

FACTORIZING MULTIVARIATE POLYNOMIALS OVER HYPERFIELDS AND THE MULTIVARIABLE DESCARTES' PROBLEM

ANDREAS GROSS AND TREVOR GUNN

ABSTRACT. We develop several notions of multiplicity for linear factors of multivariable polynomials over different arithmetics (hyperfields). The key example is multiplicities over the hyperfield of signs, which encapsulates the arithmetic of $\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{R}_{>0}$. These multiplicities give us various upper and lower bounds on the number of linear factors with a given sign pattern in terms of the signs of the coefficients of the factored polynomial. Using resultants, we can transform a square system of polynomials into a single polynomial whose multiplicities give us bounds on the number of positive solutions to the system. In particular, we are able to re-derive the lower bound of Itenberg and Roy on any potential upper bound for the number of solutions to a system of equations with a given sign pattern. In addition, our techniques also explain a particular counterexample of Li and Wang to Itenberg and Roy's proposed upper bound.

INTRODUCTION

Background. Famously, Descartes' Rule of Signs states that the number of positive solutions of a polynomial

$$f(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_nx^n \in \mathbf{R}[x]$$

is bounded above by the number of sign changes of the sequence of coefficients a_0, \dots, a_n . Numerous proofs have been found since Descartes' original work [Kri63; Alb43], some of which are extremely short [Wan04; Kom06]. There are several generalizations of Descartes' Rule of Signs as well: the Budan–Fourier theorem and Sturm's theorem give estimates of the number of solutions of real polynomials in a given interval in terms of the number of sign changes of suitable sequences of real numbers. Laguerre proved, using Rolle's theorem, that Descartes' rule also holds if the exponents appearing in f are arbitrary real numbers, and the problem of finding and characterizing more general functions satisfying Descartes' rule has received some attention [HT11; Tok11; Cur18]. Descartes' bound (in the polynomial setting) is also known to be sharp [Gra99].

In multiple variables, one possible generalization of Descartes' rule considers a single polynomial $f(\mathbf{x})$ in several variables and asks on how many components of the complement of its vanishing set the polynomial $f(\mathbf{x})$ can be positive, given the signs of its coefficients [FT22]. Another generalization considers systems of real polynomial equations $0 = f_1(\mathbf{x}) = f_2(\mathbf{x}) = \cdots$ and asks how many solutions with only positive entries such a system can have,

Date: July 19, 2023.

given the signs of the coefficients of each of the f_i . This latter formulation was first studied by Itenberg and Roy [IR96], who made a conjecture for a sharp upper bound of positive solutions in terms of Newton polytopes and mixed subdivisions. Popularized by a \$500 bounty by Bernd Sturmfels, the conjecture received some attention and was later disproven [LW98]. More recently, Bihan-Dickenstein and Bihan-Dickenstein-Forsgård gave a sharp upper bound for the number of positive solutions of systems of polynomials supported on a circuit [BD17; BDF21]. The general case is still wide open.

Example. With multiple variables, it is possible to have a family of equations with consistent signs but whose solutions have varying signs. This phenomenon does not happen in one variable where, if the coefficients change k times, Descartes' rule tells us that there will always be exactly k positive roots assuming all the roots are real. For example, consider the system

$$\begin{aligned}x^2 + y^2 &= 1, \\ax + by &= 1, \\a, b &> 0.\end{aligned}$$

The space of real solution sets consists of four open components as shown in Figure 1. \diamond




FIGURE 1. Possible sign patterns which arise from intersecting a line with the unit circle.

Descartes' rule and hyperfields. Hyperfields are generalizations of fields, where addition may be multivalued. These appear naturally when looking at the quotient of a field by a multiplicative group. For instance, we can take the real numbers and quotient by the group of absolute values ($\mathbf{R}_{>0}$) to obtain the hyperfield of signs $\mathbf{S} = \{+1, -1, 0\}$. The arithmetic of signs has rules such as $1 + 1 = 1$ (the sum of two positive numbers is always positive) and $1 + (-1) = \mathbf{S}$ (the sum of a positive and negative number may have any sign). Similarly, if we quotient \mathbf{R} by $\{\pm 1\}$, we get a hyperfield which encapsulates the arithmetic of absolute values. Arithmetic of non-Archimedean absolute values is often used in tropical geometry. We call this hyperfield the *tropical hyperfield*, \mathbf{T} . This hyperfield is an enrichment of the tropical semifield. We can also combine signs and non-Archimedean absolute values with the so-called real tropical hyperfield \mathbf{TR} , which is a sort of semidirect product of \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{T} . This hyperfield is useful to describe real tropical geometry [JSY22].

In their recent paper [BL21], Baker and Lorscheid have given a proof of Descartes' Rule of Signs using hyperfields. What they show is that given a real polynomial $f(x) \in \mathbf{R}[x]$ with n positive roots, its image f^{sgn} in $\mathbf{S}[x]$ must

be divisible by $x - 1 \in \mathbf{S}[x]$ at least n times. The multiplicity $\text{mult}_{x-1}^{\mathbf{S}}(f^{\text{sgn}})$ of $x - 1$ as a factor of f^{sgn} therefore bounds the number of positive roots of f from above. Moreover, Baker and Lorscheid show that the maximal number of times one can factor out $x - 1$ (i.e. $\text{mult}_{x-1}^{\mathbf{S}}(f^{\text{sgn}})$) is exactly the number of sign alterations as in Descartes' rule. Their theory also applies to the tropical hyperfield [BL21] as well as other hyperfields like those associated to higher rank valuations or combining valuations and signs [Gun22a; Gun22b]. Akian-Gaubert-Tavikalipour have also carried out similar factorization results for polynomials over Rowan's "semiring systems" [AGT23].

Linear factors of multivariate polynomials. An analogous formulation of Descartes' rule that has, so far, received little attention asks the following: given a polynomial $f(\mathbf{x})$ in *several* variables with given support and coefficients with prescribed signs, what is the sharp upper bound for the number of its linear factors with a prescribed sign pattern? There is some relationship between this problem and the system-of-equation problem because the sparse resultant of a system of equations yields a single polynomial whose linear factors correspond (with multiplicity!) to the common solutions of the system. However, as shown in the example above, the signs of the resultant are not uniquely determined from the signs of the system.

We approach the linear factor problem with the same strategy used by Baker and Lorscheid [BL21] in the univariate case: for a real multivariate polynomial $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbf{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ and a "signed" degree-1 polynomial $l = s_0 + \sum s_i x_i \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$, we define $\text{mult}_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{R}}(f)$ as the maximal number of degree-1 polynomials k with $k^{\text{sgn}} = l$ that we can factor out of f . Similarly, we define $\text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f^{\text{sgn}})$ as the maximal number of times that we can factor l out of f^{sgn} (as pointed out by Baker and Lorscheid [BL21], one has to be careful here since quotients are not unique; see Definition 3.1).

Theorem A (= Lemma 3.5). *We have*

$$\text{mult}_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{R}}(f) = \sum_k \text{mult}_k^{\mathbf{R}}(f) \leq \text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f^{\text{sgn}}),$$

where we sum over a set of representatives k of the image of $\text{sgn}^{-1}\{l\}$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbf{x}]/\mathbf{R}^*$, using unique factorization in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbf{x}]$.

Even in the one variable case, a real polynomial might have complex roots, meaning its observed number of positive roots could be less than the maximum allowed by its sign configuration. We define the relative multiplicity (with respect to sgn) of l in a polynomial $g \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$, by

$$\text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(g) = \max\{\text{mult}_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{R}}(f) : f^{\text{sgn}} = g\}.$$

Then the problem of finding the sharp upper bound for the number of linear factors with prescribed sign pattern in a polynomial with coefficients of prescribed signs becomes the question of determining the relative multiplicities $\text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(g)$. As an immediate consequence of the Theorem A, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary B (= Proposition 3.29). *For $l \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ of degree 1 and $g \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ arbitrary we have*

$$\text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(g) \leq \text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(g).$$

Note that we prove Corollary **B** in much greater generality, where sgn is replaced by an arbitrary morphism of hyperfields.

Example. Let

$$f = (x-1)(x-2)(x^2+2) = x^4 - 3x^3 + 4x^2 - 6x + 4 \in \mathbf{R}[x].$$

Then $f^{\text{sgn}} = x^4 - x^3 + x^2 - x + 1 \in \mathbf{S}[x]$. By Descartes' rule [BL21, Theorem C], we have $\text{mult}_{x-1}^{\mathbf{S}}(f^{\text{sgn}}) = 4$ (the number of sign changes) but

$$\text{mult}_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{x-1\}}^{\mathbf{R}}(f) = \text{mult}_{x-1}^{\mathbf{R}} f + \text{mult}_{x-2}^{\mathbf{R}} f = 2.$$

On the other hand, $\text{mult}_{x-1}^{\text{sgn}}(f^{\text{sgn}}) = 4$ since, for example, $(x-1)^4$ is a real polynomial in $\text{sgn}^{-1}\{f^{\text{sgn}}\}$ with 4 positive roots. \diamond

The sharpness in Descartes' rule of signs for univariate polynomials means precisely that $\text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(g) = \text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(g)$ for any $g \in \mathbf{S}[x]$. In more than one variable, this is not true.

Theorem C (= Example 3.31). *There exists a degree-3 polynomial $g \in \mathbf{S}[x, y]$ and a degree-1 polynomial $l \in \mathbf{S}[x, y]$ with*

$$\text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(g) < \text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(g).$$

In addition to not being a sharp bound for the relative multiplicity, we do not have a combinatorial description for the multiplicity $\text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(g)$ like in the univariate case. This makes the multiplicity hard to compute. In practice, it is often sufficient to work with what we call the boundary multiplicity $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(g)$, which is the maximum of the multiplicities obtained after setting one of the variables to 0.

Subdivisions, Geometry and Multiplicities. Something that makes factoring tropical polynomials easier than factoring sign polynomials is that there is a geometry associated to tropical polynomials. A linear factor of a tropical polynomial corresponds to a tropical hyperplane within the tropical hypersurface defined by that polynomial. For a polynomial over \mathbf{TR} , we define enriched tropical hypersurfaces and consider the multiplicities of enriched linear hyperplanes. We call this the (*enriched*) *geometric multiplicity*. See Figure 5 for a demonstration of this idea.

Looking the opposite way, if we have a polynomial over \mathbf{S} , then we can try to perturb the coefficients a little bit to yield a polynomial over \mathbf{TR} . Where the geometric multiplicity tells us to exploit an existing subdivision of the Newton polytope, here we *impose* a subdivision by perturbing coefficients. We call this the *perturbation multiplicity*, $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(g)$. The perturbation multiplicity is a lower bound on the hyperfield multiplicity because factoring with respect to an imposed subdivision is stricter than factoring irrespective of a subdivision. Moreover, it is also a lower bound on the relative multiplicity because the factors with the imposed subdivision can be lifted to, say, the real Puiseux series.

Theorem D (= Corollary 3.35, Proposition 3.29, Corollary 3.7, Theorem 3.42). *If $f \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ is dense—meaning every monomial of degree $\leq \deg f$ has a non-zero coefficient—and $l \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ has degree 1, then we have*

$$\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) \leq \text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(f) \leq \text{mult}_p^{\mathbf{S}}(f) \leq \partial\text{-mult}_p^{\mathbf{S}}(f).$$

If f is dense of degree two in two variables, then we have equality everywhere.

Systems of equations. Let $\varphi: K \rightarrow H$ be a morphism from a field K to a hyperfield H . Given polynomials $g_1, \dots, g_n \in H[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $\mathbf{h} \in (H^*)^n$ we denote by

$$N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\varphi}(g_1, \dots, g_n)$$

the maximal number of solutions \mathbf{x} with $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{h}$ that a system $f_1(\mathbf{x}) = \dots = f_n(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ of equations over K with finite solution set (in \overline{K}) and $f_i^{\text{sgn}} = g_i$ can have. For $K = \mathbf{C}$ and $H = \mathbf{K}$, the answer is given by the Bernstein-Khovanskii-Kushnirenko (BKK) theorem. For $\varphi = \text{sgn}: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ these are precisely the numbers studied by Itenberg and Roy [IR96]. Let $f_i \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ with $f_i^{\varphi} = g_i$. Introducing an auxiliary linear form $l = 1 + y_1x_1 \dots y_nx_n$ with indeterminate coefficients and taking the (mixed sparse) resultant $R_{f_1, \dots, f_n} \in K[\mathbf{y}]$ of f_1, \dots, f_n, l , finding solutions to the system of equations

$$f_1(\mathbf{x}) = \dots = f_n(\mathbf{x}) = 0$$

is equivalent to finding linear factors of R . More precisely, if the coefficients of f_1, \dots, f_n are generic, then we have

$$R_{f_1, \dots, f_n} \propto \prod_{\mathbf{a} \in V(f_i) \subset (\overline{K}^*)^n} (1 + a_1y_1 + \dots + a_ny_n),$$

with the proportionality being up to a unit. The polynomial R_{f_1, \dots, f_n} is a specialization of a polynomial $R_{A_1, \dots, A_n} \in \mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{y}]$ which is determined just by the support sets $A_i = \text{supp}(f_i)$. Resultants allow us to apply our techniques to systems of equations:

Theorem E (=Theorem 4.10). *Let $R_{g_1, \dots, g_n} \subseteq H[\mathbf{y}]$ be the set of polynomials obtained by evaluating the resultant $\tilde{R}_{A_1, \dots, A_n} \in \mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{y}]$ at the coefficients of the g_i , where $A_i = \text{supp}(g_i)$. Moreover, let $l_{\mathbf{h}} = 1 + \sum h_i y_i$. Then we have*

$$N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\varphi}(g_1, \dots, g_n) \leq \max\{\text{mult}_{l_{\mathbf{h}}}^H(r) : r \in R_{g_1, \dots, g_n}\}.$$

We observe in several examples that the bound is far from sharp. However, applying the theorem to the counterexample to the Itenberg-Roy conjecture given by Li and Wang [LW98] yields the correct bound and shows that Li and Wang have in fact chosen an example where the number of positive solutions is maximal for the given choices of supports and signs.

We also study the numbers $N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\varphi}(g_1, \dots, g_n)$ when φ is a valuation and $H = \mathbf{T}$ or $H = \mathbf{TR}$, depending on whether K is algebraically closed or real closed. In this case each of the g_i defines a tropical hypersurface $V(g_i)$ and we study the case where the intersection $\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i)$ is transverse at the image of \mathbf{h} in \mathbf{R}^n (this means that if $H = \mathbf{TR}$ we apply the projection $\mathbf{TR} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}$ coordinate-wise). Using a result by Sturmfels on initial forms of resultants [Stu94], we prove the following result.

Theorem F (= Theorem 4.6). *Assume that $H = \mathbf{T}$, that φ is a valuation, and that $\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i)$ meets transversely at \mathbf{h} . Then $N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\varphi}(g_1, \dots, g_n)$ equals the multiplicity of the tropical intersection product $V(g_1) \cdots V(g_n)$ at \mathbf{h} . If $H = \mathbf{TR}$ and φ is the “signed valuation”, then $N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\varphi}(g_1, \dots, g_n)$ equals 1 if \mathbf{h} is an alternating point of $V(g_1) \cdots V(g_n)$ and 0 otherwise (see page 37 for a definition of alternating).*

Combining Theorem **F** with the completeness of the theory of real closed fields, we obtain a combinatorial multiplicity $\epsilon\text{-}N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\text{sgn}}(g_1, \dots, g_n)$ in terms of transverse tropical intersections or, dually, mixed Newton subdivisions. It is analogous to the combinatorial multiplicities $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l(g)$ and agrees with the numbers appearing in the conjecture of Itenberg and Roy. Our methods allow us to reprove Itenberg and Roy's lower bound.

Corollary G ([IR96], Corollary 4.8). *For $g_1, \dots, g_n \in \mathbf{S}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $h \in (\mathbf{S}^*)^n$ we have*

$$\epsilon\text{-}N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\text{sgn}}(g_1, \dots, g_n) \leq N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\text{sgn}}(g_1, \dots, g_n).$$

Acknowledgement. We thank Matt Baker and Josephine Yu for numerous insightful discussions. We thank Matt Baker and Oliver Lorscheid for providing comments on an earlier draft.

This project has received funding from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) TRR 326 *Geometry and Arithmetic of Uniformized Structures*, project number 444845124; and *From Riemann surfaces to tropical curves (and back again)*, project number 456557832.

Notation.

