

Graph States and the Variety of Principal Minors

Vincenzo Galgano*, Frédéric Holweck†

Abstract

In Quantum Information theory, graph states are quantum states defined by graphs. In this work we exhibit a correspondence between graph states and the variety of binary symmetric principal minors, in particular their corresponding orbits under the action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$. We start by approaching the topic more widely, that is by studying the orbits of stabilizer-state subgroups of the n -fold Pauli group under an action of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\mathrm{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$, where $\mathcal{C}_n^{\mathrm{loc}}$ is the n -fold local Clifford group: we derive this action from the natural action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ on the variety $\mathcal{Z}_n \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{F}_2^{2^n})$ of principal minors of binary symmetric $n \times n$ matrices. The crucial step in this correspondence is in translating the latter action into an action of the local symplectic group $\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ on the Lagrangian Grassmannian $\mathrm{LG}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(n, 2n)$. We conclude by studying how the action on the stabilizer-state groups induces onto the stabilizer states, and finally restricting to the case of graph states.

Key-words: graph states, stabilizer states, Pauli group, local Clifford group, Lagrangian Grassmannian, symmetric principal minors.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	3
2.1	The Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n and the local Clifford group $\mathcal{C}_n^{\mathrm{loc}}$	3
2.2	The symplectic polar space $\mathcal{W}(2n - 1, 2)$ and \mathcal{I}^n	5
2.3	The Lagrangian Grassmannian $\mathrm{LG}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(n, 2n)$ and \mathcal{Z}_n	7
3	Orbits in \mathcal{Z}_n induced by $\mathcal{C}_n^{\mathrm{loc}}$ acting on \mathcal{P}_n	11
3.1	$\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ acting on $\mathcal{W}(2n - 1, 2)$ and \mathcal{I}^n	11
3.2	$\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ acting on $\mathrm{LG}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(n, 2n)$	13
3.3	$\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ acting on \mathcal{Z}_n as $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n}$	14

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Trento, 38123 Povo (TN), Italy

†Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire Carnot de Bourgogne, ICB/UTBM, UMR6303 CNRS, Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté, F-90010 Belfort, France

4	Orbits in $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ induced by $SL(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ acting on \mathcal{Z}_n	17
4.1	$SL(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ acting on \mathcal{Z}_n	17
4.2	$Sp_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ acting on $LG_{\mathbb{F}_2}(n, 2n)$ and \mathcal{I}_n	19
4.3	$\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ acting on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$	22
5	Stabilizer states and their orbits under $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$	24
6	Graph states and their orbits under $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$	26
7	Applications	31
7.1	Orbits of 4-qubit graph states from orbits of \mathcal{Z}_4	31
7.2	Orbits of \mathcal{Z}_5 from 5-qubit graph states classification	32
	Acknowledgement	35
	References	35

1 Introduction

In Quantum Information, stabilizer states are quantum states known in particular for quantum error correcting codes [6]. In the stabilizer formalism, a stabilizer state is described by a maximal n -fold abelian subgroup $\mathcal{S}_{M_1, \dots, M_n}$ of the n -fold Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n (see Sec. 2 for definitions) that stabilizes it. Graph states are a special class of quantum stabilizer states that can also be elegantly described by a graph $G = (V, E)$ that encodes its stabilizer group. Graph states have also many applications in quantum information processing [10]. They are in particular useful for Measured Based Quantum Computation (MBQC) [10, 2, 18], for quantum error correcting codes [6] and for secret sharing [17, 1]. As a resource for quantum information, it is interesting to propose classification of graph states. A natural framework to classify quantum states is to consider the group of local unitary operations LU. However for stabilizer states (and graph states), one usually restricts ourselves to the group of local unitaries within the Clifford group [24, 25]. We will denote by $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \subset \text{LU}$ the group of local Clifford acting on n qubit states. Under the action of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$, graph states have been classified up to $n = 12$ qubits [10, 3, 4].

The variety \mathcal{Z}_n of principal minors for $n \times n$ symmetric matrices over a field \mathbb{K} [20] is an algebraic variety of $\mathbb{P}^{2^n - 1}(\mathbb{K})$ introduced by Holtz and Strumfels [11] in order to study relations among principal minors of symmetric matrices. The question of finding if there exists a matrix satisfying predefined conditions on its principal minors has many applications to matrix theory, probability, statistical physics and computer vision [7, 13, 21]. The goal of this paper is to show another potential application of

the study of this variety over the two-elements field $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{F}_2$ by establishing a bijection between classes of graph states and orbits of the variety \mathcal{Z}_n . More precisely, the main result of this paper is the following theorem.

Theorem 1. The Lagrangian mapping (Sec. 2) induces a bijection between the $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ -orbits of maximal n -fold abelian subgroups of \mathcal{P}_n and the $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ -orbits of $\mathcal{Z}_n \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{F}_2^{2^n})$. In particular, there is a one to one correspondence between representatives of the graph states classification, for the $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ action, and the normal forms of the $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ -orbits of \mathcal{Z}_n .

Regarding the cardinality of the orbits, the Lagrangian mapping shows that, if \mathcal{O}_i is a $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ -orbit of \mathcal{Z}_n , then the number of corresponding stabilizer states is $4^n |\mathcal{O}_i|$.

Maximal n -fold abelian subgroups correspond to subspaces of maximal dimension of the symplectic polar space of rank n and order 2, $\mathcal{W}(2n - 1, 2)$ (See Sec. 2). The bijection induced by the Lagrangian mapping between subspaces of maximal dimension of $\mathcal{W}(2n - 1, 2)$ and points of \mathcal{Z}_n was already established in [12] in order to generalize observations made in [16] regarding the $n = 3$ case and its connection with the so-called black-holes/qubits correspondence. More recently, that same bijection was also considered in [26] with motivating examples from supergravity theory. It was proven that over \mathbb{F}_2 , \mathcal{Z}_n is the image of the Spinor variety and thus a $\text{Spin}(2n + 1)$ -orbit. However the correspondence of orbits, as established in Theorem 1, was not proven in the former papers, neither was the connection with graph states classification.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we recall the basic definitions regarding the n -qubit Pauli group, the symplectic polar space and the Lagrangian mapping. In Sec. 3 and 4 we show how the $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ action on the symplectic polar space translates to an action on the variety of principal minors, proving the first part of Theorem 1. In Sec. 5 and 6 we recall the definition and basic properties of stabilizer states and graph states. This achieves the proof of our Theorem. Finally Sec. 7 is dedicated to applications of our correspondence.

2 Preliminaries

In this first section one recalls the definitions the n -fold Pauli group and the Clifford group, one introduces the symplectic polar space of rank n and order 2 that encodes the commutation relations of \mathcal{P}_n and finally we describe the Lagrangian mapping.

2.1 The Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n and the local Clifford group $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$

The group of the elementary *Pauli matrices* is the group $\mathcal{P}_1 = \langle iX, iZ, iY \rangle \subset \text{U}(2, \mathbb{C})$ where

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We notice that $X^2 = Z^2 = Y^2 = I$ and the following commutation rules hold

$$XZ = -ZX = -iY, \quad XY = -YX = iZ, \quad ZY = -YZ = -iX.$$

Moreover, $\#\mathcal{P}_1 = 16$ and its center is $Z(\mathcal{P}_1) = \{\pm I, \pm iI\} \simeq \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$: in particular, $V_1 = \mathcal{P}_1/Z(\mathcal{P}_1) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

Definition. The n -fold **Pauli group** is the group $\mathcal{P}_n = \{A_1 \otimes \dots \otimes A_n \mid A_i \in \mathcal{P}_1\} \subset U(2^n, \mathbb{C})$.

From the commutation rules above it is clear that

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \left\{ \pm Z^{\mu_1} X^{\nu_1} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\mu_n} X^{\nu_n}, \pm i Z^{\mu_1} X^{\nu_1} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\mu_n} X^{\nu_n} \mid \mu_i, \nu_i \in \{0, 1\} \right\}.$$

We notice that $\#\mathcal{P}_n = 4 \cdot 4^n$ and its center is $Z(\mathcal{P}_n) = \{\pm I^{\otimes n}, \pm i I^{\otimes n}\} \simeq \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$.

Remark 2.1. The quotient $V_n = \mathcal{P}_n/Z(\mathcal{P}_n)$ is in one-to-one correspondence with \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_n & \xleftrightarrow{1:1} & \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} \\ [Z^{\mu_1} X^{\nu_1} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\mu_n} X^{\nu_n}] & \longleftrightarrow & (\mu_1, \nu_1, \dots, \mu_n, \nu_n) \end{array} \quad (1)$$

However, this correspondence is not unique, but it depends on the coordinates we choose in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} : for instance, another one-to-one correspondence is given by

$$[Z^{\mu_1} X^{\nu_1} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\mu_n} X^{\nu_n}] \longleftrightarrow (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n, \nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_n). \quad (2)$$

Definition. The n -fold **Clifford group** is the normalizer

$$\mathcal{C}_n = N_{U(2^n, \mathbb{C})}(\mathcal{P}_n) = \{U \in U(2^n, \mathbb{C}) \mid U\mathcal{P}_n U^H = \mathcal{P}_n\}.$$

It is known that $\mathcal{C}_n = \langle H_j, \sqrt{Z}_k, CNOT_{st} \rangle$ where

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sqrt{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{bmatrix}, \quad CNOT = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & 0 \\ 0 & X \end{bmatrix}$$

and $H_j = I \otimes \dots \otimes \overbrace{H}^{j\text{-th}} \otimes \dots \otimes I$ (same for \sqrt{Z}_k), while $CNOT_{st}$ acts as $CNOT$ on the s -th and t -th factors of $U(2^n, \mathbb{C}) \simeq U(2, \mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ and as the identity on the remaining ones.

Since not all matrices in \mathcal{C}_n are decomposable (i.e. of the form $U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n$ with $U_i \in U(2, \mathbb{C})$), it makes sense to give the next definition.

Definition. The n -fold local Clifford group is the subgroup

$$\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} = \{U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n \mid U_i \in \mathcal{C}_1\} < \mathcal{C}_n .$$

By definition, the local Clifford group $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ acts on the Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n by conjugacy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \times \mathcal{P}_n &\longrightarrow \mathcal{P}_n \\ (U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n, A_1 \otimes \dots \otimes A_n) &\mapsto (U_1 A_1 U_1^H) \otimes \dots \otimes (U_n A_n U_n^H) . \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Fact 2.2. $\mathcal{C}_1^{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{C}_1 = \langle H, \sqrt{Z} \rangle$ and $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} = \langle H_j, \sqrt{Z_k} \rangle$.

