

# ON APPROXIMATION OF 2D PERSISTENCE MODULES BY INTERVAL-DECOMPOSABLES

HIDETO ASASHIBA, EMERSON G. ESCOLAR, KEN NAKASHIMA, AND MICHIO YOSHIWAKI

ABSTRACT. In this work, we propose a new invariant for 2D persistence modules called the compressed multiplicity and show that it generalizes the notions of the dimension vector and the rank invariant. In addition, we propose an “interval-decomposable approximation”  $\delta^*(M)$  of a 2D persistence module  $M$ . In the case that  $M$  is interval-decomposable, we show that  $\delta^*(M) = M$ . Furthermore, even for representations  $M$  not necessarily interval-decomposable,  $\delta^*(M)$  preserves the dimension vector and the rank invariant of  $M$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Persistent homology [7, 6] is one of the main tools in the rapidly growing field of topological data analysis. Given a filtration – a one-parameter increasing sequence of spaces – persistent homology captures the persistence of topological features such as connected components, holes, voids, etc. in the filtration. Here, the persistence of features is quantified by birth and death parameter values. This can be summarized compactly by the so-called persistence diagram, which is the multiset of birth-death pairs drawn on the plane with multiplicity.

One way to deal with multiparametric data is to use multidimensional persistence [4]. However, multidimensional persistence presents theoretical difficulties that hinder the construction of a persistence diagram as in one-dimensional persistence. In particular, there is no complete discrete invariant that captures all isomorphism classes of indecomposable persistence modules [4]. Another way of expressing this difficulty is that the equioriented  $m \times n$  commutative grid  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  of sufficiently large size is of wild representation type.

One way to avoid this problem is to consider only a restricted class of representations. Inspired by 1D persistence, there has been much interest in the so-called interval-decomposable representations, which are direct sums of interval representations (Definition 2.6). The work [1] studied this family of representations and provided a criterion to determine whether or not a given persistence module is interval-decomposable.

It is hoped that most persistence modules coming from “real-world data” contain very few or indeed no non-interval summands. Let us consider the silica glass example computed in [8], which compares the atomic configuration of silica glass with its configuration after physical pressurization. The underlying bound quiver is the commutative ladder  $CL_3(fb)$ , with only two non-interval indecomposable representations given by dimension vectors  $(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix})$  and  $(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix})$ . Then, the numerical result in [8] has  $(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix})$  appearing with only multiplicity 1 and  $(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix})$  with multiplicity 0, in an example with more than ten thousand indecomposable summands. While in the slightly different setting of a non-equioriented commutative ladder, this provides an example where the non-interval part is minute compared to the interval-decomposable part.

On the other hand, the work [3] argues via a geometric example that the non-interval indecomposables may contain important information that should not be ignored, and that even in relatively simple geometric point clouds embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , indecomposable summands with arbitrarily large dimension (as a vector space) may be present. These large indecomposable summands are clearly not interval.

In this work, we take neither position, but instead propose a method to replace an arbitrary representation  $M \in \text{rep } \vec{G}_{m,n}$  by an object  $\delta^*(M)$  (Definition 5.8) that is interval-decomposable. To construct  $\delta^*(M)$ , we first define what we call the *compressed multiplicity* of  $M$  by a masking and compression operation that picks up information in  $M$  restricted to intervals.

We show that the compressed multiplicity in fact generalizes the notions of dimension vector (Proposition 4.15) and rank invariant (Proposition 4.13). Furthermore, we exhibit representations

---

This work is partially supported by Japan Science and Technology Agency CREST Mathematics (15656429) and Osaka City University Advanced Mathematical Institute (MEXT Joint Usage/Research Center on Mathematics and Theoretical Physics).

that can be distinguished by their compressed multiplicities but not by their rank invariants. We thus propose the compressed multiplicity as a new, finer invariant for 2D persistence modules. Moreover, we show that for interval-decomposable representations, the multiplicity can be recovered from the compressed multiplicity (Theorem 4.20). In the equioriented commutative ladder [8] case ( $\vec{G}_{2,n}$ ), the masking and compression operation reduces the underlying bound quiver to a representation-finite bound quiver. This enables easy computation of the compressed multiplicity using preexisting algorithms.

Then, the object  $\delta^*(M)$  is defined using Möbius inversion of the compressed multiplicity of  $M$ . In the case that  $M$  is interval-decomposable, it follows that  $\delta^*(M) = M$  (Theorem 5.9). Furthermore, we show that even for representations  $M$  not necessarily interval-decomposable,  $\delta^*(M)$  preserves the dimension vector and the rank invariant of  $M$  (Corollary 5.13, Theorem 5.11). In this sense, we think of  $\delta^*(M)$  as an interval-decomposable “approximation” of  $M$ .

We organize this work as follows. In Section 2, we review the necessary background from representation theory and poset theory, and then, in Section 3, we study the poset of interval representations. In Section 4, we introduce our concept of compressed multiplicities and study its properties. In Section 5, we give the construction of  $\delta^*(M)$  from  $M$  via Möbius inversion of the compressed multiplicity and give some results about its properties.

We note that our construction of  $\delta^*(M)$  can be seen as a generalization of the well-known fact that the multiplicities of interval summands in 1D persistence modules can be obtained via an application of inclusion-exclusion on the ranks of the linear maps (see for example [6, 5]). In our setting, we obtain a new multiplicity function from which we build the approximating object  $\delta^*(M)$ .

The work [11] also uses the idea of Möbius inversion in order to define generalized persistence diagrams, but only in the setting of persistence modules over  $(\mathbb{R}, \leq)$  [11, Definition 2.1]. In this work, our concept of interval approximation can also be seen as an application of Möbius inversion for the more general setting of the 2D commutative grid. However, we do not consider “generalized persistence diagrams” in the sense of [11], but rather restrict our attention to the poset of interval subquivers as we are motivated by their use in practical computation and applications.

On the other hand, the work [10] defines a concept of a “persistence diagram” for  $n$ D persistence modules by using a Möbius inversion in a similar way as we do, and shows a bottleneck stability result. They consider only (hyper)rectangles instead of intervals as the domain for their multiplicity functions and use a partial order specifically tailored for proving bottleneck stability. We contrast this with our focus on approximation in terms of preserving algebraic information such as the dimension vector and the rank invariant.

## 2. BACKGROUND

**2.1. Representation Theory.** A *quiver*  $Q$  is a quadruple  $(Q_0, Q_1, s, t)$  of sets  $Q_0, Q_1$  of vertices and arrows, respectively and maps  $s, t : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$  that give the source and target vertices, respectively, of the arrows. We denote an arrow  $\alpha$  with source  $s(\alpha) = x$  and target  $t(\alpha) = y$  by  $\alpha : x \rightarrow y$ . In this paper, all quivers  $Q$  are assumed to be *finite*, namely,  $Q_0$  and  $Q_1$  are finite.

Throughout this work, we fix a field  $K$ . Let  $Q$  be a quiver. A *representation*  $V$  of  $Q$  (over  $K$ ) is a family  $(V(x), V(\alpha))$  of a vector space  $V(x)$  for each vertex  $x \in Q_0$  and a linear map  $V(\alpha) : V(x) \rightarrow V(y)$  for each arrow  $\alpha : x \rightarrow y$  in  $Q_1$ .

The *dimension vector*  $\underline{\dim}(V)$  of a representation  $V$  of  $Q$  is defined as the tuple

$$\underline{\dim}(V) := (\dim V(x))_{x \in Q_0}.$$

It is customary to display the dimension vector by writing each number  $\dim V(x)$  relative to where the vertex  $x$  is located on an illustration of the quiver  $Q$ . The *dimension* of  $V$  is  $\dim V := \sum_{x \in Q_0} \dim V(x)$ . A representation  $V$  of  $Q$  is said to be *finite-dimensional* if  $\dim V < \infty$ . In this work, by representation we mean finite-dimensional representation.

Let  $V$  and  $W$  be representations of  $Q$ . A morphism  $f : V \rightarrow W$  from  $V$  to  $W$  is a family  $(f_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  of linear maps  $f_x : V(x) \rightarrow W(x)$  such that the following diagram commutes for each arrow  $\alpha : x \rightarrow y$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V(x) & \xrightarrow{f_x} & W(x) \\ V(\alpha) \downarrow & & \downarrow W(\alpha) \\ V(y) & \xrightarrow{f_y} & W(y). \end{array}$$

The composition of morphisms  $f = (f_x)_{x \in Q_0} : V \rightarrow W$  and  $g = (g_x)_{x \in Q_0} : U \rightarrow V$  is defined in the obvious way:  $f \circ g : U \rightarrow W$  is given by  $(f \circ g)_x = f_x \circ g_x$ . We denote by  $\text{rep } Q$  the category of finite-dimensional representations of  $Q$  together with these morphisms and this composition.

For each vertex  $i \in Q_0$ , we have the *path of length 0 at  $i$* , which is denoted by  $e_i$ . For a given positive integer  $n$ , a *path  $\mu$  of length  $n$*  is a sequence  $\alpha_n \cdots \alpha_1$  of arrows  $\alpha_i$  such that  $t(\alpha_i) = s(\alpha_{i+1})$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ . The source vertex of  $\mu$  is  $s(\alpha_1)$ , while its target vertex is  $t(\alpha_n)$ . An  $m$ -tuple  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m$  of paths is said to be *parallel* if they all have the same source vertex and the same target vertex. A *relation  $\rho$*  in  $Q$  is a formal sum  $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \mu_i$  of parallel paths  $\mu_i$  of length at least 2 with  $t_i \in K$ . A pair  $(Q, R)$  of a quiver  $Q$  and a set  $R$  of relations is called a *bound quiver*.

