

Encoding Electromagnetic Transformation Laws for Dimensional Reduction

Marcus Christian Lehmann*, Mirsad Hadžiefendić, Albert Piwonski, Rolf Schuhmann

Theoretische Elektrotechnik, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

*Marcus Christian Lehmann
Einsteinufer 17, D-10587 Berlin
lehmann@tet.tu-berlin.de

Abstract

Electromagnetic phenomena are mathematically described by solutions of boundary value problems. For exploiting symmetries of these boundary value problems in a way that is offered by techniques of dimensional reduction, it needs to be justified that the derivative in symmetry direction is constant or even vanishing. The generalized notion of symmetry can assume at every point in space a different direction, as long as it is possible to exhibit the unidirectional symmetry in some coordinate representation. This can be achieved e.g. when the symmetry direction is given by the direct construction out of a unidirectional symmetry via a coordinate transformation, which poses a demand on the boundary value problem that is investigated. Coordinate independent formulations of boundary value problems do exist but turning that theory into practice demands a pedantic process of backtranslation to the computational notions. We try to fill this gap and present the more general, isolated problems of that translation.

Within this contribution, the partial derivative and the corresponding chain rule for multivariate calculus are investigated with respect to their encodability in computational terms. We target the layer above univariate calculus, but below tensor calculus.

This is the pre-peer reviewed version of the following submitted article:

Lehmann MC, Hadiefendi M, Piwonski A, Schuhmann R, Suchantke R, Plath R, (2018), *Encoding Electromagnetic Transformation Laws for Dimensional Reduction*, *Int J Numerical Modelling*, 2018;31(2):e2217.

which might be published in final form. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

1 Introduction

The coordinate-induced transformation of vector components, following a coordinate-system change, of fields and fluxes in classical electromagnetism knows a variety of different formulas resulting in a different matrix-transformation scheme, depending on the physical meaning of the vectors in question. Different transformation properties of the objects considered in electromagnetic theories, have been known

for a long time [1][2] and can be systematically formulated within tensor calculus at the cost of using antisymmetric tensors. There is a high amount of combinatorics involved when resolving the many permutations in that calculus due to the symmetries of the tensor representation of electromagnetic objects. The theory of differential forms provides a formalism to abstract over that.

From the several formalisms available within the domain of computational electromagnetism *to represent physical entities for a logic-based formal discourse*, their mathematical objects, here listed to represent the surrounding theory establishing them, are:

- Quaternions
- Vectors
- Tensors
- Clifford numbers
- Differential forms.

Of course, this list taken from A. Bossavit[3] does not aim to be complete. Although the borders of the theories for these objects, i.e. the precise number of logical laws belonging to each theory, are differently blurry, and despite the possibility to embed some theories into other ones, we still list them here next to each other, alluding these issues.

$$\begin{array}{ll} d_\tau E = -\mathcal{L}_T B & d_\gamma F^* E = -\mathcal{L}_\Gamma F^* B \\ d_\tau H = J + \mathcal{L}_T D & d_\gamma F^* H = F^* J + \mathcal{L}_\Gamma F^* D \\ d_\tau D = \rho & d_\gamma F^* D = F^* \rho \\ d_\tau B = 0 & d_\gamma F^* B = 0 \end{array}$$

Figure 1: Formulation of a generic electromagnetic boundary value problem on the manifold M with differential forms (left) and an equivalent boundary value problem on the manifold N (right) given by P. Raunonen [4]. The material laws and the boundary values are omitted but they also follow the same pattern of transformation.

The theory of differential forms prescribes the direction, but it is not at all needed in our consideration here. To give a motivation we will just state, that within the theory of differential forms the physical space is modeled by the notion of

manifold which is one sort of entities, and the electromagnetic potentials, fields, fluxes and densities are modeled by the notion of a *differential form*, which is another sort of entities of this theory. An electromagnetic boundary value problem can be posed within that theory with the help of an *observer structure*, which is a special choice of two entities in the theory of differential forms. Using them, the differential operators d_τ and \mathcal{L}_T can be established.

An example of the formulation of an equivalent transformation of a generic boundary value problem, as it is used in the theory of dimensional reduction, was developed thoroughly by [4]. For an observer structure (τ, T) on the manifold M , an observer structure (γ, Γ) on the manifold N , on these entities a transformation $F : N \rightarrow M$ and on the differential forms the induced transformation F^* , the two formulations of fig. 1 pose the same boundary value problem.

There is a very regular pattern present in these equations stating what needs to be done to transform a boundary value problem, which is the reason this theory was used to develop such a notion. But in that formulation it is not that obvious anymore, what the actual calculations are, that are needed to perform such a transformation on the number data given for one boundary value problem to obtain the new number data for the transformed one.

For an implementation, therefore one needs multiple formulations: for the computation, low-level matrix-operations can directly be executed by the machine, but for deriving the computation, only the high level differential forms statements can be overviewed. We are convinced, that these high level abstractions as in fig. 1 pay off in the most beneficial way only, when stacked on top of a layer providing

- a) a good abstraction to provide coordinate transformation rules in terms of matrix-based or just general computation schemes for a given tensorial formulation and
- b) a good abstraction to incorporate combinatorial notions, especially the enumeration of permutations, which enables the reasoning on a level of differential forms to be automatically transferred into a tensorial representation.

It is important to emphasize, that the representation of the corresponding raw number data, i.e. the numbers that are stored within the computers memory, might not even need to change during that translation process and that the corresponding numerical scheme can be a matrix-based one in a way, that all the abstractions are stripped before the cost-intensive computational task is started. The abstractions should only allow to produce an efficient computational scheme on spot in some form that is available, be it matrix or parallel or other kinds of computations.

