arXiv:2309.03142v2 [math.AT] 4 Nov 2023

EULER CHARACTERISTICS AND HOMOTOPY TYPES OF DEFINABLE SUBLEVEL SETS, WITH APPLICATIONS TO TOPOLOGICAL DATA ANALYSIS

MATTIE JI, KUN MENG, AND KEXIN DING

Abstract. Given a definable function $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$ on a definable set S, we study sublevel sets of the form $S_t^f := \{x \in S : f(x) \leq t\}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Using o-minimal structures, we prove that the Euler characteristic of S_t^f is right continuous with respect to t. Furthermore, when S is compact, we show that $S_{t+\delta}^f$ deformation retracts to S_t^f for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. Applying these results, we also characterize the connections between the following concepts in topological data analysis: the Euler characteristic transform (ECT), smooth ECT, Euler-Radon transform (ERT), and smooth ERT.

1. Introduction

Sublevel sets have been widely used in both pure and applied branches of mathematics. Motivated by Morse theory and topological data analysis (TDA), we dedicate this paper to the Euler characteristics and homotopy properties of sublevel sets in o-minimal structures. As an application to TDA, our results provide new perspectives and techniques to several Euler characteristic-based representations of shapes and images.

1.1. **Motivation I: Morse Theory.** Informally, Morse theory (Milnor, 1963; Matsumoto, 2002) studies the topology of differentiable manifolds by analyzing critical points of a class of real-valued smooth functions known as Morse functions. Given a compact manifold M and Morse function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$, Morse theory is interested in sublevel sets of M with respect to f, which we define as

$$M_t^f := \{x \in M : f(x) \leq t\}, \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

A classical result in Morse theory (Milnor, 1963, Part I.3) completely classifies the homotopy types of the collection $\{M_t^f, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ based on the critical values on f in $\mathbb{R}$. A consequence of this classification we are interested in is the following (Milnor, 1963, Remark 3.4, page 20 therein).

Theorem 1.1. *For all $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, $M_{t+\delta}^f$ deformation retracts onto M_t^f. This also implies that the Euler characteristics of $M_{t+\delta}^f$ equals that of M_t^f for all $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small.*

While Morse theory was originally developed by Marston Morse (Morse, 1929) and was traditionally a subject in differential topology, it has since then inspired combinatorial adaptations such as discrete Morse theory (Forman, 2002) and digital Morse theory (Cox et al., 2003) without necessarily requiring any smoothness. A natural question would then be - *when M is some "shape" instead of a differential manifold and f is no longer even smooth, how do the Euler characteristics and homotopy types of M_t^f behave outside of a smooth category?* This is the question we will explore in this paper.

1.2. **Motivation II: Topological Data Analysis.** Shape-valued data have emerged in various scientific domains. Traditionally in applications, modeling shapes and evaluating (dis-)similarity between shapes have been achieved using either landmark-based or diffeomorphism-based methods (Kendall, 1977, 1984, 1989; Dupuis et al., 1998; Gao et al., 2019a,b). However, these methods are not directly applicable to many databases used in applications, as extensively discussed in the literature (e.g., Turner et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2021).

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 03C64, 46M20. Secondary: 55N31.

Topological data analysis (TDA, Edelsbrunner et al., 2000; Carlsson, 2009; Edelsbrunner and Harer, 2010; Turner et al., 2014; Robinson and Turner, 2017) offers innovative approaches to shape modeling without reliance on landmarks or diffeomorphisms. One prominent source of inspiration in TDA is Morse theory — information one can extract from a shape S with a real-valued function $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$. One common practice is to look at topological invariants (e.g., Euler characteristics) on sublevel sets of S with respect to f, which we define as

$$S_t^f := \{x \in S : f(x) \leq t\}, \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The following special case is of particular importance in TDA: $f(x) = \varphi_\nu(x) := x \cdot \nu$ and ν is a fixed unit vector of appropriate dimension. This special case is a building block of the Euler characteristic transform (ECT, Turner et al., 2014). The ECT and related integral transforms are of interest to many topological data analysts and have been widely utilized in applied sciences (Crawford et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2021; Marsh et al., 2022). The ECT represents shapes utilizing integer-valued functions. Specifically, for a given shape S in $\mathbb{R}^n$, its ECT is defined as the function $\mathrm{ECT}(S) : (\nu, t) \mapsto \mathrm{ECT}(S)(\nu, t) := \chi(S_t^\nu)$, where $\chi(\cdot)$ denotes the Euler characteristic and $S_t^\nu := \{x \in S : x \cdot \nu \leq t\}$ for $(\nu, t) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$. Notably, Ghrist et al. (2018) and Curry et al. (2022) conclusively demonstrated that the representation $\mathrm{ECT}(S)$ preserves all the information within the shape S. Additionally, Munch (2023) provided a comprehensive survey of the ECT from both theoretical and applied perspectives.

Each shape S may be equivalently identified as the indicator function $\mathbb{1}_S$ of S. With this perspective, the ECT can be generalized to take in suitable real-valued functions rather than a given shape S (equivalently $\mathbb{1}_S$). In this paper, we are interested in the following two possible generalizations of ECT.

(1) Kirveslahti and Mukherjee (2023) proposed the lifted and super lifted Euler characteristic transform (LECT and SELECT) based on computing the Euler characteristics of level sets and superlevel sets, respectively.

(2) Meng et al. (2023) proposed the Euler-Radon transform (ERT) using the Euler integration framework developed by Baryshnikov and Ghrist (2010) to model grayscale images in medical imaging. Given a suitable compactly supported real-valued function $g : S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, which represents a grayscale image, the ERT of g is a function $(\nu, t) \mapsto \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t)$ defined for all $(\nu, t) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$.

We will rigorously define these integral transforms in Section 2.

1.3. **Overview of Contributions.** As an analog to Theorem 1.1 in Morse theory, we prove the following main results in this paper.

(1) Given a "definable" shape $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a "definable" function $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$, we show in Theorem 3.1 that the map $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^f)$ is right continuous. The notion of "definability" will be made precise in Section 2.

(2) Furthermore, if the shape S is compact and f is continuous, we show in Theorem 4.1 that $S_{t+\delta}^f$ deformation retracts onto S_t^f for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$.

(3) Using the results presented above, we show in Theorem 5.1 that the ERT can be recovered from the smooth Euler-Radon transform (SERT, Meng et al., 2023). As a corollary of Theorem 5.1, one can recover the ECT from the smooth Euler characteristic transform (SECT, Crawford et al., 2020; Meng et al., 2022; Marsh and Beers, 2023).

As a consequence of Theorem 3.1, we can prove the right continuity of the map $t \mapsto \mathrm{ECT}(S)(\nu, t)$ for each fixed $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ in Theorem 3.4. Using the right continuity of the ECT, we will also show in Theorem 3.8 that $t \mapsto \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t)$ is right continuous whenever g is a bounded, compactly supported, and definable function. In addition, Theorem 3.4 helps the future development of the stochastic properties of the map $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^\nu)$. From the statistical viewpoint, shapes S are considered random data in various applications (Vishwanath et al., 2020). Two probability spaces that account for the randomness of shapes have been proposed in Mileyko et al. (2011) and Meng et al. (2022), respectively, for the applications of TDA. Due to the inherent randomness of S, the function $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^\nu)$ becomes a stochastic process for each fixed $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

Our result on right continuity, combined with Lemma 2.5 stated in Section 2, suggests that the sample paths of this stochastic process are right continuous with left limits (RCLL). Stochastic processes with RCLL sample paths have been extensively studied in probability theory (Klenke, 2020, Section 21.4).

1.4. **Outline.** The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the background and context for o-minimal structures and definability, Euler calculus, ECT, LECT, SELECT, and ERT. In Section 3, we prove the right continuity of the map $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^f)$ for definable sets S and definable functions $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$, which is presented in Theorem 3.1. We also discuss its applications to showing that $t \mapsto \mathrm{ECT}(S)(\nu, t)$ and $t \mapsto \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t)$ are both right continuous for each fixed $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ in Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 3.8 respectively. In Section 4, we show that for a compact definable set K, $K_{t+\delta}^f$ deformation retracts onto K_t^f for all $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small. As an application of Sections 3 and 4, we characterize the connections between the ECT, SECT, ERT, and SERT in Section 5.

Acknowledgements. M.J. would like to thank Dr. Mark Ainsworth and Dr. Paul Dupuis for helpful discussions and comments, Dr. Thomas Goodwillie for helpful conversations on piecewise linear topology, and both Dr. Nicole Looper and Dr. Richard Schwartz for helpful conversations and advice on the contexts of this paper. K.M. would like to thank Dr. Ningchuan Zhang for helpful conversations on Morse theory. We thank Dr. Pierre Schapira for helpful conversations on microlocal sheaf theory and constructible functions. We also thank Dr. Vadim Lebovici for helpful conversations on Euler calculus and real analytic geometry, especially for providing references to Remark 3.2 and Remark 4.4.

2. Background

In this section, we briefly cover the necessary background in o-minimal structures, Euler calculus, the Euler characteristic transform (ECT), and two relevant extensions of the ECT to real-valued definable functions — the lifted and super lifted Euler characteristics transform (LECT and SELECT, Kirveslahti and Mukherjee, 2023) and the Euler-Radon Transform (ERT, Meng et al., 2023). We refer the reader to van den Dries (1998b) for more details on o-minimal structures, to Curry et al. (2012) for more details on Euler calculus, and to Ghrist et al. (2018) and Curry et al. (2022) for more details on the ECT.

