

Efficient Algorithms for Complexes of Persistence Modules with Applications

Tamal K. Dey ✉

Department of Computer Science, Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

Florian Russold ✉

Institute of Geometry, Graz University of Technology, Graz, Austria

Shreyas N. Samaga ✉

Department of Computer Science, Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

Abstract

We extend the persistence algorithm, viewed as an algorithm computing the homology of a complex of free persistence or graded modules, to complexes of modules that are not free. We replace persistence modules by their presentations and develop an efficient algorithm to compute the homology of a complex of presentations. To deal with inputs that are not given in terms of presentations, we give an efficient algorithm to compute a presentation of a morphism of persistence modules. This allows us to compute persistent (co)homology of instances giving rise to complexes of non-free modules. Our methods lead to a new efficient algorithm for computing the persistent homology of simplicial towers and they enable efficient algorithms to compute the persistent homology of cosheaves over simplicial towers and cohomology of persistent sheaves on simplicial complexes. We also show that we can compute the cohomology of persistent sheaves over arbitrary finite posets by reducing the computation to a computation over simplicial complexes.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Computational geometry; Mathematics of computing → Algebraic topology

Keywords and phrases Persistent (co)homology, Persistence modules, Sheaves, Presentations

Funding This work is supported partially by NSF grants CCF 2049010 and 2301360 and by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): W1230

1 Introduction

The theory of persistence, a central building block of topological data analysis, is concerned with the study of persistent objects and their persistent homology. A *persistent object* $\vec{A}: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$ is a sequence of objects

$$\vec{A}: A_0 \xrightarrow{f_0} A_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} A_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} \dots \quad (1)$$

in a category \mathbf{A} with morphisms f_i . Let \mathbb{k} be a field. Assuming that there is a chain complex of \mathbb{k} -vector spaces $C_\bullet(A_i)$ (in a category denoted $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathbf{A})$) associated to these objects inducing their homology, a persistent object provides a persistent chain complex $C_\bullet(\vec{A}): \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\mathbf{A})$ ((2) right) or equivalently a chain complex of persistence modules ((2) left).

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} C_{k+1}(\vec{A}): & C_{k+1}(A_0) & \xrightarrow{C_{k+1}(f_0)} & C_{k+1}(A_1) & \xrightarrow{C_{k+1}(f_1)} & C_{k+1}(A_2) & \xrightarrow{C_{k+1}(f_2)} \dots \\ & \downarrow \partial_{k+1} & & \downarrow \partial_{k+1}^0 & & \downarrow \partial_{k+1}^1 & & \downarrow \partial_{k+1}^2 \\ C_k(\vec{A}): & C_k(A_0) & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_0)} & C_k(A_1) & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_1)} & C_k(A_2) & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_2)} \dots \\ & \downarrow \partial_k & & \downarrow \partial_k^0 & & \downarrow \partial_k^1 & & \downarrow \partial_k^2 \\ C_{k-1}(\vec{A}): & C_{k-1}(A_0) & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_0)} & C_{k-1}(A_1) & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_1)} & C_{k-1}(A_2) & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_2)} \dots \end{array} \quad (2)$$

We call the sequence $C_{k+1}(\vec{A}) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+1}} C_k(\vec{A}) \xrightarrow{\partial_k} C_{k-1}(\vec{A})$ where $C_k(\vec{A})$ is a persistence module and $\partial_k \circ \partial_{k+1} = 0$ a *complex of persistence modules*. The *persistent homology* $H_k(\vec{A}) := \ker \partial_k / \text{im } \partial_{k+1}$ of the complex of persistence modules (2) is given by the persistence module

$$H_k(\vec{A}) : H_k(A_0) \xrightarrow{H_k(f_0)} H_k(A_1) \xrightarrow{H_k(f_1)} H_k(A_2) \xrightarrow{H_k(f_2)} \dots$$

where $H_k(A_i) := \ker \partial_k^i / \text{im } \partial_{k+1}^i$ and $H_k(f_i)$ are induced by the chain maps $C_k(f_i)$. The goal of this paper is to present an efficient general purpose algorithm to compute the homology of a complex of persistence modules and demonstrate some of its applications.

The inspiration for our approach comes from the well-known persistence algorithm [12]. Suppose the persistent object in (1) is a finite filtration of simplicial complexes, i.e. A_i is a finite simplicial complex, f_i is an inclusion and $C_\bullet(\vec{A})$ is the complex of persistent simplicial chains. In [29] the authors observed that a persistence module can equivalently be viewed as a graded module over the polynomial ring $\mathbb{k}[t]$. Using this perspective, $C_k(\vec{A})$ is a free module with a basis given by the k -simplices in the filtration and the boundary morphisms ∂_k can be represented by matrices w.r.t. these bases. The persistence algorithm leverages this compressed representation of $C_\bullet(\vec{A})$ by its generators and computes the persistent homology of the whole filtration at once. This makes it much more efficient than naively computing $H_k(A_i)$ for each index i , where simplices would be considered multiple times.

If we allow the f_i 's to be arbitrary simplicial maps, we obtain what is called a *simplicial tower*. It turns out that this apparently simple modification brings a significant change at the algebraic level because the persistence modules $C_k(\vec{A})$ in the complex may no longer remain free (relations among generators may appear). Thus, in general, they do not admit a basis and we can not straightforwardly represent ∂_k by matrices and compute the homology using linear algebra over $\mathbb{k}[t]$. In [11, 19] the authors tackle this algebraic difficulty on a topological level, by expanding a tower into a filtration and then applying efficient algorithms for filtrations. We tackle the problem directly at the algebraic level by designing algorithms that can handle complexes of non-free modules. These algorithms enable a further generalization obtained by additionally considering algebraic information over a simplicial tower. If this algebraic information is provided by a cosheaf, we obtain the case of persistent cosheaf homology [24]. The persistent cosheaf homology is again the homology of a complex of not necessarily free persistence modules. But cosheaf homology is not a homotopy invariant, so the methods for the plain tower [11, 19] do not work in this case. Here we are forced to tackle the problem at an algebraic level.

One of our main observations is that we can compute the homology of a complex of non-free modules if we consider relations in addition to the generators. This brings *presentations* of modules into the picture which are morphisms from the free modules of relations to the free modules of generators. So, we design: 1) an efficient algorithm (Section 4) to compute a presentation of a morphism of persistence modules by free modules which allows us to convert a complex of persistence modules into a *complex of presentations*, and 2) an efficient algorithm (Section 3) to compute the homology of a complex of presentations. In the spirit of the persistence algorithm our method considers a generator only once even though it may exist over a wide range of indices. In fact, our algorithm is a direct generalization of the persistence algorithm to which it specializes in the case of free modules.

At this point, we note that we are not aware of any computational approach in the TDA literature that deals with complexes of persistence modules and complexes of presentations in the full generality as our approach does. The closest along this line is the recent work in [25] where the author introduces a new framework of barcode bases and operations on

them to compute a barcode basis of the homology of a complex of persistence modules in the context of distributed persistent homology computations. Our presentation algorithm does not require such a specific barcode form and can process general presentations. The paper also does not discuss how to compute barcode bases and maps between them from general morphisms of persistence modules which we address.

Applications: A central motivation of this paper is to provide computational tools for the ever-growing body of ideas to use methods from algebraic topology in applications. In recent years, the idea of using methods from sheaf theory in applications has gained traction in the field of TDA [3, 8, 14, 18, 23]. Instead of just considering a space by itself, sheaves allow us to study the behaviour of data over a space. Sheaves and their cohomology have been used in various applications, see e.g. [2, 4, 6, 15, 16, 17, 22]. Persistent versions of sheaves and cosheaves have also appeared in the TDA literature, see e.g. [10, 26, 27]. Moreover persistent (co)sheaves have been used as a framework for a distributed computation of (persistent) homology [9, 25, 28]. In [24], a general theory of persistent sheaf cohomology has been developed for which this paper establishes a complete computational framework.

We have already mentioned that our approach provides a novel efficient algorithm to compute the barcode of a given tower (Section 6.1). We demonstrate that it provides efficient algorithms to compute various flavors of persistent cosheaf homology and sheaf cohomology. We consider the persistent homology of a cosheaf over a varying simplicial complex (Section 6.2) and the cohomology of a persistent sheaf on a fixed simplicial complex (Section 6.3). We also show that we can reduce the computation of persistent sheaf cohomology over an arbitrary finite poset to a computation over a simplicial complex (Section 6.4).

We have a preliminary implementation of the two basic algorithms mentioned before. Experimental results (Appendix H) suggest that our approach is not merely theoretical, but has the potential to be useful in practice (<https://github.com/TDA-Jyamiti/Algos-cplx-pers-modules/>).

2 Persistence modules, graded modules, and presentations

In this section we recall basic notions of persistence modules, graded modules and their presentations. A persistence module, as depicted in the top row of (3), is a functor $M: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ where \mathbf{vec} denotes the category of finite dimensional vector spaces. It is of *finite type*, if there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $M(i \leq j)$ is an isomorphism for all $i \geq m$. A morphism of persistence modules $\phi: M \rightarrow N$, as depicted in (3),

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
 M : & M(0) & \xrightarrow{M(0 \leq 1)} & M(1) & \xrightarrow{M(1 \leq 2)} & \dots & \xrightarrow{M(m-1 \leq m)} & M(m) & \xrightarrow{M(m \leq m+1)} & \dots \\
 \phi \downarrow & \downarrow \phi(0) & & \downarrow \phi(1) & & & & \downarrow \phi(m) & & \\
 N : & N(0) & \xrightarrow{N(0 \leq 1)} & N(1) & \xrightarrow{N(1 \leq 2)} & \dots & \xrightarrow{N(m-1 \leq m)} & N(m) & \xrightarrow{N(m \leq m+1)} & \dots
 \end{array} \tag{3}$$

is a natural transformation of functors $\mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$. Let \mathbf{pMod} denote the category of persistence modules of finite type.

► **Example 1.** The following diagram shows a concrete example of a morphism of persistence

modules of finite type over $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{Z}_2$ (the field with 2 elements):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 M : & \mathbb{Z}_2^3 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 100 \\ 010 \\ 000 \end{pmatrix}} & \mathbb{Z}_2^3 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 001 \\ 000 \\ 000 \end{pmatrix}} & \mathbb{Z}_2^3 & \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots \\
 \phi \downarrow & & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 000 \\ 011 \\ 111 \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 001 \\ 001 \\ 000 \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 111 \\ 111 \\ 010 \end{pmatrix} & & & (4) \\
 N : & \mathbb{Z}_2^3 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 100 \\ 000 \\ 000 \end{pmatrix}} & \mathbb{Z}_2^3 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 100 \\ 010 \\ 001 \end{pmatrix}} & \mathbb{Z}_2^3 & \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots
 \end{array}$$

An \mathbb{N}_0 -graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -module M is a direct sum of \mathbb{k} -vector spaces $\bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0} M_i$ with the usual \mathbb{k} -action on the summands and a t^i -action for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $t^i \cdot M_j \subseteq M_{i+j}$. If $m \in M_i$ it is called a homogeneous element and we define its *degree* by $\deg(m) := i$. A (homogeneous) morphism $\phi: M \rightarrow N$ of graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules M and N is a map of $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules such that $\phi(M_i) \subseteq N_i$. Let $\mathbf{grMod}_{\mathbb{k}[t]}$ denote the category of finitely generated \mathbb{N}_0 -graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules. We know the following equivalence [7, Corollary 10][29, Theorem 3.1] which allows us to use persistence modules and graded modules interchangeably in the following.

► **Proposition 2.** $\mathbf{pMod} \cong \mathbf{grMod}_{\mathbb{k}[t]}$.

In what follows, we assume that all persistence modules and graded modules are of finite type or finitely generated, respectively. Persistence modules as well as morphisms between them can be represented by collections of matrices (Example 1). Their equivalent counterpart graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules can not be handled by matrices directly since they can have torsion in general. To handle them with methods of linear algebra over $\mathbb{k}[t]$ we use presentations.

► **Definition 3** (Presentation of module). *Let M be a finitely generated graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -module. A presentation of M is an exact sequence of the form*

$$0 \longleftarrow M \xleftarrow{\mu} P_0 \xleftarrow{p} P_1$$

where P_0 and P_1 are free finitely generated graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules. We call a presentation reduced, if p is a monomorphism.

► **Definition 4** (Presentation of morphism). *Let $\phi: M \rightarrow N$ be a morphism of finitely generated graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules M and N . A presentation of ϕ is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longleftarrow & M & \xleftarrow{\mu} & P_0 & \xleftarrow{p} & P_1 \\
 & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow f_0 & & \downarrow f_1 \\
 0 & \longleftarrow & N & \xleftarrow{\nu} & Q_0 & \xleftarrow{q} & Q_1
 \end{array} \quad (5)$$

where the rows are presentations of M and N respectively.

In the following, we also refer to the morphism of free modules $P_0 \xleftarrow{p} P_1$ in Definition 3 as a presentation of M . By the exactness assumption $M \cong \text{coker } p$ and $\mu \cong (P_0 \xrightarrow{\pi} \text{coker } p)$. We also refer to the right square in (5) as a morphism of presentations.

Given $a < b \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$, let $\mathbb{I}_{[a, \infty)}$ denote the free graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -module generated by a single generator of degree a . Moreover, we denote by $\mathbb{I}_{[a, b)}$ the quotient module $\mathbb{I}_{[a, \infty)}/\mathbb{I}_{[b, \infty)}$. By the equivalence of Proposition 2, $\mathbb{I}_{[a, b)}$ corresponds to the indecomposable interval persistence module starting at index a and ending at index b . By the Theorems of Krull-Remak-Schmidt [1, Theorem 1] and Gabriel [13, Chapter 2.2] and Proposition 2, every finitely generated graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -module M is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of indecomposable interval modules $M \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}_{[a_i, b_i)}$. We call the multiset of intervals $\{\{a_i, b_i\} | 1 \leq i \leq d\}$ the *barcode* of M .

► **Example 5.** For the persistence modules M and N in Example 1 we get $M \cong \mathbb{I}_{[0,2]} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[0,2]} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[0,1]} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[1,\infty)} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[2,\infty)} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[2,\infty)}$ and $N \cong \mathbb{I}_{[0,\infty)} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[0,1]} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[0,1]} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[1,\infty)} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[1,\infty)}$. This can be inferred from the ranks of the matrices in the upper and lower row. In the upper row we have $\text{rank } M(0 \leq 1) = 2$, $\text{rank } M(1 \leq 2) = 1$ and $\text{rank } M(0 \leq 2) = 0$. This implies that only two of the three bars starting in index 0 reach index 1 and none of them reaches index 2. Moreover, only one of the three bars at index 1 reaches index 2.

For two interval modules $\mathbb{I}_{[a,b]}$ and $\mathbb{I}_{[c,d]}$ we have

$$\text{Hom}(\mathbb{I}_{[a,b]}, \mathbb{I}_{[c,d]}) \cong \begin{cases} \mathbb{k} & \text{if } c \leq a < d \leq b \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}. \quad (6)$$

In other words, if two bars overlap in a certain way as stated in (6), then, for every scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{k}$, there is a unique morphism defined by multiplication with λ where the bars overlap. Moreover, given two finitely generated graded modules M and N , we have

$$\text{Hom}(M, N) \cong \text{Hom}\left(\bigoplus_i \mathbb{I}_{[a_i, b_i]}, \bigoplus_j \mathbb{I}_{[c_j, d_j]}\right) \cong \bigoplus_i \bigoplus_j \text{Hom}(\mathbb{I}_{[a_i, b_i]}, \mathbb{I}_{[c_j, d_j]}). \quad (7)$$

We call the following reduced presentation of $\mathbb{I}_{[a,b]}$ an *elementary presentation*

$$0 \longleftarrow \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]} \longleftarrow \mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xleftarrow{\cdot t^{b-a}} \mathbb{I}_{[b,\infty)} \longleftarrow 0 \quad (8)$$

where we set $\mathbb{I}_{[b,\infty)}$ and the map to zero if $b = \infty$. The direct sum of presentations is defined by the pointwise direct sum of graded modules. Thus, assuming $b_i \neq \infty$ iff $1 \leq i \leq d' \leq d$, we obtain the following reduced presentation of M (up to isomorphism)

$$0 \longleftarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}_{[a_i, b_i]} \longleftarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}_{[a_i, \infty)} \xleftarrow{p} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{d'} \mathbb{I}_{[b_i, \infty)} \longleftarrow 0$$

as a direct sum of elementary presentations where p is of the form

$$p = \begin{pmatrix} t^{b_1-a_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & t^{b_2-a_2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & t^{b_{d'}-a_{d'}} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

We call a presentation *canonical* if it is a direct sum of elementary presentations and has no elementary summands (8) with $a = b$. The matrix p of a canonical presentation has a form as in (9), i.e. every relation in P_1 maps to a unique generator in P_0 . We obtain a natural inclusion and projection of elementary summands, i.e. a commutative diagram of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[a_i, b_i]} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[a_i, \infty)} & \xleftarrow{\cdot t^{b_i-a_i}} & \mathbb{I}_{[b_i, \infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \iota_0 & & \downarrow \iota_1 & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_l \mathbb{I}_{[a_l, b_l]} & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_l \mathbb{I}_{[a_l, \infty)} & \xleftarrow{p} & \bigoplus_l \mathbb{I}_{[b_l, \infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi_0 & & \downarrow \pi_1 & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[a_j, b_j]} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[a_j, \infty)} & \xleftarrow{\cdot t^{b_j-a_j}} & \mathbb{I}_{[b_j, \infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

where $\psi \circ \phi = 0$. Suppose that we are given reduced presentations of this sequence, i.e., a commutative diagram with exact rows of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longleftarrow & L & \xleftarrow{\lambda} & P_0 & \xleftarrow{p} & P_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow f_0 & & \downarrow f_1 & & \\
0 & \longleftarrow & M & \xleftarrow{\mu} & Q_0 & \xleftarrow{q} & Q_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow \psi & & \downarrow g_0 & & \downarrow g_1 & & \\
0 & \longleftarrow & N & \xleftarrow{\nu} & R_0 & \xleftarrow{r} & R_1 & \longleftarrow & 0
\end{array} \tag{10}$$

such that $g_0 \circ f_0 = 0$ and $g_1 \circ f_1 = 0$. The condition $g_0 \circ f_0 = 0$ and $g_1 \circ f_1 = 0$ means that (10) is a complex of presentations. In Example 12 one can find a concrete instance of such a complex of presentations. Our goal is to compute a presentation of $\ker \psi / \text{im } \phi$ from the presentations in (10), i.e., an exact sequence of the form:

$$0 \longleftarrow \ker \psi / \text{im } \phi \longleftarrow W_0 \xleftarrow{w} W_1$$

where $W_0 \xleftarrow{w} W_1$ is a morphism of free modules. We first construct a presentation of $\ker \psi$ through the maps

$$\begin{aligned}
(g_0 \ -r) : Q_0 \times R_1 &\rightarrow R_0, \quad (g_0 \ -r)(x, y) := g_0(x) - r(y) \\
\begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix} : Q_1 &\rightarrow Q_0 \times R_1, \quad \begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix}(a) := (q(a), g_1(a))
\end{aligned}$$

where $\ker(g_0 \ -r) = \{(x, y) \in Q_0 \times R_1 \mid g_0(x) = r(y)\}$. Note that the kernel of a morphism of free modules is again a free module. Moreover, we define the map

$$\kappa : \ker(g_0 \ -r) \rightarrow M, \quad \kappa(x, y) := \mu(x).$$

► **Proposition 8.** *The following exact sequence*

$$0 \longleftarrow \ker \psi \xleftarrow{\kappa} \ker(g_0 \ -r) \xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix}} Q_1$$

is a presentation of $\ker \psi$.

