

Persistent Cycle Representatives and Generalized Landscapes for Codimension 1 Persistent Homology

Fabian Lenzen, Leon Renkin

December 11, 2025

For a filtered simplicial complex K embedded in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , the merge tree of the complement of K induces a forest structure on the persistent homology $H_d(K)$ via Alexander duality. We prove that the connected components of $\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus K_r$ correspond to representative cycles for a basis of $H_d(K_r)$ which are volume-optimal. By keeping track of how these representatives evolve with the filtration of K , we can equip each interval I in the barcode of $H_d(K)$ with a sequence of canonical representative cycles. We develop and implement an efficient algorithm to compute the progression of cycles in time $\mathcal{O}((\#K)^2)$. We apply functionals to these representatives, such as path length, enclosed volume, or total curvature. This way, we obtain a real-valued function for each interval, which captures geometric information about K . Deriving from this construction, we introduce the *generalized persistence landscapes*. Using the constant one-function as the functional, this construction gives back the standard persistence landscapes. Generalized landscapes can distinguish point clouds with similar persistent homology but distinct shape, which we demonstrate by concrete examples.

1 Introduction

Persistent homology [22; 12; 17; 5], a central tool in topological data analysis, seeks to estimate the homology of spaces from finite samples. The general pipeline is that one assigns to a data set X an \mathbb{R} -indexed filtration K of simplicial complexes and computes its persistent homology $H_k(K)$ w.r.t. a field \mathbb{k} , which yields a so-called persistence module. If K_t is finite for all t , a standard result [6] asserts that the isomorphism type of $H_k(K)$ is uniquely determined by the *barcode* $\text{Bar}(H_k(K))$ of $H_k(K)$, which is the multiset of intervals in \mathbb{R} corresponding to its indecomposable summands. Intuitively, each interval I in $\text{Bar}(H_k(K))$ represents a distinct k -dimensional topological feature of K , which persists for all filtration values $t \in I$. An important vectorial summary of barcodes is the persistence landscape [4], which encodes the interval data of a barcode as a sequence of 1-Lipschitz functions, and thereby enables the application of classical statistical as well as machine learning tools. Standard barcodes and persistence landscapes, however, summarize only the lifetimes of features and do not capture the geometry of the cycles that realize them.

To incorporate such geometric information, one must consider the cycles representing these homology classes. Since cycle representatives are not unique, one aims to find cycles that minimize or maximize a certain target function among all cycles representing a given homology class. While this problem is NP-hard in general, special cases are tractable in polynomial time. One such case, on which we focus here, is to find a *volume-optimal cycle basis* for an embedded complex K in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} in codimension one, i.e., for $H_d(K)$. Instead of assigning a single representative cycle to each bar in the barcode, we define *cycle progression barcodes*, which contain a pair (I, γ) for each $I \in \text{Bar}(H_d(K))$ with $\gamma: I \rightarrow Z_d(K_\infty)$, such that the cycle $\gamma(t)$ optimally represents the summand of $H_d(K_t)$ corresponding to I .

By evaluating a functional $f: Z_d(K_\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on γ , we obtain a function $f \circ \gamma$ that contains information about the evolution of the shape of γ . For example, $(f \circ \gamma)(t)$ could be the arc length of $\gamma(t)$, or the volume enclosed by it. From the convolution of $f \circ \gamma$ with the indicator function of I , we construct generalized persistence landscapes, which are given by a sequence of real-valued functions and specialize to standard persistence landscapes for the constant one-functional.

1.1 Related work

Computing optimal homology representatives has widely been studied in the literature [13; 8; 7; 14]. For a simplicial complex L and $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, we extend a weight function $wt: L^{(k)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ linearly to $C_k(L)$. A cycle $z \in Z_k(L)$ *optimally represents* the homology class $[z]$ if it minimizes wt among all elements of $[z]$. A set $S \subseteq Z_k(L)$ is an *optimal cycle basis* if $\{[z] \mid z \in S\}$ is a basis of $H_k(L)$ that minimizes $\sum_{z \in S} wt(z)$. Both problems can be phrased as integer programming problems [7; 14], which in general is NP-hard. Polynomial time algorithms exist in special cases, such as $k = 1$ [13; 8], or if $H_k(L', L'')$ is torsion-free for all pure subcomplexes $L'' \subseteq L' \subseteq L$ of dimension k and $k + 1$ [7].

A different kind of optimality for k -cycles can be considered if a weight function $wt: L^{(k+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is considered; in this case, one speaks of *volume-optimal representatives* [20]. If $\dim L = d + 1$, and $|L| \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, then Alexander duality gives a correspondence between volume-optimal d -cycles and connected components of $\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus |L|$. This correspondence is compatible with filtrations, and a polynomial time algorithm for computing volume-optimal cycles (w.r.t. the constant weight function $\sigma \mapsto 1$) in codimension one has been presented in [24; 20]. It is implemented in the Homcloud package [21].

In contrast to [24; 20; 21], which assign a single optimal representative to each bar, our approach provides a sequence of optimal representatives for each bar, updating exactly at filtration events. An algorithm for tracking representative cycles across a sequence of simplicial complexes was also presented in [16], which uses heuristics such as shortest cycles to choose representatives and does not enforce geometric optimality. In contrast, we compute canonical and volume-optimal representative cycles that evolve across the filtration via the persistence forest.

1.2 Contribution

We build on [20], giving a new proof for the volume-optimally (w.r.t. any weight function) of the codimension-one cycles obtained via Alexander duality. Based on this, we introduce the *persistence forest* of a $(d + 1)$ -dimensional filtered complex $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$; which is closely related to persistence tree as defined and computed in [24; 20], see Remark 13. We extend the Alexander duality correspondence and persistence forests to the setting of *signed cycles*, which contain strictly more information than ordinary cycles. We provide a polynomial time algorithm that computes the (signed) persistence forest of K , using an approach similar to the algorithm presented in [20].

From the persistence forest, we derive the construction of *cycle progression barcodes*, which enrich each bar in $\text{Bar}(H_d(K))$ by a sequence of volume-optimal representative cycles. We show that if K is a contractible $(d + 1)$ -dimensional filtered simplicial complex embedded in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , one can compute the cycle progression barcode that minimizes the enclosed weight for any linear weight function $wt: K_\infty^{(d+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ in time $\mathcal{O}((\#K)^2)$. Using progression barcodes, we define *generalized landscapes*, which take geometric information of the representative cycles into account. The standard persistence landscapes [4] arise as special case of the generalized landscapes. Figure 1 shows an example of such a generalized persistence landscape, and the cycle progression barcode giving rise to it. We note that our concept of generalized landscapes differs from the one introduced in [2]: while the latter generalizes landscapes derived from barcodes by admitting other kernel functions than the distance to the closer boundary $t \mapsto \max\{0, \min\{t - b, d - t\}\}$ for an interval $I = [b, d]$, we use kernels that take geometric information about the cycle progression representing I into account.

We provide algorithms and implementations for efficiently computing persistence forests, cycle progression barcodes and generalized landscapes. Computing these structures for a Delaunay triangulation of 100 000 points in \mathbb{R}^2 can be done within seconds. We demonstrate the effectiveness of generalized




Figure 1: Top right: The H_1 -barcode of the α -complex of the point cloud on the left, and the first two associated generalized persistence landscapes w.r.t. $\frac{(\text{arc length})^2}{\text{enclosed area}} - 4\pi$. Bottom right: The cycle progressions corresponding to the bars of the same color. Each picture corresponds to the state of the cycles at the time indicated by a dashed vertical lines.

landscapes as shape descriptors by distinguishing point clouds with similar barcodes but distinct shape. Additionally, we show that using signed chains enables us to detect thin bridges between clusters more accurately.

