

THE TROPICAL CRITICAL POINT AND MIRROR SYMMETRY

JAMIE JUDD AND KONSTANZE RIETSCH

ABSTRACT. Call a Laurent polynomial W ‘complete’ if its Newton polytope is full-dimensional with zero in its interior. We show that if W is any complete Laurent polynomial with coefficients in the positive part of the field \mathbf{K} of generalised Puiseux series, then W has a unique positive critical point p_{crit} . Here a generalised Puiseux series is called ‘positive’ if the coefficient of its leading term is in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Using the valuation on \mathbf{K} we obtain from $p_{\text{crit}} \in \mathbf{K}_{>0}^r$ a canonically associated ‘tropical critical point’ $d_{\text{crit}} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ for which we give a finite recursive construction.

One application, using results of [FOOO12], is that any symplectic toric manifold X_Δ with rational moment polytope has a canonically associated non-displaceable Lagrangian torus, which can be explicitly constructed as a moment map fiber. This Lagrangian torus in X_Δ generalises the Clifford torus inside $\mathbb{C}P^r$.

In the context of a complete toric variety X_Σ our results construct a canonical point in the moment polytope of any ample line bundle $\mathcal{O}(D)$. If this point is a lattice point, we obtain a distinguished toric divisor in the divisor class $[D]$. This distinguished divisor generalises the standard toric boundary divisor to divisor classes other than the anti-canonical class.

We also show that the positive critical point is preserved by mutation and thus is well-defined in the setting of cluster varieties. Finally, we show if the field \mathbf{K} is replaced by the ordinary field of Puiseux series \mathcal{K} , then the positive critical point lies in $\mathcal{K}_{>0}^r$ and $d_{\text{crit}} \in \mathbb{Q}^r$. And in the other direction, we show that our theorem carries over to the case where the exponents v_i of W are not integral but in \mathbb{R}^r , even though W is then no longer Laurent.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. We begin by giving a concrete statement of our main result. Consider the field \mathbf{K} of generalised Puiseux series, whose elements are essentially Laurent series in one variable t but with \mathbb{R} -exponents that tend to $+\infty$. This field has an \mathbb{R} -valued valuation, and it has a positive part $\mathbf{K}_{>0}$ consisting of those series whose leading term coefficients are positive. Let us write x^m for the Laurent monomial $x_1^{m_1} \dots x_r^{m_r}$, where $m \in \mathbb{Z}^r$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $W = \sum \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ be a Laurent polynomial satisfying two properties which we call ‘positivity’ and ‘completeness’. Namely*

- (1) *The coefficients γ_i lie in $\mathbf{K}_{>0}$.*
- (2) *The Newton polytope of W , that is the convex hull of $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, is full-dimensional with zero in the interior.*

Then W has a unique critical point in $(\mathbf{K}_{>0})^r$. We call this point the positive critical point of W .

Moreover this Theorem is optimal in the sense that any positive Laurent polynomial with a unique positive critical point must be complete, see Corollary 8.5.

Taking the valuation of the positive critical point p_{crit} we obtain a distinguished point d_{crit} in \mathbb{R}^r associated to the positive, complete Laurent polynomial W . We call this distinguished point the *tropical critical point* of W .

Consider the tropicalization of $W = \sum \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ which is, concretely, the piecewise linear function

$$\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \min_i \{c_i + \langle v_i, d \rangle\},$$

where $c_i = \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\gamma_i)$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the standard inner product on \mathbb{R}^r . Associated to $\text{Trop}(W)$ we have the following subset of \mathbb{R}^r ,

$$\mathcal{P}_W = \{d \in \mathbb{R}^r \mid \text{Trop}(W)(d) \geq 0\}.$$

This set is either empty or it is a convex polytope. The second aspect of our result is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose W is a complete, positive Laurent polynomial over \mathbf{K} with tropical critical point $d_{\text{crit}} \in \mathbb{R}^r$. Then $\text{Trop}(W)(d_{\text{crit}})$ is the maximal value of $\text{Trop}(W)$. In particular whenever \mathcal{P}_W is nonempty then d_{crit} lies in its relative interior.*

By Theorem 1.2, if $\text{Trop}(W)$ attains its maximum at a unique point, then this point is d_{crit} . However even if not, our work includes an explicit recursive construction of the tropical critical point for any W . To this end we define a ‘complete Newton datum’ in Section 4.3, which we think of as encoding similar but more detailed information than the Newton polytope of W . The same Section 4.3 also contains the construction of d_{crit} in terms of the complete Newton datum of W , though it is beyond the scope of this introduction to recall it here.

After proving the main Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, and explicitly constructing d_{crit} we extend our results in a variety of ways. We extend beyond Laurent polynomials by allowing rational or real exponents, and we check when the positive critical point is defined over Puiseux series, so that in particular the tropical critical point is rational. Furthermore we show that the positive critical point is non-degenerate. Finally, we have applications of our results to toric geometry and we show that our positive critical point is compatible with cluster mutation. We will describe the applications in more detail in Section 1.3, after first giving some background to our results.

1.2. The general idea of tropicalization, and in particular the approach to tropicalization that we use in this paper, comes from the work of Lusztig who indexed his canonical basis of a quantum universal enveloping algebra using tropicalization and the Langlands dual flag variety [Lus94]. Indeed there is a representation theoretic background to this paper which we now describe.

In the context of mirror symmetry for flag varieties there appears to be a favoured anti-canonical divisor. Namely if it is a full flag variety then this divisor is the union of all Schubert and opposite Schubert divisors. Some time ago Victor Ginzburg asked the question, what is the associated line in the 2ρ -representation (given that the elements of the 2ρ -representation can be interpreted as sections of the anti-canonical bundle by the Borel-Weil construction). Indeed, from the perspective of representation theory, it is completely surprising that there should be a distinguished line in the middle of the 2ρ -representation.

An answer to the question of Ginzburg is given in a precursor [Jud18] to this paper and involves computing the tropical critical point of Berenstein and Kazhdan’s

‘potential function’ W_{BK}^λ from their theory of geometric crystals [BK07]. Namely [Jud18] proves the uniqueness and existence of a positive critical point in the special case of W_{BK}^λ , and shows that the special basis element in the 2ρ -representation is indexed by this tropical critical point for $\lambda = 2\rho$, which is a lattice point in a Gelfand-Zetlin polytope. We note that the Berenstein-Kazhdan potential function agrees with the superpotential mirror dual to the flag variety given in [Rie08]. Thus this result fits into the framework of mirror symmetry.

The second precursor to the present paper is a paper of Galkin [Gal97] related to Jacobi rings and quantum cohomology. Like our paper, Galkin’s paper also generalises a result for the superpotential of a flag variety. Namely it proves the analogue of our Theorem 1.1 with \mathbf{K} replaced by \mathbb{R} . This had previously been done just for the superpotential of a flag variety in [Rie06].

Thus our main result, Theorem 1.1, can be viewed as a simultaneous generalisation of [Jud18] and [Gal97]. We also note that Galkin’s theorem is in fact an ingredient that is used in our construction of the leading term coefficient of p_{crit} .

1.3. We now outline three applications of the results from Section 1.1.

1.3.1. The first application of our result is the analogue for toric varieties of the result for flag varieties in [Jud18]. Namely if X_Σ is a complete toric variety with a torus-invariant Weil divisor D , then we associate a positive, complete Laurent polynomial to X_Σ and with it its tropical critical point, which, if D is ample, lies in the moment polytope P_D . If that tropical critical point is a lattice point then we obtain a distinguished section of $\mathcal{O}(D)$, or a distinguished divisor in the divisor class of D . In the case where D is anti-canonical the special divisor in the class of D will always be the toric boundary divisor, and this is the analogue of the special vector in the 2ρ -representation of Section 1.2.

1.3.2. The second application is related to Lagrangian torus fibers in symplectic manifolds. For example consider the symplectic manifold $\mathbb{C}P^r$ with moment map $\mu : \mathbb{C}P^r \rightarrow \Delta_r$ given by

$$[z_0 : \cdots : z_r] \mapsto \left(\frac{|z_1|^2}{\sum_{i=0}^r |z_i|^2}, \dots, \frac{|z_r|^2}{\sum_{i=0}^r |z_i|^2} \right).$$

It has a distinguished Lagrangian torus fibre which is a *Clifford torus* and which is known to be a non-displaceable Lagrangian [BEP04]. It is the fibre of a special point in the moment polytope Δ_r , namely $(\frac{1}{r+1}, \dots, \frac{1}{r+1})$.

Consider now a Delzant polytope Δ , that is, the moment polytope of a smooth toric symplectic manifold X_Δ . In the case where X_Δ is not Fano we additionally assume Δ to be rational. The symplectic manifold X_Δ has a canonically associated superpotential or ‘leading order potential function’ W_Δ which is positive and complete, and for which $\mathcal{P}_W = \Delta$. Using work of Fukaya, Oh, Ohta and Ono [FOOO12], if the valuation of a non-degenerate critical point of this superpotential lies within the moment polytope, then it follows that the moment map fibre is a non-displaceable Lagrangian torus.

Thus a corollary of our result is a generalisation of this Clifford torus in $\mathbb{C}P^r$ to any toric symplectic Fano manifold X_Δ , or any symplectic toric manifold with rational moment polytope. Indeed, using our Theorem 2 and Lemma 5.4 we obtain a canonical point in the moment polytope Δ which is the valuation of a non-degenerate critical point of the superpotential, and its fibre is (by an application

of [FOOO12]) a non-displaceable Lagrangian in X_Δ . This result also extends to orbifolds using the generalisation of [FOOO12] by Woodward [Woo11].

We note that this result also has a precursor for the flag variety SL_n/B which is due to Nishinou, Nohara and Ueda. Namely the fiber under the Gelfand-Zetlin moment map of the center of a Gelfand-Zetlin polytope is a non-displaceable Lagrangian torus in the flag variety, see [TN10].

1.3.3. Laurent polynomials arise in mirror symmetry for toric varieties, but they also play a role for more general varieties which have a toric degeneration. In this setting, because the toric degenerations will not be unique, it is natural to expect a multitude of Laurent polynomials associated to the same variety. The way one generally tries makes sense of a plethora of Laurent polynomials that one thinks are mirror to a single variety, is by relating these various Laurent polynomials to one another through birational transformations called *mutations*. This can be mutation as in the sense of cluster varieties [FZ02, GHKK18]; for an explicit example related to mirror symmetry see [RW17]. Or it can be a more general type of mutation, as in [ACGK12]. We show that as long as mutation preserves positivity and Laurentness of our function W , then it also preserves the positive critical point. This opens the way to a generalisation of the above applications from toric varieties to other settings such as non-toric Fano varieties.

1.4. The paper is organised as follows. An important part of our set-up is Lusztig's construction of the tropicalisation of a torus via a local field with a positive semifield. This construction is laid out in Section 2. Then in Section 3 we are able to restate the two main theorems from above in a coordinate-free way.

The longest section is Section 4, which is devoted to the proof of the theorems stated in Section 3. The first three subsections of Section 4, culminating in the key Corollary 4.35, are devoted to determining d_{crit} under the assumption that p_{crit} exists. Section 4.4 is then concerned with constructing the coefficient of the leading term of p_{crit} . Finally Section 4.5 shows that the leading term which was constructed in the previous subsections extends to a well-defined solution p_{crit} of the critical point equations of W , and moreover that this solution is unique. This proves the first theorem. The second theorem follows from results proved along the way.

The next main section, Section 5 contains the various extensions and refinements of the main Theorem. The application to toric varieties is contained in Section 6. Then in Section 7 we give the symplectic application in connection with [FOOO12]. Finally, in Section 8 we show that the positive critical point is preserved under mutations.

1.5. **Acknowledgements.** The authors thank Mohammad Akhtar for useful discussions at the start of this project. The second author also thanks Denis Auroux, Agnes Gadbled, Sergey Galkin, Yankı Lekili, Dima Panov and Lauren Williams for helpful conversations.

2. POSITIVITY FOR TORI AND TROPICALISATION

Suppose T is an algebraic torus of dimension r over a field K . Consider the character group $M := X^*(T)$ and cocharacter group $N := X_*(T)$ of T (with the group structure written additively). We have $M \cong \mathbb{Z}^r$ and $N \cong \mathbb{Z}^r$ and a dual pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : M \times N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ which extends to a dual pairing on the real vector spaces $M_{\mathbb{R}} = M \otimes \mathbb{R}$ and $N_{\mathbb{R}} = N \otimes \mathbb{R}$.

Suppose for a moment that $K = \mathbb{C}$. Consider the category \mathcal{T} whose objects are algebraic tori over K , and whose morphisms $T^{(1)} \rightarrow T^{(2)}$ are rational maps with positive real coefficients, with regard to a/any choice of bases of characters for $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$. The *tropicalisation functor* Trop in this setting is a functor

$$\text{Trop} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{PL}$$

from \mathcal{T} to the category \mathcal{PL} of finite-dimensional real vector spaces with piecewise linear (PL) maps. Informally Trop associates to a torus T the vector space $N_{\mathbb{R}}$, and to a subtraction-free rational map $T^{(1)} \rightarrow T^{(2)}$, the PL map $N_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)} \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}^{(2)}$ obtained in suitable coordinates by replacing multiplication by addition and addition by \min .

In the following two subsections we give a more intrinsic description of tropicalisation following an original construction due to Lusztig [Lus94].

2.1. Positivity and the field of generalised Puiseux series. Let K be an infinite field and assume K has a ‘positive’ subset $K_{>0}$, satisfying

$$k, k' \in K_{>0} \implies k + k' \in K_{>0}, \quad kk' \in K_{>0}, \quad 1/k \in K_{>0},$$

compare [Lus94, Section 2.1]. Observe that in particular $K_{>0}$ is a subgroup of the multiplicative group K^* of K . Examples include $K = \mathbb{C}$ with $K_{>0} = \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, or $K = \mathbb{C}((t))$ where $K_{>0}$ consists of Laurent series with positive leading term coefficient. Our preferred example is the following field of generalised Puiseux series, also referred to as the ‘universal Novikov field’ in [FOOO12].

Definition 2.1 (Generalised Puiseux series [Mar10]). Let \mathbf{K} denote the field of *generalised Puiseux series* in a variable t . These are series whose exponent sets are described by

$$\text{MonSeq} = \{A \subset \mathbb{R} \mid \text{Cardinality}(A \cap \mathbb{R}_{\leq x}) < \infty \text{ for arbitrarily large } x \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

In other words the exponent sets $A \in \text{MonSeq}$ may be thought of as strictly monotone sequences which are either finite, or are countable and tending to infinity. We write $(\mu_k) \in \text{MonSeq}$ if $(\mu_k)_k = (\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots)$ is such a strictly monotone increasing sequence, and then

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbf{K} = \left\{ c(t) = \sum_{(\mu_k) \in \text{MonSeq}} c_{\mu_k} t^{\mu_k} \mid c_{\mu_k} \in \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

The field \mathbf{K} has a positive subset in the above sense given by

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbf{K}_{>0} = \left\{ c(t) \in \mathbf{K} \mid c(t) = \sum_{(\mu_k) \in \text{MonSeq}} c_{\mu_k} t^{\mu_k}, \quad c_{\mu_0} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \right\}.$$

Consider the valuation, $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}} : \mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, defined on nonzero elements by $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(c(t)) = \mu_0$ if $c(t) = \sum c_{\mu_k} t^{\mu_k}$, where the lowest order term is assumed to have non-zero coefficient, $c_{\mu_0} \neq 0$, and we set $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(0) = \infty$. We also consider the associated local ring

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}} := \{c \in \mathbf{K} \mid \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(c) \geq 0\},$$

with its maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = \{c \in \mathbf{K} \mid \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(c) > 0\}$.

The field \mathbf{K} is algebraically closed, and it is complete for the ‘ t -adic topology’ induced from the norm associated to this valuation, see [Mar10].

Definition 2.2. We define a group homomorphism $\text{Coeff} : \mathbf{K} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ which takes $c(t)$ to the coefficient of its lowest order non-vanishing term

$$(2.3) \quad \text{Coeff}(c(t)) := c_{\mu_0}.$$

Remark 2.3. The field \mathbf{K} is a completion of the usual field of Puiseux series $\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \mathbb{C} \left(\left(t^{\frac{1}{\ell}} \right) \right)$. Furthermore the field of Puiseux series \mathcal{K} is the algebraic closure of the field of Laurent series $\mathbf{L} = \mathbb{C}((t))$. Both \mathcal{K} and \mathbf{L} have positive parts which are described by $\mathcal{K}_{>0} = \mathcal{K} \cap \mathbf{K}_{>0}$ and $\mathbf{L}_{>0} = \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K}_{>0}$. And $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}$ restricts to the usual valuations $\text{Val}_{\mathcal{K}} : \mathcal{K} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ and $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{L}} : \mathbf{L} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$.

2.2. Algebraic tori over \mathbf{K} and tropicalisation. Suppose K is an infinite field with a positive part $K_{>0}$, as in Section 2.1. We can describe the K -valued points of T as group homomorphisms from the character group to the multiplicative group of K , namely we identify $T(K) = \text{Hom}(M, K^*)$. The group homomorphisms which take values in $K_{>0}$ define a positive part $T(K_{>0}) = \text{Hom}(M, K_{>0})$ of $T(K)$. If $v \in M$ and $p \in T(K)$ we will write either p^v or $\chi^v(p)$ for the associated evaluation “ $p(v)$ ” in K^* . We call χ^v the (multiplicative) character associated to v .

We will be primarily interested in the case where $K = \mathbf{K}$, where we define the tropicalization functor using an identical approach to the one introduced Lusztig (albeit in his case in the setting of the subfield \mathbf{L} of Laurent series in t).

By a *Laurent polynomial* on T we will mean a \mathbf{K} -linear combination of characters χ^v . We may choose a basis of characters so that the coordinate ring of T is described as $\mathbf{K}[x_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, x_r^{\pm 1}]$ in which case this definition recovers Laurent polynomials in the variables x_i . A *positive Laurent polynomial* is a linear combination of characters with coefficients in $\mathbf{K}_{>0}$. Suppose $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$ are tori over \mathbf{K} . By a *positive rational map* $\phi : T^{(1)} \rightarrow T^{(2)}$ we mean a rational map such that for any character χ of $T^{(2)}$ the composition $\chi \circ \phi : T^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ is given by a quotient of positive Laurent polynomials on $T^{(1)}$.

Definition 2.4 (The tropicalisation of the torus T). Define an equivalence relation \sim on $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ by $x \sim x'$ if and only if $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\chi(x)) = \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\chi(x'))$ for all characters χ of T . Then

$$\text{Trop}(T) := T(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) / \sim.$$

The set $\text{Trop}(T)$ inherits from the group structure of $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ a structure of abelian group (which we denote as addition).

Definition 2.5 (The map Val_T and identifying $\text{Trop}(T)$ with $N_{\mathbb{R}}$). Let Val_T denote the group homomorphism from the multiplicative group $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ to the additive group $N_{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$\text{Val}_T : T(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}},$$

which is characterised by the property that for any character χ of T and $x \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ the \mathbf{K} -valuation of $\chi(x)$ satisfies

$$\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\chi(x)) = \langle \chi, \text{Val}_T(x) \rangle,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the pairing between $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Note that $\text{Val}_T(x)$ is well-defined, as follows for example by choosing a basis for M and using the additivity property $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\chi^{m_1+m_2}(x)) = \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\chi^{m_1}(x)) + \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\chi^{m_2}(x))$.

Since, by definition, $\text{Val}_T(x)$ depends only on the \mathbf{K} -valuations $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\chi(x))$, we observe that the map Val_T descends to a homomorphism, $\text{Trop}(T) \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$, which we may also call Val_T , by abuse of notation.

The map $\text{Trop}(T) \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$ defined by Val_T is an isomorphism. Its inverse,

$$\iota : N_{\mathbb{R}} \longrightarrow \text{Trop}(T) : d \mapsto [x_{\text{mon}}(d)],$$

is defined by sending $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ to the equivalence class of the ‘monomial’ element $x_{\text{mon}}(d)$ in $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$, which is characterised by

$$\chi(x_{\text{mon}}(d)) = t^{\langle \chi, d \rangle} \quad \text{for all } \chi \in X^*(T).$$

This bijection endows $\text{Trop}(T)$ with the structure of an \mathbb{R} -vector space.

Definition 2.6 (The tropicalisation of a positive rational map). Suppose $\phi : T^{(1)} \rightarrow T^{(2)}$ is a positive rational map between two tori. Then $\phi(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) : T^{(1)}(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) \rightarrow T^{(2)}(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ is everywhere well-defined and is compatible with the equivalence relation \sim . Note that the compatibility with \sim uses the positivity of the leading terms. The tropicalisation $\text{Trop}(\phi)$ is defined to be the resulting map

$$\text{Trop}(\phi) : \text{Trop}(T^{(1)}) \rightarrow \text{Trop}(T^{(2)})$$

between equivalence classes. The map $\text{Trop}(\phi)$ is piecewise-linear with respect to the linear structures on the $\text{Trop}(T^{(i)})$ from Definition 2.5.

Example 2.7. A positive Laurent polynomial $W = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i}$, where $x^{v_i} = \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{v_{i,j}}$ and $\gamma_i \in \mathbf{K}_{>0}$, can be considered as a positive rational map from the torus $(\mathbf{K} \setminus \{0\})^r$ to $\mathbf{K} \setminus \{0\}$, and its tropicalisation can be identified with the piecewise linear map $\mathbb{R}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\text{Trop}(W)(d_1, \dots, d_r) = \min(\{c_i + \sum_{j=1}^r v_{i,j} d_j \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}),$$

where $c_i := \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\gamma_i)$.

