

# Persistent Homology

From Theory to Computation

Ulrich Bauer

TUM

November 19, 2018

Workshop on Computational Topology and Topological Data Analysis – Heidelberg



$\approx$



?




$\approx$




?


# Persistent homology




























# What is homology?




- *Simplicial complex*  $K$ : space built from *simpllices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)

# What is homology?




- *Simplicial complex  $K$ :* space built from *simplices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)
- *Chains  $C_d(K)$ :* subsets of  $d$ -simplices (seen as formal  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -linear combinations)

# What is homology?




- *Simplicial complex  $K$ :* space built from *simplices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)
- *Chains  $C_d(K)$ :* subsets of  $d$ -simplices (seen as formal  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -linear combinations)
- Each simplex has a boundary

# What is homology?




- *Simplicial complex*  $K$ : space built from *simpllices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)
- *Chains*  $C_d(K)$ : subsets of  $d$ -simplices (seen as formal  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -linear combinations)
- Each simplex has a boundary
- Defines linear *boundary map*  $\partial_d : C_d(K) \rightarrow C_{d-1}(K)$

# What is homology?




- *Simplicial complex  $K$ :* space built from *simpllices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)
- *Chains  $C_d(K)$ :* subsets of  $d$ -simplices (seen as formal  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -linear combinations)
- Each simplex has a boundary
- Defines linear *boundary map*  $\partial_d : C_d(K) \rightarrow C_{d-1}(K)$

# What is homology?




- *Simplicial complex*  $K$ : space built from *simpllices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)
- *Chains*  $C_d(K)$ : subsets of  $d$ -simplices (seen as formal  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -linear combinations)
- Each simplex has a boundary
- Defines linear *boundary map*  $\partial_d : C_d(K) \rightarrow C_{d-1}(K)$
- *Cycles*  $Z_d(K) = \ker \partial_d$ : chains with zero boundary

# What is homology?




- *Simplicial complex*  $K$ : space built from *simpllices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)
- *Chains*  $C_d(K)$ : subsets of  $d$ -simplices (seen as formal  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -linear combinations)
- Each simplex has a boundary
- Defines linear *boundary map*  $\partial_d : C_d(K) \rightarrow C_{d-1}(K)$
- *Cycles*  $Z_d(K) = \ker \partial_d$ : chains with zero boundary
- *Boundaries*  $B_d(K) = \text{im } \partial_{d+1}$  are always cycles

# What is homology?




- *Simplicial complex*  $K$ : space built from *simpllices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)
- *Chains*  $C_d(K)$ : subsets of  $d$ -simplices (seen as formal  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -linear combinations)
- Each simplex has a boundary
- Defines linear *boundary map*  $\partial_d : C_d(K) \rightarrow C_{d-1}(K)$
- *Cycles*  $Z_d(K) = \ker \partial_d$ : chains with zero boundary
- *Boundaries*  $B_d(K) = \text{im } \partial_{d+1}$  are always cycles
- Two cycles are *homologous* if they differ by a boundary

# What is homology?




- *Simplicial complex  $K$* : space built from *simplices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)
- *Chains  $C_d(K)$* : subsets of  $d$ -simplices (seen as formal  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -linear combinations)
- Each simplex has a boundary
- Defines linear *boundary map*  $\partial_d : C_d(K) \rightarrow C_{d-1}(K)$
- *Cycles  $Z_d(K) = \ker \partial_d$* : chains with zero boundary
- *Boundaries  $B_d(K) = \text{im } \partial_{d+1}$*  are always cycles
- Two cycles are *homologous* if they differ by a boundary

# What is homology?




- *Simplicial complex  $K$* : space built from *simplices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)
- *Chains  $C_d(K)$* : subsets of  $d$ -simplices (seen as formal  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -linear combinations)
- Each simplex has a boundary
- Defines linear *boundary map*  $\partial_d : C_d(K) \rightarrow C_{d-1}(K)$
- *Cycles  $Z_d(K) = \ker \partial_d$* : chains with zero boundary
- *Boundaries  $B_d(K) = \text{im } \partial_{d+1}$*  are always cycles
- Two cycles are *homologous* if they differ by a boundary

# What is homology?




- *Simplicial complex  $K$* : space built from *simpllices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)
- *Chains  $C_d(K)$* : subsets of  $d$ -simplices (seen as formal  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -linear combinations)
- Each simplex has a boundary
- Defines linear *boundary map*  $\partial_d : C_d(K) \rightarrow C_{d-1}(K)$
- *Cycles  $Z_d(K) = \ker \partial_d$* : chains with zero boundary
- *Boundaries  $B_d(K) = \text{im } \partial_{d+1}$*  are always cycles
- Two cycles are *homologous* if they differ by a boundary

# What is homology?



- *Simplicial complex  $K$* : space built from *simplices* (points, edges, triangles, tetrahedra, ...)
- *Chains  $C_d(K)$* : subsets of  $d$ -simplices (seen as formal  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -linear combinations)
- Each simplex has a boundary
- Defines linear *boundary map*  $\partial_d : C_d(K) \rightarrow C_{d-1}(K)$
- *Cycles  $Z_d(K) = \ker \partial_d$* : chains with zero boundary
- *Boundaries  $B_d(K) = \text{im } \partial_{d+1}$*  are always cycles
- Two cycles are *homologous* if they differ by a boundary
- The equivalence classes form the *homology group*  $H_*(K) = Z_*(K)/B_*(K)$  (a vector space over  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ )

# Beating around the bush



Homology captures something that is not there (a *hole*)  
by something that is there (a *cycle*)  
and that has an interesting property (is not a *boundary*).

