

Revisiting Tropical Polynomial Division: Theory, Algorithms and Application to Neural Networks.

Ioannis Kordonis, Petros Maragos

Abstract—Tropical geometry has recently found several applications in the analysis of neural networks with piecewise linear activation functions. This paper presents a new look at the problem of tropical polynomial division and its application to the simplification of neural networks. We analyze tropical polynomials with real coefficients, extending earlier ideas and methods developed for polynomials with integer coefficients. We first prove the existence of a unique quotient-remainder pair and characterize the quotient in terms of the convex bi-conjugate of a related function. Interestingly, the quotient of tropical polynomials with integer coefficients does not necessarily have integer coefficients. Furthermore, we develop a relationship of tropical polynomial division with the computation of the convex hull of unions of convex polyhedra and use it to derive an exact algorithm for tropical polynomial division. An approximate algorithm is also presented, based on an alternation between data partition and linear programming. We also develop special techniques to divide composite polynomials, described as sums or maxima of simpler ones. Finally, we present some numerical results to illustrate the efficiency of the algorithms proposed, using the MNIST handwritten digit and CIFAR-10 datasets.

Index Terms— Tropical geometry, Piecewise linear neural networks, Tropical polynomial division, Neural network compression

I. INTRODUCTION

Tropical geometry is a relatively new research field combining elements and ideas from polyhedral and algebraic geometry [1]. The underlying algebraic structure is the max-plus semiring (also known as tropical semiring), where the usual addition is replaced by maximization and the standard multiplication by addition. Tropical polynomials (also known as max-polynomials) are the polynomials in the max-plus algebra and have a central role in tropical geometry. This work deals with the division of tropical polynomials and presents some applications in neural network compression.

A link between tropical geometry and machine learning was recently developed [2], [3]. An important application is the analysis of neural networks with piecewise linear activations (e.g., ReLU). In this front, [3], [4], [5], [6], [7] use a tropical representation of neural networks to describe the complexity of a network structure, defined as the number of its linear regions, or describe their decision boundaries.

The authors are with the National Technical University of Athens, School of Electrical and Computer Engineering 9, Iroon Polytechniou St Athens, Postal Code 157 80, Greece.

Author emails: I. Kordonis: kordonis@central.ntua.gr, P. Maragos maragos@cs.ntua.gr.

The research project was supported by the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation (H.F.R.I.) under the “2nd Call for H.F.R.I. Research Projects to support Faculty Members & Researchers” (Project Number:2656, Acronym: TROGEMAL).

[8] presents an algorithm to extract the linear regions of deep ReLU neural networks. Papers [9], [10], [11] deal with the problem of tropical polynomial division and its use in the simplification of neural networks. The analysis is, however, restricted to polynomials with integer coefficients. Article [12] uses tropical representations of neural networks and employs polytope approximation tools to simplify them. Another class of networks represented in terms of tropical algebra is morphological neural networks [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18]. Other applications of tropical algebra and geometry include the tropical modeling of classical algorithms in probabilistic graphical models [19], [20] and piecewise linear regression [21], [22]. Neural networks employing the closely related log-sum-exp nonlinearity were presented in [23], [24].

Another problem very much related to the current work is the factorization of tropical polynomials. This problem was first studied in [25], [26], [27], [28], for the single-variable case, and in [29], [30] for the multivariate case. The problem of tropical rational function simplification was studied in [31]. Another related problem is approximation in tropical algebra (see, e.g., [32]).

Contribution: This work deals with the problem of tropical polynomial division and its applications in simplifying neural networks. The analysis generalizes previous works [9], [10], [11] to include polynomials with real coefficients. We first introduce a new notion of division and show that there is a unique quotient-remainder pair. Furthermore, we show that the quotient is equal to the convex bi-conjugate of the difference between the dividend and the divisor. Then, the quotient is characterized in terms of the closed convex hull of the union of a finite collection of convex (unbounded) polyhedra. This characterization leads to a simple exact algorithm based on polyhedral geometry. We propose an efficient approximate scheme inspired by an optimization algorithm for convex, piecewise-linear fitting [33]. The approximate algorithm alternates between data clustering and linear programming. Then, we focus on developing algorithms for dividing composite polynomials expressed as the sum of simpler ones. The division results are then applied to simplify neural networks with ReLU activation functions. The resulting neural network has fewer neurons with maxout activations and a reduced total number of parameters. Finally, we present numerical results for the MNIST handwritten digit recognition and the CIFAR-10 image classification problem. As a baseline for comparison, we use the structured L1 pruning without retraining. The proposed method is very competitive in the large compression regime, that is, in the case where there are

very few parameters remaining after compression.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section II presents some preliminary algebraic and geometric material. In Section III, we develop some theoretical tools for tropical polynomial division. An exact division algorithm is presented in Section IV, and an approximate algorithm in Section V. Section VI-B deals with the division of composite tropical polynomials. Finally, VII gives some numerical examples. The proofs of the theoretical results are presented in the Appendix.

II. PRELIMINARIES, BACKGROUND AND NOTATION

Max-plus algebra is a modification of the usual algebra of the real numbers, where the usual summation is substituted by maximum and the usual multiplication is substituted by summation [34], [35], [36], [37]. Particularly, max-plus algebra is defined on the set $\mathbb{R}_{\max} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ with the binary operations “ \vee ” and “ $+$ ”. The operation “ $+$ ” is the usual addition. The operation “ \vee ” stands for the maximum, i.e. for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_{\max}$, it holds $x \vee y = \max\{x, y\}$. For more than two terms we use “ \bigvee ”, i.e., $\bigvee_{i \in I} x_i = \sup\{x_i : i \in I\}$. We will also use the ‘ \wedge ’ notation to denote the minimum, i.e., $x \wedge y = \min\{x, y\}$. A unified view of max-plus and several related algebras, was developed in [38], in terms of weighted lattices.

A tropical polynomial is a polynomial in the max-plus algebra. Particularly, a tropical polynomial function [39], [40], [41] is defined as $p : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\max}$ with

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_p} (\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b_i), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\max}$. In this paper, we will use the terms tropical polynomial and tropical polynomial function interchangeably.

For the tropical polynomial $p(\mathbf{x})$, the Newton polytope is defined as

$$\text{Newt}(p) = \text{conv}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{m_p}\}, \quad (2)$$

where “conv” stands for the convex hull, and extended Newton polytope as

$$\text{ENewt}(p) = \text{conv}\{[\mathbf{a}_1^T \ b_1]^T, \dots, [\mathbf{a}_{m_p}^T \ b_{m_p}]^T\}. \quad (3)$$

The values of the polynomial function p depend on the upper hull of the extended Newton polytope [1] (see also [4]). A polyhedron is subset of \mathbb{R}^n which can be represented either as the set of solutions of a finite collection of linear inequalities (\mathcal{H} -representation)

$$P = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}\},$$

or in terms of a set of vertices $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_l \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a set of rays $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_s \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$P = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^l \lambda_j \mathbf{v}_j + \sum_{j=1}^s \mu_j \mathbf{w}_j : \lambda_j \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^l \lambda_j = 1, \mu_j \geq 0 \right\}, \quad (4)$$

(\mathcal{V} -representation). The Minkowski-Weyl (resolution) theorem states that each polyhedron admits both




Fig. 1. Illustration of the Minkowski-Weyl theorem. The unbounded polyhedron P (green color in the figure) has two representations: \mathcal{H} -representation as the intersection of halfspaces H_1, \dots, H_4 and \mathcal{V} -representation generated by vertices v_1, v_2, v_3 and rays w_1, w_2 .

representations [42]. Figure 1 illustrates the Minkowski-Weyl resolution of an unbounded polyhedron. Furthermore, there are several well-known algorithms for representation conversion (e.g., [42], Ch. 9). Bounded polyhedra are called polytopes. It is often convenient to describe polytopes in terms of extended representations (e.g., [43]). An extension of a polytope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a polyhedron $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{n'}$, with $n' > n$, along with a linear projection $F : \mathbb{R}^{n'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $F(Q) = P$.

For a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ the epigraph is defined as

$$\text{epi}(f) = \{(\mathbf{x}, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : z \geq f(\mathbf{x})\}.$$

The convex conjugate of f is a function $f^* : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}$ given by (see [44])

$$f^*(\mathbf{a}) = \sup\{\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} - f(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

For a pair of polyhedra $P_1, P_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ the Minkowski sum is defined as

$$P_1 \oplus P_2 = \{\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{x} \in P_1, \mathbf{y} \in P_2\}.$$

The following properties hold (see [4])

$$\text{Newt}(p_1 + p_2) = \text{Newt}(p_1) \oplus \text{Newt}(p_2),$$

$$\text{Newt}(p_1 \vee p_2) = \text{conv}(\text{Newt}(p_1) \cup \text{Newt}(p_2)).$$

Similar relations hold for the extended Newton polytopes as well.

We then introduce a dual function of a tropical polynomial, called Extended Newton Function (ENF). For a tropical polynomial p , the ENF is defined as:

$$\text{ENF}_p(\mathbf{a}) = \sup\{b \in \mathbb{R} : [\mathbf{a}^T \ b]^T \in \text{ENewt}(p)\},$$

where $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\sup(\emptyset) = -\infty$. This function describes the upper hull of the extended Newton polytope. Thus, the ENF fully characterizes the tropical polynomial function p .

Proposition 1: Let p_1, p_2 be two tropical polynomials. Then $p_1(\mathbf{x}) \leq p_2(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, if and only if $\text{ENF}_{p_1}(\mathbf{a}) \leq \text{ENF}_{p_2}(\mathbf{a})$, for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof: See Appendix A.

The significance of ENFs is that we can often express inequality $\text{ENF}_{p_1} \leq \text{ENF}_{p_2}$, using a finite number of inequalities in terms of the tropical polynomial coefficients of p_1, p_2 .

III. TROPICAL POLYNOMIAL DIVISION DEFINITION AND EXISTENCE

We first define the tropical polynomial division.

Definition 1: Let p, d be tropical polynomials. We define the quotient and the remainder of the division of p by d .

- (a) A tropical polynomial q is the quotient if

$$p(\mathbf{x}) \geq q(\mathbf{x}) + d(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (5)$$

and q is the maximum polynomial satisfying this inequality. Particularly, for any tropical polynomial \tilde{q} , such that $p(\mathbf{x}) \geq \tilde{q}(\mathbf{x}) + d(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, it holds $\tilde{q}(\mathbf{x}) \leq q(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

- (b) A tropical polynomial r is the remainder of the division of p by d with quotient q if

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = (q(\mathbf{x}) + d(\mathbf{x})) \vee r(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (6)$$

and r is the minimum tropical polynomial satisfying this equality. Particularly, for any tropical polynomial \tilde{r} , such that $p(\mathbf{x}) = (q(\mathbf{x}) + d(\mathbf{x})) \vee \tilde{r}(\mathbf{x})$, it holds $\tilde{r}(\mathbf{x}) \geq r(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Observe that the set of tropical polynomials q satisfying (5) is closed under the pointwise maximum. That is, assume that q_1, q_2 are tropical polynomials such that $p(\mathbf{x}) \geq d(\mathbf{x}) + q_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $p(\mathbf{x}) \geq d(\mathbf{x}) + q_2(\mathbf{x})$, then it holds $p(\mathbf{x}) \geq d(\mathbf{x}) + (q_1(\mathbf{x}) \vee q_2(\mathbf{x}))$. This property motivates us to determine the monomials

$$q_M^{\mathbf{a}, b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b,$$

that satisfy (5). For each monomial coefficient \mathbf{a} , define the maximum value of b that satisfy $p(\mathbf{x}) \geq d(\mathbf{x}) + q_M^{\mathbf{a}, b}(\mathbf{x})$ as

$$l(\mathbf{a}) = \sup\{b : q_M^{\mathbf{a}, b}(\mathbf{x}) + d(\mathbf{x}) \leq p(\mathbf{x}), \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n\}. \quad (7)$$

Note that $l(\mathbf{a})$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} l(\mathbf{a}) &= \sup\{b : b \leq p(\mathbf{x}) - d(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}, \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{p(\mathbf{x}) - d(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting by $f(\mathbf{x})$ the difference $p(\mathbf{x}) - d(\mathbf{x})$, we have

$$l(\mathbf{a}) = -f^*(\mathbf{x}),$$

where f^* is the convex conjugate of f . A candidate for the quotient is

$$q(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + l(\mathbf{a})\}.$$

Note that q is the bi-conjugate of f . Indeed

$$q(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} - f^*(\mathbf{a})\} = f^{**}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (8)$$

The following proposition shows that $q(\mathbf{x})$ is indeed the quotient of the division.

