

Generalized Eigenvalue Complementarity Problem for Tensors

Zhongming Chen ^{*}, Qingzhi Yang [†], Lu Ye [‡]

May 12, 2015

Abstract

In this paper, the generalized eigenvalue complementarity problem for tensors (GEiCP-T) is addressed, which arises from the stability analysis of finite dimensional mechanical systems and find applications in differential dynamical systems. The general properties of the (GEiCP-T) have been studied. We establish its relationship with the generalized tensor eigenvalue problem. It follows that if exist, the number of λ -solutions can be bounded. We also give some sufficient conditions for the existence of the solution. In particular, there exists a unique solution of the (EiCP-T) (i.e., $J = [n]$) for irreducible nonnegative tensors. For the symmetric case, we derive a sufficient and necessary condition for the solvability of the (GEiCP-T) by reformulating it as a nonlinear program. It has also been proved that deciding the solvability of the (EiCP-T) is NP-hard in general. Moreover, a shifted projected power method is proposed to solve the symmetric (GEiCP-T). The monotonic convergence is also established. The numerical experiments demonstrate convergence behavior of our method and show that the algorithm presented is promising.

Key words: Generalized eigenvalue complementarity, generalized tensor eigenpair, solution existence, nonlinear program, NP-hard, shifted projected power method

AMS subject classifications (2010): 15A18; 15A69; 90C33

^{*}School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China. Email: czm183015@mail.nankai.edu.cn. This author's work was partially done when he was visiting The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

[†]Corresponding author. School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China. Email: qz-yang@nankai.edu.cn. This author's work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11271206), Doctoral fund of Chinese Ministry of Education (Grant No. 20120031110024).

[‡]School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China. Email: zjwzajyl@mail.nankai.edu.cn.

1 Introduction

Denote $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. A real m th order n -dimensional tensor $\mathcal{A} = (a_{i_1 \dots i_m})$ is a multidimensional array with each entry $a_{i_1 \dots i_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $i_1, \dots, i_m \in [n]$. Denote the set of all real m th order n -dimensional tensors by $T_{m,n}$. For any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1}$ be a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ whose i th component is defined by

$$(\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1})_i = \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_m=1}^n a_{ii_2 \dots i_m} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_m}.$$

And let $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m$ be the scale denoted by $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1}$. We say a tensor $\mathcal{A}$ is *symmetric* if its entries are invariant under permutation. Denote the set of all real symmetric m th order n -dimensional tensors by $S_{m,n}$. Clearly, $S_{m,n}$ is a linear subspace of $T_{m,n}$. A tensor $\mathcal{A} \in S_{m,n}$ is called *positive definite* if $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m > 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \neq 0$.

In 2005, the definition of eigenvalue for tensors was introduced by Qi [16] and Lim [11], independently. Later, these definitions were unified by Chang, Person and Zhang [3] as follows. Let $\mathcal{A} \in T_{m,n}$. Assume that m is even and $\mathcal{B} \in S_{m,n}$ is positive definite. We say $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ is a *generalized eigenpair* of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ if

$$\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} = \lambda \mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^{m-1}. \quad (1)$$

The advantage of this definition is that the definitions of H -eigenvalue [16], Z -eigenvalue [16] and D -eigenvalue [18] can be unified by replacing $\mathcal{B}$ with some special forms, respectively [3]. After that, the study of tensors and the spectra of tensors with their various applications has attracted extensive attention and interest.

However, in many practical problems, the eigenpair $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ in equations (1) should be solved to satisfy actual requirement, or can always be constrained according to prior information. For example, in the stability analysis of finite dimensional mechanical systems with frictional contact [15], a necessary and sufficient condition for the occurrence of divergence instability along a constant admissible direction, is to find $\lambda \geq 0$ and a nonzero vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{w} = (\lambda M^* + K^*)\mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{w}_f = 0 \\ 0 \leq \mathbf{x}_c \perp \mathbf{w}_c \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad \mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_f \\ \mathbf{x}_c \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{w} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_f \\ \mathbf{w}_c \end{bmatrix},$$

where the matrices $M^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $K^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are linear pencils of matrices in the coefficient of friction at the particles in impending slip. For the matrix case, this problem was well-studied and found application in different areas of science and engineering, for instance, see [14, 19].

More general, we consider a homogeneous differential dynamical system constrained by linear complementarity conditions. To be more specific, given a homogeneous mapping $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, we consider an equilibrium system of the form:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u}(t) \geq 0 \\ \mathbf{u}'(t) - F(\mathbf{u}(t)) \geq 0 \\ \langle \mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{u}'(t) - F(\mathbf{u}(t)) \rangle = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

When the mapping F is linear, i.e., $F(\mathbf{x}) = A\mathbf{x}$ with a given matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the solution of (2) is called the *linear complementarity process* in [20]. Here, we consider a mapping defined by a nonnegative tensor $\mathcal{A} \in T_{m,n}$, i.e.,

$$F_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1})^{[\frac{1}{m-1}]}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n,$$

where the i th component of the vector $\mathbf{y}^{[r]}$ is given by y_i^r . Clearly, the definition of $F_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x})$ is well-defined since $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbf{x}$ are nonnegative. And the mapping $F_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is positively homogeneous, i.e., $F_{\mathcal{A}}(t\mathbf{x}) = tF_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x})$ for any $t > 0$. Like the linear case, if we require a solution which has the form $\mathbf{u}(t) = e^{\lambda t}\mathbf{x}$ and $\lambda > 0$, then the equilibrium system (2) can be expressed as

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x} \geq 0 \\ \lambda\mathbf{x} - F_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \\ \langle \mathbf{x}, \lambda\mathbf{x} - F_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

This transformation makes use of the positive homogeneity of $F_{\mathcal{A}}$. Note that the second inequality in (3) is equivalent to $\lambda^{m-1}\mathbf{x}^{[m-1]} - \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} \geq 0$ since $\lambda > 0$ and $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$. It follows that the complementarity condition can also be equivalently written as

$$\langle \mathbf{x}, \lambda^{m-1}\mathbf{x}^{[m-1]} - \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} \rangle = 0.$$

Denote the identity tensor by $\mathcal{I} = (\delta_{i_1 \dots i_m}) \in S_{m,n}$, where $\delta_{i_1 \dots i_m}$ is the generalized Kronecker symbol defined as

$$\delta_{i_1 \dots i_m} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i_1 = \dots = i_m, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, the equilibrium system (3) is to find $\lambda > 0$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x} \geq 0 \\ (\lambda^{m-1}\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{A})\mathbf{x}^{m-1} \geq 0 \\ \langle \mathbf{x}, (\lambda^{m-1}\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{A})\mathbf{x}^{m-1} \rangle = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

This is exactly an eigenvalue complementarity problem for tensors.