# Why is homology algebraic?


Roughly:  $\dim H_*(K)$  is the number of holes



- Why not just count holes then?

# Why is homology algebraic?

Roughly:  $\dim H_*(K)$  is the number of holes



- Why not just count holes then?

Homology is a *functor*:

- An inclusion map  $L \hookrightarrow K$  induces a linear map  $H_*(L) \rightarrow H_*(K)$

# Why is homology algebraic?

Roughly:  $\dim H_*(K)$  is the number of holes




- Why not just count holes then?

Homology is a *functor*:

- An inclusion map  $L \hookrightarrow K$  induces a linear map  $H_*(L) \rightarrow H_*(K)$
- A cycle around a “hole” might get mapped to a *linear combination* of two cycles around “holes”

# Why is homology algebraic?

Roughly:  $\dim H_*(K)$  is the number of holes



- Why not just count holes then?


Homology is a *functor*:

- An inclusion map  $L \hookrightarrow K$  induces a linear map  $H_*(L) \rightarrow H_*(K)$
- A cycle around a “hole” might get mapped to a *linear combination* of two cycles around “holes”



Homology does not have a canonical basis

- Computing (persistent) homology is all about choosing (compatible) bases



# What is persistent homology?





# What is persistent homology?





# What is persistent homology?





# What is persistent homology?





# What is persistent homology?



# What is persistent homology?



# What is persistent homology?



# What is persistent homology?

# What is persistent homology?

Persistent homology is the homology of a filtration.

# What is persistent homology?

Persistent homology is the homology of a filtration.

- A filtration is a certain diagram  $K : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ 
  - $\mathbf{R}$  is the poset  $(\mathbb{R}, \leq)$
  - A topological space  $K_t$  for each  $t \in \mathbb{R}$
  - An inclusion map  $K_s \hookrightarrow K_t$  for each  $s \leq t \in \mathbb{R}$

# What is persistent homology?

Persistent homology is the homology of a filtration.

- A filtration is a certain diagram  $K : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ 
  - $\mathbf{R}$  is the poset  $(\mathbb{R}, \leq)$
  - A topological space  $K_t$  for each  $t \in \mathbb{R}$
  - An inclusion map  $K_s \hookrightarrow K_t$  for each  $s \leq t \in \mathbb{R}$
- Consider homology  $H_* : \mathbf{Top} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}$

# What is persistent homology?

Persistent homology is the homology of a filtration.

- A filtration is a certain diagram  $K : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ 
  - $\mathbf{R}$  is the poset  $(\mathbb{R}, \leq)$
  - A topological space  $K_t$  for each  $t \in \mathbb{R}$
  - An inclusion map  $K_s \hookrightarrow K_t$  for each  $s \leq t \in \mathbb{R}$
- Consider homology  $H_* : \mathbf{Top} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}$
- Persistent homology is a diagram  $M : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}$   
*(persistence module)*

# Barcodes: the structure of persistence modules

Theorem (Krull–Schmidt–Remak–Azumaya;  
Crawley-Boevey 2015)

*Any persistence module  $M$  of vector spaces over the field  $\mathbb{F}$  is a direct sum of interval modules*

$$0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow 0$$

*(in an essentially unique way).*

- The supporting intervals form the *persistence barcode*.
- It completely describes the persistence module (up to isomorphism).
- This is why we use homology with coefficients in a field.

# Barcodes: the structure of persistence modules

Theorem (Krull–Schmidt–Remak–Azumaya;  
Crawley-Boevey 2015)


*Any persistence module  $M$  of vector spaces over the field  $\mathbb{F}$  is a direct sum of interval modules*


$$0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow 0$$


*(in an essentially unique way).*


- The supporting intervals form the *persistence barcode*.
- It completely describes the persistence module (up to isomorphism).
- This is why we use homology with coefficients in a field.


# Complexes


































































# Simplicial collapses

Definition (Whitehead 1938)

Let  $K$  be a simplicial complex.




# Simplicial collapses

## Definition (Whitehead 1938)

Let  $K$  be a simplicial complex.

- A *free face* of  $K$  is a simplex that has a unique proper coface.



# Simplicial collapses

## Definition (Whitehead 1938)

Let  $K$  be a simplicial complex.

- A *free face* of  $K$  is a simplex that has a unique proper coface.
- We can *collapse*  $K$  to a subcomplex  $L$  by removing a free face and its proper coface.



# Simplicial collapses

## Definition (Whitehead 1938)

Let  $K$  be a simplicial complex.

