

Volume 57 Number 1 January 2014 1–220

ISSN 1674-7283 CN 11-5837/O1

中国科学：数学

# SCIENCE CHINA Mathematics

*Sponsored by*

CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

NATIONAL NATURAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION OF CHINA

[math.scichina.com](http://math.scichina.com)

[www.springer.com/scp](http://www.springer.com/scp)

[link.springer.com](http://link.springer.com)





# Editorial Board

## Honorary Editor General

ZHOU GuangZhao (Zhou Guang Zhao)

## Editor General

ZHU ZuoYan Institute of Hydrobiology, CAS, China

## Editor-in-Chief

YUAN YaXiang Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, CAS, China

## Associate Editors-in-Chief

CHEN YongChuan Tianjin University, China

GE LiMing Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, CAS, China

SHAO QiMan The Chinese University of Hong Kong, China

JI NanHua Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, CAS, China

ZHANG WeiPing Nankai University, China

## Members

### BAI ZhaoJun

University of California, Davis, USA

### WANG YueFei

Academy of Mathematics and Systems  
Science, CAS, China

### CAO DaoMin

Academy of Mathematics and Systems  
Science, CAS, China

### WU SiJue

University of Michigan, USA

### CHEM XiaoJun

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University,  
China

### WU SiYe

The University of Hong Kong, China

### CHEN ZhenQing

University of Washington, USA

### XIAO Jie

Tsinghua University, China

### CHEN ZhiMing

Academy of Mathematics and Systems  
Science, CAS, China

### XIN ZhouPing

The Chinese University of Hong Kong,  
China

### CHENG ChongQing

Nanjing University, China

### XU Fei

Capital Normal University, China

### DAI YuHong

Academy of Mathematics and Systems  
Science, CAS, China

### XU Feng

University of California, Riverside, USA

### DONG ChongYing

University of California, Santa Cruz,  
USA

### XU JinChao

Pennsylvania State University, USA

### DUAN HaiBao

Academy of Mathematics and Systems  
Science, CAS, China

### XU XiaoPing

Academy of Mathematics and Systems  
Science, CAS, China

### E WeiNan

Princeton University, USA  
Peking University, China

### YAN Catherine H. F.

Texas A&M University, USA

### FAN JianQing

Princeton University, USA

### YE XiangDong

University of Science and Technology  
of China, China

### FENG Qi

Academy of Mathematics and Systems  
Science, CAS, China

### YU XingXing

Georgia Institute of Technology, USA

### FU JiXiang

Fudan University, China

### ZHANG James J.

University of Washington, USA

### GAO XiaoShan

Academy of Mathematics and Systems  
Science, CAS, China

### ZHANG JiPing

Peking University, China

### GE GenNian

Capital Normal University, China

### ZHANG Ping

Academy of Mathematics and Systems  
Science, CAS, China

### GUO XianPing

Sun Yat-sen University, China

### ZHANG PingWen

Peking University, China

### HE XuMing

University of Michigan, USA

### ZHANG ShouWu

Columbia University, USA

### HONG JiaXing

Fudan University, China

### ZHANG Xu

Sichuan University, China

### HSU Elton P.

Northwestern University, USA

### ZHANG YiTang

University of New Hampshire, USA

### JI LiZhen

University of Michigan, USA

### ZHOU XiangYu

Academy of Mathematics and Systems  
Science, CAS, China

### JING Bing-Yi

The Hong Kong University of Science  
and Technology, China

### ZHU XiPing

Sun Yat-sen University, China

### ZONG ChuanMing

Peking University, China

## Editorial Staff

### CHAI Zhao

chajiaozhao@scichina.org

### YANG ZhiHua

zhihua@scichina.org

### ZHANG RuiYan

zhangry@scichina.org

## Cover Designer

### HU Yu

huyu@scichina.org

# Strictly nonnegative tensors and nonnegative tensor partition

HU ShengLong<sup>1</sup>, HUANG ZhengHai<sup>2,3,\*</sup> & QI LiQun<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China;

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, School of Science, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China;

<sup>3</sup>The Center for Applied Mathematics of Tianjin University, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China

Email: Tim.Hu@connect.polyu.hk, huangzhenghai@tju.edu.cn, maqilq@polyu.edu.hk

Received October 29, 2012; accepted May 19, 2013; published online November 28, 2013

**Abstract** We introduce a new class of nonnegative tensors—strictly nonnegative tensors. A weakly irreducible nonnegative tensor is a strictly nonnegative tensor but not vice versa. We show that the spectral radius of a strictly nonnegative tensor is always positive. We give some necessary and sufficient conditions for the six well-conditional classes of nonnegative tensors, introduced in the literature, and a full relationship picture about strictly nonnegative tensors with these six classes of nonnegative tensors. We then establish global R-linear convergence of a power method for finding the spectral radius of a nonnegative tensor under the condition of weak irreducibility. We show that for a nonnegative tensor  $T$ , there always exists a partition of the index set such that every tensor induced by the partition is weakly irreducible; and the spectral radius of  $T$  can be obtained from those spectral radii of the induced tensors. In this way, we develop a convergent algorithm for finding the spectral radius of a general nonnegative tensor without any additional assumption. Some preliminary numerical results show the feasibility and effectiveness of the algorithm.

**Keywords** nonnegative tensor, spectral radius, strict nonnegativity, weak irreducibility

**MSC(2010)** 15-02, 15A18, 15A69, 65F15

---

**Citation:** Hu S L, Huang Z H, Qi L. Strictly nonnegative tensors and nonnegative tensor partition. Sci China Math, 2014, 57: 181–195, doi: 10.1007/s11425-013-4752-4

---

## 1 Introduction

Recently, the research topic on eigenvalues of nonnegative tensors has attracted much attention [2–8, 10–14, 16, 18–27]. Researchers studied the Perron-Frobenius theorem for nonnegative tensors and algorithms for finding the largest eigenvalue, i.e., the spectral radius, of a nonnegative tensor. Six well-conditional classes of nonnegative tensors have been introduced: Irreducible nonnegative tensors [3, 12], essentially positive tensors [16], primitive tensors [4], weakly positive tensors [25], weakly irreducible nonnegative tensors [8] and weakly primitive tensors [8]. Zhang et al. [25] concluded the relationships among the first four classes of nonnegative tensors. Friedland et al. [8] introduced weakly irreducible nonnegative tensors and weakly primitive tensors. These two classes, as their names suggest, are broader than the classes of irreducible nonnegative tensors and primitive tensors respectively.

In the next section, we propose a new class of nonnegative tensors, we call them *strictly nonnegative* tensors. We show that the class of strictly nonnegative tensors strictly contains the class of weakly

---

\*Corresponding author

irreducible nonnegative tensors mentioned above. We also prove that the spectral radius of a strictly non-negative tensor is always positive. This further strengthens the Perron-Frobenius results for nonnegative tensors in [3–5, 8, 18, 19].

In Section 3, we give sufficient and necessary conditions for the six well-conditional classes of non-negative tensors, introduced in the literature, and a full relationship picture about strictly nonnegative tensors with these six classes of nonnegative tensors.

Friedland et al. [8] proposed a power method for finding the largest eigenvalue of a weakly irreducible nonnegative tensor, and established its R-linear convergence under the condition of weak primitivity. In Section 4, we modify that method and establish its global R-linear convergence for weakly irreducible nonnegative tensors.

It is well known for nonnegative matrices that: For a general nonnegative matrix, we can place it into an upper block triangular form with irreducible blocks through simultaneous row/column permutations, and the spectral radius is equal to the largest of the spectral radii of the block sub-matrices. Can this result be generalized for nonnegative tensors? The answer is not so obvious: There are two concepts of “irreducibility”, namely irreducibility [3, 12] and weak irreducibility [8]. Can the above result be generalized based on either, both or neither? We will give an affirmative answer to these questions. We show that the result can be generalized based on weak reducibility but not reducibility in Section 5. We show that for a nonnegative tensor  $T$ , always there exists a partition of the index set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  such that every tensor induced by the partition is weakly irreducible, and the largest eigenvalue of  $T$  can be obtained from those largest eigenvalues of the induced tensors.

In Section 6, based on the power method for weakly irreducible nonnegative tensors proposed in Section 4, we develop a convergent algorithm for finding the spectral radius of a general nonnegative tensor without any additional assumption. We report some preliminary numerical results of the proposed method for general nonnegative tensors. These numerical results demonstrate the feasibility and efficiency of the proposed algorithm. Conclusions and remarks are given in Section 7.

