SOLVING TROPICAL EQUATIONS

ZUR IZHAKIAN AND LOUIS ROWEN

ABSTRACT. We continue the study of matrices over a supertropical algebra, proving the existence of a tangible adjoint of A, which turns out to be the left quasi-inverse uniquely maximal with respect to a given quasi-identity of A; this provides a unique maximal (tangible) solution to tropical vector equations and a version of Cramer's rule. We also describe various properties of this tangible adjoint.

1. INTRODUCTION

In [3], the foundations of supertropical matrix theory were laid out. Continuing that study, we consider the tangible version of the supertropical adjoint, which yields a version of Cramer's rule for finding tangible solutions to tropical vector equations, assuming that the coefficient matrix is nonsingular.

We recall that the underlying structure is a **semiring with ghosts**, which we recall is a triple (R, \mathcal{G}, ν) , where R is a semiring with zero element, \mathbb{O}_R , (often identified in the examples with $-\infty$, as indicated below), and $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G} \cup {\mathbb{O}_R}$ is a semigroup ideal, called the **ghost ideal**, together with an idempotent map

$$\nu: R \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \cup \{\mathbb{O}_R\}$$

called the **ghost map**, i.e., which preserves multiplication as well as addition.

Note 1.1. Throughout this paper, we also assume the key property

$$\nu(a) = a + a.$$

We write a^{ν} for $\nu(a)$, called the ν -value, or the ghost value, of a. Two element a and b in R are said to be **matched** if they have the same ν -value; we say that a **dominates** b if $a^{\nu} \ge b^{\nu}$. We write a = b+ghost to indicate that a equals b plus some undetermined ghost element. We focus on the **tangible elements** $\mathcal{T} = R \setminus \mathcal{G}_0$ and write \mathcal{T}_0 for $\mathcal{T} \cup \{\emptyset_R\}$.

A supertropical semiring has the extra properties:

- (i) $a + b = a^{\nu}$ if $a^{\nu} = b^{\nu}$;
- (ii) $a + b \in \{a, b\}, \forall a, b \in R \text{ s.t. } a^{\nu} \neq b^{\nu}$. (Equivalently, \mathcal{G}_0 is ordered, via $a^{\nu} \leq b^{\nu}$ iff $a^{\nu} + b^{\nu} = b^{\nu}$.)

A supertropical domain is a supertropical semiring for which \mathcal{T} is a cancellative monoid; we also defined a supertropical semifield to be a supertropical domain (R, \mathcal{G}, ν) when the following two extra conditions are satisfied:

- (i) Every tangible element of R is invertible; in other words, \mathcal{T} is a group.
- (ii) The map $\nu_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{G}$ (defined as the restriction from ν to \mathcal{T}) is onto; in other words, every element of \mathcal{G} has the form a^{ν} for some $a \in \mathcal{T}$. Thus, \mathcal{G} is also a group.

Since any commutative cancellative domain has an Abelian group of fractions, one can often reduce from the case of a (commutative) supertropical domain to that of a semifield.

Although in general, the map $\nu : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{G}$ need not be 1:1, we define a function $\hat{\nu} : R \to \mathcal{T}_0$ such that $\hat{\nu}$ restricts to the identity map on \mathcal{T}_0 and $\nu \circ \hat{\nu}$ restricts to the identity map on \mathcal{G} , and we write \hat{b} for $\hat{\nu}(b)$. Thus, $(\hat{b})^{\nu} = b$ for all $b \in \mathcal{G}_0$.

²⁰⁰⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 15A09, 15A03, 15A15, 65F15; Secondary 16Y60.

Key words and phrases. Supertropical matrix algebra, Adjoint matrix, Cramer's rule, Solving equations.

The first author has been supported by the Chateaubriand scientific post-doctorate fellowships, Ministry of Science, French Government, 2007-2008.

The second author is supported in part by the Israel Science Foundation, grant 1178/06.

The following observation shows that $\hat{\nu}$ often enables us to make calculations that parallel those of the max-plus algebra.

Proposition 1.2. If $\sum_k a_k \widehat{b_{j,k}} \in \mathcal{G}$ for each j, then $\sum_k a_k \hat{\nu}(\sum_j b_{j,k}c_j) \in \mathcal{G}$ for any $c_j \in R$.

