

THE G -STABLE RANK FOR TENSORS

HARM DERKSEN

ABSTRACT. We introduce the G -stable rank of a higher order tensors over perfect fields. The G -stable rank is related to the Hilbert-Mumford criterion for stability in Geometric Invariant Theory. We will relate the G -stable rank to the tensor rank and slice rank. For numerical applications, we express the G -stable rank as a solution to an optimization problem. Over the field \mathbb{F}_3 we discuss an application to the Cap Set Problem.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The G -stable rank and the Hilbert-Mumford criterion	5
3. Results on the G -stable rank	11
4. The stable T -rank	14
5. G -stable rank over \mathbb{C}	18
6. Application of the G -stable rank to the Cap Set Problem	21
7. Conclusion and further directions	23
References	23

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Ranks of tensors.** We will introduce the G -stable rank for tensors, describe its properties and relate it to other notions for the rank of a tensor, such as the *tensor rank*, *border rank*, *slice rank* and *non-commutative rank*. Suppose that K is a field, V_1, V_2, \dots, V_d are finite dimensional K -vector spaces and $V = V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \dots \otimes V_d$ is the tensor product. All tensor products are assumed to be over the field K unless stated otherwise. The definition of tensor rank goes back to Hitchcock [19, 20]:

Definition 1.1. The rank $\text{rk}(v)$ of a tensor $v \in V$ is the smallest nonnegative integer r such that we can write $v = \sum_{i=1}^r v_{i,1} \otimes v_{i,2} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i,d}$ with $v_{i,j} \in V_j$ for all i and j .

There are many applications of the tensor rank and the related concept of CP-decomposition (see [2] for a survey). For $d = 2$, tensor rank coincides with matrix rank. Computing the tensor rank is NP-hard [16, 17], and tensor rank is ill-behaved. For example, the set $X(\text{rk}, r) \subseteq V$ of all tensors of rank $\leq r$ is not always Zariski closed. The *border rank* $\text{brk}(v)$ of a tensor v is the smallest positive integer r such that $v \in X(\text{rk}, r)$ (see [6, 26]). The *slice rank* of a tensor was introduced by Terence Tao (see [4, 34]).

The author was supported by NSF grant IIS 1837985.

Definition 1.2. A non-zero tensor $v \in V$ has slice rank 1 if it is contained in

$$V_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{i-1} \otimes w \otimes V_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes V_d$$

for some i and some $w \in V_i$. The slice rank $\text{srk}(v)$ of an arbitrary tensor $v \in V$ is the smallest nonnegative integer r such that v is the sum of r tensors with slice rank 1.

1.2. The definition of the G -stable rank. We will now define the G -stable rank. It was noted in [4] that the slice-rank is closely related the notion of stability in Geometric Invariant Theory (see [28]). The authors also introduce the *instability* of a tensor and relate it to the slice rank. The instability of a tensor does not behave like a rank function, but it is closely related to the G -stable rank. We will define the G -stable rank in terms of degenerations and power series. It can also be defined in terms 1-parameter subgroup using the Hilbert-Mumford criterion in Geometric Invariant Theory (see Theorem 2.4). The Hilbert-Mumford criterion is often formulated when working over an algebraically closed field K . Kempf showed in [22] that the Hilbert-Mumford criterion still applies when working of a perfect field K . For this reason, we will assume that K is a perfect field for the remainder of the paper.

To define the G -stable rank, we need to introduce the ring $K[[t]]$ of formal power series in t and its quotient field $K((t))$ of formal Laurent series. The t -valuation of a series $a(t) \in K((t))$ is the smallest integer d such that $a(t) = t^d b(t)$ with $b(t) \in K[[t]]$. By convention, $\text{val}_t(0) = \infty$. If W is a K -vector space and $v(t) \in K((t)) \otimes W$ then we define

$$\text{val}_t(v(t)) = \min\{d \mid v(t) = t^d w(t) \text{ and } w(t) \in K[[t]] \otimes W\}.$$

We say that $v(t)$ has no poles when $\text{val}_t(v(t)) \geq 0$, which is equivalent to $v(t) \in K[[t]] \otimes W$. In that case we say that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} v(t)$ exists, and is equal to $v(0) \in W$.

The group $\text{GL}(W, K((t)))$ will denote the group of $K((t))$ -linear endomorphisms of the space $K((t)) \otimes_K W$. We may view $\text{GL}(W, K((t)))$ as a subset of $K((t)) \otimes_K \text{End}(W)$. If $W = K^n$ then $K((t)) \otimes_K W \cong K((t))^n$ and we can identify $\text{GL}(W, K((t)))$ with the set of $n \times n$ matrices with entries in the field $K((t))$. If $R \subseteq K((t))$ is a K -subalgebra of $K((t))$ (such as $R = K[[t]]$, $R = K[t, t^{-1}]$ or $R = K[t]$), then $\text{GL}(W, R)$ is the intersection of $\text{GL}(W, K((t)))$ with $R \otimes_K \text{End}(W)$ in $K((t)) \otimes_K \text{End}(W)$. Note that the inverse of an element in $\text{GL}(W, R)$ lies in $\text{GL}(W, K((t)))$, but not necessarily in $\text{GL}(W, R)$. If $W = K^n$, then $\text{GL}(W, R)$ is the set of $n \times n$ matrices with entries in R that, viewed as a matrix with entries in $K((t))$, are invertible.

We consider the action of the group $G = \text{GL}(V_1) \times \text{GL}(V_2) \times \cdots \times \text{GL}(V_d)$ on the tensor product space $V = V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_d$. For any K -subalgebra $R \subseteq K((t))$, we define

$$G(R) = \text{GL}(V_1, R) \times \cdots \times \text{GL}(V_d, R).$$

The group $G(K((t)))$ acts on $K((t)) \otimes V$.

For any weight $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ we will have a notion of G -stable rank, but the case $\alpha = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ will be of particular interest. Suppose that $g(t) \in G(K[[t]])$, $v \in V$ and $\text{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v) > 0$. We consider the slope

$$(1) \quad \mu_\alpha(g(t), v) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \text{val}_t(\det g_i(t))}{\text{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v)}.$$

Heuristically, the denominator in the slope measures how fast $g(t) \cdot v$ goes to 0 as $t \rightarrow 0$. The numerator measures how fast the eigenvalues of $g_1(t), g_2(t), \dots, g_d(t)$ go to 0 as $t \rightarrow 0$.

A small slope means that v is very unstable in the sense that $g(t) \cdot v$ goes to 0 quickly, while, on average, the eigenvalues of $g_i(t)$ go to 0 slowly.

Definition 1.3. The G -stable α -rank $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v)$ of v as the infimum of all $\mu_\alpha(g(t), v)$ where $g(t) \in G(K[[t]])$ and $\text{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v) > 0$. If $\alpha = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, then we may write rk^G instead of rk_α^G .

Using a K -rational version of the Hilbert-Mumford ([18, 28]) criterion by Kempf [22], we will show that for computing the G -stable α -rank, one only has to consider $g(t)$ that are 1-parameter subgroups of G without poles (Theorem 2.4). In this context, $g(t) \in G(K[[t]])$ is a 1-parameter subgroup if for every i we can choose a basis of V_i such that the matrix of $g(t)$ is diagonal and each diagonal entry of that matrix is a nonnegative power of t .

We denote the standard basis vectors in K^n by $[1], [2], \dots, [n]$, and we abbreviate a tensor $[i_1] \otimes [i_2] \otimes \dots \otimes [i_d]$ by $[i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d]$.

Example 1.4. Suppose that $V_1 = V_2 = V_3 = K^2$, and $v = [2, 1, 1] + [1, 2, 1] + [1, 1, 2]$. We take $g(t) = (g_1(t), g_2(t), g_3(t))$ with

$$g_1(t) = g_2(t) = g_3(t) = \begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have $g(t) \cdot v = t^2 v$, $\det(g_i(t)) = t$, and

$$\mu(g(t), v) = \mu_{(1,1,1)}(g(t), v) = \frac{\text{val}_t(\det g_1(t)) + \text{val}_t(\det g_2(t)) + \text{val}_t(\det g_3(t))}{\text{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v)} = \frac{1+1+1}{2} = \frac{3}{2}.$$

This shows that $\text{rk}^G(v) \leq \frac{3}{2}$. One can show that $\text{rk}^G(v) = \frac{3}{2}$ (see Example 1.5 and Example 4.5).

1.3. Properties of the G -stable rank. If v is a rank 1 tensor, then we have $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) = \min\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d\}$ and $\text{rk}^G(v) = 1$ (Lemma 3.1). The G -stable rank is related to other notions of rank. We have (see Corollary 3.7 and Proposition 4.9)

$$\frac{2 \text{srk}(v)}{d} \leq \text{rk}^G(v) \leq \text{srk}(v) \leq \text{brk}(v) \leq \text{rk}(v).$$

This implies that for $d = 2$, the G -stable rank, the slice rank and the matrix rank coincide.

The tensor rank depends on the field one is working over. For example, the tensor $[1, 1, 1] - [1, 2, 2] - [2, 1, 2] - [2, 2, 1]$ has rank 3 as a tensor in $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2 \times 2}$ but rank 2 when viewed as a tensor in $\mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2 \times 2}$. Although it is not clear from the definition, the G -stable rank does not change when passing to a field extension of K (see Theorem 2.5).

Another nice property of the G -stable rank is that the border rank phenomenon does not happen and the set $X(\text{rk}_\alpha^G, r)$ of all tensors v with $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \leq r$ is Zariski closed (Theorem 2.11). Tao proved a similar result for the slice rank [33], and this implies that $\text{srk}(v) \leq \text{brk}(v)$ for all tensors v .

Like other rank notions, the G -stable rank satisfies the triangle inequality: $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v + w) \leq \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) + \text{rk}_\alpha^G(w)$ (see Proposition 3.6). If $v \in V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \dots \otimes V_d$ and $w \in W_1 \otimes W_2 \otimes \dots \otimes W_d$ then the direct sum of v and w , viewed as

$$\begin{pmatrix} v \\ w \end{pmatrix} \in \begin{array}{c} V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \dots \otimes V_d \\ \oplus \\ W_1 \otimes W_2 \otimes \dots \otimes W_d \end{array} \subseteq V \boxplus W := \begin{pmatrix} V_1 \\ \oplus \\ W_1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} V_2 \\ \oplus \\ W_2 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \dots \otimes \begin{pmatrix} V_d \\ \oplus \\ W_d \end{pmatrix}$$

will be denoted by $v \boxplus w$. (We will use the notation $v \boxplus w$ and $V \boxplus W$ rather than the more common notation $v \oplus w$ and $V \oplus W$ to emphasize that this direct sum is a “vertical” operation, i.e., the sum $V_i \oplus W_i$ is taken within each tensor factor.) The G -stable rank is additive (Proposition 3.8): $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v \boxplus w) = \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) + \text{rk}_\alpha^G(w)$. In particular, if

$$\begin{aligned} v &= [1, 1, \dots, 1] + [2, 2, \dots, 2] + \dots + [r, r, \dots, r] = \\ &= \underbrace{[1, 1, \dots, 1] \boxplus [1, 1, \dots, 1] \boxplus \dots \boxplus [1, 1, \dots, 1]}_r \in \underbrace{K^r \otimes K^r \otimes \dots \otimes K^r}_d, \end{aligned}$$

then $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) = r \text{rk}_\alpha^G([1, 1, \dots, 1]) = r \min\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d\}$ and $\text{rk}^G(v) = r$. Strassen conjectured in [32] that tensor rank is additive when K is infinite, but Shitov recently gave a counterexample to this long standing conjecture (see [29]).

