

JORDAN DECOMPOSITIONS FOR TENSORS

FRÉDÉRIC HOLWECK AND LUKE OEDING

ABSTRACT. We expand on an idea of Vinberg to take a tensor space and the natural Lie algebra which acts on it and embed them into an auxiliary algebra. Viewed as endomorphisms of this algebra we associate adjoint operators to tensors. We show that the group actions on the tensor space and on the adjoint operators are consistent, which endows the tensor with a Jordan decomposition. We utilize aspects of the Jordan decomposition to study orbit separation and classification in examples that are relevant for quantum information.

1. INTRODUCTION

The classical Jordan decomposition of a square matrix A with entries in an algebraically closed field \mathbb{F} is an expression $A = S + N$ with S diagonal (semi-simple) and N upper triangular (nilpotent), and the two commute. Let $V \cong \mathbb{F}^n$ be a vector space, which naturally carries the action of the group of invertible (unimodular) linear transformations $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ (resp. $\mathrm{SL}(V)$). Let $A \in \mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F})$. Then A represents a linear mapping $T_A: V \rightarrow V$ with respect to the standard basis of V , and T_A is viewed as an element of the algebra of endomorphisms $\mathrm{End}(V)$. This algebra is a representation of $\mathrm{GL}(V)$, and since the actions of $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ and $\mathrm{SL}(V)$ are the same on $\mathrm{End}(V)$, due to the commutativity of scalar multiplication past tensor products, we often work with $\mathrm{SL}(V)$. We write $\mathrm{End}(V) = V \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} V^*$ which carries the implicit meaning of a tensor product of $\mathrm{SL}(V)$ -modules, and indicates the induced action, conjugation. The eigenspace decomposition of A , or T_A , is preserved by conjugation. As a consequence, one has:

Theorem 1.1 (Jordan Canonical Form). *Let \mathbb{F} be an algebraically closed field. Every $A \in \mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F})$ is similar to its Jordan canonical form, which is a decomposition:*

$$A \sim J_{k_1}(\lambda_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus J_{k_d}(\lambda_d) \oplus \mathbf{0},$$

where the $k \times k$ Jordan blocks are $J_k(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 1 & & \\ & \lambda & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & 1 \\ & & & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$. The algebraic multiplicity of the eigenvalue λ is the sum $\sum_{\lambda_j=\lambda} k_j$, and the geometric multiplicity of λ is the number s of blocks with eigenvalue λ , $s = \sum_{\lambda_j=\lambda} 1$.

The analogous statements hold for operators $T_A \in \mathrm{End}(V)$. The expression $T_A = T_S + T_N$ as a sum of a semi-simple (diagonalizable) T_S and a nilpotent T_N operator is the **Jordan-Chevalley decomposition**. Recall that a linear operator T is nilpotent if $T^n = 0$ for some finite positive integer n , and equivalently if T has no non-zero eigenvalues, and the characteristic polynomial of an operator T on an n -dimensional space is $\chi_T(t) = t^n$ if and only if T is nilpotent.

The Jordan decomposition is also the answer to an orbit-classification problem: The group $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ acts on the vector space $V \otimes V^*$, and Jordan normal form gives canonical representatives for the orbits.

Like many notions for matrices, there are many possible generalizations to higher order tensors. Our starting point is to note that the vector space $V \otimes V^*$ is also a Lie algebra of endomorphisms and is the Lie algebra of the group $\text{GL}(V)$ acting on it. So, in this case the Lie algebra for the orbit problem is acting on itself. To generalize this to tensors we consider a tensor space W , like $U_1 \otimes U_2 \otimes U_3$ or $\bigwedge^k V$, the natural group G acting on it, like $\text{GL}(U_1) \times \text{GL}(U_2) \times \text{GL}(U_3)$ or $\text{GL}(V)$ respectively, and the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , and attempt to build a graded algebra starting from their direct sum $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus W$ with enough properties so that elements of W can be viewed as adjoint operators acting on \mathfrak{a} whose Jordan decomposition is both non-trivial and invariant under the G -action. This method, which is inspired by work of Vinberg, Kac, and others [24, 44] invites comparison to the work of Landsberg and Manivel [26], which constructed all simple Lie algebras. Our goal, rather than to classify algebras that arise from this construction, is to explore the construction of this adjoint operator and its Jordan decomposition and the consequences for tensors. We plan to explore the structure of these algebras and their connections to Lie superalgebras in a future project. In particular, the Jacobi identity is not necessary to compute the adjoint operators or their Jordan forms.

1.1. Computing the Jordan-Chevalley decomposition of an operator. Suppose $T \in \text{End}(V)$, with a complete set of non-zero eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ listed with repeats according to the algebraic multiplicity of each eigenvalue. Without loss of generality, assume these are listed in non-increasing order of magnitude, and identical eigenvalues are adjacent. Then compute a (an orthonormal) basis of each eigenspace E_λ of T by computing a basis of $\ker(T - \lambda \text{Id})$ for each non-redundant λ and choose any basis of a complement K of E . Set $E = \bigoplus_\lambda (E_\lambda)$ with the basis respecting to the direct sum. Then with respect to the basis adapted to the splitting $E \oplus K$, we have

$$T = T_E + T_K,$$

with T_E diagonal (diagonalizable) if one changes coordinates in $\text{SL}(E)$, and T_K nilpotent. Notice that if T_K were not nilpotent, it would have a non-zero eigenvector, but it can't since E is the sum of all the eigenspaces associated with non-zero eigenvalues. In particular, the image of the restriction of T to K is a subspace of E . Likewise, by construction, the image of T_E is a subspace of E . Therefore, as a matrix in this adapted basis is $A = \begin{pmatrix} D & B \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, with D diagonal, and B arbitrary. The matrix representatives of T_E and T_K are respectively $\begin{pmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & B \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. One might be interested in a more refined expression, which obtains the Jordan normal form. This typically done by computing bases of the *generalized eigenspaces*, which are spanned by the elements \mathbf{x} such that $(A - \lambda I)^n \mathbf{x} = 0$ but $(A - \lambda I)^{n-1} \mathbf{x} \neq 0$.

1.2. Linear algebra review. Let V^* denote the vector space dual to V , that is the set of linear functionals $\{V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}\}$, which is also the dual $\text{SL}(V)$ -module to V with the right action:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SL}(V) \times V^* &\rightarrow V^* \\ (g, \alpha) &\mapsto \alpha g^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the natural (linear) action of $\text{SL}(V)$ on $V \otimes V^*$ is obtained by defining the action on simple elements and extending by linearity: Simple elements $V \otimes V^*$ are of the form $v \otimes \alpha$, so the action is induced from

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SL}(V) \times V \otimes V^* &\rightarrow V \otimes V^* \\ (g, v \otimes \alpha) &\mapsto (gv) \otimes (\alpha g^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the natural action of $\text{SL}(V)$ on $\text{End}(V)$ is by conjugation. Since the matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ is obtained from T_A by expanding T_A in the standard basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ of V and dual basis $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ of V^* via extracting the coefficients in the expression

$$T_A = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} e_i \otimes f_j.$$

So for a vector $x = \sum_i x_i e_i \in V$, $T_A(x) = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} e_i \otimes f_j \sum_k x_k e_k = \sum_{ij,k} a_{ij} x_k e_i \otimes f_j(e_k) = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} x_j e_i = \sum_i (\sum_j a_{ij} x_j) e_i$, i.e. the usual matrix-vector product Ax .

The natural $\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ -action on matrices is also conjugation (since scalar multiplication commutes with matrix product and linear operators):

$$g.T_A = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} g.(e_i \otimes f_j) = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} (g e_i) \otimes (f_j g^{-1}).$$

Evaluating $g.T_A$ on a vector x we see that $(g.T_A)(x) = g(T_A(g^{-1}x))$. Replacing T_A and g respectively with the matrices that represent them with respect to the standard basis, A and M respectively, and using associativity we obtain $g.T_A(x) = MAM^{-1}x$. So, the standard matrix representative of the coordinate-changed transformation $g.T_A$ is MAM^{-1} .

If the field \mathbb{F} is algebraically closed, then the operator T_A has eigen-pairs $(\lambda, v) \in \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F}^n$ consisting of a (scalar) eigenvalue and an eigenvector defined by

$$Av = \lambda v,$$

or, equivalently by pairs $(\lambda, v) \in \mathbb{F} \times V$ such that $T_A(v) = \lambda v$. Since T_A is a linear operator the λ -eigenspace of T_A is a well-defined subspace of V :

$$E_\lambda := \{v \in V \mid T_A v = \lambda v\}.$$

Eigenvalues are preserved by conjugation: if (λ, v) is an eigen-pair of T_A then

$$(g.T_A)(gv) = gT_A(g^{-1}gv) = gT_A(v) = g(\lambda v) = \lambda gv,$$

so (λ, gv) is also an eigen-pair of T_A . Eigenvalues as well as the λ -eigenspaces are preserved under conjugation. Note that E_0 is just the kernel of the operator T_A .

Restricting T_A to an eigenspace E_λ one obtains a linear mapping to V , whose image is in E_λ by construction. Moreover, $T_A: E_\lambda \rightarrow E_\lambda$ acts as $\lambda \cdot \text{Id}$ since $T_A(v) = \lambda v$ for all $v \in E_\lambda$. In particular, T_A is diagonal on the subspace E_λ . Now $E_\lambda = \ker(T_A - \lambda \text{Id})$.

Remark 1.2. Morozov's theorem [32] can be interpreted in this case by noting that the nilpotent part of the upper triangular Jordan block is dual (transpose) to a lower triangular block, and whose commutator is on the diagonal. Triples consisting of a matrix with a single 1 above the diagonal, its transpose, and their commutator form a 3-dimensional Lie algebra.

2. HISTORICAL REMARKS ON JORDAN DECOMPOSITION FOR TENSORS

Concepts from linear algebra often have several distinct generalizations to the multi-linear or tensor setting. It seems natural that any generalization of Jordan decomposition to tensors should involve the concepts of eigenvalues and the conjugation of operators (simultaneous change of basis of source and target) by a group that respects the tensor structure. In their seminal work that reintroduced hyperdeterminants (one generalization of the determinant to tensors) Gelfand Kapranov and Zelevinski [14] wondered what a spectral theory of tensors might look like. This was fleshed out for the first time simultaneously in the works [30, 38] (see also [39]). One definition of an eigen-pair of a tensor $T \in (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes d}$ is a vector $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and

a number λ such that $T(v^{\otimes d-1}) = \lambda v$. Cartwright and Sturmfels computed the number of eigenvectors of a symmetric tensor [4] and Ottaviani gave further computations using Chern classes of vector bundles, see for example [34]. Further considerations in this vein appeared in [15], which gave a different product, and hence algebra structure, on tensor spaces. While this concept of eigenvector has been very important, it doesn't seem immediately amenable to a Jordan decomposition because of the following features:

- (1) The operator $T: S^{d-1}V \rightarrow V$ is not usually square.
- (2) Contracting $T \in V^{\otimes d}$ with the same vector $v \in V$ $d - 1$ times has a symmetrization effect, which collapses the group that acts to $\text{SL}(V)$ versus $\text{SL}(V)^{\times d}$.
- (3) It's not immediately clear that a conjugation group action on T makes sense because of the (typically) non-square matrices coming from contractions or flattenings.

See [6] for a multilinear generalization of a Jordan decomposition, which considered 3rd order tensors, and focused on approximating a tensor with one that is block upper triangular.