1.3 Structure

We briefly review the relevant concepts from the theory of persistent homology in section 2. We discuss Alexander duality and volume-optimal representative cycles in section 3. In section 4, we introduce signed chains and cycles, and present (signed or unsigned) persistence forests including an algorithm to compute them. In section 5, we present the definition and computation of cycle progression barcodes and generalized landscapes. We show the effectiveness of signed cycles and generalized landscapes as shape descriptors in section 6.

2 Preliminaries

A *filtered simplicial* (resp. *cellular*) *complex* is an assignment K of a finite simplicial (resp. cellular) complex K_t for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $K_s \subseteq K_t$ for each $s \leq t$. We often assume that K is a $(d+1)$ -dimensional complex that can be extended to a triangulation of a $(d+1)$ -sphere S^{d+1} . If K_∞ is embedded in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} and triangulates the convex hull of its vertices, then ∂K_∞ is a d -sphere. We can embed K_∞ into S^{d+1} by using the one-point compactification of \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . We denote the point in $S^{d+1} \setminus \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ by ∞ . A triangulation T of S^{d+1} is given by $T = K_\infty \cup (\partial K_\infty * \infty)$, where $*$ denotes the simplicial join. For example, the α -filtration [11] or the Čech–Delaunay filtration [1] of a point cloud $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ are of this kind.

Let \mathbb{k} be an arbitrary field. A *persistence module* $M : (\mathbb{R}, \leq) \rightarrow \mathbf{vec}_{\mathbb{k}}$ is a functor from the poset category (\mathbb{R}, \leq) into the category of \mathbb{k} -vector spaces $\mathbf{vec}_{\mathbb{k}}$. We call M *pointwise finite dimensional* if M_t is a finite dimensional vector space for each t . For an interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, we write $\text{Int}(I)$ for the interval module supported on I . If M is pointwise finite dimensional, then there is an isomorphism $\bigoplus_{I \in \text{Bar}(M)} \text{Int}(I) \rightarrow M$ for a uniquely determined multiset $\text{Bar}(M)$ of intervals, called the *barcode* of M [6].

Let K be a filtered simplicial (or cellular) complex as above. Taking k -th homology of K (with coefficients in \mathbb{k}) defines a persistence module $H_k(K)$, where $H_k(K)_t = H_k(K_t)$, and $H_k(K)_s \rightarrow H_k(K)_t$ is the map induced by the inclusion $K_s \hookrightarrow K_t$. Since K_t is finite for all t , $H_k(K)$ has a barcode. Analogously, taking k -th cohomology defines a pointwise finite dimensional persistence module $H^k(K)$, with $H^k(K)_t = H^k(K_{-t})$. The reduced (co)homology modules $\tilde{H}_k(K)$ and $\tilde{H}^k(K)$ are defined analogously.




Figure 2: The triangulation T of S^2 (gray), its subcomplex $L \subseteq T$ (black), the cell complex decomposition \bar{T} of S^2 dual to T (pink), and its subcomplex $\bar{X} \subseteq \bar{T}$ dual to $X \subseteq T$ (red).

3 Volume-optimal cycles in codimension-one

3.1 Alexander Duality

We briefly revisit Alexander duality and refer to [15, §17.4, §17.11; 20, Appendix A.2; 3] for proofs and details. Let T be a triangulation of the $(d+1)$ -sphere S^{d+1} and $L \subsetneq T$ be a subcomplex. There exists a polyhedral decomposition \bar{T} of S^{d+1} , called the *dual decomposition* of T , whose k -cells $\bar{T}^{(k)}$ are in bijection with $T^{(d+1-k)}$. The cell corresponding to a simplex $\sigma \in T$ is denoted by $\bar{\sigma}$. After choosing appropriate orientations for the cells of \bar{T} , the matrix representing the boundary operator of \bar{T} with respect to the standard basis is the transpose of that of T . If $L \subseteq T$ is a simplicial subcomplex, then $\bar{L} := \{\bar{\sigma} \mid \sigma \in T \setminus L\}$ is a cellular subcomplex of \bar{T} ; see fig. 2.

Theorem 1 (Alexander duality). *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a natural isomorphism $\tilde{H}^k(\bar{L}) \cong \tilde{H}_{d-k}(L)$ in reduced (co)homology.*

We will make the isomorphism explicit for $k = 0$. First, to choose an “appropriate orientation” of the 1-cells in \bar{T} , let $\omega \in Z^{d+1}(T, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $[\omega]$ generates $H^{d+1}(T, \mathbb{Z})$. Then for each $\tau \in T^{(d+1)}$ with face σ , we orient the dual cell $\bar{\sigma}$ such that $\bar{\tau}^*(\partial \bar{\sigma}) = \sigma^*(\partial \tau)\omega(\tau)$, where $\bar{\tau}^*$ and σ^* denote the basis elements of $Z^0(\bar{T})$ and $Z^d(T)$ dual to $\bar{\tau}$ and σ , respectively. Now, for a complex $L \subseteq T$, consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_L: C^0(\bar{L}) &\rightarrow C_{d+1}(T), \\ \bar{\sigma}^* &\mapsto \omega(\sigma)\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

One can show that for $\gamma \in Z^0(\bar{L})$, one has $\partial \Phi_L(\gamma) \in Z_d(L)$. The isomorphism from theorem 1 now is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}_L: \tilde{H}^0(\bar{L}) &\rightarrow H_d(L) \\ [\gamma] &\mapsto [\partial \Phi_L(\gamma)]. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

3.2 Optimal cycles

The goal of this section is to show that the d -cycles on L corresponding to the connected components of \bar{L} under Alexander duality give “nice” representatives for a basis of $H_d(L)$. Assume that $L \subsetneq T$; then there exists a $(d+1)$ -cell $\infty \in T \setminus L$. Its dual $\bar{\infty}$ is a vertex of \bar{L} . Let $T^* := T \setminus \{\infty\}$. Then T^* is a contractible, which immediately yields the following:

Theorem 2. *For every $z \in Z_d(T^*)$ there exists a uniquely determined chain $\text{Int } z \in C_{d+1}(T^*)$ bounded by z .*

Define the linear map

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_L: Z_d(L) &\rightarrow C^0(\bar{L}), \\ c &\mapsto \Phi_L^{-1}(\text{Int } c). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Unravelling this definition immediately yields the following:

Theorem 3. *The map $R := \partial \Phi_L \Psi_L: Z_d(L) \rightarrow Z_d(L)$ satisfies $R(z) = \sum_{\sigma \in T^* \setminus L} \sigma^*(z)\sigma$.*

Intuitively, $R(z)$ strips away the $B_d(L)$ -part of z . The following makes this precise.

Theorem 4. *For all $z \in Z_d(L)$, we have $z - R(z) \in B_d(L)$.*

Proof. Expressing z in the standard basis of $C_d(T^*)$ yields

$$z = \sum_{\sigma \in L} \sigma^*(z) \sigma + \sum_{\sigma \in T^* \setminus L} \sigma^*(z) \sigma.$$

By lemma 3, the second sum equals $R(z)$, which yields the claim. \square

The *support* of a cycle $z \in Z_k(T)$ and a cochain $\gamma \in C^k(T)$ is

$$\text{supp } z := \{\sigma \in T^{(k)} \mid \sigma^*(z) \neq 0\}, \quad \text{supp } \gamma := \{\sigma \in T^{(k)} \mid \gamma(\sigma) \neq 0\}. \quad (4)$$

Let $wt: (T^*)^{(d+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a weight function. We define the weight of z and γ by

$$wt(z) := \sum_{\sigma \in \text{supp}(\text{Int } z)} wt(\sigma), \quad wt(\gamma) := \sum_{\sigma \in \text{supp } \gamma} wt(\sigma). \quad (5)$$

Definition 5. A *cycle basis* of L is a set $S \subseteq Z_d(L)$ such that $\{[z] \mid z \in S\}$ is a basis of $\tilde{H}_d(L)$. A *cocycle basis* of \bar{L} is a set $S \subseteq Z^0(\bar{L})$ such that $\{[\gamma] \mid \gamma \in S\}$ is a basis of $\tilde{H}^0(\bar{L})$. A (co)cycle basis S is called *minimal* if it minimizes $wt(S) := \sum_{z \in S} wt(z)$.

