

Barcoding Invariants and Their Equivalent Discriminating Power

Emerson G. Escolar^{1*†} and Woojin Kim^{2*†}

^{1*} Graduate School of Human Development and Environment, Kobe University, 3-11 Tsurukabuto, Nada-ku, Kobe, 657-8501, Hyogo, Japan .

^{2*} Department of Mathematical Sciences, KAIST, Daejeon, South Korea.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): e.g.escolar@people.kobe-u.ac.jp;
woojin.kim@kaist.ac.kr;

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

The persistence barcode (equivalently, the persistence diagram), which can be obtained from the interval decomposition of a persistence module, plays a pivotal role in applications of persistent homology. For *multi*-parameter persistent homology, which lacks a complete discrete invariant, and where persistence modules are no longer always interval decomposable, many alternative invariants have been proposed. Many of these invariants are akin to persistence barcodes, in that they assign (possibly signed) multisets of intervals. Furthermore, those invariants assign any interval decomposable module to its corresponding multiset of intervals. Naturally, identifying the relationships among invariants of this type, or ordering them by their discriminating power, is a fundamental question. To address this, we formalize the notion of *barcoding invariants* and compare their discriminating powers. Notably, this formalization enables us to prove that *all* barcoding invariants with the same basis possess equivalent discriminating power. One implication of our result is that introducing a new barcoding invariant does not add any value in terms of its generic discriminating power, even if the new invariant is distinct from the existing barcoding invariants. This suggests the need for a more flexible and adaptable comparison framework for barcoding invariants. Along the way, we generalize several recent results on the discriminative power of invariants for poset representations within our unified framework.

Keywords: poset representations, multi-parameter persistence, persistence barcodes, persistence diagrams, relative homological algebra

1 Introduction

Persistent homology is a central concept in Topological Data Analysis (TDA), with many applications to date [1–8]. One of the most common methods for obtaining persistent homology starts with a dataset X , a finite set of points in Euclidean space, and then we construct a nested sequence of simplicial complexes on X that captures the structure of X . Applying the homology functor with field coefficients to this nested family gives us persistent homology, or more specifically, a *persistence module*, i.e. a representation of a totally ordered poset. In general, a *representation of a poset* is a functor from the poset to the category of vector spaces and linear maps over a field.

Multi-parameter persistent homology or the homology of filtered topological spaces over posets, extends the concept of persistent homology [9–11]. This generalization arises when considering multiple aspects or features of the dataset X . Examples include aspects (properties) such as the density of points in X (in order to differentiate the role of outliers in X from that of the other points in X when constructing a simplicial filtration), time (when X is time-varying [12]), or domain-specific features—such as ionization energy (when X stands for an atomic configuration [13]). From such considerations, we obtain a representation of a poset, often a product of totally ordered sets. A representation of a product of totally ordered sets is often referred to as a *multi-parameter persistence module* in TDA.

Whereas persistence modules admit *persistence barcodes* as their complete discrete invariants, multi-parameter persistence modules do not admit such an invariant [11]. From the perspective of representation theory, representations of a poset P is of *wild type* unless P is one of the exceptional posets [14–16]. This motivates researchers in the TDA community to investigate a proxy for persistence barcodes for representations of a general poset P , which are not necessarily complete, but potentially useful in practical applications of TDA.

In this effort, numerous invariants have been proposed for multi-parameter persistence modules or general poset representations. Examples include the rank invariant [11], the fibered barcode [17], the Hilbert functions (a.k.a. dimension vectors) and graded Betti numbers [17, 18], the generalized rank invariant and its Möbius inversion [19–21], the elder-rule-staircode [22], the zigzag-indexed-barcode [23], the meta-diagram [24], the birth-death function and its Möbius inversion [25], the multirank invariant [26], compressed multiplicities and interval replacement [27, 28], connected persistence diagrams [29], invariants using relative resolutions [14, 30–35], the fringe presentations [36, 37], the graphcode [38], the Grassmannian persistence diagrams [39], and the skyscraper invariant which is based on the Harder-Narasimhan types of quiver representations [40, 41].

Several of these invariants are akin to persistence barcodes, in that they assign (possibly signed) multisets of intervals. Furthermore, those invariants assign any interval decomposable module to its corresponding multiset of intervals. Naturally, identifying the relationships among those of invariants or ordering them by their discriminating power is a fundamental question. We take a systematic approach to address this question. We summarize our contributions in Items 1-5 below.

Contributions

Let P be a poset.

1. Building on the concept of *invariant* from [32], we formalize the notion of *barcoding invariants*. Broadly speaking, given a fixed set of indecomposable representations of P , a barcoding invariant f is defined as a \mathbb{Z} -linear map sending each representation of P to a \mathbb{Z} -linear combination of representations in the fixed set, so that map is the identity on this fixed set. We call the fixed set the *basis* for f ; see Definitions 3.1 and 3.2.

We remark that, in the literature, the basis is often taken to be the set of *interval representations* of P (cf. Definition 2.1) or its subsets [23, 27, 28, 31, 34, 35, 42], mainly motivated by the goal of devising proxies for persistence barcodes in the setting of multi-parameter persistent homology.

To compare barcoding invariants, we adopt the comparison framework from [32, 33], where, given any two additive invariants f and g , the relation $\ker(f) \subseteq \ker(g)$ indicates that f is *finer* than g (cf. Definition 2.12).

2. We show that any pair of barcoding invariants f and g having the same basis are either equivalent or incomparable; see Corollary 3.11.
3. We take the previous item further by proving that f and g have isomorphic kernels, i.e. f and g have identical discriminating power in a generic sense; see Lemma 2.15 (i) and Theorem 3.13.
4. We apply the abstract results from Items 2-3 to particular invariants proposed for multi-parameter persistence modules. For example, we show that the *generalized persistence diagram* (cf. Example 2.32) and the collection of signed intervals that naturally arises from the *interval resolution* (cf. Example 2.39) are not comparable and have the same discriminating power, strengthening findings from [32]; see Theorem 4.1. Also, we identify a universal property of the generalized persistence diagram that does not involve Möbius inversion; see Theorem 4.7.

One implication of Items 2-4 is that introducing a new barcoding invariant does not add any value in terms of its generic discriminating power, even if the new invariant is distinct from any of the existing barcoding invariants. For instance, while there are numerous *compression systems* that produce different barcoding invariants (cf. Example 2.23), none of them are distinct in their generic discriminating power.

5. Our framework allows us to easily generalize results on the discriminative power of two recently introduced invariants for poset representations. This demonstrates that those results stem from the general properties of barcoding invariants, rather than their specialized constructions; see Proposition 3.7 and Theorem 3.8.

Organization

Section 2 provides the preliminaries for our results. Section 3 covers the content of Contributions 1, 2, 3, and 5. Section 4 discusses the content of Contribution 4. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 Background

In Section 2.1, we review basic concepts related to representations of posets. In Section 2.2, we review the notion of Krull-Schmidt category in the context of our study. In Section 2.3, we review the notion of additive invariants and their comparison framework, as introduced in the literature. In Section 2.4, we discuss several simple additive invariants. In Section 2.5, we review the concept of Möbius inversion and relevant additive invariants. In Section 2.6, we review basic concepts in (relative) homological algebra, and relevant additive invariants.

2.1 Poset representations

Throughout this paper, P denotes a poset, and k denotes a fixed field. We identify P with the category whose objects are the elements of P , and for any $x, y \in P$, the set of morphisms from x to y consists of the unique element $x \rightarrow y$ if $x \leq y$, and is the empty set otherwise.

A k -representation of P (or simply *representation*, when the specification of k and P is clear) is defined as a functor from P to the category of k -vector spaces Vect_k . By $\text{Rep } P$, we denote the category of k -representations (i.e., the functor category), which is an additive k -category.

The *direct sum* of any two $M, N \in \text{Rep } P$ is defined pointwisely, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} (M \oplus N)(x) &:= M(x) \oplus N(x) && \text{for all } x \in P, \\ (M \oplus N)(x \rightarrow y) &:= M(x \rightarrow y) \oplus N(x \rightarrow y) && \text{for all } x \rightarrow y \in P. \end{aligned}$$

A representation M is said to be (i) *trivial* or *zero* if $M(x) = 0$ for all $x \in P$ (in this case, we write $M = 0$), and (ii) *decomposable* if M is isomorphic to a direct sum of two nontrivial representations.

The structurally simplest indecomposable representations are perhaps the ‘interval representations’ that we are about to define. A subposet I of P is said to be *connected* if I is nonempty, and for any pair of points $x, y \in I$, there exists a sequence of points $x =: x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n := y$ in I such that either $x_i \leq x_{i+1}$ or $x_{i+1} \leq x_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. A full subposet I of P is said to be *convex* if for any elements $x \leq y \leq z$ of P with $x, z \in I$, it holds that $y \in I$. If a full subposet I of P is both connected and convex, then I is said to be an *interval*.¹ Let $\text{Int}(P)$ denote the set of all intervals in a poset P . For any $x, z \in P$ with $x \leq z$, the *segment* from x to z is the full subposet $[x, z] := \{y \in P : x \leq y \leq z\}$. Let $\text{Seg}(P)$ denote the set of all segments in P . It is clear that $\text{Seg}(P) \subseteq \text{Int}(P)$.

Definition 2.1. For any $I \in \text{Int}(P)$, the *interval representation with support I* is $k_I \in \text{Rep } P$ defined as

$$k_I(x) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } x \in I \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad k_I(x \rightarrow y) = \begin{cases} 1_k : k \rightarrow k & \text{if } x, y \in I \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

¹Intervals have also been called *spreads* [32].

for any object x of P and any morphism $x \rightarrow y$ of P (i.e. $x \leq y$), respectively.

Proposition 2.2 ([43, Proposition 2.2]). *For any $I \in \text{Int}(P)$, the interval representation k_I of P is indecomposable.*

If a given $M \in \text{Rep } P$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of interval representations, then M is said to be *interval decomposable*.

For any $x \in P$, let x^\uparrow denote the full subposet of all points $y \in P$ such that $x \leq y$. Then, $x^\uparrow \in \text{Int}(P)$. The interval representations k_{x^\uparrow} , $x \in P$ are precisely indecomposable projective objects in $\text{Rep } P$ (see for example [44, Section 3.7]).

A representation $M \in \text{Rep } P$ is said to be *finitely presentable* if M is isomorphic to the cokernel of a morphism between finitely generated projective representations in $\text{Rep } P$, i.e. finite direct sums of representations of the form k_{x^\uparrow} . Also, M is said to be *pointwise finite dimensional* if $\dim_k M(x)$ is finite for all $x \in P$.

Definition 2.3. We consider the following additive subcategories of $\text{Rep } P$.

- (i) By $\text{rep } P$ we denote the full subcategory of all pointwise finite dimensional k -representations of P . Objects in this category are said to be pfd k -representations of P .
- (ii) By $\text{fds-rep } P$ we denote the full subcategory of all $M \in \text{rep } P$ that decomposes into a **finite direct sum** of indecomposables.
- (iii) By $\text{fp-rep } P$, we denote the full subcategory of all **finitely presentable** k -representations of P .

We will recall later that $\text{fp-rep } P$ is a subcategory of $\text{fds-rep } P$ and thus we have $\text{fp-rep } P \subseteq \text{fds-rep } P \subseteq \text{rep } P$ (cf. Proposition 2.5). While we prove the main results of this paper in a general setting, they will be relevant to some of the above categories.

Let us once again consider the intervals $\text{Int}(P)$. It is clear that for $I \in \text{Int}(P)$, $k_I \in \text{fds-rep } P \subseteq \text{rep } P$. However, in general, the representation k_I may not be finitely presentable. Let

$$\text{int}(P) := \{I \in \text{Int}(P) \mid k_I \text{ is finitely presentable}\}.$$

Similarly, even for $I \in \text{Seg}(P)$, k_I is not necessarily finitely presentable. Let

$$\text{seg}(P) := \{I \in \text{Seg}(P) \mid k_I \text{ is finitely presentable}\}.$$

Remark 2.4. (i) By abuse of notation, we simply write I for the interval representation k_I . Accordingly, we may consider $\text{Int}(P)$ as the set of interval representations k_I , or even the set of the isomorphism classes $[k_I]$. A similar convention applies to $\text{int}(P)$ and $\text{seg}(P)$.

- (ii) The category $\text{fp-rep } P$ with $P = \mathbb{R}^d$ is of particular interest in practical applications of multi-parameter persistent homology; see, e.g., [9, 11].²
- (iii) When P is a finite poset, the three subcategories given in Definition 2.3 are identical, $\text{Int}(P) = \text{int}(P)$, and $\text{Seg}(P) = \text{seg}(P)$.