The generalization we will offer segues the following line of research. Any semisimple Lie algebra has a Jordan decomposition [25], and Jordan decomposition is preserved under any representation [12, Th. 9.20]. See also [22] for some recent work in this direction. The existence of such a Jordan decomposition has been the key to answering classical questions like orbit classification. Specifically, given a vector space V with a connected linear algebraic group $G \subset \text{GL}(V)$ acting on it, what are all the orbits? Which pairs (G, V) have finitely many orbits [7, 24], or if not, which are of *tame* or *wild* representation type? These questions have intrigued algebraists for a long time. Dynkin [10, 11] noted to call something a *classification* of representations one must have a set of “characteristics” satisfying the following:

- The characteristics must be invariant under inner automorphisms, so that the characteristics of equivalent representations must coincide.
- They should be complete: If two representations have the same characteristics, then they must be equivalent.
- They should be compact and easy to compute.

Certainly, a requirement for finitely many orbits is that the dimension of the group G must be at least that of the vector space V . However, for tensors this is rare. Yet, in some cases Vinberg's θ -representation method [43] can classify orbits even in the tame setting, and in fact does so by embedding the question of classifying orbits for the pair (G, V) to classifying nilpotent orbits in the adjoint representation V' of an auxiliary group G' , hence the classification comes down to classifying the subalgebras of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}' . This classification was done by Dynkin [10, 11]. One can follow these details in [44], for instance in the case of $(\text{SL}(9), \wedge^3 \mathbb{C}^9)$ whose orbit classification relied upon the connection to the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{e}_8 , or for the case of $(\text{SL}(8), \wedge^4 \mathbb{C}^8)$ in [1]. However, Vinberg and Èlašvili, comment that while they did succeed in classifying the orbits for $(\text{SL}(9), \wedge^3 \mathbb{C}^9)$, which involved 7 families of semi-simple elements depending on 4 continuous parameters, and up to as many as 102 nilpotent parts for each, such a classification of orbits for $(\text{SL}(n), \wedge^3 \mathbb{C}^n)$, “if at all possible, is significantly more complicated.” One reason for this is that all the orbits for case n are nilpotent for case $n+1$ (being non-concise), hence for $n \geq 10$ even the nilpotent orbits will depend on parameters. In addition, it is not clear what should come next in a family of classification problems that follows the sequence E_6, E_7, E_8 . We offer an option for the next step by being agnostic to the algebra classification problem, and just focus on

putting tensor spaces into a naturally occurring graded algebras, whose product (bracket) is compatible with the group action on the tensor space.

Though we do not compute a full Jordan decomposition many times in this article, we emphasize that all the features we study (like matrix block ranks and eigenvalues) are consequences of the existence of a Jordan decomposition compatible with the tensor structure. All the computations we report take under a few seconds on a desktop computer.

3. CONSTRUCTING AN ALGEBRA EXTENDING TENSOR SPACE

Now we will generalize a part of the Vinberg construction (discussed briefly in Section 2) embedding tensor spaces into a graded algebra, obtaining adjoint operators for tensors such that the group action on the tensor space is consistent with the Jordan decomposition of the operator. This involves structure tensors of algebras, (see [2, 46] for recent studies).

3.1. A graded algebra extending a G -module. Let M denote a finite dimensional G -module, with \mathfrak{g} the Lie algebra of G , thought of as an algebra over \mathbb{F} . We wish to give the vector space $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus M$ the structure of an algebra, with structure compatible with the G -action. In order to have closure, we may need to extend M to a larger G -module, i.e, we may also consider the vector space $\mathfrak{a}' = \mathfrak{g} \oplus M \oplus M^*$ in Section 3.5, or more in Section 3.6.

We will attempt to define a bracket on \mathfrak{a} with the following properties:

$$[\ , \]: \mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a} \tag{3.1}$$

- (1) The bracket is bi-linear, and hence equivalent to a structure tensor $B \in \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}$.
- (2) The bracket is *interesting*, i.e., the structure tensor is non-zero.
- (3) The bracket respects the grading, i.e., $[\ , \]: \mathfrak{a}_i \times \mathfrak{a}_j \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_{i+j}$.
- (4) The bracket agrees with the \mathfrak{g} -action on \mathfrak{g} , and on M . This ensures that the Jordan decomposition respects the G -action on M .
- (5) The structure tensor B is G -invariant, so that the G -action on elements of \mathfrak{a} is conjugation for adjoint operators, and hence Jordan decomposition makes sense.

If the bracket satisfies these properties, we can also ask for the following properties that would make \mathfrak{a} into a Lie algebra.

- (6) The bracket is globally skew-commuting, i.e., $[T, S] = -[S, T]$ for all $S, T \in \mathfrak{a}$. Note it must be skew-commuting for the products $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g} \times M \rightarrow M$ if it is to respect the grading and the G -action on \mathfrak{g} and on M .
- (7) The bracket satisfies the Jacobi criterion and hence makes \mathfrak{a} a Lie algebra.

We will see that these last 2 criteria may not always be possible to impose. We may wish to ask if our brackets define Lie superalgebras, which we hope to explore in a future work. However, the conditions (1)-(5) are enough to define the following.

Definition 3.1. Given an element T in an algebra \mathfrak{a} , we associate its adjoint form

$$\text{ad}_T := [T, \]: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}.$$

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose \mathfrak{a} is a G -module. Then the structure tensor B of an algebra \mathfrak{a} is G -invariant if and only if the operation $T \mapsto \text{ad}_T$ is G -equivariant in the sense that*

$$\text{ad}_{gT} = g(\text{ad}_T)g^{-1}, \tag{3.2}$$

with gT denoting the G -action on \mathfrak{a} on the LHS and juxtaposition standing for the matrix product on the RHS. In particular, the Jordan form of ad_T is a G -invariant for $T \in \mathfrak{a}$.

Proof. Let $B = \sum_{i,j,k} B_{i,j,k} \alpha_i \otimes \alpha_j \otimes a_k \in \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}$ represent a potential bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]$. For $T \in \mathfrak{a}$ we have that $\text{ad}_T = B(T) \in \mathbb{F} \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}$ is the contraction in the first factor. Since the G -action is a linear action, it suffices to work with on rank-one tensors such as $\alpha \otimes \beta \otimes a$, for which the contraction with T is $\alpha(T) \cdot \beta \otimes a$, and \cdot denotes the scalar product. For $g \in G$ the G -action on the contraction is

$$g.(\alpha(T)\beta \otimes a) = \alpha(T) \cdot (g.\beta) \otimes (g.a),$$

because G acts as the identity on \mathbb{F} . Extending this by linearity and noting that $g.\beta(v) = \beta(g^{-1}v)$ (the dual action) we have that

$$g.(B(T)) = g(B(T))g^{-1}, \tag{3.3}$$

where no dot (juxtaposition) means matrix product. Then we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} g.(\alpha \otimes \beta \otimes a) &= (g.\alpha) \otimes (g.\beta) \otimes (g.a), \text{ and} \\ (g.(\alpha \otimes \beta \otimes a))(T) &= (g.\alpha)(T) \cdot (g.\beta) \otimes (g.a) = \alpha(g^{-1}T) \cdot (g.\beta) \otimes (g.a). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$(g.B)(T) = g.(B(g^{-1}T)) = g(B(g^{-1}T))g^{-1}, \tag{3.4}$$

where the second equality is by (3.3).

If we assume that $g.B = B$ we can conclude from (3.4) that

$$B(T) = g(B(g^{-1}T))g^{-1},$$

or replacing T with gT

$$B(gT) = g(B(T))g^{-1},$$

which shows that B is G -invariant. Hence the construction of the adjoint operators is G -equivariant. This argument is also reversible since (3.4) holds for any tensor B , and if

$$B(T) = g(B(g^{-1}T))g^{-1}$$

holds for all T , then $B(T) = (g.B)(T)$ for all T , which implies that $B = g.B$. \square

3.2. Invariants from adjoint operators. Since conjugation preserves eigenvalues, we have that elementary symmetric functions of the eigenvalues, including the trace and determinant, and hence also the characteristic polynomial of the adjoint form of a tensor are all invariant under the action of G . Hence x and y are not in the same orbit if they do not have the same values for each of these invariants. We list three such invariants for later reference.

Definition 3.3. For generic $T \in \mathfrak{g}$ the adjoint operator ad_T induces **trace-power invariants**:

$$f_k(T) := \text{tr}((\text{ad}_T)^k).$$

The ring $\mathcal{F} := \mathbb{C}[f_1, \dots, f_n]$ is a subring of the invariant ring $\mathbb{C}[V]^G$, though \mathcal{F} is not likely to be freely generated by the f_k , and it is likely to be a proper subring, see also [45]. This opens a slew of interesting commutative algebra problems such as: computing the syzygies of the f_k 's, or even the entire minimal free resolution (over $\mathbb{C}[V]$) of such; obtaining a minimal set of basic invariants; finding expressions of other known invariants in terms of the f_k , for example, one could ask for an expression of the hyperdeterminant, as was done in [3, 17].

Invariance also holds for the set of algebraic multiplicities of the roots of the adjoint form of the tensor, as well as the ranks of the adjoint form and its blocks induced from the natural grading. This leads us to the following invariants that are easy to compute, and which are often sufficient to distinguish orbits.

Definition 3.4. Suppose $T \in M$, \mathfrak{a} is an algebra containing $\mathfrak{g} \oplus M$, and ad_T is the adjoint operator of T . We call the **adjoint root profile**, which is listing the roots (with multiplicities) of the characteristic polynomial of ad_T .

Definition 3.5. We list the ranks of the blocks of ad_T and its powers, and call this the **adjoint rank profile**. We depict the rank profile by a table whose rows correspond to the power k on $(\text{ad}_T)^k$, and whose columns are labeled by the blocks of $(\text{ad}_T)^k$, with the last column corresponding to the total rank.

Recall that the **null cone** \mathcal{N}_G is the common zero locus of the invariants, i.e., the generators of $\mathbb{C}[V]^G$. We have the following straightforward conclusion:

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose \mathfrak{a} has a Jordan decomposition consistent with the G -action on M . If a tensor T is in the null cone \mathcal{N}_G , then ad_T is a nilpotent operator. Moreover, if the trace powers f_k generate the invariant ring $\mathbb{C}[V]^G$, then null-cone membership and nilpotency are equivalent.*

Proof. If $T \in \mathcal{N}_G$ then every invariant vanishes, in particular all elementary symmetric polynomials in the eigenvalues of ad_T , hence all the eigenvalues of ad_T are zero, so null-cone membership always implies nilpotency. Conversely, if ad_T is nilpotent, then all the eigenvalues of ad_T are zero, and since the trace powers are symmetric functions in the eigenvalues of ad_T , they all vanish. If these trace powers generate the invariant ring, then nilpotent tensors are in the null cone. \square

3.3. Algebra structures on $\text{End}(V)_0$. The vector space of traceless endomorphisms, denoted $\mathfrak{g} = \text{End}(V)_0$ (or \mathfrak{sl}_n or $\mathfrak{sl}(V)$ when we imply the Lie algebra structure), can be given more than one G -invariant algebra structure, as we will now show. We attempt to define a G -equivariant bracket

$$\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}.$$

The following result implies that up to re-scaling, there are two canonical G -equivariant product structures on \mathfrak{g} , one commuting and one skew-commuting.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $\mathfrak{g} = \text{End}(V)_0$ denote the vector space of traceless endomorphisms of a finite dimensional vector space V . Then $\mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ contains 2 copies of the trivial representation, and more specifically, each of $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ and $S^2 \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ contains a 1-dimensional space of invariants.*

Proof. Since \mathfrak{g} is an irreducible G -module, we only need to show that there is an isomorphic copy of \mathfrak{g}^* in each of $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}^*$ and $S^2 \mathfrak{g}^*$, then each of $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ and $S^2 \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ will have a non-trivial space of invariants. This is just a character computation, but we can also see it as an application of the Pieri rule and the algebra of Schur functors. We do the case of $S^2 \mathfrak{g}^*$ since the other case is quite similar, and we already know that $\text{End}(V)_0$ has the structure of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(V)$ with a skew-commuting product.

