

About the Metric Space of Merge Trees with the Edit Distance

Matteo Pegoraro*

December 6, 2021

Abstract

In this paper we consider the metric space of merge trees endowed with an edit distance and we start to study the properties of such space. This investigation is intended as a first step into a geometric understanding of this space, aiming at defining exploratory and statistical tools. In particular, we present some results about its topological properties and its geodesic structure, with particular attention to objects called Frechét Means.

Keywords: Topological Data Analysis, Merge Trees, Frechét Means, Geodesics, Tree Edit Distance

1. Introduction

Topological Data Analysis (TDA) is a particular set of techniques within the field of Geometric Data Analysis which aim at including some topological information into data analysis pipelines.

Usually this topological information is understood in terms of generators of homology groups (Hatcher, 2000) with coefficients in some field. These generators are followed along a filtration of topological spaces which capture at “different resolutions” the shape of the initial datum, typically function or a point cloud (Edelsbrunner and Harer, 2008). To proceed with the analysis, this sequence is then represented with some kind of topological summary. There are many available topological summaries such as persistence diagrams (Edelsbrunner et al., 2002), persistence silhouettes (Chazal et al., 2015), persistence landscapes (Bubenik, 2015). Each of these summaries live in a space with different properties and purposes: for instance persistence diagrams are highly interpretable and live in a metric space, persistence landscapes are embedded in a linear space of functions, but the embedding is not closed under linear combinations, persistence silhouettes are instead obtained as vectors in \mathbb{R}^n , making them suitable for many Machine Learning techniques. Along with the aforementioned summaries, there are also tree-shaped objects called merge trees. Merge trees arise naturally within the framework of TDA when dealing with zero dimensional homology groups, i.e. connected components, but they had already been used in topology outside TDA, as a particular case of Reeb graphs (Shinagawa et al., 1991; Biasotti et al., 2008). Similar trees like hierarchical clustering dendrograms (Murtagh and Contreras, 2017) or phylogenetic trees (Felsenstein and Felsenstein, 2004) had also been used before, in different fields. The arrival of TDA, however, has propelled works aiming at using merge trees and Reeb graphs as topological summaries and thus developing metrics and frameworks to analyze sets of such objects (Beketayev et al., 2014; Morozov et al., 2013; Gasparovic et al., 2019; Touli, 2020; Sridharamurthy et al., 2020; Di Fabio and Landi, 2016; Bauer et al., 2020).

*. MOX – Department of Mathematics, Politecnico di Milano

Once the topological representation is chosen, then, the tools that can be employed for the analysis are a direct consequence of the properties of the space the summaries live in, as for any other data analysis situation. For instance, many statistical techniques rely on the linear structure of Euclidean spaces: typical examples are linear regression and principal components analysis (PCA). However, there are many examples of analyses carried out on data not lying (at least naively) in \mathbb{R}^n or other vector spaces. Quotient spaces of functions up to reparametrization, point clouds up to isometries, probability distributions, matrices up to some kind of base change etc. all require complex mathematical frameworks to be treated, since even things like moving from one point to another must be carefully defined. For these reasons there has been a lot of effort in generalizing statistical tools for data living outside Euclidean spaces. The most commonly considered generalization is the case of data being sampled from Riemannian manifolds (Pennec, 2006; Pennec et al., 2019; Pennec, 2018; Huckemann and Eltzner, 2018; Huckemann et al., 2010a; Jung et al., 2012; Thomas Fletcher, 2013; Patrangenu and Ellingson, 2015), where the richness of the Riemannian structure is fundamental to develop techniques and results. The situation becomes further challenging when one cannot build a differential or even a topological structure which falls into the realm of well-known and deeply studied geometrical objects like manifolds. In this case ad-hoc, meaningful tools and definitions must be carefully obtained in order to be able to work in such spaces (Mileyko et al., 2011; Leygonie et al., 2021; Calissano et al., 2020; Miller et al., 2015; Garba et al., 2021).

The aim of this manuscript is to investigate some geometric properties of the space of merge trees, in order to start developing statistical tools to analyze sets of such objects, in analogy with what has already been done for persistence diagrams (Mileyko et al., 2011; Turner et al., 2014; Bubenik and Wagner, 2020; Che et al., 2021) and other kinds of trees (Billera et al., 2001; Miller et al., 2015; Garba et al., 2021). We work with merge trees with the metric structure defined in Pegoraro (2021) because it provides a very handy parametrization of particular geodesic paths which make the metric feasible in many situations and that can be used as a tool to study the structure of the space. In particular we focus on two directions. The first is the definition of 0-dimensional summaries of finite empirical distributions of merge trees, via their *Frechét Means* (sometimes called *Karcher means*) (Karcher, 1977): these objects generalize the widely used euclidean means and can be seen as the most basic statistics employed in data analysis, but that can provide important results even outside the euclidean context (Davis, 2008; Pennec, 2018). Second, we start studying the metric structure of the space of merge trees, with results on the uniqueness of its geodesic paths. Having a good understanding of the metric structure in neighborhoods of points is fundamental to build some kind “tangent bundle” along with maps to/from the tree space which can then lead to differential calculus, approximations and statistical tools like “linear” regression and principal component analysis in the space of merge trees.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review the definition of merge trees and their metric structure. In Section 3 we discuss an equivalence relationship we need to properly work with merge trees. In Section 4 we start to stratify the space of merge trees in order to obtain more tractable sets of trees, whose topological properties are studied in Section 5. Section 6 is devoted to the topic of Frechét Means and Section 7 tackles the problem of understanding the geodesic structure of the space.

2. Merge Tree and Edit Distance

We start by introducing merge trees with the combinatorial approach found in Pegoraro (2021). To do so we define a combinatorial object, called tree structure, to which we add some weights with a weight function.

2.1 Merge Trees and Edits

The combinatorial basis on which we build merge trees is the following.

Definition 1 *A tree structure T is given by a set of vertices V_T and a set of edges $E_T \subset V_T \times V_T$ which form a connected rooted acyclic graph. We indicate the root of the tree with r_T . We say that T is finite if V_T is finite. The order of a vertex of T is the number of edges which have that vertex as one of the extremes. Any vertex with an edge connecting it to the root is its child and the root is its father: this is the first step of a recursion which defines the father and children relationship for all vertices in V_T . The vertices with no children are called leaves and are collected in the set L_T , while the set children of a vertex $x \in V_T$ is called $child(x)$. Similarly, the vertex $father(x)$ is the father of the vertex x . Vertices with the same father are called siblings. Vertices which are not leaves are called internals and collected in the set I_T .*

The relation father $>$ child induces a partial order on V_T and the edges in E_T are identified in the form of ordered couples (a, b) with $a < b$. A subtree of a vertex v is the tree structure whose set of vertices is $\{x \in V_T | x \leq v\}$. The trivial tree-structure with just one vertex and no edges, will be referred to as $\{pt\}$.

To obtain a merge tree we add a weight function to a tree structure, in the following way.

Definition 2 *A merge tree is a finite tree structure T coupled with a weight function $w_T : V_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the image of $V_T - \{r_T\}$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.*

The metric for merge trees defined in Pegoraro (2021), which we will call d_E , is based on edit distances (Bille, 2005): it allows for certain modifications of a starting merge tree, each with its own cost, to obtain a second merge tree. An edit path is a finite sequence of edits, each applied on the tree modified by the previous edit operation in the sequence. The cost of an edit path is then the sum of the costs of its edits. A geodesic is then given by the least expensive edit path that turns the first merge tree into the final merge tree. Its length is the edit distance between the two merge trees.

The properties of the metric d_E are determined by the costs of the edits operations, which make it suitable to compare topological information (see Pegoraro (2021)). The available edit operations are the one listed below.

- *Shrinking* an edge means changing the weight value of the edge with a new positive value or the weight value of the root with any real number. The inverse of this transformation is the shrinking which restores the original edge weight.
- *Deleting* an edge (v_1, v_2) results into a new tree, with the same vertices apart from v_1 (the lower one), and with the father of the deleted vertex which gains all of its children. This edit cannot be done on the root. With a slight abuse of language, we might also refer to this edit as the deletion of the vertex v_1 , which indeed means deleting the edge between v_1 and its father.




Figure 1: (a)→(e) form an edit path made by one deletion , one ghosting and a final shrinking.

The inverse of deletion is the *insertion* of an edge along with its child vertex. We can insert an edge at a vertex v specifying the child of v and its children (that can be either none or any portion of the children of v) and the weight of the edge.

- Lastly, we can eliminate an order two vertex v , that is a father with an only child, connecting the two adjacent edges which arrive and depart from v . The weight of the resulting edge is the sum of the weights of the joined edges. This transformation is the *ghosting* of the vertex v and it cannot be done on the root. Its inverse transformation is called the *splitting* of an edge.

The cost of the edit operations is defined as follows:

- the cost of shrinking an edge is equal to the absolute value of the difference of the two weights;
- for any deletion/insertion, the cost is equal to the weight of the edge deleted/inserted;
- the cost of ghosting is zero.

Remark 1 *The root of a merge tree can only be edited by changing its weight and the cost of such editing is the absolute value of the weight change, and thus there are degrees of freedom involved. For this reason in this manuscript we forget about the weight value of the root and pretend that $w_T(r_T) = 0$ for all the trees and subtrees we consider.*

Given a tree T we can edit it, thus obtaining another tree, on which we can apply a new edit to obtain a third tree and so on. Any finite composition of edits is called *edit path*. The cost of an edit path is the sum of the costs of its edit operations. Putting all the pieces together, we can define the edit distance d_E as:

$$d_E(T, T') = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma(T, T')} \text{cost}(\gamma)$$

where $\Gamma(T, T')$ indicates the set of edit paths which start in T and end in T' . In Pegoraro (2021) it is proved that d_E is a metric on the space of merge trees considered up to order two vertices, that is identified up to ghostings or splittings.