A relation  $\rho$  is called a *commutativity relation* if  $\rho = \mu_1 - \mu_2$  for some two parallel paths  $\mu_1, \mu_2$ . If  $R$  is the set of all possible commutative relations in  $Q$ ,  $(Q, R)$  is called a *quiver with full commutativity relations*.

Let  $(Q, R)$  be a bound quiver and let  $V$  be a representation of  $Q$ . Put  $V(\mu) := V(\alpha_n) \circ \cdots \circ V(\alpha_1)$  for any path  $\mu = \alpha_n \cdots \alpha_1$  of length  $n \geq 1$ . Then,  $V \in \text{rep } Q$  is said to be a representation of  $(Q, R)$  if  $V(\rho) := \sum_{i=1}^m t_i V(\mu_i) = 0$  for any  $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \mu_i \in R$ . We denote by  $\text{rep}(Q, R)$  the full subcategory of  $\text{rep } Q$  consisting of representations of  $(Q, R)$ .

A fundamental result in representation theory is the Krull-Schmidt theorem.

**Theorem 2.1** (Krull-Schmidt). *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a complete set of representatives of isoclasses of indecomposable representations of a bound quiver  $(Q, R)$ . For each representation  $M$  of  $(Q, R)$ , there exists a unique function  $d_M : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that*

$$M \cong \bigoplus_{L \in \mathcal{L}} L^{d_M(L)}.$$

The function  $d_M$  is called the *multiplicity function* of  $M$ , and the value  $d_M(L)$  the *multiplicity* of the indecomposable  $L$  in  $M$ .

As an example, let us consider the equioriented  $A_n$ -type quiver:

$$\vec{A}_n : 1 \longrightarrow 2 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow n .$$

It is known that in this case,  $\mathcal{L}$  is the set  $\{\mathbb{I}[b, d]\}_{1 \leq b \leq d \leq n}$  of the so-called *interval representations*  $\mathbb{I}[b, d]$  of  $\vec{A}_n$  [9]. The interval representation  $\mathbb{I}[b, d]$  is


$$\mathbb{I}[b, d] : 0 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow 0 \xrightarrow{b\text{-th}} K \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow \cdots \xrightarrow{d\text{-th}} K \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow 0,$$

which has the vector space  $\mathbb{I}[b, d](i) = K$  at the vertices  $i$  with  $b \leq i \leq d$ , and 0 elsewhere, and where the maps between the neighboring vector spaces  $K$  are identity maps and zero elsewhere. In the context of persistent homology [7, 6], a persistence module can be viewed as a representation of  $\vec{A}_n$ , and the multiplicity function  $d_M$  encodes the information of the persistence diagram.

The underlying bound quiver we study in this work is the equioriented commutative grid  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  defined below. Then, we consider 2D persistence modules as representations of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ .

**Definition 2.2** (Equioriented commutative grid). Let  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . The bound quiver  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  is defined to be the 2D grid of size  $m \times n$  with all horizontal arrows in the same direction and all vertical arrows in the same direction, together with full commutativity relations. It is also called the *equioriented commutative grid* of size  $m \times n$ .

For example, the equioriented  $2 \times 4$  commutative grid  $\vec{G}_{2,4}$  is the quiver



with full commutativity relations.

As mentioned in the introduction, for large enough size,  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  is of wild representation type. That is,  $\mathcal{L}$  can be very complicated and impossible to classify. Instead, we consider a restricted class of representations, the interval-decomposable representations. Following the notation in [1], we first recall the definition of interval subquivers and interval representations for general bound quivers.

**Definition 2.3** (Interval subquiver).

- (1) Let  $Q$  be a quiver. A full subquiver  $Q'$  of  $Q$  is said to be *convex* in  $Q$  if and only if for all vertices  $x, y \in Q'_0$  and all vertices  $z \in Q_0$ , the existence of paths  $x$  to  $z$  and  $z$  to  $y$  in  $Q$  imply that  $z \in Q'_0$ .
- (2) A quiver  $Q$  is said to be *connected* if it is connected as an “undirected graph”,
- (3) A subquiver  $Q'$  of  $Q$  is said to be an *interval subquiver* of  $Q$  if  $Q'$  is convex (in  $Q$ ) and connected.

For any two full subquivers  $Q', Q''$  of  $Q$ , the intersection  $Q' \cap Q''$  (respectively, the union  $Q' \cup Q''$ ) of  $Q'$  and  $Q''$  is defined as the full subquiver of  $Q$  having the vertex set  $Q'_0 \cap Q''_0$  (respectively,  $Q'_0 \cup Q''_0$ ).

Suppose that  $Q'$  and  $Q''$  are interval subquivers of  $Q$  with  $Q'_0 \cap Q''_0 \neq \emptyset$ . Note that  $Q' \cap Q''$  may not be connected, in general, and so may not be an interval. However, the following statement can be checked.


**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $Q'$  and  $Q''$  be interval subquivers of  $Q$ . Then,  $Q' \cap Q''$  is a disjoint union of interval subquivers of  $Q$ .*

*Proof.* To see this, we write  $Q' \cap Q''$  as a disjoint union of its connected components  $C_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and show that each connected component  $C_i$  is actually an interval subquiver of  $Q$ . It suffices to check that  $C_i$  is convex. Let  $x, y$  be vertices of  $C_i$  and  $z$  a vertex of  $Q$ . If there exist paths  $x$  to  $z$  and  $z$  to  $y$  in  $Q$ , then  $z$  is a vertex of  $Q'$  and  $Q''$  since  $Q'$  and  $Q''$  are convex. Then  $z$  is a vertex of a connected component  $C_j$  for some  $j$ . If  $j \neq i$ , then there are no paths from  $z$  to any vertex of  $C_i$  since  $C_i$  and  $C_j$  are disjoint. This is a contradiction. Thus we have  $j = i$  and so  $C_i$  is convex.  $\square$

On the other hand,  $Q' \cup Q''$  is not an interval subquiver in general, even if  $Q'$  and  $Q''$  are interval subquivers of  $Q$  with  $Q'_0 \cap Q''_0 \neq \emptyset$ . While connectedness is guaranteed since  $Q'_0 \cap Q''_0 \neq \emptyset$ , convexity may fail to hold.

**Definition 2.5.** For  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , define  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  to be the set of all nonempty interval subquivers of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ .

It is known that the interval subquivers of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  take on a distinctive “staircase” shape. See [1]. Below is an example of an interval subquiver of  $\vec{G}_{4,6}$ .



Recall that for  $M$  a representation of a bound quiver  $(Q, R)$ , the *support*  $\text{supp } M$  of  $M$  is the full subquiver of  $Q$  with vertices  $\{i \in Q \mid M(i) \neq 0\}$ . Finally, we are ready to recall the following generalization of interval representations of  $\vec{A}_n$ .

**Definition 2.6** (Interval representations). A representation  $V \in \text{rep}(Q, R)$  is said to be an *interval representation* if

- $\dim V(x) \leq 1$  for each vertex  $x$  of  $Q$ ,
- its support  $\text{supp}(V)$  is an interval of  $Q$ , and
- for all arrows  $\alpha \in \text{supp}(V)$ ,  $V(\alpha)$  is an identity map.

Note that by this definition, an interval representation  $V$  is determined (up to isomorphism) by its support  $\text{supp } V$ . If  $I$  is an interval subquiver, the corresponding interval representation with support equal to  $I$  is denoted by  $V_I$ . For example, the interval subquiver  $I$  of  $\vec{G}_{4,6}$  given by the quiver (2.1) is the support of  $V_I$  with dimension vector (3.1).

A representation  $M \in \text{rep}(Q, R)$  is said to be *interval-decomposable* if it can be expressed as a direct sum of interval representations. Equivalently, by Theorem 2.1,  $M$  is interval-decomposable if and only if  $d_M(L) = 0$  for all non-interval indecomposables  $L$ .

**2.2. Posets and Lattices.** In this subsection, we recall some basic definitions from poset and lattice theory. See [13] for more details.

Recall that a poset (partially ordered set)  $(P, \leq)$  is a set  $P$  with partial order  $\leq$ . A poset  $P$  is said to be *finite* if  $P$  is finite as a set. Throughout this work, all posets are assumed to be finite.

**Definition 2.7.** Let  $P$  be a poset and  $x, y \in P$ . The *segment*  $[x, y]$  between  $x$  and  $y$  is defined to be

$$[x, y] := \{z \in P \mid x \leq z \leq y\}$$

and define  $\text{Seg}(P)$  to be the set of all segments of  $P$ . The *open segment*  $(x, y)$  between  $x$  and  $y$  is defined to be

$$(x, y) := \{z \in P \mid x < z < y\}.$$

It is clear that segments and open segments form subposets of  $P$ . We say that  $y$  *covers*  $x$  if  $x < y$  and  $(x, y) = \emptyset$ . The set of the elements covering  $x$  is denoted by  $\text{Cov}(x)$ .

We note that a segment  $[x, y]$  is also called an interval in the literature, but we do not use this term this to avoid confusion.

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $P$  be a poset and  $S$  a subset of  $P$ .

