arXiv:2405.03261v1 [quant-ph] 6 May 2024

A nonlinear criterion for characterizing high-dimensional multipartite entanglement

Shuheng Liu ⁽⁰⁾,^{1,2} Qiongyi He ⁽⁰⁾,^{1,3,4,*} Marcus Huber ⁽⁰⁾,^{2,5,†} and Giuseppe Vitagliano ⁽⁰⁾,[‡]

¹State Key Laboratory for Mesoscopic Physics, School of Physics,

Frontiers Science Center for Nano-optoelectronics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

²Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology, Atominstitut, TU Wien, 1020 Vienna, Austria

³Collaborative Innovation Center of Extreme Optics, Shanxi University, Taiyuan, Shanxi 030006, China

⁴Hefei National Laboratory, Hefei 230088, China

⁵Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI), Austrian Academy of Sciences, 1090 Vienna, Austria

(Dated: May 7, 2024)

Understanding entanglement of potentially high-dimensional multipartite quantum systems is crucial across different disciplines in quantum sciences. We take inspiration from covariance matrix based techniques to derive a nonlinear criterion that can be used to lower bound the dimensionality vector of mixed quantum states, revealing both the level of multipartiteness and the dimensionality of the entanglement in the quantum states. The technique is based on a system of inequalities that has to be satisfied by all quantum states with a given entanglement dimensionality vector, which can be checked via linear programming. We test our condition on paradigmatic classes of high-dimensional multipartite entangled states like imperfect Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states and find that, in comparison with other available criteria our method provides a significant advantage, which is enhanced especially in the case that the dimensions of the individual particles are different from each other.

Quantification of entanglement is a topic of wide interest crossing various areas of physics, because of its foundational interest, its connection to thermodynamics and also because of its deep connections with several quantum information problems [1–6]. The task is highly non-trivial and has become subject of intense investigation starting from the case of two particles of relatively small dimension, but reaches a daunting complexity when either or both the number of particles or the particles' dimensions increase.

In fact, multipartite entanglement is very complex to even characterize qualitatively since different inequivalent notions can be given and its classification is known to be itself a very complex subject [7]. Beyond its classification, important questions are how to witness the various forms of multipartite entanglement and how to properly quantify it. Due to the complex structure of multipartite entangled states it is often not possible to provide a satisfactory quantification with only a single number, but it is better to consider entanglement monotones across some set of bipartitions. Concrete entanglement monotones considered are convex-roof extended entropies of marginal states, which are defined first for pure states as follows.

Taking first a given bipartition $(\alpha | \bar{\alpha})$ we consider the entropy of the single-party marginal:

$$S_{\alpha}(\Psi) := S(\operatorname{tr}_{\bar{\alpha}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)), \tag{1}$$

where $S(\varrho)$ is a given entropy, like e.g., the linear entropy $S^{\text{lin}}(\varrho) = \sqrt{2[1 - \text{tr}(\varrho^2)]}$, the von Neumann entropy $S^{\text{vN}}(\varrho) = -\text{tr}(\varrho \log \varrho)$, or the zero entropy $S^{\text{zero}}(\varrho) = \log(\text{rank}(\varrho))$. For a single bipartition, these measures are then extended to mixed states via convex-roof, i.e., by taking the minimum over all possible decompositions into pure states. It is here that the complexity of all entanglement quantification tasks originates: (almost) all states feature an infinite number of possible decompositions, or equivalently, an infinite set of possible preparations that lead to the experimental situation described by the

density matrix. So the convex roof basically corresponds to the worst-case scenario among all the possible pure-state decompositions, i.e., which preparation needs the least amount of entanglement. Clearly, this makes it quite complex in practical scenarios to calculate, since considering all possible (infinitely many) pure-state decompositions of a density matrix is in general a very challenging task, leading to the NP-hardness of entanglement certification [8].

In the multipartite scenario, all the above-mentioned difficulties to quantify entanglement are exacerbated, as each decomposition element might now feature different factorisations. Hence, in order to characterize and properly quantify the genuinely multipartite nature of the entanglement in the state it is important not only to consider the full set of bipartitions, but also to take the worst-case scenario amongst all possible mixtures of states entangled in different ways in the different bipartitions. This translates into considering the vector of entropies of the reductions for all possible bipartitions, which can be enumerated with an index going from 1 to $N = 2^{N-1} - 1$ for a *N*-particle system, and moreover order such a vector, for example non-increasingly. This way, one defines measures like

$$\mathcal{E}_{k}^{\downarrow}(\varrho) = \inf_{\mathcal{D}(\varrho)} \sum_{k} p_{k} S_{k}^{\downarrow}(\psi_{k}), \qquad (2)$$

where S_k^{\downarrow} are the components of the vector of entropies of the marginal states for all partitions and the infimum is taken over all pure state decompositions $\mathcal{D}(\varrho) = \{p_k, |\psi_k\rangle\}$: $\varrho = \sum_k p_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|$. Among all possible entanglement entropy vectors, only the von Neumann and the 0-entropy cases feature a nontrivial asymptotic structure that can be constrained by linear inequalities [9–11].

In this work, we will focus on the 0-entropy case, which is nothing but the logarithm of the rank of the density matrix, which, being discrete, is also a special case that allows for a better classification of the state as a resource as opposite to continuous measures [12–14]. This extends to multipartite states the concept of *Schmidt number* (or entanglement dimensionality) [15, 16] and, for example, is a necessary resource to achieve an exponential speedup in a pure-state quantum circuit [12, 17]. Concretely, for pure states, one defines the *Schmidt-rank vector* as the vector of Schmidt ranks with respect to all possible bipartitions

$$SN(|\psi\rangle) = (s_1, s_2, \cdots, s_N), \qquad (3)$$

and then orders its elements non-increasingly. As we mentioned, the ordering becomes crucial for extending this notion to the multipartite case and for clarity we denote the ordered vectors by SN^{\downarrow} .

To be more clear, let us first recall the definition of a Genuinely Multipartite Entangled state, which is a state that is not biseparable. A biseparable state ρ_{bs} is defined as a mixture of states that are separable across (at least) one partition, which can be different for the different decomposition elements. Such a state has an entanglement-dimensionality vector such that its last (smallest) component is one, i.e., $SN_N^{\downarrow}(\rho_{bs}) =$ 1. More in general, then, one defines the entanglementdimensionality vector element-wise via the convex roof construction, i.e.,

$$S\mathcal{N}_{k}^{\downarrow}(\varrho) = \inf_{\mathcal{D}(\varrho)} \max_{|\psi_{i}\rangle \in \mathcal{D}(\varrho)} S\mathcal{N}_{k}^{\downarrow}(|\psi_{i}\rangle), \tag{4}$$

with again the crucial requirement that the pure-state Schmidtrank vector is ordered non-increasingly. In other words, a density matrix has $SN_k^{\downarrow} = v_k$ whenever it has a pure-state decomposition such that the *k*-th largest Schmidt rank among all possible bipartitions is always smaller than or equal to v_k . Thus, overall a density matrix with entanglement-dimensionality vector given by *v* can be decomposed as

$$\varrho = \sum_{k} p_k \varrho_{s_k},\tag{5}$$

where p_k are probabilities and ρ_{s_k} are states with a given (unordered) Schmidt number vector s_k that is such that its components, when ordered non-increasingly, satisfy $s_k^{\downarrow} \leq v_k$.

This definition creates a structure of states with different entanglement dimensionality vectors which is far more complex than that arising in the bipartite case, especially because it is not simply formed by nested convex sets contained into each other. In particular, it is not possible to order all the different entanglement dimensionality vectors, even though the states having a particular SN^{\downarrow} still form a convex set. See fig. 1 for a pictorial representation.

Furthermore, Schmidt numbers across different bipartitions satisfy highly nontrivial relations amongst each other, also depending on the dimensions and number of particles [11]. These are analogous to the so-called monogamy relations arising between bipartite and multipartite entanglement monotones in a multipartite state [18]. Because of this, usual methods to witness the Schmidt number become much more complex when extended to the multipartite case, and thus there is a



FIG. 1. The structure of all possible Schmidt number vectors in a $4 \times 3 \times 2$ state space.

lack of efficient methods to characterize the full entanglement dimensionality vector in general [13, 14, 19].

Thus, it would be extremely interesting to provide new approaches to characterize the entanglement-dimensionality vector. This is also further motivated from the fact that high-dimensional multipartite entanglement is known to be a resource for a number of tasks, like high-dimensional quantum teleportation [20], stronger violation of multipartite Bell inequalities [21–25], generation of increased randomness [26] and increased Quantum Key-Distribution (QKD) rates [27–31]. In fact, high-dimensional multipartite entangled states have been the target of numerous recent experiments, particularly with photonic systems [20, 26, 29, 32–59].

