Subject: tensor multiplication Posted by Daniel Luebbert on Wed, 17 May 2000 07:00:00 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message Hi, does anybody out there know an efficient and elegant way (i.e., without for-loops) to implement a tensor multiplication in IDL? What I mean is this: IDL can do a matrix multiplication, e.g. if I do c = indgen(3,4)d = indgen(4)then for help, c#d I get LONG ARRAY[3], and that's what I expect. But now, when I take one more dimension, like c = indgen(2,3,4)d = indgen(4)then help, c#d gives an error! (incompatible matrix dimensions...). What a would like to get is obviously an ARRAY[2,3]

Does anybody know how?

Daniel

Daniel Luebbert luebbert@slac.stanford.edu

Subject: Re: tensor multiplication
Posted by Daniel Luebbert on Thu, 18 May 2000 07:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi,

ok, thanks for the various answers. In case anybody should be interested in the future,

Subject: Re: tensor multiplication
Posted by Craig Markwardt on Thu, 18 May 2000 07:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Paul van Delst <pvandelst@ncep.noaa.gov> writes:

```
> Daniel Luebbert wrote:
>>
>> Hi,
>>
>> does anybody out there know an efficient and elegant way (i.e., without
>> for-loops)
>> to implement a tensor multiplication in IDL?
>>
>> But now, when I take one more dimension, like
        c = indgen(2,3,4)
>>
        d = indgen(4)
>>
>> then
        help, c#d
>> gives an error! (incompatible matrix dimensions...).
>> What a would like to get is obviously an
```

```
>> ARRAY[2,3]
>>
>> Does anybody know how?
>
> Great question! I have always only thought about 2D matrices, but why
> should nD be any different? Maybe when IDL says "matrix" is really means
> 2-D array?
>
> how about
>
> sz = size(c)
> e = INTARR( sz(1), sz(2) )
> FOR i = 0, sz(1) - 1 DO BEGIN
> tmp_e = REFORM( c[i,*,*] ) # d
> e[i,*] = TEMPORARY( tmp_e )
> ENDFOR
```

I would have done something similar. The point is that FOR loops are reasonable to use if you can do enough processing within one loop iteration. Here, "enough" is an entire matrix multiply.

Yorick, a language similar to IDL, has a cool tensor contraction operator which would fit the bill nicely, or at least make it look more compact.

- > p.s. Can someone explain to me the utility/need for having both the #
- > *and* ## operator? I understand their operation but why both?
- > Convenience? Performance?

I do occasionally use ## for matrix multiply. I use # more often to expand a vector into an array; there's been discussion here before on which is faster, # or rebin.

Subject: Re: tensor multiplication
Posted by Paul van Delst on Thu, 18 May 2000 07:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Daniel Luebbert wrote:

>

```
> Hi,
>
> does anybody out there know an efficient and elegant way (i.e., without
> for-loops)
  to implement a tensor multiplication in IDL?
> What I mean is this:
> IDL can do a matrix multiplication, e.g. if I do
       c = indgen(3,4)
       d = indgen(4)
>
> then for
       help, c#d
>
> I get
       LONG ARRAY[3],
>
  and that's what I expect.
 But now, when I take one more dimension, like
       c = indgen(2,3,4)
>
       d = indgen(4)
>
> then
       help, c#d
> gives an error! (incompatible matrix dimensions...).
> What a would like to get is obviously an
       ARRAY[2,3]
>
> Does anybody know how?
Great question! I have always only thought about 2D matrices, but why
should nD be any different? Maybe when IDL says "matrix" is really means
2-D array?
how about
```

```
sz = size(c)
e = INTARR( sz(1), sz(2) )
FOR i = 0, sz(1) - 1 DO BEGIN
tmp_e = REFORM( c[i,*,*] ) # d
e[i,*] = TEMPORARY( tmp_e )
ENDFOR
```

I know it is not a great solution (I haven't tested it, just typed it) but something like this should work. If you encapsulate it in it's own function, you would have a general tensor mult. method.

I'm sure the Gumley's, Fanning's, Markwardt's, and JD Smith's of the world will have more elegant answers.

paulv

p.s. Can someone explain to me the utility/need for having both the # *and* ## operator? I understand their operation but why both? Convenience? Performance?

Paul van Delst Ph: (301) 763-8000 x7274 CIMSS @ NOAA/NCEP Fax: (301) 763-8545

Rm.202, 5200 Auth Rd. Email: pvandelst@ncep.noaa.gov

Camp Springs MD 20746

Subject: Re: tensor multiplication

Posted by hcp on Fri, 19 May 2000 07:00:00 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article <onpuqjsoqp.fsf@cow.physics.wisc.edu>, Craig Markwardt <craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu> writes:

|> Yorick, a language similar to IDL, has a cool tensor contraction

|> operator which would fit the bill nicely, or at least make it look

> more compact.

That's similar as in "it's an interpreted language for scientific data handling and prototyping" not similar as in "the syntax is just about the same" As a language it looks very C-like -- not for the curly-bracket haters.

Yorick is much smaller than IDL and doesn't have geographic maps and sundry other things. However it is free software and the array syntax is very sophisticated, the contraction operator being in some ways one of the better features as Craig points out. It seems fairly stable and behaves well when you try to actually achieve something with it -- this isn't true of some similar packages.

Interested parties can point their browsers at

ftp://ftp-icf.llnl.gov/pub/Yorick/yorick-ad.html

Hugh

--

Hugh C. Pumphrey | Telephone 0131-650-6026 Department of Meteorology | FAX 0131-650-5780

The University of Edinburgh | Replace 0131 with +44-131 if outside U.K.

EDINBURGH EH9 3JZ, Scotland | Email hcp@met.ed.ac.uk OBDisclaimer: The views expressed herein are mine, not those of UofE.
