

# COMPUTING BETTI TABLES AND MINIMAL PRESENTATIONS OF ZERO-DIMENSIONAL PERSISTENT HOMOLOGY

DMITRIY MOROZOV AND LUIS SCOCCOLA

ABSTRACT. The Betti tables of a multigraded module encode the grades at which there is an algebraic change in the module. Multigraded modules show up in many areas of pure and applied mathematics, and in particular in topological data analysis, where they are known as persistence modules, and where their Betti tables describe the places at which the homology of filtered simplicial complexes change. Although Betti tables of singly and bigraded modules are already being used in applications of topological data analysis, their computation in the bigraded case (which relies on an algorithm that is cubic in the size of the filtered simplicial complex) is a bottleneck when working with large datasets. We show that, in the special case of 0-dimensional homology (which is relevant for clustering and graph classification) the Betti tables of a bigraded module can be computed in log-linear time. We also consider the problem of computing minimal presentations, and show that a minimal presentation of 0-dimensional persistent homology can be computed in quadratic time, regardless of the grading poset.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**Betti tables and persistence.** Betti tables are a classical descriptor of a multigraded modules [18, 28, 32], which encode the grades of the generators in a minimal projective resolution of the module (see, e.g., Fig. 1 and Example 2.15). Informally, one can interpret the Betti tables of a graded module as recording the grades at which there is an algebraic change in the module. Graded modules have applications in a wide variety of areas of pure and applied mathematics, including topological data analysis, and more specifically, persistence theory [31, 7], where they are known as *persistence modules*, and where they are used to describe the varying topology of simplicial complexes and other spaces as they are filtered by one or more real parameters.

Informally, *one-parameter persistence modules* correspond to  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded  $\mathbb{k}[x]$ -modules, and can thus be classified up to isomorphism effectively. *Multiparameter persistence modules* [11, 7] correspond to  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded  $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ -modules, and thus do not admit any reasonable classification up to isomorphism (formally, one is dealing with categories of wild representation type [29]; see [11, 2, 4] for manifestations of this phenomenon in persistence theory). For this reason, much of the research in multiparameter persistence is devoted to the study of incomplete descriptors of multiparameter persistence modules. Betti tables (also known as multigraded Betti numbers) provide one of the simplest such descriptors, and various properties of this descriptor from the point of view of persistence theory are well understood, including their effective computation [26, 25, 19, 3], their relationship to discrete Morse theory [22, 1, 21], their optimal transport Lipschitz-continuity with respect to perturbations [30], and their usage in supervised learning [27, 36].

**Two-parameter persistent homology.** The simplest case beyond the one-parameter case (i.e., the singly graded case) is the two-parameter case (i.e., the bigraded case). Here, one is usually given a finite simplicial complex  $K$  together with a function  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  mapping the simplices of  $K$  to  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , which is monotonic, i.e., such that  $f(\sigma) \leq f(\tau)$  whenever  $\sigma \subseteq \tau \in K$  (see Fig. 1 for an example). By filtering  $K$  using  $f$  and taking homology in dimension  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  with coefficients in a field  $\mathbb{k}$ , one obtains an  $\mathbb{R}^2$ -graded module, or equivalently, a functor  $H_i(K, f; \mathbb{k}) : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}_{\mathbb{k}}$ . Examples include geometric complexes of point clouds filtered by a function on data points, such as a density estimate [8, 12], and graphs representing, say, molecules or networks, filtered by two application-dependent quantities [15]. Applying homology to a bifiltered simplicial complex is justified by the




FIGURE 1. *Left.* A bifiltered graph  $(G, f)$  with vertex set  $\{u, v, w, x_1, x_2, x_3\}$  and edge set  $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, h_1, h_2, d_1, d_2, d_3\}$ . *Right.* The bifiltered graph schematically mapped to  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , together with the Betti tables  $\beta_0(H_0(G, f))$  (circles),  $\beta_1(H_0(G, f))$  (crosses),  $\beta_2(H_0(G, f))$  (stars), and  $\beta_0(H_1(G, f))$  (squares).

fact that the output is automatically invariant under relabeling, meaning that any operation based on this module, such as computing its Betti tables, will result in a relabeling-invariant descriptor. In this setup, one of the main stability results of [30] implies that, for  $f, g : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  any two monotonic functions, we have

$$\|\mu_f - \mu_g\|_1^K \leq 2 \cdot \|f - g\|_1,$$

where  $\| - \|_1^K$  denotes the Kantorovich–Rubinstein norm between signed measures (also known as the 1-Wasserstein distance), and  $\mu_f$  and  $\mu_g$  are the signed measures on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  obtained as the alternating sum of Betti tables of  $H_i(K, f; \mathbb{k})$  and  $H_i(K, g; \mathbb{k})$ , respectively; see [27, Theorem 1] for details. The upshot is that the Betti tables of the homology of bifiltered simplicial complexes form a perturbation-stable, relabeling-invariant descriptor of bifiltered simplicial complexes.

The current standard algorithm for computing the Betti tables of  $H_i(K, f; \mathbb{k})$  in the two-parameter case is the Lesnick–Wright algorithm [26], which runs in time  $O(|K|^3)$ . Because of results such as those of [16], one does not expect to find algorithms with better worst-case time complexity than matrix-multiplication time, at least when  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  is arbitrary. Current options to speed up practical computations include sparsifying the filtered complex before computing homology [39], as well as computational shortcuts that are known to significantly reduce computational time in practice [25, 3]. Nevertheless, computational cost is still a main bottleneck in real-world applications of persistence, limiting the size of the datasets on which it can be applied.

**Zero-dimensional persistent homology.** In many applications, persistent homology in dimension zero is all that is required, as it encodes information about the changes in connectivity of filtered simplicial complexes, making it useful for clustering [10, 9, 14, 8, 33, 35] and graph classification [38, 13, 24, 27, 23].

But, if one is only interested in 0-dimensional homology  $H_0(K, f; \mathbb{k})$ , algorithms relying on linear algebra are usually far from the most efficient ones: For example, in the one-parameter case, the Betti tables of the 0-dimensional homology of an  $\mathbb{R}$ -filtered graph  $(G, f)$  can be computed in  $O(|G| \log |G|)$  time by first sorting the simplices of  $G$  by their  $f$ -value, and then doing an ordered pass using a union-find data structure; in the language of barcodes, the Betti tables simply record

the endpoints of the barcode, and the barcode can be computed using the elder rule (see [17, pp. 188] or [33, Algorithm 1]).

**Contributions.** The paper has two main contributions, concerned with the following question: What is the complexity of computing the Betti tables of graphs filtered by posets other than  $\mathbb{R}$ ?

As our first main contribution, we introduce algorithms for the computation of a minimal set of generators and of a minimal presentation of 0-dimensional persistent homology indexed by an arbitrary poset. In the results,  $\beta_j$  denotes the  $j$ th Betti table of a persistence module (see Definition 2.12).

**Theorem A.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be any poset, and let  $(G, f)$  be a finite  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph. Algorithm 2 outputs  $\beta_0(H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k}))$  in  $O(|G|)$  time. Algorithm 3 outputs a minimal presentation, and hence the 0th and 1st Betti tables, of  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})$  in  $O(|G|^2)$  time.*

As our second main contribution, we introduce an efficient algorithm specialized to the two-parameter case.

**Theorem B.** *Let  $(G, f)$  be a finite  $\mathbb{R}^2$ -filtered graph. Algorithm 4 outputs a minimal presentation and the Betti tables of  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})$  and of  $H_1(G, f; \mathbb{k})$  in  $O(|G| \log |G|)$  time.*

Of note is the fact that Betti tables of 0-dimensional two-parameter persistent homology can be computed in log-linear time, as in the one-parameter case.

In order to prove these results, we establish a connection between minimal presentations (and Betti tables) and connectivity properties of filtered graphs (Theorems 3.8 and 3.10), which allows us to abstract away the algebraic problem, and focus on a simpler combinatorial problem.

**Summary of approach and structure of the paper.** The main body of the paper has three sections: one on background results (Section 2), one on theoretical results (Section 3), and one on algorithms (Section 4). Appendix A contains proofs for background and theoretical results.

In order to describe and prove the correctness of our algorithms, we introduce, in the theory section, the notion of a *minimal filtered graph* (Definition 3.2). Informally, a minimal filtered graph is one whose vertices and edges induce a minimal presentation of its 0-dimensional persistent homology (see Theorem 3.8). A graph is not minimal if it has some edge that can be either contracted or deleted without changing its 0-dimensional persistent homology (for example, the graph of Fig. 1 has both contractible and deletable edges, and is thus not minimal; see Examples 2.15 and 3.3). The idea is that, by contracting and deleting edges that do not change 0-dimensional persistent homology, one inevitably ends up with a minimal filtered graph, from which a minimal presentation can be easily extracted. Our main theoretical contributions (Theorems 3.8 and 3.10) make this idea precise by giving an explicit minimal presentation of  $H_0$  of any minimal filtered graph, and an explicit minimal resolution of  $H_0$  of any minimal  $\mathbb{R}^2$ -filtered graph. Our main algorithmic contributions are efficient algorithms for contracting and deleting edges as necessary. In particular, Algorithm 4 makes use of a dynamic tree data structure [37], which is the main ingredient that allows us to compute the Betti tables of bifiltered graphs in log-linear time.

**Related work.** To the best of our knowledge, the only subcubic algorithm related to Algorithm 4 is that of [8], which, in particular, can be used to compute the Betti tables of  $H_0$  of a function-Rips complex of a finite metric space  $X$  in time  $O(|X|^2 \log |X|)$ . When applied to a function-Rips complex, our Algorithm 4 has the same time complexity; however, our Algorithm 4 applies to arbitrary bifiltered graphs, while function-Rips complexes are very special (and do not include arbitrary filtered graphs). The inner workings of Algorithm 4 are also different from those of [8]: While we rely on dynamic trees, their algorithm relies on a dynamic minimum spanning tree, and, notably, on the fact that, in a function-Rips bifiltration, vertices are filtered exclusively by one of the two filtering functions (so that vertices are linearly ordered in the bifiltration).