Proof. 1. Let $(x, y) \in \ker(g_0 \ -r)$, then $\psi \circ \kappa(x, y) = \psi \circ \mu(x) = \nu \circ g_0(x) = \nu \circ r(y) = 0$.

Thus, $\text{im } \kappa \subseteq \ker \psi$ and $\kappa : \ker(g_0 \ -r) \rightarrow \ker \psi$.

2. Let $a \in \ker \psi$. Since μ is an epimorphism, $\exists x \in Q_0$ s.t. $\mu(x) = a$ and $\psi \circ \mu(x) = 0 = \nu \circ g_0(x)$. We get $g_0(x) \in \ker \nu = \text{im } r$ and $\exists y \in R_1$ s.t. $r(y) = g_0(x)$. Thus, $(g_0 \ -r)(x, y) = 0$ and $\kappa(x, y) = \mu(x) = a$. Hence, κ is an epimorphism.

3. Let $z \in Q_1$, then $(g_0 \ -r) \circ \begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix}(z) = g_0 \circ q(z) - r \circ g_1(z) = 0$. Thus, $\text{im } \begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix} \subseteq$

$$\ker(g_0 \ -r) \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix} : Q_1 \rightarrow \ker(g_0 \ -r).$$

4. Let $(x, y) \in \ker \kappa$. Then, $\kappa(x, y) = \mu(x) = 0$ and $x \in \ker \mu = \text{im } q$. Thus, $\exists a \in Q_1$ s.t. $q(a) = x$. Since, $g_0(x) = g_0 \circ q(a) = r \circ g_1(a) = r(y)$, we get $g_1(a) - y \in \ker r = 0$. This implies, $g_1(a) = y$ and $\begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix}(a) = (q(a), g_1(a)) = (x, y)$. Hence, $\ker \kappa \subseteq \text{im } \begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix}$.

Conversely, let $(x, y) \in \text{im} \begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $\exists a \in Q_1$ s.t. $\begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix} (a) = (q(a), g_1(a)) = (x, y)$.

We get $\kappa(x, y) = \kappa(q(a), g_1(a)) = \mu \circ q(a) = 0$. Hence, $(x, y) \in \ker \kappa$ and $\ker \kappa = \text{im} \begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix}$. \blacktriangleleft

Next we show that the presentations of L , $\ker \psi$ and ϕ are compatible via the map

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} : P_0 \rightarrow Q_0 \times R_1, \quad \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} (x) := (f_0(x), 0).$$

► **Proposition 9.** *The following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longleftarrow & L & \xleftarrow{\lambda} & P_0 & \xleftarrow{p} & P_1 \\ & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix} & \downarrow f_1 \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & \ker \psi & \xleftarrow{\kappa} & \ker(g_0 - r) & \xleftarrow{\quad} & Q_1 \end{array}$$

Proof. 1. Let $x \in P_0$. Since $g_0 \circ f_0 = 0$, we have $\begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -r \end{pmatrix} (f_0(x), 0) = g_0(f_0(x)) = 0$. Thus,

$$\text{im} \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \subseteq \ker \begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -r \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} : P_0 \rightarrow \ker \begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -r \end{pmatrix}.$$

2. Let $x \in P_1$. Since $g_1 \circ f_1 = 0$ we get $\begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix} \circ f_1(x) = (q(f_1(x)), g_1(f_1(x))) = (f_0(p(x)), 0) = \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \circ p(x)$. Hence, the right square commutes.

3. Let $x \in P_0$. Then $\kappa \circ \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} (x) = \kappa(f_0(x), 0) = \mu(f_0(x)) = \phi \circ \lambda(x)$. Thus, also the left square commutes. \blacktriangleleft

Finally, we define the presentation map from the relations to the generators

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix} : P_0 \times Q_1 \rightarrow \ker(g_0 - r), \quad \begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix} (x, y) := \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} (x) - \begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix} (y)$$

and denote by $\pi : \ker \psi \rightarrow \ker \psi / \text{im} \phi$ the quotient map.

► **Theorem 10.** *The following exact sequence*

$$0 \longleftarrow \ker \psi / \text{im} \phi \xleftarrow{\pi \circ \kappa} \ker(g_0 - r) \xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}} P_0 \times Q_1$$

is a presentation of $\ker \psi / \text{im} \phi$.

Proof. 1. Since κ is an epimorphism by Proposition 8 and π is an epimorphism as a quotient map, $\pi \circ \kappa$ is also an epimorphism.

2. Let $(x, y) \in \ker(\pi \circ \kappa)$ i.e. $\pi \circ \kappa(x, y) = 0$ and $\kappa(x, y) \in \ker \pi = \text{im } \phi$. Hence, $\exists a \in L$ s.t. $\phi(a) = \kappa(x, y)$ and, moreover, $\exists b \in P_0$ s.t. $\lambda(b) = a$. By Proposition 9, we get $\phi \circ \lambda(b) = \kappa \circ \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} (b) = \kappa(x, y)$ and $\begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} (b) - (x, y) \in \ker \kappa = \text{im } \begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix}$. Thus, $\exists z \in Q_1$ s.t. $\begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix} (z) = \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} (b) - (x, y)$ and $(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} (b) - \begin{pmatrix} q \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix} (z) = \begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix} (b, z)$. Therefore, $(x, y) \in \text{im } \begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\ker \pi \circ \kappa \subseteq \text{im } \begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$. Conversely, let $(x, y) \in \text{im } \begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$ i.e. $(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix} (a, b)$ for some $(a, b) \in P_0 \times Q_1$. We get $\kappa(x, y) = \kappa(f_0(a), 0) - \kappa(q(b), g_1(b)) = \mu \circ f_0(a) - \mu \circ q(b) = \phi \circ \lambda(a) \in \text{im } \phi$. Hence, $\pi \circ \kappa(x, y) = 0$, $(x, y) \in \ker \pi \circ \kappa$ and $\ker \pi \circ \kappa = \text{im } \begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$. ◀

Theorem 10 leads us to the following algorithm **PresHom** for computing the barcode of the persistence module or graded module $\ker \psi / \text{im } \phi$:

Input: A complex of presentations as in (10) given by the matrices $p, q, r, f_0, f_1, g_0, g_1$.

Step 1: Build the matrices $\begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -r \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$ and order the columns by degree.

Step 2: Column reduce $\begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -r \end{pmatrix}$ from left to right. The generators corresponding to the zero columns of the reduced matrix span $\ker \begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -r \end{pmatrix}$.

Step 3: Remove the rows of $\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$ corresponding to non-zero columns of the reduced matrix $\begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -r \end{pmatrix}$.

Step 4: Column reduce the resulting matrix from left to right.

Output: The barcode can be read off from the final matrix $\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$ in the following way: If the row r_j is a pivot row with pivot in column c_{j_i} , output the bar $[\text{deg}(r_j), \text{deg}(c_{j_i}))$ otherwise output the bar $[\text{deg}(r_j), \infty)$.

► **Theorem 11.** *The algorithm **PresHom** computes the barcode of $\ker \psi / \text{im } \phi$. If the matrices $p, q, r, f_0, f_1, g_0, g_1$ are of size $O(n) \times O(n)$ the algorithm takes $O(n^3)$ time.*

Proof. From the input we can construct the matrices $\begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -r \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$ and order the columns by degree of the generators. After a column reduction from left to right, the zero columns of the reduced matrix span $\ker \begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -r \end{pmatrix}$. Removing the rows of $\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$ corresponding to the non-zero columns of the reduced matrix yields

$$\ker \begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -r \end{pmatrix} \xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}} P_0 \times Q_1 \quad (11)$$

Note that we do not need any transformations on $\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$. When we perform the change of basis, we never add a zero column of $\ker \begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -r \end{pmatrix}$ to another column. Therefore, in the

other matrix there is never a row added to a row corresponding to a zero column. Hence the only rows we care about stay unchanged.

Theorem 10 shows that (11) is a presentation of the homology $\ker \psi / \text{im } \phi$. After column reducing the presentation matrix in (11) from left to right, every column is either zero or has a unique pivot. We could now row reduce the presentation matrix and bring it to canonical form. After this step we could read off the elementary summands defining the barcode. Every row r_j corresponds to a bar that is born at $\deg(r_j)$. If it is a pivot row with pivot in column c_{j_i} the bar dies at index $\deg(c_{j_i})$. If it is a zero row the bar lives forever. Since the row reduction does not change the pivots and the bars only depend on the pivots, we can avoid the row reduction and read of the bars directly. Hence, after the column reduction every pivot row contributes a bar $[\deg(r_j), \deg(c_{j_i})]$ and every non-pivot row contributes a bar $[\deg(r_j), \infty)$. All required matrix reductions can be done in time $O(n^3)$. ◀

If we have a complex of free graded modules, then P_1, Q_1, R_1 and the morphisms p, q, r in (10) can be chosen as zero. In this case, the algorithm **PresHom** described above reduces to the persistence algorithm as described in [29].

► **Example 12.** Consider the following instance of the complex of presentations in (10)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & \begin{matrix} 6 & 5 & 7 \\ 2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} & & \\
 0 & \longleftarrow & L & \longleftarrow & P_0 & \longleftarrow & P_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \begin{matrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} & & \begin{matrix} 5 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} & & \begin{matrix} 6 & 5 & 7 \\ 5 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} & & \\
 0 & \longleftarrow & M & \longleftarrow & Q_0 & \longleftarrow & Q_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \psi & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \begin{matrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} & & \begin{matrix} 3 \\ 0 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} & & \begin{matrix} 5 & 5 & 6 \\ 3 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} & & \\
 0 & \longleftarrow & N & \longleftarrow & R_0 & \longleftarrow & R_1 & \longleftarrow & 0
 \end{array}$$

where the matrices are labeled by column and row degrees and have coefficients in \mathbb{Z}_2 . We build the matrices

$$(g_0 \ -r) = \begin{matrix} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{matrix} & 2 & 1 & 1 & 5 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 3 & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix}$$

column reduce $(g_0 \ -r)$, delete the rows corresponding to non-zero columns from $\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$ and order its columns by degree

$$(g_0 \ -r) = \begin{matrix} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{matrix} & 1 & 1 & 2 & 5 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 3 & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix}$$

Now we column reduce $\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix}$ and obtain the reduced matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_0 & -q \\ 0 & -g_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{matrix} & 1 & 1 & 2 & 5 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} \quad (12)$$

Finally we read off the barcode of $\ker \psi / \text{im } \phi$ from (12) in the following way: Row 1 contributes the bar $[0, 1)$, row 2 contributes the empty bar $[1, 1)$, and row 3 contributes the bar $[3, 5)$.

4 Computing presentations of morphisms of persistence modules

The algorithm described in the previous section requires as input a complex of presentations of graded modules. In practice, when working with, for example, simplicial towers or persistent sheaves (see Appendix A) we cannot always assume that the input is given as a complex of presentations. Thus, to make use of our algorithm in various settings, we develop an efficient algorithm **PresPersMod** to compute a presentation of a morphism of persistence modules. Given a morphism of persistence modules $\phi: M \rightarrow N$ of finite type

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} M_0 & \xrightarrow{A_0} & M_1 & \xrightarrow{A_1} & \dots & \xrightarrow{A_{m-1}} & M_m \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots \\ \downarrow C_0 & & \downarrow C_1 & & & & \downarrow C_m \\ N_0 & \xrightarrow{B_0} & N_1 & \xrightarrow{B_1} & \dots & \xrightarrow{B_{m-1}} & N_m \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots \end{array} \quad (13)$$

where we use the notation $M_i := M(i)$, $N_i := N(i)$ and the morphisms $M(i \leq i + 1)$, $N(i \leq i + 1)$ and $\phi(i)$ are input by the respective matrices A_i , B_i and C_i . Our goal is to compute a canonical presentation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_0 & \xleftarrow{p} & P_1 \\ f_0 \downarrow & & \downarrow f_1 \\ Q_0 & \xleftarrow{q} & Q_1 \end{array} \quad (14)$$

presenting a morphism of persistence modules isomorphic to (13). As explained in Section 2, it is enough to compute the matrix f_0 where each row and column additionally stores the degree of the corresponding generator $b(-)$ and its relation $d(-)$. Each generator-relation pair in a canonical presentation corresponds to an interval summand in a persistence module isomorphic to the top or bottom row of (13). Hence, an alternative point of view is that the algorithm computes the barcodes of (13) while keeping track of how the bars map to each other (cf. (6) and (7)). The algorithm **PresPersMod** maintains a canonical presentation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_0^i & \xleftarrow{p^i} & P_1^i \\ f_0^i \downarrow & & \downarrow f_1^i \\ Q_0^i & \xleftarrow{q^i} & Q_1^i \end{array}$$

of a morphism of persistence modules obtained by restricting the original modules up to index i

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} M_0 & \xrightarrow{A_0} & \dots & \xrightarrow{A_{i-1}} & M_i & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & M_i \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \dots \\ \downarrow C_0 & & & & \downarrow C_i & & \downarrow C_i \\ N_0 & \xrightarrow{B_0} & \dots & \xrightarrow{B_{i-1}} & N_i & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & N_i \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \dots \end{array} \quad (15)$$

while processing (13) from left $i = 0$ to right $i = m$. Iteratively, we build the matrix f_0^i with the birth- and death-time annotations. In a generic step, when we arrive at i from $i - 1$, the matrices A_i , B_i , and C_i are already transformed to A_i^t , B_i^t , and C_i^t respectively. We reduce these matrices further to A_i^r , B_i^r , and C_i^r which induce transformations of A_{i+1} , B_{i+1} , and C_{i+1} as we go forward in **PresPersMod** described below.

Initialization at $i = 0$: We start with the matrices A_0 , B_0 and C_0 . Each column and row of C_0 corresponds to a basis element of M_0 and N_0 . Since we are at index 0, each of these basis elements has to start a new bar and they are mapped according to the matrix C_0 . Therefore, we set $f_0^0 := C_0$ with $b(c_j) = 0$, $d(c_j) = \infty$ and $b(r_k) = 0$, $d(r_k) = \infty$ for every column c_j and every row r_k of C_0 . Each bar at index 0 now corresponds to a generator in P_0^0 or Q_0^0 and their maps are determined by the matrix of generators f_0^0 . Initially, we set $A_0^t := A_0$, $B_0^t := B_0$ and $C_0^t := C_0$ respectively.

Moving from i to $i + 1$: Given the matrix f_0^i and the matrices A_i^t and B_i^t from the previous step. Each column c_j and row r_k of f_0^i corresponds to a bar in persistence modules isomorphic to (15). The bars with $d(c_j), d(r_k) < \infty$ already finished (died) and need no further processing. For the bars with $d(c_j), d(r_k) = \infty$ we need to determine which of them die entering index $i + 1$. Moreover, we need to determine how many new bars are born at index $i + 1$ and how they are mapped.

Each column of A_i^t and B_i^t corresponds to a column and row of f_0^i respectively and they are ordered w.r.t. their order in f_0^i . Column reduce A_i^t and B_i^t from left to right to have reduced matrices A_i^r and B_i^r respectively while performing the corresponding column and row operations on f_0^i to obtain the new matrix \bar{f}_0^i . If a_j is a zero column in A_i^r and $\bar{c}_{i,j}$ is the corresponding column of \bar{f}_0^i , we set $d(\bar{c}_{i,j}) = i + 1$. We proceed in the same way for the columns of B_i^r and the rows of \bar{f}_0^i .

Every row of A_i^r or B_i^r that is not a pivot row could be zeroed out by row reductions. Hence, after a change of basis, every non-pivot row of A_i^r or B_i^r is a generator of the respective cokernel and thus generates a new bar born at index $i + 1$. We do not perform the row reduction on A_i^r or B_i^r but we transform A_{i+1} , B_{i+1} and C_{i+1} according to this change of bases to maintain matrices that are consistent with the bases induced by our presentation. These transformed matrices constitute A_{i+1}^t , B_{i+1}^t and C_{i+1}^t for the next iteration. Observe that every column of A_{i+1}^t and B_{i+1}^t and every column and row of C_{i+1}^t corresponds either to a non-pivot row of A_i^r or B_i^r and thus to a new born bar at index $i + 1$ or to a pivot row with pivot in the j -th column and thus to the bar of the j -th column in A_i^r or B_i^r . We sort the columns of A_{i+1}^t and B_{i+1}^t and the columns and rows of C_{i+1}^t w.r.t. their order in \bar{f}_0^i where columns and rows for new generators are added at the end in arbitrary order. The matrix C_{i+1}^t , restricted to the columns corresponding to non-pivot rows of A_i^r (new generators), is added to \bar{f}_0^i to obtain $f_0^{i+1} := \bar{f}_0^i$. For each new column g_j and row h_k we set $b(g_j) = i + 1$, $d(g_j) = \infty$ and $b(h_k) = i + 1$, $d(h_k) = \infty$.