Clearly, $\mathcal{P}_1 \subset \langle H, \sqrt{Z} \rangle = \mathcal{C}_1$: indeed $Z = (\sqrt{Z})^2 \in \mathcal{C}_1$, $X = HZH^H \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $Y = -iXZ \in \mathcal{C}_1$. Let us explicit the action of \mathcal{C}_1 on the elementary Pauli matrices:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} X \\ H \swarrow \quad \searrow \sqrt{Z} \circ \\ Z \quad \quad Y \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} Z \\ H \swarrow \quad \searrow \sqrt{Z} \circ \\ X \quad \quad Z \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} Y \\ H \swarrow \quad \searrow \sqrt{Z} \circ \\ -Y \quad \quad -X \end{array} \end{array}$$

2.2 The symplectic polar space $\mathcal{W}(2n-1, 2)$ and \mathcal{I}^n

By Remark 2.1 we know that the Pauli group quotient V_n is in one-to-one correspondence with the affine space \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} . Let us denote the binary projective space $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{F}_2^{2n})$ by \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} and let us fix the coordinates (2). Thus we have

$$M = \alpha Z^{\mu_1} X^{\nu_1} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\mu_n} X^{\nu_n} \dashrightarrow [\mu_1 : \dots : \mu_n : \nu_1 : \dots : \nu_n] = P_M \quad (4)$$

where the arrow is dashed since the above map is actually not defined in $\alpha I^{\otimes n}$.

Moreover, given two Pauli group elements $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and their associated points $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1}$, it holds

$$M_1 M_2 \mapsto P_1 + P_2 .$$

Up to the coefficients α 's (which are considered as global phases), this association completely describes \mathcal{P}_n by projective points as a set, but it loses the commutation information we have in \mathcal{P}_n . Next we want to recover such information [9, 15].

Let $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1}$ be the corresponding points. By a simple count it comes out that

$$M_1 M_2 = M_2 M_1 \iff \sum_{i=1}^n (\mu_i^{(1)} \nu_i^{(2)} - \mu_i^{(2)} \nu_i^{(1)}) = 0 .$$

Consider the symplectic bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_J$ on \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} (hence on \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1}) where

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} & I_n \\ -I_n & \end{bmatrix} \stackrel{\mathbb{F}_2}{=} \begin{bmatrix} I_n & \\ & I_n \end{bmatrix} .$$

Since $\langle P_1, P_2 \rangle_J = {}^t P_1 J P_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (\mu_i^{(1)} \nu_i^{(2)} - \mu_i^{(2)} \nu_i^{(1)})$, the previous relation is equivalent to

$$M_1 M_2 = M_2 M_1 \iff \langle P_1, P_2 \rangle_J = 0$$

that is *commuting Pauli group elements correspond to isotropic points with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_J$* .

Definition. The **symplectic polar space** of rank n over \mathbb{F}_2 (with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_J$) is the set of (fully) isotropic subspaces of \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1}

$$\mathcal{W}(2n-1, 2) = \{W \subset \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} \mid \forall P, Q \in W, \langle P, Q \rangle_J = 0\} .$$

Let $M \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and let $P \in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1}$ be its associated point: then P defines the hyperplane in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1}

$$H_P = \{Q \in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} \mid \langle P, Q \rangle_J = 0\} .$$

Clearly, this hyperplane is not fully isotropic. However, we can extend this construction to any set of Pauli group elements with the only condition that they mutually commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P}_n & \dashrightarrow & \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} \quad \vee \\ M_1, \dots, M_k & \mapsto & P_1, \dots, P_k \quad \mapsto \quad H_{P_1, \dots, P_k} = \{Q \in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} \mid \langle P_i, Q \rangle_J = 0, \forall i = 1 : k\} \end{array}$$

The condition for the M_i 's to be mutually commuting implies that P_i 's are two-by-two isotropic, but the subspace H_{P_1, \dots, P_k} is not fully isotropic in general.

We know that, for any $P \in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1}$, H_P is a hyperplane, hence it has (projective) dimension $2n-2$. Generally, given $P_1, \dots, P_k \in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1}$ two-by-two isotropic, the subspace H_{P_1, \dots, P_k} does not have dimension $2n-1-k$, but it holds so if we start from k mutually commuting Pauli group elements M_1, \dots, M_k with the additional condition to be *independent*, that is

$$M_1^{c_1} \cdots M_k^{c_k} = I^{\otimes n} \iff \forall i = 1 : k, c_i = 0 .$$

Proposition 2.3. Let $M_1, \dots, M_k \in \mathcal{P}_n$ be mutually commuting and independent Pauli group elements and let $P_1, \dots, P_k \in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1}$ be their associated points. Then:

- (i) the matrix $S = [P_1 | \dots | P_k] \in \mathfrak{M}_{2n \times k}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ has full rank k and it holds ${}^t S J S = 0$;
- (ii) $H_{P_1, \dots, P_k} = \text{Col}(S)^\vee$, where $\text{Col}(S) \subset \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1}$ is the subspace generated by the columns of S and $\text{Col}(S)^\vee$ is its dual space.

Proof. The thesis (i) follows by (4) and the definition of being independent: in particular, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_2} \text{Col}(S) = k$. Moreover, since ${}^t S J S = 0$, in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} it is easy to prove (by double inclusion) that $\text{Col}(S)^\vee = H_{P_1, \dots, P_k}$, hence the thesis (ii) in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} . \square

Corollary 2.4. If $M_1, \dots, M_k \in \mathcal{P}_n$ are mutually commuting and independent Pauli group elements, then $\dim_{\mathbb{P}} H_{P_1, \dots, P_k} = 2n - 1 - k$.

Remark 2.5. Since we work in characteristic 2, the symplectic form J is actually a quadratic form and it defines a quadric $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1}$. Thus the isotropic subspaces of \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} with respect to the symplectic form J coincide with the subspaces of \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} which are contained in the quadric \mathcal{Q} : it is a classical result that such subspaces have dimension *at most* $\lfloor \frac{2n-2}{2} \rfloor = n - 1$.

By Remark 2.5, it follows that to actually reach out subspaces of type H_{P_1, \dots, P_k} (with P_i 's mutually commuting and independent!) which are fully isotropic (i.e. $H_{P_1, \dots, P_k} \in \mathcal{W}(2n - 1, 2)$) we need to impose $\dim H_{P_1, \dots, P_k} = 2n - 1 - k \leq n - 1$, that is $k \geq n$. Actually, our interest is focused on the $n - 1$ -dimensional fully isotropic subspaces of \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} also known as generators of $\mathcal{W}(2n - 1, 2)$

$$\mathcal{I}^n = \{W \in \mathcal{W}(2n - 1, 2) \mid \dim_{\mathbb{P}} W = n - 1\} .$$

By Proposition (2.3)(ii), it follows that every $W \in \mathcal{I}^n$ is of the form H_{P_1, \dots, P_n} where P_1, \dots, P_n come from mutually commuting and independent Pauli group elements M_1, \dots, M_n :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{P}_n & \dashrightarrow & \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} & \dashrightarrow & \mathcal{I}^n \subset \mathcal{W}(2n - 1, 2) \\ \underbrace{M_1, \dots, M_n}_{\text{indep. \& commut.}} & \mapsto & \underbrace{P_1, \dots, P_n}_{\text{indep. in } \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}} & \mapsto & \underbrace{H_{P_1, \dots, P_n}}_{\dim_{\mathbb{P}} = n-1} . \end{array} \quad (5)$$

Definition. A n -fold maximal abelian subgroup $\mathcal{S}_{M_1, \dots, M_n}$ in \mathcal{P}_n is a subgroup of \mathcal{P}_n generated by n independent and mutually commuting Pauli group elements M_1, \dots, M_n .

Let us denote by $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ the set of n -fold abelian subgroups in \mathcal{P}_n . Thus, in the previous notations, we can reinterpret the correspondence (5) as

$$\mathcal{S}_{M_1, \dots, M_n} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n) \longleftrightarrow H_{P_1, \dots, P_n} \in \mathcal{I}^n . \quad (6)$$

2.3 The Lagrangian Grassmannian $\text{LG}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(n, 2n)$ and \mathcal{Z}_n

We recall that the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(n, 2n)$ is the set of n -dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} : we will write $\text{Gr}(n, 2n)$ by omitting the ground field \mathbb{F}_2 . The Grassmannian

gains the structure of projective variety by the Plücker embedding [8]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pl: } \text{Gr}(n, 2n) &\hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}\left(\bigwedge^n \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}\right) \simeq \mathbb{P}_2^{\binom{2n}{n}-1} \\ \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle &\mapsto [v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_n] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

By abuse of notation, we will simply look at $\text{Gr}(n, 2n)$ as a subset of $\mathbb{P}(\bigwedge^n \mathbb{F}_2^{2n})$. It is useful to describe the Grassmannian by its parameterization in $\mathbb{P}_2^{\binom{2n}{n}-1}$: given $\langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle \in \text{Gr}(n, 2n)$, by a basis change we can rewrite the vectors v_i 's with respect to the canonical basis

$$v_i = e_i + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ji} e_{n+j} \quad (8)$$

that is, by putting the two basis in columns, we have the matrices

$$\left[v_1 \mid \dots \mid v_n \right] \rightsquigarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & 1 & \\ a_{11} & \dots & a_{1n} & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \\ a_{n1} & \dots & a_{nn} & \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ A \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{M}_{2n \times n}(\mathbb{F}_2).$$

Definition. The matrix $A \in \mathfrak{M}_n(\mathbb{F}_2)$ is called the **Plücker** (coordinates) **matrix** of the subspace $\langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle$, and we refer to its (ordered) columns as the **Plücker basis**.

After the basis change (8), we obtain the following projective coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigwedge^n \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}\right) &\xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbb{P}_2^{\binom{2n}{n}-1} \\ [v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_n] &\mapsto [1 : a_{ji} : A_{\{i,j\}\{s,t\}} : \dots : A_{\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}\{j_1, \dots, j_k\}} : \dots : \det A] \end{aligned}$$

where $A_{\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}\{j_1, \dots, j_k\}}$ is the (determinant of the) $k \times k$ minor of A given by the rows i_1, \dots, i_k and the columns j_1, \dots, j_k .

Fact 2.6. The Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(n, 2n) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(\bigwedge^n \mathbb{F}_2^{2n})$ is parameterized by all minors of $n \times n$ matrices with coefficients in \mathbb{F}_2 .

Remark 2.7. The parameterization of the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(n, 2n)$ by all minors of $n \times n$ matrices can be seen as induced by all minors of $2n \times n$ matrices of the form $\begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ A \end{bmatrix}$ as A varies among the $n \times n$ matrices: indeed, it is enough to project onto the coordinates given by minors fully contained in A . This different perspective is meaningless in the case of Grassmannians but it will make sense soon, when working with Lagrangian Grassmannians.

Let us restrict the Plücker embedding (7) to $\mathcal{I}^n \subset \mathcal{W}(2n-1, 2)$: more formally we have to apply the Plücker embedding to the set of n -dimensional affine subspaces of \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} whose projectivizations are in \mathcal{I}^n .

