

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

FINAL MASTER THESIS

STRUCTURE AND STABILITY THEOREMS  
IN TOPOLOGICAL DATA ANALYSIS  
DRAFT

Author:

Gonzalo Ortega Carpintero

Tutor:

Manuel Mellado Cuerno

13/03/2025

## **Abstract**

This is a draft version of a in-work Master's thesis on TDA, compiled for the application to the PhD position in area of topological data analysis in VU University.

## **Key words**

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Structure Theorem</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Structure theorem for finitely generated modules over a principal ideal domain . . . . .	7
2.2	Structure theorem for persistence diagrams . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Interleaving Stability Theorem</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Edelsbrunner &amp; Harer’s (Hausdorff) Stability Theorem</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Gromov-Hausdorff’s Stability Theorem</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Vectorizations’ Stability Theorems</b>	<b>25</b>
6.1	Persistence landscapes . . . . .	25
6.2	Persistence images . . . . .	25
6.3	Euler curves . . . . .	25



# Chapter 1

## Preliminaries

The contents of this chapter are based on [\[2\]](#), [\[3\]](#) and [\[4\]](#).

**Definition 1.0.1** (Graded ring).

**Definition 1.0.2** (Graded ideal).

**Definition 1.0.3** (Graded module).

**Definition 1.0.4** (Persistence module, finite type).

**Definition 1.0.5** (Module morphism, shift).

**Definition 1.0.6** (Interval module).

**Definition 1.0.7** (Direct sum of persistence modules).

**Definition 1.0.8** (Barcode).

**Definition 1.0.9** ( $\delta$ -interleaving modules).

**Definition 1.0.10** (Interleaving distance).

**Definition 1.0.11** (Multiset matching).

**Definition 1.0.12** ( $\delta$ -matching barcodes).

**Definition 1.0.13** (Bottleneck distance).



# Chapter 2

## Structure Theorem

### 2.1 Structure theorem for finitely generated modules over a principal ideal domain

### 2.2 Structure theorem for persistence diagrams

The Structure Theorem for persistence modules is referred to as the “first miracle” of persistence homology [2]. This algebraic property allows to express a persistence module of finite type as a direct sum of finitely many interval modules.

Its proof requires the algebraic structure theorem for finitely generated modules over a principal domain. Due to the lengthy concepts needed to prove it, we will refer to it as a well known fact. An introduction to module theory and a detailed proof of the theorem of Fact 2.2.1 can be found at [1, Chapter IV].

**Fact 2.2.1** (Structure theorem for finitely generated modules over a principal ideal domain). *[1, Chapter IV, Theorem 6.12] Let  $M$  be a finitely generated module over a principal ideal domain  $R$ . There exist a finite sequence of proper ideals  $(d_1) \supseteq (d_2) \supseteq \cdots \supseteq (d_n)$  such that*

$$M \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n R/(d_i).$$

In addition to Fact 2.2.1, we will use the following simple algebraic statement.

**Proposition 2.2.2** (Proposition 4.6, [4]). *An ideal  $I \subseteq R$  is graded if and only if it is generated by homogeneous elements.*

*Proof.* First, if  $I$  is a graded ideal  $I = \bigoplus_p I^p$  and is generated by  $\bigcup_p I^p$ . Then, each

$$I^p = I \cap R^p \subseteq R^p$$

is a subset of homogeneous elements. Therefore,  $I$  is generated by homogeneous elements.

Now, let  $I$  be generated by a set  $X$  of homogeneous elements. For sure,  $I \cap R^p \subseteq I$ , so we just need to prove the converse inclusion. As  $I$  is generated by  $X$ , its elements  $u \in I$  are of the form

$$u = \sum_i r_i x_i s_i, \quad (2.1)$$

for  $r_i, s_i \in R$  and  $x_i \in X$ . And as  $I \subseteq R$ , also,

$$u = \sum_p u_p,$$

for  $u_p \in R^p$ . For every term in (2.1), we have

$$r_i = \sum_j r_{i,j}, \quad s_i = \sum_l s_{i,l},$$

with each  $r_{i,j}, s_{i,l}$  being homogeneous. Therefore, combining all we have that

$$u = \sum_i \sum_{j,l} r_{i,j} x_i s_{i,l}. \quad (2.2)$$

Each term in (2.2) is homogeneous as is a product of homogeneous elements. Thus  $u_p$  is the sum of those terms, and  $u$  has degree  $p$ . Therefore  $u_p \in I$  and  $I \subseteq I \cap R^p$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.3** (Structure). *[4, Proposition 4.8] Let  $(V, \pi)$  be a persistence module. There exist a barcode  $\text{Bar}(V, \pi)$ , with  $\mu: \text{Bar}(V, \pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , the multiplicity of the barcode intervals, such as there is a unique direct sum decomposition*