2.2 Mappings

Given an edit path between two merge trees, its cost is often invariant up to many permutations of the edits. To better work in such environment, we should start considering paths up to some kind of permutation of the edits. The objects called *mappings*, as defined in Pegoraro (2021), help us in doing this, as well as making the metric d_E more tractable. For this reason now we report their definition. As in Pegoraro (2021), we suppose that in the set of vertices of any dendrogram there are not the letters “D” and “G” (which are used to indicate “deletion” and “ghosting”). Since associating an edge to its lower vertex gives a bijection between E_T and the set $V_T - \{r_T\}$, we use the former to indicate the latter set of vertices.

A *mapping* between T and T' is a set $M \subset (E_T \cup \{D, G\}) \times (E_{T'} \cup \{D, G\})$ with the following properties:

- (M1) consider the projection of the Cartesian product $(E_T \cup \{D, G\}) \times (E_{T'} \cup \{D, G\}) \rightarrow (E_T \cup \{D, G\})$; we can restrict this map to M obtaining $\pi_T : M \rightarrow (E_T \cup \{D, G\})$. The maps π_T and $\pi_{T'}$ are surjective on $E_T \subset (E_T \cup \{D, G\})$ and $E_{T'} \subset (E_{T'} \cup \{D, G\})$ respectively;
- (M2) π_T and $\pi_{T'}$ are injective;
- (M3) $M \cap (V_T \times V_{T'})$ is such that, given (a, b) and $(c, d) \in M \cap (V_T \times V_{T'})$, $a > c$, if and only if $b > d$;
- (M4) if (a, G) (or (G, a)) is in M , let b_1, \dots, b_n be the children of a . Then there is one and only one i such that for all $j \neq i$, for all $x \in V_{sub(b_j)}$, we have $(x, D) \in M$ (respectively (D, x)); and there is one and only one c such that $c = \max\{x' \in sub(b_i) \mid (x', y) \in M \text{ for any } y \in V_{T'}\}$.

We briefly point out that the conditions (M1)-(M2) are asking that every vertex is associated to one and only one edit; (M3) guarantees that the couples induced by $M \cap (V_T \times V_{T'})$ respect the tree structures of T and T' ; lastly (M4) means that, once all vertices v appearing in the couples (v, D) or (D, v) in M are deleted, the points which are coupled with G (that is (a, G) or (G, a)) are all vertices of order two and therefore they can be ghosted.

We call $Mapp(T, T')$ the set of all mappings between T and T' .

As in Pegoraro (2021), we use the properties of $M \in Mapp(T, T')$ to parametrize a set of edit paths starting from T and ending in T' , which are collected under the name γ_M .

- γ_d^T is a path made by the deletions to be done in T , that is, the couples (v, D) , executed in any order. So we obtain $T_d^M = \gamma_d^T(T)$, which, instead, is well defined and not depending on the order of the deletions.
- One then proceeds with ghosting all the vertices (v, G) in M , in any order, getting a path γ_g^T and the dendrogram $T_M := \gamma_g^T \circ \gamma_d^T(T)$.
- Since all the remaining points in M are couples, the two dendrograms T'_M (defined in the same way as T_M , but starting from T') and T_M must be isomorphic as tree structures. This is guaranteed by the properties of M . So one can shrink T_M onto T'_M , and the composition of the shrinkings, executed in any order is an edit path γ_s^T .




Figure 2: Given the sets of vertices in Figure 2a and Figure 2b, the edit path in Figure 1 is represented by the mapping $M = \{(B, D), (C, G), (A, A'), (R, R')\}$ between T and T' . With Figure 1b being T_d^M and Figure 1d being T_M ; in this case $T_M' = T'$.

By definition:

$$\gamma_s^T \circ \gamma_g^T \circ \gamma_d^T(T) = T_M',$$

and:

$$(\gamma_d^{T'})^{-1} \circ (\gamma_g^{T'})^{-1} \circ \gamma_s^T \circ \gamma_g^T \circ \gamma_d^T(T) = T'$$

where the inverse of an edit path is thought as the composition of the inverses of the single edit operations, taken in the inverse order.

Lastly, we call γ_M the set of all possible edit paths of the form:

$$(\gamma_d^{T'})^{-1} \circ (\gamma_g^{T'})^{-1} \circ \gamma_s^T \circ \gamma_g^T \circ \gamma_d^T.$$

Note that the cost of γ_M is well defined:

$$\text{cost}(M) := \text{cost}(\gamma_M) = \text{cost}(\gamma_d^T) + \text{cost}(\gamma_s^T) + \text{cost}(\gamma_d^{T'}).$$

For notational convenience, we collect in M_D all the deletions of M , in M_G all the ghostings and in $C(M)$ all the shrinking edits.

See Figure 2 for an example of a mapping between merge trees. We conclude this section by recalling that Pegoraro (2021) proves that given two merge trees T and T' , for every finite edit path $\gamma \in \Gamma(T, T')$, there exists a mapping $M \in \text{Mapp}(T, T')$ such that $\text{cost}(M) \leq \text{cost}(\gamma)$.

3. Order 2 Vertices

With this section we start the investigation of the metric space of merge trees.

As a first step we need to define clearly which space we are interested in studying, in fact, as motivated by (Pegoraro, 2021), merge trees should be considered up to some equivalence relationships which we now report.

Definition 3 *Two tree structures T and T' are isomorphic if there $g : V_T \rightarrow V_{T'}$ bijective which induces a bijection of edges in the form $(a, b) \mapsto (g(a), g(b))$.*

Definition 4 *Two merge trees T and T' are isomorphic if there is $M \in \text{Mapp}(T, T')$ such that $C(M) = M$ and $\text{cost}(M) = 0$. While T and T' are equivalent up to order 2 vertices if there is $M \in \text{Mapp}(T, T')$ such that $\text{cost}(M) = 0$.*

Remark 2 *Is not difficult to see that two merge trees are isomorphic if and only if there is an isomorphism of tree structures $g : V_T \rightarrow V_{T'}$ such that $w_T((a, b)) = w_{T'}((g(a), g(b)))$.*

We call \mathcal{T} the space of merge trees up to isomorphism and then we can define $\mathcal{T}_2 := \mathcal{T} / \sim$, where $T \sim T'$ if they are equivalent up to order two vertices. We indicate with T_2 the only representative without order 2 vertices inside the equivalence class $[T] \in \mathcal{T}_2$. Note that $d_E(T, T') = 0$ iff $T \sim T'$. This is equivalent to saying that, if we consider the topological spaces (\mathcal{T}, d_E) and (\mathcal{T}_2, d_E) , respectively with the pseudo-metric and the metric topology, then (\mathcal{T}_2, d_E) is the metric space induced by the pseudometric d_E of \mathcal{T} via metric identification i.e. $x \sim y$ iff $d(x, y) = 0$. In particular, the projection on the quotient $\Pi : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_2$ preserves distances and so open balls. In other words we can focus our attention on \mathcal{T} , to avoid formal complications given by equivalence classes, and most topological result obtained for such space will hold also for \mathcal{T}_2 . Moreover, since $B_\varepsilon(T) = B_\varepsilon(T')$ for any $T \sim T'$, where $B_\varepsilon(T) := \{T' \mid d_E(T, T') < \varepsilon\}$, to obtain local topological results we can always assume $T = T_2$.

4. Subspaces

The first structure of \mathcal{T} that we point out is that there is a natural notion of dimension for merge trees. If we denote with $\dim(T) := \#E_T$, that is, the number of edges in the tree structure T , we can give the following definition. To induce the notion of dimension in \mathcal{T}_2 we do as follows: $\dim([T]) = \inf_{T' \in [T]} \dim(T')$, which entails $\dim([T]) = \dim(T_2)$.

Now we can consider trees grouped by dimension.

Definition 5 $\mathcal{T}^N = \{T \mid \dim(T) \leq N\}$ for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$. The subspaces \mathcal{T}_2^N are defined analogously.

The results proved in Pegoraro (2021), tells us that for any pair of trees the distance between them is given by the length of a path γ_M , with M being a mapping between the two trees. Moreover, looking at how mappings parametrize finite edit paths, we see that if $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}^N$, then there is at least a geodesic between them which does not exit \mathcal{T}^N . By considering T_2 and T'_2 we obtain the same consequence for \mathcal{T}_2^N . We sum up these things with the following proposition.

Proposition 1 *The spaces (\mathcal{T}, d_E) , (\mathcal{T}_2, d_E) , (\mathcal{T}^N, d_E) and (\mathcal{T}_2^N, d_E) are geodesic spaces.*

Understanding how these strata interact with each other and how we can navigate between them can shed some light on the structure of the space (\mathcal{T}_2, d_E) .

5. Topology

Topology plays a central role when investigating the properties of a space. For instance, being able to characterize or identify open, closed and in particular compact sets is fundamental to work with real valued operators defined on such space.

We establish the notation $\|T\| = \sum_{e \in E_T} w_T(e)$, so that the reversed triangle inequality in the case of merge trees has the following form.

Proposition 2 *Given T, T' merge trees then:*

$$\left| \|T\| - \|T'\| \right| \leq d_E(T, T')$$

Note that if $T \sim T'$ then $\|T\| = \|T'\|$ and thus Proposition 2 holds also in \mathcal{T}_2 . Moreover, given $C > 0$, $B_C(\{pt\}) = \{T \in \mathcal{T} \mid \|T\| < C\}$. We establish the notation: $B(C)^N := B_C(\{pt\}) \cap \mathcal{T}^N$.

