

REALISATIONS OF POSETS AND TAMENESS

WOJCIECH CHACHÓLSKI, ALVIN JIN, AND FRANCESCA TOMBARI

ABSTRACT. We introduce a construction called realisation which transforms posets into posets. We show that realisations share several key features with upper semilattices which are essential in persistence. For example, we define local dimensions of points in a poset and show that these numbers for realisations behave in a similar way as they do for upper semilattices. Furthermore, similarly to upper semilattices, realisations have well behaved discrete approximations which are suitable for capturing homological properties of functors indexed by them. These discretisations are convenient and effective for describing tameness of functors. Homotopical and homological properties of tame functors, particularly those indexed by realisations, are discussed.

1. INTRODUCTION

An input for persistent homology can be organised into two ingredients: a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$, between a topological space X and a set Y , and a functor $\alpha: [0, \infty)^r \rightarrow 2^Y$, between the poset of r -tuples of non-negative integers and the inclusion poset of all subsets of Y , representing a r -multifiltration of subsets of Y . Persistent homology transforms such an input into a functor, indexed by the poset $[0, \infty)^r$, assigning to an element a the homology of the inverse image $f^{-1}(\alpha(a))$. For example, the homologies of the sublevel sets of a function $X \rightarrow [0, \infty)^r$ form a persistent homology functor, and so do the homologies of Vietoris-Rips (multi) filtrations (see [7]).

Encoding information in form of functors indexed by the poset $[0, \infty)^r$ is attractive for three reasons:

- metric properties of $[0, \infty)^r$ can be used to define and study distances on functors indexed by $[0, \infty)^r$ (see for example [12, 17]), which are essential for addressing stability of various invariants and can be used for hierarchical stabilisation constructions (see [24, 21, 11]);

Mathematics, KTH, S-10044 Stockholm, Sweden .

- the poset $[0, \infty)^r$ has well behaved discrete approximations given by sublattices of the form $\mathbb{N}^r \hookrightarrow [0, \infty)^r$, which can be used to provide finite approximations of functors indexed by $[0, \infty)^r$;
- the mentioned discretisations and approximations have well studied algebraic and homological properties, as the path algebra of the poset \mathbb{N}^r is isomorphic to the multigraded polynomial ring in r variables.

There has been a lot of research focused on understanding the interplay between the mentioned three aspects of functors indexed by the poset $[0, \infty)^r$. For example, the study of this interplay for the homologies of the sublevel sets of $X \rightarrow [0, \infty)^r$ has been truly beneficial for understanding geometrical and topological properties of X , for instance properties described by Morse functions. This interplay has been also central in applied topology (see for example [1, 15]). For instance, the rank invariant (see [10, 8]) is an algebraic invariant, is stable with respect to natural choices of distances, and can be effectively calculated using the discretisations. The tight relation between these three aspects of the rank invariant makes it informative and attractive for data analysis purposes.

Generalising these results to functors indexed by other posets is a growing research direction in the applied topology community, reflected by an increasing number of publications on this subject, see for example [20, 6, 4, 16, 22]. However there seems to be lack of explicit examples of posets, not directly related to $[0, \infty)^r$, for which the mentioned three aspects are tightly intertwined. The aim of this article is to introduce a rich family of such posets. We define a construction called **realisation** (see 4.10) which transforms posets into posets, and show that the realisations of finite type posets (posets where down sets of elements are finite) have natural discretisations tightly related to homological properties of functors indexed by them. Metric aspects of functors indexed by realisations are going to be the subject of a follow up paper, however we hope that the “continuity” properties of realisations, related to their metric properties, will be at least intuitively clear.

The realisation of a poset I is assembled by posets of the form $(-1, 0)^s$ in the following way. For every element a in I , and for every finite subset S of parents of a (a parent is an element covered by a) that has a common ancestor, consider the poset $(-1, 0)^{|S|}$. The realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is the disjoint union of all these posets $(-1, 0)^{|S|}$ for all a in I and all S . For example, if S is empty, then $(-1, 0)^0$ is of size 1 and we identify its element with a . In this way we obtain an inclusion




FIGURE 1.

$I \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$. If $S = \{p\}$ is of size 1, then we think about the associated subposet $(-1, 0) \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$ as time of going back from a to its parent p . Figure 1 illustrates the realisations of the posets $[1] := \{0 < 1\}$ and $[1]^2$ with colors indicating some of the summands $(-1, 0)^s$, identifying these posets with, respectively, $[0, 1]$ and $[0, 1]^2$. A similar description of the realisation can be obtained if I is a finite type distributive (or more generally consistent, see 4.2) upper semilattice. For example, $[0, \infty)^r$ is the realisation of \mathbb{N}^r . For a general poset, however, to define the poset relation on its realisation is non-trivial. Our strategy is to identify the realisation as a subposet of the Grothendieck construction of a certain lax functor, which may fail to be a functor in the case I is not a consistent upper semilattice. The fact that for an arbitrary poset this functor is essentially lax is the main difficulty in expressing the poset relation in the realisation in simple terms.

The subposet inclusion $I \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$, of which the standard inclusion $\mathbb{N}^r \subset [0, \infty)^r$ is an example, has the following property. Assume a distance is chosen on a set Y . Then every poset functor $U: I \rightarrow 2^Y$ with non-empty values can be extended to the realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$ and induce a commutative triangle of poset functors (see 4.14):

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 I & \xhookrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{R}(I) \\
 & \searrow U & \swarrow \overline{U} \\
 & 2^Y &
 \end{array}$$

For example, consider a pair of non-empty subsets $U_0 \subset U_1 \subset Y$, which describes a functor $[1] \rightarrow 2^Y$. Choose a distance d on Y whose maximum value is finite. For t in $(-1, 0)$, consider $\overline{U}(t) := U_1 \cap B(U_0, (1+t)\max(d))$, where $B(U_0, s)$ denotes the set $\{y \in Y \mid d(x, y) < s \text{ for some } x \in U_0\}$. All these sets form a functor $\overline{U}: \mathcal{R}([1]) \rightarrow 2^Y$ which is a desired extension.

The functor $\overline{U}: \mathcal{R}(I) \rightarrow Y$ can be then used to transform a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ into a functor, indexed by $\mathcal{R}(I)$, assigning to an element a the homology of the preimage $f^{-1}(\overline{U}(a))$. This procedure is analogous to the way persistent homology is constructed (see the first paragraph of this introduction), and it is a rich and important source of examples of functors indexed by realisations.

Our story about realisations is divided into two parts. In the first part, the internal properties of realisations as posets are discussed. This part starts with describing a certain regularity property of realisations of finite type posets. This regularity is expressed in terms of two natural numbers assigned to every element in a poset (see Section 3). These numbers, called dimension and parental dimension, are supposed to capture the complexity of expressing an element as an upper bound of subsets in the poset. For every element, its dimension is never bigger than its parental dimension (see Proposition 3.6). Although in general these numbers might differ, they are the same for every element in a distributive upper semilattice, which we regard as a regular poset. It turns out that these numbers coincide also for every element in the realisation of a finite type poset (Corollary 4.18). The parental dimension is important since it often bounds the homological dimension of vector space valued functors indexed by the poset. This is the case if for example the indexing poset is an upper semilattice (see 10.18). The same is also true for realisations of finite type posets (see 10.19), again an illustration of their regularity.

Recall that the realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is assembled from posets of the form $(-1, 0)^s$. If we choose a finite subposet $V \subset (-1, 0)$ and use V^s , instead of $(-1, 0)^s$, we obtain a subposet denoted by $\mathcal{R}(I, V) \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$ (see 4.16). For instance, if $V = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{R}(I, V) = I$. These subposets, for various V , form discrete approximations of the realisation. These approximations are informative since, for example, we prove that, for every element x in $\mathcal{R}(I)$, there is V for which x belongs to $\mathcal{R}(I, V)$ and the dimension of x as an element of $\mathcal{R}(I, V)$ equals its dimension as an element of $\mathcal{R}(I)$ (see Theorem 4.17). Furthermore, if $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is a (distributive) upper semilattice, then so is $\mathcal{R}(I, V)$ and it is a sublattice of the realisation. The intuition is that the denser V is in $(-1, 0)$, the denser $\mathcal{R}(I, V)$ is in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ in the following sense: every tame functor (see Definition 8.1) indexed by $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is discretised by some $\mathcal{R}(I, V) \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$ (Proposition 8.2).

In the first part, we also discuss assumptions under which the realisation of an upper semilattice is again an upper semilattice. We show that this is guaranteed under a consistency assumption (see 4.2). Key

examples of consistent upper semilattices are distributive upper semilattices. In this context, our main result is Theorem 6.1 which states that the realisation of a finite type distributive upper semilattice is a distributive upper semilattice.

The reason we care about upper semilattices is because finite type functions out of them admit transfers (see Section 7). Let I be an upper semilattice and $f: I \rightarrow J$ be a function of finite type (not necessarily a functor) (see 2.2). The transfer of f is a functor of the form $f^!: J_* \rightarrow I_*$, where $-_*$ denotes the operation of adding a global minimum to a poset. It assigns to an element a in J_* the coproduct of $(f_* \leq a)$ in I_* (see 7.1 and compare with [4]). In the case f is a homomorphism (it maps sup elements to sup elements, see 5.2), its transfer can be characterised by the following universal property: for every category \mathcal{C} with an initial object, the functor $(-)^{f^!}: \text{Fun}_*(I_*, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}_*(J_*, \mathcal{C})$, given by precomposing with $f^!$, is left adjoint to $(-)^{f_*}: \text{Fun}_*(J_*, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}_*(I_*, \mathcal{C})$ (see 7.4). Thus, in this case, $(-)^{f^!}$ is the left Kan extension of f (see [18]). Recall that left Kan extensions commute with colimits but do not in general commute with limits. Since the precomposition operation does commute with limits, we obtain an important property of homomorphisms of finite type out of upper semilattices: left Kan extensions along them commute with both colimits and limits (see Propositions 8.2 and 8.5).

Left Kan extensions play an essential role in the second part of our article whose focus is on tame functors. The notion of tameness of functors indexed by the posets $[0, \infty)^r$ has been central in both geometry and applied topology, as finiteness properties of such functors guarantee that various invariants can be defined and calculated. By definition (see Definition 8.1), a functor $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, is tame if there is a finite poset I and functors $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $f: I \rightarrow J$ for which F is isomorphic to the left Kan extension of G along f . The notion of tameness is restrictive and meaningful only when J is an infinite poset, for example if it is a realisation. Every tame functor is finally encoded in the following sense (compare with [19]): there is a finite poset I and functors $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $g: J \rightarrow I$ for which F is isomorphic to the composition Gg . The reverse implication is not true and finitely encoded functors may not be tame in general. However, in the case I is a finite consistent upper semilattice, then we prove that a functor $F: \mathcal{R}(I) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is tame if and only if there is a finite subposet $V \subset (-1, 0)$ and a functor $G: \mathcal{R}(I, V)_* \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ for which F is isomorphic to $Gf^!$ where $f^!: \mathcal{R}(I) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(I, V)_*$ is the transfer of the inclusion $\mathcal{R}(I, V) \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$ (see 7.10). Thus tame functors indexed by $\mathcal{R}(I)$, when I is a finite consistent upper semilattice, are exactly the functors which are constant on the fibers of the transfer

$f^!: \mathcal{R}(I) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(I, V)_*$ for some V . For example if $V = \emptyset$, then the fibers of the transfer $f^!: \mathcal{R}([0, n]^r) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}([0, n]^r, \emptyset)_* = [0, n]_*^r$ are of the form $[k_1, k_1 + 1) \times \cdots \times [k_r, k_r + 1)$, where k_i belongs to $[0, n]$. This is a standard way of describing tame functors indexed by $[0, n]^r$ (see [13, 24, 22]).

Tame functors indexed by an upper semilattice form a particularly nice category. For example, if the values have finite colimits and limits, then so does the category of tame functors indexed by an upper semilattice. More generally, we prove (see Theorem 9.3) that a model structure on the category \mathcal{C} naturally extends to a model structure on tame functors indexed by an upper semilattice with values in \mathcal{C} . This enables the use of homotopical and homological algebra tools to study tame functors indexed by upper semilattices.

There are situations however when we would like to understand homological properties of tame functors indexed by realisations which are not upper semilattices. Surprisingly, a lot can be described in such cases as well. The last Section 10 is devoted to present how one might construct minimal resolutions, Betti diagrams, and how to calculate them using Koszul complexes for tame functors indexed by rather general posets with values in the category of vector spaces. These results become particularly transparent in the case of functors indexed by realisations which are described in Theorem 10.19. For example, parental dimensions of its elements can be used to bound their homological dimensions.

Part I, posets.

2. BASIC NOTIONS

In this section, we recall and introduce some basic concepts that might already be familiar. The reader may choose to skip this section and come back to it whenever the text refers to a specific notion.

2.1. The standard poset of real numbers is denoted by \mathbb{R} . Its subposet of non-negative real numbers is denoted by $[0, \infty)$, of natural numbers $\{0, 1, \dots\}$ by \mathbb{N} , the first $n + 1$ natural numbers by $[n]$, $[a, b] := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \leq x \leq b\}$, and $(a, b] := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a < x \leq b\}$.

The product of posets (I, \leq) and (J, \leq) is the poset $(I \times J, \leq)$, where $(x, y) \leq (x_1, y_1)$ if $x \leq x_1$ and $y \leq y_1$. For a set S and a poset I , the symbol I^S denotes the poset of all functions $f: S \rightarrow I$ with $f \leq g$ if $f(x) \leq g(x)$ for every x in S . The poset I^S is isomorphic to the $|S|$ fold product $I^{|S|}$.

The poset $[1]^S$ is called the **discrete cube** of dimension $|S|$ and the poset $[-1, 0]^S$ is called the **geometric cube** of dimension $|S|$.

The inclusion poset of all subsets of S is denoted by 2^S . The function mapping $f: S \rightarrow [1]$ in $[1]^S$ to the subset $f^{-1}(1) \subset S$ is an isomorphism between the posets $[1]^S$ and 2^S . This function is used to identify these two posets, and 2^S is also referred to as the discrete cube of dimension $|S|$.

Enlarge a set S with two additional elements (denoted by $\bigwedge S$ and $\bigvee S$) to form a disjoint union $S \coprod \{\bigwedge S, \bigvee S\}$, and consider the following relation on this enlarged set: elements in S are incomparable and $\bigwedge S \leq s \leq \bigvee S$ for all s in S . This poset is denoted by ΣS and called the **suspension** of S .

2.2. Let I be a poset and a be its element. For a subset $S \subset I$: $S \leq a := \{s \in S \mid s \leq a\}$, $S < a := \{s \in S \mid s < a\}$, and $a \leq S := \{s \in S \mid a \leq s\}$.

A poset I is called of **finite type** if $I \leq a$ is finite for every a in I . A finite poset is of finite type. The poset \mathbb{N} is infinite and of finite type. The poset \mathbb{R} is not of finite type.

An element x in I is called a **parent** of a if $x < a$ and there is no element y in I such that $x < y < a$. The term a **covers** x is also commonly used to describe x is a parent of a . The symbol $\mathcal{P}_I(a)$ or $\mathcal{P}(a)$, if I is understood from the context, denotes the set of all parents of a . For example, every element in \mathbb{R} has an empty set of parents. In the poset $[1]$, $\mathcal{P}_{[1]}(0) = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{P}_{[1]}(1) = \{0\}$. A poset I is of finite type if and only if, for every a in I , the sets $\mathcal{P}_I(a)$ and $\{n \mid \text{there is a sequence } x_0 < \dots < x_n = a \text{ in } I\}$ are finite.

Let I and J be posets and $f: I \rightarrow J$ be a function (not necessarily preserving the poset relations). For an element a in J :

$$f \leq a := \{x \in I \mid f(x) \leq a\} \quad a \leq f := \{x \in I \mid a \leq f(x)\}.$$

For example $(\text{id}_I \leq a) \subset I$ coincides with $(I \leq a) \subset I$.

If $f \leq a$ is finite for every a in J , then $f: I \rightarrow J$ is called of **finite type**. For example, if I is finite, then every function $f: I \rightarrow J$ is of finite type.

2.3. Let $S \subset I$ be a subset of a poset I . If $(a \leq S) = S$ (i.e. $a \leq s$ for all s in S), then a is called an **ancestor** of S . If $(a < S) = S$ (i.e. $a < s$ for all s in S), then a is called a **proper ancestor** of S . Every proper ancestor of S is its ancestor. Every element is a proper ancestor of the empty subset.

If a is an ancestor of S for which there is no other ancestor b of S such that $a < b$, then a is called an **inf** of S . For example, an element

a in I is an inf of the empty subset if and only if there is no b in I for which $a < b$. Such an element is also called **maximal** in I . For instance an element is an inf of S if and only if it is maximal in the subposet $\{a \in I \mid (a \leq S) = S\} \subset I$. An element a in I is an inf of the entire I if and only if $a \leq x$ for every x in I . If such an element exists, then it is unique and is called the **global minimum** of I . Two different inf elements of a subset are not comparable.

In general, S can have many inf elements. In the case S has only one inf element, then this element is called the **product** of S and is denoted either by $\bigwedge_I S$ or $\bigwedge S$, if I is clear from the context. Explicitly, the product of S is an element ν in I such that $(\nu \leq S) = S$ and, for every a in I for which $(a \leq S) = S$, the relation $a \leq \nu$ holds. The product $\bigwedge_I \{x, y\}$ is also denoted as $x \wedge_I y$ or $x \wedge y$. For example, if the product of the empty subset of I exists, then I has a unique maximal element given by $\bigwedge_I \emptyset$. This element may fail however to be the global maximum of I . The element $\bigwedge_I I$, if it exists, is the global minimum of I .

2.4. Let $S \subset I$ be a subset of a poset I . If $(S \leq a) = S$ ($s \leq a$ for all s in S), then a is called a **descendent** of S . For example, every element is a descendent of the empty subset.

If a is a descendent of S for which there is no other descendent b of S such that $b < a$, then a is called a **sup** of S . For example, an element a in I is a sup of the empty subset if and only if there is no b in I for which $b < a$. Such an element is also called **minimal** in I . For instance an element is a sup of S if and only if it is minimal in the subposet $\{a \in I \mid (S \leq a) = S\} \subset I$. An element a in I is a sup of the entire I if and only if $x \leq a$ for every x in I . If such an element exists, then it is unique and is called the **global maximum** of I . Two different sup elements of a subset are not comparable.

In general, S can have many sup elements. In the case S has only one sup element, then this element is called the **coproduct** of S and is denoted either by $\bigvee_I S$ or $\bigvee S$, if I is clear from the context. Explicitly, the coproduct of S is an element ν in I such that $(S \leq \nu) = S$, and for every a in I for which $(S \leq a) = S$, the relation $\nu \leq a$ holds. The coproduct $\bigvee_I \{x, y\}$ is also denoted as $x \vee_I y$ or $x \vee y$. For example, if the coproduct of the empty subset of I exists, then I has a unique minimal element given by $\bigvee_I \emptyset$. This element may fail however to be the global minimum of I . The element $\bigvee_I I$, if it exists, is the global maximum of I .

The product can be expressed as a coproduct $\bigwedge_I S = \bigvee_I (\bigcap_{x \in S} (I \leq x))$, where the equality should be read as follows: the coproduct on the right

exists if and only if the product on the left exists, in which case they are equal. Thus, if every subset of I has the coproduct, then every subset has also the product.

2.5. Every subset of $[0, \infty)$ has the product. Every subset of $[-1, 0]$ has both the product and the coproduct.

Let S be a set. If all subsets of a poset I have products, then the same is true for all subsets of I^S , where the product of $T \subset I^S$ is given by the function mapping x in S to the product $\bigwedge_I \{f(x) \mid f \in T\}$ in I .

If all subsets of I have coproducts, then the same is true for all subsets of I^S , where the coproduct of $T \subset I^S$ is given by the function mapping x in S to the coproduct $\bigvee_I \{f(x) \mid f \in T\}$ in I .

In the suspension ΣS (see 2.1), the element $\bigwedge S$ is its global minimum, and the element $\bigvee S$ is its global maximum. The elements $\bigwedge S$ and $\bigvee S$ are respectively the product and coproduct of any subset $U \subset S$ of size at least 2. The suspension ΣS is of finite type if and only if S is finite.

The discrete cube 2^S (see 2.1) is a poset whose every subset Z has the coproduct and consequently the product which are given respectively by the union $\bigvee Z = \bigcup_{\sigma \in Z} \sigma$ and the intersection $\bigwedge Z = \bigcap_{\sigma \in Z} \sigma$. The subset $\emptyset \subset S$ is the global minimum of 2^S and $S \subset S$ is the global maximum. Note also that every parent of $U \subset S$ in 2^S is of the form $U \setminus \{x\}$ for x in U . Thus, the function $x \mapsto U \setminus \{x\}$ is a bijection between U and $\mathcal{P}_{2^S}(U)$ (see 2.2).

2.6. A poset that has a global minimum is called **unital**. For example $[-1, 0]$ is unital and \mathbb{R} is not. If I is unital, then so is I^S , for every set S , with its global minimum given by the constant function mapping every s in S to the global minimum of I . A function $f: I \rightarrow J$ between unital posets is called **unital** if it maps the global minimum in I to the global minimum in J .

For a poset I , the symbol I_* denotes the poset formed by adding an additional element $-\infty$ to I and setting $-\infty < x$ for all x in I . The element $-\infty$ in I_* is its global minimum.

Any function $f: I \rightarrow J$ extends uniquely to a unital function $f_*: I_* \rightarrow J_*$ making the following diagram commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I & \xrightarrow{f} & J \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ I_* & \xrightarrow{f_*} & J_* \end{array}$$

Note that $(f_* \leq -\infty) = \{-\infty\}$, and $(f_* \leq a) = (f \leq a) \cup \{-\infty\}$ if a is in J . Thus, a function $f: I \rightarrow J$ is of finite type if and only if

$f_*: I_* \rightarrow J_*$ is of finite type. Furthermore, $f_* \leq a$ is non-empty for every a in J_* .

The function $J^I \rightarrow J_*^I$, mapping f to f_* , is injective and preserves the poset relations: if $f \leq g$, then $f_* \leq g_*$.

2.7. For a poset (I, \leq) , the same symbol I denotes also the category whose set of objects is I and where $\text{mor}_I(x, y)$ is either empty if $x \not\leq y$, or has cardinality 1 in case $x \leq y$.

A **functor** between poset categories I and J is a function $f: I \rightarrow J$ preserving the poset relations: if $x \leq y$ in I , then $f(x) \leq f(y)$ in J . For example the function $J^I \rightarrow J_*^I$, described in 2.6, is a functor. A poset isomorphism is also a functor. The category whose objects are posets and morphisms are functors is denoted by **Posets**.

A function $f: I \rightarrow J$ is called a **subposet inclusion** if, for every x and y in I , $x \leq y$ if and only if $f(x) \leq f(y)$ in J . A subposet inclusion is always an injective functor. Not all injective functors however are subposet inclusions. If $I \subset J$ is a subposet of J , then this inclusion is a subposet inclusion. If $f: I \rightarrow J$ is a subposet inclusion, then it induces a poset isomorphism between I and its image subposet $f(I) \subset J$.