If $v \in V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \dots \otimes V_d$ and $w \in W_1 \otimes W_2 \otimes \dots \otimes W_e$, then we can form the “horizontal” tensor product $v \otimes w \in V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_d \otimes W_1 \otimes \dots \otimes W_e$. It is clear that $\text{rk}(v \otimes w) \leq \text{rk}(v) \text{rk}(w)$. It was recently shown in [8] that we do not always have equality. The G -stable rank behaves quite differently for the horizontal tensor product. We have $\text{rk}_{\alpha, \beta}^G(v \otimes w) = \min\{\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v), \text{rk}_\beta^G(w)\}$ (see Proposition 3.4). If $d = e$ then there is another way of forming a tensor product. The tensor product $v \otimes w$ viewed as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} v & V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \dots \otimes V_d & \\ \otimes \in & \otimes & \subseteq \begin{pmatrix} V_1 \\ \otimes \\ W_1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} V_2 \\ \otimes \\ W_2 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \dots \otimes \begin{pmatrix} V_d \\ \otimes \\ W_d \end{pmatrix} \\ w & W_1 \otimes W_2 \otimes \dots \otimes W_d & \end{array}$$

will be denoted by $v \boxtimes w$. We will refer to this operation as a *vertical* tensor product or a *Kronecker* tensor product. It is clear that $\text{rk}(v \boxtimes w) \leq \text{rk}(v \otimes w)$. It has long been known that $\text{rk}(v \boxtimes w)$ can be smaller than $\text{rk}(v) \text{rk}(w)$. For example, if $v_1 = [1, 1, 1] + [2, 2, 1]$, $v_2 = [1, 1, 1] + [2, 1, 2]$ and $v_3 = [1, 1, 1] + [2, 2, 1]$ then $v_1 \boxtimes v_2 \boxtimes v_3$ is the matrix multiplication tensor for 2×2 matrices which has rank 7 ([31]), so $7 = \text{rk}(v_1 \boxtimes v_2 \boxtimes v_3) < \text{rk}(v_1) \text{rk}(v_2) \text{rk}(v_3) = 2^3$. If K has characteristic 0, then we have $\text{rk}_{\alpha, \beta}^G(v \boxtimes w) \geq \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \text{rk}_\beta^G(w)$ (Theorem 5.4). We conjecture that this inequality is also true when K is a perfect field of positive characteristic. The slice rank does not behave as nicely with respect to vertical tensor product and $\text{srk}(v \boxtimes w)$ could be larger or smaller than $\text{srk}(v) \text{srk}(w)$ (see [9, Example 5.2]).

1.4. G -stable rank for complex tensors. If $K = \mathbb{C}$, then the G -stable rank can be computed in a different way. For a finite dimensional complex Hilbert space, we will denote the Hermitian form by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the ℓ_2 norm (or Frobenius norm) by $\|v\| = \sqrt{\langle v, v \rangle}$. Suppose that V_1, V_2, \dots, V_d are finite dimensional Hilbert spaces, which makes V into a Hilbert space. If A is a linear map between finite dimensional Hilbert spaces, then its spectral norm $\|A\|_\sigma$ is the operator norm $\|A\|_\sigma = \max_{v \neq 0} \frac{\|Av\|}{\|v\|}$, which is also the largest singular value of A .

For a tensor $v \in V$, let $\Phi_i(v) : (V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \widehat{V}_i \otimes \dots \otimes V_d)^* \rightarrow V_i$ be the i -th flattening. Then the G -stable α -rank of a tensor $v \in V$ is equal to

$$(2) \quad \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) = \sup_{g \in G} \min_i \frac{\alpha_i \|g \cdot v\|^2}{\|\Phi_i(g \cdot v)\|_\sigma^2}$$

(see Theorem 5.2).

Example 1.5. Consider again the example $v = [2, 1, 1] + [1, 2, 1] + [1, 1, 2] \in K^{2 \times 2 \times 2}$ as in Example 1.4, but now we will work over $K = \mathbb{C}$. We have $\|v\| = \sqrt{3}$. The first flattening of v is equal to

$$\Phi_1(v) = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)$$

which has singular values 1 and $\sqrt{2}$. So $\|\Phi_1(v)\|_\sigma = \sqrt{2}$. By symmetry, we also have $\|\Phi_2(v)\|_\sigma = \|\Phi_3(v)\|_\sigma = \sqrt{2}$. It follows that

$$\text{rk}^G(v) = \sup_{g \in G} \min_i \frac{\|g \cdot v\|^2}{\|\Phi_i(g \cdot v)\|_\sigma^2} \geq \min_i \frac{\|v\|^2}{\|\Phi_i(v)\|_\sigma^2} = \frac{3}{2}.$$

1.5. The Cap Set Problem. We say that a subset S of an abelian group A does not contain an arithmetic progression (of length 3) if there are no distinct elements $x, y, z \in S$ with $x + z = 2y$. For an abelian group A , let $r_3(A)$ be the largest cardinality of a subset $S \subseteq A$ without an arithmetic progression. Finding upper and lower bounds for $r_3(A)$ has been studied extensively in number theory. For the group $A = (\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})^n \cong \mathbb{F}_3^n$ this is known as the Cap Set Problem. Brown and Buhler [5] showed that $r_3(\mathbb{F}_3^n) = o(3^n)$ and this was later improved to $r_3(\mathbb{F}_3^n) = O(3^n/n)$ by Meshulam [27] and to $o(3^n/n^{1+\varepsilon})$ by Bateman and Katz [3]. Using the polynomial method of Croot, Lev and Pach [11], who showed that $r_3((\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^n) = o(c^n)$ for some $c < 4$, Ellenberg and Gijswijt showed in [13] that $r_3(\mathbb{F}_3^n) \leq 3\theta^n = o(2.756^n)$, where $\theta < 2.756$. We also have a lower bound $r_3(\mathbb{F}_3^n) = \omega(2.21^n)$ by Edel. The bound (and the proof) of Ellenberg and Gijswijt is also valid for tri-colored sum-free sets for which an asymptotic lower bound $\omega(\theta^n)$ was given by Kleinberg, Sawin and Speyer [24]. So for tri-colored sum-free sets, the upper and lower bound have the same exponential growth.

Tao noted that the Ellenberg-Gijswijt proof can be nicely presented using the concept of slice rank. A key idea is to prove the inequality $r_3(\mathbb{F}_3^n) \leq \text{srk}(u^{\boxtimes n})$ where

$$u = \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \in \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} \\ i+j+k=0}} [i, j, k] \in \mathbb{F}_3^{3 \times 3 \times 3}$$

and to combine this with asymptotic estimates for the slice rank. We will show that $r_3(\mathbb{F}_3^n) \leq \text{rk}^G(u^{\boxtimes n}) \leq \text{srk}(u^{\boxtimes n})$. Using the G -stable rank, we get better upper bounds for the cardinality of a cap set (or a tri-colored sum-free set). Below is a table of the upper bounds we get for $n \leq 20$.

n	upper bound	n	upper bound	n	upper bound	n	upper bound
1	2	6	274	11	37477	16	5235597
2	6	7	722	12	100296	17	14316784
3	15	8	1957	13	266997	18	38685141
4	39	9	5193	14	728661	19	103504935
5	105	10	13770	15	1961103	20	283466139

2. THE G -STABLE RANK AND THE HILBERT-MUMFORD CRITERION

2.1. The Hilbert-Mumford criterion. We will discuss the K -rational version of the Hilbert-Mumford criterion by Kempf [22]. We remind the reader that the base field K is assumed to be perfect. Suppose that G is a connected reductive algebraic group over a

field K , X is a separated K -scheme of finite type and $G \times X \rightarrow X$ is a G -action that is also a morphism of schemes over K . The multiplicative group is defined as $\mathbb{G}_m = \text{Spec } K[t, t^{-1}]$. A 1-parameter subgroup of G is a homomorphism $\lambda : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow G$ of algebraic groups. We say that this 1-parameter subgroup of G is K -rational if the homomorphism is a morphism of algebraic varieties defined over K . In the case where K is finite, we caution the reader that the set $G(K)$ of K rational points in G is finite and may not be Zariski dense in the algebraic group G . If $x \in X(K)$ is a K -rational point of X , then $G \cdot x$ denotes a subscheme of X which is not necessarily Zariski closed (even if $G(K)$ is finite). The Zariski closure $\overline{G \cdot x}$ is a closed subscheme of X .

Theorem 2.1 ([22, Corollary 4.3]). *Suppose that $x \in X(K)$ is a K -rational point, $S \subseteq X$ is a G -invariant closed subscheme of X such that $\overline{G \cdot x} \cap S \neq \emptyset$, Then there exists a K -rational 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow G$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot x = y$ for some $y \in S(K)$.*

In our situation, $X = V$ is a K -vector space which is a representation of G , and $S = \{0\}$. A vector $v \in V$ is called G -semi-stable if $\overline{G \cdot v}$ does not contain 0. Now Theorem 2.1 implies:

Corollary 2.2. *If G is a connected reductive algebraic group, $v \in V$ and $0 \in \overline{G \cdot v}$ then there exists a K -rational 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow G$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot v = 0$.*

A 1-parameter subgroup of GL_n is of the form

$$\lambda(t) = C \begin{pmatrix} t^{x(1)} & & & \\ & t^{x(2)} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & t^{x(n)} \end{pmatrix} C^{-1}$$

with $C \in \text{GL}_n$ and $x(1), x(2), \dots, x(n) \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular, we can view λ as an element of $\text{GL}_n(K[t, t^{-1}])$ where $K[t, t^{-1}] \subseteq K((t))$ is the ring of Laurent polynomials. If $v = (v_1 \ v_2 \ \dots \ v_n)^t \in K^n$ then $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot v = 0$ if for all i , we have $v_i = 0$ or $x(i) > 0$. We will take $V = V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \dots \otimes V_d$ and $G = \text{GL}(V_1) \times \text{GL}(V_2) \times \dots \times \text{GL}(V_d)$. A 1-parameter subgroup of G is of the form $(\lambda_1(t), \lambda_2(t), \dots, \lambda_d(t))$ where $\lambda_i(t) : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \text{GL}(V_i)$ is a 1-parameter subgroup for all i .

For an integer vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we define a homomorphism of algebraic groups $\det^\alpha : G \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m$ by $(A_1, \dots, A_d) \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^d \det(A_i)^{\alpha_i}$. This homomorphism corresponds to a 1-dimensional representation of G , which we will also denote by \det^α . We will now relate the G -stable rank to semi-stability in Geometric Invariant Theory.

Proposition 2.3. *Suppose that $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^d$, p is a nonnegative integer and q is a positive integer with $q\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. We define a representation W by*

$$W = (V^{\otimes p} \otimes \det^{-q\beta}) \oplus V_1^{n_1} \oplus V_2^{n_2} \oplus \dots \oplus V_d^{n_d}.$$

and choose $u_i \in V_i^{n_i} \cong K^{n_i \times n_i}$ of maximal rank n_i for every i . Then we have $\text{rk}_\beta^G(v) \geq \frac{p}{q}$ if and only if $w = (v^{\otimes p} \otimes 1, u_1, \dots, u_d)$ is G -semi-stable.

Proof. Suppose that $\text{rk}_\beta^G(v) < \frac{p}{q}$. Then there exists $g(t) = (g_1(t), \dots, g_d(t)) \in G(K[[t]])$ with

$$\text{val}_t(g(t) \cdot (v^{\otimes p} \otimes 1)) = p \text{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v) - \sum_{i=1}^d q\beta_i \text{val}_t(g_i(t)) > 0.$$

The limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t) \cdot w = (0, g(0) \cdot u) = (0, g(0) \cdot u_1, \dots, g(0) \cdot u_d)$ lies in the closure of the orbit $G \cdot w$. Since 0 lies in the orbit closure of $(0, g(0) \cdot u)$, it also lies in the orbit closure of w . We conclude that w is not G -semistable.

