

Uncertainty relation and the constrained quadratic programming

Lin Zhang^{1*}, Dade Wu¹, Ming-Jing Zhao², Hua Nan³

¹*School of Science, Hangzhou Dianzi University, Hangzhou 310018, PR China*

²*School of Science, Beijing Information Science and Technology University, Beijing, 100192, PR China*

³*Department of Mathematics, College of Sciences, Yanbian University, Yanji 133002, PR China*

Abstract

The uncertainty relation is a fundamental concept in quantum theory, plays a pivotal role in various quantum information processing tasks. In this study, we explore the additive uncertainty relation pertaining to two or more observables, in terms of their variance, by utilizing the generalized Gell-Mann representation in qudit systems. We find that the tight state-independent lower bound of the variance sum can be characterized as a quadratic programming problem with nonlinear constraints in optimization theory. As illustrative examples, we derive analytical solutions for these quadratic programming problems in lower-dimensional systems, which align with the state-independent lower bounds. Additionally, we introduce a numerical algorithm tailored for solving these quadratic programming instances, highlighting its efficiency and accuracy. The advantage of our approach lies in its potential ability to simultaneously achieve the optimal value of the quadratic programming problem with nonlinear constraints but also precisely identify the extremal state where this optimal value is attained. This enables us to establish a tight state-independent lower bound for the sum of variances, and further identify the extremal state at which this lower bound is realized.

*E-mail: godyalin@163.com

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Preliminaries	4
3	Main result: additive uncertainty relation	9
4	Typical example I: the qubit state case	12
5	Typical example II: the qutrit state case	13
5.1	Parametrization of Ω_3^{ext}	17
5.2	Examples with analytical computations	19
6	Discussions	27
7	Concluding remarks	28
	Appendices	33
A	Specific forms of all D_k's in qutrit system	33
B	Algorithm for calculating $\ell_{a,b}$ in Theorem 3.1	35

1 Introduction

Quantum theory serves as a fundamental framework for elucidating the behavior of matter and energy at atomic and subatomic scales. Central to this theory is the uncertainty relation, a principle that asserts the impossibility of simultaneously determining certain physical properties of a particle with absolute precision. The earliest formulation of the uncertainty relations stemmed from Heisenberg’s pioneering work [1]. Specifically, for quantum systems characterized by a definite position and momentum or a specific spin direction, it is inherently impossible to definitively predict measurement outcomes, as quantum theory instead provides probability distributions. Subsequently, Robertson [2] broadened Heisenberg’s uncertainty relation to encompass any two observables within any finite-dimensional space.

Furthermore, the uncertainty relation imposes fundamental limits on the extractable information from a given quantum system. Measurements pertaining to one property often perturb or alter other properties, thus constraining the amount of knowledge that can be gained. Consequently, the uncertainty relations have been formulated in various forms [3, 4], including Shannon entropy [5, 6, 7], Rényi entropy [8], conditional entropy [9, 10, 11], and mutual information [12]. These formulations have profound implications for quantum information processing tasks, such as quantum key distribution and two-party quantum cryptography [7, 13]. Additionally, the uncertainty relation has emerged as a pivotal tool in quantum random number generation [14, 15], entanglement witnessing [16], EPR steering [17, 18], and quantum metrology [19].

Recently, the additive uncertainty relation has garnered significant interest among researchers due to its profound insights into the limitations of simultaneously measuring two observables [20, 21]. This relation has been extensively studied both theoretically and experimentally [22, 23], posing a crucial challenge to our understanding of quantum system behavior, particularly in the realm of quantum technology such as quantum communication, cryptography, and computation. Investigations in quantum information have demonstrated novel applications of additive uncertainty, enabling secure and efficient quantum information processing. This includes the generation and manipulation of entangled states in quantum systems, as well as the development of quantum error correction codes. Overall, the additive uncertainty relation occupies a pivotal position in quantum mechanics research, with implications extending to both fundamental inquiries and practical quantum technology advancements. Specifically, elucidating the interplay between quantum uncertainty and entanglement [26, 24, 25] could reveal novel strategies for harnessing the unique properties of quantum systems in information processing and communication tasks.

In this paper, motivated by the intricate relationship between the sum uncertainty of two or more observables and the concept of quantum entanglement, we aim to explore the additive un-

certainty relation of any two or more observables in terms of variance [27, 28]. To achieve this, we employ the generalized Gell-Mann representation in qudit systems. Through our analysis, we will reveal that the state-independent lower bound [29] of the additive uncertainty relation in qudit systems is akin to a quadratic programming problem involving nonlinear constraints in optimization theory. Furthermore, we derive analytical lower bounds for the additive uncertainty relation, which provide a deeper understanding of its fundamental properties and potential applications.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we present the preliminaries necessary for our investigation. Subsequently, in Section 3, we present our main findings, specifically the additive uncertainty relation of any two or more observables in terms of variance, formulated as a quadratic programming problem with nonlinear constraints (Theorem 3.1) in qudit systems. In Section 4 and Section 5, we focus on lower-dimensional cases, exploring specific calculations for qubit and qutrit systems, respectively, and characterizing the conditions for equality in these cases through the explicit construction of extremal states. Following these illustrative examples, Section 6 discusses the potential applications of the additive uncertainty relation in entanglement detection. Finally, in Section 7, we summarize our findings and conclude the paper.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this notes, all inner products involved in vectors are Euclidean one, i.e., $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle := \sum_k \bar{x}_k y_k$, here the bar means complex conjugate; and all inner products involved in matrices are Hilbert-Schmidt one, i.e., $\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \rangle := \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^\dagger \mathbf{Y})$, where \dagger means the complex conjugate and transpose.

In [30, 31], the authors develop the Bloch vectors formalism for an arbitrary finite-dimensional quantum system. In this formalism, they use the following convention for the generators $\mathbf{G}_k (k = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1)$, where $n \geq 2$, of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ of $\text{SU}(n)$:

$$\langle \mathbf{G}_i, \mathbf{G}_j \rangle = 2\delta_{ij}. \quad (2.1)$$

The commutation and anticommutation¹ for these generators can also be specified as:

$$[\mathbf{G}_i, \mathbf{G}_j] = 2\sqrt{-1}f_{ijk}\mathbf{G}_k = 2\sqrt{-1}f_{ij}^{(k)}\mathbf{G}_k \quad (2.2)$$

$$\{\mathbf{G}_i, \mathbf{G}_j\} = \frac{4}{n}\delta_{ij}\mathbb{1} + 2d_{ijk}\mathbf{G}_k = \frac{4}{n}\delta_{ij}\mathbb{1} + 2d_{ij}^{(k)}\mathbf{G}_k, \quad (2.3)$$

where the expansion coefficients $d_{ijk} = \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}(\{\mathbf{G}_i, \mathbf{G}_j\}\mathbf{G}_k) =: d_{ij}^{(k)}$ are *totally symmetric* and the expansion coefficients $f_{ijk} = -\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{4} \text{Tr}([\mathbf{G}_i, \mathbf{G}_j]\mathbf{G}_k) =: f_{ij}^{(k)}$, the structure constants of $\mathfrak{su}(n)$, are

¹Here $[\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}] := \mathbf{XY} - \mathbf{YX}$ stands for the commutator and $\{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}\} := \mathbf{XY} + \mathbf{YX}$ the anticommutator

totally antisymmetric in their indices; and by convention the summation is performed for repeated indices. Both two identities can be summarized as

$$\mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{G}_j = \frac{2}{n} \delta_{ij} \mathbb{1} + \left(d_{ij}^{(k)} + \sqrt{-1} f_{ij}^{(k)} \right) \mathbf{G}_k, \quad (2.4)$$

which implies $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{G}_j \mathbf{G}_k) = 2(d_{ijk} + \sqrt{-1} f_{ijk}) = 2\left(d_{ij}^{(k)} + \sqrt{-1} f_{ij}^{(k)}\right)$ or

$$d_{ijk} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Re Tr}(\mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{G}_j \mathbf{G}_k) \quad \text{and} \quad f_{ijk} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Im Tr}(\mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{G}_j \mathbf{G}_k). \quad (2.5)$$

These generators of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ can be used to describe any $n \times n$ qudit state (or density matrix) ρ in terms of a corresponding $(n^2 - 1)$ -dimensional *real* vector $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)}$:

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{n} \left(\mathbb{1} + \sqrt{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G} \right), \quad (2.6)$$

where $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_{n^2-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)}$ and $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G} = \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} r_k \mathbf{G}_k$ for $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{G}_1, \dots, \mathbf{G}_{n^2-1})$. This representation is called the *generalized Gell-Mann representation* (or *coherence vector representation* with \mathbf{r} the coherence vector [30]), which are the higher-dimensional extensions of the Pauli matrices $\boldsymbol{\sigma} := (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ on \mathbb{C}^2 and the Gell-Mann matrices on \mathbb{C}^3 [32]. We use the notation $\|\mathbf{r}\| := \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} r_k^2}$ stands for the usual Euclidean length of $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)}$. Denote by

$$\Omega_n := \left\{ \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)} : \rho(\mathbf{r}) \geqslant \mathbf{0} \right\}. \quad (2.7)$$

We also denote by

$$\Omega_n^{\text{ext}} := \{ \mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n : \rho(\mathbf{r})^2 = \rho(\mathbf{r}) \}, \quad (2.8)$$

which corresponds to the set of all pure qudit states. As a submanifold, $\dim(\Omega_n^{\text{ext}}) = 2(n-1)$. In order to characterize analytically the structures of Ω_n and Ω_n^{ext} , respectively, we need the following notion—symmetric star-product.

Definition 2.1 (Symmetric star-product in $\mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)}$, [30]). The so-called *symmetric star-product* \star in $\mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)}$ on vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)}$ through

$$(\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y})_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n-2} \sqrt{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} d_{ij}^{(k)} x_i y_j, \quad (2.9)$$

where $k = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1$.

Essentially, the symmetric star-product in $\mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)}$ is a diagonal mapping on $\mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)} \times \mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)}$. For a convenient usage, we rewrite star-product as following form:

Proposition 2.2. *The star-product in $\mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)}$ can be represented by*

$$\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\langle \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{D}_1 | \mathbf{y} \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{D}_{n^2-1} | \mathbf{y} \rangle) \quad (\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)}), \quad (2.10)$$

where \mathbf{D}_k is an $(n^2 - 1) \times (n^2 - 1)$ real symmetric matrix whose (i, j) -entries being identified with

$$\langle i | \mathbf{D}_k | j \rangle := \frac{1}{n-2} \sqrt{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} d_{ij}^{(k)}, \quad (2.11)$$

where $k = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1$; and $i, j = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1$. Moreover we have the following statements:

(i) $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}_k) = 0$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1$.