2.1. **O-minimal Structures.** The goal of o-minimal structures is to create a collection of subsets of Euclidean spaces that abstracts the features of "well-behaved sets" such as the semialgebraic and semilinear sets (van den Dries, 1998b, Chapters 1 and 2), while excluding "poorly-behaved sets" like the topologist's sine curve given by the graph of $f(x) = \sin(\frac{1}{x})$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$. O-minimal structures are defined as follows:

Definition 2.1. Suppose we have a sequence $\mathcal{O} = \{\mathcal{O}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ where $\mathcal{O}_n$ is a Boolean algebra of subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ for each n. We call $\mathcal{O}$ an *o-minimal structure* on $\mathbb{R}$ if it satisfies the following:

(1) If $A \in \mathcal{O}_n$, then $A \times \mathbb{R} \in \mathcal{O}_{n+1}$ and $\mathbb{R} \times A \in \mathcal{O}_{n+1}$.

(2) $\{(x_1, ..., x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_i = x_j\} \in \mathcal{O}_n$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.

(3) $\mathcal{O}$ is closed under axis-aligned projections.

(4) $\{r\} \in \mathcal{O}_1$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x < y\} \in \mathcal{O}_2$.

(5) $\mathcal{O}_1$ is exactly the finite unions of points and open intervals.

(6) $\mathcal{O}_3$ contains the graphs of addition and multiplication.

In Definition 2.1, Conditions (1)-(5) form the fundamental definition of o-minimal structures as presented in van den Dries (1998b). To utilize powerful theorems, such as the "trivialization theorem" referenced in our Theorem 3.1, one also requires Condition (6). Many authors choose to define o-minimal structures on $\mathbb{R}$ to include Condition (6), e.g., Curry et al. (2012) and Coste (2002). A notable consequence of assuming Conditions (1)-(6), due to the Tarski-Seidenberg theorem (Tarski and McKinsey, 1951), is that any o-minimal structures on $\mathbb{R}$ defined this way must encompass the collection of all semialgebraic sets (van den Dries, 1998a, Example 1.2). Definition 2.1 is also sometimes called an o-minimal expansion of the real numbers.

The concepts in the following definition will be employed in our study. More details regarding these concepts are available in van den Dries (1998b) and Baryshnikov and Ghrist (2010).

Definition 2.2. Suppose an o-minimal structure $\mathcal{O} = \{\mathcal{O}_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ is given.

(1) A subset S of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called a *definable* set if $S \in \mathcal{O}_n$. Throughout this paper, a definable set is also referred to as a *shape*.

(2) Let X be definable. A function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}^n$, for some n, is said to be *definable* if its graph is definable.

(3) A function that is both continuous and definable, and possesses a continuous definable inverse, is called a *definable homeomorphism*. Two definable sets are *definably homeomorphic* if there is a definable homeomorphism between them.

(4) A definable function is called *constructible* if it is integer-valued. Without loss of generality, we will restrict the codomain of constructible functions to $\mathbb{Z}$.

Note that a constructible function has to be bounded. This is because the image of a constructible function is a definable subset of $\mathbb{Z}$, which is a finite union of points in $\mathbb{Z}$ by Condition (5) of Definition 2.1.

2.2. **Euler Calculus.** The Euler calculus is based on the observation that the Euler characteristic is finitely additive and well-defined for certain well-behaved subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The main theme of Euler calculus is to apply Euler characteristic as an analog of a signed measure. The subject was originally introduced by Schapira (1991, 1995) and Viro (1988).

By the "cell decomposition theorem" (van den Dries, 1998b, Chapter 3, Theorem 2.11), any definable set S can be partitioned into cells $S_1, ..., S_N$. The (combinatorial) *Euler characteristic* of S is defined as

$$\chi(S) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (-1)^{\dim(S_i)}, \tag{1}$$

where $\dim(S_i)$ is the dimension of the cell S_i (van den Dries, 1998b, Section 1 of Chapter 4 therein, for a precise definition of dimensions). Proposition 2.2 from Chapter 4 of van den Dries (1998b) shows that the value of $\chi(S)$ is independent of the choice of cell decomposition. The Euler characteristic $\chi(\cdot)$ defined in Equation (1) is equivalent to the alternating sum of Betti numbers via the Borel-Moore homology or cohomology with compact support (Baryshnikov and Ghrist, 2010). That is, $\chi(K) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} (-1)^n \cdot \dim H_n^{BM}(K; \mathbb{R})$, where H_*^{BM} denoting the Borel-Moore homology (Bredon, 2012). Notably, $\chi(S)$ is a homotopy invariant if S is compact but is only a homeomorphism invariant in general. On compact definable sets, $\chi(S)$ is equivalent to the alternating sum of Betti numbers via the singular homology.

With the Euler characteristic $\chi(\cdot)$ in Equation (1), the Euler integration functional $\int(\cdot)d\chi$ is defined as follows (Ghrist, 2014, Section 3.6).

Definition 2.3. For any constructible function $g : X \to \mathbb{Z}$, we define its *Euler integral* as

$$\int_X g \, d\chi := \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} n \cdot \chi\left(g^{-1}(n)\right). \tag{2}$$

Since g is constructible, it is bounded, and each $g^{-1}(n)$ is definable. Therefore, Equation (2) is well-defined.

It is worth remaking that there is also a different approach to Euler calculus and definable sets using the constructible sheaves. This was the approach taken in Schapira's original paper (Schapira, 1991). We refer the reader to Kashiwara and Schapira (1990) for a thorough introduction to constructible sheaves.

2.3. **Euler Characteristic Transform.** Hereafter, for any subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and function $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$, we adopt the following notations for sub-level sets,

$$S_t^f := \{x \in S \mid f(x) \leq t\}, \tag{3}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. In the special case where $f(x) = \varphi_\nu(x) := x \cdot \nu$ for a fixed direction $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, we write $S_t^{\varphi_\nu}$ in the following notation instead

$$S_t^\nu := \{x \in S \mid x \cdot \nu \leq t\}.$$

If S and f are both definable, then S_t^f is definable since our o-minimal structure includes all real semialgebraic sets and is closed under finite intersections.

The ECT was introduced by Turner et al. (2014). Using the definition of Euler integration from Equation (2), Ghrist et al. (2018) and Curry et al. (2022) provided a representation and generalization of the ECT as follows.

Definition 2.4 (Euler Characteristic Transform)**.** (i) Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a definable set and $g : X \to \mathbb{Z}$ be a constructible function. Then, the *Euler characteristic transform* of g is a function $(\nu, t) \mapsto \mathrm{ECT}(g)(\nu, t)$ on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows

$$\mathrm{ECT}(g)(\nu, t) := \int_X g \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X_t^\nu} \, d\chi. \tag{4}$$

(ii) In the special case that $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ and g is the indicator function of a definable subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we write $\mathrm{ECT}(S) := \mathrm{ECT}(\mathbb{1}\{S\})$, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{ECT}(S)(\nu, t) = \chi(S_t^\nu), \quad \text{for all } (\nu, t) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{5}$$

Equation (5) represents the version of the ECT as originally proposed in Turner et al. (2014). Meanwhile, Jiang et al. (2020) utilized the version depicted in Equation (4) to analyze images of glioblastoma multiforme tumors.

Finally, we will need the following lemma which is a trivial generalization of Lemma 3.4 of Curry et al. (2022):

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a definable set and $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$ is a definable function.*

(1) S_t^f falls into finitely many homeomorphism types as t ranges over $\mathbb{R}$.

(2) $\chi(S_t^f)$ takes finitely many values as t ranges over $\mathbb{R}$.

(3) The function $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^f)$ has at most finitely many discontinuities; the function is constant between any two consecutive distinct discontinuities.

Lemma 2.5 follows as a consequence of the "trivialization theorem" (van den Dries, 1998b, Chapter 9, Theorem 1.2). More specifically, it requires the following lemma from Chapter 9 of van den Dries (1998b).

Lemma 2.6 (Rephrased from §2 of Chapter 9 of van den Dries (1998b))**.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ be a definable set. For any $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$, define $X_a := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (a, x) \in X\}$. Then, there exists a finite definable partition $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^M$ of $\mathbb{R}^m$, together with definable sets $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ for some N, such that X_a is definably homeomorphic to F_i for all $a \in A_i$.*

Proof of Lemma 2.5. We implement Lemma 2.6 by defining the following: (i) $m := 1$, (ii) $a := t \in \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}^m$, and (iii) $X := \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in S \text{ and } f(x) - t \leq 0\}$. Note that X is definable. Lemma 2.6 implies that $X_a = S_t^f$ falls into at most M homeomorphism types as $a = t$ ranges over $\mathbb{R}$. Since the Euler characteristic is a definable homeomorphism invariant, clearly $\chi(S_t^f)$ can only take at most M values as t runs through $\mathbb{R}$.

The discussion above shows that the function $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^f)$ is a definable function. The "cell decomposition theorem" (van den Dries, 1998b, Chapter 3, Theorem 2.11) implies that $\mathbb{R}$ has a finite partition into cells such

that the function $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^f)$ is continuous on each cell. Therefore, the function $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^f)$ has at most finitely many discontinuities and the function is constant between any two consecutive distinct discontinuities. □

2.4. **Extending the ECT to Real Definable Functions.** One limitation of the ECT is that it can only take in integer-valued functions and does not apply to most real-valued functions. Several papers have discussed possible generalizations of the ECT, and we will briefly outline two approaches here.

