

DECOMPOSING ZERO-DIMENSIONAL PERSISTENT HOMOLOGY OVER ROOTED TREE QUIVERS

RIJU BINDUA, THOMAS BRÜSTLE, AND LUIS SCOCCOLA

ABSTRACT. Given a functor from any category into the category of topological spaces, one obtains a linear representation of the category by post-composing the given functor with a homology functor with field coefficients. This construction is fundamental in persistence theory, where it is known as persistent homology, and where the category is typically a poset. Persistence theory is particularly successful when the poset is a finite linearly ordered set, owing to the fact that in this case its category of representations is of finite type. We show that when the poset is a rooted tree poset (a poset with a maximum and whose Hasse diagram is a tree) the additive closure of the category of representations obtainable as zero-dimensional persistent homology is of finite type, and give a quadratic-time algorithm for decomposition into indecomposables. In doing this, we give an algebraic characterization of the additive closure in terms of Ringel’s tree modules, and show that its indecomposable objects are the reduced representations of Kinser.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Context. Let P be a rooted tree poset. We study the category $\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(P)$ of those linear representations of P that are in the essential image of the zero-dimensional persistent homology functor $H_0 : \mathbf{top}^P \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(P)$, where \mathbf{top} is the category of topological spaces with finitely many path-connected components (equivalently, we study representations of P that come from linearizing functors $P \rightarrow \mathbf{set}$).

We now give context and briefly discuss our results; we detail our contributions in the next section. For some of the main notions involved in this paper, see Table 1.

Poset representations in applied topology. Geometric data can be studied using tools from algebraic topology, notably homology [15]. Given a geometric dataset, various constructions from topological data analysis can be used to build a nested family of topological spaces $K_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq K_n$, called a *filtration*, which encodes the topology of the dataset. By applying homology with field coefficients to this sequence, one obtains a representation of a quiver of type A_n , called the *persistent homology* of the filtration. This representation can be effectively decomposed into indecomposable summands, thanks in part to the fact that A_n has finite representation type. Each of the indecomposable summands can be interpreted as a topological feature of the data, enabling the incorporation of topological information in statistical and machine learning applications [16, 9]. More recently, this collection of ideas, now known as persistence theory [21], has also found theoretical applications in geometry and analysis [26, 22, 6].

If P is any partially ordered set, a P -filtration is a collection of topological spaces $\{K_p\}_{p \in P}$ such that $K_p \subseteq K_q$ whenever $p \leq q \in P$. For example, the filtrations in the previous paragraph are P -filtrations for $P = \{1 < \dots < n\}$. The persistent homology of a P -filtration is a representation of the indexing poset P (that is a functor $P \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$), and we denote the category of such representations by $\mathbf{rep}(P)$.

Applications of topology to time-dependent, noisy, or otherwise parametrized data, motivate developing a persistence theory for filtrations indexed by non-linear posets [4]. The first issue encountered is that non-linear posets are typically not of finite representation type [20], and usually of wild representation type. This means that a classification of the indecomposable objects of $\mathbf{rep}(P)$ is generally infeasible, which in turn implies that directly using the indecomposable decomposition of a certain representation as a statistic is hard or impossible.



FIGURE 1. A rooted tree can be seen both as a poset and as a quiver. *Left.* The Hasse diagram of a rooted tree poset P . *Right.* The corresponding rooted tree quiver Q_P . The categories of representations are equivalent $\mathbf{rep}(P) \simeq \mathbf{rep}(Q_P)$ (Lemma 2.8).

Zero-dimensional persistent homology. In several applications, notably clustering [8, 7, 25], the most relevant homological degree is zero. Since the zero-dimensional homology of a topological space is conceptually and computationally simpler than higher dimensional homology, it seems plausible that the category $\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(P)$ of representations of P that can be obtained as the zero-dimensional persistent homology $H_0(X)$ of a P -filtration X is simpler than the full category of representations $\mathbf{rep}(P)$. Note that, for any higher homological degree $i > 0$, it is known that the analogous category $\mathbf{rep}_{H_i}(P)$ is equivalent to the whole category of representations $\mathbf{rep}(P)$ (see [5, Section 4]), when P is a finite poset and homology has prime-field coefficients.

With this motivation, the authors of [3] consider the image of zero-dimensional persistent homology for $P = \{1 < \dots < m\} \times \{1 < \dots < n\}$, a Cartesian product of two finite linear orders. Since common filtrations in topological data analysis have the property that the horizontal morphisms of their zero-dimensional persistent homology are epimorphisms, they focus on the subcategory $\mathbf{rep}^{e,*}(P) \subseteq \mathbf{rep}(P)$ of representations with the property that the horizontal structure morphisms are epimorphic. Their main conclusion [3, Corollary 1.6] says that, except when P belongs to a finite set of small grids, the category $\mathbf{rep}^{e,*}(P)$ is still of wild type. Nevertheless, they observe that $\mathbf{rep}^{e,*}(P) \not\subseteq \mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(P)$ in general, and ask whether more can be said about representations in the image of H_0 . In this work, we conduct such a study in the case where P is a rooted tree poset (see Fig. 1 and Section 2.2).

We show in particular that for a rooted tree poset P , the category $\mathbf{add}(\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(P))$ is of finite type (Corollary C). This is interesting for two reasons: even for a rooted tree poset P , the category $\mathbf{rep}(P)$ is usually of wild type (e.g., when P is a six-element poset with five incomparable elements all smaller than the sixth one), and $\mathbf{add}(\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(P))$ can be of infinite type when P is the opposite of a rooted tree poset (e.g., when P is a five-element poset, with four incomparable elements all larger than the fifth element [5, Example 5.13]).

Ringel's tree modules and Kinser's reduced representations. Representations of a rooted tree poset can equivalently be seen as representations of a *rooted tree quiver* Q (see Fig. 1 and Lemma 2.8). In this paper, we take the point of view of quivers rather than that of posets, since this has some technical advantages, and since it connects more readily with work of Ringel [23] and of Kinser [18], which we now present.

A representation of a quiver Q is a *tree module* [23] if there exists a basis for the representation such that the coefficient quiver of the representation with respect to this basis (Definition 2.22) is a tree quiver. This implies, for example, that tree modules admit a basis for which all of their structure morphisms have only 0 and 1 in their matrix representation.

For Q a rooted tree quiver, Theorem A(2) says that representations in $\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(Q)$ are direct sums of tree modules, and in fact of *rooted tree modules* (i.e., representations admitting a basis for which the coefficient quiver is a rooted tree quiver). In order to prove that $\mathbf{add}(\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(Q))$ is of finite type, we show in Theorem B that any rooted tree module over a rooted tree quiver decomposes as a direct sum of *reduced rooted tree modules* (Definition 2.25), which are certain representations of rooted tree quivers defined inductively, and introduced by Kinser [18] for the study of the representation ring of rooted tree quivers.

The elder rule for rooted tree modules over rooted tree quivers. The decomposition algorithms we introduce in Theorem D make use of a generalization of the *elder rule*, a concept

from persistence theory [13, pp. 188], key in efficiently decomposing zero-dimensional persistent homology over linearly ordered sets, and revisited in different contexts such as [10, Theorem 3.10], [7, Theorem 4.4], and [25, Lemma 117].

The version of the elder rule relevant in our setup is our Proposition 4.3, which makes use of a partial preorder on the collection of rooted tree modules over a rooted tree quiver (Definition 2.14), which is a slight generalization of an order introduced by Kinser [18] for different purposes. See also [17, Lemma 1] for another, related, algebraic incarnation of the elder rule.

1.2. Contributions. Recall that any finite quiver Q has an associated path category (Definition 3.1), which we also denote by Q , and that there is a canonical equivalence of categories between $\mathbf{rep}(Q)$, the category of finite dimensional representations of Q over some field \mathbb{k} , and \mathbf{vec}^Q , the category of functors from the path category of Q to the category of finite dimensional \mathbb{k} -vector spaces. Post-composition with $H_0 : \mathbf{top} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ gives the *zero-dimensional persistent homology* functor $H_0 : \mathbf{top}^Q \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$. Let $\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(Q) \subseteq \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ denote the essential image of the zero-dimensional persistent homology functor, that is the collection of representations of Q that can be obtained, up to isomorphism, as the zero-dimensional persistent homology of a functor $Q \rightarrow \mathbf{top}$.

A *rooted tree quiver* (T, f_T) over a rooted tree quiver Q consists of a rooted tree quiver T together with a root-preserving quiver morphism $f_T : T \rightarrow Q$. One of the contributions of this paper is to give an inductive description of rooted tree quivers and of rooted tree quivers over a rooted tree quiver (Section 2.5). Any such rooted tree quiver over Q can be *linearized* by pushing forward the constant representation of T along f_T (Definition 2.17) to obtain a representation $\mathbb{k}_T \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$.

Our first main result gives an algebraic characterization of the essential image of the zero-dimensional persistent homology functor over rooted tree quivers, and of the additive closure of the essential image (recall that the additive closure of a collection of objects is formed by taking all direct sums of all direct summands of the objects in the collection).

Theorem A. *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver. Then*

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(Q) = \left\{ \text{finite direct sums of linearized rooted tree quivers over } Q \right\}$$

$$(2) \quad \text{add}(\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(Q)) = \left\{ \text{finite direct sums of rooted tree modules over } Q \right\}$$

where the notation on the right-hand side of the equations denotes the corresponding subcategory of $\mathbf{rep}(Q)$ spanned by objects isomorphic to those specified.

The second main result, together with Kinser's work [18], implies that, when Q is a rooted tree quiver, the category $\text{add}(\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(Q))$ is of finite type, and the indecomposables are the reduced rooted tree modules. Reduced rooted tree modules were introduced in [18] under the name of "reduced representations", and they are linearizations of so-called reduced rooted trees over (subtrees of) Q ; the original definition of these objects is slightly involved, but see Proposition 4.2, which characterizes them as those admitting a unique endomorphism.

Theorem B. *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver. Every rooted tree module over Q decomposes as a direct sum of reduced rooted tree modules over Q .*

Corollary C. *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver. The category $\text{add}(\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(Q))$ is of finite type, and the indecomposables are the reduced rooted tree modules over Q .*

The third main contribution consists of algorithms for the effective decomposition of rooted tree modules over rooted tree quivers.