Typical witnesses of the entanglement-dimensionality vector are given in terms of fidelities with respect to target states [32]. Concretely, given a certain (non-increasingly ordered) entanglement dimensionality vector $\mathbf{v} := (v_1, \dots, v_N)$ and a certain target state $|\Psi\rangle$ one defines the maximum fidelity with a generic density matrix σ with $SN^{\downarrow}(\sigma) = \mathbf{v}$:

$$F_{\max}(\nu, \Psi) := \max_{\mathcal{SN}^{\downarrow}(\sigma)=\nu} \operatorname{tr}\left(\sigma \left|\Psi\right\rangle \left|\Psi\right|\right) = \max_{\mathcal{SN}^{\downarrow}(\phi)=\nu} \left|\langle\phi \left|\Psi\right\rangle\right|^{2}, \quad (6)$$

where $|\phi\rangle$ is a generic pure state with ordered Schmidt-rank vector given by v and the equality follows from convexity of the fidelity. Then, whenever one finds that

$$\operatorname{tr}\left(\varrho\left|\Psi\right\rangle\!\!\left\langle\Psi\right|\right) > F_{\max}(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) \tag{7}$$

one can conclude that ρ is outside of the set of states with entanglement dimensionality vector given by v.

Note once more however, that one cannot generally conclude that ρ has a particular entanglement-dimensionality vector which is "greater" than ν , because such an ordering is lost in the multipartite case. Furthermore, even though the fidelity is a convex function of the state and therefore to calculate its maximum in Eq. (6) one can restrict to pure states, one needs to know the Schmidt eigenvalues of the target state across all bipartitions and, even after that, perform in general a quite demanding optimization. See Supplemental Material for more details [60]. This is because one needs to consider pure states with many different Schmidt-number vectors. A great simplification to this task can come from choosing a target state which is highly symmetric, a typical example being the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state:

$$\left|\Psi_{\rm GHZ}^{d}\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^{d} |i\rangle^{\otimes N} \,. \tag{8}$$

The simplification comes from the fact that the state is invariant under permutation of the parties and the one-body marginals are all maximally mixed.

With such a target state the bound $F_{\max}(v, \Psi_{GHZ}^d)$ coincides for all entanglement-dimensionality vectors v that have a given v_N . In general this is one of the few examples for which the bound in Eq. (6) is known and can thus be applied to practical entanglement detection. Beyond fidelities, nonlinear witnesses of the entanglement dimensionality vector have been derived in [13, 61], which we summarize in the Supplemental Material [60] and later compare to our criterion. These are essentially all criteria that exist to witness the entanglement-dimensionality vector. Because of this, it is useful to find alternative criteria, especially some that would be readily applicable even without further optimization.

Our approach is based on an alternative method that has been extended recently to witness the Schmidt number across bipartitions, called Covariance Matrix Criterion (CMC) [62– 66], which is written in terms of the covariance matrix of an orthonormal operator basis for each party. Here, working explicitly in a multipartite setting, we consider single-particle operators $\{g_{\mu}^{(n)}\}_{\mu=1}^{d_n^2}$ that satisfy $\operatorname{tr}(g_{\nu}^{(n)}g_{\nu}^{(n)}) = \delta_{\mu\nu}$. Given a bipartition $(\alpha|\bar{\alpha})$ we can construct basis for a party α by simply taking tensor products of single-particle operators among all the particles in α : $\{g_K^{(\alpha)}\} = \{g_{\mu}^{(n)} \otimes g_{\nu}^{(m)} \otimes \ldots\}_{n,m\cdots\in\alpha}$. To be more clear and compact, we used a single capitalized index $K = (\mu\nu \dots)$ for such a basis.

First, let us fix a bipartition α and consider the crosscovariances

$$[X_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}]_{KL} = \langle g_K^{(\alpha)} \otimes g_L^{(\alpha)} \rangle_{\varrho} - \langle g_K^{(\alpha)} \rangle_{\varrho} \langle g_L^{(\alpha)} \rangle_{\varrho}$$
(9)

on a quantum state ρ . Using the results of [62] (generalizing those of [64–66]) we know that one important corollary of the CMC is given by the following expression, which is invariant under change of bases for the parties ($\alpha |\bar{\alpha}$):

$$f_{\alpha}(\varrho) := \operatorname{tr}|X_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}| - \sqrt{[1 - \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\alpha}^{2})][1 - \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\bar{\alpha}}^{2})]} + 1 \le r_{\alpha}, \quad (10)$$

where $tr|X| = tr \sqrt{X^{\dagger}X}$ is the trace norm of a matrix and we named the left-hand side as $f_{\alpha}(\rho)$ to shorten the notation in the following. Eq. (10) must hold for all states ρ that have Schmidt number at most equal to r_{α} across partition α .

Now, let us try to extend such a relation to detect the entire entanglement dimensionality vector. For that, we need to consider all partitions at the same time, and correspondingly all matrices $X_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}$ labelled by the different bipartitions α and obtain the following result: **Observation 1.** Let us consider the functions $f_{\alpha}(\varrho)$ as defined in Eq. (10). Every density matrix ϱ that has an entanglement dimensionality vector given by $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N)$ must satisfy the following system of equations:

$$f_{1}(\varrho) \leq R_{1},$$

$$f_{2}(\varrho) \leq R_{2},$$

$$\vdots$$

$$f_{N}(\varrho) \leq R_{N},$$
(11)

where $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, \dots, R_N)$ is a vector of real numbers such that

$$\boldsymbol{R} \prec \boldsymbol{v}, \tag{12}$$

which means that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} R_k^{\downarrow} \le \sum_{k=1}^{K} v_k \quad for \ all \quad K \le \mathcal{N},$$
(13)

where R^{\downarrow} are the elements of **R** ordered non-increasingly. This system of equations can be solved with a linear program in the variables R_{α} . If no **R** solution to this problem can be found, then the state cannot have entanglement dimensionality vector given by **v**.

The technical details of the proof of this statement can be found in the Supplemental Material [60]. Note that a similar idea can be applied to other corollaries of the CMC potentially, whenever they are found, which is a task that we leave for further investigation. Here we just consider Eq. (10) as a prototypical example which is relevant for concrete situations. Note also that simpler conditions can be obtained from this system of equations, e.g., by summing up all equations and obtaining:

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} f_{\alpha}(\varrho) \le \sum_{k=1}^{N} v_k.$$
(14)

An even simpler criterion can be derived from Eq. (10) by further bounding its left-hand side. Consider orthonormal bases of the single particle operator space for each particle $\{g_{\mu}^{(n)}\}_{\mu=1}^{d_n^2}$ and let $d = \min_n d_n$ be the smallest among the single-particle dimensions. The following inequality

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^{d^2} \langle g_{\mu}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes g_{\mu}^{(N)} \rangle_{\varrho} \le v_{\mathcal{N}}, \tag{15}$$

must be satisfied by all states that are such that the last element of their entanglement dimensionality vector is given by v_N . Thus, a violation of this inequality implies that ρ has the minimal entanglement dimensionality which is larger than v_N . This condition simply follows from the fact that the left-hand side of Eq. (10), i.e., $f_\alpha(\rho)$ is larger than that of Eq. (15) for every α . Thus, we can take the minimum among all α and we obtain that Eq. (15) is valid for pure states. At the same time, the left-hand side is linear under mixing the quantum state and thus it is immediately extended to all density matrices. In this derivation, we can also observe the important difference with respect to Eq. (11): Taking the expression $\min_{\alpha} f_{\alpha}(\varrho)$ is by itself neither linear nor concave under mixing the quantum state. Thus, even though the analogous condition as in Eq. (15) holds for pure states, it cannot be readily extended to mixed states of the form (5). For that, it was needed to consider the whole set { f_{α} } with the corresponding bounds changing from the set of r_{α} to a set of real number R_{α} that only has to satisfy a weaker constraint $\mathbf{R} < \mathbf{v}$.

As a result, we get two independent conditions, Eqs. (11) and (15) that provide complementary information about the entanglement-dimensionality vector, as we will clarify afterwards with some examples. In particular, the condition in Eq. (15) it is nothing but the fidelity bound with respect to a target state of the form

$$|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\mu=1}^{d^2} g_{\mu}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes g_{\mu}^{(N)}, \qquad (16)$$

which is such that its single-particle marginals are all maximally mixed (such a state is called 1-uniform in the literature about multipartite entanglement classification [67–69]), and in that sense is analogous to the GHZ state. A detailed proof of Eq. (15) and its relation with fidelities to 1-uniform states can be found in the Supplemental Material [60].

Let us now investigate the practical applicability of our results, also in comparison with other methods. First of all, it is clear that the combination of the two inequalities (11,15) provides a witness which is stronger than the fidelity witness with respect to an optimal 1-uniform state that depends on ρ . Moreover, although it is hard to make fully general statements due to the variety and complexity of all the potential cases, we can observe that our method outperforms also the other known entanglement-dimensionality witnesses, at least in several important cases. First of all, we can consider the most common example of high-dimensional multipartite entangled states, which are GHZ states mixed with white noise. The noiseless case is actually a very important target state [35, 70–75] for several tasks in which distribution of entanglement is required among many parties, for example error-correction [67– 69] and quantum communication [32], and the white noise provides a general worst-case scenario for practical imperfections. In fact, known witnesses for genuine multipartite entanglement were tested on these states [19, 76, 77].