2.4.1. *The Lifted and Super Lifted Euler Characteristic Transform.* Motivated by Gaussian random fields (Adler and Taylor, 2009; Taylor and Worsley, 2008), Kirveslahti and Mukherjee (2023) introduced the lifted and super lifted Euler characteristic transform (LECT and SELECT) to capture the Euler characteristics of level sets and superlevel sets of a definable function.

Definition 2.7. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a definable set and $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a definable function, then the *lifted Euler characteristic transform* of g is a function $(\nu, t, s) \mapsto \mathrm{LECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows

$$\mathrm{LECT}(g)(\nu, t, s) := \int_X \mathbb{1}_{\{g=s\}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X_t^\nu} \, d\chi.$$

Similarly, the *super lifted Euler characteristic transform* of g is a function $(\nu, t, s) \mapsto \mathrm{SELECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows

$$\mathrm{SELECT}(g)(\nu, t, s) := \int_X \mathbb{1}_{\{g\geq s\}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X_t^\nu} \, d\chi.$$

Regarding the LECT and SELECT, we have the following lemma that is similar to the case of Lemma 2.5.

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a definable set and $g : S \to \mathbb{R}$ is a definable function. Then*

(1) $\mathrm{LECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ and $\mathrm{SELECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ take only finitely many values as (ν, t, s) runs through $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$.

(2) The functions $t \to \mathrm{LECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ and $t \to \mathrm{SELECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ have at most finitely many discontinuities.

Lemma 2.8 is adapted from Meng et al. (2023). The proof is similar to that of Lemma 2.5 and is omitted here.

2.4.2. *The Euler-Radon Transform.* Meng et al. (2023) introduced the Euler-Radon transform (ERT) based on the framework of Euler integration for real definable functions proposed by Baryshnikov and Ghrist (2010). Similar to approximating real integrals using a Riemann sum, the idea proposed by Baryshnikov and Ghrist (2010) was to integrate real definable functions with approximations by the floor and ceiling functions. Concretely, given a compactly supported definable function $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$, we adopt the following the Euler integral of g

$$\int_X g \, [d\chi] := \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2n} \int_X \lfloor ng \rfloor + \lceil ng \rceil \, d\chi \right). \tag{6}$$

Baryshnikov and Ghrist (2010) showed that the limit in Equation (6) exists and is well-defined. Meng et al. (2023) defined the Euler-Radon transform using the functional $\int (\cdot) \, [d\chi]$ as follows

Definition 2.9. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a definable set and $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a compactly supported definable function. The *Euler-Radon transform* of g is a function $(\nu, t) \mapsto \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t)$ on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows

$$\mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t) := \int_X g \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X_t^\nu} [d\chi].$$

Note that when g is a constructible function, $\mathrm{ERT}(g) = \mathrm{ECT}(g)$, i.e., the ERT is an extension of the ECT. Specifically, in this case, $\lfloor n \cdot (g \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X_t^\nu}) \rfloor = \lceil n \cdot (g \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X_t^\nu}) \rceil = n \cdot (g \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X_t^\nu})$, and the integral simply becomes

$$\mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \int_X 2n \cdot (g \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X_t^\nu}) \, d\chi \right\} = \int_X g \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X_t^\nu} \, d\chi = \mathrm{ECT}(g)(\nu, t). \tag{7}$$

3. Right Continuity

In this section, we will prove the right continuity of $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^f)$ for all definable sets S and definable functions $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$ (in Section 3.1). As a consequence, we will also prove the right continuity of the ECT (in Section 3.2) and subsequently the right continuity of the ERT (in Section 3.3).

3.1. A General Right Continuity Result.

Motivated by Theorem 1.1, we have the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a definable set and $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$ be a definable function.*

(1) The function $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^f)$ is right continuous.

(2) There exists $C < 0$ such that $\chi(S_t^f) = 0$ for all $t \leq C$.

Proof. By the "cell decomposition theorem" (van den Dries, 1998b, Chapter 3, Theorem 2.11), there exists a disjoint partition of S into definable subsets $S_1, ..., S_N$ such that the restriction of f to each S_i becomes a continuous definable function. Since the Euler characteristic is finitely additive, we have that

$$\chi(S_t^f) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \chi\left((S_j)_t^f\right).$$

For Theorem 3.1(1), if the function $t \mapsto (S_j)_t^f$ is right continuous for each j, then the function $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^f)$ would also be right continuous. Similarly for Theorem 3.1(2), if there exists some $C_j < 0$ associated to each S_j such that $\chi((S_j)_t^f) = 0$ for all $t \leq C_j$, we could take $C = \max\{C_1, ..., C_N\}$ and use the finite additivity of Euler characteristics for the general case. Both arguments amount down to proving Theorem 3.1 when f is continuous definable. Thus, without loss of generality, we will hereafter assume that f is a continuous definable function.

We will first prove Theorem 3.1(1). Since f is a continuous definable function, by the "trivialization theorem" (van den Dries, 1998b, Chapter 9, Theorem 1.2), there is a finite partition of $\mathbb{R}$ into definable subsets $A_1, ..., A_M$; for each A_i, there exists some definable set B_i and a definable homeomorphism $h_i : f^{-1}(A_i) \to A_i \times B_i$ such that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f^{-1}(A_i) & \xrightarrow{\quad h_i \quad} & A_i \times B_i \\ & {\scriptstyle f}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & \\ & A_i & \end{array} \tag{8}$$

where $\pi : A_i \times B_i \to A_i$ denotes the standard projection. We say that f is "definably trivial" over each A_i in this case.

Lemma 2.5 indicates that $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^f)$ is piecewise constant with at most finitely many discontinuities. It suffices to show the right continuity of $t \mapsto \chi(S_t^f)$ at each discontinuity. Suppose $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is an aforementioned discontinuity. It suffices to show the following for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \chi(S_{t+\epsilon}^f) - \chi(S_t^f) \\ &= \chi(S_{t+\epsilon}^f - S_t^f), \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the last equality follows from the finite additivity of $\chi(\cdot)$.

We observe that $f(S_{t+\epsilon}^f - S_t^f) = (t, t+\epsilon]$ and $f^{-1}((t, t+\epsilon]) = S_{t+\epsilon}^f - S_t^f$. Since definable subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ are precisely finite unions of points and open intervals, $(t, t+\epsilon]$ must be contained in exactly one of the $A_1, ..., A_M$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $(t, t+\epsilon]$ is contained in A_1. The diagram in Equation (8) induces the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f^{-1}((t, t+\epsilon]) & \xrightarrow{\quad \cong \quad} & (t, t+\epsilon] \times B_1 \\ & {\scriptstyle f}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & \\ & (t, t+\epsilon] & \end{array} \tag{10}$$

where $f^{-1}((t,t+\epsilon])$ is definably homeomorphic to $(t,t+\epsilon]\times B_1$. Since the Euler characteristic is a definable homeomorphism invariant, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(S^f_{t+\epsilon}-S^f_t) &= \chi\left(f^{-1}((t,t+\epsilon])\right)\\ &= \chi\left((t,t+\epsilon]\times B_1\right)\\ &= \chi\left((t,t+\epsilon]\right)\chi(B_1)\\ &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $\chi((t,t+\epsilon]) = \chi((t,t+\epsilon)) + \chi(\{t+\epsilon\}) = 0$. Thus, Equation (9) holds for sufficiently small ϵ.

Finally, we will now prove Theorem 3.1(2). Since $A_1,...,A_M$ are finite unions of points and intervals that partition $\mathbb{R}$, there exists some $C<0$ such that for all $t\le C$ the interval $(-\infty,t]$ is contained in exactly one of the A_i's. By the same argument as above, it follows that S^f_t is definably homeomorphic to $(-\infty,t]\times B_i$ for some definable set B_i and for all $|t|>R$. Hence, by the multiplicativity of Euler characteristics,

$$\chi(S^f_t) = \chi((-\infty,t]\times B_i)) = \chi((-\infty,t])\times\chi(B_i) = 0.$$

The proof is completed. □

Remark 3.2. After posting the first version of this manuscript, we learned the following: the right continuity of $t\mapsto\chi(S^f_t)$ is already known when the set S is an element of the o-minimal structure of globally subanalytic subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and f is a continuous subanalytic function. This is a consequence of Theorem 1.11 of Kashiwara and Schapira (2018) and Theorem 4.17 of Schapira (2023); it is also a consequence of Proposition 4.18 of Schapira (2023) and Proposition 7.5 of Lebovici (2022). Compared to the existing results, our contribution lies in the universal applicability of Theorem 3.1 — our Theorem 3.1(1) applies to any sets S in any o-minimal structures satisfying the axioms in Definition 2.1. Theorem 3.1 opens doors to explore o-minimal structures beyond the globally subanalytic realm. Notably, many interesting o-minimal structures do not fit into the globally subanalytic universe, including the real exponential field in Wilkie (1996) and the field of real numbers with multisummable real power series in van den Dries and Speissegger (2000). In fact, Rolin et al. (2007) constructed an infinite family of pairwise incompatible o-minimal structures that expands the o-minimal structure of globally subanalytic subsets. In each case, our result also extends to all definable functions in their respective o-minimal structure, which includes definable functions whose graphs are not subanalytic.