► **Theorem 13.** *Given a morphism as in (13), the algorithm **PresPersMod** computes a canonical presentation (14) in $O(n^3)$ time where $\dim(M_i), \dim(N_i) = O(n_i)$ and $n = \sum_{i=0}^m n_i$.*

Proof. See Appendix C. ◀

► **Example 14.** Consider the following morphism of persistence modules over \mathbb{Z}_2

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 M_0 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 010 \\ 111 \\ 111 \end{pmatrix}} & M_1 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 011 \\ 000 \\ 011 \end{pmatrix}} & M_2 & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \dots \\
 \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 011 \\ 011 \\ 100 \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 000 \\ 011 \\ 000 \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 100 \\ 100 \\ 010 \end{pmatrix} & & \\
 N_0 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 110 \\ 110 \\ 000 \end{pmatrix}} & N_1 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 111 \\ 011 \\ 001 \end{pmatrix}} & N_2 & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \dots
 \end{array} \tag{16}$$

We initialize $f_0^0 = C_0$ and set the birth- and death-time of every generator to 0 and ∞ :

$$f_0^0 = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \\ r_3 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b \begin{matrix} c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & r_1 & r_2 & r_3 \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

We column reduce A_0 and B_0 while performing the corresponding operations on f_0^0 : To reduce A_0 we add column c_1 to column c_2 and c_3 and obtain the reduced matrix A_0^r . We also have to add column c_1 to column c_2 and c_3 in f_0^0 . To reduce B_0 we add column r_1 to column r_2 and obtain the reduced matrix B_0^r . Now we have to add row r_2 to r_1 in f_0^0 to obtain \bar{f}_0^0 .

$$A_0^r = \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_0^r = \begin{pmatrix} r_1 & r_2 & r_3 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{f}_0^0 = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \\ r_3 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

We perform the basis transformation corresponding to a row reduction of A_0^r and B_0^r on A_1 , B_1 and C_1 : To row reduce A_0^r we would have to add the third row to the second one. Hence, we add the second column to the third one in A_1 and C_1 . To row reduce B_0^r we would have to add the second row to the first one. Hence, we add the first column of B_1 to the second one and the second row of C_1 to the first one. Finally we reorder the columns of A_1 and B_1 and the columns and rows of C_1 such that their order matches the order of the generators of \bar{f}_0^0 . After row reducing A_0^r and B_0^r , the second row of A_0^r and the first and third row of B_0^r would be zero. Thus, these rows span the respective cokernel and the corresponding columns of A_1 and B_1 start new bars and get sorted in at the end.

$$A_1^t = \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & c_2 & c_4 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_1^t = \begin{pmatrix} r_1 & r_4 & r_5 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_1^t = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} c_1 & c_2 & c_4 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} r_1 \\ r_4 \\ r_5 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

We update \bar{f}_0^0 to f_0^1 as follows: The column c_4 and the rows r_4 and r_5 of C_1^t correspond to non-pivot rows of A_0^r or B_0^r . We add them as new columns and rows of f_0^1 born at index 1. The columns c_3 of A_0^r and r_2, r_3 of B_0^r are zero-columns, thus we set $d(c_3), d(r_2), d(r_3) = 1$:

$$f_0^1 = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & c_4 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \\ r_3 \\ r_4 \\ r_5 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b \begin{matrix} c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & c_4 & r_1 & r_2 & r_3 & r_4 & r_5 \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \infty & \infty & 1 & \infty & \infty & 1 & 1 & \infty & \infty \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

Since A_1^t and B_1^t are already column reduced we can directly transform C_2 : To row reduce A_1^t we would have to add the third row to the first one. Thus, we add the first column of C_2 to the third one. To row reduce B_1^t we would have to add the third row to the first one and the second one. Hence, we add the third row of C_2 to the first and the second one. Finally we reorder the columns and rows of C_2 according to the order of the corresponding generators in f_0^1 where new generators corresponding to non-pivot rows of A_1^t and B_1^t are sorted in at the end.

$$C_2^t = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} c_4 & c_5 & c_6 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} r_1 \\ r_4 \\ r_5 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

We update $\bar{f}_0^1 := f_0^1$ by adding columns c_5, c_6 of C_2^t , corresponding to non-pivot rows of A_1^t , with $b(c_5), b(c_6) = 2$ and $d(c_5), d(c_6) = \infty$. Since c_1 and c_2 are zero-columns of A_1^t , we set $d(c_1), d(c_2) = 2$ and obtain the final result:

$$f_0^2 = \begin{matrix} & c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & c_4 & c_5 & c_6 \\ \begin{matrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \\ r_3 \\ r_4 \\ r_5 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & b & \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & c_4 & c_5 & c_6 & r_1 & r_2 & r_3 & r_4 & r_5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & 1 & 1 & \infty & \infty \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

Note that the obtained presentation is equal to the presentation of (4) in Example 7. This implies that the morphisms of persistence modules (16) is isomorphic to (4).

5 Complexes of presentations

The algorithm introduced in the previous section allows us to compute a canonical presentation of a complex of persistence modules. To obtain a valid input for our homology algorithm the resulting presentations need to form a complex, i.e., a sequence of presentations connected by morphisms where composition of consecutive morphisms is zero. The problem is that an arbitrary presentation of a complex of graded modules is not necessarily a complex of presentations. Consider the following complex of persistence modules over \mathbb{Z}_2

$$\mathbb{I}_{[1,2]} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathbb{I}_{[0,2]} \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathbb{I}_{[0,1]}$$

where ϕ and ψ are the identity map on the overlap of the intervals and 0 elsewhere. Note that the composition is zero because the first and the third interval do not overlap. The following canonical presentation of the corresponding complex of $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[1,2]} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[1,\infty]} & \xleftarrow{t} & \mathbb{I}_{[2,\infty]} & \longleftarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow t & & \downarrow 1 & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[0,2]} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[0,\infty]} & \xleftarrow{t^2} & \mathbb{I}_{[2,\infty]} & \longleftarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \psi & & \downarrow 1 & & \downarrow t & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[0,1]} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[0,\infty]} & \xleftarrow{t} & \mathbb{I}_{[1,\infty]} & \longleftarrow & 0 \end{array} \quad (17)$$

is not a complex of presentations because $1 \circ t \neq 0$ and $t \circ 1 \neq 0$. The following propositions help us to show that we can always modify a canonical presentation of a complex of graded modules to a complex of presentations.

► **Proposition 15.** *Given a commutative diagram with exact rows of the form*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]} & \xleftarrow{\cdot 1} & \mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty]} & \xleftarrow{\cdot t^{b-a}} & \mathbb{I}_{[b,\infty]} & \longleftarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow f_0 & & \downarrow f_1 & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[c,d]} & \xleftarrow{\cdot 1} & \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty]} & \xleftarrow{\cdot t^{d-c}} & \mathbb{I}_{[d,\infty]} & \longleftarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

such that $a < b$ and $c < d$. There are three cases:

1. If $c \leq a < d \leq b$, then $(\phi = 0 \iff f_0 = 0 \iff f_1 = 0)$.
2. If $c < d \leq a < b$, then $\phi = 0$ and $(f_0 = 0 \iff f_1 = 0)$.
3. Else, $\phi = f_0 = f_1 = 0$.

Proof. As defined in (6), if $c \leq a < d \leq b$, there is a unique non-zero morphism, up to multiplication with a scalar, between two interval modules. We denote this morphism w.r.t. the unit 1 of the field \mathbb{k} by $(\cdot 1)$ and $(\cdot t^r)$.

1. Since $a < b$, $c \leq a$, $d \leq b$ and $c < d$, we have $(\cdot 1) \circ f_0 = 0$ and $f_0 \circ (\cdot t^{b-a}) = 0$ if and only if $f_0 = 0$ and $(\cdot t^{d-c}) \circ f_1 = 0$ if and only if $f_1 = 0$. Moreover, since $a < d$, we have $\phi \circ (\cdot 1) = 0$ if and only if $\phi = 0$.
2. Since $d \leq a$, we get $\phi = 0$. Similar to (1), we obtain $f_0 = 0 \iff f_1 = 0$.
3. If we are not in case (1), then $\phi = 0$. If $a < c$, then $f_0 = 0$. If $f_1 \neq 0$, then $d \leq b$ and $(\cdot t^{d-c}) \circ f_1 \neq 0 = f_0 \circ (\cdot t^{b-a})$. A contradiction. If $b < d$, then $f_1 = 0$. If $f_0 \neq 0$, then $c \leq a$ and $f_0 \circ (\cdot t^{b-a}) \neq 0 = (\cdot t^{d-c}) \circ f_1$. A contradiction. If $c \leq a$ and $d \leq b$ we are in case (1) or (2). ◀

► **Proposition 16.** Consider a commutative diagram of canonical presentations of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} & \xleftarrow{\cdot t^{b-a}} & \mathbb{I}_{[b,\infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \iota_0 & & \downarrow \iota_1 & & \\
 0 & \longleftarrow & M & \xleftarrow{\mu} & P_0 & \xleftarrow{p} & P_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow f_0 & & \downarrow f_1 & & \\
 0 & \longleftarrow & N & \xleftarrow{\nu} & Q_0 & \xleftarrow{q} & Q_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi_0 & & \downarrow \pi_1 & & \\
 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[c,d]} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)} & \xleftarrow{\cdot t^{d-c}} & \mathbb{I}_{[d,\infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0
 \end{array} \tag{18}$$

If not $(c < d \leq a < b)$, then $(\pi \circ \phi \circ \iota = 0 \iff \pi_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 = 0 \iff \pi_1 \circ f_1 \circ \iota_1 = 0)$.

Proof. By Proposition 15, in case (1), we have $\pi \circ \phi \circ \iota = 0 \iff \pi_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 = 0 \iff \pi_1 \circ f_1 \circ \iota_1 = 0$. Moreover, in case (3), we get $\pi \circ \phi \circ \iota = \pi_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 = \pi_1 \circ f_1 \circ \iota_1 = 0$. ◀

Proposition 16 implies that given canonical presentations as in (10), the only case where the entry of the matrix $g_0 \circ f_0$, corresponding to the bars $\mathbb{I}_{[a,b]}$ and $\mathbb{I}_{[c,d]}$, can be non-zero is when $c < d \leq a < b$. In this case, we can add a new bar $\mathbb{I}_{[e,e]}$ of length zero with $d \leq e \leq a$ to the middle presentation in (10), and map $\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \rightarrow \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)}$ and $\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \rightarrow \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}$ in such a way that the resulting map $\mathbb{I}_{[a,b]} \rightarrow \mathbb{I}_{[c,d]}$ is zero. Given the morphisms of presentations in (17), we add $\mathbb{I}_{[1,\infty)} \xleftarrow{1} \mathbb{I}_{[1,\infty)}$ to the middle term to obtain the following complex of presentations:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[1,2]} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[1,\infty)} & \xleftarrow{t} & \mathbb{I}_{[2,\infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} t \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ t \end{pmatrix} & & \\
 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[0,2]} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[0,\infty)} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[1,\infty)} & \xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} t^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}} & \mathbb{I}_{[2,\infty)} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[1,\infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \psi & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} t & 1 \end{pmatrix} & & \\
 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[0,1]} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[0,\infty)} & \xleftarrow{t} & \mathbb{I}_{[1,\infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0
 \end{array}$$

► **Theorem 17.** Let $L \xrightarrow{\phi} M \xrightarrow{\psi} N$ be a complex of graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules, then there exists a complex of presentations presenting $L \xrightarrow{\phi} M \xrightarrow{\psi} N$.

Proof. See Appendix D. ◀

► **Corollary 18.** *Given a complex of graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules $L \xrightarrow{\phi} M \xrightarrow{\psi} N$ and a canonical presentation as in (10) of size $n := \max\{\text{rank}(P_0), \text{rank}(Q_0), \text{rank}(R_0)\}$, we can modify (10) such that the modified presentation is a reduced complex of presentations of size $O(n)$.*

Proof. See Appendix D. ◀

The modification described in the proof of Corollary 18 can be implemented in the following way:

Input: The matrices f_0 and g_0 with birth/death annotations representing canonical presentations of ϕ and ψ .

Step 1: Compute the matrix product $g_0 \circ f_0$.

Step 2: For every non-zero column c_j of $g_0 \circ f_0$, add a row $(0, \dots, 0, \underset{j}{1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ with birth and death index $b(c_j)$ to the end of f_0 and the column $-c_j$ with birth and death index $b(c_j)$ to the end of g_0 .

Output: The modified matrices f_0 and g_0 .

This modification takes $O(n^3)$ time.

6 Applications

6.1 Persistent homology of simplicial towers

We consider a simplicial tower:

$$\vec{K} : K_0 \xrightarrow{f_0} K_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} \dots \xrightarrow{f_{m-1}} K_m \quad (19)$$

where K_i is a finite simplicial complex and f_i an arbitrary simplicial map. Our goal is to compute the barcode of the homology persistence module

$$H_k(\vec{K}) : H_k(K_0) \xrightarrow{H_k(f_0)} H_k(K_1) \xrightarrow{H_k(f_1)} \dots \xrightarrow{H_k(f_{m-1})} H_k(K_m) \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots \quad (20)$$

where we artificially extend finite persistence modules by isomorphisms to infinite persistence modules of finite type to fit them into the algebraic framework discussed in Section 2. From an input tower (19), we can construct the following complex of persistence modules for computing its persistent homology

$$C_{k+1}(\vec{K}) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+1}} C_k(\vec{K}) \xrightarrow{\partial_k} C_{k-1}(\vec{K}) \quad (21)$$

where $C_k(\vec{K})$ is the persistence module of simplicial k -chains in \vec{K} defined by

$$C_k(\vec{K}) : C_k(K_0) \xrightarrow{C_k(f_0)} C_k(K_1) \xrightarrow{C_k(f_1)} \dots \xrightarrow{C_k(f_{m-1})} C_k(K_m) \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots \quad (22)$$

Since simplices can be collapsed in a tower, the linear maps $C_k(f_i)$ are not necessarily injective. Thus, in general $C_k(\vec{K})$ is not a free module, but we can use the pipeline developed in Sections 4, 5 and 3 to compute the barcode of (20).




Figure 1 The pullback f^*F of a cosheaf F along an elementary collapse $f : v_3 \rightarrow v_2$.

Algorithm Tower: In practice a tower is usually represented as a sequence of elementary inclusions (adding a single simplex) and elementary collapses (collapsing exactly two vertices). It is known that every tower can be represented in this way [11], so w.l.o.g. we assume that (19) is a sequence of elementary inclusions and collapses. Every collapse can be thought of as making some simplices (chains) collapse trivially to 0, and some other pairs of simplices merging together. The number of such trivial collapses and mergings cannot be more than the number of elementary inclusions. So, we define the size n of the tower as the number of elementary inclusions in \vec{K} . The special kind of persistence modules (22), arising from simplicial towers, significantly simplify the computation of a presentation of (21). The reason for this simplification is that in the matrices $C_k(f_i)$ in (22) each column is either zero or contains a single 1 which implies that each column is reduced by a single other column and there is no need to explicitly construct these matrices. In fact, a canonical presentation of $C_k(\vec{K})$ can be computed in $O(n)$ time directly by observing elementary inclusions (creating generators), trivial collapses (pairing simplices to itself), and mergings (pairing the relation to the simplex in the merge appearing later in the filtration). Corresponding to every merge, we have a basis change which needs to be reflected by a sum of two columns in the boundary matrices that connect two modules. This will incur quadratic complexity (see Appendix E, Proposition 34). By Proposition 16 and the fact that the boundary of a simplicial chain can not die before the chain itself, this computation of a canonical presentation of the complex in (21) yields a complex of presentations.

► **Theorem 19.** *Given a simplicial tower (19) of size n , the algorithm **Tower** outlined above computes the persistent homology, i.e., the barcode of (20) in $O(n^3)$ time.*

Proof. See Appendix E. ◀

6.2 Persistent cosheaf homology over simplicial towers

In this section and the next, we consider cosheaves and sheaves over finite simplicial complexes. Briefly, as depicted in Figure 1, a (co)sheaf is an assignment of vector spaces on simplices of a simplicial complex and linear maps among them, which satisfy certain conditions of commutativity. Similar to the homology of a simplicial complex, the homology of a cosheaf over a simplicial complex can be computed from a chain complex where the boundary operators are determined by how the vector spaces over k -simplices map to the vector spaces over their $(k - 1)$ -dimensional faces. For some background on cosheaves over persistent spaces, persistent sheaves, and, their persistent homology and cohomology, see Appendices A and B.

The persistent homology of a tower can be viewed as a special case of persistent cosheaf homology over a tower (Appendix B) where the cosheaf is the constant cosheaf. We consider a simplicial tower as in the lower row of (23) and a cosheaf $F: K_m^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ over K_m .

$$\begin{aligned} F^0 &\xleftarrow{f_0^*} F^1 \xleftarrow{f_1^*} \dots \xleftarrow{f_{m-1}^*} F^m \\ \vec{K}: K_0 &\xrightarrow{f_0} K_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} \dots \xrightarrow{f_{m-1}} K_m \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

As shown in Figure 1, we use the inverse image functors f_i^* to iteratively pull back $F = F^m$ to cosheaves on all the complexes K_i by defining $F^i := f_i^* F^{i+1}$. We now use the induced maps $H_k(f_i): H_k(K_i, F^i) \rightarrow H_k(K_{i+1}, F^{i+1})$ to construct the cosheaf homology persistence module

$$H_k(\vec{K}, F): H_k(K_0, F^0) \xrightarrow{H_k(f_0)} H_k(K_1, F^1) \xrightarrow{H_k(f_1)} \dots \xrightarrow{H_k(f_{m-1})} H_k(K_m, F^m) \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots \quad (24)$$

The persistent cosheaf homology is the homology of the complex of persistence modules

$$C_{k+1}(\vec{K}, F) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+1}} C_k(\vec{K}, F) \xrightarrow{\partial_k} C_{k-1}(\vec{K}, F)$$

where $C_k(\vec{K}, F)$ is the persistence module of finite type defined by


$$C_k(\vec{K}, F): C_k(K_0, F^0) \xrightarrow{C_k(f_0)} C_k(K_1, F^1) \xrightarrow{C_k(f_1)} \dots \xrightarrow{C_k(f_{m-1})} C_k(K_m, F^m) \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots$$

Algorithm Cosheaf: As in the case of simplicial towers the persistence modules $C_k(\vec{K}, F)$ are not necessarily free. We can again assume that the tower is given by a sequence of elementary inclusions and collapses and define the size n of the instance (\vec{K}, F) as $n := \# \text{ elementary inclusions} \times \max_{\sigma \in K_m} \dim(F(\sigma))$. We can now use our pipeline developed in Sections 4, 5 and 3 to compute the barcode of (24) where the same simplifications as in the tower case (Section 6.1) apply (see Appendix F, Proposition 35).