Before proceeding we recall some topological and metric definitions we will use throughout this section.

Definition 6 Consider a metric space (X, d) .

- X is contractible if there is $x \in X$ with $F : [0, 1] \times X \rightarrow X$ continuous such that $F(0, p) = p$ and $F(1, p) = x$ for every $p \in X$;
- X is totally bounded if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a finite collection of points x_1, \dots, x_N such that $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^N B_\varepsilon(x_i)$;
- X is complete if every Cauchy sequence is converging; recall that in metric spaces, a set which is complete and totally bounded is also compact and viceversa;
- X sequentially compact if every sequence in X admits a converging subsequence. In metric spaces it is equivalent to compactness;
- X is locally compact if for every point $x \in X$ there is an open set U and a compact set K such that $x \in U$ and $U \subset K$.

The following result presents some topological properties of the space \mathcal{T} and its subspaces \mathcal{T}^N . By Section 3, all the results which follow hold also for the quotient spaces \mathcal{T}_2 and \mathcal{T}_2^N .

Theorem 1 For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$:

1. (\mathcal{T}, d_E) is contractible.
2. (\mathcal{T}, d_E) is not locally compact.
3. (\mathcal{T}^N, d_E) is locally compact.

Proof

By Section 3 we can consider only merge trees such that $T_2 = T$.

1. Given $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}$ we define $\lambda \cdot T$ to be the tree obtained by shrinking each edge of T by a factor of λ i.e. if w' is the weight function of $\lambda \cdot T$, we have $w'(v) = \lambda \cdot w(v)$.

Now consider $M \in \text{Mapp}(T, T')$. We call M_λ the same mapping but inside $\text{Mapp}(\lambda \cdot T, \lambda \cdot T')$. Since we can take λ outside the cost of all the edits, then $\text{cost}(M_\lambda) = \lambda \cdot \text{cost}(M)$. In other words $d_E(\lambda \cdot T, \lambda \cdot T') \leq \lambda \cdot d_E(T, T') < d_E(T, T')$.

This of course implies that $F : [0, 1] \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$, such that $F(t, T) = t \cdot T$ is continuous, and so \mathcal{T} is contractible.

2. We prove that given for any tree T and any $\varepsilon > 0$, $B_\varepsilon(T)$ is not complete. Build the following Cauchy sequence: let $T_0 = T$ and obtain the tree T_n by attaching to a leaf of T_{n-1} a pair of edges, each with length $\frac{\varepsilon}{2 \cdot 2^n}$. Consider $n > m$, then $d_E(T_n, T_m) \leq \varepsilon \sum_{k=m}^n 2^{-k}$ which is arbitrarily small as n, m increase. Thus $\{T_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Moreover $d_E(T, T_n) \leq \varepsilon \sum_{k=0}^n 2^{-k} \leq \varepsilon$ and thus $\{T_n\} \subset B_\varepsilon(T)$.

Suppose that exists T' such that $T_n \rightarrow T'$. By construction we know $\#V_{T_n} \rightarrow \infty$. Let $M_n \in \text{Mapp}(T_n, T')$ minimizing mapping. Clearly $\text{cost}(M_n) \rightarrow 0$. For ease of notation we call $C_n := C(M_n)$ and $D_n := (M_n)_D$.

By definition $\#C_n \leq K = \dim(T')$. We know that all the vertices in $V_{T_n} - V_T$ have one sibling since they are added as couples. This means that, even if we take away K vertices, at least one out of every pair of the remaining siblings will be

deleted once $\dim(T_n) > \dim(T')$. Of course $\text{cost}(M_n) \geq \text{cost}(C_n) + \text{cost}(D_n)$ and so $\text{cost}(D_n) \rightarrow 0$.

But $\text{cost}(D_n) > \varepsilon \cdot \frac{1}{2} \sum_K^n \frac{1}{2^n}$ and so it does not go to zero.

This shows that $C = \overline{B_\varepsilon(T)}$ is not compact. In fact $\{T_n\} \subset C$ is a Cauchy sequence but it is not converging.

3. We need to prove local compactness and we do so via sequential compactness.

Consider $T \in \mathcal{T}^N$ and $\{T_n\} \subset \overline{B_\varepsilon(T)}$ with $\varepsilon < \min_{v \in V_T} w_T(v)$.

If we consider an edge $l = (v, v')$ in T , along the sequence T_n we know that l will never get wholly deleted. It might be split, shrunk but it will never disappear.

We fix a sequence of mappings M_n such that $M_n \in \text{Mapp}(T, T_n)$ and $\text{cost}(M_n) = d_E(T, T_n)$. For any edge $l = (v, v')$ in T , with $v < v'$, we consider the set $E_n^l = \{e_n^k\}$ such that $e_n^k \in M_n$ edits the edge l . With that we mean: shrinkings of l , splittings inserting points w with $v < w < v'$ (note that these appear only after the shrinkings), insertion of edges in points w with $v \leq w \leq v'$. Of course for each n , we might have e_n^1, e_n^2, \dots acting on the same edge. While there can be at most one shrinking on l for each n , there can be multiple insertions or splittings; of course this number is uniformly bounded because of the dimension constraints.

For a fixed n we have a natural order between splittings, given by the height at which the new point is inserted, and a similarly induced partial ordering between insertions. Insertions are comparable with respect to this partial order if they happen at different heights. We fix a random order on insertions happening at the same vertex so that all insertions are completely ordered. For a fixed l we partition these edits into Sh^n , S_k^n and $I_{k',k}^n$, which, for each n , collects the elements in E_n^l which are respectively the shrinking, the k -th splitting and the k -th insertion at the k' -th inserted vertex. One can set $k' = 0$ being the index of v , and $k' = -1$ being the index of v' .

We know that for each edge l :

- $Sh = \cup_n Sh^n$ is at most countable, and the sequence given by the different weights of l obtained through the shrinkings, is a sequence in $[L - \varepsilon, L + \varepsilon]$, with L the original length of l . Then we can extract a converging subsequence.
- $S_k = \cup_n S_k^n$ is at most countable, then the ratio of the distance in height between v and the splitting point, over the length of l (after the shrinking of the n -th mapping) form a sequence in $[0, 1]$. So we can extract a converging subsequence in $[0, 1]$. In other words we can find a subsequence of edits which converges to a certain splitting.
- $I_{k',k} = \cup_n I_{k',k}^n$ is at most countable for every k, k' ; the length of the inserted edges form a sequence in $[0, \varepsilon]$. So for every k, k' we can extract a converging subsequence.

If some of the sets defined above are finite we discard from the sequence the indexes n which appear in the collection of edit, being it Sh , S_k or $I_{k',k}$. Note that, by the dimension bounds, we have a finite number of such sets, for a finite number of edges.

Thus, for every edge l , we proceed in this way:

- (a) since Sh is countable we extract a converging subsequence of shrinkings.

- (b) starting from $k = 1$, from the subsequence just obtained we extract a converging subsequence of splitting locations. Starting from this sequence we repeat the extraction procedure for $k = 2$, then recursively till we reach k such that S_k is empty. Again if, for some k , S_k is finite, we simply discard elements of the subsequence appearing in S_k .
- (c) lastly, from the last set of indexes we obtained, we extract from $I_{k',k}$ a converging subsequence of insertions for every k and k' ; working on k and k' as in the previous point. In a finite number of steps we reach $I_{\widehat{k},\widehat{k}}$ such that for all $k' > \widehat{k}'$ and $k > \widehat{k}$, $I_{k,k'} = \emptyset$.

Given any ordering on the edges, we recursively apply this for every l , and obtain a subsequence which, with an abuse of notation, we still call $\{T_n\}$.

We fix n and take for every edge the edits in $Sh^n \cup_k S_k^n \cup_{k',k} I_{k',k}^n$. If we take the union of such edits over the edges l we obtain a mapping N_n for every n . The mapping N_n is defined on T and by construction is contained in M_n . Note that N_n collects all the edits which are applied by M_n on T that is all the shrinkings and splitting, plus all the insertions which are made directly on the vertices of T or on the splittings already applied. In other words $M_n - N_n$ is made by insertions which are applied on edges which are obtained by other insertions.

Call ST_n the tree obtained from T with the edits in N_n . Then clearly $N_n \in \text{Mapp}(T, ST_n)$. For what we have said, T_n can be obtained from ST_n with the edits in $M_n - N_n$, which are only a particular case of insertions.

By construction, any edit in N_n is part of a converging sequence of edits: shrinking converge to a final weight value, splittings converge to a final position on the edge and insertions converge to a final weight of the inserted edge. We call \overline{N} the mapping obtained with the limit of the edits of N_n . Clearly $\text{cost}(N_n) \rightarrow \text{cost}(\overline{N})$. Let ST be the tree obtained from T with \overline{N} . We have $ST_n \rightarrow ST$. In fact, consider one edge $l \in E_T$. Take for instance the sequence of shrinkings in $Sh = \{e_1, \dots, e_n, \dots\}$ parametrized such that $w_{ST_n}(l) = e_n$ and $e_n \rightarrow e$. For any fixed ϵ and for n big enough we know $|e_n - e| < \epsilon$. Thus $|w_{ST_n}(l) - w_{ST_{n+1}}(l)| < \epsilon$ is a shrinking with cost less than ϵ . For the same edge l there are at most N splittings, each edit splits l in E_{ST_n} at a certain height. Similarly, the difference in heights between splittings in S_k^n and S_k^m with $m > n$ is going to zero, and thus we can again choose n big enough so that the k -th splitting of ST_n can be turned in the k -th splitting of ST , for all k , with cost less than ϵ . The same reasoning can be done on the weights of the insertions. Thus we can go from ST_n to ST with a finite set of edits, with cost less than ϵ and whose number is uniformly bound. For instance we know that on every tree we can have at most N shrinkings, N ghostings, and N insertions. Thus, for every ϵ , there is n big enough such that $d_E(ST_n, ST) < 3N\epsilon$. We remark that, since $N_n \subset M_n$, then $\text{cost}(N_n) \leq \epsilon$ for every n , and thus $d_E(T, ST) \leq \epsilon$.