- (1) An element  $u \in P$  is said to be an *upper bound* of  $S$  if  $s \leq u$  for each  $s \in S$ . The set of upper bounds of  $S$  is denoted by  $U(S)$ .
- (2) An element  $x \in U(S)$  is said to be the *join* of  $S$  if  $x \leq u$  for each  $u \in U(S)$ . Note that the join of  $S$  is unique if it exists, and is denoted by  $\bigvee S$ . When  $S = \{a, b\}$ , then the join of  $S$  is denoted by  $a \vee b$ .

Dually,

- (3) An element  $l \in P$  is said to be a *lower bound* of  $S$  if  $l \leq s$  for each  $s \in S$ . The set of lower bounds of  $S$  is denoted by  $L(S)$ .
- (4) An element  $x \in L(S)$  is said to be the *meet* of  $S$  if  $l \leq x$  for each  $l \in L(S)$ . Note that the meet of  $S$  is unique if it exists, and is denoted by  $\bigwedge S$ . When  $S = \{a, b\}$ , then the meet of  $S$  is denoted by  $a \wedge b$ .

**Definition 2.9.** Let  $P$  be a poset.

- (1)  $P$  is called a *join-semilattice* (respectively, *meet-semilattice*) if each two-element subset  $\{a, b\} \subseteq P$  has a join (respectively, meet).
- (2)  $P$  is called a *lattice* if  $P$  is a join-semilattice and a meet-semilattice.
- (3) When  $P$  is a lattice,  $P$  is said to be *distributive* if for all  $x, y, z \in P$ ,

$$x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z)$$

or equivalently, if for all  $x, y, z \in P$ ,

$$x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z).$$

For a join-semilattice  $P$  and  $a, b, c \in P$ , note that  $(a \vee b) \vee c = \bigvee \{a, b, c\} = a \vee (b \vee c)$ . Thus the binary operation  $\vee$  satisfies associativity, and hence generalized associativity. Therefore in general, if  $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subseteq P$ , then

$$x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \dots \vee x_n$$

is well-defined and equal to  $\bigvee S$ . A similar remark holds for  $\bigwedge S$  in meet-semilattices.

The following fact is well-known and can be checked easily.

**Proposition 2.10.** *If  $P$  is a finite join-semilattice (meet-semilattice) possessing a lower bound (upper bound), then  $P$  is a lattice.*

We will see later that the poset of intervals does not form a lattice globally, so we provide the following "local" definitions.

**Definition 2.11.**

- (1) A poset  $P$  is called a *local lattice* if for any  $x, y \in P$ , the segment  $[x, y]$  is a lattice.
- (2) A local lattice  $P$  is said to be *locally distributive* if for any  $x, y \in P$ , the segment  $[x, y]$  is a distributive lattice.

**2.3. Möbius Functions.** In this subsection, we review some basic facts about Möbius functions. We refer the reader again to [13] for more details.

Let  $F$  be a field of characteristic zero, and  $P$  a poset. Recall that  $\text{Seg}(P)$  is the set of segments of  $P$ . The *incidence algebra* of  $P$  over  $F$  is the set of functions from  $\text{Seg}(P)$  to  $F$ , together with a "pointwise"  $+$  operation, and convolution as the multiplication  $*$  operation. More precisely, for  $f, g : \text{Seg}(P) \rightarrow F$ , define  $f * g : \text{Seg}(P) \rightarrow F$  by

$$(f * g)([x, y]) := \sum_{x \leq z \leq y} f([x, z])g([z, y]).$$

It can be shown that the incidence algebra of  $P$  over  $F$  is indeed a  $F$ -algebra, which we denote by  $I(P)$ . Its identity element is the delta function  $\delta : \text{Seg}(P) \rightarrow F$  with

$$\delta([x, y]) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Definition 2.12** (Zeta and Möbius function). The *zeta function*  $\zeta : \text{Seg}(P) \rightarrow F$  is the function with constant value  $1_K$ . Then, it can be shown that  $\zeta$  is an invertible element of  $I(P)$ , with inverse called the *Möbius function*  $\mu$ .

Now, let  $F^P$  be the set of all functions  $P \rightarrow F$ . Note that  $F^P$  has natural  $F$ -vector space structure by pointwise addition and scalar multiplication of functions. The incidence algebra  $I(P)$  acts on  $F^P$  from the left by the following. For each  $f \in F^P$ ,  $\phi \in I(P)$ , define  $\phi f \in F^P$  by

$$(\phi f)(x) := \sum_{x \leq y} \phi([x, y])f(y).$$

It can be checked that  $F^P$  is a left  $I(P)$  module with this left action. For example, the computation

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi(\phi f))(x) &= \sum_{x \leq y} \psi([x, y])(\phi f)(y) \\ &= \sum_{x \leq y} \psi([x, y]) \sum_{y \leq z} \phi([y, z])f(z) \\ &= \sum_{x \leq z} \sum_{x \leq y \leq z} \psi([x, y])\phi([y, z])f(z) \\ &= \sum_{x \leq z} (\psi * \phi)([x, z])f(z) \\ &= [(\psi * \phi)f](x) \end{aligned}$$

shows that this action is compatible with the multiplication (convolution) in  $I(P)$ .

### 3. LATTICE OF INTERVALS

In this section, we study the set of isomorphism classes of interval representations for a fixed equioriented commutative 2D grid  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ . Note that an interval representation is uniquely defined (up to isomorphism) by its support, and thus it suffices to consider the set of interval subquivers  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ .

First, we start with the following easy observation.

**Proposition 3.1.** *With the order  $\leq$  on  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  defined by  $I \leq I' \iff I \subseteq I'$ ,  $(\mathbb{I}_{m,n}, \leq)$  is a poset.*

*Proof.* Trivial.  $\square$

By Proposition 4.1 in [1], each element  $I$  of  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  has a “staircase” form, which was denoted by:

$$I = \bigsqcup_{i=s}^t [b_i, d_i]_i$$

for some integers  $1 \leq s \leq t \leq m$  and some integers  $1 \leq b_i \leq d_i \leq n$  for each  $s \leq i \leq t$  such that  $b_{i+1} \leq b_i \leq d_{i+1} \leq d_i$  for any  $i \in \{s, \dots, t-1\}$ . In this notation, each  $[b_i, d_i]_i$  is the “slice” of the staircase at height  $i$ . For example, the staircase

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

of  $\vec{G}_{4,6}$  corresponds to  $[5, 6]_1 \sqcup [3, 5]_2 \sqcup [3, 4]_3 \sqcup [2, 4]_4$ . In general, the interval  $I = \bigsqcup_{i=s}^t [b_i, d_i]_i$  means that  $I$  has vertices

$$I_0 = \{(i, x) \mid s \leq i \leq t, b_i \leq x \leq d_i\}.$$

**Example 3.2.** For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and any interval  $I = [b_1, d_1]_1 \sqcup [b_2, d_2]_2 \in \mathbb{I}_{2,n}$ ,  $\#\text{Cov}(I) \leq 4$ . Indeed, any cover of  $I$  takes on one of the following forms:

$$\begin{aligned} &[b_1 - 1, d_1]_1 \sqcup [b_2, d_2]_2, \\ &[b_1, d_1 + 1]_1 \sqcup [b_2, d_2]_2, \\ &[b_1, d_1]_1 \sqcup [b_2 - 1, d_2]_2, \text{ or} \\ &[b_1, d_1]_1 \sqcup [b_2, d_2 + 1]_2. \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 3.3.** *The poset  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  is a local lattice.*

*Proof.* Let  $I, J$  be an intervals of  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  with  $I \leq J$ . We show that the segment  $[I, J]$  is a lattice.

Let  $J_1, J_2 \in [I, J]$ . Then, by Lemma 2.4, the intersection  $J_1 \cap J_2$  is equal to a disjoint union of intervals  $C_i: \bigsqcup_{i=1}^l C_i$ . In this setting, there exists a unique  $j$  such that  $C_j$  contains  $I$ . Then the meet  $J_1 \wedge J_2$  of  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  over  $I$  is exactly the interval  $C_j$ . Proposition 2.10 implies that the segment  $[I, J]$  is a lattice.  $\square$

Let  $I$  be an interval and  $J_1, J_2 \in U(I)$ . It is immediate from the definition that the join  $J_1 \vee J_2$  over  $I$  is the minimum interval containing  $J_1 \cup J_2$ .

**Example 3.4.** Let  $I = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  be an interval of  $\mathbb{I}_{2,3}$ . The intervals  $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $J' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  in  $U(I)$  have join  $J \vee J' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ .

While we have seen in Proposition 3.3 that  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  is a local lattice, it is not a lattice as a whole, nor is it locally distributive.

**Remark 3.5.** In general, the meet and join is ill-defined. For example, let  $J = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $J' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  be intervals in  $\mathbb{I}_{2,3}$ . We note that  $J \cap J' = \emptyset$ , so that there is no  $I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  with  $J, J' \in U(I)$ . Then,  $X_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $X_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  are both minimal among intervals containing both  $J$  and  $J'$ . Thus,  $J \vee J'$ , which is supposed to be the minimum interval containing  $J \cup J'$ , is not well-defined. The poset  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  is not a lattice, in general.

