

Computing with traceable tensor networks

Sarah Ellwein^a, Daniele Venturi^{a,*}

^a*Department of Applied Mathematics, University of California Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz (CA) 95064*

Abstract

We introduce a new SVD-based tensor decomposition method for tensor networks with arbitrary graph topologies, extending classical hierarchical SVD-based techniques to networks with cycles and general connectivity. We also introduce addition and rounding procedures for traceable tensor graphs, enabling step-rounding time integration of high-dimensional PDEs directly in graph format, with rank truncation controlled to a prescribed tolerance at every time step. We demonstrate the new method on the decomposition of multivariate functions and on the numerical solution of the Fokker–Planck equation, and find that the graph-format representation attains comparable or better accuracy than the classical tensor train and hierarchical Tucker tensor formats, while using substantially fewer degrees of freedom at lower computational cost.

Keywords: Tensor networks, approximation of high-dimensional functions, tensor train, hierarchical Tucker, Fokker–Planck equation, low-rank methods, high-dimensional PDEs.

1. Introduction

Approximating high-dimensional problems via numerical algorithms usually runs into a fundamental challenge: the number of degrees of freedom (DOF) grows exponentially with the dimension of the problem. Classical examples include the approximation of high-dimensional functions and numerical solvers for high-dimensional partial differential equations (PDEs), such as the Fokker–Planck equation [1, 2, 3, 4], the BBGKY hierarchy in kinetic theory [5, 6, 7, 8], and functional differential equations [9, 10, 11].

When the solution admits a low-rank structure, numerical tensor methods can mitigate this growth via low-rank approximations. A successful class of such methods are based on singular value decompositions (SVD), which construct each factor of the representation by applying a hierarchical sequence of SVDs to the target tensor. Two widely used tensor formats in this class, namely tensor train (TT) [12] and hierarchical Tucker (HT) [13], yield provable quasi-optimal low-rank approximations and reduce DOF growth from exponential to polynomial in dimension. SVD-based decompositions have been extended to other topologies, including the tensor ring (TR) [14], tensor wheel (TW) [15], and the fully-connected tensor network (FCTN) [16, 17]. FCTN in particular generalizes the chain and tree topologies of TT and HT to an arbitrary graph and admits a recursive SVD construction (FCTN-SVD) [17].

These tensor formats extend naturally to high-dimensional PDEs, where the curse of dimensionality represents one of the main computational bottlenecks. As an example, consider an initial-value

*Corresponding author

Email address: venturi@ucsc.edu (Daniele Venturi)

problem of the form

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}(u), \quad u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = u_0, \quad (1)$$

where $u(\mathbf{x}, t)$ depends on d variables $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ is a linear differential operator, possibly depending on $\mathbf{x}$. Discretizing in space on a tensor-product grid yields a semi-discrete system $\dot{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u})$, where $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_d}$ is a d -mode tensor whose full storage cost is prohibitive even for moderate d and n_j . For instance, with $n_j = 200$ points per dimension and $d = 6$, one has 64×10^{12} (64 trillion) grid points, requiring about 512 terabytes of storage in double precision.

To overcome this problem, one may consider a low-rank representation of $\mathbf{u}(t)$ in a chosen tensor format throughout the simulation. One such method is *step-truncation* (or *step-rounding*), in which the tensor solution undergoes a time step forward using any conventional time-stepping scheme, followed by a recompression to remain on a low-rank manifold [18, 2, 11]. As an example, the forward Euler step-truncation scheme takes the form

$$\mathbf{u}^{n+1} = \mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}^n + \Delta t \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}^n)), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ is a rounding operator that projects the input back onto the low-rank manifold up to a prescribed tolerance ε . Two primitive operations are required for this scheme to operate: addition, since $\mathbf{u}^n + \Delta t \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}^n)$ has rank up to the sum of the ranks of its summands, and rounding $\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon$, which restores low-rankness after each step. Both TT and HT tensor formats satisfy these requirements: the addition is performed by a block-diagonal concatenation of factors, and $\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon$ is implemented as an SVD-based sweep along the structure of the format [12, 13]. A similar SVD-based rounding has been developed for the Tensor Ring (TR) format, where addition uses max-concatenation in place of block-diagonal concatenation, allowing an SVD sweep to compress inflated ranks [19]. While various algorithms exist for the SVD-based construction of low-rank tensor network representations of a d -dimensional full tensor, to our knowledge, no SVD-sweep based rounding procedures are available for tensor network formats other than TT, HT, or TR.

In this paper, we develop new SVD-based algorithm to compute arbitrary graph tensor network (GTN) decompositions with user-specified network topology—given the topology admits a graph structure—we call GTN-SVD. For the subclass of *traceable graphs*—those whose network admits a traceable path—we further introduce addition and rounding operations inspired by their TT counterparts [12]. Together, these operations close the step-truncation workflow on traceable GTNs, allowing time-evolving low-rank solutions to be carried in graph topologies beyond classic formats like TT, HT or TR. The rounding procedure exploits the traceable path ordering to reduce the SVD sweep to a TT-style pass. We demonstrate the resulting integrator on a four-dimensional Fokker-Planck equation, where the traceable GTN representation achieves comparable accuracy to TT and HT at lower DOF and reduced per-step rounding time.

As a preview of what a GTN decomposition can offer, consider the 4D multivariate function

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \exp\left(-4\left[\cos(x_1 - \pi) + \cos(x_3 - \pi) - 0.5\right]^2 + 1.5 \sin(x_1 - \pi) \sin(x_3 - \pi) + 1.6 \cos(x_2 - x_4) + 1.2 \cos(2(x_2 + x_4))\right], \quad (3)$$

In Figure 1 we compare the performance of our GTN-SVD algorithm in a barbell topology (GTN-BB) against TT on this function. The two formats attain the same accuracy at very different cost: at a prescribed tolerance $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ the barbell requires 8,802 degrees of freedom against 3.37×10^6 for TT, a factor of 382 fewer, and this factor grows to 498 at $\varepsilon = 10^{-10}$. The same advantage carries over to time integration. Applying the two formats to a heat diffusion equation with a step truncation scheme, GTN-BB holds one to two orders of magnitude fewer degrees of freedom than




Figure 1: Performance of our GTN-SVD algorithm on a barbell topology (GTN-BB) versus TT. Top: the two graph topologies, GTN-BB (left) and TT (right). Bottom: degrees of freedom for the tensor representation of the function (3) versus prescribed tolerance ε (left), and versus time t for the time-dependent solution of a four-dimensional diffusion PDE on a torus (right).

TT throughout the evolution while meeting the same per-step tolerance. These preliminary results, detailed later in this paper, motivate the central question addressed here: how to decompose, add, and round tensors in a traceable graph format so as to enable efficient computation on low-rank tensor manifolds.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we establish the graph representation of tensor networks and introduce a new SVD-based algorithm that decomposes a tensor into an arbitrary user-defined graph tensor format. In Section 3, we define the essential operations—addition, Hadamard product, and rounding—that act on an arbitrary traceable GTN decomposition while remaining in its format, without reconstructing the full tensor. In Section 4 we present numerical examples applying the proposed algorithms to multivariate functions and to the 4D Fokker–Planck equation. The main findings are summarized in Section 5.

2. SVD-Based Algorithms for Graph Tensor Networks

In this section, we introduce the tensor notation used throughout the paper, review the representation of tensor networks as graphs, and define the rank adjacency matrix, a compact encoding of a tensor network’s topology and dimensions. Building on this, we then present our GTN-SVD algorithm, an SVD-based decomposition algorithm that produces a tensor decomposition in a user-defined graph tensor format.

2.1. Tensor Notation and Basic Tensor Operations

Throughout, we denote tensors by calligraphic letters ($\mathcal{X}$) and matrices by bold capitals ($\mathbf{X}$). We describe here the two important tensor operations used throughout the paper: matricization, which reshapes a tensor into a matrix, and the k -mode product, which applies a matrix to a single mode of a tensor.

