

The hierarchical structure of local unitary invariants.

Graeme Mitchison^{1,*}

¹*Centre for Quantum Information and Foundations, DAMTP,
University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK*

Local unitary invariants allow one to test whether multipartite states are equivalent up to local basis changes. Equivalently, they specify the geometry of the “orbit space” obtained by factoring out local unitary action from the state space. This space is of interest because of its intimate relationship to entanglement. Unfortunately, the dimension of the orbit space grows exponentially with the number of subsystems, and the number of invariants needed to characterise orbits grows at least as fast. This makes the study of entanglement via local unitary invariants seem very daunting. I point out here that there is a simplifying principle: Invariants fall into families related by the tracing-out of subsystems, and these families grow exponentially with the number of subsystems. In particular, in the case of pure qubit systems, there is a family whose size is about half the dimension of orbit space. These invariants are closely related to cumulants and to multipartite separability. Members of the family have been repeatedly discovered in the literature, but the fact that they are related to cumulants and constitute a family has apparently not been observed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Given a multipartite quantum state, the action of local unitaries maps out an orbit of locally equivalent states. It would be very interesting to understand the structure of the space of such orbits. Polynomial invariants of the local unitary action provide a way to do this. These are polynomials in the coefficients of a state (and the complex conjugates of these coefficients) that are invariant when the coefficients change under local unitary action. It is known that a finite set of invariants, a *fundamental set*, suffices to generate all the polynomial invariants and to distinguish local unitary orbits in state space [23, 26, 28]. The geometry of the orbit space is determined by the invariants in a fundamental set and the algebraic relations between them. Indeed, the ring of invariants can be viewed as the coordinate ring of the orbit space, whose geometrical structure is therefore specified by the algebraic relations amongst invariants.

Fundamental sets of invariants have been determined for pure states of two and three qubits [2, 10, 19, 27, 28], and for two-qubit mixed states [10, 14]. Finding fundamental sets is generally a hard problem. One reason for this is that the dimension $D(n)$ of the orbit space grows exponentially with the number, n , of systems, and the size of a fundamental set is generally far larger. I point out here that there is a redeeming feature: an invariant in n systems gives rise to a set of invariants in $n + 1$ systems via a tracing-out operation. This means that any invariant generates a family that grows exponentially with the number of systems. So, given an invariant, one gets an exponential family of them for free. I illustrate this by defining a family of invariants for pure n -qubit states that grows exponentially with n and asymptotically has $\frac{1}{2}D(n)$ members. Moreover, for any n , the members of this family are algebraically independent, which means that they are useful candidates for building a fundamental set.

The key to the construction of this family is the set of joint cumulants [8, 9, 13, 24, 29, 30]. Cumulants are most commonly encountered as statistical tools, or as ingredients in cluster expansions. For our purposes, they are simply polynomials in the coefficients of states that have certain desirable properties; for instance, they are closely related to the separability of multiparty states. Cumulants can be introduced in an attractive if unorthodox way by giving the space of vectors in $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$ the structure of an algebra in which a Taylor series and hence analytic functions can be defined. In particular, one can define a log function with the property that

$$\log(|\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle) = \log(|\psi\rangle) + \log(|\phi\rangle),$$

for all $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$; see (9) and (10) for a more precise statement. The coefficients in the log-expansion are cumulants, which is how the connection between cumulants and separability comes about.

This algebra is a rather unnatural construction, since it depends on a particular choice of basis. However, twirling with respect to local unitaries allows one to remove this artificiality and to generate a set of invariants. It turns out that these cumulant-based invariants are already known in the literature, though their relationship to cumulants is

*gjm12@cam.ac.uk

apparently not recognised. They account for five of the six independent 3-qubit invariants and eleven of the nineteen 4-qubit invariants given in [20]. Asymptotically, there are $O(2^n)$ of them whereas $D(n)$ is $O(2^{n+1})$. There are also other families of invariants, including a family of 4th degree polynomials that is of size $O(2^{n-1})$. Breaking down the invariants into (generally overlapping) hierarchical families gives a perspective on their structure and on the entanglement of states.

The orbit space can be explored in other ways. Kraus [16, 17] showed how to reduce multipartite qubit states to a standard form that is invariant under local unitaries. An alternative, geometric procedure that applies to local spaces of arbitrary dimension (not just qubits) has also been proposed [25]. These methods enable one to determine if two states belong to the same orbit, and give insights that complement those obtained from polynomial invariants. Finally, there is alternative way of deriving invariants from cumulants (see Section VIII A), due to Zhou et al [32]. Despite certain formal similarities, these seem not to have a simple functional relationship to our invariants.

II. THE ALGEBRA OF MULTI-PARTITE STATES

Let $\mathcal{A}_n^{(d)}$ be the commutative algebra over \mathbb{C} with generators e_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ satisfying $e_i^d = 0$. An element ψ of $\mathcal{A}_n^{(d)}$ has the form

$$\psi = \sum a_{i_1 \dots i_n} e^{i_1} \dots e^{i_n},$$

where $0 \leq i_k \leq d-1$ and the a 's are complex coefficients. Then $\psi = a + r$, where $a = a_{0 \dots 0}$, and r consists of at most $d^n - 1$ terms and satisfies $r^{n(d-1)+1} = 0$. Any analytic function $f : \mathcal{A}_n^{(d)} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n^{(d)}$ can be expanded in a Taylor series in r :

$$f(\psi) = f(a) + f'(a)r + f''(a)r^2/2! + \dots \quad (1)$$

This series is finite, because of the nilpotency of r , and is thus well defined. For instance, in $\mathcal{A}_n^{(2)}$ any ψ can be written

$$\psi = a_{00} + a_{10}e_1 + a_{01}e_2 + a_{11}e_1e_2 \quad (2)$$

and if $a_{00} \neq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \log \psi &= \log(a_{00} + r) = \log a_{00} + \log(1 + r/a_{00}) = \log a_{00} + r/a_{00} - r^2/(2a_{00}^2), \\ &= \log a_{00} + (a_{10}/a_{00})e_1 + (a_{01}/a_{00})e_2 + (a_{11}/a_{00} - a_{10}a_{01}/a_{00}^2)e_1e_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Similarly, there is a finite polynomial for the algebra inverse; e.g.

$$\psi^{-1} = a_{00}^{-1} - (a_{10}/a_{00}^2)e_1 - (a_{01}/a_{00}^2)e_2 - (a_{11}/a_{00}^2 - 2a_{10}a_{01}/a_{00}^3)e_1e_2; \quad (4)$$

and for other functions, such as \exp . These functions have all the expected properties, e.g.

$$\psi\psi^{-1} = 1, \quad (5)$$

$$\log(\psi\phi) = \log(\psi) + \log(\phi), \quad (6)$$

$$\exp(\psi + \phi) = \exp(\psi)\exp(\phi), \quad (7)$$

$$\exp(\log)(\psi) = \psi. \quad (8)$$

Now identify $e_1^{i_1} \dots e_n^{i_n}$ with the n -qudit basis element $|i_1 \dots i_n\rangle$. This sets up an isomorphism between elements ψ of $\mathcal{A}_n^{(d)}$ and unnormalised n -qudit states $|\psi\rangle$. For instance, $\psi = a_{00} + a_{10}e_1 + a_{01}e_2 + a_{11}e_1e_2$ in $\mathcal{A}_n^{(2)}$ can be identified with the two qubit state $|\psi\rangle = a_{00}|00\rangle + a_{10}|10\rangle + a_{01}|01\rangle + a_{11}|11\rangle$. One can then carry across the structure of the algebra. For instance, if $|\phi\rangle = b_{00}|00\rangle + b_{10}|10\rangle + b_{01}|01\rangle + b_{11}|11\rangle$ we have the product

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle|\phi\rangle &= a_{00}b_{00}|00\rangle + (a_{00}b_{10} + a_{10}b_{00})|10\rangle + (a_{00}b_{01} + a_{01}b_{00})|01\rangle \\ &\quad + (a_{00}b_{11} + a_{10}b_{01} + a_{01}b_{10} + a_{11}b_{00})|11\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The identity element in $\mathcal{A}_n^{(d)}$, is $|\underbrace{0 \dots 0}_n\rangle$, and the inverse, log and exponential are carried over in the obvious way from the corresponding functions in $\mathcal{A}_n^{(d)}$.

Suppose the n subsystems are divided into two sets S and T . We write

$$|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle_S \otimes |\psi\rangle_T, \quad (9)$$

to indicate that $|\psi\rangle$ is separable with respect to these subsets, the order in which S and T appear in the tensor product not being necessarily related to the order of their indices (e.g. we might write $|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle_{13} \otimes |\psi\rangle_2$). Then $|\psi\rangle$ can also be written in terms of the algebra product as $|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle_S |\psi\rangle_T$, where $|\psi\rangle_S$ is identified with an element of the algebra that only uses those e_i with $i \in S$, and $|\psi\rangle_T$ using only those e_i with $i \in T$. From (6) we have

$$\log |\psi\rangle = \log |\psi\rangle_S + \log |\psi\rangle_T. \quad (10)$$

thus linearising the tensor product when the log is defined, i.e. when the constant coefficients in the algebra do not vanish.