The second part b) is motivated in section 6 and not treated in detail here. For the first part a), i.e. the generation of transformation rules, we show in this paper a way to realize such a layer which is independent of - in our case polymorphic to - the actual function representation. Of course the varieties of available simplifications depend on the chosen function representation later-on, e.g. polynomes, other analytical functions or black box computations. Therefore, it matters very much that this realization is done in a way that enables equivalence properties to be stated, to fully exploit these specific properties of a function representation. Furthermore they have to be

resolved at the scheme generation step, before the cost intensive calculation is performed.

2 Computational Context

Our aim is to connect more high level theories, such as tensor calculus and differential forms in which it is possible in a tractable way to express sound notions of differentials, to more low level theories, such as vector calculus and λ -calculus in which it is possible in a tractable way to express sound notions of an univariate derivative and computations, and then to give representations and implementations that argueably behave in a way respecting these notions. All this we do in order to contribute to the discussion, how these higher level *representations of physical entities* should be encoded then in a program.

We start with the assumption of a given univariate derivative operation $'$ that for a given univariate function representation f can compute the univariate function representation of the derivative of that function f' . For the computational description, we make use of an untyped, simplified λ -calculus. Instead of $\lambda x.f x$, we write $x \mapsto f(x)$. We emphasize that only the following rules are used and it does not matter if you do not know λ -calculus yet, if you can familiarize yourself with these four *computational equivalences* (1- 4) that are already in use in engineering mathematics and denoted by \equiv here.

$$f \equiv_\eta x \mapsto f(x) \quad (1)$$

$$x \mapsto f(x) \equiv_\alpha y \mapsto f(y) \quad (2)$$

$$(y \mapsto \mathbf{term})(x) \equiv_\beta \mathbf{term}[y := x] \quad (3)$$

$$f(g(x)) \equiv_\circ (f \circ g)(x) \quad (4)$$

The intention here is to state the rules to be able to distinguish and name them. Our application of the η -equivalence on univariate functions (1) states, that a function f and the λ -abstraction (wrapper function) immediately applying the argument $x \mapsto f(x)$ are computationally equivalent and therefore can be substituted against each other respecting the computation's result. The α -equivalence (2) in this case states, that it does not matter for the computation how the argument is named, of course. So every time \equiv_α appears, the left hand side can be transformed in a computationally equivalent way to the right hand side by argument-renaming and vice versa. The β -equivalence (3) expresses that the application of the function $y \mapsto \mathbf{term}$, i.e. the **term** regarded as dependent on its variable y , to the argument x is computationally equivalent to a **term** $[y := x]$ where all occurrences of y are substituted for x , which is denoted by the substitution $[y := x]$ acting on the **term** as a postfix operation. Lastly, not that much a rule of λ -calculus but more a definition of the composition operation \circ , is the rule (4).

These rules (1- 4) are the somewhat standard rules that are most likely fulfilled in any context of computation. In λ -calculus every function takes exactly one argument and has one result which is a perfect interpretation for *univariate* calculus. In computational electromagnetism, the representations of the considered objects, the electric and magnetic fields, the geometry, e.g. when given by parametrized

coordinates, and coordinate transformations are expressed as *multivariate* functions, taking multiple arguments to multiple results¹. Although multiple arguments can be represented as one with the help of the notion of a tuple, where the single arguments are separated by commas, and multiple results in a similar manner, we choose a notation here that allows a multiple-argument-interpretation that is most familiar to the engineering community and does not pose a limitation since it is translatable to the one-argument-interpretation.

That notation is motivated by the tediousness of multivariate calculus to express function application for these multiple arguments. Our proposed variant is mostly borrowed from the *parameter-pack expansion* which is a carefully specified notation that appeared in the 2011 standard of the C++ programming language and that is implemented in all the current compilers complying to that standard. For a **term** we denote the *expansion* by **term**... which should be computationally equivalent to a context where the comma-separation of copies of the term substituted with every single parameter, or variable in our case, of a *parameter-pack*, is applied. If \underline{x} denotes a pack of four parameters, the expansion of the most simple term, just consisting of \underline{x} itself, corresponds to

$$(\underline{x}...) \equiv_m (x^1, x^2, x^3, x^4).$$

The three dots are used frequently in a meta-logical manner where it is clear from the context how to continue the pattern. When it comes to an implementation, one needs to make this pattern-repetition precise. In this paper we make use of the three dots ... only in the sense of this kind of expansion, where the parameter-pack is again underlined to highlight its meaning as a placeholder. The unexpanded term is denoted in an m -way as computationally equivalent \equiv_m to the expanded one.

The reason for introducing this particular notation is that it supports us in making precise arguments about multivariate functions in the previous sense. Our most important application is to express multivariate function application. E.g. suppose g is a multivariate function in $\mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ such that it can be decomposed into the functions g^1, g^2 and g^3 in $\mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then we have two computationally equivalent terms with the *nested use of the operation of parameter-pack-expansion ...*:

$$(g(\underline{x}...)...) \equiv_m (g^1(x^1, x^2), g^2(x^1, x^2), g^3(x^1, x^2)).$$

Another use, also borrowed from the C++ programming language standard, is, given that γ is a multivariate function in $\mathbb{R}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ that can be decomposed into the functions γ^1, γ^2 and γ^3 in $\mathbb{R}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then we have two computationally equivalent terms with the expansion ... of *multiple nested parameter-packs* $\underline{\gamma}$ and \underline{x} :

$$(\underline{\gamma}(\underline{x})...) \equiv_m (\gamma^1(x^1), \gamma^2(x^2), \gamma^3(x^3)).$$

Given the notion of parameter-packs $\underline{x}, \underline{y}$ and the operation of parameter-pack-expansion ..., we can restate the previous