One might wonder whether the discussion in the proof of Theorem 3.1 can be extended to any other topological invariants. As a remark, we observe that the proof of Theorem 3.1 works for any real-valued homeomorphism invariant ψ on definable sets provided that ψ is finitely additive and $\psi((0,1]\times B)=0$ for any definable sets B. However, the following proposition shows that ψ has to be the Euler characteristics multiplied by some constant.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose ψ is a real-valued function of definable subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $n=1,2,...$ such that*

(1) ψ is a homeomorphism invariant.

(2) For A,B definable and disjoint, $\psi(A\cup B)=\psi(A)+\psi(B)$

(3) For B definable, $\psi((0,1]\times B)=0$

Then ψ is equal to some constant times Euler characteristic.

Proof. For any point $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$, the singleton $\{x\}$ is definable. By Claim 1, $\psi(\{x\})$ is the same for any point x. We denote $\psi(\{x\})=\alpha$. For any $n>0$, we observe that $0=\psi((0,1]\times(0,1)^n)=\psi((0,1)^{n+1})+\psi(\{1\}\times(0,1)^n)=\psi(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})+\psi(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Inductively, we have that $\psi(\mathbb{R}^n)=\alpha(-1)^n$ as $\psi(\mathbb{R}^1)=\psi((0,1])-\psi(\{1\})=0-\alpha=-\alpha$.

The "cell decomposition theorem" (van den Dries, 1998b, Chapter 3, Theorem 2.11) implies that every definable set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ can be broken down into a finite disjoint union of cells. Furthermore, each cell $\mathcal{C}$ is

definably homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{\dim \mathcal{C}}$ (van den Dries, 1998b, Chapter 3, "(2.7)" therein). Hence we can deduce that for any definable set A, $\psi(A) = \alpha \cdot \chi(A)$. □

3.2. **Right Continuity of the Euler Characteristic Transform.** As a consequence of Theorem 3.1(1), we show the right continuity of the ECT. This is a generalization of Remark 4.14 in Curry et al. (2022) (also see Proposition 5.18 of Curry et al. (2022), Lemma 2.3 of Bestvina and Brady (1997), and §VI.3 Edelsbrunner and Harer (2010)), which showed that the ECT is right continuous on piecewise linearly embedded simplicial complexes. Theorem 3.4 below only assumes that S is definable, which is a much weaker assumption. In contrast, the statement of Remark 4.14 in Curry et al. (2022) assumed that $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is setwise a compact geometric simplicial complex and thus imposed some rigidity on the geometry of S. For example, $\mathbb{S}^n$ is not a compact geometric simplicial complex but is definable.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be definable. For each fixed $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, the following univariate function is right continuous*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ECT}(S)(\nu, -) : \mathbb{R} &\to \mathbb{Z}, \\ t &\mapsto \chi(S_t^\nu). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Suppose $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is arbitrarily chosen and fixed. For this ν, we define function φ_ν by the following

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\nu : \ S &\to \mathbb{R}, \\ x &\mapsto x \cdot \nu, \end{aligned}$$

which is continuous. The graph $\Gamma(\varphi_\nu)$ of φ_ν can be represented as follows

$$\Gamma(\varphi_\nu) = \{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} : x \in S \text{ and } x \cdot \nu - t = 0\} = (S \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid x \cdot \nu - t = 0\}.$$

Since both $S \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid \nu \cdot x - t = 0\}$ are definable, the graph $\Gamma(\varphi_\nu)$ is definable, indicating that φ_ν is a definable function. The right continuity of $\mathrm{ECT}(S)(\nu, -)$ then follows from Theorem 3.1(1) and choosing $f = \varphi_\nu$. □

Theorem 3.4 directly implies the following corollary as any constructible function is a linear combination of indicator functions of definable sets (e.g., see the discussion in Section 3.6 of Ghrist (2014)).

Corollary 3.5. *Suppose $g : X \to \mathbb{Z}$ is a constructible function. Then, $\mathrm{ECT}(g)(\nu, -) : t \mapsto \mathrm{ECT}(g)(\nu, t)$ is right continuous.*

The arguments implemented in the proofs of Theorem 3.1 and 3.4 do not imply the left continuity of $\mathrm{ECT}(S)(\nu, -)$. The obstacle arises from the inherent structure of the interval $(t - \epsilon, t]$, which consistently includes the endpoint t, irrespective of the chosen value for $\epsilon > 0$. This differs from the context of right continuity, where the right endpoint of the interval $(t, t+\epsilon]$ offers greater flexibility. Importantly, the function $\mathrm{ECT}(S)(\nu, -)$ is not left continuous at its discontinuities, as demonstrated by the following example.

Example 3.6. Consider the shape $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|x\| \leq 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$. Let $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^1$ be arbitrarily chosen and fixed. We have the following:

(1) When $t < -1$, the set S_t^ν is empty. Then, $\mathrm{ECT}(S)(\nu, t) = \chi(S_t^\nu) = 0$.

(2) When $t \geq -1$, the set S_t^ν is non-empty and compact, and it deformation retracts to a point. Then, $\mathrm{ECT}(S)(\nu, t) = \chi(S_t^\nu) = 1$.

Therefore, for each fixed ν, we have $\mathrm{ECT}(S)(\nu, t) = \mathbb{1}\{t \geq -1\}$, which is a right continuous function of t. However, it is not left continuous at $t = -1$.

3.3. **Right Continuity of the Euler-Radon Transform.** Before discussing the ERT, we first study the LECT and SELECT as preparation. As a result of Theorem 3.1(1) and Theorem 3.4, we obtain the following right continuity results.

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a definable set and $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is a definable function. We have the following:*

(1) For each fixed direction $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and fixed $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the functions $t \mapsto \mathrm{LECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ and $t \mapsto \mathrm{SELECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ are both right continuous.

(2) For each fixed $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the function $s \mapsto \mathrm{SELECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ is left continuous.

Proof. According to the definition of the ECT in Equation (4), the function $t \mapsto \mathrm{LECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ can be represented using the ECT as

$$t \mapsto \mathrm{LECT}(g)(\nu, t, s) = \mathrm{ECT}(\{g = s\})(\nu, t) = \mathrm{ECT}(\mathbb{1}_{\{g=s\}})(\nu, t).$$

Hence, this function is right continuous by Theorem 3.4. Similarly, we may represent the function $t \mapsto \mathrm{SELECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ as

$$t \mapsto \mathrm{SELECT}(g)(\nu, t, s) = \mathrm{ECT}(\{g \geq s\})(\nu, t) = \mathrm{ECT}(\mathbb{1}_{\{g\geq s\}})(\nu, t).$$

The proof of result (1) is completed. For (2), using the notation defined in Equation (3), the function $s \mapsto \mathrm{SELECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)$ can be represented as follows

$$s \mapsto \mathrm{SELECT}(g)(\nu, t, s) = \chi\left(\{x \in X \mid x \cdot \nu \leq t, -g(x) \leq -s\}\right) = \chi\left(\{x \in X \mid x \cdot \nu \leq t\}_{-s}^{-g}\right).$$

This function is then left continuous by Theorem 3.1(1). □

Following Corollary 3.7, we now show that the ERT proposed in Meng et al. (2023) is right continuous.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a definable set and $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded and compactly supported definable function. For each fixed $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, the function $t \mapsto \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t)$ is right continuous.*

Proof. Following Meng et al. (2023), we represent the ERT using Lebesgue integrals as follows

$$\mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t) = \int_0^\infty G(\nu, t, s)\, ds, \quad \text{where} \tag{11}$$

$$G(\nu, t, s) := \{\mathrm{SELECT}(g)(\nu, t, s) - \mathrm{SELECT}(-g)(\nu, t, s)\} + \frac{1}{2}\{\mathrm{LECT}(-g)(\nu, t, s) - \mathrm{LECT}(g)(\nu, t, s)\}.$$

Since $t \mapsto G(\nu, t, s)$ is a finite sum of right continuous functions by Corollary 3.7, $G(\nu, t, s)$ is right continuous with respect to t.

Since g is a bounded function, there exists some $R > 0$ such that $G(\nu, t, s) = 0$ for all $|s| > R$. By Lemma 2.8, $G(\nu, t, s)$ takes only finitely many values $c_1, ..., c_n$, as (ν, t, s) ranges through $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. To apply the dominated convergence theorem (DCT), we define the dominating function $F(s)$ to be

$$F(s) = \left(\max_{1\leq i\leq n} |c_n|\right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[-R,R]}(s).$$

Since $\int_0^\infty F(s)ds < \infty$ and $|G(\nu, t, s)| \leq F(s)$ for all $(\nu, t, s) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, the DCT and the right continuity of $t \mapsto G(\nu, t, s)$ imply

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} \int_0^\infty \{G(\nu, t+\epsilon, s) - G(\nu, t, s)\}ds = \int_0^\infty \lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} \{G(\nu, t+\epsilon, s) - G(\nu, t, s)\}ds = 0.$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t+\epsilon) - \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} \int_0^\infty \{G(\nu, t+\epsilon, s) - G(\nu, t, s)\}ds = 0.$$

Thus, the function $t \mapsto \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t)$ is right continuous. □

4. Homotopy Type of Compact Definable Sublevel Sets

Propositon 3.3 shows the obstructions in generalizing the right continuity to other invariants (e.g., Betti numbers) on general definable sets. In this section, we will restrict our attention to compact definable sets $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, which is always satisfied in practical applications of TDA (e.g., the sets K represent glioblastoma multiforme tumors in Crawford et al. (2020), and K represent mandibular molars of primates in Wang et al. (2021)). The notation K is preferred over S to emphasize this compactness constraint. The additional constraint of compactness is instrumental in the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1. *Let K be a compact definable subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\Phi : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous definable function.*

(1) For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $K^{\Phi}_{t+\delta} = \Phi^{-1}((-\infty, t+\delta])$ deformation retracts to $K^{\Phi}_t = \Phi^{-1}((-\infty, t])$ for all $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small.