²In the poset \mathbb{R}^d , we have $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \leq (y_1, \dots, y_d)$ if and only if $x_i \leq y_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, d$.

2.2 Krull-Schmidt categories

In this section, we review the notion of Krull-Schmidt category, and identify properties of the categories given in Definition 2.3. Refer to [45, 46] for an overview of general category theory and [47, 48] for additive (and abelian) categories.

An additive category \mathcal{D} is said to be a *Krull-Schmidt category* if every object of \mathcal{D} decomposes as a finite direct sum of objects of \mathcal{D} , each with local endomorphism ring.³ In a Krull-Schmidt category, such decompositions are unique up to permutation of summands and isomorphisms (see for example [49, Theorem 4.2]). A category is said to be *essentially small* if the isomorphism classes (*isoclasses*) of its objects form a set.

We clarify the hierarchy of the categories given in Definition 2.3 and address their properties. In what follows, P stands for a poset.

Proposition 2.5. (i) *The categories $\text{fp-rep } P$, $\text{fds-rep } P$, $\text{rep } P$ are essentially small, with the following inclusions:*

$$\text{fp-rep } P \subseteq \text{fds-rep } P \subseteq \text{rep } P.$$

- (ii) *Any $M \in \text{rep } P$ is a direct sum of indecomposable representations with local endomorphism rings.*
- (iii) *$\text{fds-rep } P$ is a Krull-Schmidt category.*
- (iv) *$\text{fp-rep } P$ is a Krull-Schmidt category, where $\dim_k \text{Hom}(M, N)$ is finite for any $M, N \in \text{fp-rep } P$.*

Proof. Item (ii) is identical to [50, Theorem 1.1]. Item (iii) follows from definition (we restrict to those objects such that the Krull-Schmidt property holds). Item (iv) is a corollary of [44, Corollary 8.4]⁴.

Now, we show Item (i). We first show that $\text{rep } P$ is essentially small, that is, the collection of isoclasses of representations in $\text{rep } P$ is a set. For each $\{d_x\}_{x \in P} \in \prod_{x \in P} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, consider the isoclasses of $M \in \text{rep } P$ satisfying $\dim M(x) = d_x$ for all $x \in P$. By choices of bases, we can consider as a representative of each isoclass the representation with $M(x) = k^{d_x}$ and linear maps $M(x \rightarrow y)$ given by left multiplication of a $d_y \times d_x$ matrix over k . The union (indexed by $\{d_x\}_{x \in P} \in \prod_{x \in P} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$) of the collections of representatives is clearly a set.

We show the claimed inclusions. The inclusion $\text{fds-rep } P \subseteq \text{rep } P$ is clear. To see that $\text{fp-rep } P \subseteq \text{fds-rep } P$, we note that since $\text{fp-rep } P$ is Krull-Schmidt by Item (iv), each object M in $\text{fp-rep } P$ decomposes as a finite direct sum of indecomposables. It remains to show that M is pointwise finite dimensional. This follows immediately from the fact that M is isomorphic to the cokernel of a morphism between finitely generated projective representations, which are pointwise finite dimensional. \square

³A ring R is *local* if $1_R \neq 0_R$, and for every $x \in R$, x or $1 - x$ is a unit.

⁴Some translation is needed to adapt to the terminology of [44], which we explain as follows. First, we note that $\text{fp-rep } P$ is isomorphic to the category $\text{mod } kP^{\text{op}}$ of finite-presented right modules over the k -linearization of the opposite category of P . Then, for any poset, $\mathcal{A} := kP^{\text{op}}$ is a *spectroid* (i.e. \mathcal{A} is an essentially small k -category, with all endomorphism algebras local, and with distinct objects non-isomorphic, and $\mathcal{A}(x, y)$ is finite-dimensional for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$). Corollary 8.4 of [44] states that for \mathcal{A} a spectroid, $\text{mod } \mathcal{A}$ is an *aggregate* (i.e. an essentially small additive k -category, with each object a finite sum of objects with local endomorphism algebras, and $(\text{mod } \mathcal{A})(x, y)$ is finite-dimensional for all $x, y \in \text{mod } \mathcal{A}$).

For an essentially small Krull-Schmidt category \mathcal{D} (especially $\mathcal{D} = \text{fds-rep } P$ or $\mathcal{D} = \text{fp-rep } P$), we let $\text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$ be the set of the isoclasses of indecomposable objects in \mathcal{D} . For any $Q \subseteq \text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$, a set of isoclasses of indecomposables of \mathcal{D} , the *additive closure* $\text{add } Q$ of Q , is the smallest full additive subcategory which contains Q and is closed under taking direct summands. Thus, $\text{add } Q$ satisfies the property that it contains the zero object and is closed under isomorphisms, direct sums, and direct summands. The following property can be immediately checked for such subcategories.

Lemma 2.6. *Let \mathcal{D} be an essentially small Krull-Schmidt category and \mathcal{C} be full subcategory of \mathcal{D} containing the zero object, closed under isomorphisms, direct sums, and direct summands. Then,*

- (i) \mathcal{C} is Krull-Schmidt, and
- (ii) $\text{ind}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$.

Throughout the rest of this paper, we adopt the following conventions.

Convention 2.7. \mathcal{D} stands for an essentially small Krull-Schmidt category. Also, by $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, we mean that \mathcal{C} is a full subcategory of \mathcal{D} containing the zero object of \mathcal{D} and is closed under isomorphisms, direct sums, and direct summands.

We will often consider the subcategory $\mathcal{C} = \text{add } Q$ of \mathcal{D} for some $Q \subseteq \text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$. Then, Lemma 2.6 implies that \mathcal{C} is a Krull-Schmidt category and $\text{ind}(\mathcal{C}) = Q$.

2.3 Additive invariants and their comparisons

In this section, we recall from [33] the notion of additive invariants and their comparison framework.

Definition 2.8 (Split Grothendieck group). The split Grothendieck group of \mathcal{D} , denoted by $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$, is the free abelian group generated by isomorphism classes $[M]$ of objects in \mathcal{D} modulo relations $[M_1 \oplus M_2] = [M_1] + [M_2]$ for all objects $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{D}$.

Lemma 2.9 (e.g. [51, Theorem 2.3.6]). *The set $\text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$ is a basis for $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$.*

This lemma allows us to define the positive and negative parts of any element in $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$:

Definition 2.10. Let $x \in K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$ be nonzero. Then, we can write

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i [I_i]$$

for some $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, $[I_i] \in \text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$, and $m_i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We call

$$X_+ := \bigoplus_{i:m_i>0} I_i^{m_i} \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } X_- := \bigoplus_{i:m_i<0} I_i^{-m_i} \in \mathcal{D}$$

the *positive part* and *negative part* of $x \in K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$ respectively, which are unique up to isomorphism. When $x = 0$, then the positive and negative parts of x are defined to be 0. Whether or not $x = 0$, we have

$$x = [X_+] - [X_-].$$

For any set S , the free abelian group with basis S is denoted by $\mathbb{Z}^{(S)}$. Then, each element $x \in \mathbb{Z}^{(S)}$ can be written uniquely as $x = \sum_{s \in S} a_s s \in \mathbb{Z}^{(S)}$ with $a_s \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $s \in S$ where $a_s = 0$ except for a finite number of $s \in S$. Then, x can be identified with the function $h_x : S \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ with $h_x(s) = a_s$ for all $s \in S$. This function is finitely supported. Let \mathbb{Z}^S be the abelian group of all functions $S \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. In general, $\mathbb{Z}^{(S)} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^S$; however, when S is finite, we have $\mathbb{Z}^S = \mathbb{Z}^{(S)}$.

Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ (cf. Convention 2.7). By Lemmas 2.6 and 2.9, the sets $\text{ind}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$ are bases for $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$ and $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$, respectively. Hence, we have:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{Z}^{\text{ind}(\mathcal{C})} & \subseteq & \mathbb{Z}^{\text{ind}(\mathcal{D})} \\ \cup & & \cup \\ K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}) & \cong \mathbb{Z}^{\text{ind}(\mathcal{C})} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^{\text{ind}(\mathcal{D})} \cong & K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}). \end{array} \quad (1)$$

Now, let G be an abelian group. Given a map f sending each object in \mathcal{D} to an element of G such that (i) f is constant on each isomorphism class, (ii) f sends the zero object to 0_G , and (iii) $f(M \oplus N) = f(M) + f(N)$ for all $M, N \in \mathcal{D}$, then f naturally induces a group homomorphism $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow G$. This motivates:

Definition 2.11 ([33, Definition 2.13]). An *additive invariant on \mathcal{D}* is a group homomorphism $f : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow G$ for some abelian group G .

A natural way of defining the fineness and coarseness of an additive invariant is by measuring its discriminating power. Since the failure to distinguish between two objects $M, N \in \mathcal{D}$ is indicated by the containment of $[M] - [N]$ in $\ker(f)$, the following definition provides a natural method for comparing two additive invariants in terms of their discriminating power.

Definition 2.12 ([33, Definition 2.13]). Let f and g be additive invariants on \mathcal{D} . We say that:

- (i) f is *finer* than g if $\ker f \subseteq \ker g$. In this case, we write $f \gtrsim g$.
- (ii) f and g are *equivalent* if $f \gtrsim g$ and $g \gtrsim f$. In this case, we write $f \sim g$.

Clearly, \gtrsim is a partial order on the collection of *all* additive invariants on \mathcal{D} . Also, we remark that any additive invariant $f : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow G$ is equivalent to $f' : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{im } f$ that is simply obtained by restricting the codomain of f to its image.

The relation \gtrsim can be reformulated as follows; in fact, this reformulated version was used as the definition of \gtrsim in [30, Definition 2.4].

Lemma 2.13. *Let f and g be any two additive invariants on \mathcal{D} .*

- (i) $f \gtrsim g$ if and only if there exists a homomorphism $\phi : \text{im } f \rightarrow \text{im } g$ such that $g = \phi f$, i.e. the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{f} & \text{im } f \\ & \searrow g & \downarrow \phi \\ & & \text{im } g. \end{array}$$

In words, a coarser invariant g can be derived from a finer invariant f through a homomorphism ϕ , which can be applied for every object in \mathcal{D} .

(ii) $f \sim g$ if and only if there exists an isomorphism $\phi : \text{im } f \rightarrow \text{im } g$ such that $g = \phi f$.

Proof. (i) If there exists $\phi : \text{im } f \rightarrow \text{im } g$ such that $g = \phi f$, then it is clear that $\ker f \subseteq \ker g$. Conversely, if $f \succeq g$ (i.e. $\ker f \subseteq \ker g$), then we have the canonical homomorphism $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})/\ker f \rightarrow K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})/\ker g$ which induces a homomorphism $\phi : \text{im } f \rightarrow \text{im } g$ that makes the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{f} & \text{im } f & \xrightarrow{\cong} & K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})/\ker f \\
 & \searrow g & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \\
 & & \text{im } g & \xleftarrow{\cong} & K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})/\ker g.
 \end{array} \tag{2}$$

(ii) The backward direction is direct from Item (i). Next, we prove the forward direction. Assume that $f \sim g$. Then, by definition, $\ker f = \ker g$ and thus the homomorphism $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})/\ker f \rightarrow K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})/\ker g$ of Diagram (2) is the identity and ϕ is the required isomorphism. \square

Remark 2.14. The proof of Lemma 2.13 does not actually utilize the fact that the domain is a split Grothendieck group. More general statements are given as follows:

Let $f : H \rightarrow G$ and $g : H \rightarrow G'$ be any two homomorphisms of abelian groups.

- (i) $\ker f \subseteq \ker g$ if and only if there exists a homomorphism $\phi : \text{im } f \rightarrow \text{im } g$ with $g = \phi f$.
- (ii) $\ker f = \ker g$ if and only if there exists an isomorphism $\phi : \text{im } f \rightarrow \text{im } g$ with $g = \phi f$.

Next, we connect the kernels of additive invariants on \mathcal{D} with pairs of objects in \mathcal{D} .

Lemma 2.15. *Let f and g be any two additive invariants on \mathcal{D} .*

(i) *Let $x = [X_+] - [X_-] \in K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$ (cf. Definition 2.10). Then, $x \in \ker f$ if and only if*

$$f([X_+]) = f([X_-]).$$

In words, the elements of $\ker f$ correspond to the pairs of objects in \mathcal{D} that f cannot distinguish, and vice versa.

(ii) *$f \not\succeq g$ if and only if there exist $M, N \in \mathcal{D}$ such that*

$$f([M]) = f([N]) \text{ but } g([M]) \neq g([N]). \tag{3}$$

In words, f not being finer than g means that there exists a pair of objects that g can distinguish, but f cannot.