2.3. Leading terms and exponential map for $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$. For any point $p \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ the map which associates to $v \in M$ the leading term of $\chi^v(p)$ defines a group homomorphism,

$$p_0 \in \text{Hom}(M, \{ct^\mu \mid c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}, \mu \in \mathbb{R}\}).$$

We call p_0 the *leading term* of p . Observe that p_0 lies in the group

$$\text{Hom}(M, \{ct^\mu \mid c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}, \mu \in \mathbb{R}\}) \subset \text{Hom}(M, \mathbf{K}_{>0}) = T(\mathbf{K}_{>0}),$$

which we call the ‘leading term subgroup’ of $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$. This subgroup is a product of the groups $T(\mathbb{R}_{>0})$ and $\text{Hom}(M, \{t^\mu \mid \mu \in \mathbb{R}\})$, and the map $p \mapsto p_0$ is a surjective group homomorphism, which is in a sense a projection from $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ to this subgroup.

Recall that $\mathfrak{m} = \{\gamma \in \mathbf{K} \mid \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\gamma) > 0\}$. A general element p of $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ is the product of its leading term p_0 and a factor from

$$T_e(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) := \{p \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) \mid \chi^v(p) \in 1 + \mathfrak{m} \text{ for all } v \in M\}.$$

We may describe an element of $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ entirely in ‘logarithmic terms’ using the factorisation above and the following exponential maps.

Definition 2.8 ($u \mapsto e^u$). We have the exponential map $N_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow T(\mathbb{R}_{>0})$ which sends $u \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ to the element e^u defined by the property that $\chi^v(e^u) = e^{\langle v, u \rangle}$ for all $v \in M$. This is just the usual exponential map of the real Lie group $T(\mathbb{R}_{>0})$, and it is an isomorphism.

Definition 2.9 ($d \mapsto t^d$). We also have an analogous isomorphism

$$N_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, \{t^\mu \mid \mu \in \mathbb{R}\}),$$

where the image t^d of $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ is defined by $\chi^v(t^d) = t^{\langle v, d \rangle}$, for all $v \in M$.

Observe that the leading term group is isomorphic via the above two exponential maps (or rather their inverse maps) to $N_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus N_{\mathbb{R}}$, and any leading term p_0 of a $p \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ is of the form e^{ut^d} for unique $(u, d) \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus N_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Definition 2.10 (\exp_T and \log_T). Let $\exp : \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \mathbf{K}_{>0}$ be the exponential map of \mathbf{K} , which is defined in terms of its power series. Its image is $\mathbf{K}_1 := \{k \in \mathbf{K}_{>0} \mid k \in 1 + \mathfrak{m}\}$, and we have an inverse map $\log : \mathbf{K}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}$ defined in terms of the power series for the logarithm.

Suppose $N_{\mathfrak{m}} = N \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{m}$. We let $\exp_T : N_{\mathfrak{m}} \rightarrow T_e(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ be the map $w \mapsto \exp_T(w)$ defined by the property that for any $v \in M$ with associated character χ^v ,

$$\chi^v(\exp_T(w)) = \exp(\langle v, w \rangle).$$

Here, by abuse of notation, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : M \times N_{\mathfrak{m}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}$ is the \mathfrak{m} -linear extension of the pairing between M and N .

The character $\chi^v(\exp_T(w))$ always has valuation 0 and leading coefficient 1 for any $w \in N_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Indeed, the map \exp_T is an isomorphism from the additive group $N_{\mathfrak{m}}$ to the multiplicative group $T_e(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$, and has an inverse $\log_T : T_e(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) \rightarrow N_{\mathfrak{m}}$.

Combining the three types of ‘exponential map’ above we obtain a group isomorphism

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} N_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus N_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus N_{\mathfrak{m}} &\xrightarrow{\sim} T(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) \\ (u, d, w) &\mapsto e^{ut^d} \exp_T(w). \end{aligned}$$

The inverse of this map is defined by $p \mapsto (u, d, \log_T(e^{-u}t^{-d}p))$, where the leading term p_0 of p is e^{ut^d} .

Definition 2.11. Suppose $p \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ and $p = e^{ut^d} \exp_T(w)$, as in (2.4) above. Then we note that $d = \text{Val}_T(p)$. We also introduce a notation for u , namely we call u the ‘logarithmic leading coefficient’ of p and write $u = \text{LogCoeff}_T(p)$.

In terms of coordinates, the map $\text{LogCoeff}_T : T(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$ is simply given by

$$(c^{(1)}(t), \dots, c^{(d)}(t)) \mapsto (\log(c_{m_0^{(1)}}^{(1)}), \log(c_{m_0^{(2)}}^{(2)}), \dots, \log(c_{m_0^{(d)}}^{(d)})),$$

where $c_{m_0^{(j)}}^{(j)} = \text{Coeff}(c^{(j)}(t)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, the coefficient of the leading term of $c^{(j)}(t)$.

Thus for $p \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$, the leading term p_0 of p is given by

$$p_0 = e^{\text{LogCoeff}_T(p)} t^{\text{Val}_T(p)},$$

and any $p \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ is of the form $e^{\text{LogCoeff}_T(p)} t^{\text{Val}_T(p)} \exp(w)$ for some (unique) $w \in \mathfrak{m}$.

Definition 2.12. For the purpose of rationality considerations (Section 5.1), we also make the analogous definitions over the field \mathcal{K} of Puiseux series,

$$\mathcal{K} := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \mathbb{C}[[t^{\frac{1}{n}}]] \subset \mathbf{K}.$$

Namely, this field comes with positive part $\mathcal{K}_{>0} = \mathcal{K} \cap \mathbf{K}_{>0}$, and valuation $\text{Val}_{\mathcal{K}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$, and associated ring of integers $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{K}}$ and maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{K}}$. Moreover we note that we have an analogue $T(\mathcal{K}_{>0})$ of $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ which can be described by

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} N_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus N_{\mathbb{Q}} \oplus N_{\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{K}}} &\xrightarrow{\sim} T(\mathcal{K}_{>0}) \\ (u, d, w) &\mapsto e^u t^d \exp_T(w). \end{aligned}$$

3. THE POSITIVE CRITICAL POINT THEOREM

In this section we state our main result.

Definition 3.1 (Positive and tropical critical points). Suppose W is a Laurent polynomial on the torus T over \mathbf{K} . We say a point $p \in T(\mathbf{K})$ is a critical point for W if the gradient of W (in terms of some/any coordinates x_i) vanishes at p . This property of p is independent of the choice of the coordinates. If p lies in $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ we say that p is a *positive critical point* of W . For a positive critical point p , we call the equivalence class $[p] \in \text{Trop}(T)$ a *tropical critical point* of W .

Definition 3.2 (Complete Laurent polynomials). Suppose we have identified regular functions on T as Laurent polynomials in variables x_1, \dots, x_r . Then associated to a positive Laurent polynomial $W = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ with $\gamma_i \in \mathbf{K}_{>0}$ and $v_i \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, we consider its Newton polytope

$$\text{Newton}(W) = \text{ConvexHull}(\{v_i \mid i = 1 \dots, n\}) \subset \mathbb{R}^r.$$

Let us call W *complete* if its Newton polytope is r -dimensional with zero in its interior. This polytope can be considered to be in $M_{\mathbb{R}}$, without choice of coordinates. The property of a Laurent polynomial being *complete* is independent of the choice of basis of characters of T . By abuse of notation we may, also in the absence of chosen coordinates x_i , write x^v for the function $T(\mathbf{K}) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ associated to $v \in M$, and p^v for the value of x^v on $p \in T(\mathbf{K})$.

For Laurent polynomials with coefficients in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ whose Newton polytopes are complete in the above sense, it was shown by Galkin that there exists a unique positive critical point, referred to by him as the ‘conifold point’.

Proposition 3.3. [Gal97] *Suppose $L \in \mathbb{R}[x_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, x_r^{\pm 1}]$ is a Laurent polynomial with positive coefficients, and that the Newton polytope of L is full-dimensional and contains 0 in its interior. Then L has a unique critical point in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$. This critical point is non-degenerate and a global minimum for $L|_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}^r}$.*

Our main theorem is an analogue of Galkin’s result over the field \mathbf{K} of generalised Puiseux series.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose T is a torus over \mathbf{K} and W is positive Laurent polynomial on T which is complete in the sense of Definition 3.2. Then W has a unique positive critical point $p_{\text{crit}} \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$.*

As an application of this theorem we obtain from any positive, complete Laurent polynomial W a distinguished point in $\text{Trop}(T)$ given by the equivalence class $[p_{\text{crit}}]$ of the positive critical point. Equivalently, we have that $\text{Val}_T(p_{\text{crit}})$ is a point in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ canonically associated to W . We call this point *the tropical critical point* of W .

Let us consider associated to W the following subset of $N_{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{P}_W = \{d \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \text{Trop}(W)(d) \geq 0\}.$$

This set is either empty or it is a convex polytope. We also show the following.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose W is a complete, positive Laurent polynomial over \mathbf{K} with tropical critical point $d_{\text{crit}} \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then we have*

$$\text{Trop}(W)(d_{\text{crit}}) = \max_{d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}}(\text{Trop}(W)(d)).$$

In particular whenever \mathcal{P}_W is nonempty then d_{crit} lies in its relative interior.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.4 AND THEOREM 3.5

We begin the proof of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 by choosing notation. Let T be an r -dimensional algebraic torus over \mathbf{K} with character lattice M and cocharacter lattice N . Let x^v denote the function on the torus T associated to $v \in M$. We consider a positive Laurent polynomial,

$$(4.1) \quad W = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i},$$

with $v_i \in M$, and coefficients $\gamma_i \in \mathbf{K}_{>0}$. Recall that

$$\text{Newton}(W) = \text{ConvexHull}(\{v_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}) \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

Since W is positive we consider its tropicalisation in the sense of Section 2. This tropicalisation is the piecewise linear map $\text{Trop}(W) : N_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ explicitly given by

$$(4.2) \quad \text{Trop}(W)(d) = \min(\{c_i + \langle v_i, d \rangle \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}),$$

where $c_i := \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\gamma_i)$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the dual pairing between M and N .

Our main goal is to construct a critical point $p_{\text{crit}} \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ for W and show that it is unique. The first three subsections will be concerned with determining the valuation $\text{Val}_T(p_{\text{crit}}) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$, or equivalently $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(p_{\text{crit}}^v)$ for all $v \in M$.

4.1. The augmented Newton polytope and the maximum value of $\text{Trop}(W)$.

We note that the Newton polytope of W depends only on the exponent vectors v_i and takes no account of the coefficients γ_i or their valuations. It is useful to think of $\text{Newton}(W)$ as the projection of a more general polytope. The following polytope associated to W generalises the ‘t-Newton polygon’ from [Mar10] and comes up for a different purpose in [Mac12, Stu07].

Definition 4.1 (Augmented Newton Polytope). For W given by (4.1), let

$$\text{AugNewton}(W) := \text{ConvexHull}(\{(c_i, v_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}) \subset \mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

We refer to $\text{AugNewton}(W)$ as the *augmented Newton polytope* associated to W . It comes with a projection

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr} : \text{AugNewton}(W) &\rightarrow \text{Newton}(W) \\ (c, v) &\mapsto v. \end{aligned}$$

We now show for later use how the augmented Newton polytope encodes the maximal value of $\text{Trop}(W)$.

Remark 4.2. To aid with intuition, let us interpret the points of $\text{AugNewton}(W)$ as linear functions on $\mathbb{R} \oplus N_{\mathbb{R}}$, or, by restriction, as functions on $\{1\} \times N_{\mathbb{R}}$. In particular note that for a vertex (c_i, v_i) this restriction gives $(1, d) \mapsto c_i + \langle v_i, d \rangle$. The map $\text{Trop}(W) : N_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, see (4.2), can now be interpreted as taking the (pointwise) min of *all* of these functions associated to points of $\text{AugNewton}(W)$. Namely,

$$\text{Trop}(W) : d \mapsto \min_{w \in \text{AugNewton}(W)} \langle w, (1, d) \rangle.$$

This defines the same function as (4.2), since the above min will always be attained on some extremal $w = (c_i, v_i)$.

If W is complete, then this implies that $\text{AugNewton}(W)$ has a nonempty intersection with the line $\mathbb{R} \oplus \{0\}$. As a consequence the function $\text{Trop}(W)$ is bounded from above by the (constant) function

$$d \mapsto \min_{(c,0) \in \text{AugNewton}(W)} \langle (c, 0), (1, d) \rangle = \min_{(c,0) \in \text{AugNewton}(W)} c.$$

The main lemma of this section shows that this bound is best possible.

Definition 4.3. Given a complete Laurent polynomial W with its associated polytope $\text{AugNewton}(W)$ we refer to

$$\tau = \min(\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid (c, 0) \in \text{AugNewton}(W)\})$$

as the *minimal height* above 0 of $\text{AugNewton}(W)$. We refer to $(\tau, 0)$ as the *lowest point* above 0 in $\text{AugNewton}(W)$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let W be any positive, complete Laurent polynomial, and let τ be the minimal height above 0 of $\text{AugNewton}(W)$. Then*

$$\tau = \max_{d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}} \text{Trop}(W)(d).$$

To prove this lemma we require the notion of a lowest face of a polytope with respect to a vector in the dual space.

Definition 4.5 (Lowest face). Suppose Δ is a polytope in a real vector space V (such as $\mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}$), and α is a nonzero vector in the dual space V^* . Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : V \times V^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the dual pairing. We define

$$\text{LowestFace}_{\alpha}(\Delta) := \{w \in \Delta \mid \langle w, \alpha \rangle \leq \langle v, \alpha \rangle \text{ for all } v \in \Delta\}.$$

We let

$$(4.3) \quad \langle \Delta, \alpha \rangle := \min\{\langle v, \alpha \rangle \mid v \in \Delta\}.$$

Then we have, equivalently, $\text{LowestFace}_{\alpha}(\Delta) = \{w \in \Delta \mid \langle w, \alpha \rangle = \langle \Delta, \alpha \rangle\}$.

Remark 4.6. If the polytope Δ in the above definition is not full-dimensional, then it can happen that $\text{LowestFace}_{\alpha}(\Delta)$ equals to all of Δ . In this case we include Δ itself among the faces of Δ . If Δ is full-dimensional however, then we use the word ‘face’ to mean ‘proper face’.

Remark 4.7. Suppose $\Delta = \text{AugNewton}(W)$ and $\text{pr} : \text{AugNewton}(W) \rightarrow \text{Newton}(W)$, as in Definition 4.1. We note that if 0 lies in the interior of $\text{Newton}(W)$, i.e. if W is complete, then every face of Δ intersects $\text{pr}^{-1}(0)$ in at most one point.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. We use the notations as above. In particular note that as explained in Remark 4.2,

$$(4.4) \quad \text{Trop}(W)(d) = \min_{w \in \text{AugNewton}(W)} \langle w, (1, d) \rangle = \langle \text{AugNewton}(W), (1, d) \rangle.$$

For any $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ we therefore have

$$(4.5) \quad \text{Trop}(W)(d) \leq \langle (\tau, 0), (1, d) \rangle = \tau,$$

simply because $(\tau, 0)$ lies in the polytope. Thus we know that $\text{Trop}(W)(d) \leq \tau$ for any d .

On the other hand $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ can be chosen in such a way that $(\tau, 0)$ itself lies on the lowest face $\text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$ of $(1, d)$. In that case by Definition 4.5,

$$\langle (\tau, 0), (1, d) \rangle = \langle \text{AugNewton}(W), (1, d) \rangle.$$

The left hand side above equals to τ , and the right hand side equals to $\text{Trop}(W)(d)$. Thus we see that $\tau = \text{Trop}(W)(d)$ and the value τ is attained. Hence τ is the maximal value of $\text{Trop}(W)$. \square

Following on from the proof of Lemma 4.4, we can characterise for which $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ the function $\text{Trop}(W)$ attains its maximal value τ .

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose W is a positive, complete Laurent polynomial and $(\tau, 0)$ is the lowest point above 0 in $\text{AugNewton}(W)$. Then for $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ we have*

$$\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \tau \iff (\tau, 0) \in \text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W)).$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.4, τ is the maximal value of $\text{Trop}(W)$. We saw in the proof of Lemma 4.4 that if $\text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$ contains $(\tau, 0)$, then this maximal value τ of $\text{Trop}(W)$ is attained at d . Thus the implication \Leftarrow is already proved. For the other direction suppose that $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \tau$. Then, since $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \langle \text{AugNewton}(W), (1, d) \rangle$, see (4.4), we have that

$$\langle \text{AugNewton}(W), (1, d) \rangle = \tau = \langle (\tau, 0), (1, d) \rangle.$$

This implies that $(\tau, 0) \in \text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$, see Definition 4.5. Thus we have proved the lemma. \square

Remark 4.9. Let F denote the *minimal-dimensional* face of $\text{AugNewton}(W)$ containing the point $(\tau, 0)$. In the case that F has codimension 1 in $\mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}$, it turns out that there is a *unique* element $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ for which $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \tau$. Namely, if $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \tau$ then Lemma 4.8 implies $F \subseteq \text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$. For dimension reasons this implies that $F = \text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$. But then $\text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$ has codimension 1 in $\mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}$, and therefore it determines the vector $(1, d)$ in $\mathbb{R} \oplus N_{\mathbb{R}}$ (which must be perpendicular to its ‘lowest face’) uniquely.

4.2. The tropical critical conditions. We now introduce a set of conditions which we will show must be satisfied by the valuation of any positive critical point of W .

Definition 4.10 (The functions δ_i). For $i = 1, \dots, n$ we consider the piecewise linear functions $\delta_i : N_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ associated to the summands of $W = \sum_i \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ given by

$$(4.6) \quad \delta_i(d) := c_i + \langle v_i, d \rangle - \text{Trop}(W)(d),$$

where $c_i = \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\gamma_i)$. Sometimes d will be fixed and we may write δ_i for $\delta_i(d)$ in this context.

Remark 4.11. Suppose $x \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ has $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{T}}(x) = d$. It will be useful at times to group the summands of $W(x)$ according to the valuations, $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{T}}(\gamma_i x^{v_i}) = c_i + \langle v_i, d \rangle$. Note that the minimal valuation achieved by any $\gamma_i x^{v_i}$ is $\text{Trop}(W)(d)$, and we have

$$(4.7) \quad \text{Val}_{\mathbf{T}}(\gamma_i x^{v_i}) = \text{Trop}(W)(d) + \delta_i(d).$$

Thus grouping summands of $W(x)$ by their valuations is equivalent to grouping them according to the value of $\delta_i(d)$.

Definition 4.12 (Tropical critical conditions for W). We say that $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the *tropical critical conditions for W* if

$$(4.8) \quad \text{ConvexHull}^{\circ}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) = \varepsilon\}) \cap \text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) < \varepsilon\}) \neq \emptyset,$$

for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Here $\text{ConvexHull}^{\circ}$ stands for the relative interior of the convex hull, by which we mean the set of linear combinations $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i v_i$ where $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i = 1$ and all r_i are *strictly* positive. We set $\text{ConvexHull}^{\circ}(\emptyset) = \{0\}$. Also $\text{Span}(\emptyset) = \{0\}$.

Remark 4.13. Observe that the condition (4.8) is automatically satisfied for d if ε does not equal to any of the values $\delta_i(d)$, since then the convex hull is just $\{0\}$ and automatically lies in the span. The condition (4.8) is also automatically satisfied whenever $\text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) < \varepsilon\}) = M_{\mathbb{R}}$, as happens for large enough ε if $\text{Newton}(W)$ is full-dimensional.

If $\varepsilon = 0$, on the other hand, then we always have a nontrivial convex hull in (4.8), since for any d there exist some i such that $\delta_i(d) = 0$. In this case the span in (4.8) is automatically $\{0\}$, and the associated tropical critical condition says that

$$0 \in \text{ConvexHull}^{\circ}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) = 0\}).$$

More generally, if $\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) = \varepsilon\}$ is nonempty and $\varepsilon > 0$, then the tropical critical condition for ε says that

$$(4.9) \quad 0 \in \text{ConvexHull}^{\circ}(\{\bar{v}_i \mid \delta_i(d) = \varepsilon\}),$$

where \bar{v}_i is the image of v_i under the quotient map

$$\text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) \leq \varepsilon\}) \rightarrow \text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) \leq \varepsilon\}) / \text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) < \varepsilon\}),$$

and the convex hull in (4.9) is in the quotient space above.

Lemma 4.14. *Let W be a positive Laurent polynomial. If p is a positive critical point of W , then $b = \text{Val}_{\Gamma}(p)$ satisfies the tropical critical conditions for W .*

Definition 4.15 (The *gradient function* of W). Recall that $W = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i}$. Associated to any $u \in N$ consider the associated T -invariant vector field ∂_u acting by $\partial_u(x^v) = \langle v, u \rangle x^v$. We have

$$(4.10) \quad \partial_u W = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \langle v_i, u \rangle x^{v_i}.$$

Let $M_{\mathbb{C}} = M_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes \mathbb{C}$ and $M_{\mathbf{K}} = M_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes \mathbf{K}$. The derivatives of W all together are encoded in the $M_{\mathbf{K}}$ -valued function

$$(4.11) \quad G(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i} v_i,$$

for which $\langle G(x), u \rangle = \partial_u W(x)$. We call G the gradient function of W .