Recall that $V \otimes V^* = \text{End}(V)_0 \oplus \mathbb{C}$, where the trivial factor is the trace, and as a Schur module $\text{End}(V)_0 = S_{2,1^{n-2}}V$. Also $S^2(A \oplus B) = S^2A \oplus (A \otimes B) \oplus S^2B$ so we can compute $S^2 \mathfrak{g}$ by computing $S^2(V \otimes V^*)$ and taking a quotient. We have

$$S^2(V \otimes V^*) = (S^2V \otimes S^2V^*) \oplus (\wedge^2V \otimes \wedge^2V^*).$$

Now apply the Pieri rule (let exponents denote repetition in the Schur functors)

$$= (S_{2^n}V \oplus \underline{S_{3,2^{n-2},1}}V \oplus S_{4,2^{n-2}}V) \oplus (\wedge^nV \oplus \underline{S_{2,1^{n-2}}}V \oplus S_{2,2,1^{n-3}}V),$$

where we have underlined the copies of \mathfrak{g} . Since $S^2(V \otimes V^*)$ contains 2 copies of \mathfrak{g} and only one copy can occur in the complement of $S^2\mathfrak{sl}(V)$ (which is $\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathbb{C} \oplus S^2\mathbb{C}$), we conclude that there must be precisely one copy of \mathfrak{g} in $S^2\mathfrak{g}$. \square

Remark 3.8. Note the traceless commuting product is defined via:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} &\rightarrow \mathfrak{g} \\ (A, B) &\mapsto (AB + BA) - I \cdot \text{tr}(AB + BA). \end{aligned}$$

Then we know that the trace is G -invariant, the G action is linear and moreover

$$g(AB + BA)g^{-1} = (gAg^{-1})(gBg^{-1}) + (gBg^{-1})(gAg^{-1}),$$

so $g.[A, B] = [g.A, g.B]$, i.e., the product is G -equivariant.

Remark 3.9. Since both $\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{sl}_n \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n$ and $S^2 \mathfrak{sl}_n \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n$ have a space of non-trivial invariants, we could put a commuting or skew-commuting product on \mathfrak{sl}_n and yield different algebra structures on \mathfrak{a} . However, if we want the product to agree with the action of \mathfrak{sl}_n on itself and with the action of \mathfrak{sl}_n on M (and hence obtain a Jordan decomposition), then we should insist that we choose the bracket that is skew-commuting on \mathfrak{sl}_n . This structure is inherited from viewing \mathfrak{g} as the adjoint representation of G .

3.4. A \mathbb{Z}_2 graded algebra from a G -module. For a G -module M we define $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus M$ and attempt to construct a bracket

$$[\cdot, \cdot]: \mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a},$$

viewed as an element of a tensor product $B \in \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}$, with the requirements in Section 3.1.

For the bracket on \mathfrak{a} to respect the \mathbb{Z}_2 grading $\mathfrak{a}_0 = \mathfrak{g}$, $\mathfrak{a}_1 = M$, it must impose conditions that respect the following decomposition.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a} &= (\mathfrak{a}_0^* \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^*) \otimes (\mathfrak{a}_0^* \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^*) \otimes (\mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1) \\ &= \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \\ &\quad \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \end{aligned}$$

Correspondingly denote by B_{ijk} the graded pieces of B , i.e., B_{ijk} is the restriction of B to $\mathfrak{a}_i^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_j^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_k$. Respecting the grading requires that the maps $B_{001} = 0$, $B_{010} = 0$, $B_{100} = 0$, and $B_{111} = 0$. So B must have the following structure:

$$B \in \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0,$$

For $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ write $B(X) = \text{ad}_X$, likewise, for $T \in M$ write $B(T) = \text{ad}_T$, and correspondingly with the graded pieces of each. So, the adjoint operators have formats:

$$B(X) = \begin{pmatrix} B_{000}(X) & 0 \\ 0 & B_{011}(X) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad B(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & B_{110}(T) \\ B_{101}(T) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.5)$$

where we note that each of the blocks are maps:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{000}(X): \mathfrak{a}_0 &\rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_0, & B_{011}(X): \mathfrak{a}_1 &\rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_1, \\ B_{110}(T): \mathfrak{a}_1 &\rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_0, & B_{101}(T): \mathfrak{a}_0 &\rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_1, \end{aligned}$$

that depend linearly on their argument, X or T . The linearity of the construction is apparent, so that if $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, $T \in M$ then

$$B(X + T) = B(X) + B(T),$$

respecting the matrix decompositions at (3.5).

Agreement with the \mathfrak{g} -action would require that B_{000} be the usual commutator on \mathfrak{g} and that B_{011} should be the usual \mathfrak{g} -action on M , which is not an obstruction. The remaining requirement is a G -invariant in $\mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0$ (respectively in $\mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1$), which will allow for an invariant B_{110} (respectively B_{101}). Formally:

Proposition 3.10. *The vector space $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus M = \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1$ has a G -invariant structure tensor, and hence elements of the corresponding graded algebra have a non-trivial Jordan decomposition that is consistent with the G -action on $T \in M$ if and only if the spaces of G -invariants in $\mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0$ and in $\mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1$ are non-trivial.*

Skew-symmetry would force the elements B_{000} and B_{110} to be skew-symmetric in their first two arguments, and $B_{101} = -B_{011}^\top$. On the level of modules, this is

$$B \in \bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0^* \wedge \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0,$$

where we have encoded the condition that $B_{101} = -B_{011}^\top$ by replacing $(\mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1) \oplus (\mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1)$ with $\mathfrak{a}_0^* \wedge \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1$. We record this condition as follows:

Proposition 3.11. *The algebra $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus M = \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1$ has a skew-commuting product with a non-trivial Jordan decomposition that is consistent with the G -action on $T \in M$ if and only if the spaces of G -invariants in $\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0$ and in $\mathfrak{a}_0^* \wedge \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1$ are non-trivial.*

Example 1. Consider $M = \bigwedge^3 \mathbb{C}^6$, and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_6$. Note that $M \cong M^*$ as G -modules, and likewise $\mathfrak{g}^* = \mathfrak{g}$. We ask if there is a non-trivial invariant

$$B \in \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0.$$

Noting the self-dualities and permuting tensor factors, we can check for invariants in

$$\mathfrak{a}_0 \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0 \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1.$$

By the Pieri rule we have $M \otimes M = \bigwedge^6 \mathbb{C}^6 \oplus S_{2,1,1,1,1} \mathbb{C}^6 \oplus S_{2,2,1,1} \mathbb{C}^6 \oplus S_{2,2,2} \mathbb{C}^6$.

Since \mathfrak{sl}_6 is irreducible, existence of a non-trivial space of invariants in $M^* \otimes M^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_6$ requires a summand in $M \otimes M$ be isomorphic to \mathfrak{sl}_6 , which is the case since $\mathfrak{sl}_6 \cong S_{2,1,1,1,1} \mathbb{C}^6$ as a G -module. Note also (by [12, Ex. 15.32]) $\bigwedge^2 M = \bigwedge^6 \mathbb{C}^6 \oplus S_{2,2,1,1} \mathbb{C}^6$. So, it is impossible to have a G -invariant structure tensor for a globally skew-commuting product in this example. But (by the same exercise) since $\mathfrak{sl}_6 \subset S^2 \bigwedge^3 \mathbb{C}^6$ we see that \mathfrak{a} does have a non-trivial G -invariant structure tensor that is commuting on M . We give up skew-symmetry and the Jacobi identity, but we retain Jordan decompositions of adjoint operators.

The orbits of $\mathrm{SL}_6(\mathbb{C})$ in $\mathbb{P} \bigwedge^3 \mathbb{C}^6$ were classified in the 1930s by Schouten [16, 40]. Their closures are linearly ordered. One sees in Table 1 that the adjoint rank profiles separate orbits. Note we actually constructed adjoint operators for $\mathfrak{gl}_6 \oplus \bigwedge^3 \mathbb{C}^6$ because it is easier to program. This produces adjoint matrices of size 56×56 instead of 55×55 with an extra kernel. In the last case we stop the table since the form is not nilpotent.

The characteristic polynomials for the nilpotent elements are t^{56} . The on the basis semi-simple element $T = e_0 e_1 e_2 + e_3 e_4 e_5$ we have $\chi_T(t) = \frac{1}{3^{18}} (t)^{20} (3t^2 - 4)^9 (3t^2 + 4)^9$, with root profile is $(20_0, (9_{\mathbb{C}})^2, (9_{\mathbb{R}})^2)$, i.e., there are roots of multiplicity 20 at 0, and 2 complex roots and 2 real roots each with multiplicity 9.

For the nilpotent normal forms the trace-power invariants are zero. For the general point the trace powers of order $4k$ are non-zero. Since the ring of invariants is generated in degree 4, the invariant $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{ad}_T^4)$ must be equal to a scalar multiple of this invariant, which is known as a hyperpfaffian. It has value 64 on the form $e_0 e_1 e_2 + e_3 e_4 e_5$. \diamond

Grassmannian: $e_0e_1e_2$	Restricted Chordal: $e_0e_1e_2 + e_0e_3e_4$	Tangential: $e_0e_1e_2 + e_0e_3e_4 + e_1e_3e_5$	Secant (general): $e_0e_1e_2 + e_3e_4e_5$																																																																																																														
<table style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{00}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{01}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{10}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{11}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B</th></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>10</td><td>10</td><td>0</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B	0	10	10	0	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	<table style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{00}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{01}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{10}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{11}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B</th></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>15</td><td>15</td><td>0</td><td>30</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>6</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B	0	15	15	0	30	10	0	0	6	16	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	<table style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{00}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{01}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{10}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{11}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B</th></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>19</td><td>19</td><td>0</td><td>38</td></tr> <tr><td>18</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>11</td><td>29</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>10</td><td>10</td><td>0</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>2</td><td>11</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B	0	19	19	0	38	18	0	0	11	29	0	10	10	0	20	9	0	0	2	11	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	<table style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{00}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{01}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{10}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B_{11}</th><th style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">B</th></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>19</td><td>19</td><td>0</td><td>38</td></tr> <tr><td>18</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>19</td><td>37</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>18</td><td>18</td><td>0</td><td>36</td></tr> </table>	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B	0	19	19	0	38	18	0	0	19	37	0	18	18	0	36
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B																																																																																																													
0	10	10	0	20																																																																																																													
0	0	0	1	1																																																																																																													
0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																													
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B																																																																																																													
0	15	15	0	30																																																																																																													
10	0	0	6	16																																																																																																													
0	1	1	0	2																																																																																																													
1	0	0	0	1																																																																																																													
0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																													
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B																																																																																																													
0	19	19	0	38																																																																																																													
18	0	0	11	29																																																																																																													
0	10	10	0	20																																																																																																													
9	0	0	2	11																																																																																																													
0	1	1	0	2																																																																																																													
0	0	0	1	1																																																																																																													
0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																													
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B																																																																																																													
0	19	19	0	38																																																																																																													
18	0	0	19	37																																																																																																													
0	18	18	0	36																																																																																																													

TABLE 1. Normal forms and adjoint rank profiles of orbits in $\mathbb{P}\Lambda^3\mathbb{C}^6$.

