

# GENERALISING KAPRANOV'S THEOREM FOR TROPICAL GEOMETRY OVER HYPERFIELDS

JAMES MAXWELL

ABSTRACT. Kapranov's theorem is a foundational result in tropical geometry. It states that the set of tropicalisations of points on a hypersurface coincides precisely with the tropical variety of the tropicalisation of the defining polynomial. The aim of this paper is to generalise Kapranov's theorem, replacing the role of a valuation,  $trop : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ , with a more general class of hyperfield homomorphisms,  $\mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ , which satisfy a relative algebraic closure condition. The map,  $\eta : \mathbb{TC} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ ,  $\eta(x) := \log(|x|)$ , where  $\mathbb{TC}$  is the tropical complex hyperfield, provides an example of such a hyperfield homomorphism.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Hyperfields are generalisations of fields, where the addition is allowed to be a multivalued operation. The notion of a multivalued operation was introduced by Marty in the mid 1930's, who discussed hypergroups. Then, Krasner in [14] progressed the notion to hyperrings, and more recently the connection to tropical geometry has been discussed by Viro in [16], then by Connes and Consani in [9]. One of the main objects studied in this paper is  $\mathbb{TC}$ , the tropical complex hyperfield. It was first introduced by Viro in [17], and is described as a dequantisation of the complex numbers. The motivation of Viro's work was to utilise structures with multivalued addition as an algebraic foundation for tropical geometry. There has been substantial progress made in the last several years in the development of the algebraic theory of hyperfields. Baker and Bowler developed a theory of matroids over hyperfields in [3], and there has been work done by Bowler and Lorscheid on roots and multiplicities, especially characterising multiplicities for the Krasner, sign and tropical hyperfields, in [5]. The work completed by Jun, in [13] and [12], is a more recent study of algebraic geometry over hyperfields. In [12] algebraic sets over hyperfields are introduced and connected to tropical varieties, along with a scheme-theoretic point of view leading to a demonstration that hyperrings without zero divisors can be realised as the hyperring of global regular functions

in [12, Theorem D]. One consequence of the multivalued addition is a necessary extension of the notion of a root. Over hyperfields roots are defined as elements at which the polynomial outputs a set which includes zero, rather than exactly equals zero.

The motivation for this paper comes from Kapranov's Theorem in tropical geometry, [15, Theorem 3.1.3], which states, under mild hypotheses, the set of roots of the tropicalisation of a polynomial  $p$  coincides with the set of tropicalisations of roots of  $p$ . I.e every root of  $\text{trop}(p)$  lifts to a root of  $p$ . The connection is that the tropicalisation map, or valuation  $\text{trop} : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ , is naturally a hyperfield homomorphism .

We define a property of maps between hyperfields called *relatively algebraically closed* (RAC). We describe this precisely in Definition 2.29, but intuitively the RAC property states that when a univariate polynomial is pushed forward through a hyperfield homomorphism, the roots of the polynomial can be lifted back to roots of the original polynomial. The existence of a hyperfield homomorphism which has this property is demonstrated by the map  $\eta = \log(|\cdot|) : \mathbb{TC} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ , in Theorem 2.37, where  $\mathbb{TC}$  is the tropical complex hyperfield and  $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  is the tropical hyperfield. In particular, the operations on  $\mathbb{T}$  are the hyperaddition  $\boxplus$ , defined as  $a \boxplus b = \max(a, b)$ , unless  $a = b$  then  $a \boxplus b = [-\infty, a]$ . The multiplication is  $\odot := +$ . This is a hyperfield analogue of the idempotent semiring structure that has been studied in [15] and [16].

The main result of this paper is a hyperfield version of Kapranov's theorem for RAC hyperfield homomorphisms which map to  $\mathbb{T}$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *Take a RAC hyperfield homomorphism,  $f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ , with induced polynomial map  $f_* : \mathbb{H}[X_1, \dots, X_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ , given by applying  $f$  coefficient-wise. Then for all polynomials  $p \in \mathbb{H}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ ,*

$$V(f_*(p)) = f(V(p)).$$

A natural question regarding the RAC property of hyperfield homomorphisms is: can we give tractable sufficient conditions to guarantee that a map between hyperfields is RAC?

This question is explored in Section 4 and partially answered, stating sufficient conditions for a specific class of hyperfield homomorphisms to be RAC.

**Structure of the paper.** In Section 2 hyperfields and hyperfield homomorphisms will be introduced and the definitions of polynomials and their roots over hyperfields are recalled. This will include examples of common hyperfields. The relative algebraic closure property is defined in Section 2, along with examples, in particular it is shown that  $\eta = \log(|\cdot|) : \mathbb{TC} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  has this property. Then in Section 3 the RAC property is used to construct a proof of a hyperfield version of Kapranov's theorem for maps  $\mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ .

1.1. **Acknowledgements.** The author thanks Jeffrey Giansiracusa for the support and input during the supervision sessions, where the ideas and content for the work was developed. The author would also like to thank Ben Smith, Jaiung Jun and the two anonymous referees for helpful feedback on the first draft. This work was carried out during the author's PhD and was supported by Swansea University, College of Science Bursary EPSRC DTP (EP/R51312X/1), and the author would like to show thanks for making the research possible.

## 2. BACKGROUND

A hyperfield is a generalisation of a field, where the addition operation is allowed to be a multi-valued operation, introduced by Marty and developed into hyperrings by Krasner [14]. Hyperfields are one class of generalisations of rings and fields; others include tracts (see [4]) and fuzzy rings (see [10]). There is a discussion of this range of algebraic structures in [6]. The connection between fuzzy rings and hyperrings is described in [11], where a fully faithful functor from hyperfields to fuzzy rings with weak morphisms is constructed. One particular motivation for working with hyperfields is that the tropical semi-ring, for which a foundational theory has been thoroughly developed in [15], has a natural analogue as the tropical hyperfield. This section will recall the definitions and notation of hyperfields.

2.1. **Hyperfields.** Given a set  $\mathbb{H}$ , then a map  $\boxplus : \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H} \rightarrow P(\mathbb{H})^*$  will denote the hyperoperation of  $\mathbb{H}$ , where  $P(\mathbb{H})^*$  is the power set of  $\mathbb{H}$ . Explicitly,  $P(\mathbb{H})^*$  is the set of all nonempty subsets of  $\mathbb{H}$ . Then for subsets  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{H}$ ,

$$A \boxplus B := \bigcup_{a \in A, b \in B} (a \boxplus b).$$

This definition can be extended for a string of elements. Let  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{H}$  then we define their sum as follows;

$$x_1 \boxplus x_2 \boxplus \dots \boxplus x_k = \bigcup_{x' \in x_2 \boxplus \dots \boxplus x_k} x_1 \boxplus x' \quad .$$

The hyper-operation  $\boxplus$  is called commutative and associative if it satisfies

$$(2.1) \quad x \boxplus y = y \boxplus x$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad (x \boxplus y) \boxplus z = x \boxplus (y \boxplus z)$$

respectively.

