

ON THE BOTTLENECK STABILITY OF RANK DECOMPOSITIONS OF MULTI-PARAMETER PERSISTENCE MODULES

MAGNUS BAKKE BOTNAN, STEFFEN OPPERMAN, STEVE OUDOT, AND LUIS SCOCCOLA

ABSTRACT. The notion of rank decomposition of a multi-parameter persistence module was introduced as a way of constructing complete and discrete representations of the rank invariant of the module. In particular, the minimal rank decomposition by rectangles of a persistence module, also known as the generalized persistence diagram, gives a uniquely defined representation of the rank invariant of the module by a pair of rectangle-decomposable modules. This pair is interpreted as a signed barcode, with the rectangle summands of the first (resp. second) module playing the role of the positive (resp. negative) bars. The minimal rank decomposition by rectangles generalizes the concept of persistence barcode from one-parameter persistence, and, being a discrete invariant, it is amenable to manipulations on a computer. However, we show that it is not bottleneck stable under the natural notion of signed bottleneck matching between signed barcodes. To remedy this, we turn our focus to the signed barcode induced by the Betti numbers of the module relative to the so-called rank exact structure, which we prove to be bottleneck stable under signed matchings. As part of our proof, we obtain two intermediate results of independent interest: we compute the global dimension of the rank exact structure on the category of finitely presentable multi-parameter persistence modules, and we prove a bottleneck stability result for hook-decomposable modules, which are in fact the relative projective modules of the rank exact structure. We also bound the size of the multigraded Betti numbers relative to the rank exact structure in terms of the usual multigraded Betti numbers, we prove a universality result for the dissimilarity function induced by the notion of signed matching, and we compute, in the two-parameter case, the global dimension of a different exact structure that is related to the upsets of the indexing poset.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Background and notation	6
3.	Bottleneck instability of minimal rank decompositions	9
4.	Bottleneck stability of hook-decomposable modules	10
5.	Global dimension of the rank exact structure and size of the rank exact decomposition	12
6.	Bottleneck stability of the rank exact decomposition and universality	20
7.	Other exact structures	21
	References	23
	Appendix A. Proofs of results from previous work	25

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Context and objectives. The design and study of discrete invariants for persistence modules lies at the heart of topological data analysis (TDA), which uses these invariants as features, regularizers, or estimators in applications. The discrete nature of the invariants is paramount, enabling their accurate construction and comparison on a computer. In the one-parameter setting, the persistence barcodes, or equivalently the persistence diagrams, have emerged as the canonical choice of discrete invariant, notably because they are provably complete and comparatively easy to interpret.

The situation in the multi-parameter setting is much less clear-cut, as it is known that no complete discrete invariant exists, even for finitely presentable persistence modules [CZ09]. Research in multi-parameter TDA within the past decade has therefore considered alternative, incomplete, discrete invariants, most notably: the Hilbert function and its associated Hilbert series [HOST19]; the multigraded Betti numbers [LW15, Ber21]; the fibered barcode [Lan18, LW15]; the rank invariant [CZ09] and its generalized version [KM21]; the generalized persistence diagrams [KM21, MP20, Pat18, CKM22], compressed multiplicities [AENY19], and minimal rank decompositions [BOO21], which have strong ties with one another; the rank decompositions coming from rank exact resolutions [BOO21]; the persistence contours and their associated simple noise

systems [GC17, SCL⁺17]; the stable rank and its associated shift dimension [CCS21, GC17]. The significant increase in the number and variety of these invariants over time calls for a general effort to classify and sort them according to their respective qualities. This, in turn, raises the question of defining what it means to be a *good* discrete invariant.

To the end user in data sciences, the most natural measure of quality for a discrete invariant would be its performances in machine learning or data mining applications. But in order to explain these performances, prior foundational developments are required, including notably the study of the stability properties of the invariant under perturbations of the persistence module it describes. For this, a suitable choice of distance or dissimilarity measure between invariants must be made, with the following trade-off in mind: on the one hand, stability bounds are sought for; on the other hand, the dissimilarity should be as discriminative as possible. Meanwhile, for practical purposes, the dissimilarity should be computationally tractable. In the one-parameter setting, the bottleneck distance is the metric of choice on persistence barcodes or diagrams, as it is both computationally tractable, easily interpretable (being a best-matching distance), and provably equivalent (via an isometry theorem) to the universal interleaving distance between the persistence modules themselves.

Again, the situation in the multi-parameter setting is more contrasted. First, stability results for discrete invariants in this context are scarce; second, existing metrics such as for instance the matching distance between fibered barcodes, are not amenable to interpretation, and their computation poses some serious challenges [BK21, KLO20, KN20]. A recent development [OS21] aimed at resolving these issues by extending the classical bottleneck distance on persistence barcodes to a signed version designed for the comparison of multigraded Betti numbers. While not a pseudo-metric (the triangle inequality may be infringed), this dissimilarity does satisfy a universality property, it is just as easy to compute and interpret as its unsigned counterpart, and it makes the multigraded Betti numbers stable.

Our focus here is on the study of a finer invariant through the lens of the signed bottleneck dissimilarity. This invariant is given by the multigraded Betti numbers relative to an exact structure other than the standard one, namely the rank exact structure, which was introduced in [BOO21] for the purpose of proving the existence of decompositions of the rank invariant. Our primary objective is to obtain bottleneck stability guarantees for these relative multigraded Betti numbers. Our approach is part of a general program which aims to study multi-parameter persistence modules via relative homological algebra [Hoc56, AS93, EJ11]. The basic idea of the program is to associate an exact structure to a given invariant of persistence modules (such as the Hilbert function or the rank invariant), which allows one to decompose the value of the invariant on a certain module as a formal sum of simpler modules, namely, projective modules relative to the exact structure. This formal sum can be interpreted as a signed barcode and gives a discrete representation of the invariant. This program was initiated in [BOO21] in the case of the rank invariant and was then extended to other invariants in [BBH21]. Recent papers following this line of work include: [OS21], which focuses on the usual exact structure on persistence modules whose associated invariant is the Hilbert function and gives a bottleneck stability result for signed barcodes coming from more general exact structures; [AENY22], which focuses on the exact structure whose projective modules are the interval decomposable modules; and [CGR⁺], which focuses on the effective computation of relative Betti numbers of modules over posets.

1.2. Mathematical framework and contributions. For details about the notions used here, the reader may refer to Section 2. Let \mathcal{P} be a poset and let vec be the category of finite dimensional vector spaces over a fixed field \mathbb{k} . A (pointwise finite dimensional) \mathcal{P} -persistence module is a functor $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$, and a \mathcal{P} -barcode is a multiset of isomorphism classes of indecomposable \mathcal{P} -persistence modules, usually denoted by \mathcal{C} . A *signed \mathcal{P} -barcode* is an ordered pair $(\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-)$ of \mathcal{P} -barcodes, for which we use the shorthand \mathcal{C}_\pm . Of particular interest is the n -fold product poset \mathcal{R}^n , where \mathcal{R} is the poset of real numbers with its standard linear order, and n is a fixed natural number. Modules of the form $\mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ are known as *n -parameter persistence modules*. By a result of Botnan and Crawley-Boevey [BCB20], and the Krull–Remak–Schmidt–Azumaya theorem, any \mathcal{P} -persistence module can be decomposed as a direct sum of indecomposable persistence modules in an essentially unique way (see Section 2.8). The *barcode* of a \mathcal{P} -persistence module M , denoted $\mathcal{B}(M)$, is the multiset of isomorphism classes of indecomposables of M , counted with multiplicity. A \mathcal{P} -persistence module is *finitely presentable* (*fp*) if it is the cokernel of a morphism between persistence modules that are finite direct sums of indecomposable projectives. The subcategory of *fp* \mathcal{P} -persistence modules is denoted by $\text{vec}_{fp}^{\mathcal{P}}$. When the indexing poset is \mathcal{R}^n , persistence modules are usually compared using the *interleaving distance* [Les15, CdSGO16], denoted d_I . The interleaving distance is based on the notion of ε -interleaving between \mathcal{R}^n -persistence modules, which can be interpreted as an approximate version of the notion of isomorphism.




FIGURE 1. The minimal rank projective resolution of Fig. 1a is used to define the rank exact decomposition of the \mathcal{R}^2 -persistence module M , which, in this case, is an interval module. The rank exact decomposition of M is shown in Fig. 1b by representing an indecomposable summand $L_{i,j}$ by a segment joining i and j . Summands in even homological degrees correspond to positive bars and are colored in blue; summands in odd homological degrees correspond to negative bars and are colored in red.

The *rank invariant* of a \mathcal{P} -persistence module M is the function $\text{rk}(M) : \{(a, b) \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P} : a \leq b\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ where $\text{rk}(M)(a, b)$ is the rank of the structure morphism $M(a) \rightarrow M(b)$. A *rank decomposition* of a \mathcal{P} -persistence module M is a signed \mathcal{P} -barcode \mathcal{C}_\pm such that $\text{rk}(M) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{C}_+} \text{rk}(A) - \sum_{B \in \mathcal{C}_-} \text{rk}(B)$ as \mathbb{Z} -valued functions. It is shown in [BOO21] that every *fp* \mathcal{R}^n -persistence module admits a rank decomposition \mathcal{C}_\pm with the property that the modules in \mathcal{C}_+ and in \mathcal{C}_- are (right open) rectangle modules. Moreover, if one requires the multisets \mathcal{C}_+ and \mathcal{C}_- to be disjoint, then the signed barcode \mathcal{C}_\pm is uniquely determined, and is called the *minimal rank decomposition by rectangles* of M , denoted $\mathcal{B}_\pm^{\text{rc}}(M)$.

The starting point of this work is the following bottleneck instability result for the minimal rank decomposition by rectangles, already noted in [OS21]. In order to state the result, we use the following notion of bottleneck matching for signed barcodes, from [OS21]. An ε -*matching* between barcodes \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} is a partial bijection $\mathcal{C} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ with the property that matched indecomposables are ε -interleaved, and unmatched ones are ε -interleaved with the zero module. An ε -matching between signed barcodes \mathcal{C}_\pm and \mathcal{D}_\pm is an ε -matching between $\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{D}_-$ and $\mathcal{D}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$. The *bottleneck distance* is then defined by $d_B(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) = \inf\{\varepsilon : \exists \varepsilon\text{-matching } \mathcal{C} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}\}$, and the *signed bottleneck dissimilarity* by

$$\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{C}_\pm, \mathcal{D}_\pm) = d_B(\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{D}_-, \mathcal{D}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-).$$

Result A (Proposition 3.1). *Let $n \geq 2 \in \mathbb{N}$. There is no function $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $f(r) \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow 0} 0$ such that the following inequality holds for all *fp* modules $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$:*

$$\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{B}_\pm^{\text{rc}}(M), \mathcal{B}_\pm^{\text{rc}}(N)) \leq f(d_I(M, N)).$$

Considering minimal rank decompositions by shapes other than right open rectangles does not in general resolve the issue: in Remark 3.2, we explain how a result analogous to Result A can be proven for the minimal rank decomposition by hooks, also introduced in [BOO21] and recalled in Section 2.10.

We thus turn our focus to a different type of rank decomposition, which may not be minimal in the above sense, but which, for this very reason, can be proven to be bottleneck stable. We call this rank decomposition the rank exact decomposition. There are two main differences between the minimal rank decomposition by rectangles and the rank exact decomposition:

- (i) Instead of using rectangle modules to decompose the rank invariant, we use hook modules, whose definition we recall below.
- (ii) The notion of minimality of the minimal rank decomposition by rectangles—which requires the positive and negative barcodes to be disjoint—is replaced by the requirement that the signed barcode comes from a minimal projective resolution in the so-called rank exact structure, also described below.

In the case of the rank invariant, the right notion of resolution is that of a rank projective resolution [BOO21]. A short exact sequence of \mathcal{R}^n -persistence modules $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ is *rank exact* if $\text{rk}(M) = \text{rk}(N) + \text{rk}(L)$, and a long exact sequence is rank exact if it can be broken up into short exact sequences that are rank exact. An \mathcal{R}^n -persistence module P is *rank projective* if $\text{Hom}(P, -)$ maps rank exact sequences to exact sequences. A *rank projective resolution* of an \mathcal{R}^n -persistence module M is a resolution of M by rank projective modules, which, as a long exact sequence, is rank exact. It is shown in [BOO21] that the rank projective modules are precisely the hook-decomposable modules, that is, the modules that decompose as direct sums of hook modules, where the *hook module* $L_{i,j}$ with $i < j \in \mathcal{R}^n \cup \{\infty\}$ is the interval module with support $\{a \in \mathcal{R}^n : a \geq i, a \not\geq j\}$. Note that, in particular, hook modules are a generalization of the (right open) one-dimensional interval modules. Let M be a *fp* \mathcal{R}^n -persistence module and let $P_\bullet \rightarrow M$




FIGURE 2. An example of a low-cost matching (right) between the rank exact decompositions of two fp \mathcal{R}^2 -persistence modules at small interleaving distance (left).

be a minimal rank projective resolution (the fact that this resolution exists and has finite length follows from [BOO21]); see Fig. 1a for an illustration. Let $\beta_k^{rk}(M) = \mathcal{B}(P_k)$, which is independent of the choice of minimal rank projective resolution. The *rank exact decomposition* of M is the signed barcode

$$\mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{rk}(M) = \left(\beta_{2\mathbb{N}}^{rk}(M), \beta_{2\mathbb{N}+1}^{rk}(M) \right) = \left(\bigcup_{k \text{ even}} \beta_k^{rk}(M), \bigcup_{k \text{ odd}} \beta_k^{rk}(M) \right);$$

see Fig. 1b for an illustration.

Our first positive result is the following bottleneck stability result for the rank exact decomposition. Fig. 2 illustrates the kind of bottleneck matching that Result B guarantees to exist. It is interesting to note that, when $n = 1$, Result B specializes to the well-known algebraic stability of one-parameter barcodes [CCSG⁺09, CdSGO16, BL14].

Result B (Theorem 6.1). *Let $n \geq 1 \in \mathbb{N}$. For all fp modules $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, we have*

$$\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{rk}(M), \mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{rk}(N)) \leq (2n - 1)^2 \cdot d_I(M, N).$$

In other words, for all fp modules $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, we have

$$d_B(\beta_{2\mathbb{N}}^{rk}(M) \cup \beta_{2\mathbb{N}+1}^{rk}(N), \beta_{2\mathbb{N}}^{rk}(N) \cup \beta_{2\mathbb{N}+1}^{rk}(M)) \leq (2n - 1)^2 \cdot d_I(M, N).$$

We prove Result B by following [OS21, Theorem 26], which is a general stability result for signed barcodes that arise from a given exact structure. Informally, the result says that the bottleneck stability of such a signed barcode follows from two main ingredients:

- (1) A bottleneck stability result for the projectives relative to the exact structure.
- (2) A finite upper bound for the global dimension of the exact structure.

Most of our work goes into checking these two facts in the case of the rank exact structure, which yields two intermediate results of independent interest stated as Result C and Result D below. In the proofs of Result B and [OS21, Theorem 26], ingredients (1) and (2) are combined using a persistent version of Schanuel's lemma (Proposition 2.7), which applies, under mild assumptions, to any exact structure on the category of \mathcal{R}^n -persistence modules.

Result C adapts, from rectangles to hooks, Bjerkevik's bottleneck stability result for rectangle-decomposable modules [Bje21, Theorem 4.3]:

Result C (Proposition 4.3). *Let $P, Q : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ decompose as countable direct sums of hook modules and let $\varepsilon \geq 0$. If P and Q are ε -interleaved, then there exists a $(2n - 1)\varepsilon$ -matching between $\mathcal{B}(P)$ and $\mathcal{B}(Q)$.*

We explain in Remark 4.4 how we can also adapt [Bje21, Example 5.2] to show that the bound in Result C is tight when $n = 2$.

Result D does not just give an upper bound for the global dimension of the rank exact structure on the category of fp \mathcal{R}^n -persistence modules, but actually gives the global dimension itself. The result follows from Theorem 5.16, which provides lower and upper bounds for the global dimension of the rank exact structure on the category of persistence modules over a finite lattice.

Result D (Theorem 5.18). *We have $\text{gldim}^{rk}(\text{vec}_{fp}^{\mathcal{R}^n}) = 2n - 2$.*

For computation purposes, one is not only interested in the maximum length of a minimal rank projective resolution, but also in the number of bars in the rank exact decomposition. Our next result gives an upper bound on the size of the rank exact decomposition of a module, which, for any fixed number of parameters n , is polynomial in the size of the (usual) multigraded Betti numbers of the module. It also gives a quadratic lower bound. While the gap between the upper and lower bounds is quite significant, the result is a first step

towards establishing how practical the rank exact decomposition is. Recall that, for a fp $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, the k th multigraded Betti numbers of M are given by $\beta_k(M) = \mathcal{B}(P_k)$, where $P_\bullet \rightarrow M$ is a (usual) minimal projective resolution of M .