¹We use the nomer multivariate, although it usually denotes functions taking multiple arguments to one result. Since in our case the results are not correlated to each other, and functions that give multiple uncorrelated results can be represented as a collection of these multivariate functions in the usual sense, we do not distinguish the terms here that much.

computational equivalences (1- 4) in their multivariate version (5- 8):

$$f \equiv_\eta (\underline{x}...) \mapsto f(\underline{x}...) \quad (5)$$

$$(\underline{x}...) \mapsto f(\underline{x}...) \equiv_\alpha (\underline{y}...) \mapsto f(\underline{y}...) \quad (6)$$

$$((\underline{y}...) \mapsto \mathbf{term})(\underline{x}...) \equiv_\beta \mathbf{term}[(\underline{y} := \underline{x})...] \quad (7)$$

$$f(g(\underline{x}...)...) \equiv_\circ (f \circ g)(\underline{x}...) . \quad (8)$$

Note especially how the expansion interacts with the composition of multivariate functions in (8).

3 Encoding the partial derivative

We make use of the previously introduced equivalences to formulate what a partial derivative should be in that context. It is thought of as being the univariate derivative of a multivariate function which is regarded as a univariate function only depending on its one argument that we are taking the derivative of. That *univariate regarding of a multivariate function* can be made precise now.

$$h \equiv_\eta (\underline{x}...) \mapsto h(\underline{x}...) \quad (9)$$

$$\equiv_\beta (\underline{x}...) \mapsto (x^2 \mapsto h(\underline{x}...)) (x^2) \quad (10)$$

$$\equiv_m (x^1, x^2, x^3) \mapsto (x^2 \mapsto h(x^1, x^2, x^3)) (x^2) \quad (11)$$

$$\equiv_\alpha (x^1, x^2, x^3) \mapsto (z \mapsto h(x^1, z, x^3)) (x^2) \quad (12)$$

$$\equiv_m (\underline{x}...) \mapsto (z \mapsto h(\underline{x}... [\bullet^2 := z])) (x^2) \quad (13)$$

Suppose the multivariate function h is in $\mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then h is computationally equivalent in an η -way to the multivariate function $(\underline{x}...) \mapsto h(\underline{x}...)$ as in (9). Just the inner **term** $h(\underline{x}...)$ of that new multivariate function is computationally equivalent to $(x^2 \mapsto h(\underline{x}...)) (x^2)$ in a univariate- β -way (10). To see this, for the example, we look at the expanded version (11). What happened here is that the inner abstraction of x^2 is *shadowing*² the outer argument x^2 . To highlight this difference, we explicitly rename the inner x^2 into an α -equivalent function with z occurring instead (12). This in a multivariate way constitutes the *substituted expansion of the parameter-pack* \underline{x} , denoted as $\underline{x}... [\bullet^2 := z]$, where entry 2 is replaced with z as in (13).

This leads to the last rule of computational equivalence that we need for our considerations and it relates a multivariate function application to the use of a univariate function application:

$$(z \mapsto h(\underline{x}... [\bullet^i := z])) (x^i) \equiv_\beta h(\underline{x}...) . \quad (14)$$

To better familiarize with it, looking forward to an implementation, we give the syntax tree of this rule in fig. 2.

That is, finally, enough to define the partial derivative on multivariate functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^c$ by the notion of the

²In theoretical computer science this is usually realized not by shadowing, but by limiting the α -equivalence to the cases where the argument x of $x \mapsto \mathbf{term}$ does not occur as a free variable of the **term**, which is stated as $x \notin \text{FV}(\mathbf{term})$. But shadowing exists in the most programming languages.




Figure 2: Univariate abstraction over an expansion \dots is expressed explicitly as substituted expansion $\dots [\bullet := \bullet]$ to avoid implicit shadowing.

derivative $'$ on univariate functions for a general arity and the indices $\mathbf{j} \in [1, c]$ and $\mathbf{i} \in [1, d]$ as the multivariate function

$$\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial x^{\mathbf{i}}} := (\underline{x} \dots) \mapsto (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^{\mathbf{j}}(\underline{x} \dots [\bullet := \mathbf{z}]))' (x^{\mathbf{i}}), \quad (15)$$

where $f^{\mathbf{j}}$ is the projection $\text{proj}^{\mathbf{j}} \circ f$ of the \mathbf{j} -th result of the multivariate function f or similarly the \mathbf{j} -th part of the decomposition of f in the previously discussed manner.

And of course we do not yet made use of the information how the argument, with respect to which we are taking the partial derivative, is named in that definition, as we can show by the α -equivalence, that they are computationally equivalent:

$$\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial x^{\mathbf{i}}} \equiv_{\alpha} \frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^{\mathbf{i}}} \equiv_{\alpha} \partial_{\mathbf{i}} f^{\mathbf{j}}.$$

There are two remarks here to make. Firstly, the α -equivalence, i.e. computational equivalence of the partial derivative under renaming of the argument, motivates to omit the variable name $\partial_{\mathbf{i}} f^{\mathbf{j}}$, although later-on in the theory of differential forms this exact spot to give a name to the argument is used to indicate which charts are involved in the process of coordinate transition³. Secondly, for a transition along f from A -coordinates to B -coordinates, i.e. where f is a function expressing the B -coordinates in terms of A -coordinates $(f(\underline{a} \dots)) = (\underline{b}(\underline{a} \dots))$, we have $\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial a^{\mathbf{i}}}(\underline{a} \dots)$ to constitute the number in the \mathbf{j} 'th row and the \mathbf{i} 'th column of the Jacobi-matrix \mathbf{J}_f evaluated in A -coordinates at $(\underline{a} \dots)$. That matrix is used to transform the numbers $(\underline{v}_B \dots)$ that are the vector-components with respect to the B -induced basis at a point given by the same A -coordinates into the the numbers $(\underline{v}_A \dots)$ that are the vector-components with respect to the A -induced basis at the same physical point by matrix-vector-multiplication⁴. This scrutiny forms the foundation of a matrix-translation in terms of the Jacobi-matrix for different kinds of vectors and it is important to gain any support from encoding this logics into the notation and into the program to handle these different calculations and check them for consistency.