In particular, for any fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, and $\Phi(x) = \varphi_\nu(x) = x \cdot \nu$ be as in Theorem 3.4, we obtain the following two consequences:

(2) The definable set $K^{\nu}_{t+\delta}$ deformation retracts onto K^{ν}_t for all $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small.

(3) For each fixed $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and integer k, the function $t \mapsto \beta_k(K^{\nu}_t)$ is right continuous, where $\beta_k(K^{\nu}_t)$ denotes the k-th Betti number of K^{ν}_t.

Theorem 4.1(2) is a generalization of Theorem 3.4 on compact definable sets. Theorem 4.1 may not be true when K is not compact, which is demonstrated by the following example.

Example 4.2. Consider $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^1$ and $\Phi = \nu \cdot t$ where ν is the positive unit vector on the real line. Note that S is definable but not compact.

(1) For any $t > 0$, we have $S^{\nu}_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : 0 < x \leq t\} \neq \varnothing$.

(2) For any $t \leq 0$, we have $S^{\nu}_t = \varnothing$.

Hence, no matter how small δ is, S^{ν}_{δ} does not deformation retract onto S^{ν}_0.

The proof of Theorem 4.1 will rely on the following lemma:

Lemma 4.3 (Exercise 4.11 of Coste (2002))**.** *Let $Z \subseteq S$ be two closed and bounded definable sets. Let f be a nonnegative continuous definable function on S such that $f^{-1}(0) = Z$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small and a continuous definable map $h : f^{-1}(\delta) \times [0, \delta] \to f^{-1}([0, \delta])$ such that*

(1) $f(h(x,t)) = t$ for every $(x,t) \in f^{-1}(\delta) \times [0,\delta]$,

(2) $h(x, \delta) = x$ for every $x \in f^{-1}(\delta)$,

(3) h restricted to $f^{-1}(\delta) \times (0, \delta]$ is a homeomorphism onto $f^{-1}((0, \delta])$.

Because this is a known result, we will leave its proof in the Appendix (Section 6.1). We are now ready to prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We will first prove Theorem 4.1(1). Theorem 4.1(2) then follows directly from the definition of K^{ν}_t, and Theorem 4.1(3) is a direct corollary of Theorem 4.1(2) as Betti numbers are homotopy invariants on compact sets.

For Theorem 4.1(1), it suffices for us to show that $\Phi^{-1}([t, t+\delta])$ deformation retracts onto $\Phi^{-1}(\{t\})$. This is because, by the "pasting lemma" (Munkres, 2014, Theorem 18.3), we can combine this deformation retract with the identity homotopy on $\Phi^{-1}((-\infty, t])$ to create a deformation retract of $\Phi^{-1}((-\infty, t+\delta]))$ onto $\Phi^{-1}((-\infty, t])$.

Consider the continuous definable non-negative function $f : \Phi^{-1}([t, +\infty)) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $f(x) = \Phi(x) - t$. We apply Lemma 4.3 with $S = \Phi^{-1}([t, +\infty))$, $Z = f^{-1}(0) = \Phi^{-1}(\{t\})$, and $f^{-1}([0, \delta]) = \Phi^{-1}([t, t+\delta])$.

By Lemma 4.3, there exists $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small and a continuous definable map $h : f^{-1}(\delta) \times [0, \delta] \to f^{-1}([0, \delta])$ with properties (1), (2), (3) listed in the lemma. Now consider the map

$$F : (f^{-1}(\delta) \times [0, \delta]) \sqcup f^{-1}(0) \to f^{-1}([0, \delta]) = \Phi^{-1}([t, t + \delta]),$$

whose restriction to $f^{-1}(\delta) \times [0, \delta]$ is the map h and whose restriction to $f^{-1}(0)$ is the identity embedding. F is a continuous map by the pasting lemma. We also observe that F is surjective because h restircted to $f^{-1}(\delta) \times (0, \delta]$ is a homeomorphism onto $f^{-1}((0, \delta])$ and the restriction of F on $f^{-1}(0)$ is surjective onto $f^{-1}(0)$.

Since $f^{-1}(\delta) \times [0, \delta]$ and $f^{-1}(0)$ are both compact, F is a continuous map from a compact topological space into a Hausdorff space. Hence, F is a closed continuous surjection and is thus a quotient map. Thus, F induces a homeomorphism between $f^{-1}([0, \delta])$ and the quotient space $(f^{-1}(\delta) \times [0, \delta]) \sqcup f^{-1}(0)/\sim$, where $\sim$ is given by the relation $\xi \sim \eta$ if and only if $F(\xi) = F(\eta)$.

For ease of notation, let P denote $(f^{-1}(\delta) \times [0, \delta]) \sqcup f^{-1}(0)$. We will treat the equivalence relation $\sim$ explicitly as a subset of $P \times P$. We will write $R_1 = \{(\xi, \eta) \in P \times P \mid F(\xi) = F(\eta)\}$ as the equivalence relation $\sim$ on P given by the quotient map $F : P \to f^{-1}([0, \delta])$.

Let $g : f^{-1}(\delta) \to f^{-1}(0)$ be the continuous map defined by $g(x) = h(x, 0)$ and M_g be the mapping cylinder of g (Hatcher, 2002, Chapter 0). Note that g is well-defined as the image of $f^{-1}(\delta)$ under g is contained in $f^{-1}(0)$ by Lemma 4.3(1). The mapping cylinder M_g can be realized as the quotient space of P with the smallest equivalence relation $\sim'$ containing the relations $(x, 0) \sim' g(x) = h(x, 0)$ for all $(x, 0) \in f^{-1}(\delta) \times \{0\}$. Explicitly, we can denote $\sim'$ as $R_2 \subseteq P \times P$, where R_2 is the intersection of all equivalence relations on P containing the set $X = \{((x, 0), h(x, 0)) \mid (x, 0) \in f^{-1}(\delta) \times \{0\}\}$.

We claim that $R_1 = R_2$. First of all, $F(x, 0) = h(x, 0) = id(h(x, 0)) = F(h(x, 0))$, hence $X \subseteq R_1$. Thus, R_2 is a subset of R_1. Conversely, to show that $R_1 \subseteq R_2$, it suffices for us to show that for any equivalence relation R on P containing X, R contains R_1. Indeed, suppose R contains X, and let $(\xi, \eta) \in P \times P$ such that $F(\xi) = F(\eta)$, then we wish to show that $(\xi, \eta) \in R$ by doing the following case works:

- If $\xi \in f^{-1}(\delta) \times (0, \delta] \cup f^{-1}(0)$ and $\eta \in f^{-1}(\delta) \times (0, \delta] \cup f^{-1}(0)$, the restriction of F to this subspace is injective, hence $F(\xi) = F(\eta)$ implies $\xi = \eta$. Clearly $(\xi, \xi) \in R$ by reflexivity.

By Lemma 4.3(1), we know that the image of $f^{-1}(\delta) \times \{t\}$ under F is contained in $f^{-1}(t)$. Therefore, if $\xi \in f^{-1}(\delta) \times \{0\}$ such that $F(\xi) = F(\eta)$, then η must be in either $f^{-1}(0)$ or $f^{-1}(\delta) \times \{0\}$

- If $\xi = (x, 0) \in f^{-1}(\delta) \times \{0\}$ and $\eta \in f^{-1}(0)$. In this case, $h(x, 0) = F(\xi) = F(\eta) = id(\eta) = \eta$. Hence, $(\xi, \eta) = ((x, 0), h(x, 0)) \in X \subseteq R$.
- If $\xi = (x, 0) \in f^{-1}(\delta) \times \{0\}$ and $\eta = (y, 0) \in f^{-1}(\delta) \times \{0\}$. In this case, $h(x, 0) = F(\xi) = F(\eta) = h(y, 0)$. Since $X \subseteq R$, we know that $((x, 0), h(x, 0)), ((y, 0), h(y, 0)) \in R$. By symmetry, $(h(y, 0), (y, 0)) \in R$.

  Since $((x, 0), h(x, 0)), (h(y, 0), (y, 0)) \in R$ and $h(x, 0) = h(y, 0)$, we have that $((x, 0), (y, 0)) = (\xi, \eta) \in R$ by transitivity.
- Finally, if $\xi \in f^{-1}(0)$ and $\eta \in f^{-1}(\delta) \times \{0\}$, this is covered by a previous case via symmetry.

Thus, we conclude that $R_1 \subseteq R$ for any equivalence relation R on P that contains X. Therefore, $R_1 \subseteq R_2$. It then follows that $R_1 = R_2$.

Hence, it follows that $\Phi^{-1}([t, t + \delta]) = f^{-1}([0, \delta])$ is homeomorphic to $P/\sim = P/\sim' = M_g$ with a homeomorphism that is the identity on $f^{-1}(0) = \Phi^{-1}(\{t\})$. It is a well-known fact in algebraic topology (Hatcher, 2002, Chapter 0) that the mapping cylinder M_g deformation retracts to $f^{-1}(0)$.

