

Families of Perfect Tensors

Runshi Geng

December 6, 2022

Abstract

Perfect tensors are the tensors corresponding to the absolutely maximally entangled states, a special type of quantum states of interest in quantum information theory. We establish a method to compute parameterized families of perfect tensors in $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes 4}$ using exponential maps from Lie theory. With this method, we find explicit examples of non-classical perfect tensors in $(\mathbb{C}^3)^{\otimes 4}$. In particular, we answer an open question posted by Życzkowski et al.

1 Introduction

The entanglement of quantum states plays a central role in quantum information theory. For bipartite states, the entanglement is usually measured by the von Neumann entropies of the partial traces of the states [2], but its generalization for multipartite states is more complicated. One is interested in an extremal class of multipartite states: the absolutely maximally entangled (AME) states – the pure states that are maximally entangled for every bipartitions of the system. The AME states are closely related to quantum secret sharing [7], quantum error-correcting [8] and quantum repeaters [1].

The existence of AME states in $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$, denoted as $\text{AME}(n, d)$, is an open-problem [11]. For $n = 2$ and 3, the Bell and GHZ states are AME states. For $n = 4$, it was proved that $\text{AME}(4, 2)$ does not exist [3, 5], and $\text{AME}(4, d)$ can be obtained by orthogonal Latin squares (also known as Graeco-Latin squares) of order d , denoted as $\text{OLS}(d)$ [5]. $\text{OLS}(d)$'s have been constructed for all $d > 2$ except $d = 6$ [6, 4], which implies the existence of $\text{AME}(4, d)$ for such d . Although $\text{OLS}(6)$ was proved not existing [10], an explicit example of $\text{AME}(4, 6)$ is found in [9].

The tensors corresponding to the AME states are perfect tensors [8]. An open question is asked in [12]: for $d = 3, 4$ and 5, are there nonzero perfect tensors in $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes 4}$ that are non-classical, i.e., not locally equivalent to a solution corresponding to an $\text{OLS}(d)$? In this paper, we establish a method with the exponential maps from Lie theory to find parameterized families of perfect tensors in $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes 4}$ for $d > 2$ and $d \neq 6$. Particularly we find explicitly parameterized families of perfect tensors in $(\mathbb{C}^3)^{\otimes 4}$ and we proved that there are 4-dimensional subsets in those families consisting of non-classical perfect tensors.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 The Varieties of Perfect Tensors

Let $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_n$, where each \mathcal{H}_i is a d -dimensional complex Hilbert space with the inner product $\langle \Phi | \Psi \rangle := \Phi^\dagger \Psi$.

Write $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. A **bipartition** of $[n]$ is a pair of non-empty subsets $I, J \subset [n]$ such that $I \cup J = [n]$ and $I \cap J = \emptyset$. Identifying \mathcal{H}_I with its dual space \mathcal{H}_I^* , any tensor $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$ can be regarded as a linear map $\Phi_{I,J} : \mathcal{H}_I \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_J$, where $\mathcal{H}_I := \bigotimes_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}_i$ and $\mathcal{H}_J := \bigotimes_{j \in J} \mathcal{H}_j$.

Definition 1 ([8]). A tensor $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$ is called a **perfect tensor** if for every bipartition (I, J) of $[n]$ with $|I| \leq |J|$, $\Phi_{I,J}$ is proportional to an isometry.

For even n , let $\mathcal{P}(n, d)$ be the set of tensors $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$ such that for every bipartition (I, J) of $[n]$ with $|I| = |J| = \frac{n}{2}$, $\Phi_{I,J}$ is unitary.

Proposition 2 ([8]). *When n is even, $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$ is perfect if and only if it is proportional to a tensor in $\mathcal{P}(n, d)$.*

That is, the set of all perfect tensors in \mathcal{H} is just the cone over the real algebraic variety $\mathcal{P}(n, d)$, which we will mainly study for the rest of this paper.