The symbol $\text{Fun}(I, J)$ denotes the subposet of J^I (see 2.1) whose elements are functors. Since in this poset $f \leq g$ if $f(x) \leq g(x)$ for all x in I , the category $\text{Fun}(I, J)$ coincides with the category whose morphisms are natural transformations. More generally, for a poset I and a category \mathcal{C} , the symbol $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C})$ denotes the category of functors $I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ with natural transformations as morphisms. If $f: I \rightarrow J$ is a functor of posets, then precomposing with f functor is denoted by $(-)^f: \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C})$.

The global minimum (see 2.3) of a poset coincides with the initial object in the associated category. If I is a unital poset (it has the global minimum) and \mathcal{C} is a category with an initial object, then a functor $f: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is called **unital** if it maps the global minimum in I to an initial object in \mathcal{C} . The symbol $\text{Fun}_*(I, \mathcal{C})$ denotes the category whose objects are unital functors from I to \mathcal{C} and morphisms are natural transformations.

Let I be a poset and \mathcal{C} be a category with a unique initial object. Any functor $F: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ can be extended uniquely to a unital functor $F_*: I_* \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ whose composition with $I \subset I_*$ is F . The association $F \mapsto F_*$ is an isomorphism of categories between $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C})$ and $\text{Fun}_*(I_*, \mathcal{C})$. We use this isomorphism to identify these categories.

2.8. Let I be a poset. A **lax functor** $T: I \rightsquigarrow \text{Posets}$ ([25, Definition 1]) assigns to every element a in I a poset T_a and to every relation $a \leq b$ in I a functor $T_{a \leq b}: T_a \rightarrow T_b$. These functors are required to

satisfy two conditions. First, $T_{a \leq a}$ is the identity for all a in I . Second, $T_{a \leq c} \leq T_{b \leq c} T_{a \leq b}$ for all $a \leq b \leq c$ in I . For example, every functor is a lax functor, as in this case the equality $T_{a \leq c} = T_{b \leq c} T_{a \leq b}$ holds.

Let $T: I \rightsquigarrow \text{Posets}$ be a lax functor. Define $\text{Gr}_I T := \{(a, f) \mid a \in I, f \in T_a\}$. For (a, f) and (b, g) in $\text{Gr}_I T$, set $(a, f) \leq (b, g)$ if $a \leq b$ in I and $T_{a \leq b}(f) \leq g$ in T_b . For example, $(a, f) \leq (a, g)$ if and only if $f \leq g$ in T_a . The conditions required to be satisfied by lax functors guarantee the transitivity of the relation \leq on $\text{Gr}_I T$. The poset $(\text{Gr}_I T, \leq)$ is called **Grothendieck construction**. In the case T is the constant functor with value J , then $\text{Gr}_I T$ is isomorphic to the product $I \times J$.

The function $\pi: \text{Gr}_I T \rightarrow I$, mapping (a, f) to a , is a functor called the **standard projection**. For a in I , the function $\text{in}_a: T_a \rightarrow \text{Gr}_I T$, mapping f to (a, f) , is also a functor called the **standard inclusion**. The functor in_a is a subposet inclusion (see 2.7).

2.9. Proposition. *Let I be a poset, $T: I \rightsquigarrow \text{Posets}$ a lax functor, and $S \subset \text{Gr}_I T$ a non-empty subset.*

- (1) *Assume $\pi(S) = \{a\}$. Then an element (b, y) is a sup of S in $\text{Gr}_I T$ if and only if $b = a$ and y is a sup of $\{f \mid (a, f) \in S\}$ in T_a .*
- (2) *Let b be a sup of $\pi(S)$ in I . Then an element (b, m) is a sup of S in $\text{Gr}_I T$ if and only if m is a sup of $\{T_{a \leq b} f \mid (a, f) \in S\}$ in T_b .*

Proof. Statement (1) is a particular case of (2). Statement (2) is a consequence of the equivalence: $T_{a \leq b} f \leq g \leq m$ in T_b , for every (a, f) in S , if and only if $(a, f) \leq (b, g) \leq (b, m)$ in $\text{Gr}_I T$, for every (a, f) in S . \square

2.10. Let $f: I \rightarrow J$ be a function (not necessarily a functor). Define $J[f] \subset 2^I$ to be the subposet whose elements are subsets of the form $(f \leq a) \subset I$, for a in J . Let $f \leq: J \rightarrow J[f]$ be the function mapping a to $f \leq a$. Note that if $a \leq b$ in J , then $(f \leq a) \subset (f \leq b)$, which means $f \leq$ is a functor. An important property of being a functor is that its fibers $(f \leq)^{-1}(f \leq a) \subset J$, for a in J , satisfy the following property: if $x \leq y$ in J belong to $(f \leq)^{-1}(f \leq a)$, then so does any z in J such that $x \leq z \leq y$. Recall that such subposets of J are called **intervals** or **convex**.

2.11. Let $f: I \rightarrow J$ be a functor of posets and \mathcal{C} a category. Recall that a functor $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is called a **left Kan extension** of $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ along f (see [18]), if there is a natural transformation $\alpha: G \rightarrow Ff$ satisfying the following universal property: for every functor $H: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, the function $\text{Nat}_J(F, H) \rightarrow \text{Nat}_I(G, Hf)$, mapping $\phi: F \rightarrow H$ to

the following composition, called the **adjoint** to ϕ , is a bijection:

$$G \xrightarrow{\alpha} Ff \xrightarrow{\phi^f} Hf$$

This universal property has two consequences. First, is the uniqueness: if F and F' are two left Kan extensions of G along $f: I \rightarrow J$, and $\alpha: G \rightarrow Ff$ and $\alpha': G \rightarrow F'f$ are natural transformations satisfying the above universal property, then there is a unique isomorphism $\psi: F \rightarrow F'$ for which $\alpha' = \psi^f \alpha$. Because of this uniqueness, if it exists, a left Kan extension of $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ along $f: I \rightarrow J$ is denoted by $f^k G: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. Functoriality of left Kan extensions is another consequence of the universal property. Let $\phi: G \rightarrow G'$ be a natural transformation between two functors $G, G': I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. If these functors admit the left Kan extensions along f , then there is a unique natural transformation $f^k \phi: f^k G \rightarrow f^k G'$ for which the following square commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G & \xrightarrow{\phi} & G' \\ \alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha' \\ (f^k G)f & \xrightarrow{(f^k \phi)^f} & (f^k G')f \end{array}$$

If all functors in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C})$ admit left Kan extensions along f , then the association $f^k: \text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C})$ is a functor which is left adjoint to the precomposition with f functor $(-)^f: \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C})$. For example, this happens if \mathcal{C} is closed under finite colimits and $f: I \rightarrow J$ is of finite type. In this case, the left Kan extension of G along f is given by $a \mapsto \text{colim}_{f \leq a} G$ (see [18]). This description of the left Kan extension, in the case f is of finite type and \mathcal{C} is closed under finite colimits, has several consequences. For example, $f^k G$ is isomorphic to a functor given by a composition (see 2.10):

$$J \xrightarrow{f \leq} J[f] \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

The restrictions of $f^k G$ to the fibres $(f \leq)^{-1}(f \leq a) = \{b \in J \mid (f \leq b) = (f \leq a)\} \subset J$, for a in J , are therefore isomorphic to constant functors. When I is finite, then, since $J[f]$ is also finite, the left Kan extension $f^k G$ factors through a finite poset $J[f]$. Such functors have been considered for example in [20, Definition 2.11].

2.12. Let \mathcal{C} be a category closed under finite colimits, $f: I \subset J$ a subposet inclusion (see 2.7) of finite type, and $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ a functor. Since every a in I is the terminal object in $f \leq f(a)$, the morphism

$G(a) \rightarrow \operatorname{colim}_{f \leq a} G$ is an isomorphism. Consequently the natural transformation $\alpha: G \rightarrow (f^k G)f$, adjoint to $\operatorname{id}: f^k G \rightarrow f^k G$, is an isomorphism.

This implies that, for every pair of functors $G, H: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, the function $f^k: \operatorname{Nat}_I(H, G) \rightarrow \operatorname{Nat}_J(f^k H, f^k G)$, mapping ϕ to $f^k \phi$, is a bijection. Injectivity is clear by what has been already stated. For surjectivity, consider a natural transformation $\psi: f^k H \rightarrow f^k G$. Let $\phi: H \rightarrow G$ be the unique natural transformation which makes the following left triangle commutative, and where the horizontal arrow ψ' represent the adjoint to ψ (such ϕ exists since α is an isomorphism):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H & \xrightarrow{\psi'} & (f^k G)f \\ & \searrow \phi & \uparrow \alpha \\ & & G \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} f^k H & \xrightarrow{\psi} & f^k G \\ & \searrow f^k \phi & \uparrow \operatorname{id} \\ & & f^k G \end{array}$$

By taking adjoints to ψ' and α we obtain a commutative triangle depicted on the right above, showing that $\psi = f^k \phi$.

3. DIMENSION AND PARENTAL DIMENSION

Let (I, \leq) be a poset and x be an element in I . In this section we propose two ways of measuring complexity of expressing x as a sup (see 2.4).

3.1. Let

$$\Phi_I(x) := \left\{ U \mid \begin{array}{l} U \subset I \text{ is finite, has a proper ancestor, } x \text{ is a sup of it, and} \\ x \text{ is not a sup of any } S \text{ such that } \emptyset \neq S \subsetneq U \end{array} \right\}.$$

Since \emptyset belongs to $\Phi_I(x)$, this collection is non-empty. The following extended (containing ∞) number is called the **dimension** of x :

$$\dim_I(x) := \sup\{|U| \mid U \in \Phi_I(x)\}.$$

An element U in $\Phi_I(x)$, for which $\dim_I(x) = |U|$, is said to **realise** $\dim_I(x)$.

Since any subset $U \subset I$, for which x is a sup, is contained in $I \leq x$, there is an inequality $\dim_I(x) \leq |I \leq x|$. In particular, if I is of finite type (see 2.2), then $\dim_I(x)$ is finite for every x .

The empty set realises $\dim_I(x)$ if and only if $\dim_I(x) = 0$, which happens if and only if x is minimal in I (see 2.4). The set $\{x\}$ is the only set realising $\dim_I(x)$ if and only if $\dim_I(x) = 1$. If $\dim_I(x) > 1$, then every set realising $\dim_I(x)$ cannot contain x .

Here are some examples:

- In the poset $[n]$, $\dim_{[n]}(k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k = 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } k > 0 \end{cases}$.
- In the poset $[-1, 0]$, $\dim_{[-1, 0]}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = -1 \\ 1 & \text{if } x > -1 \end{cases}$.
- In the poset \mathbb{R} , $\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(x) = 1$ for every x in \mathbb{R} .
- In the poset 2^S (see 2.1), $\dim_{2^S}(\sigma) = |\sigma|$ and this dimension is realised by, for example, $\{\{x\} \mid x \in \sigma\}$.
- In the suspension poset ΣS (see 2.1),

$$\dim_{\Sigma S}(x) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } x = \bigvee S \text{ and } |S| \geq 2 \\ 1 & \text{if either } x \in S, \text{ or } x = \bigvee S \text{ and } |S| < 2 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = \bigwedge S \end{cases}$$

If $|S| \geq 2$, then every subset of S of size 2 realises $\dim_{\Sigma S}(\bigvee S) = 2$.

The dimension of an element x depends on the global properties of the subposet $I \leq x$. This dimension can be approximated by a more tractable parental dimension which for elements in a finite type poset depends only on their parents (see Proposition 3.5).

3.2. Let

$$\Psi_I(x) := \left\{ U \mid \begin{array}{l} U \subset (I < x) \text{ is finite, has an ancestor, and} \\ x \text{ is a sup of every two element subset of } U \end{array} \right\}.$$

Since \emptyset belongs to $\Psi_I(x)$, this collection is non-empty. The following extended number is called the **parental dimension** of x :

$$\text{par-dim}_I(x) := \sup\{|U| \mid U \in \Psi_I(x)\}.$$

An element U in $\Psi_I(x)$, for which $\text{par-dim}_I(x) = |U|$, is said to **realise** $\text{par-dim}_I(x)$. Here are some examples:

- If I is $[n]$, or $[-1, 0]$, or \mathbb{R} , then $\text{par-dim}_I(x) = \dim_I(x)$ for all x in I .
- In the poset 2^S , for every $\sigma \subset S$, $\text{par-dim}_I(x) = |\sigma| = \dim_I(x)$ and the parental dimension is realised by for example $\{\sigma \setminus \{x\} \mid x \in \sigma\}$.
- In the suspension poset ΣS , $\text{par-dim}_{\Sigma S}(\bigvee S) = \max\{|S|, 1\}$, and, if S is non-empty, then S realises $\text{par-dim}_{\Sigma S}(\bigvee S)$. If S has at least three elements, then there is a strict inequality $\dim_{\Sigma S}(\bigvee S) = 2 < |S| = \text{par-dim}_{\Sigma S}(\bigvee S)$.

The empty set realises $\text{par-dim}_I(x)$ if and only if $\text{par-dim}_I(x) = 0$, which happens if and only if x is minimal in I . Thus, $\text{par-dim}_I(x) = 0$ if and only if $\dim_I(x) = 0$.

The equality $\text{par-dim}_I(x) = 1$ holds if and only if there is $y < x$ and x is not a sup of any two element subset that has an ancestor. Let S in $\Phi_I(x)$ (see 3.1) be such that $|S| \geq 2$. Choose s in S . Since x is not a sup of $S \setminus \{s\}$, there is $z < x$ for which $(S \setminus \{s\}) \subset (I \leq z)$. Moreover $s < x$ and x is a sup of $\{s, z\}$ which is a contradiction. Thus every element of $\Phi_I(x)$ is of size at most 1, and hence $\text{dim}_I(x) = 1$. We have just proved:

3.3. Proposition. *Let I be a poset.*

- (1) $\text{dim}_I(x) = 0$ if and only if $\text{par-dim}_I(x) = 0$.
- (2) $\text{dim}_I(x) = 1$ if and only if $\text{par-dim}_I(x) = 1$.
- (3) $\text{dim}_I(x) \geq 2$ if and only if $\text{par-dim}_I(x) \geq 2$.

One reason why parental dimension is easier to calculate is:

3.4. Lemma. *Let I be a poset, x its element, and U be in $\Psi_I(x)$. Assume $\alpha: U \rightarrow I$ is a function such that $u \leq \alpha(u) < x$, for every u in U . Then α is injective, in particular $|\alpha(U)| = |U|$, and its image $\alpha(U)$ belongs to $\Psi_I(x)$.*

Proof. Let s and u be elements in U . If $\alpha(s) = \alpha(u)$, then the relations $s \leq \alpha(s) = \alpha(u) \geq u$ and $\alpha(s) < x$ imply that x is not a sup of $\{s, u\}$. This can happen only if $s = u$, as U belongs to $\Psi_I(x)$. Thus α is injective and $|U| = |\alpha(U)|$. If $\alpha(s) \neq \alpha(u)$, then a consequence of the relations $s \leq \alpha(s) < x > \alpha(u) \geq u$ and the fact that x is a sup of $\{s, u\}$, is that x is also a sup of $\{\alpha(s), \alpha(u)\}$. Furthermore, any ancestor of U is also an ancestor of $\alpha(U)$. The set $\alpha(U)$ belongs therefore to $\Psi_I(x)$. \square

Lemma 3.4 can be used to prove the following proposition which is the reason behind choosing the name parental dimension.

3.5. Proposition. *If I is a poset of finite type, then, for every x in I :*

$$\text{par-dim}_I(x) = \max\{|S| \mid S \subset \mathcal{P}(x) \text{ and } S \text{ has an ancestor}\}$$

Proof. Since x is a sup of every two elements subset of $\mathcal{P}(x)$, the right side of the claimed equality is smaller or equal than the left side.

Let U be in $\Psi_I(x)$. Since I is of finite type, for all u in U , there is a $\alpha(u)$ in $\mathcal{P}(x)$ for which $u \leq \alpha(u)$. According to Lemma 3.4, $|\alpha(U)| = |U|$ so the left side of the claimed equality is smaller or equal than the right side. \square

There are two numbers assigned to x in I , its dimension $\text{dim}_I(x)$ and its parental dimension $\text{par-dim}_I(x)$. According to Proposition 3.3, if one of these dimensions is 0 or 1 then so is the other. In general the parental dimension always bounds the dimension:

3.6. Proposition. *For every x in a poset I , $\dim_I(x) \leq \text{par-dim}_I(x)$.*

Proof. The cases when $\dim_I(x)$ is 0 and 1 follow from Proposition 3.3. Let U be in $\Phi_I(x)$, with $|U| \geq 2$. Since, for every u in U , the element x is not a sup of $U \setminus \{u\}$, there is s_u in I such that $u' \leq s_u < x$ for every u' in $U \setminus \{u\}$. If u_0 and u_1 are different elements in U , then x being a sup of U implies that s_{u_0} and s_{u_1} are also different and x is a sup of $\{s_{u_0}, s_{u_1}\}$. Moreover, any proper ancestor of U is also an ancestor of $S := \{s_u \mid u \in U\}$. Thus, S has the same size as U and belongs to $\Psi_I(x)$. For every element U in $\Phi_I(x)$, we have constructed an element S in $\Psi_I(x)$ of the same size as U . \square

Note that the inequality in 3.6 can be strict (see 3.2).

3.7. Proposition. *Let I and J be posets. For every x in I and y in J :*

- (1) $\dim_{I \times J}(x, y) = \dim_I(x) + \dim_J(y)$,
- (2) $\text{par-dim}_{I \times J}(x, y) = \text{par-dim}_I(x) + \text{par-dim}_J(y)$.

Proof. (1): First, we show $\dim_{I \times J}(x, y) \geq \dim_I(x) + \dim_J(y)$.

If $\dim_I(x) = 0$, then x is minimal in I . In this case every element of $\Phi_{I \times J}(x, y)$ is of the form $\{x\} \times U$, where U belongs to $\Phi_J(y)$ and hence the inequality is clear. Assume $\dim_I(x) \geq 1$ and $\dim_J(y) \geq 1$. Let S and U belong respectively to $\Phi_I(x)$ and $\Phi_J(y)$. Let x' be a proper ancestor of S and y' be a proper ancestor of U . Then $|S| + |U| = |(S \times \{y'\}) \cup (\{x'\} \times U)|$. Since $(S \times \{y'\}) \cup (\{x'\} \times U) \subset I \times J$ belongs to $\Phi_{I \times J}(x, y)$, we get $\dim_{I \times J}(x, y) \geq |S| + |U|$, which gives the desired inequality.

To show $\dim_{I \times J}(x, y) \leq \dim_I(x) + \dim_J(y)$, consider W in $\Phi_{I \times J}(x, y)$. For every element (a, b) in W , the set W cannot contain a subset of the form $\{(a', b), (a, b')\}$, where $a' \neq a$ and $b' \neq b$, otherwise (x, y) would be a sup of $W \setminus \{(a, b)\}$. Consequently, $|W| \leq |\text{pr}_I(W)| + |\text{pr}_J(W)|$, where pr_I and pr_J denote the projections. Moreover, $\text{pr}_I(W)$ and $\text{pr}_J(W)$ have, respectively, x and y as sup, so $|\text{pr}_I(W)| + |\text{pr}_J(W)| \leq \dim_I(x) + \dim_J(y)$.

(2): As before, we start by showing $\text{par-dim}_{I \times J}(x, y) \geq \text{par-dim}_I(x) + \text{par-dim}_J(y)$. We argue in the same way. Let S and U belong respectively to $\Psi_I(x)$ and $\Psi_J(y)$. Then $(S \times \{y\}) \cup (\{x\} \times U) \subset I \times J$ belongs to $\Psi_{I \times J}(x, y)$ and is of size $|S| + |U|$, which gives the desired inequality.

To show the other inequality $\text{par-dim}_{I \times J}(x, y) \leq \text{par-dim}_I(x) + \text{par-dim}_J(y)$ consider W in $\Psi_{I \times J}(x, y)$. Then every (a, b) in W is such that $(a, b) < (x, y)$ and we define $\alpha(a, b) := (a, y)$ if $a < x$, and $\alpha(a, b) := (a, b)$ if $a = x$. These elements are chosen so that $(a, b) \leq \alpha(a, b) < (x, y)$ for every (a, b) in W . By Lemma 3.4, $\alpha(W)$ also belongs to $\Psi_{I \times J}(x, y)$.

Since $|\alpha(W)| \leq |\text{pr}_I \alpha(W)| + |\text{pr}_J \alpha(W)|$, we get the desired inequality. \square

Let S be a finite set. Since $[-1, 0]^S$ and $[-1, 0]^{|S|}$ are isomorphic (see 2.1), Proposition 3.7 gives $\dim_{[-1, 0]^S} f = \text{par-dim}_{[-1, 0]^S} f = |\{s \in S \mid f(s) > -1\}|$.

3.8. Neither the dimension nor the parental dimension are monotonic in the following sense. If $I \subset J$ is a subposet inclusion (see 2.7) and $x \in I$, then in general the following inequalities may fail: $\dim_I(x) \leq \dim_J(x)$ and $\text{par-dim}_I(x) \leq \text{par-dim}_J(x)$. For example, consider:

$$I = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (2, 2)\} \subset \mathbb{N}^2$$

$$J = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1), (2, 2)\} \subset \mathbb{N}^2$$

Then $\dim_I(2, 2) = \text{par-dim}_I(2, 2) = 2$, $\dim_J(2, 2) = \text{par-dim}_J(2, 2) = 1$. For the monotonicity, additional assumptions need to be made, for example:

3.9. Proposition. *Let $I \subset J$ be a subposet inclusion (see 2.7). Assume an element x in I has the following property: for every finite subset $S \subset I$, if x is a sup of S in I , then x is a sup of S in J . Under this assumption $\dim_I(x) \leq \dim_J(x)$ and $\text{par-dim}_I(x) \leq \text{par-dim}_J(x)$.*

Proof. The assumption on x implies that $\Phi_I(x) \subset \Phi_J(x)$ (see 3.1) and $\Psi_I(x) \subset \Psi_J(x)$ (see 3.2), which gives the claimed inequalities. \square

4. REALISING POSETS

In this section we introduce a construction that transforms posets into posets, mimicking the relation between \mathbb{N}^r and $[0, \infty)^r$. Let (I, \leq) be a poset.

4.1. Consider a in I and its set of parents $\mathcal{P}(a)$. Table 1 describes how a partitions I into three disjoint subsets of a -**inconsistent**, a -**dependent**, and a -**independent** elements. For example, x is a -independent if it is not a -dependent ($a \not\leq x$), however it is p -dependent ($p \leq x$) for some p in $\mathcal{P}(a)$. Observe that every parent p of a is a -independent. An element which is either a -dependent or a -independent is called a -**consistent**. This terminology is inspired by linear algebra. We think of this partition as solutions of certain poset conditions, which in the case of an upper semilattice (see 6.2) behave as solutions of a linear system: an inconsistent system has no solutions, an independent system has a unique solution, and a dependent system has many solutions.




FIGURE 2. Black triangles are a -dependent, dark grey squares are a -independent, and light grey dots are a -inconsistent

x is a -consistent	x is a -dependent	$a \leq x$
	x is a -independent	$a \not\leq x$ and $(\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x) \neq \emptyset$
a -inconsistent		$a \not\leq x$ and $(\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x) = \emptyset$

TABLE 1.

Figure 2 illustrates the partitions of \mathbb{N}^2 , ΣS , and a poset of size 5 (as illustrated in (c)), into a -inconsistent, a -dependent, and a -independent blocks for some choices of a .

