

Weak Universality in Random Persistent Homology and Scale-Invariant Functionals

Omer Bobrowski* and Primoz Skraba†

Abstract

In this paper, we prove a universality result for the limiting distribution of persistence diagrams arising from geometric filtrations over random point processes. Specifically, we consider the distribution of the ratio of persistence values (death/birth), and show that for fixed dimension, homological degree and filtration type (Čech or Vietoris-Rips), the limiting distribution is independent of the underlying point process distribution, i.e., universal. In proving this result, we present a novel general framework for proving universality for scale-invariant functionals on point processes. Finally, we also provide a number of new results related to Morse theory in random geometric complexes, which may be of an independent interest.

1 Introduction

Persistent homology has established itself in the last two decades as an important tool both within theoretical mathematics [1, 19, 20, 32] and in the field of topological data analysis (TDA) [9, 11, 14, 17]. In its most prevalent form, persistent homology is an invariant associated with a filtration of topological spaces $\mathcal{F} = \{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. Applying the homology functor, we obtain a *persistence module* – a sequence of homology groups associated to each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ along with homomorphisms $\psi_{s,t} : H_*(X_s) \rightarrow H_*(X_t)$ for all $s \leq t$. Taking homology over a field, the persistent homology module admits a simple decomposition, formalizing the notion of *tracking changes* in homology over the filtration, with new generators appearing (birth) and later becoming trivial (death). The collection of all (birth,death) pairs for classes appearing throughout the filtration, can be considered as a point-set, or a discrete measure, in \mathbb{R}^2 , known as the *persistence diagram*.

In this paper we focus on filtrations of simplicial complexes generated by random point-processes in \mathbb{R}^d (indexed by a radius parameter r). Extensive study over the past two decades has revealed novel phase transitions describing major changes related to persistent homology [3, 5, 27], as well

*o.bobrowski@qmul.ac.uk

†p.skraba@qmul.ac.uk

as various limit theorems [15, 22, 25, 29, 35]. A key property of all previous results, is that the limiting behavior depends on the underlying distribution of the point-process.

Viewing persistence diagrams as Radon measures in \mathbb{R}^2 (the birth-death distribution), it was shown in [15, 22] that for random geometric complexes, these measures have a deterministic limit. The limiting measure, however, depends on the underlying point-process distribution in \mathbb{R}^d . Contrary to this, [7] presented comprehensive experimental evidence leading to a number of surprising conjectures. The main claim is that the distribution of the ratio values $\pi = \text{death/birth}$ is *universal* – independent of the underlying point-process distribution.

In this paper, we prove the first conjecture in [7] – if we fix the dimension of the space d , the homological degree k , and the construction type (i.e., Čech or Vietoris-Rips), the empirical distribution of the π -values, generated by iid point-processes is universal. This conjecture was named “Weak Universality”, since the experiments in [7] suggest a much stronger universal behavior (i.e., beyond iid, independent of dimensions, homological degree, and complex-type). Aside from it being a surprising result in the context of stochastic topology, universality in persistence diagram has immense potential in developing statistical applications in TDA. For example, it can lead to robust topological inference methods [7], new and powerful clustering algorithms [6], dimensionality estimation, measuring system disorder, and more. In particular, it implies that statistical-topological tests can be designed with very little knowledge about the nature of the data.

To prove universality in persistence diagrams, we develop a novel generic framework for a *universal law of large numbers* that applies to scale-invariant point-process functionals. Let $\mathcal{X}_n = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ be a collection of n iid random variables, with a probability density function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We show that under some conditions, for scale-invariant and linearly scaling functionals \mathcal{H} , we have $\frac{1}{n}\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{X}_n) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathcal{H}^*$ where \mathcal{H}^* is a (nonzero) deterministic constant independent of f (i.e., universal). While our main interest is for persistence diagrams, we also demonstrate the broader potential of this framework using the example of the degree distribution in random k-nearest neighbor graphs.

Related work. Since the early days of persistent homology, there has been an ongoing effort to reveal the probabilistic behavior of random persistence diagrams. The seminal result in [22] shows that for stationary point processes, random persistence diagrams have a deterministic limiting measure (in the weak sense). This result was further explored in numerous directions, including the existence of density [15], central limit theorems [25], special limits for the sparse regime [28], extreme value analysis [29], spanning acycles [34], marked point processes [33], generic weight functions [16], and dependencies [24]. In these results, and more generally in stochastic geometry and topology, the limiting distributions and related constants depend on the underlying point-process distribution. Our results show that by projecting the persistence measures from \mathbb{R}^2 to \mathbb{R} , via the (death/birth) transformation, we obtain a random measure whose (non-random) limit is

independent of the underlying distribution, and hence universal.

The first (and to the best of our knowledge, the only) description of universal limits for point-process functionals appeared in [31]. The goal there is to prove weak laws of large numbers for functionals over binomial processes, that can be written as sums of score functions for individual points. The limit provided in [31] has an explicit formula in terms of the density f , and in the case where the functional is scale-invariant, the dependency in f vanishes. The examples presented there are related to the k -th nearest neighbor (k -NN) graph and Voronoi/Delaunay graphs. The functionals considered include the number of components, sub-graph counts, and sums of edge-lengths. While that framework is quite powerful, we are not able to apply it for persistence diagrams due to three main challenges: (a) Persistent-cycles counting is not naturally expressed as a sum of score functions; (b) The coupling used in [31], presents a limitation of the results to the thermodynamic limit, which in our case is essential to bypass; (c) For the most part, a required assumption in [31] is that the density has a compact and convex support, and is lower-bounded away from zero. This poses a strong limitation which we wish to avoid. The framework we develop here is quite different than the coupling method in [31], and provides a “bottom-up” constructive approach. In addition to addressing (a)-(c), our framework allows for functionals that are scale-invariant only in an asymptotic sense, and provides conditions for strong laws of large numbers.

2 Preliminaries

We begin with a brief review some basic definitions required to state the main results.

2.1 Geometric complexes

Our primary concern will be finite point sets $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Commonly, if these points lie on or near some underlying subspace, we can study the topology of subspace by using discrete approximations based on \mathcal{X} . In this paper, we consider two of the most common geometric constructions used in this context (see [17]).

The Čech complex at radius r over \mathcal{X} is an abstract simplicial complex defined as,

$$\mathcal{C}_r(\mathcal{X}) = \left\{ \mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{X} : \bigcap_{x \in \mathcal{I}} B_r(x) \neq \emptyset \right\},$$

where $B_r(x)$ is a closed ball of radius r , centered at x .

The Vietoris-Rips complex at radius r over \mathcal{X} is defined as,

$$\mathcal{R}_r(\mathcal{X}) = \{ \mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{X} : |x_1 - x_2| \leq r, \forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{I} \},$$

where by $|\cdot|$ we refer to the Euclidean norm.

Remark 2.1. *We use the closed edge definition (i.e., $|x_1 - x_2| \leq r$ compared to $|x_1 - x_2| < r$) to be consistent with the Čech complex and its corresponding Morse theory later. This may result in pathologies, even for compact metric spaces. However, for the random point processes we study, these do not occur, as for any fixed r , the probability of having any pair with $|x_1 - x_2| = r$ is zero.*

2.2 Persistent homology

In this paper, we restrict ourselves to homology with field coefficients. In this case, given a filtration of spaces $\mathcal{F} = \{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ (i.e., $X_{t_1} \subset X_{t_2}$ for $t_1 \leq t_2$), the persistent homology $\text{PH}_k(\mathcal{F})$ is a module of vector spaces $\{\text{H}_k(X_t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ along with linear maps $\text{H}_k(X_{t_1}) \rightarrow \text{H}_k(X_{t_2})$ for all $t_1 \leq t_2$ induced by the corresponding inclusion maps. If $\text{H}_k(X_t)$ is finite dimensional for every t , then the module $\text{PH}_k(\mathcal{F})$ admits a simple decomposition into interval summands (i.e., rank-one submodules which are non-trivial over an interval of parameters $[b, d)$, and zero everywhere else, denoted $\mathbb{I}[b, d)$).

Theorem 2.2 ([12], Theorem 1.1). *Any pointwise finite-dimensional persistence module is a direct sum of interval summands, up to an isomorphism. In other words,*

$$(2.1) \quad \text{PH}_k(\mathcal{F}) \cong \bigoplus_i \mathbb{I}[b_i, d_i).$$

where b_i and d_i are the lower and upper bounds of the interval where the i -th summand is non-trivial.

A common way to summarize the information encoded in persistent homology, is to look at the collection of (b_i, d_i) pairs in the decomposition. We note that, as is standard in persistent homology, we only consider pairs with $b_i < d_i$.

Definition 2.3. The *persistence diagram* associated with a filtration \mathcal{F} , is a multiset of points in $\mathbb{R}^* \times \mathbb{R}^*$, where $\mathbb{R}^* := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, defined as

$$\text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{F}) := \left\{ (b_i, d_i), \quad i \in \mathcal{I} : \text{PH}_k(\mathcal{F}) \cong \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{I}[b_i, d_i) \right\}$$

We will restrict our discussion to filtrations generated by the geometric constructions \mathcal{C}_r and \mathcal{R}_r defined above, indexed by the distance parameter r . These are often referred to as *geometric* or *proximity* filtrations. If \mathcal{X} is finite then the homology is finite-dimensional for all values of r , and the persistence diagram is well defined.

A key motivation for using persistent homology in the context of data analysis, is that k -cycles with a long lifetime are assumed to represent important topological features. In this paper,

we focus on the lifetime of cycle in a multiplicative perspective. Let \mathcal{F} be a filtration, and let $p_i = (b_i, d_i) \in \text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{F})$ for some $k > 0$. We define the corresponding ‘ π -value’, as

$$\pi(p_i) := \frac{d_i}{b_i}.$$

The motivation to study the ratio rather the difference $(d_i - b_i)$ to measure cycle-size stems from the facts that: (a) it is a scale-invariant measure, and (b) it is robust to statistical outliers (see more information in [7]). Note that in geometric filtrations all cycles in degree 0 are born at $r = 0$. Therefore, we only consider the k -th homology for $k > 0$.

Remark 2.4. *Throughout this paper, $H_k(\cdot)$ always refers to the reduced homology. As we only consider $k > 0$, this does not change the persistence diagrams or functionals we study, but does simplify the exposition and proofs.*

2.3 Probabilistic settings

Point processes

Our main statements will be proved for two tightly-related point processes. The *binomial process*, denoted $\mathcal{X}_n \sim \text{Binomial}(n; f)$, is generated by taking n iid points with probability density f . The *Poisson process* $\mathcal{P}_n \sim \text{Poisson}(n; f)$ is generated the same way, but the number of points is $N \sim \text{Poisson}(n)$ (i.e., random). To avoid confusion, and also to highlight the fact that the rate of the Poisson process does not need to be an integer, we will use \mathcal{P}_ν instead of \mathcal{P}_n throughout the paper.

Good densities

Our goal is to prove the main results for the largest possible class of distributions. We assume that all such distributions are equipped with a probability density function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We denote the support of f by $U = \text{cl}(f^{-1}(0, \infty))$ (where cl denotes the closure). As the framework requires a number of conditions, our statements for persistent homology will be proved for three types of distributions:

- **Type I:** U is compact, $\inf_U f > 0$.
- **Type II:** U is compact, $\inf_U f = 0$.

Here, we need an additional assumption. Let $U_0 = f^{-1}(0) \cap U$. For every $x \in U$ define $\delta(x) = \inf_{z \in U_0} |x - z|$. We assume that there exist $q, \delta_0, C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that if $\delta(x) \leq \delta_0$ then

$$C_1(\delta(x))^q \leq f(x) \leq C_2(\delta(x))^q.$$

In other words, the growth rate of the density around its zeros is polynomial.

- **Type III:** $U = \mathbb{R}^d$.

Here, we will focus on densities of the following type,

$$f(x) = ce^{-\Psi(x)},$$

where $c > 0$ is a normalization constant, and Ψ decomposes into radial and spherical components,

$$\Psi(x) = \Psi_{\text{rad}}(|x|)\Psi_{\text{sph}}(x/|x|).$$

The spherical component is assumed to be a Lipschitz function $\Psi_{\text{sph}} : S^{d-1} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$. The radial part is assumed to be $\Psi_{\text{rad}} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, with $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\text{rad}}(\tau) = \infty$. We further assume that there exists $R_0 > 0$ such that for all $\tau \geq R_0$, the following holds:

- (III.1) $\Psi_{\text{rad}}(\tau) \geq A_1 \log(\tau)$, for some $A_1 > d$.
- (III.2) $\Psi'_{\text{rad}}(\tau) \geq A_2/\tau$, for some $A_2 > 0$.
- (III.3) $|\Psi_{\text{rad}}(\tau + \varepsilon) - \Psi_{\text{rad}}(\tau)| \leq A_3 \varepsilon \Psi_{\text{rad}}(\tau)$ for any small enough $\varepsilon > 0$.

Note that (III.2) implies that Ψ_{rad} is increasing in τ (for $\tau \geq R_0$). Type III is seemingly restrictive, however, it contains many of the well-known distributions. For example,

- The normal distribution (with any non-singular covariance matrix).
- Any density of the type $f(x) \propto e^{-|x|^\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 0$.
- Any density of the type $f(x) \propto e^{-e^{|x|^\alpha}}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.
- Any density of the type $f(x) = (1 + |x|^\alpha)^{-1}$, for $\alpha > d$.

Remark 2.5. *In some cases, assumption (III.3) may still be too restrictive (for example $f(x) = e^{-e^{|x|^\alpha}}$ with $\alpha \geq 1$). In this case we can replace it with the following weaker assumption.*

(III.3') Let $R = \Psi_{\text{rad}}^{-1}\left(\frac{k+1}{1-d/A_1} \log \nu\right)$. Then there exists $r = r(\nu) \rightarrow 0$ such that $\nu r^d \rightarrow \infty$, and for all $\tau \in [R_0, R]$ we have

$$|\Psi_{\text{rad}}(\tau + r) - \Psi_{\text{rad}}(\tau)| \leq \frac{A_3}{\log \nu} \Psi_{\text{rad}}(\tau).$$

3 Main results

Let \mathcal{X} be a finite subset of \mathbb{R}^d and $\mathcal{K} = \{K_r\}_{r=0}^\infty$ denote either the Čech or Vietoris-Rips filtrations generated by \mathcal{X} with $\text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{K})$ the persistence diagram for the k -th degree homology. We define

the k -th *persistence measure* Π_k as follows. For every Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Pi_k(B) := |\{p \in \text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{K}) : \pi(p) \in B\}|.$$

Note that $\Pi_k((-\infty, 1]) = 0$, so the actual support of the measure is $[1, \infty)$. Since Π_k is a finite measure, we can turn it into a probability measure Ψ_k by defining

$$\Psi_k(B) := \frac{\Pi_k(B)}{\Pi_k(\mathbb{R})}.$$

In the case where \mathcal{X} is random, we can study the expected measure $\bar{\Pi}_k$

$$\bar{\Pi}_k(B) := \mathbb{E} \{\Pi_k(B)\},$$

and the associated probability measure $\bar{\Psi}_k$,

$$\bar{\Psi}_k(B) := \frac{\bar{\Pi}_k(B)}{\bar{\Pi}_k(\mathbb{R})}.$$

The main theorems in this paper refer to the persistence diagrams generated by either the Poisson or the binomial processes, where the number of points (n) goes to infinity. In this context, it is shown in [23] that the so-called *thermodynamic limit* (i.e., $nr^d = \text{const}$) is the dominant range where most k -cycles are born and die. Thus, our statements in this paper are focused on covering this entire range. In other words, we will re-define the persistence measure to be

$$(3.1) \quad \Pi_{k,n}(B) := |\{p \in \text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{K}) : \pi(p) \in B, \text{death}(p) \leq r_{\max}\}|,$$

where $r_{\max} = r_{\max}(n)$ is chosen such that $r_{\max} \rightarrow 0$ (as $n \rightarrow \infty$) and $nr_{\max}^d \rightarrow \infty$, so that we focus our attention on small cycles, but make sure to include all of those cycles generated within the thermodynamic limit. Considering the dichotomy between topological *signal* and *noise* (cf., [7]), we can say that our analysis here applies to the noisy cycles (which make the vast majority of cycles in these settings). The bound on the death time (r_{\max}) will be implicit in the main statements, but will be explicitly used in the proof. Our limiting results are in the sense of the weak convergence of measures [2].

Theorem 3.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a good density function, $\mathcal{P}_\nu \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; f)$, and let $\Pi_{k,\nu}, \Psi_{k,\nu}$ be the corresponding persistence measures. Then,*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \bar{\Pi}_{k,\nu} = \Pi_k^*,$$

where Π_k^* is a finite measure on \mathbb{R} . The measure Π_k^* depends on d and k , as well as the choice

of filtration (Čech or Vietoris-Rips), but is otherwise independent of f . Furthermore, defining the probability measure $\Psi_k^* := \Pi_k^*/\Pi_k^*(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\Psi}_{k,\nu} = \Psi_k^*.$$

For the binomial process, we also obtain a strong law of large numbers.

Theorem 3.2. *Let f be a good density function, $\mathcal{X}_n \sim \text{Binomial}(n; f)$, and let $\Pi_{k,n}, \Psi_{k,n}$ be the corresponding persistence measures. Then almost surely,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \Pi_{k,n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \bar{\Pi}_{k,n} = \Pi_k^*,$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{k,n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\Psi}_{k,n} = \Psi_k^*,$$

where Π_k^*, Ψ_k^* are the same universal measures as in Theorem 3.1.