- A *free face* of  $K$  is a simplex that has a unique proper coface.
- We can *collapse*  $K$  to a subcomplex  $L$  by removing a free face and its proper coface.
- $L$  is homotopy equivalent to  $K$ .  
In particular, they have isomorphic homology.



# Simplicial collapses

## Definition (Whitehead 1938)

Let  $K$  be a simplicial complex.

- A *free face* of  $K$  is a simplex that has a unique proper coface.
- We can *collapse*  $K$  to a subcomplex  $L$  by removing a free face and its proper coface.
- $L$  is homotopy equivalent to  $K$ .  
In particular, they have isomorphic homology.




If there is a sequence of such elementary collapses from  $K$  to  $M$ , we say that  $K$  *collapses* to  $M$  (written as  $K \searrow M$ ).

# Discrete Morse theory

## Definition (Forman 1998)

A *discrete vector field* on a cell complex  
is a partition of the set of simplices into

- singleton sets  $\{\phi\}$  (*critical cells*), and
- pairs  $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ , where  $\sigma$  is a facet of  $\tau$ .




# Discrete Morse theory

## Definition (Forman 1998)

A *discrete vector field* on a cell complex is a partition of the set of simplices into

- singleton sets  $\{\phi\}$  (*critical cells*), and
- pairs  $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ , where  $\sigma$  is a facet of  $\tau$ .



A function  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on a cell complex is a *discrete Morse function* if


- sublevel sets are subcomplexes, and

# Discrete Morse theory

## Definition (Forman 1998)

A *discrete vector field* on a cell complex is a partition of the set of simplices into

- singleton sets  $\{\phi\}$  (*critical cells*), and
- pairs  $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ , where  $\sigma$  is a facet of  $\tau$ .



A function  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on a cell complex is a *discrete Morse function* if

- sublevel sets are subcomplexes, and




# Discrete Morse theory

## Definition (Forman 1998)


A *discrete vector field* on a cell complex is a partition of the set of simplices into

- singleton sets  $\{\phi\}$  (*critical cells*), and
- pairs  $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ , where  $\sigma$  is a facet of  $\tau$ .



A function  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on a cell complex is a *discrete Morse function* if

- sublevel sets are subcomplexes, and




# Discrete Morse theory

## Definition (Forman 1998)

A *discrete vector field* on a cell complex is a partition of the set of simplices into

- singleton sets  $\{\phi\}$  (*critical cells*), and
- pairs  $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ , where  $\sigma$  is a facet of  $\tau$ .



A function  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on a cell complex is a *discrete Morse function* if

- sublevel sets are subcomplexes, and




# Discrete Morse theory

## Definition (Forman 1998)


A *discrete vector field* on a cell complex is a partition of the set of simplices into

- singleton sets  $\{\phi\}$  (*critical cells*), and
- pairs  $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ , where  $\sigma$  is a facet of  $\tau$ .



A function  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on a cell complex is a *discrete Morse function* if

- sublevel sets are subcomplexes, and



# Discrete Morse theory



## Definition (Forman 1998)

A *discrete vector field* on a cell complex is a partition of the set of simplices into

- singleton sets  $\{\phi\}$  (*critical cells*), and
- pairs  $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ , where  $\sigma$  is a facet of  $\tau$ .

A function  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on a cell complex is a *discrete Morse function* if

- sublevel sets are subcomplexes, and




# Discrete Morse theory

## Definition (Forman 1998)


A *discrete vector field* on a cell complex is a partition of the set of simplices into

- singleton sets  $\{\phi\}$  (*critical cells*), and
- pairs  $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ , where  $\sigma$  is a facet of  $\tau$ .



A function  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on a cell complex is a *discrete Morse function* if

- sublevel sets are subcomplexes, and
- level sets form a discrete vector field.



## Fundamental theorem of discrete Morse theory


Let  $f$  be a discrete Morse function on a cell complex  $K$ .

# Fundamental theorem of discrete Morse theory

Let  $f$  be a discrete Morse function on a cell complex  $K$ .

## Theorem (Forman 1998)

If  $(s, t]$  contains no critical value of  $f$ ,  
then the sublevel set  $K_t$  collapses to  $K_s$   
(written as  $K_t \searrow K_s$ ).




# Fundamental theorem of discrete Morse theory

Let  $f$  be a discrete Morse function on a cell complex  $K$ .

## Theorem (Forman 1998)

If  $(s, t]$  contains no critical value of  $f$ ,  
then the sublevel set  $K_t$  collapses to  $K_s$   
(written as  $K_t \searrow K_s$ ).




# Fundamental theorem of discrete Morse theory

Let  $f$  be a discrete Morse function on a cell complex  $K$ .

## Theorem (Forman 1998)

If  $(s, t]$  contains no critical value of  $f$ ,  
then the sublevel set  $K_t$  collapses to  $K_s$   
(written as  $K_t \searrow K_s$ ).



# Fundamental theorem of discrete Morse theory

Let  $f$  be a discrete Morse function on a cell complex  $K$ .