A consequence of the transitivity is that being dependent is preserved by the poset relation: if $a \leq b$, then a b -dependent element is also a -dependent. Being independent does not have this property: a b -independent element may fail to be a -independent for some $a \leq b$. For example, consider the subposet $I = \{(0, 0), (2, 0), (3, 0), (0, 2), (3, 2)\} \subset [0, \infty)^2$. Then, in I , the element $(0, 2)$ is $(3, 2)$ -independent, however it is not $(3, 0)$ -independent. The element $(0, 2)$ is neither $(3, 0)$ -dependent and hence neither consistency is in general preserved by the poset relation.

4.2. Define I to be **consistent** if, for every $a \leq b$ in I , every b -independent element, which has a common ancestor with a , is also a -consistent. Thus, I being consistent is equivalent to the following condition for every $a \leq b$ in I : a b -consistent element x is a -consistent if and only if there is an element y in I such that $x \geq y \leq a$.

Distributive upper semilattices of finite type are key examples of consistent posets (see 6.4). For example, the poset \mathbb{N}^r is consistent. If $|S| \geq 3$, then the suspension ΣS (see 2.1) is an example of a consistent upper semilattice which is not distributive (see 5.1).

4.3. Define $\mathcal{G}(I) := \coprod_{a \in I} [-1, 0]^{\mathcal{P}(a)}$ (see 2.1 and 2.2). We are going to identify elements of $\mathcal{G}(I)$ with pairs (a, f) consisting of an element

a in I and a function $f: \mathcal{P}(a) \rightarrow [-1, 0]$. The set $\text{supp}(f) := \{p \in \mathcal{P}(a) \mid f(p) < 0\}$ is called the **support** of f . If $\mathcal{P}(a)$ is empty, then the set $[-1, 0]^{\mathcal{P}(a)}$ contains only one element which we denote by 0, in which case $(a, 0)$ is the only element in $\mathcal{G}(I)$ with the first coordinate a .

For (a, f) and (b, g) in $\mathcal{G}(I)$, set $(a, f) \leq (b, g)$ if:

- (a) $a \leq b$ in I ;
- (b) all elements in $\text{supp}(g)$ are a -consistent: if $g(x) < 0$, then either x is a -dependent ($a \leq x$) or x is a -independent ($a \not\leq x$ and $(\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x) \neq \emptyset$);
- (c) $\bigwedge_{[-1, 0]} \{f(y) \mid y \in (\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x)\} \leq g(x)$ for all a -independent x in $\mathcal{P}(b)$.

For example, $(a, f) \leq (a, g)$ in $\mathcal{G}(I)$ if and only if $f \leq g$ in $[-1, 0]^{\mathcal{P}(a)}$. Thus the inclusion $[-1, 0]^{\mathcal{P}(a)} \subset \mathcal{G}(I)$, assigning to f the pair (a, f) , is a subposet inclusion (2.7). If 0 is the constant function with value 0, then $(a, 0) \leq (b, 0)$ in $\mathcal{G}(I)$ if and only if $a \leq b$ in I . Thus the inclusion $I \subset \mathcal{G}(I)$, assigning to a the pair $(a, 0)$, is also a subposet inclusion. The projection $\pi: \mathcal{G}(I) \rightarrow I$, assigning to a pair (a, f) the element a , is a functor of posets.

We think about an element (a, f) in $\mathcal{G}(I)$ as an intermediate point between a and its parents, where the value of $f(p)$ describes the time needed to go back in the direction of the parent p .

4.4. Proposition. *If $(a, f) \leq (b, g)$ in $\mathcal{G}(I)$, then every $w \leq a$ which is an ancestor of $\text{supp}(f)$ is also an ancestor of $\text{supp}(g)$.*

Proof. Let $w \leq a$ be an ancestor of $\text{supp}(f)$, and x be in $\text{supp}(g)$. Then x is a -consistent, and, thus, either $a \leq x$, implying $w \leq x$, or $\bigwedge \{f(y) \mid y \in (\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x)\} \leq g(x) < 0$, implying the existence of y in $\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x$ with $f(y) < 0$. For such a y , $w \leq y \leq x$. \square

To understand the relation \leq on $\mathcal{G}(I)$ it is convenient to describe it in an alternative way using translations.

4.5. Definition. For a in I , define $T_a := [-1, 0]^{\mathcal{P}(a)}$ (see 2.1). For $a \leq b$ in I , define $T_{a \leq b}: T_a \rightarrow T_b$ to map $f: \mathcal{P}(a) \rightarrow [-1, 0]$ to $T_{a \leq b}f: \mathcal{P}(b) \rightarrow [-1, 0]$ where:

$$(T_{a \leq b}f)(x) := \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } x \text{ is } a\text{-dependent,} \\ \bigwedge_{[-1, 0]} \{f(y) \mid y \in (\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x)\} & \text{if } x \text{ is } a\text{-independent,} \\ 0 & \text{if } x \text{ is } a\text{-inconsistent.} \end{cases}$$

The function $T_{a \leq b}$ is called **translation** along $a \leq b$.

Translations form a lax functor (see 2.8) which is the content of:

4.6. Lemma. *Let $a \leq b \leq c$ be in I .*

- (1) $T_{a \leq a}: T_a \rightarrow T_a$ is the identity,
- (2) $T_{a \leq b}: [-1, 0]^{\mathcal{P}(a)} \rightarrow [-1, 0]^{\mathcal{P}(b)}$ is a functor of posets (see 2.7),
- (3) $T_{a \leq c} \leq T_{b \leq c} T_{a \leq b}$.

Proof. Statements (1) and (2) are direct consequences of the definition.

To prove statement (3) choose a function $f: \mathcal{P}(a) \rightarrow [-1, 0]$ and an element x in $\mathcal{P}(c)$. If x is a -dependent, then $(T_{a \leq c}f)(x) = -1 \leq (T_{b \leq c}T_{a \leq b}f)(x)$.

Assume x is not a -dependent. Then x is not b -dependent. If x is b -inconsistent, then $(T_{a \leq c}f)(x) \leq 0 = (T_{b \leq c}T_{a \leq b}f)(x)$. Let x be b -independent. Then $(T_{b \leq c}T_{a \leq b}f)(x) = \bigwedge \{(T_{a \leq b}f)(y) \mid y \in (\mathcal{P}(b) \leq x)\}$, and the desired inequality $(T_{a \leq c}f)(x) \leq (T_{b \leq c}T_{a \leq b}f)(x)$ would then follow if $(T_{a \leq c}f)(x) \leq (T_{a \leq b}f)(y)$ for all y in $\mathcal{P}(b) \leq x$. Let y be in $\mathcal{P}(b) \leq x$. Then y cannot be a -dependent, since x is not a -dependent. If y is a -independent, then x is also a -independent, and since $(\mathcal{P}(a) \leq y) \subset (\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x)$, then:

$$(T_{a \leq c}f)(x) = \bigwedge \{f(z) \mid z \in (\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x)\} \leq \bigwedge \{f(z) \mid z \in (\mathcal{P}(a) \leq y)\} = (T_{a \leq b}f)(y)$$

Finally, if y is a -inconsistent, then $(T_{a \leq c}f)(x) \leq 0 = (T_{a \leq b}f)(y)$. \square

According to Lemma 4.6, translations form a lax functor which we denote by $T: I \rightsquigarrow \text{Posets}$ and name **I -translation**. One should be aware that in general T may fail to be a functor. For example:

4.7. Example. Consider the subposet $I = \{x = (0, 0), a = (2, 0), b = (3, 0), y = (0, 2), c = (3, 2)\} \subset [0, \infty)^2$. Then $\mathcal{P}(a) = \{x\}$, $\mathcal{P}(b) = \{a\}$, and $\mathcal{P}(c) = \{y, b\}$. Furthermore, y is b -inconsistent. Then:

- $T_{a \leq b}(-0.5): \mathcal{P}(b) \rightarrow [-1, 0]$ is the constant function -1 .
- $T_{b \leq c}(T_{a \leq b}(-0.5)): \mathcal{P}(c) \rightarrow [-1, 0]$ maps y to 0 and b to -1 .
- $T_{a \leq c}(-0.5): \mathcal{P}(c) \rightarrow [-1, 0]$ maps y to -0.5 and b to -1 .

In this case $T_{a \leq c}(-0.5) < T_{b \leq c}T_{a \leq b}(-0.5)$.

Since $T: I \rightsquigarrow \text{Posets}$ is a lax functor, we can form its Grothendieck construction $\text{Gr}_I T$ (see 2.8). As sets, $\mathcal{G}(I)$ and $\text{Gr}_I T$ are identical. The next lemma states that the relation \leq on $\mathcal{G}(I)$ coincides with the poset relation on the Grothendieck construction $\text{Gr}_I T$ described in 2.8.

4.8. Lemma. *Let (a, f) and (b, g) be elements in $\mathcal{G}(I)$.*

- (1) $(a, f) \leq (b, g)$ if and only if $a \leq b$ in I and $T_{a \leq b}f \leq g$ in $[-1, 0]^{\mathcal{P}(b)}$.
- (2) If $a \leq b$, then $(a, f) \leq (b, T_{a \leq b}f)$.
- (3) Elements in $\text{supp}(T_{a \leq b}f)$ are a -consistent.

Proof. Statement (3) is a direct consequence of (2) and (2) is a direct consequence of (1). To show (1), choose x in $\mathcal{P}(b)$. If x is a -dependent, then $(T_{a \leq b} f)(x) = -1 \leq g(x)$. If x is a -independent, then $(T_{a \leq b} f)(x) = \bigwedge \{f(y) \mid y \in (\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x)\}$ and hence $(T_{a \leq b} f)(x) \leq g(x)$ is equivalent to condition (c) in 4.3. If x is a -inconsistent, then $T_{a \leq b} f(x) = 0$ and hence $T_{a \leq b} f(x) \leq g(x)$ if and only if x is not in the support of g . These equivalences are what is needed to show (1). \square

Since the posets $\mathcal{G}(I)$ and $\text{Gr}_I T$ coincide, Proposition 2.9 gives the following explicit description of some sup elements in $\mathcal{G}(I)$.

4.9. Corollary. *Let $S \subset \mathcal{G}(I)$ be a non-empty subset.*

- (1) *If $\pi(S) = \{a\}$, then S has a coproduct and $\bigvee_{\mathcal{G}(I)} S = (a, g)$, where $g = \bigvee_{[-1,0]^{\mathcal{P}(a)}} \{f \mid (a, f) \in S\}$.*
- (2) *If b is a sup of $\pi(S)$ in I , then there is a unique sup of S in $\mathcal{G}(I)$ of the form (b, m) , and $m = \bigvee_{[-1,0]^{\mathcal{P}(b)}} \{T_{a \leq b} f \mid (a, f) \text{ in } S\}$.*

In this article, we are primarily interested not in $\mathcal{G}(I)$, but in its subposet called the realisation of I :

4.10. Definition. For an element a in I , define $\mathcal{R}_a(I)$ to be the subposet of $\mathcal{G}(I)$ consisting of all the pairs (a, f) satisfying the following conditions:

- $f(x) > -1$, for every x in $\mathcal{P}(a)$;
- $\text{supp}(f)$ is finite;
- $\text{supp}(f)$ has an ancestor in I .

The subposet $\mathcal{R}(I) := \bigcup_{a \in I} \mathcal{R}_a(I) \subset \mathcal{G}(I)$ is called the **realisation** of I .

For example, for every a in I , the element $(a, 0)$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_a(I) \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$. The function $I \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(I)$, mapping a to $(a, 0)$, is a subposet inclusion, and we identify I with its image in $\mathcal{R}(I)$.

Let (a, f) be in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ and $(a, f) \leq (b, g)$ in $\mathcal{G}(I)$. Then, according to Proposition 4.4, $\text{supp}(g)$ has an ancestor. Thus to show (b, g) is in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ only the first two conditions in Definition 4.10 need to be verified, which are: the values of g are strictly bigger than -1 and the support of g is finite.

Let a be in I . For a finite subset $S \subset \mathcal{P}(a)$ which has an ancestor and a function $f: S \rightarrow (-1, 0)$, denote by $\bar{f}: \mathcal{P}(a) \rightarrow (-1, 0]$ the extension:

$$\bar{f}(x) := \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in S \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin S \end{cases}$$

The element (a, \overline{f}) belongs to $\mathcal{R}_a(I) \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$. The function $(-1, 0)^S \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_a(I)$, mapping f to (a, \overline{f}) , is a subposet inclusion. Since these subposets are disjoint, as a set, $\mathcal{R}_a(I)$ can be identified with the disjoint union $\coprod_S (-1, 0)^S$ where S ranges over finite subsets of $\mathcal{P}(a)$ that have ancestors. Thus $\mathcal{R}(I)$ can be identified with the disjoint union $\coprod_a \coprod_S (-1, 0)^S$ where a ranges over all elements of I and, for each such a , S ranges over all finite subsets of $\mathcal{P}(a)$ that have ancestors.

Here are two families of examples of realisations:

4.11. The reason we are interested in the realisation is that it generalises the relation $\mathbb{N}^r \subset [0, \infty)^r$. Consider $\alpha: \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{N}^r) \rightarrow [0, \infty)^r$ mapping (a, f) to $a + \sum_{(a-e_i) \in \mathcal{P}(a)} f(a-e_i)e_i$ where e_i is the i -th vector in the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^r . This function is an isomorphism of posets. We use this to identify the realisation $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{N}^r)$ with $[0, \infty)^r$. The composition of the function $\mathbb{N}^r \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{N}^r)$, mapping a to $(a, 0)$, with α is the inclusion $\mathbb{N}^r \subset [0, \infty)^r$. The same formula $(a, f) \mapsto a + \sum_{(a-e_i) \in \mathcal{P}(a)} f(a-e_i)e_i$ gives a poset isomorphism between $\mathcal{R}([1]^r)$ and $[0, 1]^r$.

4.12. Let P be a set. Consider the inclusion poset 2^P of subsets of P (see 2.1). Since 2^P has a global minimum (see 2.3), given by the empty subset, all subsets of 2^P have an ancestor. Every parent of S in 2^P is of the form $S \setminus \{x\}$ for x in S , and hence the function mapping x in S to $S \setminus \{x\}$ is a bijection between S and the set of its parents $\mathcal{P}_{2^P}(S)$ in 2^P . We use this bijection to identify $\mathcal{P}_{2^P}(S)$ with S (see 2.5). The realisation $\mathcal{R}(2^P)$ can be identified with a subposet of $[-1, 0]^P$. By definition, $\mathcal{R}(2^P)$ consists of pairs $(S, f: S \rightarrow (-1, 0])$ (here we use the identification between S and $\mathcal{P}_{2^P}(S)$) where the support of f is finite. For such an element in $\mathcal{R}(2^P)$, define $\underline{f}: P \rightarrow [-1, 0]$:

$$\underline{f}(x) := \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in S \\ -1 & \text{if } x \notin S \end{cases}$$

The function $\mathcal{R}(2^P) \rightarrow [-1, 0]^P$, mapping $(S, f: S \rightarrow (-1, 0])$ to \underline{f} , is a subposet inclusion (see 2.7). Its image consists of these functions $g: P \rightarrow [-1, 0]$ for which the set $g^{-1}((-1, 0)) = \{x \in P \mid -1 < g(x) < 0\}$ is finite. The subposet in $[-1, 0]^P$ of such functions is therefore isomorphic to $\mathcal{R}(2^P)$. For example, if P is finite, then $\mathcal{R}(2^P)$ is isomorphic to $[-1, 0]^P$: the realisation of the discrete cube of finite dimension is isomorphic to the geometric cube of the same dimension (see 2.1).

4.13. The realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$ has the following extension property, which is convenient for constructing functors indexed by it. Let $U: I \rightarrow 2^Y$ be a functor of posets (see 2.7) where Y is a set and 2^Y is the inclusion poset of all subsets of Y (see 2.1). Choose a distance d on Y whose

values are bounded by a real number m . When all the values of U are non-empty, we are going to use this distance to extend U along $I \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$ to form a commutative diagram of poset functors:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I & \xhookrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{R}(I) \\ & \searrow U & \swarrow \bar{U} \\ & 2^Y & \end{array}$$

For (a, f) in $\mathcal{R}(I)$, define:

$$\bar{U}(a, f) := U(a) \cap \bigcap_{p \in \mathcal{P}(a)} B(U(p), (1 + f(p))m)$$

where $B(V, r) = \{y \in Y \mid d(x, y) < r \text{ for some } x \text{ in } V\}$. Note that $\bar{U}(a, 0) = U(a)$. To prove the functoriality of \bar{U} all the conditions describing the poset relation on $\mathcal{R}(I)$ (see 4.3) are needed.

4.14. Proposition. *Let Y be a set and $U: I \rightarrow 2^Y$ be a functor of posets whose values are non-empty subsets of Y . If $(a, f) \leq (b, g)$ in $\mathcal{R}(I)$, then $\bar{U}(a, f) \subset \bar{U}(b, g)$ in 2^Y . Moreover all values of \bar{U} are non-empty.*

Proof. Let u be in $\bar{U}(a, f)$. By definition, this means: u is in $U(a)$ and, for all p in $\mathcal{P}(a)$, there is u_p in $U(p)$ for which $d(u, u_p) < (1 + f(p))m$. We need to show that u is in $\bar{U}(b, g)$, which is equivalent to: u being in $U(b)$ and, for all x in $\mathcal{P}(b)$, there is v_x in $U(x)$ for which $d(u, v_x) < (1 + g(x))m$.

The relation $(a, f) \leq (b, g)$ yields $a \leq b$ (condition (a) in 4.3), and hence $U(a) \subset U(b)$, implying u is in $U(b)$.

Choose x in $\mathcal{P}(b)$. If $g(x) = 0$, then since all distances in Y are bounded by m , we can choose v_x to be any element in $U(x)$ (which exists since $U(x)$ is non-empty by assumption). Assume $g(x) < 0$. By condition (b) in 4.3, either x is a -dependent ($a \leq x$) or x is a -independent ($a \not\leq x$ and $(\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x) \neq \emptyset$). If $a \leq x$, then we can take $v_x = u$, since $U(a) \subset U(x)$. If x is a -independent, then the relation $(a, f) \leq (b, g)$ implies the existence of p in $\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x$ for which $f(p) \leq g(x)$ (here we use the fact that $\text{supp}(f)$ is finite so that $\bigwedge_{[-1,0]} \{f(y) \mid y \in (\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x)\}$ is realised by p , see condition (c) in 4.3). In this case we can take $v_x = u_p$, as $d(u_p, x) \leq (1 + f(p))m \leq (1 + g(x))m$.

To show non-emptiness of $\bar{U}(a, f)$, note that $\text{supp}(f)$ has an ancestor w . Thus $U(w) \subset U(a)$ and $U(w) \subset U(p)$ for every p in $\text{supp}(f)$ and consequently $U(w) \subset \bar{U}(a, f)$. \square

Since $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is a subposet of $\mathcal{G}(I)$, one may also construct some sup elements in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ analogously to Corollary 4.9.

4.15. **Corollary.** *Let $S \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$ be a non-empty subset.*

- (1) *If $\pi(S) = \{a\}$, then S has a coproduct in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ and $\bigvee_{\mathcal{R}(I)} S = (a, g)$ where $g = \bigvee_{[-1,0]^{\mathcal{P}(a)}} \{f \mid (a, f) \in S\}$.*
- (2) *Assume I is a poset whose every element has a finite set of parents. If b is a sup of $\pi(S)$ in I , then there is a unique sup of S in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ of the form (b, m) and $m = \bigvee_{[-1,0]^{\mathcal{P}(b)}} \{T_{a \leq b} f \mid (a, f) \text{ in } S\}$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is a subposet of $\mathcal{G}(I)$, to prove the result it is enough to show (a, g) and (b, m) belong to $\mathcal{R}(I)$.

(1): For every (a, f) in S , since $f \leq g$, then $g(x) > -1$ for all x in $\mathcal{P}(a)$, and $\text{supp}(g) \subset \text{supp}(f)$. Thus, $\text{supp}(g)$ is finite and every ancestor of $\text{supp}(f)$ is also an ancestor of $\text{supp}(g)$.

(2): The equality $m(x) = -1$ holds if and only if $(T_{a \leq b} f)(x) = -1$ for all (a, f) in S . Thus, $m(x) = -1$ if and only if $a \leq x$ (x is a -dependent), for every a in $\pi(S)$. The equality $m(x) = -1$ would then contradict the assumption that b is a sup of $\pi(S)$, since x is in $\mathcal{P}(b)$. The values of the function m belong, therefore, to $(-1, 0]$. The finiteness of $\text{supp}(m)$ is guaranteed by the finiteness assumption on the sets of parents in I , and the existence of its ancestor is guaranteed by Lemma 4.4. \square

According to Corollary 4.15, if the set of parents of every element in I is finite, then elements in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ of the form $(b, \bigvee \{T_{a \leq b} f \mid (a, f) \text{ in } S\})$, where b is a sup of $\pi(S)$ in I , are sups of $S \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$. One should be aware however that an element (c, h) in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ may be a sup of S even though c is not a sup of $\pi(S)$ in I as Example 6.9 illustrates.

4.16. An important aspect of realisations is that they admit explicit grid-like discretisations. These discretisations are particularly useful for describing properties of tame functors, such as their homological dimension (see 10.19).

For subposets $D \subset I$ and $V \subset (-1, 0)$, denote by $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V) \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$ the following subposet:

$$\mathcal{R}_D(I, V) := \{(a, f) \in \mathcal{R}(I) \mid a \in D \text{ and } f(\text{supp}(f)) \subset V\}.$$

An element (a, f) in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$ if and only if a is in D and all non-zero values of f belong to V . In particular $(a, 0)$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$ if and only if a is in D , which means the following inclusions hold:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{R}_D(I, V) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ I & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{R}(I) \end{array}$$

Recall $\mathcal{R}(I)$ can be identified with the disjoint union $\coprod_a \coprod_S (-1, 0)^S$, where for every a in I , $S \subset$ the sets S (see the paragraph after 4.10). Via this identification, $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$ corresponds to $\coprod_a \coprod_S V^S$ where a ranges over all elements in D and, for each such a , S ranges over all finite subsets of $\mathcal{P}(a)$ that have ancestors.

If $D = \{a\}$, then $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$ is also denoted as $\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)$, if $D = I$, then $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$ is also denoted as $\mathcal{R}(I, V)$, and if $V = (-1, 0)$, then $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$ is also denoted as $\mathcal{R}_D(I)$. For example, choose $V = \{-0.5\} \subset (-1, 0)$. Recall that the realisation $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{N}^r)$ can be identified with the poset $[0, \infty)^r$ (see 4.11). Via this identification, $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{N}^r, V) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{N}^r)$ corresponds to $0.5\mathbb{N}^r \subset [0, \infty)^r$.

If D and V are finite, then so is $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$. Furthermore, for any finite subposet $S \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$, there is a finite $D \subset I$ and a finite $V \subset (-1, 0)$ for which $S \subset \mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$. In case I is of finite type we could choose D to be of the form $I \leq a$ for some a in I .

If I is of finite type, then the dimension and the parental dimension of every element in the realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$ coincide and can be calculated in an analogous way as in Proposition 3.5.

