

# 1 Poking a Simplicial Complex

2 **Benjamin Holmgren**

3 Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, USA

4 benjamin.holmgren@student.montana.edu

5 **Marco Huot**

6 Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, USA

7 marco.huot@student.montana.edu

8 **Bradley McCoy**

9 School of Computing, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, USA

10 bradley.mccoy@montana.edu

11 **Brittany Terese Fasy** 

12 School of Computing and Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, Montana State University, Bozeman,

13 MT, USA

14 brittany.fasy@montana.edu

15 **David L. Millman** 

16 School of Computing, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, USA

17 david.millman@montana.edu

---

## 18 Abstract

19 Persistent homology has been used successfully to gain information about data. This success has  
20 increased the demand for computing the homology of a simplicial complex. For large data sets, these  
21 computations are expensive. We present an educational video that illustrates how discrete Morse  
22 theory can be applied to simplify a simplicial complex without losing any homological information.

23 **2012 ACM Subject Classification** Computational Geometry → Mathematics of Computing; Geo-  
24 metric topology

25 **Keywords and phrases** Discrete Morse theory, simplicial complex, persistence homology

26 **Digital Object Identifier** 10.4230/LIPIcs..2020.77

27 **Funding** *Brittany Terese Fasy*: BTF is supported by NSF CCF 1618605, and NIH/NSF DMS  
28 1664858.

29 *David L. Millman*: DLM is supported by NSF ABI 1661530.

30 **Acknowledgements** All authors thank the members of the CompTaG club at Montana State Uni-  
31 versity for their thoughtful discussions and feedback on this work.

## 32 1 Introduction

33 The amount of high dimensional data being generated continues to increase rapidly. Persistent  
34 homology is useful in gaining insight into these data sets, as seen in [1, 3, 6, 8] among others.  
35 In [7], a common algorithm for computing persistent homology is given with a runtime of  
36  $O(n^\omega)$ , where  $\omega = \log_2(7)$  from matrix multiplication and  $n$  is the number of simplices in the  
37 simplicial complex. Currently this is the best known bound. For large data sets this runtime  
38 is impractical. In [5], the authors show that discrete Morse theory can be used to reduce the  
39 size of the initial complex, while retaining all homological information. This preprocessing  
40 step leads to a faster algorithm for computing the homology of a simplicial complex that  
41 uses less space.

42 In this video, we show how a simplicial complex can be simplified by a sequence of  
43 homotopies called *elementary collapses*. These collapses are generated by a gradient vector



© Benjamin Holmgren, Benjamin Huot, Brad McCoy, Brittany Terese Fasy, David L. Millman;  
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY

Symposium on Computational Geometry, 2020.



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

44 field that is induced by a discrete Morse function. The definitions can be difficult to parse,  
 45 but the geometry of the simplification is quite natural. Let  $\sigma$  be a simplex in a simplicial  
 46 complex. Intuitively, elementary collapses eliminate  $\sigma$  by pairing  $\sigma$  with one of its faces  
 47 or cofaces  $\tau$  and removing both from the complex. Our video illustrates this paring and  
 48 elimination by showing a finger poking a simplicial complex. Our objective is to convey how  
 49 discrete Morse theory can be used to simplify simplicial complexes without changing the  
 50 homotopy type of the complex.

## 51 2 Background Definitions

52 In this section we provide definitions of the objects that appear in our video. In general our  
 53 notation follows that of [2]. Let  $K$  be a simplicial complex. We denote a typical  $p$ -simplex  
 54 by  $\sigma^p$  or  $\sigma$  if the dimension is clear.

55 The following definition is due to [9].

56 ► **Definition 1.** *Let  $K$  be a simplicial complex and suppose that there is a pair of simplices*  
 57  *$\{\sigma^{p-1}, \tau^p\}$  in  $K$  such that  $\sigma$  is a face of  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$  has no other cofaces. Then  $K - \{\sigma, \tau\}$  is*  
 58 *a simplicial complex called an **elementary collapse** of  $K$ . The pair  $\{\sigma, \tau\}$  is called a **free***  
 59 *pair.*

60 Moreover,  $K$  and  $K - \{\sigma, \tau\}$  have the same homotopy type. The concept that we hope  
 61 to convey in our video is that an elementary collapse does not change the homotopy type  
 62 of  $K$  and results in a simplified simplicial complex. But how do we know which simplices  
 63 belong to a free pair? This is where discrete Morse theory is helpful.

64 ► **Definition 2.** *A function  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a **discrete Morse function**, if for every  $\sigma^p \in K$ ,*  
 65 *the following two conditions hold:*

- 66 1.  $|\{\tau^{(p+1)} > \sigma \mid f(\tau) \leq f(\sigma)\}| \leq 1$ ,
- 67 2.  $|\{\gamma^{(p-1)} < \sigma \mid f(\gamma) \geq f(\sigma)\}| \leq 1$ .