Hyperfields

K	Krasner hyperfield 1.3
S	Sign hyperfield 1.4
T	Tropical hyperfield 1.5
$H \rtimes \Gamma, \mathbf{TR}$	Tropical extensions, tropical real hyperfield 1.6
$ht^w = (h, w)$	Element of a tropical extension

Maps and Morphisms

$\text{sgn}: K \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$	The sign of an element of a real field 1.17
$\nu: K \rightarrow \mathbf{T}$	A (Krull) valuation 1.14
$f^\varphi, f^{\text{sgn}}, f^\nu$, etc.	Apply φ, sgn, ν , etc. to each coefficient 2.4
$\text{ac}: K \rightarrow \kappa$	Angular component map for a valued field 1.16
$\text{ac}: H \rtimes \Gamma \rightarrow H$	Angular component map for a tropical extension 1.14
$\nu_{\text{ac}}: K \rightarrow \kappa \rtimes \Gamma$	Refined valuation 1.16
$\nu_{\text{sgn}}: K \rightarrow \mathbf{S} \rtimes \Gamma$	Signed valuation 1.3
PF	Polynomial function map 2.13

Multiplicities

$\epsilon\text{-mult}^H$	Perturbation multiplicity 3.34
mult^φ	Relative multiplicity 3.28
mult^H	Hyperfield multiplicity 3.1
$\partial\text{-mult}^H$	Boundary multiplicity 3.6
gmult^H	H -enriched geometric multiplicity 3.20
$N_{\mathbf{h}}^\varphi$	Multiplicity for systems of equations 4
$\epsilon\text{-}N_{\mathbf{h}}$	Perturbation multiplicity for systems of equations 4.9

1. FIELDS AND HYPERFIELDS

Hyperfields are algebraic objects which are well-suited to capture the arithmetic of signs (having forgotten the absolute value) or the arithmetic of absolute values (having forgotten the signs). One can think of a hyperfield

as a field but where adding pairs of elements gives a non-empty set subject to the usual rules of commutativity, associativity, distributivity, etc. The axiom labeled “reversible” behaves as an ersatz subtraction.

Definition 1.1. A *hyperfield* is a tuple $H = (H, 0, 1, \cdot, \boxplus)$ where

- $0 \neq 1$,
- $H^* = (H \setminus \{0\}, 1, \cdot)$ is an Abelian group,
- 0 is an absorbing element: $0 \cdot a = a \cdot 0$ for all $a \in H$.

Additionally, the *hyperaddition* \boxplus is a multivalued operation, that is a function $\boxplus: H \times H \rightarrow \{\text{nonempty subsets of } H\}$, such that for all $a, b \in H$:

- $a \boxplus b = b \boxplus a$ (commutative),
- $0 \boxplus a = \{a\}$ (identity),
- there is a unique element $-a$ such that $0 \in a \boxplus (-a)$ (inverses),
- $\bigcup\{a \boxplus t : t \in b \boxplus c\} = \bigcup\{t \boxplus c : t \in a \boxplus b\}$ (associative)
- $a \in b \boxplus c \iff -b \in (-a) \boxplus c$ (reversible)

Repeated addition is treated monadically, using the power set monad. This means that notationally we will identify elements of H and singletons and repeated hyperaddition is flattened by unions—for example, $a \boxplus (b \boxplus c) = (a \boxplus b) \boxplus c$ means exactly what the associativity axiom says.

In what follows, we will rarely need to work directly with the axioms above because we will use a common and more familiar subtype of hyperfields called quotient hyperfields. All the hyperfields used in this paper are quotient hyperfields.

Definition 1.2. Let F be a field and let G be a subgroup of the group of units F^* . The *quotient hyperfield* F/G is the quotient set with the induced multiplication and the hyperaddition defined by

$$aG \boxplus bG = \{(c + d)G : c \in aG \text{ and } d \in bG\}.$$

If instead F was a ring, then F/G is a *quotient hyperring*.

For simplicity of notation, we will often use the same symbols in F to denote their equivalence classes in F/G . Furthermore, if $a \boxplus b$ is a singleton, we will omit the braces which indicate that the sum is a set.

Example 1.3. If F is any field with at least 3 elements, then the hyperfield $\mathbf{K} = F/F^* = \{0, 1\}$ is called the *Krasner hyperfield* after Marc Krasner. It has the following arithmetic:

$$\begin{array}{c|cc} \cdot & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c|cc} \boxplus & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & \mathbf{K} \end{array}$$

The Krasner hyperfield is the hyperfield analogue of the Boolean semifield which has the same arithmetic except that $1 + 1 = 1$ instead of $\{0, 1\}$. \diamond

Example 1.4. The *sign hyperfield* $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{R}/\mathbf{R}_{>0} = \{0, 1, -1\}$ is a quotient of the real numbers by the subgroup of positive real numbers. The arithmetic

on \mathbf{S} is given by the following tables.

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc} \cdot & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c|ccc} \boxplus & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \mathbf{S} \\ -1 & -1 & \mathbf{S} & -1 \end{array}$$

This arithmetic encodes rules like “positive times negative is negative”, “negative plus negative is negative,” and “positive plus negative can be anything.” \diamond

Example 1.5. If $(F, |\cdot|)$ is a field with an absolute value, then we can take its quotient by the group of elements with absolute value 1 to create a hyperfield whose underlying set is the image $|F|$. The resulting hyperfield is called a *triangle hyperfield* in the Archimedean case or an *ultratriangle hyperfield* in the non-Archimedean case. Such hyperfields were first described by Viro who showed how they can be used to do computations in tropical geometry [Vir11].

The most common such hyperfield is where $|\cdot|$ is a non-Archimedean valuation whose image is $\mathbf{R}_{\geq 0}$. For our purposes, it will be more convenient to use the image of the associated valuation $\text{val}(x) = -\log|x|$ (i.e. the set $\mathbf{R} \cup \{\infty\}$) as the base set instead. We call this the *tropical hyperfield*, denoted by \mathbf{T} , where the arithmetic is given by $a \cdot_{\mathbf{T}} b = a +_{\mathbf{R}} b$ and

$$a \boxplus b = \begin{cases} \min\{a, b\} & a \neq b, \\ [a, \infty] & a = b. \end{cases} \quad \diamond$$

1.1. Tropical Extensions.

Example 1.6. If H is any hyperfield and Γ is an ordered Abelian group, then we can extend Γ by H to get a version of the ultratriangle hyperfields of Example 1.5 “with coefficients in H .”

Define the set

$$H \rtimes \Gamma = \{(h, \gamma) : h \in H^*, \gamma \in \Gamma\} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

We will also use the notation $ht^\gamma = (h, \gamma)$ to better emphasize the relation between these extensions of hyperfields and extensions of a valued field K to a valuation on $K(t)$ or $K((t))$ or similar (Remark 1.9).

Multiplication is defined by $(h_1 t^{\gamma_1})(h_2 t^{\gamma_2}) = (h_1 h_2) t^{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}$ and the hyper-sum of $h_1 t^{\gamma_1}$ and $h_2 t^{\gamma_2}$ is defined as

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} h_1 t^{\gamma_1} & \gamma_1 < \gamma_2, \\ h_2 t^{\gamma_2} & \gamma_2 < \gamma_1, \\ (h_1 \boxplus h_2) t^{\gamma_1} & \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 \text{ and } 0_H \notin h_1 \boxplus h_2, \\ (h_1 \boxplus h_2) t^{\gamma_1} \cup \{ht^\gamma : h \in H, \gamma > \gamma_1\} & \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 \text{ and } 0_H \in h_1 \boxplus h_2. \end{cases}$$

We call this construction a *tropical extension*. \diamond

Remark 1.7. The hyperfield $\mathbf{TR} = \mathbf{S} \rtimes \mathbf{R}$ is called the *tropical real hyperfield*. This hyperfield and other specific tropical extensions were first described in Viro’s work [Vir11]. The idea of extending ordered groups by a hyperfield appeared in the work of Bowler and Su [BS21]. The tropical real hyperfield has also been used to describe real tropical geometry (e.g. [JSY22]).

Remark 1.8. In terms of tropical extensions, we also have $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{K} \rtimes \mathbf{R}$ and, in fact, every ultratriangle hyperfield described in Example 1.5 is of the form $\mathbf{K} \rtimes \Gamma$ where Γ is the image of the non-Archimedean valuation or absolute value.

Remark 1.9. If $H = F/G$ as in Definition 1.2, then we can form the field of Hahn series

$$F[[t^\Gamma]] = \left\{ \sum_{i \in I} a_i t^i : a_i \in F \text{ and } I \text{ is a well-ordered subset of } \Gamma \right\}.$$

There is a natural valuation ν on $F[[t^\Gamma]]$ given by $\nu(\sum_{i \in I} a_i t^i) = \min\{i \in I : a_i \neq 0\}$. Now define

$$G_0 = \left\{ f = \sum_{i \in I} a_i t^i \in F[[t^\Gamma]] : \nu(f) = 0_\Gamma \text{ and } a_0 \in G \right\}.$$

The hyperfield $H \rtimes \Gamma$ is isomorphic to $F[[t^\Gamma]]/G_0$.

Remark 1.10. Bowler and Su [BS21] have a more general construction of a hyperfield from any extension

$$1 \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow G \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow 0$$

of groups in which the conjugation operation of G on H^* extends to an action of G on H via automorphisms of hyperfields. In this context, $H \rtimes \Gamma$ is the hyperfield corresponding to the split extension of Γ by H^* . Moreover, Bowler and Su show if $H \in \{\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{S}\}$, then all such extensions are split [BS21, Theorem 4.17]. In a paper of the second author (TG), Bowler and Su's construction is described using the language of ordered blueprints [Gun22b].

Remark 1.11. We can make the same definition if Γ is an ordered semigroup instead of a group. If Γ is not a group, then $H \rtimes \Gamma$ will be a hyperring instead of a hyperfield. This will be useful for us to talk about valuation hyperrings, which take the form $H \rtimes \Gamma_{\geq 0}$ with $\Gamma_{\geq 0} = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \gamma \geq 0\}$.

1.2. Morphisms.

Definition 1.12. A morphism between two hyperfields H_1 and H_2 is a map $\varphi: H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ such that for all $x, y \in H_1$:

- $\varphi(0) = 0$,
- $\varphi(1) = 1$,
- $\varphi(xy) = \varphi(x)\varphi(y)$,
- $\varphi(x \boxplus y) \subseteq \varphi(x) \boxplus \varphi(y)$.

Lemma 1.13. *If $\varphi: H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ is a morphism of hyperfields and we have $A \in \boxplus_{i=1}^n B_i C_i$ in H_1 , then*

$$\varphi(A) \in \boxplus_{i=1}^n \varphi(B_i)\varphi(C_i).$$

Proof. By induction. □

1.3. Valuations.

Definition 1.14. Let H be a hyperfield. A valuation on H is a morphism

$$\nu: H \rightarrow \mathbf{K} \rtimes \Gamma$$

of hyperfields for some totally ordered Abelian group Γ .

Example 1.15.

- (a) If K is a field and $\nu: K \rightarrow \mathbf{K} \rtimes \Gamma$ is a map, then ν is a valuation in the sense of Definition 1.14 if and only if it is a valuation in the usual sense.
- (b) For every hyperfield H and every totally ordered Abelian group Γ , we obtain a valuation

$$\nu: H \rtimes \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{K} \rtimes \Gamma, \quad (h, \gamma) \mapsto \gamma.$$

The map

$$\text{ac}: H \rtimes \Gamma \rightarrow H, \quad (h, \gamma) \mapsto h$$

is not a morphism of hyperfields in general. We call it the *angular component map*

- (c) For every hyperfield H there is a unique morphism of hyperfields

$$\nu_0: H \rightarrow \mathbf{K}.$$

As $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K} \rtimes 0$, this is a valuation with value group 0, the *trivial valuation*. \diamond

Definition 1.16. Let K be a valued field with valuation $\nu: K \rightarrow \mathbf{K} \rtimes \Gamma$ and residue field κ . Assume that the valuation $\nu: K \rightarrow \mathbf{T}$ splits, that is that there exists a morphism of Abelian groups $\psi: \Gamma \rightarrow K^*$ with $\nu(\psi(\gamma)) = t^\gamma$. By abuse of notation, we denote $\psi(\gamma) = t^\gamma$. We define the *angular component* (with respect to the given splitting) $\text{ac}(a)$ of $a \in K^*$ by

$$\text{ac}(a) = \overline{t^{-\nu(a)}a} \in \kappa,$$

where the bar indicates that we take the class in the residue field. We also set $\text{ac}(0) = 0$. We can then refine the valuation to a morphism of hyperfields

$$\nu_{\text{ac}}: K \rightarrow \kappa \rtimes \mathbf{R}, \quad a \mapsto \begin{cases} \text{ac}(a)t^{\nu(a)} & , \text{ if } a \neq 0 \\ 0 & , \text{ else.} \end{cases}$$

By definition, we have $\text{ac}(a) = \text{ac}(\nu_{\text{ac}}(a))$ for every $a \in K$.

Recall that a *real closed field* is a field K which is not algebraically closed and whose algebraic closure is $K(i) = K[x]/(x^2 + 1)$. Every real closed field is an ordered field, where the non-negative elements are precisely the squares. A *valued real closed field* is a real closed field K together with a valuation

$$\nu: K \rightarrow \mathbf{K} \rtimes \Gamma$$

such that $0 < a < b$ implies $\nu(a) \geq \nu(b)$. In this case, the residue field κ is real closed again. If ν is surjective, then it splits [AGS20, Lemma 2.4]. Since the angular component is multiplicative, we have

$$\text{sgn}(a) = \text{sgn}(\text{ac}(a))$$

for all $a \in K$. We define the *signed valuation* ν_{sgn} as the composite

$$K \xrightarrow{\nu_{\text{ac}}} \kappa \rtimes \Gamma \xrightarrow{\text{sgn} \rtimes \Gamma} \mathbf{S} \rtimes \Gamma.$$

By what we just observed, we have $\nu(\nu_{\text{sgn}}(a)) = \nu(a)$ and $\text{ac}(\nu_{\text{sgn}}(a)) = \text{sgn}(a)$ for all $a \in K$.

1.4. Real fields.

Definition 1.17. A hyperfield R , is called *real* if it is equipped with a morphism $\text{sgn}: R \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$. We call sgn a sign map on R .

Remark 1.18. Definition 1.17 mirrors Definition 1.14 and, in fact, both are special cases of “valuations” in the theory of ordered blueprints [Lor18, Chapter 6].

Remark 1.19. For any ordering \leq on a field R , there exists a unique morphism $\varphi: R \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ such that $\varphi(x) = 1$ if $x > 0$ and $\varphi(x) = -1$ if $x < 0$. In fact, if R is a ring, then morphisms $s: R \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ correspond to pairs consisting of a prime ideal $\ker(s)$ and a total order on $R/\ker(s)$ [CC11, Proposition 2.12]. This concept can be extended to the language of schemes [Jun21].

Remark 1.20. Given a morphism from a field K to \mathbf{TR} , we get both a total order on K defined by the composition $K \rightarrow \mathbf{TR} \xrightarrow{\text{ac}} \mathbf{S}$ and a valuation on K defined by $K \rightarrow \mathbf{TR} \xrightarrow{\nu} \mathbf{T}$. The converse does not need to hold. For instance, \mathbf{Q} has a natural total order and various p -adic valuations, but these p -adic valuations are not compatible with the total order. For a description of what makes a valuation compatible with a total order, we refer the reader to discussions in other papers [Gun22a; AGT23].

2. POLYNOMIALS OVER HYPERFIELDS

Definition 2.1. If H is a hyperfield and $\mathbf{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ are indeterminants, we define the set of *polynomials*

$$H[\mathbf{x}] = \left\{ \sum a_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{m}} : \mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n, \text{ with finite support} \right\},$$

where we use multi-index notation $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{m}} = x_1^{m_1} \cdots x_n^{m_n}$ and the *support* of $f = \sum a_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{m}}$ is the set $\text{supp}(f) = \{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n : a_{\mathbf{m}} \neq 0\}$. Addition and multiplication (defined by convolution) give set-valued operations, meaning that $H[\mathbf{x}]$ is not, in general, a hyperfield.

If $f, g, h \in H[\mathbf{x}]$ are such that $f \in g \cdot h$, we call this a *factorization* of f . Concretely, if the coefficients of f, g, h are $a_{\mathbf{m}}, b_{\mathbf{m}}, c_{\mathbf{m}}$, respectively, this means that for every $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ we have,

$$a_{\mathbf{m}} \in \bigsqcup_{\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{m}} b_{\mathbf{n}} c_{\mathbf{p}}.$$

If $f = \sum a_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{m}} \in H[\mathbf{x}]$ and $\mathbf{z} \in H^n$, then $f(\mathbf{z})$ denotes the evaluation of f at \mathbf{z} , which is the set $\bigsqcup a_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{m}}$.