(ii) The set of all \mathbf{D}_k 's, $\{\mathbf{D}_k : k = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1\}$, is linearly independent for odd number n .

(iii) It holds that

$$\|\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y}\|^2 = \frac{n(n-1)}{8(n-2)^2} \left[\text{Tr}((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G} \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G})^2) + \frac{4}{n} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y} \rangle + \frac{4(n-2)^2}{n(n-1)} \langle \mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \star \mathbf{y} \rangle - \frac{8}{n} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle^2 \right].$$

In particular,

$$\|\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{x}\|^2 = \frac{n(n-1)}{4(n-2)^2} \left[\text{Tr}((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G})^4) - \frac{4}{n} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2 \right].$$

Proof. The reformulation of star-product is trivially, and it is omitted here. Next we show the 1st item. In fact, we have already known that $\{\mathbb{1}, \mathbf{G}_1, \dots, \mathbf{G}_{n^2-1}\}$ is orthogonal matrix basis for the set of Hermitian matrices on \mathbb{C}^n . Then $\{\text{vec}(\mathbb{1}), \text{vec}(\mathbf{G}_1), \dots, \text{vec}(\mathbf{G}_{n^2-1})\}$ is just orthogonal basis for $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$. By normalizing them, we get the orthonormal basis,

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \text{vec}(\mathbb{1}), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \text{vec}(\mathbf{G}_1), \dots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \text{vec}(\mathbf{G}_{n^2-1}) \right\},$$

leading to the following fact

$$\frac{1}{n} \text{vec}(\mathbb{1}) \text{vec}(\mathbb{1})^\dagger + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \text{vec}(\mathbf{G}_k) \text{vec}(\mathbf{G}_k)^\dagger = \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1}. \quad (2.12)$$

By partial-tracing the 2nd subsystem, we get that $\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{1} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \mathbf{G}_k^2 = n \mathbb{1}$, that is,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \mathbf{G}_k^2 = 2 \left(n - \frac{1}{n} \right) \mathbb{1} \propto \mathbb{1}. \quad (2.13)$$

This leads $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}_k) = 0$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}_k) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n^2-1} d_{ii}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{n^2-1} \text{Tr}(\{\mathbf{G}_i, \mathbf{G}_i\} \mathbf{G}_k) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n^2-1} \mathbf{G}_i^2 \right) \mathbf{G}_k \right) \\ &= \left(n - \frac{1}{n} \right) \text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_k) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For the 2nd item, in order to get the independence, we show that, if there are $(n^2 - 1)$ real numbers $\alpha_k (k = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1)$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \alpha_k \mathbf{D}_k = \mathbf{0}$, then $\alpha_k = 0 (k = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1)$. Indeed, $\sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \alpha_k \mathbf{D}_k = \mathbf{0}$ means that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left\langle i \left| \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \alpha_k \mathbf{D}_k \right| j \right\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \alpha_k d_{ij}^{(k)} = \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \alpha_k d_{ij}^{(k)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \alpha_k \text{Re Tr} (\mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{G}_j \mathbf{G}_k) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Re Tr} \left(\mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{G}_j \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \alpha_k \mathbf{G}_k \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\mathbf{M} := \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \alpha_k \mathbf{G}_k = \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{G}$. Apparently \mathbf{M} is Hermitian matrix. From (2.4), we see that

$$\text{Tr} (\{\mathbf{G}_i, \mathbf{G}_j\} \mathbf{M}) = \text{Tr} (\mathbf{G}_i \{\mathbf{G}_j, \mathbf{M}\}) = \langle \mathbf{G}_i, \{\mathbf{G}_j, \mathbf{M}\} \rangle = 0 \quad (\forall (i, j)).$$

This means that $\{\mathbf{G}_j, \mathbf{M}\} \propto \mathbb{1}$ for all j . Without loss of generality, let $\{\mathbf{G}_j, \mathbf{M}\} = c_j \mathbb{1}$ for some constants $c_j \in \mathbb{R}$. By taking the trace on both sides, we get that $c_j = \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} (\{\mathbf{G}_j, \mathbf{M}\}) = \frac{4}{n} \alpha_j$, leading to

$$\{\mathbf{G}_j, \mathbf{M}\} = \frac{4}{n} \alpha_j \mathbb{1}, \quad (2.14)$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4}{n} \alpha_j \mathbf{G}_j &= \mathbf{G}_j \{\mathbf{G}_j, \mathbf{M}\} = \mathbf{G}_j^2 \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{G}_j \mathbf{M} \mathbf{G}_j = \mathbf{G}_j^2 \mathbf{M} + \left(\frac{4}{n} \alpha_j \mathbb{1} - \mathbf{M} \mathbf{G}_j \right) \mathbf{G}_j \\ &= \mathbf{G}_j^2 \mathbf{M} + \frac{4}{n} \alpha_j \mathbf{G}_j - \mathbf{M} \mathbf{G}_j^2, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $\mathbf{G}_j^2 \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M} \mathbf{G}_j^2$. Then $\mathbf{M}^2 = \frac{2}{n} \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2 \mathbb{1}$. Now from

$$\mathbf{M}^2 = (\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{G})^2 = \frac{2}{n} \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2 \mathbb{1} + (n-2) \sqrt{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \star \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{G}, \quad (2.15)$$

we see that $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \star \boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{0}$. For a generic eigenvalue λ of \mathbf{M} , it must be $\lambda = \pm \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|$. Let the number of positive eigenvalues of \mathbf{M} is m , then the number of negative eigenvalue of \mathbf{M} is $n - m$. By the fact that $\text{Tr} (\mathbf{M}) = 0$, we see that

$$m \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| + (n - m) \left(-\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| \right) = 0,$$

i.e., $(2m - n) \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| = 0$, which is equivalent $2m - n = 0$ or $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| = 0$. If n is odd, we must have $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{0}$ because $2m - n \neq 0$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y}\|^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \langle \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{D}_k | \mathbf{y} \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{(n-2)^2} \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \left[\sum_{i,j} x_i d_{ij}^{(k)} y_j \right]^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{(n-2)^2} \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} [\text{Tr}(\{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G}\} \mathbf{G}_k)]^2 \\
&= \frac{n(n-1)}{32(n-2)^2} \left\langle \text{vec}(\{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G}\}) \left| \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \text{vec}(\mathbf{G}_k) \text{vec}(\mathbf{G}_k)^\dagger \right| \text{vec}(\{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G}\}) \right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Eq. (2.12), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y}\|^2 &= \frac{n(n-1)}{32(n-2)^2} \left\langle \text{vec}(\{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G}\}) \left| 2\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} - \frac{2}{n} \text{vec}(\mathbb{1}) \text{vec}(\mathbb{1})^\dagger \right| \text{vec}(\{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G}\}) \right\rangle \\
&= \frac{n(n-1)}{16(n-2)^2} \left[\text{Tr}(\{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G}\}^2) - \frac{1}{n} (\text{Tr}(\{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G}\}))^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{n(n-1)}{8(n-2)^2} \left[\text{Tr}((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G} \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G})^2) + \text{Tr}((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G})^2 (\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G})^2) - \frac{2}{n} (\text{Tr}((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G})(\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G})))^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Now we see that $\text{Tr}((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G})^2 (\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G})^2) = \frac{4}{n} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y} \rangle + \frac{4(n-2)^2}{n(n-1)} \langle \mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \star \mathbf{y} \rangle$. It follows from that

$$\|\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y}\|^2 = \frac{n(n-1)}{8(n-2)^2} \left[\text{Tr}((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G} \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{G})^2) \right] + \frac{4}{n} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y} \rangle + \frac{4(n-2)^2}{n(n-1)} \langle \mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \star \mathbf{y} \rangle - \frac{8}{n} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle^2.$$

In particular, for $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{x}\|^2 &= \frac{n(n-1)}{4(n-2)^2} \left[\text{Tr}((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G})^4) - \frac{1}{n} (\text{Tr}((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G})^2))^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{n(n-1)}{4(n-2)^2} \left[\text{Tr}((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G})^4) - \frac{4}{n} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 2.3. *For any positive integer $n > 2$, it holds that*

$$\Omega_n^{\text{ext}} = \left\{ \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n^2-1)} : \|\mathbf{r}\| = 1, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} \right\}. \quad (2.16)$$

In particular, for $n = 2$, $\Omega_2^{\text{ext}} = \{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \|\mathbf{r}\| = 1\}$.

Proof. Recall that

$$(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G})^2 = \frac{2}{n} \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 \mathbb{1} + (n-2) \sqrt{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}} \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G}. \quad (2.17)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(\mathbf{r})^2 &= \frac{1}{n^2} \left(\mathbb{1} + 2\sqrt{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G} + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G})^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \left[\left(1 + (n-1) \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 \right) \mathbb{1} + \sqrt{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} (2\mathbf{r} + (n-2)\mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r}) \cdot \mathbf{G} \right], \\
\rho(\mathbf{r}) &= \frac{1}{n^2} \left(n\mathbb{1} + n\sqrt{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Then $\rho(\mathbf{r})^2 = \rho(\mathbf{r})$ becomes as

$$1 + (n-1) \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 = n \quad (2.18)$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} (2\mathbf{r} + (n-2)\mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r}) = n\sqrt{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \mathbf{r} \quad (2.19)$$

That is, $\|\mathbf{r}\| = 1$ and $\mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}$ for $n > 2$; or $\|\mathbf{r}\| = 1$ for $n = 2$. \square

3 Main result: additive uncertainty relation

Given two qudit observables $A = a_0\mathbb{1} + \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{G}$ and $B = b_0\mathbb{1} + \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{G}$, acting on \mathbb{C}^n . For any qudit state $\rho = \frac{1}{n} \left(\mathbb{1} + \sqrt{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G} \right)$, we see that

$$\langle A, \rho \rangle = a_0 + \sqrt{\frac{2(n-1)}{n}} \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{r} \rangle, \quad \langle B, \rho \rangle = b_0 + \sqrt{\frac{2(n-1)}{n}} \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle.$$

The so-called additive uncertainty relation is the following matrix optimization problem:

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) + \text{Var}_\rho(B) \geq \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^n)} [\text{Var}_\rho(A) + \text{Var}_\rho(B)] =: m_{A,B}. \quad (3.1)$$

