then describe frame shapes in terms of their Betti numbers.

Frame shapes are approximately descriptively close, provided the difference between the Betti numbers of the free group presentations of the corresponding homotopic nerves, is close. Determining the persistence of frame shapes then reduces to tracking the appearance, disappearance and possible reappearance of the shapes in terms of their recurring Betti numbers. For an implementation of this approach to tracking the persistence of polytopes covering brain activation regions in resting state (rs)-fMRI videos, see [17].

APPENDIX A. ČECH PROXIMITY

A nonempty set X equipped with the relation δ is a Čech proximity space (denoted by (X, δ)) [22, §2.5,p 439], provided provided the following axioms are satisfied.

Čech Axioms

- (P.0): All nonempty subsets in X are far from the empty set, *i.e.*, $A \not\delta \emptyset$ for all $A \subseteq X$.
- (P.1): $A \delta B \Rightarrow B \delta A$.
- (P.2): $A \cap B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A \delta B$.
- (P.3): $A \delta (B \cup C) \Rightarrow A \delta B$ or $A \delta C$.

The closure of a subset A , denoted by clA , of the proximity space X is the set of all points in X which are near A :

$$clA = \{x \in X : x \delta_L A\}.$$

Note that A is closed, provided $clA = A$.

Lemma 3. [18, p. 9] *The closure of any nonempty set E in a proximity space X is the set of all points which are close to E .*

We define a nearness relation on \mathbb{R} as follows [9, §1.7, p. 48]. Two nonempty subsets A and B of \mathbb{R} are near if and only if the Hausdorff distance [3] $D(A, B) = 0$, where

$$D(A, B) = \begin{cases} \inf\{|a - b| : a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\}, & \text{if } A, B \neq \emptyset, \\ \infty, & \text{if } A = \emptyset \text{ or } B = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Note that \mathbb{R} is symmetric (or weakly regular), since \mathbb{R} satisfies the following condition [9, §3.1, p. 71].

$$(*) \quad x \text{ is near } \{y\} \Rightarrow y \text{ is near } \{x\}.$$

In that case, this nearness relation defines a Lodato proximity δ_L on \mathbb{R} by [9, §3, Theorem 3.1]

$$A \delta_L B \Leftrightarrow c\ell A \cap c\ell B \neq \emptyset,$$

where $c\ell E = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : D(x, E) = 0\}$.

The topological space X satisfying (*) becomes a Čech-Lodato proximity space (X, δ_L) where δ_L is defined by

$$A \delta_L B \Leftrightarrow c\ell A \cap c\ell B \neq \emptyset,$$

and $c\ell E$ is the closure of $E \subset X$ with respect to the topology on X .

We assume that the proximity on the closed interval $[0, 1]$ is the subspace proximity [9, §3.1, p. 74] induced by the (metric) proximity on \mathbb{R} .

APPENDIX B. DESCRIPTIVE PROXIMITY

This section gives the axioms for a descriptive proximity space (X, δ_Φ) in which δ_Φ is a descriptive proximity relation on a nonempty set X . Nonempty sets $A, B \subset X$ with overlapping descriptions are descriptively proximal (denoted by $A \delta_\Phi B$). The descriptive intersection [11] of nonempty subsets in $A \cup B$ (denoted by $A \underset{\Phi}{\cap} B$) is defined by

i.e., Descriptions $\Phi(A)$ & $\Phi(B)$ overlap

$$A \underset{\Phi}{\cap} B = \overbrace{\{x \in A \cup B : \Phi(x) \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B)\}}.$$

Let 2^X denote the collection of all subsets in a nonvoid set X . A nonempty set X equipped with the relation δ_Φ with non-void subsets $A, B, C \in 2^X$ is a descriptive proximity space, provided the following descriptive forms of the Čech axioms are satisfied.

Descriptive Proximity Axioms

(dP.0): All nonempty subsets in 2^X are descriptively far from the empty set, *i.e.,* $A \not\delta_\Phi \emptyset$ for all $A \in 2^X$.

(dP.1): $A \delta_\Phi B \Rightarrow B \delta_\Phi A$.

(dP.2): $A \underset{\Phi}{\cap} B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A \delta_\Phi B$.

(dP.3): $A \delta_\Phi (B \cup C) \Rightarrow A \delta_\Phi B$ or $A \delta_\Phi C$.

REFERENCES

1. H. Edelsbrunner and J.L. Harer, *Computational topology. an introduction*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, xii+241 pp. ISBN: 978-0-8218-4925-5, MR2572029.
2. V.A. Efremovič, *The geometry of proximity I (in Russian)*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **31(73)** (1952), no. 1, 189–200.
3. F. Hausdorff, *Grundzüge der mengenlehre*, Veit and Company, Leipzig, 1914, viii + 476 pp.
4. ———, *Set theory, trans. by j.r. aumann*, AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 1957, 352 pp.
5. P.J. Hilton, *An introduction to homotopy theory. cambridge tracts in mathematics and mathematical physics, no. 43*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 1953, viii+142 pp., MR0056289.