Proof. (i) This follows immediately from the fact that $x = [X_+] - [X_-]$, and f is a group homomorphism.

(ii) Assume that $f \not\succeq g$, i.e. there exists $x \in \ker f$ with $x \notin \ker g$. Let X_+ and X_- respectively be the positive and negative parts of x . By Item (i), $M := X_+$ and $N := X_-$ satisfy Condition (3).

Conversely, given any $M, N \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfying Condition (3), it is clear that $x := [M] - [N]$ satisfies $x \in \ker f$ and $x \notin \ker g$, completing the proof.

□

The following definition is useful for clarifying the discriminating power of additive invariants.

Definition 2.16. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ (cf. Convention 2.7). An additive invariant $f : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow G$ is said to be \mathcal{C} -complete if $\ker f \cap K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}) = \{[0]\}$.

Let $\iota : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$ be the inclusion map via the identifications made in Diagram (1). Then, for any additive invariant $f : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow G$, we have $\ker f \cap K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}) = \ker(f \circ \iota)$. Thus, f is \mathcal{C} -complete if and only if f restricted to $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$, denoted $f|_{K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})}$, is injective, i.e. f distinguishes any two distinct objects of \mathcal{C} (cf. Lemma 2.15(i)).

2.4 First examples of additive invariants

In this section, we discuss several additive invariants. Some of these invariants will turn out to be *barcoding invariants* that we will define in a later section.

Example 2.17 (Trivial invariants). A trivial invariant is given by the identity map

$$1 : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$$

which satisfies $1 \gtrsim g$ for any additive invariant g on \mathcal{D} .

This invariant corresponds to an indecomposable decomposition in the following sense: Let $M \in \mathcal{D}$ with $M \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n N_i$ with each N_i indecomposable. Then, we have

$$1([M]) = [M] = \sum_{i=1}^n [N_i]$$

and thus, under the isomorphism $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{\text{ind}(\mathcal{D})}$ (cf. Lemma 2.9), $1([M])$ is the map that assigns each indecomposable its multiplicity as a direct summand of M . Thus, we also call it the *multiplicity invariant*. If P is a totally ordered set, setting $\mathcal{D} = \text{fds-rep } P$, the invariant 1 corresponds to the *barcode* or *persistence diagram* [52–55].

At the other extreme of the spectrum, there is the *zero invariant*

$$0 : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \{0\}.$$

Clearly, for any additive invariant g on \mathcal{D} , we have $g \gtrsim 0$.

Example 2.18. For any $Q \subseteq \text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$, the natural projection

$$\pi^Q : \mathbb{Z}^{\text{ind}(\mathcal{D})} (\cong K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^Q$$

defines an additive invariant, which can be thought of as the multiplicity invariant *restricted* to the indecomposables in Q . For example, if $\mathcal{D} = \text{fds-rep } P$, and Q is the set of isoclasses of interval representations of P , then for each $M \in \mathcal{D}$, $\pi^Q([M]) =: \pi^{\text{Int}}([M])$ assigns each interval representation its multiplicity as a direct summand of M .

Example 2.19. The *dimension vector* (a.k.a. *Hilbert function*) is the additive invariant $\underline{\dim} : K_0^{\text{SP}}(\text{fds-rep } P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^P$ given by⁵

$$[M] \mapsto \underline{\dim}(M) := (\dim(M(x)))_{x \in P}.$$

A finer invariant than the dimension vector is the rank invariant:

Example 2.20. Let \leq_P be the partial order on the poset P . The *rank invariant* [11] is the additive invariant $\text{rk} : K_0^{\text{SP}}(\text{fds-rep } P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\leq_P}$ given by

$$[M] \mapsto \text{rk}_M := (\text{rank } M(x \rightarrow y))_{(x,y) \in \leq_P}.$$

Remark 2.21. Via the bijection from \leq_P to $\text{Seg}(P)$ given by $(x, y) \mapsto [x, y]$, we have the induced isomorphism $\mathbb{Z}^{\text{Seg}(P)} \cong \mathbb{Z}^{\leq_P}$.

A finer invariant than the rank invariant is the generalized rank invariant. First, recall that when P is connected and $M \in \text{rep } P$, the *rank* of M , denoted by $\text{rank}(M)$, is defined to be the rank of the canonical linear map from the limit of M to the colimit of M [19, 20]. This rank, by definition, does not exceed $\min_{x \in P} \dim_k M(x)$ and thus is finite.

Example 2.22. Let $Q \subseteq \text{Int}(P)$. The *generalized rank invariant over Q* is the additive invariant $\text{rk}^Q : K_0^{\text{SP}}(\text{fds-rep } P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^Q$ given by

$$[M] \mapsto \text{rk}_M^Q := (\text{rank}(M|_I))_{I \in Q}$$

where $M|_I$ is the restriction of M to I , as a full subposet of P [20, Section 3] [21]. If $Q \supseteq \text{Seg}(P)$, by postcomposing the natural projection $\mathbb{Z}^Q \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\text{Seg}(P)}$ and the isomorphism $\mathbb{Z}^{\text{Seg}(P)} \cong \mathbb{Z}^{\leq}$, we retrieve the rank invariant. When $Q = \text{Int}(P)$, for brevity, we write rk^{Int} instead of $\text{rk}^{\text{Int}(P)}$.

In what follows, we will see a generalization of the generalized rank invariant.

A *compression system* for P [27, 28] is a family $\xi = (\xi_I)_{I \in \text{Int}(P)}$, where each ξ_I is a poset morphism $\xi_I : Q_I \rightarrow P$ (i.e. a functor, when viewing posets as categories) from some finite connected poset Q_I , satisfying the following conditions.

1. ξ_I factors through the poset inclusion $I \hookrightarrow P$, for each $I \in \text{Int}(P)$.
2. $\xi_I(Q_I)$ contains all maximal and all minimal elements of I , for each $I \in \text{Int}(P)$.
3. For each $I = [x, y] \in \text{Seg}(P) \subseteq \text{Int}(P)$, there exists a $[x', y'] \in \text{Seg}(Q_I)$ with $\xi_I(x') = x$ and $\xi_I(y') = y$.

Given a compression system ξ , for each $I \in \text{Int}(P)$, ξ_I defines a functor $R_I : \text{Rep } P \rightarrow \text{Rep } Q_I$ via precomposition, i.e. for each $M \in \text{Rep } P$, we have $R_I(M) = M \circ \xi_I$.

Example 2.23. For any $M \in \text{fds-rep } P$ and $I \in \text{Int}(P)$, the *compression multiplicity of I in M under ξ* is defined to be the multiplicity of $R_I(k_I)$ as a direct summand of $R_I(M)$. By additivity [28, Proposition 3.13], we obtain the additive invariant

$$c^\xi : K_0^{\text{SP}}(\text{fds-rep } P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\text{Int}(P)}$$

⁵Note that, among the three subcategories considered in Definition 2.3, $\text{fds-rep } P$ is the largest Krull-Schmidt category (cf. Proposition 2.5). It is convenient to work with Krull-Schmidt categories as Lemma 2.9 provides a basis for its split Grothendieck group.

which we call the *compression multiplicity invariant*.⁶ Now, we clarify how the compression multiplicity invariant generalizes the generalized rank invariant (Example 2.22).

Assume that P is finite and define the compression system $\xi := \text{tot} = (\text{tot}_I)_{I \in \text{Int}(P)}$ by setting, for each $I \in \text{Int}(P)$, $Q_I := I$ and $\text{tot}_I : I \hookrightarrow P$ be the poset inclusion. Then, the compression multiplicity c^{tot} is equal to the generalized rank invariant over $\text{Int}(P)$ [56, Lemma 3.1] [28, Remark 5.39].

Remark 2.24. A sufficient condition for a compression system ξ to yield a compression multiplicity c^ξ identical to c^{tot} is known, as a generalization of [42, Theorem 3.12]. More specifically, when ξ_I *essentially covers* I for all $I \in \text{int}(P)$, we have $c^\xi = c^{\text{tot}} = \text{rk}$ [28, Definition 5.32 and Theorem 5.37].

Next, we recall the dim-Hom invariant [32]:

Example 2.25. Let Q be any set of isoclasses of indecomposable objects in $\text{fp-rep } P$. The *dim-Hom invariant over* Q is the additive invariant $\text{dimh}_\mathcal{D}^Q : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^Q$ given by

$$\text{dimh}_\mathcal{D}^Q([M]) = (\dim_k \text{Hom}_\mathcal{D}(L, M))_{[L] \in Q},$$

where Proposition 2.5 (iv) guarantees that $\dim_k \text{Hom}_\mathcal{D}(L, M) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for each $[L] \in Q$. When $Q = \text{Int}(P)$ (cf. Remark 2.4 (i)), we write $\text{dimh}_\mathcal{D}^{\text{Int}}$ instead of $\text{dimh}_\mathcal{D}^{\text{Int}(P)}$. When \mathcal{D} is clear, we also write dimh^{Int} .

2.5 The Möbius inversion formula and additive invariants

There have been many works utilizing Möbius inversion in TDA, starting from [57]. In this section, we review the Möbius inversion formula (Section 2.5.1) and explain how one obtains an additive invariant from another additive invariant via Möbius inversion (Section 2.5.2).

2.5.1 General construction

We review the notions of incidence algebra and Möbius inversion [58, 59] in general. Throughout this subsection, let Q denote a *locally finite* poset, i.e. for all $p, q \in Q$ with $p \leq q$, the segment $[p, q]$ is finite (we note that in certain examples discussed later, the poset Q will be considered as a subset of $\text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$ with an appropriate partial order).

Fix a field \mathbb{F} (which may be different from the field k in the previous sections). Given any function $\alpha : \text{Seg}(Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, we write $\alpha(p, q)$ for $\alpha([p, q])$. The *incidence algebra* $I(Q, \mathbb{F})$ of Q over \mathbb{F} is the \mathbb{F} -algebra of all functions $\text{Seg}(Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ with the usual structure of a vector space over \mathbb{F} , where multiplication is given by convolution:

$$(\alpha\beta)(p, r) := \sum_{q \in [p, r]} \alpha(p, q) \cdot \beta(q, r). \quad (4)$$

⁶The compression multiplicity invariant is also called the *interval rank invariant* [28, Definition 4.10].

Since Q is locally finite, the above sum is finite and hence $\alpha\beta$ is well-defined. The *Dirac delta function* $\delta_Q \in I(Q, \mathbb{F})$ is given by

$$\delta_Q(p, q) := \begin{cases} 1, & p = q \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

and serves as the two-sided multiplicative identity of $I(Q, \mathbb{F})$.

Remark 2.26 (See [59]). An element $\alpha \in I(Q, \mathbb{F})$ admits a multiplicative inverse if and only if $\alpha(q, q) \neq 0$ for all $q \in Q$.

Another important element of $I(Q, \mathbb{F})$ is the *zeta function*:

$$\zeta_Q(p, q) := 1 \text{ for all } [p, q] \in \text{Seg}(P). \quad (6)$$

By Remark 2.26, the zeta function ζ_Q admits a multiplicative inverse, which is called the *Möbius function* $\mu_Q \in I(Q, \mathbb{F})$. The Möbius function can be computed recursively as

$$\mu_Q(p, q) = \begin{cases} 1, & p = q, \\ -\sum_{p \leq r < q} \mu_Q(p, r), & p < q. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Let \mathbb{F}^Q denote the vector space of all functions $Q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$. Also, for $q \in Q$, let

$$q^\downarrow := \{p \in Q : p \leq q\},$$

called a *principal ideal*. Let $\text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{F}) \subseteq \mathbb{F}^Q$ be the subset

$$\text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{F}) := \{f \in \mathbb{F}^Q \mid \text{for every } q \in Q, f(r) = 0 \text{ for all but finitely many } r \in q^\downarrow\}.$$

This is clearly a subspace of \mathbb{F}^Q . Elements of $\text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{F})$ are said to be *convolvable* (over Q).

Each element in $I(Q, \mathbb{F})$ acts on $\text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{F})$ by right multiplication: for any $f \in \text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{F})$ and for any $\alpha \in I(Q, \mathbb{F})$, we define:

$$(f * \alpha)(q) := \sum_{p \leq q} f(p) \alpha(p, q). \quad (8)$$

It can be easily checked that for a locally finite poset Q , $f * \alpha$ belongs to $\text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{F})$.

Remark 2.27. Let Q be a locally finite poset and $\alpha \in I(Q, \mathbb{F})$.