Matricization. Reshaping a tensor into a matrix amounts to merging several of its indices into one. Given $i_k \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$ for $k = 1, \dots, d$, we write the resulting *multi-index* as

$$\overline{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^d (i_k - 1) \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j, \quad (4)$$

which enumerates the merged indices in first-index-fastest order. Two reshaping of $\mathcal{X}$ recur. The *single k -mode unfolding* $\mathbf{X}_{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k \times \prod_{i \neq k} n_i}$ isolates one mode against all the others,

$$\mathcal{X}(i_1, \dots, i_k, \dots, i_d) = \mathbf{X}_{(k)}(i_k, \overline{i_1 \dots i_{k-1} i_{k+1} \dots i_d}), \quad (5)$$

placing mode k along the rows and the merged remaining modes along the columns. The *k -mode unfolding* $\mathbf{X}_{\langle k \rangle} \in \mathbb{R}^{\prod_{i \leq k} n_i \times \prod_{i > k} n_i}$ instead splits the modes into a leading and a trailing multi-index,

$$\mathcal{X}(i_1, \dots, i_k, \dots, i_d) = \mathbf{X}_{\langle k \rangle}(\overline{i_1 \dots i_k}, \overline{i_{k+1} \dots i_d}), \quad (6)$$

separating the first k modes of $\mathcal{X}$ from the remaining $d - k$.

k -mode product. The *k -mode product* applies a matrix along a single mode, leaving the others untouched. For $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_k}$, the k -mode product $\mathcal{X} \times_k \mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_{k-1} \times m \times n_{k+1} \times \dots \times n_d}$ is given by

$$(\mathcal{X} \times_k \mathbf{M})(i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, j, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_d) = \sum_{i_k=1}^{n_k} \mathcal{X}(i_1, \dots, i_k, \dots, i_d) \mathbf{M}(j, i_k), \quad (7)$$

so that mode k is contracted against the columns of $\mathbf{M}$ and replaced by its rows. Equivalently, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} \times_k \mathbf{M}$ is the tensor whose unfolding satisfies $\mathbf{Y}_{(k)} = \mathbf{M} \mathbf{X}_{(k)}$.

Tensor contraction. Given $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_p}$ and $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times \dots \times m_q}$ sharing a common dimension along mode k of $\mathcal{X}$ and mode l of $\mathcal{Y}$ (i.e., $n_k = m_l$), their contraction along this pair of modes is the tensor $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_{k-1} \times n_{k+1} \times \dots \times n_p \times m_1 \times \dots \times m_{l-1} \times m_{l+1} \times \dots \times m_q}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{Z}(i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_p, j_1, \dots, j_{l-1}, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_q) = \sum_{i_k=1}^{n_k} \mathcal{X}(i_1, \dots, i_k, \dots, i_p) \mathcal{Y}(j_1, \dots, i_k, \dots, j_q), \quad (8)$$

so that mode k of $\mathcal{X}$ and mode l of $\mathcal{Y}$ are summed away and the remaining modes of both tensors are concatenated into a single, higher-order tensor. The order of $\mathcal{Z}$ is thus $p + q - 2$, reduced by two for each pair of contracted modes. Equivalently, a contraction can be written as a matrix product between the matricizations of $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ along the contracted modes, $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{X}_{(k)}^\top \mathbf{Y}_{(l)}$, reshaped back into a tensor.




Figure 2: Tensor train (TT), tensor ring (TR), fully-connected tensor network (FCTN), and hierarchical Tucker (HT) diagrams for $d = 4$ (left to right). TT forms a path graph P_4 , TR forms a cycle graph C_4 , HT forms a binary tree, and FCTN forms a complete graph K_4 .

2.2. Tensor Network Representation as Graphs

Let $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_d}$ be a d -dimensional tensor, and suppose $\mathcal{X}$ admits a low-rank approximation $\mathcal{X} \approx \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ is built from the contraction of smaller factor tensors $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_M$, $M \geq d$, called tensor *cores*. The tensor $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ can be conveniently represented in terms of a *graph* whose nodes represent the cores $\mathcal{G}_j$ and whose edges represent indices that are summed over (contracted). For example, the classical TT format [12] expresses elements of $\mathcal{X}$ as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(i_1, \dots, i_d) = \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d-1}} \mathcal{G}_1(i_1, \alpha_1) \mathcal{G}_2(\alpha_1, i_2, \alpha_2) \cdots \mathcal{G}_d(\alpha_{d-1}, i_d), \quad (9)$$

which corresponds to a path graph P_d . Closing the TT chain into a loop by adding a single edge between the first and last cores produces the TR format [14]

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(i_1, \dots, i_d) = \sum_{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d-1}} \mathcal{G}_1(\alpha_0, i_1, \alpha_1) \mathcal{G}_2(\alpha_1, i_2, \alpha_2) \cdots \mathcal{G}_d(\alpha_{d-1}, i_d, \alpha_0), \quad (10)$$

which corresponds to a cycle graph C_d . The HT format [13] index form representation can be depicted as a binary tree, the d physical indices are attached as leaves, and each interior node carries a transfer tensor $\mathcal{B}_t$ that contracts the two child subtrees into a single edge:

$$\mathcal{U}_t(i_{\mu(t)}, \alpha_t) = \sum_{\alpha_{t_\ell}, \alpha_{t_r}} \mathcal{B}_t(\alpha_{t_\ell}, \alpha_{t_r}, \alpha_t) \mathcal{U}_{t_\ell}(i_{\mu(t_\ell)}, \alpha_{t_\ell}) \mathcal{U}_{t_r}(i_{\mu(t_r)}, \alpha_{t_r}), \quad (11)$$

with $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{U}_{t_{\text{root}}}$. The FCTN format [16] places an edge between every pair of cores

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(i_1, \dots, i_d) = \sum_{\{\alpha_{j,k}\}_{1 \leq j < k \leq d}} \prod_{k=1}^d \mathcal{G}_k(i_k, \{\alpha_{j,k}\}_{j \neq k}), \quad (12)$$

yielding the complete graph K_d . These tensor formats, i.e., TT, HT, TR, and FCTN, are depicted in Figure 2 for $d = 4$. They are all particular instances of a broader category of *graph tensor networks*, in which the cores and edge structure are arranged according to a graph.

To specify such a graph, we encode its topology in a *rank adjacency matrix* $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{Z}^{p \times p}$, with $p \geq d$, whose entries record the physical mode sizes and the edge dimensions between every pair of cores, akin to an adjacency matrix used in graph theory. Specifically, the rank adjacency matrix has entries

$$\mathbf{R}_{ij} = \begin{cases} n_i, & i = j, \\ r_{i,j} \text{ rank}(i, j), & i \neq j, \text{ edge connects } i \text{ and } j. \\ 1, & i \neq j, \text{ no edge connects } i \text{ and } j. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$




	Tensor network	Rank adjacency matrix
FCTN		$\begin{matrix} & \mathcal{G}_1 & \mathcal{G}_2 & \mathcal{G}_3 & \mathcal{G}_4 & \mathcal{G}_5 \\ \begin{matrix} \mathcal{G}_1 \\ \mathcal{G}_2 \\ \mathcal{G}_3 \\ \mathcal{G}_4 \\ \mathcal{G}_5 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} n_1 & r_{1,2} & r_{1,3} & r_{1,4} & r_{1,5} \\ r_{1,2} & n_2 & r_{2,3} & r_{2,4} & r_{2,5} \\ r_{1,3} & r_{2,3} & n_3 & r_{3,4} & r_{3,5} \\ r_{1,4} & r_{2,4} & r_{3,4} & n_4 & r_{4,5} \\ r_{1,5} & r_{2,5} & r_{3,5} & r_{4,5} & n_5 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$
TT		$\begin{matrix} & \mathcal{G}_1 & \mathcal{G}_2 & \mathcal{G}_3 & \mathcal{G}_4 \\ \begin{matrix} \mathcal{G}_1 \\ \mathcal{G}_2 \\ \mathcal{G}_3 \\ \mathcal{G}_4 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} n_1 & r_{1,2} & 1 & 1 \\ r_{1,2} & n_2 & r_{2,3} & 1 \\ 1 & r_{2,3} & n_3 & r_{3,4} \\ 1 & 1 & r_{3,4} & n_4 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$
HT		$\begin{matrix} & \mathcal{G}_1 & \mathcal{G}_2 & \mathcal{G}_3 & \mathcal{G}_4 & \mathcal{G}_5 & \mathcal{G}_6 & \mathcal{G}_7 \\ \begin{matrix} \mathcal{G}_1 \\ \mathcal{G}_2 \\ \mathcal{G}_3 \\ \mathcal{G}_4 \\ \mathcal{G}_5 \\ \mathcal{G}_6 \\ \mathcal{G}_7 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} n_1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & r_{1,5} & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & n_2 & 1 & 1 & r_{2,5} & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & n_3 & 1 & 1 & r_{3,6} & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & n_4 & 1 & r_{4,6} & 1 \\ r_{1,5} & r_{2,5} & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & r_{5,7} \\ 1 & 1 & r_{3,6} & r_{4,6} & 1 & 1 & r_{6,7} \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & r_{5,7} & r_{6,7} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$

Figure 3: Examples of well-known tensor formats expressed as graphs (left) and rank adjacency matrices (right). For FCTN, the graph is the complete graph K_d , with the corresponding matrix fully populated with ranks. For TT, the graph is the path graph P_d , with only the superdiagonal and subdiagonal entries populated with ranks. For HT, the graph is a balanced binary tree, requiring internal cores $\mathcal{G}_5, \mathcal{G}_6, \mathcal{G}_7$.