## Theorem (Forman 1998)

If  $(s, t]$  contains no critical value of  $f$ ,  
then the sublevel set  $K_t$  collapses to  $K_s$   
(written as  $K_t \searrow K_s$ ).



## Corollary


$K$  is homotopy-equivalent to a cell complex  $M$  built from the critical cells of  $f$ .

# Fundamental theorem of discrete Morse theory

Let  $f$  be a discrete Morse function on a cell complex  $K$ .

## Theorem (Forman 1998)

If  $(s, t]$  contains no critical value of  $f$ ,  
then the sublevel set  $K_t$  collapses to  $K_s$   
(written as  $K_t \searrow K_s$ ).



## Corollary

$K$  is homotopy-equivalent to a cell complex  $M$  built from the critical cells of  $f$ .

This homotopy equivalence is compatible with the filtration.

## Corollary

$K$  and  $M$  have isomorphic persistent homology (with regard to  $f$ ).

# Morse theory for Čech and Delaunay complexes

## Proposition

*The Čech complexes and the Delaunay complexes (alpha shapes) are sublevel sets of (generalized) discrete Morse functions.*

# Morse theory for Čech and Delaunay complexes

## Proposition

*The Čech complexes and the Delaunay complexes (alpha shapes) are sublevel sets of (generalized) discrete Morse functions.*

## Theorem (B., Edelsbrunner 2017)

*Čech, Delaunay–Čech, Delaunay, and Wrap complexes are homotopy equivalent through a sequence of collapses*

$$\text{Cech}_r X \searrow \text{Cech}_r X \cap \text{Del} X \searrow \text{Del}_r X \searrow \text{Wrap}_r X,$$


*induced by a single discrete gradient field.*



# Delaunay and Wrap complexes



# Delaunay and Wrap complexes



## Vietoris–Rips complexes

Consider a finite metric space  $(X, d)$ .

The *Vietoris–Rips complex* is the simplicial complex

$$\text{Rips}_t(X) = \{S \subseteq X \mid \text{diam } S \leq t\}$$

- all edges with pairwise distance  $\leq t$
- all possible higher simplices
- *not* a sublevel set of a discrete Morse functions

# Vietoris–Rips complexes

Consider a finite metric space  $(X, d)$ .

The *Vietoris–Rips complex* is the simplicial complex

$$\text{Rips}_t(X) = \{S \subseteq X \mid \text{diam } S \leq t\}$$

- all edges with pairwise distance  $\leq t$
- all possible higher simplices
- *not* a sublevel set of a discrete Morse functions

For large  $t$ ,  $\text{Rips}_t(X)$  is the full simplex with vertices  $X$

- Number of simplices grows exponentially in dimension
- Computation is one of the most important challenges in applied topology!

# Computation

# Demo: Ripser

Example data set:

- 192 points on  $\mathbb{S}^2$
- persistent homology barcodes up to dimension 2
- over 56 mio. simplices in 3-skeleton

Some previous software:

- javaplex (Stanford): 3200 seconds, 12 GB
- Dionysus (Duke): 615 seconds, 3.4 GB
- DIPHA (IST Austria): 50 seconds, 6 GB
- GUDHI (INRIA): 60 seconds, 3 GB

# Demo: Ripser

Example data set:

- 192 points on  $\mathbb{S}^2$
- persistent homology barcodes up to dimension 2
- over 56 mio. simplices in 3-skeleton

Some previous software:

- javaplex (Stanford): 3200 seconds, 12 GB
- Dionysus (Duke): 615 seconds, 3.4 GB
- DIPHA (IST Austria): 50 seconds, 6 GB
- GUDHI (INRIA): 60 seconds, 3 GB

Demo: [live.ripser.org](http://live.ripser.org)

# Demo: Ripser

Example data set:

- 192 points on  $\mathbb{S}^2$
- persistent homology barcodes up to dimension 2
- over 56 mio. simplices in 3-skeleton

Some previous software:

- javaplex (Stanford): 3200 seconds, 12 GB
- Dionysus (Duke): 615 seconds, 3.4 GB
- DIPHA (IST Austria): 50 seconds, 6 GB
- GUDHI (INRIA): 60 seconds, 3 GB

Demo: [live.ripser.org](http://live.ripser.org)

- Ripser: 1.2 seconds, 160 MB

# Ripser

A software for computing Vietoris–Rips persistence barcodes

- around 1000 lines of C++ code, no external dependencies
- support for
  - coefficients in a prime field  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$
  - sparse distance matrices (for distance threshold)
- open source (<http://ripser.org>)
  - released in July 2016
- online version (<http://live.ripser.org>)
  - launched in August 2016
- (co-)winner of 2016 ATMCS Best New Software Award

# Computing homology

Computing homology:

- compute basis for boundaries  $B_* = \text{im } \partial_*$
- extend to basis for cycles  $Z_* = \ker \partial_*$
- new (non-boundary) basis cycles generate quotient  
 $H_* = Z_*/B_*$

# The four special ingredients of Ripser

The improved performance of Ripser is based on 4 insights:


- Compute cohomology [de Silva et al. 2011]
  - reduce transposed matrix
- Skip inessential columns [Chen, Kerber 2011]
  - many columns are redundant for homology
- Implicit boundary matrix
  - don't store the (reduced) boundary matrix in memory
- Apparent pairs
  - find column pivot without constructing entire column

# Stability

# Stability of persistence barcodes for functions

Theorem (Cohen-Steiner, Edelsbrunner, Harer 2005)

Let  $\|f - g\|_\infty = \delta$ . Then there exists a matching between the intervals of the persistence barcodes of  $f$  and  $g$  such that




# Stability of persistence barcodes for functions

Theorem (Cohen-Steiner, Edelsbrunner, Harer 2005)

Let  $\|f - g\|_\infty = \delta$ . Then there exists a matching between the intervals of the persistence barcodes of  $f$  and  $g$  such that

- matched intervals have endpoints within distance  $\leq \delta$ , and




# Stability of persistence barcodes for functions

Theorem (Cohen-Steiner, Edelsbrunner, Harer 2005)

Let  $\|f - g\|_\infty = \delta$ . Then there exists a matching between the intervals of the persistence barcodes of  $f$  and  $g$  such that

- matched intervals have endpoints within distance  $\leq \delta$ , and
- unmatched intervals have length  $\leq 2\delta$ .




# Persistence and stability: the big picture

Data


point cloud

$$P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$$


# Persistence and stability: the big picture




# Persistence and stability: the big picture




# Persistence and stability: the big picture




# Persistence and stability: the big picture




# Geometric interleavings




# Geometric interleavings




# Geometric interleavings




# Geometric interleavings



# Geometric interleavings



# Geometric interleavings




# Interleavings

Let  $\delta = \|f - g\|_\infty$ . Write  $F_t = f^{-1}(-\infty, t]$  and  $G_t = g^{-1}(-\infty, t]$ .

# Interleavings

Let  $\delta = \|f - g\|_\infty$ . Write  $F_t = f^{-1}(-\infty, t]$  and  $G_t = g^{-1}(-\infty, t]$ .

Then the sublevel set filtrations  $F, G : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$  are  
 $\delta$ -interleaved:



# Interleavings

Let  $\delta = \|f - g\|_\infty$ . Write  $F_t = f^{-1}(-\infty, t]$  and  $G_t = g^{-1}(-\infty, t]$ .

Then the sublevel set filtrations  $F, G : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$  are  $\delta$ -interleaved:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F_t & \hookrightarrow & F_{t+\delta} & \hookrightarrow & F_{t+2\delta} & \cdots \cdots & \rightarrow \\ \swarrow \searrow & & \swarrow \searrow & & \swarrow \searrow & & \\ G_t & \hookrightarrow & G_{t+\delta} & \hookrightarrow & G_{t+2\delta} & \cdots \cdots & \rightarrow \end{array}$$

Applying homology (a functor) preserves commutativity

- persistent homology of  $f, g$  yields  $\delta$ -interleaved persistence modules  $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}$

# Algebraic stability of persistence barcodes

Theorem (Chazal et al. 2009, 2012; B, Lesnick 2015)

*If two persistence modules are  $\delta$ -interleaved,  
then there exists a  $\delta$ -matching of their barcodes:*


- matched intervals have endpoints within distance  $\leq \delta$ ,
- unmatched intervals have length  $\leq 2\delta$ .

# Algebraic stability of persistence barcodes

Theorem (Chazal et al. 2009, 2012; B. Lesnick 2015)

If two persistence modules are  $\delta$ -interleaved,  
then there exists a  $\delta$ -matching of their barcodes:

- matched intervals have endpoints within distance  $\leq \delta$ ,
- unmatched intervals have length  $\leq 2\delta$ .



# An interleaving morphism and its image

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \dots & \longrightarrow & M_s & \longrightarrow & M_t & \longrightarrow & M_u & \longrightarrow & \dots \\ & & \downarrow f_s & & \downarrow f_t & & \downarrow f_u & & \\ \dots & \longrightarrow & N_{s+\delta} & \longrightarrow & N_{t+\delta} & \longrightarrow & N_{u+\delta} & \longrightarrow & \dots \end{array}$$

# An interleaving morphism and its image

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \dots & \longrightarrow & M_s & \longrightarrow & M_t & \longrightarrow & M_u & \longrightarrow \dots \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \dots & \longrightarrow & \text{im } f_s & \longrightarrow & \text{im } f_t & \longrightarrow & \text{im } f_u & \longrightarrow \dots \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \dots & \longrightarrow & N_{s+\delta} & \longrightarrow & N_{t+\delta} & \longrightarrow & N_{u+\delta} & \longrightarrow \dots \end{array}$$


# Stability via induced matchings




# Stability via induced matchings




# Stability via induced matchings




# Stability via induced matchings




# Stability via induced matchings



# Stability via induced matchings



# Stability via induced matchings



# Homology inference

# Homology inference

Given: finite sample  $P \subset \Omega$  of unknown shape  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$