Definition. The **Lagrangian Grassmannian** $\text{LG}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(n, 2n)$ is the image via the Plücker embedding of \mathcal{I}^n

$$\text{LG}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(n, 2n) = \text{Pl}(\mathcal{I}^n) \subset \mathbb{P}\left(\bigwedge^n \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}\right).$$

Thus the Lagrangian Grassmannian is the projective variety parameterizing all $(n-1)$ -dimensional (fully) isotropic subspaces of \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} : again, we will write $\text{LG}(n, 2n)$ by omitting the ground field.

Our next goal is to find a parameterization of $\text{LG}(n, 2n)$ in $\mathbb{P}_2^{\binom{2n}{n}-1}$ [14].

Setting: Let us fix the coordinates (2) in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} and the symplectic form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_J$.

Given (v_1, \dots, v_n) a basis of $H_{P_1, \dots, P_n} \in \mathcal{I}^n$, by isotropicity we have $\langle v_i, v_j \rangle_J = 0$ for all $i, j = 1 : n$. By basis change (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_i, v_j \rangle_J = 0 &\iff \left\langle e_i + \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ki} e_{n+k}, e_j + \sum_{l=1}^n a_{lj} e_{n+l} \right\rangle_J = 0 \\ &\iff \left\langle e_i + \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ki} e_{n+k}, \sum_{l=1}^n a_{lj} e_l + e_{n+j} \right\rangle_I = 0 \\ &\iff a_{ij} + a_{ji} = 0 \xleftrightarrow{\mathbb{F}_2} a_{ji} = a_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

that is the matrix A of the Plücker coordinates of $H_{P_1, \dots, P_n} \in \mathcal{I}^n$ is symmetric.

Fact 2.8. The Lagrangian Grassmannian $\text{LG}(n, 2n)$ is parameterized by all minors of $n \times n$ symmetric matrices with coefficients in \mathbb{F}_2 .

$$\begin{aligned} H_{P_1, \dots, P_n} = \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} e_1 \\ \vdots \\ a_{11} \\ \vdots \\ a_{n1} \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} e_n \\ \vdots \\ a_{1n} \\ \vdots \\ a_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle &\dashrightarrow \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n) \dashrightarrow \text{LG}(n, 2n) \\ &\mapsto A = (a_{ji})_{i,j} \mapsto [1 : a_{ji} : A_{\{i,j\}\{s,t\}} : \dots : \det A] \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Among all minors $A_{\{i_1 \dots i_k\}\{j_1 \dots j_k\}}$ of a $n \times n$ symmetric matrix $A \in \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$,

we can restrict ourselves to consider the principal ones, that are the ones such that $i_1 = j_1, \dots, i_k = j_k$: we denote them by

$$A_{[i_1, \dots, i_k]} = \det \begin{bmatrix} a_{i_1, i_1} & \dots & a_{i_1, i_k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{i_k, i_1} & \dots & a_{i_k, i_k} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Clearly the principal minors appear in the coordinates of the Lagrangian Grassmannian: in a very naive way, we can write $\{A_{[i_1, \dots, i_k]}\} \subset \{A_{\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}\{j_1, \dots, j_k\}}\}$. Thus it makes sense to consider the projection of the Lagrangian Grassmannian $\text{LG}(n, 2n)$ to the coordinates represented by principal minors: since the number of principal minors of a $n \times n$ matrix is $\sum_{q=0}^n \binom{n}{q} = 2^n$, we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{LG}(n, 2n) \subset \mathbb{P}_2^{\binom{2n}{n}-1} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathbb{P}_2^{2^n-1} \\ [1 : a_{ji} : A_{\{i,j\}\{s,t\}} : \dots : \det A] & \mapsto & [1 : a_{ii} : A_{[i,j]} : \dots : \det A] \end{array}.$$

Definition. [19] The image of $\text{LG}(n, 2n)$ via the projection π is the **variety of principal minors** of $n \times n$ symmetric matrices. We denote it by

$$\mathcal{Z}_n = \pi(\text{LG}(n, 2n)) \subset \mathbb{P}_2^{2^n-1}.$$

Over a generic field \mathbb{K} , the projection π is just surjective, but over \mathbb{F}_2 it is injective too.

Proposition 2.9. The projection $\pi : \text{LG}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(n, 2n) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n \subset \mathbb{P}_2^{2^n-1}$ is an isomorphism [12].

Proof. The off-diagonal entries of $A \in \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ are determined by 2×2 principal minors: indeed

$$A_{[i,j]} = a_{ii}a_{jj} - a_{ij}^2 \xrightarrow{\mathbb{F}_2} a_{ij} = a_{ij}^2 = A_{[i,j]} - a_{ii}a_{jj}.$$

□

Let us recap all objects we have worked with so far in a unique diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} & & \mathbb{P}_2^{\binom{2n}{n}-1} & & \mathbb{P}_2^{2^n-1} \\ \mathcal{P}_n \dashrightarrow \mathcal{I}^n & \xrightarrow{\text{Pl}} & \text{LG}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(n, 2n) & \xrightarrow{\pi \simeq} & \mathcal{Z}_n \\ \\ M_1, \dots, M_n \dashrightarrow H_{P_1, \dots, P_n} & & [1 : a_{ij} : A_{\{i,j\}\{s,t\}} : \dots] & \xrightarrow{\pi} & [1 : a_{ii} : A_{[i,j]} : \dots] \\ & = \vdots & \uparrow & & \\ & \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} e_1 \\ \vdots \\ a_{11} \\ \vdots \\ a_{n1} \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} e_n \\ \vdots \\ a_{1n} \\ \vdots \\ a_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{Pl}} & \begin{bmatrix} e_1 \\ \vdots \\ a_{11} \\ \vdots \\ a_{n1} \end{bmatrix} \wedge \dots \wedge \begin{bmatrix} e_n \\ \vdots \\ a_{1n} \\ \vdots \\ a_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \end{array} \tag{10}$$

Definition. We denote by $\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ the **local symplectic group**

$$\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) = \{S \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{F}_2) \mid S \text{ is of the form (11) with } a_i d_i - b_i c_i \neq 0\} < \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{F}_2)$$

To lighten up the notation, we will use the same letter for both the local Clifford group element and its corresponding local symplectic transformation (that is U instead of S_U), but we will distinguish them by writing $U \in \mathcal{C}_n^{\mathrm{loc}}$ and $U \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$.

By (11) we can explicit the coordinates of the transformation $U \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$:

$$[\mu_1 : \dots : \mu_n : \nu_1 : \dots : \nu_n] \xrightarrow{U} [a_1 \mu_1 + b_1 \nu_1 : \dots : a_n \mu_n + b_n \nu_n : c_1 \mu_1 + d_1 \nu_1 : \dots : c_n \mu_n + d_n \nu_n] \quad (12)$$

Next we translate the action onto $\mathcal{W}(2n-1, 2)$: this immediately follows from the relation (even for non-isotropic subspaces)

$$\forall U \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2), \forall H_P \in (\mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1})^\vee, \quad U \cdot H_P = H_{UP} \in (\mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1})^\vee.$$

Moreover, the local symplectic transformations preserve the dimensions of the (fully) isotropic subspaces in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} , hence the subspace \mathcal{I}^n is $\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ -invariant. Thus the action (3) $\mathcal{C}_n^{\mathrm{loc}} \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_n$ induces the action

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \times \mathcal{I}^n &\longrightarrow \mathcal{I}^n \\ (U, H_{P_1, \dots, P_n}) &\longmapsto H_{UP_1, \dots, UP_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Now we can update the correspondence (5) to the following one:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P}_n & \dashrightarrow & \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} \xrightarrow{\vee} \mathcal{I}^n \subset \mathcal{W}(2n-1, 2) \\ \underbrace{M_1, \dots, M_n}_{\text{indep. \& commut.}} & \dashrightarrow & \underbrace{P_1, \dots, P_n}_{\text{indep. in } \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}} \xrightarrow{\vee} \underbrace{H_{P_1, \dots, P_n}}_{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} = n-1} \\ U \in \mathcal{C}_n^{\mathrm{loc}} \curvearrowright \downarrow & & U \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \curvearrowright \downarrow \\ UM_1 U^H, \dots, UM_n U^H & \dashrightarrow & UP_1, \dots, UP_n \xrightarrow{\vee} H_{UP_1, \dots, UP_n} \quad U \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \curvearrowright \end{array} \quad (14)$$

Remark 3.3. By definition, the local symplectic group $\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \simeq \mathfrak{S}_3^{\times n}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_n^{\mathrm{loc}} &\dashrightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \simeq \mathfrak{S}_3^{\times n} \\ U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n &\mapsto U \text{ as in (11)} \mapsto (U_1, \dots, U_n) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we underline that, in characteristics 2, the following isomorphism holds

$$\mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2) \simeq \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)$$

hence from now on we will use the two groups indistinctly.

where δ_{kj} is the Kronecker symbol: this is equivalent to the matrix product

$$U \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & a_n \end{bmatrix} I_n + \begin{bmatrix} b_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & b_n \end{bmatrix} S \\ \hline \begin{bmatrix} c_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & c_n \end{bmatrix} I_n + \begin{bmatrix} d_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & d_n \end{bmatrix} S \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 + b_1 s_{11} & b_1 s_{12} & \cdots & b_1 s_{1n} \\ b_2 s_{12} & a_2 + b_2 s_{22} & \cdots & b_2 s_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_n s_{1n} & \cdots & \cdots & a_n + b_n s_{nn} \\ \hline c_1 + d_1 s_{11} & d_1 s_{12} & \cdots & d_1 s_{1n} \\ d_2 s_{12} & c_2 + d_2 s_{22} & \cdots & d_2 s_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ d_n s_{1n} & \cdots & \cdots & c_n + d_n s_{nn} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

Thus $U(H_{P_1, \dots, P_n}) = \left\langle U \begin{bmatrix} e_1 \\ \vdots \\ s_{11} \\ \vdots \\ s_{n1} \end{bmatrix}, \dots, U \begin{bmatrix} e_n \\ \vdots \\ s_{1n} \\ \vdots \\ s_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle$ and, by applying the Plücker embedding,

$$\text{Pl} \left(U(H_{P_1, \dots, P_n}) \right) = \left[U \begin{bmatrix} e_1 \\ \vdots \\ s_{11} \\ \vdots \\ s_{n1} \end{bmatrix} \wedge \dots \wedge U \begin{bmatrix} e_n \\ \vdots \\ s_{1n} \\ \vdots \\ s_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \right]. \quad (17)$$

Remark 3.5. We must pay attention to the fact that the coordinates of (17) are *not* given by the minors of the matrix S in $\begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S \end{bmatrix}$ (16). Actually, they are given by all minors of the lower half of the Plücker matrix obtained by (16) after a basis change: if $\begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S' \end{bmatrix}$ is the Plücker matrix of $U(H_{P_1, \dots, P_n})$, the coordinates of (17) are given by all minors of S' .