- (i) The right multiplication map $*\alpha : \text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{F}) \rightarrow \text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{F})$ given by $f \mapsto f * \alpha$ is an automorphism if and only if α is invertible.
- (ii) By Remark 2.26 and the previous item, the right multiplication map $*\zeta_Q$ by the zeta function is an automorphism on $\text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{F})$ with inverse $*\mu_Q$.
- (iii) As a special case, if q^\downarrow is a finite set for each $q \in Q$ (for example if Q itself is a finite poset), then every function $Q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is convolvable: $\text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{F}) = \mathbb{F}^Q$.

The Möbius inversion formula is a powerful tool in combinatorics with widespread applications:

Theorem 2.28 (Möbius Inversion formula [58]). *Let Q be a locally finite poset. For any pair of convolvable functions $f, g : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$,*

$$g(q) = \sum_{r \leq q} f(r) \text{ for all } q \in Q \quad (9)$$

if and only if

$$f(q) = \sum_{r \leq q} g(r) \cdot \mu_Q(r, q) \text{ for all } q \in Q. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Equation (9) can be represented as $g = f * \zeta_Q$. By multiplying both sides by $\zeta_Q^{-1} = \mu_Q$ on the right, we have $g * \mu_Q = f$, which is precisely Equation (10). \square

The function $f = g * \mu_Q$ is referred to as the *Möbius inversion* of g (over Q).

Remark 2.29. In Theorem 2.28, further assume that \mathbb{F} is a field containing the ring of integers \mathbb{Z} , such as the rationals or the reals. Since the Möbius function μ_Q is an integer-valued map (cf. Equation (7)), the automorphism $*\mu_Q$ on $\text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{F})$ described in Remark 2.27 (i) can be restricted to the automorphism on $\text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{Z})$, the abelian group of integer-valued convolvable functions on Q .

Furthermore, similar to Remark 2.27 (iii), if every principal ideal of Q is finite (for example if Q itself is a finite poset), then $\text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^Q$, and thus this gives an automorphism $*\mu_Q$ on \mathbb{Z}^Q .

2.5.2 Möbius inversion of additive invariants

The aim of this section is to demonstrate that the Möbius inversion of an additive invariant f , whenever well-defined, is equivalent to f in the sense of Definition 2.12 (ii).

For any set Q of isoclasses of indecomposables in \mathcal{D} , let $\mathcal{C} = \text{add } Q \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ (cf. Convention 2.7). We also assume that this set Q is equipped with a partial order \leq , and that Q is a locally finite poset under this partial order. By Remarks 2.27 and 2.29, the right multiplication map $*\mu_Q$ is an automorphism on $\text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{Z})$. Thus, whenever an additive invariant $f : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{Z})$ is given, we obtain another additive invariant $g : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{Z})$ by defining, for each $[M] \in K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$,

$$g([M]) := f([M]) * \mu_Q,$$

which is the Möbius inversion of $f([M])$. This gives the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{f} & \text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{Z}) \\ & \searrow g & \downarrow *\mu_Q \\ & & \text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{Z}) \end{array}$$

i.e. $g = (*\mu_Q) \circ f$ where $*\mu_Q$ is pointwise right multiplication by μ_Q . By a slight abuse of language we also call g the Möbius inversion of f , where it should be noted that

the Möbius inversion is taken “pointwise”, i.e. for each $[M] \in K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$, and not on f itself. By Lemma 2.13, we have $f \sim g$. Hence, from Theorem 2.28 and Remark 2.29 we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.30. (i) Let Q be a set of isoclasses of indecomposables in \mathcal{D} . Let Q be equipped with a partial order \leq so that (Q, \leq) is a locally finite poset. Then, any additive invariant $f : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{Z})$ is equivalent to its Möbius inversion $(*\mu_Q) \circ f : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{Conv}(Q, \mathbb{Z})$.

(ii) Additionally, if every principal ideal of Q is finite, then any additive invariant $f : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^Q$ is equivalent to its Möbius inversion $(*\mu_Q) \circ f : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^Q$.

Examples of additive invariants that are involved with Möbius inversion follow. Let P be any poset.

Example 2.31. Consider the set $\text{Seg}(P)$ of segments in P . Via the bijection from \leq to $\text{Seg}(P)$ given by $(x, y) \mapsto [x, y]$, the rank invariant given in Example 2.20 can be viewed as the additive invariant $\text{rk} : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\text{fds-rep } P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\text{Seg}(P)}$. Assume that every principal ideal in $(\text{Seg}(P), \supseteq)$ ⁷ is finite (for example if P is a finite poset)⁸. Then, by Corollary 2.30 (ii), the Möbius inversion $\text{rk} * \mu_{(\text{Seg}(P), \supseteq)}$ is equivalent to rk . This Möbius inversion was considered in [31].

We can generalize this example as follows. Consider the generalized rank invariant of Example 2.22.

Example 2.32. Let $Q \subseteq \text{Int}(P)$ such that the induced poset (Q, \supseteq) is locally finite. Let rk^Q be the restriction of the generalized rank invariant to Q . When every principal ideal of (Q, \supseteq) is finite, by Corollary 2.30 (ii), we obtain the additive invariant

$$\text{rk}^Q * \mu_{(Q, \supseteq)} := \text{dgm}^Q : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\text{fds-rep } P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^Q,$$

called the *generalized persistence diagram* over Q [23] and is equivalent to rk^Q . When $Q = \text{Int}(P)$, we use dgm^{Int} instead of $\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}(P)}$.

Remark 2.33. In the previous example, even if (Q, \supseteq) does not have finite principal ideals, in certain settings a generalized notion of dgm^Q can be defined and shown to be equivalent to rk^Q via a generalization of Möbius inversion [23, Definition 3.1].⁹ For example, consider the following two sets of assumptions:

- (i) $P = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{D} := \text{rep } P$, and Q is any nonempty subset of $\text{Int}(P)$.
- (ii) $P = \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 2$), $\mathcal{D} := \text{fp-rep } P$, and Q is any nonempty subset of $\text{Int}(P)$.

Under either of these two sets of assumptions, (the generalized) dgm^Q is a well-defined additive invariant on \mathcal{D} . Its construction, however, requires a more delicate method than what is described in this section. For details, we refer the reader to [23, Section 3].

Example 2.34. Whenever the Möbius inversion of the compression multiplicity invariant c^ξ (cf. Example 2.23) over $(\text{Int}(P), \supseteq)$ is well-defined, the Möbius inversion $c^\xi * \mu_{(\text{Int}(P), \supseteq)}$ is called the *signed interval multiplicity* [28] under ξ ¹⁰. In fact, in [28], P is assumed to be finite, and thus the Möbius inversion is well-defined therein.

⁷We clarify that this partial order on $\text{Seg}(P)$ is defined by $I \leq J$ if and only if $I \supseteq J$.

⁸We remark that, even if P is infinite, every principal ideal in $(\text{Seg}(P), \supseteq)$ can be finite. An extreme example is as follows: Let P be an infinite set in which no pair of points is comparable. In this case, $(\text{Seg}(P), \supseteq)$ is isomorphic to the poset P , and every principal ideal of P is a singleton.

⁹Similar ideas can also be found in [60].

¹⁰By the isomorphisms from Diagram (1), the signed interval multiplicity one-to-one corresponds to the *interval replacement* [28, Definition 4.1].

In the next theorem, we see the following: (i) On the collection of interval decomposable representations, the multiplicity invariant 1 given in Example 2.17 coincides with the generalized persistence diagram, and (ii) the discriminating power of the generalized rank invariant rk^Q increases, when it is taken with respect to larger Q .

Theorem 2.35 ([23, Theorems E and F] [31, Proposition 2.4]). *Let Q be any set of isoclasses of interval representations of any poset P . Let $\mathcal{C} := \text{add } Q \subseteq \mathcal{D} := \text{fds-rep } P$.*

(i) For any $M \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\text{dgm}^Q([M])^{11} = 1([M]).$$

(ii) Assume $Q \subsetneq Q' \subseteq \text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$ and let $\mathcal{C}' := \text{add } Q'$. Then, rk^Q is \mathcal{C} -complete, but not \mathcal{C}' -complete.

2.6 Relative homological algebra and additive invariants

In this section, we recall basic terminology of relative homological algebra from [32, 34] and relevant additive invariants. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. For a morphism $f: C \rightarrow M$ in \mathcal{D} with $C \in \mathcal{C}$, f is said to be a \mathcal{C} -cover or a *right minimal \mathcal{C} -approximation* of M if the following two conditions hold.

(i) For any morphism $f': C' \rightarrow M$ with $C' \in \mathcal{C}$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C' & & \\ \downarrow & \searrow f' & \\ C & \xrightarrow{f} & M \end{array}$$

can be completed to be commutative, i.e., there exists a morphism $C' \rightarrow C$ in \mathcal{C} that makes the diagram commute.

(ii) The diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & & \\ \downarrow & \searrow f & \\ C & \xrightarrow{f} & M \end{array}$$

can only be completed to commutativity by automorphisms of C .

If f satisfies Item (i) but possibly not Item (ii), then f is said to be a \mathcal{C} -precover, or a \mathcal{C} -approximation of M .

As before, let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ (cf. Convention 2.7) and for simplicity assume that (i) \mathcal{D} is an abelian category, and (ii) for any $M \in \mathcal{D}$, an epimorphic \mathcal{C} -cover of M exists. For example, these conditions are satisfied for P a finite poset, $\mathcal{D} = \text{rep } P$, and any \mathcal{C} containing all the indecomposable projectives¹². Instead of the above assumptions, one can work with exact structures, in particular the exact structure $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$ induced by \mathcal{C} and under the assumption of “enough projectives”. See [33, 61] for more details. Let $\Omega^0(M) := M$ and define $\Omega^i(M)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ recursively as follows: Let f_i be a

¹¹We remark that the definition for the *function* dgm^Q in Example 2.32 relies on finiteness conditions on (Q, \supseteq) . However, even in cases where we do not have those finiteness conditions, for $[M] \in \mathcal{C}$, $\text{dgm}^Q([M]) \in \mathbb{Z}^Q$ on the left-hand side is well-defined as an *element* of \mathbb{Z}^Q [23, Definition 3.1 and Theorem C (i)].

¹²Note that in general, for a non-finite poset P , it is possible that \mathcal{C} -(pre)covers $f: C \rightarrow M$ may not exist.

\mathcal{C} -cover $f_i: J_i \rightarrow \Omega^i(M)$, inducing a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \ker f_i \xrightarrow{\iota_i} J_i \xrightarrow{f_i} \Omega_i(M) \longrightarrow 0,$$

from which we let $\Omega^{i+1}(M) := \ker f_i$. Then, we obtain the long exact sequence

$$\dots \longrightarrow J_m \xrightarrow{g_m} \dots \xrightarrow{g_2} J_1 \xrightarrow{g_1} J_0 \xrightarrow{f_0} M \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $g_i := \iota_{i-1} \circ f_i$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots$, called a *minimal \mathcal{C} -resolution* of M . If there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $J_m \neq 0$ and $J_\ell = 0$ for $\ell > m$, then we say that the \mathcal{C} -dimension of M is m . If such $m \in \mathbb{N}$ does not exist, then we say that the \mathcal{C} -dimension of M is infinity. Equivalently, the \mathcal{C} -dimension of M can be defined as the infimum of the length of (not necessarily minimal) \mathcal{C} -resolutions of M ; see, e.g., [34, Proposition 3.9]. Finally, the *global \mathcal{C} -dimension* of \mathcal{D} is defined to be the supremum of the \mathcal{C} -dimensions of all $M \in \mathcal{D}$.

For example, for a finite poset P , $\mathcal{D} := \text{rep } P$, Q the set of isoclasses of all projective representations of P , and $\mathcal{C} := \text{add } Q$, the \mathcal{C} -cover, minimal \mathcal{C} -resolution, \mathcal{C} -dimension, and global \mathcal{C} -dimension of \mathcal{D} correspond to the usual concepts of projective cover, minimal projective resolution, projective dimension, and global dimension of $\text{rep } P$.

In general, extra care needs to be taken for infinite posets. Below, we discuss the particular case of $P = \mathbb{R}^d$, where we first note that the category $\text{fp-rep } \mathbb{R}^d$ has been noted to be analogous to the category of finitely generated \mathbb{N}^d -graded modules over the \mathbb{N}^d -graded polynomial ring $k[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ (see [11, Theorem 1], [18, Section 2], [17]). For a general discussion on multigraded modules, including the claims made in the next example, see [62]. See [36, 63] for more on the homological algebra of modules over $P = \mathbb{R}^d$.