The coefficients $c_{i_1 \dots i_n}$ of $\log |\phi\rangle = \sum c_{i_1 \dots i_n} |i_1 \dots i_n\rangle$ are called *cumulants*. The cumulant corresponding to $c_{i_1 \dots i_n}$ is defined for classical random variables X_i as the coefficient of $\lambda_1^{i_1} \dots \lambda_n^{i_n}$ in $\log \langle e^{\sum_i \lambda_i X_i} \rangle$ [24]. This follows by identifying $\langle X_1^{i_1} \dots X_n^{i_n} \rangle$ with $a_{i_1 \dots i_n}$ and taking $a_{0 \dots 0} = 1$. For instance, the equivalent of

$$c_{11} = (a_{11}a_{00} - a_{10}a_{01})/a_{00}^2, \quad (11)$$

which is the coefficient of $e_1 e_2$ in (3), is the classical second degree cumulant $\langle X_1 X_2 \rangle - \langle X_1 \rangle \langle X_2 \rangle$. The algebra $\mathcal{A}_n^{(2)}$ can also be identified with the ‘‘moment algebra’’ in [1] by associating to the term $c e_{i_1} \dots e_{i_n}$ in $\mathcal{A}_n^{(2)}$ the map that assigns to the integers $\{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ the value c .

III. MULTIPARTITE SEPARABILITY

Write the state space for an n -party state as $(\mathbb{C}^d)_1 \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathbb{C}^d)_n$. If $\pi = \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_k\}$ is a partition of n , we say $|\phi\rangle$ is π -separable if we can write

$$|\phi\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^k |\phi\rangle_{\pi_i}, \quad (12)$$

where each $|\phi\rangle_{\pi_i}$ is a state in the subspace $\bigotimes_{j \in \pi_i} (\mathbb{C}^d)_j$. As we have seen, we can also write this using the algebra product as

$$|\phi\rangle = |\phi\rangle_{\pi_1} \dots |\phi\rangle_{\pi_k}. \quad (13)$$

From (6) we get

$$\log |\phi\rangle = \log |\phi\rangle_{\pi_1} + \dots + \log |\phi\rangle_{\pi_k}. \quad (14)$$

This immediately gives a characterisation of multipartite separability. Let us say that a set of indices $i_1 \dots i_n$ *splits* the partition π if there are non-zero indices i_j in more than one subset of π .

Theorem III.1. *An n -party pure state $|\phi\rangle$ with $a_{0 \dots 0} \neq 0$ is π -separable if and only if $c_{i_1 \dots i_n} = 0$ whenever $i_1 \dots i_n$ splits π .*

Proof. Necessity follows from the fact that the cumulants with indices splitting π are absent from the expansion (14) of $\log |\phi\rangle$. Sufficiency follows by noting that, if these cumulants are zero, we can write $\log |\phi\rangle$ in the form

$$\log |\phi\rangle = \sum_k \sum_{\{i_j=1 \implies j \in \pi_k\}} c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n} |i_1 i_2 \dots i_n\rangle$$

and exponentiating this shows $|\phi\rangle$ to be π -separable. \square

The condition $a_{0 \dots 0} \neq 0$ reflects the special role played by $|0 \dots 0\rangle$ as the identity in the algebra. We shall shortly give a version of this theorem (IV.2) which does not have this unpleasant restriction.

It should be emphasised that one can easily write down algebraic conditions for a pure state to be π -separable. However, the characterisation of Theorem III.1 will turn out to provide a useful starting point for making qubit

invariants. It is also economical, in the sense that the vanishing of the c 's gives the right number of equations to define the subspace of π -separable normalised states. Indeed, the (real parameter) dimension of this subspace is

$$d_\pi = \sum \left(2d^{|\pi_i|} - 2 \right),$$

the expression in brackets counting the real and imaginary parts of each coefficient of $|\psi\rangle_{\pi_i}$, with 2 subtracted for normalisation and phase invariance. On the other hand, the number N_π of index sets that split π is

$$N_\pi = (d^n - 1) - \sum \left(d^{|\pi_i|} - 1 \right),$$

this being the total number of index sets minus those that do not split π , i.e. those where the 1-indices lie wholly within some π_i . (One subtracts 1 for the all-zero sets so as not to overcount.) But the total dimension of normalised states is

$$d_{all} = 2d^n - 2$$

and, as each equation $c_{i_1 \dots i_n} = 0$ contributes two constraints from the vanishing of its real and imaginary parts, we require

$$d_\pi = d_{all} - 2N_\pi,$$

which is readily seen to hold.

There is a result closely analogous to Theorem III.1 for maximal rank mixed states. For such a state the usual logarithm exists, viz. $\log \rho = U \text{diag}(\log \lambda_1, \dots, \log \lambda_n) U^\dagger$, where U diagonalises ρ with eigenvalues λ_i . Following the approach of Zhou [33] we write

$$\log \rho = \sum f_{i_1 \dots i_n} \sigma_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{i_n}, \quad (15)$$

where σ_j , $j = 0, 1, \dots, d^2 - 1$ is a Hermitian operator basis orthonormal with respect to the trace inner product $\text{tr}(AB^\dagger)/d$ (e.g. for $d = 2$, the Pauli matrices). We may choose $\sigma_0 = \mathbb{1}$, in which case σ_i , $i \geq 1$ are trace-free. By the definition of the σ_j , the coefficients are given by

$$f_{i_1 \dots i_n} = \frac{1}{d} \text{tr}(\sigma_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{i_n} \log \rho), \quad (16)$$

and are real. We now say ρ is π -factorisable if

$$\rho = \bigotimes_{i=1}^k \rho_{\pi_i}, \quad (17)$$

in which case

$$\log \rho = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{1}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \log \rho_{\pi_i} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{1}_k. \quad (18)$$

As above, we say that a set of indices $i_1 \dots i_n$ splits π if there are non-zero indices i_j in more than one subset of π . Then we have

Theorem III.2. *An n -party mixed state ρ is π -factorisable if and only if $f_{i_1 \dots i_n} = 0$ whenever $i_1 \dots i_n$ splits π .*

Proof. That $\text{tr}(\sigma_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{i_n} \log \rho) = 0$ when $i_1 \dots i_n$ splits π follows from (18) and the assumption that σ_j is trace-free for $j \geq 1$. Conversely, if the former condition holds, then (15) implies

$$\log \rho = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{1}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \tau_{\pi_i} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{1}_k,$$

where τ_{π_i} is hermitian. Exponentiating gives

$$\rho = \bigotimes_{i=1}^k e^{\tau_{\pi_i}},$$

where each of the exponential factors has positive eigenvalues and can be normalised by distributing numerical factors amongst the terms suitably. \square

Once again, the splitting condition gives the right number of equations. The dimension of the subspace of π -factorisable states is $d_\pi = \sum_i (d^{2|\pi_i|} - 1)$, the number of index sets that split π is $N_\pi = (d^{2n} - 1) - \sum_i (d^{2|\pi_i|} - 1)$, and $d_{all} = (d^{2n} - 1)$ is the dimension of the space of n -partite states. This time $f_{i_1 \dots i_n} = 0$ only yields one constraint, since the f 's are real, so we require $d_\pi = d_{all} - N_\pi$, which holds.

There is a version of Theorem III.2 that addresses multipartite separability rather than factorisability, obtained by borrowing the construction from classical multipartite squashed entanglement [6, 31]. We say $\rho_{.E}$ is a classical extension of ρ if $\text{tr}_E \rho_{.E} = \rho$ and $\rho_{.E}$ has the form $\sum_i p_i \tau^i \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_E$, where τ^i are states on $(\mathbb{C}^d)_1 \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathbb{C}^d)_n$.

Theorem III.3. *An n -party mixed state ρ is π -separable if and only if there exists a classical extension $\rho_{.E}$ such that $\text{tr}(\sigma_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{i_n} \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_E \log \rho_{.E}) = 0$ whenever $i_1 \dots i_n$ splits π .*

Proof. This follows the same lines as the proof of Theorem III.2, noting that ρ is π -separable if and only if there exists a classical extension where the τ^i are π -factorisable. \square

IV. INVARIANTS FOR PURE N-QUBIT STATES

From now on we restrict attention to qubit states. We are interested in polynomial invariants of the action of local unitaries, which we take to be the group $SU(2)^n \times U(1)$. Given a state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i_1 \dots i_n} a_{i_1 \dots i_n} |i_1 \dots i_n\rangle$, we seek polynomials $I(|\psi\rangle)$ in the coefficients $a_{i_1 \dots i_n}$ and their complex conjugates $\bar{a}_{i_1 \dots i_n}$ satisfying

$$I(g|\psi\rangle) = I(|\psi\rangle), \quad (19)$$

for any $g \in SU(2)^n \times U(1)$. Equivalently, we can express the group action on the i th copy of $SU(2)$ by

$$\rho_i(g) a_{j_1 \dots j_i \dots j_n} = \sum_{k_i} g_{j_i k_i} a_{j_1 \dots k_i \dots j_n}, \quad (20)$$

and extend this to any monomial $m = \prod_{q=1}^k a_{j_{q,1} \dots j_{q,n}}$ by $\rho_i(g)m = \prod (\rho_i(g) a_{j_{q,1} \dots j_{q,n}})$. We then require the polynomial I to be invariant under $\rho_i(g)$ for all i and $g \in SU(2)$ as well as invariant under phase changes introduced by $U(1)$.