The computation of minimal presentations of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -filtered complexes is studied in [5]; they consider homology in all dimensions, so their complexity is significantly worse than the quadratic complexity of Algorithm 3, which, of course, only applies to 0-dimensional homology.

## 2. BACKGROUND

As is common in persistence theory, we assume familiarity with very basic notions of category theory, specifically, that of a category and of a functor. We let  $\mathbb{k}$  denote a field,  $\mathbf{vec}_{\mathbb{k}}$  denote the category of finite dimensional  $\mathbb{k}$ -vector spaces, and  $\mathbf{set}$  denote the category of finite sets. If and when the field  $\mathbb{k}$  plays no role, we may denote  $\mathbf{vec}_{\mathbb{k}}$  simply by  $\mathbf{vec}$ .

**2.1. Graphs and filtered graphs.** A *graph*  $G = (V, E, \partial)$  consists of finite sets  $V$  and  $E$ , and a function  $\partial : E \rightarrow V \times V$ . We refer to the elements of  $V$  as *vertices*, typically denoted  $v, w, x, y \in V$ , and to the elements of  $E$  as *edges*, typically denoted  $e, d, h \in E$ . If  $\partial e = (v, w)$ , we write  $e_0 = v$  and  $e_1 = w$ . The *size* of a graph  $G$  is  $|G| = |V| + |E|$ .

A *subgraph* of a graph  $G = (V, E, \partial)$  is a graph  $G' = (V', E', \partial)$ , where  $V' \subseteq V$ ,  $E' \subseteq E$ , and the restriction of  $\partial$  to  $E'$  takes values in  $V' \times V' \subseteq V \times V$ . If  $G'$  is a subgraph of  $G$ , we write  $G' \subseteq G$ .

If  $E' \subseteq E$  is a set of edges of  $G$ , we let  $G \setminus E'$  be the subgraph of  $G$  with the same vertices and  $E \setminus E'$  as set of edges.

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a poset. A  $\mathcal{P}$ -*filtered graph*  $(G, f^V, f^E)$  consists of a graph  $G$  and functions  $f^V : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  and  $f^E : E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  such that  $f^V(e_0) \leq f^E(e)$  and  $f^V(e_1) \leq f^E(e)$  for all  $e \in E$ . When there is no risk of confusion, we refer to  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graphs simply as filtered graph, and denote both  $f^V$  and  $f^E$  by  $f$  and the filtered graph  $(G, f^V, f^E)$  by  $(G, f)$ .

If  $(G, f)$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph and  $r \in \mathcal{P}$ , we let  $(G, f)_r$  be the subgraph of  $G$  with vertices  $\{v \in V : f(v) \leq r\}$  and edges  $\{e \in E : f(e) \leq r\}$ .

**2.2. Persistence modules and persistent sets.** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a poset. A  $\mathcal{P}$ -*persistence module* is a functor  $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the category associated with  $\mathcal{P}$ . Explicitly, a  $\mathcal{P}$ -persistence module  $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  consists of the following:

- for each  $r \in \mathcal{P}$ , a vector space  $M(r)$ ;
- for each pair  $r \leq s \in \mathcal{P}$ , a linear morphism  $\varphi_{r,s}^M : M(r) \rightarrow M(s)$ ; such that
- for all  $r \in \mathcal{P}$ , the linear morphism  $\varphi_{r,r}^M : M(r) \rightarrow M(r)$  is the identity;
- for all  $r \leq s \leq t \in \mathcal{P}$ , we have  $\varphi_{s,t}^M \circ \varphi_{r,s}^M = \varphi_{r,t}^M : M(r) \rightarrow M(t)$ .

When there is no risk of confusion, we may refer to a  $\mathcal{P}$ -persistence module simply as a persistence module. If  $n \geq 1 \in \mathbb{N}$ , an  $n$ -*parameter persistence module* is an  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -persistence module.

A *morphism*  $g : M \rightarrow N$  between persistence modules is a natural transformation between functors, that is, a family of linear maps  $\{g_r : M(r) \rightarrow N(r)\}_{r \in \mathcal{P}}$  with the property that  $\varphi_{r,s}^N \circ g_r = g_s \circ \varphi_{r,s}^M : M(r) \rightarrow N(s)$ , for all  $r \leq s \in \mathcal{P}$ . Such a morphism is an *isomorphism* if  $g_r : M(r) \rightarrow N(r)$  is an isomorphism of vector spaces for all  $r \in \mathcal{P}$ .

If  $M, N : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  are persistence modules, their *direct sum*, denoted  $M \oplus N : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ , is the persistence module with  $(M \oplus N)(r) := M(r) \oplus N(r)$  and with  $\varphi_{r,s}^{M \oplus N} := \varphi_{r,s}^M \oplus \varphi_{r,s}^N : M(r) \oplus N(r) \rightarrow M(s) \oplus N(s)$ , for all  $r \leq s \in \mathcal{P}$ .

Similarly, a  $\mathcal{P}$ -*persistent set* is a functor  $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{set}$ , where  $\mathbf{set}$  is the category of sets. The concepts of  $n$ -*parameter persistent set*, and of *morphism* and *isomorphism* between persistent sets are defined analogously.

**2.3. Persistent homology and connected components of filtered graphs.** If  $S \in \mathbf{set}$ , we let  $\langle S \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} \in \mathbf{vec}$  denote the free vector space generated by  $S$ ; this defines a functor  $\langle - \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} : \mathbf{set} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}_{\mathbb{k}}$ .

Let  $G = (V, E, \partial)$  be a graph. Consider the  $\mathbb{k}$ -linear map

$$(1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \langle E \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} & \xrightarrow{d} & \langle V \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} \\ & & e \longmapsto e_1 - e_0 \end{array}$$

The *0-dimensional homology* of  $G$ , denoted  $H_0(G; \mathbb{k})$ , is the  $\mathbb{k}$ -vector space  $\text{coker}(d)$ , and the *1-dimensional homology* of  $G$ , denoted  $H_1(G; \mathbb{k})$ , is the  $\mathbb{k}$ -vector space  $\text{ker}(d)$ . In particular, every vertex  $v \in V$  gives an element  $[v] \in H_0(G; \mathbb{k})$ . When there is no risk of confusion, we omit the field  $\mathbb{k}$  and write  $H_i(G)$  instead of  $H_i(G; \mathbb{k})$ .

Homology is functorial, in the following sense. If  $G' = (V', E', \partial')$  is a subgraph of  $G$ , we have a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \langle E' \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} & \xrightarrow{d'} & \langle V' \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \langle E \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} & \xrightarrow{d} & \langle V \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} \end{array}$$

induced by the inclusions  $V' \subseteq V$  and  $E' \subseteq E$ . This induces  $\mathbb{k}$ -linear maps  $H_0(G') \rightarrow H_0(G)$  and  $H_1(G') \rightarrow H_1(G)$ . Moreover, the morphism  $H_{\bullet}(G') \rightarrow H_{\bullet}(G)$  induced by a subgraph  $G' \subseteq G$  is equal to the composite  $H_{\bullet}(G') \rightarrow H_{\bullet}(G) \rightarrow H_{\bullet}(G)$ .

In particular, if  $(G, f)$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph, and  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , we get a  $\mathcal{P}$ -persistence module  $H_i(G, f) : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ , with  $H_i(G, f)(r) = H_i((G, f)_r)$ , and with the structure morphism  $H_i(G, f)(r) \rightarrow H_i(G, f)(s)$  for  $r \leq s \in \mathcal{P}$  induced by the inclusion of graphs  $(G, f)_r \subseteq (G, f)_s$ .

The set of *connected components* of  $G$ , denoted  $\pi_0(G)$ , is the quotient of  $V$  by the equivalence relation  $\sim$  where  $v \sim w \in V$  if and only if there exists a path in  $G$  between  $v$  and  $w$ . If  $v \in V$ , we let  $[v] \in \pi_0(G)$  denote its connected component, so that  $[v] = [w] \in \pi_0(G)$  if and only if  $v$  and  $w$  belong to the same connected component.

The set of connected components is also functorial with respect to inclusions  $G' \subseteq G$ , since  $[v] = [w] \in \pi_0(G')$  implies  $[v] = [w] \in \pi_0(G)$ . In particular, if  $(G, f)$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph, we get a  $\mathcal{P}$ -persistent set  $\pi_0(G, f) : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{set}$ , with  $\pi_0(G, f)(r) = \pi_0((G, f)_r)$ , and with the structure morphism  $\pi_0(G, f)(r) \rightarrow \pi_0(G, f)(s)$  for  $r \leq s \in \mathcal{P}$  induced by the inclusion of graphs  $(G, f)_r \subseteq (G, f)_s$ .

The following is straightforward to check.

**Lemma 2.1.** *If  $G$  is a graph, then the map  $\langle \pi_0(G) \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} \rightarrow H_0(G)$  sending a basis element  $[v] \in \pi_0(G)$  to  $[v] \in H_0(G)$  is well-defined and an isomorphism of vector spaces. In particular, if  $(G, f)$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph, composing the persistent set  $\pi_0(G, f) : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{set}$  with the free vector space functor  $\langle - \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} : \mathbf{set} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  yields a persistence module isomorphic to  $H_0(G, f) : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ .  $\square$*

**2.4. Projective persistence modules.** Given  $r \in \mathcal{P}$ , let  $P_r : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  be the persistence module with  $P_r(s) = \mathbb{k}$  if  $r \leq s$  and  $P_r(s) = 0$  if  $r \not\leq s$ , with all structure morphisms that are not forced to be zero being the identity  $\mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ . Equivalently, one can define  $P_r$  to be  $H_0(\{x\}, \emptyset, \partial, f)$ , with  $f(x) = r$ .