Remark 2.2. Because addition in hyperfields is set-valued, when we construct polynomials, both multiplication and addition are set-valued. We will make use of these operations, but we will not try to develop a broader theory of ring-like algebras with multivalued multiplication and addition for

two reasons. First, $H[\mathbf{x}]$ is generally not “free” in the usual understanding of the adjective. Second, there is an existing theory due to Lorscheid of “ordered blueprints” which contains both hyperfields and free algebras, and which is a nicer and more natural setting to discuss polynomial algebras over hyperfields [Lor18], [BL21, Appendix]. See [Gun22b] for a demonstration of how to rephrase hyperfield notation and multiplicities in terms of ordered blueprints.

Definition 2.3. In some examples, it will be convenient to use a grid notation for polynomials in two variables, where we put the coefficient of $x^i y^j$ at position (i, j) and an empty space for a 0 coefficient. For instance, the grid

$$f = \begin{array}{ccc} & & + \\ & & - \\ + & - & + \end{array}$$

denotes the polynomial $+1 - x - y + x^2 + y^2 \in \mathbf{S}[x, y]$.

Definition 2.4. Let $\varphi: H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ be a morphism of hyperfields and let $f \in H_1[\mathbf{x}]$. We denote by f^φ the polynomial in $H_2[\mathbf{x}]$ obtained by applying φ to all coefficients of f .

Corollary 2.5. *If $\varphi: H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ is a morphism of hyperfields, and $f \in g \cdot h$ in $H_1[\mathbf{x}]$, then $f^\varphi \in g^\varphi \cdot h^\varphi$.*

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 1.13. \square

Definition 2.6. Given two sets of polynomials $H_1[\mathbf{x}]$ and $H_2[\mathbf{x}]$, by a *diagonal transformation*, $\Phi: H_1[\mathbf{x}] \rightarrow H_2[\mathbf{x}]$, we mean a function which is a composite of a map as in Definition 2.4 and a *diagonal monomial substitution* of the form $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{a}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{k}} = (a_1 x_1^{k_1}, \dots, a_n x_n^{k_n})$ for some $\mathbf{a} \in H_2^n$ and $\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbf{Z}_{>0})^n$.

Remark 2.7. More general monomial substitutions do not necessarily lead to element-to-element maps. For instance, substituting $y \mapsto x$ in $x + y$ yields $(1 \boxplus 1)x$. In the next lemma, we could also consider substitutions coming from injective semigroup homomorphisms $\mathbf{N}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{N}^n$ instead of just a diagonal ones but since the only substitutions we use have the form $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{a}\mathbf{x}$ or maybe relabelling some variables, it just makes for easier notation to only consider diagonal substitutions.

Lemma 2.8. *If $f \in g \cdot h$ and $(x_i) \mapsto (a_i x_i^{k_i})$ is a diagonal monomial transformation, then $f(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{k}}) \in g(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{k}}) \cdot h(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{k}})$.*

Proof. Let A_m, B_n, C_p be the coefficients of f, g, h , respectively. So we have

$$A_m \in \bigsqcup_{m=n+p} B_n C_p$$

for all $m \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$. This implies that

$$A_m \mathbf{a}^{m\mathbf{k}} \in \bigsqcup_{m=n+p} B_n C_p \mathbf{a}^{n\mathbf{k}+p\mathbf{k}}$$

which is the condition that $f(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{k}}) \in g(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{k}}) \cdot h(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{k}})$. \square

Combining Corollary 2.5 and Lemma 2.8, we obtain the following:

Corollary 2.9. *If $\Phi: H_1[\mathbf{x}] \rightarrow H_2[\mathbf{x}]$ is a diagonal transformation and $f \in g \cdot h \in H_1[\mathbf{x}]$, then $\Phi(f) \in \Phi(g) \cdot \Phi(h)$.*

2.1. Newton Polygons. A useful tool to understand the combinatorics of polynomials over valued (hyper)fields is the *Newton polytope*.

Definition 2.10. Let $f = \sum a_m \mathbf{x}^m \in H[\mathbf{x}]$. We call the convex hull of $\text{supp}(f) \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ the *Newton polytope*, denoted $\text{Newt}(f)$. We say that f is *dense* if $\text{supp}(f) = \text{Newt}(f) \cap \mathbf{Z}^m$. When H has a valuation $v: H \rightarrow \mathbf{T}$, we furthermore have a subdivision of $\text{Newt}(f)$, constructed as follows.

Take the set of points

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(m, v(a_m)) \in \mathbf{Z}^m \times \mathbf{R} : m \in \text{supp}(f)\}.$$

The *lower convex hull* of \mathcal{S} is the intersection of all “lower-halfspaces” containing \mathcal{S} . Here, a lower-halfspace is a halfspace cut out by a “lower-inequality”: $\{p \in \mathbf{R}^{m+1} : \langle u, p \rangle + c \geq 0\}$ for some $u \in \mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $c \in \mathbf{R}$. This lower convex hull is sometimes called the *extended Newton polytope* of f .

By projecting the faces of this extended Newton polytope into the first m coordinates, we obtain a subdivision of $\text{Newt}(f)$. For polynomials over valued hyperfields, $\text{Newt}(f)$ refers to both the polytope and the subdivision, where appropriate.

Example 2.11. Consider the polynomial $1 + x + y + x^2 + xy + 1y^2 \in \mathbf{T}[x, y]$. The edges and vertices of the extended Newton polytope are drawn in Figure 2 in greyscale and the associated subdivision is drawn beneath it in purple. ◇




FIGURE 2. Extended Newton polytope of the polynomial $f = 1 + x + y + x^2 + xy + 1y^2 \in \mathbf{T}[x, y]$ and associated subdivision of $\text{Newt}(f)$. Numbers indicate the valuation of the corresponding coefficient.

Definition 2.12. The Newton polytope of $1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ is the standard $(n+1)$ -simplex, denoted Δ_{n+1} . The Newton polytope of $1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^d$ is denoted $d\Delta_{n+1}$ and is the d -fold Minkowski sum of Δ_{n+1} . Concretely,

$$d\Delta_{n+1} = \left\{ \mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \sum a_i \leq d \right\}.$$

Given a polynomial $f \in H[\mathbf{x}]$, we say that f has *Newton-degree* d if $\text{Newt}(f) = d\Delta_{n+1}$.

2.2. Polynomial Functions.

Definition 2.13. Every polynomial $f = \sum a_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathbf{T}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ determines a tropical polynomial function PF_f , given by

$$\text{PF}_f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}, \quad \mathbf{x} \mapsto \min\{a_{\mathbf{m}} + \langle \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{x} \rangle : \mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n\}.$$

Tropical polynomial functions are piecewise linear with integral slopes. We say that a monomial $a_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{m}}$ of f is *essential* if $\text{PF}_f(\mathbf{x}) = a_{\mathbf{m}} + \langle \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ on some open subset of \mathbf{R}^n . In general, the polynomial f is not determined by PF_f , but all of its essential monomials are. More precisely, if f^{ess} denotes the sum of the essential monomials of f , then $\text{PF}_f = \text{PF}_{f^{\text{ess}}}$. It follows that for two polynomials $f, g \in \mathbf{T}[\mathbf{x}]$ we have $\text{PF}_f = \text{PF}_g$ if and only if $f^{\text{ess}} = g^{\text{ess}}$. We say that f is *strictly convex* if $f = f^{\text{ess}}$. Note that we always have $\text{Newt}(f) = \text{Newt}(f^{\text{ess}})$.

Remark 2.14. Polynomial functions use arithmetic from the tropical *semifield* $\bar{\mathbf{R}}$ where $a \oplus b$ is the single element $\min\{a, b\}$. In Lorscheid's theory of ordered blueprints, there is a functor which relates the hyperfield \mathbf{T} with the semifield $\bar{\mathbf{R}}$. Consider the order \leq on \mathbf{T} , defined by $a \leq b + c$ if $a \in b \boxplus c$. If we add the relation $1 + 1 \leq 1$, we obtain $\bar{\mathbf{R}}$.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $f, g \in \mathbf{T}[\mathbf{x}]$ be polynomials and let $h \in f \cdot g$. Then we have*

$$\text{PF}_h = \text{PF}_f + \text{PF}_g.$$

Proof. Let $a_{\mathbf{m}}, b_{\mathbf{m}}$ and $c_{\mathbf{m}}$ denote the coefficients of f, g , and h , respectively. Let $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}^n$ be generic; more precisely, we require that \mathbf{w} is contained in the dense open subset of \mathbf{R}^n where there exist unique $\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2 \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ such that $\text{PF}_f(\mathbf{w}) = a_{\mathbf{m}_1} + \langle \mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{w} \rangle$ and $\text{PF}_g(\mathbf{w}) = b_{\mathbf{m}_2} + \langle \mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{w} \rangle$. In particular, the minimum

$$\min\{a_{\mathbf{m}} + b_{\mathbf{m}'} + \langle \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{m}', \mathbf{w} \rangle : \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n\}$$

is attained exactly once, namely for $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}_1$ and $\mathbf{m}' = \mathbf{m}_2$, and equal to $\text{PF}_f(\mathbf{w}) + \text{PF}_g(\mathbf{w})$. Since for $k \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ we have $c_k \geq \min\{a_{\mathbf{m}} + b_{\mathbf{m}'} : \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{m}' = k\}$, with equality if the minimum is attained exactly once, it follows that $c_{\mathbf{m}_1 + \mathbf{m}_2} = a_{\mathbf{m}_1} + b_{\mathbf{m}_2}$ and that

$$\text{PF}_h(\mathbf{w}) = c_{\mathbf{m}_1 + \mathbf{m}_2} + \langle \mathbf{m}_1 + \mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{w} \rangle = \text{PF}_f(\mathbf{w}) + \text{PF}_g(\mathbf{w}).$$

By continuity of polynomial functions, this implies that $\text{PF}_h = \text{PF}_f + \text{PF}_g$ on all of \mathbf{R}^n . \square

2.3. Initial forms. Let H be a hyperfield and $f \in (H \rtimes \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ and let $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}^n$. Consider the sub-hypperring $H \rtimes \mathbf{R}_{\geq 0} = \nu^{-1}(\mathbf{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\})$ analogous to the valuation subring in a valued field. By definition of polynomial functions, we have

$$\tilde{f} := t^{-\text{PF}_{f\nu}(\mathbf{w})} f(t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_n}x_n) \in (H \rtimes \mathbf{R}_{\geq 0})[\mathbf{x}]$$

and the minimum of the valuations of the coefficients of \tilde{f} is 0. Denote

$$r: H \rtimes \mathbf{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow H, \quad (h, l) \mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } l > 0, \\ h & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

One checks that r is a morphism of hyperrings. The *initial form* $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$ is defined as the image of \tilde{f} under r , that is

$$\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = (\tilde{f})^r.$$

Lemma 2.16. *Let $f, g \in (H \rtimes \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$, let $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}^n$, and let $h \in f \cdot g$. Then we have*

$$\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(h) \in \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f) \cdot \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(g).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.15 we have $\text{PF}_{h\nu}(\mathbf{w}) = \text{PF}_{f\nu}(\mathbf{w}) + \text{PF}_{g\nu}(\mathbf{w})$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & t^{-\text{PF}_{h\nu}(\mathbf{w})} h(t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_n}x_n) \\ & \in \left(t^{-\text{PF}_{f\nu}(\mathbf{w})} f(t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_n}x_n) \right) \left(t^{-\text{PF}_{g\nu}(\mathbf{w})} g(t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_n}x_n) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the hyperring morphism $H \rtimes \mathbf{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow H$ to both sides of “ \in ” finishes the proof. \square

We can then define the initial form of $f \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ at $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}^n$ by

$$\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f^{\nu_{\text{ac}}}).$$

This recovers the definition from the literature [MS15, Chapter 2.4].

2.4. Tropical Hypersurfaces.

Definition 2.17. Let $f \in \mathbf{T}[\mathbf{x}]$ be a tropical polynomial. Its associated *bend locus*, *zero set*, *variety* or *hypersurface* is the set $V(f) = \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{R}^n : f(\mathbf{b}) \ni \infty\}$.

Remark 2.18. Over a general hyperfield, one can also consider the zero set of a polynomial f as $\{a \in H^n : f(a) \ni 0_H\}$. For our purposes, we defined the zero set as a subset of $\mathbf{R}^n = (\mathbf{T}^*)^n$ instead of \mathbf{T}^n as that matches the more familiar definition of a tropical hypersurface [MS15].

Such “equations over hyperfields” were first studied by Viro [Vir11]. For the tropical reals, Jell-Scheiderer-Yu reworded semialgebraic inequalities in terms of a polynomial containing a positive, non-negative, zero, etc. element of \mathbf{TR} [JSY22].

For a polynomial $f \in \mathbf{T}[\mathbf{x}]$, the associated hypersurface, $V(f)$, carries a natural polyhedral structure. Namely, one defines $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in V(f)$ to be in the relative interior of the same polyhedron if and only if $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}'}(f)$. The facets of this polyhedral complex consist of precisely those points \mathbf{w} for which $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$ is a binomial.

This is a *weighted* polyhedral complex where, if $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} + \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{b}}$ is a binomial, the weight $V(f)[\sigma]$ of the facet σ containing \mathbf{w} is the integral length of $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$. The polyhedral complex on $V(f)$, together with the weights on the facets, is called the tropical hypersurface of f . By abuse of notation, we also denote it by $V(f)$.

There is also a dual complex to $V(f)$, which is the polyhedral complex on the Newton polytope of f whose non-empty polyhedra are the convex hull of the supports of polynomials of the form $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$ for $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}^n$. The components of $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus V(f)$ correspond to the vertices of the Newton subdivision, which in turn are precisely the exponents of the essential monomials of f . The facets of $V(f)$ correspond to the edges of the Newton subdivision.

While we described $V(f)$ in terms of f for simplicity, it only depends on the polynomial function PF_f . In fact, $V(f)$ determines PF_f up to a linear function. As polynomial functions can be added (tropical multiplication), this induces a sum of tropical hypersurfaces as well. The sum of two tropical hypersurfaces V and W can be described explicitly without reference to the defining polynomials (or polynomial functions). Namely, the underlying set of $V + W$ is $V \cup W$, and the weights are the sums of the weights of V and W , where on $V \setminus W$ we take the weight to be 0, and similarly on $W \setminus V$.

3. FACTORING MULTIVARIATE POLYNOMIALS OVER HYPERFIELDS

3.1. The hyperfield multiplicity.

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L} \subseteq H[\mathbf{x}]$ be non-empty sets of polynomials over a hyperfield H and assume that the degree is bounded on \mathcal{F} (i.e. there exists some $d > 0$ such that all $f \in \mathcal{F}$ have degree at most d). We let

$$(\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{L}) = \{g \in H[\mathbf{x}] : g \cdot l \cap \mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset \text{ for some } l \in \mathcal{L}\}.$$

Then we define the *hyperfield multiplicity* $\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F})$ as follows: if \mathcal{L} contains a unit, we set $\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}) = \infty$. Otherwise, we define the multiplicity inductively as

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{L}) = \emptyset, \\ 1 + \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H((\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{L})) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

If $\mathcal{L} = \{l\}$ or $\mathcal{F} = \{f\}$ are singletons, we will use the same notation without the braces, such as $(f : l)$ or $\text{mult}_l^H(f)$.

Remark 3.2. In most prior works, the multiplicity operator is defined for one polynomial and one linear factor. The exception to this is the work of Liu, which allows for a set of linear factors (but where \mathcal{F} is still a single polynomial) [Liu20].

Example 3.3. If $H = \mathbf{K}$, and $l = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \in \mathbf{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, then $l \cdot \sum_{|\mathbf{m}| \leq d-1} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{m}}$ is the set of all polynomials over \mathbf{K} of Newton-degree d . So if $f \in \mathbf{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ has Newton-degree d , then $\text{mult}_l(f) = d$. \diamond

Lemma 3.4. Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L} \subseteq H[\mathbf{x}]$ be non-empty sets such that the degree is bounded on \mathcal{F} . Then we have

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}) = \max\{\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(f) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

Proof. It follows directly from the definition of the multiplicity that if $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, then

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}') \leq \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}) \geq \max\{\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(f) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

We show the reverse implication by induction on $\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F})$, the base case $\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ being trivial. If $\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}) > 0$, then we have

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H((\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{L})) = \max\{\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(g) : g \in (\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{L})\}$$

by the induction hypothesis. Let $g \in (\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{L})$ be an element where this maximum is attained and let $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $l \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $f \in g \cdot l$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(f) &= \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H((f : \mathcal{L})) + 1 \geq \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(g) + 1 \\ &= \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H((\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{L})) + 1 = \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let H_1 and H_2 be hyperfields, let $\Phi: H_1[\mathbf{x}] \rightarrow H_2[\mathbf{x}]$ be a diagonal transformation. Let $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{F} \subseteq H_1[\mathbf{x}]$ such that the degree is bounded on \mathcal{F} . Suppose that $\Phi(\mathcal{F})$ does not contain the zero polynomial. Then we have*

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H_1}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \text{mult}_{\Phi(\mathcal{L})}^{H_2}(\Phi(\mathcal{F})).$$

Proof. Since the degree is bounded on \mathcal{F} , it is also bounded on $\Phi(\mathcal{F})$. Also, if \mathcal{L} contains a unit, then so does $\Phi(\mathcal{L})$. Therefore, we may assume that neither \mathcal{L} nor $\Phi(\mathcal{L})$ contain a unit.