The remaining sections of this paper are dedicated to proving Theorems 3.1 and 3.2. The key property underlying the universality behavior, is the *scale invariance* of the π -values. By that, we mean that if Π_k is the persistence measure for a set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and Π'_k is the persistence measure for $\mathcal{X}' = c\mathcal{X}$ for some $c > 0$, then $\Pi'_k \equiv \Pi_k$. We therefore begin with short detour, proving universality in the more general setting of scale-invariant functionals.

4 Universal limits for scale-invariant functionals

We first develop a generic framework that can be applied to a wide class of scale-invariant functionals. While we originally developed this framework to address the persistence measure, we observed that the conditions required for universality are not unique to the persistence measure functional. To demonstrate that, in Section 8 we prove universal limits for the vertex degree in the random k -NN graph. We note that while this example, along with other functionals of the k -NN graph and the Voronoi/Delaunay graphs, were studied in [31], the framework provided here covers functionals that are not expressed as score functions, which is crucial in the case of the persistence measure. Additionally, our framework poses fewer restrictions on the density function, and provides a strong law of large numbers.

4.1 Universality statements

Our framework concerns functionals \mathcal{H}_η applied to finite subsets of \mathbb{R}^d , that are optionally controlled by a parameter η (e.g., determining the value $r_{\max}(\eta)$ for the persistence measures). For every such functional, we define $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ as the collection of all probability density functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for

which we want to prove universality. We start by listing the conditions required for our generic universality statements.

Translation invariance. Let \mathcal{X} be a finite subset of \mathbb{R}^d . We say that \mathcal{H}_η is *translation invariant* if for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{H}_\eta(\mathcal{X} + x_0) = \mathcal{H}_\eta(\mathcal{X}),$$

where $\mathcal{X} + x_0 = \{x + x_0 : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

Linear scale. Let $\mathcal{P}_\nu^* \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; \mathbb{1}_{Q^d})$ with $Q^d = [0, 1]^d$, which we name as the *reference model*. Then there exists $\mathcal{H}^* > 0$ such that

$$(4.2) \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_\nu^*) \} = \mathcal{H}^*.$$

Scale invariance Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $\mathcal{P}_\nu^{(\varepsilon)} \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; \varepsilon^{-d} \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon Q^d})$, be a homogeneous Poisson process on εQ^d with rate ν . Then

$$(4.3) \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_\nu^{(\varepsilon)}) \} = \mathcal{H}^*.$$

In other words, changing the scale of the box does not affect the limit. Note, that if \mathcal{H}_ν is strictly scale-invariant (i.e., $\mathcal{H}_\nu(c\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{X})$ for all \mathcal{X}), then (4.3) holds trivially.

Homogeneity. Let $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$, and $\mathcal{P}_\nu \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; f)$. For any constant $c > 1$,

$$(4.4) \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_{c\nu}(\mathcal{P}_\nu) \}}{\mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_\nu) \}} = 1.$$

Additivity. Take any integer $m > 1$, and divide Q^d into $M = m^d$ sub-cubes Q_1, \dots, Q_M of side-length $1/m$. For $i = 1, \dots, M$ let $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} \sim \text{Poisson}(c_i\nu; M \cdot \mathbb{1}_{Q_i})$ be independent homogeneous Poisson processes, for some $c_i \geq 0$ with $\sum_i c_i = 1$. Define $\mathcal{P}_\nu = \bigcup_i \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}$, then

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \left| \mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_\nu) \} - \sum_i \mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}) \} \right| = 0.$$

Continuity. Let $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$, and $\mathcal{P}_\nu \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; f)$. Let f_1, f_2, \dots be a sequence of functions, such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq f_i(x) \leq f_j(x), \quad \forall i < j, \\ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} f_i(x) &= f(x). \end{aligned}$$

Setting

$$\delta_i = 1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_i(x) dx,$$

we further assume that $\tilde{f}_i = f_i/(1 - \delta_i) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} \sim \text{Poisson}((1 - \delta_i)\nu; \tilde{f}_i)$ (i.e., \mathcal{P}_{ν} has intensity function νf_i). Thenm=,

$$(4.6) \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} |\mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_{\nu}(\mathcal{P}_{\nu}) \} - \mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_{\nu}(\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}) \}| = 0.$$

With these six conditions, we can now state the universality result for the Poisson case.

Theorem 4.1 (Poisson). *Suppose that \mathcal{H}_{ν} satisfies the assumptions in (4.1)-(4.6), and let $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\nu} \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; f)$, then*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_{\nu}(\mathcal{P}_{\nu}) \} = \mathcal{H}^*,$$

where \mathcal{H}^* is limit of the reference model, as defined in (4.2).

For the binomial case we will require two additional assumptions.

Polynomial bound. We assume that almost surely,

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) \leq C_3 n^q,$$

for some $C_3, q > 0$.

Bounded difference. We assume there exists an event A_n , such that

$$(4.8) \quad \mathbb{P}(A_n^c) \leq e^{-n^a},$$

for some $a > 0$, and almost surely for all $\Delta < n$,

$$(4.9) \quad |\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_{n \pm \Delta})| \mathbb{1}_{A_n} \leq C_4 \Delta n^b,$$

for some $C_4 > 0$ and $b < 1/4$. With these additional conditions, we can prove a stronger result for the binomial process.

Theorem 4.2 (Binomial). *Suppose that \mathcal{H}_n satisfies the assumptions in (4.1)-(4.9), and let $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$. Let $\mathcal{X}_n \sim \text{Binomial}(n; f)$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) \} = \mathcal{H}^*,$$

where \mathcal{H}^* is the limit of the reference model, defined in (4.2). Furthermore, we have almost surely

that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) = \mathcal{H}^*.$$

4.2 Proofs

We will focus our efforts on proving universality for the Poisson case. The proof for the binomial will follow from that.

Proof for Theorem 4.1. The proof is divided into three main steps: (1) piecewise-constant densities, (2) bounded support densities, and (3) the entire class $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$.

Step 1 – piecewise constant densities:

This step is the key to understand the roots of universality. We consider piecewise constant densities supported on Q^d . Fix $m > 0$, and divide Q^d into $M = m^d$ boxes of side-length $1/m$, denoted Q_1, \dots, Q_M . Let f be of the form

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^M c_i M \mathbb{1}_{Q_i}(x),$$

where $0 \leq c_i$ for all i , and $\sum_i c_i = 1$. Further, suppose that the boxes are ordered so that the first M_+ boxes ($1 \leq M_+ \leq M$) have $c_i > 0$, and the rest have $c_i = 0$.

Let $\mathcal{P}_\nu \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; f)$, and let $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} = \mathcal{P}_\nu \cap Q_i$. If $c_i = 0$, then $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}) = 0$. Otherwise, note that $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} \sim \text{Poisson}(c_i \nu; M \mathbb{1}_{Q_i})$. Therefore, we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_\nu) \} = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}) \} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M_+} c_i \mathcal{H}^* = \mathcal{H}^*,$$

The first equality uses assumption (4.5), and the second equality holds due to assumptions (4.1)-(4.4). This completes the proof for step 1.

In other words, the source of universality in this case is that in each of the small boxes Q_i , we have a uniform distribution, and by scale invariance, the limit will be \mathcal{H}^* as in the reference model (uniform in Q^d). Thus, taking a convex combination of the limits yields \mathcal{H}^* as well.

Step 2 – bounded support densities:

Here, we will prove universality for any density f whose support is contained in Q^d . The idea is to approximate f with a piecewise constant density, and bound the difference. Once proven for Q^d , by the shift and scale invariance, we can conclude that the same holds for any compactly supported distribution.

Let $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ be a density with a bounded support, and without loss of generality, suppose that its support is contained in Q^d . For any $m > 1$, we denote $Q_{m,1}, \dots, Q_{m,M}$ the division of Q^d

into $M = m^d$ sub-cubes of side-length $1/m$. For every $1 \leq i \leq M$, define

$$c_{m,i} = \min_{x \in Q_{m,i}} f(x),$$

and

$$f_m(x) = \sum_{i=1}^M c_{m,i} \mathbb{1}_{Q_{m,i}}(x).$$

Note that the sequence f_1, f_2, \dots , satisfies the conditions of the continuity assumption (4.6). Therefore, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find m large enough, so that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} |\mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_\nu)\} - \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_{\nu,m})\}| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Since $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,m} \sim \text{Poisson}((1 - \delta_m)\nu; \tilde{f}_m)$ has piecewise constant density, we conclude from the previous step and (4.4) that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_{\nu,m})\} = (1 - \delta_m)\mathcal{H}^*.$$

Therefore,

$$(1 - \delta_m)\mathcal{H}^* - \varepsilon \leq \liminf_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_\nu)\} \leq \limsup_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_\nu)\} \leq (1 - \delta_m)\mathcal{H}^* + \varepsilon.$$

As ε and δ_m can be arbitrarily small, this completes the proof for step 2.

Step 3 – unbounded support:

Let $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ be an arbitrary density with a non-compact support. Take a sequence of radii $R_1 < R_2 < R_3 < \dots < \infty$ and define

$$f_i(x) = f(x) \mathbb{1}\{|x| \leq R_i\},$$

then the sequence f_1, f_2, \dots , satisfies the conditions of assumption (4.6). Since f_i has a compact support, we can conclude from the previous step and (4.4) that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i})\} = (1 - \delta_i)\mathcal{H}^*.$$

Similarly to step 2, we can take ε and δ_i small enough, and use (4.6) to complete the proof. \square

Next, we prove universality for the binomial process, including a strong law of large numbers. The proof will rely on a generic martingale-based statement for the law of large numbers that we present in the appendix, Lemma B.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Consider the Poisson process \mathcal{P}_ν , with $\nu = n$, and let $N = |\mathcal{P}_n|$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{P}_n)\} = \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{P}_n) ; |N - n| > n^{3/4}/2\} + \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{P}_n) ; |N - n| \leq n^{3/4}/2\}.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\Delta_1(n) := \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{P}_n) ; |N - n| > n^{3/4}/2\} \leq \left(\mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n^2(\mathcal{P}_n)\} \mathbb{P}(|N - n| > n^{3/4}/2) \right)^{1/2}.$$

Using the concentration of the Poisson distribution (e.g., in [30]) and (4.7), we have

$$(4.10) \quad \Delta_1(n) \leq \sqrt{2}n^q e^{-n^{1/2}/18} = o(n).$$

Next, define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2(n) &:= \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{P}_n) - \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) ; |N - n| \leq n^{3/4}/2\} \\ &= \sum_{m=n_1}^{n_2} (\mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_m)\} - \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)\}) \mathbb{P}(N = m), \end{aligned}$$

where $n_1 = \lceil n - n^{3/4}/2 \rceil$, $n_2 = \lfloor n + n^{3/4}/2 \rfloor$. Recall the definition of the event A_n in (4.8)-(4.9). Then for all $n_1 \leq m \leq n_2$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_m)\} - \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)\}| &\leq \mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_m) - \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)| \mathbb{1}_{A_n}\} + \mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_m) - \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)| \mathbb{1}_{A_n^c}\} \\ &\leq C_4 |n - m| n^b + n_2^q e^{-n^a}, \\ &\leq C_4 n^{3/4+b} + n_2^q e^{-n^a}, \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $b < 1/4$, we have $\Delta_2(n) = o(n)$. Combined with (4.10), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)\} \mathbb{P}(|N - n| \leq n^{3/4}/2) + \Delta_2(n) \leq \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{P}_n)\} \leq \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)\} + \Delta_1(n) + \Delta_2(n).$$

Dividing by n and taking the limit we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)\} = \mathcal{H}^*.$$

In addition, (4.7)-(4.9) imply that Lemma B.1 holds, and therefore for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)\}| \geq \varepsilon n) \leq e^{-n^\gamma}.$$

Since the right hand side is summable, using the Borel-Cantelli Lemma, we conclude that almost

surely,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) \} \} = 0,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

5 Critical faces

With the general framework in hand, our goal is to analyze the ensemble of k -cycles formed in the *entire* thermodynamic limit ($nr^d = \lambda$ for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$). In order to bound the tail distribution in the thermodynamic limit, we will use the notion of *critical faces*. Consider either the Čech filtration ($\{\mathcal{C}_r\}_{r=0}^\infty$) or the Vietoris-Rips filtration ($\{\mathcal{R}_r\}_{r=0}^\infty$). As we increase the parameter r , new simplices enter the filtration, potentially changing the homology of the complex. We refer to the simplices that facilitate these changes in homology as *critical faces*.

For the Čech complex, the Nerve Lemma [8] implies that $\mathcal{C}_r(\mathcal{X})$ is homotopy equivalent $B_r(\mathcal{X}) = \cup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} B_r(x)$, and the latter is the sub-level set of the distance function to \mathcal{X} . Using Morse theory for the distance function [4], we can define a unique k -dimensional critical face for every new k -cycle generated, and a unique $(k + 1)$ -dimensional critical face for every k -cycle terminated (becoming trivial). Furthermore, precise geometric conditions for k -faces to be critical are provided. The main reason we can do so is that the random distance function is a min-type function [21] which behaves like a Morse function. This implies that at every radius r there can be at most a single change in the homology.

To identify the critical faces, let $\mathcal{X}^{(k)}$ denote the set of all k -simplices in \mathcal{X} (i.e., all subsets of size $k + 1$), and let $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{X}^{(k)}$. Assuming general position, the points in \mathcal{Y} can be placed on a unique $(k - 1)$ -sphere, whose center and radius we denote by $c(\mathcal{Y})$ and $\rho(\mathcal{Y})$. Denote by $B(\mathcal{Y})$ the open d -dimensional ball centered at $c(\mathcal{Y})$ with radius $\rho(\mathcal{Y})$, and by $\sigma(\mathcal{Y})$ the open k -simplex spanned by \mathcal{Y} (i.e., the convex hull of \mathcal{Y}). The k -face \mathcal{Y} is then critical if only if: (a) $c(\mathcal{Y}) \in \sigma(\mathcal{Y})$, and (b) $B(\mathcal{Y}) \cap \mathcal{X} = \emptyset$. Thus, defining $\tilde{F}_k(r)$ as the number of critical k -faces entering the filtration in the interval $[0, r]$, we have

$$(5.1) \quad \tilde{F}_k(r) = \sum_{\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{X}^{(k)}} h(\mathcal{Y}) \mathbb{1} \{ B(\mathcal{Y}) \cap \mathcal{X} = \emptyset \} \mathbb{1} \{ \rho(\mathcal{Y}) \leq r \},$$

where $h(\mathcal{Y}) := \mathbb{1} \{ c(\mathcal{Y}) \in \sigma(\mathcal{Y}) \}$.

For the Vietoris-Rips complex, the situation is more complicated. When a new edge enters the complex at radius r , multiple changes can occur in homology simultaneously, across different homological degrees. Furthermore, apart from the edge, it is impossible to uniquely assign a single simplex to any of the changes. Fortunately, we do not need to actually identify the critical faces, but merely to count them (or more precisely, the changes in homology). Suppose that $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$,

and $|x_1 - x_2| = \rho$. Define $\text{lk}((x_1, x_2); \mathcal{X})$ to be the link of the edge (x_1, x_2) , in the complex generated by \mathcal{X} , at radius ρ (see definition in Section 6). Lemma 6.1 states that the number of critical k -faces that are added at ρ is equal to $\beta_{k-2}(\text{lk}((x_1, x_2); \mathcal{X}))$ for $k \geq 2$, where β_k is the *reduced Betti number*. Therefore, for the Vietoris-Rips complex ($k \geq 2$) we have,

$$(5.2) \quad \tilde{F}_k(r) = \sum_{\{x_1, x_2\} \in \mathcal{X}^{(1)}} \beta_{k-2}(\text{lk}((x_1, x_2); \mathcal{X})) \mathbf{1}_{\{|x_1 - x_2| \leq r\}}.$$

In the random setting, we will use $\tilde{F}_k(r)$ for the case when $\nu r^d = \lambda$ (for Poisson, or $nr^d = \lambda$ for binomial). Furthermore, we will sometime study ranges of values $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$. Thus, from here onwards we will use

$$\begin{aligned} F_k(\lambda) &:= \tilde{F}_k((\lambda/\nu)^{1/d}), \\ F_k(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &:= F_k(\lambda_2) - F_k(\lambda_1). \end{aligned}$$

In both the Čech and Vietoris-Rips complex, we can write

$$F_k(\lambda) = F_k^+(\lambda) + F_k^-(\lambda),$$

where $F_k^+(\lambda)$ counts critical k -faces that generate new k -cycles (*positive faces*), and $F_k^-(\lambda)$ counts critical k -faces that terminate existing $(k-1)$ -cycles (*negative faces*).

A word on notation: Some of the limits we prove in the following are *universal*, in which case we use a star (*), to denote that the limit is the same as the reference model (also denoted with *), independently of the underlying distribution. Other limits, which are distribution-specific, will be denoted by a diamond (\diamond).

Proposition 5.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded density function, and let $\mathcal{P}_\nu \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; f)$. Let $F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)$ be the number of critical k -faces for either the Čech or the Vietoris-Rips filtration, generated by \mathcal{P}_ν . Then,*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f),$$

where $F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f) > 0$ is given in (7.11) for the Čech, and (7.16) for the Vietoris-Rips. Furthermore, in both cases we have

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f) = F_k^*,$$

where $F_k^* > 0$ is given in (7.12) for the Čech, and (7.17) for the Vietoris-Rips. Most notably, F_k^* is independent of f (but does depend on d, k and the filtration type).

The result of Proposition 5.1 holds more generally for Poisson processes with intensity νf , even when f is not a probability measure. This will be useful later.

Corollary 5.2. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded and integrable function. Define $c = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)dx$, and $\tilde{f} = f/c$. Take $\mathcal{P}_\nu \sim \text{Poisson}(c\nu; \tilde{f})$, then*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f),$$

and

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f) = cF_k^*,$$

where $F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f)$ and F_k^* are the same as in Proposition 5.1.