Proposition 2: For any pair of tropical polynomials p, d there is a quotient-remainder pair. The quotient is given by




Fig. 2. This figure refers to Example 1. The left plot presents the dividend p and the divisor d . The middle plot their difference f and the quotient q . The right part shows the dividend p , its approximation $d + q$ and the remainder r .

- (8). Furthermore, the polynomial functions of the quotient and remainder are unique.

Proof See Appendix B.

Remark 1: The use of the convex conjugate is closely related to the slope transform [45], [46], [47]. The slope transform was used to derive an analog of frequency response of max-plus and more generally morphological systems.

Example 1 (Tropical Polynomial Division in 1D): Let $p(x) = \max(-2x - 1, 1, x + 1, 3x - 3)$ and $d(x) = \max(x, 2x - 1)$. Equivalently, the polynomial functions p and d are written as

$$p(x) = \begin{cases} -2x - 1, & \text{if } x \leq -1 \\ 1, & \text{if } -1 < x \leq 0 \\ x + 1, & \text{if } 0 < x \leq 2 \\ 3x - 3, & \text{if } x \geq 2 \end{cases},$$

$$d(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \leq 1 \\ 2x - 1, & \text{if } x > 1 \end{cases}.$$

Thus,

$$f(x) = p(x) - d(x) = \begin{cases} -3x - 1, & \text{if } x \leq -1 \\ 1 - x, & \text{if } -1 < x \leq 0 \\ 1, & \text{if } 0 < x \leq 1 \\ -x + 2, & \text{if } 1 < x \leq 2 \\ x - 2, & \text{if } x \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

The plots of p, d and f are given in Figure 2. The difference f is not convex since the slopes $-3, -1, 0, -1, 1$ are not increasing. The quotient q is given as the convex bi-conjugate of f , that is the largest convex function which is less than or equal to f , for all x . Thus, the quotient is given $q(x) = \max(-3x + 1, 1 - x, -0.5x + 1, x - 2)$. The sum $d(x) + q(x)$ is equal to $p(x)$, for all x , except $x \in (0, 2)$. Thus, $r(x) = x + 1$, that is, the form of $p(x)$, for $x \in (0, 2)$.

We call the division *nontrivial* if $q(\mathbf{x}) > -\infty$ and *effective* if $r(\mathbf{x}) \neq p(\mathbf{x})$, for some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. It is easy to see that an effective division is also nontrivial. As shown in the previous example, these notions are not equivalent.

Proposition 3: Assume that p and d are tropical polynomials. If the division of p by d has quotient q and remainder r . Then:

- (a) The division of r by d is not effective.
- (b) The division of p by q has quotient d and remainder r .

Proof See Appendix C.

Remark 2: For the Euclidean division of a positive integer p by a positive integer d with quotient q and remainder r , the notion of nontrivial division corresponds to $q \neq 0$ and effective division to $r < p$. For the division of positive integers, we observe that these notions are equivalent. Furthermore, the converse of (a) is true. Particularly, if for some $\bar{q}, \bar{r} \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds $p = d\bar{q} + \bar{r}$ and the division of r by d is not effective, then \bar{q} is the quotient and \bar{r} the remainder.

On the other hand, for tropical polynomials, the converse of (a) is not true. Particularly, it is possible that for a pair of tropical polynomials p, d there is another pair q, r such that (6) is satisfied, the division of r by d is not effective (or even is trivial), but q, r is not a quotient-remainder pair. For example consider $p(x) = \max(3x, -3x), d(x) = \max(2x, -2x)$ and $q(x) = \max(0, x), r(x) = \max(0, -3x)$. It is easy to see that the division of r by d is trivial.

Consider the set

$$C = \{c \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{Newt}(c^T \mathbf{x} + d(\mathbf{x})) \subset \text{Newt}(p(\mathbf{x}))\}. \quad (9)$$

This set appears also [9], [10], [11] for the case of discrete coefficients. It is not difficult to see that C is a convex polytope. The following proposition shows that the division is non-trivial if and only if $C \neq \emptyset$.

Proposition 4: Let C be the set defined in (9). Then,

- (a) C is equal to the domain of function $l(\cdot)$ (given by (7)). That is,

$$C = \text{dom}(l(\mathbf{a})) = \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n : l(\mathbf{a}) > -\infty\}.$$

- (b) The division is non-trivial if and only if $C \neq \emptyset$
- (c) If the quotient has the form $q(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_q} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x} + \hat{b}_i)$, then $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \in C$, for all i .

Proof See Appendix D.

Corollary 1: Assume that the division of a tropical polynomial $p(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_p} (\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b_i)$ by another tropical polynomial $d(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_d} (\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x} + \tilde{b}_i)$ is nontrivial. Then

- (i) It holds

$$\text{span}\{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{m_d}\} \subset \text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{m_p}\}.$$

- (ii) The quotient $q(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_q} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x} + \hat{b}_i)$ is such that

$$\text{span}\{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{m_q}\} \subset \text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{m_p}\}.$$

Proof: See Appendix E.

Remark 3: Corollary 1 can be used to simplify the division of two tropical polynomials. Particularly, assume that

$$\text{span}\{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{m_d}\} \subset \text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{m_p}\} \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^d.$$

If \mathbf{Q} is a matrix the columns of which represent an orthonormal basis of the subspace $\text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{m_p}\}$, then \mathbf{a}_i can be expressed in terms of a reduced dimension vector \mathbf{a}_i^r as $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{a}_i^r$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i$ similarly in terms of $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i^r$ as $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i = \mathbf{Q}\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i^r$. Then, the division of polynomials p and d can be expressed in terms of reduced dimension polynomials p^r, d^r as $p(\mathbf{x}) = p^r(\mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{x}) = p^r(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}), d(\mathbf{x}) = d^r(\mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{x}) = d^r(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$, where the dimension of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is equal to the rank of \mathbf{Q} .

This observation is certainly useful when the number of terms of the dividend m_p is less than the space dimension d . It will be also used in Section VI-B.

IV. AN EXACT ALGORITHM FOR TROPICAL DIVISION

We now present an algorithm to compute the quotient and remainder of a division. The algorithm uses polyhedral computations. Particularly, we use (8), and its equivalent in terms of the epigraphs (see (34) in the appendix) to compute q .

The input of the algorithm is a pair of tropical polynomials

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_p} (\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b_i), \quad d(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{j=1}^{m_d} (\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_j^T \mathbf{x} + \tilde{b}_j).$$

The first step is to compute a partition of \mathbb{R}^n in polyhedra on which $f(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x}) - d(\mathbf{x})$ is linear. To do so, for each i, j , consider the polyhedron on which the terms i, j attain the maximum in p and d respectively.

$$P_{i,j} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b_i \geq \mathbf{a}_{i'}^T \mathbf{x} + b_{i'}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_j^T \mathbf{x} + \tilde{b}_j \geq \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{j'}^T \mathbf{x} + \tilde{b}_{j'}, i' = 1, \dots, m_p, j' = 1, \dots, m_d\}.$$

Polyhedron $P_{i,j}$ can be compactly written in terms of a matrix $\mathbf{A}^{i,j}$ and a vector $\mathbf{b}^{i,j}$ as

$$P_{i,j} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{A}^{i,j} \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{b}^{i,j}\}.$$

Note that some $P_{i,j}$'s can be empty.

The second step is to compute the polyhedra that represent the epigraph of $f(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x}) - d(\mathbf{x})$ for each $P_{i,j}$. The epigraphs are given by:

$$E_{i,j} = \{(\mathbf{x}, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \mathbf{A}^{i,j} \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{b}^{i,j}, \\ z \geq (\mathbf{a}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_j)^T \mathbf{x} + b_i - \tilde{b}_j\}.$$

For each polyhedron $E_{i,j}$, we compute the corresponding \mathcal{V} -representation, consisting of a set of vertices $V_{i,j}$ and a set of rays $R_{i,j}$, satisfying (4). Note that the epigraph of f is given by $\cup_{i,j} E_{i,j}$.

The epigraph of the quotient q is given by the closed convex hull of the epigraph of f (see (34) in the appendix). Next, we consider the union of vertices $V = \cup_{i,j} V_{i,j}$, and rays $R = \cup_{i,j} R_{i,j}$, and consider the polyhedron E generated by V and R (as in (4)). Due to Proposition 2, E is the epigraph of the quotient $q(\mathbf{x})$. Then, compute the \mathcal{H} -representation of E

$$E = \{(\mathbf{x}, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : [\mathbf{A}^{E,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{a}^{E,z}] [\mathbf{x}^T \ z]^T \geq \mathbf{b}^E\}, \quad (10)$$

for appropriate matrix $\mathbf{A}^{E,\mathbf{x}}$ and vectors $\mathbf{a}^{E,z}, \mathbf{b}^E$. Assume that $E \neq \mathbb{R}^n$. We will prove in Proposition 5 that the components of $\mathbf{a}^{E,z}$ are positive. Thus,

$$E = \left\{ (\mathbf{x}, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : z \geq -\frac{1}{[\mathbf{a}^{E,z}]_l} [\mathbf{A}^{E,\mathbf{x}}]_l \mathbf{x} + [\mathbf{b}^E]_l / [\mathbf{a}^{E,z}]_l, l = 1, \dots, L \right\},$$

where L is the number of rows of $\mathbf{A}^{E,\mathbf{x}}$. Therefore,

$$q(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{l=1}^L \left(-\frac{1}{[\mathbf{a}^{E,z}]_l} [\mathbf{A}^{E,\mathbf{x}}]_l \mathbf{x} + [\mathbf{b}^E]_l / [\mathbf{a}^{E,z}]_l \right). \quad (11)$$




Fig. 3. Illustration of the algorithm applied to Example 1. Function $f(x) = p(x) - d(x)$ is linear on each of the subsets P_1, \dots, P_5 . The epigraphs are generated as follows: E_1 by vertex V_1 and rays R_1 and R_2 , epigraph E_2 by vertices V_1, V_2 and ray R_2 , epigraph E_3 by vertices V_2, V_3 and ray R_2 , epigraph E_4 by vertices V_3, V_4 and ray R_2 , and finally epigraph E_5 by vertex V_4 and rays R_2, R_3 . Their closed convex hull E is generated by vertices V_1, V_2, V_4 and rays R_1, R_3 . The quotient $q(x)$ is computed by the \mathcal{H} -representation of E .

The procedure is illustrated in Figure 3.