³One distinguishes the function-level partial derivative ∂_i with respect to the i -th argument of a function from the vector field $\partial/\partial x^i$ induced by the i -th coordinate x^i , where both fulfill the rules of what it means to be called a *derivative*.

⁴This is just the other way around as for the *basis*, where J_f transforms the A -induced basis into the B -induced basis.

4 The Chain-Rule revised

Using just these established conditions, we will derive what it means to have a notion of a chain rule for the partial derivative, lifting the notion of the univariate chain rule to the multivariate level. The whole calculation is given in Appendix A. In order to create the multivariate listing in appendix A and the corresponding one for a concrete two-variate case in appendix B, we have implemented the parameter-pack expansion the previously introduced way.

We begin in A1 with the partial derivative that can be represented in an implementation not carrying anymore information than written in A1, i.e. which function $f^{\mathbf{j}} \circ g$ it applies to with respect to which entry \mathbf{i} or directly as the function that we encoded definitionally in (15). In the first case an implementation needs to provide a function that converts these bits of informations into that encoding, where in the second case we directly operate on these objects. The multivariate function (A2) again does not need more information encoded than written out there and the data structure is very similar to the one resulting from a tree-like encoding of fig. 2. The expanded terms for the two-variate case where $\mathbf{i} = 1$ is given by (B2) and you can follow the expanded variant in Appendix B alongside this investigation.

An equivalent computation (A3) is given by the multivariate \circ -equivalence, applying $f^{\mathbf{j}}$ to \underline{g} instead of composing it with g . At this point, we make use of a linearity-property which needs to be fulfilled for a concrete realization of the univariate derivative $'$ later-on, namely that the univariate derivative of a multiply occurring argument is given by the sum of the univariate derivatives of each occurrence which we denote by $=_{\text{lin}'}$ for the two-variate example given by:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{z} \mapsto h(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}))' (x) \\ =_{\text{lin}'} & (\mathbf{z} \mapsto h(\mathbf{z}, x))' (x) \\ & + (\mathbf{z} \mapsto h(x, \mathbf{z}))' (x). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

For our general multivariate notation, h has to be identified with

$$h := (\underline{z} \dots) \mapsto f(g(\underline{x} \dots [\bullet := \underline{z}]) \dots),$$

leading to the general multivariate variant of this linearity, expressed with a summation \sum_k over a new index k :

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f(g(\underline{x} \dots [\bullet := \mathbf{z}]) \dots))' (x^{\mathbf{i}}) \\ =_{\text{lin}'} & \sum_k (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f(g(\underline{x} \dots) \dots [\bullet^k := g^k(\underline{x} \dots [\bullet := \mathbf{z}])]))' (x^{\mathbf{i}}), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

which expands in the two-variate case for $\mathbf{i} = 1$ to:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f(g^1(\mathbf{z}, x^2), g^2(\mathbf{z}, x^2)))' (x^1) \\ =_{\text{lin}'} & (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f(g^1(\mathbf{z}, x^2), g^2(x^1, x^2)))' (x^1) \\ & + (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f(g^1(x^1, x^2), g^2(\mathbf{z}, x^2)))' (x^1). \end{aligned}$$

Note the nested substitution in the right-hand-side term of (17) now, where only the application of the k 'th decomposition of g is differently applied to the x 's of which just the

i th one is replaced with \mathbf{z} . Therefore the linearity $=_{\text{lin}}$ justifies whether (A4) computes the same result. The nested substitution is computationally equivalent to the composition of univariate functions containing just a single substitution as in (18) which is the needed transformation that leads to (A5).

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f(\underline{g}(\underline{x}\dots) \dots [\bullet^k := g^k(\underline{x}\dots [\bullet^i := \mathbf{z}]])]) \quad (18) \\ \equiv_{\circ} & (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f(\underline{g}(\underline{x}\dots) \dots [\bullet^k := \mathbf{z}])) \circ (\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^k(\underline{x}\dots [\bullet^i := \mathbf{z}])) \end{aligned}$$

At this point, we have encoded the sum of k different univariate derivatives of a composition of two univariate functions (A6), where k -times the univariate chain rule can be applied (A7) to lead to (A8). For the right multiplicand after transforming it in a β -way to the computationally equivalent form in (A9) it matches the definition of the partial derivative on g (A10). The left multiplicand can be turned in a \circ - and β -way to the computationally equivalent form (A11-A12) where the definition of the partial derivative again applies to lead to the common form (A13) of the right hand side of the chain rule for the partial derivative of the composition of two functions $f^j \circ g$, almost, but not quite:

$$\frac{\partial (f^j \circ g)}{\partial x^i} = (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k} (\underline{g}(\underline{x}\dots) \dots) \cdot \frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i} (\underline{x}\dots) . \quad (19)$$

The applied calculus enforced an explicit mentioning of the abstraction $(\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto$ since these are function objects and only if they are applied to the same arguments, the one resulting number is equal for both sides:

$$\frac{\partial (f^j \circ g)}{\partial x^i} (\underline{x}\dots) = \sum_k \frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k} (\underline{g}(\underline{x}\dots) \dots) \cdot \frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i} (\underline{x}\dots) . \quad (20)$$

5 Chain of Justification

All the data structures and data transformations described before, represent computations for the partial derivative function and they are not yet more than the mere skeletons carrying around meta-data and all the transformations respecting this, yet hypothetical, computation we described are just operations transforming that meta-data. These skeletons can only be turned into a computation when a lower layer, i.e. an implementation providing the univariate derivative and a representation of functions, providing these computations, is present such that the lines can be turned into a computation and executed.