► **Theorem 20.** *Given an instance (\vec{K}, F) of size n as in (23), the algorithm **Cosheaf** above computes the persistent cosheaf homology, i.e., the barcode of (24) in $O(n^3)$ time.*

Proof. See Appendix F. ◀

► **Example 21.** We consider the following simplicial tower \vec{K} :



where we assume that K_8 is obtained by simplex-wise inclusions in order

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\ u & v & w & z & uv & vw & wz & uz & uw \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, we consider the constant cosheaf $F = F^{11}$ on K_{11} defined by $F(u) := \mathbb{k}$ and set $\mathbb{k} := \mathbb{Z}_2$. By pulling back F along the maps $f_i: K_i \rightarrow K_{11}$ of the tower we obtain cosheaves $F^i = f_i^* F$ defined by $F^i(\sigma) = F(f_i(\sigma)) = F(u) = \mathbb{k}$ for all $\sigma \in K_i$. Thus we obtain the constant cosheaf on all K_i in \vec{K} . We now demonstrate how to compute a presentation of the morphism $\partial_1: C_1(\vec{K}, F) \rightarrow C_0(\vec{K}, F)$. We process the cosheaf-tower from (K_0, F^0) to (K_{11}, F^{11}) and build the matrix f_0 with birth/death annotations. We start with an empty matrix $f_0 = \emptyset$. If an edge τ is included at index i we add the matrix $\partial_1(\tau): C_1(K_i, F^i)|_{F^i(\tau)} \rightarrow C_0(K_i, F^i)$ consisting of $\dim(F^i(\tau)) = 1$ columns with $b(\text{col}) = i$ and $d(\text{col}) = \infty$ to f_0 . If a vertex σ is included at index j we add a zero-matrix consisting of $\dim(F^j(\sigma)) = 1$ rows to f_0 with $b(\text{row}) = j$ and $d(\text{row}) = \infty$. Note that the boundary matrix of the constant cosheaf $\partial_1: C_1(K_i, F^i) \rightarrow C_0(K_i, F^i)$ agrees with the boundary matrix of the simplicial complex itself. Hence, after processing K_0, \dots, K_8 we have

$$f_0 = \begin{array}{c} [0, \infty) \\ [1, \infty) \\ [2, \infty) \\ [3, \infty) \end{array} \begin{array}{ccccc} [4, \infty) & [5, \infty) & [6, \infty) & [7, \infty) & [8, \infty) \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & u & v & w & z \\ uv & vw & wz & uz & uw \end{array}$$


At index 9 the vertex z gets collapsed into w . As a consequence the edge uz is merged into uw and the edge wz is collapsed to the vertex w . Hence, we have to add the column corresponding to uz , which is born first, to the column corresponding to uw and set $d(uw) = 9$ and $d(wz) = 9$. Moreover, we have to add the row corresponding to z to the one corresponding to w and set $d(z) = 9$. After this step we have

$$f_0 = \begin{array}{c} [0, \infty) \\ [1, \infty) \\ [2, \infty) \\ [3, 9) \end{array} \begin{array}{ccccc} [4, \infty) & [5, \infty) & [6, 9) & [7, \infty) & [8, 9) \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & u & v & w & z \end{array}$$

When moving from 9 to 10 the vertex w is collapsed into v . As a consequence the edge uw is merged into uv and the edge vw is collapsed into v . Hence, we have to add the column corresponding to uv to the column corresponding to uz and set $d(uz) = 10$ and $d(vw) = 10$. Moreover, we have to add the row corresponding to w to the one corresponding to v and set $d(w) = 10$. After this step we have

$$f_0 = \begin{array}{c} [0, \infty) \\ [1, \infty) \\ [2, 10) \\ [3, 9) \end{array} \begin{array}{ccccc} [4, \infty) & [5, 10) & [6, 9) & [7, 10) & [8, 9) \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & u & v & w & z \end{array}$$

When moving from 10 to 11 the vertex v is collapsed into u . As a consequence the edge uv is collapsed into u . Hence, we have to set $d(uv) = 11$. Moreover, we have to add the row corresponding to v to the one corresponding to u and set $d(v) = 11$. After this step we



■ **Figure 2** A sheaf morphism $\phi: F \rightarrow G$ over a triangle and its faces.

obtain the final result

$$f_0 = \begin{matrix} [0, \infty) \\ [1, 11) \\ [2, 10) \\ [3, 9) \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} [4, 11) & [5, 10) & [6, 9) & [7, 10) & [8, 9) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

6.3 Cohomology of persistent sheaves over simplicial complexes

In this section we compute the cohomology of a persistent sheaf over a simplicial complex. We consider a persistent sheaf $\vec{F}: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Shv}(K, \mathbf{vec})$ (Appendix A) of finite type on a finite simplicial complex K , i.e. a diagram of sheaves and sheaf morphisms (see Figure 2) over K

$$\vec{F}: F_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_0} F_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_1} \dots \xrightarrow{\phi_{m-1}} F_m \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots \quad (25)$$


where ϕ_i is an isomorphism for all $i \geq m$. As depicted in Figure 3, a persistent sheaf can also be viewed as a sheaf of persistence modules. The figure shows parts of the sheaf in (26) of interval persistence modules on a simplicial complex containing a triangle and its faces where the maps are identity on the overlap of intervals and zero elsewhere:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathbb{I}_{[1,7)} & & \\ & \swarrow & & \searrow & \\ \mathbb{I}_{[1,6)} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[0,3)} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[0,5)} \\ \swarrow & & \uparrow & & \swarrow \\ \mathbb{I}_{[2,6)} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[0,5)} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[1,5)} \end{array} \quad (26)$$

Our goal is to compute the persistent sheaf cohomology of \vec{F} , i.e. the barcode of the following persistence module:

$$H^k(X, \vec{F}): H^k(K, F_0) \xrightarrow{H^k(K, \phi_0)} H^k(K, F_1) \xrightarrow{H^k(K, \phi_1)} \dots \xrightarrow{H^k(K, \phi_{m-1})} H^k(K, F_m) \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots \quad (27)$$

Algorithm PersistentSheaf: We first assume that the input for the computation is given by a collection of matrices representing the internal maps $F_i(\sigma \leq \tau)$ of the sheaves for all



■ **Figure 3** Two equivalent viewpoints of a persistent sheaf over a triangle and its faces.

$0 \leq i \leq m$ and $\sigma <_1 \tau \in K$ and a collection of matrices representing the sheaf morphisms $\phi_i(\sigma)$ for all $0 \leq i < m$ and $\sigma \in K$. We define the size of the input as $n := \sum_{i=0}^m n_i$ where $n_i := \sum_{\sigma \in K} \dim(F_i(\sigma))$.

From the input we can construct the following complex of persistence modules

$$C^{k-1}(K, \vec{F}) \xrightarrow{\delta^{k-1}} C^k(K, \vec{F}) \xrightarrow{\delta^k} C^{k+1}(K, \vec{F}) \quad (28)$$

where $C^k(K, \vec{F})$ is a persistence module of finite type defined by

$$C^k(K, \vec{F}) : C^k(K, F_0) \xrightarrow{C^k(X, \phi_0)} C^k(K, F_1) \xrightarrow{C^k(K, \phi_1)} \dots \xrightarrow{C^k(K, \phi_{m-1})} C^k(K, F_m) \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots$$

Using the pipeline developed in Sections 4, 5 and 3, we can compute a presentation of (28), transform it into a complex of presentations and compute the barcode of the cohomology.

► **Theorem 22.** *Given a persistent sheaf (25) of size n , the algorithm **PersistentSheaf** above computes the persistent sheaf cohomology, i.e., the barcode of (27), in $O(n^3)$ time.*

Proof. This follows directly from the results in Section 4, 5 and 3. ◀

► **Example 23.** We demonstrate how to compute the cohomology in degree $k = 1$ of the persistent sheaf in (26). We assume $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{Z}_2$ and start by constructing a complex of presentations of (28) for $k = 1$. As in (31), we can build $C^k(K, \vec{F})$ by taking the direct sum of all the persistence modules $\vec{F}(\sigma)$ over k -simplices $\sigma \in K$, i.e., $C^k(K, \vec{F}) := \bigoplus_{\sigma \in K^k} \vec{F}(\sigma)$. In

the case of (26), we obtain:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C^0(K, \vec{F}) & = & \mathbb{I}_{[2,6]} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[1,5]} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[1,7]} \\ \downarrow \delta^0 & & \downarrow \swarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ C^1(K, \vec{F}) & = & \mathbb{I}_{[0,5]} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[1,6]} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[0,5]} \\ \downarrow \delta^1 & & \swarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \swarrow \\ C^2(K, \vec{F}) & = & \mathbb{I}_{[0,3]} \end{array}$$

where the arrows depict morphisms between interval modules over K which are the identity on the overlap of intervals and zero elsewhere. Note that the structures of the maps δ^0 and

δ^1 resemble the coboundary morphisms of a triangle

$$\delta^0 = \begin{matrix} [0,5] \\ [0,5] \\ [1,6] \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} [2,6] & [1,5] & [1,7] \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \delta^1 = [0,3] \begin{pmatrix} [0,5] & [0,5] & [1,6] \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using these observations we can easily build the following complex of canonical presentations:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longleftarrow & C^0(K, \vec{F}) & \longleftarrow & P_0 & \longleftarrow & P_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\ & & \delta^0 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & \begin{matrix} 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & & \end{matrix} & & \begin{matrix} 2 & 5 & 7 \\ 1 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & & \end{matrix} & & \\ & & \delta^1 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & \begin{matrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & & \end{matrix} & & \begin{matrix} 5 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & & \end{matrix} & & \begin{matrix} 5 & 6 & 7 \\ 5 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & & \end{matrix} & & \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & & & \begin{matrix} 0 & 3 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} & & \begin{matrix} 5 & 5 & 6 \\ 3 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & C^1(K, \vec{F}) & \longleftarrow & Q_0 & \longleftarrow & Q_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\ & & \delta^1 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & \begin{matrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & & \end{matrix} & & \begin{matrix} 0 & 3 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} & & \begin{matrix} 5 & 5 & 6 \\ 3 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} & & \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & C^2(K, \vec{F}) & \longleftarrow & R_0 & \longleftarrow & R_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

The cohomology of this complex of presentations is computed in Example 12 in Section 3. From there we get $H^1(K, \vec{F}) = \ker \delta^1 / \text{im } \delta^0 \cong \mathbb{I}_{[0,1]} \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[3,5]}$ for the persistent sheaf cohomology of \vec{F} over K .

In practice, it is unlikely that one is just handed a persistent sheaf in the form described above. In an application the persistent sheaf has to be constructed in the first place. To construct a persistent sheaf $\vec{F}: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Shv}(K, \mathbf{vec})$ or equivalently a sheaf of persistence modules $\vec{F}: K \rightarrow \mathbf{pMod}$, one has to construct a persistence module $\vec{F}(\sigma): \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ over every simplex $\sigma \in K$ and connect them by a morphism of persistence modules $\vec{F}(\sigma \leq \tau)$ if $\sigma <_1 \tau$. The idea of sheaves is to organize local information over a space. We use this idea to compute presentations $0 \leftarrow \vec{F}(\sigma) \leftarrow P_0^\sigma \xleftarrow{P_1^\sigma} P_1^\sigma$ of the modules over each simplex and the morphisms $\vec{F}(\sigma \leq \tau)$ locally in time $O(\max\{\sum_{i=0}^m \dim(F_i(\sigma)), \sum_{i=0}^m \dim(F_i(\tau))\}^3)$. This can be computed in a distributed manner while constructing the persistent sheaf. From these local presentations we can assemble a presentation of (28). After this construction / preprocessing step we can define the size of the presentation as $\bar{n} := \sum_{\sigma \in K} \text{rank}(P_0^\sigma)$. The size of \bar{n} depends on the structure of the modules $\vec{F}(\sigma)$. If all their summands restricted to $[0, m]$ are intervals of length 0, then $\bar{n} = n$, but, if all their summands are intervals of length m , then $\bar{n} = \frac{n}{m}$. The remaining steps in our pipeline take $O(\bar{n}^3)$ time. Therefore, if one can take advantage of distributed computation of the input and local presentations, our approach can be significantly faster than $O(n^3)$.

6.4 Cohomology of persistent sheaves over posets

So far our algorithms allow us to compute the persistent sheaf cohomology barcode of persistent sheaves over simplicial complexes. Discrete sheaves and their persistent version can be defined more generally on finite posets. The problem is that for arbitrary finite posets there is no direct analog to the explicit (co)chain complex (of polynomial size) computing the sheaf cohomology over a simplicial complex. For arbitrary posets one could use the general definition of sheaf cohomology via derived functors (see [5] for the non-persistent case). We now show that we can reduce the computation of persistent sheaf cohomology over a finite poset to a

computation over a simplicial complex. Let X be a finite poset and $\vec{F}: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Shv}(X, \mathbf{vec})$ a persistent sheaf. The order complex $\mathcal{K}(X)$ is the simplicial complex defined by all totally ordered subsets of X , i.e. $\mathcal{K}(X) := \{\{x_0, \dots, x_k\} | x_0 < \dots < x_k \in X\}$. It comes with a surjective projection morphism $f: \mathcal{K}(X) \rightarrow X$ defined by $f(x_0 < \dots < x_k) := x_k$. We can now pull back \vec{F} along this projection f to a persistent sheaf on $\mathcal{K}(X)$. Given $x_\bullet = (x_0 < \dots < x_k) \leq (y_0 < \dots < y_l) = y_\bullet \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ we define this pullback by $f^*\vec{F}(x_\bullet) := \vec{F}(x_k)$ and $f^*\vec{F}(x_\bullet \leq y_\bullet) := \vec{F}(x_k \leq y_l)$. The following theorem shows that the persistent sheaf cohomology of \vec{F} on the poset X is isomorphic to the persistent sheaf cohomology of $f^*\vec{F}$ on the simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}(X)$.

► **Theorem 24.** *If X is a finite poset, \vec{F} a persistent sheaf on X and $f: \mathcal{K}(X) \rightarrow X$ the projection from the order complex, then $H^k(X, \vec{F}) \cong H^k(\mathcal{K}(X), f^*\vec{F})$.*


Proof. See Appendix G.1. ◀

We are now able to compute the persistent sheaf cohomology over any finite poset by pulling back to the order complex and using our pipeline for simplicial complexes. Unfortunately this approach is only practical for small instances since the size of the order complex is exponential in the size of the poset. This raises the question if it is possible to compute the persistent sheaf cohomology over a general poset in polynomial time. In the following we give an example of a class of posets, which can have exponentially large order complexes, where we can compute the persistent cohomology in polynomial time.

Let X be a zigzag-poset, i.e. a poset with the following Hasse diagram

$$x_0 \longleftrightarrow x_1 \longleftrightarrow \dots \longleftrightarrow x_{n-1} \longleftrightarrow x_n \quad (29)$$

where each arrow can point to the left or to the right. Let \vec{F} be a persistent sheaf on X . We now construct a poset X' in the following way: Suppose the points in X are ordered from left to right as in (29). Let x_{i_0} be the minimal element in X with the smallest index $i_0 \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. Let x_{i_1} be the maximal element of X with minimal index $i_1 > i_0$. Let x_{i_2} be the minimal element of X with minimal index $i_2 > i_1$. We proceed in this way until we reach the minimal element x_{i_m} with maximal index i_m and define $X' := \{x_{i_0}, \dots, x_{i_m}\}$. The constructed zigzag-poset X' is an alternating zigzag poset of the form:



and is a subposet of X , i.e. there is an order-preserving inclusion $\iota: X' \hookrightarrow X$. We can pull back the persistent sheaf \vec{F} along this inclusion to obtain a persistent sheaf $\iota^*\vec{F}$ on X' . Since X' is the poset of a one-dimensional simplicial complex, our algorithms are applicable to $\iota^*\vec{F}$. Now, we can show that the cohomology of \vec{F} on X agrees with the cohomology of $\iota^*\vec{F}$ on X' .

► **Theorem 25.** *Let X be a zigzag-poset and $\iota: X' \hookrightarrow X$ the inclusion of the alternating subposet. If \vec{F} is a persistent sheaf on X , then $H^k(X, \vec{F}) \cong H^k(X', \iota^*\vec{F})$.*

Proof. See Appendix G.2. ◀

7 Conclusion

We developed efficient general purpose algorithms to compute the (co)homology of complexes of persistence modules. Our methods can deal with complexes of persistence modules given in

raw form by matrices and by complexes of their presentations. They can be used to efficiently compute the persistent homology of towers, the persistent cosheaf homology over towers and the persistent sheaf cohomology over simplicial complexes. We also showed that we can use our pipeline to compute the cohomology of persistent sheaves over arbitrary finite posets by reducing it to a computation over simplicial complexes. Unfortunately, this reduction leads to an exponential time algorithm in general. For the class of zigzag posets we proved that we can compute the persistent cohomology in polynomial time. This result demonstrates that we can reduce persistent sheaves over some posets to ones over simplicial complexes of polynomial size in a way preserving the persistent cohomology. This leaves us with the open question: What is the class of posets for which the persistent sheaf cohomology can be computed in polynomial time and is the computation NP-hard for arbitrary posets?