4.17. Theorem. *Let $V \subset (-1, 0)$ be a subset, I be a poset of finite type, and $D \subset I$ a subposet such that $(I \leq d) \subset D$ for every d in D . Assume (a, f) is in $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$ for which there is ε in V such that $\varepsilon < f(x)$ for all x in $\mathcal{P}(a)$. Then the numbers $\text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)}(a, f)$, $\text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)}(a, f)$, $\text{dim}_{\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)}(a, f)$, and $\text{dim}_{\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)}(a, f)$ coincide and are equal to:*

$$\max\{|S| \mid \text{supp}(f) \subset S \subset \mathcal{P}(a) \text{ and } S \text{ has an ancestor.}\}$$

Proof. The vertical inequalities in the following diagram follow from Proposition 3.6. The horizontal inequalities are a consequence of Proposition 3.9, where the required assumption is given by Corollary 4.15.(1):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)}(a, f) & \geq & \text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)}(a, f) \\ \text{IV} & & \text{IV} \\ \text{dim}_{\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)}(a, f) & \geq & \text{dim}_{\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)}(a, f) \end{array}$$

Let $\mathcal{A} := \{S \mid \text{supp}(f) \subset S \subset \mathcal{P}(a) \text{ and } S \text{ has an ancestor}\}$. Next we show $\text{dim}_{\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)}(a, f) \geq \max\{|S| \mid S \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Since I is of finite type, the collection \mathcal{A} is finite and all its elements are finite. Let S be in \mathcal{A} . Define $\varepsilon_S: \mathcal{P}(a) \rightarrow (-1, 0]$ and $f_p: \mathcal{P}(a) \rightarrow (-1, 0]$, for every p in S ,

by the formulas:

$$\varepsilon_S(x) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } x \in S \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin S \end{cases} \quad f_p(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x = p \\ \varepsilon & \text{if } x \in S \setminus \{p\} \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin S \end{cases}$$

These functions are chosen so that, for every p in S , $-1 < \varepsilon_S < f_p < f$. Since $\text{supp}(f_p) \subset S = \text{supp}(\varepsilon_S)$, both sets $\text{supp}(f_p)$ and $\text{supp}(\varepsilon_S)$ have ancestors in I and thus (a, f_p) and (a, ε_S) belong to $\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)$. The relation $\varepsilon_S < f_p$, for every p , implies (a, ε_S) is a proper ancestor of $U := \{(a, f_p) \mid p \in S\}$ in $\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)$. If $p \neq q$ in S , then $f_p \neq f_q$, and hence $|U| = |S|$. Furthermore, $\bigvee_{\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)} U = (a, f)$ and $\bigvee_{\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)} (U \setminus \{(a, f_p)\}) < (a, f)$ for every p in S . The set U belongs, therefore, to the collection $\Phi_{\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)}(a, f)$ used to define the dimension (see 3.1), and, consequently, $\dim_{\mathcal{R}_a(I, V)}(a, f) \geq |U| = |S|$. As this happens for every S in \mathcal{A} , we get the desired inequality.

To finish the proof we show $\max\{|S| \mid S \in \mathcal{A}\} \geq \text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)}(a, f)$. Let U be an element in $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)}(a, f)$ (see 3.2). In particular, U has an ancestor (c, h) in $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$. For (b, g) in U consider $\alpha(b, g) := (T_{b \leq a} g) \vee \varepsilon$. We claim $(a, \alpha(b, g))$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$ and $\alpha(b, g) < f$. This is clear if $b = a$. If $b < a$, since I is of finite type, there is a parent p of a such that $b \leq p < a$. In this case $T_{b \leq a} g(p) = -1$, and, consequently, $\alpha(b, g)(p) = \varepsilon < f(p)$. Furthermore, any ancestor of $\text{supp}(h)$ is also an ancestor of $\text{supp}(\alpha(b, g))$. In particular, $S := \bigcup_{(b, g) \in U} \text{supp}(\alpha(b, g))$ has an ancestor, and it contains $\text{supp}(f)$, as $(T_{b \leq a} g \vee \varepsilon) \leq f$. Thus, S is in \mathcal{A} .

For every (b, g) in U , let $p_{(b, g)}$ be a parent of a in I for which $\alpha(b, g)(p_{(b, g)}) < f(p_{(b, g)})$. If $\alpha(b, g) \neq \alpha(b', g')$, then, since $\alpha(b, g) \vee \alpha(b', g') = f$, the elements $p_{(b, g)}$ and $p_{(b', g')}$ have to be different. Thus $|\{p_{(b, g)} \mid (b, g) \in U\}| = |U|$, and consequently $|S| \geq |U|$ as $\{p_{(b, g)} \mid (b, g) \in U\} \subset S$. As this happens for every U in $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)}(a, f)$, we get $\max\{|S| \mid S \in \mathcal{A}\} \geq \text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)}(a, f)$. \square

Note that the considered dimensions in Theorem 4.17 do not depend on the choice of D and V . Consequently:

4.18. Corollary. *Let I be a poset of finite type. Then for every element (a, f) in $\mathcal{R}(I)$, the following numbers $\text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}_a(I)}(a, f)$, $\text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}(I)}(a, f)$, $\dim_{\mathcal{R}_a(I)}(a, f)$, and $\dim_{\mathcal{R}(I)}(a, f)$ coincide and are equal to:*

$$\max\{|S| \mid \text{supp}(f) \subset S \subset \mathcal{P}(a) \text{ and } S \text{ has an ancestor}\}$$

4.19. Let I be a poset of finite type and (a, f) be in $\mathcal{R}(I)$. According to Theorem 4.17, $\text{par-dim}_I(a) = \text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}(I)}(a, 0)$ and $\text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}(I)}(a, f) \leq$

$\text{par-dim}_I(a)$. This last inequality can be sharp. For example, consider the subposet $I = \{(1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Let $a = (1, 1, 1)$ and $f: \mathcal{P}(a) \rightarrow (-1, 0]$ be the function which is 0 except for $f(0, 1, 1) \neq 0$. In this case, $\text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}(I)}(a, f) = 1$ and $\text{par-dim}_I(a) = 2$.

4.20. We now aim to give a visual representation of realisations of some finite posets. Consider the following elements in \mathbb{R}^2 : $a = (0, 0)$, $b = (3, 0)$, $c = (0, 2)$, $d = (3, 2)$, $h = (2, 0)$, and $k = (1, 2)$, and the following subposets of \mathbb{R}^2 : $I_1 = \{a, b, c, d\}$, $I_2 = \{a, b, c, d, h\}$, and $I_3 = \{a, b, c, d, h, k\}$. Then their realisations are isomorphic to subposets of \mathbb{R}^2 illustrated in Figure 4.20. Note that in the second subfigure, the points in the grey square are not comparable to the points in the line segment from h to b . In the third subfigure, the points in the grey square are not comparable to the points in the line segments from c to k and from h to b .




FIGURE 3. The dashed lines are not part of the realisation poset.

5. UPPER SEMILATTICES

5.1. By definition an **upper semilattice** is a poset whose every non-empty finite subset has a coproduct (see 2.4). To verify if a poset is an upper semilattice it is enough to prove the existence of the coproduct of every two non-comparable elements.

An upper semilattice I is called **distributive** if, for every a, b, x in I for which the products $a \wedge x$ and $b \wedge x$ exist, the product $(a \vee b) \wedge x$ also exists and $(a \vee b) \wedge x = (a \wedge x) \vee (b \wedge x)$.

A poset I is an upper semilattice if I_* (see 2.6) is an upper semilattice. Moreover, an upper semilattice I is distributive if and only if I_* is distributive.

The product $I \times J$ of posets (see 2.1) is an upper semilattice if and only if I and J are upper semilattices. If I and J are upper semilattices, then $(x_1, y_1) \vee (x_2, y_2) = (x_1 \vee x_2, y_1 \vee y_2)$ for $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)$ in $I \times J$. The product $I \times J$ is a distributive upper semilattice if and only if I

and J are distributive upper semilattices (compare with 5.4). If I is a (distributive) upper semilattice, then so is I^S for every set S .

The poset \mathbb{R} is a distributive upper semilattice which is not unital. The posets $[n]$, \mathbb{N}^r , $[-1, 0]^S$, and $[0, \infty)^r$ are unital distributive upper semilattices.

Let S be a set. The suspension ΣS (see 2.1) is a consistent and unital upper semilattice. It is distributive if and only if $|S| \leq 2$. For example, if $S = \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$, then $(s_1 \vee s_2) \wedge s_3 = s_3$, while $(s_1 \wedge s_3) \vee (s_2 \wedge s_3) = \bigwedge S$. Thus, if $|S| > 2$, then ΣS is a consistent unital upper semilattice which is not distributive.

For every element a in a poset I , the poset $\mathcal{R}_a(I)$ (see 4.10) is a distributive upper semilattice. Thus, the realisation $\mathcal{R}(I) = \bigcup_{a \in I} \mathcal{R}_a(I)$ is a union of distributive upper semilattices. The realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$, however, may fail to be an upper semilattice, even if I is an upper semilattice (see Example 6.9).

5.2. Let I be an upper semilattice and J be a poset. A function $f: I \rightarrow J$ is called a **homomorphism** if, for every non-empty finite subset $S \subset I$, the element $f(\bigvee_I S)$ is a sup of $f(S)$ in J .

If $f: I \rightarrow J$ is a homomorphism, then it is a functor since if $a \leq b$ in I , then $f(b) = f(a \vee b)$ is a sup of $\{f(a), f(b)\}$, which implies $f(a) \leq f(b)$ in J .

If J is an upper semilattice, then a function $f: I \rightarrow J$ is a homomorphism if and only if it is a functor and $f(x \vee y) = f(x) \vee f(y)$ for all non-comparable elements x and y in I . If every two elements in I are comparable, then a function $f: I \rightarrow J$ is a homomorphism if and only if it is a functor. For example $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, \infty)^r$ is a homomorphism if and only if it is a functor.

The inclusion $I \subset I_*$ is a homomorphism (see 2.6). Furthermore, a function $f: I \rightarrow J$ is a homomorphism if and only if $f_*: I_* \rightarrow J_*$ is a homomorphism. The standard inclusion $\text{in}: I \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(I)$ (see 4.10) is also a homomorphism. For every a in J , the poset $\mathcal{R}_a(J)$ is an upper semilattice (see 5.1) and according to Corollary 4.9 the inclusion $\mathcal{R}_a(J) \subset \mathcal{R}(J)$ is a homomorphism. For every a in J , $T_a = [-1, 0]^{\mathcal{P}(a)}$ is an upper semilattice and, for every $a \leq b$ in J , the translation $T_{a \leq b}$ (see 4.5) is a homomorphism.

5.3. Example. Let $f: [1]^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)^2$ be a function defined as follows:

$$f(0, 0) = (0, 0), \quad f(1, 0) = (1, 0), \quad f(0, 1) = (0, 1), \quad f(1, 1) = (2, 2)$$

This function is a unital functor, however it is not a homomorphism since:

$$\bigvee_{[1]^2} \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\} = (1, 1) \quad \bigvee_{[0, \infty)^2} \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\} = (1, 1)$$

$$f(\bigvee_{[1]^2} \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}) = f(1, 1) = (2, 2) \neq (1, 1) = \bigvee_{[0, \infty)^2} \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$$

5.4. To construct upper semilattices, the Grothendieck construction (see 2.8) can be used. Let I be an upper semilattice and $T: I \rightarrow \text{Posets}$ be a functor (and not just a lax functor) such that T_a is an upper semilattice and $T_{a \leq b}$ is a homomorphism, for every $a \leq b$ in I . Then $\text{Gr}_I T$ is also an upper semilattice. To see this, consider (a, x) and (b, y) in $\text{Gr}_I T$. We claim $(a \vee b, T_{a \leq a \vee b} x \vee T_{b \leq a \vee b} y)$ is their coproduct in $\text{Gr}_I T$. Let $(a, x) \leq (c, z) \geq (b, y)$, which means $a \leq c \geq b$ in I and $T_{a \leq c} x \leq z \geq T_{b \leq c} y$ in T_c . Since I is an upper semilattice, $a \vee b \leq c$, and, since T is a functor, $T_{a \vee b \leq c} T_{a \leq a \vee b} x = T_{a \leq c} x \leq z \geq T_{b \leq c} y = T_{a \vee b \leq c} T_{b \leq a \vee b} y$. Consequently, $(T_{a \vee b \leq c} T_{a \leq a \vee b} x) \vee (T_{a \vee b \leq c} T_{b \leq a \vee b} y) \leq z$. Using the fact $T_{a \vee b \leq c}$ is a homomorphism, we get $T_{a \vee b \leq c} (T_{a \leq a \vee b} x \vee T_{b \leq a \vee b} y) \leq z$, which implies $(a \vee b, T_{a \leq a \vee b} x \vee T_{b \leq a \vee b} y) \leq (c, z)$.

5.5. The dimension (see 3.1) and the parental dimension (see 3.2) of an element x in an upper semilattice I can be described using coproducts:

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_I(x) &= \sup \left\{ |U| \mid \begin{array}{l} U \subset I \text{ is finite, has a proper ancestor, } \bigvee U = x, \\ \text{and } \bigvee S < x \text{ for every set } S \text{ such that } \emptyset \neq S \subsetneq U \end{array} \right\} \\ \text{par-dim}_I(x) &= \sup \left\{ |U| \mid \begin{array}{l} U \subset (I < x) \text{ is finite, has an ancestor,} \\ \text{and } a \vee b = x, \text{ for every } a \neq b \text{ in } U \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

5.6. Let I be an upper semilattice of finite type (see 2.2) and $S \subset I$ be non-empty. If the product of S exists, then it is an ancestor of S . On the other hand, if S has an ancestor, then this ancestor belongs to $\bigcap_{x \in S} (I \leq x)$, which is finite by the finite type assumption. Thus, if S has an ancestor, then the coproduct $\bigvee (\bigcap_{x \in S} (I \leq x))$ exists (I is an upper semilattice), which implies the existence of the product $\bigwedge S$ and the equality $\bigwedge S = \bigvee (\bigcap_{x \in S} (I \leq x))$ (see the end of 2.2). In conclusion, the product of a subset of a finite type upper semilattice exists if and only if this subset has an ancestor. In particular, if $\bigwedge S$ exists in I , then so does $\bigwedge U$ for every non-empty subset $U \subset S$.

From this discussion and Proposition 3.5 it follows that the parental dimension of an element x in I can be described using products:

$$\text{par-dim}_I(x) = \max\{|S| \mid S \subset \mathcal{P}(x) \text{ for which } \bigwedge S \text{ exists}\}$$

5.7. Let J be a poset. A subposet inclusion $f: I \subset J$ is called a **sublattice** if I is an upper semilattice and f is a homomorphism: for every finite non-empty subset $S \subset I$, the coproduct $\bigvee_I S$ is a sup of S in J . For example $[0, \infty) \subset \mathbb{R} \supset \mathbb{N}$ are sublattices. If J is an upper semilattice, then for every a in J , the inclusion $(J \leq a) \subset J$ is a sublattice.

A sublattice $I \subset J$ satisfies the assumption of Proposition 3.9 and hence $\dim_I(x) \leq \dim_J(x)$ and $\text{par-dim}_I(x) \leq \text{par-dim}_J(x)$, for all x in I .

If J is an upper semilattice, then the intersection of sublattices in J is also a sublattice (note that this may fail if J is not an upper semilattice). Thus, if J is an upper semilattice, then the intersection of all the sublattices of J containing a subset $U \subset J$ is the smallest sublattice of J containing U . This intersection is denoted by $\langle U \rangle$ and called the sublattice **generated** by U . A sublattice generated by a subset $U \subset J$ is only defined when J is an upper semilattice and this is automatically assumed whenever $\langle U \rangle$ is discussed. The sublattice $\langle U \rangle$ can be described explicitly $\langle U \rangle = U \cup \{\bigvee_J S \mid S \subset U \text{ is finite and non-empty}\}$. Thus if U is finite, then so is $\langle U \rangle$.

In Proposition 3.6 it was shown that the parental dimension of an element bounds its dimension. This bound can be strict as the suspension example (see 3.2) illustrates. However, for distributive upper semilattices of finite type:

5.8. Proposition. *Assume I is a finite type distributive upper semilattice. Then $\dim_I(x) = \text{par-dim}_I(x)$ for every x in I .*

Proof. The cases when $\dim_I(x)$ is 0 and 1 follow from Proposition 3.3. Assume $\text{par-dim}_I(x) \geq 2$. Let $S \subset \mathcal{P}(x)$ be a subset realising $\text{par-dim}_I(x)$, which means S is a maximal subset of $\mathcal{P}(x)$ whose product $\bigwedge S$ exists. The assumption $\text{par-dim}_I(x) \geq 2$ guarantees $|S| \geq 2$. For s in S , set $u_s := \bigwedge(S \setminus \{s\})$ and $U := \{u_s \mid s \in S\}$. We claim: (a) $\bigwedge U = \bigwedge S$, (b) $(\bigvee U) = x$, (c) $|U| = |S|$, and (d) $(\bigvee U') < x$ if $\emptyset \neq U' \subsetneq U$. These properties imply that U belongs to $\Phi_I(x)$ (see 2.2) and hence $\dim_I(x) \geq |U| = |S| = \text{par-dim}_I(x)$, which together with 3.6 gives the desired equality.

Property (a) is clear. Assume (b) does not hold and there is p in $\mathcal{P}(x)$ such that $\bigvee U \leq p < x$, which means $u_s \leq p$ for every s in S . If p is not in S , then $\bigwedge S \leq \bigwedge(S \setminus \{s\}) \leq p$ would imply existence of the product $\bigwedge(S \cup \{p\})$ contradicting the maximality of S . The element p is therefore in S , and $\bigwedge(S \setminus \{p\}) = u_p \leq p$, leading to $u_p \vee p = p$. Since $s \vee p = x$ for every s in $S \setminus \{p\}$, distributivity gives a contradiction $x = \bigwedge_{s \in S \setminus \{p\}} (s \vee p) \leq u_p \vee p = p$.

To prove the property (c) we need to show that if $s \neq s'$, then $t_s \neq t_{s'}$. Assume this is not the case and $t_s = t_{s'}$. Distributivity, the already proven property (b) and the equality $\bigvee U = x$ leads to a contradiction:

$$\begin{aligned} s' = x \wedge s' &= (\bigvee U) \wedge s' = \bigvee_s (u_s \wedge s') = (u_{s'} \wedge s') \vee (\bigvee_{s \neq s'} (u_s \wedge s')) = \\ &= (\bigwedge S) \vee (\bigvee_{s \neq s'} u_s) = \bigvee_{s \neq s'} u_s = \bigvee_s u_s = \bigvee U = x \end{aligned}$$

Thus, U and S have the same size, which coincide with property (c).

It remains to show (d): $\bigvee U' < x$ if $\emptyset \neq U' \subsetneq U$. Assume by contradiction that there is s' in S such that $\bigvee_{s \neq s'} u_s = x$. Then again distributivity and $\bigvee U = x$ leads to a contradiction:

$$s' = x \wedge s' = \left(\bigvee_{s \neq s'} u_s \right) \wedge s' = \bigvee_{s \neq s'} (u_s \wedge s') = \bigvee_{s \neq s'} u_s = x. \quad \square$$

5.9. We finish this section with a characterisation of finite type posets whose elements have dimension at most one. A poset I is called a **forest** if every pair of non-comparable elements x and y in I has no common ancestor. Every subposet of a forest is still a forest. A forest is called a **tree** if it is connected. Therefore, every connected subposet of a forest is a tree.

5.10. **Proposition.** (1) *An upper semilattice whose every element has dimension (see 3.1) at most 1 is a tree.*
(2) *A tree of finite type is an upper semilattice whose every element has dimension at most 1.*

Proof. (1): Let x and y be non-comparable elements in an upper semilattice I whose every element has dimension at most 1. If x and y had a common ancestor, then $\{x, y\}$ would belong to $\Phi_I(x \vee y)$ (see 3.1) leading to a contradiction $\dim_I(x \vee y) \geq 2$.

(2): Let I be a tree of finite type and x, y be its elements. We need to show the existence of $x \vee y$. First, assume x and y have a common descendent. Then, since I is of finite type, $\{x, y\}$ has a sup. We claim that this sup is unique, otherwise two such sup elements would be non-comparable and have x as a common ancestor contradicting the assumption I is a tree.

Assume x and y do not have a common descendent. Since I is connected, there is a sequence $C = \{c_0 = x, c_1, \dots, c_n = y\}$ in I where c_i is related to c_{i+1} for every $0 \leq i < n$. This set C does not have a descendent, otherwise $\{x, y\}$ would also have it. Thus C must have at least two maximal elements. Among these, there are c_i and c_j such that $(C \leq c_i) \cap (C \leq c_j) \neq \emptyset$, otherwise C would not be connected. The elements c_i and c_j are not comparable and have no common ancestor. This contradicts again the assumption I is a tree.

Finally, for every x in I , $\dim_I(x) \leq 1$, since any subset of size at least 2 with x as sup cannot have a common ancestor by hypothesis. \square

6. REALISATIONS OF UPPER SEMILATTICES

The realisation of an upper semilattice may fail to be an upper semilattice (see Example 6.9). This section is devoted to discussing some

of the reasons for this and what assumptions can eliminate them. Our aim is to prove:

6.1. Theorem. *If I is a distributive upper semilattice of finite type, then its realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$ (see 4.3) is also a distributive upper semilattice.*

For example, an upper semilattice whose elements have dimension at most 1 is distributive. In particular finite type trees are distributive upper semilattices (see 5.10.(2)). Theorem 6.1 implies therefore that the realisation of a finite type tree is a distributive upper semilattice, and since its elements have dimensions at most 1 (see 4.17), it is a tree (see 5.10.(1)).

6.2. Let I be an upper semilattice and a, x be in I . If $\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x$ contains two different elements y_1 and y_2 , then $y_1 \vee y_2 = a$, which implies $a \leq x$, and hence $(\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x) = \mathcal{P}(a)$. Thus, there are three possibilities: the set $\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x$ might be empty, or consist of only one element, or be the entire set $\mathcal{P}(a)$. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x$ contains only one element and $a \not\leq x$, then this element has to be the product $a \wedge x$. These facts are used to give in Table 2 a characterisation of the blocks in the partition of I described in 4.1.

x is a -consistent	x is a -dependent	$a \leq x$. In this case $(\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x) = \mathcal{P}(a)$
	x is a -independent	$a \not\leq x$ and the product $a \wedge x$ exists and belongs to $\mathcal{P}(a)$. In this case $ \mathcal{P}(a) \leq x = 1$.
a -inconsistent		$a \not\leq x$ and either the product $a \wedge x$ does not exist or it exists but does not belong to $\mathcal{P}(a)$. In this case $(\mathcal{P}(a) \leq x) = \emptyset$.

TABLE 2.

This table can be used to describe the translation operation (see 4.5) more explicitly. Let $a \leq b$ in I and $f: \mathcal{P}(a) \rightarrow [-1, 0]$ be a function. Then:

$$(T_{a \leq b} f)(x) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } x \text{ is } a\text{-dependent,} \\ f(a \wedge x) & \text{if } x \text{ is } a\text{-independent,} \\ 0 & \text{if } x \text{ is } a\text{-inconsistent.} \end{cases}$$

Similarly, a simplified characterisation of an upper semilattice of finite type to be consistent (see 4.1) can be given.