Here is some notation in this paper. A tensor  $T$  in the field  $\mathfrak{R}$  of real numbers of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$  with  $m, n \geq 2$  is an  $m$ -way array which can be denoted by  $(T_{i_1 \dots i_m})$  with  $T_{i_1 \dots i_m} \in \mathfrak{R}$  for all

$$i_j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad \text{and} \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\}.$$

For a tensor  $T$  of order  $m \geq 2$  and dimension  $n \geq 2$ , if there exist  $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$(Tx^{m-1})_i := \sum_{i_2 \dots i_m=1}^n T_{ii_2 \dots i_m} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = \lambda x_i^{m-1}, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad (1.1)$$

holds, then  $\lambda$  is called an eigenvalue of  $T$ ,  $x$  is called a corresponding eigenvector of  $T$  with respect to  $\lambda$ , and  $(\lambda, x)$  is called an eigenpair of  $T$ . This definition was introduced by Qi [17] when  $m$  is even and  $T$  is symmetric (i.e.,  $T_{j_1 \dots j_m} = T_{i_1 \dots i_m}$  among all the permutations  $(j_1, \dots, j_m)$  of  $(i_1, \dots, i_m)$ ). Independently, Lim [12] gave such a definition but restricted  $x$  to be a real vector and  $\lambda$  to be a real number. Let

$$\mathfrak{R}_+^n := \{x \in \mathfrak{R}^n \mid x \geq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{R}_{++}^n := \{x \in \mathfrak{R}^n \mid x > 0\}.$$

Suppose that  $T$  is a nonnegative tensor, i.e., that all of its entries are nonnegative. It can be seen that if we define function  $F_T : \mathfrak{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}_+^n$  associated the nonnegative tensor  $T$  as

$$(F_T)_i(x) := \left( \sum_{i_2 \dots i_m=1}^n T_{ii_2 \dots i_m} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}, \quad (1.2)$$

for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $x \in \mathfrak{R}_+^n$ , then (1.1) is strongly related to the eigenvalue problem for the nonlinear map  $F_T$  discussed in [15]. Denote by  $\rho(T) := \max\{|\lambda| \mid \lambda \in \sigma(T)\}$ , where  $\sigma(T)$  is the set of all the eigenvalues of  $T$ . We call  $\rho(T)$  and  $\sigma(T)$  the spectral radius and the spectrum of the tensor  $T$ , respectively.

## 2 Strictly nonnegative tensors

In this section, we propose and analyze a new class of nonnegative tensors, namely *strictly nonnegative tensors*. To this end, we first recall several concepts related to nonnegative tensors in [3, 4, 8, 12, 16, 25].

**Definition 2.1.** Suppose that  $T$  is a nonnegative tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ .

- $T$  is called *reducible* if there exists a nonempty proper index subset  $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that

$$T_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_m} = 0, \quad \forall i_1 \in I, \quad \forall i_2, \dots, i_m \notin I. \quad (2.1)$$

If  $T$  is not reducible, then  $T$  is called *irreducible*.

- $T$  is called *essentially positive* if  $Tx^{m-1} \in \Re_{++}^n$  for any nonzero  $x \in \Re_+^n$ .
- $T$  is called *primitive* if for some positive integer  $k$ ,  $F_T^k(x) \in \Re_{++}^n$  for any nonzero  $x \in \Re_+^n$ . Here  $F_T^k := F_T(F_T^{k-1})$ .
- A nonnegative matrix  $M(T)$  is called the *majorization* associated to the nonnegative tensor  $T$ , if the  $(i, j)$ -th element of  $M(T)$  is defined to be  $T_{i j \dots j}$  for any  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .  $T$  is called *weakly positive* if  $[M(T)]_{ij} > 0$  for all  $i \neq j$ .

In Definition 2.1, the concepts of *reducibility* and *irreducibility* were proposed by Chang et al. [3, Definition 2.1] and Lim [12, p. 131], the concept of *essential positivity* was given by Pearson [16, Definition 3.1], and the concept of *primitivity* was given by Chang et al. [4, Definition 2.6] while we used its equivalent definition [4, Thoerem 2.7]. In addition, the concept of *majorization* was given by Chang et al. [3, Definition 3.5] and earned this name in [16, Definition 2.1]; and the concept of *weak positivity* was given by Zhang et al. [25, Definition 3.1].

Friedland et al. [8] defined *weakly irreducible* polynomial maps and *weakly primitive* polynomial maps by using the strong connectivity of a graph associated to a polynomial map [9]. Their concepts for homogeneous polynomials gave the following two classes of nonnegative tensors.

**Definition 2.2.** Suppose that  $T$  is a nonnegative tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ .

- We call a nonnegative matrix  $G(T)$  the *representation* associated to the nonnegative tensor  $T$ , if the  $(i, j)$ -th element of  $G(T)$  is defined to be the summation of  $T_{ii_2 \dots i_m}$  with indices  $\{i_2, \dots, i_m\} \ni j$ .
- We call the tensor  $T$  *weakly reducible* if its representation  $G(T)$  is a reducible matrix, and *weakly primitive* if  $G(T)$  is a primitive matrix. If  $T$  is not *weakly reducible*, then it is called *weakly irreducible*.

Now, we introduce *strictly nonnegative tensors*.

**Definition 2.3.** Suppose that  $T$  is a nonnegative tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ . Then, it is called *strictly nonnegative* if  $F_T(x) > 0$  for any  $x > 0$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** An  $m$ -th order  $n$ -dimensional nonnegative tensor  $T$  is strictly nonnegative if and only if the vector  $R(T)$  with its  $i$ -th element being  $\sum_{i_2, \dots, i_m=1}^n T_{ii_2 \dots i_m}$  is positive.

*Proof.* By Definition 2.3,  $Te^{m-1} > 0$  with  $e$  being the vector of all ones. So,

$$(Te^{m-1})_i = \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_m=1}^n T_{ii_2 \dots i_m} > 0,$$

for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . The “only if” part follows.

Now, suppose  $R(T) > 0$ . Then, for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we could find  $j_{2i}, \dots, j_{m_i}$  such that  $T_{ij_{2i} \dots j_{m_i}} > 0$ . So, for any  $x > 0$ , we have

$$(Tx^{m-1})_i = \sum_{j_2, \dots, j_m=1}^n T_{ij_2 \dots j_m} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_m} \geq T_{ij_{2i} \dots j_{m_i}} x_{j_{2i}} \cdots x_{j_{m_i}} > 0,$$

for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Hence, the “if” part follows. The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.1.** An  $m$ -th order  $n$ -dimensional nonnegative tensor  $T$  is strictly nonnegative if it is weakly irreducible.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $T$  is weakly irreducible. By the definition, we have that the signs of vectors  $G(T)e$  and  $R(T)$  are the same. Moreover,  $G(T)e$  is positive since  $T$  is weakly irreducible. Because, otherwise, we would have a zero row of the matrix  $G(T)$ , which further implies that  $G(T)$  is reducible, a contradiction to Definition 2.2. So, by Lemma 2.1,  $T$  is strictly nonnegative.  $\square$

A result similar to this corollary was given in [8, (3.2)]. On the other hand, the converse of Corollary 2.1 is not true in general.

**Example 2.1.** Let the third-order two-dimensional nonnegative tensor  $T$  be defined as:

$$T_{122} = T_{222} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad T_{ijk} = 0 \quad \text{for other } i, j, k \in \{1, 2\},$$

then  $R(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} > 0$ . So  $T$  is strictly nonnegative by Lemma 2.1. While,  $G(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  is a reducible nonnegative matrix, so  $T$  is weakly reducible.

**Proposition 2.1.** An  $m$ -th order  $n$ -dimensional nonnegative tensor  $T$  is strictly nonnegative if and only if  $F_T$  is strictly increasing [4], i.e.,  $F_T(x) > F_T(y)$  for any  $x > y \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* If  $F_T$  is strictly increasing, then, for any  $x > 0$ , we have  $Tx^{m-1} > T0^{m-1} = 0$ . So,  $T$  is strictly nonnegative. The “if” part follows.

Now, suppose that  $T$  is strictly nonnegative. Then,  $R(T) > 0$  by Lemma 2.1. So, for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we could find  $j_{2_i}, \dots, j_{m_i}$  such that  $T_{ij_{2_i} \dots j_{m_i}} > 0$ . If  $0 \leq x < y$ , then  $x_{j_{2_i}} \dots x_{j_{m_i}} < y_{j_{2_i}} \dots y_{j_{m_i}}$  for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} (Ty^{m-1})_i - (Tx^{m-1})_i &= \sum_{j_2, \dots, j_m=1}^n T_{ij_{2_i} \dots j_{m_i}} (y_{j_2} \dots y_{j_m} - x_{j_2} \dots x_{j_m}) \\ &\geq T_{ij_{2_i} \dots j_{m_i}} (y_{j_{2_i}} \dots y_{j_{m_i}} - x_{j_{2_i}} \dots x_{j_{m_i}}) \\ &> 0, \end{aligned}$$

for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . So, by (1.2), the “only if” part follows. The proof is complete.  $\square$

We now show that the spectral radius of a strictly nonnegative tensor is always positive. At first, we present some notation. For any nonnegative tensor  $T$  of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$  and a nonempty subset  $I$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , the induced tensor denoted by  $T_I$  of  $I$  is defined as the  $m$ -th order  $|I|$ -dimensional tensor  $\{T_{i_1 \dots i_m} \mid i_1, \dots, i_m \in I\}$ . Here,  $|I|$  denotes the cardinality of the set  $I$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** For any  $m$ -th order  $n$ -dimensional nonnegative tensor  $T$  and nonempty subset  $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\rho(T) \geq \rho(T_I)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $K$  be a nonnegative tensor of the same size of  $T$  with  $K_I = T_I$  and zero anywhere else. Then, obviously,  $T \geq K \geq 0$  in the sense of componentwise and  $\rho(K) = \rho(T_I)$ . Now, by [19, Lemma 3.4],  $\rho(K) \leq \rho(T)$ . So, the result follows immediately.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.1.** If nonnegative tensor  $T$  is strictly nonnegative, then  $\rho(T) > 0$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.1,  $R(T) > 0$ , so  $G(T)e > 0$ . We have two cases.

