

An Irreducible Function Basis of Isotropic Invariants of A Third Order Three-Dimensional Symmetric Tensor

Zhongming Chen* Jinjie Liu[†] Liqun Qi[‡] Quanshui Zheng[§] Wennan Zou[¶]

June 22, 2018

Abstract

In this paper, we present an eleven invariant isotropic irreducible function basis of a third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor. This irreducible function basis is a proper subset of the Olive-Auffray minimal isotropic integrity basis of that tensor. The octic invariant and a sextic invariant in the Olive-Auffray integrity basis are dropped out. This result is of significance to the further research of irreducible function bases of higher order tensors.

Key words. irreducible function basis, symmetric tensor, syzygy.

*Department of Mathematics, School of Science, Hangzhou Dianzi University, Hangzhou 310018, China (zmchen@hdu.edu.cn). This author's work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11701132).

[†]Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong (jinjie.liu@connect.polyu.hk).

[‡]Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong (maqilq@polyu.edu.hk). This author's work was partially supported by the Hong Kong Research Grant Council (Grant No. PolyU 15302114, 15300715, 15301716 and 15300717).

[§]Department of Engineering Mechanics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China (zhengqs@tsinghua.edu.cn).

[¶]Institute for Advanced Study, Nanchang University, Nanchang 330031, China (zouwn@ncu.edu.cn). This author was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11372124)

1 Introduction

Tensor function representation theory constitutes an important fundamental of theoretical and applied mechanics. Representations of complete and irreducible basis for isotropic invariants could predict the available nonlinear constitutive theories by the formulation of energy term. Since irreducible representations for tensor-valued functions can be immediately yielded from known irreducible representations for invariants (scalar-valued functions) [17], the studies of isotropic function basis have most priority. Perhaps we may trace back the modern development of tensor representation theory to the great mathematician Hermann Weyl's book [16]. This book was first published in 1939. Here, we cite its new edition in 2016. Then, since the 1955 paper of Rivlin and Ericksen [13], many researchers, such as Smith, Pipkin, Spencer, Boehler, Betten, Pennisi and Zheng [12, 9, 1, 8, 14, 19, 18], to name only a few of them here, have made important contributions to tensor representation theory. For the literature of tensor representation theory before 1994, people may find it in the 1994 survey paper of Zheng [17]. The development of tensor representation theory after 1994 paid more attentions to minimal integrity bases of isotropic invariants of third and fourth order three-dimensional tensors [2, 6, 7, 11, 18, 19]. The polynomial basis of anisotropic invariants of the elasticity tensor was studied by Boehler, Kirillov and Onat [2] in 1994. Zheng and Betten [19] and Zheng [18] studied the tensor function representations involving tensors of orders higher than two. Smith and Bao [11] presented minimal integrity bases of isotropic invariants for third and fourth order three-dimensional symmetric and traceless tensors in 1997. Note that Boehler, Kirillov and Onat [2] had already given a minimal integrity basis for a fourth order three-dimensional symmetric and traceless tensor in 1994. But the minimal integrity basis given by Smith and Bao [11] for the same tensor is slightly different [3]. In 2014, an integrity basis with thirteen isotropic invariants of a (completely) symmetric third order three-dimensional tensor was presented by Olive and Auffray [6]. Olive [5][p. 1409] stated that this integrity basis is a minimal integrity basis. Olive, Kolev and Auffray [7] presented a minimal integrity basis of the elasticity tensor, with 297 invariants, in 2017. Very recently, Chen, Qi and Zou [3] showed that the four invariant Smith-Bao minimal isotropic integrity basis of a third order three-dimensional symmetric and traceless tensor is also an irreducible function basis of that tensor.

In this paper, the summation convention is used. If an index is repeated twice in a product, then it means that this product is summed up with respect to this index from 1 to 3.

Suppose that a tensor \mathbf{A} has the form $A_{i_1 \dots i_m}$ under an orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$. A scalar function of \mathbf{A} , $f(\mathbf{A}) = f(A_{i_1 \dots i_m})$ is said to be an isotropic invariant of \mathbf{A} if for any orthogonal matrix q_{ij} , we have

$$f(A_{i_1 \dots i_m}) = f(A_{j_1 \dots j_m} q_{i_1 j_1} \dots q_{i_m j_m}).$$

By [17, 19], a set of isotropic polynomial invariants f_1, \dots, f_r of \mathbf{A} is said to be an *integrity basis* of \mathbf{A} if any isotropic polynomial invariant is a polynomial of f_1, \dots, f_r , and a set of isotropic invariants f_1, \dots, f_m of \mathbf{A} is said to be a *function basis* of \mathbf{A} if any isotropic invariant is a function of f_1, \dots, f_m . An integrity basis is always a function basis but not vice versa [7]. A set of isotropic polynomial invariants f_1, \dots, f_r of \mathbf{A} is said to be *polynomially irreducible* if none of

them can be a polynomial of the others. Similarly, a set of isotropic invariants f_1, \dots, f_m of \mathbf{A} is said to be *functionally irreducible* if none of them can be a function of the others. An integrity basis of \mathbf{A} is said to be a *minimal integrity basis* of \mathbf{A} if it is polynomially irreducible, and a function basis of \mathbf{A} is said to be an *irreducible function basis* of \mathbf{A} if it is functionally irreducible.