The following statements aim to cover the critical faces in the *entire* thermodynamic limit (as opposed to a fixed λ). The proofs require the notion of ‘good’ density functions f – see Section 2.3 for the definition of this class of functions.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a good density function. There exists $\Lambda_{\max} = \Lambda_{\max}(\nu) \rightarrow \infty$, so that*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda_{\max})\} = F_k^* = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f).$$

In other words, for good densities, we can choose a radius beyond the thermodynamic limit that guarantees we count all critical faces within the thermodynamic limit, while the number of critical faces at larger radii is negligible. Note that (a) the limit of $\mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda_{\max})\}$ in this case is *universal*, and (b) the same limit holds for $F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda)$ for any $\Lambda \leq \Lambda_{\max}$ that satisfies $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$.

In the special case where the support of the density f is compact and convex, a stronger statement can be made, and will be useful later.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a density with a compact and convex support U , such that $\inf_U f > 0$. Then,*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\infty)\} = F_k^* = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f).$$

6 Topological lemmas

In this section, we provide two deterministic topological statements that will play a key role in the probabilistic proofs for Theorems 3.1 and 3.2. The first is about the critical faces in the Vietoris-Rips complex, and the second is a bound on the potential changes to persistence diagrams.

6.1 Critical faces for the Vietoris-Rips filtration

Unlike for the Čech filtration, for the Vietoris-Rips filtration we are unable to appeal to Morse theory to define critical simplices. Note that the Vietoris-Rips complex is a special type of a *clique* or *flag* complex. For these complexes, critical edges are well-defined. However, as higher

dimensional simplices may enter at the same time, the notion of critical faces is difficult to define. Nevertheless, in this section we quantify the changes in the homology, analogously to the changes induced by critical points in Morse theory. Note that in this section, we do not make use of any metric properties of the Vietoris-Rips complex and thus our statements are phrased in terms of general clique complexes. We begin with some basic constructions.

Let K be an abstract simplicial complex. The (closed) star of a simplex $\sigma \in K$ is defined as

$$\text{st}_K(\sigma) = \text{cl}(\{\tau \in K : \sigma \preceq \tau\}),$$

i.e., the smallest simplicial complex made by all simplices that contain σ . The *link* of a simplex σ is defined as

$$\text{lk}_K(\sigma) = \{\tau \in \text{st}_K(\sigma) : \sigma \cap \tau = \emptyset\}.$$

Let G be a graph, and define $K = K(G)$ as the clique complex generated by G (i.e., the maximal simplicial complex whose 1-dimensional skeleton is G). Take an edge $e \notin G$, and set $K' := K(G \cup \{e\})$. Since $K' = K \cup \text{st}_{K'}(e)$, we can relate the homology groups of K , K' , and $K \cap \text{st}_{K'}(e)$ via the reduced Mayer-Vietoris long exact sequence. Using the fact that $K \cap \text{st}_{K'}(e)$ is contractible and has trivial homology, we obtain

$$(6.1) \quad \cdots \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_{k+1}(K') \xrightarrow{\delta_{k+1}} \mathbb{H}_k(K \cap \text{st}_{K'}(e)) \xrightarrow{i_k} \mathbb{H}_k(K) \xrightarrow{q_k} \mathbb{H}_k(K') \rightarrow \cdots$$

Denoting,

$$\begin{aligned} F_k^+(e) &= \text{rk}(\ker i_{k-1}), \\ F_k^-(e) &= \text{rk}(\text{im } i_{k-1}), \end{aligned}$$

the next lemma shows that for clique complexes, $F_k^+(e)$ represents the positive changes (new k -cycles generated) that occur when e is added, and F_k^- represents the negative changes (existing $(k-1)$ -cycles terminated). The total number of critical k -faces is then $F_k(e) := F_k^+(e) + F_k^-(e)$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let G be a graph and $e \notin G$. Let $K = K(G)$ and $K' = K(G \cup \{e\})$ be the corresponding clique complexes. Then,*

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta_k(K') &= \beta_k(K) + F_k^+(e) - F_{k+1}^-(e), \quad k > 0 \\ \beta_0(K') &= \beta_0(K) - F_1^-(e), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} F_k(e) &:= F_k^+(e) + F_k^-(e) = \beta_{k-2}(\text{lk}_{K'}(e)), \quad k > 1 \\ F_1(e) &:= F_1^+(e) + F_1^-(e) = \mathbb{1} \{\text{lk}_{K'}(e) = \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.2. We note that the proof below covers a stronger statement than (6.2). Rather than the changes in the reduced Betti numbers, we can characterize the actual changes in the homology groups. That is, considering the map $q_k : \mathbb{H}_k(K) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_k(K')$ (induced by inclusion), then our proof shows that $\text{rk}(\text{coker } q_k) = F_k^+(e)$ and $\text{rk}(\text{ker } q_k) = F_{k+1}^-(e)$.

Proof. From (6.1), by exactness we have that

$$(6.4) \quad \text{rk}(\mathbb{H}_k(K')) = \text{rk}(\text{ker } i_{k-1}) + \text{rk}(\text{coker } i_k).$$

Furthermore,

$$\text{rk}(\text{coker } i_k) = \text{rk}(\mathbb{H}_k(K)) - \text{rk}(\text{im } i_k) = \beta_k(K) - F_{k+1}^-(e).$$

For $k > 0$, substituting this into (6.4) yields (6.2). For $k = 0$, we note that $F_0^+(e) = 0$ ($\text{ker } i_{-1} = 0$).

It remains to prove (6.3). By the rank-nullity theorem,

$$\text{rk}(\mathbb{H}_{k-1}(K \cap \text{st}_{K'}(e))) = \text{rk}(\text{ker } i_{k-1}) + \text{rk}(\text{im } i_{k-1}) = F_k^+(e) + F_k^-(e).$$

Thus, we need to show that $\mathbb{H}_{k-1}(K \cap \text{st}_{K'}(e)) \cong \mathbb{H}_{k-2}(\text{lk}_{K'}(e))$. Let $e = (u, v)$ and take a cover of $X := K \cap \text{st}_{K'}(e)$ by $\mathcal{U} := \text{st}_K(u) \cap X$ and $\mathcal{V} := \text{st}_K(v) \cap X$. That \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} cover X follows immediately, since any simplex in $\text{st}_{K'}(e) \cap X$ must be in either $\text{st}_K(u)$, $\text{st}_K(v)$, or both. Also note that, by definition, we have $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \text{lk}_{K'}(e)$. To complete the proof, we apply the reduced Mayer-Vietoris sequence again, obtaining

$$\cdots \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_k(\text{lk}_{K'}(e)) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_k(\mathcal{U}) \oplus \mathbb{H}_k(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_k(K \cap \text{st}_{K'}(e)) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_{k-1}(\text{lk}_{K'}(e)) \rightarrow \cdots$$

Since both $\text{st}_K(u) \cap X$ and $\text{st}_K(v) \cap X$ are contractible (as stars of vertices), it follows by exactness that

$$\mathbb{H}_k(K \cap \text{st}_{K'}(e)) \cong \mathbb{H}_{k-1}(\text{lk}_{K'}(e)),$$

completing the proof for first part of (6.3).

For the second part of (6.3) ($k = 1$), if $\text{lk}_{K'}(e) \neq \emptyset$ then $K \cap \text{st}_{K'}(e)$ is connected, implying that both $\text{im } i_0$ and $\text{ker } i_0$ are trivial, and $F_1^+(e) = F_1^-(e) = 0$, so the equation holds trivially. On the other hand, if $\text{lk}_{K'}(e) = \emptyset$, then u and v are not connected in $K \cap \text{st}_{K'}(e)$ and so $F_1^+ + F_1^- = \text{rk}(\text{ker } i_0) + \text{rk}(\text{im } i_0) = 1$.

□

6.2 Stability

The proofs in Section 7 focus on subsets of the persistence diagram where $\pi(p) \geq \alpha$, for some fixed α . We call the corresponding cycles “ α -persistent,” and denote their count by $\Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F})$. A key argument in proving Theorem 3.1 is the following result, showing that $\Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F})$ is stable with respect to adding a single simplex to the filtration. Abusing notation, we write $\mathcal{F} \cup \sigma$, to denote adding σ at some point along the filtration (in a consistent way).

Lemma 6.3. *Let \mathcal{F} be a filtration and $\sigma \notin \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathcal{F} \cup \sigma$ is a valid filtration. Let $\Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F})$ be the number of α -persistent k -cycles in $\text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{F})$. For any $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$, if $\dim(\sigma) = k, k + 1$, then*

$$\Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F}) - 1 \leq \Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F} \cup \sigma) \leq \Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F}) + 1.$$

Otherwise, if $\dim(\sigma) \neq k, k + 1$ then

$$\Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F} \cup \sigma) = \Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F}).$$

Remark 6.4. *The proof of Lemma 6.3 below shows that if $\dim(\sigma) = k$ then the difference in $\Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F})$ comes from a single k -cycle, generated by σ , and hence has an infinite death time. Thus, when we later consider cycles with a bounded death time (r_{\max}), the only difference in $\Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F})$ stems from the case $\dim(\sigma) = k + 1$.*

We begin with some notation. Let $\mathcal{F}' := \mathcal{F} \cup \sigma$, and let $\text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{F})$ and $\text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{F}')$ denote the respective persistence diagrams and $i : \mathcal{F} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}'$ denote the natural inclusion map. Let $w(\sigma)$ be the filtration value function (i.e., the time at which σ joins the complex).

Recall that the persistence diagram is a representation of the algebraic structure of the corresponding persistence module, namely each point in the diagram corresponds to a rank-one summand in the decomposition (2.1). We use γ to denote the persistent homology class corresponding to a single point in $\text{dgm}(\mathcal{F})$. In this section, we assume that the filtration has been extended to a total order (i.e., that the filtrations values w are unique). In cases where multiple simplices enter the filtration at the same time, the ties are broken in an arbitrary but consistent way (i.e., respecting the conditions for simplicial complexes).

Note that inserting a k -simplex into a simplicial complex either creates a new class in the k -th homology, in which case the simplex is referred to as a *positive*, or it bounds an existing class in the $(k - 1)$ -th homology, and is referred to as *negative* (c.f., [13]). We define the function $\phi_{\mathcal{F}}(\gamma)$ as a matching between a class γ and the negative simplex in \mathcal{F} that kills it. This matching is well-defined due to the assumption on the total order.

Definition 6.5. Let \mathcal{F} be a filtration, $\sigma \notin \mathcal{F}$, and $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F} \cup \sigma$. The *cascade* of σ , denoted $\text{Csc}_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)$, is the set of points in the persistence diagram, whose values change when σ is added to \mathcal{F} , and is defined as,

$$\text{Csc}_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = \{(b_j, d_j) \in \text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{F}) : \phi_{\mathcal{F}}(\gamma_j) \neq \phi_{\mathcal{F}'}(i_*(\gamma_j))\}$$

where i_* is map on homology induced by the inclusion $i : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$.

The key technical lemma in this section is regarding the structure of a cascade.

Lemma 6.6. *Suppose that $\text{Csc}_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = \{(b_1, d_1), \dots, (b_m, d_m)\}$ where $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_m$, and denote the corresponding classes by $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$. If σ is a negative simplex in \mathcal{F}' , then*

- (A) $w(\sigma) \leq d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_m$,
- (B) $\phi_{\mathcal{F}'}(i_*(\gamma_1)) = \sigma$,
- (C) $\phi_{\mathcal{F}'}(i_*(\gamma_j)) = \phi_{\mathcal{F}}(\gamma_{j-1})$ for $j > 1$.

Note that from (A) we can conclude that $(b_1, d_1) \subset (b_2, d_2) \subset \dots \subset (b_m, d_m)$, justifying the name ‘cascade’. We postpone proving this lemma to later, but we use it next to prove the main result.

Proof of Lemma 6.3. First, note that if $\dim(\sigma) \neq k, k+1$, then σ has no effect on H_k . Next, suppose that $\dim(\sigma) = k$. In this case there are two possible cases which can affect Π_k :

- σ is a positive simplex in \mathcal{F}' ,
- σ is a negative simplex in \mathcal{F}' , and there is another k -simplex $\sigma' \in \mathcal{F}$ that is negative in \mathcal{F} and positive in \mathcal{F}' (i.e., $w(\sigma) < w(\sigma')$ with σ killing the $(k-1)$ -cycle that σ' used to)¹.

In both cases, a new k -th homology class is generated whose cycle representative includes σ . This new class must be infinite in \mathcal{F}' , since by assumption σ has no cofaces in \mathcal{F}' . Hence, we can deduce that $\text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{F}') = \text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{F}) \cup \{(w(\sigma), \infty)\}$. That is, we add one point to the diagram with birth at $w(\sigma)$ and infinite death time. Hence, $\Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F}') = \Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F}) + 1$ for all α .

The last case is when σ is a negative $(k+1)$ -simplex in \mathcal{F}' . Here, by definition, all the points in the diagram which contribute to $\Delta\Pi_k(\alpha) := |\Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F}) - \Pi_k(\alpha; \mathcal{F}')|$ are in $\text{Csc}_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)$. Indexing the points as in Lemma 6.6, we first observe that since the b_j 's are decreasing and the d_j 's are increasing ((A) in Lemma 6.6), the ratio d_j/b_j is increasing in j . Denoting $w(\phi_{\mathcal{F}'}(i_*(\gamma_j)))$ by d'_j , we observe that for $j > 1$, $d'_j = d_{j-1} \leq d_j$ and for $j = 1$, $d'_1 = w(\sigma) \leq d_1$ ((B) and (C) in Lemma 6.6). This implies that for all j , we have $d_j/b_j \geq d'_j/b_j$.

¹More precisely, this occurs when the chains $\partial\sigma'$ and $\partial\sigma$ are homologous, and when σ enters both become a boundary. Thus, the insertion of σ' forms a new cycle in \mathcal{F}' .

Let j_0 be the first point in $\text{Csc}_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)$ such that $d_{j_0}/b_{j_0} \geq \alpha$. We argue that for all $j \neq j_0$, the point $(b_j, d_j) \in \text{Csc}_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)$ does not contribute to $\Delta\Pi_k(\alpha)$. If $j < j_0$, then $d'_j/b_j \leq d_j/b_j < \alpha$, and therefore the j -th point does not contribute to $\Delta\Pi_k(\alpha)$. If $j > j_0$, then $d'_j = d_{j-1} \geq d_{j_0}$, and $b_j \leq b_{j_0}$. Therefore, $d_j/b_j \geq d'_j/b_j \geq d_{j_0}/b_{j_0} \geq \alpha$, so here as well the j -th point does not contribute to $\Delta\Pi_k(\alpha)$.

To summarize, out of all the points in $\text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{F})$ that change as a result of adding σ , only a single point $(b_{j_0}, d_{j_0}) \in \text{Csc}_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)$ might contribute to $\Delta\Pi_k(\alpha)$, concluding the proof. \square

We conclude this section by proving Lemma 6.6. The proof relies on the following result from [26], describing the possible changes in persistence diagrams in response to changing the order of the simplices in the filtration. As before, we assume a total ordering on the simplices in the filtration. Somewhat surprisingly, swapping the order of two consecutive simplexes, can affect at most two points in the persistence diagram (see the Switch Lemma in [26]). The types of possible changes are listed in the next theorem. To describe these changes, a useful view for points in a persistence diagram is as pairings between positive and negative simplices (along with their filtration values), which we refer to as the *birth-death pairings*. Suppose that $(b_1, d_1), (b_2, d_2) \in \text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{F})$. We say that the corresponding pairings are *nested* if $(b_1, d_1) \subset (b_2, d_2)$ (as intervals in \mathbb{R}), and similarly we say the pairings are *disjoint* if $(b_1, d_1) \cap (b_2, d_2) = \emptyset$.

Theorem 6.7 (Pairing Change Theorem, [26]). *After switching the order of two consecutive simplices, the birth-death pairings may change only if the dimension of the swapped simplices is the same. The possible changes are:*

- (1) *Two nested pairings swap their birth-simplices to remain nested.*
- (2) *Two nested pairings swap their death-simplices to remain nested.*
- (3) *Two disjoint pairings swap a birth-simplex with a death-simplex to remain disjoint.*

We illustrate the possible changes in Figure 1. In case (1), two positive simplices are swapped (affecting the birth times). In case (2), two negative simplices are swapped (affecting death times). Finally, in case (3), a positive and negative simplex are swapped. We note that although the changes in the birth-death pairings is effectively the same in cases (1) and (2) (i.e., we swap the matching of the birth and death simplices), the difference is in which of the values changes: in case (1), the birth time changes value, while in cases (2), the death time changes value.

Proof of Lemma 6.6. We prove the characterization inductively. We first construct a filtration \mathcal{F}_0 , where σ is appended to the end of the filtration \mathcal{F} . We then construct a sequence of filtrations, \mathcal{F}_ℓ such that at each step, σ is swapped with an earlier simplex towards its final position in \mathcal{F}' . We




Figure 1: The three possible cases of pairing switches. We depict the two affected pairings, before and after the switch, where the height of the bottom points represent birth, and the height of the top ones represent death. The arrow indicates which simplex is moving backwards in the filtration and how the pairing changes. Note that moving simplices forward is simply the reverse of one of the four cases above.

use Theorem 6.7, to show that the cascade satisfies the properties (A)-(C) stated in Lemma 6.6 at each \mathcal{F}_ℓ and refer to the intermediate filtration functions as w_ℓ .