The matrix is symmetric, as $\mathbf{R}_{ij} = \mathbf{R}_{ji}$. We write its diagonal entries as $\mathbf{R}_{jj} = n_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$, where $n_1, \dots, n_d$ are the physical mode sizes of $\mathcal{X}$ and $n_j = 1$ for $d < j \leq p$, corresponding to internal nodes that are not associated with a physical index of the original tensor. In Figure 3, we provide examples of the rank adjacency matrix for three well-known tensor formats, namely FCTN, TT, and HT.

To describe the main idea underpinning our GTN-SVD algorithm, we begin with a simple observation: any simple graph on p vertices is a subgraph of the complete graph K_p . The FCTN format is precisely the tensor network realization of K_p , where each of its p cores is associated with an index and every pair of cores shares an edge. An arbitrary GTN can then be recovered from this complete network by trivializing its absent edges.

2.3. GTN-SVD Algorithm

To describe the main idea of our GTN-SVD algorithm, we begin with the observation that any simple graph on p vertices is a subgraph of the complete graph K_p . The FCTN format is precisely the tensor network realization of K_p , where each of its p cores is associated with an index and every pair of cores shares an edge. An arbitrary GTN can then be recovered from this complete network by *trivializing its absent edges*. To this end, let $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{N}^{p \times p}$ be the rank adjacency matrix, with $\mathbf{R}_{jj} = n_j$




Figure 4: (a) Rank adjacency matrix for a graph tensor network. Red entries equal to one mark either a disconnection between cores (off-diagonal) or an internal core with no physical index (diagonal). (b) Equivalent FCTN representation from rank adjacency matrix (a), in which the red dotted edges correspond to the unit entries and the blue solid lines correspond to a nontrivial edge rank or a physical index. (c) GTN isomorphic to the FCTN depicted in (b).

the size of the j -th physical mode and $\mathbf{R}_{ij} = r_{i,j}$, $i \neq j$, the size of the edge between cores i and j . Since indexing over a singleton dimension acts as the identity, setting $\mathbf{R}_{ij} = 1$ deletes the edge $\{i, j\}$ and setting $n_j = 1$ removes the physical index of core j , neither of which alters the original tensor (see Figure 3). As a consequence, every graph tensor network on p cores is isomorphic to an FCTN on p cores whose corresponding entries of $\mathbf{R}$ equal one. Figure 4 illustrates this for a 4D tensor represented on $p = 6$ cores, two of which are internal ($n_5 = n_6 = 1$). The singleton ranks delete the missing edges, recovering an FCTN on six cores. The isomorphism between GTN and FCTN allows us to extend the FCTN-SVD algorithm, originally proposed by Wang and Li [17], to SVD-based decompositions of GTNs corresponding to any user-defined rank adjacency matrix $\mathbf{R}$. The new algorithm, which we call GTN-SVD (see Algorithm 1), takes in a full tensor $\mathcal{X}$, a user-prescribed $p \times p$ rank adjacency matrix $\mathbf{R}$, and a prescribed error tolerance ε to produce tensor cores $\{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_p\}$ and, correspondingly, a GTN tensor $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ satisfying

$$\|\mathcal{X} - \tilde{\mathcal{X}}\|_F \leq \varepsilon \|\mathcal{X}\|_F. \quad (14)$$

The algorithm is based on the following error bound, which follows from the results in [17].

Theorem 1 (GTN-SVD error bound). Let $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_d}$ be a given tensor and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ its GTN approximation using $p \geq d$ cores $\{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_p\}$. Suppose that the k -unfoldings $\mathbf{X}_{\langle k \rangle}$ of the tensor $\mathcal{X}$ satisfy

$$\mathbf{X}_{\langle k \rangle} = \mathbf{A}_k + \mathbf{E}_k, \quad \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_k) = r_k, \quad \|\mathbf{E}_k\|_F = \varepsilon_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, p-1, \quad (15)$$

and that the outgoing edges of core k are chosen so that

$$\prod_{\substack{j > k \\ \mathbf{R}_{kj} \neq 1}} \mathbf{R}_{kj} = r_k. \quad (16)$$

Then GTN-SVD returns a tensor $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ in the graph tensor network format prescribed by the rank

adjacency matrix $\mathbf{R}$, with

$$\|\mathcal{X} - \tilde{\mathcal{X}}\|_F \leq \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \varepsilon_k^2}. \quad (17)$$

Moreover, if each SVD in Algorithm 1 is truncated at

$$\delta_k = \sqrt{\frac{2(p-k)}{p(p-1)}} \varepsilon \|\mathcal{X}\|_F, \quad (18)$$

where ε is a prescribed tolerance, then the error bound (14) holds.

Proof. The proof is by induction on p . For $p = 2$ the statement follows from the properties of the SVD. Consider an arbitrary $p > 2$. The first unfolding $\mathbf{X}_{\langle 1 \rangle}$ is decomposed as

$$\mathbf{X}_{\langle 1 \rangle} = \mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{V}_1^\top + \mathbf{E}_1 = \mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{B}_1 + \mathbf{E}_1,$$

where $\mathbf{U}_1$ is of size $n_1 \times r_1$, has orthonormal columns, and $\|\mathbf{E}_1\|_F = \varepsilon_1$. The first core $\mathcal{G}_1$ is obtained by reshaping the r_1 columns of $\mathbf{U}_1$ onto the present outgoing edges $\{j > 1 : R_{1j} \neq 1\}$ of core 1; as this re-indexes the columns, it leaves $\mathbf{U}_1$ unchanged as a linear map. The matrix $\mathbf{B}_1$ is associated with a $(p-1)$ -core tensor $\mathcal{B}_1$, which GTN-SVD decomposes further; that is, $\mathbf{B}_1$ is approximated by some matrix $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_1$. From the properties of the SVD it follows that $\mathbf{U}_1^\top \mathbf{E}_1 = 0$, and thus

$$\|\mathcal{X} - \tilde{\mathcal{X}}\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{X}_{\langle 1 \rangle} - \mathbf{U}_1 \hat{\mathbf{B}}_1\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{X}_{\langle 1 \rangle} - \mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{B}_1\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{U}_1 (\mathbf{B}_1 - \hat{\mathbf{B}}_1)\|_F^2,$$

and since $\mathbf{U}_1$ has orthonormal columns,

$$\|\mathcal{X} - \tilde{\mathcal{X}}\|_F^2 \leq \varepsilon_1^2 + \|\mathbf{B}_1 - \hat{\mathbf{B}}_1\|_F^2.$$

The matrix $\mathbf{B}_1$ is expressed from $\mathbf{X}_{\langle 1 \rangle}$ as $\mathbf{B}_1 = \mathbf{U}_1^\top \mathbf{X}_{\langle 1 \rangle}$, and from the orthonormality of the columns of $\mathbf{U}_1$ it is not difficult to see that the distance of the k -th unfolding ($k = 2, \dots, p-1$) of the $(p-1)$ -core tensor $\mathcal{B}_1$ to the rank- r_k matrix cannot be larger than ε_k . Proceeding by induction,

$$\|\mathbf{B}_1 - \hat{\mathbf{B}}_1\|_F^2 \leq \sum_{k=2}^{p-1} \varepsilon_k^2,$$

which together with the previous inequality gives (17). If each SVD is truncated at δ_k as in (18), then $\varepsilon_k \leq \delta_k$ and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \delta_k^2 = \varepsilon^2 \|\mathcal{X}\|_F^2 \frac{2}{p(p-1)} \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} (p-k) = \varepsilon^2 \|\mathcal{X}\|_F^2,$$

so that $\|\mathcal{X} - \tilde{\mathcal{X}}\|_F \leq \varepsilon \|\mathcal{X}\|_F$. □

Let us make a couple remarks to the proposed GTN-SVD Algorithm 1. First we address the rank assignment strategy. We use the rank adjacency matrix $\mathbf{R}$ both to declare the network topology and to mark which edges the algorithm should assign ranks to. Our implementation uses $r_{k,j} = -1$ to indicate/initialize which edges are assigned ranks. The particular value -1 is immaterial: any marker that cannot be confused with an edge label works, that is, any indicator that is not 1 or above. At each step the columns of the orthonormal factor are reshaped onto the edges carrying this indicator. Next, we address the rank distribution strategy. When a core carries more than one

Algorithm 1 GTN-SVD: decomposing a full tensor to GTN cores

Input: Dense tensor $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_d}$; rank adjacency matrix $\mathbf{R}$; prescribed relative error ε

