

THE DUAL DEGREE CECH BIFILTRATION

MORTEN BRUN¹

In topological data analysis (TDA), a longstanding challenge is to recognize underlying geometric structures in noisy data. One motivating examples is the shape of a point cloud in Euclidean space given by image patches [9]. Carlsson et al. [5] proposed a method to detect topological features in point clouds by first filtering by density and then applying persistent homology. Later more refined methods have been developed, such as the degree Rips complex [10] of Lesnick and Wright and the multicover bifiltration [2, 6, 7, 12]. In this paper we introduce the dual Degree Cech bifiltration, a Prohorov stable bicomplex of a point cloud in a metric space with the point cloud itself as vertex set. It is of the same homotopy type as the Measure Dowker bifiltration [8, 14] but it has a different vertex set.

The dual Degree Cech bifiltration can be constructed both in an ambient and an intrinsic way. The intrinsic dual Degree Cech bifiltration is $(1, 2)$ -intereaved with the ambient dual Degree Cech bifiltration in the distance parameter. This interleaving can be used to leverage a stability result for the intrinsically defined dual Degree Cech bifiltration. Such a stability result recently occured in work by Hellmer and Spaliński [8, Theorem 4.2].

1. INTRODUCTION

Let μ be a measure with support $S(\mu)$ on the Borel σ -algebra of a metric space M with metric $d: M \times M \rightarrow [0, \infty]$. The *dual degree Cech bifiltration of d and μ* is the family $\{DC(d, \mu)_{m,r}\}_{(m,r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]}$ of simplicial complexes where

$$DC(d, \mu)_{m,r} = \{\tau \in \Delta(S(\mu)) \mid \exists x \in M \text{ with } \tau \subseteq B_d(x, r) \text{ and } \mu(B_d(x, r)) \geq m\}.$$

Here $\Delta(S(\mu))$ is the set of finite non-empty subsets of $S(\mu)$ and $B_d(x, r)$ is the closed ball centered at x with radius r , that is, $B_d(x, r) = \{y \in M \mid d(x, y) \leq r\}$. The vertex sets of these simplicial complexes is the support $S(\mu)$ of μ .

Observe that if μ is the counting measure of a finite subset S of M then $DC(d, \mu)_{1,r}$ is the ordinary Cech complex of the finite subset $S = S(\mu)$ of the metric space M at filtration degree r .

Let us refer to Definition 2.10 for the concept of homotopy weak interleaving distance and to Definition 6.1 for the concept of Prohorov distance appearing in the next Theorem. The concept of homotopy weak interleaving distance is a variation on the usual concept of interleaving distance for bifiltrations. One justification for the homotopy weak interleaving distance is that interleaving distance between homology persistence modules is bounded above by both homotopy weak interleaving distance and interleaving distance.

The following result states that the dual Degree Cech bifiltration is Prohorov stable.

Theorem 1.1. *If μ_0 and μ_1 are two Borel measures on a separable metric space M , then the homotopy weak interleaving distance between the bifiltered simplicial complexes $DC(d, \mu_0)$ and $DC(d, \mu_1)$ is bounded above by the Prohorov distance between μ_0 and μ_1 .*

The dual degree Čech bifiltration is closely related to the measure bifiltration $\{\mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}\}_{(m,r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]}$ associated to a metric d on a set M and a Borel measure μ on M . The space $\mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}$ consists of the points x in M satisfying that the ball $B_d(x, r)$ has measure at least m . That is,

$$\mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r} = \{x \in M \mid \mu(B_d(x, r)) \geq m\}.$$

This definition appears several places in the literature, see for example [8, Definition 2.6] or [2, Definition 2.6] where it is denoted $\mathcal{B}(\mu)_{m,r}$ and $\mathcal{B}(M)_{m,r}$ respectively. By [2, Theorem 3.1], given Borel measures μ and η on a metric space M with metric d , the interleaving distance of the bifiltered topological spaces $\mathcal{M}(d, \mu)$ and $\mathcal{M}(d, \eta)$ is bounded above by the Prohorov distance between μ and η . That is, the measure bifiltration is Prohorov stable.

Definition 1.2. Given a subset X of a metric space M with metric d and $r \geq 0$, the r -offset X^r is the union of all closed balls $B_d(x, r)$ of radius r centered at a point x in X .

Theorem 1.3. *Let M be a separable metric space with metric d and with a Borel measure μ . The nerve of the cover of $\mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}$, consisting of the closed subsets $B_d(x, r) \cap \mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}$ given by intersections with balls of radius r centered at points x in the r -offset $\mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}^r$, is homotopy equivalent to the dual degree Čech bifiltration $DC(d, \mu)_{m,r}$. Such homotopy equivalences can be chosen to be compatible with the bifiltration.*

Unfortunately Theorem 1.3 contains no information about the homotopy type of the dual degree Čech bifiltration.

Restricting d and μ to the support of μ we obtain an intrinsic version of the dual degree Čech bifiltration. Like the usual intrinsic Čech filtration is multiplicatively interleaved with the (ambient) Čech filtration, the intrinsic degree Čech bifiltration is multiplicatively interleaved with the (ambient) dual degree Čech bifiltration.

Theorem 1.4. *Let M be a separable metric space with metric d and let μ be a Borel measure on M with support S . Let $d|_{S \times S}$ be the restriction of d to S and let $\mu|_S$ be the restriction of μ to S . For all $(m, r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]$, there are inclusions*

$$DC(d|_{S \times S}, \mu|_S)_{m,r} \subseteq DC(d, \mu)_{m,r} \subseteq DC(d|_{S \times S}, \mu|_S)_{m,2r}.$$

We refer to Definition 2.8 for the concept of a weak interleaving of bifiltered simplicial complexes and to Definition 2.7 for the concept of a forward shift map occurring below. Combining Theorems 1.1 and 1.4 we obtain the following result that is closely related to [8, Theorem 4.2].

Theorem 1.5. *If μ and η are two Borel measures with compact supports on a separable metric space M of Prohorov distance at less than ε , then there are maps*

$\pi_1: S(\mu) \rightarrow S(\eta)$ and $\pi_0: S(\eta) \rightarrow S(\mu)$ which for all $(m, r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]$ induce maps

$$\pi_1: DC(d_{S(\mu) \times S(\mu)}, \mu|_{S(\mu)})_{m,r} \rightarrow DC(d_{S(\eta) \times S(\eta)}, \eta|_{S(\eta)})_{m-\varepsilon, 2(r+\varepsilon)}$$

and

$$\pi_0: DC(d_{S(\eta) \times S(\eta)}, \eta|_{S(\eta)})_{m,r} \rightarrow DC(d_{S(\mu) \times S(\mu)}, \mu|_{S(\mu)})_{m-\varepsilon, 2(r+\varepsilon)}.$$

These maps form a weak interleaving of the intrinsic dual degree Cech bifiltrations $DC(d_{S(\mu) \times S(\mu)}, \mu|_{S(\mu)})$ and $DC(d_{S(\eta) \times S(\eta)}, \eta|_{S(\eta)})$ with respect to the forward shift map $(m, r) \mapsto (m - \varepsilon, 2(r + \varepsilon))$.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce variations on the concepts of bifiltrations and interleavings and state some results about them. In Section 3 we extend results about Dowker duality to our context. In Section 4 we prove that the passage from set bifiltrations to bifiltered simplicial complexes is stable with respect to our notion of interleaving distance. In Section 5 we use Dowker duality to prove that a restriction of the vertex set of the dual Dowker nerve to the support of a measure preserves homotopy type. In Section 6 we show that Prohorov distance and interleaving distance are related. Finally, in Section 7 we prove Theorem 1.5.

2. DENSITY DEPENDENT BIFILTRATION

In this section we introduce notation around bifiltrations and we state some results about them.