**Definition 2.3.** A canonical hypergroup is a tuple  $(\mathbb{H}, \boxplus, \mathbf{0})$ , where  $\boxplus$  is a commutative and associative hyper-operation on  $\mathbb{H}$  such that:

- (H0)  $\mathbf{0} \boxplus x = \{x\} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{H}$ .
- (H1) For every  $x \in \mathbb{H}$  there is a unique element of  $\mathbb{H}$ , denoted  $-x$ , such that  $\mathbf{0} \in x \boxplus -x$ .
- (H2)  $x \in y \boxplus z$  iff  $z \in x \boxplus (-y)$ . This is normally referred to as *reversibility*.

The reversibility condition is not required for non-canonical hypergroups, but throughout this work only canonical hypergroups will be used so the label canonical is dropped.

**Definition 2.4.** A hyperring is a tuple  $(\mathbb{H}, \odot, \boxplus, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0})$  such that:

- $(\mathbb{H}, \odot, \mathbf{1})$  is a commutative monoid.
- $(\mathbb{H}, \boxplus, \mathbf{0})$  is a commutative hypergroup.
- (Absorption rule)  $\mathbf{0} \odot x = x \odot \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{H}$ .
- (Distributive law)  $a \odot (x \boxplus y) = (a \odot x) \boxplus (a \odot y)$  for all  $a, x, y \in \mathbb{H}$ .

**Definition 2.5.** A hyperring  $\mathbb{H}$  is called a hyperfield if  $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{1}$  and every non-zero element of  $\mathbb{H}$  has a multiplicative inverse.

*Remark 2.6.* From this point onward, to clarify context, when discussing results over a field  $K$  the following notation will be used:  $+$ ,  $\times$  (or  $\cdot$ ) and  $\sum$ . Whereas, when discussing results over a hyperfield  $\mathbb{H}$  the following notation will be used:  $\boxplus$ ,  $\odot$  and  $\boxplus$ .

**2.2. Examples of Hyperfields.** The following are some key examples of common hyperfields used in the literature. They will be used to demonstrate the properties that are defined in this paper.

**Example 2.7.** The tropical hyperfield has the underlying set  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  and is denoted as  $\mathbb{T}$ . The multiplication on  $\mathbb{T}$  is an extension of the addition on  $\mathbb{R}$ :

$$x \odot y := x + y.$$

The hyper-addition is defined as the following multivalued operation:

$$(2.8) \quad x \boxplus y = \begin{cases} \{\max(x, y)\} & \text{if } x \neq y \\ \{z \mid z \leq x\} \cup \{-\infty\} & \text{if } x = y \end{cases}$$

In  $\mathbb{T}$ ,  $\mathbf{0}$  is  $-\infty$ . The tropical hyperfield is a hyperfield analogue of the tropical semi-ring described in [15]. The tropical hyperfield can also be defined using the *min* instead of *max*, and  $\{\infty\}$  instead of  $\{-\infty\}$ , which yields an isomorphic structure. For further discussions of the tropical hyperfield and demonstrations of its usefulness, see both [17] and [16].

The next example is a key part of the results outlined in the following sections. It will play the role of the valued field in our variation of Kapranov's Theorem.

The main purpose it has is as a candidate to replace the valued field in Kapranov's theorem.

**Example 2.9.** The tropical complex hyperfield is denoted  $\mathbb{TC}$  and has the complex numbers  $\mathbb{C}$  as its underlying set. The standard complex multiplication is given to  $\mathbb{TC}$ . The hyper-addition is defined in the following way for all  $z, w \in \mathbb{C}$ :

$$z \boxplus w = \begin{cases} \{c \in \mathbb{C} : |c| \leq z\} & \text{if } w = -z. \\ z, & \text{if } |z| > |w|. \\ w, & \text{if } |w| > |z|. \\ \text{Shortest arc connecting } z \text{ and } w, \text{ with radius } |z|, & \text{if } |z| = |w|, z \neq \pm w. \end{cases}$$

With this hyper-addition  $\mathbb{TC}$  is a hyperfield. Over  $\mathbb{TC}$ ,  $\mathbf{0}$  is 0. This hyperfield is discussed in Example 9 in [2] and was introduced in [17, Section 6] where it is described as the dequantization of the field of complex numbers. For further intuition to the behaviour of the addition over  $\mathbb{TC}$  see Figure 1 in Section 6 of [17]

**Example 2.10.** A field  $K$  can be viewed as a hyperfield in a trivial manner, where the hyper-addition is defined as  $x \boxplus y = \{x + y\}$ .

**Example 2.11.** The Krasner hyperfield has the underlying set  $\{0, 1\}$ , and denoted  $\mathbb{K}$ . It is defined with standard multiplication and hyper-addition is defined as:

$$0 \boxplus x = x \boxplus 0 = \{x\} \quad \text{for } x = 0, 1$$

$$1 \boxplus 1 = \{0, 1\}.$$

Over  $\mathbb{K}$ ,  $\mathbb{0}$  is 0.

**Example 2.12.** The hyperfield of signs has the underlying set  $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ , and denoted by  $\mathbb{S}$ . The multiplication is the restriction of the usual multiplication on the real numbers and the hyper-addition defined as:

$$0 \boxplus 0 = 0, \quad 0 \boxplus 1 = 1, \quad 0 \boxplus -1 = -1,$$

$$1 \boxplus 1 = 1, \quad -1 \boxplus -1 = -1,$$

$$1 \boxplus -1 = \{0, 1, -1\}.$$

Over  $\mathbb{S}$ ,  $\mathbb{0}$  is 0.

**Example 2.13.** The phase hyperfield, denoted by  $\mathbb{P}$ , has the underlying set of  $S^1 \cup \{0\}$ , where  $S^1 = \{e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{C} \mid 0 \leq \theta < 2\pi\}$ , which is the complex unit circle union with zero. Multiplication on  $\mathbb{P}$  is inherited from  $\mathbb{C}$ , and the hyper-addition is defined by the rule,

$$\text{if } \theta_1 = \theta_2 + \pi, \quad \text{then } e^{i\theta_1} \boxplus e^{i\theta_2} = \{0, e^{i\theta_1}, e^{i\theta_2}\}.$$

$$\text{If } \theta_1 < \theta_2 < \theta_1 + \pi, \quad \text{then } e^{i\theta_1} \boxplus e^{i\theta_2} = \{e^{i\theta} \mid \theta_1 < \theta < \theta_2\}.$$

$$\text{If } \theta_2 < \theta_1 < \theta_2 + \pi, \quad \text{then } e^{i\theta_1} \boxplus e^{i\theta_2} = \{e^{i\theta} \mid \theta_2 < \theta < \theta_1\}.$$

Over  $\mathbb{P}$ ,  $\mathbb{0}$  is 0. See [3] and [8] for alternative but equivalent definitions of the phase hyperfield.

**2.3. Hyperfield Homomorphisms.** The maps between hyperfields are called hyperfield homomorphisms and are defined in the following way.

**Definition 2.14.** Given hypergroups  $\mathbb{H}_1$  and  $\mathbb{H}_2$ , with respective hyper-operations  $\boxplus_1$  and  $\boxplus_2$ , a hypergroup homomorphism is a map  $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2$ , such that  $f(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $f(x \boxplus_1 y) \subseteq f(x) \boxplus_2 f(y)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{H}_1$ .