Output: Tensor cores $\{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_p\}$ of a GTN $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ such that $\|\mathcal{X} - \tilde{\mathcal{X}}\|_F \leq \varepsilon \|\mathcal{X}\|_F$

1: Compute truncation parameters for $k = 1, \dots, p - 1$

$$\delta_k \leftarrow \frac{\sqrt{2(d-k)}}{\sqrt{d(d-1)}} \|\varepsilon \mathcal{X}\|_F$$

2: Compute low-rank approximation via δ_1 -truncated SVD: $\mathbf{X}_{<1>} = \mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{V}_1^T + \mathbf{E}_1$

3: Compute ranks $[r_{1,2}, r_{1,3}, \dots, r_{1,p}]$ via SPLITRANKRULE [17] using $\text{rank}(\mathbf{U}_1)$ and $\mathbf{R}[1, :]$

4: $\mathcal{G}_1 \leftarrow \text{Reshape}(\mathbf{U}_1, [n_1, r_{1,2}, r_{1,3}, \dots, r_{1,p}])$

5: Temporary tensor $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \text{Reshape}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{V}_1^T, [r_{1,2}, r_{1,3}, \dots, r_{1,p}, n_2, n_3, \dots, n_p])$

6: Permute $\mathcal{C}$ such that the new axis order is

$$[r_{1,2}, n_2, r_{1,3}, n_3, \dots, r_{1,p}, n_p]$$

7: **for** $k = 2$ to $p - 1$ **do**

8: $\mathbf{C} \leftarrow \text{Reshape}(\mathcal{C}, [n_k \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} r_{i,k}, (\prod_{j=k+1}^p n_j)(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \prod_{j=k+1}^p n_j r_{i,j})])$

9: Compute low-rank approximation via δ_k -truncated SVD: $\mathbf{C}_{<k>} = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^T + \mathbf{E}_k$

10: Compute ranks $[r_{k,k+1}, r_{k,k+2}, \dots, r_{k,p}]$ via SPLITRANKRULE [17] using $\text{rank}(\mathbf{U}_1)$ and $\mathbf{R}[k, :]$

11: $\mathcal{G}_k \leftarrow \text{Reshape}(\mathbf{U}_k, [r_{1,k}, r_{2,k}, \dots, r_{k-1,k}, n_k, \dots])$

12: $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \text{Reshape}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_k \mathbf{V}_k^T, [r_{k,k+1}, r_{k,k+2}, \dots, r_{k,p}, (\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} r_{i,k+1}), n_{k+1}, \dots, (\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} r_{i,p}), n_p])$

13: Permute $\mathcal{C}$ such that the new axis order is

$$\left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} r_{i,k+1} \right), r_{k,k+1}, n_{k+1}, \dots, \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} r_{i,p} \right), r_{k,p}, n_p \right]$$

14: **end for**

15: $\mathcal{G}_p \leftarrow \text{Reshape}(\mathcal{C}, [r_{1,p}, r_{2,p}, \dots, r_{p-1,p}, n_p])$

edge flagged for assignment, the rank r_k returned by the truncated SVD must be split among them. We follow the *Split Rank Rule* (SRR) of Wang and Li [17] (Algorithm 2 of FCTN-SVD), which factors r_k into prime factors and distributes them across the flagged edges. We summarize SRR in Algorithm 2. We emphasize that the SRR is a heuristic: it is not known to be an optimal way to allocate r_k , and other distributions of the rank among the edges may yield smaller representations or better accuracy. We simply adopt it for ease of implementation. This algorithm can be modified to prescribe ranks instead of assignment to adapt to a prescribed error tolerance, as long as each row $m = 1, \dots, p$ of the rank adjacency matrix suffices the following to ensure the truncation per iteration possible:

$$\prod_{k=1}^m r_{m,k} \geq \prod_{l=m+1}^p r_{m,l}. \quad (19)$$

This constraint also leads us to believe the best organization of a rank adjacency matrix is to decompose all physical modes of the full tensor before decomposing the internal cores. Refer to the HT rank adjacency matrix in Figure 3 for an example.

Algorithm 2 SPLITRANKRULE (SRR) [17]: distribute a rank among outgoing bonds

Input: Rank r_k to be split; row $\mathbf{R}[k, :]$ identifying the m outgoing bonds of core k flagged for sizing

Output: Vector of split ranks $\mathbf{s} = [r_{k,k+1}, \dots, r_{k,p}]$ for those bonds, with all other bonds set to 1

```
1: Initialize  $\mathbf{s} \leftarrow \text{ones}(1:m)$ 
2: Compute the prime factors of  $r_k$  and sort them in descending order into a vector  $\mathbf{a}$ 
3:  $\text{dim} \leftarrow \text{length}(\mathbf{a})$ 
4: if  $\text{dim} \leq m$  then
5:    $\mathbf{s}(1:\text{dim}) \leftarrow \mathbf{a}$ 
6: else
7:    $\mathbf{s} \leftarrow \mathbf{a}(1:m)$ 
8:    $\mathbf{a} \leftarrow \text{flip}(\mathbf{a}(m+1:\text{dim}))$ 
9:    $\text{dim} \leftarrow \text{length}(\mathbf{a})$ 
10:  while  $\text{dim} > m$  do
11:     $\mathbf{s} \leftarrow \mathbf{s} \odot \mathbf{a}(1:m)$ 
12:     $\mathbf{a} \leftarrow \mathbf{a}(m+1:\text{dim})$ 
13:     $\text{dim} \leftarrow \text{length}(\mathbf{a})$ 
14:  end while
15:   $\mathbf{s}(m-\text{dim}+1:m) \leftarrow \mathbf{s}(m-\text{dim}+1:m) \odot \mathbf{a}$ 
16: end if
```

$\triangleright \odot$: Hadamard (elementwise) product

3. Addition and Rounding Operations for Traceable GTNs

In this section, we introduce three operations on GTN tensor formats, namely addition, Hadamard product, and rounding, which significantly broaden the applicability of the GTN format to high-dimensional problems. Before doing so, we briefly introduce the concept of *traceable graphs*, which is foundational to both the addition and rounding operations. We then define addition and the Hadamard product, which together allow us to define a norm operation. Finally, we propose a rounding procedure and discuss how to implement iterative rounding schemes in which both addition and rounding are used. Such iterative schemes arise naturally, for instance, when integrating high-dimensional linear PDEs on GTN tensor manifolds using step-truncation methods.

3.1. Traceable Paths in Graph Tensor Networks

SVD-based algorithms in the TT format owe much of their effectiveness to the underlying path structure: because the cores are arranged in a line, there is an unambiguous ordering in which to perform QR and SVD operations. This ordering enables well-defined operations such as orthogonalization and recompression, as required, for instance, in TT-rounding. A GTN format, on the other hand, is not guaranteed such an arrangement, since the presence of a cycle leaves the traversal order undetermined. This poses a challenge for defining operations such as rounding, and motivates the search for a traversal ordering of the tensor network in GTN format that visits each core exactly once.

This is a *traceable path* (or Hamiltonian path): a path in the network that visits every node, without repeating any node or edge. A graph that admits such a path is called *traceable*. In graph theory terms, a traceable path is a spanning subgraph of the network, so ordering the cores along it exposes a TT-like structure inside the GTN, as shown in Figure 5. We want to note that deciding traceability is NP-complete in general, but the graphs arising in tensor decompositions are small—their size is governed by the dimensionality of the problem, not the mode sizes—so a path can be located by exhaustive or heuristic search at negligible cost relative to the decomposition




Figure 5: (a) A traceable path through an arbitrary GTN: the dotted blue arrows visit every core once, in the order $\mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_5 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_6 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_4$, crossing the edges $r_{1,2} \rightarrow r_{2,5} \rightarrow r_{5,6} \rightarrow r_{3,6} \rightarrow r_{3,4}$ between consecutive cores. (b) Re-indexing the cores in this path order reveals the TT-like substructure.




Figure 6: Traceability of common tensor network formats for $d = 4$ (left to right): TT, TR, FCTN, and HT. The dashed green arrows mark a traceable path (except for HT) visiting every core once. TT is trivial, being a path itself; TR becomes traceable by omitting a single ring edge; and FCTN admits many traceable paths, one of which is shown. The HT tree admits none: two nodes cannot be visited without revisiting a node or edge.

itself. With a traceable path in hand, GTN is “close enough” to a TT that we can reuse TT-based algorithmic machinery. In particular, addition concatenates cores along the edges of the network, and rounding sweeps the traceable order to compress the result back to a prescribed tolerance.

