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## Proof 1 of dyatic vector.

$$
\begin{align*}
\vec{a} \times(\vec{b} \cdot \vec{c}) \vec{d} & =\vec{a} \times \vec{d}(\vec{b} \cdot \vec{c}) \\
& =\vec{e}(\vec{b} \cdot \vec{c}) \\
& =\left(\vec{e}_{2}-\vec{e}_{1}\right)\left[\left(\vec{b}_{2}-\vec{b}_{1}\right) \cdot \vec{c}\right]  \tag{1}\\
& =\left[\vec{e}_{2} \vec{b}_{2}-\vec{e}_{2} \vec{b}_{1}-\vec{e}_{1} \vec{b}_{2}+\vec{e}_{1} \vec{b}_{1}\right] \cdot \vec{c} .
\end{align*}
$$

Proof of $\vec{k}=-(\vec{b} \cdot \nabla) \vec{b}$. The basic:

$$
\begin{align*}
\vec{b} & =\vec{\imath} b_{x}+\vec{\jmath} b_{y}+\vec{k} b_{z} \\
\nabla & =\vec{\imath} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}+\vec{\jmath} \frac{\partial}{\partial y}+\vec{k} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} . \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

For $\vec{b} \cdot \nabla$ as a united operator:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\vec{b} \cdot \nabla=b_{x} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}+b_{y} \frac{\partial}{\partial y}+b_{z} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The curvature $\vec{k}$ (not the same $\vec{k}$ as the unit vector) can be defined as $\mathrm{d} \vec{b} / \mathrm{d} l$ (which is very straightforward to understand):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\mathrm{d} \vec{b}}{\mathrm{~d} l}=\frac{\vec{\imath} \mathrm{d} b_{x}+\vec{\jmath} \mathrm{d} b_{y}+\vec{k} \mathrm{~d} b_{z}}{\mathrm{~d} l} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiple the operator $\vec{b} \nabla$ and $\vec{b}$, focus on the first term (since the second and the third term use the same approach):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\vec{\imath}\left(b_{x} \frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial x}+b_{y} \frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial y}+b_{z} \frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial z}\right) . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We have:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{d} b_{x}=\frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial x} \mathrm{~d} x+\frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial y} \mathrm{~d} y+\frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial z} \mathrm{~d} z \\
& \frac{\mathrm{~d} b_{x}}{\mathrm{~d} l}=\frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial x} \frac{\mathrm{~d} x}{\mathrm{~d} l}+\frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial y} \frac{\mathrm{~d} y}{\mathrm{~d} l}+\frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial z} \frac{\mathrm{~d} z}{\mathrm{~d} l} \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

Using the definition of the unit vector $\vec{b}$ and a very easy triangle relation, we have:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\mathrm{d} x}{\mathrm{~d} l}=b_{x}=\frac{b_{x}}{|b|}, \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

combine equation ?? and equation ??, it is very easy to get:

$$
\begin{equation*}
b_{x} \frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial x}+b_{y} \frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial y}+b_{z} \frac{\partial b_{x}}{\partial z} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

which happens to be the norm of the curvature vector $\vec{k}$ in the $\vec{\imath}$ direction, which is shown in equation ??. This is also why the equation should be written at the form of $\vec{k}=-(\vec{b} \cdot \nabla) \vec{b}$, instead of $\vec{k}=(\vec{b} \nabla) \cdot \vec{b}$ or something else. This will soon be proven next.

Proof of why the Taylor Formula of a vector should be written at the form of $(\vec{r} \cdot \nabla) \vec{B}_{0}$ instead of $\vec{r}\left(\nabla \cdot \vec{B}_{0}\right)$.