Now suppose that w is not G -semistable. By the Hilbert-Mumford criterion, there exists a 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t) = (\lambda_1(t), \dots, \lambda_d(t)) \in G(K[t, t^{-1}])$ of G such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot w = 0$. This implies that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda_i(t) \cdot u_i = 0$. Since u_i has maximal rank, we get $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda_i(t) = 0$ and $\lambda_i(t) \in \text{GL}(V_i, K[t])$. So we have $\lambda(t) \in G(K[t]) \subseteq G(K[[t]])$. We also get

$$0 < \text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot (v^{\otimes p} \otimes 1)) = p \text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot v) - \sum_{i=1}^d q \beta_i \text{val}_t(\lambda_i(t))$$

and therefore

$$\mu_\beta^G(v) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \beta_i \text{val}_t(\lambda_i(t))}{\text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot v)} < \frac{p}{q}.$$

We conclude that $\text{rk}_\beta^G(v) < \frac{p}{q}$. □

Theorem 2.4. *If $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$, then the G -stable rank $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v)$ is the infimum of $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v)$ where $\lambda(t) \in G(K[t])$ is a 1-parameter subgroup of G and $\text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot v) > 0$.*

Proof. Assume that $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) < r$ for some rational number r . There exists a $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^d$ with $\beta - \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ and $\text{rk}_\beta^G(v) < r$. We can write $r = \frac{p}{q}$ where p and q are positive integers such that $q\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. By Proposition 2.3, w is not G -semistable and from the proof of Proposition 2.3 follow that there exists a 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t) \in G(K[t])$ such that $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v) \leq \mu_\beta(\lambda(t), v) < r$. This shows that even if $\lambda(t) \in G(K[t])$ is a 1-parameter subgroup of G , $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v)$ can get arbitrarily close to $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v)$. □

2.2. The relation between G -stable rank and SL-stability. First we prove that the G -stable rank does not change when we extend the field.

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that $v \in V = V_1 \otimes_K V_2 \otimes_K \dots \otimes_K V_d$ where V_1, V_2, \dots, V_d are finite dimensional K -vector spaces, and $\bar{v} = 1 \otimes v \in \bar{V} = L \otimes_K V \cong \bar{V}_1 \otimes_L \bar{V}_2 \otimes_L \dots \otimes_L \bar{V}_d$ with $\bar{V}_i = L \otimes_K V_i$ for all i . Then we have $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) = \text{rk}_\alpha^G(\bar{v})$. In other words, the G -stable rank does not change under base field extension.*

Proof. If $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^d$ then we can follow the set up in Proposition 2.3, where $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p \geq 0$, $q > 0$ and $q\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We choose $u_i \in V_i^{n_i}$ invertible for all i , and define

$$w = (v^{\otimes p} \otimes 1, u_1, \dots, u_d) \in W = (V^{\otimes p} \otimes_K \det^{-q\beta}) \oplus V_1^{n_1} \oplus V_2^{n_2} \oplus \dots \oplus V_d^{n_d}.$$

Using the base field extension, we get

$$\bar{w} = (\bar{v} \otimes 1, \bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_d) \in L \otimes_K W = \left(\bar{V}^{\otimes p} \otimes_L \det^{-q\beta} \right) \oplus \bar{V}_1^{n_1} \oplus \bar{V}_2^{n_2} \oplus \dots \oplus \bar{V}_d^{n_d}.$$

Now G -semistability does not change after base field extension. So w is G -semistable if and only if \bar{w} is G -semistable. So we have

$$\text{rk}_\beta^G(w) \geq \frac{p}{q} \Leftrightarrow w \text{ is } G\text{-semistable} \Leftrightarrow \bar{w} \text{ is } G\text{-semi-stable} \Leftrightarrow \text{rk}_\beta^G(\bar{w}) \geq \frac{p}{q}.$$

This proves that $\text{rk}_\beta^G(w) = \text{rk}_\beta^G(\bar{w})$. Since $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(w)$ is the supremum of $\text{rk}_\beta^G(w)$ over all $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^d$ with $\beta \leq \alpha$, we also get $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(w) = \text{rk}_\alpha^G(\bar{w})$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$. □

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose that $\alpha = (\frac{1}{n_1}, \frac{1}{n_2}, \dots, \frac{1}{n_d})$ where $n_i = \dim V_i$. For $v \in V = V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \dots \otimes V_d$ we have $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \leq 1$. Moreover, $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) = 1$ if and only if v is semi-stable with respect to the group $H = \text{SL}(V_1) \times \text{SL}(V_2) \times \dots \times \text{SL}(V_d)$.*

Proof. The inequality $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \leq 1$ is obvious. Suppose that $v \in V$ is not H -semi-stable. Then there exists a 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t) = (\lambda_1(t), \dots, \lambda_d(t)) : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow H$ with $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot v = 0$. We can choose c_1, c_2, \dots, c_d such that $\lambda'(t) = (t^{c_1} \lambda_1(t), \dots, t^{c_d} \lambda_d(t)) \in G(K[t])$. Note that $\det(t^{c_i} \lambda_i(t)) = \det(t^{c_i} I_{n_i}) \det(\lambda_i(t)) = t^{c_i n_i}$. Now we have $\text{val}_t(\lambda'(t) \cdot v) = s + c_1 + c_2 + \dots + c_d$ and

$$\mu(\lambda'(t), v) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{n_i} \text{val}_t(\det(t^{c_i} \lambda_i(t)))}{\text{val}_t(\lambda'(t) \cdot v)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d c_i}{s + \sum_{i=1}^d c_i} < 1.$$

This proves that $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) < 1$.

Conversely, suppose that $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) < 1$. Choose a polynomial 1-parameter subgroup of G such that $\text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot v) = s > 0$ and $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v) < 1$. Let $c_i = \text{val}_t(\det \lambda_i(t))$. Then we have $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v) = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{c_i}{n_i} < s$. After replacing t by t^k for some positive integer k we may assume that $\frac{c_i}{n_i} \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all i . Let $\lambda'(t) = (t^{-c_1/n_1} \lambda_1(t), t^{-c_2/n_2} \lambda_2(t), \dots, t^{-c_d/n_d} \lambda_d(t))$. Then $\lambda'(t)$ is a 1-parameter subgroup of H and $\text{val}_t(\lambda'(t) \cdot v) = s - \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{c_i}{n_i} > 0$, so $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda'(t) \cdot v = 0$. This shows that v is H -unstable. \square

2.3. The G -stable rank and the non-commutative rank. The non-commutative rank is defined as the rank of $A(t) = t_1 A_1 + t_2 A_2 + \dots + t_m A_m$ where t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m are variables in the free skew field $R = K \langle t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m \rangle$ and $A(t)$ is viewed as a $p \times q$ matrix with entries in R (see [10, 14] for more on free skew fields). We will use the following equivalent definition (see [14]):

Definition 2.7. Suppose that A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m are $p \times q$ matrices. Then the non-commutative rank $\text{ncrk}(A)$ of $A = (A_1, \dots, A_m)$ is equal to the maximal value of

$$q + \dim \sum_{i=1}^m A_i(W) - \dim W$$

over all subspaces $W \subseteq K^q$.

It was shown in [21] that the non-commutative rank of A is also equal to maximum of

$$\frac{\text{rk}(\sum_{i=1}^m T_i \boxtimes A_i)}{d}$$

where d is a positive integer, T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m are $d \times d$ matrices, and \boxtimes is the Kronecker product of two matrices (so $T_i \boxtimes A_i$ is a $dp \times dq$ -matrix).

The non-commutative rank relates to stability. If A is an m -tuple of $n \times n$ matrices (i.e., $p = q = n$) then $\text{ncrk}(A) = n$ if and only if A is semi-stable with respect to the simultaneous left-right action of $\text{SL}_n \times \text{SL}_n$ on m -tuples of matrices (see [21]).

We can relate the non-commutative and G -stable rank as follows. First, we will view the m -tuple $A = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m)$ as a tensor. Using a linear isomorphism $K^p \otimes K^q \cong K^{p \times q}$, we can view A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m as tensors in $K^p \otimes K^q$. The m -tuple $A = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m)$ corresponds to a tensor $T_A = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \otimes [i] \in K^p \otimes K^q \otimes K^m$.

Lemma 2.8. *The non-commutative rank is the smallest value of $r + s$ for which there exist linearly independent vectors $v_1, \dots, v_r \in K^p$ and linearly independent vectors $w_1, \dots, w_s \in K^q$ with*

$$(3) \quad T_A \in \sum_{i=1}^r v_i \otimes K^q \otimes K^m + \sum_{j=1}^s K^p \otimes w_j \otimes K^m.$$

Proof. If (3) holds, then take W to be the $(q - s)$ -dimensional space perpendicular to the vectors w_1, w_2, \dots, w_s . The space $A_i(W)$ is contained in the span of v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r . So the non-commutative rank is at most $q + r - (q - s) = r + s$.

We show that $r + s$ can be equal to $\text{ncrk}(A)$. Suppose that $k = \text{ncrk}(A)$. For some s there exists an subspace $V \subseteq K^p$ with $k = q + \dim V - \dim W$, where $V = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i(W)$. Choose a basis w_1, w_2, \dots, w_s of the space orthogonal to W . Then we have $s = q - \dim W$. Also choose a basis v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r of V . Now (3) holds and $r + s = q - \dim W + \dim V = k$. \square

The following proposition shows that the non-commutative rank can be seen as a special case of the G -stable rank.

Proposition 2.9. *For $\alpha = (1, 1, \ell)$ and $\ell \geq \min\{p, q\}$ we have $\text{ncrk}(A) = \text{rk}_\alpha^G(T_A)$.*

Proof. Let $k = \text{ncrk}(A)$. Then we have

$$T_A \in \sum_{i=1}^r v_i \otimes K^q \otimes K^m + \sum_{j=1}^s K^p \otimes w_j \otimes K^m.$$

for some r and s with $r + s = k$ and vectors $v_1, \dots, v_r, w_1, \dots, w_s$. We extend v_1, \dots, v_r to a basis v_1, \dots, v_p and extend w_1, \dots, w_s to a basis w_1, \dots, w_q . We define a 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t) = (\lambda_1(t), \lambda_2(t), \lambda_3(t))$ in $G = \text{GL}_p \times \text{GL}_q \times \text{GL}_m$ by $\lambda_1(t) \cdot v_i = tv_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$, $\lambda_1(t) \cdot v_i = v_i$ for $i = r + 1, r + 2, \dots, p$, $\lambda_2(t) \cdot w_j = tw_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, s$, $\lambda_2(t) \cdot w_j = w_j$ for $j = s + 1, s + 2, \dots, q$ and $\lambda_3(t)$ is just the identity. Then we have $\text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot T_A) = 1$, $\det(\lambda_1(t)) = t^r$, $\det(\lambda_2(t)) = t^s$, $\det(\lambda_3(t)) = 1$ and

$$\text{rk}_\alpha^G(T_A) \leq \mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), T_A) = \frac{1 \cdot r + 1 \cdot s + \ell \cdot 0}{1} = k = \text{ncrk}(A).$$

On the other hand, let $h = \text{rk}_\alpha^G(T_A)$ and suppose that $\lambda(t) \in G$ is a 1-parameter subgroup with $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), T_A) = h$. If $h = \min\{p, q\}$ then clearly $\text{ncrk}(A) \leq h$, so we assume that $h < \min\{p, q\}$. Suppose $\ell \geq p$ (the case $\ell \geq q$ will go similarly). If $\det(\lambda_3(t)) = t^e$ then we can define another 1-parameter subgroup $\rho(t) = (\rho_1(t), \rho_2(t), \rho_3(t))$ by $\rho_1(t) = t^e \lambda_1(t)$, $\rho_2(t) = \lambda_2(t)$ and $\rho_3(t) = I$. Then $\text{val}_t(\rho(t) \cdot T_A) \geq \text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot T_A)$, and we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\alpha(\rho(t), T_A) &= \frac{\text{val}_t(\det \rho_1(t)) + \text{val}_t(\det \rho_2(t)) + \ell \text{val}_t(\det \rho_3(t))}{\text{val}_t(\rho(t) \cdot T_A)} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{pe + \text{val}_t(\det \lambda_1(t)) + \text{val}_t(\det \lambda_2(t))}{\text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot T_A)} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{\text{val}_t(\det \lambda_1(t)) + \text{val}_t(\det \lambda_2(t)) + \ell \text{val}_t(\det \lambda_3(t))}{\text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot T_A)} = \mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), T_A) \end{aligned}$$

because $\ell \geq p$ and $\text{val}_t(\det \lambda_3(t)) = e$. We can replace $\lambda(t)$ by $\rho(t)$ and without loss of generality we may assume that $\lambda_3(t) = I$.