Proof of Lemma 4.14. First observe that x is a critical point of W if and only if $G(x) = 0$, where G is the gradient function from Definition 4.15. Let us assume $x \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ with valuation $\text{Val}_{\Gamma}(x) = d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Note that we have

$$\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\gamma_i x^{v_i}) = c_i + \langle v_i, d \rangle,$$

and recall that

$$(4.12) \quad \text{Trop}(W)(d) = \min(\{c_i + \langle v_i, d \rangle \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}),$$

as in Example 2.7. Therefore we can expand $G(x) \in M_{\mathbf{K}}$ in terms of t giving

$$G(x) = t^{\text{Trop}(W)(d)} \sum_{\varepsilon \geq 0} g_{\varepsilon}(x) t^{\varepsilon},$$

for vector-valued coefficients $g_{\varepsilon}(x) \in M_{\mathbb{C}}$. The point x is a critical point of W if and only if $g_{\varepsilon}(x) = 0$ for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

Now suppose p is a critical point of W with $\text{Val}_{\Gamma}(p) = b$, and we have fixed $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Expanding $\gamma_i p^{v_i}$ with regard to t we get an element of \mathbf{K} of the form

$$(4.13) \quad \gamma_i p^{v_i} = t^{c_i + \langle v_i, b \rangle} \lambda_i = t^{c_i + \langle v_i, b \rangle} \left(\sum_{\delta \geq 0} \lambda_{i, \delta} t^{\delta} \right),$$

and it follows that

$$(4.14) \quad G(p) = \sum_{i=1}^n t^{c_i + \langle v_i, b \rangle} \left(\sum_{\delta \geq 0} \lambda_{i, \delta} t^{\delta} \right) v_i.$$

Then $\lambda_{i, \delta}$ contributes a summand $\lambda_{i, \delta} v_i$ to $g_{\varepsilon}(p)$ precisely if $\varepsilon + \text{Trop}(W)(b) = \delta + c_i + \langle v_i, b \rangle$. Let $\delta_i = \delta_i(b)$, compare Definition 4.10. Then the condition for $\lambda_{i, \delta}$ to contribute to $g_{\varepsilon}(p)$ becomes $\delta = \varepsilon - \delta_i$, and it implies $\delta_i \leq \varepsilon$. Therefore we have

$$(4.15) \quad g_{\varepsilon}(p) = \sum_{\{i | \delta_i \leq \varepsilon\}} \lambda_{i, \varepsilon - \delta_i} v_i = 0.$$

To summarise, if $b = \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(p)$ is the valuation of a critical point p of W , and the $\lambda_i \in \mathbf{K}$ are defined from p and W as above, then the equation (4.15) must be satisfied for every $\varepsilon \geq 0$, and vice versa.

Rewriting the right hand equality in (4.15) we get

$$(4.16) \quad \sum_{\{i | \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} \lambda_{i, 0} v_i = - \sum_{\{i | \delta_i < \varepsilon\}} \lambda_{i, \varepsilon - \delta_i} v_i.$$

We now use that W is positive, and p is a *positive* critical point. Thus by positivity of p^{v_i} and γ_i in (4.13) we have that $\lambda_i \in \mathbf{K}_{>0}$, and therefore $\lambda_{i, 0} > 0$ for every i . Dividing both sides of (4.16) by $\sum_{\{i | \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} \lambda_{i, 0}$ we get a point

$$v := \frac{\sum_{\{i | \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} \lambda_{i, 0} v_i}{\sum_{\{i | \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} \lambda_{i, 0}} = - \frac{\sum_{\{i | \delta_i < \varepsilon\}} \lambda_{i, \varepsilon - \delta_i} v_i}{\sum_{\{i | \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} \lambda_{i, 0}}.$$

By the first description of v we see that v lies in $\text{ConvexHull}^{\circ}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(b) = \varepsilon\})$ inside $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. The second description tells us that $v \in \text{Span}_{\mathbb{C}}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(b) < \varepsilon\})$. In fact since $v \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$, the imaginary part of v must be zero and we have $v \in \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(b) < \varepsilon\})$. Therefore the intersection

$$\text{ConvexHull}^{\circ}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(b) = \varepsilon\}) \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(b) < \varepsilon\})$$

is nonempty. This is true for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, thus $b = \text{Val}_{\Gamma}(p)$ satisfies the tropical critical conditions for W as claimed. \square

The next lemma interprets the $\varepsilon = 0$ tropical critical conditions.

Lemma 4.16. *Let W be a positive, complete Laurent polynomial, and let τ be the minimal height above 0 of $\text{AugNewton}(W)$. The following two conditions on $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ are equivalent.*

- (1) d satisfies the $\varepsilon = 0$ tropical critical conditions for W from Definition 4.12.

- (2) $\text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$ is the minimal face F of $\text{AugNewton}(W)$ containing $(\tau, 0)$. In particular $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \tau$ by Lemma 4.8.

Proof. Recall that $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the $\varepsilon = 0$ tropical critical conditions for W if

$$(4.17) \quad 0 \in \text{ConvexHull}^{\circ}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) = 0\}),$$

see Remark 4.13. We prove first (1) \implies (2). Let $0 = \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i = 0\}} r_i v_i$ be an expression of $0 \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$ as strict convex combination, so $r_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\sum r_i = 1$. Then we define $(c, 0) := \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i = 0\}} r_i (c_i, v_i)$. Note that $(c, 0)$ clearly lies in $\text{AugNewton}(W)$. We begin by proving that $(c, 0) = (\tau, 0)$ and lies in $\text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$.

Note that $\delta_i(d) = 0$ implies that $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \langle (c_i, v_i), (1, d) \rangle$. Thus we have

$$\sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i = 0\}} r_i \langle (c_i, v_i), (1, d) \rangle = \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i = 0\}} r_i \text{Trop}(W)(d) = \text{Trop}(W)(d).$$

On the other hand

$$\sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i = 0\}} r_i \langle (c_i, v_i), (1, d) \rangle = \langle (c, 0), (1, d) \rangle = c.$$

Thus c is a value of $\text{Trop}(W)$; namely $c = \text{Trop}(W)(d)$. By Lemma 4.4 we know that the only point of the form $(c, 0)$ in $\text{AugNewton}(W)$ for which c is a value of $\text{Trop}(W)$ is the ‘lowest’ point $(\tau, 0)$. Thus $c = \tau$ and, as also shown in Lemma 4.4, this is the maximal value attained by $\text{Trop}(W)$.

So far we have shown that $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \tau$. By Lemma 4.8 we now see that $(\tau, 0) \in \text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$. Let us show that $(\tau, 0)$ lies in the relative interior of this face. Then the minimality of the face will follow and the proof of (2) will be complete. We use the following Claim.

Claim: If $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \tau$ then we have that

$$(4.18) \quad \text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W)) = \text{ConvexHull}(\{(c_i, v_i) \mid \delta_i(d) = 0\}).$$

Proof of Claim: Since $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \tau$, we have that

$$\text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W)) = \{(c, v) \in \text{AugNewton}(W) \mid \langle (c, v), (1, d) \rangle = \tau\},$$

by Definition 4.5. As a face of $\text{AugNewton}(W)$ this convex set can also be expressed as a convex hull by

$$\text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W)) = \text{ConvexHull}(\{(c_i, v_i) \mid \langle (c_i, v_i), (1, d) \rangle = \tau\}).$$

On the other hand

$$\langle (c_i, v_i), (1, d) \rangle = \tau \iff \delta_i(d) = 0,$$

since $\tau = \text{Trop}(W)(d)$. Therefore (4.18) holds and this proves the Claim.

Now the $\varepsilon = 0$ tropical critical condition (4.17) implies, that

$$(\tau, 0) \in \text{ConvexHull}^{\circ}(\{(c_i, v_i) \mid \delta_i(d) = 0\}).$$

Thus the $\varepsilon = 0$ tropical critical condition can be interpreted as saying that $(\tau, 0)$ lies in the relative interior of $\text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$, by (4.18).

We now prove (2) \implies (1). Assume we have that the point $(\tau, 0)$ lies in the interior of $\text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$. Then $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \tau$ and applying

the Claim from above, we have that $\text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W))$ is described by (4.18). Therefore we have that

$$(\tau, 0) \in \text{ConvexHull}^\circ(\{(c_i, v_i) \mid \delta_i(d) = 0\}).$$

This implies the tropical critical condition (4.17) by projection to $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. \square

Remark 4.17. Note that Lemma 4.16 implies the existence of a $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying the $\varepsilon = 0$ tropical critical condition.

Lemma 4.18. *Let W be a positive, complete Laurent polynomial and let τ be the minimal height above 0 of $\text{AugNewton}(W)$. Let F be the minimal face of $\text{AugNewton}(W)$ containing the point $(\tau, 0)$. If F has codimension 1 in $\mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}$, then there exists a unique point $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying the tropical critical conditions.*

Proof. If d satisfies the tropical critical conditions, then in particular it satisfies the tropical critical condition for $\varepsilon = 0$. Therefore by Lemma 4.16 we see that $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \tau$. This together with the codimension 1 condition implies that d is uniquely determined, see Remark 4.9. Moreover, d , if it exists, is the unique element of $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ for which

$$(4.19) \quad \text{LowestFace}_{(1,d)}(\text{AugNewton}(W)) = F.$$

Now suppose d is the element defined by (4.19). It automatically satisfies the tropical critical condition for $\varepsilon = 0$, by Lemma 4.16. Let us assume that $\varepsilon > 0$. Note that by (4.19) combined with (4.18) from the proof of Lemma 4.16,

$$F = \text{ConvexHull}(\{(c_i, v_i) \mid \delta_i(d) = 0\}).$$

Therefore

$$\text{pr}(F) = \text{ConvexHull}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) = 0\}).$$

Then clearly, since $\varepsilon > 0$, we have that

$$\text{pr}(F) \subset \text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) < \varepsilon\}).$$

By our assumptions, F has codimension 1 in $\mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}$, and we have that F is transversal to $\text{pr}^{-1}(0)$, see Remark 4.7. Therefore the projection, $\text{pr}(F)$, is full-dimensional in $M_{\mathbb{R}}$, that is, there is no proper linear subspace of $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ which contains $\text{pr}(F)$. It follows that

$$\text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d) < \varepsilon\}) = M_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

This implies that the tropical critical condition (4.8) is satisfied for $\varepsilon > 0$. \square

We now prove uniqueness in general.

Lemma 4.19 (Uniqueness). *Suppose W is a positive, complete Laurent polynomial over \mathbf{K} as above. There is at most one element $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying the tropical critical conditions for W from Definition 4.12.*

Proof. Suppose d and d' in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ both satisfy the tropical critical conditions from Definition 4.12. Let us write δ_i for $\delta_i(d)$ and δ'_i for $\delta_i(d')$, compare Definition 4.10. By Lemma 4.16, $\text{Trop}(W)(d) = \text{Trop}(W)(d')$. Therefore we have that

$$(4.20) \quad \delta'_i - \delta_i = \langle v_i, d' \rangle - \langle v_i, d \rangle = \langle v_i, d' - d \rangle.$$

Claim: If d and d' both satisfy the tropical critical conditions for W then $\delta_i = \delta'_i$ for all i .

Note that this claim implies the lemma. Namely because of (4.20) the claim implies that $\langle v_i, d' - d \rangle = 0$ for all i . On the other hand since $\text{Newton}(W)$ is full-dimensional, we have that the v_i span all of $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. Therefore it follows that $d' = d$.

Proof of the Claim: Recall that the tropical critical conditions for d say that

$$\text{ConvexHull}^\circ(\{v_i \mid \delta_i = \varepsilon\}) \cap \text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i < \varepsilon\}) \neq \emptyset,$$

and these conditions are non-trivial only if $\varepsilon \in \{\delta_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Note that the conditions for d' are the same but with δ_i replaced by δ'_i everywhere. We will prove the claim by induction “on ε ” as follows.

Induction hypothesis: $\delta'_i = \delta_i$ whenever $\delta_i < \varepsilon$ or $\delta'_i < \varepsilon$.

Induction step: Assuming the induction hypothesis, $\delta'_i = \delta_i$ whenever $\delta_i \leq \varepsilon$ or $\delta'_i \leq \varepsilon$.

This should be thought of as an induction on ε 's lying in the finite ordered set $\{\min(\delta_i, \delta'_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ with natural ordering inherited from $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

For the start of the induction we observe that the induction hypothesis is automatically satisfied if $\varepsilon = 0$. Thus we can move straight to the induction step. For this we only need to show that $\delta'_i = \delta_i$ whenever $\delta_i = \varepsilon$ or $\delta'_i = \varepsilon$.

By the tropical critical conditions for d we have the existence of a $v \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that

$$v = \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} r_i v_i = \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i < \varepsilon\}} \nu_i v_i,$$

where $r_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with $\sum r_i = 1$, and $\nu_i \in \mathbb{R}$. As a consequence

$$\langle v, d' - d \rangle = \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} r_i \langle v_i, d' - d \rangle = \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i < \varepsilon\}} \nu_i \langle v_i, d' - d \rangle,$$

and thus by (4.20),

$$\sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} r_i (\delta'_i - \delta_i) = \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i < \varepsilon\}} \nu_i (\delta'_i - \delta_i).$$

By the induction hypothesis the right-hand side vanishes. Thus also

$$\sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} r_i (\delta'_i - \delta_i) = 0.$$

However the induction hypothesis implies that if $\delta_i = \varepsilon$, then $\delta'_i \geq \varepsilon$. Thus each summand $r_i (\delta'_i - \delta_i) \geq 0$ and therefore the summands must individually vanish. Since r_i is non-zero, it follows that $\delta'_i = \delta_i$ if $\delta_i = \varepsilon$.

If we reverse the roles of d and d' above, using instead the tropical critical conditions for d' , then the same argument will also prove that $\delta'_i = \delta_i$ if $\delta'_i = \varepsilon$. Thus the induction step is complete. \square

4.3. Construction of a canonical point in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ associated to W . In this subsection we prove existence of a point satisfying the tropical critical conditions associated to a positive, complete Laurent polynomial W . The proof involves an inductive construction and therefore we introduce some notation for our general set-up.

Definition 4.20 (Complete Newton datum). Suppose that we have a short exact sequence of real vector spaces

$$(4.21) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{\eta} V \xrightarrow{\beta} U \rightarrow 0,$$

together with a finite subset $\mathcal{W} = \{w_i\}$ of V . We call the tuple $\Xi = (U, V, \eta, \beta, \mathcal{W})$ a *Newton datum*, and refer to $\Delta := \text{ConvexHull}(\beta(\mathcal{W}))$ as the *Newton polytope* of Ξ . We call $\Xi = (U, V, \eta, \beta, \mathcal{W})$ a *complete Newton datum* if Δ is a full-dimensional polytope that contains 0 in its interior. We refer to $\bar{\Delta} := \text{ConvexHull}(\mathcal{W})$ as the *full polytope* of Ξ . If we also have a splitting of the exact sequence (4.21) then we say that the Newton datum Ξ is *split*.

Example 4.21 (The split complete Newton datum Ξ_W of W). Let $W : T \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ be a positive, complete Laurent polynomial as in Definition 3.2, and recall Definition 4.1. Then we get a complete Newton datum by setting $V = \mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}$, $U = M_{\mathbb{R}}$, $\beta = \text{pr}$, choosing the map $\eta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}$ to be $c \mapsto (c, 0)$, and setting $\mathcal{W} = \{(c_i, v_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$. In this case $\Delta = \text{AugNewton}(W)$ and $\bar{\Delta} = \text{Newton}(W)$. This complete Newton datum comes with a splitting $\tilde{\beta} : U \rightarrow V$ given by $v \mapsto (0, v)$. We denote the resulting split complete Newton datum associated to W by Ξ_W .

Our initial goal is to construct, given a general complete Newton datum $\Xi = (U, V, \eta, \beta, \mathcal{W})$, a particular point in V^* . We think of this point as being canonically associated to Ξ . In the case where Ξ is split, the associated canonical point in V^* also gives rise to a point in U^* .

The construction of the canonical point will in general be a recursive one and involve constructing out of $\Xi =: \Xi_1$ a sequence of Ξ_i . We use the following auxiliary definition.

Definition 4.22. Suppose $\Xi = (U, V, \eta, \beta, \mathcal{W})$ is a complete Newton datum. We associate to Ξ the set

$$(4.22) \quad \overline{\mathcal{W}} := \{w \in \mathcal{W} \mid \beta(w) \neq 0\}$$

and call it the *reduced set* of Ξ . If $\dim(U) > 0$, then $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \neq \emptyset$, by the completeness assumption. We refer to the convex hull $\bar{\Delta} = \text{ConvexHull}(\overline{\mathcal{W}})$ as the *reduced polytope* of Ξ . If $\overline{\mathcal{W}} = \emptyset$ we set $\bar{\Delta} = \emptyset$. We associate real numbers $\tau, \bar{\tau}$ to Ξ using the full polytope Δ and the reduced polytope $\bar{\Delta}$, by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &:= \min(\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid \eta(c) \in \Delta\}) \\ \bar{\tau} &:= \min(\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid \eta(c) \in \bar{\Delta}\}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we let $\min(\emptyset) := \infty$ for the case that $\bar{\Delta} = \emptyset$. We refer to τ and $\bar{\tau}$ as the *minimal height* above 0 of Δ and $\bar{\Delta}$, respectively. Note that since 0 is assumed to lie in the interior of Newton polytope Δ of Ξ , we have that $\Delta = \beta(\Delta) = \beta(\bar{\Delta})$.

Suppose $\bar{\Delta} \neq \emptyset$. We note that by the construction of the reduced polytope we have that the lowest point $\eta(\bar{\tau})$ above 0 is never a vertex of $\bar{\Delta}$. We will denote the minimal face of $\bar{\Delta}$ containing $\eta(\bar{\tau})$ by F . We also let E be the linear span of

the translate $F - \eta(\bar{\tau})$. Thus E is a positive-dimensional subspace of V and is the minimal subspace for which $F \subset \eta(\bar{\tau}) + E$.

Remark 4.23. In the setting of Ξ_W , see Example 4.21, since $\Delta = \text{AugNewton}(W)$, the minimal height above 0 of Δ recovers the minimal height τ associated to W in the earlier Definition 4.3. Also in this setting, the reduced polytope $\bar{\Delta}$ agrees with the polytope $\text{AugNewton}(W - W_{\text{const}})$ where $W_{\text{const}} \in \mathbf{K}$ is the constant term of W . Note that both W and $W - W_{\text{const}}$ have the same Newton polytope by the completeness assumption. They also have the same set of critical points.

Recursion Step 4.24. Assume $\Xi = (U, V, \eta, \beta, \mathcal{W})$ is a complete Newton datum such that $\dim(U) > 0$. Consider the associated reduced polytope $\bar{\Delta}$ with minimal height $\bar{\tau}$. We construct a new datum $\Xi' = (U', V', \eta', \beta', \mathcal{W}')$ with reduced polytope $\bar{\Delta}'$ having minimal height $\bar{\tau}'$, along with connecting maps from Ξ to Ξ' , as follows. As in Definition 4.22, let F be the minimal-dimensional face of $\bar{\Delta}$ containing $\eta(\bar{\tau})$ and let E be the span of the translation of the face F through 0. Now E is a linear subspace of V and $\dim(E) > 0$. We define

- $V' := V/E$ and $U' := U/\beta(E)$,
- associated projections

$$\sigma : V \rightarrow V' = V/E, \quad \pi : U \rightarrow U' = U/\beta(E),$$

- maps $\eta' : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow V'$ and $\beta' : V' \rightarrow U'$ induced by the maps η and β ,
- a set $\mathcal{W}' := \sigma(\bar{\mathcal{W}})$ in V' for $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ as in (4.22).

Let us denote the tuple $(U', V', \eta', \beta', \mathcal{W}')$ constructed above by Ξ' . We also set $\Delta' := \text{ConvexHull}(\mathcal{W}')$. We also set $\bar{\mathcal{W}}' := \{w \in \mathcal{W}' \mid \beta'(w) \neq 0\}$. If $\bar{\mathcal{W}}' \neq \emptyset$ we define $\bar{\Delta}' = \text{ConvexHull}(\bar{\mathcal{W}}')$. Otherwise we set $\bar{\Delta}' := \emptyset$. We now prove that Ξ' is again a complete Newton datum.

Lemma 4.25. *Let $\Xi = (U, V, \eta, \beta, \mathcal{W})$ be a complete Newton datum with $\dim(U) > 0$ and all notations as above. Let $\Xi' = (U', V', \eta', \beta', \mathcal{W}')$ be the tuple constructed from Ξ in the recursion step. Then the following properties hold.*

- (1) Ξ' is a complete Newton datum, and we have $\dim(U') < \dim(U)$.
- (2) The minimal height $\bar{\tau}'$ of the reduced polytope $\bar{\Delta}'$ of Ξ' is related to the minimal height $\bar{\tau}$ of $\bar{\Delta}$ from Ξ by the inequality $\bar{\tau} < \bar{\tau}'$.
- (3) We have the inclusion of convex sets, $\sigma(\bar{\Delta}) \subset \eta'(\bar{\tau} + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \bar{\Delta}'$.

Proof. We first prove (1). We have commutative diagram where the top row is known to be an exact sequence,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{\eta} & V & \xrightarrow{\beta} & U & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & id \downarrow & & \sigma \downarrow & & \pi \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{\eta'} & V' & \xrightarrow{\beta'} & U' & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

We need to show that the bottom row is also exact. Clearly β and π are both surjective, hence the commutativity of the second square implies that β' is also surjective. The commutativity of the diagram also implies that the image of η' lies in the kernel of β' .

Now by the recursion step we have $V' = V/E$. To show that η' is injective and $\text{im}(\eta') = \ker(\beta')$ we need to show precisely that $\ker(\beta) \cap E = \{0\}$. Or, if

we translate by $\eta(\bar{\tau})$, then it suffices to prove that $\ker(\beta) \cap F = \{\eta(\bar{\tau})\}$, for the minimal-dimensional face F of $\bar{\Delta}$ containing $\eta(\bar{\tau})$.