In this paper, we present an eleven invariant isotropic irreducible function basis of a third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor. This irreducible function basis is a proper subset of the Olive-Auffray minimal isotropic integrity basis of that tensor. The octic invariant and a sextic invariant in the Olive-Auffray integrity basis are dropped out.

In the next section, some preliminary results are given. These include the minimal integrity basis result of Smith and Bao [11] for a third order three-dimensional symmetric and traceless tensor, the consequent result of Chen, Qi and Zou [3] to confirm it is also an irreducible function basis, and the result of Olive and Auffray [6] for a minimal integrity basis of a third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor.

In Section 3, we present an eleven invariant isotropic function basis of a third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor. This function basis is obtained by using two syzygy relations to drop out the octic invariant and a sextic invariant from the Olive-Auffray integrity basis. Note that a *syzygy relation* is a set of coefficients in the polynomial ring such that the corresponding element generated by the function basis vanishes in the module.

Then in Section 4, we show that this function basis is indeed an irreducible function basis of a third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor.

This result is significant to the further research of irreducible function bases of higher order tensors. First, this is the first time to give an irreducible function basis of isotropic invariants of a third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor. Second, there are still three syzygy relations among these eleven invariants. This shows that an irreducible function basis consisting of polynomial invariants may not be algebraically minimal. We discuss this in Section 5.

From now on, we use \mathbf{A} to denote a third order three-dimensional tensor, and assume that it is represented by A_{ijk} under an orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$. We consider the three-dimensional physical space. Hence $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. We say that \mathbf{A} is a symmetric tensor if for $i, j, k = 1, 2, 3$, we have

$$A_{ijk} = A_{jik} = A_{ikj} = A_{kji}.$$

We say that \mathbf{A} is traceless if

$$A_{iij} = A_{ijj} = A_{iji} = 0.$$

We use $\mathbf{0}$ to denote the zero vector and \mathcal{O} to denote the third order three-dimensional zero tensor.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we review the minimal integrity basis result of Smith and Bao [11] for a third order three-dimensional symmetric and traceless tensor, the consequent result of Chen, Qi and Zou [3] to confirm it is also an irreducible function basis, and the minimal integrity basis result of Olive and Auffray [6] for a third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor.

2.1 An Irreducible Function Basis of A Third Order Three-Dimensional Symmetric and Traceless Tensor

In 1997, Smith and Bao [11] presented the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let \mathbf{D} be an irreducible (i.e., symmetric and traceless) third order three-dimensional tensor. Denote $v_p := D_{ijk}D_{ij\ell}D_{k\ell p}$, $I_2 := D_{ijk}D_{ijk}$, $I_4 := D_{ijk}D_{ij\ell}D_{pqk}D_{pql}$, $I_6 := v_i v_i$ and $I_{10} := D_{ijk}v_i v_j v_k$. Then $\{I_2, I_4, I_6, I_{10}\}$ is a minimal integrity basis of \mathbf{D} .*

Very recently, Chen, Qi and Zou [3] proved the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2. *Under the notation of Theorem 2.1, the Smith-Bao minimal integrity basis $\{I_2, I_4, I_6, I_{10}\}$ is also an irreducible function basis of \mathbf{D} .*

2.2 The Olive-Auffray Integrity Basis of A Third Order Three-Dimensional Symmetric Tensor

According to [18], we decompose a third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor \mathbf{A} into a third order three-dimensional symmetric and traceless tensor \mathbf{D} and a vector \mathbf{u} , with

$$u_i = A_{i\ell\ell}$$

and

$$D_{ijk} = A_{ijk} - \frac{1}{5}(u_k \delta_{ij} + u_j \delta_{ik} + u_i \delta_{jk}),$$

where $\delta_{pq} = 1$ if $p = q$ and $\delta_{pq} = 0$ if $p \neq q$.

In 2014, Olive and Auffray [6] presented the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *Let \mathbf{A} be a third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor with the above decomposition. The following thirteen invariants*

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &:= D_{ijk}D_{ijk}, & J_2 &:= u_i u_i, & I_4 &:= D_{ijk}D_{ij\ell}D_{pqk}D_{pql}, \\ J_4 &:= D_{ijk}u_k D_{ij\ell}u_\ell, & K_4 &:= D_{ijk}D_{ij\ell}D_{k\ell p}u_p, & L_4 &:= D_{ijk}u_k u_j u_i, \\ I_6 &:= v_i v_i, & J_6 &:= D_{ijk}D_{ij\ell}u_k D_{\ell pq}u_p u_q, & K_6 &:= v_k w_k, \\ L_6 &:= D_{ijk}D_{ij\ell}u_k v_\ell, & M_6 &:= D_{ijk}D_{pqk}u_i u_j u_p u_q, & I_8 &:= D_{ijk}D_{ij\ell}u_k D_{pql}D_{pqr}v_r, \\ I_{10} &:= D_{ijk}v_i v_j v_k, \end{aligned}$$

where $v_p := D_{ijk}D_{ij\ell}D_{k\ell p}$ and $w_k := D_{ijk}u_i u_j$, form an integrity basis of \mathbf{A} .