At this point we have obtained a sequence $\{ST_n\}$ such that: $ST_n \rightarrow ST$ in $\overline{B_\epsilon(T)}$ and $V_{ST_n} \subset V_{T_n}$. Then next natural step is to recursively "enlarge" ST_n .

Take each M_n and substitute each edit in $N_n \subset M_n$ with its limit \overline{N} , obtaining $\overline{M_n}$. Note that $\text{cost}(M_n) \rightarrow \text{cost}(\overline{M_n})$ as n grows.

We can obtain a new sequence of trees T'_n and mappings $M'_n \in \text{Mapp}(ST, T'_n)$ in this way:

- T'_n is obtained from T applying the mapping $\overline{M_n}$.

- $M'_n \in \text{Mapp}(ST, T'_n)$ is the mapping induced by the identifications given by the composition of the paths: $T \xrightarrow{\bar{N}} ST \xrightarrow{\overline{M_n - \bar{N}}} T'_n$; which is well defined since $\overline{M_n} - \bar{N}$ is made only by insertions to be done on ST . Thus we can identify M'_n as given by the “identity” on the vertices of ST , and the edits in $M_n - N_n$, which, as already noted, are only insertions. We call id_{ST} the set of couplings embedding ST into T'_n .

The first thing we highlight is that, since $M_n \rightarrow \overline{M_n}$, in the sense that their edits converge as already explained, then $d_E(T_n, T'_n) \rightarrow 0$. So in $\{T'_n\}$ converges to a limit point, so does $\{T_n\}$. For the same reason we have that also $\{T'_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence.

We can perform the steps which lead us to obtain $\{ST_n\} \rightarrow ST$ starting from T and the sequence $\{T_n\}$, but taking ST as “reference tree” and $\{T'_n\}$ as initial sequence. So we obtain the subsequence of $\{ST_n\}$ which we use to build sequence $\{ST'_n\} \rightarrow ST'$ along with mappings $N'_n \in \text{Mapp}(ST, ST'_n)$. For notational convenience, any time we throw away indexes from $\{T'_n\}$, we remove the same indexes also from $\{T_n\}$.

The key point is that $\text{id}_{ST} \subset N'_n$ for all n and, in particular, we have $ST \neq ST'_n$ if and only if $\text{id}_{ST} \subsetneq N'_n$. Since $M'_n - N'_n$ contains only insertions to be applied on edges which have already been inserted in ST , if there are no such edges, we have $ST = T'_n$.

Now we relate $\{ST'_n\} \rightarrow ST'$ with T and $\{ST_n\} \rightarrow ST$. To do so, consider: $A_n = (N'_n - \text{id}_{ST}) \cup N_n$. By construction $A_n \in \text{Mapp}(T, ST'_n)$. For what we have said, either $N_n \subsetneq A_n$ or $ST = T'_n$ and so $A_n = N_n = M_n$. On top of that $A_n \subset M_n$ and thus $d_E(T, ST') \leq \varepsilon$. Now, call SST_n the merge tree obtained by editing T with the edits contained in A_n : either $V_{ST_n} \subsetneq V_{SST_n}$ or $SST_n = T_n$. Moreover, since $N_n \rightarrow \bar{N}$ and $ST'_n \rightarrow ST'$ we get $SST_n \rightarrow ST'$.

Thus, this further step has produced a a sequence of merge trees $\{SST_n\}$ “bigger” than $\{ST_n\}$ and such that $SST_n \rightarrow ST'$ with $d_E(T, ST') \leq \varepsilon$.

We can recursively repeat this procedure and obtain a converging sequence G_n which, after a finite number of steps (thanks to the bound on the edge number), will have $G_n = T_n$ for all n ; and G_n converges inside $\overline{B_\varepsilon(T)}$. ■

Theorem 1 states that our spaces are “without holes”, that is we can continuously shrink the whole space onto the tree with one vertex and no edges and so \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}^N are contractible. As predictable \mathcal{T} has at every point issues with losing compactness because of the growing dimension of the trees. However, now we see that these compactness issues can be solved by setting an upper bound on the dimension, which means working in \mathcal{T}^N for some N . Thus we can further characterize the subspaces \mathcal{T}^N (and \mathcal{T}_2^N) with the following results.

Theorem 2 *The metric spaces (\mathcal{T}^N, d_E) and (\mathcal{T}_2^N, d_E) are complete.*

Proof *It's enough to prove it for (\mathcal{T}^N, d_E) .*

Consider a Cauchy sequence $\{T_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. By Proposition 2, $|||T_n||| - |||T_m||| \leq d_E(T_n, T_m)$. Thus, $\{|||T_n|||\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and thus, it converges in \mathbb{R} . In other words, $|||T_n||| \rightarrow$

C. If $C = 0$ then $T_n \rightarrow 0$, the tree with one vertex and no edges. Therefore, we can suppose $C > 0$.

Define $\epsilon(T) := \min_{e \in E_T} w_T(e)$. In the proof of Theorem 1 we show that $\overline{B_r(T_m)}$ is compact for every $r < \epsilon(T_m)$. We know $\{\epsilon(T_n)\}$ is a bounded sequence in \mathbb{R} and thus, up to taking a subsequence, it converges. If $\epsilon(T_n) \rightarrow q > 0$ then, the sequence $\{T_n\}$ is definitely in a compact ball of the form $\overline{B_{\epsilon(T_m)}(T_m)}$. In fact, fix $0 < \lambda$ such that $\lambda N < q$; we can find m such that $(|\epsilon(T_m) - q| + \lambda)N \leq \epsilon(T_m)$ and $d_E(T_m, T_n) \leq \epsilon(T_m)/2$ for all $n > m$. Thus we can build \widehat{T}_m , obtained from T_m by raising the weight of its maximal edges by $|\epsilon(T_m) - q| + \lambda$, so that $q < \epsilon(\widehat{T}_m)$. We now that, at most, we need to shrink N edges by $|\epsilon(T_m) - q| + \lambda$. Thus:

$$d_E(T_m, \widehat{T}_m) < N(|q - \epsilon(T_m)| + \lambda) \leq \epsilon(T_m)$$

Moreover for $n > m$ we have $d(\widehat{T}_m, T_n) \leq d_E(\widehat{T}_m, T_m) + d_E(T_m, T_n) \leq \epsilon(T_m)$ and so $\{T_n\}$ converges.

Suppose then $\epsilon(T_n) \rightarrow 0$. For all n , take T_n , and obtain T_n^1 by deleting $\operatorname{argmin}_{e \in E_{T_n}} w_{T_n}(e)$. By construction we know $d_E(T_n, T_n^1, n) \leq N\epsilon(T_n)$ and thus $d(T_n, T_n^1) \rightarrow 0$. So, if $\{T_n^1\}$ converges, also $\{T_n\}$ converges. We repeat the same reasoning as above, considering $\{\epsilon(T_n)\}$; if $\epsilon(T_n^1) \rightarrow q > 0$ we are done, otherwise we take $\{T_n^1\}$ and obtain $\{T_n^2\}$ removing the smallest edge and repeat again the procedure. Since $\#E_{T_n} \leq N$, we know $\#E_{T_n^1} \leq N - 1$ and so $\#E_{T_n^j} \leq N - j$ etc. Since $T_n^j \rightarrow C$, $0 < \#E_{T_n^j}$ and thus in a finite number of step we obtain $\{T_n^j\}$ which converges and so does $\{T_n\}$. ■

We can now use completeness to characterize compactness inside the subspaces previously defined.

Proposition 3 *The set $\overline{B(C)^N}$ in (\mathcal{T}^N, d_E) is complete and totally bounded. And the same holds for $\overline{B(C)^N}$ in (\mathcal{T}_2^N, d_E) .*

Proof We prove it for $\|T\| \leq C$ in (\mathcal{T}^N, d_E) .

Completeness is easily obtained because, given a Cauchy sequence $\{T_n\}$ with $\dim(T_n) \leq N$ and $\|T_n\| \leq C$, then by Theorem 2 and Proposition 2 we have: $T_n \rightarrow T$ and $\|T_n\| \rightarrow \|T\| \leq C$.

Now we prove the second statement of the proposition. For a fixed N we only have a finite number of available tree structures having $\dim(T) \leq N$. The weight of every edge in such tree structures is bound to be in $(0, C]$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and take a sequence of numbers $0 = a_1 < \dots < a_M = C$ such that $a_{i+1} - a_i < \varepsilon/N$. Let Consider $w_i = (a_{i+1} + a_i)/2$.

For each of the available tree structures, take all possible combinations of weights w_1, \dots, w_N for the edges. For instance, if we consider the tree structure T with just two vertices $a < b = r_T$ and one edge $e = (a, b)$; then we have N possible merge trees given by $w_T(e) = w_i$. When we have three vertices and two edges $E_T = \{e, e'\}$ we need to take all the combinations $w_T(e) = w_i$ and $w_T(e') = w_j$ and so on and so forth. We call this finite set of merge trees \mathcal{A}_ε .