**Definition 2.15.** Given hyperrings  $\mathbb{H}_1$  and  $\mathbb{H}_2$ , with respective hyper-operations  $\boxplus_1$  and  $\boxplus_2$  and multiplication  $\odot_1$  and  $\odot_2$ , a homomorphism of hyperrings  $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2$  is a map such that:

- (1)  $f(x \boxplus_1 y) \subseteq f(x) \boxplus_2 f(y)$  and  $f(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$
- (2)  $f(x \odot_1 y) = f(x) \odot_2 f(y)$  and  $f(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$

Essentially, this is a homomorphism of additive hypergroups and a homomorphism of multiplicative monoids.

**Definition 2.16.** A hyperfield homomorphism is defined as a homomorphism of underlying hyperrings.

**Example 2.17.** The following are common examples of hyperfield homomorphisms between the hyperfields outlined in the previous subsection.

$$f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}, \quad f(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \neq 0. \\ 0, & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases}$$

$$ph : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}, \quad ph(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{|x|}, & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}. \\ 0, & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases}$$

$$sgn : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}, \quad sgn(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \\ -1, & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}. \\ 0, & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases}$$

The next example will be a description of the hyperfield homomorphism which is the basis for the results in this paper.

**Example 2.18.** There exists a hyperfield homomorphism from the tropical complex hyperfield to the tropical hyperfield. The map is denoted  $\eta : \mathbb{TC} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ , and is defined as:

$$\eta(z) := \log(|z|).$$

There are more details of how this map is constructed outlined in [1, Figure 1], and consequent discussion in part 9 of the hyperfield examples of [1] where the map is discussed in two parts.

**2.4. Polynomials over Hyperfields.** This section will outline how polynomials and their roots are defined over hyperfields.

**Definition 2.19.** The set of polynomials in  $n$ -variables over a hyperfield  $\mathbb{H}$  will be denoted  $\mathbb{H}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ , where elements of this set are defined as,

$$(2.20) \quad p(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \bigsqcup_I c_I \odot X^{i_1} \odot \dots \odot X^{i_n} = \bigsqcup_I c_I \odot \underline{X}^I,$$

where the multi-index notation is used and  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  and  $c_I \in \mathbb{H}$ .

*Remark 2.21.* Note that the notation  $\mathbb{H}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  is used only to denote the *set* of polynomials over  $\mathbb{H}$ . In general there is no ring or hyperring structure on  $\mathbb{H}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ , unlike the specialised case where  $\mathbb{H}$  is a field. Although it can be given additional algebraic structure as a  $\mathbb{H}$ -module. It can be illustrated in the univariate case that this object is not in general a hyperring; the multivalued nature of the addition in  $\mathbb{H}$  combined with the distributivity leads to products of polynomials also being multivalued. For example,  $(aX \boxplus b)(cX \boxplus d) \subseteq acX^2 \boxplus (ad \boxplus bc)X \boxplus bd$ . The coefficient  $(ad \boxplus bc)$  is not necessarily single valued, which shows that multiplication of polynomials is multivalued, hence  $\mathbb{H}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  is not a hyperring. See Remark 4.4 and Example 4.13 in [13] for an explicit example where the behaviour of  $\mathbb{H}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  is more controllable.

One difference to note between polynomials defined over a field and those defined over a hyperfield occurs when the polynomial is evaluated at an element of  $\mathbb{H}$ . When a polynomial defined over a hyperfield is evaluated at an element, the output, unlike over a field, can be a set of elements. This leads to the following notion of a root of a polynomial over  $\mathbb{H}$ .



**Definition 2.22.** Let  $p(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \boxplus_I c_I \odot \underline{X}^I \in \mathbb{H}[\underline{X}]$ , then an element  $\underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  is a *root* of the polynomial if  $\mathbb{0} \in p(\underline{a}) = \boxplus_I c_I \odot \underline{a}^I$ .

This allows for a natural definition of the variety of  $p(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  as,

$$V(p) := \{\underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{H}^n \mid \mathbb{0} \in p(\underline{a})\}.$$

The next definition recalls the notion of the multiplicity of a root for univariate polynomials defined over hyperfields.

**Definition 2.23** ([5], Def. 1.5). Let  $p(X) \in \mathbb{H}[X]$ , the multiplicity of an element  $a \in \mathbb{H}$  is denoted  $\text{mult}_a(p)$  and defined as,

$$(2.24) \quad \text{mult}_a(p) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } a \text{ is not a root.} \\ 1 + \max\{\text{mult}_a(q), \text{ if } \exists q \in \mathbb{H}[X], \text{ s.t. } p \in (X \boxplus -a)q(X)\}. \end{cases}$$

Because of the multivalued nature of multiplication of polynomials with coefficients in a hyperfield, the polynomial  $q(X)$  in (2.24) is not necessarily unique. This is the motivation behind the recursive definition of the multiplicity. See [5] for details on the original definition and examples of the non-uniqueness.

**Example 2.25.** (1) If  $p(X) = X^2 \boxplus X \boxplus 1 \in \mathbb{K}[X]$ , then  $1 \in V(p)$ , as

$$p(1) = 1 \boxplus 1 \boxplus 1 = \mathbb{K} \ni \mathbb{0}.$$

(2) If  $p(X) = X^2 \boxplus X \boxplus -1 \in \mathbb{S}[X]$ , then  $-1 \in V(p)$ , as

$$p(-1) = 1 \boxplus -1 \boxplus -1 = \mathbb{S} \ni \mathbb{0}.$$

*Remark 2.26.* There is a complete description of roots and corresponding multiplicities for univariate polynomials over  $\mathbb{K}$ ,  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  in [5], where the results are used to demonstrate proofs of Descartes' Rule of Signs and Newton's Polygon Rule.

Now that polynomials have been defined, their structure can be combined with hyperfield homomorphisms to describe an induced map of polynomials over hyperfields.

**Definition 2.27.** Let  $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2$  be a hyperfield homomorphism. This induces a map from polynomials with coefficients in  $\mathbb{H}_1$  to polynomials with coefficients in  $\mathbb{H}_2$ . This map is

denoted  $f_* : \mathbb{H}_1[X_1, \dots, X_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ , and is defined for  $p(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \bigoplus_I c_I \odot \underline{X}^I \in \mathbb{H}_1[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  as;

$$f_*(p) = \bigoplus_I f(c_I) \odot \underline{X}^I \in \mathbb{H}_2[X_1, \dots, X_n].$$

(Note: the hyper-operations are now the operations over  $\mathbb{H}_2$ , and  $f_*(p)$  will be called the push-forward of  $p$ .)

**Example 2.28.** Take the polynomial  $p(X) = 4X^2 - 5X + 1 \in \mathbb{R}[X]$ , the hyperfield homomorphism  $sgn : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$  induces the map  $sgn_* : \mathbb{R}[X] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}[X]$ , which gives  $sgn_*(p)(X) = X^2 \boxplus -X \boxplus 1 \in \mathbb{S}[X]$ .

Note that roots of  $p \in \mathbb{H}_1[X]$  push-forward to roots of  $f_*(p) \in \mathbb{H}_2[X]$ . This is precisely described in Lemma 3.2. Next the definition of a *relatively algebraically closed* hyperfield homomorphism is introduced.

