We present a construction of highly entangled states defined on the topology of a platonic solid using tensor networks based on ancillary Absolute Maximally Entangled (AME) states. We illustrate the idea using the example of a quantum state based on AME(5,2) over a dodecahedron. We analyze the entropy of such states on many different partitions, and observe that they come on integer numbers and are almost maximal. We also observe that all platonic solids accept the construction of AME states based on Reed-Solomon codes since their number of facets, vertices and edges are always a prime number plus one.

**ENTANGLEMENT AND TENSOR NETWORKS**

The way multipartite entanglement is distributed over a quantum system is key to understand its emerging properties and, also, to devise good classical approximation strategies. A successful technology to achieve this dual goal is to represent quantum states as Tensor Networks (TN) \[1, 2\]. Indeed, TN provide one of the most powerful methods to represent classically a quantum state as a contraction of a series of tensors that take indices in an ancillary space.

It can be argued that TN attempt to describe a quantum state on a basis, different from the computational one, that rightly fits the entanglement properties of the system. Therefore, the technology of TN can be considered as a bona fide method to exploit the actual Kolmogorov complexity of a quantum state. They provide a most economical and adaptive description of quantum correlations.

Symmetries play a relevant role when choosing the appropriate TN to describe a quantum state. Most of condensed matter systems are defined on regular lattices, favoring the use of variants of TN such as Matrix Product States (MPS), or Projected Entangled Pair States (PEPS). At criticality, scale invariance is better captured by Multiscale Entanglement Renormalization Ansatz (MERA). In general, TN should adapt to the geometry dictated by the Hamiltonian of the system to implement the area law of the entanglement entropy. Although there are exceptions to this rule such as the rainbow state \[3, 4\].

It is perfectly correct to try TN which are not based on entangling only pairs of ancillary degrees of freedom. For instance, it may be advantageous to use TN based on three-body entangled units to describe triangular lattices. It can be argued that standard pair-wise entangling units, as in MPS and PEPS, will describe any entangling structure given a sufficient large ancillary dimension. This is indeed true, thought such an approach may not be the most efficient one. Some efforts have been devoted to analyze the properties of TN based on GHZ and W states to analyze frustrated systems \[5\]. Multpartite ancillary states have also been used to represent solutions to 3SAT problems \[6\].

A more sophisticated use of TN has been explored in the context of holography. There, TN based on Absolute Maximally Entangled (AME) \[7-11\] states are used to understand the emergence of space time and its holography properties \[19-23\].

Here, we consider the playful idea of building quantum states as the result of using AME states on topologies dictated by platonic solids. It is not obvious how such states can be built and, if so, how entanglement will be globally distributed. We shall find that large entanglement gets distributed if TN based on AMEs are used.

Let us also mention that the idea to choose the directions of quantum measurements according to the vertices of Platonic solids has been pursued in Ref \[24\]. Other works where Platonic solids have appeared in the context of Quantum Information can be found in references \[25-29\].

**ABSOLUTE MAXIMALLY ENTANGLED STATES**

Absolute Maximally Entangled \[7-11\] states, also called Perfect states \[29\], are defined as those multipartite quantum states whose reduced density matrices for any bi-partition are proportional to the identity. To be precise, given a state of \(n\) qudits, \(|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H} = (\mathbb{C}^d)^\otimes n\), this state will be an AME state if all its reduced density matrices carry a von Neumann entropy

\[
S_A = -\text{tr}(\rho_A \log_2 \rho_A)
\]

given by

\[
S_A = m \log_2 d .
\]

(1)
This is equivalent to finding that all the reduced density matrices for \( m \leq n/2 \) are proportional to the identity
\[
\rho_m = \frac{1}{d^m} I_{d^m} .
\] (2)

We shall be considering states made with an even number of parts. It is then sufficient to verify that even bipartitions are maximally entangled to guarantee that the same properties hold for smaller partitions.