Here $\text{Var}_\rho(X)$ is the matrix variance of observable X , defined by $\text{Var}_\rho(X) := \langle X^2, \rho \rangle - \langle X, \rho \rangle^2$, where $X = A, B$. Because $\rho \mapsto \text{Var}_\rho(A) + \text{Var}_\rho(B)$ is *concave* in the argument ρ , we see that

$$m_{A,B} = \min_{|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^n: \|\psi\|=1} (\text{Var}_\psi(A) + \text{Var}_\psi(B)). \quad (3.2)$$

Note that

$$A^2 = \left(a_0^2 + \frac{2}{n} \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \right) \mathbb{1} + 2a_0 \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{G} + (n-2) \sqrt{\frac{2}{n(n-2)}} \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{G}.$$

We get that

$$\langle A^2, \rho \rangle = a_0^2 + \frac{2}{n} \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \left\langle 2a_0 \sqrt{\frac{2(n-1)}{n}} \mathbf{a} + \frac{2(n-2)}{n} \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{r} \right\rangle.$$

From the above observation, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{A}) + \text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{B}) &= \langle \mathbf{A}^2 + \mathbf{B}^2, \rho \rangle - \langle \mathbf{A}, \rho \rangle^2 - \langle \mathbf{B}, \rho \rangle^2 \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \left(\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 \right) + \frac{2(n-2)}{n} \langle \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \star \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle - \frac{2(n-1)}{n} \left(\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 + \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Let

$$\ell_{a,b} := \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}} \left[(n-2) \langle \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \star \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle - (n-1) \left(\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 + \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 \right) \right]. \quad (3.4)$$

Thus we get that

$$m_{A,B} = \frac{2}{n} (\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 + \ell_{a,b}). \quad (3.5)$$

In the following, we consider to calculate $\ell_{a,b}$. In fact,

Theorem 3.1. For given two qudit observables $\mathbf{A} = a_0 \mathbb{1} + \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{B} = b_0 \mathbb{1} + \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{G}$ on \mathbb{C}^n , let

$$\mathbf{T}_{a,b} := (n-2) \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{O}_{a,b} \mathbf{D}_k) \mathbf{D}_k - (n-1) \mathbf{O}_{a,b}, \quad (3.6)$$

where $\mathbf{O}_{a,b} := |\mathbf{a}\rangle\langle\mathbf{a}| + |\mathbf{b}\rangle\langle\mathbf{b}|$ and \mathbf{D}_k 's are identified from (2.11). It holds that

$$\ell_{a,b} = \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle \quad (3.7)$$

$$m_{A,B} = \frac{2}{n} \left[-\frac{1}{n-1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{T}_{a,b}) + \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle \right]. \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. Because $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}$, we see $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \star \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \star \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} (\langle \mathbf{a} | \mathbf{D}_k | \mathbf{a} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{b} | \mathbf{D}_k | \mathbf{b} \rangle) \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{D}_k | \mathbf{r} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{O}_{a,b} \mathbf{D}_k) \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{D}_k | \mathbf{r} \rangle \\ &= \left\langle \mathbf{r} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{O}_{a,b} \mathbf{D}_k) \mathbf{D}_k \right| \mathbf{r} \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

and $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 + \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 = \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{O}_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{a,b} &= \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}} \left[(n-2) \langle \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \star \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle - (n-1) \left(\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 + \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 \right) \right] \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}} \left[(n-2) \langle \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \star \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle - (n-1) \left(\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 + \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 \right) \right] \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}} \left[\left\langle \mathbf{r} \left| (n-2) \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{O}_{a,b} \mathbf{D}_k) \mathbf{D}_k \right| \mathbf{r} \right\rangle - (n-1) \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{O}_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle \right] \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}_k) = 0$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1$. This implies that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{T}_{a,b}) = -(n-1) \text{Tr}(\mathbf{O}_{a,b}) = -(n-1)(\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|^2)$, i.e., $\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 = -\frac{1}{n-1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{T}_{a,b})$. Substituting this expression into the defining equation of $m_{A,B}$, we get the desired result. This completes the proof. \square

In fact, our method here can also be used to study the additive uncertainty relation for multiple qudit observables. According to the above reasoning, we get the following result:

Corollary 3.2. *For any given K -tuple of qudit observables (A_1, \dots, A_K) on \mathbb{C}^n , where $A_\mu = a_0^{(\mu)} \mathbb{1} + \mathbf{a}_\mu \cdot \mathbf{G}$ for $\mu = 1, \dots, K$. Let*

$$m_{A_1, \dots, A_K} := \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^n)} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \text{Var}_\rho(A_\mu), \quad (3.9)$$

$$\mathbf{O}_{a_1, \dots, a_K} := \sum_{\mu=1}^K |\mathbf{a}_\mu\rangle\langle\mathbf{a}_\mu|, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\mathbf{T}_{a_1, \dots, a_K} := (n-2) \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{O}_{a_1, \dots, a_K} \mathbf{D}_k) \mathbf{D}_k - (n-1) \mathbf{O}_{a_1, \dots, a_K}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\ell_{a_1, \dots, a_K} := \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{a_1, \dots, a_K} | \mathbf{r} \rangle, \quad (3.12)$$

where \mathbf{D}_j 's are identified from (2.11). It holds that

$$m_{A_1, \dots, A_K} = \frac{2}{n} \left(\sum_{\mu=1}^K \|\mathbf{a}_\mu\|^2 + \ell_{a_1, \dots, a_K} \right) \quad (3.13)$$

$$= \frac{2}{n} \left[-\frac{1}{n-1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{T}_{a_1, \dots, a_K}) + \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{a_1, \dots, a_K} | \mathbf{r} \rangle \right]. \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. The proof can be easily obtained by repeating K times the proof of Theorem 3.1. It is omitted here. \square

Remark 3.3. From the above theorem, we can see that the optimization problem (3.7) is the famous quadratic programming [33, 34, 35] with the following prototype: $\min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T} | \mathbf{r} \rangle$, where \mathbf{T} is an $(n^2 - 1) \times (n^2 - 1)$ real symmetric matrix. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T} | \mathbf{r} \rangle \\ & \text{subject to: } \|\mathbf{r}\| = 1, \\ & \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}. \end{aligned}$$

In Appendix B, we present a universal algorithm to find the minimum of $\langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T} | \mathbf{r} \rangle$, where $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}$ for $n = 3$.

In addition, such problem is also related to the numerical range of \mathbf{T} , defined by $\{\langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T} | \mathbf{r} \rangle : \|\mathbf{r}\| = 1\}$. We have already known that the numerical range of \mathbf{T} is just the closed interval

$[\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{T}), \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{T})]$, where $\lambda_{\max/\min}(\mathbf{T})$ is the maximal/minimal eigenvalue of \mathbf{T} . Clearly the set $\{\langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T} | \mathbf{r} \rangle : \mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}\}$ is also a closed subinterval of the numerical range of \mathbf{T} , called the *constrained numerical range*. The minimal boundary point of $\{\langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T} | \mathbf{r} \rangle : \mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}}\}$ is the desired one.

Remark 3.4. Let

$$\mathcal{U}_m(n, K) := \{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_n^{\text{ext}} : \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = \ell_{a_1, \dots, a_K}\}. \quad (3.15)$$

Using such set, we can construct the set of all qudit states of *minimal uncertainty* in the sense of $\min_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^n)} [\text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{A}) + \text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{B})] = m_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}}$:

$$\mathcal{D}_m(n, K) := \{\rho(\mathbf{r}) : \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{U}_m(n, K)\}. \quad (3.16)$$

4 Typical example I: the qubit state case

The Pauli matrices are the generator of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$, which are given by the following:

$$\mathbf{G}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{G}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{G}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.1)$$

Instead of using \mathbf{G}_k 's, we use the notation σ_k to replace \mathbf{G}_k in the qubit system. The Pauli matrices satisfy the identities:

$$\sigma_k^2 = \mathbb{1}, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\{\sigma_i, \sigma_j\} = 2\delta_{ij}\mathbb{1}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\sigma_i \sigma_j = \delta_{ij}\mathbb{1} + \sqrt{-1}\epsilon_{ijk}\sigma_k, \quad (4.4)$$

where ϵ is the permutation symbol. These facts leads to the fact that $\mathbf{D}_1 = \mathbf{D}_2 = \mathbf{D}_3 = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., $\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}$ for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

For any qubit observables $\mathbf{A} = a_0\mathbb{1} + \mathbf{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{B} = b_0\mathbb{1} + \mathbf{b} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, we see from Theorem 3.1 that $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}} = -\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}} &= \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 + \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_2^{\text{ext}}} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}} | \mathbf{r} \rangle \\ &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}) - \max\{\langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}} | \mathbf{r} \rangle : \|\mathbf{r}\| = 1\} \\ &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}) - \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}})$ is attained at any one element in the following set

$$\mathcal{U}_m(2, 2) := \{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_2^{\text{ext}} : \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}})\}. \quad (4.5)$$

In fact, in the above set, we can choose the eigenvector $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ of $\mathbf{O}_{a,b}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{O}_{a,b})$, i.e., $\mathbf{O}_{a,b}|\tilde{\mathbf{r}}\rangle = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{O}_{a,b})|\tilde{\mathbf{r}}\rangle$. This means that

$$\min_{\psi \in \mathbb{C}^2: \|\psi\|=1} [\text{Var}_\psi(\mathbf{A}) + \text{Var}_\psi(\mathbf{B})] = \text{Var}_{\tilde{\psi}}(\mathbf{A}) + \text{Var}_{\tilde{\psi}}(\mathbf{B}), \quad (4.6)$$

where $\tilde{\psi} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{1} + \tilde{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})$, which is the state of the so-called *minimal uncertainty* in the sense above. All states of minimal uncertainty is just the following set

$$\mathcal{D}_m(2, 2) = \{\psi(\mathbf{r}) : \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{U}_m(2, 2)\}. \quad (4.7)$$

Besides, $\mathbf{O}_{a,b}$ is unitarily equivalent to the 2×2 matrix $\begin{pmatrix} \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \rangle & \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \\ \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle & \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \end{pmatrix}$ whose minimal eigenvalue is just $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{O}_{a,b}) - \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{O}_{a,b})$. This recovers the result in [20, Theorem 2.2].