Bifiltered Simplicial Complexes. Given a set X , we let $\Delta(X)$ be the collection of all finite non-empty subsets of X , considered as a partially ordered set under inclusion.

Definition 2.1. A *simplicial complex* on the vertex set X is a subset K of $\Delta(X)$ with the property that if $\sigma \in K$ and $\tau \subseteq \sigma$ is a subset of the set σ , then $\tau \in K$.

We allow simplicial complexes to have ghost vertices, that is, we do not require that the singleton set $\{x\}$ is a member of K for every $x \in X$. Note that $\Delta(X)$ itself is a simplicial complex, referred to as the simplex with the vertex set X . Let us stress that for us, a simplicial complex is a collection of non-empty sets.

Definition 2.2. A *bifiltered simplicial complex* on the vertex set X is a collection

$$K = \{K_{m,r}\}_{(m,r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]}$$

of simplicial complexes with vertex set X such that $K_{m,r} \subseteq K_{m',r'}$ whenever $m' \leq m$ and $r \leq r'$.

In the terminology of categories and functors, a bifiltered simplicial complex K is a functor

$$K: \mathbb{R}^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow \text{sCx}, \quad (m, r) \mapsto Nf_{m,r}.$$

Here \mathbb{R}^{op} is the opposite of the category \mathbb{R} , where \mathbb{R} is the category with the elements of \mathbb{R} as objects and with exactly one morphism $s \rightarrow t$ for each pair

$(s, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ with $s \leq t$. Similarly the category $[0, \infty]$ has one object for each element of $[0, \infty]$.

The objects of the category sCx are simplicial complexes, and a morphism $\phi: A \rightarrow B$ in sCx from a simplicial complex A on the vertex set X to a simplicial complex B on the vertex set Y consists of a function $\phi: X \rightarrow Y$ with the property that if $\sigma \subseteq X$ is a member of A , then its image $\phi(\sigma) = \{\phi(x) \mid x \in \sigma\}$ under ϕ is a member of B . Composition of morphisms of simplicial complexes is given by composition of functions.

Definition 2.3. Let K^0 and K^1 be bifiltered simplicial complexes on the vertex sets X_0 and X_1 respectively. A *weak ε -interleaving* of K^0 and K^1 is a pair maps $\pi_1: X_0 \rightarrow X_1$ and $\pi_0: X_1 \rightarrow X_0$ satisfying the following conditions for every $(m, r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]$:

- (1) The map π_1 induces a map $\pi_1: K_{m,r}^0 \rightarrow K_{m-\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon}^1$.
- (2) The map π_0 induces a map $\pi_0: K_{m,r}^1 \rightarrow K_{m-\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon}^0$.
- (3) The map $\pi_1\pi_0: K_{m,r}^1 \rightarrow K_{m-2\varepsilon, r+2\varepsilon}^1$ is homotopic to the inclusion map.
- (4) The map $\pi_0\pi_1: K_{m,r}^0 \rightarrow K_{m-2\varepsilon, r+2\varepsilon}^0$ is homotopic to the inclusion map.

If there exists a weak ε -interleaving of K^0 and K^1 , we say that are weakly ε -interleaved.

Let us emphasize that the difference between a weak interleaving and an interleaving as it appear in the literature is that the maps $\pi_1 \circ \pi_0$ and $\pi_0 \circ \pi_1$ are not required to be inclusion maps. We have introduced weak interleavings because they naturally occur in our context.

Definition 2.4. The *weak interleaving distance* $d_{WI}(K^0, K^1)$ between two bifiltered simplicial complexes K^0 and K^1 is the infimum of all $\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that K^0 and K^1 are ε -weakly interleaved.

Since homotopic maps induce identical maps on homology groups, after applying homology the difference between weak interleavings and interleavings disappears. In particular, homology is non-increasing under with respect to weak interleaving distance of bifiltrations and interleaving distance of persistence modules.

A *bifiltered topological space* X consists of a collection $\{X_{m,r}\}_{(m,r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]}$ of topological spaces such that $X_{m,r} \subseteq X_{m',r'}$ whenever $m' \leq m$ and $r \leq r'$. A morphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$ of bifiltered topological spaces consists of continuous maps $f_{m,r}: X_{m,r} \rightarrow Y_{m,r}$ such that for all $m' \leq m$ and $r \leq r'$, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_{m,r} & \xrightarrow{f_{m,r}} & Y_{m,r} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X_{m',r'} & \xrightarrow{f_{m',r'}} & Y_{m',r'}. \end{array}$$

Definition 2.5. A morphism $f: K \rightarrow L$ is a *homotopy equivalence* if for each $(m, r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]$, the induced map $|f_{m,r}|: |K_{m,r}| \rightarrow |L_{m,r}|$ of geometric realizations is a homotopy equivalence. If a (possibly infinite) zig-zag chain of homotopy equivalences between K and L exists, then K and L are *homotopy equivalent*.

Remark 2.6. A homotopy equivalence in the above sense is often called an objectwise homotopy equivalence. We refrain from going into details about this and refer the interested reader to [2, Definition 2.35].

Definition 2.7. A *forward shift map* is an order preserving map of the form $\alpha: \mathbb{R}^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$ with the property that $\alpha(m, r) \geq (m, r)$ for all $(m, r) \in \mathbb{R}^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$.

Notice that if $\alpha(m, r) = (\alpha_0(m, r), \alpha_1(m, r))$ then $(m, r) \leq \alpha(m, r)$ means that $m \geq \alpha_0(m, r)$ and $r \leq \alpha_1(m, r)$.

Definition 2.8. Let $K = \{K_{m,r}\}_{(m,r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]}$ and $L = \{L_{m,r}\}_{(m,r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]}$ be bifiltrations and let $\alpha, \beta: \mathbb{R}^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$ be forward shift maps. A *weak (α, β) -interleaving* between K and L consists of maps $\pi_{m,r}: K_{m,r} \rightarrow L_{\alpha(m,r)}$ and $\psi_{m,r}: L_{m,r} \rightarrow K_{\beta(m,r)}$ of simplicial complexes for every $(m, r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]$ such that $\psi_{\alpha(m,r)} \circ \pi_{m,r}$ and $\pi_{\beta(m,r)} \circ \psi_{m,r}$ are homotopic to the inclusions $K_{m,r} \rightarrow K_{\beta \circ \alpha(m,r)}$ and $L_{m,r} \rightarrow L_{\alpha \circ \beta(m,r)}$ respectively.

If a weak (α, β) -interleaving exists, the bifiltrations K and L are (α, β) -*weakly interleaved*.

If $\alpha = \beta$ are given by $\alpha(m, r) = (m - \varepsilon, r + \varepsilon)$ for some $\varepsilon \geq 0$, then we say that K and L are ε -*weakly interleaved*.

Definition 2.9. Let K and L be bifiltrations and let α, β be forward shift maps. We say that K and L are *homotopy (α, β) -weakly interleaved* if there exists bifiltrations K' and L' that are homotopy equivalent to K and L respectively and a weak (α, β) -interleaving between K' and L' .

If $\alpha = \beta$ are given by $\alpha(m, r) = (m - \varepsilon, r + \varepsilon)$ for some $\varepsilon \geq 0$, then we say that K and L are *homotopy ε -weakly interleaved*.

Definition 2.10. The *homotopy weak interleaving distance* between two bifiltrations K and L is the infimum of all $\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that K and L are homotopy ε -weakly interleaved.

Note that homology is also non-increasing under with respect to homotopy weak interleaving distance of bifiltrations and interleaving distance of persistence modules.

Set Bifiltrations. Given a set X , let $\Delta(X)^{\text{op}}$ be the opposite poset of the poset $\Delta(X)$ of finite subsets of X ordered by inclusion. In this convention a function $f: \Delta(X)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is order preserving if and only if $f(\sigma, r) \leq f(\sigma', r')$ whenever $\sigma' \subseteq \sigma$ in $\Delta(X)$ and $r \leq r'$ in $[0, \infty]$.