Having computed the quotient, we formulate the sum $\tilde{p}(x) = d(x) + q(x)$. For each $P_{i,j}$ we choose a point $x_{i,j}$ in its relative interior, for example

$$x_{i,j} = \frac{1}{|V_{i,j}|} \sum_{v \in V_{i,j}} v + \sum_{w \in R_{i,j}} w. \quad (12)$$

Let I be the set of indices i such that there is an index j satisfying $p(x_{i,j}) > \tilde{p}(x_{i,j})$. Then,

$$r(x) = \bigvee_{i \in I} (a_i^T x + b_i). \quad (13)$$

The computation of the quotient and the remainder is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Exact Polynomial Division

- 0: Input: Tropical Polynomials $p(x)$ and $d(x)$
 - 1: Compute a partition of \mathbb{R}^n into polyhedra $P_{i,j}$, $i = 1, \dots, m_p$, $j = 1, \dots, m_d$, and their interior points $x_{i,j}$ according to (12)
 - 2: Compute the epigraphs $E_{i,j}$
 - 3: For each epigraph, compute the resolution into a set of vertices $V_{i,j}$ and a set of rays $R_{i,j}$, using a representation conversion algorithm
 - 4: Compute the \mathcal{H} -representation of the polyhedron generated by the union of the set of vertices $V = \cup_{i,j} V_{i,j}$, and the union of the set of rays $R = \cup_{i,j} R_{i,j}$, in the form (10)
 - 5: If $L > 0$ then $q(x)$ is given by (11). Otherwise, $q(x) = -\infty$.
 - 6: Compute the set of indices i such that there is a j with $p(x_{i,j}) - d(x_{i,j}) - q(x_{i,j}) > 0$. Compute $r(x)$ according to (13)
 - 7: Return $q(x), r(x)$
-

Proposition 5: If $E \neq \mathbb{R}^n$, then the output of the algorithm is indeed the quotient and the remainder of the division. If




Fig. 4. The linear regions of $f(x, y)$ and $q(x, y)$. The two functions coincide on the bold half-lines. The figure also illustrates the Newton polygons of $p(x, y)$, $d(x, y)$, and $d(x, y) + q(x, y)$.

$E = \mathbb{R}^n$, then the quotient is $q(x) = -\infty$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the remainder is equal to the dividend, i.e., $r = p$.

Proof See Appendix F.

Remark 4: The algorithm involves first computing the resolution of a number of polyhedra and then the computation of the \mathcal{H} -representation of the convex hull of their union. The computational complexity of these operations is exponential on their input size (e.g. [48]). Therefore, we expect that the algorithm will be usable only for small examples.

Example 2: Let us divide the tropical polynomial $p(x, y) = \max(0, 3x+3y, 6x)$, by $d(x, y) = \max(x, x+y, 2x+y)$, using Algorithm 1. The quotient is

$$q(x, y) = \max(1.5x + 1.5y, 3x, 0),$$

and $d(x) + q(x)$ is given by $\max(x, x+y, 2.5x+2.5y, 3.5x+2.5y, 5x+y, 4x)$.

The linearity regions of $f(x, y)$ and $q(x)$ are shown in Figure 4. Furthermore, Figure 4 illustrates the Newton polygons for p, d and $d + q$.

V. APPROXIMATE ALGORITHMS FOR TROPICAL DIVISION

We now present an approximate algorithm for computing the quotient of a tropical division, assuming that the quotient has a predefined maximum number of terms \tilde{m}_q . The algorithm mimics the procedure developed in [33].

The quotient has the form $q(x) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}_q} (\hat{a}_i^T x + \hat{b}_i)$. From the proof of Proposition 2 we know that $q(x)$ is the maximum tropical polynomial function, all the terms of which satisfy $\hat{a}_i^T x + \hat{b}_i \leq f(x)$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We will utilize this property to formulate an optimization problem on a set of sample points $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Given the set of sample points and the corresponding set of the values of function $f(\cdot)$, i.e., $f(x_1), \dots, f(x_N)$, the optimization problem is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{j=1}^N \bigvee_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}_q} (\hat{a}_i^T x_j + \hat{b}_i) \\ & \hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i, i=1, \dots, \tilde{m}_q && \\ & \text{subject to} && \hat{a}_i^T x_j + \hat{b}_i \leq f(x_j), \quad \forall i, j \\ & && \hat{a}_i \in C, \quad i = 1, \dots, \tilde{m}_q \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where C is the set defined in (9). Since C is a polytope, the last constraint in (16) can be written as a set of linear inequalities. The details are presented in subsection V-A.

The algorithm alternates between two phases. Phase 1 partitions the data. Particularly, assuming a set of solutions

$(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i, \hat{b}_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{m}_q$, we partition the samples \mathbf{x}_j into sets $I_1, \dots, I_{\tilde{m}_q}$ with $j \in I_i$, if

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_i \geq \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i'}^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_{i'}, \quad \text{for all } i'. \quad (15)$$

Phase 2, solves the linear optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i, \hat{b}_i, i=1, \dots, \tilde{m}_q}{\text{maximize}} && \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}_q} \sum_{j \in I_i} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_i \\ & \text{subject to} && \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_i \leq f(\mathbf{x}_j), \quad \forall i, j \\ & && \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \in C, \quad i = 1, \dots, \tilde{m}_q \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We then simplify (16) in two ways. First, it may contain redundant inequalities. To remove the redundant inequalities we compute the lower convex hull of the set $\{(\mathbf{x}_j, f(\mathbf{x}_j)) : j = 1, \dots, N\}$ with respect to its last component, and denote by J the set of indices j , for which $(\mathbf{x}_j, f(\mathbf{x}_j))$ belongs to the lower convex hull.

Second, problem (16) decomposes into a set of \tilde{m}_q linear programs

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i, \hat{b}_i}{\text{maximize}} && \mathbf{s}_i^T \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i + N_i \hat{b}_i \\ & \text{subject to} && [(\mathbf{x}_j)^T \ 1] \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \\ \hat{b}_i \end{bmatrix} \leq f(\mathbf{x}_j), \quad j \in J, \\ & && \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \in C \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{s}_i = \sum_{j \in I_i} \mathbf{x}_j$, $N_i = |I_i|$.

The computations are summarized in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Approximate Polynomial Division

- 0: Input: Tropical Polynomials $p(\mathbf{x})$, $d(\mathbf{x})$, the degree of the approximate quotient \tilde{m}_q , the number of sample points N , the maximum number of iterations
 - 1: Compute the inequalities corresponding to set C using the formulas in Appendix V-A
 - 2: Sample the points \mathbf{x}_j , for $j = 1, \dots, N$, and compute the values of $f(\mathbf{x}_j) = p(\mathbf{x}_j) - d(\mathbf{x}_j)$
 - 3: Compute the lower convex hull of the set $\{(\mathbf{x}_j, f(\mathbf{x}_j)) : j = 1, \dots, N\}$, and use the samples belonging to it to formulate the first constraint in (16)
 - 4: Initialize the partition $I_1, \dots, I_{\tilde{m}_q}$
 - 5: Solve Problems (17), for all i
 - 6: Compute the partitions I_i that satisfy (15)
 - 7: If the number of iterations has not exceeded the maximum number of iterations go to Step 5
 - 8: Return $\hat{q}(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}_q} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x} + \hat{b}_i$,
-

We then examine the quality of approximation of $p(\mathbf{x})$ by $d(\mathbf{x}) + q_t(\mathbf{x})$ on the sample set given by

$$e(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N [p(\mathbf{x}_j) - d(\mathbf{x}_j) - q_t(\mathbf{x}_j)], \quad (18)$$

where q_t is the quotient computed after t steps of the algorithm. The following proposition shows that the quality of approximation improves as the number of steps increases.

Proposition 6: The quantity $e(t)$ is nonnegative and non-increasing with respect to t .

Proof See Appendix G.

Remark 5: In practice some issues with Algorithm 1 may arise. Some of the classes I_i may end up empty. In this case, we may split another existing class randomly. Furthermore, we expect the algorithm to converge to a local optimum. We may use a multiple start method to avoid bad local optima.

Remark 6: Let us comment about the relationship between Algorithm 2 and [33]. Inspired by [33], Algorithm 2 partitions the data in several clusters. The major difference is that in Algorithm 2 we use the sharper lower linear approximation of each class of data subject to the constraint that this approximation does not exceed any sample point of any class. Thus, instead of alternating between clustering and linear regression, we alternate between clustering and linear programming.

Another related work is [49] which studies the problem of computing a convex under-approximation for a given dataset by a piecewise linear function. The algorithm uses an iterative linear programming technique and has two phases. At phase one of each iteration, it considers a subset of the data set and minimizes the maximum approximation error for this subset, using a piecewise linear function with a number of terms equal to the iteration count. At phase two, it adds to this subset the data point that maximizes the approximation error. Then, it moves to the next iteration.

A. The Linear Constraints for Set C

We next compute a set of linear inequalities describing set C . Let the extreme points of $\text{Newt}(p)$ be $\mathbf{a}_{e,1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{e,k}$. Then, $\hat{\mathbf{a}} \in C$ if and only if $\hat{\mathbf{a}} + \text{Newt}(d(\mathbf{x})) \subset \text{Newt}(p(\mathbf{x}))$. That is,

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_j \in \text{conv}\{\mathbf{a}_{e,1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{e,k}\},$$

for all j . Equivalently if there are auxiliary variables $\lambda_{j,l}$, such that

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_j = \sum_{l=1}^k \mathbf{a}_{e,l} \lambda_{j,l}, \quad \lambda_{j,l} \geq 0, \quad \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_{j,l} = 1$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, m_d$, $l = 1, \dots, k$.

Problem (17) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i, \hat{b}_i, \lambda}{\text{maximize}} && \mathbf{s}_i^T \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i + N_i \hat{b}_i \\ & \text{subject to} && [(\mathbf{x}_j)^T \ 1] \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \\ \hat{b}_i \end{bmatrix} \leq f(\mathbf{x}_j), \quad j \in J \\ & && \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_j = \sum_{l=1}^k \mathbf{a}_{e,l} \lambda_{j,l}, \\ & && \lambda_{j,l} \geq 0 \\ & && \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_{j,l} = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

VI. DIVISION FOR COMPOSITE POLYNOMIALS

In this section, we present some analytical results and some algorithms for dividing tropical polynomials that are sums or maxima of simpler ones.

A. General Properties

We will use $Q(p, d)$ and $R(p, d)$ to denote the quotient and remainder of the division of a tropical polynomial p by another tropical polynomial d .

Proposition 7: The following inequalities hold

$$Q(p_1 + p_2, d) \geq Q(p_1, d) + Q(p_2, d) + d, \quad (20)$$

$$Q(p_1 \vee p_2, d) \geq Q(p_1, d) \vee Q(p_2, d), \quad (21)$$

$$Q(p, d_1 + d_2) \geq Q(p, d_1) + Q(p, d_2) - p, \quad (22)$$

$$Q(p, d_1 \vee d_2) \geq Q(p, d_1) \wedge Q(p, d_2). \quad (23)$$

Furthermore, if $R(p_1, d) = R(p_2, d) = -\infty$, then (20),(21),(22) hold as equalities. Finally, if s is a monomial, i.e., it has the form $s(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b$, then

$$Q(p + s, d) = Q(p, d) + s = Q(p, d - s), \quad (24)$$

Proof See Appendix H.

Remark 7: Assume that polynomial d is fixed. Inequality (21) implies that function $Q(\cdot, d)$ is nondecreasing. If $d(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then function $Q(\cdot, d)$ is also super-additive.

In the following we call a tropical polynomial described as a summation of other tropical polynomials as composite. Furthermore, we refer to a tropical polynomial in the form 1 as simple¹.

B. Dividing a Composite Polynomial by a Simple

In the following we propose algorithms to approximately divide a composite polynomial $p(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\nu=1}^N p^\nu(\mathbf{x})$ or $p(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{\nu=1}^N p^\nu(\mathbf{x})$ by another polynomial $d(\mathbf{x})$. The computation of the value of the composite polynomial $p(\mathbf{x})$ is trivial, provided the values of the simpler polynomials $p^\nu(\mathbf{x})$. Thus, the only difficulty in order to apply Algorithm 2 is the computation of the Newton polytope $\text{Newt}(p)$.