We have made the distinction between a computational equivalence \equiv that is justified within this survey by the computational equivalences of the λ -calculus and the propositional equality $=$ that is used when a property of the univariate derivative $'$, that operation we presupposed for our whole consideration, was made use of. This distinction now enables us to give a software design argument what data structures are necessary and how the interface to this lower layer providing such a notion of univariate derivative should look like. For the equivalences \equiv it does not matter which one we are representing as a data structure. Therefore it is only one data structure needed for the lines (A1- A3), only one data structure for

(A4- A6) and only one data structure for (A7- A13). The first two blocks (A1- A3) and (A4- A6) compute equally only by the linearity property of the univariate derivative operation, where the second two blocks (A4- A6) and (A7- A13) compute equally only by the chain-rule property of the univariate derivative operation. These two equality transformations will be needed in an evaluatable way in an implementation of our regarded layer of abstraction as discussed at the beginning, but can only be implemented by the lower univariate layer. This lower layer usually is given by a symbolic implementation operating on encodings of polynomials or analytical functions, a numerical implementation operating on black box functions using the difference quotient or an intermediate variant exploiting the methods of *automatic differentiation*.

The consistency of the computational equivalence resulting from the presented transformations depends on the consistent implementation of the considered layer, of course, and precisely on the consistent implementation of these two equality-transformations of the lower layer, which are the dependencies of it. The benefit is that the implementation of the considered layer can be verified in a way independently from a lower level application increasing the overall trust and decomposing monolithic software ventures into more modular ones.

6 Targeting Tensor Calculus

In this paper the focus was to establish the lower interface that the encoding of the chain rule of multivariate functions demands from an encoding of the univariate chain rule. What is open for discussion is the question how the upper interface to tensor calculus should look like. Continuing on (A13), with the \circ -equivalence we have a context (A14) where it is possible to make use of a function-level multiplication \otimes that is given by the corresponding point-wise multiplication (A15). This is a binary operation and could be precomposed with a function applying g to the left argument and the identity id to the right argument in favor for having just one binary operation on the two partial derivatives (A16), making a corresponding data structure definition even more obvious. Establishing a function-level summation \oplus makes it possible to express the chain-rule in a completely so-called *point-free* style (A17). The objects reasoned about in this expression should correspond (denoted by \cong_T) to the objects of the expression (A18) of tensor calculus, where unfortunately $'$ is a decoration on indices and not to be confused with the univariate derivative. We think that based on the way of that correspondence \cong_T the question of encoding could be answered in a tractable way.

In the appendix of [5], E. Tonti collects the notions of:

- tensors and pseudotensors, such as tensor densities and tensor capacities, that differ in their transformation laws on a power of the determinant of the coordinate transition function,
- natural, reciprocal and physical basis vectors, leading to contravariant, covariant and physical components that are the number-representations of the various kinds of scalars and vectors in the electromagnetic theory, and
- algebraic and metric dual vectors that constitute different representations of antisymmetric tensors.

In classical electrodynamics, the physical base is often chosen because of its property to preserve the calculation for the length of a vector. This gives a direct interpretation for the measurement of such a quantity in a cartesian system, which is very valuable in a physical interpretation. Having these choices to be combined with constructions such as the magnetic flux *tuple* of numbers corresponding to the *three-number representation* of the magnetic flux bi-covector at a point and similar constructions, we think that it becomes arguable to investigate the computational aspects of such a correspondence. In accordance to follow his notation, which is very well chosen to support the application in various physical theories, we give correspondences in fig. 3.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Tonti 2013 } x'^h = f^h(x^k) & \text{this paper } f : A \rightarrow B \\
\lambda_h^k(x') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\partial x^k(x')}{\partial x'^h} & \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{h}'}^{\mathbf{k}}(\underline{a}\dots) \cong_T \frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{k}}}{\partial a^{\mathbf{h}}}(\underline{a}\dots) \\
\Lambda_k^h(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\partial x'^h(x)}{\partial x^k} & \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mathbf{h}'}(\underline{b}\dots) \cong_T \frac{\partial (f^{-1})^{\mathbf{h}}}{\partial b^{\mathbf{k}}}(\underline{b}\dots) \\
\Delta(x') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \det(\lambda_h^k(x')) & (\text{proposes permutations}) \\
g \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \det(g_{hk}) & (\text{proposes permutations})
\end{array}$$

Figure 3: Denotational correspondences, where g_{hk} is the metric tensor and \det being the determinant.

Note especially, the choice of different symbols λ and Λ to reflect the information in which *logical direction*⁵ the partial derivative has to be taken and the drive to name the argument, x or x' respectively, to remember the coordinate transition function's domain. The difference between tensor calculus and the presented formalism, and, therefore, the key abstraction necessary to use an implementation suitable of computing the chain-rule as a supporting layer, is that we regard objects that are functions and function compositions where tensor calculus has a notion of *coordinate system*. Consequently, we had no need to name the arguments and it is indeed not possible by α -equivalence \equiv_α to encode that additional information.

Just to oppose it, we give in fig. 3 another popular choice for denoting the partial derivative in tensor calculus $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{h}'}^{\mathbf{k}}$ for λ_h^k and $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mathbf{h}'}$ for Λ_k^h . As mentioned before, the $'$ here should not be confused with the univariate derivative and is a decoration on the indices \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{h} to represent their coordinate system belongingness.