Absolutely Maximally Entangled states are usually labeled as AME\((n,d)\), where \( n \) is the number of local degrees of freedom and \( d \) is the local dimension. In general, there is an obstruction to find AME states; for certain values of \( n \) and \( d \) they may not exist any. For instance, there is no 4-qubit maximally entangled state in all its partitions, that is, there is no AME(4,2). However, there exist AME(5,2) and AME(6,2) states. It is proven that there are no AME states for \( n > 6 \) and \( d = 2 \) [12,13], or for \( n = 7 \) and \( d = 5 \) [14,15] (see also [16] for \( d = 3,4,5 \) and several \( n \)’s). Some applications of AME states is to test the efficiency to implement multipartite quantum protocols in quantum computers [17] and as quantum repeaters [18].

Let us give an explicit form of AME(5,2)
\[
|\text{AME}(5,2)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=0}^{2^5-1} c_i^{(5,2)} |i\rangle ,
\] (3)
where we used the usual shorthand notation for the elements in the computational basis and the coefficients have the same modulus and signs given by [17,10]
\[
c^{(5,2)} = \{1,1,1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,-1,1,1,-1,-1,1\} .
\] (4)

A more explicit form is given in Table I, which shows that this state is not invariant under rotations of the qubit positions, say \( |s_1s_2s_3s_4s_5\rangle \rightarrow |s_5s_1s_2s_3s_4\rangle \). We shall give below another AME(5,2) state with this property.

The state (3) can be cast in different forms using local unitaries, that will never change its entanglement properties.

Let us also provide the absolutely maximal entangled 6-qubit state
\[
|\text{AME}(6,2)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=0}^{2^6-1} c_i^{(6,2)} |i\rangle ,
\] (5)

with
\[
c^{(6,2)} = \{1,1,1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,-1,1,1,-1,-1,1\} .
\] (6)

A less trivial example of AME state corresponds to the case of 4 qutrits. Its explicit form is
\[
|\text{AME}(4,3)\rangle = \frac{1}{9} \sum_{i,j=0,1,2} |i\rangle |j\rangle |i+j\rangle |i+2j\rangle ,
\] (7)
where all labels are understood as mod 3. Each bipartition in 2 + 2 qutrits of the above state carries a von Neumann entropy \( S = 2 \log_2 3 \). This state was used in [19] to construct an holographic code where 3 qutrits were ancillae and one qutrit was a physical variable.

### TABLE I: The state (4) with \( \pm \) denoting the values \( \pm 1 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( s_1 )</th>
<th>( s_2 )</th>
<th>( s_3 )</th>
<th>( s_4 )</th>
<th>( s_5 )</th>
<th>( s_6 )</th>
<th>( c_i )</th>
<th>( s_1 )</th>
<th>( s_2 )</th>
<th>( s_3 )</th>
<th>( s_4 )</th>
<th>( s_5 )</th>
<th>( c_i )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLATONIC STATES

We shall now construct novel quantum states which are constructed as a contraction of TN defined on the geometry of a platonic solid. We call these states, Platonic states.
Qubits on vertices of a dodecahedron

To illustrate the construction of a platonic state, we consider the explicit example of a quantum state defined on the 20 vertices of a dodecahedron (see Fig. 1). The way to construct this state consists in producing a tensor network similar in spirit to the well-known PEPs, but using 5-qubit maximally entangled states instead of the usual maximally entangled pairs. The intuition behind this construction is that the AME(5,2) state may be able to distribute entanglement in a very efficient manner.

FIG. 1: A quantum state is defined on the vertices of a dodecahedron using an underlying tensor network. Each qubit is colored in red, whereas the ancillary degrees of freedom associated to 5-qubit maximally entangled states live on the pentagon faces and are represented in violet.

To be precise, the construction starts by filling the 12 pentagons of the dodecahedron with AME(5,2). Then, we define physical indices in each vertex using an agreement clause (see Fig. 2)

\[ A^a_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \delta^{a}_\alpha \delta^{a}_\beta \delta^{a}_\gamma. \]  

(8)

That is, physical indices are made to coincide with the ancillary ones when all of them agree.

Since the basic tensor defining AME(5,2) in Eq. (4) is made of ±1, the global state we are defining on a dodecahedron will carry all possible superpositions weighted with a plus or minus sign

\[ |D_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{20}}} \sum_{i=0}^{2^{20}-1} c^D_i |i\rangle, \]

(9)

that is, all \(c^D_i = 1\) or −1.