As an integrity basis is always a function basis, we may start from the Olive-Auffray integrity basis

$$\{I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, K_6, L_6, M_6, I_8, I_{10}\}$$

to find an irreducible function basis of \mathbf{A} .

3 An Eleven Invariant Function Basis

In this section, we show that the following eleven invariant set

$$\{I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6, I_{10}\}$$

is a function basis of the third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor \mathbf{A} . Note that this set is obtained by dropping K_6 and I_8 from the Olive-Auffray integrity basis

$$\{I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, K_6, L_6, M_6, I_8, I_{10}\}.$$

Thus, the task of this section is to show that K_6 and I_8 can be dropped out for a function basis.

We first prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *In the Olive-Auffray integrity basis, we have*

$$2I_2J_2 - 3J_4 \geq 0,$$

where equality holds if and only if either $\mathbf{D} = \mathcal{O}$ or $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$.

Proof. By definition, if either $\mathbf{D} = \mathcal{O}$ or $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$, we have $I_2J_2 = 0$ and $J_4 = 0$. Hence $2I_2J_2 - 3J_4 = 0$ in this case.

Consider the optimization problem

$$\min\{2I_2J_2 - 3J_4 : D_{ijk}D_{ijk} = 1, u_i u_i = 1.\},$$

where the variables are the seven independent components of \mathbf{D} and the three components of \mathbf{u} . Using GloptiPoly 3 [4] and SeDuMi [15], we compute the minimum value of this optimization problem is 0.2, where the minimizer is $D_{111} = 0.2829, D_{112} = D_{113} = 0, D_{122} = -0.2828, D_{123} = -0.2450, D_{222} = 0, D_{223} = -0.2828, u_1 = -0.4471, u_2 = -0.7746, u_3 = -0.4474$. Hence, the minimum value is positive. This implies that if $2I_2J_2 - 3J_4 = 0$ then either $\mathbf{D} = \mathcal{O}$ or $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$. \square

We are now ready to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *The eleven invariant set $\{I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6, I_{10}\}$ is a function basis of the third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor \mathbf{A} .*

Proof. Consider all possible tenth degree powers and products of these thirteen invariants $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, K_6, L_6, M_6, I_8, I_{10}$ in the Olive-Auffray minimal integrity basis of \mathbf{A} . Find linear relations among these tenth degree powers and products. Then we have two syzygy relations among these thirteen invariants as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} 6J_2I_8 &= -I_2^2J_2K_4 - I_2^3L_4 + 3I_2I_4L_4 - 3I_2J_4K_4 + 4J_2I_4K_4 + 2I_2^2J_6 \\ &\quad + 3I_2J_2L_6 - 3L_4I_6 - 6I_4J_6 + 3J_4L_6 + 6K_4K_6, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 2I_2J_2K_6 + I_2^2J_2J_4 - I_2J_4^2 + 2I_2K_4L_4 + 3J_2K_4^2 - 2J_2I_4J_4 \\ + J_2^2I_6 - 2I_2^2M_6 - 12K_4J_6 + 6L_4L_6 + 6I_4M_6 - 3J_4K_6 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$(2I_2J_2 - 3J_4)K_6 = -I_2^2J_2J_4 + I_2J_4^2 - 2I_2K_4L_4 - 3J_2K_4^2 + 2J_2I_4J_4 - J_2^2I_6 + 2I_2^2M_6 + 12K_4J_6 - 6L_4L_6 - 6I_4M_6. \quad (2)$$

We first use the syzygy relation (1). If $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$, then $J_2 = u_iu_i = 0$, and the right hand side of (1) is also equal to zero. In this case, we have $I_8 = D_{ijk}D_{ij\ell}u_kD_{pq\ell}D_{pqr}v_r = 0$, where $v_p := D_{ijk}D_{ij\ell}D_{k\ell p}$. If $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}$, then $J_2 = u_iu_i \neq 0$. By the syzygy relation (1), we have

$$I_8 = -\frac{1}{6}I_2^2K_4 + \frac{2}{3}I_4K_4 + \frac{1}{2}I_2L_6 + \frac{-I_2^3L_4 + 3I_2I_4L_4 - 3I_2J_4K_4 + 2I_2^2J_6 - 3L_4I_6 - 6I_4J_6 + 3J_4L_6 + 6K_4K_6}{6J_2}.$$

Then I_8 is a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, K_6, L_6, M_6, I_{10}$.