$$V \cong \bigoplus_{I \in \text{Bar}(V)} \mathbb{F}(I)^{\mu(I)}. \quad (2.3)$$

*Proof.*  $V$  is of finite type, so it is a finite  $\mathbb{F}[x]$ -module. As  $\mathbb{F}$  is a field,  $\mathbb{F}[x]$  is a principal ideal domain, therefore,  $V$  is a finitely generated module over a principal ideal domain. Using Fact 2.2.1,  $V$  can be decompose in the direct sum of its free and torsion subgroups,  $F \oplus T$ . Thus, we have

$$F = \bigoplus_{i \geq q} x^i \cdot \mathbb{F}$$

$$T = \bigoplus_{i \geq q} R^i / I^i.$$



Each  $x^i \cdot \mathbb{F}$  is isomorphic to ideals of the form  $(x^q)$ . By Proposition 2.2.2, each  $R^i/I^i$  is isomorphic to some quotient of graded ideals of the form  $(x^p)/(x^r)$ . Note that the free subgroup can be seen as a particular case of the torsion group taking  $r = 0$ . Thus  $V$  can be decompose as described in (2.3).  $\square$



# Chapter 3

## Interleaving Stability Theorem

In this section we are going to give a detailed proof of the first stability theorem for persistence homology. This theorem is referred to as the “geometry miracle” of persistent homology, as it allows to describe an isometry between persistence modules and barcodes [2]. This shows that *small* changes in a data sets will perform *small* changes in their persistence modules, and therefore small changes in how persistent homology groups vary through time. The theorem claims that given two persistence modules, the distance between them using the interleaving distance, is the same as the distance between their barcodes using the bottleneck distance.

**Theorem 3.0.1** (Stability). [3, Theorem 2.2.8] *There is an isometry between a persistence module with the interleaving distance and its barcode with the bottleneck distance. That is, given two persistence modules  $V$  and  $W$ , it holds that*

$$d_{int}(V, W) = d_{bot}(\text{Bar}(V), \text{Bar}(W)).$$

For the presented proof we have followed [3]. Hence, we will divide the proof into proving two complementary inequalities separately. This implies checking that if there exists a  $\delta$ -matching between two given barcodes, then there exists a  $\delta$ -interleaving morphism between, Proposition 3.0.3. Also, we need to check that, if there exists a  $\delta$ -interleaving morphism between two persistence modules, then there exists a  $\delta$ -matching between their barcodes, 3.0.11.

The first claim can be deduced from the Structure Theorem in a rather direct way, proving first the case where our modules are just interval modules.

**Lemma 3.0.2.** [3, Exercise 2.2.7] *Let  $I, J$  be two  $\delta$ -matched intervals. Then, their corresponding interval modules  $(\mathbb{F}(I), \pi)$  and  $(\mathbb{F}(J), \theta)$  are  $\delta$ -interleaved.*

*Proof.* Let  $I = (a, b]$ ,  $J = (c, d]$ . If  $\rho$  is the  $\delta$ -matching between them, then  $\rho(I) = J$  and, following Definition 1.0.12,  $(a, b] \subseteq (c - \delta, d + \delta]$  and  $(c, d] \subseteq (a - \delta, b + \delta]$ , with  $b - a > 2\delta$

and  $d - c > 2\delta$ . Then, the morphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \phi_\delta: \mathbb{F}(I) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}(J)_\delta & & \psi_\delta: \mathbb{F}(J) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}(I)_\delta \\ \phi_\delta(\mathbb{F}(I)_t) \mapsto \mathbb{F}(J)_{(t+\delta)} & \text{and} & \psi_\delta(\mathbb{F}(J)_t) \mapsto \mathbb{F}(I)_{(t+\delta)} \end{array}$$

are well defined as for any  $t \in (a, b]$ ,  $t + \delta \in (c, d]$ , as  $a + \delta > c$  and  $b + \delta \leq d$ . In the same way, for any  $t \in (c, d]$ ,  $t + \delta \in (a, b]$ . Thus,

$$\psi_\delta \circ \phi_\delta(\mathbb{F}(I)_t) = \psi_\delta(\mathbb{F}(J)_{(t+\delta)}) = \mathbb{F}(I)_{(t+2\delta)} = \pi_{t \leq t+2\delta}(\mathbb{F}(I)_t)$$

and

$$\phi_\delta \circ \psi_\delta(\mathbb{F}(J)_t) = \phi_\delta(\mathbb{F}(I)_{(t+\delta)}) = \mathbb{F}(J)_{(t+2\delta)} = \theta_{t \leq t+2\delta}(\mathbb{F}(J)_t).$$

Therefore,  $\phi_\delta$  and  $\psi_\delta$  are a pair of  $\delta$ -interleaving morphisms.  $\square$

Once we are able to build a  $\delta$ -interleaving between two  $\delta$ -matched interval modules, we will use the Structure Theorem for persistence modules to generalize the construction for arbitrary persistence modules. This will prove useful to prove the first inequality needed to prove Theorem 3.0.1.