The entanglement properties of the emerging state on a dodecahedron are non-trivial. The von Neumann entropy \(S_A(D_1)\) for the state (4) and several block sizes \(|A|\) are collected in Table II. We first observe that all bi-partitions, local or non-local, that involve 6 qubits or less carry maximal entanglement. For the bi-partitions of 10 vs 10 spins, the result for the entropy turns out to be always an integer number, and its maximal value of 10 is attainable.

| |A| | 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| \(S_A(D_1)\) | 7,8,9,10 | 7,8,9 | 7,8 | 6,7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| \(S_A(D_2)\) | 7,8 | 7,8 | 6,7,8 | 6,7 | 5,6 | 4,5 | 3,4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

TABLE II: Entanglement entropies of AME(5,2) states (9) for various blocks of sizes \(|A|\). \(S(D_1)\) are for the state based on (4) and \(S(D_2)\) are for the state using (10).

A rotational invariant AME(5,2) state

We observed above that the state (4) is not invariant under rotations of the qubits around the vertices of the pentagon. This implies that the resulting state over the dodecahedron depends on the specific choice of the AME(5,2) state for every pentagon. The analogy is that of a dodecahedron made of pentagons with different colors. The counting number of emerging states is an interesting but difficult problem that we shall not deal with here. Let us consider a rotational invariant AME(5,2) state given by [7]-[10]

\[ |\text{AME}(5,2)\rangle = \frac{1}{4} \left[ |00000\rangle + |10010\rangle + |01001\rangle \right. \]

(10)

\[ + |10100\rangle + |01010\rangle + |00101\rangle - |01111\rangle - |10111\rangle \]

\[ - |11011\rangle - |11101\rangle - |11110\rangle - |11000\rangle - |01100\rangle \]

\[ - |00110\rangle - |00011\rangle - |00110\rangle - |10001\rangle \]

This state can be written as

\[ |\text{AME}(5,2)\rangle = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{s_j=0 \pmod 2} (-1)^{\sum_j s_j} |s_1, \ldots, s_5\rangle, \]

(11)

where the sum runs over the spin configurations whose addition vanishes mod 2 (we take \(s_6 = s_1\)). Let us write
as
\[
|P\rangle = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{s_j, j \in P} (-1)^{\eta_P} |s_1, \ldots, s_5\rangle, \quad \eta_P = \sum_{j \in P} s_j s_{j+1},
\]
where \(P\) denotes the pentagon whose vertices are occupied by the spins \(s_1, \ldots, s_5\). The state over the dodecahedron constructed using (8) and (12), reads
\[
|D_2\rangle = a_D \sum_{s_1, \ldots, s_{20}} (-1)^{\eta_{P_1} + \cdots + \eta_{P_{12}}} |s_1, \ldots, s_{20}\rangle,
\]
where the spins on each pentagon satisfy the neutrality condition
\[
\sum_{i \in P_a} s_i = 0 \pmod{2}, \quad a = 1, \ldots, 12.
\]
\(a_D\) is the normalization constant of the state that is derived below. The assignment of vertices \(i = 1, \ldots, 20\), to pentagons \(P_a\) \((a = 1, \ldots, 12)\) is given in Fig. 3 that yields the neutrality conditions: \(0 = s_1 + s_2 + s_3 + s_4 + s_5 = s_6 + s_7 + s_8 + s_9 + s_{10} + s_{20} = \ldots\) where the equalities are defined \(\pmod{2}\). This is a set of 12 linearly independent equations for 20 variables that leaves 8 undetermined spins. Hence the state (13) is the linear superposition of \(2^8\) states out of the \(2^{20}\) states of the computational basis that is normalized with \(a_D = 1/\sqrt{2^8}\). Another feature of (13) is that the sign factor \((-1)^{\sum \eta_{P_a}}\) is equal to 1 for the 2\(^8\) spin configurations that satisfy the neutrality conditions (14). Indeed, let’s take a pair of spins, say \(s_i\) and \(s_j\), on a link \((i, j)\) on the dodecahedron. They give a factor \((-1)^{s_i s_j}\), associated to the pentagons sharing the link \((i, j)\), and so the total contribution is 1. Hence the state (13) takes finally the form
\[
|D_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^8}} \sum \prime |s_1, \ldots, s_{20}\rangle,
\]
where \(\sum \prime\) denotes the sum over the spin configurations that satisfy (14).