6.3. Lemma. *Let I be an upper semilattice of finite type. Then I is consistent if and only if the following condition is satisfied for every $a \leq b$ in I : if x is b -independent and the product $a \wedge x$ exists, then x is a -consistent, in which case either $a \wedge x = a$ (x is a -dependent) or $a \wedge x$ is a parent of a (x is a -independent).*

Proof. Consider elements $a \leq b$ in I . Assume I is a consistent upper semilattice and x is b -independent. If the product $a \wedge x$ exists, then $a \wedge x$ is a common ancestor of a and x , and consistency of I implies that x is a -consistent.

Assume the condition in the lemma holds. Let x be b -independent having a common ancestor with a . Since I is of finite type, the product $a \wedge x$ exists. The a -consistency of x is then given by the assumed condition. \square

Table 3 gives a characterisation, based on 6.3, of dependent, independent and inconsistent elements in a consistent upper semilattice of finite type I .

x is a -consistent	x is a -dependent	$a \leq x$
	x is a -independent	$a \not\leq x$ and the product $a \wedge x$ exists, in which case $a \wedge x$ is a parent of a
a -inconsistent		the product $a \wedge x$ does not exist

TABLE 3.

6.4. Proposition. *A distributive upper semilattice of finite type is consistent.*

Proof. To prove the proposition we use Lemma 6.3. Let $a \leq b$ and x be an element which is b -independent for which the product $a \wedge x$ exists. Let p be a parent of b such that $p \leq x$. Then $p \leq p \vee (a \wedge x) \leq b$, and since $b \not\leq x$, the element b cannot be equal to $p \vee (a \wedge x)$. Thus, $a \wedge x \leq p \vee (a \wedge x) = p$. There are three options: either $a \wedge x = p$, or $a \wedge x$ is a parent of a , or there is y such that $a \wedge x < y < a$. The first two options give a -consistency of x proving the proposition. We claim that the third option is not possible. For y such that that $a \wedge x < y < a$, we have $y \not\leq p$, otherwise $y \leq x$ implying $y \leq a \wedge x$. Since $y \not\leq p$, then $p \vee y = b$. We can then use distributivity to obtain a contradiction $a = b \wedge a = (p \vee y) \wedge a = (p \wedge a) \vee (y \wedge a) \leq (a \wedge x) \vee y \leq y$. \square

The key reason why we are interested in consistent upper semilattices is:

6.5. Lemma. *If I is a consistent upper-semilattice, then the I -translation is a functor: $T_{a \leq c} = T_{b \leq c} T_{a \leq b}$ for every $a \leq b \leq c$ in I .*

Proof. Consider a function $f: \mathcal{P}(a) \rightarrow [-1, 0]$. According to Lemma 4.6 we need to show $(T_{a \leq c} f)(x) \geq (T_{b \leq c} T_{a \leq b} f)(x)$ for all x in $\mathcal{P}(c)$. Let x be in $\mathcal{P}(c)$. If x is a -inconsistent, then $(T_{a \leq c} f)(x) = 0$ and the desired inequality is clear.

Assume x is a -consistent. Then $a \wedge x$ exists and either $a = a \wedge x$ or $a \wedge x$ is a parent of a . Since x is a parent of c , it is c -consistent. Consistency of I applied to $b \leq c$ implies the b -consistency of x . Thus, either x is b -dependent, or b -independent. If x is b -dependent, then $(T_{b \leq c} T_{a \leq b} f)(x) = -1$ and the desired inequality is clear. Assume x is b -independent. Then $(T_{b \leq c} T_{a \leq b} f)(x) = (T_{a \leq b} f)(b \wedge x)$. The product $b \wedge x$ is a -dependent if and only if x is a -dependent. If this happens, then $(T_{a \leq c} f) = -1 = (T_{a \leq b} f)(b \wedge x)$ and the desired equality holds in this case as well. The product $b \wedge x$ is a -independent if and only if x is a -independent. If this happens, then $(T_{a \leq c} f) = f(a \wedge x) = f(a \wedge b \wedge x) = (T_{a \leq b} f)(b \wedge x)$ and the desired equality also holds. \square

For every $a \leq b$ in a poset I , the translation $T_{a \leq b}$ is a homomorphism of upper semilattices. If, in addition, I is a consistent upper semilattice, then by Lemma 6.5, the I -translation is a functor, and consequently (see 5.4):

6.6. Proposition. *If I is a consistent upper semilattice, then the Grothendieck construction $\text{Gr}_I T = \mathcal{G}(I)$ is an upper semilattice.*

For the realisation $\mathcal{R}(I) \subset \mathcal{G}(I)$ (see 4.3) to be an upper semilattice we need a further finiteness restriction:

6.7. Proposition. *Let I be a consistent upper semilattice whose every element has a finite set of parents. Then $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is an upper semilattice.*

Proof. Let $(a, f), (b, g)$ be in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ and $m := \bigvee \{T_{a \leq a \vee b} f, T_{b \leq a \vee b} g\}$. The poset $\mathcal{G}(I)$ is an upper semilattice (see 6.6). Thus $(a \vee b, m)$ is the coproduct of (a, f) and (b, g) in $\mathcal{G}(I)$ (see 4.9). Since $(a \vee b, m)$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}(I)$ (see 4.15), it is the coproduct of (a, f) and (b, g) in $\mathcal{R}(I)$. \square

6.8. Corollary. *Let I be a consistent upper semilattice whose every element has a finite set of parents. Choose an element d in I and a subposet $V \subset (-1, 0)$. Then the inclusion $\alpha: \mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V) \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$ is a sublattice (see 5.7), i.e., $\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V)$ is an upper semilattice, and α is a homomorphism.*

Proof. Just note that if (a, f) and (b, g) belong to $\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V)$, then so does their coproduct $(a \vee b, m)$ described in the proof of 6.7. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 6.1.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Let I be a distributive upper semilattice of finite type. Its realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is an upper semilattice because of propositions 6.4 and 6.7. It remains to show $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is distributive. This requires understanding of products in $\mathcal{R}(I)$. Consider elements $(a, f) \geq (c, m) \leq (x, h)$ in $\mathcal{R}(I)$. Then $a \geq c \leq x$ and hence the product $a \wedge x$ exists (see discussion in 5.6). Let y be a parent of $a \wedge x$. If p_1 and p_2 are different parents of a for which $p_1 \wedge x = y = p_2 \wedge x$, then, by the distributivity, we would get a contradiction $a \wedge x = (p_1 \vee p_2) \wedge x = (p_1 \wedge x) \vee (p_2 \wedge x) = y$. Thus, the set $\{p \in \mathcal{P}(a) \mid p \wedge x = y\}$ contains at most one element. If $\{p \in \mathcal{P}(a) \mid p \wedge x = y\}$ is non-empty, then its unique element is denoted by yx^{-1} . Define $R(f): \mathcal{P}(a \wedge x) \rightarrow (-1, 0]$

$$R(f)(y) := \begin{cases} f(yx^{-1}) & \text{if } \{p \in \mathcal{P}(a) \mid p \wedge x = y\} \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Let w be an ancestor of $\text{supp}(f)$. For every y in $\text{supp}(R(f))$, the set $\{p \in \mathcal{P}(a) \mid p \wedge x = y\}$ is non-empty and $R(f)(y) = f(yx^{-1}) < 0$. Thus $w \leq yx^{-1}$ which implies $w \wedge x \leq y$. The element $w \wedge x$ is therefore an ancestor of $\text{supp}(R(f))$ and $(a \wedge x, R(f))$ is in $\mathcal{R}(I)$.

We claim that the following relations hold $(c, m) \leq (a \wedge x, R(f)) \leq (a, f)$. Let y be in $\text{supp}(R(f))$. In particular, $f(yx^{-1}) < 0$. The relation $(c, m) \leq (a, f)$ has two consequences. First, the product $yx^{-1} \wedge c = y \wedge c$ exists and y is c -consistent (see Table 3). All the elements of $\text{supp}(R(f))$ are therefore c -consistent. Second, if y in addition is c -independent, then yx^{-1} is also c -independent and $m(y \wedge c) = m(yx^{-1} \wedge c) \leq f(yx^{-1}) = R(f)(y)$. These two consequences give the relation $(c, m) \leq (a \wedge x, R(f))$.

By direct calculation:

$$T_{a \wedge x \leq a} R(f)(p) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } p \text{ is } a \wedge x\text{-dependent} \\ f(p) & \text{if } p \text{ is } a \wedge x\text{-independent} \\ 0 & \text{if } p \text{ is } a \wedge x\text{-inconsistent} \end{cases}$$

If p in $\mathcal{P}(a)$ is $a \wedge x$ -inconsistent, then it is also c -inconsistent (see Table 3). Thus, $T_{a \wedge x \leq a} R(f) \leq f$, as all the elements in $\text{supp}(f)$ are c -consistent. This proves the relation $(a \wedge x, R(f)) \leq (a, f)$ (see 4.8).

In an analogous way $(c, m) \leq (a \wedge x, R(h)) \leq (x, h)$ and the obtained relations imply:

$$(a, f) \geq (a \wedge x, \bigwedge \{R(f), R(h)\}) \leq (x, h) \\ \vee \\ (c, m)$$

This proves $(a \wedge x, \bigwedge\{R(f), R(h)\})$ is the product of (a, f) and (x, h) . In particular, the product of two elements in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ exists if and only if these elements have a common ancestor.

We are now ready to prove distributivity of $\mathcal{R}(I)$. Let $(a, f), (b, g), (x, h)$ be in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ for which the products $(a, f) \wedge (x, h)$ and $(b, g) \wedge (x, h)$ exist. Since $(a, f) \wedge (x, h)$ is an ancestor of both $(a, f) \vee (b, g)$ and (x, h) , the product $((a, f) \vee (b, g)) \wedge (x, h)$ exists. Moreover, this product is of the form $((a \wedge x) \vee (b \wedge x), m)$, where:

$$m = \bigwedge\{R(\bigvee\{T_{a \leq a \vee b}f, T_{b \leq a \vee b}g\}), R(h)\}.$$

By direct verification $m = \bigvee\{\bigwedge\{R(T_{a \leq a \vee b}f), R(h)\}, \bigwedge\{R(T_{b \leq a \vee b}g), R(h)\}\}$, which gives the desired equality $((a, f) \vee (b, g)) \wedge (x, h) = ((a, f) \wedge (x, h)) \vee ((b, g) \wedge (x, h))$. \square

6.9. Examples. The subposet $I = \{a = (0, 0), b = (3, 0), c = (0, 2), h = (2, 0), d = (3, 2)\} \subset [0, \infty)^2$ is an example of a non-consistent upper semilattice, which according to 6.4, cannot be distributive. Indeed, b is d -independent, but it is not c -consistent, even though $c \leq d$ and $b \wedge c = a$ exists. However, its realisation is still an upper semilattice (see 4.20).

Consider the subposet $I \subset [0, \infty)^3$ given by the points $\{a \wedge x = (1, 0, 0), b \wedge x = (0, 1, 0), a = (3, 0, 0), b = (0, 3, 0), x \wedge z = (1, 1, 0), z = (2, 2, 0), a \vee b = (3, 3, 0), x = (1, 1, 2), c = (3, 3, 2)\}$, where the names of the points are chosen to help understanding the relations between them (see Figure 4). Analogously, the poset I is a non-consistent upper semilattice. Furthermore, its realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is not an upper semilattice. This can be seen by taking the points $(a, f: \{a \wedge x\} \rightarrow (-1, 0])$ and $(b, g: \{b \wedge x\} \rightarrow (-1, 0])$ of $\mathcal{R}(I)$, where $f(a \wedge x) = -0.25$ and $g(b \wedge x) = -0.5$. We can define $(a \vee b, m: \{a, b, z\} \rightarrow (-1, 0])$, where $m(a) = 0$, $m(b) = 0$ and $m(z) = f(a \wedge x) \vee g(b \wedge x) = -0.25$. Consider also $(c, h: \{a \vee b, x\} \rightarrow (-1, 0])$, with $h(a \vee b) = 0$ and $h(x) = -0.25$. The two elements $(a \vee b, m)$ and (c, h) are both sups of $\{(a, f), (b, g)\}$. They are indeed not comparable, since x in $\text{supp}(h)$ is $(a \vee b)$ -inconsistent.

Part II, tameness. In this part we introduce tame functors indexed by posets. An important property of a tame functor is that to describe it only a finite amount of information is needed. For example every functor indexed by a finite poset is tame. Tameness is therefore an interesting property for functors indexed by infinite posets, for example by the realisations.




FIGURE 4. The arrows represent relations between elements in this representation of an upper semilattice.

7. TRANSFERS AND LEFT KAN EXTENSIONS

Constructions recalled in this section also play a prominent role in [4].

7.1. Let I be an upper semilattice (see 5.1) and $f: I \rightarrow J$ a function of finite type (see 2.2). Consider the unital function $f_*: I_* \rightarrow J_*$ (see 2.6). Since I_* is also an upper semilattice and $f_* \leq a$ is non-empty and finite, we can form the coproduct $\bigvee_{I_*}(f_* \leq a)$ for all a in J_* . Note that:

$$\bigvee_{I_*}(f_* \leq a) = \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } a = -\infty, \text{ or } a \text{ is in } J \text{ and } (f \leq a) = \emptyset \\ \bigvee_I(f \leq a) & \text{if } a \text{ is in } J \text{ and } (f \leq a) \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$

If $a \leq b$ in J_* , then $\bigvee_{I_*}(f_* \leq a) \leq \bigvee_{I_*}(f_* \leq b)$ since $(f_* \leq a) \subset (f_* \leq b)$. The function mapping a in J_* to $\bigvee_{I_*}(f_* \leq a)$ in I_* is therefore a unital functor, which we denote by $f^!: J_* \rightarrow I_*$ and call the **transfer** of f . The transfer $f^!: J_* \rightarrow I_*$ is only defined when $f: I \rightarrow J$ is a function of finite type between an upper semilattice I and a poset J . Whenever the transfer $f^!$ is considered, we automatically assume that these conditions are satisfied.

Since $f_* \leq f_*(a)$ contains a , the relation $a \leq \bigvee_{I_*}(f_* \leq f_*(a)) = f^! f_*(a)$ holds for every a in I_* . Consequently, $\text{id}_{I_*} \leq f^! f_*$ holds in the poset $I_*^{I_*}$.

In general, $f^!(a) = \bigvee_{I_*}(f_* \leq a)$ may fail to belong to $f_* \leq a$, i.e., the relation $f_* f^!(a) = f_*(\bigvee_{I_*}(f_* \leq a)) \leq a$ may fail to hold. For example when $f: [1]^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)^2$ is given as in Example 5.3 and $a = (1, 1)$ in $[0, \infty)^2$. However, if f is a homomorphism of finite type, then:

7.2. Proposition. *Let $f: I \rightarrow J$ be a homomorphism of finite type between an upper semilattice I and a poset J (see 5.2).*

- (1) $f_* f^! \leq \text{id}_{J_*}$ in $J_*^{J_*}$.

- (2) For every a in J_* , $f^!(a)$ belongs to $f_* \leq a$ and is its global maximum.
- (3) $f^! f_* f^! = f^!$.
- (4) $f_* f^! f_* = f_*$.
- (5) For every a in J_* , $f_* f^!(a)$ belongs to $\{b \in J_* \mid (f_* \leq a) = (f_* \leq b)\}$ and it is its global minimum.
- (6) For a and b in J , $(f \leq a) = (f \leq b)$ if and only if $f^!(a) = f^!(b)$.
- (7) If f is injective, then $f^! f_* = \text{id}_{I_*}$.
- (8) If f is surjective, then $f_* f^! = \text{id}_{J_*}$.

Proof. (1): Let a be in J_* . Since f is a homomorphism, then so is f_* , and therefore $f_* f^!(a) = f_*(\bigvee_{I_*} (f_* \leq a))$ is a sup of $\{f_*(x) \mid x \in (f_* \leq a)\}$ in J_* . The desired relation, $f_* f^!(a) \leq a$, is then a consequence of the inclusion $\{f_*(x) \mid x \in (f_* \leq a)\} \subset (J_* \leq a)$.

(2): By (1), $f_* f^!(a) \leq a$, and hence $f^!(a)$ is in $f_* \leq a$. The element $f^!(a)$ is the global maximum of $f_* \leq a$ since it belongs to it and it is its coproduct.

(3): The relation $f^! \leq f^! f_* f^!$ holds in general and does not require f to be a homomorphism. The reverse relation $f^! f_* f^! \leq f^!$ follows from (1) and the fact that $f^!$ is a functor (see 5.2).

(4): The relation $\text{id}_{I_*} \leq f^! f_*$ and f_* being a functor imply $f_* \leq f_* f^! f_*$. The reverse relation $f_* f^! f_* \leq f_*$ is a particular case of (1).

(5): The inclusion $(f_* \leq f_* f^!(a)) \subset (f_* \leq a)$ follows from (1). If x in I_* is such that $f_*(x) \leq a$, then, since $f^!$ and f_* are homomorphisms, $f_* f^! f_*(x) \leq f_* f^!(a)$. Statement (4) implies therefore $f_*(x) \leq f_* f^!(a)$. This shows $(f_* \leq a) \subset (f_* \leq f_* f^!(a))$ and consequently $(f_* \leq a) = (f_* \leq f_* f^!(a))$, proving the first part of the statement.

According to (2), if $(f \leq a) = (f \leq b)$, then $f^!(a)$ belongs to $f \leq b$, and consequently $f_* f^!(a) \leq b$, showing the minimality of $f_* f^!(a)$.

(6): If $(f \leq a) = (f \leq b)$, then $(f_* \leq a) = (f_* \leq b)$ and hence the coproducts $f^!(a) = \bigvee_I (f_* \leq a)$ and $f^!(b) = \bigvee_I (f_* \leq b)$ are equal. If $f^!(a) = f^!(b)$, then $f_* f^!(a) = f_* f^!(b)$ and consequently $(f_* \leq a) = (f_* \leq f_* f^!(a))$ and $(f_* \leq b) = (f_* \leq f_* f^!(b))$ are also equal, which implies $(f \leq a) = (f \leq b)$.

(7, 8): These two statements are direct consequences of (4). □

We can use Proposition 7.2 to interpret the transfer of a homomorphism of finite type as a localization which is a process involving inverting morphisms.

7.3. Corollary. *Let $f: I \rightarrow J$ be a homomorphism of finite type between an upper semilattice I and a poset J , and \mathcal{C} a category with an*

initial object. Then the following statements about a functor $F: J_* \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ are equivalent:

- for all a in J , the morphism $F(f_*f^!(a) \leq a)$ is an isomorphism (F inverts morphisms of the form $f_*f^!(a) \leq a$);
- there is a functor $G: I_* \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ for which F is isomorphic to $Gf^!$.

Proof. Assume $F(f_*f^!(a) \leq a)$ is an isomorphism for all a in J . The natural transformation $(Ff_*)f^! \rightarrow F$, given by the morphisms $\{F(f_*f^!(a) \leq a)\}_{a \in J}$, is therefore an isomorphism. In this case we could take Ff_* for G .

Assume F is isomorphic to $Gf^!$. Since $f^!f_*f^! = f^!$ (see 7.2.(3)), for all a in J , the morphism $Gf^!(f_*f^!(a) \leq a)$ is the identity and hence an isomorphism. The same is therefore true for $F(f_*f^!(a) \leq a)$. \square

The transfer is convenient for constructing certain left adjoints even in cases when colimits cannot be performed.

7.4. Proposition. *Let \mathcal{C} be a category with an initial object and $f: I \rightarrow J$ a homomorphism of finite type between an upper semilattice I and a poset J . Then the functor $(-)^{f^!}: \text{Fun}_*(I_*, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}_*(J_*, \mathcal{C})$ is left adjoint to $(-)^{f_*}: \text{Fun}_*(J_*, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}_*(I_*, \mathcal{C})$.*

Proof. Let $G: I_* \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $F: J_* \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be unital functors. We need to show there is a bijection, functorial in G and F , between the sets of natural transformations $\text{Nat}_{J_*}(Gf^!, F)$ and $\text{Nat}_{I_*}(G, Ff_*)$. For a natural transformation $\phi = \{\phi_a: Gf^!(a) \rightarrow F(a)\}_{a \in J_*}$ between $Gf^!$ and F in $\text{Fun}_*(J_*, \mathcal{C})$, define:

$$\bar{\phi} := \left\{ G(x) \xrightarrow{G(x \leq f^!f_*(x))} Gf^!f_*(x) \xrightarrow{\phi_{f_*(x)}} Ff_*(x) \right\}_{x \in I_*}$$

Then $\bar{\phi}$ is a natural transformation between G and Ff_* in $\text{Fun}_*(I_*, \mathcal{C})$.

For a natural transformation $\psi = \{\psi_x: G(x) \rightarrow Ff_*(x)\}_{x \in I_*}$ between G and Ff_* in $\text{Fun}_*(I_*, \mathcal{C})$, define:

$$\hat{\psi} := \left\{ Gf^!(a) \xrightarrow{\psi_{f^!(a)}} Ff_*f^!(a) \xrightarrow{F(f_*f^!(a) \leq a)} F(a) \right\}_{a \in J_*}$$

Then $\hat{\psi}$ is a natural transformation between $Gf^!$ and F in $\text{Fun}_*(J_*, \mathcal{C})$.

Statements (2) and (3) of Proposition 7.2 imply $\hat{\bar{\phi}} = \phi$ and $\widehat{\widehat{\psi}} = \psi$. The assignments $\phi \mapsto \bar{\phi}$ and $\psi \mapsto \hat{\psi}$ are therefore inverse bijections. \square

Recall that there is a commutative square of functors where the vertical functors are isomorphism of categories (see 2.7):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{(-)^f} & \text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C}) \\ \downarrow -_* & & \downarrow -_* \\ \text{Fun}_*(J_*, \mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{(-)^{f*}} & \text{Fun}_*(I_*, \mathcal{C}) \end{array}$$

Using these vertical isomorphisms, Proposition 7.4 can be rephrased as:

7.5. Corollary. *Let \mathcal{C} be a category with an initial object and $f: I \rightarrow J$ a homomorphism of finite type between an upper semilattice I and a poset J . Then $(-)^f: \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C})$ has a left adjoint given by $(-)^{f!}$.*

7.6. The left adjoint to $(-)^f: \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C})$ is also called the **left Kan extension** along f (see 2.11). Typically such left adjoints are constructed by performing colimits in \mathcal{C} . However, according to 7.5, when \mathcal{C} has an initial object e and $f: I \rightarrow J$ is a homomorphism of finite type between an upper semilattice I and a poset J , the left Kan extension $f^k G: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ of $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ along f can be constructed explicitly using the transfer (see also [4, Proposition 5.6]):

$$f^k G(a) \text{ is isomorphic to } \begin{cases} e & \text{if } (f \leq a) = \emptyset \\ G(\bigvee_I (f \leq a)) & \text{if } (f \leq a) \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$

This explicit description of the left Kan extension $f^k G$ has consequences which are generally not true for arbitrary left Kan extensions:

7.7. Proposition. *Let $f: I \rightarrow J$ be a homomorphism of finite type between an upper semilattice I and a poset J , and \mathcal{C} a category with an initial object.*

- (1) *If f is injective, then the morphism $G \rightarrow (f^k G)f$, adjoint to the identity $\text{id}: f^k G \rightarrow f^k G$, is an isomorphism for every functor $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$.*
- (2) *If f is surjective, then the morphism $f^k(Ff) \rightarrow F$, adjoint to the identity $\text{id}: Ff \rightarrow Ff$, is an isomorphism for every functor $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$.*
- (3) *If \mathcal{C} is closed under taking (finite) limits, then the left Kan extension functor $f^k: \text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C})$ commutes with (finite) limits.*

Proof. Statement (1) follows from 7.2.(7), and (2) from 7.2.(8).