Result E (Proposition 5.28). *Given fp $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, let $\mathbf{b}(M) = \sum_i |\beta_i(M)|$. We have*

$$|\mathcal{B}_+^{rk}(M)| + |\mathcal{B}_-^{rk}(M)| \leq 3^{(4n+2)^{2n-2}} \cdot \mathbf{b}(M)^{(2n+1)^{2n-1}},$$

and there exists a family of fp modules $M : \mathcal{R}^2 \rightarrow \text{vec}$ for which $\mathbf{b}(M)$ can be made arbitrarily large, and such that $|\mathcal{B}_+^{rk}(M)| + |\mathcal{B}_-^{rk}(M)| \geq \mathbf{b}(M)^2/48$.

In particular, there is no linear upper bound for $|\mathcal{B}_+^{rk}(M)| + |\mathcal{B}_-^{rk}(M)|$ in terms $\mathbf{b}(M)$ that holds for all fp $M : \mathcal{R}^2 \rightarrow \text{vec}$.

Our last result regarding the rank exact decomposition establishes a universality property for \widehat{d}_B , and, as a consequence, a no-go result for distances on signed barcodes, which suggests that it may be difficult to find a non-trivial dissimilarity on signed barcodes that satisfies the triangle inequality and at the same time makes the rank exact decomposition stable, while still being easy to compute. We first note in Remark 6.2 that \widehat{d}_B does in general not satisfy the triangle inequality, even when restricted to signed barcodes that are the rank exact decomposition of a fp \mathcal{R}^n -persistence module. Thus, \widehat{d}_B is not an extended pseudo distance, but just a dissimilarity. In order to state the results, we introduce two properties of a dissimilarity on finite signed barcodes d . We say that the dissimilarity d is \mathcal{B}_\pm^{rk} -stable if it satisfies $d(\mathcal{B}_\pm^{rk}(M), \mathcal{B}_\pm^{rk}(N)) \leq d_I(M, N)$ for all fp \mathcal{R}^n -persistence modules M and N , and that it is *balanced* if it satisfies

$$d((\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_- \cup \mathcal{A}), (\mathcal{D}_+, \mathcal{D}_-)) = d((\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-), (\mathcal{D}_+ \cup \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}_-)),$$

for all finite signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes \mathcal{C}_\pm and \mathcal{D}_\pm , and finite (unsigned) \mathcal{R}^n -barcode \mathcal{A} . The motivation for considering balanced dissimilarities on signed barcodes—besides the fact that \widehat{d}_B is balanced—is that their computation reduces to the computation of a distance between unsigned barcodes, in the sense that for any balanced dissimilarity d on finite signed barcodes there exists a dissimilarity d' on finite (unsigned) barcodes such that $d(\mathcal{C}_\pm, \mathcal{D}_\pm) = d'(\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{D}_-, \mathcal{D}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-)$ for all finite signed barcodes \mathcal{C}_\pm and \mathcal{D}_\pm .

Result F (Proposition 6.5). *The collection of \mathcal{B}_\pm^{rk} -stable and balanced dissimilarity functions on finite signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes has a maximum with respect to the pointwise order, denoted d_m . We have a bi-Lipschitz equivalence*

$$\widehat{d}_B / (2n - 1)^2 \leq d_m \leq \widehat{d}_B.$$

In particular, if d is a \mathcal{B}_\pm^{rk} -stable and balanced dissimilarity function on finite signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes that satisfies the triangle inequality, then, for all fp $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ such that $d_I(M, N) < \infty$, we have $d(\mathcal{B}_\pm^{rk}(M), \mathcal{B}_\pm^{rk}(N)) = 0$.

We conclude the paper with a discussion about other exact structures on categories of persistence modules. In particular, using an approach similar to the one used to prove Result D, we compute the global dimension of the limit exact structure on persistence modules over a finite, 2-dimensional grid, and on the category of fp two-parameter persistence modules. The *limit exact structure* on the category $\text{vec}^{\mathcal{P}}$, denoted $\widehat{\text{lim}}$, is defined to be the exact structure whose exact sequences are the sequences $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ such that, for all diagrams in the indexing poset $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, the sequence of vector spaces $0 \rightarrow \lim_{\mathcal{D}}(L \circ f) \rightarrow \lim_{\mathcal{D}}(M \circ f) \rightarrow \lim_{\mathcal{D}}(N \circ f) \rightarrow 0$ is exact. The indecomposable $\widehat{\text{lim}}$ -projective modules are the interval modules with support an upset of the indexing poset.

Result G (Theorem 7.2). *We have $\text{gldim}^{\widehat{\text{lim}}}(\text{vec}^{[m]^2}) = m - 2$, where $m \geq 3$ and $[m]^2$ is the poset given by an m -by- m 2-dimensional grid. As a consequence, we have $\text{gldim}^{\widehat{\text{lim}}}(\text{vec}_{fp}^{\mathcal{R}^n}) = \infty$.*

We also discuss, in Remark 7.3, the relationship between $\widehat{\text{lim}}$ -projective resolutions and the upset resolutions of [Mil20].

1.3. Acknowledgements. L.S. thanks Ignacio Darago and Pedro Tamaroff for inspiring conversations about homological algebra.

2. BACKGROUND AND NOTATION

We assume familiarity with basic category theory and homological algebra. Throughout the paper, we fix a field \mathbb{k} and let vec denote the category of finite dimensional \mathbb{k} -vector spaces. We also fix a natural number $n \geq 1 \in \mathbb{N}$.

2.1. Distances and dissimilarities. A *dissimilarity* on a set or proper class A is a function $d : A \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ that is non-negative and satisfies $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in A$, and $d(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in A$. An *extended pseudo distance* on A is a dissimilarity that satisfies $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ for all $x, y, z \in A$.

2.2. Posets. We consider the poset of real numbers \mathcal{R} with its standard total order, and the product poset \mathcal{R}^n . For $m \geq 1 \in \mathbb{N}$, we also consider the finite poset $[m] = \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ with its standard order, and the product poset $[m]^n$. We write $0 = (0, \dots, 0) \in \mathcal{R}^n$ and $0 = (0, \dots, 0) \in [m]^n$.

2.3. Persistence modules. Let \mathcal{P} be a poset. By an abuse of notation we also denote by \mathcal{P} the category that has as objects the elements of \mathcal{P} , and exactly one morphism from i to j whenever $i \leq j \in \mathcal{P}$. A *pointwise finite dimensional \mathcal{P} -persistence module* is a functor $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$. For simplicity, we refer to pointwise finite dimensional \mathcal{P} -persistence modules simply as *\mathcal{P} -persistence modules*.

Let $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$. For $a \leq b \in \mathcal{P}$ we let $\varphi_{a,b}^M : M(a) \rightarrow M(b)$ denote the corresponding structure morphism.

2.4. Persistence modules as modules. Given a poset \mathcal{P} , we let $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ denote the \mathbb{k} -algebra that is freely generated as a \mathbb{k} -vector space by pairs $[i, j] \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P}$ with $i \leq j$, and with multiplication given by linearly extending the rule

$$[i, j] \cdot [k, l] = \begin{cases} [i, l], & \text{if } j = k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If Λ is a \mathbb{k} -algebra, we denote the category of right Λ -modules by Mod_Λ and the category of finite dimensional Λ -modules by mod_Λ .

Lemma 2.1. *There is a full and faithful functor $\text{vec}^{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}$. The functor is given by mapping $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$ to the module with underlying vector space $\bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{P}} M(i)$, and with action given by linearly extending the rule $(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} m_i) \cdot [j, k] = \varphi_{j,k}^M(m_j)$, where $m_i \in M(i) \subseteq \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{P}} M(i)$. If \mathcal{P} is finite, then this functor restricts to an equivalence of categories $\text{vec}^{\mathcal{P}} \simeq \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}$ \square*

In view of Lemma 2.1, we abuse notation and treat \mathcal{P} -persistence modules as functors $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$ or as right $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -modules, depending on the context.

Remark 2.2. If \mathcal{P} is a finite poset, then $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ is an Artin algebra and is in fact isomorphic to the incidence \mathbb{k} -algebra of the poset \mathcal{P} , as defined in [DRS72].

2.5. Interleavings. We recall the notion of interleaving between \mathcal{R}^n -persistence modules of [Les15, Les12]. Let $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0 \in \mathcal{R}^n$. The ε -*shift* of M , denoted $M[\varepsilon] : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, is such that $M[\varepsilon](r) = M(r + \varepsilon)$ and has structure morphism corresponding to $r \leq s \in \mathcal{R}^n$ given by $\varphi_{r+\varepsilon, s+\varepsilon}^M$. Shifting gives a functor $(-)[\varepsilon] : \text{vec}^{\mathcal{R}^n} \rightarrow \text{vec}^{\mathcal{R}^n}$, and, for every persistence module M , there is a natural transformation $\iota_\varepsilon^M : M \rightarrow M[\varepsilon]$ with r -component given by $\varphi_{r, r+\varepsilon}^M : M(r) \rightarrow M(r + \varepsilon)$. For $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ and $\varepsilon, \delta \geq 0 \in \mathcal{R}^n$, an $(\varepsilon; \delta)$ -*interleaving* between M and N consists of morphisms $f : M \rightarrow N[\varepsilon]$ and $g : N \rightarrow M[\delta]$ such that $g[\varepsilon] \circ f = \iota_{\varepsilon+\delta}^M$ and $f[\delta] \circ g = \iota_{\delta+\varepsilon}^N$. When $\varepsilon \geq 0 \in \mathcal{R}$, an ε -*interleaving* is defined to be an $(\varepsilon, \dots, \varepsilon; \varepsilon, \dots, \varepsilon)$ -interleaving. The *interleaving distance* between $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ is

$$d_I(M, N) = \inf(\{\varepsilon \geq 0 \in \mathcal{R} : \text{there exists an } \varepsilon\text{-interleaving between } M \text{ and } N\} \cup \{\infty\}).$$

By composing interleavings, one shows that the interleaving distance is an extended pseudo distance on the collection of \mathcal{R}^n -persistence modules.

2.6. Interval modules. Let \mathcal{P} be a poset. An *interval* of \mathcal{P} consists of a non-empty subset $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ satisfying the following two properties: if $a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, then $c \in \mathcal{I}$ for all $a \leq c \leq b$; and for all $a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, there exists a finite sequence $c_1, \dots, c_\ell \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $a = c_1$, $b = c_\ell$, and c_k and c_{k+1} are comparable for all $1 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$.

If $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ is an interval, the *interval module* with support \mathcal{I} is the persistence module $\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$ that takes the value \mathbb{k} on the elements of \mathcal{I} and the value 0 elsewhere, and is such that all the morphisms that are not constrained to be zero are the identity of \mathbb{k} .

If $i \in \mathcal{P}$, we let $\mathbf{P}_i : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$ denote the interval module with support $\{j \in \mathcal{P} : i \leq j\}$. If $i \in \mathcal{P}$, we let $\mathbf{S}_i : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$ denote the interval module with support $\{i\}$. If $i < j \in \mathcal{P} \cup \{\infty\}$, we let $\mathbf{L}_{i,j} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$

denote the interval module with support $\{k \in \mathcal{P} : i \leq k \text{ and } j \not\leq k\}$. We refer to modules of the form $L_{i,j}$ as *hook modules*, and to modules which are isomorphic to a direct sum of hook modules as *hook-decomposable* modules. We choose the notation $L_{i,j}$ and the name ‘‘hook module’’ since they are reminiscent of the shape of the support of these modules in the case $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{R}^2$. Note that, for every $i \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $P_i = L_{i,\infty}$. If $i \leq j \in \mathcal{P}$, we let $R_{i,j} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$ denote the interval module with support $\{k \in \mathcal{P} : i \leq k \leq j\}$. We refer to modules of the form $R_{i,j}$ as *rectangle modules*, taking inspiration from their shape when the indexing poset is \mathcal{R}^2 or a 2-dimensional grid.

2.7. Multisets. Let A be a set. A finite multiset of elements of A is often defined to be a function $\alpha : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, thought of as a multiplicity function, with the property that $\{a \in A : \alpha(a) > 0\}$ is finite. Using this definition, equality of multisets is simply equality of functions, but other relationships between multisets, such as functions or partial matchings between them, are harder to manipulate. For this reason, we use an equivalent notion of multiset that is more convenient for our purposes.

An *indexed multiset of elements of A* consists of a pair (I, f) , with I a set, called the *indexing set*, and f a function $I \rightarrow A$, called the *indexing function*. An indexed multiset of elements of A is *finite* if its indexing set is finite. Fix (I, f) and (J, g) indexed multisets of elements of A . A *bijection* $h : (I, f) \rightarrow (J, g)$ is simply a bijection $h : I \rightarrow J$ between the indexing sets, and an *isomorphism* between (I, f) and (J, g) is a bijection $h : (I, f) \rightarrow (J, g)$ such that $f = g \circ h$. When (I, f) and (J, g) are isomorphic, we write $(I, f) = (J, g)$. The union $(I, f) \cup (J, g)$ is the indexed multiset of elements of A given by $(I \amalg J, f \amalg g)$. We say that (I, f) and (J, g) are *disjoint* if the images of f and g are disjoint. The *multiplicity* of $a \in A$ in (I, f) is the cardinality of the preimage $f^{-1}(a) \subseteq I$.

When there is no risk of confusion, we refer to indexed multisets simply as multisets, leave the indexing function f of a multiset (I, f) implicit, and do not distinguish an element $i \in I$ from $f(i) \in A$. When the indexing is relevant, we often write $\{a_i\}_{i \in I}$ for an indexed multiset of elements of A .

2.8. Barcodes and signed barcodes. Let \mathcal{P} be a poset. A \mathcal{P} -*barcode* consists of a multiset of isomorphism classes of indecomposable \mathcal{P} -persistence modules. A *signed \mathcal{P} -barcode* consists of an ordered pair of \mathcal{P} -barcodes. When there is no risk of confusion, we keep the poset \mathcal{P} implicit and refer to \mathcal{P} -barcodes as barcodes and to signed \mathcal{P} -barcodes as signed barcodes.

We denote the isomorphism class of a persistence module M by $[M]$. By [BCB20, Theorem 1] and the Krull–Remak–Schmidt–Azumaya theorem [Azu50], any \mathcal{P} -persistence module M decomposes as a direct sum of indecomposables $M \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ for a unique (up to isomorphism of multisets) multiset of isomorphism classes of indecomposables $\{[M_i]\}_{i \in I}$; we denote $\mathcal{B}(M) = \{[M_i]\}_{i \in I}$, which is independent of the choice of decomposition of M as direct sum of indecomposables.

2.9. Matchings, bottleneck distance, and signed bottleneck dissimilarity. A *partial matching* $h : (I, f) \dashrightarrow (J, g)$ between multisets (I, f) and (J, g) consists of subsets $\text{coim}(h) \subseteq I$ and $\text{im}(h) \subseteq J$ and a bijection $h : \text{coim}(h) \rightarrow \text{im}(h)$. We often refer to a partial matching $h : (I, f) \dashrightarrow (J, g)$ simply as a matching. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{[M_i]\}_{i \in I}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \{[N_j]\}_{j \in J}$ be \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes and let $\varepsilon \geq 0 \in \mathcal{R}$. An ε -*matching* between \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} is a matching $h : \mathcal{C} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that

- for all $i \in \text{coim}(h)$, the modules M_i and $N_{h(i)}$ are ε -interleaved,
- for all $i \in I \setminus \text{coim}(h)$, the module M_i is ε -interleaved with the zero module,
- for all $j \in J \setminus \text{im}(h)$, the module N_j is ε -interleaved with the zero module.

Although the interleaving distance between indecomposable modules may be hard to compute in general, in Remark 4.4 we give an explicit formula for computing the interleaving distance between hook modules, which is of particular relevance to this work.

The *bottleneck distance* between \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} is

$$d_B(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) = \inf \{ \varepsilon \geq 0 \in \mathcal{R} : \text{there exists an } \varepsilon\text{-matching between } \mathcal{C} \text{ and } \mathcal{D} \} \cup \{ \infty \}.$$

By composing matchings, one shows that the bottleneck distance is an extended pseudo distance on the collection of \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes. Note that, for $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, we always have $d_I(M, N) \leq d_B(\mathcal{B}(M), \mathcal{B}(N))$.

The *signed bottleneck dissimilarity* between signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes \mathcal{C}_\pm and \mathcal{D}_\pm is

$$\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{C}_\pm, \mathcal{D}_\pm) = d_B(\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{D}_-, \mathcal{D}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-).$$

2.10. Rank decompositions. Let \mathcal{P} be a poset. The *rank invariant* [CZ09] of a module $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$ is the function $\text{rk}(M) : \{(a, b) \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P} : a \leq b\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ where $\text{rk}(M)(a, b)$ is the rank of the structure morphism $\varphi_{a,b}^M : M(a) \rightarrow M(b)$. A *rank decomposition* of a \mathcal{P} -persistence module M is a signed barcode \mathcal{C}_\pm such that $\text{rk}(M) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{C}_+} \text{rk}(A) - \sum_{B \in \mathcal{C}_-} \text{rk}(B)$ as \mathbb{Z} -valued functions. We recall the existence of the minimal rank decompositions by rectangles and by hooks from [BOO21].