**Remark 3.6.** In general, the local lattice  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  is not locally distributive. Indeed, let  $I = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $J = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  be intervals of  $\mathbb{I}_{2,4}$ . Moreover, let  $I_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $I_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , and  $I_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  be intervals of the segment  $[I, J]$ . Then we compute  $I_1 \vee (I_2 \wedge I_3) = I_1$  and  $(I_1 \vee I_2) \wedge (I_1 \vee I_3) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \neq I_1$ .

#### 4. COMPRESSION AND COMPRESSED MULTIPLICITIES

In this section, we present the underlying mechanism for an “interval-approximation” that we define and study in Section 5. Here, we define compression functors based on certain essential vertices. These compression functors then lead to what we call compressed multiplicities. We show that the well-known dimension vector and rank invariant are in fact special cases of compressed multiplicities. Furthermore, we show that for interval-decomposable representations, the true multiplicity information can be recovered from the compressed multiplicities.


**4.1. Essential Vertices.** First, we define three types of “essential vertices”. Note that the theory could be generalized to abstractly defined sets of essential vertices, but this seems like an unnecessary generalization.

Recall that a vertex  $x$  is said to be a *source* if there are no arrows  $\alpha$  with target  $t(\alpha) = x$ , and is said to be a *sink* if there are no arrows  $\alpha$  with source  $s(\alpha) = x$ .

**Definition 4.1** (Source-sink-essential vertices). Let  $I$  be an interval subquiver of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ . A vertex  $x \in I_0$  is said to be *source-sink-essential* (*ss-essential*) if  $x$  is a source or a sink in  $I$ .

The set of ss-essential vertices of  $I$  will be denoted by  $I_0^{\text{ss}}$ .

**Example 4.2.** In the following interval subquiver  $I$  in  $\vec{G}_{6,4}$ :



the vertices denoted by  $\circledast$  are ss-essential vertices of  $I$ .


**Lemma 4.3.** Let  $I, J$  be intervals of  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ . Assume that  $I_0^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_0$ . Then we have  $I \leq J$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in I_0$ . Then, there is a source  $y$ , a sink  $z$ , and a path  $\mu$  in  $I$  from  $y$  to  $z$  such that  $\mu$  passes through  $x$ . Since  $y, z \in I_0^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_0$  and  $J$  is convex, we have  $x \in J_0$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Definition 4.4** (Corner-complete-essential vertices). Let  $I$  be an interval subquiver of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ . A vertex  $x \in I_0$  is said to be *corner-complete-essential* (*cc-essential*) if  $x \in (\text{pr}_1 I_0^{\text{ss}} \times \text{pr}_2 I_0^{\text{ss}}) \cap I_0$ , where  $\text{pr}_i: \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is the projection map to the  $i$ -th axis.

The set of cc-essential vertices of  $I$  is denoted by  $I_0^{\text{cc}}$ .

**Example 4.5.** For the interval subquiver  $I$  used in Example 4.2:



the vertices denoted by  $\circledast$  are cc-essential vertices of  $I$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** Let  $I, J$  be intervals of  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ . Assume that  $I_0^{cc} \subseteq J_0$ . Then we have  $I \leq J$ .

*Proof.* Since  $I_0^{ss} \subseteq I_0^{cc} \subseteq J_0$ , we have  $I \leq J$  by Lemma 4.3.  $\square$

**4.2. Compression.** In this subsection, we treat both types of essential vertices in parallel to define two types of compression of representations of the equioriented 2D commutative grid. In the previous subsection, we defined the sets of essential vertices  $I_0^{ss}$  and  $I_0^{cc}$ . First, let us consider the full subcategories they induce.

**Definition 4.7** (ss-compressed category and cc-compressed category). Let  $I$  be an interval subquiver of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  and  $E$  be the set of all ss-essential vertices (or cc-essential vertices, respectively) of  $I$ . Moreover, let  $K\vec{G}_{m,n}$  be the linearization of the path category of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ .

The *ss-compressed category*  $I^{ss}$  (resp. *cc-compressed category*  $I^{cc}$ ) of  $I$  is the full subcategory of  $K\vec{G}_{m,n}$  with set of objects  $E$ .

For completeness, we also introduce the following concept, where we take all vertices of  $I$  to be essential.


**Definition 4.8** (compressed category). The *compressed category*  $I^{\text{tot}}$  is the full subcategory of  $K\vec{G}_{m,n}$  consisting of all vertices of  $I$ .

**Remark 4.9.** For an interval  $I$ , we distinguish the following similar but different notions related to  $I$ :  $I$  itself as a full subquiver of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ ,  $V_I$  the representation of  $K\vec{G}_{m,n}$  with support  $I$ , and  $I^{\text{tot}}$  as the full subcategory of  $K\vec{G}_{m,n}$  with objects the vertices of  $I$ .


We note that the bound quiver of  $I^{\text{tot}}$  is the quiver  $(I, R)$  with full commutativity relations. The ss-compressed category or cc-compressed category can also be expressed as a bound quiver, and we identify  $\text{rep}(Q^*, R^*) \cong \text{rep } I^*$ , where  $(Q^*, R^*)$  is the bound quiver for  $I^*$  for  $*$  = ss, cc, tot.

Throughout the rest of this work, we shall use the symbol ‘\*’ to stand for either ‘ss’, ‘cc’ or ‘tot’ for statements that apply to all three cases as long as it does not cause any confusion.

**Example 4.10.** For the interval subquiver  $I$  in Example 4.2, the compressed categories (displayed as bound quivers) are the following:




and





while




**Definition 4.11** (Compression functor). Let  $I$  be an interval subquiver of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  and let  $\iota_I^{\text{ss}} : I^{\text{ss}} \hookrightarrow K\vec{G}_{m,n}$  (resp.,  $\iota_I^{\text{cc}} : I^{\text{cc}} \hookrightarrow K\vec{G}_{m,n}$ , resp.,  $\iota_I^{\text{tot}} : I^{\text{tot}} \hookrightarrow K\vec{G}_{m,n}$ ) be the inclusion functor into the equioriented 2D commutative grid.

The *ss-compression functor*  $\text{Comp}_I^{\text{ss}}(-) : \text{rep } K\vec{G}_{m,n} \rightarrow \text{rep } I^{\text{ss}}$  (the *cc-compression functor*  $\text{Comp}_I^{\text{cc}}(-)$  or the *compression functor*  $\text{Comp}_I^{\text{tot}}(-)$ , respectively) is defined by  $\text{Comp}_I^{\text{ss}}(M) = M \circ \iota_I^{\text{ss}}$  ( $\text{Comp}_I^{\text{cc}}(M) = M \circ \iota_I^{\text{cc}}$  or  $\text{Comp}_I^{\text{tot}}(M) = M \circ \iota_I^{\text{tot}}$ , respectively).


Note that these functors are exactly the restriction functors.

It is clear that the ss-compression, cc-compression and compression functors are additive by definition. To simplify the notation, we let  $\text{Comp}_I^*(-)$  stand for  $\text{Comp}_I^{\text{ss}}(-)$ ,  $\text{Comp}_I^{\text{cc}}(-)$  or  $\text{Comp}_I^{\text{tot}}(-)$  for statements that hold for all three versions of compression.

Given  $M \in \text{rep } \vec{G}_{m,n}$ , the compressed representation  $\text{Comp}_I^*(M)$  is a representation of  $I^*$ . Similarly, the interval representation  $V_I$  associated to the interval  $I$  has a compressed representation  $\text{Comp}_I^*(V_I)$ . For example, the interval  $I$  in Example 4.2 is associated to the interval representation



which has ss-compressed representation



a representation of  $I^{\text{ss}}$ .

While the compressed representation  $\text{Comp}_I^*(M)$  may be interesting in its own right, in the next definition we only consider the multiplicity of  $\text{Comp}_I^*(V_I)$  in  $\text{Comp}_I^*(M)$ .

**Definition 4.12** (Compressed multiplicities). Let  $M$  be a representation of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  and  $I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{d}_M^{\text{ss}}(I) &:= d_{\text{Comp}_I^{\text{ss}}(M)}(\text{Comp}_I^{\text{ss}}(V_I)), \\ \underline{d}_M^{\text{cc}}(I) &:= d_{\text{Comp}_I^{\text{cc}}(M)}(\text{Comp}_I^{\text{cc}}(V_I)), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\underline{d}_M^{\text{tot}}(I) := d_{\text{Comp}_I^{\text{tot}}(M)}(\text{Comp}_I^{\text{tot}}(V_I)),$$

where  $d_?(-)$  is the usual multiplicity function obtained from Theorem 2.1.

**4.3. Rank invariant and dimension vector as compression.** In this subsection, we show that the compressed multiplicity generalizes the rank invariant [4], a well-known invariant for 2D persistence modules.


Recall that the *rank invariant* is the function assigning to each pair  $s, t \in \vec{G}_{m,n}$  with a path from  $s$  to  $t$ , the value

$$\text{rank}(M(s \rightarrow t))$$

where  $M(s \rightarrow t) : M(s) \rightarrow M(t)$  is the linear map associated by  $M$  to a path from  $s$  to  $t$ . Note that this is well-defined by commutativity relations.

An interval  $R = \bigsqcup_{i=x}^y [b_i, d_i]_i \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  is said to be a *rectangle* if  $b_i = b_{i+1}$  and  $d_i = d_{i+1}$  for any  $i = x, \dots, y-1$ . The set of rectangles in  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  is denoted by  $R_{m,n}$ . It is immediate that any

rectangle  $R$  has a unique source  $s$  and a unique sink  $t$ . Below is an example of a rectangle together with its source and sink.