Thus, carrying the deformation retract in M_g back to $\Phi^{-1}([t, t + \delta])$, we have that $\Phi^{-1}([t, t + \delta])$ deformation retracts to $\Phi^{-1}(\{t\})$. Hence, $K^{\Phi}_{t+\delta} = \Phi^{-1}((-\infty, t + \delta])$ deformation retracts to $K^{\Phi}_t = \Phi^{-1}((-\infty, t])$ for all $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small. □

Remark 4.4. The proof of Theorem 4.1 only needs that the preimages of points and closed intervals under Φ are compact. In other words, it suffices for us to remove the compactness constraint on K and require the map Φ to be continuous, definable, and proper. This also aligns with the discussion of the homotopy type of sublevel sets of a smooth manifold M with respect to a Morse function f in Milnor (1963) (Section I.3 therein), where only the preimages of closed intervals under f are assumed to be compact. In the specific o-minimal structure of globally subanalytic sets, Theorem 4.1(3) is also a consequence of Theorem 1.11 in Kashiwara and Schapira (2018).

We also obtain the following "LECT and SELECT versions" of Theorem 4.1 as a corollary.

Corollary 4.5. *Let K be a compact definable subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $g : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be a definable function, then*

(1) The definable set $\{x \in K^\nu_{t+\delta} : g(x) \geq s\}$ and $\{x \in K^\nu_{t+\delta} : g(x) = s\}$ deformation retracts to $\{x \in K^\nu_t : g(x) \geq s\}$ and $\{x \in K^\nu_t : g(x) = s\}$, respectively, for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small.

(2) If g is furthermore continuous, then the definable set $\{x \in K^\nu_t : g(x) \geq s - \delta\}$ deformation retracts to $\{x \in K^\nu_t : g(x) \geq s\}$ for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small.

The proof of Corollary 4.5 is a direct application of Theorem 4.1 and is omitted here.

5. Applications to Topological Data Analysis

In this section, we utilize the results in previous sections to study several Euler characteristic-based concepts in TDA. Specifically, we investigate the following:

(1) The relationship between the ECT (Turner et al., 2014; Curry et al., 2022) and the smooth Euler characteristic transform (SECT, Crawford et al., 2020; Meng et al., 2022).

(2) The relationship between the ERT and the smooth Euler-Radon transform (SERT, Meng et al., 2023).

To incorporate the techniques in functional data analysis (Hsing and Eubank, 2015) and Gaussian process regression (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006), Crawford et al. (2020) introduced the SECT by smoothing the ECT via Lebesgue integration. Precisely, given a definable compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ bounded by an open ball $B(0, R) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\| < R\}$, the SECT of K is defined as $\mathrm{SECT}(K) := \{\mathrm{SECT}(K)(\nu, t) : (\nu, t) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}\}$, where

$$\mathrm{SECT}(K)(\nu, t) := \int_{-R}^{t} \chi(K^\nu_\tau)\, d\tau - \frac{t+R}{2R} \int_{-R}^{R} \chi(K^\nu_\tau)\, d\tau, \tag{12}$$

for all $(\nu, t) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [-R, R]$. Lemma 2.5 guarantees that the Lebesgue integrals in Equation (12) are well defined. The $\mathrm{SECT}(K)(\nu, t)$ defined in Equation (12) can be viewed as an analog of a Brownian bridge (Klenke, 2020, Chapter 21) if we view $\int_{-R}^{t} \chi(K^\nu_\tau)\, d\tau$ as an analog of a Brownian motion. The SECT converts shape-valued data (e.g., tumors and mandibular molars of primates) into functional data, which was particularly employed by Meng et al. (2022) to perform hypothesis testing on shapes via the Karhunen–Loève expansion (Hsing and Eubank, 2015, Chapter 7). Particularly, Meng et al. (2022) constructed a probability space that makes the SECT a random variable taking values in a separable Banach space. The SECT has been extensively applied in sciences, e.g., organoid morphology (Marsh et al., 2022), radiomics (Crawford et al., 2020), and evolutionary biology (Meng et al., 2022). Besides, the map $(\nu, t) \mapsto \mathrm{SECT}(K)(\nu, t)$ potentially connects TDA to manifold learning (Chen and Müller, 2012; Dunson and Wu, 2021; Meng and Eloyan, 2021; Li et al., 2022; Hamm et al., 2023; Cloninger et al., 2023).

Similarly, Meng et al. (2023) introduced the SERT by smoothing the ERT via Lebesgue integration as follows: for any bounded, definable, and compactly supported function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\mathrm{supp}(g) \subseteq B(0, R)$ and

$$\mathrm{dist}\Big(\mathrm{supp}(g),\, \partial B(0, R)\Big) := \inf\Big\{\|x - y\| : x \in \mathrm{supp}(g) \text{ and } y \in \partial B(0, R)\Big\} > 0, \tag{13}$$

the SERT of g is defined as $\mathrm{SERT}(g) := \{\mathrm{SERT}(g)(\nu, t) : (\nu, t) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}\}$, where

$$\mathrm{SERT}(g)(\nu, t) := \int_{-R}^{t} \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, \tau)\, d\tau - \frac{t+R}{2R} \int_{-R}^{R} \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, \tau)\, d\tau, \tag{14}$$

for all $(\nu, t) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [-R, R]$. The SERT converts grayscale image-valued data (e.g., computerized tomography scans of tumors) into functional data (see Meng et al. (2023) for details). Equation (7) implies

$$\mathrm{ERT}(\mathbb{1}_K) = \mathrm{ECT}(K) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{SERT}(\mathbb{1}_K) = \mathrm{SECT}(K) \tag{15}$$

for any definable compact $K \subseteq B(0, R)$. Therefore, to investigate the relationship between the ECT and SECT, it suffices to investigate the relationship between the ERT and SERT.

The SERT is formulated from the ERT using Lebesgue integrals, as demonstrated in Equation (14). Now, if we are given the SERT of a definable function g and want to recover the corresponding $\mathrm{ERT}(g)$, challenges arise due to the nature of Lebesgue integration. Without additional regularity properties (e.g., right continuity) of the function $t \mapsto \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t)$, one can recover the $\mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t)$ from the $\mathrm{SERT}(g)(\nu, t)$ only in an "almost everywhere for t with respect to Lebesgue measure" sense, rather than "exactly everywhere." To put it more concretely, given $\{\mathrm{SERT}(g)(\nu, t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ without the knowledge of the regularity of the function $t \mapsto \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t)$, one can only determine the following through the Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to the Lebesgue measure

$$\{\mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t) : t \in \mathbb{R} - N\}, \tag{16}$$

where N is a measurable subset of $\mathbb{R}$ with Lebesgue measure zero. To recover the values of $\mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t)$ for $t \in N$, we need the right continuity in Theorem 3.8, which implies the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded, definable, and compactly supported function satisfying $\mathrm{supp}(g) \subseteq B(0, R)$ and Equation (13). Then, $\mathrm{ERT}(g)$ can be represented using $\mathrm{SERT}(g)$. Hence, $\mathrm{ERT}(g)$ and $\mathrm{SERT}(g)$ represent each other.*

Theorem 5.1 implies that the smoothing procedure in Equation (14) via Lebesgue integration preserves all the information within $\mathrm{ERT}(g)$. Furthermore, Theorem 5.1, together with Equation (15), implies that the transition from the ECT to the SECT via Equation (12) is invertible. Precisely, we have the following corollary of Theorem 5.1.

Corollary 5.2. *Suppose $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is compact, definable, and bounded by the open ball $B(0, R)$. Then, $\mathrm{ECT}(K)$ can be represented using $\mathrm{SECT}(K)$. Hence, $\mathrm{ECT}(K)$ and $\mathrm{SECT}(K)$ represent each other.*

Corollary 5.2, together with the success of the ECT in applications (Turner et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2021; Jiang et al., 2020), justifies the utilization of the SECT in sciences (Crawford et al., 2020; Meng et al., 2022; Marsh et al., 2022). In addition, theoretical results on the ECT (Ghrist et al., 2018; Curry et al., 2022) can be applied to the SECT via Corollary 5.2.

We employ techniques that were previously implemented by Meng et al. (2023) in the subsequent proof.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We arbitrarily choose a direction $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and fix it. Equation (13) implies that $\mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t) = 0$ and $\mathrm{SERT}(g)(\nu, t) = -\frac{t+R}{2R} \int_{-R}^{R} \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, \tau)\, d\tau$ when $-R < t < -R + \mathrm{dist}\,(\mathrm{supp}(g),\, \partial B(0, R))$. Equation (14) implies that the following equation holds almost everywhere

$$\frac{d}{dt}\,\mathrm{SERT}(K)(\nu, t) = \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, t) + \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \int_{-R}^{R} \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, \tau)\, d\tau \right\}. \tag{17}$$

That is, there exists a measurable subset N of $\mathbb{R}$ with Lebesgue measure zero such that Equation (17) holds for all $t \notin N$. Hence,

$$\lim_{t \to -R} \frac{d}{dt}\,\mathrm{SERT}(K)(\nu, t) = \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \int_{-R}^{R} \mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu, \tau)\, d\tau \right\},$$

which implies

$$\mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu,t) = \frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{SERT}(K)(\nu,t) - \lim_{t\to -R}\frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{SERT}(K)(\nu,t), \quad \text{for all } t \notin N. \tag{18}$$

The right continuity of $t \mapsto \mathrm{ERT}(K)(\nu,t)$ indicates that Equation (18) recovers the values of $\mathrm{ERT}(g)(\nu,t)$ for $t \in N$. Therefore, the $\mathrm{ERT}(g)$ is represented by $\mathrm{SERT}(g)$ through Equation (18) and the right continuity of $t \mapsto \mathrm{ERT}(K)(\nu,t)$. □

6. Appendix

6.1. **Proof of Lemma 4.3.** Our proof will also use concepts in triangulations and simplicial complexes. We refer the reader to Rourke and Sanderson (1982) for a thorough treatment of the subject. For our purposes, we denote the geometric (closed) simplex $[a_0, ..., a_d]$ as the convex hull of affinely independent points $a_0, ..., a_d$, i.e.,

$$[a_0, ..., a_d] = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x = \lambda_0 a_0 + ... + \lambda_d a_d, \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i = 1, \lambda_i \in [0,1] \right\}.$$

We will now prove Lemma 4.3 as follows.