Theorem D. *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver.*

- (1) *Given T , a rooted tree quiver over Q , Algorithm 1 returns the summands in the indecomposable decomposition of $\mathbb{k}_T \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ in $O(|T|^2)$ time.*
- (2) *Given (G, f) a Q -filtered graph, Algorithm 2 returns the summands in the indecomposable decomposition of $H_0(f) \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ in $O(|G|^2)$ time.*

We conclude the paper by describing in Section 6 how our results can be used to study morphisms between merge trees, as well as the zero-dimensional persistent homology of two-parameter filtrations.

Rooted tree poset (a type of poset)	Sec. 2.5
Rooted tree quiver (a type of quiver)	Sec. 2.1
Rooted tree quiver over a rooted tree quiver Q (a type of quiver morphism $T \rightarrow Q$)	Sec. 2.4
Linearized rooted tree quiver over a rooted tree quiver Q (a type of representation of Q)	Def. 2.17
Rooted tree module over a quiver Q (a type of representation of Q)	Def. 2.23
Reduced rooted tree quiver over a rooted tree quiver Q (a type of quiver morphism $T \rightarrow Q$)	Def. 2.15
Reduced rooted tree module over a rooted tree quiver Q (a type of representation of Q)	Def. 2.25
Order \leq_Q (an order on vertices of a tree quiver Q)	Def. 2.1
Preorder \leq_Q (a preorder on rooted tree quivers over a rooted tree quiver Q)	Def. 2.14

TABLE 1. Table of main notions.

2. BACKGROUND

Throughout this article we fix a field \mathbb{k} , all vector spaces are taken to be \mathbb{k} -vector spaces, and we let \mathbf{vec} denote the category of finite dimensional \mathbb{k} -vector spaces. All quivers are assumed to be finite, and all representations are assumed to be finite dimensional. We assume familiarity with basic category theory.

2.1. Quivers, tree quivers, and rooted tree quivers. A (finite) quiver $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t)$ consists of a finite vertex set Q_0 and a finite edge set Q_1 , together with two functions $s, t : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$, called *source map* and *target map* respectively. Note that a quiver is equivalently a directed graph possibly with loops and multi-edges.

A quiver is a *tree quiver* if its underlying graph, when seen as undirected graph, is a tree (i.e., it is connected and without cycles). A *rooted tree quiver* is a tree quiver Q with exactly one vertex $\sigma \in Q_0$ with out-degree zero. The vertex σ is called the *root* of Q . We sometimes denote a rooted tree Q with root σ by (Q, σ) .

The one-vertex and no-edge quiver is a rooted tree quiver, which we denote by $*$.

2.2. Tree quivers and tree posets. The proofs in this subsection are straightforward exercises, and are hence omitted.

Reachability through a directed path defines, for every tree quiver Q , a partial order \leq_Q on Q_0 , which we now describe¹.

Definition 2.1. Let Q be a quiver and let $x, y \in Q_0$. A *directed path* from x to y in Q is a (possibly empty) list L of edges of Q such that, if L is empty, then $x = y$, and if $L = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k\}$, then $s(\alpha_1) = x$, $t(\alpha_k) = y$, and $t(\alpha_i) = s(\alpha_{i+1})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$. If Q is a tree quiver, let $x \leq_Q y$ if and only if there exists a directed path from x to y .

All principal downsets of a rooted tree quiver form themselves a rooted tree quiver, in the following sense.

Definition 2.2. If Q is a tree quiver (or, more generally, a disjoint union of tree quivers), and $x \in Q_0$, let $Q_{\leq x}$ denote the subquiver of Q spanned by vertices $y \in Q_0$ such that $y \leq_Q x$. The quiver $Q_{\leq x}$ is a rooted tree quiver, with root x .

Lemma 2.3. A tree quiver Q is a rooted tree quiver precisely when the poset (Q_0, \leq_Q) has a unique maximal element (which is necessarily equal to the root of Q). Moreover, if Q is a rooted tree quiver, the poset (Q_0, \leq_Q) is a join-semilattice (a.k.a. upper semilattice), that is for all $x, y \in Q_0$, the join $x \vee y$ (i.e., greatest lower bound) of $\{x, y\}$ exists (and is thus unique). \square

Lemma 2.4. If (Q, σ) is a rooted tree quiver and $x \neq \sigma \in Q_0$, then x has a unique cover in the order \leq_Q . \square

Definition 2.5. If (Q, σ) is a rooted tree quiver and $x \neq \sigma \in Q_0$, we denote the unique cover of x in the order \leq_Q by $\text{succ}(x)$ and refer to it as the *successor* of x . The set of predecessors of x is $\text{pred}(x) = \{y \in Q_0 \setminus \{\sigma\} : \text{succ}(y) = x\}$.

Definition 2.6. A *tree poset* is a poset whose Hasse diagram is a tree. A *rooted tree poset* is a tree poset with a maximum.

¹For readers familiar with [18], we mention that this order is the opposite of the one used in [18].

Given a tree poset P we construct a quiver Q_P as follows. As vertices we put the elements of the underlying set of P , and for every pair $x, y \in P$ such that y covers x , we put an edge $x \rightarrow y$.

Lemma 2.7. *If Q is a (rooted) tree quiver, then (Q_0, \leq_Q) is a (rooted) tree poset. If P is a (rooted) tree poset, then Q_P is a (rooted) tree quiver. \square*

2.3. Quiver representations. Let $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t)$ be a quiver. A (finite dimensional) representation V of Q consists of a vector space V_x for each vertex $x \in Q_0$, and a linear morphism $V_\alpha : V_{s(\alpha)} \rightarrow V_{t(\alpha)}$ for each edge $\alpha \in Q_1$. If V and W are representations of Q , a morphism $f : V \rightarrow W$ consists of a morphism $f_x : V_x \rightarrow W_x$ for every $x \in Q_0$, with the property that $W_\alpha \circ f_{s(\alpha)} = f_{t(\alpha)} \circ V_\alpha$. Representations over Q together with morphisms between them form the category of representations of Q denoted $\mathbf{rep}(Q)$.

The zero representation, denoted $\mathbb{0}$, is the (unique) representation with $\mathbb{0}_x = 0$ for every $x \in Q_0$. The constant representation, denoted $\mathbb{1}_Q \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$, is the representation such that $(\mathbb{1}_Q)_x = \mathbb{k}$ for every $x \in Q_0$, and $(\mathbb{1}_Q)_\alpha$ is the identity map $\mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ for every $\alpha \in Q_1$.

The category $\mathbf{rep}(Q)$ is an additive category [12, Section 1.2]. As in any additive category, a representation is said to be *indecomposable* if it is not the zero representation, and it is also not isomorphic to the direct sum of two non-zero representations. The category $\mathbf{rep}(Q)$ is Krull–Schmidt [12, Theorem 1.7.4], in the sense that every representation $V \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ is a finite direct sum of indecomposable representations, and these indecomposables are unique up to isomorphism.

The next result allows us to switch from posets to quivers when studying representations of rooted tree posets.

Lemma 2.8. *If P is a tree poset, the category of functors $P \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ is equivalent to the category $\mathbf{rep}(Q_P)$.*

Proof. The proof is a routine check, so let us only outline the steps involved. Given a functor $F : P \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$, we define a representation V of Q_P as follows. We let $V_x = F(x)$ for every $x \in P$. Now, by construction, each edge (x, y) in Q_P corresponds to a pair $x, y \in P$ such that y covers x , so we define $V_{(x,y)} = F(x \leq y) : V_x \rightarrow V_y$. This induces a functor $\mathbf{vec}^P \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q_P)$.

Similarly, given a representation $V \in \mathbf{rep}(Q_P)$, we define a functor $F : P \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ as follows. We let $F(x) = V_x$ for every $x \in P$. If $x \leq y \in P$, let $x_1, \dots, x_k \in P$ be such that $x_1 = x$, $x_k = y$, and x_{i+1} covers x_i . Then, define $F(x \leq y) = V_{(x_{k-1}, x_k)} \circ \dots \circ V_{(x_1, x_2)} : F(x) \rightarrow F(y)$. To check that F is indeed a functor, one uses the fact that Q_P is a tree quiver, so that there exists a unique directed path from x to y in Q_P . This induces a functor $\mathbf{rep}(Q_P) \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}^P$.

Finally, one checks that the two functors we have defined are inverse equivalences of categories. \square

2.4. Categories of quivers. A quiver morphism $f : Q \rightarrow Q'$ from a quiver $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t)$ to a quiver $Q' = (Q'_0, Q'_1, s', t')$ consists of functions $f_0 : Q_0 \rightarrow Q'_0$ and $f_1 : Q_1 \rightarrow Q'_1$ that respect source and target, in the sense that $s' \circ f_1 = f_0 \circ s$ and $t' \circ f_1 = f_0 \circ t$. Quivers and quiver morphisms form a category that we denote by \mathbf{quiv} .

A *rooted tree quiver morphism* is a quiver morphism $f : Q \rightarrow Q'$, where (Q, σ) and (Q', σ') are rooted tree quivers, such that $f_0(\sigma) = \sigma'$. Rooted tree quivers and rooted tree quiver morphisms form a (not full) subcategory $\mathbf{rtree} \subseteq \mathbf{quiv}$. Note that the one-vertex rooted tree quiver $*$ is initial in \mathbf{rtree} , in the sense that there exists a unique rooted tree quiver morphism $u_* : * \rightarrow Q$ for every rooted tree quiver Q .

If Q is a rooted tree quiver, we can consider the slice category $\mathbf{rtree}/_Q$, which has as objects the rooted tree quiver morphisms $f : T \rightarrow Q$, and as morphisms from $f : T \rightarrow Q$ to $f' : T' \rightarrow Q$ the set of morphisms $g : T \rightarrow T'$ such that $f \circ g = f'$. We refer to any object of $\mathbf{rtree}/_Q$ as a *rooted tree quiver over Q* . Then, $\mathbf{rtree}/_Q$ is naturally a full subcategory of the slice category $\mathbf{quiv}/_Q$.

By a standard abuse of notation, we sometimes denote an object $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ of a slice category simply as T .