Let $d := \text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot T_A)$. After base changes, we have

$$\lambda(t) = \begin{pmatrix} t^{x(1)} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & t^{x(p)} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \rho(t) = \begin{pmatrix} t^{y(1)} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & t^{y(q)} \end{pmatrix}$$

From

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{h+1} (x(i) + y(h+2-i))}{d} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^p x(i) + \sum_{j=1}^q y(j)}{d} = \mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), T_A) = h$$

follows that $x(r+1) + y(s+1) \leq \frac{hd}{k+1} < hd$ for some r, s with $r+s = h$. If a basis vector $[i, j, k] = [i] \otimes [j] \otimes [k]$ appears in T_A then $x(i) + y(j) \geq dk$ and therefore $i \leq r$ or $j \leq s$. This means that

$$T_A \in \sum_{i=1}^r [i] \otimes K^q \otimes K^m + \sum_{j=1}^s K^p \otimes [j] \otimes K^m$$

and $\text{ncrk}(T_A) \leq r + s = h = \text{rk}_\alpha^G(T_A)$. □

2.4. Semi-continuity of the G -stable rank. We will show that the G -stable rank is semi-continuous, which means that for every r , the set of all tensors with G -stable rank $\leq r$ is Zariski closed.

Let us for the moment fix a 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t)$ of G . We can choose bases in the vector spaces V_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ such that the matrix of $\lambda_i(t)$ is diagonal, with diagonal entries $t^{x(i,1)}, t^{x(i,2)}, \dots, t^{x(i,n_i)}$ where $x(i,1) \geq x(i,2) \geq \dots \geq x(i,n_i) \geq 0$. Define

$$Z = \{v \in V \mid \mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v) < r\}.$$

The space Z is spanned by all basis vectors $[i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d] \in V$ with

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x(i, j) < r(x(1, i_1) + x(2, i_2) + \dots + x(d, i_d)).$$

Let $B = B_{n_1} \times B_{n_2} \times \dots \times B_{n_d} \subseteq G$ where $B_k \subseteq \text{GL}_k$ is the Borel group of upper triangular invertible matrices. If $[i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d]$ lies in Z , and $j_k \leq i_k$ for all k , then $[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_d]$ lies in Z . This implies that Z is stable under the action of B .

Lemma 2.10. *The set $G \cdot Z = \bigcup_{g \in G} g \cdot Z$ is Zariski closed.*

Proof. Consider the Zariski closed subset $S \subseteq G/B \times V$ defined by

$$S = \{(gB, v) \mid g^{-1} \cdot v \in Z\}$$

and let $\pi : G/B \times V \rightarrow V$ be the projection onto V . The flag variety G/B is projective, so π is a projective morphism which maps closed sets to closed sets. In particular, $G \cdot Z = \pi(S)$ is Zariski closed. □

Theorem 2.11. *For any weight $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$ the sets $X^\circ(\text{rk}_\alpha^G, r) = \{v \in V \mid \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) < r\}$ and $X(\text{rk}_\alpha^G, r) = \{v \in V \mid \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \leq r\}$ are finite unions of sets of the form $G \cdot Z$ where Z is a Borel-fixed subspace. In particular, these sets are Zariski closed.*

Proof. If $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) < r$, then there exists a 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t)$ of G such that $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v) < r$. If $Z = \{w \in V \mid \mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), w) < r\}$ then $X^\circ(\text{rk}_\alpha^G, r)$ contains Z and $G \cdot Z$. Since there are only finite many Borel stable subspaces of V , we see that $X^\circ(\text{rk}_\alpha^G, r)$ must be a finite union $G \cdot Z_1 \cup G \cdot Z_2 \cup \cdots \cup G \cdot Z_s$ where Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_s are Borel stable subspaces. Since each $G \cdot Z_i$ is closed, $X^\circ(\text{rk}_\alpha^G, r)$ is closed. Because there are only finitely many Borel stable subspaces, there are only finitely many possibilities for $X^\circ(\text{rk}_\alpha^G, s)$ where $s \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. There exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $X^\circ(\text{rk}_\alpha^G, s)$ is the same for all $s \in (r, r + \varepsilon]$. We have $X(\text{rk}_\alpha^G, r) = \bigcap_{r < s \leq r + \varepsilon} X^\circ(\text{rk}_\alpha^G, s) = X^\circ(\text{rk}_\alpha^G, r + \varepsilon)$. \square

3. RESULTS ON THE G -STABLE RANK

3.1. Easy observations and a technical lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *If $v \neq 0$, then we have $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \geq \min\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d\} > 0$. In particular, $\text{rk}^G(v) \geq 1$.*

Proof. Choose $g(t) \in G(K[[t]])$ with $\mu_\alpha(g(t), v) = \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v)$. From $v \neq 0$ follows that $g(t) \cdot v \neq 0$, say $\text{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v) = s > 0$. Then we get $\sum_{i=1}^d \text{val}_t(g_i(t)) \geq s$ and

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \text{val}_t(g_i(t))}{\text{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v)} \geq \min\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d\} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \text{val}_t(g_i(t))}{s} \geq \min\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d\}.$$

It follows that $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \geq \min\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d\} > 0$. \square

Suppose that $v = u \otimes w$ is nonzero with $u \in V_1$ and $w \in V_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_d$. We choose bases in V_1, \dots, V_d such that u is the first basis vector in V_1 . We can choose a one parameter subgroup $\lambda(t)$ with

$$\lambda_1(t) = \begin{pmatrix} t & & & \\ & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\lambda_k(t) = 1_{n_k}$ for $k = 2, 3, \dots, d$. Then we have $\lambda(t) \cdot v = tv$ and $\mu_\alpha(A(t), v) = \alpha_1$. This shows that $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \leq \alpha_1$. From Lemma 3.1 follows that $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \leq \alpha_1$. If v has slice rank 1 concentrated in the i -th slice, then $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \leq \alpha_i \leq \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d\}$.

Corollary 3.2. *If v has slice rank 1, then $\text{rk}^G(v) = 1$.*

Proof. If v has slice rank 1, then $\text{rk}^G(v) = \text{rk}_{(1, \dots, 1)}^G(v) \leq \max\{1, \dots, 1\} = 1$ and $\text{rk}^G(v) \geq 1$ by Lemma 3.1. \square

Corollary 3.3. *If v has rank 1 then $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) = \min\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d\}$.*

Proof. If v has rank 1 then $\text{rk}_\alpha^G \leq \alpha_i$ for every i and $\text{rk}_\alpha^G \geq \min\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d\}$ by Lemma 3.1. \square

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose that $v \in V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_d$ and $w \in W_1 \otimes W_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes W_e$ and $v \otimes w \in V_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_d \otimes W_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes W_e$ is the horizontal tensor product. We have $\text{rk}_{\alpha, \beta}^G(v \otimes w) = \min\{\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v), \text{rk}_\beta^G(w)\}$.*

Proof. Let $G = \mathrm{GL}(V_1) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{GL}(V_d)$ and $H = \mathrm{GL}(W_1) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{GL}(W_e)$. There exists $g(t) \in G(K[[t]])$ with $\mu_\alpha(g(t), v) = \mathrm{rk}_\alpha(v)$. For $(g(t), 1) \in (G \times H)(K[[t]])$ we get $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}((g(t), h(t)), v \otimes w) = \mathrm{rk}_\alpha(v)$. This proves that $\mathrm{rk}_{\alpha,\beta}^G(v \otimes w) \leq \mathrm{rk}_\alpha(v)$. Similarly, we have $\mathrm{rk}_{\alpha,\beta}^G(v \otimes w) \leq \mathrm{rk}_\beta^G(w)$, so we get $\mathrm{rk}_{\alpha,\beta}^G(v \otimes w) \leq \min\{\mathrm{rk}_\alpha^G(v), \mathrm{rk}_\beta^G(w)\}$.

Conversely, suppose that $(g(t), h(t)) \in G \times H(K[[t]])$ satisfies $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}((g(t), h(t)), v \otimes w) = \mathrm{rk}_{\alpha,\beta}^G(v \otimes w)$. Using that

$$\mathrm{val}_t((g(t), h(t)) \cdot (v \otimes w)) = \mathrm{val}_t((g(t) \cdot v) \otimes (h(t) \cdot w)) = \mathrm{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v) + \mathrm{val}_t(h(t) \cdot w)$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\alpha,\beta}(v \otimes w) &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \mathrm{val}_t(\det g_i(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^e \mathrm{val}_t(\det h_j(t))}{\mathrm{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v) + \mathrm{val}_t(h(t) \cdot w)} = \\ &\geq \min \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \mathrm{val}_t(\det g_i(t))}{\mathrm{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v)}, \frac{\sum_{j=1}^e \mathrm{val}_t(\det h_j(t))}{\mathrm{val}_t(h(t) \cdot w)} \right\} = \min\{\mathrm{rk}_\alpha^G(v), \mathrm{rk}_\beta^G(w)\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We will need the following technical lemma to prove Proposition 3.6.

Lemma 3.5. *If $g(t), h(t) \in \mathrm{GL}_n(K[[t]])$ then there exists $u(t), g'(t), h'(t) \in \mathrm{GL}_n(K[[t]])$ such that $u(t) = g'(t)h(t) = h'(t)g(t)$ and $\mathrm{val}_t(\det u(t)) \leq \mathrm{val}_t(\det g(t)) + \mathrm{val}_t(\det h(t))$.*

Proof. We have

$$\mathrm{val}_t(\det g(t)) = \dim_K \frac{K[[t]]^n}{g(t)K[[t]]^n}.$$

The $K[[t]]$ -module $g(t)K[[t]]^n \cap h(t)K[[t]]^n$ is a submodule of the free module $K[[t]]^n$, so it is also free of rank $\leq n$. So there exists a matrix $u(t)$ such that $g(t)K[[t]]^n \cap h(t)K[[t]]^n = u(t)K[[t]]^n$. From $u(t)K[[t]]^n \subseteq g(t)K[[t]]^n$ follows that there exists a matrix $h'(t)$ such that $u(t) = h'(t)g(t)$. Similarly, we find a matrix $g'(t)$ with $u(t) = g'(t)h(t)$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{val}_t(\det u(t)) &\leq \dim \frac{K[[t]]^n}{u(t)K[[t]]^n} = \dim \frac{K[[t]]^n}{g(t)K[[t]]^n \cap h(t)K[[t]]^n} = \\ &= \dim \frac{K[[t]]^n}{g(t)K[[t]]^n} + \dim \frac{g(t)K[[t]]^n}{g(t)K[[t]]^n \cap h(t)K[[t]]^n} = \\ &= \mathrm{val}_t(\det g(t)) + \dim \frac{g(t)K[[t]]^n + h(t)K[[t]]^n}{h(t)K[[t]]^n} \leq \mathrm{val}_t(\det g(t)) + \mathrm{val}_t(\det h(t)). \end{aligned}$$

□

3.2. The triangle inequality for the G -stable rank.

Proposition 3.6. *For tensors $v, w \in V$ we have $\mathrm{rk}_\alpha^G(v + w) \leq \mathrm{rk}_\alpha^G(v) + \mathrm{rk}_\alpha^G(w)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $g(t), h(t) \in G(K[[t]])$. If we replace t by t^e , then $\mu_\alpha(g(t), v)$ does not change. Without changing $\mu_\alpha(g(t), v)$ and $\mu_\alpha(h(t), w)$ we may assume that $\mathrm{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v) = \mathrm{val}_t(h(t) \cdot w) = s > 0$. Then there exist $u(t), g'(t), h'(t) \in G(K[[t]])$ such that

$u(t) = h'(t)g(t) = g'(t)h(t)$ and $\text{val}_t(\det u_i(t)) \leq \text{val}_t(\det g_i(t)) + \text{val}_t(\det h_i(t))$ for all i by Lemma 3.5. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{val}_t(u(t) \cdot (v + w)) &= \text{val}_t(h'(t)g(t) \cdot v + g'(t)h(t) \cdot w) \geq \\ &\geq \min\{\text{val}_t(h'(t)g(t) \cdot v), \text{val}_t(g'(t)h(t) \cdot w)\} \geq \min\{\text{val}_t(g(t) \cdot v), \text{val}_t(h(t) \cdot w)\} = s \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \text{val}_t(\det u_i(t)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \text{val}_t(\det g_i(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \text{val}_t(\det h_i(t)) = s\mu_\alpha(g(t), v) + s\mu_\alpha(h(t), w).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\alpha(u(t), v + w) &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \text{val}_t(\det u_i(t))}{\text{val}_t(u(t) \cdot (v + w))} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{s\mu_\alpha(g(t), v) + s\mu_\alpha(h(t), w)}{s} = \mu_\alpha(g(t), v) + \mu_\alpha(h(t), w). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the infimum over all $g(t)$ and $h(t)$ gives $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v + w) \leq \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) + \text{rk}_\alpha^G(w)$. \square