Besides the choice of using different kinds of decorations for the indices to omit giving indices to the indices, which is the inevitable problem one has to deal with when multiple coordinate systems are considered, there is the legitimate choice of the *property of coordinate system belongingness* being one of the index, as in the notation we opposed, or being a property of the *partial derivative object* itself, which was denoted λ or Λ respectively by E. Tonti. This state of affairs is shown in fig. 4. The answer to that question of choice drastically

⁵The direction, i.e. *from the A coordinate system to the B coordinate system or in the direction that f is defined*, is meant here. To emphasize its distinction from the physical direction in space, we call it the *logical direction* instead.




Figure 4: Encoding of the partial derivative used in tensor calculus

influences the encoding of tensor calculus for the purpose of an implementation.

As promised in the title, we will show here transformation laws for the magnetic flux B and the electric field E , although the reason of this paper is not the result but the process of deriving these laws. For a clarified choice of \cong_T , which we did not yet made here, suppose that Z , A and B are given by left decorated z' , undecorated a and right decorated b' coordinate systems. In this notation, for clarification, the coordinate system belongingness is redundantly encoded in the choice of the letter, as well as in the decoration of that letter, since in the calculus of multivariate functions, just different letters are used, where in tensor calculus only different decorations are used. Then for the two transition functions $g : Z \rightarrow A$ and $f : A \rightarrow B$ the tensor calculus expression that relates the covariant components $B_{i'j'}$ of the bi-covector of the right decorated coordinate system b' to the ones B_{ij} of the undecorated coordinate system a is given by:

$$B_{i'j'} = J_i^{i'} J_j^{j'} B_{ij} ,$$

which translates into:

$$B_{i'j'} \equiv (\underline{b}\dots) \mapsto \sum_i \sum_j \frac{\partial (f^{-1})^i}{\partial b^{i'}}(\underline{b}\dots) \cdot \frac{\partial (f^{-1})^j}{\partial b^{j'}}(\underline{b}\dots) \cdot B_{ij}(f(\underline{b}\dots)\dots)$$

As B_{ij} should be regarded to *naturally* live on the undecorated coordinates a and the resulting object $B_{i'j'}$ to live on the right decorated coordinates b' , a precomposition with f is necessary to obtain the B_{ij} value at b' coordinates. Although this transformation goes in the same logical direction as the functions g and f are defined, the partial derivatives of the inverses of these functions appear due to the contravariant transformation property of the considered electromagnetic quantity.

For the other example the tensor calculus expression relating the contravariant components $E^{i'}$ of the vector E in the right decorated coordinate system b' to the ones E^i of the left decorated coordinate system z' is given by:

$$E^{i'} = J_i^{i'} J_i^i E^i = J_i^{i'} E^i ,$$

which translates into:

$$\begin{aligned}
E^{i'} \equiv (\underline{b}\dots) \mapsto & \sum_i \sum_{i'} \frac{\partial f^{i'}}{\partial a^i} (f^{-1}(\underline{b}\dots)\dots) \\
& \cdot \frac{\partial g^i}{\partial z^{i'}} (g^{-1}(f^{-1}(\underline{b}\dots)\dots)\dots) \\
& \cdot E^{i'} (g^{-1}(f^{-1}(\underline{b}\dots)\dots)\dots)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&=_{\text{chain rule}} (\underline{b}\dots) \mapsto \sum_{\mathbf{i}} \sum_{\mathbf{i}'} \frac{\partial(f^{\mathbf{i}'} \circ g)}{\partial z^{\mathbf{i}'}} (\underline{g}^{-1}(\underline{f}^{-1}(\underline{b}\dots)\dots)\dots) \\
&\quad \cdot E^{\mathbf{i}'} (\underline{g}^{-1}(\underline{f}^{-1}(\underline{b}\dots)\dots)\dots)
\end{aligned}$$

Here again the resulting $E^{\mathbf{i}'}$ should live on the right decorated coordinates b' , where the original $E^{\mathbf{i}}$ lives on the left decorated coordinates $z^{\mathbf{i}}$. The transformation happened again in the same logical direction as the functions go, but this time we've transformed twice. To apply the introduced partial differential of the multivariate functions, it becomes necessary to precompose with the proper inverses to obtain an expression that again depends on the right decorated coordinates b' .

7 Conclusion

We have explained transformations on the partial derivative in terms of computational notions from λ -calculus, extended by parameter-pack-expansion, which is a templating mechanism borrowed from the C++ programming language, with an additional term substitution. This mechanism has been implemented to generate listings for the general case as in Appendix A and for all concrete multivariate cases, indexed by $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{i} \in [1, \mathbf{j}]$, exemplary for $\mathbf{j} = 2$ and $\mathbf{i} = 1$ as in appendix B, out of the same internal representation. It was argued, what general obligations arise when translating the theory into a computational layer of abstraction, for which the λ -calculus served as a model.

Small programs as well as big software, no matter whether directly implementing this layer or not, will suffer from the inevitable tediousness of coordinate transformations when exploiting these techniques too much. That does not pose a problem when being aware of this issue and actively increasing rigor if this kind of complexity escalates out of control. We have presented a way to establish that direction of rigor, motivated by the application of encoding the transformation laws common to the electromagnetic theory and provided an interpretation to guide an implementation demanding it.

8 Appendix

In the appendix we give a carefully revised, although not yet formalized, listing of the computational equivalences used to demonstrate the dependencies of the notion of partial derivative and the chain rule of the partial derivative on the notion of univariate derivative and the corresponding univariate chain rule. Both listings have been created out of the same internal representation with the rules of parameter-pack expansion borrowed from the C++ programming language, with the help of our own implementation of the parameter-pack expansion, supporting the mentioned substitution. For the expanded listing in 8.2 we chose $f, g : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathbf{i} = 1$.