If σ appended to the end of \mathcal{F} is positive, the cascade is empty and so the properties holds vacuously. By assumption, σ at its final location in the filtration is negative, so there must be a step $\ell_0 \geq 0$ where σ becomes negative. This is case (3) in Theorem 6.7, where a positive and negative simplices switch. Hence, the cascade consists of a single point, whose death time corresponds to the simplex which was swapped with σ . As there is only one point in the cascade, (A) and (C) hold vacuously. As the death time of the point is given by the current filtration value of σ , (B) holds as well.

For steps $\ell > \ell_0$, we continue to move σ backwards in the filtration. At each step, if no pairing switch occurs, then the cascade remains unchanged and so the (A)-(C) still hold. As cases (1a) and (1b) in Theorem 6.7 are for swapping positive simplices, these changes cannot occur here. Likewise, case (3) cannot occur as σ would need to be positive before the swap.

It remains to check the effect of case (2). Suppose that $(b_1, d_1), (b_2, d_2) \in \text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{F}_{\ell-1})$ are the points affected by the swap, so that $w_{\ell-1}(\sigma) = d_2$ and $w_\ell(\sigma) = d'_1 \leq d_1$. Since the pairings are nested before and after the swap, we have $b_2 \leq b_1 \leq d_1 \leq d_2$, and $b_2 \leq b_1 \leq d'_1 \leq d_1$. By the induction assumption, (A) holds before the swap, so ordering by decreasing values of b_j , we have $d_2 \leq d_j$ for $j > 2$. After the swap, $b_1 \geq b_2$, and $w_\ell(\sigma) = d'_1 \leq d_1$ and $d_1 \leq d_3 \leq \dots$ (recall that d_2 was changed into d'_1). Reindexing by decreasing b_j , we obtain (A) again.

Let γ_1 and γ_2 denote the respective classes in $\text{PH}_k(\mathcal{F}_{\ell-1})$. Note that we can identify γ_1 with b_1 and γ_2 with b_2 . Hence, after the swap, as the new point in the diagram is (b_1, d'_1) , we conclude

that σ is matched with γ_1 , which is precisely (B). As these are the only changes, at each step the properties hold, completing the proof. \square

7 Proofs

In this section we provide the details needed for the proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2. We first introduce some useful notation. We use the following asymptotic notation:

- $a_n \sim b_n$ if $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$.
- $a_n \approx b_n$ if $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 1$.
- $a_n \ll b_n$ if $a_n = o(b_n)$.

Additionally, for $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and a Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote $f(A) := \int_A f(x)dx$. We also denote $B_r(A) := \cup_{x \in A} B_r(x)$. Finally, we use ‘ C ’ to represent constants where the actual value plays no role in the result, and needs no tracking. Thus, the actual value of C may change, even within the same equation.

The largest death time. Recall that $r_{\max} = r_{\max}(n)$ (and correspondingly $\Lambda_{\max} = nr_{\max}^d$) is bounding the death times that we allow. While none of the results explicitly depend on the value of r_{\max} , the proof techniques impose different conditions in different settings. For Theorem 3.1, if f is Type I or II, we can take $\Lambda_{\max} = n^{\frac{1}{dk+2}}$, while for Type III it is sufficient that $r_{\max} = O(1/\log n)$ (or $\Lambda_{\max} = O(n/(\log n)^d)$). For the law of large numbers in Theorem 3.2, we can take $\Lambda_{\max} = n^{\frac{1}{4(k+2)}}$. In all these cases, the important part is that $r_{\max} \rightarrow 0$ while $\Lambda_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$, so that we account for all cycles within the thermodynamic limit.

7.1 Persistent cycles – Poisson

Our goal in this section is to prove Theorem 3.1 using Theorem 4.1. In this case, we fix α , and take $\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_\nu) = \Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha)$. Note that the parameter ν controls both the rate of the Poisson process (\mathcal{P}_ν) and the threshold death value ($r_{\max} = r_{\max}(\nu)$). We start by analyzing the reference model, and then move on to the general case. We note that while the analysis of critical faces is different between the Čech and Vietoris-Rips complexes (see Sections 5 and 7.3), the proofs in this section are the same for both filtrations.

The reference model

Recall that our reference model is $\mathcal{P}_\nu = \mathcal{P}_\nu^* \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; \mathbb{1}_{Q^d})$. We start with the following lemma, proving the limit for $\bar{\Pi}_{k,\nu}(\mathbb{R})$ (expected number of *all* points in the persistence diagram with death $\leq r_{\max}$), and thus the finiteness of the limiting measure.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a density with a compact and convex support U , such that $\inf_U f > 0$. Let $\mathcal{P}_\nu \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; f)$. Then,*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \bar{\Pi}_{k,\nu}(\mathbb{R}) = \Pi_k^*(\mathbb{R}) := \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} F_j^*,$$

where F_j^* are the limits defined in Proposition 5.1, and $F_0^* = 1$. Note that since F_j^* are independent of f , so is $\Pi_k^*(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. Consider either the Čech or the Vietoris-Rips filtration. Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite set, and let F_k be the total number of critical k -faces in the corresponding filtration (i.e., without any restriction on the radius). We can decompose F_k into $F_k^+ + F_k^-$, standing for the positive and negative faces. For every $k \geq 1$ we have $\Pi_k(\mathbb{R}) = F_k^+ = F_{k+1}^-$ (since every cycle born is eventually killed²). Finally, the total number of components generated is $|\mathcal{X}|$, and all but one of them die. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^- &= F_0 := |\mathcal{X}| - 1, \\ F_2^- &= F_1^+ = F_1 - F_0, \\ F_3^- &= F_2^+ = F_2 - F_1 + F_0, \end{aligned}$$

and by induction, we have

$$(7.1) \quad \Pi_k(\mathbb{R}) = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} F_j.$$

Switching to the (random) reference model, recall that $\Pi_{k,\nu}$ counts cycles with death bounded by r_{\max} . Define $\tilde{\Pi}_{k,\nu}$ the total count without the r_{\max} restriction. Then by bounding the negative faces,

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{k,\nu}(\mathbb{R}) - \Pi_{k,\nu}(\mathbb{R}) \leq F_{k+1,\nu}(\Lambda_{\max}, \infty),$$

and using Lemma 5.4 we have,

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \Pi_{k,\nu}(\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \tilde{\Pi}_{k,\nu}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Finally, applying (7.1) to $\tilde{\Pi}_{k,\nu}(\mathbb{R})$, noting that for \mathcal{P}_ν we have $\mathbb{E}\{F_{0,\nu}(\infty)\} = \nu - 1$, and using Lemma 5.4, completes the proof. \square

Next, we show that the limits for α -persistent k -cycles in the reference model exist.

²Importantly, this holds in this case only because we do not threshold the death-times with r_{\max} .

Lemma 7.2. Fix $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ and let $\Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha) := \Pi_{k,\nu}^*([\alpha, \infty))$ be the number of α -persistent k -cycles generated by $\mathcal{P}_\nu^* \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; \mathbb{1}_{Q^d})$. Then

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha)\} = \Pi_k^*(\alpha),$$

for some $\Pi_k^*(\alpha) > 0$.

Remark 7.3. Note that the case $\alpha = 1$ was covered in Lemma 7.1 (where the limit is $\Pi_k^*(\mathbb{R})$). Ideally (and supported by experiments), we should have $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \Pi_k^*(\alpha) = \Pi_k^*(\mathbb{R})$. However, the proof for this claim remains as future work.

Proof. Fix any $\alpha > 1$. We will decompose $\Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha)$ into different radii ranges. Let $I \subset [0, \infty)$, and define $\Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha; I)$ as the number of points in $\text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{P}_\nu^*)$ with $\pi(p) \geq \alpha$, and with death(p) = ρ such that $\nu\rho^d \in I$. For any $\lambda > 0$, we can write

$$(7.2) \quad \Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha) = \Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha; (0, 1/\lambda]) + \Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha; (1/\lambda, \lambda]) + \Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha; (\lambda, \Lambda_{\max})).$$

To bound the first and last term, it is sufficient to bound the number of negative critical $(k+1)$ -faces appearing in the corresponding range. We will do so using Proposition 5.1. Whenever it is clear what f is (e.g., $f = \mathbb{1}_Q$ in this case), we will use $F_k^\diamond(\lambda) := F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f)$. For the first term, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha; (0, 1/\lambda])\} \leq \mathbb{E}\{F_{k+1,\nu}^\diamond(1/\lambda)\} \approx \nu F_{k+1}^\diamond(1/\lambda).$$

Since $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} F_{k+1}^\diamond(1/\lambda) = 0$, for large enough λ we have $F_{k+1}^\diamond(1/\lambda) \leq \varepsilon/3$. For the last term in (7.2), we use Lemma 5.3

$$\mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha; (\lambda, \Lambda_{\max}))\} \leq \mathbb{E}\{F_{k+1,\nu}^*(\lambda, \Lambda_{\max})\} \approx \nu(F_{k+1}^* - F_{k+1}^\diamond(\lambda)).$$

By the definition of F_{k+1}^* (Proposition 5.1), for large enough λ we have $(F_{k+1}^* - F_{k+1}^\diamond(\lambda)) \leq \varepsilon/3$.

Finally, from [22, Theorem 1.5], we know that for \mathcal{P}_ν^* , and for any fixed λ , we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha; (1/\lambda, \lambda])\} = \mathcal{L}(\alpha; \lambda),$$

for some $\mathcal{L}(\alpha; \lambda) > 0$. Note that $\mathcal{L}(\alpha; \lambda)$ is increasing in λ , and is also bounded by $\Pi_k^*(\mathbb{R})$, and therefore there exists a limit $\mathcal{L}(\alpha) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(\alpha; \lambda)$. Thus, for large enough λ , we have $|\mathcal{L}(\alpha; \lambda) - \mathcal{L}(\alpha)| < \varepsilon/3$. Combining the three bounds, we have

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha) - \varepsilon/3 \leq \liminf_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha)\} \leq \limsup_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha)\} \leq \mathcal{L}(\alpha) + \varepsilon.$$

As this holds for any $\varepsilon > 0$, setting $\Pi_k^*(\alpha) = \mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ concludes the proof.

□

General distributions

In this section we prove universality for the class of good densities (see Section 2.3).

Lemma 7.4. *Let f be a good density, and $\mathcal{P}_\nu \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; f)$. Then for all $\alpha \geq 1$, we have*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{ \Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha) \} = \Pi_k^*(\alpha)$$

where the limits $\Pi_k^*(\alpha)$ are the same as for the reference model, presented in Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2, respectively.

Proof. Fix $\alpha \geq 1$. If we can show that the conditions of Theorem 4.1 apply here (i.e., with $\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mathcal{P}_\nu) = \Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha)$) that will prove the lemma. The translation-invariance condition (4.1) holds immediately for $\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha)$. Assumption (4.2) is proved by Lemma 7.2. Finally, Lemmas 7.5-7.8 below, verify that conditions (4.3)-(4.6) hold as well.

□

We are therefore left with proving the following lemmas.

Lemma 7.5. *Assumption (4.3) holds for $\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha)$.*

Lemma 7.6. *Assumption (4.4) holds for $\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha)$.*

Lemma 7.7. *Assumption (4.5) holds for $\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha)$.*

Lemma 7.8. *Assumption (4.6) holds for $\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha)$.*

Proof of Lemma 7.5. Fix $\alpha \geq 1$, and let $\Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha)$ and $\Pi_{k,\nu}^{(\varepsilon)}(\alpha)$ be the persistence measures corresponding to the reference model $\mathcal{P}_\nu^* \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; \mathbb{1}_{Q^d})$ and its scaled version $\mathcal{P}_\nu^{(\varepsilon)} \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; \varepsilon^{-d} \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon Q^d})$. We need to show that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{ \Pi_{k,\nu}^{(\varepsilon)}(\alpha) \} = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{ \Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha) \}.$$

Recall that $\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha)$ counts k -cycles with $\pi(p) \geq \alpha$, and $\text{death}(p) \leq r_{\max}$. If we define $\tilde{\Pi}_{k,\nu}$ similarly, but without the restriction on the death-time, then $\tilde{\Pi}_{k,\nu}^{(\varepsilon)}(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha)$ have the same distribution, and in particular the same expected value. Therefore, it suffices to show that the difference $(\tilde{\Pi}_{k,\nu}(\alpha) - \Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha))$ is negligible. To this end, note that

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{k,\nu}(\alpha) - \Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha) \leq F_{k+1,\nu}(\Lambda_{\max}, \infty).$$

Using Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, we have that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \left(\tilde{\Pi}_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha) - \Pi_{k,\nu}^*(\alpha) \right) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \left(\tilde{\Pi}_{k,\nu}^{(\varepsilon)}(\alpha) - \Pi_{k,\nu}^{(\varepsilon)}(\alpha) \right) = 0,$$

completing the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 7.6. Denote $\Pi_{k,\nu,c\nu}(\alpha)$ the number of α -persistent k -cycles for \mathcal{P}_ν , with death time bounded by $r_{\max}(c\nu) < r_{\max}(\nu)$. We need to show that $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu,c\nu}\} / \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}\} = 1$.

Note that

$$\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha) = \Pi_{k,\nu,c\nu}(\alpha) + \Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha; (\Lambda_{\max}(c), \Lambda_{\max}]),$$

where $\Lambda_{\max}(c) = nr_{\max}^d(c\nu)$. Since $r_{\max}(c\nu) < r_{\max}(\nu)$, and $r_{\max}(c\nu) \rightarrow \infty$, using Lemma 5.3,

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha; (\Lambda_{\max}(c), \Lambda_{\max}])}{\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha)} = 0,$$

concluding the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 7.7. Take any $M = m^d$, and define $\mathcal{P}_\nu = \bigcup_i \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}$, where $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} \sim \text{Poisson}(c_i\nu; M\mathbf{1}_{Q_i})$ are independent. For all $1 \leq i \leq M$, let \mathcal{K}_i denote the filtration (either Čech or Vietoris-Rips) generated by $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}$, and denote by \mathcal{K} the filtration generated by \mathcal{P}_ν . Defining $\Pi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}(\alpha)$ as the persistence measure for $\text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{K}_i)$, our goal is to prove

$$(7.3) \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \left| \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha)\} - \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}(\alpha)\} \right| = 0.$$

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 7.2, for any $I \subset [0, \infty)$, define $\Pi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}(\alpha; I)$, as the number points $p \in \text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{K}_i)$ with $\pi(p) \geq \alpha$ and with $\text{death}(p) = \rho$, such that $\nu\rho^d \in I$. We will split the proof of (7.3) into $I = (0, \lambda]$, and $I = (\lambda, \Lambda_{\max}]$.

We start with $I = (0, \lambda]$. Fix $\lambda > 0$, and let $\mathcal{K}_i^{(\lambda)} \subset \mathcal{K}_i$ be the filtration generated by $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}$, with simplices that appear at radius ρ such that $\nu\rho^d \leq \lambda$. Similarly, define $\mathcal{K}^{(\lambda)} \subset \mathcal{K}$ as the filtration generated by the full process \mathcal{P}_ν . Then

$$\mathcal{K}^{(\lambda)} = (\mathcal{K}_1^{(\lambda)} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{K}_M^{(\lambda)}) \sqcup \Sigma,$$

where Σ contains all simplices generated by points from two or more different boxes, and with radius ρ satisfying $\nu\rho^d \leq \lambda$. Note that $\mathcal{K}_1^{(\lambda)}, \dots, \mathcal{K}_M^{(\lambda)}$ are disjoint filtrations, and therefore

$$\text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{K}_1^{(\lambda)} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{K}_M^{(\lambda)}) = \text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{K}_1^{(\lambda)}) \sqcup \dots \sqcup \text{dgm}_k(\mathcal{K}_M^{(\lambda)}).$$

Thus, using Lemma 6.3 and Remark 6.4, we have

$$\left| \Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha; (0, \lambda]) - \sum_i \Pi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}(\alpha; (0, \lambda]) \right| \leq \Sigma_{k+1},$$

where Σ_{k+1} counts all $(k+1)$ -simplices in Σ . Note that these simplices must contain points from several boxes, and their radius is bounded by $r = (\lambda/\nu)^{1/d}$. Thus, they are necessarily generated by points lying in $\partial_r := B_r(\bigcup_i \partial Q_i)$, where ∂Q_i is the boundary of Q_i . In addition, since $Ar \leq \text{Vol}(\partial_r) \leq Br$ for some $A, B > 0$, we have

$$(7.4) \quad \mathbb{E}\{\Sigma_{k+1}\} = O((\nu r)^{k+2} r^{(d-1)(k+1)}) = O(\nu r) = o(\nu).$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$(7.5) \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \left| \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha; (0, \lambda])\} - \sum_i \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}(\alpha; (0, \lambda])\} \right| = 0.$$

Next, note that similarly to the proof of Lemma 7.2, we can choose λ large enough so that

$$\mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha; (\lambda, \Lambda_{\max}])\} \leq \mathbb{E}\{F_{k+1,\nu}(\lambda, \Lambda_{\max})\} \approx \nu(F_{k+1}^* - F_{k+1}^\diamond(\lambda)) \leq \varepsilon\nu,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}(\alpha; (\lambda, \Lambda_{\max}])\} \leq \mathbb{E}\{F_{k+1,\nu}^{(i)}(\lambda, \Lambda_{\max})\} \approx c_i \nu(F_{k+1}^* - F_{k+1}^\diamond(\lambda; M\mathbf{1}_{Q_i})) \leq c_i \varepsilon\nu,$$

Therefore, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ we can take λ to be sufficiently large, and have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \left| \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha; (\lambda, \Lambda_{\max}])\} - \sum_i \mathbb{E}\{\Pi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}(\alpha; (\lambda, \Lambda_{\max}])\} \right| \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

This, combined with (7.5), concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 7.8. Let f_1, f_2, \dots , be a sequence of good functions, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} f_i(x) &= f(x), \\ f_i(x) &\leq f_j(x), \quad i < j. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\delta_i = 1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_i(x) dx,$$

so that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \delta_i = 0$. Note that for every i we can write

$$\mathcal{P}_\nu = \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} \cup \Delta_{\nu,i},$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}$ and $\Delta_{\nu,i}$ are independent, and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} &\sim \text{Poisson}((1 - \delta_i)\nu; f_i/(1 - \delta_i)) \\ \Delta_{\nu,i} &\sim \text{Poisson}(\delta_i\nu; (f - f_i)/\delta_i).\end{aligned}$$

Fix $\alpha > 0$ and let $\Pi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}(\alpha)$ be the persistence measure generated by $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}$. Similarly to the previous proofs, we split the calculations into separate radii ranges. In this case, from Lemma 6.3 and Remark 6.4, we have

$$\left| \Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha; (0, \lambda]) - \Pi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}(\alpha; (0, \lambda]) \right| \leq \Sigma_{k+1}(\lambda) - \Sigma_{k+1}^{(i)}(\lambda),$$

where Σ_{k+1} and $\Sigma_{k+1}^{(i)}(\lambda)$ count the number of $(k+1)$ -simplices generated by \mathcal{P}_ν and $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}$ respectively, with radius ρ such that $\nu\rho^d \leq \lambda$. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}\{\Sigma_{k+1}(\lambda)\} = \frac{\nu^{k+2}}{(k+2)!} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k+2}} f(\mathbf{x}) h_r(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x},$$

where $h_r(\mathbf{x})$ is an indicator for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{k+2})$ spanning a simplex at radius $\rho \leq r$. Taking a change of variables $x_1 \rightarrow x$, $x_j \rightarrow x + ry_j$, we can show that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{\Sigma_{k+1}(\lambda)\} = \frac{\bar{h}}{(k+2)!} \lambda^{k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^{k+2}(x) dx,$$

where $\bar{h} = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k+1}} h_1(0, \mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y}$. Similarly,

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{\Sigma_{k+1}^{(i)}(\lambda)\} = \frac{\bar{h}}{(k+2)!} \lambda^{k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_i^{k+2}(x) dx.$$

Using the fact that

$$f^{k+2}(x) - f_i^{k+2}(x) \leq (k+2) f_{\max}^{k+1}(f(x) - f_i(x)),$$

we have,

$$(7.6) \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{\Sigma_{k+1}(\lambda) - \Sigma_{k+1}^{(i)}(\lambda)\} \leq C \delta_i \lambda^{k+1},$$

for some $C > 0$.