With one exception, all the invariants we discuss are real-valued. However, for systems of three or more qubits real-valued invariants do not suffice to form a fundamental set. Indeed, if J is real, then it cannot distinguish a state from its complex conjugate, since $J(|\bar{\psi}\rangle) = \bar{J}(|\psi\rangle) = J(|\psi\rangle)$. For two qubits, a state and its conjugate are equivalent under local unitaries; this is not true for more qubits [2].

The cumulant $c_{i_1 \dots i_n}$ can be made into a polynomial $d_{i_1 \dots i_n}$ by putting

$$d_{i_1 \dots i_n} = a_{0 \dots 0}^\theta c_{i_1 \dots i_n}, \quad (21)$$

where θ is the the number of 1's in the set $i_1 \dots i_n$. This is a homogeneous polynomial of degree θ in the a 's. For instance, from (11) we have $d_{11} = a_{00}^2 c_{11} = a_{11} a_{00} - a_{10} a_{01}$. In general, we have the following formula for $d_{i_1 \dots i_n}$. Let $S = \{k | i_k = 1\}$, so $|S| = \theta$ is the degree of $d_{i_1 \dots i_n}$. If $A \subset S$ let a_A denote $a_{j_1 \dots j_n}$ where $j_k = 1$ if $k \in A$ and $j_k = 0$ otherwise. Then

$$d_{i_1 \dots i_n} = \sum_{\pi} (-1)^{|\pi|-1} (|\pi| - 1)! a_0^{\theta - |\pi|} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} a_{\pi_i}, \quad (22)$$

where the sum is over all partitions $\pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{|\pi|}\}$ of S , $|\pi|$ being the number of subsets in the partition.

The action of local unitaries on d_{11} is given by

$$\rho_i(g) d_{11} = \Delta d_{11}, \quad (23)$$

for $i = 1, 2$, where $\Delta = \det g$. To remove the dependence on the phase Δ , i.e. to get invariance under the action of $U(1)$, we take

$$I_{11} = |d_{11}|^2. \quad (24)$$

This gives us a local unitary invariant, and

$$I_{11} = |d_{11}|^2. \quad (25)$$

This gives us a local unitary invariant, and there is just one such invariant for normalised 2-qubit states. The transformation of cumulants for three or more qubits is more complicated (Theorem IV.6). However, we can always get an invariant by integrating the squared modulus of $d_{i_1 \dots i_n}$ over the group $SU(2)^n$, and this prompts the following:

Definition IV.1.

$$I_{i_1 \dots i_n} = \gamma_{n,\theta} \int_{SU(2)^n} |\rho_1(g_1) \dots \rho_n(g_n) d_{i_1 \dots i_n}|^2 dg_1 \dots dg_n. \quad (26)$$

Here the integral is over the Haar measure, and the constant factor $\gamma_{n,\theta} = (\theta + 1)^{n-\theta} (\theta - 1)^\theta$ is introduced for later convenience.

We now explore the properties of these invariants. First, we note that we can give a more satisfying, basis independent, version of Theorem III.1:

Theorem IV.2 (Separability criterion). *An n -qubit state $|\psi\rangle$ is π -separable if and only if $I_{i_1 \dots i_n} = 0$ whenever $i_1 \dots i_n$ splits π .*

Proof. Suppose $|\psi\rangle$ is π -separable, so $|\psi\rangle = \bigotimes |\psi\rangle_{\pi_i}$. If $a_{0 \dots 0} \neq 0$, Theorem III.1 says that $c_{i_1 \dots i_n} = 0$ and hence $d_{i_1 \dots i_n} = 0$. If $a_{0 \dots 0} = 0$, define $|\psi\rangle_x = \bigotimes (|\psi\rangle_{\pi_i} + x|0 \dots 0\rangle_{\pi_i})$. If $x \neq 0$, $a_{0 \dots 0} \neq 0$, so $d_{i_1 \dots i_n} = 0$ for this state. By continuity, $d_{i_1 \dots i_n} = 0$ for $x = 0$, i.e. for the original $|\psi\rangle$. Thus $I_{i_1 \dots i_n} = 0$. Conversely, if $I_{i_1 \dots i_n} = 0$, then $d_{i_1 \dots i_n}(g|\psi\rangle) = 0$ for all g , and for some g we must have $a_{0 \dots 0} \neq 0$, so Theorem III.1 can be applied. \square

Next we define the action of elements $g \in SU(2)$ on our cumulant polynomials. We will need some notation.

Definition IV.3. Define \mathcal{S}_i by

$$\mathcal{S}_i a_{l_1 \dots 0_i \dots l_n} = a_{l_1 \dots 1_i \dots l_n}, \quad (27)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_i a_{l_1 \dots 1_i \dots l_n} = 0. \quad (28)$$

Now, given a monomial $m = \prod_{q=1}^{\theta} a_{i_1, q \dots i_n, q}$ of degree θ , define $\mathcal{R}_{i,k}$ to be the coefficient of x^k in $\prod (\mathbb{1} + x\mathcal{S}_i) a_{i_1, q \dots i_n, q}$. Extend this definition by linearity to any homogeneous polynomial of degree θ .

For instance, for $\theta = 3$ we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{i,1} m = (\mathcal{S}_i \mathbb{1} \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \mathcal{S}_i \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \mathbb{1} \mathcal{S}_i) m.$$

Note that, by virtue of the symmetry, this definition does not depend on the order of the a 's in m . We can think of $\mathcal{R}_{i,k}$ as being like a raising operator (hence the 'R'). For example

$$\mathcal{R}_{3,0} d_{110} = a_{110} a_{000} - a_{100} a_{010}, \quad (29)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{3,1} d_{110} = a_{111} a_{000} + a_{110} a_{001} - a_{101} a_{010} - a_{100} a_{011}, \quad (30)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{3,2} d_{110} = a_{111} a_{001} - a_{101} a_{011}, \quad (31)$$

Lemma IV.4. *If $l_i = 1$ and at least one other index in $d_{l_1 \dots l_n}$ is 1, then $\mathcal{R}_{i,\theta} d_{l_1 \dots l_n} = \mathcal{R}_{i,\theta-1} d_{l_1 \dots l_n} = 0$.*

Proof. Writing d for $d_{l_1 \dots l_n}$, $\mathcal{R}_{i,\theta} d = 0$ because we cannot add θ 1's to the $\theta - 1$ a 's that originally had zeros in position i . $\mathcal{R}_{i,\theta-1} d$ has 1's at position i in every a , so we can write $\mathcal{R}_{i,\theta-1} d = d(|\psi\rangle)$, where $|\psi\rangle$ is a state with $a_{l_1 \dots 0_i \dots l_n} = a_{l_1 \dots 1_i \dots l_n}$. This means that $|\psi\rangle$ factorises as $\left(\frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}\right)_i \otimes |\psi\rangle_{\mathcal{N}-i}$. We now invoke Theorem IV.2, since $\{l_1, \dots, l_n\}$ splits the partition $\{i\}, \{\mathcal{N} - i\}$. \square

Lemma IV.5. *If we write $L_i d$ for the result of replacing all the 1's in position i in d by 0, and if $l_i = 1$, then $L_i d = 0$.*

Proof. The same argument as in the proof above shows that $L_i d = d(|\psi\rangle)$ where $|\psi\rangle$ factorises. \square

Theorem IV.6 (Action of local unitaries). *Let l_i be one of the indices of d_{l_1, \dots, l_n} , and let $g = \begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ w & z \end{pmatrix}$. Assume that the index set l_1, \dots, l_n contains at least two 1's. Then if $l_i = 0$,*

$$\rho_i(g) d = \sum_{k=0}^{\theta} u^{\theta-k} v^k \mathcal{R}_{i,k} d, \quad (32)$$

and if $l_i = 1$,

$$\rho_i(g) d = \Delta \sum_{k=0}^{\theta-2} u^{\theta-k-2} v^k \mathcal{R}_{i,k} d, \quad (33)$$

where d stands for d_{l_1, \dots, l_n} .

Proof. When $l_i = 0$ and $m = \prod_{q=1}^{\theta} a_{j_{q1} \dots j_{qn}}$,

$$\rho_i(g)m = \prod_{q=1}^{\theta} (ua_{j_{q,1} \dots 0_i \dots j_{q,n}} + va_{j_{q,1} \dots 1_i \dots j_{q,n}}), \quad (34)$$

and it is clear that the coefficient of u^{θ} is the original monomial m , and the coefficient of $u^{\theta-k}v^k$ is $\mathcal{R}_{i,k}d$.