Proof. Consider the dominating term $a_k \hat{\nu}(b_{j,k}c_j)$ of the right side. We are done unless $a_k \in \mathcal{T}$. But $a_k \widehat{b_{j,k}}$ dominates $a_{k'} \widehat{b_{j,k'}}$ for each k' (since $a_k \hat{\nu}(b_{j,k}c_j)$ dominates $a'_k \hat{\nu}(b_{j,k'}c_j)$), so by hypothesis, there must be k' with $a_k \widehat{b_{j,k}} \nu$ -matched by $a_k \widehat{b_{j,k'}}$. But then $a_k \hat{\nu}(b_{j,k}c_j)$ is ν -matched by $a_{k'} \hat{\nu}(b_{j,k'}c_j)$ and thus their sum is ghost.

1.1. Matrices. We write $M_n(R)$ for the semiring of $n \times n$ matrices, whose multiplicative identity is denoted as I, and we define the supertropical determinant to be the permanent, as in [1, 4, 2].

Definition 1.3. A permutation $\sigma \in S_n$ attains |A| if $|A|^{\nu} = (a_{\sigma(1),1} \cdots a_{\sigma(n),n})^{\nu}$, where $A = (a_{i,j})$.

Definition 1.4. The minor $A_{i,j}$ is obtained by deleting the *i* row and *j* column of *A*. The adjoint matrix $\operatorname{adj}(A)$ of a matrix $A = (a_{i,j})$ is defined as the transpose of the matrix $(a'_{i,j})$, where $a'_{i,j} = |A_{i,j}|$.

The tangible adjoint matrix $\widehat{\operatorname{adj}}(A)$ of A is defined as the transpose of the matrix $(a'_{i,j})$.

A matrix A is defined to be singular if $|A| \in \mathcal{G}_0$, otherwise A is called nonsingular.

2. TANGIBLE QUASI-INVERTIBLE MATRICES

Recall the following definition from [4]:

Definition 2.1. A quasi-zero matrix $Z_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a matrix equal to \mathbb{O}_R on the diagonal, and whose off-diagonal entries are ghosts or \mathbb{O}_R . (Despite the notation, the quasi-zero matrix $Z_{\mathcal{G}}$ is not unique, since the ν -values of the ghost entries may vary.) A quasi-identity matrix $I_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a nonsingular, multiplicatively idempotent matrix equal to $I + Z_{\mathcal{G}}$, where $Z_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a quasi-zero matrix.

Most of the following result is contained in [4, Theorem 4.9].

Theorem 2.2. Suppose $A = (a_{i,j})$, with |A| invertible. Define $A^{\nabla} = \frac{1}{|A|} \operatorname{adj}(A)$ and $A^{\widehat{\nabla}} = \frac{1}{|A|} \operatorname{adj}(A)$. Then $AA^{\nabla} = AA^{\widehat{\nabla}} = I_A$ and $A^{\nabla}A = A^{\widehat{\nabla}}A = I'_A$ are quasi-identities.

Proof. It remains to show that $AA^{\nabla} = AA^{\widehat{\nabla}}$. The ν -values are the same, so we need only check that the diagonal entries of $AA^{\widehat{\nabla}}$ are tangible (which is a fortiori, since this is true for the diagonal entries of $AA^{\widehat{\nabla}}$), and the off-diagonal entries of $AA^{\widehat{\nabla}}$ are ghost, which holds because of [4, Remark 4.4].

Inspired by Theorem 2.2, when |A| is invertible, we call A quasi-invertible, and define the **right** quasi-identity of A to be the matrix $I_A = AA^{\nabla} = AA^{\widehat{\nabla}}$, and the left quasi-identity of A to be the matrix $I'_A = A^{\nabla}A = A^{\widehat{\nabla}}A$.