Next, using the number of critical faces to bound the death times, we have

$$\left| \Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha; (\lambda, \Lambda_{\max}]) - \Pi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}(\alpha; (\lambda, \Lambda_{\max}]) \right| \leq F_{k+1,\nu}(\lambda, \Lambda_{\max}) + F_{k+1,\nu}^{(i)}(\lambda, \Lambda_{\max}),$$

where $F_{k+1,\nu}$ and $F_{k+1,\nu}^{(i)}$ count the critical faces in the given range, generated by \mathcal{P}_ν and $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}$

respectively. From Corollary 5.2, we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k+1,\nu}^{(i)}(\lambda)\} = F_{k+1}^\diamond(\lambda; f_i),$$

and

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} F_{k+1}^\diamond(\lambda; f_i) = (1 - \delta_i)F_{k+1}^*.$$

Therefore, fixing i_0 , we can find $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$(7.7) \quad F_{k+1}^\diamond(\lambda_0; f_{i_0}) \geq (1 - 2\delta_{i_0})F_{k+1}^*.$$

Note that the expression for $F_{k+1}^\diamond(\lambda; f)$ in (7.11) is increasing in f , in the sense that

$$F_{k+1}^\diamond(\lambda; f_{i_0}) \leq F_{k+1}^\diamond(\lambda; f_i), \quad i > i_0,$$

and therefore, from (7.7) for all $i \geq i_0$, we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k+1,\nu}^{(i)}(\lambda_0, \Lambda_{\max})\} = (1 - \delta_i)F_{k+1}^* - F_{k+1}^\diamond(\lambda_0; f_i) \leq (2\delta_{i_0} - \delta_i)F_{k+1}^*.$$

Finally, fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and take $i_0 > 0$ such that $\delta_{i_0} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2F_{k+1}^*}$. Then for all $i \geq i_0$,

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k+1,\nu}^{(i)}(\lambda_0, \Lambda_{\max})\} \leq 2\delta_{i_0}F_{k+1}^* < \varepsilon.$$

Taking λ_0 sufficiently large, also ensures that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k+1,\nu}(\lambda_0, \Lambda_{\max})\} < \varepsilon,$$

and going back to (7.6), for i large enough we have $C\delta_i\lambda_0^{k+1} < \varepsilon$. Putting it together, we conclude that

$$\limsup_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left\{\left|\Pi_{k,\nu}(\alpha) - \Pi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}(\alpha)\right|\right\} \leq 3\varepsilon.$$

This concludes the proof. □

Finally, we can prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Set $L_\alpha = [\alpha, \infty)$. From Lemma 7.4, we conclude that $\frac{1}{\nu}\bar{\Pi}_{k,\nu}(L_\alpha)$ has a universal limit $\Pi_k^*(L_\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Additionally, as the limiting measure is finite, this is sufficient to conclude that $\frac{1}{\nu}\Pi_{k,\nu}$ weakly converges to Π_k^* . □

7.2 Persistent cycles – binomial

In this section we prove Theorem 3.2.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Let $\mathcal{X}_n \sim \text{Binomial}(n; f)$, and similarly to the previous section, we use the shorthand $\Pi_{k,n}(\alpha) = \Pi_{k,n}([\alpha, \infty))$, for a fixed value of α . Note that we already verified that assumptions (4.1)-(4.6) hold for the $\Pi_{k,n}(\alpha)$ functional. Thus, to apply Theorem 4.2, we need to prove the remaining conditions in (4.7)-(4.9). The main ideas here are inspired by the methods presented in [30][Theorem 3.17] and [36][Theorem 4.5].

Using the number of k -faces as an upper bound we have $\Pi_{k,n}(\alpha) \leq n^{k+1}$, so (4.7) holds. Denote $\Pi_{k,m,n}(\alpha)$ the number of α -persistent k -cycles generated by \mathcal{X}_m , and with death-time bounded by $r_{\max} = r_{\max}(n)$. We need to find an event A_n , such that

$$|\Pi_{k,n}(\alpha) - \Pi_{k,n \pm \Delta, n}(\alpha)| \mathbf{1}_{A_n} \leq C_4 \Delta n^b.$$

We first assume that f is of Type I or II, so that $\text{supp}(f)$ is compact. In this case, we can select a collection of boxes $Q_{n,1}, \dots, Q_{n,M}$ whose side-length is r_{\max} , that cover $\text{supp}(f)$, and such that $M \leq C r_{\max}^{-d}$ for some $C > 0$. Defining $N_j = |\mathcal{X}_{2n} \cap Q_{n,j}|$, then N_j is stochastically dominated by $\text{Binom}(2n, f_{\max} r_{\max}^d)$. Therefore, using [30][Lemma 1.1], we have for n large enough, for all $j \leq M$,

$$\mathbb{P}(N_j > n^\delta) \leq e^{-n^\delta},$$

for any δ such that $n r_{\max}^d \ll n^\delta$. Defining the event

$$A_n := \left\{ \max_{1 \leq j \leq M} N_j \leq n^\delta \right\},$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n^c) \leq M e^{-n^\delta} \sim r_{\max}^{-d} e^{-n^\delta}.$$

Since $r_{\max}^d \gg 1/n$, for any $a < \delta$ and large enough n ,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n^c) \leq e^{-n^a},$$

so that (4.8) holds. Next, define

$$\Delta_{n,m} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{X}_n \setminus \mathcal{X}_m & n > m, \\ \mathcal{X}_m \setminus \mathcal{X}_n & n < m, \end{cases}$$

and note that from Lemma 6.3 and Remark 6.4,

$$|\Pi_{k,n}(\alpha) - \Pi_{k,m,n}(\alpha)| \leq \Sigma_{k+1},$$

where Σ_{k+1} is the number of $(k+1)$ -simplices that include points from $\Delta_{n,m}$, and with radius less than r_{\max} . If A_n holds, then all points in $\Delta_{n,m}$ have at most Cn^δ neighbors, and therefore

$$|\Pi_{k,n}(\alpha) - \Pi_{k,n,m}(\alpha)| \leq C_2|n - m|n^{(k+1)\delta},$$

for some $C_2 > 0$. Taking $b = (k+1)\delta$, for sufficiently small δ we have $b < 1/4$, and (4.9) holds as well, completing the proof.

Next, suppose that f is of Type III. Fix δ , and take $R = R(n) > 0$ such that

$$(7.8) \quad f(B_R^c) \ll n^{\delta-1},$$

where B_R is a ball of radius R around the origin. Let $N_R := |\mathcal{X}_{2n} \cap B_R^c|$, then $N_R \sim \text{Binom}(2n, f(B_R^c))$, and using a similar bound as before, since $nf(B_R^c) \ll n^\delta$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(N_R > n^\delta) \leq e^{-n^\delta}.$$

In addition, we can cover B_R with $M \sim R^d/r_{\max}^d$ boxes of side-length r_{\max} , and we can bound the number of points in each box as before. Therefore, defining

$$A_n := \left\{ \max(N_1, \dots, N_M, N_R) \leq n^\delta \right\},$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n^c) \leq (M+1)e^{-n^\delta}.$$

From (III.1), we have that

$$f(B_R^c) \leq C \int_R^\infty \tau^{d-1-A_1} d\tau = CR^{d-A_1}.$$

Therefore, if we take $R = n^{\frac{\delta-1}{2(d-A_1)}}$, we have that (7.8) holds. Finally, as $M \sim (R/r_{\max})^d$, and $nr_{\max}^d \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n^c) \leq CnR^d e^{-n^\delta} < e^{-n^a},$$

for some $a < \delta$. The rest of the proof similar to Types I and II. \square

Remark 7.9. Note that the proof above imposed the condition that $\Lambda_{\max} \ll n^\delta$, while $\delta < \frac{1}{4(k+1)}$.

Thus, for example, if we require $\Lambda_{\max} = n^{\frac{1}{4(k+2)}}$ the proof would apply.

7.3 Critical faces

The remaining part to complete is proving the statements for the asymptotics of the number of critical faces presented in Section 5.

Critical faces in the thermodynamic limit

Proof of Proposition 5.1 – Čech. Using (5.1) and Mecke’s formula (see [30][Theorem 1.6]), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = \frac{\nu^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k+1}} f(\mathbf{x})h(\mathbf{x})\mathbb{1}_{\{\rho(\mathbf{x}) \leq r\}}e^{-\nu(f(B(\mathbf{x})))}d\mathbf{x},$$

where $r = (\lambda/\nu)^{1/d}$, and $h(\mathbf{x}), \rho(\mathbf{x})$, and $B(\mathbf{x})$ are defined in Section 5, and $f(\mathbf{x}) = f(x_1) \cdots f(x_{k+1})$.

Next, applying Blaschke-Petkantschin change of variables (A.1), we have

$$(7.9) \quad \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = \frac{\nu^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} (k!)^{d-k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^r \rho^{dk-1} e^{-\nu f(B_\rho(c))} p(c, \rho) d\rho dc,$$

where

$$(7.10) \quad p(c, \rho) := \int_{\Gamma(d,k)} \int_{(S^{k-1})^{k+1}} f(c + \rho(\gamma \circ \boldsymbol{\theta}))h(\boldsymbol{\theta})V_{\text{simp}}^{d-k+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})d\boldsymbol{\theta}d\gamma,$$

$\Gamma(d, k)$ is the k -dimensional Grassmannian in \mathbb{R}^d , S^{k-1} is a unit $(k-1)$ -dimensional sphere, and $V_{\text{simp}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the volume of the simplex spanned by $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Taking the change of variables $\tau = \nu\rho^d$, and taking $\lambda = \nu r^d$, yields

$$\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = \frac{\nu}{d(k+1)!} (k!)^{d-k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\lambda \tau^{k-1} e^{-\nu f(B_{\rho(\tau)}(c))} p(c, \rho(\tau)) d\tau dc,$$

where $\rho(\tau) = (\tau/\nu)^{1/d}$. Note that the integrand is bounded, and therefore we can apply the dominated convergence theorem (DCT). Taking the limit, we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} p(c, (\tau/\nu)^{1/d}) = f^{k+1}(c)V_{d,k}\Gamma_{d,k},$$

where $V_{d,k} = \int_{(S^{k-1})^{k+1}} h(\boldsymbol{\theta})V_{\text{simp}}^{d-k+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})d\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and $\Gamma_{d,k}$ is the volume of the Grassmannian. Also, using the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \nu f(B_{\rho(\tau)}(c)) = \omega_d \tau f(c),$$

where ω_d is the volume of a d -dimensional unit ball. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} &= \frac{V_{d,k} \Gamma_{d,k}(k!)^{d-k+1}}{d(k+1)!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^{k+1}(c) \int_0^\lambda \tau^{k-1} e^{-\omega_d \tau f(c)} d\tau dc \\ &= \frac{V_{d,k} \Gamma_{d,k}(k!)^{d-k+1}}{d\omega_d^k (k+1)!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(c) \int_0^{\omega_d f(c)\lambda} t^{k-1} e^{-t} dt dc. \end{aligned}$$

We can write this limit as

$$(7.11) \quad F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f) := \frac{V_{d,k} \Gamma_{d,k}(k!)^{d-k+1}}{d\omega_d^k (k+1)!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(c) \gamma_k^c(\omega_d f(c)\lambda) dc,$$

where γ_k^c is the lower incomplete gamma function. Noting that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_k^c(\omega_d f(c)\lambda) = \Gamma(k) = (k-1)!$, we have

$$(7.12) \quad F_k^* = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f) = \frac{V_{d,k} \Gamma_{d,k}(k!)^{d-k+1}}{d\omega_d^k (k+1)!},$$

which is independent of f . This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.1 – Vietoris-Rips. Using (5.2) and Mecke's formula, for $k \geq 2$ we have

$$\mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = \frac{\nu^2}{2} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^2} f(x_1) f(x_2) \mathbb{E} \{\beta_{k-2}(x_1, x_2)\} \mathbb{1} \{|x_1 - x_2| \leq r\} dx_1 dx_2,$$

where

$$\beta_{k-2}(x_1, x_2) := \beta_{k-2}(\text{lk}((x_1, x_2); \mathcal{P}_\nu \cup \{x_1, x_2\})).$$

Taking the change of variables $x_1 \rightarrow x$, $x_2 \rightarrow x + \rho\theta$, we have

$$(7.13) \quad \mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = \frac{\nu^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^r \int_{S^{d-1}} f(x) f(x + \rho\theta) \rho^{d-1} \mathbb{E} \{\beta_{k-2}(x, x + \rho\theta)\} d\theta d\rho dx.$$

Taking $\tau = \nu\rho^d$, we have

$$(7.14) \quad \mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = \frac{\nu}{2d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\lambda \int_{S^{d-1}} f(x) f(x + \rho(\tau)\theta) \mathbb{E} \{\beta_{k-2}(x, x + \rho(\tau)\theta)\} d\theta d\tau dx,$$

with $\rho(\tau) = (\tau/\nu)^{1/d}$. Denote $I(x_1, x_2) = B_{|x_1-x_2|}(x_1) \cap B_{|x_1-x_2|}(x_2)$. By bounding the number of $(k-1)$ -faces, we have

$$\beta_{k-2}(x_1, x_2) \leq |\mathcal{P}_\nu \cap I(x_1, x_2)|^{k-1}.$$

Since the number of points is a Poisson random variable, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{\beta_{k-2}(x_1, x_2)\} \leq C(\nu f(I(x_1, x_2)))^{k-1},$$

for some $C > 0$. Note that

$$f(I(x_1, x_2)) \leq f_{\max} \text{Vol}(I(x_1, x_2)) = f_{\max} |x_1 - x_2|^d \kappa_d,$$

where $\kappa_d = \text{Vol}(I_0)$, and $I_0 = B_1(\mathbf{0}) \cap B_1(\mathbf{1})$, with $\mathbf{0}$ being the origin in \mathbb{R}^d , and $\mathbf{1} = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\{\beta_{k-2}(x, x + \rho(\tau)\theta)\} \leq C(\tau f_{\max} \kappa_d)^{k-1},$$

and we can apply the DCT to (7.14). To find the limit of the integrand, we note that

$$(7.15) \quad \mathbb{E}\{\beta_{k-2}(x_1, x_2)\} = e^{-\nu f(I(x_1, x_2))} \sum_{m=2(k-1)}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} (\nu f(I(x_1, x_2)))^m \bar{\beta}_{k-2}(x_1, x_2; m),$$

where

$$\bar{\beta}_{k-2}(x_1, x_2; m) := \mathbb{E}\{\beta_{k-2}(x_1, x_2) \mid |\mathcal{P}_\nu \cap I(x_1, x_2)| = m\}.$$

For $x_1 = x$ and $x_2 = x + \rho(\tau)\theta$, we can bound the term inside the summation by

$$\frac{1}{m!} (\tau f_{\max} \kappa_d)^m m^{k-1},$$

which is summable, and therefore we can use the DCT for the sum as well. Note that $\text{lk}((x_1, x_2); \mathcal{P}_\nu \cup \{x_1, x_2\}) = \mathcal{R}_{|x_1 - x_2|}(\mathcal{P}_\nu \cap I(x_1, x_2))$ (i.e., the link itself is a Vietoris-Rips complex), and therefore,

$$\bar{\beta}_{k-2}(x_1, x_2; m) = \int_{(I(x_1, x_2))^m} \frac{f(\mathbf{y})}{(f(I(x_1, x_2)))^m} \beta_{k-2}(\mathcal{R}_{|x_1 - x_2|}(\mathbf{y})) d\mathbf{y}.$$