## Problem (Homology inference)

*Determine the homology  $H_*(\Omega)$ .*

# Homology inference

Given: finite sample  $P \subset \Omega$  of unknown shape  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$

## Problem (Homology inference)

*Determine the homology  $H_*(\Omega)$ .*

## Problem (Homological reconstruction)

*Construct a shape  $X$  with  $H_*(X) \cong H_*(\Omega)$ .*

# Homology inference

Given: finite sample  $P \subset \Omega$  of unknown shape  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$

## Problem (Homology inference)

*Determine the homology  $H_*(\Omega)$ .*

## Problem (Homological reconstruction)

*Construct a shape  $X$  with  $H_*(X) \cong H_*(\Omega)$ .*

Idea:

- approximate the shape by a thickening  $B_\delta(P)$  covering  $\Omega$

# Homology inference

Given: finite sample  $P \subset \Omega$  of unknown shape  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$

## Problem (Homology inference)

*Determine the homology  $H_*(\Omega)$ .*

## Problem (Homological reconstruction)

*Construct a shape  $X$  with  $H_*(X) \cong H_*(\Omega)$ .*

Idea:

- approximate the shape by a thickening  $B_\delta(P)$  covering  $\Omega$

Requires strong assumptions:


# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .




# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .




# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology reconstruction by thickening

Theorem (Niyogi, Smale, Weinberger 2006)

Let  $M$  be a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset M$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $M$ , and
- $\delta < \sqrt{3/20} \text{reach}(M)$ .

Then  $H_*(M) \cong H_*(B_{2\delta}(P))$ .





# Homology inference using persistence

Theorem (Cohen-Steiner, Edelsbrunner, Harer 2005)

Let  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $P \subset X$ ,  $\delta > 0$  be such that

- $B_\delta(P)$  covers  $X$ , and
- the inclusions  $X \hookrightarrow B_\delta(X) \hookrightarrow B_{2\delta}(X)$  preserve homology.

Then  $H_*(X) \cong \text{im } H_*(B_\delta(P) \hookrightarrow B_{2\delta}(P))$ .



# Homological realization

This motivates the *homological realization problem*:

## Problem

*Given a simplicial pair  $L \subseteq K$ , find  $X$  with  $L \subseteq X \subseteq K$  such that*

$$H_*(X) = \text{im } H_*(L \hookrightarrow K).$$



# Homological realization

This motivates the *homological realization problem*:

## Problem

Given a simplicial pair  $L \subseteq K$ , find  $X$  with  $L \subseteq X \subseteq K$  such that

$$H_*(X) = \text{im } H_*(L \hookrightarrow K).$$




# Homological realization

This motivates the *homological realization problem*:

## Problem

Given a simplicial pair  $L \subseteq K$ , find  $X$  with  $L \subseteq X \subseteq K$  such that

$$H_*(X) = \text{im } H_*(L \hookrightarrow K).$$



# Homological realization


This motivates the *homological realization problem*:

## Problem

Given a simplicial pair  $L \subseteq K$ , find  $X$  with  $L \subseteq X \subseteq K$  such that

$$H_*(X) = \text{im } H_*(L \hookrightarrow K).$$

This is not always possible:



# Homological realization


This motivates the *homological realization problem*:

## Problem

Given a simplicial pair  $L \subseteq K$ , find  $X$  with  $L \subseteq X \subseteq K$  such that

$$H_*(X) = \text{im } H_*(L \hookrightarrow K).$$

This is not always possible:



# Homological realization


This motivates the *homological realization problem*:

## Problem

Given a simplicial pair  $L \subseteq K$ , find  $X$  with  $L \subseteq X \subseteq K$  such that

$$H_*(X) = \text{im } H_*(L \hookrightarrow K).$$

This is not always possible:



# Homological realization


This motivates the *homological realization problem*:

## Problem

Given a simplicial pair  $L \subseteq K$ , find  $X$  with  $L \subseteq X \subseteq K$  such that

$$H_*(X) = \text{im } H_*(L \hookrightarrow K).$$

This is not always possible:



# Homological realization


This motivates the *homological realization problem*:

## Problem

Given a simplicial pair  $L \subseteq K$ , find  $X$  with  $L \subseteq X \subseteq K$  such that

$$H_*(X) = \text{im } H_*(L \hookrightarrow K).$$


This is not always possible:




Theorem (Attali, B, Devillers, Glisse, Lieutier 2013)

The homological realization problem is NP-hard, even in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

# Simplification





# Sublevel set simplification


Let  $F_{\leq t} = f^{-1}(-\infty, t]$  denote the  $t$ -sublevel set of  $f$ .