For $n = 4$, write $\mathcal{H} = A \otimes B \otimes C \otimes D := (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes 4}$. There are 3 flattening maps:

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 : \mathcal{H} &\rightarrow (A \otimes B) \otimes (C \otimes D), \\ F_2 : \mathcal{H} &\rightarrow (A \otimes C) \otimes (B \otimes D), \\ F_3 : \mathcal{H} &\rightarrow (A \otimes D) \otimes (C \otimes B). \end{aligned}$$

Let U_1, U_2 and U_3 be the unitary groups in $(A \otimes B) \otimes (C \otimes D)$, $(A \otimes C) \otimes (B \otimes D)$ and $(A \otimes D) \otimes (C \otimes B)$ respectively. Then

$$\mathcal{P}(4, d) = F_1^{-1}(U_1) \cap F_2^{-1}(U_2) \cap F_3^{-1}(U_3). \quad (\text{A})$$

Generally, when n is even, there are $\frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{n/2}$ flattening maps F_i 's and unitary groups U_i 's, then $\mathcal{P}(n, d) = \bigcap_i F_i^{-1}(U_i)$.

2.2 Orthogonal Latin Squares

Definition 3 ([5]). An **orthogonal Latin square** of order d (OLS(d)) is an ordered pair of two $d \times d$ matrices $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j}$, $B = (b_{ij})_{i,j}$ with entries in $[d]$, such that each integer in $[d]$ appears exactly once in each column and each row of A and B , and all d^2 pairs (a_{ij}, b_{ij}) are distinct.

Any OLS(d) gives us a tensor $\Phi = \sum \Phi_{ijkl} |ijkl\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes 4}$ via $\Phi_{ijkl} = \delta_{a_{kl}, i} \delta_{b_{kl}, j}$. Then $F_i(\Phi)$ is a permutation matrix for $i = 1, 2, 3$, so $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}(4, d)$. On the contrary, any tensor $\Phi \in (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes 4}$ such that $F_i(\Phi)$ is a permutation matrix for $i = 1, 2, 3$ yields an OLS(d). [9]

Example 4 ([9]). An example of OLS(3), written as a 3×3 table whose (i, j) -th cell is the pair (a_{ij}, b_{ij}) :

2,3	3,1	1,2
3,2	1,3	2,1
1,1	2,2	3,3

corresponds to the tensor $\Phi = |1123\rangle + |1231\rangle + |1312\rangle + |2132\rangle + |2213\rangle + |2321\rangle + |3111\rangle + |3222\rangle + |3333\rangle$.

2.3 Exponential Maps

For any matrix Lie group G and any element $g \in G$, let $T_g G$ be the tangent space of G at g , and $\exp_g : T_g G \rightarrow G$ be the exponential map at g . One has the left translation map L_g and its differential dL_g :

$$\begin{aligned} L_g : G &\longrightarrow G, \\ g' &\longmapsto gg', \\ dL_g : T_{\text{Id}}G &\longrightarrow T_g G, \\ X &\longmapsto gX. \end{aligned}$$

The exponential map at the identity $\exp_{\text{Id}} : T_{\text{Id}}G \rightarrow G$ agrees with the matrix exponential, that is:

$$\exp_{\text{Id}}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{X^i}{i!}.$$

We obtain the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_{\text{Id}}G & \xrightarrow{dL_g} & T_g G \\ \exp_{\text{Id}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \exp_g \\ G & \xrightarrow{L_g} & G \end{array}$$

which implies that $\exp_g(X) = g \exp_{\text{Id}}(g^{-1}X)$.

3 Parameterized Families in $\mathcal{P}(4, d)$

The equation (A) shows $\mathcal{P}(4, d)$ is determined by numerous quadratic equations, and it is hard to find a complete solution and understand its geometric structure. However, if there is a sparse tensor $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}(4, d)$, it is much easier to find the intersection of the tangent spaces $T_{\Phi} F_i^{-1}(U_i)$. Then by applying the exponential maps to tangent vectors in a subset of $T := \bigcap_{i=1}^3 T_{\Phi} F_i^{-1}(U_i)$, we can obtain some curves of, and possibly higher dimensional manifolds of, tensors in $\mathcal{P}(4, d)$.