A *right open rectangle module* over \mathcal{R}^n is an interval \mathcal{R}^n -persistence module with support $[a_1, b_1] \times \cdots \times [a_n, b_n] \subseteq \mathcal{R}^n$ for some $a \leq b \in (\mathcal{R} \cup \{\infty\})^n$. We denote such an interval module by $R_{a,b}^o$.

Theorem 2.3 ([BOO21, Corollary 5.6]). *Let $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ be fp. There exists a unique signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcode $\mathcal{B}_\pm^\square(M) = (\mathcal{B}_+^\square(M), \mathcal{B}_-^\square(M))$ with the following properties:*

- the (isomorphism classes of) modules appearing in $\mathcal{B}_+^\square(M)$ and $\mathcal{B}_-^\square(M)$ are right open rectangle modules;
- the multisets $\mathcal{B}_+^\square(M)$ and $\mathcal{B}_-^\square(M)$ are disjoint;
- $\mathcal{B}_\pm^\square(M)$ is a rank decomposition of M .

Similarly, there exists a unique signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcode $\mathcal{B}_\pm^\natural(M) = (\mathcal{B}_+^\natural(M), \mathcal{B}_-^\natural(M))$ with the following properties:

- the (isomorphism classes of) modules appearing in $\mathcal{B}_+^\natural(M)$ and $\mathcal{B}_-^\natural(M)$ are hook modules;
- the multisets $\mathcal{B}_+^\natural(M)$ and $\mathcal{B}_-^\natural(M)$ are disjoint;
- $\mathcal{B}_\pm^\natural(M)$ is a rank decomposition of M .

If $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ is fp, we refer to $\mathcal{B}_\pm^\square(M)$ and $\mathcal{B}_\pm^\natural(M)$ as the *minimal rank decomposition by rectangles* of M and the *minimal rank decomposition by hooks* of M , respectively.

2.11. Basic homological algebra of persistence modules. Let \mathcal{P} be a poset and let $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$. We say that M is *finitely presentable* (abbreviated *fp*) if it is isomorphic to the cokernel of a morphism $P \rightarrow Q$ such that P and Q are isomorphic to finite direct sums of modules of the form P_i . The subcategory of $\text{vec}^\mathcal{P}$ spanned by fp \mathcal{P} -persistence modules is denoted by $\text{vec}_{fp}^\mathcal{P}$. Note that $\text{vec}_{fp}^\mathcal{P}$ is an Abelian category. If \mathcal{P} is finite, then every \mathcal{P} -persistence module is finitely presentable, but this need not be the case if \mathcal{P} is infinite. The following is well known (see, e.g., [Mit65, Chapter 9, Corollary 7.3]).

Lemma 2.4. *Let \mathcal{P} be a finite poset. A module $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}$ is $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -projective if and only if M is isomorphic to a direct sum $\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i$ for some finite multiset I of elements of \mathcal{P} . If \mathcal{P} has a minimum $0 \in \mathcal{P}$, a module $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}$ is $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -injective if and only if it is isomorphic to a direct sum $\bigoplus_{i \in I} R_{0,i}$ for some finite multiset I of elements of \mathcal{P} . \square*

The following is well known and follows from, e.g., [Mit65, Chapter 9, Corollary 10.3].

Lemma 2.5. *If \mathcal{P} is a finite poset, then every module $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}$ admits a finite $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -projective resolution and a finite $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -injective resolution. \square*

2.12. Exact structures. We start with a standard definition to fix notation. A sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$ in an Abelian category is *exact* if f is the kernel of g and g is the cokernel of f . We refer to exact sequences of the form $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ as *short exact sequences*.

Let \mathcal{E} be a collection of short exact sequences of an Abelian category \mathcal{C} . If $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{i} B \xrightarrow{d} C \rightarrow 0$ is in \mathcal{E} , we say that i is an *inflation* and that d is a *deflation*. The collection \mathcal{E} is an *exact structure* on \mathcal{C} if it satisfies the following properties:

- \mathcal{E} is closed under isomorphisms of short exact sequences;
- the identity morphism on the zero object is a deflation;
- the composition of two deflations is a deflation;
- the pullback of a deflation along any morphism is a deflation;
- the pushout of an inflation along any morphism is an inflation.

As an illustrative example, the collection of all short exact sequences of an Abelian category \mathcal{C} forms an exact structure on \mathcal{C} . For a thorough introduction to the theory of exact structures as well as some context and history, we refer the reader to [DRSS99]. Note that the notion of exact structure is self-dual.

Let \mathcal{E} be an exact structure on an Abelian category \mathcal{C} . A short exact sequence of \mathcal{C} is \mathcal{E} -*exact* if it belongs to the exact structure \mathcal{E} . A sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow A_{k+1} \xrightarrow{f_{k+1}} A_k \xrightarrow{f_k} A_{k-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow A_0$$

is \mathcal{E} -*exact* if it is exact and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \ker(f_{k+1}) \rightarrow A_k \rightarrow \text{coker}(f_{k+1}) \rightarrow 0$ is \mathcal{E} -exact. An object $X \in \mathcal{C}$ is \mathcal{E} -*projective* if $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, -) : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$ maps sequences in

\mathcal{E} to short exact sequences of Abelian groups. The notion of \mathcal{E} -injective is dual. An \mathcal{E} -projective resolution of $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ consists of an \mathcal{E} -exact sequence $\cdots \rightarrow X_{k+1} \rightarrow X_k \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow 0$ where X_k is \mathcal{E} -projective for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The notion of \mathcal{E} -injective resolution is dual.

2.13. Signed barcodes from exact structures. Let \mathcal{P} be a poset and let \mathcal{E} be an exact structure on the category of \mathcal{P} -persistence modules. Assume that $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$ admits a minimal \mathcal{E} -projective resolution $P_\bullet \rightarrow M$. In that case, we define the k th \mathcal{E} -relative Betti numbers of M by $\beta_k^\mathcal{E}(M) := \mathcal{B}(P_k)$, which are independent of the particular choice of minimal resolution for M . We also define the \mathcal{E} -signed barcode of M as the signed barcode

$$\mathcal{B}_\pm^\mathcal{E}(M) := \left(\bigcup_{k \text{ even}} \beta_k^\mathcal{E}(M), \bigcup_{k \text{ odd}} \beta_k^\mathcal{E}(M) \right).$$

The prototypical example comes from the usual exact structure on the category of *fp* \mathcal{P} -persistence modules, which has as exact sequences the usual exact sequences. The k th Betti numbers of a *fp* \mathcal{P} -persistence module M relative to the usual exact structure are called the k th (multigraded) Betti numbers of M , and are denoted by $\beta_k(M)$.

2.14. The rank exact structure. Let \mathcal{P} be a poset. A short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ in $\text{vec}^\mathcal{P}$ is *rank exact* [BOO21] if $\text{rk}(B) = \text{rk}(A) + \text{rk}(C)$.

Theorem 2.6 ([BOO21, Theorem 4.4 and Proposition 4.14]). *Let \mathcal{P} be a poset.*

- (1) *The collection of rank exact sequences forms an exact structure on the category $\text{vec}^\mathcal{P}$, called the rank exact structure. The projectives of this exact structure are the hook-decomposable modules.*
- (2) *Let $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ be *fp*. Then, M admits a minimal rank projective resolution, which is finite and unique up to isomorphism. This resolution is the left Kan extension of a minimal rank projective resolution of a module $M' : [m]^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ along a monotonic map $f : [m]^n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^n$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

For any fixed poset \mathcal{P} , we denote the rank exact structure on the category of \mathcal{P} -persistence modules by rk .

Since Theorem 2.6(2), which corresponds to [BOO21, Proposition 4.14], is not stated in exactly that way in [BOO21], we include a proof of the result in Appendix A, for completeness.

By Theorem 2.6(2), any *fp* \mathcal{R}^n -persistence module admits Betti numbers relative to the rank exact structure. We can thus instantiate the definition of relative signed barcode to the rank exact structure on *fp* persistence modules, which we now do. The *rank exact decomposition* of a *fp* persistence module $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ is the signed barcode

$$\mathcal{B}_\pm^{\text{rk}}(M) = \left(\bigcup_{k \text{ even}} \beta_k^{\text{rk}}(M), \bigcup_{k \text{ odd}} \beta_k^{\text{rk}}(M) \right).$$

2.15. Stability of relative projective resolutions. An exact structure \mathcal{E} on $\text{vec}^{\mathcal{R}^n}$ is *shift-invariant* if, for all $\varepsilon \geq 0 \in \mathcal{R}$ and \mathcal{E} -exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$, we have that $0 \rightarrow A[\varepsilon] \rightarrow B[\varepsilon] \rightarrow C[\varepsilon] \rightarrow 0$ is \mathcal{E} -exact. The following result is a straightforward generalization of the stability of projective resolutions proven in [OS21, Section 3]; we include its proof in Appendix A, for completeness.

Proposition 2.7. *Let \mathcal{E} be a shift-invariant exact structure on $\text{vec}^{\mathcal{R}^n}$. Let $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, and let $P_\bullet \rightarrow M$ and $Q_\bullet \rightarrow N$ be \mathcal{E} -projective resolutions of finite length. If M and N are ε -interleaved, then so are*

$$P_0 \oplus Q_1[\varepsilon] \oplus P_2[2\varepsilon] \oplus Q_3[3\varepsilon] \oplus \cdots \text{ and } Q_0 \oplus P_1[\varepsilon] \oplus Q_2[2\varepsilon] \oplus P_3[3\varepsilon] \oplus \cdots$$

3. BOTTLENECK INSTABILITY OF MINIMAL RANK DECOMPOSITIONS

In this section, we prove Proposition 3.1, the instability result for minimal rank decompositions by rectangles in the signed bottleneck dissimilarity. We also explain in Remark 3.2 how a similar example shows that minimal rank decompositions by hooks are also not stable in the signed bottleneck dissimilarity.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $n \geq 2 \in \mathbb{N}$. There is no function $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $f(r) \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow 0} 0$ such that the following inequality holds for all *fp* modules $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$:*

$$\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{B}_\pm^{\text{rk}}(M), \mathcal{B}_\pm^{\text{rk}}(N)) \leq f(d_I(M, N)).$$




FIGURE 3. The minimal rank decompositions of the modules A and B of the proof of Proposition 3.1, when $k = 4$.

Proof. We prove the claim in the case $n = 2$. Examples in dimension $n \geq 3$ can be constructed by taking the external tensor product of each of the modules in the example we give with $P_0 : \mathcal{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \text{vec}$, where the external tensor product of $X : \mathcal{R}^k \rightarrow \text{vec}$ and $Y : \mathcal{R}^\ell \rightarrow \text{vec}$ is the persistence module $X \widehat{\otimes} Y : \mathcal{R}^{k+\ell} \rightarrow \text{vec}$ with $(X \widehat{\otimes} Y)(r) = X(r_1, \dots, r_k) \otimes Y(r_{k+1}, \dots, r_{k+\ell})$.

Let $b = 10$ and $a = 2$. Let $H_{a,b}, V_{a,b}, T_a : \mathcal{R}^2 \rightarrow \text{vec}$ be the right open rectangle modules with support $[0, b) \times [0, a)$, $[0, a) \times [0, b)$, and $[0, a) \times [0, a)$, respectively. Let $M_{a,b}$ be the interval module whose support is the union of the supports of $H_{a,b}$ and $V_{a,b}$. In particular, we have $\mathcal{B}_\pm^\square(M_{a,b}) = (\{[V_{a,b}], [H_{a,b}]\}, \{[T_a]\})$. Given a natural number $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\varepsilon = 1/(k+1)$ and consider the following two persistence modules

$$\begin{aligned} A &= (M_{a,b} \oplus T_a) \oplus (M_{a+\varepsilon,b} \oplus T_{a+\varepsilon}) \oplus (M_{a+2\varepsilon,b} \oplus T_{a+2\varepsilon}) \oplus \cdots \oplus (M_{a+k\varepsilon,b} \oplus T_{a+k\varepsilon}) \\ B &= (M_{a,b} \oplus T_{a+\varepsilon}) \oplus (M_{a+\varepsilon,b} \oplus T_{a+2\varepsilon}) \oplus (M_{a+2\varepsilon,b} \oplus T_{a+3\varepsilon}) \oplus \cdots \oplus (M_{a+k\varepsilon,b} \oplus T_{a+(k+1)\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that A and B are $\varepsilon/2$ -interleaved, and that their minimal rank decompositions by rectangles are as follows (see Fig. 3):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_\pm^\square(A) &= (\{[V_{a,b}], [H_{a,b}]\} \cup \{[V_{a+\varepsilon,b}], [H_{a+\varepsilon,b}]\} \cup \cdots \cup \{[V_{a+k\varepsilon,b}], [H_{a+k\varepsilon,b}]\}, \emptyset) \\ \mathcal{B}_\pm^\square(B) &= (\{[V_{a,b}], [H_{a,b}]\} \cup \{[V_{a+\varepsilon,b}], [H_{a+\varepsilon,b}]\} \cup \cdots \cup \{[V_{a+k\varepsilon,b}], [H_{a+k\varepsilon,b}]\} \cup \{[T_{a+(k+1)\varepsilon}]\}, \{[T_a]\}). \end{aligned}$$

Any matching between $\mathcal{B}_\pm^\square(A)$ and $\mathcal{B}_\pm^\square(B)$ has cost at least 1, since $[T_a] \in \mathcal{B}_\pm^\square(B)$ is either unmatched, which has cost 1, matched with $[T_{a+(k+1)\varepsilon}] = [T_{a+1}] \in \mathcal{B}_\pm^\square(B)$, which has cost 1, or matched with another bar in $\mathcal{B}_\pm^\square(B)$, which has cost larger than 1. By letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ we get a sequence of pairs of modules A and B whose interleaving distance converges to 0, and such that an optimal matching between their minimal rank decomposition by rectangles has cost at least 1. \square

Remark 3.2. An example analogous to that in the proof of Proposition 3.1 shows that the minimal rank decomposition by hooks (Section 2.10) is also not stable in the signed bottleneck dissimilarity when $n \geq 2$. To build the example, one replaces the modules $M_{a+i\varepsilon,b}$ by the modules $T_{a+i\varepsilon}$, the modules $T_{a+i\varepsilon}$ by the modules $\mathsf{L}_{0,(a+i\varepsilon,a+i\varepsilon)}$, the modules $H_{a+i\varepsilon,b}$ by the modules $\mathsf{L}_{0,(0,a+i\varepsilon)}$, and the modules $V_{a+i\varepsilon,b}$ by the modules $\mathsf{L}_{0,(a+i\varepsilon,0)}$.

4. BOTTLENECK STABILITY OF HOOK-DECOMPOSABLE MODULES

In this section, we prove Proposition 4.3, the bottleneck stability result for hook-decomposable modules. We also give Remark 4.4, in which we compute the cost of matching hooks explicitly and describe some of

the differences and similarities between hook modules and (right open) rectangle modules. We start with some definitions that let us state simple generalizations of the main constructions in [Bje21].

Let \mathcal{P} be a class of indecomposable persistence modules $\mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$. A *matching constant* for \mathcal{P} is a number $c \geq 1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, whenever $P, Q : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ are ε -interleaved countably \mathcal{P} -decomposable modules, there exists a $c\varepsilon$ -matching between $\mathcal{B}(P)$ and $\mathcal{B}(Q)$ and thus, in particular, we have $d_B(\mathcal{B}(P), \mathcal{B}(Q)) \leq c \cdot d_I(P, Q)$.

We use the following version of Bjerkevik's stability result [Bje21]; the proof of the result is analogous to the proof of [Bje21, Theorem 4.2], which relies on [Bje21, Lemma 4.8]. In order to adapt the proof of [Bje21, Lemma 4.8] to the setting of Theorem 4.1, one uses conditions (1) and (2) of Theorem 4.1 instead of [Bje21, Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7], respectively.

Theorem 4.1 (Bjerkevik). *Let \mathcal{P} be a class of isomorphism classes of interval modules that is closed under shifts, and for which there exists a total pre-order \preceq and a constant $c \geq 1$ satisfying the following two conditions for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $R, S, T \in \mathcal{P}$ with $R \preceq T$:*

- (1) *If there are non-zero morphisms $\mathbb{k}_R \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_S[\varepsilon]$ and $\mathbb{k}_S \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_T[\varepsilon]$, then S is $c\varepsilon$ -interleaved with R or T .*
- (2) *Assume R and T are $2c\varepsilon$ -significant. If there are non-zero morphisms $\mathbb{k}_R \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_S[\varepsilon]$ and $\mathbb{k}_S \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_T[\varepsilon]$, then their composite $\mathbb{k}_R \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_T[2\varepsilon]$ is non-zero.*

Then c is a matching constant for \mathcal{P} . □

The following lemma is also implicit in Bjerkevik's work.