**Notation 2.2.** If  $I$  is a set and  $f : I \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  is any function, we can consider the direct sum  $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_{f(i)} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ . When we need to work with elements of such a direct sum, we distinguish summands by writing  $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_{f(i)} \cdot \{i\}$ , and letting  $\{i\} \in P_{f(i)}(r)$  be a generator for each  $i \in I$  and  $r \geq f(i)$ .

**Definition 2.3.** A persistence module  $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  is *projective of finite rank* if there exists a function  $\beta^M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  of finite support such that  $M \cong \bigoplus_{r \in \mathcal{P}^n} P_r^{\beta^M(r)}$ .

Note that, drawing inspiration from commutative algebra, projective persistence modules are sometimes also called *free*. The following result justifies the term projective used in Definition 2.3; see, e.g., [34, Section 3.1] for the usual notion of projective module.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $g : M \rightarrow N$  be a surjection between  $\mathcal{P}$ -persistence modules, and let  $h : P \rightarrow N$  with  $P$  projective of finite rank. There exists a morphism  $h' : P \rightarrow M$  such that  $g \circ h' = h$ .*

**2.5. Resolutions, presentations, and Betti tables.** The next result is standard, and follows from the uniqueness of decomposition into indecomposables: specifically, a non-zero persistence module is indecomposable if it is not isomorphic to the direct sum of two non-zero persistence modules; and any persistence module  $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  can be written as a direct sum of indecomposable persistence modules in an essentially unique way. For details, see, e.g., [6] or [4, Section 2].

**Lemma 2.5.** *If  $M$  is projective of finite rank, then there exists exactly one function (necessarily of finite support)  $\beta^M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that  $M \cong \bigoplus_{r \in \mathcal{P}} P_r^{\beta^M(r)}$ .*  $\square$

**Definition 2.6.** The *Betti table* of a persistence module  $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  that is projective of finite rank is the function  $\beta^M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  characterized in Lemma 2.5.

The following notation is sometimes convenient.

**Notation 2.7.** If  $r \in \mathcal{P}$ , we let  $\delta_r : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  be the function defined by  $\delta_r(s) = 1$  if  $s = r \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $\delta_r(s) = 0$  if  $s \neq r$ . In particular,  $\delta_r = \beta^{P_r} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -persistence module. A *finite projective cover* of  $M$  is a surjective morphism  $P \rightarrow M$  with the property that  $P$  is projective of finite rank, and  $\sum_{r \in \mathcal{P}} \beta^P(r) \in \mathbb{N}$  is minimal.

**Definition 2.9.** Let  $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -persistence module, and let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . A *finite projective  $k$ -resolution* (resp. *minimal finite projective  $k$ -resolution*) of  $M$ , denoted  $C_\bullet \rightarrow M$ , is a sequence of morphisms:

$$C_k \xrightarrow{\partial_k} C_{k-1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{k-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\partial_2} C_1 \xrightarrow{\partial_1} C_0 \xrightarrow{\partial_0} M,$$

such that

- $C_i$  is projective of finite rank, for every  $0 \leq i \leq k$ ;
- $C_0 \rightarrow M$  is surjective (resp. a projective cover);
- $\partial_i \circ \partial_{i+1} = 0$ , for every  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$  (so that  $\partial_{i+1}$  factors through  $\ker \partial_i$ );
- $C_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{i+1}} \ker(\partial_i)$  is surjective (resp. a projective cover), for every  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ .

Note that, in particular, a minimal finite projective 0-resolution is simply a projective cover.

**Notation 2.10.** Since we only consider finite resolutions, we omit the word “finite” and simply say projective  $k$ -resolution. A *(minimal) projective presentation* is a *(minimal) projective 1-resolution*.

**Definition 2.11.** Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . A persistence module  $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  is *finitely  $k$ -resolvable* if it admits a finite projective  $k$ -resolution.

**Definition 2.12.** Let  $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  be finitely  $k$ -resolvable and let  $0 \leq i \leq k$ . The  *$i$ th Betti table* of  $M$  is the function  $\beta_i^M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  (necessarily of finite support) defined as  $\beta_i^M := \beta^{C_i}$ , where  $C_\bullet \rightarrow M$  is a minimal  $k$ -resolution of  $M$ .

The Betti tables of  $M$ , as defined in Definition 2.12, are independent of the choice of minimal presentation or resolution, thanks to the following standard result.

**Lemma 2.13.** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$  is finitely  $k$ -resolvable, then it admits a minimal projective  $k$ -resolution  $C_\bullet \rightarrow M$ . Moreover, any other projective  $k$ -resolution  $C'_\bullet \rightarrow M$  has the property that  $\beta^{C_i} \leq \beta^{C'_i}$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq k$ .*

**Notation 2.14.** When convenient, we write  $\beta_i(M)$  instead of  $\beta_i^M$  for the Betti tables of a persistence module  $M$ .

Drawing inspiration from commutative algebra and topology, the Betti tables of  $M$  are also sometimes called the *(multigraded) Betti numbers* of  $M$ .

**Example 2.15.** Consider the graph  $G = (V, E, \partial)$  with  $V = \{x, y\}$ ,  $E = \{a, b\}$ , and  $\partial(a) = \partial(b) = (x, y)$ . Consider the filtration  $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  with  $f(x) = f(y) = (0, 0)$ ,  $f(a) = (0, 1)$ , and  $f(b) = (1, 0)$ . Then, a minimal resolution of  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})$  is given by

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{(1,1)} \cdot \{\alpha\} \xrightarrow{\partial_2} \mathbb{P}_{(1,0)} \cdot \{a\} \oplus \mathbb{P}_{(0,1)} \cdot \{b\} \xrightarrow{\partial_1} \mathbb{P}_{(0,0)} \cdot \{x\} \oplus \mathbb{P}_{(0,0)} \cdot \{y\} \xrightarrow{\partial_0} H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k}),$$

where  $\partial_0(\{x\}) = [x]$ ,  $\partial_0(\{y\}) = [y]$ ,  $\partial_1(\{a\}) = \partial_1(\{b\}) = \{y\} - \{x\}$ , and  $\partial_2(\{\alpha\}) = \{a\} - \{b\}$ . In particular,  $\beta_0(H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})) = \delta_{(0,0)} + \delta_{(0,0)}$ ,  $\beta_1(H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})) = \delta_{(1,0)} + \delta_{(0,1)}$ , and  $\beta_2(H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})) = \delta_{(1,1)}$ . This can be easily checked by hand, but it also follows from Theorems 3.8 and 3.10, since  $(G, f)$  is a minimal filtered graph, in the sense of Definition 3.2, which we give in the next section.

### 3. THEORY

We start with a simple, standard result which says that a projective presentation of 0-dimensional homology is given by using as generators the grades of the vertices, and as relations the grades of the edges.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a poset, let  $(G, f)$  be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph, and consider the following morphism of projective modules*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigoplus_{e \in E} \mathbb{P}_{f(e)} \cdot \{e\} & \xrightarrow{\partial_1^{(G,f)}} & \bigoplus_{v \in V} \mathbb{P}_{f(v)} \cdot \{v\} \\ \{e\} & \longmapsto & \{e_1\} - \{e_0\} \end{array}$$

Then  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k}) \cong \text{coker}(\partial_1^{(G,f)})$  and  $H_1(G, f; \mathbb{k}) \cong \ker(\partial_1^{(G,f)})$ . In particular,  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})$  is a finitely presentable persistence module.

The point of minimal filtered graphs, which we now introduce, is that they make the presentation in Lemma 3.1 minimal (see Theorem 3.8).

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $(V, E, \partial, f)$  be a filtered graph and let  $e \in E$ .

- The edge  $e$  is *collapsible* if  $e_0 \neq e_1$  and  $f(e) = f(e_i)$  for some  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ .
- The edge  $e$  is *deletable* if  $[e_0] = [e_1] \in \pi_0(V, E \setminus \{e\}, \partial, f)(f(e))$ .

A filtered graph  $(G, f)$  is

- *vertex-minimal* if it does not contain any collapsible edges.
- *edge-minimal* if it does not contain any deletable edges.
- *minimal* if it is vertex-minimal and edge-minimal.

**Example 3.3.** The graph of Example 2.15 is minimal, as neither of the two edges is collapsible or deletable. On the other hand, the graph of Fig. 1 is not minimal since  $h_1$ ,  $h_2$ ,  $d_1$ ,  $d_2$ , and  $d_3$  are collapsible, and  $e_3$  is deletable.

As their name suggests, collapsible and deletable edges can be collapsed or deleted, as follows.

**Construction 3.4.** Let  $(G, f) = (V, E, \partial, f)$  be a filtered graph.

- If  $e \in E$  is collapsible, let  $i \in \{0, 1\}$  be such that  $f(e) = f(e_i)$ . Define the *simple collapse*  $G \downarrow e := (V \setminus \{e_i\}, E \setminus \{e\}, \partial')$ , where  $\partial' = (\varphi \times \varphi) \circ \partial$  and  $\varphi : V \rightarrow V$  is given by  $\varphi(v) = v$  if  $v \neq e_i$  and  $\varphi(v) = e_{1-i}$  if  $v = e_i$ .
- If  $e \in E$  is any edge, define the *simple deletion*  $G \setminus e := (V, E \setminus \{e\}, \partial)$ .