Conversely, given any pair  $s, t \in \vec{G}_{m,n}$  with a path from  $s$  to  $t$  (as in the definition of the rank invariant), there is a unique rectangle  $R$  with source  $s$  and sink  $t$ . Thus, the rank invariant can be equivalently defined as the function assigning to each rectangle  $R$  in  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  the value  $\text{rank}(M(s \rightarrow t))$ , where  $s$  is the unique source of  $R$  and  $t$  the unique sink.

Let  $R$  be a rectangle with source  $s$  and sink  $t$ . Let us compute the value of the compressed multiplicity on  $R$ .

- The ss-compressed category of  $R$  is:  $R^{\text{ss}} : s \rightarrow t$ , so that  $\text{Comp}_R^{\text{ss}}(M)$  is  $M(s) \xrightarrow{M(s \rightarrow t)} M(t)$ . We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{d}_M^{\text{ss}}(R) &= d_{(\text{Comp}_R^{\text{ss}}(M))}(\text{Comp}_R^{\text{ss}}(V_R)) \\ &= d\left(M(s) \xrightarrow{M(s \rightarrow t)} M(t)\right) (K \xrightarrow{1} K) \\ &= \text{rank}(M(s \rightarrow t)). \end{aligned}$$

- Next,  $R$  has  $s, t$  together with the two other corners:  $u$  and  $w$  as its cc-essential vertices. The cc-compressed category of  $R$  is:

$$R^{\text{cc}} : \begin{array}{ccc} u & \longrightarrow & t \\ \uparrow & \mathbb{G} & \uparrow \\ s & \longrightarrow & w \end{array}$$

so that  $\text{Comp}_R^{\text{cc}}(M)$  is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M(u) & \longrightarrow & M(t) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ M(s) & \longrightarrow & M(w) \end{array}.$$

Furthermore,  $\text{Comp}_R^{\text{cc}}(V_R)$  is the injective representation  $I(t)$  associated to the vertex  $t$ :

$$I(t) = \begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{1} & K \\ 1 \uparrow & & 1 \uparrow \\ K & \xrightarrow{1} & K \end{array},$$

and so by [2, Theorem 3 (see also Example 3)]

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{d}_M^{\text{cc}}(R) &= d\left(\begin{array}{ccc} M(u) & \longrightarrow & M(t) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ M(s) & \longrightarrow & M(w) \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{1} & K \\ 1 \uparrow & & 1 \uparrow \\ K & \xrightarrow{1} & K \end{array}\right) \\ &= \dim \text{Hom}_{R^{\text{cc}}}(I(t), M) - \dim \text{Hom}_{R^{\text{cc}}}(I(t)/\text{soc } I(t), M) \\ &= \dim M(s) - (\dim M(s) - \text{rank}(M(s \rightarrow t))) \\ &= \text{rank}(M(s \rightarrow t)). \end{aligned}$$

- Finally,  $\text{Comp}_R^{\text{tot}}(M)$  is the representation of  $R^{\text{tot}}$  obtained by restricting  $M$  to the rectangle  $R$ . Furthermore,  $\text{Comp}_R^{\text{tot}}(V_R)$  is the injective representation  $I(t)$  of  $R^{\text{tot}}$ , and

$$\underline{d}_M^{\text{tot}}(R) = \text{rank}(M(s \rightarrow t)).$$

follows from [2, Theorem 3], as above.

The above considerations prove the following.

**Proposition 4.13.** *Let  $M$  be a representation of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  and  $R$  a rectangle. For  $*$  = ss, cc, tot, we have*

$$\underline{d}_M^*(R) = \text{rank } M(s \rightarrow t),$$

where  $s$  is the unique source vertex of  $R$  and  $t$  is the unique sink vertex of  $R$ .

In this sense, the compressed multiplicities  $\underline{d}_M^*(-)$  are generalizations of the rank invariant. With our invariant we hope to capture finer information that cannot be detected by just the rank invariant.

Next, we give an example of representations with the same rank invariants but different compressed multiplicities.

**Example 4.14.** Let  $I = \begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & \longrightarrow & \bullet \\ & \uparrow & \\ & \bullet & \end{array}$  be an interval of  $\vec{G}_{2,2} = \begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & \longrightarrow & \bullet \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \bullet & \longrightarrow & \bullet \end{array}$ . Note that  $I$  is not a rectangle.

We consider the following representations of  $\vec{G}_{2,2}$ :

$$M = \begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}} & K^2 \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K \end{array}, \quad N = \begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}} & K^2 \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K \end{array}.$$

Clearly, rank invariants of  $M$  and  $N$  coincide. However, we have  $\underline{d}_M^{\text{ss}}(I) = 1 \neq 0 = \underline{d}_N^{\text{ss}}(I)$ .

We end this subsection with the following observation.

**Proposition 4.15.** *Let  $M$  be a representation of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  and  $i$  a vertex of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ . For  $*$  = ss, cc, tot, we have*

$$\underline{d}_M^*(\{i\}) = \dim M(i),$$

where  $\{i\}$  is the interval subquiver consisting of only the vertex  $i$ .

*Proof.* A direct computation shows that

$$\underline{d}_M^*(\{i\}) = d_{\text{Comp}_{\{i\}}^*(M)}(\text{Comp}_{\{i\}}^*(V_{\{i\}})) = d_{M(i)}(K) = \dim M(i).$$

Alternatively, this follows immediately from Proposition 4.13 by considering the rectangle with  $s = t = i$ .  $\square$

Namely, the compressed multiplicities  $\underline{d}_M^*(-)$  restricted to vertices coincide with the dimension vector of  $M$ .

**4.4. Compression and Inversion.** Next, we derive some basic properties of  $\underline{d}_M^*(-)$ , and end this section with Theorem 4.20, which states that for *interval-decomposable representations*  $M$ , we can recover  $d_M$  using  $\underline{d}_M^*(-)$ .

First, we start with some Lemmas that lead to a Key Lemma 4.18.

**Lemma 4.16.** *If a representation  $M$  of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  decomposes as  $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ , then*

$$\underline{d}_M^*(I) = \underline{d}_{M_1}^*(I) + \underline{d}_{M_2}^*(I)$$

for  $*$  = ss, cc, tot.

*Proof.* Since the compression functor  $\text{Comp}_I^*(-)$  is additive, we have  $\text{Comp}_I^*(M) = \text{Comp}_I^*(M_1) \oplus \text{Comp}_I^*(M_2)$ . Then the statement follows by the Krull-Schmidt theorem.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.17.** *Let  $I, J$  be intervals of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ . Then*

$$\underline{d}_{V_J}^*(I) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } J \in U(I), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

for  $*$  = ss, cc, tot.

*Proof.* If  $I \leq J$ , then  $\text{Comp}_I^*(V_J) = \text{Comp}_I^*(V_I)$ , thus  $\underline{d}_{V_J}^*(I) = 1$ .

On the other hand, if  $I \not\leq J$ , then there exists some  $i \in I_0^* \setminus J_0$  by Lemma 4.3 or Lemma 4.6 for  $*$  = ss, cc, respectively, and by the fact that  $I_0^{\text{tot}} = I_0$ , for  $*$  = tot. Thus,  $i \notin \text{supp}(\text{Comp}_I^*(V_J))$ , and hence  $\text{Comp}_I^*(V_J)$  cannot have a direct summand isomorphic to  $\text{Comp}_I^*(V_I)$ , showing that  $\underline{d}_{V_J}^*(I) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.18 (Key Lemma).** *Let  $M$  be an interval-decomposable representation of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  and  $I$  an interval in  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ . Then*

$$\underline{d}_M^*(I) = \sum_{J \in U(I)} d_M(V_J)$$

for  $*$  = ss, cc, tot.

*Proof.* Let  $M \cong \bigoplus_{J \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} V_J^{d_M(V_J)}$  be an interval decomposition of a representation  $M$  of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ . Then

$$\underline{d}_M^*(I) = \sum_{J \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} d_M(V_J) \cdot \underline{d}_{V_J}^*(I) = \sum_{J \in U(I)} d_M(V_J)$$

by Lemmas 4.16 and 4.17.  $\square$

As a consequence, in the case that  $M$  is interval-decomposable,  $\underline{d}_M^*(I)$  does not depend on  $*$ .

Readers familiar with the Möbius theory for (locally-finite) posets [12] may recognize that Lemma 4.18 simply states that for interval-decomposable representations, the function  $\underline{d}_M^*(-)$  is equal to  $d_M(-)$  multiplied by the zeta function. Theorem 4.20 can then be seen as an application of Möbius inversion. Here, we give a direct proof of Theorem 4.20 and delay these Möbius theoretic considerations to a later section.

First, we note the following proposition which follows immediately from Lemma 4.18.

**Proposition 4.19.** *Let  $M$  be an interval-decomposable representation of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  and  $I$  an interval in  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ . Then*

$$d_M(V_I) = \underline{d}_M^*(I) - \sum_{J \in U(I) \setminus \{I\}} d_M(V_J).$$

for  $*$  = *ss, cc, tot*.

**Theorem 4.20.** *Let  $M$  be an interval decomposable representation of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  and  $I$  an interval in  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ . Then:*

$$d_M(V_I) = \underline{d}_M^*(I) + \sum_{\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \text{Cov}(I)} (-1)^{\#S} \underline{d}_M^*(\bigvee S).$$

for  $*$  = *ss, cc, tot*.