To prove (3), consider a functor $\phi: D \rightarrow \text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C})$ indexed by a (finite) small category D . Since \mathcal{C} is closed under taking (finite) limits, then so is $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C})$. According to the above description of the left Kan extension and the fact that the limits in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C})$ are constructed objectwise:

$$f^k(\lim_D \phi)(a) \text{ is isomorphic to } \begin{cases} e & \text{if } (f \leq a) = \emptyset \\ (\lim_D \phi)(\bigvee_I (f \leq a)) & \text{if } (f \leq a) \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$

$$\lim_D (f^k \phi)(a) \text{ is isomorphic to } \begin{cases} e & \text{if } (f \leq a) = \emptyset \\ \lim_D (\phi(\bigvee_I (f \leq a))) & \text{if } (f \leq a) \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$

from which it follows that $\lim_D (f^k \phi)$ and $f^k(\lim_D \phi)$ are isomorphic. \square

Here is a characterisation, based on Corollary 7.3, of functors isomorphic to left Kan extensions along a homomorphism of finite type:

7.8. Corollary. *Let $f: I \rightarrow J$ be a homomorphism of finite type between an upper semilattice I and a poset J , and \mathcal{C} a category with an initial object e . Then the following statements about a functor $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ are equivalent:*

- *for all a in J , if $(f \leq a) \neq \emptyset$, then $F(f(\bigvee_I (f \leq a))) \leq a$ is an isomorphism, and if $(f \leq a) = \emptyset$, then $F(a)$ is isomorphic to e ;*
- *there is a functor $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ for which F is isomorphic to $f^k G$;*
- *F is isomorphic to $f^k(Ff)$;*
- *there is a unital functor $G: I_* \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ for which F is isomorphic to the composition $J \hookrightarrow J_* \xrightarrow{f^!} I_* \xrightarrow{G} \mathcal{C}$.*

7.9. Recall that every function $f: I \rightarrow J$ leads to a functor $f \leq: J \rightarrow J[f]$, where $J[f] \subset 2^I$ is the subposet consisting of subsets of the form $(f \leq a) \subset I$ for a in J , and $f \leq$ maps a to $f \leq a$ (see 2.10). Since $f \leq$ is a functor, its fibers $(f \leq)^{-1}(f \leq a) \subset J$, for a in J , are convex subposets of J (see 2.10).

As noted in 2.11, if f is a functor of finite type and \mathcal{C} is a category closed under finite colimits, then, for every $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, the left Kan extension $f^k G: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is isomorphic to a functor that factors through $f \leq: J \rightarrow J[f]$. This implies that the restrictions of $f^k G$ to the fibers $(f \leq)^{-1}(f \leq a) \subset J$ of $f \leq$, for a in J , are isomorphic to constant functors. In general these fibers, although being convex, can still be rather complex subposets of J .

Assume $f: I \rightarrow J$ is a homomorphism of finite type between an upper semilattice I and a poset J . In this case, the only assumption

we need to make about \mathcal{C} is that it has an initial object e . Under these assumptions the fibers of $f \leq$ can be described using the transfer. Both functors, the transfer $f^!: J_* \rightarrow I_*$ and $f \leq: J \rightarrow J[f]$, fit into the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} I & \xrightarrow{f} & J & \xrightarrow{f \leq} & J[f] \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow V \\ & & J_* & \xrightarrow{f^!} & I_* \end{array}$$

where $V(f \leq a) := f^!(a) = \bigvee_{I_*} (f_* \leq a)$. According to Proposition 7.2.(6), $V: J[f] \rightarrow I_*$ is a monomorphism. Since $f \leq$ is a surjection, V is a poset isomorphism between $J[f]$ and the image $f^!(J) \subset I_*$. Moreover, the fibers of $f \leq$ can be expressed using the fibers of the transfer:

$$(f \leq)^{-1}(I \leq a) = \begin{cases} (f^!)^{-1}(-\infty) \cap J & \text{if } (I \leq a) = \emptyset \\ (f^!)^{-1}(f^!(a)) & \text{if } (I \leq a) \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$

Thus, if $(I \leq a) \neq \emptyset$, then, according to 7.2.(5), the fiber $(f \leq)^{-1}(I \leq a) = (f^!)^{-1}(f^!(a))$ is a poset with a global minimum given by $f(\bigvee_I (f \leq a))$. In this case, for every $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, the left Kan extension $f^k G: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is constant on subposets of J that are not only convex but also have global minima.

7.10. Assume I is a consistent upper semilattice of finite type. According to 6.7, its realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is also an upper semilattice. Choose an element d in I and a finite subset $V \subset (-1, 0)$. According to Corollary 6.8, the inclusion $\alpha: \mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V) \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$ is a sublattice (see 5.7). It consists of these pairs (a, f) for which $a \leq d$, and non-zero values of f are in V .

We are going to describe the transfer $\alpha^!: \mathcal{R}(I)_* \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V)_*$. Let (a, f) be in $\mathcal{R}(I)$. By definition (see 7.1):

$$\alpha^!(a, f) = \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } \mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V) \leq (a, f) \text{ is empty} \\ \bigvee (\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V)) \leq (a, f) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Thus, to describe $\alpha^!(a, f)$, the set $\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V) \leq (a, f)$ needs to be discussed. We claim that it is non-empty if and only if d and $\text{supp}(f)$ have a common ancestor. Here is a proof. If there is (b, g) in $\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V)$ for which $(b, g) \leq (a, f)$, then, according to Proposition 4.4, any ancestor of $\text{supp}(g)$ is also an ancestor of $\text{supp}(f)$. The relation $b \leq d$ implies therefore that any common ancestor of b and $\text{supp}(g)$ is also a common ancestor of d and $\text{supp}(f)$.

Assume d and $\text{supp}(f)$ have a common ancestor. If V is empty, set $v_0 := 0$, if V is non-empty, set v_0 to be the minimal element in V . Define $S := \{x \in \mathcal{P}(a) \mid f(x) < v_0\}$. Since S is a subset of $\text{supp}(f)$, it has a common ancestor with d , and consequently the following definition of an element c in I makes sense as the necessary products exist due to I being an upper semilattice of finite type:

$$c := \begin{cases} (\bigwedge S) \wedge d & \text{if } S \neq \emptyset \\ a \wedge d & \text{if } S = \emptyset \end{cases}$$

Any ancestor of $\{d, \text{supp}(f), a\}$ is also an ancestor of c . Let y be a parent of c . Consider the subset $(y \leq \mathcal{P}(a)) \subset \mathcal{P}(a)$. There are two possibilities, either c is an ancestor of the set $y \leq \mathcal{P}(a)$ or not. In the second case, for every x in $(y \leq \mathcal{P}(a)) \setminus (c \leq I)$, two things happen: first $f(x) \geq v_0$ (x does not belong to S) and second there is an equality $y = c \wedge x$. We use the first inequality to define a function $h: \mathcal{P}(c) \rightarrow (-1, 0]$ by the following formula:

$$h(y) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } c \text{ is an ancestor of } y \leq \mathcal{P}(a) \\ \max\{v \in V \mid v \leq f((y \leq \mathcal{P}(a)) \setminus (c \leq I))\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

According to the above formula, if $h(y) < 0$, then there is x in $\mathcal{P}(a)$ for which $y = c \wedge x$ and $f(x) < 0$. Any common ancestor of c and $\text{supp}(f)$ is therefore also an ancestor of y . As this happens for every y for which $h(y) < 0$, the support $\text{supp}(h)$ has an ancestor, and hence (c, h) belongs to the realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$. Since h has values in V , the element (c, h) belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V)$.

Consider the translation $T_{c \leq a}h$. Let x be a parent of a for which $f(x) < 0$. Consistency of I and the fact c and $\text{supp}(f)$ have a common ancestor, imply that the product $c \wedge x$ exists and is either c or is a parent of c . If $c \leq x$, then $T_{c \leq a}h(x) = -1 \leq f(x)$, and, if $c \wedge x$ is a parent of c , then $T_{c \leq a}h(x) = h(c \wedge x) \leq f(x)$ by the formula defining h . These relations imply $(c, h) \leq (a, f)$, and hence the set $\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V) \leq (a, f)$ is non-empty.

We are going to prove $(c, h) = \bigvee (\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V)) \leq (a, f)$, which gives:

$$\alpha^!(a, f) = (c, h)$$

Let (b, g) be in $\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V) \leq (a, f)$. We need to show $(b, g) \leq (c, h)$. The relation $b \leq c$ holds since b is an ancestor of $\{d, \text{supp}(f), a\}$. Consider $T_{b \leq c}g$. Let y be a parent of c for which $h(y) < 0$. Then there is x in $\mathcal{P}(a)$ such that $y = c \wedge x$ and $f(x) < 0$. By the assumption $T_{b \leq c}g(y) \leq f(x)$. Since the values of $T_{b \leq c}g$ are in V , then $T_{b \leq c}g(y) \leq h(y)$, which gives $(b, g) \leq (c, h)$.




FIGURE 5. The intersections of the solid lines correspond to points in \mathbb{N}^2 . All the intersections of solid and dashed lines correspond to points in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{N}^2 \leq (2,2)}(\mathbb{N}^2, \{-0.5, 0\})$.

Consider $V = \{-0.5\}$ and $d = (2, 2)$. Recall that the subposet inclusion $\alpha: \mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{N}^2 \leq d}(\mathbb{N}^2, V) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{N}^2)$ can be identified with $0.5[2]^2 \subset [0, \infty)^2$ (see 4.16). Figure 5 illustrates the effect of the transfer of α via this identification.

8. TAME FUNCTORS

8.1. Definition. Let \mathcal{C} be category and J a poset. A functor $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is called **tame** or **discretisable** if there is a finite poset I and functors $f: I \rightarrow J$ and $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ for which F is isomorphic to the left Kan extension $f^k G$ of G along f (see 2.11), in which case F is also said to be **discretised** by f , and G is called a **discretisation** of F .

The symbol $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{C})$ denotes the full subcategory of $\text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C})$ whose objects are tame functors.

If J is a finite poset, then any functor $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is tame. The notion of tameness is therefore restrictive and meaningful only in case J is infinite. To determine if $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is tame we need to look for two things: a functor $f: I \rightarrow J$ that discretises F and a discretisation $G: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ of F .

How can we search for a discretising f ? In many situations it is enough to consider only finite subposet inclusions $I \subset J$. This is the case if for example \mathcal{C} is closed under finite colimits. For example, consider \mathcal{C} the category of vector spaces over a given field. The closure of \mathcal{C} under finite colimits guarantees the existence of the left Kan extension $f^k: \text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C})$ for every functor $f: I \rightarrow J$ with finite I . This has the following consequences:

8.2. Proposition. *Let \mathcal{C} be a category closed under finite colimits and J a poset.*

- (1) *Consider the following commutative diagram of poset functors with I_0 and I_1 finite:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I_0 & \xrightarrow{g} & I_1 \\ & \searrow f_0 & \swarrow f_1 \\ & J & \end{array}$$

If $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is discretised by f_0 , then it is also discretised by f_1 .

- (2) *If $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is discretised by $f: I \rightarrow J$, then it is also discretised by every subposet $I' \subset J$ for which $f(I) \subset I'$.*
- (3) *Let $F_1, \dots, F_n: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a finite sequence of tame functors. Then there is a finite subposet $I \subset J$ that discretises F_i for all i .*
- (4) *Let L a finite category, and $\phi: L \rightarrow \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C})$ a functor. Assume $\phi(l)$ is tame for every object l in L . Then the functor $\text{colim}_L \phi$ is also tame.*

Proof. (1): As long as they exist, Kan extensions commute with compositions: f_0^k and $f_1^k g^k$ are naturally isomorphic. Thus if F is isomorphic to $f_0^k G$ (is discretised by f_0), then it is also isomorphic to $f_1^k (g^k G)$.

(2): It is a direct consequence of (1).

(3): Let $I_i \subset J$ be a finite subposet discretising F_i . Then, according to (2), $\cup_{i=1}^n I_i \subset I$ discretises F_i , for every i .

(4): Use (3) to choose a finite subposet $f: I \subset J$ that discretises $\phi(l)$ for every l in L (see 8.3.(3)). Since f is an injection, the natural transformation $f^k(\phi f) \rightarrow \phi$, adjoint to the identity $\text{id}: \phi f \rightarrow \phi f$, is an isomorphism (see the end of 2.11). Consequently $\text{colim}_L \phi$ is isomorphic to $\text{colim}_L f^k(\phi f)$. Kan extensions commute with colimits and hence we can conclude $\text{colim}_L \phi$ is isomorphic to $f^k \text{colim}_L(\phi f)$ proving its tameness. \square

According to Proposition 8.2, if \mathcal{C} is closed under finite colimits, the search for discretising functors can be restricted to finite subposet inclusions $I \subset J$, in which case a discretisation is given by restricting to I (see 2.11). That is a considerable simplification. For example, a tame functor indexed by a realisation $\mathcal{R}(I)$ with values in a category closed under finite colimits can always be discretised by a subposet of the form $\mathcal{R}_D(I, V)$, for some finite $D \subset I$ and a finite $V \subset (-1, 0)$

(see 4.16). However not all the categories \mathcal{C} for which we would like to have a simpler way of verifying tameness are closed under finite colimits. For example, the category of simplicial complexes fails to have this property. In such a case Corollary 7.8 can be used where the only assumption on \mathcal{C} is that it has an initial object e . It gives a characterisation of functors which are discretised by a homomorphism $f: I \rightarrow J$ out of a finite upper semilattice I . According to this corollary, a functor $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is discretised by f if and only if, for every a in J , if $(f \leq a) \neq \emptyset$, then $F(f(\bigvee_I (f \leq a))) \leq a$ is an isomorphism, and if $(f \leq a) = \emptyset$, then $F(a)$ is isomorphic to e . For an arbitrary J , not all tame functors are discretised by homomorphisms. To make sure all tame functors are discretised by a homomorphism, J itself needs to be an upper semilattice. The rest of this section is devoted to discussing tameness under this assumption on J and when \mathcal{C} is a category with an initial object e . We start with a statement analogous to Proposition 8.2:

8.3. Proposition. *Let J be an upper semilattice and \mathcal{C} a category with an initial object.*

- (1) *A functor $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is tame if and only if it is discretised by a finite sublattice $I \subset J$ (see 5.7).*
- (2) *Let $I_0 \subset I_1 \subset J$ be finite sublattices of J . If $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is discretised by $I_0 \subset J$, then it is also discretised by $I_1 \subset J$.*
- (3) *Let $F_1, \dots, F_n: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a finite sequence of tame functors. Then there is a finite sublattice $I \subset J$ that discretises F_i for all i .*

Proof. (1): Let $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be tame. Chose a finite poset I' and functors $f: I' \rightarrow J$ and $G: I' \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ for which there is an isomorphism $f^k G \rightarrow F$. Let $\phi: G \rightarrow Ff$ be the natural transformation adjoint to this isomorphism. Since $f(I') \subset J$ is finite, the sublattice generated by this image $I := \langle f(I') \rangle \subset J$ is also finite (see 5.7). Let us denote the inclusion $I' \subset J$ by g and by $h: I \rightarrow I'$ the functor that maps x to $f(x)$. Since g is a homomorphism of finite type between upper semilattices, the left Kan extension $g^k: \text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C})$ exists (see Section 7). We claim the natural transformation $g^k(Fg) \rightarrow F$, adjoint to the identity $\text{id}: Fg \rightarrow Fg$, is an isomorphism. This would mean F is discretised by the finite sublattice $I \subset J$ proving the lemma. According to Proposition 7.7.(1), we have $g^k(Fg)f = g^k(Fg)gh = Fgh = Ff$. Thus the natural transformation $F \rightarrow g^k(Fg)$, whose adjoint is $\phi: G \rightarrow Ff = g^k(Fg)f$, is the inverse to $g^k(Fg) \rightarrow F$.

(2): Exactly the same argument as in 8.2.(2) can be used to prove this statement since the left Kan extensions along $I_0 \subset I_1$, $I_0 \subset J$, and $I_1 \subset J$ exist by 7.5.

(3): For every i choose a finite sublattice $I_i \subset J$ discretising F_i . Define $I := \langle I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_n \rangle \subset Q$ (see 5.7). Since I is finite, according to (2), F_i is discretised by the inclusion $I \subset J$ for every i . \square

8.4. For example, let J be an upper semilattice of finite type. Then for every finite subset $I \subset J$, there is b (for example $\bigvee_J I$) for which $I \subset (J \leq b) \subset J$. Consequently, according to Proposition 8.3, a functor $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is tame if and only if it is discretised by the sublattice $(J \leq b) \subset J$, for some b in J . Thus, according to Corollary 7.8, F is tame if and only if, there is b in J such that, for every a in J , if $(J \leq b) \cap (J \leq a) \neq \emptyset$, then $F((\bigvee (J \leq b) \cap (J \leq a)) \leq a)$ is an isomorphism, and if $(J \leq b) \cap (J \leq a) = \emptyset$, then $F(a)$ is isomorphic to e .

If \mathcal{C} is closed under taking finite colimits and limits, then so is the category of all functors $\text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C})$ for every poset J . In this case the category $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{C})$ is also closed under finite colimits (see 8.2.(4)). In general, we do not know if $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{C})$ is closed under finite limits. A sufficient assumption to guarantee this is again J being an upper semilattice.

8.5. Proposition. *Let J be an upper semilattice, \mathcal{C} a category closed under finite limits, L a finite category, and $\phi: L \rightarrow \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C})$ a functor. Assume $\phi(l)$ is tame for every object l in L . Then the functor $\lim_L \phi$ is also tame.*

Proof. Let $f: I \subset J$ be a finite sublattice that discretises $\phi(l)$ for every object l in L (see 8.3.(3)). Then the natural transformation $f^k(\phi f) \rightarrow \phi$, adjoint to the identity $\text{id}: \phi f \rightarrow \phi f$, is an isomorphism (see 7.8). Consequently $\lim_L \phi$ is isomorphic to $\lim_L f^k(\phi f)$ and hence, by Proposition 7.7, it is also isomorphic to $f^k(\lim_L \phi f)$. \square

According to 8.2.(4) and 8.5, if J is an upper semilattice and \mathcal{C} is closed under finite limits and colimits, then so is the category of tame functors $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{C})$. Furthermore the inclusion $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{C}) \subset \text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{C})$ preserves finite limits and colimits.

9. HOMOTOPY THEORY OF TAME FUNCTORS

Let \mathcal{M} be a model category as defined in [14]. This means three classes of morphisms in \mathcal{M} are chosen: **weak equivalences** ($\xrightarrow{\sim}$), **fibrations** (\twoheadrightarrow), and **cofibrations** (\hookrightarrow), which are required to satisfy the following axioms:

MC1 Finite limits and colimits exist in \mathcal{M} .

- MC2 If f and g are morphisms in \mathcal{M} for which gf is defined and if two of the three morphisms f , g , gf are weak equivalences, then so is the third.
- MC3 The three classes of morphisms are preserved by retracts.
- MC4 Consider a commutative square in \mathcal{M} consisting of the solid morphisms:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \longrightarrow & E \\ \alpha \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \beta \\ Y & \longrightarrow & B \end{array}$$

Then a morphism, depicted by the dotted arrow, making this diagram commutative, exists under either of the following two assumptions: (i) α is a cofibration and a weak equivalence and β is a fibration, or (ii) α is a cofibration and β is a fibration and a weak equivalence.

- MC5 Every morphism in \mathcal{M} can be factored in two ways: (i) $\beta\alpha$, where α is a cofibration and β is a fibration and a weak equivalence, and (ii) $\beta\alpha$, where α is a cofibration and a weak equivalence and β is a fibration.

In particular, the axiom MC1 guarantees the existence of the initial object $\text{colim}_{\emptyset} F$, denoted by e , and of the terminal object $\text{lim}_{\emptyset} F$, denoted by $*$. An object X in \mathcal{M} is called **cofibrant** if the morphism $e \rightarrow X$ is a cofibration. If the morphism $X \rightarrow *$ is a fibration, then X is called **fibrant**.

Assume I is a finite poset. Then the following choices of weak equivalences, fibrations, and cofibrations in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$ is a model structure (see for example [23, 14]). A natural transformation $\varphi : F \rightarrow G$ in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$ is:

- a weak equivalence (resp. a fibration) if, for all a in I , the morphism $\varphi_a : F(a) \rightarrow G(a)$ is a weak equivalence (resp. a fibration) in \mathcal{M} ;
- a cofibration if, for all a in I , the morphism

$$\text{colim}(\text{colim}_{I < a} G \leftarrow \text{colim}_{I < a} F \rightarrow F(a)) \rightarrow G(a),$$

induced by the following commutative diagram, is a cofibration in \mathcal{M} :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{colim}_{I < a} F & \longrightarrow & F(a) \\ \text{colim}_{I < a} \varphi \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi_a \\ \text{colim}_{I < a} G & \longrightarrow & G(a) \end{array}$$

The described model structures on functors indexed by finite posets are compatible in the following sense. Let $f : I_0 \rightarrow I_1$ be a functor

between finite posets. If $\phi: F \rightarrow G$ is a cofibration (resp. a cofibration and a weak equivalence) in $\text{Fun}(I_0, \mathcal{M})$, then so is $f^k \phi: f^k F \rightarrow f^k G$ in $\text{Fun}(I_1, \mathcal{M})$. This is a consequence of the universal property of left Kan extensions and the axiom (MC4). However, left Kan extensions in general fail to preserve weak equivalences and fibrations (compare with Proposition 9.4).

To verify if a natural transformation in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$ is a cofibration, we need to perform colimits over subposets $(I < a) \subset I$. In general, such subposets can be large and constructing colimits over them may require performing a lot of identifications. When I is an upper semilattice however, we can be more efficient. For a in a finite upper semilattice I , define a sublattice:

$$I_a := \{\bigwedge S \mid S \subset \mathcal{P}(a) \text{ has an ancestor}\} \subset (I < a).$$

For all b in $I < a$, the set $b \leq \mathcal{P}(a)$ is non-empty and $b \leq \bigwedge(b \leq \mathcal{P}(a))$. The element $\bigwedge(b \leq \mathcal{P}(a))$ is therefore the initial object in $b \leq I_a$ and consequently $b \leq I_a$ is contractible (see [5]). As this happens for all b in $I < a$, the inclusion $I_a \subset (I < a)$ is cofinal (see [18, 5]), which proves:

9.1. Proposition. *Let I be a finite upper semilattice and a its element. For every functor $F: (I < a) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, the morphism $\text{colim}_{I_a} F \rightarrow \text{colim}_{I < a} F$ is an isomorphism and $\text{hocolim}_{I_a} F \rightarrow \text{hocolim}_{I < a} F$ is a weak equivalence.*

According to Proposition 9.1, when I is a finite upper semilattice, to verify if a natural transformation in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$ is a cofibration, we need only to perform colimits over the subposets $I_a \subset I$ for a in I . How can such colimits be calculated? One way is to consider, for a in I , the subposet of the discrete cube (see 2.1):

$$C_a := \{S \subset \mathcal{P}(a) \mid \mathcal{P}(a) \setminus S \text{ has an ancestor}\} \subset 2^{\mathcal{P}(a)}$$

and the functor $\bigwedge^c: C_a \rightarrow I_a$ mapping S to $\bigwedge(\mathcal{P}(a) \setminus S)$. Since, for every b in I_a , the subset $\mathcal{P}(a) \setminus (b \leq \mathcal{P}(a)) \subset \mathcal{P}(a)$ is the initial object in the poset $b \leq \bigwedge^c$ (see 2.7), this poset is contractible. The functor \bigwedge^c is therefore cofinal. Thus, for every $F: I_a \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, the morphism $\text{colim}_{C_a}(F \bigwedge^c) \rightarrow \text{colim}_{I_a} F$ is an isomorphism and $\text{hocolim}_{C_a}(F \bigwedge^c) \rightarrow \text{hocolim}_{I_a} F$ is a weak equivalence.