**Proposition 3.0.3.** [3, Theorem 3.0.1] *Given two persistence modules  $V$ ,  $W$ , if there is a  $\delta$ -matching between their barcodes, then there is a  $\delta$ -interleaving morphism between them.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\rho: \text{Bar}(V) \rightarrow \text{Bar}(W)$  is a  $\delta$ -matching between the barcodes of  $V$  and  $W$ . By the Structure Theorem 2.2.3,  $V$  and  $W$  decompose in a finite direct sum of interval modules

$$V \cong \bigoplus_{I \in \text{Bar}(V)} \mathbb{F}(I), \quad W \cong \bigoplus_{J \in \text{Bar}(W)} \mathbb{F}(J).$$

We can express  $V = V_Y \oplus V_N$ ,  $W = W_Y \oplus W_N$  denoting

$$\begin{array}{ll} V_Y \cong \bigoplus_{I \in \text{coim } \rho} \mathbb{F}(I), & V_N \cong \bigoplus_{I \in \text{Bar}(V) \setminus \text{coim } \rho} \mathbb{F}(I), \\ W_Y \cong \bigoplus_{J \in \text{im } \rho} \mathbb{F}(J), & W_N \cong \bigoplus_{J \in \text{Bar}(W) \setminus \text{im } \rho} \mathbb{F}(J). \end{array}$$

The  $V_Y, W_Y$  modules separate the “yes, matched” intervals, from the  $V_N, W_N$  “not matched” intervals. For every interval  $I \in \text{Bar}(V_Y)$ ,  $I$  is  $\delta$ -matched to an interval  $J \in \text{Bar}(W_Y)$  by  $\rho(I) = J$ . Thus, by Lemma 3.0.2, for all pair  $I, J$  of matched intervals, there exist a pair of  $\delta$ -interleaved morphisms

$$\phi_\delta: \mathbb{F}(I) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}(J)_\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_\delta: \mathbb{F}(J) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}(I)_\delta$$

which induce the pair of  $\delta$ -interleaved morphisms

$$\phi_\delta: V_Y \rightarrow W_{Y\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_\delta: W_Y \rightarrow V_{Y\delta}.$$

Not matched intervals are of length smaller than  $2\delta$ , therefore both,  $V_N$  and  $V_Y$  are  $\delta$ -interleaved with the empty set. We can now construct the  $\delta$ -interleaving morphism  $\phi: V \rightarrow W$  such as  $\phi|_{V_Y} = \phi_Y$  and  $\phi|_{V_N} = 0$ . In a similar way, we also construct  $\psi: W \rightarrow V$ .  $\square$

With Proposition 3.0.3 we have proven the first halve of Stability Theorem 3.0.1. Now we need to prove that we can build a  $\delta$ -interleaving morphism from a  $\delta$ -matching. To verify this claim we need several previous lemmas that will lead us to prove Proposition 3.0.3.

First, we will introduce some notation. Let  $(V, \pi), (W, \theta)$  be two persistence modules and let  $I = (b, d]$  be an interval with  $d \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ . Denote the set of bars of  $\text{Bar}(V)$  that start before  $b$  end exactly at  $d$  as

$$\text{Bar}_{I-}(V) := \{(a, d] \in \text{Bar}(V) : a \leq b\}.$$

Analogously, denote the set of bars that start at  $b$  and end after  $d$  as

$$\text{Bar}_{I+}(V) := \{(b, c] \in \text{Bar}(V) : c \geq d\}.$$

**Lemma 3.0.4.** [3, Proposition 3.1.1] *Let  $I = (b, d]$  be an interval. It exists an injective morphism  $\iota: (V, \pi) \rightarrow (W, \theta)$ , then  $\#(\text{Bar}_{I-}(V)) \leq \#(\text{Bar}_{I-}(W))$ . Where  $\#(\cdot)$  denotes the cardinal operator.*

*Proof.* For  $b < s < d < r$ , denote the set of elements in  $V_d$  witch come from all  $V_s$  and disappear in all  $V_r$  as

$$E_{I-} = \bigcap_{b < s < d} \text{im } \pi_{s \leq d} \cap \bigcap_{r > d} \ker \pi_{d \leq r} \subseteq V_d.$$