Definition 2.11. A *set bifiltration on a set X* is an order preserving function of the form $f: \Delta(X)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$.

Definition 2.12. Let f_0 and f_1 be set bifiltrations on the sets X_0 and X_1 respectively. A *weak ε -interleaving* of f_0 and f_1 is a pair of maps $\pi_1: X_0 \rightarrow X_1$ and $\pi_0: X_1 \rightarrow X_0$ satisfying the following conditions for every $(\sigma, r) \in \Delta(X_0)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$:

- (1) $f_0(\sigma, r) \leq f_1(\pi_1(\sigma), r + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ for every $(\sigma, r) \in \Delta(X_0)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$.
- (2) $f_1(\sigma, r) \leq f_0(\pi_0(\sigma), r + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ for every $(\sigma, r) \in \Delta(X_1)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$.
- (3) $f_0(\sigma, r) \leq f_0(\sigma \cup \pi_0\pi_1(\sigma), r + 2\varepsilon) + 2\varepsilon$ for every $(\sigma, r) \in \Delta(X_0)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$.
- (4) $f_1(\sigma, r) \leq f_1(\sigma \cup \pi_1\pi_0(\sigma), r + 2\varepsilon) + 2\varepsilon$ for every $(\sigma, r) \in \Delta(X_1)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$.

If a weak ε -interleaving of f_0 and f_1 exists, we say that are ε -weakly interleaved.

Definition 2.13. The *interleaving distance* $d_{WI}(f_0, f_1)$ between two set bifiltrations f_0 and f_1 is the infimum of all $\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that f_0 and f_1 are ε -weakly interleaved.

Definition 2.14. The *bifiltered simplicial complex associated to a set bifiltration f on a set X* is the bifiltration of $\Delta(X)$ given by the collection $Nf = \{Nf_{m,r}\}_{(m,r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]}$ of simplicial complexes where a finite subset σ of X is in $Nf_{m,r}$ if and only if $f(\sigma, r) \geq m$.

Notice that in Definition 2.14, we have $Nf_{0,r} = \Delta(X)$ for every $r \in [0, \infty]$. In section 4 we prove the following result stating that the interleaving distance is non-increasing under the associated bifiltered complex construction:

Proposition 2.15. *The interleaving distance is non-increasing under the associated bifiltered simplicial complex construction, that is if f_0 and f_1 are set bifiltrations, then*

$$d_{WI}(Nf_0, Nf_1) \leq d_{WI}(f_0, f_1).$$

We are going to use this result throughout the paper when we consider the interleaving distance of bifiltered simplicial complexes associated to set bifiltrations. In particular for set bifiltrations arising from measures on metric spaces.

Dowker Dual Bifiltrations.

Definition 2.16. A *Dowker dissimilarity* Λ consists of two sets X and Y and a function

$$\Lambda: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty].$$

Definition 2.17. Given a Dowker dissimilarity $\Lambda: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ and $x \in X$ and $r \in [0, \infty]$, the Λ -ball centered at x with radius r is the set

$$B_\Lambda(x, r) = \{y \in Y \mid \Lambda(x, y) \leq r\}.$$

Given a finite subset σ of X and $r \in [0, \infty]$, the Λ -ball centered at σ with radius r is the intersection

$$B_\Lambda(\sigma, r) = \bigcap_{x \in \sigma} B_\Lambda(x, r)$$

of all Λ -balls centered at points in σ .

Definition 2.18. Let $\Lambda: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a Dowker dissimilarity and let f be a set bifiltration on X . The Λ -Dowker dual bifiltration $D_\Lambda Nf$ of the bifiltered simplicial complex Nf associated to f is the collection $\{(D_\Lambda Nf)_{m,r}\}_{(m,r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]}$ of simplicial complexes with Y as vertex set defined as follows: a finite subset τ of Y is in $(D_\Lambda Nf)_{m,r}$ if and only there exists $x \in X$ with $f(\{x\}, r) \geq m$ and $\tau \subseteq B_\Lambda(x, r)$.

Remark 2.19. If $\Lambda^T: Y \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is the transpose of Λ , given by $\Lambda^T(y, x) = \Lambda(x, y)$, then $\tau \subseteq B_\Lambda(x, r)$ if and only if $x \in B_{\Lambda^T}(\tau, r)$.

Definition 2.20. A *Dowker bifiltration* (Λ, f) is a pair of a Dowker dissimilarity $\Lambda: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ and a set bifiltration f on X with the property that for every finite subset σ of X and $r \in [0, \infty]$ with $f(\sigma, r) > 0$ we have that $B_\Lambda(\sigma, r)$ is non-empty.

The following result is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.2.

Proposition 2.21. *For every Dowker bifiltration (Λ, f) , the Λ -dual bifiltration $D_\Lambda Nf$, of the bifiltered simplicial complex Nf associated to f , is homotopy equivalent to Nf .*

3. RECTANGLE BIFILTRATION

In this section we extend Dowker duality from Dowker dissimilarities to Dowker bifiltrations. The main ingredient in this extension is the concept of a rectangle bifiltration.

Definition 3.1. Let $\Lambda: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a Dowker dissimilarity and let f be a set bifiltration on X . The *rectangle bifiltration* of (Λ, f) is the collection $\{E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r}\}_{(m,r)}$ of simplicial complexes with $X \times Y$ as vertex set where a finite subset U of $X \times Y$ is in $E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r}$ if and only both the projection of U to X is in $Nf_{m,r}$, the projection of U to Y is in $D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r}$ and $\Lambda(x, y) \leq r$ for every $(x, y) \in U$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let (Λ, f) be a Dowker bifiltration. If Λ is of the form $\Lambda: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ then, for all $(m, r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]$, the projections $\pi_X: X \times Y \rightarrow X$ and $\pi_Y: X \times Y \rightarrow Y$ induce homotopy equivalences $\pi_X: E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r} \rightarrow Nf_{m,r}$ and $\pi_Y: E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r} \rightarrow D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r}$.*

The proof we present of this proposition is a slight modification of the proof of [4, Theorem 4.3]. In order to present the proof we repeat some background and notation from [4].

If K is a simplicial complex, then K is a partially ordered set under inclusion, and its order complex is the barycentric subdivision of K . It is well-known that the barycentric subdivision of K is homeomorphic to K itself [13, p. 3.3.9].

Let $\pi: (K, V) \rightarrow (K', V')$ be a simplicial map. The fiber of π over $\sigma \in K'$ is the simplicial complex $\pi/\sigma = \{\tau \in K \mid \pi(\tau) \subseteq \sigma\}$.

Theorem 3.3 ([1, Thm. 10.5], [11, Prop. 1.6]). *Let $\pi: (K, V) \rightarrow (K', V')$ be a simplicial map. If the fiber π/σ is a contractible simplicial complex for every $\sigma \in K'$, then π induces a homotopy equivalence $|\pi|: |K| \rightarrow |K'|$.*

The *nerve* of a collection \mathcal{U} of sets is the simplicial complex with vertex set \mathcal{U} and simplices given by the finite subsets of \mathcal{U} with non-empty intersection.

Theorem 3.4 (Borsuk Nerve Theorem [3, Cor. 9.3]). *Let \mathcal{U} be a cover of a simplicial complex K by simplicial subcomplexes. If every finite intersection of elements in \mathcal{U} is contractible, then the geometric realization of the nerve of \mathcal{U} is homotopy equivalent to the geometric realization of K*

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Let $\pi_X: E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r} \rightarrow Nf_{m,r}$ be the map of simplicial complexes induced by the projection $X \times Y \rightarrow X$. We first prove that π_X is a homotopy equivalence. Given a finite subset σ of X , we let

$$Y(\sigma) = B_\Lambda(\sigma, r) = \{y \in Y \mid \Lambda(x, y) \leq r \text{ for all } x \in \sigma\},$$

and we let $F(\sigma) = \Delta(\sigma \times Y(\sigma))$ be the set of all finite non-empty subsets of $\sigma \times Y(\sigma)$. We first prove that the fibres of the map $\pi_X: E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r} \rightarrow Nf_{m,r}$ are contractible.

