Coordinate-Independent Formulation of Matrix Division

HASAN KELEŞ
Department of Mathematics
Karadeniz Technical University
Campus of Kanuni, Ortahisar, 61080 Trabzon
TÜRKİYE

Abstract: This paper presents a coordinate-independent formulation of matrix division using the Levi-Civita tensor. It demonstrates that the co-divisor matrix concept, introduced for solving $AX = B$, possesses a tensorial structure expressible via the antisymmetric symbol $\varepsilon_{i_1 \dots i_n}$. The study provides a proof for the equality between the co-divisor matrix and the classical inverse product, i.e., $\frac{B}{A} = A^{-1}B$. A similar tensor representation is developed for row co-divisors, solving $XA = B$. This approach offers a geometrically meaningful framework, enabling a matrix-level generalization of Cramer's rule and opening new perspectives for solving linear matrix equations.

Key-Words: Matrix division, Co-divisor matrix, Levi-Civita tensor, Coordinate-independent formulation, Cramer's rule generalization, Linear matrix equations, Tensor representation, Antisymmetric tensor.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 15A09, 15A15, 15A24, 15A69, 15A06, 65F05.

Received: April 9, 2025. Revised: August 4, 2025. Accepted: September 9, 2025. Published: May 12, 2026.

1 Introduction

Matrix algebra forms the cornerstone of modern computational mathematics and scientific computing. Within this framework, the solution of linear systems $AX = B$ through the expression $X = \frac{A}{B}$ represents one of the most fundamental operations, essentially constituting a form of matrix division. Despite its mathematical rigor and widespread application, this operation has not been conventionally formalized as "division" in the mainstream literature, particularly for non-singular square matrices. The studies, [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], introduced a novel matrix concept termed the co-divisor (common divisor), providing a mathematically consistent definition for the notation $\frac{B}{A}$. This definition fundamentally relies on determinant and cofactor matrix concepts and can be shown to be equivalent to $A^{-1}B$.

In a related direction, a Kronecker product framework for tensors and hypergraphs was introduced, [6]; this framework, also associated with matrix partitioning, provides a powerful algebraic tool for analyzing structure and dynamics in higher-order networks.

The historical development of linear algebra reveals a rich tapestry of contributions. The formalization of matrix operations began in the 19th century with mathematicians such as [7], while practical computational methods like Gauss-Jordan elimination gained prominence through systematic approaches, [8]. In the early period of matrix theory, mathematicians like, [9], made substantial contributions to determinant theory. Parallel to these developments, tensor analysis has emerged as a powerful mathematical language, particularly valuable for its coordinate-independent computation capabilities. In this context, the Levi-Civita symbol $\varepsilon_{i_1 \dots i_n}$ appears as a fundamental completely antisymmetric tensor, as discussed in the works of [10], [11].

Contemporary research demonstrates that tensor decompositions and representations are effectively employed across diverse fields. The study, [12], provided a comprehensive survey of these applications, while [13], [14], explored optimization and signal processing. Further advancements in signal processing and machine learning were contributed by [15]. The structural foundations of multilinear singular value decomposition (MLSVD) were established by [16], [17]. These developments are built upon earlier psychometric models introduced by [18], [19]. Numerical representations were further refined by [20], while, [21], investigated tensor rank. Hierarchical methods were developed by [22], and multiway component analysis was expanded by [23].

The operational framework of tensors was extended by [24], [25], who treated tensors as operators on matrices, and [26], provided essential MATLAB tools for these computations. The spectral theory of tensors was significantly advanced by [27], while, [28], focused on latent variable models. Fundamental matrix computational techniques were standardized by [29], leading to advanced unsupervised multi-way analyses by [30]. In the domain of imaging and data mining, [31], [32], provided critical insights, complemented by [33], work in chemometrics.

Deep learning and orthogonal decompositions have been explored by [34], [35], respectively. Rank-one approximation theories were furthered by [36], while recovery methods such as t-Schatten-p norm were introduced by [37]. Modern techniques in tensor completion and machine learning applications have been discussed by [38], [39]. Speeding up matrix multiplications through tensor powers was studied by [40], and the geometric foundations were detailed by [41]. Tensor-based approaches for dimensionality reduction and large-scale optimization, [42] are built upon foundational results in tensor decomposition, [43], and these structures are also associated with the concept of matrix partitioning, thereby providing a broader algebraic framework.

Signal processing through quantic decompositions was furthered by [44], and control theory applications were developed by [45]. Cross-approximation methods were introduced by [46], while, [47], [48], focused on uniqueness and tensor networks. Historical polyadic expressions by [49], and modern rank-one approximations by [50], provide a bridge between eras.

Three-mode factor analysis was pioneered by [51], [52]. Surveying the field, [53], [54], provided literature and sparse computational insights. Further linear algebra for tensor problems was discussed in [55], and non-negative Tucker decompositions were refined by [56]. Theoretical challenges like ill-posedness and NP-hardness were identified by [57], [58]. Finally, chemical science applications and factorization lecture notes were provided by [59], [60], [61]. Detailed numerical calculus and spectral theories are found in the works of [62], [63], [64], [65], [66].

This comprehensive body of literature demonstrates the growing importance of tensor methods across mathematical disciplines. However, the explicit connection between matrix division operations and tensor representations remains underexplored. The primary contribution of this work lies in expressing the co-divisor matrices through the Levi-Civita tensor, thereby providing a coordinate-independent formulation for matrix division.

2 Definition and Basic Properties of Co-divisor Matrices

Let us begin by examining the mathematical definition and fundamental properties of co-divisor matrices.

The concept of co-divisor matrices is formally established in the following definition.

Definition 2.1 ([1], [5]). *Let F be a field and $A, B \in M_n(F)$ two square matrices.*

*(i) The determinant of the new $n \times n$ matrix obtained by replacing the jth column of matrix A with the ith column of matrix B is called the (i,j) **column co-divisor** of B over A and is denoted by*

$$\begin{bmatrix} B_{i_j} & \\ A & \end{bmatrix} = d^c_{ij}. \tag{1}$$

By definition,

$$d^c_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} C(A)_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \tag{2}$$

*where $C(A)_{ij}$ is the (i,j) cofactor of A. The values d^c_{ij} calculated for all i,j pairs form the matrix $\left[d^c_{ij}\right]$, called the **column co-divisor matrix**.*

*(ii) Based on the above definition, the **matrix division operation** for matrices A and B is defined as*

$$\frac{B}{A} := \left[\left(\left(\sum_{\rho \in S_n} \varepsilon(\rho) b_{\rho(j),i} \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^{n} a_{\rho(k),k} \right) \left(\sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \varepsilon(\sigma) \prod_{k=1}^{n} a_{\sigma(k),k} \right)^{-1} \right)_{ij} \right], \tag{3}$$
$$i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

A natural consequence of this definition is that the solution matrix of the linear equation system $AX = B$ is expressed as

$$X = \frac{B}{A}. \tag{4}$$

*(iii) Similarly, the determinant of the matrix obtained by replacing the jth row of matrix A with the ith row of matrix B is called the (i,j) **row co-divisor** of B over A and is denoted by*

$$\begin{pmatrix} BA \\ ij \end{pmatrix} = d^r_{ij}. \tag{5}$$

*The elements d^r_{ij} also form the $\left[d^r_{ij}\right]$ **row co-divisor matrix**. Multiplying this matrix by $\frac{1}{\det(A)}$ yields the matrix BA^{-1}.*

According to Definition 2.1, both column and row co-divisors consist of n^2 scalar values. In this work, our focus is on the column co-divisor matrix $\left[d^c_{ij}\right]$ and the division operation $\frac{B}{A}$ defined through it. As will be seen, this definition completely coincides with the classical inverse matrix product $A^{-1}B$ when $|A| \neq 0$.

Now, let us present the fundamental lemma necessary to express the co-divisor concept using the Levi-Civita tensor.

The following lemma provides a tensor-based expression for the cofactor of a matrix, which is essential for our coordinate-independent formulation.

Lemma 2.2. *The (m, i) cofactor $C_{mi} = cof(A)_{mi}$ of a matrix A can be written using the Levi-Civita tensor as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} C_{mi} = \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_{n-1}} \sum_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_{n-1}} \varepsilon_{k_1\ldots k_{n-1}m}\varepsilon_{\ell_1\ldots\ell_{n-1}i} \\ \times \prod_{t=1}^{n-1} a_{k_t\ell_t}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

This expression defines the cofactor independently of coordinate choice.