References

- 1 Gorô Azumaya. Corrections and supplementaries to my paper concerning Krull-Remak-Schmidt's theorem. *Nagoya Mathematical Journal*, 1:117–124, 1950.
- 2 Federico Barbero, Cristian Bodnar, Haitz Sáez de Ocáriz Borde, Michael Bronstein, Petar Veličković, and Pietro Liò. Sheaf neural networks with connection laplacians. In *Proceedings of Topological, Algebraic, and Geometric Learning Workshops 2022*, volume 196 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 28–36. PMLR, 25 Feb–22 Jul 2022.
- 3 Nicolas Berkouk, Grégory Ginot, and Steve Oudot. Level-sets persistence and sheaf theory. *CoRR*, abs/1907.09759, 2019. [arXiv:1907.09759](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.09759).
- 4 Cristian Bodnar, Francesco Di Giovanni, Benjamin Chamberlain, Pietro Lió, and Michael Bronstein. Neural sheaf diffusion: A topological perspective on heterophily and oversmoothing in gns. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 18527–18541. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022.
- 5 Adam Brown and Ondrej Draganov. Discrete microlocal morse theory, 2022. [arXiv:2209.14993](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.14993).
- 6 Adam Brown and Bei Wang. Sheaf-theoretic stratification learning from geometric and topological perspectives. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 65, 2021. [doi:10.1007/s00454-020-00206-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-020-00206-y).
- 7 René Corbet and Michael Kerber. The representation theorem of persistence revisited and generalized. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, 2(1-2):1–31, 2018. [doi:10.1007/s41468-018-0015-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s41468-018-0015-3).
- 8 Justin Curry. *Sheaves, Cosheaves and Applications*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 2014. [arXiv:1303.3255](https://arxiv.org/abs/1303.3255).
- 9 Justin Curry, Robert Ghrist, and Vidit Nanda. Discrete morse theory for computing cellular sheaf cohomology. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 16, 2013. [doi:10.1007/s10208-015-9266-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-015-9266-8).
- 10 Justin Curry, Washington Mio, Tom Needham, Osman Berat Okutan, and Florian Russold. Convergence of leray cosheaves for decorated mapper graphs, 2023. [arXiv:2303.00130](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.00130).
- 11 Tamal K. Dey, Fengtao Fan, and Yusu Wang. Computing topological persistence for simplicial maps. In *Proc. 13th Annu. Sympos. Comput. Geom. (SoCG)*, pages 345:345–345:354, 2014.
- 12 Herbert Edelsbrunner, David Letscher, and Afra Zomorodian. Topological persistence and simplification. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 28(4):511–533, Nov 2002.
- 13 Peter Gabriel. Unzerlegbare Darstellungen I. *Manuscripta Mathematica*, 6(1):71–103, 1972. [doi:10.1007/BF01298413](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01298413).
- 14 Robert Ghrist. *Elementary Applied Topology*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2014.
- 15 Robert Ghrist and Yasuaki Hiraoka. Applications of sheaf cohomology and exact sequences on network codings. 2011. URL: <https://www2.math.upenn.edu/~ghrist/preprints/networkcodingshort.pdf>.

- 16 Jakob Hansen and Thomas Gebhart. Sheaf neural networks, 2020. [arXiv:2012.06333](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.06333).
- 17 Jakob Hansen and Robert Ghrist. Opinion dynamics on discourse sheaves. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 81:2033–2060, 2021. doi:10.1137/20M1341088.
- 18 Masaki Kashiwara and Pierre Schapira. Persistent homology and microlocal sheaf theory. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, 2, 2018. doi:10.1007/s41468-018-0019-z.
- 19 Michael Kerber and Hannah Schreiber. Barcodes of towers and a streaming algorithm for persistent homology. In *33rd International Symposium on Computational Geometry, SoCG 2017*, volume 77 of *LIPICs*, pages 57:1–57:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017.
- 20 S. Lang. *Algebra*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 2005.
- 21 nLab authors. adjoint functor. <https://ncatlab.org/nlab/show/adjoint+functor>, July 2023. Revision 134.
- 22 Michael Robinson. Understanding networks and their behaviors using sheaf theory. *2013 IEEE Global Conference on Signal and Information Processing, GlobalSIP 2013 - Proceedings*, 2013. doi:10.1109/GlobalSIP.2013.6737040.
- 23 Michael Robinson. *Topological Signal Processing*. Mathematical Engineering. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2014.
- 24 Florian Russold. Persistent sheaf cohomology, 2022. [arXiv:2204.13446](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.13446).
- 25 Álvaro Torras-Casas. Distributing persistent homology via spectral sequences. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, pages 1–40, 2023.
- 26 Xiaoqi Wei, Jiahui Chen, and Guo-Wei Wei. Persistent topological Laplacian analysis of SARS-CoV-2 variants. *J Comput Biophys Chem.*, 01 2023.
- 27 Xiaoqi Wei and Guo-Wei Wei. Persistent sheaf Laplacians, 2022. [arXiv:2112.10906](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.10906).
- 28 Hee Rhang Yoon and Robert Ghrist. Persistence by parts: Multiscale feature detection via distributed persistent homology, 2020. [arXiv:2001.01623](https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.01623).
- 29 Afra Zomorodian and Gunnar Carlsson. Computing persistent homology. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 33:249–274, 2005. doi:10.1007/s00454-004-1146-y.

A Sheaves and their persistent version

A sheaf is a structure that organizes information over a topological space. For example, a sheaf of vector spaces over a topological space X is a collection of vector spaces and linear maps parameterized by the open sets of X . In this paper we will only work with sheaves in the discrete setting of finite posets. The theory of sheaves over posets is connected to the general theory of sheaves on topological spaces by the Alexandrov topology on posets [8, Theorem 4.2.10]. In the following we will also view a poset X as a category with a unique morphism $\sigma \rightarrow \tau$ if and only if $\sigma \leq \tau \in X$.

► **Definition 26** (Sheaves and sheaf morphisms over poset). *A sheaf F on a finite poset X with values in a category \mathbf{C} is a functor $F: X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$. In other words, F is an assignment of an object $F(\sigma) \in \mathbf{C}$ to every element $\sigma \in X$ and an assignment of a morphism $F(\sigma) \xrightarrow{F(\sigma \leq \tau)} F(\tau)$ to every relation $\sigma \leq \tau \in X$.*

A morphism of sheaves $\phi: F \rightarrow G$ on X is a natural transformation of the functors F and G , i.e. a collection of morphisms $\phi(\sigma): F(\sigma) \rightarrow G(\sigma)$ such that $G(\sigma \leq \tau) \circ \phi(\sigma) = \phi(\tau) \circ F(\sigma \leq \tau)$ for all $\sigma \leq \tau \in X$.

Our main example will be sheaves over finite abstract simplicial complexes where a simplicial complex K is viewed as a poset with $\sigma \leq \tau \in K$ whenever σ is a face of τ . Figure 2 shows an example of sheaves (black) on a complex comprising a triangle and its faces and a sheaf morphism (red). Sheaves over X with values in \mathbf{C} and their morphisms form a category which we denote by $\mathbf{Shv}(X, \mathbf{C})$. In the following, we will work with the categories of

sheaves $\mathbf{Shv}(X, \mathbf{vec})$ of finite-dimensional vector spaces \mathbf{vec} or sheaves $\mathbf{Shv}(X, \mathbf{grMod}_{\mathbb{k}[t]})$ of finitely generated graded modules $\mathbf{grMod}_{\mathbb{k}[t]}$ over the polynomial ring $\mathbb{k}[t]$.

Sheaves with values in a suitable category \mathbf{C} have a notion of cohomology, i.e., for every $k \geq 0$, there is a cohomology functor $H^k(X, -): \mathbf{Shv}(X, \mathbf{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ defined by $F \mapsto H^k(X, F)$ and $(F \xrightarrow{\phi} G) \mapsto (H^k(X, F) \xrightarrow{H^k(X, \phi)} H^k(X, G))$. If K is a simplicial complex, the cohomology of F can be computed by a cochain complex similar to the one computing simplicial cohomology [8]. In the following, we denote by K^k the set of k -simplices of K and by $[\sigma : \tau]$ a signed incidence relation on K . Such an incidence relation can be defined as follows. Choose an arbitrary ordering of the vertex set $K^0 = (v_0, \dots, v_d)$. A simplex $\tau \in K$ can be expressed as $\tau = (v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_t})$ such that $i_j < i_{j+1}$. If σ is a codimension 1 face of τ , denoted by $\sigma <_1 \tau$, then $\sigma = (v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_{j-1}}, v_{i_{j+1}}, \dots, v_{i_t})$. Now we define

$$[\sigma : \tau] := \begin{cases} (-1)^j & \text{if } \sigma <_1 \tau \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

The cohomology $H^k(K, F)$ of a sheaf of finite-dimensional vector spaces F on a finite simplicial complex K is given by the cohomology of the following cochain complex

$$0 \longrightarrow C^0(K, F) \xrightarrow{\delta^0} C^1(K, F) \xrightarrow{\delta^1} C^2(K, F) \xrightarrow{\delta^2} \dots \quad (30)$$

where

$$C^k(K, F) := \bigoplus_{\sigma \in K^k} F(\sigma) \quad (31)$$

$$\delta_{\sigma, \tau}^k := [\sigma : \tau] F(\sigma \leq \tau)$$

and $\delta_{\sigma, \tau}^k$ denotes the block of the block-matrix $\delta^k: \bigoplus_{\sigma \in K^k} F(\sigma) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\tau \in K^{k+1}} F(\tau)$ corresponding to the simplices σ and τ . Moreover, the morphism $H^k(K, \phi): H^k(K, F) \rightarrow H^k(K, G)$ induced in cohomology by a sheaf morphism $\phi: F \rightarrow G$ is the morphism induced by the following morphism of cochain complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & C^0(K, F) & \xrightarrow{\delta^0} & C^1(K, F) & \xrightarrow{\delta^1} & C^2(K, F) \xrightarrow{\delta^2} \dots \\ & & \downarrow C^0(K, \phi) & & \downarrow C^1(K, \phi) & & \downarrow C^2(K, \phi) \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C^0(K, G) & \xrightarrow{\delta^0} & C^1(K, G) & \xrightarrow{\delta^1} & C^2(K, G) \xrightarrow{\delta^2} \dots \end{array} \quad (32)$$

where $C^k(K, \phi)$ is the block matrix defined by

$$C_k(K, \phi)_{\sigma\tau} := \begin{cases} \phi(\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma = \tau \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$


for all $\sigma, \tau \in K^k$.

We now come to persistent sheaves. In topological data analysis we study the evolution of topological spaces under variation of a parameter. We can think of them as persistence modules of topological spaces or persistent spaces. A persistent sheaf describes the evolution of algebraic information over a fixed space X .

► **Definition 27** (Persistent sheaf). *A persistent sheaf is a functor*

$$\vec{F}: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Shv}(X, \mathbf{vec}).$$

We call \vec{F} of finite type if $\exists m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ so that $\vec{F}(i \leq j)$ is an isomorphism $\forall m \leq i \leq j$.



■ **Figure 4** A persistent sheaf \vec{F} and the corresponding sheaf of graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules $\mathcal{M}\vec{F}$.

The following theorem shows that a persistent sheaf (Figure 4 left) can also be viewed as a sheaf of graded modules (Figure 4 right), or by Proposition 2, a sheaf of persistence modules (Figure 3). The significance of this theorem is that, as illustrated in Figure 4, it allows for a compressed representation of a persistent sheaf.

► **Theorem 28.** [24, Theorem 3.6] *A persistent sheaf $\vec{F}: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Shv}(X, \mathbf{vec})$ of finite type corresponds to a sheaf of finitely generated \mathbb{N}_0 -graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules $\mathcal{M}\vec{F}$. More precisely, if X is a finite poset, there is an equivalence of categories*

$$\mathcal{M}: \mathbf{Fun}_{ft}(\mathbb{N}_0, \mathbf{Shv}(X, \mathbf{vec})) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbf{Shv}(X, \mathbf{grMod}_{\mathbb{k}[t]}).$$

When X is a single point, $\mathbf{Shv}(X, \mathbf{C}) \cong \mathbf{C}$. Thus persistent sheaves over a point are equivalent to persistence modules. Hence, Proposition 2 is the special case of Theorem 28 when X is a single point.

Our goal is to compute the persistent cohomology of \vec{F} , i.e. the barcode of the persistence module $H^k(X, \vec{F}) := H^k(X, -) \circ \vec{F}: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ obtained by composing \vec{F} with the sheaf cohomology functor $H^k(X, -): \mathbf{Shv}(X, \mathbf{vec}) \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$.

If K is a finite simplicial complex, the sheaf cohomology persistence module $H^k(K, \vec{F})$ can be computed by pointwise computation of all cohomology vector spaces $H^k(K, \vec{F}(i))$ and induced morphisms $H^k(K, \vec{F}(i \leq i+1))$ from the cochain complexes given in (32). The following theorem suggests an alternative method of computation.

► **Theorem 29.** [24, Theorem 3.8] *The persistent cohomology of \vec{F} corresponds to the cohomology of the sheaf of graded $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -modules $\mathcal{M}\vec{F}$, i.e.,*

$$\mathcal{M}H^k(X, \vec{F}) \cong H^k(X, \mathcal{M}\vec{F}).$$

Over a simplicial complex, the cohomology of $\mathcal{M}\vec{F}$ can be computed from a cochain complex in the same way as the cohomology of a sheaf of vector spaces by replacing the sheaf of vector spaces F in (30) and (31) by the sheaf of graded modules $\mathcal{M}\vec{F}$ [24]. In Section 6.3 we present an algorithm motivated by this viewpoint.

B Cosheaves over persistent spaces

The notion of a cosheaf is dual to the one of a sheaf. Over finite posets they are equivalent [8, Definition 6.2.8]. Every result for sheaves over finite posets can be translated to cosheaves

by dualization.

► **Definition 30** (Cosheaves and cosheaf morphisms over poset). *A cosheaf F on a finite poset X with values in a category \mathbf{C} is a functor $F: X^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$. In other words, F is an assignment of an object $F(\sigma) \in \mathbf{C}$ to every element $\sigma \in X$ and an assignment of a morphism $F(\tau) \xrightarrow{F(\sigma \leq \tau)} F(\sigma)$ to every relation $\sigma \leq \tau \in X$.*

A morphism of cosheaves $\phi: F \rightarrow G$ on X is a natural transformation of the functors F and G , i.e. a collection of morphisms $\phi(\sigma): F(\sigma) \rightarrow G(\sigma)$ such that $G(\sigma \leq \tau) \circ \phi(\tau) = \phi(\sigma) \circ F(\sigma \leq \tau)$ for all $\sigma \leq \tau \in X$.

In this section we want to study the behavior of a "fixed" cosheaf over a varying space.

► **Definition 31** (Persistent space). *A persistent space is a functor*

$$\vec{X}: \bar{\mathbb{N}}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$$

where $\bar{\mathbb{N}}_0 := \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$. *The persistent space \vec{X} is of finite type, if $\exists m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\vec{X}(i \leq j)$ is an isomorphism $\forall m \leq i \leq j$.*

► **Example 32.** An abstract simplicial complex viewed as a poset equipped with the Alexandrov topology can be viewed as a finite topological space. Let $K_0 \subseteq K_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq K_m$ be a filtered simplicial complex. Then, $\vec{K}(i) := K_i$ for $0 \leq i < m$ and $\vec{K}(i) := K_m$ for $m \leq i$ defines a persistent space of finite type.

Let \vec{X} be a persistent space and $F = F^\infty$ a cosheaf on $\vec{X}(\infty)$. In the following, we use the notation $X_i := \vec{X}(i)$ and $f_i := \vec{X}(i \leq i+1)$. The cosheaf F^∞ defines a cosheaf F^i on X_i for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ via the pull back $F^i := \vec{X}(i \leq \infty)^* F^\infty$. Since $\vec{X}(i \leq \infty) = \vec{X}(j \leq \infty) \circ \vec{X}(i \leq j)$ for all $i \leq j \leq \infty$, we obtain $F^i \cong \vec{X}(i \leq \infty)^* F^\infty \cong \vec{X}(i \leq j)^* \vec{X}(j \leq \infty)^* F^\infty \cong \vec{X}(i \leq j)^* F^j$. Hence, we can also define the F^i by iteratively pulling back F^∞ to every space X_i as depicted in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} F^0 & \xleftarrow{f_0^*} & F_1 & \xleftarrow{f_1^*} & \dots & \xleftarrow{f_{i-1}^*} & F^i & \xleftarrow{f_i^*} & F^{i+1} & \xleftarrow{f_{i+1}^*} & \dots & \xleftarrow{\quad} & F^\infty \\ X_0 & \xrightarrow{f_0} & X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & \dots & \xrightarrow{f_{i-1}} & X_i & \xrightarrow{f_i} & X_{i+1} & \xrightarrow{f_{i+1}} & \dots & \longrightarrow & X_\infty \end{array} \quad (33)$$

Our goal is to compute the persistent homology of F^∞ over \vec{X} which we define in the following way: Let $H_k(f_i): H_k(X_i, f_i^* F^{i+1}) \rightarrow H_k(X_{i+1}, F^{i+1})$ denote the induced morphism in homology. Then (33) induces the following persistence module

$$H_k(X_0, F^0) \xrightarrow{H_k(f_0)} H_k(X_1, F^1) \xrightarrow{H_k(f_1)} H_k(X_2, F^2) \xrightarrow{H_k(f_2)} \dots \quad (34)$$

denoted by $H_k(\vec{X}, F): \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$. We call $H_k(\vec{X}, F)$ the homology persistence module of (\vec{X}, F) . If \vec{X} is of finite type, then (34) is determined up to isomorphism by the finite persistence module of F^m over the finite persistent space in (35)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} F^0 & \xleftarrow{f_0^*} & F^1 & \xleftarrow{f_1^*} & \dots & \xleftarrow{f_{m-1}^*} & F^m \\ X_0 & \xrightarrow{f_0} & X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & \dots & \xrightarrow{f_{m-1}} & X_m \\ H_k(X_0, F^0) & \xrightarrow{H_k(f_0)} & H_k(X_1, F^1) & \xrightarrow{H_k(f_1)} & \dots & \xrightarrow{H_k(f_{m-1})} & H_k(X_m, F^m) \end{array} \quad (35)$$

In practice, the finite persistent space in (35) will most likely be a simplicial tower, i.e. a sequence of arbitrary simplicial maps. In this case, we can explicitly construct chain complexes and morphisms computing the persistent homology. Let $f: K \rightarrow L$ be a simplicial map and F be a cosheaf on L . The pullback f^*F on K is defined by $f^*F(\sigma) := F(f(\sigma))$. The k -chains of F and f^*F are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} C_k(L, F) &:= \bigoplus_{\tau \in L^k} F(\tau) \\ C_k(K, f^*F) &:= \bigoplus_{\sigma \in K^k} f^*F(\sigma) = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in K^k} F(f(\sigma)) \end{aligned}$$

The induced map $C_k(f): C_k(K, f^*F) \rightarrow C_k(L, F)$ is defined by the block-matrix with the following entries: For $\sigma \in K^k$ and $\tau \in L^k$

$$\begin{aligned} C_k(f)_{\sigma\tau} &: F(f(\sigma)) \rightarrow F(\tau) \\ C_k(f)_{\sigma\tau} &= \begin{cases} \text{id} & : \text{if } f(\sigma) = \tau \\ 0 & : \text{else} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The homology of a cosheaf over a simplicial complex is computed by a chain complex dual to the one in (30). Given a simplicial tower as in (35), the cosheaf chain complexes together with the chain morphisms of (36) induced by the f_i yield the following chain complex of persistence modules

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} C_{k+1}(K_0, F^0) & \xrightarrow{C_{k+1}(f_0)} & C_{k+1}(K_1, F^1) & \xrightarrow{C_{k+1}(f_1)} & \dots & \xrightarrow{C_{k+1}(f_{m-1})} & C_{k+1}(K_m, F^m) \\ \downarrow \partial_{k+1}^0 & & \downarrow \partial_{k+1}^1 & & & & \downarrow \partial_{k+1}^m \\ C_k(K_0, F^0) & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_0)} & C_k(K_1, F^1) & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_1)} & \dots & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_{m-1})} & C_k(K_m, F^m) \\ \downarrow \partial_k^0 & & \downarrow \partial_k^1 & & & & \downarrow \partial_k^m \\ C_{k-1}(K_0, F^0) & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_0)} & C_{k-1}(K_1, F^1) & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_1)} & \dots & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_{m-1})} & C_{k-1}(K_m, F^m) \end{array} \quad (37)$$

which computes the persistent homology of F on \vec{K} . By extending (37) by isomorphisms we view

$$C_k(K_0, F^0) \xrightarrow{C_k(f_0)} C_k(K_1, F^1) \xrightarrow{C_k(f_1)} \dots \xrightarrow{C_k(f_{m-1})} C_k(K_m, F^m) \xrightarrow{\cong} \dots$$

denoted by $C^k(\vec{K}, F)$ as a persistence module of finite type and denote the corresponding chain complex of persistence modules by

$$C_{k+1}(\vec{K}, F) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+1}} C_k(\vec{K}, F) \xrightarrow{\partial_k} C_{k-1}(\vec{K}, F) \quad (38)$$

As in the case of persistent sheaves, we have two options to compute the persistent homology. The first option is to compute the homology $H_k(K_i, F^i)$, $H_k(K_{i+1}, F^{i+1})$ and the induced morphism $H_k(f_i): H_k(K_i, F^i) \rightarrow H_k(K_{i+1}, F^{i+1})$ pointwise. The second option is to compute the homology of the chain complex of persistence modules (38) in the category of graded modules.