We now use the syzygy relation (2). If $2I_2J_2 - 3J_4 = 0$, by Proposition 3.1, either $\mathbf{D} = \mathcal{O}$ or $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$. This implies that $K_6 = 0$. Note in this case, the right hand side of (2) also equal to zero. If $2I_2J_2 - 3J_4 \neq 0$, we have

$$K_6 = \frac{-I_2^2J_2J_4 + I_2J_4^2 - 2I_2K_4L_4 - 3J_2K_4^2 + 2J_2I_4J_4 - J_2^2I_6 + 2I_2^2M_6 + 12K_4J_6 - 6L_4L_6 - 6I_4M_6}{2I_2J_2 - 3J_4}.$$

This shows that K_6 is a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6, I_{10}$.

Hence, $\{I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6, I_{10}\}$ is a function basis of the third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor \mathbf{A} . \square

4 This Function Basis Is An Irreducible Function Basis

To show that $\{I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6, I_{10}\}$ is an irreducible function basis of the third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor \mathbf{A} , we only need to show that each of these eleven invariants is not a function of the other ten invariants.

To show that each of K_4, L_4, J_6 and L_6 is not a function of the ten other invariants in this function basis, we may use a tactics, which is stated in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *We have the following four conclusions.*

(a) *If there is a third order three-dimensional tensor \mathbf{A} such that $K_4 = L_4 = J_6 = 0$ but $L_6 \neq 0$, then L_6 is not a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, M_6$ and I_{10} .*

(b) *If there is a third order three-dimensional tensor \mathbf{A} such that $K_4 = L_4 = L_6 = 0$ but $J_6 \neq 0$, then J_6 is not a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, L_6, M_6$ and I_{10} .*

(c) *If there is a third order three-dimensional tensor \mathbf{A} such that $K_4 = J_6 = L_6 = 0$ but $L_4 \neq 0$, then L_4 is not a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6$ and I_{10} .*

(d) *If there is a third order three-dimensional tensor \mathbf{A} such that $L_4 = J_6 = L_6 = 0$ but $K_4 \neq 0$, then K_4 is not a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6$ and I_{10} .*

Proof. By the definition of invariants $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6$ and I_{10} , if we keep \mathbf{D} be unchanged but change \mathbf{u} to $-\mathbf{u}$, then $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, I_6, M_6$ and I_{10} are unchanged, but K_4, L_4, J_6 and L_6 change their signs.

We now prove conclusion (a). If there is a third order three-dimensional tensor \mathbf{A} such that $K_4 = L_4 = J_6 = 0$ but $L_6 \neq 0$, we may keep \mathbf{D} be unchanged but change \mathbf{u} to $-\mathbf{u}$, then $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, I_6, M_6$ and I_{10} are unchanged, K_4, L_4 and J_6 are still zeros, but L_6 changes its sign and value as it is not zero. This implies that L_6 is not a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, M_6$ and I_{10} . The other three conclusions (b), (c) and (d) can be proved similarly. \square

We now present the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 4.2. *The eleven invariant set $\{I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6, I_{10}\}$ is an irreducible function basis of the third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor \mathbf{A} .*

Proof. By Theorem 3.2, $\{I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6, I_{10}\}$ is a function basis of \mathbf{A} . It suffices to show that each of these eleven invariants is not a function of the ten other invariants.

We divide the proof into three parts.

Part A. In this part, we show that each of I_2, I_4, I_6, I_{10} and J_2 is not a function of the other ten invariants. The first four invariants form an irreducible function basis of the symmetric and traceless tensor \mathbf{D} . The fifth invariant J_2 forms an irreducible function basis of the vector \mathbf{u} . Using this property, we may prove that each of them is not a function of the other ten invariants easily.

By Theorem 2.2, $\{I_2, I_4, I_6, I_{10}\}$ is an irreducible function basis of \mathbf{D} . This implies that each of these four invariants is not a function of the other three invariants. Hence, each of these four invariants is not a function of the ten other invariants of $\{I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6, I_{10}\}$.

Let $\mathbf{D} = \mathcal{O}$, and $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{u}'$ such that $u_i u_i \neq u'_i u'_i$. Then J_2 takes two different values but the other ten invariants $I_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6$ and I_{10} are all zero. This shows that J_2 is not a function of the ten other invariants $I_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6$ and I_{10} .

Part B. In this part, we show that each of K_4, L_4, J_6 and L_6 is not a function of the ten other invariants. We use Proposition 4.1 to realize this purpose.

We first show that L_6 is not a function of the other ten invariants. Let $A_{111}, A_{112}, A_{113}, A_{122}, A_{123}, A_{133}, A_{222}, A_{223}, A_{233}$ and A_{333} be the representatives of the components of \mathbf{A} . If the values of these ten components are fixed, then the other components of \mathbf{A} also fixed by symmetry. Let $A_{111} = \frac{3}{5}, A_{122} = \frac{6}{5}, A_{133} = -\frac{4}{5}, A_{223} = \frac{1}{2}, A_{333} = -\frac{1}{2}$, and $A_{112} = A_{113} = A_{123} = A_{222} = A_{233} = 0$, Then we have $K_4 = L_4 = J_6 = 0$ and $L_6 = -2$, such that we may use Proposition 4.1 (a). The values of the other invariants are: $I_2 = 7, J_2 = 1, I_4 = \frac{37}{2}, J_4 = 2, I_6 = 4, M_6 = 0, I_{10} = 4$. By Proposition 4.1 (a), L_6 is not a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, M_6$ and I_{10} .