FIGURE 2. A rooted tree quiver T over a rooted tree quiver Q and its corresponding representation $k_T \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$. *Left.* An illustration of $T \rightarrow Q$ given by labeling the vertices of Q with distinct letters, and labeling the vertices of T with the label of their image. *Center.* Another illustration of $T \rightarrow Q$, as well as its construction as an inductive rooted tree quiver over an inductive rooted tree quiver. *Right.* The linearization $k_T \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$.

2.5. Inductive description of rooted tree quivers. We start by giving an inductive definition of rooted tree quivers.

Definition 2.9. An *inductive rooted tree quiver* is:

- (Base case) either the quiver $*$ with one vertex and no edges;
- (Ind. case) or a quiver of the form $\mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$, where Q_1, \dots, Q_k are inductive rooted tree quivers, and where $\mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$ is constructed by first taking the disjoint union of Q_1, \dots, Q_k , then adjoining a new vertex σ , and adding a single edge from the root of Q_i to σ , for each $1 \leq i \leq k$.

See Fig. 2 for an illustration. We refer to the operation \mathcal{G} as the *gluing* operation.

Lemma 2.10. Every object of \mathbf{rtree} is isomorphic to an inductive rooted tree quiver.

Proof. Let $Q \in \mathbf{rtree}$. This is proven by induction on the number of vertices in Q . If Q has a unique vertex, then it is isomorphic to the inductive rooted tree quiver with a single vertex. If Q has more than one vertex, by removing the root and all adjacent edges from Q , one obtains a disjoint union of rooted tree quivers Q_1, \dots, Q_k , which by inductive hypothesis, must be isomorphic to inductive rooted tree quivers Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k , respectively. Then, Q is isomorphic to $\mathcal{G}(Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k)$. \square

Thanks to Lemma 2.10, when it is convenient, we can (and do) assume that rooted tree quivers are constructed inductively using the \mathcal{G} operation of the result.

Rooted tree quivers over a rooted tree quiver Q can also be defined inductively, as follows.

Definition 2.11. Let (Q, σ) be an inductive rooted tree quiver. An *inductive rooted tree quiver over Q* is a pair $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ such that:

- (Base case) either $T = *$ and $f_T = u_* : * \rightarrow Q$;
- (Ind. case) or $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$, $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, and $f = \mathcal{G}(f_1^\bullet, \dots, f_k^\bullet)$, where, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, we have that $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{\ell_i}\}$ is a (possibly empty) list of rooted tree quivers, and $f_i^\bullet = \{f_i^1 : T_i^1 \rightarrow Q_i, \dots, f_i^{\ell_i} : T_i^{\ell_i} \rightarrow Q_i\}$ is a (possibly empty) list of rooted tree quiver morphisms. The rooted tree quiver T is constructed using the same operation \mathcal{G} as in Definition 2.9, that is

$$\mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet) := \mathcal{G}(T_1^1, \dots, T_1^{\ell_1}, \dots, T_k^1, \dots, T_k^{\ell_k}),$$

resulting in a rooted tree quiver with root τ . The morphism $\mathcal{G}(f_1^\bullet, \dots, f_k^\bullet)$ is uniquely characterized by mapping τ to σ , and by coinciding with f_i^j when restricted to T_i^j for every $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$.

See Fig. 2 for an illustration. In this case, we also refer to the operation \mathcal{G} as the *gluing* operation.

Lemma 2.12. *Let Q be an inductive rooted tree quiver. Every object of $\mathbf{rtree}/_Q$ is isomorphic to an inductive rooted tree quiver over Q .*

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction on Q and on the number of vertices of T , and is very similar to that of Lemma 2.10. If T has a single vertex, then $(T, f : T \rightarrow Q)$ is isomorphic to $(*, u_* : * \rightarrow Q)$. Otherwise, $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$. Let $T \setminus \tau$ be obtained by removing the root and all adjacent edges from T . It is straightforward to see that, for each connected component C of $T \setminus \tau$, the restriction $f|_C : C \rightarrow Q$ factors as a rooted tree quiver morphism $f_C : C \rightarrow Q_{i_C}$, for some $1 \leq i_C \leq k$, followed by the inclusion $Q_{i_C} \rightarrow Q$, and that the gluing of the rooted tree quivers $(C, f_C : C \rightarrow Q_{i_C})$ for all C is isomorphic to $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$. By inductive hypothesis, each rooted tree quiver $(C, f_C : C \rightarrow Q_{i_C})$ is isomorphic to an inductive rooted tree quiver, so $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ is isomorphic to an inductive rooted tree quiver over Q . \square

We can use induction to give a useful characterization of morphisms in $\mathbf{rtree}/_Q$.

Lemma 2.13. *Let Q be an inductive rooted tree quiver and let $(S, f_S : S \rightarrow Q)$ and $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ be inductive rooted tree quivers over Q . Then we are in one of the following three cases:*

- (1) *If $T = *$ but $S \neq *$, then $\mathbf{hom}_{\mathbf{rtree}/_Q}(S, T) = \emptyset$.*
- (2) *If $S = *$, then $\mathbf{hom}_{\mathbf{rtree}/_Q}(S, T) = \{u_* : * \rightarrow T\}$.*
- (3) *Otherwise, let $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$, $S = \mathcal{G}(S_1^\bullet, \dots, S_k^\bullet)$, and $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $S_i^\bullet = \{S_i^1, \dots, S_i^{\ell_i}\}$ and $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{m_i}\}$. Then $\mathbf{hom}_{\mathbf{rtree}/_Q}(S, T)$ is in bijection with the set of pairs (ν, g) , where ν is a function taking as input $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$, and returning $1 \leq \nu(i, j) \leq m_i$; and g is a function taking as input $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$, and returning a morphism $g_i^j \in \mathbf{hom}_{\mathbf{rtree}/_{Q_i}}(S_i^j, T_i^{\nu(i, j)})$.*

The bijection in (3) is given as follows. Given a morphism $g : S \rightarrow T$ in $\mathbf{rtree}/_Q$, restrict it to S minus its root to get, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$ and every $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$, an index $1 \leq \nu(i, j) \leq m_i$ and a morphism $g_i^j : S_i^j \rightarrow T_i^{\nu(i, j)}$.

In particular, in case (3) we get the following recursive formula for counting morphisms in $\mathbf{rtree}/_Q$:

$$|\mathbf{hom}_{\mathbf{rtree}/_Q}(S, T)| = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \sum_{n=1}^{m_i} |\mathbf{hom}_{\mathbf{rtree}/_{Q_i}}(S_i^j, T_i^n)|.$$

Proof. The cases (1) and (2) are straightforward. For case (3), note that, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$, the quiver S_i^j is connected, so its image under g must lie entirely in T_i^n for some $1 \leq n \leq m_i$; so that we can only have $\nu(i, j) = n$. This shows that the bijection described in the statement is a well-defined function. The fact that it is a bijection is a routine check. The formula then follows directly from (3). \square

2.6. The preorder on rooted tree quivers over a rooted tree quiver. Let Q be a rooted tree quiver. We now define a preorder on the (isomorphism classes of) objects of $\mathbf{rtree}/_Q$. This is a generalization of an order introduced by Kinser only on a certain subset of the rooted tree quivers over Q (the reduced ones, defined below). Since the definition is isomorphism invariant, we assume that all rooted tree quivers involved are inductive, thanks to Lemmas 2.10 and 2.12.

Definition 2.14. Let S and T be rooted tree quivers over Q . Let $S \preceq_Q T$ if and only if:

- (Base case) either $S = *$;
- (Ind. case) or the following holds. We have $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$, $S = \mathcal{G}(S_1^\bullet, \dots, S_k^\bullet)$, $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $S_i^\bullet = \{S_i^1, \dots, S_i^{\ell_i}\}$ and $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{m_i}\}$, and for every $1 \leq i \leq k$ and every $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$, there exists $1 \leq n \leq m_i$ such that $S_i^j \preceq_{Q_i} T_i^n$.

We now define the reduced rooted tree quivers over a rooted tree quiver, originally introduced by Kinser. Since this notion is isomorphism-invariant, we again use Lemmas 2.10 and 2.12 and only consider inductive rooted tree quivers.

Definition 2.15 (cf. [18, Definition 7]). A rooted tree quiver T over a rooted tree quiver Q is *reduced* if:

(Base case) either $T = *$;

(Ind. case) or the following holds. We have $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$, $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{\ell_i}\}$ a (possibly empty) list of reduced rooted tree quivers over Q_i for every $1 \leq i \leq k$. And, moreover, for every $1 \leq i \leq k$ and every $1 \leq j, j' \leq \ell_i$, if $j \neq j'$, the rooted tree quivers T_i^j and $T_i^{j'}$ over Q_i are incomparable with respect to \leq_{Q_i} .

2.7. Linearization of rooted tree quivers over a rooted tree quiver. Any quiver morphism $f : Q' \rightarrow Q$ induces a *push-forward* functor $f_* : \mathbf{rep}(Q') \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$, where $f_*(V)$ is obtained as follows for each vertex $x \in Q$ and every arrow $\alpha \in Q$:

$$f_*(V)_x = \bigoplus_{y \in f_0^{-1}(x)} V_y \quad f_*(V)_\alpha = \sum_{\beta \in f_1^{-1}(\alpha)} V_\beta$$

Definition 2.16. Let Q be a quiver and let $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ be a quiver over Q . The *linearization* of T , denoted $\mathbb{k}_T \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$, is defined by $\mathbb{k}_T := (f_T)_*(\mathbb{1}_{Q'})$, the push-forward by f_T of the constant representation $\mathbb{1}_{Q'} \in \mathbf{rep}(Q')$.

See Fig. 2 for an example.

Definition 2.17. Let Q be a rooted tree quiver. A *linearized rooted tree quiver* over Q is any representation of Q isomorphic to \mathbb{k}_T for $T \rightarrow Q$ a rooted tree quiver over Q .

If Q is a rooted tree quiver, linearization of rooted tree quivers over Q can be extended to a functor $\mathbf{rtree}/_Q \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$. In order to describe this, we first introduce a gluing construction for representations of rooted tree quivers; this is a particular case of the construction in [24, Section 2]. In this case too, we refer to the operation \mathcal{G} as the *gluing* operation.

Definition 2.18. Let $(Q_1, \sigma_1), \dots, (Q_k, \sigma_k)$ be rooted tree quivers.