When $l_i = 1$,

$$\rho_i(g)m = (wa_{j_{p,1} \dots 0_i \dots j_{p,n}} + za_{j_{p,1} \dots 1_i \dots j_{p,n}}) \prod_{q=1, q \neq p}^{\theta} (ua_{j_{q,1} \dots 0_i \dots j_{q,n}} + va_{j_{q,1} \dots 1_i \dots j_{q,n}}), \quad (35)$$

where $a_{j_{p,1} \dots j_{p,n}}$ is the unique a in m that has a 1 at position i . The coefficient of $zv^{\theta-1}$ is $\mathcal{R}_{i,\theta-1}d$, which is zero by Lemma IV.4, and for $k \leq \theta - 2$ the coefficient of $u^{\theta-k-2}v^k(uz)$ is $cP_{i,k}d$. The coefficient of $u^{\theta-1}w$ is Ld , which is zero by Lemma IV.5, and for $k \geq 0$, the coefficient of $u^{\theta-k-2}v^k(vw)$ is $\mathcal{R}_{i,k+1}(Ld) - \mathcal{R}_{i,k}d = -\mathcal{R}_{i,k}d$. Since $\Delta = uz - vw$, the theorem follows. \square

The polynomials $\mathcal{R}_{i,k}d$ appearing in equations (32) and (33) form an irreducible representation for $SU(2)$. To see this, let $h = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$. Then, for $l_i = 0$, applying $\rho_i(h)$ to (32) gives

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\theta} u^{\theta-k}v^k (\rho_i(h)\mathcal{R}_{i,k}d) = \rho_i(h)\rho_i(g)d = \rho_i(gh) = \sum_{k=0}^{\theta} (ua + vc)^{\theta-k} (ub + vd)^k \mathcal{R}_{i,k}d, \quad (36)$$

and equating coefficients of $u^{\theta-k}v^k$ in the left- and right-hand sides of (36) gives the action of h at position i on all the polynomials $\mathcal{R}_{i,k}d$ and thus defines the representation matrix, which can easily be recognised as the symmetric representation with Young diagram (θ) . When $l_i = 1$, the same argument applied to (33) shows that we obtain the representation with Young diagram $(\theta - 1, 1)$. Classically, cumulants were called ‘‘half-invariants’’ [7, 29] because, if c is the classical joint cumulant in the random variables $X_1 \dots X_n$, then c is mapped to $z^n c$ when X_i is transformed by the affine map $X_i \rightarrow zX_i + w$. The equivalent of an affine map in our setting is the group of matrices $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ w & z \end{pmatrix}$ with $z \neq 0$. From Theorem IV.6 we see that the representation becomes 1-dimensional, sending $d \rightarrow z^{\theta}d$.

Theorem IV.7 (Formula for invariants). *If the index set i_1, \dots, i_n contains at least two 1’s, then*

$$I_{i_1, \dots, i_n} = \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_n} \left| \prod_{p=1}^n (\alpha_{k_p}^{i_p} \mathcal{R}_{i_p, k_p}) d_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \right|^2. \quad (37)$$

Here, if $i_p = 0$, k_p ranges from 0 to θ , and $\alpha_{k_p}^0 = \binom{\theta}{k_p}^{-1}$. If $i_p = 1$, k_p ranges from 0 to $\theta - 2$, and $\alpha_{k_p}^1 = \binom{\theta-2}{k_p}^{-1}$.

Proof. Combining (26) and Theorem IV.6 we get terms from $\int |\rho_i(g)d|^2 dg$ such as $\int |u|^{2(\theta-k)} |v|^{2k} dg |\mathcal{R}_{i,k}d|^2$, and the integral can be calculated by using Schur’s lemma:

$$\binom{p+q}{p} \int |u|^{2p} |v|^{2q} dg = \langle \psi_{p,q} | \int g^{\otimes(p+q)} |0\rangle \langle 0|^{\otimes(p+q)} (g^\dagger)^{\otimes(p+q)} dg | \psi_{p,q} \rangle \quad (38)$$

$$= \dim \text{Sym}^{p+q}(\mathbb{C}^2)^{-1} \langle \psi_{p,q} | P_{Sym} | \psi_{p,q} \rangle \quad (39)$$

$$= \dim \text{Sym}^{p+q}(\mathbb{C}^2)^{-1} \quad (40)$$

$$= (p+q+1)^{-1}. \quad (41)$$

Here P_{Sym} is the projector onto the symmetric representation, and $|\psi_{p,q}\rangle$ is the normalised weight vector $\binom{p+q}{p}^{-1} \sum_{\sigma} |i_{\sigma(1)} \dots i_{\sigma(p+q)}\rangle$, with $i_1 = \dots = i_p = 0$, $i_{p+1} = \dots = i_{p+q} = 1$, and with the sum taken over all permutations in S_{p+q} . There are $n - \theta$ indices i_p that are zero, where $(p+q+1) = \theta + 1$, and θ indices i_p that are 1, where $(p+q+1) = \theta - 1$. These terms therefore cancel the constant $\gamma_{n,\theta} = (\theta + 1)^{n-\theta} (\theta - 1)^{\theta}$ in (26), and the $\alpha_{k_p}^{i_p}$ ’s come from the factor $\binom{p+q}{p}$ in (38).

There are also cross-terms in $\int |\rho_i(g)d|^2 dg$, but these have the form $\int u^{(\theta-k)} v^k \bar{u}^{(\theta-j)} \bar{v}^j dg (\mathcal{R}_{i,k} \overline{d\mathcal{R}_{i,j}d})$, and

$$\int u^{(\theta-k)} v^k \bar{u}^{(\theta-j)} \bar{v}^j dg = \langle \psi_{\theta-k,k} | \psi_{\theta-j,j} \rangle, \quad (42)$$

which vanishes for $j \neq k$ since distinct weight vectors are orthogonal. \square

Next we show that the invariants are algebraically independent. This means there can be no non-trivial polynomial relations between them. In the case of our cumulant-derived invariants, we can quickly eliminate certain types of functional dependence by using the separability criterion, Theorem IV.2. For instance, we cannot have $I_{110} = f(I_{111}, I_{101}, I_{011})$ for any function f because all the invariants on the right-hand side are zero for any $\{12\}\{3\}$ -separable state, whereas I_{110} can take a range of values according to the choice of the state. But we cannot use the separability criterion to rule out a relation of the form $I_{111} = f(I_{011}, I_{101}, I_{110})$, say. It turns out, however, that we can rule out such relations. Indeed, we have

Theorem IV.8 (Algebraic independence). *A polynomial relationship between the invariants $I_{i_1 \dots i_n}$*

$$\sum \alpha_{i_1,1 \dots i_k,n} I_{i_1,1 \dots i_1,n}^{j_1} \dots I_{i_k,1 \dots i_k,n}^{j_k} = 0, \quad (43)$$

can only hold if each $\alpha_{i_1,1 \dots i_k,n} = 0$.

Proof. Consider the neighbourhood of the fully separable state $|0 \dots 0\rangle$, where the $a_{i_1 \dots i_n}$'s with not all $i_j = 0$ are small. From (37) and (22) we see that the expansion of the invariants in lowest degree terms in these small variables only has contributions from the term $a_{j_1 \dots j_n} a_{0 \dots 0}^{\theta-1}$ in $d_{j_1 \dots j_n}$, and from the corresponding term where operators $\mathcal{R}_{i,1}$ applied to positions where the index $j_i = 0$. Thus, assuming that the indices i_1, \dots, i_n include at least two 1's, we have

$$I_{i_1 \dots i_n} \approx x_{0 \dots 0}^{\theta-1} \sum_{i_{t_1}=0}^1 \dots \sum_{i_{t_{n-\theta}}=0}^1 \left(\theta^{-\sum_j i_{t_j}} \right) x_{i_1 \dots i_{t_1} \dots i_{t_2} \dots i_n}, \quad (44)$$

where $x_{j_1 \dots j_n} = |a_{j_1 \dots j_n}|^2$, and $t_1 \dots t_{n-\theta}$ denote the positions of indices in i_1, \dots, i_n that are zero. We also have the special case

$$I_{10 \dots 0} = \sum_{i_1=0}^1 \dots \sum_{i_n=0}^1 x_{i_1 \dots i_n}.$$

Let us write $I_1 = I_{10 \dots 0} - x_{0 \dots 0}$, and $x_1 = x_{10 \dots 0} + x_{010 \dots 0} + \dots + x_{0 \dots 01}$. Then the lowest degree expansion defines an invertible map A . For instance, for $n = 3$ this map is given by

$$A = \begin{matrix} & I_1 & I_{110} & I_{101} & I_{011} & I_{111} \\ \begin{matrix} x_1 \\ x_{110} \\ x_{101} \\ x_{011} \\ x_{111} \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & x_{000} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & x_{000} & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & x_{000} & 0 \\ 1 & \frac{1}{2}x_{000} & \frac{1}{2}x_{000} & \frac{1}{2}x_{000} & x_{000}^2 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

This extends to a map A^{poly} from polynomials in the I 's to polynomials in the x 's. Since A is invertible, the same is true of A^{poly} . If we now take the lowest degree terms in (43), they map to a polynomial in the x 's whose coefficients must be zero, since the x 's are independent variables. Applying the inverse of A^{poly} , we deduce that the corresponding coefficients in (43) are zero. Looking at the next highest degree terms in (43), we again deduce that their coefficients are zero. And so on for the whole I -polynomial. \square

We can therefore conclude that we get $2^n - n$ algebraically independent invariants from cumulants, namely one invariant, the squared-amplitude, from the first-degree cumulants, and $2^n - n - 1$ from the second and higher degree cumulants. On the other hand, $D(n)$, the dimension of the space of orbits, is $2^{n+1} - (3n + 1)$ for $n \geq 3$, [4]. Thus asymptotically the number of cumulant-based invariants is $\frac{1}{2}D(n)$.