Example 2.36. A representation $F \in \text{fp-rep } \mathbb{R}^d$ is projective¹³ if F is isomorphic to a direct sum $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n k_{p_i}^\uparrow$ for some $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Given any $M \in \text{fp-rep } \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a *minimal projective resolution* of length at most d

$$0 \rightarrow F_d \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow F_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0,$$

which is unique up to isomorphism. For $i = 0, \dots, d$, the *i -th graded Betti number* $\beta_i(M)$ is the map $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ that sends $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to the number of indecomposable summands of F_i that are isomorphic to k_{p^\uparrow} . As β_i preserves direct sums, for $\mathcal{D} = \text{fp-rep } \mathbb{R}^d$, we obtain the corresponding additive invariant $\beta_i: K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{R}^d}$.

Given any poset P , let $P \cup \{\infty\}$ be the extension of P with $a < \infty$ for all $a \in P$. For any $a, b \in P \cup \{\infty\}$ with $a < b$, let $\langle a, b \rangle := \{p \in P : a \leq p \not\leq b\}$, called a *hook* in P . Note that, when $b = \infty$, we have $\langle a, b \rangle = a^\uparrow$. Let $\text{Hook}(P)$ be the set of all hooks in P , which is a subset of $\text{Int}(P)$.

¹³In the graded polynomial ring setting, “free”.

Example 2.37 (Rank-exact resolutions [31]). Let P be any upper-semilattice.¹⁴ Given any $M \in \text{fp-rep } P =: \mathcal{D}$, there exists a minimal resolution of finite length

$$0 \rightarrow H_n \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow H_1 \rightarrow H_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$$

such that each H_i is isomorphic to a finite direct sum $\bigoplus_{j=1}^n k_{\langle a_j, b_j \rangle}$. This resolution is called a *minimal rank-exact resolution*, which is unique up to isomorphism. Similar to Example 2.36, for $i = 0, 1, \dots$, we obtain the i -th *rank-exact-Betti numbers* $\beta_i^{\text{rk}} : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\langle \text{Hook}(P) \rangle}$, which are additive invariants on \mathcal{D} . The alternating sum $\sum_i (-1)^i \beta_i^{\text{rk}} : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\langle \text{Hook}(P) \rangle}$ is also an additive invariant, which is called the *minimal rank decomposition using hooks*. As the name indicates, given the above exact sequence, the rank invariant rk_M (cf. Example 2.20) coincides with $\sum_i (-1)^i \text{rk}_{H_i}$.

In the rest of this section, we assume that P is a finite poset (therefore, $\text{int}(P) = \text{Int}(P)$ and $\text{fp-rep } P = \text{fds-rep } P = \text{rep } P$).

Also, we assume that $\mathcal{C} := \text{add } Q$ for some $Q \subseteq \text{ind}(\text{rep } P)$ such that (1) Q is finite, and (2) Q contains all the isoclasses of indecomposable projective representations. In particular, Assumption (2) implies that every $M \in \text{rep } P$ admits a surjective \mathcal{C} -cover.

For example, let $\mathcal{C} = \text{add } Q$ where Q is the set of isoclasses of all interval representations in P . In this setting, we call a minimal \mathcal{C} -resolution a *minimal interval resolution*, and the global \mathcal{C} -dimension of $\text{rep } P$ the *global interval dimension* of P .

Proposition 2.38 ([34, Proposition 4.5]). *The global interval dimension of a finite poset is finite.*

Proposition 2.38 implies that for any finite poset P , any $M \in \text{rep } P$ admits a minimal interval resolution of finite length ℓ (where ℓ is at most the global interval dimension of P):

$$0 \rightarrow I_\ell \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow I_1 \rightarrow I_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0, \quad (11)$$

in which each I_i is a direct sum of interval representations.

Example 2.39. For each $i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, the i -th *interval Betti number* of M , denoted $\beta_i^{\text{Int}}(M)$, is the map $\text{Int}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ sending each $J \in \text{Int}(P)$ to the number of summands of I_i that are isomorphic to J . We obtain the corresponding additive invariant

$$\beta_i^{\text{Int}} : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\text{rep } P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\text{Int}(P)}.$$

Furthermore, by taking the alternating sum, we define the *interval Euler characteristic*

$$\chi^{\text{Int}} := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i \beta_i^{\text{Int}} : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\text{rep } P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\text{Int}(P)}.$$

By Proposition 2.38, the above infinite sum includes only finitely many nonzero terms.

¹⁴ P is said to be an *upper semi-lattice* if, for every pair of points in P , their join exists in P .

The interval Euler characteristic of M can also be viewed as an element of the *relative Grothendieck group of the incidence algebra of P , relative to interval representations* (see [32]). This perspective, along with results presented in [34], leads to:

Proposition 2.40. *Let $\mathcal{D} := \text{rep } P$. Let Q be the set of all isoclasses of interval representations in \mathcal{D} . Then, the dim-hom invariant $\text{dimh}_{\mathcal{D}}^Q$ is equivalent to the interval Euler characteristic χ^{Int} .*

Although this proposition is already given in [32, Remark 6.6] and [34], we provide a proof below.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} := \text{add } Q$. Proposition 2.38 together with [32, Proposition 4.9] guarantees that the interval Euler characteristic χ^{Int} is the canonical quotient map from $K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{D})$ to $\mathbb{Z}^{\text{Int}(P)}$, with $\mathbb{Z}^{\text{Int}(P)}$ isomorphic to the Grothendieck group relative to $\text{Int}(P)$ (see [32, Definition 4.7] for the precise definition of the relative Grothendieck group). Now, [32, Theorem 4.22] directly implies that $\text{dimh}_{\mathcal{D}}^Q$ and χ^{Int} are equivalent. \square

3 Barcoding invariants and their comparison

The critical property of the generalized persistence diagram or interval replacement (Examples 2.32 and 2.34) is that they serve as invariants of poset representations in terms of interval representations. This naturally generalizes the notion of a barcode for one-parameter persistence modules. In this section, we abstract and generalize the concept of the generalized persistence diagram or interval replacement, leading to the notion of a *barcoding invariant*. The key idea is that, given $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ (cf. Convention 2.7), a \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariant for objects in \mathcal{D} is a homomorphism $f : K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$ that acts as the identity on the subdomain $K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{D})$ (cf. Diagram (1)). In other words, through f , any object in \mathcal{D} is *described* or *approximated* by a formal \mathbb{Z} -linear combination¹⁵ of objects in \mathcal{C} , while keeping the objects in \mathcal{C} unchanged.

The goals of this section are to reveal the structure of the collection of \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariants under the partial order \succsim from Definition 2.12, and to compare the discriminating power of \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariants. Namely, we show that the poset of \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariants ordered by \succsim does not contain any pair of invariants where one strictly refines the other (Theorem 3.10 and Corollary 3.11), and in fact, all the \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariants have identical discriminating power (Theorem 3.13). In addition, we generalize some prior results on the discriminative power of invariants for poset representations within our unified framework (Proposition 3.7 and Theorem 3.8).

Barcoding invariants: definitions and examples

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ (cf. Convention 2.7) and G be an abelian group.

- (i) An additive invariant $f : K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$ is said to be *\mathcal{C} -barcoding* if $f(c) = c$ for any $c \in K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$ ¹⁶.
- (ii) An additive invariant $f : K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow G$ is said to be *\mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent* if f is equivalent to a \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariant.

¹⁵Note that by definition, a linear combination is finite.

¹⁶In this case, each element of $K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$ is a fixed point of f . We simply say that f fixes elements of $K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$.

We refer to a \mathcal{C} -barcoding(-equivalent) invariant simply as a *barcoding(-equivalent) invariant* whenever the subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ is clear from context.

We remark that given any \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent invariant f on \mathcal{D} , Lemma 2.13(ii) implies that $\text{im } f \cong K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$. Furthermore, for such an invariant f , Lemma 2.9 shows that $\text{ind}(\mathcal{C})$ is a basis for $K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$ and thus for $\text{im } f$ under the previous isomorphism. We abuse the language and simply say that $\text{ind}(\mathcal{C})$ is a *basis* for the \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent invariant f .

The notions of the generalized persistence diagram and interval replacement can be abstracted as follows:

Definition 3.2 (Interval-barcoding invariant). Let $\mathcal{D} := \text{fds-rep } P$ (resp. $\mathcal{D} := \text{fp-rep } P$) and Q be the set of isoclasses of all interval representations in \mathcal{D} , i.e. $\text{Int}(P)$ (resp. $\text{int}(P)$) respectively. Let $\mathcal{C} := \text{add } Q \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. A \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariant $K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$ is said to be *interval-barcoding*. Also, any \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent invariant $K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow G$ (where G is an abelian group) is said to be *interval-barcoding-equivalent*.

We provide a list of interval-barcoding or interval-barcoding-equivalent invariants:

Example 3.3. Let P be a finite poset. Then:

- (i) The interval multiplicity map π^{Int} (cf. Example 2.18) is interval-barcoding.
- (ii) The generalized rank invariant rk (cf. Example 2.22) is interval-barcoding-equivalent.
- (iii) For *any* compression system ξ , the compression multiplicity invariant c^ξ (cf. Example 2.23) is interval-barcoding-equivalent.
- (iv) The generalized persistence diagram (cf. Example 2.32) is interval-barcoding.

For the invariants defined via relative homological algebra, we have:

- (v) The 0th interval Betti number β_0^{Int} (cf. Example 2.39) is interval-barcoding.
- (vi) The interval Euler characteristic χ^{Int} (cf. Example 2.39) is interval-barcoding.
- (vii) The dim-hom invariant $\text{dimh}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{Int}}$ (cf. Example 2.25) is interval-barcoding-equivalent.

In the end of Section 4, we discuss some interval-barcoding invariants in the setting where P is infinite.

Item (i) follows by definition. Items (iii), (ii), and (iv) directly follow from [28, Corollary 3.15], Corollary 2.30 (ii) and Theorem 2.35 (i). Items (v) and (vi) follow from the fact that for an interval-decomposable M , its minimal interval resolution is given by:

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0.$$

Item (vii) follows from the fact that $\chi^{\text{Int}} \sim \text{dimh}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{Int}}$ (cf. Proposition 2.40).

Below, we explore the properties of additive invariants satisfying one of the conditions in Definition 3.1. However, we note that these properties can be stated in terms of general properties of homomorphisms between abelian groups. To highlight this fact, we provide the statements in general terms in addition to the main statements in terms of additive invariants. While these are elementary results from the point of view of abelian groups, we found their implications for additive invariants of persistence modules to be surprising and counter-intuitive.

For any two abelian groups G and H , by $G \subseteq H$, we mean that G is a subgroup of H . We have the following:

Lemma 3.4. *Let $f : H \rightarrow G'$ be a homomorphism of abelian groups, and let $G \subseteq H$. The following are equivalent.*

- (i) *There exists a homomorphism $f' : H \rightarrow G$ with $\ker f = \ker f'$, such that $f'(g) = g$ for each $g \in G$.*
- (ii) *$f|_G$ is injective, and $\{f(x) \mid x \in J\}$ is a generating set for $\operatorname{im} f$ for some (in fact, any) generating set $J \subset G$ of G .*
- (iii) *$f|_G$ is injective, and $f(G) = \operatorname{im} f$.*

Proof. The implication (ii) \implies (iii) is clear. We prove (i) \implies (ii) and (iii) \implies (i).

(i) \implies (ii): We first show that $f|_G$ is injective. Let $f' : H \rightarrow G$ be such that $\ker f = \ker f'$, and $f'(g) = g$ for each $g \in G$. By Remark 2.14(ii), there exists an isomorphism $\phi : \operatorname{im} f \rightarrow \operatorname{im} f'$ such that $f' = \phi f$. Let $\iota : G \subseteq H$ be the inclusion map. Then, we have

$$\ker(f|_G) = \ker(f\iota) = \ker(\phi f\iota) = \ker(f'\iota) = \{0\},$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $f'(g) = g$ for any $g \in G$ (i.e. $f'\iota = \operatorname{id}_G$ is the identity map). Therefore, $f|_G$ is injective.

Let $J \subset G$ be any generating set for G . Then, for each $z \in \operatorname{im} f$, we can write $\phi(z) \in \operatorname{im} f' = G$ as a \mathbb{Z} -linear combination of elements from J . Since each $x \in J$ satisfies that $x = f'(x) = \phi(f(x))$, by applying the inverse ϕ^{-1} to the \mathbb{Z} -linear combination, we see that z equals a \mathbb{Z} -linear combination of elements from $\{f(x) \mid x \in J\}$, as desired.