Example 2. Now consider $M = \Lambda^4\mathbb{C}^8$ and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_8$. Note that $M \cong M^*$ as G -modules. By the Pieri rule $M \otimes M = \Lambda^8\mathbb{C}^8 \oplus S_{2,1,1,1,1,1,1,1}\mathbb{C}^8 \oplus S_{2,2,1,1,1,1,1}\mathbb{C}^8 \oplus S_{2,2,2,1,1}\mathbb{C}^8 \oplus S_{2,2,2,2}\mathbb{C}^8$. Since \mathfrak{sl}_8 is irreducible, $M^* \otimes M^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_8$ has a non-trivial space of invariants if and only if a summand in $M \otimes M$ is isomorphic to \mathfrak{sl}_8 , which is the case since $\mathfrak{sl}_8 \cong S_{2,1,1,1,1,1,1,1}\mathbb{C}^6$ as a G -module.

Note also (by [12, Ex. 15.32]) $\Lambda^2 M = \Lambda^8\mathbb{C}^8 \oplus S_{2,1,1,1,1,1,1,1}\mathbb{C}^8 \oplus S_{2,2,2,1,1}\mathbb{C}^8$, which contains a copy of \mathfrak{sl}_8 . So \mathfrak{a} has a non-trivial G -invariant structure tensor for a skew-commuting product in this case. One checks that this product (which is unique up to scalar) also satisfies the Jacobi identity. Antonyan [1] noticed that this algebra is a copy of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{e}_7 and carried out Vinberg’s method [43], which says, essentially, that since \mathfrak{e}_7 is a semi-simple Lie-algebra the nilpotent orbits can be classified by utilizing Dynkin classification of subalgebras of semi-simple Lie algebras [11]. Antonyan uses a modification of Dynkin’s *Characteristics* to separate nilpotent orbits.

The appendix in [36] provides normal forms for each of the nilpotent orbits. The adjoint rank profiles can distinguish orbits. The adjoint rank profile has the advantage that it does not require one to be able to use the group action to put a given tensor into its normal form, and in that sense, it is an automatic computation. It is interesting consider normal forms of nilpotent orbits whose stabilizers have type associated with the full Lie algebra \mathfrak{e}_7 , and respectively $\mathfrak{e}_7(a_1)$ and $\mathfrak{e}_7(a_2)$. The respective normal forms, orbit numbers (from Antonyan), and adjoint rank profiles are listed in Table 2. These orbits are also distinguishable by their dimensions (seen in the first row of the adjoint rank profiles by Remark 3.19). We also highlight orbits №65, №67, and №69, which all have the same dimension (60). Their normal forms and adjoint rank profiles are listed in Table 3. Here two of them even appear to have the same rank of normal form (though the true rank could be smaller).

Notice that even the ranks of the powers may not distinguish orbits, but however, the blocks for №65, №67, do have some different ranks starting at the 6-th power. \diamond

The previous two examples are special cases of the following straightforward generalization:

Theorem 3.12. *The vector space $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{sl}_{2m} \oplus \Lambda^m\mathbb{C}^{2m}$ has a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded algebra structure with a Jordan decomposition consistent with the G -action. There is a unique (up to scale) equivariant bracket product that agrees with the \mathfrak{g} -action on M , and moreover it must satisfy the property that the restriction to $M \times M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ must be commuting when m is odd and skew-commuting when m is even.*

Proof. Note first that \mathfrak{sl}_{2m} is an irreducible $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_{2m}$ -module (the adjoint representation), and hence a non-zero invariant structure tensor exists if and only if there is a copy of \mathfrak{g} in $M \otimes M$. Moreover, the number of such is determined by the multiplicity of \mathfrak{g} in $M \otimes M$. Indeed, by [12, Ex. 15.32], we have for $M = \Lambda^m\mathbb{C}^{2m}$ that precisely one copy of $\mathfrak{g} = S_{2,1^{2m-2}}\mathbb{C}^{2m}$ is contained only in $S^2\Lambda^m\mathbb{C}^{2m}$ when m is odd, and only in $\Lambda^2\Lambda^m\mathbb{C}^{2m}$ when m is even. \square

$$\begin{aligned} \text{№83 : } & e_{1345} + e_{1246} + e_{0356} + e_{1237} + e_{0247} + e_{0257} + e_{0167} \\ \text{№86 : } & e_{1245} + e_{1346} + e_{0256} + e_{1237} + e_{0347} + e_{0157} + e_{0167} \\ \text{№88 : } & e_{2345} + e_{1346} + e_{1256} + e_{0356} + e_{1237} + e_{0247} + e_{0157} \end{aligned}$$

№83 :					№86 :					№88 :				
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B
0	62	62	0	124	0	61	61	0	122	0	63	63	0	126
54	0	0	61	115	52	0	0	59	111	56	0	0	63	119
0	53	53	0	106	0	50	50	0	100	0	56	56	0	112
46	0	0	52	98	43	0	0	48	91	50	0	0	56	106
0	45	45	0	90	0	41	41	0	82	0	50	50	0	100
38	0	0	44	82	34	0	0	39	73	44	0	0	50	94
0	37	37	0	74	0	32	32	0	64	0	44	44	0	88
31	0	0	36	67	26	0	0	30	56	38	0	0	44	82
0	30	30	0	60	0	24	24	0	48	0	38	38	0	76
24	0	0	29	53	18	0	0	23	41	32	0	0	38	70
0	23	23	0	46	0	17	17	0	34	0	32	32	0	64
19	0	0	22	41	13	0	0	16	29	27	0	0	32	59
0	18	18	0	36	8	0	0	11	19	0	27	27	0	54
14	0	0	17	31	0	7	7	0	14	22	0	0	27	49
0	13	13	0	26	5	0	0	6	11	0	22	22	0	44
10	0	0	12	22	0	4	4	0	8	18	0	0	22	40
0	9	9	0	18	2	0	0	2	4	0	18	18	0	36
6	0	0	9	15	0	2	2	0	4	14	0	0	18	32
0	6	6	0	12	1	0	0	2	3	0	14	14	0	28
4	0	0	6	10	0	1	1	0	2	11	0	0	14	25
0	4	4	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	11	11	0	22
2	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	0	0	11	19
0	2	2	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	8	8	0	16
0	2	2	0	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	0	0	8	14
1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	2	3	0	6	6	0	12
0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0	6	10
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4	0	8
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	4	7
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	3	0	6
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	3	5
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	4
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	3
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 2. Some normal forms of orbits in $\bigwedge^4 \mathbb{C}^8$ and their adjoint rank profiles.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{№65 : } & e_{2345} + e_{0246} + e_{1356} + e_{0237} + e_{1237} + e_{0147} + e_{0157} \\ \text{№67 : } & e_{1345} + e_{1246} + e_{0346} + e_{0256} + e_{1237} + e_{0247} + e_{0167} \\ \text{№69 : } & e_{1345} + e_{1246} + e_{0356} + e_{1237} + e_{0247} + e_{0157} \end{aligned}$$

№65 :					№67 :					№69 :				
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B
0	60	60	0	120	0	60	60	0	120	0	60	60	0	120
50	0	0	57	107	50	0	0	57	107	52	0	0	58	110
0	47	47	0	94	0	47	47	0	94	0	50	50	0	100
39	0	0	44	83	0	47	47	0	94	43	0	0	48	91
0	36	36	0	72	39	0	0	44	83	0	41	41	0	82
28	0	0	34	62	0	36	36	0	72	34	0	0	39	73
0	26	26	0	52	29	0	0	33	62	0	32	32	0	64
20	0	0	24	44	0	26	26	0	52	25	0	0	30	55
0	18	18	0	36	20	0	0	24	44	0	23	23	0	46
12	0	0	17	29	0	18	18	0	36	18	0	0	22	40
0	11	11	0	22	13	0	0	16	29	0	17	17	0	34
8	0	0	10	18	0	11	11	0	22	13	0	0	16	29
0	7	7	0	14	0	11	11	0	22	0	12	12	0	24
4	0	0	6	10	8	0	0	10	18	8	0	0	11	19
0	3	3	0	6	0	7	7	0	14	0	7	7	0	14
2	0	0	2	4	4	0	0	6	10	4	0	0	6	10
0	1	1	0	2	0	3	3	0	6	0	3	3	0	6
0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	3	5
0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	2	2	0	4
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	3
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 3. More normal forms of orbits in $\bigwedge^4 \mathbb{C}^8$ and their adjoint rank profiles.

3.5. A \mathbb{Z}_3 graded algebra from a \mathfrak{g} -module. At the risk of confusion of notation, for this subsection let $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_{-1}$ with $\mathfrak{a}_0 = \mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{a}_1 = M$ as before, but also $\mathfrak{a}_{-1} = M^*$, the dual \mathfrak{g} -module. For the bracket on \mathfrak{a} to respect the \mathbb{Z}_3 grading, it must impose conditions that respect the following decomposition.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a} &= (\mathfrak{a}_0^* \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \oplus \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^*) \otimes (\mathfrak{a}_0^* \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \oplus \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^*) \otimes (\mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_{-1}) \\ &= \bigoplus_{i,j,k \in \{0,1,-1\}} \mathfrak{a}_i^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_j^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_k \end{aligned}$$

Correspondingly denote by B_{ijk} the graded pieces of B , i.e., B_{ijk} is the restriction of B to $\mathfrak{a}_i^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_j^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_k$, and we equate 1 with + and -1 with $-$ for notational ease. Respecting the \mathbb{Z}_3 grading now requires the following vanishing: $B_{ijk} = 0$ if $k \neq i + j \pmod{3}$. Thus, the only non-zero blocks of B must be:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B_{000} & B_{0++} & B_{0--} \\ B_{+0+} & B_{+-0} & B_{++-} \\ B_{-0-} & B_{--+} & B_{-+0} \end{array}$$

So B must have the following structure:

$$B \in \begin{array}{ccccc} & \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 & \oplus & \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 & \oplus & \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1} \\ \oplus & \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 & \oplus & \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 & \oplus & \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1} \\ \oplus & \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1} & \oplus & \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 & \oplus & \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \end{array}$$

Correspondingly, there are three types of adjoint operators: for $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ write $B(X) = \text{ad}_X$, likewise, for $T \in M$ write $B(T) = \text{ad}_T$, and for $\tau \in M^*$ write $B(\tau) = \text{ad}_\tau$, and correspondingly with the graded pieces of each. So, the adjoint operators have formats

$$\begin{aligned} B(X) &= \begin{pmatrix} B_{000}(X) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_{0++}(X) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & B_{0--}(X) \end{pmatrix}, & B(T) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & B_{+-0}(T) \\ B_{+0+}(T) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_{++-}(T) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ B(\tau) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & B_{-+0}(\tau) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & B_{--+}(\tau) \\ B_{-0-}(\tau) & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

The linearity of the construction and the grading of the bracket is apparent. Note that each of the blocks are maps that depend linearly on their argument, $(X, T, \text{ or } \tau)$.

Theorem 3.13. *The vector space $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{sl}_n \oplus \bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n \oplus \bigwedge^{n-k} \mathbb{C}^n$ has an essentially unique non-trivial \mathbb{Z}_3 -graded algebra structure with a Jordan decomposition consistent with the G -action precisely when $n = 3k$. Any non-trivial equivariant bracket product must satisfy the property that the restriction to $M \times M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ must be skew-commuting when k is odd and commuting when k is even.*

Proof. Agreement with the \mathfrak{g} -action requires that B_{000} be the usual commutator on \mathfrak{g} and that B_{0++} should be the usual \mathfrak{g} -action on M , while B_{0--} should be the usual \mathfrak{g} -action on M^* . More care must be given to ensure that the other blocks come from an invariant tensor.