We conclude that the action (13) $\text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}} \curvearrowright \mathcal{I}^n$ induces the action

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \times \text{LG}(n, 2n) &\longrightarrow \text{LG}(n, 2n) \\ (U, [v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_n]) &\mapsto [Uv_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Uv_n] \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

which, in Plücker coordinates and in the same notations of Remark 3.5, corresponds to the action

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \times \text{LG}(n, 2n) &\longrightarrow \text{LG}(n, 2n) \\ (U, [1 : s_{ij} : S_{\{i,j\}, \{s,t\}} : \dots : \det S]) &\mapsto [1 : s'_{ij} : S'_{\{i,j\}, \{s,t\}} : \dots : \det S'] \cdot \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

3.3 $\text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ acting on \mathcal{Z}_n as $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n}$

The action (19) translates into an action of $\text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ on \mathcal{Z}_n via the projection (actually, isomorphism over \mathbb{F}_2) $\pi : \text{LG}(n, 2n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n$: in the same notations,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \times \mathcal{Z}_n &\longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n \\ (U, [1 : s_{ii} : S_{[i,j]} : \dots : \det S]) &\mapsto [1 : s'_{ii} : S'_{[i,j]} : \dots : \det S'] \cdot \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$U \cdot [1 : s_{ii} : S_{[i,j]} : \dots : \det S] = [1 : s'_{ii} : S'_{[i,j]} : \dots : \det S'] .$$

Finally, the action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \curvearrowright \mathcal{Z}_n$ is equivalent to the action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n}$ on \mathcal{Z}_n via the representation (23).

4 Orbits in $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ induced by $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ acting on \mathcal{Z}_n

We complete the previous section by extending the previous group action by the semi-direct product with the group of permutation in order to prove the first part of Theorem 1.

4.1 $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ acting on \mathcal{Z}_n

Fix (v_0, v_1) a basis of \mathbb{F}_2^2 and the induced basis $(|i_1 \dots i_n\rangle = v_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_n} \mid i_k \in \{0, 1\})$ (in Dirac notation) of $\mathbb{F}_2^2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{F}_2^2$. Consider the isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F}_2^2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{F}_2^2 &\xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbb{F}_2^{2^n} \\ |0 \dots 0\rangle &\mapsto (1, 0, \dots, 0) \\ |0 \dots \underbrace{1}_{n-i} \dots 0\rangle &\mapsto (0, \dots, \underbrace{1}_{i+2}, \dots, 0) \\ &\vdots \\ |1 \dots 1\rangle &\mapsto (0, \dots, 0, 1) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

By Proposition 3.6 we know that the natural action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n}$ on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{F}_2^{2^n})$

$$(U_1, \dots, U_n) \cdot [v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_n] = [U_1 v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n v_n]$$

induces an action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n}$ on the variety of symmetric principal minors $\mathcal{Z}_n \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{F}_2^{2^n})$. Another natural action on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{F}_2^{2^n})$ is the one of the symmetric group \mathfrak{S}_n

$$\sigma \cdot [v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_n] = [v_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{\sigma(n)}]$$

which permutes the tensor product entries. It is known that this action preserves \mathcal{Z}_n : in particular, by isomorphism (24), the action of \mathfrak{S}_n on \mathcal{Z}_n is given by

$$\sigma \cdot [1 : s_{ii} : S_{[i,j]} : \dots : \det S] = [1 : s_{\sigma(i)\sigma(i)} : S_{[\sigma(i), \sigma(j)]} : \dots : \det S] . \quad (25)$$

It follows that there is an action of the semidirect product $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ on \mathcal{Z}_n .

Moreover, the action of \mathfrak{S}_n on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{F}_2^2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{F}_2^2)$ permuting the tensor entries induces an action of \mathfrak{S}_n on $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n}$ permuting the entries of the direct product

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : \mathfrak{S}_n \times \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} &\longrightarrow \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \\ (\sigma, (U_1, \dots, U_n)) &\mapsto (U_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, U_{\sigma(n)}) \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to an action of \mathfrak{S}_n on $\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ given by

$$\varphi : \left(\sigma, \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{S}_n \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \\ a_1 & & & b_1 & & \\ & \ddots & & & \ddots & \\ c_1 & & a_n & d_1 & & b_n \\ & \ddots & & & \ddots & \\ & & c_n & & & d_n \end{bmatrix} \right) \longmapsto \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \\ a_{\sigma(1)} & & & b_{\sigma(1)} & & \\ & \ddots & & & \ddots & \\ c_{\sigma(1)} & & a_{\sigma(n)} & d_{\sigma(1)} & & b_{\sigma(n)} \\ & \ddots & & & \ddots & \\ & & c_{\sigma(n)} & & & d_{\sigma(n)} \end{bmatrix}$$

Remark 4.1. This action φ is precisely the action $\varphi : \mathfrak{S}_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n})$ defining the semidirect product $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes_{\varphi} \mathfrak{S}_n$ which acts on \mathcal{Z}_n : in particular, the operation in $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes_{\varphi} \mathfrak{S}_n$ is

$$(g, \sigma) \cdot_{\varphi} (h, \tau) = (\varphi_{\tau}(g) \cdot h, \sigma \cdot \tau) \quad (26)$$

that is $((U_1, \dots, U_n), \sigma) \cdot_{\varphi} ((W_1, \dots, W_n), \tau) = ((U_{\tau(1)}W_1, \dots, U_{\tau(n)}W_n), \sigma \cdot \tau)$.

Now we translate the action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes_{\varphi} \mathfrak{S}_n$ on \mathcal{Z}_n into an action on $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ via the correspondence (21). We already know that $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n}$ acts on $S \in \mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ as $\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ on $\begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S \end{bmatrix}$ (see Proposition 3.6), that is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \times \mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n) \\ (g, S) &\mapsto S^g \end{aligned}$$

where

- $U_g \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2n}^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ the symplectic matrix corresponding to a given $g \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n}$;
- $\begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S^g \end{bmatrix}$ the Plücker matrix of $U_g \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S \end{bmatrix}$.

We derive the action of \mathfrak{S}_n on $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ by the relation (25): given $S \in \mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ and $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, we denote by ${}^{\sigma}S$ the matrix

$${}^{\sigma}S = \begin{bmatrix} s_{\sigma(1)\sigma(1)} & s_{\sigma(1)\sigma(2)} & \cdots & s_{\sigma(1)\sigma(n)} \\ s_{\sigma(2)\sigma(1)} & s_{\sigma(2)\sigma(2)} & \cdots & s_{\sigma(2)\sigma(n)} \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ s_{\sigma(n)\sigma(1)} & \cdots & & s_{\sigma(n)\sigma(n)} \end{bmatrix}$$

obtained by permuting via σ both columns and rows of S .

Remark 4.2. The matrix ${}^\sigma S$ is still symmetric since

$$s_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)} = s_{\sigma(j)\sigma(i)}$$

and it corresponds precisely to the point in the right-side of (25).

Remark 4.3. The action of \mathfrak{S}_n on $\text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ which permutes only the columns *can not* be the action induced by \mathcal{Z}_n : indeed, the matrix obtained by permuting only the columns of a symmetric matrix is (in general) not symmetric, hence this action is not an action at all on $\text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$.

Hence the action of \mathfrak{S}_n on \mathcal{Z}_n (25) induces the action

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{S}_n \times \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n) & \longrightarrow & \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n) \\ (\sigma, S) & \mapsto & {}^\sigma S \end{array} . \quad (27)$$

In the notations above, the action of the semidirect product on $\text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ is precisely

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Theta : \left(\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes_{\varphi} \mathfrak{S}_n \right) \times \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n) & \longrightarrow & \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n) \\ ((g, id), S) & \mapsto & S^g \\ ((I, \sigma), S) & \mapsto & {}^\sigma S \end{array} \quad (28)$$

and by (26) it follows the general definition of Θ

$$(g, \sigma) \cdot S = ((I, \sigma) \cdot_{\varphi} (g, id)) \cdot S = (I, \sigma) \cdot S^g = {}^\sigma(S^g) . \quad (29)$$

Remark 4.4. By the operation rule (26), it holds

$$(\varphi_{\sigma}^{-1}(g), id) \cdot_{\varphi} (I, \sigma) \stackrel{(a)}{=} (g, \sigma) \stackrel{(b)}{=} (I, \sigma) \cdot_{\varphi} (g, id) .$$

Since $\varphi_{\sigma}^{-1} = \varphi_{\sigma^{-1}}$, by equality (a) it follows

$$(g, \sigma) \cdot S = \left((\varphi_{\sigma^{-1}}(g), id) \cdot_{\varphi} (I, \sigma) \right) \cdot S = (\varphi_{\sigma^{-1}}(g), id) \cdot {}^\sigma S = ({}^\sigma S)^{\varphi_{\sigma^{-1}}(g)}$$

which, together with (29), implies

$$({}^\sigma S)^{\varphi_{\sigma^{-1}}(g)} = {}^\sigma(S^g) .$$

4.2 $\text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ acting on $\text{LG}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(n, 2n)$ and \mathcal{I}_n

Consider the action

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \left(\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes_{\varphi} \mathfrak{S}_n \right) \times \mathcal{Z}_n & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Z}_n \\ ((g, id), [1 : s_{ii} : S_{[i,j]} : \dots : \det S]) & \mapsto & [1 : (S^g)_{ii} : (S^g)_{[i,j]} : \dots : \det S^g] \\ ((I, \sigma), [1 : s_{ii} : S_{[i,j]} : \dots : \det S]) & \mapsto & [1 : s_{\sigma(i)\sigma(i)} : S_{[\sigma(i), \sigma(j)]} : \dots : \det S] \end{array} \quad (30)$$

and the equivalent action (28) on $\text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$. We recall that the action of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n}$ on $\text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ extends onto the Plücker matrices via the isomorphism $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \simeq \text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ as

$$g \cdot \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S^g \end{bmatrix} .$$

On the other hand, we extend the action (27) of \mathfrak{S}_n on $\text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ onto the Plücker matrices as

$$\sigma \cdot \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ \sigma S \end{bmatrix} \quad (31)$$

so that \mathfrak{S}_n sends Plücker matrices in Plücker matrices.

We are interested in extending the action of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \times \mathfrak{S}_n$ onto the Lagrangian Grassmannian $\text{LG}(n, 2n)$: we can easily derive it in Plücker coordinates as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \rtimes_{\varphi} \mathfrak{S}_n \right) \times \text{LG}(n, 2n) &\longrightarrow \text{LG}(n, 2n) \\ ((g, id), [1 : s_{ij} : S_{\{i,j\}\{h,k\}} : \dots : \det S]) &\mapsto [1 : (S^g)_{ij} : (S^g)_{\{i,j\}\{h,k\}} : \dots : \det S^g] \quad \cdot \\ ((I, \sigma), [1 : s_{ij} : S_{\{i,j\}\{h,k\}} : \dots : \det S]) &\mapsto [1 : s_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)} : S_{\{\sigma(i),\sigma(j)\}\{\sigma(h),\sigma(k)\}} : \dots : \det S] \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

However, our interest is into describe the above action in a more theoretic way, that is how the semidirect product acts on the elements of the form $[v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_n] \in \text{LG}(n, 2n)$: this is because next we want to pull the action back to \mathcal{L}_n .