It is convenient to consider the Newton polytopes $\text{Newt}(p^\nu)$ in terms of an extended description. Particularly, assume matrices $\mathbf{A}^\nu, \mathbf{F}^\nu$, and vectors β^ν of appropriate dimensions, such that

$$\text{Newt}(p^\nu) = \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{F}^\nu \alpha^\nu, \mathbf{A}^\nu \alpha^\nu \leq \beta_\nu\}. \quad (25)$$

For $p(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\nu=1}^N p^\nu(\mathbf{x})$, the Newton polytope is given by

$$\text{Newt}(p) = \{\mathbf{F}^1 \alpha^1 + \dots + \mathbf{F}^N \alpha^N : \mathbf{A}^\nu \alpha^\nu \leq \beta_\nu, \nu = 1, \dots, N\},$$

which corresponds to the Minkowski sum $\text{Newt}(p^1) \oplus \dots \oplus \text{Newt}(p^N)$. For $p(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{\nu=1}^N p^\nu(\mathbf{x})$, the Newton polytope is given by

$$\text{Newt}(p) = \{\mathbf{F}^1 \alpha^1 + \dots + \mathbf{F}^N \alpha^N : \exists \lambda^\nu \geq 0, \nu = 1, \dots, N, \mathbf{A}^\nu \alpha^\nu \leq \beta_\nu \lambda^\nu, \sum_{\nu=1}^N \lambda^\nu = 1\}.$$

¹These notions refer to the representation of the tropical polynomials, and not to whether or not they can be written as a sum of other polynomials. That is, it is possible that a tropical polynomial with a simple representation (in the form (1)), can be factorized and written in a composite form.

C. Neural Networks As Differences of Composite Polynomials

We then present some examples of neural networks represented as the difference of two composite tropical polynomials.

Example 3 (Single hidden layer ReLU network): This example follows [9]. Consider a neural network with n inputs, a single hidden layer with m_p neurons and ReLU activation functions, and a single linear output neuron. The output of the ν -th neuron of the hidden layer is:

$$z_\nu = \max(\mathbf{w}_\nu^T \mathbf{x} + \beta_\nu, 0)$$

The output y can be written as

$$y = \sum_{\nu=1}^{N_1} w_\nu^{2+} z_\nu - \sum_{\nu=N_1+1}^N w_\nu^{2-} z_\nu + \beta^2,$$

where $N_1 + N_2 = N$, and N_1, N_2 are the number of neurons that have positive weight and negative weights respectively. Without loss of generality, we assume that the neurons are ordered such that the weights of the first neurons to be positive and the weights of the last negative. The output of the neural network can be expressed as the difference of two tropical polynomials $p_1(\mathbf{x}), p_2(\mathbf{x})$, plus a constant term. Each of these tropical polynomials is written as the sum of simpler ones

$$\begin{aligned} p_1(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\nu=1}^{N_1} \max(w_\nu^{2+} \mathbf{w}_\nu^T \mathbf{x} + w_\nu^{2+} \beta_\nu, 0) \\ &= \sum_{\nu=1}^{N_1} \max((\mathbf{a}_1^\nu)^T \mathbf{x} + b_\nu, 0) \\ p_2(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\nu=N_1+1}^N \max(w_\nu^{2-} \mathbf{w}_\nu^T \mathbf{x} + w_\nu^{2-} \beta_\nu, 0) \\ &= \sum_{\nu=N_1+1}^N \max((\mathbf{a}_2^\nu)^T \mathbf{x} + b_\nu, 0) \end{aligned}$$

Note that p_1, p_2 , expressed in their canonical form (1), can have a large number of terms, corresponding to linear regions of tropical polynomial functions p_1, p_2 (for an enumeration of the linear regions see [3], [4]).

The Newton polytope of the simple tropical polynomial $\max((\mathbf{a}_1^\nu)^T \mathbf{x} + b_\nu, 0)$ is the line segment $[0, \mathbf{a}_1^\nu]$ in the d -dimensional space. This polytope is equivalently described in the form (25) as $\text{Newt}(p^\nu) = \{\alpha^\nu \mathbf{a}_1^\nu : 0 \leq \alpha^\nu \leq 1\}$. Thus, the Newton polytope of p_1 is given by

$$\text{Newt}(p_1) = \{\alpha^1 \mathbf{a}_1^1 + \dots + \alpha^1 \mathbf{a}_1^{n_1} : 0 \leq \alpha^\nu \leq 1\},$$

which is a zonotope (see also [4]).

The constraint $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \in C$ of problem (17) becomes

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_j = \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbf{a}^l \lambda_{j,l}, \quad 0 \leq \lambda_{j,l} \leq 1.$$

Finally, note that if the number of neurons of the hidden layer N_1, N_2 is smaller than the input dimension n , then the tropical polynomials p_1, p_2 can be expressed in dimensions N_1, N_2 .

Example 4 (Multi-class to binary classification with a ReLU network): Assume a neural network with a single ReLU hidden

layer with N units and a softmax output layer with K units trained to classify samples to K classes. The equations are the following

$$z_\nu^1 = \max((\mathbf{w}_\nu^1)^T \mathbf{x} + b_\nu^1, 0), \quad z_k^2 = (\mathbf{w}_k^2)^T \mathbf{z}^1, \quad y_k = \frac{e^{z_k^2}}{\sum_{k'} e^{z_{k'}^2}}$$

We then assume, that for a given set of samples, we know that the correct class is either i_1 or i_2 . The neural network can be simply reduced for binary classification, substituting the last layer with a single neuron with sigmoid activation with output given by

$$y = \sigma((\mathbf{w}_{i_1}^2 - \mathbf{w}_{i_2}^2)^T \mathbf{z}^2 + \beta^2),$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid activation function, i.e. $\sigma(z) = 1/(1 + e^{-z})$. Note that this transformation corresponds to the application of Bayes' rule with prior probability of 1/2 for classes i_1, i_2 , and likelihoods given by the output of the initial neural network.

The output of the new network can be represented as a difference of two tropical polynomials as in the previous example.

Example 5 (Representing a multi-class network as a vector of tropical polynomials): Consider a neural network with a single-hidden layer having ReLU activations and a linear output layer with K neurons, followed by softmax. Each output (before the softmax) z_k^2 can be expressed as a difference of two tropical polynomials plus a constant term

$$z_k^2 = p_k^+(\mathbf{x}) - p_k^-(\mathbf{x}) + b_k.$$

The output is given by

$$y_k = \frac{e^{z_k^2}}{\sum_{k'} e^{z_{k'}^2}}.$$

Let us add to each of z_k^2 's the sum of all negative polynomials. We get the tropical polynomials

$$\tilde{z}_k^2 = p_k^+(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{k' \neq k} p_{k'}^-(\mathbf{x}) + b_k. \quad (26)$$

Then, it is easy to see that

$$y_k = \frac{e^{\tilde{z}_k^2}}{\sum_{k'} e^{\tilde{z}_{k'}^2}}.$$

Finally, denoting by $z_i^1, i = 1, \dots, M$ the output of the hidden layer before the ReLU, then \tilde{z}_k^2 can be written in the form

$$\tilde{z}_k^2 = \sum_{i=1}^M \bar{w}_{k,i} \max(z_i^1, 0), \quad (27)$$

for appropriate non-negative constants $\bar{w}_{k,i}$.

Remark 8: In the tropical framework, the difference of two polynomials is considered as a tropical rational function. The addition of all the negative polynomials (denominators) corresponds to making the tropical fractions have the same denominator.

D. Division Algorithm for Composite Quotient

We then describe an algorithm to divide a composite tropical polynomial $p(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \max(\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b_i, 0)$, where n is the dimension of the underlying space, by the zero polynomial $d(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ and search for a quotient in the form $q(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m_q} \max(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x} + \hat{b}_i, 0)$. Such polynomials occur in single hidden layer ReLU neural networks if the number of neurons in the hidden layer is smaller than the space dimension, using a dimensionality reduction transformation (e.g., QR).

We assume that the vectors \mathbf{a}_i are linearly independent. Denote by \mathbf{A} the square matrix of vectors \mathbf{a}_i , i.e., $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1 \dots \mathbf{a}_n]$, and by \mathbf{B} the vector of b_i , i.e., $\mathbf{B} = [b_1 \dots b_n]^T$.

The algorithm is based on the fact that the quotient q is the largest tropical polynomial function which is less than or equal to p . Consider a set of sample points x^1, \dots, x^N . Then the problem of maximizing q can be approximated by

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^{m_q} \max(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x}^j + \hat{b}_i, 0) \\ & \text{subject to} && q(\mathbf{x}) \leq p(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \end{aligned}, \quad (28)$$

The following proposition reformulates the constraint $q(\mathbf{x}) \leq p(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in terms of the variables $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i, \hat{b}_i, i = 1, \dots, m_q$.

Proposition 8: Let $p(\mathbf{x}), q(\mathbf{x})$ as above. Then, $q(\mathbf{x}) \leq p(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if

$$\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{A}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i, \quad \mathbf{A}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_q} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \leq \mathbf{1}, \quad \hat{b}_i \leq \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \quad (29)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m_q$, where $\mathbf{0}$ is the vector having all its entries equal to zero and $\mathbf{1}$ all entries equal to one.

Phase 1: For the set of sample points $\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^N$ we compute $y_{i,j} = \chi_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x}^j + \hat{b}_i \geq 0}$, where χ is the indicator function (i.e., $\chi_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x}^j + \hat{b}_i \geq 0} = 1$ if $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x}^j + \hat{b}_i \geq 0$ and 0 otherwise). Based on the values of $y_{i,j}$, we determine the local form of the objective in (28). Then, we compute \mathbf{c}_1 and \mathbf{c}_2 as

$$\left[\sum_{j=1}^N y_{1,j} \mathbf{x}_j^T \dots \sum_{j=1}^N y_{m_{\hat{q}},j} \mathbf{x}_j^T \right], \left[\sum_{j=1}^N y_{1,j} \dots \sum_{j=1}^N y_{m_{\hat{q}},j} \right].$$

Phase 2: We solve the linear programming problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \mathbf{c}_1 \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{m_{\hat{q}}} \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{c}_2 \begin{bmatrix} \hat{b}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \hat{b}_{m_{\hat{q}}} \end{bmatrix} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{A}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i, \quad \hat{b}_i \leq \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \\ & && \mathbf{A}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_q} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \leq \mathbf{1}, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

and denote its solution by $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^{\text{new}}, \hat{b}_i^{\text{new}}$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i & \leftarrow (1 - \rho) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^{\text{new}}, \\ \hat{b}_i & \leftarrow (1 - \rho) \hat{b}_i + \hat{b}_i^{\text{new}}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and go to Phase 1.

Remark 9: The algorithm corresponds to the application of Frank–Wolfe (conditional gradient) method (see, e.g., [50]) to (28).

Let us note that this linear programming problem (30) is analytically solvable. Indeed, observing that the coefficients of \hat{b}_i 's are nonnegative, we can use the second inequality to compute the optimal value of \hat{b}_i 's. Substituting back to the problem, we end up with n independent linear programs. The feasible set of each of these problems has $\tilde{m}_q + 1$ vertices. We obtain the optimal solution of the problem comparing the value of the linear objective on these vertices.

Remark 10: Let us comment on the difference of the algorithm of this subsection with the algorithm of Subsection VI-B. The algorithm of this subsection provides a solution a composite tropical polynomial, which corresponds to a (compressed) neural network with ReLU activations, while the algorithm of Subsection VI-B provides maxout solutions.