In fig. 2 we make an explicit comparison among all known methods and we can see that there is a noise region in which Eq. (11) actually improves the detection of the whole entanglement-dimensionality vector as compared to the fidelity witness alone. All other methods are also clearly weaker in this case.

Besides this important paradigmatic case, we tested our method on other example states and randomly sampled states and we can summarize our findings as follows. In short, we find that our criterion is significantly advantageous when the



FIG. 2. Comparison among correlation tensor norm criterion, linear entropy criterion and the fidelity witness criterion Eq.(15) alone or used in combination with Eq.(11). The target state is a GHZ state with $d_1 = d_2 = d_3 = 3$ mixed with white noise. The horizontal axis represents increasing probability p, and different entanglement-dimensionality vectors are drawn in different colors.

dimension of one subsystem is higher than that of all other subsystems. Let us elucidate that with a concrete example. Consider the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4$ and the following pure state, that has a Schmidt number vector (4, 3, 2):

$$|\psi_{432}\rangle(\mathbf{c}) := c_1 |000\rangle + c_2 |111\rangle + c_3 |012\rangle + c_4 |123\rangle$$
 (17)

where $c = (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4)$ is a unit vector of complex coefficients. The case with all $c_i = \frac{1}{2}$ was considered in [13] as a simple paradigmatic example to show the partial ordering structure of the Schmidt number vector $SN(|\psi_{432}\rangle)$. In our simulations we then mix such randomly sampled pure states with white noise and consider the state

$$\varrho(p, \boldsymbol{c}) = p |\psi_{432} \rangle \langle \psi_{432} | (\boldsymbol{c}) + (1-p) \frac{\mathbb{1}}{24}.$$
 (18)

We then try to detect the state mixed with white noise using Eq. (11) and the fidelity with respect to $|\psi_{432}\rangle$ for comparison. All other criteria mentioned earlier are worse than either our method or the fidelity with respect to $|\psi_{432}\rangle$. To certify $SN(|\psi_{432}\rangle) = (4, 3, 2)$, one must exclude (4, 2, 2) and (3, 3, 2) simultaneously, while these two subsets are not comparable, i.e., they are addressed by two bounds individually. We make this comparison between the two criteria using completely random coefficients c_i across a total of 10000 samples. We use t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE) [78] as a dimension reduction technique to show the sample data. This is a method that ensures that states with coefficient vectors c that are close to each other, remain close also in the lower-dimensional projected figure. The results are shown in fig. 3.

As shown in the plot, our method outperforms the fidelity witness in most of the cases (about 92%). It is also worth noting that the points that are detected by our method mostly coincide with states that have a relatively high value of the so-called genuine multipartite concurrence, which is defined as



FIG. 3. Comparison of fidelity-witness based criterion and Eq. (11) over random states of the form (18), visualized with a 2-dimensional clustering made using t-SNE. (a) Blue points represent states detected with higher white-noise (1 - p) by our criterion (11). Conversely, red points correspond to states that are detected with a higher tolerance by the fidelity witness with respect to the state $|\psi_{432}\rangle$ (c). (b) Blue points represent states for which the GM concurrence $C_{\rm GM} > 0.8$, while orange points correspond to those with $C_{\rm GM} \leq 0.8$. The region in figure (a) where the fidelity witness is stronger roughly corresponds to the area in figure (b) with lower GM concurrence.

the lowest element of the entropy vector in Eq. (2) where the entropy of choice is the linear entropy [79–81]:

$$C_{\rm GM}(\varrho) := (\mathcal{E}_k^{\downarrow})^{\rm lin}(\varrho) = \min_{\alpha} \inf_{\mathcal{D}(\varrho)} \sum_k p_k S_{\alpha}^{\rm lin}(\psi_k).$$
(19)

However, notice that C_{GM} is not high enough to witness a SN better than either our criterion (11) or the fidelity with respect to $|\psi_{432}\rangle$.

In conclusion, we have presented a new approach to find witnesses for the entanglement dimensionality vector in multipartite systems, which is based on extending corollaries of the bipartite Covariance Matrix Criterion to the multipartite case. We have applied this idea explicitly to a known corollary of the CMC, which leads to a criterion that is strictly stronger than fidelity witnesses with respect to 1-uniform states such as the GHZ states, which represent in practice the most widely used witnesses. Moreover, we have shown that this criterion also improves over known methods on a wide class of states, which include important paradigmatic examples useful for applications. Further developments of our approach can be obtained by finding new corollaries to the CMC, or in general nonlinear witnesses of the Schmidt number in the bipartite case, which thus represents a promising direction for further research in this topic.

Acknowledgments.—This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 12125402), the Innovation Program for Quantum Science and Technology (No. 2021ZD0301500) and the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (No. 2023M740119). GV acknowledges financial support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) through the grants P 35810-N and P 36633-N (Stand-Alone). M.H. acknowledges support from the Horizon-Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 101070168 (HyperSpace).

- * qiongyihe@pku.edu.cn
- [†] marcus.huber@tuwien.ac.at
- * giuseppe.vitagliano@tuwien.ac.at
- R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, Rev. Mod. Phys. 81, 865 (2009).
- [2] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral, Entanglement in many-body systems, Rev. Mod. Phys. 80, 517 (2008).
- [3] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, Entanglement detection, Phys. Rep. 474, 1 (2009).
- [4] N. Laflorencie, Quantum entanglement in condensed matter systems, Phys. Rep. 646, 1 (2016).
- [5] N. Friis, G. Vitagliano, M. Malik, and M. Huber, Entanglement certification from theory to experiment, Nat. Rev. Phys. 1, 72 (2019).
- [6] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, A one-way quantum computer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 5188 (2001).
- [7] C. Eltschka and J. Siewert, Quantifying entanglement resources, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 47, 424005 (2014).
- [8] L. Gurvits, Classical deterministic complexity of Edmonds' Problem and quantum entanglement, in Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (Association for Computing Machinery), STOC '03, 10–19 (2003).
- [9] E. H. Lieb and M. B. Ruskai, A fundamental property of quantum-mechanical entropy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 30, 434 (1973).
- [10] E. H. Lieb and M. B. Ruskai, Proof of the strong subadditivity of quantum-mechanical entropy, J. Math. Phys. 14, 1938 (1973).
- [11] J. Cadney, M. Huber, N. Linden, and A. Winter, Inequalities for the ranks of multipartite quantum states, Linear Algebra Appl. 452, 153 (2014).
- [12] M. Van den Nest, Universal quantum computation with little entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 060504 (2013).
- [13] M. Huber and J. I. de Vicente, Structure of multidimensional entanglement in multipartite systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 030501 (2013).
- [14] M. Huber, M. Perarnau-Llobet, and J. I. de Vicente, Entropy vector formalism and the structure of multidimensional entanglement in multipartite systems, Phys. Rev. A 88, 042328 (2013).
- [15] B. M. Terhal and P. Horodecki, Schmidt number for density matrices, Phys. Rev. A 61, 040301 (2000).
- [16] A. Sanpera, D. Bruß, and M. Lewenstein, Schmidt-number witnesses and bound entanglement, Phys. Rev. A 63, 050301 (2001).
- [17] G. Vidal, Efficient classical simulation of slightly entangled quantum computations, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 147902 (2003).
- [18] T. J. Osborne and F. Verstraete, General monogamy inequality for bipartite qubit entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 220503 (2006).
- [19] M. Huber, F. Mintert, A. Gabriel, and B. C. Hiesmayr, Detection of high-dimensional genuine multipartite entanglement of mixed states, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 210501 (2010).
- [20] Y.-H. Luo, H.-S. Zhong, M. Erhard, X.-L. Wang, L.-C. Peng, M. Krenn, X. Jiang, L. Li, N.-L. Liu, C.-Y. Lu, A. Zeilinger, and J.-W. Pan, Quantum teleportation in high dimensions, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 070505 (2019).