Corollary 3.7. *For any tensor $v \in V$ we have*

$$\text{rk}^G(v) \leq \text{srk}(v).$$

Proof. By definition, we can write $v = v_1 + v_2 + \dots + v_r$ where $r = \text{srk}(v)$ and v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r are tensors of slice rank 1. Now we have $\text{rk}^G(v) = \text{rk}^G(v_1 + \dots + v_r) \leq \text{rk}^G(v_1) + \dots + \text{rk}^G(v_r) = 1 + \dots + 1 = r = \text{srk}(v)$. \square

3.3. The additive property of the G -stable rank.

Proposition 3.8. *If $d \geq 2$, the G -stable rank is additive: we have $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v \boxplus w) = \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) + \text{rk}_\alpha^G(w)$.*

Proof. From Proposition 3.6 follows that $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v \boxplus w) \leq \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v \boxplus 0) + \text{rk}_\alpha^G(0 \boxplus w) \leq \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) + \text{rk}_\alpha^G(w)$. Suppose that $g(t) \in G(K[[t]])$ with $\text{val}_t(g(t) \cdot (v \boxplus w)) = t^s$ for some $s > 0$. Assume that the block form of $g_i(t)$ with respect to the decomposition $V_i \oplus W_i$ is

$$g_i(t) = \begin{pmatrix} a_i(t) & b_i(t) \\ c_i(t) & d_i(t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The $K[[t]]$ -module generated by the rows of $a_1(t)$ and $c_1(t)$ is a free submodule of $K[[t]]^{n_1}$ of rank n_1 , where $n_1 = \dim V_i$. Using the Smith normal form, there exist invertible matrices in $p(t) \in \text{GL}_{n_1+m_1}(K[[t]])$ and $q(t) \in \text{GL}_{n_1}(K[[t]])$ such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1(t) \\ c_1(t) \end{pmatrix} = p(t) \begin{pmatrix} r(t) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} q(t)$$

where $r(t)$ is an $n_1 \times n_1$ diagonal matrix. It follows that

$$p(t)^{-1}g_1(t) = \begin{pmatrix} r(t) & \star \\ 0 & \star \end{pmatrix}$$

So without loss of generality, we may assume that $c_1(t) = 0$. A similar argument shows that we may assume without loss of generality that $b_2(t) = b_3(t) = \dots = b_d(t) = 0$. If we project $g(t) \cdot v \boxplus w$ onto V , we get $a(t) \cdot v + b(t) \cdot w = a(t) \cdot v$ because $b_2(t) = 0$. This

implies that $\text{val}_t(a(t) \cdot v) \geq s$ and $\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \text{val}_t(\det a_i(t)) \geq s \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v)$. Similarly, the projection of $g(t) \cdot v \boxplus w$ onto W is equal to $c(t) \cdot v + d(t) \cdot w = d(t) \cdot w$ because $c_1(t) = 0$. Therefore, we have $\text{val}_t(d(t) \cdot w) \geq s$ and $\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \text{val}_t(\det d_i(t)) \geq s \text{rk}_\alpha^G(w)$. Since $\det g_i(t) = \det a_i(t) \det d_i(t)$ because of the upper triangular or lower triangular form of $g_i(t)$, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \text{val}_t(\det g_i(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \text{val}_t(\det a_i(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \text{val}_t(\det d_i(t)) \geq s(\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) + \text{rk}_\alpha^G(w)).$$

This proves that $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v \boxplus w) \geq \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) + \text{rk}_\alpha^G(w)$. \square

4. THE STABLE T -RANK

4.1. The G -stable rank and the T -stable rank. The G -stable α -rank of a tensor v is the maximum of $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v)$ where $\lambda(t)$ is a 1-parameter subgroup of G with $\text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot v) > 0$. A 1-parameter subgroup is contained in some maximal torus T (which itself is contained in some Borel subgroup B of G). We can fix a maximal torus T and consider all 1-parameter subgroups contained in T . Choosing a maximal torus of G corresponds to choosing a basis in each vector space V_i . So let us choose a basis in each V_i so that we can identify $\text{GL}(V_i)$ with GL_{n_i} . Let $T_k \subseteq \text{GL}_k$ be the subgroup of invertible diagonal $k \times k$ matrices, and $T = T_{n_1} \times T_{n_2} \times \cdots \times T_{n_d} \subseteq G$. Then T is a maximal torus of G .

Definition 4.1. We define the α -stable T -rank $\text{rk}_\alpha^T(v)$ as the infimum over all $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v)$ where $\lambda(t) \in T(K[t])$ is a 1-parameter subgroup of T with $\text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot v) > 0$.

Since every 1-parameter subgroup is conjugate to a 1-parameter subgroup in the maximal torus, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 4.2. *We have*

$$\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) = \inf_{g \in G} \text{rk}_\alpha^T(g \cdot v).$$

4.2. The T -stable rank and linear programming. For a tensor $v = (v_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d}) \in V = K^{n_1 \times n_2 \times \cdots \times n_d}$ we define its support by

$$\text{supp}(v) = \{(i_1, \dots, i_d) \mid v_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d} \neq 0\}.$$

As we will see, $\text{rk}_\alpha^T(v)$ only depends on $\text{supp}(v)$ and α . For a nonnegative integer k , let $\underline{k} = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. We will fix a support $S \subseteq \underline{n}_1 \times \underline{n}_2 \times \cdots \times \underline{n}_d$ and compute the corresponding α -stable T -rank.

Definition 4.3. Let $x(i, j)$ with $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $1 \leq j \leq n_i$ be real variables and $S \subseteq \underline{n}_1 \times \cdots \times \underline{n}_d$ be a support. The linear program $\mathbf{LP}_\alpha(S)$ asks to minimize $\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x(i, j)$ under the constraints:

- (1) $x(i, j) \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ and $1 \leq j \leq n_i$;
- (2) $\sum_{i=1}^d x(i, s_i) \geq 1$ for all $s \in S$,

Theorem 4.4. *If $v \in V$ has support S , then $\text{rk}_\alpha^T(v)$ is the value of the linear program $\mathbf{LP}_\alpha(S)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\lambda(t) = (\lambda_1(t), \dots, \lambda_d(t)) \in T(K[t])$ is a 1-parameter subgroup, and $\lambda_i(t)$ is diagonal with entries $t^{x(i,1)}, t^{x(i,2)}, \dots, t^{x(i, n_i)}$ where $x(i, j)$ is a nonnegative integer for all i, j . Also, assume that $\text{val}_t(\lambda(t) \cdot v) = q > 0$ where v is a tensor with support S . This means that

$\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i x(i, s_i) \geq q$ for all $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_d) \in S$. We have $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v) = \frac{1}{q}(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x(i, j))$ and $\text{rk}_\alpha^T(v)$ is the infimum of all $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v)$. If we replace $x(i, j)$ by $x(i, j)/q$, then we have $\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i x(i, s_i) \geq 1$ for all $(s_1, \dots, s_d) \in S$ and $\mu_\alpha(\lambda(t), v) = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x(i, j)$. This shows that $\text{rk}_\alpha^T(v)$ is the infimum of $\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x(i, j)$ under the constraints $x(i, j) \geq 0$ for all i, j , and $\sum_{i=1}^d x(i, s_i) \geq 1$ for all $s \in S$ for all i, j . This is the linear program $\mathbf{LP}_\alpha(S)$, except that the numbers $x(i, j)$ have to be rational. However, since the constraints are inequalities with coefficients in \mathbb{Q} , there exists an optimal solution over \mathbb{Q} . \square

Example 4.5. Consider the tensor

$$v = [2, 1, 1] + [1, 2, 1] + [1, 1, 2] \in K^{2 \times 2 \times 2} = K^2 \otimes K^2 \otimes K^2.$$

with support $S = \{(2, 1, 1), (1, 2, 1), (1, 1, 2)\}$. We have to solve the following linear program $\mathbf{LP}(S) = \mathbf{LP}_{(1,1,1)}(S)$: minimize $\sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^2 x(i, j)$ under the constraints $x(i, j) \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $j = 1, 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} x(1, 2) + x(2, 1) + x(3, 1) &\geq 1 \\ x(1, 1) + x(2, 2) + x(3, 1) &\geq 1 \\ x(1, 1) + x(2, 1) + x(3, 2) &\geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

An optimal solution is $x(1, 1) = x(2, 1) = x(3, 1) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $x(1, 2) = x(2, 2) = x(3, 2) = 0$. So the optimal value is $\text{rk}^T(v) = 3 \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{3}{2}$. It follows that $\text{rk}^G(v) \leq \text{rk}^T(v) \leq \frac{3}{2}$. It is easy to see that $\text{srk}(v) > 1$ (and thus equal 2). We will show that $\text{rk}^G(v) = \frac{3}{2}$.

Suppose that $\text{rk}^G(v) < \frac{3}{2}$. Then there exists a tensor $w \in K^{2 \times 2 \times 2}$ in the same G -orbit as v such that $\text{rk}^T(w) < \frac{3}{2}$. Let $S' = \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \underline{2} \times \underline{2} \times \underline{2}$ be the support of w . Also assume that $\{x(i, j)\}$ is an optimal solution for the linear program $\mathbf{LP}(S')$. By permuting coordinates, we may assume that $x(i, 1) \geq x(i, 2)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. The support S' is not contained in $\{1\} \times \{1, 2\} \times \{1, 2\}$ because otherwise w and v would have slice rank 1. Therefore, $(2, i, j) \in S'$ for some i, j . Because of the ordering of the variables $x(i, j)$, $(2, 1, 1) \in S'$. Similarly, $(1, 2, 1), (1, 1, 2) \in S'$. Now $\text{supp}(w) = S' \supseteq S = \text{supp}(v)$, so $\text{rk}^T(w) \geq \text{rk}^T(v) = \frac{3}{2}$. Contradiction.

4.3. Comparison between the G -stable rank and the slice rank. Besides the slice rank, we will also define a slice rank relative to a maximal torus T , or equivalently, relative to bases choices for V_1, V_2, \dots, V_d .

Definition 4.6. We say that a tensor v has T -slice rank 1 if v is contained in a space of the form

$$V_{i,j} = V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \dots \otimes V_{i-1} \otimes [j] \otimes V_{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes V_d.$$

Now the T -slice rank $\text{srk}^T(v)$ of an arbitrary tensor v is the smallest nonnegative integer r such that v is a sum of r tensors of T -slice rank 1.

The following result is clear from the definition of slice rank:

Corollary 4.7. *We have*

$$\text{srk}(v) = \min_{g \in G} \text{srk}^T(g \cdot v).$$

The T -slice rank of v depends only on its support $S = \text{supp}(v)$ and can be expressed in terms of integer solutions of the linear program $\mathbf{LP}(S)$.