The result now follows by induction from Corollary 2.5 and Lemma 2.8. \square

3.2. The boundary multiplicity. For $i = 0, \dots, n$, let π_i be the monomial transformation which substitutes $x_i \mapsto 0$ and $x_j \mapsto x_j$ for $j \neq i$. These monomial transformations are subject to Lemma 3.5.

Definition 3.6. Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L} \subseteq H[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be nonempty sets such that the degree on \mathcal{F} is bounded. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ denote the polynomials in the variables x_0, \dots, x_n obtained by homogenizing the sets \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{L} , respectively. We define the *boundary multiplicity* of \mathcal{F} at \mathcal{L} to be

$$\partial\text{-mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}) = \partial\text{-mult}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}^H(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}) = \min\{\text{mult}_{\pi_i(\tilde{\mathcal{L}})}^H(\pi_i(\tilde{\mathcal{F}})) : 0 \leq i \leq n\}$$

Corollary 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L} \subset H[\mathbf{x}]$ be nonempty sets with bounded degree on \mathcal{F} . We have*

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}) \leq \partial\text{-mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(\mathcal{F}).$$

Proof. Since multiplicities are not affected by homogenization, this follows directly from Lemma 3.5 applied to the morphisms π_i for $0 \leq i \leq n$. \square

Example 3.8.

- (a) If $f \in \mathbf{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ has Newton-degree d and $l \in \mathbf{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ is the unique polynomial of Newton-degree 1, then by Example 3.3 we have

$$\text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{K}}(f) = \partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{K}}(f) = d.$$

(b) Let $f \in \mathbf{S}[x, y, z]$ be the degree-3 polynomial given by

$$f = \begin{array}{ccccc} & & + & & \\ & - & + & & \\ & + & + & - & \\ & & + & + & - & + \end{array}$$

and let l be the degree-1 polynomial given by

$$l = \begin{array}{ccc} & + & \\ & + & + \end{array}.$$

Then by the univariate Descartes' Rule of Signs [Gun22b, Example A.2], [BL21, Theorem C], we have $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 1$. We claim that $\text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 0$. Indeed, if $f \in g \cdot l$, then it follows from the conditions on the boundary that

$$g = \begin{array}{ccc} & + & \\ - & - & \\ + & - & + \end{array}$$

But for this choice of g , the xy -coefficient of any $h \in g \cdot l$ is necessarily negative, contradicting the fact that the xy -coefficient of f is positive. \diamond

3.3. Multiplicities and initial forms.

Example 3.9. Let $f = \sum_{m \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n} a_m x^m \in (H \times \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ be a polynomial in n -variables and let $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}^n$. Moreover, let $l = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n t^{-w_i} x_i \in (H \times \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$. We have

$$\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i.$$

In the univariate case (i.e. $n = 1$), we have

$$\text{mult}_l(f) = \text{mult}_{\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l)}(\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f))$$

by [Gun22b, Theorem A]. This cannot be true in higher dimensions by Lemma 2.15. Concretely, it fails for the polynomial

$$f = 0 + x + y + 2x^2 + 1xy + 2y^2 \in \mathbf{T}[x, y]$$

and $w = 0$. In this case, we have $\text{in}_0(f) = \text{in}_0(l) = 1 + x + y$ and hence $\text{mult}_{\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l)}(\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f)) = 1$. On the other hand, $V(f)$ does not contain $V(l)$, as shown in Figure 3, and therefore $\text{mult}_l(f) = 0$ by Lemma 2.15. We observe that

$$\text{mult}_l(f) \leq \text{mult}_{\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l)}(\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f))$$

in this example. \diamond




FIGURE 3. Tropical curves defined by $0 + x + y + 2x^2 + 1xy + 2y^2$ and $0 + x + y$.

Proposition 3.10. *Let H be a hyperfield, let $f \in (H \times \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$, and let $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}^n$. Moreover, let \mathcal{L} be a set of linear forms. Then we have*

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}(f) \leq \text{mult}_{\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{L})}(\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f)),$$

where $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{L}) = \{\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l) : l \in \mathcal{L}\}$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 2.16 and induction. \square

In the case where the polynomial f is defined over a field and factors as a product of linear forms, the initial forms contain considerably more information:

Proposition 3.11. *Let K be an algebraically closed valued field with residue field κ , let $f = \prod_{i=1}^d l_i \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ be a product of linear polynomials $l_i \in K[\mathbf{x}]$, and let $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}^n$. Moreover, let $l = 0 + \sum(-w_i) \cdot x_i \in \mathbf{T}[\mathbf{x}]$. Then we have*

$$\text{mult}_{\nu^{-1}\{l\}}^K(f) = \text{mult}_{\nu_0^{-1}\{\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l)\}}^{\kappa}(\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f))$$

Proof. After potentially scaling f and the l_i , we may assume that the constant coefficient of each l_i , if it exists, is equal to 1. Then the multiplicity $\text{mult}_{\nu^{-1}\{l\}}^K(f)$ is equal to the number of $1 \leq i \leq d$ such that $l_i^{\nu} = l$. Under the assumption on the constant coefficients, $l_i^{\nu} = l$ is equivalent to $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l_i)$ having support Δ_n , which is equivalent to

$$\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l_i)^{\nu_0} = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n x_j = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l) \in \mathbf{K}[\mathbf{x}]$$

Combining this with the fact that

$$\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = \prod_{i=1}^d \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l_i)$$

(Lemma 2.16), concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.12. *Let K be a valued real closed field with residue field κ , and let $f = \prod_{i=1}^d l_i \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ be a product of linear polynomials $l_i \in \overline{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ over the algebraic closure $\overline{K} = K[\sqrt{-1}]$ of K . Furthermore, let $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and assume that a degree-1 polynomial $\bar{l} \in \kappa[\mathbf{x}]$ divides $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$ with multiplicity 1. Then there exists a degree-1 polynomial $l \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ dividing f with $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l) = \bar{l}$.*

Proof. We have $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = \prod_{i=1}^d \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l_i)$ by Lemma 2.16. In particular, we may assume that after potentially renumbering and scaling by an appropriate element in \overline{K}^* , we have $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l_1) = \bar{l}$. It remains to show that $l_1 \in K[\mathbf{x}]$. Let $\iota: \overline{K} \rightarrow \overline{K}$ denote complex conjugation. Then $f^\iota = f$, and therefore l_1^ι agrees with l_j up to a constant factor for some $1 \leq j \leq d$. It follows that $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l_j)$ and $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l_1) = \bar{l}$ differ by a constant. By the assumption that \bar{l} divides $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$ with multiplicity 1, we conclude that $j = 1$. After potentially scaling by a constant, we may thus assume that $l_1^\iota = l_1$, that is that $l_1 \in K[\mathbf{x}]$. \square

Proposition 3.13. *Let K be a valued real closed field with residue field κ . Suppose $f \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ factors as a product of linear forms $f = \prod_{i=1}^d l_i$ over the algebraic closure $\overline{K} = K[\sqrt{-1}]$ of K , and let $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}^n$. Moreover, let $l = 1t^0 + \sum s_i t^{-w_i} x_i \in \mathbf{TR}[\mathbf{x}]$ for a choice of signs $s_i \in \mathbf{S}^*$. Assume that each factor of $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$ has multiplicity 1. Then we have*

$$\text{mult}_{\nu_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{l\}}^K}(f) = \text{mult}_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l)\}}^{\kappa}(\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f))$$

Proof. We have

$$\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = \prod_{i=1}^d \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l_i).$$

As a linear form $g \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ is contained in $K_{>0} \cdot \nu_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{l\}}$ if and only if $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(g) \in \text{sgn}^{-1}\{\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l)\}$, it follows that

$$\text{mult}_{\nu_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{l\}}^K}(f) \leq \text{mult}_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(l)\}}^{\kappa}(\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f)).$$

The reverse inequality follows directly from Lemma 3.12. \square

3.4. The geometric multiplicity. Suppose we have a hyperfield with valuation, say $H \rtimes \mathbf{R}$. Given a polynomial f over $H \rtimes \mathbf{R}$, the valuation creates a tropical hypersurface $V(f)$. If f has a linear factor, then we will have a linear component in this tropical hypersurface as well. Specifically, as observed in Example 3.9, it is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.15 that for any linear form l and polynomial f we have

$$V(f) = \text{mult}_l(f) \cdot V(l) + V(g)$$

for some polynomial g . This warrants the following definition.

Definition 3.14. Let V be a tropical hypersurface and let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq (H \rtimes \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ be a subset consisting of polynomials of degree 1 that are not monomials. Then we define the *geometric multiplicity*, $\text{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{\mathbf{K}}(V)$, of V with respect to \mathcal{L} to be

$$\text{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{\mathbf{K}}(V) = \max \sum_{i=1}^k a_i$$

with the maximum taken over all k and all $a_i \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$W + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i V(l_i) = V$$

for some tropical hypersurface W and some $l_i \in \mathcal{L}$. For $f \in (H \rtimes \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ we abbreviate $\text{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{\mathbf{K}}(V(f)) = \text{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{\mathbf{K}}(f)$.

Example 3.15.

- (a) Let $f = 0 + x + y + 1x^3 + 1x^2y + 2y^3 \in \mathbf{T}[x, y]$. As we see from the Newton subdivision shown in Figure 4, the vanishing locus $V(f)$ is a union of 2 tropical lines, one of which centered at the origin and one at $(-0.5, -1)$. So if $l = 0 + x + y$, then $\text{gmult}_l^{\mathbf{K}}(f) = 1$. On the other hand, we claim that $\text{mult}_l(f) = 0$. Indeed, assume that

$$f \in l \cdot (a + bx + cy + dx^2 + exy + fy^2).$$

By looking at the coefficients of the constant term, x^3 , and y^3 , we see that we need to have $a = 0$, $d = 1$, and $f = 2$. Because the coefficients of f at x^2 , y^2 , and xy^2 are infinite, we also need to have $b = 1$, $c = 2$, and $e = 2$. But then the xy -coefficient of f is contained in $2 + 3 + 3 = \{2\}$, a contradiction.

- (b) Let $f = +0 - x + y \in \mathbf{TR}[x, y]$ and $l = +0 + x + y$. Then $\text{gmult}_l^{\mathbf{K}}(f) = 1$, but $\text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{TR}}(f) = 0$. \diamond




FIGURE 4. Newton subdivision of $f = 0 + x + y + 1x^3 + 1x^2y + 2y^3$ and associated tropical curve $V(f)$.

While both Example 3.15 (a) and (b) show that the geometric multiplicity is, in general, larger than the multiplicity, the two examples are of a very different nature. Morally, in part (a) the reason for the discrepancy is that the vanishing locus of f does not “see” all monomials of f inside the Newton polytope, whereas in part (b) the reason is that the definition of geometric multiplicity of a polynomial over $H \times \mathbf{R}$ only uses the valuation of the coefficients and does not use any information about H . To change this, we make the following definition.

Definition 3.16. Let H be a hyperfield. An H -enrichment of a tropical hypersurface A in \mathbf{R}^n , is an assignment of an element in H^* to every connected component of $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus A$. Equivalently, it is a map $V \rightarrow H$, where V is the set of vertices of the Newton subdivision corresponding to A . In particular, every $f \in (H \times \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ induces an H -enriched tropical hypersurface $V(f)$.

If A and B are two H -enriched tropical hypersurfaces, their sum $A + B$ is defined to have the sum of the underlying tropical hypersurfaces of A and B as the underlying tropical hypersurface, and the value of a connected component C of $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus A + B$ is the product of the values of the connected components of $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus A$ and $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus B$ that contain A .

Remark 3.17. Enriched tropical hypersurfaces have also appeared in recent work of [JP22] in the context of \mathbf{A}^1 -geometry. In that setting, the components of the complement of a tropical hypersurface take values in the quotient hyperfield $k/(k^*)^2$ for some field k .

Definition 3.18. An H -enriched tropical polynomial function on \mathbf{R}^n is a tropical polynomial function $f: \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, together with an H -enrichment s of $V(f)$. The tropical product of two H -enriched tropical polynomial functions (f, s) and (g, s') is given by $(f + g, t)$, where t is the enrichment of $V(f + g)$ obtained by adding the H -enriched hypersurfaces $(V(f), s)$ and $(V(g), t)$. Given a polynomial $f \in (H \times \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ in n variables, the polynomial function PF_{f^ν} is naturally H -enriched: on each component C of $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus V(f)$, a unique monomial, say $at^w x^m$, of f^ν is minimized, and we assign to C the value $a \in H^*$. We denote by PF_f the H -enriched polynomial function obtained this way.

Lemma 3.19. *Let $f, g \in (H \times \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ and let $h \in f \cdot g$. Then*

$$\text{PF}_h = \text{PF}_f \odot \text{PF}_g$$

as H -enriched tropical polynomial functions. In particular, we have

$$V(h) = V(f) + V(g).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.15, we only need to show that the H -enrichments on both sides coincide. Let C be a component of $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus V(h^\nu)$ and suppose the unique monomials of f and g that are minimized on C are $M_1 = at^{w_1} \mathbf{x}^{m_1}$ and $M_2 = bt^{w_2} \mathbf{x}^{m_2}$, respectively. Let f' and g' be the polynomials obtained from f and g by omitting M_1 and M_2 , respectively, then

$$h \in M_1 M_2 + M_1 g' + M_2 f' + f' g'.$$

By construction, we have for any point $\mathbf{w} \in C$ that $\text{PF}_f(\mathbf{w}) = \text{PF}_{M_1}(\mathbf{w}) < \text{PF}_{f'}(\mathbf{w})$ and $\text{PF}_g(\mathbf{w}) = \text{PF}_{M_2}(\mathbf{w}) < \text{PF}_{g'}(\mathbf{w})$. Therefore,

$$\text{PF}_{M_1 M_2}(\mathbf{w}) < \text{PF}_{M_1 g' + M_2 f' + f' g'}(\mathbf{w}),$$

from which we conclude that $M_1 M_2$ is the unique monomial of h minimized at \mathbf{w} (and hence on C) and that the enrichment of h on C is given by $a \cdot b$, which is precisely the product of the enrichments of f and g there.

The statement about hypersurfaces follows immediately from the statements about polynomial functions and the fact that $V(h^\nu) = V(f^\nu) + V(g^\nu)$. \square

We can now define an enriched version of the geometric multiplicity, completely analogous to the geometric multiplicity.

Definition 3.20. Let V be an H -enriched tropical hypersurface and let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq (H \times \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ be a subset consisting of linear forms. Then we define the H -enriched geometric multiplicity $\text{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(V)$ of V with respect to \mathcal{L} to be

$$\text{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(V) = \max \sum_{i=1}^k a_i$$

with the maximum taken over all k and all $a_i \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$W + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i V(l_i) = V$$

for some H -enriched tropical hypersurface W and some $l_i \in \mathcal{L}$. For $f \in (H \rtimes \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ we abbreviate $\text{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(V(f)) = \text{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(f)$.

Remark 3.21. Since \mathbf{K}^* only consists of one element, tropical hypersurfaces and \mathbf{K} -enriched tropical hypersurfaces are equivalent. In particular, for $H = \mathbf{K}$ the definition of $\text{gmult}^{\mathbf{K}}$ of Definition 3.20 agrees with the definition of $\text{gmult}^{\mathbf{K}}$ from Definition 3.14.

Lemma 3.22. *Let $f \in (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}]$ and let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}]$ be a set of polynomials of degree 1 that are not monomials. Then we have*

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}(f) \leq \text{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(f).$$

Proof. The assertion is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.19. \square

Example 3.23.

- (a) As noted in Remark 3.21, geometric multiplicity and enriched geometric multiplicity coincide over \mathbf{K} . In particular, Example 3.15 (a) can be seen as an example where the enriched geometric multiplicity is strictly smaller than the multiplicity. Morally speaking, any discrepancy between the geometric multiplicity and (hyperfield) multiplicity in that example is entirely due to the valuations, replacing geometric multiplicity with enriched geometric multiplicity will not reduce the discrepancy.
- (b) Let $f = 0 - x + y \in \mathbf{TR}$ and $l = 0 + x + y$, as in Example 3.15. Then $\text{gmult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \text{gmult}_l^{\mathbf{K}}(f) = 0$.