**Definition 2.29.** Let  $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2$  be a hyperfield homomorphism, with induced map  $f_* : \mathbb{H}_1[X] \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2[X]$ . We say that  $f$  is *relatively algebraically closed* (RAC) if for all univariate polynomials  $f_*(p) \in \mathbb{H}_2[X]$  and every root  $b \in V(f_*(p))$ , there exists  $a \in f^{-1}(b)$  such that  $a \in V(p)$ .

The map  $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2$  being RAC has the immediate consequence that  $V(f_*(p)) \subseteq f(V(p))$  for all  $p(X) \in \mathbb{H}_1[X]$ . Then combining with Lemma 3.2,  $V(f_*(p)) = f(V(p))$ . The following example outlines a RAC map which is the main motivating example for this paper. It is the map that is studied in tropical geometry, and is the basis for the generalisation to hyperfield homomorphisms.

**Definition 2.30.** A hyperfield  $\mathbb{H}$  is called *algebraically closed* if every univariate polynomial has a root in  $\mathbb{H}$ .

The Krasner hyperfield  $\mathbb{K}$  is algebraically closed, by [5, Remark 1.11]. This leads to a relationship that a hyperfield  $\mathbb{H}$  is algebraically closed if and only if and the canonical map  $f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  is RAC.

**Example 2.31.** Let  $K$  be an algebraically closed field with surjective valuation,  $trop : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ , then this is RAC hyperfield homomorphism. This is the underlying structure

investigated when discussing valuations and tropicalisation maps in relation to tropical geometry. See Section 2.1 and Theorem 3.1.3 in [15] for a more detailed description.

**Example 2.32.** Take the map  $\text{sgn} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ , and  $p(X) = X^2 - X + 1 \in \mathbb{R}[X]$ . Then,  $\text{sgn}_*(p) = X^2 \boxplus -X \boxplus 1 \in \mathbb{S}[X]$ . The polynomial  $p(X)$  has an empty variety, whereas  $\text{sgn}_*(p)(1) = 1 \boxplus -1 \boxplus 1 = \mathbb{S}$ , so  $1 \in V(\text{sgn}_*(p))$ . This demonstrates that the map  $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$  is not a RAC map.

**Example 2.33.** Take the map  $ph : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ , and the polynomial  $p(X) = X^2 + X + 1 \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ . It is shown in [5, Remark 1.10], that  $ph_*(p)(X)$  has a root at each  $a = e^{i\theta}$  for all  $\pi/2 < \theta < 3\pi/2$ . Not every element of this set can be lifted and hence  $ph : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$  is not a RAC map.

**2.5. Connecting RAC to TC.** The remainder of the section will be focused on demonstrating that the map  $\eta : \mathbb{TC} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  satisfies the RAC property.

**Proposition 2.34.** *Let  $p(X) = \boxplus_{i=0}^n c_i \odot X^i \in \mathbb{TC}[X]$ . An element  $a \in \mathbb{TC}$  is a root of  $p(X)$  if there exists  $j_1, \dots, j_m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that*

$$|c_{j_1} a^{j_1}| = \dots = |c_{j_m} a^{j_m}| > |c_i a^i| \quad \forall i \notin \{j_1, \dots, j_m\} \quad \text{and} \quad -c_0 \in \boxplus_{k=1}^m c_{j_k} \odot a^{j_k}.$$

*Proof.* For  $a \in \mathbb{TC}$  to be a root of a polynomial  $p(X)$ , a zero must belong to the output set, or

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{0} \in p(a) &\iff \mathbb{0} \in \boxplus_{i=0}^n c_i \odot a^i \\ &\iff \mathbb{0} \in c_0 \boxplus c_1 \odot a \boxplus \dots \boxplus c_n \odot a^n \\ &\iff -c_0 \in c_1 \odot a \boxplus \dots \boxplus c_n \odot a^n \end{aligned}$$

This set  $c_1 \odot a \boxplus \dots \boxplus c_n \odot a^n$  is determined by the monomials with the largest absolute values. Thus,  $-c_0$  must belong to the output set determined by the dominating monomials, as precisely asserted in the statement.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.35.** *Given  $p(X) \in \mathbb{T}[X]$ , an element  $a \in \mathbb{T}$  is a root of  $p$  if the maximum of  $p(a)$  is achieved more than once.*

**Lemma 2.36.** *Given  $a, b \in \mathbb{T}$ , if  $a > b$ , then for all  $\alpha \in \eta^{-1}(a)$  and  $\beta \in \eta^{-1}(b)$ , it holds that  $|\alpha| > |\beta|$ .*

*Proof.* Taking  $a, b \in \mathbb{T}$  such that  $a > b$ , if  $\alpha \in \eta^{-1}(a)$ , and  $\beta \in \eta^{-1}(b)$  then  $\log(|\alpha|) = a > b = \log(|\beta|)$ . As both the logarithm and exponential functions preserve order,  $\log(|\alpha|) > \log(|\beta|) \Rightarrow |\alpha| > |\beta|$ , as required.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.37.** *The hyperfield homomorphism  $\eta : \mathbb{TC} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  is RAC.*

*Proof.* A polynomial  $p = \bigoplus_{i=0}^n c_i \odot X^i \in \mathbb{TC}[X]$  has push-forward  $\eta_*(p) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^n \eta(c_i) \odot X^i \in \mathbb{T}[X]$ , under the induced polynomial map  $\eta_* : \mathbb{TC}[X] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}[X]$ . For convenience denote  $\eta_*(p) = q \in \mathbb{T}[X]$ . Take an element  $a \in V(q)$ , and observe how  $a \in \mathbb{T}$  gives rise to  $-\infty = \mathbb{0}$  in the output set.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{0} \in q(a) &\iff \mathbb{0} \in \bigoplus_{i=0}^n \eta(c_i) \odot a^i \\ &\iff -\infty \in \eta(c_0) \boxplus \eta(c_1) \odot a \boxplus \dots \boxplus \eta(c_n) \odot a^n \\ &\iff \eta(c_0) \in \eta(c_1) \odot a \boxplus \dots \boxplus \eta(c_n) \odot a^n \end{aligned}$$

The output set produced by  $\eta(c_1) \odot a \boxplus \dots \boxplus \eta(c_n) \odot a^n$  can take one of two forms: first it could be a single element, or it could be a set of elements. Given that  $a \in V(q)$ , this can be written as

$$(2.38) \quad \eta(c_1) \odot a \boxplus \dots \boxplus \eta(c_n) \odot a^n = \eta(c_0)$$

or

$$(2.39) \quad \eta(c_1) \odot a \boxplus \dots \boxplus \eta(c_n) \odot a^n = [-\infty, R] \ni \eta(c_0), \quad \eta(c_0) \leq R \in \mathbb{T}.$$

These two cases will be dealt with together, as they both can be characterised by,

$$\eta(c_1) \odot a \boxplus \dots \boxplus \eta(c_n) \odot a^n \ni \eta(c_0).$$

For this to occur there must exist  $k_1, \dots, k_m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that,  $\eta(c_{k_1})a^{k_1} = \dots = \eta(c_{k_m})a^{k_m} > \eta(c_i)a^i$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k_1, \dots, k_m\}$ . Explicitly, the maximum is achieved more than once in the terms  $\eta(c_1)a^1, \dots, \eta(c_n)a^n$ , and this maximum is greater than or equal to  $\eta(c_0)$ . A lift of  $a$  is denoted as  $\tilde{a} \in \eta^{-1}(a)$ , and is here specifically defined as,

$$\tilde{a} = \left( \frac{-c_{t'}}{c_t} \right)^{\frac{1}{t-t'}},$$

where  $t, t' \in \{k_1, \dots, k_m\}$ . Firstly, note that the division and exponents are taken in the standard sense over  $\mathbb{C}$  as the multiplication on  $\mathbb{TC}$  is inherited from  $\mathbb{C}$ . Secondly, if  $m = 1$ ,

i.e the situation in (2.38), set  $t' = 0$ .