The terminology ‘‘exponential map’’ might not make sense on T or $T_{\Phi} \mathcal{P}(4, d)$ if $\mathcal{P}(4, d)$ is not smooth at Φ . Let $Z_1, \dots, Z_m \subset \mathcal{P}(4, d)$ be all unknown irreducible components of $\mathcal{P}(4, d)$ containing Φ ,

such that Φ is a smooth point of Z_j . Then $\bigcup_j T_\Phi Z_j$ is the subset of $T_\Phi \mathcal{P}(4, d)$ where the exponential map exists. We have

$$T \supset T_\Phi \mathcal{P}(4, d) \supset \bigcup_j T_\Phi Z_j.$$

For $i = 1, 2, 3$, let $\exp_{F_i(\Phi)}$ be the exponential map of U_i at $F_i(\Phi)$. Note that the exponential map on $T_\Phi Z_j$ is the restriction of $F_i^{-1} \circ \exp_{F_i(\Phi)} \circ F_i$ to the subspace $T_\Phi Z_j$, for all i and j . Thus for $X \in \bigcup_j T_\Phi Z_j$, we can define $\exp_\Phi(X) := F_i^{-1}(\exp_{F_i(\Phi)}(F_i(X)))$, which is independent of the choice of $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

In practice, for each $X \in T$, we will check if the following equations hold:

$$F_1^{-1}(\exp_{F_1(\Phi)}(F_1(X))) = F_2^{-1}(\exp_{F_2(\Phi)}(F_2(X))) = F_3^{-1}(\exp_{F_3(\Phi)}(F_3(X))). \quad (\text{B})$$

The equality implies $X \in \bigcup_j T_\Phi Z_j$ and we obtain a perfect tensor $\exp_\Phi(X) \in \bigcup_j Z_j \subset \mathcal{P}(4, d)$. Replacing X with $\sum_{j=1}^k t_j X_j$ for some $k \leq \dim T$, some linearly independent vectors X_j 's and real symbolic variables t_j 's, we can obtain positive-dimensional families of perfect tensors parameterized by t_j 's, provided (B) still holds.

Since F_i is a linear isomorphism, $T_\Phi F_i^{-1}(U_i) = F_i^{-1}(T_{F_i(\Phi)} U_i)$. And the equation for all $X \in T_{F_i(\Phi)} U_i$ is $X F_i(\Phi)^\dagger + F_i(\Phi) X^\dagger = 0$. Thus, the equations for the space T is

$$F_i(X) F_i(\Phi)^\dagger + F_i(\Phi) F_i(X)^\dagger = 0, \forall i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (\text{C})$$

To summarize, our method to find families of perfect tensors in $\mathcal{P}(4, d)$ is:

- Step 1: pick a known solution $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}(4, d)$;
- Step 2: compute T via equation (C);
- Step 3: pick some linearly independent vectors X_j 's in T , then verify if (B) holds when replacing X with $\sum_j t_j X_j$. If it holds, we obtain $\exp_\Phi(\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{X_j \mid j\})$, a parameterized family of perfect tensors in $\mathcal{P}(4, d)$.

Remark 5. In step 1, a good choice of Φ is the tensor corresponding to an OLS(d) if $d \neq 6$. Since $F_i(\Phi)$ is a sparse matrix for all i , it would be much faster to compute T and the exponential maps afterwards.

4 Results on $\mathcal{P}(4, 3)$

We choose Φ to be the tensor from Example 4. We compute the intersection of the tangent spaces T with Python and then perform step 3 with MATLAB.