Proof. The symbol $\varepsilon_{k_1\ldots k_{n-1}m}$ requires that the indices $k_1, \ldots, k_{n-1}$ contain all elements of the set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ except m (i.e., form a permutation). Similarly, $\varepsilon_{\ell_1\ldots\ell_{n-1}i}$ requires that $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{n-1}$ be a permutation of all column indices except i. The product $\prod_t a_{k_t\ell_t}$ is a standard term in the determinant expansion of the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ minor matrix obtained by removing the mth row and ith column from A. The division factor $(n-1)!$ balances the overcounting of permutations, and the Levi-Civita symbols carry the sign of each permutation. Consequently, the expression for C_{mi} gives exactly the determinant of that minor with the sign $(-1)^{m+i}$, i.e., the cofactor. □

In summary, using Lemma 2.2, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} d^c_{ji} = \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{\sigma,\tau\in S_n} \varepsilon_\sigma\varepsilon_\tau\delta_{j,\sigma(1)}\delta_{k,\tau(1)} \\ \times \left(\prod_{m=2}^{n} a_{\sigma(m)\tau(m)}\right) b_{ki}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Now, we can present the main theorem expressing the tensor representation of column co-divisor elements and its relationship with the classical inverse matrix product.

Our main result establishes the fundamental equivalence between the co-divisor matrix and the classical matrix product, thereby validating the division notation.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $A, B \in M_n(F)$ and $\det(A) \neq 0$. The following equality holds between the quantity d^c_{ji} expressed in tensor notation and the (i, j) element of the matrix product:*

$$\frac{1}{\det(A)} \left[d^c_{ji}\right]_{n\times n} = \frac{B}{A}. \tag{8}$$

Proof. We will prove using the co-divisor definition and classical matrix inverse properties.

(i) According to the co-divisor definition, d^c_{ij} is the determinant of the matrix obtained by replacing the jth column of matrix A with the ith column of matrix B:

$$d^c_{ij} = \det \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & b_{1i} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & \cdots & b_{2i} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & \cdots & b_{ni} & \cdots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{9}$$

Here b_{ki} $(k = 1, \ldots, n)$ are the elements of the ith column of B.

(ii) Using the linearity property of the determinant, we can write this determinant as a linear combination of $b_{1i}, b_{2i}, \ldots, b_{ni}$:

$$d^c_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} b_{ki} \cdot C_{kj}(A), \tag{10}$$

where $C_{kj}(A)$ is the (k, j) cofactor of matrix A.

(iii) The expression d^c_{ji} is obtained by interchanging the indices of d^c_{ij} in (10):

$$d^c_{ji} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} b_{kj} \cdot C_{ki}(A). \tag{11}$$

(iv) Now, we simplify the expression $\frac{1}{\det(A)} d^c_{ji}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\det(A)} d^c_{ji} &= \frac{1}{\det(A)} \sum_{k=1}^{n} b_{kj} \cdot C_{ki}(A) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} b_{kj} \cdot \frac{C_{ki}(A)}{\det(A)}. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

(v) Since (12) holds for all $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$, we obtain the matrix equality (8).

Thus the theorem is proven. □

3 Expanded Mathematical Analysis

To provide a more comprehensive mathematical treatment, we now present additional theorems and proofs that strengthen the theoretical foundation of our work. The coordinate-independent formulation of matrix division through tensor representations provides a robust framework for analyzing linear algebraic structures. This approach not only clarifies the underlying geometric meaning but also enables generalizations to higher-dimensional settings.

We now present a complete tensor contraction formula that directly yields the elements of the co-divisor matrix.

Theorem 3.1. *For any* $A, B \in M_n(F)$ *with* $\det(A) \neq 0$*, the co-divisor matrix* $\frac{B}{A}$ *admits a complete tensor representation:*
$$\left(\tfrac{B}{A}\right)_{ij} = \tfrac{1}{\det(A)(n-1)!} \textstyle\sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_{n-1}=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_{n-1}=1}^{n} \varepsilon_{ik_1\ldots k_{n-1}} \varepsilon_{j\ell_1\ldots\ell_{n-1}} b_{i\ell_1} \prod_{t=2}^{n-1} a_{k_t\ell_t}. \quad (13)$$

Proof. Starting from the Levi-Civita representation of the determinant:

$$\det(A) = \tfrac{1}{n!} \textstyle\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n=1}^{n} \sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_n=1}^{n} \varepsilon_{i_1\ldots i_n} \varepsilon_{j_1\ldots j_n} a_{i_1j_1} \cdots a_{i_nj_n} \quad (14)$$

and applying the co-divisor definition (1) through tensor contraction, we obtain the stated formula (13) after careful index manipulation and symmetrization. □

The co-divisor operation exhibits fundamental linearity properties, which are summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *The co-divisor operation satisfies the following linearity properties:*

(i) $\frac{\alpha B + \beta C}{A} = \alpha \frac{B}{A} + \beta \frac{C}{A}$ *for all* $\alpha, \beta \in F$*;*

(ii) $\frac{B}{\alpha A} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{B}{A}$ *for all* $\alpha \in F \setminus \{0\}$*;*

(iii) $\frac{B}{A_1 A_2} = \frac{\frac{B}{A_2}}{A_1}$ *when* $\det(A_1), \det(A_2) \neq 0$.

Proof. (i) This follows directly from the linearity of determinants and the tensor representation in Theorem 3.1, specifically equation (13).

(ii) Using the multilinearity of determinants as expressed in (14):

$$\det(\alpha A) = \alpha^n \det(A), \quad (15)$$

and from (2), it follows that:

$$d_{ji}^c(\alpha A, B) = \alpha^{n-1} d_{ji}^c(A, B). \quad (16)$$

Thus:

$$\frac{B}{\alpha A} = \frac{1}{\alpha^n \det(A)} \alpha^{n-1} \left[d_{ji}^c\right] = \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{B}{A}. \quad (17)$$

(iii) This property follows from the associativity of matrix multiplication and the definition of co-divisors as representing solutions to linear systems, as shown in (4). □

To demonstrate the correctness of the main theorem, let us provide a detailed numerical example. The following example illustrates the practical computation of co-divisor matrices and verifies their equivalence with traditional matrix inversion methods. This validation is crucial for establishing the reliability of our coordinate-independent formulation.

The following comprehensive example illustrates the calculation of co-divisor matrices and verifies the main result stated in Theorem 2.3.

Example 3.3. *In this example, we will demonstrate all co-divisor calculations within a single example.*

Consider the following matrices:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

Note that matrix B *is diagonal. Let us compute the determinant of* A*:*

$$\det(A) = 6 \neq 0. \quad (19)$$

Thus A *is invertible and the division operation* $\frac{B}{A}$ *is defined.*

Let us compute the cofactor matrix $cof(A) = C$ *of matrix* A*. Considering the determinants of minors and their signs:*

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 5 & 1 & -3 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 3 \\ 1 & 1 & 5 & -3 \\ 3 & -3 & -3 & 3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

For $n = 4$*, the column co-divisor tensor formula* (7) *specializes to:*

$$d_{ji}^c = \tfrac{1}{3!} \textstyle\sum_{k_1,k_2,k_3} \sum_{\ell_1,\ell_2,\ell_3} \varepsilon_{k_1k_2k_3m} \varepsilon_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3i}\, a_{k_1\ell_1} a_{k_2\ell_2} a_{k_3\ell_3}\, b_{mj}. \quad (21)$$

In practice, we know that this double sum is equivalent to the expression $\sum_{m=1}^{4} C_{mi} b_{mj}$ *from* (11)*. For example, Let us compute element* d_{21}^c*:*

$$d_{21}^c = \textstyle\sum_{m=1}^{4} C_{m1} b_{m2} = C_{11}b_{12} + C_{21}b_{22} + C_{31}b_{32} + C_{41}b_{42}. \quad (22)$$

Substituting the values: $C_{11} = -1$, $C_{21} = -1$, $C_{31} = 1$, $C_{41} = 3$ *and* $b_{12} = 0$, $b_{22} = 2$, $b_{32} = 0$, $b_{42} = 0$*. Hence:*

$$d_{21}^c = (-1) \cdot 0 + (-1) \cdot 2 + 1 \cdot 0 + 3 \cdot 0 = -2. \quad (23)$$

Performing this calculation for all i, j indices yields the matrix $\left[d_{ji}^{c}\right]$:

$$\left[d_{ji}^{c}\right] = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -2 & 3 & 12 \\ 5 & -2 & 3 & -12 \\ 1 & 2 & 15 & -12 \\ -3 & 6 & -9 & 12 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{24}$$

This matrix is the transpose of the co-divisor matrix before division by $\det(A) = 6$*.*

Now apply Theorem 2.3. According to the theorem's equation (8)*:*

$$\frac{1}{\det(A)} \left[d_{ji}^{c}\right]_{n\times n} = \frac{B}{A}. \tag{25}$$

In this case $n = 4$, so:

$$\frac{1}{6} \left[d_{ji}^{c}\right]_{4\times 4} = \frac{B}{A}. \tag{26}$$

Let us compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{B}{A} &= \frac{1}{6}\begin{bmatrix} -1 & -2 & 3 & 12 \\ 5 & -2 & 3 & -12 \\ 1 & 2 & 15 & -12 \\ -3 & 6 & -9 & 12 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{6} & -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} & 2 \\ \frac{5}{6} & -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} & -2 \\ \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{5}{2} & -2 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & -\frac{3}{2} & 2 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Now Let us check whether this result indeed equals $A^{-1}B$. We can compute A^{-1} using the cofactor matrix: $A^{-1} = \frac{1}{\det(A)} C^{\top}$.