\diamond

Lemma 3.24. *Let $V \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ be an H -enriched tropical hypersurface and let $l \in (H \rtimes \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ be a linear form. If $\text{gmult}_l^{\mathbf{K}}(V) > 1$, then $\text{gmult}_l^H(V) \geq 1$. In particular, we either have $\text{gmult}_l^H(V) = \text{gmult}_l^{\mathbf{K}}(V)$ or $\text{gmult}_l^H(V) = \text{gmult}_l^{\mathbf{K}}(V) - 1$.*

Proof. Let W be the unique tropical hypersurface with $W + V(l^\nu) = V$ as tropical hypersurfaces. Because $\text{gmult}_l^{\mathbf{K}}(V) > 1$, we have $V(l^\nu) \subseteq W$, and hence $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus V = \mathbf{R}^n \setminus W$. Denote by s and t the enrichments of V and $V(l)$, respectively. Let C be a component of $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus W$ and let C' be the unique component of $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus V(l^\nu)$ containing C . Then we can enrich W by assigning to C the element $s(C) \cdot t(C')^{-1} \in H^*$. By construction, we then have $W + V(l^\nu) = V$ as enriched tropical hypersurfaces. This shows that $\text{gmult}_l^H(V) \geq 1$. The remainder of the assertion follows by induction. \square

Definition 3.25. We call a polynomial $f \in (H \rtimes \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ *strictly convex* if $f^\nu \in \mathbf{T}[\mathbf{x}]$ is strictly convex.

Proposition 3.26. *Let Γ be a subgroup of \mathbf{R} , let H be a hyperfield, let $f \in (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}]$ be a dense strictly convex polynomial, and let $l \in (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}]$ be a degree-1 polynomial that is not a monomial and such that $\text{gmult}_l^H(f) > 0$. Then there exists a unique polynomial $g \in (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}]$ with $f \in g \cdot l$ and in fact g is dense, strictly convex, and we have $\{f\} = g \cdot l$.*

Proof. Let W be an enriched tropical hyperplane such that $W + V(l) = V(f)$ and let $g \in (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}^{\pm 1}]$ with $V(g) = W$. Then $V(\mathrm{PF}_g \odot \mathrm{PF}_l) = W + V(l) = V(\mathrm{PF}_f)$ and therefore $\mathrm{PF}_g \odot \mathrm{PF}_l$ and PF_f differ by a linear function. After multiplying g by a suitable monomial, we may thus assume that $\mathrm{PF}_g \odot \mathrm{PF}_l = \mathrm{PF}_f$. For every $h \in g \cdot l$, we have $\mathrm{PF}_h = \mathrm{PF}_f$ by Lemma 3.19. But since f is dense and strictly convex this is only possible if $f = h$. We conclude that $g \cdot l = \{f\}$.

Now let $g' \in (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}^{\pm 1}]$ with $f \in g' \cdot l$. We will first show that g' is strictly convex. Let P be a maximal polytope in the Newton subdivision of g . It corresponds to some vertex \mathbf{p} of $V(g)$. Let Q be the polytope in the Newton subdivision of l , corresponding to the stratum of $V(l)$ containing \mathbf{p} . Then the polytope in the Newton subdivision of f corresponding to \mathbf{p} is given by the Minkowski sum $P + Q$. Let \mathbf{v} be a vertex of Q and let \mathbf{w} be a lattice point contained in P . Then $\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{v}$ is a lattice point of $P + Q$. Because f is dense and strictly convex, this implies that $\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{v}$ is a vertex of $P + Q$ and hence a vertex of $P + \mathbf{v}$. Therefore, \mathbf{w} is a vertex of P . We conclude that every lattice point in the Newton polytope of g' is a vertex of the Newton subdivision of g' , which implies that g' is dense and strictly convex. We can now show that $g' = g$. Because

$$\mathrm{PF}_g \odot \mathrm{PF}_l = \mathrm{PF}_f = \mathrm{PF}_{g'} \odot \mathrm{PF}_l,$$

we have $\mathrm{PF}_g = \mathrm{PF}_{g'}$. But by what we just showed, both g and g' are strictly convex and hence uniquely determined by their enriched polynomial functions. We conclude that $g = g'$.

Finally, note that l has order 0 with respect to each of the variables x_i . Therefore, the order of g coincides with the order of f with respect to each of the variables x_i . It follows that g is a polynomial, that is $g \in (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}]$. \square

Corollary 3.27. *Let Γ be a subgroup of \mathbf{R} , let H be a hyperfield, and let $f \in (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}]$ be a dense strictly convex polynomial. Moreover, let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}]$ be a set of degree-1 polynomials not containing a monomial. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(f) = \mathrm{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}(f).$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.22, we need to show that

$$\mathrm{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(f) \leq \mathrm{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}(f).$$

We do induction on $n = \mathrm{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(f)$, the base case $n = 0$ being trivial. For $n > 0$, there exists an H -enriched tropical hypersurface W and a polynomial $l \in \mathcal{L}$ with $\mathrm{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(W) = n - 1$ and $W + V(l) = V(f)$. In particular $\mathrm{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(f) > 0$. By Proposition 3.26, there exists a dense strictly convex polynomial $g \in (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}]$ with $f \in g \cdot l$. In particular, we have $V(f) = V(g) + V(l)$ by Lemma 3.19 and hence $V(g) = W$. Using the induction hypothesis, we conclude that

$$\mathrm{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(f) = 1 + \mathrm{gmult}_{\mathcal{L}}^H(g) \leq 1 + \mathrm{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}(g) \leq \mathrm{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}(f). \quad \square$$

3.5. Relative hyperfield multiplicity.

Definition 3.28. Let $\varphi: H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ be a morphism of hyperfields and let $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L} \subseteq H_2[\mathbf{x}]$ such that the degree is bounded on \mathcal{F} . The *relative*

multiplicity of \mathcal{F} at \mathcal{L} with respect to φ , denoted by $\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})$, is given by

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\mathcal{L}}^{H_1}(\varphi^{-1}\mathcal{F}).$$

Proposition 3.29. *Let $\varphi: H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ be a morphism of hyperfields and let $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L} \subseteq H_2[\mathbf{x}]$ such that the degree is bounded on \mathcal{F} . Then we have*

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H_2}(\mathcal{F}).$$

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 3.5 applied to the morphism $H_1[\mathbf{x}] \rightarrow H_2[\mathbf{x}]$ induced by φ . \square

Example 3.30.

- (a) Let K be a field and let $\nu_0: K \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ be the trivial valuation. Let $d \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ be coprime to the characteristic of K , and let $f = 1 + x^d + y^d$ and $l = 1 + x + y$ be elements in $\mathbf{K}[x, y]$. We have already seen in Example 3.3 that $\text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{K}}(f) = d$. To compute the relative multiplicity with respect to ν_0 , let $g = a + bx^d + cy^d \in K[x, y]$ be any polynomial with $g^{\nu_0} = f$. Since $a + cy^d$ has only simple roots, Eisenstein's criterion, applied with respect to any prime factor of $a + cy^d$, shows that g is irreducible. We conclude that

$$\text{mult}_{\nu_0^{-1}\{l\}}^K(g) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d = 1, \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

and therefore

$$\text{mult}_l^{\nu_0}(f) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d = 1, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

- (b) We keep the setting of part (a), but instead take $f = \sum_{|m| \leq d} x^m$. If K is infinite, then for d generic linear forms $l_1, \dots, l_d \in \nu_0^{-1}\{l\}$ we have $(\prod_{i=1}^d l_i)^{\nu_0} = f$, and hence $\text{mult}_l^{\nu_0}(f) = \text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{K}}(f) = d$. If the field K is finite, things are more complicated. For example, if $K = \mathbf{F}_2$ and $d = 2$, then $\text{mult}_l^{\nu_0}(f) = 0$. \diamond

Example 3.31. For the morphism $\text{sgn}: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$, the hyperfield multiplicity can be strictly larger than the relative hyperfield multiplicity, even for dense polynomials. Consider the polynomial

$$f = \begin{array}{ccc} & + & \\ - & + & \\ + & - & - \\ + & - & + & + \end{array} \in \begin{array}{ccc} & + & + \\ + & + & \cdot \\ & - & - \\ + & - & + \end{array}.$$

The given factorization of f is the unique way to factor out $l = 1 + x + y$, so we see that $\text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 1$. However, there exists no degree-2 polynomial $g \in \mathbf{R}[x, y]$ such that $(1 + x + y)g$ has the given sign pattern. Assume on the contrary that such g existed. We may assume that $g(0, 0) = 1$, and write $g(x, y) = 1 - ax - by + cx^2 - dxy + ey^2$, where a, b, c, d, e are positive reals. Then we have

$$(1+x+y)g(x, y) = 1+(1-a)x+(1-b)y+(c-a)x^2+(-a-b-d)xy+(e-b)y^2+cx^3+(c-d)x^2y+(-d+e)xy^2+ey^3.$$

This product having the signs of f is equivalent to

$$\begin{array}{ll} 1 < a & 1 > b \\ c > a & e < b \\ c < d & e > d, \end{array}$$

from which we obtain a chain

$$1 < a < c < d < e < b < 1.$$

A contradiction! ◇

Proposition 3.32. *Let K be a field, H a hyperfield, $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ a totally ordered group, and let $\varphi: K \rightarrow H \rtimes \Gamma$ be a surjective morphism of hyperfields. Moreover, let $f \in (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}]$ be a dense strictly convex polynomial, and let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq (H \rtimes \Gamma)[\mathbf{x}]$ be a set of polynomials of Newton-degree 1. Then we have*

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{\varphi}(f) = \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}(f).$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.29, we have $\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{\varphi}(f) \leq \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}(f)$. We show the reverse inequality by induction on $m = \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}(f)$. The base case $m = 0$ is trivial, so we may assume that $m > 0$, in which case we have $m = 1 + \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}((f : \mathcal{L}))$. By Lemma 3.4, there exists $g \in (f : \mathcal{L})$ with $\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}((f : \mathcal{L})) = \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}(g)$, and by definition of $(f : \mathcal{L})$ we have $f \in g \cdot l$ for some $l \in \mathcal{L}$. By Proposition 3.26, the polynomial g is dense, strictly convex, and $g \cdot l = \{f\}$, so by the induction hypothesis we have

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{H \rtimes \Gamma}(g) = \text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{\varphi}(g) = \text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\mathcal{L}}^K(\varphi^{-1}\{g\}).$$

Again by Lemma 3.4, there exists $\tilde{g} \in \varphi^{-1}\{g\}$ with

$$\text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\mathcal{L}}^K(\varphi^{-1}\{g\}) = \text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\mathcal{L}}^K(\tilde{g}).$$

Let $\tilde{l} \in \varphi^{-1}\{l\}$. Then we have

$$(\tilde{g} \cdot \tilde{l})^{\varphi} \in g \cdot l = \{f\},$$

that is $(\tilde{g} \cdot \tilde{l})^{\varphi} = f$. It follows that

$$\text{mult}_{\mathcal{L}}^{\varphi}(f) = \text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\mathcal{L}}^K(\varphi^{-1}\{f\}) \geq \text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\mathcal{L}}^K(\tilde{g} \cdot \tilde{l}) \geq 1 + \text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\mathcal{L}}^K(\tilde{g}) = m. \quad \square$$

3.6. Perturbation multiplicity. One technique for analyzing the roots of a polynomial in $\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ is to perturb the coefficients within the field of Puiseux series $\mathbf{C}[[t^{\mathbf{Q}}]]$ and consider a homotopy as $t \rightarrow 0$. By analogy, if we want to compute a multiplicity over a hyperfield H , we can consider the same multiplicity in $H \rtimes \mathbf{R}$ after a small perturbation. We will only consider strictly convex perturbations; in the case where the polynomial $f \in H[\mathbf{x}]$ we start with is dense, this allows us to bound the multiplicity of f from below by H -enriched geometric multiplicities, which are much easier to compute than hyperfield multiplicities.

For this multiplicity, we work over \mathbf{S} . The sign hyperfield is special in that the inclusion $\mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{S} \rtimes \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{TR}$ splits canonically. That is, the angular component map $\text{ac}: \mathbf{TR} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ is a morphism of hyperfields.

Remark 3.33. A tropical extension consists of an exact sequence of groups $1 \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow E^* \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow 1$ meaning $\text{im}(H^* \rightarrow E^*) = \text{eq}(1, E^* \rightarrow \Gamma)$. The corresponding sequence of hyperrings $0 \rightarrow H \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathbf{K} \rtimes \Gamma \rightarrow 0$ is not necessarily exact because $\text{eq}(1, E^* \rightarrow \Gamma)$ is only the multiplicative kernel. So despite having a section $\Gamma \rightarrow H \rtimes \Gamma, \gamma \mapsto t^\gamma$, we should not expect that the angular component map $\text{ac}: H \rtimes \Gamma \rightarrow H$ is a morphism.

Definition 3.34. Let $f \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ and let $l \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ be a linear form. Let \mathcal{F} denote the subset of $\text{ac}^{-1}\{f\}$ consisting of strictly convex polynomials in $\mathbf{TR}[\mathbf{x}]$. We define the *perturbation multiplicity* of l in f , denoted $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f)$ by

$$\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \text{mult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{TR}}(\mathcal{F}).$$

Corollary 3.35. *Let $f \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ and let $l \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ be a linear form. Then we have*

$$\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) \leq \tilde{\text{mult}}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f).$$

If f is dense, $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbf{TR}[\mathbf{x}]$ is the set of all strictly convex polynomials in $\text{ac}^{-1}(f)$, and l is not a monomial, then

$$\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \text{gmult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathcal{F})$$

Proof. The inequality is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.5, the equality a direct consequence of Corollary 3.27. \square

Remark 3.36. Given a dense polynomial $f \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ and a linear form $l \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$, the equality $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \text{gmult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathcal{F})$ from Corollary 3.35 reduces the computation of $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f)$ to a finite problem, that is only finitely many multiplicities $\text{gmult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{S}}(\tilde{f})$ for $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ need to be computed. Indeed, the condition that $V(\tilde{f}) = W + V(\tilde{l})$ for some \mathbf{S} -enriched tropical hypersurface W and some $\tilde{l} \in \text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}$ does not depend on the exact position of the vertices of the \mathbf{S} -enriched tropical hypersurface $V(\tilde{f})$, but only its combinatorial type. Expressed dually, $\text{gmult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{S}}(\tilde{f})$ only depends on l , f , and the Newton subdivision of \tilde{f} , for which there are only finitely many choices.

Now assume we are in two variables and we are given a strictly convex \tilde{f} in $\text{ac}^{-1}\{f\}$. If $V(\tilde{f}) = W + V(\tilde{l})$ as above, then the Newton subdivision of \tilde{f} is a mixed subdivision of the Newton subdivisions of W and $V(\tilde{l})$. Because \tilde{f} is dense and strictly convex, every lattice point of $\text{Newt}(\tilde{f})$ appears as a vertex of the Newton subdivision of \tilde{f} . This can only happen if W and $V(\tilde{l})$ meet transversally with intersection multiplicity 1. Therefore, every cell in the mixed subdivision of W and $V(\tilde{l})$ either is a translate of a cell in the Newton subdivision of W or $V(\tilde{l})$, or a parallelogram of volume 1. Since $V(\tilde{f}) = W + V(\tilde{l})$ needs to hold on the level of \mathbf{S} -enriched tropical hypersurfaces, the signs of f and l give additional constraints on which mixed subdivisions can appear for \tilde{f} . Namely, each translate of a cell of the Newton subdivision of W and $V(\tilde{l})$ has to have the same signs as in W or $V(\tilde{l})$ or exactly opposite signs, and each parallelogram has to be of the following form, up to translation and the action of $\text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z})$:





FIGURE 5. Sign compatible subdivision, quotient with induced subdivision, and associated tropical hypersurfaces.



Example 3.37. With the notation as in Remark 3.36, let $\tilde{f} \in \mathbf{TR}[x, y]$ be a polynomial of Newton-degree 5 with f^{ac} and its Newton subdivision as in Figure 5 on the top left. Then the Newton subdivision can be realized as a mixed subdivision of subdivisions of the 4-simplex and the Newton polytope of $l = 1 + x + y$ (the 1-simplex) by declaring the triangle in dark purple in the figure as the unique unmixed cell coming from the 1-simplex, and declaring the light purple cells as the mixed cells. The dark purple unmixed cell has the same sign pattern as the Newton polytope of l and the mixed cells all have the allowed sign patterns outlined in Remark 3.36. We can conclude that $V(\tilde{f}) = W + V(l)$ for some \mathbf{S} -enriched tropical hypersurface W and some $l \in ac^{-1}\{l\}$. Moreover, the procedure determines the subdivision and signs of the Newton polytope of W : simply remove the cells in purple and push together the remaining cells. The result is depicted on the lower left of Figure 5. Note that this procedure can be repeated with the all-negative

triangle and suitably chosen mixed cells, giving a total geometric multiplicity of $\text{gmult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{S}}(\tilde{f}) = 2$.

