

Persistent homology of partially ordered spaces

Cameron Calk*, Eric Goubault† and Philippe Malbos‡

Abstract

In this work, we explore links between natural homology and persistent homology for the classification of directed spaces. The former is an algebraic invariant of directed spaces, a semantic model of concurrent programs. The latter was developed in the context of topological data analysis, in which topological properties of point-cloud data sets are extracted while eliminating noise. In both approaches, the evolution of homological properties is tracked through a sequence of inclusions of usual topological spaces. Exploiting this similarity, we show that natural homology may be considered a persistence object, and may be calculated as a colimit of uni-dimensional persistent homologies along traces.

Keywords – Concurrent programs, semantic models, directed homotopy, persistent homology.

M.S.C. 2020 – 55N31, 68Q55, 68Q85.

1 Introduction

Geometry, algebraic topology and homological algebra have become part of the computer science landscape, thanks to a number of significant applications in recent years. Topological data analysis aims to analyze data sets using techniques from topology [1]. One of its main tools is persistent homology, a homological theory that provides efficient algorithms for the analysis of point cloud data which emerged simultaneously in several works

*Laboratoire d'Informatique et des Systèmes, Université Aix-Marseille, Marseille 13397 Cedex, France

†LIX, École Polytechnique, CNRS, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, 91128 Palaiseau, France

‡Univ Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS UMR 5208, Institut Camille Jordan, 43 blvd. du 11 novembre 1918, F-69622 Villeurbanne cedex, France

in the late 1990s [2, 3, 4]. In the same period, similar ideas appeared in the realm of semantics of programming languages, in particular in concurrency theory [5, 6] and distributed computing [7], see e.g. [8, 9, 10] for surveys.

This article makes a formal bridge between these two approaches and illustrates the interest of applying methods from persistent homology to problems such as the classification of potential behaviors in concurrency theory and distributed computing through motivational examples.

The semantic models that describe possible executions of concurrent programs are based on the notion of *directed space*, which is a topological space X equipped with a set dX of *directed paths*, *i.e.* maps from the unit interval to X which enjoy a number of properties, see Section 4.1 and [11, 9]. For the purpose of this article, we will be exemplifying our results on directed spaces which are generated by *compact partially-ordered spaces* (*pospaces*), which will furthermore be (directed) geometric realizations of finite precubical sets, see e.g. [9]. A compact partially-ordered space is a compact topological space X , together with a partial ordering \leq which is a closed subset of $X \times X$ for the product topology. The directed paths in X are continuous and increasing maps from the unit interval, with the standard total order, to X . The particular class of compact partially-ordered spaces we will be considering here is given by the geometric realization of loop-free, non-self linked finite precubical sets, in which all n -cubes are realized by the unit n -cube in \mathbb{R}^n , with the componentwise ordering [12].

Consider now the problem of classifying such directed spaces, meaning determining when two directed spaces are “the same”, that is, dihomeomorphic, as defined in Section 4.1, meaning homeomorphic as topological spaces plus some extra condition implying preservation of the directed structure. From the concurrency theory point of view, having dihomeomorphic directed spaces means essentially having the same coordination between concurrent processes [9].

As for the classification problem of topological spaces, it is far too hard a problem as such, and we need tractable (directed) topological invariants to give witnesses of the non-existence of dihomeomorphisms. One such invariant, called *natural homology*, is based on homology, as generally done in classical algebraic topology, and has been developed in [13], see Section 4.3. The idea is to observe that a dihomeomorphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ induces, for all points α, β in X , an isomorphism f^* between sub-spaces $dX(\alpha, \beta)$ of dipaths in X from α to β (see Section 4.1) and sub-spaces $dY(f(\alpha), f(\beta))$ of dipaths in Y from $f(\alpha)$ to $f(\beta)$. The natural homology of directed space X is a diagram (or a “natural system” of groups, [14]) combining all (classical) homology groups of $dX(\alpha, \beta)$ for α and β varying over X , with induced





Figure 1: Two essentially different concurrent programs with homeomorphic state spaces.

“extension maps” between them. When f is a dihomeomorphism, the graph of the homology of f^* is a bisimulation between the natural homology of X and the natural homology of Y (Lemma 1)

Consider for instance the two compact partially-ordered spaces within \mathbb{R}^2 with the componentwise ordering pictured in Figure 1. They give semantics, for the left one X , to program $U.S \parallel U.S$, and for the one on the right Y , to the program $U.S \parallel S.U$, where S stands for a scan operation and U stands for an update operation in shared memory, see e.g. [15]. As topological spaces, X and Y are homeomorphic, homotopically equivalent to a wedge of two circles. Still, they are not dihomeomorphic directed spaces. Indeed, for α, β in X , $dX(\alpha, \beta)$ can only be homotopic to a point, two points, or three points, whereas for γ, δ in Y , $dY(\gamma, \delta)$ can only be homotopic to a point, two points, or four points. All these points do indeed correspond to traces of executions of the respective concurrent programs. These traces describe distinct coordination properties between two processes, and may give different outcomes. Figure 1 shows the three maximal directed paths up to directed homotopy for the space on the left, and the four maximal ones in the space on the right.

Even more importantly, for any directed path u from α' to α in X and any path v from β to β' in X , we have a continuous map $dX\langle u, v \rangle$ from $dX(\alpha, \beta)$ to $dX(\alpha', \beta')$ by pre-composition by u and post-composition by v . This is illustrated in a simplified form below, in which the red arrows represent elements of $dX(\alpha, \beta)$:



In other words, each pair of paths $(u : \alpha' \rightarrow \alpha, v : \beta \rightarrow \beta')$ determine a different continuous inclusion from $dX(\alpha, \beta)$ to $dX(\alpha', \beta')$. We will recap

this notion in Section 4. The study of the shape of such spaces of dipaths, when moving α and β , will be the essential ingredient of invariants under directed homeomorphisms.

Now, the idea of persistent homology comes from a different line, but we will see that it is based on similar intuitions. In the classical “unidimensional” approach to persistent homology of a point cloud in a space \mathbb{R}^n , we construct a filtration, i.e. a sequence of inclusions of simplicial sets. Typically, this starts on the point cloud and develops by adding relationships between the initial points resulting in a \mathbb{R} -persistence simplicial complex, a sequence of inclusions of simplicial complexes indexed over the reals, from which we extract a sequence of homological invariants. This sequence will witness the appearances, or births, of homological generators, as well as their disappearances, or deaths, as the filtration develops. The method of filtration depends on the nature and characteristics of the point cloud, according to which one can consider Čech, Vietoris-Rips, witness filtrations... [1]. In general these filtrations are unidimensional but there exist multidimensional analogues [16], in which multiple parameters can vary, which we will briefly discuss later on.

Similarly to persistent homology, there is a natural notion of birth and death of homological generators within natural homology. It is therefore natural to study the relationship between natural homology and persistent homology. For instance, when X is a cubical complex as in [17], which can be embedded as a sub-directed space of \mathbb{R}^n for some high enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$, endowed with the component-wise ordering, it is natural to consider multidimensional persistence on $2n$ parameters, the n coordinates of the start point α and the n coordinates of the end point β and study the evolution of $dX(\alpha, \beta)$. In Section 2, we show that this point of view does not quite work, using a simple example.

The objective of this article is to cope with this difficulty, in order to give a meaning to natural homology as persistent homology. The shift of point of view we are going to make is similar to recent approaches in multidimensional persistence [16]. We will look at all unidimensional persistent homologies that are compatible with the structure of a directed space, and glue this information together. In many ways, this resembles “probing” approaches in multidimensional homology, see e.g. [18].

In this work, we apply this idea to concurrent programs described by directed spaces. Here, the data which we want to study via homological persistence are not points, but traces in directed spaces, *i.e.* images of directed paths, which correspond to all observable executions of some concurrent

program.

The directed structure of the space allows for each trace to define several one-dimensional filtrations of the associated trace space. The objective is to amalgamate all of these filtrations to obtain directed algebraico-topological properties of the considered directed space. Contrary to the classical case, wherein the poset-persistence underlying the filtrations is obtained by external methods, the filtrations in the directed framework are inherent to the object of study.

Apart from the theoretical bridge between seemingly different lines of work, this work is a first step toward providing more tractable ways of computing natural homology (such as rank invariants [16]), as well as giving succinct descriptions of the semantics of concurrent and distributed systems, as some sort of barcodes (see e.g. [19]), an approach which has proven very practical in different areas of engineering, see e.g. [1]. This will be developed elsewhere.

Our first result, Proposition 1, provides the basis for this work. Indeed, it states that in the case of a partially ordered space \mathcal{X} , there exists an order relation on traces which is isomorphic to the factorisation category of \mathcal{X} , which we afterwards call the trace poset $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$ of \mathcal{X} . The latter is the domain of the natural homology functor, so in particular, Proposition 1 states that natural homology is a persistence vector space.

Theorem 1, characterises maximal chains in the trace poset of a compact partially ordered space, and Proposition 2 shows that parametrisations of (maximal) traces yield unidimensional persistence modules along (maximal) chains by restriction of the natural homology functor.

Finally, in order to link these unidimensional persistence modules to the full natural homology functor, we prove Propositions 3 and 4, stating that an arbitrary poset may be obtained as the colimit of the diagram of its (maximal) chains. We then apply this to functors whose domain is a poset, showing in Proposition 5 that the colimit construction along chains also applies to such functors.

All of this leads to our main result, Theorem 2, stating that natural homology is obtained as the colimit of the unidimensional persistence modules along (maximal) traces, thereby establishing a concrete theoretical link between these two homology theories.

Outline of the article.

The first section presents a motivational example to introduce the relationship between persistent homology and natural homology. In particular,

we argue that there is no canonical (multidimensional) filtration of the trace spaces of a given directed space which is solely based on end-points of dipaths. Indeed, we show that one must consider filtrations given by inclusions of trace spaces induced by pre- or post-concatenation with dipaths.

Section 3 deals with basic notions of persistent homology, fixing the notations and making the article self-contained. We recall the definitions of persistence objects and persistent homology, as well as an algorithm for computing persistent homology, more details on which can be found in [1, 20, 21].

Section 4 recalls the main definitions of directed topology and homological algebra used in this work. In Sections 4.1 and 4.2, we recall the structure of directed space, while the definition of natural homology is recalled in 4.3. Before moving on to the main results of the article, we recall in Section 4.4 the definition of bisimulation, which constitutes the appropriate notion of equivalence of natural homology modules.


The first results of the paper are shown in Section 5. First, we show by way of Proposition 1 that in the case of a partially ordered space \mathcal{X} , the domain of the associated natural homology functor is in fact a poset $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$, thus allowing us to consider it as a persistence object. In Section 5.2, we define a unidimensional persistence module along traces in a pospace, before proving Theorem 1 and Proposition 2, relating (maximal) chains in the poset $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$ to (maximal) traces in \mathcal{X} . These concepts are illustrated in Section 5.4 on the motivational example from Section 3, the matchbox, for which full calculations are made. The relation to the natural homology of the matchbox is described in Section 5.5.

In Section 6, we show how colimit constructions permit us to glue together the unidimensional persistence modules obtained along traces in order to recover the entire natural homology diagram of a given pospace. First, in Section 6.1, we recall folkloric results about posets which provide various ways of reconstructing a poset as a colimit of its (maximal) chains. In Section 6.2, we show via Proposition 5 that these constructions carry over to functors whose domains are posets. Finally, putting this together with results from Section 5, we obtain the main result of this article in Section 6.3, namely Theorem 2, stating that the natural homology of a pospace, or certain subdiagrams thereof, can be obtained from the uni-dimensional persistence modules along traces.

Finally, Section 7 finishes up by giving hints about extensions of these results, further linking natural homology with persistence when the considered partially ordered spaces are equipped with some metric structure in Section 7.1, and briefly touching on algorithmic considerations in Section 7.2.


