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#### Abstract

The rank of a tensor is analyzed in context of quantum entanglement. A pure quantum state $\mathbf{v}$ of a composite system consisting of $d$ subsystems with $n$ levels each is viewed as a vector in the $d$-fold tensor product of $n$-dimensional Hilbert space and can be identified with a tensor with $d$ indices, each running from 1 to $n$. We discuss the notions of the generic rank and the maximal rank of a tensor and review results known for the low dimensions. Another variant of this notion, called the border rank of a tensor, is shown to be relevant for characterization of orbits of quantum states generated by the group of special linear transformations. A quantum state $\mathbf{v}$ is called entangled, if it cannot be written in the product form, $\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{v}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{v}_{2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{v}_{d}$, what implies correlations between physical subsystems. A relation between various ranks and norms of a tensor and the entanglement of the corresponding quantum state is revealed.
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## 1. Introduction

1.1. Quantum mechanics and tensors. Quantum mechanics was born in the beginning of twentieth century. One way of its description was the "matrix mechanics" created by Heisenberg-Born-Jordan in 1925 [145. The matrix formalism of quantum mechanics was created by von Neumann [140] and Landau 95. The probabilistic nature of quantum mechanics is puzzling, which led Einstein-PodolskyRosen to the notion of entanglement [59. Entanglement deals with quantum systems, for which there exists a physically distinguished partition of the entire system into $d$ parts with $d \geqslant 2$. The mathematical description of $d$-partite systems involves the theory of tensors. The common physics notation for tensors was introduced by Dirac in 1939 [54]. It is very concise, but it is unfamiliar to a good portion of mathematical community, and in several cases it is not adequate.

There are several ways to measure the entanglement of a $d$-partite system described by a $d$-tensor $\mathcal{T}$, which in quantum mechanics can be called a state. It is a nonzero tensor, which can be thought as a $d$-array with entries $\mathcal{T}_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}}$. The bi-partite case, $d=2$, corresponds to matrices, so a 2 -tensor will sometimes be denoted by $T$. The case $d \geqslant 3$ corresponds to tensors with $d$ indices. For simplicity of exposition we will call $\mathcal{T}$ any $d$-array for $d \geqslant 2$.

The simplest integer invariant of $\mathcal{T}$ is its rank, denoted as $r(\mathcal{T})$. Rank-one tensor corresponds to a tensor product of $d$-vectors, which is called a product state. The
rank of $\mathcal{T}$ is the minimum number of summands in the decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ to a sum of rank-one tensor. Thus the higher the rank of a tensor, the more entangled the corresponding quantum state. A different way to decompose $\mathcal{T}$ into a sum of rankone tensors is to have a decomposition with the minimal norm, which in quantum physics might be related to energy. This brings us to the notion of the nuclear norm (7.10). The minimal number of rank-one terms in the nuclear norm decomposition is called the nuclear rank, and denoted as $r^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{T})$. For matrices the rank and the nuclear rank are equal to the standard rank of matrices. The nuclear norm of a matrix is a sum of its singular values. For tensors $d \geqslant 3$, while the description of the rank and nuclear rank are relatively easy, the numerical computation can be quite extensive. In computer science termonology, the computation of all the above mentioned quantites in NP-hard.

The aim of this paper is to give a survey of many results on the rank of tensors, and to emphasize the connection to quantum mechanics and quantum information theory. This work is addressed to a broad audience consisting of computer scientists, mathematicians and physicists.
1.2. Quantum information and related fields. In this subsection we discuss in more details Quantum information theory that our paper deal with. Since the publication of the pioneering paper of Ingarden [83], there was an explosion in the theory of quantum information and related fields in the last twenty five years. On the one hand one could witness enormous success related to quantum cryptography [14] and practical implementations of quantum communication 69]. On the other hand the progress in quantum computation is still moderate 108 and some experts raise doubts 88, whether an operating quantum computer will be ever constructed.

A quantum computer would allow us to solve some problems that are not known to be solvable in polynomial time on a classical computer, for instance factorization of large integers [122]. The practical impossibility of factoring integers to primes is the basis for the widely used RSA cryptographic scheme. One of the key advantages of processing of information by a quantum computer relies in the possibility of going beyond the standard set of digits ' 0 ' and ' 1 ', and using nonclassical states, represented by normalized vectors in a $n$-dimensional, complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{n}$. They include superposition of classical states, which after a measurement yield the result ' 0 ' with a certain probability $p$ and ' 1 ' with probability $1-p$, often written as $\sqrt{p}|0\rangle+\sqrt{1-p}|1\rangle$. We used here the notation of Dirac, explained in details in section 2.1 in which $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ denote any two normalized orthogonal vectors the elements of an orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{H}_{n}$. Assumed normalization of vectors has a simple interpretation: The squared modulus of each component represents the probability of the state to be measured in the corresponding basis state and the sum of probabilities is equal to one.

Non-classical properties characterize also the notable Bell state [12, written $\left(|0\rangle_{A} \otimes|0\rangle_{B}+|1\rangle_{A} \otimes|1\rangle_{B}\right) / \sqrt{2}$, which exhibits quantum entanglement - the effect of non-classical correlations between subsystems, predicted already by Einstein and Schrödinger [59, 115, 116]. Note that the outcomes of a measurement performed on both subsystems are perfectly correlated: if ' 0 ' is registered in the subsystem $A$, the same result will be obtained in the subsystem $B$.

To define quantum entanglement one requires a physical system consisting of two (or more) distinguished subsystems [22, 80], the state of which is described by a vector from a complex Hilbert space with a tensor product structure, $\mathcal{H}_{A B}=$
$\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$. A special role in such a space is played by the product states, $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle=$ $\left|\phi_{A}\right\rangle \otimes\left|\phi_{B}\right\rangle$, where $\left|\phi_{A}\right\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{A}$ and $\left|\phi_{B}\right\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{B}$. A state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{A B}$ is called entangled if it is not of the product form, as it carries some quantum correlations between subsystems - for the definitions of necessary notions used in quantum mechanics see Appendix A.

The motivation for the definition of entanglement between two predefined systems stems from the classical probability theory: A product quantum state can be compared to a product probability vector, $p(x, y)=p_{1}(x) p_{2}(y)$, which describes independent variables $x$ and $y$, while entangled state corresponds to correlated events. It is thus important to characterize degree of entanglement, interpreted as a degree of quantum correlations between subsystems.

Product states allow one to construct a complete orthonormal product basis, which reads $|i\rangle_{A} \otimes|j\rangle_{B}$ with $i, j=0, \ldots n-1$ for a system consisting of two subsystems $A$ and $B$ with $n$ levels each. Any pure state $\left|\psi_{T}\right\rangle$ in the tensor product space $\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$ of a bipartite system (i.e. consisting of two subsystmes) can be represented in a product basis by a matrix $T$ of expansion coefficients, $\left|\psi_{T}\right\rangle=\sum_{i, j=0}^{n-1} T_{i j}|i\rangle \otimes|j\rangle$.

Note that the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{A}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{B}$ are identified with two vector spaces, while $\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$ is identified with the space of matrices. Similarly, the tensor product of $d \geqslant 3$ vector spaces $\otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathcal{H}_{j}$ is identified with the space of $d$-mode multiarrays (tensors). A rank-one tensor (matrix) corresponds to a product state.
1.3. Matrices and tensors. To characterize entanglement of the state $\left|\psi_{T}\right\rangle$ it is sufficient to perform the singular value decomposition (SVD) of the matrix $T$ : if there is more than one nonzero singular value then the corresponding quantum state is not of the product form so it is entangled. In other words, the bipartite pure state is entangled if the rank of the corresponding matrix $T$ is larger than one 80 .

In a similar way any pure state of a multipartite system, consisting of $d>2$ subsystems, can be represented by a tensor $\mathcal{T}$ with $d$ indices. A standard definition of a rank of $\mathcal{T} \neq 0$ is the minimum number of product states whose sum is $\mathcal{T}$. However, description of entanglement in such a multipartite case is more difficult than for bipartite systems, as algebraic transformations on tensors are much more involved than the operations on matrices [141, 13]. Tensor product and entanglement optimization are used in modern quantum chemistry [132].

For matrices there exists a single notion of the rank of a matrix, as various ways to introduce this quantity lead to the same definition. This is not the case for tensors with $d \geqslant 3$ modes, for which different approaches lead to different definitions of the rank of a tensor (with various names). Furthermore, most interesting definitions of the rank of tensors, as the above definition of the rank, are hard to compute [74, 75, 65, 119, 125]. In the present paper by 'hard' we mean that the complexity of their computations are suspected to be at least NP-complete.

A special phenomenon occurs for tensors that does not hold for matrices: There are tensors of rank greater than one such that their rank decomposition is unique (up to permutation of order of rank-one summands). Such tensors are called identifiable. It is conjectured that general tensors of rank less than the generic rank are identifiable 34, 36.

Another example is a generalization the notion of SVD for the space of tensors [89, 47, 104 . However in general, these decompositions of a tensor as a sum of rankone factors do not have the property that in each mode the vectors are orthogonal as in the matrix case.

An analysis of tensors as multiarrays can be traced to the two papers of Hitchcock 77, 78, which introduce the notion of $d$-mode tensor and its rank. In algebraic geometry the study of symmetric tensors, which is equivalent to homogeneous polynomials, was started by Sylvester [130]. Sylvester discussed the decomposition of a homogeneous polynomial of degree $d$ in 2 -variables as a minimal sum of linear forms of degree $d$. In modern terminology, a minimal decomposition of a homogeneous polynomial of degree $d$ as a minimal sum of $d$-powers of linear terms is called the Waring decomposition [96. Waring raised the general problem of minimum decomposition of an integer as a sum of $d$-powers of integers 102 .

A good introduction of tensor decompositions in given by Kolda and Bader in [89]. A reader interested in results on tensor rank is advised to take a look at this survey [89] and its extensive list of 247 references. Some of them are not directly related to the scope of this work, and not quoted here. However, we provide a few relevant references [15, 126, 135, 139 related to ranks of tensors that are not mentioned in 89 and are not discussed in the present paper. We also omitted the topic of rank of tensors related to the product of matrices, as discussed in 96 .

The purpose of this review is twofold: first, we aim to introduce the problems of pure states entanglement to the community of researchers working in applied and pure mathematics, and computer science. Second, we wish to present a survey of recent mathematical results concerning the rank of a tensor and its various generalizations that are relevant in studies of quantum entanglement.

Note that the rank of a tensor $r(\mathcal{T})$ with $d$ modes over the complex numbers, can be viewed as a simple integer quantity characterizing entanglement of a pure state of a quantum system composed out of $d$ subsystems. The rank of a nonzero tensor ranges from 1, which characterizes a product (separable) state, to the maximum rank $r_{\max }$, defined for a given size of the tensor. It is convenient to use the notion 'rank of a pure quantum state' $|\psi\rangle$, which means the rank of the corresponding tensor $\mathcal{T}$.

As most of the problems in tensors, the problem of finding the rank of a given tensor is NP-hard 74. A $d$-mode complex-valued tensor of dimensions $\mathbf{n}=\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}\right)$ with its entries chosen independently at random (a generic tensor) has a fixed rank $r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$ with probability one. The value of $r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$ can be computed in randomized polynomial time using Terracini's lemma [136]. The original Terracini's lemma characterizes the generic Waring rank of a homogeneous polynomial of degree $d$ of $n$-variables over the complex numbers as discussed above.

There is a general conjecture about the value of the generic rank of 3-mode tensors 61], see Conjecture 4.12, which is known to hold in special cases [2]. A generalization of this conjecture to $d$-mode tensors is stated as an open problem below (5.5). A related problem is the value of the tensor rank of the tensor product of two tensors, linked to the issue of characterization of entanglement and finding an optimal decomposition of several copies of a given entangled state [37, 32, 146].

The rank of the tensor product of tensors is submultiplicative (the rank of the tensor product is not greater than the product of ranks), and can be strictly submulitplicative 38. It is then important to ask whether the rank of the tensor
product of two generic tensors of the same dimension is equal to the product of their ranks. The rank of the direct sum of two tensors is subadditive. Strassen's direct sum conjecture stated that the rank of the direct sum of two tensors is the sum of the ranks [128]. This conjecture was disproved by Shitov [120]. A special case of Strassen's conjecture can be related to the above product rank conjecture for the generic case, i.e., the rank of the product of $k$-copies of a generic tensor is the $k$-power of the rank of this tensor [33. Yet another related notion is the border rank of a tensor: It is the minimum $r$ such that a given tensor is a limit of tensors of rank $r$. This notion is fundamental in algebraic geometry and numerical analysis, in particular for problems of approximation of tensors by lower rank tensors [89].

A special interesting case is the case of symmetric tensors, which correspond in quantum physics to problems involving bosons - particles with an integer spin following the Bose-Einstein statistics. Symmetric tensors can be viewed as homogeneous polynomials [96, 67]. The relevant notion of the rank of a symmetric tensor, is the symmetric rank, which is the Waring rank of the homogeneous polynomial discussed above. Comon's conjecture claimed that the symmetric rank and the rank of a symmetric tensor are equal [42. Recently Shitov gave a counterexample to this conjecture 120 . The generic symmetric rank of a symmetric tensor is given in (3), which is the analog of Conjecture 4.12

Another way to measure the entanglement of a quantum pure state is the spectral or nuclear norm (see definitions (7.2) and (7.10)) of the corresponding tensor [66, 52], which are dual norms. The spectral norm, also known as the injective norm [112] of a tensor, determines the geometric measure of entanglement [143] of the corresponding pure quantum state. The nuclear norm, also known as projective norm [112, is the minimum value of the "energy" of a decomposition of a tensor as sum of rank-one tensors - see the sentence below (7.10). The minimum number of rank-one tensors in the minimal decomposition of a given tensor (7.11) is called the nuclear rank, and denoted $r^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{T})$. Hence $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant r^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{T})$. For matrices the nuclear rank is equal to the rank. Nuclear rank of tensors possesses similar properties as matrix rank, unlike the tensor rank 65. That is, if $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}_{k}=\mathcal{T}$ then $\lim _{\inf }^{k \rightarrow \infty}$ $r^{\text {nucl }} \mathcal{T}_{k} \geqslant r^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{T})$. Assume that there exists $\mathcal{T}$ such that $r(\mathcal{T})$ is greater than the generic rank $r_{\text {gen }}$. Then $r^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{T}) \geqslant r(\mathcal{T})>r_{\text {gen }}$, and the nuclear rank of every tensor in a small enough neighborhood of $\mathcal{T}$ is not less than $r^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{T})$. Therefore there exists an open set of tensors whose nuclear rank is greater than their ranks. The nuclear rank of the quantum state provides another simple integer measure of quantum entanglement.

The application part of our paper is how to compute (or estimate) the various ranks we survey. Apart of computing the generic ranks, which can be done in randomized polynomial time, all other quantities seem to be NP-hard to compute. A good way to find or estimate from below the rank and symmetric rank is to use polynomial equations, in particular the effective Nullstellensatz 4] - If $r$ is less than the rank of a tensor then the corresponding system of polynomials equations is not solvable - see Subsection 5.5. Hence the Bertini software 11 is an appropriate tool. To compute the nuclear rank we can use the numerical methods and the software suggested in 52 .
1.4. Notation. We use several notions of rank in various context, hence we present a table that collects all symbols used in the text with reference to the page on which the objects appears for the first time:

| description | notation | defined at page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| rank of a matrix $A$ | $r(A)$ | 13 |
| rank of a tensor $\mathcal{T}$ | $r(\mathcal{T})$ | 16 |
| generic rank of $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ | $r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$ | 17 |
| maximum rank of $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ | $r_{\text {max }}(\mathbf{n})$ | 17 |
| border rank of $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ | $r_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T})$ | 17 |
| Kruskal's rank of vectors $\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{l} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}$ | $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{l}\right)$ | 19 |
| symmetric rank of $\mathcal{S}$ | $r_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathcal{S})$ | 38 |
| generic rank of symmetric tensor | $r_{\text {gen }}(d, n)$ | 39 |
| maximum rank of symmetric tensor | $r_{\text {max }}(d, n)$ | 39 |
| nuclear rank of $\mathcal{T}$ | $r^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{T})$ | 47 |
| generic nuclear rank of $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ | $r_{\text {gen }}^{\text {nucl }}(\mathbf{n})$ | 47 |
| maximum nuclear rank of $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ | $r_{\text {max }}^{\text {nucl }}(\mathbf{n})$ | 47 |
| symmetric nuclear rank of $\mathcal{S}$ | $r_{\text {s }}^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{S})$ | 49 |

1.5. Summary of the paper. Section 2 discusses basic notions in quantum information theory (QIT) and tensors that will be used in this paper. Subsection 2.1 discusses briefly the Dirac notation, and the notion of a simple physical system. A simple system is represented by a vector, which is usually of length one (normalized), and corresponds to a single party system. Subsection 2.2 discusses complex systems and the notion of entanglement. A composite system is represented by tensor product of $d$-simple components. The simplest composite system consists of two parties $(d=2)$, and usually referred as a bipartite system. It is represented by a matrix, which usually has Frobenius norm one (normalized). The bipartite state is entangled if and only if the corresponding matrix has rank greater than one. For $d \geqslant 3$ a $d$-partite system is represented by a $d$-mode tensor, which usually has Hilbert-Schmidt norm one (normalized). It is entangled if and only if the corresponding tensor has rank greater than one. Subsection 2.3 discusses the Kronecker product of $d$-vector spaces and their interpretation in QIT.

Section 3 discusses properties and results on tensor rank of general tensors. Subsection 3.1 recalls the standard properties of matrix rank. Subsection 3.2 discusses the well known properties of Singular Value Decomposition (SVD), which is known in physics community as Schmidt decomposition. In subsection 3.3 we discuss the notions of tensor rank, generic rank and border rank, and some of their properties.

In section 4 we discuss in details the rank properties of 3 -mode tensors. Subsection 4.1 gives basic results on the rank of 3 -tensors. In particular we discuss Kruskal's uniqueness theorem [93]. Subsection 4.2 reviews the formula for the rank of $m \times n \times 2$ tensors discovered in 85]. In subsection 4.3 we discuss the validity of Strassen's direct sum conjecture for certain 3 -tensors. Subsection 4.4 discusses known results and a conjecture on the formula for the generic rank of 3-tensors. In subsection 4.5 we give a randomized polynomial-time algorithm to compute the generic rank of 3-tensor. Subsection 4.6 discusses known results on maximal ranks of 3 -tensors.

In section 5 we discuss ranks of $d$-tensors for $d \geqslant 4$. In subsection 5.1 we bring known generalizations of results from subsection 4.1 to $d$-mode tensors. In subsection 5.2 we recall Terracini's lemma, which is a basic tool in understanding and analyzing the set of tensors of rank $r$. Subsection 5.3 gives an upper bound on the generic rank of tensors using pure combinatorial methods. In subsection 5.4 we discuss the generic rank of $d$-qunits ( $d$-mode tensors whose each mode is
$\mathbb{C}^{n}$ ). Subsection 5.5 discusses an algorithmic way to find the rank of a tensor using solvability of system of linear equations with many variables. In subsection 5.6 we discuss the problem of generic identifiability of tensors. Namely, assuming an integer $r$ is less than a generic rank, when a generic tensor of rank $r$ has a unique decomposition as a sum of $r$ rank one tensors?

In section 6 we discuss symmetric tensors-bosons in physics. Subsection 6.1 discusses basic properties of symmetric tensors and their relation to homogeneous polynomials. In subsection 6.2 we give a known general upper bound for the maximum symmetric rank in terms of generic symmetric rank, and some known values of maximum symmetric rank. Subsection 6.3 shows that the rank of symmetric tensor $\left|W_{d}\right\rangle$ is $d$, while its border rank is 2 . Here $\left|W_{d}\right\rangle \in \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{2}$ corresponds to the polynomial $d x_{1}^{d-1} x_{2}$. For instance, the three-qubit $|W\rangle$ state reads $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle=\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|100\rangle+|010\rangle+|001\rangle)$. In subsection 6.4 we show explicitly that the rank of Kronecker and tensor products can be strictly submulitplicative by considering the ranks of $|W\rangle \otimes_{K}|W\rangle$ and $|W\rangle \otimes|W\rangle$, which are 7 and 8 respectively, while the square of the rank of $|W\rangle$ is 9 . In a short subsection 6.5 we discuss briefly computational methods for symmetric rank of symmetric tensors. Subsection 6.6 gives a short account of the results in [35], which show that the generic identifiability property of symmetric tensors holds for a rank less than the symmetric generic rank, except a number of known cases.

Section 7 is mainly devoted to the notion of the nuclear rank of a tensor. In subsection 7.1] we discuss the spectral norm and geometric measure of entanglement. Subsection 7.2 introduces the nuclear norm and nuclear rank. In subsection 7.3 we discuss the faces of the unit ball of the nuclear norm. Subsection 7.4 discusses the exposed faces and facets of the unit balls of matrix nuclear and spectral norms. In subsection 7.5 we show that the nuclear rank of the state $|G H Z\rangle=|000\rangle+|111\rangle / \sqrt{2}$ is 2 . Subsection 7.6 discusses the generic and maximum nuclear rank of symmetric 3-qubits.

In Appendix A we present definitions of some notions used in quantum theory and discussed in this work.

## 2. Preliminary Results

This Section is organized as follows: In subsection 2.1 we introduce the Dirac notation and the notion of a simple quantum system aimed at mathematicians. In subsection 2.2 we describe a composite systems consisting of $d$-simple systems. Mathematically this is equivalent to the introduction of $d$-tensor product of the corresponding vector spaces. Next we introduce the notion of entanglement, which corresponds to a tensor of rank greater than one. We discuss the differences between the bipartite case that corresponds to matrices and $d$-partite case for $d \geqslant 3$. In subsection 2.3 we discuss Kronecker tensor product of tensor spaces and their quantum interpretation.
2.1. Dirac notation and simple systems. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space with an inner product $\langle\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\rangle$. (So $\mathcal{H}$ is a vector space over the field of complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$. We assume that the inner product is linear in $\mathbf{x}$ and bar linear in $\mathbf{y}$, see below.) We denote by $\mathcal{H}_{n}$ an $n$-dimensional Hilbert space. Let $\mathbf{e}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{n}$ be an orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{H}_{n}$. We identify $\mathcal{H}_{n}$ with the column space $\mathbb{C}^{n}=\{\mathbf{x}=$ $\left.\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)^{\top}\right\}$, where $\mathbf{x}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i} \mathbf{e}_{i}, \mathbf{y}^{*}=\left(\bar{y}_{1}, \ldots, \bar{y}_{n}\right)$ and $\langle\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\rangle=\mathbf{y}^{*} \mathbf{x}$. Here $\bar{z}$
stands for the complex conjugate of $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Thus one can write

$$
\langle a \mathbf{x}+b \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}\rangle=a\langle\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\rangle+b\langle\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}\rangle, \quad\langle\mathbf{x}, a \mathbf{y}+b \mathbf{z}\rangle=\bar{a}\langle\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\rangle+\bar{b}\langle\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}\rangle
$$

The notation of Dirac, which is routinely used in the literature on quantum physics, can be summarized as follows. The symbol $|i\rangle$ represents a basis vector in $\mathcal{H}_{n}$ and usually stands for $\mathbf{e}_{i+1}$ for $i \in\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$, or for $\mathbf{e}_{i}$, where $i \in[n]=\{1, \ldots, n\}$. For simplicity of our exposition the latter convention will be used.

A vector in $\mathcal{H}_{n}$ is often denoted as $|\psi\rangle=\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}|i\rangle$. In quantum theory such a vector describes a physical system and it is called a pure quantum state, but for brevity the shorter versions as a 'pure state' or a 'state' are also used. Thus $|\psi\rangle$ corresponds to $\mathbf{x}$ and $\langle\psi|$ corresponds to $\mathbf{x}^{*}$. Furthermore $\langle\phi \mid \psi\rangle$ is the inner product $\langle\psi, \phi\rangle$. For physical applications one assumes that $|\psi\rangle \neq 0$ and the states are normalized, $\langle\phi \mid \phi\rangle=\|\phi\|^{2}=1$, but sometimes non-normalized states will also be used here. A given quantum system is described by a state in a $n$ dimensional space, $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{n}$, also denoted as $\mathbb{C}^{n}$. In physics parlance the spaces $\mathbb{C}^{2}, \mathbb{C}^{3}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ are often called the space of qubits, qutrits and qunits, respectively. As the overall phase is physically not relevant, a quantum pure state refers to entire equivalence class, $|\psi\rangle \sim e^{i \alpha}|\psi\rangle$, with $\alpha \in[0,2 \pi)$. Thus the space of normalized pure quantum states forms a complex projective manifold, $\mathbb{C} P^{n-1}$, which is obtained from $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ by identifying each complex line through the origin as a point in $\mathbb{C} P^{n-1}$. It has complex dimension $n-1$ and real dimension $2(n-1)$. In the simple case of a single qubit, $n=2$, the space of pure states is called the Bloch sphere, $\mathbb{C} P^{1}=S^{2}$.

Observe that $|\psi\rangle\langle\phi|$ stands for the corresponding matrix $\mathbf{x y}^{*}$ of rank one. In particular $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|=P_{\psi}$ represents a projector onto a normalized state $|\psi\rangle$, and it is easy to see that $P_{\psi}^{2}=|\psi\rangle\langle\psi \mid \psi\rangle\langle\psi|=P_{\psi}$, where we used the fact that $\langle\psi \mid \psi\rangle=1$. Besides pure states, in quantum physics one works with convex combinations of projectors onto pure states, $\rho=\sum_{i} a_{i}\left|\psi_{i}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi_{i}\right|$ with nonnegative weights, $a_{i} \geqslant 0$, $\sum_{i} a_{i}=1$, called mixed states. They are represented by positive semi-definite density matrices, $\rho^{*}=\rho \geqslant 0$ - see Appendix A - but in this work they appear only sporadically.
2.2. Composite systems and quantum entanglement. A key axiom of quantum theory states that a quantum system composed of two subsystems $A$ and $B$, of dimension $n_{1}$ and $n_{2}$, respectively, is described in a tensor product Hilbert space, $\mathcal{H}_{n_{1} n_{2}}=\mathcal{H}_{n_{1}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n_{2}}$, sometimes written $\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$. For instance, if the system consists of two particles $A$ and $B$ each represented as vectors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}_{A}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{H}_{B}$ then the joint system $A B$ is represented by their tensor product or a matrix $X \in \mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A}$. Note that $X=\mathbf{x y}^{\top}$ if and only if both subsystems are not entangled, see below. The composite system $A B$ is said to consists of two parts $A$ and $B$. In a similar way, a physical system composed of $d$ parts is represented in a tensor product Hilbert space with $d$ factors.

The shortness of Dirac notation is transparent when considering tensor product of $d$ Hilbert spaces: $\mathcal{H}=\otimes_{k=1}^{d} \mathcal{H}_{n_{k}}=\mathcal{H}_{n_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n_{d}}$ of product dimension, $\prod_{j=1}^{d} n_{j}$. This tensor product is viewed in quantum physics as the $d$-partite space. Assume that $\left|\psi_{k}\right\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{n_{k}}$ for $k \in[d]$. The product vector (state) is denoted as

$$
\left|\psi_{1}\right\rangle\left|\psi_{2}\right\rangle \cdots\left|\psi_{d}\right\rangle=\left|\psi_{1}\right\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes\left|\psi_{d}\right\rangle=\otimes_{k=1}^{d}\left|\psi_{k}\right\rangle .
$$

Assume that $\mathbf{e}_{1, k}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{n_{k}, k}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_{n_{k}}$. Then $\otimes_{k=1}^{d} \mathbf{e}_{i_{k}, k}$ for $i_{1} \in\left[n_{1}\right], \ldots, i_{d} \in\left[n_{d}\right]$ is an orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{H}$. In Dirac notation the vector $\otimes_{k=1}^{d} \mathbf{e}_{i_{k}, k}$ is denoted as $\left|i_{1} \cdots i_{d}\right\rangle$ or $\left|i_{1}\right\rangle \otimes\left|i_{2}\right\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes\left|i_{d}\right\rangle$.

Any pure quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}$ (a vector of length one) corresponding to a physical system composed of $d$ subsystems with $n$ levels each and described in a vector space of dimension $n_{1} n_{2} \cdots n_{d}$, can be written in a product basis,

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\psi\rangle=\sum_{i_{1}=1}^{n_{1}} \sum_{i_{2}=1}^{n_{2}} \cdots \sum_{i_{d}=1}^{n_{d}} \mathcal{T}_{i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots, i_{d}}\left|i_{1}\right\rangle \otimes\left|i_{2}\right\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes\left|i_{d}\right\rangle \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, for a multipartite system, $d>2$, the state $|\psi\rangle$ corresponds to a tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \otimes_{k=1}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n_{k}}$, whose coordinates in the standard basis are $\mathcal{T}_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}} \in \mathbb{C}$. In the special cases of simple systems, $d=1$, or bipartite systems, $d=2$, the tensor $\mathcal{T}$ reduces to a vector or to a matrix, respectively. The normalization condition, $\langle\psi \mid \psi\rangle=\|\psi\|^{2}=1$, implies that the Hilbert-Schmidt norm (also known as Frobenius norm for matrices)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\mathcal{T}\|_{2}=\sqrt{\sum_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}=1}^{n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}}\left|\mathcal{T}_{i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots, i_{d}}\right|^{2}} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

is fixed to unity, $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{2}=1$.
In many parts of this paper we will restrict ourselves to the most interesting case in quantum setting: $n_{1}=\cdots=n_{d}=n$. This means that each subsystem lives in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{n}$ of the same size $n$. Then $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted either $\mathcal{H}_{n}^{\otimes d}$ (physical notation) or $\otimes^{d} \mathcal{H}_{n}$ (mathematical notation). Furthermore, assume that $\left|\psi_{1}\right\rangle=\cdots=\left|\psi_{d}\right\rangle=|\psi\rangle$ then $\otimes_{k=1}^{d}\left|\psi_{k}\right\rangle$ is denoted either $|\psi\rangle^{\otimes d}$ or $\otimes^{d}|\psi\rangle$.

In an experimental setting one may change the physical partition of the entire system into a different composition of subsystems. This change corresponds to a reshaping tensor in such a way that the total number of elements is preserved. For instance, a matrix $6 \times 6$ describes a bipartite $6 \times 6$ system, while a four-index tensor $\sum_{i_{1}, i_{2}, i_{3}, i_{4}} \mathcal{T}_{i_{1}, i_{2}, i_{3}, i_{4}}\left|i_{1} i_{2} i_{3} i_{4}\right\rangle$ with $i_{1}, i_{2} \in\{1,2\}$ and $i_{3}, i_{4} \in\{1,2,3\}$ represents a $2 \times 2 \times 3 \times 3$ system composed of two qubits and two qutrits.

A quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ is called separable (and hence non-entangled) if the state has a product form, $|\psi\rangle=\left|\phi_{1}\right\rangle \otimes\left|\phi_{2}\right\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes\left|\phi_{d}\right\rangle$, so that the rank of the corresponding tensor $\mathcal{T}$ is equal to one. In all other cases the state is called entangled, as it has no product form - see Appendix A

Note that the term entanglement has a meaning if the tensor product structure is specified. Then the physical partition of the entire system into $d$ subsystems is fixed, and the product basis $\left|i_{1} i_{2} \ldots i_{d}\right\rangle=\left|i_{1}\right\rangle \otimes\left|i_{2}\right\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes\left|i_{d}\right\rangle$ in which the state (2.1) is represented is well defined.

Characterization of the degree of entanglement is easier in the case of bipartite systems. A normalized pure state of an $n \times n$ system can be represented in a product basis by a complex square matrix, $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle=\sum_{i, j=1}^{n} T_{i j}|i, j\rangle$, where states $|i\rangle$ with $i \in[n]$ form an orthonormal basis in the first subsystem $A$, while an analogous basis $|j\rangle$ refers to the second subsystem $B$. Complex expansion coefficients $T_{i j}$ form a vector of length $n^{2}$, but it is often convenient to treat them as a square matrix of size $n$. The quantity $\left|T_{i j}\right|^{2}$ can be viewed as a probability that the system $A B$ is measured in the state $|i j\rangle$.

The state $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle$ is called separable if and only if the rank of the matrix $T$ is one, so the state has the product form, $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle=\left|\phi_{A}\right\rangle \otimes\left|\phi_{B}\right\rangle$. Separability refers to the fact that the joint physical system $A B$ can be then divided into two separate parts, $A$ and $B$, and the results of measurements performed separately on both of them are not correlated. Note that the space of separable pure states is equivalent to the Cartesian product of two complex projective manifolds [13, which forms a Segre embedding, $\mathbb{C} P^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C} P^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{C} P^{n^{2}-1}$. In the simplest case of two-qubit system, $n=2$, the set of separable states forms the Cartesian product of two Bloch spheres, $S^{2} \times S^{2} \subset \mathbb{C} P^{3}$.

A pure state which is not separable is called entangled and one may introduce several measures of quantum entanglement [80, 13, which aim to quantify, to what extend a given bipartite state $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle$ is not of the product form. In general, entanglement measures are not equivalent, in the sense that their maximal values are attained for different states. The simplest quantity is given by the rank $r$ of the corresponding matrix $T$ of size $n$, but it is not a smooth function of the state. Another possibility is to deal with various norms of $T$. Assumed normalization of the state, $\left\langle\psi_{A B} \mid \psi_{A B}\right\rangle=1$, implies the following constraint for the Frobenius (HilbertSchmidt) norm, $\|T\|_{2}^{2}=\operatorname{Tr} T^{*} T=1=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i}$. Here $\lambda_{i}$ denote the eigenvalues of the positive semidefinite matrix $T^{*} T$, while $\sigma_{i}=\sqrt{\lambda_{i}}$ represent the singular values of $T$. They arise by the singular value decomposition, $T=U D V^{*}$, where $U$ and $V$ are unitary, while $D$ is a diagonal matrix with non-negative entries $\sigma_{i}$ at the diagonal - see Section 3.2 Then the corresponding bipartite state can be written using the Schmidt decomposition, $|\psi\rangle=\sum_{j=1}^{r} \sigma_{j}|j\rangle \otimes\left|j^{\prime}\right\rangle$, equivalent to Eq. (2.1), where unitaries $U$ and $V$ determine the basis $|j\rangle$ and $\left|j^{\prime}\right\rangle$, respectively.

Let $\lambda_{\text {max }}$ denote the largest eigenvalue of $T^{*} T$, so that the spectral norm of $T$ is given by the largest singular value, $\|T\|_{\infty}=\sigma_{\max }=\sqrt{\lambda_{\max }}$. Then the state $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle$ is separable if and only if $\lambda_{\max }=\sigma_{\max }=1$, so that, the smaller the norm $\|T\|_{\infty}$, (under the restriction that the Frobenius norm of $T$ is fixed), the larger entanglement. Thus, as a measure of entanglement one can take a suitable smooth function of $\lambda_{\max }\left(\right.$ or $\left.\sigma_{\max }\right)$, for instance $1-\lambda_{\max }$ or $-\log \left(\lambda_{\max }\right)$ advocated in [143]. The Schmidt decomposition implies that the maximal overlap of the analyzed state with any product state reads, $\max _{\left|\psi_{\text {sep }}\right\rangle}\left|\left\langle\psi_{A B} \mid \psi_{\text {sep }}\right\rangle\right|^{2}=\lambda_{\text {max }}$, where $\left|\psi_{\text {sep }}\right\rangle=$ $\left|\phi_{A}\right\rangle \otimes\left|\phi_{B}\right\rangle$. This scalar product determines the minimal distance of the analyzed state to the manifold of separable (product) states, a quantity called geometric measure of entanglement [118, 149, 143 .

In the case of pure states the natural geodesic distance on $\mathbb{C} P^{n^{2}-1}$ is equivalent to the Fubini-Study distance, $D_{F S}^{\min }=\arccos \left(\left|\left\langle\psi_{A B} \mid \psi_{C D}\right\rangle\right|\right)$ also called the quantum angle, as it corresponds to the angle between $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle$ and $\left|\psi_{C D}\right\rangle$. One may also analyze various distances in the space of mixed states (density matrices) between the projector on the analyzed state, $\rho_{\psi_{A B}}=\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi_{A B}\right|$, and the projector on the closest product state. Depending on the distance selected [98, 149, one obtains $D_{H S}^{\min }=\sqrt{2\left(1-\lambda_{\max }\right)}$ for the smallest Hilbert-Schmidt distance between two states $\rho$ and $\omega$, namely $D_{H S}(\rho, \omega)=\left[\operatorname{Tr}(\rho-\omega)^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}$. The smallest value with respect to the trace distance, $D_{1}(\rho, \omega)=\operatorname{Tr}|\rho-\omega|$ with $|X|=\sqrt{X^{*} X}$ reads $D_{1}^{\min }=$ $2 \sqrt{1-\lambda_{\max }}$, while the Bures distance, $D_{B}(\rho, \omega)=[2-2 \operatorname{Tr}|\sqrt{\rho} \sqrt{\omega}|]^{1 / 2}$, leads to $D_{B}^{\min }=\left[2\left(1-\sigma_{\max }\right)\right]^{1 / 2}-$ see also Section 7.1.

Another, more precise entanglement measure can be obtained from the entire vector of squared singular values of $T$, which sum to unity, $\sum_{i} \lambda_{i}=1$. Hence
one can write down the entropy of this vector, $S\left(\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle\right)=-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} \log \lambda_{i}$, called entanglement entropy of the bipartite pure state $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle$. This quantity, being a continuous function of $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle$ and having several information-theoretical interpretations, is often considered as a distinguished measure of the bipartite entanglement 80, 13. For instance, in the simplest case of two-qubit system, $\mathcal{H}_{4}=\mathcal{H}_{2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{2}$, the entropy is maximized for the Bell entangled state [12], $\left|\phi_{A B}^{+}\right\rangle=(|00\rangle+|11\rangle) / \sqrt{2}$, for which $\lambda_{1}=\lambda_{2}=1 / 2$, so that $S\left(\left|\phi_{A B}^{+}\right\rangle\right)=\log 2$. Recall that $|00\rangle$ is a useful shorthand for the product state, often written in various ways, $|0\rangle_{A} \otimes|0\rangle_{B}=|0\rangle \otimes|0\rangle=$ $|0,0\rangle=|00\rangle$.

The vector of singular values of the matrix $T$, representing the analyzed state, allows one to compute its trace norm, $\|T\|_{1}=\operatorname{Tr} \sqrt{T^{*} T}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_{i}$. Since the bipartite state $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle$ is separable if and only if $\sigma_{\max }=1$ so that $\|T\|_{1}=1$, to construct an alternative measure of bipartite entanglement one can consider the quantity $\|T\|_{1}-1$. In short, under the normalization assumption, $\|T\|_{2}=1$, the larger trace norm of $T$, the more entangled state. In the case of a two-qubit system the maximal value of the trace norm, $\|T\|_{1}^{\max }=\sqrt{2}$, is achieved for the Bell entangled state $\left|\phi_{A B}^{+}\right\rangle=(|00\rangle+|11\rangle) / \sqrt{2}$.

For composite systems with $d \geqslant 3$ parts, a similar strategy does not work as the singular value decomposition of a matrix has no direct generalization for a tensor with $d$ indices [48, 31]. However, the rank of the tensor can still serve as one of the simplest measures of quantum entanglement, as in this setting the rank $r(\mathcal{T})$ is given by the minimal natural number $r$ such that the corresponding state (2.1) can be represented as a superposition of $r$ product states,

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\psi\rangle=\sum_{i=1}^{r} a_{i}\left|\phi_{1}^{(i)}\right\rangle \otimes\left|\phi_{2}^{(i)}\right\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes\left|\phi_{d}^{(i)}\right\rangle \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with arbitrary complex coefficients $a_{i}$. Note that the states $\left|\phi_{j}^{(i)}\right\rangle$ related to the subsystem number $j$, with $1 \leqslant j \leqslant d$, need not be orthogonal. In physics literature one uses the term rank of a composite pure state, which is equal to the rank of the corresponding tensor $\mathcal{T}$. Furthermore, to quantify entanglement of a multipartite state one uses the Schmidt measure [60, 141], equal to the log of the rank of the corresponding tensor, $E_{S}(|\psi\rangle)=\log r(\mathcal{T})$. More precise description of multipartite entanglement can be obtained by studying the spectral norm $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}$ of a tensor (7.2), under the assumption that the Hilbert-Schmidt norm (2.2) is fixed to unity. An alternative approach is based on the nuclear norm $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{1}$ of a tensor (7.10), which can be considered as a generalization of the matrix trace norm for tensors.
2.3. Kronecker tensor product. As discussed in $\$ 2.1$ the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes$ $\mathcal{H}_{B}$ corresponds to a bipartite space, while $\mathcal{H}=\otimes_{k=1}^{d} \mathcal{H}_{n_{k}}$ corresponds to a $d$ partite space. Denote by $\mathcal{H}_{B}^{\vee}=\left\{|\psi\rangle^{\vee},|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{B}\right\}$ the dual space to $\mathcal{H}_{B}$. That is, $|\psi\rangle^{\vee}$ is viewed as a linear function on $\mathcal{H}_{B}:|\psi\rangle^{\vee}(|\phi\rangle)=\langle\psi \mid \phi\rangle$. Then bipartite product $\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}^{\vee}$, is identified in a classical way with the space of linear operators $L\left(\mathcal{H}_{A}, \mathcal{H}_{B}\right)=\left\{L, L: \mathcal{H}_{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{A}\right\}$. Namely, $|\theta\rangle \otimes|\psi\rangle^{\vee}(|\phi\rangle)=\langle\psi \mid \phi\rangle|\theta\rangle$. It is customary to abuse the notation by identifying $\mathcal{H}_{m} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n}$ with the space of $m \times n$ matrices $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$.

Let $A=\left[A_{i, j}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ and $B=\left[B_{k, l}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times q}$. Then the Kronecker tensor product $C=A \otimes_{K} B$ is the block matrix $C=\left[A_{i, j} B\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{(m p) \times(n q)}$. (Note that $A \otimes B$ is a 4 -tensor in $\mathbb{C}^{m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{p} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{q}$ with $\left.(A \otimes B)_{i, j, k, l}=A_{i, j} B_{k, l}.\right)$ This
is equivalent to $\left(\mathcal{H}_{m} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n}\right) \otimes_{K}\left(\mathcal{H}_{p} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{q}\right)=\mathcal{H}_{m p} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n q}$, where $\mathcal{H}_{m} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{p}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{q}$ are viewed as Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{m p}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{n q}$ respectively. More generally, given $l$ tensor product spaces $\mathcal{H}_{n_{1, i}, \cdots, n_{d, i}}=\otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathcal{H}_{n_{j, i}}$ for $i \in[l]$, the Kronecker tensor product is defined as the following $d$-tensor product

$$
\begin{equation*}
\otimes_{K}^{i \in[l]} \mathcal{H}_{n_{1, i}, \cdots, n_{d, i}}=\otimes_{K}^{i \in[l]}\left(\otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathcal{H}_{n_{j, i}}\right)=\otimes_{j=1}^{d}\left(\otimes_{i=1}^{l} \mathcal{H}_{n_{j, i}}\right) . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that for $d=2$, the above definition reduces to the standard fact that Kronecker product of $l$ matrices is a matrix. In [38] the Kronecker product $\otimes_{K}$ is denoted by $\boxtimes$.

The Kronecker product (2.4) has the following quantum interpretation 33]. Consider a group of $d$ people that share $l$ states with $d$-subsystems each. This means that the person $j$ controls $l$ subsystems, corresponding to the subspaces $\mathcal{H}_{n_{j, 1}}, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_{n_{j, l}}$. These subsystems are described by vectors in the product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{n_{j, 1} \cdots n_{j, l}}=\otimes_{i=1}^{l} \mathcal{H}_{n_{j, i}}$. Thus we can interpret the total system shared by $d$ of users, each controls $l$ subsystems, as a $d$-partite system on the corresponding Hilbert spaces.

It is possible to define the Kronecker tensor product of $l$ tensor product spaces $\mathcal{H}_{n_{1, i}, \cdots, n_{d_{i}, i}}$ for $i \in[l]$, where $d_{1}, \ldots, d_{l}$ are different. Set $d=\max \left\{d_{1}, \ldots, d_{l}\right\}$. For $d_{i}<d$ set $\mathcal{H}_{d_{i}+k, i}=\mathbb{C}, n_{d_{i}+k, i}=1$ for $k \in\left[d-d_{i}\right]$. Define $\mathcal{H}_{n_{1, i}, \ldots, n_{d, i}}=$ $\otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathcal{H}_{n_{j, i}}$. Let $\mathcal{H}_{i}^{\prime}$ be a tensor product obtained from $\mathcal{H}_{n_{1, i}, \ldots, n_{d, i}}$ by permuting the factors $\mathcal{H}_{d_{i}+1, i}, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_{d, i}$ with other factors. For $d_{i}=d$ let $\mathcal{H}_{i}^{\prime}=\mathcal{H}_{n_{1, i}, \ldots, n_{d, i}}$. Then $\otimes_{K}^{i \in[l]} \mathcal{H}_{n_{1, i}, \cdots, n_{d_{i}, i}}=\otimes_{K}^{i \in[l]} \mathcal{H}_{i}^{\prime}$.

## 3. Tensor Rank

In this section we discuss basic notions and results on matrices and tensors, with the emphasis on the notion of tensor rank. In subsection 3.1 we discuss the well known characterizations and properties of matrix rank. In subsection 3.2 we recall the properties of Singular Value Decomposition (SVD), which is known in the physics community as Schmidt decomposition. We also discuss the geometric measure of entanglement of a bipartite state, which has a simple formula in terms of the operator norm $\left(\sigma_{\max }\right)$ of the corresponding matrix. The maximally entangled bi-partite Bell state has the minimum $\sigma_{\max }(A)$. In subsection 3.3 we discuss the notion of the rank of tensor. We point out the submultiplicativity of the rank of tensors under the tensor and Kronecker tensor product. An example of strict submulitplicativity is given in Lemma 6.1. A similar result holds for the subadditivity of tensor rank under the direct sum. In some cases the strict inequality holds, that is the Strassen's direct sum conjecture is false. The notions of generic, maximum and border ranks of tensors are also reviewed.
3.1. Matrix rank. Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ be a nonzero matrix. Then rank $A$ also written $r(A)$ is the minimum $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbf{x}_{i} \mathbf{y}_{i}^{*}$, where $\mathbf{x}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}, \mathbf{y}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$ for $i \in[k]$. Equivalently, for a bipartite state $A \in \mathcal{H}_{m} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n}$ the rank of $A$ is the minimum number of summands in the decomposition of $A$ as a sum of the product states. The rank of zero matrix is 0 . The rank of a product state is 1 , and the matrix $\mathbf{x y}^{*}$, for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^{m} \backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{C}^{n} \backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$, is called rank-one matrix.

It is quite simple to find the rank of a matrix $A$ using Gauss elimination. Hence the complexity of finding the rank of $A$ is $O\left(\min (m, n)^{2} \max (m, n)\right)$ in exact arithmetic. Better complexity results can be found in [26]. There are many equivalent
ways to define the rank of a matrix. We bring together a few of the equivalent definitions and some related inequalities 63, 76]:

Lemma 3.1. Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$. Then each of the integers below is $r(A)$ :
(1) The dimension of the row space (subspace spanned by the rows of $A$ ).
(2) The dimension of the column space, (subspace spanned by the columns of A).
(3) The dimension of a maximal nonzero minor of $A$. (Minor of $A$ : a determinant of a square submatrix of $A$.)
(4) The rank of $P A Q$ for two invertible matrices $P$ and $Q$ of dimension $m$ and $n$ respectively.
Furthermore,
(1) Assume that $B$ is a submatrix of $A$ (obtained by deleting some rows and columns of $A)$. Then $r(B) \leqslant r(A)$.
(2) Assume that $P \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}, Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$. Then $r(P A Q) \leqslant r(A)$.
(3) Assume that $A_{k} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} A_{k}=A$.

Then $\lim \inf _{k \rightarrow \infty} r\left(A_{k}\right) \geqslant r(A)$.
The last statement of Lemma 3.1 is the lower semicontinuity of the matrix rank.
Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}, B \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times q}$. Then $A \oplus B$ is the block diagonal matrix $\left[\begin{array}{cc}A & 0 \\ 0 & B\end{array}\right] \in$ $\mathbb{C}^{(m+p) \times(n+q)}$. Hence the dimension of the column space of $A \oplus B$ is the sum of the dimensions of the column space of $A$ and $B$, which yields the equality, $r(A \oplus B)=r(A)+r(B)$.

A decomposition of $A$ as a sum of $r(A)$ rank-one matrices is called a rank decomposition. If $r=r(A)>1$ then this decomposition is not unique. (We ignore the order of the summands.) For example, if we choose a basis $\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}$ in the column space of $A$, then there exists unique basis $\mathbf{y}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_{r} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$ of the column space of $A^{*}=\bar{A}^{\top}$ such that $A=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \mathbf{x}_{i} \mathbf{y}_{i}^{*}$.

Let $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{L}_{n} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be the group of invertible matrices. Denote by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{orb}(A)=\left\{B=P A Q, P \in \mathbf{G} \mathbf{L}_{m}, Q \in \mathbf{G} \mathbf{L}_{n}\right\} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

the orbit of $A$ under the action of $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{L}_{m} \times \mathbf{G} \mathbf{L}_{n}$. Since any basis $\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{m}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{m}$ is of the form $P \mathbf{e}_{1}, \ldots, P \mathbf{e}_{m}$ for a unique $P \in \mathbf{G} \mathbf{L}_{m}$ it follows that $\operatorname{orb}(A)$ is the set (quasi (algebraic) variety) of all matrices of rank $r(A)$. Furthermore, the closure of $\operatorname{orb}(A)$ is the (algebraic) variety of all matrices of at most $r(A)$. In terms of quantum physics this statement is written that the SLOCC transformations of a given bipartite state of rank $r$ do not increase its rank. The above abbreviation stands for stochastic local operations and classical communication, as these experimentally realizable transformations play a key role in the theory of quantum information [13].

Observe next that if we choose at random a matrix $A$ in $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ (where each entry has a standard Gaussian distribution) then $r(A)$ is $\min (m, n)$ with probability 1. That is, the value of the maximal minor of $A$ of order $\min (m, n)$ is nonzero with probability 1 . In the language of algebraic geometry, the generic rank of $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is $\min (m, n)$. Note that $\min (m, n)$ is also the maximal possible rank of matrices in $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$. That is a generic bipartite state is maximally entangled, if the rank of the tensor is considered as a simple discrete measure of quantum entanglement. There
exist also continuous measures of entanglement including the geometric measure see the next subsection.

The rank of a matrix behaves nicely under the Kronecker tensor product 63]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
r\left(\otimes_{K}^{i \in[l]} A_{i}\right)=\prod_{i=1}^{l} r\left(A_{i}\right) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The reason for that is very simple. Observe that column space of $B=\otimes_{K}^{i \in[l]} A_{i}$ is the tensor product of the column spaces of $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{l}$. Hence the dimension of the column space of $B$ is the product of the dimension of the column spaces of $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{l}$.
3.2. SVD or Schmidt decomposition. There is a standard way to make a minimal rank decomposition unique in a generic case. This is the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) (in mathematics) or Schmidt decomposition (in physics): For a given $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ there exists a decomposition

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\sum_{i=1}^{r(A)} \sigma_{i}(A) \mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{v}_{i}^{*}, \quad \mathbf{u}_{i}^{*} \mathbf{u}_{j}=\mathbf{v}_{i}^{*} \mathbf{v}_{j}=\delta_{i j}, \quad i, j \in[r(A)] \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{r(A)}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{r(A)}$ are orthonormal bases of the column spaces of $A$ and $A^{*}$ respectively. Furthermore $\sigma_{1}(A) \geqslant \cdots \geqslant \sigma_{r(A)}(A)>0$ are the positive singular values of $A$. Note that

$$
\begin{equation*}
A A^{*} \mathbf{u}_{i}=\sigma_{i}(A)^{2} \mathbf{u}_{i}, \quad A^{*} A \mathbf{v}_{i}=\sigma_{i}(A)^{2} \mathbf{v}_{i}, \quad i \in[r(A)] \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

That is, the square of the positives singular values of $A$ are the positive eigenvalues of $A A^{*}$ and $A^{*} A$. In particular, the decomposition (3.3) is unique if and only if $\sigma_{1}(A)>\cdots>\sigma_{r(A)}(A)$ 63]. By uniqueness we mean here that each rank-one matrix $\mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{v}_{i}^{*}$ is unique, but $\mathbf{u}_{i}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{i}$ need not be unique.

We now recall various approximation properties of the SVD decomposition of A. Recall that $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is a Hilbert space with the inner product $\langle A, B\rangle=\operatorname{Tr} B^{*} A$, where the trace of a square matrix $C=\left[C_{i, j}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ is given as $\operatorname{Tr} C=\sum_{i=1}^{m} C_{i, i}$. Then the Frobenius norm (also called Hilbert-Schmidt norm) of $A$ is given by $\|A\|_{F}=\sqrt{\operatorname{Tr} A^{*} A}=\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{r(A)} \sigma_{i}(A)^{2}}$. The operator norm of $A$ is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\|A\| & =\sigma_{1}(A)=\max \{\|A \mathbf{x}\|,\|\mathbf{x}\|=1\}  \tag{3.5}\\
& =\max \left\{\left|\mathbf{y}^{*} A \mathbf{x}\right|,\|\mathbf{x}\|=\|\mathbf{y}\|=1\right\}=\max \left\{\Re\left(\mathbf{y}^{*} A \mathbf{x}\right),\|\mathbf{x}\|=\|\mathbf{y}\|=1\right\}
\end{align*}
$$

The real part of a complex number $z$ is denoted by $\Re z$.
Denote by $\Pi(m, n) \subset \mathcal{H}_{m} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n}$ all normalized product states with the norm set to 1. Assume that $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{m} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n}$ is a normalized state. The geometric measure of entanglement can be described [149, 143] by the Hilbert-Schmidt distance of $|\psi\rangle$ to $\Pi(m, n)$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \min \{\||\psi\rangle-|\xi\rangle \otimes|\eta\rangle\|,\||\xi\rangle\|=\||\eta\rangle \|=1\}=  \tag{3.6}\\
& \min \{\sqrt{2-2 \Re\langle\xi \mid \psi\rangle|\eta\rangle}, \||\xi\rangle\|=\||\eta\rangle \|=1\}=\sqrt{2\left(1-\sigma_{1}(|\psi\rangle)\right)}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence the maximally entangled states with respect to the geometric measure of entanglement are the Bell states $|\psi\rangle$, which are characterized by $\sigma_{i}(|\psi\rangle)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\min (m, n)}}$ for $i \in[\min (m, n)]$.

Furthermore, for each $k \in[r(A)]$ let $B_{k} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ be any element such that $r\left(B_{k}\right)=k$. Then the distance of $A$ from the orbit $\operatorname{orb}\left(B_{k}\right)$, or its closure, is $\sigma_{k+1}(A)$, and is achieved at $A_{k}:=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_{i}(A) \mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{v}_{i}^{*}$. Recall that $\sigma_{j}(A)=0$ for $j>r(A)$. See for example 63].
3.3. Definition of a rank of a tensor. Let $d>2$ be a positive integer. Assume that $n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}$ are positive integers. Let $\mathbf{n}=\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}\right)$ and denote $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{n}}=$ $\otimes_{i=1}^{d} \mathcal{H}_{n_{i}}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}=\otimes_{i=1}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n_{i}}$. The dimension of these vector spaces is $N(\mathbf{n})=$ $\prod_{i=1}^{d} n_{i}$. A non-normalized $d$-product state $\otimes_{i=1}^{d}\left|\psi_{i}\right\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{n}}$ corresponds to a rankone tensor $\otimes_{i=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}} \backslash\{0\}$. Note that $\otimes_{i=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ is the zero tensor if and only if at least one of $\mathbf{x}_{i}$ is a zero vector. Assume that $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ is the pure state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{n}}$. Then $\mathcal{T}$ has a representation (2.1). The rank of a nonzero tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$, denoted as $r(\mathcal{T})$, is the minimal number of summands in the representation of $\mathcal{T}$ as a sum of rank-one tensors. Equivalently, the rank of the state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{n}}$ is the minimal dimension of a subspace spanned by normalized product states that contains $|\psi\rangle$. The equality (2.1) yields that $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant N(\mathbf{n})$. Actually, a stronger inequality is known - see 5.1 .

$$
\begin{equation*}
r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant \frac{N(\mathbf{n})}{\max \left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}\right)}, \quad \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}} \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

While the definition of the rank of the tensor is in principle the same as for matrices, the calculation of the rank of a given tensor can be NP-hard even for 3-tensors 74.

Let $\mathbf{p}=\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{d}\right) \in \mathbb{N}^{d}$. Assume that $\mathcal{U}=\left[\mathcal{U}_{j_{1}, \ldots, j_{d}}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{p}}$. Recall that $\mathcal{T} \otimes \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{q}}$, where $\mathbf{q}=(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{p})$. On the other hand the tensor $\mathcal{T} \otimes_{K} \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{p}}$, where $\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{p}=\left(n_{1} p_{1}, \ldots, n_{d} p_{d}\right)$. From the rank minimal decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ we deduce the obvious inequalities [33]

$$
\begin{equation*}
r\left(\mathcal{T} \otimes_{K} \mathcal{U}\right) \leqslant r(\mathcal{T} \otimes \mathcal{U}) \leqslant r(\mathcal{T}) r(\mathcal{U}) \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recall that $\mathcal{V}=\mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{U}$ is a tensor in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{p}}$, such that $(\mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{U})_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}}=\mathcal{T}_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}}$ for $i_{k} \in$ $\left[n_{k}\right], k \in[d],(\mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{U})_{n_{1}+j_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}+j_{d}}=\mathcal{U}_{j_{1}, \ldots, j_{d}}$ for $j_{k} \in\left[p_{k}\right], k \in[d]$, and all other entries are zero. It is straightforward to show that $r(\mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{U}) \leqslant r(\mathcal{T})+r(\mathcal{U})$. Recall that for $d=2$ we have equality in the above inequality. In 128 Strassen asked if $r(\mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{U})=r(\mathcal{T})+r(\mathcal{U})$ for 3-tensors. For general $d$ this problem is sometimes called Strassen's direct sum conjecture. For $d=3$ this is true if $\min \left(n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{3}, p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right) \leqslant$ 2 , see $\$ 4.3$. Some additional cases where Strassen's direct sum conjecture holds are discussed in [24, 134]. For border rank this conjecture was known to be wrong [114], see below. Recently Shitov showed that even for $d=3$ the direct sum conjecture of Strassen is in general false 121. Let $\oplus^{k} \mathcal{T}$ be the direct sum of $k$ copies of $\mathcal{T}$. By definition $r\left(\oplus^{k} \mathcal{T}\right) \leqslant k r(\mathcal{T})$ and the restricted Strassen's conjecture [33] is asking, whether equality holds, $r\left(\oplus^{k} \mathcal{T}\right)=k r(\mathcal{T})$ ?

It was shown in [33, 114 that this equality can be stated in the following form. Let $\mathcal{I}(k, d) \in\left(\mathbb{C}^{k}\right)^{\otimes d}$ be the identity tensor: $\mathcal{I}(k, d)=\sum_{i=1}^{k}|i\rangle^{\otimes d}$. One can show that $\mathcal{I}(k, d) \otimes_{K} \mathcal{T}$ is $\oplus^{k} \mathcal{T}$, if we use the lexicographical order on the standard bases $\left(\mathbb{C}^{k}\right)^{\otimes d} \otimes_{K} \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ and $r(\mathcal{I}(k, d))=k$. (It follows from the observation that if we view $\mathcal{I}(k, d)$ as a matrix in $\mathbb{C}^{k \times k^{d-1}}$, then this matrix has rank $k$.) Hence the restricted Strassen conjecture (which is still open) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
r\left(\mathcal{I}(k, d) \otimes_{K} \mathcal{T}\right)=r(\mathcal{I}(k, d)) r(\mathcal{T})=k r(\mathcal{T}) \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assume that the above equality holds for some $\mathcal{T}$. Observe that (3.8) and (3.9) imply that equalities in (3.8) hold. This implies 33] that $r(\mathcal{I}(k, d) \otimes \mathcal{T})=k r(\mathcal{T})$.

Consider the following simple example. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be $2 \times 2 \times 2$ with entries $\mathcal{T}_{i, j, k}$ where $i, j, k \in[2]$. Then the tensor $\mathcal{U}=\mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{T}$ is $4 \times 4 \times 4$ tensor. To give the exact formula for the entires of $\mathcal{U}$ we relabel $\{1,2,3,4\}$ as the pairs as $\{(1,1),(1,2),(2,1),(2,2)\}$. Then the entries of $\mathcal{U}$ are $\mathcal{U}_{\left(i_{1}, i_{2}\right),\left(j_{1}, j_{2}\right),\left(k_{1}, k_{2}\right)}$. These entries are zero unless $i_{1}=$ $j_{1}=k_{1}=l \in[2]$. The formula for possible nonzero entries of $\mathcal{U}$ is $\mathcal{U}_{\left(l, i_{2}\right),\left(l, j_{2}\right),\left(l, k_{2}\right)}=$ $\mathcal{T}_{i_{2}, j_{2}, k_{2}}$. The nonzero entries of $2 \times 2 \times 2$ tensor $\mathcal{I}(2,3)$ are the entries $(1,1,1)$ and $(2,2,2)$ which are equal to 1 . It is straightforward to see that $\mathcal{I}(2,3) \otimes \mathcal{T}=\mathcal{U}$. Corollary 4.9 claims that in this example the restricted Strassen conjecture holds.