Finally, the right of Figure 5 shows the dual tropical picture. The given Newton subdivision of \tilde{f} makes $V(\tilde{f}^\nu)$ a union of tropical lines. The tropical line L in purple on the top right corresponds to the purple cells and what we phrased in terms of subdivisions above is that there exists an \mathbf{S} -enrichment \tilde{L} of L and an \mathbf{S} -enriched tropical hypersurface W such that $V(\tilde{f}) = W + \tilde{L}$ and $\tilde{L} = V(\tilde{l})$ for some $\tilde{l} \in \text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}$. The \mathbf{S} -enriched tropical hypersurface W is depicted on the bottom right. \diamond

Example 3.38. The perturbation multiplicity can also be defined over hyperfields H for which the angular component $\text{ac}: H \rtimes \mathbf{R} \rightarrow H$ is not a morphism. However, in these settings the inequality $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^H(f) \leq \text{mult}_l^H(f)$ will fail to hold in general. Consider the polynomial

$$f(x, y) = 0 + 1x + y + 1x^2 + 1xy + y^2 \in \mathbf{T}[x, y]$$

and let $l = 0 + x + y \in \mathbf{T}[x, y]$. Then $\text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{T}}(f) = \text{gmult}_l^{\mathbf{T}}(f) = 0$. Now extend from \mathbf{T} to $\mathbf{T} \rtimes \mathbf{R}$ (using reverse lexicographic order). We have

$$\begin{aligned} & [(0, 0) + (0, 0)x + (0, 0)y] \cdot [(0, 0) + (1, -1)x + (0, 1)y] \\ &= (0, 0) + (1, -1)x + (0, 0)y + (1, -1)x^2 + (1, -1)xy + (0, 1)y^2 \end{aligned}$$

This is a strictly convex polynomial whose (coefficient-wise) angular component is f , so $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{T}}(f) \geq 1$. \diamond

Proposition 3.39. *Let $f \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ be dense and let $l \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ be of Newton-degree 1. Moreover, let K be a valued real closed field with value group \mathbf{R} . Then we have*

$$\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) \leq \text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(f).$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.4, there exists a polynomial $g \in \text{ac}^{-1}\{f\} \subseteq \mathbf{TR}[\mathbf{x}]$, which is strictly convex and where $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \text{mult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{TR}}(g)$. Because f is dense, g is dense as well. By the definition of the relative multiplicity and Proposition 3.32, we have

$$\text{mult}_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{l\}}^K(\nu_{\text{sgn}}^{-1}\{g\}) = \text{mult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\nu_{\text{sgn}}}(g) = \text{mult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{TR}}(g).$$

As $\nu_{\text{sgn}}^{-1}\{g\} \subseteq \text{sgn}^{-1}\{f\}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(f) &= \text{mult}_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{l\}}^K(\text{sgn}^{-1}\{f\}) \\ &\geq \text{mult}_{\text{sgn}^{-1}\{l\}}^K(\nu_{\text{sgn}}^{-1}\{g\}) = \text{mult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{TR}}(g). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Example 3.40. The perturbation multiplicity can be strictly smaller than the relative multiplicity with respect to sgn , even for dense polynomials. To see this, consider the polynomial

$$f = \begin{array}{cccc} & - & & \\ - & + & & \\ + & - & - & \\ + & + & + & - \end{array} \in \begin{array}{cc} + & - \\ + & + \end{array} \cdot \begin{array}{ccc} & - & \\ - & + & \\ + & + & - \end{array}$$

and let $l = 1 + x + y$. The given factorization of f is the unique way to factor out l , so we see that $\text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 1$. We also have

$$f = ((1 + x + y)(1 + .5x - .3y)(1 - .33x + .01y))^{\text{sgn}},$$

so that $\text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(f) = 1$ as well. However, there is no signed mixed subdivision containing a positive or negative triangle, so $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 0$. \diamond

3.7. Multiplicities over \mathbf{S} in degree 2. Since multiplicities in degree 1 are trivial, we now study in detail the first interesting case of polynomials of Newton-degree 2. We work entirely over the hyperfield \mathbf{S} .

Proposition 3.41. *Let H be a hyperfield, let $f \in H[\mathbf{x}]$ be a polynomial of Newton-degree 2 in $n \geq 2$ variables and let $l \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ be of Newton-degree 1. Then we have*

$$\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f).$$

Proof. To simplify notation, we homogenize both l and f , introducing a new variable x_0 . After scaling the variables appropriately, we may further assume that $l = \sum_{i=0}^n x_i$. Let A be the support of f and write $f = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in A} c_{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}$. Let $h = \sum_{i=0}^n c_{2\mathbf{e}_i} x_i$, where $\mathbf{e}_0, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$ denotes the standard basis of \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} . Whenever $f \in l \cdot g$, the square terms $c_{2\mathbf{e}_i} x_i^2$ of f uniquely determine g . More precisely, $f \in l \cdot g$ implies that $g = h$.

For $0 \leq i \leq n$ let $\pi_i: H[x_0, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow H[x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_n]$ be the morphism sending x_i to 0 and x_j to x_j for $j \neq i$. For each $0 \leq i \leq n$, the polynomial $\pi_i(f)$ also has Newton-degree 2. Therefore, the same reasoning as for f applies to $\pi_i(f)$ and $\pi_i(f) \in \pi_i(l) \cdot g$ implies $g = \pi_i(h)$. Because all monomials of f only involve two variables and $n \geq 2$, we have $f \in l \cdot h$ if and only if $\pi_i(f) \in \pi_i(l) \cdot \pi_i(h)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. By what we have observed, this implies that $\text{mult}_l^H(f) \geq 1$ is equivalent to $\partial\text{-mult}_l^H(f) \geq 1$. Moreover, we have $\text{mult}_l^H(f) = 2$ if and only if $\text{mult}_l^H(f) \geq 1$ and h and l differ by a factor in H^* . On the other hand, h and l differ by a factor in H^* if and only if $\pi_i(h)$ and $\pi_i(l)$ differ by a factor in H^* for all $0 \leq i \leq n$, so that $\text{mult}_l^H(f) = 2$ is equivalent to $\partial\text{-mult}_l^H(f) = 2$. \square

Theorem 3.42. *Let $f \in \mathbf{S}[x, y]$ be a dense polynomial of Newton-degree 2 and let $l \in \mathbf{S}[x, y]$ be of Newton-degree 1. Then we have*

$$\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(f) = \text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f).$$

Proof. In light of the inequalities from Proposition 3.39, Proposition 3.29, and Corollary 3.7, it suffices to show that

$$\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f).$$

There are 64 dense polynomials in $\mathbf{S}[x, y]$ of Newton-degree 2, but using symmetry we can group these into 4 cases. First, consider the corners of the Newton polytope. By multiplying everything by -1 , we may assume that either 2 or 3 of the corners are $+$. Additionally, if we view these sign arrangements as a homogeneous polynomial $f(x, y, z) \in \mathbf{S}[x, y, z]$ then we can make use of the symmetries $x \leftrightarrow y$, $x \leftrightarrow z$ and $y \leftrightarrow z$ to permute the

corners arbitrarily. This splits the 64 polynomials into two categories:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} + & & + \\ * & * & * & * & . \\ + & * & + & + & * & - \end{array} \quad \text{and}$$

Secondly, we have the symmetries $x \leftrightarrow -x$, $y \leftrightarrow -y$ and $z \leftrightarrow -z$ which affect the middle signs as indicated in Figure 6. Using these symmetries, we




FIGURE 6. Transformations $x \leftrightarrow -x, y \leftrightarrow -y, z \leftrightarrow -z$.

can assume that at least 2 of the middle signs are +, and that leaves us with just 4 cases which we number as in Figure 7.

We now need to show that $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f)$ for all Newton-degree-1 polynomials $l \in \mathbf{S}[x, y]$. After scaling, we may assume that $l = 1 + sx + ty$ for some $s, t \in \mathbf{S}^*$. In all four cases, the constant, the y , and the y^2 coefficient are positive, so $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 0$ unless $t = 1$. In case 1, we have $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 0$ if $s = -1$ and

$$\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 2 = \epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f)$$

if $s = +1$, where the subdivision realizing the perturbation multiplicity is depicted in Figure 7. In case 3, we have $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 0$ for any choice of s .




FIGURE 7. The 4 cases of Newton-degree 2 sign configurations and subdivisions.

In cases 2 and 4, we have

$$\partial\text{-mult}_l(f) = 1 = \epsilon\text{-mult}_l(f)$$

for all $s \in \mathbf{S}^*$, where the subdivision realizing the perturbation multiplicity is depicted in Figure 7 (the same subdivision works for both choices of s). \square

Example 3.43. In dimension at least 3, there exist dense quadratic polynomials with $\text{mult}_{1+\sum x_i}^{\text{sgn}}(f) < \text{mult}_{1+\sum x_i}^{\mathbf{S}}(f)$. To see this, consider the polynomial

$$f = 1 + x + y - z - xy - xz + yz - x^2 + y^2 - z^2 \in \mathbf{S}[x, y, z].$$

Let $l = 1 + x + y + z$. Then we check that

$$f \in (1 + x + y + z)(1 - x + y - z)$$

over \mathbf{S} and hence $\text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 1$. Now assume $\text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(f) = 1$. Then there exist polynomials $g, h \in \mathbf{R}[x, y, z]$ with $(g \cdot h)^{\text{sgn}} = f$ and $g^{\text{sgn}} = l$. After first scaling g such that its constant coefficient is 1 and then rescaling each variable, we may assume that $g = 1 + x + y + z$. Write $h = a + bx + cy + dz$ for $a, b, c, d \in \mathbf{R}$. Looking at the coefficients of x, xy, yz , and z in gh we obtain the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} a + b &> 0 \\ b + c &< 0 \\ c + d &> 0 \\ a + d &< 0, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to the contradiction

$$a > -b > c > -d > a. \quad \diamond$$

Theorem 3.44. Let $f \in \mathbf{S}[x, y]$ be a (not necessarily dense) polynomial of Newton-degree 2, and let $l \in \mathbf{S}[x, y]$ be of Newton-degree 1. Then we have

$$\text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(f) = \text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f).$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.42 we only need to treat the cases where f is not dense, and by Proposition 3.29 and Corollary 3.7 it suffices to show that

$$\text{mult}_l^{\text{sgn}}(f) = \partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f)$$

If a coefficient of a middle term (e.g. x) in f is zero, then $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f)$ is zero unless the coefficients of the adjacent corners of the Newton polytope (e.g. 1 and x^2) have different signs. Therefore, if all three middle terms of f are zero, we have $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 0$. We may thus assume that either one or two middle terms are zero. After interchanging variables (as in the proof of Theorem 3.42), we may assume that either only the x -coefficient is zero or the x - and y -coefficient are both zero. After scaling f by a unit, we may assume that the constant coefficient is 1, in which case we may assume that the x^2 -coefficient is -1 . If the y -coefficient is also zero, we may also assume that the y^2 -coefficient is -1 . Using the transformations $x \leftrightarrow -x$ and $y \leftrightarrow -y$ we may assume that the non-zero middle terms have coefficient 1.




FIGURE 8. The 3 non-dense cases needed to be checked after all reductions.

This leaves us with three cases for f , as depicted in Figure 8. After rescaling l , we may assume that the constant coefficient of l is 1.

In case 1, we have $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 0$ unless $l = 1 \pm x + y$, in which case $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 1$. We also have

$$f = ((1 + x + y)(1 - x + 2y))^{\text{sgn}}.$$

This shows that $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 1$ for either choice of l .

In case 2, we have $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 0$ unless $l = 1 \pm x \mp y$, in which case $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 1$. We also have

$$f = ((1 + x - y)(1 - x + 2y))^{\text{sgn}}.$$

This shows that $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 1$ for either choice of l .

In case 3, we have $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 0$ unless $l = 1 \pm x \mp y$, in which case $\partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 1$. We also have

$$f = ((1 + x - y)(1 - x + y))^{\text{sgn}}.$$

This shows that $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 1$ for either choice of l . □

Example 3.45. If $f \in \mathbf{S}[x, y]$ is quadratic but not dense, and $l \in \mathbf{S}[x, y]$ has degree 1, it is possible that $\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) < \text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f)$. For example, consider the polynomial

$$f(x, y) = 1 - x^2 + xy - y^2 \in \mathbf{S}[x, y]$$

and let

$$l(x, y) = 1 + x - y.$$

Then we have $\text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = \partial\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 1$. On the other hand, the only subdivision of the Newton polytope of f that appears as the Newton subdivision of a strictly convex polynomial in $\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}$ is depicted in Figure 9. Since the tropical hypersurface associated to any polynomial $h \in \mathbf{TR}[x, y]$ with that Newton subdivision can never contain a tropical line, we have $\text{gmult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{K}}(h) = 0$ and hence $\text{mult}_{\text{ac}^{-1}\{l\}}^{\mathbf{TR}}(h) = 0$ by Lemma 3.22. In particular, we have

$$\epsilon\text{-mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f) = 0 < 1 = \text{mult}_l^{\mathbf{S}}(f). \quad \diamond$$




FIGURE 9. The only Newton subdivision including the support of $1 - x^2 + xy - y^2$ as vertices.

4. SYSTEMS OF EQUATIONS OVER HYPERFIELDS

Let K be a field with a morphism $\varphi: K \rightarrow H$ to a hyperfield H , let $f_1, \dots, f_n \in H[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and let $\mathbf{h} \in (H^*)^n$. In this section, we study the number

$$N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\varphi}(f_1, \dots, f_n) = \max \left\{ \left| \bigcap V(g_i) \cap \varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{h}\} \right| : g_i^{\varphi} = f_i, \left| \bigcap V(g_i) \right| < \infty \right\}.$$

In the case where $H = \mathbf{S}$ (resp. $H = \mathbf{T}$), this is the maximum number of solutions with given signs (resp. given valuations) that a system of equations with given supports and signs (resp. valuations) can have, provided it has finitely many solutions. Our technique to bound this number is via sparse resultants, which translate the problem of finding solutions to a system of equations into the problem of finding linear factors of a single multivariate polynomial.

4.1. Sparse resultants. Let A_0, \dots, A_n be subsets of $\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$. For each $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $\mathbf{a} \in A_i$ introduce a variable $c_{i,\mathbf{a}}$. Then the (sparse mixed) resultant $R = R_{A_0, \dots, A_n}$ of A_0, \dots, A_n is the unique (up to scaling) irreducible integer polynomial in the variables $c_{i,\mathbf{a}}$, which vanishes precisely when the intersection

$$(2) \quad \bigcap_{i=0}^n V \left(\sum_{\mathbf{a} \in A_i} c_{i,\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} \right) \cap (K^*)^n$$

is nonempty for some (and hence any) algebraically closed field K of characteristic 0. We expect the intersection to be nonempty on a codimension 1 set because there is one more equation than variables (x_1, \dots, x_n) . Only if the codimension is indeed 1 the resultant is well-defined; otherwise one sets $R = 1$. For more on resultants, we refer the reader to the book of Gelfand-Kapranov-Zelevinsky [GKZ94]. The resultants we use here are the mixed (A_0, \dots, A_n) -resultants covered in Chapter 8 of their book.

Given $n + 1$ polynomials in n -variables, say $g_i = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in A_i} d_{i,\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} \in H[\mathbf{x}]$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$ over some hyperfield H , we denote by R_{g_0, \dots, g_n} the set (we get a set because hyperaddition is multivalued) of polynomials obtained by substituting $d_{i,\mathbf{a}}$ for $c_{i,\mathbf{a}}$ in R_{A_0, \dots, A_n} . If only n polynomials in n variables are given, say the polynomials g_1, \dots, g_n with the expressions as before, we introduce new variables y_1, \dots, y_n and set

$$R_{g_1, \dots, g_n} = R_{1 + \sum y_i x_i, g_1, \dots, g_n} \subseteq H[\mathbf{y}],$$

substituting y_i for the variables c_{0,e_i} corresponding to

$$A_0 = \{0\} \cup \{\mathbf{e}_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\},$$

where \mathbf{e}_i denotes the i -th standard basis vector in $\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$.