Let I be the intersection of $\bar{\Delta}$ with $\ker(\beta)$. Then either $I = \{\eta(\bar{\tau})\}$, in which case we are done, or I is an interval in the line $\ker(\beta) = \text{im}(\eta)$, and $\eta(\bar{\tau})$ is an endpoint of the interval I . In the latter case suppose there exists a face G of $\bar{\Delta}$ which contains the interval I . We may suppose that G is minimal with this property. Then $\eta(\bar{\tau})$ is on the boundary of the face G . Therefore there is a proper face of G which contains $\eta(\bar{\tau})$, and this face does not contain the interval I (by minimality of G). This face must contain F , since F was the minimal face of $\bar{\Delta}$ that contained $\eta(\bar{\tau})$. Thus F also does not contain the interval I , intersecting it only in $\eta(\bar{\tau})$. It follows that $F \cap \ker(\beta) = \{\eta(\bar{\tau})\}$, which concludes the proof of exactness of the bottom row.

Now let Δ' denote the convex hull of \mathcal{W}' . It remains to observe that the projection $\beta'(\Delta')$ of the polytope Δ' is full-dimensional with zero in the interior, which follows from the fact that $\beta'(\Delta') = \pi(\beta(\bar{\Delta}))$ and $\beta(\bar{\Delta}) = \beta(\Delta)$ is full-dimensional with zero in the interior.

We now prove (2). Note that $\Delta' = \sigma(\bar{\Delta})$. This is the full polytope of the complete Newton datum Ξ' . Consider the face F of $\bar{\Delta}$ and its image under σ . We show that this image is a vertex of Δ' .

Namely suppose H is an affine hyperplane in V intersecting $\bar{\Delta}$ in F . Then

$$H \cap \bar{\Delta} = F \subset \eta(\bar{\tau}) + E.$$

Therefore the projection $H' = \sigma(H)$ is an affine hyperplane in V' which intersects $\bar{\Delta}'$ precisely in a point. Indeed, this point is the projection the face F of $\bar{\Delta}$, and it also equals $\sigma(\eta(\bar{\tau})) = \eta'(\bar{\tau})$. The point $\eta'(\bar{\tau})$ is therefore a vertex of Δ' , as the intersection of Δ' with the hyperplane H' .

Since $\Delta' = \text{ConvexHull}(\mathcal{W}')$, the vertex $\eta'(\bar{\tau})$ is necessarily a point of \mathcal{W}' . As it is also an element in the kernel of β' , it is removed in the construction of $\overline{\mathcal{W}'}$. Thus the reduced polytope $\bar{\Delta}' = \text{ConvexHull}(\overline{\mathcal{W}'})$ does not contain $\eta'(\bar{\tau})$, and therefore its lowest point above 0, namely $\eta(\bar{\tau}')$, necessarily satisfies $\bar{\tau}' > \bar{\tau}$. This proves part (2) of the lemma.

We now prove (3). First assume that $\bar{\Delta}' \neq \emptyset$. For the left-hand side of the inclusion, $\sigma(\bar{\Delta}) = \Delta'$. This equals the convex hull of \mathcal{W}' . The set \mathcal{W}' is the union of the set $\overline{\mathcal{W}'}$ and a set of points which can be written in the form $\eta(c)$, where $c \geq \bar{\tau}$, by part (2). Thus (3) follows. \square

Remark 4.26. Note that in the proof of Lemma 4.25 we showed that the subspace E from Definition 4.22 is transversal to the line $\tau(\mathbb{R})$. Indeed this property is equivalent to the injectivity of the map $\eta' : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow V/E$.

Definition 4.27 (Canonical point of a complete Newton datum). Let $\Xi = (U, V, \eta, \beta, \mathcal{W})$ be a complete Newton datum. We define a canonical point $\widehat{d}_{\text{crit}}(\Xi) \in V^*$ associated to Ξ as follows.

Define $\Xi_1 = (U_1, V_1, \eta_1, \beta_1, \mathcal{W}_1) := \Xi$ and construct a finite sequence of complete Newton data $\Xi_k = (U_k, V_k, \eta_k, \beta_k, \mathcal{W}_k)$ by applying the recursion step whenever $\dim(U_k) > 0$, setting $\Xi_{k+1} := (\Xi_k)'$. In particular we have $V_{k+1} = V_k/E_k$ and we call the projection map $\sigma_k : V_k \rightarrow V_{k+1}$. Let m be the first index for which $\dim(U_m) = 0$. Thus V_m is 1-dimensional and Ξ_m is the final complete Newton datum in the sequence. We identify V_m^* with \mathbb{R} via the isomorphism

$$\eta_m^* : V_m^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

and we have a sequence of injections

$$\mathbb{R} = V_m^* \xrightarrow{\sigma_{m-1}^*} V_{m-1}^* \xrightarrow{\sigma_{m-2}^*} V_{m-2}^* \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow V_2^* \xrightarrow{\sigma_1^*} V_1^* = V^*.$$

We set $\widetilde{d}_{\text{crit}}(\Xi) \in V^*$ be the image of 1 under the above composition of maps.

Definition 4.28 (Canonical point of a split complete Newton datum). Suppose that $\Xi = (U, V, \eta, \beta, \mathcal{W})$ is a split complete Newton datum with splitting $\beta : U \rightarrow V$. We define a point in U^* by setting

$$d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi) = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi, \tilde{\beta}) := \tilde{\beta}^*(\widetilde{d}_{\text{crit}}(\Xi)).$$

Remark 4.29. We note that $\widetilde{d}_{\text{crit}}(\Xi) \in V^*$ is nonzero by its construction. The canonical point $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi, \tilde{\beta}) \in U^*$ of a split complete Newton datum on the other hand may be equal to 0.

If $\Xi = \Xi_W$ is the split complete Newton datum from Example 4.21 which is associated to a complete, positive $W : T \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$, then $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ since $U = M_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $N_{\mathbb{R}} = M_{\mathbb{R}}^*$. Moreover $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ can be interpreted as a tropical point of T via the identification $N_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \text{Trop}(T)$ from Definition 2.5.

The key property of the canonical point associated to Ξ_W is that it satisfies the tropical critical conditions for W , as we will prove next. Note that the property of satisfying the tropical critical conditions for W in fact only depends on the complete Newton datum Ξ_W .

Proposition 4.30. *Let W be a positive, complete Laurent polynomial, and let Ξ_W be the split complete Newton datum associated to W in Example 4.21. Then the canonical point $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ from Definition 4.28 satisfies the tropical critical conditions for W , see Definition 4.12.*

We first give a more direct description of $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi)$ which will be useful in the proof of the proposition. Namely we describe the point $\widetilde{d}_{\text{crit}}(\Xi)$ and $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi)$ concretely as follows.

Lemma 4.31. *Let $\Xi = (U, V, \eta, \beta, \mathcal{W})$ be a complete Newton datum with full polytope Δ and let $\widetilde{d}_{\text{crit}}(\Xi)$ be its associated canonical point in V^* . Recall also the maps σ_i from Definition 4.27. We define a subspace \tilde{E} in V by setting $\tilde{E} := \ker(\sigma_{m-1} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_1)$.*

- (1) *The subspace \tilde{E} is the kernel of $\widetilde{d}_{\text{crit}}(\Xi)$, and $\widetilde{d}_{\text{crit}}(\Xi)$ maps to 1 under the map $\eta^* : V^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Moreover these two properties uniquely characterise the canonical point $\widetilde{d}_{\text{crit}}(\Xi)$.*
- (2) *We have that $\Delta \subset \eta(\tau + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \tilde{E}$, where τ is the minimal height above 0 of Δ from Definition 4.22.*

Remark 4.32. If additionally the complete Newton datum Ξ is split, then we may identify V^* with $\mathbb{R} \oplus U^*$ such that η^* is the projection onto the first coordinate. In this setting the above lemma implies that the canonical point $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi)$ from Definition 4.28 is the unique element $a \in U^*$ such that $(1, a)$ vanishes on \tilde{E} .

Proof. Let $\sigma_{[m]} : V \rightarrow V_m$ be the composition of projections, $\sigma_{[m]} = \sigma_{m-1} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_1$, so that \tilde{E} the kernel of $\sigma_{[m]}$. Since $V_m \cong V/\tilde{E}$ is 1-dimensional, see Definition 4.27,

the linear subspace \widetilde{E} is a hyperplane in V . Moreover, by construction, \widetilde{E} is transversal to the line $\eta(\mathbb{R})$, compare Remark 4.26.

By definition we have that $\widetilde{d}_{\text{crit}}(\Xi) \in V^*$ is equal to the image of 1 under the composition $\sigma_{[m]}^* \circ (\eta_m^*)^{-1}$, that is under the diagonal map in the commutative diagram,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_m^* = (V/\widetilde{E})^* & \xrightarrow{\sigma_{[m]}^*} & V^* \\ \downarrow \eta_m^* & \nearrow & \downarrow \eta^* \\ \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{=} & \mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

Thus we see that $\widetilde{d}_{\text{crit}}(\Xi) \in V^*$ is the unique point in V^* which vanishes on \widetilde{E} and maps to 1 under η^* . Thus (1) is proved.

Let us now prove (2). By definition of τ and $\overline{\Delta}$ we have that

$$(4.23) \quad \Delta \subset \eta(\tau + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \overline{\Delta}$$

Recall $\Xi_k = (U_k, V_k, \eta_k, \beta_k, \mathcal{W}_k)$, the k -th complete Newton datum from Definition 4.27, and $\overline{\Delta}_k$ its reduced polytope with minimal height above 0 denoted $\overline{\tau}_k$. In particular, $\overline{\Delta}_1 = \overline{\Delta}$ and the minimal height above zero $\overline{\tau}_1$ satisfies $\overline{\tau}_1 \geq \tau$. We prove (2) by applying the maps $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}$ successively to both sides of (4.23). Note first that for any k we have

$$(4.24) \quad \sigma_k(\overline{\Delta}_k) \subset \eta_{k+1}(\overline{\tau}_k + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \overline{\Delta}_{k+1} \subset \eta_{k+1}(\tau + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \overline{\Delta}_{k+1},$$

where the first inclusion follows from Lemma 4.25(3), and the second from the inequality $\overline{\tau}_1 \geq \tau$ together with Lemma 4.25(2). This gives that

$$(4.25) \quad \sigma_{[m]}(\Delta) = \sigma_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ \sigma_1(\Delta) \subset \eta_m(\tau + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \overline{\Delta}_m.$$

Now we have $\overline{\Delta}_m = \emptyset$, compare Recursion Step 4.24. Therefore we obtain that

$$\sigma_{[m]}(\Delta) \subset \eta_m(\tau + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}).$$

Taking the inverse image $\sigma_{[m]}^{-1}$, we see that $\Delta \subset \eta(\tau + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \widetilde{E}$. \square

Remark 4.33. Using the notation of the above proof, we also claim that for every index j the intermediate inclusion,

$$(4.26) \quad \overline{\Delta}_j \subset \eta_j(\overline{\tau}_j + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \sigma_{[j]}(\widetilde{E}),$$

holds. In particular, for $j = 1$ we have $\overline{\Delta} \subset \eta(\overline{\tau} + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \widetilde{E}$.

Namely, if we take as our starting point instead of (4.23) the analogous inclusion

$$\sigma_j(\overline{\Delta}_j) = \Delta_{j+1} \subset \eta_{j+1}(\overline{\tau}_j + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \overline{\Delta}_{j+1},$$

and apply $\sigma_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ \sigma_{j+1}$ to both sides (using again (4.24)), we obtain

$$\sigma_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ \sigma_j(\overline{\Delta}_j) \subset \eta_m(\overline{\tau}_j + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}).$$

The inverse image $(\sigma_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ \sigma_j)^{-1}(\eta_m(\overline{\tau}_j + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}))$ of the right hand side is just

$$\eta_j(\overline{\tau}_j + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \ker(\sigma_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ \sigma_j) = \eta_j(\overline{\tau}_j + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \sigma_{[j]}(\widetilde{E}).$$

Thus (4.26) follows.

Lemma 4.34. *Let Ξ_W be the split complete Newton datum associated to a positive, complete Laurent polynomial W as in Example 4.21, and let $d_{\text{crit}} = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ be its canonical point. Then $\text{Trop}(W)(d_{\text{crit}})$ is the maximum of the piecewise linear function $\text{Trop}(W)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.4 the maximal value of $\text{Trop}(W)$ is τ , the minimal height above 0 of $\text{AugNewton}(W)$. We denote $\text{AugNewton}(W)$ also by Δ . We now consider the hyperplane $\tilde{E} \subset V = \mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}$ defined in Lemma 4.31, and recall that $(1, d_{\text{crit}}) \in V^*$ is characterised by the property of vanishing on \tilde{E} .

By Lemma 4.31(2) we have that $\Delta \subset \eta(\tau + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) + \tilde{E}$. Now pairing with $(1, d_{\text{crit}})$ gives

$$\langle (1, d_{\text{crit}}), w \rangle \geq \tau, \quad \text{for all } w \in \Delta.$$

This inequality becomes an equality if we choose $w = (\tau, 0)$. In other words $(1, d_{\text{crit}})$ applied to elements of Δ attains its minimal value at $(\tau, 0)$, and therefore we have that

$$(\tau, 0) \in \text{LowestFace}_{(1, d_{\text{crit}})}(\text{AugNewton}(W)).$$

By Lemma 4.8 this inclusion implies that $\text{Trop}(W)(d_{\text{crit}}) = \tau$. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.30. We use the notations from earlier in this section. In particular we have the split complete Newton datum $\Xi_W = \Xi_1 = (V_1, U_1, \eta_1, \beta_1, \mathcal{W}_1)$, with $U_1 = M_{\mathbb{R}}$, $V_1 = \mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\mathcal{W}_1 = \{(c_i, v_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\Delta = \Delta_1 = \text{AugNewton}(W)$, that is, the convex hull of \mathcal{W}_1 .

Recall the sequence of complete Newton data, $\Xi_j = (V_j, U_j, \eta_j, \beta_j, \mathcal{W}_j)$, where $j = 1, \dots, m$, which we construct out of Ξ_1 using the Recursion Step 4.24. We have associated to each Ξ_j a reduced set, $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_j$, with convex hull the reduced polytope, $\overline{\Delta}_j$, and the minimal height above 0 of $\overline{\Delta}_j$ is denoted $\overline{\tau}_j$, compare Definition 4.22. Note that the real numbers $\overline{\tau}_j$ are strictly increasing, by Lemma 4.25.(2). We also denote by F_j the minimal face of $\overline{\Delta}_j$ containing the point $\eta_j(\overline{\tau}_j)$. Recall that $V_{j+1} = V_j/E_j$, where E_j is the span of the translated face $F_j - \eta_j(\overline{\tau}_j)$.

The proof of the proposition will rely on understanding the faces F_j and for each F_j writing its special point $\eta_j(\overline{\tau}_j)$ as a convex combination of vertices. We now recall the key property of the canonical point $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$.

Recall the definition of $\tilde{E} = \ker(\sigma_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ \sigma_1)$ from Lemma 4.31. We have that \tilde{E} is a hyperplane in $V_1 = \mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}$, which is transversal to $\mathbb{R} \oplus \{0\}$ and whose projection to any V_j contains the subspace E_j . Consider also the projection $\sigma_{[j]} = \sigma_{j-1} \circ \dots \circ \sigma_1 : V_1 \rightarrow V_j$, and denote by \tilde{E}_{j-1} the kernel of this projection map. Thus we have $\sigma_{[j]}(\tilde{E}_j) = E_j$ and we have a flag of subspaces of V_1 ,

$$(4.27) \quad \{0\} \subset \tilde{E}_1 \subset \dots \subset \tilde{E}_{m-1} \subset \tilde{E}_m = \tilde{E},$$

for which we may identify V_j with V_1/\tilde{E}_{j-1} . Under this identification the subspace E_j of V_j is identified with $\tilde{E}_j/\tilde{E}_{j-1}$.

Let $a = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$. Then by Lemma 4.31(1), a is the unique element of $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that that $(1, a) \in V_1^*$ vanishes on the hyperplane \tilde{E} , i.e.

$$(4.28) \quad \langle e, (1, a) \rangle = 0, \quad \text{for all } e \in \tilde{E}.$$

The condition (4.28) is equivalent to the statement that pairing with $(1, a)$ gives rise to a well-defined linear map on each $V_j = V_1/\tilde{E}_{j-1}$, denoted

$$h_{a,j} = \langle _ , (1, a) \rangle : V_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover, we note that $h_{a,j}$ vanishes on the subspace E_j .

We now use the canonical point a to give a description of the face F_j as an intersection of $\bar{\Delta}_j$ with a hyperplane.

Claim 1: Let $a = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$ as above. For every j the minimal height $\bar{\tau}_j$ above 0 of $\bar{\Delta}_j$ is equal to the minimal value on $\bar{\Delta}_j$ attained by the linear map $h_{a,j}$. In particular, $\bar{\Delta}_j$ lies in the half-space $\{h_{a,j} \geq \bar{\tau}_j\}$,

$$(4.29) \quad \bar{\Delta}_j \subset \{h_{a,j} \geq \bar{\tau}_j\}.$$

Moreover, the intersection with the boundary, $\{h_{a,j} = \bar{\tau}_j\}$, of the half-space recovers the minimal face F_j containing $\eta_j(\bar{\tau}_j)$,

$$(4.30) \quad \bar{\Delta}_j \cap \{h_{a,j} = \bar{\tau}_j\} = F_j.$$

Proof of Claim 1: Recall that $F_j \subset \eta_j(\bar{\tau}_j) + E_j$, indeed by minimality of E_j we have that

$$(4.31) \quad F_j = \bar{\Delta}_j \cap (\eta_j(\bar{\tau}_j) + E_j).$$

Since $h_{a,j}$ vanishes on E_j , we see that for any point $f \in F_j$,

$$h_{a,j}(f) = h_{a,j}(\eta_j(\bar{\tau}_j)) = h_{a,j}(\sigma_{[j]}(\bar{\tau}_j, 0)) = \langle (1, a), (\bar{\tau}_j, 0) \rangle = \bar{\tau}_j.$$

Therefore F_j lies in the hyperplane $\{h_{a,j} = \bar{\tau}_j\}$ in V_j . It follows from Remark 4.33, by applying $h_{a,j}$ to both sides of the inclusion (4.26), that the polytope $\bar{\Delta}_j$ must lie in the upper half-space $\{h_{a,j} \geq \bar{\tau}_j\}$. Thus we have shown (4.29), and the inclusion “ \supseteq ” of (4.30).

Consider now the intersection

$$\tilde{F}_j := \bar{\Delta}_j \cap \{h_{a,j} = \bar{\tau}_j\},$$

which contains F_j , and because of (4.29) must be a face of $\bar{\Delta}_j$. If it is not equal to F_j then let $\sigma_{[j]}(c_i, v_i)$ be a vertex of the face \tilde{F}_j not in F_j . We have that

$$\sigma_{[j]}(c_i, v_i) \notin \eta_j(\bar{\tau}_j) + E_j,$$

because of (4.31). Moreover

$$\sigma_{[j]}(c_i, v_i) \notin \eta_j(c) + E_j,$$

for any other $c \in \mathbb{R}$, since $h_{a,j}(\sigma_{[j]}(c_i, v_i)) = \bar{\tau}_j \neq c$. Therefore this vertex of \tilde{F}_j is not in $\eta_j(\mathbb{R}) + E_j$, which says precisely that its image in V_{j+1} does not lie in the kernel of β_{j+1} . So $\sigma_{[j+1]}(c_i, v_i)$ is an element of the reduced set \overline{W}_{j+1} , and in particular lies in the reduced polytope, $\bar{\Delta}_{j+1}$. Thus we have constructed an element of $\bar{\Delta}_{j+1}$ on which $h_{a,j+1}$ takes the value $\bar{\tau}_j$.

However by (4.29) applied to V_{j+1} we know that $\bar{\Delta}_{j+1}$ lies in the half-space $\{h_{a,j} \geq \bar{\tau}_{j+1}\}$. This contradicts the strict inequality $\bar{\tau}_{j+1} > \bar{\tau}_j$ which we have by Lemma 4.25.(2). Thus the claim is proved.

For $a = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$, let $\delta_i = \langle (c_i, v_i), (1, a) \rangle - \text{Trop}(W)(a)$ for every $(c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{W}_1$. Note that for τ as in Lemma 4.34 and $h_a := h_{a,1}$, i.e. the linear map on V_1 given by $(1, a)$, we have

$$\delta_i = h_a(c_i, v_i) - \tau.$$

Let us set

$$(4.32) \quad \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon = \{(c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{W}_1 \mid h_a(c_i, v_i) = \tau + \varepsilon\} = \{(c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{W}_1 \mid \delta_i = \varepsilon\}.$$

We can now describe the face F_j as a convex hull.

Claim 2: Let $\varepsilon_j := \bar{\tau}_j - \tau$. Then

$$(4.33) \quad F_j = \text{ConvexHull}(\sigma_{[j]}(\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_j})).$$

Proof of Claim 2: We first prove the inclusion “ \subseteq ”. Since F_j is a face of $\bar{\Delta}_j$, its vertices are certain elements $w_i = \sigma_{[j]}(c_i, v_i) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_j$. By (4.30) these lie on the hyperplane $\{h_{a,j} = \bar{\tau}_j\}$, that is $h_{a,j}(w_i) = c_i + \langle v_i, a \rangle = \bar{\tau}_j$. This implies that $w_i \in \sigma_{[j]}(\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_j})$. Thus F_j lies inside the convex hull from (4.33).