To describe the action in the more theoretic way is equivalent to describe the action onto $2n \times n$ matrices $\begin{bmatrix} F \\ G \end{bmatrix}$ (describing lagrangian elements) so that, restricted to the Plücker matrices, it is the same as the one observed previously: this means that the action of the semidirect product on such matrices has to well-behave with respect to basis changes. Clearly, we already know the action of $\text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ on $\text{LG}(n, 2n)$: it only remains to understand the action of \mathfrak{S}_n .

Proposition 4.5. The action of \mathfrak{S}_n on the $2n \times n$ matrices describing lagrangian elements is given by

$$\sigma \cdot \begin{bmatrix} F \\ G \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma F \\ \sigma G \end{bmatrix} \quad (33)$$

where σ acts by permuting both the columns and rows of the two block separately.

Proof. By abuse of notation, let us fix $\begin{bmatrix} F \\ G \end{bmatrix} \in \text{LG}(n, 2n)$ and $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. Let $\begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S \end{bmatrix} = M_{2n} \begin{bmatrix} F \\ G \end{bmatrix} M_n$ be the Plücker matrix obtained by the basis changes $M_{2n} \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{F}_2^{2n})$ and $M_n \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$.

Since the action extends from (31), we know that σ must permute columns and rows of the matrices, thus we can represent it as a basis change: let $\Sigma_{2n} = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{bmatrix} \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{F}_2^{2n})$ and $\Sigma_n \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ be such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ \sigma S \end{bmatrix} = \sigma \cdot \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S \end{bmatrix} = \Sigma_{2n} \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S \end{bmatrix} \Sigma_n .$$

Since σ acts separately on I_n and S , it holds $\Sigma_{12} = \Sigma_{21} = 0$ and $\Sigma_{11} = \Sigma_{22}$. Moreover, Σ_n permutes the rows both of I_n and S , and, since I_n is preserved in (31), it follows that $\Sigma_n = \Sigma_{11}$ and $\Sigma_{2n} = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_n & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_n \end{bmatrix}$. In particular, a candidate for the action we are looking for is actually the one in (33) permuting columns and rows of both the upper and the lower block.

It only remains to show that this action of \mathfrak{S}_n well-behaves with respect to basis changes, that is there exist $M'_{2n} \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{F}_2^{2n})$ and $M'_n \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ such that $M'_{2n} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma F \\ \sigma G \end{bmatrix} M'_n = \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ \sigma S \end{bmatrix}$. But it is enough to take $M'_{2n} = \Sigma_{2n} M_{2n} \Sigma_{2n}^{-1}$ and $M'_n = \Sigma_n^{-1} M_n \Sigma_n$: indeed

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ \sigma S \end{bmatrix} = \Sigma_{2n} \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ S \end{bmatrix} \Sigma_n = \Sigma_{2n} M_{2n} \begin{bmatrix} F \\ G \end{bmatrix} M_n \Sigma_n = M'_{2n} \Sigma_{2n} \begin{bmatrix} F \\ G \end{bmatrix} \Sigma_n M'_n = M'_{2n} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma F \\ \sigma G \end{bmatrix} M'_n .$$

□

Corollary 4.6. The action (32) is equivalent to the action

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2) \rtimes_{\varphi} \mathfrak{S}_n \right) \times \text{LG}(n, 2n) &\longrightarrow \text{LG}(n, 2n) \\ ((U, \sigma), [v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_n]) &\mapsto [\sigma(Uv_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \sigma(Uv_n)] \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where, if $Uv_i = \begin{bmatrix} z_{1i} \\ \vdots \\ z_{n1} \\ \vdots \\ w_{1i} \\ \vdots \\ w_{ni} \end{bmatrix}$, then $\sigma(Uv_i) = \begin{bmatrix} z_{\sigma(1)\sigma(i)} \\ \vdots \\ z_{\sigma(n)\sigma(i)} \\ \vdots \\ w_{\sigma(1)\sigma(i)} \\ \vdots \\ w_{\sigma(n)\sigma(i)} \end{bmatrix}$.

Basically, \mathfrak{S}_n on the upper and lower halves of the vectors separately, both by permuting them each other and by permuting their entries.

Now that we have translated the action onto the Lagrangian Grassmannian, it is immediate to pull it back to the set $\mathcal{I}_n \subset \mathcal{W}(2n-1, 2)$ of $n-1$ -dimensional (fully) isotropic subspaces of \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \times \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n) \\ \left(\underbrace{U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n}_U, \langle M_1, \dots, M_n \rangle \right) &\mapsto \langle UM_1U^H, \dots, UM_nU^H \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where, if $M_i = Z^{\mu_1^{(i)}} X^{\nu_1^{(i)}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\mu_n^{(i)}} X^{\nu_n^{(i)}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} UM_iU^H &= U_1 Z^{\mu_1^{(i)}} X^{\nu_1^{(i)}} U_1^H \otimes \dots \otimes U_n Z^{\mu_n^{(i)}} X^{\nu_n^{(i)}} U_n^H \\ &= Z^{a_1 \mu_1^{(i)} + b_1 \nu_1^{(i)}} X^{c_1 \mu_1^{(i)} + d_1 \nu_1^{(i)}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{a_n \mu_n^{(i)} + b_n \nu_n^{(i)}} X^{c_n \mu_n^{(i)} + d_n \nu_n^{(i)}}. \end{aligned}$$

To study the action of \mathfrak{S}_n on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ it is helpful to look at the M_i 's as points in \mathbb{P}_2^{2n-1} and, by Remark 4.8, consider the action of \mathfrak{S}_n on the $n-1$ -dimensional isotropic subspace they generate. Thus, by (36), we obtain the action

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{S}_n \times \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n) \\ (\sigma, \langle M_1, \dots, M_n \rangle) &\mapsto \langle \sigma M_1, \dots, \sigma M_n \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where, in the same notations of (37),

$$\sigma M_i = Z^{\mu_{\sigma(1)}^{(\sigma(i))}} X^{\nu_{\sigma(1)}^{(\sigma(i))}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\mu_{\sigma(n)}^{(\sigma(i))}} X^{\nu_{\sigma(n)}^{(\sigma(i))}}.$$

Remark 4.9. It is worth remarking that the above equation makes clear that \mathfrak{S}_n acts simultaneously on M_1, \dots, M_n by permuting not only the tensor entries of each M_i , but also the Z 's (resp. X 's) exponents among different M_i 's. This action precisely reflects the action (33) permuting both columns and rows of each block.

Thus, by “gluing” together the actions (37) and (38) in a semidirect product, we obtain that the action (30) of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes_{\varphi} \mathfrak{S}_n$ on \mathcal{Z}_n induces on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ the action

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n \right) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n) \\ \left(\underbrace{U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n}_U, \sigma, \langle M_1, \dots, M_n \rangle \right) &\mapsto \langle \sigma(UM_1U^H), \dots, \sigma(UM_nU^H) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where, if $M_i = Z^{\mu_1^{(i)}} X^{\nu_1^{(i)}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\mu_n^{(i)}} X^{\nu_n^{(i)}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(UM_iU^H) &= \sigma \left(Z^{a_1 \mu_1^{(i)} + b_1 \nu_1^{(i)}} X^{c_1 \mu_1^{(i)} + d_1 \nu_1^{(i)}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{a_n \mu_n^{(i)} + b_n \nu_n^{(i)}} X^{c_n \mu_n^{(i)} + d_n \nu_n^{(i)}} \right) \\ &= Z^{a_{\sigma(1)} \mu_{\sigma(1)}^{(\sigma(i))} + b_{\sigma(1)} \nu_{\sigma(1)}^{(\sigma(i))}} X^{c_{\sigma(1)} \mu_{\sigma(1)}^{(\sigma(i))} + d_{\sigma(1)} \nu_{\sigma(1)}^{(\sigma(i))}} \otimes \dots \\ &\quad \dots \otimes Z^{a_{\sigma(n)} \mu_{\sigma(n)}^{(\sigma(i))} + b_{\sigma(n)} \nu_{\sigma(n)}^{(\sigma(i))}} X^{c_{\sigma(n)} \mu_{\sigma(n)}^{(\sigma(i))} + d_{\sigma(n)} \nu_{\sigma(n)}^{(\sigma(i))}} \end{aligned}$$

that is, first we apply the local Clifford transformation, then we permutes by σ the exponents of the Z 's and X 's in the tensor entries, as underlined in Remark 4.9.

Remark 4.10. We conclude the section by remarking that the (operation in the) semidirect product $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ is defined by the action

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : \quad \mathfrak{S}_n \times \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \\ (\sigma, U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n) &\mapsto U_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes U_{\sigma(n)} \end{aligned}$$

that is, up to tensor product, precisely the same action of \mathfrak{S}_n on $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n}$ (as expected).

This Section and Section 3 achieve the proof of the first part of Theorem 1 by establishing the bijection between the $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ orbits of maximal n -fold abelian subgroups of \mathcal{P}_n , or equivalently maximal isotropic subspaces of $\mathcal{W}(2n-1, 2)$, and the $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ orbits of $\mathcal{Z}_n \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{F}_2^{2n})$.

5 Stabilizer states and their orbits under $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$

Consider the set $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ of the n -fold abelian subgroups of the Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n . By definition, for each element $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ we can consider n independent and mutually commuting Pauli group elements $M_1, \dots, M_n \in \mathcal{P}_n$ which generate S : since these elements commute, they admits (at least) one common eigenvector $|\phi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$.

Definition. A (n -fold) **stabilizer-state group** is a n -fold abelian subgroup $S = \langle M_1, \dots, M_n \rangle \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ which does not contains $-I^{\otimes n}$. We denote the set of stabilizer-state groups in \mathcal{P}_n by $\mathcal{S}^+(\mathcal{P}_n)$, or simply \mathcal{S}_n^+ .

Proposition 5.1. A stabilizer-state group $S \in \mathcal{S}_n^+$ admits a (unique) common eigenvector $|\phi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$ with eigenvalue $+1$, that is, given $S = \langle M_1, \dots, M_n \rangle$,

$$\begin{cases} M_1 |\phi\rangle = |\phi\rangle \\ \vdots \\ M_n |\phi\rangle = |\phi\rangle \end{cases}$$

Definition. A (n -qubit) **stabilizer-state** is the simultaneous eigenvector with eigenvalue $+1$ of n independent and mutually commuting Pauli group elements. We denote by Φ_1^n the set of n -qubit stabilizer states.

By definition, there is a one-to-one correspondence between Φ_1^n and \mathcal{S}_n^+ : we denote by $S_{|\phi\rangle}$ the stabilizer-state group associated to the stabilizer state $|\phi\rangle$.