2 A motivational example

To give a glimpse of the intimate relationship between multidimensional persistence and natural homology, let us describe our construction on the following example, namely Fahrenberg's matchbox [22]:




The faces of the unit cube $[0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$, except the bottom face, constitute the associated cubical complex, *i.e.* there are 5 squares glued together. Dipaths in the matchbox are given by continuous maps which are increasing in each coordinate, the order being given by considering the disk in the figure as the origin, and the empty circle as $(1, 1, 1)$. To simplify, in the rest of this example we will only consider so-called combinatorial dipaths, *i.e.* those which follow the black lines in the above diagram. A *trace* is the equivalence class \bar{p} of a dipath p modulo reparametrisation equivalence as defined in Section 4.1, and the set of such equivalence classes can be given the structure of a topological space $\mathfrak{T}(K)(a, b)$ for all start (resp. end) points a (resp. b), homotopic to a CW-complex for a large class of geometric realizations of pre-cubical sets.


Using Ziemiański's construction [23], the simplicial set corresponding to its trace space from beginning to end is as follows



where the edges A , B , C , D and E correspond to the following five 2-dimensional cubical paths:



and the vertices $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon$ and ζ correspond to the following six combinatorial dipaths:



Here β is the geometric intersection of B with E , γ is the geometric intersection of B with A and so forth. This leads to the simplicial set pictured in (1).

In order to apply persistent homology, we need to obtain a (multidimensional) filtration of the simplicial set pictured in (1) from this directed space, *i.e.* a map from some poset P such as \mathbb{N}^2 to the category of simplicial sets. One could think that such a filtration could be obtained by moving the end-points a and b associated to a trace space $\mathfrak{T}(K)(a, b)$. However, as we illustrate below, there is no canonical way of obtaining such a filtration in general; we must use extensions along traces to define inclusion maps.

There are maps from $\mathfrak{T}(K)(a, b)$ to $\mathfrak{T}(K)(a', b')$, for $a \leq a'$ and $b' \leq b$ that act as restriction maps : they just “cut” the combinatorial dipaths so as to only keep the parts (if any) that go from a' to b' . Hence, we get a decreasing sequence of simplicial sets as soon as any of the coordinates of a increase or any of the coordinates of b decrease. Below, we have represented the part of the multidimensional filtration generated, for the vertical coordinate of b (the end point) and of a (the starting point); recall also that the 5 squares are here unit squares and the lower coordinates are 0, upper ones are 1. In this filtration, the restriction maps acting on combinatorial dipaths should correspond to inclusion maps from bottom to top, and from left to right, of simplicial sets representing the corresponding trace spaces.

For instance, moving the end point b from vertical coordinate 1 to 0 while keeping the vertical coordinate of a at 0 (right column in the table below), the only 1-dimensional paths going through coordinate 0 for b are α and ζ , hence all other vertices (and edges) have to disappear. This induces the upwards inclusion map from the two point simplicial set (α and ζ) into the connected simplicial set above : H_0 of these simplicial sets goes from \mathbb{Z}^2 to \mathbb{Z} , “killing” one component when extending paths to reach the end point of the matchbox. This corresponds, in the natural homology diagram $\overrightarrow{H}_1(K)$, to part of the diagram being a projection map from \mathbb{Z}^2 to \mathbb{Z} when moving b to the endpoint of the matchbox, while keeping the starting point fixed at the initial vertex.

	a=1	a=0
b=1		
b=0	\emptyset	

The reason that we obtain an inclusion map from bottom to top in this case is because there is a unique map from the point $(1, 1, 0)$ to the point $(1, 1, 1)$. When there is a choice between maps, we no longer obtain a canonical inclusion map. Indeed, consider the case in which $a = (0, 0, 0)$, the initial point, $b' = (1, 1, 0)$ and $b = (1, 1, 1)$, the terminal point. There are two extension maps from $\mathfrak{T}(K)(b', b)$ to $\mathfrak{T}(K)(a, b)$, one by precomposition by the trace of ζ , and one by precomposition by the trace of α . These will produce different homology maps once the invariant is applied.

Therefore there is no canonical multidimensional filtration of the trace spaces which depends only on start and end points. More generally, it is easily seen that such a multidimensional filtration for studying a directed space X would exist only if we had a way to associate in a continuous manner, to each pair of points α and β , a directed path going from α to β . It is well-known that indeed, such a continuous map will only exist if X is contractible in a directed manner, *i.e.* is trivial, see e.g. [24].

The objective of this article is to cope with this difficulty, in order to give a meaning to natural homology as persistence homology. The shift of point of view we are going to make is similar to recent approaches in multidimensional persistence. We are going to look at all unidimensional persistence homologies that are compatible with our directed space structure, and glue this information together. As exemplified above, in general there exist several extensions between the same trace spaces which induce different homology maps. For this reason, filtrations parametrised by beginning- and end-points do not suffice to capture all of the directed homological information of a given space; we therefore choose to consider filtrations generated

by the extensions themselves. These have a natural interpretation as uni-dimensional persistence modules and are closely related to the structure of the directed space in question.

3 A sketch of persistence

In this section we recall the definitions of persistent homology using the notion of persistence module from [25]. We also recall an algorithm for computing persistent homology based on a structure theorem for persistence vector spaces [25]. We refer the reader to [1, 20, 21] for more detailed accounts of persistent homology.

3.1 Persistence complexes

Given a poset P , considered as a category, a P -persistence object in a category \mathcal{C} is a functor $\Phi : P \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. Explicitly, it is given by a collection $\{C_x\}_{x \in P}$ of objects in \mathcal{C} indexed by the elements of P , and such that for all $x \leq y$ in P , we choose a map $\phi_{x,y} : C_x \rightarrow C_y$ satisfying $\phi_{y,z} \circ \phi_{x,y} = \phi_{x,z}$ whenever $x \leq y \leq z$. We denote by $P_{pers}(\mathcal{C})$ the functor category of P -persistence objects in \mathcal{C} . When \mathcal{C} is the category of simplicial complexes, chain complexes, groups, respectively, the objects of $P_{pers}(\mathcal{C})$ are called P -persistence simplicial complexes, chain complexes, groups respectively.

In particular, considering the poset \mathbb{N} of natural numbers with the usual order, a *positive \mathbb{N} -persistence complex*, or *persistence complex* for short, over a ground ring R is a family of chain complexes $C = \{C_*^i\}_{i \geq 0}$ over R , together with chain maps $f^i : C_*^i \rightarrow C_*^{i+1}$, giving the following diagrams in the category of R -modules:

$$C_*^0 \xrightarrow{f^0} C_*^1 \xrightarrow{f^1} \dots \longrightarrow C_*^i \xrightarrow{f^i} C_*^{i+1} \longrightarrow \dots$$

A *persistence module* M is a persistence complex concentrated in degree zero, *i.e.* a family of R -modules $\{M^i\}_{i \geq 0}$, together with maps $f^i : M^i \rightarrow M^{i+1}$.

The persistence complex C is said to be of *finite type* if each R -module C_k^i is finitely generated, and if there exists some N such that the maps f^i are isomorphisms for $i \geq N$.

3.2 Persistent homology

A *simplicial complex* is a set K , together with a collection \mathcal{K} of subsets of K , satisfying the following two conditions:

- i) for every $v \in K$, $\{v\} \in \mathcal{K}$, and $\{v\}$ is called a *vertex* of K ;
- ii) $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\sigma' \subseteq \sigma$ implies $\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}$.

A k -simplex of K is an element σ of \mathcal{K} whose cardinal $|\sigma|$ is equal to $k+1$. An *orientation* of a k -simplex $\sigma = \{v_0, \dots, v_k\}$ is an equivalence class of orderings of the v_i in σ under the equivalence relation generated by even permutations. A simplex with an orientation is called an oriented simplex, and we write $[v_0, \dots, v_k]$ or $[\sigma]$ to denote the equivalence class.

Denote by $C_k(K)$ the k th chain module of K defined as the free R -module on oriented k -simplices of K . The boundary operator $\partial_k : C_k(K) \rightarrow C_{k-1}(K)$ is the map defined on any simplex $\sigma = \{v_0, \dots, v_k\}$ by setting

$$\partial_k(\sigma) = \sum_i (-1)^i [v_0, \dots, \widehat{v_i}, \dots, v_k],$$

where, on the right side, $\widehat{v_i}$ indicates that the vertex v_i is eliminated from the simplex. Denote by $Z_k(K) = \ker \partial_k$, $B_k(K) = \text{Im } \partial_{k+1}$, and $H_k(K) = Z_k(K)/B_k(K)$ the *cycle*, *boundary*, and *homology* modules respectively.

A *subcomplex* of K is a simplicial complex L such that $L \subseteq K$. A *filtered complex* is a complex K together with a *filtration*, that is a nested sequence of subcomplexes:

$$K^0 \subseteq K^1 \subseteq K^2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq K^n = K.$$

Given such a filtration, we define the persistence complex $C(K) = \{C_*(K^i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, in which the chain maps $f^{i,i+1} : C_*(K^i) \rightarrow C_*(K^{i+1})$ are induced by the inclusions $K^i \rightarrow K^{i+1}$. Applying the k th homology functor H_k to each complex, we obtain $H_k(C(K)) := \{H_k(C(K^i)_*)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, which has the structure of persistence module over the ground ring R . Denoting by $\eta_k^{i,i+p} : H_k(K^i) \rightarrow H_k(K^{i+p})$ the map induced by the inclusion $K^i \rightarrow K^{i+p}$, we define the p -persistent k th homology group of K^i as $\text{Im}(\eta_k^{i,i+p})$, which we denote by $H_k^{i,p}(K)$, see [4].

When K is finite, the persistence complex $C(K)$ is of finite type, and hence the persistent homology $H_k(C(K))$ is also of finite.

3.3 Classification of persistence module and algorithm for persistence

Given a persistence R -module $(M^i, \phi_{i,i+1})_i$, we define a graded module over $R[t]$ by setting

$$\alpha(M) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} M^i,$$

where the R -module structure is induced by the direct sum of its components, and the action of t is defined by

$$t \cdot (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_k, \dots) = (0, \phi_{0,1}(m_0), \phi_{1,2}(m_1), \dots, \phi_{n,n+1}(m_k), \dots).$$

The correspondence α is functorial and establishes an equivalence between the category of persistence R -modules of finite type and the category of finitely generated graded $R[t]$ -modules. When the ground ring is a field \mathbb{k} , combining this with the structure theorem of finitely generated graded modules, we know that a persistence module has a decomposition

$$\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Sigma^{k_i} \mathbb{k}[t] \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^m \Sigma^{l_j} \mathbb{k}[t]/(t^{h_j}) \right) \quad (3)$$

for some n, m and families of natural numbers $(k_i)_i$, $(l_j)_j$ and $(h_j)_j$, where Σ^k denotes a k -shift in grading.

From this classification of persistent modules one derives an algorithm for computation of persistence homology over a field [25]. This algorithm is defined as follows. Let $\{e_j\}$ and $\{\hat{e}_i\}$ denote homogenous bases for the persistence \mathbb{k} -modules C_k and Z_{k-1} . Denote by M_k the matrix of ∂_k in these bases. The usual procedure for calculating homology is to reduce the matrix to Smith normal form and read off the description of H_k from the diagonal elements. We compute these bases and matrix representations by induction on k . For $k = 1$, the standard basis of $C_0 = Z_0$ is homogenous and we may proceed as usual.

Suppose now that we have a representation M_k of ∂_k relative to the standard basis $\{e_j\}$ of C_k and a homogeneous basis $\{\hat{e}_i\}$ of Z_{k-1} . For induction, we must compute a homogeneous basis for Z_k and represent ∂_{k+1} relative to the computed basis for Z_k and the standard basis of C_{k+1} .