For any finite number of qubit observables $A_k = a_0^{(k)}\mathbb{1} + \mathbf{a}_k \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, where $k = 1, \dots, K$, we have

$$m_{A_1, \dots, A_K} = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{O}_{a_1, \dots, a_K}) - \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{O}_{a_1, \dots, a_K}).$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{O}_{a_1, \dots, a_K})$ is attained at any one element in the following set

$$\mathcal{U}_m(2, K) := \{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_2^{\text{ext}} : \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{O}_{a_1, \dots, a_K} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{O}_{a_1, \dots, a_K})\}. \quad (4.8)$$

All states of minimal uncertainty is just the following set

$$\mathcal{D}_m(2, K) = \{\psi(\mathbf{r}) : \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{U}_m(2, K)\}. \quad (4.9)$$

5 Typical example II: the qutrit state case

The so-called *Gell-Mann matrices* are the following 3×3 Hermitian matrices, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{G}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{G}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{G}_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{G}_5 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{G}_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{G}_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{G}_8 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Some useful properties of Gell-Mann matrices are listed below.

- $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_k) = 0$, where $k = 1, \dots, 8$;
- $\langle \mathbf{G}_i, \mathbf{G}_j \rangle = 2\delta_{ij}$, where $1 \leq i, j \leq 8$;

- $\{\mathbb{1}, G_1, \dots, G_8\}$ is an orthogonal matrix basis such that each 3×3 Hermitian matrix A can be represented by

$$A = a_0 \mathbb{1} + \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{G}, \quad (a_0, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathbb{R}^9,$$

where $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{G} := \sum_{k=1}^8 a_k G_k$ for $\mathbf{G} := (G_1, \dots, G_8)$.

- $\langle \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{G} \rangle = 2 \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle$, where $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^8$.
- If 3×3 Hermitian matrix $A = a_0 \mathbb{1} + \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{G}$, then we have

$$a_0 = \frac{1}{3} \text{Tr}(A), \quad a_k = \frac{1}{2} \langle A, G_k \rangle \quad (k = 1, \dots, 8).$$

- The algebraic structure of these matrices is determined by the product property:

$$G_i G_j = \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} \mathbb{1} + (d_{ij}^{(k)} + i f_{ij}^{(k)}) G_k,$$

where the expansion coefficients $d_{ijk} := d_{ij}^{(k)}$ are *totally symmetric*. The numerical values of all the independent non-vanishing components of d_{ijk} are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{118} &= d_{228} = d_{338} = -d_{888} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \\ d_{146} &= d_{157} = -d_{247} = d_{256} = \frac{1}{2}, \\ d_{344} &= d_{355} = -d_{366} = -d_{377} = \frac{1}{2}, \\ d_{448} &= d_{558} = d_{668} = d_{778} = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}, \end{aligned}$$

and the expansion coefficients $f_{ijk} := f_{ij}^{(k)}$, the structure constants of the Lie algebra of $SU(3)$, are *totally antisymmetric* in their indices. The numerical values of all the independent non-vanishing components of f_{ijk} are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{123} &= 1, \quad f_{458} = f_{678} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, \\ f_{147} &= f_{246} = f_{257} = f_{345} = f_{516} = f_{637} = \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

For a convenient usage, we rewrite star-product as following form:

Proposition 5.1. *For $n = 3$, the star-product in \mathbb{R}^8 can be represented by*

$$\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y} = (\langle \mathbf{x} | D_1 | \mathbf{y} \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathbf{x} | D_8 | \mathbf{y} \rangle) \quad (\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^8),$$

where $D_k (k = 1, \dots, 8)$ are displayed in Appendix A. Moreover, $\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y} \star \mathbf{x}$ and

$$\langle \mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{x} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2 \iff \|\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{x}\| = \|\mathbf{x}\|^2.$$

For a completeness, here we present a proof again albeit they appeared in other literatures.

Proof. In fact, $\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y} = (\langle \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{D}_1 | \mathbf{y} \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{D}_8 | \mathbf{y} \rangle)$ can be derived from the Definition 2.1 of the symmetric star-product. Due to the symmetry of all matrices \mathbf{D}_k 's, $\langle \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{D}_k | \mathbf{y} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{D}_k | \mathbf{x} \rangle$ for all $k = 1, \dots, 8$. This indicates that $\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y} \star \mathbf{x}$. Finally, we see from Proposition 2.2 (iii) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{x}\|^2 &= \frac{3}{2} \text{Tr} \left((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G})^4 \right) - 2 \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2 \\ &= 3 \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2 - 2 \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2 = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the Gell-Mann matrices to derive the fact $\text{Tr} \left((\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G})^4 \right) = 2 \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2$ in the second equality, that is, $\|\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{x}\| = \|\mathbf{x}\|^2$. This completes the proof. \square

Some properties of star product can also be found in [36, 37, 38].

Lemma 5.2. *For a generic 3×3 Hermitian matrix ρ of fixed-trace one, it is positive semi-definite if and only if $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) \leq 1$ and $\det(\rho) \geq 0$.*

Proof. Let λ_k be all eigenvalues of ρ with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3$. Then we have that $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 1$, which leads to the result $\lambda_1 \geq \frac{1}{3} \geq \lambda_3$. Now $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) \leq 1$ means that $\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 \leq 1$, which implies that $\lambda_k^2 \leq 1$, where $k = 1, 2, 3$. Thus $1 \geq \lambda_1 \geq \frac{1}{3}$, thus $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 1 - \lambda_1 \in [0, \frac{2}{3}]$. If $\lambda_1 = 1$, then $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$ and thus $\rho \geq 0$; if $\lambda_1 \in [\frac{1}{3}, 1)$, then $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 1 - \lambda_1 \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$, together with $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3$, implying that $\lambda_2 > 0$. Now $\det(\rho) = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \geq 0$ amounts to say that $\lambda_3 \geq 0$. Therefore $\lambda_k \geq 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, 3$. That is, $\rho \geq 0$.

Based on the above observation, we get that $\rho \geq 0$ whenever $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) \leq 1$ and $\det(\rho) \geq 0$ for the 3×3 Hermitian matrix ρ of fixed-trace one. \square

With these preparations, we can now derive very quickly the characterizations of Ω_3 and Ω_3^{ext} .

Proposition 5.3. *It holds that*

$$\Omega_3 = \{ \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^8 : \|\mathbf{r}\| \leq 1, 1 + 2 \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \geq 3 \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \rangle \}, \quad (5.1)$$

$$\Omega_3^{\text{ext}} = \{ \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^8 : \|\mathbf{r}\| = 1, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} \}. \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. In fact, for the parametrization, $\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{3}(\mathbb{1} + \sqrt{3}\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G})$, we see that

$$\text{Tr}(\rho(\mathbf{r})^2) = \frac{1 + 2\|\mathbf{r}\|^2}{3}, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\det(\rho(\mathbf{r})) = \frac{1 + 2 \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle - 3 \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \rangle}{27}. \quad (5.4)$$

Thus by Lemma 5.2, $\text{Tr}(\rho(\mathbf{r})^2) \leq 1$ is equivalent to $\|\mathbf{r}\| \leq 1$, and $\det(\rho(\mathbf{r})) \geq 0$ is equivalent to $1 + 2 \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \geq 3 \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \rangle$. Put together, we get that

$$\Omega_3 = \{ \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^8 : \|\mathbf{r}\| \leq 1, 1 + 2 \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \geq 3 \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \rangle \}.$$

Now for $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_3^{\text{ext}}$, we get that $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_3$ and $\text{Tr}(\rho(\mathbf{r})^2) = 1$. That is, $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_3$ and $\|\mathbf{r}\| = 1$. Substituting $\|\mathbf{r}\| = 1$ into $1 + 2\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \geq 3\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \rangle = 3$, reduced to $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \geq 1$. The using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we see that

$$1 \leq \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \leq \|\mathbf{r}\| \|\mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r}\| = \|\mathbf{r}\|^3 = 1. \quad (5.5)$$

This inequality is saturated iff $\mathbf{r} \propto \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r}$. The following facts $\|\mathbf{r}\| = 1$, $\|\mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r}\| = \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 = 1$, and $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle = 1$ indicate that $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r}$. Therefore $\Omega_3^{\text{ext}} = \{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^8 : \|\mathbf{r}\| = 1, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}\}$. \square

Remark 5.4. There is another characterization of Ω_3 , which is described by

$$\Omega_3 = \left\{ \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^8 : \|\mathbf{r}\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cup \left\{ \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^8 : \|\mathbf{r}\| \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1 \right], \arccos\left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{r}\|^3}\right) + 3\arccos\left(\frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{r}\|}\right) \leq \pi \right\}. \quad (5.6)$$

Indeed, for a 3×3 generic Hermitian matrix of fixed-trace one $\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{3}(\mathbb{1} + \sqrt{3}\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G})$, where $\mathbf{r} \neq \mathbf{0}$, its all eigenvalues are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(\rho(\mathbf{r})) &= \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3}\cos\theta, \\ \lambda_2(\rho(\mathbf{r})) &= \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3}\cos\left(\theta - \frac{2\pi}{3}\right), \\ \lambda_3(\rho(\mathbf{r})) &= \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3}\cos\left(\theta + \frac{2\pi}{3}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta = \theta(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{3}\arccos\left(\|\mathbf{r}\|^{-3}\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle\right)$. Note that

$$\|\mathbf{r}\|^{-3}\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \in [-1, 1] \quad \text{and} \quad \arccos(\|\mathbf{r}\|^{-3}\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle) \in [0, \pi].$$

Then $\theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{3}]$. Based on this observation, we see that $\lambda_1(\rho(\mathbf{r})) \geq \lambda_2(\rho(\mathbf{r})) \geq \lambda_3(\rho(\mathbf{r}))$. In order to get the positivity of $\rho(\mathbf{r})$, it suffices to characterize $\lambda_3(\rho(\mathbf{r})) \geq 0$. That is, $2\|\mathbf{r}\|\cos(\theta + \frac{2\pi}{3}) \geq -1$. Clearly if $\|\mathbf{r}\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then $\lambda_3(\rho(\mathbf{r})) \geq 0$. We can assume that $\|\mathbf{r}\| \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$\cos\left(\theta - \frac{\pi}{3}\right) = \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{3} - \theta\right) \leq \frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{r}\|} \leq 1.$$

In summary, we obtain that

$$\frac{\pi}{3} - \theta \geq \arccos\left(\frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{r}\|}\right) \iff \arccos\left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{r}\|^3}\right) + 3\arccos\left(\frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{r}\|}\right) \leq \pi.$$

In what follows, we show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^8 : \|\mathbf{r}\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cup \left\{ \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^8 : \|\mathbf{r}\| \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1 \right], \arccos\left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{r}\|^3}\right) + 3\arccos\left(\frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{r}\|}\right) \leq \pi \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^8 : \|\mathbf{r}\| \leq 1, 1 + 2\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \geq 3\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \rangle \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Because $|2\|\mathbf{r}\|\cos(\theta \pm \frac{2\pi}{3})| \leq 2\|\mathbf{r}\|$, which means that $2\|\mathbf{r}\|\cos(\theta \pm \frac{2\pi}{3}) \geq -2\|\mathbf{r}\|$. Then

$$\lambda_3(\rho) \geq \frac{1 - 2\|\mathbf{r}\|}{3} \geq 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \|\mathbf{r}\| \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

In what follows, we assume that $\|\mathbf{r}\| \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Since $\text{Tr}(\rho(\mathbf{r})^2) = \frac{1+2\|\mathbf{r}\|^2}{3}$ and $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ is a legal state iff $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_3$, it follows that $\text{Tr}(\rho(\mathbf{r})^2) \leq 1$, i.e., $\|\mathbf{r}\| \leq 1$.