Example 2.3. For
$$A \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$
, we have $\operatorname{adj}(A) = \begin{pmatrix} d & b \\ c & a \end{pmatrix}$; hence $A \operatorname{adj}(A) = \begin{pmatrix} |A| & (ab)^{\nu} \\ (cd)^{\nu} & |A| \end{pmatrix}$ whereas

 $\operatorname{adj}(A)A = \begin{pmatrix} |A| & (0a) \\ (ac)^{\nu} & |A| \end{pmatrix}$. Thus, the left and right quasi-inverses of a quasi-invertible matrix can be quite different. This enique will only be resolved in Corollary 4.8 below.

In view of [4, Proposition 4.12], every quasi-identity is its own left and right quasi-inverse as well as its own left and right quasi-identity, and $I_{\mathcal{G}} = I_{\mathcal{G}}^{\nabla}$ for any quasi-identity $I_{\mathcal{G}}$ [4, Proposition 4.11]. The thrust of this investigation is to start with a given quasi-invertible matrix and work with its quasi-inverses and quasi-identities.

Example 2.4. Take the following matrices in logarithmic notation (i.e., $-\infty$ is the additive identity and 0 is the multiplicative identity):

$$A = I = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\infty \\ -\infty & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 10^{\nu} \\ -\infty & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad and \quad B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\infty \\ 10^{\nu} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

then $AB_1 = B_1$ and $AB_2 = B_2$ are quasi-identities, but

$$\widehat{A(B_1 + B_2)} = B_1 + B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 10^{\nu} \\ 10^{\nu} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

is a singular matrix, and thus not a quasi-identity.

Nevertheless, this example did not yield I_A , and we want to show that A^{∇} is unique as a quasi-inverse in a certain sense.

Definition 2.5. We define the supertropical pre-order \leq on a supertropical semiring R, by $a \leq b$ iff $(a + b)^{\nu} = b^{\nu}$; i.e., iff $a^{\nu} \leq b^{\nu}$. (This is total, and is ν -antisymmetric, in the sense that if $a \leq b$ and $b \leq a$, then $a^{\nu} = b^{\nu}$.)

This extends to the supertropical partial pre-order \leq on matrices given by $A \leq B$ if $(A + B)^{\nu} = B^{\nu}$; i.e., $(a_{i,j})^{\nu} \leq (b_{i,j})^{\nu}$ for each i, j. (\leq is no longer total on matrices.) We write $A \approx B$ if $A \leq B$ and $B \leq A$; this happens when the entries of A and B have the same respective ν -values.

Lemma 2.6. $BI_A \succeq B$ for any quasi-identity I_A .

Proof. Let $C = BI_A$, where $I_A = (\iota_{k,j})$. Then, for any i, j, we have

$$c_{i,j} = \sum_{k} b_{i,k} \iota_{k,j} = b_{i,j} \mathbb{1}_R + \sum_{k \neq j} b_{i,k} \iota_{k,j} \ge b_{i,j}.$$

We need some results from [4].

Lemma 2.7. Assume that $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is a diagraph in which the in-degree $d_{in}(j) \ge k$ for all vertices $i \in \mathcal{V}$ except one (at most) which has positive in-degree, and the out-degree $d_{out}(i) \le k$ for all vertices $i \in \mathcal{V}$. Then G contains an n-multicycle.

Proof. By [4, Lemma 3.15].

Theorem 2.8. $A^{\nabla}I_A \approx A^{\nabla}$, for any matrix A with |A| invertible.

Proof. Clearly $A^{\nabla}I_A = A^{\nabla}AA^{\nabla} \succeq A^{\nabla}$ (cf. Lemma 2.6), so we need only show that $\operatorname{adj}(A)A\operatorname{adj}(A) \preceq |A|\operatorname{adj}(A)$. But the (i, j)-entry of $\operatorname{adj}(A)A\operatorname{adj}(A)$ is the sum of entries of the form $a'_{k,i}a_{k,\ell}a'_{j,\ell}$, each of which is the sum of whose digraphs have in-degree 2 at every vertex except j, and out-degree 2 at every vertex except i. Hence, we can take out an n-cycle, by [4], which has value at most |A|, so $\operatorname{adj}(A)A\operatorname{adj}(A) \preceq |A|\operatorname{adj}(A)$, as desired. \Box

We can conclude that $A^{\widehat{\nabla}}$ is the "maximal" right quasi-inverse of A:

Corollary 2.9. If $AB = I_A$, then $B \preceq A^{\widehat{\nabla}}$.