(I) If  $G(T)$  is an irreducible matrix, then  $T$  is weakly irreducible by Definition 2.2. By Perron-Frobenius theorem [8], there is  $x > 0$  such that  $Tx^{m-1} = \rho(T)x^{[m-1]}$ . Thus, by Lemma 2.1, the strict positivity of  $T$  implies  $\rho(T) > 0$ .

(II) If  $G(T)$  is a reducible matrix, then  $T$  is weakly reducible by Definition 2.2.  $T$  may not have a positive eigenvector. While, we can find a nonempty  $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $[G(T)]_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i \in I$  and  $j \notin I$ . Denote by  $K$  the principal submatrix of  $G(T)$  indexed by  $I$ , and  $T'$  the tensor induced by  $I$ . Since  $G(T)e > 0$  and  $[G(T)]_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i \in I$  and  $j \notin I$ , we still have  $Ke > 0$ . Hence,  $T'$  is also strictly nonnegative since  $G(T') = K$  and  $Ke > 0$ . By Lemma 2.2, we have that  $\rho(T) \geq \rho(T')$ .

So, inductively, we can finally get a tensor sequence  $T, T', \dots, T^*$  (since  $n$  is finite) with

$$\rho(T) \geq \rho(T') \geq \dots \geq \rho(T^*).$$

Moreover,  $T^*$  is either a weakly irreducible tensor when the dimension of  $T^*$  is higher than 1, or a positive scalar since  $T^*$  is strictly positive. In both cases,  $\rho(T^*) > 0$  by (I). The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Example 2.2.** Let third order 2-dimensional nonnegative tensor  $T$  be defined as:

$$T_{122} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad T_{ijk} = 0 \quad \text{for other } i, j, k \in \{1, 2\}.$$

The eigenvalue equation of the tensor  $T$  becomes

$$\begin{cases} x_2^2 = \lambda x_1^2, \\ 0 = \lambda x_2^2. \end{cases}$$

Obviously,  $\rho(T) = 0$ . Hence, a nonzero nonnegative tensor may have zero spectral radius. So, Theorem 2.1 is not vacuous in general.

At the end of this section, we summarize the Perron-Frobenius theorem for nonnegative tensors as follows.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $T$  be an  $m$ -th order  $n$ -dimensional nonnegative tensor, then*

- (Yang and Yang [19])  $\rho(T)$  is an eigenvalue of  $T$  with a nonnegative eigenvector;
- (See Theorem 2.1) if furthermore  $T$  is strictly nonnegative, then  $\rho(T) > 0$ ;
- (Friedland et al. [8]) if furthermore  $T$  is weakly irreducible, then  $\rho(T)$  has a unique positive eigenvector;
- (Chang et al. [3]) if furthermore  $T$  is irreducible and if  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue with a nonnegative eigenvector, then  $\lambda = \rho(T)$ ;
- (Yang and Yang [19]) if  $T$  is irreducible, and  $T$  has  $k$  distinct eigenvalues of modulus  $\rho(T)$ , then the eigenvalues are  $\rho(T) \exp(i2\pi j/k)$  with  $i^2 = -1$  and  $j = 0, \dots, k-1$ ;
- (Chang et al. [4]) if furthermore  $T$  is primitive, then  $k = 1$ ; and
- (Pearson [16]) if  $T$  is further essentially positive and  $m$  is even,  $\rho(T)$  is real geometrically simple.

### 3 Relationships of the seven classes of nonnegative tensors

In this section, we make a clear diagram of the relationships among the concepts of nonnegative tensors mentioned above. Let  $T$  be a nonnegative tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$  throughout this section. Let  $E$  be the identity tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$  with its diagonal elements being 1 and off-diagonal elements being 0 (when  $m = 2$ ,  $E$  is the usual identity matrix).

The relationships among irreducibility, primitivity, weak positivity and essential positivity were characterized in [25, Section 3], which can be summarized as follows:

- If  $T$  is essentially positive, then  $T$  is both weakly positive and primitive. But the converse is not true. Moreover, there exists a tensor which is weakly positive and primitive simultaneously, but not essentially positive.
- There is no inclusion relation between the class of weakly positive tensors and the class of primitive tensors.
- If  $T$  is weakly positive or primitive, then  $T$  is irreducible. But the converse is not true.

Actually, there are close relationships between (weakly) irreducibility and (weakly) primitivity, and between weak positivity and essential positivity.

**Theorem 3.1.** *A nonnegative tensor  $T$  is weakly irreducible/primitive/weakly positive if and only if  $T + E$  is weakly primitive/primitive/essentially positive. A nonnegative tensor  $T$  is essentially positive if and only if it is weakly positive, and all of its diagonal elements are positive.*

*Proof.* • (Weakly irreducible/Weakly primitive) We have that nonnegative representation matrix  $G(T)$  is irreducible if and only if matrix  $G(T + E)$  is primitive [1, Theorem 2.1.3 and Corollary 2.4.8]. So, by Definition 2.2, tensor  $T$  is weakly irreducible if and only if tensor  $T + E$  is weakly primitive.

• (Weakly positive/Essentially positive) The claims follow directly from Definition 2.1 and the nonnegativity of  $T$ .

• (Irreducible/Primitive) Firstly, it follows from [19, Theorem 6.6] immediately that  $T$  is irreducible if and only if  $F_{T+E}^{n-1}(x) > 0$  for any nonzero  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ . Secondly, if  $T + E$  is primitive, then  $T + E$  is

irreducible. We can prove that  $F_{T+E}^{n-1}(x) > 0$  for any nonzero  $x \in \Re_+^n$ , which implies that  $T$  is irreducible by the above result. Actually, let  $K := T + \frac{1}{2}E$ , then,  $2K$  is irreducible and nonnegative. We have

$$2(T+E) = 2\left(K + \frac{1}{2}E\right) = 2K + E$$

and  $F_{2(T+E)}^{n-1}(x) = F_{2K+E}^{n-1}(x) > 0$  for any nonzero  $x \in \Re_+^n$  by the above result. It is straightforward to check that

$$F_{2(T+E)}^{n-1}(x) = 2^{\frac{n-1}{m-1}} F_{T+E}^{n-1}(x)$$

for any nonzero  $x \in \Re_+^n$ . So, the result follows.  $\square$

We now discuss some other relations among these six classes of nonnegative tensors. By Definitions 2.1 and 2.2, if  $T$  is irreducible, then it is weakly irreducible. Nevertheless, the converse is not true in general, which can be seen from the following example.

**Example 3.1.** Let  $T$  be a third order three-dimensional tensor which is defined by  $T_{123} = T_{221} = T_{223} = T_{312} = T_{332} = 1$  and  $T_{ijk} = 0$  for other  $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Then,  $G(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  is irreducible but  $T_{2ij} = 0$  for all  $i, j \in \{1, 3\}$ , which says that  $T$  is reducible.

By Definition 2.2, if  $T$  is weakly primitive, then  $T$  is weakly irreducible. The following example demonstrates that the converse is not true.

**Example 3.2.** Let  $T$  be a third order three-dimensional tensor which is defined by  $T_{122} = T_{233} = T_{311} = 1$  and  $T_{ijk} = 0$  for other  $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Then,  $T$  is not weakly primitive, since its representation matrix  $G(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  is not primitive. But it is an irreducible matrix, and hence,  $T$  is weakly irreducible by Definition 2.2.

We now discuss the relations between primitivity and weak primitivity. The following result is a complementary to that in Chang et al. [4].

**Lemma 3.1.** For a nonnegative tensor  $T$  of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ , if  $M(T)$  is primitive, then  $T$  is primitive, and if  $T$  is primitive, then  $G(T)$  is primitive.

*Proof.* If  $M(T)$  is primitive, then let  $K := [M(T)]^k$  with  $k := n^2 - 2n + 2$ , we have  $K_{ij} > 0$  for any  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  (see [1, Theorem 2.4.14]). Now, for any nonzero  $x \in \Re_+^n$ , suppose  $x_j > 0$ . Then, for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , there exist  $i_2, \dots, i_k$  such that  $M(T)_{ii_2}, M(T)_{ii_3}, \dots, M(T)_{ikj} > 0$ . So,  $T_{ii_2 \dots i_2}, \dots, T_{ikj \dots j} > 0$ . Thus, we have  $[F_T^k(x)]_i > 0$  for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . As the above inequalities hold for any nonzero  $x \in \Re_+^n$ , we obtain that  $T$  is primitive.