The fact that resultants translate the problem of finding solutions to systems of equations to the problem of finding linear factors of a polynomial already mentioned above, is made precise in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let K be a field of characteristic 0 and let $\varphi: K \rightarrow H$ be a morphism of hyperfields. Moreover, let $\mathbf{h} \in (H^*)^n$, let $l = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i x_i \in H[\mathbf{x}]$, and let $g_1, \dots, g_n \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ generic with respect to their support and such that $R = R_{g_1, \dots, g_n}$ is not constant. Then we have*

$$\left| \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i) \cap \varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{h}\} \right| = \text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\{l\}}^K(R).$$

Proof. Because the coefficients of the g_i are generic with respect to their supports, the intersection

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i)$$

is transverse and consists of $D := \deg(R)$ many distinct points

$$p_j = (p_{j1}, \dots, p_{jn}) \in (\overline{K}^*)^n, \quad 1 \leq j \leq D.$$

Then the intersection

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i) \cap V\left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i x_i\right)$$

is nonempty if and only if

$$1 + \sum_{i=1}^n p_{ji} y_i = 0$$

for some $1 \leq j \leq D$, which happens, by definition of the resultant, if and only if

$$R(y_1, \dots, y_n) = 0.$$

Because D is the degree of R , it follows that R differs from

$$\prod_{j=1}^D \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^n p_{ji} y_i\right)$$

by a unit. The assertion now follows from the observation that $\varphi(p_j) = \mathbf{h}$ if and only if

$$\left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^n p_{ji} y_i\right)^\varphi = l. \quad \square$$

An important observation in the proof of the preceding lemma is that a resultant R_{g_1, \dots, g_n} is (up to a unit), the product of the linear forms $1 + \sum p_{ji} y_i$ corresponding to the common roots p_j of the system

$$g_1(\mathbf{x}) = \dots = g_n(\mathbf{x}) = 0$$

in the algebraic closure of the ground field. Let us illustrate this with an example.

Example 4.2. Take the line $f(x, y) = 3x + 4y - 5$ and intersect it with the circle $g(x, y) = x^2 + y^2 - 1$. These two polynomials have one intersection point $[3 : 4 : 5] \in \mathbf{P}^2$, with multiplicity 2. The resultant of f and g in the variables u, v is therefore proportional to $(3u + 4v + 5)^2$.

We can compute this in the Singular computer algebra system [Sing4] using the `mpresmat` function.

```

system("random", 12341234);
// other seeds lead to different monomial factors
ring R = 0,(u,v),dp;
ring S = R,(x,y),dp;
ideal I = 3x + 4y - 5, x2 + y2 - 1, 1 + ux + vy;
string s = string(det(mpresmat(I, 0)));
// use a string to get this polynomial from S to R
// s = (9u2+24uv+30u+16v2+40v+25)
setring R;
execute("poly p = " + s);
factorize(p);
// Output (factors and multiplicities)
// [1]:
//   _[1]=1
//   _[2]=3u+4v+5
// [2]:
//   1,2

```

◇

4.2. Tropically transverse intersections. We will now study the cases where $H = \mathbf{T}$ or $H = \mathbf{TR}$, where $\varphi: K \rightarrow H$ is either a valuation ν or a signed valuation ν_{sgn} , and where the intersection

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(f_i^\nu)$$

in \mathbf{R}^n is transverse. Recall that this means that $\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(f_i^\nu)$ is finite and every $\mathbf{h} \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(f_i^\nu)$ is contained in the relative interior of a maximal cell of $V(f_i^\nu)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

For every choice of $g_i \in \varphi^{-1}\{f_i\}$ and $\mathbf{h} \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i) \cap (K^*)^n$ we then have $\varphi(\mathbf{h}) \subseteq \bigcap V(f_i^\nu)$. Therefore, we have

$$N_{\mathbf{h}}^\varphi(f_1, \dots, f_n) = 0$$

for all $\mathbf{h} \notin \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(f_i^\nu)$.

Now suppose $\mathbf{h} \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(f_i^\nu)$. Then for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, the initial form $\text{in}_{\mathbf{h}}(f_i)$ is a binomial, say $f_i = a_i \mathbf{x}^{s_i} - b_i \mathbf{x}^{t_i}$. We define the *intersection multiplicity* $m^{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{h}; f_1^\nu \cdots f_n^\nu)$ as

$$m^{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{h}; f_1^\nu \cdots f_n^\nu) = \left| \begin{pmatrix} s_1 - t_1 \\ \vdots \\ s_n - t_n \end{pmatrix} \right|.$$

Lemma 4.3 ([HS95, Lemma 3.2]). *Let $\mathbf{h} \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(f_i^\nu)$ and for $1 \leq i \leq n$ let g_i be polynomials with $g_i^{\nu_0} = \text{in}_{\mathbf{h}}(f_i)^{\nu_0}$ over an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0. Then $\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i)$ contains precisely $m^{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{h}; f_1 \cdots f_n)$ many distinct points.*

Now suppose that $f_i \in \mathbf{TR}[\mathbf{x}]$, and still assume that $V(f_1^\nu), \dots, V(f_n^\nu)$ intersect transversally. Let $\mathbf{h} \in \nu^{-1} \cap_{i=1}^n V(f_i^\nu) \subseteq (\mathbf{TR}^*)^n$. Then $\text{in}_\nu(\mathbf{h})(f_i)$ is a binomial for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Following [IR96], we say that \mathbf{h} is *alternating* if the two coefficients of the binomial $\text{in}_\nu(\mathbf{h})(f_i)$ have opposite signs for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. If $\text{ac}(\mathbf{h}) = (1, \dots, 1)$, we define the signed multiplicity $m^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{h}; f_1 \cdots f_n)$ by

$$m^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{h}; f_1 \cdots f_n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{h} \in \cap_{i=1}^n V(f_i^\nu) \text{ and } \mathbf{h} \text{ is alternating,} \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

For general \mathbf{h} , let $|\mathbf{h}| = (\text{ac}(h_1)h_1, \dots, \text{ac}(h_n)h_n)$ and for $1 \leq i \leq n$ denote

$$f_i^{\mathbf{h}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f_i(\text{ac}(h_1)x_1, \dots, \text{ac}(h_n)x_n),$$

where we identify \mathbf{S}^* with $\nu^{-1}\{0\} = \{\pm t^0\} \subseteq \mathbf{TR}$. The signed multiplicity is then given by

$$m^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{h}; f_1 \cdots f_n) = m^{\mathbf{S}}(|\mathbf{h}|; f_1^{\mathbf{h}} \cdots f_n^{\mathbf{h}}).$$

Lemma 4.4 ([IR96, Lemma 2]). *Let K be a real closed field. Suppose we have binomials $g_1, \dots, g_n \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ such that the affine span of all the Newton polytopes of the g_i is \mathbf{R}^n . If for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, the coefficients of the two monomials of g_i have the same sign, then the intersection*

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i) \cap (K_{>0})^n$$

is empty. Otherwise, it is a singleton.

In particular, suppose $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathbf{TR}[\mathbf{x}]$ and $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbf{TR}^)^n$ are such that $V(f_1^\nu), \dots, V(f_n^\nu)$ intersect transversally at $\nu(\mathbf{h})$. If $g_i \in \text{sgn}^{-1}\{\text{in}_\nu(\mathbf{h})(f_i)\}$, then we have*

$$\left| \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i) \cap \text{sgn}^{-1}\{\text{ac}(\mathbf{h})\} \right| = m^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{h}; f_1 \cdots f_n).$$

Proof. The statement about the positive common roots of the g_i is proven in [IR96, Lemma 2]. The ‘‘in particular’’ statement follows directly from that in the case where $\text{ac}(\mathbf{h}) = (1, \dots, 1)$. The general case is reduced to that case by the coordinate change $x_i \mapsto \text{ac}(h_i)x_i$. \square

We have the following relationship between the initial form of a resultant and the resultant of initial forms.

Proposition 4.5. *Let (K, ν) be a valued field of characteristic 0, equipped with a splitting of the valuation, and let $g_i \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Assume that $V(g_1^\nu), \dots, V(g_n^\nu)$ intersect transversally at $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbf{R}^n$. Then $\text{in}_{-\mathbf{h}}R_{g_1, \dots, g_n}$ and $R_{\text{in}_{\mathbf{h}}(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\mathbf{h}}(g_n)}$ differ by a polynomial q with*

$$\text{mult}_{\nu_0^{-1}\{1 + \sum_{j=1}^n x_j\}}(q) = 0.$$

Proof. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ denote the support of g_i by A_i and let

$$A_0 = \{0\} \cup \{\mathbf{e}_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\},$$

where \mathbf{e}_i denotes the i -th standard basis vector. Moreover, let $R = R_{A_0, \dots, A_n}$ be the resultant of the supports, which is a polynomial in coefficients $c_{i, \mathbf{a}}$, where $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $\mathbf{a} \in A_i$. We defined R_{g_1, \dots, g_n} as a polynomial in

variables y_1, \dots, y_n , but in this proof we will substitute c_{0,e_i} for y_i and view R_{g_1, \dots, g_n} as a polynomial in the variables $c_{0,e_1}, \dots, c_{0,e_n}$. Then R_{g_1, \dots, g_n} is obtained by plugging 1 for $c_{0,\mathbf{0}}$ and $d_{i,\mathbf{a}}$ for $c_{i,\mathbf{a}}$ for $i > 0$ and $\mathbf{a} \in A_i$ into R . We note that R is homogeneous in the coefficients $c_{0,\mathbf{0}}, c_{0,e_1}, \dots, c_{0,e_n}$, so plugging in 1 for $c_{0,\mathbf{0}}$ amounts to dehomogenizing. Therefore, $\text{in}_{-\mathbf{h}}(R_{g_1, \dots, g_n})$ is equal to the polynomial we obtain by plugging in 1 for $c_{0,\mathbf{0}}$ into the initial form

$$\text{in}_{(0, -\mathbf{h})} R((c_{0,\mathbf{a}})_{\mathbf{a} \in A_0}, (d_{i,\mathbf{a}})_{i > 0, \mathbf{a} \in A_i}),$$

where the additional 0 in $(0, \mathbf{h})$ means that we give $c_{0,\mathbf{0}}$ weight zero. Let $\mathbf{w} = (0, -\mathbf{h}, (\nu(d_{i,\mathbf{a}}))_{i > 0, \mathbf{a} \in A_i})$. We view \mathbf{w} as a weight on $\mathbf{R} \lfloor_{i=0}^n A_i$. If for a monomial M of R , we denote $M' = M((c_{0,\mathbf{a}})_{\mathbf{a} \in A_0}, (d_{i,\mathbf{a}})_{i > 0, \mathbf{a} \in A_i})$, then the \mathbf{w} -weight of M with respect to the trivial valuation ν_0 equals the $(0, -\mathbf{h})$ -weight of M' with respect to ν (note that R has integer coefficients). It follows that if

$$(\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}^0(R))((c_{0,\mathbf{a}})_{\mathbf{a} \in A_0}, (\text{ac}(d_{i,\mathbf{a}}))_{i > 0, \mathbf{a} \in A_i}) \neq 0,$$

where the superscript 0 in in^0 indicates that we take the initial form with respect to the trivial valuation, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{in}_{(0, -\mathbf{h})} (R((c_{0,\mathbf{a}})_{\mathbf{a} \in A_0}, (d_{i,\mathbf{a}})_{i > 0, \mathbf{a} \in A_i})) \\ &= (\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}^0(R))((c_{0,\mathbf{a}})_{\mathbf{a} \in A_0}, (\text{ac}(d_{i,\mathbf{a}}))_{i > 0, \mathbf{a} \in A_i}). \end{aligned}$$

To finish the proof, we compute $(\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}^0(R))((c_{0,\mathbf{a}})_{\mathbf{a} \in A_0}, (\text{ac}(d_{i,\mathbf{a}}))_{i > 0, \mathbf{a} \in A_i})$ and, in particular, show that it is non-zero. To this end, let $g_0 = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n c_{0,e_i} x_i$, and let Δ be the polyhedral complex in \mathbf{R}^n , the relative interior of whose faces are precisely the equivalence classes of the relation

$$\mathbf{w}_1 \sim \mathbf{w}_2 \iff \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_1}(g_i) = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_2}(g_i) \text{ for all } 0 \leq i \leq n.$$

Here, we give weight $-h_i$ to the coefficient $c_{0,i}$ of x_i in g_0 . Note that Δ coincides with the intersection of the $n+1$ complexes on \mathbf{R}^n induced by the tropical hypersurfaces $V(g_i')$. By [Stu94, Theorem 4.1], we have

$$(\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}^0(R))((c_{0,\mathbf{a}})_{\mathbf{a} \in A_0}, (\text{ac}(d_{i,\mathbf{a}}))_{i > 0, \mathbf{a} \in A_i}) = \pm \prod_{\mathbf{v}} R_{\mathbf{v}}^{d_{\mathbf{v}}},$$

where the product runs over all vertices \mathbf{v} of Δ , and where

$$R_{\mathbf{v}} = R_{\text{in}_{\mathbf{v}}(g_0), \text{in}_{\mathbf{v}}(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\mathbf{v}}(g_n)}$$

and the $d_{\mathbf{v}}$ are positive integers that can be computed explicitly in terms of the supports of the $\text{in}_{\mathbf{v}}(g_i)$.

The resultant $R_{\mathbf{v}}$ is a monomial if at least one of the $\text{in}_{\mathbf{v}}(g_i)$ is a monomial. Therefore, the set of vertices \mathbf{v} for which $R_{\mathbf{v}}$ is not a monomial is contained in the set S defined by $S = \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i')$. For each $\mathbf{v} \in S$ the polynomials $\text{in}_{\mathbf{v}}(g_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ are binomials that intersect in finitely many points, by Lemma 4.3, no matter how we vary their coefficients. Therefore, $R_{\mathbf{v}} \neq 0$. Moreover, for $\mathbf{h} \neq \mathbf{v} \in S$ the initial form $\text{in}_{\mathbf{v}}(g_0)$ has support strictly smaller than the support of g_0 . As $R_{\mathbf{v}}$ is a product of polynomials with the same support as $\text{in}_{\mathbf{v}}(g_0)$, this implies that

$$\text{mult}_{\nu_0^{-1}\{1 + \sum_{j=1}^n x_j\}}(R_{\mathbf{v}}) = 0.$$

Finally, according to [Stu94, Theorem 4.1] we have $d_{\mathbf{h}} = 1$ because $\text{in}_{\mathbf{h}}(g_0)$ and g_0 have the same support and the support of g_0 spans \mathbf{Z}^n . \square

Theorem 4.6. *Let K be an algebraically closed valued field or a real closed valued field with compatible valuation, with residue field κ . Let $H = \kappa/\kappa^2$ (either \mathbf{K} or \mathbf{S}). Let $\bar{\varphi}: \kappa \rightarrow H$ denote the quotient morphism, and let $\varphi: K \rightarrow H \rtimes \mathbf{R}$ denote the composite $K \xrightarrow{\nu_{\text{ac}}} \kappa \rtimes \mathbf{R} \xrightarrow{\varphi \times \mathbf{R}} H \rtimes \mathbf{R}$. Furthermore, let $f_1, \dots, f_n \in (H \rtimes \mathbf{R})[\mathbf{x}]$ be such that $V(f_1^\nu), \dots, V(f_n^\nu)$ intersect transversally, and let $\mathbf{h} \in ((H \rtimes \mathbf{R})^*)^n$. Then we have*

$$N_{\mathbf{h}}^\varphi(f_1, \dots, f_n) = m^H(\mathbf{h}; f_1 \cdots f_n).$$

In fact, for every generic choice of $g_i \in \varphi^{-1}\{f_i\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have

$$\left| \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i) \cap \varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{h}\} \right| = m^H(\mathbf{h}; f_1 \cdots f_n).$$

Remark 4.7. If K is algebraically closed, then $H \rtimes \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{T}$ and $\varphi = \nu$, and if \mathbf{K} is real closed, then $H \rtimes \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{TR}$ and $\varphi = \nu_{\text{sgn}}$.