Proof. $B \leq I'_A B = (A^{\widehat{\nabla}} A)B = A^{\widehat{\nabla}}(AB) = A^{\widehat{\nabla}}I_A \approx A^{\widehat{\nabla}}$, by Theorem 2.8.

By symmetry $A^{\widehat{\nabla}}$ is the "maximal" left quasi-inverse of A (although the corresponding left and right quasi-identities I_A and I'_A may differ!)

The same sort of reasoning shows that I_A is also maximal in a certain sense:

Remark 2.10. If $A^{\widehat{\nabla}}B = A^{\widehat{\nabla}}$, then $B \preceq I_A B = A A^{\widehat{\nabla}} B = A A^{\widehat{\nabla}} = I_A$.

3. Solving Equations

Let us solve the matrix equation $Ax + v \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)}$, for an $n \times n$ matrix A and vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{(n)}$ over a supertropical domain $\mathbb{R} = (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{G}, \nu)$. First we dispose of a trivial situation.

Remark 3.1. When A is a singular matrix, then its rows are tropical dependent, and thus $Ax \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)}$ for some tangible vector x by [2, Theorem 2.10] which could be taken with $x_k = |\widehat{A_{i,k}}|$ for some i (see [2, proof of Lemma 2.8]). Accordingly, $Ax + v \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)}$ has the tangible vector solution cx for any fixed large tangible constant c.

Thus, we consider only nonsingular matrices A. Furthermore, we look for tangible solutions, since any large ghost vector would be a solution.

Example 3.2. In logarithmic notation, let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 10 \\ -\infty & 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad and \qquad v = (0,0).$$

Then we need a tangible solution of the equations $x_1 + 10x_2 + 0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and $x_2 + 0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$, which yields $x_2 = 0$ and thus $x_1 = 10$.

Note that Ax = v has no tangible solutions!

In general, although Ax = v need not be solvable, we shall see that $Ax + v \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)}$ always has a tangible solution, and the unique maximal tangible solution can be computed explicitly. We start with the tropical analog of Cramer's rule.

Theorem 3.3. If A is a nonsingular matrix and v is a tangible vector, then the equation $Ax + v \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)}$ has the tangible vector solution $x = \hat{\nu}(A^{\nabla}v)$.

Proof. The proposed solution x satisfies $|A|x_k = \sum_j \hat{\nu}(a'_{j,k}v_j)$, with the proviso that perhaps some of the terms of the right side are matched by ghost terms on the left side. Thus,

(3.1)
$$|A|(Ax+v)_i = \sum_k \left(a_{i,k} \sum_j \hat{\nu}(a'_{j,k}v_j) \right) + |A|v_i,$$

with the same proviso. Thus we need to show that each of the components on the right side of (3.1) is ghost. For j = i, we see that $\sum_{k} a_{i,k} \hat{\nu}(a'_{i,k} v_i)$ has the same ν -value as $\sum_{k} a_{i,k} a'_{i,k} v_i$, which is $|A|v_i$, implying

$$\sum_{k} a_{i,k} \hat{\nu}(a'_{i,k} v_i) + |A| v_i \quad \text{ is ghost.}$$

For $j \neq i$,

$$\sum_{k} a_{i,k} \hat{\nu}(a'_{j,k} v_j) = \sum_{k} a_{i,k} \widehat{a'_{j,k}} \widehat{v_j}$$

is ghost, by [4, Remark 4.4] and Proposition 1.2. Hence the sum is ghost.

Corollary 3.4. If A is a quasi-invertible $n \times n$ matrix and $v \in \mathcal{T}_0^{(n)}$, then $x = \hat{\nu}(A^{\widehat{\nabla}}v)$ is a tangible solution of the equation $Ax + v \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)}$.

We also have uniqueness, in a certain sense. Note that if A is a nonsingular matrix, then the only tangible solution to $Ax \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)}$ is x = (0), in view of [4, Lemma 6.10].

Let us generalize this fact.

Theorem 3.5. If $Ax + v \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)}$ for A quasi-invertible and tangible vectors x, v, then $x \leq \hat{\nu}(A^{\widehat{\nabla}}v)$.