Let $\sigma \in Nf_{m,r}$. By assumption $Y(\sigma)$ and $F(\sigma)$ are non-empty. The fibre π_X/σ is the union

$$\pi_X/\sigma = \bigcup_{\tau \subseteq \sigma} F(\tau).$$

We will show that the nerve of the cover $\{F(\tau) \mid \tau \subseteq \sigma\}$ of π_X/σ is both homotopy equivalent to π_X/σ and contractible. In order to see that the nerve of the cover is homotopy equivalent to π_X/σ , it suffices to show that the cover is a good cover.

In order to see that the cover is good, we note that

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^k F(\tau_i) = \Delta\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k \tau_i \times Y(\tau_i)\right).$$

This is a simplex, and simplices are contractible. Thus, $\{F(\tau) \mid \tau \subseteq \sigma\}$ is a good cover.

In order to show that the nerve of the cover $\{F(\tau) \mid \tau \subseteq \sigma\}$ is contractible we show that it has the vertex $F(\sigma)$ as a cone point. Let γ be a simplex in the nerve of the cover. Then γ is of the form $\gamma = \{F(\tau_1), \dots, F(\tau_k)\}$ with $\bigcap_{i=1}^k \tau_i \times Y(\tau_i)$ non-empty. In particular $\bigcap_{i=1}^k \tau_i$ is non-empty. Let $x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^k \tau_i$ and let $y \in Y(\sigma)$. Since $\tau_i \subseteq \sigma$ for every i , we have that $y \in \bigcap_{i=1}^k Y(\tau_i)$. We conclude that $(x, y) \in (\sigma \times Y(\sigma)) \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k \tau_i \times Y(\tau_i)$ so that $\gamma \cup \{F(\sigma)\}$ is a simplex in the nerve of the cover. Thus, the nerve of the cover is contractible. We use Theorem 3.3 to conclude that $\pi_X: E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r} \rightarrow Nf_{m,r}$ is a homotopy equivalence.

We next prove that the map $\pi_Y: E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r} \rightarrow D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r}$ is a homotopy equivalence. Given a finite subset τ of Y , we let

$$X(\tau) = B_{\Lambda^T}(\tau, r) = \{x \in X \mid \Lambda(x, y) \leq r \text{ for all } y \in \tau\},$$

and we let $G(\tau)$ be the set of all subsets of $X(\tau) \times \tau$. We first prove that the fibres of the map $\pi_Y: E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r} \rightarrow D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r}$ are contractible. Let $\tau \in D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r}$

and let $x \in B$ with $f(\{x\}, r) \geq m$ and $\tau \subseteq B_\Lambda(x, r)$. Then $x \in X(\{\tau\})$ so $G(\tau)$ is non-empty. The fibre π_Y/τ is the union

$$\pi_Y/\tau = \bigcup_{\sigma \subseteq \tau} G(\sigma).$$

We will show that the nerve of the cover $\{G(\sigma) \mid \sigma \subseteq \tau\}$ is both homotopy equivalent to the fibre π_Y/τ and contractible. In order to see that the nerve of the cover is homotopy equivalent to the fibre π_Y/τ , it suffices to show that the cover is a good cover.

In order to see that the cover is good, we note that

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^k G(\sigma_i) = \Delta\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k X(\sigma_i) \times \sigma_i\right).$$

This is a simplex, and simplices are contractible. Thus, the cover is good.

In order to show that the nerve of the cover is contractible we show that it has the vertex $G(\tau)$ as a cone point. Let τ be a simplex in the nerve of the cover. Then τ is of the form $\tau = \{G(\sigma_1), \dots, G(\sigma_k)\}$ with $\bigcap_{i=1}^k X(\sigma_i) \times \sigma_i$ non-empty. In particular $\bigcap_{i=1}^k \sigma_i$ is non-empty. Let $y \in \bigcap_{i=1}^k \sigma_i$ and let $x \in X(\tau)$. Since $\sigma_i \subseteq \tau$ for every i , we have that $x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^k X(\sigma_i)$. We conclude that $(x, y) \in (X(\tau) \times \tau) \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k X(\sigma_i) \times \sigma_i$ so that $\gamma \cup \{X(\tau) \times \tau\}$ is a simplex in the nerve of the cover. Thus, the nerve of the cover is contractible.

Finally, we use Theorem 3.3 to conclude that $\pi_Y: E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r} \rightarrow D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r}$ is a homotopy equivalence. \square

4. SET BIFILTRATION DISTANCE

In this section we pursue the concept of interleaving of set bifiltrations and prove Theorem 2.15 stating that the transition to the associated bifiltered simplicial complexes is 1-Lipschitz with respect to the interleaving distance. We also consider interleavings of set bifiltrations with respect to forward shift maps.

The following lemma illustrates the main idea of this section.

Lemma 4.1. *Let f_0 and f_1 be set bifiltrations on the sets X_0 and X_1 respectively and let $\varepsilon, \delta \in [0, \infty]$. If $\pi_0: X_1 \rightarrow X_0$ is a function such that*

$$f_1(\sigma, r) \leq f_0(\pi_0\sigma, r + \delta) + \varepsilon$$

for all $\sigma \in \Delta(X_1)$ and $r \in [0, \infty]$, then $\pi_0: X_1 \rightarrow X_0$ induces a map

$$\pi_0: N(f_1)_{m,r} \rightarrow N(f_0)_{m-\varepsilon, r+\delta}.$$

If $\pi'_0: X_1 \rightarrow X_0$ is another function such that $f_1(\sigma, r) \leq f_0(\pi'_0\sigma \cup \pi_0\sigma, r + \delta) + \varepsilon$ for all $\sigma \in \Delta(X)$ and $r \in [0, \infty]$ then π'_0 induces a map

$$\pi'_0: N(f_1)_{m,r} \rightarrow N(f_0)_{m-\varepsilon, r+\delta}$$

that is contiguous to π_0 .

Proof. Let $\sigma \in N(f_1)_{m,r}$. Then

$$m \leq f_1(\sigma, r) \leq f_0(\pi_0\sigma, r + \delta) + \varepsilon.$$

Rearranging the inequality we get $f_0(\pi_0\sigma, r + \delta) \geq m - \varepsilon$, so $\pi_0\sigma \in N(f_0)_{m-\varepsilon, r+\delta}$. A similar argument shows if π'_0 is as described in the statement, then $\pi'_0\sigma \cup \pi_0\sigma \in N(f_0)_{m-\varepsilon, r+\delta}$, so π'_0 induces a map $\pi'_0: N(f_1)_{m,r} \rightarrow N(f_0)_{m-\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon}$ that is contiguous to π_0 . \square

Corollary 4.2. *Let f and g be set bifiltrations on the same set X . Given $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $f(\sigma, r) \leq g(\sigma, r + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ for every $\sigma \in \Delta(X)$ and $r \in [0, \infty]$, we have that $Nf_{m,r} \subseteq N\Lambda_{m-\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon}^g$.*

Proof of Proposition 2.15. It suffices to show that if f_0 and f_1 are ε -weakly interleaved, then Nf_0 and Nf_1 are ε -weakly interleaved. Let X_0 and X_1 be the sets underlying f_0 and f_1 respectively. Let $\pi_0: X_1 \rightarrow X_0$ and $\pi_1: X_0 \rightarrow X_1$ be functions such that for every $(\sigma, r) \in \Delta(X_0)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$ we have:

- (1) $f_0(\sigma, r) \leq f_1(\pi_1(\sigma), r + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ for every $(\sigma, r) \in \Delta(X_0)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$.
- (2) $f_1(\sigma, r) \leq f_0(\pi_0(\sigma), r + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ for every $(\sigma, r) \in \Delta(X_1)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$.
- (3) $f_0(\sigma, r) \leq f_0(\sigma \cup \pi_0\pi_1(\sigma), r + 2\varepsilon) + 2\varepsilon$ for every $(\sigma, r) \in \Delta(X_0)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$.
- (4) $f_1(\sigma, r) \leq f_1(\sigma \cup \pi_1\pi_0(\sigma), r + 2\varepsilon) + 2\varepsilon$ for every $(\sigma, r) \in \Delta(X_1)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty]$.