If  $T$  is primitive, then for some integer  $k > 0$ ,  $F_T^k(x) > 0$  for any nonzero  $x \in \Re_+^n$ . For any  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , let  $e_j$  denote the  $j$ -th column of the  $n \times n$  identity matrix for any  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We thus have  $[F_T^k(e_j)]_i > 0$ . So, we must have indices  $\{i_2^2, \dots, i_m^2\}, \{i_1^3, \dots, i_m^3\}, \dots, \{i_1^{k-1}, \dots, i_m^{k-1}\}, i_k$  such that

$$T_{ii_2^2 \dots i_m^2}, T_{i_1^3 \dots i_m^3}, \dots, T_{i_1^{k-1} \dots i_m^{k-1}}, T_{i_k j \dots j} > 0$$

and  $i^{l+1} \in \{i_2^l, \dots, i_m^l\}$  for  $l \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ . Thus, if we let  $L := [G(T)]^k$ , we should have  $L_{ij} > 0$  for all  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Hence,  $G(T)$  is primitive.  $\square$

By Lemma 3.1 and Definition 2.2, if  $T$  is primitive, then  $T$  is weakly primitive.


We list some further relationships among the concepts mentioned above as follows:

- By Example 3.1, we see that  $G(T)$  is primitive but  $T$  is reducible since  $T_{2ij} = 0$  for all  $i, j \in \{1, 3\}$ . Hence, there exists a nonnegative tensor which is weakly primitive but not irreducible.

- Let  $T$  be a third order two-dimensional tensor which is defined by  $T_{122} = T_{211} = 1$  and  $T_{ijk} = 0$  for other  $i, j, k \in \{1, 2\}$ . Then,  $T$  is weakly positive, and hence, irreducible, but not weakly primitive.

- Let  $T$  be a third order two-dimensional tensor which is defined by  $T_{122} = T_{211} = T_{212} = T_{121} = 1$  and  $T_{ijk} = 0$  for other  $i, j, k \in \{1, 2\}$ . Then,  $T$  is weakly positive but not primitive, since  $Te_1^2 = e_2$  and  $Te_2^2 = e_1$ . However, it is weakly primitive, since  $G(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  is obviously primitive.

Using Corollary 2.1 and Example 2.1, we can summarize the relationships obtained so far in Figure 1.



**Figure 1** Relationships of the seven classes of nonnegative tensors

#### 4 Global R-linear convergence of a power method for weakly irreducible nonnegative tensors

We present here a modification of the power method proposed in [8].

**Algorithm 4.1** (A higher order power method (HOPM)). **Step 0.** Initialization: choose  $x^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ .

Let  $k := 0$ .

**Step 1.** Compute

$$\bar{x}^{(k+1)} := T(x^{(k)})^{m-1}, \quad x^{(k+1)} := \frac{(\bar{x}^{(k+1)})^{[\frac{1}{m-1}]}}{e^T[(\bar{x}^{(k+1)})^{[\frac{1}{m-1}]}]},$$

$$\alpha(x^{(k+1)}) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{(T(x^{(k)})^{m-1})_i}{(x^{(k)})_i^{m-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(x^{(k+1)}) := \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{(T(x^{(k)})^{m-1})_i}{(x^{(k)})_i^{m-1}}.$$

**Step 2.** If  $\alpha(x^{(k+1)}) = \beta(x^{(k+1)})$ , stop. Otherwise, let  $k := k + 1$ , go to Step 1.

Algorithm 4.1 is well defined if the underlying tensor  $T$  is a strictly nonnegative tensor, as in this case,  $Tx^{m-1} > 0$  for any  $x > 0$ . Hence, Algorithm 4.1 is also well defined for weakly irreducible nonnegative tensors. The following theorem establishes the convergence of Algorithm 4.1 if the underlying tensor  $T$  is weakly primitive, where we need to use the concept of Hilbert's projective metric [15]. We first recall such a concept. For any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus \{0\}$ , if there are  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  such that  $\alpha x \leq y \leq \beta x$ , then  $x$  and  $y$  are called *comparable*. If  $x$  and  $y$  are comparable, and define

$$m(y/x) := \sup\{\alpha > 0 \mid \alpha x \leq y\} \quad \text{and} \quad M(y/x) := \inf\{\beta > 0 \mid y \leq \beta x\},$$

then, the Hilbert's projective metric  $d$  can be defined by

$$d(x, y) := \begin{cases} \log\left(\frac{M(y/x)}{m(y/x)}\right), & \text{if } x \text{ and } y \text{ are comparable,} \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus \{0\}$ . Note that if  $x, y \in \Delta_n := \{z \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \mid e^T z = 1\}$ , then  $d(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = y$ . Actually, it is easy to check that  $d$  is a metric on  $\Delta_n$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** Suppose that  $T$  is a weakly irreducible nonnegative tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ . Then, the following results hold:

- (i)  $T$  has a positive eigenpair  $(\lambda, x)$ , and  $x$  is unique up to a multiplicative constant.
- (ii) Let  $(\lambda_*, x^*)$  be the unique positive eigenpair of  $T$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^n (x^*)_i = 1$ . Then,

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{(Tx^{m-1})_i}{x_i^{m-1}} = \lambda_* = \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{(Tx^{m-1})_i}{x_i^{m-1}}.$$

(iii) If  $(\nu, v)$  is another eigenpair of  $T$ , then  $|\nu| \leq \lambda_*$ .

(iv) Suppose that  $T$  is weakly primitive and the sequence  $\{x^{(k)}\}$  is generated by Algorithm 4.1. Then,  $\{x^{(k)}\}$  converges to the unique vector  $x^* \in \Re_{++}^n$  satisfying  $T(x^*)^{m-1} = \lambda_*(x^*)^{[m-1]}$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^* = 1$ , and there exist constant  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  and positive integer  $M$  such that

$$d(x^{(k)}, x^*) \leq \theta^{\frac{k}{M}} \frac{d(x^{(0)}, x^*)}{\theta}, \quad (4.1)$$

holds for all  $k \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* Except the result in (4.1), all the other results in this theorem can be easily obtained from [8, Theorem 4.1, Corollaries 4.2, 4.3 and 5.1]. So, we only give the proof of (4.1) here. We have the following observations first:

- $\Re_+^n$  is a normal cone in Banach space  $\Re^n$  (see [15]), since  $y \geq x \geq 0$  implies  $\|y\| \geq \|x\|$ ;
- $\Re_+^n$  has nonempty interior  $\Re_{++}^n$  which is an open cone, and  $F_T : \Re_{++}^n \rightarrow \Re_{++}^n$  is continuous and order-preserving by Corollary 2.1 and the nonnegativity of tensor  $T$ ;
- $F_T$  is homogeneous of degree 1 in  $\Re_{++}^n$ ;
- the set  $\Delta_n$  is connected and  $T$  has an eigenvector  $x^*$  in  $\Delta_n$  by Theorem 4.1(i);
- by (1.2),  $F_T$  is continuously differentiable in an open neighborhood of  $x^*$ , since  $x^* > 0$ ;
- by Definition 2.2,  $G(T)$  is primitive, hence there exists an integer  $N$  such that  $[G(T)]^N > 0$ . So,  $[G(T)]^N x$  is comparable with  $x^*$  for any nonzero  $x \in \Re_+^n$ ;
- $G(T) : \Re^n \rightarrow \Re^n$  is a compact linear map, hence its essential spectrum radius is zero (see [15, p. 38]), while its spectral radius is positive since it is a primitive matrix (see [1]).

Hence, by [15, Corollary 2.5 and Theorem 2.7], we have that there exist a constant  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  and a positive integer  $M$  such that

$$d(x^{(Mj)}, x^*) \leq \theta^j d(x^{(0)}, x^*), \quad (4.2)$$

where  $d$  denotes the Hilbert's projective metric on  $\Re_+^n \setminus \{0\}$ .

By [15, Proposition 1.5], we also have that

$$d(F_T(x), F_T(y)) \leq d(x, y), \quad (4.3)$$

for any  $x, y \in \Re_+^n$ . Since  $\lambda_* > 0$ , by the property of Hilbert's projective metric  $d$  (see [15, p. 13]), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x^{(k+1)}, x^*) &= d\left(\frac{F_T(x^{(k)})}{e^T F_T(x^{(k)})}, x^*\right) = d\left(\frac{F_T(x^{(k)})}{e^T F_T(x^{(k)})}, \frac{1}{(\lambda_*)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}} F_T(x^*)\right) \\ &= d(F_T(x^{(k)}), F_T(x^*)) \leq d(x^{(k)}, x^*) \end{aligned}$$

holds for any  $k$ . So, for any  $k \geq M$ , we can find the largest  $j$  such that  $k \geq Mj$  and  $M(j+1) \geq k$ . Hence,

$$d(x^{(k)}, x^*) \leq d(x^{(Mj)}, x^*) \leq \theta^j d(x^{(0)}, x^*) \leq \theta^{\frac{k}{M}-1} d(x^{(0)}, x^*),$$

which implies (4.1) for all  $k \geq M$ . When  $1 \leq k < M$ , we have  $\theta^{\frac{k}{M}} > \theta$ , since  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ . Therefore, (4.1) is true for all  $k \geq 1$ .  $\square$

We denote by  $x^{[p]}$  a vector with its  $i$ -th element being  $x_i^p$ .