It remains to be shown that  $\tilde{a} \in \eta^{-1}(a)$  and  $\tilde{a} \in V(p)$ . Observe that  $\eta(c_t)a^t = \eta(c_{t'})a^{t'}$ , even when  $t' = 0$  it holds that  $\eta c_t a^t = \eta(c_0)$ . This can be manipulated to give,

$$a = \left( \frac{\eta(c_{t'})}{\eta(c_t)} \right)^{\frac{1}{t-t'}}.$$

With some applications of the hyperfield homomorphism properties it can be shown that  $\tilde{a} \in \eta^{-1}(a)$ . What remains is to demonstrate that  $\tilde{a}$  is a root of the original polynomial  $p$ . Note that due to Lemma 2.36,

$$|c_{k_1} \tilde{a}^{k_1}| = \dots = |c_{k_m} \tilde{a}^{k_m}| > |c_i \tilde{a}^i|, \quad \text{for all } i \notin \{k_1, \dots, k_m\}.$$

Furthermore, observe the relationship between the monomial terms with  $t, t'$  exponents,

$$\begin{aligned} c_t \tilde{a}^t \boxplus c_{t'} \tilde{a}^{t'} &= c_t \left( \left( \frac{-c_{t'}}{c_t} \right)^{\frac{1}{t-t'}} \right)^t \boxplus c_{t'} \left( \left( \frac{-c_{t'}}{c_t} \right)^{\frac{1}{t-t'}} \right)^{t'} \\ &= (-1)^{\frac{t}{t-t'}} (c_t)^{\frac{-t}{t-t'}} (c_{t'})^{\frac{t}{t-t'}} \boxplus (-1)^{\frac{t'}{t-t'}} (c_t)^{\frac{-t'}{t-t'}} (c_{t'})^{\frac{t'}{t-t'}} \\ &= (-1)(-1)^{\frac{t'}{t-t'}} (c_t)^{\frac{-t}{t-t'}} (c_{t'})^{\frac{t}{t-t'}} \boxplus (-1)^{\frac{t'}{t-t'}} (c_t)^{\frac{-t'}{t-t'}} (c_{t'})^{\frac{t'}{t-t'}} \\ &= \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq R\}, \quad \text{where } R = |c_t \tilde{a}^t| \geq c_0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 \boxplus c_1 \tilde{a} \boxplus \dots \boxplus c_n \tilde{a}^n &= c_{k_1} \tilde{a}^{k_1} \boxplus \dots \boxplus c_{k_m} \tilde{a}^{k_m} \\ &= c_t \tilde{a}^t \boxplus c_{t'} \tilde{a}^{t'} \boxplus \bigoplus_{K \in \{k_1 \dots k_m\} \setminus \{t, t'\}} c_K \tilde{a}^K \\ &= \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq R\} \boxplus \bigoplus_{K \in \{k_1 \dots k_m\} \setminus \{t, t'\}} c_K \tilde{a}^K \\ &= \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq R\} \ni \mathbb{0} \end{aligned}$$

This is precisely what is required, showing that  $\tilde{a} \in V(p)$  and  $\tilde{a} \in \eta^{-1}(a)$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.40.** *The tropical complex hyperfield  $\mathbb{TC}$  is algebraically closed.*

*Proof.* As a consequence of the results on roots and multiplicities in [5],  $\mathbb{T}$  is algebraically closed. As the map  $\eta : \mathbb{TC} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  is RAC and surjective, every polynomial  $p(X) \in \mathbb{TC}[X]$  has

a corresponding polynomial  $\eta_*(p)(X) \in \mathbb{T}[X]$ , which has a root and can be lifted back to a root of  $p(X)$ . Hence, every polynomial in  $\mathbb{TC}[X]$  has a root.  $\square$

**Example 2.41.** Take the polynomial  $p(X) = i \odot X^2 \boxplus \left(\frac{-1+i\sqrt{3}}{2}\right) \odot X \boxplus -1 \in \mathbb{TC}[X]$ , then the push-forward is  $\eta_*(p)(X) = 0 \odot X^2 \boxplus 0 \odot X \boxplus 0 \in \mathbb{T}[X]$ . It can be seen that  $0 \in V(\eta_*(p))$ . In accordance with the proof of Theorem 2.37, take  $t = 2$  and  $t' = 1$ . This gives,

$$c_t = c_2 = i, \quad -c_{t'} = -c_1 = \left(\frac{1-i\sqrt{3}}{2}\right), \quad 1/(t-t') = 1$$

Taking the template for the lift,

$$\tilde{a} = \left(\frac{-c_{t'}}{c_t}\right)^{\frac{1}{t-t'}} = \left(\frac{1-i\sqrt{3}}{2i}\right).$$

Now to confirm that this is a pull back of 0 and is a root of  $p(X)$ :

$$\left|\left(\frac{1-i\sqrt{3}}{2i}\right)\right| = \frac{1}{2}|1-i\sqrt{3}| = 1 \Rightarrow f\left(\frac{1-i\sqrt{3}}{2i}\right) = 0.$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} p(\tilde{a}) &= p\left(\frac{1-i\sqrt{3}}{2i}\right) = i\left(\frac{1-i\sqrt{3}}{2i}\right)^2 \boxplus \left(\frac{-1+i\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-i\sqrt{3}}{2i}\right) \boxplus -1 \\ &= \left(\frac{i-\sqrt{3}}{2}\right) \boxplus \left(\frac{1+i\sqrt{3}}{2i}\right) \boxplus -1 \\ &= \left(\frac{i-\sqrt{3}}{2}\right) \boxplus -\left(\frac{i-\sqrt{3}}{2}\right) \boxplus -1 \\ &= \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 1\} \boxplus -1 \ni \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $\tilde{a}$  is a lifted root, which demonstrates the application of the structure of the proof of Theorem 2.37.

### 3. A GENERALISATION OF KAPRANOV'S THEOREM

This section will present a specific generalisation of Kapranov's Theorem over hyperfields. The theorem by Kapranov (see Theorem 3.1.3 in [15]) is a key result in tropical geometry, which leads to the Fundamental Theorem of tropical geometry in [15]. Recall the statement of Kapranov's Theorem in tropical geometry.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Given an algebraically closed field  $K$  with surjective valuation,  $\text{trop} : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ , then for a Laurent polynomial  $p(X) = \sum_{I \in \mathbb{Z}^n} c_I X^I \in K[X_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, X_n^{\pm 1}]$ ,*

$$V(\text{trop}(p)) = \text{trop}(V(p)).$$

(For further details, see [15, Theorem 3.1.3]).