The generic rank of a tensor in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$, denoted as $r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$, is the rank of a tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ whose entries are chosen at random, assuming that the entries of tensors in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ are $N(\mathbf{n})$ independent Gaussian random variables. We will justify later ( $\S 4.4$ ) the existence of generic rank, and discuss briefly how to compute efficiently this rank using Terracini's lemma [136]. For example the generic rank of an $m \times n$ matrix is $\min (m, n)=r_{\text {gen }}(m, n)$. It is well known that $r_{\text {gen }}(2,2,2)=2$, and the state $|G H Z\rangle=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle+|111\rangle)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \mathcal{I}(2,3)$ serves as an example of a state with such a rank 61] - see the discussion after Lemma 4.5 The maximum rank of a tensor in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$, denoted as $r_{\max }(\mathbf{n})$, is the maximum possible rank of tensors in $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$. By definition, for tensors $r_{\operatorname{gen}}(\mathbf{n}) \leqslant r_{\max }(\mathbf{n})$, while for matrices equality holds. Furthermore, the maximal rank for a three-qubit state reads $r_{\max }(2,2,2)=3$ and the state $|W\rangle=\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|100\rangle+|010\rangle+|001\rangle)$ saturates the bound - see discussion following Lemma 4.5. Nice results in [23] state that

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{\max }(\mathbf{n}) \leqslant 2 r_{\operatorname{gen}}(\mathbf{n})-1 \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

See example $16(2)$ on page 7 in [23]. For $\mathbf{n}=(2,2,2)$ the generic rank is 2 and $\sigma_{r_{\text {gen }}-1}$ is the variety of rank-one tensors. This variety has projective dimension 3 in the space of projective dimension 7 . Note that for $\mathbf{n}=(2,2,2)$ this inequality boils down to $3<4$. We will outline a short proof of the weaker inequality $r_{\max }(\mathbf{n}) \leqslant$ $2 r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$ [19] later.

We now discuss the border rank of $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$, denoted as $r_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T})$, which was discovered in [17]. It is the smallest $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with the following properties: There exists a sequence $\mathcal{T}_{j}, j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r\left(\mathcal{T}_{j}\right)=k$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lim _{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}_{j}=\mathcal{T}$. By definition, inequality $r_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant r(\mathcal{T})$ holds, which is always saturated for matrices. Rank-one tensor satisfies the equality $r_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T})=r(\mathcal{T})$. That is, the set of all tensors of rank one and norm one is closed. We will show later that $r_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$ for any $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$. It is known that $r_{\mathrm{b}}|W\rangle=2$, see 84.1 . Actually, this result follows from the above remarks. The border rank is subadditive: $r_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{U}) \leqslant r_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T})+r_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{U})$, and the inequality may be strict [26, 114]. Thus the conjecture of Strassen for border rank is false. More about algebraical methods and criteria of determining the border rank of tensors with border rank not greater than two, can be found in [109].

Denote by $\mathbf{G L}(\mathbf{n})$ the product group $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{L}_{n_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbf{G} \mathbf{L}_{n_{d}}$. Then $\mathbf{G L}(\mathbf{n})$ acts on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ as follows. Let $\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{d}\right) \in \mathbf{G L}(\mathbf{n})$. Assume that $\mathcal{T}=\sum_{i=1}^{r^{\prime}} \otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{j . i}$. Then $\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{d}\right)(\mathcal{T})=\sum_{i=1}^{r^{\prime}} \otimes_{j=1}^{d}\left(A_{j} \mathbf{x}_{j . i}\right)$. The orbit of $\mathcal{T}$ under this action reads

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{orb}(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{G L}(n))=\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{r^{\prime}} \otimes_{j=1}^{d}\left(A_{j} \mathbf{x}_{j . i}\right),\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{d}\right) \in \mathbf{G L}(\mathbf{n})\right\} \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

This orbit corresponds to all states equivalent to $\mathcal{T}$ under the SLOCC operations 13]. Note that each tensor in $\operatorname{orb}(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{G L}(n))$ has $\operatorname{rank} r(\mathcal{T})$. The closure of the orbit of $\mathcal{T}$ is denoted by Closure $(\operatorname{orb}(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{G L}(n)))$, it contains the set of the states that can be obtained from $\mathcal{T}$ by SLOCC. It can happen that this closed set may contain tensors of rank greater than $r(\mathcal{T})$. For instance, the closure of the set of $2 \times 2 \times 2$ tensors obtained from the $|G H Z\rangle$ state by changing bases in each copy of $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ forms the entire set of all $2 \times 2 \times 2$ tensors, see $\S 4.1$.

To illustrate the challenges of finding rank of $d$-mode tensors and other ranks of tensors we present a small survey on the ranks of 3-tensors.

## 4. Ranks of 3-TEnsors

In this section we survey several known results on the rank of 3 -tensors of dimension ( $m, n, p$ ) related to quantum entanglement. In subsection 4.1 we bring the celebrated Kruskal's theorem that gives a necessary condition that a decomposition of a tensor into a sum of rank-one tensors is unique up to a permutation of the summands. Subsection 4.2 covers the results of JáJá 84, 85, which completely characterize the rank of $m \times n \times 2$ tensors. Similar results were obtained by Grigoriev [70, 71]. In Subsection 4.3 we recall the results of JáJá-Takche [86] and Buczyński-Postinghel-Rupniewski [24, which give sufficient conditions under which the direct sum conjecture of Strassen holds. Subsection 4.4 discusses the values of generic rank for 3 -tensors. Theorem 4.10 combined with (4.12) implies that the generic rank of such a three-tensor is equal to $p$ if $(m-1)(n-1)+1 \leqslant p \leqslant m n$. For $2 \leqslant m \leqslant n \leqslant p \leqslant(m-1)(n-1)$ we state a well known conjecture concerning the value of generic rank. This conjecture holds in some cases. In subsection 4.5 we describe a known algorithm to find the generic rank. Subsection 4.6 surveys briefly some known results on maximal ranks of 3 -tensors.
4.1. Basic results on rank of 3 -tensors. Assume that $d=3$ and $\mathbf{n}=(m, n, p)$. Since 3-tensors represent three-partite system, the order of the parties: Alice, Bob and Charlie is arbitrary. In some cases we are going to assume

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 \leqslant m \leqslant n \leqslant p \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

(The reason for the assumption that $m \geqslant 2$ is that for $m=1$ a 3 -tensor is a matrix.) Given a 3 -tensor $\mathcal{T}=\left[\mathcal{T}_{i_{1}, i_{2}, i_{3}}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ we can associate with it four kind of ranks. The first rank is $r(\mathcal{T})$, while the other three $\operatorname{ranks} r_{A}(\mathcal{T}), r_{B}(\mathcal{T})$ and $r_{C}(\mathcal{T})$ are corresponding matrix ranks. Let us first consider $r_{C}(\mathcal{T})$. View the two parties $\{A, B\}$ (Alice and Bob) as one party, which corresponds to the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{m n}$. Then $\mathcal{T}$ is viewed as a bipartite state $\mathcal{T}_{C} \in \mathcal{H}_{m n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{p}$. It has $p$ columns $T_{k}=\left[\mathcal{T}_{i, j, k}\right]_{i=j=1}^{m, n} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ for $k \in[p]$. Each column is a matrix, and $T_{k}$ is called a frontal slice. The collection of the $p$ columns $\left\{T_{1}, \ldots, T_{p}\right\}$ can be viewed as an album of $p$ photos, where the matrix $T_{k}$ is $k$-th photo. Then $r_{C}(\mathcal{T})$ is the dimension of the subspace in $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ spanned by $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{p}$. We next observe that $r_{C}(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant r(\mathcal{T})$. Indeed, a singular value decomposition of $T_{C}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{T}_{C}=\sum_{k=1}^{r_{C}(\mathcal{T})} \sigma_{k}\left(\mathcal{T}_{C}\right) U_{k} \otimes \mathbf{z}_{k}, \quad \operatorname{Tr} U_{j}^{*} U_{k}=\mathbf{z}_{j}^{*} \mathbf{z}_{k}=\delta_{j k}, \quad j, k \in\left[r_{C}\left(\mathcal{T}_{C}\right)\right] \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that here $U_{j}$ does not have to be a rank-one matrix. Observe next that a rank decomposition $\mathcal{T}=\sum_{i=1}^{r(\mathcal{T})} \mathbf{x}_{i} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{i} \otimes \mathbf{z}_{i}$ induces a decomposition $\mathcal{T}_{C}=$ $\sum_{i=1}^{r(\mathcal{T})}\left(\mathbf{x}_{i} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{i}\right) \otimes \mathbf{z}_{i}$ to rank-one vectors in $\mathcal{H}_{m n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{p}$.

The ranks $r_{A}(\mathcal{T})$ and $r_{B}(\mathcal{T})$ are defined similarly. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \left(r_{A}(\mathcal{T}), r_{B}(\mathcal{T}), r_{C}(\mathcal{T})\right) \leqslant r(\mathcal{T}) \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{T}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \mathbf{x}_{i} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{i} \otimes \mathbf{z}_{i} \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Under what conditions $r=r(\mathcal{T})$ ? A simple sufficient condition is: the set of the matrices $\mathbf{x}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{r}$ and the set of vectors $\mathbf{z}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_{r}$ are linearly independent. Indeed, this condition insures that $r_{C}(\mathcal{T})=r \leqslant r(\mathcal{T})$.

Kruskal's conditions 93 gives sufficient conditions for $r=r(\mathcal{T})$, and that the above rank decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ is unique: Any rank decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ is a sum of rank-one tensors $\mathbf{x}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{z}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{r} \otimes \mathbf{z}_{r}$ in any order. To state Kruskal's condition we need to define Kruskal's rank of $l$ nonzero vectors $\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{l} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}$, denoted as $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{l}\right)$. Namely, $r=r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{l}\right)$ if and only if any $r$ vectors in $\left\{\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{l}\right\}$ are linearly independent, and there are $r+1$ vectors in $\left\{\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{l}\right\}$ that are linearly dependent. For example, if $\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{l} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}$ are chosen at random then $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{l}\right)=\min (l, m)$. We call a set $\left\{\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{l}\right\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{m}$ generic, or in general position, if $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{l}\right)=\min (l, m)$. We call a decomposition (4.4) generic if the three sets of vectors $\left\{\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r}\right\},\left\{\mathbf{y}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_{r}\right\},\left\{\mathbf{z}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_{r}\right\}$ are generic.

Theorem of Kruskal 93 yields:
Theorem 4.1. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$ have a decomposition (4.4), where each $\mathbf{x}_{i}, \mathbf{y}_{i}, \mathbf{z}_{i}$ is nonzero. If

$$
r_{K}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r}\right)+r_{K}\left(\mathbf{y}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_{r}\right)+r_{K}\left(\mathbf{z}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_{r}\right) \geqslant 2 r+2
$$

then $r=r(\mathcal{T})$ and the decomposition (4.4) is unique.
Note that for $m=n>1, p=2$ and $r=m$ this result is sharp. Indeed, assume that $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{m}\right)=r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathbf{y}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_{m}\right)=m$. Note that $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathbf{z}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_{m}\right)=l$ where $l \in[2]$. If $l=2$, that is any pair $\mathbf{z}_{i}, \mathbf{z}_{j}$ is linearly independent then Kruskal's theorem claims that $r(\mathcal{T})=m$ and the decomposition (4.4) is unique. Assume now that $\mathbf{z}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_{l}$ are nonzero colinear vectors. Then $\mathcal{T}$ is a matrix of the form $T=\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{i} \mathbf{x}_{i} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{i}$ where each $a_{i} \neq 0$. Thus $r(\mathcal{T})=r(T)=m$ but the rank decomposition of $T$ is not unique, since the rank decompositon of a matrix of rank greater than one is not unique. Hence the rank decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ is not unique. See 51 for more examples showing that Kruskal's theorem is sharp. See [110 for a simple proof of Kruskal's theorem. We will discuss Kruskal's theorem for $d$-mode tensors, where $d>3$, later.

The following corollary follows from Kruskal's theorem:
Corollary 4.2. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$. Assume that a decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ is generic. If

$$
\min (r, m)+\min (r, n)+\min (r, p) \geqslant 2 r+2
$$

then $r=r(\mathcal{T})$ and the rank decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ is unique.

We call a 3-tensor $\mathcal{T}$ that satisfies the conditions of the above corollary a rank- $r$ tensor with the generic decomposition.

The following theorem 61] gives a characterization of the rank of 3-tensor:
Theorem 4.3. Let $\mathbf{n}=(m, n, p)$. Assume that $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$, and let $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{p} \in$ $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ be the $p$ frontal slices of $\mathcal{T}$. Then $r(\mathcal{T})$ is the minimum dimension of $a$ subspace of $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ spanned by rank-one matrices that contains the subspace spanned by $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{p}$.

A composite space $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is spanned by $m n$ linearly independent tensors of rank one. Hence $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant m n$. This yields the inequality (3.7) for $d=3$, as we can assume (4.1).

Denote by $r_{\max }(m, n, p)$ the maximum possible rank of tensors in $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$. The inequality (3.7) yields that $r_{\max }(m, n, p) \leqslant \frac{m n p}{\max (m, n, p)}$.

Proposition 4.4. Let $m, n, p \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $k \in\left\{1, \ldots, r_{\max }(m, n, p)\right\}$ there exists a tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$ such that $r(\mathcal{T})=k$.

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$, and $r(\mathcal{A})=r=r_{\max }(m, n, p)>1$. Write $\mathcal{A}=x_{1} \otimes y_{1} \otimes z_{1}+\cdots+x_{r} \otimes y_{r} \otimes z_{r}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{k}=x_{1} \otimes y_{1} \otimes z_{1}+\cdots+x_{k} \otimes y_{k} \otimes z_{k}$ for $k \in[r-1]$. Clearly, $r\left(\mathcal{B}_{k}\right) \leqslant k$. Use the rank decomposition of $\mathcal{B}_{k}$, and the fact that $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{B}_{k}+\sum_{j=k+1}^{r} x_{j} \otimes y_{r} \otimes z_{j}$ to deduce that $r=r(\mathcal{A}) \leqslant r\left(\mathcal{B}_{k}\right)+r-k$ which yields that $r\left(\mathcal{B}_{k}\right) \geqslant k$. Hence $r\left(\mathcal{B}_{k}\right)=k$.

Let us assume that $p=2$. So $\mathcal{T}$ has two frontal slices $T_{1}, T_{2} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$. Let us first examine all possible nonzero ranks of $2 \times 2 \times 2$ tensors in terms of the matrices in the subspace spanned by the frontal sections:

Lemma 4.5. Let $\mathbf{n}=(2,2,2)$ and assume that $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}} \backslash\{0\}$. Suppose that $T_{1}, T_{2} \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ are the two frontal slices of $\mathcal{T}$. Then
(1) $r(\mathcal{T})=1$ if and only if $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$ are linearly dependent, and one of the slices is rank-one matrix.
(2) $r(\mathcal{T})=2$ if and only if one of the following conditions hold:
(a) The matrices $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$ are linearly dependent, and one of the slices is rank-two matrix.
(b) The matrices $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$ are linearly independent, and each matrix in $\operatorname{span}\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$ is singular.
(c) The subspace span $\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$ contains two linearly independent matrices $X, Y$ such that $X$ is invertible and $X^{-1} Y$ is diagonalizable.
(3) $r(\mathcal{T})=3$ if and only if $T_{1}, T_{2}$ are linearly independent, and the $\operatorname{span}\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$ contains two matrices $X, Y$ such that $X$ is invertible and $X^{-1} Y$ is not diagonalizable.

Consider a rank-two tensor $\mathcal{T}=\mathbf{x}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{z}_{1}+\mathbf{x}_{2} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{2} \otimes \mathbf{z}_{2}$ with the generic decomposition. Corollary 4.2 yields that the rank decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ is unique. The orbit of the tensor $\mathcal{T}$ with respect to the general linear transformations, written $\operatorname{orb}(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{G L})$, consists of all rank-two tensors with the generic decomposition. In particular, the GHZ (non-normalized) state $|G H Z\rangle=|111\rangle+|222\rangle$ is a rank-two state with the generic decomposition. Furthemore the closure of orb $(|G H Z\rangle, \mathbf{G L})$ is $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$. Let $W$ be the (non-normalized) state

$$
\begin{equation*}
|W\rangle=|112\rangle+|121\rangle+|211\rangle=M_{1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{1}+M_{2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{2} \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
M_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1  \tag{4.6}\\
1 & 0
\end{array}\right], M_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right] .
$$

As $M_{1}$ is invertible and $M_{1}^{-1} M_{2}$ is not diagonalizable, it follows that $r(|W\rangle)=3$. This is essentially [85, Corollary 3.2.1] after a change of variables in the first factor $\mathbb{C}^{2}$. Note that $r_{\mathrm{K}}(|1\rangle,|1\rangle,|2\rangle)=1$. Hence the above decomposition of $|W\rangle$ fails to satisfy the conditions of Kruskal's theorem: The sum of Kruskal ranks reads $1+1+1=3$ and $2 \times 3+2=8$. It is easy to show that the above rank decomposition of $|W\rangle$ is not unique. It is also known that $r(\mathcal{T})=3$ if and only if $\mathcal{T} \in \operatorname{orb}(|W\rangle, \mathbf{G L})$. (It is enough to show that if $r(\mathcal{T})=3$ then $\left(A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}\right)(\mathcal{T})=|W\rangle$ for some $\left.\left(A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}\right) \in \mathbf{G L}(\mathbf{n}).\right)$

We give a short proof of this claim. Assume that $\mathcal{T}=T_{1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{1}+T_{2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{2}$ for some $T_{1}, T_{2} \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$. First note that the action of $A_{3}$ on $\mathcal{T}$ is equivalent to choose a different basis $T_{1}^{\prime}, T_{2}^{\prime}$ in $\operatorname{span}\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$. Choose $X=a T_{1}+b T_{2}$ to be invertible, $Y=c T_{1}+c T_{2}$ be such that $X^{-1} Y$ is not diagonalizable. Then $X^{-1} Y$ has a double eigenvalue $\lambda$. Set $Z=Y-\lambda X$. Then $X^{-1} Z$ is a rank-one nondiagonalizable matrix. Hence $\mathcal{T}_{1}=\left(I_{2}, I_{2}, A_{3}\right)(\mathcal{T})=X \otimes \mathbf{e}_{1}+Z \otimes \mathbf{e}_{2}$ for some $A_{3} \in \mathbf{G L}_{2}$. Observe next that for $B_{1}, B_{2} \in \mathbf{G} \mathbf{L}_{2}$ we obtain $\mathcal{T}_{2}=\left(B_{1}, B_{2}, I_{2}\right) \mathcal{T}^{\prime}=B_{1} X B_{2}^{\top} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{1}+B_{1} Z B_{2}^{\top} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{2}$. Choose $B_{1}, B_{2}$ such that $B_{1} X B_{2}^{\top}=I_{2}$. Then $\mathcal{T}_{2}=I_{2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{1}+C \otimes \mathbf{e}_{2}$. Observe that $C$ is similar to $X^{-1} Z$. As $X^{-1} Z$ is a rank-one nondiagonalizable matrix it follows that $C$ is similar to the Jordan block $M_{1}^{-1} M_{2}$. That is $C=Q^{-1}\left(M_{1}^{-1} M_{2}\right) Q$. Let $\mathcal{T}_{3}=\left(Q^{-1}, Q^{\top}, I_{2}\right)\left(\mathcal{T}_{2}\right)=I_{2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{1}+\left(M_{1}^{-1} M_{2}\right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_{2}$. Finally, $\left(M_{1}, I_{2}, I_{2}\right)\left(\mathcal{T}_{3}\right)=|W\rangle$.

The equality

$$
\begin{equation*}
|W\rangle=\lim _{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t}\left((|1\rangle+t|2\rangle)^{\otimes 3}-|1\rangle^{\otimes 3}\right) \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

shows that the border rank of $|W\rangle$ is 2 .
4.2. The rank of $m \times n \times 2$ tensors. In this subsection we describe the complete solution to the problem of computing the rank of $\mathcal{T}=\left[\mathcal{T}_{i, j, k}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times 2}$. Denote by $T_{1}=\left[\mathcal{T}_{i, j, 1}\right], T_{2}=\left[\mathcal{T}_{i, j, 2}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ the frontal slices of $\mathcal{T}$. It was shown by JáJá 85 how to apply the Kronecker theory of the canonical form of a pencil of matrices [92] to determine the rank of a $m \times n \times 2$ tensor. We present some results of 85 ] using the notions and the results discussed above.

Theorem 4.3 states that $r(\mathcal{T})$ is the minimal dimension of a subspace spanned by rank-one matrices in $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, which contains the subspace $\mathbf{V}=\operatorname{span}\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$. We can assume that $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$ are linearly independent, otherwise the rank of $\mathcal{T}$ is $\max \left(r\left(T_{1}\right), r\left(T_{2}\right)\right)$. Then one can change a basis in $\operatorname{span}\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$ to $T_{1}^{\prime}, T_{2}^{\prime}$. This is equivalent to considering $\mathcal{T}^{\prime}=\left(I_{m}, I_{n}, A_{3}\right)(\mathcal{T})$ corresponding to some $A_{3} \in$ $\mathbf{G L}(2)$. Next we consider $\mathcal{T}_{1}=\left(P, Q^{\top}, I_{2}\right)\left(\mathcal{T}^{\prime}\right)$, where $P \in \mathbf{G L}(m), Q \in \mathbf{G L}(n)$. This corresponds to replacing the pair $\left(T_{1}^{\prime}, T_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ by $\left(P T_{1}^{\prime} Q, P T_{2}^{\prime} Q\right)$. It is a classical problem to find the canonical form of a pair of matrices $(A, B) \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ under the simultaneous equivalence: $(A, B) \mapsto P(A, B) Q$, where $P \in \mathbf{G L}(m)$, $Q \in \mathbf{G L}(n)$. This problem was solved completely by Kronecker 92. See the classical exposition in 68, or a short exposition in [63, Problems, §2.1]. It is common to consider the matrix $A+t B$ with a complex parameter $t$, which is usually called a pencil 63].

Let us first consider the case where $m=n$ and $\operatorname{span}\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$ contains an invertible matrix. In this case $\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$ is called a regular pair. Equivalently, the pencil $T_{2}+t T_{1}$
is called a regular pencil. So we can assume that $T_{1}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{span}\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$ is invertible. Now choose $P=T_{1}^{\prime-1}, Q=I_{m}$ to obtain that the pair $\left(T_{1}^{\prime}, T_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ is equivalent to the pair $\left(I_{m}, A\right)$. Note that $r_{A}(\mathcal{T})=m$. Hence $r(\mathcal{T}) \geqslant m$.

All other pairs of the form $\left(I_{m}, B\right)$ are equivalent to $\left(I_{m}, A\right)$ if $B=Q A Q^{-1}$ for some $Q \in \mathbf{G L}(m)$. We can choose $B$ to be the Jordan canonical form of $A$, or to be the rational canonical form of $A[63]$.

We first discuss the case where $A$ is a diagonalizable matrix. That is, we can choose $B$ to be the diagonal matrix $\operatorname{diag}\left(\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}\right)$. Then $\operatorname{span}\left(I_{m}, B\right)$ is contained in the span of $m$ linearly independent rank-one diagonal matrices. Hence $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant m$. Whence $r(\mathcal{T})=m$. Vice versa, assume that $r(\mathcal{T})=m$. Then $\operatorname{span}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1} \mathbf{y}_{1}^{\top}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{m} \mathbf{y}_{m}^{\top}\right)$ that contains $T_{1}, T_{2}$ must contain an invertible matrix. So $\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{m}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_{m}$ are linearly independent. Hence there exist unique $P, Q^{\top} \in \mathbf{G L}(m)$ such that $P \mathbf{x}_{i}=Q^{\top} \mathbf{y}_{i}=\mathbf{e}_{i}$ for $i \in[m]$. Thus $P T_{1} Q$ and $P T_{2} Q$ are diagonal matrices. In particular, $B$ is a diagonal matrix, hence $A$ is diagonalizable.

Assume now that $A$ is not diagonalizable. Hence $r(\mathcal{T})>m$. We now discuss the case where $r(\mathcal{T})=m+1$.

Recall the notion of the companion matrix 63] which corresponds to monic polynomial $p(t)=t^{m}-p_{1} t^{m-1}-\ldots-p_{m}$ :

$$
C(p)=\left[\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0  \tag{4.8}\\
0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\
p_{m} & p_{m-1} & p_{m-2} & \cdots & p_{2} & p_{1}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Then $\operatorname{det}\left(t I_{m}-C(p)\right)=p(t)$. Assume that $p(t)=\prod_{i=1}^{k}\left(t-\lambda_{i}\right)^{m_{i}}$, where $k \in[m]$, each $m_{i}$ is a positive integer, $\sum_{i=1}^{k} m_{i}=m$, and $\lambda_{i} \neq \lambda_{j}$ for $i \neq j$. Then the Jordan canonical form of $C(p)$ has exactly one Jordan block of order $m_{i}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda_{i}$ for $i \in[k]$. Assume that $k<m$. Hence $C(p)$ is not diagonalizable.

Suppose that $B=C(p)$. Let $\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{e}_{n}, \mathbf{y}=\left(-1+p_{m}, p_{m-1}, \ldots, p_{1}\right)^{\top}$. Then $C(p)-\mathbf{x y}^{\top}=C(q)$ where $q(t)=t^{m}-1$. Hence $C(q)$ is diagonalized, and there exists $m$ rank-one matrices $\mathbf{x}_{1} \mathbf{y}_{1}^{\top}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{m} \mathbf{y}_{m}^{\top}$ whose span contains $I_{m}, C(q)$. Therefore the span of $\mathbf{x} \mathbf{y}^{\top}, \mathbf{x}_{1} \mathbf{y}_{1}^{\top}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{m} \mathbf{y}_{m}^{\top}$ contains $I, C(p)$. Hence $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant m+1$ and therefore $r(\mathcal{T})=m+1$.

Recall next that a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ is similar to the unique matrix $B=$ $\oplus_{i=1}^{l} C\left(p_{i}\right)$ where $p_{i+1}(t)$ divides $p_{i}(t)$ for $i \in[l-1] . \quad B$ is called the rational canonical form of $A 63$. ( $A$ is similar to $C(p)$ if and only if $l=1$.) The polynomials $p_{1}(t), \ldots, p_{l}(t)$ are called the invariant polynomials of $t I_{m}-A$ (or simply of $A$.) Thus $\left(I_{m}, B\right)=\oplus_{i=1}^{l}\left(I_{n_{i}}, C\left(p_{i}\right)\right.$, where $n_{i}$ is the degree of $p_{i}$ for $i \in[l]$.

The result of JáJá 85] can be summarized in the following lemma:
Lemma 4.6. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m \times 2}$. Let $T_{1}, T_{2}$ be two frontal slices of $\mathcal{T}$. Suppose that $\operatorname{span}\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$ has dimension 2 and contains an invertible matrix $X$. Let $X, Y$ be a basis in span $\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$, and assume that $X^{-1} Y$ has the rational canonical form $\oplus_{i=1}^{l} C\left(p_{i}\right)$. If $p_{1}$ has simple roots then $r(\mathcal{T})=m$. Suppose that $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{k}$ have multiple roots, and $p_{k+1}$ has simple roots if $k<l$. Then $r(\mathcal{T})=m+k$.

Indeed, observe first that if $p_{1}$ has simple roots, then all other $p_{i}$ have also simple roots, as each $p_{i}$ divides $p_{1}$. Hence each $C\left(p_{i}\right)$ is diagonalizable, and whence $X^{-1} Y$ is diagonalizable. Therefore $r(\mathcal{T})=m$. Suppose now that $p_{i}$ does have
multiple roots. Then $C\left(p_{i}\right)$ is not diagonalizable. Hence there exists $\left(A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}\right) \in$ $\mathbf{G L}(m, m, 2)$ such that $\left(A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}\right)(\mathcal{T})=\oplus_{i=1}^{l} \mathcal{T}_{i}$, where $\mathcal{T}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{m_{i} \times m_{i} \times 2}$, where the two frontal slices of $\mathcal{T}_{i}$ are $I_{m_{i}}, C\left(p_{i}\right)$. If $p_{i}$ have simple roots then $r\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)=m_{i}$. Otherwise $r\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)=m_{i}+1$. Therefore $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant m+k$. It is shown in 85 that $r(\mathcal{T})=m+k$.

The rank of tensors $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times 2}$ which do not satisfy conditions of Lemma 4.6 is determined by the following theorem 85]:

Theorem 4.7. Assume that $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times 2}$ where the two frontal slices $T_{1}, T_{2}$ are linearly independent. Suppose furthermore that either $m \neq n$ or $m=n$ and the $\operatorname{span}\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)$ does not contain an invertible matrix. Then there exists $\left(A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}\right) \in$ $\mathbf{G L}(m, n, 2)$ such that $\left(A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}\right)(\mathcal{T})=\oplus_{i=1}^{p} \mathcal{T}_{i}, \mathcal{T}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{m_{i} \times n_{i} \times 2}$ for $i \in[p]$. Either $p>1, m_{p}=n_{p}$ and the subspace spanned by the two frontal slices of $\mathcal{T}_{p}$ contains an invertible matrix, or $\left|m_{p}-n_{p}\right|=1$. If $p>1$ then for all other $i \in[p-1]$ one has the equality $\left|m_{i}-n_{i}\right|=1$.
(1) Suppose that $n_{j}=m_{j}+1$. Then the two frontal slices of $\mathcal{T}_{j}$ are $\left[I_{m_{j}} \mathbf{0}\right]$, $\left[\mathbf{0} I_{m_{j}}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{m_{j} \times n_{j}}$. In this case $r\left(\mathcal{T}_{j}\right)=n_{j}$.
(2) Suppose that $m_{j}=n_{j}+1$. Then the two frontal slices of $\mathcal{T}_{j}$ are $\left[I_{n_{j}} \mathbf{0}\right]^{\top}$, $\left[\mathbf{O} I_{n_{j}}\right]^{\top} \in \mathbb{C}^{m_{j} \times n_{j}}$. In this case $r\left(\mathcal{T}_{j}\right)=m_{j}$.
Finally, $r(\mathcal{T})=\sum_{i=1}^{p} r\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$.
To see that the $r\left(\mathcal{T}_{j}\right)$ in the case (1) is $n_{j}$ we do as follows: We extend $\mathcal{T}_{j} \in$ $\mathbb{C}^{m_{j} \times n_{j} \times 2}$ to $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{j} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_{j} \times n_{j} \times 2}$ by adding a row $n_{j}$ to the two frontal sections. To the first section we add the row $\mathbf{e}_{n_{j}}^{\top}$ to obtain $I_{n_{j}}$, and to the second section we add the zero row to obtain the Jordan block $J_{n_{j}}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $0 . J_{n_{j}}$ is the companion matrix of $p(t)=t^{n_{j}}$. Hence $r\left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{j}\right)=n_{j}+1$. We showed above that there are $n_{j}+1$ rank-one matrices whose linear combinations span $I_{n_{j}}$ and $J_{n_{j}}$. As in the case $p=1, m_{p}=n_{p}$ and $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{T}=n_{1}+1$ discussed in the beginning of this section, we can assume that one of these rank-one matrices is of the form $\mathbf{e}_{n_{j}} \mathbf{e}_{1}^{\top}$. Hence, if we delete the last row of the other $n_{j}$ rank-one matrices, they will span the two frontal slices of $\mathcal{T}_{j}$. Thus $r\left(\mathcal{T}_{j}\right) \leqslant n_{j}$. It is straightforward to show that $r\left(\mathcal{T}_{j}\right)>m_{j}$. The case (2) can be shown similarly. The main result of this theorem is its last part.