*Proof.* We define a function  $f: 2^{\text{Cov}(I)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  by  $f(S) := \sum_{J \in S} d_M(V_J)$  for  $S \in 2^{\text{Cov}(I)}$ . Then by Proposition 4.19 we have

$$d_M(V_I) = \underline{d}_M^*(I) - f\left(\bigcup_{J \in \text{Cov}(I)} U(J)\right).$$

Here the inclusion-exclusion principle shows

$$f\left(\bigcup_{J \in \text{Cov}(I)} U(J)\right) = \sum_{\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \text{Cov}(I)} (-1)^{\#S-1} f\left(\bigcap_{J \in S} U(J)\right).$$

By Proposition 3.3, the join  $\bigvee S$  in  $U(I)$  exists, and it can be checked that

$$\bigcap_{J \in S} U(J) = U(\bigvee S)$$

by definition. Therefore

$$f\left(\bigcap_{J \in S} U(J)\right) = f(U(\bigvee S)) = \underline{d}_M^*(\bigvee S)$$

by Lemma 4.18, which completes our proof.  $\square$

Theorem 4.20 says that to calculate  $d_M(V_I)$ , it is enough to calculate  $\underline{d}_M^{\text{ss}}(J)$  (which is equal to  $\underline{d}_M^{\text{cc}}(J)$  and also to  $\underline{d}_M^{\text{tot}}(J)$  since  $M$  is interval-decomposable) for certain intervals  $J$ . We warn that the assumption that  $M$  is interval-decomposable is necessary for Key Lemma 4.18, and so is also necessary here. It is easy to construct examples where the equality in Theorem 4.20 fails for non-interval-decomposable representations.

**Example 4.21.** Let us follow the proof of Theorem 4.20 by computing for a particular example. Let  $M$  be an interval decomposable representation of  $\vec{G}_{2,4}$  and let  $I = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{I}_{2,4}$ , an interval.

In this case,  $\text{Cov}(I) = \{I_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, I_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\}$  and  $I_1 \vee I_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ . By Lemma 4.18, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{d}_M^*(I) &= \sum_{J \in U(I)} d_M(J) \\ &= d_M\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) + d_M\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) + d_M\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) \\ &\quad + d_M\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) + d_M\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) + d_M\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) \\ &\quad + d_M\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) + d_M\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) + d_M\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) \\ &= d_M(V_I) + \sum_{J \in (U(I_1) \cup U(I_2))} d_M(J) \\ &= d_M(V_I) + \sum_{J \in U(I_1)} d_M(J) + \sum_{J \in U(I_2)} d_M(J) - \sum_{J \in (U(I_1) \cap U(I_2))} d_M(J) \\ &= d_M(V_I) + \sum_{J \in U(I_1)} d_M(J) + \sum_{J \in U(I_2)} d_M(J) - \sum_{J \in U(I_1 \vee I_2)} d_M(J). \end{aligned}$$

We thus have

$$d_M(V_I) = \underline{d}_M^*(I) - \underline{d}_M^*(I_1) - \underline{d}_M^*(I_2) + \underline{d}_M^*(I_1 \vee I_2)$$

which is also given by Theorem 4.20.

As another example, let us consider the equioriented  $A_n$ -type quiver, which can be viewed as  $\vec{G}_{1,n}$ . In this setting, Theorem 4.20 reduces to the following well-known formula. See for example, [6] and Definition 3.2 of [5].

**Corollary 4.22.** *Let  $M \in \text{rep } \vec{G}_{1,n}$ . For  $\mathbb{I}[i, j]$  an interval representation of  $\vec{G}_{1,n}$ ,*

$$d_M(\mathbb{I}[i, j]) = \begin{aligned} &[\text{rank } M((i-1) \rightarrow (j+1)) - \text{rank } M((i-1) \rightarrow j)] - \\ &[\text{rank } M(i \rightarrow (j+1)) - \text{rank } M(i \rightarrow j)], \end{aligned}$$

where if  $i-1$  and/or  $j+1$  is not in  $\vec{G}_{1,n}$ , the corresponding term above is 0.

*Proof.* In  $\vec{G}_{1,n}$ , it follows immediately from the definition that

$$\underline{d}_M^*(\mathbb{I}[i, j]) = \text{rank } M(i \rightarrow j)$$

for  $*$  = ss, cc, tot. Furthermore,  $\text{Cov}(\mathbb{I}[i, j])$  contains  $\mathbb{I}[i-1, j]$  if  $i-1 \in \vec{G}_{1,n}$  and contains  $\mathbb{I}[i, j+1]$  if  $j+1 \in \vec{G}_{1,n}$ , and no other elements.

It is well-known that all representations of  $\vec{G}_{1,n}$  are interval-decomposable, and thus Theorem 4.20 is applicable. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_M(\mathbb{I}[i, j]) &= \underline{d}_M^*(\mathbb{I}[i, j]) \\ &\quad - \underline{d}_M^*(\mathbb{I}[i-1, j]) - \underline{d}_M^*(\mathbb{I}[i, j+1]) \\ &\quad + \underline{d}_M^*(\mathbb{I}[i-1, j+1]), \end{aligned}$$

where if  $i-1$  and/or  $j+1$  is not in  $\vec{G}_{1,n}$ , the corresponding term above is 0. Expanding and rearranging terms gives us the required expression.  $\square$

We note that the same formula has been obtained by using Auslander-Reiten Theory in the paper [2] (Equation (9) of [2]). Our Theorem 4.20 here uses only the local lattice structure of  $\mathbb{I}_{1,n}$ , and it would be interesting to explore Theorem 4.20 using a representation-theoretic perspective.

**4.5. Restriction to equioriented  $2 \times n$  commutative grid.** In this subsection, we study the special case of  $\vec{G}_{2,n}$ , which is the equioriented commutative ladder. In this setting, the compressed categories take on very nice forms.

**Proposition 4.23.** *Let  $I \in \mathbb{I}_{2,n}$ . The quiver of the ss-compressed category  $I^{ss}$  has one of the following forms:*

- (1)  $\bullet$ ,
- (2)  $\bullet \rightarrow \bullet$ ,
- (3)  $\bullet \rightarrow \bullet \leftarrow \bullet$ ,
- (4)  $\bullet \leftarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet$ ,
- (5)  $\bullet \rightarrow \bullet \leftarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet$ .

*Proof.* A direct computation shows this.  $\square$

Similarly, we have the following.

**Proposition 4.24.** *Let  $I \in \mathbb{I}_{2,n}$ . The bound quiver of the cc-compressed category  $I^{cc}$  has one of the following forms:*



*Proof.* It is immediate that there are at most 6 cc-essential vertices, arranged in the shape of (9), for an interval in  $\mathbb{I}_{2,n}$ . The rest of the forms cover the cases where some of those vertices are not cc-essential in  $I$ .  $\square$

Almost all  $I^{\text{tot}}$  is of infinite representation type for enough large  $n$ . Therefore, it is difficult to calculate the values  $\underline{d}_M^{\text{tot}}(I)$ .

On the other hand, Proposition 4.23 and Proposition 4.24 shows that  $I^{\text{ss}}$  and  $I^{\text{cc}}$  are of finite type for any  $I \in \mathbb{I}_{2,n}$ . In addition, the Auslander-Reiten quivers for the bound quivers in the lists of Proposition 4.23 and Proposition 4.24 can be calculated explicitly. Thus, it is *not* difficult to calculate the values  $\underline{d}_M^*(I)$  for  $*$  = ss, cc, in the setting of the equioriented  $2 \times n$  commutative grid.

## 5. APPROXIMATION

In this section, let us discuss how to use the above ideas as an approximation of general 2D persistence modules in  $\text{rep } \vec{G}_{m,n}$  by interval-decomposable one. First, let us rephrase Theorem 4.20 using the language of Möbius inversion, as discussed in Subsection 2.3, with underlying field  $F = \mathbb{R}$ .

We can view  $d_M$  and  $\underline{d}_M^*$  as functions  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . This is a slight abuse of notation, since  $d_M$  is a function from (isomorphism classes) of *all* indecomposables, but here we are using the symbol to denote it restricted to the intervals  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ . Furthermore,  $d_M$  and  $\underline{d}_M^*$  take on only nonnegative integer values in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

In the notation of Subsection 2.3, we have  $d_M, \underline{d}_M^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{I}_{m,n}}$ . Then, the Key Lemma 4.18 states that for  $M$  interval-decomposable,

$$\underline{d}_M^* = \zeta d_M \quad (5.1)$$

where the multiplication of  $\zeta$  in Eq. (5.1) is precisely the left action of  $I(\mathbb{I}_{m,n})$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{I}_{m,n}}$ . By Möbius inversion (multiplication of  $\mu = \zeta^{-1}$ ), we obtain

$$d_M = \mu \underline{d}_M^*.$$

This expresses  $d_M$  in terms of  $\underline{d}_M^*$ , a conclusion similar to the one of Theorem 4.20. Next, we show that the coefficients appearing in Theorem 4.20 gives the values of the Möbius function  $\mu([I, J])$  of  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ .

**Definition 5.1.** Define the function  $\mu' : \text{Seg}(\mathbb{I}_{m,n}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , an element of the incidence algebra  $I(\mathbb{I}_{m,n})$  by the following.

$$\mu'([I, J]) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } I = J, \\ \sum_{J = \bigvee S, \emptyset \neq S \subseteq \text{Cov}(I)} (-1)^{\#S} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

Note that in the case  $I \neq J$  and where there is no  $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \text{Cov}(I)$  such that  $J = \bigvee S$ , the sum above is empty, and thus  $\mu'([I, J]) = 0$ . The values of  $\mu'$  are exactly the coefficients appearing in the formula of Theorem 4.20, from which we immediately get the following Corollary.

**Corollary 5.2** (Restatement of Theorem 4.20). *Let  $M$  be an interval-decomposable representation of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$  and  $I$  an interval in  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ . Then:*

$$d_M = \mu' \underline{d}_M^*$$

for  $*$  = ss, cc, tot.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $\mu'$  be as defined in Definition 5.1, and  $\mu$  be the Möbius function of the poset  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ . Then,*

$$\mu = \mu'.$$

In particular, Equation (5.2) gives the values of  $\mu$ .

*Proof.* Let  $I$  be an interval of  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  and  $L$  a cover of  $I$ . By Corollary 5.2, we have

$$\mu' \underline{d}_M^* = \mu \underline{d}_M^*.$$

Taking  $M = V_L$ , we obtain the following sequence of equations by working on both sides of the first equation.

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu' \underline{d}_M^*)(I) &= (\mu \underline{d}_M^*)(I) \\ \sum_{I \leq J} \mu'([I, J]) \underline{d}_M^*(J) &= \sum_{I \leq J} \mu([I, J]) \underline{d}_M^*(J) \\ \sum_{I \leq J \leq L} \mu'([I, J]) \underline{d}_M^*(J) &= \sum_{I \leq J \leq L} \mu([I, J]) \underline{d}_M^*(J) \\ \mu'([I, I]) + \mu'([I, L]) &= \mu([I, I]) + \mu([I, L]) \\ 1 + \mu'([I, L]) &= 1 + \mu([I, L]), \end{aligned}$$

where going from the second line to the third line follows by Lemma 4.17. We conclude  $\mu'([I, L]) = \mu([I, L])$  for any  $L \in \text{Cov}(I)$ .

Next, we assume that for any interval  $L'$  with  $L' < L$ ,  $\mu'([I, L']) = \mu([I, L'])$ . Then we have the following sequence of equations by taking  $M = V_L$  and again using Lemma 4.17:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu' \underline{d}_M^*)(I) &= (\mu \underline{d}_M^*)(I) \\ \sum_{I \leq J \leq L} \mu'([I, J]) &= \sum_{I \leq J \leq L} \mu([I, J]) \\ \sum_{I \leq J < L} \mu'([I, J]) + \mu'([I, L]) &= \sum_{I \leq J < L} \mu([I, J]) + \mu([I, L]). \end{aligned}$$

Since we have  $\sum_{I \leq J < L} \mu'([I, J]) = \sum_{I \leq J < L} \mu([I, J])$  by the inductive assumption, we obtain  $\mu'([I, L]) = \mu([I, L])$ . By the induction, we get the conclusion.  $\square$

As we have seen,  $d_M = \mu \underline{d}_M^*$  for  $M$  interval-decomposable. Even in the case where  $M$  is not interval-decomposable, we nevertheless can do the transformation. Thus we *define*  $\delta_M^* := \mu \underline{d}_M^*$  in general.

**Definition 5.4.** Put  $*$  = ss, cc, tot. Define  $\delta_M^* := \mu \underline{d}_M^*$ . In particular, for each  $I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  an interval subquiver of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ ,

$$\delta_M^*(I) := \underline{d}_M^*(I) + \sum_{\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \text{Cov}(I)} (-1)^{\#S} \underline{d}_M^*(\bigvee S).$$

First, we note the following obvious property of  $\delta_M^*(-)$ .

**Lemma 5.5.** *If  $M \cong M_1 \oplus M_2$ , then we have*

$$\delta_M^*(-) = \delta_{M_1}^*(-) + \delta_{M_2}^*(-).$$

*Proof.* Since  $\underline{d}_M^*(-) = \underline{d}_{M_1}^*(-) + \underline{d}_{M_2}^*(-)$  by Lemma 4.16, we have the desired equation by definition.  $\square$

Since in general

$$M \cong \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{L}} X^{d_M(X)}$$

by Theorem 2.1, one way of constructing an approximating interval-decomposable object is to naively define

$$\delta^*(M) = \bigoplus_{I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} (V_I)^{\delta_M^*(I)} \quad (5.3)$$





by taking the function  $\delta_M^*$  on  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$  as a substitute for the function  $d_M$  on  $\mathcal{L}$ . Defined this way,  $M \cong \delta^*(M)$  for interval-decomposable  $M$ . However, the value  $\delta_M^*(I)$  can be negative in general and thus the direct sum in Eq. (5.3) does not make sense.

For example, we have the following.

**Example 5.6.** Let  $M$  be the representation of  $\vec{G}_{2,3}$  given by

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} K & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}} & K^2 & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}} & K \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & & \uparrow 1 \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K & \xrightarrow{1} & K \end{array}$$

The value of  $\delta_M^{\text{ss}}(I)$  is 0 except in the cases of  $I$  being one of the intervals  $I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4$  given below.

- (1) For  $I_1$  :  ,  $\delta_M^{\text{ss}}(I_1) = -1$ ,
- (2) For  $I_2$  :  ,  $\delta_M^{\text{ss}}(I_2) = 1$ ,
- (3) For  $I_3$  :  ,  $\delta_M^{\text{ss}}(I_3) = 1$ ,
- (4) For  $I_4$  :  ,  $\delta_M^{\text{ss}}(I_4) = 1$ .

*Proof.* We directly use Definition 5.4 to compute  $\delta_M^{\text{ss}}(I_1)$ . We let  $\text{Cov}(I_1) = \{I_2, I_5\}$ , and let  $I_6 = I_2 \vee I_5$ , where the intervals are given below. We first compute the value of the compressed multiplicity  $\underline{d}_M^{\text{ss}}(-)$  of these intervals. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 I_1 &: \text{Interval representation as above}, \quad \underline{d}_M^{\text{ss}}(I_1) = 0, \\
 I_2 &: \text{Interval representation as above}, \quad \underline{d}_M^{\text{ss}}(I_2) = 1, \\
 I_5 &: \text{Interval representation as above}, \quad \underline{d}_M^{\text{ss}}(I_5) = 0, \\
 I_6 &: \text{Interval representation as above}, \quad \underline{d}_M^{\text{ss}}(I_6) = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by definition,

$$\delta_M^{\text{ss}}(I_1) = 0 - 1 - 0 + 0 = -1.$$

The other computations follow similarly.  $\square$

For  $M$  interval-decomposable, it is clear from the above that all values of  $\delta_M^*$  are nonnegative, as it is equal to  $d_M$  itself. In the next example we see that the converse does not hold, and so we cannot use the nonnegativity of  $\delta_M^*$  to check for interval-decomposability.

**Example 5.7** (Continuation of Example 5.6). There exist  $N$  such that  $\delta_N^*$  is nonnegative, but  $N$  is not interval-decomposable.

In particular, let  $M$  and  $I_i (i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$  be as given in Example 5.6. Then  $N := M \oplus I_1$  is such an example.

*Proof.* Since  $N = M \oplus I_1$ ,  $\delta_N^{\text{ss}} = \delta_M^{\text{ss}} + \delta_{I_1}^{\text{ss}}$  by Lemma 5.5. Then we have

$$\delta_N^{\text{ss}}(I_1) = -1 + 1 = 0$$

and  $\delta_N^{\text{ss}}(I) = \delta_M^{\text{ss}}(I) + 0 \geq 0$  for all intervals  $I \neq I_1$ . Thus,  $\delta_N^{\text{ss}}$  is nonnegative, but  $N$  is not interval-decomposable since  $M$  is an indecomposable summand of  $N$  that is not isomorphic to an interval representation.  $\square$

To deal with the possibility of negative terms in  $\delta_M^*$  in general, we use the formalism of the split Grothendieck group to express the addition of a negative number of copies of an interval in a direct sum. Recall that the split Grothendieck group  $\text{Gr}(\mathcal{C})$  of an additive category  $\mathcal{C}$  is the free abelian group generated by isomorphism classes  $[C]$  of objects in  $\mathcal{C}$  modulo the relations  $[C_1 \oplus C_2] = [C_1] + [C_2]$  for all objects  $C_1, C_2$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ . For an object  $C$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ , we denote by  $\llbracket C \rrbracket$  the element of  $\text{Gr}(\mathcal{C})$  represented by  $[C]$ . In this case, we identify  $\llbracket C \rrbracket = C$ .

**Definition 5.8.** Let  $M \in \text{rep } \vec{G}_{m,n}$ . Define

$$\delta^*(M) := \sum_{I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} \delta_M^*(I) \llbracket V_I \rrbracket \in \text{Gr}(\text{rep } \vec{G}_{m,n}) \quad (5.4)$$

for  $*$  = ss, cc, or, tot.

**Theorem 5.9.** Let  $M \in \text{rep } \vec{G}_{m,n}$  be interval-decomposable. Then,  $\delta^*(M) = \llbracket M \rrbracket = M$ .

*Proof.* Because  $M$  is interval-decomposable,  $\delta_M^* = d_M$ . The conclusion follows immediately from this.  $\square$

Finally, we discuss the relationship between  $M$  and  $\delta^*(M)$ . In particular, we focus on dimension vectors and rank invariants.