For $B(T)$ we seek a non-zero invariant tensor in each block of $\mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1}$, or noting that $\mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* = \mathfrak{a}_1$ we seek a non-zero tensor in each block of $\mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^*$. In the last block, note that $(\bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes 3}$ decomposes by an iterated application of Pieri's rule. In order to have $3k$ boxes fitting in a rectangle of height n , and it can have either 0, 1, 2 or 3 columns, since $k \leq n$ and $n - k \leq n$, so the corresponding possibilities for k are (in order) $k = 0$, $3k = n$, or $3k = 2n$ or $3k = 3n$. The middle two are the only non-trivial ones and they correspond to the modules $M = \bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^{3k}$ and $M^* = \bigwedge^{2k} \mathbb{C}^{3k}$. Hereafter $n = 3k$.

Now we look for invariants in $\mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0$. Since \mathfrak{sl}_{3k} is an irreducible $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_{3k}$ -module (the adjoint representation), an interesting non-zero invariant structure tensor exists if and only if there is a copy of \mathfrak{g}^* in $M^* \otimes M$. One sees a copy of \mathfrak{g}^* in $M^* \otimes M$ simultaneously by taking the transpose and noting that $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{g}^*$ as \mathfrak{g} -modules.

Lemma 3.14. *Consider $M = \bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n$ and $M^* = \bigwedge^{n-k} \mathbb{C}^n$. There is precisely one copy of $\mathfrak{sl}_n = \mathfrak{g} = S_{2,1^{n-2}}$ in $M \otimes M^*$. Moreover, if $n = 2k$ then the copy of \mathfrak{g} lives in $S^2 M$ if k is odd and in $\bigwedge^2 M$ if k is even.*

proof of lemma. By the Pieri rule, $M = \bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n$ and $M^* = \bigwedge^{n-k} \mathbb{C}^n$ there is always a copy of $\mathfrak{g} = S_{2,1^{n-2}} \mathbb{C}^n$ in $M \otimes M^*$ is obtained by adding to a column of height k one box to the second column and the rest to the first column. The total number of boxes is n . This decomposition is multiplicity free, so there is only one copy of \mathfrak{g} in $M \otimes M^*$. The ‘‘moreover’’ statement follows from [12, Ex. 15.32]. \square

Similarly, if we wish to define the bracket for elements τ of M^* we must find an interesting non-zero invariant tensor in $\mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0$. This turns out to be the same computation as in the case of T in M . So, we obtain no additional obstructions.

The question of whether this bracket can be symmetric or skew-symmetric for $T \in M$ (respectively for $\tau \in M^*$) comes down to the existence of a non-zero invariant in $\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{a}_1^*) \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1}$ or in $S^2(\mathfrak{a}_1^*) \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1}$. Again, this amounts to finding a copy of \mathfrak{a}_{-1} in $\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{a}_1$ or in $S^2 \mathfrak{a}_1$.

Again by [12, Ex. 15.32], when k is even there is only a copy of $\mathfrak{a}_{-1} \cong \mathfrak{a}_1$ in $S^2 \mathfrak{a}_1$, hence the bracket must be commuting on this part. When k is odd there is only a copy of $\mathfrak{a}_{-1} \cong \mathfrak{a}_1$ in $\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{a}_1$, hence the bracket must be skew-commuting on this summand. Moreover, since these decompositions are multiplicity free, the structure tensors are essentially unique. \square

Remark 3.15. Up to a scalar multiple the maps $\mathfrak{a}_{-1} \times \mathfrak{a}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_0$ must be contraction, and the map $\mathfrak{a}_1 \times \mathfrak{a}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_{-1}$ must be multiplication. Note that the product of k forms is skew-symmetric when k is odd and symmetric when k is even. Similarly, the map $\mathfrak{a}_{-1} \times \mathfrak{a}_{-1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_1$ must be contraction with the volume form followed by product and then contraction again.

Skew-symmetry would require that the maps $B_{000}, B_{++-}, B_{--+}$ must be skew-symmetric, and that $B_{0++} = -B_{+0+}^\top, B_{0--} = -B_{-0-}^\top, B_{+-0} = -B_{+0-}^\top$, hence this would force B in

$$\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1} \oplus \bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0^* \wedge \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0^* \wedge \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1^* \wedge \mathfrak{a}_{-1}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0,$$

where for example, we have again encoded the condition that $B_{101} = -B_{011}^\top$ by replacing $(\mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1) \oplus (\mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_0^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1)$ with $\mathfrak{a}_0^* \wedge \mathfrak{a}_1^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}_1$.

Example 3. In Table 4 we report the adjoint rank profiles of points in $\bigwedge^3 \mathbb{C}^9$ of rank k (as sums of points of the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(3, 9)$). We note that the rank profiles distinguish ranks up to 5, but not 6.

We are curious about nilpotent orbits, N^o79, N^o82, and N^o87 (in the notation of [44]), with respective types $D_4, A_3 + A_1$, and $A_3 + A_1$. Orbit N^o79 has normal form with indices 129 138 237 456 and the following adjoint rank profile:

Rank 1:	Rank 2:																																																																																																				
<table border="1"> <tr><th>B_{00}</th><th>B_{01}</th><th>B_{02}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{11}</th><th>B_{12}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{21}</th><th>B_{22}</th><th>B</th></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>19</td><td>19</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>20</td><td>0</td><td>58</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B	0	0	19	19	0	0	0	20	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<table border="1"> <tr><th>B_{00}</th><th>B_{01}</th><th>B_{02}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{11}</th><th>B_{12}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{21}</th><th>B_{22}</th><th>B</th></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>38</td><td>38</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>38</td><td>0</td><td>114</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>19</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>20</td><td>19</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>58</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B	0	0	38	38	0	0	0	38	0	114	0	19	0	0	0	20	19	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B																																																																																												
0	0	19	19	0	0	0	20	0	58																																																																																												
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1																																																																																												
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																												
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B																																																																																												
0	0	38	38	0	0	0	38	0	114																																																																																												
0	19	0	0	0	20	19	0	0	58																																																																																												
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2																																																																																												
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1																																																																																												
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																												
Rank 3:	Rank 4:																																																																																																				
<table border="1"> <tr><th>B_{00}</th><th>B_{01}</th><th>B_{02}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{11}</th><th>B_{12}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{21}</th><th>B_{22}</th><th>B</th></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>56</td><td>56</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>56</td><td>0</td><td>168</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>56</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>56</td><td>56</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>168</td></tr> </table>	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B	0	0	56	56	0	0	0	56	0	168	0	56	0	0	0	56	56	0	0	168	<table border="1"> <tr><th>B_{00}</th><th>B_{01}</th><th>B_{02}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{11}</th><th>B_{12}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{21}</th><th>B_{22}</th><th>B</th></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>72</td><td>72</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>72</td><td>0</td><td>216</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>72</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>72</td><td>72</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>216</td></tr> </table>	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B	0	0	72	72	0	0	0	72	0	216	0	72	0	0	0	72	72	0	0	216																																								
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B																																																																																												
0	0	56	56	0	0	0	56	0	168																																																																																												
0	56	0	0	0	56	56	0	0	168																																																																																												
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B																																																																																												
0	0	72	72	0	0	0	72	0	216																																																																																												
0	72	0	0	0	72	72	0	0	216																																																																																												
Rank 5:	Rank 6:																																																																																																				
<table border="1"> <tr><th>B_{00}</th><th>B_{01}</th><th>B_{02}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{11}</th><th>B_{12}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{21}</th><th>B_{22}</th><th>B</th></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>80</td><td>0</td><td>240</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>80</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>240</td></tr> </table>	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B	0	0	80	80	0	0	0	80	0	240	0	80	0	0	0	80	80	0	0	240	<table border="1"> <tr><th>B_{00}</th><th>B_{01}</th><th>B_{02}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{11}</th><th>B_{12}</th><th>B_{10}</th><th>B_{21}</th><th>B_{22}</th><th>B</th></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>0</td><td>240</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>80</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>240</td></tr> </table>	B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B	0	0	80	80	0	0	80	80	0	240	0	80	0	0	0	80	80	0	0	240																																								
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B																																																																																												
0	0	80	80	0	0	0	80	0	240																																																																																												
0	80	0	0	0	80	80	0	0	240																																																																																												
B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B																																																																																												
0	0	80	80	0	0	80	80	0	240																																																																																												
0	80	0	0	0	80	80	0	0	240																																																																																												

TABLE 4. Adjoint rank profiles for each tensor rank in $\bigwedge^3 \mathbb{C}^9$.

B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B
0	0	56	56	0	0	0	56	0	168
0	46	0	0	0	48	46	0	0	140
36	0	0	0	38	0	0	0	38	112
0	0	28	28	0	0	0	29	0	85
0	19	0	0	0	20	19	0	0	58
9	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	11	31
0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4
0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Change to 129 138 237 458 (should be of type $A_3 + A_1$) produces the following rank profile:

B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B
0	0	55	55	0	0	0	54	0	164
0	33	0	0	0	38	33	0	0	104
16	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	21	58
0	0	6	6	0	0	0	10	0	22
0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	4
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

This agrees with the rank profile of orbit №82, and not that of №87 which has rank profile:

B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B
0	0	52	52	0	0	0	60	0	164
0	33	0	0	0	38	33	0	0	104
16	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	21	58
0	0	8	8	0	0	0	6	0	22
0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	4
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The differences are subtle, and are not recognized by the total rank, only by the block ranks.

The rank profiles and trace powers of all SL_9 orbits in $\bigwedge^3 \mathbb{C}^9$ take too much space to include here, so we include them as an ancillary file accompanying the arXiv version of this article.

Two other interesting cases both fall into orbit №9:

$$E_1 = e_3 e_4 e_5 + e_0 e_3 e_6 + e_1 e_4 e_6 + e_2 e_5 e_6 + e_1 e_3 e_7 + e_2 e_4 e_7 + e_0 e_5 e_7 + e_1 e_2 e_8,$$

$$E_2 = e_3 e_4 e_5 + e_0 e_3 e_6 + e_1 e_4 e_6 + e_2 e_4 e_6 + e_2 e_3 e_7 + e_0 e_4 e_7 + e_1 e_5 e_7 + e_0 e_2 e_8.$$

They both have the same rank profile:

B_{00}	B_{01}	B_{02}	B_{10}	B_{11}	B_{12}	B_{10}	B_{21}	B_{22}	B
0	0	76	76	0	0	0	74	0	226
0	66	0	0	0	72	66	0	0	204
58	0	0	0	62	0	0	0	62	182
0	0	54	54	0	0	0	56	0	164
0	48	0	0	0	50	48	0	0	146
41	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	44	129
0	0	37	37	0	0	0	38	0	112
0	31	0	0	0	35	31	0	0	97
24	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	29	82
0	0	22	22	0	0	0	26	0	70
0	19	0	0	0	20	19	0	0	58
15	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	17	49
0	0	13	13	0	0	0	14	0	40
0	10	0	0	0	11	10	0	0	31
6	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	8	22
0	0	4	4	0	0	0	8	0	16
0	4	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	10
3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	7
0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4
0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

So, we need to use a finer tool to distinguish these orbits. Note that [44] distinguishes these orbits via their stabilizers, which could also be realized by considering the angles between the roots associated with the indices of the trivectors showing up in the normal form. \diamond