Proposition 6. *The triple intersection of the tangent spaces $T := \bigcap_{i=1}^3 T_\Phi F_i^{-1}(U_i)$ equals to all 3 pairwise intersections $T_\Phi F_i^{-1}(U_i) \cap T_\Phi F_j^{-1}(U_j)$, $\forall 1 \leq i < j \leq 3$.*

Proposition 7. T is a 33-dimensional real vector space. A basis is given below, where \mathbf{i} stands for the imaginary unit, and $ijkl$ denotes the computational basis $|ijkl\rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned}
e_1 &= -1132 + 1223 - 2113 + 2231 - 3121 + 3212, & f_1 &= (1132 + 1223 + 2113 + 2231 + 3121 + 3212)\mathbf{i}, \\
e_2 &= -1111 + 1323 - 2122 + 2331 - 3133 + 3312, & f_2 &= (1111 + 1323 + 2122 + 2331 + 3133 + 3312)\mathbf{i}, \\
e_3 &= -1211 + 1332 - 2222 + 2313 - 3233 + 3321, & f_3 &= (1211 + 1332 + 2222 + 2313 + 3233 + 3321)\mathbf{i}, \\
e_4 &= -1131 - 1213 - 1322 + 2123 + 2232 + 2311, & f_4 &= (1131 + 1213 + 1322 + 2123 + 2232 + 2311)\mathbf{i}, \\
e_5 &= -1112 - 1221 - 1333 + 3123 + 3232 + 3311, & f_5 &= (1112 + 1221 + 1333 + 3123 + 3232 + 3311)\mathbf{i}, \\
e_6 &= -2112 - 2221 - 2333 + 3131 + 3213 + 3322, & f_6 &= (2112 + 2221 + 2333 + 3131 + 3213 + 3322)\mathbf{i}, \\
e_7 &= 1113 - 1321 - 2223 + 2312 - 3122 + 3211, & f_7 &= (1113 + 1321 + 2223 + 2312 + 3122 + 3211)\mathbf{i}, \\
e_8 &= -1133 + 1222 + 2121 - 2332 - 3231 + 3323, & f_8 &= (1133 + 1222 + 2121 + 2332 + 3231 + 3323)\mathbf{i}, \\
e_9 &= 1212 - 1331 + 2111 - 2233 - 3132 + 3313, & f_9 &= (1212 + 1331 + 2111 + 2233 + 3132 + 3313)\mathbf{i}, \\
e_{10} &= 1122 - 1233 + 2212 - 2323 - 3113 + 3332, & f_{10} &= (1122 + 1233 + 2212 + 2323 + 3113 + 3332)\mathbf{i}, \\
e_{11} &= 1121 - 1313 - 2133 + 2211 - 3223 + 3331, & f_{11} &= (1121 + 1313 + 2133 + 2211 + 3223 + 3331)\mathbf{i}, \\
e_{12} &= -1231 + 1312 + 2132 - 2321 - 3111 + 3222, & f_{12} &= (1231 + 1312 + 2132 + 2321 + 3111 + 3222)\mathbf{i}, \\
g_1 \text{ to } g_9 &: 1123\mathbf{i}, 1232\mathbf{i}, 1311\mathbf{i}, 2131\mathbf{i}, 2213\mathbf{i}, 2322\mathbf{i}, 3112\mathbf{i}, 3221\mathbf{i}, 3333\mathbf{i}.
\end{aligned}$$

This basis consists of 12 pairs of tensors of rank 6, and 9 pure imaginary tensors of rank 1. For each j , e_j and f_j form a pair, in the sense that they have the same support (set computational basis vectors $|ijkl\rangle$ that appear in the sum), and e_j is pure real while f_j is pure imaginary. Any two vectors in this basis have disjoint supports, unless they are a pair (e_j, f_j) .

Proposition 8. All vectors in the following 12 4-dimensional spaces satisfy Equation (B):

$$\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{e_i, e_j, f_i, f_j\}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i < j \leq 3, 4 \leq i < j \leq 6, 7 \leq i < j \leq 9, \text{ or } 10 \leq i < j \leq 12,$$

which give us 12 4-dimensional families of perfect tensors $\exp_{\mathbb{F}}(\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{e_i, e_j, f_i, f_j\}) \subset \mathcal{P}(4, 3)$.