Proof. First we assume that $A = I_A = (a_{i,j})$ is a quasi-identity. Since $A^{\nabla} = I_A^{\nabla} = I_A = A$, the system $Ax + v \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)}$ has the solution $y = \hat{\nu}(A^{\widehat{\nabla}}v) = \hat{\nu}(Av)$; i.e. for each $i, y_i = \widehat{a_{i,j}v_j}$ for suitable $j = j_i$. Note that

$$(Ay)^{\nu} = (AA^{\nabla}v)^{\nu} = (I_A^2v)^{\nu} = (I_Av)^{\nu} = y^{\nu},$$

implying $y = \hat{\nu}(A^{\widehat{\nabla}}y) = \hat{\nu}(Ay)$ Thus, $y_i \succeq a_{i,j}y_j$ for all i, j. Suppose

$$Ax + v \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)},$$

with $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. We need to show that $x_i \leq y_i$ for each *i*.

Suppose $x_i \succ y_i$. Since $a_{i,i} = \mathbb{1}_R$, we have

$$a_{i,i}x_i = x_i \succ y_i = a_{i,i}y_i = v_i,$$

implying in view of (3.2) that $a_{i,i}x_i \leq a_{i,j}x_j$ for some j. Then

$$a_{i,j}x_j \succeq a_{i,i}x_i \succ y_i \succeq a_{i,j}y_j,$$

implying $x_j^{\nu} \succ y_j^{\nu}$. Continuing this argument yields a path in the reduced digraph of A, which eventually produces a cycle which must be of determinant at least $\mathbb{1}_R$, contradicting the fact that A is quasi-invertible. In general, suppose $Ax + v \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)}$. Then $I'_A x + A^{\widehat{\nabla}} v = A^{\widehat{\nabla}} Ax + A^{\widehat{\nabla}} v \in \mathcal{G}_0^{(n)}$, implying

$$x \preceq \hat{\nu}(I'_A \widehat{\nabla} A \widehat{\nabla} v) = \hat{\nu}((I'_A A \widehat{\nabla}) v) = \hat{\nu}(A \widehat{\nabla} v).$$

4. Properties of the adjoint and tangible adjoint

Example 4.1. Let us compute $A^{\nabla \nabla} = (A^{\nabla})^{\nabla}$ for a triangular nonsingular matrix:

$$A = \left(\begin{array}{rrr} a_{1,1} & a_{1,2} & a_{1,3} \\ & a_{2,2} & a_{2,3} \\ & & & a_{3,3} \end{array}\right)$$

For this case, $|A| = a_{1,1} a_{2,2} a_{3,3}$. Then

$$A^{\nabla} = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{R}}{|A|} \begin{pmatrix} a_{2,2}a_{3,3} & a_{1,2}a_{3,3} & a_{1,3}a_{2,2} + a_{1,2}a_{2,3} \\ a_{1,1}a_{3,3} & a_{1,1}a_{2,3} \\ a_{1,1}a_{2,2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad with \quad |A^{\nabla}| = \mathbb{1}_{R}/|A|,$$

and $A^{\nabla\nabla} = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{R}}{|A^{\nabla}|} \operatorname{adj}(A^{\nabla}) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{R}}{|A|} \begin{pmatrix} a_{1,1}|A| & a_{1,2}|A| & a_{1,3}|A| + (a_{1,1}a_{1,2}a_{2,3}a_{3,3})^{\nu} \\ a_{2,2}|A| & a_{2,3}|A| \\ a_{3,3}|A| \end{pmatrix}$

Therefore, when $a_{1,2}a_{2,3}succa_{1,3}a_{2,2}$ we have $(a_{1,1}a_{1,2}a_{2,3}a_{3,3})^{\nu}/|A| \succ a_{1,3}$, and thus $A^{\nabla \nabla} \succ A$.

Although $A^{\nabla \nabla} \neq A$ in general, we would like to prove that $A^{\nabla \nabla} \succeq A$. To do this, we introduce some operations on matrices which ease the computation of adjoints.