- Let $M_1^\bullet, \dots, M_k^\bullet$ be (possibly empty) lists such that $M_i^\bullet = \{M_i^1, \dots, M_i^{\ell_i}\}$ is a list of representations of Q_i , with the property that they take the value \mathbb{k} at the root of Q_i . Define a representation $M = \mathcal{G}(M_1^\bullet, \dots, M_k^\bullet)$ of $(Q, \sigma) = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$ as follows: $M(\sigma) = \mathbb{k}$, $M|_{Q_i} = \bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq \ell_i} M_i^j$, and the structure morphism $M_i^j(\sigma_i) \rightarrow M(\sigma)$ is the identity $\mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.
- Moreover, let $N_1^\bullet, \dots, N_n^\bullet$ be (possibly empty) lists such that $N_i^\bullet = \{N_i^1, \dots, N_i^{m_i}\}$ is a list of representations of Q_i , with the property that they take the value \mathbb{k} at the root of Q_i . Let us also be given a list of morphisms $\{g_1, \dots, g_k\}$ such that

$$g_i : \bigoplus_{1 \leq a \leq m_i} N_i^a \rightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \leq b \leq \ell_i} M_i^b.$$

Define $\mathcal{G}(g_1, \dots, g_k) : \mathcal{G}(N_1^\bullet, \dots, N_k^\bullet) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_1^\bullet, \dots, M_k^\bullet)$ as the only morphism that restricts to $\sum g_i$ on Q minus the root.

The following result says that gluing rooted tree quivers and then linearizing is the same as linearizing and then gluing. The proof is straightforward.

Lemma 2.19. Let $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$ and $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{\ell_i}\}$. Define $M_i^\bullet = \{\mathbb{k}_{T_i^1}, \dots, \mathbb{k}_{T_i^{\ell_i}}\}$. Then, $\mathbb{k}_T \cong \mathcal{G}(M_1^\bullet, \dots, M_k^\bullet)$. \square

As is usual, in the next definition we assume that all rooted tree quivers are inductive.

Definition 2.20. The *linearization functor* $\mathcal{L} : \mathbf{rtree}/_Q \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ is defined on objects inductively, as follows

- Let $\mathcal{L}(*)$ be the representation of Q that is \mathbb{k} at the root and zero elsewhere.

- Let $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$, and $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{\ell_i}\}$. Define

$$\mathcal{L}(T) = \mathcal{G} \left(\bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq \ell_1} \mathcal{L}(T_1^j), \dots, \bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq \ell_k} \mathcal{L}(T_k^j) \right),$$

where we used the inductive hypothesis and the gluing operation for representations.

The functor \mathcal{L} is defined on a morphism $g : S \rightarrow T$ of \mathbf{rtree}/Q also inductively:

- If $S = *$, the representation $\mathcal{L}(S)$ is \mathbb{k} at the root and zero elsewhere, and the morphism $\mathcal{L}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(T)$ is defined to be the identity \mathbb{k} at the root and zero elsewhere.
- If $S \neq *$, then $T \neq *$, since there would otherwise not be any morphism $S \rightarrow T$. Let $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$, $S = \mathcal{G}(S_1^\bullet, \dots, S_k^\bullet)$, and $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $S_i^\bullet = \{S_i^1, \dots, S_i^{\ell_i}\}$ and $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{m_i}\}$. Restrict $g : S \rightarrow T$ to T minus its root, to get, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$, a $1 \leq n \leq m_i$ and a morphism $g_i^j : S_i^j \rightarrow T_i^n$, as in Lemma 2.13(3). By inductive hypothesis, we get morphisms $\mathcal{L}(g_i^j) : \mathcal{L}(S_i^j) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(T_i^n)$ in $\mathbf{rep}(Q_i)$, which we glue using Definition 2.18(2) to get a morphism $\mathcal{L}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(T)$.

The following is proven by a straightforward induction.

Lemma 2.21. *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver, and let $T \rightarrow Q$ be a rooted tree quiver over Q . Then $\mathbb{k}_T \cong \mathcal{L}(T) \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$.* \square

2.8. Rooted tree modules. Following [23], we first define the coefficient quiver of a representation with respect to a basis.

Definition 2.22. Let Q be a quiver, and let $V \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$. Given a set of bases $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_x \subseteq V_x\}_{x \in Q_0}$, define the *coefficient quiver* $\Gamma(V; \mathcal{B})$ of V with respect to \mathcal{B} as follows. The set of vertices of $\Gamma(V; \mathcal{B})$ is given by $\bigsqcup_{x \in Q_0} \mathcal{B}_x$, the disjoint union of all basis elements in \mathcal{B} , and we add an arrow from a vertex $b \in \mathcal{B}_x$ to a vertex $b' \in \mathcal{B}_{x'}$ for each arrow $\alpha : x \rightarrow x'$ in Q such that there is a non-zero coefficient in column b and row b' of the matrix of $V_\alpha : Q_x \rightarrow Q_{x'}$ in the basis \mathcal{B} .

As an example, if $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ is a quiver over a quiver Q , then the coefficient quiver $\Gamma(\mathbb{k}_T, \mathcal{B})$ is isomorphic to the quiver T itself, where \mathbb{k}_T is the linearization of T (Definition 2.16), and \mathcal{B} is the basis exhibiting each vector space $(\mathbb{k}_T)_x$ as freely generated by the vertices $(f_T)^{-1}(x) \subseteq T_0$, for $x \in Q_0$.

Definition 2.23. Let Q be a quiver. A representation $V \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ is a *rooted tree module* if there exists a basis for V for which the coefficient quiver is a rooted tree quiver.

Rooted tree modules are a special case of *tree modules* [23], which are representations admitting a basis for which the coefficient quiver is a tree.

Recall that if Q is a rooted tree quiver, and $x \in Q_0$, then $Q_{\leq x}$ is a subquiver of Q , which is also a rooted tree quiver. Let $\iota : Q_{\leq x} \rightarrow Q$ denote the inclusion.

Lemma 2.24. *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver, and let $V \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$. The representation V is a rooted tree module if and only if there exists $x \in Q$ and $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q_{\leq x})$, a rooted tree quiver over $Q_{\leq x}$, such that $V \cong \iota_*(\mathbb{k}_T)$.*

Proof. Of course, if $V \cong \iota_*(\mathbb{k}_T)$ as in the lemma, then V is a rooted tree module. Conversely, let $x \in Q_0$ be the maximum (in the poset relation \leq_Q) of the vertices at which M is non-zero (Lemma 2.3). Let \mathcal{B} be a basis of V such that $\Gamma(V; \mathcal{B})$ is a rooted tree quiver. As observed in [23, Prop 2], there is a base change turning all the non-zero coefficients into 1, thus $V \cong \iota_*(\mathbb{k}_T)$. \square

We now introduce, in our language, the reduced representations of Kinser.

Definition 2.25 (cf. [18, Definition 16]). Let Q be a rooted tree quiver, and let $V \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$. The representation V is a *reduced rooted tree module* if there exists $x \in Q$ and $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q_{\leq x})$, a reduced rooted tree quiver over $Q_{\leq x}$, such that $V \cong \iota_*(\mathbb{k}_T)$.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM A(1)

This section contains straightforward, yet sometimes tedious, categorical arguments. We skip some details for conciseness. We start by recalling the definition of the path category of a quiver.

Definition 3.1. Let Q be a quiver. The *path category* of Q has as objects the set of vertices Q_0 of Q , and for $x, y \in Q_0$, as set of morphisms $\text{hom}(x, y)$ the set of directed paths (Definition 2.1) from x to y . Composition is given by composition of paths.

By a standard abuse of notation, we denote the path category of a quiver Q also by Q .

Definition 3.2. Let Q be a rooted tree quiver. Let $\mathbf{rtrees}/_Q$ denote the full subcategory of $\mathbf{quiv}/_Q$ of objects $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ such that T is a (potentially empty) disjoint union of rooted tree quivers $T = T_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup T_k$ ($k \geq 0$), and such that, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, the restriction of f_T to T_i is a rooted tree quiver morphism (i.e., it is root-preserving).

Let \mathbf{set} denote the category of finite sets. We now define a functor $\Sigma : \mathbf{set}^Q \rightarrow \mathbf{rtrees}/_Q$.

Definition 3.3. Let Q be a rooted tree quiver, and let $X : Q \rightarrow \mathbf{set}$ be a functor from the path category of Q . The vertex set of ΣX is the disjoint union $\bigsqcup_{s \in Q_0} X(s)$, and there is an arrow from a to b in ΣX whenever $X(\alpha)(a) = b$ for some arrow α in Q . The function $f_{\Sigma X} : \Sigma X \rightarrow Q$ is the quiver morphism determined by $f^{-1}(s) = X(s)$ for all $s \in Q_0$. Given a natural transformation $g : X \Rightarrow Y$, we let $\Sigma g : \Sigma X \rightarrow \Sigma Y$ be the quiver morphism determined by mapping a vertex x of ΣX corresponding to $x \in X(s)$ to the vertex of ΣY corresponding to $g_s(x) \in Y(s)$.

We now define a functor $\mathbf{fib} : \mathbf{rtrees}/_Q \rightarrow \mathbf{set}^Q$.

Definition 3.4. Let Q be a rooted tree quiver, and let $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ in $\mathbf{rtrees}/_Q$. Define $\mathbf{fib}_T : Q \rightarrow \mathbf{set}$ by $\mathbf{fib}_T(x) = f_T^{-1}(x)$. If $\varphi : x \rightarrow y$ is a morphism of the path category of Q , then $y = \text{succ}^n(x)$ for some n . Then, if $s \in \mathbf{fib}_T(x)$, define $\mathbf{fib}_T(\varphi)(s) = \text{succ}^n(s)$.

The following is then a straightforward check.

Lemma 3.5. *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver. The functors Σ and \mathbf{fib} are inverse equivalences of categories.* \square

The linearization functor $\mathcal{L} : \mathbf{rtree}/_Q \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ then extends readily to a functor $\mathcal{L} : \mathbf{rtrees}/_Q \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ by $\mathcal{L}(T) = \mathcal{L}(T_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{L}(T_k)$, where $T = T_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup T_k \in \mathbf{rtrees}/_Q$.

If $F : D \rightarrow E$ is a functor and C is a category, let $F_* : D^C \rightarrow E^C$ denote the functor between functor categories given by post-composition, that is $F_*(G) = F \circ G$ for $G : C \rightarrow D$.