Per Alexander duality, the map $\partial\Phi_L$ sends cocycle bases of $\tilde{H}_0(\bar{L})$ to cycle basis of $\tilde{H}_d(L)$.

Theorem 6. *The image of $\partial\Phi_L$ contains a minimal cycle basis. If $wt(\sigma) > 0$ for all $\sigma \in L^{(d+1)}$, then every minimal cycle basis of L lies in $\text{im } \partial\Phi_L$.*

Proof. Let $S \subseteq Z_d(L)$ be a cycle basis. By lemma 4, $R(S) := \{R(z) \mid z \in S\}$ is also a cycle basis, which is contained in $\text{im } \partial\Phi_L$. Let $z \in S$ be a cycle. Then $\text{supp } R(z) \subseteq (T^*)^{(d)} \setminus L^{(d)}$ and $\text{supp}(z - R(z)) \subseteq L^{(d)}$ are disjoint, which implies $wt(z) = wt(R(z)) + wt(z - R(z))$. Since the second term is nonnegative, we get $wt(z) \geq wt(R(z))$, so in particular $wt(S) \geq wt(R(S))$. If $wt(\sigma) > 0$ for all $\sigma \in L^{(d+1)}$, then $wt(z) = wt(R(z))$ precisely if $z = R(z)$. \square

Remark 7. We view the set $\pi_0(L)$ of connected components of L as a subset of $Z^0(\bar{L})$ by identifying a connected component c with the cocycle $\sum_{v \in c} v^*$ supported on it. In this sense, $\pi_0(\bar{L})$ is a basis of the vector space $Z^0(\bar{L})$. Let $\tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{L})$ be the subset of $\pi_0(\bar{L})$ not containing the the connected component of ∞ . Then $\tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{L})$ is a cocycle basis for $\tilde{H}^0(\bar{L})$.

Theorem 8. *The set $\{\partial\Phi_L(c) \mid c \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{L})\}$ is a minimal cycle basis of L . If $wt(\sigma) > 0$ for all σ , it is unique up to rescaling.*

Proof. A cycle basis $S \subseteq Z_d(L)$ is minimal if and only if $S = \partial\Phi_L(S')$ for a minimal cocycle basis $S' \subseteq Z^0(\bar{L})$. Therefore, it suffices to show that $\tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{L})$ is a minimal cocycle basis, and it is the only one if $wt(\sigma) > 0$ for all σ . The elements of $\tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{L})$ have pairwise disjoint support, so any cocycle $\gamma = \sum_{c \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{L})} \mu_{\gamma c} c$ with scalar coefficients $\mu_{\gamma c}$ has weight $wt(\gamma) = \sum_{\mu_{\gamma c} \neq 0} wt(c)$. Let $S' \subseteq Z^0(\bar{L})$ be any cocycle basis. We obtain that

$$\sum_{\gamma \in S'} wt(\gamma) = \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in S', c \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{L}) \\ \mu_{\gamma c} \neq 0}} wt(c).$$

Since the $\mu_{\gamma c}$ encode a change of basis, at least one $\mu_{\gamma c}$ is non zero for each $c \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{L})$. This implies that $\sum_{\gamma \in S'} wt(\gamma) \geq \sum_{c \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{L})} wt(c)$. If $wt(\sigma) > 0$ for all σ , then equality holds if and only if precisely one $\mu_{\gamma c}$ is non-zero for each c , which implies that each $\gamma \in S'$ is a scalar multiple of some $c \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{L})$. \square




Figure 3: The bounded connected components of the dual filtered complex \tilde{K} (red) correspond to a weight-minimal basis (green) for the codimension-one homology group of K (black and blue).

3.3 Filtrations

The isomorphism $\tilde{\Phi}_L$ from (2) is natural in the sense that for any subcomplex $L' \subseteq L$, the inclusion $\iota: L' \hookrightarrow L$ and the induced inclusion $\bar{\iota}: \bar{L}' \hookrightarrow \bar{L}$ yield the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{H}^0(\bar{L}') & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Phi}_{L'}} & H_d(L') \\ \bar{\iota}^* \downarrow & & \downarrow \iota_* \\ \tilde{H}^0(\bar{L}) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Phi}_L} & H_d(L). \end{array}$$

Theorem 1 immediately yields the following persistent version of Alexander duality. For a filtered simplicial complex K with $K_\infty \subseteq T^*$, denote by $\bar{K} \subseteq \bar{T}$ the filtered cell complex given by $\bar{K}_t := \overline{K_{-t}}$. Then we have:

Corollary 9. *The maps $\tilde{\Phi}_{K_t}: \tilde{H}^0(\bar{K}_t) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_d(K_t)$ from theorem 1 with $t \in \mathbb{R}$ induce an isomorphism of persistence modules $\tilde{\Phi}_K: \tilde{H}^0(\bar{K}) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_d(K)$; see fig. 3.*

Orientations Recall that the construction of $\tilde{\Phi}_K$ depends on the choice of a cochain $\omega \in Z^{d+1}(T, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $[\omega]$ generates $H^{d+1}(T, \mathbb{Z})$. We call an element $\omega \in Z^{d+1}(K_\infty, \mathbb{Z})$ an *orientation* of K if $[\omega]$ extends to a generator $H^{d+1}(T, \mathbb{Z})$. An orientation ω for K is unique up to sign and satisfies $\omega(\sigma) \in \{\pm 1\}$ for every $\sigma \in K_\infty^{(d+1)}$.

Example 10. If K_∞ is embedded in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , then an orientation of K is given by the cocycle $\omega: [v_0, \dots, v_{d+1}] \mapsto \text{sgn det}(v_1 - v_0, \dots, v_{d+1} - v_0)$.

4 Merge trees and persistence forests

We say that a filtered simplicial complex K is a *closed* (resp. *open*) *sublevel filtration* if there is a poset map $\tau: K_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ such that $K_t = \tau^{-1}([-\infty, t])$ (resp. $K_t = \tau^{-1}([-\infty, t))$). We call τ the filtration function of K . The *Hasse diagram* of a poset P is the directed graph (P, E) with an edge $p \rightarrow q$ if $p < q$ and there exists no r such that $p < r < q$.

Definition 11. Let K be a finite closed (resp. open) sublevel filtration. Consider the set $S = \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \pi_0(K_t) \times \{t\}$ (resp. $S = \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \pi_0(\bigcap_{s > t} K_s) \times \{t\}$), partially ordered by $(c_1, t_1) \leq (c_2, t_2)$ if $c_1 \subseteq c_2$ and $t_1 \leq t_2$. The (labeled) *merge tree* of K is the Hasse diagram $M(K)$ of its finite subposet

$$\{(c, t) \in S \mid \bigcup_{(c', t') < (c, t)} c' \subsetneq c\}.$$

If $K_{-\infty} := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} K_t$ is connected, then the *reduced (labeled) merge forest* $\tilde{M}(K)$ of K is obtained from $M(K)$ as follows. Let Γ be the maximal directed path emanating from the leaf $-\infty$ corresponding to the unique class in $\pi_0(K_{-\infty})$, and let U be the set of vertices on that path. One then obtains $\tilde{M}(K)$ from $M(K)$ by replacing every edge $(c', t') \rightarrow (c, t)$ for $(c, t) \in U$ by an edge $(c', t'') \rightarrow (c, t)$ for a new vertex (c', t) , and deleting all edges in Γ and vertices in U , including the leaf $-\infty$; see fig. 4.