► **Example 33.** Let \vec{K} be a simplicial tower as in (35) and F be the constant cosheaf on K_m defined by $F(\sigma) = \mathbb{k}$ and $F(\sigma \leq \tau) = \text{id}$ for all $\sigma \leq \tau \in K_m$. In this case $f_i^*F^i$ will be

the constant cosheaf on K_i for all $0 \leq i < m$. It is easy to see that for constant cosheaves the chain complexes dual to the ones in (30) and the chain complex morphisms defined by (36) are just the chain complexes of the underlying simplicial complexes and simplicial maps. Hence, the homology of the constant cosheaf computes the homology of the underlying space and we obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_k(K_i, F^i) & \xrightarrow{H_k(f_i)} & H_k(K_{i+1}, F^{i+1}) \\ \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ H_k(K_i) & \xrightarrow{H_k(f_i)} & H_k(K_{i+1}) \end{array} \quad (39)$$

Moreover, (39) implies that the persistent homology of the constant cosheaf over the tower is isomorphic to the persistent homology of the underlying tower. This shows that persistent homology is just a special case of persistent cosheaf homology.

C Proofs in Section 4

Constructions: Consider a morphism of canonical presentations:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_0 & \xleftarrow{p} & P_1 \\ f_0 \downarrow & & \downarrow f_1 \\ Q_0 & \xleftarrow{q} & Q_1 \end{array} \quad (40)$$

We can construct the birth- and death-time annotations for f_0 in the following way: If c_j is a column of f_0 , then the j -th row of p has at most one non-zero entry. If there is a non-zero entry in column g_{l_j} we set $b(c_j) = \deg(c_j)$ and $d(c_j) = \deg(g_{l_j})$. Otherwise, we set $b(c_j) = \deg(c_j)$ and $d(c_j) = \infty$. Similarly we can construct the annotations of the rows of f_0 .

Conversely, if we have a matrix f_0 with birth- and death-time annotations we can construct a morphism of presentations as in (40) in the following way: Let $P_0 = \text{span}\{c_1, \dots, c_v\}$ and $Q_0 = \text{span}\{r_1, \dots, r_w\}$ where c_j and r_k are the columns and rows of f_0 with $\deg(c_j) = b(c_j)$ and $\deg(r_k) = b(r_k)$. Let c_{j_s} and r_{k_t} be the columns and rows of f_0 with $d(c_{j_s}) < \infty$ and $d(r_{k_t}) < \infty$. Define $P_1 := \text{span}\{g_s\}_s$, $Q_1 := \text{span}\{h_t\}_t$ with $\deg(g_s) = d(c_{j_s})$, $\deg(h_t) = d(r_{k_t})$ and $p(g_s) := c_{j_s}$, $q(h_t) := r_{k_t}$. Finally, let f_1 be the unique morphism making the diagram commute.

Given the matrix f_0 with birth- and death-time annotations, we can construct the corresponding morphism of persistence modules (3) in the following way: First we define the columns c_j and rows r_k that are active at index i :

$$\begin{aligned} G_M^i &:= \{c_j | b(c_j) \leq i \text{ and } d(c_j) > i\} \\ G_N^i &:= \{r_k | b(r_k) \leq i \text{ and } d(r_k) > i\} \end{aligned}$$

Given a column c_j of f_0 , we have $f_0(c_j) = \sum_{l=1}^w \lambda_l^j r_l$. Using this relation, we define

$$\begin{aligned} M(i) &:= \text{span } G_M^i \\ N(i) &:= \text{span } G_N^i \\ M(i \leq i+1)(c_j) &:= \begin{cases} c_j & \text{if } c_j \in G_M^{i+1} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \\ N(i \leq i+1)(r_k) &:= \begin{cases} r_k & \text{if } r_k \in G_N^{i+1} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \\ \phi(i)(c_j) &:= \sum_{l:r_l \in G_N^i} \lambda_l^j r_l \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the morphism of persistence modules defined in this way corresponds to the morphism of graded modules $\text{coker } p \rightarrow \text{coker } q$ induced by the morphism of presentations defined by f_0 .

Proof of Theorem 13. Given a morphism of persistence modules $\phi: M \rightarrow N$ of finite type

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} M_0 & \xrightarrow{A_0} & M_1 & \xrightarrow{A_1} & \dots & \xrightarrow{A_{m-1}} & M_m & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \dots \\ \downarrow C_0 & & \downarrow C_1 & & & & \downarrow C_m & & \\ N_0 & \xrightarrow{B_0} & N_1 & \xrightarrow{B_1} & \dots & \xrightarrow{B_{m-1}} & N_m & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \dots \end{array} \quad (41)$$

represented by the sequences of matrices (A_0, \dots, A_{m-1}) , (B_0, \dots, B_{m-1}) and (C_0, \dots, C_m) . We show by induction that the algorithm maintains a canonical presentation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_0^l & \xleftarrow{p^l} & P_1^l \\ f_0^l \downarrow & & \downarrow f_1^l \\ Q_0^l & \xleftarrow{q^l} & Q_1^l \end{array} \quad (42)$$

inducing a persistence module via the construction above

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} M_0^l & \xrightarrow{A_0^l} & \dots & \xrightarrow{A_{l-1}^l} & M_l^l & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & M_l^l & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \dots \\ \downarrow C_0^l & & & & \downarrow C_l^l & & \downarrow C_l^l & & \\ N_0^l & \xrightarrow{B_0^l} & \dots & \xrightarrow{B_{l-1}^l} & N_l^l & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & N_l^l & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \dots \end{array} \quad (43)$$

that is isomorphic to

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} M_0 & \xrightarrow{A_0} & \dots & \xrightarrow{A_{l-1}} & M_l & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & M_l & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \dots \\ \downarrow C_0 & & & & \downarrow C_l & & \downarrow C_l & & \\ N_0 & \xrightarrow{B_0} & \dots & \xrightarrow{B_{l-1}} & N_l & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & N_l & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \dots \end{array} \quad (44)$$

while processing the morphism of persistence modules (41) from left $l = 0$ to right $l = m$.

Induction base $l = 0$: Let $M_0 = \text{span}\{c_1, \dots, c_{d_0}\}$, $N_0 = \text{span}\{r_1, \dots, r_{d_0'}\}$ and C_0 be given w.r.t. these bases. We set $M_0^0 = M_0$, $N_0^0 = N_0$ and $C_0^0 = C_0$. With these definitions (43) is clearly isomorphic to (44) for $l = 0$. In the algorithm we set $f_0^0 = C_0$, $b(c_j) = 0$, $d(c_j) = \infty$ and $b(r_k) = 0$, $d(r_k) = \infty$ for the columns c_j and rows r_k of f_0^0 . As

discussed in the constructions above, on the presentation level this is equivalent to defining $P_0^0 := \text{span}\{c_1, \dots, c_{d_0}\}$ with $\deg(c_j) = 0$, $Q_0^0 := \text{span}\{r_1, \dots, r_{d_0'}\}$ with $\deg(r_k) = 0$, $f_0^0 = C_0^0$ and $P_1^0, Q_1^0, p^0, q^0, f_1^0 = 0$. With these definitions (42) is clearly a presentation inducing (43) for $l = 0$. The algorithm proceeds with $f_0^0, A_0^t = A_0$ and $B_0^t = B_0$ to the next step.

Induction step $l = i$ to $l = i + 1$: We are given f_0^i, A_i^t and B_i^t from the previous step of the algorithm where f_0^i defines a canonical presentation (42) for $l = i$ and the columns and rows of f_0^i are ordered w.r.t increasing birth-time. Our inductive hypothesis is that this presentation induces a persistence module (43) isomorphic to (44) and that the matrices A_i^t and B_i^t are given w.r.t. the bases induced on M_i^i and N_i^i by the presentation. Since A_i^t and B_i^t are given w.r.t. the bases induced by f_0^i , every column of A_i^t or B_i^t corresponds to a column or row of f_0^i and the columns of A_i^t and B_i^t inherit the column and row order of f_0^i . In particular, since (42) is a presentation of (43), every generator that is alive at index i lives forever. Thus every column c_j or row r_k of f_0^i corresponding to a column of A_i^t or B_i^t satisfies $d(c_j) = \infty$ or $d(r_k) = \infty$. The first step of the algorithm is to column reduce A_i^t and B_i^t from left to right while doing the corresponding column and row operations on f_0^i . The matrices A_i^t and B_i^t have size $O(n_{i+1}) \times O(n_i)$. Hence, the reductions take $O(n_i^2 \cdot n_{i+1}) = O(n_i^2 \cdot n)$ time. The matrix f_0^i is of size $O(n) \times O(n)$ but since we are only adding columns or rows corresponding to columns of A_i^t or B_i^t we perform at most $O(n_i^2)$ column and row additions. Therefore, the operations on f_0^i take $O(n_i^2 \cdot n)$ time. After this step we obtain reduced matrices A_i^r and B_i^r and a new matrix \bar{f}_0^i . The column and row operations on f_0^i correspond to a change of basis $P_0^i \xrightarrow{\cong} \bar{P}_0^i$ and $Q_0^i \xrightarrow{\cong} \bar{Q}_0^i$. Since all the columns and rows of f_0^i corresponding to columns of A_i^t and B_i^t satisfy $d(c_j), d(r_k) = \infty$, we can set $\bar{P}_1^i = P_1^i, \bar{Q}_1^i = Q_1^i, \bar{p}^i = p^i, \bar{q}^i = q^i$ and $\bar{f}_1^i = f_1^i$ and we obtain a presentation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{P}_0^i & \xleftarrow{\bar{p}^i} & \bar{P}_1^i \\ \bar{f}_0^i \downarrow & & \downarrow \bar{f}_1^i \\ \bar{Q}_0^i & \xleftarrow{\bar{q}^i} & \bar{Q}_1^i \end{array} \quad (45)$$

isomorphic to (42). Since the new presentation is obtained by a change of basis, it induces a persistence module

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \bar{M}_0^i & \xrightarrow{\bar{A}_0^i} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\bar{A}_{i-1}^i} & \bar{M}_i^i & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \bar{M}_i^i & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \dots \\ \downarrow \bar{C}_0^i & & & & \downarrow \bar{C}_i^i & & \downarrow \bar{C}_i^i & & \\ \bar{N}_0^i & \xrightarrow{\bar{B}_0^i} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\bar{B}_{i-1}^i} & \bar{N}_i^i & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \bar{N}_i^i & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \dots c \end{array}$$

isomorphic to (43). We can now attach the matrices A_i^r and B_i^r to obtain a persistence module

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} \bar{M}_0^i & \xrightarrow{\bar{A}_0^i} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\bar{A}_{i-1}^i} & \bar{M}_i^i & \xrightarrow{A_i^r} & M_{i+1} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & M_{i+1} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \dots \\ \downarrow \bar{C}_0^i & & & & \downarrow \bar{C}_i^i & & \downarrow C_{i+1} & & \downarrow C_{i+1} & & \\ \bar{N}_0^i & \xrightarrow{\bar{B}_0^i} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\bar{B}_{i-1}^i} & \bar{N}_i^i & \xrightarrow{B_i^r} & N_{i+1} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & N_{i+1} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \dots \end{array}$$

isomorphic to (44) for $l = i + 1$. Next we row reduce A_i^r and B_i^r and order the rows w.r.t. the order of the pivot columns to obtain the matrices A_{i+1}^{i+1} and B_{i+1}^{i+1} . This corresponds to a change of bases $M_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\cong} M_{i+1}^{i+1}$ and $N_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\cong} N_{i+1}^{i+1}$. Moreover, let $A_{i+1}^{i+1}, B_{i+1}^{i+1}$ and C_{i+1}^{i+1}

be the matrices A_{i+1} , B_{i+1} and C_{i+1} w.r.t. these new bases. We now set $M_j^{i+1} := \overline{M}_j^i$, $N_j^{i+1} := \overline{N}_j^i$ and $C_j^{i+1} = \overline{C}_j^i$ for $j = 0, \dots, i$ and $A_j^{i+1} = \overline{A}_j^i$, $B_j^{i+1} = \overline{B}_j^i$ for $j = 0, \dots, i-1$ to define the persistence module (43) for $l = i+1$. The matrices A_i^{i+1} and B_i^{i+1} are now completely reduced. Let ca_1, \dots, ca_s and cb_1, \dots, cb_t be the zero columns of A_i^{i+1} and B_i^{i+1} and $\bar{c}_{j_1}, \dots, \bar{c}_{j_s}$ and $\bar{r}_{k_1}, \dots, \bar{r}_{k_t}$ be the corresponding columns and rows of \overline{f}_0^i . Furthermore, let ra_1, \dots, ra_u and rb_1, \dots, rb_v be the zero rows of A_i^{i+1} and B_i^{i+1} . We now define the presentation (42) for $l = i+1$ in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_0^{i+1} &:= \overline{P}_0^i \oplus \text{span}\{ra_1, \dots, ra_u\} \text{ with } \deg(ra_j) = i+1 \\
Q_0^{i+1} &:= \overline{Q}_0^i \oplus \text{span}\{rb_1, \dots, rb_v\} \text{ with } \deg(rb_k) = i+1 \\
P_1^{i+1} &:= \overline{P}_1^i \oplus \text{span}\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s\} \text{ with } \deg(\gamma_j) = i+1 \\
Q_1^{i+1} &:= \overline{Q}_1^i \oplus \text{span}\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_t\} \text{ with } \deg(\rho_k) = i+1 \\
p^{i+1} &:= \overline{p}^i \oplus \{\gamma_1 \rightarrow \bar{c}_{j_1}, \dots, \gamma_s \rightarrow \bar{c}_{j_s}\} \\
q^{i+1} &:= \overline{q}^i \oplus \{\rho_1 \rightarrow \bar{r}_{k_1}, \dots, \rho_t \rightarrow \bar{r}_{k_t}\} \\
f_0^{i+1} &:= \overline{f}_0^i \oplus C_{i+1}^{i+1}|_{ra_1, \dots, ra_u} \\
f_1^{i+1} &:= \text{unique map making (42) commute}
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{i+1}^{i+1}|_{ra_1, \dots, ra_u}$ denotes the matrix C_{i+1}^{i+1} restricted to the columns corresponding to the zero-rows of A_i^{i+1} . By construction this new presentation induces the persistence module (43) for $l = i+1$ as defined above which is isomorphic to (44) for $l = i+1$. The actual algorithm does not perform the row reduction on A_i^r and B_i^r . It just updates the matrix f_0^{i+1} by setting $d(\bar{c}_{j_w}) = i+1$ and $d(\bar{r}_{k_w}) = i+1$ and adding the transformed matrix C_{i+1}^{i+1} restricted to the columns corresponding to non-pivot rows ra_1, \dots, ra_u . By the construction discussed in the beginning of this section, this is enough to recover the canonical presentation defined above. Since the non-pivot rows are exactly the ones that get reduced to zero in a row reduction, this does not change the result. The algorithm has to perform the transformations, corresponding to the row reduction of A_i^r and B_i^r , of the matrices A_{i+1} , B_{i+1} and C_{i+1} which are of size $O(n_{i+2}) \times O(n_{i+1})$ and $O(n_{i+1}) \times O(n_{i+1})$, respectively. Since we would have to do $O(n_{i+1}^2)$ row additions on A_i^r and B_i^r in the reduction, we have to do $O(n_{i+1}^2)$ column additions on A_{i+1} and B_{i+1} and $O(n_{i+1}^2)$ column and row additions on C_{i+1} . Hence, this step takes $O(n_{i+1}^2 \cdot n)$ time. Finally the algorithm proceeds with the new presentation matrix f_0^{i+1} and the matrices $A_{i+1}^t := A_{i+1}^{i+1}$ and $B_{i+1}^t := B_{i+1}^{i+1}$ given w.r.t. the bases M_{i+1}^{i+1} and N_{i+1}^{i+1} .