In this paper, we consider the Generalized Eigenvalue Complementarity Problem for Tensors (GEiCP-T) $_J$ which has the form

$$(\text{GEiCP-T})_J : \text{Find } \lambda > 0, \mathbf{x} \neq 0 \text{ such that } \begin{cases} \mathbf{w} = (\lambda \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A})\mathbf{x}^{m-1} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{J}} = 0 \\ \mathbf{w}_J \geq 0 \\ \mathbf{x}_J \geq 0 \\ \mathbf{w}_J^\top \mathbf{x}_J = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{A} \in T_{m,n}$ and $\mathcal{B} \in S_{m,n}$ is positive definite. Here, $J \subseteq [n]$ is given and $\bar{J} = [n] \setminus J$. The Eigenvalue Complementarity Problem for tensors (EiCP-T) is a special case of the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ with $J = [n]$. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the general properties of the (GEiCP-T) are studied. We establish its relationship with the generalized tensor eigenvalue problem. We also give some sufficient conditions for the existence of the solution. The symmetric (GEiCP-T) is discussed in Section 3. By reformulating the symmetric (GEiCP-T) as a nonlinear program, we derive a sufficient and necessary condition for the solvability of the symmetric (GEiCP-T). In Section 4, we proposed a shifted projected power method to solve the symmetric (GEiCP-T). The monotonic convergence is also established. Some numerical experiments are reported in Section 5.

Throughout this paper, we assume that m is even and $\mathcal{B} \in S_{m,n}$ is positive definite. We use small letters $x, y, \dots$, for scalars, small bold letters $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \dots$, for vectors, capital letters $A, B, \dots$, for matrices, calligraphic letters $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \dots$, for tensors. All the tensors discussed in this paper are real.

2 The Generalized Eigenvalue Complementarity Problem for Tensors

In this section, we concentrate on the properties of the Generalized Eigenvalue Complementarity Problem for Tensors (GEiCP-T), including the existence of solution. As stated in the Introduction, the (EiCP-T) may be expressed as

$$(\text{EiCP-T}): \text{Find } \lambda > 0, \mathbf{x} \neq 0 \text{ such that } \begin{cases} \mathbf{w} = (\lambda \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A})\mathbf{x}^{m-1} \\ \mathbf{w} \geq 0 \\ \mathbf{x} \geq 0 \\ \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{A} \in T_{m,n}$ and $\mathcal{B} \in S_{m,n}$ is positive definite. Note that any solution with $\mathbf{w} = 0$ is a generalized tensor eigenpair of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.

Recall that given a set $J \subseteq [n]$, the principal sub-tensor of a tensor $\mathcal{A} = (a_{i_1 \dots i_m}) \in T_{m,n}$, denoted by $\mathcal{A}_J$, is tensor in $T_{m,|J|}$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}_J = (a_{i_1 \dots i_m}) \quad \text{for all } i_1, \dots, i_m \in J.$$

The Generalized Eigenvalue Complementarity Problem for tensors (GEiCP-T) $_J$ is

$$(\text{GEiCP-T})_J : \text{Find } \lambda > 0, \mathbf{x} \neq 0 \text{ such that } \begin{cases} \mathbf{w} = (\lambda \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A})\mathbf{x}^{m-1} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{J}} = 0 \\ \mathbf{w}_J \geq 0 \\ \mathbf{x}_J \geq 0 \\ \mathbf{w}_J^\top \mathbf{x}_J = 0, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $J \subseteq [n]$ is given and $\bar{J} = [n] \setminus J$. It is easy to see that if $J = \emptyset$, any solution λ is a positive eigenvalue of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ with a corresponding eigenvector $\mathbf{x}$. And the (EiCP-T) can be a special case of (GEiCP-T) $_J$ with $J = [n]$.

For any solution $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$, the value λ is called a *(general) complementary eigenvalue* of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ and the vector $\mathbf{x}$ is called a corresponding *(general) complementary eigenvector*. Clearly, for any $\alpha > 0$, $\alpha \mathbf{x}$ is also a complementary eigenvector of the complementary eigenvalue λ . Without loss of generality, we may restrict $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$ to replace the constraint $\mathbf{x} \neq 0$. In the case of (EiCP-T), we use the linear constraint $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 = \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{x} = 1$ since $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$. Here, $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes all-ones vector.

The relationship between the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ and the generalized eigenvalue problem is stated as follows.

Proposition 1 *Suppose that $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of (GEiCP-T) $_J$ with a given set $J \subseteq [n]$. Then, there exists a set I satisfying $\bar{J} \subseteq I \subseteq [n]$, such that λ is a positive generalized eigenvalue of $(\mathcal{A}_I, \mathcal{B}_I)$ and $\mathbf{x}_I$ is a corresponding eigenvector with $\mathbf{x}_{J \cap I} \geq 0$.*

Proof. Let $I = \{i \in [n] : w_i = 0\}$. Obviously, $\bar{J} \subseteq I \subseteq [n]$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\bar{I}} > 0$. By complementarity, we have $\mathbf{x}_{\bar{I}} = 0$. It follows that $\mathbf{x}_I \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_{J \cap I} \geq 0$. On the other hand, by definition, for any $i \in [n]$,

$$w_i = \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_m \in [n]} (\lambda \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A})_{ii_2 \dots i_m} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_m} = \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_m \in I} (\lambda \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A})_{ii_2 \dots i_m} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_m}.$$

Hence, $0 = \mathbf{w}_I = (\lambda \mathcal{B}_I - \mathcal{A}_I)\mathbf{x}_I^{m-1}$, i.e., $\mathcal{A}_I \mathbf{x}_I^{m-1} = \lambda \mathcal{B}_I \mathbf{x}_I^{m-1}$. $\square$

It follows that if exist, the number of λ -solutions of the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ can be bounded. Before that, two important equalities are presented.

Lemma 1 *Given a positive integer n , the following equalities hold:*

$$(a) \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} t^k = (1+t)^n, \quad \forall t \neq 0;$$

$$(b) \sum_{k=0}^n k \binom{n}{k} t^k = nt(1+t)^{n-1}, \quad \forall t \neq 0.$$

Proof. The first conclusion can be easily derived by the binomial theorem. For the second part, we first claim that

$$k \binom{n}{k} - (k-1) \binom{n}{k-1} = n \left[\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-1}{k-2} \right], \quad \forall 2 \leq k \leq n.$$

Note that $k \binom{n}{k} = n \binom{n-1}{k-1}$ for all $k \in [n]$.

For any $a \neq 0$, let $S = \sum_{k=0}^n k \binom{n}{k} a^k$. If $a = 1$, then

$$2S = \sum_{k=0}^n k \binom{n}{k} + \sum_{k=0}^n (n-k) \binom{n}{k} = n \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} = n2^n.$$

Here we use the fact $\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n}{n-k}$ for all $k \in [n]$. So we have $S = n2^{n-1}$. Suppose $a \neq 1$. Then, $aS = \sum_{k=0}^n k \binom{n}{k} a^{k+1} = \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} (k-1) \binom{n}{k-1} a^k$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (1-a)S &= na + \sum_{k=2}^n \left[k \binom{n}{k} - (k-1) \binom{n}{k-1} \right] a^k - na^{n+1} \\ &= na + \sum_{k=2}^n \left[\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-1}{k-2} \right] na^k - na^{n+1} \\ &= na \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} a^k - na^2 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} a^k \\ &= na(1-a)(1+a)^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $S = na(1+a)^{n-1}$ if $a \neq 1$. Combining the results above, the second conclusion follows immediately. $\square$

Theorem 1 *The (EiCP-T) has at most nm^{n-1} distinct λ -solutions. Moreover, given a set $J \subseteq [n]$, the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ has at most $(mn - |J|)m^{|J|-1}(m-1)^{n-1-|J|}$ distinct λ -solutions.*