E. Dividing a Vector of Composite Polynomials

In this subsection, we propose a simplified algorithm for dividing a vector of tropical polynomials by the zero polynomial. The motivation comes from Example 5. Consider a set of tropical polynomials in the form (27).

We then describe a simplified version of the the linear optimization part of Algorithm 2. Consider a set of sample points $z^1(1), \dots, z^1(N)$. Observe that, with this formulation, both constraints (17) are satisfied by any $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_k$, such that its i -th component $\hat{a}_{i,k}$ satisfies $0 \leq \hat{a}_{i,k} \leq \bar{w}_{i,k}$ and $\hat{b}_k = 0$. Then, the solution of (17), for the l -th term of the division of the k -th polynomial is approximated by the optimal solution of

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_k^l}{\text{maximize}} && \mathbf{s}_{l,k}^T \hat{\mathbf{a}}_k^l \\ & \text{subject to} && 0 \leq \hat{a}_{i,k}^l \leq \bar{w}_{i,k}, \quad i = 1, \dots, M \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The solution of (32) is given by:

$$\hat{a}_{i,k}^l = \begin{cases} \bar{w}_{i,k} & \text{if } s_{i,l,k} > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

VII. NUMERICAL RESULTS

This section, presents some numerical examples for the tropical division algorithms. First, we present some simple examples to build some intuition for the behaviour of Algorithm 2. Then, some applications of tropical division to the compression of neural networks are presented. We focus on MNIST handwritten and CIFAR-10 datasets.

A. Numerical Examples for Algorithm 2

As a first example, we present the application of Algorithm 2 to the tropical polynomial division of Example 2. We choose 200 sample points distributed according to the normal distribution with unit variance $\mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$. The algorithm converges in two steps and gives an approximate solution².

$$\hat{q}(x, y) = \max(1.5038x + 1.4962y + 0.0182, \\ 0.0003x + 0.0288, 3x + 0.0241),$$

²The code for the numerical experiments is available online at <https://github.com/jkordonis/TropicalML>




Fig. 5. The total error e for executions of Algorithm 2, for different initial partitions.




Fig. 6. The total error e for divisions having different number of terms for the approximate quotient

which is very close to the actual quotient (see Example 2). Running again the algorithm with larger sample sizes we conclude that increasing the number of sample points reduces the error.

As a second example we divide a random tropical polynomial with $m_p = 128$ terms in $n = 3$ dimensions with another having $m_d = 2$ terms. First, we run Algorithm 2, for $\tilde{m}_q = 5$, with multiple initial partitions. The evolution of the error for the several runs is shown in Figure 5. The results illustrate the need for a multi-start method. Indeed, for different random initial partitions the algorithm converges to different local minima. The quality of the approximation e after 10 steps of the algorithm is given in Figure 6 for a varying number of terms \tilde{m}_q . This result shows that we may derive a good approximation of the division using a small number of terms (e.g. 8).

B. MNIST Dataset

This example considers the MNIST handwritten digits data set. It consists of 60000 training examples and 10000 test examples of 28×28 gray scale images, that represent digits 0–9. We start with a single hidden layer neural network with 100 hidden units with ReLU activations and 10 softmax output units. The network is trained in the original training data set using standard techniques (Adam optimizer on cross-entropy loss, batch size of 128). We then design a smaller network discriminating between digits 3 and 5. The input space has $28 \cdot 28 = 784$ dimensions.

We first use the technique described in Example 4 to reduce the output layer of the original network to a single neuron. Then, using the technique described in Example 3, we express

the output (before the sigmoid) as the difference of two tropical polynomials. These polynomials are expressed as the summation of 100 terms in the form $\max(\alpha_l^\nu \mathbf{x}, 0)$, where $l = 1, 2$. We then apply a reduced QR decomposition to the matrices $\mathbf{A}_1 = [\alpha_1^1 \dots, \alpha_1^{100}]$ and $\mathbf{A}_2 = [\alpha_2^1 \dots, \alpha_2^{100}]$, writing them as $\mathbf{A}_1 = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{A}_1^r$ and $\mathbf{A}_2 = \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{A}_2^r$. The \mathbf{A}_l^r matrices have as columns $\alpha_l^{r,\nu}$, i.e., an expression of the vectors α_l^ν in the subspace of their span. For each polynomial the input has been transformed as $\mathbf{x}_l = \mathbf{Q}_l^T \mathbf{x}$ (recall Remark 3).

We divide each of these polynomials with the zero polynomial $d = 0$, applying two different variants of the Algorithm 2. In both cases, we use as sample points the first 200 training points. The first variant (modification of Section VI-B), the approximate quotients have the form $q_l(\mathbf{x}_l) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}_q} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^l \mathbf{x}_l + \hat{b}_i^l)$, $l = 1, 2$. Then, the output of the original network can be approximated as

$$y^{\text{appr}} = \sigma(q_1(\mathbf{Q}_1^T \mathbf{x}) - q_2(\mathbf{Q}_2^T \mathbf{x}) + \beta^2)$$

The computation of the approximate output corresponds to a neural network an input layer, a hidden layer with two maxout units, a linear layer with a single unit (computing the difference of the two maxout units) and an output layer with a single sigmoid unit.

The second variant, uses approximates the quotients in the form $\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}_q} \max(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x} + \hat{b}_i, 0)$ and uses the modification of subsection VI-D. The compressed network in this case is simply a smaller ReLU network.

Table I presents the error rate on the test set for the original neural network, as well as the computed maxout and ReLU networks. We compare the results when each maxout unit has 3, 5, and 10 terms respectively and each of the tropical polynomials (positive and negative) has 3, 5, and 10 ReLU units. It also presents the percentage of parameters that remain after the compression. As a baseline for comparison, we use structured L1 pruning without retraining (see e.g. [51]). That is, this method deletes the neurons having weights with small L1 norm. We compare reduced neural networks with the same number of parameters. We present two results, the binary comparison of digits 3 and 5 and an average of the $45 = 10 \cdot 9/2$ different binary comparisons.

The performance of the algorithms is shown in Figure 7. We observe that the algorithm of Section VI-B produce superior results compared to the algorithm of Section VI-D. Furthermore, both algorithms outperform L1 structured pruning, especially in the high compression regime. Let us note that the linear programming problem of Section VI-D is analytically solvable, and thus the corresponding algorithm is faster.

Remark 11: It is worth noting substituting \mathbf{x}_l into q_l , we get

$$q_1(\mathbf{Q}_1^T \mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}_q} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^l \mathbf{Q}_1^T \mathbf{x} + \hat{b}_i^l).$$

Thus we do not need to store $\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2$ but only the vectors $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^l \mathbf{Q}_l^T$, and the scalars \hat{b}_i^l, β^2 , for $l = 1, 2$ and $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{m}_q$.




Fig. 7. The average error rate of the compressed networks for the binary MNIST classification, compared with L1 structured pruning. Both techniques lead to better accuracies compared to L1 pruning. Furthermore, maxout networks clearly outperform both the L1 structured pruning and the ReLU compressed network, especially in the large compression regime.

Network.	Orig. 2 cl.	$\tilde{m}_q = 7$	$\tilde{m}_q = 5$	$\tilde{m}_q = 3$
Err. L1 Avg.	0.4 ± 0.25%	9.27 ± 10.53%	13.76 ± 11.46%	21.37 ± 13.84%
Err. Maxout. Avg.	0.4 ± 0.25%	0.87 ± 0.63%	0.89 ± 0.63%	1.1 ± 0.75%
Err. ReLU. Avg.	0.4 ± 0.25%	0.92 ± 0.65%	1.17 ± 0.85%	1.25 ± 1.26%
Err. L1 3-5	0.79%	4.83%	16.35%	17.98%
Err. Maxout. 3-5	1.05%	2.05%	1.84%	2.21%
Err. ReLU. 3-5	1.05%	2.05%	2.68%	3.83%
# Param.	77001	15381	7691	4615
% of Param. Remaining	100%	20%	10%	6%

TABLE I

Results for the MNIST dataset. Error rate of the original network and the reduced networks. Err. Maxout represents the error rate for the reduced networks obtained using the tropical division algorithm of Section VI-B, Err. ReLU, the error of the network obtained using the tropical division algorithm of Section VI-D, and Err. L1 the error rate of with the L1 structured pruning algorithm. The error rates for the 3-5 binary comparison and the average over the 45 binary comparisons are presented.

Remark 12: Let us note that for computing the reduced networks, we used only the first 200 samples of the training data.

In the following, we continue exploring the algorithm of Section VI-B to more complex examples.

C. CIFAR-10 Dataset-Binary

This example concerns CIFAR-10 dataset which contains small (32×32) color images. The training set consists of 50000 images of 10 classes (5000 samples for each class) and the test set of 10000 images (1000 samples per class). We first train a VGG-like network [52], having three blocks consisting of two convolution layers with ReLU activation followed by a 2×2 max-pooling layer with padding, a dense layer with 1024 neurons, and an output layer with 10 neurons. The convolution layers in the first, second, and third block have 32, 64, and 128 neurons, respectively. The network was trained using standard techniques (Adam optimizer for the cross-entropy loss, batch normalization and dropout for regularization and data augmentation). Let us note that the input of the dense layer has dimension $4 \cdot 4 \cdot 128 = 2048$.

We then design a simplified neural network discriminating between pairs of classes (e.g., “Automobile” and “Truck”).

To do so, we approximate the dense layer with 1024 neurons using the techniques of the previous section. Particularly, using the technique of Example 4 we describe the output of the neural network as the difference of two tropical polynomials in 2048 dimensions. These polynomials are then divided by the zero polynomial applying the Algorithm 2, with the modification of Section VI-B, and using as sample points the first 500 training points.

Table II presents the error rate on the test set when the maxout units on the dense layer have 3, and 5 terms respectively. Three tests results are presented: on pairs Automobile-Truck (A-T), Cat-Dog (C-D) and the average of the $45=9 \cdot 10/2$ possible binary comparisons. The results obtained with the tropical division algorithm are compared with the L1 structured pruning. Table II also presents the number of parameters of the dense layer of the networks. We observe that the dense layer can be compressed to less than 1% of its original size with minimum performance loss.

Network	Orig. 2 classes	$\tilde{m}_q = 5$	$\tilde{m}_q = 3$
Err. L1 A-T	4.04%	25.8%	46.45%
Err. Div. A-T	4.05%	4.6%	4.4%
Err. L1 C-D	13.7%	49.3%	50%
Err. Div. C-D	13.7%	15.4%	16.85%
Err. L1 Avg.	$2.74 \pm 2.57\%$	$43.45 \pm 10.57\%$	$43.62 \pm 10.61\%$
Err. Div. Avg.	$2.74 \pm 2.57\%$	$3.85 \pm 3.16\%$	$4.06 \pm 3.37\%$
# Param.	$2.1 \cdot 10^6$	$2 \cdot 10^4$	$1.2 \cdot 10^4$
% of Param. Remaining	100%	0.95%	0.57%

TABLE II

Results for the CIFAR-10 dataset. Error rate of the original network, the reduced maxout networks and the reduced networks obtained using the L1 structured pruning algorithm. We present the Automobile vs Truck case, the Cat vs Dog case, and the average of the $45 = 10 \cdot 9/2$ different binary comparisons. The results are indexed using A-T, C-D, and Avg.

Remark 13: The proposed scheme is very competitive for the large compression regime, that is, in the case where there are very few parameters remaining. Furthermore, it can be performed assuming access to a small portion of the training data (500 out of 50000).

D. CIFAR-10 Multiclass

We then compress the multi-class neural network trained in the previous subsection for the CIFAR-10 dataset. As the input to the compression algorithm, we consider the output of the convolutional part of the neural network with dimension 2048.