By Theorems 3.1 and 4.1, the following result holds obviously.

**Theorem 4.2.** Suppose that  $T$  is a weakly irreducible nonnegative tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ , and the sequence  $\{x^{(k)}\}$  is generated by Algorithm 4.1 with  $T$  being replaced by  $T + E$ . Then,  $\{x^{(k)}\}$  converges to the unique vector  $x^* \in \Re_{++}^n$  satisfying  $T(x^*)^{m-1} = \lambda_*(x^*)^{[m-1]}$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^* = 1$ , and there exist a constant  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  and a positive integer  $M$  such that (4.1) holds for all  $k \geq 1$ .

**Remark 4.1.** (i) Compared with [8, Corollaries 5.1 and 5.2], a main advantage of our results is that (4.1) in Theorem 4.1(iv) gives the global R-linear convergence of Algorithm 4.1; while the geometric convergence given in [8, Corollary 5.2] is essentially a result of local R-linear convergence. (ii) Compared with the results in [25], a main advantage of our results is that the problem we considered in Theorem 4.2 is broader than that in [25], i.e., our results are obtained for the weakly irreducible nonnegative tensors; while the results in [25] hold for the irreducible nonnegative tensors. There are also other differences between Theorem 4.2 and those in [25], such as, Theorem 4.2 gives the global R-linear convergence of the *iterated sequence*  $\{x^{(k)}\}$  of Algorithm 4.1 for weakly irreducible nonnegative tensors; while the Q-linear convergence of the corresponding *eigenvalue sequence* was proved in [25] for weakly positive nonnegative tensors.

Theorem 4.2 is one of the corner stones for us to develop a method for finding the spectral radius of a *general nonnegative tensor*.

## 5 Partition a general nonnegative tensor to weakly irreducible nonnegative tensors

If a nonnegative tensor  $T$  of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$  is weakly irreducible, then from Theorem 4.2, we can find the spectral radius and the corresponding positive eigenvector of  $T$  by using Algorithm 4.1. If  $T$  is not weakly irreducible, there is no guarantee for the convergence as that in Theorem 4.2.

In this section, we show that if a nonnegative tensor  $T$  is not weakly irreducible, then there exists a partition of the index set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  such that every tensor induced by the set in the partition is weakly irreducible, and the largest eigenvalue of  $T$  can be obtained from these induced tensors. Thus, we can find the spectral radius of a general nonnegative tensor by using Algorithm 4.1 for these induced weakly irreducible tensors. At the end of this section, we show that, if weakly reducibility is replaced by reducibility, a similar method does not work.

The following result is useful.

**Theorem 5.1** (See [19, Theorem 2.3]). *For any nonnegative tensor  $T$  of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ ,  $\rho(T)$  is an eigenvalue with a nonnegative eigenvector  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  corresponding to it.*

To develop an algorithm for general nonnegative tensors, we prove the following theorem which is an extension of the corresponding result for nonnegative matrices [1]. For the convenience of the subsequent analysis, a one-dimensional tensor is always considered as irreducible, hence weakly irreducible. Similarly, one-dimensional positive tensors are considered as primitive. Note that Algorithm 4.1 works for one-dimensional primitive tensor as well. However, weakly irreducible nonnegative tensors with dimension one may have zero spectral radius, but they are always positive when the dimension  $n \geq 2$  by Theorem 2.1. Note that,  $n$  is assumed to be no smaller than two throughout this paper, while the case of one-dimensional tensors is needed in the presentation of the partition results in this section.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Suppose that  $T$  is a nonnegative tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ . If  $T$  is weakly reducible, then there is a partition  $\{I_1, \dots, I_k\}$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  such that every tensor in  $\{T_{I_j} \mid j \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}$  is weakly irreducible.*

*Proof.* Since  $T$  is weakly reducible, by Definition 2.2 we can obtain that the matrix  $G(T)$  is reducible. Thus, we can find a partition  $\{J_1, \dots, J_l\}$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  such that

( $\star$ ) every matrix (a second order tensor) in  $\{[G(T)]_{J_i} \mid i \in \{1, \dots, l\}\}$  is irreducible and  $[G(T)]_{st} = 0$  for any  $s \in J_p$  and  $t \in J_q$  such that  $p > q$ .

Actually, by the definition of reducibility of a matrix, we can find a partition  $\{J_1, J_2\}$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $[G(T)]_{st} = 0$  for any  $s \in J_2$  and  $t \in J_1$ . If both  $[G(T)]_{J_1}$  and  $[G(T)]_{J_2}$  are irreducible, then we are done. Otherwise, we can repeat the above analysis to any reducible block(s) obtained above. In this way, since  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  is a finite set, we can arrive at the desired result ( $\star$ ).

Now, if every tensor in  $\{T_{J_i} \mid i \in \{1, \dots, l\}\}$  is weakly irreducible, then we are done. Otherwise, we repeat the above procedure to generate a partition of  $T$  to these induced tensors which are not weakly

irreducible. Since  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  is finite, this process will stop in finite steps. Hence, the theorem follows.  $\square$

By Theorems 5.2 and 3.1, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.1.** *Suppose that  $T$  is a nonnegative tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ . If  $T$  is weakly irreducible, then  $T + E$  is weakly primitive; otherwise, there is a partition  $\{I_1, \dots, I_k\}$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  such that every tensor in  $\{(T + E)_{I_j} \mid j \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}$  is weakly primitive.*

Given a nonempty subset  $I$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  and an  $n$  vector  $x$ , we will denote by  $x_I$  an  $n$  vector with its  $i$ -th element being  $x_i$  if  $i \in I$  and zero otherwise; and  $x(I)$  a  $|I|$  vector after deleting  $x_j$  for  $j \notin I$  from  $x$ .

**Theorem 5.3.** *Suppose that  $T$  is a weakly reducible nonnegative tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ , and  $\{I_1, \dots, I_k\}$  is the partition of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  determined by Theorem 5.2. Then,  $\rho(T) = \rho(T_{I_p})$  for some  $p \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .*

*Proof.* By the proof of Theorem 5.2, for the nonnegative matrix  $G(T)$ , we can find a partition  $\{J_1, \dots, J_l\}$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  such that

- every matrix in  $\{[G(T)]_{J_i} \mid i \in \{1, \dots, l\}\}$  is irreducible and  $[G(T)]_{st} = 0$  for any  $s \in J_p$  and  $t \in J_q$  such that  $p > q$ .

Firstly, we have that  $\rho(T_{J_i}) \leq \rho(T)$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$  by Lemma 2.2.

Then, denote by  $(\rho(T), x)$  a nonnegative eigenpair of  $T$  which is guaranteed by Theorem 5.1. Since  $[G(T)]_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i \in J_l$  and  $j \in \bigcup_{s=1}^{l-1} J_s$ . We must have

$$T_{ii_2 \dots i_m} = 0, \quad \forall i \in J_l, \quad \forall \{i_2, \dots, i_m\} \not\subseteq J_l. \quad (5.1)$$

Hence, for all  $i \in J_l$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(T)x_i^{m-1} &= (Tx^{m-1})_i \\ &= \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_m=1}^n T_{ii_2 \dots i_m} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} \\ &= \sum_{\{i_2, \dots, i_m\} \subseteq J_l} T_{ii_2 \dots i_m} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} \\ &= \{T_{J_l}(x(J_l))^{m-1}\}_i, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from (5.1). If  $x(J_l) \neq 0$ , then  $(\rho(T), x(J_l))$  is a nonnegative eigenpair of tensor  $T_{J_l}$ , and if  $x(J_l) = 0$ , then we have

$$T_{\bigcup_{j=1}^{l-1} J_j} \left( x \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^{l-1} J_j \right) \right)^{m-1} = \rho(T) \left[ x \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^{l-1} J_j \right) \right]^{[m-1]}.$$

In the later case, repeat the above analysis with  $T$  being replaced by  $T_{\bigcup_{j=1}^{l-1} J_j}$ . Since  $x \neq 0$  and  $l$  is finite, we must find some  $t \in \{1, \dots, l\}$  such that  $x(J_t) \neq 0$  and  $(\rho(T), x(J_t))$  is a nonnegative eigenpair of the tensor  $T_{J_t}$ .