(iii) \implies (i): By assumption, the restriction of f to G is an isomorphism $G \rightarrow \operatorname{im} f$. Let $\phi : \operatorname{im} f \rightarrow G$ be the inverse of this isomorphism. Then, the map $f' := \phi f$ satisfies the condition described in the statement, as desired. \square

Lemma 3.4 specializes to the following, which relates the concepts of \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent invariants and \mathcal{C} -complete invariants (Definition 2.16):

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ (cf. Convention 2.7), and let f be any additive invariant on \mathcal{D} . The following are equivalent.*

- (i) *f is \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent.*
- (ii) *f is \mathcal{C} -complete and $\{f([c])\}_{c \in \operatorname{ind}(\mathcal{C})}$ is a generating set for $\operatorname{im} f$.*
- (iii) *f is \mathcal{C} -complete and $f(K_0^{\operatorname{sp}}(\mathcal{C})) = \operatorname{im} f$.*

Proof. We note that by Lemma 2.9, $\{[c]\}_{c \in \operatorname{ind}(\mathcal{C})}$ is a generating set for $K_0^{\operatorname{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$ (in fact, a basis). Then, the statement follows from Lemma 3.4 with $G = K_0^{\operatorname{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$. \square

The following remark will be useful later.

Remark 3.6. Let $f : K_0^{\operatorname{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow K_0^{\operatorname{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$ be \mathcal{C} -barcoding. Then, for any $x \in K_0^{\operatorname{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$, $f(x) \in K_0^{\operatorname{sp}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq K_0^{\operatorname{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$ and thus $f(f(x)) = f(x)$ as f fixes \mathcal{C} . More precisely, we have $f\iota f = f$ where $\iota : K_0^{\operatorname{sp}}(\mathcal{C}) \hookrightarrow K_0^{\operatorname{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$ is the natural inclusion map (cf. Diagram (1)). By abuse of notation, we simply write $ff = f$. More generally, given any invariant g on \mathcal{D} with codomain $K_0^{\operatorname{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$, it follows that $fg = g$.

Generalizations of prior results

We generalize [28, Theorem 4.11] and [27, Theorem 5.12], which state that their proposed invariant (the interval replacement) preserves the (interval) rank invariant:

Proposition 3.7. *Let f be a \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariant on \mathcal{D} , and let g be an additive invariant on \mathcal{D} that is equivalent to f . Then, $gf = g$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.13 (ii), there exists an isomorphism $\phi : \text{im } f \rightarrow \text{im } g$ with $g = \phi f$. Then $gf = \phi f f = \phi f = g$. \square

By this proposition, the \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariant f preserves the equivalent invariant g , in the sense for any $x \in K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$, the g -value of x is the same as the g -value of $f(x)$. This shows that the property of preserving an equivalent invariant is one of the general properties of \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariants, not unique to the interval replacement in [28].

Next, we generalize Theorem 2.35 (ii) as follows:

Theorem 3.8 (Optimality of Completeness). *Let $\mathcal{C} \subsetneq \mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ and let f be a \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent invariant on \mathcal{D} (and thus \mathcal{C} -complete; cf. Proposition 3.5). Then, f is not \mathcal{C}' -complete (and thus not \mathcal{C}' -barcoding-equivalent).*

Proof. Let $f : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow G$ be \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent invariant. By Lemma 2.13(ii), there exists an isomorphism $\phi : G \rightarrow K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$ such that ϕf is \mathcal{C} -barcoding and thus ϕf fixes any element of $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$. Let $x \in K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}') \setminus K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$ and $t := x - \phi f(x) \in K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}')$, where we consider $\phi f(x) \in K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}')$ as an element of $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}')$. We have:

$$\phi f(t) = \phi f(x - \phi f(x)) = \phi f(x) - \phi f(\phi f(x)) = \phi f(x) - \phi f(x) = 0,$$

which shows $t \in \ker \phi f = \ker f$. Note that $t \neq 0$ since otherwise $x = \phi f(x) \in K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$, which is a contradiction. This shows that $0 \neq t \in \ker f \cap K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}')$, i.e. f is not \mathcal{C}' -complete. \square

Barcoding invariants form a discrete poset

Next, we will show that the partial order \succsim (cf. Definition 2.12), when restricted to \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariants, is *discrete* in the sense that $f \succsim g$ if and only if $f = g$. We also recall that f and g are said to be *incomparable* if $f \not\succeq g$ and $g \not\succeq f$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $f, g : H \rightarrow G$ be homomorphisms of abelian groups with $G \subseteq H$ and $f(x) = x = g(x)$ for each $x \in G$. If $\ker f \subseteq \ker g$, then $f = g$.*

Proof. If $\ker f \subseteq \ker g$, then, by Remark 2.14 (i), there is a group homomorphism $\phi : \text{im } f \rightarrow \text{im } g$ such that $g = \phi f$. Also, since f and g fix elements of G , $\text{im } f = G = \text{im } g$. Then, for any $x \in G \subseteq H$, we have $x = g(x) = \phi(f(x)) = \phi(x)$, i.e. ϕ is the identity map on G . This implies $g = f$. \square

Theorem 3.10 (Barcoding invariants form a discrete poset). *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ (cf. Convention 2.7), and let $f, g : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$ be \mathcal{C} -barcoding. Then, either*

- (i) *f and g are incomparable, or*
- (ii) *$f = g$.*

Proof. Suppose that $f \succsim g$. Then, we have $\ker f \subseteq \ker g$ and thus $f = g$ by Lemma 3.9. Similarly, the assumption $g \succsim f$ also implies that $f = g$. This completes the proof. \square

By weakening the assumption that f and g are \mathcal{C} -barcoding to the condition that f and g are \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent, we obtain:

Corollary 3.11. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, and suppose that both f and g are \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent invariants on \mathcal{D} (whose codomain may differ). Then, either*

- (i) f and g are incomparable, or
- (ii) $f \sim g$.

In the previous corollary, f and g are assumed to have $\text{ind}(\mathcal{C})$ as a common basis. By allowing f and g to have different bases, we obtain a variation of this corollary. More specifically, if g is barcoding-equivalent with basis containing the basis for f , then f cannot be finer than g .

Corollary 3.12. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subsetneq \mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, and let f and g be \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent and \mathcal{C}' -barcoding-equivalent, respectively. Then, either*

- (i) f and g are incomparable, or
- (ii) $g \succsim f$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, suppose that f is \mathcal{C} -barcoding and g is \mathcal{C}' -barcoding (and thus have codomains $K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$ and $K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C}')$ respectively). Consider the natural projection $\pi : K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C}') \rightarrow K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$, which induces the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{g} & K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C}') \\
 & \searrow \pi g & \downarrow \pi \\
 & & K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C}) \\
 & \searrow f & \\
 & &
 \end{array} \tag{12}$$

Since $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$ and g fixes elements of $K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C}')$, πg fixes elements of $K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$. By Theorem 3.10, either $\pi g = f$, or πg and f are incomparable.

- Suppose that $\pi g = f$, which implies that $\ker g \subseteq \ker \pi g = \ker f$, i.e. $g \succsim f$. Also, by Theorem 3.8, f cannot be \mathcal{C}' -complete and thus $g \succsim f$.
- Suppose that πg and f are incomparable, which implies $f \not\prec \pi g$ and $\pi g \not\prec f$. Now, $f \not\prec \pi g$ implies that $\ker f \not\subseteq \ker \pi g$, i.e. there exists $x \in K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{D})$ with $f(x) = 0$ and $\pi(g(x)) \neq 0$. This implies that $g(x) \neq 0$, and thus $\ker f \not\subseteq \ker g$, i.e. $f \not\prec g$. This implies that either $g \succsim f$, or f and g are incomparable.

On the other hand, $\pi g \not\prec f$ implies that there exists $x \in K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{D})$ with $\pi(g(x)) = 0$ and $f(x) \neq 0$. However, we cannot conclude anything interesting from this. In particular, this does not necessarily imply $g(x) = 0$. □

Identical discriminating power of barcoding invariants

Recall from Corollary 3.11 that, when $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, the collection of \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent invariants on \mathcal{D} does not contain any pair of invariants where one strictly refines the other. We take this further by establishing that any \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent invariants have identical discriminating power in the sense that they have the isomorphic kernel.

Given two \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariants $f, g : K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$, suppose that there exists $x \in \ker f$ such that $x \notin \ker g$ (and thus $f \not\prec g$). Then, since $g(x) \in K_0^{\text{SP}}(\mathcal{C})$, we have $f(g(x)) = g(x)$ and $g(g(x)) = g(x)$ (cf. Remark 3.6). Hence, for $y := x - g(x)$,

we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(y) &= f(x - g(x)) = f(x) - f(g(x)) = f(x) - g(x) = -g(x) \neq 0, \\ g(y) &= g(x - g(x)) = g(x) - g(g(x)) = g(x) - g(x) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which proves $y \notin \ker f$, $y \in \ker g$, and in turn $g \not\sim f$.

In fact, we can show:

Theorem 3.13 (Identical discriminating power of barcoding invariants). *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, and let f and g be \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent. Then, $\ker f \cong \ker g$ with*

$$\begin{aligned} T : \ker f &\rightarrow \ker g \\ x &\mapsto x - g(x) \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

an isomorphism.

Proof. We can assume without loss of generality that f and g are \mathcal{C} -barcoding since equivalent additive invariants have the same kernel. Let $x \in \ker f$. Then,

$$g(T(x)) = g(x - g(x)) = g(x) - g(g(x)) = g(x) - g(x) = 0,$$

which shows $T(x) \in \ker g$. It is also clear that T is a homomorphism, whose inverse is $S : \ker g \rightarrow \ker f$ defined by $S(y) := y - f(y)$. Indeed, for any $x \in \ker f$, $(S \circ T)(x) = x - g(x) - f(x) + f(g(x)) = x$ (cf. Remark 3.6), and symmetrically $T \circ S = \text{id}_{\ker g}$. \square

Direct implications follow:

Corollary 3.14. (i) *The multiplicity invariant restricted to $\text{ind}(\mathcal{C})$ (cf. Example 2.18) $\pi^{\text{ind}(\mathcal{C})}$ is the unique \mathcal{C} -barcoding-equivalent invariant up to isomorphisms of kernels. This is in a sense the simplest \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariant, which simply gives the multiplicities of $\text{ind}(\mathcal{C})$.*

(ii) *All of the interval-barcoding or interval-barcoding-equivalent invariants for fds representations (or fp representations) of any poset have isomorphic kernels.*

As a consequence, all the additive invariants given in Example 3.3 have isomorphic kernels. Furthermore, Lemma 2.15(i) implies that, for any two invariants f and g from Example 3.3, there exists a map sending the pairs of k -representations of P that are not distinguishable by f to the pairs of k -representations of P that are not distinguishable by g , and vice versa.

Remark 3.15. In Theorem 3.13, under the extra assumption that $\text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$ is finite, the result can be proved without the map defined in Equation (13): Let $f, g : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$ be \mathcal{C} -barcoding. Since $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$ is a free abelian group (thus projective) and f is surjective, the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \ker f \rightarrow K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{f} K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow 0$ splits, i.e.

$$K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \cong \ker f \oplus K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}), \text{ and similarly, } K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \cong \ker g \oplus K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}).$$

Since $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$ is a free abelian group of finite rank, so are $\ker f$ and $\ker g$. Thus, $\ker f \cong \ker g \cong \mathbb{Z}^m$, where m equals the difference between the ranks of $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D})$ and $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$. We note that, in contrast to the earlier proof of Theorem 3.13, this proof does not specify any particular isomorphism between $\ker f$ and $\ker g$.




Fig. 1 Illustration for Theorem 4.1, for any finite poset P for which the 2×3 commutative grid is embedded. Inside the box is the Hasse diagram of the poset of equivalence classes of interval-barcoding invariants on P . The collection of interval Betti numbers $\{\beta_i^{\text{Int}}\}_{i=0}^\infty$ is an invariant on fp-rep P which determines both χ^{Int} and β_0^{Int} . The equivalence $\text{rk}_M^{\text{Int}} \sim c^\xi$ follows from Remark 2.24 and that $\text{rk}^{\text{Int}} \sim \text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}$ (cf. Example 2.32).

4 Applications

In this section, we see (i) applications of Theorem 3.10 and Corollaries 3.11 and 3.14, and (ii) examples of utilizing the map given in Equation (13) for generating pairs of representations that one invariant can distinguish but another cannot.

Applications to interval-barcoding-equivalent invariants for representations of finite posets

First, we classify the interval-barcoding-equivalent invariants considered in Example 3.3, using the equivalence \sim from Definition 2.12. Recall that the 2×3 commutative grid is the poset $\{1 < 2\} \times \{1 < 2 < 3\}$.