Figure 4: Passing from the merge tree $M(K)$ (left) to the reduced merge forest $\tilde{M}(K)$ (right).




Figure 5: Left: a filtered simplicial complex. The filtration values are given in black for the edges and in red for the triangles. The filtration values of the vertices are not relevant and thus omitted. Middle: The persistence tree of this complex as constructed in [24; 20]. Right: The persistence forest of this complex as defined in definition 12. The colors correspond to fig. 8.

Let T be a triangulation of S^{d+1} and $K \subsetneq T$ be a closed sublevel set filtration of a $(d+1)$ -dimensional complex with filtration function τ such that K_∞ is contractible. Then the dual filtration \bar{K} is an open sublevel set filtration with filtration function $-\tau$. The intersection $\bar{K}_{-\infty} := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \bar{K}_t$ has a single connected component containing the vertex ∞ of \bar{K}_∞ . Recall from (7) that for a complex L , we identify $\pi_0(L)$ with a subset of $Z^0(L)$. Consider the map $\Theta_L := \partial\Phi_L : Z^0(L) \rightarrow Z_d(L)$, where Φ_L denotes the map from (1). Note that the definition of Θ_L depends on the choice of an orientation ω of K .

Definition 12. Let K be as above. Let $(\bar{V}, \bar{E}) = \tilde{M}(\bar{K})$ be the reduced merge forest of \bar{K} . The *persistence forest* $T(K)$ of K (w.r.t. ω) is the directed graph (V, E) with $V := \{(\Theta_{K_t}(c), -t) \mid (c, t) \in \bar{V}\}$ and E obtained from \bar{E} in the obvious way.

Because the orientation ω on K is unique up to sign, so is the persistence forest. We thus often omit the orientation, and speak of “the” persistence forest of K .

Remark 13. The *persistence tree* from [20] is related to our persistence forest as follows. Let (V, E) be the persistence forest of a simplex-wise filtration K , and (V', E') be a persistence tree in the sense of [20]. Then $V' = \{\infty\} \cup \{t \mid V \text{ has a leaf } (z, t)\}$, and E' contains a directed edge $d \xrightarrow{b} s$ for each two leaves (z_d, d) and (z_s, s) with a common ancestor (z_b, b) such that $d < s$ and both are the leaves with maximal d and s in their respective subtrees below (z_b, b) . Additionally, E' contains an edge $d \xrightarrow{b} \infty$ for every root (z_b, b) in V , where (z_d, d) is the leaf of (z_b, b) with maximal d . See fig. 5 for an example comparing the two constructions.

Theorem 14. Let K be as in definition 12. For any $c \in \pi_0(\bar{K}_t)$, we have

$$\text{supp}(\text{Int}(\Theta_{K_t}(c))) = \{\sigma \in K_\infty^{(d+1)} \mid \bar{\sigma} \in c\}.$$

Proof. Let ω be the orientation of K . We obtain

$$\text{Int } \Theta_{K_t}(c) = \text{Int } \partial\Phi_{K_t}(c) = \Phi_{K_t}(c) = \Phi_{K_t}\left(\sum_{\bar{\sigma} \in c} \bar{\sigma}^*\right) = \sum_{\bar{\sigma} \in c} \omega(\sigma)\sigma. \quad \square$$

Theorem 15. For $s \leq t$, and component $c \in \pi_0(\bar{K}_s)$, let $C := \{c' \in \pi_0(\bar{K}_t) \mid c' \subseteq c\}$. Then the following equations holds in $H_d(K_t)$:

$$[\Theta_{K_s}(c)] = \sum_{c' \in C} [\Theta_{K_t}(c')].$$




Figure 6: Unsigned cycles cannot distinguish X (left) and Y (right).




Figure 7: Difference between a unsigned (left) and signed (right) cycle in a simplicial complex.

Proof. First, we note that $\Theta_{K_s}(c) \in Z_d(K_s) \subseteq Z_d(K_t)$. With $c'' = c \setminus \bigcup C$, we get

$$\Theta_{K_s}(c) = \sum_{\bar{\sigma} \in c} \omega(\sigma) \partial \sigma = \sum_{\bar{\sigma} \in c''} \omega(\sigma) \partial \sigma + \sum_{c' \in C} \sum_{\bar{\sigma} \in c'} \omega(\sigma) \partial \sigma = \partial \left(\sum_{\bar{\sigma} \in c''} \omega(\sigma) \sigma \right) + \sum_{c' \in C} \Theta_{K_t}(c').$$

The result now follows from that fact that $\sum_{\bar{\sigma} \in c''} \omega(\sigma) \sigma \in C_d(K_t)$ because $c'' \cap \bar{K}_t = \emptyset$. \square

4.1 Signed chains and cycles

Observe that the complexes X and Y in fig. 6 have the same set of 1-cycles $Z_1(X)$ and $Z_1(Y)$. In particular, their minimal cycle bases are the same (up to rescaling). To capture the structural difference between X and Y , we introduce signed chains.

Definition 16. For a simplicial complex L , the *signed k -chains* $C_k^\pm(L)$ are the vector space spanned by symbols σ^+ , σ^- for each k -simplex $\sigma \in L$. Let ι be the involution defined by $\iota(\sigma^\pm) := \sigma^\mp$, where σ^\pm stands for either σ^+ or σ^- . Define the map

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_n^\pm: C_k^\pm(L) &\rightarrow C_{k-1}^\pm(L), \\ [v_0, \dots, v_n]^\pm &\mapsto \sum_{i=0}^n \iota^i([v_0, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n]^\pm), \end{aligned}$$

where $\iota^{\pm k}$ refers to the k -fold composition of ι with itself.

We call the generators σ^\pm of $C_k^\pm(L)$ *signed simplices*. Note that $(C_k^\pm(L), \partial_k^\pm)$ is not a chain complex. There is a natural map $\pi_k^\pm: C_k^\pm(L) \rightarrow C_k(L)$ given by $\sigma^\pm \mapsto \pm \sigma$. We have

$$\partial_k \circ \pi_k^\pm = \pi_{k-1}^\pm \circ \partial_k^\pm.$$

The *signed k -cycles* of L are $Z_k^\pm(L) := \ker(\partial_k \circ \pi_k^\pm)$. If $z \in Z_k^\pm(L)$ is a signed cycle, we write $[z] := [\pi_k^\pm(z)] \in H_k(L)$. For $z \in Z_d^\pm(L)$, we set $\text{Int}(z) = \text{Int}(\pi_d^\pm(z))$. Consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_L^\pm: C^0(\bar{L}) &\rightarrow C_d^\pm(T), \\ \bar{\sigma}^* &\mapsto \iota^{\frac{1}{2}(\omega(\sigma)-1)}(\sigma^+); \end{aligned}$$

cf. the definition of Φ_L in (1). Clearly, $\pi_d^\pm \Phi_L^\pm = \Phi_L$. Consider the projection $p_L: C_d^\pm(T) \rightarrow C_d^\pm(L)$. We obtain the composition $\Theta_L^\pm := p_L \partial^\pm \Phi_L^\pm: C^0(\bar{L}) \rightarrow C_d(L)$. Observe that $\pi_d^\pm \Theta_L^\pm = \Theta_L$. If K is as in definition 12, we define its *signed persistence forest* $T^\pm(K)$ (w.r.t. an orientation ω of K) as in definition 12, with Θ^\pm instead of Θ . Replacing ω with $-\omega$ transforms $\Theta_{K_t}^\pm(-)$ into $\iota(\Theta_{K_t}^\pm(-))$. Since the orientation on K is unique up to sign, the signed persistence forest on K is unique up to application of ι .