3.2. Tensor Addition

As is well known, for the TT and HT formats, addition is carried out by block concatenation: the cores of the two summands are stacked into disjoint blocks and padded with zeros off the diagonal, so that each edge dimension becomes the sum of the two incoming dimensions. This zero padding is a conceptual device rather than a computational one: in practice, neither the zero blocks are stored nor are any operations performed on them, so the added cost of addition is negligible relative to the size of the summands. Structurally, the zero padding is what makes the construction work: it guarantees that no contraction through the network can mix a core belonging to the first summand with a core belonging to the second. Every surviving term draws all of its cores from one summand or all from the other, so the network evaluates to $\mathcal{X}^1 + \mathcal{X}^2$.

Nothing about this argument fails when the network contains cycles. Concatenating every edge of a cyclic network block-diagonally still yields the exact sum, for the same reason. What fails is the aftermath: addition doubles every edge it touches, so in any iterative scheme (where a sum is formed at every step), the ranks must be compressed back down afterwards, and this is where the topology intervenes. Rounding a GTN proceeds by sweeping along a traceable path, and the edges lying on that path are orthogonalized and truncated; the remaining edges, i.e., the *chords*, are

carried along. A chord that addition has inflated from r to $2r$ is therefore inflated: the sweep never touches it, and no subsequent rounding can undo the growth [19]. Over many steps the chord ranks increase upward without bound, even though the tensor they represent may not be dramatically changed than when it started.

This is resolved, following Mickelin and Karaman [19], by treating certain edges differently. Once the cores are laid out along a traceable path, each core's edges fall into one of two classes: the edges of the traceable path, joining the core to its immediate predecessor and successor, and the chords, joining it to other cores elsewhere in the network. Addition then concatenates along the traceable path, as in the tensor train, but overlays along the chords. Hence, after the addition, a traceable path edge of dimensions r' and r'' becomes an edge of dimension $r' + r''$, while a chord of dimensions r' and r'' becomes an edge of dimension $\max(r', r'')$, with both summands written into the chord starting from the same index so that they overlap rather than occupying separate blocks. Writing α_{k-1}, α_k for the traceable path indices of core k and γ for its chord indices, the cores of the sum are defined as

$$\mathcal{G}_k(\alpha_{k-1}, i_k, \alpha_k, \gamma) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{G}_k^1(\alpha_{k-1}, i_k, \alpha_k, \gamma), & \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_k \text{ in the first block, } \gamma \leq r', \\ \mathcal{G}_k^2(\alpha_{k-1}, i_k, \alpha_k, \gamma), & \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_k \text{ in the second block, } \gamma \leq r'', \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

The construction therefore inflates where inflation can be repaired. Traceable path edges grow additively, but they lie on the path, so the rounding procedure compresses them back to whatever the prescribed tolerance permits. Chords are frozen at the larger of the two incoming dimensions and never grow at all. This is not a concern in practice, since chord dimensions are governed by the network topology rather than by the number of additions performed, and remain small relative to the path ranks throughout. Repeated addition, the operation on which every step-truncation scheme rests, is in this way kept stable on networks with cycles.

3.3. Hadamard Product and Frobenius Norm

The Hadamard product between two tensors $\mathcal{X}^1$ and $\mathcal{X}^2$, denoted as $\mathcal{X}^1 \odot \mathcal{X}^2$, is well suited to the graph format because it acts on each tensor entry independently. Fix an index tuple $(i_1, \dots, i_p)$. The corresponding entry of $\mathcal{X}^1$ is a scalar obtained by contracting the network of slices $\{\mathcal{G}_1^1(i_1), \dots, \mathcal{G}_p^1(i_p)\}$, and likewise for $\mathcal{X}^2$. The entry of the product is just the product of these two scalars. Two independent contractions may always be run side by side as a single contraction over the pair of networks, and the object that does this is the Kronecker product. Slicing each core at a fixed physical index and taking the product of the slices,

$$\mathcal{G}_k(i_k) = \mathcal{G}_k^1(i_k) \otimes \mathcal{G}_k^2(i_k), \quad i_k = 1, \dots, n_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, p, \quad (21)$$

therefore produces cores whose contraction reproduces $\mathcal{X}^1 \odot \mathcal{X}^2$ entry by entry. The graph topology is untouched by this construction, but the edge dimensions change. An edge that carried dimensions $r'_{i,j}$ and $r''_{i,j}$ in the two factors carries dimension

$$r_{i,j} = r'_{i,j} r''_{i,j}, \quad i \neq j, \quad (22)$$

in the product, while the physical mode sizes n_k are unchanged. Everything else follows. The inner product of two tensors in the format is the sum of all entries of their Hadamard product, and summing all entries of a graph tensor network requires no reconstruction either. Taking $\mathcal{X}^1 = \mathcal{X}^2 = \mathcal{X}$ then gives the squared Frobenius norm of $\mathcal{X}$

$$\|\mathcal{X}\|_F^2 = \langle \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X} \rangle = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_p} \mathcal{X}(i_1, \dots, i_p)^2 = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_p} (\mathcal{X} \odot \mathcal{X})(i_1, \dots, i_p), \quad (23)$$

where $(\mathcal{X} \odot \mathcal{X})(i_1, \dots, i_p)$ is computed directly from the cores.

3.4. Tensor Rounding

Tensor rounding (or truncation) is a crucial tensor operation, which takes a decomposed tensor with suboptimal ranks and returns one with compressed ranks. Formats like TT have a well-defined SVD-based rounding operation that is quasi-optimal [12]. Although rounding tensor formats with loops is known to be a challenging problem with fundamental limitations [20], here we propose a heuristic rounding operation that reduces the ranks of GTN formats containing loops with bounded error. To achieve this, the GTN must admit a traceable path.

Ordering the cores along a traceable path organizes the network into a chain with chords: along a chain a TT-like rounding procedure applies. We therefore round GTNs in two sweeps. The first passes right to left along the traceable path, replacing each core by an orthogonal factor and pushing the remaining triangular factor into its predecessor. This sweep is a change of basis and nothing more: it introduces no error, and it leaves the network orthogonalized. The second sweep passes left to right, taking a truncated SVD at each edge of the traceable path and discarding every singular value below a threshold δ . Because the first sweep has orthogonalized everything to the right of the working core, the error committed at each edge is the tail of the discarded singular values. The chords take no part in either sweep. They are carried as additional legs of the cores they attach to, consistent with how chords are treated in the tensor addition operation we defined in Section 3.2.

On a network with no chords, i.e., a path, the proposed rounding procedure reduces to TT rounding and inherits its quasi-optimality. In the presence of chords it does not, and we claim no optimality. What it does retain, though, is an error bound. That bound rests on the choice of the truncation threshold δ . Specifically, distributing a relative tolerance ε across m SVD truncations whose errors are governed by $\delta = \varepsilon \|\mathcal{X}\|_F / \sqrt{m}$ gives the desired bound. For instance, taking $m = d - 1$ would recover the usual TT rule. Setting $m = (p - 1) + c$, where c is the number of chords, yields instead

$$\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{(p-1)+c}} \|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}\|_F \quad (24)$$

which budgets for truncations at the chords as well, even though the sweep performs none there. This is deliberately conservative: the quasi-optimality argument breaks down once the cores carry chord legs, so in the absence of a sharper bound, we compensate by shrinking every individual threshold. The cost is a mild over-truncation (ranks slightly larger than a sharper rule would permit) and the benefit is that the accumulated error remains below $\varepsilon \|\mathcal{X}\|_F$ in practice, uniformly across the topologies we tested. The norm appearing in (24) is itself computed in the format by applying the Hadamard product discussed previously, so setting the truncation threshold never requires forming the full tensor.

4. Numerical Experiments

In this section we present numerical experiments demonstrating the efficiency of both GTN-SVD and GTN-rounding compared to their TT and HT counterparts. Throughout each experiment, we compare our Python implementation with the TT and HT tensor algorithm implemented in `tt-toolbox` developed by Oseledets [21] and `htucker` developed by Kressner & Tobler [22].

Before presenting our results, we would like to provide a few comments on the formatting of the baseline TT and HT representations used in our comparisons. The ranks of a TT decomposition (and therefore its number of degrees of freedom) depend on the ordering of the tensor cores: permuting the cores can raise or lower the TT-ranks [23]. This has been studied, for instance through algorithms that optimize the ordering to reduce the ranks [24]. The same structural sensitivity motivates the

Algorithm 3 GTN-ROUND: rounding a traceable path-ordered GTN

Input: Trace-ordered cores $\{\mathcal{G}_k\}_{k=1}^p$ with $\mathcal{G}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{1,k} \times \dots \times r_{k-1,k} \times n_k \times r_{k,k+1} \times \dots \times r_{k,p}}$ (axis j is bond (k, j) of size $r_{k,j}$, axis k is the physical mode n_k); trace-ordered rank adjacency matrix $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{Z}^{p \times p}$ with $(\mathbf{R})_{i,j} = r_{i,j}$ and $(\mathbf{R})_{k,k} = n_k$; prescribed relative error ε .
Output: Rounded cores $\{\mathcal{G}_k\}_{k=1}^p$ with $\|\mathcal{X} - \tilde{\mathcal{X}}\|_F \leq \varepsilon \|\mathcal{X}\|_F$.