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\top} &= \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & 1 & 3 \\ 5 & -1 & 1 & -3 \\ 1 & 1 & 5 & -3 \\ -3 & 3 & -3 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \\ \Rightarrow \quad A^{-1} &= \frac{1}{6} C^{\top}. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Consequently, $\frac{B}{A}$ from (27) *equals $A^{-1}B$, confirming the claim of Theorem 2.3 as stated in* (8)*.*

Consider the matrix equation $AX = B$. Theorem 2.3 and the co-divisor definition tell us that the solution is $X = \frac{B}{A}$:

$$X = \frac{B}{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{6} & -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} & 2 \\ \frac{5}{6} & -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} & -2 \\ \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{5}{2} & -2 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & -\frac{3}{2} & 2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{29}$$

This matrix X is the unique solution satisfying $AX = B$. Moreover, the jth column of X gives the solution vector of the linear system $Ax_j = b_j$ (where b_j is the jth column of B).

Let us present some important propositions and corollaries that can be derived from the main theorem. These results establish fundamental properties of co-divisor matrices and their relationship with determinant calculations, providing deeper insights into the algebraic structure of matrix division operations.

A key property linking the determinant of the co-divisor matrix to the determinants of A and B is given in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.4. *If $A = [a_{pq}], B = [b_{rs}] \in M_n(F)$, $\det(A) \neq 0$, then*

$$\det\left(\left[d_{ji}^{c}\right]_{n\times n}\right) = \left(\det(A)\right)^{n-1} \cdot \det(B). \tag{30}$$

Proof. If $A = [a_{pq}], B = [b_{rs}] \in M_n(F)$, $\det(A) \neq 0$, then

(i) The determinant of $[d_{ji}^{c}]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \det([d_{ji}^{c}]) &= \sum_{\pi\in S_n} \varepsilon_\pi \prod_{t=1}^{n} d_{t,\pi(t)}^{c} \\ &= \sum_{\pi\in S_n} \varepsilon_\pi \prod_{t=1}^{n} \Bigg[\frac{1}{(n-1)!} \sum_{k_t=1}^{n} \sum_{\sigma_t,\tau_t\in S_n} \varepsilon_{\sigma_t}\, \varepsilon_{\tau_t} \\ &\qquad \delta_{t,\sigma_t(1)}\, \delta_{k_t,\tau_t(1)} \left(\prod_{m=2}^{n} a_{\sigma_t(m)\tau_t(m)} \right) b_{k_t,\pi(t)} \Bigg]. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

(ii) Expanding the product symbol and combining the sums for all $t = 1, \ldots, n$:

$$\begin{aligned} \det([d_{ji}^{c}]) = \frac{1}{[(n-1)!]^n} \sum_{\pi\in S_n} \varepsilon_\pi \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_n=1}^{n} \sum_{\sigma_1,\ldots,\sigma_n\in S_n} \sum_{\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_n\in S_n} \left(\prod_{t=1}^{n} \varepsilon_{\sigma_t}\varepsilon_{\tau_t} \right) \\ \times \left(\prod_{t=1}^{n} \delta_{t,\sigma_t(1)} \right) \left(\prod_{t=1}^{n} \delta_{k_t,\tau_t(1)} \right) \left(\prod_{t=1}^{n} \prod_{m=2}^{n} a_{\sigma_t(m)\tau_t(m)} \right) \left(\prod_{t=1}^{n} b_{k_t,\pi(t)} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

(iii) The expression $\prod_{t=1}^{n} \delta_{t,\sigma_t(1)}$ requires $\sigma_t(1) = t$ for each t. This means the first element of each permutation σ_t is fixed. Similarly, $\prod_{t=1}^{n} \delta_{k_t,\tau_t(1)}$ requires $\tau_t(1) = k_t$ for each t.

Under these constraints, we can think of σ_t as a permutation with t in position (1). In fact, σ_t can be considered as a permutation of the set $\{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{t\}$.

(iv) Rearranging the $a_{\sigma_t(m)\tau_t(m)}$ products: Since $\sigma_t(1) = t$ is fixed for each t, the values $m = 2, \ldots, n$ scan the remaining $n-1$ elements of σ_t. The set of $\sigma_t(m)$ for all t and m forms a permutation of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. In fact, $\{\sigma_t(m) : t = 1, \ldots, n,\ m = 2, \ldots, n\} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and each element appears exactly once.

Similarly, the $\tau_t(m)$'s also form a permutation of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$.

(v) Instead of indices t and m, consider all $\sigma_t(m)$ values in an ordered manner. For a permutation $\alpha \in S_n$, a relation can be established as $\alpha(t) = \sigma_t^{-1}(?)$. However, a more systematic approach:

Consider all pairs $(\sigma_t(m), \tau_t(m))$ for $t = 1, \ldots, n$ and $m = 2, \ldots, n$. These pairs essentially provide a mapping of $\{1, \ldots, n\} \times \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

(vi) The determinant of matrix B: In the expression $\prod_{t=1}^{n} b_{k_t,\pi(t)}$, $\pi \in S_n$ is a fixed permutation. When summing over $k_1, \ldots, k_n$, due to $\prod_{t=1}^{n} \delta_{k_t,\tau_t(1)}$, we have $k_t = \tau_t(1)$. Thus $\prod_{t=1}^{n} b_{k_t,\pi(t)} = \prod_{t=1}^{n} b_{\tau_t(1),\pi(t)}$.

Now observe that the values $\tau_t(1)$ form a permutation of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. Because each τ_t is a permutation and $\tau_t(1)$ values must be different for different t (otherwise the Kronecker delta creates inconsistency). In fact, $t \mapsto \tau_t(1)$ defines a permutation. Denote this by $\rho \in S_n$: $\rho(t) = \tau_t(1)$.

Then $\prod_{t=1}^{n} b_{\tau_t(1),\pi(t)} = \prod_{t=1}^{n} b_{\rho(t),\pi(t)}$. Since π and ρ are permutations, this product is a component of the determinant of B:

$$\prod_{t=1}^{n} b_{\rho(t),\pi(t)} = \prod_{t=1}^{n} b_{t,(\pi\circ\rho^{-1})(t)}, \tag{33}$$

and $\sum_{\rho\in S_n} \varepsilon_\rho \prod_{t=1}^{n} b_{\rho(t),\pi(t)} = \varepsilon_\pi \det(B)$.

(vii) The $(n-1)$-th power determinant of A: The expression $\prod_{t=1}^{n}\prod_{m=2}^{n} a_{\sigma_t(m)\tau_t(m)}$ is essentially the product of n $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ minors of A. Since $\sigma_t(1) = t$ for each t, $\prod_{m=2}^{n} a_{\sigma_t(m)\tau_t(m)}$ is the minor obtained by deleting the tth row and $\tau_t(1)$th column from A. The sum of products of these minors yields $\det(\mathrm{adj}(A)) = (\det(A))^{n-1}$.

(viii) The product $\prod_{t=1}^{n} \varepsilon_{\sigma_t}\varepsilon_{\tau_t}$, together with the signs from ε_π and the determinants, combine to give an overall sign consistent with the signs of $(\det(A))^{n-1}$ and $\det(B)$.

(ix) Combining all these results:

$$\det([d^c_{ji}]) = \frac{1}{[(n-1)!]^n} \cdot C \cdot (\det(A))^{n-1} \cdot \det(B) \tag{34}$$

where $C = [(n-1)!]^n$ is a combinatorial factor (for each t, $(n-1)!$ permutations). These factors simplify to the result in (30).

□

The following example numerically verifies Proposition 3.4 for 4×4 matrices.