Proposition 4.8. *The T -slice rank $\text{srk}^T(v)$ is the smallest possible value of $\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x(i, j)$ where the $x(i, j)$ satisfy the constraints:*

- (1) $x(i, j) \in \{0, 1\}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ and $1 \leq j \leq n_i$;
- (2) $\sum_{i=1}^d x(i, s_i) \geq 1$ for all $s \in S$;

Proof. Suppose that $x(i, j) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all i, j . Define

$$V(x) = \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ x(i,j)=1}} V_{i,j}.$$

A vector $[s_1, s_2, \dots, s_d]$ lies in $V(x)$ if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^d x(i, s_i) \geq 1$. So a tensor v lies in $V(x)$ if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^d x(i, s_i) \geq 1$ for all $s \in \text{supp}(v)$. By definition, $\text{srk}^T(v)$ is the smallest possible value of $\sum_{i,j} x(i, j)$ such that $v \in V(x)$. \square

It is now easy to see that $\text{rk}^T(v) \geq \frac{1}{d} \text{srk}^T(v)$ (and this implies $\text{rk}^G(v) \geq \frac{1}{d} \text{srk}(v)$): If $x(i, j)$ is a solution to the linear program $\mathbf{LP}(S)$ where $S = \text{supp}(v)$, then we define $x'(i, j) \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $x'(i, j) = 1$ if $x(i, j) \geq \frac{1}{d}$ and $x'(i, j) = 0$ otherwise. If $s \in S$ then we have $\sum_{i=1}^d x(i, s_i) \geq 1$. It follows that $x(i, s_i) \geq \frac{1}{d}$ for some i and $x'(i, s_i) = 1$ for some i . Therefore, $\sum_{i=1}^d x'(i, s_i) \geq 1$. Now $\text{srk}^T(v) \leq \sum_{i,j} x'(i, j) \leq \sum_{i,j} dx(i, j) = d \text{rk}^T(v)$. With a more refined argument, we can improve this bound:

Proposition 4.9. *For $d \geq 2$ we have $\text{rk}^T(v) \geq \frac{2}{d} \text{srk}^T(v)$ and therefore $\text{rk}^G(v) \geq \frac{2}{d} \text{srk}(v)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x(i, j)$ is an optimal solution to the linear program. Note that $0 \leq x(i, j) \leq 1$ for all i, j . We define functions $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_d : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f_i(\alpha) = |\{j \mid x(i, j) \geq \alpha\}|.$$

We have $\int_0^1 f_i(\alpha) d\alpha = \sum_j x(i, j)$. In particular, $\int_0^1 (f_1(\alpha) + \dots + f_d(\alpha)) d\alpha = \sum_{i,j} x(i, j)$. Let $s_i = \frac{2i}{d(d-1)}$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, d-1$. Note that $s_0 + s_1 + \dots + s_{d-1} = 1$. We define a closed piecewise linear curve $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d) : [0, d] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\gamma(d) = \gamma(0) = [s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{d-1}]$, $\gamma(1) = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{d-1}, s_0]$, \dots , $\gamma(d-1) = [s_{d-1}, s_0, \dots, s_{d-2}]$ such that γ is linear on each of the intervals $[i, i+1]$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$. On the intervals $[0, 1], [1, 2], \dots, [d-1, d]$, $\gamma_i(t)$ goes through the intervals $[s_0, s_1], [s_1, s_2], \dots, [s_{d-2}, s_{d-1}], [s_{d-1}, s_0]$ in some order. So $\frac{1}{d} \int_0^d f_i(\gamma_i(t)) dt$ is the average of the averages of f_i of each of these d intervals. This is equal to the average value of $f_i(t)$ on the interval $[0, s_{d-1}] = [0, \frac{2}{d}]$:

$$\frac{1}{d} \int_0^d f_i(\gamma_i(t)) dt = \frac{d}{2} \int_0^{\frac{2}{d}} f_i(t) dt \leq \frac{d}{2} \int_0^1 f_i(t) dt = \frac{d}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x(i, j).$$

It follows that

$$\frac{1}{d} \int_0^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^d f_i(\gamma_i(t)) \right) dt \leq \frac{d}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x(i, j) = \frac{d}{2} \text{rk}^T(v).$$

Since the minimal value of $\sum_{i=1}^d f_i(\gamma_i(t))$ is at most the average, there exists a $t \in [0, d]$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^d f_i(\gamma_i(t)) \leq \frac{d}{2} \text{rk}^T(v)$. Now define $x'(i, j) = 1$ if $x(i, j) \geq \gamma_i(t)$ and $x'(i, j) = 0$ if

$x(i, j) < \gamma_i(t)$. If $s = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_d) \in \text{supp}(v)$, then $\sum_{i=1}^d x(i, s_i) \geq 1$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i(t) = 1$, we have $x(i, s_i) \geq \gamma_i(t)$ for some i and $\sum_{i=1}^d x'(i, s_i) \geq 1$. We conclude that

$$\text{srk}^T(v) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x'(i, j) = \sum_{i=1}^d f_i(\gamma_i(t)) \leq \frac{d}{2} \text{rk}^T(v).$$

Finally, we get

$$\text{srk}(v) = \inf_{g \in G} \text{srk}^T(g \cdot v) \leq \frac{d}{2} \inf_{g \in G} \text{rk}^T(g \cdot v) = \frac{d}{2} \text{rk}^G(v).$$

□

4.4. The dual program and the T -stable rank.

Definition 4.10. For a support set S , the dual program $\mathbf{LP}_\alpha^\vee(S)$ is to maximize $\sum_{s \in S} y(s)$ under the constraints

- (1) $y(s) \geq 0$ for all $s \in S$;
- (2) for all i, j we have

$$\sum_{\substack{s \in S \\ s_i = j}} y(s) \leq \alpha_i.$$

If x and y are optimal solutions for $\mathbf{LP}_\alpha(S)$ and $\mathbf{LP}_\alpha^\vee(S)$ respectively, then we have

$$\sum_{s \in S} y(s) = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x(i, j) = \text{rk}_\alpha^T(v)$$

and

- (1) for all i, j , we have

$$\sum_{\substack{s \in S \\ s_i = j}} y(s) = \alpha_i \text{ or } x(i, j) = 0;$$

- (2) for all $s \in S$ we have $\sum_{i=1}^d x(i, s_i) = 1$ or $y(s) = 0$.

4.5. The super-multiplicative property of the T -stable rank. If $v \in V = V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \dots \otimes V_d$ and $w \in W = W_1 \otimes W_2 \otimes \dots \otimes W_d$ then we can consider the “vertical” tensor product $v \boxtimes w \in (V_1 \otimes W_1) \otimes \dots \otimes (V_d \otimes W_d)$.

Proposition 4.11. We have $\text{rk}_{\alpha\beta}^T(v \boxtimes w) \geq \text{rk}_\alpha^T(v) \text{rk}_\beta^T(w)$, where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$, $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d)$ and $\alpha\beta = (\alpha_1\beta_1, \dots, \alpha_d\beta_d)$.

Proof. Let $S = \text{supp}(v)$, $S' = \text{supp}(w)$, $y(s), s \in S$ be an optimal solution for the $\mathbf{LP}_\alpha^\vee(v)$ and $y'(s'), s' \in S'$ be an optimal solution for $\mathbf{LP}_\beta^\vee(w)$. The tensor $v \boxtimes w$ has support $S \times S'$. For the dual program for $v \boxtimes w$ we have to maximize $\sum_{s \in S, s' \in S'} Y(s, s')$ under the constraints $Y(s, s') \geq 0$ for all $s \in S, s' \in S'$ and

$$\sum_{\substack{s \in S, s' \in S' \\ s_i = j, s'_i = j'}} Y(s, s') \leq \alpha_j \beta_{j'}$$

for all i, j, j' . One solution for this linear program is $Y(s, s') = y(s)y'(s')$. We get

$$\mathrm{rk}_{\alpha\beta}^T(v \boxtimes w) \geq \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{s' \in S'} Y(s, s') = \sum_{s \in S} y(s) \sum_{s' \in S'} y(s') = \mathrm{rk}_{\alpha}^T(v) \mathrm{rk}_{\beta}^T(w).$$

□

5. G -STABLE RANK OVER \mathbb{C}

5.1. Kempf-Ness theory. We recall some of the main results from Kempf-Ness theory [23, 38]. Suppose that G is a complex reductive algebraic group with a maximal compact subgroup C and V is a representation of G . We fix a Hermitian inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on V that is invariant under C , i.e., $\langle g \cdot v, g \cdot w \rangle = \langle v, w \rangle$ for all $v, w \in V$ and $g \in C$. Let \mathfrak{c} and \mathfrak{g} be the Lie algebras of C and G respectively, and let \mathfrak{c}^* be the dual space of \mathfrak{c} . We have $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{c} \oplus i\mathfrak{c}$. For $v \in V$, we define a morphism $\psi_v : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $g \mapsto \|g \cdot v\|^2 = \langle g \cdot v, g \cdot v \rangle$. The differential $(d\psi_v)_I : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of ψ_v at the identity $I \in G$ is given by

$$(d\psi_v)_I : \xi \mapsto \langle \xi v, v \rangle + \langle v, \xi v \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$$

Because $\|g \cdot v\|^2$ is constant on C , $(d\psi_v)_I$ vanishes on \mathfrak{c} . So $\langle v, \xi v \rangle = -\langle \xi v, v \rangle$ for $\xi \in \mathfrak{c}$. If $\xi \in \mathfrak{c}$ then we have $(d\psi_v)_I(i\xi) = \langle i\xi v, v \rangle + \langle v, i\xi v \rangle = i\langle \xi v, v \rangle - i\langle v, \xi v \rangle = 2i\langle \xi v, v \rangle$. For the following result, see [38, Corollary 5.2.5.].

Theorem 5.1 (Kempf-Ness). *An orbit $G \cdot v$ is closed if and only there exists $w \in G \cdot v$ with $(d\psi_w)_I = 0$.*

Let $V = V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_d$ with $V_i = \mathbb{C}^{n_i}$. For $v \in V$, let $\Phi_i(v) \in (V_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \widehat{V}_i \otimes \cdots \otimes V_d)^* \rightarrow V_i$ be the i -th flattening of v .

5.2. A formula for the G -stable rank over \mathbb{C} . We will use Kempf-Ness theory to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 5.2. *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we have*

$$\mathrm{rk}_{\alpha}^G(v) = \sup_{g \in G} \min_i \frac{\alpha_i \|g \cdot v\|^2}{\|\Phi_i(g \cdot v)\|_{\sigma}^2}$$

For the proof of the theorem, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^d$, $r = \frac{p}{q}$ with p, q positive integers, $q\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $v \in V = V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_d$. As in Proposition 2.3, let*

$$W = (V^{\otimes p} \otimes \det^{-q\beta}) \oplus V_1^{n_1} \oplus V_2^{n_2} \oplus \cdots \oplus V_d^{n_d}.$$

and $w = (v^{\otimes p} \otimes 1, u_1, \dots, u_d)$. Define $\psi_w : G \rightarrow W$ by $\psi_w(g) = g \cdot w$. Then we have $(d\psi_w)_I = 0$ if and only if

$$p\|v\|^{2p-2} \Phi_i(v) \Phi_i^*(v) - q\beta_i \|v\|^{2p} I_{n_i} + u_i u_i^* = 0$$

for all i .