It holds that  $\dim E_{I-}(V) = \#(\text{Bar}_{I-}(V))$ . For every morphism  $p: (V, \pi) \rightarrow (W, \theta)$  the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_s & \xrightarrow{\pi_{s \leq r}} & V_r \\ p_s \downarrow & & \downarrow p_r \\ W_s & \xrightarrow{\theta_{s \leq r}} & W_r \end{array}$$

This implies that

$$p_r(\text{im } \pi_{s \leq r}) \subseteq \text{im } \theta_{s \leq r}, \quad p_s(\ker \pi_{s \leq r}) \subseteq \ker \theta_{s \leq r}.$$

Taking  $r = d$ ,  $b < s < d$  in the first inclusion, and  $s = d$ ,  $r > d$  in the second, we have that

$$p_d(\text{im } \pi_{s \leq d}) \subseteq \text{im } \theta_{s \leq d}, \quad p_d(\ker \pi_{d \leq r}) \subseteq \ker \theta_{d \leq r},$$

and

$$p_d(E_{I-}(V)) \subseteq E_{I-}(W).$$

If we now take  $p$  as the injective morphism of the hypothesis,  $p = \iota$ , we get

$$\dim E_{I-}(V) \leq \dim E_{I-}(W).$$

□

**Lemma 3.0.5.** [3, Exercise 3.1.3] *Let  $I = (b, d]$  be an interval. It exists a surjective morphism  $s: (V, \pi) \rightarrow (W, \theta)$ , then  $\#(\text{Bar}_{I+}(V)) \geq \#(\text{Bar}_{I+}(W))$ .*

*Proof.* Analogously to the proof of Lemma 3.0.4 we now define

$$E_{I+}(V) = \bigcap \text{im } \pi_{d \leq r}.$$

Therefore  $\dim E_{I+}(V) = \#(\text{Bar}_{I+}(V))$ , and recalling the diagram used for the previous proof, and using the fact that is commutative, we have that

$$p_r(\text{im } \pi_{s \leq r}) \supseteq \text{im } \theta_{s \leq r}.$$

Taking  $s = d$  we then have that

$$p_d(E_{I+}(V)) \supseteq E_{I+}(W).$$

And finally, taking the surjective morphism  $p = s$  we have that

$$\dim E_{I-}(V) \geq \dim E_{I-}(W).$$

□

To build our  $\delta$ -matching we first define two induced matchings, by an injection and by a surjection respectively. First, suppose that there exists an injection  $\iota: V \rightarrow W$ . For every  $c \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ , sort the bars  $(a_i, c] \in \text{Bar}(V)$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  by decreasing length order,

$$(a_1, c] \supseteq (a_2, c] \supseteq \dots \supseteq (a_k, c], \text{ with } a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_k.$$

Sort in the same manner the bars  $(b_j, c] \in \text{Bar}(W)$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ ,

$$(b_1, c] \supseteq (b_2, c] \supseteq \dots \supseteq (b_l, c], \text{ with } b_1 \leq b_2 \leq \dots \leq b_l.$$

As there is an injection between  $V$  and  $W$ , Lemma 3.0.4 assures that the amount of bars in  $\text{Bar}(V)$  is lower than the amount in  $\text{Bar}(W)$ , i.e.,  $k \leq l$ . We define the *injective induced matching*  $\mu_{inj}: \text{Bar}(V) \rightarrow \text{Bar}(W)$  matching, for each  $c \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ , the intervals from both lists by decreasing length.

**Lemma 3.0.6.** [3, Proposition 3.1.5] *If there exists an injection  $\iota: (V, \pi) \in (W, \theta)$ , then the induced matching  $\mu_{inj}: \text{Bar}(V) \rightarrow \text{Bar}(W)$  satisfies:*

1.  $\text{coim } \mu_{inj} = \text{Bar}(V)$ ,
2.  $\mu_{inj}(a, c] = (b, c]$ ,  $\forall b \leq a$ ,  $\forall (a, d] \in \text{Bar}(V)$ .