Proof. We follow the hints outlined in the exercise. By the triangulation theorem for definable functions (Coste, 1998, Theorem 2), there exists a finite simplicial complex L_S with a definable homeomorphism $\rho : |L_S| \to S$ from the polyhedron of L_S to S such that $f \circ \rho$ is linear on each simplex of L_S. Furthermore, this triangulation may be chosen so that Z is definably homeomorphic to $|L_Z|$, where L_Z is a full subcomplex of L_S.

We outline the proof in several steps:

(1) For $(x,t) \in f^{-1}(\delta) \times [0,\delta]$, we will construct $h(x,t)$ and show it is well-defined in this section. Since L_S is a finite triangulation, we may choose $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small that any vertex v of L_S that is not in L_Z satisfies $f(\rho(v)) > \delta$.

   (a) Let $x' = \rho^{-1}(x)$ denote the element x on $|L_Z|$.

   (b) By the construction of δ, x' is contained in a simplex $[a_0, ..., a_d]$ such that $x' = \sum_{i=0}^{d} \lambda_i a_i$ in barycentric coordinates. We may assume without loss that $a_i \in L_Z$ for $i = 0, ..., k$ and $a_i \notin L_Z$ for $i = k+1, ..., d$.

   (c) Let $\alpha = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \lambda_i$. We claim that $0 < \alpha < 1$. Indeed, if $\alpha = 0$, since each $\lambda_i \geq 0$, this means that x' is contained in the simplex $[a_{k+1}, ..., a_d]$. But this would mean that $f(\rho(x')) = f(x) > \delta$. On the other hand, if $\alpha = 1$, then this would mean similarly that x' is contained in the simplex $[a_1, ..., a_k]$, so $f(\rho(x')) = f(x) = 0$. Thus, we conclude that $0 < \alpha < 1$.

   (d) Now consider the point $q(x') = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\alpha}\right) a_i$ in the simplex $[a_0, ..., a_k] \subseteq [a_0, ..., a_d]$. Since a (geometric) simplex is convex, we may define a line from x' to $q(x')$. We then define $h(x,t) = \rho(y')$, where y' is the point on the line such that $f(\rho(y')) = t$.

   (e) We note that such y' must exist and is uniquely determined by x' and $q(x')$. Indeed, this is because $f \circ \rho$ is a linear function on the simplex $[a_0, ..., a_d]$. Hence,

$$f \circ \rho(q(x')) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \frac{\lambda_i}{\alpha} f \circ \rho(a_i) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} 0 = 0.$$

   We also know that $f \circ \rho(x') = f(x) = \delta$. Since our function is continuous, such y' must exist. Furthermore, this y' is uniquely determined by x' and $q(x')$ since our function is linear.

   (f) We also need to check that $h(x,t)$ is independent of which simplex x' is contained in. Indeed, suppose x' is contained in the simplex $[a_0, ..., a_d]$ and $[b_0, ..., b_e]$, then $x' \in [a_0, ..., a_d] \cap [b_0, ..., b_e]$, which is also a simplex spanned by some common vertices in $\{a_0, ..., a_d\} \cap \{b_0, ..., b_e\}$. Let's say $x' \in \{c_0, ..., c_f\}$.

Let $q_a(x'), q_b(x'), q_c(x')$ be the correspondent point in Z given by each of the three vertex sets. We see that $q_a(x') = q_c(x') = q_b(x')$. This is because, if we were to write $x' = \sum_{i=0}^{d} a_i\lambda_i = \sum_{j=0}^{e} b_j\xi_j$ in terms of the barycentric coordinates of $[a_0, ..., a_d]$ and $[b_0, .., b_e]$, the vertices where a_i is non-zero and the vertices where b_j is non-zero are all in $\{c_0, ..., c_f\}$.

(2) Now that we have constructed $h(x, t)$. We will verify Lemma 4.3(1) and Lemma 4.3(2):

- For Lemma 4.3(1), clearly by definition $f(h(x, t)) = f(\rho(y')) = t$.
- For Lemma 4.3(2), clearly $f(x) = f(\rho(x')) = \delta$ and x' is on the line between x' and $q(x')$. Thus, $h(x, \delta) = x$.

(3) Now we will check that $h(x, t)$ is continuous definable. We first define a natural map $Q : f^{-1}(\delta) \to f^{-1}([0, \delta])$ such that $Q(x) = \rho(q(\rho^{-1}(x))) = \rho(q(x'))$, where $q(x')$ is the same well-defined element we specified in the construction of $h(x, t)$.

To show that Q is continuous and definable, it suffices for us to show that $q : \rho^{-1}(f^{-1}(\delta)) \to \rho^{-1}(f^{-1}([0, \delta]))$ is continuous and definable.

We can show that q is a continuous definable function by considering the Pasting Lemma (Munkres, 2014, Theorem 18.3) on the restriction of q on each of $[a_0, ..., a_d] \cap \rho^{-1}(f^{-1}(\delta))$. Write $x' = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i a_i$. In terms of barycentric coordinate, the map $x' \mapsto q(x')$ is just $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_d) \mapsto (\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha}, ..., \frac{\lambda_k}{\alpha}, 0, ..., 0)$, which is clearly continuous and definable.

Let $i : f^{-1}(\delta) \to f^{-1}([0, \delta])$ be the standard inclusion map. We note that $h(x, t) : f^{-1}(\delta) \times [0, \delta] \to f^{-1}([0, \delta])$ is the "straight line" homotopy between the functions i and Q (Technically, $\rho^{-1} \circ h$ is a straight line homotopy between $\rho^{-1} \circ i$ and $\rho^{-1} \circ Q$ on $|L_Z|$ under the definable homeomorphism ρ). Thus, $h(x, t)$ is also a continuous definable function.

(4) Finally, we will prove Lemma 4.3(3). We first want to prove that h is bijective on $f^{-1}(\delta) \times (0, \delta] \to f^{-1}((0, \delta])$.

Indeed, let $y \in f^{-1}((0, \delta])$, since $0 < f(y) = t_0 \leq \delta$, we can find a simplex $[a_0, ..., a_d]$ containing $y' := \rho^{-1}(y)$.

We will write $y' = \sum_{i=1}^{d} r_i a_i$ in terms of barycentric coordinates. We wish to find an element $x' \in [a_0, ..., a_d]$ such that y' lies between x' and $q(x')$. This will prove surjectivity.

Indeed, consider an arbitrary element $x' = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i a_i$. The condition that y' lies between x' and $q(x')$ is true if and only if, in terms of barycentric coordinates,

$$(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_d) + \frac{\delta - t_0}{\delta}\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha} - \lambda_1, ..., \frac{\lambda_k}{\alpha} - \lambda_k, -\lambda_{k+1}, ..., -\lambda_d\right) = (r_1, ..., r_d). \tag{19}$$

We then see that this uniquely determines the coefficients $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_d$. The fact that $f(y) = f(\rho(y')) > 0$ is crucial here. If $f(\rho(y')) = 0$, then the coefficients $\lambda_{k+1}, ..., \lambda_d$ cannot be determined.

This also proves injectivity since if there's any $z', q(z')$ in $[b_0, ..., b_e]$ such that y' is also in the line segment between z' and $q(z')$. Then $y' \in [a_0, ..., a_d] \cap [b_0, ..., b_e] = [c_0, ..., c_f]$. Suppose for contradiction that z' is not in $[c_0, ..., c_f]$, then the line from z' to $q(z')$ would not be contained in $[b_0, ..., b_e]$. Thus z' must be an element of $[a_0, ..., a_d]$, which forces it to have the same coefficients $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_d$. Thus, we conclude that h is bijective on $f^{-1}(\delta) \times (0, \delta]$.

(5) Now consider the inverse of h on $f^{-1}((0, \delta])$. We can show h^{-1} is continuous by showing $h^{-1} \circ \rho$ is continuous on $\rho^{-1}(f^{-1}((0, \delta]))$. For ease of notation, we will call this space $X = \rho^{-1}(f^{-1}((0, \delta]))$.

We can verify this using the Pasting Lemma (Munkres, 2014, Theorem 18.3) on the intersection of X with each simplex $[a_0, ..., a_d]$. Now $h^{-1} \circ \rho$ restricted to $[a_0, ..., a_d] \cap X$ is a function from $[a_0, ..., a_d] \cap X \to f^{-1}(\delta) \times (0, \delta]$.

By the definition of product topology, it suffices for us to verify that the map is coordinate-wise continuous. The composition of $h^{-1} \circ \rho$ and projection to $(0, \delta]$ is clearly continuous because this is the same as the map $f \circ \rho$. Indeed, for any $y' \in [a_0, ..., a_d] \cap X$ such that $\rho(y') = h(x,t)$,

$$f \circ \rho(y') = f(\rho(y')) = f(h(x,t)) = t, \quad \text{by Lemma 4.3(1)}$$

As for the first coordinate $f^{-1}(\delta)$. For any $y' = \sum_{i=1}^{d} r_i a_i \in [a_0, ..., a_d] \cap X$ such that $\rho(y') = h(x,t)$, Equation (19) shows that the map from y' to $\rho^{-1}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i a_i$ is continuous definable.