With the above assumption, $\frac{1}{2} \leq \|\mathbf{r}\| \leq 1$, and thus $\frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{r}\|} \leq 1$. Let $x = \frac{\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{r}\|^3} \in [-1, 1]$ and $y = \frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{r}\|} \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Clearly we always have $\arccos y \in [0, \frac{\pi}{3}]$. We separate it into two cases:

- (i) If $x \geq 0$, then $0 \leq \arccos x \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$. Thus $\arccos x + 3\arccos y \leq \pi$ will give rise to $0 \leq \arccos x \leq \min\{\pi - 3\arccos y, \frac{\pi}{2}\}$, i.e.,

$$x \geq \max\{-\cos(3\arccos y), 0\} = \max\{3y - 4y^3, 0\}.$$

- (ii) If $x \leq 0$, then $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \arccos x \leq \pi$. Thus $\arccos x + 3\arccos y \leq \pi$ will give rise to $3\arccos y \leq \pi - \arccos x \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, i.e.,

$$\cos(3\arccos y) = 4y^3 - 3y \geq -x.$$

In summary, we always have $x \geq 3y - 4y^3$. that is

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{r}\|^3} \geq 3\frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{r}\|} - 4\left(\frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{r}\|}\right)^3 \iff 1 + 2\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \geq 3\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \rangle.$$

In fact, if $\|\mathbf{r}\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$|\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{r}\|^3 \leq \frac{1}{8},$$

implying that $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \geq -\frac{1}{8}$. Thus

$$1 + 2\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} \rangle \geq 1 - \frac{1}{4} = \frac{3}{4} = 3\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \geq 3\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 = 3\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \rangle.$$

5.1 Parametrization of Ω_3^{ext}

As a submanifold of the manifold Ω_3 , Ω_3^{ext} is 4-dimensional. Now for $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_8) \in \Omega_3^{\text{ext}}$, we see that

$$\mathbf{r} \star \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{r}\| = 1,$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{D}_k | \mathbf{r} \rangle &= r_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, 8; \\ \sum_{k=1}^8 r_k^2 &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The above constraints are reduced into the following forms:

$$0 = \sqrt{3}(r_4r_6 + r_5r_7) + r_1(2r_8 - 1), \quad (5.8)$$

$$0 = \sqrt{3}(r_5r_6 - r_4r_7) + r_2(2r_8 - 1), \quad (5.9)$$

$$0 = \sqrt{3}(r_4^2 + r_5^2 - r_6^2 - r_7^2) + 2r_3(2r_8 - 1), \quad (5.10)$$

$$0 = \sqrt{3}(r_1r_6 - r_2r_7) + r_4(\sqrt{3}r_3 - r_8 - 1),$$

$$0 = \sqrt{3}(r_2r_6 + r_1r_7) + r_5(\sqrt{3}r_3 - r_8 - 1),$$

$$0 = \sqrt{3}(r_1r_4 + r_2r_5) - r_6(\sqrt{3}r_3 + r_8 + 1),$$

$$0 = \sqrt{3}(r_2r_4 - r_1r_5) + r_7(\sqrt{3}r_3 + r_8 + 1),$$

$$0 = 2(r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2) - (r_4^2 + r_5^2 + r_6^2 + r_7^2) - 2r_8(r_8 + 1), \quad (5.11)$$

$$1 = r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 + r_4^2 + r_5^2 + r_6^2 + r_7^2 + r_8^2. \quad (5.12)$$

Let $R^2 = r_4^2 + r_5^2 + r_6^2 + r_7^2 \in [0, 1]$, where $R \geq 0$. Then $r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 + r_8^2 = 1 - R^2$ by Eq. (5.12). From Eq. (5.11), it follows that $2(1 - R^2 - r_8^2) - R^2 - 2r_8(r_8 + 1) = 0$, i.e.,

$$4r_8^2 + 2r_8 + (3R^2 - 2) = 0.$$

As the quadratic equation of argument r_8 , its roots must be real. This indicates that its discriminant $\Delta = 2^2 - 4 \cdot 4(3R^2 - 2) \geq 0$. That is, $R^2 \leq \frac{3}{4}$. At this time, the solution is given by

$$r_8(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{4} \left(-1 + \epsilon \sqrt{3(3 - 4R^2)} \right), \quad \forall R \in [0, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}] \text{ and } \epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}. \quad (5.13)$$

- If $R = 0$, i.e., $(r_4, r_5, r_6, r_7) = (0, 0, 0, 0)$, then $r_8(\epsilon) = \frac{3\epsilon - 1}{4}$. Based on this, we have

$$0 = r_1(2r_8 - 1) = r_2(2r_8 - 1) = r_3(2r_8 - 1)$$

$$1 = r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 + r_8^2$$

If $\epsilon = -1$, $r_8(\epsilon) = -1$, and $(r_1, r_2, r_3) = (0, 0, 0)$; if $\epsilon = 1$, $r_8(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2}$, and $r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 = \frac{3}{4}$.

- If $R \in (0, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}]$, then $2r_8(\epsilon) - 1 < 0$. Solving this group of equations, we get that

$$r_1(\epsilon) = \frac{\sqrt{3} + \epsilon\sqrt{3 - 4R^2}}{2R^2}(r_4r_6 + r_5r_7), \quad (5.14)$$

$$r_2(\epsilon) = \frac{\sqrt{3} + \epsilon\sqrt{3 - 4R^2}}{2R^2}(r_5r_6 - r_4r_7), \quad (5.15)$$

$$r_3(\epsilon) = \frac{\sqrt{3} + \epsilon\sqrt{3 - 4R^2}}{4R^2}(r_4^2 + r_5^2 - r_6^2 - r_7^2), \quad (5.16)$$

$$r_8(\epsilon) = \frac{-1 + \epsilon\sqrt{3(3 - 4R^2)}}{4}. \quad (5.17)$$

Thus, as the free variables, (r_4, r_5, r_6, r_7) is the suitable choice for the parametrization of Ω_3^{ext} .

In summary, for a generic $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_3^{\text{ext}}$, it can be classified into the following three categories $\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2$, and \mathcal{I}_3 :

$$\mathcal{I}_1 = \{(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1)\}, \quad (5.18)$$

$$\mathcal{I}_2 = \left\{ (r_1, r_2, r_3, 0, 0, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2}) : r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 = \frac{3}{4} \right\}, \quad (5.19)$$

$$\mathcal{I}_3 = \left\{ (r_1(\epsilon), r_2(\epsilon), r_3(\epsilon), r_4, r_5, r_6, r_7, r_8(\epsilon)) : 0 < \sum_{i=4}^7 r_i^2 \leq \frac{3}{4} \text{ for } \epsilon \in \{\pm 1\} \right\}. \quad (5.20)$$

That is,

$$\Omega_3^{\text{ext}} = \mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_2 \cup \mathcal{I}_3. \quad (5.21)$$

For a convenient usage, denote

$$\mathcal{J}_R(\epsilon) = \left\{ \mathbf{r}(\epsilon) \in \mathcal{I}_3 : \sum_{i=4}^7 r_i^2 = R^2 \right\} \quad (5.22)$$

for $R \in (0, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}]$ and $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. Let $\mathcal{J}_R = \cup_{\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}} \mathcal{J}_R(\epsilon)$. Then

$$\mathcal{I}_3 = \bigcup_{R \in (0, \sqrt{3}/2]} \mathcal{J}_R. \quad (5.23)$$

5.2 Examples with analytical computations

Example 5.5. For given two qutrit observables

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{G}_3 - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\mathbf{G}_8 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i \\ 0 & -i & 0 \end{pmatrix} = -\mathbf{G}_7,$$

we have that

$$\min_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^3)} [\text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{A}) + \text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{B})] = 0.$$

Indeed, we rewrite $\mathbf{A} = a_0 \mathbb{1} + \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{B} = b_0 \mathbb{1} + \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{G}$, where $a_0 = b_0 = 0$ and

$$\mathbf{a} = \left(0, 0, -\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, 0, 0, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right), \quad \mathbf{b} = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0).$$

Then $T_{a,b} = -D_8 - 2O_{a,b}$, which is equal to

$$T_{a,b} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{3}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{3}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.24)$$

Now

$$\langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left(-2r_1^2 - 2r_2^2 - 3r_3^2 + r_4^2 + r_5^2 + r_6^2 - 3r_7^2 - r_8^2 - 2\sqrt{3}r_3r_8 \right). \quad (5.25)$$

- $\min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_1} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -\frac{1}{2}$.
- For $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_2$, we see that $\langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = \frac{-8(r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2) - 4r_3^2 - 4\sqrt{3}r_3 - 1}{8} = \frac{-4r_3^2 - 4\sqrt{3}r_3 - 7}{8}$. By using spherical coordinates, we let $r_3 = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \cos \theta$, then we have $\min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_2} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -2$.
- For $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{J}_R := \cup_{\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}} \mathcal{J}_R(\epsilon)$, we see that $\sum_{k=1}^3 r_k^2(\epsilon) + r_8^2(\epsilon) = 1 - R^2$, where $\sum_{k=1}^7 r_k^2 = R^2$, then

$$\langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left(-r_3^2 - 4r_7^2 + r_8^2 - 2\sqrt{3}r_3r_8 + 3R^2 - 2 \right).$$

We construct Lagrange multiplier function as follows:

$$L(r_4, r_5, r_6, r_7, \lambda) = \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle + \lambda \left(\sum_{k=4}^7 r_k^2 - R^2 \right).$$

Then $\frac{\partial L}{\partial r_4} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial r_5} = 0$ means that $r_4 = r_5 = 0$; and $\frac{\partial L}{\partial r_6} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial r_7} = 0$ means that

$$\lambda = 3, r_6 = 0, r_7 = \pm R \quad \text{or} \quad \lambda = 1, r_6 = \pm R, r_7 = 0.$$

For $\lambda = 3$ and $(r_4, r_5, r_6, r_7) = (0, 0, 0, \pm R)$ and

$$(r_1(\epsilon), r_2(\epsilon), r_3(\epsilon), r_8(\epsilon)) = \left(0, 0, \frac{-\sqrt{3} - \epsilon\sqrt{3 - 4R^2}}{4}, \frac{-1 + \epsilon\sqrt{3(3 - 4R^2)}}{4} \right),$$

and thus

$$\langle \mathbf{r}(\epsilon) | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r}(\epsilon) \rangle = -\frac{3R^2 + 1}{2} \quad \forall \epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}.$$

We get that

$$\min_{R \in (0, \sqrt{3}/2]} \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{J}_R} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -\max_{R \in (0, \sqrt{3}/2]} \frac{3R^2 + 1}{2} = -\frac{13}{8}$$

which is attained at $R = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$. That is, $\min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_3} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -\frac{13}{8}$.