Proof. Given a set J , there are $2^{|J|}$ possible subsets I such that $\bar{J} \subseteq I \subseteq [n]$. For each possible I , it has been shown that there are at most $|I|(m-1)^{|I|-1}$ generalized eigenvalues of $(\mathcal{A}_I, \mathcal{B}_I)$ [3]. By Proposition 1, the total number of λ -solutions is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^{|J|} \binom{|J|}{k} (|\bar{J}| + k)(m-1)^{|\bar{J}|+k-1} \\ &= |\bar{J}|(m-1)^{|\bar{J}|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|J|} \binom{|J|}{k} (m-1)^k + (m-1)^{|\bar{J}|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|J|} k \binom{|J|}{k} (m-1)^k \\ &= |\bar{J}|(m-1)^{|\bar{J}|-1} m^{|J|} + (m-1)^{|\bar{J}|-1} |J|(m-1)^{|J|-1} \\ &= (m|\bar{J}| + m|J| - |J|)m^{|J|-1}(m-1)^{|\bar{J}|-1} \\ &= (mn - |J|)m^{|J|-1}(m-1)^{n-1-|J|}. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality holds by substituting $t = m - 1$ in Lemma 1.

Since the (EiCP) is a special case of (GEiCP-T) $_J$ by taking $J = [n]$, it follows that the (EiCP-T) has at most nm^{n-1} distinct λ -solutions. $\square$

In the following, we give some sufficient conditions to check the existence of solution for (GEiCP-T) $_J$ with a given set $J \subseteq [n]$.

Proposition 2 *Suppose $J \subseteq [n]$. If $\mathcal{A} \in T_{m,n}$ is negative semi-definite (i.e., $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m \leq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$), then the corresponding (GEiCP-T) $_J$ is unsolvable.*

Proof. Suppose that $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of (GEiCP-T) $_J$. By Proposition 1, there exists a set I satisfying $\bar{J} \subseteq I \subseteq [n]$ such that $\mathcal{A}_I \mathbf{x}_I^{m-1} = \lambda \mathcal{B}_I \mathbf{x}_I^{m-1}$. Taking the dot product with $\mathbf{x}_I$, it is clear that any solution satisfies

$$\lambda = \frac{\mathcal{A}_I \mathbf{x}_I^m}{\mathcal{B}_I \mathbf{x}_I^m}.$$

On the other hand, let $\mathbf{y}$ be the vector whose entries are the same with $\mathbf{x}_I$ in the index set I and 0 otherwise. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is negative semi-definite, we have $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{y}^m = \mathcal{A}_I \mathbf{x}_I^m \leq 0$. Similarly, we have $\mathcal{B}\mathbf{y}^m = \mathcal{B}_I \mathbf{x}_I^m > 0$. Thus, $\lambda \leq 0$ which contradicts the constraint $\lambda > 0$. $\square$

Now we consider the case $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{I}$. For any $i \in [n]$, we denote by $\mathbf{e}_i$ the i th unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then we have the following proposition which can be easily derived.

Proposition 3 *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} = (a_{i_1 \dots i_m}) \in T_{m,n}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{I}$. If there is an index $j \in [n]$ such that $a_{jj \dots j} > 0$ and $a_{ij \dots j} \leq 0$ for all $i \neq j$, then $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of (EiCP-T) with $\lambda = a_{jj \dots j}$ and $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{e}_j$.*

In particular, this property holds for the well-known class of nonsingular M -tensors [5] (also called strong M -tensors in [23]).

Recall that a tensor $\mathcal{A} = (a_{i_1 \dots i_m}) \in T_{m,n}$ is called *reducible* if there exists a nonempty proper index subset $I \subseteq [n]$ such that

$$a_{ii_2 \dots i_m} = 0, \quad \forall i \in I, \quad i_2, \dots, i_m \in \bar{I}.$$

If $\mathcal{A}$ is not reducible, we call $\mathcal{A}$ *irreducible*. The Perron-Frobenius theorem is a well-known result that describes the spectral radius of a nonnegative matrix. Recently, Perron-Frobenius theorem has been extended to nonnegative tensors, see [2, 22, 21]. It can be stated as follows.

Lemma 2 *Suppose $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{I}$. If $\mathcal{A} \in T_{m,n}$ is irreducible nonnegative, then there exists a pair $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ satisfying (1) such that:*

- (a) $\lambda^* > 0$ is an eigenvalue.
- (b) $\mathbf{x}^* > 0$, i.e., all components of $\mathbf{x}^*$ are positive.

(c) If λ is an eigenvalue with nonnegative eigenvector, then $\lambda = \lambda^*$. Moreover, the nonnegative eigenvector is unique up to a multiplicative constant.

(d) If λ is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{A}$, then $|\lambda| \leq \lambda^*$.

Based on this lemma, we can derive the existence and uniqueness of the solution of (EiCP-T) for irreducible nonnegative tensors.

Theorem 2 Suppose $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{I}$. If $\mathcal{A} = (a_{i_1 \dots i_m}) \in T_{m,n}$ is irreducible nonnegative, then the (EiCP-T) has a solution $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ with $\lambda^* > 0$ and $\mathbf{x}^* > 0$. Moreover, the solution λ^* is unique and $\mathbf{x}^*$ is unique up to a multiplicative constant.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is irreducible nonnegative, by Lemma 2, there exists $\lambda^* > 0$ and $\mathbf{x}^* > 0$ satisfying (1), i.e., $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x}^*)^{m-1} = \lambda^* \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{x}^*)^{m-1}$. It follows that $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ is a solution of (EiCP-T). Now we prove the uniqueness of the solution of (EiCP-T). Suppose that $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of (EiCP-T). Clearly, $\mathbf{x} \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$. Let I be the index set defined by

$$I = \{i \in [n] : x_i = 0\}.$$

Then $I \subsetneq [n]$ and $x_i > 0$ for all $i \in \bar{I}$. Moreover, we claim that $I = \emptyset$. Otherwise, I is a nonempty proper index subset of $[n]$. By definition, we have that for any $i \in I$,

$$\begin{aligned} w_i &= \lambda x_i^{m-1} - \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_m \in [n]} a_{ii_2 \dots i_m} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_m} \\ &= - \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_m \in \bar{I}} a_{ii_2 \dots i_m} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_m} \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is nonnegative, we have $\sum_{i_2, \dots, i_m \in \bar{I}} a_{ii_2 \dots i_m} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_m} = 0$ for any $i \in I$. Note that $x_i > 0$ for all $i \in \bar{I}$. It follows that

$$a_{ii_2 \dots i_m} = 0, \quad \forall i \in I, \quad i_2, \dots, i_m \in \bar{I}.$$

It means that $\mathcal{A}$ is reducible, which is a contradiction. Hence, $I = \emptyset$, i.e., $\mathbf{x} > 0$. By complementary condition of (EiCP-T), λ is an eigenvalue with a positive eigenvector $\mathbf{x}$. Again, by Lemma 2, the conclusion follows immediately. $\square$

In fact, for any $J \subseteq [n]$, the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ still has a solution $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ with $\lambda^* > 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_J^* > 0$ for irreducible nonnegative tensors. Before that, we give a useful lemma, which describes the relationship of solutions between different generalized eigenvalue complementarity problems.