*Proof.* Applying Lemma 3.0.4 with the interval  $(a_k, c]$ , we have that for each  $c \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $\# \text{Bar}_{(a_k, c]-}(V) \leq \# \text{Bar}_{(a_k, c]-}(W)$ , having  $k \leq l$  as we note earlier. This means that every bar in  $\text{Bar}(V)$  is matched to some bar in  $\text{Bar}(W)$ . Hence  $\text{coim } \mu_{inj} = \text{Bar}(V)$ . Moreover, as the matching is carried out in length descending order, for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $\mu_{inj}(a_i, c] = (b_i, c]$ , and applying Lemma 3.0.4, now with the interval  $(a_i, c]$ , and making the same reasoning,  $a_i \leq b_i$ .  $\square$

Now we suppose that there exists a surjection  $\sigma: V \rightarrow W$ . For every  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , sort the intervals  $(a, c_i] \in \text{Bar}(V)$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  by decreasing length order as before,

$$(a, c_1] \supseteq (a, c_2] \supseteq \dots \supseteq (a, c_k], \text{ with } c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \dots \geq a_k,$$

and again in the same manner, sort the intervals  $(a, d_j] \in \text{Bar}(W)$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ ,

$$(a, d_1] \supseteq (a, d_2] \supseteq \dots \supseteq (a, d_l], \text{ with } d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_l.$$

We define the *surjective induced matching*  $\mu_{sur}: \text{Bar}(V) \rightarrow \text{Bar}(W)$  matching, for each  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , the intervals from both lists by decreasing length.

**Lemma 3.0.7.** [3, Exercise 3.1.8] *If there exists a surjection  $s: (V, \pi) \rightarrow (W, \theta)$ , then the induced matching  $\mu_{sur}: \text{Bar}(V) \rightarrow \text{Bar}(W)$  satisfies:*

1.  $\text{im } \mu_{sur} = \text{Bar}(W)$ ,
2.  $\mu_{sur}(a, c] = (a, d]$ ,  $\forall c \geq d$ ,  $\forall (a, d] \in \text{Bar}(V)$ .

*Proof.* Using Lemma 3.0.5 with the interval  $(b, d_k]$  for each  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ , we get that, as there exists a surjection between the modules, now  $k \geq l$ . Therefore, every bar in  $\text{Bar}(W)$  is matched to some bar in  $\text{Bar}(V)$  and  $\text{im } \mu_{sur} = \text{Bar}(W)$ . In an analogue way to the previous lemma, as the intervals in both lists are matched in a decreasing manner, for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ ,  $\mu_{sur}(a, c_j] = (a, d_j]$ , and if we now apply Lemma 3.0.5, we get that  $c_j \geq d_j$ .  $\square$

Hence, with the injective and the surjective induced matchings at hand, for a general morphism  $f$ , we can define the *induced matching*  $\mu(f): \text{Bar}(V) \rightarrow \text{Bar}(W)$ , as the composition  $\mu_{inj} \circ \mu_{sur}$ , defined as  $\text{im } \mu_{sur} = \text{Bar}(\text{im } f) = \text{coim } \mu_{inj}$ .

The following lemma verifies that, in fact, the mapping between persistence modules with its morphisms and barcodes with induced matchings (either the injective or the surjective versions) has functorial properties between the two categories.

**Lemma 3.0.8.** *[3, Claim 3.1.13] Let  $U, V$  and  $W$  persistence diagrams and  $f, g, h$  morphisms between them defined as in the following diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} U & \xrightarrow{f} & V & \xrightarrow{g} & W \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & h & & \end{array}$$

*If all  $f, g, h$  are all injections, or all surjections, then the corresponding diagram formed by the barcodes of the modules, and their respective matchings commutes as well.*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Bar}(U) & \xrightarrow{\mu_*(f)} & \text{Bar}(V) & \xrightarrow{\mu_*(g)} & \text{Bar}(W) \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & \mu_*(h) & & \end{array}$$

Where  $\mu_*$  denotes  $\mu_{inj}$  or  $\mu_{sur}$  accordingly.

*Proof.* Let  $f, g, h$  injective morphisms, by the definition of the injective induced matching and Lemma 3.0.4 for any  $d \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ , there exist  $k \leq l \leq q$  such that the barcodes of  $U, V, W$  consist on the following bars:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bar}(U) &: (a_1, d] \supset \cdots \supset (a_k, d] \\ \text{Bar}(V) &: (b_1, d] \supset \cdots \supset (b_k, d] \supset \cdots \supset (b_l, d] \\ \text{Bar}(W) &: (c_1, d] \supset \cdots \supset (c_k, d] \supset \cdots \supset (c_l, d] \supset \cdots \supset (c_q, d]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any  $d$  the diagram commutes as

$$\mu_{inj}(f)(a_i, d] = (b_i, d], \quad \mu_{inj}(g)(b_i, d] = (c_i, d], \quad \mu_{inj}(h)(a_i, d] = (c_i, d]$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . If  $f, g, h$  were surjective morphisms, an analogue reasoning using the surjective induced matching definition and Lemma 3.0.5 completes the proof.  $\square$

Finally, we can claim the two main lemmas from which we will construct our desired  $\delta$ -matching.