We now bring one application of this theorem [8]:

$$
r_{\max }(m, n, 2)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
m+\left\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\right\rfloor \text { for } 2 \leqslant m \leqslant n \leqslant 2 m  \tag{4.9}\\
2 m \text { for } 2 \leqslant m, 2 m<n
\end{array}\right.
$$

First observe that the second case and the first case with $n=2 m$ is a simple consequence of Theorem4.3 when applied to horizontal sections $H_{1}, \ldots, H_{n} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times 2}$ of $\mathcal{T}$. In that case $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant 2 m$ because the whole space $\mathbb{C}^{m \times 2}$ is spanned by $2 m$ rank-one matrices. Assume now that $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{2 m}$ are linearly independent. Then these matrices span $\mathbb{C}^{m \times 2}$ and $r(\mathcal{T}) \geqslant 2 m$.

We now discuss the first case of (4.9). Let us consider first the case $m=n$. For $m=2$ we know that the maximal rank is $3=2+\lfloor 2 / 2\rfloor$. Furthermore, equality holds if and only if $\mathcal{T} \in \operatorname{orb}(W)$.

Let us consider the case $m=3$. Then we have two choices in Theorem4.7. First, $\mathcal{T}$ is a direct sum of two singular pencils of dimensions $1 \times 2$ and $2 \times 1$. In this case the rank of $\mathcal{T}$ is 4 . The other choice is that the two frontal sections form a regular pair. Then Lemma 4.6 yields that the maximal rank is 4 .

Next consider the case $m=4$. If the two sections form a nonsingular pencil then $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant 6$. Equality is achieved if the Jordan canonical form $X^{-1} Y$ in Lemma 4.6 forms two nilpotent Jordan blocks of order 2. Other choices have smaller rank.

We now deduce the general formula for the case $m=n$ as follows. For $m$ even, we have $r_{\text {max }}(m, m, 2)=3 m / 2$ which is achieved for a nonsingular two frontal slices, which are equaivalent to $(I, C)$, where $C$ is a sum of $m / 2$ nilpotent Jordan blocks. If $m \geqslant 3$ is odd, we have two possible ways to achieve the maximum rank $(3 m-1) / 2$. First, a nonsingular pair $(I, C)$ where $C$ is a sum of $(m-1) / 2$ nilpotent Jordan blocks and one Jordan block. Second, a direct sum of $3 \times 3$ singular pair of rank 4 , and a regular pair $(I, C)$ of order $m-3$ with the maximal rank $3(m-3) / 2$.

For the case $m<n \leqslant 2 m$ the maximum possible rank is obtained as follows. First, we consider the sum of $n-m$ copies of singular pairs of $1 \times 2$. This part contributes $2(n-m)$ to the rank of $\mathcal{T}$. If $n=2 m$ we are done. Otherwise we are left with a regular pencil of order $m-(n-m)=2 m-n$ with the maximal rank $2 m-n+\lfloor(2 m-n) / 2\rfloor$. Hence the maximal rank is

$$
\begin{equation*}
2(n-m)+2 m-n+\lfloor(2 m-2 n) / 2+n / 2\rfloor=m+\lfloor n / 2\rfloor \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

4.3. Validity of Strassen's direct sum conjecture for certain 3-tensors. The results of JáJá and Takche [86] yield:
Theorem 4.8. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}, \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{p}}$, where $\mathbf{n}=\left(n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{3}\right), \mathbf{p}=\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)$. Then $r(\mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{U})=r(\mathcal{T})+r(\mathcal{U})$ if one of the following conditions holds:
(1) $2 \in\left\{n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{3}, p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right\}$.
(2) $2 \in\left\{n_{i} n_{j}-n_{k}, p_{i} p_{j}-p_{k}\right\}$ for some $i, j, k$ satisfying $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$.

Use induction on $k$ to deduce the following result:
Corollary 4.9. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$, where $\mathbf{n}=\left(n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{3}\right)$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
r\left(\mathcal{I}(k, 3) \otimes_{K} \mathcal{T}\right)=r(\mathcal{I}(k, 3) \otimes \mathcal{T})=k r(\mathcal{T}) \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

if one of the following conditions holds:
(1) $2 \in\left\{n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{2}\right\}$.
(2) $2 \in\left\{n_{i} n_{j}-n_{k}\right\}$ for some $i, j, k$ satisfying $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$.

A recent paper [24] gives additional conditions where Strassen's additivity conjecture holds. Namely, Theorem 4.8 holds if one of the following conditions is satisfied:
(1) $\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)=\left(p_{1}, 3,3\right)$.
(2) $r(\mathcal{U}) \leqslant 6$.
(3) $\max \left(r_{A}(\mathcal{U}), r_{B}(\mathcal{U}), r_{C}(\mathcal{U})\right)+2 \geqslant r(\mathcal{U})$.
4.4. Generic rank of 3 -tensors. We first observe that $r_{\text {gen }}(m, n, p)$ is a symmetric function in the positive integer variables $m, n, p$. Let us fix $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that $2 \leqslant m \leqslant n$. We first observe the simple equality

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{\mathrm{gen}}(m, n, p)=r_{\max }(m, n, p)=m n \text { for } p \geqslant m n \tag{4.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, let $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{p} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ be the $p$ frontal sections of $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$. Hence $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{p}$ are chosen at random, where each entry of each $T_{k}, k \in[p]$ is independent Gaussian random variable. As $p \geqslant m n$, every set of $m n$ matrices out of $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{p} \in$ $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is linearly independent. Hence the subspace spanned by $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{p}$ is $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$.

Theorem4.3yields that $r(\mathcal{T})=m n$. Apply Theorem4.3 to deduce that for $p \geqslant m n$ one has $r_{\max }(m, n, p)=m n$.

It is left to discuss the case where $p<m n$. We now bring the following well known result, see 61 and references therein:

Theorem 4.10. Assume that $2 \leqslant m \leqslant n$ and $(m-1)(n-1)+1 \leqslant p \leqslant m n-1$. Then $r_{g e n}(m, n, p)=p$.

We now outline briefly the proof of this theorem which will need some basic notions and results in algebraic geometry that we will be using in this paper. A good reference on a basic algebraic geometry is [73. A set $V \subset \mathbb{C}^{N}$ is called a variety if it is zero of a finite number of polynomials in $N$ complex variables. The algebra of polynomials in $N$ complex variables is denoted by $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}], \mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{N}\right)^{\top} \in \mathbb{C}^{N}$. $V$ is called irreducible if it is not a union of two varieties, each strictly contained in $V$. Assume that $V$ is an irreducible variety. There is a strict subvariety of V , called Sing $V$, which consists of singular points of $V$, such that $M=V \backslash \operatorname{Sing} V$ is a connected complex manifold. The complex dimension of $M$ is called the dimension of $V$, and denoted by $\operatorname{dim} V$. In general, a point $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{N}$ is called generic, or in general position if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{N} \backslash V$. Usually, $V$ will depend on the property that one studies.

A variety $V \neq\{\mathbf{0}\}$ is called a projective if for each $t \in \mathbb{C} \backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$ we have that $t V=V$. Note that a projective irreducible variety $V$ satisfies $\operatorname{dim} V \geqslant 1$. A simplest irreducible projective variety of dimension $d$ will be a subspace $L \subset \mathbb{C}^{N}$ of dimension $d$. A basic result in algebraic geometry says that given a projective irreducible variety $V, d=\operatorname{dim} V \in[N-1]$ then for each subspace $L$ of dimension $N-d+1$ the intersection $V \cap L$ contains at least one line, i.e., a subspace of dimension 1. Furthermore, there exist a subvariety $W(V)$ on the "space" of all vector spaces in $\mathbb{C}^{N}$ of dimension $N-d+1$, such that $V \cap L$ has a constant number of lines for each $L \notin W(V)$, which is denoted as $\operatorname{deg} V$. Moreover, for $L \notin W(V)$, each set of $\min (N, \operatorname{deg} V)$ lines in $V \cap L$ is linearly independent. Note that if $V$ is also a subspace then $\operatorname{deg} V=1$.

We now consider the variety of rank-one matrices plus zero matrix in $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$. We view $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ as $\mathbb{C}^{m n}$. This variety is called the Segre variety $\operatorname{Seg}\left(\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}\right)$. This variety has dimension $m+n-1$ and has one singular point $A=0$. Let us take a vector space $L$ of dimension $m n-(m+n-1)+1=(m-1)(n-1)+1$. The above results yield that each such subspace contains a rank-one matrix. One can compute the degree of $\operatorname{Seg}\left(\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}\right)$ and it is not less than $(m-1)(n-1)+1$ 61. Hence a generic $(m-1)(n-1)+1$ dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is spanned by $(m-1)(n-1)+1$ rank-one matrices. Consider now a generic tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times((m-1)(n-1)+1)}$. Let $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{(m-1)(n-1)+1}$ be its frontal sections. Hence $\operatorname{span}\left(T_{1}, \ldots, T_{(m-1)(n-1)+1}\right)$ is a generic subspace of dimension $(m-1)(n-1)+1$, which has a basis consisting of rank-one matrices. Theorem 4.3 yields that $r(\mathcal{T})=(m-1)(n-1)+1$. Similar arguments yield Theorem 4.10 for $p$ that satisfies the inequalities $(m-1)(n-1)+1<$ $p<m n$.

Letting $m=2$ in Theorem4.10 we deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{\mathrm{gen}}(2, n, p)=p \text { for } n \leqslant p \leqslant 2 n \tag{4.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus it is left to determine the generic rank in the critical range

$$
\begin{equation*}
3 \leqslant m \leqslant n \leqslant p \leqslant(m-1)(n-1) \tag{4.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

For any subset $X$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}^{n_{d}}$ we denote the closure of $X$ in the standard Euclidean topology on $\mathbb{C}^{n_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}^{n_{d}}$ by Closure $(X)$. Let us now recall the lemma of Terracini's [136 - see 61].

Lemma 4.11. Let $m, n, p$ be positive integer greater than 1. Fix $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the polynomial map $\mathbf{F}_{r}:\left(\mathbb{C}^{m} \times \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{C}^{p}\right)^{r} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$ given as follows:

$$
\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \mathbf{y}_{1}, \mathbf{z}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r}, \mathbf{y}_{r}, \mathbf{z}_{r}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \mathbf{x}_{i} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{i} \otimes \mathbf{z}_{i}
$$

Then
(1) The set $\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^{m} \times \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{C}^{p}\right)^{r}\right)$ is the set of all tensors in $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$ of rank at most $r$.
(2) The set $\operatorname{Closure}\left(\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^{m} \times \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{C}^{p}\right)^{r}\right)\right)$ is the set of all tensors in $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$ of border rank at most $r$.
(3) The set Closure $\left(\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^{m} \times \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{C}^{p}\right)^{r}\right)\right)$ is an irreducible variety $V_{r}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$.
(4) There exists a subvariety $W_{r} \subset V_{r}$ such that $\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^{m} \times \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{C}^{p}\right)^{r}\right) \supset V_{r} \backslash W_{r}$.
(5) The dimension of $V_{r}$ is the maximal rank of the Jacobian of $\mathbf{F}_{r}$.
(6) There exists a subvariety $U_{r} \subset\left(\mathbb{C}^{m} \times \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{C}^{p}\right)^{r}$ such that the rank of the Jacobian of $\mathbf{F}_{r}$ for each point not in $U_{r}$ is $\operatorname{dim} V_{r}$.
(7) The generic rank $r_{g e n}(m, n, p)$ is the minimal $r$ such that $\operatorname{dim} V_{r}=m n p$.
(8) $\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^{m} \times \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{C}^{p}\right)^{r}\right) \subseteq \mathbf{F}_{r+1}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^{m} \times \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{C}^{p}\right)^{r+1}\right)$. Equality holds if and only if $r \geqslant r_{\max }(m, n, p)$. In particular $\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^{m} \times \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{C}^{p}\right)^{r}\right)=\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$ if and only if $r \geqslant r_{\max }(m, n, p)$.

We now give a lower bound for $r_{\text {gen }}(m, n, p)$. Denote by

$$
\operatorname{Seg}\left(\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}\right)=\left\{\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{p}\right\}
$$

the variety of all tensors of rank at most 1 . So $\operatorname{Seg}\left(\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}\right)$, the Segre variety, is a projective variety of dimension $m+n+p-2$, with one singular point 0. Observe that the polynomial map $\mathbf{F}_{r}$ can be viewed as an $r$-secant map $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_{r}:\left(\operatorname{Seg}\left(\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}\right)\right)^{r} \rightarrow$ $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$. Note that the dimension of the variety $\left(\operatorname{Seg}\left(\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}\right)\right)^{r}$ is $r(m+n+p-2)$. Hence Lemma 4.11 yields that $r_{\text {gen }}(m, n, p)(m+n+p-2) \geqslant m n p$. Introducing a new quantity $r_{0}(m, n, p)$ we obtain a lower bound:

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{0}(m, n, p):=\left\lceil\frac{m n p}{m+n+p-2}\right\rceil \leqslant r_{\operatorname{gen}}(m, n, p) \tag{4.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that for the case $p=(m-1)(n-1)+1$ Theorem 4.10 yields equality. For $p>(m-1)(n-1)+1$ one can have strict inequality in (4.15). For example for $m=n=3$ and $p=5,6$ we have equality in the above inequality, while for $p=7$ we have a strict inequality.

We now state the conjecture on the value of $r_{\text {gen }}(m, n, p)$ in the critical range 61:

Conjecture 4.12. Assume that $m, n, p$ are integers satisfying (4.14). Then equality in (4.15) holds unless $(m, n, p)=(3,2 k+1,2 k+1)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In this exceptional case it is known [129] that $r_{\text {gen }}(3,2 k+1,2 k+1)=r_{0}(3,2 k+1,2 k+1)+1$.

It was shown in 129 that for $(m, n, p)=(3,2 k+1,2 k+1)$ the tensors of border rank at most $r_{0}(3,2 k+1,2 k+1)$ forms a hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{(3,2 k+1,2 k+1)}$.

The conjecture holds for $(3, n, n)$ and $n \geqslant 3$ [129], for $(4, n, n)$ and $n \geqslant 3$ [2], and $(n, n, n)$ for $n \geqslant 4$ 100, 2.

We conclude this section with a short outline of a weaker version of the inequality (3.10) [19] for 3 -tensors. Set $r=r_{\operatorname{gen}}(m, n, p)$. It is enough to consider the case where $r<r_{\max }(m, n, p)$. Observe that a finite union of subvarieties of $\mathbb{C}^{N}$ is a subvariety of some hypersurface $H(p)=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^{N}, p(\mathbf{x})=0\right\}$. Identify $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$ with $\mathbb{C}^{m n p}$. Theorem4.11implies that $V_{r}=\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$ and $V_{r-1}$ is a strict subvariety of $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$. There exists a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}^{m n p}[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $H(p) \supseteq V_{r-1} \cup W_{r}$. Hence all tensors in $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p} \backslash H(p)$ have rank $r$. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n \times p}$ such that $r(\mathcal{T})=r_{\max }(m, n, p)$. So $\mathcal{T} \in H(p)$. Recall that there exists a line through $\mathcal{T}$ that intersects $H(f)$ at a finite number of points. Choose two points $\mathcal{T}_{1}, \mathcal{T}_{2}$ on this line which do not lie in $H(p)$. Hence $r\left(\mathcal{T}_{1}\right)=r\left(\mathcal{T}_{2}\right)=r$ and $\mathcal{T}$ is a linear combination of $\mathcal{T}_{1}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{2}$. Hence $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant 2 r$.

The inequality (3.10) can be improved to $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant 2 r-2$ if the closure of tensors of rank $r-1$ is a hypersurface [23].
4.5. A numerical way to compute $r_{\text {gen }}(m, n, p)$. View $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})=\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{z}$, as $f: \mathbb{C}^{m} \times \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{C}^{p} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{p}$. Then the Jacobian of $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ is given by a rectangular block matrix 61:

$$
\begin{align*}
& D f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})=\left[A_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\left|A_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})\right| A_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\right]  \tag{4.16}\\
& A_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})=\left[e_{1,1} \otimes \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{z}|\ldots| e_{m, 1} \otimes \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{z}\right] \\
& A_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})=\left[\mathbf{x} \otimes e_{1,2} \otimes \mathbf{z}|\ldots| \mathbf{x} \otimes e_{n, 2} \otimes \mathbf{z}\right] \\
& A_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=\left[\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{y} \otimes e_{1,3}|\ldots| \mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{p, 3}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

We assume that we are in the critical range (4.14). For a positive integer $r$ we define $\mathbf{F}_{r}$ as in Lemma 4.11. Then the Jacobian $D \mathbf{F}_{r}$ is given by

$$
D \mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \mathbf{y}_{1}, \mathbf{z}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r}, \mathbf{y}_{r}, \mathbf{z}_{r}\right)=\left[\begin{array}{c}
D f\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \mathbf{y}_{1}, \mathbf{z}_{1}\right)  \tag{4.17}\\
\vdots \\
D f\left(\mathbf{x}_{r}, \mathbf{y}_{r}, \mathbf{z}_{r}\right)
\end{array}\right] .
$$

We fix a positive integer $N$. We start our procedure with $r=r_{0}(m, n, p)$ (4.15) and $j=1$. Next we select $r$ triplets $\mathbf{x}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}, \mathbf{y}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}, \mathbf{z}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{p}$ at random for $i \in[r]$. It is enough to assume that components of each vector are drawn from the standard Gaussian distribution. We compute the rank of $D \mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \mathbf{y}_{1}, \mathbf{z}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r}, \mathbf{y}_{r}, \mathbf{z}_{r}\right)$, denoted as $R$. If $R=m n p$ then $r_{\operatorname{gen}}(m, n, p)=r$, and we stop our procedure. If $R<m n p$ and $j<N$ we set $j=j+1$ and repeat the above procedure. If $j=N$ and $R<m n p$ we conclude that $r<r_{\operatorname{gen}}(m, n, p)$. We set $r=r+1$ and repeat until the procedure stops.

One may assume that the generic rank $r_{\text {gen }}(m, n, p)$ is equal to $r_{0}(m, n, p)$, which is often the case. For $3 \leqslant n \leqslant p \leqslant 20$ in the critical range (4.14), numerical results show that $r_{0}(m, n, p)$ is the generic rank, except the cases of $(3,2 k+1,2 k+1)$ with $k \in[9]$. In these exceptional cases $r_{\text {gen }}(3,2 k+1,2 k+1)=r_{0}(3,2 k+1,2 k+1)+1$. That is, Conjecture 4.12 holds for $3 \leqslant n \leqslant p \leqslant 20$ in the critical range (4.14). Such anomalies for generic rank are analogous to those reported earlier for $(3,3,3)$ and $(3,5,5)$.

It was shown in 129 that for all positive integers $k$

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{\text {gen }}(3,2(k+1), 2(k+1))=r_{0}(3,2(k+1), 2(k+1)) \tag{4.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{\operatorname{gen}}(3,2 k+1,2 k+1)=r_{0}(3,2 k+1,2 k+1)+1 \tag{4.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

4.6. Known results on maximal ranks of 3 -tensors. Besides the exact values (4.9), we know the following results. The table in [8] gives all the values of the maximal rank $r_{\max }(3,3, p)$ for $\mathbf{n}=(3,3, p)$ for $p \in[9] \backslash\{5\}$. It is known that $r_{\text {max }}(3,3,5) \in\{6,7\}$. We give their table:

$$
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
p & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9  \tag{4.20}\\
r_{\max }(3,3, p) & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & \{6,7\} & 7 & 8 & 8 & 9
\end{array}
$$

Recall the table of the generic rank of $3 \times 3 \times p$ tensor.

$$
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
p & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9  \tag{4.21}\\
r_{\mathrm{gen}}(3,3, p) & 3 & 3 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9
\end{array}
$$

We now explain briefly this formula. Recall (4.12) and Theorem 4.10. First, $r_{\text {gen }}(3,3,1)$ is the maximal possible rank of $3 \times 3$ matrix which is 3 . Now $r_{\text {gen }}(3,3,2)=$ $r(2,3,3)$. As $3=(2-1)(3-1)+1$ it follows from Theorem4.10 that $r_{\text {gen }}(3,3,2)=3$. The equality $r_{\text {gen }}(3,3,3)=5$ is well known and is stated in the big table of generic rank in 5.4. Again for $p \geqslant(3-1)(3-1)+1=5$ we get that $r_{\text {gen }}(3,3, p)=p$ for $5 \leqslant p \leqslant 9$. As $r_{\text {gen }}(3,3,3) \leqslant r_{\text {gen }}(3,3,4) \leqslant r_{\text {gen }}(3,3,5)$ it follows that $r_{\text {gen }}(3,3,4)=5$.

The papers [8, 7] give the following upper bounds on the rank of 3-tensors

$$
\begin{align*}
& r_{\max }(m, n, n) \leqslant\left\lfloor\frac{(m+1) n}{2}\right\rfloor, \quad 3 \leqslant m, n  \tag{4.22}\\
& r_{\max }(m, n, p) \leqslant m+\left\lfloor\frac{p}{2}\right\rfloor n, \quad 3 \leqslant m \leqslant n, 3 \leqslant p  \tag{4.23}\\
& r_{\max }(m, n, m n-u)=m n-\left\lceil\frac{u}{2}\right\rceil, \quad 3 \leqslant m \leqslant n, u \leqslant \min (4, m, n) \tag{4.24}
\end{align*}
$$

These results and the known results that $r(m, m, m)=\left\lceil\frac{m^{3}}{3 m-2}\right\rceil$ for $m>3$ [100] yield:

$$
\begin{align*}
& r_{\max }(4,4,4) \leqslant 10, \quad r_{\text {gen }}(4,4,4)=7  \tag{4.25}\\
& r_{\max }(5,5,5) \leqslant 15,  \tag{4.26}\\
& r_{\max }(6,6,6) \leqslant 21, \quad r_{\text {gen }}(6,6,6)=14  \tag{4.27}\\
& r_{\max }(7,7,7) \leqslant 28, \quad r_{\text {gen }}(7,7,7)=19 \tag{4.28}
\end{align*}
$$

## 5. Ranks of $d$-TEnsors for $d \geqslant 4$

This section discusses ranks of $d$-tensors for $d \geqslant 4$, where $\mathbf{n}=\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}\right), 2 \leqslant$ $n_{1} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_{d}$. In subsection 5.1 we give a well known characterization of the tensor rank in terms of the dimension of the minimal subspace spanned by rank-one $(d-1)$-mode tensors that contains all frontal sections of the given tensor. Next we bring a generalization of the Kruskal uniqueness theorem by Sidiropoulos and Bro [123. Theorem5.6 states the known result, under which conditions the generic rank $r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$ of a tensor is equal to $n_{d}$. Subsection 5.2 states the lemma of Terracini. In subsection 5.3 we give an upper bound on the generic rank of a tensor using purely combinatorial methods. This upper bound is sharp for the case of $d$ subsystems with $n$ levels each: $n_{1}=\cdots=n_{d}=n$, for which perfect codes exist 28]. Subsection 5.4 concentrates on the generic rank of $d$ qunits. In particular, we provide a table
of generic ranks of tensors with $d$ indices running from 1 to $n$, for which these values are known. Subsection 5.5 discusses an algorithmic way to find the rank of a tensor using solvability of a system of linear equations with several variables. In subsection 5.6 we discuss the problem of generic identifiability of tensors. Namely, assuming an integer $r$ is less than a generic rank, when a generic tensor of rank $r$ has a unique decomposition as a sum of $r$ rank-one tensors? The results of Chiantini-Ottaviani-Vannieuwenhoven [34] show that if $\prod_{i=1}^{d}\left(n_{i}-1\right) \leqslant 15000$ then the generic identifiability property holds except in a number of known cases.
5.1. General case. We now bring the analog of Theorem 4.3 for a general $d \geqslant 3$.

Theorem 5.1. Let $\mathbf{n}=\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}\right)$, where $d \geqslant 3$ and $n_{i} \geqslant 2$ for $i \in[d]$. Assume that $\mathcal{T}=\left[\mathcal{T}_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$, and let $\mathcal{T}_{1}=\left[\mathcal{T}_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d-1}, 1}\right], \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{n_{d}}=\left[\mathcal{T}_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d-1}, n_{d}}\right] \in$ $\mathbb{C}^{\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d-1}\right)}$ be the $n_{d}$ frontal slices of $\mathcal{T}$. Then $r(\mathcal{T})$ is the minimum dimension of a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^{\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d-1}\right)}$ spanned by rank-one tensors that contains the subspace spanned by $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{n_{d}}$.

In particular, we deduce that $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant N(\mathbf{n}) / n_{d}$. Apply the above theorem to a mode $k \in[d]$ to deduce that $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant N(\mathbf{n}) / n_{k}$. This proves (3.7).

The following generalization of Kruskal's theorem for $d$-tensors is due to Sidiropoulos and Bro 123]:

Lemma 5.2. Assume that $3 \leqslant d, 2 \leqslant n_{1} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_{d}$ are integers. Assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{T}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i, j}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{i, j} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_{j}} \backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}, i \in[r], j \in[d] . \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

If

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{d} r_{K}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1, j}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{n_{j}, j}\right) \geqslant 2 r+(d-1) \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $r=r(\mathcal{T})$ and the decomposition (5.1) is unique.
To establish the uniqueness of a rank decomposition using the above lemma, it seems that in many cases it is beneficial to view a $d$-tensor as a 3 -tensor in $\mathcal{H}_{n_{1}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n_{2}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n_{3}, \ldots, n_{d}}$ [62]:

Lemma 5.3. Assume that $3 \leqslant d, 2 \leqslant n_{1} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_{d}$ are integers. Decompose the multiset $\left\{n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}\right\}$ to a union of three nonempty disjoint multisets $S_{1} \cup S_{2} \cup S_{3}$, which induce three vectors $\mathbf{n}_{1} \in \mathbb{N}^{\left|S_{1}\right|}, \mathbf{n}_{2} \in \mathbb{N}^{\left|S_{2}\right|}, \mathbf{n}_{3} \in \mathbb{N}^{\left|S_{3}\right|}$. ( $\left|S_{k}\right|$ is the cardinality of $S_{k}$.) Then $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}_{1}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}_{2}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}_{3}}$ is obtained from $\otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n_{j}}$ by permuting factors $\mathbb{C}^{n_{1}}, \ldots, \mathbb{C}^{n_{d}}$. Thus each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ induces $\hat{\mathcal{T}} \in \otimes_{k=1}^{3} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}_{k}}$. Assume that $\mathcal{T}$ has a decomposition (5.1). Let $\hat{\mathcal{T}}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \otimes_{k=1}^{3} \mathcal{T}_{i, k}$, where each $\mathcal{T}_{i, k} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}_{k}}$ is a rank-one tensor induced decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$. View each $\mathcal{T}_{i, k}$ as a vector in $\mathbb{C}^{N\left(\mathbf{n}_{k}\right)}$. If

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{K}\left(\mathcal{T}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{r, 1}\right)+r_{K}\left(\mathcal{T}_{1,2}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{r, 2}\right)+r_{K}\left(\mathcal{T}_{1,3}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{r, 3}\right) \geqslant 2 r+2 \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $r(\mathcal{T})=r(\hat{\mathcal{T}})=r$ and the above decomposition of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ and the corresponding decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ is unique up to a permutation of rank-one tensors in the decomposition.

Proposition 5.4. Let the assumptions of Lemma 5.3 hold. Moreover, assume that $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right) \leqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right) \leqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{T}$ has a decomposition (5.1), where all $\mathbf{x}_{i, j}$ are in general position. (The entries of each $\mathbf{x}_{i, j}$ are chosen from independent $N(0,1)$ Gaussian distribution.) Then $r=r(\mathcal{T})$ and the decomposition (5.1) of $\mathcal{T}$ is unique up to a permutation of summands for the following values of $r$ :
(1) If $r \leqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)-2$ and $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right) \geqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)-2$.
(2) If $r \leqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)-3, N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right) \geqslant 3$ and $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)=N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)-3$.
(3) If $r \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\left(N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)-2\right), N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right) \geqslant 4$ and $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)-4 \geqslant$ $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)$.

Proof. The results in [62] yield that $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathcal{T}_{1, k}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{r, k}\right)=\min \left(r, N\left(\mathbf{n}_{k}\right)\right)$ for $k \in$ [3]. Suppose first that $2 \leqslant r \leqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)$. Then the left hand side of (5.3) is $3 r$. As $r \geqslant 2$ the inequality (5.3) holds. Hence $r(\mathcal{T})=r$.

Assume now that $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)<r \leqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)$. Then $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathcal{T}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{r, 1}\right)=N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)$ and $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathcal{T}_{1, k}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{r, k}\right)=r$ for $k \in\{2,3\}$. Then the inequality (5.3) holds. Hence $r(\mathcal{T})=r$. Assume that $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right) \leqslant r \leqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)$. Then $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathcal{T}_{1, k}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{r, k}\right)=N\left(\mathbf{n}_{k}\right)$ for $k \in$ [2] and $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathcal{T}_{1,3}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{r, 3}\right)=r$. Then the inequality (5.3) is equivalent to $r \leqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)-2$. Therefore (1) holds.

Suppose that $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)=N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)-3$. As $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right) \geqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)$ we deduce that $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right) \geqslant 3$. Suppose that $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right) \leqslant r \leqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)=N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)-3$. Then the above arguments show that (5.3) holds. For $r=N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)-2$ we obtain that $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathcal{T}_{1, k}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{r, k}\right)=N\left(\mathbf{n}_{k}\right)$ for $k \in[3]$. For this value of $r$ the inequality (5.3) does not hold. Thus (2) is the best one can obtain for the case $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)=N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)-3$.

Assume that $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)-4 \geqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)$. As $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right) \geqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)$ we deduce that $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right) \geqslant 4$. Suppose that $r \leqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)$. Then the above arguments show that (5.3) holds. Assume that $r>N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)$. Then $r_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathcal{T}_{1, k}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{r, k}\right)=N\left(\mathbf{n}_{k}\right)$ for $k \in[3]$. Hence (5.3) is equivalent to $r \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\left(N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)+N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)-2\right)$. This establishes (3).