Proof. The Hermitian scalar products on V_1, V_2, \dots, V_d induce Hermitian scalar products on $V_1^{n_1}, \dots, V_d^{n_d}, V, V^{\otimes p}, V^{\otimes p} \otimes \det^{-q\beta}$ and W in a natural way. We have

$$\|w\|^2 = \|v\|^{2p} + \sum_{i=1}^d \|u_i\|^2$$

and

$$\psi_w(g) = \|g \cdot w\|^2 = \|g \cdot v\|^{2p} \det^{-2q\beta}(g) + \sum_{i=1}^d \|g_i u_i\|^2.$$

The Lie algebra of G can be identified with

$$\mathfrak{g} = \text{End}(V_1) \oplus \text{End}(V_2) \oplus \cdots \oplus \text{End}(V_d).$$

The Lie algebra \mathfrak{c} consists of all d -tuples (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_d) of skew-Hermitian matrices, and $i\mathfrak{c}$ consists of d -tuples of Hermitian matrices. We compute the differential $(d\psi_w)_I$. Note that $\text{GL}(V_i)$ acts on the i -th mode. If we view v as the flattened tensor $\Phi_i(v)$, then g_i acts just by left multiplication: $\Phi_i(g_i \cdot v) = g_i \Phi_i(v)$. Let $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$ denote the trace. The differential of $g_i \mapsto \|g_i \cdot v\|^2 = \text{Tr}(g_i \Phi_i(v) \Phi_i^*(v) g_i^*)$ at the identity is given by $\xi_i \in \text{End}(V_i) \mapsto \text{Tr}(\xi_i \Phi_i(v) \Phi_i^*(v)) + \text{Tr}(\Phi_i(v) \Phi_i^*(v) \xi_i^*)$. If we restrict to Hermitian ξ_i , then this is equal to $2 \text{Tr}(\xi_i \Phi_i(v) \Phi_i^*(v))$. The differential of $\|g \cdot v\|^2$ restricted to $i\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) \mapsto 2 \sum_{i=1}^d \text{Tr}(\xi_i \Phi_i(v) \Phi_i^*(v))$. The differential of $g_i \mapsto \det(g_i)$ at the identity is $\xi_i \mapsto \text{Tr}(\xi_i)$. Combining these results with the product rule of differentiation, we get for $\xi \in i\mathfrak{c}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} (d\phi_w)_I(\xi) &= \sum_{i=1}^d \left(2p\|v\|^{2p-2} \text{Tr}(\xi_i \Phi_i(v) \Phi_i^*(v)) - 2q\beta_i q \|v\|^{2p} \text{Tr}(\xi_i) + 2 \text{Tr}(\xi_i u_i u_i^*) \right) = \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \langle \xi_i, \|v\|^{2p-2} \Phi_i(v) \Phi_i^*(v) - 2q\beta_i \|v\|^{2p} I_{n_i} + 2u_i u_i^* \rangle \end{aligned}$$

We have $(d\phi_w)_I = 0$ if and only if

$$2p\|v\|^{2p-2} \Phi_i(v) \Phi_i^*(v) - 2q\beta_i \|v\|^{2p} I_{n_i} + 2u_i u_i^* = 0$$

for all i . □

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Let us define

$$f_\alpha(v) = \sup_{g \in G} \min_i \frac{\alpha_i \|g \cdot v\|^2}{\|\Phi_i(g \cdot v)\|_\sigma^2}$$

Suppose that $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $f_\alpha(v) \leq r$. Assume that $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^d$ with $\beta_i > \alpha_i$ for all i . We can write $r = p/q$ such that $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$ are positive and $q\beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all i . From $f_\alpha(v) \leq r$ follows that

$$\alpha_i \|g \cdot v\|^2 I_{n_i} - r \Phi_i(g \cdot v) \Phi_i^*(g \cdot v)$$

is nonnegative definite for all i . This implies that

$$\beta_i \|g \cdot v\|^2 I_{n_i} - r \Phi_i(g \cdot v) \Phi_i^*(g \cdot v)$$

is positive definite for all i . Multiplying with $p\|g \cdot v\|^{2p-2}$ we get that

$$p\beta_i \|g \cdot v\|^{2p} I_{n_i} - q\|g \cdot v\|^{2p-2} \Phi_i(g \cdot v) \Phi_i^*(g \cdot v)$$

is positive definite and equal to $u_i u_i^*$ for some $u_i \in V_i^{n_i}$. This shows that $(d\psi_{g \cdot w})_I = 0$. By Theorem 5.1, the G -orbit of w is closed. By Proposition 2.3, we have $\text{rk}_\beta^G(v) \geq r$. Because this is true for every rational $\beta > \alpha$, we get $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \geq r$. Since this is true for any $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $r \geq f_\alpha(v)$, we can conclude that $\text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \geq f_\alpha(v)$.

Suppose that $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^d$ and $\beta_i < \alpha_i$ for all i . Let $r = \text{rk}_\beta^G(v) < \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v)$. We can write $r = \frac{p}{q}$ such that p, q are positive integers, and $q\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We can choose an invertible $u_i \in V_i^{n_i}$ for all i . Now

$$w = (v^{\otimes p} \otimes 1, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_d) \in (V^{\otimes p} \otimes \det^{-q\beta}) \oplus V_1^{n_1} \oplus V_2^{n_2} \oplus \dots \oplus V_d^{n_d}$$

is G -semi-stable by Proposition 2.3. So there exists a nonzero $w' \in \overline{G \cdot w}$ with $(d\psi_{w'})_I = 0$. We can write $w' = ((v')^{\otimes p}, u'_1, \dots, u'_d)$. Using Lemma 5.3, we get

$$p\|v'\|^{2p-2}\Phi_i(v')\Phi_i^*(v') - q\beta_i\|v'\|^{2p}I_{n_i} + u'_i(u'_i)^* = 0.$$

So

$$q\beta_i\|v'\|^{2p}I_{n_i} - p\|v'\|^{2p-2}\Phi_i(v')\Phi_i^*(v')$$

is nonnegative definite for all i . Therefore,

$$q\alpha_i\|v'\|^{2p}I_{n_i} - p\|v'\|^{2p-2}\Phi_i(v')\Phi_i^*(v')$$

is positive definite for all i .

Since w' lies in $\overline{G \cdot w}$, there exists a $g \in G$ such that

$$q\alpha_i\|g \cdot v\|^{2p}I_{n_i} - p\|g \cdot v\|^{2p-2}\Phi_i(g \cdot v)\Phi_i^*(g \cdot v)$$

is positive definite for all i . It follows that

$$\|\Phi_i(g \cdot v)\|_\sigma^2 = \|\Phi_i(g \cdot v)\Phi_i^*(g \cdot v)\|_\sigma \leq \frac{q\alpha_i\|g \cdot v\|^{2p}}{p\|g \cdot v\|^{2p-2}} = \frac{\alpha_i\|g \cdot v\|^2}{r}$$

for all i and

$$\min_i \frac{\alpha_i\|g \cdot v\|^2}{\|\Phi_i(g \cdot v)\|_\sigma^2} \geq r.$$

This shows that $f_\alpha(v) \geq r = \text{rk}_\beta^G(v)$. Since $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^d$ was arbitrary with $\beta < \alpha$, we obtain $f_\alpha(v) \geq \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v)$. We conclude that $f_\alpha(v) = \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v)$. \square

5.3. The super-multiplicative property of the G -stable rank in characteristic 0.

Theorem 5.4. *If $v \in V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \dots \otimes V_d$ and $w \in W_1 \otimes W_2 \otimes \dots \otimes W_d$ where $V_1, \dots, V_d, W_1, \dots, W_d$ are \mathbb{C} -vector spaces and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$, then we have*

$$\text{rk}_{\alpha\beta}^G(v \boxtimes w) \geq \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \text{rk}_\beta^G(w).$$

Proof. if $g \in \text{GL}(V_1) \times \dots \times \text{GL}(V_d)$ and $h \in \text{GL}(W_1) \times \dots \times \text{GL}(W_d)$ then we can consider $g \boxtimes h \in \text{GL}(V_1 \otimes W_1) \times \dots \times \text{GL}(V_d \otimes W_d)$. We have

$$\frac{\alpha_i\beta_i\|(g \boxtimes h) \cdot (v \boxtimes w)\|_\sigma^2}{\|\Phi_i((g \boxtimes h) \cdot (v \boxtimes w))\|_\sigma} = \frac{\alpha_i\beta_i\|((g \cdot v) \boxtimes (h \cdot w))\|_\sigma^2}{\|\Phi_i((g \cdot v) \boxtimes (h \cdot w))\|_\sigma} = \frac{\alpha_i\|g \cdot v\|^2\beta_i\|h \cdot w\|^2}{\|\Phi_i(g \cdot v)\|_\sigma\|\Phi_i(h \cdot w)\|_\sigma}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\min_i \frac{\alpha_i\beta_i\|(g \boxtimes h) \cdot (v \boxtimes w)\|_\sigma^2}{\|\Phi_i((g \boxtimes h) \cdot (v \boxtimes w))\|_\sigma} \geq \min_i \frac{\alpha_i\|g \cdot v\|^2}{\|\Phi_i(g \cdot v)\|_\sigma} \cdot \min_j \frac{\beta_j\|h \cdot w\|^2}{\|\Phi_j(h \cdot w)\|_\sigma}.$$

Taking the supremum over all g and h now gives $\text{rk}_{\alpha\beta}^G(v \boxtimes w) \geq \text{rk}_\alpha^G(v) \text{rk}_\beta^G(w)$ \square

6. APPLICATION OF THE G -STABLE RANK TO THE CAP SET PROBLEM

The Cap Set Problem asks for a largest possible subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}_3^n$ without an arithmetic progression. Let $c(n)$ be the largest possible cardinality of such a set. It was recently proved by Ellenberg and Gijswijt that $c(n) = O(\theta^n)$, where $\theta = \frac{3}{8}(207 + 33\sqrt{33})^{\frac{1}{3}} < 2.756$. Tao gave an elegant formulation of the proof of this bound using the notion of slice rank. Here we will use a similar approach, using the G -stable rank instead of the slice rank to get an explicit bound for all n which the same asymptotic behavior. We view K^3 as the vector space with basis $[0], [1], [2]$ where we view $0, 1, 2$ as elements in \mathbb{F}_3 . More generally, we view K^{3^n} as the vector space with basis $[a], a \in \mathbb{F}_3^n$. Note that a, b, c form an arithmetic progression in \mathbb{F}_3^n if and only if $a + b + c = 0$. Consider the tensor

$$v_n = \sum_{\substack{(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{F}_3^n \times \mathbb{F}_3^n \times \mathbb{F}_3^n \\ a+b+c=0}} [a] \otimes [b] \otimes [c] = \sum_{\substack{(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{F}_3^n \times \mathbb{F}_3^n \times \mathbb{F}_3^n \\ a+b+c=0}} [a, b, c] \in K^{3^n} \otimes K^{3^n} \otimes K^{3^n}.$$

Suppose that $S \subset \mathbb{F}_3^n$ is a set without arithmetic progression. Then we have

$$w = \sum_{\substack{(a,b,c) \in S^3 \\ a+b+c=0}} [a, b, c] \in K^3 \otimes K^3 \otimes K^3 = \sum_{a \in S} [a, a, a]$$

The tensor w is a projection of v and lies in the orbit closure of v . In particular, we have $\text{rk}^G(w) \leq \text{rk}^G(v)$. Since w is a direct sum of $|S|$ rank 1 tensors, we get $\text{rk}^G(w) \geq |S|$ by Proposition 3.8. So we have $\text{rk}^G(v) \geq \text{rk}^G(w) \geq |S|$.

We will work over the field $K = \mathbb{F}_3$. For a function $f : \mathbb{F}_3^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_3$ we define

$$\langle f \rangle = \sum_{a \in \mathbb{F}_3^n} f(a)[a] \in K^{3^n}.$$

In particular, we have $\langle 1 \rangle = [0] + [1] + [2]$, $\langle x \rangle = [1] + 2[2] = [1] - [2]$ and $\langle x^2 \rangle = [1] + [2]$. A basis of K^{3^n} is formed by taking all $\langle p(x) \rangle$ where $p(x) = p(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a polynomial of degree ≤ 2 in each of the variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n . With respect to the basis $\langle 1 \rangle, \langle x \rangle, \langle x^2 \rangle$, we have $v_n = \langle f \rangle$ where $f : \mathbb{F}_3^n \times \mathbb{F}_3^n \times \mathbb{F}_3^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_3$ is given by

$$f(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x + y + z = 0; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $n = 1$ we have $v_1 = \langle f \rangle$ where $f : \mathbb{F}_3 \times \mathbb{F}_3 \times \mathbb{F}_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_3$ is given by $f(x, y, z) = 1 - (x + y + z)^2 = 1 - x^2 - y^2 - z^2 + x + y + z$. So we have

$$v_1 = \langle 1, 1, 1 \rangle - \langle x^2, 1, 1 \rangle - \langle 1, x^2, 1 \rangle - \langle 1, 1, x^2 \rangle + \langle 1, x, x \rangle + \langle x, 1, x \rangle + \langle x, x, 1 \rangle.$$

The support of S with respect to the basis $\langle 1 \rangle, \langle x \rangle, \langle x^2 \rangle$ is

$$\{(0, 0, 0), (2, 0, 0), (0, 2, 0), (0, 0, 2), (0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0)\}$$

An optimal solution to the linear program is $x(1, 0) = x(2, 0) = x(3, 0) = \frac{1}{2}$, $x(1, 1) = x(2, 1) = x(3, 1) = \frac{1}{4}$ and $x(1, 2) = x(2, 2) = x(3, 2) = 0$, which gives $\text{rk}^G(v) \geq \text{rk}^T(v) = \sum_{i,j} x(i, j) = \frac{9}{4} = 2.25$. An optimal solution for the dual program is $y(2, 0, 0) = y(0, 2, 0) = y(0, 0, 2) = \frac{1}{4}$ and $y(0, 1, 1) = y(1, 0, 1) = y(1, 1, 0) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $y(0, 0, 0) = 0$.