- [21] D. Collins, N. Gisin, N. Linden, S. Massar, and S. Popescu, Bell inequalities for arbitrarily high-dimensional systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 040404 (2002).
- [22] J. Ryu, C. Lee, M. Żukowski, and J. Lee, Greenberger-hornezeilinger theorem for *n* qudits, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 042101 (2013).
- [23] J. Ryu, C. Lee, Z. Yin, R. Rahaman, D. G. Angelakis, J. Lee, and M. Żukowski, Multisetting greenberger-horne-zeilinger theorem, Phys. Rev. A 89, 024103 (2014).
- [24] J. Lawrence, Rotational covariance and greenberger-hornezeilinger theorems for three or more particles of any dimension, Phys. Rev. A 89, 012105 (2014).
- [25] W. Tang, S. Yu, and C. H. Oh, Multisetting greenberger-hornezeilinger paradoxes, Phys. Rev. A 95, 012131 (2017).
- [26] J. Wang, S. Paesani, Y. Ding, R. Santagati, P. Skrzypczyk, A. Salavrakos, J. Tura, R. Augusiak, L. Mančinska, D. Bacco, D. Bonneau, J. W. Silverstone, Q. Gong, A. Acín, K. Rottwitt, L. K. Oxenløwe, J. L. O'Brien, A. Laing, and M. G. Thompson, Multidimensional quantum entanglement with large-scale integrated optics, Science **360**, 285 (2018).
- [27] N. J. Cerf, M. Bourennane, A. Karlsson, and N. Gisin, Security of quantum key distribution using *d*-level systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 127902 (2002).
- [28] S. Gröblacher, T. Jennewein, A. Vaziri, G. Weihs, and A. Zeilinger, Experimental quantum cryptography with qutrits, New J. Phys. 8, 75 (2006).
- [29] S. Ecker, F. Bouchard, L. Bulla, F. Brandt, O. Kohout, F. Steinlechner, R. Fickler, M. Malik, Y. Guryanova, R. Ursin, and M. Huber, Overcoming noise in entanglement distribution, Phys. Rev. X 9, 041042 (2019).
- [30] I. Ali-Khan, C. J. Broadbent, and J. C. Howell, Large-alphabet quantum key distribution using energy-time entangled bipartite states, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 060503 (2007).
- [31] T. Vértesi, S. Pironio, and N. Brunner, Closing the detection loophole in bell experiments using qudits, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 060401 (2010).
- [32] M. Malik, M. Erhard, M. Huber, M. Krenn, R. Fickler, and A. Zeilinger, Multi-photon entanglement in high dimensions, Nat. Photonics 10, 248–252 (2016).
- [33] L. Li, Z. Liu, X. Ren, S. Wang, V.-C. Su, M.-K. Chen, C. H. Chu, H. Y. Kuo, B. Liu, W. Zang, G. Guo, L. Zhang, Z. Wang, S. Zhu, and D. P. Tsai, Metalens-array–based high-dimensional and multiphoton quantum source, Science **368**, 1487 (2020).
- [34] Y. Chi, J. Huang, Z. Zhang, J. Mao, Z. Zhou, X. Chen, C. Zhai, J. Bao, T. Dai, H. Yuan, et al., A programmable qudit-based quantum processor, Nat. Commun. 13, 1166 (2022).
- [35] M. Erhard, M. Malik, M. Krenn, and A. Zeilinger, Experimental greenberger–horne–zeilinger entanglement beyond qubits, Nat. Photonics 12, 759 (2018).
- [36] Y. Guo, X.-M. Hu, B.-H. Liu, Y.-F. Huang, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, Experimental witness of genuine high-dimensional entanglement, Phys. Rev. A 97, 062309 (2018).
- [37] M. Krenn, M. Huber, R. Fickler, R. Lapkiewicz, S. Ramelow, and A. Zeilinger, Generation and confirmation of a (100 × 100)dimensional entangled quantum system, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 111, 6243 (2014).
- [38] A. C. Dada, J. Leach, G. S. Buller, M. J. Padgett, and E. Andersson, Experimental high-dimensional two-photon entanglement and violations of generalized bell inequalities, Nat. Phys. 7, 677 (2011).
- [39] C. Schaeff, R. Polster, M. Huber, S. Ramelow, and A. Zeilinger, Experimental access to higher-dimensional entangled quantum systems using integrated optics, Optica 2, 523 (2015).
- [40] A. Martin, T. Guerreiro, A. Tiranov, S. Designolle, F. Fröwis, N. Brunner, M. Huber, and N. Gisin, Quantifying photonic

high-dimensional entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 110501 (2017).

- [41] Q. Zeng, B. Wang, P. Li, and X. Zhang, Experimental highdimensional einstein-podolsky-rosen steering, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120, 030401 (2018).
- [42] X.-L. Wang, Y.-H. Luo, H.-L. Huang, M.-C. Chen, Z.-E. Su, C. Liu, C. Chen, W. Li, Y.-Q. Fang, X. Jiang, J. Zhang, L. Li, N.-L. Liu, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, 18-qubit entanglement with six photons' three degrees of freedom, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 260502 (2018).
- [43] Y. Guo, S. Cheng, X. Hu, B.-H. Liu, E.-M. Huang, Y.-F. Huang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, and E. G. Cavalcanti, Experimental measurement-device-independent quantum steering and randomness generation beyond qubits, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 170402 (2019).
- [44] R. Qu, Y. Wang, X. Zhang, S. Ru, F. Wang, H. Gao, F. Li, and P. Zhang, Robust method for certifying genuine highdimensional quantum steering with multimeasurement settings, Optica 9, 473 (2022).
- [45] A. Mair, A. Vaziri, G. Weihs, and A. Zeilinger, Entanglement of the orbital angular momentum states of photons, Nature 412, 313 (2001).
- [46] R. Qu, Y. Wang, M. An, F. Wang, Q. Quan, H. Li, H. Gao, F. Li, and P. Zhang, Retrieving high-dimensional quantum steering from a noisy environment with *n* measurement settings, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 240402 (2022).
- [47] Y. Li, S.-Y. Huang, M. Wang, C. Tu, X.-L. Wang, Y. Li, and H.-T. Wang, Two-measurement tomography of high-dimensional orbital angular momentum entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. 130, 050805 (2023).
- [48] X.-M. Hu, W.-B. Xing, Y. Guo, M. Weilenmann, E. A. Aguilar, X. Gao, B.-H. Liu, Y.-F. Huang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, Z. Wang, and M. Navascués, Optimized detection of high-dimensional entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. **127**, 220501 (2021).
- [49] X.-M. Hu, C. Zhang, Y. Guo, F.-X. Wang, W.-B. Xing, C.-X. Huang, B.-H. Liu, Y.-F. Huang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, X. Gao, M. Pivoluska, and M. Huber, Pathways for entanglement-based quantum communication in the face of high noise, Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 110505 (2021).
- [50] Z.-Q. Zhou, Y.-L. Hua, X. Liu, G. Chen, J.-S. Xu, Y.-J. Han, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, Quantum storage of three-dimensional orbital-angular-momentum entanglement in a crystal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 070502 (2015).
- [51] X.-M. Hu, W.-B. Xing, B.-H. Liu, Y.-F. Huang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, P. Erker, and M. Huber, Efficient generation of highdimensional entanglement through multipath down-conversion, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 090503 (2020).
- [52] N. H. Valencia, S. Goel, W. McCutcheon, H. Defienne, and M. Malik, Unscrambling entanglement through a complex medium, Nat. Phys. 16, 1112 (2020).
- [53] J. Bavaresco, N. Herrera Valencia, C. Klöckl, M. Pivoluska, P. Erker, N. Friis, M. Malik, and M. Huber, Measurements in two bases are sufficient for certifying high-dimensional entanglement, Nat. Phys. 14, 1032 (2018).
- [54] R. Fickler, R. Lapkiewicz, M. Huber, M. P. Lavery, M. J. Padgett, and A. Zeilinger, Interface between path and orbital angular momentum entanglement for high-dimensional photonic quantum information, Nat. Commun. 5, 4502 (2014).
- [55] Y. Zhang, M. Agnew, T. Roger, F. S. Roux, T. Konrad, D. Faccio, J. Leach, and A. Forbes, Simultaneous entanglement swapping of multiple orbital angular momentum states of light, Nat. Commun. 8, 632 (2017).
- [56] F. Zhu, M. Tyler, N. H. Valencia, M. Malik, and J. Leach, Is high-dimensional photonic entanglement robust to noise?, AVS

Quantum Sci. 3, 011401 (2021).

- [57] Y. Zheng, C. Zhai, D. Liu, J. Mao, X. Chen, T. Dai, J. Huang, J. Bao, Z. Fu, Y. Tong, X. Zhou, Y. Yang, B. Tang, Z. Li, Y. Li, Q. Gong, H. K. Tsang, D. Dai, and J. Wang, Multichip multidimensional quantum networks with entanglement retrievability, Science **381**, 221 (2023).
- [58] B. C. Hiesmayr, M. J. A. de Dood, and W. Löffler, Observation of four-photon orbital angular momentum entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 073601 (2016).
- [59] J. Bao, Z. Fu, T. Pramanik, J. Mao, Y. Chi, Y. Cao, C. Zhai, Y. Mao, T. Dai, X. Chen, <u>et al.</u>, Very-large-scale integrated quantum graph photonics, Nat. Photonics **17**, 573 (2023).
- [60] See supplemental material for a summary of nonlinear witnesses of the entanglement dimensionality vector, along with detailed proofs of the observations presented in the main text.
- [61] C. Klöckl and M. Huber, Characterizing multipartite entanglement without shared reference frames, Phys. Rev. A 91, 042339 (2015).
- [62] S. Liu, M. Fadel, Q. He, M. Huber, and G. Vitagliano, Bounding entanglement dimensionality from the covariance matrix, Quantum 8, 1236 (2024).
- [63] O. Gühne, Characterizing Entanglement via Uncertainty Relations, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 117903 (2004).
- [64] O. Gühne, P. Hyllus, O. Gittsovich, and J. Eisert, Covariance matrices and the separability problem, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 130504 (2007).
- [65] O. Gittsovich, O. Gühne, P. Hyllus, and J. Eisert, Unifying several separability conditions using the covariance matrix criterion, Phys. Rev. A 78, 052319 (2008).
- [66] O. Gittsovich and O. Gühne, Quantifying entanglement with covariance matrices, Phys. Rev. A 81, 032333 (2010).
- [67] A. J. Scott, Multipartite entanglement, quantum-errorcorrecting codes, and entangling power of quantum evolutions, Phys. Rev. A 69, 052330 (2004).
- [68] L. Arnaud and N. J. Cerf, Exploring pure quantum states with maximally mixed reductions, Phys. Rev. A 87, 012319 (2013).
- [69] D. Goyeneche and K. Życzkowski, Genuinely multipartite entangled states and orthogonal arrays, Phys. Rev. A 90, 022316 (2014).
- [70] D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, M. Daniell, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, Observation of three-photon greenberger-hornezeilinger entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 1345 (1999).
- [71] J.-W. Pan, D. Bouwmeester, M. Daniell, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, Experimental test of quantum nonlocality in three-

photon greenberger-horne-zeilinger entanglement, Nature **403**, 515 (2000).