At every step of the algorithm we spend $O(n_i^2 \cdot n) + O(n_{i+1}^2 \cdot n)$ time. Thus, overall it takes time

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} O(n_i^2 \cdot n) + O(n_{i+1}^2 \cdot n) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} O(n_i^2) \cdot O(n) + \sum_{i=1}^m O(n_i^2) \cdot O(n) \\
&= O(n) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^m O(n_i^2) + O(n) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^m O(n_i^2) \\
&= O(n^3).
\end{aligned}$$

◀

D Proofs in Section 5

Proof of Theorem 17. Let

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]} & \xleftarrow{\cdot 1} & \mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} & \xleftarrow{\cdot t^{b-a}} & \mathbb{I}_{[b,\infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \iota_0 & & \downarrow \iota_1 & & \\
0 & \longleftarrow & L & \xleftarrow{\lambda} & P_0 & \xleftarrow{p} & P_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow f_0 & & \downarrow f_1 & & \\
0 & \longleftarrow & M & \xleftarrow{\mu} & Q_0 & \xleftarrow{q} & Q_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow \psi & & \downarrow g_0 & & \downarrow g_1 & & \\
0 & \longleftarrow & N & \xleftarrow{\nu} & R_0 & \xleftarrow{r} & R_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi_0 & & \downarrow \pi_1 & & \\
0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[c,d]} & \xleftarrow{\cdot 1} & \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)} & \xleftarrow{\cdot t^{d-c}} & \mathbb{I}_{[d,\infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0
\end{array} \tag{46}$$

be a canonical presentation of $L \xrightarrow{\phi} M \xrightarrow{\psi} N$. Suppose that $g_0 \circ f_0 \neq 0$. Then, by Proposition 16, there exist $\mathbb{I}_{[a,b]} \leq L$ and $\mathbb{I}_{[c,d]} \leq N$ such that $\pi_0 \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 \neq 0$ and $c < d \leq a < b$. W.l.o.g. assume $\pi_0 \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 = (\cdot \eta t^{a-c})$. Let $c < d \leq e \leq a < b$. Define $Q'_0 := Q_0 \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)}$, $Q'_1 := Q_1 \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
q' &: Q'_1 \rightarrow Q'_0, \quad q' := \begin{pmatrix} q & 0 \\ 0 & \text{id} \end{pmatrix} \\
\mu' &: Q'_0 \rightarrow M, \quad \mu' := (\mu \quad 0) \\
f'_0 &: P_0 \rightarrow Q'_0, \quad f'_0 := \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot t^{a-e}} \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)}) \end{pmatrix} \\
f'_1 &: P_1 \rightarrow Q'_1, \quad f'_1 := \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ (\mathbb{I}_{[b,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot t^{b-e}} \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)}) \end{pmatrix} \\
g'_0 &: Q'_0 \rightarrow R_0, \quad g'_0 := \left(g_0 \quad (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) \right) \\
g'_1 &: Q'_1 \rightarrow R_1, \quad g'_1 := \left(g_1 \quad (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-d}} \mathbb{I}_{[d,\infty)}) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

After replacing Q_0 and Q_1 by Q'_0 and Q'_1 we obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]} & \xleftarrow{\cdot 1} & \mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} & \xleftarrow{\cdot t^{b-a}} & \mathbb{I}_{[b,\infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \iota_0 & & \downarrow \iota_1 & & \\
0 & \longleftarrow & L & \xleftarrow{\lambda} & P_0 & \xleftarrow{p} & P_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow f'_0 & & \downarrow f'_1 & & \\
0 & \longleftarrow & M & \xleftarrow{\mu'} & Q'_0 & \xleftarrow{q'} & Q'_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow \psi & & \downarrow g'_0 & & \downarrow g'_1 & & \\
0 & \longleftarrow & N & \xleftarrow{\nu} & R_0 & \xleftarrow{r} & R_1 & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi_0 & & \downarrow \pi_1 & & \\
0 & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{I}_{[c,d]} & \xleftarrow{\cdot 1} & \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)} & \xleftarrow{\cdot t^{d-c}} & \mathbb{I}_{[d,\infty)} & \longleftarrow & 0
\end{array} \tag{48}$$

We now show that (48) is still a reduced presentation of $L \xrightarrow{\phi} M \xrightarrow{\psi} N$:

1. $\text{im } \mu' = \text{im } \mu = M$.
 2. $\ker \mu' = \ker \mu \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} = \text{im } q \oplus \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} = \text{im } q'$.
 3. $\ker q' = \ker q = 0$.
 4. $\mu' \circ f'_0 = (\mu \ 0) \circ \left(\begin{array}{c} f_0 \\ \mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot t^{a-e}} \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \end{array} \right) = \mu \circ f_0 = \phi \circ \lambda$.
 5. $q' \circ f'_1 = \left(\begin{array}{cc} q & 0 \\ 0 & \text{id} \end{array} \right) \circ \left(\begin{array}{c} f_1 \\ \mathbb{I}_{[b,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot t^{b-e}} \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} q \circ f_1 \\ (\mathbb{I}_{[b,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot t^{b-e}} \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)}) \end{array} \right)$
 $= \left(\begin{array}{c} f_0 \circ p \\ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot t^{a-e}} \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)}) \circ p \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} f_0 \\ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot t^{a-e}} \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)}) \end{array} \right) \circ p = f'_0 \circ p$.
 6. $\nu \circ g'_0 = \nu \circ \left(g_0 \ (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) \right) = \left(\nu \circ g_0 \ \nu \circ (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) \right)$
 $= (\psi \circ \mu \ 0) = \psi \circ \mu'$.
- Note that, since $d \leq e$, $\text{im } (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) \subseteq \mathbb{I}_{[d,\infty)} \subseteq \ker \nu$.
7. $r \circ g'_1 = r \circ \left(g_1 \ (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-d}} \mathbb{I}_{[d,\infty)}) \right) = \left(r \circ g_1 \ r \circ (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-d}} \mathbb{I}_{[d,\infty)}) \right)$
 $= \left(g_0 \circ q \ (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) \right) = \left(g_0 \ (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) \right) \circ \left(\begin{array}{cc} q & 0 \\ 0 & \text{id} \end{array} \right) = g'_0 \circ q'$.

Moreover, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0 \circ g'_0 \circ f'_0 \circ \iota_0 &= \pi_0 \circ \left(g_0 \ (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) \right) \circ \left(\begin{array}{c} f_0 \\ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot t^{a-e}} \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)}) \end{array} \right) \circ \iota_0 \\ &= \pi_0 \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 - \pi_0 \circ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot \eta t^{a-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) \circ \iota_0 = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

since $\pi_0 \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 = (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot \eta t^{a-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)})$. If $\mathbb{I}_{[a',\infty)} \neq \mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)}$ or $\mathbb{I}_{[c',\infty)} \neq \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}$, then $\pi'_0 \circ g'_0 \circ f'_0 \circ \iota'_0 = \pi'_0 \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota'_0$ since $\pi'_0 \circ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot \eta t^{a-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) \circ \iota'_0 = 0$. By commutativity, $\pi_0 \circ g'_0 \circ f'_0 \circ \iota_0 = 0$ implies $\pi_1 \circ g'_1 \circ f'_1 \circ \iota_1 = 0$. Therefore, we have reduced the number of pairs $\mathbb{I}_{[a,b)}, \mathbb{I}_{[c,d)}$ such that $\pi_0 \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 \neq 0$ by one. Since there is only a finite number of such pairs, we can repeat this process until $g'_0 \circ f'_0 = 0$ and $g'_1 \circ f'_1 = 0$. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Corollary 18. In the proof of Theorem 17, we show that given $\mathbb{I}_{[a,b)} \leq L$ and $\mathbb{I}_{[c,d)} \leq N$ such that $c < d \leq a < b$ and $\pi_0 \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 \neq 0$, we can modify the presentations as in (47) such that $\pi_0 \circ g'_0 \circ f'_0 \circ \iota_0 = 0$ and for all $\mathbb{I}_{[a',b')} \neq \mathbb{I}_{[a,b)} \leq L$ and $\mathbb{I}_{[c',d')} \neq \mathbb{I}_{[c,d)} \leq N$ we have $\pi'_0 \circ g'_0 \circ f'_0 \circ \iota'_0 = \pi'_0 \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota'_0$. Suppose $\mathbb{I}_{[c',d')} \leq N$ is another bar such that $c' < d' \leq a < b$ and $\pi'_0 \circ g'_0 \circ f'_0 \circ \iota'_0 = \xi t^{a-c'} \neq 0$. We could repeat the same process again to resolve this issue but we don't have to add another generator to Q'_0 . We can assume that $e = a$ and modify the g -maps in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} g''_0: Q'_0 &\rightarrow R_0, \quad g''_0 := \left(g_0 \ (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) + (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\xi)t^{e-c'}} \mathbb{I}_{[c',\infty)}) \right) \\ g''_1: Q'_1 &\rightarrow R_1, \quad g''_1 := \left(g_1 \ (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-d}} \mathbb{I}_{[d,\infty)}) + (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\xi)t^{e-d'}} \mathbb{I}_{[d',\infty)}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

After this modification we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0 \circ g''_0 \circ f'_0 \circ \iota_0 &= \pi_0 \circ \left(g_0 \ (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\eta)t^{e-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) + (\mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot (-\xi)t^{e-c'}} \mathbb{I}_{[c',\infty)}) \right) \\ &\circ \left(f_0 \ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot t^{a-e}} \mathbb{I}_{[e,\infty)}) \right) \circ \iota_0 = \pi_0 \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 - \pi_0 \circ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot \eta t^{a-c}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) \circ \iota_0 \\ &- \pi_0 \circ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot \xi t^{a-c'}} \mathbb{I}_{[c',\infty)}) \circ \iota_0 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $\pi_0 \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 = (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot\eta^{t^{a-c}}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)})$ and $\pi_0 \circ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot\xi^{t^{a-c'}}} \mathbb{I}_{[c',\infty)}) \circ \iota_0 = 0$. Moreover, by the same argument, we get $\pi_0'' \circ g_0'' \circ f_0'' \circ \iota_0'' = 0$. If $\mathbb{I}_{[a'',b'']} \neq \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]} \leq L$ or $\mathbb{I}_{[c'',d'']} \neq \mathbb{I}_{[c,d]}, \mathbb{I}_{[c'',d'']} \leq L$, then $\pi_0'' \circ g_0'' \circ f_0'' \circ \iota_0'' = \pi_0'' \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0''$ since $\pi_0'' \circ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot\eta^{t^{a-c}}} \mathbb{I}_{[c,\infty)}) \circ \iota_0'' = \pi_0'' \circ (\mathbb{I}_{[a,\infty)} \xrightarrow{\cdot\xi^{t^{a-c'}}} \mathbb{I}_{[c',\infty)}) \circ \iota_0'' = 0$.

Using this construction method, given a generator $\mathbb{I}_{[a,b]} \leq L$, we can modify the presentation such that $\pi_0 \circ g_0 \circ f_0 \circ \iota_0 = 0$ for all $\mathbb{I}_{[c,d]} \leq N$ by adding a single generator to Q_0 and Q_1 . Since, $\text{rank}(P_0) \leq n$, to fix the whole presentation, we have to add at most n generators to Q_0 . This implies after the modification is completed, we have $\text{rank}(Q_0') \leq 2n$. \blacktriangleleft

E Proofs in Section 6.1

► **Proposition 34.** *Consider a simplicial tower*

$$K_0 \xrightarrow{f_0} K_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} \dots \xrightarrow{f_{m-1}} K_m \quad (50)$$

where each f_i is an elementary inclusion or collapse and n is the number of elementary inclusions. Then, using a modified version of the algorithm in Section 4, we can compute a presentation of

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} C_k(\vec{K}) : & C_k(K_0) & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_0)} & C_k(K_1) & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_1)} & \dots & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_{m-1})} & C_k(K_m) \\ & \downarrow \partial_k & & \downarrow \partial_k^0 & & \downarrow \partial_k^1 & & \downarrow \partial_k^m \\ C_{k-1}(\vec{K}) : & C_{k-1}(K_0) & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_0)} & C_{k-1}(K_1) & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_1)} & \dots & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_{m-1})} & C_{k-1}(K_m) \end{array} \quad (51)$$

in $O(n^2)$ time.

Proof. We already proved that the algorithm in Section 4 is correct. This algorithm builds a canonical presentation

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longleftarrow & C_k(\vec{K}) & \longleftarrow & P_0 & \xleftarrow{P} & P_1 \\ & & \downarrow \partial_k & & \downarrow f_0 & & \downarrow f_1 \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & C_{k-1}(\vec{K}) & \longleftarrow & Q_0 & \xleftarrow{Q} & Q_1 \end{array}$$

by processing the morphism of persistence modules (51) from left to right. In this process the algorithm reduces the matrices $C_k(f_i)$ while performing the corresponding operations on f_0 . The simple structure of the matrices $C_k(f_i)$ allows us to simplify the algorithm. We distinguish two cases:

First we assume that f_i is an elementary inclusion. This means that at step $i + 1$ a single simplex σ is inserted into the tower. If σ is neither a k - nor a $(k - 1)$ -simplex then $C_k(f_i)$ and $C_{k-1}(f_i)$ are just identity matrices. In this case our algorithm does nothing at this step. If σ is a k -simplex, then $C_{k-1}(f_i)$ is an identity matrix and $C_k(f_i)$ is an identity matrix with one additional zero-row. Both matrices are already column- and row-reduced so our algorithm will not perform any operations here. The zero-row of the matrix $C_k(f_i)$ implies the birth of a new bar corresponding to the inserted simplex. The algorithm takes account of that by adding a new column $\partial_k^{i+1}(\sigma)$ to f_0 with $b(\text{new col}) = i + 1$. Similarly, if σ is a $(k - 1)$ -simplex, the algorithm adds a new zero-row to f_0 with $b(\text{new row}) = i + 1$.

Note that we don't have to build or reduce any of the $C_k(f_i)$ matrices to execute this step we just have to add a new row or column to f_0 or do nothing.

Now we assume that f_i is an elementary collapse. This means that f_i is surjective, $f_i(b) = a$ for some $b \neq a \in K_i^0$ and f_i is injective on $K_i^0 \setminus b$. If τ is a k -simplex in K_{i+1} , there are two cases: 1) τ is the image of exactly one k -simplex σ in K_i . 2) τ is the image of exactly two k -simplices τ and σ in K_i , i.e. σ is merged into τ and τ is already in K_i . This can be seen in the following way: By surjectivity there exists a simplex $\sigma \in K_i^k$ such that $f(\sigma) = \tau$. If $\sigma = (v_0, \dots, v_k) \neq (w_0, \dots, w_k) = \kappa$ and $f(\sigma) = f(\kappa) = \tau$, there exists a $0 \leq j \leq k$ such that $v_i = w_i$ for all $i \neq j$ and $v_j \neq w_j$ and $f(v_i) = f(w_i)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k$. This is only possible if either $v_j = a$ and $w_j = b$ or $v_j = b$ and $w_j = a$. Hence, there are at most two k -simplices in K_i that map to τ and if there are two, then one of them is τ itself. This implies that every row of the matrix $C_k(f_i)$ has either one or two non-zero entries. Since every k -simplex can map to at most one other k -simplex, each column of $C_k(f_i)$ has at most one non-zero entry. If σ is a k -simplex in K_i there are two cases: 1) σ is mapped to a k -simplex τ , i.e. $C_k(f_i)_\sigma$ has a single non-zero entry in row τ . 2) σ is mapped to a $(k-1)$ -simplex, i.e. $C_k(f_i)_\sigma$ is a zero-column. To reduce $C_k(f_i)$ the algorithm has to add exactly one column to each column corresponding to a simplex that is merged into another simplex. Note that we have to add the column of the simplex which is born first to the one which is born later, i.e., if σ and τ are merged and $b(\sigma) < b(\tau)$ we have to add the column of σ to the column of τ . After that the matrix is column- and row-reduced. For each zero-column, i.e. for each simplex that is merged into another simplex which is born before or mapped to a $(k-1)$ -simplex, the algorithm sets $d(col) = i+1$ for the corresponding column in f_0 . As in the case of elementary inclusions, we don't have to construct or reduce the matrices $C_k(f_i)$ to execute the algorithm. We just have to add the column corresponding to σ in f_0 to the column corresponding to τ in f_0 if τ and σ are merged and $b(\sigma) < b(\tau)$ for all simplices that are merged and set $d(col) = i+1$ for each column corresponding to a simplex that is merged into a simplex born before or mapped to a $(k-1)$ -simplex. We can proceed in a similar way for the $(k-1)$ -simplices and the rows of f_0 .

Since there are n elementary inclusions we add at most n columns and rows to f_0 . This implies that f_0 is of size $O(n) \times O(n)$. For each simplex that is merged into another simplex born before we have to add exactly one column or row in f_0 . Such an addition takes $O(n)$ time. Since there are at most n simplices and each simplex can be merged only once into a simplex born before, the overall cost of these operations is $O(n^2)$. ◀

Proof of Theorem 19. As shown in Proposition 34, we can compute a presentation of the complex of persistence modules

$$C_{k+1}(\vec{K}) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+1}} C_k(\vec{K}) \xrightarrow{\partial_k} C_{k-1}(\vec{K}) \quad (52)$$

in $O(n^2)$ time. The proposition also shows that the matrices in this presentation are of size $O(n) \times O(n)$. The methods developed in Sections 3 and 5 now allow us to compute the homology of (52) in $O(n^3)$ time. ◀

F Proofs in Section 6.2

▶ **Proposition 35.** *Given a simplicial tower \vec{K} and a cosheaf F on K_m*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F^0 & \xleftarrow{f_0^*} & F^1 & \xleftarrow{f_1^*} & \dots & \xleftarrow{f_{m-1}^*} & F^m \\ K_0 & \xrightarrow{f_0} & K_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & \dots & \xrightarrow{f_{m-1}} & K_m \end{array} \quad (53)$$

where each f_i is an elementary inclusion or collapse. Let $n = \# \text{ elementary inclusions} \times \max_{\sigma \in K_m} \dim(F(\sigma))$, then, using a modified version of the algorithm in Section 4, we can compute a presentation of

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} C_k(\vec{K}, F) : & C_k(K_0, F^0) & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_0)} & C_k(K_1, F^1) & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_1)} & \dots & \xrightarrow{C_k(f_{m-1})} & C_k(K_m, F^m) \\ \downarrow \partial_k & \downarrow \partial_k^0 & & \downarrow \partial_k^1 & & & & \downarrow \partial_k^m \\ C_{k-1}(\vec{K}, F) : & C_{k-1}(K_0, F^0) & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_0)} & C_{k-1}(K_1, F^1) & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_1)} & \dots & \xrightarrow{C_{k-1}(f_{m-1})} & C_{k-1}(K_m, F^m) \end{array}$$

in $O(n^2)$ time.