Geometrically speaking, algebraically independent invariants give information about independent directions in orbit space, and $D(n)$ is the number of invariants in a maximal algebraically independent set. However, a maximal algebraically independent set will generally not suffice to characterize orbits fully: there will be a finite set of states that take the same values on all of the invariants in such a set, and additional invariants are needed to distinguish amongst these states. Thus a fundamental set, while it certainly contains a maximal algebraically independent set, will contain additional invariants, and generally contains a large number of such invariants.

Example IV.9. Consider the case of three qubits. From (37) we find

$$I_{110} = |\mathcal{R}_{3,0}d_{110}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{R}_{3,1}d_{110}|^2 + |\mathcal{R}_{3,2}d_{110}|^2, \quad (45)$$

which is a polynomial invariant of degree 4. The terms are given explicitly by (29), (30) and (31). There are two other 4th degree invariants, I_{101} and I_{011} obtained by permuting the indices. We also have

$$I_{111} = \sum_{i,j,k=0}^1 |\mathcal{R}_{1,i}\mathcal{R}_{2,j}\mathcal{R}_{3,k}d_{111}|^2, \quad (46)$$

which is of degree 6. The theorem excludes the case where there is a single 1 in the index set, but in that case Definition 26 just gives the squared amplitude $\langle\psi|\psi\rangle$, irrespective of the position of the 1.

So we get altogether five cumulant-based invariants. We can relate these to well-known sets of three-qubit invariants [19, 20, 27]. For instance, in the list given in Luque et. al. [20] we can make the following identifications:

$$I_{100} \leftrightarrow A_{111}, \quad (47)$$

$$I_{110} \leftrightarrow B_{002}, \quad (48)$$

$$I_{111} \leftrightarrow C_{111}, \quad (49)$$

including permutations of (48). Sudbery's list [27] includes $J_1 = \langle\psi|\psi\rangle$, the three fourth-degree polynomials $J_2 = \text{tr}\rho_3^2$, $J_3 = \text{tr}\rho_2^2$, $J_4 = \text{tr}\rho_1^2$, and the sixth-degree polynomial $J_5 = 3\text{tr}[(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2)\rho_{12}] - \text{tr}(\rho_1^3) - \text{tr}(\rho_2^3)$, where $\rho_1 = \text{tr}_{23}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, $\rho_2 = \text{tr}_{13}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, $\rho_3 = \text{tr}_{12}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, and $\rho_{12} = \text{tr}_3|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. These are related to the cumulant-based invariants by

$$\begin{aligned} I_{100} &= I_{010} = I_{001} = J_1, \\ 4I_{110} &= J_1^2 + J_2 - J_3 - J_4, \\ 4I_{101} &= J_1^2 + J_3 - J_2 - J_4, \\ 4I_{011} &= J_1^2 + J_4 - J_2 - J_3, \\ 6I_{111} &= 5J_1^3 - 3J_1(J_2 + J_3 + J_4) + 4J_5. \end{aligned}$$

Since $D(3) = 6$, one extra invariant is needed to make a maximal algebraically independent set. In Sudbery's list [27] this is $J_6 = |\text{Det}(|\psi\rangle)|^2$, where

$$\text{Det}(|\psi\rangle) = a_{ijk}a_{i'j'm}a_{npk'}a_{n'p'm'}\epsilon_{ii'}\epsilon_{jj'}\epsilon_{kk'}\epsilon_{mm'}\epsilon_{nn'}\epsilon_{pp'} \quad (50)$$

is the hyperdeterminant [21]. J_6 is closely related to the 3-tangle [5], $\tau = 2|\text{Det}(|\psi\rangle)|$.

To make a fundamental set, we need to add one more invariant to this maximal algebraically independent set, and Grassl [11] has identified a suitable 12th degree polynomial. This is a complex invariant, and is necessary for distinguishing a state from its complex conjugate [2].

V. THE HIERARCHICAL STRUCTURE OF INVARIANTS

The 3-qubit invariants I_{011} , I_{101} and I_{110} are closely related to the 2-qubit invariant I_{11} . We obtain I_{110} from I_{11} by adding a '0' index in the third position to I_{11} and twirling. More generally, we wish to make an $(n+1)$ -qubit invariant from an n -qubit invariant J . Phase invariance requires every term in J to be a product of an equal number of a 's and \bar{a} 's. Given a monomial $m = \prod a_{j_1\dots j_n}\bar{a}_{k_1\dots k_n}$ in J , of degree θ in the a 's and \bar{a} 's, we define

$$m_0 = (\theta + 1) \int_{SU(2)} \rho_i(g) \prod a_{j_1\dots 0_i\dots j_n}\bar{a}_{k_1\dots 0_i\dots k_n} dg. \quad (51)$$

We refer to this process as *lifting* and use a subscript '0' to denote a lifted index. Table I shows lifts of I_{11} and I_{111} up to five qubits. We say that an invariant together with its lifts constitute a *family*.

Lifting can also be understood in terms of tracing-out operations. Let us write a mixed state of n qubits as

$$\rho = \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_n;j_1,\dots,j_n} \alpha_{i_1,\dots,i_n}^{j_1,\dots,j_n} \bigotimes_{r=1}^n |i_r\rangle\langle j_r| \quad (52)$$

The following rules, applied to each monomial, enable one to interconvert between any pure state invariant J of degree θ in the a 's and \bar{a} 's, and a mixed state invariant \hat{J} of degree θ in the coefficients of (52):

$$J \rightarrow \hat{J} : \prod_{r=1}^{\theta} a_{i_1^r, \dots, i_n^r} \prod_{s=1}^{\theta} \bar{a}_{j_1^s, \dots, j_n^s} \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\theta!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_{\theta}} \prod_{r=1}^{\theta} a_{i_1^{\sigma(r)}, \dots, i_n^{\sigma(r)}} \quad (53)$$

$$\hat{J} \rightarrow J : \prod_{r=1}^{\theta} a_{i_1^r, \dots, i_n^r}^{j_1^r, \dots, j_n^r} \longrightarrow \prod_{r=1}^{\theta} a_{i_1^r, \dots, i_n^r} \prod_{r=1}^{\theta} \bar{a}_{j_1^r, \dots, j_n^r} \quad (54)$$

The map (53) is given in [18], but without the averaging over all permutations of pairings of upper and lower indices, which is essential for the following:

Proposition V.1. *If $\rho_i(g)J = J$ then $\rho_i(g)\hat{J}\rho_i(g)^{\dagger} = \hat{J}$. Thus given any pure state invariant J , \hat{J} is a mixed state invariant.*

Proof. The statement is equivalent to the commuting of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J & \xrightarrow{\rho_i(g)} & J \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \hat{J} & \xrightarrow{\Psi(\rho_i(g))} & \hat{J} \end{array}$$

where $\Psi(x)\hat{J} = x\hat{J}x^{\dagger}$. □

The following is immediate:

Proposition V.2.

$$\hat{J}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = J(|\psi\rangle).$$

Proposition V.3. *If $|\psi\rangle$ is an n -qubit state and $J_{p_1 \dots p_k}$ a polynomial invariant, then*

$$J_{p_1 \dots p_k} 0^{n-k}(|\psi\rangle) = \hat{J}_{p_1 \dots p_k}(\text{tr}_{n-k}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|),$$

where 0^{n-k} means a string of $(n-k)$ '0' indices, and tr_{n-k} means tracing out the last $(n-k)$ systems.