Let $\mathbf{free} : \mathbf{set} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ be the free vector space functor.

Lemma 3.6. *There is a natural isomorphism of functors $\mathcal{L} \cong \mathbf{free}_* \circ \mathbf{fib} : \mathbf{rtrees}/_Q \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$, where $\mathbf{free}_* : \mathbf{set}^Q \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to do this only for rooted tree quivers over Q (as opposed to disjoint unions of these). We prove that, for every $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ rooted tree quiver over Q we have $\mathcal{L}(T) \cong \mathbf{free}_*(\mathbf{fib}_T)$, and omit the naturality proof. To prove this, we proceed by induction. The case $T = *$ is immediate. Otherwise, let $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{\ell_i}\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(T) &= \mathcal{G} \left(\bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq \ell_1} \mathcal{L}(T_1^j), \dots, \bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq \ell_k} \mathcal{L}(T_k^j) \right) \\ &\cong \mathcal{G} \left(\bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq \ell_1} \mathbf{free}_*(\mathbf{fib}_{T_1^j}), \dots, \bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq \ell_k} \mathbf{free}_*(\mathbf{fib}_{T_k^j}) \right) \\ &\cong \mathbf{free}_*(\mathbf{fib}_{\mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)}), \end{aligned}$$

where in the equality we used Definition 2.20, and in the first isomorphism we used the inductive hypothesis. The second isomorphism is straightforward to check, using Definition 2.18. \square

The following is standard.

Lemma 3.7. *There is a natural isomorphism $\text{free} \circ \pi_0 \cong H_0(-; \mathbb{k}) : \mathbf{top} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$.* \square

Let $\text{disc} : \mathbf{set} \rightarrow \mathbf{top}$ be the functor that endows every finite set with the discrete topology. The proof of the following result is straightforward.

Lemma 3.8. *There is a natural isomorphism $\pi_0 \circ \text{disc} \cong \text{id}_{\mathbf{set}} : \mathbf{set} \rightarrow \mathbf{set}$.* \square

Proof of Theorem A(1). Consider the following diagram of categories and functors:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathbf{top}^Q & \xrightarrow{(\pi_0)_*} & \mathbf{set}^Q & \xleftarrow{\text{fib}} & \mathbf{rtrees}/Q \\
 & \searrow H_0 & \downarrow \text{free}_* & & \swarrow \mathcal{L} \\
 & & \mathbf{rep}(Q) & &
 \end{array}$$

Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8 imply that the essential image of $H_0 : \mathbf{top}^Q \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ is equal to the essential image of $\text{free}_* : \mathbf{set}^Q \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$, and Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6 imply that the essential image of free_* is equal to the essential image of \mathcal{L} , which, by Lemma 2.21, consists of all direct sums of linearized rooted tree quivers over Q . \square

4. PROOFS OF THEOREM B AND THEOREM A(2)

Let Q be a rooted tree quiver. In this section we partly redevelop and generalize Kinser's theory [18] using our induction methods, which simplify exposition. We also prove the elder rule (Proposition 4.3), which is the key ingredient in the proof of Theorem B and in the algorithms of Theorem D.

We give the proofs of Theorem B, Corollary C, and Theorem A(2) in that order, since the proof of Theorem A(2) relies on Corollary C, which in turn relies on Theorem A(1).

Proposition 4.1 (cf. [18, Proposition 9 and Theorem 18]). *Let (Q, σ) be a rooted tree quiver, and let S and T be rooted tree quivers over Q . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *We have $S \preceq_Q T$.*
- (2) *There exists a morphism from S to T in $\mathbf{quiv}/_Q$.*
- (3) *There exists a morphism $\varphi : \mathbb{k}_S \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_T$ which is non-zero at the root, that is, such that $\varphi_\sigma : (\mathbb{k}_S)_\sigma \rightarrow (\mathbb{k}_T)_\sigma$ is non-zero.*

Proof. Since all of the conditions are isomorphism invariant, we can assume that all rooted tree quivers involved are inductive, thanks to Lemmas 2.10 and 2.12. The equivalence (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) is then proven by induction.

If $S = *$ or $T = *$, this is clear. Otherwise, let $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$, $S = \mathcal{G}(S_1^\bullet, \dots, S_k^\bullet)$, and $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $S_i^\bullet = \{S_i^1, \dots, S_i^{\ell_i}\}$ and $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{m_i}\}$.

(1) \Rightarrow (2). Assume that $S \preceq_Q T$. Then, for every $1 \leq i \leq k$ and every $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$, there exists $1 \leq n \leq m_i$ such that $S_i^j \preceq_{Q_i} T_i^n$. By inductive hypothesis, there exists a morphism $S_i^j \rightarrow T_i^n$ in $\mathbf{quiv}/_{Q_i}$. A morphism $S \rightarrow T$ in $\mathbf{quiv}/_Q$ is then constructed by simply combining all these morphisms, as in Lemma 2.13(3).

(2) \Rightarrow (3). This implication does not require the inductive hypothesis, and just follows by applying the linearization functor $\mathcal{L} : \mathbf{quiv}/_Q \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ to the quiver morphism $S \rightarrow T$ over Q , and using Lemma 2.21.

(3) \Rightarrow (1). Assume that there exists a morphism $\varphi : \mathbb{k}_S \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_T$ that is non-zero at the root. The morphism φ induces, by restriction to $Q \setminus \sigma$, a morphism $\varphi_{i,j,n} : \mathbb{k}_{S_i^j} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{T_i^n}$, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$, and $1 \leq n \leq m_i$. Since φ is non-zero at the root, for every $1 \leq i \leq k$, there exist $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$ and $1 \leq n \leq m_i$ such that $\varphi_{i,j,n}$ is non-zero at the root of Q_i . By inductive hypothesis, this implies that $S_i^j \preceq_{Q_i} T_i^n$, and thus $S \preceq_Q T$, by definition. \square

This characterization of the order relation on rooted tree quivers over Q allows us to identify the reduced rooted tree quivers over Q as those having no non-trivial endomorphisms (compare [18, Proposition 9] for the “only if” part):

Proposition 4.2. *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver and let $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ be a rooted tree quiver over Q . Then T is reduced if and only if $\text{hom}_{\mathbf{rtree}/Q}(T, T) = \{\text{id}_T\}$.*

Proof. We only consider the case $T \neq *$, thus $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{m_i}\}$. Assume that T is reduced, so by Proposition 4.1 there are no morphisms between T_i^j and $T_i^{j'}$ for $j \neq j'$. Therefore, in the counting formula in Lemma 2.13, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{m_i} \left| \text{hom}_{\mathbf{rtree}_{Q_i}}(T_i^j, T_i^n) \right| = 1$$

since only $n = j$ qualifies for a non-zero set, and since $\left| \text{hom}_{\mathbf{rtree}_{Q_i}}(T_i^j, T_i^j) \right| = 1$ by inductive hypothesis. Therefore there is only one morphism, the identity.

Conversely, assume that T is not reduced. If one of the T_i^j is not reduced, it admits by inductive hypothesis a non-identity endomorphism, and so T_i^j alone contributes more than 1 to the counting formula in Lemma 2.13. If all of the T_i^j are reduced, but T is not, then by Proposition 4.1 there is a morphism from T_i^j to $T_i^{j'}$ for some $j \neq j'$. By Lemma 2.13, this induces a non-trivial endomorphism of T . \square

The next result gives a sufficient condition to split off a summand of the linearization of a gluing of reduced trees: this can be done as soon as one of the trees being glued is smaller, in Kinser’s preorder, to another of the trees being glued. For a related result (not stronger or weaker), see [17, Lemma 1].

Proposition 4.3 (Elder rule). *Let $(Q, \sigma) = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$ be an inductive rooted tree quiver, and let T be an inductive rooted tree quiver over Q such that $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{\ell_i}\}$. Suppose that there exists $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j, j' \leq \ell_i$, with $j \neq j'$ and $T_i^j \preceq_{Q_i} T_i^{j'}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{k}_T \cong \mathbb{k}_S \oplus \iota_*(\mathbb{k}_{T_i^j}),$$

where $\iota : Q_i \rightarrow Q$ is the inclusion, and where $S = \mathcal{G}(S_1^\bullet, \dots, S_k^\bullet)$, $S_n^\bullet = T_n^\bullet$ if $n \neq i$, and $S_i^\bullet = T_i^\bullet \setminus \{T_i^j\}$ otherwise.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $i = 1$, $j = 1$, and $j' = 2$. By Proposition 4.1, there exists a morphism $T_1^1 \rightarrow T_1^2$ in \mathbf{quiv}/Q_1 , which, after linearization, results in a morphism $\varphi : \mathbb{k}_{T_1^1} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{T_1^2}$ that is the identity $\mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ at the root of Q_i . We now give an explicit isomorphism from $\iota_*(\mathbb{k}_{T_1^1}) \oplus \mathbb{k}_S$ to \mathbb{k}_T .