An essential point to recognise is that replacing the valuation with an arbitrary hyperfield homomorphism, one containment holds automatically.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2$  be a hyperfield homomorphism. For  $p(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \bigsqcup_I c_I \odot \underline{X}^I \in \mathbb{H}_1[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ ,*

$$f(V(p)) \subseteq V(f_*(p)).$$

*Proof.* By definition  $f_*(p)(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \bigsqcup_I f(c_I) \odot \underline{X}^I \in \mathbb{H}_2[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ . Let  $\underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{H}_1^n$  be a root of  $p(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ , meaning  $\underline{a} \in V(p)$  and

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbb{0} \in p(\underline{a}) = p(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \bigsqcup_I c_I \odot \underline{a}^I.$$

The aim is to demonstrate that  $f(\underline{a}) \in V(f_*(p))$  holds. Firstly,

$$\begin{aligned} f_*(p)(f(\underline{a})) &= \bigsqcup_I f(c_I) \odot f(\underline{a})^I \\ &= \bigsqcup_I f(c_I \odot \underline{a}^I) \\ &\supseteq f\left(\bigsqcup_I c_I \odot \underline{a}^I\right) \\ &\ni f(\mathbb{0}) = \mathbb{0} \end{aligned}$$

The above steps use the properties of a hyperfield homomorphism to give that  $\mathbb{0} \in f(p)(f(\underline{a}))$ , yielding  $f(\underline{a}) \in V(f_*(p))$ . Hence, proving that  $f(V(p)) \subseteq V(f_*(p))$ .  $\square$

The main result of the paper is to specifically generalise Kapranov's Theorem to hyperfield homomorphisms  $f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ , which satisfy the RAC property. The following theorem demonstrates that the RAC property for a hyperfield homomorphism  $\mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  can be used to deduce the existence of a pull-back of roots for polynomials in  $n$ -variables.

**Theorem 3.4** (Generalised Kapranov's Theorem). *Given a polynomial  $p \in \mathbb{H}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ , then for a RAC hyperfield homomorphism  $f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ ,*

$$V(f_*(p)) = f(V(p)).$$

*Proof.* The proof will comprise of two parts, each of which will show the inclusion of sets in one direction. The first inclusion  $f(V(p)) \subseteq V(f_*(p))$  is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.2.

The inclusion in the reverse direction,  $V(f_*(p)) \subseteq f(V(p))$ , is more interesting and requires a more involved explanation. Take a point  $\underline{a} \in V(f_*(p))$ , so  $\mathbb{0} \in f_*(p)(\underline{a})$ . The aim is to demonstrate that there exists an element in  $V(p)$  that pushes forward to  $\underline{a}$ . This will be done by restricting to univariate polynomials and using the property that  $f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  is a RAC map, to find an appropriate lift of  $\underline{a}$ . The following diagram will be used to illustrate how the  $p(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  will be restricted to a univariate polynomial.

Consider the following maps :

$$F : \mathbb{H}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n, \quad F(x_1, \dots, x_n) := (f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n))$$

$$\varphi : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^n, \quad \varphi(x) := (\lambda_1 \odot x^{d_1}, \dots, \lambda_n \odot x^{d_n}), \quad \text{where } \lambda_i \in \mathbb{H}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n, \quad \psi(x) &:= (f(\lambda_1) \odot x^{d_1}, \dots, f(\lambda_n) \odot x^{d_n}) \\ &= (f(\lambda_1) + d_1 x, \dots, f(\lambda_n) + d_n x). \end{aligned}$$

Below is a diagram of how these maps commutatively interact.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{H} & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbb{T} \\ \varphi \downarrow & & \downarrow \psi \\ \mathbb{H}^n & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathbb{T}^n \end{array}$$

There are some key conditions that need to be imposed on  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  through restrictions on  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  and  $d_1, \dots, d_n$ . Choose each  $\lambda_i$  such that  $\lambda_i \in f^{-1}(a_i)$ , where  $\underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in V(f_*(p))$ . Secondly, choose the set  $D = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ , such that the dot products of  $D$  taken with exponent vectors of monomial terms of  $p$  are all distinct. Explicitly,

$$D \cdot K = d_1 \cdot k_1 + \dots + d_n \cdot k_n \neq d_1 \cdot j_1 + \dots + d_n \cdot j_n = D \cdot J,$$



where  $K$  and  $J$  are the exponent vectors for distinct monomial terms of  $p$ . It can now be noted that  $\psi(0) = f(\underline{\lambda}) = \underline{a}$ . Next there will be a restriction of  $p$  through  $\varphi$  to a univariate polynomial over  $\mathbb{H}$ . This restriction is denoted  $\varphi^*p$  and is defined as;

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^*p &:= p(\varphi(X)) = p(\lambda_1 \odot X^{d_1}, \dots, \lambda_n \odot X^{d_n}) \\ &= \bigsqcup_I c_I \odot (\lambda_1 \odot X^{d_1})^{i_1} \odot \dots \odot (\lambda_n \odot X^{d_n})^{i_n} \\ &= \bigsqcup_I c_I \odot \underline{\lambda}^I \odot X^{D \cdot I} \in \mathbb{H}[X]. \end{aligned}$$

This restriction draws on the requirement imposed on the set  $D = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ . If the requirement was not imposed, this would allow multiple monomials in the restricted polynomial to have equal exponents. This would lead to the corresponding coefficient being a hyper-sum, thus the potentially detrimental possibility of the restriction becoming a set of polynomials rather than a single polynomial, which is what is needed here.

The pull-back polynomial  $\varphi^*p$  is now pushed-forward to  $f_*(\varphi^*p) \in \mathbb{T}[X]$ . The image of  $f_*(\varphi^*p)$  is equal to the image of  $f_*(p)$  when restricted to  $\psi$ .

$$\begin{aligned} f_*(p)(\psi(X)) &= f_*(p)(f(\lambda_1) \odot X^{d_1}, \dots, f(\lambda_n) \odot X^{d_n}) \\ &= \bigsqcup_I f(c_I) \odot f(\underline{\lambda})^I \odot X^{D \cdot I} \\ &= f_*(\varphi^*p)(X). \end{aligned}$$

The next step is to show that  $f_*(\varphi^*p)$  has a root at  $0 \in \mathbb{T}$ . This can be seen as,

$$f_*(\varphi^*p)(0) = \bigsqcup_I f(c_I) \odot f(\underline{\lambda})^I \odot 0^{D \cdot I}.$$

Then, due to the arithmetic over  $\mathbb{T}$ ,

$$\bigsqcup_I f(c_I) \odot f(\underline{\lambda})^I \odot 0^{D \cdot I} = \bigsqcup_I f(c_I) \odot f(\underline{\lambda})^I,$$

Which can be realised as,

$$\bigsqcup_I f(c_I) \odot f(\underline{\lambda})^I = \bigsqcup_I f(c_I) \odot \underline{a}^I = f_*(p)(\underline{a}) \ni 0.$$

This shows that  $0 \in V(f_*(\varphi^*p))$ . Then the property that the map  $f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  is a RAC homomorphism gives that there exists an element  $\tilde{a} \in \mathbb{H}$  such that  $f(\tilde{a}) = 0$  and  $\tilde{a} \in V(\varphi^*p)$ .