**Lemma 3.0.9.** [3, Lemma 3.2.1] Let  $(V, \pi), (W, \theta)$  be  $\delta$ -interleaved persistence modules, with  $\delta$ -interleaving morphisms  $\phi: V \rightarrow W_\delta$  and  $\psi: W \rightarrow V_\delta$ . Let  $\phi: V \rightarrow \text{im } \phi$  be a surjection and  $\mu_{sur}: \text{Bar}(V) \rightarrow \text{Bar}(\text{im } \phi)$  the induced matching. Then

1.  $\text{coim } \mu_{sur} \supseteq \text{Bar}(V)_{\geq 2\delta}$ ,
2.  $\text{im } \mu_{sur} = \text{Bar}(\text{im } \phi)$  and
3.  $\mu_{sur}(b, d] = (b, d']$ ,  $\forall (b, d] \in \text{coim } \mu_{sur}$ ,  $d' \in [d - 2\delta, d]$ .

*Proof.* 1. To check the first part, we observe that, in the following diagram, the three morphisms are surjective as  $\phi$  and  $\pi_{t \leq t+2\delta}$  are defined onto their images, and the diagram commutes,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} V & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \text{im } \phi & \xrightarrow{\psi_\delta} & \text{im } \pi_{t \leq t+2\delta} \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & \pi_{t \leq t+2\delta} & & \end{array}.$$

Therefore, because of Lemma 3.0.8 the barcode diagram also commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Bar}(V) & \xrightarrow{\mu_{sur}(\phi)} & \text{Bar}(\text{im } \phi) & \xrightarrow{\mu_{sur}(\psi_\delta)} & \text{Bar}(\text{im } \pi_{t \leq t+2\delta}) \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & \mu_{sur}(\pi_{t \leq t+2\delta}) & & \end{array}.$$

By the definition of the surjective induced matching,

$$\text{coim } \mu_{sur}(\pi_{t \leq t+2\delta}) = \text{Bar}(V)_{\geq 2\delta}.$$

For each starting point  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have that

$$\text{Bar}(\text{im } \pi_{t \leq t+2\delta}) = \{(a, b - 2\delta]: (a, b] \in \text{Bar}(V), b - a > 2\delta\}.$$

Sorting all bars of  $\text{Bar}(V)$  and of  $\text{Bar}(\text{im } \pi_{t \leq t+2\delta})$  in length-not-increasing order and matching the bars though the longest-first order, each bar  $(a, b] \in \text{Bar}(V)$  is matched with the bar  $(a, b - 2\delta] \in \text{Bar}(\text{im } \pi_{t \leq t+2\delta})$  while  $b - a > 2\delta$ . The smaller bars are not matched. Thus,

$$\text{coim } \mu_{sur}(\phi) \supseteq \text{coim } \mu_{sur}(\text{im } \pi_{t \leq t+2\delta}) = \text{Bar}(V)_{\geq 2\delta}.$$

2. The second part is just a reformulation of Lemma 3.0.4.
3. Let  $(b, d] \in \text{coim}$ . There are two cases:

On one hand, if  $d - b \leq 2\delta$ ,  $(b, d]$  is matched to  $(b, d']$  where  $d \geq d'$ , by definition of  $\mu_{sur}$ . Also,  $d' > b$  and, as in this case we have  $b \geq d - 2\delta$ , we have  $d' > d - 2\delta$ . Therefore,  $d' \in [d - 2\delta, d]$ .

On the other hand, if  $d - b > 2\delta$ ,  $(b, d]$  is matched to  $(b, d']$  by  $\mu_{sur}(\phi)$ , with  $(b, d'] \in W_{\leq 2\delta}$ . We can therefore use Lemma 3.0.7 to check that  $d' \geq d$ . In the same manner,  $(b, d']$  is matched to  $(b, d'']$  by  $\mu_{sur}(\psi)_\delta$  with  $d'' \geq d'$ . Finally, using the commutativity of the following diagram, we have that  $(b, d''] = (b, d - 2\delta]$ , making  $d' \in [d - 2\delta, d]$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{Bar}(V)_{\geq 2\delta} & & \text{Bar}(\text{im } \phi) & & \text{Bar}(\text{im } \pi_{t \leq t+2\delta}) \\
\Downarrow & & \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \\
(b, d] & \xrightarrow{\mu_{sur}(\phi)} & (b, d'] & \xrightarrow{\mu_{sur}(\psi)_\delta} & (b, d''] \\
& & & & \parallel \\
& & & & (b, d - 2\delta] \\
& \searrow \mu_{sur}(\pi_{t \leq t+2\delta}) \nearrow & & & 
\end{array}$$