Note that such a morphism $\iota_*(\mathbb{k}_{T_1^1}) \oplus \mathbb{k}_S \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_T$ is completely determined by its restriction to the root σ , as well as by its restriction to $Q \setminus \sigma = \bigsqcup_{1 \leq n \leq k} Q_n$, where both modules decompose as $\bigoplus_{1 \leq m \leq k} \bigoplus_{1 \leq n \leq \ell_m} \mathbb{k}_{T_m^n}$. Thus, we can use block matrix notation to define the morphism as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbb{k}_{T_1^1} \\ \mathbb{k}_{T_1^2} \\ \mathbb{k}_{T_1^3} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{k}_{T_1^{\ell_1}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{k}_{T_k^1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{k}_{T_k^{\ell_k}} \\ \mathbb{k}_\sigma \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{k}_{T_1^1} & \mathbb{k}_{T_1^2} & \mathbb{k}_{T_1^3} & \cdots & \mathbb{k}_{T_1^{\ell_1}} & \cdots & \mathbb{k}_{T_k^1} & \cdots & \mathbb{k}_{T_k^{\ell_k}} & \mathbb{k}_\sigma \\ \text{id} & 0 & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & 0 \\ -\varphi & \text{id} & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{id} & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & & & & & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & \text{id} & & 0 & & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & & \ddots & & & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & 0 & & \text{id} & & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & \ddots & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & \text{id} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & \text{id} \end{pmatrix}$$

This morphism is well-defined since this only needs to be checked at the root, where it is well-defined thanks to the fact that as structure morphisms out of $\mathbb{k}_{T_1^\bullet}$ we are using $\text{id} - \varphi$, which can be extended to the root as 0. The morphism is an isomorphism since the inverse can be defined using a matrix with the same form, but with φ instead of $-\varphi$. \square

The following technical result is useful when applying the elder rule (Proposition 4.3) inductively.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$ be a rooted tree quiver, and let $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{\ell_i}\}$. Assume that there exists $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$ such that $\mathbb{k}_{T_i^j} \cong \mathbb{k}_{T''} \oplus N \in \mathbf{rep}(Q_i)$, for $T'' \rightarrow Q_i$ a rooted tree quiver over Q_i . Then $\mathbb{k}_T = \mathbb{k}_{T'} \oplus N$, where $T' = \mathcal{G}(S_1^\bullet, \dots, S_k^\bullet)$ with $S_m^\bullet = \{T_m^1, \dots, T_m^{\ell_m}\}$, except for $m = i$, where we define $S_i^\bullet = (T_i^\bullet \setminus T_i^j) \cup \{T''\}$.*

Proof. Note that N in the statement must have the property that $N(\tau_i^j) = 0$, where τ_i^j is the root of T_i^j . Let $M_i^\bullet = \{\mathbb{k}_{T_i^1}, \dots, \mathbb{k}_{T_i^{\ell_i}}\}$ (as in Lemma 2.19), and let $L_i^\bullet = \{\mathbb{k}_{S_i^1}, \dots, \mathbb{k}_{S_i^{\ell_i}}\}$. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{k}_T \cong \mathcal{G}(M_1^\bullet, \dots, M_k^\bullet) \cong \mathcal{G}(L_1^\bullet, \dots, L_k^\bullet) \oplus N \cong \mathbb{k}_{T'} \oplus N,$$

where in the first and third isomorphism we used Lemma 2.19, and in the second isomorphism we used the fact that $N(\tau_i^j) = 0$, so it does not interact in the gluing operation of modules (Definition 2.18). \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver, and let $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ be a rooted tree quiver over Q . If T is not reduced, then there exists a reduced rooted tree module N over Q and a rooted tree quiver $T' \rightarrow Q$ over Q such that $\mathbb{k}_T \cong \mathbb{k}_{T'} \oplus N$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that Q is an inductive rooted tree quiver and that T is an inductive rooted tree quiver over Q , and proceed by induction. Since T is not reduced we have $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$, $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{\ell_i}\}$, and there are two cases to consider.

If there exist $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j, j' \leq \ell_i$ with $j \neq j'$, such that $T_i^j \leq_{Q_i} T_i^{j'}$, then \mathbb{k}_T decomposes as required, by Proposition 4.3, Lemma 4.4, and inductive hypothesis.

If there exists $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$ such that T_i^j is not reduced, then, by inductive hypothesis, $\mathbb{k}_{T_i^j} \cong \mathbb{k}_{T''} \oplus N$, with N a reduced rooted tree module and $T'' \rightarrow Q_i$ a rooted tree quiver over Q_i . Lemma 4.4 then finishes the proof. \square

We now reprove a theorem of Kinser's, which, in our language, gives a combinatorial characterization of the indecomposable linearized rooted tree quivers over a rooted tree quiver Q . Thanks to Lemma 2.24, it is enough to give this characterization for linearizations of rooted tree quivers over Q .

Theorem 4.6 (cf. [18, Corollary 19]). *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver, and let $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ be a rooted tree quiver over Q . The representation $\mathbb{k}_T \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ is indecomposable if and only if T is reduced.*

Proof. If T is not reduced, then it is not indecomposable, by Lemma 4.5. Assume now that T is reduced. We will prove that $\text{End}(\mathbb{k}_T)$ is a local ring, which implies that \mathbb{k}_T is indecomposable [2, Corollary I.4.8 (a)]. First, let $I \subseteq \text{End}(\mathbb{k}_T)$ be the ideal of morphism $\mathbb{k}_T \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_T$ which are zero at the root. To prove that this ideal is the only maximal ideal of $\text{End}(\mathbb{k}_T)$ (and thus that $\text{End}(\mathbb{k}_T)$ is local), we prove that every element $\varphi \in \text{End}(\mathbb{k}_T) \setminus I$ is invertible. We proceed by induction. If T has a single vertex, then \mathbb{k}_T is clearly indecomposable. Otherwise, $Q = \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$, and $T = \mathcal{G}(T_1^\bullet, \dots, T_k^\bullet)$, with $T_i^\bullet = \{T_i^1, \dots, T_i^{\ell_i}\}$. The morphism φ induces, by restriction to Q minus its root σ , a morphism $\varphi_{i,j,n} : \mathbb{k}_{T_i^j} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{T_i^n}$, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$, and $1 \leq n \leq m_i$. By Proposition 4.1(3 \Rightarrow 1), the morphism $\varphi_{i,j,n}$ must be zero unless $j = n$, so it suffices to prove that $\varphi_{i,j,j} : \mathbb{k}_{T_i^j} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{T_i^j}$ is invertible for all $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$. The morphism $\varphi_{i,j,j}$ is non-zero at the root of Q_i , since φ is non-zero at the root of Q , so, by inductive hypothesis, it is invertible, concluding the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem B. This follows directly from Lemma 4.5 and induction. \square

Proof of Corollary C. We first show that there are finitely many isomorphism classes of reduced rooted tree modules over Q . By Definition 2.25, this is equivalent to showing that there are finitely many isomorphism classes of reduced rooted tree quivers over any given rooted tree quiver. This follows directly from the definition of reduced rooted tree quiver over a rooted tree quiver (Definition 2.15) and induction over rooted tree quivers over rooted tree quivers (Section 2.5).

To conclude, we must show that every representation in $\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(Q)$ decomposes as a direct sum of reduced rooted tree modules over Q , since the reduced rooted tree modules are indecomposable (Theorem 4.6), and every representation in $\mathbf{rep}(Q)$ decomposes uniquely as a direct sum of indecomposables. By Theorem A(1) and Lemma 2.24, every representation in $\mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(Q)$ is a direct sum of rooted tree modules over Q , so the result follows from Theorem B. \square

Proof of Theorem A(2). The inclusion (\subseteq) follows directly from Corollary C. To prove the inclusion (\supseteq) it is sufficient to show that, for every rooted tree module $M \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$, there exists representations $V \in \mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(Q)$ and $A \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ such that $V \cong M \oplus A$.

By Lemma 2.24, there exists $x \in Q_0$ and a rooted tree quiver $T \rightarrow Q_{\leq x}$ over $Q_{\leq x}$ such that $\iota_*(\mathbb{k}_T) \cong M$, where $\iota : Q_{\leq x} \rightarrow Q$ is the inclusion. If x is the root of Q , then $\mathbb{k}_T \in \mathbf{rep}_{H_0}(Q)$ by Theorem A(1), and $\mathbb{k}_T \cong M$, which proves the claim in this case.

Otherwise, there exist elements $y_1, \dots, y_k \in Q$ such that

$$Q_{\leq \text{succ}(x)} = \mathcal{G}(Q_{\leq x}, Q_{\leq y_1}, \dots, Q_{\leq y_k}).$$

Define $S_1 = \mathcal{G}(\{T\}, \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)$ and $T_1 = \mathcal{G}(\{T, T\}, \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)$, which are rooted tree quivers over $Q_{\leq \text{succ}(x)}$. By Proposition 4.3, we have $\mathbb{k}_{T_1} \cong \mathbb{k}_T \oplus \mathbb{k}_{S_1} \in \mathbf{rep}(Q_{\leq \text{succ}(x)})$. If $\text{succ}(x)$ is the root of Q , then we are done. Otherwise, define $S_{n+1} = \mathcal{G}(\{S_n\}, \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)$ and $T_{n+1} = \mathcal{G}(\{T_n\}, \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)$ for all $1 \leq n \leq d-1$, where $d \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that, and note that, if $\text{succ}^d(x)$ is the root of Q . Then $\mathbb{k}_{T_d} \cong \iota_*(\mathbb{k}_T) \oplus \mathbb{k}_{S_d}$ by Lemma 4.4 and induction, which finishes the proof. \square

5. ALGORITHMS

In this section we describe an algorithm to decompose the linearization of a rooted tree quiver over a rooted tree quiver (Algorithm 1), and an algorithm to decompose the zero-dimensional persistent homology of a graph filtered by a rooted tree poset (Algorithm 2). We prove in Propositions 5.1 and 5.2 that these algorithms are correct, and run in quadratic time.

Proof of Theorem D. This is a direct consequence of Propositions 5.1 and 5.2. \square

5.1. Decomposing linearized rooted tree quiver over a rooted tree quiver. The following basic definitions are required for Algorithm 1.

Let (T, τ) be a rooted tree quiver. The *level* $\ell(x)$ of a vertex $x \in T_0$ is the length of the (unique) directed path from x to the root τ . The *levels* of T are then $\ell(T_0) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, and the *height* $\text{height}(T)$ of T is the maximum among its levels.

Proposition 5.1. *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver. Given T , a rooted tree quiver over Q , Algorithm 1 runs in $O(|T|^2)$ time, and returns a subquiver $S \subseteq T$ such that $\mathbb{k}_S \cong \mathbb{k}_T \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$, and such that $\mathbb{k}_{S'}$ is indecomposable for each connected component $S' \subseteq S$.*

Proof. Correctness. We consider the following invariant

Invariant. At the end of the ℓ th iteration of the for-loop of line 3 the following is satisfied.

- (1) The subquiver $S \subseteq T$ is such that $\mathbb{k}_S \cong \mathbb{k}_T \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$.
- (2) The restriction $S^\ell \rightarrow Q^\ell$ of $f_T|_S$ to levels ℓ and higher has the property that every connected component of S^ℓ is a rooted tree quiver (C, c) , and $C \rightarrow Q_{\leq f_T(c)}$ is a reduced rooted tree quiver over $Q_{\leq f_T(c)}$.
- (3) For x, y vertices of S of level ℓ we have that xRy if and only if $f_T(x) = f_T(y) =: z$ and $(S_{\leq x}) \precee_{(Q_{\leq z})} (S_{\leq y})$.