Proof. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ let $g_i \in \varphi^{-1}\{f_i\}$, let $R = R_{g_1, \dots, g_n}$, and let $l = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i x_i \in \mathbf{TR}[\mathbf{x}]$. By Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\left| \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i) \cap \varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{h}\} \right| = \text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\{l\}}^K(R).$$

By Proposition 3.11 in the algebraically closed case and Lemma 4.3 and Proposition 3.13 in the real closed case, we have

$$\text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\{l\}}^K(R) = \text{mult}_{\bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\text{ac}(\mathbf{h})\}}^{\kappa}(\text{in}_{-\nu(\mathbf{h})}(R)).$$

By Proposition 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{mult}_{\bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\text{ac}(\mathbf{h})\}}^{\kappa}(\text{in}_{-\nu(\mathbf{h})}(R)) \\ &= \text{mult}_{\bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\text{ac}(\mathbf{h})\}}^{\kappa}(R_{\text{in}_{\nu(\mathbf{h})}(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\nu(\mathbf{h})}(g_n)}), \end{aligned}$$

which, again by Lemma 4.1, is equal to

$$\left| \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(\text{in}_{\nu(\mathbf{h})}(g_i)) \cap \bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\text{ac}(\mathbf{h})\} \right|.$$

By Proposition 3.11 in the algebraically closed case and Proposition 3.13 in the real closed case, we have

$$\left| \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(\text{in}_{\mathbf{h}}(g_i)) \cap \bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\text{ac}(\mathbf{h})\} \right| = m^H(\mathbf{h}; f_1^\nu \cdots f_n^\nu). \quad \square$$

Using some model theory, we can now use our results about the numbers $N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\nu_{\text{sgn}}}(f_1, \dots, f_n)$ for $f_i \in \mathbf{TR}[\mathbf{x}]$ to obtain the following result about the analogous numbers for $f_i \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$. As further explained below after Definition 4.9, we reprove the main Corollary to [IR96, Theorem 2].

Corollary 4.8. *Let K be a real closed field and let $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathbf{TR}[\mathbf{x}]$ such that the tropical hypersurfaces $V(f_i^\nu)$ intersect transversally. Moreover, let $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbf{S}^*)^n$ and denote*

$$G = \text{ac}^{-1}\{\mathbf{h}\} \cap \nu^{-1}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(f_i^\nu)\right) \subseteq (\mathbf{TR}^*)^n.$$

Then we have

$$N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\text{sgn}}(f_1^{\text{ac}}, \dots, f_n^{\text{ac}}) \geq \sum_{\mathbf{g} \in G} m^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{g}; f_1 \cdots f_n).$$

Proof. First, note that the inequality

$$N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\text{sgn}}(f_1^{\text{ac}}, \dots, f_n^{\text{ac}}) \geq \sum_{\mathbf{g} \in G} m^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{g}; f_1 \cdots f_n)$$

can be formulated in the language of real closed fields. Since the theory of real closed fields is complete (see e.g. [Mar02, Chapter 3.3]), we may assume that K is a valued real closed field with surjective valuation. We pick, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, a polynomial $g_i \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ with $g_i^{\nu_{\text{sgn}}} = f_i$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\text{sgn}}(f_1^{\text{ac}}, \dots, f_n^{\text{ac}}) &\geq \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i) \cap \text{sgn}^{-1}\{\mathbf{h}\} \right| = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{g} \in G} \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i) \cap \nu_{\text{sgn}}^{-1}\{\mathbf{g}\} \right| = \sum_{\mathbf{g} \in G} m^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{g}; f_1 \cdots f_n), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Theorem 4.6. \square

Definition 4.9. Let $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$, let $h \in (\mathbf{S}^*)^n$, and let \tilde{F} be the sets of tuples $(\tilde{f}_1, \dots, \tilde{f}_n)$ of polynomials $\tilde{f}_i \in \mathbf{TR}[\mathbf{x}]$ with $\tilde{f}_i^{\text{ac}} = f_i$ and such that $V(\tilde{f}_1^\nu), \dots, V(\tilde{f}_n^\nu)$ intersect transversally. In analogy to the perturbation multiplicity, we define

$$\epsilon\text{-}N_{\mathbf{h}}(f_1, \dots, f_n) = \max \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{g} \in G(\mathbf{h}; \tilde{f}_1, \dots, \tilde{f}_n)} m^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{g}; \tilde{f}_1 \cdots \tilde{f}_n) : (\tilde{f}_i)_i \in \tilde{F} \right\},$$

where

$$G(\mathbf{h}; \tilde{f}_1, \dots, \tilde{f}_n) = \text{ac}^{-1}\{\mathbf{h}\} \cap \nu^{-1}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(\tilde{f}_i^\nu)\right).$$

The statement of Corollary 4.8 can now be rephrased as

$$(3) \quad N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\text{sgn}}(f_1, \dots, f_n) \geq \epsilon\text{-}N_{\mathbf{h}}(f_1, \dots, f_n).$$

If we identify $f_i \in \mathbf{S}[\mathbf{x}]$ with its signed Newton polytope and \mathbf{h} with the orthant of \mathbf{R}^n it determines, then the number $\epsilon\text{-}N_{\mathbf{h}}(f_1, \dots, f_n)$ is precisely what is denoted by $n((f_1, \dots, f_n), \mathbf{h})$ by Itenberg-Roy [IR96]. Corollary 4.8 follows from [IR96, Theorem 2]. Based on the inequality (3) and the idea that the tropically transverse case is the most degenerate and therefore that with the most real solutions, Itenberg and Roy conjectured [*loc. cit.*] that there is equality in (3). This was later disproven by Li and Wang with an explicit counterexample [LW98]. We will revisit that counterexample below in Example 4.11.

4.3. Resultants over hyperfields. As before, let $f_1, \dots, f_n \in H[\mathbf{x}]$, where $f_i = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in A_i} d_{i,\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}$, let $h \in (H^*)^n$, and let $\varphi: K \rightarrow H$ be a morphism from a field K to H . We wish to give an upper bound for

$$N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\varphi}(f_1, \dots, f_n)$$

in terms of the multiplicities introduced in the previous section. Recall that R_{f_1, \dots, f_n} denotes the set of polynomials in $H[\mathbf{y}]$ obtained by taking the sparse resultant of the supports of the f_i and the support of $k = 1 + \sum y_i x_i$, and plugging in the coefficients of the f_i and k .

Theorem 4.10. *Let $l = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i x_i$. Then with the notation as above we have*

$$N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\varphi}(f_1, \dots, f_n) \leq \text{mult}_l^{\varphi}(R_{f_1, \dots, f_n}).$$

In particular, we have $N_{\mathbf{h}}^{\varphi}(f_1, \dots, f_n) \leq \text{mult}_l(R_{f_1, \dots, f_n})$.

Proof. Given $g_i \in \varphi^{-1}\{f_i\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ with $\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i)$ finite, we have

$$R_{g_1, \dots, g_n}^{\varphi} \in R_{f_1, \dots, f_n}.$$

By Lemma 4.1, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(g_i) \cap \varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{h}\} \right| &= \text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{h}\}}^K(R_{g_1, \dots, g_n}) \leq \\ &\leq \text{mult}_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{h}\}}^K(\varphi^{-1}\{R_{f_1, \dots, f_n}\}) = \text{mult}_l^{\varphi}(R_{f_1, \dots, f_n}). \end{aligned}$$

□

In the remainder of this section, we analyze the utility of Theorem 4.10 in two explicit examples. Our computations rely on the help of the Singular Computer Algebra System [Sing4].

Example 4.11. Let a, b, r, s, t be positive reals and consider the polynomial system in two variables given by

$$\begin{cases} f := 1 + ax - by = 0 \\ g := 1 + rx^3 - sy^3 - tx^3y^3 = 0 \end{cases}$$

Li and Wang showed that for appropriate choices of a, b, r, s, t the system has 3 positive real solutions [LW98]. This served as a counterexample to the Itenberg-Roy conjecture that predicted at most 2 real solutions. We now show that a resultant computation can predict the correct bound. As before, we introduce an auxiliary linear form

$$l := 1 + ux + vy$$

with parameters u, v , compute a multiple of the sparse resultant of l, f , and g and then specialize to the sign hyperfield to obtain a set of signed polynomials in u and v . In this set of signed polynomials, some but not all coefficients have a constant sign (up to multiplying everything by -1). We use the following Singular code to compute the resultant.

```
system("random", 12341234);
ring R = (0, (u, v, a, b, r, s, t)), (x, y), dp;
ideal I = 1+ux+vy, 1+ax-by, 1+rx3-sy3-tx3y3;
module m = mpresmat(I, 0);
det(m) / b9; // simplify by dividing by b^9
```

This gives (abbreviating terms with multiple signs)

$$\begin{aligned} & u^6(\dots) + u^5v(\dots) - 3u^5ab^3s + u^4v^2(\dots) - 9u^4va^2b^2s + 3u^4a^2b^3s + u^3v^3(\dots) \\ & \quad + u^3v^2(\dots) + u^3v(\dots) + u^3(\dots) + u^2v^4(\dots) + u^2v^3(\dots) \\ & + u^2v^2(9a^4bs + 9ab^4r + 9abt) + u^2v(\dots) + 3u^2ab^3t + uv^5(\dots) + 9uv^4a^2b^2r \\ & + uv^3(\dots) + uv^2(\dots) - 9uva^2b^2t - 3ua^2b^3t + v^6(\dots) + 3v^5a^3br + 3v^4a^3b^2r \\ & \quad + v^3(\dots) + 3v^2a^3bt + 3va^3b^2t + a^3b^3t. \end{aligned}$$

Specializing to the sign hyperfield, we obtain the set of signed polynomials in u and v represented in Figure 10. The maximal boundary multiplicity of the polynomials in this set is 3, the constants coming from for the lower boundary. Since we know that this bound can be achieved by [LW98], the boundary-multiplicity is equal to the multiplicity in this case. \diamond

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & * & & \\ & & & & + & * & \\ & & & & + & + & * \\ & & & & * & * & * & * \\ & & & & + & * & + & * & * \\ & & & & + & - & * & * & - & * \\ & & & & + & - & + & * & + & - & * \end{array}$$

FIGURE 10. A multiple of the signed sparse resultant of f , g and l . A $*$ means the sign is undetermined.

Note that signed resultants are not always the best way to look at certain problems, as the next example shows.

Example 4.12. We compute a multiple of the resultant of $1 + ux + vy$, $1 + ax + by$ and $1 + tx + rx^2 - sy^2$ using the following code:

```
system("random", 12341234);
ring R = (0,(u,v,a,b,r,s,t)),(x,y),dp;
ideal I = 1+ux+vy, 1+ax+by,1+rx2-sy2+tx;
module m = mpresmat(I,0);
det(m) / b; // simplify by dividing by b
```

The result is the polynomial in u and v given by

$$\begin{aligned} & u^2(b^2 - s) + uv(-ab + bt) + u(2as - b^2t) + \\ & \quad + v^2(a^2 - at + r) + v(abt - 2br) - a^2s + b^2r. \end{aligned}$$

None of the signs of the coefficients are determined, so our bound is 2. But clearly $a, b > 0$ implies that the system cannot have any positive solutions. \diamond

REFERENCES

- [AGS20] Xavier Allamigeon, Stéphane Gaubert, and Mateusz Skomra. “Tropical spectrahedra”. In: *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 63.3 (2020), pp. 507–548. arXiv: [1610.06746](https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.06746) [math.AG].

- [AGT23] Marianne Akian, Stephane Gaubert, and Hanieh Tavakolipour. *Factorization of polynomials over the symmetrized tropical semiring and Descartes' rule of sign over ordered valued fields*. 2023. arXiv: [2301.05483 \[math.RA\]](#).
- [Alb43] A. A. Albert. “An inductive proof of Descartes' rule of signs”. In: *Amer. Math. Monthly* 50 (1943), pp. 178–180.
- [BD17] Frédéric Bihan and Alicia Dickenstein. “Descartes' rule of signs for polynomial systems supported on circuits”. In: *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 22 (2017), pp. 6867–6893. arXiv: [1601.05826 \[math.AG\]](#).
- [BDF21] Frédéric Bihan, Alicia Dickenstein, and Jens Forsgård. “Optimal Descartes' rule of signs for systems supported on circuits”. In: *Math. Ann.* 381.3-4 (2021), pp. 1283–1307. arXiv: [2010.09165 \[math.AG\]](#).
- [BL21] Matthew Baker and Oliver Lorscheid. “Descartes' rule of signs, Newton polygons, and polynomials over hyperfields”. In: *Journal of Algebra* 569 (2021), pp. 416–441. arXiv: [1811.04966 \[math.NT\]](#).
- [BS21] Nathan Bowler and Ting Su. “Classification of doubly distributive skew hyperfields and stringent hypergroups”. In: *Journal of Algebra* 574 (2021), pp. 669–698. arXiv: [2003.03751 \[math.RA\]](#).
- [CC11] Alain Connes and Caterina Consani. “The hyperring of adèle classes”. In: *J. Number Theory* 131.2 (2011), pp. 159–194. arXiv: [1001.4260 \[math.AG\]](#).
- [Cur18] D. R. Curtiss. “Recent extensions of Descartes' rule of signs”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 19.4 (1918), pp. 251–278.
- [FT22] Elisenda Feliu and Máté L. Telek. “On generalizing Descartes' rule of signs to hypersurfaces”. In: *Adv. Math.* 408.part A (2022), Paper No. 108582, 29. arXiv: [2107.10002 \[math.AG\]](#).
- [GKZ94] Isreal M. Gel'fand, Mikhail M. Kapranov, and Andrei V. Zelevinsky. *Discriminants, resultants, and multidimensional determinants*. Mathematics: Theory & Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1994.
- [Gra99] David J. Grabiner. “Descartes' rule of signs: another construction”. In: *Amer. Math. Monthly* 106.9 (1999), pp. 854–856.
- [Gun22a] Trevor Gunn. “A Newton Polygon Rule for Formally-Real Valued Fields and Multiplicities over the Signed Tropical Hyperfield”. 2022. arXiv: [1911.12274 \[math.RA\]](#).
- [Gun22b] Trevor Gunn. “Tropical Extensions and Baker-Lorscheid Multiplicities for Idylls”. 2022. arXiv: [2211.06480 \[math.RA\]](#).
- [HS95] Birkett Huber and Bernd Sturmfels. “A polyhedral method for solving sparse polynomial systems”. In: *Math. Comp.* 64.212 (1995), pp. 1541–1555.
- [HT11] Pentti Haukkanen and Timo Tossavainen. “A generalization of Descartes' rule of signs and fundamental theorem of algebra”. In: *Appl. Math. Comput.* 218.4 (2011), pp. 1203–1207.
- [IR96] Ilia Itenberg and Marie-Françoise Roy. “Multivariate Descartes' rule”. In: *Beiträge Algebra Geom.* 37.2 (1996), pp. 337–346.

- [JP22] Andrés Jaramillo Puentes and Sabrina Pauli. “Quadratically enriched tropical intersections”. 2022. arXiv: [2208 . 00240](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.00240) [[math.AG](#)].
- [JSY22] Philipp Jell, Claus Scheiderer, and Josephine Yu. “Real tropicalization and analytification of semialgebraic sets”. In: *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2 (2022). [Initially appeared as 2021, no. 24, 19178–19208], pp. 928–958. arXiv: [1810.05132](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.05132) [[math.AG](#)].
- [Jun21] Jaiung Jun. “Geometry of hyperfields”. In: *J. Algebra* 569 (2021), pp. 220–257. arXiv: [1707.09348](https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.09348) [[math.AG](#)].
- [Kom06] Vilmos Komornik. “Another short proof of Descartes’s rule of signs”. In: *Amer. Math. Monthly* 113.9 (2006), pp. 829–830.
- [Kri63] P. V. Krishnaiah. “A Simple Proof of Descartes’ Rule of Signs”. In: *Math. Mag.* 36.3 (1963), p. 190.
- [Liu20] Ziqi Liu. “Examples on the sharpness of an inequality about multiplicities over hyperfields”. 2020. arXiv: [2010.09492](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.09492) [[math.NT](#)].
- [Lor18] Oliver Lorscheid. *Blueprints and tropical scheme theory*. <https://oliver.impa.br/notes/2018-Blueprints/versions/lecturenotes180509.pdf>. 2018.
- [LW98] T. Y. Li and Xiaoshen Wang. “On multivariate Descartes’ rule—a counterexample”. In: *Beiträge Algebra Geom.* 39.1 (1998). <https://eudml.org/doc/228888>, pp. 1–5.
- [Mar02] David Marker. *Model theory*. Vol. 217. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. An introduction. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [MS15] Diane Maclagan and Bernd Sturmfels. *Introduction to tropical geometry*. Vol. 161. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [Sing4] Wolfram Decker, Gert-Martin Greuel, Gerhard Pfister, and Hans Schönemann. *SINGULAR 4-3-0 — A computer algebra system for polynomial computations*. <http://www.singular.uni-kl.de>. 2022.
- [Stu94] Bernd Sturmfels. “On the Newton polytope of the resultant”. In: *J. Algebraic Combin.* 3.2 (1994), pp. 207–236.
- [Tok11] Daniel V Tokarev. “A generalisation of Descartes’ rule of signs”. In: *J. Aust. Math. Soc.* 91.3 (2011), pp. 415–420.
- [Vir11] Oleg Ya. Viro. “On basic concepts of tropical geometry”. In: *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics* 273.1 (July 2011), pp. 252–282.
- [Wan04] Xiaoshen Wang. “A simple proof of Descartes’s rule of signs”. In: *Amer. Math. Monthly* 111.6 (2004), pp. 525–526.