Now, if  $T_{J_t}$  is weakly irreducible, we are done since  $J_t = I_p$  for some  $p \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  by the proof of Theorem 5.2. Otherwise, repeat the above analysis with  $T$  and  $x$  being replaced by  $T_{J_t}$  and  $x(J_t)$ , respectively. Such a process is finite, since  $n$  is finite. Thus, we always obtain a weakly irreducible nonnegative tensor  $T_{I_p}$  with  $I_p \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  for some  $p$  such that  $(\rho(T), x(I_p))$  is a nonnegative eigenpair of the tensor  $T_{I_p}$ . Furthermore,  $(\rho(T), x_S)$  with  $S := \bigcup_{i=1}^p I_p$  is a nonnegative eigenpair of tensor  $T$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

Note that if  $T$  is furthermore symmetric, then we can get a diagonal block representation of  $T$  with diagonal blocks  $T_{I_i}$  (after some permutation, if necessary). Then, by Corollary 5.1 and Theorems 4.2, 5.2 and 5.3, we can get the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Suppose that  $T$  is a nonnegative tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ .*

(a) If  $T$  is weakly irreducible, then  $T+E$  is weakly primitive by Theorem 3.1, and hence, Algorithm 4.1 with  $T$  being replaced by  $T+E$  converges to the unique positive eigenpair  $(\rho(T+E), x)$  of  $T+E$ . Moreover,  $(\rho(T+E)-1, x)$  is the unique positive eigenpair of  $T$ .

(b) If  $T$  is not weakly irreducible, then, we can get a set of weakly irreducible tensors  $\{T_{I_j} \mid j = 1, \dots, k\}$  with  $k > 1$  by Theorem 5.2. For each  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , we use Theorem 5.4(a) to find the unique positive eigenpair  $(\rho(T_{I_j}), x^j)$  of  $T_{I_j}$ , which is guaranteed by Corollary 5.1 when  $|I_j| \geq 2$  or eigenpair  $(T_{I_j}, 1)$  when  $|I_j| = 1$ . Then,  $\rho(T) = \max_{j=1, \dots, k} \rho(T_{I_j})$  by Theorem 5.3. If  $T$  is furthermore symmetric, then,  $x$  with  $x(I_{j^*}) = x^{j^*}$  is a nonnegative eigenvector of  $T$  where  $j^* \in \operatorname{argmax}_{j=1, \dots, k} \rho(T_{I_j})$ .

**Remark 5.1.** By Theorem 5.4 and Algorithm 4.1, if nonnegative tensor  $T$  is weakly irreducible, then, the spectral radius of  $T$  can be found directly by Algorithm 4.1 with  $T$  being replaced by  $T+E$ . If  $T$  is not weakly irreducible, then, we have to find the partition of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  determined by Theorem 5.2. Fortunately, we can find such a partition through the corresponding partition of the nonnegative representation matrix of  $T$  and its induced tensors according to Theorem 5.3. The specific method of finding such a partition is given in the next section.

Most of the known papers, which established the Perron-Frobenius theorem and showed the convergence of the power method for nonnegative tensors, concentrated on the class of irreducible nonnegative tensors (see [6]). A natural question is that, *for any given reducible nonnegative tensor  $T$ , whether a partition of  $T$  similar to the result given in Theorem 5.2 can be derived or not?* If so, *whether the spectral radius of  $T$  can be obtained by using the power method for the induced irreducible nonnegative tensors or not?* At the end of this section, we answer these two questions. The answer to the first question is positive, which is given as follows.

**Theorem 5.5.** Suppose that  $T$  is a nonnegative tensor of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ . If  $T$  is reducible, then there is a partition  $\{I_1, \dots, I_k\}$  of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that any one of the tensors  $\{T_{I_j} \mid j \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}$  is irreducible and

$$T_{st_2 \dots t_m} = 0, \quad \forall s \in I_p, \quad \forall \{t_2, \dots, t_m\} \subset I_q, \quad \forall p > q.$$

*Proof.* Since  $T$  is reducible, by the definition of reducibility, there exists a nonempty proper subset  $I_2$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  such that

$$T_{ii_2 \dots i_m} = 0, \quad \forall i \in I_2, \quad \forall i_2, \dots, i_m \in I_1 := \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus I_2.$$

If both  $T_{I_1}$  and  $T_{I_2}$  are irreducible, then we are done. Without loss of generality, we assume that  $T_{I_1}$  is irreducible and  $T_{I_2}$  is reducible. Then, by the reducibility of  $T_{I_2}$ , we can get a partition  $\{J_2, J_3\}$  of  $I_2$  such that

$$T_{ii_2 \dots i_m} = 0, \quad \forall i \in J_3, \quad \forall i_2, \dots, i_m \in J_2 := I_2 \setminus J_3.$$

If both  $T_{J_2}$  and  $T_{J_3}$  are irreducible, then we are done, since  $\{I_1, J_2, J_3\}$  is the desired partition of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . Otherwise, repeating the above procedure, we can get the desired results, since  $n$  is finite.  $\square$

However, the answer to the second question is negative, which can be seen by the following example.

**Example 5.1.** Let  $T$  be a third order two-dimensional tensor which is defined by

$$T_{111} = 1, \quad T_{112} = T_{121} = T_{211} = 4, \quad T_{122} = T_{212} = T_{221} = 0, \quad T_{222} = 1.$$

Since  $T_{122} = 0$ , the tensor  $T$  is reducible. And  $T_{111} = T_{222} = 1$  is the largest eigenvalue of both induced tensors by Theorem 5.5. While the nonnegative eigenpairs of  $T$  are

$$(1, (0, 1)^T) \quad \text{and} \quad (7.3496, (0.5575, 0.4425)^T).$$

This example prevents us to use  $\rho(T_{I_i})$ 's to get  $\rho(T)$  under the framework of irreducibility. In addition, it is easy to see that checking weak irreducibility of a tensor  $T$  is much easier than checking irreducibility of the tensor  $T$ , since the former is based on a nonnegative matrix which has both sophisticated theory and algorithms (see [1]).

## 6 A specific algorithm and numerical experiments

In this section, based on Algorithm 4.1, Theorem 4.2, and the theory established in Section 5, we develop a specific algorithm for finding the spectral radius of a general nonnegative tensor.

### 6.1 A specific algorithm

In this subsection, we give an algorithm for finding the spectral radius of a nonnegative tensor. We need an algorithm to find the irreducible blocks of a nonnegative matrix  $M$ . There are sophisticated algorithms for it. For example, the following naive approach is based on the fact that a nonnegative matrix  $M$  is irreducible if and only if  $(M + E)^{n-1} > 0$  (see [1]).

**Algorithm 6.2** (Irreducible blocks of nonnegative matrices). **Step 0.** Given a nonnegative matrix  $M$ , let  $k = 1$  and  $C^1 := M + E$ .

**Step 1.** Until  $k = n - 1$ , repeat  $C^k := C^{k-1}(M + E)$  and  $k := k + 1$ .

**Step 2.** Sort the numbers of nonzero elements of columns of  $C^{n-1}$  in ascend order, then perform symmetric permutation to  $C^{n-1}$  according to the sorting order into a matrix  $K$ ; sort the numbers of nonzero elements of rows of  $K$  in descend order, then perform symmetric permutation to  $K$  according to the sorting order into a matrix  $L$ . Record the two sorting orders.

**Step 3.** Let  $i = 1$ ,  $j = 1$  and  $s = 1$ , create an index set  $I_j$  and an vector  $\text{ind}$ , put  $i$  into  $I_j$  and index it to be the  $s$ -th element in  $I_j$ , and set  $\text{ind}(i)$  to be 1.

**Step 4.** If  $L(d, I_j(s)) > 0$  and  $L(I_j(s), d) > 0$  for some  $d \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $\text{ind}(d)$  being not 1, where  $I_j(s)$  is the  $s$ -th element in  $I_j$ , set  $s := s + 1$  and put  $d$  into  $I_j$  and index it to be the  $s$ -th element in  $I_j$ . Set  $\text{ind}(d)$  to be 1, and  $i := i + 1$ . If there is no such  $d$  or  $i = n$ , go to Step 6; if there is no such  $d$  but  $i < n$ , go to Step 5.

**Step 5.** Let  $j := j + 1$  and  $s := 1$ . Create index set  $I_j$ , and find a  $d$  with  $\text{ind}(d)$  being not 1, put  $d$  into  $I_j$  and index it to be the  $s$ -th element in  $I_j$ . Set  $\text{ind}(d)$  to be 1, go back to Step 4.

**Step 6.** Using sorting orders in Step 2 and partition  $\{I_1, \dots, I_k\}$  found by Steps 3–5, we can find the partition for the matrix  $M$  easily.

Now, we propose a specific algorithm for finding the spectral radius of a general nonnegative tensor.

**Algorithm 6.3** (Spectral radius of a nonnegative tensor). **Step 0.** Let  $v$  be an  $n$  vector with its elements being zeros, and  $i = 1$ .

**Step 1.** Given a nonnegative tensor  $T$  of order  $m$  and dimension  $n$ , compute its representation matrix  $G(T)$  as Definition 2.2.

**Step 2.** Finding out the partition  $\{I_1, \dots, I_k\}$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  using Algorithm 6.2 with  $M$  being replaced by  $G(T)$ .

**Step 3.** If  $k = 1$ , using Algorithm 4.1 to finding out the spectral radius  $\rho$  of  $T$ , set  $v(i) = \rho$ , and  $i = i + 1$ . Otherwise, go to Step 4.