- [72] Z. Zhao, T. Yang, Y.-A. Chen, A.-N. Zhang, M. Żukowski, and J.-W. Pan, Experimental violation of local realism by fourphoton greenberger-horne-zeilinger entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 180401 (2003).
- [73] C.-Y. Lu, X.-Q. Zhou, O. Gühne, W.-B. Gao, J. Zhang, Z.-S. Yuan, A. Goebel, T. Yang, and J.-W. Pan, Experimental entanglement of six photons in graph states, Nature physics 3, 91 (2007).
- [74] W.-B. Gao, C.-Y. Lu, X.-C. Yao, P. Xu, O. Gühne, A. Goebel, Y.-A. Chen, C.-Z. Peng, Z.-B. Chen, and J.-W. Pan, Experimental demonstration of a hyper-entangled ten-qubit schrödinger cat state, Nature physics 6, 331 (2010).
- [75] A. Cervera-Lierta, M. Krenn, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and A. Galda, Experimental high-dimensional greenberger-horne-zeilinger entanglement with superconducting transmon qutrits, Phys. Rev. Appl. 17, 024062 (2022).
- [76] G. Tóth and O. Gühne, Detecting genuine multipartite entanglement with two local measurements, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 060501 (2005).
- [77] O. Gühne and M. Seevinck, Separability criteria for genuine multiparticle entanglement, New J. Phys. 12, 053002 (2010).
- [78] L. van der Maaten and G. Hinton, Visualizing data using t-sne, J. Mach. Learn. Res. 9, 2579 (2008).
- [79] W.-C. Qiang, G.-H. Sun, Q. Dong, and S.-H. Dong, Genuine multipartite concurrence for entanglement of dirac fields in noninertial frames, Phys. Rev. A 98, 022320 (2018).
- [80] S. M. Hashemi Rafsanjani, M. Huber, C. J. Broadbent, and J. H. Eberly, Genuinely multipartite concurrence of *n*-qubit *x* matrices, Phys. Rev. A 86, 062303 (2012).
- [81] Z.-H. Ma, Z.-H. Chen, J.-L. Chen, C. Spengler, A. Gabriel, and M. Huber, Measure of genuine multipartite entanglement with computable lower bounds, Phys. Rev. A 83, 062325 (2011).
- [82] P. Erker, M. Krenn, and M. Huber, Quantifying high dimensional entanglement with two mutually unbiased bases, Quantum 1, 22 (2017).
- [83] S. T. Flammia and Y.-K. Liu, Direct Fidelity Estimation from Few Pauli Measurements, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 230501 (2011).
- [84] Note that as compared to [61] we now use a different normalization. In [61] they normalized the basis observables with $tr(g_{\mu}g_{\nu}) = d\delta_{\mu\nu}$.
- [85] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, <u>Topics in Matrix Analysis</u> (Cambridge University Press, 1991) p. 209 theorem 3.5.15.

Supplemental Material

Known entanglement-dimensionality-vector witnesses

Here we present and discuss known witnesses of the entanglement-dimensionality vector.

Fidelity-based witnesses

First let us start with the fidelity witness, defined formally in Eqs. (6) and (7). In the bipartite case they are among the most typical Schmidt-number witnesses used in experiments [37, 53, 82, 83]. In that case, given a target state written in its Schmidt decomposition

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i} \sqrt{\lambda_{i}} |i_{a}i_{b}\rangle, \qquad (20)$$

where λ_i are the squared Schmidt coefficients which are ordered non-increasingly, one can easily calculate its maximal fidelity with any state ρ with Schmidt number bounded by r. This is simply given by

$$F_{\max}(r, \Psi) := \max_{\mathcal{SN}(\varrho)=r} \operatorname{tr} \left(\sigma \left| \Psi \right\rangle \Psi \right| \right) = \max_{\mathcal{SN}(\psi_r)=r} \left| \left\langle \psi_r \right| \Psi \right\rangle \right|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i, \tag{21}$$

i.e., by the sum of the r largest squared Schmidt coefficients of the target state.

Let us now elucidate how to extend this result to the multipartite case, in which many possible bipartitions have to be considered. Let us start with the simple question: Is the smallest Schmidt number across all possible bipartitions larger than a given v_N ? Again, in the particular case $v_N > 1$ the state is called Genuinely Multipartite Entangled.

To obtain this fidelity bound we have to allow the possibility that the value v_N corresponds to the Schmidt-rank across any bipartition. Using Eq. (21) we know that the fidelity between $|\Psi\rangle$ and a state with Schmidt-rank equal to v_N across partition α will be given by $\sum_{i=1}^{\nu_N} \lambda_i^{(\alpha)}$ at most, where again $\lambda_i^{(\alpha)}$ are the non-increasingly ordered squared Schmidt coefficients of $|\Psi\rangle$ across the bipartition α . Thus, scanning across all partitions we get

$$F_{\max}(\nu_{\mathcal{N}}, \Psi) = \max_{\alpha} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_{\mathcal{N}}} \lambda_i^{(\alpha)} \right\},\tag{22}$$

which follows from the fact that we want to take the worst-case scenario.

Next, suppose that we want to find the fidelity bound with such a given target state among all possible density matrices that have $SN_1^{\downarrow}(\sigma) = v_N$ and $SN_2^{\downarrow}(\sigma) = v_{N-1}$, i.e., the two smallest Schmidt numbers are v_N and v_{N-1} respectively. Once again, we have to check all pure states that have Schmidt ranks equal to v_N and v_{N-1} across any pair of partitions and these are the two smallest. Now, given a pure state $|\Phi_{\alpha_N = v_N, \alpha_{N-1} = v_{N-1}}\rangle$ that has Schmidt ranks equal to v_N and v_{N-1} across partitions α_N and α_{N-1} we know that its fidelity with respect to $|\Psi\rangle$ is upper bounded by

$$F_{\max}(\Phi_{\alpha_{N}=\nu_{N},\alpha_{N-1}=\nu_{N-1}},\Psi) \le \min\{\sum_{i=1}^{\nu_{N}}\lambda_{i}^{(\alpha_{N})},\sum_{i=1}^{\nu_{N-1}}\lambda_{i}^{(\alpha_{N-1})}\}.$$
(23)

Because of that, again scanning all states with these two Schmidt ranks across all possible pairs of partitions we get

$$F_{\max}((v_{\mathcal{N}}, v_{\mathcal{N}-1}), \Psi) = \max_{(\alpha_{\mathcal{N}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{N}-1})} \min\{\sum_{i=1}^{v_{\mathcal{N}}} \lambda_i^{(\alpha_{\mathcal{N}})}, \sum_{i=1}^{v_{\mathcal{N}}} \lambda_i^{(\alpha_{\mathcal{N}-1})}\},$$
(24)

and so on an so forth for increasing number of entanglement-dimensionality vector elements.

In general, the maximal fidelity with respect to the target state $|\Psi\rangle$ obtained for any state, given a fixed entanglement dimensionality vector v is calculated as

$$F_{\max}(\mathbf{v}, \Psi) = \max_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N)} \min\{\sum_{i=1}^{\nu_N} \lambda_i^{(\alpha_N)}, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_1} \lambda_i^{(\alpha_1)}\},$$
(25)

where $\lambda_i^{(\alpha_j)}$ are the non-increasingly ordered squared Schmidt coefficients of $|\Psi\rangle$ across the bipartition α_j .