3.6. Extending the exterior algebra.

Theorem 3.16. *The vector space $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{sl}_n \oplus \bigoplus_{k=1 \dots n-1} \bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n$ has a \mathbb{Z}_n -graded algebra structure with a Jordan decomposition consistent with the $G = \mathrm{SL}(V)$ -action. There is a unique (up to scale) equivariant bracket product that agrees with the \mathfrak{g} -action on $\bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n$ for all k . Moreover if $n = 2k$ the equivariant bracket must satisfy the property that the restriction to $\bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n \times \bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ must be commuting when k is odd and skew-commuting when k is even.*

Proof. To construct this algebra, consider the exterior algebra $\bigwedge^\bullet \mathbb{C}^n$ as a graded algebra and we attach \mathfrak{sl}_n to it to try to make a Jordan decomposition as well. We do this by replacing $\bigwedge^0 \mathbb{C}^n = \bigwedge^n \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\mathfrak{sl}_n = \mathfrak{a}_0$. We define the brackets $\mathfrak{sl}_n \times \bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n$ via the usual Lie algebra action on $\bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n$. We use the usual exterior algebra products or their contracted forms to define the brackets $[\cdot, \cdot]: \bigwedge^i \mathbb{C}^n \times \bigwedge^j \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \bigwedge^{i+j \bmod n} \mathbb{C}^n$ for $i + j \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$. When $i + j = n$ we utilize Lemma 3.14 to define the bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]: \bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n \times \bigwedge^{n-k} \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{sl}_n$, and in the case $n = 2k$ we have a “middle map”, which must be commuting / skew-commuting respectively when k is odd / even, again by Lemma 3.14. \square

3.7. Other approachable examples. As the exterior algebra has dimension 2^n this can get unwieldy quickly. It seems, however, that the case $n = 12$ and the subalgebra, $\bigwedge^{3\bullet} \mathbb{C}^{12}$ are still approachable. From this we could hope to obtain a coarse classification of trivectors in a 10-, 11-, and 12-dimensional space, which seemed out of reach [44, Sec.4.4]. We also hope to be able to handle the case of 2×2 matrix multiplication operators, since $\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4$ is a submodule of $\bigwedge^4 \mathbb{C}^{12}$, and the matrices of the adjoint operators do not seem to be too large to compute in this case. Similarly, it is reasonable that this method could handle the \mathbb{Z}_{10} -graded algebra for $\bigwedge^3 \mathbb{C}^{10}$, which seems relevant for the structure of Kähler manifolds.

3.8. Rank subadditivity and semi-continuity. Because of the linearity of the construction, the rank of the adjoint operator $B(T)$ gives a bound for the additive rank and border rank of the element T . In the \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded and \mathbb{Z}_3 -graded cases we have respective block structures seen at (3.5) and (3.6), and these blocks also provide rank and border rank bounds. In general, the following statement mimics prior work of Landsberg and Ottaviani (see [13, 27]):

Proposition 3.17. *Suppose M is a graded \mathfrak{g} -module such that $\mathfrak{g} \oplus M$ has a meaningful Jordan decomposition, that X is a G -variety for G the connected component of the identity of the Lie group $\exp \mathfrak{g}$. The X -rank of a tensor T is bounded by*

$$X\text{-rank}(T) \leq \text{rank}(B(T))/k, \quad \text{and} \quad X\text{-rank}(T) \leq \text{rank}(B_I(T))/k_I.$$

where k is the maximal possible rank of $B(S)$ for $S \in X$, k_I is the maximal possible rank of $B_I(S)$ for $S \in X$ for each relevant index I .

We also note that the semi-continuity of matrix rank implies that the rank profiles of adjoint forms can be used as a negative test for orbit closure containment.

3.9. Dimensions of conical orbits from adjoint rank profiles. Suppose $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \dots$ with $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{a}_0$ and a tensor $T \in M = \mathfrak{a}_1$, as constructed above so that T has a meaningful Jordan decomposition. The rank of the block matrices $B_{101}(T)$ are connected to the dimension of the cone over the orbit closure $\mathbb{P}(G.T) \subset \mathbb{P}(M)$. More precisely we have the following:

Proposition 3.18. *Notation as above. If T is such that $G.T \subset M$ is conical, i.e., invariant by scalar multiplication, then $\text{rank}(B_{101}(T)) = \dim(\mathbb{P}(\overline{G.T}) \subset \mathbb{P}M) + 1$. If $G.T$ is not conical then $\text{rank}(B_{101}(T)) = \dim(\mathbb{P}(\overline{G.T}) \subset \mathbb{P}M)$*

Proof. Consider $\pi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{P}M$ the projection and let p be a point of the orbit $G.T \subset M$. Our proof comes down to an interpretation of the tangent space $\widehat{T}_p G.T$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $p = T$ since the dimension of the tangent space of an orbit is constant along the orbit. The tangent space $\widehat{T}_T G.T$ projects to $T_{\pi(T)} \pi(G.T)$ and we have:

$$\widehat{T}_T G.T = T + [\mathfrak{g}, T]. \tag{3.7}$$

If $G.T$ is conical then $T \in [\mathfrak{g}, T]$ while if $G.T$ is not conical $T \notin [\mathfrak{g}, T]$. Combining with the fact that the image of $B_{101}(T)$ is the space $[\mathfrak{g}, T]$ the result follows. \square

Remark 3.19. Since nilpotent are conical we can read the dimension of the orbit from the block of the first row in the Table of Example 1. For the Grassmannian, the restricted chordal and the tangential variety, which are all nilpotent and thus conical, the first entry of the table provides the dimension of the cone of the orbit (10, 15, 19), i.e., the dimension of the projective variety plus one. However, the secant variety is not conical and therefore the value provided by the table, i.e., 19, is the dimension of the secant variety $\sigma_2(\text{Gr}(3, 6)) \subset \mathbb{P}\wedge^3 \mathbb{C}^6$.

4. APPLICATIONS TO QUANTUM INFORMATION

The classical problem of classifying and distinguishing G -orbits on a module M have regained popularity in the past twenty years in the context of quantum information theory. In this section we explain the connection and how our Jordan decomposition can be used as an efficient tool to study entanglement. While the examples we consider have been addressed before, our point of departure is that we handle all of these by a single construction (an adjoint operator), and straightforward computations (matrix ranks and eigenvalues). A standard reference for quantum information is [33]. For an introduction for mathematician see [28], and for an algebraic geometry perspective on entanglement classification see [19].

4.1. General theory. In quantum computation, information is encoded in quantum states. More precisely the quantum analogue of the classical bit $\{0, 1\}$ in information theory is a quantum-bit or qubit. In Dirac's notation a qubit reads

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle = \alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \beta \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^2, \text{ with } |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1. \quad (4.1)$$

Mathematically a qubit is just a normalized vector in \mathbb{C}^2 . The idea is that with the resources of quantum physics, the information could be given by a classical state of the system, state $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$, but also in a superposition of the basis states. A system made of n qubits will be a normalized tensor $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$. Normalized tensors of rank 1 are said to be *separable* while all other states are said to be *entangled*. From a physical point of view a separable state, $\psi = \psi_1 \otimes \psi_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_n$, can be fully described from the knowledge of one of its components, while entangled states share non-classical correlations among their different components. This property of entanglement is a non-classical resource in quantum information that can be exploited to perform non-classical tasks (quantum teleportation, super-dense coding). It is also considered to be a resource that could explain the speed-up of some quantum algorithms over their classical counterparts.

There are different frameworks in which to study the entanglement classification problem, one such is to consider equivalence of quantum states up to Stochastic Local Operations with Classical Communication (SLOCC). The quantum physics operations corresponding to the SLOCC group include local unitary transformations, measurements and classical coordinations. This set of operations comprising the SLOCC group has been shown to be the group of local invertible transformations [9]. The following cases are of interest for the quantum community. We denote by M the module (also called a Hilbert space in quantum physics) where the quantum states live, and G the corresponding SLOCC group:

- (1) $M = (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$, the Hilbert space of n -qubit quantum states, with $G = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})^{\times n}$. In the projective space $\mathbb{P}M$, the variety of separable states is the Segre variety $X = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^1 \subset \mathbb{P}M$.
- (2) $M = S^k \mathbb{C}^n$, the Hilbert space of k -symmetric (bosonic) quantum states, with $G = \text{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Here a single boson in a normalized vector of \mathbb{C}^n . In the projective space $\mathbb{P}M$, the variety of separable states is the Veronese variety $X = v_k(\mathbb{P}^{n-1}) \subset \mathbb{P}(S^k \mathbb{C}^n)$.
- (3) $M = \bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n$, the Hilbert space of k fermions where a single fermion is a n -state particle, i.e., a normalized vector of \mathbb{C}^n , with $G = \text{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$. In the projective space $\mathbb{P}M$, the variety of separable states is the Grassmann variety $X = \text{Gr}(k, n) \subset \mathbb{P}(\bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^n)$.

4.2. Application to QI for small numbers of qubits.

4.2.1. 3-qubits. A very famous case in quantum information is the three-qubit SLOCC classification, i.e., the $G = \text{SL}_2 \mathbb{C} \times \text{SL}_2 \mathbb{C} \times \text{SL}_2 \mathbb{C}$ orbits of normalized tensors in $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$. Even though this classification was mathematically known for a long time [14, 29], the result got a lot of attention in the context of quantum physics as it proved for the first time that quantum states could be genuinely entangled in two non-equivalent ways [9]. The orbit structure of the three-qubit case is similar to other tripartite system like the three-bosonic qubit ($v_3 \mathbb{P}^1 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$) or three-fermion with 6-single particle states ($\text{Gr}(3, 6) \subset \mathbb{P} \bigwedge^3 \mathbb{C}^6$). The rank profile allows us to easily distinguish those orbits because those orbits (up to qubit permutation) have different dimensions, see Example 1.

4.2.2. *4-qubits.* Another important classification is the four-qubit classification, i.e., $M = (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 4}$ and $G = (\mathrm{SL}_2 \mathbb{C})^{\times 4}$. Here the number of orbits is infinite, and a description depend on parameters. A classification was first established by Verstraete et al. [42] and later corrected by [5]. A complete and irredundant classification was given by Dietrich et al. [8]. The Verstraete classification is made of 9 families denoted $G_{abcd}, L_{abc_2}, L_{a_2b_2}, L_{ab_3}, L_{a_4}, L_{a_2 0_{3\oplus 1}}$ for the six orbits that depend on parameters and $L_{0_{7\oplus \bar{1}}}, L_{0_{5\oplus \bar{3}}}$ and $L_{0_{3\oplus \bar{1}} 0_{3\oplus \bar{1}}}$ (See [18]). Note that $\mathfrak{gl}_8 \oplus \wedge^4 \mathbb{C}^8$ contains $\mathfrak{gl}_2^{\oplus 4} \oplus (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 4}$ as a subalgebra. We constructed the adjoint operators for random tensors (generic choice of parameters) of each format and computed their rank profiles, which allows us to distinguish the different families (Table 5).