The ordinary Taylor Formula is written as:
$f(x)=\frac{f\left(x_{0}\right)}{0!}+\frac{f^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)}{1!}\left(x-x_{0}\right)+\ldots+\frac{f^{(n)}\left(x_{0}\right)}{n!}\left(x-x_{0}\right)^{n}+\ldots$

$$
\begin{align*}
f(x, y)=f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) & +\frac{(\partial f / \partial x)^{(1)}}{1!}\left(x-x_{0}\right)+\ldots  \tag{10}\\
& +\frac{(\partial f / \partial y)^{(1)}}{1!}\left(y-y_{0}\right)+\ldots
\end{align*}
$$

And,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\vec{B}\left[B_{x}(x, y, z), B_{y}(x, y, z), B_{z}(x, y, z)\right]=\vec{\imath} B_{x}+\vec{\jmath} B_{y}+\vec{k} B_{z} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using Taylor Formula,

$$
\begin{align*}
B_{x}(x, y, z)=B_{x}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}, z_{0}\right) & +\frac{\partial B_{x}}{\partial x}\left(x-x_{0}\right)+\ldots \\
& +\frac{\partial B_{x}}{\partial y}\left(y-y_{0}\right)+\ldots  \tag{12}\\
& +\frac{\partial B_{x}}{\partial z}\left(z-z_{0}\right)+\ldots
\end{align*}
$$

And for $\vec{r}(\nabla \cdot \vec{B})$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\vec{r}(\nabla \cdot \vec{B})=(\vec{\imath} x+\vec{\jmath} y+\vec{k} z) \cdot\left(\frac{\partial B_{x}}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial B_{y}}{\partial y}+\frac{\partial B_{z}}{\partial z}\right) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

and,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\vec{r} \cdot \nabla) \vec{B}=\left(x \frac{\partial}{\partial x}+y \frac{\partial}{\partial y}+z \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right) \cdot\left(\vec{\imath} B_{x}+\vec{\jmath} B_{y}+\vec{k} B_{z}\right) \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Which one meets the demand of equation ?? is extremely obvious. The proof can always be used in the first order approximation. Like when we try to calculate the magnetic drift in plasma physics.

Proof of $\nabla \times(\nabla \times \vec{A})=\nabla(\nabla \cdot \vec{A})-(\nabla \cdot \nabla) \vec{A}$. First,

$$
\begin{align*}
\nabla \times \vec{B} & =\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
\vec{\imath} & \vec{\jmath} & \vec{k} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \\
B x & B y & B z
\end{array}\right| \\
& =\left(\frac{\partial B_{z}}{\partial y}-\frac{\partial B_{y}}{\partial z}\right) \vec{\imath}+\left(\frac{\partial B_{x}}{\partial z}-\frac{\partial B_{z}}{\partial x}\right) \vec{\jmath}+\left(\frac{\partial B_{y}}{\partial x}-\frac{\partial B_{x}}{\partial y}\right) \vec{k} \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\nabla \times(\nabla \times \vec{A})=\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
\vec{\imath} & \vec{\jmath} & \vec{k}  \tag{16}\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \\
\frac{\partial A_{z}}{\partial y}-\frac{\partial A_{y}}{\partial z} & \frac{\partial A_{x}}{\partial z}-\frac{\partial A_{z}}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial A_{y}}{\partial x}-\frac{\partial A_{x}}{\partial y}
\end{array}\right|
$$

$\nabla(\nabla \cdot \vec{A})=\left(\vec{\imath} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}+\vec{\jmath} \frac{\partial}{\partial y}+\vec{k} \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right)\left(\frac{\partial A_{x}}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial A_{y}}{\partial y}+\frac{\partial A_{z}}{\partial z}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\nabla \cdot \nabla) \vec{A}=\left(\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial x^{2}}+\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial y^{2}}+\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial z^{2}}\right)\left(\vec{\imath} A_{x}+\vec{\jmath} A_{y}+\vec{k} A_{z}\right) \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, it is quite easy to use preliminary school calculating method to see their mathematical relation. All proofs above can be better written in a tensor form.

$$
\begin{align*}
\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{A} & =\sum_{i} \frac{\partial A_{i}}{\partial x_{i}}=\partial_{i} A^{i} .  \tag{19}\\
\nabla \times \boldsymbol{A} & =\sum_{i}\left(\frac{\partial A_{k}}{\partial x_{j}}-\frac{\partial A_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}\right) \hat{e}_{i} \\
& =\sum_{i j k} \varepsilon_{i j k} \frac{\partial A_{j}}{\partial x_{i}} \hat{e_{k}}  \tag{20}\\
& =\varepsilon^{i j k} \partial_{i} A_{j}=\varepsilon^{k i j} \partial_{i} A_{j} .
\end{align*}
$$