Lemma 4.2. *Let \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' be isomorphism classes of interval modules with matching constants c and c' . Suppose that, every time R and T belong to one of the two classes and S belongs to the other class, we have that any composite $\mathbb{k}_R \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_S \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_T$ is zero. Then $\max(c, c')$ is a matching constant for $\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{P}'$. □*

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $P, Q : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ decompose as countable direct sums of hook modules and let $\varepsilon \geq 0$. If P and Q are ε -interleaved, then there exists a $(2n - 1)\varepsilon$ -matching between $\mathcal{B}(P)$ and $\mathcal{B}(Q)$.*

Proof. We use Lemma 4.2 with one class consisting of modules of the form $\mathbb{L}_{a,b}$ with $a < b \in \mathcal{R}^n$, and the other class consisting of modules of the form $\mathbb{L}_{a,\infty} = \mathbb{P}_a$ with $a \in \mathcal{R}^n$. By [Bje21, Theorem 4.16], and the bottleneck stability theorem for one-parameter barcodes, a matching constant for the second class is $\max(1, n - 1)$.

It thus suffices to show that $2n - 1$ is a matching constant for the first class. To prove this, we use Theorem 4.1, so we need to verify conditions (1) and (2). We start by defining the pre-order \preceq , which we do by following Bjerkevik's arguments. For $i \in \mathcal{R}^n$, let $\alpha(i) = \sum_{k=1}^n i_k$. Now, we let $\mathbb{L}_{i,j} \preceq \mathbb{L}_{i',j'}$ if and only if $\alpha(i) + \alpha(j) \leq \alpha(i') + \alpha(j')$.

To verify condition (1), one follows the proof of [Bje21, Lemma 4.6] word by word.

To verify condition (2), we adapt the proof of [Bje21, Lemma 4.7]. Suppose that there exist non-zero morphisms $f : \mathbb{L}_{i,j} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{a,b}[\varepsilon]$ and $g : \mathbb{L}_{a,b} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{c,d}[\varepsilon]$, that $\mathbb{L}_{i,j} \preceq \mathbb{L}_{c,d}$, and that $\mathbb{L}_{i,j}$ and $\mathbb{L}_{c,d}$ are $2(2n - 1)\varepsilon$ -significant. We must prove that $g[\varepsilon] \circ f$ is non-zero, and we proceed by contradiction. If we assume $g[\varepsilon] \circ f = 0$, then, we claim we have the following:

- (i) $i + 2\varepsilon \geq c$;
- (ii) $i + 2\varepsilon \geq d$;
- (iii) $j + 2\varepsilon \geq d$;
- (iv) $j_k > d_k + (2n - 4)\varepsilon$ for some $1 \leq k \leq n$;
- (v) $i_{k'} > c_{k'} + (2n - 4)\varepsilon$ for some $1 \leq k' \leq n$.

The first and third claims follow from the fact that f and g are non-zero. The second claim follows from the fact that, if $i_l + 2\varepsilon < d_l$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n$, then $\mathbb{L}_{i,j}$ and $\mathbb{L}_{c,d}[2\varepsilon]$ would intersect, and $g[\varepsilon] \circ f$ would be non-zero. The fourth claim follows from the second claim and the fact that R is $(4n - 2)\varepsilon$ -significant, while the fifth claim follows from the second one and the fact that T is $(4n - 2)\varepsilon$ -significant. We can then compute as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(i) + \alpha(j) &= \sum_{m=1}^n i_m + \sum_{m'=1}^n j_{m'} \\ &> c_m + (2n - 4)\varepsilon + d_{m'} + (2n - 4)\varepsilon + \sum_{m \neq k} (c_m - 2\varepsilon) + \sum_{m' \neq k'} (d_{m'} - 2\varepsilon) \\ &= \alpha(c) + \alpha(d) + (4n - 4)\varepsilon \geq \alpha(c) + \alpha(d), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the fact that $\mathbb{L}_{i,j} \preceq \mathbb{L}_{c,d}$. □

Remark 4.4. When $i < j \in \mathcal{R}^n$, the pair (i, j) determines both the right open rectangle module $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^o$ and the hook module $\mathbf{L}_{i,j}$. There thus seem to be a kind of duality between these two types of modules. We warn the reader that, in general, right open rectangle modules and their corresponding hook modules can have quite different properties. As an important example, note that $d_I(\mathbf{R}_{(0,0),(2,1)}^o, 0) = 1/2$, while $d_I(\mathbf{L}_{(0,0),(2,1)}, 0) = 1$. This prevents us from directly applying [Bje21, Theorem 4.3] to prove Proposition 4.3.

We now give explicit formulas for the interleaving distance between rectangles and between hooks. We then use these to derive some relationships between rectangles and their corresponding hook modules. Let $a < b \in \mathcal{R}^n$ and $c < d \in \mathcal{R}^n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} d_I(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}^o, 0) &= \min_{1 \leq k \leq n} |b_k - a_k|/2 \\ d_I(\mathbf{L}_{a,b}, 0) &= \|b - a\|_\infty/2 \\ d_I(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}^o, \mathbf{R}_{c,d}^o) &= \min \left(\max(\|c - a\|_\infty, \|d - b\|_\infty), \max(d_I(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}^o, 0), d_I(\mathbf{R}_{c,d}^o, 0)) \right) \\ d_I(\mathbf{L}_{a,b}, \mathbf{L}_{c,d}) &= \min \left(\max(\|c - a\|_\infty, \|d - b\|_\infty), \max(d_I(\mathbf{L}_{a,b}, 0), d_I(\mathbf{L}_{c,d}, 0)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We thus have the following property relating rectangle modules and hook modules:

- (1) An ε -matching between barcodes consisting of hook modules induces an ε -matching between the barcodes consisting of the corresponding right open rectangle modules.

Similarly, it is not hard to prove the following:

- (2) Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and suppose that M and N are right open rectangle-decomposable modules with the property that all of their indecomposable summands are not ε -interleaved with the zero module. If M and N are ε -interleaved, then so are their corresponding hook-decomposable modules.

With this in mind, [Bje21, Example 5.2] implies that, when $n = 2$, the constant $2n - 1 = 3$ of Proposition 4.3 is the smallest possible.

5. GLOBAL DIMENSION OF THE RANK EXACT STRUCTURE AND SIZE OF THE RANK EXACT DECOMPOSITION

In Section 5.1, we give lower and upper bounds for the global dimension of the rank exact structure on the category of modules over a finite lattice, and use these to prove Theorem 5.18, which gives the global dimension of the rank exact structure on the category of fp \mathcal{R}^n -persistence modules. In Section 5.2, we prove Proposition 5.28, which gives lower and upper bounds for the size of the rank exact decomposition of a fp module M in terms of the size of the (usual) Betti numbers of M .

5.1. Global dimension. The general strategy to give an upper bound for the global dimension of the rank exact structure on the category of modules over a finite lattice is to construct a functor to a different category of modules, which maps rank projective resolutions to usual projective resolutions. The codomain of the functor is not a category of modules over a poset, but it is a category of modules over the quotient of a poset algebra related to the hook modules. This approach ends up requiring a good upper bound for the (usual) projective dimension of a module over a poset, and we start with this.

The following is a Koszul-like resolution for interval modules whose support is an upset of a lattice. We use this resolution in Corollary 5.3 to bound the projective dimension of rectangle modules, which in particular include the (usual) injective modules.

Proposition 5.1. *Let \mathcal{P} be a lattice. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $f : [m] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ be a function, not assumed to be monotonic. Let $\mathcal{I} = \{i \in \mathcal{P} : \exists k \in [m], f(k) \leq i\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ be the upset generated by $f([m])$. There exists a $k\mathcal{P}$ -projective resolution of $\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of length $m - 1$, as follows:*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbf{P}_{\vee f([m])} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{A \subseteq [m] \\ |A|=m-1}} \mathbf{P}_{\vee f(A)} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{A \subseteq [m] \\ |A|=2}} \mathbf{P}_{\vee f(A)} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{k \in [m]} \mathbf{P}_{f(k)} \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}.$$

If for every proper subset $A \subsetneq [m]$ we have $\vee f(A) < \vee f([m])$, then the above resolution is a shortest possible projective resolution.

Proof. We start by specifying the morphisms in the resolution. For convenience, given a function $h : S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ and an element of a direct sum $x \in \bigoplus_{s \in S} \mathbf{P}_{h(s)}$ we let $x = \sum_{s \in S} x_s \{s\}$, so that x_s denotes the component

of x belonging to $\mathcal{P}_{h(s)}$. Note that

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{A \subseteq [m] \\ |A|=k}} \mathcal{P}_{\vee f(A)} = \bigoplus_{\substack{g:[k] \rightarrow [m] \text{ injective} \\ \text{and monotonic}}} \mathcal{P}_{\vee f(g([k]))}.$$

Given $g : [k] \rightarrow [m]$ injective and monotonic and $l \in [m]$, let $g^l : [k-1] \rightarrow [m]$ denote the composite of g with the unique injective and monotonic function $[k-1] \rightarrow [k]$ that does not have l in its image. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \bigoplus_{\substack{g:[k] \rightarrow [m] \\ \text{inj. and mon.}}} \mathcal{P}_{\vee f(g([k]))} &\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{g:[k-1] \rightarrow [m] \\ \text{inj. and mon.}}} \mathcal{P}_{\vee f(g([k]))} \\ \sum_g x_g \{g\} &\longmapsto \sum_g \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} (-1)^l \iota^{g,l}(x_g) \{g^l\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\iota^{g,l} : \mathcal{P}_{\vee f(g([k]))} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\vee f(g^l([k-1]))}$ denotes the canonical injection. It is easy to see that this gives a well-defined sequence of morphism of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -modules, and that the composite of consecutive morphisms is zero. It is also easy to see that the cokernel of the last morphism, from $k=2$ to $k=1$, is isomorphic to $\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}$. In order to see that the sequence is exact, it is enough to consider all the modules as persistence modules, evaluate the chain complex at each $i \in \mathcal{P}$, and check that one gets an exact sequence of vector spaces. This is indeed the case, as the sequence of vector spaces one obtains is easily seen to be isomorphic to a tensor power of the resolution $0 \rightarrow \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$.

Finally, if we additionally assume that $\vee f(A) < \vee f([m])$ for all proper subsets A of $[m]$, then the first morphism (on the left) of the resolution is not a split monomorphism, so the resolution is a shortest possible projective resolution. \square

Notation 5.2. Let \mathcal{P} be a finite poset. If $i \in \mathcal{P}$, let $i^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ be the set of minimal elements of $\{a \in \mathcal{P} : a \not\leq i\}$, and let $i^+ = \{a \in \mathcal{P} : i < a, \nexists i < j < a\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ be the set of elements directly above i in the Hasse diagram of \mathcal{P} .

Corollary 5.3. Let \mathcal{P} be a finite lattice, let $0 \in \mathcal{P}$ denote its minimum, and let $i \in \mathcal{P}$. Then $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{R}_{0,i}) \leq |i^\wedge|$. If for any proper subset $A \subsetneq i^\wedge$ we have $\vee A < \vee i^\wedge$, then $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{R}_{0,i}) = |i^\wedge|$.

Proof. This follows by combining Proposition 5.1 with the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{0,i} \rightarrow 0$, where \mathcal{I} is the upset generated by i^\wedge . \square

We now start setting up the functor that takes rank projective resolutions to usual projective resolutions in a different module category. The functor takes modules over a lattice \mathcal{S} to modules over an algebra $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$ that is related to the lattice, and that we now define. We then give a lemma that gives a concrete characterization of the algebra $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$, which we use later.

Definition 5.4. If $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ are finite posets, let $e = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}} [i, i] \in \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ be the idempotent of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ corresponding to \mathcal{Q} . We define the quotient algebra $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q} := \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/(e)$, where (e) is the two-sided ideal of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ generated by e .

Lemma 5.5. Let $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ be finite posets. The \mathbb{k} -algebra $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$ is isomorphic to the following \mathbb{k} -algebra \mathbb{A} . As a vector space, \mathbb{A} is freely generated by pairs $[i, j]$ such that $i \leq j \in \mathcal{P}$ and such that there does not exist $x \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $i \leq x \leq j$. The multiplication of \mathbb{A} is given by linearly extending the rule

$$[i, j] \cdot [k, l] = \begin{cases} [i, l], & \text{if } j = k, \text{ and } \nexists x \in \mathcal{Q} \text{ such that } i \leq x \leq l. \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Consider the \mathbb{k} -linear map $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ which maps $[i, j]$ to $[i, j]$ if there does not exist $x \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $i \leq x \leq j$, and to 0 otherwise. It is clear that this linear map is a \mathbb{k} -algebra morphism. Its kernel is generated, as a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -bimodule, by the elements $[x, x]$ with $x \in \mathcal{Q}$. Thus, its kernel is the two-sided ideal (e) , where $e \in \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ is the idempotent corresponding to \mathcal{Q} . \square

The following results establish basic homological facts about $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$.

Lemma 5.6. Let $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ be finite posets such that any subset of \mathcal{Q} has a join in \mathcal{P} which lies in \mathcal{Q} . Then, for $k \notin \mathcal{Q}$ we have $\text{Tor}_d^{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}) = 0$, for all $d > 0 \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Denote by $e \in \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ the idempotent of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ corresponding to Ω . Note that, as left $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -modules, we have

$$(e) = \text{Span}\{[i, j] : \exists s \in \Omega \text{ with } i \leq s \leq j\} \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{P} \text{ s.t.} \\ \exists s \in \Omega, s \leq j}} \mathbb{P}_{\vee\{s \in \Omega : s \leq j\}},$$

where Span is taken as a submodule of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathbb{P}_i = \text{Span}\{[i, i]\} \subseteq \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ as left $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -modules. In particular, we have a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -projective resolution of the left $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -module $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$:

$$0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{P} \text{ s.t.} \\ \exists s \in \Omega, s \leq j}} \mathbb{P}_{\vee\{s \in \Omega : s \leq j\}} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega \rightarrow 0.$$

In order to compute $\text{Tor}_d^{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(\mathbb{S}_k, \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega)$, we tensor the above resolution by \mathbb{S}_k on the left. Note that $\mathbb{S}_k \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_i = 0$, unless $k = i$. Since $k \notin \Omega$ and $\vee\{s \in \Omega : s \leq j\} \in \Omega$ for all $j \in \mathcal{P}$, we have that

$$\mathbb{S}_k \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}} \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{P} \text{ s.t.} \\ \exists s \in \Omega, s \leq j}} \mathbb{P}_{\vee\{s \in \Omega : s \leq j\}} \right) = 0,$$

which implies that $\text{Tor}_d^{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(\mathbb{S}_k, \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega) = 0$ for all $d > 0 \in \mathbb{N}$, as required. \square

Lemma 5.7. *If $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ are finite posets such that any subset of Ω has a join in \mathcal{P} which lies in Ω , then $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega) \leq \text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P})$.*

Proof. By a standard result (see, e.g., [MR01, Section 7, Corollary 1.14]), it is enough to show that, for every simple module $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega}$, we have $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega}(M) \leq \text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P})$. We claim that any simple $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$ -module M is isomorphic to $\mathbb{S}_i \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$ for some $i \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \Omega$. To see this, note that, as a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -module, the module M must also be simple. This implies that, as a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -module, M must be isomorphic to \mathbb{S}_i for some $i \in \mathcal{P}$, so that, as a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$ -module, M must be isomorphic to $\mathbb{S}_i \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$, with $i \notin \Omega$ since M is non-zero.

We can now take a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -projective resolution of \mathbb{S}_i of length at most $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P})$ and tensor it on the right with $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$, which, by Lemma 5.6, gives us a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$ -projective resolution of $\mathbb{S}_i \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega \cong M$ of length at most $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P})$, as required. \square

Lemma 5.8. *Let \mathcal{P} be a finite lattice and let $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ be closed under joins and meets. For any $i \notin \Omega$, we have that $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega}(\mathbb{S}_i \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega) \leq |i^+|$. If, moreover, $\vee i^+ \notin \Omega$ and for any proper subset $A \subsetneq i^+$ we have $\vee A < \vee i^+$, then $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega}(\mathbb{S}_i \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega) = |i^+|$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{I} be the upset of elements that are greater than or equal to an element of i^+ . By splicing the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_i \rightarrow 0$ with the resolution of $\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}$ in Proposition 5.1, we get a projective resolution of \mathbb{S}_i of length $|i^+|$. Tensor this resolution with $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$. By Lemma 5.6 we obtain a projective resolution of $\mathbb{S}_i \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$ over $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$, which proves the first claim. To prove the second claim, note that, under the additional assumptions of the claim, the first map (on the left) in the resolution we constructed is not a split monomorphism. \square

Before constructing the functor from modules over a lattice \mathcal{S} to modules over $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$, we fix some notation.