We begin by sorting the basis $\{\hat{e}_i\}$ in reverse degree order and then transforming the matrix M_k into column-echelon form \tilde{M}_k , also known as lower staircase form. We call the first non-zero value in a column a pivot, and a row with a pivot is called a pivot row. The diagonal elements in Smith normal form are the same as the pivots in column-echelon form and the degrees of the corresponding basis elements are also the same in both cases [25]. Zomorodian and Carlsson prove in [25] that each row contributes to the persistent homology H_{k-1} of C_* in the following way:

- i) If row i is a pivot row with pivot t^n , then it contributes $\Sigma^{\deg \hat{e}_i} \mathbb{k}[t]/t^n$.
- ii) If row i is not a pivot row, it contributes $\Sigma^{\deg \hat{e}_i} \mathbb{k}[t]$.

where these contributions correspond to factors in the characterization (3), see [25] for additional details.

4 Natural homology of directed spaces

In this section, we recall definitions and constructions involving directed spaces and in particular, we recall natural homology, an invariant thereof. In Sections 4.1 and 4.2, we recall the definition of directed space and associated categorical constructions, as well as the notions of natural systems and composition pairings. Finally, Section 4.3 recalls the definition of natural homology from [13], an invariant of directed spaces encoded via natural systems. Therein we also recall the notion of bisimulation and provide, see Lemma 1, the link between dihomeomorphic directed spaces and bisimulation equivalence of their associated natural homology diagrams.

4.1 Directed spaces

Recall from [11] that a *directed space*, or *dispace*, is a pair $\mathcal{X} = (X, dX)$, where X is a topological space and dX is a set of paths in X , *i.e.* continuous maps from $[0, 1]$ to X , called *directed paths*, or *dipaths*, satisfying the three following conditions:

- i) Every constant path is directed,
- ii) If $f \in dX$, then given any continuous, monotonic map $\rho : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we have $f \circ \rho \in dX$. The map ρ is called a *reparametrisation-restriction*, or simply a *reparametrisation* if it is surjective
- iii) dX is closed under concatenation.

We will denote by $f \star g$ the concatenation of dipaths f and g . A morphism $\varphi : (X, dX) \rightarrow (Y, dY)$ of dispaces is a continuous function $\varphi : X \rightarrow Y$ that preserves directed paths, *i.e.*, for every path $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ in dX , the path $\varphi_*(p) = \varphi \circ f : [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ belongs to dY . The category of dispaces is denoted \mathbf{dTop} .

A *partially ordered space*, or *pospace* $\mathcal{X} = (X, \leq_X)$ consists of a Hausdorff topological space X and a partial order \leq_X which is closed in the product topology $X \times X$. Pospaces are naturally interpreted as directed spaces by equipping them with the set of increasing paths dX from the unit interval, with its usual ordering, to X . Thus, morphisms in \mathbf{dTop} between pospaces are simply continuous, order-preserving maps.

Given two directed spaces X and Y , a dihomeomorphism from X to Y is a morphism of directed spaces $\varphi : X \rightarrow Y$ such that there exists a morphism of directed spaces $\psi : Y \rightarrow X$, with $\varphi \circ \psi = Id_Y$ and $\psi \circ \varphi = Id_X$. In the case of compact partially ordered spaces, this is implied by φ and ψ being continuous, order-preserving, and mutually inverse. Having dihomeomorphic directed spaces is a semantic equivalence when it comes to applications in concurrency theory.

Two dipaths f and g are *reparametrisation equivalent* if there exist reparametrisations ρ, λ such that $f \circ \rho = g \circ \lambda$. The *trace* [12] of a dipath f in \mathcal{X} , denoted by \overline{f} , or f if no confusion is possible, is the equivalence class of f modulo reparametrisation equivalence. The concatenation of dipaths of \mathcal{X} is compatible with this quotient, inducing a concatenation of traces defined by $\overline{f} \star \overline{g} := \overline{f \star g}$, for all dipaths f and g of \mathcal{X} , [26]. For $\varphi : X \rightarrow Y$ a morphism of directed spaces, abusing notation, we write $\varphi_*(\overline{f}) = \overline{\varphi_*(f)}$ for the image of the trace \overline{f} .

In the case of the geometric realization of finite geometric precubical sets without loops, it is known [27] that we have a complete metric space and that we can define the l_1 -arc length $l_1(p)$ of a directed path p . In that context, traces \overline{f} always have a representative f such that the length of the sub-path from $f(0)$ to $f(t)$ along f is t .

For a dispace $\mathcal{X} = (X, dX)$ and $x, y \in X$, we denote by $\overrightarrow{Di}(\mathcal{X})(x, y)$ the space of dipaths f in X with source $x = f(0)$ and target $y = f(1)$, equipped with the compact-open topology. For $x, y \in X$, the *trace space* of the dispace \mathcal{X} from x to y , denoted by $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{X})(x, y)$, is the quotient of $\overrightarrow{Di}(\mathcal{X})(x, y)$ by reparametrisation equivalence, equipped with the quotient topology.

4.2 Trace category and trace diagrams

Recall that the *category of factorizations* of a category \mathcal{C} , denoted by FC , is the category whose objects are the morphisms of \mathcal{C} , and a morphism from f to g is a pair (u, v) of morphisms of \mathcal{C} such that $v \circ f \circ u = g$ holds in \mathcal{C} .

$$(u, v) : f \rightarrow g \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{f} & \\ u \nearrow & = & \searrow v \\ & \xrightarrow{g} & \end{array}$$

Composition is given by

$$(u, v)(u', v') = (u \circ u', v' \circ v)$$

whenever the pairs u', u and v, v' are composable in \mathcal{C} , and the identity on $f : x \rightarrow y$ is the pair $(1_x, 1_y)$. A *natural system on \mathcal{C} with values in a category \mathbf{V}* is a functor $D : FC \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$. We will denote by D_f (resp. $D(u, v)$) the image of an object f (resp. morphism (u, v)) of FC .

A directed space may be seen as a category using the notion of traces, and this association is functorial. Indeed, consider the functor

$$\vec{\mathbf{P}} : \mathbf{dTop} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$$

with values in the category of small categories which associates to a dispace \mathcal{X} the *trace category of \mathcal{X}* , whose objects are points of X , morphisms are traces of \mathcal{X} , and composition is given by concatenation of traces. The *trace diagram* of a dispace \mathcal{X} in the category \mathbf{Top} of topological spaces is the natural system

$$T(\mathcal{X}) : F\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Top},$$

sending a trace $\bar{f} : x \rightarrow y$ of \mathcal{X} to the topological space $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{X})(x, y)$, and a morphism (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) of $F\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{X})$ to the continuous map

$$\bar{u} \star \bar{v} : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{X})(x, y) \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{X})(x', y'),$$

which sends a trace \bar{f} to $\bar{u} \star \bar{f} \star \bar{v}$.

Recall from [28], that the *category of natural systems with values in \mathbf{V}* , denoted by $\mathbf{opNat}(\mathbf{V})$, is defined as follows:

- i) its objects are pairs (\mathcal{C}, D) made of a category \mathcal{C} and a natural system $D : FC \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$,
- ii) its morphisms are pairs

$$(\Phi, \tau) : (\mathcal{C}, D) \rightarrow (\mathcal{C}', D')$$

consisting of a functor $\Phi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ and a natural transformation $\tau : D \rightarrow \Phi^* D'$, where the natural system $\Phi^* D' : FC \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ is defined by

$$(\Phi^* D')(f) = D'(\Phi f),$$

for every morphism f in \mathcal{C} , and $\Phi^* D'(u, v) = D'(\Phi(u), \Phi(v))$, for all morphisms u, v of \mathcal{C} ,

- iii) composition of morphisms $(\Psi, \sigma) : (\mathcal{C}', D') \rightarrow (\mathcal{C}'', D'')$ and $(\Phi, \tau) : (\mathcal{C}, D) \rightarrow (\mathcal{C}', D')$ is defined by

$$(\Psi, \sigma) \circ (\Phi, \tau) := (\Psi \circ \Phi, (\Phi^* \sigma) \circ \tau),$$

where $\Psi \circ \Phi$ denotes composition of functors and where the component of the natural transformation $(\Phi^* \sigma) \circ \tau$ at a morphism f of \mathcal{C} is $\tau_f \circ \sigma_{\Phi(f)}$.

The family of functors $T(\mathcal{X})$ indexed by dispaces \mathcal{X} extends to a functor

$$T : \mathbf{dTop} \rightarrow \mathbf{opNat}(\mathbf{Top})$$

sending a dispace \mathcal{X} to the pair $(\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{X}), T(\mathcal{X}))$. A morphism of dispaces $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ induces continuous maps

$$\varphi_{x,y} : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{X})(x, y) \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{Y})(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)),$$

for all points x, y of X , and thus a natural transformation between the corresponding trace diagrams:

$$\vec{\varphi} : T(\mathcal{X}) \Rightarrow \vec{\mathbf{P}}(\varphi)^* T(\mathcal{Y}).$$

4.3 Natural homology

This subsection is taken from [17]. For $n \geq 1$, the n^{th} *natural homology functor of \mathcal{X}*

$$\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X}) : F\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$$

is the functor defined as the composite

$$F\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{X}) \xrightarrow{T(\mathcal{X})} \mathbf{Top} \xrightarrow{H_{n-1}} \mathbf{Ab},$$

where $T(\mathcal{X})$ is the trace diagram and H_{n-1} is the $(n-1)^{th}$ singular homology functor. This extends to a functor

$$\vec{H}_n : \mathbf{dTop} \longrightarrow \mathbf{opNat}(\mathbf{Ab}),$$

sending a dispace \mathcal{X} to $(\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{X}), \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X}))$.

The natural homology $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})$ of a directed topological space \mathcal{X} is very fine-grained: it not only records local homology groups $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_f$ for a trace f of \mathcal{X} , but also for which traces they occur. As with persistent homology, see Section 3, the aim is to describe the transformation between the groups $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_f$ and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_g$ for any concatenation $g = u \star f \star v$ of f by an extension (u, v) , rather than just the groups $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_f$ themselves. This is done by looking at natural homology modulo a notion of bisimulation of natural systems, and more generally of \mathbf{Ab} -valued functors, defined in [13] and recalled below.

4.4 Bisimulation

Given two small categories \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{D} and two functors $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$, $G : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$, we call *bisimulation* between F and G any set R of triples (x, η, y) , with x an object of \mathcal{C} , y an object of \mathcal{D} and $\eta : Fx \rightarrow Gy$ an isomorphism such that:

- i) for every object x of \mathcal{C} , R contains some triple of the form (x, η, y) , and similarly for every object y of \mathcal{D} ;
- ii) for every triple $(x, \eta, y) \in R$ and every morphism $i : x \rightarrow x'$ in \mathcal{C} , there is a triple $(x', \eta', y') \in R$ and a morphism $j : y \rightarrow y'$ in \mathcal{D} such that $\eta' \circ Fi = Gj \circ \eta$, and symmetrically, for every $(x, \eta, y) \in R$ and every morphism $j : y \rightarrow y'$ of \mathcal{D} there is a triple $(x', \eta', y') \in R$ and a morphism $i : x \rightarrow x'$ such that $\eta' \circ Fi = Gj \circ \eta$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 x & Fx & \xrightarrow{\eta} & Gy & y \\
 \downarrow i & \downarrow Fi & & \downarrow Gj & \downarrow j \\
 x' & Fx' & \xrightarrow{\eta'} & Gy' & y'
 \end{array}$$

We say that F and G are *bisimulation equivalent* provided that there is a bisimulation R between them. This is an equivalence relation. We now prove that dihomeomorphic directed spaces have bisimilar natural homologies.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a directed homeomorphism. Then the functors $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})$ and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})$ are bisimulation equivalent, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. By hypothesis, f is a morphism of directed spaces with inverse $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. For a given n in \mathbb{N} , we need to construct R , a set of triples (x, η, y) , with x an object of $F\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{X})$, y an object of $F\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{Y})$, that is x and y are traces of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} respectively, and $\eta : \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_x \rightarrow \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_y$ is an isomorphism making this set of triples a bisimulation.