We first represent the logits (the output before the softmax) as a vector of tropical polynomials using (26) in Example 5. We then simplify each of the tropical polynomials using the simplified algorithm of Section VI-E and a random sample of 500 training points. The results are summarized in Table III. Additionally, we present an improved prediction scheme, where the $K \times \tilde{m}_q$ values $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_k^l)^T \mathbf{z}^1$, with $k = 1, \dots, K$ and $l = 1, \dots, \tilde{m}_q$ are fed to a small single hidden layer ReLU neural network with 100 units. We refer to this small neural network as head.

Note that the additional parameters for the improved prediction are very few. Indeed for the case of $\tilde{m}_q = 3, 5, 7$ we have 4110, 6110 and 8110 parameters respectively.

Network	Original	$\tilde{m}_q = 7$	$\tilde{m}_q = 5$	$\tilde{m}_q = 3$
Error L1	14.18%	45%	57.3%	71.7%
Error Div.	14.18%	$41 \pm 1.8\%$	$40.1 \pm 1.7\%$	$42.5 \pm 2\%$
Err. Div. Improved	14.18%	$26.6 \pm 0.3\%$	$26.4 \pm 0.3\%$	$28.1 \pm 0.1\%$
# Param.	$2.1 \cdot 10^6$	$1.4 \cdot 10^5$	10^5	$6.6 \cdot 10^4$
% of Param. Remaining	100%	7.32%	5.24%	3.16%

TABLE III

Results for the compression on the CIFAR-10 dataset. Average error rates for multiple executions. Comparison of the original division algorithm, the improved division algorithm and the L1 pruning. The number of parameters include also the parameters of the head.




Fig. 8. The structure of the proposed reduced network. Each pink box consists of linear neurons obtained by successive implementations of the division algorithm.

We observe again that the division algorithm works well on the large compression regime. Furthermore, in this example there is no improvement when we use more terms in the quotient polynomials. This is probably due to stacking in local optima.

We then exploit the good behaviour of the binary classification algorithm and apply it to the multi-class problem. To do so, we use a subset of the tropical polynomials obtained for binary classification. In each binary comparison, the division algorithm gives two tropical polynomials and the $9 \times 10/2 = 45$ binary comparisons give a total of 90 tropical polynomials. The value of a subset of the tropical polynomials is fed to a single hidden layer network with ReLU activations, as described in Figure 8.

Figure 9 presents the error of the compressed networks obtained using the multiple binary division algorithm of the previous paragraph. To produce these results we used a random set of m tropical polynomials with $m = 10, 20, 40, 60$.

We observe that the proposed method works better than L1-structured pruning, when the number of remaining parameters is small.

Remark 14: Note that in all the examples, the tropical division compression algorithms used only a small subset of the training data. This can be useful when simplifying a network where only parts of the training dataset are available.

Remark 15: An interesting point of future research is to investigate whether producing additional sample points with the usual data augmentation techniques improves the final result.




Fig. 9. The error rate of the compressed neural networks obtained using the multiple division algorithm. The blue and yellow lines use divisions with $\tilde{m}_q = 3$ and $\tilde{m}_q = 5$, respectively. The horizontal axis represents the percentage of the remaining parameters. Finally, the green line corresponds to using random vectors instead of the quotients.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This work proposed a new framework for tropical polynomial division and its application to neural networks. We showed the existence of a unique quotient-remainder pair and characterized the quotient as the convex bi-conjugate of the difference of the dividend from the divisor. This characterization led to an exact algorithm based on polyhedral geometry. We also proposed an approximate algorithm based on the alternation between clustering and linear programming. We then focused on dividing composite tropical polynomials and proposed two modified algorithms, one producing simple quotients and the other composite. Finally, we applied tropical polynomial division techniques to simplify neural networks with ReLU activations. The resulting neural networks have either maxout or ReLU activations, depending on the division algorithm chosen. The results are promising and compare favorably with a simple baseline (L1 pruning).

There are several directions for future research. First, we may combine L1 regularization to the problem (19) to induce sparse solutions and improve further neural network compression. Another direction is to study compression problems for neural networks with many outputs, using a single division. A possible tool in this direction is the Cayley trick [53], [54]. Finally, the study of alternative optimization algorithms is of certain interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors are grateful to Dr. George Retsinas for his valuable suggestions and comments.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Proposition 1

The proof follows closely the proof of Proposition 3.1.6 in [39]. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} p_i(x) &= \max_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Newt}(p_i)} \{[\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{1}][\mathbf{a}^T \text{ENF}_{p_i}(\mathbf{a})]^T\} \\ &= \max_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{[\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{1}][\mathbf{a}^T \text{ENF}_{p_i}(\mathbf{a})]^T\}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Which implies that if $\text{ENF}_{p_1}(\mathbf{a}) \leq \text{ENF}_{p_2}(\mathbf{a})$ then $p_1(\mathbf{x}) \leq p_2(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. On the other hand, assume that $p_1(\mathbf{x}) \leq p_2(\mathbf{x})$, and that for some \mathbf{a}_0 it holds $\text{ENF}_{p_1}(\mathbf{a}_0) > \text{ENF}_{p_2}(\mathbf{a}_0)$. Then, the point $[\mathbf{a}_0^T \text{ENF}_{p_1}(\mathbf{a}_0)]$ does not belong to the convex set $C = \{[\mathbf{a}^T z] \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : z \leq \text{ENF}_{p_2}(\mathbf{a})\}$. Thus, there is a $[\mathbf{c}_x^T \ c_z] \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that $\mathbf{c}_x^T \mathbf{a}_0 + c_z \text{ENF}_{p_1}(\mathbf{a}_0) > \mathbf{c}_x^T \mathbf{a} + c_z z$, for all $[\mathbf{a}^T z] \in C$. Since C is unbounded below, $c_z > 0$. Furthermore, since $[\mathbf{a}^T \text{ENF}_{p_2}(\mathbf{a})] \in C$ it holds

$$\mathbf{a}_0^T \mathbf{x}_0 + \text{ENF}_{p_1}(\mathbf{a}_0) > \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_0 + \text{ENF}_{p_2}(\mathbf{a}),$$

for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{c}_x/c_z$. Taking the maximum with respect to \mathbf{a} and using (33) in both sides we have:

$$\begin{aligned} p_1(\mathbf{x}_0) &\geq \mathbf{a}_0^T \mathbf{x}_0 + \text{ENF}_{p_1}(\mathbf{a}_0) > \max_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_0 + \text{ENF}_{p_2}(\mathbf{a})\} \\ &= p_2(\mathbf{x}_0), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

B. Proof of Proposition 2

It is not difficult to see that if $\tilde{q}(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_q} (\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x} + \tilde{b}_i)$, and \tilde{q} satisfies (5), then $\tilde{q}(\mathbf{x}) \leq q(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Indeed, since

$$\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x} + \tilde{b}_i \leq \tilde{q}(\mathbf{x}) \leq p(\mathbf{x}) - d(\mathbf{x}),$$

it holds $\tilde{b}_i \leq l(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i)$. Thus,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x} + \tilde{b}_i \leq \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x} + l(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i) \leq q(\mathbf{x}).$$

Hence, $\tilde{q}(\mathbf{x}) \leq q(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

To prove that q is a quotient, it remains to show that it is a tropical polynomial. The epigraph of q is the closed convex hull of the epigraph of f [44]

$$\text{epi}(q) = \overline{\text{conv}(\text{epi}(f))}. \quad (34)$$

On the other hand, f is a piecewise linear function. Thus, its epigraph is a union of a finite number of convex polyhedra. Indeed if A_1, \dots, A_{m_f} its linear regions (i.e., intersections of linear regions of p and d) then A_i , $i = 1, \dots, m_f$ are convex polyhedra and

$$\text{epi}(f) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_f} \{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \mathbf{x} \in A_i, t \geq f(\mathbf{x})\}.$$

Observe that $\text{epi}(q)$ is a convex polyhedron and q is a piecewise linear convex function. Thus, q is a tropical polynomial. From the definition it is obvious that the quotient is unique.

Let q be the quotient and assume that for some tropical polynomial \tilde{r} it holds

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = (q(\mathbf{x}) + d(\mathbf{x})) \vee \tilde{r}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Assume that for some point \mathbf{x}_0 it holds $p(\mathbf{x}_0) > d(\mathbf{x}_0) + q(\mathbf{x}_0)$ and that p has the linear form $\mathbf{a}_{i_0}^T \mathbf{x} + b_{i_0}$ in a neighborhood of \mathbf{x}_0 . Then, $\tilde{r}(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x})$ in this neighborhood. Furthermore, since \tilde{r} is convex, we have

$$\tilde{r}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \bigvee_{i \in I} \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{x} + b_i = r(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $I = \{i \in \{1, \dots, m_p\} : \exists \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with } p(\mathbf{x}) > d(\mathbf{x}) + q(\mathbf{x}), \text{ and } p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{x} + b_i\}$. It is not difficult to see that r is a remainder.

C. Proof of Proposition 3

a) Let \bar{q} and \bar{r} be the quotient and the remainder of the division of r by d . Then

$$r(\mathbf{x}) = (d(\mathbf{x}) + \bar{q}(\mathbf{x})) \vee \bar{r}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (35)$$

Combining with

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = (d(\mathbf{x}) + q(\mathbf{x})) \vee r(\mathbf{x}),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{x}) &= (d(\mathbf{x}) + q(\mathbf{x})) \vee (d(\mathbf{x}) + \bar{q}(\mathbf{x})) \vee \bar{r}(\mathbf{x}) \\ p(\mathbf{x}) &= (d(\mathbf{x}) + q(\mathbf{x}) \vee \bar{q}(\mathbf{x})) \vee \bar{r}(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Equation (35) implies that $\bar{r}(\mathbf{x}) \leq r(\mathbf{x})$. This fact combined with the fact that $q(\mathbf{x})$ is the quotient of the division of $p(\mathbf{x})$ by $d(\mathbf{x})$ and (36) implies that $\bar{q}(\mathbf{x}) \vee q(\mathbf{x}) = q(\mathbf{x})$. Hence, since $r(\mathbf{x})$ is the remainder of the division of $p(\mathbf{x})$ by $d(\mathbf{x})$ it holds $r(\mathbf{x}) \leq \bar{r}(\mathbf{x})$. Hence, $r(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{r}(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$

b) The proof is trivial.

D. Proof of Proposition 4

Assume $p(\mathbf{x})$ is given by (1) and $d(\mathbf{x})$ by

$$d(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_d} \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i \mathbf{x} + \tilde{b}_i.$$

(a) We first show that $C \subset \mathbf{dom}(l(\mathbf{a}))$. Assume that $\mathbf{a} \in C$. That is $\mathbf{a} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i \in \text{Newt}(p)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m_d$. Then, there are $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m_d} \geq 0$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{m_d} \lambda_i = 1$ such that

$$\mathbf{a} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i.$$

Thus,

$$(\mathbf{a} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i)^T \mathbf{x} \leq \bigvee_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{x} \leq p(\mathbf{x}) - \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n_p} b_i.$$

Furthermore,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i \mathbf{x} + \tilde{b}_i - \tilde{b}_i \geq \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i \mathbf{x} + \tilde{b}_i - \bigvee_{j=1}^{m_d} \tilde{b}_j.$$

Combining the last two equations we have

$$p(\mathbf{x}) - d(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \geq \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n_p} b_i - \bigvee_{j=1}^{m_d} \tilde{b}_j > -\infty.$$

Hence, $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{dom}(l)$.