Take now a merge tree T with $\dim(T) \leq N$ and $\|T\| \leq C$. There is at least one tree $T' \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ and such that there is $g : V_T \rightarrow V_{T'}$ isomorphism of tree structures with $|w_T(e) - w_{T'}(g(e))| < \varepsilon/N$. Which implies $d_E(T, T') \leq \varepsilon$. ■

Thus, by well known results, we have the following corollary which tells us that whenever we can bound the norm of some merge trees and their dimension, we know that we

are moving inside a compact set. In other words we are not far away from the behavior of \mathbb{R}^N .

Corollary 1 *The sets $\overline{B(C)^N}$ in (\mathcal{T}^N, d_E) and $\overline{B(C)^N}$ in (\mathcal{T}_2^N, d_E) are compact sets.*

6. Frechét Means

In this section we take the next step in the study of the space (\mathcal{T}, d_E) , focusing on the Frechét means of a set of trees. Relying heavily on the results obtained in Section 5 we obtain that these objects exist in (\mathcal{T}, d_E) and (\mathcal{T}_2, d_E) .

Frechét means are objects of particular interest in data analysis. They are defined as the minimizers of operators which look for central points in the distribution of a random variable. More formally, given X random variable with values in (M, d_M) metric space, a p -Frechét mean is defined as $\operatorname{argmin}_{q \in M} \mathbb{E}_X(d_M(q, x)^p)$ - if it exists. Often this definition is given with $p = 2$ but, at this point we have no reasons to make this choice. In this work we deal with empirical distributions, which amount to considering the case of a finite sets of merge trees.

As generalization of the idea of “average”, or 0-dimensional summary of a random variable, Frechét means are among the most used statistics and data analysis for manifold valued data (Davis, 2008) but not only (Turner et al., 2014; Calissano et al., 2020), and are used as starting points to build more refined tools Pennec (2018).

Proposition 4 *Given T_1, \dots, T_n merge trees and $p > 0$; then exist at least one \bar{T} such that:*

$$\bar{T} = \operatorname{argmin}_T \sum_i d_E^p(T, T_i)$$

Proof *Since $\mathcal{F}(T) := \sum_i d_E^2(T, T_i)$ is a continuous real valued function, if we can restrict the minimization domain in some compact subset of \mathcal{T} , we obtain the result, since continuous functions preserve compactness.*

First we know that, if \bar{T} exists, then $\|\bar{T}\| \leq \sum_i \|T_i\|^2$. Otherwise $\mathcal{F}(\{\text{pt}\}) < \mathcal{F}(\bar{T})$, with $\{\text{pt}\}$ being the tree with no edges. Lets call $N_i = \dim(T_i)$ and $N = \sum_i N_i$. Consider T such that $\#L_T = R$ with $R > N$. For all i , any geodesic between T and T_i deletes at least $R - \#L_{T_i}$ edges of T . Since $\#L_{T_i} \leq N_i$, we have $\sum_i R - \#L_{T_i} > \sum_i R - \#N_i > R(n - 1)$. This implies that there is at least one leaf of T which is deleted all the times. Then, if we delete it, we obtain T' such that, for all i , $d_E(T', T_i) < d_E(T, T_i)$.

Thus, the number of leaves of \bar{T} cannot exceed N . But this immediately implies that, if it exists, $\dim(\bar{T}) < 2N$.

Since we have a bound on the norm and the dimension of \bar{T} , we can restrict the optimization domain on a compact set, which means that \bar{T} exists. ■

Thus, for any finite set of trees, we can minimize the function $T \mapsto \sum_i d_E^p(T, T_i)$, obtaining a p -Frechét mean of the subset. We also make the following claim which is still to be investigated.

Claim 1 *Given T_1, \dots, T_n merge trees, if $T_i \in \mathcal{T}^N$, then there is at least one Frechét mean \bar{T} such that $\bar{T} \in \mathcal{T}^N$.*

This claim is supported by the fact that \mathcal{T}^N are geodesic spaces, and thus is reasonable that we do not need to increase the dimension to find a Frechét mean.

7. Metric Structure

When working outside linear spaces there are many definitions that must be reinterpreted and generalized to work where no linear structure is available. In the case of manifold, the most common way to do so is exploiting locally the linear structure of the tangent space and to focus on the geodesic nature of straight lines in linear spaces. For instance in Geodesic Principal Component analysis (Huckemann et al., 2010a), principal components are replaced by geodesic minimizing the average distance from data points and orthogonality if verified in the tangent space at the barycenter. Moreover the geodesic structure of a space is strictly connected to its *curvature* in the metric geometry sense (Bridson and Haefliger, 1999), also called *Alexandrov's curvature*, which in turns is often used to show convergence of statistical estimation algorithms (Sturm, 2003; Miller et al., 2015; Chakraborty and Vemuri, 2015).

For these reasons we want to get a better understanding of the metric structure of the tree space, with particular attention to its geodesic paths. Since the cost of geodesic paths with the metric d_E is often invariant up to many permutations of the edits, we explore the metric structure of \mathcal{T} assuming the point of view of mappings.

The first thing that we prove is that (\mathcal{T}, d_E) and (\mathcal{T}_2, d_E) are not well behaved in terms of curvature/geodesic structure, in fact we have non-uniqueness issues arising in every neighbor of every tree.

Proposition 5 *For every $T \in \mathcal{T}$, for every ε , exists $T' \in \mathcal{T}$ such that T and T' are connected by multiple minimizing mappings and $d_E(T, T') < \varepsilon$.*

Proof *It is enough to attach to any of the leaves of T a pair of equal branches of length less than $\varepsilon/2$ each, obtaining T' . WLOG let l_1, l_2 be the two added leaves and let x be their father in T' .*

Then we can build two mappings M and M' such that: $M \cap M' = \{(v, v) \text{ for all } v \in V_T, v \neq x\}, (D, l_1), (D, l_2), (x, x) \in M$ and $(D, l_1), (x, l_2), (G, x) \in M'$. The cost of both mappings is ε . ■

The set of points in whose neighbors there are non-unique minimizing mappings (and so geodesics) is therefore the whole space. We want to get a better understanding of the origins of these problems. For example, consider the trees in Figure 2. Suppose $w(A) = w(B) < \varepsilon/2$ and $w(A') = w(C)$; then both $M = \{(B, D), (C, G), (A, A')\}$ and $M' = \{(A, D), (B, D), (C, A')\}$ are minimizing mappings with costs less than ε . From these examples and looking at Figure 3 and Figure 4, we see there are two reasons for this non uniqueness to arise:

- similarity between subtrees of the same tree;
- exchange of father-son relationships through the deletion of internal edges.

In Figure 4 we find an example of non uniqueness arising because of similar subtrees, and also in the proof of Proposition 5 we see this problem in action between subtrees made by a branch each.

In Figure 3, on the other hand, we can see uniqueness being broken by topological changes made with internal edges: if we need to change lengths of branches sometimes it can be less expensive to make topological changes like deleting internal edges, and regrowing them to swap children. When this kind of mapping is as expensive as adjusting




Figure 3: We see in the first line the two merge trees T and T' , which admit a minimizing path through deletion and insertion of an internal edge, and a minimizing path which just shrinks the edges. The first path from T to T' is represented, from left to right, in the second line. The third line represents the path made only by shrinkings.




Figure 4: With the weights properly defined, it is clear that the tree T' can be mapped both in the left and in the right subtrees of the root r_T with equal cost.

the children we have of course multiple mappings. To hope to achieve some kind of general uniqueness for mappings we must therefore prevent these things to happen.

Using the notation defined in Section 2 we call:

$$k_T = \min_{v,v' \in V_T - L_T, v \neq v'} d_E(\text{sub}_T(v), \text{sub}_T(v'))$$

Lastly let $m_T = \min_{v \in V_T - L_T} w_T(v)$ and $\mathcal{K}_T = \min\{m_T, k_T\}$.

We want to prove that for trees with $\mathcal{K}_T > 0$, if we don't go too far, at least on internal vertices the minimizing mappings with certain properties are uniquely determined. But we need some preliminary results and tools.

Remark 3 *Given $M \in \text{Mapp}(T, T')$, thanks to property (M3), $C(M)$ can be given the partial order: $(a, b) \leq (c, d)$ iff $a \leq c$ iff $b \leq d$.*

Given $(v, w) \in C(M)$, one can restrict M to $\text{sub}(v)$ and $\text{sub}(w)$, obtaining $M_{|(v,w)} = \{(a, b) \in M \mid a \leq v \text{ or } b \leq w\} \in \text{Mapp}(\text{sub}(v), \text{sub}(w))$ and, as for M , we can consider projections $\pi_T : C(M) \rightarrow V_T$. When restricting a mapping intuitively the cost cannot grow, as proven by the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *Consider $M \in \text{Mapp}(T', T)$ and $(v, w) \in C(M)$. We can restrict the mapping M to $M_{|(v,w)} \in \text{Mapp}(\text{sub}_{T'}(v), \text{sub}_{T'}(w))$ and $\text{cost}(M_{|(v,w)}) \leq \text{cost}(M)$. Moreover if v is an order 2 vertex and there is $v' < v$ with $[v, v']$ being a continuous sequence completely deleted by M , then we can also consider $M_{|(v',w)}$ and we have $\text{cost}(M_{|(v',w)}) \leq \text{cost}(M)$.*

Proof *Due to the properties of M , in particular property (M3), M edits $\text{sub}_{T'}(v)$ so that it becomes $\text{sub}_{T'}(w)$, up to neglecting the heights of the roots. In other words $M_{|(v,w)} = \{(v', y) \in M \mid v' < v\} \cup \{(x, w') \in M \mid w' < w\}$ is again a mapping and the costs of the single edits does not change between going from M to $M_{|(v,w)}$ a part from $\text{cost}((v, w))$ which goes from $|w_T(v) - w_{T'}(w)| \geq 0$ to $|h_T(v) - w_{T'}(w)| = 0$, as a consequence of Remark 1.*

Now we turn to the case of $v' > v$, $[v, v'] \subset M_D$. We need to define $M_{|(v',w)}$.