By (2) and Lemma 4.1 we have that π_0 induces a simplicial map $\pi_0: (Nf_1)_{m,r} \rightarrow (Nf_0)_{m-\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon}$. By (4) and Lemma 4.1 we have that $\pi_1\pi_0$ induces a simplicial map $\pi_1\pi_0: (Nf_1)_{m,r} \rightarrow (Nf_1)_{m-2\varepsilon, r+2\varepsilon}$ that is contiguous to the inclusion map. By (1) and Lemma 4.1 we have that π_1 induces a map $\pi_1: (Nf_0)_{m,r} \rightarrow (Nf_1)_{m-\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon}$. By (3) and Lemma 4.1 we have that $\pi_0\pi_1$ induces a map $\pi_0\pi_1: (Nf_0)_{m,r} \rightarrow (Nf_0)_{m-2\varepsilon, r+2\varepsilon}$ that is contiguous to the identity map.

We conclude that Nf_0 and Nf_1 are ε -weakly interleaved. \square

Applying Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 2.15 we get:

Corollary 4.3. *Let (Λ_0, f_0) and (Λ_1, f_1) be Dowker bifiltrations. If the set bifiltration distance of f_0 and f_1 is less than ε then the bifiltered complexes $D_{\Lambda_0}Nf_0$ and $D_{\Lambda_1}Nf_1$ are homotopy ε -weakly interleaved.*

Definition 4.4. Let f_0 and f_1 be set bifiltrations on the sets X_0 and X_1 respectively and let α and β be forward shift maps with components $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1)$ and $\beta = (\beta_0, \beta_1)$. A weak (α, β) interleaving between f_0 and f_1 consists of functions $\pi_0: X_1 \rightarrow X_0$ and $\pi_1: X_0 \rightarrow X_1$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $\alpha_0(f_1(\sigma, r), r) \leq f_0(\pi_0\sigma, \alpha_1(f_1(\sigma, r), r))$ for all $\sigma \in \Delta(X_1)$, and $r \in [0, \infty]$.
- (2) $\beta_0(f_0(\tau, r), r) \leq f_1(\pi_1\tau, \beta_1(f_0(\tau, r), r))$ for all $\tau \in \Delta(X_0)$ and $r \in [0, \infty]$.
- (3) $\beta_0(\alpha(f_1(\sigma, r), r)) \leq f_1(\sigma \cup \pi_1\pi_0\sigma, \beta_1(\alpha(f_1(\sigma, r), r)))$ for all $\sigma \in \Delta(X_1)$ and $r \in [0, \infty]$.
- (4) $\alpha_0(\beta(f_0(\tau, r), r)) \leq f_0(\tau \cup \pi_0\pi_1\tau, \alpha_1(\beta(f_0(\tau, r), r)))$ for all $\tau \in \Delta(X_0)$, and $r \in [0, \infty]$.

If an (α, β) -interleaving exists, the filtered Dowker dissimilarities are (α, β) -weakly interleaved.

If $\alpha = \beta$ we say that (π_0, π_1) is an α -interleaving and that the set bifiltrations are α -weakly interleaved.

If $\alpha = \beta$ and $\alpha(m, r) = (m - \varepsilon, r + \varepsilon)$ we say that (π_0, π_1) is an ε -interleaving and that the set bifiltrations are ε -weakly interleaved.

Proposition 4.5. *Let f_0 and f_1 be set bifiltrations on the sets X_0 and X_1 respectively and let α and β be forward shift maps with components $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1)$ and $\beta = (\beta_0, \beta_1)$. Let $\pi_0: X_1 \rightarrow X_0$ and $\pi_1: X_0 \rightarrow X_1$ be a weak (α, β) interleaving of the set bifiltrations f_0 and f_1 . Then π_0 and π_1 induce a weak (α, β) interleaving between Nf_0 and Nf_1 .*

Proof. Let $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r \in [0, \infty]$.

Let $\sigma \in N(f_1)_{m,r}$. By part (1) of Definition 4.4 we have $\alpha_0(f_1(\sigma, r), r) \leq f_0(\pi_0\sigma, \alpha_1(f_1(\sigma, r), r))$. Since $m \leq f_1(\sigma, r)$ we have that $\alpha_0(m, r) \leq \alpha_0(f_1(\sigma, r), r)$ and that $\alpha_1(m, r) \geq \alpha_1(f_1(\sigma, r), r)$. Collecting these inequalities we get

$$\alpha_0(m, r) \leq \alpha_0(f_1(\sigma, r), r) \leq f_0(\pi_0\sigma, \alpha_1(f_1(\sigma, r), r)) \leq f_0(\pi_0\sigma, \alpha_1(m, r)).$$

This means that $\pi_0\sigma \in N(f_0)_{\alpha(m,r)}$ and that π_0 induces a map

$$\pi_0: N(f_1)_{m,r} \rightarrow N(f_0)_{\alpha(m,r)}.$$

Let $\tau \in N(f_0)_{m,r}$. By part (2) of Definition 4.4 we have $\beta_0(f_0(\tau, r), r) \leq f_1(\pi_1\tau, \beta_1(f_0(\tau, r), r))$. Since $m \leq f_0(\tau, r)$ we have that $\beta_0(m, r) \leq \beta_0(f_0(\tau, r), r)$ and that $\beta_1(m, r) \geq \beta_1(f_0(\tau, r), r)$. Collecting these inequalities we get

$$\beta_0(m, r) \leq \beta_0(f_0(\tau, r), r) \leq f_1(\pi_1\tau, \beta_1(f_0(\tau, r), r)) \leq f_1(\pi_1\tau, \beta_1(m, r)).$$

This means that $\pi_1\tau \in N(f_1)_{\beta(m,r)}$ and that π_1 induces a map

$$\pi_1: N(f_0)_{m,r} \rightarrow N(f_1)_{\beta(m,r)}.$$

Let $\sigma \in N(f_1)_{m,r}$. By part (3) of Definition 4.4 we have $\beta_0(\alpha(f_1(\sigma, r), r)) \leq f_1(\sigma \cup \pi_0\pi_1\sigma, \beta_1(\alpha(f_1(\sigma, r), r)))$. Since $m \leq f_1(\sigma, r)$ we have that $\beta_0\alpha(m, r) \leq \beta_0\alpha(f_1(\sigma, r), r)$ and that $\beta_1\alpha(m, r) \geq \beta_1\alpha(f_1(\sigma, r), r)$. Collecting these inequalities we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0\alpha(m, r) &\leq \beta_0\alpha(f_1(\sigma, r), r) \\ &\leq f_1(\sigma \cup \pi_0\pi_1\sigma, \beta_1\alpha(f_1(\sigma, r), r)) \\ &\leq f_1(\sigma \cup \pi_0\pi_1\sigma, \beta_1\alpha(m, r)). \end{aligned}$$

This means that $\sigma \cup \pi_0\pi_1\sigma \in N(f_1)_{\alpha\beta(m,r)}$ and that π_0 induces a map

$$\pi_0: N(f_1)_{m,r} \rightarrow N(f_1)_{\alpha\beta(m,r)}$$

that is homotopic to the inclusion map.