Let us clarify this with a concrete example in a tripartite system with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$. Let us consider as a target the GHZ state as in Eq. (8) with d = 3 and N = 3, which has entanglement dimensionality vector $SN^{\downarrow}(|\Psi_{GHZ}^3\rangle) = (3, 3, 3)$. In this case we also simply have

$$\lambda^{(\alpha=1)} = \lambda^{(\alpha=2)} = \lambda^{(\alpha=3)} = \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}\right),$$
(26)

because the state is invariant under permutation of the parties and the one-body marginals are all maximally mixed. Let us now try to find the maximal fidelity with $|\Psi_{GHZ}^3\rangle$ among all states that have an ordered Schmidt number vector given by $\mathbf{v} = (3, 3, 2)$, namely calculate $F_{max}(\mathbf{v} = (3, 3, 2), \Psi_{GHZ}^3)$. For this case, we have to check all pure states that have (non-ordered) Schmidt rank vectors given by $\mathbf{s}_1 = (3, 3, 2), \mathbf{s}_2 = (3, 2, 3)$ and $\mathbf{s}_3 = (2, 3, 3)$. For this specific target state we actually always get the same bound, which is

$$F_{\max}(\mathbf{v} = (3, 3, 2), \Psi_{\text{GHZ}}^3) \le \frac{2}{3}.$$
 (27)

At the same time, the symmetry of the state has also the consequence that the same bound holds for all given v such that their smallest element is a given v_N (which is equal to two in this example). Thus, with the fidelity with GHZ states we can only distinguish states with a given v_N . In particular, for a canonical GHZ state (8) with all particles of dimension *d* and we get the bound

$$F_{\max}(\nu_{\mathcal{N}}, \Psi^d_{\text{GHZ}}) \le \frac{\nu_{\mathcal{N}}}{d},\tag{28}$$

which we are going to explain in more detail later.

Correlation tensor norm

Klöckl and Huber proposed a criterion for entanglement-dimensionality vector based on the 2-norm of the correlation tensor [61], which we are going to summarize in the following. Let us consider a *N*-qu*d*it density matrix and expand it in terms of single-particle orthonormal bases:

$$\varrho = \sum_{\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N} \langle g_{\mu_1}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes g_{\mu_N}^{(N)} \rangle g_{\mu_1}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes g_{\mu_N}^{(N)},$$
(29)

and consider single-particle bases $g_{\mu_k}^{(1)}$ that are composed of the identity matrix $g_0^{(n)} = \mathbb{1}_d / \sqrt{d}$ and the (normalized) generators of the su(d) algebra { $\sigma_1^{(n)}, \ldots, \sigma_{d^2-1}^{(n)}$ }. In this generalized Bloch decomposition all relevant information about the density matrix is carried by the correlation tensor among su(d) operators for all possible subsystems. In particular, in [61] the authors considered the correlations of su(d) observables among all particles[84]:

$$T_{\mu_1,\dots,\mu_n} = \langle \sigma_{\mu_1}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{\mu_N}^{(N)} \rangle, \tag{30}$$

where note that the indices μ_n now run from 1 to $d^2 - 1$ for each particle. Partitioning the *N*-particle system in two parts $(\alpha | \bar{\alpha})$ the marginal state with respect to party α composed of particles $\{k_1, \ldots, k_{|\alpha|}\} \subset \{1, \ldots, N\}$ is then characterized by the corresponding $|\alpha|$ -body tensor:

$$T^{(\alpha)}_{\mu_1,\mu_2,\dots,\mu_{|\alpha|}} := \langle \sigma^{(k_1)}_{\mu_{k_1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma^{(k_{|\alpha|})}_{\mu_{k_{|\alpha|}}} \rangle.$$
(31)

Let us now consider its 2-norm, defined as

$$||T^{(\alpha)}||_{2} := \sqrt{\sum_{\mu_{1},\mu_{2},\dots,\mu_{|\alpha|}} \left(T^{(\alpha)}_{\mu_{1},\mu_{2},\dots,\mu_{|\alpha|}}\right)^{2}},$$
(32)

where again the indices run from 1 to $d^2 - 1$ for each particle. We then take the *K*-particle correlation tensor norm, which is defined as

$$C_{K}(\rho) := \sum_{m=K}^{N} \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \left\| T^{(\alpha)} \right\|_{2}^{2},$$
(33)

where *m* is the number of single parties included in the party α . For example, the 2-particle correlation tensor norm of a tripartite state is

$$C_{2}(\varrho) = \left\| T^{(12)} \right\|_{2}^{2} + \left\| T^{(23)} \right\|_{2}^{2} + \left\| T^{(13)} \right\|_{2}^{2} + \left\| T^{(123)} \right\|_{2}^{2}.$$
(34)

Now, since $C_K(\varrho)$ is convex, it is possible to find upper bounds that are valid for all pure states with a given Schmidt rank vector v, and then those will be immediately valid for all mixed states with entanglement dimensionality vector given by v.

To find such an upper bound, the authors of [61] used the constraint

$$\sum_{\mu_n} \langle \sigma_{\mu_n}^{(n)} \rangle^2 \ge \frac{1}{d} \left(\frac{d}{k_n} - 1 \right)^2, \tag{35}$$

which is valid for all pure states such that the ranks of the single-particle marginals have are k_n , along with the relation

$$\operatorname{tr}\left(\varrho^{2}\right) = \left(\sum_{m=0}^{N}\sum_{|\alpha|=m}\left|T^{(\alpha)}\right|^{2}\right) = 1,\tag{36}$$

where now also the case zero particles subsystems $|\alpha| = 0$ is formally included.

Thus, every pure state $|\Psi\rangle$ that is such that its single-particle ranks are (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N) , must satisfy the inequality

$$C_2\left(|\Psi\rangle\right) \leqslant d^N + N - 1 - \sum_n \frac{d}{k_n},\tag{37}$$

which is then extended by convexity to all mixed states such that their single-particle marginals have Schmidt numbers given by the k_n .

As a consequence, violating Eq. (37) indicates that at least one of the single-particle Schmidt numbers of ρ is greater than the corresponding rank in the vector $(k_1, k_2, ..., k_N)$. Different from the full entanglement-dimensionality vector, this vector only contains local ranks of single particles. The two vectors only coincide for the case N = 3, which corresponds to our examples in the main text.

Linear entropy vector

Huber et al. introduced a criterion in [13, 14] based on the convex-roof-extended linear entropy vector \mathcal{E}^{lin} with elements defined in Eq. (19) and ordered non-increasingly. Let us recall their method in the following. Let us consider a generic *N*-particle pure state, expanded in the computational basis

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\eta} c_{\eta} |\eta\rangle, \tag{38}$$

where $\eta = (i_1, ..., i_N)$ is a multi-index with *N* entries, taking values from 0 to $d_n - 1$, where d_n is the dimension of particle *n*. Let us now consider a partition $(\alpha | \bar{\alpha})$ and denote by $(\eta_{\alpha}, \eta'_{\alpha})$ the pair of multi-indices that is obtained from (η, η') by exchanging all indices corresponding to party α .

For a pure state expanded as in Eq. (38), the linear entropy relative to party α can be expressed as

$$S_{\alpha}^{\rm lin}(\Psi) = \sum_{\eta,\eta'} \left| c_{\eta} c_{\eta'} - c_{\eta_{\alpha}} c_{\eta'_{\alpha}} \right|^2, \tag{39}$$

and given any subset of pairs of multi-indices C can be lower bounded as

$$S_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{lin}}(\Psi) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{|C|}} \sum_{\eta,\eta' \in C} \left(\left| c_{\eta} c_{\eta'} \right| - \left| c_{\eta_{\alpha}} c_{\eta'_{\alpha}} \right| \right).$$

$$\tag{40}$$

Because of that, the *k*-th element of the ordered vector of linear entropies of the marginals can be lower bounded, for pure states, as

$$(S_{k}^{\downarrow})^{\mathrm{lin}}(\Psi) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{|C|}} \sum_{\eta,\eta' \in C} \left(\left| c_{\eta} c_{\eta'} \right| - \min_{\mathcal{R}_{k} \subset \{1,\dots,\mathcal{N}\}} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \left| c_{\eta_{a_{m}}} c_{\eta'_{a_{m}}} \right| \right), \tag{41}$$

where the minimization is over all subsets of bipartitions $\mathcal{R}_k = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k\} \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ with cardinality equal to k.

This relation can be generalized to mixed states through the application of $\inf(A - B) \ge \inf A - \sup B$, which then allows to minimize over all decomposition $\mathcal{D}(\rho)$. As a result one gets the following lower bound for the *k*-th component of the linear entropy vector:

$$(\mathcal{E}_{k}^{\downarrow})^{\mathrm{lin}}(\varrho) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{|C|}} \sum_{\eta,\eta'\in C} \left[\left| \langle \eta | \varrho | \eta' \rangle \right| - \min_{\mathcal{R}_{k}} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \sqrt{\langle \eta_{\alpha_{m}} | \varrho | \eta_{\alpha_{m}} \rangle \langle \eta'_{\alpha_{m}} | \varrho | \eta'_{\alpha_{m}} \rangle} \right], \tag{42}$$

which depends on a chosen subset of pair of indices *C*. Then the elements v_k in the Schmidt number vector are bounded by using the relation

$$(\mathcal{E}_{k}^{\downarrow})^{\mathrm{lin}}(\varrho) \leq \sqrt{2\left(1 - \frac{1}{\nu_{k}}\right)},\tag{43}$$

which must hold for all states such that

$$\mathcal{SN}_{k}^{\downarrow}(\varrho) \le v_{k}. \tag{44}$$

This method thus, gives some flexibility in choosing the best set of indices *C* so to optimize the detection of a given state. For example, for the GHZ state $|\Psi_{GHZ}^3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle + |222\rangle)$, that is the paradigmatic example that we consider for comparison, proper choices of *C* are $C_k = \{(000, 111), (000, 222), (111, 222)\}$, with k = 1, 2, 3.