Proof. Let us see how this works in a simple case. The generalisation is then straightforward. So consider the monomial $m = a_{i_1 i_2} a_{j_1 j_2} \bar{a}_{k_1 k_2} \bar{a}_{l_1 l_2}$ of a 4th degree 2-qubit invariant $J_{p_1 p_2}$. Under the map (53) m becomes $\hat{m} = \frac{1}{2} (a_{i_1 i_2}^{k_1 k_2} a_{j_1 j_2}^{l_1 l_2} + a_{i_1 i_2}^{l_1 l_2} a_{j_1 j_2}^{k_1 k_2})$. The monomial m lifts, by (51), to

$$m_0 = (\theta + 1) \int \rho_3(g) a_{i_1 i_2 0} a_{j_1 j_2 0} \bar{a}_{k_1 k_2 0} \bar{a}_{l_1 l_2 0} dg \quad (55)$$

in $J_{p_1 p_2 0}(|\psi\rangle)$ for a 3-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$, and $(\theta + 1) = 3$. We therefore wish to show that $m_0 = \hat{m}$, where the coefficients $a_{i_1 i_2}^{k_1 k_2}$, etc., in \hat{m} come from $\text{tr}_3|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{m} &= \frac{1}{2} (a_{i_1 i_2 0} \bar{a}_{k_1 k_2 0} + a_{i_1 i_2 1} \bar{a}_{k_1 k_2 1}) (a_{j_1 j_2 0} \bar{a}_{l_1 l_2 0} + a_{j_1 j_2 1} \bar{a}_{l_1 l_2 1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (a_{i_1 i_2 0} \bar{a}_{l_1 l_2 0} + a_{i_1 i_2 1} \bar{a}_{l_1 l_2 1}) (a_{j_1 j_2 0} \bar{a}_{k_1 k_2 0} + a_{j_1 j_2 1} \bar{a}_{k_1 k_2 1}), \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

and from (55) we have

$$m_0 = \int (ua_{i_1 i_2 0} + va_{i_1 i_2 1}) (ua_{j_1 j_2 0} + va_{j_1 j_2 1}) \overline{(ua_{k_1 k_2 0} + va_{k_1 k_2 1})} \overline{(ua_{l_1 l_2 0} + va_{l_1 l_2 1})} . dg \quad (57)$$

Comparing (56) and (57), and using (38), (41) and (42), we see that $m_0 = \hat{m}$. This argument is unchanged when J is an n -qubit invariants (we just permute notationally more cumbersome blocks of indices). When the degree, 2θ , is arbitrary, a term in \hat{m} that has p 0's in the a 's in the lifted index position occurs $p!(\theta - p)!$ times in the generalisation of (56). With the normalising factor $1/\theta!$ from (53), we obtain the coefficient $\int |u|^{2p} |v|^{2\theta - 2p}$ of the corresponding term in m_0 , as given by (57). □

TABLE I: Some 2, 3, 4, and 5-qubit invariants related by lifting.

2 qubits	3 qubits	4 qubits	5 qubits
I_{10}	I_{100}	I_{1000}	I_{10000}
I_{11}	$I_{110}, I_{101}, I_{011}$	$I_{1100}, I_{1010}, I_{0110}, I_{1001}, I_{0101}, I_{0011}$	$I_{11000}, I_{10100}, \text{etc. (10)}$
-	-	G_{1111}	$G_{11110}, G_{11101}, G_{11011}, G_{10111}, G_{01111}$
-	I_{111}	$I_{1110}, I_{1101}, I_{1011}, I_{0111}$	$I_{11100}, I_{11010}, \text{etc. (10)}$
-	H_{222}	$H_{2220}, H_{2202}, H_{2022}, H_{0222}$	$H_{22200}, H_{22020}, \text{etc. (10)}$

TABLE II: Sixteen of the nineteen four-qubit invariants in [20] written in transvectant notation.

Invariants	Corresponding covariants	number	degree
I_{1000}	f	1	2
G_{1111}	$(f, f)^{1111}$	1	4
I_{1100}	$(f, f)^{1100}$	6	4
I_{1110}	$(f, (f, f)^{1100})^{0010}$	4	6
H_{2220}	$(f, (f, (f, f)^{1100})^{0010})^{1110}$	4	8

Proposition V.3 provides an alternative definition of lifting via tracing-out of subsystems. Combining this Proposition with Proposition V.2 we get

Corollary V.4. *If $|\psi\rangle = |\mu\rangle_k \otimes |\nu\rangle_{n-k}$ then*

$$J_{i_1 \dots i_k 0^{n-k}}(|\psi\rangle) = J_{i_1 \dots i_k}(|\mu\rangle).$$

The third, equivalent, definition of lifting comes from a technique called transvection, invented by Cayley in the 19th century heyday of invariant theory. Transvection is a useful device for generating invariants; understanding it will enable us to interpret the 4-qubit invariants given in [20] in the language used here.

The *fundamental form* for a n -qubit state is the polynomial f in the a 's and the variables $x_0^{(j)}, x_1^{(j)}$, for $1 \leq j \leq n$ given by

$$f = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n} a_{i_1 \dots i_n} x_{i_1}^{(1)} \dots x_{i_n}^{(n)} \quad (58)$$

If we let $g \in SU(n)$ act on the i th index of a 's by the usual transpose action (20) and upon the $x^{(i)}$'s via the inverse, g^\dagger , then one easily checks that $\rho(g)f = f$. More generally, a *covariant* of weight q is a polynomial p in the a 's and x 's satisfying

$$\rho_i(g)p = \Delta_i^q p. \quad (59)$$

Given two covariants, p and q , we define $\langle p, q \rangle$, by $\langle \mu(a) | \nu(a) \rangle = \mu(a) \overline{\nu(a)}$ for expressions in the a 's, and, for each i ,

$$\langle (x_0^{(i)})^{p_i} (x_1^{(i)})^{q_i} | (x_0^{(i)})^{p'_i} (x_1^{(i)})^{q'_i} \rangle = \delta_{p_i, p'_i} \delta_{q_i, q'_i} p_i! q_i!. \quad (60)$$

This is sometimes called the *derivative inner product* because we obtain it by setting $x_j^{(i)}$ on the lefthand side to $\partial/\partial x_j^{(i)}$ and applying these derivatives to (unchanged) x 's on the righthand side.

If p is a covariant, then $\langle p, p \rangle$ is an invariant, so any means of generating covariants also supplies us with invariants. Transvection is just such a means. Given two covariants, $p(x_j^{(i)})$, $q(y_j^{(i)})$, define the *transvectant* by

$$(p, q)^{i_1 \dots i_k} = \Omega_{i_1} \dots \Omega_{i_k} (pq) \Big|_{y \rightarrow x} \quad \text{where } \Omega_i X = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_0^{(i)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1^{(i)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1^{(i)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_0^{(i)}}. \quad (61)$$

The vertical bar indicates that, after applying the differential operators Ω_i , we change the y 's to x 's, so $(p, q)^{i_1 \dots i_k}$ is a polynomial in a 's and x 's. A classical theorem [22] asserts that, for any binary indices $i_1 \dots i_k$, $(p, q)^{i_1 \dots i_k}$ is a covariant if p and q are. Starting with the fundamental form, we can build up a wealth of covariants p and derive invariants $\langle p|p \rangle$ from them (see Table II).

Example V.5. For two-qubit states, $f = \sum a_{ij} x_i^{(1)} x_j^{(2)}$. Take $p = (f, f)^{11}$. Then $p = d_{11}$ and $\langle p|p \rangle = |d_{11}|^2 = I_{11}$. For three-qubit states, $f = \sum a_{ijk} x_i^{(1)} x_j^{(2)} x_k^{(3)}$. Take $\iota_{110} = (f, f)^{110}$. Applying (61) we get

$$\iota_{110} = (f, f)^{110} = d_{110}(x_0^{(3)})^2 + \mathcal{R}_{3,1} d_{110}(x_0^{(3)} x_1^{(3)}) + \mathcal{R}_{3,2} d_{110}(x_1^{(3)})^2.$$

Using the derivative formula for the inner product (60) we find that $\langle \iota_{110} | \iota_{110} \rangle = 4I_{110}$.

More generally, we have the following result:

Theorem V.6. Let

$$\iota_{1^k 0^{n-k}} = (f, (f, \dots (f, f)^{110 \dots 0})^{001 \dots 0} \dots)^{0 \dots 010^{n-k}}.$$

Then

$$\langle \iota_{1^k 0^{n-k}} | \iota_{1^k 0^{n-k}} \rangle = \xi I_{1^k 0^{n-k}},$$

where $\xi = 4((k-2)!)^k (k!)^{n-k}$.

Proof. Consider first the terms in $\iota_{1^k 0^{n-k}}$ where the subscript in every x is 0. The first transvectant step, $(f, f)^{110 \dots 0}$, yields terms

$$\sum_{i_3 \dots i_n; j_3 \dots j_n} (a_{11i_3 \dots i_n} a_{00j_3 \dots j_n} - a_{10i_3 \dots i_n} a_{01j_3 \dots j_n}) x_{i_3}^{(3)} x_{j_3}^{(3)} \dots x_{i_n}^{(n)} x_{j_n}^{(n)}. \quad (62)$$

If $k = 2$, the restriction to x_0 's means that we get

$$\iota_{11(0^{n-2})}|_{x_0} = d_{11(0^{n-2})} (x_0^{(3)} \dots x_0^{(n)})^2.$$

If $k > 2$, at the next transvectant step we set the x 's in (62) to y 's, multiply by the fundamental form f and apply Ω_3 to get

$$\Omega_3 \left[\sum_{k_1 \dots k_n} a_{k_1 \dots k_n} x_{k_1}^{(1)} \dots x_{k_n}^{(n)} \right] \left[\sum_{i_3 \dots i_n; j_1 \dots j_n} (a_{11i_3 \dots i_n} a_{00j_3 \dots j_n} - a_{10i_3 \dots i_n} a_{01j_3 \dots j_n}) y_{i_3}^{(3)} y_{j_3}^{(3)} \dots y_{i_n}^{(n)} y_{j_n}^{(n)} \right] \Big|_{y \rightarrow x}.$$