The assumption on the indexing poset being an upper semilattice is not only helpful in verifying if a natural transformation is a cofibration. It is also crucial in proving that the following choices of weak equivalences, fibrations, and cofibrations in $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{M})$ satisfy the axioms of a model structure.

9.2. Definition. Let J be an upper semilattice and \mathcal{M} a model category. A natural transformation $\phi: F \rightarrow G$ in $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{M})$ is called:

- a weak equivalence (resp. fibration) if, for all a in J , the morphism $\phi_a: F(a) \rightarrow G(a)$ is a weak equivalence (resp. fibration) in \mathcal{M} ;
- a cofibration if there is a finite subposet inclusion $f: I \subset J$ discretising F and G , and for which $\phi^f: Ff \rightarrow Gf$ is a cofibration in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$.

9.3. Theorem. *Let J be an upper semilattice and \mathcal{M} a model category. The choices described in Definition 9.2 satisfy the axioms of a model structure on $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{M})$.*

Before we prove Theorem 9.3, we first show:

9.4. Proposition. *Let \mathcal{M} be a model category and $f: I \rightarrow J$ a homomorphism of finite type between upper semilattices. If a natural transformation $\phi: F \rightarrow G$ in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$ is a weak equivalence (resp. fibration), then so is its left Kan extension $f^k\phi: f^kF \rightarrow f^kG$ in $\text{Fun}(J, \mathcal{M})$.*

Proof. Let $\phi: F \rightarrow G$ in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$ be a weak equivalence (resp. fibration). Since f is a finite-type homomorphism between upper semilattices, the morphism $(f^k\phi)_a: f^kF(a) \rightarrow f^kG(a)$ is isomorphic to either $\text{id}: e \rightarrow e$, if $(f \leq a) = \emptyset$, or to $\phi_{\bigvee_I(f \leq a)}: F(\bigvee_I(f \leq a)) \rightarrow G(\bigvee_I(f \leq a))$, if $(f \leq a) \neq \emptyset$ (see 7.6). As these morphisms are weak equivalences (resp. fibrations), for all a , then so is the left Kan extension $f^k\phi$. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.3. Requirement MC1 follows from Proposition 8.5. MC2 and MC3 are clear since \mathcal{M} satisfies them.

MC4: Let $\alpha: F \hookrightarrow G$ be a cofibration in $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{M})$. Choose a finite sublattice $I \subset J$ and functor $f: I \rightarrow J$ that discretises both F and G and for which $\alpha^f: Ff \rightarrow Gf$ is a cofibration in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$. Assume α is part of a commutative square in $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{M})$ depicted in Figure 6 on the left, where β is a fibration. By applying $(-)^f$ to this square we get a commutative square in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$, depicted by the solid arrows square on the right in Figure 6, where as indicated the natural transformations are a cofibration and a fibration in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$. If in addition either α or β is a weak equivalence, then the lift, depicted by the dotted arrow in the right of Figure 6, exists since $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$ is a model category.

By applying the left Kan extension f^k to the square on the right in Figure 6 and comparing the result to the original square on the left in Figure 6 we can form the commutative 3-dimensional cube in Figure 7 in $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{M})$. Since the natural transformation $f^k(Gf) \rightarrow G$ is an

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F & \longrightarrow & E \\
\alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta \\
G & \longrightarrow & B
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{ccc}
Ff & \longrightarrow & Ef \\
\alpha^f \downarrow & \nearrow s & \downarrow \beta^f \\
Gf & \longrightarrow & Bf
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 6.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & F & \longrightarrow & E \\
& \nearrow & \downarrow \alpha & & \nearrow \\
f^k(Ff) & \longrightarrow & f^k(Ef) & & \downarrow \beta \\
\downarrow (f^k\alpha)^f & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& \nearrow & G & \longrightarrow & B \\
& \nearrow f^k s & \downarrow (f^k\beta)^f & & \nearrow \\
f^k(Gf) & \longrightarrow & f^k(Bf) & &
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 7.

isomorphism, a desired lift exists in the right square of Figure 6 under the additional assumption that either α or β is a weak equivalence.

MC5: Let $\phi: F \rightarrow G$ be a natural transformation in $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{M})$. Choose a finite sublattice $f: I \subset J$ that discretises both F and G . Factor the natural transformation $\phi^f: Ff \rightarrow Gf$ in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$ as $\phi^f = \beta\alpha$ where $\alpha: Ff \rightarrow H$ is a cofibration, $\beta: H \rightarrow Gf$ is a fibration, and either α or β is a weak equivalence. By applying the left Kan extension f^k to these factorisations we obtain a commutative diagram in $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{M})$ where the vertical natural transformations are isomorphisms:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
f^k(Ff) & \xrightarrow{f^k\alpha} & f^k H & \xrightarrow{f^k\beta} & f^k(Gf) \\
\downarrow & & & & \downarrow \\
F & \xrightarrow{\phi} & G & &
\end{array}$$

Since $(f^k\alpha)^f$ is isomorphic to α , it is a cofibration in $\text{Fun}(I, \mathcal{M})$ and consequently $f^k\alpha$ is a cofibration in $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{M})$. According to Proposition 9.4, $f^k\beta$ is a fibration in $\text{Tame}(J, \mathcal{M})$. The same proposition assures also that if α (resp. β) is a weak equivalence, then so is $f^k\alpha$ (resp. $f^k\beta$). This gives the desired factorisation of ϕ . \square

10. BETTI DIAGRAMS OF VECTOR SPACES VALUED FUNCTORS.

In this section we are going to discuss a standard strategy of retrieving Betti diagrams of functors indexed by posets with values in the category vect_K of **finite dimensional** K -vector spaces, where K is a chosen field.

If J is a finite poset, then the language of model categories can be used for phrasing homological properties of functors in $\text{Fun}(J, \text{vect}_K)$. This is because, in this case, the category $\text{ch}(\text{Fun}(J, \text{vect}_K))$ of **non-negative chain complexes** of such functors, which can be identified with $\text{Fun}(J, \text{ch}(\text{vect}_K))$, has a natural model structure where weak equivalences are given by the homology isomorphisms. See Section 9 for a recollection of how such a model structure can be obtained. It is however unlikely that the category $\text{Fun}(J, \text{ch}(\text{vect}_K))$ has a natural model structure with same weak equivalences for a general infinite J . The reason is the restriction to functors with values in finite dimensional K vector spaces which might prevent the existence of the required factorisations. This restriction however is important as our primary interest is in circumstances when Betti diagrams can be defined and calculated. For that the finite dimensionality assumption is essential.

In Section 9 (see 9.3), it was also explained how the model structures on $\text{Fun}(I, \text{ch}(\text{vect}_K))$, for finite I , can be extended to $\text{Tame}(J, \text{ch}(\text{vect}_K))$ where J is an arbitrary upper semilattice. However, if J is not finite and not an upper semilattice, then $\text{Tame}(J, \text{ch}(\text{vect}_K))$ may even fail to be closed under finite limits, preventing for example the existence of resolutions.

This means that for J which is not finite, care needs to be exercised in order to be able to consider resolutions and Betti diagrams of functors indexed by J . In this section we recall necessary foundations for defining Betti diagrams, and also present a strategy based on Koszul complexes to calculate them.

10.1 (Freeness). Let J be a poset with the poset relation denoted by \leq . Consider the poset $(J, =)$ with the trivial poset relation on the set J , where two elements are related if and only if they are equal. The identity function $\iota: (J, =) \rightarrow J$, mapping a to $\iota(a) = a$, is a functor. A functor $V: (J, =) \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ is just a sequence $\{V_a\}_{a \in J}$ of finite dimensional K -vector spaces. The set $\{a \in J \mid V_a \neq 0\}$ is called the support of V and is denoted by $\text{supp}(V)$.

A functor $F: J \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ is called **free finitely generated** if it is isomorphic to the left Kan extension along $\iota: (J, =) \rightarrow J$ of some $V = \{V_a\}_{a \in J}$ whose support is finite. Since all free functors considered

in this article are finitely generated, we use the term **free**, without mentioning finite generation, to describe such functors. The name free is justified by the universal property of the left Kan extension, which gives a linear isomorphism between $\text{Nat}_J(\iota^k V, H)$ and $\prod_{a \in J} \text{Hom}(V_a, H(a))$, for every functor $H: J \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$. For example, for b in J and a finite dimensional vector space U , consider the simple functor $U[b]: J \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$:

$$U[b](a) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a \neq b \\ U & \text{if } a = b \end{cases}$$

Then the vector spaces $\text{Nat}_J(\iota^k V, U[b])$ and $\text{Hom}(V_b, U)$ are isomorphic. By varying b in J and taking U to be K , we can conclude that free functors $\iota^k V$ and $\iota^k W$ are isomorphic if and only if V_a and W_a are isomorphic for all a in J . Thus, a free functor F determines a unique sequence $\beta F = \{(\beta F)_a\}_{a \in J}$ of vector spaces whose support is finite, called the **Betti diagram** of F , for which F is isomorphic to the left Kan extension $\iota^k(\beta F)$. If $\text{supp}(\beta F) = \{a\}$, then F is called **homogeneous** and is also denoted by the symbol $F(a)[a, -]$. The restriction of $F(a)[a, -]$ to the subposet $(a \leq J) \subset J$ is isomorphic to the constant functor with value $F(a)$. Its restriction to $\{x \in J \mid a \not\leq x\}$ is isomorphic to the constant functor with value 0. If F is free, then it is isomorphic to the direct sum $\bigoplus_{a \in J} (\beta F)_a[a, -]$ and, consequently, F is isomorphic to the left Kan extension of $\{(\beta F)_a\}_{a \in \text{supp}(\beta F)}$ along $(\text{supp}(\beta F), =) \hookrightarrow J$. Thus, every free functor F is tame and is discretised by the subposet inclusion $\text{supp}(\beta F) \subset J$. Moreover every collection $V = \{V_a\}_{a \in J}$ with finite support is the Betti diagram of a free functor.

If $G: I \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ is free, then, for every functor $f: I \rightarrow J$, the left Kan extension $f^k G: J \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ is also free and $(\beta f^k G)_a = 0$ if $f^{-1}(a)$ is empty, and $(\beta f^k G)_a$ is isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{b \in f^{-1}(a)} (\beta G)_b$, if $f^{-1}(a)$ is non-empty.

10.2 (Resolutions). Let J be a poset and $F: J \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ a functor. An exact sequence $P_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$ in $\text{Fun}(J, \text{vect}_K)$, with P_i free for all i , is called an **n -resolution** of F . A 1-resolution $P_0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$ is also called a **cover** of F . A 2-resolution $P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$ is also called a **presentation** of F . An infinite exact sequence $\cdots \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$, with P_i free for all i , is called an **∞ -resolution** of F . An n -resolution of F is also denoted, as a map of chain complexes, by $P \rightarrow F$, where F is a chain complex concentrated in degree 0, and either $P = (P_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P_0)$ or $P = (\cdots \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0)$, depending if n is finite.

A functor $F: J \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ is called **n -resolvable** if it has an n -resolution. Functors which are 1-resolvable are also called **finitely**

generated. Functors which are 2-resolvable are also called **finitely presented**. If the indexing poset J is finite, then all functors are ∞ -resolvable. This is because all such functors are finitely generated, and hence by taking covers of successive kernels, an ∞ -resolution can be constructed.

If J is infinite, then not all n -resolvable functors have to be $(n+1)$ -resolvable. For example, let $J = [0, 2) \coprod \{a, b\} \coprod (2, 3]$, with a and b incomparable and $x < a < y$ and $x < b < y$, for x in $[0, 2)$ and y in $(2, 3]$. Consider the subposet $I := \{1, a, b\} \subset J$ and a functor $G: I \rightarrow \text{Vect}_K$ where both $G(1 < a)$ and $G(1 < b)$ are given by the function $K \rightarrow 0$. Let $F: J \rightarrow \text{Vect}_K$ be the left Kan extension of G along $I \subset J$. Then F is finitely presented (2-resolvable), however it is not 3-resolvable.

Here is a characterisation of finitely generated and presented functors.

10.3. Proposition. *Let J be a poset and $F: J \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ a functor.*

- (1) *F is finitely generated if and only if there is a finite poset I and a functor $f: I \rightarrow J$ for which the natural transformation $\mu: f^k(Ff) \rightarrow F$, adjoint to the identity $\text{id}: Ff \rightarrow Ff$, is surjective.*
- (2) *F is finitely presented if and only if it is tame, i.e., if and only if there is a finite poset I and a functor $f: I \rightarrow J$ for which the natural transformation $\mu: f^k(Ff) \rightarrow F$, adjoint to the identity $\text{id}: Ff \rightarrow Ff$, is an isomorphism.*

Proof. (1): Let $\pi: P_0 \rightarrow F$ be a cover. Since P_0 is tame, there is a functor $f: I \rightarrow J$, with finite I , discretising P_0 (for example $I = \text{supp}(\beta P_0) \subset J$). The commutativity of the following square and the fact that left Kan extensions preserve surjections imply the surjectivity of μ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f^k(P_0 f) & \longrightarrow & P_0 \\ f^k(\pi f) \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ f^k(Ff) & \xrightarrow{\mu} & F \end{array}$$

Let I be a finite poset, $f: I \rightarrow J$ a functor for which $\mu: f^k(Ff) \rightarrow F$ is surjective, and $\pi: P_0 \rightarrow Ff$ a cover. The surjectivity of μ implies the surjectivity of the following composition, which is then a cover of F :

$$f^k(P_0) \xrightarrow{f^k \pi} f^k(Ff) \xrightarrow{\mu} F$$

(2): If $P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$ is a 2-resolution, then $\operatorname{colim}(0 \leftarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0)$ is isomorphic to F . Since tameness is preserved by finite colimits (see 8.2.(4)), F is tame.

Assume F is discretised by a subposet inclusion $f: I \subset J$ with finite I . Consider a 2-resolution $P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow Ff \rightarrow 0$, which exists since I is finite. As before, $f^k(Ff)$, and hence F , is isomorphic to $\operatorname{colim}(0 \leftarrow f^kP_1 \rightarrow f^kP_0)$. Since f^kP_1 and f^kP_0 are free, F is finitely presented. \square

Proposition 10.3 characterises n -resolvable functors for $n \leq 2$. We do not have a similar characterisation for $n > 2$, only a partial result:

10.4. Proposition. *Let J be a poset. Assume $F: J \rightarrow \operatorname{vect}_K$ is discretised by a functor $f: I \rightarrow J$ out of a finite poset I and for which $f^k: \operatorname{Fun}(I, \operatorname{vect}_K) \rightarrow \operatorname{Fun}(J, \operatorname{vect}_K)$ is exact. Then F is ∞ -resolvable.*

Proof. Let $G: I \rightarrow \operatorname{vect}_K$ be a functor for which f^kG is isomorphic to F . Choose an ∞ -resolution $\pi: P \rightarrow G$. Exactness of f^k means that the left Kan extension $f^k\pi: f^kP \rightarrow f^kG$ is an ∞ -resolution f^kG . \square

Here is a condition guaranteeing exactness of the left Kan extension:

10.5. Lemma. *Assume $f: I \rightarrow J$ is a functor of posets with finite I satisfying the following property: for every a in J , every pair of elements in $f \leq a$ that have an ancestor also has a descendent (such posets are called weakly directed in [3]). Then $f^k: \operatorname{Fun}(I, \operatorname{vect}_K) \rightarrow \operatorname{Fun}(J, \operatorname{vect}_K)$ is exact.*

Proof. We show $\operatorname{colim}_{f \leq a}: \operatorname{Fun}(f \leq a, \operatorname{vect}_K) \rightarrow \operatorname{vect}_K$ is exact for all a in J . Let $M \subset (f \leq a)$ consists of all the maximal elements. The assumption on f implies $M \subset (f \leq a)$ is cofinal and hence $\operatorname{colim}_{f \leq a} F$ is isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{x \in M} F(x)$. The lemma follows from the exactness of direct sums. \square

10.6. Corollary. *Let J be a poset.*

- (1) *Every functor $F: J \rightarrow \operatorname{vect}_K$ discretised by a homomorphism $f: I \rightarrow J$ from a finite upper semilattice I is ∞ -resolvable.*
- (2) *If J is an upper semilattice, then a functor $F: J \rightarrow \operatorname{vect}_K$ is tame if and only if it is ∞ -resolvable.*

Proof. In both cases (1) and (2) the poset $f \leq a$, for all a in J , has a terminal object given by its coproduct in I . Thus the assumption of Lemma 10.5 is satisfied and hence the conclusion of 10.4 holds. \square

10.7 (Minimality and Betti diagrams). An n -resolution $\pi: P \rightarrow F$ is called **minimal** if every chain map $\phi: P \rightarrow P$, for which the following

triangle commutes, is an isomorphism:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{\phi} & P \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & F & \end{array}$$

If $P \rightarrow F$ and $Q \rightarrow F$ are minimal n -resolutions of F , then P and Q are isomorphic. Thus, if $P \rightarrow F$ is a minimal n -resolution, then the isomorphism type of P_i , for $i < n$, is uniquely determined by the isomorphism type of F , and its Betti diagram βP_i is called the i -th **Betti diagram** of F , and is denoted by $\beta^i F$. For example if F is free, then $\text{id}: F \rightarrow F$ is a minimal ∞ -resolution of F and, hence, for every a in J , the vector space $(\beta^0 F)_a$ is isomorphic to $(\beta F)_a$, and $(\beta^i F)_a = 0$ for $i > 0$.

A minimal 1-resolution $P_0 \rightarrow F$ is also called a **minimal cover** of F . An n -resolution $P \rightarrow F$ is minimal if and only if, for every $i < n$, the following natural transformations are minimal covers: $P_0 \rightarrow F$, $P_1 \rightarrow \ker(P_0 \rightarrow F)$, \dots , $P_i \rightarrow \ker(P_{i-1} \rightarrow P_{i-2})$. Thus, if $P_0 \rightarrow F$ is a minimal cover of an n -resolvable functor, then, for $1 \leq i < n$, $\beta^i F$ is isomorphic to $\beta^{i-1} \ker(P_0 \rightarrow F)$. Also, if $P \rightarrow F$ is a minimal n -resolution, then $\beta^0 F$ is isomorphic to βP_0 , $\beta^1 F$ is isomorphic to $\beta^0 \ker(P_0 \rightarrow F)$, and for $i > 1$, $\beta^i F$ is isomorphic to $\beta^0 \ker(P_{i-1} \rightarrow P_{i-2})$.

Our strategy for constructing minimal resolutions of n -resolvable functors indexed by an arbitrary poset is to reduce this problem to the case when the indexing poset is finite.

10.8. Proposition. *Let J be a poset and $F: J \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ a functor. Assume $P \rightarrow F$ is an n -resolution which is discretised by a subposet inclusion $f: I \subset J$ with finite I . If $Q \rightarrow Ff$ is a minimal n -resolution of Ff , then its adjoint $f^k Q \rightarrow F$ is a minimal resolution of F and, for $i < n$ and a in J :*

$$(\beta^i F)_a \text{ is isomorphic to } \begin{cases} (\beta^i(Ff))_a = (\beta Q_i)_a & \text{if } a \in I \\ 0 & \text{if } a \notin I \end{cases}$$

Proof. By restricting the n -resolution $P \rightarrow F$ of F along f , we obtain a resolution $Pf \rightarrow Ff$ of Ff . Let $Q \rightarrow Ff$ be a minimal n -resolution. Then there are chain maps $\phi: Q \rightarrow Pf$ and $\psi: Pf \rightarrow Q$ for which the composition $\psi\phi: Q \rightarrow Q$ is an isomorphism and the diagram on the

left commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 Q & \xrightarrow{\phi} & Pf & \xrightarrow{\psi} & Q \\
 & \searrow & \downarrow & \swarrow & \\
 & & Ff & &
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 f^k Q & \xrightarrow{\phi} & f^k(Pf) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & f^k Q \\
 & \searrow & \downarrow & \swarrow & \\
 & & F & &
 \end{array}$$

By taking the adjoints of the vertical maps in the left diagram, we obtain a commutative diagram on the right. Since $f^k(Pf) \rightarrow F$ is an n -resolution, then so is its retract $f^k Q \rightarrow F$. Its minimality follows from the minimality of $Q \rightarrow Ff$ and the fact that $f^k: \text{Nat}_I(Q_i, Q_i) \rightarrow \text{Nat}_J(f^k Q_i, f^k Q_i)$ is a bijection for every i (see 2.12). \square

According to Proposition 10.8, to construct a minimal n -resolution of a functor $F: J \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$, the first step is to find a finite subposet inclusion $f: I \subset J$ for which there is an n -resolution $P \rightarrow F$ with P being discretised by f (the natural transformation $f^k(Pf) \rightarrow P$ is an isomorphism). For $n = 1$, according to the proof of 10.3.(1), such a subposet inclusion is given by any $f: I \subset J$ for which $f^k(Ff) \rightarrow F$ is a surjection. For $n = 2$, according to the proof of 10.3.(2), such a subposet inclusion is given by any $f: I \subset J$ that discretises F . We do not have a similar statement for $n > 2$.

The second step is to construct a minimal n -resolution $Q \rightarrow Ff$ of the restriction Ff . The adjoint of this minimal resolution $f^k Q \rightarrow F$ is then the desired minimal n -resolution of F . This process reduces finding a minimal n -resolution of F to finding a minimal n -resolution of Ff which is a functor indexed by a finite poset. Constructing minimal resolutions of functors indexed by finite posets is standard and involves radicals (see for example [2, 9]).

10.9 (Radical). Let I be a finite poset. The **radical** of $G: I \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ is a subfunctor $\text{rad}(G) \subset G$ given by $\text{rad}(G)(a) = \sum_{s \in (I < a)} \text{im}(G(s < a))$ for a in I . The quotient functor $G/\text{rad}(G)$ is semisimple as it is isomorphic to a direct sum $\oplus_{a \in I} U_a[a]$ of simple functors (see 10.1), where $U_a := (G/\text{rad}(G))(a)$. For example, for a free functor $G = \oplus_{a \in I} (\beta G)_a[a, -]$, the quotient $G/\text{rad}(G)$ is isomorphic to $\oplus_{a \in I} (\beta G)_a[a]$.

A key property of the quotienting by the radical, when the indexing poset is finite, is the surjectivity detection: a natural transformation $H \rightarrow G$ is surjective if and only if its composition with the quotient $G \rightarrow G/\text{rad}(G)$ is surjective. The surjectivity detection may fail for infinite posets.