Theorem 4.1. *For any finite poset P for which the 2×3 commutative grid is embedded, the following pairs of invariants are incomparable.*

- (i) dgm^{Int} and π^{Int} .
- (ii) dgm^{Int} and χ^{Int} .
- (iii) dgm^{Int} and β_0^{Int} .

For any finite poset P such that there exists at least one indecomposable representation of P that is not isomorphic to an interval representation, the following pairs of invariants are incomparable.

- (iv) π^{Int} and χ^{Int} .
- (v) π^{Int} and β_0^{Int} .
- (vi) χ^{Int} and β_0^{Int} .

See Figure 1 for an illustration. We emphasize that, although many interval-barcoding invariants are incomparable, they all have the identical discriminating power in the sense that their kernels are isomorphic (cf. Corollary 3.14).

Proof. By Corollary 3.11, in order to prove that two interval-barcoding-equivalent invariants are incomparable, it suffices to show that one is not finer than the other.

(i): The representations N and L given in Example 4.4 are distinguished by π^{Int} , but not by dgm^{Int} . Hence $\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}} \not\prec \pi^{\text{Int}}$.

(ii): It is known from [32] that $\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}} \not\prec \text{dimh}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{Int}}$ (see Example 4.4 below for details; the representations N and L described therein are distinguished by dimh^{Int} , but not by dgm^{Int}). From Proposition 2.40, we know $\chi^{\text{Int}} \sim \text{dimh}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{Int}}$, and thus $\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}} \not\prec \chi^{\text{Int}}$.

(iii): The representations M and Y_- given in Example 4.5 are distinguished by dgm^{Int} , but not by β_0^{Int} . Hence, $\beta_0^{\text{Int}} \not\prec \text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}$.

(iv),(v): Let $X \neq 0$ be any non-interval indecomposable representation. Then, π^{Int} cannot distinguish 0 and X , while β_0^{Int} and χ^{Int} can.

(vi): First, assume that there exists a representation X with interval dimension 1, and let $z := [X] - \beta_0^{\text{Int}}([X])$. Then, $\beta_0^{\text{Int}}(z) = 0$, while

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^{\text{Int}}(z) &= \chi^{\text{Int}}([X]) - \chi^{\text{Int}}(\beta_0^{\text{Int}}([X])) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i \beta_i^{\text{Int}}([X]) - \beta_0^{\text{Int}}([X]) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (-1)^i \beta_i^{\text{Int}}([X]) \\ &= \beta_1^{\text{Int}}([X]) \neq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality and last inequality both follow from the assumption that X has interval dimension 1. Thus, by Lemma 2.15 (i), χ^{Int} distinguishes the positive part Z_+ and the negative part Z_- of z , while β_0^{Int} does not. Next, we show that there indeed exists such a representation X . We note that the hypothesis on P is equivalent to assuming that P has nonzero global interval dimension d , which is finite by Proposition 2.38. Then, there exists a representation M with interval dimension equal to d , and $\Omega^{d-1}(M)$ has interval dimension 1 (recall the construction in subsection 2.6). \square

We recall that finite posets P such that every indecomposable representation of P is isomorphic to an interval representation (i.e. P has global interval dimension 0) have been completely classified in [14, Theorem 5.1]. The proof for the first half of Theorem 4.1 relies on specific examples constructed for the 2×3 commutative grid. We conjecture that it is possible to provide similar examples in the more general setting where P has nonzero global interval dimension (i.e. there exists at least one indecomposable representation of P that is not isomorphic to an interval representation).

Question 4.2. *Is it true that, for any finite poset with nonzero global interval dimension, the following pairs of invariants are incomparable?*

1. dgm^{Int} and π^{Int} .
2. dgm^{Int} and χ^{Int} .
3. dgm^{Int} and β_0^{Int} .

Next we show that, among homological invariants with finite global dimensions that are complete for interval decomposable representations, the interval Euler characteristic has the weakest discriminating power.

Theorem 4.3 (Hierarchy of homological invariants). *Let P be a finite poset and let $\mathcal{D} := \text{rep } P$. Let $\text{Int}(P) \subseteq Q_1 \subsetneq Q_2 \subseteq \text{ind}(\mathcal{D})$ and $\mathcal{C}_1 := \text{add } Q_1$, and $\mathcal{C}_2 := \text{add } Q_2$ such that the global \mathcal{C}_1 -dimension and global \mathcal{C}_2 -dimension are both finite. Then, any homological invariant relative to Q_2 is strictly finer than any homological invariant relative to Q_1 .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} := \text{add Int}(P)$. Then, we have $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_1 \subsetneq \mathcal{C}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. Also, any homological invariant g relative Q_2 is a \mathcal{C}_2 -barcoding invariant, whereas any homological invariant f relative to Q_1 is a \mathcal{C}_1 -barcoding invariant. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} g &\sim \text{dimh}_{\mathcal{D}}^{Q_2} && \text{by [32, Proposition 4.13]} \\ &\gtrsim \text{dimh}_{\mathcal{D}}^{Q_1} && \text{by definition} \\ &\sim f && \text{by [32, Proposition 4.13]} \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 3.12, $g \gtrsim f$ implies that $g \gtrsim f$, completing the proof. \square

The following examples serve as part of the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Example 4.4 ([32, Proposition 7.8]). Consider the k -representation M of the poset $P := \{1 < 2\} \times \{1 < 2 < 3\}$ given as:

$$M : \begin{array}{ccccc} k & \xrightarrow{1} & k & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \uparrow 1 & & \uparrow [1 \ 0] & & \uparrow 1 \\ k & \xrightarrow{[1]} & k^2 & \xrightarrow{[0 \ 1]} & k. \end{array}$$

whose dimension vector is $[\frac{1}{1} \ \frac{1}{2} \ \frac{0}{1}]$. Also, consider the representations

$$N := M \oplus [\frac{1}{1} \ \frac{0}{1} \ \frac{0}{0}] \quad \text{and} \quad L := [\frac{1}{1} \ \frac{0}{1} \ \frac{0}{1}] \oplus [\frac{1}{1} \ \frac{1}{1} \ \frac{0}{0}] \oplus [\frac{0}{0} \ \frac{0}{1} \ \frac{0}{0}]$$

where the dimension vectors stand for the corresponding interval representations. Then, the generalized persistence diagram dgm^{Int} cannot distinguish N and L , whereas the dim-hom invariant dimh^{Int} can, as noted in [32, Proposition 7.8]. Namely,

$$\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}([N]) = [L] = \text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}([L]), \tag{14}$$

whereas, for the interval $I = [\frac{1}{1} \ \frac{0}{1} \ \frac{0}{0}]$,

$$\text{dimh}^{\text{Int}}([N])(I) = 1 \neq 0 = \text{dimh}^{\text{Int}}([L])(I).$$

It is also clear that the interval multiplicity π^{Int} can distinguish N and L . For example,

$$\pi^{\text{Int}}([N])(I) = 1 \neq 0 = \pi^{\text{Int}}([L])(I).$$

As noted in [32, Corollary 7.10], these examples embed into examples in any finite poset for which the 2×3 commutative grid is embedded.

Next, we illustrate the use of the map in Equation (13) to generate a pair of representations that can be distinguished by one invariant, f , but not by another, g , starting from a pair that is distinguished by g but not by f .

Example 4.5. Consider N and L in the previous example. For $x := [N] - [L] \in K_0^{\text{sp}}(\text{fp-rep } P)$, by Equation (14), we have

$$x \in \ker(\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}), \text{ but } x \notin \ker(\chi^{\text{Int}}).$$

As we showed in the proof of Theorem 3.13, for $y := x - \chi^{\text{Int}}(x)$, we have

$$y \notin \ker(\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}) \text{ and } y \in \ker(\chi^{\text{Int}}).$$

By Lemma 2.15 (i), the positive part Y_+ and the negative part Y_- of y can be distinguished by dgm^{Int} , but not by χ^{Int} . While we know this without explicitly computing y , let us compute y nonetheless. First, note that L is interval decomposable and thus $\chi^{\text{Int}}([L]) = [L]$. Also, for the representation M from the previous example, the interval resolution of M is given as:

$$0 \longrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{f} M \longrightarrow 0,$$

implying that $\chi^{\text{Int}}(M) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$. Note that since P is representation-finite, we can compute the interval cover of M by referring to the Auslander-Reiten quiver of P [64, Fig. 14]. See [14, Example 2.6] for a similar computation (but over a different poset).

Since $N = M \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, we have $x = [N] - [L] = [M] + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} - [L]$, and thus additivity of χ^{Int} implies:

$$\begin{aligned} y &= x - \chi^{\text{Int}}(x) \\ &= ([M] + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} - [L]) - (\chi^{\text{Int}}([M]) + \chi^{\text{Int}}(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}) - \chi^{\text{Int}}([L])) \\ &= [M] - \chi^{\text{Int}}([M]) \\ &= [M] + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from $\chi^{\text{Int}}([L]) = [L]$ and $\chi^{\text{Int}}(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Hence,

$$Y_+ = M \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } Y_- = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

are not distinguishable by χ^{Int} .

We also claim that $\beta_0^{\text{Int}} \not\prec \text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}$. This follows from the observation that, by the definition of β_0^{Int} ,

$$\beta_0^{\text{Int}}([M]) = \beta_0^{\text{Int}}([Y_-]) = [Y_-],$$

whereas

$$\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}([M]) \neq \text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}([Y_-]) = [Y_-].$$

For instance, $\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}([M])$ vanishes at $I := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ but β_0^{Int} does not.¹⁷

Applications to interval-barcoding-equivalent invariants for representations of infinite posets

The previous examples consider barcoding-equivalent invariants of *finite* poset representations. We now consider barcoding-equivalent invariants specifically for representations of *infinite* posets P .

First, we consider the setting $P = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{D} = \text{fp-rep } P$. Here, dgm^{Int} is defined [23, Definition 3.1] [23, Theorem C(iii)], finitely supported [23, Proposition 3.17], additive (see the proof of Theorem 4.7 below), fixes intervals (Theorem 2.35 (i)), and is thus a barcoding-invariant (cf. Remark 2.33).

Remark 4.6. By definition, any \mathcal{C} -barcoding invariant $f : K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C})$ has codomain $K_0^{\text{sp}}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathbb{Z}^{\text{ind}(\mathcal{C})}$. This implies that the value $f([M])$, viewed as a function on $\text{ind}(\mathcal{C})$, of the barcoding invariant f must be finitely supported for each $M \in \mathcal{D}$. This is not necessarily the case for barcoding-*equivalent* invariants. The above setting provides an example: the generalized rank invariant (Example 2.22) is not finitely supported, but is equivalent to dgm^{Int} which is finitely supported and barcoding.

Next, we obtain a new characterization of dgm^{Int} that does not invoke Möbius inversion.

Theorem 4.7 (Universality of the generalized persistence diagram). *Under any of the following settings,*

(i) $P = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{D} := \text{rep } P$.

(ii) P is either \mathbb{R}^d or a finite poset, and $\mathcal{D} := \text{fp-rep } P$.

The invariant dgm^{Int} is the unique additive invariant on \mathcal{D} that is equivalent to the generalized rank invariant rk^{Int} and fixes intervals.

Proof. Firstly, we prove that, in either setting, dgm^{Int} is additive. Let M, N be any two P -representations where $\text{dgm}_M^{\text{Int}} := \text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}([M])$ and $\text{dgm}_N^{\text{Int}} := \text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}([N])$ exist. Then, for all $I \in \text{Int}(P)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}^{\text{Int}}([M \oplus N])(I) &= \text{rk}^{\text{Int}}([M])(I) + \text{rk}^{\text{Int}}([N])(I) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{J \supseteq I \\ J \in \text{Int}(P)}} \text{dgm}_M^{\text{Int}}(J) + \sum_{\substack{J \supseteq I \\ J \in \text{Int}(P)}} \text{dgm}_N^{\text{Int}}(J) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{J \supseteq I \\ J \in \text{Int}(P)}} (\text{dgm}_M^{\text{Int}} + \text{dgm}_N^{\text{Int}})(J) \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from the additivity of rk^{Int} , and the second equality from [23, Definition 3.1 and Theorem A]. Again by [23, Definition 3.1 and Theorem A], we conclude that $\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}([M \oplus N])$ exists and coincides with $\text{dgm}_M + \text{dgm}_N$.

¹⁷The fact that $\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}}([M])$ vanishes at I directly follows from the facts that $\text{rk}([M])$ vanishes at I , and that the support of dgm^{Int} is a subset of the support of rk [21, Remark 8].