We define R from f and g as follows. It is going to contain all triples $(x, \eta_{x,y}, y)$ with x any trace of \mathcal{X} , $y = f_*(x)$ which is a trace of \mathcal{Y} , and $\eta_{x,y}$ is the map from $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_x$ to $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_y$ induced by f as follows.

We note first that when f is an homeomorphism, its induced map f_* from $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{X})$ to $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{Y})$ is an homeomorphism as well, and similarly for its restriction to $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{X})(\alpha, \beta)$, into $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{Y})(f(\alpha), f(\beta))$, where $\alpha = x(0)$ and $\beta = y(0)$. Hence f_* induces an isomorphism from the (standard) homology $H_{n-1}(\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{X})(\alpha, \beta))$

to the (standard) homology $H_{n-1}(\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{Y})(f(\alpha), f(\beta)))$. The former is $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_x$ and the latter is $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_y$ since $y(0) = f(\alpha)$ and $y(1) = f(\beta)$. This isomorphism $\eta_{x,y}$ can be written explicitly as follows.

Consider a singular homology class $[p]$, where p is a cycle of dimension $n-1$ in the trace space of \mathcal{X} from α to β . More precisely, this is the homology class of a sum $p = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i p_i$ for some singular simplexes p_i of dimension $n-1$, which are continuous maps $p_i : \Delta_{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{X}}$ taking its image within the traces of $\mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{X}}$ that start at α and end at β . Then $\eta_{x,y}([p])$ is

$$\eta_{x,y}([p]) = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i [p'_i], \quad (4)$$

where p'_i is the $(n-1)$ -simplex defined by $p'_i(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}) = f_*(p_i(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}))$, for $(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}) \in \Delta_{n-1}$ the standard $(n-1)$ -simplex in \mathbb{R}^n . By an abuse of notation, we write $p'_i = f_*(p_i)$. The definition above is legal, indeed, if v_i is reparameterization equivalent to u_i , $\eta_{x,y}(v_i)$ is reparameterization equivalent to $\eta_{x,y}(u_i)$.

Now we check that the set of triples R is indeed a bisimulation. Consider a morphism $i : x \rightarrow x'$ in $F\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{X})$, i.e. $i = (u, v)$ with u and v , traces in \mathcal{X} . We consider now the morphism $j : y \rightarrow y'$ in $F\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{Y})$ defined as $j = (f_*(u), f_*(v))$ and $y' = f_*(u) \star y \star f_*(v) = f_*(x')$. As before, f_* induces an isomorphism $\eta_{x',y'}$ between $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{x'}$ and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{y'}$ and $(x', \eta_{x',y'}, y')$ is in R . Furthermore, $\eta_{x',y'} \circ \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_i = \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_j \circ \eta_{x,y}$ as we are going to see.

Let $[p]$ be again a (standard) homology class in dimension $n-1$, of $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{X})(\alpha, \beta)$ with $\alpha = x(0)$ to $\beta = x(1)$, i.e. $[p]$ is the homology class of the cycle $p = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i p_i$ as we have seen already, for some singular simplexes p_i of dimension $n-1$, which are continuous maps $p_i : \Delta_{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{X}}$ taking its image within the traces of $\mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{X}}$ that start at α and end at β . The effect of $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_i$ on $[p]$ is the homology class in $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_y$:

$$[q] = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i [q_i]$$

where q_i is the $(n-1)$ -simplex in $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{Y})$ defined as

$$q_i(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}) = u \star p_i(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}) \star v,$$

for $(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}) \in \Delta_{n-1}$. We will write $q_i = u \star p_i \star v$ for short. Now,

$$\eta_{x',y'} \circ \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_i([p]) = \sum_{i=1}^k \eta_{x',y'}([q_i]),$$

which is equal, by Equation (4), to

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{x',y'} \circ \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_i([p]) &= \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i[f_*(q_i)], \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i[f_*(u) \star f_*(p_i) \star f_*(v)], \end{aligned}$$

as easily checked by instantiating the left and right terms of the equation on tuples $(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}) \in \Delta_{n-1}$.

But as we saw in Equation 4, $\eta_{x,y}([p]) = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i[f_*(p_i)]$. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_j \circ \eta_{x,y}([p]) &= \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i[f_*(u) \star f_*(p_i) \star f_*(v)] \\ &= \eta_{x',y'} \circ \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_i([p]). \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, consider a morphism $j : y \rightarrow y'$ in $F\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{Y})$ with $j = (u', v')$. We have $x' = g_*(u') \star y \star g_*(v') = g_*(y')$. Let us consider now $i : x \rightarrow x'$ in $F\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{X})$, with $i = (g_*(u'), g_*(v'))$. As before, g_* induces an isomorphism $\eta'_{x',y'}$ (resp. $\eta'_{x,y}$) between $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{x'}$ (resp. $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_x$) and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{y'}$ (resp. $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_y$), which is easily seen to be equal to the inverse $\eta_{x',y'}^{-1}$ (resp. $\eta_{x,y}^{-1}$) of $\eta_{x',y'}$ (resp. $\eta_{x,y}$), since g_* is the inverse of f_* .

The same calculation as before, exchanging the roles of \mathcal{X} with \mathcal{Y} , and η with η' , yields $\eta'_{x',y'} \circ \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_j = \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_i \circ \eta'_{x,y}$, *i.e.* $\eta_{x',y'}^{-1} \circ \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_j = \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_i \circ \eta_{x,y}^{-1}$, and, by pre-composing this equation with $\eta_{x',y'}$ and post-composing it with $\eta_{x,y}$, we get $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_j \circ \eta_{x,y} = \eta_{x',y'} \circ \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_i$, and $(x, \eta_{x,y}, y) \in R$.

Hence R is a bisimulation. \square

5 Persistent homology of directed spaces

In this section we explore the use of persistent homology as an invariant of directed spaces, as well as its relationship to natural homology in the context of partially ordered spaces. First, we show that for these directed spaces, the associated natural homology modules are in fact persistence objects as defined in Section 3. We then define persistent homology along traces in a directed space and show the compatibility of this definition with

the interpretation of natural homology as a persistence object. To finish the section, we illustrate our constructions on the matchbox example.

5.1 Natural homology as a persistence object

Consider a directed space $\mathcal{X} = (X, dX)$ and its trace category $\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{X})$. We define a relation on traces in \mathcal{X} by setting

$$f \leq g \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \exists u, v, \quad g = ufv, \quad (5)$$

that is, there exists an extension (u, v) from f to g .

We recall that a *pospace* $\mathcal{X} = (X, \leq_X)$ consists of a Hausdorff topological space X and a partial order \leq_X which is closed in the product topology $X \times X$. In what follows, we will exclusively consider compact pospaces. Pospaces are naturally interpreted as directed spaces by equipping them with the set of increasing paths dX from the unit interval, with its usual ordering, to X .

Lemma 2. *In any directed space, the relation \leq defined in (5) is a pre-order. In a pospace, it is a partial order relation.*

Proof. Since constant paths are directed, the relation is reflexive, and we have transitivity by associativity of concatenation of traces. Indeed, if $f \leq g$ and $g \leq h$, there exist extensions (u, v) and (u', v') such that

$$f = ugv \quad \text{and} \quad g = u'hv'.$$

Thus, $f = u(u'hv')v = (uu')h(v'v)$, and $f \leq h$. In the case of a pospace, we also prove anti-symmetry of \leq . Consider $f, g \in dX$ such that $f \leq g$ and $g \leq f$. By definition there exist extensions such that $f = ugv$ and $g = u'fv'$. Thus $f = uu'fv'v$, so uu' and vv' each have the same beginning and end-points, which implies they are both constant paths. Indeed, given a path $h : x \rightarrow x$ in a pospace, any point x' in the image of h satisfies $x \leq x' \leq x$. This means that the image of both uu' and vv' are singletons, meaning that the image of each of the dipaths u, u', v, v' are singletons, *i.e.* these are all constant paths, concluding the proof. \square

This poset, denoted by $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$, will be called the *trace poset* of $\mathcal{X} = (X, \leq_X)$. In particular, by construction, we obtain the following result:

Proposition 1. *For a pospace \mathcal{X} , $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is isomorphic to $F\vec{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. By the same arguments as in the preceding proof, if $ufv = u'fv'$ then $u = u'$ and $v = v'$ since these must be constant maps equal to $f(0)$ (resp. $f(1)$). Thus there is at most one extension between any two traces in a pospace, which concludes the proof. \square

This allows us to interpret natural homology as a functor on a poset, *i.e.* as a persistence object. Indeed, in a pospace \mathcal{X} , the i^{th} natural homology diagram associated to \mathcal{X} is a $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$ -persistence group. Taking coefficients in a field \mathbb{k} , we obtain $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$ -persistence \mathbb{k} -vector spaces.

5.2 Persistent homology along a trace

Here, we show how unidimensional persistence modules may be obtained from parametrisations of traces. For the following, we fix a trace \bar{f} in a pospace \mathcal{X} , and a parametrisation f thereof. Moreover, we fix a point α_f in the image of f , and denote by t_0 the value such that $f(t_0) = \alpha_f$.

We abuse notation in the following, denoting by α_f the constant trace equal to the point α_f , thereby considering it as an element of the trace poset $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$. In this optic, we denote by $[\alpha_f, f]$ the interval between α_f and f in the trace poset, *i.e.* traces p such that $\alpha_f \leq p \leq f$ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$.

Given parametrisations of $[0, t_0]$ and $[t_0, 1]$ within $[0, 1]$ via maps $\gamma_- : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, t_0]$ and $\gamma_+ : [0, 1] \rightarrow [t_0, 1]$ respectively, we denote by ${}_s f_s$ the trace of f restricted to $[t_0 - \gamma_-(s), \gamma_+(s)]$. Applying the trace space functor, we thus obtain a $[0, 1]$ -persistence topological space $\{T({}_s f_s)\}_s$. This is a filtration of the trace space associated to the trace \bar{f} . Notice that this is derived from a chain $({}_s f_s)_{s \in [0, 1]}$ in the poset of traces (see Section 5.3) from the constant trace α_f to f . We call such filtrations initial (resp. terminal) point filtrations when $\alpha_f = f(0)$ (resp. $\alpha_f = f(1)$). Taking some order preserving map $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we obtain \mathbb{N} -persistence simplicial complexes from the above constructions.

All of these can be considered as \mathbb{R} -persistence objects as follows: $[0, 1]$ -persistence objects are \mathbb{R} -persistence objects which are constant on negative parameters and on parameters greater or equal than one. The \mathbb{N} -persistence objects constructed above will be considered as \mathbb{R} -persistence objects by considering them first as piecewise constant $[0, 1]$ -persistence objects. However, for questions of computability, it is useful to consider \mathbb{N} -persistence.

In all the above cases, we obtain a chain $c = (f_i)_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$ in the interval $[\alpha_f, f]$ and define the *persistent homology along a trace f with respect to c* as a functor from \mathbb{R} , seen as the poset category (with the usual ordering) to

the category of abelian groups, associating $i \in \mathbb{R}$ to:

$$\vec{H}_n(f, c)_i := \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{f_i}$$

In the following section, we will see that this object is independent of the chosen parametrisations f , γ_- , and γ_+ .

5.3 Maximal traces and maximal chains

In order to make the link between parametrisations and chains more concrete, we present the relationship between maximal chains in the trace poset and parametrisations of extensions along maximal traces. In fact, the chain we use does not depend on (re)parametrisations, but rather on the pair of end-points visited along a trace.