Applying π_d^\pm to the labels yields the persistence forest as defined in definition 12. Observe that only 0 and 1 can appear as coefficients in a signed chain of the form $\Theta_{K_t}^\pm(c)$ for $c \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{L})$. Thus, the choice of coefficient field does not affect the (signed) persistence forest.

Algorithm 1: Persistence Forest Algorithm

Input: A filtered simplicial complex K as in theorem 17 with filtration function τ and orientation ω

Output: A signed persistence forest $T^\pm(K)$ of K

choose an enumeration $K = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{|K|}\}$ of K such that $\sigma_i \subseteq \sigma_j$ implies $i \leq j$

let $A = \emptyset$, $V \leftarrow \emptyset$ and $E \leftarrow \emptyset$

for $i = |K|, \dots, 1$ **do**

if $\dim \sigma_i = d + 1$ **then**

 add a new vertex $v = (\iota^{\frac{1}{2}(\omega(\sigma)-1)} \partial^\pm \sigma_i, \tau(\sigma_i))$ to V

 add $(\iota^{\frac{1}{2}(\omega(\sigma)-1)} \partial^\pm \sigma_i, v)$ to A

else if $\dim \sigma_i = d$ **then**

 find (z^+, v^+) and $(z^-, v^-) \in A$ such that z^\pm contains σ^\pm , if they exist

if (z^\pm, v^\pm) was found but not (z^\mp, v^\mp) **then**

 add a new vertex $w = (z^\pm, \tau(\sigma_i))$ to V

 add a new edge $e: v \rightarrow w$ to E

 remove (z^\pm, v^\pm) from A

else if both were found and are unequal then

 let $z = \text{MERGE}_{\sigma_i}(z^+, z^-)$

 add a new vertex $w = (z, \tau(\sigma_i))$ to V

 add two new edges $e^\pm: w \rightarrow v^\pm$ to E

 add (z, w) to A and remove both (z^\pm, v^\pm) from A

else if both were found and are equal then

 let $z = \text{CANCEL}_{\sigma_i}(z^+)$

 add a new vertex $w = (z, \tau(\sigma_i))$ to V

 add a new edge $e: w \rightarrow v$ to E

 add (z, w) to A and remove (z^+, v^+) from A

contract all edges $(z_1, t_1) \rightarrow (z_2, t_2)$ with $t_1 = t_2$ and remove vertices of degree 0

return (V, E)

4.2 The persistence forest algorithm

We say that a signed chain *contains* the signed simplex σ^\pm if the coefficient of σ^\pm is non-zero. For an unsigned d -simplex $\sigma \in K$ and signed d -chains $z_1, z_2 \in C_d^\pm(L)$, we define the functions $\text{MERGE}_\sigma(z_1, z_2) = z_1 + z_2 - \sigma_+^*(z_1 + z_2)\sigma^+ - \sigma_-^*(z_1 + z_2)\sigma^-$ and $\text{CANCEL}_\sigma(z) = z - \sigma_+^*(z)\sigma^+ - \sigma_-^*(z)\sigma^-$, where σ_\pm^* denotes the dual of σ^\pm .

Theorem 17. *Let K be a $(d + 1)$ -dimensional closed sublevel filtered simplicial complex, such that K_∞ is contractible and extends to a triangulation of S^{d+1} . Then the Persistence Forest Algorithm 1 returns the signed persistence forest $T^\pm(K)$ of K .*

The unsigned persistence forest $T(K)$ of K is obtained by applying π^\pm to $T^\pm(K)$. Note that the persistence forest algorithm does not depend on the choice of coefficient field.

Proof of theorem 17. W.l.o.g., we may assume that $\tau: K_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is injective, i.e., is a simplex-wise filtration. Enumerate the simplices of K such that $K_i = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_i\}$. By slight abuse of notation, we assume that the signed dual boundary $\Theta_{K_i}^\pm$ and the projection p_{K_i} map into $C_d^\pm(K_\infty)$. We proceed to show that at the end of step i of the iteration, there is a bijection between A and $\tilde{\pi}_0(\overline{K_i})$; i.e., for each $(z, v) \in A$, we have $z = \Theta_{K_i}^\pm(c)$ for some connected component $c \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\overline{K_i})$.

We first note that if $\dim \sigma_i = d + 1$, then removing σ_i from K_i creates the new connected component $\{\bar{\sigma}_i\}$ in $\overline{K_i}$ and $\Theta_{K_i}^\pm(\{\bar{\sigma}_i\}) = \iota^{\frac{1}{2}(\omega(\sigma)-1)} \partial^\pm \sigma_i$.

If $\dim \sigma_i = d$, it corresponds to an edge $\bar{\sigma}_i \in \overline{K_i} \setminus \overline{K_{i-1}}$. A d -simplex in K has at most two cofaces, τ_1 and τ_2 . The elements $(z^+, v^+), (z^-, v^-) \in A$ from the algorithm correspond to the connected components of these cofaces in $\overline{K_i}$.

If neither (z^+, v^+) nor (z^-, v^-) exist, then the two vertices $\bar{\tau}_1, \bar{\tau}_2$ connected by the edge $\bar{\sigma}_i$ lie in the connected component of ∞ . Therefore, inserting $\bar{\sigma}_i$ into \bar{K}_i does not change the bounded connected components. If (z^\pm, v^\pm) exists but not (z^\mp, v^\mp) , we know that $\bar{\sigma}_i$ connects a bounded connected component to ∞ , which corresponds to a root in the persistence forest. If both (z^+, v^+) and (z^-, v^-) are found and are distinct, we deduce that $\bar{\sigma}_i$ connects two bounded connected components $c^+, c^- \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{K}_i)$, which corresponds to a merger of two tree branches in the persistence forest. The correspondence between connected components and signed cycles yields $\Theta_{K_i}^\pm(c^\pm) = z^\pm$. Since $\Theta_{K_i}^\pm(c^+) + \Theta_{K_i}^\pm(c^-) = \Theta_{K_i}^\pm(c^+ \cup c^-)$, we deduce

$$\text{MERGE}_{\sigma_i}(\Theta_{K_i}^\pm(c^+), \Theta_{K_i}^\pm(c^-)) = p_{K_{i-1}}(\Theta_{K_i}^\pm(c^+ \cup c^-)) = \Theta_{K_{i-1}}^\pm(c^+ \cup c^-).$$

In the case $(z^+, v^+) = (z^-, v^-)$, the edge $\bar{\sigma}_i$ connects two points in the connected component $c \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\bar{K}_i)$, and $z^+ = z^- = \Theta_{K_i}^\pm(c)$. It is easy to verify that

$$\text{CANCEL}_{\sigma_i}(\Theta_{K_i}^\pm(c)) = p_{K_{i-1}}(\Theta_{K_i}^\pm(c)) = \Theta_{K_{i-1}}^\pm(c).$$

After the for-loop terminates, the graph (V, E) is the signed persistence forest of K . For general τ , we obtain the merge forest of K by contracting all edges such that start and end point have the same filtration value, and deleting redundant vertices of degree 0 afterwards. With contracting a parent-child pair in a forest, we refer to the process of deleting the child vertex and all its edges, and adding new edges from the all children of the child vertex to the parent vertex. If the reduction process leads to a root with multiple children, we create a copy of that root node for each child, add an edge from each child to its new root, and delete the original root node. \square