For the other inclusion we need to show that $\sigma_{[j]}(\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_j})$ lies in F_j . Note that

$$\sigma_{[j]}(\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_j}) = (\sigma_{[j]}(\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_j}) \cap \bar{\mathcal{W}}_j) \cup (\sigma_{[j]}(\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_j}) \cap \beta_j^{-1}(0)),$$

by the construction of $\bar{\mathcal{W}}_j$. In this union the left hand set consists of all those $w_i \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_j$ which also lie in the hyperplane $\{h_{a,j} = \bar{\tau}_j\}$. Thus it is clearly contained in F_j by (4.30). The right hand set lies in the intersection of $\beta_j^{-1}(0) = \eta_j(\mathbb{R})$ with the hyperplane $\{h_{a,j} = \bar{\tau}_j\}$. But this intersection is a single point, namely $\eta_j(\bar{\tau}_j)$. Thus it also lies in F_j , and Claim 2 follows.

We now claim that a satisfies the tropical critical conditions for W .

Claim 3: Let $a = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$ and $\delta_i = \langle (c_i, v_i), (1, a) \rangle - \text{Trop}(W)(a)$, as above. Then for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$

$$(4.34) \quad \text{ConvexHull}^\circ(\{v_i \mid \delta_i = \varepsilon\}) \cap \text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i < \varepsilon\}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof of Claim 3: Let us first consider the case where $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_j = \bar{\tau}_j - \tau$ for some fixed j . By Claim 2 we have

$$F_j = \text{ConvexHull}(\sigma_{[j]}(\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_j})).$$

By the definition of F_j we have that $\eta_j(\bar{\tau}_j) \in F_j^\circ$, and thus (4.33) implies that $\eta_j(\bar{\tau}_j)$ can be written in the form

$$\eta_j(\bar{\tau}_j) = \sum_{(c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_j}} r_i \sigma_{[j]}((c_i, v_i)) = \sigma_{[j]} \left(\sum_{(c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_j}} r_i (c_i, v_i) \right),$$

for some $r_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with $\sum r_i = 1$. Let

$$v = \sum_{(c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_j}} r_i v_i.$$

Then by (4.32),

$$(4.35) \quad v \in \text{ConvexHull}^\circ(\{v_i \mid \delta_i = \varepsilon_j\}).$$

On the other hand we have

$$(c, v) = \sum_{(c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_j}} r_i (c_i, v_i) \in (\bar{\tau}_j, 0) + \tilde{E}_{j-1}.$$

Therefore applying the projection β_1 we have

$$(4.36) \quad v = \beta_1(c, v) \in \beta_1 \left((\bar{\tau}_j, 0) + \tilde{E}_{j-1} \right) = \beta_1 \left(\tilde{E}_{j-1} \right).$$

Recall that E_ℓ is the span in V_ℓ of $F_\ell - \eta_\ell(\bar{\tau}_\ell)$. And by Claim 2, the face F_ℓ is the convex hull of $\sigma_{[\ell]}(\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_\ell})$. Therefore

$$E_\ell = \sigma_{[\ell]}(\text{Span}(\{(c_i, v_i) - (\bar{\tau}_\ell, 0) \mid (c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_\ell}\})).$$

In terms of the flag of subspaces (4.27) we have $E_\ell = \widetilde{E}_\ell / \widetilde{E}_{\ell-1}$, and so we see that

$$\widetilde{E}_\ell = \text{Span}(\{(c_i, v_i) - (\overline{\tau}_\ell, 0) \mid (c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_\ell}\}) + \widetilde{E}_{\ell-1}.$$

Applying the above equality recursively we obtain the following key description of \widetilde{E}_{j-1} as a span,

$$(4.37) \quad \widetilde{E}_{j-1} = \text{Span}(\{(c_i, v_i) - (\overline{\tau}_\ell, 0) \mid \ell \leq j-1, (c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_\ell}\}).$$

Applying the projection β_1 to both sides of (4.37) gives us that

$$(4.38) \quad \beta_1(\widetilde{E}_{j-1}) = \text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \ell \leq j-1, (c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_\ell}\}).$$

Recall that $\varepsilon_\ell = \overline{\tau}_\ell - \tau$, and thus by Lemma 4.25.(2) we have that $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2 < \dots < \varepsilon_j$. Now (4.38) together with the definition of \mathcal{F}_ε implies that

$$(4.39) \quad \beta_1(\widetilde{E}_{j-1}) \subseteq \text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i \leq \varepsilon_{j-1}\}).$$

Combining (4.39) with the special property of v from (4.36) we see that

$$(4.40) \quad v \in \text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i < \varepsilon_j\}).$$

The two observations about v , (4.35) and (4.40), imply that the tropical critical condition (4.34) holds for $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_j$, completing the proof for such ε .

Now it remains to consider the case where ε is not one of the ε_j . In this case there exists a j such that $\varepsilon_{j-1} < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_j$. Since (4.34) holds trivially if $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon = \emptyset$, compare Remark 4.13, we can assume ε is such that \mathcal{F}_ε is nonempty.

Let (c_i, v_i) be an arbitrary element in \mathcal{F}_ε . The projection $\sigma_{[j]}(c_i, v_i) \in V_j$ satisfies

$$h_{a,j}(\sigma_{[j]}(c_i, v_i)) = \tau + \varepsilon < \tau + \varepsilon_j = \overline{\tau}_j.$$

Therefore by (4.29) in Claim 1, $\sigma_{[j]}(c_i, v_i) \notin \overline{\Delta}_j$. This implies that

$$\sigma_{[j]}(c_i, v_i) \in \ker(\beta_j),$$

by definition of $\overline{\Delta}_j$. Thus, since $V_j = V_1 / \widetilde{E}_{j-1}$,

$$(4.41) \quad (c_i, v_i) \in \eta_1(\mathbb{R}) + \widetilde{E}_{j-1}.$$

The equation (4.41) holds for all $(c_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$, and therefore for any convex combination. We take a strict convex combination of all of the elements of \mathcal{F}_ε to obtain an element $(c, v) \in \eta_1(\mathbb{R}) + \widetilde{E}_{j-1}$. Note that then

$$v \in \text{ConvexHull}^\circ(\{v_i \mid \delta_i = \varepsilon\}) \quad \text{and} \quad v \in \beta_1(\widetilde{E}_{j-1}).$$

Applying (4.39) to the observation on the right hand side above, we see that

$$v \in \text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i \leq \varepsilon_{j-1}\}) \subset \text{Span}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i < \varepsilon\}).$$

Therefore (4.34) holds again and Claim 3 is proved. \square

Corollary 4.35. *Suppose $W : T \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ is a positive, complete Laurent polynomial and p is a critical point of W lying in $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$. Let Ξ_W be the split complete Newton datum associated to W in Example 4.21 and $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$ its associated canonical point in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then $\text{Val}_T(p) = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$.*

Proof. Given that p is a positive critical point of W , then its valuation $\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(p)$ satisfies the tropical critical conditions by Lemma 4.14. On the other hand the point $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$ satisfies the tropical critical conditions by Proposition 4.30. By uniqueness, Lemma 4.19, there is *at most* one point in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying the tropical critical conditions. It follows that $\text{Val}_T(p) = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$. \square

4.4. Leading coefficient of a positive critical point of W . Recall that $W = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ denotes a positive, complete Laurent polynomial over \mathbf{K} , as in (4.1). By Corollary 4.35 if a critical point $p \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ of W exists then its valuation is given by the canonical point $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ which was constructed in Section 4.3. We write d_{crit} for $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$, thinking of W as fixed.

Recall from Section 2.3 the definition of the leading term and the logarithmic leading coefficient. We have that the leading term p_0 of p takes the form

$$p_0 = e^{\text{LogCoeff}_T(p)} t^{d_{\text{crit}}}.$$

Our goal in this section is to determine $\text{LogCoeff}_T(p)$ and prove that it is unique, that is, depends only on W .

Definition 4.36. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and let $W = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ be a positive, complete Laurent polynomial (with its associated functions δ_i from Definition 4.10, and its canonical point $d_{\text{crit}} \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$). We define a linear subspace of $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ by

$$B_{<\varepsilon} = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\{v_i \mid \delta_i(d_{\text{crit}}) < \varepsilon\}).$$

We have a set of ‘relevant ε ’,

$$\mathcal{E} := \{\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid \delta_i(d_{\text{crit}}) = \varepsilon \text{ some } i \in 1, \dots, n\}.$$

We may order this set, so that $\mathcal{E} = \{\varepsilon_0 = 0, \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m\}$ where $\varepsilon_j < \varepsilon_{j+1}$. Observe that if $\varepsilon_{j-1} < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_j$, then $B_{<\varepsilon} = B_{<\varepsilon_j}$. Thus we have a nested sequence of subspaces

$$\{0\} \subseteq B_{<\varepsilon_1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq B_{<\varepsilon_m} \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}},$$

and dually,

$$N_{\mathbb{R}} \supseteq B_{<\varepsilon_1}^{\perp} \supseteq \dots \supseteq B_{<\varepsilon_m}^{\perp} \supseteq \{0\}.$$

Note that the subspaces $B_{<\varepsilon}$ defined above depend only on the split complete Newton datum Ξ_W of W .

Remark 4.37. We note that the ε_j which came up in the proof of Proposition 4.30 and were associated to the special faces F_j lie in the set \mathcal{E} of relevant ε , but may not exhaust this set. Namely this can happen if there are terms $\gamma_i x^{v_i}$ in W which never give rise to a vertex of one of the F_j . Thus there is a small change in notation here.

We now introduce a set of conditions which we will show must be satisfied by the logarithmic leading coefficient $\text{LogCoeff}_T(p)$ of any positive critical point p of W .

Definition 4.38 (Critical coefficient conditions for W). Recall that we have $W = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ with $d_{\text{crit}} = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ and the piecewise linear maps $\delta_i : N_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We say that $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the *critical coefficient conditions* for W if

$$(4.42) \quad \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i(d_{\text{crit}}) = \varepsilon\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d \rangle} v_i \in B_{<\varepsilon}$$

for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

Remark 4.39. The key property of the canonical point $d_{\text{crit}} = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$ is that it satisfies the tropical critical conditions (4.8). Using above notation, these say that there exists for every $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ a convex combination $v = \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i(d_{\text{crit}}) = \varepsilon\}} r_i v_i$ which

lies in $B_{<\varepsilon}$. In light of this, the critical coefficient conditions can be interpreted as specifying that such a convex combination is given explicitly by setting the r_i to be

$$(4.43) \quad r_i := \frac{\text{Coeff}(\gamma_i)e^{\langle v_i, d \rangle}}{\sum_{\{k \mid \delta_k(d_{\text{crit}}) = \varepsilon\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_k)e^{\langle v_k, d \rangle}},$$

where i is such that $\delta_i(d_{\text{crit}}) = \varepsilon$. Note in particular that the existence of a d satisfying the critical coefficient conditions requires the tropical critical conditions to hold for d_{crit} .

Lemma 4.40. *Let W be a positive, complete Laurent polynomial. If p is a positive critical point of W , then the critical coefficient conditions (4.42) are satisfied for $d = \text{LogCoeff}_T(p) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$.*

Proof. Recall that $W = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ and $c_i = \text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\gamma_i)$. Consider the summand $\gamma_i p^{v_i} \in \mathbf{K}_{>0}$ of $W(p)$ and expand it in terms of t giving

$$(4.44) \quad \gamma_i p^{v_i} = t^{c_i + \langle v_i, d_{\text{crit}} \rangle} \lambda_i = t^{c_i + \langle v_i, d_{\text{crit}} \rangle} \left(\sum_{\delta \geq 0} \lambda_{i,\delta} t^\delta \right).$$

This defines elements $\lambda_i \in \mathbf{K}_{>0}$ and $\lambda_{i,\delta} \in \mathbb{C}$. We follow the proof of Lemma 4.14, taking the derivatives of W along T -invariant vector fields ∂_u , and deduce from the fact that p is a critical point of W , that the identity

$$(4.45) \quad \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i(d_{\text{crit}}) = \varepsilon\}} \lambda_{i,0} v_i = - \sum_{\{i \mid \delta_i(d_{\text{crit}}) < \varepsilon\}} \lambda_{i,\varepsilon - \delta_i(d_{\text{crit}})} v_i,$$

holds for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$, compare (4.16). Now observe that

$$\lambda_{i,0} = \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i p^{v_i}) = \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) \text{Coeff}(p^{v_i}) = \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, \text{LogCoeff}_T(p) \rangle}.$$

The left hand side of (4.45) therefore agrees with the left hand side of (4.42) for $d = \text{LogCoeff}_T(p)$, and thus the equation (4.45) implies the critical coefficient conditions for $\text{LogCoeff}_T(p)$. \square

The goal of this subsection is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4.41. *For W a positive, complete Laurent polynomial, there exists a unique element $d_{\text{coeff}} = d_{\text{coeff}}(W) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that the critical coefficient conditions (4.42) are satisfied for $d = d_{\text{coeff}}$.*

Remark 4.42. Note that the canonical point $d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ depends only on the complete Newton datum Ξ_W and its construction has a piecewise-linear flavour. The critical coefficient $d_{\text{coeff}}(W) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ on the other hand depends on W itself and its construction is real analytic.

We begin by stating a lemma which is proved by Galkin in the course of proving Proposition 3.3.

Lemma 4.43. [Gal97] *Suppose a function $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by a linear combination with positive coefficients of exponential functions,*

$$(4.46) \quad f(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i e^{\langle \nu_i, \rho \rangle},$$

where $c_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\nu_i \in (\mathbb{R}^m)^*$. If $\text{ConvexHull}(\{\nu_i \mid i = 1, \dots, k\}) \subset (\mathbb{R}^m)^*$ is full-dimensional and contains 0 in its interior, then f has a unique critical point. \square

The idea of the proof of Galkin's lemma is to observe that f has values in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and show that the special conditions imply that the values tend to positive infinity in any unbounded direction. Thus f has a critical point which is a minimum. Its uniqueness is shown by observing that the Hessian of f is always positive definite. Note that Proposition 3.3 about the Laurent polynomial L follows from Lemma 4.43 by writing L in terms of logarithmic coordinates.

Lemma 4.44. *For W a positive, complete Laurent polynomial, $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the critical coefficient conditions for W if and only if the function $f_{\varepsilon,d} : B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$f_{\varepsilon,d} : \rho \rightarrow \sum_{\{i|\delta_i(d_{\text{crit}})=\varepsilon\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i)e^{\langle v_i, d+\rho \rangle}$$

has a critical point at 0 for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

Proof. The function $f_{\varepsilon,d}$ has a critical point at 0 if and only if for all $u \in B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp}$ the derivative in the direction of u vanishes at 0. This derivative is given by

$$\partial_u f_{\varepsilon,d}(\rho) = \sum_{\{i|\delta_i(a)=\varepsilon\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i)e^{\langle v_i, d+\rho \rangle} \langle u, v_i \rangle = \langle u, \sum_{\{i|\delta_i(d_{\text{crit}})=\varepsilon\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i)e^{\langle v_i, d+\rho \rangle} v_i \rangle.$$

Clearly, for $v \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$ we have $\langle v, u \rangle = 0$ for all $u \in B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp}$ if and only if $v \in B_{<\varepsilon}$. Thus

$$\partial_u f_{\varepsilon,d}(0) = 0 \iff \sum_{\{i|\delta_i(d_{\text{crit}})=\varepsilon\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i)e^{\langle v_i, d \rangle} v_i \in B_{<\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore the condition on d that $\partial_u f_{\varepsilon,d}(0) = 0$ for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $u \in B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp}$ is equivalent to the critical coefficient conditions from Definition 4.38. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.41. By Lemma 4.44 we need to show existence and uniqueness of a point $d = d_{\text{coeff}}$ such that

$$f_{\varepsilon,d} : \rho \rightarrow \sum_{\{i|\delta_i(d_{\text{crit}})=\varepsilon\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i)e^{\langle v_i, d+\rho \rangle}$$

has a critical point at $0 \in B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp}$ for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

First we show existence. Consider the span $B_{\leq\varepsilon} = \text{Span}(\{v_j \mid \delta_j(d_{\text{crit}}) \leq \varepsilon\})$, so that we have

$$B_{\leq\varepsilon}^{\perp} \subseteq B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp} \subseteq N_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

Note that if $\delta_i(d_{\text{crit}}) = \varepsilon$ and $\rho \in B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp}$ then $\langle v_i, \rho \rangle = 0$. It follows that we can define a function $\bar{f}_{\varepsilon,d}$ on $B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp}/B_{\leq\varepsilon}^{\perp}$ by the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp}/B_{\leq\varepsilon}^{\perp} \\ & \searrow f_{\varepsilon,d} & \downarrow \bar{f}_{\varepsilon,d} \\ & & \mathbb{R}. \end{array}$$

Indeed, if $\delta_i(d_{\text{crit}}) = \varepsilon$ then pairing with v_i defines an element

$$(4.47) \quad \bar{v}_i \in (B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp}/B_{\leq\varepsilon}^{\perp})^*,$$

and the function $\bar{f}_{\varepsilon,d}$ is a sum of exponential functions $\bar{\rho} \mapsto e^{\langle \bar{v}_i, \bar{\rho} \rangle}$ with positive coefficients. In other words, if we choose a basis so that $B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp}/B_{\leq\varepsilon}^{\perp} = \mathbb{R}^m$, then it is of the form (4.46). Consider the polytope

$$(4.48) \quad \Delta_{\varepsilon} := \text{ConvexHull}(\{\bar{v}_i \mid \delta_i(d_{\text{crit}}) = \varepsilon\}) \subset (B_{<\varepsilon}^{\perp}/B_{\leq\varepsilon}^{\perp})^*.$$

Claim: The polytope Δ_ε in $(B_{<\varepsilon}^\perp/B_{\leq\varepsilon}^\perp)^*$ is full-dimensional and contains 0 in its interior.

Proof of the Claim: Note that for any triple of finite-dimensional vector spaces $U \subseteq V \subseteq W$ we have a natural isomorphism $(U^\perp/V^\perp)^* \cong V/U$. Applied to the triple $B_{<\varepsilon} \subseteq B_{\leq\varepsilon} \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}}$ we obtain that

$$(B_{<\varepsilon}^\perp/B_{\leq\varepsilon}^\perp)^* \cong B_{\leq\varepsilon}/B_{<\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover it is straightforward that under this isomorphism the vector \bar{v}_i from (4.47) is identified with the coset $v_i + B_{<\varepsilon}$ on the right hand side, which we also denote \bar{v}_i . It follows from its construction that $B_{\leq\varepsilon}/B_{<\varepsilon}$ is spanned by the \bar{v}_i with $\delta_i(d_{\text{crit}}) = \varepsilon$. This implies that the polytope Δ_ε is full-dimensional.

Now we use that $d_{\text{crit}} = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$ satisfies the tropical critical conditions (4.8), by Proposition 4.30. It follows from these conditions that 0 lies in the interior of Δ_ε . See Remark 4.13, and in particular (4.9). This concludes the proof of the claim.

The above claim together with Lemma 4.43 implies that the functions $\bar{f}_{\varepsilon,d}$ each have a unique critical point in $B_{<\varepsilon}^\perp/B_{\leq\varepsilon}^\perp$. We denote this critical point by $\bar{\rho}_{\varepsilon,d}$. Let us furthermore pick an arbitrary coset representative $\rho_{\varepsilon,d}$ of $\bar{\rho}_{\varepsilon,d} \in B_{<\varepsilon}^\perp/B_{\leq\varepsilon}^\perp$. It follows that $\rho_{\varepsilon,d} \in B_{<\varepsilon}^\perp$ is a critical point of $f_{\varepsilon,d}$.

Note that for $r \in B_{<\varepsilon}^\perp$ and any $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ we have a commutative diagram

$$(4.49) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} B_{<\varepsilon}^\perp & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{T}_r} & B_{<\varepsilon}^\perp \\ f_{\varepsilon,d+r} \downarrow & \swarrow f_{\varepsilon,d} & \\ \mathbb{R} & & \end{array}$$

where $\mathbb{T}_r : \rho \mapsto \rho + r$ is the map of translation by r . It follows from this diagram that if $r = \rho_{\varepsilon,d}$, our chosen critical point of $f_{\varepsilon,d}$, then 0 is a critical point of $f_{\varepsilon,d+\rho_{\varepsilon,d}}$.

Now recall the set $\mathcal{E} = \{\varepsilon_0 = 0, \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m\}$ of relevant ε from Definition 4.36 and the nested sequence of domains

$$N_{\mathbb{R}} \supseteq B_{<\varepsilon_1}^\perp \supseteq \dots \supseteq B_{<\varepsilon_m}^\perp \supseteq \{0\}$$

for our functions $f_{\varepsilon_j,d}$. We need to construct a $d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that 0 is a critical point of $f_{\varepsilon_j,d}$ for all j . We construct a sequence of $d_j \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$, where $j = -1, \dots, m$, by the following recursion.

- Let $d_{-1} = 0$.
- If d_{j-1} has been constructed, then we set $d_j := d_{j-1} + \rho_{\varepsilon_j, d_{j-1}}$.

We record the following properties of the elements d_j of $N_{\mathbb{R}}$.

- (1) By the commutative diagram (4.49) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_j$, $r = \rho_{\varepsilon_j, d_{j-1}}$ and $d = d_{j-1}$, we have that 0 is a critical point of the left hand side vertical map, f_{ε_j, d_j} .
- (2) For any j we have $d_j - d_{j-1} \in B_{<\varepsilon_j}^\perp$.
- (3) Applying (2) recursively, it follows that for any $0 \leq h \leq j$, we have

$$d_j \equiv d_h \pmod{B_{<\varepsilon_{h+1}}^\perp},$$

and therefore $f_{\varepsilon_h, d_j} = f_{\varepsilon_h, d_h}$.

- (4) Moreover, if $0 \leq h \leq j$ then 0 is a critical point of f_{ε_h, d_j} , by the combination of (1) and (3).