Recall from the previous subsection that given a trace \bar{f} , we construct a persistence module using the following data:

- A parametrisation f of \bar{f} .
- A point $\alpha = f(t_0)$ in the image of f .
- Reparametrisations $\gamma_- : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, t_0]$ and $\gamma_+ : [0, 1] \rightarrow [t_0, 1]$.

A *maximal trace* is a trace which cannot be extended on either side. Hence, these are the maximal elements in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$. Maximal chains in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$ link minimal elements, *i.e.* constant dipaths, to maximal traces along a sequence of extensions. Clearly, for a trace \bar{f} , the above data encodes a maximal chain in the trace poset. Indeed, we obtain a chain ${}_s f_s$ from α , seen as a constant trace, to \bar{f} , which is maximal since it is derived from the continuous maps γ_+ and γ_- .

Consider $t \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$ a maximal trace. Let $\alpha_0 := t(0) \in \mathcal{X}$ be the starting point of t , and consider the interval $[\alpha_0, t]$ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$. For any $g, h \in [\alpha_0, t]$, we have either $g \leq h$ or $h \leq g$, since all elements of this interval are traces starting at α_0 and which are sub-traces of t . Thus the interval $[\alpha_0, t]$ is itself a chain.

From this we deduce that there is a unique maximal chain from α_0 to t , which we denote by C_t^0 , namely the interval between them. A symmetric argument shows that this is also the case when we consider chains from $\alpha_1 := t(1)$, the terminal point of t , in which case the unique chain, denoted by C_t^1 is the interval $[\alpha_1, t]$.

Now let us consider a point α in the trace t which is neither the starting nor terminal point of t . Let $t_1 \leq t$ the trace from α_0 to α , and $t_2 \leq t$ the

trace from α to α_1 . We claim that the interval $[\alpha, t]$ is the cartesian product, as posets, of the chains $C_{t_1}^1$ and $C_{t_2}^0$. Indeed, given any trace $f \in [\alpha, t]$, we know that f is a subtrace of t which passes through α . Thus there exist a unique pair of traces $(f_1, f_2) \in [\alpha, t_1] \times [\alpha, t_2]$ such that $f = f_1 \star f_2$. Conversely, any pair $(f_1, f_2) \in [\alpha, t_1] \times [\alpha, t_2]$ of traces can be concatenated to obtain a trace in the interval $[\alpha, t]$. So any chain from α to t is a chain in the product $[\alpha, t_1] \times [\alpha, t_2]$, ordered coordinate-wise.

More generally, given *any* complete, *i.e.* closed under infima and suprema, maximal chain C in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we know that it has a maximal element, namely its supremum, which we denote by t . Furthermore, since every trace is a compact subspace of X , it has a minimal element, α , which must be a constant trace by maximality of C . Thus every maximal chain in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is of the type described in the previous paragraphs.

Summing this up, we obtain the following result:

Theorem 1. *Let \mathcal{X} be a compact pospace, consider its trace poset $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$, and let C be a complete maximal chain therein. Then the maximal element of C is a maximal trace t_C , and its minimal element is a constant trace α_C . Furthermore,*

- *If α_C is the beginning-point α_0 or end-point α_1 of t_C , then C is unique and is equal to the interval $[\alpha_C, t_C]$.*
- *If not, then C is a chain in the product of chains $C_{t_1}^1$ and $C_{t_2}^0$, where t_1 (resp. t_2) is the unique subtrace of t_C going from α_0 to α_C (resp. from α_C to α_1).*

This shows that complete maximal chains in the trace poset are independent of the parametrisation we choose for our maximal traces. Indeed, given a maximal trace \bar{f} the first item above states that there is only one chain from the initial or terminal point, which can be obtained from *any* parametrisation f of \bar{f} . The second item states that if we are considering extensions from an interior point α , the maximal chains from α to \bar{f} correspond to directed paths in the cartesian square $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$. These directed paths correspond to equivalence classes of pairs γ_+, γ_- under the equivalence relation which identifies pairs which visit the same pairs of extremal points.

As a result, the \mathbb{R} -persistence vector space defined in Section 5.2 from parametrisations f, γ_-, γ_+ coincides with the restriction of the n th natural homology of \mathcal{X} to a given maximal chain:


Proposition 2. *Let $\mathcal{X} = (X, dX)$ be a compact pospace and \bar{f} a trace in \mathcal{X} . Let C be a complete maximal chain in the interval $[\alpha_f, \bar{f}]$ in the poset of*

traces. Let $(f_i)_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$ be obtained from \bar{f} as described in Section 5.2. Restricting the natural homology functor $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})$ to C , we obtain the persistence \mathbb{R} -vector space $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{f_i}$.

5.4 Example: persistent homology of the matchbox

Consider the case of the matchbox example presented in Section 2. Let us calculate the persistent homology along each of its maximal traces, starting at the initial point and extending into the future. We fix some field \mathbb{k} and will proceed via the method developed in [25]. To each of the maximal traces $\zeta, \epsilon, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \gamma$ pictured in (2), we associate a sequence of subtraces corresponding to a decomposition of the trace along each 1-simplex in the matchbox. For example, the trace α is decomposed into the chain

$$\alpha_0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_3 = \alpha,$$



where α_0 is the constant path equal to $(0, 0, 0)$, which α_1 extends to $(0, 1, 0)$. This trace is further extended to $(0, 1, 1)$ obtaining α_2 , and then finally extended to $(1, 1, 1)$ giving the total trace α . A similar decomposition, which we will denote with the same indices, can be found for each of the maximal traces. This sequence of traces gives a filtration of the simplicial complex pictured above. In the case of α , we obtain the following filtration:

$K(\alpha_0)$	$K(\alpha_1)$	$K(\alpha_2)$	$K(\alpha_3)$

We extend this filtration into a \mathbb{N} -persistence simplicial complex by considering copies of $K(\alpha_3)$ for all $i \geq 4$. We denote by $C_*(K(\alpha_i))$ the chain complex over \mathbb{k} obtained from the simplicial complex $K(\alpha_i)$, obtaining a \mathbb{N} -persistence chain complex

$$C_*(K(\alpha_0)) \xrightarrow{f_{0,1}} C_*(K(\alpha_1)) \xrightarrow{f_{1,2}} C_*(K(\alpha_2)) \xrightarrow{f_{2,3}} C_*(K(\alpha_3)) \xrightarrow{f_{3,4}} \dots$$

where $f_{n,n+1}$ are induced by the inclusions of simplicial sets given by the filtration. For each natural number p , we denote by H_p^i the p^{th} homology group of $C_*(K(\alpha_i))$, thus obtaining a sequence of homology groups

$$H_p^0 \xrightarrow{\phi_{0,1}} H_p^1 \xrightarrow{\phi_{1,2}} H_p^2 \xrightarrow{\phi_{2,3}} H_p^3 \xrightarrow{\phi_{3,4}} H_p^3 \xrightarrow{\phi_{4,5}} \dots \xrightarrow{\phi_{n-1,n}} H_p^3 \xrightarrow{\phi_{n,n+1}} \dots,$$

where the $\phi_{n,n+1}$ are identities for $n \geq 3$. This is in fact an \mathbb{N} -persistence \mathbb{k} -vector space. We define a non-negatively graded module over $\mathbb{k}[t]$ by setting

$$H_p := \left(\bigoplus_{i=0}^2 H_p^i \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{i=3}^{\infty} H_p^3 \right),$$

and defining the action of t by $t \cdot (h_i)_i = (\phi_{i,i+1}(h_i))_i$, where the h_i belongs to H_p^i .

We will calculate the graded module of persistent homology via matrix representations of the boundary maps ∂_k associated to the persistence chain complex $C_*(K(\alpha_i))$ as described in [25]. We calculate $H_0(\alpha)$, the 0^{th} persistent homology along α . For this, we fix homogeneous bases for Z_0 and \mathcal{C}_1 . Since $Z_0 = \mathcal{C}_0$, we may take the standard basis in both cases. Thus, for \mathcal{C}_0 we obtain the basis $\{\alpha_0, \zeta_2, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon\}$, and for \mathcal{C}_1 we obtain the basis $\{A, B, C, D, E\}$. We now calculate the matrix of ∂_1 with respect to these bases, taking care to order the basis of \mathcal{C}_0 in reverse degree order:

		B	A	C	D	E
β		-1	0	0	0	1
γ		1	-1	0	0	0
δ		0	1	-1	0	0
ϵ		0	0	1	-1	0
ζ_2		0	0	0	t	0
α_0		0	0	0	0	$-t^3$

We now calculate the column-echelon form of the above matrix, obtaining

		B	A	C	D	E'
β		-1	0	0	0	0
γ		1	-1	0	0	0
δ		0	1	-1	0	0
ϵ		0	0	1	-1	0
ζ_2		0	0	0	t	t
α_0		0	0	0	0	$-t^3$

where $E' = A + B + C + D + E$. In the case of the persistent homology along α , we see that the first four rows contribute nothing to the description of $H_0(\alpha)$, and that the last two contribute $\Sigma^2 \mathbb{k}[t]/t$ and $\mathbb{k}[t]$ respectively, *i.e.*

$$H_0(\alpha) \cong \mathbb{k} \oplus \mathbb{k} \oplus \mathbb{k}^2 \oplus \mathbb{k} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{k} \oplus \cdots$$

We obtain a similar result for the persistent homology along ζ . Below are the standard and column-echelon forms of ∂_1 in this case:

	B	A	C	D	E		B	A	C	D	E'
β	-1	0	0	0	1	β	-1	0	0	0	0
γ	1	-1	0	0	0	γ	1	-1	0	0	0
δ	0	1	-1	0	0	δ	0	1	-1	0	0
ϵ	0	0	1	-1	0	ϵ	0	0	1	-1	0
ζ_2	0	0	0	0	$-t$	ζ_2	0	0	0	0	$-t$
α_0	0	0	0	t^3	0	α_0	0	0	0	t^3	t^3

We therefore obtain the same isomorphism class for $H_0(\zeta)$ as we did in the case of α :

$$H_0(\zeta) \cong \mathbb{k} \oplus \mathbb{k} \oplus \mathbb{k}^2 \oplus \mathbb{k} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{k} \oplus \cdots$$

The other four dipaths yield a simple persistent homology since there is only one class which persists throughout the sequence. For example, along β , a homogeneous basis of C_0 is $\{\beta_0, \gamma_2, \epsilon, \zeta, \delta, \alpha\}$. The basis for C_1 is the same, but now B has degree two rather than three. We obtain the following matrix representation of ∂_1 :


	E	A	C	D	B		E	A	D	$A + C$	B
α	-1	0	0	0	0	α	-1	0	0	0	0
δ	0	1	-1	0	0	δ	0	1	0	0	0
ζ	0	0	0	1	0	ζ	0	0	1	0	0
ϵ	0	0	1	-1	0	ϵ	0	0	-1	1	0
γ_2	0	$-t$	0	0	1	γ_2	0	$-t$	0	$-t$	1
β_0	t^3	0	0	0	$-t^2$	β_0	t^3	0	0	0	$-t^2$

We see that the graded module $H_0(\beta)$ is simply $\mathbb{k}[t]$, since all pivots are of degree zero and there is one non-pivot row.