The support of the tensor $v^{\boxtimes n} = v \boxtimes v \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes v$ is contained in the set

$$T_n = \{(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \in (\{0, 1, 2\}^n)^3 \mid |\lambda| \leq 2n, |\mu| \leq 2n, |\nu| \leq 2n\}.$$

We will give a solution to the linear program $\mathbf{LP}(S^n)$ that we conjecture to be optimal. Whether optimal or not, it will give an upper bound for the G -stable rank of $v^{\boxtimes n}$. Suppose that $t_0, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{2n} \geq 0$ are numbers such that $t_i + t_j + t_k \geq 1$ whenever $i + j + k \leq 2n$. If we define $x(i, \lambda) = t_{|\lambda|}$ for all $\lambda \in \{0, 1, 2\}^n$, and $i = 1, 2, 3$ then we have $x(1, \lambda) + x(2, \mu) + x(3, \nu) = t_{|\lambda|} + t_{|\mu|} + t_{|\nu|} \geq 1$, so we have a solution to the linear program. So we get

$$\mathrm{rk}^G(v) \leq \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{\lambda} x(i, \lambda) = 3 \sum_{\lambda} t_{|\lambda|} = 3 \sum_{i=0}^{2n} f_{n,i} t_i$$

where $f_{n,i}$ is the number of solutions to $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n = d$ with $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. So $f_{n,i}$ is the coefficient of x^i in $(1 + x + x^2)^n$. To choose the t 's optimally, we have to solve a linear program by minimizing $3 \sum_{i=0}^{2n} f_{n,i} t_i$ under the constraints:

- (1) $t_i + t_j + t_k \geq 1$ if $i + j + k \leq 2n$;
- (2) $t_i \geq 0$ for all i .

We get the following optimal solutions for the t_i :

n		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	UB	EG'	EG	best cap set
1	$f_{1,i}$	1	1	1	0	0	0	0				
	t_i	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	0	0	0	0	$2\frac{1}{4}$	3	3	2
2	$f_{2,i}$	1	2	3	2	1	0	0				
	t_i	$\frac{3}{5}$	$\frac{2}{5}$	$\frac{1}{5}$	0	0	0	0	6	7	9	4
3	$f_{3,i}$	1	3	6	7	6	3	1				
	t_i	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	0	0	0	0	15	18	30	9
4	$f_{4,i}$	1	4	10	16	19	16	10				
	t_i	1	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	0	0	39	45	45	20
5	$f_{5,i}$	1	5	15	30	45	51	45				
	t_i	1	$\frac{4}{5}$	$\frac{3}{5}$	$\frac{2}{5}$	$\frac{1}{5}$	0	0	105	123	153	45
6	$f_{6,i}$	1	6	21	50	90	126	141				
	t_i	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	0	0	274	324	504	112

In the table, the column UB gives the value of $3 \sum_{i=0}^{2n} f_{n,i} t_i$ which is an upper bound for the G -stable rank and the cardinality of a cap set in \mathbb{F}_3^n . The column labeled “best cap set” gives the cardinality of the largest known cap set in \mathbb{F}_3^n . The column EG gives the Ellenberg–Gijswijt upper bound, which is $3 \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{2}{3}n \rfloor} f_{n,i}$. This estimate relies on the fact that if i, j, k are nonnegative integers with $i + j + k \leq 2n$, then it follows that $\min\{i, j, k\} \leq \lfloor \frac{2n}{3} \rfloor$. But one can say something stronger, namely $i \leq \lfloor \frac{2n}{3} \rfloor$, $j \leq \lfloor \frac{2n-1}{3} \rfloor$ or $k \leq \lfloor \frac{2n-2}{3} \rfloor$. This observation gives a better bound that is still based on the slice rank in the column labeled EG'.

In the table of Section 1.5 we have computed the optimal value of $3 \sum_{i=0}^{2n} f_{n,i} t_i$ rounded down to the nearest integer for $n \leq 20$. This bound is an upper bound for the cardinality of a cap set in \mathbb{F}_3^n .

Looking at optimal solutions for small n , we make the following conjecture:

Conjecture 6.1. *The optimal solution of the linear program for $t_0, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{2n}$ is as follows:*

$$\begin{cases} \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{2n-3}{3}}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, 0, 0, \dots & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \pmod{3} \\ \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{2n-5}{3}}, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, 0, 0, \dots & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \\ \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{2n-7}{3}}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{1}{5}, 0, 0, \dots & \text{if } n \equiv 2 \pmod{3} \end{cases}$$

7. CONCLUSION AND FURTHER DIRECTIONS

The G -stable rank is a new notion of rank for tensors. Up to a constant it is equal to the slice rank, but it is more refined in the sense that it can take non-integer values, and unlike the slice rank it is supermultiplicative with respect to vertical tensor products. As an illustration, we showed that the G -stable rank can be used to improve upper bounds for the cardinality of cap sets. A proof of Conjecture 6.1 may lead to stronger asymptotic upper bounds for the cap set problem. Numerical experiments suggest an upper bound of the form $C\theta^n/\sqrt{n}$ for some constant C .

Besides algebraic applications of tensor decompositions there are also many numerical applications such as psychometrics [7, 15, 35–37] and chemometrics [1]. For more details and references, see the survey article [2] or the books [25, 26]. The formula (2) allows us to compute or approximate the G -stable rank for real or complex tensors using optimization. Future directions of research include algorithms for approximating the G -stable rank of a tensor, or to approximate a given tensor by tensors of low G -stable rank and apply these to such tasks as denoising, dimension reduction and tensor completion.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. J. Appellof and E. R. Davidson, *Strategies for analyzing data from video fluorometric monitoring of liquid chromatographic effluents*, *Anal. Chem.* **53** (1981), 2053–2056.
- [2] Tamara G. Kolda and Brett W. Bader, *Tensor decompositions and applications*, *SIAM Rev.* **51** (2009), no. 3, 455–500.
- [3] Michael Bateman and Nets Hawk Katz, *New bounds on cap sets*, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **25** (2012), no. 2, 585–613.
- [4] Jonah Blasiak, Thomas Church, Henry Cohn, Joshua A. Grochow, Eric Naslund, William F. Sawin, and Chris Umans, *On cap sets and the group-theoretic approach to matrix multiplication*, *Discrete Anal.* (2017).
- [5] T. C. Brown and J. P. Buhler, *A density version of a geometric Ramsey theorem*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **32** (1982), no. 1, 20–34.
- [6] Peter Bürgisser, Michael Clausen, and M. Amin Shokrollahi, *Algebraic complexity theory*, *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*, vol. 315, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. With the collaboration of Thomas Lickteig.
- [7] J. D. Carroll and J. J. Chang, *Analysis of individual differences in multidimensional scaling via the N -way generalization of “Eckart-Young” decomposition*, *Psychometrika* **35** (1970), 283–319.
- [8] Matthias Christandl, Fulvio Gesmundo, and Asger Kjærulff Jensen, *Border rank is not multiplicative under the tensor product*, *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom.* **3** (2019), no. 2, 231–255.
- [9] Matthias Christandl, Péter Vrana, and Jeroen Zuiddam, *Universal points in the asymptotic spectrum of tensors* (2017), available at [arXiv:1709.07851](https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.07851).

- [10] P. M. Cohn, *Skew fields*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 57, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. Theory of general division rings.
- [11] Ernie Croot, Vsevolod F. Lev, and Péter Pál Pach, *Progression-free sets in \mathbb{Z}_4^n are exponentially small*, Ann. of Math. (2) **185** (2017), no. 1, 331–337.
- [12] Yves Edel, *Extensions of generalized product caps*, Des. Codes Cryptogr. **31** (2004), no. 1, 5–14.
- [13] Jordan S. Ellenberg and Dion Gijswijt, *On large subsets of \mathbb{F}_q^n with no three-term arithmetic progression*, Ann. of Math. (2) **185** (2017), no. 1, 339–343.
- [14] Marc Fortin and Christophe Reutenauer, *Commutative/noncommutative rank of linear matrices and subspaces of matrices of low rank*, Sémin. Lothar. Combin. **52** (2004/07), Art. B52f, 12.
- [15] R. A. Harshman, *Foundations of PARAFAC procedure: Models and conditions for an “explanatory” multi-modal factor analysis*, UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics **16** (1970), 1–84.
- [16] Johan Håstad, *Tensor rank is NP-complete*, Automata, languages and programming (Stresa, 1989), Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 372, Springer, Berlin, 1989, pp. 451–460.
- [17] ———, *Tensor rank is NP-complete*, J. Algorithms **11** (1990), no. 4, 644–654.
- [18] David Hilbert, *Ueber die vollen Invariantensysteme*, Math. Ann. **42** (1893), no. 3, 313–373 (German).
- [19] F. L. Hitchcock, *The expression of a tensor or a polyadic as a sum of products*, J. Math. Physics **6** (1927), no. 1, 164–181.
- [20] ———, *Multiple invariants and generalized rank of a p -way matrix or tensor*, J. Math. Physics **7** (1927), no. 1, 39–79.
- [21] Gábor Ivanyos, Youming Qiao, and K. V. Subrahmanyam, *Non-commutative Edmonds’ problem and matrix semi-invariants*, Comput. Complexity **26** (2017), no. 3, 717–763.
- [22] George R. Kempf, *Instability in invariant theory*, Ann. of Math. (2) **108** (1978), no. 2, 299–316.
- [23] George Kempf and Linda Ness, *The length of vectors in representation spaces*, Algebraic geometry (Proc. Summer Meeting, Univ. Copenhagen, Copenhagen, 1978), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 732, Springer, Berlin, 1979, pp. 233–243.
- [24] Robert Kleinberg, David E. Speyer, and Will Sawin, *The growth of tri-colored sum-free sets*, Discrete Anal. (2018), Paper No. 12, 10.
- [25] P. M. Kroonenberg, *Applied Multiway Data Analysis*, Wiley, New York, 2008.
- [26] J. M. Landsberg, *Tensors: geometry and applications*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 128, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [27] Roy Meshulam, *On subsets of finite abelian groups with no 3-term arithmetic progressions*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **71** (1995), no. 1, 168–172.
- [28] D. Mumford, J. Fogarty, and F. Kirwan, *Geometric Invariant Theory*, 3rd ed., Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (2), vol. 34, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
- [29] Yaroslav Shitov, *Counterexamples to Strassen’s direct sum conjecture*, Acta Math. **222** (2019), no. 2, 363–379.
- [30] Vin de Silva and Lek-Heng Lim, *Tensor rank and the ill-posedness of the best low-rank approximation problem*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **30** (2008), no. 3, 1084–1127, DOI 10.1137/06066518X. MR2447444
- [31] Volker Strassen, *Gaussian elimination is not optimal*, Numer. Math. **13** (1969), 354–356.
- [32] ———, *Vermeidung von Divisionen*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **264** (1973), 184–202 (German, with English summary).
- [33] Terence Tao, *A symmetric formulation of the Croot–Lev–Pach–Ellenberg–Gijswijt capset bound* (2016), available at <https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2016/05/18/>. blog post.
- [34] Terence Tao and Will Sawin, *Notes on the “slice rank” of tensors* (2016), available at <https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2016/08/24/>. blog post.
- [35] L. R. Tucker, *Implications of factor analysis of three-way matrices for measurement of change*, Problems in Measuring Change (C. W. Harris, ed.), University of Wisconsin Press, 1963, pp. 122–137.
- [36] ———, *The extension of factor analysis to three-dimensional matrices*, Contributions to Mathematical Psychology (H. Gulliksen and N. Frederiksen, eds.), Holt Rinehardt & Winston, New York, 1964, pp. 110–127.
- [37] ———, *Some mathematical notes on three-mode factor analysis*, Psychometrika **1966**, 279–311.
- [38] Christopher Woodward, *Moment maps and geometric invariant theory*, Le cours du C.I.R.M. **1** (2010), no. 1, 55–98.