Algorithmic Complexity Observe that it suffices to iterate over the simplices in $K_\infty^{(d)} \cup K_\infty^{(d+1)}$, and $\#K_\infty^{(d+1)} \leq \#K_\infty^{(d)}$. Let $L := \max\{\#\text{supp}(z) \mid z \text{ appears in } A\} \leq \#K_\infty^{(d)}$ be the number of simplices in the largest appearing cycle. For a d -simplex σ , we can find $(z^+, v^+), (z^-, v^-) \in A$ containing σ^+, σ^- by finding the roots v_1, v_2 above the leaves induced by its cofaces $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in K_\infty^{(d+1)}$. Let z_1, z_2 be the signed cycles at v_1, v_2 . If $(z_1, v_1), (z_2, v_2) \in A$, then $\{(z_1, v_1), (z_2, v_2)\} = \{(z^+, v^+), (z^-, v^-)\}$, and otherwise either (z^+, v^+) or (z^-, v^-) does not exist. If σ only has a single coface in $K_\infty^{(d+1)}$, then (z^+, v^+) or (z^-, v^-) does not exist. With proper bookkeeping, this procedure can be done in $\mathcal{O}(L)$ since the number of nodes between a leaf and its root is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(L)$. Since we can also compute $\text{MERGE}_\sigma(z_1, z_2)$ in $\mathcal{O}(\#\text{supp}(z_1) + \#\text{supp}(z_2)) \leq \mathcal{O}(L)$, the complexity of the i -th iteration is $\mathcal{O}(L)$. The overall algorithmic complexity is thus bounded by $\mathcal{O}(L \cdot \#K_\infty^{(d)}) \leq \mathcal{O}((\#K_\infty^{(d)})^2)$.

For a point cloud in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} with n points, we can use persistence forest algorithm on a filtration of the Delaunay complex, which has up to $\mathcal{O}(n^{\lceil \frac{d+1}{2} \rceil})$ simplices [25], and can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(n \log n + n^{\lceil \frac{d+1}{2} \rceil})$, see [10]. This yields an overall complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \lceil \frac{d+1}{2} \rceil)$. We note that the expected size of the Delaunay triangulation is $\mathcal{O}(n)$ in many settings [9; 18], and can be computed with expected complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ for i.i.d. points [10].

Proposition 18. *If $(z_1, t_1), (z_2, t_2)$ are vertices in the (signed) persistence forest of K such that there exists a directed path from (z_1, t_1) to (z_2, t_2) , then $\text{supp } z_1 \subseteq \langle \text{supp Int } z_2 \rangle$.*

Proof. By construction of the persistence forest, we get $c_1 \in \pi_0(\bar{K}_{t_1})$ and $c_2 \in \pi_0(\bar{K}_{t_2})$ such that $z_1 = \Theta_{K_{t_1}}(c_1)$, $z_2 = \Theta_{K_{t_2}}(c_2)$ and $c_1 \subseteq c_2$. Using lemma 14, we conclude

$$\text{supp Int } \Theta_{K_{t_1}}(c_1) = \{\sigma \in K_\infty^{(d+1)} \mid \bar{\sigma} \in c_1\} \subseteq \{\sigma \in K_\infty^{(d+1)} \mid \bar{\sigma} \in c_2\} = \text{supp Int } \Theta_{K_{t_2}}(c_2).$$

We thus know that $\text{supp } z_1 \subseteq \langle \text{supp Int } z_1 \rangle \subseteq \langle \text{supp Int } z_2 \rangle$. The signed case follows immediately since $\text{Int } \Theta_{K_{t_1}}^\pm = \text{Int } \Theta_{K_{t_1}}$. \square

5 Generalized Landscapes

5.1 Cycle Progression Barcode

Let K be as in theorem 17. Recall from lemma 2 that every $c \in Z_d(K_\infty)$ bounds a uniquely determined chain $\text{Int}(c) \in C_{d+1}(K_\infty)$.

Definition 19. A *cycle progression barcode* of $H_d(K)$ is a set Γ containing a pair (I, γ) with $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Z_d(K_\infty)$ for each $I \in \text{Bar}(H_d(K))$, such that

1. $\gamma(r) \in Z_d(K_r)$ for every $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(I, \gamma) \in \Gamma$,
2. $\gamma(r) = 0$ for all $(I, \gamma) \in \Gamma$ and $r \notin I$,
3. the set $\{\gamma(r) \mid (I, \gamma) \in \Gamma \text{ and } r \in I\}$ is a cycle basis of K_r ,
4. for $r \leq s$, we have $\text{supp } \gamma(s) \subseteq \langle \text{supp } \text{Int}(\gamma(r)) \rangle$, where the right side is the subcomplex of K_∞ generated by the simplices on which $\text{Int}(\gamma(r))$ is supported
5. the $[\gamma(s)]$ -coefficient of $[\gamma(r)]$ w.r.t. the basis $\{[\gamma'(s)] \mid (I', \gamma') \in \Gamma, s \in I'\}$ of $H_d(K_s)$ is 1.

We call a cycle progression barcode *minimal* w.r.t. a weight $wt: (T^*)^{(d+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ if the cycle basis in 3 is minimal w.r.t. wt for all r .

Example 20. Recall the complex from fig. 5. Ignoring sign, a minimal cycle progression barcode of it is given by the cycles in fig. 8.

Theorem 21. Let K be as above, and $T(K)$ be its (signed) persistence forest. Then algorithm 2 computes a cycle progression barcode of $H_d(K)$ which is minimal for any weight.

Proof. From corollary 9, we deduce that the well-known elder-rule determines the intervals of $\text{Bar}(H_d(K))$. The representatives $\gamma(r)$ give a cycle basis for each r by the definition of $T(K)$. Minimality follows from minimality of the representatives in $T(K)$ by theorem 8. \square

Signed cycle progression barcodes are defined analogously, and can also be obtained from signed persistence forests using algorithm 2. We call a signed cycle progression barcode Γ^\pm *minimal* if $\{(I, \pi^\pm(\gamma)) \mid (I, \gamma) \in \Gamma^\pm\}$ is a minimal cycle progression barcode and $\gamma(r) = p_{K_r}(\partial^\pm(\text{Int}(\gamma(r))))$ for all $(I, \gamma) \in \Gamma^\pm$. For a signed persistence forest, algorithm 2 yields a minimal signed cycle progression barcode.




Figure 8: Cycles belonging to a minimal cycle progression barcode of the filtered complex. The colors of the cycles correspond to the maximal paths in the persistence forest in fig. 5.

Algorithm 2: Obtaining a cycle progression barcode from a persistence forest.