Example 9. We obtain the explicit parameterization of the family $\exp_{\mathbb{F}}(\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{e_1, e_2, f_1, f_2\})$. Write $\Psi := \exp_{\mathbb{F}}(t_1 e_1 + t_2 f_1 + t_3 e_2 + t_4 f_2) = \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^3 \Psi_{ijkl} |ijkl\rangle$ and $\|t\| := (t_1^2 + t_2^2 + t_3^2 + t_4^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{1111} &= \Psi_{2122} = \Psi_{3133} = -\sinh(\|t\|\mathbf{i})(t_3 - \mathbf{i}t_4)/(\|t\|\mathbf{i}), \\
\Psi_{1211} &= \Psi_{2222} = \Psi_{3233} = (\cos(\|t\|) - 1)(t_1 + t_2\mathbf{i})(t_3 - t_4\mathbf{i})/\|t\|^2, \\
\Psi_{1311} &= \Psi_{2322} = \Psi_{3333} = ((t_3^2 + t_4^2)\cos(\|t\|) + t_1^2 + t_2^2)/\|t\|^2, \\
\Psi_{3112} &= \Psi_{1123} = \Psi_{2131} = \cosh(\|t\|\mathbf{i}), \\
\Psi_{3212} &= \Psi_{1223} = \Psi_{2231} = \sinh(\|t\|\mathbf{i})(t_1 + \mathbf{i}t_2)/(\|t\|\mathbf{i}), \\
\Psi_{3312} &= \Psi_{1323} = \Psi_{2331} = \sinh(\|t\|\mathbf{i})(t_3 + \mathbf{i}t_4)/(\|t\|\mathbf{i}), \\
\Psi_{2113} &= \Psi_{3121} = \Psi_{1132} = -\sinh(\|t\|\mathbf{i})(t_1 - \mathbf{i}t_2)/(\|t\|\mathbf{i}), \\
\Psi_{2213} &= \Psi_{3221} = \Psi_{1232} = ((t_1^2 + t_2^2)\cos(\|t\|) + t_3^2 + t_4^2)/\|t\|^2, \\
\Psi_{2313} &= \Psi_{3321} = \Psi_{1332} = (\cos(\|t\|) - 1)(t_1 - t_2\mathbf{i})(t_3 + t_4\mathbf{i})/\|t\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and all Ψ_{ijkl} 's not listed above are zero.

Theorem 10. For each one of the 12 families of perfect tensors given in Proposition 8, there is a 4-dimensional subset consisting of perfect tensors not locally equivalent to any solution corresponding to any OLS(3).

Proof. For any perfect tensor Ψ , a tensor is locally equivalent to Ψ if and only if it belongs to the orbit $\text{Orb}_\Psi := (U_1 \times U_2 \times U_3 \times U_4) \cdot \Psi$, where U_i is the unitary group on \mathcal{H}_i . Without loss of generality, we only need to show the existence of a 4-dimensional subset of $\exp_\Phi(\text{span}_\mathbb{R}\{e_1, e_2, f_1, f_2\})$ that has no intersection with Orb_Ψ for any Ψ corresponding to an OLS(3).

Note that the orbit Orb_Φ is smooth at Φ , so $\text{Orb}_\Phi = \exp_\Phi(T_\Phi \text{Orb}_\Phi)$. Let \mathfrak{u}_i be the Lie algebra of U_i . With the relation

$$T_\Phi \text{Orb}_\Phi = T_\Phi((U_1 \times U_2 \times U_3 \times U_4) \cdot \Phi) = (\mathfrak{u}_1 \cdot \Phi) \oplus \cdots \oplus (\mathfrak{u}_4 \cdot \Phi)$$

and the fact that the equation $\sum_{i=1}^4 (X_i \cdot \Phi) = e_1$ has no solutions for $X_i \in \mathfrak{u}_i$, we conclude that $e_1 \notin T_\Phi \text{Orb}_\Phi$. Therefore any tangent vector $t_1 e_1 + t_2 f_1 + t_3 e_2 + t_4 f_2$ with $t_1 \neq 0$ does not belong to $T_\Phi \text{Orb}_\Phi$, which implies the 4-dimensional subset $S := \exp_\Phi(\text{span}_\mathbb{R}\{e_1, e_2, f_1, f_2\} \setminus \text{span}_\mathbb{R}\{e_2, f_1, f_2\})$ has no intersection with Orb_Φ .