Proof. The modification of the algorithm of Section 4 and the proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 34. As defined in (36), the matrices $C_k(f_i)$ viewed as block matrices have the same structure as the ones in the tower case. The only difference is that a single 1 entry is replaced by an identity block. Since, a single simplex can contribute at most $\max_{\sigma \in K_m} \dim(F(\sigma))$ columns or rows we obtain the claimed complexity. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Theorem 20. As shown in Proposition 35, we can compute a presentation of the complex of persistence modules

$$C_{k+1}(\vec{K}, F) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+1}} C_k(\vec{K}, F) \xrightarrow{\partial_k} C_{k-1}(\vec{K}, F) \quad (54)$$

in $O(n^2)$ time. The proposition also shows that the matrices in this presentation are of size $O(n) \times O(n)$. The methods developed in Sections 3 and 5 now allow us to compute the homology of (54) in $O(n^3)$ time. \blacktriangleleft

G Proofs in Section 6.4

G.1 Computation by order complex

► **Proposition 36.** *Let X be a finite poset and $f: \mathcal{K}(X) \rightarrow X$ the projection from the order complex, then f^* is fully faithful.*

Proof. Let F and G be sheaves on X and $H_{F,G}: \text{Hom}(F, G) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(f^*F, f^*G)$ the map defined by $H_{F,G}(\phi) := f^*\phi$. Let $\phi, \psi \in \text{Hom}(F, G)$ such that $f^*\phi = f^*\psi$. Let $x \in X$, then $(x) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ and $f((x)) = x$. Hence, $\phi(x) = \phi(f((x))) = f^*\phi((x)) = f^*\psi((x)) = \psi(f((x))) = \psi(x)$. This implies $H_{F,G}$ is injective. Let $\phi \in \text{Hom}(f^*F, f^*G)$. For every $x \in X$ define $\psi(x) := \phi((x))$. Note that, since ϕ is a sheaf morphism and $f^*F((x_0 < \dots < x_n)) = F(x_n)$, we obtain the following commutative diagram for every $(x_0 < \dots < x_n) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f^*F((x_n)) & \xrightarrow{\phi((x_n))} & f^*G((x_n)) \\ \text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id} \\ f^*F((x_0 < \dots < x_n)) & \xrightarrow{\phi((x_0 < \dots < x_n))} & f^*G((x_0 < \dots < x_n)) \end{array}$$

Hence, $\phi((x_0 < \dots < x_n)) = \phi((x_n))$. If $x < y \in X$, we obtain $(x) \leq (x < y) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ and

the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F(x) & \xrightarrow{\psi(x)} & G(x) \\
\text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id} \\
f^*F((x)) & \xrightarrow{\phi((x))} & f^*G((x)) \\
f^*F((x) \leq (x < y)) \downarrow & & \downarrow f^*G((x) \leq (x < y)) \\
f^*F((x < y)) & \xrightarrow{\phi((x < y))} & f^*G((x < y)) \\
\text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id} \\
F(y) & \xrightarrow{\psi(y)} & G(y)
\end{array}$$

Since, $f^*F((x) \leq (x < y)) = F(x < y)$, the morphism $\psi: F \rightarrow G$ is well defined. Moreover, for $(x_0 < \dots < x_n) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ we obtain $f^*\psi((x_0 < \dots < x_n)) = \psi(x_n) = \phi(x_n) = \phi((x_0 < \dots < x_n))$. Therefore, $H_{F,G}(\psi) = f^*\psi = \phi$ and $H_{F,G}$ is surjective. This implies that f^* is fully faithful. ◀

► **Proposition 37.** *Let X be a finite poset and $f: \mathcal{K}(X) \rightarrow X$ the projection from the order complex, then the unit $\eta: \text{id} \rightarrow f_*f^*$ of the adjunction $f^* \dashv f_*$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. The functor f^* is left adjoint to f_* . By [21, Proposition 3.4], given adjoint functors $f^* \dashv f_*$, the unit $\eta: \text{id} \rightarrow f_*f^*$ of the adjunction is an isomorphism if and only if f^* is fully faithful. By Proposition 36, f^* is fully faithful. ◀

► **Proposition 38.** *Let X be a finite poset, $f: \mathcal{K}(X) \rightarrow X$ the projection from the order complex and F a sheaf on X , then the induced morphism $H^k(f): H^k(X, F) \rightarrow H^k(\mathcal{K}(X), f^*F)$ is an isomorphism for all $k \geq 0$.*

Proof. Let $0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow I^\bullet$ be an injective resolution. By Proposition 37, we obtain the following isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & F & \longrightarrow & I^\bullet \\
& & \downarrow \eta^F & & \downarrow \eta_{I^\bullet} \\
0 & \longrightarrow & f_*f^*F & \longrightarrow & f_*f^*I^\bullet
\end{array}$$

This isomorphism induces an isomorphism in cohomology $H^k\Gamma\eta_{I^\bullet}: H^k\Gamma I^\bullet \rightarrow H^k\Gamma f_*f^*I^\bullet$ for all $k \geq 0$. By the proof of [5, Lemma 3.15], $0 \rightarrow f^*F \rightarrow f^*I^\bullet$ is an acyclic resolution of f^*F . Let $0 \rightarrow f^*F \rightarrow J^\bullet$ be an injective resolution of f^*F , then, by Theorem 6.2 in Chapter 20 of [20], there exists a morphism g^\bullet

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & f^*F & \longrightarrow & f^*I^\bullet \\
& & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow g^\bullet \\
0 & \longrightarrow & f^*F & \longrightarrow & J^\bullet
\end{array}$$

lifting the identity, such that $H^k\Gamma g^\bullet: H^k\Gamma f^*I^\bullet \rightarrow H^k\Gamma J^\bullet$ is an isomorphism for all $k \geq 0$. Therefore, $H^k(f) = H^k\Gamma g^\bullet \circ H^k\Gamma\eta_{I^\bullet}$ is an isomorphism for all $k \geq 0$. ◀

Proof of Theorem 24. By [24, A.5], we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 H^k(X, \vec{F}_i) & \xrightarrow{H^k(X, \vec{F}_i^{i+1})} & H^k(X, \vec{F}_{i+1}) \\
 \downarrow H^k(f, \vec{F}_i) & & \downarrow H^k(f, \vec{F}_{i+1}) \\
 H^k(\mathcal{K}(X), f^* \vec{F}_i) & \xrightarrow{H^k(\mathcal{K}(X), f^* \vec{F}_i^{i+1})} & H^k(\mathcal{K}(X), f^* \vec{F}_{i+1})
 \end{array}$$

and, by Proposition 38, the vertical morphisms are isomorphisms for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. \blacktriangleleft

G.2 Simplification for zigzag posets

► **Proposition 39.** *If X is a zigzag-poset, F a sheaf on X , and $\iota: X' \hookrightarrow X$ the inclusion of the alternating subposet, then $\lim F \cong \lim \iota^* F$.*

Proof. A sheaf on X is a functor $F: X \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$. Moreover, let $F' := \iota^* F: X' \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}$ and note that $F' = F|_{X'}$. Denote by $(\lim F, (\phi_x)_{x \in X})$ the limit of F and $(\lim F', (\psi_x)_{x \in X'})$ the limit of F' . The restriction $(\lim F, (\phi_x)_{x \in X'})$ is obviously a cone of F' . Hence, by the universal property of the limit, there is a unique morphism $\lim F \xrightarrow{f} \lim F'$ compatible with the morphisms ϕ_x and ψ_x . We can also extend the limit of F' to a cone of F in the following way. Let $x < y \in X$, then there exists a unique minimal element $z \in X'$ such that $z \leq x < y$. We can now define $\bar{\psi}_x := F(z \leq x) \circ \psi_z$ and $\bar{\psi}_y := F(z \leq y) \circ \psi_z$ to obtain the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 F(x) & \xrightarrow{F(x < y)} & F(y) \\
 \swarrow F(z \leq x) & & \searrow F(z \leq y) \\
 & F(z) & \\
 \swarrow \bar{\psi}_x & \uparrow \psi_z & \searrow \bar{\psi}_y \\
 & \lim F' &
 \end{array}$$

This implies that there is a unique morphism $\lim F' \xrightarrow{g} \lim F$ compatible with the morphisms ϕ_x and $\bar{\psi}_x$. By combining these results, we obtain the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 F(x) & \xrightarrow{F(x \leq y)} & F(y) \\
 \swarrow \phi_x & & \searrow \phi_y \\
 & \lim F & \\
 \swarrow \bar{\psi}_x & \uparrow g & \searrow \bar{\psi}_y \\
 & \lim F' & \\
 \swarrow \phi_x & \uparrow f & \searrow \phi_y \\
 & \lim F &
 \end{array}$$

By the properties of f and g , we have $\bar{\psi}_x \circ f = F(z \leq x) \circ \psi_z \circ f = F(z \leq x) \circ \phi_z = \phi_x$ and $\phi_x \circ g = \bar{\psi}_x$. Hence, the diagram commutes and, by the universal property of the limit, $g \circ f = \text{id}$. In a similar fashion we obtain $f \circ g = \text{id}$. Therefore, $\lim F \cong \lim F'$. \blacktriangleleft

► **Proposition 40.** *Let X be a zigzag-poset and $\iota: X' \hookrightarrow X$ the inclusion of the alternating subposet, then ι^* preserves injectives.*

Proof. Let $y \in X$ and $[y]$ be the elementary injective sheaf [8, Def 7.1.3] concentrated on y , i.e.

$$[y](x) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{k} & \text{if } x \leq y \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

If y is not an internal maximal element in X , then there exists a unique minimal element $z \in X' \subseteq X$ such that $z \leq y$. This implies

$$\iota^*[y](x) = [y](\iota(x)) = [y](x) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{k} & \text{if } x \leq y \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{k} & \text{if } x = z \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} = [z].$$

If y is an internal maximal element in X , then $y \in X'$ and we obtain

$$\iota^*[y](x) = [y](\iota(x)) = [y](x) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{k} & \text{if } x \leq y \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} = [y].$$

Hence, $\iota^*[y]$ is an elementary injective sheaf on X' . Since every injective sheaf on a poset is a direct sum of elementary injective sheaves and the inverse image functor is additive, ι^* preserves injectives. \blacktriangleleft

► **Proposition 41.** *Let X be a zigzag-poset, $\iota: X' \hookrightarrow X$ the inclusion of the alternating subposet, and $\eta: id \rightarrow \iota_*\iota^*$ the unit of the push-pull-adjunction. Then, for any sheaf F on X we have that $\Gamma\eta_F: \Gamma F \rightarrow \Gamma\iota_*\iota^*F$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. For any $x \in X$ we get

$$\iota_*\iota^*F(x) = \lim_{y \in X': \iota(y) \geq x} \iota^*F(y) = \lim_{y \in X': y \geq x} F(y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \text{ is external} \\ F(x) & \text{if } x \text{ is minimal} \\ F(z) & \text{otherwise, where } z \\ & \text{is the unique maximal element } \geq x \end{cases}$$

Moreover, for $\eta_F: F \rightarrow \iota_*\iota^*F$, given by the induced map to the limit $\eta_F(x): F(x) \rightarrow \lim_{y \in X': y \geq x} F(y)$, we get

$$\eta_F(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \text{ is external} \\ \text{id} & \text{if } x \text{ is minimal} \\ F(x \leq z) & \text{otherwise, where } z \text{ is the unique maximal element } \geq x \end{cases}$$

Hence, $\eta_F(x) = F(x \leq x) = \text{id}$ if x is minimal or internal maximal. Since $\Gamma F = \lim F$ and, by Proposition 39, the limit over a zigzag-poset only depends on the minimal and internal maximal elements and the maps between them, we obtain $\Gamma\eta_F: \Gamma F \rightarrow \Gamma\iota_*\iota^*F$ is an isomorphism. \blacktriangleleft

► **Proposition 42.** *Let X be a zigzag-poset and $\iota: X' \hookrightarrow X$ the inclusion of the alternating subposet. If F is a sheaf on X , then the induced morphism $H^k(\iota): H^k(X, F) \rightarrow H^k(X', \iota^*F)$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Let $0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow I^\bullet$ be an injective resolution. Since, ι^* is exact and preserves injectives by Proposition 40, $0 \rightarrow \iota^*F \rightarrow \iota^*I^\bullet$ is an injective resolution of ι^*F . The morphism induced in cohomology by ι is given by the following cochain morphism [24, A.4]

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \Gamma I^0 & \longrightarrow & \Gamma I^1 & \longrightarrow & \Gamma I_2 \longrightarrow \dots \\
& & \downarrow \Gamma \eta_{I^0} & & \downarrow \Gamma \eta_{I^1} & & \downarrow \Gamma \eta_{I^2} \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \Gamma \iota_* \iota^* I^0 & \longrightarrow & \Gamma \iota_* \iota^* I^1 & \longrightarrow & \Gamma \iota_* \iota^* I_2 \longrightarrow \dots \\
& & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow \text{id} \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \Gamma \iota^* I^0 & \longrightarrow & \Gamma \iota^* I^1 & \longrightarrow & \Gamma \iota^* I_2 \longrightarrow \dots
\end{array}$$

where $\Gamma \iota_* \iota^* I^k = \Gamma \iota^* I^k$ for all $k \geq 0$. By Proposition 41, $\Gamma \eta_{I_k}$ is an isomorphism for every $k \geq 0$. Thus, $(\Gamma \eta_{I_k})_{k \geq 0}$ is a cochain isomorphism and $H^k(\iota): H^k(X, F) \rightarrow H^k(X', \iota^*F)$ is an isomorphism. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Theorem 25. By [24, A.5], for every $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H^k(X, \vec{F}_i) & \xrightarrow{H^k(X, \vec{F}_i^{i+1})} & H^k(X, \vec{F}_{i+1}) \\
\downarrow H^k(\iota, \vec{F}_i) & & \downarrow H^k(\iota, \vec{F}_{i+1}) \\
H^k(X', \iota^* \vec{F}_i) & \xrightarrow{H^k(X', \iota^* \vec{F}_i^{i+1})} & H^k(X', \iota^* \vec{F}_{i+1})
\end{array}$$

and, by Proposition 42, the vertical morphisms are isomorphism. Therefore, $H^k(X, \vec{F}) \cong H^k(X', \iota^* \vec{F})$. \blacktriangleleft

► Corollary 43. Let X be a zigzag-poset and \vec{F} a persistent sheaf on X , then $H^k(X, \vec{F}) = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$.

Proof. Let X' be the alternating subposet of X . By Theorem 25, we have $H^k(X, \vec{F}) \cong H^k(X', \iota^* \vec{F})$. Since, X' is the face-relation-poset of a one-dimensional simplicial complex $H^k(X', \iota^* \vec{F}) = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$. \blacktriangleleft

H Experiments


We have an implementation (<https://github.com/TDA-Jyamiti/Algos-cplx-pers-modules/>) of the algorithms proposed in the paper. In this section, we report the run-time results of computing persistent sheaf cohomology of inputs of different sizes. For implementation purposes, we consider (co)homology over \mathbb{Z}_2 . All the experiments were performed on a machine with 4 Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6248R CPUs.

Given a persistent sheaf over a simplicial complex, we use the algorithm in Section 4 to obtain presentations of the persistence modules associated with each simplex and the presentations of morphisms between these persistence modules. With this processed input, we use the algorithm presented in Section 3 to compute the presentation (barcode) of persistent sheaf cohomology. Figure 6 shows the processed input of a persistent sheaf over a graph. The persistence modules on each vertex and edge are decomposed into interval modules (red and blue bars) and the green arrows show the maps between these interval modules.

For our experiments, we consider Erdős-Rényi graphs of different sizes with $p = 0.4$. We generate persistence modules of the same length over each vertex and edge and maps between these persistence modules corresponding to the face relation in the graph. Note that these

Number of simplices	Length of Persistence Module	Σn_i	Time
2060	500	5143040	285 s
563	500	1429218	79 s
534	500	1270016	68 s
531	100	221260	15 s
98	500	204672	13 s
115	50	15770	3 s

■ **Table 1** Run times for computing persistent sheaf cohomology. The third column shows the input size Σn_i as defined in section 4.




■ **Figure 5** Plot of run time of the algorithm to compute persistent sheaf cohomology versus number of cores being used for computation.

persistence modules and the corresponding maps are represented as a sequence of matrices (the input for the algorithm in Section 4). We report the results in Table 1.

We can compute the presentations of persistence modules and morphism between them in parallel for each vertex-edge pair. In Figure 5, we plot the run times for computing persistent sheaf cohomology of a persistent sheaf over a graph with 2060 simplices with filtration length of 500 and the input size 5.1 million versus the number of cores used for computation. We see that there is a significant increase in performance from 8 to 16 cores. However, increasing the number of cores beyond 16 does not really give any performance enhancement.

We note that in these experiments, we compute degree 0 cohomology of the persistent sheaf because there are no higher dimensional simplices. Thus, according to (10), we only compute f_0, f_1, p, q because g_0, g_1, r are 0-maps. We would like to point out that the run-time for computing the subsequent higher degree cohomology would be very similar because we can reuse f_0, f_1, p, q and only compute g_0, g_1 and r for an input that has higher dimensional simplices and the corresponding persistence modules over each of those simplex.



■ **Figure 6** The figure above shows a processed persistent sheaf over a graph with 4 vertices and 4 edges. In the figure, the persistence modules are represented as bars/interval modules (red bars denote the persistence modules associated with vertices and blue bars denote those associated with edges). Each bar has a birth-time b and a death-time d shown towards the left and right of the bar respectively and is to be interpreted as a bar $[b, d)$. The green arrows show the map between persistence modules which can be represented as maps between interval modules (bars). One of the green arrows, towards the top part of the figure, has been zoomed in to show how one of the red bars (interval modules) associated with v_1 is mapped to the blue bar associated with e_1 . $\mathbb{B}(\sigma)$ denotes the interval decomposition of the persistence module associated with σ where $\sigma \in \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$.