5.5 Natural homology of the matchbox

Now we describe the natural homology diagram of the matchbox. First we will describe its restriction to the principal upset in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$ given by the

constant path at the initial point $(0,0,0)$. The following diagram depicts the Hasse diagram of this upset:



Traces in the same dotted circle yield the same trace space, *i.e.* have the same beginning and end points. Each line corresponds to an extension. The natural homology diagram, in which copies of \mathbb{k} corresponding to the same trace spaces have been identified, is depicted below, the arrows being induced by extensions:



Each path of length 3 in the above diagram corresponds to the persistence vector space obtained by taking the persistent homology along one of the maximal traces. All maps from \mathbb{k} to \mathbb{k} depicted in the diagram are identities, the two maps from \mathbb{k} to \mathbb{k}^2 are canonical injection into the first (resp. the

second) component of \mathbb{k}^2 . The map from \mathbb{k}^2 to \mathbb{k} is the sum of the two components of \mathbb{k}^2 .

Comparing the above with the Hasse diagram of the trace poset of the matchbox, it is clear that “glueing” the persistence modules along chains while taking end-points into account relates the uni-dimensional persistence complexes to natural homology. This will be made explicit in the next section.


6 Simultaneous persistence of directed spaces

In this section, we give methods for amalgamating information from persistent homology along traces. We recall constructions in the category of posets which will be useful when using persistent homology along traces to recover natural homology. We will denote by \mathbf{Pos} the category of posets and order preserving maps, and by \mathbf{Pos}_{in} the wide subcategory with order preserving inclusions.

6.1 Colimits of chains in posets

In order to reconstruct natural homology from persistent homology along traces, we must amalgamate information from each chain in the trace poset. For this reason, we discuss here how to construct a poset from its (maximal) chains.

Firstly, notice that in general, using exclusively maximal chains is not enough to reconstruct a poset. Indeed, consider the poset whose Hasse diagram is depicted below:



Its maximal chains are (x, y_1, z) and (x, y_2, z) . In order to obtain the whole poset as a colimit, we additionally need the inclusions of x and z into these chains.

While a poset is in general not the colimit of its maximal chains, it is the colimit of all of its chains. Given a poset P , we consider the thin subcategory \mathbf{Ch}_P of \mathbf{Pos}_{in} consisting of the chains of P and their inclusions, called the

poset of chains. The *diagram of chains* associated to P is the inclusion functor $\mathcal{F}_P : \mathbf{Ch}_P \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}$. The following result is well-known, we include a short proof for completeness:

Proposition 3. *For any poset P ,*

$$\operatorname{colim} \mathcal{F}_P = P.$$

Proof. P is clearly a co-cone for \mathcal{F}_P . Let $(f_C : C \rightarrow Q)_{C \in \mathbf{Ch}_P}$ be another. Define a map $f : P \rightarrow Q$ by $f(x) = f_{\{x\}}(x)$. Then $f|_C = f_C$ for all $C \in \mathbf{Ch}_P$. Indeed, since, for all $x \in C$, $\{x\}$ is a sub-chain of C , we have $f_x(x) = f_C(x)$, so f commutes with all maps of the co-cone. Consider $x, y \in P$ such that $x \leq y$. Then $f(x) = f_{\{x,y\}}(x) \leq f_{\{x,y\}}(y) = f(y)$, meaning that f is a morphism of posets. Given another such morphism of posets $g : P \rightarrow Q$ which commutes with maps of the co-cone, we have $g(x) = f_x(x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in P$ and hence $g = f$. \square

When considering exclusively maximal chains, we may obtain P by adding their intersections to the diagram. Consider a poset P and two maximal chains C_1, C_2 of P . The pullback of C_1, C_2 in \mathbf{Pos} corresponds to the full sub-poset of P given by the intersection $C_1 \cap C_2$, which is also a chain. Denote by \mathbf{pmCh}_P the subcategory of \mathbf{Pos}_{in} consisting of maximal chains in P and their pullbacks. By maximality of the considered chains, this category looks like a zig-zag.

Proposition 4. *A poset P is the colimit of the diagram of its maximal chains $\mathbf{pmCh}_P \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}$.*

Proof. This follows the same schema as the proof of Proposition 3, but with a different map f . Consider again another co-cone $(f_C : C \rightarrow Q)_{C \in \mathbf{Ch}_P}$. Define the map f by sending $x \in P$ to $f_C(x)$ if x is an element of only one maximal chain C , and to $f_{C_1 \cap C_2}(x)$ if $x \in C_1 \cap C_2$. The map f commutes with the co-cone maps and is unique by construction. It is a morphism of posets since if $x \leq y$, then x and y are elements of the same maximal chain(s) and hence $f(x) = f_C(x) \leq f_C(y) = f(y)$ where C is either a maximal chain or the intersection of two maximal chains. \square

6.2 Application to diagrams

Now that we have assembled information on colimits of chains, we will see how these constructions carry over to diagrams over subposets. We fix a category \mathbf{V} .

First, we introduce a category representing persistence objects of a certain type \mathbf{V} , without fixing the indexing poset. Specifically, this category, denoted by $Pers(\mathbf{V})$, has for objects pairs $(P, F : P \rightarrow \mathbf{V})$ where P is a poset (*i.e.* F is a P -persistence object in \mathbf{V}). A morphism from $(P, F : P \rightarrow \mathbf{V})$ to $(Q, G : Q \rightarrow \mathbf{V})$ is a pair (f, σ) where f is a morphism $P \rightarrow Q$ of \mathbf{Pos} and σ is a natural transformation $F \Rightarrow G \circ \phi$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{f} & Q \\ & \searrow F \quad \nearrow \sigma & \\ & \mathbf{V} & \end{array}$$

Composition of morphisms is given by $(g, \tau) \circ (f, \sigma) = (g \circ f, \tau_f \circ \sigma)$, and the identity on (P, F) is the pair $(1_P, id_F)$.

Consider the full sub-category of $\mathbf{opNat}(\mathbf{V})$, as defined in Section 4.2, consisting of natural systems (\mathcal{C}, D) with values in \mathbf{V} such that $F\mathcal{C}$ is a poset. This category naturally embeds in the category of diagrams $Pers(\mathbf{V})$.

Let P be a poset and an inclusion $G : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}_{in}$, where Φ is a category of sub-posets of P and their inclusions such that $\text{colim}_{\Phi} G = P$. Suppose that we are given a functor $D : P \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$, *i.e.* an object of $Pers(\mathbf{V})$. Since the colimit of G is P , for each ϕ in Φ , we have an inclusion $i_{\phi} : \phi \rightarrow P$. Using these inclusions, we define a functor $F : \Phi \rightarrow Pers(\mathbf{V})$, sending each ϕ to the restriction of D to ϕ , denoted by $F_{\phi} := (i_{\phi})^* D$. Given an inclusion $i_{\phi, \phi'} : \phi \rightarrow \phi'$ in Φ , the functor F induces the morphism of persistence objects given by $F_{\phi, \phi'} = (i_{\phi, \phi'}, id_{F_{\phi}})$, where the latter is the identity natural transformation on F_{ϕ} since $F_{\phi'} \circ i_{\phi, \phi'} = F_{\phi}$.

Proposition 5. *Let P , G , D and F be as defined in the above paragraph. We have*

$$\text{colim}_{Pers(\mathbf{V})} F = D.$$

Proof. We show that D satisfies the colimit property. Firstly, it is a co-cone for F since by construction, for any morphism $i_{\phi, \phi'} : \phi \rightarrow \phi'$ of Φ , the following diagram commutes in $Pers(\mathbf{V})$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_{\phi} & \xrightarrow{(i_{\phi, \phi'}, id_{F_{\phi}})} & F_{\phi'} \\ & \searrow (i_{\phi}, id_{F_{\phi}}) \quad \swarrow (i_{\phi'}, id_{F_{\phi'}}) & \\ & D. & \end{array}$$

Now to show that it is universal. Let $\Delta : Q \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ be another co-cone for F , *i.e.* for any $i_{\phi, \phi'} : \phi \rightarrow \phi'$, we have morphisms $F_\phi \rightarrow \Delta$ and $F_{\phi'} \rightarrow \Delta$ in $\text{Pers}(\mathbf{V})$ such that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_\phi & \xrightarrow{(i_{\phi, \phi'}, id_{F_\phi})} & F_{\phi'} \\ & \searrow (\psi_\phi, \tau_\phi) \quad \swarrow (\psi_{\phi'}, \tau_{\phi'}) & \\ & \Delta. & \end{array} \quad (6)$$

In particular, this means that Q is a co-cone for G , since the outer triangle in the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \phi & \xrightarrow{i_{\phi, \phi'}} & \phi' \\ & \searrow i_\phi \quad \swarrow i_{\phi'} & \\ & P & \\ & \searrow \psi_\phi \quad \swarrow \psi_{\phi'} & \\ & Q. & \end{array}$$

In particular, we obtain a unique inclusion of posets $f : P \rightarrow Q$ such that all triangles in the above diagram commute.

Now, we observe that for any $p \in P$, there exist a sub-poset ϕ in Φ and an element $\pi \in \phi$ such that $i_\phi(\pi) = p$. Indeed, if not, the poset obtained by removing p from P would be a co-cone over G , contradicting the assumption that P is its colimit. Given two such distinct sub-posets (ϕ, π) , (ϕ', π') and a morphism $i_{\phi, \phi'}$ between them, the hypothesis that Δ is a co-cone for F implies that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F_\phi(\pi) & \xlongequal{\quad} & D_p & \xlongequal{\quad} & F_{\phi'}(\pi') \\ \tau_\phi(\pi) \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \tau_{\phi'}(\pi') \\ \Delta_{\psi_\phi(\pi)} & \xlongequal{\quad} & \Delta_{f(p)} & \xlongequal{\quad} & \Delta_{\psi_{\phi'}(\pi')} \end{array}$$

meaning that all such components of the τ_ϕ 's must be equal. Indeed, we have

$$\tau_\phi(\pi) = \tau_{\phi'}(i_{\phi, \phi'}(\pi)) \circ id_{F_\phi}(\pi) = \tau_{\phi'}(\pi') \circ 1_{F_\phi}(\pi) = \tau_{\phi'}(\pi'),$$

in which the first equality holds because diagram (6) commutes, the second by definition, and the third because $F_\phi(\pi) = F_{\phi'}(\pi')$. We denote this

morphism of \mathbf{V} by $\sigma_p : D_p \rightarrow \Delta_{f(p)}$. Now, we must show that σ defines a natural transformation between D and $\Delta \circ f$.

Consider $p, p' \in P$ such that p is a lower cover of p' , i.e. $p \leq p'$ and any other element $q \in P$ such that $p \leq q \leq p'$ is equal to either p or p' . For any such pair, there exists a sub-poset ϕ in Φ and elements $\pi \leq \pi'$ such that $i_\phi(\pi) = p$ and $i_\phi(\pi') = p'$. Indeed, if not, the partial order on P defined by $\leq_P \setminus \{(p, p')\}$ would be a co-cone for G .

Given such a sub-poset ϕ and elements π, π' thereof, the diagram below on the left commutes, in which the vertical arrows are those induced by the inequality $\pi \leq \pi'$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_\phi(\pi) & \xrightarrow{\tau_\phi(\pi)} & \Delta_{\psi_\phi(\pi)} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ F_\phi(\pi') & \xrightarrow{\tau_\phi(\pi')} & \Delta_{\psi_\phi(\pi')} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} D_p & \xrightarrow{\sigma_p} & \Delta_{f(p)} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ D_{p'} & \xrightarrow{\sigma_{p'}} & \Delta_{f(p')} \end{array}$$

since τ_ϕ is a natural transformation between F_ϕ and $\Delta \circ \psi_\phi$. The two diagrams above are exactly the same, and thus, since the ordering on P is induced by the covering relation, we conclude that σ is a natural transformation.