Lemma 3 Suppose that $J \subseteq [n]$ and $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of the (GEiCP-T) $_J$. Let J_0 and J_1 be the subsets of $[n]$ given by

$$J_0 = \{i \in [n] : \mathbf{w}_i > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad J_1 = \{i \in [n] : \mathbf{x}_i \geq 0\},$$

where $\mathbf{w}$ is defined in (6). Then $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ for any $J_0 \subseteq \hat{J} \subseteq J_1$.

Proof. By definition, $J_0 \subseteq J \subseteq J_1$. And for any $J_0 \subseteq \hat{J} \subseteq J_1$, we have $\mathbf{w}_{\hat{J}} \geq 0$, $\mathbf{x}_{\hat{J}} \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\hat{J}}^\top \mathbf{x}_{\hat{J}} = \mathbf{w}_J^\top \mathbf{x}_J = 0$. It follows that $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of the (GEiCP-T) $_J$. $\square$

Theorem 3 *Suppose $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{I}$. If $\mathcal{A} = (a_{i_1 \dots i_m}) \in T_{m,n}$ is irreducible nonnegative, then for any $J \subseteq [n]$, the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ has a solution $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ with $\lambda^* > 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_J^* > 0$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2, the (EiCP-T) has a unique solution $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ with $\lambda^* > 0$ and $\mathbf{x}^* > 0$. It follows that $\mathbf{w}^* = 0$. By the definition of J_0 and J_1 in Lemma 3, we have $J_0 = \emptyset$ and $J_1 = [n]$. According to Lemma 3, the conclusion follows immediately. $\square$

Note that for irreducible nonnegative tensors, the uniqueness of the solution of the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ does not hold in general.

3 The symmetric Generalized Eigenvalue Complementarity Problem for Tensors

In this section, we assume $\mathcal{A} \in S_{m,n}$ and focus on the symmetric Generalized Eigenvalue Complementarity Problem for Tensors. Its relationship with an optimization problem is established. And we give a sufficient and necessary condition for the solution existence of symmetric (GEiCP-T).

Suppose that $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ with a given $J \subseteq [n]$. Then we have $0 = \mathbf{w}_J^\top \mathbf{x}_J = \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x} = \lambda \mathcal{B} \mathbf{x}^m - \mathcal{A} \mathbf{x}^m$. It follows that

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathcal{A} \mathbf{x}^m}{\mathcal{B} \mathbf{x}^m}, \quad (7)$$

which can be seen as the generalized Rayleigh quotient for tensors.

Theorem 4 *Suppose $J \subseteq [n]$. The symmetric (GEiCP-T) $_J$ is equivalent to the following optimization problem*

$$(P)_J \quad \begin{cases} \max & \lambda(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{s.t.} & \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} = 1 \\ & \mathbf{x}_J \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

in the sense that any equilibrium solution $\mathbf{x}$ of $(P)_J$ with $\lambda(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ is a solution of the symmetric (GEiCP-T) $_J$.

Proof. The Lagrangian associated with the problem $(P)_J$ is defined as

$$L(\mathbf{x}, \mu, \mathbf{v}) = \lambda(\mathbf{x}) + \mu(\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} - 1) + \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{x}_J,$$

where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{|J|}$ are the Lagrange multipliers. Without loss of generality, we may assume that J denotes the first $|J|$ indexes, i.e., $J = [|J|]$. Any equilibrium solution of $(P)_J$ satisfies the KKT conditions

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu \mathbf{x} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = 0, \\ \mathbf{v} \geq 0, \\ \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{x}_J = 0, \\ \mathbf{x}_J \geq 0, \\ \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} = 1, \end{cases}$$

where $\nabla \lambda(\mathbf{x})$ is the gradient of $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$. Since $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in S_{m,n}$, by simple computation, we have

$$\nabla \lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{2}{\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^m} (\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} - \lambda(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^{m-1}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \neq 0.$$

According to the definition of $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{x}^\top \nabla \lambda(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. By taking the dot product with $\mathbf{x}$ in the first equation, we have $\mu = 0$. Notice that in the (GEiCP-T) $_J$, $\mathbf{w} = \lambda(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} - \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1}$. Since $\lambda(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is positive definite, it follows that $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of (GEiCP-T) $_J$. The result follows immediately. $\square$

Here, we use $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 = 1$ to normalize the nonzero vector $\mathbf{x}$. In fact, from the proof above, the conclusion still holds if we normalize the nonzero vector $\mathbf{x}$ by $\|\mathbf{x}\|_k^k = 1$ for any $k \geq 1$. For the (EiCP), i.e., $J = [n]$, it is simple to normalize $\mathbf{x}$ by $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 = 1$. Notice that $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$. The constraint can be written as $\mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{x} = 1$. Then, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1 *The symmetric (EiCP-T) is equivalent to the following optimization problem*

$$(P) \quad \begin{cases} \max & \lambda(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{s.t.} & \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{x} = 1 \\ & \mathbf{x} \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

in the sense that any equilibrium solution $\mathbf{x}$ of (P) with $\lambda(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ is a solution of the symmetric (EiCP-T).

From the reformulation of the symmetric (GEiCP-T) $_J$ as a nonlinear program, several important conclusions are derived. The following result gives a sufficient and necessary condition for the solvability of the symmetric (GEiCP-T) $_J$.

Theorem 5 *Suppose $J \subseteq [n]$. The symmetric (GEiCP-T) $_J$ is solvable if and only if there exists a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathbf{x}_J \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m > 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of the (GEiCP-T) $_J$. Then, $\mathbf{x}_J \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m = \lambda\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^m$. Since $\lambda > 0$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is positive definite, we have $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m > 0$.

On the other hand, suppose that there is a vector $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_J \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{A}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^m > 0$. Clearly, $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \neq 0$ and $\lambda(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|_2}) = \lambda(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) > 0$. Denote

$$\Omega = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{x}_J \geq 0, \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} = 1\}.$$

Since the set Ω is compact and $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ is continuous on Ω , then there exists a vector $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Omega$ satisfying $\lambda(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq \lambda(\mathbf{x})$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$. And it is an equilibrium solution of $(P)_J$. In particular, $\lambda(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq \lambda(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|_2}) = \lambda(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) > 0$. By Theorem 4, we can see that $(\lambda(\mathbf{x}^*), \mathbf{x}^*)$ is a solution of the symmetric (GEiCP-T) $_J$. $\square$

Based on the theorem above, we have the following two corollaries.

Corollary 2 *The symmetric (EiCP-T) is solvable if and only if there exists a vector $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m > 0$.*

Corollary 3 *If the symmetric (EiCP-T) is solvable, then the corresponding symmetric (GEiCP-T) $_J$ is also solvable for any given $J \subseteq [n]$.*

It has been shown [8] that most tensor problems are NP-hard. Here, we also show that in general, deciding the solvability of the (EiCP-T) is NP-hard.