Conversely assume that $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{dom}(l)$ but $\mathbf{a} \notin C$. Then, there is a $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i$ such that $\mathbf{a} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i \notin \text{Newt}(p)$. Furthermore, since $\text{Newt}(p)$ is a convex set, there is a vector \mathbf{v} such that $(\mathbf{a} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i)^T \mathbf{v} > \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{v}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n_p$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} l(\mathbf{a}) &= \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{p(\mathbf{x}) - d(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}\} \\ &\leq \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow -\infty} p(\lambda \mathbf{v}) - d(\lambda \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{a}^T (\lambda \mathbf{v}) = -\infty \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathbf{a} \notin \mathbf{dom}(l)$, which is a contradiction.

(b) Since

$$q(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} - f^*(\mathbf{a})\}$$

It holds

$$q(\mathbf{x}) = -\infty \Leftrightarrow l(\mathbf{a}) = -\infty, \text{ for all } \mathbf{a} \Leftrightarrow C = \mathbf{dom}(l) = \emptyset$$

(c) If for some i it holds $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \notin C$, then $l(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i) = -\infty$. That is, for all b there is an $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b > f(\mathbf{x})$. This is particularly true for $b = \hat{b}_i$, and thus $q(\mathbf{x})$ is not a quotient.

E. Proof of Corollary 1

The proof of the first part is immediate from Proposition 4. To contradict, assume that the inclusion in (ii) is not true. Then, there exists a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{m_p}\}^\perp$ but $\mathbf{x} \notin \text{span}\{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{m_q}\}^\perp$. Thus, there is an index i_0 such that $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i_0}^T \mathbf{x} \neq 0$. Without loss of generality assume that $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i_0}^T \mathbf{x} > 0$ (if it is negative, use $-\mathbf{x}$ in the place of \mathbf{x}). Using (i) we have $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} (q(\lambda \mathbf{x}) + d(\lambda \mathbf{x})) = \infty$, but $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} p(\lambda \mathbf{x}) < \infty$. Hence, there is a λ such that $p(\lambda \mathbf{x}) < q(\lambda \mathbf{x}) + d(\lambda \mathbf{x})$, which contradicts the fact that q is the quotient.

F. Proof of Proposition 5

First we need to show that all the components of $\mathbf{a}^{E,z}$ are positive. Due to the convexity of E , either

$$\inf\{z : (\mathbf{x}, z) \in E\} = -\infty, \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

or

$$\inf\{z : (\mathbf{x}, z) \in E\} > -\infty, \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

If $E = \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, then there are no non-trivial constraints, i.e., $L = 0$. In the following assume that $L > 0$, that is there are some nontrivial constraints, and $E \neq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. From the definition of E , for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, it holds $\inf\{z : (\mathbf{x}, z) \in E\} < \infty$, and $\sup\{z : (\mathbf{x}, z) \in E\} = \infty$.

Note that it is not possible to have a constraint in (10) in the form $[\mathbf{A}^{E,\mathbf{x}}]_l \mathbf{x} \geq [b^E]_l$, that is nontrivial, i.e., $[\mathbf{A}^{E,\mathbf{x}}]_l \neq \mathbf{0}^T$. Indeed, if such a constraint existed, then for an \mathbf{x} not satisfying this constraint we would have $\inf\{z : (\mathbf{x}, z) \in E\} = \infty$, which is a contradiction. On the other hand if there were a constraint with $[\mathbf{A}^{E,\mathbf{x}}]_l \mathbf{x} + [\mathbf{a}^{E,z}]_l z \geq [b^E]_l$, with $[\mathbf{a}^{E,z}]_l < 0$ then, for all $(\mathbf{x}, z) \in E$ we would have $z \leq (-[\mathbf{A}^{E,\mathbf{x}}]_l \mathbf{x} + [b^E]_l) / [\mathbf{a}^{E,z}]_l$ and thus $\sup\{z : (\mathbf{x}, z) \in E\} < \infty$.

It is then easy to see that the function q given by (11) has as epigraph the set E . Therefore, it is the quotient.

To determine the remainder it is sufficient to find all the terms i of $p(\mathbf{x})$ for which $p(\mathbf{x}) > \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})$, for an $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that the term i attains the maximum in $p(\mathbf{x})$. The function $p(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})$ is linear on $P_{i,j}$ for all i, j . Therefore, since $p(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, and $\mathbf{x}_{i,j}$ is in the relative interior of $P_{i,j}$ we have either $p(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in P_{i,j}$, or $p(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}) > \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}_{i,j})$. Hence, the procedure described in Algorithm 1 produces the remainder.

G. Proof of Proposition 6

Observe that

$$p(\mathbf{x}_j) - d(\mathbf{x}_j) - q_t(\mathbf{x}_j) = f(\mathbf{x}_j) - q_t(\mathbf{x}_j) \geq 0,$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of the first constraint of (16). Furthermore,

$$e(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N f(\mathbf{x}_j) - \sum_{j=1}^N \bigvee_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}_q} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i,t}^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_{i,t}), \quad (37)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i,t}$ is the solution of (17) at the iteration t . Each term of the last sum can be written as:

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}_q} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i,t}^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_{i,t}) = (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i'_{j,t}}^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_{i'_{j,t}}),$$

where $i'_{j,t}$ is the partition that j belongs after step t , i.e., $j \in I'_{j,t}$ and $I_{\cdot,t}$ is the partition obtained at Step 6 in iteration t . Furthermore due to the optimization in (16),

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i'_{j,t}}^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_{i'_{j,t}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i'_{j,t+1}}^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_{i'_{j,t+1}}.$$

From Step 6,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i'_{j,t+1}}^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_{i'_{j,t+1}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i'_{j,t+1}}^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_{i'_{j,t+1}}.$$

Therefore, $\sum_{j=1}^N \bigvee_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}_q} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i,t}^T \mathbf{x}_j + \hat{b}_{i,t})$ is non-increasing, and thus, $e(t)$ is non-decreasing.

H. Proof of Proposition 7

We first prove (20). The quotients $Q(p_1, d)$ and $Q(p_2, d)$ satisfy

$$p_1(\mathbf{x}) \geq d(\mathbf{x}) + Q(p_1, d)(\mathbf{x}), \quad (38)$$

$$p_2(\mathbf{x}) \geq d(\mathbf{x}) + Q(p_2, d)(\mathbf{x}). \quad (39)$$

Thus,

$$p_1(\mathbf{x}) + p_2(\mathbf{x}) \geq d(\mathbf{x}) + [Q(p_1, d) + Q(p_2, d)(\mathbf{x}) + d(\mathbf{x})].$$

But $Q(p_1 + p_2, d)$ is the maximum tropical polynomial satisfying this inequality. Thus it is greater than or equal to the expression in the bracket, i.e.,

$$Q(p_1 + p_2, d)(\mathbf{x}) \geq Q(p_1, d)(\mathbf{x}) + Q(p_2, d)(\mathbf{x}) + d(\mathbf{x}).$$

To prove (21), take the maximum of (38) and (39). Using the distributive property we get

$$p_1(\mathbf{x}) \vee p_2(\mathbf{x}) \geq d(\mathbf{x}) + [Q(p_1, d)(\mathbf{x}) \vee Q(p_2, d)(\mathbf{x})].$$

Thus,

$$Q(p_1 \vee p_2, d) \geq Q(p_1, d)(\mathbf{x}) \vee Q(p_2, d)(\mathbf{x}).$$

We then prove (22). The quotients $Q(p, d_1)$ and $Q(p, d_2)$ satisfy

$$p(\mathbf{x}) \geq d_1(\mathbf{x}) + Q(p, d_1)(\mathbf{x}), \quad (40)$$

$$p(\mathbf{x}) \geq d_2(\mathbf{x}) + Q(p, d_2)(\mathbf{x}). \quad (41)$$

Thus,

$$p(\mathbf{x}) \geq d_1(\mathbf{x}) + d_2(\mathbf{x}) + [Q(p, d_1)(\mathbf{x}) + Q(p, d_2)(\mathbf{x}) - p(\mathbf{x})].$$

Hence,

$$Q(p, d_1 + d_2)(\mathbf{x}) \geq Q(p, d_1)(\mathbf{x}) + Q(p, d_2)(\mathbf{x}) - p(\mathbf{x}).$$

To prove (23), take the maximum of (40) and (41)

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{x}) &\geq [d_1(\mathbf{x}) + Q(p, d_1)(\mathbf{x})] \vee [d_2(\mathbf{x}) + Q(p, d_2)(\mathbf{x})] \\ &\geq [d_1(\mathbf{x}) \vee d_2(\mathbf{x})] + [Q(p, d_1)(\mathbf{x}) \wedge Q(p, d_2)(\mathbf{x})] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$Q(p, d_1 \vee d_2)(\mathbf{x}) \geq Q(p, d_1)(\mathbf{x}) \wedge Q(p, d_2)(\mathbf{x})$$

I. Proof of Proposition 8

The Newton polytopes of p and q are given by the zonotopes

$$\text{Newt}(p) = \{\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\mu} : \boldsymbol{\mu} \in [0, 1]^n\}, \quad (42)$$

$$\text{Newt}(q) = \{\hat{\mathbf{A}}\boldsymbol{\lambda} : \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in [0, 1]^{m_q}\}, \quad (43)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = [\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \dots \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{m_q}]$. We start proving the following lemma.

Lemma 1: Let $\text{Newt}(p)$, $\text{Newt}(q)$ as the above. Then $\text{Newt}(q) \subset \text{Newt}(p)$ if and only if

$$\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{A}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i, \quad \mathbf{A}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_q} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \leq \mathbf{1}, \quad (44)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m_q$,

Proof of the lemma: $\text{Newt}(q) \subset \text{Newt}(p)$ if and only if for any $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in [0, 1]^{m_q}$ there exists a $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in [0, 1]^n$ such that $\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\mu} = \hat{\mathbf{A}}\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. Thus, $\text{Newt}(q) \subset \text{Newt}(p)$ is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{A}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\boldsymbol{\lambda} \leq \mathbf{1}, \quad (45)$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in [0, 1]^{m_q}$.

Direct part: Assume $\text{Newt}(q) \subset \text{Newt}(p)$. Substituting $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{e}_i$, i.e., the i -th unit vector, in (45), we get the first inequality of (44). Now with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{1}$ we get the second inequality of (44).

Converse part: Assume that (44) holds true. Multiplying the first inequality of (44) by $\lambda_i \geq 0$ and adding, we get the first inequality of (45). Furthermore, for $0 \leq \lambda_i \leq 1$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{m_q} \lambda_i \mathbf{A}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \leq \mathbf{A}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_q} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \leq \mathbf{1}$, which implies the right part of inequality of (45). \square

From Lemma 1, $q(\mathbf{x}) \leq p(\mathbf{x})$ for all \mathbf{x} is equivalent to $\text{ENF}_q(\mathbf{a}) \leq \text{ENF}_p(\mathbf{a})$, for all \mathbf{a} . We first compute $\text{ENF}_p(\mathbf{a})$. It holds

$$\text{ENF}_p(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{a}, \quad (46)$$

for $\mathbf{a} \in \text{Newt}(p)$ and $-\infty$ otherwise. Indeed, the extended Newton function of p is given by $\text{ENewt}_p(\mathbf{a}) = \max\{\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i b_i : \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{a}, \mu_i \in [0, 1]\}$. However, $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{a}$ has a solution $\boldsymbol{\mu} = [\mu_1 \dots \mu_n]^T \in [0, 1]^n$, if and only if $\mathbf{a} \in \text{Newt}(p)$. Furthermore, for $\mathbf{a} \in \text{Newt}(p)$ the solution is unique and given by $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{a}$. Thus $\text{ENF}_p(\mathbf{a})$ is given by (46).