Next, we take $x_1 = x, x_2 = x + \rho\theta$, and the change of variables $y_i \rightarrow x + \rho \cdot (\theta \circ z_i)$, where $z_i \in I_0$ and $\theta \circ z_i$ is the rotation in the direction of $\theta \in S^{d-1}$. Then,

$$\bar{\beta}_{k-2}(x, x + \rho\theta; m) = (f(I(x, x + \rho\theta)))^{-m} \rho^{dm} \int_{I_0^m} f(x + \rho \cdot (\theta \circ \mathbf{z})) \beta_{k-2}(\mathcal{R}_1(\mathbf{z})) d\mathbf{z},$$

where we used the fact that $\beta_{k-2}(\mathcal{R}_\rho(x + \rho(\theta \circ \mathbf{z}))) = \beta_{k-2}(\mathcal{R}_1(\mathbf{z}))$, by translation and rotation invariance and scaling. Putting this back into (7.15) yields,

$$\mathbb{E}\{\beta_{k-2}(x, x + \rho(\tau)\theta)\} = e^{-\nu f(I(x, x + \rho(\tau)\theta))} \sum_{m=2(k-1)}^{\infty} \frac{\tau^m}{m!} \int_{I_0^m} f(x + \rho(\tau)(\theta \circ \mathbf{z})) \beta_{k-2}(\mathcal{R}_1(\mathbf{z})) d\mathbf{z},$$

and when $\nu \rightarrow \infty$, since $\rho(\tau) \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\{\beta_{k-2}(x, x + \rho(\tau)\theta)\} = e^{-\tau f(x)\kappa_d} \sum_{m=2(k-1)}^{\infty} \frac{(\tau f(x)\kappa_d)^m}{m!} \beta_{k-2}^*(m),$$

where

$$\beta_{k-2}^*(m) := \int_{I_0^m} \kappa_d^{-m} \beta_{k-2}(\mathcal{R}_1(\mathbf{z})) \mathbf{z}.$$

is the expected reduced Betti number for m points uniformly distributed in I_0 . Putting back into (7.14), we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = \frac{\omega_d}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\lambda f^2(x) e^{-\tau f(x)\kappa_d} \left(\sum_{m=2(k-1)}^{\infty} \frac{(\tau f(x)\kappa_d)^m}{m!} \beta_{k-2}^*(m) \right) d\tau dx.$$

For a fixed x , we can take a change of variables $t = \tau f(x)\kappa_d$, and then,

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = \frac{\omega_d}{2\kappa_d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) \int_0^{\lambda f(x)\kappa_d} e^{-t} \left(\sum_{m=2(k-1)}^{\infty} \frac{t^m}{m!} \beta_{k-2}^*(m) \right) dt dx.$$

Defining

$$\gamma_k^{\mathcal{R}}(z) := \int_0^z e^{-t} \left(\sum_{m=2(k-1)}^{\infty} \frac{t^m}{m!} \beta_{k-2}^*(m) \right) dt,$$

then

$$(7.16) \quad F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f) := \frac{\omega_d}{2\kappa_d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) \gamma_k^{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda f(x)\kappa_d) dx.$$

Note that

$$\gamma_k^{\mathcal{R}}(\infty) = \sum_{m=2(k-1)}^{\infty} \beta_{k-2}^*(m).$$

Therefore,

$$(7.17) \quad F_k^* = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} F_k^\diamond(\lambda; f) = \frac{\omega_d}{2\kappa_d} \sum_{m=2(k-1)}^{\infty} \beta_{k-2}^*(m),$$

which is indeed independent of f , completing the proof for $k \geq 2$.

The case $k = 1$ is simpler. Recall from Lemma 6.1 that here we only need to count isolated

edges, i.e., such that $\text{lk}(e; \mathcal{P}_\nu) = \emptyset$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\{F_{1,\nu}(\lambda)\} &= \frac{\nu^2}{2} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^2} f(x_1)f(x_2)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}_\nu \cap I(x_1, x_2) = \emptyset) \mathbb{1}\{|x_1 - x_2| \leq r\} dx_1 dx_2, \\ &= \frac{\nu^2}{2} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^2} f(x_1)f(x_2)e^{-\nu f(I(x_1, x_2))} \mathbb{1}\{|x_1 - x_2| \leq r\} dx_1 dx_2.\end{aligned}$$

Similar limits as above, yield

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{1,\nu}(\lambda)\} &= F_1^\diamond(\lambda; f) := \frac{\omega_d}{2\kappa_d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)(1 - e^{-\lambda f(x)\kappa_d}) dx, \\ \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} F_1^\diamond(\lambda; f) &= F_1^*(\lambda) := \frac{\omega_d}{2\kappa_d}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Corollary 5.2. Recall that here $\mathcal{P}_\nu \sim \text{Poisson}(c\nu; \tilde{f})$, where $\tilde{f} = f/c$. In this case, for the Čech complex, (7.9) should be replaced with

$$(7.18) \quad \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = \frac{(c\nu)^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} (k!)^{d-k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^r \rho^{dk-1} e^{-c\nu \tilde{f}(B_\rho(c))} \tilde{p}(c, \rho) d\rho dc,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{p}(c, \rho) &:= \int_{\Gamma(d,k)} \int_{(S^{k-1})^{k+1}} \tilde{f}(c + \rho(\gamma \circ \boldsymbol{\theta})) h(\boldsymbol{\theta}) V_{\text{simp}}^{d-k+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} d\gamma \\ &= c^{-(k+1)} \int_{\Gamma(d,k)} \int_{(S^{k-1})^{k+1}} f(c + \rho(\gamma \circ \boldsymbol{\theta})) h(\boldsymbol{\theta}) V_{\text{simp}}^{d-k+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} d\gamma,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$c\tilde{f}(B_\rho(c)) = f(B_\rho(c)).$$

Thus, (7.18) is equal to the right hand side of (7.9). So we can continue with the same steps as the proof of Proposition 5.1, to have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}(\lambda)\} = F_k^\diamond(\lambda).$$

Note that in this case, taking the limit in (7.11), yields

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} F_k^\diamond(\lambda) = \frac{V_{d,k} \Gamma_{d,k} (k!)^{d-k+1}}{d\omega_d^k k(k+1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(c) dc = cF_k^*.$$

Similar arguments apply for the Vietoris-Rips case. □

The total number of critical faces

Proof of Lemma 5.3 – Čech. Take $r \rightarrow 0$ and $\Lambda = \nu r^d \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly to (7.9), we have

$$(7.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda)\} &= \frac{\nu^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} (k!)^{d-k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^r \rho^{dk-1} e^{-\nu f(B_\rho(c))} p(c, \rho) d\rho dc \\ &= \frac{\nu^{k+1}}{d\omega_d^k (k+1)!} (k!)^{d-k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^r \Delta(c, \rho) f(S_\rho(c)) f^{k-1}(B_\rho(c)) e^{-\nu f(B_\rho(c))} d\rho dc, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(7.20) \quad \Delta(c, \rho) := \frac{d\omega_d^k \rho^{dk-1} p(c, \rho)}{f(S_\rho(c)) f^{k-1}(B_\rho(c))} = \frac{p(c, \rho)}{\bar{f}(S_\rho(c)) \bar{f}^{k-1}(B_\rho(c))},$$

$S_\rho(c)$ is the $(d-1)$ -sphere centered at c , and \bar{f} is the average value. Note that by $f(S_\rho(c))$ we refer to the integral with respect to the $(d-1)$ -dimensional surface measure of the sphere.

Fix c , and denote $f_c(\rho) = f(B_\rho(c))$. Then $f_c(\rho)$ is increasing (in ρ), and $\frac{d}{d\rho} f_c(\rho) = f(S_\rho(c))$. We will thus take the change of variables $t = \nu f_c(\rho)$, leading to

$$(7.21) \quad \mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda)\} = \frac{\nu}{d\omega_d^k (k+1)!} (k!)^{d-k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\infty \Delta(c, \rho(t)) \mathbb{1}_{\{t \leq \nu f_c(r)\}} t^{k-1} e^{-t} d\rho dc,$$

where $\rho(t) = f_c^{-1}(t/\nu)$. Note that for any fixed $c \in \text{supp}(f)$ and $t < \nu$, we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \rho(t) = 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \Delta(c, \rho) = \Gamma_{d,k} V_{d,k} f(c).$$

Therefore, if we are allowed to take the point-wise limit of the integrand in (7.21) we get

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda)\} = F_k^*$$

as in (7.12). Our goal next will be to justify taking the limit for the integrand in (7.21), by bounding $\Delta(c, \rho)$, and applying the DCT. The approach for the bounds will be different between the three types presented in Section 2.3.

Type I: Recall that here the support $U = \text{supp}(f)$ is compact and $f_{\min} = \inf_U f > 0$. Let ∂U be the boundary of U , and define

$$U^{(r)} := \left\{ x \in U : \inf_{z \in \partial U} |x - z| > r \right\},$$

i.e., all points in U that are at least r away from the boundary. Next, we split $F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda)$ into $F_{k,\nu}^{(1)}(\Lambda) + F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}(\Lambda)$, where $F_{k,\nu}^{(1)}(\Lambda)$ counts critical k -faces whose center c is in $U^{(r)}$, and $F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}(\Lambda)$ counts the rest. If $c \in U^{(r)}$, and $\rho \leq r$, then $B_\rho(c) \subset U$, and thus

$$\bar{f}(B_\rho(c)) \geq f_{\min} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{f}(S_\rho(c)) \geq f_{\min}.$$

Also, note that from (7.10)

$$\begin{aligned} p(c, \rho) &\leq V_{\max} \int_{\Gamma(d,k)} \left(\int_{S^{k-1}} f(c + \rho\gamma\theta) d\theta \right)^{k+1} d\gamma \\ &\leq V_{\max} \Gamma_{d,k}(k\omega_k f_{\max})^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $V_{\max} = \sup_{(S^{k-1})^{k+1}} V_{\text{simp}}^{d-k+1}(\theta)$, and $f_{\max} = \sup_U f(x) < \infty$. Therefore, from (7.20), we have

$$\Delta(c, \rho) \leq C = \frac{V_{\max} \Gamma_{d,k}(k\omega_k f_{\max})^{k+1}}{f_{\min}^k}.$$

Similarly to (7.21), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(1)}(\Lambda)\} = \frac{\nu}{d\omega_d^k (k+1)!} (k!)^{d-k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\infty \Delta(c, \rho(t)) \mathbb{1}\{t \leq \nu f_c(r)\} \mathbb{1}\{c \in U^{(r)}\} t^{k-1} e^{-t} d\rho dc,$$

where the integrand is bounded and we can apply the DCT. Note that for every $c \in U \setminus \partial U$ we have $\mathbb{1}\{c \in U^{(r)}\} \rightarrow 1$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(1)}(\Lambda)\} = F_k^*.$$

To bound $F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}$, we note that if $c(\mathbf{x}) \in U^{(r)}$ then all the points in \mathbf{x} must lie in $U \setminus U^{(2r)}$. Denote by $N_{k,\nu}$ the number of k -faces in $\mathcal{C}_r(\mathcal{P}_\nu)$ that are contained in $U \setminus U^{(2r)}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}(\Lambda)\} &\leq \mathbb{E}\{N_{k,\nu}\} \leq \frac{\nu^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} \int_{(U \setminus U^{(2r)})^{k+1}} f(\mathbf{x}) \mathbb{1}\{|x_i - x_1| \leq 2r, 2 \leq i \leq k+1\} d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq C\nu^{k+1} r^{dk+1}, \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$, where we used the fact that $\text{Vol}(U \setminus U^{(2r)}) = O(r)$. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}(\Lambda)\} \leq Cr(\nu r^d)^k = C \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\nu}\right)^{1/d} \Lambda^k.$$

Thus, taking $\Lambda_{\max} = \nu^{\frac{1}{dk+2}}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}(\Lambda_{\max})\} \rightarrow 0,$$

implying that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda_{\max})\} = F_k^*,$$

completing the proof for Type I.

Type II: Recall that here U is compact, while $f_{\min} = 0$. We defined δ_0 so that for all $x \in U$ at most δ_0 away from $U_0 = f^{-1}(0) \cap U$, we have $C_1(\delta(x))^q \leq f(x) \leq C_2(\delta(x))^q$.

Consider first, the case where $c \in U^{(2r)} \setminus U^{(\delta_0-r)}$. Defining

$$(7.22) \quad f_{\min}(c, \rho) = \inf_{B_\rho(c)} f, \quad f_{\max}(c, \rho) = \sup_{B_\rho(c)} f,$$

we have

$$f_{\max}(c, \rho) \leq C_2(\delta(c) + r)^\alpha, \quad f_{\min} \geq C_1(\delta(c) - r)^\alpha,$$

and therefore,

$$\frac{f_{\max}(c, \rho)}{f_{\min}(c, \rho)} \leq \frac{C_2}{C_1} \left(\frac{\delta(c) + r}{\delta(c) - r} \right)^\alpha = \frac{C_2}{C_1} \left(\frac{1 + r/\delta(c)}{1 - r/\delta(c)} \right)^\alpha$$

Since $\delta(c) \geq 2r$, the last term is bounded by a constant $C > 0$.

Next, consider $c \in U^{(\delta_0-r)}$. In this case, we have $B_\rho(c) \subset U^{(\delta_0-2r)}$. For r small enough, $\delta_0 - 2r > \delta_0/2$, where $U^{(\delta_0/2)}$ is compact, and $\tilde{f}_{\min} := \inf_{U^{(\delta_0/2)}} f > 0$. Therefore,

$$\bar{f}(B_\rho(c)) \geq \tilde{f}_{\min} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{f}(S_\rho(c)) \geq \tilde{f}_{\min}$$

and

$$\Delta(c, \rho) \leq \frac{V_{\max} \Gamma_{d,k} (k\omega_k f_{\max})^{k+1}}{\tilde{f}_{\min}^k}.$$

To conclude, we have that for all $c \in U^{(2r)}$, $\Delta(c, \rho)$ is upper bounded by a constant C . We can therefore continue the same way we did for Type I to complete the proof.

Type III: Here, $U = \mathbb{R}^d$, and $f(x) = ce^{-\Psi_{\text{rad}}(x)\Psi_{\text{sph}}(x/|x|)}$. First, we write

$$F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda) = F_{k,\nu}^{(1)}(\Lambda) + F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}(\Lambda) + F_{k,\nu}^{(3)}(\Lambda),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} F_{k,\nu}^{(1)}(\Lambda) &:= \#\text{critical } k\text{-faces with } \nu\rho^d \leq \Lambda \text{ and } |c| \leq R_0, \\ F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}(\Lambda) &:= \#\text{critical } k\text{-faces with } \nu\rho^d \leq \Lambda \text{ and } R_0 < |c| \leq R, \\ F_{k,\nu}^{(3)}(\Lambda) &:= \#\text{critical } k\text{-faces with } \nu\rho^d \leq \Lambda \text{ and } R < |c|, \end{aligned}$$

where R_0 is the radius required for conditions (III.1)-(III.3) to hold, and R will be chosen later. For $F_{k,\nu}^{(1)}$ note that $B_{R_0}(\mathbf{0})$ is compact, with $\inf_{B_{R_0}(\mathbf{0})} f > 0$. Therefore, similarly to Type I, we have,

$$(7.23) \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(1)}(\Lambda)\} = f(B_{R_0}(\mathbf{0}))F_k^*.$$

Next, we skip to $F_{k,\nu}^{(3)}$. Denote by $N_{k,\nu}$ the number of k -faces in $\mathcal{C}_r(\mathcal{P}_\nu)$, with at least one vertex lying in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_R(\mathbf{0})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(3)}(\Lambda)\} &\leq \mathbb{E}\{N_{k,\nu}\} \leq (k+1) \frac{\nu^{k+1}}{k!} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_R(\mathbf{0})) \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^k} f(\mathbf{x}) \mathbb{1}\{|x_i - x_1| \leq 2r, 2 \leq i \leq k+1\} d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq C\nu^{k+1} r^{dk} \int_R^\infty \int_{S^{d-1}} \tau^{d-1} e^{-\Psi_{\text{rad}}(\tau) \Psi_{\text{sph}}(\theta)} d\theta d\tau \\ &\leq C\nu^{k+1} r^{dk} \int_R^\infty \tau^{d-1} e^{-\Psi_{\text{rad}}(\tau)} d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

since we assume $\Psi_{\text{sph}} \geq 1$. Take the change of variables $t = \Psi_{\text{rad}}(\tau)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(3)}(\Lambda)\} \leq C\nu^{k+1} r^{dk} \int_{\Psi_{\text{rad}}(R)}^\infty \frac{(\Psi_{\text{rad}}^{-1}(t))^{d-1}}{\Psi'_{\text{rad}}(\Psi_{\text{rad}}^{-1}(t))} e^{-t} dt.$$

Using assumption (III.2), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(3)}(\Lambda)\} \leq C\nu^{k+1} r^{dk} \int_{\Psi_{\text{rad}}(R)}^\infty (\Psi_{\text{rad}}^{-1}(t))^d e^{-t} dt.$$

Finally, using assumption (III.1), we have $\Psi_{\text{rad}}^{-1}(t) \leq e^{t/A_1}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(3)}(\Lambda)\} \leq C\nu^{k+1} r^{dk} \int_{\Psi_{\text{rad}}(R)}^\infty e^{-t(1-\frac{d}{A_1})} dt = C\nu^{k+1} r^{dk} e^{-\Psi_{\text{rad}}(R)(1-\frac{d}{A_1})}.$$

Thus, if $A_1 > d$ we can take

$$(7.24) \quad R = \Psi_{\text{rad}}^{-1}\left(\frac{k+1}{1-d/A_1} \log \nu\right),$$

and then $\mathbb{E}\{F_k^{(3)}(\Lambda)\} \rightarrow 0$.