Theorem 6 *The solvability of the (EiCP-T) is an NP-hard decision problem.*

Proof. Let $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a symmetric matrix. Note that m is even. Suppose $m = 2k$. Consider the tensor $\mathcal{T} = (t_{i_1 \dots i_m}) \in T_{m,n}$ defined by

$$t_{i_1 \dots i_m} = \begin{cases} a_{i_1 i_{k+1}} & \text{if } i_1 = \dots = i_k \text{ and } i_{k+1} = \dots = i_m, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In general, $\mathcal{T}$ is not symmetric. Let $\mathcal{A} = (a_{i_1 \dots i_m}) \in S_{m,n}$ be the symmetrization of $\mathcal{T}$, i.e.,

$$a_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_m} = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} t_{i_{\sigma(1)} i_{\sigma(2)} \dots i_{\sigma(m)}},$$

where S_n denotes the permutation group on $[n]$. Clearly, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m = \mathcal{T}\mathbf{x}^m = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_i^k x_j^k.$$

Since $\mathcal{A}$ is symmetric, by Corollary 2, the (EiCP-T) corresponding to $\mathcal{A}$ is solvable if and only if there exists a vector $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m > 0$. Hence, deciding the solvability of the (EiCP-T) is at least as difficult as finding a vector $\mathbf{y} \geq 0$ such that $\mathbf{y}^\top A \mathbf{y} > 0$ ($y_i = x_i^k$). It has been proved that the latter problem is NP-hard (see Theorem 2.18 of [12]). The conclusion follows immediately. $\square$

It follows that solving the (EiCP-T) is NP-hard in general. Despite the fact, the solvability of the (EiCP-T) can be answered easily for some structured tensors.

Proposition 4 Suppose $\mathcal{A} = (a_{i_1 \dots i_m}) \in S_{m,n}$. If $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies one of the conditions

- (a) $\exists i \in [n]$ such that $a_{ii \dots i} > 0$;
- (b) $\mathcal{A} \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{A} \neq 0$;
- (c) $\mathcal{A}$ is a nonsingular M -tensor;
- (d) $\mathcal{A}$ is strictly copositive [17], i.e., $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m > 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus \{0\}$,

then there exists $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{A}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^m > 0$ and the corresponding (EiCP-T) is solvable.

Proof. (a) Let $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{e}_i$; (b) Let $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{e}$; (c) Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a nonsingular M -tensor, by Theorem 2 of [5], there exists $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{A}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{m-1} > 0$. It follows that $\mathcal{A}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^m > 0$. (d) Trivial. $\square$

Recall that a tensor $\mathcal{A} \in T_{m,n}$ is called *weakly symmetric* [3] if

$$\nabla(\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m) = m\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

And it has also been shown [3] that a symmetric tensor is weakly symmetric, but the converse is not true in general. It is worth mentioning that most of the results in this section can be extended to weakly symmetric tensors since only the derivative information is used here.

4 Shifted Projected Power Method

According to Proposition 1, the relationship between the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ and the generalized eigenvalue problem is established. Based on this, the solution set (GEiCP-T) $_J$ can be obtained via complete enumeration.

Algorithm 1 A procedure to compute all the complementary eigenpairs of (GEiCP-T) $_J$

Input: Given a subset $J \subseteq [n]$, $\mathcal{A} \in T_{m,n}$ and a positive definite tensor $\mathcal{B} \in S_{m,n}$.

Output: The solution set S .

Step 1. Find all the subsets I such that $\bar{J} \subseteq I \subseteq [n]$.

Step 2. Compute all the generalized eigenpairs $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}_I)$ of $(\mathcal{A}_I, \mathcal{B}_I)$ for each I , where $\mathbf{x}_I$ is normalized by $\|\mathbf{x}_I\| = 1$. Denote the set by $\sigma(I)$.

Step 3. For any $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}_I) \in \sigma(I)$, let $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_I, 0)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Check

$$\begin{cases} \lambda > 0, \\ \mathbf{x}_{I \cap J} \geq 0, \\ \lambda \mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} - \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

If all the conditions hold, then $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in S$.

We can see that the Step 2 in Algorithm 1 is exactly a generalized eigenvalue problem. Recently, several methods have been proposed to solve this problem (or partially). For example, Ng et al. [13] proposed an iterative method for finding the largest eigenvalue

of nonnegative tensors. Kolda et al. [9] presented a shifted power method for computing Z-eigenvalues, and they also generalized this method to compute generalized eigenpairs by choosing the shift adaptively [10]. Hao et al. [7] presented a sequential subspace projection method for computing extreme Z-eigenvalues. Han [6] introduced an unconstrained optimization method for even order symmetric tensors. By using the Jacobian SDP relaxations in polynomial optimization, Cui et al. [4] proposed an method for computing all the real eigenvalues of symmetric tensors.

However, Algorithm 1 may do not work in practice. The computational cost can be very high, especially when the scale of the problem becomes large. And it is not necessary to compute all the solutions of the $(\text{GEiCP-T})_J$. In fact, it provides a way to decide the solvability of the $(\text{GEiCP-T})_J$, i.e., the $(\text{GEiCP-T})_J$ is unsolvable if the solution set S is empty. As stated in Theorem 6, it is an NP-hard problem in general.

Motivated by the work of Kolda and Mayo [9, 10], we propose a shifted projected power method for finding a solution of the symmetric $(\text{GEiCP-T})_J$. Here, we assume that the $(\text{GEiCP-T})_J$ given is solvable. Instead of using the gradient directly, we do a projection of the gradient to make the new iterative point feasible. And it will be shown that the monotonic convergence is also guaranteed.

Given a set $J \subseteq [n]$, denote $\Omega = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{x}_J \geq 0, \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} = 1\}$. Clearly, Ω is bounded and closed. Consider the following nonlinear program

$$\max f(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{subject to } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega,$$

where $f(\mathbf{x})$ is a given nonlinear function.

Theorem 7 *Suppose that $\mathbf{w} \in \Omega$ and $f(\mathbf{x})$ is a given function. Let Σ be the open neighborhood of $\mathbf{w}$ such that $f(\mathbf{x})$ is convex and continuously differentiable on it. Let $d(\mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be given by*

$$d(\mathbf{w})_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in J \text{ and } \nabla f(\mathbf{w})_i < 0, \\ \nabla f(\mathbf{w})_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Assume $\|d(\mathbf{w})\| \neq 0$. Define $\mathbf{v} = \frac{d(\mathbf{w})}{\|d(\mathbf{w})\|}$. If $\mathbf{v} \in \Sigma$ and $\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{w}$, then $f(\mathbf{v}) - f(\mathbf{w}) > 0$.

Proof. Clearly, $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega$. By definition, we have $\nabla f(\mathbf{w})^\top d(\mathbf{w}) = \|d(\mathbf{w})\|^2$. Note that $\mathbf{w}_J \geq 0$. It follows that $\nabla f(\mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{w} \leq d(\mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{w}$. Then, $\nabla f(\mathbf{w})^\top (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}) \geq \|d(\mathbf{w})\| - d(\mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{w} > 0$ since $\mathbf{w} \in \Omega$ and $\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{w}$. On the other hand, since $f(x)$ is convex on Σ , we have

$$f(\mathbf{v}) - f(\mathbf{w}) \geq \nabla f(\mathbf{w})^\top (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}).$$

Consequently, $f(\mathbf{v}) - f(\mathbf{w}) > 0$. □

We can see that $d(\mathbf{w})$ is a ascent direction since $\nabla f(\mathbf{w})^\top d(\mathbf{w}) = \|d(\mathbf{w})\|^2 \geq 0$. In fact, by the definition of $d(\mathbf{w})$, it can be seen as the projection of the gradient $\nabla f(\mathbf{w})$ on the set

$\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{x}_J \geq 0\}$. According to Theorem 7, the simple iterative algorithm, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{x}^+ = d(\mathbf{x})/\|d(\mathbf{x})\|,$$

will monotonically ascent if $f(\mathbf{x})$ is local convex. Unfortunately, the objective function $f(\mathbf{x})$ in $(P)_J$ is $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$, defined as (7). It is not convex in general.