If we are restricted to x_0 's, we must have $k_1 = k_2 = 0$ since no further Ω operations are applied in these index positions and so these x 's will be unchanged. Only certain sets of indices are consistent with a y_0 remaining after applying Ω_3 to $x_{k_3}^{(3)} y_{i_3}^{(3)} y_{j_3}^{(3)}$; namely (1) $k_3 = 0, i_3 = 1, j_3 = 0$; (2) $k_3 = 0, i_3 = 0, j_3 = 1$; (3) $k_3 = 1, i_3 = 0, j_3 = 0$. The result of this operation is of the form

$$\sum_{i,j,k} (\alpha_{i,j,k} + \beta_{i,j,k}) x_0^{(1)} x_0^{(2)} x_0^{(3)} x_{i_4}^{(4)} x_{j_4}^{(4)} x_{k_4}^{(4)} \dots x_{i_n}^{(n)} x_{j_n}^{(n)} x_{k_n}^{(n)},$$

where $\alpha_{i,j,k}, \beta_{i,j,k}$ are terms in the a 's with compound indices $i = \{i_4 \dots i_n\}$, etc., and $\alpha_{i,j,k}$ comes from the conditions (1) and (2) above on index sets:

$$\alpha_{i,j,k} = a_{000k_4 \dots k_n} \mathcal{R}_{3,1} [a_{110i_4 \dots i_n} a_{000j_4 \dots j_n} - a_{010i_4 \dots i_n} a_{100j_4 \dots j_n}],$$

whereas from condition (3) we get

$$\beta_{i,j,k} = a_{001k_4 \dots k_n} [a_{110i_4 \dots i_n} a_{000j_4 \dots j_n} - a_{010i_4 \dots i_n} a_{100j_4 \dots j_n}].$$

If $k = 3$ this simplifies to

$$\iota_{111(0^{n-3})}|_{x_0} = [a_{000(0^{n-3})} \mathcal{R}_{3,1} d_{110(0^{n-3})} - 2a_{001(0^{n-3})} d_{110(0^{n-3})}] (x_0^{(1)} x_0^{(2)} x_0^{(3)}) (x_0^{(4)} \dots x_0^{(n)})^3. \quad (63)$$

Using (22), a straightforward calculation shows that

$$d_{111(0^{n-3})} = a_{000(0^{n-3})}\mathcal{R}_{3,1}d_{110(0^{n-3})} - 2a_{001(0^{n-3})}d_{110(0^{n-3})}. \quad (64)$$

Repeating the above argument, we have

$$\iota_{1^k 0^{n-k}}|_{x_0} = d_{1^k 0^{n-k}} \left(x_0^{(1)} \dots x_0^{(k)} \right)^{k-2} \left(x_0^{(k+1)} \dots x_0^{(n)} \right)^k, \quad (65)$$

and the generalisation of (64) is

$$d_{1^k 0^{n-k}} = a_{0^n} \mathcal{R}_{k,1} d_{1^{k-1} 0^{n-k+1}} - 2a_{0^{k-1} 1 0^{n-k+1}} d_{1^{k-1} 0^{n-k+1}}. \quad (66)$$

This last equation has a straightforward interpretation. When evaluating $f(\psi)$ by the Taylor series (1), the coefficient of, say, e_1 can be obtained by differentiating $\frac{\partial}{\partial e_1} f(\psi)$ and setting $e_i = 0$, for all i . Writing $\psi = a + r$, where $a = a_{0\dots 0}$, we find

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial e_1} f(a+r)|_{e_i=0} = f'(a+r) \frac{\partial}{\partial e_1} r|_{e_i=0} = f'(a) a_{10\dots 0} = f'(a) \mathcal{R}_{1,1} a.$$

We can interpret the last expression above as the formal derivative of $f(\psi)$ using the raising operator $\mathcal{R}_{1,1}$, and similarly the coefficient of any product $e_{i_1} \dots e_{i_q}$ is the result of formal derivatives by $\mathcal{R}_{i_1,1} \dots \mathcal{R}_{i_q,1}$. This can indeed be taken as the *definition* of the expansion of $f(\psi)$, as in [1]. For the log function, the coefficient of $e_1 \dots e_{k-1}$ is $c_{1^{k-1} 0^{n-k+1}}$, and the coefficient of $e_1 \dots e_k$, namely $c_{1^k 0^{n-k}}$ is obtained by applying $\mathcal{R}_{k,1}$ to $c_{1^{k-1} 0^{n-k+1}}$. Differentiating $\log(\psi)$ and using $c_{1^q 0^{n-q}} = d_{1^q 0^{n-q}} (a_{0^n})^{-q}$ gives (66).

From (65) and the definition of the inner product (60) we find that

$$\langle (\iota_{1^k 0^{n-k}}|_{x_0}) | (\iota_{1^k 0^{n-k}}|_{x_0}) \rangle = \xi |d_{1^k 0^{n-k}}|^2,$$

where ξ is the constant given in the Proposition. With the restriction to x_0 's we therefore get, up to the factor ξ , the term in the formula for $I_{1^k 0^{n-k}}$ (Theorem IV.7) where $k_p = 0$ for all p . To complete the proof, one observes that, allowing k $x_1^{(i)}$'s introduces k 1's into the a 's at position i , and is equivalent to applying \mathcal{R}_{i_p, k_p} to $d_{1^k 0^{n-k}}$. The values of the coefficients $\alpha_{k_p}^{i_p}$ are given by the derivative inner product. \square

This enables us to recognise some of the four-qubit invariants in [20]. Up to a constant factor, we have the following identifications:

$$I_{1000} \leftrightarrow A_{1111}, \quad (67)$$

$$I_{1100} \leftrightarrow \langle B_{0022} | B_{0022} \rangle, \quad (68)$$

$$I_{1110} \leftrightarrow \langle C_{1113} | C_{1113} \rangle, \quad (69)$$

which, with permutations of indices in (68) and (69), yields 11 corresponding pairs. Note that we use different letters for the invariants, and our subscripts indicate the total number of 1's at a given position in successive transvection operations; see Table II.

We now come to the third way of defining the lift. Suppose that a covariant $p_{l_1 \dots l_n}$ is derived by some sequence of transvectant operations. Define its i th lift $p_{l_1 \dots 0_i \dots l_n}$ by adding an index position in the i th position in the ground form, and applying the same transvectant operations, but with an '0' added to the transvectant indices in the i th position.

Proposition V.7. *If $P_{l_1 \dots l_n} = \langle p_{l_1 \dots l_n} | p_{l_1 \dots l_n} \rangle$ is the invariant derived from the covariant $p_{l_1 \dots l_n}$, then the i th lift of $P_{l_1 \dots l_n}$ is given by $P_{l_1 \dots 0_i \dots l_n} = \langle p_{l_1 \dots 0_i \dots l_n} | p_{l_1 \dots 0_i \dots l_n} \rangle$.*

Proof. Because there is a 0 at position i in the transvectant indices, Ω_i is never applied during the transvection operations. This means that we get all possible products of $x_0^{(i)}$ and $x_1^{(i)}$, and the terms with k $x_1^{(i)}$'s correspond to products of a 's with k 1's in index position 1. \square

As an example, consider the invariant of highest degree for 3-qubits in [20]. It is given (in our notation) by $H_{222} = \langle h_{222} | h_{222} \rangle$, where

$$h_{222} = (f, (f, (f, f)^{110})^{001})^{111}. \quad (70)$$

Equivalently, $H_{222} = |\text{Det}(|\psi\rangle)|^2$, where $\text{Det}(|\psi\rangle)$ is the hyperdeterminant (50). From (70), the lift of h_{222} at position 4 is $h_{2220} = (f, (f, (f, f)^{1100})^{0010})^{1110}$, and therefore by Proposition V.7 $H_{2220} = \langle h_{2220} | h_{2220} \rangle$ is the lift at position 4 of H_{222} . In the terminology of [20], H_{222} is D_{000} and H_{2220} is $\langle D_{0004} | D_{0004} \rangle$.

Another example is obtained by putting $g_{1111} = (f, f)^{1111}$ and setting $G_{1111} = \langle g_{1111} | g_{1111} \rangle$. This 4th degree invariant can be written

$$G_{1111} = a_{0000}a_{1111} - (a_{1000}a_{0111} + \text{permutations}) + (a_{1100}a_{0011} + \text{permutations}).$$

In general, for each k , we add a new $2k$ -party invariant $G_{1^{2k}} = \langle g_{1^{2k}} | g_{1^{2k}} \rangle$, where $g_{1^{2k}} = (f, f)^{1^{2k}}$. Together with all its lifts, the G family comprises $\binom{n}{2} + \binom{n}{4} + \binom{n}{6} + \dots = 2^{n-1} - 1$ independent invariants of degree 4 for an n -qubit system. This coincides with the family B_d in [20].

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have seen that local unitary invariants come in families, related by a tracing operation (Proposition V.3). An invariant for n -qubit states can be 'lifted' to give invariants of $n + 1$ -qubit states; when this process is repeated, one gets an exponentially large family of invariants.