**Step 4.** For  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , computing the induced tensor  $T_{I_j}$  and its corresponding representation matrix  $G_j$ , set  $T$  as  $T_{I_j}$ ,  $G(T)$  as  $G_j$  and  $n$  as  $|I_j|$ , run subroutine Steps 2–4.

**Step 5.** Out put the spectral radius of  $T$  as  $\max_{i=1}^n v(i)$ .

### 6.2 Numerical experiments

In this subsection, we report some preliminary numerical results for computing the spectral radius of a general nonnegative tensor using Algorithm 6.3 (with Algorithm 4.1). All experiments are done on a PC with CPU of 3.4 GHz and RAM of 2.0 GB, and all codes are written in MATLAB.

To demonstrate that Algorithm 6.3 works for general nonnegative tensors, we randomly generate third order nonnegative tensors with dimension  $n$  which is specialized in Table 1. We generate the testing tensors by randomly generating their every element uniformly in  $[0, 1]$  with a density Den which is specialized in Table 1. We use Algorithm 6.3 to find the spectral radii of the generated tensors for

**Table 1** Numerical results

<i>n</i>	Den	$\rho$	Per	Ite	Blks	Res	TolCpu
3	0.10	0.148	0.00	6.88	2.88	2.0516e-8	0.30
3	0.20	0.409	14.00	17.88	2.52	1.3521e-7	0.38
3	0.30	0.671	36.00	25.32	2.06	6.2038e-8	0.44
3	0.40	0.787	44.00	27.60	1.90	1.4773e-6	0.41
3	0.50	1.113	66.00	31.06	1.38	8.1021e-8	0.42
3	0.60	1.032	72.00	33.76	1.44	9.8837e-8	0.44
3	0.70	1.196	78.00	31.40	1.34	8.6830e-8	0.47
3	0.80	1.244	80.00	37.82	1.28	7.3281e-7	0.50
3	0.90	1.528	86.00	33.26	1.22	2.1994e-6	0.44
4	0.10	0.368	14.00	19.56	3.26	3.5644e-8	0.47
4	0.20	0.554	24.00	27.04	2.74	7.1762e-8	0.48
4	0.40	1.060	62.00	42.28	1.64	1.6366e-6	0.50
4	0.80	1.945	90.00	35.76	1.10	6.5548e-8	0.47
10	0.05	0.466	14.00	51.60	5.72	1.8168e-6	0.94
10	0.10	1.214	56.00	49.44	2.34	5.5063e-7	1.05
10	0.15	2.363	78.00	40.96	1.26	1.5255e-8	0.98
10	0.20	3.124	88.00	31.44	1.20	1.2771e-8	0.95
20	0.05	2.537	56.00	39.54	2.08	4.8818e-9	3.58
20	0.10	5.606	86.00	31.34	1.14	4.7892e-9	3.28
30	0.05	6.103	80.00	31.84	1.28	2.9270e-9	9.42
30	0.10	12.173	84.00	27.06	1.16	2.6974e-9	8.02
40	0.05	10.698	82.00	28.18	1.26	1.8279e-9	18.02
50	0.05	16.740	94.00	27.20	1.06	1.3807e-9	36.80

every case, i.e., with different dimensions  $n$  and element density Den. The algorithm is terminated if  $|\alpha(x^{(k)}) - \beta(x^{(k)})| \leq 10^{-6}$ . For every case, we simulate 50 times to get the average spectral radius  $\rho := \frac{\alpha(x^{(k)}) + \beta(x^{(k)})}{2}$ , the average number of iterations Ite performed by Algorithm 4.1, the average weakly irreducible blocks of the generated tensors Blks (which is the number of the sets in the partition), and the average residual of  $Tx^2 - \rho x^{[2]}$  with the found spectral radius  $\rho$  and its corresponding eigenvector  $x$  in 2-norm Res. We also use Per to denote the percentage of weakly irreducible tensors generated among the 50 simulations, and TolCpu to denote the total cputime spent for the simulation in every case. All results are listed in Table 1.

In addition, we also test the following example and the related numerical results are listed in Table 2, where Blk denotes the block number of the computation, Ite denotes the iteration number, and the other items are clear from Algorithm 6.3. The initial points for both tests in Tables 1 and 2 are randomly generated with their every element uniformly in  $(0, 1)$ . All the simulated tensors are strictly nonnegative by the above simulation strategy, since every component of  $R(T)$  is the summation of so many terms, it is never zero in our simulation.

**Example 6.1.** Let third order three-dimensional tensor  $T$  be defined by  $T_{111} = T_{222} = 1$ ,  $T_{122} = 3$ ,  $T_{211} = 5$ ,  $T_{333} = 4$  and  $T_{ijk} = 0$  for other  $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Then, the eigenvalue problem (1.1) reduces to

$$\begin{cases} x_1^2 + 3x_2^2 = \lambda x_1^2, \\ 5x_1^2 + x_2^2 = \lambda x_2^2, \\ 4x_3^2 = \lambda x_3^2. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that the tensor  $T$  is not weakly irreducible and the nonnegative eigenpairs of  $T$  are

$$(4, (0, 0, 1)^T) \quad \text{and} \quad (4.8730, (0.4365, 0.5635, 0)^T).$$

**Table 2** Numerical results for Example 6.1

Blk	Ite	$\alpha(x^{(k)})$	$\beta(x^{(k)})$	$\alpha(x^{(k)}) - \beta(x^{(k)})$	$\ T(x^{(k)})^2 - \frac{\alpha(x^{(k)}) + \beta(x^{(k)})}{2}(x^{(k)})^{[2]}\ $
1	1	6.000	4.000	2.000e+0	1.414e+0
1	2	5.200	4.571	6.286e-1	1.134e-1
1	3	4.974	4.774	2.002e-1	3.573e-2
1	4	4.905	4.841	6.383e-2	1.143e-2
1	5	4.883	4.863	2.035e-2	3.641e-3
1	6	4.876	4.870	6.491e-3	1.162e-3
1	7	4.874	4.872	2.070e-3	3.704e-4
1	8	4.873	4.873	6.602e-4	1.181e-4
1	9	4.873	4.873	2.106e-4	3.767e-5
1	10	4.873	4.873	6.715e-5	1.201e-5
1	11	4.873	4.873	2.141e-5	3.832e-6
1	12	4.873	4.873	6.830e-6	1.222e-6
1	13	4.873	4.873	2.178e-6	3.897e-7
1	14	4.873	4.873	6.946e-7	1.243e-7
2	1	4.000	4.000	0.000e+0	0.000e+0

Hence, the spectral radius of  $T$  is 4.8730 which agrees the numerical results in Table 2. The algorithm finds the partition as  $\{I_1 = \{1, 2\}, I_2 = \{3\}\}$ , which is the expected one.

From Tables 1 and 2, we have some preliminary observations:

- Algorithm 6.3 can find the spectral radius of a general nonnegative tensor efficiently.
- As expected, the more dense of nonzero elements of the underlying tensor, the higher the probability of it being weakly irreducible. We note that function *sprand* which is used in our test in matlab does not return a full-dense matrix even with the density parameter being 1, so the percentage Per for  $n = 3$  is not close enough to 100 even when Den = 0.9.
- From Definition 2.2, we note that elements of  $G(T)$  are the summation of so many elements of  $T$ . So, it is possible that  $G(T)$  is an irreducible matrix even when  $T$  is a very sparse tensor. This can be noticed from the last several rows in Table 1.

## 7 Conclusions and remarks

In this paper, we proposed a new class of nonnegative tensors — strictly nonnegative tensors, and proved that the spectral radii for strictly nonnegative tensors are always positive. We discussed the relationships among the seven well-conditional classes of nonnegative tensors, and showed that the class of strictly nonnegative tensors strictly contains the other six classes of nonnegative tensors. We showed that a modification of the power method in [8] for finding the spectral radius of a nonnegative tensor is globally R-linearly convergent for weakly irreducible nonnegative tensors. We also showed that the spectral radius of a general nonnegative tensor is equal to the spectral radii of some weakly irreducible sub-tensors of it. Based on these two results, we proposed an algorithm for finding the spectral radius of a general nonnegative tensor. The preliminary numerical results addressed the efficiency of the method.

**Acknowledgements** This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11171252) and the Hong Kong Research Grant Council (Grant Nos. PolyU 501909, 502510, 502111 and 501212). We are grateful to Professor Qin Ni for inspiring Theorem 2.1, and the anonymous referees for valuable suggestions.