The other exemplary states that we consider are of the form (17), namely

$$|\psi_{432}\rangle(\mathbf{c}) := c_1 |000\rangle + c_2 |111\rangle + c_3 |012\rangle + c_4 |123\rangle \tag{45}$$

mixed with white noise. For such states in our numerical calculations we consider the following choices:

$$C_{1} = \{(000, 111), (000, 123), (012, 123), (000, 012), (111, 123), (111, 012)\},\$$

$$C_{2} = \{(000, 111), (000, 123), (012, 123), (000, 012), (111, 123)\},\$$

$$C_{3} = \{(000, 111), (000, 123), (012, 123)\}.$$
(46)

The CMC for Schmidt number and its corollary

We consider the (symmetric) covariance matrix, that for a generic vector of (hermitian) operators $M = (M_1, \ldots, M_K)$ is defined as

$$[\Gamma_{\varrho}(\boldsymbol{M})]_{jk} := \frac{1}{2} \langle M_j M_k + M_k M_j \rangle_{\varrho} - \langle M_j \rangle_{\varrho} \langle M_k \rangle_{\varrho}.$$
⁽⁴⁷⁾

The covariance matrix is: (i) *positive* for all states ρ and all vectors of operators M and (ii) *concave* for mixing the quantum state, i.e., $\Gamma_{p\rho_1+(1-p)\rho_2} \ge p\Gamma_{\rho_1} + (1-p)\Gamma_{\rho_2}$.

In particular, fixed a bipartition α we consider the covariance matrix of a couple of orthonormal bases $g = (g_{\alpha}, g_{\bar{\alpha}})$. Calculated on a generic mixed state ρ , this assumes the block form

$$\operatorname{Cov}_{\varrho}(\boldsymbol{g}) := \Gamma_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{\alpha} & X_{\varrho} \\ X_{\varrho}^{T} & \gamma_{\bar{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix},$$
(48)

in which the diagonals $\gamma_{\alpha} := \operatorname{Cov}_{\varrho_{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{g}_{\alpha})$ and $\gamma_{\bar{\alpha}} := \operatorname{Cov}_{\varrho_{\bar{\alpha}}}(\boldsymbol{g}_{\bar{\alpha}})$ are the covariance matrices of each party, and the off-diagonal blocks are

$$(X_{\varrho})_{kl} = \langle g_k^{(\alpha)} \otimes g_l^{(\tilde{\alpha})} \rangle_{\varrho} - \langle g_k^{(\alpha)} \rangle_{\varrho} \langle g_l^{(\tilde{\alpha})} \rangle_{\varrho}, \tag{49}$$

namely the cross-covariances between the single-party observables vectors. It is useful to recall that this matrix can be brought in a block singular value decomposition with a suitable local orthogonal transformation $O\Gamma_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}O^T$, with $O = O_a \oplus O_b$. This corresponds to an orthonormal change of local bases $\mathbf{g} \mapsto \mathbf{g}' = O\mathbf{g}$.

Let us then consider a density matrix ρ such that its Schmidt number across bipartition labelled by α is $s(\rho) \leq r_{\alpha}$. We know [62] that every such a density matrix must satisfy

$$\Gamma_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)} \ge \sum_{k} p_k \Gamma_{\psi_k^{r_\alpha}}^{(\alpha)},\tag{50}$$

where $|\psi_k^{r_\alpha}\rangle$ are generic pure states with Schmidt rank smaller or equal to r_α across partition $(\alpha|\bar{\alpha})$ that provide the boundary covariance matrices. This has been proven in [62] by using essentially concavity of the covariance matrix, and at the same time a general form of the boundary covariance matrices for the pure Schmidt-rank-*r* states has been provided.

Corollaries of Eq. (50) were also studied in [62], and especially one can write the following relation in terms of the trace norm of the blocks:

$$f_{\alpha}(\varrho) := \operatorname{tr}|X_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}| - \sqrt{[1 - \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\alpha}^{2})][1 - \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\bar{\alpha}}^{2})]} + 1 \le r_{\alpha},$$
(51)

which is a relation that must hold for all states that have a Schmidt number of at most r_{α} across the bipartition ($\alpha | \bar{\alpha} \rangle$). Here, ρ_{α} is the reduced density matrix relative to party α and $\rho_{\bar{\alpha}}$ is the reduced density matrix of its complement. Below we repeat the idea of the proof as an illustration for the subsequent proof of our criterion in the multipartite scenario.

Consider the matrix $\Delta := \Gamma_{\varrho} - \sum_{k} p_{k} \Gamma_{r}^{(k)}$, which due to Eq. (50) must be positive for all Schmidt-number-*r* states. Positivity of a block matrix implies the inequality (see e.g., [85])

$$\operatorname{tr}|\Delta_{\alpha}| \cdot \operatorname{tr}|\Delta_{\bar{\alpha}}| \ge \operatorname{tr}|(\Delta_{X}^{T}\Delta_{X})^{1/2}|^{2}, \tag{52}$$

where we have labelled the blocks $\Delta_{\alpha,\bar{\alpha},X}$ in analogy with a generic covariance matrix. The above inequality is equivalent to the following family of inequalities

$$\operatorname{tr}(\Delta_{\alpha}) + 4t^{2}\operatorname{tr}(\Delta_{\bar{\alpha}}) \ge 4|t|\operatorname{tr}|\Delta_{X}| \ge 4|t|(\operatorname{tr}|X_{\varrho}| - \operatorname{tr}|X_{\psi_{r}}|),$$
(53)

where t is a real parameter. Here, in the last inequality we substituted the expression $\Delta_X = X_{\varrho} - X_{\psi_r}$ and used the triangle inequality.

Since Δ_{α} and $\Delta_{\bar{\alpha}}$ are positive (being principal minors of Δ) we have

$$\operatorname{tr}(\Delta_{\alpha}) = \operatorname{tr}(\gamma_{\alpha}) - \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_{\alpha}) = 1 - \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\alpha}^{2}) - E_{L}(\psi_{r})$$
(54)

and analogously for tr($\Delta_{\bar{\alpha}}$) where where $E_L(\psi) = 1 - \sum_k (\lambda_{\psi})_k^2$ is the linear entanglement entropy of a pure bipartite state with squared Schmidt coefficients given by $(\lambda_{\psi})_k$. To derive Eq. (54) we used that

$$\operatorname{tr}(\gamma_{\rho}) = d - \operatorname{tr}(\rho^2) \tag{55}$$

holds for a generic single qudit covariance matrix and we consider the generic (optimal) pure Schmidt rank-r state $|\psi_r\rangle$.

The rest of the proof consists basically in exploiting the bound

$$\operatorname{tr}|X_{\psi_r}| \le r - 1 + E_L(|\psi_r\rangle),\tag{56}$$

which was proven in [62]. Substituting all the relations above into Eq. (53) we obtain

$$1 - \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\alpha}^{2}) - E_{L}(|\psi_{r}\rangle) + 4t^{2}(1 - \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\bar{\alpha}}^{2}) - E_{L}(|\psi_{r}\rangle)) \ge 4|t|(\operatorname{tr}|X_{\varrho}| - r + 1 - E_{L}(|\psi_{r}\rangle)),$$
(57)

which can be rearranged to

$$(1 - 4|t| + 4t^2) \ge (1 - 4|t| + 4t^2)(1 - E_L(|\psi_r\rangle)) \ge \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_\alpha^2) + 4t^2\operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\bar{\alpha}}^2) + 4|t|(\operatorname{tr}|X_{\varrho}| - r).$$
(58)

Thus, we have that

$$(1 - 4|t| + 4t^2) - \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\alpha}^2) - 4t^2 \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\bar{\alpha}}^2) - 4|t|(\operatorname{tr}|X_{\varrho}| - r) \ge 0$$
(59)

holds for all values of t. Minimizing the left-hand side over t we get that the minimum is achieved for $2|t| = (tr|X_{\varrho}| - r + 1)/(1 - tr(\varrho_{\alpha}^2))$ and results in Eq. (51).