It seems that the best way to group the multiset $\left\{n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}\right\}$ to $S_{1} \cup S_{2} \cup S_{3}$ is in such a way that $\mathbf{n}_{1}=\left(n_{1}\right), N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right) \leqslant N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)$ and $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)-N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right)$ is smallest possible. (Note that $N\left(\mathbf{n}_{1}\right) N\left(\mathbf{n}_{2}\right) N\left(\mathbf{n}_{3}\right)=N(\mathbf{n})$.) The following Corollary reveals the advantage of our decomposition of a tensor $\mathcal{T}$ as a three tensor:

Corollary 5.5. Assume that $d=2 p+1, p \geqslant 2, n_{1}=\cdots=n_{d}=n \geqslant 2$ are integers. Suppose that $\mathcal{T}$ has a decomposition $\sum_{i=1}^{r} \otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i, j}$, where all $\mathbf{x}_{i, j}$ are in general position. (The entries of each $\mathbf{x}_{i, j}$ are chosen from independent $N(0,1)$ Gaussian distribution.) If $r$ satisfies the following inequalities then $r=r(\mathcal{T})$ :

$$
r \leqslant\left\{\begin{array}{l}
n^{p} \text { if } n=2,3 \\
n^{p}-1+\frac{n}{2} \text { if } n \geqslant 4
\end{array}\right.
$$

and the above decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ is unique.
We now bring the known analog of Theorem4.10
Theorem 5.6. Assume that $3 \leqslant d, 2 \leqslant n_{1} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_{d}$ are integers. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{g e n}(\mathbf{n})=n_{d} \text { for } \prod_{j=1}^{d-1} n_{j}+d-1-\sum_{j=1}^{d-1} n_{j} \leqslant n_{d} \leqslant N(\mathbf{n}) \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.10. Denote by $M(\mathbf{n}):=1-d+$ $\sum_{j=1}^{d} n_{j}$ the dimension of the Segre variety in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$. Let $\mathbf{n}^{\prime}=\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d-1}\right)$. Hence a generic subspace in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}^{\prime}}$ of dimension $N\left(\mathbf{n}^{\prime}\right)-M\left(\mathbf{n}^{\prime}\right)+1$ intersects the Segre variety in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}^{\prime}}$ in a finite number of points, whose linear span is this subspace. Use Theorem 5.1 to deduce Theorem 5.6 for $n_{d}=N\left(\mathbf{n}^{\prime}\right)-M\left(\mathbf{n}^{\prime}\right)+1$. Similar arguments yield the theorem for $n_{d}>N\left(\mathbf{n}^{\prime}\right)-M\left(\mathbf{n}^{\prime}\right)+1$.

Introducing the generalized version of the lower bound given in (4.15) we obtain the following lower bound for the generic rank

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{0}(\mathbf{n}):=\left\lceil\frac{N(\mathbf{n})}{M(\mathbf{n})}\right\rceil \leqslant r_{\mathrm{gen}}(\mathbf{n}) \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assume that $2 \leqslant n_{1} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_{d}$. Is the above inequality optimal for $n_{d} \leqslant$ $N\left(\mathbf{n}^{\prime}\right)-M\left(\mathbf{n}^{\prime}\right) ?$

In $\S 5.4$ we show some affirmative results for the case $n=n_{1}=\cdots=n_{d}$, which we call $d$-qunit states, or simply $d$-qunits. We now discuss in detail Terracini's lemma in the general setting.
5.2. Terracini's lemma. We recall the results in 61. For a fixed $r \in \mathbb{N}$ consider the map

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\mathbf{F}_{r}:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}^{n_{d}}\right)^{r} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}, \\
\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{1, r}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, r}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{j, i} \tag{5.6}
\end{array}
$$

The set $\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^{n_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}^{n_{d}}\right)^{r}\right)$ is a constructible set, of dimension $d(\mathbf{n}, r)$, whose closure is an irreducible variety in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$. (A constructible set of dimension $k$ in $\mathbb{C}^{m}$ is a finite union of irreducible varieties whose maximal dimension is $k$ minus a union of a finite number of constructible sets of dimension at most $k-1$ [73].) The dimension $d(\mathbf{n}, r)$ is the rank of the Jacobian matrix of $\mathbf{F}_{r}$ at a generic point

$$
\left(\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{1, r}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, r}\right) \in\left(\mathbb{C}^{n_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}^{n_{d}}\right)^{r}
$$

The following results are known [61]:
(1) $d\left(\mathbf{n}, r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})\right)=N(\mathbf{n})$.
(2) The sequence $d(\mathbf{n}, r)$ is strictly increasing for $r \in\left[r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})\right]$.
(3) $d(\mathbf{n}, r)=N(\mathbf{n})$ for each integer $r>r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$.

The rank of the Jacobian $D \mathbf{F}_{r}$ at the point $\left(\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{1, r}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, r}\right)$ is the dimension of the subspaces spanned by the following vectors

$$
\left(\otimes_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{x}_{j, i}\right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_{l_{k}, k, i}\left(\otimes_{j=k+1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{j, i}\right), \quad l_{k} \in\left[n_{k}\right], i \in[r] .
$$

Here $\mathbf{e}_{1, k, i}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{n_{k}, k, i}$ is a basis in $\mathbb{C}^{n_{k}}$ for $k \in[d]$ and $i \in[r]$, since for each rank-one component $\otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{j, i}$ one can have a different basis in each component $\mathbb{C}^{n_{j}}$.
5.3. An upper bound on $r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$. We now give an upper bound on the generic rank using pure combinatorial methods. Consider the standard basis in $\mathbb{C}^{\text {n }}$ :

$$
\otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{e}_{l_{j}, j}, \quad \mathbf{e}_{l_{j}, j}=\left(\delta_{l_{j} 1}, \ldots, \delta_{l_{j} n_{j}}\right)^{\top}, l_{j} \in\left[n_{j}\right], j \in[d] .
$$

That is, each element in the basis corresponds to a $d$-tuple $\left(l_{1}, \ldots, l_{d}\right)$, where $l_{j} \in$ $\left[n_{j}\right]$ for $j \in[d]$. Denote by $[\mathbf{n}]$ the set of such of such $d$-tuples:

$$
[\mathbf{n}]:=\left[n_{1}\right] \times \cdots \times\left[n_{d}\right]=\left\{\mathbf{l}=\left(l_{1}, \ldots, l_{d}\right), l_{j} \in\left[n_{j}\right], j \in[d]\right\} .
$$

Recall the Hamming distance on [ $\mathbf{n}]$ is given by the formula:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{dist}\left(\left(l_{1}, \ldots, l_{d}\right),\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{d}\right)\right)=p \tag{5.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

if $m_{j} \neq l_{j}$ for exactly $p$ indices. Denote by $O(\mathbf{l})$ the set of all points in [n] whose distance from $\mathbf{l}$ is at most 1 . Note that the cardinality of $O(\mathbf{l})$, denoted as $|O(\mathbf{l})|$, is $M(\mathbf{n})$.

A subset $A \subseteq[\mathbf{n}]$ is called a dominating set of $[\mathbf{n}]$ if $\cup_{\mathbf{l} \in A} O(\mathbf{l})=[\mathbf{n}]$. The cardinality of each dominating set $A$ satisfies the inequality $|A| M(\mathbf{n}) \geqslant N(\mathbf{n})$. Denote by $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{n})$ the set of dominating sets. Let $\gamma(\mathbf{n}):=\min \{|A|, A \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{n})\}$ be the minimum cardinality of the dominating set.

A subset $B$ of $[\mathbf{n}]$ is called 3 -separated set if the Hamming distance between any two elements of $B$ is at least 3. Note that if $B$ is 3 -separated then $|B| M(\mathbf{n}) \leqslant N(\mathbf{n})$. Denote by $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{n})$ the set of 3 -separated sets of $[\mathbf{n}]$. Let $\kappa(\mathbf{n}):=\max \{|B|, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{n})\}$ be the maximum cardinality of 3 -separable set. Observe that $\gamma(\mathbf{n}) \geqslant \kappa(\mathbf{n})$. A maximum 3-separated set $B$ is called a 1-perfect code if $\gamma(\mathbf{n})=\kappa(\mathbf{n})$. That is, the Hamming distance between every two elements of $B$ is at least 3 , and for each $\mathbf{p} \in[\mathbf{n}]$ there exists $\mathbf{q} \in B$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \leqslant 1$. The following result is due to 28:

Lemma 5.7. Assume that $3 \leqslant d$ and $2 \leqslant n_{1} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_{d}$ be integers. Then the following assertions hold:
(1) The inequality $r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n}) \leqslant \gamma(\mathbf{n})$ holds.
(2) For each $r \in[k(\mathbf{n})]$ the closure of $\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\mathbb{C}^{n_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}^{n_{d}}\right)$ is an irreducible variety of dimension at most $r M(\mathbf{n})$. In particular, if the dimension of $\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\mathbb{C}^{n_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}^{n_{d}}\right)$ is $r M(\mathbf{n})$ then most of tensors of rank $r$ have exactly $\operatorname{deg} F_{r}$ different rank decomposition.

The above inequalities for dominating and 3-separated sets yield that $|B|=$ $\frac{N(\mathbf{n})}{M(\mathbf{n})}$. In particular $\frac{N(\mathbf{n})}{M(\mathbf{n})}$ is an integer. Furthermore, the inequality (5.5) and Lemma 5.7 yield that $r_{0}(\mathbf{n})=r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$.

It is known [137] that 1-perfect code exists if

$$
n_{1}=\cdots=n_{d}=n=q^{l}, d=\frac{n^{a+1}-1}{n-1}, \quad q \text { is prime }, \quad l, a \in \mathbb{N}, a \geqslant 2
$$

Use Lemma 5.7 to deduce that in this case $r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})=n^{d-a-1}$.
Let $G=(V, E)$ be a simple graph on the set of vertices $V$ and edges $E$. Recall that $A \subseteq V$ is a dominating set if each vertex $v$ not in $A$ is adjacent to some vertex in $A$. Then $\gamma(G)$ is called the domination number of $G$, if $\gamma(G)$ is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set in $G$. We will show below that $\gamma(\mathbf{n})=\gamma(G(\mathbf{n}))$, where $G(\mathbf{n})=([\mathbf{n}], E(\mathbf{n}))$ is the induced graph on $[\mathbf{n}]$ by the Hamming distance.

The domination number of $G$ is a solution to the following minimum problem in $|V|$ variables $x_{v}, v \in V$ whose values are in $\{0,1\}$. For each $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{v}\right)_{v \in V} \in\{0,1\}^{V}$ we denote by supp $\mathbf{x}$ the subset $\left\{v \in V, x_{v}=1\right\}$. Then $\operatorname{supp} \mathbf{x}$ is a dominating set in $V$ if and only if the following inequalities hold

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{v}+\sum_{u,(u, v) \in E} x_{u} \geqslant 1 \text { for all } v \in V \tag{5.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence $\gamma(G)$ is the minimum of $\sum_{v \in V} x_{v}$ on $\mathbf{x} \in\{0,1\}^{V}$ subject to (5.8). It is known that computing $\gamma(G)$ for general graphs is an NP-complete problem 91 .

A greedy algorithm to find an upper bound for $\gamma(G)$ is as follows: Let $G_{1}=G$. Suppose that at the stage $k \in[V]$ we have the graph $G_{k}=\left(V_{k}, E_{k}\right)$, where $V_{k}$ is a nonempty subset of $V$, and $G_{k}$ is the induced subgraph of $G$ by the set $V_{k}$. We choose a vertex $v_{k} \in V_{k}$ of a maximum degree in $G_{k}$. Let $O_{k} \subset V_{k}$ be the neighbors of $v_{k}$ in $G_{k}$. Then $V_{k+1}=V_{k} \backslash\left\{\left\{v_{k}\right\} \cup O_{k}\right\}$. If $V_{k+1}=\emptyset$ then $A=\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k}\right\}$ is the dominating set. Otherwise set $k$ as $k+1$.

Recall the standard linear programming (LP) relaxation of the above minimal problem on $\{0,1\}^{V}[46]$. Namely, we replace the condition $x_{v} \in\{0,1\}, v \in V$ by the condition $0 \leqslant x_{v} \leqslant 1, v \in V$. Thus we consider the minimum $\sum_{v \in V} x_{v}$ satisfying the inequalities (5.8) for $\mathbf{x} \in[0,1]^{V}$. Denote this minimum by $\beta(G)$.

The following result is well known [107]: Let $G=(V, E)$ be a simple graph with maximal degree $\Delta(G)$. Denote by $A(G) \subseteq V$, a dominating set obtained by the above greedy algorithm. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta(G) \leqslant \gamma(G) \leqslant|A(G)| \leqslant O(\log \Delta(G)) \beta(G) \tag{5.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recall that $G$ is called regular, if the degree of each vertex is $\Delta(G)$. One can show that for a regular graph $G$ one arrives at the inequality:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta(G) \leqslant \frac{\# V}{\Delta(G)+1} \tag{5.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, define $x_{v}=\frac{1}{\Delta(G)+1}$ for each $v \in V$. Then the conditions (5.8) are satisfied. As the following equality is true, $\sum_{v \in V} x_{v}=\frac{\# V}{\Delta(G)+1}$, the above inequality holds. Thus we showed that for regular graph $G$ we have the following inequalities:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\# V}{\Delta(G)+1} \leqslant \gamma(G) \leqslant|A(G)| \leqslant O(\log \Delta(G)) \frac{\# V}{\Delta(G)+1} \tag{5.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

(Recall the notation $O(m)$ for some function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow[0, \infty)$. Namely, there exists a universal $K>0$ so that $f(m) \leqslant K m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.)

We now apply these results to estimate from above the generic rank. Let $G(\mathbf{n})=$ $([\mathbf{n}], E(\mathbf{n}))$. Two vertices $\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{m} \in[\mathbf{n}]$ are adjacent if $\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{m})=1$. Observe that $G(\mathbf{n})$ is a regular graph with $\Delta(G(\mathbf{n}))=M(\mathbf{n})-1$. It is easy to show that $A \subseteq[\mathbf{n}]$ is a dominating set if and only if $A$ is a dominating set in $G(\mathbf{n})$. That is, $\gamma(\mathbf{n})=$ $\gamma(G(\mathbf{n}))$. Thus (5.11) applies to $G(\mathbf{n})$. We do not know how good is the upper bound on $\gamma(n)$ given in (5.11) in the general case. Apply Lemma (5.7) to deduce sandwich bound:

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{0}(\mathbf{n}) \leqslant r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n}) \leqslant O\left(\log \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d}\left(n_{i}-1\right)\right)\right) r_{0}(\mathbf{n}) \tag{5.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us consider the following simple examples for $d=3$ and $n_{1}=n_{2}=n_{3}=3$. Choose

$$
A=\{(1,1,1),(2,2,2),(3,3,3),(1,1,2),(2,2,3),(3,3,1)\}
$$

end

$$
B=\{(1,1,1),(2,2,2),(3,3,3)
$$

Then $A$ is a dominating set and $B$ is 3 -separated set. Recall that $r_{\text {gen }}(3,3,3)=$ $5<|A|=6$. It is straightforward to show that $B$ is a maximal 3 -separated set. So $\kappa(3,3,3)=3$.
5.4. The generic rank of $d$-qunits. Let $n^{\times d}=(n, \ldots, n) \in \mathbb{N}^{d}$. Then $r_{\text {gen }}\left(n^{\times d}\right)$ is the generic rank of $d$-qunits. Inequality (5.5) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{\text {gen }}\left(n^{\times d}\right) \geqslant\left\lceil\theta\left(n^{\times d}\right)\right\rceil, \quad \text { where } \quad \theta\left(n^{\times d}\right)=\frac{n^{d}}{d(n-1)+1} . \tag{5.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

In previous subsection we showed that equality holds if $[n]^{d}$ has 1 -perfect code [28].
It was shown in [30] that equality holds in (5.13) for $n=2$ and any $d \geqslant 2$. That is, the generic rank of $d$-qubits is $\left\lceil 2^{d} /(d+1)\right\rceil$.

We now recall some results in [2] for $r_{\operatorname{gen}}\left(n^{\times d}\right)$. First, assume that $\theta\left(n^{\times d}\right)$ is integer. (Thus $d=\frac{n^{a+1}-1}{n-1}$ for $a \in \mathbb{N}$.) Then $r_{\text {gen }}\left(n^{\times d}\right)=\theta\left(n^{\times d}\right)$. Second, assume that $\theta\left(n^{\times d}\right)$ is not an integer. Let $\left\lfloor\theta\left(n^{\times d}\right)\right\rfloor \equiv{ }_{\bmod n} \delta\left(n^{\times d}\right) \in\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. Then

$$
r_{\mathrm{gen}}\left(n^{\times d}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\left\lceil\frac{n^{d}}{d(n-1)+1}\right\rceil \text { if } \delta\left(n^{\times d}\right)=n-1,  \tag{5.14}\\
r_{\mathrm{gen}}\left(n^{\times d}\right) \leqslant\left\lceil\frac{n^{d}}{d(n-1)+1}\right\rceil+n-1-\delta\left(n^{\times d}\right) .
\end{array}\right.
$$

We now provide a few examples of the above equalities and inequalities. According to 30 for $n=2$ and the known table of the values of $r_{\operatorname{gen}}\left(n^{\times d}\right)$, which is given later, in all below cases the upper bound on $r_{\text {gen }}\left(n^{\times d}\right)$ is a strict inequality.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \theta\left(2^{\times 4}\right)=16 / 5,\left\lfloor\gamma\left(2^{\times 4}\right)\right\rfloor=3, \delta\left(2^{\times 4}\right)=1, r_{\operatorname{gen}}\left(2^{\times 4}\right)=4,  \tag{5.15}\\
& \theta\left(2^{\times 5}\right)=32 / 6,\left\lfloor\gamma\left(2^{\times 5}\right)\right\rfloor=5, \delta\left(2^{\times 5}\right)=1, r_{\operatorname{gen}}\left(2^{\times 5}\right)=6,  \tag{5.16}\\
& \theta\left(2^{\times 8}\right)=256 / 9,\left\lfloor\theta\left(2^{\times 5}\right)\right\rfloor=28, \delta\left(2^{\times 5}\right)=0, r_{\text {gen }}\left(2^{\times 8}\right)=29<30,  \tag{5.17}\\
& \theta\left(3^{\times 3}\right)=27 / 7,\left\lfloor\theta\left(3^{\times 3}\right)\right\rfloor=3, \delta\left(3^{\times 3}\right)=0, r_{\text {gen }}\left(3^{\times 3}\right)=5<6,  \tag{5.18}\\
& \theta\left(3^{\times 5}\right)=243 / 11,\left\lfloor\theta\left(3^{\times 5}\right)\right\rfloor=22, \delta\left(3^{\times 5}\right)=1, r_{\text {gen }}\left(3^{\times 5}\right)=23<24,  \tag{5.19}\\
& \theta\left(3^{\times 6}\right)=729 / 13,\left\lfloor\theta\left(3^{\times 6}\right)\right\rfloor=56, \delta\left(3^{\times 3}\right)=2, r_{\text {gen }}\left(3^{\times 6}\right)=57 . \tag{5.20}
\end{align*}
$$

Known values of generic rank, $r_{\text {gen }}\left(n^{\times d}\right)$, for the system of $d$ qunits are listed in Table 1.

Table 2 provides a comparison between the generic rank $r_{\text {gen }}$, the maximal ranks $r_{\text {max }}$ and the maximal number $R_{U}$ of terms in the shortest representation of a pure state of $d$ subsystems with $n$ levels each in an orthogonal product basis in $\mathcal{H}_{n}^{\otimes d}$. The upper bound $R_{U}=n^{d}-d n(n-1) / 2$ follows directly from the work of Carteret, Higuchi and Sudbery 31. They demonstrated that out of $n^{d}$ entries of any tensor $\mathcal{T}$ one can set to zero $n(n-1) / 2$ entries by performing a single unitary rotation which affects a single index. As there are $d$ independent indices, for which such a transformation can be applied, the total number of entries which can be set to zero is $d n(n-1) / 2$. This explains the bound $R_{U}$ stated above.
5.5. Estimating and computing the rank of a tensor using polynomial equations. It is clear to many researchers in the field that the rank of a tensor over a given given field $\mathbb{F}$ is equivalent to solvability of corresponding system of polynomial equations over $\mathbb{F}$. See for example [40, where the author deals with ranks of tensors over the real numbers. In this subsection we report briefly on the approach outlined in 4] to estimate and to compute the rank of a tensor using polynomial equations. We start with the following lemma:

Lemma 5.8. Assume that $d \geqslant 3$ and $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}} \backslash\{0\}$ is given. Fix $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the equality (5.1) as a system of polynomial equations in the entries of unknown

| $\begin{gathered} (5.21) \\ d \backslash n \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | ${ }^{[a, b]} 2$ | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 3 | ${ }^{[b, c, d]} 2$ | ${ }^{[c, d]} 5$ | ${ }^{[c, d]} 7$ | ${ }^{[a, c, d]} 10$ | ${ }^{[c, d]} 14$ | ${ }^{[c, d]} 19$ | ${ }^{[a, c, d]} 24$ | ${ }^{[c]} 30$ | ${ }^{[c]} 36$ |
| 4 | ${ }^{[a, b, d]} 4$ |  | ${ }^{[a, d]} 20$ | ${ }^{[d]} 37$ | ${ }^{[d]} 62$ | ${ }^{[d]} 97$ | 142 | 199 | 271 |
| 5 | ${ }^{[a, b]} 6$ |  | ${ }^{[a, b]} 64$ | 149 | ${ }^{[a]} 300$ | 543 |  |  |  |
| 6 | ${ }^{[a, b]} 10$ | ${ }^{[a]} 57$ | ${ }^{[a]} 216$ | ${ }^{[a, b]} 625$ | ${ }^{[a]} 1506$ | . |  |  |  |
| 7 | ${ }^{[a, b]} 16$ | 146 | 745 |  | ${ }^{[a]} 6^{5}$ |  | ${ }^{[a]} 41944$ |  | ${ }^{[a]} 156250$ |
| 8 | ${ }^{[b]} 29$ | 386 |  |  |  | ${ }^{[a, b]} 7^{6}$ | . |  |  |
| 9 | ${ }^{[a, b]} 52$ | 1036 |  | . |  | . | ${ }^{[a, b]} 8^{7}$ |  |  |
| 10 | ${ }^{[a, b]} 94$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{[1]} 1185612$ | . |  | ${ }^{[a, b]} 9^{8}$ | ${ }^{[a]} 109890110$ |
| 11 | ${ }^{[b]} 171$ |  |  | ${ }^{[a]} 1085070$ |  | . | . |  | . |
| 12 | ${ }^{[a, b]} 316$ | ${ }^{[a]} 21258$ |  |  | . | . | . |  | ${ }^{[a]} 10^{9}$ |
| 13 | ${ }^{[a, b]} 586$ | ${ }^{[a, b]} 3^{10}$ | . | ${ }^{[a]} 23032135$ |  | . | . |  |  |
| 14 | ${ }^{[b]} 1093$ |  | . |  | ${ }^{[a]} 1103720622$ |  | . |  |  |
| 15 | ${ }^{[b]} 2048$ |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |
| 16 | ${ }^{[a, b]} 3856$ |  |  | ${ }^{[a]} 2347506010$ | ${ }^{[a]} 2^{16} 3^{12}$ |  | ${ }^{[a]} 2490928997440$ |  | ${ }^{[a]} 68965517241380$ |

Table 1. Values of the generic rank calculated for several $n$-level systems. Polygonal chain defines two areas in the array. Numbers in the upper-left part corresponding to the right-hand side of the formula (5.13) are confirmed numerically. Numbers decorated with ${ }^{[a, b, c, d]}$ on the left represent known results according to the reference in [2, 30, 26, 41], respectively, while numbers in bold are results obtained in this work by numerical calculations.

TABLE 2. Generic ranks $r_{\text {gen }}$, maximal ranks $r_{\max }$ and the maximal number $R_{U}$ of terms in the shortest representation of a pure state of $d$ subsystems with $n$ levels each in an orthogonal product basis in $\mathcal{H}_{n}^{\otimes d}$. Numbers in bold denote exact results, other numbers denote upper bounds obtained in [41] and in 61, 19].

|  | $n=2$ |  |  | 3 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $d$ | $r_{\text {gen }}$ | $r_{\max }$ | $R_{U}$ | $r_{\text {gen }}$ | $r_{\max }$ | $R_{U}$ | $r_{\text {gen }}$ | $r_{\max }$ | $R_{U}$ | $r_{\text {gen }}$ | $r_{\max }$ | $R_{U}$ |
| 2 | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| 3 | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | 13 | $\mathbf{4 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 20 | $\mathbf{9 5}$ |
| 4 | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | 18 | $\mathbf{6 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 40 | $\mathbf{2 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | 74 | $\mathbf{5 8 5}$ |

vectors $\mathbf{x}_{i, j}$ for $i \in[r], j \in[d]$ :
$\underset{(5.22)}{f_{k_{j}}} \underset{\sim}{f_{d}}, k_{d}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{1, r}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, r}\right) \equiv\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r} \otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i, j}-\mathcal{T}\right)_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{d}}=0$,

$$
k_{j} \in\left[n_{j}\right], j \in[d] .
$$

Then $r(\mathcal{T})>r$ if and only if the following equivalent conditions hold:
(a) The above system of polynomial equations is not solvable.
(b) There exist $N(\mathbf{n})$ polynomials $g_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{d}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{1, r}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, r}\right)$ for $k_{j} \in$ $\left[n_{j}\right], j \in[d]$ of degree at most

$$
L(r, \mathbf{n})=d^{-1+\min \left(N(n), r \sum_{i=1}^{d} n_{i}\right)}
$$

such that the following identity holds:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k_{1}=1}^{n_{1}} \cdots \sum_{k_{d}=1}^{n_{d}} g_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{d}} f_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{d}}=1 \tag{5.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant r$ if and only if the following equivalent conditons hold:
(i) The system of polynomial equations (5.22) is solvable.
(ii) There are no $N(\mathbf{n})$ polynomials $g_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{d}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{1, r}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, r}\right)$ for $k_{j} \in\left[n_{j}\right], j \in[d]$ of degree at most $L(r, \mathbf{n})$ such that the identity (5.23) holds.
Proof. Clearly, $r<r(\mathcal{T})$ if and only if the system (5.22) is not solvable. Hilbert's Nullstellensatz states that non-solvability of (5.22) is equivalent to the existence of polynomials $g_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{d}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{1, r}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, r}\right)$ that satisfy the identity (5.23). The claim that the degree of each $g_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{d}}$ is at most $L(r, \mathbf{n})$ is due to Kóllar (90].

Suppose that $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant r$. Then the system (5.22) is solvable. (Some of $\mathbf{x}_{i, j}$ can be zero.) The identity (5.23) cannot hold. Part (b) yields that there are no polynomials $g_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{d}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{1, r}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, r}\right)$ for $k_{j} \in\left[n_{j}\right], j \in[d]$ of degree at most $M(r, \mathbf{n})$ that satisfy (5.23).

We now explain briefly how to use this lemma effectively of estimate or to compute the rank of $\mathcal{T}$. For $i \in[d]$ let $T_{i}$ be the $n_{i} \times\left(N(\mathbf{n}) / n_{i}\right)$ matrix obtained from $\mathcal{T}$ by viewing $\left[n_{1}\right] \times \cdots \times\left[n_{d}\right]$ as $\left[n_{i}\right] \times\left(\left[n_{1}\right] \times \cdots\left[n_{i-1}\right] \times\left[n_{i+1}\right] \cdots \times\left[n_{d}\right]\right)$. (We partition $\mathcal{T}$ to a bipartite state.) Let $r_{i}(\mathcal{T})$ be the matrix rank $r\left(T_{i}\right)$, which is easy to compute. (For $d=3$ those are ranks $r_{A}(\mathcal{T}), r_{B}(\mathcal{T}), r_{C}(\mathcal{T})$ introduced in $\$ 4.1$.) As in 4.1 we have $r(\mathcal{T}) \geqslant r m=\max \left(r_{1}(\mathcal{T}), \ldots, r_{d}(\mathcal{T})\right)$. Fix $r \geqslant r m$. Write each $g_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{d}}$ as a polynomial of degree $L(r, \mathbf{n})$ with unknown monomial coefficients. Then view the identity (5.23) as a huge system of linear equations in the unknown coefficients of monomials of $g_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{d}}$ for $k_{j} \in\left[n_{j}\right], j \in[d]$. If this system of linear equations is solvable we deduce that $r<r(\mathcal{T})$. If this system is not solvable then $r \geqslant r(\mathcal{T})$. To find $r(\mathcal{T})$ we start an algorithm with the above procedure for $r=r m$. If this system of linear equations corresponding to (5.23) is not solvable then $r(\mathcal{T})=r$. Otherwise set $r=r+1$ and repeat the above procedure. The main drawback of this algorithm for finding $r(\mathcal{T})$ is an exponential number of variables and equations in $d$.

### 5.6. Generic identifiability of tensors.

Definition 5.9. Assume that $d \geqslant 3$. A tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ is identifiable if its rank decomposition as a sum of rank-one decomposition is unique up to the order of summation.

Note that for $d=2$ any matrix $T$ with $r(T)>1$ is not identifiable. Lemma 5.3 gives sufficient conditions on the identifiability of a tensor. The obvious question arises, what happens if the inequality (5.3) does not hold. A simple example is the case of $\mathcal{T} \in \otimes^{3} \mathbb{C}^{2}$ discussed after Lemma 4.5. Namely a generic decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ as a sum of two rank-one tensors is a unique rank decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$, since it satisfies the condition (5.3). If $r(\mathcal{T})=3$ then any rank decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ does not
satisfy (5.3), and its rank decomposition is not unique. In particular a symmetric decomposition of $|W\rangle=\sum_{i=1}^{3} \otimes^{3} \mathbf{x}_{i}$ is not unique. It is shown in [51] that Kruskal's theorem fails if we replace $2 r+2$ in the right hand side of (5.3) by $2 r+1$.