## References

- Berman A, Plemmons R. Nonnegative Matrices in the Mathematical Sciences. New York: Academic Press, 1979

- 2 Chang K C. A nonlinear Krein Rutman theorem. *J Syst Sci Complex*, 2009, 22: 542–554
- 3 Chang K C, Pearson K, Zhang T. Perron-Frobenius theorem for nonnegative tensors. *Commun Math Sci*, 2008, 6: 507–520
- 4 Chang K C, Pearson K, Zhang T. Primitivity, the convergence of the NZQ method, and the largest eigenvalue for nonnegative tensors. *SIAM J Matrix Anal Appl*, 2011, 32: 806–819
- 5 Chang K C, Pearson K, Zhang T. Some variational principles of the  $Z$ -eigenvalues for nonnegative tensors. *Linear Algebra Appl*, 2013, 438: 4166–4182
- 6 Chang K C, Qi L, Zhang T. A survey on the spectral theory of nonnegative tensors. *Numer Linear Algebra Appl*, doi: 10.1002/nla.1902, 2013
- 7 Chang K C, Zhang T. On the uniqueness and non-uniqueness of the positive  $Z$ -eigenvector for transition probability tensors. *J Math Anal Appl*, 2013, 408: 525–540
- 8 Friedland S, Gaubert S, Han L. Perron-Frobenius theorem for nonnegative multilinear forms and extensions. *Linear Algebra Appl*, 2013, 438: 738–749
- 9 Gaubert S, Gunawardena J. The Perron-Frobenius theorem for homogeneous, monotone functions. *Trans Amer Math Soc*, 2004, 356: 4931–4950
- 10 Hu S L, Qi L. Convergence of a second order Markov chain. ArXiv:1307.6919, 2013
- 11 Hu S L, Qi L, Zhang G. The geometric measure of entanglement of pure states with nonnegative amplitudes and the spectral theory of nonnegative tensors. ArXiv:1203.3675, 2012
- 12 Lim L H. Singular values and eigenvalues of tensors: A variational approach. In: Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing, vol. 1. Puerto Vallarta: IEEE, 2005, 129–132
- 13 Liu Y, Zhou G L, Ibrahim N F. An always convergent algorithm for the largest eigenvalue of an irreducible nonnegative tensor. *J Comput Appl Math*, 2010, 235: 286–292
- 14 Ng M, Qi L, Zhou G L. Finding the largest eigenvalue of a non-negative tensor. *SIAM J Matrix Anal Appl*, 2009, 31: 1090–1099
- 15 Nussbaum R D. Hilbert's Projective Metric and Iterated Nonlinear Maps. Boston, MA: Amer Math Soc, 1988
- 16 Pearson K J. Essentially positive tensors. *Internat J Algebra*, 2010, 4: 421–427
- 17 Qi L. Eigenvalues of a real supersymmetric tensor. *J Symbolic Comput*, 2005, 40: 1302–1324
- 18 Yang Q, Yang Y. Further results for Perron-Frobenius theorem for nonnegative tensors II. *SIAM J Matrix Anal Appl*, 2011, 32: 1236–1250
- 19 Yang Y, Yang Q. Further results for Perron-Frobenius theorem for nonnegative tensors. *SIAM J Matrix Anal Appl*, 2010, 31: 2517–2530
- 20 Yang Y, Yang Q. Singular values of nonnegative rectangular tensors. *Front Math China*, 2011, 6: 363–378
- 21 Yang Y, Yang Q. Geometric simplicity of spectral radius of nonnegative irreducible tensors. *Front Math China*, 2013, 8: 129–140
- 22 Yang Y, Yang Q, Li Y. An algorithm to find the spectral radius of nonnegative tensors and its convergence analysis. ArXiv:1102.2668, 2011
- 23 Zhang L, Qi L. Linear convergence of an algorithm for computing the largest eigenvalue of a nonnegative tensor. *Numer Linear Algebra Appl*, 2012, 19: 830–841
- 24 Zhang L, Qi L, Luo L, et al. The dominant eigenvalue of an essentially nonnegative tensor. *Numer Linear Algebra Appl*, in press, 2013
- 25 Zhang L, Qi L, Xu Y. Linear convergence of the LZI algorithm for weakly positive tensors. *J Comput Math*, 2012, 30: 24–33
- 26 Zhang L, Qi L, Zhou G.  $M$ -tensors and the positive definiteness of a multivariate form. ArXiv:1202.6431, 2012
- 27 Zhou G L, Caccetta L, Qi L. Convergence of an algorithm for the largest singular value of a nonnegative rectangular tensor. *Linear Algebra Appl*, 2013, 438: 959–968

In: Bass H, Kuku A O, Pedrini C, eds. Algebraic K-Theory and Its Application. Singapore: World Scientific, 1999, 600—607

● Conference proceedings

Dmtriev V. Complete tables of the second rank constitutive tensors for linear homogeneous bianisotropic media described by point magnetic groups of symmetry and some general properties of the media. In: Proceedings of IEEE MTT-S IMOC'99. Berlin: Springer, 2000, 435—439

● Dissertation

Liu G X. Classification of finite dimensional basic Hopf algebras and related topics. Dissertation for the Doctoral Degree. Hangzhou: Hangzhou University, 2005, 24—28

● Electronic version of a journal

Christine M. Plant physiology: plant biology in the Genome Era. Science, 2003, 281: 331—332 [2003-09-23] <http://www.sciencemag.org/anatmorp.htm>

## Subscription information

**ISSN print edition:** 1674-7283

**ISSN electronic edition:** 1869-1862

**Subscription rates:**

For information on subscription rates please contact:

Customer Service

**China:** [sales@scichina.org](mailto:sales@scichina.org)

**North and South America:**

[journals-ny@springer.com](mailto:journals-ny@springer.com)

**Outside North and South America:**

[subscriptions@springer.com](mailto:subscriptions@springer.com)

**Orders and inquiries:**

**China:**

Science China Press

16 Donghuangchenggen North Street

Beijing 100717, China

Tel: 86-10-64036232

Fax: 86-10-64016350

**North and South America:**

Springer New York, Inc.

Journal Fulfillment, P.O. Box 2485

Secaucus, NJ 07096, USA

Tel: 1-800-SPRINGER or 1-201-348-4033

Fax: 1-201-348-4505

Email: [journals-ny@springer.com](mailto:journals-ny@springer.com)

**Outside North and South America:**

Springer Distribution Center

Customer Service Journals

Haberstr. 7, 69126 Heidelberg, Germany

Tel: 49-6221-345-0, Fax: 49-6221-345-4229

Email: [subscriptions@springer.com](mailto:subscriptions@springer.com)

**Cancellations** must be received by September 30 to take effect at the end of the same year.

**Changes of address:** Allow for six weeks for all changes to become effective. All communications should include both old and new addresses (with postal codes) and should be accompanied by a mailing label from a recent issue. According to § 4 Sect. 3 of the German Postal Services Data Protection Regulations, if a subscriber's address changes, the German Federal Post Office can inform the publisher of the new address even if the subscriber has not submitted a formal application for mail to be forwarded. Subscribers not in agreement with this procedure may send a written complaint to Customer Service Journals, Karin Tiks, within 14 days of publication of this issue.

**Microform editions** are available from: ProQuest. Further information available at <http://www.il.proquest.com/uni>

**Electronic edition:**

An electronic version is available at [link.springer.com](http://link.springer.com).

**Production:**

Science China Press

16 Donghuangchenggen North Street

Beijing 100717, China

Tel: 86-10-64036232

Fax: 86-10-64016350

Printed in the People's Republic of China

**Jointly Published by**

Science China Press and Springer

## CONTENTS

Vol. 57 No. 1 January 2014

## Progress of Projects Supported by NSFC

- The pointwise convergence of  $p$ -adic Möbius maps ..... 1  
 WANG YueFei & YANG JingHua

## Articles

An Ohsawa-Takegoshi theorem on compact Kähler manifolds ..... YI Li	9
On variance of exponents for isolated surface singularities with modality $\leq 2$ ..... YAU Stephen S. T. & ZUO HuaiQing	31
The densities for 3-ranks of tame kernels of cyclic cubic number fields ..... CHENG XiaoYun, GUO XueJun & QIN HouRong	43
On the sum of two integral squares in the imaginary quadratic field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-2p})$ ..... WEI DaSheng	49
The morphism induced by Frobenius push-forward ..... LI LingGuang	61
Homological properties of Podleś quantum spheres ..... LIU LiYu, SHEN YunYi & WU QuanShui	69
Symmetric period solutions with prescribed minimal period for even autonomous semipositive Hamiltonian systems ..... ZHANG DuanZhi	81
Subsonic Euler flows in a divergent nozzle ..... WENG ShangKun	97
Regularity for solutions to anisotropic obstacle problems ..... GAO HongYa	111
Equivalent boundedness of Marcinkiewicz integrals on non-homogeneous metric measure spaces ..... LIN HaiBo & YANG DaChun	123
Rational time-frequency multi-window subspace Gabor frames and their Gabor duals ..... ZHANG Yan & LI YunZhang	145
Uniqueness of Fokker-Planck equations for spin lattice systems (II): Non-compact case ..... LEMLE Ludovic Dan, WANG Ran & WU LiMing	161
Weak convergence of the sequential empirical processes of residuals in TAR models ..... LI Dong	173
Strictly nonnegative tensors and nonnegative tensor partition ..... HU ShengLong, HUANG ZhengHai & QI LiQuN	181
Acyclic 6-choosability of planar graphs without adjacent short cycles ..... WANG WeiFan, ZHANG Ge & CHEN Min	197
Total coloring of graphs embedded in surfaces of nonnegative Euler characteristic ..... WANG HuiJuan, LIU Bin, WU JianLiang & WANG Bing	211