Let us set $d_{\text{coeff}} := d_m$. Then (4) above implies that 0 is a critical point of $f_{\varepsilon, d_{\text{coeff}}}$ for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Therefore d_{coeff} satisfies the critical coefficient conditions.

The above construction of d_{coeff} appears to depend on the choices of representatives $\rho_{\varepsilon_j, d}$ of the critical points $\bar{\rho}_{\varepsilon_j, d}$ of the $\bar{f}_{\varepsilon_j, d}$. It remains to prove that d_{coeff} is the *unique* element of $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying the critical coefficient conditions, in particular that different choices of representatives lead to the same d_{coeff} .

To prove uniqueness, let us suppose that $d'_{\text{coeff}} \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the critical coefficient conditions. Thus we have that 0 is a critical point of $f_{\varepsilon_j, d'_{\text{coeff}}}$ for all $j = 0, \dots, m$. For convenience we also introduce $\varepsilon_{m+1} > \varepsilon_m$, so that $B_{<\varepsilon_{m+1}} = M_{\mathbb{R}}$, and we have $B_{<\varepsilon_{m+1}}^{\perp} = \{0\}$. To prove that $d'_{\text{coeff}} = d_{\text{coeff}}$ we show inductively that $d'_{\text{coeff}} \equiv d_{\text{coeff}} \pmod{B_{<\varepsilon_j}^{\perp}}$ for $j = 0, \dots, m+1$, starting with the trivial case, $j = 0$. By our induction hypothesis we assume that we have shown that

$$d'_{\text{coeff}} \equiv d_{\text{coeff}} \pmod{B_{<\varepsilon_{j-1}}^{\perp}}.$$

Then we have the commutative diagram

$$(4.50) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} B_{<\varepsilon_{j-1}}^{\perp} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{T}^{d'_{\text{coeff}} - d_{\text{coeff}}}} & B_{<\varepsilon_{j-1}}^{\perp} \\ f_{\varepsilon_{j-1}, d'_{\text{coeff}}} \downarrow & \swarrow f_{\varepsilon_{j-1}, d_{\text{coeff}}} & \\ \mathbb{R} & & \end{array}.$$

Since 0 is a critical point of $f_{\varepsilon_{j-1}, d'_{\text{coeff}}} : B_{<\varepsilon_{j-1}}^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, by assumption, it follows from the diagram that $d'_{\text{coeff}} - d_{\text{coeff}}$ is a critical point of the right hand map $f_{\varepsilon_{j-1}, d_{\text{coeff}}}$. On the other hand, by assumption on d_{coeff} , the right hand map has critical point 0 as well. Moreover, by Lemma 4.43 the function $\bar{f}_{\varepsilon_{j-1}, d_{\text{coeff}}} : B_{<\varepsilon_{j-1}}^{\perp} / B_{<\varepsilon_j}^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has a unique critical point, $\bar{\rho}_{\varepsilon_{j-1}, d_{\text{coeff}}}$. Therefore it follows that

$$d'_{\text{coeff}} - d_{\text{coeff}} \equiv 0 \pmod{B_{<\varepsilon_j}^{\perp}}.$$

In other words, we have shown that $d'_{\text{coeff}} \equiv d_{\text{coeff}} \pmod{B_{<\varepsilon_j}^{\perp}}$ and the induction is complete. Setting $j = m+1$ so that $B_{<\varepsilon_{m+1}}^{\perp} = \{0\}$ we see that $d'_{\text{coeff}} = d_{\text{coeff}}$, which completes the proof of uniqueness. \square

4.5. Construction of the positive critical point. Consider the positive, complete Laurent polynomial $W : T(\mathbf{K}) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$, given by $W = \sum \gamma_i x^{v_i}$. Suppose that p is a positive critical point of W . So far we have determined the leading term p_0 of p completely. Namely, by Lemmas 4.14 and 4.19 and Proposition 4.30 regarding $d_{\text{crit}} = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ and Lemma 4.40 and Proposition 4.41 regarding $d_{\text{coeff}} = d_{\text{coeff}}(W) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ it follows that $p_0 = e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}}$. Therefore p must be of the form $e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}} \exp_T(w)$ for some $w \in N_{\mathbf{m}}$.

In this section we construct a $w_{\text{crit}} \in N_{\mathbf{m}}$ such that $p_{\text{crit}} := e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}} \exp_T(w_{\text{crit}})$ is a critical point of W , and we prove that this condition determines w_{crit} uniquely. Thus our constructed p_{crit} is the only critical point of W in $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$.

In order to describe the critical points of W we associate to W the function $G : T(\mathbf{K}) \rightarrow M_{\mathbf{K}}$ defined by

$$(4.51) \quad G(x) := \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i} v_i.$$

The function G encodes all of the derivatives $\partial_u W$ of W , where $u \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$, via $(\partial_u W)(x) = \langle G(x), u \rangle$. We recall that this function G was first introduced in (4.11).

Clearly p is a critical point of W if and only if $G(p) = 0$. From now on let us write δ_i for the value $\delta_i(d_{\text{crit}})$ of the piecewise linear function from Definition 4.10. We define the following partial versions of the function $G : T(\mathbf{K}) \rightarrow M_{\mathbf{K}}$.

Definition 4.45 ($G_\varepsilon, G_{\leq \varepsilon}$ and $G_{< \varepsilon}$). Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Define maps $G_\varepsilon, G_{\leq \varepsilon}$ and $G_{< \varepsilon} : T(\mathbf{K}) \rightarrow M_{\mathbf{K}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} G_\varepsilon(x) &:= \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon\}} \gamma_i x^{v_i} v_i, \\ G_{\leq \varepsilon}(x) &:= \sum_{\{i|\delta_i \leq \varepsilon\}} \gamma_i x^{v_i} v_i, \\ G_{< \varepsilon}(x) &:= \sum_{\{i|\delta_i < \varepsilon\}} \gamma_i x^{v_i} v_i. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that we denote by $\varepsilon_0 = 0 < \varepsilon_1 < \dots < \varepsilon_m$ the elements of the set $\mathcal{E} = \{\delta_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Therefore $G(x) = \sum_{j=0}^m G_{\varepsilon_j}(x) = G_{\leq \varepsilon_m}(x)$. Observe that $G_{\leq \varepsilon}$ takes values in $B_{\leq \varepsilon} \otimes \mathbf{K}$, see Definition 4.36.

Definition 4.46 ($\text{Val}_{V_{\mathbf{K}}}$). Suppose $V_{\mathbf{K}} = V_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{K}$ where $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a real vector space and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : V_{\mathbb{R}} \times V_{\mathbb{R}}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes the dual pairing (and its bilinear extension over \mathbf{K}). For any nonzero $F \in V_{\mathbf{K}}$ we define $\text{Val}_{V_{\mathbf{K}}}(F) \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\text{Val}_{V_{\mathbf{K}}}(F) := \min_{u \in V_{\mathbb{R}}^*} (\text{Val}_{\mathbf{K}}(\langle F, u \rangle)).$$

Equivalently, $\text{Val}_{V_{\mathbf{K}}}(F)$ is the unique real number such that the expansion of F in t takes the form

$$(4.52) \quad F = t^{\text{Val}_{V_{\mathbf{K}}}(F)} \sum_{\delta \geq 0} f_\delta t^\delta,$$

with $f_\delta \in V_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $f_0 \neq 0$. As usual $\text{Val}_{V_{\mathbf{K}}}(0) := \infty$. We also define $\text{Coeff}_\mu(F) \in V_{\mathbb{C}}$ to be the coefficient of t^μ in the expansion of F , thus if $F \neq 0$ is expressed as in (4.52), then

$$\text{Coeff}_\mu(F) = f_\delta, \quad \text{where } \delta = \mu - \text{Val}_{V_{\mathbf{K}}}(F).$$

The coefficient $\text{Coeff}_{\text{Val}_{V_{\mathbf{K}}}(F)}(F) = f_0 \in V_{\mathbb{C}}$ is also referred to as the leading vector-coefficient of F and denoted simply $\text{Coeff}(F)$, generalising Definition 2.2.

Our construction of the positive critical point of W will be recursive and relies on the following proposition.

Proposition 4.47. *Let $W = \sum_i \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ be a positive, complete Laurent polynomial. Let $d_{\text{crit}} = d_{\text{crit}}(\Xi_W)$ be the canonical point of the associated complete Newton datum Ξ_W and $d_{\text{coeff}} = d_{\text{coeff}}(W)$ the critical coefficient for W . Set $\tau := \text{Trop}(W)(d_{\text{crit}})$.*

Let $G = \sum_i \gamma_i x^{v_i} v_i$ be the $M_{\mathbf{K}}$ -valued function associated to W from (4.51). Suppose $p \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ has leading term $p_0 = e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}}$ and satisfies $G(p) \neq 0$. Set $\nu := \text{Val}_{M_{\mathbf{K}}}(G(p)) - \tau$.

- (1) *Suppose ε_h is the unique minimal element of $\mathcal{E} = \{\varepsilon_0, \dots, \varepsilon_m\}$ such that*

$$\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p)) \in B_{\leq \varepsilon_h} \otimes \mathbb{C},$$

compare Definition 4.36. Then we have that $0 \leq \varepsilon_h < \nu$. In particular $\nu > 0$.

(2) *There exists an element $u' \in B_{<\varepsilon_h}^\perp \otimes \mathbb{C}$ such that $p' := p \exp_T(t^{\nu-\varepsilon_h} u')$ satisfies*

$$(4.53) \quad \text{Val}_{M_{\mathbf{K}}}(G(p')) \geq \tau + \nu$$

and

$$(4.54) \quad \text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p')) \in B_{<\varepsilon_h} \otimes \mathbb{C}.$$

In particular if $\varepsilon_h = 0$ then $\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p')) = 0$ and $\text{Val}_{M_{\mathbf{K}}}(G(p')) > \tau + \nu$.

Proof. First observe that $\nu \geq 0$. This is because the leading term of p is $e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}}$, and therefore each individual summand of $G(p)$ has valuation bounded below by $\text{Trop}(W)(d_{\text{crit}})$. Note also that $\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p))$ is non-zero, by the definition of ν . Thus our assumption on ε_h can be stated as saying that

$$(4.55) \quad \text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p)) \in (B_{\leq \varepsilon_h} \otimes \mathbb{C}) \setminus (B_{<\varepsilon_h} \otimes \mathbb{C}).$$

First let us prove (1). It is equivalent to prove that $\nu > 0$ and $\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p)) \in B_{<\nu} \otimes \mathbb{C}$. If $\nu > \varepsilon_m$ then (1) holds automatically. Let us now suppose that $0 \leq \nu \leq \varepsilon_m$. Thus either $\varepsilon_{j-1} < \nu \leq \varepsilon_j$ for some $j \in [1, m]$, or $\nu = 0$. Observe that

$$\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p)) = \text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G_{\leq \nu}(p)) \in B_{\leq \nu} \otimes \mathbb{C}.$$

This is because for $\varepsilon > \nu$ all the summands $\gamma_i p^{v_i} v_i$ in G_ε have lowest degree $c_i + \langle v_i, d_{\text{crit}} \rangle = \tau + \varepsilon > \tau + \nu$, and therefore these G_ε do not contribute to $\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p))$, leaving only $G_{\leq \nu}$. If $\nu \notin \mathcal{E}$ then we have that $B_{\leq \nu} = B_{<\nu}$ and thus (1) follows immediately. We are left with the case where $\nu = \varepsilon_j$ for $j \in [0, m]$. In this case we have

$$G_{\leq \varepsilon_j}(p) = G_{<\varepsilon_j}(p) + G_{\varepsilon_j}(p),$$

and since $G_{<\varepsilon_j}(p) \in B_{<\varepsilon_j} \otimes M_{\mathbf{K}}$, by its definition, it remains to show that the coefficient

$$\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G_{\varepsilon_j}(p))$$

of $G_{\varepsilon_j}(p)$ lies in $B_{<\varepsilon_j} \otimes \mathbb{C}$. The valuation of each summand $\gamma_i p^{v_i} v_i$ of $G_{\varepsilon_j}(p)$ is given by $\tau + \varepsilon_j = \tau + \nu$, and the corresponding lowest order term is $\text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} v_i$, determined by the leading term of p . Therefore we have that

$$\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G_{\varepsilon_j}(p)) = \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\nu\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} v_i.$$

Now the critical coefficient condition (4.42), satisfied by d_{coeff} , implies that the above sum lies in $B_{<\varepsilon_j} = B_{<\nu}$. If $\nu > 0$ we are therefore done. To rule out the case $\nu = 0$ note that the critical coefficient condition implies in that case that $\text{Coeff}_\tau(G_0(p)) = 0$, but since

$$\text{Coeff}_\tau(G_0(p)) = \text{Coeff}_\tau(G_{\leq 0}(p)) = \text{Coeff}_\tau(G(p)) = \text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p)) \neq 0$$

with the inequality following from the definition of ν , we obtain a contradiction. Thus we must have that $\nu > 0$ and the proof of part (1) of the proposition is complete.

We now turn to (2). Let ε_h be as defined in part (1). In order to define u' we introduce a linear map $\phi_h : B_{<\varepsilon_h}^\perp / B_{\leq \varepsilon_h}^\perp \rightarrow B_{\leq \varepsilon_h} / B_{<\varepsilon_h}$ by

$$\phi_h(\bar{u}) := \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon_h\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} \langle v_i, u \rangle v_i \quad \text{mod } B_{<\varepsilon_h},$$

where \bar{u} denotes the coset in $B_{<\varepsilon_h}^\perp/B_{\leq\varepsilon_h}^\perp$ represented by u . Then ϕ_h is related to the symmetric bilinear form on $B_{<\varepsilon_h}^\perp/B_{\leq\varepsilon_h}^\perp$,

$$(4.56) \quad \mathbb{B}_h(\bar{u}_1, \bar{u}_2) := \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon_h\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} \langle v_i, u_1 \rangle \langle v_i, u_2 \rangle,$$

by the equality

$$\mathbb{B}_h(\bar{u}_1, \bar{u}_2) = \langle \phi_h(\bar{u}_1), \bar{u}_2 \rangle.$$

Note that \mathbb{B}_h is positive definite and hence non-degenerate. This implies that ϕ_h is invertible. We extend coefficients by tensoring with \mathbb{C} , but keep the notation ϕ_h for the resulting isomorphism of \mathbb{C} -vector spaces.

Recall that we have $\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p)) \in B_{\leq\varepsilon_h} \otimes \mathbb{C}$. Using the invertibility of ϕ_h we may choose a $u' \in B_{<\varepsilon_h}^\perp \otimes \mathbb{C}$ so that

$$\phi_h(\bar{u}') = -\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p)) \pmod{B_{<\varepsilon_h} \otimes \mathbb{C}}.$$

By its definition, u' has the property

$$(4.57) \quad \text{Coeff}_{\tau+\nu}(G(p)) + \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon_h\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} \langle v_i, u' \rangle v_i \in B_{<\varepsilon_h} \otimes \mathbb{C}.$$

We set $p' = p \exp_T(t^{\nu-\varepsilon_h} u')$ for this u' . Note that the element $t^{\nu-\varepsilon_h} u'$ of $N_{\mathbf{K}}$ now lies in $B_{<\varepsilon_h}^\perp \otimes \mathfrak{m}$, so that in particular $\exp_T(t^{\nu-\varepsilon_h} u')$ is well-defined. It remains to show that p' satisfies both (4.53) and (4.54). Thus to finish the proof we need to analyse $G(p')$.

We start by noting that $G(p') = \sum_{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}} G_\varepsilon(p')$ and

$$G_\varepsilon(p') = \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon\}} \gamma_i [p']^{v_i} v_i = \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon\}} \gamma_i p^{v_i} \exp(t^{\nu-\varepsilon_h} \langle v_i, u' \rangle) v_i,$$

where the valuation of each summand is equal to $\tau + \varepsilon$. Simultaneously beginning to expand out the exponentials we also have that

$$G_\varepsilon(p') = G_\varepsilon(p) + t^{\nu-\varepsilon_h} \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon\}} \langle v_i, u' \rangle (\gamma_i p^{v_i} v_i + t^{\tau+\varepsilon} N_{\mathfrak{m}}).$$

If $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_h$, then each term in the second sum has valuation greater than $\tau + \nu$. Summing over all the $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ we may therefore write

$$G(p') = G(p) + t^{\nu-\varepsilon_h} \sum_{\{i|\delta_i \leq \varepsilon_h\}} \langle v_i, u' \rangle (\gamma_i p^{v_i} v_i + t^{\tau+\delta_i} N_{\mathfrak{m}}) + t^{\tau+\nu} N_{\mathfrak{m}}.$$

Using that $u' \in B_{<\varepsilon_h}^\perp \otimes \mathbb{C}$, we can rewrite the middle term,

$$\begin{aligned} & t^{\nu-\varepsilon_h} \sum_{\{i|\delta_i \leq \varepsilon_h\}} \langle v_i, u' \rangle (\gamma_i p^{v_i} v_i + t^{\tau+\delta_i} N_{\mathfrak{m}}) \\ &= t^{\nu-\varepsilon_h} \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon_h\}} \langle v_i, u' \rangle (\gamma_i p^{v_i} v_i + t^{\tau+\varepsilon_h} N_{\mathfrak{m}}) \\ &= t^{\nu-\varepsilon_h} \left(\sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon_h\}} \langle v_i, u' \rangle \gamma_i p^{v_i} v_i \right) + t^{\tau+\nu} N_{\mathfrak{m}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore all in all we have that

$$(4.58) \quad G(p') = G(p) + t^{\nu - \varepsilon_h} \left(\sum_{\{i|\delta_i = \varepsilon_h\}} \gamma_i p^{v_i} \langle v_i, u' \rangle v_i \right) + t^{\tau + \nu} N_{\mathbf{m}}.$$

Recall that the first summand, namely $G(p)$, has valuation $\tau + \nu$. Each summand from the middle term also has valuation $\tau + \nu$. The remaining expression has valuation greater than $\tau + \nu$. It follows that $\text{Val}_M(G(p')) \geq \tau + \nu$. Thus (4.53) is proved.

Now for (4.54) we work out the vector coefficient $\text{Coeff}_{\tau + \nu}(G(p'))$ explicitly. Note that

$$\sum_{\{i|\delta_i = \varepsilon_h\}} \gamma_i p^{v_i} \langle v_i, u' \rangle v_i = t^{\tau + \varepsilon_h} \left(\sum_{\{i|\delta_i = \varepsilon_h\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} \langle v_i, u' \rangle v_i \right) + t^{\tau + \varepsilon_h} N_{\mathbf{m}}.$$

This expansion combined with (4.58) implies that

$$\text{Coeff}_{\tau + \nu}(G(p')) = \text{Coeff}_{\tau + \nu}(G(p)) + \sum_{\{i|\delta_i = \varepsilon_h\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} \langle v_i, u' \rangle v_i.$$

Finally, comparing with (4.57) we deduce that $\text{Coeff}_{\tau + \nu}(G(p'))$ lies in $B_{< \varepsilon_h} \otimes \mathbb{C}$ and (4.54) is proved. \square

Our next step will be to recursively construct a sequence $(p_j)_j$ of elements of $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ of the form $p_j := e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}} \exp_T(w_j)$, starting with $p_0 := e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}}$.

Recursive Construction 4.48. Let $w_0 = 0$. Suppose $w_k \in N_{\mathbf{m}}$ and hence $p_k = e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}} \exp_T(w_k)$ in $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ has been defined. Recall Proposition 4.47 with all of its notations. We use this proposition to construct w_{k+1} and p_{k+1} as follows.

- If $G(p_k) = 0$ we set $w_{k+1} = w_k$, so that $p_{k+1} = p_k$. In this case the sequence $(p_j)_j$ is constant for $j \geq k$.
- If $G(p_k) \neq 0$, set

$$(4.59) \quad \nu_k := \text{Val}_{M_{\mathbf{K}}}(G(p_k)) - \tau.$$

Then from Proposition 4.47 with $p = p_k$ and $\nu = \nu_k$ we have an associated $\varepsilon_{h(k)} := \varepsilon_h \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\varepsilon_{h(k)} < \nu_k$ and a $u'_k := u' \in B_{< \varepsilon_{h(k)}}^{\perp} \otimes \mathbb{C}$. We define $w_{k+1} \in N_{\mathbf{m}}$ by

$$w_{k+1} := w_k + t^{\nu_k - \varepsilon_{h(k)}} u'_k,$$

and set $p_{k+1} := e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}} \exp_T(w_{k+1})$.

By its definition, $\varepsilon_{h(k)}$ is the minimal element of \mathcal{E} for which

$$\text{Coeff}_{\tau + \nu_k}(G(p_k)) \in B_{\leq \varepsilon_{h(k)}} \otimes \mathbb{C},$$

while u'_k is constructed so that p_{k+1} satisfies $\nu_{k+1} := \text{Val}_{M_{\mathbf{K}}}(G(p_{k+1})) - \tau \geq \nu_k$ and

$$(4.60) \quad \text{Coeff}_{\tau + \nu_k}(G(p_{k+1})) \in B_{< \varepsilon_{h(k)}} \otimes \mathbb{C}.$$

The proposition thus implies that we have either

- (1) $\nu_{k+1} = \nu_k$ and $\varepsilon_{h(k+1)} < \varepsilon_{h(k)}$, in the case that the coefficient (4.60) is nonzero,
- (2) or we have that $\text{Coeff}_{\tau + \nu_k}(G(p_{k+1})) = 0$, and therefore $\nu_{k+1} > \nu_k$.

Note that if $\varepsilon_{h(k)} = 0$ then $B_{< \varepsilon_{h(k)}} = 0$ and we are necessarily in the second case.