68 A intuitive definition is given in [4], "the function generally increases as you increase the  
 69 dimension of the simplices. But we allow at most one exception per simplex." Simplices with  
 70 this exception deserve special attention.

71 ► **Definition 3.** *A simplex is **regular** if and only if either of the following hold*

- 72 1. *There exists  $\tau^{(p+1)} > \sigma$  with  $f(\tau) \leq f(\sigma)$*
- 73 2. *There exists  $\gamma^{(p-1)} < \sigma$  with  $f(\gamma) \geq f(\sigma)$ .*

74 A simplex that is not regular is called **critical**. Conditions 1 and 2 in definition 2 cannot  
 75 both be true. If  $\sigma \in K$  is regular then  $\sigma$  has a face  $\gamma$  with a greater function value or a  
 76 coface  $\tau$  with a lesser function value but not both. We pair all regular simplices with the  
 77 unique  $\gamma$  or  $\tau$  determined by the Morse function.

78 This leads to the definition an induced gradient vector field.

► **Definition 4.** *Let  $f$  be a discrete Morse function on  $K$ . The **induced gradient vector**  
**field**  $V_f$  is*

$$V_f := \{(\sigma^p, \tau^{p+1}) : \sigma < \tau, f(\sigma) \geq f(\tau)\}.$$

79 *if  $(\sigma, \tau) \in V_f$ ,  $(\sigma, \tau)$  is called an **arrow** with **tail**  $\sigma$  and **head**  $\tau$ .*

80 All arrows determine a free pair. Our video shows how we can collapse free pairs without  
 81 changing the homotopy of  $K$ . To summarize, we begin with a simplicial complex  $K$ , then

82 assign real values to each simplex satisfying the definition of a morse function,  $f$  on  $K$ . Next,  
 83 we pair all regular simplices in  $K$  with the simplex determined by the Morse function. This  
 84 gives us a gradient vector field that determines free pairs. Finally, we collapse free pairs  
 85 leaving us with the simplex consisting of critical simplices.

### 86 **3** Video

87 The video begins by defining a simplicial complex and giving an example that will be used  
 88 throughout the video,  $K$ , which consists of a tetrahedron, two cycles, a triangle and two  
 89 edges. We also give a non-example. We then attempt to give an intuitive feeling for simplicial  
 90 homology as ‘holes’ of various dimensions. We explain that computing the Betti numbers  
 91 involves considering all simplicies in  $K$  and that this is computationally expensive.

92 The next scene introduces discrete Morse functions. We illustrate the values of a Morse  
 93 function on  $K$ . Then we depict how a discrete Morse function induces a gradient vector field  
 94 on the simplicial complex.

95 Now the video shows a finger poking the simplicial complex on paired simplicies. The  
 96 poked simplicies are removed and we see a simplified simplicial complex  $K'$  which is  $K$  with  
 97 all free pairs collapsed. When the finger is done poking we are left with two connected  
 98 triangles, which is the same homotopy type as our original simplicial complex  $K$ .

### 99 ——— References ———

- 100 **1** Herbert Edelsbrunner and John Harer. *Computational Topology: An Introduction*. American  
 101 Mathematical Society, 2010.
- 102 **2** Robin Forman. A user’s guide to discrete morse theory. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, 42:Art. B48c,  
 103 35pp, 2002.
- 104 **3** Chad Giusti, Eva Pastalkova, Carina Curto, and Vladimir Itskov. Clique topology reveals  
 105 intrinsic geometric structure in neural correlations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of  
 106 Sciences*, 112(44):13455–13460, 2015.
- 107 **4** Henry King, Kevin Knudson, and Neža Mramor. Generating discrete morse functions from  
 108 point data. *Experiment. Math*, 14:435–444, 2005. MR2193806.
- 109 **5** Konstantin Mischaikow and Vidit Nanda. Morse theory for filtrations and efficient computation  
 110 of persistent homology. *Discrete Comput Geom*, (50):330, 2013.
- 111 **6** Monica Nicolau, Arnold J. Levine, and Gunnar Carlsson. Topology based data analysis  
 112 identifies a subgroup of breast cancers with a unique mutational profile and excellent survival.  
 113 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(17):7265–7270, 2011.
- 114 **7** Primoz Skraba Nikola Milosavljevic, Dmitriy Morozov. Zigzag persistent homology in matrix  
 115 multiplication time. *[Research Report] RR-7393, INRIA*, 2010.
- 116 **8** Abbas H. Rizvi, Pablo G. Camara, Elena K. Kandror, Thomas J. Roberts, Ira Schieren, Tom  
 117 Maniatis, and Raul Rabadan. Single-cell topological RNA-seq analysis reveals insights into  
 118 cellular differentiation and development. *Nature Biotechnology*, 35(6):551, 2017.
- 119 **9** Nicholas A. Scoville. *Discrete Morse Theory*. American Mathematica Society, Providence,  
 120 Rhode Island, 2019.