Since there are only finitely many OLS(3)'s, there exists a neighborhood N of Φ that has no intersection with Orb_Ψ for any Ψ corresponding to an OLS(3) but not equivalent to Φ . We obtain is a 4-dimensional subset $N \cap S \subset \exp_\Phi(\text{span}_\mathbb{R}\{e_1, e_2, f_1, f_2\})$ consisting of perfect tensors not corresponding to any OLS(3). \square

Proposition 11. *All vectors in $\text{span}_\mathbb{R}\{g_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq 9\}$ satisfy Equation (B). For the general vectors $X = \sum_{j=1}^9 t_j g_j$ in this subspace, $F_1(\exp_\Phi(X)) =$*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \exp(it_1) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \exp(it_2) & 0 \\ \exp(it_3) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \exp(it_4) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \exp(it_5) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \exp(it_6) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \exp(it_7) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \exp(it_8) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \exp(it_9) \end{pmatrix}$$

which gives us a 9-dimensional family of $\mathcal{P}(4, 3)$.

Note that unlike the families given in Proposition 8, $\exp_\Phi(\sum_{j=1}^9 t_j g_j)$ is locally equivalent to Φ for all $t_j \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 12. *1. For a general vector in the following four 6-dimensional subspaces, the first 13th terms of the Taylor series of the three exponential maps in Equations (B) agree:*

$$\text{span}_\mathbb{R}\{e_i, e_j, e_k, f_i, f_j, f_k\}, \text{ for } (i, j, k) = (1, 2, 3), (4, 5, 6), (7, 8, 9), \text{ or } (10, 11, 12). \quad (\text{D})$$

2. For any vector in $T = \bigcap_{i=1}^3 T_\Phi F_i^{-1}(U_i)$ but not in the four 6-dimensional subspaces in (D) or the 9-dimensional subspace $\text{span}_\mathbb{R}\{g_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq 9\}$, the Taylor series of the three exponential maps in Equations (B) does not agree from degree 2, so \exp_Φ is not defined at those vectors.

In the first statement of Proposition 12, it is not known if further terms in Taylor series agree not not, since it takes too much time to compute terms of higher degrees on my computer. If all terms agree, i.e., the Equations (B) hold for all four 6-dimensional subspaces in (D), then there will be two good results:

1. we will obtain four 6-dimensional families of perfect tensors $\exp_{\Phi}(\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{e_i, e_j, e_k, f_i, f_j, f_k\})$, which would be a better result than Proposition 8;
2. together with Proposition 11 and the second statement of Proposition 12, the following equality will hold:

$$\bigcup_j T_{\Phi} Z_j = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{g_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq 9\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1,4,7,10} \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{e_i, e_{i+1}, e_{i+2}, f_i, f_{i+1}, f_{i+2}\} \right), \quad (\text{E})$$

and therefore the all Z_j 's are just the exponential of the five subspaces in the right-hand side of the Equation (E).

Conjecture 13. There exist and only exist five irreducible components of $\mathcal{P}(4, 3)$ that are smooth at Φ , which are:

$$\exp_{\Phi}(\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{g_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq 9\}), \exp_{\Phi}(\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{e_i, e_{i+1}, e_{i+2}, f_i, f_{i+1}, f_{i+2}\}), i = 1, 4, 7, 10.$$

5 Results on $\mathcal{P}(4, 4)$ and $\mathcal{P}(4, 5)$

Our choice of Φ is given by the following OLS's.

1,1	2,3	3,4	4,2
2,2	1,4	4,3	3,1
3,3	4,1	1,2	2,4
4,4	3,2	2,1	1,3

1,1	2,4	3,2	4,5	5,3
2,2	3,5	4,3	5,1	1,4
3,3	4,1	5,4	1,2	2,5
4,4	5,2	1,5	2,3	3,1
5,5	1,3	2,1	3,4	4,2

With the same method to study $\mathcal{P}(4, 3)$, we obtain the following results.

Proposition 14. The statement of Proposition 6 holds for $\mathcal{P}(4, 5)$ but not for $\mathcal{P}(4, 4)$.