We now study the effect of collapsing collapsible edges, and of deleting deletable edges. We start with a useful observation, whose proof is straightforward.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $(G, f)$  be a filtered graph and let  $e$  and  $d$  be two different edges of  $G$ .*

- (1) *Assume that  $e$  is collapsible. If  $d$  is not collapsible (resp. deletable) in  $(G, f)$ , then  $d$  is not collapsible (resp. deletable) in  $(G \downarrow e, f)$ .*
- (2) *If  $d$  is not collapsible (resp. deletable) in  $(G, f)$ , then  $d$  is not collapsible (resp. deletable) in  $(G \setminus e, f)$ .  $\square$*

**Lemma 3.6.** *If  $(G, f) = (V, E, \partial, f)$  is a filtered graph and  $e \in E$  is collapsible, then  $H_i(G, f; \mathbb{k}) \cong H_i(G \downarrow e, f; \mathbb{k})$  for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ .*

**Lemma 3.7.** *If  $(G, f) = (V, E, \partial, f)$  is a filtered graph and  $e \in E$  is deletable, then  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k}) \cong H_0(G \setminus e, f; \mathbb{k})$  and  $H_1(G, f; \mathbb{k}) \cong H_1(G \setminus e, f; \mathbb{k}) \oplus \mathbb{P}_{f(e)}$ .*

Next is an explicit construction for a minimal presentation of  $H_0$  of a minimal filtered graph.

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a poset, let  $(G, f)$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph, and let  $\partial_1^{(G, f)} : C_1 \rightarrow C_0$  be the morphism of Lemma 3.1.*

- (1) *If  $(G, f)$  is vertex-minimal, then the map  $C_0 \rightarrow \text{coker}(\partial_1^{(G, f)})$  is a projective cover. In this case,  $\beta_0(H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})) = \sum_{v \in V} \delta_{f(v)}$ .*
- (2) *If  $(G, f)$  is a minimal filtered graph, then  $C_1 \xrightarrow{\partial_1^{(G, f)}} C_0 \rightarrow \text{coker}(\partial_1^{(G, f)})$  is a minimal presentation. In this case, we also have  $\beta_1(H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})) = \sum_{e \in E} \delta_{f(e)}$ .*

We now focus on the case of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ -filtered graphs. If  $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is a filtration, we let  $f_x, f_y : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denote the first and second coordinates of  $f$ , respectively.

**Definition 3.9.** Let  $(G, f)$  be a minimal  $\mathbb{R}^2$ -filtered graph. An edge  $d \in E$  is *cycle-creating* if  $[e_0] = [e_1] \in \pi_0(G, f)(x, y)$  for some  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  with  $x < f_x(d)$ .

Thus,  $d \in E$  is cycle-creating if there exists a list of edges  $e^1, \dots, e^k \in E$  with  $f_x(e^i) < f_x(d)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , and a list of signs  $s^1, \dots, s^k \in \{+, -\}$ , such that  $s^1 e^1, \dots, s^k e^k$  is a directed path from  $d_0$  to  $d_1$ . Such a path  $w = (s^\bullet, e^\bullet)$  is called a *witness* for  $d$ , and we denote  $f(w) := (f_x(d), \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} f_y(e_d^i))$ . A *minimal witness*  $w$  of for a cycle-creating edge  $d$  is one for which  $f_y(w) \in \mathbb{R}$  is as small as possible.

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $(G, f)$  be a minimal  $\mathbb{R}^2$ -filtered graph, and for each  $d \in E$  cycle-creating, let  $w_d = (s_d^\bullet, e_d^\bullet)$  be a minimal witness. The kernel of the morphism  $\partial_1^{(G, f)}$  of Lemma 3.1 is given by:*

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{\text{cycle-creating} \\ d \in E}} \mathbb{P}_{f(w_d)} \cdot \{d\} \xrightarrow{\kappa^{(G, f)}} \bigoplus_{e \in E} \mathbb{P}_{f(e)} \cdot \{e\}$$

$$\{d\} \longmapsto \{d\} - (s_d^1 \{e_d^1\} + \dots + s_d^k \{e_d^k\}),$$

so that  $\beta_0(H_0(G, f)) = \sum_{v \in V} \delta_{f(v)}$ ,  $\beta_1(H_0(G, f)) = \sum_{e \in E} \delta_{f(e)}$ , and  $\beta_0(H_1(G, f)) = \beta_2(H_0(G, f)) = \sum_{\substack{d \in E \\ \text{cycle-creating}}} \delta_{f(w_d)}$ .

## 4. ALGORITHMS

**4.1. Pseudocode.** We describe the main algorithms; their correctness is proven in the next section.

In this section, we say that two  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph  $(G, f)$  and  $(G', f')$  are *homology-equivalent* (over  $\mathbb{k}$ ) if  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k}) \cong H_0(G', f'; \mathbb{k})$  and  $H_1(G, f; \mathbb{k}) \cong H_1(G', f'; \mathbb{k})$ .

Algorithm 2 reduces the input filtered graph to a vertex-minimal filtered graph by collapsing edges. A *local collapsible edge* of a filtered graph  $(G, f)$  is an edge  $e$  such that  $e_0 \neq e_1$  and  $f(e) = f(e_0) = f(e_1)$ ; Algorithm 2 first calls Algorithm 1, which collapses local collapsible edges.

**Algorithm 1:** Collapse local collapsible edges**Input:** Filtered graph  $(G, f) = (V, E, \partial, f)$ **Output:** Filtered graph  $(G', f)$  homology-equivalent to  $(G, f)$  and without any local collapsible edges

```

1 Initialize dictionary  $\varphi$  with identity map,  $\varphi[v] = v$  for  $v \in V$ 
2 Initialize empty set visited
3 Initialize  $E' \leftarrow E$ 
4 for  $v \in V$  do ▷ Run depth-first search from  $v$  on local edges
5   Initialize stack with  $(v, \emptyset, v)$ 
6   while stack is not empty do
7      $(v, e, u) \leftarrow \text{stack.pop}()$ 
8     if  $u \notin \text{visited}$  then
9       add  $u$  to visited
10      if  $e \neq \emptyset$  then
11         $\varphi[u] \leftarrow v$ 
12        remove  $e$  from  $E'$ 
13      for  $e \in E$  with  $\{e_0, e_1\} = \{u, x\}$  and  $f(e) = f(x) = f(u)$  do ▷ local collapsible
14        push  $(v, e, x)$  onto stack
15  $V' \leftarrow \{v \in V : \varphi[v] = v\}$ 
16 return  $(G', f) = (V', E', (\varphi \times \varphi) \circ \partial, f)$ 

```

After calling Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2 identifies *minimal vertices*, that is, vertices with no adjacent collapsible edge decreasing the grade, and runs a depth-first search from each of these to build and then collapse a tree of collapsible edges.

**Algorithm 2:** Collapse to vertex-minimal filtered graph**Input:** Filtered graph  $(G, f) = (V, E, \partial, f)$ **Output:** Vertex-minimal filtered graph  $(G', f)$  homology-equivalent to  $(G, f)$ , and  $\beta_0(H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k}))$ 

```

1  $(G_i, f) = (V_i, E_i, \partial_i, f) \leftarrow \text{Algorithm 1}(G, f)$ 
2 Initialize dictionary  $\varphi$  with identity map,  $\varphi[v] = v$  for  $v \in V_i$ 
3 Initialize empty set visited
4 Initialize  $E' \leftarrow E_i$ 
5 for  $v$  in  $V_i$  do ▷ Run depth-first search from minimal vertices
6   if  $\exists$  edge  $e \in E_i$  with  $\{e_0, e_1\} = \{u, v\}$  and  $f(e) = f(v) > f(u)$  then ▷  $v$  is not minimal
7     continue
8   Initialize stack with  $(v, \emptyset, v)$ 
9   while stack is not empty do
10     $v, e, u \leftarrow \text{stack.pop}()$ 
11    if  $u \notin \text{visited}$  then
12      add  $u$  to visited
13      if  $e \neq \emptyset$  then
14         $\varphi[u] \leftarrow v$ 
15        remove  $e$  from  $E'$ 
16      for every edge  $e \in E_i$  with  $\{e_0, e_1\} = \{u, x\}$  with  $f(e) = f(x) > f(u)$  do
17        push  $(v, e, x)$  onto stack
18  $V' \leftarrow \{v \in V_i : \varphi[v] = v\}$ 
19 return  $(G', f) = (V', E', (\varphi \times \varphi) \circ \partial_i, f)$  and  $\beta_0 = [f(v) : v \in V']$ 

```

Algorithm 3 first calls Algorithm 2 to perform all collapses and then deletes deletable edges until there are no more deletable edges. It then builds the presentation of Lemma 3.1.