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\ell_{a,b} &= \min \left\{ \min_{r \in \mathcal{I}_1} \langle r | T_{a,b} | r \rangle, \min_{r \in \mathcal{I}_2} \langle r | T_{a,b} | r \rangle, \min_{r \in \mathcal{I}_3} \langle r | T_{a,b} | r \rangle \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}, -2, -\frac{13}{8} \right\} = -2\end{aligned}$$

Now $m_{A,B} = \frac{2}{3}(1+1-2) = 0$ is attained at the qutrit state

$$\rho(r) = \frac{1}{3}(\mathbb{1} + \sqrt{3}r \cdot \mathbf{G}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$r = \left(0, 0, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, 0, 0, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

Example 5.6. For given two qutrit observables

$$A = G_4 \quad \text{and} \quad B = G_6,$$

we have that [39]

$$\min_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^3)} [\text{Var}_\rho(A) + \text{Var}_\rho(B)] = \frac{7}{16}.$$

Indeed, we rewrite $A = a \cdot \mathbf{G}$ and $B = b \cdot \mathbf{G}$, where

$$a = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0), \quad b = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0).$$

Then

$$T_{a,b} = -D_8 - 2O_{a,b} = \text{diag} \left(-1, -1, -1, -\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \right).$$

- $\min_{r \in \mathcal{I}_1} \langle r | T_{a,b} | r \rangle = 1$
- $\min_{r \in \mathcal{I}_2} \langle r | T_{a,b} | r \rangle = -\frac{1}{2}$. Indeed, for $r \in \mathcal{I}_2$, we see that $\langle r | T_{a,b} | r \rangle = \frac{1}{4} - (r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2) = -\frac{1}{2}$.
- $\min_{r \in \mathcal{I}_3} \langle r | T_{a,b} | r \rangle = -\frac{43}{32}$. In fact, for $r \in \mathcal{I}_3$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle r | T_{a,b} | r \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} [4(r_8^2 - r_4^2 - r_6^2) - 2(r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 + r_8^2) + (r_4^2 + r_5^2 + r_6^2 + r_7^2)] \\ &= 2(r_8^2 - r_4^2 - r_6^2) + \frac{-2(1 - R^2) + R^2}{2} \\ &= 2(r_8^2 - r_4^2 - r_6^2) + \left(\frac{3}{2}R^2 - 1 \right).\end{aligned}$$

Note that $r_8 = \frac{-1+\epsilon\sqrt{3(3-4R^2)}}{4}$. We have $\langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -2(r_4^2 + r_6^2) + \frac{1-\epsilon\sqrt{3(3-4R^2)}}{4}$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{J}_R(\epsilon)} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle &= -2 \max_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{J}_R(\epsilon)} (r_4^2 + r_6^2) + \frac{1-\epsilon\sqrt{3(3-4R^2)}}{4} \\ &= -2R^2 + \frac{1-\epsilon\sqrt{3(3-4R^2)}}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality, we used the fact that $r_4^2 + r_6^2 + r_5^2 + r_7^2 = R^2$ and $\max_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{J}_R(\epsilon)} (r_4^2 + r_6^2) = R^2$ only if $(r_5, r_7) = (0, 0)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_3} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle &= \min_{R \in (0, \sqrt{3}/2]} \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{J}_R} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle \\ &= \min_{R \in (0, \sqrt{3}/2]} \left[-2R^2 + \frac{1-\sqrt{3(3-4R^2)}}{4} \right] = -\frac{43}{32}, \end{aligned}$$

which is attained at $R = \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{8}$.

From the above discussion, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{a,b} &= \min \left\{ \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_1} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle, \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_2} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle, \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_3} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ 1, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{43}{32} \right\} = -\frac{43}{32}, \end{aligned}$$

from which we obtain that

$$m_{A,B} = \frac{2}{3} (|\mathbf{a}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2 + \ell_{a,b}) = \frac{7}{16}.$$

In this situation, we present the specific form of qutrit state saturating the lower bound in the additive uncertainty relation $\text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{G}_4) + \text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{G}_6) \geq \frac{7}{16}$:

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{3}(\mathbb{1} + \sqrt{3}\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G}) = \frac{1}{16} \begin{pmatrix} 5(1+2\cos(2t)) & 5\sin(2t) & 2\sqrt{15}\cos t \\ 5\sin(2t) & 5(1-2\cos(2t)) & 2\sqrt{15}\sin t \\ 2\sqrt{15}\cos t & 2\sqrt{15}\sin t & 6 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.26)$$

where

$$\mathbf{r} = \left(\frac{5\sqrt{3}}{16}\sin(2t), 0, \frac{5\sqrt{3}}{8}\cos(2t), \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{8}\cos t, 0, \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{8}\sin t, 0, -\frac{1}{16} \right).$$

Example 5.7. Choose the angular momentum operators [40, 41, 42]

$$L_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad L_y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad L_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $L_x = \frac{G_1+G_6}{\sqrt{2}}$, $L_y = \frac{G_2+G_7}{\sqrt{2}}$, and $L_z = \frac{G_3+\sqrt{3}G_8}{2}$. We have that

$$\min_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^3)} [\text{Var}_\rho(L_x) + \text{Var}_\rho(L_y) + \text{Var}_\rho(L_z)] = 1.$$

Indeed, we can rewrite them as

$$L_x = \mathbf{a}_x \cdot \mathbf{G}, \quad L_y = \mathbf{a}_y \cdot \mathbf{G}, \quad L_z = \mathbf{a}_z \cdot \mathbf{G},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_x &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, 0, 0, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, 0 \right), \\ \mathbf{a}_y &= \left(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, 0, 0, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0 \right), \\ \mathbf{a}_z &= \left(0, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, 0, 0, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then $T_{x,y,z} = -2(|\mathbf{a}_x\rangle\langle\mathbf{a}_x| + |\mathbf{a}_y\rangle\langle\mathbf{a}_y| + |\mathbf{a}_z\rangle\langle\mathbf{a}_z|)$, that is,

$$T_{x,y,z} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{3}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now

$$\langle \mathbf{r} | T_{x,y,z} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \left[2(r_1 + r_6)^2 + 2(r_2 + r_7)^2 + (r_3 + \sqrt{3}r_8)^2 \right]. \quad (5.27)$$

Thus

- $\min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_1} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{x,y,z} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -\frac{3}{2}$.
- $\min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_2} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{x,y,z} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -\frac{3}{2}$. Indeed, for $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_2$, $\langle \mathbf{r} | T_{x,y,z} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -(r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2) + \frac{4r_3^2 - 4\sqrt{3}r_3 - 3}{8} = \frac{4r_3^2 - 4\sqrt{3}r_3 - 9}{8}$. Again, using spherical coordinate, let $r_3 = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \cos \theta$, and we see that

$$\min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_2} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{x,y,z} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -\frac{3}{2},$$

which is attained at $r_3 = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$.

- Let $\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{3-4R^2}\epsilon}{4R^2}$ and $\beta = \frac{-1+\epsilon\sqrt{3(3-4R^2)}}{4}$. For $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_3$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{x,y,z} | \mathbf{r} \rangle &= \frac{r_3^2}{2} - \sqrt{3}r_8r_3 - r_6^2 - r_7^2 - 2r_1r_6 - 2r_2r_7 - \frac{r_8^2}{2} - (r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 + r_8^2) \\ &= \frac{r_3^2}{2} - \sqrt{3}r_8r_3 - r_6^2 - r_7^2 - 2r_1r_6 - 2r_2r_7 - \frac{r_8^2}{2} + R^2 - 1.\end{aligned}$$

For the Lagrange multiplier function $L = \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{x,y,z} | \mathbf{r} \rangle - \lambda \left(\sum_{k=4}^7 r_k^2 - R^2 \right)$, the vanishing gradient $\nabla L = \mathbf{0}$ means that

$$\begin{aligned}2\lambda r_4 &= -2\sqrt{3}\alpha\beta r_4 - 4\alpha r_6^2 + 4\alpha r_7^2 + 2\alpha^2 r_4(R^2 - 2r_6^2 - 2r_7^2), \\ 2\lambda r_5 &= 4\alpha^2 r_4 r_5, \\ 2\lambda r_6 &= 0, \\ 2\lambda r_7 &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

- If $\lambda \neq 0$, then $r_6 = r_7 = 0$. Thus $(2\lambda - 1)r_4 = 0$ and $(\lambda - 2\alpha^2 r_4)r_5 = 0$. So $r_4 \neq 0$ by $r_4^2 + r_5^2 = R^2$. Otherwise $r_4 = 0$ leads $r_5 = 0$, a contradiction. Then $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$. If $r_5 \neq 0$, then $r_4 = \frac{1}{4\alpha^2}$ and $r_5^2 = R^2 - r_4^2 = R^2 - \frac{1}{16\alpha^4}$; if $r_5 = 0$, then $r_4 = \pm R$. Thus $\langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{x,y,z} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2(r_4^2 + r_5^2)^2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha\beta(r_4^2 + r_5^2) + R^2 - 1$, and

$$\inf_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_3} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{x,y,z} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = \inf_{0 < R \leq \sqrt{3}/2} \frac{4R^2 - 3}{2} = -\frac{3}{2}.$$