The proof that π_1 induces a map

$$\pi_1: N(f_0)_{m,r} \rightarrow N(f_0)_{\beta\alpha(m,r)}$$

that is homotopic to the inclusion map is similar. \square

5. RESTRICTION TO THE SUPPORT

Recall that a *measurable space* (X, Σ) consists of a set X and a σ -algebra Σ of subsets of X . That Σ is a σ -algebra means that it is closed under complements and countable unions and countable intersections. Also recall that a *measure* μ on the σ -algebra Σ is a function $\mu: \Sigma \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ that is countably additive, in that sense that $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ and that for disjoint sets B_1, B_2, \dots in Σ we have $\mu(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i)$. A *measure space* is a triple (X, Σ, μ) where (X, Σ) measurable space and μ is a measure on Σ .

Definition 5.1. The σ -algebra Σ_Λ associated to a Dowker dissimilarity

$$\Lambda: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

is the smallest σ -algebra on Y containing the sets

$$B_\Lambda(x, r) = \{y \in Y \mid \Lambda(x, y) \leq r\}$$

and

$$\text{int}(B_\Lambda(x, r)) = \{y \in Y \mid \Lambda(x, y) < r\}$$

for every $x \in X$ and $r \in [0, \infty]$.

Definition 5.2. Let $\Lambda: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a Dowker dissimilarity and let μ be a measure on the σ -algebra Σ_Λ . The *support* $S(\mu)$ of μ consists of the elements $y \in Y$ with the property that if $y \in B_\Lambda(x, r)$ for any $x \in X$ and $r > 0$ then $\mu(B_\Lambda(x, r)) > 0$.

Definition 5.3. A *Dowker measure space* is a pair (Λ, μ) of a Dowker dissimilarity $\Lambda: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ and a measure μ on the σ -algebra Σ_Λ such that both $S(\mu) \in \Sigma_\Lambda$ and $\mu(Y \setminus S(\mu)) = 0$.

Example 5.4. Let M be a separable metric space with metric d and let μ be a Borel measure on M . Write $\mu|_{\Sigma_d}$ for the restriction of μ to the subset Σ_d of the Borel σ -algebra of M . We claim that $(d, \mu|_{\Sigma_d})$ is a Dowker measure space. Firstly, the complement $M \setminus S(\mu)$ is open. Secondly, M has a countable basis $\{B_1, B_2, \dots\}$ consisting of balls of the form $\text{int}(B_d(x, r))$. Thus, $M \setminus S(\mu)$ is a countable union of sets in Σ_d , and hence $M \setminus S(\mu)$ is itself in Σ_d . Moreover, for every $x \in M \setminus S(\mu)$ we can pick a basis open B_i with $x \in B_i$ and $\mu(B_i) = 0$. Thus, $M \setminus S(\mu)$ is a countable union of sets of measure 0, and hence $\mu(M \setminus S(\mu)) = 0$. Finally, since $M \setminus S(\mu)$ is in Σ_d , also $S(\mu)$ is in Σ_d .

Example 5.5 (Distance to Measure Dowker Bifiltration). Let (Λ, μ) be a Dowker measure space.

Given $p > 0$ we define a Dowker bifiltration (Λ, f_p) , where f_p is the function $f_p: \Delta(X)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ given by

$$f_p(\sigma, r) = \left(\int_{y \in Y} \min\{\Lambda(x, y)^p : x \in \sigma\} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{B_\Lambda(\sigma, r)} d\mu(y) \right)^{1/p}.$$

Note that if μ is a Borel measure on Y , then, as $p \rightarrow 0$, the value $f_p(\sigma, r)$ converges to $\mu(B_\Lambda(\sigma, r))$.

Given a simplicial complex K with vertex set V and a subset S of V , we let $K|_S$ be the simplicial complex with vertex set S and simplices of the form $\sigma \cap S$ for $\sigma \in K$.

Proposition 5.6. *Let (Λ, μ) be a Dowker measure space and let*

$$f: \Delta(X)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

be the set bifiltration $f(\sigma, r) = \mu(B_\Lambda(\sigma, r))$. The inclusion

$$DC(\Lambda, \mu)_{m,r} = (D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r})|_{S(\mu)} \subseteq D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r}$$

is a homotopy equivalence.

Proof. Let Λ be of the form $\Lambda: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ and let $\tau \in Nf_{m,r}$. Then there exists $x \in X$ with $\mu(B_\Lambda(x, r)) \geq m$ and $\tau \subseteq B_\Lambda(x, r)$. If $m = 0$, then both $(D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r})|_{S(\mu)}$ and $D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r}$ are contractible, and the inclusion is a $(D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r})|_{S(\mu)} \subseteq D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r}$ homotopy equivalence. Now, assume $m > 0$. In the rest of this proof we write S for $S(\mu)$ and $\Lambda|_{X \times S}$ for the restriction of Λ to $X \times S$. We have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Nf_{m,r} & \xleftarrow{\pi_X} & E(\Lambda|_{X \times S}, f)_{m,r} & \xrightarrow{\pi_Y} & D_{\Lambda|_{X \times S}} Nf_{m,r} \\ \text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow j & & \downarrow i \\ Nf_{m,r} & \xleftarrow{\pi_X} & E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r} & \xrightarrow{\pi_Y} & D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r} \end{array}$$

where, by Proposition 3.2, the horizontal maps are homotopy equivalences. The map i is the inclusion

$$D_{\Lambda|_{X \times S}} Nf_{m,r} = (D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r})|_S \subseteq D_\Lambda Nf_{m,r}$$

and j is the inclusion

$$E(\Lambda|_{X \times S}, f)_{m,r} = (E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r})|_{X \times S} \subseteq E(\Lambda, f)_{m,r}.$$

We conclude that the inclusion i is a homotopy equivalence, as desired. \square

Proof of theorem 1.3. Let $f: \Delta(M)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be the set bifiltration $f(\sigma, r) = \mu(B_d(\sigma, r))$. By definition we have $DC(d, \mu) = (D_d Nf)|_{S(\mu)}$. By Proposition 5.6 this bifiltered simplicial complex is homotopy equivalent to the dual measure Dowker bifiltration $D_d Nf$. Let \mathcal{U} be the cover of $\mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}$ consisting of the sets $B_d(y, r) \cap \mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}$ for $y \in \mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}^r$.

If $\tau \in N\mathcal{U}$ is an element of the nerve of this cover, then the intersection $\bigcap_{y \in \tau} B_d(y, r) \cap \mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}$ is non-empty. Pick $x \in \bigcap_{y \in \tau} B_d(y, r) \cap \mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}$. Then $f(\{x\}, r) = \mu(B_d(x, r)) \geq m$ and $\tau \subseteq B_d(x, r)$, so $\tau \in D_d Nf_{m,r}$.

Conversely, if $\tau \in D_d Nf_{m,r}$, then we can pick $x \in M$ such that $f(\{x\}, \sigma) = \mu(B_d(x, r)) \geq m$ and $\tau \subseteq B_d(x, r) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}^r$. This means that $x \in B_d(\tau, r) \cap \mathcal{M}(d, \mu)_{m,r}$, so $\tau \in N\mathcal{U}$. \square

6. PROHOROV DISTANCE

In this section we relate interleaving distance to Prohorov distance and extract results for the Prohorov distance from the results in Section 4.

Let M be a metric space with metric $d: M \times M \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ and let Ω be the Borel σ -algebra on M . Recall from Definition 1.2 that given $B \in \Omega$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, the ε -offset B_d^ε of B is the union of all closed ε -balls with centers in B . Observe that, by the triangle inequality, for $x \in M$ and $r \geq 0$, $B_d(x, r)^\varepsilon$ is a subset of $B_d(x, r + \varepsilon)$.