---

**Algorithm 3:** Minimal presentation of  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph

---

**Input:** Filtered graph  $(G, f) = (V, E, \partial, f)$

**Output:** Minimal presentation of  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})$

```

1 Initialize  $\beta_0, \beta_1$  with empty lists
2 Initialize empty sparse matrix  $\mathcal{M}$  and empty dictionary row_idx
3  $(V', E', \partial', f) \leftarrow$  Algorithm 2( $G, f$ )
4 for  $e \in E'$  do ▷ Check each edge, and delete it if it is deletable
5   | Define set of vertices  $V_e \leftarrow \{v \in V' : f(v) \leq f(e)\}$ 
6   | Define set of edges  $E_e \leftarrow \{d \in E' : f(d) \leq f(e)\} \setminus e$ 
7   | Run breadth-first search on  $(V_e, E_e, \partial')$  starting from  $e_0$ 
8   | if  $e_1$  is reachable from  $e_0$  then ▷  $[e_0] = [e_1] \in \pi_0(V_e, E_e, \partial')$  so  $e$  is deletable
9   |   |  $E' \leftarrow E' \setminus \{e\}$ 
10 for  $v \in V'$  do
11   |  $\beta_0.append(f(v))$ 
12   |  $row\_idx[v] \leftarrow |\beta_0|$ 
13 for  $e \in E'$  do ▷ The morphism  $\partial_1^{(V', E', \partial')}$  of Lemma 3.1
14   |  $\beta_1.append(f(e))$ 
15   |  $\mathcal{M}[row\_idx[e_0], |\beta_1|] \leftarrow -1$ 
16   |  $\mathcal{M}[row\_idx[e_1], |\beta_1|] \leftarrow 1$ 
17 return  $\beta_0, \beta_1, \mathcal{M}$ 

```

---

Before giving Algorithm 4, we introduce the dynamic dendrogram data structure, which, informally, represents a dendrogram where elements merge as time goes from 0 to  $\infty$ , and is dynamic in that one is allowed to change the dendrogram by making two elements merge earlier.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $(G, f) = (V, E, \partial, f)$  be a  $[-\infty, \infty)$ -filtered graph. A *dynamic dendrogram*  $D$  for  $(G, f)$  is a data structure supporting the following operations:

- If  $v, w \in V$ , the operation  $D.time\_of\_merge(v, w)$  returns the smallest  $r \in [-\infty, \infty)$  such that  $[v] = [w] \in \pi_0(G, f)(r)$ , or  $\infty$  if  $[v] \neq [w] \in \pi_0(G, f)(r)$  for all  $r \in [-\infty, \infty)$ .
- If  $v, w \in V$  and  $t \geq 0$ , the operation  $D.merge\_at\_time(v, w, t)$  modifies the dendrogram so that it is a dynamic dendrogram for  $(V, E \sqcup \{e\}, \partial', f')$ , with  $f'|_E = f$ ,  $\partial'|_E = \partial$ ,  $f'(e) = t$ , and  $\partial'(e) = (v, w)$ .

A dynamic dendrogram  $D$  can easily and efficiently be implemented using a *mergeable tree*  $T$  in the sense of [20], as follows. We use the operations of mergeable trees as in [20]; with the only difference that we use the opposite order on labels.

- To implement  $D.time\_of\_merge(v, w)$ , return the label of  $T.nca(v, w)$ .
- To implement  $D.merge\_at\_time(v, w, t)$ , let  $h$  be a new vertex not already in the mergeable tree  $T$ , do  $T.insert(h, t)$ , then  $T.merge(v, h)$ , and  $T.merge(w, h)$ .

Algorithm 4 first calls Algorithm 2 to perform all collapses, and then goes through all edges, with respect to the lex order on their grades, and identifies deletable edges, non-deletable edges, and cycle-creating edges.

---

**Algorithm 4:** Betti tables and minimal presentation of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ -filtered graph
 

---

**Input:** Filtered graph  $(G, f) = (V, E, \partial, f)$   
**Output:** Betti tables  $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2$  and minimal presentation of  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})$ , and  $\beta_0^1 := \beta_0(H_1(G, f; \mathbb{k}))$

- 1 Initialize  $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_0^1$  with empty lists
- 2  $(V', E', \partial', f) \leftarrow \text{Algorithm 2}(G, f)$
- 3 Let  $D$  be a dynamic dendrogram on  $(V', \emptyset, \partial, g)$ , with  $g(v) = -\infty$  for all  $v \in V'$
- 4 Initialize empty sparse matrix  $\mathcal{M}$  and empty dictionary `row_idx`
- 5 **for**  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  s.t.  $f^{-1}(x, y) \neq \emptyset$  in lex order **do** ▷ Visit grades lexicographically
- 6     **for**  $v \in V'$  with  $f(v) = (x, y)$  **do** ▷ All vertices belong to the projective cover
- 7          $\beta_0.\text{append}((x, y))$
- 8         `row_idx[v] ← | $\beta_0$ |`
- 9     **for**  $e \in E'$  with  $f(e) = (x, y)$  **do**
- 10          $s \leftarrow D.\text{time\_of\_merge}(e_0, e_1)$
- 11         **if**  $s \leq y$  **then** ▷ The edge is deletable, so it only affects  $H_1$
- 12              $\beta_0^1.\text{append}((x, y))$
- 13         **else** ▷ Edge is not deletable, so belongs to relations in resolution
- 14              $D.\text{merge\_at\_time}(e_0, e_1, y)$
- 15              $\beta_1.\text{append}((x, y))$
- 16              $\mathcal{M}[\text{row\_idx}[e_0], |\beta_1|] \leftarrow -1$
- 17              $\mathcal{M}[\text{row\_idx}[e_1], |\beta_1|] \leftarrow 1$
- 18             **if**  $s < \infty$  **then** ▷ The edge is cycle-creating
- 19                  $\beta_2.\text{append}((x, s))$
- 20                  $\beta_0^1.\text{append}((x, s))$
- 21 **return**  $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_0^1, \mathcal{M}$

---

**4.2. Complexity and correctness.** We conclude the paper by using the theoretical results of Section 3 to prove the main results in the introduction.

We start by proving a convenient lemma, which gives conditions under which one can collapse an entire subgraph and produce a homology-equivalent filtered graph. The following definition describes the type of subgraph that can be collapsed.

**Definition 4.2.** Let  $(G, f) = (V, E, \partial, f)$  be a filtered graph. A subset  $E' \subseteq E$  is a *monotonic forest* of  $(G, f)$  if:

- (1) The subgraph of  $G$  spanned by the edges in  $E'$  is a forest.
- (2) For every vertex  $v$  in the forest, there exists at most one edge  $e \in E'$  such that  $\{e_0, e_1\} = \{v, w\}$  and  $f(w) < f(v)$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** Let  $(G, f) = (V, E, \partial, f)$  be a filtered graph, and let  $E' \subseteq E$  be a set of collapsible edges, which forms a monotonic forest. If  $e \in E'$ , then all the edges in  $E' \setminus \{e\}$  are collapsible in  $(G \downarrow e, f)$ . In particular, the whole forest  $E'$  can be collapsed (in any order) to obtain a filtered graph that is homology-equivalent to  $(G, f)$ .

*Proof.* Collapsing a single collapsible edge produces a homology-equivalent filtered graph, by Lemma 3.6. So we need to prove that collapsing an edge of the monotonic forest  $E'$  consisting of collapsible edges does not affect the collapsibility of other edges in  $E'$ .

Let  $e, d \in E'$ . We prove that  $d$  is collapsible in  $(G \downarrow e, f)$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $f(d) = f(d_1)$ . Without loss of generality, we also assume that  $f(e) = f(e_1)$  and that the simple collapse deletes  $e_1$  and  $e$ , and makes every edge adjacent to  $e_1$  now be adjacent to  $e_0$ .

Let  $G' = (V', E' \setminus \{e\}, \partial') = G \downarrow e$ . For notational convenience, let  $(d'_0, d'_1) = \partial'(d)$ . We prove that  $d'_0 \neq d'_1$  and  $f(d'_0) = f(d)$  or  $f(d'_1) = f(d)$ , which implies that  $d$  is collapsible in  $(G \downarrow d, f)$ , by definition. The fact that  $d'_0 \neq d'_1$  in  $G \downarrow e$  is clear, since  $d_0 \neq d_1$ , so  $d'_0 = d'_1$  would mean that  $\{e_0, e_1\} = \{d_0, d_1\}$ , which is not possible because  $E'$  is a forest and thus contains no loops.

We prove  $f(d'_0) = f(d)$  or  $f(d'_1) = f(d)$  by considering two cases. The first case is when we have  $d_1 \neq e_1$ . In this case  $d'_1 = d_1$ , so  $f(d'_1) = f(d_1) = f(d)$ . The second case is when  $d_1 = e_1$ . In this case, we cannot have  $f(d_0) < f(d)$ , as this would violate condition (2) of Definition 4.2 for the vertex  $v = e_1$ , so we must have  $f(d_0) = f(d)$ . But since  $d_0 \neq d_1 = e_1$ , we have that  $d'_0 = d_0$ , so  $f(d'_0) = f(d_0) = f(d)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $(G, f)$  be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph. Algorithm 1 outputs a filtered graph homology-equivalent to  $(G, f)$  and without local collapsible edges in time  $O(|G|)$ .*

*Proof.* The algorithm performs a depth-first search on the local collapsible edges. It removes the edges of the depth-first search forest and makes each edge adjacent to a vertex in the forest now be adjacent to the root of a tree in the forest, using the map  $\varphi$ . This is equivalent to collapsing the forest, which produces a homology-equivalent graph, by Lemma 4.3. To see that the output contains no local collapsible edges, note that all local collapsible edges in the initial graph are identified by the algorithm, and collapsing an edge cannot make any previously non-collapsible edge be collapsible, by Lemma 3.5(1). Moreover, since collapsing a local collapsible edge does not change the  $f$ -value of the endpoints of any edge, a local collapse cannot make a previously non-local, collapsible edge become local collapsible.  $\square$

The time complexity of the depth-first search is linear.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $(G, f)$  be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph. Algorithm 2 outputs a vertex-minimal filtered graph homology-equivalent to  $(G, f)$  and  $\beta_0(H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k}))$  in  $O(|G|)$  time.*

*Proof.* The guiding principle for collapsing collapsible edges followed by the algorithm is simple: first identify a maximal monotonic tree (Definition 4.2) of collapsible edges; then collapse that subtree, which does not change the homology by Lemma 4.3; and then iterate this. In order to do this efficiently, note that any maximal monotonic tree of collapsible edges contains exactly one local connected component of the graph (that is, a connected component in the subgraph of vertices and edges having the same  $f$ -value) that is minimal (that is, that has no adjacent collapsible edge decreasing the grade). Since the input is assumed to not have any locally collapsible edges, minimal local components are the same as minimal vertices, which are easy to identify, since these are simply vertices with no adjacent collapsible edge decreasing the grade.