To fix this, we consider an equivalent optimization problem of $(P)_J$

$$\max \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda(\mathbf{x}) + \alpha\|\mathbf{x}\|^m \quad \text{subject to } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega,$$

where α is a shifted factor which makes the objective function $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})$ locally convex. Denote by $H(\mathbf{x})$ the Hessian of $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$. By simple computation, we have

$$\nabla \lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{m}{\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^m} [\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} - \lambda(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^{m-1}] \quad (9)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mathbf{x}) = & \frac{m(m-1)}{\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^m} \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-2} - \frac{m^2}{(\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^m)^2} \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} (\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^{m-1})^\top - \frac{m(m-1)}{(\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^m)^2} \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m \mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^{m-2} \\ & - \frac{m^2}{(\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^m)^3} \mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} (\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^m \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} - 2\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^m \mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^{m-1})^\top. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

It follows that

$$\nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla \lambda(\mathbf{x}) + \alpha m \mathbf{x} \quad (11)$$

and

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{x}) = H(\mathbf{x}) + \alpha m I + \alpha m(m-2)\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\top. \quad (12)$$

Our goal is choose the shifted factor α to make $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})$ locally convex, i.e., $\hat{H}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$. The following result gives a way to choose the shifted factor adaptively. Denote by $\lambda_{\min}(H)$ the minimal eigenvalue of the matrix H .

Lemma 4 (Corollary 4.4 of [10]) *Assume $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$. Let $\tau > 0$. If*

$$\alpha = \max\{0, (\tau - \lambda_{\min}(H))/m\},$$

the $\lambda_{\min}(\hat{H}) > \tau$.

Then, given $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, a shifted factor can be chosen to make $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})$ locally convex according to Lemma 4. It follows that

$$\mathbf{x}^+ = \frac{\hat{d}(\mathbf{x})}{\|\hat{d}(\mathbf{x})\|} \in \Sigma \Rightarrow \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}^+) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) > 0 \Rightarrow \lambda(\mathbf{x}^+) - \lambda(\mathbf{x}) > 0,$$

where $\hat{d}(\mathbf{x})$ is defined as (8) for $\nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x})$. Though the shifted factor changes adaptively, we can see that the original function increases after each iteration. In particular, the shifted projected power method can be described as follows.

Algorithm 2 Shifted Projected Power Method for solving the symmetric (GEiCP-T)_J

Step 0. Given $\tau > 0$ and let $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \Omega$ be the vector such that $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x}^0)^m > 0$. Set $k = 0$.

Step 1. Compute the gradient $\nabla \lambda(\mathbf{x}^k)$ and the Hessian $H(\mathbf{x}^k)$ by (9) and (10), respectively. Let $\alpha_k = \max\{0, (\tau - \lambda_{\min}(H(\mathbf{x}^k)))/m\}$, $\nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}^k) = \nabla \lambda(\mathbf{x}^k) + \alpha_k m \mathbf{x}^k$ and $\hat{d}(\mathbf{x}^k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be given by

$$\hat{d}(\mathbf{x}^k)_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in J \text{ and } \nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}^k)_i < 0, \\ \nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}^k)_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Step 2. If $\|\hat{d}(\mathbf{x}^k)\| = 0$, stop. Otherwise,

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = \frac{\hat{d}(\mathbf{x}^k)}{\|\hat{d}(\mathbf{x}^k)\|}.$$

Step 3. Set $k = k + 1$ and go back to Step 1.

The convergence of this method is also established as follows.

Theorem 8 If there is a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ such that $\hat{d}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, then $(\lambda(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of the symmetric (GEiCP-T)_J.

Proof. According to (13), we have $\nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x})_{\bar{J}} = 0$ and $\nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x})_J \leq 0$ since $\hat{d}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. Clearly, $\mathbf{x}_J \geq 0$ since $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$. It follows that $\mathbf{x}^\top \nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}_J^\top \nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x})_J \leq 0$. On the other hand, $\nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla \lambda(\mathbf{x}) + \alpha m \mathbf{x}$. Note that $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$ and $\mathbf{x}^\top \nabla \lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{m}{\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^m} \mathbf{x}^\top [\mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} - \lambda(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^{m-1}] = 0$. Thus, $\mathbf{x}^\top \nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha m \geq 0$ since $\alpha \geq 0$. As a result, $\mathbf{x}^\top \nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha m = 0$. It implies that $\alpha = 0$. Recall that $\mathbf{w} = \lambda(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{B}\mathbf{x}^{m-1} - \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}^{m-1}$ for the symmetric (GEiCP-T)_J. Then, we have $\mathbf{x}_J \geq 0$, $\mathbf{w}_{\bar{J}} = 0$ and $\mathbf{w}_J \geq 0$. Moreover, $\mathbf{w}_J^\top \mathbf{x}_J = \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x} = 0$. This exactly means that $(\lambda(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x})$ is a solution of the symmetric (GEiCP-T)_J. The proof is completed. $\square$

Theorem 9 Suppose that $\hat{d}(\mathbf{x}^k) \neq 0$ for all $k \geq 0$ in Algorithm 2. Let $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be the corresponding generated sequence. Then, $\mathbf{x}^k \in \Omega$ for any $k \geq 0$. Furthermore, if $\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \in \Sigma(\mathbf{x}^k)$ for all $k \geq 0$, then the sequence $\{\lambda(\mathbf{x}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ increases monotonically, and converges to a λ -solution of the symmetric (GEiCP-T)_J.

Proof. Based on the analysis above, it is obvious that $\mathbf{x}^k \in \Omega$ for any $k \geq 0$, and $\lambda(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) \geq \lambda(\mathbf{x}^k)$ if $\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \in \Sigma(\mathbf{x}^k)$. Note that Ω is compact and $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ is continuous. Then $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ is bounded on Ω . Hence, the sequence $\{\lambda(\mathbf{x}^k)\}$ converges. Let $\lambda^* = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(\mathbf{x}^k)$. It follows that λ^* is a local maximal value of the optimization problem $(P)_J$. By Theorem 4, λ^* is a λ -solution of the symmetric (GEiCP-T)_J. $\square$

Note that $\mathbf{x}^k$ need not converge to optimal point, although any accumulation point of the sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ is a local maximal point of the optimization problem $(P)_J$. Here, we assume that $\mathbf{x}^+ \in \Sigma$ for each iteration. That is $\mathbf{x}^+$ should be located in the open neighborhood

of $\mathbf{x}$, on which $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})$ is convex. If the condition does not hold, we may see decrease in the origin function. As explained in [10], one strategy is to choose a sufficiently large α until the condition is satisfied. However, from the numerical experiments in the next section, it is not necessary to worry about the unexpected case. Thus, we don't include this technique in the implementation of the algorithm.

5 Numerical experiments

In this section, the numerical performance of the shifted projected power method is presented. All codes were written by using Matlab Version R2012b and the Tensor Toolbox Version 2.5 [1]. And the numerical experiments were done on a laptop with an Intel Core i5-2430M CPU (2.4GHz) and RAM of 5.58GB.