Definition 6.1. The *Prohorov distance* between two Borel probability measures μ_0 and μ_1 on M is the infimum of all $\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that

$$\mu_0(B) \leq \mu_1(B^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$$

and

$$\mu_1(B) \leq \mu_0(B^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$$

for all $B \in \Omega$.

Proof of theorem 1.1. Let μ_0 and μ_1 be two measures on the separable metric space M . Define $f_0: \Delta(M)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ and $f_1: \Delta(M)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by $f_0(\sigma, r) = \mu_0(B_d(\sigma, r))$ and $f_1(\sigma, r) = \mu_1(B_d(\sigma, r))$. Since μ_0 and μ_1 are of Prohorov distance less than ε , the identity on M gives a homotopy weak ε -interleaving between the set bifiltrations f_0 and f_1 . By Corollary 4.3 the bifiltered complexes $D_d N f_0$ and $D_d N f_1$ are homotopy weakly ε -interleaved. By Proposition 5.6 also the bifiltered complexes $DC(d, \mu_0) = D_d N f_0|_{S(\mu_0)}$ and $DC(d, \mu_1) = D_d N f_1|_{S(\mu_1)}$ are homotopy weakly ε -interleaved. \square

Note that this proof of Proposition 1.1 does not involve applying the Nerve Lemma to a cover of M .

7. GROMOV-PROHOROV DISTANCE

Definition 7.1. A *metric measure space* is a triple (X, d, μ) consisting of a metric space (X, d) and a Borel measure μ on X .

Definition 7.2. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a measurable function between measurable spaces (X, Σ_X) and (Y, Σ_Y) . Given a measure μ on Σ_X the *pushforward measure* $f_*\mu$ is the measure on Σ_Y defined by $f_*\mu(B) = \mu(f^{-1}(B))$ for all $B \in \Sigma_Y$.

Definition 7.3. Let (X_0, d_0, μ_0) and (X_1, d_1, μ_1) be metric measure spaces. Their *Gromov-Prohorov distance* is the infimum over all common distance preserving embeddings $\iota_0: X_0 \rightarrow M$ and $\iota_1: X_1 \rightarrow M$ into a common metric space M of the Prohorov distance between $\iota_{0*}\mu_0$ and $\iota_{1*}\mu_1$.

Definition 7.4. Let $\iota: X \rightarrow M$ be a distance preserving embedding of a metric space X into a metric space M . A *nearest neighbor projection* $p: M \rightarrow X$ is a function taking $x \in M$ to an element $z = p(x) \in X$ minimizing the distance $d(x, \iota(z))$.

Note that in general a nearest neighbor projection is not unique, and that it may happen that no nearest neighbor projection exists. If X is compact, then a nearest neighbor projection always exists.

Lemma 7.5. *Let $\iota_0: X_0 \rightarrow M$ and $\iota_1: X_1 \rightarrow M$ be embeddings of two compact metric spaces (X_0, d_0) and (X_1, d_1) into a common metric space (M, d) with a nearest neighbor projection $p_0: M \rightarrow X_0$.*

Given $x \in X_1$ and $y \in X_0$ we have

$$d(\iota_0 p_0 \iota_1 x, \iota_0 y) \leq 2d(\iota_1 x, \iota_0 y).$$

Proof. By symmetry and the definition of p_0 ,

$$d(\iota_0 p_0 \iota_1 x, \iota_1 x) \leq d(\iota_0 y, \iota_1 x) = d(\iota_1 x, \iota_0 y).$$

By the triangle inequality we have

$$d(\iota_0 p_0 \iota_1 x, \iota_0 y) \leq d(\iota_0 p_0 \iota_1 x, \iota_1 x) + d(\iota_1 x, \iota_0 y).$$

However, we have just seen that

$$d(\iota_0 p_0 \iota_1 x, \iota_1 x) \leq d(\iota_1 x, \iota_0 y),$$

so

$$d(\iota_0 p_0 \iota_1 x, \iota_0 y) \leq 2d(\iota_1 x, \iota_0 y).$$

□

Recall that given $\varepsilon > 0$, the forward shift map β^ε is defined by $\beta^\varepsilon(m, r) = (m - \varepsilon, 2(r + \varepsilon))$. The following is Theorem 1.5 stated in terms of interleavings.

Proposition 7.6. *Let (X_0, d_0, μ_0) and (X_1, d_1, μ_1) be compact metric measure spaces. If ε strictly greater than the Gromov-Prohorov distance between (X_0, d_0, μ_0) and (X_1, d_1, μ_1) then the bifiltered simplicial complexes $DC(d_0, \mu_0)$ and $DC(d_1, \mu_1)$ are β^ε -weakly interleaved.*

Proof. Let $\iota_0: X_0 \rightarrow M$ and $\iota_1: X_1 \rightarrow M$ be embeddings of the metric spaces (X_0, d_0) and (X_1, d_1) into a common metric space (M, d) such that the Prohorov distance between $\iota_{0*}\mu_0$ and $\iota_{1*}\mu_1$ is less than ε .

Let f_0 and f_1 be the set bifiltrations

$$f_1: \Delta(X_1)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty], \quad f_1(\sigma, r) = \mu_1(B_{d_1}(\sigma, r))$$

and

$$f_0: \Delta(X_0)^{\text{op}} \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty], \quad f_0(\sigma, r) = \mu_0(B_{d_0}(\sigma, r)).$$

Then $DC(d_0, \mu_0) = (D_{d_0} N f_0)|_{S(\mu_0)}$ and $DC(d_1, \mu_1) = (D_{d_1} N f_1)|_{S(\mu_1)}$.

Let $p_1: M \rightarrow X_1$ and $p_0: M \rightarrow X_0$ be nearest neighbor projections. We let $\pi_0 = p_0 \circ \iota_1$ and $\pi_1 = p_1 \circ \iota_0$. Since X_0 and X_1 are compact, they are separable, so as explained in Example 5.4 (d_0, μ_0) and (d_1, μ_1) are Dowker measure spaces. By Proposition 4.3, Proposition 5.6 and Proposition 4.5 it suffices to show that the conditions of Definition 4.4 are satisfied by the maps π_0 and π_1 and the set bifiltrations f_0 and f_1 .

In the current context, the first condition of Definition 4.4 is that

$$f_1(\sigma, r) - \varepsilon \leq f_0(\pi_0 \sigma, 2(r + \varepsilon)),$$

that is,

$$\mu_1(B_{d_1}(\sigma, r)) - \varepsilon \leq \mu_0(B_{d_0}(\pi_0\sigma, 2(r + \varepsilon)))$$

for all $\sigma \in \Delta(X_1)$, and $r \in [0, \infty]$. Let us first note that since the Prohorov distance between $\iota_{1*}\mu_1$ and $\iota_{0*}\mu_0$ is less than ε , for $\sigma \in \Delta(X_1)$ and $r \in [0, \infty]$ we have

$$\mu_1(B_{d_1}(\sigma, r)) = \iota_{1*}\mu_1(B_d(\iota_1(\sigma), r)) \leq \iota_{0*}\mu_0(B_d(\iota_1(\sigma), r + \varepsilon)) + \varepsilon.$$

In order to verify the first condition of Definition 4.4 it suffices to show that

$$\iota_{0*}\mu_0(B_d(\iota_1(\sigma), r + \varepsilon)) \leq \iota_{0*}\mu_0(B_d(\iota_0(\pi_0\sigma), 2(r + \varepsilon))) = \mu_0(B_{d_0}(\pi_0\sigma, 2(r + \varepsilon))).$$

For this, it suffices to show that

$$B_d(\iota_1(\sigma), r + \varepsilon) \cap \iota_0(X_0) \subseteq B_d(\iota_0(\pi_0\sigma), 2(r + \varepsilon)).$$

For this in turn, it suffices to show that, for every $x \in X_1$, we have

$$B_d(\iota_1(x), r + \varepsilon) \cap \iota_0(X_0) \subseteq B_d(\iota_0(\pi_0x), 2(r + \varepsilon)).$$

Now, let $y \in X_0$ with $\iota_0y \in B_d(\iota_1(x), r + \varepsilon)$. By Lemma 7.5 we have

$$d(\iota_0\pi_0x, \iota_0y) \leq 2d(\iota_1x, \iota_0y) \leq 2(r + \varepsilon).$$

We conclude that $\iota_0y \in B_d(\iota_0(\pi_0x), 2(r + \varepsilon))$ as desired.