Consider the space of tensors $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ where $d \geqslant 3$ and $2 \leqslant n_{1} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_{d}$. Fix $r>1$ and assume that there exists $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ such that $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{T}=r$. Let $\mathbf{F}_{r}$ be the map defined by (5.6). A tensor $\mathcal{T}$ is called a random tensor in $\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^{n_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}^{n_{d}}\right)^{r}\right)$ if $\mathcal{T}=$ $\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{1, r}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, r}\right)$, and the coordinates of vectors $\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, r}$ are sampled from independent Gaussian complex-valued distribution. We say that the identifiability property holds if for a random $\mathcal{T}$ of the above form $r=r(\mathcal{T})$, and the decomposition $\left.\mathcal{T}=\mathbf{F}_{r}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{1, r}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{d, r}\right)\right)$ is unique up to a permutation of the summands $\otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{j, i}$. Recall the inequality (5.5). By counting the parameters we deduce that if $\frac{N(\mathbf{n})}{M(\mathbf{n})}$ is not an integer then for $r=r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$ identifiability property fails. Thus it makes sense to consider the identifiability property for $r<r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$. Theorem 5.6 states that $r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})=n_{d}$ if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\prod_{j=1}^{d-1} n_{j}\right)+d-1-\sum_{j=1}^{d-1} n_{j} \leqslant n_{d} \tag{5.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $n_{d}$ satisfies the above inequality then the identifiability property holds if and only if 20]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
r \leqslant\left(\prod_{j=1}^{d-1} n_{j}\right)+d-2-\sum_{j=1}^{d-1} n_{j} \tag{5.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus it is enough to consider the identifiability property for

$$
\begin{equation*}
n_{1} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_{d-1} \leqslant n_{d} \leqslant\left(\prod_{j=1}^{d-1} n_{j}\right)+d-2-\sum_{j=1}^{d-1} n_{j} \tag{5.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is shown in 34 that if the above inequalities hold, and $\prod_{i=1}^{d}\left(n_{i}-1\right) \leqslant 15000$ then the identifiability property holds for $r<r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$ except the following cases of $\mathbf{n}=\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}\right)$ and the corresponding $r$ :

$$
\begin{array}{r}
(4,5,5) \text { and } r=5, \\
(5,5,5) \text { and } r=6, \\
(4,7,7) \text { and } r=8, \\
(3,3, n, n) \text { and } r=2 n-1, \\
(3,3,3,3,3) \text { and } r=5 . \tag{5.31}
\end{array}
$$

Domanov and de Lathauwer studied the identifiability property for 3-mode tensors using mostly matrix methods in [55, 56, 57, 58.

## 6. Symmetric tensors

This section is devoted to symmetric tensors, which can be applied in quantum physics to describe systems of bosons. In subsection 6.1 we recall the known one-to-one correspondence between symmetric $d$-mode tensors and homogeneous polynomials of degree $d$. In particular, the symmetric rank of a symmetric tensor is the Waring rank of a homogeneous polynomial. Next we bring the celebrated result of Alexander-Hirschowitz [3] that gives the formula for the generic symmetric rank except a number of known cases. Subsection 6.2 discusses the recent upper bound
of Buczyński-Han-Mella-Teitler on the maximum symmetric rank in terms of the generic symmetric rank [23]. We also provide some known values of the maximum symmetric rank. Subsection 6.3 shows that the rank of the symmetric tensor representing the state $\left|W_{d}\right\rangle$ is equal to $d$, while its border rank is 2 . In subsection 6.4 we show explicitly that the rank of Kronecker and tensor products of quantum states can be strictly submulitplicative. This is achieved by considering the ranks of $|W\rangle \otimes_{K}|W\rangle$ and $|W\rangle \otimes|W\rangle$, which read 7 and 8 respectively, while the square of the rank of $|W\rangle$ is 9 . In a short subsection 6.5 we discuss briefly computational methods for symmetric rank of symmetric tensors. Subsection 6.6 gives a short account of the results in [35], which show that the generic identifiability property of symmetric tensors holds for a rank less than the symmetric generic rank, except a number of known cases.
6.1. Basic properties and relation to homogeneous polynomials. A tensor $\mathcal{S}=\left[\mathcal{S}_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}}\right] \in \otimes^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$ is called symmetric if the value of the coordinates $\mathcal{S}_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}}$ does not change under the permutation of indices. We denote by $\mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n} \subset \otimes^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$ the subspaces of all $d$-mode symmetric tensors over $\mathbb{C}^{n}$. In physics this space is called the $(d, n)$ boson space. A symmetric $\mathcal{S}$ is rank-one tensor if and only if $\mathcal{S}=\otimes^{d} \mathbf{x}$, where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^{n} \backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$. There exists one-to-one correspondence between symmetric tensors and the space of all homogeneous polynomials of degree $d$ in $n$ complex variables denoted as $\mathrm{P}(d, n)$. Indeed, let $f(\mathbf{x})=\left\langle\mathcal{S}, \otimes^{d} \overline{\mathbf{x}}\right\rangle$, where $\langle\cdot, \cdot\rangle$ is the standard inner product in $\otimes^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$. Then $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathrm{P}(d, n)$. Conversely, each polynomial $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathrm{P}(d, n)$ induces a unique $\mathcal{S} \in \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$ as we explain below.

We now introduce the standard multinomial notation. Let $\mathbb{Z}_{+}$be the set of all nonnegative integers. Denote by $J(d, n)$ the set $J(d, n)=\left\{\mathbf{j}=\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{n}\right) \in\right.$ $\left.\mathbb{Z}_{+}^{n}, j_{1}+\cdots+j_{n}=d\right\}$. Recall that $|J(d, n)|$, the cardinality of the set $J(d, n)$, is $\binom{n+d-1}{d}$. For $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)^{\top} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$ and $\mathbf{j}=\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{n}\right) \in J(d, n)$ let $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{j}}$ be the monomial $x_{1}^{j_{1}} \cdots x_{n}^{j_{n}}$. Define $c(\mathbf{j})=\frac{d!}{j_{1}!\cdots j_{n}!}$. Then $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathrm{P}(n, d)$ expressed as a sum of monomials is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in J(d, n)} c(\mathbf{j}) f_{\mathbf{j}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{j}} \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose that $f(\mathbf{x})=\left\langle\mathcal{S}, \otimes^{d} \overline{\mathbf{x}}\right\rangle$. Then the correspondence between $f_{\mathbf{j}}$ and the entries of $\mathcal{S}=\left[\mathcal{S}_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}}\right]$ is as follows. Assume that $\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}\right) \in[n]^{d}$ is fixed. For each $l \in[n]$ let $j_{l}$ be the number of times that $l$ appears in the sequence $i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}$. Set $\mathbf{j}=\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{n}\right)$. Then $f_{\mathbf{j}}=\mathcal{S}_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{d}}$.

Thus $\operatorname{dim} \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}=\binom{n+d-1}{d}=\binom{n+d-1}{n-1}$. This dimension is usually significantly smaller than $\operatorname{dim} \otimes^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}=n^{d}$. For example for $n=2$, the space $\mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{2}$, the boson $d$-qubit space, has dimension $d+1$, while the space $\otimes^{d} \mathbb{C}^{2}$, of $d$-mode qubits is $2^{d}$. Thus $(d, n)$ bosons are much less entangled that then $d$-qunits.

A symmetric rank decomposition of $\mathcal{S} \in \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$ is a decomposition of $\mathcal{S}$ to a sum of rank-one symmetric tensors. This is analogous to the Waring decomposition of $f \in \mathrm{P}(d, n)$ to a sum of linear terms to the power $d: f(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{r}\left\langle\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}_{i}\right\rangle^{d}$, where $\mathbf{a}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{n} \backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$. The minimal number of summands in symmetric rank decomposition of symmetric $\mathcal{S}$ is called the symmetric rank of $\mathcal{S}$, and denoted as $r_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathcal{S})$. This is equivalent to the Waring rank of $f(\mathbf{x})=\left\langle\mathcal{S}, \otimes^{d} \overline{\mathbf{x}}\right\rangle$. The following inequality holds by definition, $r(\mathcal{S}) \leqslant r_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathcal{S})$.

We now recall two positive results when $r(\mathcal{S})=r_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathcal{S})$. For a $(d, n)$ symmetric tensor $\mathcal{S}$ denote by $r_{A}(\mathcal{S})$ the matrix rank of $\mathcal{S}$ viewed as a bipartite state in $\mathbb{C}^{n} \otimes\left(\otimes^{d-1} \mathbb{C}^{n}\right)$. As in $\$ 4.1$ we deduce that $r_{A}(\mathcal{S}) \leqslant r(\mathcal{S})$. In 62 it is shown that if $r(\mathcal{S}) \in\left\{r_{A}(\mathcal{S}), r_{A}(\mathcal{S})+1\right\}$ then $r(\mathcal{S})=r_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathcal{S})$. It is shown in 147 that if $\mathcal{S} \in \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$ and $r_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathcal{S}) \leqslant d$ then $r(\mathcal{S})=r_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathcal{S})$. However, even for general 3-mode symmetric tensors one has a strict inequality $r(\mathcal{S})<r_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathcal{S})$ 120].

As for general tensors, one can define a generic rank of $(d, n)$ symmetric tensor as the symmetric rank of a random $\mathcal{S} \in \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$. Denote by $r_{\text {gen }}(d, n)$ the generic rank of $(d, n)$ symmetric tensor. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^{r}\left\langle\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}_{i}\right\rangle^{d}$ has $r n$ complex parameters. The dimension count yields the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{\mathrm{gen}}(d, n) \geqslant\left\lceil\frac{\binom{n+d-1}{d}}{n}\right\rceil \tag{6.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The celebrated Alexander-Hirschowitz result 3 claims that equality holds in the above inequality except the following cases 21:

$$
\begin{array}{lc}
n=3, & d=4 \\
n=4, & d=4 \\
n=5, & d=3 \\
n=5, & d=4
\end{array}
$$

In all the exceptional cases the value of generic rank is $\left[\frac{\binom{n+d-1}{d}}{n}\right\rceil+1$. Furthermore, in these exceptional cases, all tensors of border rank at most $\left\lceil\frac{\binom{n+d-1}{d}}{n}\right\rceil$ form a hypersurface in $S^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$. (We thank G. Ottaviani for pointing out this fact to us.)
6.2. Maximum symmetric rank. Denote by $r_{\max }(d, n)$ the maximum rank of $(d, n)$ symmetric tensors. The following analogue of (3.10) is proved in [23]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{\max }(d, n) \leqslant 2 r_{\operatorname{gen}}(d, n)-1 \tag{6.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

This bound can be further improved [23] to $r_{\max }(d, n) \leqslant 2 r_{\text {gen }}(d, n)-2$ if the variety of all symmetric tensors of border symmetric rank at most $r_{\text {gen }}(d, n)-1$ is a hypersurface. This assumption holds in all the above exceptional cases.

We now discuss briefly the known maximum ranks. The first nontrivial case is $r_{\max }(2,3)$. As $r_{\max }(2,2,2)=3$ and $r(|W\rangle)=3$ we deduce that $r_{\max }(3,2)=3$. Observe that the relation $r_{\text {gen }}(3,2)=r_{\text {gen }}(2,2,2)=2$ implies that inequality (6.3) is not sharp in this case.

The following maximum ranks are known. We also display the value of the generic symmetric rank in these cases:

$$
\begin{align*}
& r_{\max }(d, 2)=d \quad \text { [44, [19, §3.1], } \quad r_{\text {gen }}(d, 2)=\left[\frac{d+1}{2}\right],  \tag{6.4}\\
& r_{\max }(3,3)=5 \quad \text { [117, §96], [43, }, ~\left[97, \quad r_{\operatorname{gen}}(3,3)=4,\right.  \tag{6.5}\\
& r_{\max }(4,3)=7 \quad \text { [117, §97], [87, [49, } \quad r_{\operatorname{gen}}(4,3)=6,  \tag{6.6}\\
& r_{\max }(5,3)=10 \quad \text { [49], [25], } \quad r_{\operatorname{gen}}(5,3)=7 . \tag{6.7}
\end{align*}
$$

In $\sqrt[6.4]{ }$ we show that $r_{\text {max }}(3,4) \geqslant 7$. See also [25].
6.3. The rank of $\left|W_{d}\right\rangle$. Denote by $\left|W_{d}\right\rangle \in \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{2}$ the symmetric tensor corresponding to polynomial $d x_{1}^{d-1} x_{2}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|W_{d}\right\rangle=\sum_{j=0}^{d-1}\left(\otimes^{d-j-1} \mathbf{e}_{1}\right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_{2} \otimes\left(\otimes^{j} \mathbf{e}_{1}\right) \tag{6.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence $r\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle\right) \leqslant d$. We claim that $r\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle\right)=r_{\mathrm{s}}\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle\right)=d$. As $|W\rangle=\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$, we know that $r\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)=3$. We first claim that $r\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle\right)=d$ 18. We prove that by induction on $d=k \geqslant 3$. Suppose that $r\left(\left|W_{k}\right\rangle\right)=k$ for $k \geqslant 3$. Assume to the contrary that

$$
\left|W_{k+1}\right\rangle=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \otimes_{j=1}^{k+1} \mathbf{x}_{i, j}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{i, j} \in \mathbb{C}^{2}, j \in[k+1], i \in[r], r<k+1
$$

Observe that $\left|W_{k+1}\right\rangle=\left|W_{k}\right\rangle \otimes \mathbf{e}_{1}+\mathbf{e}_{1}^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{2}$. Hence $\operatorname{span}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1, k+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r, k+1}\right)=\mathbb{C}^{2}$. For $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{C}^{2}$ let $\left|W_{k+1}\right\rangle \times \mathbf{y}=\sum_{i=1}^{r}\left(\mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{x}_{i, k+1}\right) \otimes_{j=1}^{k} \mathbf{x}_{i, j}$ be the contraction with respect to the last coordinate. Choose $\mathbf{x}_{l, k+1}$ which is linearly independent to $\mathbf{e}_{1}$. Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{C}^{2} \backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$ satisfy $\mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{x}_{l, k+1}=0$. Hence $\mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{e}_{1} \neq 0$ and we fix $\mathbf{y}$ by letting $\mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{e}_{1}=1$. Thus $\mathcal{T}=\left|W_{k+1}\right\rangle \times \mathbf{y}$ equals to $\sum_{i \in[r] \backslash\{l\}}\left(\mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{x}_{i, k+1}\right) \otimes_{j=1}^{k} \mathbf{x}_{i, j}$. Therefore $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant k-1$. Observe next that $\mathcal{T}=\left|W_{k}\right\rangle+\left(\mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{e}_{2}\right) \mathbf{e}_{1}^{\otimes k}$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{T}$ is a symmetric tensor which corresponds to the polynomial

$$
f(x)=d x_{1}^{d-1} x_{2}+\left(\mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{e}_{2}\right) x_{1}^{d}=d x_{1}^{d-1}\left(x_{2}+\left(\left(\mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{e}_{2}\right) / d\right) x_{1}\right)
$$

Change coordinates $\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)$ to $\left(x_{1}, x_{2}+\left(\left(\mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{e}_{2}\right) / d\right) x_{1}\right)$ to deduce that $\mathcal{T}$ is in the orbit of $\left|W_{k}\right\rangle$. Hence $r(\mathcal{T})=k$ which contradicts our assumption that $r\left(\left|W_{k+1}\right\rangle\right)<$ $k+1$. Thus $r\left(\left|W_{k+1}\right\rangle\right)=k+1$.

Observe finally that $d=r\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle\right) \leqslant r_{\mathrm{s}}\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle\right) \leqslant r_{\max }(d, 2)=d$.
We close this subsection with the well known fact that $r_{\mathrm{b}}\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle\right)=2$. As the set of rank-one states is closed it follows that $r_{\mathrm{b}}\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle\right) \geqslant 2$. On the other hand we have the equality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|W_{d}\right\rangle=\lim _{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t}\left(\left(\mathbf{e}_{1}+t \mathbf{e}_{2}\right)^{\otimes d}-\mathbf{e}_{1}^{\otimes d}\right) \tag{6.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 6.4. Tensor rank of product of tensors.

Lemma 6.1. Let $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{m}}, \mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ be two tensors, where $\mathbf{m}=\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{p}\right), \mathbf{n}=$ $\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{q}\right)$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
r\left(\mathcal{U} \otimes_{K} \mathcal{V}\right) \leqslant r(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}) \leqslant r(\mathcal{U}) r(\mathcal{V}) \tag{6.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore
(a) If $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d}$ and $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{C}^{2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m}$ then equalities hold in (6.10).
(b) Suppose that $\mathcal{U}=\mathcal{V}=|W\rangle$. Then strict inequalities hold in 6.10). More precisely

$$
\begin{equation*}
r\left(|W\rangle \otimes_{K}|W\rangle\right)=7, \quad r(|W\rangle \otimes|W\rangle)=8 \tag{6.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. If $p=q$ then we have the inequalities (3.8). The general case follows from the same arguments. The equality $r\left(\mathcal{U} \otimes_{K} \mathcal{V}\right)=r(\mathcal{U}) r(\mathcal{V})$ yields the equality $r(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V})=r(\mathcal{U}) r(\mathcal{V})$. It is easy to show that if either $p=1$ or $q=1$ then equality holds in (6.10). Indeed, it is enough to assume that $q=1$ and $\mathcal{V} \neq 0$. As in the proof that $r\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle\right)=d$ we deduce equality by contracting the last index in $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$. Since for matrices $r\left(\mathcal{U} \otimes_{K} \mathcal{V}\right)=r(\mathcal{U}) r(\mathcal{V})$, it follows that for $p=q=2$ equality
holds in (6.10). Corollary 4.9 gives an example when one has equalities in (3.8) for special two 3-tensors.

We now show part (a) of the Lemma. Proposition 22 in 38] gives the following application of Theorem 4.7
$r\left(\mathcal{X} \otimes_{K} \mathcal{Y}\right)=r(\mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y})=r(\mathcal{X}) r(\mathcal{Y}), \quad \mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d}, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{C}^{2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m}$.
Note that $\mathcal{X}$ can be viewed as a matrix $X \in \mathbb{C}^{d} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d}$. Any matrix $T \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times q}$ can be trivially extended to a bigger matrix $X \in \mathbb{C}^{d} \times \mathbb{C}^{d}$ for $d=\max (p, q)$ by adding additional zero rows or columns. It is straightforward to show that $r(T \otimes \mathcal{Y})=r(X \otimes \mathcal{Y})$. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
r(X \otimes \mathcal{Y})=r(\mathcal{X}) r(\mathcal{Y}), \quad X \in \mathbb{C}^{p} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{q}, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{C}^{2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m} \tag{6.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

A special case of this equality is proved independently in the first part of Proposition 9 in 33.

We now show part (b) of the Lemma. First we show that one can have strict inequalities in (6.12) for $\mathcal{U}=\mathcal{V}=\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$. Assume that $\mathcal{X}=\left|W_{3}\right\rangle \otimes_{K}\left|W_{3}\right\rangle \in \otimes^{3} \mathbb{C}^{4}$. It will be convenient to use Dirac notation, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
|00\rangle=|0\rangle, \quad|01\rangle=|1\rangle, \quad|10\rangle=|2\rangle, \quad|11\rangle=|3\rangle \tag{6.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{X}=(|001\rangle+|010\rangle+|100\rangle) \otimes_{K}(|001\rangle+|010\rangle+|100\rangle)= \\
& |003\rangle+|012\rangle+|102\rangle+|021\rangle+|030\rangle+|120\rangle+|201\rangle+|210\rangle+|300\rangle .
\end{aligned}
$$

The above three tensor is symmetric on $\mathbb{C}^{4}$ and it corresponds to the following polynomial of degree three, $f\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right)=3 x_{1}^{2} x_{4}+6 x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}$. Observe next that [32, 33]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 6 x_{1}^{2} x_{4}=\left(x_{1}+x_{4}\right)^{3}-\left(x_{1}-x_{4}\right)^{3}-2 x_{4}^{3} \\
& 24 x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}=\left(x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{3}\right)^{3}-\left(-x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{3}\right)^{3}-\left(x_{1}-x_{2}+x_{3}\right)^{3}-\left(x_{1}+x_{2}-x_{3}\right)^{3} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies that $r_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathcal{X}) \leqslant 7$.
We now follow the arguments of [146] to show that $r(\mathcal{X}) \geqslant 7$. First observe that the four frontal sections of $\mathcal{X}$ form the following four matrices:

$$
\begin{gathered}
A_{1}=|00\rangle\langle 00|=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right], \quad A_{2}=|01\rangle\langle 01|+|10\rangle\langle 10|=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right] \\
A_{3}=|02\rangle\langle 02|+|20\rangle\langle 20|=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right], \\
A_{4}=|03\rangle\langle 03|+|12\rangle\langle 12|+|21\rangle\langle 21|+|30\rangle\langle 30|=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right] .
\end{gathered}
$$

Matrices $A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}, A_{4}$ are linearly independent. Furthermore $\operatorname{det}\left(A_{4}+a_{1} A_{1}+\right.$ $\left.a_{2} A_{2}+a_{3} A_{3}\right)=1$, which is obtained by expanding this determinant by the rows $4,3,2,1$.

Assume to the contrary that $r(\mathcal{X})=r<7$. As $r_{3}(\mathcal{X})=4$ we have that $r \geqslant 4$. Let $B_{1}, \ldots, B_{r}$ be $r$ linearly independent rank-one matrices so that they span the subspace $\mathbf{V} \subset \mathbb{C}^{4 \times 4}$, which contains $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{4}$. As $A_{1}, A_{2}$ and $A_{3}$ are independent we have a basis in $\mathbf{V}$ consisting of $A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}$ and $C_{1}, \ldots, C_{r-3} \in\left\{B_{1}, \ldots, B_{r}\right\}$. Express $A_{4}$ in this basis to deduce that $A_{4}+\sum_{i=1}^{3} a_{i} A_{i}=\sum_{j=1}^{r-3} c_{j} C_{j}$. That is $r\left(A_{4}+\sum_{i=1}^{3} a_{i} A_{i}\right) \leqslant r-3 \leqslant 3$. This contradicts the equality $\operatorname{det}\left(A_{4}+a_{1} A_{1}+\right.$ $\left.a_{2} A_{2}+a_{3} A_{3}\right)=1$.

We now show that the rank of $\mathcal{Y}=\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2} \in \otimes^{6} \mathbb{C}^{2}$ is eight. We first give a simple decomposition of $\mathcal{Y}$ as a sum of 8 rank-one tensors as in 38. Recall that the generic rank of tensors in $\otimes^{3} \mathbb{C}^{2}$ is two. Hence most rank-one perturbation of $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ have rank two. For example, for $\mathbf{z}=|0\rangle$ the two tensors $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle+\mathbf{z}^{\otimes 3}$ and $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle+\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}^{\otimes 3}$ have rank two. Next observe that
$\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}=\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}+\mathbf{z}^{\otimes 3}\right)^{\otimes 2}-\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle+\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}^{\otimes 3}\right) \otimes \mathbf{z}^{\otimes 3}-\mathbf{z}^{\otimes 3} \otimes\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle+\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}^{\otimes 3}\right)$.
Use the inequality (6.10) for each tensor product appearing in the right hand side of the above identity to deduce that $r\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}\right) \leqslant 4+2+2=8$.

We now outline briefly the main arguments in 33] to show that $r\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}\right) \geqslant 8$. Recall that $r\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}\right) \geqslant r(\mathcal{X})=7$. Assume to the contrary

$$
\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}=\sum_{i=1}^{7} \otimes_{j=1}^{6} \mathbf{a}_{j, i}
$$

We claim that for each $i \in[7]$ either $\mathbf{a}_{1, i}, \mathbf{a}_{2, i}, \mathbf{a}_{3, i} \in \operatorname{span}(|0\rangle)$ or $\mathbf{a}_{4, i}, \mathbf{a}_{5, i}, \mathbf{a}_{6, i} \in$ $\operatorname{span}(|0\rangle)$. Suppose the opposite case. Then we may assume that this dichotomy does not hold for $i=7$. Since each copy of $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ is symmetric, by permuting the first and the last 3 components of $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}$, we can assume that $\mathbf{a}_{1,7}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{6,7}$ are not in span $(|0\rangle)$. Contract $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ with respect to the first coordinate using a vector $\mathbf{x}$ orthogonal to $\mathbf{a}_{1,7}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{x} \times\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}=\left(\mathbf{x} \times\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right) \otimes\left|W_{3}\right\rangle=\sum_{i=1}^{6}\left(\mathbf{x}^{\top} \mathbf{a}_{1, i}\right) \otimes_{j=2}^{6} \mathbf{a}_{j, i} \tag{6.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Observe next that since $\mathbf{x} \neq c|1\rangle$ it follows that the rank of the $2 \times 2$ matrix $\mathbf{x} \times\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ is two. Use (6.12) to deduce that $r\left(\left(\mathbf{x} \times\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right) \otimes\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)=6$.

The second part of Proposition 9 in [33] states that the following six 3-mode rank-one tensors are linearly dependent:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{a}_{2, i} \otimes \mathbf{a}_{3, i} \otimes \mathbf{a}_{p, i}, \quad i \in[6] \text { for } p \in\{4,5,6\} \tag{6.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the following six 3-mode rank-one tensors are linearly independent:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{a}_{p, i} \otimes \mathbf{a}_{q, i} \otimes \mathbf{a}_{r, i}, \quad i \in[6] \text { for } p \in\{2,3\}, 4 \leqslant q<r \leqslant 6 \tag{6.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next contract $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ on the last mode with respect to $\mathbf{y}$ orthogonal to $\mathbf{a}_{6,7}$ and use [33, Proprosition 9] to deduce that the following six vectors are linearly independent: $\mathbf{a}_{2, i} \otimes \mathbf{a}_{3, i} \otimes \mathbf{a}_{4, i}, i \in[6]$. This contradicts to the previous statement that these six tensors are linearly dependent.

Thus we showed that for each $i \in[7]$ either $\mathbf{a}_{1, i}, \mathbf{a}_{2, i}, \mathbf{a}_{3, i} \in \operatorname{span}(|0\rangle)$ or $\mathbf{a}_{4, i}, \mathbf{a}_{5, i}, \mathbf{a}_{6, i} \in \operatorname{span}(|0\rangle)$. We now contradict this statement. Assume first that $\mathbf{a}_{1, i}, \mathbf{a}_{2, i}, \mathbf{a}_{3, i} \in \operatorname{span}(|0\rangle)$ for each $i \in[7]$. Then $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}=|0\rangle^{\times 3} \otimes \mathcal{Z}$ for some $\mathcal{Z} \in \otimes^{3} \mathbb{C}^{2}$. Thus $r(\mathcal{Z}) \leqslant 3$ and $r\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}\right) \leqslant 3$ which is impossible. Similarly, one cannot have $\mathbf{a}_{4, i}, \mathbf{a}_{5, i}, \mathbf{a}_{6, i} \in \operatorname{span}(|0\rangle)$ for $i \in[7]$. Hence $r\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 2}\right) \geqslant 8$.

We now discuss briefly the ranks of $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes k} \in \otimes^{k} \mathbb{C}^{8}$ and $\otimes_{K}^{k}\left|W_{3}\right\rangle \in \otimes^{k} \mathbb{C}^{2^{k}}$. It is shown in [146] that $r\left(\otimes_{K}^{k}\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right) \geqslant 2^{k+1}-1$, similar to the arguments we gave for the case $k=2$. Hence $r\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes k}\right) \geqslant 2^{k+1}-1$. In particular, $r\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 3}\right) \geqslant 15$. It is known [148, Theorem] that $r\left(\otimes_{K}^{3}\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)=16$. Combine this result with [33] to obtain that $16 \leqslant r\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes 3}\right) \leqslant 20$. In [32] it is shown that

$$
\begin{equation*}
r\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle^{\otimes k}\right) \geqslant r\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle^{\otimes k}\right)+(d-3)\left(2^{k}-1\right) \tag{6.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

A real sequence $\left\{a_{k}\right\}, k \in \mathbb{N}$ is called subadditive if $a_{p+q} \leqslant a_{p}+a_{q}$ for every $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$. Fekete's subadditive lemma claims that for any subadditive sequence $a_{k}$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the modified sequence converges $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_{k}}{k}=a$ with $a \in[-\infty, \infty)$.

Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$. The inequality (3.8) yields that the two sequences $\log r\left(\otimes_{K}^{k} \mathcal{T}\right)$ and $\log r\left(\mathcal{T}^{\otimes k}\right)$ are subadditive. Let

$$
r_{\lim _{K}}(\mathcal{T})=\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left(r\left(\otimes_{K} \mathcal{T}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{k}} \quad \text { and } \quad r_{\lim }(\mathcal{T})=\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left(r\left(\mathcal{T}^{\otimes k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{k}}
$$

By definition $r_{\lim _{K}}(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant r_{\lim }(\mathcal{T})$, while Corollary 12 in 38 claims that $r_{\lim }(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant$ $r_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T})$. Hence the above results for $\left|W_{d}\right\rangle$ yield the equalities

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{\lim _{K}}\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle\right)=r_{\lim }\left(\left|W_{d}\right\rangle\right)=2 \tag{6.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 6.5. Computational methods for symmetric rank of symmetric tensors.

 Recall that the symmetric rank of a symmetric tensor is the Waring rank of the corresponding homogeneous polynomial. Hence one can use theoretical methods of algebraic geometry and the available software as Bertini [11. The Waring rank of a homogeneous polynomial of degree $d$ in two variables can be determined very efficiently using Sylvester's algorithm [131. The paper [16 discusses Sylvester's algorithm in the modern language of algebraic geometry. The authors discuss also algorithms to find small border ranks of symmetric tensors. In 4 the authors provide methods of linear algebra to find the rank of symmetric tensors similar to the algorithm for determining the rank of a general tensor discussed in $\$ 5.5$.6.6. Generic identifiability of symmetric tensors. In this subsection we discuss the identifiability property for symmetric tensors, which is similar to our discussion of the identifiability property for general tensors in $\$ 5.6$. Assume that $d \geqslant 3$ and $n \geqslant 2$. Suppose that $r>1$ is an integer, and there exists a tensor $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$ of symmetric rank $r$. Denote

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{G}_{r}:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}\right)^{r} \rightarrow \mathrm{~S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}, \quad \mathbf{G}_{r}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \otimes^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i} \tag{6.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

A tensor $\mathcal{S}$ is called a random tensor in $\mathbf{G}_{r}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}\right)^{r}\right)$ if $\mathcal{S}=\mathbf{G}_{r}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r}\right)$, and the coordinates of vectors $\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r}$ are sampled from independent Gaussian complex valued distribution. We say that the identifiability property holds if for a random $\mathcal{S}$ of the above form $r=r_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathcal{S})$, and the decomposition $\mathcal{S}=\mathbf{G}_{r}\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r}\right)$ is unique up to a permutation of the summands $\otimes^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i}$.

Recall the inequality (6.2): $r_{\text {gen }}(d, n) \geqslant\left\lceil\frac{\binom{n+d-1}{d}}{n}\right\rceil$. Observe that if $\left\lceil\frac{\binom{n+d-1}{d}}{n}\right\rceil$ is not an integer then by counting the number of parameters we deduce that identifiability property fails for $r=r_{\text {gen }}(d, n)$. Similarly, the identifiability property
fails for $r>r_{\text {gen }}(d, n)$. The fundamental result in [35] states that the identifiability property holds for $r<r_{\text {gen }}(d, n)$ except the following cases:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
d=6, n=3, \text { and } r=9 \\
d=4, n=4, \text { and } r=8 \\
d=3, n=6, \text { and } r=9
\end{array}
$$

In the above exceptional cases a generic tensor of the corresponding rank has two distinct Waring decompositions. We list additional references on the identifiability property: [5, 6, 9].