Input: A persistence forest $(V, E) = T(K)$ of K
Output: A minimal cycle progression barcode Γ of $H_d(K)$
 $E \leftarrow$ edges of $T(K)$
 $\Gamma \leftarrow \emptyset$
while $E \neq \emptyset$ **do**
 $p \leftarrow$ a directed path $(x, d) \rightsquigarrow (y, b)$ in E of maximal length
 $I \leftarrow [b, d]$
 $\gamma \leftarrow (r \mapsto \text{the } v \text{ for } (v, t) \text{ on } p \text{ with minimal } t > r)$
 $\Gamma \leftarrow \Gamma \cup \{(I, \gamma)\}$
 $E \leftarrow E \setminus \{p\}$
return Γ

Proposition 22. *Let K be as in theorem 17 and let $wt: (T^*)^{(d+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be a weight function. If all intervals in $\text{Bar}(H_d(K))$ have pairwise distinct upper endpoints, then the minimal (signed) cycle progression barcode for $H_d(K)$ w.r.t. wt is unique up to rescaling.*

Proof. Let Γ be a minimal cycle progression barcode. Let $(I, \gamma) \in \Gamma$ and $s, t \in I$ with $s \leq t$. By theorem 8, weight optimality implies that there exist $c_s \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\overline{K_s})$ and $c_t \in \tilde{\pi}_0(\overline{K_t})$ such that $\gamma(s) = a_s \Theta_{K_s}(c_s)$ and $\gamma(t) = a_t \Theta_{K_t}(c_t)$ for $a_s, a_t \in \mathbb{k}$. With lemma 15 and definition 19.5, we get $a_s = a_t$ and $c_s \supseteq c_t$. We conclude that (I, γ) is induced by a path in the persistence forest. Definition 19.3 ensures that $\gamma(t) \neq \gamma'(t)$ for distinct $(I, \gamma), (J, \gamma') \in \Gamma$ and $t \in I \cap J$, from which we deduce that the induced paths can at most intersect in one of their endpoints. As the death times in $\text{Bar}(H_d(K))$ are distinct, the set of suitable paths in the persistence forest is uniquely determined by the elder rule. The uniqueness in the signed setting is a direct consequence of the unsigned case. \square

5.2 Functionals on Cycle Representatives Barcode

By a *functional*, we mean a map $f: Z_d(K_\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and analogously for signed chains.

Example 23. Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be as in theorem 17.

- The k -dimensional volume (i.e., for $k = 1$, the arc length of c) for a (signed) chain $c \in C_k^{(\pm)}(K)$ is given by $\text{Vol}(c) := \sum_{\sigma \in \text{supp } c} \text{Vol}(\sigma)$, where $\text{Vol}([v_0, \dots, v_k]^{(\pm)}) = \frac{1}{d!} |\det(v_1 - v_0, \dots, v_k - v_0)|$.
- The enclosed $d + 1$ -dimensional volume (i.e., for $d = 1$, the enclosed area) for a (signed) cycle $z \in Z_d^{(\pm)}(K)$ is defined as $\text{EVol}(z) := \text{Vol}(\text{Int } z)$.
- For $d = 1$ and coefficients in \mathbb{Z} , a 1-cycle z can be written as a sum $z = \sum_{u \in U} u$ of closed polygonal chains $u = \sum_{i=1}^n [v_i, v_{i+1}]$, taking indices mod n . For such a chain u , we define the *excess curvature* $\kappa(u) = \frac{\varkappa(u)}{2\pi} - 1$, where $\varkappa(u)$ is the *total curvature* $\varkappa(u) = \sum_i |\angle(v_i - v_{i-1}, v_{i+1} - v_i)|$, and for c , we define $\kappa(z) = \sum_{u \in U} \kappa(u)$. Note that $\kappa(z) = 0$ if and only if every polygonal chain in z is convex.

If the decomposition $z = \sum_{u \in U} u$ of z is not unique (which happens if c contains edges twice, or if z contains more than two edges incident to the same vertex), we chose the decomposition that minimizes $|U|$, and in case of equality also minimizes $\sum_{u \in U} \kappa(u)$.

Since a signed 1-chain induces a multiset of oriented edges, we can construct a polyhedral chain and define excess curvature analogously to the approach above.

Observe that $\text{Vol}(z^\pm) \geq \text{Vol}(\pi^\pm(z^\pm))$ and $\text{EVol}(z^\pm) = \text{EVol}(\pi^\pm(z^\pm))$.

Let Γ be a cycle progression barcode for K , and $(I, \gamma) \in \Gamma$. For a functional f , we consider the composition $f \circ \gamma$. Additionally, we also consider the rescaled convolution $f \boxtimes \gamma := \frac{1}{2}((f \circ \gamma) * \mathbb{1}_I)(2x - \frac{b+d}{2})$, where $\mathbb{1}_I$ denotes the indicator function on the interval $I = [a, b]$, and $g * h$ denotes the usual convolution $(g * h)(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(\tau)h(t - \tau)d\tau$. The rescaling in the definition of $f \boxtimes \gamma$ ensures the following:

Example 24. If $f = \mathbb{1}: t \mapsto 1$ is the constant function, then we get $f \circ \gamma = \mathbb{1}_I$, and $(f \boxtimes \gamma)(t) = \min\{0, t - b, d - t\}$, where $I = [b, d]$. This is precisely the pyramid function supported on I with slope ± 1 which is used for standard persistence landscapes.

For a totally ordered set S , let $n^{\text{th-max}} S$ denote the n -th largest element of S .

Definition 25. Let K be as in proposition 22 and Γ be a minimal cycle progression barcode of K . The n -th generalized persistence landscape of K with respect to the functional f and the cycle progression barcode Γ is the function

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_n^\Gamma(K, f): \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ t &\mapsto n^{\text{th-max}}\{(f \boxtimes \gamma)(t) \mid (\gamma, I) \in \Gamma\}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 9: Four different point clouds and the longest 12 bars in their H_1 -barcode. Bottom: for f denoting length, area, and excess curvature, we plot $f \circ \gamma$ for the cycle progression γ corresponding to the longest bar, and the first landscape $\lambda_1(-, f)$ for each point cloud. The colors correspond to the point clouds.

The n -th *generalized signed persistence landscape* $\lambda_n^{\Gamma^\pm}(K, f)$ is defined analogously for a minimal cycle progression barcode Γ^\pm . We note that if all intervals in $\text{Bar}(H_d(K))$ have pairwise distinct upper endpoints and the functional f satisfies $f(az) = f(z)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{k} \setminus \{0\}$, then the generalized (signed) landscape is independent of the choice of minimal progression barcode by proposition 22. The condition $f(az) = f(z)$ for $a \in \mathbb{k} \setminus \{0\}$ holds for both the d -dimensional volume and the $d + 1$ -dimensional enclosed volume defined in *example 23*. The excess curvature satisfies $\kappa(z) = \kappa(-z)$, which ensures that the generalized landscape w.r.t. K and the cycle progression barcode given by algorithms 1 and 2 does not depend on the choice of orientation. Unless specified otherwise, we use the minimal (signed) cycle progression barcode $\Gamma^{(\pm)}$ from algorithms 1 and 2, and simply write $\lambda_n(K, -)$.

Example 26. For the constant function $\mathbb{1}$, we obtain that $\lambda_n(K, \mathbb{1})$ is the n -th persistence landscape in the usual sense.

6 Examples and Benchmarks

Generalized Landscapes We demonstrate the effectiveness of generalized persistence landscapes as a shape descriptor by computing them for some exemplary point clouds in \mathbb{R}^2 in fig. 9. We sampled 1000 points each from a circle, an ellipse, a circle with “spoke”, and a five-leaved star. Each sample is subject to normally distributed noise. Using the α -filtration for each point cloud, we compute the uniquely determined minimal cycle progression barcode Γ by combining algorithm 1 and 2. For the pair $(I, \gamma) \in \Gamma$ corresponding to the longest interval I in the H_1 -barcode, we plot $f \circ \gamma$ for every $f \in \{\text{length, area, excess curvature}\}$. Additionally, we compare the generalized landscapes $\lambda_1(-, f)$ for these point clouds. All four samples yield similar barcodes but are clearly distinguishable from $f \circ \gamma$ and $\lambda_1(-, f)$.




Figure 10: Signed chains capture bridges between connected components more accurately. Left: The two point clouds considered. Right: Number of excess connected components in the longest bar (upper row) and the associated persistence landscape (lower row) for unsigned and signed cycle representatives, for both point clouds.