## Problem (Sublevel set simplification)


*Given a function  $f : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}, \delta > 0$ ,  
find a function  $g$  with  $\|g - f\|_\infty \leq \delta$  minimizing  $\dim H_*(G_{\leq t})$ .*

## Theorem (Attali, B, Devillers, Glisse, Lieutier 2013)

*Sublevel set simplification in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  is NP-hard.*







# Topological simplification of functions

Consider the following problem:

## Problem (Topological simplification)

*Given a function  $f$  and a real number  $\delta \geq 0$ ,  
find a function  $f_\delta$  subject to  $\|f_\delta - f\|_\infty \leq \delta$   
with the minimal number of critical points.*

# Topological simplification of functions

Consider the following problem:

## Problem (Topological simplification)

*Given a function  $f$  and a real number  $\delta \geq 0$ ,  
find a function  $f_\delta$  subject to  $\|f_\delta - f\|_\infty \leq \delta$   
with the minimal number of critical points.*

Persistent homology:

- Relates homology of different sublevel set
- Identifies pairs of critical points (birth and death of homological feature) and quantifies their *persistence*

# Topological simplification of functions

Consider the following problem:

## Problem (Topological simplification)

*Given a function  $f$  and a real number  $\delta \geq 0$ ,  
find a function  $f_\delta$  subject to  $\|f_\delta - f\|_\infty \leq \delta$   
with the minimal number of critical points.*

Persistent homology:

- Relates homology of different sublevel set
- Identifies pairs of critical points (birth and death of homological feature) and quantifies their *persistence*

(Discrete) Morse theory:

- Relates critical points to homology of sublevel sets
- Provides method for canceling pairs of critical points

# Persistence and discrete Morse theory

By stability of persistence barcodes:

## Proposition

*The intervals with persistence  $> 2\delta$  provide a lower bound on the number of critical points of any function  $g$  with  $\|g - f\|_\infty \leq \delta$ .*

# Persistence and discrete Morse theory

By stability of persistence barcodes:

## Proposition

*The intervals with persistence  $> 2\delta$  provide a lower bound on the number of critical points of any function  $g$  with  $\|g - f\|_\infty \leq \delta$ .*

## Theorem (B, Lange, Wardetzky, 2011)

*Let  $f$  be a function on a surface and let  $\delta > 0$ .*

*Construct a function  $f_\delta$  from  $f$  by canceling all persistence pairs with persistence  $\leq 2\delta$ .*

# Persistence and discrete Morse theory

By stability of persistence barcodes:

## Proposition

*The intervals with persistence  $> 2\delta$  provide a lower bound on the number of critical points of any function  $g$  with  $\|g - f\|_\infty \leq \delta$ .*

## Theorem (B, Lange, Wardetzky, 2011)

*Let  $f$  be a function on a surface and let  $\delta > 0$ .*

*Construct a function  $f_\delta$  from  $f$  by canceling all persistence pairs with persistence  $\leq 2\delta$ . Then  $f_\delta$  satisfies*

$$\|f_\delta - f\|_\infty \leq \delta$$

*and achieves the lower bound on the number of critical points.*

# Persistence and discrete Morse theory

By stability of persistence barcodes:

## Proposition

*The intervals with persistence  $> 2\delta$  provide a lower bound on the number of critical points of any function  $g$  with  $\|g - f\|_\infty \leq \delta$ .*

## Theorem (B, Lange, Wardetzky, 2011)

*Let  $f$  be a function on a surface and let  $\delta > 0$ .*

*Construct a function  $f_\delta$  from  $f$  by canceling all persistence pairs with persistence  $\leq 2\delta$ . Then  $f_\delta$  satisfies*

$$\|f_\delta - f\|_\infty \leq \delta$$

*and achieves the lower bound on the number of critical points.*

- Does not generalize to higher-dimensional manifolds!

# History

# When was persistent homology invented?

- [Edelsbrunner/Letscher/Zomorodian 2000]

# When was persistent homology invented?

- [Edelsbrunner/Letscher/Zomorodian 2000]
- [Robbins 1999]

# When was persistent homology invented?

- [Edelsbrunner/Letscher/Zomorodian 2000]
- [Robbins 1999]
- [Frosini 1990]

# When was persistent homology invented?

- [Edelsbrunner/Letscher/Zomorodian 2000]
- [Robbins 1999]
- [Frosini 1990]
- [Leray 1946]?

When was persistent homology invented first?

# When was persistent homology invented first?

ANNALS OF MATHEMATICS  
Vol. 41, No. 2, April, 1940

## RANK AND SPAN IN FUNCTIONAL TOPOLOGY

BY MARSTON MORSE

(Received August 9, 1939)

### 1. Introduction.

The analysis of functions  $F$  on metric spaces  $M$  of the type which appear in variational theories is made difficult by the fact that the critical limits, such as absolute minima, relative minima, minimax values etc., are in general infinite in number. These limits are associated with relative  $k$ -cycles of various dimensions and are classified as 0-limits, 1-limits etc. The number of  $k$ -limits suitably counted is called the  $k^{\text{th}}$  type number  $m_k$  of  $F$ . The theory seeks to establish relations between the numbers  $m_k$  and the connectivities  $p_k$  of  $M$ . The numbers  $p_k$  are finite in the most important applications. It is otherwise with the numbers  $m_k$ .