To conclude, we have found a morphism $(f, \sigma) : D \rightarrow \Delta$ of $\text{Pers}(\mathbf{V})$ which commutes with the co-cone maps. This morphism is unique since f was obtained by the colimit property of P , and, given any other candidate σ' for the natural transformation, its components would have to coincide with the τ_ϕ on appropriate sub-posets, meaning that it is equal to σ . In other words, D is the universal co-cone for F , thereby concluding the proof. \square

6.3 Natural homology as a colimit

Using Proposition 5 and constructions similar to those explained above, we obtain the following results:


Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{X} = (X, dX)$ be a compact pospace, α a point in X , and \mathbf{Vect} the category of \mathbb{k} -vector spaces.*

1. *The natural homology of \mathcal{X} is the colimit in $\text{Pers}(\mathbf{Vect})$ of the persistent homology along each of its traces.*
2. *The natural homology of \mathcal{X} is the colimit in $\text{Pers}(\mathbf{Vect})$ of the persistent homology of its maximal traces, seen as maximal chains in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$, completed with pullbacks.*


3. The natural homology of the up-set of α , seen as a constant trace, in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is the colimit in $\text{Pers}(\text{Vect})$ of the persistent homologies along the maximal chains passing through α , completed with pullbacks.

Proof. These are direct consequences of Propositions 5 and 3. \square

Example 1. Here we illustrate the above construction in the case of a particular directed graph using the initial point filtration. Consider the following directed acyclic graph G :



This graph contains six maximal discrete traces, considered as words over the labels on the edges. Since we will consider initial point filtrations, we depict below the Hasse diagram of the up-set of the constant trace on i as a subposet of the trace poset:



The bottom-most node in the Hasse diagram corresponds to the constant trace on i , and each of the others corresponds to the trace built from the labels on the arrows in the above diagram, starting at the bottom-most node and ending at the node in question. For example, the circled node corresponds to the (maximal) path $d_1 \cdot s_4 \cdot s_5 \cdot d_2$. All nodes at the same height correspond to

paths with the same beginning- and end-points, the degree of which is noted on the right.

We first consider the initial filtrations associated to the maximal traces

$$\alpha := d_1 \cdot s_4 \cdot s_5 \cdot u_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha' := d_1 \cdot s_4 \cdot s_5 \cdot d_2.$$

The persistence vector space $\vec{H}_0(G)_\alpha$ obtained along α is

$$\mathbb{k} \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}^3 \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}^3 \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}^3 \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}^6,$$

where each of the linear maps are given by the one-step extensions along α and all are injective. The persistence vector space associated to α' is identical, except for the final map $\mathbb{k}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{k}^6$. Indeed, the map induced along α coincides with that induced along α' on two of the basis elements of \mathbb{k}^3 , but have distinct images for the third.

This means that in the colimit, the first three maps will be identified, giving a subdiagram of the form:

$$\mathbb{k} \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}^3 \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}^3 \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}^3 \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array} \mathbb{k}^6,$$

where we have identified the two copies of \mathbb{k}^6 .

Applying similar reasoning to the other maximal paths, the colimit we obtain is given below:


$$\mathbb{k} \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \longrightarrow \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array} \mathbb{k} \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}^2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}^3 \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}^3 \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}^3 \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \longrightarrow \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array} \mathbb{k}^6.$$

We have identified copies of \mathbb{k}^n corresponding to the same end-points in order to visually relate the natural homology diagram to the graph G .

The persistent homology along a path in a directed acyclic graph tells us, at each step, how many parallel paths reach the same point. In this sense, the birth of generators in the persistent homology along a given trace α indicate the existence of a trace which has “merged” with α at that point. Long periods of “sterility”, *i.e.* intervals $[k, k']$ in which no births occur, indicate a portion of the trace which has no parallel paths for that portion. In this sense, such “stagnant” or “sterile” intervals indicate parts of the graph which have only one path connecting them. Furthermore, in the above example, there is only one *source*, *i.e.* , node with only outgoing edges, and one *sink*, *i.e.* , node with only incoming edges. In a finite directed acyclic graph, there

are only finitely many pairs of sources and sinks, and applying the above to each pair yields the natural homology diagram restricted to up-sets, in the trace poset, of sinks.

Example 2. *We are now considering the case of a cube of dimension 3, minus its interior, where we labelled two points, the initial point 0 and the final point 1, as well as the twelve arrows $x, y, z, xy, xz, yx, yz, zx, zy, xyz, yxz$ and zxy :*




We now consider, as in the previous example, the sub-diagram of the natural homology, for traces beginning at the initial state 0.

We start with the first natural homology group: the unidimensional persistent homology value for any filtration of any maximal trace starting at 0 is just \mathbb{k} , and its colimit just identifies all these copies of \mathbb{k} for each prefix of maximal traces that are the same. This colimit is indeed isomorphic to the natural homology in dimension 1 of the cube, which is \mathbb{k} for each trace starting at 0.

We examine now the case of the second natural homology group: the unidimensional persistence diagram for any filtration of any maximal trace starting at 0 is $0 \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ (\mathbb{k} corresponds to the case of a maximal trace from 0 to 1), and its colimit just identifies all these copies of \mathbb{k} for maximal trace, from 0 to 1. This colimit is indeed isomorphic to the natural homology in dimension 2 of the cube, which is 0 for each trace starting at 0 and ending at a point which is not 1, and which is equal to \mathbb{k} for maximal traces, from 0 to 1.

Example 3. *Consider Fahrenberg's matchbox, which is the sub-space of the cube $[0, 1]^3$, where we leave out the interior of the cube, and the bottom face (which is the convex hull of points $(0, 0, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0)$, $(1, 0, 0)$ and $(1, 1, 0)$). We recall from Section 5.5, that the sub-diagram of the natural homology in dimension 1 of Fahrenberg's matchbox example, for traces starting at the*

initial point is:



This can also be obtained by applying Theorem 2 as follows. The unidimensional persistence diagrams for any filtration of any maximal trace starting at the initial state $(0, 0, 0)$ and finishing at the final trace $(1, 1, 1)$ are:

- Either \mathbb{k} , if the trace never intersects the half-open segment going from $(1, 1, 0)$ to $(1, 1, 1)$ (without the last point),
- Or $\mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$, otherwise.

There again, the colimit identifies the copies of \mathbb{k} (resp. \mathbb{k}^2) on equal prefixes of maximal trace, and we recover the diagram above.

7 Further remarks

In this section we discuss two lines of research concerning the persistence homology of trace spaces and its potential application.

7.1 Metric structure on natural homology

An important feature of persistent homology is that it gives information about a space in terms of its metric and not just its topology. We show that the construction of persistent homology bears similarities with the one of natural homology, with particular functors from a factorization category to \mathbf{Top} . One may ask whether, when the directed space X we consider has a metric space structure, if there is a metric structure that can be exploited in the corresponding persistence modules.

In the case of the geometric realization of finite geometric precubical sets without loops, as we saw in Section 4.1, we can define the l_1 -arc length $l_1(p)$ of a directed path p . From this, we can define a distance between

elements of the trace poset, or more precisely, we can see the trace poset as a weighted poset as in [29, 30] as follows: $w(p, q) = 0$ if $p \not\leq q$, otherwise $q = upv$ and $w(p, q) = \max\{l_1(u), l_1(v)\}$. Interleaving distances in such contexts are expressed in terms of translations on posets, that vastly generalize the translations $t \mapsto t + \epsilon$ which define the usual interleaving distance in unidimensional persistence. Here, we will only briefly discuss the classical interleaving distance in unidimensional persistence homology, extracted along a trace of a directed space, that will be induced by translations on the trace poset. The construction of interleaving distances for the full persistence object derived from natural homology is left for future work.

Take two directed spaces \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , geometric realizations of finite geometric precubical sets without loops, p a trace of \mathcal{X} and q a trace of \mathcal{Y} . We also suppose we are given a chain $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$ in the interval $[p(0), p]$, and a chain $(q_i)_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$ in the interval $[q(0), q]$. In what follows, we write p_i (resp. q_i) for the trace going from x_i^p to y_i^p (resp. from x_i^q to y_i^q) and $(\alpha_{i,j}^p, \beta_{i,j}^p)$ (resp. $(\alpha_{i,j}^q, \beta_{i,j}^q)$) for the morphism from p_i to p_j (resp. from q_i to q_j).

We construct by Proposition 2 a persistence \mathbb{k} -vector space $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_i}$ indexed by the chain $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$ and a persistence \mathbb{k} -vector space $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{q_i}$ indexed by the chain $(q_i)_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$. In particular we have linear maps

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{(\alpha_{i,j}^p, \beta_{i,j}^p)} : \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_i} &\rightarrow \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_j} \\ \text{resp. } \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{(\alpha_{i,j}^q, \beta_{i,j}^q)} : \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{q_i} &\rightarrow \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{q_j} \end{aligned}$$

The *interleaving distance* between $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_i}$ and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{q_i}$ is defined as follows. We say that $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_i}$ and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{q_i}$ are ϵ -interleaved, for some $\epsilon \geq 0$, if we have families of linear maps $(\phi_i : \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_i} \rightarrow \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{q_{i+\epsilon}})_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$ and $(\psi_i : \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{q_i} \rightarrow \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_{i+\epsilon}})_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$ such that for all $i \leq j \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\phi_j \circ \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{(\alpha_{i,j}^p, \beta_{i,j}^p)} = \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{(\alpha_{i+\epsilon, j+\epsilon}^q, \beta_{i+\epsilon, j+\epsilon}^q)} \circ \phi_i \quad (7)$$

$$\psi_j \circ \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{(\alpha_{i,j}^q, \beta_{i,j}^q)} = \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{(\alpha_{i+\epsilon, j+\epsilon}^p, \beta_{i+\epsilon, j+\epsilon}^p)} \circ \psi_i \quad (8)$$

$$\psi_{i+\epsilon} \circ \phi_i = \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{(\alpha_{i, i+2\epsilon}^p, \beta_{i, i+2\epsilon}^p)} \quad (9)$$

$$\phi_{i+\epsilon} \circ \psi_i = \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{(\alpha_{i, i+2\epsilon}^q, \beta_{i, i+2\epsilon}^q)} \quad (10)$$

Then the interleaving distance between $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_i}$ and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{q_i}$ is the infimum of all $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_i}$ and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{q_i}$ are ϵ -interleaved, ∞ if there is no such ϵ .

There are similarities and essential differences between bisimulation equivalent natural homologies and having non-infinite interleaving distance, as we show below.

When there exists a dihomeomorphism $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, we know from Lemma 1 that their corresponding natural homologies are bisimulation equivalent, and we now show that there are particular relations between the persistent objects $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_i}$ and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{q_i}$. Then, for any chain $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$ in the interval $[p(0), p]$, for any dipath p in \mathcal{X} , $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_i}$ and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{f^*(p_i)}$ have interleaving distance 0.

Indeed, we take $\phi_t : \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_t} \rightarrow \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{f^*(p_t)}$ to be $[f^*(x)]$, for each $[x] \in \vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{p_t}$, the homology class of path $f^*(x)$, for $[x]$ the homology class of any dipath x from $p_t(0)$ to $p_t(1)$. Equations (9) and (10) are trivially verified since $(f^{-1})^* \circ f^* = f^* \circ (f^{-1})^*$ and the maps $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{(\alpha_{i,i}^p, \beta_{i,i}^p)}$ and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{(\alpha_{i,i}^{f^*(p)}, \beta_{i,i}^{f^*(p)})}$ are identities (since $\alpha_{i,i}^p, \beta_{i,i}^p, \alpha_{i,i}^{f^*(p)}$ and $\beta_{i,i}^{f^*(p)}$ are constant dipaths). Similarly, Equations (7) and (8) are trivially satisfied since the maps $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{(\alpha_{i,i}^p, \beta_{i,i}^p)}$, $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{(\alpha_{i,i}^{f^*(p)}, \beta_{i,i}^{f^*(p)})}$ are identities.