Then we show that J_6 is not a function of the other ten invariants. Let

$$A_{111} = \frac{1}{6} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(149 - \sqrt{313})} - \frac{18(-215 + 7\sqrt{313})}{5\sqrt{8053043 - 308071\sqrt{313}}},$$

$$A_{112} = \frac{121(2963 - 103\sqrt{313})}{10(-215 + 7\sqrt{313})} \sqrt{\frac{298 - 2\sqrt{313}}{648164815 - 26977811\sqrt{313}}},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{113} &= \frac{3966519 - 219867\sqrt{313}}{5\sqrt{648164815 - 26977811\sqrt{313}}(-215 + 7\sqrt{313})}, \\
A_{122} &= -\frac{6(-215 + 7\sqrt{313})}{5\sqrt{8053043 - 308071\sqrt{313}}}, \quad A_{123} = 1, \\
A_{133} &= -\frac{1}{6}\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(149 - \sqrt{313})} - \frac{6(-215 + 7\sqrt{313})}{5\sqrt{8053043 - 308071\sqrt{313}}}, \\
A_{222} &= \frac{363(2963 - 103\sqrt{313})}{10(-215 + 7\sqrt{313})} \sqrt{\frac{298 - 2\sqrt{313}}{648164815 - 26977811\sqrt{313}}}, \\
A_{223} &= 1 + \frac{3966519 - 219867\sqrt{313}}{5\sqrt{648164815 - 26977811\sqrt{313}}(-215 + 7\sqrt{313})}, \\
A_{233} &= \frac{121(2963 - 103\sqrt{313})}{10(-215 + 7\sqrt{313})} \sqrt{\frac{298 - 2\sqrt{313}}{648164815 - 26977811\sqrt{313}}}, \\
A_{333} &= -1 + \frac{3(3966519 - 219867\sqrt{313})}{5\sqrt{648164815 - 26977811\sqrt{313}}(-215 + 7\sqrt{313})}.
\end{aligned}$$

These values are solutions of $K_4 = L_4 = L_6 = 0$ and $J_6 \neq 0$. Except that $A_{123} = 1$, the approximate digit values of the other independent components are as follows:

$$A_{111} = 1.554, \quad A_{112} = -0.1877, \quad A_{113} = -0.01287, \quad A_{122} = 0.06780,$$

$$A_{133} = -1.283, \quad A_{222} = -0.5631, \quad A_{223} = 0.9871, \quad A_{233} = -0.1877, \quad A_{333} = -1.039.$$

Then we have $K_4 = L_4 = L_6 = 0$ and $J_6 = 0.5112$, satisfying the condition of Proposition 4.1 (b). The values of the other invariants are $I_2 = 17.29$, $J_2 = 1$, $I_4 = 132.6$, $J_4 = 2.547$, $I_6 = 83.81$, $M_6 = 0.1687$ and $I_{10} = -831$. By Proposition 4.1 (b), J_6 is not a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, L_6, M_6$ and I_{10} .

We now show that L_4 is not a function of the other ten invariants. Similarly, we can find a symmetric third order three-dimensional tensor \mathbf{A} such that $K_4 = J_6 = L_6 = 0$ and $L_4 \neq 0$. To be specific, except that $A_{123} = 1$, the approximate digit values of the other independent components are as follows:

$$A_{111} = 1.0358, \quad A_{112} = 0.06373, \quad A_{113} = -0.06357, \quad A_{122} = 1.8269,$$

$$A_{133} = -1.9697, \quad A_{222} = 0.1912, \quad A_{223} = 0.9364, \quad A_{233} = 0.06373, \quad A_{333} = -1.1907.$$

Then we have $K_4 = J_6 = L_6 = 0$ and $L_4 = -0.3843$, satisfying the condition of Proposition 4.1 (c). We also have $I_2 = 32.2465$, $J_2 = 1$, $I_4 = 394.69$, $J_4 = 9.1213$, $I_6 = 509.67$, $M_6 = 3.2506$ and $I_{10} = 17825.1$. By Proposition 4.1 (c), L_4 is not a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6$ and I_{10} .

We further show that K_4 is not a function of the other ten invariants. Let

$$A_{111} = \frac{3}{5\sqrt{2}}, \quad A_{112} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{10}, \quad A_{113} = \frac{1}{10}, \quad A_{122} = \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{15} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad A_{123} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}},$$

$$A_{133} = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{15} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad A_{222} = \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{10}, \quad A_{223} = -\frac{9}{10}, \quad A_{233} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{10}, \quad A_{333} = \frac{13}{10}.$$

Then we have $L_4 = J_6 = L_6 = 0$ and $K_4 = \frac{8}{9}$, satisfying the condition of Proposition 4.1 (d). We also have

$$I_2 = 8, \quad J_2 = \frac{3}{2}, \quad I_4 = \frac{88}{3}, \quad J_4 = \frac{8}{3}, \quad I_6 = \frac{64}{9}, \quad M_6 = \frac{11}{9}, \quad I_{10} = \frac{11776}{729}.$$

By Proposition 4.1 (d), K_4 is not a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6$ and I_{10} .