Definition 4.2. Given a permutation $\sigma \in S_n$, and matrix $A = (a_{i,j})$ define $R_{\sigma}(A)$ to be the matrix whose (i, j) entry is $a_{\sigma(i), j}$, and $C_{\sigma}(A)$ to be the matrix whose (i, j) entry is $a_{i, \sigma(j)}$.

Lemma 4.3. $\operatorname{adj}(R_{\sigma}(A)) = C_{\sigma}(\operatorname{adj}(A))$ and $\operatorname{adj}(C_{\sigma}(A)) = R_{\sigma}(\operatorname{adj}(A))$.

Proof. The (i, j) entry of $C_{\sigma}(\operatorname{adj}(A))$ is $a'_{i,\sigma(i)}$, the determinant of the $(\sigma(i), j)$ minor of A, which clearly equals the determinant of the (i, j) minor of $\operatorname{adj}(R_{\sigma}(A))$.

Theorem 4.4. $|A|^{n-2}A \preceq \operatorname{adj}(\operatorname{adj}(A))$ for any $n \times n$ matrix A.

Proof. First of all, we note that for any $\sigma \in S_n$,

$$\operatorname{adj}(\operatorname{adj}(R_{\sigma}(A))) = \operatorname{adj}(C_{\sigma}(\operatorname{adj}(A))) = R_{\sigma}(\operatorname{adj}(\operatorname{adj}(A)))$$

Hence, we may apply that permutation σ which attains |A| and reduce to the case where the identity permutation (1) attains |A|; i.e.,

$$|A|^{\nu} = a_{1,1} \cdots a_{n,n}.$$

Let $B = \operatorname{adj}(\operatorname{adj}(A))$; then $b_{i,j} = |\operatorname{adj}(A)_{j,i}|$.

$$a'_{k,\ell} = |A_{\ell,k}| = \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n, \\ \sigma(t) \neq k}} \prod_{u \neq \ell} a_{u,\sigma(u)}.$$

Then

$$b_{i,j} = |\operatorname{adj}(A)_{j,i}| = \sum_{\substack{\mu \in S_n, \\ \mu(t) \neq i}} \prod_{k \neq j} a'_{k,\mu(k)}.$$

$$(4.1) b_{i,j} = |\operatorname{adj}(A)_{j,i}| = \sum_{\substack{\mu \in S_n, \\ \mu(t) \neq i}} \prod_{k \neq j} \left(\sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n, \\ \sigma(t) \neq k}} \prod_{\substack{u \neq \mu(k)}} a_{u,\sigma(u)} \right) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma, \mu \in S_n, \\ \sigma(t) \neq k \\ \mu(t) \neq i}} \prod_{\substack{k \neq j}} \prod_{\substack{u \neq \mu(k)}} a_{u,\sigma(u)}.$$

But then we have $u \neq \mu(k) \neq i$, and thus i = u for some u. Similarly $\sigma(u) \neq k \neq j$, so $\sigma(i) = \sigma(u) = j$ for some $\sigma \in S_n$.

Note that $a'_{i,i} \succeq \prod_{k \neq i} a_{k,k}$, and $a'_{j,i} \succeq a_{i,j} \prod_{k \neq i,j} a_{k,k}$. Accordingly, for $i \neq j$,

$$b_{i,j} \succeq a'_{j,i} \prod_{k \neq i,j} a'_{k,k} \succeq \left(a_{i,j} \prod_{k \neq i,j} a_{k,k} \right) \left(\prod_{k \neq i,j} \prod_{\ell \neq k} a_{\ell,\ell} \right) = |A|^{n-2} a_{i,j}$$

and

$$b_{i,i} \succeq a'_{i,i} \prod_{k \neq i} a'_{k,k} \succeq (a_{i,i} \prod_{k \neq i,} a_{k,k}) (\prod_{k \neq i} \prod_{\ell \neq k} a_{\ell,\ell}) = |A|^{n-2} a_{i,i},$$

which shows that $b_{i,j} \succeq a_{i,j} |A|^{n-2}$. (In fact, we proved that (4.1) can be written as

 $b_{i,j} = a_{i,j} |A|^{n-2} +$ other components .

| | | . 1 |
|--|--|-----|
| | | . 1 |
| | | |
| | | . 1 |

Corollary 4.5. If A is a quasi-invertible matrix, then $A \leq A^{\nabla \nabla}$.