To build $M_{|(v',w)}$ we take $(M_{|(v,w)} - \{(x, y) \mid v' \leq x < \text{leq}_v\}) \cup \{(v', w)\}$. Note that $M_{|(v',w)}$ is indeed a mapping, since all the vertices $[v', v]$ are deleted or ghosted by M and so are not couple by any vertex in $V_{T'}$. Lastly, for all couples $(a, b) \in M_{|(v',w)}$ such that $(a, b) \neq (v', w)$, $\text{cost}_M((a, b)) = \text{cost}_{M_{|(v',w)}}((a, b))$. While $\text{cost}_{M_{|(v',w)}}((v', w)) = 0$ by Remark 1. ■

7.0.1 SEQUENCES OF EDGES

We start with the following definition.

Definition 7 *Given a merge tree T , a sequence of edges is an ordered sequence of adjacent edges $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. Which means that we have $e_1 < \dots < e_n$, according to the order induced by the bijection $E_T \leftrightarrow V_T - \{r_T\}$ and that e_i and e_{i+1} share a vertex. We will use the notation $[v, v']$ to indicate a sequence of edges which starts in the vertex v and ends with the vertex v' , with $v < v'$. Note that, if we write down $[v, v']$ using $E_T \simeq V_T - \{r_T\}$, v is included in the sequence, while v' is the first excluded vertex. The sequence $[v, v']$ is said to be continuous if all the vertices v'' with $v < v'' < v'$ are of order 2. A maximal continuous sequence $[v, v']$ is a continuous sequence such that v is not of order 2 and if v' is of order 2, then v' is the root of the tree.*

Now we want to give another definition to help us describing interactions between sequences of edges and mappings. Suppose we have a merge tree T and we delete an edge. Then we have a natural identification of all the other edges with edges within the newly obtained tree: each edge which is not deleted still has the same extremes and weight in the new tree, a part from the ones which share one vertex. In this latter case we simply have a replacement for the lower or upper extreme of the edge, but the identification with an edge of the new tree is still uniquely determined in a natural way.

Following this observation we can track what happens to a sequence of edges along the edit paths induced by mappings.

Definition 8 *Given merge trees T and T' and a mapping $M \in \text{Mapp}(T, T')$, a sequence $[v, v']$ is said to be (partially) deleted by M if all (some) of its edges are deleted by M . And it is said to be coupled by M if:*

1. *it is not partially deleted by M*
2. *after the deletions it becomes a continuous sequence (note that v' could be deleted and thus replaced by another vertex)*
3. *all vertices v'' with $v < v'' < v'$ are ghosted, but the extremes of the sequence are not*
4. *$v \in \pi_T(C(M))$ and the same for the father of v .*

Note that an edge is a trivial sequence of edges, and an edge is coupled if is it not deleted and its extremes are not ghosted.

With these definitions we prove a sequence of technical lemmas which will lead us to the formulation of Theorem 3. These lemmas provide characterizations of how mappings with small cost associate sequences of edges between trees.

Lemma 2 *Let $M, M' \in \text{Mapp}(T, T')$ with $\text{cost}(M), \text{cost}(M') < m_T$. Consider $[w_1, w_2], [w_3, w_4] \subset E_{T'}$ sequences of edges coupled by M . If $[w_1, w_2]$ is deleted by M' , then $[w_3, w_4]$ it cannot be deleted by M' .*

Proof

Suppose $a = \sum_{e \in [w_1, w_2]} w_{T'}(e)$, $b = \sum_{e \in [w_3, w_4]} w_{T'}(e)$ which in M are coupled with sequences of T with length A and B respectively, and thus contributing to the cost of the mapping with the quantity $|A - a| + |B - b|$. If in M' they are both deleted, the contribute to that cost bt $a + b$. This situation gives the following set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} a, b, A, B &> 0 \\ A, B &> m_T > 0 \\ |A - a| + |B - b| &< m_T \\ a + b &< m_T \end{aligned}$$

This system of course has solution only if $m_T > a$ and $m_T > b$, and so it becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} a, b, A, B &> 0 \\ A, B &> m_T > 0 \\ A + B - m_T &< a + b \\ a + b &< m_T \end{aligned}$$

which is impossible since it gives:

$$2m_T < A + B < 2m_T$$

The roles of M and M' can of course be reversed. ■

Using Lemma 2 we can actually prove the following stronger result.

Lemma 3 *Let $d_E(T', T) < m_T$ and M and M' minimizing mappings. If a sequence of edges $[w, w'] \subset E_{T'}$ is coupled by M , then it cannot be deleted by M' .*

Moreover the deletions on T' shared between M and M' , turn T' to a tree, whose representative without order two vertices has the same tree structure of T (up to isomorphisms).

Proof *Consider $M, M' \in \text{Mapp}(T', T)$ minimizing mappings.*

Suppose there is a sequence of edges $[w, w']$ in T' such that $(w, D) \in M'$, $(w, x) \in M$ for some $x \in V_T$, and $w'' \in M_G \cap M'_G$ for all $w < w'' < w'$. By Lemma 2 we know that this is not happening for any other sequences of edges. Note that, by hypothesis, w' and w are not ghosted by M .

Apply on T' all the deletions in $M_D \cap M'_D$ to be applied on it, obtaining T'' . We induce in a natural way mappings N and N' from T'' to T , simply removing, respectively, from M and M' the deletions already done. Note that the sequences paired in T' are paired also in T'' . Because $m_T \geq m_{T''}$, then Lemma 3 holds also for T'' and the mappings N and N' . As a consequence, since we already have $[w, w']$ which is paired by one mapping and deleted by the other, all the sequences of edges in T'' still to be deleted by N , cannot be paired by N' (nor can they be even partially deleted by N' , since these deletions do not lie in $M_D \cap M'_D$). Thus, any time a sequence $[v, v']$ in T'' is deleted by N_D , if after N'_D it becomes a continuous sequence, then it cannot be maximal, i.e. at least one between v and v' is an order two vertex. Otherwise $[v, v']$ would be paired, for none of its extremes can be ghosted. In particular, this implies that each deletion we have in N_D or N'_D deletes an edge of T'' which is left with at least one order 2 vertex by the deletions of the other mapping.

To recap, we have obtained T'' by applying all the deletions shared by M and M' , we have induced the mappings N and N' taking the remaining edits of, respectively, M and M' ; each deletion we still have in N_D or N'_D deletes an edge of T'' which is left with at least one order 2 vertex by the deletions of the other mapping. For both mappings there are no insertions to be done to obtain T , because their cost would be over \mathcal{K}_T .

Consider a vertex v' in T'' . The order of v' can change thanks to the deletions of N_D or N'_D obtaining different values in T' only if we have some sequence $[v, v']$ which is deleted by one mapping and not by the other.

So consider $[v, v']$ a sequence of edges in T'' which is deleted by N and not by N' . and suppose that v' is not of order 2 in T'' but it becomes of order two after N'_D . We can clearly take $[v, v']$ so that it becomes continuous after N'_D . Let v_1, \dots, v_n be the children of v' in T'' . We know that $\text{sub}_i(v')$ is deleted by N'_D for every i but one, be it v_h , such that $v_h \geq v$. This in turns tells us that $\text{sub}_i(v')$ with $i \neq h$ are not deleted by N (otherwise these deletions would lie in $M_D \cap M'_D$) and, for what has been said before, all their edges must have at least one vertex of order two in T'' . According to the mapping N , once all order 2 vertices in $\text{sub}_i(v')$, $i \neq h$, have been removed, all the maximal sequences remaining pass from being deleted by N' (and so by M') to being coupled by N (and so by M). But since the only sequence for which this happens is $[w, w']$, this means that $i \leq 2$, $w' = v'$, $v_1 \geq v$ and $v_2 \geq w$.

Putting the pieces together first we proved that, starting from T'' any further deletion in N_D or N'_D deletes an edge of T'' which is left with at least one order 2 vertex by the deletions of the other mapping. But now we saw that there can be at most one vertex which goes from order different from 2 in T'' , to order 2 thanks to N_D or N'_D . And this vertex is w . As a consequence, for any other edge of T'' deleted by N and not by N' , the extreme of order two after N'_D can have no siblings in T'' , i.e. they are already of order two. And the same reversing the role of N and N' .

To sum up, we have obtained T'' by applying all the deletion shared by M and M' , and then we proved that all other deletions but one, delete edges with at least one of the extremes which is an order 2 vertex in T'' . So, apart from the deletion of $[w, w']$ by N'_D , the others in N_D or $N'_D - \{(w, D)\}$ provide no changes in the tree structures, up to order 2 vertices. So the tree structure obtained from the deletions of such edges or the one resulting from the ghosting of their order two extremes is the same, up to order two vertices. Since T has no order 2 vertices, and since there are no insertions to be done on T'' , $[w, w']$ is paired with an edge with no vertices of order two, and so its deletion changes the topology of the tree T'' . In other words we obtain the same tree structure, which is the one of T , both by removing from T'' the order 2 vertices, and from first removing the order 2 vertices and then deleting the internal edge $[w, w']$ which is absurd. ■

At this point we have enough results to start going into the details of the comparison between two mappings M and M' with “small cost”.