The first two conditions of (29) are equivalent to the inclusion $\text{Newt}(q) \subset \text{Newt}(p)$. To prove the direct part of the proposition observe that $\hat{b}_i \leq \text{ENF}_q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i) \leq \text{ENF}_p(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i) = \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i$.

To prove the converse part assume that (29) holds true. Thus, since $\text{Newt}(q) \subset \text{Newt}(p)$, it holds $\text{ENF}_q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}) \leq \text{ENF}_p(\hat{\mathbf{a}})$,

for all $\hat{\mathbf{a}} \notin \text{Newt}(q)$. It remains to show that $\text{ENF}_q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}) \leq \text{ENF}_p(\hat{\mathbf{a}})$, for all $\hat{\mathbf{a}} \in \text{Newt}(q)$. For such an $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ENF}_q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}) &= \max\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{m_q} \lambda_i \hat{b}_i : \sum_{i=1}^{m_q} \lambda_i \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda_i \in [0, 1]\right\} \\ &\leq \max\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{m_q} \lambda_i \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i : \sum_{i=1}^{m_q} \lambda_i \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda_i \in [0, 1]\right\} \\ &= \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}} = \text{ENF}_p(\hat{\mathbf{a}}) \end{aligned}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Maclagan and B. Sturmfels, "Introduction to tropical geometry," *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, vol. 161, pp. 75–91, 2009.
- [2] P. Maragos, V. Charisopoulos, and E. Theodosis, "Tropical geometry and machine learning," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 109, no. 5, pp. 728–755, 2021.
- [3] L. Zhang, G. Naitzat, and L.-H. Lim, "Tropical geometry of deep neural networks," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 5824–5832.
- [4] V. Charisopoulos and P. Maragos, "A tropical approach to neural networks with piecewise linear activations," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.08749*, 2018.
- [5] G. Montúfar, Y. Ren, and L. Zhang, "Sharp bounds for the number of regions of maxout networks and vertices of Minkowski sums," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08135*, 2021.
- [6] M. Alfara, A. Bibi, H. Hammoud, M. Gaafar, and B. Ghanem, "On the decision boundaries of neural networks: A tropical geometry perspective," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2022.
- [7] C. Hertrich, A. Basu, M. Di Summa, and M. Skutella, "Towards lower bounds on the depth of relu neural networks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 3336–3348, 2021.
- [8] M. Trimmel, H. Petzka, and C. Sminchisescu, "Tropex: An algorithm for extracting linear terms in deep neural networks," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [9] G. Smyrnis and P. Maragos, "Tropical polynomial division and neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.12922*, 2019.
- [10] G. Smyrnis, P. Maragos, and G. Retsinas, "Maxpolynomial division with application to neural network simplification," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 4192–4196.
- [11] G. Smyrnis and P. Maragos, "Multiclass neural network minimization via tropical Newton polytope approximation," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 9068–9077.
- [12] P. Misiakos, G. Smyrnis, G. Retsinas, and P. Maragos, "Neural network approximation based on Hausdorff distance of tropical zonotopes," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [13] G. X. Ritter and P. Sussner, "An introduction to morphological neural networks," in *Proceedings of 13th International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, vol. 4. IEEE, 1996, pp. 709–717.
- [14] G. X. Ritter and G. Urcid, "Lattice algebra approach to single-neuron computation," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 282–295, 2003.
- [15] P. Sussner and E. L. Esmi, "Morphological perceptrons with competitive learning: Lattice-theoretical framework and constructive learning algorithm," *Information Sciences*, vol. 181, no. 10, pp. 1929–1950, 2011.
- [16] V. Charisopoulos and P. Maragos, "Morphological perceptrons: geometry and training algorithms," in *International Symposium on Mathematical Morphology and Its Applications to Signal and Image Processing*. Springer, 2017, pp. 3–15.
- [17] Y. Shen, X. Zhong, and F. Y. Shih, "Deep morphological neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.01532*, 2019.
- [18] N. Dimitriadis and P. Maragos, "Advances in morphological neural networks: training, pruning and enforcing shape constraints," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 3825–3829.
- [19] E. Theodosis and P. Maragos, "Analysis of the viterbi algorithm using tropical algebra and geometry," in *2018 IEEE 19th International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*, 2018, pp. 1–5.
- [20] —, "Tropical modeling of weighted transducer algorithms on graphs," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2019, pp. 8653–8657.
- [21] P. Maragos and E. Theodosis, "Tropical geometry and piecewise-linear approximation of curves and surfaces on weighted lattices," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.03891*, 2019.
- [22] —, "Multivariate tropical regression and piecewise-linear surface fitting," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 3822–3826.
- [23] G. C. Calafiore, S. Gaubert, and C. Possieri, "Log-sum-exp neural networks and posynomial models for convex and log-log-convex data," *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 827–838, 2019.
- [24] —, "A universal approximation result for difference of log-sum-exp neural networks," *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 31, no. 12, pp. 5603–5612, 2020.
- [25] K. H. Kim and F. W. Roush, "Factorization of polynomials in one variable over the tropical semiring," *arXiv preprint math/0501167*, 2005.
- [26] N. Grigg and N. Manwaring, "An elementary proof of the fundamental theorem of tropical algebra," *arXiv preprint arXiv:0707.2591*, 2007.
- [27] S. Gao and A. G. Lauder, "Decomposition of polytopes and polynomials," *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 89–104, 2001.
- [28] H. R. Tiwary, "On the hardness of computing intersection, union and Minkowski sum of polytopes," *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 469–479, 2008.
- [29] B. Lin and N. M. Tran, "Linear and rational factorization of tropical polynomials," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.03332*, 2017.
- [30] R. A. Crowell, "The tropical division problem and the Minkowski factorization of generalized permutahedra," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.00241*, 2019.
- [31] N. M. Tran and J. Wang, "Minimal representations of tropical rational signomials," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.05647*, 2022.
- [32] M. Akian, S. Gaubert, V. Nițică, and I. Singer, "Best approximation in max-plus semimodules," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 435, no. 12, pp. 3261–3296, 2011.
- [33] A. Magnani and S. P. Boyd, "Convex piecewise-linear fitting," *Optimization and Engineering*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 2009.
- [34] F. Baccelli, G. Cohen, G. J. Olsder, and J.-P. Quadrat, "Synchronization and linearity: an algebra for discrete event systems," 1992.
- [35] B. Heidergott, G. J. Olsder, and J. Van Der Woude, *Max plus at work*. Princeton University Press, 2014.
- [36] P. Butkovič, *Max-linear systems: theory and algorithms*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [37] R. A. Cuninghame-Green, *Minimax algebra*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012, vol. 166.
- [38] P. Maragos, "Dynamical systems on weighted lattices: General theory," *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 1–49, 2017.
- [39] D. Maclagan and B. Sturmfels, *Introduction to tropical geometry*. American Mathematical Society, 2021, vol. 161.
- [40] M. Joswig, *Essentials of tropical combinatorics*. American Mathematical Society, 2021, vol. 219.
- [41] I. Itenberg, G. Mikhalkin, and E. I. Shustin, *Tropical algebraic geometry*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009, vol. 35.
- [42] K. Fukuda, "Lecture: Polyhedral computation, spring 2016," *Institute for Operations Research and Institute of Theoretical Computer Science, ETH Zurich*. <https://inf.ethz.ch/personal/fukudak/lect/plect/notes2015/PolyComp2015.pdf>, 2016.
- [43] V. Kaibel, "Extended formulations in combinatorial optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1104.1023*, 2011.
- [44] R. T. Rockafellar, "Convex analysis," in *Convex analysis*. Princeton university press, 2015.
- [45] P. Maragos, "Morphological systems: slope transforms and max-min difference and differential equations," *Signal Processing*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 57–77, 1994.
- [46] —, "Slope transforms: theory and application to nonlinear signal processing," *IEEE Transactions on signal processing*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 864–877, 1995.
- [47] H. J. Heijmans and P. Maragos, "Lattice calculus of the morphological slope transform," *Signal Processing*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 17–42, 1997.
- [48] K. Fukuda *et al.*, "Frequently asked questions in polyhedral computation," *ETH, Zurich, Switzerland*, 2004.
- [49] J. Kim, L. Vandenberghe, and C.-K. K. Yang, "Convex piecewise-linear modeling method for circuit optimization via geometric programming," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 29, no. 11, pp. 1823–1827, 2010.
- [50] D. P. Bertsekas, *Nonlinear Programming*. Athena Scientific, 2016.

- [51] D. Blalock, J. J. Gonzalez Ortiz, J. Frankle, and J. Gutttag, "What is the state of neural network pruning?" *Proceedings of machine learning and systems*, vol. 2, pp. 129–146, 2020.
- [52] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, "Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [53] B. Sturmfels, "On the Newton polytope of the resultant," *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 207–236, 1994.
- [54] M. Joswig, "The Cayley trick for tropical hypersurfaces with a view toward ricardian economics," in *Homological and Computational Methods in Commutative Algebra*. Springer, 2017, pp. 107–128.



Ioannis Kordonis received both his Diploma in Electrical and Computer Engineering and his Ph.D. degree from the National Technical University of Athens, Greece, in 2009 and 2015 respectively. During 2016-2017 he was a post-doctoral researcher in the University of Southern California and he is currently employed and during 2018-2019 he held postdoctoral and ATER positions at CentraleSupélec, on the Rennes campus, in the Automatic Control Group - IETR. He is currently a postdoctoral researcher at the Intelligent Robotics

and Automation Lab of the National Technical University of Athens.

His research interests include Game Theory, Stochastic Control theory, and Machine Learning. He is also interested in applications in the areas of Energy - Power Systems, Transportation Systems and in Bioengineering.



Petros Maragos received the M.Eng. Diploma in E.E. from the National Technical University of Athens (NTUA) in 1980 and the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees from Georgia Tech, Atlanta, in 1982 and 1985. In 1985, he joined the faculty of the Division of Applied Sciences at Harvard University, where he worked for eight years as a professor of electrical engineering, affiliated with the Harvard Robotics Lab. In 1993, he joined the faculty of the School of ECE at Georgia Tech, affiliated with its Center for Signal and Image Processing. During periods of

1996-98, he had a joint appointment as director of research at the Institute of Language and Speech Processing in Athens. Since 1999, he has been working as professor at the NTUA School of ECE, where he is currently the director of the Intelligent Robotics and Automation Lab. He has held visiting positions at MIT in 2012 and at UPenn in 2016. He is a co-founder and since 2023 the acting director of the Institute of Robotics at the Athena Research Center. His research and teaching interests include signal processing, computer vision and speech, machine learning, and robotics. In the above areas as he has published numerous papers, book chapters, and co-edited three Springer research books. He has served as: Associate Editor for the IEEE Transactions on ASSP and the Transactions on PAMI, and as editorial board member for several journals on signal processing and computer vision; Co-organizer of several conferences, including recently ICASSP-2023 as general chair; Member of three IEEE SPS technical committees and the SPS Education Board; Member of the Greek National Council for Research and Technology. He is the recipient or co-recipient of several awards for his academic work, including a 1987-1992 US NSF Presidential Young Investigator Award; 1988 IEEE ASSP Young Author Best Paper Award; 1994 IEEE SPS Senior Best Paper Award; 1995 IEEE W.R.G. Baker Prize; 1996 Pattern Recognition Society's Honorable Mention best paper award; CVPR-2011 Gesture Recognition Workshop's Best Paper Award; ECCVW-2020 Data Modeling Challenge Winner Award; CVPR-2022 best paper finalist. For his research contributions, he was elected Fellow of IEEE in 1995 and Fellow of EURASIP in 2010, and received the 2007 EURASIP Technical Achievement Award. He was elected IEEE SPS Distinguished Lecturer for 2017-2018. He is currently an IEEE Life Fellow.