The algorithm iterates over minimal vertices, and collapses the corresponding DFS tree of collapsible edges going up in the filtration. Since collapsing edges cannot produce more collapsible edges (Lemma 3.5(1)), nor more minimal vertices, at the end of the main for-loop there are no collapsible edges left.

The output Betti table  $\beta_0$  is correct by Theorem 3.8(1), and the time complexity of the depth-first search is linear.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $(G, f)$  be a finite  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph. Algorithm 3 outputs a minimal presentation of  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})$  in  $O(|G|^2)$  time.*

*Proof.* We start with the claim about the time complexity. Algorithm 2 is linear by Proposition 4.5, so it remains to prove that we can check the condition  $[e_0] = [e_1] \in \pi_0(V_e, E_e, \partial')$  in  $O(|G|)$  time. To do this, we run breadth-first search on  $G'$ , starting from  $e_0$ , and simply ignore every vertex and every edge whose  $f$ -value is not less than or equal to  $f(e)$ ; and we also ignore  $e$ . If at some point we encounter  $e_1$ , then  $[e_0] = [e_1] \in \pi_0(V_e, E_e, \partial')$ , and otherwise  $[e_0] \neq [e_1] \in \pi_0(V_e, E_e, \partial')$ .

We now prove the correctness of the algorithm. By Theorem 3.8, we only need to check that, at the end of the for-loop in Line 4, the graph  $(V', E', \partial', f)$  contains no deletable edges. Clearly, the for-loop visits all edges, so correctness follows from Lemma 3.5(2).  $\square$

**Theorem A.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be any poset, and let  $(G, f)$  be a finite  $\mathcal{P}$ -filtered graph. Algorithm 2 outputs  $\beta_0(H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k}))$  in  $O(|G|)$  time. Algorithm 3 outputs a minimal presentation, and hence the 0th and 1st Betti tables, of  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})$  in  $O(|G|^2)$  time.*

*Proof.* This follows directly from Propositions 4.5 and 4.6.  $\square$

**Theorem B.** *Let  $(G, f)$  be a finite  $\mathbb{R}^2$ -filtered graph. Algorithm 4 outputs a minimal presentation and the Betti tables of  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})$  and of  $H_1(G, f; \mathbb{k})$  in  $O(|G| \log |G|)$  time.*

*Proof.* The output  $\beta_0$  is correct by the correctness of Algorithm 2. To prove correctness of the rest of the algorithm, we consider the following invariant:

- (\*) At the end of the iteration of the main for-loop in Line 5 corresponding to the grade  $(x, y)$ , the dynamic dendrogram  $D$  is a dynamic dendrogram for the filtered graph  $(V', E'_{(x,y)}, \partial', g)$ , where  $E'_{(x,y)} := \{e \in E' : f(e) \leq (x, y) \text{ or } f_{\mathbf{x}}(e) < x\}$ ,  $g(v) := -\infty$  for all  $v \in V'$ , and  $g(e) := f_{\mathbf{y}}(e)$ .

It is clear that the algorithm maintains invariant (\*).

We now address the correctness of the outputs  $\beta_0^1$ ,  $\beta_1$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$ . An element of  $\beta_0^1$  is added either in the if-clause in Line 11 checking for  $s \leq y$ , or when an element of  $\beta_2$  is added in Line 19. The if-clause corresponds exactly to an edge that is connecting two vertices in the same connected component, that is, to a deletable edge. Thus, by Theorem 3.10 and Lemma 3.7, the output  $\beta_0^1$  is correct as long as the output for  $\beta_2$  is. It also follows that the output  $\beta_1$  is correct, as deletable edges are being identified correctly, and that the output presentation matrix  $\mathcal{M}$  is correct, by Theorem 3.8.

To prove that the output  $\beta_2$  is correct, we need to show that cycle-creating edges are being identified correctly. To see this, note that the check  $s < \infty$  is being performed only after knowing that the edge  $e$  is not deletable (and thus after knowing that the edge will be part of the minimal graph, by Lemma 3.5), and that the if-clause  $s < \infty$  is true exactly when  $e_0$  and  $e_1$  belong to the same connected component at some grade  $(x', y')$  with  $x' < f_{\mathbf{x}}(e)$ , by the invariant (\*). This is precisely the case when  $e$  is cycle-creating, by Definition 3.9, and we have  $s = f_{\mathbf{y}}(w_e)$ , where  $w_e$  is a minimal witness of  $e$ , also by the invariant (\*). It follows that the output  $\beta_2$  is correct.

To conclude, we analyze the time complexity. Since the algorithm consists of for-loops visiting each vertex and each edge exactly once, we only need to make sure that the operations involving  $D$  are in  $\log(|G|)$  which is proven in [20, Section 4].  $\square$

## APPENDIX A. OTHER PROOFS

### A.1. Proofs from Section 2.

*Proof of Lemma 2.4.* Let  $P = \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_{f(i)} \cdot \{i\}$ . To define a morphism  $P \rightarrow M$  it is sufficient to say, for each  $j \in J$ , to which element of  $M(f(j))$  the element  $\{j\} \in P(f(j))$  gets mapped to. Since  $g$  is a surjection, let us choose  $m_j \in M(f(j))$  in the preimage of  $h_{f(j)}(\{j\}) \in N(f(j))$ , for each  $j \in J$ . Let  $h' : P \rightarrow M$  be defined by mapping  $\{j\} \in P(f(j))$  to  $m_j \in M(f(j))$ . It is clear that this morphism satisfies  $g \circ h' = h$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $M$  be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -persistence module and let  $g : Q = \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_{f(i)} \cdot \{i\} \rightarrow M$  be a finite projective cover. For every  $j \in I$ , we have that  $g_{f(j)}(\{j\}) \neq 0 \in M(f(j))$ , and  $\{j\} \in Q(f(j))$  is the only preimage of  $g_{f(j)}(\{j\})$ .*

*Proof.* If  $g_{f(j)}(\{j\}) = 0 \in M(f(j))$ , then the restriction of  $g$  given by  $\bigoplus_{i \in I \setminus \{j\}} P_{f(i)} \cdot \{i\} \rightarrow M$  would be surjective, and thus  $\sum_{r \in \mathcal{P}} \beta^Q(r)$  would not be minimal, so  $Q \rightarrow M$  would not be a projective cover.

Similarly, if there exists another element of  $Q(f(j))$  mapping to  $g_{f(j)}(\{j\})$ , then this element would be linearly independent of  $\{j\}$ , and again the restriction of  $g$  given by  $\bigoplus_{i \in I \setminus \{j\}} P_{f(i)} \cdot \{i\} \rightarrow M$  would be surjective, and  $Q \rightarrow M$  would not be a projective cover.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.13.* We start by proving that any finitely 0-resolvable  $M$  admits a projective cover. By definition, there exists a surjection  $P \rightarrow M$  from a projective of finite rank  $P$ . If  $\sum_{r \in \mathcal{P}} \beta^P(r) \in \mathbb{N}$  is not minimal, we can remove at least one direct summand of  $P$  to get  $P' \rightarrow M$  still a surjection. Proceeding in this way, we necessarily end up with a projective cover of  $M$ .

Now, a straightforward inductive argument shows that any  $k$ -resolvable module admits a minimal projective  $k$ -resolution.

We now prove that, if  $g : P \rightarrow N$  is a projective cover and  $h : Q \rightarrow N$  is a surjection from a finitely presentable projective, then  $\beta^P \leq \beta^Q$ . The inequality in the statement of the result involving Betti tables follows from this.

By Lemma 2.4, there exist morphisms  $g' : P \rightarrow Q$  and  $h' : Q \rightarrow P$  such that  $h \circ g' = g$  and  $g \circ h' = h$ . We claim that  $h' \circ g' : P \rightarrow P$  is the identity; this is sufficient since then  $Q \cong P \oplus P'$  for some finitely presentable projective  $Q$ , and thus  $\beta^P \leq \beta^P + \beta^{P'} = \beta^Q$ .

Let  $P = \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_{f(i)} \cdot \{i\}$ . Let  $j \in J$ . By Lemma A.1, we have that  $(h' \circ g')_{f(j)}(\{j\}) = \{j\} \in P(f(j))$ , since  $g = g \circ (h' \circ g')$  and  $\{j\}$  is the unique element of  $P(f(j))$  mapping to  $g_{f(j)}(\{j\}) \in M(f(j))$ . Since the elements  $\{j\} \in P(f(j))$  generate  $P$ , this implies that  $h' \circ g'$  is the identity.  $\square$

## A.2. Proofs from Section 3.

*Proof of Lemma 3.1.* It is straightforward to see that the evaluation of the natural transformation  $\partial_1^{(G,f)}$  at  $r \in \mathcal{P}$  coincides with morphism Eq. (1), where the graph is  $(\{v \in V : f(v) \leq r\}, \{e \in E : f(e) \leq r\}, \partial)$ . Then  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k})$  is finitely presentable by definition.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.6.* This follows at once from the homotopy-invariance property of homology; however, in order to make the exposition self-contained, let us give an algebraic proof, using the definition of homology for graphs given in Section 2.3.