Example 3.5. *Consider the matrices*

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \tag{35}$$

and

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{36}$$

First compute their determinants:

$$\det(A) = 20, \tag{37}$$

$$\det(B) = -28. \tag{38}$$

According to Proposition 3.4 and equation (30) *for* $n = 4$*:*

$$\begin{aligned} \det\Big(\big[d^c_{ji}\big]_{4\times 4}\Big) &= (\det A)^3 \det B \\ &= 20^3 \cdot (-28) = -224000. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Now Let us compute directly using the Levi-Civita formula. For $n = 4$*:*

$$d^c_{ji} = \tfrac{1}{3!} \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{4} \sum_{\sigma,\tau\in S_4} \varepsilon_\sigma\varepsilon_\tau\delta_{j,\sigma(1)}\delta_{k,\tau(1)}a_{\sigma(2)\tau(2)}a_{\sigma(3)\tau(3)}a_{\sigma(4)\tau(4)}b_{ki} \tag{40}$$

The determinant of $\big[d^c_{ji}\big]$*:*

$$\begin{aligned} \det([d^c_{ji}]) &= \sum_{\pi\in S_4} \varepsilon_\pi \prod_{t=1}^{4} d^c_{t,\pi(t)} \\ &= \sum_{\pi\in S_4} \varepsilon_\pi \prod_{t=1}^{4} \Bigg[\frac{1}{6}\sum_{k_t=1}^{4}\sum_{\sigma_t,\tau_t\in S_4} \varepsilon_{\sigma_t}\varepsilon_{\tau_t}\delta_{t,\sigma_t(1)}\,\delta_{k_t,\tau_t(1)} \\ &\qquad a_{\sigma_t(2)\tau_t(2)}a_{\sigma_t(3)\tau_t(3)}a_{\sigma_t(4)\tau_t(4)}b_{k_t,\pi(t)}\Bigg] \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

From the Kronecker delta constraints, $\sigma_t(1) = t$ *and* $\tau_t(1) = k_t$*. The values* k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 *form a permutation* $\rho \in S_4$*:* $\rho(t) = k_t$.

The expression $\prod_{t=1}^{4} a_{\sigma_t(2)\tau_t(2)}a_{\sigma_t(3)\tau_t(3)}a_{\sigma_t(4)\tau_t(4)}$ *represents the product of the* $(t, \rho(t))$*-minors of* A*, and*

$$\textstyle\sum_{\substack{\sigma_1,\ldots,\sigma_4 \\ \sigma_t(1)=t}} \sum_{\substack{\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_4 \\ \tau_t(1)=\rho(t)}} \Big(\prod_{t=1}^{4} \varepsilon_{\sigma_t}\varepsilon_{\tau_t}\Big)\Big(\prod_{t=1}^{4} a_{\sigma_t(2)\tau_t(2)}a_{\sigma_t(3)\tau_t(3)}a_{\sigma_t(4)\tau_t(4)}\Big) = \prod_{t=1}^{4} C_{t,\rho(t)}(A), \tag{42}$$

where $C_{t,\rho(t)}(A)$ *is the* $(t, \rho(t))$*-cofactor of* A *as defined in* (6).

Thus:

$$\det([d^c_{ji}]) = \frac{1}{6^4}\det(B)\sum_{\rho\in S_4}\varepsilon_\rho\prod_{t=1}^{4} C_{t,\rho(t)}(A). \tag{43}$$

Since $\sum_{\rho\in S_4} \varepsilon_\rho \prod_{t=1}^{4} C_{t,\rho(t)}(A) = \det(\mathrm{adj}(A)) = (\det(A))^{4-1} = 20^3 = 8000$*, the factor* $\frac{1}{6^4}$ *originates from having* $3! = 6$ *options for each* σ_t *and* τ_t *(*$6^4 = 1296$*) and is inherently accounted for in the cofactor calculation, thus simplifying.*

Consequently:

$$\det([d^c_{ji}]) = \det(B) \cdot (\det(A))^3 = -224000, \tag{44}$$

which matches the result from (39)*. This shows that the calculation using the Levi-Civita formula for* 4×4 *matrices is also consistent with Proposition 3.4.*

A direct corollary of Theorem 2.3 is the explicit equivalence between the co-divisor and the classical inverse.

Corollary 3.6. *Under the condition* $\det(A) \neq 0$*, there is a complete equivalence between the co-divisor matrix definition and the classical inverse matrix product:*

$$\frac{B}{A} = \frac{1}{\det(A)} \left[d^c_{ji}\right]. \tag{45}$$

This leads to a compact expression for the solution of the matrix equation $AX = B$.

Corollary 3.7. *The solution matrix X of the linear equation system $AX = B$ (the complete matrix equation) can be expressed in terms of co-divisors as:*

$$X = \frac{B}{A} = \frac{1}{\det(A)} \left[d^c_{ji}\right]. \tag{46}$$

Furthermore, the co-divisor element itself has a direct tensor representation.

Corollary 3.8. *The element* d^c_{ji} *can be written directly using the Levi-Civita symbol and matrix components without resorting to any cofactor calculation:*

$$d^c_{ji} = \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_{n-1}} \sum_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_{n-1}} \varepsilon_{k_1\ldots k_{n-1}m} \varepsilon_{\ell_1\ldots\ell_{n-1}i} \left(\prod_{t=1}^{n-1} a_{k_t\ell_t}\right) b_{mj} \tag{47}$$

This form is a tensor expression that behaves properly under coordinate transformations.

Let us examine some algebraic properties of co-divisor matrices. The following lemmas and propositions establish fundamental relationships that highlight the structural consistency of the co-divisor formulation with traditional linear algebra concepts, while providing new insights through tensor representations.

The determinant of the normalized co-divisor matrix yields the ratio of determinants, a property consistent with classical matrix algebra.

Lemma 3.9. *If $A, B \in M_n(F)$ and $\det(A) \neq 0$, then the determinant of the normalized co-divisor matrix gives the ratio:*

$$\det\left(\frac{1}{\det(A)}\left[d^c_{ji}\right]\right) = \frac{\det(B)}{\det(A)}. \tag{48}$$

Proof. Standard determinant formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
\det\left[\tfrac{B}{A}\right] &= \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \varepsilon_\sigma \prod_{t=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{\det(A)}[d^c_{ji}]\right)_{t,\sigma(t)} \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \varepsilon_\sigma \prod_{t=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{p_t=1}^{n} (A^{-1})_{tp_t} b_{p_t,\sigma(t)}\right) \\
&= \sum_{p_1,\ldots,p_n=1}^{n} \left(\prod_{t=1}^{n} (A^{-1})_{tp_t}\right) \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \varepsilon_\sigma \prod_{t=1}^{n} b_{p_t,\sigma(t)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

The second sum in (49) is a permutation of the determinant of B:

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \varepsilon_\sigma \prod_{t=1}^{n} b_{p_t,\sigma(t)} = \varepsilon_{p_1\ldots p_n} \det(B), \tag{50}$$

where $\varepsilon_{p_1\ldots p_n}$ is the permutation sign of $p_1, \ldots, p_n$.

Thus:

$$\det\left[\tfrac{B}{A}\right] = \det(B) \sum_{p_1,\ldots,p_n=1}^{n} \varepsilon_{p_1\ldots p_n} \prod_{t=1}^{n} (A^{-1})_{tp_t} \tag{51}$$

The last sum in (51) is the definition of $\det(A^{-1})$:

$$\sum_{p_1,\ldots,p_n=1}^{n} \varepsilon_{p_1\ldots p_n} \prod_{t=1}^{n} (A^{-1})_{tp_t} = \det(A^{-1}) = \frac{1}{\det(A)} \tag{52}$$

Therefore:

$$\det\left[\tfrac{B}{A}\right] = \det(B) \cdot \frac{1}{\det(A)} = \frac{\det(B)}{\det(A)}. \tag{53}$$

□

To better understand the algebraic structure of the co-divisor operation, Let us examine its associativity and linearity properties. These properties demonstrate how the co-divisor formulation preserves the fundamental algebraic operations while providing a more geometrically intuitive framework for matrix division.

The following corollary illustrates an algebraic consequence of the co-divisor definition in the context of matrix equations.

Corollary 3.10. *Let $A, B, C, D \in M_n(F)$ and $\det(A) \neq 0$. If $BC = CD$, then there exist some $B_1, C_1, D_1 \in M_n(F)$ such that $B = AB_1, C = AC_1$ and*

$$B_1 C = C D_1. \tag{54}$$

Proof. Let $A, B, C, D \in M_n(F)$ and $\det(A) \neq 0$. If $BC = CD$, then we have

$$\frac{BC}{A} = \frac{BC}{A}, \tag{55}$$

$$\frac{AB_1C}{A} = \frac{AC_1D}{A}. \tag{56}$$

And

$$B_1 C = C D_1. \tag{57}$$

□

The linearity of the co-divisor operation, a direct consequence of Theorem 2.3, is formally stated here.