- If $\lambda = 0$, then $r_4 r_5 = 0$. For $r_4 = 0$, then it must have $r_6 = r_7 = 0$, thus $r_5 = \pm R$. For $r_5 = 0$,

$$r_4 = \frac{(\sqrt{3} - \epsilon\sqrt{3-4R^2})(r_6^2 - r_7^2)}{\left(\frac{\sqrt{3} - \epsilon\sqrt{3-4R^2}}{2}\right)^2 - (r_6^2 + r_7^2)} = \frac{\frac{1}{\alpha}(r_6^2 - r_7^2)}{\frac{1}{4\alpha^2} - (r_6^2 + r_7^2)},$$

together with $r_6^2 + r_7^2 = R^2 - r_4^2$, we get that

$$r_6^2 - r_7^2 = \alpha r_4 \left(r_4^2 + \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} - R^2 \right)$$

implying that

$$\begin{aligned}r_6^2 &= \frac{4\alpha^2 r_4^3 - 4\alpha r_4^2 - 4\alpha^2 R^2 r_4 + r_4 + 4\alpha R^2}{8\alpha}, \\ r_7^2 &= \frac{-4\alpha^2 r_4^3 - 4\alpha r_4^2 + 4\alpha^2 R^2 r_4 - r_4 + 4\alpha R^2}{8\alpha}.\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{J}_R} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{x,y,z} | \mathbf{r} \rangle &= \min_{r_4 \in [-R, R]} \frac{4r_4^2 R^4 + r_4^4(-\sqrt{9-12R^2}\epsilon + 2R^2 - 3) + R^4(\sqrt{9-12R^2}\epsilon - 2R^2 - 3)}{4R^4} \\ &= -R^2,\end{aligned}$$

if $r_4^2 = \frac{2R^4}{3-2R^2+\epsilon\sqrt{3(3-4R^2)}}$, which leads to the following result

$$\min_{r \in \mathcal{I}_3} \langle r | T_{x,y,z} | r \rangle = - \max_{0 < R \leq \sqrt{3}/2} R^2 = -\frac{3}{4}.$$

Therefore $\ell_{x,y,z} = \min\{-\frac{3}{2}, -\frac{3}{4}\} = -\frac{3}{2}$. Then $m_{L_x, L_y, L_z} = \frac{2}{3} (1 + 1 + 1 - \frac{3}{2}) = 1$.

Proposition 5.8. For Gell-Mann matrices, denote

$$m_{ij} := \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^3)} [\text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{G}_i) + \text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{G}_j)], \quad (1 \leq i < j \leq 8). \quad (5.28)$$

It holds that all non-vanishing ones of $\binom{8}{2} = 28$ constants are given below:

$$m_{14} = m_{15} = m_{16} = m_{17} = m_{24} = m_{25} = m_{26} = m_{27} = m_{46} = m_{47} = m_{56} = m_{57} = \frac{7}{16}.$$

Proof. The proof goes similarly for the calculation performed in Example 5.6. \square

Example 5.9. For given two qutrit observables

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & i \\ 0 & -i & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

we have that

$$\min_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^3)} [\text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{A}) + \text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{B})] = \frac{15}{32}.$$

Indeed, we rewrite $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{G}$ and

$$\mathbf{a} = \left(0, 0, -\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, 0, 0, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right), \quad \mathbf{b} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0).$$

Then $T_{a,b} = -\sqrt{3}D_5 - 2O_{a,b}$, which is equal to

$$T_{a,b} = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{3}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & -\frac{3}{2} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{3}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ 0 & -\frac{3}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{3}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now the spectrum of $T_{a,b}$ is given by $\{-\frac{5}{2}, -2, -\sqrt{3}, (-\frac{3}{2})_{(2)}, 0, \frac{3}{2}, \sqrt{3}\}$ and

$$\langle r | T_{a,b} | r \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left(-4r_1^2 - r_3^2 - 4r_7^2 - 3r_8^2 + 2r_1r_7 - 6r_3r_5 - 6r_2r_6 - 2\sqrt{3}r_3r_8 + 2\sqrt{3}r_5r_8 \right).$$

Note

$$\langle \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \star \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle - 2 \left(\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 + \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r} \rangle^2 \right) = - \left[\sqrt{3}r_5 + 2(r_1 - r_7)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(r_3 + \sqrt{3}r_8)^2 \right] \quad (5.29)$$

In fact, we can identify $\ell_{a,b} = \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_3^{\text{ext}}} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{T}_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle = -\frac{147}{64}$ by using the method from [21]. In this situation, we present the specific form of qutrit state saturating the lower bound in the additive uncertainty relation $\text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{A}) + \text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{B}) \geq \frac{15}{32}$, where such inequality is saturated only when $\rho(\epsilon) = |\psi(\epsilon)\rangle\langle\psi(\epsilon)|$, where

$$|\psi(\epsilon)\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{14}}{8}i|0\rangle + \epsilon\frac{3}{4}i|1\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{14}}{8}|2\rangle, \quad \epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}. \quad (5.30)$$

We can rewrite it as the generalized Bloch representation:

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{3}(\mathbb{1} + \sqrt{3}\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{G}) = \frac{1}{32} \begin{pmatrix} 7 & 3\sqrt{14}\epsilon & 7i \\ 3\sqrt{14}\epsilon & 18 & 3\sqrt{14}i\epsilon \\ -7i & -3\sqrt{14}i\epsilon & 7 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.31)$$

where

$$\mathbf{r} = \left(\frac{6\sqrt{42}}{64}\epsilon, 0, -\frac{11\sqrt{3}}{64}, 0, -\frac{14\sqrt{3}}{64}, 0, -\frac{6\sqrt{42}}{64}\epsilon, \frac{11}{64} \right). \quad (5.32)$$

This example can be further generalized to the case where

$$\mathbf{A}_t = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & t \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ t & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & i \\ 0 & -i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\forall t \in \mathbb{R}),$$

then we have $\min_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^3)} [\text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{A}_t) + \text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{B})] = h(t)$, where

$$h(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{(15-t^2)(1+t^2)}{32}, & \text{if } |t| \leq 1, \\ \frac{3+4t^2}{4(1+t^2)}, & \text{if } |t| \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.33)$$

Example 5.10. For given two qutrit observables

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & -i \\ 1 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -i \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ i & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

by using the method in [21], we have that

$$\min_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^3)} [\text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{A}) + \text{Var}_\rho(\mathbf{B})] = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f(x),$$

where

$$f(x) := -\frac{2}{3}(40x^2 - 52x + 31)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sin \left[\frac{\pi}{6} + \frac{1}{3} \arccos \left(-\frac{4x^3 - 186x^2 + 192x - 23}{(40x^2 - 52x + 31)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \right] + \frac{1}{3}(3x^2 - 2x + 13).$$

In fact, $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f(x) \doteq 0.427938$, which is attained at $x \doteq -1.34253$. Note that the extremal qutrit state is approximately given by

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} 0.14742387711339922 & 0.28637384163565377i & -0.20899784782884737 \\ -0.28637384163565377i & 0.5562869379027389 & 0.4059825161855749i \\ -0.20899784782884737 & -0.4059825161855749i & 0.2962891849838617 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The above computation can be also checked by our algorithm presented in Appendix B.

6 Discussions

In section 3, we established the equivalence between the state-independent uncertainty relation expressed as the sum of variances and the quadratic programming problem with nonlinear constraints. Leveraging this equivalence, we conducted detailed computations involving specific observables in sections 4 and 5. Using qubit and qutrit systems as illustrative examples, we derived tight lower bounds for the sum of variances of observables.

Having explored the theoretical underpinnings of our uncertainty relation, we now shift our focus to its practical implications. In particular, we consider the potential application of the additive uncertainty relation to entanglement detection. Previously, the use of variance for entanglement detection has been proposed in [24, 43, 44]. Drawing on our main results, we can provide a similar method to detect entanglement, which offers a novel approach to tackle this important problem in quantum information theory. Specifically, let us suppose A_i are any observables acting on \mathbb{C}^m and B_i are any observables acting on \mathbb{C}^n . First we consider the observables $M_i = A_i \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes B_i (i = 1, 2)$. For any *separable* bipartite state ρ in $D(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_\rho(M_1) + \text{Var}_\rho(M_2) &\geq \min_{\sigma} [\text{Var}_\sigma(A_1) + \text{Var}_\sigma(A_2)] + \min_{\tau} [\text{Var}_\tau(B_1) + \text{Var}_\tau(B_2)] \\ &= m(A_1, A_2) + m(B_1, B_2). \end{aligned}$$

So if some bipartite state ϱ is such that

$$\text{Var}_\varrho(M_1) + \text{Var}_\varrho(M_2) < m(A_1, A_2) + m(B_1, B_2), \quad (6.1)$$

then ϱ must be *entangled*. The additive uncertainty relation gives rise to an entanglement criterion [20]. Second, for any bipartite state $\omega \in D(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$, if it satisfies that

$$\text{Var}_{\omega^\Gamma}(A) + \text{Var}_{\omega^\Gamma}(B) < \min_{\rho \in D(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)} [\text{Var}_\rho(A) + \text{Var}_\rho(B)] = m(A, B) \quad (6.2)$$

for both bipartite observables A and B , where ω^Γ stands for the partial-transpose with respect to either one subsystem, then ω must not be positive partial-transposed state, i.e., it must be entangled state by PPT criterion [45]. This provides another way to detect entanglement.

For further applications of our approach to entanglement detection, we need to generate random quantum states to test the criteria Eq. (6.1) and Eq. (6.2). The theoretical analysis becomes increasingly challenging due to the exponential growth of parameters in quantum states with the expansion of the underlying space's dimension, coupled with the absence of a closed-form solution for the quadratic programming problem involving nonlinear constraints in Remark 3.3. In our future research, we intend to report the numerical results pertaining to this aspect.

7 Concluding remarks

We conclude this paper by summarizing our findings and highlighting future research directions:

Firstly, we have thoroughly investigated the additive uncertainty relation of any two or more observables in qudit systems, specifically focusing on variance using the generalized Gell-Mann representation. To establish a tight state-independent lower bound, we have constructed a universal optimization model aimed at minimizing the sum of matrix variances. This model is firmly grounded in constrained quadratic programming and the constrained numerical range of real symmetric matrices, derived from the generators of $SU(n)$ and generalized Bloch vectors of observables.

Secondly, our exploration extended to lower-dimensional qubit and qutrit systems. In the qubit realm, we derived an analytical lower bound for the additive uncertainty relation applicable to any two or more observables. For qutrit systems, we developed a general algorithm to compute the analytical lower bound for pairs of observables, complementing this with illustrative examples and numerical computations.

Thirdly, we discussed the potential application of the additive uncertainty relation in entanglement detection, emphasizing its experimental feasibility. We anticipate that our results will facilitate experimental implementations in this context.