Let us study how $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ acts on the stabilizer-state groups (hence on the stabilizer states). First of all, the action (37) of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ preserves \mathcal{S}_n^+ : indeed, given $U \in \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ and $S_{|\phi\rangle} = \langle M_1, \dots, M_n \rangle \in \mathcal{S}_n^+$, it holds

$$UM_i U^H(U|\phi\rangle) = UM_i |\phi\rangle = U|\phi\rangle, \quad \forall i = 1 : n$$

that is $U|\phi\rangle$ is common eigenvector with eigenvalue $+1$ of $S_{UM_1U^H, \dots, UM_nU^H}$. In particular, the action of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ on \mathcal{S}_n^+ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \times \mathcal{S}_n^+ &\longrightarrow \mathcal{S}_n^+ \\ (U, S_{|\phi\rangle}) &\mapsto S_{U|\phi} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

and it is equivalent to the action of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ on Φ_1^n given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \times \Phi_1^n &\longrightarrow \Phi_1^n \\ (U, |\phi\rangle) &\mapsto U|\phi\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where, if $U = U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n$ and $|\phi\rangle = \sum_j |\phi_j^{(1)}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\phi_j^{(n)}\rangle$ (with $|\phi_j^{(k)}\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^2$),

$$U|\phi\rangle = \sum_j U_1|\phi_j^{(1)}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes U_n|\phi_j^{(n)}\rangle .$$

Let us show that also the action (38) of \mathfrak{S}_n on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ preserves \mathcal{S}_n^+ . Given $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and $|\phi\rangle = \sum_j |\phi_j^{(1)}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\phi_j^{(n)}\rangle \in \Phi_1^n$, we consider

$$\sigma|\phi\rangle = \sum_j |\phi_j^{(\sigma(1))}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\phi_j^{(\sigma(n))}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n} \quad (42)$$

that is the element obtained by permuting via σ the tensor entries of $|\phi\rangle$. Actually, this is precisely the action we should expect: indeed, \mathfrak{S}_n acts on a stabilizer-state group by permuting both its generators and their tensor entries, but the eigenvector is invariant under the permutation of the generators, so the only non-trivial action is the one permuting its tensor entries.

Proposition 5.2. In the notations above, $\sigma|\phi\rangle \in \Phi_1^n$.

Proof. It is enough to prove the thesis for decomposable elements, that is for $|\phi\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\phi_n\rangle$ with $|\phi_i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^2$: after that, we conclude by linearity.

Consider $S_{|\phi\rangle} = \langle M_1, \dots, M_n \rangle \in \mathcal{S}_n^+$ the stabilizer-state group associated to the stabilizer state $|\phi\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\phi_n\rangle \in \Phi_1^n$: in particular, given $M_i = Z^{\mu_1^{(i)}} X^{\nu_1^{(i)}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\mu_n^{(i)}} X^{\nu_n^{(i)}}$ for all $i = 1 : n$, it holds

$$M_i|\phi\rangle = Z^{\mu_1^{(i)}} X^{\nu_1^{(i)}} |\phi_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\mu_n^{(i)}} X^{\nu_n^{(i)}} |\phi_n\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\phi_n\rangle \quad , \forall i = 1 : n .$$

Let us apply $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ to the M_i 's and to $|\phi\rangle$: we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma M_i \cdot \sigma|\phi\rangle &= Z^{\mu_{\sigma(1)}^{(\sigma(i))}} X^{\nu_{\sigma(1)}^{(\sigma(i))}} |\phi_{\sigma(1)}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\mu_{\sigma(n)}^{(\sigma(i))}} X^{\nu_{\sigma(n)}^{(\sigma(i))}} |\phi_{\sigma(n)}\rangle \\ &= |\phi_{\sigma(1)}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\phi_{\sigma(n)}\rangle \\ &= \sigma|\phi\rangle \end{aligned}$$

that is, $\sigma|\phi\rangle$ is common eigenvector with eigenvalue 1 of the n independent and mutually commuting σM_i 's, hence $\sigma|\phi\rangle \in \Phi_1^n$. \square

Corollary 5.3. The action (38) of \mathfrak{S}_n on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ preserves \mathcal{S}_n^+ . The induced action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{S}_n \times \mathcal{S}_n^+ &\longrightarrow \mathcal{S}_n^+ \\ (\sigma, S_{|\phi\rangle}) &\mapsto S_{\sigma|\phi\rangle} \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

By (40) and (43), it follows that the action (39) of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ induces the action

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n) \times \mathcal{S}_n^+ &\longrightarrow \mathcal{S}_n^+ \\ ((U, \sigma), S_{|\phi\rangle}) &\mapsto S_{\sigma(U|\phi\rangle)} \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where, if $S_{|\phi\rangle} = \langle M_1, \dots, M_n \rangle$, then $S_{\sigma(U|\phi\rangle)} = \langle \sigma(UM_1U^H), \dots, \sigma(UM_nU^H) \rangle$. In particular, this action is equivalent to the action on the stabilizer states

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n) \times \Phi_1^n &\longrightarrow \Phi_1^n \\ ((U, \sigma), |\phi\rangle) &\mapsto \sigma(U|\phi\rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where, if $U = U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n$ and $|\phi\rangle = \sum_j |\phi_j^{(1)}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\phi_j^{(n)}\rangle$, then

$$\sigma(U|\phi\rangle) = \sum_j U_{\sigma(1)} |\phi_j^{(\sigma(1))}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes U_{\sigma(n)} |\phi_j^{(\sigma(n))}\rangle.$$

6 Graph states and their orbits under $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$

Among the stabilizer states, a privileged class is given by graph states. Consider a (non-oriented) graph $\Gamma = (V, E)$ defined by a finite set of vertices $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and a set of edges $E \subset V \times V$. We can associate to Γ a unique symmetric matrix $\theta_\Gamma \in \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$ such that

$$\theta_{ij} = 1 \iff (i, j) \in E$$

(the matrix is actually symmetric since the graph is not oriented). The graph Γ (or equivalently its matrix θ_Γ) defines (in a unique way) n Pauli group elements

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= Z^{\theta_{11}} X \otimes Z^{\theta_{12}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\theta_{1n}} \\ &\vdots \\ M_n &= Z^{\theta_{1n}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\theta_{n-1,n}} \otimes Z^{\theta_{nn}} X \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

or equivalently, in a more compact notation, $M_i = Z^{\theta_{i1}} X^{\delta_{1i}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\theta_{in}} X^{\delta_{ni}}$. These elements are independent and mutually commuting, thus they generate a n -fold abelian subgroup: we denote it $S_\Gamma = S_\theta = \langle M_1, \dots, M_n \rangle \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$.

Remark 6.1. Given a graph Γ with associated matrix $\theta \in \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_2^n)$, consider $S_\theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ and the corresponding $n-1$ -dimensional (fully) isotropic space $H_\theta \in \mathcal{I}^n$. Then H_θ is described (in the coordinates (2)) by the $2n \times n$ matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}$. In particular, the Plücker matrix of H_θ is $\begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ \theta \end{bmatrix}$, thus the n -fold abelian group S_θ corresponds to the point $[1 : \theta_{ii} : \theta_{[i,j]} : \dots : \det \theta] \in \mathcal{Z}_n$ in the variety of symmetric principal minors.

We want to prove that the n -fold abelian subgroup $S_\theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ defined by a graph Γ is actually a (n -qubit) stabilizer-state group, that is $S_\theta \in \mathcal{S}_n^+$. To do so we need to exhibit a common eigenvector with eigenvalue $+1$.

Let Γ be a graph with associated matrix θ and let M_1, \dots, M_n the generators of S_θ defined in (46). Consider a n -tuple $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ such that the system

$$\begin{cases} (-1)^{\gamma_1} M_1 |\Gamma_\gamma\rangle = |\Gamma_\gamma\rangle \\ \vdots \\ (-1)^{\gamma_n} M_n |\Gamma_\gamma\rangle = |\Gamma_\gamma\rangle \end{cases}$$

of n equations in the indeterminate $|\Gamma_\gamma\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$ has solution: then $|\Gamma_\gamma\rangle$ is common eigenvector with eigenvalue $+1$ of the n elements $(-1)^{\gamma_i} M_i$. But we can always find a local Clifford element $U \in \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ such that $U(-1)^{\gamma_i} M_i U^H = M_i$ for all $i = 1 : n$: if $\gamma_{i_1}, \dots, \gamma_{i_k}$ are the only non-zero entries of γ , then the local Clifford transformation $U_\gamma = H_{i_1} \cdot \dots \cdot H_{i_k}$ (where $H_j = I \otimes \dots \otimes \underbrace{H}_{j\text{-th}} \otimes \dots \otimes I$) is the one doing the work; it

follows that $U_\gamma |\Gamma_\gamma\rangle$ is common eigenvector with eigenvalue $+1$ of M_1, \dots, M_n , hence of S_θ . Thus, up to local Clifford action, we may assume $\gamma = \underline{0}$ and write $|\Gamma\rangle$ instead of $|\Gamma_\gamma\rangle$.

Corollary 6.2. For every graph Γ with associated matrix θ , the n -fold abelian group S_θ is actually a stabilizer-state group, that is $S_\theta \in \mathcal{S}_n^+$.

Definition. The **graph state** defined by the graph Γ is the common eigenvector $|\Gamma\rangle$ with eigenvalue $+1$ of the stabilizer-state group S_θ . We denote by Θ_n the set of n -qubit graph states

$$\Theta_n = \{|\Gamma\rangle \mid \Gamma \text{ graph with } n \text{ vertices}\} \subset \Phi_1^n$$

and by \mathcal{S}_Θ the set of stabilizer-state groups defined by a graph (or simply, **graph-state groups**)

$$\mathcal{S}_\Theta = \{S \in \mathcal{S}_n^+ \mid S = S_\theta \text{ for some graph-matrix } \theta\} \subset \mathcal{S}_n^+ .$$

Since we are interested in studying the orbits of graph states under the action of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$, first of all we need to be sure that the set Θ_n of n -qubit graph states is preserved by the action (45) of the semidirect product on the set Φ_1^n of the n -qubit stabilizer-states, that is we wonder if $U|\Gamma\rangle$ and $^\sigma|\Gamma\rangle$ are still graph states for all $U \in \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$, $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and $|\Gamma\rangle \in \Theta_n$. Let us investigate the two actions separately.

Action of \mathfrak{S}_n . Let $|\Gamma\rangle \in \Theta_n$ be the graph state defined by the graph Γ with associated matrix θ and graph-state group $S_\theta = \langle M_1, \dots, M_n \rangle \in \mathcal{S}_\Theta$. We know that S_θ is described by the $2n \times n$ matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}$.