One important family is derived from twirled cumulants. These can be shown to be algebraically independent within each n -qubit system, and asymptotically the total number of such invariants is half the dimension of the orbit space, $D(n)$. For three and four qubits, these invariants are in fact already known [20] – see (47) to (49), and (67) to (69) – but their connection to cumulants seems not to be recognised, nor their relationships to each other through lifting operations. Another example is the hyperdeterminant family: for $n = 3$, D_{000} in the notation in [20] is the 3-tangle [5], and $\langle D_{0004} | D_{0004} \rangle$ and its permutations are lifted 3-tangles.

Many of the invariants are closely related to separability of states. The hyperdeterminant, in its guise as the 3-tangle, is an entanglement measure for mixed states. The vanishing of members of the cumulant family can be used to characterise multipartite separability of pure states (see Theorem IV.2). We can also ask which states maximise these invariants. For instance, I_{11} attains its maximum for a Bell state, and I_{111} for a GHZ. I_{110} is maximised by $\Psi \otimes |0\rangle$, with Ψ a Bell state. We can regard this as an example of monogamy of entanglement [5, 15], with I_{110} detecting entanglement between the first two systems, and achieving its maximum when they are unentangled with the third system. Similarly, one might conjecture that $I_{1^k 0}$ is maximised by states of the form $|\mu\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$, where the k -qubit state $|\mu\rangle$ maximises I_{1^k} .

How far can the ideas here can be generalised beyond pure qubit states? The cumulant-based invariants can be applied to mixed states via the map (53). However, Theorem III.1 tells us only about correlation rather than mixed-state separability. The results also fail to generalise for pure states where the local dimension exceeds two. We can construct invariants, and Theorem III.1 holds, but the invariants are not algebraically independent. This is seen even for two qutrits, where we have four members of the cumulant family, namely I_{11} , I_{12} , I_{21} and I_{22} , whereas there are only two independent invariants [12]. Since four polynomial equations is the correct number to characterise separability, the simple relationship between invariants and separability cannot hold for $d > 2$. Nonetheless the basic concept of lifts and families still applies in all these wider contexts.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank Johan Åberg and Tony Sudbery for comments on the emerging manuscript, Graeme Segal for help with formulating the algebra of multi-partite states, and Markus Grassl for many helpful comments and for pointing out some egregious blunders in my exposition of invariant theory in the previous version of this paper.

-
- [1] J. Aberg, G. Mitchison, J. Math. Phys. **50**, 042103 (2009).
 - [2] A. Acin, A. Andrianov, E. Jané, R. Tarrach, quant-ph/0009107 (2000).
 - [3] H. A. Carteret, N. Linden, S. Popescu, A. Sudbery Found. Phys. **29**, 527, (1999).
 - [4] H. A. Carteret, A. Higuchi, A. Sudbery J. Math. Phys. **41**, 7932, (2000), quant-ph/0006125.
 - [5] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, W. K. Wootters Phys. Rev. A **61**, 2306 (2000), quant-ph/9907047.
 - [6] M. Christandl, A. Winter J. Math. Phys. **45**, 829 (2003).
 - [7] P. L. Dressel. Ann. Math. Stat. **11**, 33-57, (1940).
 - [8] R. A. Fisher, Proc. London Math. Soc. Ser. 2 **30**, 199 (1929).

- [9] R. A. Fisher and J. Wishart, Proc. London Math. Soc. Ser. 2 **33**, 195 (1931).
- [10] M. Grassl, M. Rötteler, T. Beth, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 1833 (1998).
- [11] M. Grassl Transparencies of a talk. Joint work with T. Beth, M.Rötteler, Y. Makhlin. http://iaks-www.ira.uka.de/home/grassl/paper/MSRI_InvarTheory.pdf
- [12] R.-J. Gu, F.-L. Zhang, S.-M. Fei, J.-L. Chen quant-ph/0912.1085 (2009).
- [13] M. Kendall and A. Stuart, *The advanced theory of statistics, Volume 1* (Charles Griffin, London and High Wycombe, 1977).
- [14] R. C. King and T. A. Welsh, Journal of Physics: Conference Series 30, 1-8 (2006).
- [15] M. Koashi, A. Winter Phys. Rev. A **69**, 022309 (2004), quant-ph/0310037.
- [16] B. Kraus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 020504 (2010), quant-ph/0909.5152.
- [17] B. Kraus, quant-ph/1005.5995 (2010).
- [18] M.S. Leifer, N. Linden, A. Winter. Phys. Rev. A **69**,052304 (2004), quant-ph/0308008.
- [19] N, Linden and S. Popescu, Fortschritte Der Physik **46**, 567, (1998), quant-ph/9711016.
- [20] J.-G. Luque, J.-Y. Thibon, F. Toumazet Math. Struct. in Comp. Science, **17**, 1133-1151, quant-ph/0604202.
- [21] A. Miyake Phys. Rev. A (3) **67**, 012108 (2003), quant-ph/0206111.
- [22] P. J. Olver, Classical Invariant Theory, CUP (1999).
- [23] A. L. Onishchik and E. B. Vinberg, *Lie groups and algebraic groups*, Springer (Berlin), English translation, Chap. 3, Theorem 3 (1990).
- [24] A. Royer, J. Math. Phys. **24**, 897 (1983).
- [25] A. Sawicki, M. Kuś, (2010) quant-ph/1009.0293.
- [26] B. Sturmfels, Algorithms in Invariant Theory, Springer (Vienna) 1993.
- [27] A. Sudbery J. Phys. A.: Math. Gen. **34**, 642-652 (2001), quant-ph/0001116.
- [28] A. Sudbery In R. F. Werner, Some Open Problems in Quantum Information Theory, quant-ph/0504166.
- [29] T. N. Thiele *The Theory of Observations* (C & E Layton, London, 1903).
- [30] T. N. Thiele, Ann. Math. Stat. Vol. 2, No. 2, p. 165-308 (1931).
- [31] D. Yang, K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and W. Song, Information Theory, IEEE Trans. **55**, 3375-3387 (2009), also quant-ph/0704.2236.
- [32] D. L. Zhou, B. Zeng, Z. Xu, L. You, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 052110 (2006) also quant-ph/0608240.
- [33] D. L. Zhou quant-ph/09093700 (2009).

VIII. APPENDIX

A. An alternative cumulant-based invariant

There is a very different way of relating cumulants and invariants, due to Zhou et al. [32]. Given an n -party mixed state ρ , one defines its cumulant by analogy with (22) as

$$\rho_c = \sum_{\pi} (-1)^{|\pi|-1} (|\pi| - 1)! \bigotimes_{i=1}^{|\pi|} \rho_{\pi_i}, \quad (71)$$

where ρ_{π_i} is the result of tracing out from ρ all systems apart from those with labels in π_i . For instance, for three systems

$$\rho_c = \rho - (\rho_1 \otimes \rho_{23} + \rho_2 \otimes \rho_{13} + \rho_3 \otimes \rho_{12}) + 2\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \otimes \rho_3.$$

The cumulant operator given by (71) is not in general a state, but Zhou et al. propose $M(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} |\rho_c|$ as a measure of correlation of the mixed state ρ . It is manifestly invariant under local unitaries, and, because of the general property cumulants have of vanishing on products, $M(\rho) = 0$ whenever $\rho = \rho_S \otimes \rho_T$. For pure states, this means it vanishes when states are separable.

It therefore seems to have formal similarities to our cumulant-based invariants, and one can carry this further by defining, in line with Proposition V.3, the lift of M to be $M(\text{tr} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$. We can in fact adopt parallel notation to the I 's, writing, for a 3-qubit state for example, $M_{111}(|\psi\rangle) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} |(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)_c|$, $M_{110}(|\psi\rangle) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} |(\text{tr}_3 |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)_c|$, and so on. Then $M_{i_1 \dots i_n}(|\psi\rangle) = 0$ for any π -separable $|\psi\rangle$ where $\{i_1 \dots i_n\}$ splits π . Furthermore, for 3-qubit states $M_{111}(|\psi\rangle) = 0$ is sufficient for separability of $|\psi\rangle$ ([32], Theorem 3), and the same is true if $I_{111}(|\psi\rangle) = 0$.

These similarities prompt the question of whether there is a functional connection. Can one write $M_{i_1 \dots i_n}(|\psi\rangle) = F(I_{i_1 \dots i_n}(|\psi\rangle))$, for some function F ? For 2-qubit states, $M_{11} = I_{11} + \sqrt{I_{11}}$. However, there is only one 2-qubit invariant for normalised states, so a functional relationship here is unsurprising. For 3-qubit states of the form $|\Psi\rangle = a|000\rangle + b|111\rangle$ one finds

$$M_{111} = 6I_{111} \sqrt{1 - 4I_{111}} + 2\sqrt{I_{111} + I_{111}^2 - 4I_{111}^3}, \quad (72)$$

whereas, for states of the form $|\phi\rangle = a|100\rangle + b|010\rangle + c|001\rangle$

$$(M_{111} - \frac{I_{111}}{2})^3 - \frac{1}{4}I_{111} = 0. \quad (73)$$

Since (72) and (73) do not define the same function of I_{111} , M_{111} must depend on other invariants besides I_{111} .