Algorithm 1: Decompose linearized rooted tree quiver over Q

Input: $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ rooted tree quiver over a rooted tree quiver Q .

Output: $S \subseteq T$, such that $\mathbb{k}_S \cong \mathbb{k}_T \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ and such that \mathbb{k}_C is indecomposable for every connected component $C \subseteq S$.

```

1  $S \leftarrow T$ 
2  $R \leftarrow$  empty relation on vertices of  $S$ 
3 for  $\ell \in \{\text{height}(T), \text{height}(T) - 1, \dots, 1, 0\}$  do
4   for  $x$  vertex of  $S$  of level  $\ell$  do
5      $A \leftarrow$  maximal set of pairwise  $R$ -incomparable predecessors of  $x$  in  $T$ 
6     for  $p \in \text{pred}(x) \setminus A$  do
7        $\mid$  delete edge  $p \rightarrow x$  from  $S$ 
8     for  $x, y$  vertices of  $S$  of level  $\ell$  do
9       if for every  $p \in \text{pred}(x)$ , there exists  $q \in \text{pred}(y)$ , such that  $pRq$  then
10       $\mid$   $R \leftarrow R \cup (x, y)$   $\triangleright$  Add  $xRy$  to the relation
11 return  $S$ 

```

Algorithm 2: Decompose zero-dimensional homology over Q

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$ and a Q -filtration $h = (h_V : V \rightarrow Q_0, h_E : E \rightarrow Q_0)$ with Q a rooted tree quiver.

Output: $(S, f_S : S \rightarrow Q)$ quiver over Q , such that $\mathbb{k}_S \cong H_0(h) \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$, and such that \mathbb{k}_C is indecomposable for every connected component $C \subseteq S$.

```

1  $S \leftarrow$  empty quiver
2  $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q) \leftarrow$  Algorithm 3 on  $(G, h)$ 
3 for  $T'$  connected component of  $T$  do
4    $(S', f_{S'} : S' \rightarrow Q) \leftarrow$  Algorithm 1 on  $(T', f_T|_{T'})$ 
5    $(S, f_S : S \rightarrow Q) \leftarrow (S \sqcup S', f_S \sqcup f_{S'} : S \sqcup S' \rightarrow Q)$ 
6 return  $S$ 

```

Algorithm 3: Filtration to disjoint union of rooted tree quivers over Q

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$ and a Q -filtration $h = (h_V : V \rightarrow Q_0, h_E : E \rightarrow Q_0)$ with Q a rooted tree quiver.

Output: An object $T \rightarrow Q$ of $\mathbf{rtrees}/_Q$ such that $\mathbb{k}_T \cong H_0(h) \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$.

```

1  $T \leftarrow$  empty quiver
2  $f_T \leftarrow$  empty function to  $Q_0$ 
3  $\text{uf} \leftarrow$  empty union find
4  $\text{max}_\ell \leftarrow$  largest level  $\ell$  of  $Q$  such that  $G$  has vertices of level  $\ell$ 
5 for  $\ell \in \{\text{max}_\ell, \text{max}_\ell - 1, \dots, 1, 0\}$  do
6   for  $v$  vertex of  $G$  of level  $\ell$  do
7      $\mid$   $\text{uf.add}(v)$ 
8   for  $\{v, w\}$  edge of  $G$  of level  $\ell$  do
9      $\mid$   $\text{uf.union}(v, w)$ 
10   $T_0^\ell \leftarrow \text{uf.representatives}()$ 
11  add  $T_0^\ell \times \{\ell\}$  to the vertices of  $T$   $\triangleright$  Product with  $\{\ell\}$  to make it disjoint
12  for  $v \in T_0^\ell$  do
13     $\mid$   $f_T(v) := f_V(v)$ 
14  for  $v \in T_0^{\ell+1}$  do
15     $\mid$   $w \leftarrow \text{uf.find}(v)$ 
16     $\mid$  add  $((v, \ell + 1), (w, \ell))$  to the edges of  $T$ 
17 return  $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow Q)$ 

```

If the invariant is preserved, then the algorithm is correct by condition (2) of the invariant and the fact that linearized reduced rooted tree quivers are indecomposable (Theorem 4.6).

Let us prove that the invariant is preserved. For this, we can actually take as base case $\ell = \text{height}(T) + 1$, where $S = T$, $S^\ell = \emptyset$, and all conditions are immediate to check. So we need to prove that, if conditions (1, 2, 3) are satisfied at the end of the $\ell + 1$ st iteration, then they are satisfied at the end of the ℓ th iteration.

We start by checking (2). Let S be the value of the variable S at the end of the $\ell + 1$ st iteration, and let S' be the value of the variable S at the end of the ℓ th iteration. The vertex x of S at level ℓ (line 4) induces a subtree quiver $S_{\leq x}$. If x has no predecessors, then this tree quiver is the trivial rooted tree quiver, and condition (1) is met at the end of the iteration. Otherwise, $S_{\leq x} \cong \mathcal{G}(S_1^\bullet, \dots, S_k^\bullet)$, with $S_i^\bullet = \{S_i^1, \dots, S_i^{\ell_i}\}$ rooted tree quivers over Q_i , where $Q_{\leq f(x)} \cong \mathcal{G}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$. What line 5 does (by condition (3) in the inductive hypothesis) is, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, choose a maximal set A_i^\bullet of pairwise \preceq_{Q_i} -incomparable elements of S_i^\bullet . This guarantees that $A = \mathcal{G}(A_1^\bullet, \dots, A_k^\bullet)$ is a reduced rooted tree quiver over $Q_{\leq f(x)}$ (by condition (2) in the inductive hypothesis), which implies that condition (2) is met at the end of the ℓ th iteration.

We now check condition (1). From the elder rule (Proposition 4.3), it follows that \mathbb{k}_S is isomorphic to \mathbb{k}_A direct sum the linearization of all trees that did not make it into A , which, by construction, is isomorphic to $\mathbb{k}_{S'}$:

$$\mathbb{k}_S \cong \mathbb{k}_A \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq k} \bigoplus_{V \in S_i^\bullet \setminus A_i^\bullet} \mathbb{k}_V \right) \cong \mathbb{k}_{S'}.$$

This implies that condition (1) is met at the end of the ℓ th iteration.

To conclude this part of the proof, we check condition (3). Line 9 is checking precisely the condition defining the preorder \preceq (Definition 2.1), so condition (3) is met at the end of the ℓ th iteration thanks to condition (3) in the inductive hypothesis.

Complexity. Here, whenever $x \in T_0 = S_0$ and we write $\text{pred}(x)$, we mean predecessors in T . Since $S \subseteq T$, the predecessors in T contain the predecessors in S .

Line 5 can be implemented by simply performing all pairwise comparisons, which takes $O(|\text{pred}(x)|^2)$ time. Lines 6 and 7 take $O(|\text{pred}(x)|)$ time. Thus, the contribution of lines 5, 6, and 7 across all iterations is $O(\sum_{x \in T_0} |\text{pred}(x)|^2)$ time. The contribution of lines 8, 9, and 10 across all iterations is

$$O \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\text{height}(T)} \sum_{x, y \text{ of level } \ell} |\text{pred}(x)| \cdot |\text{pred}(y)| \right).$$

It follows that the time complexity is in $O\left(\left(\sum_{x \in T_0} |\text{pred}(x)|\right)^2\right) = O(|T|^2)$, since each non-root vertex of T is the predecessor of exactly one vertex. \square

5.2. Decomposing zero-dimensional homology over rooted tree quiver. For clarity, we abstract a subroutine from Algorithm 2, given as Algorithm 3. The following basic definitions are required Algorithms 2 and 3.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite, simple, undirected graph, so that V is a finite set of *vertices*, and E is a set of subsets of V , each one of cardinality 2, called *edges*. Let Q be a rooted tree quiver. A Q -filtration h of G consists of a pair of functions $(h_V : V \rightarrow Q_0, h_E : E \rightarrow Q_0)$, such that $h_V(x), h_V(y) \leq_Q h_E((x, y))$ for every $\{x, y\} \in E$. We get a functor $(G, h) : Q \rightarrow \mathbf{top}$ by mapping $x \in Q_0$ to the (geometric realization of the) subgraph of G spanned by vertices and edges whose h -value $y \in Q_0$ satisfies $y \leq_Q x$.

If Q is a rooted tree quiver and (G, h) is a Q -filtration, the *level* of a vertex v (respectively edge e) of G is the level of $h_V(v) \in Q_0$ (respectively $h_E(v) \in Q_0$).

In Algorithm 3, we make use of the union-find data structure (also known as a disjoint set data structure), see, e.g., [27, Chapter 2] for details.

Proposition 5.2. *Let Q be a rooted tree quiver. Given (G, f) a Q -filtered graph, Algorithm 2 runs in $O(|G|^2)$ time, and returns $(S, f_S : S \rightarrow Q)$ a quiver over Q , such that $\mathbb{k}_S \cong H_0(h) \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$, and such that \mathbb{k}_C is indecomposable for every connected component $C \subseteq S$.*




FIGURE 3. *Left.* Two filtrations $f, g : K \rightarrow P$ of a simplicial complex K (with vertices depicted as squares) by a linear ordered set P such that $f \leq g$. *Center.* The connected components of the filtrations f and g as quivers over Q_P . *Right.* The decomposition of the homology $H_0(g)$ as a representation of the rooted tree quiver $\Sigma\pi_0(f)$ given by the connected components of f . See Section 6.1 for details.

Proof. Thanks to Proposition 5.1, it is clear that Algorithm 2 is correct as long as Algorithm 3 is, and that its time complexity is in $O(|G|^2)$ as long as the time complexity of Algorithm 3 is in $O(|G|^2)$. So let us only worry about Algorithm 3.

The fact that the time complexity of Algorithm 3 is in $O(|G|^2)$ is clear, since it iterates a constant number of times over each vertex and edge of G , and each time it performs $O(1)$ operations, or operations with the union find, all of which are in $O(|G|)$.

We conclude this proof with the correctness proof for Algorithm 3. By Lemma 3.6, it is enough to prove that $\text{fib}_T \cong \pi_0(G, h) : Q \rightarrow \mathbf{set}$. This is clear, since all the algorithm does is to keep track of the connected components in the filtration (G, h) , and of where this connected components map under the arrows of Q . \square

6. BUILDING REPRESENTATIONS AND FILTRATIONS OVER ROOTED TREE POSETS

We now describe two ways in which to build rooted tree modules over rooted tree quivers that are relevant to topological data analysis.