**Example 5.10** (Continuation of Example 5.6). With the same notation as in example 5.6, we have the equality

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I \in \mathbb{I}_{2,3}} \delta_M^{\text{ss}}(I) \cdot \underline{\dim}(V_I) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \underline{\dim}(M). \end{aligned}$$

For  $\delta_M^{\text{cc}}$ , we have a similar equality of the dimension vectors for the example above. This is not a coincidence, and in fact the equality always holds (see Corollary 5.13). First we prove the following stronger statement.

**Theorem 5.11.** *Let  $M$  be a representation of  $\vec{G}_{m,n} = (Q, R)$ , and  $p$  be a path in the quiver  $Q$  from  $i$  to  $j$ . Then we have*

$$\sum_{I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} \delta_M^*(I) \cdot \text{rank } I(i \rightarrow j) = \text{rank } M(i \rightarrow j). \quad (5.5)$$

for  $*$  = ss, cc, tot.

To prove the theorem above we need the following lemma, which is the essence of Theorem 5.11.

**Lemma 5.12.** *Let  $M \in \text{rep } \vec{G}_{m,n}$  and  $I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ . Then*

$$\underline{d}_M^*(I) = \sum_{I \leq J \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} \delta_M^*(J)$$

*Proof.* This follows from Möbius inversion. That is, by definition  $\delta_M^* := \mu \underline{d}_M^*$  and thus

$$\underline{d}_M^* = \zeta \delta_M^*$$

since  $\mu^{-1} = \zeta$ . The right-hand side expanded out gives the result.  $\square$

Then we prove Theorem 5.11.

*Proof of Theorem 5.11.* Since there is a path from  $i$  to  $j$ , the rectangle with source  $i$  and sink  $j$  exists. We denote this rectangle with source  $i$  and sink  $j$  by  $R_{i,j}$ .

We note that for an interval  $I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ ,  $\text{rank } I(i \rightarrow j)$  is 1 if and only if it contains the rectangle  $R_{i,j}$  and is 0 otherwise. This gives the first equality in the following computation. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} \delta_M^*(I) \cdot \text{rank } I(i \rightarrow j) &= \sum_{R_{i,j} \leq I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} \delta_M^*(I) \\ &= \underline{d}_M^*(R_{i,j}) \\ &= \text{rank } M(i \rightarrow j), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma 5.12, and the last equality follows by applying Proposition 4.13.  $\square$

As a corollary of Theorem 5.11, we have the following desired equation for dimension vectors.

**Corollary 5.13.** *Let  $M$  be a representation of  $\vec{G}_{m,n}$ . Then we have*

$$\sum_{I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} \delta_M^*(I) \cdot \underline{\dim}(V_I) = \underline{\dim}(M). \quad (5.6)$$

*Proof.* It is enough to show that for any  $i \in G_0$ ,

$$\sum_{I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} \delta_M^*(I) \cdot (\underline{\dim}(V_I))_i = (\underline{\dim}(M))_i.$$

Note that  $(\underline{\dim}(V_I))_i = \text{rank } I(i \rightarrow i)$  and  $(\underline{\dim}(M))_i = \text{rank } M(i \rightarrow i)$ , where the path  $i \rightarrow i$  means the path  $e_i$  of length 0 at  $i$ . Thus, by Theorem 5.11, we obtain the above equation.  $\square$

Let us give another consequence of this result, which warns us against thinking of approximation in terms of functions.

In general,  $M \in \text{rep } \vec{G}_{m,n}$  can be written as  $M \cong M_I \oplus X$ , where  $M_I$  is interval-decomposable, and  $0 \neq X$  has no interval representation as a summand. By Lemma 5.5,

$$\delta_M^* = \delta_{M_I}^* + \delta_X^* = d_{M_I} + \delta_X^* : \mathbb{I}_{m,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad (5.7)$$

where we also use the fact that  $\delta_{M_I}^* = d_{M_I}$  because  $M_I$  is interval-decomposable. Restricted to  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ ,  $d_{M_I}$  has the same values as  $d_M$ . Thus, we may be tempted to think of using  $\delta_M^*$  to

approximate  $d_{M_I} = d_M$  as functions from  $\mathbb{I}_{m,n}$ . To measure the error involved, we use the  $\ell_1$ -norm of functions  $f : \mathbb{I}_{m,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\|f\|_1 = \sum_{I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} |f(I)|$ . Let us consider the value of

$$\|\delta_X^*\|_1 = \|\delta_M^* - d_M\|_1.$$

**Corollary 5.14.** *For any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $M \in \text{rep } \vec{G}_{m,n}$ , with  $X$  its largest direct summand containing no interval representation as a summand, such that*

$$\|\delta_X^*\|_1 \geq \ell.$$

*Proof.* We consider  $M$  indecomposable but not isomorphic to an interval representation, so that  $X = M$ . Furthermore, we want  $M$  to have a vector space whose dimension is  $\ell$ . For example, the construction in [3] provides such an  $M = X$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} K^\ell & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} E \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}} & K^{2\ell} & \longrightarrow & K^{2\ell} & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} E & 0 \end{bmatrix}} & K^\ell & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K^\ell & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} E \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}} & K^{2\ell} & \longrightarrow & K^{2\ell} & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} E & 0 \end{bmatrix}} & K^\ell \end{array}$$

where each  $E$  is an  $\ell \times \ell$  identity matrix, and  $J$  is the  $\ell \times \ell$  Jordan block with eigenvalue  $\lambda = 1$ .

Let  $i$  be one of the vertices such that  $X(i)$  has dimension  $\ell$ . We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell = \dim X(i) &= \sum_{I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} \delta_X^*(I) \cdot (\underline{\dim}(V_I))_i \\ &= \sum_{I: i \in I} \delta_X^*(I) \\ &\leq \sum_{I: i \in I} |\delta_X^*(I)| \\ &\leq \sum_{I \in \mathbb{I}_{m,n}} |\delta_X^*(I)| \\ &= \|\delta_X^*\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from Corollary 5.13. □

In other words, the “error term”  $\|\delta_X^*\|_1$  can be arbitrarily large for arbitrary  $M$ .

The left-hand side of Eq. (5.5) in Theorem 5.11 and the left-hand side of Eq. (5.6) in Corollary 5.13 can be seen as the rank invariant and the dimension vector of  $\delta^*(M)$ , respectively. In this sense, Theorem 5.11 and Corollary 5.13 simply states that the object  $\delta^*(M)$  preserves the rank invariant and dimension vector of  $M$ . It is in this sense that we think of approximation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Hideto Asashiba, Mickaël Buchet, Emerson G Escolar, Ken Nakashima, and Michio Yoshiwaki. On interval decomposability of 2d persistence modules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.05261*, 2018.
- [2] Hideto Asashiba, Ken Nakashima, and Michio Yoshiwaki. Decomposition theory of modules: the case of kroenecker algebra. *Japan Journal of Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 34(2):489–507, Aug 2017.
- [3] Mickaël Buchet and Emerson G Escolar. Realizations of indecomposable persistence modules of arbitrarily large dimension. In *34th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2018)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.
- [4] Gunnar Carlsson and Afra Zomorodian. The theory of multidimensional persistence. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 42(1):71–93, 2009.
- [5] Frédéric Chazal, David Cohen-Steiner, Marc Glisse, Leonidas J Guibas, and Steve Y Oudot. Proximity of persistence modules and their diagrams. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 237–246. ACM, 2009.
- [6] Herbert Edelsbrunner and John Harer. Persistent homology—a survey. *Contemporary mathematics*, 453:257–282, 2008.
- [7] Herbert Edelsbrunner, David Letscher, and Afra Zomorodian. Topological persistence and simplification. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2000. Proceedings. 41st Annual Symposium on*, pages 454–463. IEEE, 2000.
- [8] Emerson G. Escolar and Yasuaki Hiraoka. Persistence modules on commutative ladders of finite type. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 55(1):100–157, 2016.
- [9] Peter Gabriel. Unzerlegbare darstellungen I. *Manuscripta mathematica*, 6(1):71–103, 1972.
- [10] Alex McCleary and Amit Patel. Multiparameter persistence diagrams. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13220v3*, 2019.
- [11] Amit Patel. Generalized persistence diagrams. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, 1(3-4):397–419, 2018.
- [12] Gian-Carlo Rota. On the foundations of combinatorial theory i. theory of möbius functions. *Probability theory and related fields*, 2(4):340–368, 1964.

- [13] Richard P Stanley. Enumerative combinatorics volume 1 second edition. *Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics*, 2011.

(Hideto Asashiba) FACULTY OF SCIENCE, SHIZUOKA UNIVERSITY  
*E-mail address:* `asashiba.hideto@shizuoka.ac.jp`

(Emerson G. Escolar) CENTER FOR ADVANCED INTELLIGENCE PROJECT, RIKEN / KUIAS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY  
*E-mail address:* `emerson.escolar@riken.jp`

(Ken Nakashima) FACULTY OF SCIENCE, SHIZUOKA UNIVERSITY  
*E-mail address:* `nakashima.ken@shizuoka.ac.jp`

(Michio Yoshiwaki) CENTER FOR ADVANCED INTELLIGENCE PROJECT, RIKEN /KUIAS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY  
/OSAKA CITY UNIVERSITY ADVANCED MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE  
*E-mail address:* `michio.yoshiwaki@riken.jp`