Let $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. By (33) we know that $\sigma \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} {}^\sigma\theta \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}$, and by (43) $\sigma \cdot S_\theta = {}^\sigma(S_\theta) = \langle {}^\sigma M_1, \dots, {}^\sigma M_n \rangle$: in particular, the matrix ${}^\sigma\theta$ is still symmetric, hence it uniquely defines a graph ${}^\sigma\Gamma$, and (together with the lower block I_n) it describes ${}^\sigma(S_\theta)$, that is \mathfrak{S}_n preserves \mathcal{S}_Θ . Thus we have the action on the graph-state groups

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{S}_n \times \mathcal{S}_\Theta &\longrightarrow \mathcal{S}_\Theta \\ (\sigma, S_\theta) &\mapsto {}^\sigma(S_\theta) = S_{{}^\sigma\theta} \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Remark 6.3. The action (47) reflects an action on the n -graphs described as follows: given a graph Γ and a permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, the graph ${}^\sigma\Gamma$ is obtained simply by renaming the vertices from $\{1, \dots, n\}$ to $\{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(n)\}$, without changing the edges. Roughly speaking, two graphs are in the same \mathfrak{S}_n -orbit if they have the same drawing representation as “dots-edges”.

By definition of graph state, it follows that the \mathfrak{S}_n -action (42) preserves Θ_n , hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{S}_n \times \Theta_n &\longrightarrow \Theta_n \\ (\sigma, |\Gamma\rangle) &\mapsto |{}^\sigma\Gamma\rangle = |{}^\sigma\mathbf{T}\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where $|{}^\sigma\mathbf{T}\rangle$ is obtained simply by permuting via σ the tensor entries of $|\Gamma\rangle$.

Action of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$. The situation with respect to the action of the local Clifford group is a little more tricky. Indeed, given a local Clifford transformation $U \in \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ and a graph-state group $S_\theta \in \mathcal{S}_\Theta$, we can represent U by a $2n \times 2n$ matrix of type (11) in $\text{Sp}_{2n}^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}_2)$, and S_θ by the $2n \times n$ matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}$: then the action $U \cdot S_\theta$ corresponds to the linear transformation

$$U \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & a_n \end{bmatrix} \theta + \begin{bmatrix} b_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & b_n \end{bmatrix} I_n \\ \hline \begin{bmatrix} c_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & c_n \end{bmatrix} \theta + \begin{bmatrix} d_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & d_n \end{bmatrix} I_n \end{bmatrix}$$

that is, in general, $U \cdot S_\theta$ is not a graph-state group, even if by (40) it is still a stabilizer-state group. However, it is known [24, Theorem 1] that each stabilizer-state group (resp. stabilizer state) is equivalent to a graph-state group (resp. graph state) under left-action of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ and right-action of $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{F}_2)$ (resp. action of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$). This tells us that:

- even if $U \cdot S_\theta$ is not a graph-state group, it can be brought to a graph-state group of the form $S_{\theta^U} = Q(US_\theta)G$ for suitable $Q \in \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ and $G \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{F}_2)$;
- given $S_\theta = S_{|\Gamma\rangle}$ and $U \cdot S_\theta = S_{|\psi\rangle}$, even if $U \cdot |\Gamma\rangle = |\psi\rangle$ is not a graph-state, it is equivalent under $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ -action to a graph state $|\Gamma'\rangle = Q|\psi\rangle$ for a suitable $Q \in \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$.

In particular, the graph state $|\Gamma'\rangle$ is precisely the one associated to the graph-state group S_{θ^U} . In the notations above, we denote by $\Gamma^U = \Gamma'$ the graph defining the graph-state group S_{θ^U} and by θ^U its associated matrix. Thus we have the following $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ -action on the graph-state groups

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \times \mathcal{S}_\Theta &\longrightarrow \mathcal{S}_\Theta \\ (U, S_\theta) &\mapsto S_{\theta^U} \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

and the $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ -action on the graph states

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \times \Theta_n &\longrightarrow \Theta_n \\ (U, |\Gamma\rangle) &\mapsto |\Gamma^U\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Remark 6.4. For a graphical description of the $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ -action on the graph states (actually, on the defining graphs), we refer to [24]. Together with Remark 6.3 one has a graphical description of the action of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ too.

Remark 6.5. We point out that the right-action of $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{F}_2)$ which brings $U \cdot S_\theta$ into a graph-state group does not affect the correspondence with the variety of symmetric principal minors \mathcal{Z}_n : indeed, this changing by $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{F}_2)$ becomes irrelevant.

We conclude this work by recalling that we can restrict ourselves to study a particular subclass of graph states.

Proposition 6.6. Let Γ, Γ' be two graphs whose associated matrices θ, θ' differ only in the diagonal entries, that is

$$\theta_{ij} = \theta'_{ij}, \forall i \neq j.$$

Then the graph states $|\Gamma\rangle$ and $|\Gamma'\rangle$ are $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ -equivalent. In particular, every graph state $|\Gamma\rangle$ is $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ -equivalent to the graph state $|\Gamma_0\rangle$ where Γ_0 has associated matrix θ^0

$$\theta_{ij}^0 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = j \\ \theta_{ij} & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}.$$

Proof. Clearly, it is enough to directly prove the second thesis. Let $|\Gamma\rangle$ be a graph state with associated matrix θ and let $|\Gamma_0\rangle$ be the graph state defined by θ^0 . Then $|\Gamma\rangle$ and

$|\Gamma_0\rangle$ are $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ -equivalent if and only if the corresponding graph-state groups S_θ, S_{θ^0} are so (up to right-action of $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{F}_2)$). By hypothesis, the observables generating S_θ are

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= Z^{\theta_{11}} X \otimes Z^{\theta_{12}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\theta_{1n}} \\ &\vdots \\ M_n &= Z^{\theta_{1n}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\theta_{n-1,n}} \otimes Z^{\theta_{nn}} X \end{aligned}$$

while the ones generating S_{θ^0} are

$$\begin{aligned} M'_1 &= X \otimes Z^{\theta_{12}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\theta_{1n}} \\ &\vdots \\ M'_n &= Z^{\theta_{1n}} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{\theta_{n-1,n}} \otimes X \end{aligned}$$

We wonder if there exists $U = U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n \in \mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ such that $UM_jU^H = M'_j$ for all $j = 1 : n$. Since the action is local, it is equivalent to ask that

$$\begin{cases} U_k \cdot Z^{\theta_{kk}} X \cdot U_k^H = X \\ U_k \cdot Z^{\theta_{kj}} \cdot U_k^H = Z^{\theta_{kj}} \quad \forall j \neq k \end{cases} .$$

But $\sqrt{Z}^{\theta_{kk}}$ does the work: indeed, it certainly centralizes $Z^{\theta_{kj}}$ for all $k, j = 1 : n$, and it conjugates X to $Y = ZX$ (up to phases). Thus if $\theta_{kk} = 0$ we set $U_k = I$, while if $\theta_{kk} = 1$ we set $U_k = \sqrt{Z}$. This concludes. \square

Graphically, the condition $\theta_{ii} = 0$ for all $i = 1 : n$ means that the graph Γ_0 is loopless. We denote by Θ_n^0 the set of graph states defined by loopless graphs:

$$\Theta_n^0 = \{ |\Gamma\rangle \in \Theta_n \mid \Gamma \text{ loopless} \} .$$

By equation (33), we deduce that the action of \mathfrak{S}_n on Θ_n preserves Θ_n^0 : indeed, a permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ permutes the diagonal elements of θ among themselves, hence loopless graph states are sent to loopless graph states.

Moreover, by Proposition 6.6, we know that we can always bring a graph state into a loopless graph state via a local Clifford operation, hence we can restrict the action (50) of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ onto Θ_n^0 as well.

Corollary 6.7. The actions (48) of \mathfrak{S}_n and (50) of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}}$ on Θ_n glue together into the action of $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ on the set Θ_n of graph states

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n) \times \Theta_n &\longrightarrow \Theta_n \\ ((U, \sigma), |\Gamma\rangle) &\mapsto |\sigma(\Gamma^U)\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Moreover, the above action induces an action on the set Θ_n^0 of loopless graph states.

This Section achieves the proof of Theorem 1. Indeed loopless graph states are not only a representative class for studying orbits of stabilizer states under local Clifford action, but they also provide a representative class for studying orbits of stabilizer states under the action of the semidirect product $\mathcal{C}_n^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$. We have seen in the previous sections how those orbits are in bijection with the $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times n} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ -orbits of \mathcal{Z}_n .







7 Applications

We propose two applications of the bijection of orbits of Theorem 1. First, one shows how the four-qubit graph states classification can be deduced from the orbit stratification of \mathcal{Z}_4 . Then, in the other direction, one shows how the knowledge of the five-qubit graph states classification can be used to obtain normal forms of the orbits of \mathcal{Z}_5 .

7.1 Orbits of 4-qubit graph states from orbits of \mathcal{Z}_4

Under the action of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_2)^{\times 4} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_4$, the variety of principal minor $\mathcal{Z}_4 \subset \mathbb{P}_2^{15}$ splits in six orbits whose cardinalities and representatives are listed in [12, Table 3]. Starting from that classification, we recover the orbits of 4-graphs under the action of $\mathcal{C}_4^{\text{loc}} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_4$.

Remark 7.1. In order to be faithful to the notations we used in the first part of our work, we will consider different representatives of the orbits $\mathcal{O}_2, \mathcal{O}_3, \mathcal{O}_6, \mathcal{O}_{14}, \mathcal{O}_{17}, \mathcal{O}_{18}$ in Table 3 [12]. More precisely, we will take representatives in the chart $\{z_0 \neq 0\}$ in order to recover more easily the corresponding graph-matrices. Moreover, since we want to obtain loopless graphs, we choose representatives whose coordinates $z_1 = z_2 = z_3 = z_4 = 0$ are zero: we denote by $\underline{\mathbf{0}}$ the four zero entries with respect to these coordinates.

Orbit	Representative in $\mathcal{Z}_4 \subset \mathbb{P}_2^7$	Graph-matrix	4-Graph
\mathcal{O}_2	$[1 : \underline{0} : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0]$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	
\mathcal{O}_3	$[1 : \underline{0} : 1 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0]$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & \\ 1 & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	
\mathcal{O}_6	$[1 : \underline{0} : 1 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0]$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & \\ & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	
\mathcal{O}_{14}	$[1 : \underline{0} : 1 : 1 : 1 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0]$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & & \\ 1 & & 0 & \\ 1 & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	
\mathcal{O}_{17}	$[1 : \underline{0} : 1 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 1]$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & \\ 1 & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & 1 \\ & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	
\mathcal{O}_{18}	$[1 : \underline{0} : 1 : 0 : 1 : 1 : 0 : 1 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0]$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & \\ & & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	

(52)

Remark 7.2. The vertices of the representative graphs in Table (52) are not numbered because of Remark 6.3: as representative labeling, we choose the vertex 1 to be the upper-left one and the other vertices are clockwise ordered.

By the Lagrangian mapping (Sec. 2), we know that for each orbit \mathcal{O}_i of \mathcal{Z}_4 there are $4^4|\mathcal{O}_i|$ corresponding stabilizer states. Thus, by the sizes in Table 3 [12] we recover the number of stabilizer states coming from each graph orbit.