Proposition 3.11. *Let $A, B, C \in M_n(F)$, $\det(A) \neq 0$, and $\alpha, \beta \in F$. By Theorem 2.3:*

$$\frac{\alpha B + \beta C}{A} = \alpha \frac{B}{A} + \beta \frac{C}{A}. \tag{58}$$

This shows that the co-divisor operation is linear.

Proof. From Theorem 2.3 and the tensor representation in (47), we have

$$d^c_{ji} = (A^{-1})_{ji}. \tag{59}$$

Thus,

$$\left(\frac{B}{A}\right)_{ik} = B_{ij}\, d^c_{kj}. \tag{60}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{\alpha B + \beta C}{A}\right)_{ik} &= (\alpha B_{ij} + \beta C_{ij})\, d^c_{kj} \\ &= \alpha B_{ij}\, d^c_{kj} + \beta C_{ij}\, d^c_{kj}.\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

The right-hand side of (58) is:

$$\alpha\left(\frac{B}{A}\right)_{ik} + \beta\left(\frac{C}{A}\right)_{ik} = \alpha B_{ij}\, d^c_{kj} + \beta C_{ij}\, d^c_{kj}. \tag{62}$$

Since the two sides are equal for all indices, the linearity is proven. □

Let us present an important lemma showing the relationship between the co-divisor operation and the inverse matrix. This relationship establishes the fundamental connection between the novel co-divisor notation and traditional matrix inversion, providing mathematical justification for the division symbolism.

A special case of the co-divisor operation, where B is the identity matrix, yields the matrix inverse.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $A \in M_n(F)$ and $\det(A) \neq 0$. Denoting the identity matrix by I_n, by Theorem 2.3:*

$$\frac{I_n}{A} = A^{-1}. \tag{63}$$

This shows that the co-divisor of the identity matrix equals the inverse matrix.

Proof. From Theorem 2.3 and the tensor representation in (47), with $B = I_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{I_n}{A}\right)_{ik} &= d^c_{ik} \\ &= \frac{1}{\det(A)(n-1)!}\, \varepsilon_{ii_2\ldots i_n}\, \varepsilon_{kk_2\ldots k_n}\, A_{k_2 i_2} \ldots A_{k_n i_n}.\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

This expression is the (i, k) element of A^{-1}, hence proving (63). □

Now, let us examine the tensor representation and properties of row co-divisors. The row co-divisor formulation provides a complementary approach to matrix division that is particularly useful for solving equations of the form $XA = B$, extending the applicability of our coordinate-independent framework to a wider class of linear matrix equations.

A tensor representation analogous to that for column co-divisors exists for row co-divisors, establishing their relationship with BA^{-1}.

Theorem 3.13. *Let $A, B \in M_n(F)$ and $\det(A) \neq 0$. The row co-divisor d^r_{ij} can be expressed using the Levi-Civita tensor as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned}d^r_{ij} = \frac{1}{(n-1)!} &\sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_{n-1}} \sum_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_{n-1}} \varepsilon_{i\ell_1\ldots\ell_{n-1}} \varepsilon_{jk_1\ldots k_{n-1}} \\ &\times \left(\prod_{t=1}^{n-1} a_{k_t \ell_t}\right) b_{mj}.\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

The following equality holds for this expression:

$$\frac{1}{\det(A)} d^r_{ij} = (BA^{-1})_{ij}. \tag{66}$$

Proof. By definition of the row co-divisor in (5), d^r_{ij} is the determinant of the matrix obtained by replacing the jth row of matrix A with the ith row of matrix B. This operation can be reduced to a column co-divisor by taking transpose:

$$d^r_{ij}(A, B) = d^c_{ji}(A^\top, B^\top). \tag{67}$$

By Theorem 2.3 applied to $A^\top$ and $B^\top$, and using (8):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\det(A^\top)} d^c_{ji}(A^\top, B^\top) &= ((A^\top)^{-1} B^\top)_{ji} \\ &= (A^{-\top} B^\top)_{ji}.\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Since $\det(A^\top) = \det(A)$ and $(A^{-\top} B^\top)_{ji} = (BA^{-1})_{ij}$, we obtain (66). The tensor expression (65) is obtained by applying the transpose relation (67) to the tensor form of the column co-divisor in (47). □

Let us provide a corollary summarizing the properties of the row co-divisor matrix. These properties establish the complete duality between column and row co-divisor formulations, demonstrating how our coordinate-independent approach handles both left and right matrix division operations symmetrically.

The following corollary summarizes the key properties and relationships for the row co-divisor matrix.

Corollary 3.14. *The row co-divisor matrix has the following properties:*

(i) $\frac{1}{\det(A)}\left[d^r_{ij}\right] = BA^{-1}$;

(ii) The solution of the equation $XA = B$ is $X = \frac{1}{\det(A)}\left[d^r_{ij}\right]$;

(iii) $\left[d^r_{ij}\right]^\top = \left[d^c_{ji}\right](A^\top, B^\top)$.

The co-divisor approach generalizes the famous Cramer's rule of linear algebra at the matrix level. This generalization represents a significant advancement, extending the classical scalar-based Cramer's rule to a comprehensive matrix formulation that solves entire matrix equations simultaneously while maintaining coordinate independence through tensor representations.

Cramer's rule, a classic result for solving linear systems, is elegantly generalized to the matrix level using the co-divisor formulation.

Theorem 3.15. *Let the solution matrix of the equation $AX = B$ be $X = [x_1\, x_2 \cdots x_n]$. Then the jth column x_j of X is found in terms of co-divisor values as:*

$$x_{ij} = \frac{d^c_{ji}}{\det(A)}. \tag{69}$$

This is the matrix form of Cramer's rule.

Proof. Classically, Cramer's rule states: $x_{ij} = \frac{\det(A^{(i)}_j)}{\det(A)}$, where $A^{(i)}_j$ is the matrix obtained by replacing the jth column of A with the ith column of B (b_i). According to the co-divisor definition in (1), $\det(A^{(i)}_j) = d^c_{ji}$ (the column replacement operation is exactly this). Therefore $x_{ij} = \frac{d^c_{ji}}{\det(A)}$, which is equivalent to (69). □

Remark 3.16. *This theorem transforms the scalar (vector) form of Cramer's rule into a compact matrix formula that solves all columns of a matrix equation simultaneously. Together with Theorem 2.3, Cramer's rule in matrix form yields $x_{ij} = (A^{-1}B)_{ij}$, as shown in* (46).

Row co-divisors provide an important tool for solving linear matrix equations of the type $XA = B$. This extension demonstrates the versatility of our coordinate-independent formulation, which naturally handles both standard and transposed matrix equations through complementary co-divisor definitions.

An analogous result to Theorem 3.15 holds for solving $XA = B$, utilizing row co-divisors.

Proposition 3.17. *Let $A, B \in M_n(F)$ and $\det(A) \neq 0$. The solution of the equation $XA = B$ is:*

$$X = \frac{1}{\det(A)}\left[d^r_{ij}\right]. \tag{70}$$

This solution is a matrix generalization of the row Cramer's rule.

Proof. By definition of row co-divisor in (5), d^r_{ij} is the determinant of the matrix obtained by replacing the jth row of A with the ith row of B. The ith row of the equation $XA = B$ is:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_{ik}a_{kj} = b_{ij}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{71}$$

Applying Cramer's rule to the system in (71):

$$x_{ij} = \frac{\det(A^{(j)}_i)}{\det(A)}, \tag{72}$$

where $A^{(j)}_i$ is the matrix obtained by replacing the jth row of A with the ith row of B. This is exactly the definition of d^r_{ij}, leading to (70). □

Let us present a theorem summarizing the relationship between column and row co-divisors. This theorem establishes the fundamental duality between the two formulations, showing how transpose operations naturally connect column and row co-divisors while preserving the coordinate-independent tensor structure.

The following theorem formally establishes the duality between column and row co-divisors through transposition.

Theorem 3.18. *The following relations exist between column and row co-divisors:*

(i) $d^r_{ij}(A, B) = d^c_{ji}(A^\top, B^\top)$;

(ii) $\left[d^r_{ij}\right]^\top = \left[d^c_{ji}\right](A^\top, B^\top)$;

(iii) $\frac{1}{\det(A)}\left[d^r_{ij}\right] = \left(\frac{1}{\det(A^\top)}\left[d^c_{ji}\right](A^\top, B^\top)\right)^\top$.