In a similar manner, we may prove that for any chain $(q_i)_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$ in the interval $[q(0), q]$, for any dipath q in \mathcal{Y} , $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{X})_{(f^{-1})^*(q_i)}$ and $\vec{H}_n(\mathcal{Y})_{q_i}$ have interleaving distance 0.

7.2 Algorithmical considerations

In this section, we sketch practical calculations of the persistence module that corresponds, by Theorem 2, to natural homology, in the case of directed spaces arising in concurrency theory, which was the original motivation of this work. It has been shown in e.g. [9] that concurrent languages, such as the shared memory PV language, can be given semantics in pre-cubical sets, hence a directed space. This has been implemented in such software as ALCOOL [31] and oplate [32]. It has been shown that under some hypotheses, validated for such concurrent languages as the PV language, the natural homology computed on pre-cubical sets K , which is the homology of the diagram of trace spaces $\mathfrak{T}(K)(f)$, for all a, b vertex in K_0 , and f dipath from a to b in K_1 , is bisimulation equivalent to the natural homology of the dispace, geometric realization of K , [13].

For finite pre-cubical sets, Raussen [33] and Ziemianski [23] showed that singular homology groups of trace spaces such as $\mathfrak{T}(K)(a, b)$ (which is isomorphic to all $\mathfrak{T}(K)(f)$, f dipath from a to b) are computable, by calculating a finite presentation of the trace spaces (prod-simplicial, simplicial or CW-

complex) from which we can compute homology using Smith normal form of matrices. This has also been implemented in e.g. [34].

For “nice” precubical sets X such as the ones given by the PV language (without loops), and for any vertices a and b in X , there is a way to get a finite combinatorial model $T(X)(a, b)$ (a finite CW-complex, or a finite simplicial set) that is homotopy equivalent to the trace space of X from a to b , $\mathfrak{T}(X)(a, b)$, which is both functorial in X , a , b and also minimal among such functors [23]. Algorithmically, this relies on the cells of the CW-complex being identified with certain combinatorial paths in X , as was exemplified in Section 2. This algorithm allows to construct the (poset) filtration of CW-complexes (or homotopy equivalent simplicial sets) $T(X)(a, b)$ and therefore compute their homology, for each a and b in X . Thus this would algorithmically build the persistence module, or natural homology, of the precubical set X . Of course this is a rather naive algorithm, in that we compute homology separately for each pair of points. We postpone the discussion of non naive algorithms similar to rank invariant computations for a future article.

8 Future work

In [28], we related natural homotopy, a natural system of homotopy groups associated to a dispace, to group objects in a certain category. This was achieved via the notion of composition pairing, introduced by Porter and largely inspired by lax functors. This extra structure of composition pairing is also present in natural homology, and we believe such “homological” operations may have some interesting counterparts in persistent homology, which we are planning on studying in future work.

In hybrid systems theory, there is a natural sheaf theoretic formulation of dynamical systems, starting from [35], put in action (in particular, concerning temporal logic formulas and verification) and extended in [36, 37]. The formalization bears similarities with natural homology for directed spaces, except that it takes a sheaf-theoretic view, leading to contravariant, instead of covariant, functors.

Consider the monoid $(\mathbb{R}_+, +)$, seen as a one-object category \mathbb{R} . Its factorization category $\mathcal{F}\mathbb{R}$ has as objects, intervals $[0, l]$ for $l \in \mathbb{R}$, and as morphisms, inclusions of such intervals into larger intervals $[0, l']$, translated by some value $k \leq l' - l$. Presheaves on $\mathcal{F}\mathbb{R}$ can be endowed with a Grothendieck topology, which is the Johnstone topology [38], so that sheaves correspond to dynamical systems (in some ways, “continuous graphs” described locally by gluings of paths of various lengths, that agree on subpaths).

Therefore, dynamical systems on some metric space X are considered as being particular presheaves, *i.e.* functors $D : \mathcal{F}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, describing, for each length l , the set of paths of length l , and for each inclusion Tr_k of $[0, l]$ into $[0, l']$ as $[k, k + l]$ (with $k \leq l' - l$), a restriction map from the length l' paths to length $l \leq l'$ paths.

Of course, for real continuous dynamical systems, we have an extra structure, which is that the set of paths on X is a topological space, with the compact-open topology (equivalently, uniform convergence). Hence what we really have is a presheaf $D : \mathcal{F}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$, where \mathbf{Top} is a convenient category of topological spaces.

This means that D belongs to a certain ∞ -topos [39], but the point for now is to notice that D gives in particular a filtration of topological spaces from \mathbb{R}_- to \mathbf{Top} , by setting $X_{-l} = D([0, l])$ and maps $X_{-l'} \rightarrow X_{-l}$ when $-l' \leq -l$, that we can choose to be $D(Tr_0 : X_{-l'} \rightarrow X_{-l})$. Hence this filtration looks at a dynamical system on X through, successively, its set of smaller initial paths.

Similarly, taking the additive monoid \mathbb{N} , the same sheaf construction gives the ordinary category of graphs, and the filtration we have been giving starts with the topological space of maximal length in X , and carries on with paths of smaller length.

The persistent homology for these filtrations is an interesting invariant of dynamical systems, and has a metric information induced by the metric on X that we are planning on examining in future work.

9 Declarations

Ethical Approval Not applicable.

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

Authors' contributions The authors have contributed equally to the work reported here. Part of the work was carried out when Cameron Calk was affiliated with LIX, Ecole Polytechnique, and Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1.

Funding No funding.

Availability of data and materials Not applicable.

References

- [1] Carlsson, G.: Topology and data. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **46**(2), 255–308 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0273-0979-09-01249-X>
- [2] Barannikov, S.A.: The framed morse complex and its invariants. In: *Singularities and Bifurcations*, pp. 93–115. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1994)
- [3] Frosini, P., Landi, C.: Size theory as a topological tool for computer vision. *Pattern Recognition and Image Analysis* **9**(4), 596–603 (1999)
- [4] Edelsbrunner, H., Letscher, D., Zomorodian, A.: Topological persistence and simplification. vol. 28, pp. 511–533 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-002-2885-2>
- [5] Goubault, E.: Geometry and concurrency: a user’s guide. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.* **10**(4), 411–425 (2000)
- [6] Goubault, E.: *Géométrie du parallélisme*. PhD thesis, Ecole Polytechnique (1995)
- [7] Herlihy, M., Shavit, N.: The topological structure of asynchronous computability. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* **46**(6), 858–923 (1999)
- [8] Grandis, M.: *Homological Algebra: In Strongly Non-abelian Settings*. World Scientific Publishing Company, Singapore (2013)
- [9] Fajstrup, L., Goubault, E., Haucourt, E., Mimram, S., Raussen, M.: *Directed Algebraic Topology and Concurrency*. Springer, Berlin (2016)
- [10] Herlihy, M., Kozlov, D., Rajsbaum, S.: *Distributed Computing Through Combinatorial Topology*. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam (2013)
- [11] Grandis, M.: *Directed Algebraic Topology, Models of Non-reversible Worlds*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2009)
- [12] Fajstrup, L., Raussen, M., Goubault, E.: Algebraic topology and concurrency. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **357**(1), 241–278 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2006.03.022>

- [13] Dubut, J., Goubault, E., Goubault-Larrecq, J.: Natural homology. In: Automata, Languages, and Programming - 42nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015, Proceedings, Part II, pp. 171–183 (2015)
- [14] Baues, H.-J., Wirsching, G.: Cohomology of small categories. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **38**(2–3), 187–211 (1985). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049\(85\)90008-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049(85)90008-8)
- [15] Goubault, É., Mimram, S., Tasson, C.: Geometric and combinatorial views on asynchronous computability. *Distributed Comput.* **31**(4), 289–316 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00446-018-0328-4>
- [16] Carlsson, G., Zomorodian, A.: The theory of multidimensional persistence. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **42**(1), 71–93 (2009)
- [17] Dubut, J., Goubault, É., Goubault-Larrecq, J.: Directed homology theories and Eilenberg-Steenrod axioms. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 1–33 (2016)
- [18] Curry, J., Mukherjee, S., Turner, K.: How Many Directions Determine a Shape and other Sufficiency Results for Two Topological Transforms (2021)
- [19] Lesnick, M., Wright, M.: Interactive Visualization of 2-D Persistence Modules. preprint, arXiv 1512.00180 (2015)
- [20] Edelsbrunner, H., Harer, J.: Persistent homology—a survey. In: Surveys on Discrete and Computational Geometry. *Contemp. Math.*, vol. 453, pp. 257–282. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1090/conm/453/08802>
- [21] Edelsbrunner, H., Harer, J.L.: Computational Topology. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1090/mbk/069>
- [22] Fahrenberg, U.: Directed Homology. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* **100**, 111–125 (2004)
- [23] Ziemiański, K.: Spaces of directed paths on pre-cubical sets. *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing* **28**, 497–525 (2017)

- [24] Goubault, E., Farber, M., Sagnier, A.: Directed topological complexity. *J Appl. and Comput. Topology* **4**, 11–27 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41468-019-00034-x>
- [25] Zomorodian, A., Carlsson, G.: Computing persistent homology. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **33**(2), 249–274 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-004-1146-y>
- [26] Fahrenberg, U., Raussen, M.: Reparametrizations of continuous paths. *J. Homotopy Relat. Struct.* **2**, 93–117 (2007)
- [27] Goubault, E., Mimram, S.: Directed Homotopy in non-positively curved spaces, 1–55 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS>
- [28] Calk, C., Goubault, E., Malbos, P.: Time-reversal homotopical properties of concurrent systems. *Homology Homotopy Appl.* **22**(2), 31–57 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.4310/hha.2020.v22.n2.a2>
- [29] Botnan, M.B., Curry, J., Munch, E.: A Relative Theory of Interleavings. arXiv 2004.14286 (2020)
- [30] Bubenik, P., de Silva, V., Scott, J.: Metrics for generalized persistence modules. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **15**(6), 1501–1531 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-014-9229-5>
- [31] Bonichon, R., Canet, G., Correnson, L., Goubault, E., Haucourt, E., Hirschowitz, M., Labbé, S., Mimram, S.: Rigorous evidence of freedom from concurrency faults in industrial control software. In: Flammini, F., Bologna, S., Vittorini, V. (eds.) *Computer Safety, Reliability, and Security - 30th International Conference, SAFECOMP 2011, Naples, Italy, September 19-22, 2011. Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 6894, pp. 85–98. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2011)
- [32] Haucourt, E.: Some Invariants of Directed Topology Towards a Theoretical Base for a Static Analyzer Dealing with Fine-Grain Concurrency. *Habilitation à diriger des recherches*, Université Paris 7 - Denis Diderot (September 2016). <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-01429492>
- [33] Raussen, M.: Simplicial models for trace spaces II: General higher dimensional automata. *Algebraic and Geometric Topology* **12**(3), 1741–1762 (2012)

- [34] Fajstrup, L., Goubault, E., Haucourt, E., Mimram, S., Raußen, M.: Trace spaces: An efficient new technique for state-space reduction. In: Seidl, H. (ed.) Programming Languages and Systems - 21st European Symposium on Programming. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7211, pp. 274–294. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2012)
- [35] Lawvere, F.W.: State Categories and Response Functors. preprint (1986). <https://github.com/mattearnshaw/lawvere/blob/master/pdfs/1986-state-categories-and-response-functors.pdf>
- [36] Schultz, P., Spivak, D.I., Vasilakopoulou, C.: Dynamical systems and sheaves (2019) arXiv:1609.08086 [math.CT]
- [37] Schultz, P., Spivak, D.I.: Temporal type theory **29**, 235 (2019). A topos-theoretic approach to systems and behavior
- [38] Johnstone, P.: A note on discrete conduché fibrations. Theory and Applications of Categories **5**(1), 1–11 (1999)
- [39] Lurie, J.: Higher Topos Theory (AM-170). Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, Princeton, USA (2009)