Lemma 4 Consider $M, M' \in \text{Mapp}(T', T)$ with $\text{cost}(M), \text{cost}(M') < \mathcal{K}_T/2$. Let T'' be the tree obtained from T' applying the deletions in $M_D \cap M'_D$. Then the followings hold:

- given $v \in V_{T'}$, suppose we have $(v, x) \in C(M)$ and $(v, x') \in C(M')$; if at least one between x and x' is not a leaf, then $x = x'$;
- if $[v, v'] \subset E_{T''}$ is a maximal continuous sequence then there exist one and only one $(v'', x) \in C(N)$ and one and only one $(v''', x') \in C(N')$ with $v \leq v'', v''' < v'$. If either x or x' is not a leaf, then $x = x'$;
- if x is not a leaf in T and we have $(v, x) \in M$ and $(v', x) \in M'$, then $v < v'$ or $v \geq v'$ hold. Suppose $v < v'$; then $[v, v']$ is a continuous sequence in T'' ;
- we have $(v, x) \in M$ and $(v, x') \in M'$ with $x \neq x'$, both leaves. Then x and x' are siblings.

Proof

- we know that, by definition of \mathcal{K}_T , we have $d_E(\text{sub}_T(x), \text{sub}_T(x')) > \mathcal{K}_T$, and so, thanks to Lemma 1 we have

$$\mathcal{K}_T < d_E(\text{sub}_{T'}(v), \text{sub}_T(x')) + d_E(\text{sub}_{T'}(v), \text{sub}_T(x)) \leq \mathcal{K}_T$$

which is absurd. Thus $x = x'$.

- Write down the sequence $[v, v']$ as an ordered sequence of vertices $[v, v'] = \{a_1 = v, \dots, a_r\}$ with $\text{father}(a_r) = v'$. By construction, $[v, v']$ cannot be wholly deleted by both mappings, and so each a_i can be deleted or ghosted by N or N' , but there

must be a vertex a_{i_N} which is coupled by N and one $a_{i_{N'}}$, coupled by N' . In fact if there is one mapping which wholly deletes $[v, v']$ then the other one must couple it, by construction. Which contradicts Lemma 3. We want to prove that $(a_{i_N}, x) \in N$ and $(a_{i_{N'}}, x') \in N'$ with $x = x'$. If $i_N = i_{N'}$ we already proved that $x = x'$. Then, suppose $i_N < i_{N'}$.

Since $v < a_{i_{N'}} < v'$ then $a_{i_{N'}}$ is an order two vertex, coupled with x' which is not an order two vertex. Thus the vertices between v and $a_{i_{N'}}$ must be deleted, a_{i_N} included. This in particular means that we can consider $N_{|(a_{i_N}), x}$ and $N'_{|(a_{i_{N'}}), x'}$ as in Lemma 1. Using the triangular inequality on $d_E(\text{sub}_{T'}(x), \text{sub}_T(x'))$, if at least one between x and x' is not a leaf, we obtain:

$$\mathcal{K}_T < d_E(\text{sub}_{T'}(a_{i_N}), \text{sub}_T(x')) + d_E(\text{sub}_{T'}(a_{i_{N'}}), \text{sub}_T(x)) \leq \mathcal{K}_T$$

Suppose now that there are $(a_{i_{N_1}}, x_1) \in N$ and $(a_{i_{N_2}}, x_2) \in N$. With $a_{i_{N_j}} \in [v, v']$. Suppose $a_{i_{N_1}} > a_{i_{N_2}}$. Then $a_{i_{N_1}}$ is an order 2 vertex in T'' and it is paired with a vertex of order different from 2. Since it cannot be deleted, all the vertices in $[v, v']$ which are below $a_{i_{N_1}}$ must be deleted, so that the order of $a_{i_{N_1}}$ is no more 2. But $a_{i_{N_2}}$ cannot be deleted, which is absurd. Alternatively, from Lemma 3 we see that there is a 1 : 1 correspondence between maximal continuous sequences of edes in T'' and the set of vertices corresponding to E_T . Since in every sequence there is at least one coupled vertex, the cannot be more that one, because that would break the correspondence.

- consider x an internal vertex of T . We know that there is a vertex \tilde{v} and a maximal continuous sequence $[v, v'] \subset E_{T''}$ such that $\tilde{v} \in [v, v']$ and $(\tilde{v}, x) \in N$. We know by the previous point that there is also $\hat{v} \in [v, v']$ such that $(\tilde{v}, x') \in N'$ for some x' . But since x is not a leaf, $x = x'$. By construction either $\tilde{v} \leq \hat{v}$ or $\tilde{v} > \hat{v}$ hold. Suppose $\tilde{v} \leq \hat{v}$, then $[\tilde{v}, \hat{v}]$ is a continuous sequence.
- We know that $(v_x, \text{father}(x)) \in N$ and $(v_{x'}, \text{father}(x')) \in N'$ for some $v_x, v_{x'} > v$. Suppose $v_x < v_{x'}$ and there is a vertex $v' \in V_{T''}$ with $v_x < v' < v_{x'}$ and order different from 2. Then $(v', D) \in N'$. In fact v' cannot be ghosted and it cannot be coupled by N' for it would be paired with a vertex in between x' and $\text{father}(x')$, which is absurd. Thus there are v_1, v_2, v_3 in $V_{T''}$ which give the following maximal continuous sequences of edges: $[v_1, v_2]$ which contains v , $[v_2, v']$ which contains v_x and $[v', v_3]$ which contains $v_{x'}$. Thus, for the previous points of this lemma, there is $(v_{N'}, x'') \in N'$ with $v_{N'} \in [v_2, v']$. But since $v < v_{N'} < v_{x'}$ we have $x' < x'' < \text{father}(x')$ which is absurd. Then v_x and $v_{x'}$ are part of the same continuous maximal sequence in T'' , and thus, by the previous points of this lemma, $\text{father}(x) = \text{father}(x')$. ■

7.0.2 MAIN RESULT

Putting the pieces together, we can prove the following Theorem.

Theorem 3 *Given $M, M' \in \text{Mapp}(T', T)$ minimizing mappings with $d_E(T, T') < \mathcal{K}_T/2$. Then we can obtain $M'' \in \text{Mapp}(T', T)$ minimizing mapping such that $M''_D = M_D \cap M'_D$. Moreover M'' is uniquely determined on internal vertices of T .*

Proof *We divide this proof in three steps: first we define M'' , then we check that it is a mapping and lastly we verify that it is still a minimal mapping.*

- Clearly $M_D'' = M_D \cap M_D'$. Then we have no choice but ghosting all order 2 vertices of T'' . We need to define the shrinking operations to obtain T . Each of the vertices in T'' with order different from 2 are coupled by at least one between N and N' . In fact they cannot be ghosted because to do so we would have to completely delete some sequence of edges contradicting Lemma 3. Consider $v \in V_{T''}$. Suppose $(v, x) \in N$. If $v \notin \pi_{T'}(C(N'))$ then we add (v, x) to M'' . If $(v, x') \in N'$, x or x' are not leaves, then $x = x'$ (and so both of them are internal vertices). Thus we can add again (v, x) to M'' .

Note that, up to here, M'' is uniquely determined in order to avoid further deletions, thanks to Lemma 4. In fact deletions in T' are fixed by hypothesis, ghostings are fixed as well since all order 2 vertices must be removed in order to be able to couple vertices with T without further deletions. Then also shrinkings are fixed by Lemma 4.

The only situation we are left with is $(v, x) \in N$ and $(v, x') \in N'$, with $x \neq x'$ leaves. By Lemma 4 we know that x and x' are siblings, i.e. $\text{father}(x) = \text{father}(x') = x''$. Note that also v must be a leaf in T'' , otherwise there would be $v' < v$ coupled with some vertex below x , which is absurd. Consider $v'' = \{\tilde{v} > v \mid \text{ord}(\tilde{v}) \neq 2\}$. We know $(v'', x'') \in M''$. Then $(v'', x'') \in N$ or/and $(v'', x'') \in N'$. By Lemma 4 we know that there is a correspondence between the maximal continuous sequences of $\text{sub}_{T''}(v'')$ of the form $[v_i, v'']$, such that v_i is a leaf, and the leaves x_i of $\text{sub}_T(x'')$. Suppose $(v'', x'') \in N$. Then for each i there is $(v'_i, x_i) \in N$, for $v'_i \in [v_i, v'']$. We add to M'' the couples (v_i, x_i) for every i . In this way we define M'' for every vertex in T' and T .

- We verify that M'' is a mapping.

(M1) M'' contains all the deletions needed to obtain T'' . By Lemma 4 every mapping M and M' induces a 1 : 1 correspondence between maximal continuous sequences of T'' and vertices of T . Note that by Lemma 4, on internal vertices, M and M' induce the same correspondence. To build M'' we used those correspondences to pick one point in every maximal sequence and ghost the other. On leaves we used either M or M' to complete M'' . This guarantees that we reach all vertices of T' and T'' with an edit.

(M2) For vertices which are deleted or ghosted we are sure that there is only one edit associated to them. But this is true also for vertices in $C(M'')$ thanks again to the 1 : 1 correspondence between maximal continuous sequences of T'' and vertices of T .