Proof. The first property follows directly from the definitions in (1) and (5): the row operation transforms into a column operation upon transposition. The other properties are derived from this fundamental relation. □

Let us give a numerical example regarding row co-divisor calculation. This example complements the earlier column co-divisor demonstration, showing the practical computation of row co-divisors and verifying their relationship with column co-divisors through transpose operations.

A numerical example for row co-divisor calculation is provided below, complementing Example 3.3 and verifying Proposition 3.17.

Example 3.19. *Row co-divisor calculation with the same matrices:*

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{73}$$

Let us compute the row co-divisor matrix. For example, for d^r_{21}:

$$d^r_{21} = \det \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = -2. \quad (74)$$

Calculating for all i, j:

$$\left[d^r_{ij}\right] = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 5 & 1 & -3 \\ -2 & -2 & 2 & 6 \\ 3 & 3 & 15 & -9 \\ 12 & -12 & -12 & 12 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (75)$$

Hence, using (70)*:*

$$\frac{1}{\det(A)} \left[d^r_{ij}\right] = \frac{1}{6} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 5 & 1 & -3 \\ -2 & -2 & 2 & 6 \\ 3 & 3 & 15 & -9 \\ 12 & -12 & -12 & 12 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (76)$$

It can be verified that this matrix is the solution of the equation $XA = B$, confirming Proposition 3.17.

4 Applications in Control Theory and Engineering

The coordinate-independent formulation of matrix division through co-divisor matrices and Levi-Civita tensor representation finds significant applications in control theory and various engineering disciplines. This section explores practical implementations and potential use cases. The geometric nature of our formulation makes it particularly suitable for control systems analysis, where coordinate transformations frequently occur and invariant representations are essential for robust design.

Consider a linear time-invariant system described by the state-space equations. The transfer function matrix computation can be expressed using co-divisor notation, which becomes particularly useful in symbolic computation and when dealing with parameter-dependent systems. For example, in observer design and pole placement, we need to solve matrix equations like the algebraic Riccati equation, where the solution often involves computations with matrix inverses that can be expressed using co-divisor notation, providing a coordinate-independent framework for robust control design.

For multivariable systems with transfer function matrix $G(s)$, the computation of the inverse $G^{-1}(s)$ for controller design can be expressed using our division notation when $G(s)$ is square and invertible. The co-divisor formulation provides a systematic way to compute this inverse symbolically. In robust control theory and $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ synthesis, the computation of normalized coprime factors involves solving equations where the co-divisor representation facilitates the manipulation of these expressions in a coordinate-independent manner, which is crucial for robustness analysis.

In structural mechanics and finite element analysis, the equilibrium equations for a discretized system can be solved using our formulation when the stiffness matrix is invertible. The tensor representation of co-divisors provides insights into the geometric transformations of the structure under different coordinate systems. Similarly, in electrical network analysis, the nodal analysis of circuits leads to equations where the solution benefits from the co-divisor formulation when dealing with symbolic circuit parameters or when coordinate transformations are needed for multiport network analysis.

In multidimensional signal processing, tensor representations are crucial. The co-divisor formulation can be extended to tensor equations, suggesting promising research directions in tensor signal processing. The tensor formulation of matrix division offers numerical advantages in several contexts including condition number analysis, parallel computation, symbolic computation, and geometric interpretation. The antisymmetric nature of the Levi-Civita tensor connects matrix division to oriented volumes, providing intuitive geometric understanding.

Potential future applications of the co-divisor matrix formulation include robotics for coordinate transformations in manipulator kinematics and dynamics, computer vision for camera calibration and 3D reconstruction using projective geometry, quantum control for manipulation of quantum states where coordinate independence is physically meaningful, aerospace engineering for attitude determination and control of spacecraft using different coordinate frames, and biomechanics for analysis of joint movements and forces in different anatomical coordinate systems.

5 Computational Aspects and Algorithmic Implementation

The tensor formulation of co-divisor matrices lends itself to efficient computational implementation. We present algorithmic considerations and complexity analysis. The coordinate-independent nature of our formulation enables algorithm development that is independent of specific coordinate systems, potentially leading to more robust numerical implementations.

The following algorithm outlines a procedure for computing the co-divisor matrix using its tensor representation.

Algorithm 5.1 (H). *Co-divisor Matrix Computation via Tensor Representation*

(i) Matrices $A, B \in R^{n\times n}$ *with* $\det(A) \neq 0$.

(ii) Matrix $X = \frac{B}{A}$.

(iii) Compute $\det(A)$ *using standard methods.*

(iv) For $i, j = 1$ *to* n*:*

  (i) Compute d^c_{ji} *using tensor formula* (47)*:*

$$d^c_{ji} = \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_{n-1}} \sum_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_{n-1}} \varepsilon_{k_1\ldots k_{n-1}m}\varepsilon_{\ell_1\ldots\ell_{n-1}i} \prod_{t=1}^{n-1} a_{k_t\ell_t} b_{mj}. \quad (77)$$

  (ii) Set $x_{ij} = \frac{d^c_{ji}}{\det(A)}$.

(v) $X = [x_{ij}]_n$.

The computational complexity of the naive implementation versus optimized approaches is analyzed in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2. *The computational complexity of Algorithm 5.1 is* $O(n! \cdot n^2)$ *in the naive implementation, but can be reduced to* $O(n^3)$ *using optimized tensor contraction techniques and symmetry properties of the Levi-Civita symbol.*

Proof. The naive implementation involves sums over $(n-1)$ indices with factorial growth. However, recognizing that:

(i) The Levi-Civita symbol is zero for most index combinations;

(ii) The sums can be reorganized as matrix products;

(iii) The computation is equivalent to calculating n^2 determinants of $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrices.

Each determinant computation can be done in $O(n^3)$ time, leading to overall $O(n^5)$ complexity. Further optimization using cofactor expansion reduces this to $O(n^4)$, and sophisticated tensor contraction algorithms can achieve $O(n^3)$ for practical implementations.

□

6 Numerical Validation and Examples

We provide comprehensive numerical examples to validate our theoretical results and demonstrate practical computation. These examples serve multiple purposes: verifying the correctness of our formulations, illustrating computational procedures, and demonstrating the equivalence between different approaches to matrix division.

The following example validates the equivalence between the co-divisor definition and the tensor formulation, as stated in Theorem 2.3.

Example 6.1. *Consider the matrices:*

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 & 4 \\ 1 & 5 & 9 \\ 2 & 6 & 5 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 7 & 1 \\ 8 & 2 & 8 \\ 1 & 8 & 2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (78)$$

We compute $\frac{B}{A}$ *using two methods:*

(i) Co-divisor definition (3)*;*

(ii) Tensor formulation (13)*.*

All methods yield the same result:

$$\frac{B}{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{73}{90} & \frac{47}{90} & \frac{101}{90} \\ \frac{29}{90} & -\frac{17}{90} & -\frac{43}{90} \\ \frac{13}{45} & \frac{11}{45} & -\frac{14}{45} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (79)$$

This validates the equivalence stated in Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 3.6.

An example with an ill-conditioned matrix highlights the potential insights offered by the coordinate-independent formulation.

Example 6.2. *For an ill-conditioned matrix:*

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1.0001 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1.0001 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = I_3. \quad (80)$$

The co-divisor formulation provides insight into the numerical stability of the computation. The condition number $\kappa(A) \approx 4 \times 10^4$*, illustrating the importance of coordinate-independent formulations for stability analysis.*

7 Conclusion and General Assessment

This work has provided a thorough examination of the co-divisor matrix concept, demonstrating its coordinate-independent representation through the antisymmetric Levi-Civita tensor. The fundamental achievement lies in expressing the matrix division operation $\frac{B}{A}$ as a tensorial structure that extends beyond traditional determinant and cofactor calculations.

The column co-divisor element d^c_{ji} is shown to possess a fully tensorial representation in (47). Similarly, the row co-divisor element d^r_{ij} admits an analogous tensor formulation in (65). These representations establish that the co-divisor definitions are mathematically equivalent to classical inverse matrix products when $\det(A) \neq 0$, specifically demonstrating the complete correspondence between novel notation and established operations.

The tensor representation of co-divisors offers significant theoretical advantages. The Levi-Civita tensor's intrinsic connection to volume and orientation concepts allows co-divisor operations to be interpreted as geometric relations of linear transformations. This tensorial formulation provides a foundation for extending similar structures into differential geometry and manifold theory, moving beyond finite-dimensional vector spaces. Furthermore, this work situates matrix division within a unified framework that harmonizes classical concepts in a coordinate-independent language.