Part C. In this part, we show that each of M_6 and J_4 is not a function of the ten other invariants. We cannot use Proposition 4.1 here. However, we may use another tactics. We try to find a tensor \mathbf{A} there such that $K_4 = L_4 = J_6 = L_6 = 0$ to reduce the influence of these four invariants. Then we change some components of \mathbf{A} such that K_4, L_4, J_6 and L_6 keep to be zero, the value of M_6 or J_4 is changed and the values of the remaining other six invariants unchanged.

We first show that M_6 is not a function of the ten other invariants. Let $u_1 = 5a, u_2 = 5b, u_3 = 5c, D_{123} = d$ and the other six independent components of \mathbf{D} be zeros. Let $a = b = 0$ and $c = d = 1$. Then $I_2 = 6, J_2 = 25, I_4 = 12, J_4 = 50, K_4 = L_4 = I_6 = J_6 = L_6 = I_{10} = 0$, and $M_6 = 0$. Let $a = b = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, c = 0$ and $d = 1$. We still have $I_2 = 6, J_2 = 25, I_4 = 12, J_4 = 50, K_4 = L_4 = I_6 = J_6 = L_6 = I_{10} = 0$, but $M_6 = 625$. Hence, M_6 is not a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6$ and I_{10} .

Finally, we show that J_4 is not a function of the ten other invariants. Let $A_{111} = \frac{3}{5} \cos \theta, A_{112} = \frac{1}{5} \sin \theta, A_{113} = 0, A_{122} = \frac{1}{5} \cos \theta, A_{123} = 1, A_{133} = \frac{1}{5} \cos \theta, A_{222} = \frac{3}{5} \sin \theta, A_{223} = 1, A_{233} = \frac{1}{5} \sin \theta$ and $A_{333} = -1$, Then we really have $K_4 = L_4 = J_6 = L_6 = 0$. We also have $I_2 = 10, J_2 = 1, I_4 = 44, I_6 = 16, I_{10} = -64$ and

$$J_4(\theta) = 2 + 4 \cos \theta \sin \theta + 2 \sin^2 \theta, \quad M_6(\theta) = \sin^2 \theta (2 \cos \theta + \sin^2 \theta).$$

Clearly, $J_4(\frac{3}{4}\pi) = 1, M_6(\frac{3}{4}\pi) = \frac{1}{4}, M_6(0) = 0$ and $M_6(\frac{\pi}{4}) = \frac{9}{4}$. Since $M_6(\theta)$ is continuous in the interval $[0, \frac{\pi}{4}]$, there exists $\theta_0 \in (0, \frac{\pi}{4})$ such that $M_6(\theta_0) = M_6(\frac{3}{4}\pi) = \frac{1}{4}$. On the other hand, we have

$$J_4'(\theta) = 4 \cos(2\theta) + 2 \sin(2\theta) \geq 0, \quad \forall \theta \in \left[0, \frac{\pi}{4}\right].$$

It follows that $J_4(\theta_0) \geq J_4(0) = 2 > J_4(\frac{3}{4}\pi) = 1$. Hence, J_4 is not a function of $I_2, J_2, I_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6$ and I_{10} .

Combining the results of these three parts, each of these eleven invariants is not a function of the ten other invariants. Therefore, this eleven invariant set $\{I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6, I_{10}\}$ is indeed an irreducible function basis of \mathbf{A} .

□

Part A and the first part of Part C of this proof to show that each of $I_2, J_2, I_4, I_6, M_6, I_{10}$ is not a function of the other ten invariants may follow Theorem 3.1 of [3]. For self-sufficiency and completeness of this paper, we give this part of the proof directly. The organization of the proof to three parts also makes the proof an integral entity.

5 Significance of This Result

This result is significant to the further research of irreducible function bases of higher order tensors. First, this is the first result on irreducible function bases of a third order three-dimensional symmetric tensor. Second, there are still at least three syzygy relations among these eleven invariants, see (3-5). This shows that an irreducible function basis consisting of polynomial invariants may not be algebraically minimal in the sense that the basis consists of polynomial invariants and there is no algebraic relations in these invariants [10]. The second point is observed as there are still some syzygy relations among these eleven invariants.