(M3) We can say that $[v, v'] < [v'', v''']$ if $v' < v''$. Note that this holds for any couple of vertices in the sequences, since the sequences are completely ordered. With this notation we see that the correspondences $\{\text{maximal continuous sequences of } T''\} \leftrightarrow V_T - \{r_T\}$ induced by N and N' are ordered correspondences because N and N' are mappings. Thus, given $(v, x), (v', x') \in M''$, we have $v < v'$ if and only if $[v, \tilde{v}] < [v', \tilde{v}]$ if and only if $x < x'$.

(M4) this holds by construction since we ghost only vertices which are of order 2 in T'' .

- Now we prove that M'' is still a minimizing mapping. Clearly the cost of the deletions does not increase: $M_D'' = M_D \cap M_D'$ and thus $\text{cost}(M_D'') < \text{cost}(M_D), \text{cost}(M_D')$. We need to check the elements in $C(M'')$. Let $(v, x) \in C(M'')$. The couple (v, x) couples a sequence $[v, v']$ with the edge $(x, \text{father}(x))$. Note that the mappings M and M'

still turn the sequence $[v, v']$ in the edge $(x, \text{father}(x))$ but without coupling them, because they apply some deletions on $[v, v']$. It is enough to prove that the cost with which M'' turns $[v, v']$ in $(x, \text{father}(x))$ is not greater than the one of M and M' .

Write down the sequence $[v, v']$ as an ordered sequence of vertices $[v, v'] = \{a_1 = v, \dots, a_r\}$ with $\text{father}(a_r) = v'$. We have:

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^r w_{T'}(a_i) - w_{T'}(x) \right| < \left| \sum_{i \in A} w_{T'}(a_i) - w_{T'}(x) \right| + \sum_{i \in B} w_{T'}(a_i)$$

for any A, B partition of $\{1, \dots, r\}$. And thus the cost of turning $[v, v']$ into $(x, \text{father}(x))$ using M'' not greater than the one of M and M' . ■

We conclude this section with the following Corollary which follows easily from Theorem 3, which represents a uniqueness results for deletion-minimizing mappings.

Corollary 2 *Given T, T' with $d_E(T, T') < \mathcal{K}_T/2$ there is at least one mapping M such that for any other minimizing mapping M'' , $M_D \subset M''_D$. Moreover, if M and M' both satisfy this property, then they coincide on deletion, ghostings and all the couplings with internal vertices of T .*

8. Conclusions

In this manuscript we face the problem of geometric characterization of the space of merge trees, endowed with a recently defined edit distance. The main directions of our investigation are: 1) to establish some compactness results to prove the existence of Fréchet means, which are objects of great interest in non-Euclidean statistics, 2) to start understanding the geodesic structure of such space. Thanks to previously introduced parametrizations of geodesic paths, we obtain the existence of Fréchet means, even if further properties of those objects can surely be obtained, and prove local uniqueness of geodesics for a particular class of paths, up to possible exchanges of leaves.

Natural further developments of this work would be to try to approximate Fréchet means and obtain other results on the metric structure of the space, possibly establishing some kind of tangent bundle for the space of merge trees. Such tangent structure could then open the door to optimization of real valued functions defined on merge trees and statistical tools like linear regression and principal component analysis.

Acknowledgments

This work was carried out as part of my PhD Thesis, under the supervision of Professor Piercesare Secchi.

References

Ulrich Bauer, Claudia Landi, and Facundo Mémoli. The reeb graph edit distance is universal. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, pages 1–24, 2020.

- Kenes Beketayev, Damir Yeliussizov, Dmitriy Morozov, Gunther H. Weber, and Bernd Hamann. Measuring the distance between merge trees. In *Topological Methods in Data Analysis and Visualization*, pages 151–166. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2014.
- Silvia Biasotti, Daniela Giorgi, Michela Spagnuolo, and Bianca Falcidieno. Reeb graphs for shape analysis and applications. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 392(1-3):5–22, 2008.
- Philip Bille. A survey on tree edit distance and related problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 337(1-3):217 – 239, 2005.
- Louis J Billera, Susan P Holmes, and Karen Vogtmann. Geometry of the space of phylogenetic trees. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 27(4):733–767, 2001.
- M. R. Bridson and A. Haefliger. *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*. Springer, 1999.
- Peter Bubenik. Statistical topological data analysis using persistence landscapes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(3):77–102, 2015.
- Peter Bubenik and Alexander Wagner. Embeddings of persistence diagrams into hilbert spaces. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, 4(3):339–351, 2020.
- Anna Calissano, Aasa Feragen, and Simone Vantini. Populations of unlabeled networks: Graph space geometry and geodesic principal components. *MOX Reports*, 2020.
- Rudrasis Chakraborty and Baba C Vemuri. Recursive Fréchet mean computation on the Grassmannian and its applications to computer vision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4229–4237. IEEE, 2015.
- F. Chazal, Brittany Terese Fasy, F. Lecci, A. Rinaldo, and L. Wasserman. Stochastic convergence of persistence landscapes and silhouettes. *Journal of Computational Geometry*, 6(2):140–161, 2015.
- Mauricio Che, Fernando Galaz-García, Luis Guijarro, and Ingrid Membrillo Solis. Metric geometry of spaces of persistence diagrams. *arXiv*, 2109.14697v1 [math.MG], 2021.
- Bradley C Davis. *Medical image analysis via Fréchet means of diffeomorphisms*. PhD thesis, University of North Carolina, 2008.
- Barbara Di Fabio and Claudia Landi. The edit distance for reeb graphs of surfaces. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 55(2):423–461, 2016.
- H. Edelsbrunner, D. Letscher, and A. Zomorodian. Topological persistence and simplification. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 28:511–533, 2002.
- Herbert Edelsbrunner and John Harer. Persistent homology—a survey. In *Surveys on discrete and computational geometry*, volume 453 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 257–282. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
- Joseph Felsenstein and Joseph Felsenstein. *Inferring phylogenies*, volume 2. Sinauer associates Sunderland, MA, 2004.
- Maryam Kashia Garba, Tom MW Nye, Jonas Lueg, and Stephan F Huckemann. Information geometry for phylogenetic trees. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 82(3):1–39, 2021.

- Ellen Gasparovic, E. Munch, S. Oudot, Katharine Turner, B. Wang, and Yusu Wang. Intrinsic interleaving distance for merge trees. *ArXiv*, 1908.00063v1[cs.CG], 2019.
- Allen Hatcher. *Algebraic topology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- Stephan Huckemann, Thomas Hotz, and Axel Munk. Intrinsic shape analysis: Geodesic pca for riemannian manifolds modulo isometric lie group actions. *Statistica Sinica*, 20(1):1–58, 2010a.
- Stephan Huckemann, Thomas Hotzand, and Axel Munk. Intrinsic shape analysis: Geodesic PCA for Riemannian manifolds modulo isometric lie group actions. *Statistica Sinica*, 20:1–58, 2010b.
- Stephan F Huckemann and Benjamin Eltzner. Backward nested descriptors asymptotics with inference on stem cell differentiation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(5):1994–2019, 2018.
- Sungkyu Jung, Ian L Dryden, and James Stephen Marron. Analysis of principal nested spheres. *Biometrika*, 99(3):551–568, 2012.
- Hermann Karcher. Riemannian center of mass and mollifier smoothing. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 30(5):509–541, 1977.
- Jacob Leygonie, Steve Oudot, and Ulrike Tillmann. A framework for differential calculus on persistence barcodes. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, pages 1–63, 2021.
- Yuriy Mileyko, Sayan Mukherjee, and John Harer. Probability measures on the space of persistence diagrams. *Inverse Problems*, 27, 2011.
- Ezra Miller, Megan Owen, and J. S. Provan. Polyhedral computational geometry for averaging metric phylogenetic trees. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 68:51 – 91, 2015.
- Dmitriy Morozov, Kenes Beketayev, and Gunther Weber. Interleaving distance between merge trees. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 49:22–45, 2013.
- Fionn Murtagh and Pedro Contreras. Algorithms for hierarchical clustering: An overview, ii. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 7(6):e1219, 2017.
- Vic Patrangenaru and Leif Ellingson. *Nonparametric Statistics on Manifolds and Their Application to Object Data Analysis*. CRC Press, 2015.
- Matteo Pegoraro. A metric for tree-like topological summaries. *arXiv*, 2108.13108v2 [math.CO], 2021.
- Xavier Pennec. Intrinsic Statistics on Riemannian Manifolds: Basic Tools for Geometric Measurements. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 25:127–154, 2006.
- Xavier Pennec. Barycentric subspace analysis on manifolds. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6A):2711–2746, 2018.
- Xavier Pennec, Stefan Sommer, and Tom Fletcher. *Riemannian Geometric Statistics in Medical Image Analysis*. Academic Press, 2019.

- Y. Shinagawa, T. L. Kunii, and Y. L. Kergosien. Surface coding based on morse theory. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, 11(5):66–78, 1991.
- R. Sridharamurthy, T. B. Masood, A. Kamakshidasan, and V. Natarajan. Edit distance between merge trees. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 26(3):1518–1531, 2020.
- Karl Theodor Sturm. Probability measures on metric spaces of nonpositive curvature. *Heat Kernels and Analysis on Manifolds, Graphs, and Metric Spaces*, 338:357–391, 2003.
- P. Thomas Fletcher. Geodesic Regression and the Theory of Least Squares on Riemannian Manifolds. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 105:171–185, 2013.
- Elena Farahbakhsh Touli. Frechet-like distances between two merge trees. *ArXiv*, 2004.10747v1[cs.CC], 2020.
- Katharine Turner, Yuriy Mileyko, Sayan Mukherjee, and John Harer. Fréchet means for distributions of persistence diagrams. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 52(1):44–70, 2014.