6. Camille Jordan, *Cours d'analyse de l'École polytechnique, tome i-iii*, ?ditions Jacques Gabay, Sceaux, 1991, reprint of 1915 edition, Tome I: MR1188186, Tome II: MR1188187, Tome III: MR1188188.
7. A. Mitsuishi and T. Yamaguchi, *Good coverings of alexandrov spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **372** (2019), no. 11, 8107–8130, MR4029692.
8. J.R. Munkres, *Elements of algebraic topology, 2nd ed.*, Perseus Publishing, Cambridge, MA, 1984, ix + 484 pp., ISBN: 0-201-04586-9, MR0755006.
9. S.A. Naimpally and J.F. Peters, *Topology with applications. Topological spaces via near and far*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2013, xv + 277 pp, Amer. Math. Soc. MR3075111.
10. S.A. Naimpally and B.D. Warrack, *Proximity spaces*, Cambridge Tract in Mathematics No. 59, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1970, x+128 pp., Paperback (2008), MR0278261.
11. J.F. Peters, *Near sets: An introduction*, Math. in Comp. Sci. **7** (2013), no. 1, 3–9, DOI 10.1007/s11786-013-0149-6, MR3043914.
12. ———, *Topology of digital images. visual pattern discovery in proximity spaces*, Intelligent Systems Reference Library, vol. 63, Springer, 2014, xv + 411pp, Zentralblatt MATH Zbl 1295 68010.
13. ———, *Computational proximity. Excursions in the topology of digital images.*, Intelligent Systems Reference Library **102** (2016), 433pp, xxviii + 433pp, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-30262-1, MR3727129 and Zbl 1382.68008.
14. ———, *Vortex nerves and their proximities. nerve betti numbers and descriptive proximity*, Bull. Allahabad Math. Soc. **34** (2019), no. 2, 263–276.
15. ———, *Homotopic nerve complexes with free group presentations*, Int. Online Conf. Algebraic and Geometric Methods of Analysis, 25-28 May 2021, Odesa, Ukraine, Institute of Mathematics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv Mathematical Society, 2021, dedicated to the memory of Yuriy Trokhymchuk (17.03.1928-18.12.2019), arXiv:2106.13586, pp. 110–111.
16. ———, *Temporal proximity of 1-cycles in cw spaces. Time-varying cell complexes*, Fund. Contemp. Math. Sci **2** (2021), no. 2, 1–20.
17. J.F. Peters, E. İnan, A. Tozzi, and S. Ramanna, *Bold-independent computational entropy assesses functional donut-like structures in brain fmri images*, Frontiers in Human Neuroscience **11** (2017), 1–38, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2017.00038>, DOI:10.3389/fnhum.2017.00038.
18. Ju. M. Smirnov, *On proximity spaces*, Math. Sb. (N.S.) **31** (1952), no. 73, 543–574, English translation: Amer. Math. Soc. Trans. Ser. 2, 38, 1964, 5-35.
19. ———, *On proximity spaces in the sense of V.A. Efremovič*, Math. Sb. (N.S.) **84** (1952), 895–898, English translation: Amer. Math. Soc. Trans. Ser. 2, 38, 1964, 1-4.
20. R.M. Switzer, *Algebraic topology – homology and homotopy*, Springer, Berlin, 2002, xii+526 pp., Zbl 1003.55002.
21. K. Tanaka, *Simple homotopy theory and nerve theorem for categories*, Topology Appl. **291** (2021), 1–23, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.topol.2021.107609>, MR4208071.
22. E. Čech, *Topological spaces*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., London, 1966, fr seminar, Brno, 1936-1939; rev. ed. Z. Frolik, M. Katětov.
23. F. Vigolo, *The geometry and topology of wide ribbons*, Ph.D. thesis, Balliol College, University of Oxford, UK, 2018, 207 pp., supervisor: Cornelia Druțu.
24. S. Willard, *General topology*, Dover Pub., Inc., Mineola, NY, 1970, xii + 369pp, ISBN: 0-486-43479-6 54-02, MR0264581.

COMPUTATIONAL INTELLIGENCE LABORATORY, UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA, WPG, MB, R3T 5V6, CANADA AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, ADIYAMAN UNIVERSITY, 02040 ADIYAMAN, TURKEY,

Email address: james.peters3@umanitoba.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, TRABZON, TURKEY,

Email address: tane.vergili@ktu.edu.tr