- 1: Find number of skipped bonds c
- 2: Compute the truncation parameter $\triangleright$ Use GTN norm to compute $\|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}\|_F$

$$\delta \leftarrow \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{(p-1) + c}} \|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}\|_F$$

- 3: **for** $k = p, p-1, \dots, 2$ **do** $\triangleright$ Right-to-left orthogonalization sweep
- 4: Reshape $\mathcal{G}_k$ via its $(k-1)$ -unfolding $\mathbf{G}_{(k-1)}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{k-1,k} \times t_k}$, where $t_k = \prod_{j=1, j \neq k-1}^p r_{j,k}$
- 5: $[\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{T}_k] \leftarrow \text{QR}((\mathbf{G}_{(k-1)}^{(k)})^T)$, $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{t_k \times r'_{k-1,k}}$, $\mathbf{T}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{r'_{k-1,k} \times r_{k-1,k}}$, $r'_{k-1,k} = \min(t_k, r_{k-1,k})$
- 6: Update $\mathbf{R}$: $r_{k-1,k} \leftarrow r'_{k-1,k}$
- 7: $\mathcal{G}_k \leftarrow \text{Reshape}(\mathbf{Q}^T, [r_{k-1,k}, r_{1,k}, \dots, r_{k-2,k}, n_k, r_{k,k+1}, \dots, r_{k,p}])$
- 8: Permute $\mathcal{G}_k$ to axis order

$$[r_{1,k}, \dots, r_{k-2,k}, r_{k-1,k}, n_k, r_{k,k+1}, \dots, r_{k,p}]$$

- 9: $\mathcal{G}_{k-1} \leftarrow \mathcal{G}_{k-1} \times_k \mathbf{T}_k$
- 10: **end for**

- 11: **for** $k = 1, \dots, p-1$ **do** $\triangleright$ Left-to-right compression sweep
- 12: Reshape $\mathcal{G}_k$ via its $(k+1)$ -unfolding $\mathbf{G}_{(k+1)}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{k,k+1} \times s_k}$, where $s_k = \prod_{j=1, j \neq k+1}^p r_{j,k}$
- 13: Compute low-rank approximation via δ -truncated SVD: $(\mathbf{G}_{(k+1)}^{(k)})^T = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^T + \mathbf{E}_k$, $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{s_k \times r'_{k,k+1}}$, $\mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{r'_{k,k+1} \times r_{k,k+1}}$
- 14: Update $\mathbf{R}$: $r_{k,k+1} \leftarrow r'_{k,k+1}$
- 15: $\mathcal{G}_k \leftarrow \text{Reshape}(\mathbf{U}, [r_{1,k}, \dots, r_{k-1,k}, n_k, r_{k,k+2}, \dots, r_{k,p}, r_{k,k+1}])$
- 16: Permute $\mathcal{G}_k$ to axis order

$$[r_{1,k}, \dots, r_{k-1,k}, n_k, r_{k,k+1}, r_{k,k+2}, \dots, r_{k,p}]$$

- 17: $\mathcal{G}_{k+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{G}_{k+1} \times_k (\mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^T)$
 - 18: **end for**
-

active field of *tensor network structure search* (TN-SS), which seeks the network topology best suited to a given task, including the minimization of storage or compression cost [25, 26, 27]. We emphasize that our baselines implement none of these methods: we use the `tt-toolbox` [21] and `htucker` [22] toolboxes with their default mode orderings and dimension trees, without any rearrangement or structure optimization. This is a deliberate choice, as no comparable arrangement-optimization techniques currently exist for the proposed GTN format. Structure optimization could improve the baselines and, in principle, our method, but this is left to future work.




Figure 7: Two GTN topologies representing a 6D tensor: (a) *Barbell* GTN format (GTN-BB); (b) *Bowtie* GTN format (GTN-BT).

4.1. GTN-SVD of High-Dimensional Functions

To assess the effectiveness of the GTN-SVD algorithm, we compare the TT and HT formats against two GTN topologies depicted in Figure 7. The first, which we call the *barbell* (GTN-BB), is an eight-core graph in which the six “physical” cores (i.e., the cores with a free edge) are supplemented by two internal cores $\mathcal{G}_6, \mathcal{G}_7$, forming two 4-cycles on $\{0, 2, 4, 6\}$ and $\{1, 3, 5, 7\}$ joined by the internal bridge $(6, 7)$ (see Figure 7(a)). The second, the *bowtie* (GTN-BT), uses no internal cores at all: its six physical cores form two 3-cycles $\{0, 2, 4\}$ and $\{1, 3, 5\}$ joined by the bridge $(4, 5)$ (see Figure 7(b)).

To demonstrate GTN-SVD, we first build two 6D dense tensors $\mathcal{X}_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) by evaluating the scalar functions

$$f_i : [0, 2\pi]^6 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(\mathbf{x}) = & \exp \left(-3 \left(\cos(x_0 - \pi) + \cos(x_2 - \pi) + \cos(x_4 - \pi) - 0.5 \right)^2 \right. \\ & + \sin(x_0 - \pi) \sin(x_2 - \pi) + \sin(x_2 - \pi) \sin(x_4 - \pi) + \sin(x_0 - \pi) \sin(x_4 - \pi) \\ & \left. + 1.2 \left(\cos(x_1 - x_3) + \cos(x_3 - x_5) + \cos(x_1 - x_5) \right) + 0.8 \cos(2(x_1 + x_3 + x_5)) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(\mathbf{x}) = & \left[1 + \exp \left(3 \left(\cos(x_0 - \pi) + \cos(x_2 - \pi) + \cos(x_4 - \pi) - 0.5 \right)^2 \right. \right. \\ & - \sin(x_0 - \pi) \sin(x_2 - \pi) - \sin(x_2 - \pi) \sin(x_4 - \pi) - \sin(x_0 - \pi) \sin(x_4 - \pi) \\ & + 1.2 \left(\cos(x_1 - x_3) + \cos(x_3 - x_5) + \cos(x_1 - x_5) \right) \\ & \left. \left. + 0.8 \cos(2(x_1 + x_3 + x_5)) - 2 \right) \right]^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

on a uniform Cartesian grid with $N = 24$ points along each axis. This gives two tensors with $24^6 \approx 1.9 \times 10^8$ entries each. We then decompose each $\mathcal{X}_i$ using the GTN-SVD algorithm and the BB and BT topologies shown in Figure 7, and compare against the TT and HT formats. In particular, we record the total number degrees of freedom (DoF), the wall-clock time, and the relative L^2 error for each prescribed tolerance $\varepsilon \in \{10^{-4}, 10^{-6}, 10^{-8}, 10^{-10}\}$. Figure 8 and 9 summarize these three metrics for both test functions (25) and (26), respectively, across the four prescribed tolerances. For the function f_1 in (25), all four formats remain below the prescribed tolerance, but they do so at significantly different storage cost. At $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ GTN-BB requires




Figure 8: Tensor decomposition of the six-dimensional function (25) using GTN-BB, GTN-BT, TT, and HT topologies: Shown are the degrees of freedom (DoF) (left), compute time (middle) and relative error (right) versus the tolerance ε used in Algorithm 1.




Figure 9: Tensor decomposition of the six-dimensional function (26) using GTN-BB, GTN-BT, TT, and HT topologies: DoF vs. ε (left); compute time in seconds vs. ε (middle); relative error vs. ε (right).

47,264 degrees of freedom, whereas TT requires 1.58×10^7 and HT requires 1.62×10^7 ; that is, TT exceeds GTN-BB in storage by a factor of 334, and HT by a factor of 344. The advantage widens as the tolerance tightens: these factors grow from 232 and 222 at $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$ to 351 and 358 at $\varepsilon = 10^{-10}$. Relative to the full tensor, GTN-BB retains 0.025% of the entries at $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$, a compression factor of approximately 4×10^3 compared to the full format, whereas TT and HT still require 8.7% and 8.9% of the dense storage at the tightest tolerance. We also note that, for the GTN results, the degrees of freedom remain fixed at 47,264 for $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ and 10^{-10} ; at this rank the representation is already exact to machine precision, so the last two tolerances do not constitute independent data points. In wall-clock time the barbell is also the fastest format, outperforming TT by a factor of 1.4 and HT by a factor of 3.0 at $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$.