8.1 Appendix A

$$\frac{\partial (f^j \circ g)}{\partial x^i} \tag{A1}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto (\mathbf{z} \mapsto (f^j \circ g) (\underline{x}\dots [\bullet^i := \mathbf{z}]))' (x^i) \tag{A2}$$

$$\equiv_{\circ} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^j (g (\underline{x}\dots [\bullet^i := \mathbf{z}]) \dots))' (x^i) \tag{A3}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{lin}'} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^j (g (\underline{x}\dots) \dots [\bullet^k := g^k (\underline{x}\dots [\bullet^i := \mathbf{z}])]))' (x^i) \tag{A4}$$

$$\equiv_{\circ} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \left(\overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^j (g (\underline{x}\dots) \dots [\bullet^k := \mathbf{z}]))}^{a^k} \circ \overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^k (\underline{x}\dots [\bullet^i := \mathbf{z}]))}^{b^k} \right)' (x^i) \tag{A5}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k (a^k \circ b^k)' (x^i) \tag{A6}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{chain}'} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \left((a^k \circ b^k)' (x^i) \right) \cdot b^k' (x^i) \tag{A7}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \left(\underbrace{\left(\overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^j (g (\underline{x}\dots) \dots [\bullet^k := \mathbf{z}]))}^{a^k} \circ \overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^k (\underline{x}\dots [\bullet^i := \mathbf{z}]))}^{b^k} \right)' (x^i)}_{\frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k} (g^k (\underline{x}\dots))} \right) \cdot \underbrace{\overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^k (\underline{x}\dots [\bullet^i := \mathbf{z}]))}' (x^i)}_{\frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i} (\underline{x}\dots)} \tag{A8}$$

$$\equiv_{\beta} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \left(\underbrace{\left(\overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^j (g (\underline{x}\dots) \dots [\bullet^k := \mathbf{z}]))}' \circ \overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^k (\underline{x}\dots [\bullet^i := \mathbf{z}]))}' \right) (x^i)}_{\frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k} (g^k (\underline{x}\dots))} \cdot \underbrace{\left(\overbrace{(y\dots) \mapsto (g^k (y\dots [\bullet^i := \mathbf{z}]))}' (y^i)}_{\frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i}} \right) (y^i)}_{\frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i}} \right) (\underline{x}\dots) \tag{A9}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \left(\underbrace{\left(\overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^j (g (\underline{x}\dots) \dots [\bullet^k := \mathbf{z}]))}' \circ \overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^k (\underline{x}\dots [\bullet^i := \mathbf{z}]))}' \right) (x^i)}_{\frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k} (g^k (\underline{x}\dots))} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i} (\underline{x}\dots) \tag{A10}$$

$$\equiv_{\circ} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \left(\underbrace{\left(\overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^j (g (\underline{x}\dots) \dots [\bullet^k := \mathbf{z}]))}' (g^k (\underline{x}\dots)) \right)}_{\frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k} (g^k (\underline{x}\dots))} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i} (\underline{x}\dots) \tag{A11}$$

$$\equiv_{\beta} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \left(\underbrace{\left(\overbrace{(y\dots) \mapsto (g^k (y\dots [\bullet^k := \mathbf{z}]))}' (y^k)}_{\frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k}} \right) (y^k)}_{\frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k}} \right) (g (\underline{x}\dots) \dots) \cdot \frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i} (\underline{x}\dots) \tag{A12}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k} (g (\underline{x}\dots) \dots) \cdot \frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i} (\underline{x}\dots) \tag{A13}$$

$$\equiv_{\circ} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \left(\frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k} \circ g \right) (\underline{x}\dots) \cdot \frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i} (\underline{x}\dots) \tag{A14}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \left(\left(\frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k} \circ g \right) \otimes \frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i} \right) (\underline{x}\dots) \tag{A15}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (\underline{x}\dots) \mapsto \sum_k \left(\frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k} \otimes_{(g \times \text{id})} \frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i} \right) (\underline{x}\dots) \tag{A16}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} \bigoplus_k \left(\frac{\partial f^j}{\partial y^k} \otimes_{(g \times \text{id})} \frac{\partial g^k}{\partial x^i} \right) \tag{A17}$$

$$\cong_{\text{T}} \left(\mathbf{J}_{k'}^j \quad \mathbf{J}_{i'}^{k'} \right) \tag{A18}$$

$$\equiv \mathbf{J}_{k'}^j \mathbf{J}_{i'}^{k'} \tag{A19}$$

8.2 Appendix B

$$\frac{\partial (f^{\mathbf{j}} \circ g)}{\partial x^1} \tag{B1}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto (\mathbf{z} \mapsto (f^{\mathbf{j}} \circ g)(\mathbf{z}, x^2))' (x^1) \tag{B2}$$

$$\equiv_{\circ} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^{\mathbf{j}}(g^1(\mathbf{z}, x^2), g^2(\mathbf{z}, x^2)))' (x^1) \tag{B3}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{lin}'} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^{\mathbf{j}}(g^1(\mathbf{z}, x^2), g^2(x^1, x^2)))' (x^1) + (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^{\mathbf{j}}(g^1(x^1, x^2), g^2(\mathbf{z}, x^2)))' (x^1) \tag{B4}$$