Proposition 15. For $\mathcal{P}(4, 5)$, T is 145-dimensional. Similar to Proposition 7, a basis of T consists of 60 pairs of vectors (e_j, f_j) of rank 10 and 25 pure imaginary vectors g_k of rank 1.

For $\mathcal{P}(4, 4)$, T is 76-dimensional. Unlike $\mathcal{P}(4, 3)$ and $\mathcal{P}(4, 5)$, a basis of $\mathcal{P}(4, 4)$ consists of 24 pairs vectors (e_j, f_j) 's of rank 8, 16 pure imaginary vectors g_k 's of rank 1, and 12 pure imaginary tensors h_l 's of rank 4.

In either $\mathcal{P}(4, 4)$ or $\mathcal{P}(4, 5)$, these basis vectors have disjoint supports except the pairs (e_j, f_j) . While the Equation (B) holds for all e_j 's, f_j 's and g_k 's in $\mathcal{P}(4, 4)$ and $\mathcal{P}(4, 5)$, it does not hold for any h_l 's in $\mathcal{P}(4, 4)$.

Proposition 16. The similar statements in Proposition 11 hold for $\mathcal{P}(4, 4)$ and $\mathcal{P}(4, 5)$. We obtain a 16-dimensional family in $\mathcal{P}(4, 4)$ and a 25-dimensional family in $\mathcal{P}(4, 5)$ by computing the exponential of the general point $\sum_j t_j g_j$. Perfect tensors in these two families are locally equivalent to the two tensors corresponding to the two OLS's given at the beginning of this section respectively.

References

- [1] Daniel Alsina and Mohsen Razavi, *Absolutely maximally entangled states, quantum-maximum-distance-separable codes, and quantum repeaters*, Physical Review A **103** (2021), no. 2, 022402.
- [2] Charles H. Bennett, David P. DiVincenzo, John A. Smolin, and William K. Wootters, *Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction*, Phys. Rev. A (3) **54** (1996), no. 5, 3824–3851. MR 1418618
- [3] Lieven Clarisse, Sibasish Ghosh, Simone Severini, and Anthony Sudbery, *Entangling power of permutations*, Physical Review A **72** (2005), no. 1, 012314.
- [4] Charles J Colbourn and Jeffrey H Dinitz, *Mutually orthogonal latin squares: a brief survey of constructions*, Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference **95** (2001), no. 1-2, 9–48.
- [5] Charles Colbourne and Jeffrey Dinitz, *Handbook of combinatorial designs*, CRC press Boca Raton, FL, 2007.
- [6] József Dénes and A Donald Keedwell, *Latin squares: New developments in the theory and applications*, vol. 46, Elsevier, 1991.
- [7] Wolfram Helwig, Wei Cui, José Ignacio Latorre, Arnau Riera, and Hoi-Kwong Lo, *Absolute maximal entanglement and quantum secret sharing*, Physical Review A **86** (2012), no. 5, 052335.
- [8] Fernando Pastawski, Beni Yoshida, Daniel Harlow, and John Preskill, *Holographic quantum error-correcting codes: toy models for the bulk/boundary correspondence*, J. High Energy Phys. (2015), no. 6, 149, front matter+53. MR 3370186
- [9] Suhail Ahmad Rather, Adam Burchardt, Wojciech Bruzda, Grzegorz Rajchel-Mieldzióć, Arul Lakshminarayan, and Karol Życzkowski, *Thirty-six entangled officers of Euler: quantum solution to a classically impossible problem*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128** (2022), no. 8, Paper No. 080507, 6. MR 4397007
- [10] Gaston Tarry, *Le problème des 36 officiers*, Secrétariat de l’Association française pour l’avancement des sciences, 1900.
- [11] IQOQI Vienna, *List of open quantum problems, problem 35*.
- [12] Karol Życzkowski, Wojciech Bruzda, Grzegorz Rajchel-Mieldzióć, Adam Burchardt, Suhail Ahmad Rather, and Arul Lakshminarayan, *$9 \times 4 = 6 \times 6$: Understanding the quantum solution to the euler’s problem of 36 officers*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06800 (2022).