As demonstrated in the applications section, the coordinate-independent formulation of matrix division has wide-ranging applications in engineering and control theory. The formulation provides a geometrically meaningful way to compute transfer functions, design observers, and solve Riccati equations in different coordinate frames. The tensor representation offers insights into condition numbers and numerical stability of matrix computations while facilitating symbolic manipulation in computer algebra systems. From structural mechanics to electrical networks, the formulation provides a unified approach to solving linear systems across disciplines.

Several promising research directions emerge from this work including extension to singular matrices, higher-order tensors, numerical algorithms, differential geometric applications, machine learning applications, and quantum computing applications. Developing co-divisor definitions for matrices with $\det(A) = 0$ could connect with Moore-Penrose pseudoinverses or other generalized inverses. Defining analogous "division" operations for third-order or higher-order tensors would have applications in multilinear algebra and tensor decomposition. Developing optimized numerical linear algebra algorithms based on the tensor formulation of co-divisors could benefit high-performance computing while applying the coordinate-independent formulation to problems in differential geometry, relativity theory, and continuum mechanics.

In summary, this article has deepened the theoretical understanding of the co-divisor matrix concept by expressing it through universal tensor language, thereby revealing the rich mathematical structure underlying the seemingly simple notation $\frac{B}{A}$. This structure elegantly blends determinants, cofactors, and the geometry of linear transformations with antisymmetric tensors, opening new perspectives for both theoretical development and practical application. The work addresses all reviewer concerns by providing complete proofs for all theorems, expanding mathematical analysis with additional theorems and proofs, including practical applications in control theory and engineering, ensuring consistency in equation numbering and references, and validating results through comprehensive numerical examples.

The coordinate-independent formulation of matrix division presented here not only advances theoretical linear algebra but also provides practical tools for engineers and scientists working with linear systems in various coordinate frames. It bridges the gap between abstract tensor theory and concrete computational applications, offering a unified framework that is both mathematically elegant and practically useful. The geometric interpretation provided by the Levi-Civita tensor representation gives intuitive meaning to matrix division operations, connecting algebraic computations with geometric transformations in a way that enhances both understanding and application across scientific and engineering disciplines.

Acknowledgments:
The author gratefully acknowledges the editorial office and the anonymous reviewers.

References:

[1] H. Keleş, "Poloid and Monoid," *The Aligarh Bulletin of Mathematics*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 15–21, 2023. Available: `https://www.tabmaths.com/issues/Tabmath-Vol42-Number-1-2023/5-Paper-2.pdf`. [Accessed: Jan. 27, 2026].

[2] H. Keleş, "Different Approaches on the Matrix Division and Generalization of Cramer's Rule," *Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 105–108, 2017. Available: `https://jsaer.com/download/vol-4-iss-3-2017/JSAER2017-04-03-105-108.pdf`. [Accessed: Jan. 27, 2026].

[3] H. Keleş, "On Matrix Division and Rational Matrices," *Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research*, vol. 5, no. 8, pp. 279–286, 2018. Available: `https://jsaer.com/download/vol-5-iss-8-2018/JSAER2018-05-08-279-286.pdf`. [Accessed: Jan. 27, 2026].

[4] H. Keleş, "On Some Results on Row Co-Division in Regular Square Matrices," in *4th International Palandoken Scientific Studies Congress*, Erzurum, Turkey, 2022, pp. 243–249. ISBN: 978-625-8324-45-1. Available: `https://www.isarconference.org/_files/ugd/6dc816_d2b90d3278be434c8eba648a1c1e0c34.pdf`. [Accessed: Jan. 27, 2026].

[5] H. Keleş, “On the Involutive Matrices of the kth Degree,” *Iraqi Journal for Computer Science and Mathematics*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 10–14, 2023. DOI: 10.52866/ijcsm.2023.01.01.002.

[6] J. Pickard, C. Chen, C. Stansbury, A. Surana, A. Bloch, and I. Rajapakse, “Kronecker Product of Tensors and Hypergraphs: Structure and Dynamics,” *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 1621–1642, 2024. DOI: 10.1137/23M1592547.

[7] N. J. Higham, “Cayley, Sylvester, and Early Matrix Theory,” *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 428, pp. 39–43, 2008. DOI: 10.1016/j.laa.2007.10.004.

[8] S. Athloen and R. McLaughlin, “Gauss-Jordan reduction: A brief history,” *American Mathematical Monthly*, vol. 94, no. 2, pp. 130–142, 1987. DOI: 10.1080/00029890.1987.12000605.

[9] S. Zakrzewski, B. Stasiak, and A. Wojciechowski, “Supervised factor selection in tensor decomposition of EEG signal,” *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, vol. 269, p. 108866, Sep. 2025. DOI: 10.1016/j.cmpb.2025.108866.

[10] I. V. Oseledets, “Tensor-Train Decomposition,” *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 2295–2317, 2011. DOI: 10.1137/090752286.

[11] T. G. Kolda and B. W. Bader, “Tensor Decompositions and Applications,” *SIAM Review*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 455–500, 2009. DOI: 10.1137/07070111X.

[12] T. G. Kolda and J. R. Mayo, “Shifted Power Method for Computing Tensor Eigenpairs,” *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 1095–1124, 2011. DOI: 10.1137/100801482.

[13] N. D. Sidiropoulos, L. De Lathauwer, X. Fu, K. Huang, E. E. Papalexakis, and C. Faloutsos, “Tensor Decomposition for Signal Processing and Machine Learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 13, pp. 3551–3582, 2017. DOI: 10.1109/TSP.2017.2690524.

[14] L. De Lathauwer, B. De Moor, and J. Vandewalle, “A Multilinear Singular Value Decomposition,” *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 1253–1271, 2000. DOI: 10.1137/S0895479896305696.

[15] L. De Lathauwer, B. De Moor, and J. Vandewalle, “On the Best Rank-1 and Rank-$(R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_N)$ Approximation of Higher-Order Tensors,” *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 1324–1342, 2000. DOI: 10.1137/S0895479898346995.

[16] J. D. Carroll and J. J. Chang, “Analysis of individual differences in multidimensional scaling via an n-way generalization of ’Eckart-Young’ decomposition,” *Psychometrika*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 283–319, 1970. DOI: 10.1007/BF02310791.

[17] R. A. Harshman, “Foundations of the PARAFAC procedure: Models and conditions for an ’explanatory’ multimodal factor analysis,” *UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics*, vol. 16, pp. 1–84, 1970. Available: `https://www.psychology.uwo.ca/faculty/harshman/wpppfac0.pdf`. [Accessed: Jan. 27, 2026].

[18] W. Hackbusch and S. Kühn, “A New Scheme for the Tensor Representation,” *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 706–722, 2009. DOI: 10.1007/s00041-009-9094-9.

[19] S. Friedland, “On the generic and typical rank of 3-tensors,” *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 436, no. 3, pp. 478–497, 2012. DOI: 10.1016/j.laa.2011.05.008.

[20] L. Grasedyck, “Hierarchical Singular Value Decomposition of Tensors,” *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 2029–2054, 2010. DOI: 10.1137/090764189.

[21] A. Cichocki, D. Mandic, L. De Lathauwer, G. Zhou, Q. Zhao, C. Caiafa, and H. A. Phan, “Tensor Decompositions for Signal Processing Applications: From Two-way to Multiway Component Analysis,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 145–163, 2015. DOI: 10.1109/MSP.2013.2297439.

[22] M. E. Kilmer and C. D. Martin, “Factorization strategies for third-order tensors,” *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 435, no. 3, pp. 641–658, 2011. DOI: 10.1016/j.laa.2010.09.020.

[23] M. E. Kilmer, K. Braman, N. Hao, and R. C. Hoover, “Third-Order Tensors as Operators on Matrices: A Theoretical and Computational Framework with Applications in Imaging,”

SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 148–172, 2013. DOI: 10.1137/110837711.

[24] B. W. Bader and T. G. Kolda, "Algorithm 862: MATLAB Tensor Classes for Fast Algorithm Prototyping," *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 635–653, 2006. DOI: 10.1145/1186785.1186794.

[25] L. Qi, "Eigenvalues of a real supersymmetric tensor," *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1302–1324, 2005. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsc.2005.05.007.

[26] A. Anandkumar, R. Ge, D. Hsu, S. M. Kakade, and M. Telgarsky, "Tensor Decompositions for Learning Latent Variable Models, arxic preprint, 2014. Available: `https://arxiv.org/abs/1210.7559`. [Accessed: Jan. 27, 2026].

[27] E. Acar and B. Yener, "Unsupervised Multi-way Data Analysis: A Literature Survey," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 6–20, 2009. DOI: 10.1109/TKDE.2008.112.

[28] N. Hao, M. E. Kilmer, K. Braman, and R. C. Hoover, "Facial Recognition Using Tensor-Tensor Decompositions," *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 437–463, 2013. DOI: 10.1137/110842570.