Let  $e \in E$  be collapsible, and assume that  $f(e) = f(e_0)$ ; the case  $f(e) = f(e_1)$  is analogous. Consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\left( \bigoplus_{d \in E \setminus \{e\}} P_{f(d)} \cdot \{d\} \right) \oplus (P_{f(e)} \cdot \{e\}) & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} \partial_1^{(G \downarrow e, f)} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}} & \left( \bigoplus_{v \in V \setminus \{e_i\}} P_{f(v)} \cdot \{v\} \right) \oplus (P_{f(e_i)} \cdot \{e_0\}) \\
\downarrow \begin{bmatrix} \{d\} \mapsto \begin{cases} \{d\} & \text{if } d_1 \neq e_0 \\ \{d\} + \{e\} & \text{else} \end{cases} \\ \{e\} \mapsto \{e\} \end{bmatrix}^T & & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} \{v\} \mapsto \{v\} \\ \{e_0\} \mapsto \{e_1\} - \{e_0\} \end{bmatrix}^T \\
\bigoplus_{d \in E} P_{f(d)} \cdot \{d\} & \xrightarrow{\partial_1^{(G,f)}} & \bigoplus_{v \in V} P_{f(v)} \cdot \{v\}.
\end{array}$$

It is clear that the cokernel (resp. kernel) of the top horizontal morphism is isomorphic to the cokernel (resp. kernel) of  $\partial_1^{(G \downarrow e, f)}$ , which in turn is isomorphic to the 0th (resp. 1st) persistent homology of  $(G \downarrow e, f)$ , by Lemma 3.1. So it is sufficient to prove that the diagram is commutative, and that the vertical morphisms are isomorphisms. The commutativity of the diagram is a straightforward check, using the definition of  $G \downarrow e$  (Construction 3.4) in the case where  $d \in E$  is such that  $d_1 = e_0$ . The fact that the vertical morphisms are isomorphisms is proven by a simple Gaussian elimination using the matrix representation of the vertical morphisms.  $\square$

**Lemma A.2.** *If  $(G, f) = (V, E, \partial, f)$  is a filtered graph and  $e \in E$  is deletable, then the morphism of persistent sets  $\pi_0(G \setminus e, f) \rightarrow \pi_0(G, f)$  induced by the inclusion  $G \setminus e \rightarrow G$  is an isomorphism.*

*Proof.* The morphism  $\pi_0(G \setminus e, f) \rightarrow \pi_0(G, f)$  is clearly surjective, since  $G \setminus e \rightarrow G$  is surjective on vertices. Thus, it is sufficient to prove that, for all  $r \in \mathcal{P}$  and all  $x, y \in V$  with  $f(x), f(y) \geq r$ , we

have that  $[x] = [y] \in \pi_0(G, f)_r$  implies  $[x] = [y] \in \pi_0(G \setminus e, f)_r$ . So assume that  $[x] = [y] \in \pi_0(G, f)_r$ , and let  $e^1, \dots, e^k$  be a path between  $x$  and  $y$  in  $(G, f)_r$ . If the path does not contain the edge  $e$ , then it is also a path between  $x$  and  $y$  in  $(G \setminus e, f)_r$ , and we are done. If the path does contain the edge  $e$ , then, in particular,  $r \geq f(e)$ . Since  $e$  is deletable, there exists a path  $d^1, \dots, d^\ell$  between the vertices  $e_0$  and  $e_1$  in  $(G \setminus e, f)_{f(r)}$ . Now, take the path  $e^1, \dots, e^k$  and replace every occurrence of the edge  $e$  with the path  $d^1, \dots, d^\ell$ . This yields a path between  $x$  and  $y$  in  $(G \setminus e, f)_r$ , so that  $[x] = [y] \in \pi_0(G \setminus e, f)_r$ , as required.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.7.* Lemma A.2, together with Lemma 2.1, implies that the morphism  $H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_0(G \setminus e, f; \mathbb{k})$  induced by the inclusion of graphs is an isomorphism of persistence modules.

We now prove that  $H_1(G, f; \mathbb{k}) \cong H_1(G \setminus e, f; \mathbb{k}) \oplus P_{f(e)}$ . Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & H_1(G \setminus e, f; \mathbb{k}) & \longrightarrow & H_1(G, f; \mathbb{k}) & \longrightarrow & P_{f(e)} & \dashrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{d \in E \setminus \{e\}} P_{f(d)} & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{d \in E} P_{f(d)} & \longrightarrow & P_{f(e)} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \partial_1^{(G \setminus e, f)} & & \downarrow \partial_1^{(G, f)} & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in V} P_{f(v)} & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in V} P_{f(v)} & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & \dashrightarrow & H_0(G \setminus e, f; \mathbb{k}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & H_0(G, f; \mathbb{k}) & \longrightarrow & 0 & & 
 \end{array}$$

The first and last modules in the second and third column are, respectively, a kernel and a cokernel, by Lemma 3.1, and the second and third row are clearly exact. Thus, the snake lemma [34, Corollary 6.12] implies the existence of the dashed morphism and the exactness of the sequence of modules which includes the dashed morphism. Moreover, the statement about  $H_0$  proven in the first part of the proof implies the isomorphism in the bottom row. We thus have that  $0 \rightarrow H_1(G \setminus e, f; \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_1(G, f; \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow P_{f(e)} \rightarrow 0$  is a short exact sequence, which necessarily splits since  $P_{f(e)}$  is projective [34, Proposition 3.3]. The result follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.8.* The claim about the Betti tables follows directly from the claim that the presentation  $\partial_1^{(G, f)}$  is minimal, so let us prove this claim.

We start by proving (1). Let  $G = (V, E, \partial)$  be vertex-minimal. We first prove that  $h : Q := \bigoplus_{v \in V} P_{f(v)} \cdot \{v\} \rightarrow \operatorname{coker} \partial_1^{(G, f)} \cong H_0(G, f) \cong \langle \pi_0(G, f)_{f(v)} \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$  is a projective cover, where in the last isomorphism we used Lemma 2.1. This morphism maps  $\{v\} \in Q(f(v))$  to  $[v] \in \langle \pi_0(G, f)_{f(v)} \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$ , for every  $v \in V$ . If the morphism were not a projective cover, then there would exist  $v' \in V$  such that the restriction  $h' : \bigoplus_{v \in V \setminus \{v'\}} P_{f(v)} \cdot \{v\} \rightarrow \operatorname{coker} \partial_1^{(G, f)} \cong H_0(G, f) \cong \langle \pi_0(G, f)_{f(v)} \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$  would still be surjective. This is not possible:  $(G, f)$  is vertex-minimal, so  $[v] \neq [v'] \in \pi_0(G, f)_{f(v)}$  for every  $v \in V \setminus \{v'\}$ , and thus  $h'$  would not be surjective, since  $[v'] \in \langle \pi_0(G, f)_{f(v)} \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$  would not be in its image.

The claim about  $\beta_0$  follows at once from the definition of Betti table (Definition 2.12).

We now prove (2). Let  $G = (V, E, \partial)$  be a minimal filtered graph. We prove that  $g : \bigoplus_{e \in E} P_{f(e)} \cdot \{e\} \rightarrow \ker(h)$  is a projective cover. If it were not, then there would exist  $e' \in E$  such that the

restriction  $g' : P := \bigoplus_{e \in E \setminus \{e'\}} P_{f(e)} \cdot \{e\} \rightarrow \ker(h)$  of  $g$  would still be surjective. Let  $G' = (V, E \setminus \{e\}, \partial)$ . In particular, the last two vertical morphisms in the following commutative diagram would be isomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \bigoplus_{e \in E \setminus \{e'\}} P_{f(e)} \cdot \{e\} & \xrightarrow{\partial_1^{(G', f)}} & \bigoplus_{v \in V} P_{f(v)} \cdot \{v\} & \longrightarrow & H_0(G', f) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \langle \pi_0(G', f) \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} \\ \downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bigoplus_{e \in E} P_{f(e)} \cdot \{e\} & \xrightarrow{\partial_1^{(G, f)}} & \bigoplus_{v \in V} P_{f(v)} \cdot \{v\} & \longrightarrow & H_0(G, f) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \langle \pi_0(G, f) \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} \end{array}$$

This is not possible, since the last vertical morphism maps  $[e'_0], [e'_1] \in \langle \pi_0(G', f)_{f(e')} \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$  to  $[e'_0], [e'_1] \in \langle \pi_0(G, f)_{f(e')} \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$ , and,  $[e'_0] = [e'_1] \in \langle \pi_0(G, f)_{f(e')} \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$ , since  $e'$  is an edge of  $G$ , while  $[e'_0] \neq [e'_1] \in \langle \pi_0(G', f)_{f(e')} \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$ , by the fact that  $(G, f)$  is edge-minimal.

As for the case of (1), the claim about  $\beta_1$  follows from the definition of Betti table.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.10.* The claim about the Betti tables follows at once from the first statement of the theorem together with Theorem 3.8. So let us prove the claim about the kernel.

We proceed by induction on the number of edges in the graph. Let  $h \in E$  be such that  $f(h) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  is the maximum of  $\{f(e)\}_{e \in E}$  in lexicographical order. The filtered graph  $(G', f) := (G \setminus h, f)$  is minimal, by Lemma 3.5(2), so the result holds for this graph.

We consider the following diagram, obtained by adding the edge  $h$  to  $(G', f)$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{cc \ d \in E \setminus \{h\}} P_{f(w_d)} \cdot \{d\} & \xrightarrow{\kappa^{(G', f)}} & \bigoplus_{e \in E \setminus \{h\}} P_{f(e)} \cdot \{e\} & \xrightarrow{\partial_1^{(G', f)}} & \bigoplus_{v \in V} P_{f(v)} \cdot \{v\} & \longrightarrow & H_0(G', f) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{cc \ d \in E} P_{f(w_d)} \cdot \{d\} & \xrightarrow{\kappa^{(G, f)}} & \bigoplus_{e \in E} P_{f(e)} \cdot \{e\} & \xrightarrow{\partial_1^{(G, f)}} & \bigoplus_{v \in V} P_{f(v)} \cdot \{v\} & \longrightarrow & H_0(G, f) & \longrightarrow & 0, \end{array}$$


where  $cc$  stands for ‘‘cycle-creating’’. Since  $f(h)$  is maximal in lex order, the cycle-creating edges of  $(G', f)$  are simply the cycle-creating edges of  $(G, f)$ , possibly minus  $h$  in the case where  $h$  is cycle-creating.