Figure 11: Runtime of the Persistence Forest Algorithm for point clouds in \mathbb{R}^2 and \mathbb{R}^3 .

Signed and Unsigned Landscapes To illustrate the utility of signed chains, we show in fig. 10 that they can detect bridges between connected components more accurately than unsigned chains. We compare the number of excess connected components (i.e., $f(c) = |\pi_0(c)| - 1$) between point clouds formed by a circle with three interior point clusters, both with and without bridges connecting them to the circle. The induced barcode functional $f \circ \gamma$ corresponding to the longest bar and the generalized landscapes for signed chains clearly detect the bridges whereas their unsigned counterpart incorrectly counts up to three excess connected components even if the bridges are present.

Computational Efficiency A Python implementation of algorithms 1 and 2, and of generalized landscapes is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/LoopForest>. For a point cloud in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , we compute its α -filtration using Gudhi 3.11.0 [23; 19]. All benchmarks were performed using python 3.13.3 on a MacBook Pro (14-inch, 2024) equipped with an Apple M4 Pro SoC (8 performance cores, 4 efficiency cores), 48 GB unified memory, running macOS Sequoia 15.6.1.

To estimate the practical runtime of our pipeline for $d \in \{1, 2\}$, we used uniformly distributed points in $[0, 1]^{d+1}$, uniformly distributed points a unit sphere S^d perturbed by gaussian noise with $\sigma = 0.05$, and uniformly distributed points in $[0, 1]^{d+1} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{30} B_i$, where each B_i is a ball with random center point in $[0, 1]^{d+1}$ and uniformly distributed $r \in [0, 0.05]$. We applied both algorithms 1 and 2 to the α -complexes of these point clouds, but note that the runtime contribution of algorithm 2 is negligible. We plot the average runtime across 10 runs in fig. 11. The results show that we can compute volume-optimal cycle representatives across all filtration values for $10^4 - 10^5$ points in \mathbb{R}^2 and \mathbb{R}^3 within seconds. This demonstrates that our approach is computationally feasible and applicable in practice.

References

- [1] Ulrich Bauer and Herbert Edelsbrunner. “The morse theory of Čech and delaunay complexes”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 369.5 (2017), pp. 3741–3762. DOI: 10.1090/tran/6991.
- [2] Eric Berry et al. *Functional Summaries of Persistence Diagrams*. 2018. arXiv: 1804.01618.
- [3] Anders Björner and Martin Tancer. “Note: Combinatorial Alexander Duality—A Short and Elementary Proof”. In: *Discrete & Computational Geometry* 42.4 (2009), pp. 586–593. DOI: 10.1007/s00454-008-9102-x.
- [4] Peter Bubenik. “Statistical Topological Data Analysis using Persistence Landscapes”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 16.3 (2015), pp. 77–102. ISSN: 1533-7928. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v16/bubenik15a.html>.
- [5] Gunnar Carlsson. “Topology and data”. In: *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 46.2 (2009), pp. 255–308. DOI: 10.1090/S0273-0979-09-01249-X.
- [6] William Crawley-Boevey. *Decomposition of pointwise finite-dimensional persistence modules*. 2014. arXiv: 1210.0819.
- [7] Tamal K. Dey, Anil N. Hirani, and Bala Krishnamoorthy. “Optimal homologous cycles, total unimodularity, and linear programming”. In: *Proceedings of the forty-second ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. Cambridge Massachusetts USA: ACM, 2010, pp. 221–230. DOI: 10.1145/1806689.1806721.
- [8] Tamal K. Dey, Jian Sun, and Yusu Wang. *Approximating Loops in a Shortest Homology Basis from Point Data*. 2009. arXiv: 0909.5654.
- [9] Rex A. Dwyer. “Higher-dimensional voronoi diagrams in linear expected time”. In: *Discrete & Computational Geometry* 6.3 (1991), pp. 343–367. DOI: 10.1007/BF02574694.
- [10] H. Edelsbrunner and N. R. Shah. “Incremental topological flipping works for regular triangulations”. In: *Algorithmica* 15.3 (1996), pp. 223–241. DOI: 10.1007/BF01975867.
- [11] Herbert Edelsbrunner, David Kirkpatrick, and Raimund Seidel. “On the shape of a set of points in the plane”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 29.4 (1983). Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, pp. 551–559. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.1983.1056714.
- [12] Edelsbrunner, Letscher, and Zomorodian. “Topological Persistence and Simplification”. In: *Discrete & Computational Geometry* 28.4 (2002), pp. 511–533. DOI: 10.1007/s00454-002-2885-2.
- [13] Jeff Erickson and Kim Whittlesey. “Greedy optimal homotopy and homology generators”. In: *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*. SODA '05. USA: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2005, pp. 1038–1046. ISBN: 978-0-89871-585-9.
- [14] Emerson G. Escolar and Yasuaki Hiraoka. “Optimal Cycles for Persistent Homology Via Linear Programming”. In: *Optimization in the Real World*. Ed. by Katsuki Fujisawa, Yuji Shinano, and Hayato Waki. Vol. 13. Series Title: Mathematics for Industry. Tokyo: Springer Japan, 2016, pp. 79–96. DOI: 10.1007/978-4-431-55420-2_5.
- [15] Anatoly Fomenko and Dmitry Fuchs. *Homotopical Topology*. Vol. 273. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-23488-5.
- [16] Jennifer Gamble, Harish Chintakunta, and Hamid Krim. *Adaptive tracking of representative cycles in regular and zigzag persistent homology*. 2014. arXiv: 1411.5442.
- [17] Robert Ghrist. “Barcodes: The persistent topology of data”. In: *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 45.1 (2007), pp. 61–76. DOI: 10.1090/S0273-0979-07-01191-3.
- [18] Mordecai J. Golin and Hyeon-Suk Na. “On the average complexity of 3D-Voronoi diagrams of random points on convex polytopes”. In: *Computational Geometry* 25.3 (2003), pp. 197–231. DOI: 10.1016/S0925-7721(02)00123-2.

- [19] Clément Maria. “Filtered complexes”. In: *GUDHI user and reference manual*. 3.11.0. GUDHI Editorial Board, 2025. URL: https://gudhi.inria.fr/doc/3.11.0/group__simplex__tree.html.
- [20] Ippei Obayashi. “Volume-Optimal Cycle: Tightest Representative Cycle of a Generator in Persistent Homology”. In: *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry* 2.4 (2018). Publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, pp. 508–534. DOI: 10.1137/17M1159439.
- [21] Ippei Obayashi, Takenobu Nakamura, and Yasuaki Hiraoka. “Persistent Homology Analysis for Materials Research and Persistent Homology Software: HomCloud”. In: *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* 91.9 (2022), p. 091013. DOI: 10.7566/JPSJ.91.091013.
- [22] Vanessa Robins. “Towards computing homology from finite approximations”. In: *Topology proceedings* 24.1 (1999), pp. 503–532.
- [23] Vincent Rouvreau. “Alpha complex”. In: *GUDHI user and reference manual*. 3.11.0. GUDHI Editorial Board, 2025. URL: https://gudhi.inria.fr/doc/3.11.0/group__alpha__complex.html.
- [24] Benjamin Schweinhart. “Statistical Topology of Embedded Graphs”. PhD thesis. Princeton, 2016.
- [25] Raimund Seidel. “The upper bound theorem for polytopes: an easy proof of its asymptotic version”. In: *Computational Geometry* 5.2 (1995), pp. 115–116. DOI: 10.1016/0925-7721(95)00013-Y.