Consider all possible sixteenth degree powers or products of the eleven invariants $I_2, J_2, I_4, J_4, K_4, L_4, I_6, J_6, L_6, M_6, I_{10}$. Find linear relations among these sixteenth-degree powers or products. Then we have the following three syzygy relations among these eleven invariants as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2I_2^3 J_2^3 J_4 - 4I_2 J_2^3 I_4 J_4 - 6J_2^3 J_4 I_6 - 9I_2^2 J_2^2 J_4^2 + 18J_2^2 I_4 J_4^2 + 9J_4^4 + 36I_2 J_2 J_6^2 - 54J_4 J_6^2 - 48I_2 J_2^2 K_4 J_6 \\
& + 144J_2 J_4 K_4 J_6 + 12I_2 J_2^3 K_4^2 - 36J_2^2 J_4 K_4^2 - 24I_2^2 J_2 L_4 J_6 + 36I_2 J_4 L_4 J_6 + 12I_2^2 J_2^2 K_4 L_4 \\
& - 18I_2 J_2 J_4 K_4 L_4 - 18J_4^2 K_4 L_4 + 6I_2^3 J_2 L_4^2 - 6I_2 J_2 I_4 L_4^2 - 9I_2^2 J_4 L_4^2 + 9I_4 J_4 L_4^2 - 36J_2 J_4 L_4 L_6 \\
& - 6I_2^3 J_2^2 M_6 + 12I_2 J_2^2 I_4 M_6 + 9J_2^2 I_6 M_6 + 36I_2^2 J_2 J_4 M_6 - 72J_2 I_4 J_4 M_6 - 18I_2 J_4^2 M_6 - 108K_4 J_6 M_6 \\
& + 27J_2 K_4^2 M_6 + 18I_2 K_4 L_4 M_6 + 54L_4 L_6 M_6 - 18I_2^2 M_6^2 + 54I_4 M_6^2 = 0, \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{4}{9}I_2^3 J_2^3 K_4 + \frac{2}{9}I_2^4 J_2^2 L_4 + \frac{4}{3}I_2^3 J_2 J_4 L_4 - \frac{8}{9}I_2 J_2^3 I_4 K_4 - \frac{4}{9}I_2^2 J_2^2 I_4 L_4 - \frac{4}{3}I_2^2 J_2^2 J_4 K_4 - 2I_2^2 J_4^2 L_4 \\
& + 2I_2^2 K_4 L_4^2 + 2J_2^2 K_4^3 + 4I_2 J_2 J_4^2 K_4 + 5I_2 J_2 K_4^2 L_4 - 4I_2 J_2 I_4 J_4 L_4 - \frac{4}{3}I_2^3 J_2^2 J_6 + \frac{2}{3}J_2^3 K_4 I_6 \\
& + \frac{1}{3}I_2 J_2^2 L_4 I_6 + \frac{8}{3}I_2 J_2^2 I_4 J_6 + \frac{4}{3}I_2^2 J_2 J_4 J_6 - 2I_2^3 L_4 M_6 + J_2 J_4 L_4 I_6 - 16I_2 K_4 L_4 J_6 - 14J_2 K_4^2 J_6 \\
& + 6I_2 L_4^2 L_6 + 4J_2 K_4 L_4 L_6 + 6I_2 I_4 L_4 M_6 - 2I_2 J_4 K_4 M_6 + 4J_2 I_4 K_4 M_6 + 4I_2^2 J_6 M_6 - 2J_2^2 I_6 J_6 \\
& - 4I_2 J_2 L_6 M_6 - 12I_4 J_6 M_6 + 6J_4 L_6 M_6 + 24K_4 J_6^2 - 12L_4 J_6 L_6 - 4J_4^3 K_4 + 4I_4 J_4^2 L_4 - J_4 K_4^2 L_4 = 0 \tag{4}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{18}I_2^5 J_2^3 - \frac{2}{9}I_2^3 J_2^3 I_4 + \frac{2}{9}I_2 J_2^3 I_4^2 + \frac{1}{12}I_2^2 J_2^3 I_6 - \frac{1}{6}J_2^3 I_4 I_6 - \frac{1}{6}I_2^4 J_2^2 J_4 + \frac{1}{3}I_2^2 J_2^2 I_4 J_4 + \frac{1}{2}I_2 J_2^2 J_4 I_6 \\
& + \frac{1}{2}I_2^3 J_2 J_4^2 - I_2 J_2 I_4 J_4^2 - \frac{3}{4}J_2 J_4^2 I_6 - \frac{1}{2}I_2^2 J_4^3 + I_4 J_4^3 - I_2^2 J_2 K_4 J_6 + 2J_2 I_4 K_4 J_6 + \frac{1}{4}I_2^2 J_2^2 K_4^2 \\
& - \frac{1}{2}J_2^2 I_4 K_4^2 + \frac{3}{2}I_2 J_2 J_4 K_4^2 - \frac{9}{4}J_4^2 K_4^2 + \frac{1}{2}I_2^3 J_2 K_4 L_4 - I_2 J_2 I_4 K_4 L_4 - \frac{1}{2}I_2^2 J_4 K_4 L_4 + I_4 J_4 K_4 L_4 \\
& + 2I_2 J_2 J_6 L_6 - 3J_4 J_6 L_6 - 2I_2 J_2^2 K_4 L_6 + 3J_2 J_4 K_4 L_6 - \frac{1}{2}I_2^2 J_2 L_4 L_6 - J_2 I_4 L_4 L_6 + \frac{3}{2}I_2 J_4 L_4 L_6 \\
& - \frac{1}{6}I_2^4 J_2 M_6 + \frac{5}{6}I_2^2 J_2 I_4 M_6 - J_2 I_4^2 M_6 - I_2 J_2 I_6 M_6 + \frac{3}{2}J_4 I_6 M_6 = 0. \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

As shown by Theorem 4.2, these three syzygy relations do not imply any single-valued function relation of any of these eleven invariants, with respect to the ten other invariants.