## 7. Nuclear Rank of a tensor

Section 7 is mainly devoted to the notion of the nuclear rank of a tensor. In subsection 7.1 we discuss the spectral norm and the geometric measure of entanglement. We point out the concentration law concerning the geometric measure of entanglement. It states that this measure of entanglement of a random symmetric quantum state generated with respect to the Haar measure is close to the maximal possible value. Subsection 7.2 introduces the nuclear norm and nuclear rank. The minimal nuclear decomposition of a tensor plays the role analogous to the singular value decomposition of a matrix. Hence from the point of view of applications in quantum physics, the nuclear rank of a tensor seems to be the right analog of the rank of a matrix.
In subsection 7.3 we discuss the faces of the unit ball with respect to the nuclear norm. Lemma 7.1 characterizes the exposed faces of such a unit ball. We consider also the restriction of the nuclear norm to symmetric tensors, which gives rise to the definition of a symmetric nuclear rank. Subsection 7.4 concerns the exposed faces and facets of unit balls with respect to matrix nuclear norm and spectral norm. Theorem 7.3 characterizes the exposed faces of these unit balls. In subsection 7.5 we show that the nuclear rank of $|G H Z\rangle$ state is 2 . Subsection 7.6 discusses the generic and maximum nuclear rank of symmetric states of a three-qubit system. Theorem 7.4 characterizes the face nuclear norm in $2 \times 2 \times 2$ symmetric tensors which contains the state $|W\rangle$.
7.1. Geometric measure of entanglement and spectral norm. Denote the space of all product states in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Pi(\mathbf{n})=\left\{\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}, \mathcal{P}=\otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{j}, \mathbf{x}_{j} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_{j}}, j \in[d],\|\mathcal{P}\|_{2}=1\right\} \tag{7.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For any multipartite state $|\psi\rangle$ represented by a tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ normalized by a fixed Hilbert-Schmidt norm, $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{2}=1$, its entanglement can be characterized by the Fubini-Study distance of $|\psi\rangle$ to the set of product states [149, 143. This quantity can be related to the spectral norm of $\mathcal{T}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}=\max \{|\langle\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P}\rangle|, \mathcal{P} \in \Pi(\mathbf{n})\} \tag{7.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In analogy to the bipartite case, corresponding to matrices, one defines the geometric measure of entanglement of the state $\mathcal{T}$ by $\sqrt{2\left(1-\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}\right)}$ which corresponds to the minimal Hilbert-Schmidt distance between the projector $\rho_{\psi}=|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ and the projector on a separable state - see Section 2.2

We now make a few comments on the spectral norm of $\mathcal{T}$. First, note that $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}=\max \{\Re\langle\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P}\rangle, \mathcal{P} \in \Pi(\mathbf{n})\}$. Next, observe that for $d=2$, i.e., matrices,
$\|T\|_{\infty}$ is the leading singular value $\sigma_{\max }$ of the matrix $T$, which is also the spectral norm of $T$, viewed as a linear transformation from $\mathbb{C}^{n_{2}}$ to $\mathbb{C}^{n_{1}}$. Note that $\|T\|_{\infty}$ sometimes denotes the operator norm of a matrix $T$, where $\mathbb{C}^{n_{1}}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{n_{2}}$ are endowed with $\infty$-norms, which is different from $\sigma_{1}(T)$.

Assume that $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}=\Re\langle\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P}\rangle$ for some $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi(\mathbf{n})$. Then $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty} \mathcal{P}$ is the best rank-one approximation of $\mathcal{T}:\|\mathcal{T}-\| \mathcal{T}\left\|_{\infty} \mathcal{P}\right\| \leqslant\|\mathcal{T}-\mathcal{X}\|$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is rank-one tensor 47. For a matrix $A \neq 0$ a best rank-one approximation $\|A\|_{\infty} \mathcal{P}$ is the term $\sigma_{1} \mathbf{u}_{1} \mathbf{v}_{1}^{*}$ in the SVD decomposition (3.3) [127] or [63, Corollary 4.13.2]. Furthermore, $r\left(A-\|A\|_{\infty} \mathcal{P}\right)=r(A)-1$. This equality is not true for tensors with $d \geqslant 3$ indices [127.

Assume that $\mathcal{T}$ has real entries. Then we can define the real spectral norm as $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}}=\max \left\{|\langle\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P}\rangle|, \mathcal{P} \in \Pi(\mathbf{n}) \cap \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{n}}\right\}$. By definition, the following inequality holds, $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}} \leqslant\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}$ which is saturated for bipartite states, $d=2$, represented by matrices $T$. However, for $d \geqslant 3$ one can have a strict inequality already for the space of 3 -qubits [66]. That is, the closest product state to a real state may be complex-valued. The computation of spectral norms of $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}}$ and $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}$ for $d \geqslant 3$ is NP-hard [75, 66].

In the case of a bipartite state represented by a matrix with the Hilbert-Schmidt norm fixed, the smaller spectral norm, the larger quantum entanglement - see Section 2.2 The similar reasoning holds for multipartite states represented by a tensor. Hence it makes sense to introduce the following measure of entanglement, equivalent to the geometric measure of entanglement [72]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta(\mathcal{T}):=-\log _{2}\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}^{2} \tag{7.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

One can estimate $\eta(\mathcal{T})$ from above as follows. Expand $\mathcal{T}$ in terms of the orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ which consists of product states corresponding to a choice of an orthonormal basis $\mathbf{e}_{1, i}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{n_{i}, i}$ in each $\mathcal{H}_{n_{i}}$ for $i \in[d]$. The absolute value of the coefficient of $\mathcal{T}$ with respect to $\otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{e}_{k_{i}, n_{i}}$ is $\left|\left\langle\mathcal{T}, \otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{e}_{k_{i}, n_{i}}\right\rangle\right| \leqslant|\mathcal{T}|_{\infty}$. As $\operatorname{dim} \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}=N(\mathbf{n})$ and $\|\mathcal{T}\|^{2}=1$ we easily deduce that $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}^{2} \geqslant \frac{1}{N(n)}$. A slightly better estimation $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}^{2} \geqslant \frac{\max \left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}\right)}{N(n)}$ is given in 99 . Hence

$$
0 \leqslant \eta(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant \log _{2} \frac{N(\mathbf{n})}{\max \left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{d}\right)}
$$

Assume that $\mathbf{n}=2^{\times d}$. Then $\eta(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant d-1$. It is shown in [72, using the concentration of the Haar measure on the manifold of states in $\mathbb{C}^{2 \times d}$, that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}\left[\eta(\mathcal{T}) \geqslant d-2 \log _{2}(d)-3\right] \geqslant 1-e^{-d^{2}}, \quad \text { for } d \geqslant 11 \tag{7.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the probabilities are considered with respect to the unitarily invariant measure on the space of $d$-qubit states induced by the Haar measure on $U(2)^{\otimes d}$. The physical interpretation is that most of the $d$-qubits are strongly entangled for $d \gg 1$. A generalization to $\mathbf{n}=n^{\times d}$ for a fixed number $n \geqslant 3$ and $d \gg 1$ is given in 53.

We now consider the symmetric tensors $\mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n^{\times d}}$. A fundamental result of Banach [10] claims

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\mathcal{S}\|_{\infty}=\max \left\{\left|\left\langle\mathcal{S}, \mathbf{x}^{\otimes d}\right\rangle\right|, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^{n},\|\mathbf{x}\|=1\right\}, \quad \mathcal{S} \in \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n} \tag{7.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

That is, the geometric measure of entanglement of a symmetric state is achieved at a symmetric product state. This characterization was rediscovered in [82.

Assume that $n \geqslant 2$ is fixed and $d \gg 1$. We claim that the typical symmetric states are much less entangled than the general states of $d$ qunits with respect to the discrete measure of entanglement given by the generic rank of a tensor. Recall (5.13) and the resulult by Alexander-Hirschowitz [3],

$$
\begin{gather*}
r_{\text {gen }}\left(n^{\times d}\right) \geqslant \frac{n^{d}}{d(n-1)+1}>\frac{n^{d-1}}{d}  \tag{7.6}\\
r_{\text {gen }}(d, n)=\left\lceil\frac{\binom{n+d-1}{d}}{n}\right\rceil=\left\lceil\frac{\binom{n+d-1}{n-1}}{n}\right\rceil=O\left(d^{n-1}\right) \tag{7.7}
\end{gather*}
$$

Thus $r_{\text {gen }}$ has an exponential growth in $d$ in contrast to the polynomial growth of $r_{\text {gen }}(d, n)$. This fact can be explained by observing that the dimension of $\otimes^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$ is exponential in $d$, while the dimension of $\mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$ is polynomial in $d$.

It is shown in 64] that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leqslant \eta(\mathcal{S}) \leqslant \log _{2}\binom{n+d-1}{d}=\log _{2}\binom{n+d-1}{n-1} \tag{7.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, for $n=2$ we have that $\eta(\mathcal{S}) \leqslant \log _{2}(d+1)$. There is still the concentration law which shows that most of symmetric tensor for fixed $n$ and $d \gg 1$ concentrate at the upper bound given above [64]. In particular, for symmetric $d$-qubits one has the inequality:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}\left[\eta(\mathcal{T}) \geqslant \log _{2} d-\log _{2}\left(\log _{2} d\right)-3\right] \geqslant 1-\frac{1}{2 d^{5 / 2}}, \quad \text { for } d \geqslant 42 \tag{7.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Above results show that for a fixed $n \geqslant 2$ and $d \gg 1$ a symmetric state is typically much less entangled with respect to the geometric measure of entanglement than a generic states of the same dimension.

The computation of the spectral norm of $\mathcal{S} \in \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$ is NP-hard in $n$ for $d=3$ 67. However, for a fixed $\mathcal{S}$, the computation of $\|\mathcal{S}\|_{\infty}$ is polynomial in $d$ 67]. This result is obtained by showing that the computation of $\|\mathcal{S}\|_{\infty}$ can be done by solving polynomial equations for the critical points of the function $\Re\left\langle\mathcal{S}, \otimes^{d} \mathbf{x}\right\rangle$ restricted to the unit sphere $\|\mathbf{x}\|=1$.
7.2. Nuclear norm and nuclear rank. Denote by the nuclear norm $\|\cdot\|_{1}$ the dual norm to the spectral one on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$. From the definition of the spectral norm it follows that the unit ball of the nuclear norm is the convex hull of $\Pi(\mathbf{n})$. As each $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi(\mathbf{n})$ is the extreme point on the unit sphere of the Hilbert-Schmidt norm, we deduce that each $\mathcal{P}$ is an extreme point on the unit sphere of the nuclear form. One can show that the nuclear norm has the following minimum characterization 66]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\mathcal{T}\|_{1}=\min \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{r} \prod_{j=1}^{d}\left\|\mathbf{x}_{i, j}\right\|, \mathcal{T}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i, j}\right\} \tag{7.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Viewing $\sum_{i=1}^{r} \prod_{j=1}^{d}\left\|\mathbf{x}_{i, j}\right\|$ as energy of the expression of $\mathcal{T}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i, j}$, then $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{1}$ is the minimal energy to decompose the tensor $\mathcal{T}$ into a sum of rank-one tensors.

It is well known that for $d=2$, the nuclear norm reduces to the trace norm, $\|T\|_{1}=\operatorname{Tr} \sqrt{T T^{*}}$, which is equal to the sum of singular values of the matrix $T \in \mathbb{C}^{n_{1} \times n_{2}}-$ see 66]. For $d \geqslant 3$, the computation of the nuclear norm is NP-hard,
since the computation of the (dual) spectral norm is NP-hard 66]. An interesting formula for the nuclear norms of special type tensors is given in [124, Theorem 3].

One can find numerically $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{1}$ for $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{2} \times \mathbb{C}^{m} \times \mathbb{C}^{n}$ as follows: The two first mode sections of $\mathcal{T}$ are $T_{1}, T_{2} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$. Let $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)^{\top} \in \mathbb{C}^{2}$ be a vector of length 1: $\left|x_{1}\right|^{2}+\left|x_{2}\right|^{2}=1$. Then $\mathbf{x} \times \mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})=x_{1} T_{1}+x_{2} T_{2}$ and $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}=$ $\max \left\{\|\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\infty},\|\mathbf{x}\|=1\right\}$. Note that $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$ is a matrix, so we can use software to find the singular value of $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$. Due to numerical errors one needs to find all $\mathbf{x}$ where $\|\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})\|_{1}$ is a local maximum for $\mathbf{x}$ of norm 1 .

The minimal decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ with respect to the nuclear norm reads:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{T}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i, j}, \quad\|\mathcal{T}\|_{1}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \prod_{j=1}^{d}\left\|\mathbf{x}_{i, j}\right\| . \tag{7.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

The nuclear rank of $\mathcal{T} \neq 0$, denoted as $r^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{T})$, is the minimal $r$ in the above minimal decomposition. It is assumed that $r^{\text {nucl }}(0)=0$. By definition one has $r(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant r^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{T})$, hence $r^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{T})$ can be interpreted as yet another measure of the entanglement of any $d$-partite quantum pure state represented by tensor $\mathcal{T}$. In the particular case $d=2$, corresponding to bipartite systems, one arrives at the standard matrix rank, $r^{\text {nucl }}(T)=r(T)$.

Thus we can discuss similar notions for nuclear rank as for the regular rank:
(1) What is the value of the maximum nuclear rank, denoted as $r_{\max }^{\text {nucl }}(\mathbf{n})$, and a good upper bound on its value?
(2) What is a generic nuclear rank, denoted $r_{\text {gen }}^{\text {nucl }}(\mathbf{n})$ and what is its value?
(3) Does the border rank notion exist for nuclear norm?
(4) Are there efficient algorithms to compute the nuclear rank?

We now discuss some answers to these problems. In order to do this we need to recall some notions of convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$.
7.3. Faces of unit balls in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$. We now recall several standard notions of convex sets applied to a unit ball of any complex norm $\nu: \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}} \rightarrow[0, \infty): \mathrm{B}_{\nu}=\{\mathcal{T} \in$ $\left.\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}, \nu(\mathcal{T}) \leqslant 1\right\}$. It is convenient to view $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ as a real space $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{n}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{n}}$ of dimension $2 N(\mathbf{n})$. That is $\mathcal{T}=(\Re \mathcal{T}, \Im \mathcal{T})$. Then, any real functional $\phi: \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is induced by $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}: \phi(\mathcal{T})=\Re\langle\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X}\rangle$. We denote this linear functional by $\phi_{\mathcal{X}}$. For $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathrm{B}_{\nu}$ the $\operatorname{set}[\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}]=\{t \mathcal{X}+(1-t) \mathcal{Y}, t \in[0,1]\}$ is called a closed interval in $\mathrm{B}_{\nu}$. A closed convex subset $\mathbf{F} \subset B_{\nu}$ is called a face if any open interval, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})=$ $\{t \mathcal{X}+(1-t) \mathcal{Y}, t \in(0,1)\}$, that lies in $\mathrm{B}_{\nu}$ and intersects $\mathbf{F}$ lies completely in $\mathbf{F}$. We denote that $\mathbf{F}$ is a face of $\mathrm{B}_{\nu}$ by $\mathbf{F} \triangleleft \mathrm{B}_{\nu}$. Note that $\emptyset$ and $\mathrm{B}_{\nu}$ are faces of $\mathrm{B}_{\nu}$. Other faces of $\mathrm{B}_{\nu}$ are called proper faces. A proper face $\mathbf{F}$ lies on the boundary of $B_{\nu}$, the unit sphere with respect to the nuclear norm $\mathrm{S}_{\nu}=\left\{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}, \nu(\mathcal{T})=1\right\}$. For example, any extreme point of $\mathrm{B}_{\nu}$ is a zero dimensional face. A dimension of a given convex set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^{N}$, is the dimension of the linear subspace spanned by affine combinations of the elements in $C$. As $B_{\nu}$ is a norm ball, for each tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathrm{S}_{\nu}$ one has a supporting hyperplane at $\mathcal{T}$. This supporting hyperplane can be neatly given by the dual norm $\nu^{\vee}(\mathcal{T})=\max \Re\left\{\langle\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X}\rangle, \mathcal{X} \in \mathrm{B}_{\nu}\right\}$. Then for a given $\mathcal{T} \in \mathrm{S}_{\nu}$, each supporting hyperplane of $B_{\nu}$ at $\mathcal{T}$ is $\phi_{\mathcal{X}}$ such that $\Re\langle\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X}\rangle=\nu^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$.

A proper face $\mathbf{F} \triangleleft \mathrm{B}_{\nu}$ is called an exposed face if it is an intersection of $\mathrm{B}_{\nu}$ with a supporting hyperplane. That is, each $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}} \backslash\{0\}$ induces an exposed face

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{X})=\left\{\mathcal{Y} \in \mathrm{B}_{\nu}, \nu^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})=\Re\langle\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X}\rangle\right\} \tag{7.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is known that there exist compact closed convex sets which have nonexposed faces. For example, take the standard real Hilbert norm in $\mathrm{B}_{\|\cdot\|} \subset \mathbb{R}^{N}$, and a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ outside this ball. Now take the Minkowski sum of $\mathrm{B}_{\|\cdot\|}$ and the interval $[-\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}]$. Then there exist extreme points of this balanced convex set, corresponding to the norm $\nu$, which are not exposed. (In $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ there are 4 nonexposed extreme points.)

A facet of $\mathrm{B}_{\nu}$ is a maximal set-theoretic proper face of $\mathrm{B}_{\nu}$. By separation, every face is contained in an exposed face and thus facets are automatically exposed 113 .

Let $\mathrm{B}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) \subset \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$ be the unit ball of the nuclear norm, which is the convex set spanned by $\Pi(\mathbf{n})$. (Since $\Pi(\mathbf{n})$ is closed it follows from Caratheodory's theorem that this convex set is closed.) Denote by $U(n) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ the unitary group acting on $\mathbb{C}^{n}$. Let $U(\mathbf{n})$ be the product group $U\left(n_{1}\right) \times \cdots \times U\left(n_{d}\right)$ which acts on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$. First observe that $\Pi(\mathbf{n})$ is the orbit of one product state $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi(\mathbf{n})$ under the action of $U(\mathbf{n}): \Pi(\mathbf{n})=U(\mathbf{n}) \mathcal{P}$. Hence $B_{1}(\mathbf{n})$ is an orbitope [113]. Since the nuclear norm is the dual norm of the spectral norm it follows that

$$
\|\mathcal{X}\|_{\infty}=\max \left\{\Re\langle\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}\rangle, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathrm{B}_{1}(\mathbf{n})\right\}, \quad \forall \mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}
$$

Thus we obtain the description of exposed faces of $B_{1}(\mathbf{n})$ :
Lemma 7.1. Fix a state $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}}$. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Pi(\mathcal{X})=\left\{\mathcal{P} \in \Pi(\mathbf{n}), \Re\langle\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}\rangle=\|\mathcal{X}\|_{\infty}\right\} \tag{7.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $\Pi(\mathcal{X})$ is a closed set, and its convex hull is the exposed face $\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{X})$ given by (7.12). Vice versa, every exposed face of $B_{1}(\mathbf{n})$ is of the form $\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. Every exposed face is of the form $\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{X})$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\mathcal{X}$ is a state. Assume now that $\mathcal{X}$ is a state and consider $\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{X})$. Since the linear functional $\xi(\mathcal{T})=\Re\langle\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X}\rangle$ is a supporting hyperplane of $B_{1}(\mathbf{n})$ it follows that $\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{X})$ is a facet. Let $\Pi(\mathcal{X})$ be defined as above. Then $\Pi(\mathcal{X})$ is a closed subset of $\Pi(\mathbf{n})$. Assume that $\mathcal{Y}$ is in a convex hull of $\Pi(\mathcal{X})$ :

$$
\mathcal{Y}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \alpha_{i} \mathcal{P}_{i}, \mathcal{P}_{i} \in \Pi(\mathcal{X}), \quad \alpha_{i}>0, \sum_{i=1}^{r} \alpha_{i}=1
$$

Then $\|\mathcal{Y}\|_{1} \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{r} \alpha_{i}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{i}\right\|_{1}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \alpha_{i}=1$. Furthermore

$$
\Re\langle\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}\rangle=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \alpha_{i}\left\langle\mathcal{P}_{i}, \mathcal{X}\right\rangle=\|\mathcal{X}\|_{1}
$$

Thus $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{X})$.
Assume that $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{X})$. As $\mathcal{Y} \in B_{1}(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{Y}$ is a convex combination of the extreme points of $B_{1}(\mathbf{n})$ :

$$
\mathcal{Y}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \alpha_{i} \mathcal{P}_{i}, \mathcal{P}_{i} \in \Pi(\mathbf{n}), \quad \alpha_{i}>0, \sum_{i=1}^{r} \alpha_{i}=1
$$

Hence $\Re\langle\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}\rangle=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \alpha_{i}\left\langle\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}_{i}\right\rangle \leqslant\|\mathcal{X}\|_{1}$. Since $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{X})$ it follows that $\mathcal{P}_{i} \in$ $\Pi(\mathcal{X})$ for $i \in[r]$.

As in [65, Proposition 4.3] one can generalize Lemma 7.1] to an exposed face of $B_{\nu}$, where $\Pi(\mathbf{n})$ is replaced by the set of the extreme points of $B_{\nu}$. The following corollary of Lemma 7.1 is given by [66, Lemma 4.1]:

Corollary 7.2. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}} \backslash\{0\}$ and assume that $\mathcal{T}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i, j}$, where $\otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i, j} \neq 0$ for $i \in[r]$. Then $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{1} \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{r} \prod_{j=1}^{d}\left\|\mathbf{x}_{i, j}\right\|$. Equality holds if and only if there exists $\mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}} \backslash\{0\}$ such that $\Re\left\langle\mathcal{B}, \otimes_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{x}_{i, j}\right\rangle=\|\mathcal{B}\|_{\infty} \prod_{j=1}^{d}\left\|\mathbf{x}_{i, j}\right\|$ for $i \in[r]$.

It is plausible to assume that the generic nuclear rank corresponds to a generic facet of $\mathrm{B}_{1}(\mathbf{n})$. More precisely, $r_{\text {gen }}^{\text {nucl }}(\mathbf{n})$ is 1 plus the dimension of the generic facet of $\mathrm{B}_{1}(\mathbf{n})$. By definition we know that $r_{\text {gen }}^{\text {nucl }}(\mathbf{n}) \geqslant r_{\text {gen }}(\mathbf{n})$. Caratheodory's theorem implies that $r_{\max }^{\text {nucl }}(\mathbf{n})$ is at most 1 plus the dimension of the facet of $\mathrm{B}_{1}(\mathbf{n})$ with maximum dimension. This implies that $r_{\max }^{\text {nucl }}(\mathbf{n}) \geqslant r_{\max }(\mathbf{n})$.

To find the generic nuclear rank one can do as follows: Choose at random state $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$. Then $\mathcal{Y}=\frac{1}{\|\mathcal{T}\|_{1}} \mathcal{T}$ will be an interior point of a generic facet $\mathbf{F}$ of $B_{1}(\mathbf{n})$. Let $r$ be the number of rank-one components in a numerical minimal decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ as in Corollary 7.2. Then $r$ is the value of $r_{\text {gen }}^{\text {nucl }}(\mathbf{n})$. One can find numerically the nuclear norm of $\mathcal{T}$ using an algorithm suggested in 52.

One of the main advantages of the nuclear rank of a tensor is that it behaves as the rank of a matrix, in the sense that, the nuclear rank is a lower semicontinuous function [66]. Hence in the case of the nuclear rank there is no need to introduce its border rank.

Consider the subspace of symmetric tensors $\mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n^{\times d}}$. Then the dual version of the theorem of Banach [10] claims [66]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\mathcal{S}\|_{1}=\min \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{r}\left\|\mathbf{x}_{i}\right\|^{d}, \mathcal{S}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \mathbf{x}_{i}^{\otimes d}\right\}, \quad \mathcal{S} \in \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n} \tag{7.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

The minimal $r$ in the above minimal decomposition of $\mathcal{S} \in \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$ is called the symmetric nuclear rank and is denoted as $r_{\mathrm{s}}^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{S})$. Observe that $r_{\mathrm{s}}^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{S}) \geqslant r^{\text {nucl }}(\mathcal{S})$, since in the definition of the former quantity we restrict the decomposition of $S$ to any combination of symmetric tensors of rank one.

Denote $\mathrm{B}_{1, s}\left(n^{\times d}\right)=\mathrm{B}_{1}\left(n^{\times d}\right) \cap \mathcal{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$. Then $\mathrm{B}_{1, s}\left(n^{\times d}\right)$ represents the unit ball in sense of the nuclear norm restricted to symmetric tensors. The above characterization of $\|\mathcal{S}\|_{1}$ yields that the extreme points of $\mathrm{B}_{1, s}\left(n^{\times d}\right)$ are $\Pi_{s}\left(n^{\times d}\right)=$ $\Pi\left(n^{\times d}\right) \cap \mathrm{S}^{d} \mathbb{C}^{n}$.

To have a better understanding of how generic and maximum nuclear ranks are related to facets of unit balls we discuss the matrix case.
7.4. Exposed faces and facets of matrix nuclear and spectral norms. In this subsection we consider the case of $m \times n$ matrices, where $2 \leqslant m \leqslant n$. Recall that the inner product in $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is $\operatorname{Tr} A B^{*}$, for $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$. For $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \backslash\{0\}$ the singular value decomposition reads

$$
\begin{gathered}
A=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \sigma_{i}(A) \mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{v}_{i}^{*}, r=r(A), \quad \sigma_{1}(A) \geqslant \ldots \geqslant \sigma_{r}(A)>0=\sigma_{r+1}(A)=\cdots \\
A \mathbf{v}_{i}=\sigma_{i}(A) \mathbf{u}_{i}, A^{*} \mathbf{u}_{i}=\sigma_{i}(A) \mathbf{v}_{i}, \mathbf{u}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}, \mathbf{v}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}, \mathbf{u}_{i}^{*} \mathbf{u}_{j}=\mathbf{v}_{i}^{*} \mathbf{v}_{j}=\delta_{i j}, i, j \in[r]
\end{gathered}
$$

The vectors $\mathbf{u}_{i}, \mathbf{v}_{i}$ are called the left and the right singular vectors of $A$ corresponding to the i-th singular value $\sigma_{i}(A)$. Furthermore, $\|A\|_{\infty}=\sigma_{1}(A)$ and $\|A\|_{1}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sigma_{i}(A)$.

The following results are likely to be known, but we prove them for completeness:

Theorem 7.3. Assume that $2 \leqslant m \leqslant n$. Denote by $\mathrm{B}_{\infty}(m, n), \mathrm{B}_{1}(m, n) \subset \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ the unit balls with respect to the spectral and nuclear norm respectively. Then
(1) Every exposed face of $\mathrm{B}_{1}(m, n)$ has dimension $k^{2}-1$, for $k \in[m]$. It is given by $X \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ normalized by the condition $1=\sigma_{1}(X)=\cdots=$ $\sigma_{k}(X)>\sigma_{k+1}(X)$. Let $\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{k} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{k} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$ be two orthonormal systems corresponding to the left and the right singular eigenvectors corresponding to the singular value 1 of $X$. Then the face $\mathbf{F}(X)$ is a convex combination of rank-one matrices of the form $\mathbf{u v}^{*}$, where $\mathbf{u}$ is a unit vector in $\operatorname{span}\left(\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{k}\right)$ and $\mathbf{v}=X^{*} \mathbf{u}$. For $k=1, \mathbf{F}(X)=\left\{\mathbf{u}_{1} \mathbf{v}_{1}^{*}\right\}$ is an extreme point of $\mathrm{B}_{1}(m, n)$. The face $\mathbf{F}(X)$ is a facet if and only if $k=m$.
(2) An exposed face of $\mathbf{F} \triangleleft \mathrm{B}_{\infty}(m, n)$ is of dimension $2(m-k)(n-k)$ for $k \in[m]$. It is of the following form: Fix orthonormal systems $\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{k} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{k} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$. Then

$$
\mathbf{F}=\left\{X \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n},\|X\|_{\infty}=1, X \mathbf{v}_{i}=\mathbf{u}_{i}, X^{*} \mathbf{v}_{i}=\mathbf{u}_{i}, i \in[k]\right\}
$$

$\mathbf{F}$ is a facet if and only if $k=1$ and $\mathbf{F}$ contains an extreme point if and only if $k=m$. Every extreme point $X \in \mathrm{~B}_{\infty}(\mathbf{n})$ is an exposed face and is satisfies $X X^{*}=I_{m}$.
Proof. (1) Let us consider an exposed face of $\mathrm{B}_{1}(m, n)$. By Lemma 7.1 it is of the form $\mathbf{F}(X)=\left\{A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n},\|A\|_{1}=1, \operatorname{Tr} A X^{*}=\sigma_{1}(X)\right\}$ for some $X \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \backslash\{0\}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\sigma_{1}(X)=1$. Suppose that $1=$ $\sigma_{1}(X)=\cdots=\sigma_{k}(X)>\sigma_{k+1}(X)$. Let $\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{k} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{k} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$ are two sets of orthonormal left and right singular vectors of $X$ corresponding to the first singular value of $X$. It is straightforward to show 63] that $\Re \operatorname{Tr} X \mathcal{P}^{*}=\sigma_{1}(X)$ for $\mathcal{P}=\mathbf{u v}^{*} \in \Pi(m, n)$ if and only if $\mathbf{u}$ is a unit vector in $\operatorname{span}\left(\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{k}\right)$ and $\mathbf{v}=X^{*} \mathbf{u}$. Suppose that $Z \in \mathbf{F}(X)$. Then the singular value decomposition of $Z$ is $Z=\sum_{j=1}^{r} \sigma_{j}(Z) \mathbf{x}_{j} \mathbf{y}_{j}^{*}$, where $r=r(Z)$. Recall that $\|Z\|_{1}=\sum_{j=1}^{r} \sigma_{j}(Z)=1$. Lemma 7.1 yields that $\mathbf{x}_{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}$ has unit length, $\mathbf{x}_{i} \in \operatorname{span}\left(\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots \mathbf{u}_{k}\right)$ and $\mathbf{y}_{i}=$ $X^{*} \mathbf{x}_{i}$ for $i \in[r]$. That is $\mathbf{F}(X)$ is a convex hull of $\mathbf{u v}^{*}$, where $\mathbf{u}$ of length one is in $\operatorname{span}\left(\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{k}\right)$ and $\mathbf{v}=X^{*} \mathbf{u}$. We claim that the dimension of this face is $k^{2}-1$. Indeed, without loss of generality we may assume that $m=n=k$ and $X=I_{k}$. Then the face corresponds to all density matrices $\rho$ of order $k$, which are hermitian, positive semidefnite, $\rho=\rho^{*} \geqslant 0$, and normalized, $\operatorname{Tr} \rho=1$. The real dimension of this convex set is the real dimension of all $k \times k$ hermitian matrices of trace 1 , which is $k^{2}-1$.