Notation 5.9. For the rest of this section, we let \mathcal{S} be a finite lattice, we let $\mathcal{S}_{\infty} := \mathcal{S} \cup \{\infty\}$, and we let $\mathcal{P} := \{(a, b) \in \mathcal{S}_{\infty}^2 : a \leq b\}$, which is a lattice. Note that $\Omega = \{(a, a) : a \in \mathcal{S}_{\infty}\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ is a sublattice of \mathcal{P} . We write $\mathbb{L} = \bigoplus_{a < b \in \mathcal{S}_{\infty}} \mathbb{L}_{a,b} \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$. We denote the projective dimension relative to the rank exact structure of a module $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$ by $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}^{\text{rk}}(M)$.

Lemma 5.10. *We have an isomorphism of \mathbb{k} -algebras $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}) \cong \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\Omega$.*

Proof. We start by noting that

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}_{a,b}, \mathbb{L}_{c,d}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{k} & \text{if } a \geq c, b \geq d, a \not\geq d \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, as a vector space, $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L})$ is generated by the morphisms $f_{(a,b),(c,d)} : \mathbb{L}_{c,d} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{a,b}$, only defined for pairs $(a,b) \leq (c,d)$ such that there does not exist $x \in \mathcal{S}$ with $(a,b) \leq (x,x) \leq (c,d)$, which map $1 \in \mathbb{k} = \mathbb{L}_{a,b}(a)$ to $1 \in \mathbb{k} = \mathbb{L}_{c,d}(a)$. Thus, $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L})$ has a basis in bijection with the basis of the algebra \mathbb{A} of Lemma 5.5. It is straightforward to see that the algebra multiplication coincides with that of \mathbb{A} , so the result follows from Lemma 5.5. \square

Since \mathbb{L} is an $(\text{End}(\mathbb{L}), \mathbb{k}\mathcal{S})$ -bimodule by Lemma 5.10, we have a functor

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}, -) : \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}.$$

Let $\text{add}\mathbb{L}$ denote the full subcategory of $\text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$ spanned by modules that decompose as direct sums of modules of the form $\mathbb{L}_{a,b}$ with $a < b \in \mathcal{S}_\infty$, and let $\text{proj}\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$ denote the full subcategory of $\text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}$ spanned by the projective modules.

We now establish a fundamental property of the functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}, -) : \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}$, which in particular lets us compute the projective dimension of a module M relative to the rank exact structure by computing the (usual) projective dimension of $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}, M)$.

Lemma 5.11. *The functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}, -) : \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}$ restricts to an equivalence of categories $\text{add}\mathbb{L} \simeq \text{proj}\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$. In particular, we have $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}^{\text{rk}}(M) = \text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}(\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, M))$, for every $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$.*

Proof. We start by proving the first claim. By definition, $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}, -)$ maps \mathbb{L} to $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L})$, which is isomorphic to $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$, by Lemma 5.10. Moreover, we have $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}) \cong \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q} \cong \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q})$, also induced by $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}, -)$. This implies that $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}, -)$ restricts to an equivalence of categories between the subcategory of $\text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$ spanned by the object \mathbb{L} and the subcategory of $\text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}$ spanned by the object $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$. Since the functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}, -)$ is additive, it also restricts to an equivalence $\text{add}\mathbb{L} \simeq \text{proj}\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$ between the additive closures of the modules \mathbb{L} and $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$.

To prove the equality between the projective dimensions, note that $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{L}, -)$ maps minimal relative projective resolutions to minimal $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$ -projective resolutions, where minimality is preserved by the first claim. \square

In order to bound the global dimension of the rank exact structure, we need an explicit bound for the projective dimension relative to the rank exact structure of (usual) injective modules. We compute this by constructing an explicit rank projective resolution for them. For this, we need the following.

Lemma 5.12. *Let $\mathbb{E} : 0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be a short exact sequence in $\text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$. Assume that A has property $(*)$: for all $i \in \mathcal{S}$, $A(0) \rightarrow A(i)$ is surjective. Then \mathbb{E} is rank exact. Similarly, a long exact sequence of modules with property $(*)$ is rank exact.*

Proof. We start with the first claim. Let $i < j \in \mathcal{S}$. Since $A(i) \rightarrow A(j)$ is surjective, we have that $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}_{i,j}, A) \rightarrow A(i) \rightarrow A(j) \rightarrow 0$ is exact. We can then consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \rightarrow & \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}_{i,j}, A) & \rightarrow & \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}_{i,j}, B) & \rightarrow & \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}_{i,j}, C) \rightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & A(i) & \longrightarrow & B(i) & \longrightarrow & C(i) \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & A(j) & \longrightarrow & B(j) & \longrightarrow & C(j) \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & & & \\
 & & 0 & & & &
 \end{array}$$

The middle and bottom rows are exact by assumption and the first column is exact by the previous observation. By the snake lemma, the top row is exact, as required.

For the second claim, let X_\bullet be a long exact sequence. We prove that in $0 \rightarrow \ker d_k \rightarrow X_k \rightarrow \text{coker } d_k \rightarrow 0$ the module $\ker d_k$ satisfies property $(*)$, and, since $\ker d_k = \text{coker } d_{k+1}$, it is enough to check this for $\text{coker } d_k$. Let $i \in \mathcal{S}$. Since the composite $X(0) \rightarrow X(i) \rightarrow (\text{coker } d_k)(i)$ is surjective and factors through $(\text{coker } d_k)(0) \rightarrow (\text{coker } d_k)(i)$, we have that this last map is surjective, as needed. \square

The proof of the following result is straightforward.

Lemma 5.13. *The resolution of Proposition 5.1 is functorial in f , in the following sense. Given $f : [m] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, let \mathcal{I}^f denote the upset generated by the image of f and let R_f denote the projective resolution of $\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}^f}$ of Proposition 5.1. If $f' : [m] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ is such that $f'(l) \leq f(l)$ for all $l \in [m]$, then there is a monomorphism of resolutions $R_f \rightarrow R_{f'}$ extending the natural monomorphism $\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}^f} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}^{f'}}$. In degree k , the morphism is*

given by the natural monomorphism

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{A \subseteq [m] \\ |A|=k}} \mathbb{P}_{\vee f(A)} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{A \subseteq [m] \\ |A|=k}} \mathbb{P}_{\vee f'(A)}$$

induced by the natural monomorphism in each summand. \square

We can now bound the projective dimension relative to the rank exact structure of (usual) injective modules.

Proposition 5.14. *Let $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$ be $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}$ -injective. Then $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}^{\text{rk}}(M) \leq \sup_{i \in \mathcal{S}} |i^\wedge| - 1$.*

Proof. Let $0 \in \mathcal{S}$ be the minimum element of \mathcal{S} . By Lemma 2.4, the module M is a direct sum of modules of the form $R_{0,i}$, with $i \in \mathcal{S}$, so it is enough to prove the result for one these modules. We construct a relative projective resolution of $R_{0,i}$ by taking a quotient of a resolution of \mathbb{P}_0 . Let $k = |i^\wedge|$ and let $f : [k] \rightarrow i^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be a bijection. Let $f' : [k] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ be constantly 0. Let $\mathcal{I}' = \mathcal{S}$, and let \mathcal{I} be the upset generated by i^\wedge . Applying Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 5.13 to f and f' , we get a monomorphism of resolutions $R_f \rightarrow R_{f'}$ of length $k - 1$ extending the natural inclusion $\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}'}$. By Lemma 5.13, the cokernel of $R_f \rightarrow R_{f'}$ is a resolution of $R_{0,i}$ by hook modules, which has length $k - 1 = |i^\wedge| - 1$. In order to see that this resolution is rank exact, we apply Lemma 5.12, since all the hook modules appearing in the quotient resolution start at 0. \square

Before bounding the global dimension of the rank exact structure, we state and prove an easy consequence the existence of the Koszul-like resolution of Proposition 5.1 for the usual global dimension.

Proposition 5.15. *If \mathcal{S} is a finite lattice, then $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}) \leq \sup_{i \in \mathcal{S}} |i^\wedge|$.*

Proof. Recall that any $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$ admits a finite injective resolution (Lemma 2.5). Using induction and the fact that, for every short exact sequence of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}$ -modules $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$, we have $\text{pdim}(L) \leq \max\{\text{pdim}(M), \text{pdim}(N)\}$, we reduce the problem to proving that the projective dimension of all indecomposable $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}$ -injective modules is at most $\sup_{i \in \mathcal{S}} |i^\wedge|$. By Lemma 2.4, the indecomposable injectives are isomorphic to modules of the form $R_{0,i}$, where $0 \in \mathcal{S}$ is the minimum of \mathcal{S} , so the result follows from Corollary 5.3. \square

We now give a lower and upper bound for the global dimension of the rank exact structure on an arbitrary finite lattice.

Theorem 5.16. *For any finite lattice \mathcal{S} , we have $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}) - 2 \leq \text{gldim}^{\text{rk}}(\mathcal{S}) \leq 2 \cdot \sup_{i \in \mathcal{S}} |i^\wedge| - 2$.*

Proof. We start with the upper bound. In view of Lemma 5.11, it is enough to show that, for every $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$, we have $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}(\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, M)) \leq 2n - 2$. Let $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow I^0 \rightarrow I^1$ be a copresentation by (non-relative) injectives. Applying $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, -)$ gives an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, I^0) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, I^1) \rightarrow \text{coker} \rightarrow 0,$$

from which it follows that

$$\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}(\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, M)) \leq \max\{\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}(\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, I^0)), \text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}(\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, I^1)) - 1, \text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}(\text{coker}) - 2\}.$$

Let $d = \sup_{i \in \mathcal{S}} |i^\wedge|$. Since, by Proposition 5.14, injectives have relative projective resolutions of length at most $d - 1$, we have $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}(\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, M)) \leq \max\{d - 1, d - 2, \text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}}(\text{coker}) - 2\}$, by Lemma 5.11. It is thus enough to show that $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}) \leq 2d$, and Lemma 5.7 reduces this to showing $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}) \leq 2d$. By applying Proposition 5.15 to the lattice \mathcal{P} , we see that it is enough to show that, for $j \leq k \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $|(j, k)^\wedge| \leq |j^\wedge| + |k^\wedge|$. To show this, note that if $(a, b) \not\leq (j, k)$, then $a \not\leq j$ or $b \not\leq k$. This implies that, if $(a, b) \in (j, k)^\wedge$, then $a = 0$ or $b = 0$, since, if $a \neq 0$ and $b \neq 0$, then $(a, 0) \not\leq (j, k)$ and $(a, 0) < (a, b)$, so (a, b) would not be minimal. To conclude, note that if $(a, 0) \in (j, k)^\wedge$ then $a \in j^\wedge$, and if $(0, b) \in (j, k)^\wedge$, then $b \in k^\wedge$.

We now prove the lower bound in part (2). Let $c = \text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q})$ and let $Q_\bullet \rightarrow M$ be a minimal projective resolution of length c of some $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}$ -module M . By Lemma 5.11, there exist a chain complex of relative projectives $0 \rightarrow P_c \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0$ such that $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, P_c) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, P_1) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, P_0)$ is isomorphic to $0 \rightarrow Q_c \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$. Since $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, -)$ is left exact, we have that $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, \ker(P_1 \rightarrow P_0)) \cong \ker(Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0)$. It follows that $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, P_c) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, P_2) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}, \ker(P_1 \rightarrow P_0))$ is a minimal projective resolution of length $c - 2$, and thus that $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}^{\text{rk}}(\ker(P_1 \rightarrow P_0)) \geq c - 2$, by Lemma 5.11. \square

As a consequence, we can compute the global dimension of the rank exact structure on a finite grid.

Proposition 5.17. *Let $m \geq 3$ and $\mathcal{S} = [m]^n$. Then $\text{gldim}^{\text{rk}}(\text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}) = 2n - 2$.*

Proof. For $\mathcal{S} = [m]^n$, $m \geq 3$, and $i \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $|i^\wedge| \leq n$, so $\text{gldim}^{\text{rk}}(\mathcal{S}) \leq 2n - 2$ by the upper bound in Theorem 5.16. Denote $1 = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathcal{S}$. Using the notation of Theorem 5.16, consider the element $(0, 1) \in \mathcal{P}$. By Lemma 5.8, we have $\text{pdim}(\mathcal{S}_{(0,1)} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{Q}) = |(0, 1)^+| = 2n$, since $\vee(0, 1)^+ = (1, 2) \notin \mathcal{Q}$, and $\forall A < (1, 2)$ for every $A \subsetneq (0, 1)^+$, where $2 = (2, \dots, 2) \in \mathcal{S}$. The lower bound in Theorem 5.16 now finishes the proof. \square

We conclude this section by proving Theorem 5.18.

Theorem 5.18. *We have $\text{gldim}^{\text{rk}}(\text{vec}_{\mathbb{F}\mathcal{P}}^{\mathcal{R}^n}) = 2n - 2$.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 5.17 and Theorem 2.6(2). \square

5.2. Bounds on the size of rank exact decomposition. We start by fixing notation. Given a fp persistence module $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}(M) &= |\beta_0(M) \cup \dots \cup \beta_n(M)|, \\ \mathbf{b}^{\text{rk}}(M) &= |\mathcal{B}_+^{\text{rk}}(M) \cup \mathcal{B}_-^{\text{rk}}(M)| = |\beta_0^{\text{rk}}(M) \cup \dots \cup \beta_{2n-2}^{\text{rk}}(M)|, \\ \mathbf{b}^\square(M) &= |\mathcal{B}_+^\square(M) \cup \mathcal{B}_-^\square(M)|. \end{aligned}$$

The following result is a simple consequence of the fact that a long exact sequence can be broken up into short exact sequences.

Lemma 5.19. *Let $0 \rightarrow X_\ell \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow X_0 \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of finite dimensional vector spaces. Let the sequence $[x, y, z]$ be a reordering of the sequence $[0, 1, 2]$. Then, we have $\sum_{i \equiv x \pmod{3}} \dim(X_i) \leq \sum_{i \equiv y \pmod{3}} \dim(X_i) + \sum_{i \equiv z \pmod{3}} \dim(X_i)$. \square*

We now prove a standard result which gives a characterization of the (usual) Betti numbers of a fp persistence module in terms of an Ext functor, and use it to bound the size of the Betti numbers of a module in a short exact sequence by the sum of the sizes of the Betti numbers of the other two modules.

Lemma 5.20. *Let $M : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{vec}$ be a fp persistence module, let $a \in \mathcal{P}$, and let $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the multiplicity of $[P_a]$ in $\beta_i(M)$ is equal to the dimension of $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}^i(M, \mathcal{S}_a)$*

Proof. Let $P_\bullet \rightarrow M$ be a minimal resolution of M by (usual) projectives. Assume that $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and that P_a is a direct summand of both P_{j+1} and P_j . Then, the differential $P_{j+1} \rightarrow P_j$, composed with the isomorphisms $P_{j+1} \cong P_a \oplus P'_{j+1}$ and $P_j \cong P_a \oplus P'_j$, must restrict to the zero morphism $P_a \rightarrow P_a$, since, otherwise, the resolution $P_\bullet \rightarrow M$ would not be minimal. This implies that the differentials of the chain complex $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(P_\bullet, \mathcal{S}_a)$ are all zero, and thus $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}^i(M, \mathcal{S}_a) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(P_i, \mathcal{S}_a)$. To conclude, note that $\dim(\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(P_b, \mathcal{S}_a))$ is either 0 or 1, and is 1 if and only if $a = b$. \square

Lemma 5.21. *Let $0 \rightarrow M_0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow 0$ be a short exact sequence of fp \mathcal{R}^n -persistence modules and let $[x, y, z]$ be a reordering of $[0, 1, 2]$. Then $\mathbf{b}(M_x) \leq \mathbf{b}(M_y) + \mathbf{b}(M_z)$.*

Proof. A straightforward extension of Theorem 2.6(2) shows that we can assume that M_0 , M_1 , and M_2 are left Kan extensions along a common monotonic function $[m]^n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^n$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus that M_0 , M_1 , and M_2 are $[m]^n$ -persistence modules. If $N : [m]^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, we know from Lemma 5.20 that for $a \in [m]^n$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the multiplicity of $[P_a]$ in $\beta_i(N)$ is equal to the dimension of $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{k}[m]^n}^i(N, \mathcal{S}_a)$, so that $|\beta_i(N)| = \sum_{a \in [m]^n} \dim(\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{k}[m]^n}^i(N, \mathcal{S}_a)) = \dim(\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{k}[m]^n}^i(N, \bigoplus_{a \in [m]^n} \mathcal{S}_a))$. Then, the result follows by applying Lemma 5.19 to the long exact sequence of $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{k}[m]^n}^\bullet(-, \bigoplus_{a \in [m]^n} \mathcal{S}_a)$ induced by $0 \rightarrow M_0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow 0$. \square

As a consequence, we can bound the size of the Betti numbers of the first relative syzygy of a module in terms of the size of the absolute and relative Betti numbers of the module.