For the function f_2 in (26), the tensor formats exhibit similar behavior. At $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ GTN-BB requires 5.40×10^5 degrees of freedom, whereas TT requires 1.61×10^8 ; that is, TT exceeds GTN-BB in storage by a factor of 299. This factor grows from 202 at $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$ to 299 at $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$, then eases to 278 at $\varepsilon = 10^{-10}$, where TT's storage is approaching the size of the dense tensor itself and therefore cannot grow further. Relative to the full tensor, GTN-BB retains 0.28% of the entries at $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$, a compression factor of approximately 3.5×10^2 compared to the full format, whereas TT requires 84.4% of the dense storage at the same tolerance and 95.8% at the tightest—that is, no

compression at all. The HT format fares even worse: although it meets every prescribed tolerance, its storage grows past the size of the dense tensor, requiring 103.9% of the dense storage at $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ and 119.1% at $\varepsilon = 10^{-10}$, so that HT exceeds GTN-BB in storage by a factor of 368 at $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$. In wall-clock time GTN-BB and TT are tied, differing by a factor of 1.04 at $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$, so the barbell is advantageous in storage at no additional cost in time, and it outperforms HT by a factor of 2.4.

4.2. Fokker–Planck Equation

In this section we compute the numerical solution to the Fokker–Planck equation on a four-dimensional torus $\Omega = [0, 2\pi]^4$ using GTN-based step rounding algorithms and Fourier pseudo-spectral methods. To this end, let us first consider the stochastic model

$$dx_i = \eta \mu_i(\mathbf{x}) dt + \sigma dW_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 4, \quad (27)$$

where $(x_1, \dots, x_4)$ are the phase variables, η is a real number, and $(W_1, \dots, W_4)$ is a standard vector-valued Wiener process. In particular we choose

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(\mathbf{x}) &= \sin(2x_1) \cos(2x_3), & \mu_2(\mathbf{x}) &= \sin(2x_2) \cos(2x_4), \\ \mu_3(\mathbf{x}) &= -\cos(2x_1) \sin(2x_3), & \mu_4(\mathbf{x}) &= -\cos(2x_2) \sin(2x_4), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

which defines a divergence-free drift. As is well known, the corresponding Fokker–Planck equation for the probability density function of state vector $\mathbf{x}$ has the form

$$\frac{\partial p(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = -\eta \sum_{i=1}^4 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\mu_i(\mathbf{x}) p(\mathbf{x}, t)) + \nu \sum_{i=1}^4 \frac{\partial^2 p(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial x_i^2}, \quad \nu = \frac{\sigma^2}{2}. \quad (29)$$

Setting $\eta = 0$ reduces (29) to the diffusion equation, while a non-constant $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ retains the full advection–diffusion structure.

We discretize (29) in space by Fourier collocation on a uniform grid with $N = 64$ points per axis, so that the dense solution tensor carries $N^d = 64^4 \approx 1.68 \times 10^7$ degrees of freedom, and we advance in time with a second-order Adams–Bashforth (AB2) integrator, initialized by a single forward-Euler step. GTN integration proceeds by *step truncation* [18]: each step is carried out within the graph format, forming the AB2 increment with the GTN addition and then compressing the result back to a prescribed relative tolerance $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ with GTN-Round (Algorithm 3). The two operations consist of addition, which inflates the edges along the traceable path while leaving the remaining edges unchanged, and rounding, which sweeps that same path to compress them back. Together, they return a low rank representation at every step, without ever forming the dense tensor. We set the initial condition as

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{x}, 0) \propto \exp \Big(& -4 \left(\cos(x_1 - \pi) + \cos(x_3 - \pi) - 0.5 \right)^2 + 1.5 \sin(x_1 - \pi) \sin(x_3 - \pi) + \\ & 1.6 \cos(x_2 - x_4) + 1.2 \cos(2(x_2 + x_4)) \Big), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

normalized to unit mass so that $p(\mathbf{x}, 0)$ is a valid probability density. We represent the solution in the graph tensor network barbell layout (GTN-BB) shown in Figure 10, and compare the performance of GTN-BB against the TT format. To this end, we record at every step the degrees of freedom of GTN-BB and TT, the step compute time, and the relative L^2 error against the dense reference solution.




Figure 10: The GTN barbell format (GTN-BB) used to represent the solution of the four-dimensional Fokker–Planck equation (29). Left: graph tensor network with six cores: four physical ($\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{G}_3$, carrying the physical indices i_0, i_1, i_2, i_3 , respectively) and two internal ($\mathcal{G}_4, \mathcal{G}_5$). The cores are arranged as two triangles joined by the bridge ($\mathcal{G}_4, \mathcal{G}_5$). The dashed green arrows trace the traceable path $\mathcal{G}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_4 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_5 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_3$ used for the rounding procedure; orange edges correspond to ranks that freeze during addition. Right: the corresponding rank adjacency matrix $\mathbf{R}$, with its rows and columns permuted into traceable order.




Figure 11: Fokker–Planck equation (29) with no drift term ($\eta = 0$), $\nu = 1$, and initial condition (30). Comparison between the performance of GTN-BB and TT representations of the solution in terms of DoF (left), computation time (middle), and relative error (right), all plotted versus time.

4.2.1. Zero Drift and Constant Diffusion

Setting $\eta = 0$ in (29) reduces the Fokker–Planck equation to the classical diffusion equation with periodic boundary conditions,

$$\frac{\partial p(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = \nu \nabla^2 p(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (31)$$

which we solve with diffusion constant $\nu = 1$. We use a time step $\Delta t = 2 \times 10^{-4}$ for 5000 steps up to final time $t = 1$. In Figure 11 we provide a comparison between the performance of GTN-BB and TT representations of the PDF solution in terms of DoF (left), computation time (middle), and relative error (right), all plotted versus time. It is seen that both formats hold the relative error at or below the prescribed tolerance $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ for every step: the GTN-BB error never exceeds 1.04×10^{-8} and ends at 2.46×10^{-9} , while the TT error never exceeds 1.95×10^{-8} and ends at 4.38×10^{-9} . The two formats therefore deliver similar accuracy, and the comparison rests on the storage and time required to achieve it.

The results display the most notable difference in DoF, where the gap is largest initially. At

the first step GTN-BB requires 19,528 degrees of freedom against 3.25×10^6 for TT, so that TT exceeds GTN-BB in storage by a factor of 166. GTN-BB reaches a maximum of 32,401 degrees of freedom at $t \approx 3 \times 10^{-3}$, which is 0.19% of the $64^4 = 16,777,216$ entries of the full tensor. TT is largest at the initial condition, where it occupies 19.4% of dense. Thereafter both representations shrink as diffusion damps the high-frequency content of the solution, and the advantage narrows monotonically: TT exceeds GTN-BB by a factor of 60 at $t = 10^{-2}$, 20 at $t = 10^{-1}$, 5.1 at $t = 0.5$, and 2.6 at the final time $t = 1$, where the two formats require 16,640 and 6,508 degrees of freedom respectively. This behavior is expected: as the solution relaxes toward the uniform steady state, its rank collapses in every format, and the particular topology matters less.

The timing results follow a similar pattern initially. Over the full run GTN-BB requires 1460 s against 2737 s for TT and 3338 s for the full reference, so GTN-BB outperforms TT by a factor of 1.87 and the dense solver by a factor of 2.29. This aggregate conceals a crossover. Over the first 50 steps, where the ranks are largest, TT is slower than GTN-BB by a factor of 21.6, and over the first 250 steps by a factor of 12.5. The TT step cost falls from 8.07 s to 0.06 s as its ranks decrease, whereas the GTN-BB step cost remains nearly constant at 0.29 s. Over the final 1000 steps TT is the faster of the two, by a factor of 2.8. The advantage of the graph format is thus concentrated in the regime where the solution is high-rank.

In Figure 12 we plot the (x_1, x_3) marginals of the solution obtained using GTN-BB with tolerance $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ at different times, and the error relative to the full (dense) tensor computation. It is seen that the GTN-BB solution is indistinguishable from the dense solution at every snapshot, and the pointwise error in the bottom row remains at the level of the prescribed tolerance: over the full integration period, the marginal error never exceeds 6.40×10^{-9} .

4.2.2. Non-Constant Drift and Constant Diffusion

Next, we set $\eta = 1$ and $\nu = 0.1$ in (29). Since the drift (28) is divergence-free, the advection term in (29) reduces to $-\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \nabla p$. Moreover, since the diffusion coefficient is homogeneous (does not depend on $\mathbf{x}$), the time-asymptotic solution of (29) is a uniform PDF on the torus. We use a time step $\Delta t = 10^{-4}$ for 2×10^4 steps up to final time $t = 2$.