Looking ahead, we identify two key problems for future research:

- Characterizing both endpoints of the constrained numerical range of T mentioned in Remark 3.3. Specifically, determining under what conditions these endpoints correspond to the minimal and maximal eigenvalues, $\lambda_{\min}(T)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(T)$, respectively, of T . This problem carries significant implications for matrix optimizations and could pave the way for the development of more efficient quantum algorithms.
- For any bipartite entangled state ρ , it remains an intriguing challenge to find two observ-

ables A and B whose sum of variances, $\text{Var}_\varrho(A) + \text{Var}_\varrho(B)$, can nonlinearly witness entanglement in ϱ in the manner described previously. Addressing this challenge could lead to new insights and techniques for entanglement detection in quantum systems.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. LZ23A010005, and by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Grants No. 11971140 and No. 12171044. The first author would like to express his gratitude to Prof. Jing-Ling Chen for his insightful comments on this manuscript, and also to Prof. Hua Xiang for his improved algorithm outlined in Appendix B.

References

- [1] W. Heisenberg, Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik, Z. Phys. [43](#), 172-198 (1927).
- [2] H.P. Robertson, The Uncertainty Principle, Phys. Rev. [34](#), 163 (1929).
- [3] S. Friedland, V. Gheorghiu, G. Gour, Universal Uncertainty Relations, Phys. Rev. Lett. [111](#), 230401 (2013).
- [4] Z. Puchała, L. Rudnicki, K. Życzkowski, Majorization entropic uncertainty relations, J. Phys. A : Math. Theor. [46](#), 272002 (2013).
- [5] D. Deutsch, Uncertainty in Quantum Measurements, Phys. Rev. Lett. [50](#), 631 (1983).
- [6] S. Wu, S. Yu, K. Mølmer, Entropic uncertainty relation for mutually unbiased bases, Phys. Rev. A [79](#), 022104 (2009).
- [7] P.J. Coles, M. Berta, M. Tomamichel, S. Wehner, Entropic uncertainty relations and their applications, Rev. Math. Phys. [89](#), 015002 (2017).
- [8] H. Maassen and J.B.M. Uffink, Generalized Entropic Uncertainty Relations, Phys. Rev. Lett. [60](#), 1103 (1988).
- [9] J.M. Renes, J.C. Boileau, Conjectured strong complementary information tradeoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. [103](#), 020402 (2009).
- [10] G. Gour, A. Grudka, M. Horodecki, W. Kłobus, J. Lodyga, V. Narasimhachar, Conditional uncertainty principle, Phys. Rev. A [97](#), 042130 (2018).

- [11] D. Kurzyk, L. Pawela, Z. Puchała, Conditional entropic uncertainty relations for Tsallis entropies, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **17**, 193 (2018).
- [12] A. Grudka, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, W. Kłobus, L. Pankowski, Conjectured strong complementary-correlations tradeoff, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 032106 (2013).
- [13] M. Tomamichel, R. Renner, Uncertainty Relation for Smooth Entropies, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 110506 (2011).
- [14] G. Vallone, D.G. Marangon, M. Tomasin, P. Villoresi, Quantum randomness certified by the uncertainty principle, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 052327 (2014).
- [15] Z. Cao, H. Zhou, X. Yuan, X. Ma, Source-Independent Quantum Random Number Generation, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 011020 (2016).
- [16] M. Berta, P.J. Coles, S. Wehner, Entanglement-assisted guessing of complementary measurement outcomes, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 062127 (2014).
- [17] S.P. Walborn, A. Salles, R.M. Gomes, F. Toscano, P.H.S. Ribeiro, Revealing Hidden Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Nonlocality, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 130402 (2011).
- [18] J. Schneeloch, C.J. Broadbent, S.P. Walborn, E.G. Cavalcanti, J.C. Howell, Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering inequalities from entropic uncertainty relations, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 062103 (2013).
- [19] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, L. Maccone, Advances in quantum metrology, *Nat. Photon.* **5**, 222 (2011).
- [20] L. Zhang, S. Luo, S-M. Fei, and J. Wu, Uncertainty regions of observables and state-independent uncertainty relations, *Quant. Inf Process* **20**: 357 (2021).
- [21] K. Szymański and Karol Życzkowski, Geometric and algebraic origins of additive uncertainty relations, *J. Phys. A : Math. Theor.* **53**, 015302 (2019).
- [22] R. Schowonnek, L. Dammeier, and R.F. Werner, State-Independent Uncertainty Relations and Entanglement Detection in Noisy Systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 170404 (2017).
- [23] Y-Y. Zhao, G-Y. Xiang, X-M. Hu, B-H. Liu, C-F. Li, G-C. Guo, R. Schowonnek, and R. Wolf, Entanglement Detection by Violations of Noisy Uncertainty Relations: A Proof of Principle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 220401 (2019).
- [24] O. Gühne, Characterizing entanglement via uncertainty relations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 117903 (2004).

- [25] Y. Akbari-Kourbolagh and M. Azhdargalam, Entanglement criterion for tripartite systems based on local sum uncertainty relations, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 042333 (2018).
- [26] L. Maccone and A.K. Pati, Stronger Uncertainty Relations for All Incompatible Observables, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 260401 (2014); Erratum **114**, 039902 (2015)
- [27] J-L. Li, C-F. Qiao, Reformulating the quantum uncertainty relation, *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 12708 (2015).
- [28] C. Qian, J-L. Li, and C-F. Qiao, State-independent uncertainty relations and entanglement detection, *Quant Inf Process* **17**, 84 (2018).
- [29] Y. Xiao C. Guo, F. Meng, , N. Jing, and M-H. Yung, Incompatibility of observables as state-independent bound of uncertainty relations, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 032118 (2019).
- [30] M.S. Byrd and N. Khaneja, Characterization of the positivity of the density matrices in terms of the coherence vector representation, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 062322 (2003).
- [31] G. Kimura, The Bloch vector for N -level systems, *Phys. Lett. A* **314**, 339-349 (2003).
- [32] E.R. Loubenets and M. Kulakov, The Bloch vectors formalism for a finite-dimensional quantum system, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **54**, 195301 (2021).
- [33] J. Nocedal and S.J. Wright, *Numerical optimization* (2nd Ed), Springer (2006).
- [34] M.J. Best, *Quadratic Programming With Computer Programs*, CRC Press (2017).
- [35] Z. Dostál, *Optimal Quadratic Programming Algorithms*, Springer (2009).
- [36] Arvind, K.S. Mallesh and N. Mukunda, A generalized Pancharatnam geometric phase formula for three-level quantum systems, *J. Phys. A : Math. Gen.* **30**, 2417 (1997).
- [37] E. Ercolessi, G. Marmo, and G. Morandi, Geometry of mixed states and degeneracy structure of geometric phases for multi-level quantum systems. A unitary group approach, *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **16**(31), 5007 (2001).
- [38] S.K. Goyal, B.N. Simon, R. Singh, and S. Simon, Geometry of the generalized Bloch sphere for qutrits, *J. Phys. A : Math. Theor.* **49**, 165203 (2016).
- [39] P. Kurzyński, A. Kołodziejcki, W. Laskowski, and M. Markiewicz, Three-dimensional visualization of a qutrit, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 062126 (2016).
- [40] L-M. Zhang, T. Gao, and L. Yan, Tighter uncertainty relations based on Wigner-Yanase skew information for observables and channels, *Phys. Lett. A* **387**, 127029 (2021).

- [41] G. Tóth and F. Fröwis, Uncertainty relations with the variance and the quantum Fisher information based on convex decompositions of density matrices, *Phys. Rev. Research* **4**, 013075 (2022).
- [42] S-H. Chiew and M. Gessner, Improving sum uncertainty relations with the quantum Fisher information, *Phys. Rev. Research* **4**, 013076 (2022).
- [43] H.F. Hofmann, S. Takeuchi, Violation of local uncertainty relations as a signature of entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 032103 (2003).
- [44] G. Tóth, Entanglement detection in optical lattices of bosonic atoms with collective measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 052327 (2004).
- [45] A. Peres, Separability criterion for density matrices, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1413 (1996).

Appendices

A Specific forms of all D_k 's in qutrit system

In the following, each $D_k (k = 1, \dots, 8)$ mentioned in Proposition 5.1 is an 8×8 real symmetric matrix that is given immediately.

$$D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, D_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$D_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, D_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$D_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, D_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$D_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, D_8 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

B Algorithm for calculating $\ell_{a,b}$ in Theorem 3.1

Algorithm 1: The minimum of $\langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle$ where $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_3^{\text{ext}}$

Input: a and b in \mathbb{R}^8

Output: $\ell_{a,b} = \min_{\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_3^{\text{ext}}} \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle$ and $\mathbf{r}_{\min} = \arg \ell_{a,b}$

01. Form $T_{a,b}$ by using the matrices $D_k (k = 1, 2, \dots, 8)$, given in Appendix A, and $O_{a,b} = |a\rangle\langle a| + |b\rangle\langle b|$.
02. Set $\mathbf{r} = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1)$ and compute $f_{\min} = \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle$, $\mathbf{r}_{\min} = \mathbf{r}$.
03. Repeatedly sample three normally distributed random numbers and perform the following three steps:
 04. Assign these numbers to r_1, r_2, r_3 respectively, such that $\sum_{j=1}^3 r_j^2 = \frac{3}{4}$;
 05. Set $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, r_2, r_3, 0, 0, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2})$ and compute $f(\mathbf{r}) = \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle$;
 06. If $f(\mathbf{r}) < f_{\min}$, then $f_{\min} = f(\mathbf{r})$, $\mathbf{r}_{\min} = \mathbf{r}$.
07. For $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$, Do
 08. Set $R = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2N}k$, where $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ is equally divided into N portions.
 09. Repeatedly sample four normally distributed random numbers and perform the following eight steps:
 10. Assign these numbers to r_4, r_5, r_6, r_7 respectively, such that $\sum_{j=4}^7 r_j^2 = R^2$;
 11. $s = \frac{\sqrt{3} + \epsilon \sqrt{3 - 4R^2}}{2R^2}$, where $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$;
 12. $r_1 = s(r_4 r_6 + r_5 r_7)$;
 13. $r_2 = s(r_5 r_6 - r_4 r_7)$;
 14. $r_3 = \frac{1}{2}s(r_4^2 + r_5^2 - r_6^2 - r_7^2)$;
 15. $r_8 = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}sR^2 - 1$;
 16. Set $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_8)$ and compute $f(\mathbf{r}) = \langle \mathbf{r} | T_{a,b} | \mathbf{r} \rangle$;
 17. If $f(\mathbf{r}) < f_{\min}$, then $f_{\min} = f(\mathbf{r})$, $\mathbf{r}_{\min} = \mathbf{r}$.
 18. Endfor
 19. $\ell_{a,b} = f_{\min}$.