Lemma 5.22. *Let $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ be fp and not relative projective. Let $P \rightarrow M$ be the first step in a minimal rank projective resolution of M and let $0 \rightarrow S \rightarrow P \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ be the induced short exact sequence. Then $\mathbf{b}(S) \leq 2|\beta_0^{\text{rk}}(M)| + \mathbf{b}(M)$.*

Proof. Let $P = \bigoplus_{(a,b) \in A} \mathbb{L}_{a,b}$, where A is a multiset of elements of $\mathcal{R}^n \times (\mathcal{R}^n \cup \{\infty\})$, and apply Lemma 5.21, using that $|A| = |\beta_0^{\text{rk}}(M)|$ and $\mathbf{b}\left(\bigoplus_{(a,b) \in A} \mathbb{L}_{a,b}\right) \leq 2|A|$. \square

The following is a general construction that allows us to bound the size of the relative Betti numbers in terms of the size of the absolute Betti numbers, when we only have a bound for the size of 0th relative Betti numbers.

Lemma 5.23. *Assume that there exists $\alpha \geq 1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all fp $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, we have $|\beta_0^{\text{rk}}(M)| \leq \mathbf{b}(M)^\alpha$. Then, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\sum_{j=0}^i |\beta_j^{\text{rk}}(M)| \leq 3^{(2\alpha)^i} \cdot \mathbf{b}(M)^{\alpha^{i+1}}$.*

Proof. We start with a few observations. To keep notation short, in this proof we let $s_i = \sum_{j=0}^i |\beta_j^{\text{rk}}(M)|$ and $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}(M)$. Let $P_\bullet \rightarrow M$ be a minimal rank projective resolution. Let $M_0 = M$, let M_1 be the kernel of $P_0 \rightarrow M$, and let M_{i+1} be the kernel of $P_i \rightarrow P_{i-1}$. In particular, we have short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow M_{i+1} \rightarrow P_i \rightarrow M_i \rightarrow 0$. Using Lemma 5.22 on the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M_i \rightarrow P_{i-1} \rightarrow M_{i-1} \rightarrow 0$, we get $\mathbf{b}(M_i) \leq 2|\beta_{i-1}^{\text{rk}}(M)| + \mathbf{b}(M_{i-1})$, since $\beta_0^{\text{rk}}(M_{i-1}) = \beta_{i-1}^{\text{rk}}(M)$. An inductive argument then shows that

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{b}(M_i) \leq 2s_{i-1} + \mathbf{b}.$$

We use this to bound s_i as follows

$$\begin{aligned} s_i &= s_{i-1} + |\beta_i^{\text{rk}}(M)| \\ &= s_{i-1} + |\beta_0^{\text{rk}}(M_i)| \\ &\leq s_{i-1} + \mathbf{b}(M_i)^\alpha \\ &\leq s_{i-1} + (2s_{i-1} + \mathbf{b})^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used the hypothesis of this result and in the second inequality we used Eq. (1). We use this inequality to prove the result, by induction on i .

The base case $i = 0$ is true by assumption. For the inductive step, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_i &\leq (2s_{i-1} + \mathbf{b})^\alpha + s_{i-1}, \\ &\leq \left(2 \cdot 3^{(2\alpha)^{i-1}} \cdot \mathbf{b}^{\alpha^i} + \mathbf{b}\right)^\alpha + 3^{(2\alpha)^{i-1}} \cdot \mathbf{b}^{\alpha^i} \\ &\leq \left(3^{((2\alpha)^{i-1}+1)} \cdot \mathbf{b}^{\alpha^i}\right)^\alpha + 3^{(2\alpha)^{i-1}} \cdot \mathbf{b}^{\alpha^i} \\ &\leq 3^{((2\alpha)^{i-1}\alpha + \alpha)} \cdot \mathbf{b}^{\alpha^{i+1}} + 3^{(2\alpha)^{i-1}} \cdot \mathbf{b}^{\alpha^i} \\ &\leq 3^{((2\alpha)^{i-1}\alpha + \alpha + 1)} \cdot \mathbf{b}^{\alpha^{i+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used the inductive hypothesis, and in the rest of the inequalities we used simple bounds. To conclude, note that $(2\alpha)^{i-1}\alpha + \alpha + 1 \leq (2\alpha)^i$. \square

In order to be able to use Lemma 5.23, we need an explicit bound for the size of 0th relative Betti numbers in terms of the absolute Betti numbers.

Lemma 5.24. *Let $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ be fp. Then $|\beta_0^{\text{rk}}(M)| \leq \mathbf{b}(M)^{2n+1}$.*


Proof. Let $\beta_0(M) = \{[P_i]\}_{i \in I}$ and $\beta_1(M) = \{[P_j]\}_{j \in J}$, so that I and J are multisets of elements of \mathcal{R}^n . Let $\bar{I} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^n$ be the subset of \mathcal{R}^n consisting of distinct elements of I , and define \bar{J} analogously. Let $\bar{I}^{\vee 0} = \bar{I} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^n$ and let $\bar{I}^{\vee k+1} = \bar{I} \vee \bar{I}^{\vee k}$, where, for $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{R}^n$, we let $A \vee B = \{a \vee b : a \in A, b \in B\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^n$. Define $\bar{J}^{\vee k}$ analogously.

Let $\bigoplus_{(a,b) \in A} \mathbb{L}_{a,b} \rightarrow M$ be the first step in a minimal rank projective resolution of M , where A is a multiset of elements of $\mathcal{R}^n \times (\mathcal{R}^n \cup \{\infty\})$. We claim that, for each $(a,b) \in A$, we have $a \in \bar{I}^{\vee n}$ and either $b \in \bar{J}^{\vee n}$ or $b = \infty$. To see this, note that any $\mathbb{L}_{a',b'} \rightarrow M$ with $b' \neq \infty$ must factor through a map $\mathbb{L}_{a'',b''} \rightarrow M$ with $a'' \in \bar{I}^{\vee k}$ and $b'' \in \bar{J}^{\vee k}$ for a sufficiently large k , and that $\bar{I}^{\vee k} = \bar{I}^{\vee n}$ and $\bar{J}^{\vee k} = \bar{J}^{\vee n}$ for all $k \geq n$. The case $b = \infty$ is similar. Now, note that $\dim(\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}_{a,b}, M)) \leq \dim(M(a)) \leq |I|$. We thus have

$$|\beta_0^{\text{rk}}(M)| = |A| \leq (|\bar{I}^{\vee n}| + (|\bar{I}^{\vee n}| \cdot |\bar{J}^{\vee n}|)) |I| \leq |I|^{n+1} \cdot (1 + |J|^n) \leq \mathbf{b}(M)^{2n+1},$$

as required. \square

The results up to this point allow us to give an upper bound for the size of the relative Betti numbers in terms of the size of the absolute Betti numbers. The next three results allow us to give a lower bound.


 FIGURE 4. The short exact sequence in the proof of Lemma 5.26, when $k = \ell = 3$.

Lemma 5.25. *Let $\{g_1, \dots, g_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^2$ be a sequence of incomparable elements ordered by their abscissa and let $\mathcal{I} = \{x \in \mathcal{R}^2 : \exists a, x \geq g_a\}$. Then $\beta_0(\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}) = \{[P_{g_1}], \dots, [P_{g_k}]\}$, $\beta_1(\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}) = \{[P_{g_1 \vee g_2}], [P_{g_2 \vee g_3}], \dots, [P_{g_{k-1} \vee g_k}]\}$, and $\beta_2(\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}) = \emptyset$. In particular, $\mathbf{b}(\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}) = 2k - 1$.*

Proof. It is easy to verify that we have minimal resolution

$$0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\ell} P_{g_{\ell-1} \vee g_{\ell}} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\ell} P_{g_{\ell}} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}},$$

by considering the first two stages of the resolution of Proposition 5.1. \square

Lemma 5.26. *Let $\{g_1, \dots, g_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^2$ be a sequence of incomparable elements of \mathcal{R}^2 , ordered by their abscissa, and let $\{c_1, \dots, c_{\ell}\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^2$ be a sequence of incomparable elements of \mathcal{R}^2 , also ordered by their abscissa. Assume that $(g_k)_x < (c_1)_x$ and that $(g_1)_y < (c_{\ell})_y$, so that, in particular, $\mathcal{I} = \{x \in \mathcal{R}^2 : \exists a, g_a \leq x, \exists b, x \leq c_b\}$ is an interval of \mathcal{R}^2 . We have $\mathbf{b}(\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}) \leq 2(k + \ell)$ and $\mathbf{b}^{\square}(M) \geq k\ell$.*

Proof. We start with the first claim. Let $\mathcal{J} = \{x \in \mathcal{R}^2 : \exists a, g_a \leq x\}$, $B = \{((g_1)_x, (c_1)_y), c_1 \wedge c_2, c_2 \wedge c_3, \dots, c_{\ell-2} \wedge c_{\ell-1}, c_{\ell-1} \wedge c_{\ell}, ((c_{\ell})_x, (g_k)_y)\}$, and $\mathcal{K} = \{x \in \mathcal{R}^2 : \exists b \in B, b \leq x\}$. We have a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{K}} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{J}} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow 0$. From Lemma 5.21, it follows that $\mathbf{b}(\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}) \leq \mathbf{b}(\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{J}}) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{K}})$. So that $\mathbf{b}(\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}) \leq 2(k + \ell)$ by Lemma 5.25.

The second claim follows from [BOO21, Equation 5.1], which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_+^{\square}(\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}) &= \left\{ [R_{g_a, c_b}^{\circ}] \right\}_{\substack{1 \leq a \leq k \\ 1 \leq b \leq \ell}} \cup \left\{ [R_{g_a \vee g_{a+1}, c_b \wedge c_{b+1}}^{\circ}] \right\}_{\substack{1 \leq a \leq k-1 \\ 1 \leq b \leq \ell-1}} \\ \mathcal{B}_-^{\square}(\mathbb{k}_{\mathcal{I}}) &= \left\{ [R_{g_a, c_b \wedge c_{b+1}}^{\circ}] \right\}_{\substack{1 \leq a \leq k \\ 1 \leq b \leq \ell-1}} \cup \left\{ [R_{g_a \vee g_{a+1}, c_b}^{\circ}] \right\}_{\substack{1 \leq a \leq k-1 \\ 1 \leq b \leq \ell}} \end{aligned}$$

and thus $\mathbf{b}^{\square}(M) \geq k\ell$. \square

Lemma 5.27. *Let $a < b \in \mathcal{R}^n \cup \{\infty\}$ and let $L_{a,b} : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ be the corresponding hook module. Then $\mathbf{b}^{\square}(L_{a,b}) \leq 2^n - 1$. In particular, for all fp $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, we have $\mathbf{b}^{\square}(M) \leq (2^n - 1) \mathbf{b}^{\text{rk}}(M)$.*

Proof. For the first claim, we use [BOO21, Lemma 5.5], with I the support of $L_{a,b}$, which, as observed in the proof of [BOO21, Theorem 5.4], can be written as a union of n right open rectangles, which are all downsets in I . It follows that we have $\mathbf{b}^{\square}(L_{a,b}) \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \binom{n}{i} = 2^n - 1$.

For the second claim, note that the minimal rank decomposition by rectangles of M can be computed by considering the rank exact decomposition of M , taking the minimal rank decomposition by rectangles of each of the bars taking their sign into account, and then cancelling, with multiplicity, the bars that appear both as positive and negative. \square

We are now ready to prove the final result of this section.

Proposition 5.28. *For all fp $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, we have*

$$\mathbf{b}^{\text{rk}}(M) \leq 3^{(4n+2)2^{n-2}} \cdot \mathbf{b}(M)^{(2n+1)2^{n-1}},$$

and there exists a family of fp modules $M_k : \mathcal{R}^2 \rightarrow \text{vec}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbf{b}(M_k) \leq 4k$ and $\mathbf{b}^{\text{rk}}(M_k) \geq k^2/3$.

Proof. For the upper bound, we use Lemma 5.23 and Lemma 5.24, by instantiating $i = 2n - 2$, using the global dimension of the rank exact structure (Theorem 5.18), and $\alpha = 2n + 1$.

For the lower bound, we let $M_k : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ be given by taking $\ell = k$ in Lemma 5.26. We thus have $\mathbf{b}^{\text{rk}}(M) \leq 4k$ and $k^2 \leq \mathbf{b}^{\text{ord}}(M)$ by Lemma 5.26. To conclude the proof, we combine the last inequality with the inequality of Lemma 5.27. \square

6. BOTTLENECK STABILITY OF THE RANK EXACT DECOMPOSITION AND UNIVERSALITY

In Section 6.1, we prove Theorem 6.1, the bottleneck stability result for the rank exact decomposition. In Section 6.2, we prove Proposition 6.5, the universality result for the signed bottleneck dissimilarity.

6.1. Bottleneck stability of the rank exact decomposition.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $n \geq 1 \in \mathbb{N}$. For all fp modules $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, we have*

$$\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}(M), \mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}(N)) \leq (2n - 1)^2 \cdot d_I(M, N).$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0 \in \mathcal{R}$ and assume given fp modules $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ that are ε -interleaved. Let $P_{\bullet} \rightarrow M$ and $Q_{\bullet} \rightarrow N$ be minimal rank projective resolutions. By Theorem 5.16 these resolutions have length at most $2n - 2$. By Proposition 2.7, we have that $A' = P_0 \oplus Q_1[\varepsilon] \oplus P_2[2\varepsilon] \oplus Q_3[3\varepsilon] \oplus \dots$ and $B' = Q_0 \oplus P_1[\varepsilon] \oplus Q_2[2\varepsilon] \oplus P_3[3\varepsilon] \oplus \dots$ are ε -interleaved. Since P_{\bullet} and Q_{\bullet} have length at most $2n - 2$, it follows that $A = P_0 \oplus Q_1 \oplus P_2 \oplus Q_3 \oplus \dots$ is $(0; (2n - 2)\varepsilon)$ -interleaved with A' and that $B = Q_0 \oplus P_1 \oplus Q_2 \oplus P_3 \oplus \dots$ is $(0; (2n - 2)\varepsilon)$ -interleaved with B' . By composing these interleavings, we see that A and B are $(2n - 1)\varepsilon$ -interleaved. To conclude, note that $\mathcal{B}(A) = \beta_{2\mathbb{N}}^{\text{rk}}(M) \cup \beta_{2\mathbb{N}+1}^{\text{rk}}(N)$ and $\mathcal{B}(B) = \beta_{2\mathbb{N}}^{\text{rk}}(N) \cup \beta_{2\mathbb{N}+1}^{\text{rk}}(M)$, so the result follows from Proposition 4.3. \square

6.2. Universality of the signed bottleneck dissimilarity. We start by giving a remark, showing that the signed bottleneck dissimilarity does not satisfy the triangle inequality.

Remark 6.2. The same construction of [OS21, Example 11] shows that the dissimilarity \widehat{d}_B on \mathcal{R}^2 -barcodes does not satisfy the triangle inequality, even when restricted to signed barcodes arising as the rank exact decomposition of a fp \mathcal{R}^2 -persistence module. Although the example deals with the Betti signed barcode, that is, the signed barcode associated to the usual exact structure on fp \mathcal{R}^2 -persistence modules, it applies without any changes to the rank exact decomposition, since the (usual) minimal resolutions of the modules considered in [OS21, Example 11] coincide with the minimal rank projective resolutions of the modules. Examples for $n \geq 3$ can be constructed by considering the modules of [OS21, Example 11] and taking the external tensor product with $P_0 : \mathcal{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \text{vec}$, as in the beginning of the proof of Proposition 3.1.

We now define the notions of balanced and $\mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}$ -stable dissimilarities on signed barcodes, and prove the universality result.

Definition 6.3. A dissimilarity function d on finite signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes is *balanced* if

$$d((\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_- \cup \mathcal{A}), (\mathcal{D}_+, \mathcal{D}_-)) = d((\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-), (\mathcal{D}_+ \cup \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}_-))$$

for all finite signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes \mathcal{C}_{\pm} and \mathcal{D}_{\pm} , and finite \mathcal{R}^n -barcode \mathcal{A} .

Definition 6.4. A dissimilarity function d on finite signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes is $\mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}$ -*stable* if for every pair of fp modules $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ we have $d(\mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}(M), \mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}(N)) \leq d_I(M, N)$.

Proposition 6.5. *The collection of $\mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}$ -stable and balanced dissimilarity functions on finite signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes has a maximum with respect to the pointwise order, denoted d_m . We have a bi-Lipschitz equivalence*

$$\widehat{d}_B / (2n - 1)^2 \leq d_m \leq \widehat{d}_B.$$

In particular, if d is a $\mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}$ -stable and balanced dissimilarity function on finite signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes which satisfies the triangle inequality, then, for all fp $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ such that $d_I(M, N) < \infty$, we have $d(\mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}(M), \mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}(N)) = 0$.