□

References

R. Adler and J. Taylor. *Random Fields and Geometry*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer New York, 2009. ISBN 9780387481166.

Y. Baryshnikov and R. Ghrist. Euler Integration over Definable Functions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(21):9525–9530, 2010.

M. Bestvina and N. Brady. Morse Theory and Finiteness Properties of Groups. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 129:445–470, 1997.

G. E. Bredon. *Sheaf Theory*, volume 170. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

G. Carlsson. Topology and Data. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 46(2):255–308, 2009.

D. Chen and H.-G. Müller. Nonlinear manifold representations for functional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(1), 2012.

A. Cloninger, K. Hamm, V. Khurana, and C. Moosmüller. Linearized Wasserstein Dimensionality Reduction with Approximation Guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07373*, 2023.

M. Coste. Topological Types of Fewnomials. *Banach Center Publications*, 44(1):81–92, 1998.

M. Coste. An Introduction to O-minimal Geometry. 2002.

J. Cox, D. B. Karron, and N. Ferdous. Topological Zone Organization of Scalar Volume Data. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 18:95–117, 2003.

L. Crawford, A. Monod, A. X. Chen, S. Mukherjee, and R. Rabadán. Predicting Clinical Outcomes in Glioblastoma: An Application of Topological and Functional Data Analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115(531):1139–1150, 2020.

J. Curry, R. Ghrist, and M. Robinson. Euler Calculus with Applications to Signals and Sensing. 2012.

J. Curry, S. Mukherjee, and K. Turner. How Many Directions Determine a Shape and Other Sufficiency Results for Two Topological Transforms. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, Series B*, 9(32):1006–1043, 2022.

D. B. Dunson and N. Wu. Inferring Manifolds From Noisy Data Using Gaussian Processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07478*, 2021.

P. Dupuis, U. Grenander, and M. I. Miller. Variational Problems on Flows of Diffeomorphisms for Image Matching. *Quarterly of applied mathematics*, pages 587–600, 1998.

H. Edelsbrunner and J. Harer. *Computational Topology: An Introduction*. American Mathematical Soc., 2010.

H. Edelsbrunner, D. Letscher, and A. Zomorodian. Topological Persistence and Simplification. In *Proceedings 41st annual symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 454–463. IEEE, 2000.

R. Forman. A User's Guide to Discrete Morse theory. *Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire [electronic only]*, 48:B48c, 35 p., electronic only–B48c, 35 p., electronic only, 2002.

T. Gao, S. Z. Kovalsky, D. M. Boyer, and I. Daubechies. Gaussian Process Landmarking for Three-Dimensional Geometric Morphometrics. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 1(1):237–267, 2019a.

T. Gao, S. Z. Kovalsky, and I. Daubechies. Gaussian Process Landmarking on Manifolds. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 1(1):208–236, 2019b.

R. Ghrist, R. Levanger, and H. Mai. Persistent Homology and Euler Integral Transforms. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, 2:55–60, 2018.

R. W. Ghrist. *Elementary Applied Topology*, volume 1. Createspace Seattle, 2014.

K. Hamm, N. Henscheid, and S. Kang. Wassmap: Wasserstein Isometric Mapping for Image Manifold Learning. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 5(2):475–501, 2023.

A. Hatcher. *Algebraic Topology*. New York : Cambridge University Press, 2002.

T. Hsing and R. Eubank. *Theoretical Foundations of Functional Data Analysis, with an Introduction to Linear Operators*, volume 997. John Wiley & Sons, 2015.

Q. Jiang, S. Kurtek, and T. Needham. The Weighted Euler Curve Transform for Shape and Image Analysis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 844–845, 2020.

M. Kashiwara and P. Schapira. *Sheaves on Manifolds*. Springer, 1990.

M. Kashiwara and P. Schapira. Persistent Homology and Microlocal Sheaf Theory. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, 2(1–2):83–113, 2018.

D. G. Kendall. The Diffusion of Shape. *Advances in applied probability*, 9(3):428–430, 1977.

D. G. Kendall. Shape Manifolds, Procrustean Metrics, and Complex Projective Spaces. *Bulletin of the London mathematical society*, 16(2):81–121, 1984.

D. G. Kendall. A Survey of the Statistical Theory of Shape. *Statistical Science*, 4(2):87–99, 1989.

H. Kirveslahti and S. Mukherjee. Representing Fields without Correspondences: the Lifted Euler Characteristic Transform. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, pages 1–34, 2023.

A. Klenke. *Probability Theory: A Comprehensive Course*. Springer, 2020.

V. Lebovici. Hybrid Transforms of Constructible Functions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 2022.

D. Li, M. Mukhopadhyay, and D. B. Dunson. Efficient Manifold Approximation with Spherelets. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(4):1129–1149, 2022.

L. Marsh and D. Beers. Stability and Inference of the Euler Characteristic Transform. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13200*, 2023.

L. Marsh, F. Y. Zhou, X. Quin, X. Lu, H. M. Byrne, and H. A. Harrington. Detecting Temporal Shape Changes with the Euler Characteristic Transform. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10883*, 2022.

Y. Matsumoto. *An Introduction to Morse Theory*. Iwanami series in modern mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2002. ISBN 9781470446338.

K. Meng and A. Eloyan. Principal Manifold Estimation via Model Complexity Selection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 83(2):369–394, 2021.

K. Meng, J. Wang, L. Crawford, and A. Eloyan. Randomness and Statistical Inference of Shapes via the Smooth Euler Characteristic Transform. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.12699*, 2022.

K. Meng, M. Ji, J. Wang, K. Ding, H. Kirveslahti, A. Eloyan, and L. Crawford. Statistical Inference on Grayscale Images via the Euler-Radon Transform. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14249v1*, 2023.

Y. Mileyko, S. Mukherjee, and J. Harer. Probability Measures on the Space of Persistence Diagrams. *Inverse Problems*, 27(12):124007, 2011.

J. W. Milnor. *Morse theory*. Number 51. Princeton university press, 1963.

M. Morse. The Foundations of the Calculus of Variations in the Large in m-Space (First Paper). *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 31(3):379–404, 1929. ISSN 00029947.

E. Munch. An Invitation to the Euler Characteristic Transform. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10395*, 2023.

J. Munkres. *Topology*. Pearson New International Edition, 2nd edition, 2014.

C. E. Rasmussen and C. K. Williams. *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*, volume 2. MIT press Cambridge, MA, 2006.

A. Robinson and K. Turner. Hypothesis Testing for Topological Data Analysis. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, 1(2):241–261, 2017.

J.-P. Rolin, F. Sanz, and R. Schäfke. Quasi-analytic Solutions of Analytic Ordinary Differential Equations and O-minimal Structures. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 95(2):413–442, 2007.

C. P. Rourke and B. J. Sanderson. *Introduction to Piecewise-linear Topology*. Springer, 1982.

P. Schapira. Operations on Constructible Functions. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 72(1):83–93, 1991.

P. Schapira. Tomography of Constructible Functions. In *International Symposium on Applied Algebra, Algebraic Algorithms, and Error-Correcting Codes*, pages 427–435. Springer, 1995.

P. Schapira. Constructible Sheaves and Functions Up to Infinity. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, 2023.

A. Tarski and J. C. C. McKinsey. *A Decision Method for Elementary Algebra and Geometry*. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1951. ISBN 9780520348097.

J. E. Taylor and K. J. Worsley. Random Fields of Multivariate Test Statistics, with Applications to Shape Analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(1):1–27, 2008. ISSN 00905364.

K. Turner, S. Mukherjee, and D. M. Boyer. Persistent Homology Transform for Modeling Shapes and Surfaces. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 3(4):310–344, 2014.

L. van den Dries. O-minimal Structures and Real Analytic Geometry. *Current Developments in Mathematics*, 1998(1):105–152, 1998a.

L. van den Dries. *Tame Topology and O-minimal Structures*, volume 248. Cambridge university press, 1998b.

L. van den Dries and P. Speissegger. The Field of Reals with Multisummable Series and the Exponential Function. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 81(3):513–565, 2000.

O. Y. Viro. Some Integral Calculus Based on Euler Characteristic. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, page 127–138, 1988.

S. Vishwanath, K. Fukumizu, S. Kuriki, and B. Sriperumbudur. On the Limits of Topological Data Analysis for Statistical Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.00220*, 2020.

B. Wang, T. Sudijono, H. Kirveslahti, T. Gao, D. M. Boyer, S. Mukherjee, and L. Crawford. A Statistical Pipeline for Identifying Physical Features That Differentiate Classes of 3d Shapes. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 15(2):638–661, 2021.

A. J. Wilkie. Model Completeness Results for Expansions of the Ordered Field of Real Numbers by Restricted Pfaffian Functions and the Exponential Function. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 9(4): 1051–1094, 1996. ISSN 08940347, 10886834.

Brown University, Department of Mathematics, Box 1917, 151 Thayer Street, Providence, RI 02912, USA

Email address: mattie_ji@brown.edu

Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, RI, USA

Email address: kun_meng@brown.edu

Brown University, Department of Mathematics, Box 8615, 151 Thayer Street, Providence, RI 02912, USA

Email address: kexin_ding@brown.edu