$$\equiv_{\circ} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto \left(\overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{z}, g^2(x^1, x^2))) \circ (\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^1(\mathbf{z}, x^2))}^{a^1} \right)' (x^1) + \left(\overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^{\mathbf{j}}(g^1(x^1, x^2), \mathbf{z})) \circ (\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^2(\mathbf{z}, x^2))}^{a^2} \right)' (x^1) \tag{B5}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto (a^1 \circ b^1)' (x^1) + (a^2 \circ b^2)' (x^1) \tag{B6}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{chain}'} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto \left((a^1)' \circ b^1 \right)' (x^1) \cdot b^1' (x^1) + \left((a^2)' \circ b^2 \right)' (x^1) \cdot b^2' (x^1) \tag{B7}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto \underbrace{\left(\overbrace{\left(\overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{z}, g^2(x^1, x^2)))}' \circ (\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^1(\mathbf{z}, x^2)) \right)}^{a^1'} \right)' (x^1)}_{\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^1}(g^1(x^1, x^2))} \cdot \underbrace{\overbrace{(\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^1(\mathbf{z}, x^2))}' (x^1)}^{b^1'(x^1)} + \text{one more term} \tag{B8}$$

$$\equiv_{\beta} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto \left(\left((\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{z}, g^2(x^1, x^2)))' \circ (\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^1(\mathbf{z}, x^2)) \right) (x^1) \right) \cdot \underbrace{\left((y^1, y^2) \mapsto (\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^1(\mathbf{z}, y^2))' (y^1) \right)}_{\frac{\partial g^1}{\partial x^1}} (x^1, x^2) + \text{one more term} \tag{B9}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto \underbrace{\left(\left((\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{z}, g^2(x^1, x^2)))' \circ (\mathbf{z} \mapsto g^1(\mathbf{z}, x^2)) \right) (x^1) \right)}_{\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^1}(g^1(x^1, x^2))} \cdot \frac{\partial g^1}{\partial x^1}(x^1, x^2) + \text{one more term} \tag{B10}$$

$$\equiv_{\circ} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto \underbrace{\left((\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{z}, g^2(x^1, x^2)))' (g^1(x^1, x^2)) \right)}_{\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^1}(g^1(x^1, x^2))} \cdot \frac{\partial g^1}{\partial x^1}(x^1, x^2) + \text{one more term} \tag{B11}$$

$$\equiv_{\beta} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto \underbrace{\left((y^1, y^2) \mapsto (\mathbf{z} \mapsto f^{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{z}, y^2))' (y^1) \right)}_{\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^1}} (g^1(x^1, x^2), g^2(x^1, x^2)) \cdot \frac{\partial g^1}{\partial x^1}(x^1, x^2) + \text{one more term} \tag{B12}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto \frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^1}(g^1(x^1, x^2), g^2(x^1, x^2)) \cdot \frac{\partial g^1}{\partial x^1}(x^1, x^2) + \frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^2}(g^1(x^1, x^2), g^2(x^1, x^2)) \cdot \frac{\partial g^2}{\partial x^1}(x^1, x^2) \tag{B13}$$

$$\equiv_{\circ} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto \left(\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^1} \circ g \right) (x^1, x^2) \cdot \frac{\partial g^1}{\partial x^1}(x^1, x^2) + \left(\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^2} \circ g \right) (x^1, x^2) \cdot \frac{\partial g^2}{\partial x^1}(x^1, x^2) \tag{B14}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto \left(\left(\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^1} \circ g \right) \otimes \frac{\partial g^1}{\partial x^1} \right) (x^1, x^2) + \left(\left(\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^2} \circ g \right) \otimes \frac{\partial g^2}{\partial x^1} \right) (x^1, x^2) \tag{B15}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} (x^1, x^2) \mapsto \left(\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^1} \otimes_{(g \times \text{id})} \frac{\partial g^1}{\partial x^1} \right) (x^1, x^2) + \left(\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^2} \otimes_{(g \times \text{id})} \frac{\partial g^2}{\partial x^1} \right) (x^1, x^2) \tag{B16}$$

$$\equiv_{\text{def}} \left(\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^1} \otimes_{(g \times \text{id})} \frac{\partial g^1}{\partial x^1} \right) \oplus \left(\frac{\partial f^{\mathbf{j}}}{\partial y^2} \otimes_{(g \times \text{id})} \frac{\partial g^2}{\partial x^1} \right) \tag{B17}$$

$$\cong_{\text{T}} \left(\mathbf{J}_1^{\mathbf{j}}, \mathbf{J}_{1''}^{1'} \right) +_T \left(\mathbf{J}_2^{\mathbf{j}}, \mathbf{J}_{1''}^{2'} \right) \tag{B18}$$

$$\equiv \mathbf{J}_1^{\mathbf{j}}, \mathbf{J}_{1''}^{1'} +_T \mathbf{J}_2^{\mathbf{j}}, \mathbf{J}_{1''}^{2'} \tag{B19}$$

8.3 Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by German Research Foundation (DFG) under project number 289991964.

References

- [1] Bossavit Alain. On the notion of anisotropy of constitutive laws: Some implications of the 'Hodge implies metric' result. *COMPEL - The international journal for computation and mathematics in electrical and electronic engineering*. 2001;20(1):233-239.
- [2] Dantzig D.. The fundamental equations of electromagnetism, independent of metrical geometry. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*. 1934;30(4):421-427.
- [3] Bossavit Alain. The premetric approach to electromagnetism in the 'waves are not vectors' debate. *Advanced Electromagnetics*, 1(1), 97-102. 2012;.
- [4] Raunonen P.. *Mathematical structures for dimensional reduction and equivalence classification of electromagnetic boundary value problems*. Tampere University of Technology. Publication Tampere University of Technology; 2009. Awarding institution: Tampere University of Technology.
- [5] Tonti Enzo. *The Mathematical Structure of Classical and Relativistic Physics*. Birkhäuser Basel; 2013.