Remark 4.49. The points (1) and (2) above imply that not only is the sequence $0 < \nu_0 \leq \nu_1 \leq \nu_2 \leq \dots$ monotonically increasing, also for each value $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ the number of j with $\nu_j = \nu$ is bounded above by the cardinality of \mathcal{E} and in particular is finite.

Remark 4.50. We are suppressing in our notation for the element p_k its dependence on the choices of elements u'_0, \dots, u'_{k-1} . These elements were not uniquely determined. Indeed, given u'_0, \dots, u'_{j-1} the next $u'_j \in B_{< \varepsilon_{h(j)}}^\perp \otimes \mathbb{C}$ is unique precisely up to $B_{\leq \varepsilon_{h(j)}}^\perp \otimes \mathbb{C}$, as follows from the proof of Proposition 4.47.

Lemma 4.51. *Let $p_k \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ and $w_k = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} t^{\nu_j - \varepsilon_{h(j)}} u'_j \in N_{\mathbf{m}}$ be elements constructed as above, where we assume that $G(p_k) \neq 0$ for all k . Then for every $\delta \geq 0$ the set $S_\delta = \{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \nu_j - \varepsilon_{h(j)} = \delta\}$ is finite. Moreover the set $\mathcal{D} = \{\nu_k - \varepsilon_{h(k)} \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$ lies in MonSeq. Note that \mathcal{D} is also the set of all δ such that $S_\delta \neq \emptyset$. We have that*

$$(4.61) \quad w_\infty := \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{D}} t^\delta \left(\sum_{j \in S_\delta} u'_j \right)$$

is a well-defined element of $N_{\mathbf{m}}$ and is the limit of the sequence $(w_k)_k$.

Proof. The assertion that S_δ is finite follows from Remark 4.49 together with the fact that the $\varepsilon_{h(j)}$ lie in the finite set \mathcal{E} . We now prove that $\mathcal{D} \in \text{MonSeq}$. The strategy of the proof will be to construct a set $\mathcal{S} \in \text{MonSeq}$ which has the property that $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{S}$.

Let $\Gamma_i := \{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid \text{Coeff}_{c_i + \delta}(\gamma_i) \neq 0\}$, so that

$$\gamma_i = t^{c_i} \tilde{\gamma}_i = t^{c_i} \left(\sum_{\delta \in \Gamma_i} m_\delta t^\delta \right),$$

and let $\partial\mathcal{E} := \{\varepsilon' - \varepsilon \mid \varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in \mathcal{E}, \varepsilon' \geq \varepsilon\}$. Clearly $\Gamma_i \in \text{MonSeq}$, since $\gamma_i \in \mathbf{K}$. We define \mathcal{S} to be the additive semigroup in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ generated by the sets Γ_i and $\partial\mathcal{E}$,

$$\mathcal{S} := \langle \Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_n, \partial\mathcal{E} \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}.$$

Since each $\Gamma_i \in \text{MonSeq}$, and $\partial\mathcal{E}$ is finite, it follows that also $\mathcal{S} \in \text{MonSeq}$. We now prove the following claim.

Claim. \mathcal{D} is a subset of \mathcal{S} , and therefore \mathcal{D} lies in MonSeq.

Proof of Claim. We need to show that for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ we have that $\nu_k - \varepsilon_{h(k)}$ lies in \mathcal{S} . Recall that $\varepsilon_{h(k)} \in \mathcal{E}$ is characterised by the property that

$$(4.62) \quad \text{Coeff}_{\tau + \nu_k}(G(p_k)) \in (B_{\leq \varepsilon_{h(k)}} \otimes \mathbb{C}) \setminus (B_{< \varepsilon_{h(k)}} \otimes \mathbb{C}).$$

By definition, $\tau + \nu_k$ is the valuation of

$$\begin{aligned} G(p_k) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i p_j^{v_i} v_i = \sum_{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}} \sum_{\{i | \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} \gamma_i p_k^{v_i} v_i \\ &= \sum_{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}} \sum_{\{i | \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} t^{\tau + \varepsilon} \tilde{\gamma}_i \exp_T(\langle v_i, w_k \rangle) v_i \\ &= \sum_{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}} \sum_{\{i | \delta_i = \varepsilon\}} e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} t^{\tau + \varepsilon} \tilde{\gamma}_i \exp_T \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} t^{\nu_j - \varepsilon_{h(j)}} \langle v_i, u'_j \rangle \right) v_i. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{Coeff}_{\tau + \nu_k}(G(p_k)) \notin B_{< \varepsilon_{h(k)}} \otimes \mathbb{C}$ by (4.62), therefore $t^{\tau + \nu_k}$ must appear with non-zero coefficient in some $\delta_i = \varepsilon$ summand, where $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_{h(k)}$. Thus $\tau + \nu_k$ must be of the form

$$\tau + \nu_k = \tau + \varepsilon + \delta + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}(\nu_j - \varepsilon_{h(j)}),$$

for some $\delta \in \Gamma$ and $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_{h(k)}$. It follows that

$$(4.63) \quad \nu_k - \varepsilon_{h(k)} = (\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{h(k)}) + \delta + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}(\nu_j - \varepsilon_{h(j)}).$$

If $k = 0$ we have that $\nu_0 - \varepsilon_{h(0)} = (\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{h(0)}) + \delta$, which clearly lies in \mathcal{S} . The claim for general k now follows by induction. Namely suppose the claim is true for all $j \leq k-1$. Then all the terms in the right hand side of (4.63) lie in \mathcal{S} , and therefore $\nu_k - \varepsilon_{h(k)}$ lies in \mathcal{S} , as required.

Finally, note that since $\mathcal{D} \in \text{MonSeq}$, we have for any $R > 0$ an index $k = k(R)$ such that $\nu_\ell - \varepsilon_{h(\ell)} > R$ for all $\ell \geq k$. Therefore, for this index k ,

$$w_\infty - w_k = \sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} t^{\nu_\ell - \varepsilon_{h(\ell)}} u'_\ell \in t^R N_{\mathfrak{m}},$$

implying that $w_\infty - w_k$ tends to 0 in the t -adic topology. Thus we have that $w_\infty = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} w_k$. \square

Remark 4.52. We note that this lemma implies, and indeed is equivalent to, the statement that if $G(p_k) \neq 0$ for all k , then the sequence $(\nu_k)_k$ from the Recursive Construction tends to infinity.

Definition 4.53. If $p_k = e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}} \exp_T(w_k)$ is a sequence of elements of $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ constructed as in the Recursive Construction above, then either $G(p_k) = 0$ for some k and we set $w_\infty = w_k$, or we set $w_\infty = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} w_k$ using Lemma 4.51. We define

$$p_\infty := e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}} \exp_T(w_\infty).$$

The element p_∞ of $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ is the limit of the sequence $(p_j)_j$.

Corollary 4.54. *If $(p_k)_k$ with $p_k = e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}} \exp_T(w_k)$ is a sequence of elements of $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ constructed as in the Recursive Construction above, then its limit, p_∞ , is a positive critical point of W .*

Proof. If $G(p_k) = 0$ for some k then $p_\infty = p_k$ and is clearly a critical point of W . Otherwise, by Remark 4.52, the sequence $\nu_k = \text{Val}_{M_{\mathbf{K}}}(G(p_k)) - \tau$ tends to infinity. For any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ we therefore have that $\eta < \nu_k$ for k large enough (depending on η). But then $\tau + \eta < \text{Val}_{M_{\mathbf{K}}}(G(p_k))$, implying that $\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\eta}(G(p_k)) = 0$ for large enough k . Therefore $\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\eta}(G(p_\infty)) = 0$, for all η and $G(p_\infty) = 0$, implying that p_∞ is a critical point of W . \square

We now prove an auxiliary lemma which will be used in the proof of uniqueness.

Lemma 4.55. *Suppose $w \in N_{\mathbb{C}}$ has the property that*

$$(4.64) \quad \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} \langle v_i, w \rangle v_i \in B_{<\varepsilon}$$

for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Then $w = 0$.

Proof. Dividing up w into real and imaginary parts, we may assume that $w \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Recall that we have isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_h : B_{<\varepsilon_h}^\perp / B_{\leq\varepsilon_h}^\perp &\rightarrow B_{<\varepsilon_h} / B_{<\varepsilon_h} \\ \omega + B_{\leq\varepsilon_h}^\perp &\mapsto \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon_h\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{crit}} \rangle} \langle v_i, \omega \rangle v_i \pmod{B_{<\varepsilon_h}}. \end{aligned}$$

We prove inductively that $w \in B_{\leq\varepsilon_h}^\perp$ for all h . Since $B_{\leq\varepsilon_m}^\perp = \{0\}$ this will imply that $w = 0$.

The start of the induction is given by $w \in B_{\leq\varepsilon_0}^\perp = N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Suppose we have proved that $w \in B_{\leq\varepsilon_{h-1}}^\perp$. Then since $B_{\leq\varepsilon_{h-1}}^\perp = B_{<\varepsilon_h}^\perp$ we may apply ϕ_h to $\bar{w} = w + B_{\leq\varepsilon_h}^\perp$. The condition (4.67) implies that $\phi_h(\bar{w}) = 0$. But since ϕ_h is an isomorphism, this implies that $\bar{w} = 0$, hence that $w \in B_{\leq\varepsilon_h}^\perp$. This completes the induction. \square

Proposition 4.56 (Uniqueness). *Suppose p and p' are two positive critical points of W , then $p = p'$.*

Proof. Suppose $p = p_0 \exp_T(w)$ and $p' = p_0 \exp_T(w')$ where $p_0 = e^{d_{\text{coeff}}} t^{d_{\text{crit}}}$. Let us write $w = \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}} t^\delta w_\delta$ and $w' = \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}} t^\delta w'_\delta$ where $\mathcal{C} \in \text{MonSeq}$ is the same set for w as for w' , but the coefficients $w_\delta, w'_\delta \in N_{\mathbb{C}}$ are allowed to be zero. We prove that $w = w'$ by induction on the totally ordered set \mathcal{C} . Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}$. Suppose that we have shown that $w_\delta = w'_\delta$ for all $\delta < \sigma$. If σ is the minimal element of \mathcal{C} , then this induction assumption is trivially true, giving the start of the induction. Let us set

$$G_{\geq\varepsilon}(p) = G(p) - G_{<\varepsilon}(p).$$

Consider for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$

$$G_{\geq\varepsilon}(p) = \sum_{\{i|\delta_i \geq \varepsilon\}} \gamma_i p^{v_i} v_i = \sum_{\{i|\delta_i \geq \varepsilon\}} \gamma_i p_0^{v_i} \exp\left(\sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}} t^\delta \langle v_i, w_\delta \rangle\right) v_i,$$

and similarly for $G_{\geq\varepsilon}(p')$ with each w_δ replaced by w'_δ . Since $G(p) = G(p')$, we have that $G_{\geq\varepsilon}(p) - G_{\geq\varepsilon}(p') = 0 - (G_{<\varepsilon}(p) - G_{<\varepsilon}(p')) \in B_{<\varepsilon} \otimes \mathbf{K}$. Thus,

$$(4.65) \quad \sum_{\{i|\delta_i \geq \varepsilon\}} \gamma_i p_0^{v_i} \left[\exp\left(\sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}} t^\delta \langle v_i, w_\delta \rangle\right) - \exp\left(\sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}} t^\delta \langle v_i, w'_\delta \rangle\right) \right] v_i \in B_{<\varepsilon} \otimes \mathbf{K}.$$

Note that by the induction hypothesis, any terms in the expansions of $G(p)$ and $G(p')$ involving only w_δ for $\delta < \sigma$ cancel out. The expression (4.65) can be divided

up into the sum $S_\varepsilon = \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon\}}(\dots)$ and $S_{>\varepsilon} = \sum_{\{i|\delta_i>\varepsilon\}}(\dots)$, giving $G_{\geq\varepsilon}(p) - G_{\geq\varepsilon}(p') = S_\varepsilon + S_{>\varepsilon} \in B_{<\varepsilon} \otimes \mathbf{K}$. We consider now $\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\sigma+\varepsilon}(S_\varepsilon + S_{>\varepsilon})$. For the $S_{>\varepsilon}$ summand we have

$$\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\sigma+\varepsilon}(S_{>\varepsilon}) = 0.$$

This is because no $t^\delta \langle v_i, w_\delta \rangle$ with $\delta \geq \sigma$ can contribute to the $\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\sigma+\varepsilon}$ if already $\delta_i > \varepsilon$. But for all $\delta < \sigma$ we have that $w_\delta = w'_\delta$ and any contributions to $\text{Coeff}_{\tau+\sigma+\varepsilon}$ will cancel out.

For the S_ε summand we get

$$(4.66) \quad \text{Coeff}_{\tau+\sigma+\varepsilon}(S_\varepsilon) = \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} \langle v_i, w_\sigma - w'_\sigma \rangle v_i,$$

using again the induction hypothesis to cancel out any other terms. Since $S_\varepsilon + S_{>\varepsilon} \in B_{<\varepsilon} \otimes \mathbf{K}$, it now follows that (4.66) lies in $B_{<\varepsilon} \otimes \mathbb{C}$. Thus we have shown the following property of $w_\sigma - w'_\sigma$.

Property. For the element $w = w_\sigma - w'_\sigma$ of $N_{\mathbb{C}}$ we have that

$$(4.67) \quad \sum_{\{i|\delta_i=\varepsilon\}} \text{Coeff}(\gamma_i) e^{\langle v_i, d_{\text{coeff}} \rangle} \langle v_i, w \rangle v_i \in B_{<\varepsilon} \otimes \mathbb{C}$$

for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

It therefore follows by Lemma 4.55 that $w_\sigma - w'_\sigma = 0$, completing the induction step. Thus the positive critical point is unique. \square

Remark 4.57. While the u'_j in the Recursive Construction of p_k and hence of p_∞ are non-unique, see Remark 4.50, the uniqueness of the positive critical point, Proposition 4.56, implies that the set \mathcal{D} and the sums $\sum_{j \in S_\delta} u'_j \in N_{\mathbb{C}}$ from (4.61) are unique.

Definition 4.58. Let $W = \sum_i \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ be a positive, complete Laurent polynomial. We denote by $p_{\text{crit}} = p_{\text{crit}}(W)$ the critical point of W in $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$, which is defined recursively above, see Definition 4.53, and whose uniqueness is proved in Proposition 4.56. We refer to p_{crit} as the *positive critical point* of W .

Proof of Theorem 3.5. We have already proved that the positive critical point of a positive, complete Laurent polynomial exists and is unique, and its valuation is the canonical point associated to the complete Newton datum. Therefore Theorem 3.5 follows from Lemma 4.34. \square

5. RATIONALITY, GENERALISED PUISEUX POLYNOMIALS, AND NONDEGENERACY

5.1. Rationality. In this section we observe that Theorem 3.4 holds also over the subfield \mathcal{K} of Puiseux series with its positive part $\mathcal{K}_{>0}$, see Definition 2.12. The following result is a corollary of the proof of Theorem 3.4 given in Section 4.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose $W = \sum \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ is a complete Laurent polynomial with coefficients $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}_{>0}$. Then the unique positive critical point p_{crit} from Theorem 3.4 lies in $T(\mathcal{K}_{>0})$. In particular its associated tropical point $[p_{\text{crit}}]$ gives rise to a canonical point $d_{\text{crit}} \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}$.*

Proof. A priori W has a unique positive critical point in $\mathbf{K}_{>0}$. From the construction in Section 4.3 it is clear that d_{crit} lies in $N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ if all the v_i have valuation in \mathbb{Q} . This proposition follows by tracing through the proofs in Section 4 to see that the remaining terms in the construction of p_{crit} also have rational exponents only. \square

5.2. Generalised Puiseux polynomials. We recall the Lemma 4.43 of Galkin. This lemma can be restated the following way. Suppose we have a function

$$W : T(\mathbb{R}_{>0}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}, \quad W = \sum c_i x^{v_i}$$

where $v_i \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $c_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Thus W is ‘positive’ over \mathbb{R} , but the exponents need not be integral. Then W still has a Newton polytope, namely $\text{ConvexHull}(\{v_i\})$, and Galkin’s Lemma says that if the Newton polytope is full-dimensional with 0 in its interior, then W has a unique critical point in $T(\mathbb{R}_{>0})$.

As an analogue of this result we have the following generalisation of Theorem 3.4. Consider a split torus T over \mathbf{K} with character group M , and call $W = \sum \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ where $\gamma_i \in \mathbf{K}_{>0}$ and now $v_i \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$ a *generalised Puiseux polynomial* over $\mathbf{K}_{>0}$. Note that W still gives a well-defined map

$$W : T(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}_{>0}.$$

Indeed recall that elements of $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ are of the form $p = e^u t^d \exp(w)$ for $u, d \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $w \in \mathfrak{m}$, compare Section 2.3. And therefore we can evaluate x^{v_i} on p by setting $p^{v_i} = e^{\langle v_i, u \rangle} t^{\langle v_i, d \rangle} \exp(\langle v_i, w \rangle)$.

To W we associate its Newton polytope $\text{Newton}(W) := \text{ConvexHull}(\{v_i\})$ inside $M_{\mathbb{R}}$, and we again call W complete if its Newton polytope is full-dimensional and contains 0 in its interior.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose $W = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ is a complete, generalised Puiseux polynomial over $\mathbf{K}_{>0}$. Then W has a unique critical point p_{crit} in $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$, and the valuation d_{crit} of p_{crit} is the canonical point defined in Section 4.3 of the complete Newton datum $\Xi_W = (M_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathbb{R} \oplus M_{\mathbb{R}}, \eta, \beta, \{v_i\})$, compare Example 4.21.*

Proof. The proof of Theorem 3.4 given in Section 4 does not make any use of the integrality of the exponents v_i . Therefore exactly the same proof shows the generalised version, Theorem 5.2. \square

Remark 5.3. We also get a rational version of the above theorem if we replace *generalised Puiseux polynomials* over $\mathbf{K}_{>0}$ by *Puiseux polynomials* over $\mathcal{K}_{>0}$, where Puiseux polynomial means that the exponents are rational numbers.

5.3. Nondegeneracy. Finally, the following observation can be seen as a formal analogue of the analytic property enjoyed by Galkin’s positive critical point. Namely a positive, complete Laurent polynomial over \mathbb{R} defines a convex function $f : \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (that is whose Hessian is everywhere positive definite), and this has a unique non-degenerate critical point which is a global minimum.

Lemma 5.4. *Given any positive generalised Puiseux polynomial $W = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ and any $p \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$, the bilinear map $\mathcal{H}_p : N_{\mathbb{R}} \times N_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ defined by $\mathcal{H}_p(u_1, u_2) := \partial_{u_1} \partial_{u_2} W(p)$, has the property that $\mathcal{H}_p(u, u) \in \mathbf{K}_{>0}$ for all $u \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$.*

Proof. It follows immediately from the formula for W and the definition of ∂_u that

$$\mathcal{H}_p(u_1, u_2) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \langle v_i, u_1 \rangle \langle v_i, u_2 \rangle p^{v_i}.$$

Thus for $u_1 = u_2 = u$ we get $\mathcal{H}_p(u, u) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \langle v_i, u \rangle^2 p^{v_i}$, which is clearly in $\mathbf{K}_{>0}$, since $p \in T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ and also $\gamma_i \in \mathbf{K}_{>0}$, and moreover $\langle v_i, u \rangle^2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. \square

There is also a stronger nondegeneracy condition for our critical point, see [FOOOa, Section 10], which expect to hold but have not proved yet. Proving this additional condition will mean that we can remove the rationality of the moment polytope assumption in Section 7.

6. APPLICATIONS TO TORIC VARIETIES

Let us consider a complete normal toric variety X for the torus T^\vee over \mathbb{C} with cocharacter group $M \cong \mathbb{Z}^r$. Namely $X = X_\Sigma$ for a complete rational polyhedral fan Σ in $M_\mathbb{R}$. We refer to [Ful93] for background. Let $v_1, \dots, v_n \in M$ denote the primitive generators of the rays of the fan Σ . The associated torus-invariant divisors of X are denoted D_1, \dots, D_n . The toric variety X will be fixed throughout this section.

For any T^\vee -invariant \mathbb{R} -Weil divisor $D = \sum c_i D_i$ we define an associated Laurent polynomial $W_D : T(\mathbf{K}) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ by

$$W_D = \sum_{i=1}^n t^{c_i} x^{v_i}.$$

This Laurent polynomial is positive by construction and it is also complete, by completeness of the fan Σ .

If D is a \mathbb{Q} -Weil divisor then W is defined over the field of Puiseux series \mathcal{K} . Moreover in this case the tropical critical point of W_D lies in $N_\mathbb{Q}$, by Section 5.1. If D is a Weil divisor on the other hand (i.e. with \mathbb{Z} -coefficients), it does not follow that the tropical critical point lies in N . Therefore we make the following definition.

Definition 6.1. Call a T^\vee -invariant Weil divisor $D = \sum c_i D_i$ on X_Σ *integrally balanced* if the tropical critical point of the associated Laurent polynomial W_D lies in N .

It is easy to see that being integrally balanced is a property of the divisor class $[D]$. Namely we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose D and D' are linearly equivalent T^\vee -invariant Weil divisors on X_Σ . That is $D' = D + (\chi^d)$, for some $d \in N$. Then the tropical critical point d_{crit} of W_D and the tropical critical point d'_{crit} of $W_{D'}$ are related by the formula*

$$d'_{\text{crit}} = d_{\text{crit}} - d.$$

In particular D is integrally balanced if and only if D' is integrally balanced.

Proof. Recall that the relation between divisors D_i and the primitive vectors v_i is encapsulated in the equality $(\chi^d) = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle v_i, d \rangle D_i$. Therefore if $D = \sum c_i D_i$, then we have that $D' = \sum (c_i + \langle d, v_i \rangle) D_i$ and $W_{D'} = \sum_{i=1}^n t^{c_i + \langle d, v_i \rangle} x^{v_i}$.