Proof. We start with the first claim, the universality result. Define d_m by

$$d_m(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) = \sup \left\{ d(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) : d \text{ is a } \mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}\text{-stable and balanced dissimilarity on finite signed } \mathcal{R}^n\text{-barcodes.} \right\},$$

which is easily seen to be the largest $\mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}$ -stable and balanced dissimilarity on finite signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes.

Now, to prove that $\widehat{d}_B / (2n - 1)^2 \leq d_m$, we use Theorem 6.1, which implies that $\widehat{d}_B / (2n - 1)^2$ is $\mathcal{B}_{\pm}^{\text{rk}}$ -stable, together with the fact that \widehat{d}_B is balanced.

To conclude the proof of the first claim, we must show that, for any \mathcal{B}_\pm^{κ} -stable and balanced dissimilarity function on finite signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes d , we have $d \leq \widehat{d}_B$. In order to see this, let \mathcal{C}_\pm and \mathcal{D}_\pm be finite signed \mathcal{R}^n -barcodes and consider the modules $M = \bigoplus_{[X] \in \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{D}_-} X$ and $N = \bigoplus_{[Y] \in \mathcal{D}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-} Y$. Since d is balanced, we have $d(\mathcal{C}_\pm, \mathcal{D}_\pm) = d(\mathcal{B}_\pm^{\kappa}(M), \mathcal{B}_\pm^{\kappa}(N))$, and, by the \mathcal{B}^{κ} -stability of d , we have $d(\mathcal{B}_\pm^{\kappa}(M), \mathcal{B}_\pm^{\kappa}(N)) \leq d_I(M, N)$. As observed in Section 2.9, we have $d_I(M, N) \leq d_B(\mathcal{B}(M), \mathcal{B}(N))$. Putting these together, we get $d(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \leq d_B(\mathcal{B}(M), \mathcal{B}(N))$, and, by definition, we have $d_B(\mathcal{B}(M), \mathcal{B}(N)) = \widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$, concluding the proof of the universality result.

We now prove the second claim. Let d be a \mathcal{B}_\pm^{κ} -stable and balanced dissimilarity function on signed barcodes, and assume, further, that d satisfies the triangle inequality. By the universality result, we have $d \leq \widehat{d}_B$, so it is enough to show that, given $fp M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ with $d_I(M, N) < \infty$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a signed barcode \mathcal{A}_\pm such that $\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{B}_\pm^{\kappa}(M), \mathcal{A}_\pm) + \widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{A}_\pm, \mathcal{B}_\pm^{\kappa}(N)) \leq \varepsilon$.

Let us start by observing the following: if $\mathcal{C}_\pm, \mathcal{D}_\pm, \mathcal{C}'_\pm$, and \mathcal{D}'_\pm are finite signed barcodes, then

$$(2) \quad \widehat{d}_B((\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}'_+, \mathcal{C}_- \cup \mathcal{C}'_-), (\mathcal{D}_+ \cup \mathcal{D}'_+, \mathcal{D}_- \cup \mathcal{D}'_-)) \leq \widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{C}_\pm, \mathcal{D}_\pm) + \widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{C}'_\pm, \mathcal{D}'_\pm).$$

Since M and N are at finite interleaving distance, Theorem 6.1 implies that there exists a signed matching h between $\mathcal{B}_\pm^{\kappa}(M)$ and $\mathcal{B}_\pm^{\kappa}(N)$. Let us decompose $\mathcal{B}_\pm^{\kappa}(M) = (X \cup Y \cup Z, X' \cup Y' \cup Z')$ where the multisets X and X' consist of the bars that are not matched by h , the multiset Y consists of the positive bars that are matched to negative bars of M by h , the multiset Y' consists of the negative bars that are matched to positive bars of M by h , and the multisets Z and Z' consist of the bars that are matched to bars of N by h . Decompose $\mathcal{B}_\pm^{\kappa}(N) = (U \cup V \cup W, U' \cup V' \cup W')$ in an analogous way. By Eq. (2), and a symmetry argument, it is then enough to show that (1) for every $[L_{i,j}] \in X$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a signed barcode \mathcal{A} such that $\widehat{d}_B([L_{i,j}], \emptyset, \mathcal{A}) \leq \varepsilon$, and that (2) for every $[L_{i,j}] \in Z$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a signed barcode \mathcal{A} such that $\widehat{d}_B([L_{i,j}], \emptyset, \mathcal{A}) + \widehat{d}_B([L_{a,b}], \emptyset, \mathcal{A}) \leq \varepsilon$, where $[L_{i,j}]$ and $[L_{a,b}]$ are matched by h .

To prove (1), note that, since $[L_{i,j}] \in X$, the bar is not matched by h , and thus $j < \infty$, since h has finite cost. Consider a sequence $j = j_0, j_1, \dots, j_\ell = i$ such that $\|j_k - j_{k+1}\|_\infty < \varepsilon$ for all $0 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$. Then, take $\mathcal{A} = (\{[L_{i,j_\ell}], \dots, [L_{i,j_1}]\}, \{[L_{i,j_{\ell-1}}], \dots, [L_{i,j_1}]\})$.

The proof of (2) is similar. We consider the case $j, b < \infty$; the case $j = b = \infty$ is analogous. Consider sequences $i = i_0, i_1, \dots, i_\ell = a$ and $j = j_0, j_1, \dots, j_\ell = b$ such that $\|i_k - i_{k+1}\|_\infty, \|j_k - j_{k+1}\|_\infty < \varepsilon$ for all $0 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$. Then, take $\mathcal{A} = (\{[L_{i_0, j_0}], \dots, [L_{i_\ell, j_\ell}]\}, \{[L_{i_0, j_0}], \dots, [L_{i_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-1}}]\})$. \square

7. OTHER EXACT STRUCTURES

So far we have focused exclusively on the rank exact structure, and a natural question is to what extent our analysis extends to other exact structures. As mentioned in the introduction, we have been following the roadmap outlined in [OS21, Theorem 26], which requires the following two ingredients in order to guarantee bottleneck stability for \mathcal{E} -signed barcodes derived from a given exact structure \mathcal{E} :

- (1) a stability result for the \mathcal{E} -projectives in the usual (unsigned) bottleneck distance;
- (2) a finite upper bound on $\text{gldim}^{\mathcal{E}}$.

Then, the constant factor in the stability bound for \mathcal{E} -signed barcodes is equal to the one for the \mathcal{E} -projectives, multiplied by 1 plus the upper bound on $\text{gldim}^{\mathcal{E}}$. Hence the importance of deriving bounds that are as tight as possible in ingredients 1 and 2.

In the case of the usual exact structure studied in [OS21], the two ingredients were already available in the literature, in the form of Bjerkevik's bottleneck stability result for free modules on the one hand, of Hilbert's syzygy theorem on the other hand. Bjerkevik's result is known to be tight when the number of parameters is 2 or 4, while Hilbert's syzygy theorem is tight for any number of parameters.

In the case of the rank exact structure, Proposition 4.3 in this paper provides the first ingredient, with a bound that is tight at least in the two-parameter setting (as per Remark 4.4), while Theorem 5.18 provides the second ingredient with a tight bound.

Investigating exact structures associated to classes of interval modules other than the hook modules is a natural next step. Some of these exact structures were studied recently, and upper bounds on their global dimensions were obtained [AENY22, BBH21]. However, these bounds grow with the size of the indexing poset, thus not giving a finite upper bound in the case of $fp \mathcal{R}^n$ -persistence modules. This makes them not directly usable in our approach for proving bottleneck stability. The fact that the bounds diverge does not seem to be an artifact of the proofs in [AENY22, BBH21], as the global dimension of an exact structure on a category or persistence modules seems to generally increase with the number of degrees of freedom required to specify an indecomposable relative projective. Indeed, as our Theorem 7.2 shows, $\text{gldim}^{\mathcal{E}}$ provably diverges

to infinity in the case where $\mathcal{E} = \hat{\text{lim}}$, the exact structure that has as indecomposable projectives the interval modules with support an upset. The rest of the section is devoted to the proof of this result. After giving the result, we give Remark 7.3, which comments on the relationship between $\hat{\text{lim}}$ -projective resolutions and the upset resolutions considered in [Mil20].

Let \mathcal{S} be a finite poset. An *upset module* is an interval module $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathcal{S}}$ such that $M \cong \mathbb{k}_U$ for $U \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ an upset of \mathcal{S} . A $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}$ -module is *upset-decomposable* if it is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of upset modules.

Since there are finitely many isomorphism types of upset modules and $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}$ -projective modules are upset-decomposable, there exists an exact structure $\hat{\text{lim}}$ on $\text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$ such that the $\hat{\text{lim}}$ -projective modules are the upset-decomposable modules, and this exact structure has enough projectives, that is, for every \mathcal{S} -persistence module M there exists a $\hat{\text{lim}}$ -exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow P \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ with P a $\hat{\text{lim}}$ -projective module. We call $\hat{\text{lim}}$ the *limit exact structure*. As explained in the introduction, the name comes from the fact that the limit exact sequences are precisely the sequences $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ such that, for all diagrams in the indexing poset $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, the sequence of vector spaces $0 \rightarrow \lim_{\mathcal{D}}(L \circ f) \rightarrow \lim_{\mathcal{D}}(M \circ f) \rightarrow \lim_{\mathcal{D}}(N \circ f) \rightarrow 0$ is exact. It is also easy to see that the limit exact structure on $\text{vec}_{fp}^{\mathbb{R}^n}$ exists and has enough projectives.

Before giving the main result of this section, we need a technical lemma.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $m \geq 2$ and let $\mathcal{S} = [m]^2$. Let $V \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be an upset, let C be the set of all upsets of \mathcal{S} that are contained in V , and let $D \subseteq C \setminus \{V\}$ consist of the maximal elements of $C \setminus \{V\}$ with respect to inclusion. Then $|D| \leq m$.*

Proof. Let B be the set of minimal elements of V . Start by observing that $|B| \leq m$, which follows from the fact that the map $B \rightarrow [m]$ that maps (x, y) to x must be injective, since the elements of B are all incomparable.

Now, if $V' \subsetneq V$ is a maximal sub-upset, then there exists $b \in B$ such that $b \notin V'$, since otherwise $B \subseteq V'$ and thus $V' = V$. Let $U^b = \{a \in \mathcal{S} : a \not\leq b\}$, which is an upset. Note that $U^b \cap V \subsetneq V$ is an upset. We claim that $V' \subseteq U^b \cap V \subsetneq V$ and that $U^b \cap V \subsetneq V$ is a maximal sub-upset. The fact that $V' \subseteq U^b \cap V$ is clear, since $b \notin V'$. To show that $U^b \cap V \subsetneq V$ is maximal, assume we have $U^b \cap V \subsetneq W \subseteq V$. In that case, we must have $a \in W$ such that $a \notin U^b$, and thus $a \leq b$. It follows that $b \in W$. Since for all $b' \in B \setminus \{b\}$ we have $b' \in U^b$, it follows that $B \subseteq W$, and thus $W = V$. This shows that $U^b \cap V \subsetneq V$ is a maximal sub-upset, and, since $V' \subseteq U^b \cap V$ and $V' \subsetneq V$ is also a maximal sub-upset, we must have $V' = U^b \cap V$.

The above implies that the function from B to maximal sub-upsets of V that maps b to $U^b \cap V$ is surjective, which proves the result. \square

Theorem 7.2. *If $m \geq 3$, we have $\text{gldim}^{\hat{\text{lim}}}(\text{vec}^{[m]^2}) = m - 2$. As a consequence, $\text{gldim}^{\hat{\text{lim}}}(\text{vec}_{fp}^{\mathbb{R}^n}) = \infty$.*

Proof. We first prove the claim for finite grids. We start with a general construction. Consider the right $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}$ -module

$$\mathbb{U} = \bigoplus_{\substack{U \subseteq \mathcal{S}, \\ \text{upset}}} \mathbb{k}_U.$$

Let \mathcal{P} denote the opposite of the poset of upsets of \mathcal{S} , so that the elements of \mathcal{P} are given by the upsets of \mathcal{S} , and we have $U \leq V \in \mathcal{P}$ exactly when $V \subseteq U \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. The poset \mathcal{P} is a lattice, where $U \wedge V = U \cup V$ and $U \vee V = U \cap V$. A routine check shows that $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{U}) \cong \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$, and thus that \mathbb{U} is a $(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{k}\mathcal{S})$ -bimodule. This implies that we have a functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{U}, -) : \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}$. Following the same idea as in the proof of Lemma 5.11, one shows that, for all $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$, we have $\text{pdim}^{\hat{\text{lim}}}(M) = \text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(\text{Hom}(\mathbb{U}, M))$.

We now show that $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}) = m$, starting with $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}) \geq m$. Consider the set $B = \{(a, b) : a + b = m - 1\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and the upset V generated by B . We claim that $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(\mathbb{S}_V) = m$. To see this, we use Lemma 5.8, with $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ being the empty poset. We must thus show that, in \mathcal{P} , we have $|V^+| = m$ and that, for every proper subset $A \subsetneq V^+$ we have $\vee A < \vee V^+$. Note that $B = \{(0, m - 1), (1, m - 2), \dots, (i, m - 1 - i), \dots, (m - 2, 1), (m - 1, 0)\}$. Given $i \in [m]$, let B^i be given by removing the i th element of B , that is, let $B^i = B \setminus \{(i, m - 1 - i)\}$. Let V^i be the upset generated by B^i . We have $V^+ = \{V^i\}_{i \in [m]}$, so that $|V^+| = m$. To conclude the proof that $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}) \geq m$, we must show that, if $B^i \notin A \subsetneq V^+$, then $\vee A < \vee V^+$. In terms of sets, we must show that

$$\bigcap_{j \in [m]} V^j \subsetneq \bigcap_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} V^j.$$

This follows from the fact that $(i, m - 1 - i) \in \bigcap_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} V^j$, but $(i, m - 1 - i) \notin V^i$.

We now show that $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}) \leq m$. By a standard result (see, e.g., [MR01, Corollary 1.14, Section 7]), it is enough to show that, for every simple module $S_V \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}$ corresponding to an upset $V \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, we have $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(S_V) \leq m$. Using Lemma 5.8 with $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ being the empty set, it is thus enough to show that, for every upset $V \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, seen as an element $V \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $|V^+| \leq m$, which is the content of Lemma 7.1.

We now show that $\text{gldim}^{\text{lim}}(\text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}) \leq m - 2$. Let $i \in \mathcal{S}$ and let $U \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be an upset. Since any map $\mathbb{k}_U \rightarrow R_{0,i}$ factors through the surjective map $P_0 \rightarrow R_{0,i}$, it follows that $0 \rightarrow \mathbb{k}_{i^\wedge} \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow R_{0,i}$ is a minimal lim -projective resolution, and thus that $\text{pdim}^{\text{lim}}(I) = 1$ for any non-zero $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}$ -injective module I .

As in the proof of the upper bound of Theorem 5.16(2), given $M \in \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}$, we consider an injective copresentation $M \rightarrow I \rightarrow J$, and the induced exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{U}, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{U}, I) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{U}, J) \rightarrow \text{coker} \rightarrow 0.$$

By the previous considerations, we have $\text{pdim}^{\text{lim}}(M) \leq \max\{1, \text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}) - 2\} = m - 2$.

Finally, we show that $\text{gldim}^{\text{lim}}(\text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}}) \geq m - 2$. Using that $\text{gldim}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}) = m$, let $N \in \mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ be such that $\text{pdim}_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}}(N) = m$. Then, following the proof of the lower bound in Theorem 5.16(2), we can consider a minimal $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{P}$ -projective resolution $P_\bullet \rightarrow N$, which must be of the form $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{U}, X_\bullet) \rightarrow N$, for a chain complex of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}$ -modules X_\bullet of length m . We can then consider the $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{S}$ -module $\ker(X_1 \rightarrow X_0)$, and note that, by the fact that $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{U}, -)$ is left exact, we have $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{U}, \ker(X_1 \rightarrow X_0)) \cong \ker(P_1 \rightarrow P_0)$, so that $\text{pdim}^{\text{lim}}(\ker(X_1 \rightarrow X_0)) = m - 2$.