□

**Lemma 3.0.10.** [3, Proposition 3.2.2] Let  $(V, \pi), (W, \theta)$  be  $\delta$ -interleaved persistence modules, with  $\delta$ -interleaving morphisms  $\phi: V \rightarrow W_\delta$  and  $\psi: W \rightarrow V_\delta$ . Let  $\phi: V \rightarrow \text{im } \phi$  be a injection and  $\mu_{inj}: \text{Bar}(\text{im } \phi) \rightarrow \text{Bar}(W_\delta)$  the induced matching. Then

1.  $\text{coim } \mu_{sur} = \text{Bar}(\text{im } \phi)$ ,
2.  $\text{im } \mu_{inj} \supseteq \text{Bar}(W_\delta)_{\geq 2\delta}$  and
3.  $\mu_{inj}(b, d'] = (b', d']$ ,  $(b, d'] \in \text{coim } \mu_{inj}$ ,  $b' \in [b - 2\delta, b]$ .

*Proof.* 1. Immediate using Lemma 3.0.6.

2. As  $\phi_\delta \circ \psi = \theta_{t \leq t+2\delta}$  the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
W & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \text{im } \psi & \xrightarrow{\phi_\delta} & W_{2\delta} \\
& \searrow \theta_{t \leq t+2\delta} \nearrow & & & 
\end{array} .$$

This implies that  $\text{im } \theta_{t \leq t+2\delta} \subseteq \text{im } \phi_\delta \subseteq W_{2\delta}$ , so there are some injections  $j$  and  $i$  which make the following diagram commute as well:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{im } \theta_{t \leq t+2\delta} & \xrightarrow{j} & \text{im } \phi_\delta & \xrightarrow{i} & W_{2\delta} \\
& \searrow \theta_{t \leq t+2\delta} \nearrow & & & 
\end{array} .$$

As all morphisms in the diagram above are injections, we can use the functorial properties of Lemma 3.0.8 having a commutative diagram of the barcodes of each of the previous persistence modules:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Bar}(\text{im } \theta_{t \leq t+2\delta}) & \xrightarrow{\mu_{inj}(j)} & \text{Bar}(\text{im } \phi_\delta) & \xrightarrow{\mu_{inj}(i)} & \text{Bar}(W_{2\delta}) \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & \mu_{inj}(\theta_{t \leq t+2\delta}) & & & \end{array}.$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bar}(\text{im } \theta_{t \leq t+2\delta}) &= \{(b, d - 2\delta) : (b, d] \in \text{Bar}(W), b < d - 2\delta\}, \\ \text{Bar}(W_{2\delta}) &= \{(b - 2\delta, d - 2\delta) : (b, d] \in \text{Bar}(W)\} \text{ and} \\ \mu_{inj}(\theta_{t \leq t+2\delta})((b, d - 2\delta)) &= (b - 2\delta, d - 2\delta) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\text{im}_\mu \text{inj}(i) \supseteq \text{im } \mu_{inj}(\psi_{t \leq t+2\delta}) = \text{Bar}(W_{2\delta})_{2\delta}$ . This, undoing the shifts made, make the prove.

3. Let  $(b, d] \in \text{Bar}(\text{im } f_\delta)$  such as for some  $b'$ ,  $\mu_{inj}(b, d] = (b', d] \in \text{Bar}(W)$ . Because of Lemma 3.0.6,  $b' \leq b$ . There are again two cases:

If  $d - b \leq 2\delta$ , then  $b' \geq d - 2\delta \geq b > b - 2\delta$  and  $b' \in [b - 2\delta, b]$ .

Else, if  $d - b > 2\delta$ , there exists an interval  $(b' + 2\delta, d] \in \text{Bar}(\text{im } \theta_{t \leq t+2\delta})$  such that

$$\mu_{inj}(\theta_{t \leq t+2\delta})(b' + 2\delta, d] = \mu_{inj}(i)(b, d] = (a, d].$$

Thus,  $b \leq b' + 2\delta$  and  $b' \in [b - 2\delta, b]$ .

□

At last, we can now prove the other part of the Stability theorem. For so, we will construct a  $\delta$ -matching out of a  $\delta$ -interleaving morphism.