The surjectivity detection can be used to construct minimal covers. Consider the quotient $G/\text{rad}(G)$ of $G: I \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$. Set $P_0 :=$

$\bigoplus_{a \in I} U_a[a, -]$, where $U_a = (G/\text{rad}(G))(a)$. Note that there is an isomorphism $P_0/\text{rad}(P_0) \rightarrow G/\text{rad}(G)$. Let $\pi: P_0 \rightarrow G$ be any natural transformation fitting into the following commutative square, where the bottom horizontal arrow represent the chosen isomorphism:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_0 & \xrightarrow{\pi} & G \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ P_0/\text{rad}(P_0) & \longrightarrow & G/\text{rad}(G) \end{array}$$

Such π exists since P_0 is free. The composition $P_0 \rightarrow G/\text{rad}(G)$ is surjective, and hence so is π . The same argument gives the surjectivity of every $\phi: P_0 \rightarrow P_0$ for which $\pi\phi = \pi$. Since the values of P_0 are finite dimensional, every such ϕ is therefore an isomorphism, and hence $\pi: P_0 \rightarrow G$ is a minimal cover. This shows:

10.10. Proposition. *Let I be a finite poset and $G: I \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ a functor. A natural transformation $P_0 \rightarrow G$ is a minimal cover if and only if P_0 is free and the induced natural transformation $P_0/\text{rad}(P_0) \rightarrow G/\text{rad}(G)$ is an isomorphism. Moreover $(\beta^0 G)_a$ is isomorphic to $(G/\text{rad}(G))(a)$ for all a .*

Since all the functors indexed by a finite poset I are finitely generated, by taking minimal covers of successive kernels, every functor indexed by I admits a minimal ∞ -resolution. This inductive step-wise construction of a minimal ∞ -resolution can be used for a step wise inductive procedure of calculating the Betti diagrams. Can the Betti diagrams be retrieved in one step without the need of an inductive procedure? For this purpose Koszul complexes are standardly used.

10.11. Let I be a finite poset and a its element. Choose a linear ordering \prec on the set of parents $\mathcal{P}(a)$ of a . For every functor $G: I \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$, we define a non-negative chain complex denoted by $\mathcal{K}_a G$ and called the **Koszul complex** of G at a . Let k be a natural number. Define:

$$(\mathcal{K}_a G)_k := \begin{cases} G(a) & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \bigoplus_{\substack{S \subset \mathcal{P}(a), |S|=k \\ S \text{ has an ancestor}}} \text{colim}_{\cap_{s \in S} (I \leq s)} G & \text{if } k > 0 \end{cases}$$

For example $(\mathcal{K}_a G)_1 = \bigoplus_{s \in \mathcal{P}(a)} G(s)$ and $(\mathcal{K}_a G)_k = 0$ if $k > \text{par-dim}_I(a)$ (see 3.5).

Define $\partial: (\mathcal{K}_a G)_{k+1} \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_a G)_k$ as follows:

- If $k = 0$, then $\partial: (\mathcal{K}_a G)_1 \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_a G)_0 = G(a)$ is the linear function which on the summand $G(s)$ in $(\mathcal{K}_a G)_1$, indexed by s in $\mathcal{P}(a)$, is given by $G(s < a)$.

- Let $k > 0$. For $k \geq j \geq 0$, let $\partial_j: (\mathcal{K}_a G)_{k+1} \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_a G)_k$ be the linear function mapping the summand $\text{colim}_{\cap_{s \in S} (I \leq s)} G$ in $(\mathcal{K}_a G)_{k+1}$, indexed by $S = \{s_0 \prec \cdots \prec s_k\} \subset \mathcal{P}(a)$, to the summand $\text{colim}_{\cap_{s \in S \setminus \{s_j\}} (I \leq s)} G$ in $(\mathcal{K}_a G)_k$, indexed by $S \setminus \{s_j\} \subset \mathcal{P}(a)$, via the function of the colimits $\text{colim}_{\cap_{s \in S} (I \leq s)} G \rightarrow \text{colim}_{\cap_{s \in S \setminus \{s_j\}} (I \leq s)} G$ induced by the poset inclusion $\cap_{s \in S} (I \leq s) \subset \cap_{s \in S \setminus \{s_j\}} (I \leq s)$. Define $\partial: (\mathcal{K}_a G)_{k+1} \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_a G)_k$ to be the alternating sum $\partial = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \partial_j$.

The linear functions ∂ form a chain complex as it is standard to verify that composition of two consecutive such functions is the 0 function.

For a natural transformation $\phi: F \rightarrow G$, define:

$$(\mathcal{K}_a F)_k \xrightarrow{(\mathcal{K}_a \phi)_k} (\mathcal{K}_a G)_k := \begin{cases} \phi_a & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \bigoplus_{\substack{S \subset \mathcal{P}(a), |S|=k \\ S \text{ has an ancestor}}} \text{colim}_{\cap_{s \in S} (I \leq s)} \phi & \text{if } k > 0 \end{cases}$$

These linear functions, for all k , form a chain map denoted by $\mathcal{K}_a \phi: \mathcal{K}_a F \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_a G$. The association $\phi \mapsto \mathcal{K}_a \phi$ is a functor.

The image of the differential $\partial: (\mathcal{K}_a G)_1 \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_a G)_1 = G(a)$ coincides with $\text{rad}(G)(a) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(a)} \text{im}(G(s < a))$, and consequently, according to 10.10, the vector spaces $H_0(\mathcal{K}_a G)$, $(G/\text{rad}(G))(a)$, and $(\beta^0 G)_a$ are isomorphic.

10.12. Let an element a in a finite poset I have the following property: every subset $S \subset \mathcal{P}(a)$ which has an ancestor has the product $\bigwedge S$ in I . For example, if I is an upper semilattice, then all its elements satisfy this property. Under this assumption, for every subset $S \subset \mathcal{P}(a)$ that has an ancestor, the product $\bigwedge S$ is the terminal object in the category $\cap_{s \in S} (I \leq s)$ and consequently, for $k > 0$,

$$(\mathcal{K}_a G)_k = \bigoplus_{\substack{S \subset \mathcal{P}(a), |S|=k \\ S \text{ has an ancestor}}} G(\bigwedge S)$$

10.13. Let I be a finite poset and a its element. Since colimits commute with direct sums, so does the functor \mathcal{K}_a , i.e., the natural transformation $\mathcal{K}_a F \oplus \mathcal{K}_a G \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_a (F \oplus G)$ is an isomorphism.

As the colimit operation is right exact, then so is our Koszul complex construction: if $0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow G \rightarrow H \rightarrow 0$ is an exact sequence in $\text{Fun}(I, \text{vect}_K)$, then $\mathcal{K}_a F \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_a G \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_a H \rightarrow 0$ is an exact sequence of chain complexes. In general colimits do not preserve monomorphisms, and hence one does not expect the Koszul complex construction to preserve monomorphisms in general either. Let n be an extended positive

natural number (containing ∞). An element a in I is called **Koszul n -exact** if, for every exact sequence of functors $0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow G \rightarrow H \rightarrow 0$ and $k < n$, the following sequence of vector spaces is exact:

$$0 \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_a F)_k \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_a G)_k \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_a H)_k \rightarrow 0$$

For example all elements in I turn out to be Koszul 2-exact.

10.14. Proposition. *Let I be a finite poset.*

- (1) *Then every element a in I is Koszul 2-exact.*
- (2) *Assume an element a in I has the following property: every subset $S \subset \mathcal{P}(a)$ which has an ancestor has the product $\bigwedge S$ in I . Then a is Koszul ∞ -exact.*
- (3) *If I is an upper semilattice, then all its elements are Koszul ∞ -exact.*

Proof. Statement (1) is a consequence of the fact that direct sums preserves exactness. Under the assumption of statement (2), for a functor F and $k > 0$, the vector space $(\mathcal{K}_a F)_k$ can be also described as (see 10.12):

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{S \subset \mathcal{P}(a), |S|=k \\ S \text{ has an ancestor}}} F(\bigwedge S)$$

In this case, the statement also follows from the exactness of direct sums. Finally statement (3) is a particular case of (2). \square

Proposition 10.14 translates into the homology exact sequence:

10.15. Corollary. *Let I be a finite poset and $0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow G \rightarrow H \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence in $\text{Fun}(I, \text{vect}_K)$.*

- (1) *For every element a in I , there is an exact sequence of vector spaces:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & H_2(\mathcal{K}_a G) & \longrightarrow & H_2(\mathcal{K}_a H) & \longrightarrow & \\ & \nearrow & & & & & \\ \hookrightarrow & H_1(\mathcal{K}_a F) & \longrightarrow & H_1(\mathcal{K}_a G) & \longrightarrow & H_1(\mathcal{K}_a H) & \longrightarrow \\ & \searrow & & & & & \\ \hookrightarrow & H_0(\mathcal{K}_a F) & \longrightarrow & H_0(\mathcal{K}_a G) & \longrightarrow & H_0(\mathcal{K}_a H) & \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

- (2) *Assume an element a in I has the following property: every subset $S \subset \mathcal{P}(a)$ which has an ancestor has the product $\bigwedge S$ in*

I. Then there is an exact sequence of vector spaces:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & & & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \\
& \nearrow & & & & & \\
\hookrightarrow & H_2(\mathcal{K}_a F) & \longrightarrow & H_2(\mathcal{K}_a G) & \longrightarrow & H_2(\mathcal{K}_a H) & \longrightarrow \\
& \searrow & & & & & \\
\hookrightarrow & H_1(\mathcal{K}_a F) & \longrightarrow & H_1(\mathcal{K}_a G) & \longrightarrow & H_1(\mathcal{K}_a H) & \longrightarrow \\
& \searrow & & & & & \\
\hookrightarrow & H_0(\mathcal{K}_a F) & \longrightarrow & H_0(\mathcal{K}_a G) & \longrightarrow & H_0(\mathcal{K}_a H) & \longrightarrow 0
\end{array}$$

10.16. Consider a homogeneous free functor $F = V[b, -]: I \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$, where I is a finite poset. We claim that $\mathcal{K}_a F$ has the following homology:

$$H_i(\mathcal{K}_a F) \text{ is isomorphic to } \begin{cases} V & \text{if } i = 0 \text{ and } b = a \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

To prove the claim, recall $F(x) = 0$ if $b \not\leq x$, and F restricted to $(b \leq I) \subset I$ is isomorphic to the constant functor with value V . Thus, if $b \not\leq a$, then $\mathcal{K}_a F = 0$, and the claim holds. If $b = a$, then $(\mathcal{K}_a F)_0 = F(a) = V$ and $(\mathcal{K}_a F)_i = 0$ for $i > 0$, and again the claim holds. Assume $b < a$. Then $(\mathcal{K}_a F)_0 = F(a)$, which is isomorphic to V . Moreover, for a subset that has an ancestor $S \subset \mathcal{P}(a)$ with $|S| > 0$, the colimit $\text{colim}_{\cap_{s \in S} (I \leq s)} F$ is isomorphic to $\text{colim}_{\cap_{s \in S} (b \leq I \leq s)} F$, which is either isomorphic to V , in the case $S \subset (b \leq \mathcal{P}(a))$, or is 0 otherwise. Consequently, the complex $\mathcal{K}_a F$ is isomorphic to $L \otimes V$, where L is the augmented chain complex of the standard $|b \leq \mathcal{P}(a)|$ -dimensional simplex whose homology is trivial in all degrees:

$$L := \left(\cdots \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{S \subset (b \leq \mathcal{P}(a)) \\ |S|=2}} K \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{S \subset (b \leq \mathcal{P}(a)) \\ |S|=1}} K \rightarrow K \right)$$

Since the Koszul complex commutes with direct sums, if F is free, isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{b \in I} (\beta F)_b [b, -]$, then:

$$H_i(\mathcal{K}_a F) \text{ is isomorphic to } \begin{cases} (\beta F)_a & \text{if } i = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } i > 0 \end{cases}$$

We are now ready to state the key fact connecting the homology of the Koszul complexes of a functor with its Betti diagrams.

10.17. **Theorem.** Let I be a finite poset and $G: I \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ a functor.

- (1) For every a in I and $i = 0, 1, 2$, the vector spaces $(\beta^i G)_a$ and $H_i(\mathcal{K}_a G)$ are isomorphic.
- (2) Assume an element a in I has the following property: every subset $S \subset \mathcal{P}(a)$ which has an ancestor has the product $\bigwedge S$ in I . Then, for every i , the vector spaces $(\beta^i G)_a$ and $H_i(\mathcal{K}_a G)$ are isomorphic.

Proof. The proof relies on Corollary 10.15. Since the arguments for the statements (1) and (2) are analogous, we show only (1).

The case $i = 0$ follows from Proposition 10.10 and the fact that $H_0(\mathcal{K}_a G)$ is isomorphic to $(G/\text{rad}(G))(a)$.

Consider an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow S_1 \rightarrow P_0 \xrightarrow{\pi} G \rightarrow 0$ where π is a minimal cover. It leads to an exact sequence of homologies (see 10.15):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & H_2(\mathcal{K}_a P_0) & \longrightarrow & H_2(\mathcal{K}_a G) & \longrightarrow & \\
& & \searrow \alpha_2 & & \nearrow & & \\
\hookrightarrow & H_1(\mathcal{K}_a S_1) & \longrightarrow & H_1(\mathcal{K}_a P_0) & \longrightarrow & H_1(\mathcal{K}_a G) & \longrightarrow \\
& \nearrow \alpha_1 & & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\
\hookrightarrow & H_0(\mathcal{K}_a S_1) & \longrightarrow & H_0(\mathcal{K}_a P_0) & \xrightarrow{H_0(\mathcal{K}_a \pi)} & H_0(\mathcal{K}_a G) & \longrightarrow 0
\end{array}$$

Minimality of π is equivalent to $H_0(\mathcal{K}_a \pi)$ being an isomorphism. Since P_0 is free, $H_1(\mathcal{K}_a P_0) = H_2(\mathcal{K}_a P_0) = 0$. These two observations imply $H_1(\mathcal{K}_a G)$ is isomorphic to $H_0(\mathcal{K}_a S_1)$, and $H_2(\mathcal{K}_a G)$ is isomorphic to $H_1(\mathcal{K}_a S_1)$. By the already proven case $i = 0$, $H_0(\mathcal{K}_a S_1)$ is isomorphic to $(\beta^0 S_1)_a$ which is isomorphic to $(\beta^1 G)_a$. This gives the case $i = 1$. Applying this case to S_1 , we get that $H_1(\mathcal{K}_a S_1)$ is isomorphic to $(\beta^1 S_1)_a$, which is isomorphic to $(\beta^2 G)_a$, and the case $i = 2$ also holds. \square

Here are some consequences of the presented statements, which are proved by the same strategy: first discretise and then use the Koszul complex construction.

10.18. Corollary. *Let J be a poset and $F: J \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ a functor.*

- (1) *Assume F is n -resolvable and $f: I \subset J$ is a subposet inclusion with finite I discretising an n -resolution of F . Then $\text{supp}(\beta^i F) \subset I$ for all $0 \leq i < n$. Moreover, for $0 \leq i < \min(3, n)$ and a in I , $(\beta^i F)_a$ is isomorphic to $H_i(\mathcal{K}_a(Ff))$.*
- (2) *Assume F is discretised by a subposet inclusion $f: I \subset J$ which is a homomorphism out of a finite upper semilattice I . Then F is ∞ -resolvable and $\text{supp}(\beta^i F) \subset I$ for all $i \geq 0$. Moreover, for $i \geq 0$ and a in I , $(\beta^i F)_a$ is isomorphic to $H_i(\mathcal{K}_a(Ff))$.*

- (3) Assume J is an upper semilattice and F a tame functor. Then F is ∞ -resolvable and, for a in J with $\text{par-dim}_J(a) < i$, $(\beta^i F)_a = 0$.

Proof. Statement 1 is a consequence of Proposition 10.8 and Theorem 10.17. Statement 2 is a consequence of Corollary 10.6.(1), and again Proposition 10.8 and Theorem 10.17. Statement 3 follows from statement 2 and Proposition 3.9 since tame functors indexed by an upper semilattice can be discretised by a finite sublattice (see 8.3.(1)). \square

We finish this long article with our key theorem describing how to determine Betti diagrams of functors indexed by realisations of finite type posets that admit discretisable resolutions. Our main result is that for such functors the Koszul complex can also be used for this purpose, similarly to functors indexed by upper semilattices (see 10.18). The key reason for this is the following fact: functors indexed by realisations have natural grid-like discretisations that can be refined in a way that every set of parents of an element having an ancestor also has a product in the refinement.

10.19. Theorem. *Let I be a finite type poset and $F: \mathcal{R}(I) \rightarrow \text{vect}_K$ an n -resolvable functor. Assume d is an element in I and V is a finite subset of $(-1, 0)$ for which $\text{supp}(\beta^j F) \subset \mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{R}(I)$ for all $j \leq i$.*

- (1) *Let $0 \leq i < \min(3, n)$ and (a, f) be in $\text{supp}(\beta^i F)$. Then $(\beta^i F)_{(a, f)}$ is isomorphic to $H_i(\mathcal{K}_{(a, f)}(F\alpha))$.*
- (2) *Let $i < n$ and (a, f) be in $\text{supp}(\beta^i F)$ for which there is ε in V such that $f(x) > \varepsilon$ for all x in $\mathcal{P}(a)$. Then $(\beta^i F)_{(a, f)}$ is isomorphic to $H_i(\mathcal{K}_{(a, f)}(F\alpha))$.*
- (3) *If $\text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}(I)}(a, f) < i < n$, then $(\beta^i F)_{(a, f)} = 0$.*

Proof. 1: The assumption implies that a minimal $\min(3, n)$ -resolution of F is discretised by $\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V) \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$. This statement is then a particular case of Corollary 10.18.(1).

2: The assumption implies that a minimal $i + 1$ resolution of F is discretised by $\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V) \subset \mathcal{R}(I)$. Moreover the product of every set of parents of (a, f) in $\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V)$ exists. This statement is then a particular case of Theorem 10.17.(2).

3: Since $\text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V)}(a, f) \leq \text{par-dim}_{\mathcal{R}(I)}(a, f)$ for (a, f) in $\mathcal{R}_{I \leq d}(I, V)$, this statement follows from 2. \square

Acknowledgments. A. Jin and F. Tombari were supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous System and Software Program (WASP) funded

by Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation. W. Chachólski was partially supported by VR, the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous System and Software Program (WASP) funded by Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, and MultipleMS funded by the European Union under the Horizon 2020 program, grant agreement 733161, and dBRain collaborative project at digital futures at KTH.

REFERENCES

- [1] Henry Adams, Atanas Atanasov, and Gunnar Carlsson. “Morse theory in topological data analysis”. In: (Dec. 2011).
- [2] Maurice Auslander, Idun Reiten, and Sverre O. Smalø. *Representation theory of Artin algebras*. Vol. 36. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Corrected reprint of the 1995 original. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, pp. xiv+425. ISBN: 0-521-41134-3; 0-521-59923-7.
- [3] Mattia G. Bergomi et al. “Beyond topological persistence: Starting from networks”. In: *arXiv:1901.08051* (2020).
- [4] Magnus Bakke Botnan, Justin Curry, and Elizabeth Munch. “A Relative Theory of Interleavings”. In: *ArXiv abs/2004.14286* (2020).
- [5] A. K. Bousfield and D. M. Kan. *Homotopy limits, completions and localizations*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 304. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1972, pp. v+348.
- [6] Peter Bubenik and Nikola Milićević. “Homological Algebra for Persistence Modules”. In: *Found. Comput. Math.* 21.5 (2021), pp. 1233–1278. ISSN: 1615-3375. DOI: 10.1007/s10208-020-09482-9. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-020-09482-9>.
- [7] Gunnar Carlsson. “Topology and data”. In: *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 46.2 (2009), pp. 255–308. ISSN: 0273-0979. DOI: 10.1090/S0273-0979-09-01249-X. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0273-0979-09-01249-X>.
- [8] Gunnar Carlsson and Afra Zomorodian. “The theory of multidimensional persistence”. In: *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 42.1 (2009), pp. 71–93. ISSN: 0179-5376. DOI: 10.1007/s00454-009-9176-0. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-009-9176-0>.
- [9] Henri Cartan and Samuel Eilenberg. *Homological algebra*. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. With an appendix by David A. Buchsbaum, Reprint of the 1956 original. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1999, pp. xvi+390. ISBN: 0-691-04991-2.

- [10] Andrea Cerri et al. “Betti numbers in multidimensional persistent homology are stable functions”. In: *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 36.12 (2013), pp. 1543–1557. ISSN: 0170-4214. DOI: 10.1002/mma.2704. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/mma.2704>.
- [11] Wojciech Chachólski and Henri Riihimäki. “Metrics and stabilization in one parameter persistence”. In: *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom.* 4.1 (2020), pp. 69–98. DOI: 10.1137/19M1243932. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1243932>.
- [12] F. Chazal et al. “Proximity of persistence modules and their diagrams”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th annual symposium on Computational geometry SCG ’09* (2009), pp. 237–246.
- [13] René Corbet and Michael Kerber. “The representation theorem of persistence revisited and generalized”. In: *J. Appl. Comput. Topol.* 2.1-2 (2018), pp. 1–31. ISSN: 2367-1726. DOI: 10.1007/s41468-018-0015-3. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41468-018-0015-3>.
- [14] W. G. Dwyer and J. Spaliński. “Homotopy theories and model categories”. In: *Handbook of algebraic topology*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1995, pp. 73–126. DOI: 10.1016/B978-044481779-2/50003-1. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-044481779-2/50003-1>.
- [15] Herbert Edelsbrunner, John Harer, and Afra Zomorodian. “Hierarchical Morse-Smale complexes for piecewise linear 2-manifolds”. In: vol. 30. 1. *ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry* (Medford, MA, 2001). 2003, pp. 87–107. DOI: 10.1007/s00454-003-2926-5. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-003-2926-5>.
- [16] Woojin Kim and Facundo Mémoli. “Generalized persistence diagrams for persistence modules over posets”. In: *J. Appl. Comput. Topol.* 5.4 (2021), pp. 533–581. ISSN: 2367-1726. DOI: 10.1007/s41468-021-00075-1. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41468-021-00075-1>.
- [17] M. Lesnick. “The Theory of the Interleaving Distance on Multidimensional Persistence Modules”. In: *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 15 (2015), pp. 613–650.
- [18] Saunders Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*. Second. Vol. 5. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998, pp. xii+314. ISBN: 0-387-98403-8.
- [19] Ezra Miller. “Data structures for real multiparameter persistence modules”. In: *arXiv:1709.08155* (2017).
- [20] Ezra Miller. “Essential graded algebra over polynomial rings with real exponents”. In: *arXiv:2008.03819* (2020).

- [21] Gäfvert Oliver and Chachólski Wojciech. “Stable Invariants for Multidimensional Persistence”. In: *arXiv:1703.03632* (2017).
- [22] Amit Patel. “Generalized persistence diagrams”. In: *J. Appl. Comput. Topol.* 1.3-4 (2018), pp. 397–419. ISSN: 2367-1726. DOI: 10.1007/s41468-018-0012-6. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41468-018-0012-6>.
- [23] Christopher Reedy. “Homotopy theory of model categories”. In: *Unpublished manuscript* (1974).
- [24] Martina Scolamiero et al. “Multidimensional persistence and noise”. In: *Found. Comput. Math.* 17.6 (2017), pp. 1367–1406. ISSN: 1615-3375. DOI: 10.1007/s10208-016-9323-y. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-016-9323-y>.
- [25] Ross Street. “Two constructions on lax functors”. In: *Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle* 13 (1972), pp. 217–264. ISSN: 0008-0004.

Email address: wojtek@kth.se

Email address: alvinj@kth.se

Email address: tombari@kth.se