The same argument with the roles of X_0 and X_1 interchanged shows that

$$f_0(\sigma, r) - \varepsilon \leq f_1(\pi_1\sigma, 2(r + \varepsilon)),$$

that is,

$$\mu_0(B_{d_0}(\sigma, r)) - \varepsilon \leq \mu_1(B_{d_1}(\pi_1\sigma, 2(r + \varepsilon)))$$

for all $\sigma \in \Delta(X_0)$, so condition (2) of Definition 4.4 is satisfied.

In the current context, the third condition of Definition 4.4 is

$$f_1(\sigma, r) - 2\varepsilon \leq f_1(\sigma \cup \pi_1\pi_0\sigma, 2(2(r + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon)),$$

that is,

$$\mu_1(B_{d_1}(\sigma, r)) - 2\varepsilon \leq \mu_1(B_{d_1}(\sigma \cup \pi_1\pi_0\sigma, 4r + 6\varepsilon))$$

for all $\sigma \in \Delta(X_1)$, and $r \in [0, \infty]$.

Since condition (1) of Definition 4.4 is satisfied we have

$$\mu_1(B_{d_1}(\sigma, r)) \leq \mu_0(B_{d_0}(\pi_0\sigma, 2(r + \varepsilon))) + \varepsilon$$

Prohorov stability implies that

$$\mu_0(B_{d_0}(\pi_0\sigma, 2(r + \varepsilon))) \leq \iota_{1*}\mu_1(B_d(\iota_0\pi_0\sigma, 2(r + \varepsilon))) + \varepsilon.$$

Assume that $y \in X_1$ with $\iota_1y \in B_d(\iota_0\pi_0\sigma, 2(r + \varepsilon))$. By the definition of the nearest neighbor projection p_0 , for $x \in \sigma$ we have that

$$d(\iota_1y, \iota_1x) \leq d(\iota_1y, \iota_0p_0\iota_1x) + d(\iota_0p_0\iota_1x, \iota_1x) \leq 2d(\iota_1y, \iota_0p_0\iota_1x) = 2d(\iota_1y, \iota_0\pi_0x).$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 7.5 with the roles of X_0 and X_1 interchanged we have

$$d(\iota_1y, \iota_1\pi_1\pi_0x) \leq 2d(\iota_1y, \iota_0\pi_0x).$$

The above discussion shows that

$$B_d(\iota_0\pi_0\sigma, 2(r + \varepsilon)) \cap \iota_1(X_1) \subseteq B_d(\iota_1\sigma \cup \iota_1\pi_1\pi_0\sigma, 4(r + \varepsilon)).$$

Since $\iota_{1*}\mu_1$ is order preserving, we have

$$\iota_{1*}\mu_1(B_d(\iota_0\pi_0\sigma, 2(r + \varepsilon))) \leq \iota_{1*}\mu_1(B_d(\iota_1\sigma \cup \iota_1\pi_1\pi_0\sigma, 4(r + \varepsilon))).$$

Note that

$$\iota_{1*}\mu_1(B_d(\iota_1\sigma \cup \iota_1\pi_1\pi_0\sigma, 4(r + \varepsilon))) = \mu_1(B_{d_1}(\sigma \cup \pi_1\pi_0\sigma, 4(r + \varepsilon)))$$

and that since μ_1 is order preserving we have

$$\mu_1(B_{d_1}(\sigma \cup \pi_1\pi_0\sigma, 4(r + \varepsilon))) \leq \mu_1(B_{d_1}(\sigma \cup \pi_1\pi_0\sigma, 4r + 6\varepsilon)).$$

Collecting the above inequalities we have

$$\mu_1(B_{d_1}(\sigma, r)) - 2\varepsilon \leq \mu_1(B_{d_1}(\sigma \cup \pi_1\pi_0\sigma, 4r + 6\varepsilon))$$

as desired.

The fourth condition of Definition 4.4 is verified by a similar argument. \square

Remark 7.7 (Measure Dowker bifiltration). Let (X, Λ, μ) be a metric measure space and let f be the degree bifiltration associated to μ . Then

$$\{\mathcal{MD}(X, (Y, \Omega, \mu), \Lambda)_{m,r}\}_{(m,r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]} = \{Nf_{m,2r}\}_{(m,r) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty]}$$

is the measure Dowker bifiltration of [8, Definition 3.6]. Thus Proposition 7.6 is a slight extension of [8, Theorem 4.2].

REFERENCES

- [1] A Björner. “Topological Methods”. In: *Handbook of Combinatorics 2* (1995), pp. 1819–1872.
- [2] Andrew J Blumberg and Michael Lesnick. “Stability of 2-parameter persistent homology”. In: *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 24.2 (2024), pp. 385–427.
- [3] K. Borsuk. “On the imbedding of systems of compacta in simplicial complexes”. In: *Fund. Math.* 35 (1948), pp. 217–234. ISSN: 0016-2736. DOI: [10.4064/fm-35-1-217-234](https://doi.org/10.4064/fm-35-1-217-234). URL: <https://doi.org/10.4064/fm-35-1-217-234>.
- [4] Morten Brun and Lars M. Salbu. “The Rectangle Complex of a Relation”. In: *Mediterranean Journal of Mathematics* 20 (2022). URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:250279723>.
- [5] Gunnar E. Carlsson and Tigran Ishkhanov. “A Topological Analysis of the Space of Natural Images”. In: 2007. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:15912154>.
- [6] Frédéric Chazal, David Cohen-Steiner, and Quentin Mérigot. “Geometric inference for probability measures”. In: *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 11 (2011), pp. 733–751.
- [7] Herbert Edelsbrunner and Georg Osang. “The multi-cover persistence of Euclidean balls”. In: *Discrete & Computational Geometry* 65 (2021), pp. 1296–1313.
- [8] Niklas Hellmer and Jan Spaliński. *Density Sensitive Bifiltered Dowker Complexes via Total Weight*. 2024. arXiv: [2405.15592](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.15592) [math.AT].

- [9] Ann B. Lee, Kim Steenstrup Pedersen, and David Mumford. “The Nonlinear Statistics of High-Contrast Patches in Natural Images”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 54 (2003), pp. 83–103. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:631693>.
- [10] Michael Lesnick and Matthew L. Wright. “Interactive Visualization of 2-D Persistence Modules”. In: *ArXiv* abs/1512.00180 (2015). URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:8863126>.
- [11] D. Quillen. “Homotopy Properties of the Poset of Nontrivial p -Subgroups of a Group”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 28 (1978), pp. 101–128.
- [12] Donald R Sheehy. “A Multicover Nerve for Geometric Inference.” In: *CCCG*. 2012, pp. 309–314.
- [13] Edwin H Spanier and Edwin Henry Spanier. *Algebraic topology*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1989.
- [14] Melvin Vaupel and Benjamin Dunn. *The bifiltration of a relation and extended Dowker duality*. 2023. arXiv: [2310.11529](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.11529) [math.AT].

¹ DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN, NORWAY
Email address: morten.brun@uib.no