**Proposition 3.0.11.** [3, Theorem 3.0.2] *Given two persistence modules  $V, W$ , with a  $\delta$ -interleaving morphism between them, then there is a  $\delta$ -matching between their barcodes.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mu(\phi) = \mu_{inj} \circ \mu_{sur}$  and let  $\Phi_\delta: \text{Bar}(W_\delta) \rightarrow \text{Bar}(W)$  be the *shift map* that carries each bar  $(a, b]$  into  $(a + \delta, b + \delta]$ . The composition  $\Phi_\delta \circ \mu(\phi)$  is a matching between

$\text{Bar}(V)$  and  $\text{Bar}(W)$ . Hence, using Lemma 3.0.10 and 3.0.9, we get the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{Bar}(V) & & \text{Bar}(W_\delta)_{\geq 2\delta} & & \text{Bar}(W)_{\geq 2\delta} \\
\cup \downarrow & & \cap \downarrow & & \cap \downarrow \\
\text{Bar}(V)_{\geq 2\delta} & \xrightarrow{\mu_{sur}} & \text{Bar}(\text{im } f) & \xrightarrow{\mu_{inj}} & \text{im } \mu_{inj} & \xrightarrow{\Psi_\delta} & \text{Bar } B(W) \\
\psi \downarrow & & \psi \downarrow & & \psi \downarrow & & \psi \downarrow \\
(b, d] & \longmapsto & (b, d'] & \longmapsto & (b', d'] & \longmapsto & (b' + \delta, d' + \delta]
\end{array}$$

The diagram shows that, by Lemma 3.0.9, a bar  $(b, d] \in \text{Bar}(V)_{\geq 2\delta}$  is sent to  $\mu_{sur}(b, d] = (b, d'] \in \text{Bar}(\text{im } \phi)$  with  $d' \in [d - 2\delta, d]$ . Then, by Lemma 3.0.9, it is sent to  $\mu_{sur}(b, d'] = (b', d']$  with  $b' \in [b - 2\delta, b]$ . At last, using the shift morphism  $\Phi_\delta$  it is carried to  $(b' + \delta, d' + \delta]$ .

This shows that any bar in  $\text{Bar}(V)_{\geq 2\delta}$  is matched. In the same manner it can be seen that any bar in  $\text{Bar}(W)_{\geq 2\delta}$  is matched. Thus, we have that

$$\begin{cases} d - 2\delta \leq d' \leq d \\ b - 2\delta \leq b' \leq b \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} d - \delta \leq d' + \delta \leq d + \delta \\ b - \delta \leq b' + \delta \leq b + \delta \end{cases},$$

and therefore,  $\Phi_\delta \circ \mu(\phi)$  is a  $\delta$ -matching between  $\text{Bar}(V)$  and  $\text{Bar}(W)$ .  $\square$

The constructions made by Proposition 3.0.3 and Proposition 3.0.11 assure that given a  $\delta$ -interleaving morphism we can build a  $\delta$ -matching, and conversely, given a  $\delta$ -matching we can build a  $\delta$ -interleaving morphism. This means that if one of the two exists, it fixes a  $\delta$ . Both the interleaving distance and the bottleneck distance try to minimize this  $\delta$ , so once fixed for one of them, the other needs an smaller or equal  $\delta'$ . Thus, with each of the propositions we can prove one of the inequalities needed to reach the isomorphism between the space of persistence diagrams and the space of their barcodes.

**Theorem 3.0.1** (Stability). *[3, Theorem 2.2.8] There is an isometry between a persistence module with the interleaving distance and its barcode with the bottleneck distance. That is, given two persistence modules  $V$  and  $W$ , it holds that*

$$d_{int}(V, W) = d_{bot}(\text{Bar}(V), \text{Bar}(W)).$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $d_{int}(V, W) = \delta$ . Proposition 3.0.11 assures there exist a  $\delta$ -matching between  $\text{Bar}(V)$  and  $\text{Bar}(W)$ . As  $d_{bot}(V, W)$  is the infimum  $\delta$  for which exists a  $\delta$ -matching,  $d_{bot}(V, W) \leq d_{int}(V, W)$ . On the other hand, Proposition 3.0.3 leads, with the same reasoning, to  $d_{int}(V, W) \leq d_{bot}(V, W)$ . Thus, it has to be  $d_{int}(V, W) = d_{bot}(\text{Bar}(V), \text{Bar}(W))$ .  $\square$

## Chapter 4

# Edelsbrunner & Harer's (Hausdorff) Stability Theorem



## Chapter 5

# Gromov-Hausdorff's Stability Theorem





# Chapter 6

## Vectorizations' Stability Theorems

### 6.1 Persistence landscapes

### 6.2 Persistence images

### 6.3 Euler curves



# Bibliography

- [1] HUNGERFORD, T. W. *Algebra*. Springer, 2000.
- [2] NANDA, V. Computational algebraic topology, lecture notes. *University of Oxford* (2020).
- [3] POLTEROVICH, L., ROSEN, D., SAMVELYAN, K., AND ZHANG, J. *Topological Persistence in Geometry and Analysis*. American Mathematical Society, 2020.
- [4] WANG, K. G. The basic theory of persistent homology. *University of Chicago* (2012).