6.1. An invariant of morphisms between merge trees. To every morphisms between merge trees, we associate a representation of the codomain, which can be effectively decomposed into indecomposables using the results in this paper. This construction could be useful in studying morphisms between merge trees.

Merge trees from filtrations. Let $P = \{1 < \dots < n\}$ be a finite linearly ordered set. Given a filtration $K_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq K_n$ (or a functor $K : P \rightarrow \mathbf{top}$), its connected components $\pi_0(K) : P \rightarrow \mathbf{set}$ can be visualized as a tree, known as a *merge tree*, which is a fundamental object in persistence theory and in hierarchical clustering; see, e.g., [10, 11, 25] and references therein. There are several ways of defining merge trees; the following is a natural definition using the language of this paper.

Definition 6.1. A *merge tree* is a rooted tree quiver $(T, f_T : T \rightarrow A_n)$, where $A_n = 1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow n$ is a linear rooted tree quiver.

We say that a functor $X : A_n \rightarrow \mathbf{top}$ is *connected* if $X(n) \in \mathbf{top}$ is path-connected. If $X : A_n \rightarrow \mathbf{top}$ is connected, the *merge tree of X* is $(\Sigma\pi_0(X), f_{\Sigma\pi_0(X)} : \Sigma\pi_0(X) \rightarrow A_n)$, obtained by applying the equivalence of categories $\Sigma : \mathbf{set}^{A_n} \rightarrow \mathbf{rtrees}_{/A_n}$ (Lemma 3.5) to the connected components $\pi_0(X) : A_n \rightarrow \mathbf{set}$ of X . See Fig. 3 for examples.

Morphisms of merge trees. A natural transformation $X \Rightarrow Y$ of (connected) functors $X, Y : A_n \rightarrow \mathbf{top}$ induces a natural transformation $\pi_0(X) \Rightarrow \pi_0(Y)$, and thus a morphism of $\Sigma\pi_0(X) \rightarrow \Sigma\pi_0(Y)$ of merge trees (note that connectedness of X and Y is not strong




FIGURE 4. *Left.* The Hasse diagram of a two-dimensional grid poset R (i.e., a product of two linear orders). *Center and right.* Restrictions of R that are rooted tree posets.

assumption since one can work component-by-component, in the sense that X and Y decompose as a disjoint union of connected functors, and each component of X maps to a single component of Y). This situation occurs naturally, as shown next.

- Example 6.2.** (1) Let $Z : A_n \times \{1, 2\} \rightarrow \mathbf{top}$ be a filtration over a commutative ladder, in the sense of [14]. Then, by letting $X := Z|_{A_n \times \{1\}}$ and $Y := Z|_{A_n \times \{2\}}$ we get a natural transformation $X \Rightarrow Y$.
- (2) Let $f, g : K \rightarrow A_n$ be two filtrations of the same simplicial complex K (i.e., functions mapping simplices of K to vertices of A_n , and respecting the face relation), and assume that $f \leq g$. Then, by letting $X := \mathcal{S}g$ and $Y := \mathcal{S}f$, we have a natural transformation $X \Rightarrow Y$, since we have an inclusion of sublevel-set filtrations $(\mathcal{S}g)(r) \subseteq (\mathcal{S}f)(r)$ for every $r \in A_n$ (recall that $(\mathcal{S}f)(r) = \{\eta \in K : f(\eta) \leq r\}$).

The representation associated to a morphism of merge trees. The data of a morphism of merge trees $S \rightarrow T$ in \mathbf{rtree}/A_n is simply that of a rooted tree morphism $S \rightarrow T$. Thus, we can consider the representation $\mathbb{k}_S \in \mathbf{rep}(T)$.

In the setup where we start with a natural transformation $X \Rightarrow Y$ between connected functors $X, Y : A_n \rightarrow \mathbf{top}$, we get a representation $\mathbb{k}_{\Sigma\pi_0(X)} \in \mathbf{rep}(\Sigma\pi_0(Y))$, which can be effectively decomposed into indecomposables thanks to Theorem D. See Fig. 3 for an example using the construction of Example 6.2(2).

6.2. Restriction. Let (R, \leq_R) be a poset. A *restriction* of (R, \leq_R) is a poset (P, \leq_P) such that $P \subseteq R$, and such that $p \leq_P q$ implies $p \leq_R q$ for every $p, q \in P$. If P is a restriction of R , there is a natural restriction functor $\mathbf{top}^R \rightarrow \mathbf{top}^P$ (see, e.g., [4, Section 4.3] and [1]). So in order to study the zero-dimensional persistent homology of a filtration by R , one could consider its restriction to various $P \subseteq R$, with P a rooted tree poset.

In Fig. 4 we give simple examples of restriction of a two-dimensional grid poset, a common type of poset in multiparameter persistence [14, 19].

Acknowledgements. TB was supported by Bishop’s University, Université de Sherbrooke and NSERC Discovery Grant RGPIN/04465-2019. RB was supported by a Mitacs Globalink research award. A portion of this work was completed while RB was at Université de Sherbrooke. LS was supported by a Centre de Recherches Mathématiques et Institut des Sciences Mathématiques fellowship.

REFERENCES

- [1] Claire Amiot, Thomas Brüstle, and Eric J. Hanson. Invariants of persistence modules defined by order-embeddings, 2024.
- [2] Ibrahim Assem, Daniel Simson, and Andrzej Skowroński. *Elements of the representation theory of associative algebras. Vol. 1*, volume 65 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006. Techniques of representation theory.
- [3] Ulrich Bauer, Magnus B. Botnan, Steffen Oppermann, and Johan Steen. Cotorsion torsion triples and the representation theory of filtered hierarchical clustering. *Advances in Mathematics*, 369:107171, 2020.
- [4] Magnus Bakke Botnan and Michael Lesnick. An introduction to multiparameter persistence. In *Representations of algebras and related structures*, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., pages 77–150. EMS Press, Berlin, 2023.

- [5] Jacek Brodzki, Matthew Burfitt, and Mariam Pirashvili. On the complexity of zero-dimensional multi-parameter persistence, 2020.
- [6] Lev Buhovsky, Jordan Payette, Iosif Polterovich, Leonid Polterovich, Egor Shelukhin, and Vukašin Stojisavljević. Coarse nodal count and topological persistence. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 2024.
- [7] Chen Cai, Woojin Kim, Facundo Mémoli, and Yusu Wang. Elder-rule-staircodes for augmented metric spaces. *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom.*, 5(3):417–454, 2021.
- [8] Frédéric Chazal, Leonidas J. Guibas, Steve Y. Oudot, and Primoz Skraba. Persistence-based clustering in Riemannian manifolds. *J. ACM*, 60(6):Art. 41, 38, 2013.
- [9] Frédéric Chazal and Bertrand Michel. An introduction to topological data analysis: Fundamental and practical aspects for data scientists. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 2021.
- [10] Justin Curry. The fiber of the persistence map for functions on the interval. *J. Appl. Comput. Topol.*, 2(3-4):301–321, 2018.
- [11] Justin Curry, Jordan DeSha, Adélie Garin, Kathryn Hess, Lida Kanari, and Brendan Mallery. From trees to barcodes and back again II: Combinatorial and probabilistic aspects of a topological inverse problem. *Comput. Geom.*, 116:Paper No. 102031, 28, 2024.
- [12] Harm Derksen and Jerzy Weyman. *An introduction to quiver representations*, volume 184 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017.
- [13] Herbert Edelsbrunner and John L. Harer. *Computational topology*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. An introduction.
- [14] Emerson G. Escolar and Yasuaki Hiraoka. Persistence modules on commutative ladders of finite type. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 55(1):100–157, 2016.
- [15] Robert Ghrist. Barcodes: the persistent topology of data. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 45(1):61–75, 2008.
- [16] Felix Hensel, Michael Moor, and Bastian Rieck. A survey of topological machine learning methods. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 2021.
- [17] Valentin Katter and Nils Mahrt. Reduced representations of rooted trees. *J. Algebra*, 413:41–49, 2014.
- [18] Ryan Kinser. Rank functions on rooted tree quivers. *Duke Math. J.*, 152(1):27–92, 2010.
- [19] Michael Lesnick and Matthew Wright. Computing minimal presentations and bigraded Betti numbers of 2-parameter persistent homology. *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom.*, 6(2):267–298, 2022.
- [20] Michèle Loupias. Indecomposable representations of finite ordered sets. In *Representations of algebras (Proc. Internat. Conf., Carleton Univ., Ottawa, Ont., 1974)*, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 488, pages 201–209. , 1975.
- [21] Steve Y. Oudot. *Persistence theory: from quiver representations to data analysis*, volume 209 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [22] Leonid Polterovich, Daniel Rosen, Karina Samvelyan, and Jun Zhang. *Topological persistence in geometry and analysis*, volume 74 of *University Lecture Series*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2020.
- [23] Claus Michael Ringel. Exceptional modules are tree modules. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Conference of the International Linear Algebra Society (Chemnitz, 1996)*, volume 275/276, pages 471–493, 1998.
- [24] Claus Michael Ringel. Distinguished bases of exceptional modules. In *Algebras, quivers and representations*, volume 8 of *Abel Symp.*, pages 253–274. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [25] Alexander Rolle and Luis Scoccola. Stable and consistent density-based clustering via multiparameter persistence. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(258):1–74, 2024.
- [26] Egor Shelukhin. On the Hofer-Zehnder conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 195(3):775–839, 2022.
- [27] Robert Endre Tarjan. *Data structures and network algorithms*, volume 44 of *CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1983.

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI; NEW DELHI, INDIA

BISHOP’S UNIVERSITY; UNIVERSITÉ DE SHERBROOKE; QUÉBEC, CANADA

CENTRE DE RECHERCHES MATHÉMATIQUES ET INSTITUT DES SCIENCES MATHÉMATIQUES; LABORATOIRE DE COMBINATOIRE ET D’INFORMATIQUE MATHÉMATIQUE DE L’UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC À MONTRÉAL; UNIVERSITÉ DE SHERBROOKE; QUÉBEC, CANADA