The final step is to evaluate $\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}(\Lambda)\}$. We go back to (7.19), and try to bound (7.20). Recall, that

$$p(c, \rho) = \int_{\Gamma(d,k)} \int_{(S^{k-1})^{k+1}} f(c + \rho(\gamma \circ \boldsymbol{\theta})) h(\boldsymbol{\theta}) V_{\text{simp}}^{d-k+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} d\gamma.$$

The condition imposed by $h(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ implies that at least one of the points $z = c + \rho\gamma\theta_i$ satisfies $|z| > |c|$ (otherwise all points are on a single hemisphere, and the simplex is not critical). Recall that here we have $|c| > R_0$, therefore from monotonicity (III.2),

$$\Psi_{\text{rad}}(|z|) \geq \Psi_{\text{rad}}(|c|),$$

and from the Lipschitz condition,

$$|\Psi_{\text{sph}}(z/|z|) - \Psi_{\text{sph}}(c/|c|)| \leq K \frac{\rho}{|c|},$$

for some $K > 0$. This implies that

$$\frac{f(z)}{f(c)} \leq e^{\Psi_{\text{rad}}(|c|)(\Psi_{\text{sph}}(c/|c|) - \Psi_{\text{sph}}(z/|z|))} \leq e^{K\Psi_{\text{rad}}(|c|)\frac{\rho}{c}} \leq e^{K\Psi_{\text{rad}}(R)\frac{r}{R_0}}.$$

Therefore, recalling (7.24) we have that taking any $r = O\left(\frac{1}{\log \nu}\right)$,

$$p(c, \rho) \leq C f(c) f_{\text{max}}^k(c, \rho),$$

for some $C > 0$. Thus,

$$\Delta(c, \rho) \leq C f(c) \left(\frac{f_{\text{max}}(c, \rho)}{f_{\text{min}}(c, \rho)} \right)^k.$$

Next, let $z = c + \rho\theta \in B_\rho(c)$. Then, using assumption (III.3), we have

$$\Psi_{\text{rad}}(|c|)(1 - A_3 r) \leq \Psi_{\text{rad}}(|c| - r) \leq \Psi_{\text{rad}}(|z|) \leq \Psi_{\text{rad}}(|c| + r) \leq \Psi_{\text{rad}}(|c|)(1 + A_3 r)$$

In addition, since Ψ_{sph} is Lipschitz, we have

$$\Psi_{\text{sph}}(c/|c|) - K \frac{r}{R_0} \leq \Psi_{\text{sph}}(z/|z|) \leq \Psi_{\text{sph}}(c/|c|) + K \frac{r}{R_0}.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{f_{\text{max}}(c, \rho)}{f_{\text{min}}(c, \rho)} \leq e^{2r\Psi_{\text{rad}}(R)\left(\frac{K}{R_0} + A_3\Psi_{\text{sph}}(c/|c|)\right)} \leq e^{Cr\Psi_{\text{rad}}(R)},$$

since Ψ_{sph} is bounded. Therefore, taking $r = O\left(\frac{1}{\log \nu}\right)$, from (7.24) we have that,

$$\Delta(c, \rho) \leq C f(c).$$

This implies that we can evaluate $\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}(\Lambda)\}$ similarly to (7.21),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}(\Lambda)\} &= \frac{\nu}{d\omega_d^k(k+1)!} (k!)^{d-k+1} \\ &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\infty \Delta(c, \rho(t)) \mathbb{1}\{t \leq \nu f_c(r)\} \mathbb{1}\{R_0 < |c| \leq R\} t^{k-1} e^{-t} d\rho dc,\end{aligned}$$

where we have an integrable bound for the integrand. Applying the DCT as before, assuming $r_{\max} = O(1/\log \nu)$ and $\Lambda_{\max} = \nu r_{\max}^d$, we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}^{(2)}(\Lambda_{\max})\} = f(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{R_0}(\mathbf{0})) F_k^*.$$

Together with (7.23), this completes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.3 – Vietoris-Rips. Recall (7.13), for $k \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda)\} = \frac{\nu^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^r \int_{S^{d-1}} \rho^{d-1} f(x) f(x + \rho\theta) \mathbb{E}\{\beta_{k-2}(x, x + \rho\theta)\} d\theta d\rho dx,$$

where from (7.15),

$$\mathbb{E}\{\beta_{k-2}(x, x + \rho\theta)\} = \sum_{m=2(k-1)}^\infty \frac{1}{m!} (\nu f(I(x, x + \rho\theta)))^m e^{-\nu f(I(x, x + \rho\theta))} \bar{\beta}_{k-2}(x, x + \rho\theta; m).$$

Denote $f_{x,\theta}(\rho) = f(I(x, x + \rho\theta))$, and $\Delta(x, \rho, \theta) := \frac{\rho^{d-1} f(x + \rho\theta)}{f'_{x,\theta}(\rho)}$, then we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda)\} &= \frac{\nu}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^r \int_{S^{d-1}} f(x) \Delta(x, \rho, \theta) \sum_{m=2(k-1)}^\infty \frac{1}{m!} \bar{\beta}_{k-2}(x, x + \rho\theta; m) \\ &\quad \times (\nu f'_{x,\theta}(\rho)) (\nu f_{x,\theta}(\rho))^m e^{-\nu f_{x,\theta}(\rho)} d\theta d\rho dx.\end{aligned}$$

Taking the change of variables $t = \nu f_{x,\theta}(\rho)$ and $dt = \nu f'_{x,\theta}(\rho) d\rho$, we have

$$(7.25) \quad \begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\{F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda)\} &= \frac{\nu}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\infty \int_{S^{d-1}} f(x) \Delta(x, \rho(t), \theta) \mathbb{1}\{t \leq \nu f_{x,\theta}(r)\} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{m=2(k-1)}^\infty \frac{1}{m!} \bar{\beta}_{k-2}(x, x + \rho(t)\theta; m) t^m e^{-t} d\theta dt dx,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\rho(t) := f_{x,\theta}^{-1}(t/\nu).$$

For all three types of distributions, we saw in the proof for the Čech complex that we can upper

bound the term $f_{\max}(x, \rho)/f_{\min}(x, \rho)$. We will use that to upper bound the integrand here as well. The rest of the details will be the same as for the Čech complex.

First, note that

$$f'_{x,\theta}(\rho) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_{x,\theta}(\rho + \varepsilon) - f_{x,\theta}(\rho)}{\varepsilon} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{I(x, x + (\rho + \varepsilon)\theta) \setminus I(x, x + \rho\theta)} f(z) dz \geq f_{\min}(x, \rho) V'_{x,\theta}(\rho),$$

where $V_{x,\theta}(\rho) = \text{Vol}(I(x, x + \rho\theta)) = \rho^d \text{Vol}(I_0)$, and therefore, $V'_{x,\theta}(\rho) = d\rho^{d-1} \kappa_d$. Thus,

$$f'_{x,\theta}(\rho) \geq d\kappa_d \rho^{d-1} f_{\min}(x, \rho),$$

and

$$(7.26) \quad \Delta(x, \rho, \theta) \leq \frac{1}{d\kappa_d} \frac{f_{\max}(x, \rho)}{f_{\min}(x, \rho)} \leq C,$$

for some $C > 0$ (using the bounds we established for the Čech case).

Next, Lemma C.1 provides a necessary condition for $\beta_{k-2}(x_1, x_2)$ to be nonzero. This condition requires that a “forbidden region” $I_{\ominus}(x_1, x_2) \subset I(x_1, x_2)$ may contain no points from \mathcal{P}_{ν} . Therefore,

$$\bar{\beta}_{k-2}(x_1, x_2; m) \leq \left(1 - \frac{f(I_{\ominus}(x_1, x_2))}{f(I(x_1, x_2))}\right)^m m^{k-1}.$$

Then,

$$\bar{\beta}_{k-2}(x, x + \rho\theta; m) \leq \left(1 - \frac{f_{\min}(x, \rho) \text{Vol}(I_{\ominus}(x, x + \rho\theta))}{f_{\max}(x, \rho) \text{Vol}(I(x, x + \rho\theta))}\right)^m m^{k-1} \leq \xi^m m^{k-1},$$

for some constant $0 < \xi < 1$, since the volume of I_{\ominus} is proportional to I (see Lemma C.1). In this case,

$$(7.27) \quad \sum_{m=2(k-1)}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \bar{\beta}_{k-2}(x, x + \rho(t)\theta; m) t^m e^{-t} \leq \sum_{m=2(k-1)}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} m^{k-1} (\xi t)^m e^{-t} \leq C(\xi t)^{k-1} e^{-(1-\xi)t},$$

for some $C > 0$. Combining (7.26) and (7.27), we can apply the same steps as in the Čech complex, and have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{F_{k,\nu}(\Lambda)\} = F_k^*.$$

□

8 Vertex degree in the k -NN graph

We now demonstrate the broader application of the framework developed in Section 4. Let $G_k(\mathcal{X})$ denote the k -nearest neighbor (k -NN) graph generated by a finite $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. In other words, $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ are connected by an edge if either x_2 is one of the k nearest neighbors of x_1 , or x_1 is one of the k nearest nearest neighbors of x_2 . Note that while above, k denotes the homological degree, in this section only it refers to the parameter for constructing the graph.

When \mathcal{X} is random, the degree of every vertex in $G_k(\mathcal{X})$ is a random variable (larger or equal to k). In this section we show that the distribution of the vertex degree is universal. Note that for this functional, we only require the density to be upper bounded and piecewise continuous, rather than the more restrictive conditions on good densities needed for the persistence measure.

Theorem 8.1. *Let $\mathcal{P}_\nu \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; f)$, and let $V_{\ell, \nu}$ be the number of vertices of degree ℓ in $G_k(\mathcal{P}_\nu)$. There exists a $K > k$, such that for all $k \leq \ell \leq K$, we have*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E} \{V_{\ell, \nu}\} = p_\ell^*,$$

where

$$p_m^* = \mathbb{P}(\text{deg}(0; \mathcal{H}_1 \cup \{0\}) = \ell),$$

and \mathcal{H}_1 is a homogeneous Poisson process in \mathbb{R}^d with rate 1, so that p_ℓ^* depends on d , k , and ℓ , but is independent of f (i.e., universal). Furthermore, $\sum_{\ell=k}^K p_\ell^* = 1$.

Similarly, let $\mathcal{X}_n \sim \text{Binomial}(n; f)$, and let $V_{\ell, n}$ be the number of vertices of degree ℓ in $G_k(\mathcal{X}_n)$. Then almost surely, for all $k \leq \ell \leq K$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} V_{\ell, n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \{V_{\ell, n}\} = p_\ell^*.$$

To prove Theorem 8.1, a key observation is that the neighborhood of every vertex in $G_k(\mathcal{X})$ can be determined locally. To this end, we define

$$(8.1) \quad \text{Cone}_* := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \frac{\langle x, \mathbf{1} \rangle}{|x|} \geq \sqrt{3/2} \right\},$$

where $\mathbf{1} = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, so that Cone_* is a cone whose apex is the origin and whose angle is $\pi/3$. Note that for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we can cover \mathbb{R}^d with a finite collection of translated and rotated copies of Cone_* , denoted $\text{Cone}_1(x), \dots, \text{Cone}_N(x)$.

Lemma 8.2. *Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be locally-finite, and $G_k(\mathcal{X})$ be the k -NN graph. Fix $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and define*

$$(8.2) \quad R(x; \mathcal{X}) := 2 \inf \{r > 0 : |\mathcal{X} \cap B_r(x) \cap \text{Cone}_i(x)| \geq k + 1, 1 \leq i \leq N\}.$$

Then

$$\deg(x; \mathcal{X}) = \deg(x; \mathcal{X} \cap B_{R(x; \mathcal{X})}(x)).$$

In other words, the degree of x is completely determined by the points lying in $B_{R(x; \mathcal{X})}(x)$, and is not affected by changes to the point configuration outside this ball. Additionally, taking $K = kN$, we have

$$k \leq \deg(x; \mathcal{X}) \leq K.$$

Proof. We will prove the statement for $x = \mathbf{0}$, assuming $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{X}$, the result then follows from the translation and scale invariance of the k -NN graph.

Let $\text{Cone}_i = \text{Cone}_i(\mathbf{0})$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, as defined above. Note that for every $x_1, x_2 \in \text{Cone}_i$, we have $|x_1 - x_2| \leq \max(|x_1|, |x_2|)$, since the angle between x_1 and x_2 is less than $\pi/3$ (8.1). Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{X}$, and suppose that there exist $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \text{Cone}_i \cap \mathcal{X}$, such that $0 < |x_1| \leq \dots \leq |x_m|$, which implies that $|x_m - x_j| \leq |x_m|$ for all $j \neq m$. If x_m is connected to $\mathbf{0}$ in $G_k(\mathcal{X})$, then either: (a) x_m is a k -nearest neighbor of $\mathbf{0}$, which implies that x_1, \dots, x_{m-1} are all nearest neighbors as well; (b) $\mathbf{0}$ is a k -nearest neighbor of x_m , but since $|x_m - x_j| \leq |x_m|$, we conclude that x_1, \dots, x_{m-1} are all k -nearest neighbors of x_m as well. In both cases we must have $m \leq k$. In other words, each of the cones Cone_i contains at most k neighbors of $\mathbf{0}$ in $G_k(\mathcal{X})$.

Suppose that $R(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{X}) = r$. The definition (8.2) implies that if x is a neighbor of $\mathbf{0}$ in $G_k(\mathcal{X})$ then $x \in \text{Cone}_i \cap B_{r/2}(\mathbf{0})$ for some i . Additionally, note that Cone_i contains at least k points that are within distance $r/2$ from x . Therefore all the k -nearest neighbors of x must lie in $B_{r/2}(\mathbf{0})$. This implies that $\deg(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{X}) = \deg(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{X} \cap B_r(\mathbf{0}))$.

Finally, since each Cone_i contains at most k neighbors of $\mathbf{0}$, we have $\deg(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{X}) \leq kN$. This concludes the proof. \square

Using Lemma 8.2, together with Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, we can now prove Theorem 8.1.

Proof of Theorem 8.1. The functional we consider here is $\mathcal{H}_\nu = V_{\ell, \nu}$, i.e., the number of vertices in \mathcal{P}_ν with degree ℓ . By definition, the k -NN graph is translation and scaling invariant, so (4.1) and (4.3) hold. In addition, the functional \mathcal{H}_ν in this case has no explicit dependency in ν (only via \mathcal{P}_ν), and therefore (4.4) holds as well. For the binomial proof, we note that $V_{\ell, n} \leq n$, so (4.7) holds. Finally, since the degree of every vertex is between k and K (Lemma 8.2), we have almost surely,

$$|V_{\ell, n} - V_{\ell, n \pm \Delta}| \leq (1 + K)\Delta,$$

so that (4.8)-(4.9) hold as well. Therefore, we are left with proving (4.2), (4.5), and (4.6).

Proving linear scale (4.2):

Recall that here $\mathcal{P}_\nu = \mathcal{P}_\nu^* \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu; \mathbb{1}_{Q^d})$. Using Mecke's formula, we have

$$(8.3) \quad \mathbb{E}\{V_{\ell,\nu}\} = \nu \int_{Q^d} \mathbb{P}(\deg(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x) = \ell) dx,$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\nu^x := \mathcal{P}_\nu^* \cup \{x\}$.

Fix $r \in (0, 1/2)$, and $x \in [r, 1-r]^d$. Recall the definition of $R(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x)$ (8.2), and note that $R(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x) \leq r$ if and only if $R(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x \cap B_r(x)) \leq r$. Also note that $\mathcal{P}_\nu^* \cap B_r(x)$ is a homogeneous Poisson process with rate ν . Therefore, using the scale and shift invariance of the k-NN graph, and taking $\nu r^d = \lambda$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(R(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x) > r) = \mathbb{P}(R(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0) > \lambda^{1/d}),$$

where \mathcal{H}_1 is a homogeneous Poisson process in \mathbb{R}^d with rate 1. Similarly, from Lemma 8.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\deg(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x) = \ell, R(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x) \leq r) &= \mathbb{P}(\deg(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x \cap B_r(x)) = \ell, R(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x) \leq r) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\deg(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0 \cap B_{\lambda^{1/d}}(\mathbf{0})) = \ell, R(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0) \leq \lambda^{1/d}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\deg(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0) = \ell, R(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0) \leq \lambda^{1/d}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\deg(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0) = \ell) - \mathbb{P}(\deg(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0) = \ell, R(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0) > \lambda^{1/d}). \end{aligned}$$

Denoting

$$p_\ell^* := \mathbb{P}(\deg(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0) = \ell),$$

we therefore have,

$$p_\ell^* - \mathbb{P}(R(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0) > \lambda^{1/d}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\deg(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x) = \ell) \leq p_\ell^* + \mathbb{P}(R(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0) > \lambda^{1/d}).$$

Since $R(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0)$ is almost surely finite (each Cone_i contains infinitely many points from \mathcal{H}_1), we can take λ large enough so that

$$\mathbb{P}(R(\mathbf{0}; \mathcal{H}_1^0) > \lambda^{1/d}) < \varepsilon.$$

Going back to (8.3), for every $x \in (0, 1)^d$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, we can take λ and ν large enough so that $x \in [r, 1-r]^d$, $\nu r^d = \lambda$, and

$$|\mathbb{P}(\deg(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x) = \ell) - p_\ell^*| \leq \varepsilon,$$

implying that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\deg(x; \mathcal{P}_\nu^x) = \ell) = p_\ell^*.$$

Using the DCT for (8.3) completes the proof.