The theory has been able to proceed provided one of the following hypotheses is satisfied. The critical limits cluster at most at  $+\infty$ ; the critical points are isolated;<sup>1</sup> the problem is defined by analytic functions; the critical limits taken in their natural order are well-ordered. These conditions are not generally fulfilled. The generality of the theory rested upon the fact that the cases treated approximate in a certain sense the most general problems which it

# When was persistent homology invented first?

Web Images More... Sign in

Google Scholar 9 results (0.02 sec) My Citations ▾

All citations Rank and span in functional topology

Articles  Search within citing articles

Case law

My library

Exact homomorphism sequences in homology theory ed.ac.uk [PDF]

JL Kelley, E Pitcher - Annals of Mathematics, 1947 - JSTOR

The developments of this paper stem from the attempts of one of the authors to deduce relations between homology groups of a complex and homology groups of a complex which is its image under a simplicial map. Certain relations were deduced (see [EP 1] and [EP 2] ...)

Any time Cited by 46 Related articles All 3 versions Cite Save More

Since 2016

Since 2015

Since 2012

Custom range...

Sort by relevance Cited by 24 Related articles All 4 versions Cite Save More

Sort by date

include citations

Create alert

Unstable minimal surfaces of higher topological structure

M Morse, CB Tompkins - Duke Math. J., 1941 - projecteuclid.org

1. Introduction. We are concerned with extending the calculus of variations in the large to multiple integrals. The problem of the existence of minimal surfaces of unstable type contains many of the typical difficulties, especially those of a topological nature. Having studied this ...

Cited by 19 Related articles All 2 versions Cite Save

[PDF] Persistence in discrete Morse theory psu.edu [PDF]

U Bauer - 2011 - Citeseer

The goal of this thesis is to bring together two different theories about critical points of a scalar function and their relation to topology: Discrete Morse theory and Persistent

# When was persistent homology invented first?

BULLETIN (New Series) OF THE  
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY  
Volume 3, Number 3, November 1980

## MARSTON MORSE AND HIS MATHEMATICAL WORKS

BY RAOUL BOTT<sup>1</sup>

**1. Introduction.** Marston Morse was born in 1892, so that he was 33 years old when in 1925 his paper *Relations between the critical points of a real-valued function of n independent variables* appeared in the Transactions of the American Mathematical Society. Thus Morse grew to maturity just at the time when the subject of Analysis Situs was being shaped by such masters<sup>2</sup> as Poincaré, Veblen, L. E. J. Brouwer, G. D. Birkhoff, Lefschetz and Alexander, and it was Morse's genius and destiny to discover one of the most beautiful and far-reaching relations between this fledgling and Analysis; a relation which is now known as *Morse Theory*.

In retrospect all great ideas take on a certain simplicity and inevitability, partly because they shape the whole subsequent development of the subject. And so to us, today, Morse Theory seems natural and inevitable. However one only has to glance at these early papers to see what a tour de force it was in the 1920's to go from the mini-max principle of Birkhoff to the Morse inequalities, let alone extend these inequalities to function spaces, so that by the early 30's Morse could establish the theorem that for any Riemann

# When was persistent homology invented first?

inequalities between the dimensions of the  $H_i$  and those of  $H(A_i)$ . Thus the Morse inequalities already reflect a certain part of the “Spectral Sequence magic”, and a modern and tremendously general account of Morse’s work on rank and span in the framework of Leray’s theory was developed by Deheuvels [D] in the 50’s.

Unfortunately both Morse’s and Deheuvel’s papers are not easy reading. On the other hand there is no question in my mind that the papers [36] and [44] constitute another tour de force by Morse. Let me therefore illustrate rather than explain some of the ideas of the rank and span theory in a very simple and tame example.

In the figure which follows I have drawn a homeomorph of  $M = S^1$  in the plane, and I will be studying the height function  $F = y$  on  $M$ .




FIGURE 8


The values  $a$  where  $H(a, a^-) \neq 0$  are indicated on the left, and correspond

# Morse's functional topology


Key aspects:

- early precursor of persistence and spectral sequences
- uses Vietoris homology with field coefficients
- applies to a broad class of functions on metric spaces (not necessarily continuous)
- inclusions of sublevel sets have finite rank homology (*q-tame* persistent homology)
- focus on controlled behavior in pathological cases


## Motivation and application: minimal surfaces



(a)




(b)



(c)




(from Dierkes et al.: Minimal Surfaces, Springer 2010)

# Motivation and application: minimal surfaces




(from Dierkes et al.: Minimal Surfaces, Springer 2010)

## Motivation and application: minimal surfaces



...



(from Dierkes et al.: Minimal Surfaces, Springer 2010)

# Existence of unstable minimal surfaces


Using persistent homology:

- Number of  $\epsilon$ -persistent critical points (minimal surfaces) is finite for any  $\epsilon > 0$
- Morse inequalities for  $\epsilon$ -persistent critical points

Theorem (Morse, Tompkins 1939)

*There is a  $C_1$  curve bounding an unstable minimal surface (an index 1 critical point of the area functional).*

Thanks for your attention!



Thanks for your attention!