In the implementation of Algorithm 2, we set the parameter $\tau = 10^{-6}$, where τ is the tolerance on being positive definite. We consider the iterates to be converged once $|\lambda(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - \lambda(\mathbf{x}^k)| \leq 10^{-10}$. The maximum iterations is 1000. For simplicity, the positive definite tensor $\mathcal{B}$ is chosen by $\mathcal{B} = (\delta_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_m}) \in S_{m,n}$, where m is even. To solve the minimal eigenvalue of the matrix in Step 1, we use the **eig** function built in Matlab to compute all the eigenvalues and select the minimal one. In some ways, the speed of our method can be accelerated if a better algorithm is used to find the minimal eigenvalue of a given matrix.

First, we use a randomly generated example to show the performance of Algorithm 2. In the example, the tensor $\mathcal{A} \in S_{6,4}$ is generated randomly as follows: we select random entries from $[-1, 1]$, symmetrize the result, and round to four decimal places. To make the $(\text{GEiCP-T})_J$ solvable, we reset its first entry by $a_{111111} = 0.5$. It follows that $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{e}_1^6 = a_{111111} > 0$. By Theorem 5, the corresponding $(\text{GEiCP-T})_J$ is solvable if $1 \in J$. Hence, we execute our experiment under all possible cases, i.e.,

$$J = \{1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{1, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{1, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4\}.$$

For all cases, the initial point is chosen by $\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{e}_1$. The tensor $\mathcal{A}$ is specified in Table 1. The numerical results are reported in Table 2. To show the monotonic convergence of the shifted projective power method, the courses of iteration are presented in Figure 1.

In Table 2, *Ite.* denotes the iteration number of Algorithm 2 and $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ denote the solution derived at the final iteration. And $\mathbf{w}^*$ is computed by $\mathbf{w}^* = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}^*)^{m-1} - \lambda^* \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x}^*)^{m-1}$. We can see that for all cases, the shifted projected power method can find a solution of the corresponding $(\text{GEiCP-T})_J$ successfully, i.e.,

$$\lambda^* > 0, \quad \mathbf{x}_J^* \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{w}_J^* \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{w}_J^* = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathbf{w}_J^*)^\top \mathbf{x}_J^* = 0.$$

Notice that there are four typical solutions for the cases $J = \{1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Any other solution is the same with one of these typical solutions. This phenomenon can

be well explained by Lemma 3. For instance, if $J = \{1, 3, 4\}$, $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ is a solution of the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ with $\lambda^* = 1.2894$ and $\mathbf{x}^* = (0.8801, -0.2669, 0.3927, 0)^\top$. It follows that $\mathbf{w}^* = (0, 0, 0, 0.4676)^\top$. By definition, we have $J_0 = \{4\}$ and $J_1 = \{1, 3, 4\}$. According to Lemma 3, since $J_0 \subseteq \{1, 4\} \subseteq J_1$, $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ is still a solution of the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ with $\hat{J} = \{1, 4\}$.

For these typical cases, the courses of iteration are shown in Figure 1. We can see that the generated sequence $\{\lambda(\mathbf{x}^k)\}$ is monotonically increasing, and converges to a local maximal value quickly. It is also shown that the new iteration point $\mathbf{x}^+$ is always located in $\Sigma(\mathbf{x})$, on which $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})$ is convex.

Second, we test our method by randomly generated tensors. Given order m and dimension n , the tensor $\mathcal{A} \in S_{m,n}$ is randomly generated as before, i.e., we select random entries from $[-1, 1]$ and symmetrize the result. To make the (GEiCP-T) $_J$ solvable, we reset its first entry by $a_{111111} = 0.5$. The initial point is chosen by $\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{e}_1$. And the (EiCP-T) is considered i.e., $J = [n]$. For each case, ten symmetric tensors are generated and the average time, the average λ -solution and the average number of iteration are recorded, respectively. The results are reported in Table 3.

From Table 3, we can see that our method is very efficient for randomly generated tensors. For each case, one can find a λ -solution within 500 iterations. Note that the tensor may be out of the memory of our laptop when its scale becomes large.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, the generalized eigenvalue complementarity problem for tensors (GEiCP-T) is considered, which arises from the stability analysis of finite dimensional mechanical systems. In theory, we mainly discuss the existence of the solution of the (GEiCP-T). It is shown that if exist, the number of λ -solutions is finite. And there always exists a unique solution of the (EiCP-T) (i.e. $J = [n]$) for irreducible nonnegative tensors. For the symmetric case, the (GEiCP-T) is solvable if and only if there exists a feasible point of the corresponding nonlinear program such that the objective function value is positive. It has also been proved that deciding the solvability of the (EiCP-T) is NP-hard in general.

In the aspect of algorithm, a shifted projected power method is proposed to solve the symmetric (GEiCP-T). The monotonic convergence of the algorithm is established. And the numerical experiments show that the algorithm presented is efficient and promising.

Table 1: A randomly generated tensor $\mathcal{A} = (a_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_6}) \in S_{6,4}$

$a_{111111} = 0.5000,$	$a_{111112} = -0.2369,$	$a_{111113} = 0.1953,$	$a_{111114} = -0.2691,$
$a_{111122} = 0.0835,$	$a_{111123} = -0.2016,$	$a_{111124} = -0.0441,$	$a_{111133} = 0.0567,$
$a_{111134} = -0.2784,$	$a_{111144} = 0.2321,$	$a_{111222} = -0.1250,$	$a_{111223} = 0.0333,$
$a_{111224} = 0.0235,$	$a_{111233} = 0.0093,$	$a_{111234} = -0.0304,$	$a_{111244} = -0.0167,$
$a_{111333} = 0.1028,$	$a_{111334} = -0.0385,$	$a_{111344} = 0.0068,$	$a_{111444} = 0.1627,$
$a_{112222} = -0.1002,$	$a_{112223} = 0.0733,$	$a_{112224} = 0.0607,$	$a_{112233} = -0.1125,$
$a_{112234} = 0.0096,$	$a_{112244} = -0.0810,$	$a_{112333} = -0.0299,$	$a_{112334} = 0.0153,$
$a_{112344} = 0.0572,$	$a_{112444} = 0.0251,$	$a_{113333} = 0.1927,$	$a_{113334} = -0.1024,$
$a_{113344} = -0.0885,$	$a_{113444} = 0.0289,$	$a_{114444} = -0.0668,$	$a_{122222} = -0.2707,$
$a_{122223} = -0.1066,$	$a_{122224} = -0.1592,$	$a_{122233} = 0.0805,$	$a_{122234} = -0.0540,$
$a_{122244} = -0.0434,$	$a_{122333} = -0.0048,$	$a_{122334} = -0.0118,$	$a_{122344} = 0.0196,$
$a_{122444} = -0.0585,$	$a_{123333} = -0.0442,$	$a_{123334} = -0.0618,$	$a_{123344} = 0.0318,$
$a_{123444} = 0.0332,$	$a_{124444} = -0.2490,$	$a_{133333} = 0.1291,$	$a_{133334} = 0.0704,$
$a_{133344} = -0.0032,$	$a_{133444} = 0.0270,$	$a_{134444} = 0.0232,$	$a_{144444} = -0.3403,$
$a_{222222} = -0.6637,$	$a_{222223} = 0.2191,$	$a_{222224} = 0.3280,$	$a_{222233} = 0.1834,$
$a_{222234} = 0.0627,$	$a_{222244} = 0.0860,$	$a_{222333} = 0.1590,$	$a_{222334} = -0.0217,$
$a_{222344} = 0.1198,$	$a_{222444} = -0.1674,$	$a_{223333} = 0.0549,$	$a_{223334} = -0.0868,$
$a_{223344} = 0.0043,$	$a_{223444} = 0.0101,$	$a_{224444} = -0.0307,$	$a_{233333} = -0.3553,$
$a_{233334} = 0.0207,$	$a_{233344} = 0.1544,$	$a_{233444} = -0.1707,$	$a_{234444} = -0.3557,$
$a_{244444} = -0.1706,$	$a_{333333} = 0.7354,$	$a_{333334} = -0.3628,$	$a_{333344} = -0.2650,$
$a_{333444} = -0.0479,$	$a_{334444} = -0.0084,$	$a_{344444} = -0.0559,$	$a_{444444} = 0.6136.$