This element  $\tilde{a}$  can then be pushed-forward through  $\varphi$  to give an element  $\varphi(\tilde{a}) \in V(\mathbf{p})$ . As the diagram commutes, this shows that the  $F(\varphi(\tilde{a})) = \psi(f(\tilde{a})) = \psi(0) = \underline{a}$ , which is sufficient to show that for every element of  $V(f_*(\mathbf{p}))$  there is a lift to an element of  $V(\mathbf{p})$ . This demonstrates that  $V(f_*(\mathbf{p})) \subseteq f(V(\mathbf{p}))$ , giving the desired result.

Hence, it has been shown that both  $f(V(\mathbf{p})) \subseteq V(f_*(\mathbf{p}))$  and  $V(f_*(\mathbf{p})) \subseteq f(V(\mathbf{p}))$  hold. These taken together demonstrate the required equality,  $V(f_*(\mathbf{p})) = f(V(\mathbf{p}))$ .

(The structure of the proof, restricting to univariate polynomials to use the RAC property is based on the argument outlined in a proof of the original theorem in tropical geometry, as seen in [7]. Therefore, this adapted proof along with Example 2.31 gives a proof which encompasses that of the original Kapranov's Theorem ).  $\square$

In particular, since  $\eta : \mathbb{TC} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  is RAC, the above theorem applies to it.

#### 4. CHARACTERISING RAC MAPS.

This section aims to present sufficient conditions for a hyperfield homomorphism to be a RAC map. This will not include a complete description of the necessary conditions for a hyperfield homomorphism to be a RAC; this remains an open topic. To begin the exploration into RAC hyperfield homomorphisms, a definition linking multiplicities of roots to the degree of the polynomial.

**Definition 4.1.** A hyperfield is said to satisfy the *multiplicity bound* if for all univariate polynomials,  $p(X) \in \mathbb{H}[X]$ ,

$$\sum_{a \in \mathbb{H}} \text{mult}_a(p) \leq \deg(p).$$

Furthermore, a hyperfield is said to satisfy *multiplicity equality* if the above inequality is an equality for all univariate polynomials.

Proposition B from [5] describes a relationship between the multiplicities of roots over a field and the multiplicities of the push-forwards of these roots over a hyperfield. It is stated below, in notation consistent with this paper.

**Proposition 4.2** ([5], Prop. B). *Let  $K$  be a field and  $\mathbb{H}$  a hyperfield with hyperfield homomorphism  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ . Let  $p(X) \in K[X]$ , with push-forward  $f_*(p)(X) \in \mathbb{H}[X]$ . Then,*

$$\text{mult}_b(f_*(p)) \geq \sum_{a \in f^{-1}(b)} \text{mult}_a(p)$$

for all  $b \in \mathbb{H}$ . Moreover, if  $\mathbb{H}$  satisfies the multiplicity bound for the polynomial  $f_*(p)$  and  $p \in K[X]$  splits into linear factors then,

$$\text{mult}_b(f_*(p)) = \sum_{a \in f^{-1}(b)} \text{mult}_a(p).$$

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$  be a hyperfield homomorphism, with  $\mathbb{H}$  satisfying the multiplicity bound. If the polynomial  $p \in K[X]$  splits into linear factors, then  $V(f_*(p)) \subseteq f(V(p))$  for  $p$ .*

*Proof.* Take the polynomial  $p \in K[X]$ ,  $f_*(p) \in \mathbb{H}[X]$ . Take  $b \in V(f_*(p))$ , so  $0 \in f_*(p)(b)$  and hence  $\text{mult}_b(f_*(p)) > 0$ . As  $p$  splits into linear factors over  $K$  and  $\mathbb{H}$  satisfies the multiplicity bound, by Proposition 4.2 we have,

$$0 < \text{mult}_b(f_*(p)) = \sum_{a \in f^{-1}(b)} \text{mult}_a(p).$$

Therefore, there exists  $\hat{a} \in f^{-1}(b)$  such that  $\text{mult}_{\hat{a}}(p) > 0$ . Thus,  $\hat{a}$  is a root of  $p \in K[X]$ . This demonstrates that given an element  $b \in V(f_*(p))$  there exists an element  $\hat{a}$ , such that  $f(\hat{a}) = b$  and  $p(\hat{a}) = 0$ . This shows that  $V(f_*(p)) \subseteq f(V(p))$ .  $\square$

The above lemma provides a method of detecting whether a hyperfield homomorphism from a field to a hyperfield is a RAC map. The next stage is to understand whether this view can be extended to maps  $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2$ . Proposition 4.2 is the key tool used in the proof of Lemma 4.3. The following discussion aims to explore a generalisation of this result for maps  $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2$ . Firstly, it is important to recognise that this is not a simple generalisation and the property from Prop. B in [5] does not always hold in this less restrictive setting.

**Example 4.4.** Take the hyperfield homomorphism  $f : \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ . Note that, over the Krasner hyperfield  $\mathbb{K}$ , the multiplicity bound achieves equality for all polynomials:  $\sum_{b \in \mathbb{K}} \text{mult}_b(p) = \deg(p)$  for all  $p \in \mathbb{K}[X]$ , (see Remark 1.11 in [5] for details). Take the polynomial  $p(X) = X^2 \boxplus X \boxplus 1 \in \mathbb{P}[X]$ , then due to the argument presented in [5] in Remark 1.10,  $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{P}} \text{mult}_a(p) = \infty$ , in particular  $a = e^{i\theta}$  is a root of  $p$  for all  $\frac{\pi}{2} < \theta < \frac{3\pi}{2}$ . Now the push-forward coefficients of

the polynomial are unchanged,  $f_*(p)(X) = X^2 \boxplus X \boxplus 1$ , with  $\sum_{b \in \mathbb{K}} \text{mult}_b(f(p)) = 2$ . This then leads to,

$$\infty = \sum_{a \in \mathbb{F} \setminus \{0\}} \text{mult}_a(p) = \sum_{a \in f^{-1}(1)} \text{mult}_a(p) \not\leq \text{mult}_1(f(p)) = 2.$$

This demonstrates that the property does not hold in total generality over all hyperfield homomorphisms.

There are several key properties of fields that underpin the result in Proposition 4.2. These properties do not automatically hold for hyperfields. The first key property is that all fields satisfy the multiplicity bound. The second is regarding the factorisation process of polynomials. Restricting to hyperfields with the multiplicity bound is a solution to half the problem, whereas the factorisation property needs to be discussed in further detail.

If  $K$  is a field, then  $K[X]$  is a unique factorization domain, and if  $K$  is algebraically closed then and polynomial  $p$  factors into a product of linear factors. It is not obvious that these properties extend to hyperfields. This is due to the non-uniqueness of the choice of factorisation, even for more well-behaved hyperfields, such as those with the doubly distributive property (see [8] for description of doubly distributive hyperfields). It could occur that for two distinct roots, the maximum multiplicity is achieved with different factorisations. In an attempt to overcome this the next definition is introduced.