We now prove the claim for fp \mathcal{R}^2 -modules. Towards a contradiction, assume that there exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every fp $N : \mathcal{R}^2 \rightarrow \text{vec}$ admits an lim -projective resolution of length at most d . Let $m = d + 3$. Consider the monotonic injection $\iota : [m]^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^2$ mapping (a, b) to (a, b) . Let $\iota_! : \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}[m]^2} \rightarrow \text{vec}_{fp}^{\mathcal{R}^2}$ denote left Kan extension along ι and let $\iota^* : \text{vec}_{fp}^{\mathcal{R}^2} \rightarrow \text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}[m]^2}$ denote restriction along ι . Note that, by definition of left Kan extension, we have an adjunction $\iota_! \dashv \iota^*$, and that, since ι is fully faithful, the composite $\iota^* \circ \iota_!$ is naturally isomorphic to the identity functor of $\text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}[m]^2}$. Let $M : [m]^2 \rightarrow \text{vec}$ be such that $\text{pdim}^{\text{lim}}(M) = m - 2 = d + 1$, which must exist by the first claim of the result. Let $P_\bullet \rightarrow \iota_!(M)$ be an lim -projective resolution of M of length at most d . It is enough to show that $\iota^*P_\bullet \rightarrow \iota^*\iota_!M$ is an lim -projective resolution of $\iota^*\iota_!M$, since $\iota^*\iota_!M \cong M$, contradicting the fact that M has lim -projective dimension equal to $d + 1$.

Since restricting an upset-decomposable module along ι gives an upset-decomposable module, we have that $\iota^*P_\bullet \rightarrow \iota^*\iota_!M$ is a resolution by upset-decomposable modules. Thus, to conclude, we must show that this resolution is lim -exact. Since ι^* is exact, it is enough to show that ι^* maps lim -exact sequences in $\text{vec}_{fp}^{\mathcal{R}^2}$ to lim -exact sequences in $\text{mod}_{\mathbb{k}[m]^2}$.

Let $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be an lim -exact sequence in $\text{vec}_{fp}^{\mathcal{R}^2}$. We must show that, if $Q : [m]^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ is upset-decomposable, then any morphism $Q \rightarrow \iota^*C$ factors through $\iota^*B \rightarrow \iota^*C$. By adjunction, it suffices to prove that any morphism $\iota_!Q \rightarrow C$ factors through $B \rightarrow C$, which holds since $\iota_!Q$ is upset-decomposable. \square

Remark 7.3. As a consequence of Theorem 7.2, for every module $M : [m]^2 \rightarrow \text{vec}$, there exists an exact sequence of finite length $0 \rightarrow P_\ell \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ with all of the modules P_i being upset-decomposable modules. Finite exact sequences $0 \rightarrow P_\ell \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ in $\text{vec}^{[m]^2}$ with the property that all of the modules P_i are upset-decomposable are *finite upset resolutions* as per [Mil20]. Thus, Theorem 7.2 refines [Mil20, Theorem 6.12(6)], in the special case where the indexing poset is $[m]^2$, by proving the existence of finite resolutions by upset-decomposable modules, which are not only exact but lim -exact.

REFERENCES

- [AENY19] Hideto Asashiba, Emerson G Escolar, Ken Nakashima, and Michio Yoshiwaki. On approximation of 2d persistence modules by interval-decomposables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.01637*, 2019.
- [AENY22] Hideto Asashiba, Emerson G. Escolar, Ken Nakashima, and Michio Yoshiwaki. Approximation by interval-decomposables and interval resolutions of persistence modules, 2022.
- [AS93] M. Auslander and Ø. Solberg. Relative homology and representation theory. I. Relative homology and homologically finite subcategories. *Comm. Algebra*, 21(9):2995–3031, 1993.
- [Azu50] Gorô Azumaya. Corrections and supplementaries to my paper concerning Krull-Remak-Schmidt’s theorem. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 1:117–124, 1950.
- [BBH21] Benjamin Blanchette, Thomas Brüstle, and Eric J. Hanson. Homological approximations in persistence theory, 2021.
- [BCB20] Magnus Bakke Botnan and William Crawley-Boevey. Decomposition of persistence modules. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 148(11):4581–4596, 2020.

- [Ber21] Nicolas Berkouk. Algebraic homotopy interleaving distance. In Frank Nielsen and Frédéric Barbaresco, editors, *Geometric Science of Information*, pages 656–664, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing.
- [Bje21] Håvard Bakke Bjerkevik. On the stability of interval decomposable persistence modules. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 66(1):92–121, 2021.
- [BK21] Håvard Bakke Bjerkevik and Michael Kerber. Asymptotic improvements on the exact matching distance for 2-parameter persistence, 2021.
- [BL14] Ulrich Bauer and Michael Lesnick. Induced matchings of barcodes and the algebraic stability of persistence. In *Computational geometry (SoCG'14)*, pages 355–364. ACM, New York, 2014.
- [BOO21] Magnus Bakke Botnan, Steffen Oppermann, and Steve Oudot. Signed barcodes for multi-parameter persistence via rank decompositions and rank-exact resolutions, 2021.
- [CCS21] Wojciech Chachólski, René Corbet, and Anna-Laura Sattelberger. The shift-dimension of multipersistence modules, 2021.
- [CCSG⁺09] Frédéric Chazal, David Cohen-Steiner, Marc Glisse, Leonidas J Guibas, and Steve Y Oudot. Proximity of persistence modules and their diagrams. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 237–246, 2009.
- [CdSGO16] Frédéric Chazal, Vin de Silva, Marc Glisse, and Steve Oudot. *The structure and stability of persistence modules*. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics. Springer, [Cham], 2016.
- [CGR⁺] Wojciech Chachólski, Andrea Guidolin, Isaac Ren, Martina Scolamiero, and Francesca Tombari. Effective computation of relative homological invariants for functors over posets. (*in preparation*).
- [CKM22] Nate Clause, Woojin Kim, and Facundo Memoli. The discriminating power of the generalized rank invariant, 2022.
- [CZ09] Gunnar Carlsson and Afra Zomorodian. The theory of multidimensional persistence. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 42(1):71–93, 2009.
- [DRS72] Peter Doubilet, Gian-Carlo Rota, and Richard Stanley. On the foundations of combinatorial theory. VI. The idea of generating function. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability (Univ. California, Berkeley, Calif., 1970/1971), Vol. II: Probability theory*, pages 267–318, 1972.
- [DRSS99] Peter Dräxler, Idun Reiten, Sverre O. Smalø, and Øyvind Solberg. Exact categories and vector space categories. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 351(2):647–682, 1999. With an appendix by B. Keller.
- [EJ11] Edgar E. Enochs and Overtoun M. G. Jenda. *Relative homological algebra. Volume 1*, volume 30 of *De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin, extended edition, 2011.
- [GC17] Oliver Gäfvert and Wojciech Chachólski. Stable invariants for multidimensional persistence, 2017.
- [Hoc56] G. Hochschild. Relative homological algebra. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 82:246–269, 1956.
- [HOST19] Heather A. Harrington, Nina Otter, Hal Schenck, and Ulrike Tillmann. Stratifying multiparameter persistent homology. *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom.*, 3(3):439–471, 2019.
- [KLO20] Michael Kerber, Michael Lesnick, and Steve Oudot. Exact computation of the matching distance on 2-parameter persistence modules. *Journal of Computational Geometry*, 11(2), 2020.
- [KM21] Woojin Kim and Facundo Memoli. Generalized persistence diagrams for persistence modules over posets. *J. Appl. Comput. Topol.*, 5(4):533–581, 2021.
- [KN20] Michael Kerber and Arnur Nigmatov. Efficient Approximation of the Matching Distance for 2-Parameter Persistence. In Sergio Cabello and Danny Z. Chen, editors, *36th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2020)*, volume 164 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 53:1–53:16, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2020. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [Lan18] Claudia Landi. The rank invariant stability via interleavings. In *Research in computational topology*, volume 13 of *Assoc. Women Math. Ser.*, pages 1–10. Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [Les12] Michael Lesnick. *Multidimensional interleavings and applications to topological inference*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2012.
- [Les15] Michael Lesnick. The theory of the interleaving distance on multidimensional persistence modules. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 15(3):613–650, 2015.
- [LW15] Michael Lesnick and Matthew Wright. Interactive visualization of 2-d persistence modules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.00180*, 2015.
- [Mil20] Ezra Miller. Homological algebra of modules over posets, 2020.
- [Mit65] Barry Mitchell. *Theory of categories*. Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. XVII. Academic Press, New York-London, 1965.
- [MP20] Alex McCleary and Amit Patel. Positivity of multiparameter persistence diagrams and bottleneck stability, 2020.
- [MR01] J. C. McConnell and J. C. Robson. *Noncommutative Noetherian rings*, volume 30 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, revised edition, 2001. With the cooperation of L. W. Small.
- [OS21] Steve Oudot and Luis Scoccola. On the stability of multigraded Betti numbers and Hilbert functions, 2021.
- [Pat18] Amit Patel. Generalized persistence diagrams. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, 1(3):397–419, 2018.
- [SCL⁺17] Martina Scolamiero, Wojciech Chachólski, Anders Lundman, Ryan Ramanujam, and Sebastian Öberg. Multidimensional persistence and noise. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 17(6):1367–1406, 2017.

APPENDIX A. PROOFS OF RESULTS FROM PREVIOUS WORK

Theorem 2.6 ([BOO21, Theorem 4.4 and Proposition 4.14]). *Let \mathcal{P} be a poset.*

- (1) *The collection of rank exact sequences forms an exact structure on the category $\text{vec}^{\mathcal{P}}$, called the rank exact structure. The projectives of this exact structure are the hook-decomposable modules.*
- (2) *Let $M : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ be fp. Then, M admits a minimal rank projective resolution, which is finite and unique up to isomorphism. This resolution is the left Kan extension of a minimal rank projective resolution of a module $M' : [m]^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ along a monotonic map $f : [m]^n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^n$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof of Theorem 2.6(2). We claim that there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$, a monotonic injective function $f : [m]^n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^n$, and a module $M' : [m]^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ such that M is isomorphic to the left Kan extension of M' along f . We start by proving this claim.

Let $Q \rightarrow P$ be such that $Q \cong \bigoplus_{j \in J} P_j$, $P \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i$, I and J are finite multisets of elements of \mathcal{R}^n , and M is isomorphic to the cokernel of the morphism $Q \rightarrow P$.

Consider the set $A \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ of all possible coordinates of elements in I or J . Formally, let

$$A = \{r \in \mathcal{R} : \exists a \in I \cup J, \exists 1 \leq k \leq n, r = a_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}.$$

Clearly, any element in $I \cup J$ belongs to $A^n \subseteq \mathcal{R}^n$. Moreover, by endowing A with the linear order induced by that of \mathcal{R} , there is a unique monotonic bijection $[m] \rightarrow A$, where $m = |A|$. By endowing $A^n \subseteq \mathcal{R}^n$ with the order induced by that of \mathcal{R}^n , we may consider the A^n -persistence modules $M', P', Q' : A^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ obtained by restricting M, P , and Q , respectively.

Note that, as posets, we have $[m]^n \cong A^n$, so, to prove the claim, it is sufficient to prove that M is isomorphic to the left Kan extension of M' along the inclusion $A^n \subseteq \mathcal{R}^n$.

Let $U = \{a \in \mathcal{R}^n : \exists b \in A^n, b \leq a\}$. Consider the monotonic function $g : U \rightarrow A^n$ which maps $a \in U$ to $\vee\{b \in A^n : b \leq a\}$. It is easy to see that, for any $N : A^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, the restriction of $\text{Lan}_f N$ to U is isomorphic to the composite $N \circ g$, whereas the restriction to the complement U^c is identically 0. This implies that Lan_f is exact, and that $\text{Lan}_f(Q') \cong Q$ and $\text{Lan}_f(P') \cong P$. In turn, this implies that $\text{Lan}_f(M') \cong M$, as required.

We now address the statement of the result. Let M' be as in the previous claim. From [BOO21, Theorem 4.8], it follows that M' admits a finite rank projective resolution. In particular, by a standard argument, M' admits a minimal rank projective resolution, which must be finite. To conclude the proof, note that, by the considerations in the previous part, Lan_f preserves rank projective resolutions, and also minimality of resolutions. The uniqueness up to isomorphism of the minimal resolution holds by minimality. \square

The following is a persistent version of Schanuel's lemma for relative projective covers, which we use to prove the persistent version of Schanuel's lemma for relative projective resolutions.

Lemma A.1. *Let $M, N : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$ and let $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow P \xrightarrow{\alpha} M \rightarrow 0$ and $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{\gamma} N \rightarrow 0$ be \mathcal{E} -exact sequences. Assume that P and Q are \mathcal{E} -projective. If M and N are ε -interleaved, then $P \oplus L[\varepsilon]$ and $K[\varepsilon] \oplus Q$ are ε -interleaved.*

Proof. Let $f : M \rightarrow N[\varepsilon]$ and $g : N \rightarrow M[\varepsilon]$ form an ε -interleaving. Define the submodule $X \subseteq P \oplus Q[\varepsilon]$ such that $X(r) = \{(a, b) \in P(r) \oplus Q(r + \varepsilon) : f_r(\alpha_r(a)) = \gamma_{r+\varepsilon}(b)\}$. Diagrammatically, we have the following pullback square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \longrightarrow & P \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow f \circ \alpha \\ Q[\varepsilon] & \xrightarrow{\gamma[\varepsilon]} & N[\varepsilon]. \end{array}$$

Since the kernel of the bottom horizontal map is $L[\varepsilon]$ and \mathcal{E} -exact sequences are closed under pullback, it follows that the top map is part of an \mathcal{E} -exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K[\varepsilon] \rightarrow X \rightarrow P \rightarrow 0$. Since P is \mathcal{E} -projective, it follows that $X \cong L[\varepsilon] \oplus P$. We can define, analogously, a persistence module Y with $Y(r) = \{(a, b) \in P(r + \varepsilon) \oplus Q(r) : \alpha_{r+\varepsilon}(a) = g_r(\gamma_r(b))\}$. By a symmetric argument, it follows that $Y \cong K[\varepsilon] \oplus Q$.

We now prove that X and Y are ε -interleaved. Consider, for each $r \in \mathcal{R}^n$, the morphism $X(r) \rightarrow Y(r + \varepsilon)$ that maps $(a, b) \in P(r) \oplus Q(r + \varepsilon)$ to $(\varphi_{r, r+2\varepsilon}^P(a), b) \in P(r + 2\varepsilon) \oplus Q(r + \varepsilon)$. This is well-defined since, if $(a, b) \in X(r)$, then $f_r(\alpha_r(a)) = \gamma_{r+\varepsilon}(b)$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{r+2\varepsilon}(\varphi_{r, r+2\varepsilon}^P(a)) &= \varphi_{r, r+2\varepsilon}^M(\alpha_r(a)) \\ &= g_{r+\varepsilon}(f_r(\alpha_r(a))) = g_{r+\varepsilon}(\gamma_{r+\varepsilon}(b)). \end{aligned}$$

These morphisms assemble into a morphism $X \rightarrow Y[\varepsilon]$, and there is an analogous morphism $Y \rightarrow X[\varepsilon]$. It is easy to see that these morphisms form an ε -interleaving. \square

Proposition 2.7. *Let \mathcal{E} be a shift-invariant exact structure on $\text{vec}^{\mathfrak{R}^n}$. Let $M, N : \mathfrak{R}^n \rightarrow \text{vec}$, and let $P_\bullet \rightarrow M$ and $Q_\bullet \rightarrow N$ be \mathcal{E} -projective resolutions of finite length. If M and N are ε -interleaved, then so are*

$$P_0 \oplus Q_1[\varepsilon] \oplus P_2[2\varepsilon] \oplus Q_3[3\varepsilon] \oplus \cdots \quad \text{and} \quad Q_0 \oplus P_1[\varepsilon] \oplus Q_2[2\varepsilon] \oplus P_3[3\varepsilon] \oplus \cdots$$

Proof. We may assume that the \mathcal{E} -projective resolutions have length $\ell+1 \in \mathbb{N}$. We proceed by induction on ℓ . If $\ell = 0$, there is nothing to prove. Let $\ell \geq 1$ and consider the \mathcal{E} -exact sequences $0 \rightarrow \ker \alpha \rightarrow P_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha} M \rightarrow 0$ and $0 \rightarrow \ker \gamma \rightarrow Q_0 \xrightarrow{\gamma} N \rightarrow 0$. By Lemma A.1, we have that $(\ker \gamma)[\varepsilon] \oplus P_0$ and $(\ker \alpha)[\varepsilon] \oplus Q_0$ are ε -interleaved. We can then use the inductive hypothesis on the \mathcal{E} -projective resolutions

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow P_\ell[\varepsilon] \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P_2[\varepsilon] \rightarrow P_1[\varepsilon] \oplus P_0 &\rightarrow (\ker \alpha)[\varepsilon] \oplus Q_0, \\ 0 \rightarrow Q_\ell[\varepsilon] \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow Q_2[\varepsilon] \rightarrow Q_1[\varepsilon] \oplus P_0 &\rightarrow (\ker \gamma)[\varepsilon] \oplus P_0, \end{aligned}$$

of $(\ker \alpha)[\varepsilon] \oplus P_0$ and $(\ker \gamma)[\varepsilon] \oplus P_0$, respectively, concluding the proof. \square