Proving additivity (4.5):

Take any $M = m^d$, and define $\mathcal{P}_\nu = \bigcup_i \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}$, where $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} \sim \text{Poisson}(c_i \nu; M \mathbb{1}_{Q_i})$ are independent. Denote by $V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i)}$ the number of degree- ℓ vertices generated by $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}$. Our goal is to show that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \left| \mathbb{E} \{V_{\ell,\nu}\} - \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E} \{V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i)}\} \right| = 0.$$

Fix $r > 0$, and let

$$\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}^{(r)} = \left\{ x \in \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} : \inf_{z \in \partial Q_i} |x - z| \geq r \right\}.$$

Let $V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i,r)}$ be the number of degree- ℓ points p in $G_k(\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i})$, such that $p \in \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}^{(r)}$ and $R(p, \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}) \leq r$. Then,

$$V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i,r)} \leq V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i)} \leq V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i,r)} + \Delta_{1,i} + \Delta_{2,i},$$

where $\Delta_{1,i}$ is the number of points $p \in \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}^{(r)}$ with $R(p; \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}) > r$, and $\Delta_{2,i}$ is the number of points in $\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} \setminus \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}^{(r)}$. Note that if $p \in \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}^{(r)}$ is such that $R(p, \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}) \leq r$, then $\deg(p; \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i}) = \deg(p; \mathcal{P}_\nu)$. Therefore, we also have,

$$\sum_{i=1}^M V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i,r)} \leq V_{\ell,\nu} \leq \sum_{i=1}^M V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i,r)} + \sum_{i=1}^M (\Delta_{1,i} + \Delta_{2,i}),$$

which implies that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \{V_{\ell,\nu}\} - \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E} \{V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i)}\} \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^M (\Delta_{1,i} + \Delta_{2,i}).$$

Similarly to the steps in proving (4.2), we can show that for all ε , we can take λ large enough, so that for $\nu r^d = \lambda$,

$$\limsup_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^M (\Delta_{1,i} + \Delta_{2,i}) < \varepsilon,$$

which proves (4.5).

Proving continuity (4.6):

Let f_1, f_2, \dots , be a sequence of density functions as in (4.6), and take $\mathcal{P}_\nu = \mathcal{P}_{\nu,i} \cup \Delta_{\nu,i}$. Denoting $V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i)}$ the number of degree- ℓ points in $G_k(\mathcal{P}_{\nu,i})$, note that

$$|V_{\ell,\nu} - V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i)}| \leq (1 + K) |\Delta_{\nu,i}|,$$

since every point added from $\Delta_{\nu,i}$ can be of degree ℓ , and can also affect the degree of at most K existing vertices in the graph.

Since $\mathbb{E} \{|\Delta_{\nu,i}|\} = \delta_i \nu$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ we can take i large enough so that $\delta_i \leq \varepsilon / (1 + K)$

which implies that

$$\frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}\{|V_{\ell,\nu} - V_{\ell,\nu}^{(i)}|\} \leq \varepsilon.$$

This concludes the proof. □

Appendix

A Blaschke-Petkhanchin formula

Our bounds for the number of critical faces for the Čech complex $(F_{k,\nu}(\lambda))$ involve integrating over sets of points in \mathbb{R}^d of size $k + 1$. The Blaschke-Petkahnchin formula provides a change of variables, extending the idea of polar coordinates, that significantly simplifies the integration in this context.

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k+1}$ be the coordinates we want to integrate over. Note that every $(k + 1)$ points in general position, can be placed on a unique $(k - 1)$ -dimensional sphere in \mathbb{R}^d . Denoting this sphere by $S(\mathbf{x})$, we then define the following

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mathbf{x}) &:= \text{the center of } S(\mathbf{x}), \\ \rho(\mathbf{x}) &:= \text{the radius of } S(\mathbf{x}), \\ \gamma(\mathbf{x}) &:= \text{the } k\text{-dimensional plane containing } S(\mathbf{x}), \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) &:= \text{the spherical coordinates of } \mathbf{x} \text{ in } S(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

The transformation $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow (c(\mathbf{x}), \rho(\mathbf{x}), \gamma(\mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\theta}(\mathbf{x}))$ is then a bijection, and we write $\mathbf{x} = c + \rho(\gamma \circ \boldsymbol{\theta})$, where $\gamma \circ \boldsymbol{\theta}$ takes the spherical coordinates $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ on the plane γ .

Using this representation, the following change of variables is known as the *Blaschke-Petkantschin* (BP) formula. The version presented here was proved in [18].

$$(A.1) \quad \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k+1}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\infty \int_{\Gamma_{d,k}} \int_{(S^{k-1})^{k+1}} \rho^{dk-1} \varphi(c + \rho(\gamma \circ \boldsymbol{\theta})) (k! V_{\text{simp}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^{d-k+1} d\boldsymbol{\theta} d\gamma d\rho dc,$$

where $\Gamma(d, k)$ is the k -dimensional Grassmannian in \mathbb{R}^d .

B Strong law of large numbers

The following lemma is inspired by the proof of Theorem 3.17 in [30], aiming to provide a more general context.

Lemma B.1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{X}_n \sim \text{Binomial}(n; f)$. Suppose that \mathcal{H}_n satisfies the conditions (4.7)-(4.9). Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\gamma > 0$, such that for n large enough, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)\}| \geq \varepsilon n) \leq e^{-n^\gamma}.$$

Proof. Define the martingale

$$M_i^{(n)} := \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_i\},$$

where $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(\mathcal{X}_i)$ (the σ -algebra generated by \mathcal{X}_i), and the martingale difference

$$D_i^{(n)} = M_i^{(n)} - M_{i-1}^{(n)}, \quad i \geq 1,$$

so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n D_i^{(n)} = \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)\}.$$

Define $\mathcal{X}_n^i = \mathcal{X}_{n+1} \setminus \{X_i\}$, and note that we can write

$$D_i^{(n)} = \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n^i) \mid \mathcal{F}_i\}.$$

Recall the definition of A_n in (4.8)-(4.9). We can define a similar event for \mathcal{X}_n^i , denoted $\tilde{A}_{n,i}$, and take $A_{n,i} = A_n \cap \tilde{A}_{n,i}$. Note that from (4.9), under the event $A_{n,i}$,

$$|\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n^i)| \leq |\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_{n-1}^i)| + |\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n^i) - \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_{n-1}^i)| \leq 2C_4 n^b.$$

Therefore, using (4.7),

$$\begin{aligned} (B.1) \quad |D_i^{(n)}| &\leq \mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n^i)| \mathbb{1}_{A_{n,i}} \mid \mathcal{F}_i\} + \mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n^i)| \mathbb{1}_{A_{n,i}^c} \mid \mathcal{F}_i\} \\ &\leq 2C_4 n^b + C_3 n^q \mathbb{P}(A_{n,i}^c \mid \mathcal{F}_i). \end{aligned}$$

Denote $Z_{n,i} = \mathbb{P}(A_{n,i}^c \mid \mathcal{F}_i)$, then using (4.8), Markov's inequality, and the fact that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{A}_{n,i}) = \mathbb{P}(A_n)$, yields

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_{n,i} > n^{-q}) \leq n^q \mathbb{P}(A_{n,i}^c) \leq 2n^q e^{-n^a}.$$

From [10] (see also Theorem 2.9 in [30]), for any $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n D_i^{(n)}\right| > \delta_1\right) \leq 2e^{-\frac{\delta_1^2}{32n\delta_2^2}} + \left(1 + \frac{2 \sup_i \|D_i^{(n)}\|_\infty}{\delta_1}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(|D_i^{(n)}| > \delta_2).$$

Take $\delta_1 = \varepsilon n$, and $\delta_2 = C_5 n^b$ for some $C_5 > 2C_4$. Noting that $\|D_i^{(n)}\|_\infty \leq C_3 n^q$, and that if

$Z_{n,i} \leq n^{-q}$ then from (B.1) we have $|D_i^{(n)}| \leq C_5 n^b$, we have for n large,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)\}| \geq \varepsilon n) &\leq 2e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n^2}{32C_5^2 n^{2b+1}}} + (1 + 2\varepsilon^{-1}C_3 n^{q-1}) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(Z_{n,i} > n^{-q}), \\ &\leq 2e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{32C_5^2 n^{2b-1}}} + 2(1 + 2\varepsilon^{-1}C_3 n^{q-1})n^{q+1}e^{-n^a} \\ &\leq e^{-n^{\gamma_1}} + e^{-n^{\gamma_2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_1 = (1 - 2b)/2 > 0$, and, $\gamma_2 = a/2$. Take any $\gamma < \min(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, then for n large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n) - \mathbb{E}\{\mathcal{H}_n(\mathcal{X}_n)\}| \geq \varepsilon n) \leq e^{-n^\gamma},$$

completing the proof. □

C Necessary conditions for criticality for Vietoris-Rips

Here we prove a necessary condition for an edge in the Vietoris-Rips filtration to be critical, in the sense that the insertion of the edge and its star corresponds to some births or deaths in the persistence diagram (for any k). Consider an edge $e = (x_1, x_2)$, and let $c = (x_1 + x_2)/2$, and $\rho = |x_1 - x_2|$. Recall that

$$I(x_1, x_2) := B_\rho(x_1) \cap B_\rho(x_2).$$

Note, that

$$\sup_{I(x_1, x_2)} |x - c| = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\rho.$$

Therefore, if we take

$$\rho_\circ := (1 - \sqrt{3}/2)\rho,$$

and

$$I_\circ(x_1, x_2) := B_{\rho_\circ}(c),$$

then the distance between any $y \in I_\circ(x_1, x_2)$ and $z \in I(x_1, x_2)$ is less than ρ . We use this observation to prove the following lemma.

Lemma C.1. *Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$. If $e = (x_1, x_2)$ is critical in the Vietoris-Rips filtration generated by \mathcal{X} , then $I_\circ(x_1, x_2) \cap \mathcal{X} = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Recall from Lemma 6.1, that

$$\begin{aligned} F_k(e) &= \beta_{k-2}(\text{lk}(e; \mathcal{X})), \quad k > 1 \\ F_1(e) &= \mathbf{1}\{\text{lk}(e; \mathcal{X}) = \emptyset\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the link is a Vietoris-Rips complex,

$$\text{lk}(e; \mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{R}_\rho(\mathcal{X}'), \quad \mathcal{X}' = \mathcal{X} \cap I(x_1, x_2) \setminus \{x_1, x_2\}, \quad \rho = |x_1 - x_2|.$$

Note that if $|\mathcal{X}'| = 1$, then $F_k(e) = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$. Therefore, we assume $|\mathcal{X}'| \geq 2$.

Clearly if $I_\odot(x_1, x_2) \cap \mathcal{X} \neq \emptyset$ then $F_1(e) = 0$. To show that $F_k(e) = 0$ for $k > 1$, suppose that $y \in \mathcal{X} \cap I_\odot(x_1, x_2)$. Then $|y - z| \leq \rho$ for all $z \in \mathcal{X}'$. Note that for any simplex $\tau \in \text{lk}(e; \mathcal{X})$ which does not include y , the simplex $\tau \cup \{y\}$ must also be in $\text{lk}(e; \mathcal{X})$, since all the vertices of τ are in $B_\rho(y)$. Hence, $\text{lk}(e; \mathcal{X})$ is star-shaped with respect to y , and therefore contractible, and so $\beta_{k-2}(\text{lk}(e; \mathcal{X})) = 0$ for all $k \geq 0$.

□

References

- [1] Hannah Alpert and Fedor Manin. Configuration spaces of disks in a strip, twisted algebras, persistence, and other stories. *Geometry & Topology*, 28(2):641–699, 2024. Publisher: Mathematical Sciences Publishers. 1
- [2] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013. 7
- [3] Omer Bobrowski. Homological connectivity in random Čech complexes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 183(3):715–788, 2022. Publisher: Springer. 1
- [4] Omer Bobrowski and Robert J. Adler. Distance functions, critical points, and the topology of random Čech complexes. *Homology, Homotopy and Applications*, 16(2):311–344, 2014. 14
- [5] Omer Bobrowski and Primoz Skraba. Homological percolation: The formation of giant k-cycles. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2022(8):6186–6213, 2022. Publisher: Oxford University Press. 1
- [6] Omer Bobrowski and Primoz Skraba. Cluster Persistence for Weighted Graphs. *Entropy*, 25(12):1587, 2023. Publisher: MDPI. 2
- [7] Omer Bobrowski and Primoz Skraba. A universal null-distribution for topological data analysis. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):12274, 2023. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group UK London. 2, 5, 7
- [8] Karol Borsuk. On the imbedding of systems of compacta in simplicial complexes. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 35(1):217–234, 1948. 14

- [9] Gunnar Carlsson and Mikael Vejdemo-Johansson. *Topological data analysis with applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2021. 1
- [10] T. K. Chalker, A. P. Godbole, P. Hitczenko, J. Radcliff, and O. G. Ruehr. On the size of a random sphere of influence graph. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 31(3):596–609, 1999. Publisher: Cambridge University Press. 50
- [11] Frédéric Chazal. High-dimensional topological data analysis. In *Handbook of Discrete and Computational Geometry*, pages 663–683. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2017. 1
- [12] William Crawley-Boevey. Decomposition of pointwise finite-dimensional persistence modules. *Journal of Algebra and its Applications*, 14(05):1550066, 2015. 4
- [13] Cecil Jose A. Delfinado and Herbert Edelsbrunner. An incremental algorithm for Betti numbers of simplicial complexes. In *Proceedings of the ninth annual symposium on Computational geometry - SCG '93*, pages 232–239, San Diego, California, United States, 1993. ACM Press. 19
- [14] Tamal Krishna Dey and Yusu Wang. *Computational topology for data analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2022. 1
- [15] Vincent Divol and Frédéric Chazal. The density of expected persistence diagrams and its kernel based estimation. *Journal of Computational Geometry*, 10(2):127–153, 2019. 2
- [16] Vincent Divol and Wolfgang Polonik. On the choice of weight functions for linear representations of persistence diagrams. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, 3(3):249–283, 2019. Publisher: Springer. 2
- [17] Herbert Edelsbrunner and John L. Harer. *Computational topology: an introduction*. AMS Bookstore, 2010. 1, 3
- [18] Herbert Edelsbrunner, Anton Nikitenko, and Matthias Reitzner. Expected sizes of Poisson–Delaunay mosaics and their discrete Morse functions. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 49(3):745–767, 2017. 49
- [19] Graham Ellis and Simon King. Persistent homology of groups. *Journal of Group Theory*, 14(4), January 2011. 1
- [20] Michael Entov and Leonid Polterovich. Legendrian persistence modules and dynamics. *Journal of Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, 24(2):30, 2022. Publisher: Springer. 1
- [21] Vladimir Gershkovich and Hyam Rubinstein. Morse theory for Min-type functions. *The Asian Journal of Mathematics*, 1(4):696–715, 1997. 14

- [22] Yasuaki Hiraoka, Tomoyuki Shirai, and Khanh Duy Trinh. Limit theorems for persistence diagrams. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 28(5):2740–2780, 2018. 2, 25
- [23] Matthew Kahle. Random geometric complexes. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 45(3):553–573, 2011. 7
- [24] Johannes Krebs. On limit theorems for persistent Betti numbers from dependent data. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 139:139–174, 2021. Publisher: Elsevier. 2
- [25] Johannes TN Krebs and Wolfgang Polonik. On the asymptotic normality of persistent Betti numbers. *arXiv:1903.03280*, 2019. 2
- [26] Dmitriy Morozov. *Homological illusions of persistence and stability*. Duke University, 2008. 21
- [27] Tobias Müller and Matěj Stehlík. On the contractibility of random Vietoris–Rips complexes. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, pages 1–18, 2022. Publisher: Springer. 1
- [28] Takashi Owada. Convergence of persistence diagram in the sparse regime. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 32(6):4706–4736, 2022. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics. 2
- [29] Takashi Owada and Omer Bobrowski. Convergence of persistence diagrams for topological crackle. *Bernoulli*, 26(3):2275–2310, 2020. 2
- [30] Mathew Penrose. *Random geometric graphs*, volume 5. Oxford University Press Oxford, 2003. 13, 31, 33, 49, 50
- [31] Mathew D. Penrose and J. E. Yukich. Weak laws of large numbers in geometric probability. *Annals of Applied probability*, pages 277–303, 2003. 3, 8
- [32] Leonid Polterovich, Daniel Rosen, Karina Samvelyan, and Jun Zhang. *Topological persistence in geometry and analysis*, volume 74. American Mathematical Soc., 2020. 1
- [33] Tomoyuki Shirai and Kiyotaka Suzuki. A limit theorem for persistence diagrams of random filtered complexes built over marked point processes. *Modern Stochastics: Theory and Applications*, 10(1):1–18, September 2022. Publisher: VTeX: Solutions for Science Publishing. 2
- [34] Primož Skraba and D. Yogeshwaran. Central limit theorem for euclidean minimal spanning acycles. *Journal of Topology and Analysis*, pages 1–37, November 2023. Publisher: World Scientific Publishing Co. 2
- [35] D. Yogeshwaran and Robert J. Adler. On the topology of random complexes built over stationary point processes. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 25(6):3338–3380, 2015. 2

- [36] D. Yogeshwaran, Eliran Subag, and Robert J. Adler. Random geometric complexes in the thermodynamic regime. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–36, 2016. 31