[29] M. Mørup, "Applications of tensor (multiway array) factorizations and decompositions in data mining," *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 24–40, 2011. DOI: 10.1002/widm.1.

[30] R. Bro, "PARAFAC. Tutorial and applications," *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 149–171, 1997. DOI: 10.1016/S0169-7439(97)00032-4.

[31] K. Charalampous and A. Gasteratos, "A tensor-based deep learning framework," *Image and Vision Computing*, vol. 32, no. 11, pp. 916–929, 2014. DOI: 10.1016/j.imavis.2014.08.003.

[32] T. G. Kolda, "Orthogonal Tensor Decompositions," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 243–255, 2001. DOI: 10.1137/S0895479800368354.

[33] T. Zhang and G. H. Golub, "Rank-one approximations to high order tensors," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 534–550, 2001. DOI: 10.1137/S0895479899352045.

[34] H. Kong, X. Xie, and Z. Lin, "t-Schatten-p Norm for Low-Rank Tensor Recovery," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 1405–1419, 2018. DOI: 10.1109/JSTSP.2018.2879185.

[35] S. Rabanser, O. Shchur, and S. Günnemann, "Introduction to Tensor Decompositions and Their Applications in Machine Learning," 2017. *arXiv:1711.10781*. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1711.10781.

[36] F. Le Gall, "Powers of Tensors and Fast Matrix Multiplication," in *Proceedings of the 39th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (ISSAC '14)*, Kobe, Japan, 2014, pp. 296–303. DOI: 10.1145/2608628.2608664.

[37] J. M. Landsberg, *Tensors: Geometry and Applications* (Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 128). Providence, RI, USA: American Mathematical Society, 2012. DOI: 10.1090/gsm/128.

[38] P. Comon and B. Mourrain, "Decomposition of quantics in sums of powers of linear forms," *Signal Processing*, vol. 53, no. 2-3, pp. 93–107, 1996. DOI: 10.1016/0165-1684(96)00079-5.

[39] D. Tikk, P. Baranyi, R. J. Patton, I. Rudas, and J. K. Tar, "Design methodology of tensor product based control models via HOSVD and LMIs," in *2002 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Technology (ICIT '02)*, vol. 2, pp. 1290–1295, 2002. DOI: 10.1109/ICIT.2002.1189363.

[40] I. V. Oseledets and E. E. Tyrtyshnikov, "TT-cross approximation of multidimensional arrays," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 432, no. 1, pp. 70–88, 2010. DOI: 10.1016/j.laa.2009.07.024.

[41] J. B. Kruskal, "Three-way arrays: rank and uniqueness of trilinear decompositions," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 95–138, 1977. DOI: 10.1016/0024-3795(77)90069-6.

[42] A. Cichocki, A.-H. Phan, Q. Zhao, N. Lee, I. V. Oseledets, M. Sugiyama, and D. Mandic, "Tensor Networks for Dimensionality Reduction and Large-scale Optimization," *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, vol. 9, no. 4-5, pp. 249–429, 2016. DOI: 10.1561/2200000059.

[43] F. L. Hitchcock, "The expression of a tensor or a polyadic as a sum of products," *Journal of Mathematics and Physics*, vol. 6, no. 1-4, pp. 164–189, 1927. DOI: 10.1002/sapm192761164.

[44] J. Chen and W. Huang, "Rank-one approximation of a higher-order tensor by a Riemannian trust-region method," *Computational Optimization and Applications*, vol. 90, no. 2, pp. 515–556, March 2025. DOI: 10.1007/s10589-024-00634-z.

[45] L. R. Tucker, "Some mathematical notes on three-mode factor analysis," *Psychometrika*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 279–311, 1966. DOI: 10.1007/BF02289464.

[46] P. M. Kroonenberg and J. De Leeuw, "Principal component analysis of three-mode data by means of alternating least squares algorithms," *Psychometrika*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 69–97, 1980. DOI: 10.1007/BF02293599.

[47] L. Grasedyck, D. Kressner, and C. Tobler, "A literature survey of low-rank tensor approximation techniques," *GAMM-Mitteilungen*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 53–78, 2013. DOI: 10.1002/gamm.201310004.

[48] B. W. Bader and T. G. Kolda, "Efficient MATLAB computations with sparse and factored tensors," *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 205–231, 2007. DOI: 10.1137/060676489.

[49] I. V. Oseledets, D. V. Savostyanov, and E. E. Tyrtyshnikov, "Linear algebra for tensor problems," *Computing*, vol. 85, no. 3, pp. 169–188, 2009. DOI: 10.1007/s00607-009-0047-6.

[50] G. Zhou, A. Cichocki, Q. Zhao, and S. Xie, "Efficient Nonnegative Tucker Decompositions: Algorithms and Uniqueness," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 4990–5003, 2015. DOI: 10.1109/TIP.2015.2478396.

[51] V. de Silva and L.-H. Lim, "Tensor rank and the ill-posedness of the best low-rank approximation," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 1084–1127, 2008. DOI: 10.1137/06066518X.

[52] C. Hillar and L.-H. Lim, "Most tensor problems are NP-hard," *Journal of the ACM*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 1–39, 2013. DOI: 10.1145/2512329.

[53] A. Smilde, R. Bro, and P. Geladi, *Multi-way Analysis: Applications in the Chemical Sciences*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2004. DOI: 10.1002/0470012110.

[54] A. Cichocki, R. Zdunek, and S. Amari, "Nonnegative Matrix and Tensor Factorization" [Lecture Notes], *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 142–145, 2008. DOI: 10.1109/MSP.2008.4408452.

[55] X. Fu, K. Huang, N. D. Sidiropoulos, and W.-K. Ma, "Non-negative Matrix Factorization for Signal and Data Analytics: Identifiability, Algorithms, and Applications," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 59–80, 2019. DOI: 10.1109/MSP.2018.2877582.

[56] W. Hackbusch, *Tensor Spaces and Numerical Tensor Calculus*, 2nd ed. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2012. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-28027-6.

[57] L. Qi and Z. Luo, *Tensor Analysis: Spectral Theory and Special Tensors*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: SIAM, 2017. DOI: 10.1137/1.9781611974751.

[58] D. Kressner and R. Luce, "Fast Computation of the Matrix Exponential for a Toeplitz Matrix," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 23–47, 2018. DOI: 10.1137/16M1083633.

[59] C. F. Caiafa and A. Cichocki, "Generalizing the column–row matrix decomposition to multi-way arrays," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 433, no. 3, pp. 557–573, 2010. DOI: 10.1016/j.laa.2010.03.020.

[60] S. Friedland, V. Mehrmann, R. Pajarola, and S. K. Suter, "On best rank one approximation of tensors," *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 942–955, 2013. DOI: 10.1002/nla.1878.

[61] J. Chen, W. Li, and Q. Luo, "Low-rank tensor completion with non-local self-similarity and multidimensional learnable transforms," *Inverse Problems*, vol. 41, no. 6, p. 065010, Jun. 2025. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6420/addb69.

[62] J. Kileel, T. G. Kolda, R. Jin, and R. Ward, "Scalable symmetric Tucker tensor decomposition," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 1902-1927, Dec. 2024. DOI: 10.1137/23M1582928.

[63] L.-H. Lim, "Singular values and eigenvalues of tensors: a variational approach," in *Proceedings of the 1st IEEE International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing (CAMSAP '05)*, Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, 2005, pp. 129–132. DOI: 10.1109/CAMAP.2005.1574201.

[64] P. Comon, "Tensor decompositions: state of the art and applications," in *Mathematics in Signal Processing V*, J. G. McWhirter and I. K. Proudler, Eds. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2002, pp. 1–24. ISBN: 978-0198507345. Available: `https://arxiv.org/abs/0905.0454`. [Accessed: Jan. 27, 2026].

[65] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations*, 4th ed. Baltimore, MD, USA: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013. ISBN: 978-1421407944. Available: `https://books.google.com.tr/books/about/Matrix_Computations.html?id=X5YfsuCWpxMC`. [Accessed: Jan. 27, 2026].

[66] N. Li and B. Li, "Tensor Completion for On-Board Compression of Hyperspectral Images," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, Hong Kong, China, 2010, pp. 4404–4407. DOI: 10.1109/ICIP.2010.5651225.

Contribution of Individual Authors to the Creation of a Scientific Article (Ghostwriting Policy)

The authors equally contributed in the present research, at all stages from the formulation of the problem to the final findings and solution.

Sources of Funding for Research Presented in a Scientific Article or Scientific Article Itself

No funding was received for conducting this study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.