Let $p' := t^{-d} p_{\text{crit}}$ and observe that it is a critical point of $W_{D'}$. Namely the logarithmic derivative along $u \in N_\mathbb{R}$ gives

$$\partial_u W_{D'}(p') = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle v_i, u \rangle t^{c_i + \langle d, v_i \rangle} t^{-\langle d, v_i \rangle} p^{v_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle v_i, u \rangle t^{c_i} p^{v_i} = \partial_u W_D(p) = 0.$$

By the uniqueness statement in Theorem 3.4 it follows that p' is the positive critical point of $W_{D'}$. Hence $d'_{\text{crit}} = \text{Val}_\Gamma(p') = \text{Val}_\Gamma(t^{-d} p_{\text{crit}}) = d_{\text{crit}} - d$. \square

Corollary 6.3. *In any integrally balanced divisor class $[D]$ there is a unique choice of T^\vee -invariant divisor D' such that the tropical critical point d'_{crit} of $W_{D'}$ is equal to zero. \square*

Remark 6.4. The anticanonical class is integrally balanced for any toric variety X_Σ . In this case the unique T^\vee -invariant divisor with associated tropical critical point equal to 0 just recovers the standard choice $\sum_{i=1}^n D_i$ of anticanonical divisor.

Remark 6.5. The interpretations in this section, and particularly Corollary 6.3, are a toric variety version of the first author's work in the setting of the flag variety GL_n/B . In that case the tropical critical point of the mirror Landau-Ginzburg model, with quantum parameters $q_i = t^{\langle \lambda, \omega_i^\vee \rangle}$, was computed directly and it picks out a special point in the Gelfand-Zetlin moment polytope of the representation $V(\lambda)$, see [Jud18].

Remark 6.6. If D is very ample then we also note that the polytope

$$\mathcal{P}_{W_D} = \{d \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \text{Trop}(W_D)(d) \geq 0\}$$

has an interpretation as a moment polytope P_D of the toric variety X . Moreover the tropical critical point d_{crit} of W_D automatically lies inside \mathcal{P}_{W_D} by Theorem 3.5. Therefore we are canonically assigning to the moment polytope of any very ample T^\vee -invariant divisor a special point in its interior.

7. APPLICATIONS IN SYMPLECTIC TORIC GEOMETRY

Suppose Δ is a *Delzant polytope* in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$. This means that every vertex d of Δ has r edges whose edge directions are spanned by vectors in N , and such that the primitive vectors representing the edge directions form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of N . The Delzant polytopes are precisely the moment polytopes of toric symplectic manifolds, where we are thinking of the compact torus T_c^\vee , which is the compact real form of T^\vee , as acting in a Hamiltonian fashion. Note that the lattice polytope P_D from Remark 6.6 is Delzant precisely if the toric variety is smooth. However a general Delzant polytope need not be a lattice polytope. We let X_Δ be our notation for the toric symplectic manifold with moment polytope Δ and refer to [Gui94, CdS01] for background.

We recall an approach to constructing non-displaceable moment map fibers in toric symplectic manifolds using mirror symmetry that was developed in the work of Fukaya, Oh, Ono and Ota, see [FOOO12] and references therein, as well as [KLS19].

Each facet F_i of the Delzant polytope Δ lies on an affine hyperplane $\langle v_i, d \rangle + c_i = 0$, where we can choose $v_i \in M$ to be the uniquely determined primitive facet normal vector $v_i \in M$, and then $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is also uniquely determined. We thus have a canonical description of Δ as intersection of half-spaces,

$$\Delta = \bigcap_{F_i} \{d \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \langle v_i, d \rangle + c_i \geq 0\}.$$

This data can be conveniently encoded in a Laurent polynomial. Namely associated to Δ we set $W_\Delta := \sum t^{c_i} x^{v_i}$. Note that the polytope \mathcal{P}_{W_Δ} from (3.1) recovers Δ . This function W_Δ is a kind of superpotential associated to X_Δ , see [Giv98, HV00, Bat93]. In [FOOO12, FOOOa, FOOOb] another potential function \mathfrak{P}_Δ on T associated to X_Δ is constructed using moduli spaces of holomorphic disks. This potential function, considered in the correct coordinates, exactly recovers W_Δ in

the case where X_Δ is Fano. If X_Δ is not Fano, then the potential function \mathfrak{P}_Δ still has W_Δ as its leading term, but contains possibly infinitely many additional summands of higher order. In this setting our superpotential W_Δ is also called the ‘leading order potential function’.

An application of the potential function \mathfrak{P}_Δ of [FOOO12] is that if p is any critical point \mathfrak{P}_Δ such that the valuation d of p lies in Δ , then the Lagrangian torus fiber $L(d)$ is a *non-displaceable* Lagrangian in X_Δ . (This means that no Hamiltonian isotopy can transform $L(d)$ into a Lagrangian that is completely disjoint from $L(d)$.) Moreover the condition can be weakened, see [FOOOa, Theorem 10.4], to say that it suffices to consider the leading order potential W_Δ , as long as Δ is rational and the critical point of W_Δ is non-degenerate. Thus we have the following corollary of our main theorems together with Lemma 5.4.

Corollary 7.1. *For any toric symplectic manifold X_Δ we have a canonical point $d_{\text{crit}} \in \Delta$, which is the tropical critical point of the leading order potential function W_Δ . Assuming that X_Δ is Fano or that Δ is rational, we have that the moment map fiber of d_{crit} is a non-displaceable Lagrangian torus $L(d_{\text{crit}})$ in X_Δ . \square*

Note that d_{crit} has an explicit construction as the canonical point of the complete Newton datum Ξ_{W_Δ} .

Remark 7.2. The above corollary can also be generalised to toric symplectic orbifolds using the generalisation of the results of [FOOO12] due to Woodward [Woo11].

Remark 7.3. It is straightforward to check that in the case of projective space $X_\Delta = \mathbb{C}P^r$, this fiber $L(d_{\text{crit}})$ recovers the Clifford torus.

8. MUTATIONS AND EXTENSION FROM TORI TO CLUSTER VARIETIES

The theory of cluster algebras was introduced by Fomin and Zelevinsky [FZ02, FZ03, BFZ05, FZ07], as a way to try to understand total positivity and the dual canonical basis of Lusztig. Associated *cluster varieties* give rise to an interesting generalisation of toric varieties. Here a single torus is replaced by multiple tori (called cluster tori), with fixed coordinates (constituting together with the cluster torus a *cluster seed*). These are glued together along prescribed birational maps, called mutations. A major development in the theory of cluster algebras was the duality conjectures of Fock and Goncharov [FG09], and the introduction of the ‘theta basis’ by Gross, Hacking, Keel and Kontsevich [GHKK18]. Moreover [GHKK18] use the theta basis to construct a kind of superpotential associated to a compactification of an affine cluster variety in the case that the Fock-Goncharov conjectures hold. Namely this *GHKK-superpotential* is a sum of theta-functions on the dual cluster variety, and in particular gives rise to a Laurent polynomial on every cluster torus. Another setting where mutations of a more general type have appeared is in the general setting of Fano mirror symmetry via Laurent polynomials, see [ACGK12].

Definition 8.1. Suppose $\phi : T^{(1)} \dashrightarrow T^{(2)}$ is a positive rational map between two tori over \mathbf{K} , as in Section 2.2. We call ϕ *positively birational* if it has a positive rational inverse $\phi^{-1} : T^{(2)} \dashrightarrow T^{(1)}$.

We note that all cluster mutations are positively birational maps. In this section we show that our positive critical point is preserved by any positively birational

map of tori under which W stays positive and Laurent. Thus in the setting of cluster varieties, by the ‘positive Laurent phenomenon’ [LS15, GHKK18], the positive critical point is well-defined independently of a choice of ‘seed’.

Proposition 8.2. *Suppose $\phi : T^{(1)} \dashrightarrow T^{(2)}$ is a positively birational map between two tori over \mathbf{K} , as in Definition 8.1. Let $W : T^{(2)} \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ be a positive Laurent polynomial such that $\phi^*(W)$ is a positive Laurent polynomial on $T^{(1)}$. Assume furthermore that W complete. Then we have that*

- (1) $\phi^*(W)$ is complete.
- (2) If p'_{crit} is a unique positive critical point of $\phi^*(W)$ from Theorem 3.4, then $\phi(p'_{\text{crit}}) \in T^{(2)}(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ is the unique positive critical point p_{crit} of W .
- (3) The tropical critical points $d_{\text{crit}} = [p_{\text{crit}}]$ and $d'_{\text{crit}} = [p'_{\text{crit}}]$, of W and $\phi^*(W)$, respectively, are related by $\text{Trop}(\phi)(d'_{\text{crit}}) = d_{\text{crit}}$.

Let us first prove the following two Lemmas.

Lemma 8.3. *Suppose W is a positive Laurent polynomial on the torus T over \mathbf{K} with full-dimensional Newton polytope. If W has a critical point in $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ then the Newton polytope of W must have 0 in its interior, i.e. then W is complete.*

Proof. Suppose indirectly that W has a positive critical point p , but W is not complete. In this case we can find a primitive element $u_0 \in N$ such that the Newton polytope $\text{Newton}(W)$ lies entirely in the nonnegative half-space $H_{\geq 0} = \{v \mid \langle v, u_0 \rangle \geq 0\}$ of $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. Since p is a critical point, the logarithmic derivatives $\partial_u W$ vanish at p . Therefore in particular we obtain

$$\partial_{u_0} W(p) = \sum_i \gamma_i p^{v_i} \langle v_i, u_0 \rangle = 0.$$

However $\langle v_i, u_0 \rangle \geq 0$ for all i since v_i lies in the Newton polytope which lies in $H_{\geq 0}$. Moreover since $\text{Newton}(W)$ is full-dimensional, there exists a v_i with $\langle v_i, u_0 \rangle > 0$, that is, strictly bigger than 0. On the other hand each p^{v_i} lies in $\mathbf{K}_{>0}$, and the γ_i lie in $\mathbf{K}_{>0}$. It follows that $\sum \gamma_i p^{v_i} \langle v_i, u_0 \rangle \in \mathbf{K}_{>0}$, given that at least one summand is non-vanishing and all leading terms have ≥ 0 coefficients. As a result we obtain a contradiction to the critical point equation $\partial_{u_0} W(p) = 0$. \square

Lemma 8.4. *Suppose W is a positive Laurent polynomial on the torus T over \mathbf{K} whose Newton polytope is not full-dimensional. If W has a critical point in $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ then W has a 1-parameter family of critical points in $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$.*

Proof. Let $u_0 \in N$ be chosen so that the Newton polytope of W is contained in the hyperplane $H_0 = \{v \mid \langle v, u_0 \rangle = 0\}$. Let p_0 be a critical point of W in $T(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$. Then for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that $p_s := p_0 e^{s u_0}$ is another critical point of W . Namely, for $W = \sum_i \gamma_i x^{v_i}$ and for any $u \in N$,

$$\partial_u W(p_s) = \sum_i \langle v_i, u \rangle \gamma_i p_0^{v_i} e^{s \langle v_i, u_0 \rangle} = \sum_i \langle v_i, u \rangle \gamma_i p_0^{v_i} = \partial_u W(p_0) = 0.$$

Here we used first that $\langle v_i, u_0 \rangle = 0$, since v_i is a vertex of $\text{Newton}(W)$, and then that p_0 is a critical point for W . \square

Proof of the Proposition. Since ϕ is birational we can remove a divisor $D^{(1)}$ from $T^{(1)}$ and $D^{(2)}$ from $T^{(2)}$ and obtain an isomorphism, which we still call ϕ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^{(1)} \setminus D^{(1)} & \xrightarrow{\phi} & T^{(2)} \setminus D^{(2)} \\ & \searrow \phi^*(W) & \downarrow W \\ & & \mathbf{K}. \end{array}$$

Consider the corresponding algebra isomorphism $\phi^* : A^{(2)} = \mathbf{K}[T^{(2)} \setminus D^{(2)}] \rightarrow A^{(1)} = \mathbf{K}[T^{(1)} \setminus D^{(1)}]$. If $\partial^{(1)}$ is a \mathbf{K} -derivation of $A^{(1)}$ then $(\phi^*)^{-1} \circ \partial^{(1)} \circ \phi^*$ is a \mathbf{K} -derivation of $A^{(2)}$ and vice versa. Moreover the derivations of $A^{(i)}$ are generated over $A^{(i)}$ by the ∂_u where $u \in N^{(i)}$. Thus we see that the property of a point p being a critical point of W is equivalent to the condition $\partial^{(2)}W(p) = 0$ for all \mathbf{K} -derivations $\partial^{(2)}$ of $A^{(2)}$, and analogously for $\phi^*(W)$ and $A^{(1)}$.

Now observe that if p is a critical point of W lying in $T^{(2)} \setminus D^{(2)}$, then $\phi^{-1}(p)$ is a critical point for $\phi^*(W)$. This is since for any \mathbf{K} -derivation $\partial^{(1)}$ of $A^{(1)}$ we have that $(\phi^*)^{-1} \circ \partial^{(1)} \circ \phi^*$ is a \mathbf{K} -derivation of $A^{(2)}$, so that

$$0 = [(\phi^*)^{-1} \circ \partial^{(1)} \circ \phi^*](W)(p) = \partial^{(1)}(\phi^*(W))(\phi^{-1}(p)).$$

Thus $\phi^{-1}(p)$ is a critical point of $\phi^*(W)$. Clearly this observation is true for any regular map W with no assumption on Laurentness, completeness or positivity. If we consider ϕ^{-1} in place of ϕ , then for any critical point p' of $\phi^*(W)$ we have $\phi(p')$ is a critical point of W .

Now assume that W is a positive, complete Laurent polynomial. Then by Theorem 3.4 there is a unique positive critical point p_{crit} . Since ϕ is positively birational it restricts to a well-defined bijection $\phi_{>0} : T^{(1)}(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) \rightarrow T^{(2)}(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$, and we have $T^{(1)}(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) \subset T^{(1)} \setminus D^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) \subset T^{(2)} \setminus D^{(2)}$. Since W and $\phi^*(W)$ are both positive Laurent polynomials, we also have the following commutative diagram obtained by restriction to the positive parts

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^{(1)}(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) & \xrightarrow{\phi_{>0}} & T^{(2)}(\mathbf{K}_{>0}) \\ & \searrow \phi^*(W) & \downarrow W \\ & & \mathbf{K}_{>0}. \end{array}$$

By the previous argument, we have that $\phi_{>0}^{-1}(p_{\text{crit}}) = \phi^{-1}(p_{\text{crit}})$ is a positive critical point of $\phi^*(W)$. We have by assumption that $\phi^*(W)$ is a positive Laurent polynomial. Let us now prove it is complete. Suppose indirectly its Newton polytope does not have full dimension. Then since $\phi^*(W)$ has a positive critical point, by Lemma 8.4 it must have infinitely many positive critical points. However these critical points are mapped by $\phi_{>0}$ to distinct positive critical points of W , which contradicts the fact (Theorem 3.4) that the positive critical point of W is unique. Thus we see that the Newton polytope of $\phi^*(W)$ must be full-dimensional.

Now we are in the situation of Lemma 8.3. Since $\phi^*(W)$ is a positive Laurent polynomial with full-dimensional Newton polytope, and since $\phi^*(W)$ possesses a positive critical point, it must follow that the Newton polytope of $\phi^*(W)$ contains 0 in its interior. Hence we have shown that $\phi^*(W)$ is complete. Clearly, if p'_{crit} is the unique critical point of $\phi^*(W)$ then $\phi(p'_{\text{crit}}) = p_{\text{crit}}$. Therefore (1) and (2) are proved.

Finally, (3) follows from (2) and the definitions in Section 2.2. \square

We remark that the combination of the two lemmas used in this section imply a kind of converse to our main theorem. Namely we have the following corollary.

Corollary 8.5. *Suppose W is a positive Laurent polynomial. Then W has a unique positive critical point if and only if the Newton polytope of W is full-dimensional with 0 in the interior.* \square

REFERENCES

- [ACGK12] Mohammad Akhtar, Tom Coates, Sergey Galkin, and Alexander M. Kasprzyk, *Minkowski polynomials and mutations*, SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl. **8** (2012), Paper 094, 17. MR 3007265
- [Bat93] Victor V. Batyrev, *Quantum cohomology rings of toric manifolds*, Journées de géométrie algébrique d’Orsay - Juillet 1992, Astérisque, no. 218, Société mathématique de France, 1993, pp. 9–34 (en).
- [BEP04] Paul Biran, Michael Entov, and Leonid Polterovich, *Calabi quasimorphisms for the symplectic ball*, Commun. Contemp. Math. **6** (2004), no. 5, 793–802. MR 2100764
- [BFZ05] Arkady Berenstein, Sergey Fomin, and Andrei Zelevinsky, *Cluster algebras. III. Upper bounds and double Bruhat cells*, Duke Math. J. **126** (2005), no. 1, 1–52. MR 2110627 (2005i:16065)
- [BK07] Arkady Berenstein and David Kazhdan, *Lecture notes on geometric crystals and their combinatorial analogues*, Combinatorial aspect of integrable systems, MSJ Mem., vol. 17, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2007, pp. 1–9. MR 2269125 (2008m:17031)
- [CdS01] Ana Canas da Silva, *Symplectic toric manifolds*, <https://people.math.ethz.ch/acanas/Papers/toric.pdf>, 2001.
- [FG09] Vladimir V. Fock and Alexander B. Goncharov, *Cluster ensembles, quantization and the dilogarithm*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **42** (2009), no. 6, 865–930. MR 2567745 (2011f:53202)
- [FOOOa] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, and Kaoru Ono, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds, I*, Duke Math. J. **151**.
- [FOOOb] ———, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds, II : bulk deformations*, Selecta Math.
- [FOOO12] ———, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds: survey*, Surveys in differential geometry. Vol. XVII, Surv. Differ. Geom., vol. 17, Int. Press, Boston, MA, 2012, pp. 229–298. MR 3076063
- [Ful93] W. Fulton, *Introduction to toric varieties*, Princeton University Press, 1993.
- [FZ02] Sergey Fomin and Andrei Zelevinsky, *Cluster algebras. I. Foundations*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **15** (2002), no. 2, 497–529 (electronic). MR 1887642 (2003f:16050)
- [FZ03] ———, *Cluster algebras. II. Finite type classification*, Invent. Math. **154** (2003), no. 1, 63–121. MR 2004457 (2004m:17011)
- [FZ07] ———, *Cluster algebras. IV. Coefficients*, Compos. Math. **143** (2007), no. 1, 112–164. MR 2295199 (2008d:16049)
- [Gal97] S. Galkin, *The conifold point*, arXiv:1404.7388 [math.AG], 1997.
- [GHKK18] Mark Gross, Paul Hacking, Sean Keel, and Maxim Kontsevich, *Canonical bases for cluster algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **31** (2018), no. 2, 497–608.
- [Giv98] Alexander B. Givental, *A mirror theorem for toric complete intersections*, Topological field theory, primitive forms and related topics (Kyoto, 1996), Progr. Math., vol. 160, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1998, pp. 141–175. MR 1653024 (2000a:14063)
- [Gui94] Victor Guillemin, *Moment maps and combinatorial invariants of hamiltonian t^n -spaces*, Progress in Mathematics, no. 122, Birkhäuser, 1994.
- [HV00] Kentaro Hori and Cumrun Vafa, *Mirror Symmetry*, arXiv:hep-th/0002222, 2000.
- [Jud18] Jamie Judd, *Tropical critical points of the superpotential of a flag variety*, J. Algebra **497** (2018), 102–142. MR 3743177
- [KLS19] Yoosik Kim, Jaeho Lee, and Fumihiko Sanda, *Detecting non-displaceable toric fibers on compact toric manifolds via tropicalizations*, Internat. J. Math. **30** (2019), no. 1, 1950003, 40. MR 3916270
- [LS15] Kyungyong Lee and Ralf Schiffler, *Positivity for cluster algebras*, Ann. of Math. (2) **182** (2015), no. 1, 73–125. MR 3374957

- [Lus94] G. Lusztig, *Total positivity in reductive groups*, Lie theory and geometry, Progr. Math., vol. 123, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1994, pp. 531–568. MR 1327548 (96m:20071)
- [Mac12] Diane Maclagan, *Introduction to tropical algebraic geometry*, Tropical geometry and integrable systems, Contemp. Math., vol. 580, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012, pp. 1–19. MR 2985384
- [Mar10] T. Markwig, *A field of generalised Puiseux series for tropical geometry*, Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino **68** (2010), no. 1, 79–92. MR 2759691
- [Rie06] Konstanze Rietsch, *A mirror construction for the totally nonnegative part of the Peterson variety*, Nagoya Math. J. **183** (2006), 105–142. MR 2253887 (2007i:14055)
- [Rie08] Konstanze Rietsch, *A mirror symmetric construction of $qH_T^*(G/P)_{(q)}$* , Adv. Math. **217** (2008), 2401–2442.
- [RW17] Konstanze Rietsch and Lauren Williams, *Newton-Okounkov bodies, cluster duality, and mirror symmetry for Grassmannians*, To appear in Duke.
- [Stu07] B. Sturmfels, *A combinatorial introduction to tropical geometry: Section 2*, <https://math.berkeley.edu/~bernd/tropical/sec2.pdf>, 2007.
- [TN10] Kazushi Ueda Takeo Nishinou, Yuichi Nohara, *Toric degenerations of gelfand-cetlin systems and potential functions*, Adv. Math. **224** (2010), no. 2, 648–706.
- [Woo11] Christopher T. Woodward, *Gauged Floer theory of toric moment fibers*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **21** (2011), no. 3, 680–749. MR 2810861