The top row of the diagram is exact by inductive hypothesis, and we need to prove that the bottom row is exact as well.

In order to prove this, we evaluate the persistence modules and morphisms of the diagram at each  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , and show that the bottom row is exact.

We consider three cases:

- (1)  $(x, y) \not\geq f(h)$ ;
- (2)  $(x, y) \geq f(h)$ , and either  $h$  is not cycle-creating or  $(x, y) \not\geq f(w_h)$ ;
- (3)  $(x, y) \geq f(w_h)$ , which is only considered if  $h$  is cycle-creating.



Case (1) is immediate, since the top and bottom row are equal when evaluated at  $(x, y)$ , as  $h$  is not an edge of  $(G, f)_{(x, y)}$ .

Case (2) is slightly more interesting. In this case, the difference between the two rows, when evaluated at  $(x, y)$ , is that the edge  $h$  has appeared in the second row, and it is connecting the connected components of  $h_0$  and  $h_1$ , which would otherwise be distinct. This is because either  $h$  is not cycle-creating, or  $(x, y) \not\geq f(w_h)$ , so that  $y < f_y(w_h)$ , which is the smallest grade at which  $h_0$  and  $h_1$  become connected in  $\{(x', y') \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (x', y') \geq f(h)\}$ , by the fact that  $w_h$  is a minimal witness. In going from the top row to the bottom row, both evaluated at  $(x, y)$ , the dimension of  $H_0$  is dropping by one, and the dimension of the vector space generated by edges is going up by one. Since, in the bottom row, the generator  $\{h\}$  is mapping to  $\{h_1\} - \{h_0\}$ , which is non-zero in

$H_0(G', f)(x, y)$ , this case follows from the following basic claim from linear algebra, whose proof is straightforward.

*Claim.* Let  $0 \rightarrow \ker \alpha \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{\alpha} B \rightarrow \operatorname{coker} \alpha \rightarrow 0$  be an exact sequence of  $\mathbb{k}$ -vector spaces, and let  $b \neq 0 \in B$ . Then, the following is an exact sequence of  $\mathbb{k}$ -vector spaces  $0 \rightarrow \ker \alpha \rightarrow A \oplus \mathbb{k} \xrightarrow{(\alpha, b)} B \rightarrow \operatorname{coker}(\alpha, b) \rightarrow 0$ .

Finally, we consider case (3). Thus, in going from the first to the second row, when evaluated at  $(x, y)$ , the dimension of the vector space generated by edges is going up by one, and the dimension of the space generated by vertices remains the same. In this case, in  $H_0(G', f)(x, y)$ , the elements  $[h_0]$  and  $[h_1]$  are already equal, since there is a path between  $h_0$  and  $h_1$ , namely, the witness  $w_h$ ; thus, the dimension of  $\ker \partial_1(x, y)$  is going up by one. In order to account for this,  $\kappa^{(G, f)}$  is mapping  $\{h\}$  to  $\{h\} - (s_h^1\{e_d^1\} + \cdots + s_h^k\{e_d^k\})$ , which is clearly non-zero, and in the kernel of  $\partial_1(x, y)$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Acknowledgements.** D.M. was supported by the National Science Foundation through award DMS-2324632. L.S. was partially supported by the National Science Foundation through grants CCF-2006661 and CAREER award DMS-1943758, while at Northeastern University, and by EP-SRC grant “New Approaches to Data Science: Application Driven Topological Data Analysis”, EP/R018472/1, while at the University of Oxford.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Madjid Allili, Tomasz Kaczynski, and Claudia Landi. Reducing complexes in multidimensional persistent homology theory. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 78:61–75, 2017.
- [2] Ulrich Bauer, Magnus B. Botnan, Steffen Oppermann, and Johan Steen. Cotorsion torsion triples and the representation theory of filtered hierarchical clustering. *Adv. Math.*, 369:107171, 51, 2020.
- [3] Ulrich Bauer, Fabian Lenzen, and Michael Lesnick. Efficient two-parameter persistence computation via cohomology. In *39th International Symposium on Computational Geometry*, volume 258 of *LIPICs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform.*, pages Art. No. 15, 17. Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2023.
- [4] Ulrich Bauer and Luis Scoccola. Generic multi-parameter persistence modules are nearly indecomposable. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.15306*, 2023.
- [5] Matias Bender, Oliver Gäfvert, and Michael Lesnick. Efficient computation of multiparameter persistence, (in preparation).
- [6] Magnus Bakke Botnan and William Crawley-Boevey. Decomposition of persistence modules. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 148(11):4581–4596, 2020.
- [7] 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. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, [2023] ©2023.
- [8] 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.
- [9] Gunnar Carlsson and Facundo Mémoli. Multiparameter hierarchical clustering methods. In *Classification as a tool for research*, Stud. Classification Data Anal. Knowledge Organ., pages 63–70. Springer, Berlin, 2010.
- [10] Gunnar Carlsson and Facundo Mémoli. Classifying clustering schemes. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 13(2):221–252, 2013.
- [11] Gunnar Carlsson and Afra Zomorodian. The theory of multidimensional persistence. In *Computational geometry (SCG’07)*, pages 184–193. ACM, New York, 2007.
- [12] Mathieu Carrière and Andrew J. Blumberg. Multiparameter persistence images for topological machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS ’20, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2020. Curran Associates Inc.
- [13] Mathieu Carrière, Frederic Chazal, Yuichi Ike, Theo Lacombe, Martin Royer, and Yuhei Umeda. Perslay: A neural network layer for persistence diagrams and new graph topological signatures. In Silvia Chiappa and Roberto Calandra, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2786–2796. PMLR, 26–28 Aug 2020.
- [14] 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.

- [15] Andac Demir, Baris Coskunuzer, Ignacio Segovia-Dominguez, Yuzhou Chen, Yulia Gel, and Bulent Kiziltan. Todd: topological compound fingerprinting in computer-aided drug discovery. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '22*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2024. Curran Associates Inc.
- [16] H. Edelsbrunner and S. Parsa. *On the Computational Complexity of Betti Numbers: Reductions from Matrix Rank*, pages 152–160.
- [17] Herbert Edelsbrunner and John L. Harer. *Computational topology*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. An introduction.
- [18] David Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*, volume 150 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. With a view toward algebraic geometry.
- [19] Ulderico Fugacci, Michael Kerber, and Alexander Rolle. Compression for 2-parameter persistent homology. *Comput. Geom.*, 109:Paper No. 101940, 28, 2023.
- [20] Loukas Georgiadis, Haim Kaplan, Nira Shafrir, Robert E. Tarjan, and Renato F. Werneck. Data structures for mergeable trees. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 7(2), mar 2011.
- [21] Andrea Guidolin and Claudia Landi. Morse inequalities for the Koszul complex of multi-persistence. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 227(7):Paper No. 107319, 26, 2023.
- [22] Andrea Guidolin and Claudia Landi. On the support of betti tables of multiparameter persistent homology modules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05294*, 2023.
- [23] Olympio Hacquard and Vadim Lebovici. Euler characteristic tools for topological data analysis, 2023.
- [24] Christoph Hofer, Florian Graf, Bastian Rieck, Marc Niethammer, and Roland Kwitt. Graph filtration learning. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4314–4323. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020.
- [25] Michael Kerber and Alexander Rolle. Fast minimal presentations of bi-graded persistence modules. *2021 Proceedings of the Symposium on Algorithm Engineering and Experiments (ALENEX)*, pages 207–220.
- [26] 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.
- [27] David Loiseaux, Luis Scoccola, Mathieu Carrière, Magnus Bakke Botnan, and Steve Oudot. Stable vectorization of multiparameter persistent homology using signed barcodes as measures. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [28] Ezra Miller and Bernd Sturmfels. *Combinatorial commutative algebra*, volume 227 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.
- [29] L. A. Nazarova. Partially ordered sets of infinite type. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 39(5):963–991, 1219, 1975.
- [30] Steve Oudot and Luis Scoccola. On the Stability of Multigraded Betti Numbers and Hilbert Functions. *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom.*, 8(1):54–88, 2024.
- [31] Steve Y. Oudot. *Persistence theory: from quiver representations to data analysis*, volume 209 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [32] Irena Peeva. *Graded syzygies*, volume 14 of *Algebra and Applications*. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2011.
- [33] Alexander Rolle and Luis Scoccola. Stable and consistent density-based clustering via multiparameter persistence. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(258):1–74, 2024.
- [34] Joseph J. Rotman. *An introduction to homological algebra*. Universitext. Springer, New York, second edition, 2009.
- [35] Luis Scoccola and Alexander Rolle. Persistable: persistent and stable clustering. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 8(83):5022, 2023.
- [36] Luis Scoccola, Siddharth Setlur, David Loiseaux, Mathieu Carrière, and Steve Oudot. Differentiability and optimization of multiparameter persistent homology. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [37] Daniel D. Sleator and Robert Endre Tarjan. A data structure for dynamic trees. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 26(3):362–391, 1983.
- [38] Qi Zhao and Yusu Wang. *Learning metrics for persistence-based summaries and applications for graph classification*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, 2019.
- [39] Ángel Javier Alonso, Michael Kerber, and Siddharth Pritam. Filtration-domination in bifiltered graphs. *2023 Proceedings of the Symposium on Algorithm Engineering and Experiments (ALENEX)*, pages 27–38.

INTERNATIONAL COMPUTER SCIENCE INSTITUTE; LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY; BERKELEY, CA, USA

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