Table 2: Numerical results for the tensor $\mathcal{A}$ given in Table 1

J	Ite.	Time(s)	λ^*	$\mathbf{x}^*$	$\mathbf{w}^*$
$\{1\}$	38	0.5636	1.7230	$(0.8646, -0.1272, 0.4080, -0.2642)^\top$	$(0, 0, 0, 0)^\top$
$\{1, 2\}$	41	0.6048	1.6381	$(0.8513, 0, 0.4315, -0.2985)^\top$	$(0, 0.2180, 0, 0)^\top$
$\{1, 3\}$	38	0.5662	1.7230	$(0.8646, -0.1272, 0.4080, -0.2642)^\top$	$(0, 0, 0, 0)^\top$
$\{1, 4\}$	101	1.4926	1.2894	$(0.8801, -0.2669, 0.3927, 0)^\top$	$(0, 0, 0, 0.4676)^\top$
$\{1, 2, 3\}$	41	0.6066	1.6381	$(0.8513, 0, 0.4315, -0.2985)^\top$	$(0, 0.2180, 0, 0)^\top$
$\{1, 2, 4\}$	52	0.7673	1.1666	$(0.5781, 0, 0.8160, 0)^\top$	$(0, 0.3347, 0, 0.4207)^\top$
$\{1, 3, 4\}$	101	1.4949	1.2894	$(0.8801, -0.2669, 0.3927, 0)^\top$	$(0, 0, 0, 0.4676)^\top$
$\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$	52	0.7684	1.1666	$(0.5781, 0, 0.8160, 0)^\top$	$(0, 0.3347, 0, 0.4207)^\top$

References

- [1] B.W. Bader, T.G. Kolda et. al., *MATLAB Tensor Toolbox Version 2.5*, Jan. 2012, <http://www.sandia.gov/~tgkolda/TensorToolbox/>.




Figure 1: The course of iteration for the tensor $\mathcal{A}$ given in Table 1

- [2] K.C. Chang, K. Pearson and T. Zhang, “Perron-Frobenius theorem for nonnegative tensors”, *Commun. Math. Sci.*, **6** (2008) 507-520.
- [3] K.C. Chang, K. Pearson and T. Zhang, “On eigenvalue problems of real symmetric tensors”, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **350** (2009) 416-422.
- [4] C. Cui, Y.-H. Dai and J. Nie, “All real eigenvalues of symmetric tensors”, (2014) arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.3720.
- [5] W. Ding, L. Qi and Y. Wei, “M-tensors and nonsingular M-tensors”, *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* **439** (2013) 3264-3278.
- [6] L. Han, “An unconstrained optimization approach for finding real eigenvalues of even order symmetric tensors”, *Numerical Algebra, Control and Optimization (NACO)* **3** (2012) 583-599.

Table 3: Numerical results for randomly generated tensors

m	n	Ite.	Time(s)	λ^*
4	5	50.0	0.3839	1.2143
4	10	65.7	0.5832	1.9260
4	15	116.4	1.1597	2.5069
4	20	162.8	2.3462	2.7829
4	25	187.7	4.3628	3.3754
4	30	195.1	9.9900	3.8642
4	35	225.6	21.3616	4.2010
4	40	278.7	44.2750	4.4314
4	45	432.7	91.8715	4.7232
6	4	23.8	0.3576	1.2637
6	5	38.6	0.6745	1.0581
6	6	40.5	0.8180	1.1849
6	7	51.6	1.0999	1.4305
6	8	82.3	2.2646	1.9459
6	9	95.7	3.8606	2.0624
8	4	29.3	0.8645	0.7863

- [7] C. Hao, C. Cui, and Y.-H. Dai. “A sequential subspace projection method for extreme Z-eigenvalues of supersymmetric tensors”, *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, to appear, 2014.
- [8] C.J. Hillar and L.-H. Lim, “Most tensor problems are NP-hard”, *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* **60** (2013) 45.
- [9] T.G. Kolda and J.R. Mayo, “Shifted power method for computing tensor eigenpairs”, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **32** (2011) 1095-1124.
- [10] T.G. Kolda and J.R. Mayo, “An Adaptive Shifted Power Method for Computing Generalized Tensor Eigenpairs”, (2014) arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.1183.
- [11] L.-H. Lim, “Singular values and eigenvalues of tensors: a variational approach”, *Proceedings of the IEEE International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Addaptive Processing*, **1** (2005) 129-132.
- [12] K.G. Murty, “Linear complementarity, linear and nonlinear programming”, (1988) Heldermann Verlag, Berlin.

- [13] M. Ng, L. Qi and G. Zhou, “Finding the largest eigenvalue of a nonnegative tensor”, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **31** (2009) 1090-1099.
- [14] A. Pinto da Costa, I.N. Figueiredo, J.J. Júdice and J.A.C. Martins, “A complementarity eigenproblem in the stability analysis of finite dimensional elastic systems with frictional contact”, in: *Complementarity: Applications, Algorithms and Extensions*, Springer US, (2001) 67-83.
- [15] A. Pinto da Costa, J.A.C. Martins, I.N. Figueiredo and J.J. Júdice, “The directional instability problem in systems with frictional contacts”, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **193** (2004) 357-384.
- [16] L. Qi, “Eigenvalues of a real supersymmetric tensor”, *Journal of Symbolic Computation* **40** (2005) 1302-1324.
- [17] L. Qi, “Symmetric nonnegative tensors and copositive tensors”, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **439** (2013) 228-238.
- [18] L. Qi, Y. Wang and E.X. Wu, “D-eigenvalues of diffusion kurtosis tensors”, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **221** (2008) 150-157.
- [19] M. Queiroz, J.J. Júdice and Jr.C. Humes, “The symmetric eigenvalue complementarity problem”, *Mathematics of Computation* **73** (2004) 1849-1863.
- [20] A. Seeger, “Eigenvalue analysis of equilibrium processes defined by linear complementarity conditions”, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **292** (1999) 1-14.
- [21] Q. Yang and Y. Yang, “Further results for Perron-Frobenius theorem for nonnegative tensors II”, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **32** (2011) 1236-1250.
- [22] Y. Yang and Q. Yang, “Further results for Perron-Frobenius theorem for non-negative tensors”, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **31** (2010) 2517-2530.
- [23] L. Zhang, L. Qi and G. Zhou, “M-tensors and some applications”, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **35** (2014) 437-452.