Type	rank profile	root profile	Type	rank profile	root profile
G_{abcd}	$\begin{array}{ccccc} B_{00} & B_{01} & B_{10} & B_{11} & B \\ \hline 0 & 60 & 60 & 0 & 120 \\ 60 & 0 & 0 & 60 & 120 \end{array}$	$(8_0, 1_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(24)})$			
L_{abc_2}	$\begin{array}{ccccc} B_{00} & B_{01} & B_{10} & B_{11} & B \\ \hline 0 & 60 & 60 & 0 & 120 \\ 59 & 0 & 0 & 60 & 119 \\ 0 & 59 & 59 & 0 & 118 \end{array}$	$(10_0, 2_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(8)}, 1_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(6)})$	$L_{0_{7\oplus \bar{1}}}$	$\begin{array}{ccccc} B_{00} & B_{01} & B_{10} & B_{11} & B \\ \hline 0 & 48 & 48 & 0 & 96 \\ 38 & 0 & 0 & 42 & 80 \\ 0 & 32 & 32 & 0 & 64 \\ 23 & 0 & 0 & 26 & 49 \\ 0 & 17 & 17 & 0 & 34 \\ 8 & 0 & 0 & 11 & 19 \\ 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 4 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$	(32_0)
$L_{a_2b_2}$	$\begin{array}{ccccc} B_{00} & B_{01} & B_{10} & B_{11} & B \\ \hline 0 & 56 & 56 & 0 & 112 \\ 52 & 0 & 0 & 54 & 106 \\ 0 & 50 & 50 & 0 & 100 \end{array}$	$(12_0, 4_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(4)}, 1_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(4)})$			
L_{ab_3}	$\begin{array}{ccccc} B_{00} & B_{01} & B_{10} & B_{11} & B \\ \hline 0 & 60 & 60 & 0 & 120 \\ 57 & 0 & 0 & 57 & 114 \end{array}$	$(14_0, 2_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(8)}, 1_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(6)})$	$L_{0_{5\oplus \bar{3}}}$	$\begin{array}{ccccc} B_{00} & B_{01} & B_{10} & B_{11} & B \\ \hline 0 & 47 & 47 & 0 & 94 \\ 30 & 0 & 0 & 34 & 64 \\ 0 & 17 & 17 & 0 & 34 \\ 9 & 0 & 0 & 10 & 19 \\ 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$	(32_0)
L_{a_4}	$\begin{array}{ccccc} B_{00} & B_{01} & B_{10} & B_{11} & B \\ \hline 0 & 60 & 60 & 0 & 120 \\ 57 & 0 & 0 & 57 & 114 \\ 0 & 53 & 53 & 0 & 106 \end{array}$	$(10_0, (1_{\mathbb{C}}, \overline{1_{\mathbb{C}}})^{(4)}, (1_{\mathbb{R}})^{(2)}, (1_{\mathbb{Q}})^{(4)})$			
$L_{a_2 0_{3\oplus 1}}$	$\begin{array}{ccccc} B_{00} & B_{01} & B_{10} & B_{11} & B \\ \hline 0 & 48 & 48 & 0 & 96 \\ 39 & 0 & 0 & 42 & 81 \\ 0 & 33 & 33 & 0 & 66 \end{array}$	$(14_0, 8_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(2)}, 1_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(2)})$	$L_{0_{3\oplus \bar{1}} 0_{3\oplus \bar{1}}}$	$\begin{array}{ccccc} B_{00} & B_{01} & B_{10} & B_{11} & B \\ \hline 0 & 33 & 33 & 0 & 66 \\ 14 & 0 & 0 & 20 & 34 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$	(32_0)

TABLE 5. Rank profiles and root profiles of the nine-family classification for four-qubits from [42]. In the root profiles exponents denote repetition, the first power is t^k , and $\mathbb{R}^{(k)}$, respectively $\mathbb{C}^{(k)}$ denotes multiplicity of real / complex roots when not all roots are rational in the input. For example $(10_0, (2_{\mathbb{C}})^{(4)}, (1_{\mathbb{R}})^{(2)}, (1_{\mathbb{Q}})^{(4)})$ indicates roots of multiplicity 10 (the zero), 4 complex double roots and 6 real roots with single multiplicity, 4 of which are rational in the input.

Setting all parameters (a, b, c, d) in the generic expressions to 0 one obtains representatives of the 9 orbits of the null-cone (up to qubit permutation). Here again those orbits can also be distinguished by the rank profile. It furnishes an efficient and easy way to identify the class of a nilpotent element. An algorithm, based on invariants and covariants, was published in the quantum information literature to classify four-qubit nilpotent element [20] and later implemented in the study of Grover’s quantum search algorithm and Shor’s quantum algorithm [23]. Here because the nilpotent orbits of four-qubit case have different dimensions the rank profile can be used as an alternative to distinguish the nilpotent orbits (up to qubit permutation). Similarly for the same families we found their root coincidence profiles, and in display them in Table 5. The last 3 types are nilpotent and cannot be distinguished by their root profiles but can be from the rank profile. In total these computations took about 2-3s of computational time in M2 on a desktop computer.

Note that the root profile for the states G_{abcd} is made of 24 single roots and 0 with order 8. This is a direct consequence of the fact that G_{abcd} are the elements of $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 4}$ that do not

annihilate the $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ Cayley hyperdeterminant, a degree 24 invariant polynomial. Recall that Cayley hyperdeterminant is the defining equation of the dual of $X = (\mathbb{P}^1)^4 \subset \mathbb{P}((\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 4})$. As shown in [21] it is the restriction to $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 4}$ of the adjoint discriminant $\Delta_{\mathfrak{g}}$ for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(8)$. The adjoint discriminant of a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} [41, p. 4605] is

$$\Delta_{\mathfrak{g}}(x) = \Delta \left(\frac{1}{t^n} \chi_{\text{ad}_x} \right), \quad (4.2)$$

where n is the rank of the Lie algebra and Δ is the discriminant with respect to t . Here we consider again the algebra $\mathfrak{gl}_{\mathfrak{g}} \oplus \wedge^4 \mathbb{C}^8$ which contains $\mathfrak{gl}_2^{\oplus 4} \oplus (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 4}$. In particular if one restricts to $x = T \in M = (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 4}$, the adjoint root profile should be made of 24 single roots (and 0 with order $n = 8$) for tensors T outside the zero locus of the dual variety. In other words when $\mathfrak{g} \oplus M$ is a Lie algebra, the adjoint root profile allows us to decide if a tensor T belongs to the dual variety of the highest weight vector G -orbit of M , $X_{G,M} = G \cdot [v] \subset \mathbb{P}(M)$. Note that when $\mathfrak{g} \oplus M$ is not a Lie algebra, like in Example 1 for $\wedge^3 \mathbb{C}^6$, we still have a root profile, but the connection with the dual of the adjoint variety is not clear at present.

4.2.3. 5 qubits. For larger quantum systems few results are known. The 5-qubit classification is considered intractable because the number of orbits is infinite as is the number of nilpotent orbits. However, our method already provides a criterion to decide if two SLOCC-orbits are distinct. Indeed, for a Hilbert space M with SLOCC group G and corresponding Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , then quantum states $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in M$ are not SLOCC equivalent if the rank profiles of ad_{ψ_1} and ad_{ψ_2} are distinct. In [37], the notion of entanglement filter is used to distinguish some five qubit states $M = (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 5}$. We list these states and their adjoint rank profiles in Table 7. The fact that these 5-qubit quantum states are not SLOCC equivalent was also obtained by [31] using covariants. The rank profiles seen at Table 7 lead to the same conclusion.

Example 4. As already noted, $\mathfrak{sl}_{10} \oplus \wedge^5 \mathbb{C}^{10}$ does not have a Lie algebra structure, but it does have a Jordan decomposition. Notice that $\mathbb{C}^{10} = (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\oplus 5}$, and correspondingly $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 5} \subset \wedge^5 \mathbb{C}^{10}$. This set of tensors is realized by grouping basis vectors $\{e_i, e_{i+5}\} = \mathbb{C}_i^2$. Therefore, without any more effort we can consider the subalgebra, and the Jordan decomposition for the \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded algebra we have constructed.

As seen in Table 6, the rank profiles can detect border ranks up to 4 but not higher. In [35] we proved that the set of border rank 5 tensors is defined by invariants of degrees 6 and 16. The trace power invariants of this adjoint form cannot produce these invariants for border rank 5 since the block structure of the adjoint operator implies that the only powers which can have a non-zero trace are multiples of 4, and the degree 6 invariant cannot be produced this way. This feature is also apparent in the characteristic polynomials seen in Table 6. We anticipate that embedding in the algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_{10} \oplus \wedge^{\bullet} \mathbb{C}^{10}$ could separate ranks greater than 4, and we hope to address this in the future. \diamond

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Holweck thanks Pr. Ash Abebe and his staff of the AU Mathematics and Statistics department for making his visiting year in Auburn possible as well as Pr. Ghislain Montavon from UTBM for his support in this project. Holweck was partially supported by the Conseil Régional de Bourgogne Franche-Comté (GeoQuant project). Oeding and Holweck acknowledge partial support from the Thomas Jefferson foundation. We also thank Laurent Manivel for helpful discussions.

Tensor Rank	Rank Profile in $\wedge^5 \mathbb{C}^{10}$	Rank Profile in $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 5}$	$\chi_T(t) _{(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 5}}$
1	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 26 \ 26 \ 0 \ 52 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 6 \ 6 \ 0 \ 12 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$	t^{52}
2	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 51 \ 51 \ 0 \ 102 \\ 50 \ 0 \ 0 \ 51 \ 101 \\ 0 \ 50 \ 50 \ 0 \ 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 11 \ 11 \ 0 \ 22 \\ 10 \ 0 \ 0 \ 11 \ 21 \\ 0 \ 10 \ 10 \ 0 \ 20 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$(t)^{32}(t^2-a)^5(t^2+a)^5$
3	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 75 \ 75 \ 0 \ 150 \\ 50 \ 0 \ 0 \ 67 \ 117 \\ 0 \ 50 \ 50 \ 0 \ 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 15 \ 15 \ 0 \ 30 \\ 10 \ 0 \ 0 \ 15 \ 25 \\ 0 \ 10 \ 10 \ 0 \ 20 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$(t)^{32}(t^2-a)^5(t^2+a)^5$
≥ 4	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 95 \ 95 \ 0 \ 190 \\ 90 \ 0 \ 0 \ 95 \ 185 \\ 0 \ 90 \ 90 \ 0 \ 180 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 15 \ 15 \ 0 \ 30 \\ 10 \ 0 \ 0 \ 15 \ 25 \\ 0 \ 10 \ 10 \ 0 \ 20 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$(t)^{32}(t^4-a)(t^4-b)(t^4-c)(t^4-d)(t^4-e)$

TABLE 6. Adjoint rank profiles and characteristic polynomials for each tensor rank in $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 5}$ (a, b, \dots, e denote random positive rational numbers).