The entanglement entropies \(S_A(D_2)\) of (15) are collected in Table II for several blocks. Their maximal values are always lower than those of the state (9). An heuristic explanation is that (15) contains half of the states of (9) of the computational basis.

The entanglement entropies of (15) can be easily computed. Let \(A\) be a subset of \(V_A \leq 10\) vertices. In general, not all the corresponding spins will be independent variables. For example, if \(A\) contains the sites \(i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\) forming a pentagon, their spins must satisfy that \(\sum_{i=1}^5 s_i = 0 \pmod{2}\), hence only 4 spins are independent. In this case the state (15) reads
\[
|D\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^4}} \sum \prime |s_1, \ldots, s_5\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^4}} \sum \prime |s_{6}, \ldots, s_{20}\rangle,
\]
yielding an entropy \(S_A = 4\). If the subset \(A\) contains \(n_A\) independent spin variables then (15) is decomposable as
\[
|D\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{8-n_A}}} \sum_{s_A} |s_A\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{8-n_A}}} \sum_{s_B} |s_B\rangle,
\]
that gives an entropy \(S_A = n_A\). Obviously, \(n_A \leq 8\), which is the maximal attainable entropy. This can be achieved for \(A = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20\}\) that contains two pentagons on opposite sides of the dodecahedron (see Fig. 3).

**Hovering qubits**

A different arrangement of qubits based on AME networks can be obtained as follows. Every one of the 12 pentagons in the dodecahedron will carry an associated extra ”hovering” qubit. We may think of it as placed in the center of the pentagon. This defines a unit cell made out of 6 qubits, five of them in the pentagon plus the hovering one. On each of these cells we introduce an AME(6,2).

We can then analyze the bipartitions of the 12-qubit state, either local or non-local. The resulting reduced density matrices to 6 qubits carry entropies that range from 4 to 6.

**Reed-Solomon Codes for Each Platonic Solid**

Reed-Solomon codes offer the possibility of constructing fully AME states (30). It is though clear that such codes do not make any use of the specific geometry of the dodecahedron. They just depend on the number of \(d\)-dimensional degrees of freedom placed on \(n\) sites. In particular, Reed-Solomon codes exist for states with \(d = p\) a prime number, and \(n = p+1\). This fact combines smoothly with the 5 platonic solids, since in all cases, the
number of vertices, edges and faces are a prime number plus one.

Let us illustrate the example of AME(12,11), such that the minimal Hamming distance between any pair of elements in the set is $d_H = 7$. We first need to create the Reed-Solomon generating matrix, made with increasing powers of integers 1 to 10, all mod(11),

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\ 0 & 1 & 4 & 9 & 5 & 3 & 3 & 5 & 9 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 & 8 & 5 & 9 & 4 & 7 & 2 & 6 & 3 \\ 0 & 1 & 5 & 4 & 3 & 9 & 9 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 0 & 1 & 10 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 10 & 10 & 10 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (18)

We then create all the elements of the superposition of AME(12,11) by taking each element of a basis $x_i$ for 6 11-dits and compute $a_i = x_i \cdot G$. These numbers become the coefficients of the AME state,

$$|\text{AME}(12,11)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{11^6}} \sum_{i=1,...,11^6} |a_i\rangle.$$ \hspace{1cm} (19)

The result is a state which is maximally entangled in all its partitions, and with a minimum Hamming distance 7 among each pair of superposed elements.

In general, the AME($n$, $p$) with $n = p + 1$ is obtained following a similar procedure. The elements of the superposition are obtained as the images of all elements of $n/2$ bits. The minimal Hamming distance is then $\frac{n}{2} + 1$.

**CONCLUSION**

TN based on multipartite entangled ancillary states can be used to deploy entanglement on different topologies. We have here shown how these states define very highly entangled states for the case of using AME ancillary states on platonic solids. The quantum states constructed in this manner are locally fully entangled and achieved very large entanglement on arbitrary partitions.

It is a remarkable fact that all platonic solids have a number of faces, edges and vertices corresponding to a prime number plus one. It follows that they all accept AME related to Reed-Solomon error correcting codes as the ancillary building blocks of the TN structure.
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