The second point is meaningful to the further research of irreducible function bases of higher order tensors. For example, for the nine invariant Smith-Bao minimal integrity basis of a fourth order three-dimensional symmetric and traceless tensor, there are five syzygy relations [3, 10]. These five syzygy relations are not so well-structured like (1) and (2), but even more complicated than (3-5). However, it is still possible that the nine invariant Smith-Bao minimal integrity basis is indeed an irreducible function basis of a fourth order three-dimensional symmetric and traceless tensor, just like the four invariant Smith-Bao minimal integrity basis is indeed an irreducible function basis of a third order three-dimensional symmetric and traceless tensor, which was proved in [3].

In Section 4, we show that the eleven invariant function basis is indeed an irreducible function basis, by showing that each of these eleven invariants is not a function of the ten other invariants. This is the method proposed by Pennisi and Trovato [8]. However, we divide the proof into three parts. In Part A, we show that each of the five invariants I_2, I_4, I_6, I_{10} and J_2 , which form the irreducible function bases of the composition tensors \mathbf{D} and \mathbf{u} , is not a function of the ten other invariants. In Part B, we use Proposition 4.1 to show that each of K_4, L_4, L_4 and J_6 is not a function of the ten other invariants. In Part C, we use another tactics to show that each of the remaining two invariants M_6 and J_4 is not a function of the ten other invariants. Such tactics may be also instructive for the further research of irreducible function bases of higher order tensors.

References

- [1] J.P. Boehler, *Applications of tensor functions in solid mechanics*, Springer, New York, 1987.
- [2] J.P. Boehler, A.A. Kirillov, and E.T. Onat, “On the polynomial invariants of the elasticity tensor”, *Journal of elasticity* **34**(2) (1994) 97–110.
- [3] Y. Chen, L. Qi and W. Zou, “Irreducible function bases of isotropic invariants of third and fourth order symmetric tensors”, arXiv1712.02087v3, February 2018.
- [4] D. Henrion, J.B. Lasserre and J. Löfberg, “GloptiPoly 3: moments, optimization and semidefinite programming”, *Optimization Methods and Software* **24** (2009) 761-779.
- [5] M. Olive, “About Gordan’s algorithm for binary forms”. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **17**(6) (2017) 1407–1466.
- [6] M. Olive and N. Auffray, “Isotropic invariants of completely symmetric third-order tensor”, *J. Math. Phys.* **55** (2014) 092901.
- [7] M. Olive, B. Kolev and N. Auffray, “A minimal integrity basis for the elasticity tensor”, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **226** (2017) 1–31.

- [8] S. Pennisi and M. Trovato, “On the irreducibility of Professor G.F. Smith’s representations for isotropic functions”, *Int. J. Engng. Sci.* **25** (1987) 1059-1065.
- [9] A.C. Pipkin and R.S. Rivlin, “The formulation of constitutive equations in continuum physics. I” *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **4** (1959) 129-144.
- [10] T. Shioda, “On the graded ring of invariants of binary octavics”, *American Journal of Mathematics*, **89** (1967) 1022-1046.
- [11] G.F. Smith and G. Bao, “Isotropic invariants of traceless symmetric tensors of orders three and four”, *Int. J. Eng. Sci.* **35** (1997) 1457–1462.
- [12] G.F. Smith and R.S. Rivlin, “The strain-energy function for anisotropic elastic materials”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **88** (1958) 175-193.
- [13] R.S. Rivlin and J.L. Ericksen, “Stress-deformation relations for isotropic materials”, *J. Ratl. Mech. Anal.* **4** (1955) 323-425.
- [14] A.J.M. Spencer, “A note on the decomposition of tensors into traceless symmetric tensors”, *International Journal of Engineering Science*, **8**(6) (1970) 475-481.
- [15] J.F. Sturm, “SeDuMi version 1.1R3”, (2006). Available at <http://sedumi.ie.lehigh.edu>.
- [16] H. Weyl, *The classical groups: their invariants and representations*, Princeton university press, 2016.
- [17] Q.S. Zheng, “Theory of representations for tensor functions - A unified invariant approach to constitute equations”, *Appl. Mech. Rev.* **47** (1994) 545-587.
- [18] Q.S. Zheng, “Two-dimensional tensor function representations involving third-order tensors”, *Arch. Mech.* **48** (1996) 659–673.
- [19] Q.S. Zheng and J. Betten, “On the tensor function representations of 2nd-order and 4th-order tensors. Part I”, *ZAMM Z. angew. Math. Mech.* **75** (1995) 269–281.