In Figures 13 and 14 we provide a comparison between the performance of GTN-BB and TT representations of the PDF solution in terms of DoF, computation time, relative error, and mass conservation, all plotted versus time. First, we see that the storage comparison favors the GTN-BB format over TT by a wide margin (more than one order of magnitude). The timing results also display clear separation (approx one order of magnitude) between the performance of the two tensor formats: the mean step costs are approximately 1.16 s and 13.6 s respectively. However, unlike the zero-drift case, the two formats do not deliver comparable accuracy. In particular, at the final time the GTN-BB relative error reaches 1.07×10^{-7} , while the TT error first increases and then decreases to 6.23×10^{-9} . Hence here TT is slightly more accurate than GTN-BB. Both methods exceed the per-step tolerance $\varepsilon = 10^{-9}$, which is expected. Indeed, over 2×10^4 steps the truncation error at each step accumulates, and therefore the reported error measures the departure from the dense solution over the whole trajectory rather than the error of a single truncation. The same ordering holds for mass conservation, shown in the right panel of Figure 14. The TT solution conserves total mass to 3.31×10^{-11} , whereas GTN-BB conserves it to 3.50×10^{-8} . Both are far below the accuracy of the solution itself, but TT is the more conservative of the two formats.

Finally, in Figure 15 we plot the (x_1, x_3) PDF marginals of the solution obtained using GTN-BB with tolerance $\varepsilon = 10^{-9}$ at different times, and the error relative to the full (dense) tensor computation. The GTN-BB reconstruction is visibly indistinguishable from the dense solution as the initial ring is wound by the vortex. The pointwise error relative to the full (dense) tensor solution remains at the level of the accumulated error. In particular, over the full integration period




Figure 12: Fokker–Planck equation (29) with no drift term ($\eta = 0$), $\nu = 1$, and initial condition (30). We plot the (x_1, x_3) marginals of the solution obtained using GTN-BB with tolerance $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ at different times, and the error relative to the full (dense) tensor computation.

the pointwise error never exceeds 1.12×10^{-7} .

5. Summary

We introduced a new SVD-based tensor decomposition method for tensor networks with arbitrary graph topologies, extending classical hierarchical SVD-based techniques to networks with cycles and general connectivity. We also introduced addition and rounding procedures for traceable tensor graphs, enabling step-truncation time integration of high-dimensional PDEs directly in graph format, with rank truncation controlled to a prescribed tolerance at every step. We demonstrated the proposed methods on the decomposition of multivariate functions and on the numerical solution of the Fokker–Planck equation, where the graph-format representation attained comparable or better accuracy than the tensor train and hierarchical Tucker formats while using substantially fewer degrees of freedom at lower computational cost.

We emphasize that our results are empirical, and we make no theoretical claim that a graph tensor network (GTN) will outperform the tensor train or hierarchical Tucker in general. Rather, our experiments provide evidence that there are cases in which GTN is more efficient than the fixed




Figure 13: Fokker–Planck equation (29) with $\eta = 1$, $\nu = 0.1$, and initial condition (30). Comparison between the performance of GTN-BB and TT representations of the solution in terms of DoF (left) and computation time (right), all plotted versus time.




Figure 14: Fokker–Planck equation (29) with $\eta = 1$, $\nu = 0.1$, and initial condition (30). Comparison between the performance of GTN-BB and TT representations of the solution in terms of error relative to full (dense) tensor computations (left) and mass conservation (right), all plotted versus time.

path and tree formats, and is at least competitive with them in the others we considered. This leaves considerable room for future work. In its current form the iterative rounding algorithm depends on a heuristic choice of traceable paths through the network. A principled strategy for this selection, together with a sharper truncation criterion on the cyclic edges, would likely improve the rounding algorithm further. Extensions to more complex graphs, higher dimensions, and a wider range of evolution equations are natural directions for future work as well.




Figure 15: Fokker-Planck equation (29) with $\eta = 1$, $\nu = 0.1$, and initial condition (30). We plot the (x_1, x_3) marginals of the solution obtained using GTN-BB with tolerance $\varepsilon = 10^{-9}$ at different times, and the error relative to the full (dense) tensor computation.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR), contract number FA9550-24-1-0254.

References

- [1] H. Risken, The Fokker-Planck Equation: Methods of Solution and Applications, Springer, 1996.
- [2] A. Dektor, A. Rodgers, D. Venturi, Rank-adaptive tensor methods for high-dimensional non-linear PDEs, Journal of Scientific Computing 88 (2) (2021) 36.
- [3] A. Rodgers, D. Venturi, Implicit integration of nonlinear evolution equations on tensor manifolds, Journal of Scientific Computing 97 (2) (2023) 33.
- [4] X. Tang, L. Ying, Solving high-dimensional Fokker-Planck equation with functional hierarchical tensor, Journal of Computational Physics 511 (2024) 113110.

- [5] A. M. P. Boelens, D. Venturi, D. M. Tartakovsky, Tensor methods for the Boltzmann-BGK equation, *Journal of Computational Physics* 421 (2020) 109744.
- [6] C. Cercignani, *The Boltzmann Equation and Its Applications*, Vol. 67 of Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer, New York, 1988.
- [7] G. Dimarco, L. Pareschi, Numerical methods for kinetic equations, *Acta Numerica* 23 (2014) 369–520.
- [8] L. Einkemmer, K. Kormann, J. Kusch, R. G. McClarren, J.-M. Qiu, A review of low-rank methods for time-dependent kinetic simulations, *Journal of Computational Physics* 538 (2025) 114191.
- [9] A. Rodgers, D. Venturi, Tensor approximation of functional differential equations, *Physical Review E* 110 (2024) 015310.
- [10] D. Venturi, D. A, Spectral methods for nonlinear functionals and functional differential equations, *Research in the Mathematical Sciences* 8 (2021) 1–39.
- [11] D. Venturi, The numerical approximation of nonlinear functionals and functional differential equations, *Physics Reports* 732 (2018) 1–102.
- [12] I. V. Oseledets, Tensor-train decomposition, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 33 (5) (2011) 2295–2317.
- [13] L. Grasedyck, Hierarchical singular value decomposition of tensors, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* 31 (4) (2010) 2029–2054.
- [14] Q. Zhao, G. Zhou, S. Xie, L. Zhang, A. Cichocki, Tensor ring decomposition, *arXiv:1606.05535* (2016).
- [15] M. Wang, H. Cui, H. Li, SVD-based algorithms for tensor wheel decomposition, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 50 (5) (2024) 99.
- [16] Y.-B. Zheng, T.-Z. Huang, X.-L. Zhao, Q. Zhao, T.-X. Jiang, Fully-connected tensor network decomposition and its application to higher-order tensor completion, *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 35 (12) (2021) 11071–11078.
- [17] M. Wang, H. Li, SVD-based algorithms for fully-connected tensor network decomposition, *Computational and Applied Mathematics* 43 (5) (2024) 265.
- [18] A. Rodgers, A. Dektor, D. Venturi, Adaptive integration of nonlinear evolution equations on tensor manifolds, *Journal of Scientific Computing* 92 (2) (2022) 39.
- [19] O. Mickelin, S. Karaman, On algorithms for and computing with the tensor ring decomposition, *arXiv:1807.02513* (2020).
- [20] K. Batselier, The trouble with tensor ring decompositions, *arXiv:1811.03813* (2018).
- [21] I. V. Oseledets, TT-Toolbox: The git repository for the TT-Toolbox (2014).
- [22] D. Kressner, C. Tobler, Algorithm 941: Htucker—a Matlab toolbox for tensors in hierarchical tucker format, *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software* 40 (3) (2014) 22:1–22:22.

- [23] C. Li, J. Zeng, Z. Tao, Q. Zhao, Permutation search of tensor network structures via local sampling, in: Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning, 2022, pp. 13106–13124.
- [24] P. Tichavský, O. Straka, Optimizing the order of modes in tensor train decomposition, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 32 (2025) 1361–1365.
- [25] C. Li, Z. Sun, Evolutionary topology search for tensor network decomposition, in: Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, Vol. 119, 2020, pp. 5947–5957.
- [26] C. Li, J. Zeng, C. Li, C. F. Caiafa, Q. Zhao, Alternating local enumeration (TnALE): Solving tensor network structure search with fewer evaluations, in: Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning, Vol. 202, 2023, pp. 20384–20411.
- [27] J. Zeng, G. Zhou, Y. Qiu, C. Li, Q. Zhao, Bayesian tensor network structure search and its application to tensor completion, *Neural Networks* 175 (2024) 106290.