Theorem 4.6. $\operatorname{adj}(A) \operatorname{adj}(\operatorname{adj}(A)) \operatorname{adj}(A) = |A|^{n-1} \operatorname{adj}(A)$ for any $n \times n$ matrix A.

Proof. Another application of Hall's Marriage Theorem. Let $\operatorname{adj}(\operatorname{adj}(A)) = (a_{i,j}')$. Clearly

$$\operatorname{adj}(A) \operatorname{adj}(\operatorname{adj}(A)) \operatorname{adj}(A) = \operatorname{adj}(A) \operatorname{adj}(A \operatorname{adj}(A)) = \operatorname{adj}(A) \operatorname{adj}(|A|I_{\operatorname{adj}(A)}) \succeq |A|^{n-1} \operatorname{adj}(A),$$

so it suffices to prove \leq . But the (i, j) entry of the left side is a sum of elements of the form $a'_{i,k}a''_{\ell,k}a'_{\ell,j}a'_{\ell$

Corollary 4.7. If A is a quasi-invertible matrix, then $A^{\nabla}A^{\nabla\nabla}A^{\nabla} = A^{\nabla}$.

We are finally ready for the connection between left quasi-identities and right quasi-identities; the key is to switch from A to $A^{\hat{\nabla}}$.

Corollary 4.8. If A is a quasi-invertible matrix, then $A^{\widehat{\nabla}\widehat{\nabla}}A^{\widehat{\nabla}} = I_A$. In other words, $I_A = I'_{A\widehat{\nabla}}$.

Proof. $I'_{A\widehat{\nabla}} = A^{\widehat{\nabla}\widehat{\nabla}}A^{\widehat{\nabla}} \preceq I_A$ by Corollary 4.7 and Remark 2.10, but $A^{\widehat{\nabla}\widehat{\nabla}}A^{\widehat{\nabla}} \succeq AA^{\widehat{\nabla}} = I_A$ by Corollary 4.5. Hence the entries of I_A and $I'_{A\widehat{\nabla}}$ have the same respective ν -values. We conclude by noting that both I_A and $I'_{A\widehat{\nabla}}$ are tangible on the diagonal and ghost off the diagonal.

Corollary 4.9. By symmetry, $I'_A = I_{A\widehat{\nabla}}$.

Corollary 4.10. If A is a quasi-invertible matrix, then $A^{\widehat{\nabla}}A^{\widehat{\nabla}\widehat{\nabla}}A^{\widehat{\nabla}} \approx A^{\widehat{\nabla}}$.

Corollary 4.11. If A is a quasi-invertible matrix, then $AA^{\widehat{\nabla}}A \preceq A^{\widehat{\nabla}\widehat{\nabla}}$.

 $\textit{Proof. } A^{\widehat{\nabla}}(AA^{\widehat{\nabla}}A) = {I'_A}^2 = {I'_A} = {I_{A\widehat{\nabla}}} \text{ by Corollary 4.9, implying } AA^{\widehat{\nabla}}A \preceq A^{\widehat{\nabla}\widehat{\nabla}} \text{ by Corollary 2.9.} \qquad \Box$

References

- [1] Z. Izhakian. The tropical rank of a tropical matrix. preprint at arXiv:math.AC/0604208, 2005.
- [2] Z. Izhakian and L. Rowen. The tropical rank of a tropical matrix. *Communincation in Algebra*, to appear. (preprint at arXiv:math.AC/060420,2005).
- [3] Z. Izhakian and L. Rowen. Supertropical algebra. preprint at arXiv:0806.1175, 2007.
- [4] Z. Izhakian and L. Rowen. Supertropical matrix algebra. preprint at arXiv:0806.1178, 2008.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT-GAN 52900, ISRAEL CNRS ET UNIVERSITE DENIS DIDEROT (PARIS 7), 175, RUE DU CHEVALERET 75013 PARIS, FRANCE *E-mail address*: zzur@math.biu.ac.il, zzur@post.tau.ac.il

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT-GAN 52900, ISRAEL *E-mail address:* rowen@macs.biu.ac.il