The face $\mathbf{F}(X)$ is maximally exposed if and only if $k=m$, i.e., $X X^{*}=I_{m}$. Indeed, if $k<m$ then extend the orthonormal systems $\left\{\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{k}\right\},\left\{\mathbf{v}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{k}\right\}$ to an orthonormal system $\left\{\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{m}\right\},\left\{\mathbf{v}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{m}\right\}$ and set $C=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{v}_{i}^{*}$. It now follows that $\mathbf{F}(X) \subsetneq \mathbf{F}(C)$.
(2) Recall that an exposed face of $\mathrm{B}_{\infty}(\mathbf{n})$ is $\mathbf{F}(Y)=\left\{X \in \mathrm{~S}_{\infty}(\mathbf{n}), \operatorname{Tr} X Y^{*}=\right.$ $\left.\|Y\|_{1}\right\}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\|Y\|_{1}=1$. Assume that the SVD decomposition reads $Y=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \sigma_{1}(Y) \mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{v}_{i}^{*}$, where $r=r(Y), \sigma_{1}(Y) \geqslant$ $\cdots \sigma_{r}(Y)>0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{r} \sigma_{1}(Y)=1$. Assume that $X \in \mathrm{~S}_{\infty}(\mathbf{n})$. Then $\Re \operatorname{Tr} X\left(\mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{v}_{i}^{*}\right)^{*} \leqslant$ $\|X\|_{\infty}=1$. Equality holds if and only if $X \mathbf{v}_{i}=\mathbf{u}_{i}$ and $X^{*} \mathbf{u}_{i}=\mathbf{v}_{i}$ for $i \in[r]$. Thus $\mathbf{F}(Y)$ consists of all $X \in \mathrm{~B}_{\infty}(\mathbf{n})$ satisfying $X \mathbf{v}_{i}=\mathbf{u}_{i}$ and $X^{*} \mathbf{u}_{i}=\mathbf{v}_{i}$ for $i \in[r]$. In particular, $\sigma_{1}(X)=\cdots=\sigma_{k}(X)=1 \geqslant \sigma_{k+1}(X)$. By choosing an orthonormal bases $\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{m} \in \mathbb{C}^{m}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{n} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$ we see that $X$ is a direct sum $I_{k} \oplus X^{\prime}$,
where $X^{\prime} \in \mathbb{C}^{(m-k) \times(n-k)}$ and $\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} \leqslant 1$. Hence the real dimension of the face $\mathbf{F}(Y)$ is $2(m-k)(n-k)$.

Observe first that $\mathbf{F}(Y)$ is a facet if $Y$ is a rank-one matrix. In this case the dimension of the facet is $2(m-1)(n-1)$. The face $\mathbf{F}(Y)$ is zero dimensional if and only if $r(Y)=m$. In this case $\mathbf{F}(Y)=\{X\}$, where $X=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{v}_{i}^{*}$. Thus $X$ is an extreme point of $\mathrm{B}_{\infty}$. It is left to show that every extreme point $X$ of $\mathrm{B}_{\infty}$ is of this form. Let $X \in \mathrm{~B}_{1}(\mathbf{n})$ and consider the full SVD decomposition of $X=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sigma_{i}(X) \mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{v}_{i}^{*}$, where $\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{m}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{m}$ are orthonormal vectors. Furthermore, $1=\sigma_{1}(X) \geqslant \cdots \geqslant \sigma_{m}(X) \geqslant 0$. Assume to the contrary that $1>\sigma_{m}(X)$. Choose $\varepsilon>0$ such that $1>\sigma_{m}(X)+\varepsilon$. Then

$$
X( \pm \varepsilon)=\left(\sigma_{m}(X) \pm \varepsilon\right) \mathbf{u}_{m} \mathbf{v}_{m}^{*}+\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_{i}(X) \mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{v}_{i}^{*} \in \mathrm{~B}_{1}(\mathbf{n})
$$

Since $X=\frac{1}{2}(X(\varepsilon)+X(-\varepsilon))$ its is not an extreme point.
7.5. The nuclear rank of the $|G H Z\rangle$ state. We now discuss the nuclear rank of 3-qubits. First observe that the state $|G H Z\rangle$ has nuclear rank 2. Indeed, up to a normalization constant we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
|G H Z\rangle=\mathbf{e}_{1}^{\otimes 3}+\mathbf{e}_{2}^{\otimes 3}=\mathbf{e}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{1}^{\otimes 2}+\mathbf{e}_{2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{2}^{\otimes 2} \tag{7.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Written in physics notation, $|G H Z\rangle=|000\rangle+|111\rangle$, this state has a two-term representation, so its rank is not more than two, $\||G H Z\rangle \|_{1} \leqslant 2$.

On the other hand, when we unfold $|G H Z\rangle$ in mode 1 we obtain $T \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 4}$, for which $\|T\|_{1}=2$. Hence the above decomposition of $|G H Z\rangle$ is a minimal decomposition. As $r(|G H Z\rangle)=2$ we deduce that $r^{\text {nucl }}(|G H Z\rangle)=2$. Let us try to find the facet that contains $|G H Z\rangle$. We claim that we can choose the supporting plane $\xi(\mathcal{T})=\Re\langle\mid G Z W\rangle, \mathcal{T}\rangle$. Indeed, $|G H Z\rangle$ is a symmetric tensor corresponding to symmetric polynomial $x_{1}^{3}+x_{2}^{3}$. Then max $\left\{\Re x_{1}^{3}+x_{2}^{3},\left|x_{1}\right|^{2}+\left|x_{2}\right|^{2}=1\right\}$ is achieved at the vectors $\zeta \mathbf{e}_{1}, \zeta \mathbf{e}_{2}$ where $\zeta^{3}=1$. By Corollary 7.2 we see that $\frac{1}{2}|G H Z\rangle \in \mathbf{F}(|G H Z\rangle)$.
7.6. Generic and maximum nuclear rank of symmetric 3-qubit states. We now discuss in details the exposed facets and faces of the nuclear norm ball in $S^{3} \mathbb{C}^{2}$. Denote by $B_{1}(3,2) \subset \mathrm{S}^{3} \mathbb{C}^{2}$ the unit ball of the nuclear norm. Denote by $\partial B_{1}(3,2)$ the boundary of $B_{1}(2,3)$, which is the unit sphere of the nuclear ball. Recall that the complex dimension of $\mathrm{S}^{3} \mathbb{C}^{2}$ is 4 . Hence, its real dimension is 8 . Any supporting hyperplane of $B_{1}(3,2)$ is of the form $\left\{S \in B_{1}(3,2), \Re\langle\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}\rangle=\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\infty}\right\}$ for some $\mathcal{T} \in \mathrm{S}^{3} \mathbb{C}^{2} \backslash\{0\}$. For simplicity of notation we will identify $\mathcal{T}$ with a homogeneous polynomial of degree 3 in $x_{1}, x_{2}$.

The extreme points of $B_{1}(3,2)$ are rank-one symmetric tensors of the $\mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3}$ with $\|\mathbf{u}\|=1$. Such symmetric tensor determines $\mathbf{u}$ up to a third root of unity. That is, we can replace $\mathbf{u}$ by $\zeta \mathbf{u}$, where $\zeta^{3}=1$. Thus all extreme points can be identified with the 3 -dimensional real sphere $S^{3}$ in the complex space $\mathbb{C}^{2}$, quotient by the action of multiplication by third roots of unity. The supporting hyperplane is a corresponding nonzero homogeneous polynomial $\left(a x_{1}+b x_{2}\right)^{3}$. Thus the nuclear rank of an extreme point of $B_{1}(3,2)$ is 1 , and the dimension of the exposed face is 0.

We next discuss exposed face of dimension 1. Let us first consider the example of the $|G H Z\rangle$ state. It corresponds to the polynomial $x_{1}^{3}+x_{2}^{3}$, up to multiplication by a constant. Hence $\||G H Z\rangle \|_{\infty}=1$ and the maximum is achieved for the two
extreme points of $B_{1}(3,2)$ : $\mathbf{e}_{1}^{\otimes 3}, \mathbf{e}_{2}^{\otimes 3}$, and any convex combination of these two points. Thus, the exposed face corresponding to $|G H Z\rangle$ is a convex combination of two unit orthogonal vectors in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$. The variety of all these 1-dimensional exposed faces is of real dimension 4 - three for $\mathbf{x}$ of length one, and an extra dimension for an orthogonal vector $\mathbf{y}$ of length one. It is not known to the authors whether there exist additional exposed faces of dimension 1.

To find the spectral norm of a tensor one may follow the approach which is described in 67. For a generic tensor in $S^{3} \mathbb{C}^{2}$ one can find all critical points for $\max \left\{\Re\left\langle\mathcal{S}, \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3}\right\rangle,\|\mathbf{u}\|=1\right\}$. It will have usually at most 5 critical $\mathbf{u}$ viewed as a point on the Riemann sphere. Those points that correspond to 2 points of maximum will yield a supporting hyperplane of $B_{1}(3,2)$ which supports an exposed face of dimension 1. There are exceptional cases that are discussed in 67].

Let us now consider the three-qubit state $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle=(|100\rangle+|010\rangle+|001\rangle) / \sqrt{3}$. Recall that $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ is a symmetric tensor corresponding to the polynomial $f=\sqrt{3} x_{1}^{2} x_{2}$. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\left|W_{3}\right\rangle \|_{\infty}=\max \left\{\left|f\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)\right|=\sqrt{3}\left|x_{1}\right|^{2}\left|x_{2}\right|,\left|x_{1}\right|^{2}+\left|x_{2}\right|^{2}=1\right\}=\frac{2}{3} \tag{7.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

as $\left|x_{1}\right|=\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}},\left|x_{2}\right|=\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$. Recall that among all 3-qubit states $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ has the minimal spectral norm, i.e., it has the highest geometrical measure of entanglement [133].

In [66, §6] we gave a nuclear decomposition of $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ with four terms. We showed that $\|\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\left\|_{1}=3 / 2=\right\|\left|W_{3}\right\rangle \|_{\infty}^{-1}$. The last equality follows from [52, Theorem 2.2 ], as $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ has the minimal spectral norm, In particular, $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ has the maximum nuclear norm among the 3 -qubit states.

The four rank-one symmetric tensors of norm one that appear in the nuclear decomposition of $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$, given in [66, §6] are all rank-one symmetric states for which $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ achieves its spectral norms. Thus $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle \in \mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$.

Let us now consider $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ in the ball of the nuclear norm in $S^{3} \mathbb{C}^{2}$. Extreme points are all tensors $\mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3},\|\mathbf{u}\|=1$, such that $\left.\Re\left\langle\mid W_{3}\right\rangle, \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3}\right\rangle=\|\left|W_{3}\right\rangle \|_{\infty}$. It is straightforward to show that $\mathbf{u}=\left(\zeta \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}, \bar{\zeta}^{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\right)^{\top}$, where $|\zeta|=1$.

Indeed, each rank-one tensor $\mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3}, \mathbf{u}=(a, b)^{\top}$, corresponds to the polynomial

$$
\left(a x_{1}+b x_{2}\right)^{3}=a^{3} x_{1}^{3}+a^{2} b\left(3 x_{1}^{2} x_{2}\right)+a b^{2}\left(3 x_{1} x_{2}^{2}\right)+b^{3}\left(x_{2}^{3}\right) .
$$

Hence in the basis $\left\{x_{1}^{3}, 3 x_{1}^{2} x_{2}, 3 x_{1} x_{2}^{2}, x_{3}^{3}\right\}$ of homogeneous polynomials of degree 3 in $x_{1}, x_{2}$ tensor $\mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3}$ is represented by a vector $\left(a^{3}, a^{2} b, a b^{2}, b^{3}\right)$. Assume that $a \neq 0$. Then this vector is $a^{3}\left(1, z, z^{2}, z^{3}\right)$ and $z=b / a$. For the extreme points of the exposed face corresponding to $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ one has $z=\eta \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, where $\eta=\bar{\zeta}^{3}$. So $\eta$ has an arbirary value on the unit circle in $\mathbb{C}$. In particular, if we choose four pairwise distinct points on the unit circle $\eta_{1}, \ldots, \eta_{4}$, the four points $\left(1, \eta_{i}, \eta_{i}^{2}, \eta_{i}^{3}\right), i \in[4]$ are linearly independent, as their determinant has Vandermonde form and does not vanish.

Since we consider the convex hull of the extreme points of $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$, we need to know what is the real dimension of this convex set. We claim that the dimension is 4:

Theorem 7.4. Let

$$
\left.\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)=\left\{\mathcal{S} \in B_{1}(3,2), \Re\left\langle\mathcal{S}, \mid W_{3}\right\rangle\right\rangle=\|\left|W_{3}\right\rangle \|_{\infty}\right\}
$$

be the face of the ball corresponding to the real functional $\left.\mathcal{S} \mapsto \Re\left\langle\mathcal{S}, \mid W_{3}\right\rangle\right\rangle$. Then
(1) The real dimension of $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ is 4 .
(2) The state $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ has the following nuclear decomposition:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|W_{3}\right\rangle=\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \mathbf{e}_{1}\right.\right. & \left.+\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \mathbf{e}_{2}\right)^{\otimes 3}+\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \zeta \mathbf{e}_{1}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \bar{\zeta}^{2} \mathbf{e}_{2}\right)^{\otimes 3} \\
& \left.+\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \bar{\zeta} \mathbf{e}_{1}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \zeta^{2} \mathbf{e}_{2}\right)^{\otimes 3}\right), \zeta=e^{2 \pi \mathbf{i} / 9}
\end{aligned}
$$

As the above nuclear decomposition is a sum of three symmetric tensors of rank-one, and rank $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle=3$, we deduce: the nuclear rank of $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ is 3, which is equal to its rank.
(3) The nuclear rank of any $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ is at most 4.
(4) The subgroup of $G$ of the two dimensional unitary group $U(2)$ that fixes either $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$ or $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ is one dimensional subgroup of the form

$$
G=\left\{U \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}, U=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\zeta & 0 \\
0 & \bar{\zeta}^{2}
\end{array}\right], \zeta \in \mathbb{C},|\zeta|=1\right\}
$$

(5) The semialgebraic set of faces of the form $U \mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right), U \in U(2)$ has dimension 7 .

Proof. (1) Recall that our three symmetric tensors, which are the extreme points of $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ correspond to linear forms $\left(a x_{1}+b x_{2}\right)^{3}$, where $a=\zeta s$ and $b=\bar{\zeta}^{2} t$ where $s=\sqrt{2} / \sqrt{3}$ and $t=1 / \sqrt{3}$. By considering new variables $y_{1}=s x_{1}$ and $y_{2}=t x_{2}$, we have that the qubic forms are $\left(\zeta y_{1}+\bar{\zeta}^{2} y_{2}\right)^{3}$. Hence the Veronese coordinates of these cubic forms are $\left(\zeta^{3}, 1, \bar{\zeta}^{3}, \bar{\zeta}^{6}\right)$. Letting $\xi=\bar{\zeta}^{3}$ and rearranging the coordinates we have that the coordinates are $\left(1, \xi, \bar{\xi}, \xi^{2}\right)$, where $|\xi|=1$. Since we consider convex (or affine) combination we can drop the first coordinate. Thus we are looking at convex combinations of the vectors of $\left(\xi, \bar{\xi}, \xi^{2}\right)$, where $\xi$ is on the unit circle in $\mathbb{C}$. Let us try to find a basis in the space of all real linear combinations whose sum is 1. The vector $\left(-\xi, \overline{-\xi},(-\xi)^{2}\right)=\left(-\xi,-\bar{\xi}, \xi^{2}\right)$ is such a point. Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\left(\xi, \bar{\xi}, \xi^{2}\right)+\left(-\xi,-\bar{\xi}, \xi^{2}\right)\right) / 2=\left(0,0, \xi^{2}\right), \quad|\xi|=1 \tag{7.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

The set of all convex combinations of unimodular points, $|\eta|=1$, forms the unit disk, $|z| \leqslant 1$, of real dimension 2 . Thus the convex combination of all vectors of the form $\left(0,0, \xi^{2}\right)$ has a real dimension 2. Note that $\left(0,0,-\xi^{2}\right)$ is also in the convex set. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}(\xi, \bar{\xi}, 0)=\left(\left(\xi, \bar{\xi}, \xi^{2}\right)+\left(0,0,-\xi^{2}\right)\right) / 2 \tag{7.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, observe that the convex hull of the above vectors is $1 / 2(z, \bar{z}, 0)$ where $|z| \leqslant 1$. Thus its real dimension is 2 . Hence the convex combinations of vectors $1 / 2(z, \bar{z}, 0)$ and $(0,0, w)$, where $z$ and $w$ are in a unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$ has real dimension 4 . Therefore the real dimension of $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ is 4 .
(2) Straightforward.
(3) We claim that any point in $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ is a convex combination of at most 4 extreme points. Note that any convex combination of the exteme points is of the form $(z, \bar{z}, w)$. Hence it is enough to consider the convex combinations of vectors $\left(\xi, \xi^{2}\right)$ for $|\xi|=1$. As the ambient subspace is 4-real dimensional, Caratheodory's theorem shows that every point is a convex combination of at most 5 extreme
points. Assume that $(z, w)$ is in this convex set and

$$
(z, w)=\sum_{i=1}^{5} a_{i}\left(\xi_{i}, \xi_{i}^{2}\right), \quad a_{i}>0, \sum_{i=1}^{5} a_{i}=1
$$

We assume that $\xi_{i} \neq \xi_{j}$ for $i \neq j$. If the real span of $\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{1}^{2}\right), \ldots,\left(\xi_{5}, \xi_{5}^{2}\right)$ is 3dimensional we are done. Then, there must be a real nonzero linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^{5} b_{i}\left(\xi_{i}, \xi_{i}^{2}\right)=0$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{5} b_{i}=0$. By considering the linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^{5}\left(a_{i}+t b_{i}\right)\left(\xi_{i}, \xi_{i}^{2}\right)$ we can choose a positive $t>0$ such that $a_{i}+t b_{i} \geqslant 0$ for all $i \in[5]$ such that at least one $a_{i}+t b_{i}=0$.

Thus we are left with the case that every minimal convex combination that contains $(w, z)$ has exactly 5 extreme points with positive coefficients and which have 4 linear independent extreme points. Assume for simplicity that these linearly independent (over real domain) elements are $\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{1}^{2}\right), \ldots,\left(\xi_{4}, \xi_{4}^{2}\right)$. Then $\left(\xi_{5}, \xi_{5}^{2}\right)=$ $\sum_{i=1}^{4} c_{i}\left(\xi_{i}, \xi_{i}^{2}\right)$. Suppose first that $\sum_{i=1}^{4} c_{i}=1$. Since $\left(\xi_{5}, \xi_{5}^{2}\right)$ is an extreme point we must have that $c_{i}<0$ for some $i \in[4]$. Observe next that

$$
(z, w)=\sum_{i=1}^{5} a_{i}\left(\xi_{i}, \xi_{i}^{2}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(a_{i}+a_{5} c_{i}\right)\left(\xi_{i}, \xi_{i}^{2}\right)
$$

Let $a_{i}(t)=a_{i}+t c_{i}$ for $i \in[4]$ and $a_{5}(t)=a_{5}-t$. Then

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{5} a_{i}(t)=1, \quad(z, w)=\sum_{i=1}^{5} a_{i}(t)\left(\xi_{i}, \xi_{i}^{2}\right)
$$

Start to increase $t$ from 0 to $a_{5}$ until $a_{i}(t)$ is zero. In this case we obtained that $(z, w)$ is a convex combination of at most 4 extreme points in $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$.

Thus, it is left to discuss the case where $\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{1}^{2}\right), \ldots,\left(\xi_{4}, \xi_{4}^{2}\right)$ are linearly independent and $\left(\xi_{5}, \xi_{5}^{2}\right)$ is not an affine combination of $\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{1}^{2}\right), \ldots,\left(\xi_{4}, \xi_{4}^{2}\right)$. Note that the convex span of $\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{1}^{2}\right), \ldots,\left(\xi_{4}, \xi_{4}^{2}\right)$ has real dimension 3. Furthermore, the convex span of $\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{1}^{2}\right), \ldots,\left(\xi_{5}, \xi_{5}^{2}\right)$ has dimension 4.

Let us denote by $\Delta=\Delta(w, z)$ these 5 tuples of points $\left(\left(\xi_{i_{1}}, \xi_{i_{1}} 1^{2}\right), \cdots,\left(\xi_{i_{5}}, \xi_{i_{5}}^{2}\right)\right)$, where $\left\{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{5}\right\}=[5]$. This is an open set in $C^{5}$, where $C$ is a complex closed curve, $C:=\left\{\left(\zeta, \zeta^{2}\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{2},|\zeta|=1\right\}$. That is $\Delta \subset C^{5}$ is an open set, which is not $C^{5}$. Now consider a boundary point of $\Delta$ in $C^{5}$. This boundary point consists of 5 tuples $\eta=\left(\left(\eta_{1}, \eta_{1}^{2}\right), \ldots,\left(\eta_{5}, \eta_{5}^{2}\right)\right),\left|\eta_{i}\right|=1, i \in[5]$. As this boundary point is a limit of points in $\Delta$ it follows that $\eta \in \Delta$. But then, either the five points $\left(\eta_{i}, \eta_{i}^{2}\right), i \in[5]$ span at most 3 -dimensional subspace, or there are 4 extreme points which are linearly independent and the fifth point is an affine combination of the remaining four. In these cases we obtain that $(z, w)$ is a convex combination of 4 extreme points.
(4) We now do the dimension count: How big is the subgroup of $U(2)$ that fixes $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$. It is equivalent to the subgroup that fixes $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$. It has a real dimension at least 1: Assume that $U \mathbf{e}_{1}=\zeta \mathbf{e}_{1}, U \mathbf{e}_{2}=\bar{\zeta}^{2} \mathbf{e}_{2}$ for $|\zeta|=1$, which implies $U^{\otimes 3}\left|W_{3}\right\rangle=$ $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$. So for sure we have a one-parameter group that fixes $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$.

We now show that the above subgroup is the only subgroup that fixes $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$. Indeed, suppose that

$$
\mathcal{S}=U^{\otimes 3}\left|W_{3}\right\rangle=\mathbf{x}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{x}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{x}_{2}+\mathbf{x}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{x}_{2} \otimes \mathbf{x}_{1}+\mathbf{x}_{2} \otimes \mathbf{x}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{x}_{1}, \mathbf{x}_{i}^{*} \mathbf{x}_{j}=\delta_{i j}, i, j \in[2]
$$

where the two pairs of vectors $\mathbf{e}_{1}, \mathbf{x}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{e}_{2}, \mathbf{x}_{2}$ are linearly independent. Consider the rank-one matrix $\mathcal{S} \times \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{2}=\mathbf{x}_{1} \otimes \mathbf{x}_{1}$, where the contraction is on the third mode. Assume that $\mathcal{S}=\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$. Since $\mathbf{e}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{1}$ are linearly independent it follows that $\mathbf{x}_{2}^{*} \mathbf{e}_{1} \neq 0$. A straightforward computation implies that the rank of the matrix $\left|W_{3}\right\rangle \times \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{2}$ is 2 . This contradicts the assumption that $\mathcal{S}=\left|W_{3}\right\rangle$. Hence the subgroup $G$ is of the form given above.
(5) Observe that $U \mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right), U \in U(2)$ must be also an exposed face of dimension 4. As the subgroup of $U(2)$ that fixes $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ is one dimensional, it follows that the dimension of union of all faces of the form $U \mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ is $3+4=7$. Recall that 7 is the dimension of $\partial B(3,2)$.

Let us conclude the work with a short list of open questions:
(1) Is the nuclear rank of $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ at most 3?
(2) Is $\mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right)$ a face of maximum real dimension?
(3) Is $U \mathbf{F}\left(\left|W_{3}\right\rangle\right), U \in U(2)$ the set of all faces of $B_{1}(3,2)$ ?
(4) Is the generic face of $B_{1}(3,2)$ of dimension 3 , such that the subgroup of $U(2)$ that fixes generic faces is a finite group? In such a case the semialgebraic set of $U \mathbf{F}, U \in U(2)$ has dimension $3+4=7$.
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## Appendix A. Basic notions of quantum theory

In this Appendix we present definitions of some notions used in quantum theory and discussed in this work. To make it easier for the reader to study the literature of the subject we are going to use the Dirac notation presented in Section 2.1 In short, the 'ket' $|\psi\rangle$ denotes a complex vector of a fixed size $n$ represented by a column, the 'bra' $\langle\psi|$ is a conjugated (dual) vector forming a row, the scalar product is written as a bra-ket, $\langle\psi \mid \phi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}$, while $|\phi\rangle\langle\psi|$ forms an operator, represented by a rank-one square matrix of size $n$.

The term state is understood as a mathematical tool used to calculate the probability of a given outcome of any measurement. In the classical probability theory one uses probability vectors, $p=\left\{p_{1}, \ldots p_{n}\right\}$, such that $p_{i} \geqslant 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}=1$. The natural number $n$ describes the number of distinguishable events and is fixed. The set of classical states forms the probability simplex of dimension $n-1$. A probability vector $p$ with a single component equal to unity, representing a vertex of the simplex, is called an extremal point or a classical pure state, and corresponds to a certain event. Any point inside the simplex can be considered as a classical mixed state.

One of the key notions of quantum theory is the quantum state, which characterizes the way a physical system was prepared and allows one to compute the
probability of an outcome of any quantum measurement. Let us fix a natural number $n$, assumed here to be finite, and discuss first a special class of states. A pure quantum state is represented by a ray in an $n$ dimensional complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{n}$.

Definition. Consider a complex vector $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{n}$, normalized as $\|\psi\|^{2}=$ $\langle\psi \mid \psi\rangle=1$ and an arbitrary complex phase, $e^{i \alpha}$, with $\alpha \in[0,2 \pi]$. A pure quantum state denotes the equivalence class, $|\psi\rangle \sim e^{i \alpha}|\psi\rangle$.

The space of all pure states forms a complex projective space, $\mathbb{C} P^{n-1}$, of $2(n-1)$ real dimensions. In the simplest case, $n=2$, often called a single qubit (i.e. a quantum bit) system, this space forms a sphere, $\mathbb{C} P^{1}=S^{2}$, in physics called the Bloch sphere. The set of pure quantum states is continuous, in contrast to the discrete set of classical pure states - the corners of the probability simplex.

A hermitian operator $P_{\psi}=|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|=P_{\psi}^{2}$ is a projection operator onto a pure state $|\psi\rangle$. In physics literature the term 'pure state' may denote a state $|\psi\rangle$ or the corresponding projector $P_{\psi}$ and the meaning depends on the context. This difference is not relevant in physics, since the vectors representing rays are in one-to-one correspondence with the projectors.

Any convex combination of such projectors, $\rho=\sum_{j=1}^{k} q_{j}\left|\psi_{j}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi_{j}\right|$, forms a mixture of pure states, where $q$ represents a probability vector of an arbitrary length $k$. Such a mixture, called a density matrix or a mixed state or just a quantum state, can be introduced in a more formal way.

Definition. A square matrix $\rho$ of order $n$ is called a density matrix if it is hermitian, $\rho=\rho^{*}$, positive semi-definite, $\rho \geqslant 0$, and normalized, $\operatorname{Tr} \rho=1$.

Any convex mixture of 1-dimensional projection operators $P_{\psi}$ satisfies above properties. Note that the diagonal entries of a density operator represented in any basis are real and form a classical state - the probability vector $p$ of length $n$ with components $p_{i}=\rho_{i i}, i=1, \ldots n$. Let $\rho=\sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_{j}\left|\chi_{j}\right\rangle\left\langle\chi_{j}\right|$ be the eigendecomposition of the state $\rho$, where the eigenvalues $\lambda$ form a probability vector. The rank $r$ of the state $\rho$ is equal to the number of its positive eigenvalues. The case $r=1$ corresponds to the projector, $\rho=\left|\chi_{1}\right\rangle\left\langle\chi_{1}\right|=\rho^{2}$. It forms an extremal point of the set of all density matrices of order $n$, which explains the term 'pure state'. In Euclidean geometry, induced by the Hilbert-Schmidt distance, $d_{\mathrm{HS}}(X, Y)=$ $\|X-Y\|$, the space of all mixed states for $n=2$ forms a solid Bloch ball with the Bloch sphere consisting of pure states at its boundary. In higher dimensions $n \geqslant 3$ there exist points from the boundary of the set of mixed states which are not pure - see e.g. [13].

In some physical systems one can observe an internal structure and can identify its subsystems. Assume first, that the system is bipartite, so two parties, called $A$ and $B$ are distinguished. Let $\mathcal{H}_{A}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{B}$ denote Hilbert spaces used to describe subsystems $A$ and $B$, respectively. Then the bipartite system $A B$ is described by a quantum state from the composite Hilbert space with a tensor product structure, $\mathcal{H}_{A B}=\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$. Once both subsystems $A$ and $B$ are well defined and the above splitting of $\mathcal{H}_{A B}$ is fixed, one can introduce the notion of separable and entangled states [12, 80],

Definition. A bipartite pure quantum state $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$ is called separable, if it has the product form, $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle=\left|\phi_{A}\right\rangle \otimes\left|\phi_{B}\right\rangle$, where $\left|\phi_{A}\right\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{A}$ and $\left|\phi_{B}\right\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{B}$.

Definition. A bipartite pure quantum state $\left|\psi_{A B}\right\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$ is called entangled if it is not separable, so it is not of the product form.

The above definitions do not depend on the choice of the local bases in both subspaces, but they do depend on the splitting of $\mathcal{H}_{A B}$ into $\mathcal{H}_{A}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{B}$. Let $n$ and $m$ denote the dimensions of these two subspaces, respectively. The entanglement is then invariant with respect to the local unitary transformations from the group $U(n) \otimes U(m)$, but it can change under global unitary transformations, $|\psi\rangle \rightarrow V|\psi\rangle$, with $V \in U(n m)$.

Note that a separable pure state represents independent events, for which the joint probability of events measured seperately in both subsystems has the product form, while correlated events correspond to entangled states. In the general case of density matrices the definition of separability is slightly more involved [144].

Definition. A bipartite quantum (mixed) state $\rho^{A B}$ acting on the composite space $\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$ is called separable, if it can be represented as a convex combination of product states,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{\mathrm{sep}}^{A B}=\sum_{j=1}^{k} q_{j} \rho_{j}^{A} \otimes \rho_{j}^{B}, \tag{A.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $q$ is a probability vector of length $k$, while $\left\{\rho_{j}^{A}\right\}$ and $\left\{\rho_{j}^{B}\right\}$ denote collections of $k$ quantum states acting on Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{A}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{B}$, respectively.

Definition. A bipartite quantum (mixed) state $\rho^{A B}$ acting on the composite space $\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$ is called entangled if it is not separable.

It is easy to see that in the case of pure states, which are extremal and cannot be represented by a mixture of other pure states, both definitions of entanglement are consistent. Furthermore, entanglement does not depend on the choice of the local bases also for mixed states, but it depends on the partition of the total system into two parts. In the case of a two-qubit system, $n=m=2$, the necessary and sufficient conditions for separability of a given density matrix $\rho$ of size 4 are known [80, 13, but already for $n=m=3$ the separability problem remains open.

The above notions are easy to generalize for multipartite systems which consist of $d \geqslant 3$ subsystems. For instance, a separable pure state of a $d$-partite system has the product form, $|\psi\rangle=\left|\phi_{1}\right\rangle \otimes\left|\phi_{2}\right\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes\left|\phi_{d}\right\rangle$.
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