**Definition 4.5.** A hyperfield  $\mathbb{H}$  is said to have the inheritance property if for every polynomial  $p \in \mathbb{H}[X]$  and list of roots  $\{a_1 \dots a_k\}$ , inclusive of repetitions corresponding to multiplicities, then for a subset  $\{a_{j_1} \dots a_{j_m}\} \subseteq \{a_1 \dots a_k\}$ , such that  $m \leq \deg(p)$  there exists  $q \in \mathbb{H}[X]$  such that

$$p \in (X - a_{j_1}) \odot (X - a_{j_2}) \odot \dots \odot (X - a_{j_m}) \odot q.$$

The work in this paper does not extend to characterising the multiplicity bound or inheritance properties, but rather opens this area up for exploration. The following conjectures are based on the current knowledge of doubly distributive hyperfields, specifically including  $\mathbb{K}, \mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$ .

**Conjecture 4.6.** *All hyperfields with the doubly distributive property satisfies the multiplicity bound.*

**Conjecture 4.7.** *All hyperfields with the doubly distributive property satisfies the inheritance property.*

There will now be an demonstration of the implications of the multiplicity bound and the inheritance property.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Given the hyperfield homomorphism  $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2$ , then for all  $p(X) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^n c_i \odot X^i \in \mathbb{H}_1[X]$ ,*

$$(4.9) \quad \text{mult}_b(f(p)) \geq \sum_{a \in f^{-1}(b)} \text{mult}_a(p)$$

*holds if  $\mathbb{H}_1$  satisfies the multiplicity bound and inheritance property.*

*Proof.* As  $\mathbb{H}_1$  satisfies the multiplicity bound the list of roots, inclusive of multiplicities,  $\{a_1 \dots a_k\}$  is a finite set with  $k \leq \deg(p)$ . Take the subset  $\{a_{j_1} \dots a_{j_m}\} \subseteq \{a_1 \dots a_k\}$ , such that  $f(a_{j_1}) = \dots = f(a_{j_m}) = b$ . These are the only elements of  $\mathbb{H}_1$  that are roots of  $p$  and push-forward to  $b$ . By the inheritance property, there exists a  $q \in \mathbb{H}_1[X]$ , such that,

$$p \in (X - a_{j_1}) \odot \dots \odot (X - a_{j_m}) \odot q.$$

By the hyperfield homomorphism properties it can be seen that under  $f_*$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_*(p) &\in (X - f(a_{j_1})) \odot \dots \odot (X - f(a_{j_m})) \odot f_*(q) \\ &\in (X - b) \odot \dots \odot (X - b) \odot f_*(q). \end{aligned}$$

This gives  $\text{mult}_b(f_*(p)) \geq m$ , implying that,

$$\text{mult}_b(f_*(p)) \geq \sum_{a \in f^{-1}(b)} \text{mult}_a(p).$$

□

**Theorem 4.10.** *Given  $\mathbb{H}_1$  which satisfies the multiplicity equality and has the inheritance property, and  $\mathbb{H}_2$  that satisfies the multiplicity bound, then a surjective homomorphism  $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2$  is a RAC map.*

*Proof.* The hyperfield  $\mathbb{H}_1$  satisfying the multiplicity equality and the inheritance property implies by Lemma 4.8 that,  $\text{mult}_b(f_*(p)) \geq \sum_{a \in f^{-1}(b)} \text{mult}_a(p)$  holds. These together then

imply that  $\text{mult}_b(f_*(p)) = \sum_{a \in f^{-1}(b)} \text{mult}_a(p)$ , by the following logic;

$$\deg(p) = \sum_{a \in \mathbb{H}_1} \text{mult}_a(p) \leq \sum_{b \in \mathbb{H}_2} \text{mult}_b(f(p)) \leq \deg(f_*(p)) = \deg(p).$$

Then finally,  $\text{mult}_b(f_*(p)) = \sum_{a \in f^{-1}(b)} \text{mult}_a(p)$  gives that the map  $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2$  is RAC, using analogous logic to the proof of Lemma 4.3.  $\square$

*Remark 4.11.* Theorem 4.10 demonstrates that there are sufficient conditions that can be given to both hyperfields to give the corresponding homomorphism as RAC, although this does not classify all RAC maps. It does incorporate the motivating example for the paper,  $\text{trop} : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ . Although, it can be seen that  $\mathbb{TC}$  does not satisfy the multiplicity bound, and hence does not fulfil the conditions of Theorem 4.10. This demonstrates the theoretical complexity in attempting to outline the conditions for a hyperfield homomorphism to be RAC.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Laura Anderson and James F Davis. Hyperfield grassmannians. *Advances in Mathematics*, 341:336–366, 2019.
- [2] Laura Anderson and Emanuele Delucchi. Foundations for a theory of complex matroids. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 48(4):807–846, 2012.
- [3] Matt Baker and Nathan Bowler. Matroids over hyperfields. In *AIP Conference Proceedings*, volume 1978, page 340010. AIP Publishing LLC, 2018.
- [4] Matthew Baker and Nathan Bowler. Matroids over partial hyperstructures. *Advances in Mathematics*, 343:821–863, 2019.
- [5] Matthew Baker and Oliver Lorscheid. Descartes’ rule of signs, newton polygons, and polynomials over hyperfields. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.04966*, 2018.
- [6] Matthew Baker and Oliver Lorscheid. The moduli space of matroids. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.03542*, 2018.
- [7] Milo Bogaard. *Introduction to amoebas and tropical geometry*. PhD thesis, M. Sc. thesis, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands, 2015. URL: <https://esc...>, 2015.
- [8] Nathan Bowler and Ting Su. Classification of doubly distributive skew hyperfields and stringent hypergroups. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.03751*, 2020.
- [9] Alain Connes and Caterina Consani. The hyperring of adèle classes. *Journal of Number Theory*, 131(2):159–194, 2011.
- [10] Andreas WM Dress and Walter Wenzel. Perfect matroids. *Advances in Mathematics*, 91(2):158–208, 1992.

- [11] Jeffrey Giansiracusa, Jaiung Jun, and Oliver Lorscheid. On the relation between hyperrings and fuzzy rings. *Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometrie/Contributions to Algebra and Geometry*, 58(4):735–764, 2017.
- [12] Jaiung Jun. Geometry of hyperfields. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.09348*, 2017.
- [13] Jaiung Jun. Algebraic geometry over hyperrings. *Advances in Mathematics*, 323:142–192, 2018.
- [14] Marc Krasner. A class of hyperrings and hyperfields. *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, 6(2):307–311, 1983.
- [15] Diane Maclagan and Bernd Sturmfels. *Introduction to tropical geometry*, volume 161. American Mathematical Soc., 2015.
- [16] O Ya Viro. On basic concepts of tropical geometry. *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, 273(1):252–282, 2011.
- [17] Oleg Viro. Hyperfields for tropical geometry i. hyperfields and dequantization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1006.3034*, 2010.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COMPUTATIONAL FOUNDRY, BAY CAMPUS, SWANSEA UNIVERSITY,  
FABIAN WAY, SWANSEA, SA1 8EN

*Email address:* 825537@swansea.ac.uk, james.william.maxwell@gmail