By Theorem 2.35 (i), dgm^{Int} fixes intervals. Let f be any additive invariant that is equivalent to the generalized rank invariant and fixes intervals. Then, since $\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}} \sim \text{rk} \sim f$, we have that $\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}} \sim f$. By Theorem 3.10, we have $\text{dgm}^{\text{Int}} = f$. \square

Let the category \mathcal{D} be either $\text{fp-rep } P$ or $\text{fds-rep } P$. Then, the multiplicity invariant restricted to any set of indecomposables Q (Example 2.18) satisfies the finite support condition (since \mathcal{D} is Krull-Schmidt), is additive, and is a barcoding-invariant.

Hence, the previous theorem directly implies:

Corollary 4.8. *Let P be either \mathbb{R}^d or a finite poset, and $\mathcal{D} := \text{fp-rep } P$. Then, the barcoding invariants dgm^{Int} and π^{Int} on \mathcal{D} are incomparable.*

5 Discussion

Theorem 3.10 implies that any pair of barcoding invariants are either identical or incomparable, indicating that comparing barcoding invariants with the partial order \succeq (which compares their kernels) is too rigid. Furthermore, Theorem 3.13 suggests that any two different barcoding invariants have equivalent discriminating power in the sense that their kernels are isomorphic. For example, since any choice of compression system ξ yields a compression multiplicity c^ξ , which is an interval-barcoding-equivalent invariant (cf. Example 3.3 (iii)), our result is not specific to just a few invariants, but rather general. Theorem 3.13 actually implies that no interval-barcoding invariant can be fundamentally better or worse than the others, in terms of this generic discriminating power.

Our results also suggest a need to develop data-dependent, probabilistic, and/or statistical approaches to analyzing the discriminating power of invariants. With knowledge of the specific data being analyzed using poset representations certain (interval-)barcoding invariants may possess superior discriminating power, potentially leading to conclusions that significantly differ from ours.

Acknowledgements. E.G.E. would like to thank H. Asashiba for discussions on the interval replacements, and T. Brüstle for discussions on the comparison of invariants. W.K. would like to thank Donghan Kim for insightful conversations. Both authors would also like to thank the attendees of the BIRS workshop “Representation Theory and Topological Data Analysis (24w5241)”¹⁸ for stimulating discussions on multi-parameter persistence and representation theory.

Declarations

Funding. E.G.E. is supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Transformative Research Areas (A) (22H05105).

Conflict of interest. The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Ethics approval and consent to participate. Not applicable.

Consent for publication. Not applicable.

¹⁸Work on this project started prior to both authors attending the BIRS workshop.

Data availability. Not applicable.

Materials availability. Not applicable.

Code availability. Not applicable.

Author contribution. Both authors contributed equally to this work.

References

- [1] Cang, Z., Mu, L., Wu, K., Opron, K., Xia, K., Wei, G.-W.: A topological approach for protein classification. *Computational and Mathematical Biophysics* **3**(1) (2015)
- [2] Carlsson, G., Vejdemo-Johansson, M.: *Topological Data Analysis with Applications*. Cambridge University Press, ??? (2021)
- [3] Chan, J.M., Carlsson, G., Rabadan, R.: Topology of viral evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**(46), 18566–18571 (2013)
- [4] Dabaghian, Y., Mémoli, F., Frank, L., Carlsson, G.: A topological paradigm for hippocampal spatial map formation using persistent homology. *PLoS Computational Biology* **8**(8) (2012)
- [5] Hamilton, G., Dore, T., Plumberg, C.: Applications of persistent homology in nuclear collisions. *Phys. Rev. C* **106**, 064912 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.106.064912>
- [6] Lee, Y., Barthel, S.D., Dlotko, P., Moosavi, S.M., Hess, K., Smit, B.: High-throughput screening approach for nanoporous materials genome using topological data analysis: application to zeolites. *Journal of chemical theory and computation* **14**(8), 4427–4437 (2018)
- [7] Stolz, B.J., Dhesi, J., Bull, J.A., Harrington, H.A., Byrne, H.M., Yoon, I.H.: Relational persistent homology for multispecies data with application to the tumor microenvironment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06205* (2023)
- [8] Hiraoka, Y., Nakamura, T., Hirata, A., Escolar, E.G., Matsue, K., Nishiura, Y.: Hierarchical structures of amorphous solids characterized by persistent homology. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**(26), 7035–7040 (2016)
- [9] Botnan, M.B., Lesnick, M.: An introduction to multiparameter persistence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14289* (2022)
- [10] Bubenik, P., De Silva, V., Scott, J.: Metrics for generalized persistence modules. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **15**, 1501–1531 (2015)
- [11] Carlsson, G., Zomorodian, A.: The theory of multidimensional persistence. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **42**(1), 71–93 (2009)

- [12] Kim, W., Mémoli, F.: Spatiotemporal persistent homology for dynamic metric spaces. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **66**(3), 831–875 (2021)
- [13] Demir, A., Prael III, F., Kiziltan, B.: Se (3)-invariant multiparameter persistent homology for chiral-sensitive molecular property prediction. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.07633 (2023)
- [14] Aoki, T., Escolar, E.G., Tada, S.: Summand-injectivity of interval covers and monotonicity of interval resolution global dimensions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14979 (2023)
- [15] Bauer, U., Botnan, M.B., Oppermann, S., Steen, J.: Cotorsion torsion triples and the representation theory of filtered hierarchical clustering. *Advances in Mathematics* **369**, 107171 (2020)
- [16] Derksen, H., Weyman, J.: Quiver representations. *Notices of the AMS* **52**(2), 200–206 (2005)
- [17] Lesnick, M., Wright, M.: Interactive visualization of 2d persistence modules. arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.00180 (2015)
- [18] Oudot, S., Scoccola, L.: On the stability of multigraded betti numbers and hilbert functions. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry* **8**(1), 54–88 (2024)
- [19] Kinser, R.: The rank of a quiver representation. *Journal of Algebra* **320**(6), 2363–2387 (2008)
- [20] Kim, W., Mémoli, F.: Generalized persistence diagrams for persistence modules over posets. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology* **5**(4), 533–581 (2021)
- [21] Kim, W., Mémoli, F.: Persistence over posets. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* **70**(08) (2023)
- [22] Cai, C., Kim, W., Mémoli, F., Wang, Y.: Elder-rule-staircodes for augmented metric spaces. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry* **5**(3), 417–454 (2021)
- [23] Clause, N., Kim, W., Memoli, F.: The Generalized Rank invariant: Möbius invertibility, Discriminating power, and Connection to Other Invariants. arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.11591v5 (2024)
- [24] Clause, N., Dey, T.K., Mémoli, F., Wang, B.: Meta-diagrams for 2-parameter persistence. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08270 (2023)
- [25] McCleary, A., Patel, A.: Edit distance and persistence diagrams over lattices. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry* **6**(2), 134–155 (2022)

- [26] Thomas, A.L.: Invariants and metrics for multiparameter persistent homology. PhD thesis, Duke University (2019)
- [27] Asashiba, H., Escolar, E.G., Nakashima, K., Yoshiwaki, M.: On approximation of 2D persistence modules by interval-decomposables. *Journal of Computational Algebra* **6**, 100007 (2023)
- [28] Asashiba, H., Gauthier, E., Liu, E.: Interval replacements of persistence modules. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08308 (2024)
- [29] Hiraoka, Y., Nakashima, K., Obayashi, I., Xu, C.: Refinement of interval approximations for fully commutative quivers. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03649 (2023)
- [30] Amiot, C., Brüstle, T., Hanson, E.J.: Invariants of persistence modules defined by order-embeddings. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09190 (2024)
- [31] Botnan, M.B., Oppermann, S., Oudot, S.: Signed barcodes for multi-parameter persistence via rank decompositions and rank-exact resolutions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 1–60 (2024)
- [32] Blanchette, B., Brüstle, T., Hanson, E.J.: Homological approximations in persistence theory. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* **76**(1), 66–103 (2024)
- [33] Blanchette, B., Brüstle, T., Hanson, E.J.: Exact structures for persistence modules. arXiv. arXiv:2308.01790 [cs, math] (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.01790> . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.01790>
- [34] Asashiba, H., Escolar, E.G., Nakashima, K., Yoshiwaki, M.: Approximation by interval-decomposables and interval resolutions of persistence modules. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **227**(10), 107397 (2023)
- [35] Chachólski, W., Guidolin, A., Ren, I., Scolamiero, M., Tombari, F.: Koszul complexes and relative homological algebra of functors over posets. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 1–45 (2024)
- [36] Miller, E.: Homological algebra of modules over posets. arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.00063 (2020)
- [37] Lenzen, F.: Computing fringe presentations of multigraded persistence modules. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06008 (2024)
- [38] Russold, F., Kerber, M.: Graphcode: Learning from multiparameter persistent homology using graph neural networks. In: *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*
- [39] Gülen, A.B., Mémoli, F., Wan, Z.: Orthogonal Möbius inversion and grassmannian persistence diagrams. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06870 (2023)

- [40] Fersztand, M., Jacquard, E., Nanda, V., Tillmann, U.: Harder-narasimhan filtrations of persistence modules. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16075 (2023)
- [41] Fersztand, M.: Harder-narasimhan filtrations of persistence modules: metric stability. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05069 (2024)
- [42] Dey, T.K., Kim, W., Mémoli, F.: Computing generalized rank invariant for 2-parameter persistence modules via zigzag persistence and its applications. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **71**(1), 67–94 (2024)
- [43] Botnan, M., Lesnick, M.: Algebraic stability of zigzag persistence modules. *Algebraic & Geometric topology* **18**(6), 3133–3204 (2018)
- [44] Gabriel, P., Roiter, A.V.: *Representations of Finite-dimensional Algebras* vol. 73. Springer Science & Business Media, ??? (1992)
- [45] Mac Lane, S.: *Categories for the Working Mathematician* vol. 5. Springer, ??? (2013)
- [46] Borceux, F.: *Handbook of Categorical Algebra: Volume 1, Basic Category Theory* vol. 1. Cambridge University Press, ??? (1994)
- [47] Borceux, F.: *Handbook of Categorical Algebra: Volume 2, Categories and Structures* vol. 2. Cambridge University Press, ??? (1994)
- [48] Freyd, P.J.: *Abelian Categories* vol. 1964. Harper & Row New York, ??? (1964)
- [49] Krause, H.: Krull–schmidt categories and projective covers. *Expositiones Mathematicae* **33**(4), 535–549 (2015)
- [50] Botnan, M., Crawley-Boevey, W.: Decomposition of persistence modules. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **148**(11), 4581–4596 (2020)
- [51] Lu, W., McBride, A.K.: *Algebraic structures on grothendieck groups* (2013)
- [52] Abeasis, S., Del Fra, A., Kraft, H.: The geometry of representations of A_m . *Mathematische Annalen* **256**(3), 401–418 (1981)
- [53] Zomorodian, A., Carlsson, G.: Computing persistent homology. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **33**(2), 249–274 (2005)
- [54] Cohen-Steiner, D., Edelsbrunner, H., Harer, J.: Stability of persistence diagrams. *Discrete & computational geometry* **37**(1), 103–120 (2007)
- [55] Crawley-Boevey, W.: Decomposition of pointwise finite-dimensional persistence modules. *Journal of Algebra and its Applications* **14**(05), 1550066 (2015)
- [56] Chambers, E., Letscher, D.: Persistent homology over directed acyclic graphs. In:

- Research in Computational Topology, pp. 11–32. Springer, ??? (2018)
- [57] Patel, A.: Generalized persistence diagrams. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology* **1**(3), 397–419 (2018)
 - [58] Rota, G.-C.: On the foundations of combinatorial theory I: Theory of Möbius functions. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete* **2**(4), 340–368 (1964)
 - [59] Stanley, R.P.: *Enumerative combinatorics volume 1 second edition*. Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics (2011)
 - [60] Gulen, A.B., McCleary, A.: Galois connections in persistent homology. arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.06650 (2022)
 - [61] Bühler, T.: Exact categories. *Expositiones Mathematicae* **28**(1), 1–69 (2010)
 - [62] Miller, E., Sturmfels, B.: *Combinatorial Commutative Algebra* vol. 227. Springer, ??? (2005)
 - [63] Geist, N., Miller, E.: Global dimension of real-exponent polynomial rings. *Algebra & Number Theory* **17**(10), 1779–1788 (2023)
 - [64] Escolar, E.G., Hiraoka, Y.: Persistence modules on commutative ladders of finite type. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **55**, 100–157 (2016)