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\Psi_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_0e_0e_0e_0e_0 + e_1e_1e_1e_1e_1) \\
 |\Psi_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(e_1e_1e_1e_1e_1 + e_1e_1e_1e_0e_0 + e_0e_0e_0e_1e_0 + e_0e_0e_0e_0e_1) \\
 |\Psi_5\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(\sqrt{2}e_1e_1e_1e_1e_1 + e_1e_1e_0e_0e_0 + e_0e_0e_0e_1e_0 + e_0e_0e_0e_1e_0 + e_0e_0e_0e_0e_1) \\
 |\Psi_6\rangle &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(\sqrt{3}e_1e_1e_1e_1e_1 + e_1e_0e_0e_0e_0 + e_0e_1e_0e_0e_0 + e_0e_0e_1e_0e_0 + e_0e_0e_0e_1e_0 + e_0e_0e_0e_0e_1)
 \end{aligned}$$

Normal Form in $\wedge^5 \mathbb{C}^{10}$	Rank Profile in $\wedge^5 \mathbb{C}^{10}$	Rank Profile in $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 5}$	$\chi_T(t) _{(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 5}}$
$\Psi_2 = e_0e_1e_2e_3e_4 + e_5e_6e_7e_8e_9$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 51 \ 51 \ 0 \ 102 \\ 50 \ 0 \ 0 \ 51 \ 101 \\ 0 \ 50 \ 50 \ 0 \ 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 11 \ 11 \ 0 \ 22 \\ 10 \ 0 \ 0 \ 11 \ 21 \\ 0 \ 10 \ 10 \ 0 \ 20 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$t^{32}(5t^2-4)^5(5t^2+4)^5(\frac{1}{5^{10}})$
$\Psi_4 = e_3e_4e_5e_6e_7 - e_0e_1e_2e_4e_8 + e_0e_1e_2e_3e_9 + e_5e_6e_7e_8e_9$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 76 \ 76 \ 0 \ 152 \\ 56 \ 0 \ 0 \ 76 \ 132 \\ 0 \ 56 \ 56 \ 0 \ 112 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 12 \ 12 \ 0 \ 24 \\ 4 \ 0 \ 0 \ 12 \ 16 \\ 0 \ 4 \ 4 \ 0 \ 8 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$t^{44}(5t^2-8)^2(5t^2+8)^2(\frac{1}{5^4})$
$\Psi_5 = \sqrt{2}e_5e_6e_7e_8e_9 + e_2e_3e_4e_5e_6 + e_0e_1e_3e_4e_7 - e_0e_1e_2e_4e_8 + e_0e_1e_2e_3e_9$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 84 \ 84 \ 0 \ 168 \\ 42 \ 0 \ 0 \ 84 \ 126 \\ 0 \ 42 \ 42 \ 0 \ 84 \\ 9 \ 0 \ 0 \ 42 \ 51 \\ 0 \ 9 \ 9 \ 0 \ 18 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 9 \ 9 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 14 \ 14 \ 0 \ 28 \\ 6 \ 0 \ 0 \ 14 \ 20 \\ 0 \ 6 \ 6 \ 0 \ 12 \\ 3 \ 0 \ 0 \ 6 \ 9 \\ 0 \ 3 \ 3 \ 0 \ 6 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 3 \ 3 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$	t^{52}
$\Psi_6 = \sqrt{3}e_5e_6e_7e_8e_9 + e_1e_2e_3e_4e_5 - e_0e_2e_3e_4e_6 + e_0e_1e_3e_4e_7 - e_0e_1e_2e_4e_8 + e_0e_1e_2e_3e_9$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 75 \ 75 \ 0 \ 150 \\ 50 \ 0 \ 0 \ 75 \ 125 \\ 0 \ 50 \ 50 \ 0 \ 100 \\ 25 \ 0 \ 0 \ 50 \ 75 \\ 0 \ 25 \ 25 \ 0 \ 50 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 25 \ 25 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline B_{00} \ B_{01} \ B_{10} \ B_{11} \ B \\ \hline 0 \ 15 \ 15 \ 0 \ 30 \\ 10 \ 0 \ 0 \ 15 \ 25 \\ 0 \ 10 \ 10 \ 0 \ 20 \\ 5 \ 0 \ 0 \ 10 \ 15 \\ 0 \ 5 \ 5 \ 0 \ 10 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 5 \ 5 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$	t^{52}

TABLE 7. Adjoint rank profiles and characteristic polynomials for the examples for 5 qubits from [37].

REFERENCES

- [1] L. V. Antonyan, *Classification of four-vectors of an eight-dimensional space*, Trudy Sem. Vektor. Tenzor. Anal. **20** (1981), 144–161. MR622013
- [2] K. Bari, *On the structure tensor of \mathfrak{sl}_n* , arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.08171 (2021).
- [3] M. Bremner, J. Hu, and L. Oeding, *The $3 \times 3 \times 3$ hyperdeterminant as a polynomial in the fundamental invariants for $SL_3(\mathbb{C}) \times SL_3(\mathbb{C}) \times SL_3(\mathbb{C})$* , Mathematics in Computer Science (2014), 1–10 (English). arXiv:1310.3257.
- [4] D. Cartwright and B. Sturmfels, *The number of eigenvalues of a tensor*, Linear Algebra Appl. **438** (2013), no. 2, 942–952.
- [5] O. Chterental and D. Z Djokovic, *Normal forms and tensor ranks of pure states of four qubits*, arXiv preprint quant-ph (2006).
- [6] L.-B. Cui and M.-H. Li, *A note on the three-way generalization of the Jordan canonical form*, Open Math. **16** (2018), no. 1, 897–912. MR3841899
- [7] J. Dadok and V. Kac, *Polar representations*, J. Algebra **92** (1985), no. 2, 504–524.
- [8] H. Dietrich, W. A De Graaf, A. Marrani, and M. Origlia, *Classification of four qubit states and their stabilisers under slocc operations*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical (2022). arXiv:2111.05488.
- [9] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J I. Cirac, *Three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways*, Physical Review A **62** (2000), no. 6, 062314.
- [10] E. B. Dynkin, A. A. Yushkevich, A. A. Yushkevich, G. M. Seitz, and A. L. Onishchik, *Selected Papers of E. B. Dynkin with Commentary*, CWorks / American Mathematical Society, American Mathematical Society, 2000.
- [11] E. B. Dynkin, *Semisimple subalgebras of semisimple Lie algebras*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2 **6** (1960), 111–244.
- [12] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation theory, a first course (graduate texts in mathematics)*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 129, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [13] M. Gałazka, *Vector bundles give equations of cactus varieties*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **521** (2017), 254–262.
- [14] I. M. Gelfand, M. M. Kapranov, and A. V. Zelevinsky, *Discriminants, resultants, and multidimensional determinants*, Mathematics: Theory & Applications, Boston: Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 1994.
- [15] E. K. Gnan, A. Elgammal, and V. Retakh, *A spectral theory for tensors*, Annales de la faculté des sciences de Toulouse Mathématiques **20** (20117), no. 4, 801–841 (eng).
- [16] G. B. Gurevich, *Foundations of the theory of algebraic invariants*, Translated by J. R. M. Radok and A. J.M. Spencer, P. Noordhoff Ltd., Groningen, 1964.
- [17] F. Holweck and L. Oeding, *Hyperdeterminants from the E_8 Discriminant*, J. Algebra (2022). arXiv:1810.05857.
- [18] F. Holweck, J.-G. Luque, and M. Planat, *Singularity of type D_4 arising from four-qubit systems*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **47** (2014), no. 13, 135301.
- [19] F. Holweck, J.-G. Luque, and J.-Y. Thibon, *Geometric descriptions of entangled states by auxiliary varieties*, J. Math. Phys. **53** (2012), no. 10, 102203.
- [20] ———, *Entanglement of four qubit systems: A geometric atlas with polynomial compass I (the finite world)*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **55** (2014), no. 1, 012202.
- [21] ———, *Entanglement of four-qubit systems: a geometric atlas with polynomial compass II (the tame world)*, J. Math. Phys. **58** (2017), no. 2, 022201.
- [22] H. Huang and S. Kim, *On Kostant’s partial order on hyperbolic elements*, Linear and Multilinear Algebra **58** (2010), no. 6, 783–788, available at <https://doi.org/10.1080/03081080903062113>.
- [23] H. Jaffali and F. Holweck, *Quantum entanglement involved in grover’s and shor’s algorithms: the four-qubit case*, Quantum Information Processing **18** (2019), no. 5, 1–41.
- [24] V. Kac, *Some remarks on nilpotent orbits*, J. Algebra **64** (1980), no. 1, 190–213.
- [25] B. Kostant, *On convexity, the Weyl group and the Iwasawa decomposition*, Annales scientifiques de l’école normale supérieure, 1973, pp. 413–455.
- [26] J. M. Landsberg and L. Manivel, *Construction and classification of complex simple Lie algebras via projective geometry*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **8** (2002), no. 1, 137–159.

- [27] J. M. Landsberg and G. Ottaviani, *Equations for secant varieties of Veronese and other varieties*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) (2011), 1–38 (English). [arXiv:1111.4567](#).
- [28] J. M. Landsberg, *A very brief introduction to quantum computing and quantum information theory for mathematicians*, Quantum physics and geometry, 2019, pp. 5–41.
- [29] C. Le Paige, *Sur la théorie des formes binaires à plusieurs séries de variables*, Bull. Acad. Roy. Sci. Belgique (3), bf **2** (1881), no. 40-53, 45.
- [30] L.-H. Lim, *Singular values and eigenvalues of tensors: a variational approach*, Computational advances in multi-sensor adaptive processing, 2005 1st IEEE international workshop on, 2005, pp. 129–132.
- [31] J.-G. Luque and J.-Y. Thibon, *Algebraic invariants of five qubits*, Journal of physics A: mathematical and general **39** (2005), no. 2, 371.
- [32] V. V. Morozov, *On a nilpotent element in a semi-simple Lie algebra*, C. R. (Doklady) Acad. Sci. URSS (N.S.) **36** (1942), 83–86. MR0007750
- [33] M. A. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information*, American Association of Physics Teachers, 2002.
- [34] L. Oeding and G. Ottaviani, *Eigenvectors of tensors and algorithms for Waring decomposition*, J. Symbolic Comput. **54** (2013), 9–35. [arXiv:1103.0203](#).
- [35] L. Oeding and S. V. Sam, *Equations for the fifth secant variety of Segre products of projective spaces*, Experimental Mathematics **25** (2016), 94–99. [arXiv:1502.00203](#).
- [36] L. Oeding, *A translation of "classification of four-vectors of an 8-dimensional space," by antonyan, l. v. , with an appendix by the translator*, arXiv, 2022.
- [37] A. Osterloh and J. Siewert, *Entanglement monotones and maximally entangled states in multipartite qubit systems*, International journal of quantum information **4** (2006), no. 03, 531–540.
- [38] L. Qi, *Eigenvalues of a real supersymmetric tensor*, J. Symbolic Comput. **40** (2005), no. 6, 1302–1324.
- [39] L. Qi, H. Chen, and Y. Chen, *Tensor eigenvalues and their applications*, Vol. 39, Springer, 2018.
- [40] J. Schouten, *Klassifizierung der alternierenden Größen dritten Grades in 7 Dimensionen*, Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo (1884 - 1940) **55** (1931), 137–156. 10.1007/BF03016791.
- [41] E. A. Tevelev, *Projectively dual varieties*, J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) **117** (2003), no. 6, 4585–4732. Algebraic geometry. MR2027446
- [42] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. De Moor, and H. Verschelde, *Four qubits can be entangled in nine different ways*, Physical Review A **65** (2002), no. 5, 052112.
- [43] È. B. Vinberg, *The classification of nilpotent elements of graded Lie algebras*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **225** (1975), no. 4, 745–748. MR0506488
- [44] È. B. Vinberg and A. G. Èlašvili, *A classification of the three-vectors of nine-dimensional space*, Trudy Sem. Vektor. Tensor. Anal. **18** (1978), 197–233.
- [45] N. R. Wallach, *The hilbert series of measures of entanglement for 4 qubits*, Acta Applicandae Mathematicae **86** (2005), no. 1-2, 203–220.
- [46] K. Ye and L.-H. Lim, *Fast structured matrix computations: tensor rank and Cohn–Umans method*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics **18** (2018), no. 1, 45–95.

Email address: frederic.holweck@utbm.fr

LABORATOIRE INTERDISCIPLINAIRE CARNOT DE BOURGOGNE, ICB/UTBM, UMR 6303 CNRS, UNIVERSITÉ BOURGOGNE FRANCHE-COMTÉ, 90010 BELFORT CEDEX, FRANCE

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, AUBURN UNIVERSITY, AUBURN, AL, USA

Email address: oeding@auburn.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, AUBURN UNIVERSITY, AUBURN, AL, USA