Orbit	Size of orbit in \mathcal{Z}_4	# of stabilizer states
\mathcal{O}_2	81	20736
\mathcal{O}_3	324	82944
\mathcal{O}_6	648	165888
\mathcal{O}_{14}	162	41472
\mathcal{O}_{17}	108	27648
\mathcal{O}_{18}	972	248832

(53)

7.2 Orbits of \mathcal{Z}_5 from 5-qubit graph states classification

In [5] the number of orbits of 5-graphs were computed to be 11 (see also [10, Table IV]). In the following, we exhibit 11 representatives of such orbits and by them we recover the representatives of the orbits of the principal minor variety \mathcal{Z}_5 over \mathbb{F}_2 .

Orbit	5-Graph	Graph-matrix	Stabilizer-group in \mathcal{P}_5
\mathcal{O}_1		$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ & 0 & & & \\ & & 0 & & \\ & & & 0 & \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\langle ZIIII, IZIII, IIZII, IIIZI, IIIIZ \rangle$
\mathcal{O}_2		$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & 0 & & & \\ & & 0 & & \\ & & & 0 & \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\langle ZXIII, XZIII, IIZII, IIIZI, IIIIZ \rangle$
\mathcal{O}_3		$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & & \\ & 1 & 0 & & \\ & & & 0 & \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\langle ZXIII, XZXII, IXZII, IIIZI, IIIIZ \rangle$
\mathcal{O}_4		$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & 0 & & & \\ & & 0 & 1 & \\ & & 1 & 0 & \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\langle ZXIII, XZIII, IIZX, IIXZI, IIIIZ \rangle$
\mathcal{O}_5		$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & & \\ & 1 & 0 & 1 & \\ & & 1 & 0 & \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\langle ZXIII, XZXII, IXZXI, IIXZI, IIIIZ \rangle$
\mathcal{O}_6		$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & & & \\ & & 0 & 1 & \\ & & 1 & 0 & \\ 1 & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\langle ZXIIX, XZIII, IIZXI, IIXZI, XIIIZ \rangle$
\mathcal{O}_7		$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & & \\ & 1 & 0 & 1 & \\ & & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\langle ZXIII, XZXII, IXZXI, IIXZX, IIIIXZ \rangle$
\mathcal{O}_8		$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & 1 & \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & & \\ & 1 & 0 & 1 & \\ & & 1 & 0 & \\ 1 & & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\langle ZXIXI, XZXII, IXZXI, XIXZI, IIIIZ \rangle$
\mathcal{O}_9		$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & & & \\ 1 & & 0 & & \\ 1 & & & 0 & \\ 1 & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\langle ZXXXX, XZIII, XIZII, XIIZI, XIIIZ \rangle$
\mathcal{O}_{10}		$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & & \\ & 1 & 0 & 1 & \\ & & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\langle ZXIIX, XZXII, IXZXI, IIXZX, XIIIXZ \rangle$
\mathcal{O}_{11}		$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ 1 & 0 & & & \\ 1 & & 0 & & \\ 1 & & & 0 & \\ 1 & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\langle ZXXXI, XZIII, XIZII, XIIZI, IIIIZ \rangle$

Orbit	5-Graph	Representative point in $\mathcal{Z}_5 \subset \mathbb{P}_2^{31}$
\mathcal{O}_1		$[1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$
\mathcal{O}_2		$[1 : \underline{0} : \underbrace{1}_{z_6} : 0 : \dots : 0]$
\mathcal{O}_3		$[1 : \underline{0} : \underbrace{1}_{z_6} : 0 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$
\mathcal{O}_4		$[1 : \underline{0} : \underbrace{1}_{z_6} : 0 : \dots : 0 : \underbrace{1}_{z_{13}} : 0 : \dots : 0 : \underbrace{1}_{z_{26}} : 0 : \dots : 0]$
\mathcal{O}_5		$[1 : \underline{0} : \underbrace{1}_{z_6} : 0 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \dots : 0 : \underbrace{1}_{z_{26}} : 0 : \dots : 0]$
\mathcal{O}_6		$[1 : \underline{0} : \underbrace{1}_{z_6} : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \dots : 0 : \underbrace{1}_{z_{26}} : 0 : \dots : 0]$
\mathcal{O}_7		$[1 : \underline{0} : \underbrace{1}_{z_6} : 0 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \dots : 0 : \underbrace{1}_{z_{26}} : 0 : 1 : 0 : 1 : 0]$
\mathcal{O}_8		$[1 : \underline{0} : \underbrace{1}_{z_6} : 0 : 1 : 0 : 1 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$
\mathcal{O}_9		$[1 : \underline{0} : \underbrace{1}_{z_6} : 1 : 1 : 1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$
\mathcal{O}_{10}		$[1 : \underline{0} : \underbrace{1}_{z_6} : 0 : 0 : 1 : 1 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \dots : 0 : \underbrace{1}_{z_{27}} : 1 : 1 : 1 : 0]$
\mathcal{O}_{11}		$[1 : \underline{0} : \underbrace{1}_{z_6} : 1 : 1 : 1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$


(55)

Remark 7.3. The representative graphs in Table (54) and Table (55) are loopless and their vertices are not numbered because of Remark 6.3: as representative labeling, we choose the vertex 1 to be the highest one and the other vertices are clockwise ordered.

In the last column of Table (54), the observables generating the stabilizer-groups are obtained by the columns of the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} I_5 \\ \theta \end{bmatrix}$ where θ is the matrix in the third column.

In the last column of Table (55), the coordinates of the points in $\mathcal{Z}_5 \subset \mathbb{P}_2^{31}$ are given by the principal minors of the matrix θ (third column of Table (54)) by following the correspondence (21). In particular, the points are taken in the chart $\{z_0 \neq 0\}$ and the entries $z_1 = \dots = z_5 = 0$ are all zero since the representative graphs are loopless (i.e. $\theta_{ii} = 0$ for all $i = 1 : 5$): for layout reasons, we compactly write such five coordinates as a zero vector $\mathbf{0}$.

Remark 7.4. Another representative of the orbit \mathcal{O}_9 is the 5-graph of the GHZ state



Acknowledgement

The work presented in this paper started when F.H. was a guest Professor at Trento University in October 2020 within the Quantum@Trento program. F.H. would like to warmly thank Alessandra Bernardi and Iacopo Carusotto for making this invitation possible. This work was partially supported by the French Investissements d’Avenir programme, project ISITE-BFC (contract ANR-15-IDEX-03). V.G. is partially supported by Italian GNSAGA-INDAM.

References

- [1] BA Bell et al. “Experimental demonstration of graph-state quantum secret sharing”. In: *Nature communications* 5.1 (2014), pp. 1–12.
- [2] Hans J Briegel et al. “Measurement-based quantum computation”. In: *Nature Physics* 5.1 (2009), pp. 19–26.
- [3] Adán Cabello et al. “Entanglement in eight-qubit graph states”. In: *Physics Letters A* 373.26 (2009), pp. 2219–2225.
- [4] Adán Cabello et al. “Optimal preparation of graph states”. In: *Physical Review A* 83.4 (2011), p. 042314.

- [5] Lars Eirik Danielsen. “On self-dual quantum codes, graphs, and Boolean functions”. In: *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0503236* (2005).
- [6] Daniel Gottesman. “Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction”. In: *Ph. D. Thesis* (1997).
- [7] Kent Griffin and Michael J Tsatsomeros. “Principal minors, Part II: The principal minor assignment problem”. In: *Linear Algebra and its applications* 419.1 (2006), pp. 125–171.
- [8] Joe Harris. *Algebraic geometry: a first course*. Vol. 133. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [9] Hans Havlicek, Boris Odehnal, Metod Saniga, et al. “Factor-group-generated polar spaces and (multi-) qudits”. In: *SIGMA. Symmetry, Integrability and Geometry: Methods and Applications* 5 (2009), p. 096.
- [10] Marc Hein et al. “Entanglement in graph states and its applications”. In: *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0602096* (2006).
- [11] Olga Holtz and Bernd Sturmfels. “Hyperdeterminantal relations among symmetric principal minors”. In: *Journal of Algebra* 316.2 (2007), pp. 634–648.
- [12] Frédéric Holweck, Metod Saniga, Péter Lévy, et al. “A Notable Relation between N-Qubit and 2^{N-1} -Qubit Pauli Groups via Binary LGr(N, 2N)”. In: *SIGMA. Symmetry, Integrability and Geometry: Methods and Applications* 10 (2014), p. 041.
- [13] Richard Kenyon and Robin Pemantle. “Principal minors and rhombus tilings”. In: *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 47.47 (2014), p. 474010.
- [14] Joseph M Landsberg. “Tensors: geometry and applications”. In: *Representation theory* 381.402 (2012), p. 3.
- [15] Péter Lévy, Frédéric Holweck, and Metod Saniga. “Magic three-qubit Veldkamp line: A finite geometric underpinning for form theories of gravity and black hole entropy”. In: *Physical Review D* 96.2 (2017), p. 026018.
- [16] Péter Lévy, Michel Planat, and Metod Saniga. “Grassmannian connection between three-and four-qubit observables, Mermin’s contextuality and black holes”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2013.9 (2013), p. 37.
- [17] Damian Markham and Barry C. Sanders. “Graph states for quantum secret sharing”. In: *Physical Review A* 78.4 (2008), p. 042309.
- [18] Mehdi Mhalla et al. “Which graph states are useful for quantum information processing?” In: *Conference on Quantum Computation, Communication, and Cryptography*. Springer. 2011, pp. 174–187.

- [19] Luke Oeding. *G-varieties and the principal minors of symmetric matrices*. Texas A&M University, 2009.
- [20] Luke Oeding. “Set-theoretic defining equations of the variety of principal minors of symmetric matrices”. In: *Algebra & Number Theory* 5.1 (2011), pp. 75–109.
- [21] Luke Oeding. “The quadrifocal variety”. In: *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* 512 (2017), pp. 306–330.
- [22] Metod Saniga and Michel Planat. “Multiple qubits as symplectic polar spaces of order two”. In: *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0612179* (2006).
- [23] Koen Thas. “The geometry of generalized Pauli operators of N-qudit Hilbert space, and an application to MUBs”. In: *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* 86.6 (2009), p. 60005.
- [24] M. Van den Nest, J. Dehaene, and B. De Moor. “Graphical description of the action of local Clifford transformations on graph states”. In: *Physical Review A* 69.2 (2004), p. 022316.
- [25] Maarten Van den Nest, Jeroen Dehaene, and Bart De Moor. “Local unitary versus local Clifford equivalence of stabilizer states”. In: *Physical Review A* 71.6 (2005), p. 062323.
- [26] Bert Van Geemen, Alessio Marrani, et al. “Lagrangian Grassmannians and spinor varieties in characteristic two”. In: *SIGMA. Symmetry, Integrability and Geometry: Methods and Applications* 15 (2019), p. 064.