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In previous work the authors introduced a notion of generic states and obtained criteria for local equivalence of them. Here they introduce the concept of CHG states maintaining the criteria of local equivalence. This fact allows the authors to halve the number of invariants necessary to characterize the equivalence classes under local unitary transformations for the set of tripartite states whose partial trace with respect to one of the subsystems belongs to the class of CHG mixed states.

Keywords: tripartite quantum states, local unitary transformations, en-

[^0]tanglement, invariants
In the paper [1] we exploited the equivalence criterion for the members of a class of bipartite mixed states constructed in [2, 3] to write an equivalence criterion for the members of a class of pure tripartite states. In this Addendum we show how the conditions assumed in [2, 3, 1] can be relaxed.

We first consider (mixed) states on a bipartite system $H_{A} \otimes H_{B}$, where $H_{A}$ and $H_{B}$ are finite dimensional Hilbert spaces of dimension $N_{A}$ and $N_{B}$, respectively. Let $\rho$ be a density matrix defined on $H_{A} \otimes H_{B}$ with $\operatorname{rank}(\rho)=n \leq N^{2}$, where $N=\min \left\{N_{A}, N_{B}\right\} . \rho$ can be decomposed according to its eigenvalues and eigenvectors:

$$
\rho=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i}\left|\varphi_{i}\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_{i}\right|,
$$

where $\lambda_{i}$ resp. $\left|\varphi_{i}\right\rangle, i=1, \ldots, n$, are the nonzero eigenvalues resp. eigenvectors of the density matrix $\rho .\left|\varphi_{i}\right\rangle$ has the form

$$
\left|\varphi_{i}\right\rangle=\sum_{k=1}^{N_{A}} \sum_{l=1}^{N_{B}} a_{k l}^{i}\left|e_{k}\right\rangle \otimes\left|f_{l}\right\rangle, \quad a_{k l}^{i} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{N_{A}} \sum_{l=1}^{N_{B}} a_{k l}^{i} a_{k l}^{i *}=1, \quad i=1, \ldots, n,
$$

where $\left\{\left|e_{i}\right\rangle\right\}_{i=1}^{N_{A}}$ and $\left\{\left|f_{i}\right\rangle\right\}_{i=1}^{N_{B}}$ are orthonormal bases in $\mathcal{H}_{A}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{B}$, respectively, and ${ }^{*}$ means complex conjugation. Let $A_{i}$ denote the matrix given by $\left(A_{i}\right)_{k l}=a_{k l}^{i}$. We introduce $\left\{\rho_{i}\right\},\left\{\theta_{i}\right\}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{i}=\operatorname{Tr}_{B}\left|\varphi_{i}\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_{i}\right|=A_{i} A_{i}^{\dagger}, \quad \theta_{i}=\left(\operatorname{Tr}_{A}\left|\varphi_{i}\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_{i}\right|\right)^{*}=A_{i}^{\dagger} A_{i}, \quad i=1, \ldots, n \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with ${ }^{\dagger}$ denoting adjoint. $T r_{A}$ and $T r_{B}$ stand for the traces over the first and second Hilbert spaces respectively, and therefore, $\rho_{i}$ and $\theta_{i}$ can be regarded as reduced density matrices. Let $\Omega(\rho)$ and $\Theta(\rho)$ be two "metric tensor" matrices, with entries given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Omega(\rho)_{i j}=\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_{i} \rho_{j}\right), \quad \Theta(\rho)_{i j}=\operatorname{Tr}\left(\theta_{i} \theta_{j}\right), \quad \text { for } i, j=1, \ldots, n, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\Omega(\rho)_{i j}=\Theta(\rho)_{i j}=0, \quad \text { for } N^{2} \geq i, j>n .
$$

In [3] a mixed state $\rho$ is called generic if the corresponding "metric tensor" matrices $\Omega$ and $\Theta$ satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{det}(\Omega(\rho)) \neq 0 \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{det}(\Theta(\rho)) \neq 0 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We shall say here that a mixed state $\rho$ is high generic if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{det}(\Omega(\rho)) \neq 0 \quad \text { or } \quad \operatorname{det}(\Theta(\rho)) \neq 0 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we add conditions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\rho_{i}, \rho_{j}\right]=0, \quad\left[\theta_{i}, \theta_{j}\right]=0 \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\rho_{i}$ is a full rank matrix. We call a mixed state is a comm-high generic or $C H G$ state if it is a high generic one and also satisfy the above two conditions. Condition (5) assures that $A_{i} A_{i}^{\dagger}$ and $A_{i}^{\dagger} A_{i}$ have common eigenvectors.

Similarly we also introduce trilinear expressions $X(\rho)$ and $Y(\rho)$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
X(\rho)_{i j k}=\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_{i} \rho_{j} \rho_{k}\right), \quad Y(\rho)_{i j k}=\operatorname{Tr}\left(\theta_{i} \theta_{j} \theta_{k}\right), \quad i, j, k=1, \ldots, n \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proposition 1. Two CHG density matrices with non-degenerate $\Omega$ (or non-degenerate $\Theta$ ) are equivalent under local unitary transformations if and only if there exists an ordering of the corresponding eigenstates such that the following invariants have the same values for both density matrices:

$$
\begin{align*}
& J^{s}(\rho)=\operatorname{Tr}_{B}\left(\operatorname{Tr}_{A} \rho^{s}\right), \quad s=1, \ldots, n \\
& \Omega(\rho), X(\rho) \quad(\operatorname{or} \Theta(\rho), Y(\rho)) \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof: In [2] it was proved that two generic states such that $\Omega$ and $\Theta$ are both non-degenerate are equivalent under local unitary transformations if and only if there exists an ordering of the corresponding eigenstates such that the invariants $J^{s}(\rho), s=1, \ldots, n, \Omega(\rho), \Theta(\rho), X(\rho)$, and $Y(\rho)$ take the same values for both density matrices. In particular (see [2, eq.(14)] or [3, eq.(15)]), from the conditions $\Omega(\rho)$ non-degenerate, $\Omega(\rho)=\Omega\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)$, and $X(\rho)=X\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)$ follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{i}^{\prime}=u \rho_{i} u^{\dagger}, \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $u \in \mathcal{U}_{A}$, where $\mathcal{U}_{A}$ denotes the space of all unitary matrices on $\mathcal{H}_{A}$. So we have $A_{i}^{\prime} A_{i}^{\prime \dagger}=u A_{i} A_{i}^{\dagger} u^{\dagger}$. Thus $A_{i}$ and $A_{i}^{\prime}$ have the same singular
values. The Singular value decomposition of matrices (see, e.g., (4) and (5) assure the existence of unitary matrices $U, V, U^{\prime}, V^{\prime}$ such that

$$
U A_{i} V=\operatorname{diag}\left(s_{1}\left(A_{i}\right), \cdots, s_{n}\left(A_{i}\right)\right), \quad U^{\prime} A_{i}^{\prime} V^{\prime}=\operatorname{diag}\left(s_{1}\left(A_{i}^{\prime}\right), \cdots, s_{n}\left(A_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right)
$$

where $s_{j}\left(A_{i}\right)$ and $s_{j}\left(A_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ represent the $j$-th singular value of $A_{i}$ and $A_{i}^{\prime}$, respectively, and diag means the principal diagonal (of a non necessarily diagonal matrix). Because of $s_{j}\left(A_{i}^{\prime}\right)=s_{j}\left(A_{i}\right)$ for all $i$, we have $A_{i}^{\prime}=u_{1} A_{i} w_{1}$, and $\left|\varphi_{i}^{\prime}\right\rangle=u_{1} \otimes w_{1}\left|\varphi_{i}\right\rangle, i=1, \ldots, n$, where $u_{1}=U^{\prime \dagger} U, w_{1}=V^{\prime *} V^{T}$.

From the genericity condition $\Theta(\rho)$ non-degenerate, and from $\Theta(\rho)=$ $\Theta\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)$ and $Y_{i j k}(\rho)=Y_{i j k}\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)$ we can similarly deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\theta_{i}^{\prime}=w^{\dagger} \theta_{i} w \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $w \in \mathcal{U}_{B}$. Again from the Singular value decomposition of matrices, we have $\left|\varphi_{i}^{\prime}\right\rangle=u \otimes w\left|\varphi_{i}\right\rangle, i=1, \ldots, N^{2}$, and $\rho^{\prime}=u \otimes w \rho u^{\dagger} \otimes w^{\dagger}$. Hence $\rho^{\prime}$ and $\rho$ are equivalent under local unitary transformations: the common $u$ and $v$ for different $\left|\varphi_{i}\right\rangle$ 's can be obtained in two ways, either from the condition $\Omega(\rho)$ non-degenerate, $\Omega(\rho)=\Omega\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)$ and $X_{i j k}(\rho)=X_{i j k}\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)$, or from $\Theta(\rho)$ non-degenerate, $\Theta(\rho)=\Theta\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)$ and $Y_{i j k}(\rho)=Y_{i j k}\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)$. Therefore, it is sufficient to consider only $\Omega(\rho)$ and $X(\rho)$ (or $\Theta(\rho)$ and $Y(\rho)$ ).

Consider now tripartite pure states of a system $H_{A} \otimes H_{B} \otimes H_{C}$, where $H_{i}, i \in\{A, B, C\}$, is a finite dimensional Hilbert space of dimension $N_{i}$. By using the results of Proposition [1, Proposition 2 in [1] can be rewritten as follows.

Proposition 2. Let $|\psi\rangle$ and $\left|\psi^{\prime}\right\rangle$ be two pure states of $\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C}$ and assume that $\rho=\operatorname{Tr}_{A}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ is a CHG mixed state. $|\psi\rangle$ is equivalent to $\left|\psi^{\prime}\right\rangle$ under local unitary transformations if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{\alpha, \beta}^{A, s}(|\psi\rangle)=I_{\alpha, \beta}^{A, s}\left(\left|\psi^{\prime}\right\rangle\right) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $s \in\{B, C\}, \alpha=1, \ldots, \min \left\{N_{B}^{2}, N_{C}^{2}\right\}, \beta=1, \ldots, N_{r}$, where $r \in\{B, C\}$ but is different from $s$, and for $\rho^{\prime}=\operatorname{Tr}_{A}\left(\left|\psi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi^{\prime}\right|\right)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Omega(\rho)_{j k}=\Omega\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)_{j k}, \quad X(\rho)_{j k l}=X\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)_{j k l}, \\
& \left(\text { or } \Theta(\rho)_{j k}=\Theta\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)_{j k}, \quad Y(\rho)_{j k l}=Y\left(\rho^{\prime}\right)_{j k l}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

for the $j, k$ such that $\lambda_{j}=\lambda_{k}$.

The weaker conditions allow us to halve the number of invariants to consider, as compared to the statements of [1].
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