Afterwards, we observe that given the inequality (51) one can find weaker conditions. For example, by using the inequality between arithmetic and geometric mean, we can find the bound

$$f_{\alpha}(\varrho) \ge \operatorname{tr}|X_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}| + \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\alpha}^{2}) + \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\bar{\alpha}}^{2})}{2} \ge \operatorname{tr}(X_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}) + \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\alpha}^{2}) + \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\bar{\alpha}}^{2})}{2}, \tag{60}$$

which would lead to the criterion:

$$\operatorname{tr}(X_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}) + \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\alpha}^{2}) + \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\tilde{\alpha}}^{2})}{2} \le r_{\alpha}.$$
(61)

Note that this criterion can be also directly obtained from Eq. (59) for t = 1/2. Interestingly, an even weaker criterion is related to the fidelity with respect to states that are maximally entangled across the partition α and reads

$$\sum_{K=1}^{d_{\alpha}^{2}} \langle g_{K}^{(\alpha)} \otimes g_{K}^{(\tilde{\alpha})} \rangle_{\varrho} \le r_{\alpha},$$
(62)

where d_{α} is a shorthand notation for min $\{d_{\alpha}, d_{\bar{\alpha}}\}$, i.e., the smaller of the two dimensions between the parties and $\{g_{\mu}^{(\alpha)}\}, \{g_{\mu}^{(\bar{\alpha})}\}$ are basis of observables for the two parties. To prove Eq. (62) we simply observe that

$$\operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\alpha}^{2}) + \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\bar{\alpha}}^{2}) + 2\operatorname{tr}|X_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}| \geq \sum_{K=1}^{d_{\alpha}^{2}} \left(\langle g_{K}^{(\alpha)} \rangle^{2} + \langle g_{K}^{(\bar{\alpha})} \rangle^{2} - 2\langle g_{K}^{(\alpha)} \rangle \langle g_{K}^{(\bar{\alpha})} \rangle + 2\langle g_{K}^{(\alpha)} \otimes g_{K}^{(\bar{\alpha})} \rangle \right)$$

$$= \sum_{K=1}^{d_{\alpha}^{2}} \left[\left(\langle g_{K}^{(\alpha)} \rangle - \langle g_{K}^{(\bar{\alpha})} \rangle \right)^{2} + 2\langle g_{K}^{(\alpha)} \otimes g_{K}^{(\bar{\alpha})} \rangle \right] \geq 2 \sum_{K} \langle g_{K}^{(\alpha)} \otimes g_{K}^{(\bar{\alpha})} \rangle, \tag{63}$$

where $\{g_K^{(\alpha)}\}\$ and $\{g_K^{(\bar{\alpha})}\}\$ are optimally chosen as the bases that bring $X_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}$ in its singular-value decomposition. Note also that we can derive a bound similar to the above by considering any other two bases $\{\tilde{g}_K^{(\alpha)}\}\$ and $\{\tilde{g}_K^{(\bar{\alpha})}\}\$ and also by discarding some of the indices *K*. This is because each of the terms inside the sum in Eq. (63) come from the singular value decomposition of $X_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}$ and are positive.

When there is only one bipartition, i.e., in the bipartite case, the criterion in Eq. (62) is related to the fidelity with respect to a (optimal) maximally entangled state

$$\left|\Psi^{d}\right\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{K} g_{K} \otimes g_{K},\tag{64}$$

that is constructed from the optimally chosen bases $\{g_K^{(\alpha)}\}$ and $\{g_K^{(\bar{\alpha})}\}$ [62].

Proof of Eq. (11)

Let us consider a mixed state ρ such that $SN^{\downarrow}(\rho) = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N)$. From the assumption on the entanglement dimensionality vector we know that we can find a decomposition of the form

$$\varrho = \sum_{k} p_k \varrho_{s_k},\tag{65}$$

where p_k are probabilities and ρ_{s_k} are states with a given (unordered) Schmidt number vector s_k that is such that $(s_k^{\downarrow})_j \leq v_j$ when the components of s_k are ordered non-increasingly. Thus, simply from concavity of the covariance matrix, we can derive the matrix inequality analogous to Eq. (50) for the covariance matrix of ρ relative to the partition α , which we write as

$$\Gamma_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)} \ge \sum_{k} p_k \Gamma_{s_k}^{(\alpha)} := \Gamma_{\nu}^{(\alpha)},\tag{66}$$

where the bound on the right-hand side contains a mixture of covariance matrices of pure states with different Schmidt numbers $s_{k,\alpha}$.

For these pure state boundary covariance matrices, we can use the relation

$$\operatorname{tr}|X_{\psi}| \le s - 1 + E_L(\psi),\tag{67}$$

and summing up all the terms in the decomposition in Eq. (65) we get that

$$\operatorname{tr}|X_{\nu}^{(\alpha)}| \leq \sum_{k} p_{k} \left(s_{k,\alpha} - 1 + E_{L}(\psi_{k,\alpha}) \right), \tag{68}$$

where $X_{\nu}^{(\alpha)}$ denotes the off-diagonal block of the boundary covariance matrix $\Gamma_{\nu}^{(\alpha)}$.

$$\kappa_{\nu}^{(\alpha)} = \sum_{k} p_{k} \kappa_{s_{k}}^{(\alpha)},$$

$$\kappa_{\nu}^{(\bar{\alpha})} = \sum_{k} p_{k} \kappa_{s_{k}}^{(\bar{\alpha})},$$
(69)

where $\kappa_{s_k}^{(\alpha)}$ and $\kappa_{s_k}^{(\bar{\alpha})}$ are covariance matrices of pure states with Schmidt number vector given by s_k . Thus, we can again bound their traces by using the relation

$$\operatorname{tr}(\kappa_{s_k}^{(\alpha)}) = d_{\alpha} - 1 + E_L(\psi_{k,\alpha}),$$

$$\operatorname{tr}(\kappa_{s_k}^{(\bar{\alpha})}) = d_{\bar{\alpha}} - 1 + E_L(\psi_{k,\alpha}),$$
(70)

where $E_L(\psi_{k,\alpha})$ is the linear entanglement entropy of the pure boundary state $|\psi_{k,\alpha}\rangle$, that has Schmidt number vector s_k .

Thus, the trace norms of the diagonal blocks of $\Gamma_{v}^{(\alpha)}$ (which are positive) are given by

$$\operatorname{tr}|\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(\alpha)}| = \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(\alpha)}) = \sum_{k} p_{k} \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\boldsymbol{s}_{k}}^{(\alpha)}) = \sum_{k} p_{k} d_{\alpha} - 1 + \sum_{k} p_{k} E_{L}(\psi_{k,\alpha}),$$

$$\operatorname{tr}|\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(\bar{\alpha})}| = \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(\bar{\alpha})}) = \sum_{k} p_{k} \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\boldsymbol{s}_{k}}^{(\bar{\alpha})}) = \sum_{k} p_{k} d_{\bar{\alpha}} - 1 + \sum_{k} p_{k} E_{L}(\psi_{k,\alpha}).$$

$$(71)$$

Using these bounds and following the steps of the proof of Eq. (51) we get to the bound

$$\operatorname{tr}|X_{\varrho}^{(\alpha)}| - \sqrt{\left(1 - \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\alpha}^{2})\right)\left(1 - \operatorname{tr}(\varrho_{\bar{\alpha}}^{2})\right)} \le R_{\alpha} - 1, \tag{72}$$

where $R_{\alpha} = \sum_{k} p_k s_{k,\alpha}$. Considering all the inequalities of this form for all α we also get the constraints on the full vector *R* to be $\mathbf{R} < \mathbf{v}$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{l=1}^{K} R_l^{\downarrow} \le \sum_{l=1}^{K} \sum_k p_k s_{k,l}^{\downarrow} \le \sum_{l=1}^{K} v_l.$$

$$\tag{73}$$

This is due to the fact that the vector $\mathbf{R}^{\downarrow} = \sum_{k} p_k s_k^{\downarrow} = M\mathbf{R}$ where *M* is a doubly stochastic matrix and the elements of the vector $\mathbf{s}_k^{\downarrow}$ are upper bounded by the elements of \mathbf{v} .

Proof of Eq. (15)

Here we derive a condition analogous to Eq. (62) for the multipartite case. This case is more complex because the various bipartitions have different bases with different dimensions. In such a case, one way to relate the expression in Eq. (62) to fidelities is as follows. Let us consider the bases of the parties α and $\bar{\alpha}$ constructed from the single-particle bases:

$$\{g_K^{(\alpha)}\} = \{g_\mu^{(n)} \otimes g_\nu^{(m)} \otimes \dots\}_{n,m \cdots \in \alpha},\tag{74}$$

and similarly for $\{g_K^{(\tilde{\alpha})}\}$. Let us also consider only the indices $K = (\mu, \mu, \mu, \dots)$ with $1 \le \mu \le d$ and $d = \min_n d_n$ being the minimal dimension among the particles.

Let us now consider the criterion in Eq. (62), now for pure states that have Schmidt rank at most r_{α} across partition α . By considering the above bases with the restricted set of indices, Eq. (62) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{K=1}^{d^2} \langle g_K^{(\alpha)} \otimes g_K^{(\tilde{\alpha})} \rangle_{\varrho} = \sum_{\mu=1}^{d^2} \langle g_\mu^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes g_\mu^{(N)} \rangle \le r_{\alpha},$$
(75)

and in this way the left-hand side is the same for all partitions. This is important because in this way we get a condition that can be minimized over all α and leads to

$$\sum_{K=1}^{d^2} \langle g_{\mu}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes g_{\mu}^{(N)} \rangle \le \min_{\alpha} r_{\alpha} := v_{\mathcal{N}},$$
(76)

which is thus a criterion that must be valid for all pure states such that their minimal entanglement dimensionality is smaller than or equal to v_N . The other advantage now is that the left-hand side is linear under mixing the quantum state. Thus the same criterion remains valid for all density matrices of the form

$$\varrho = \sum_{k} p_k \varrho_{s_k},\tag{77}$$

where the ρ_{s_k} are pure states such that their minimal entanglement dimensionality across all partitions is upper bounded by v_N .

Afterwards, we can also observe that such a criterion relates to fidelities with 1-uniform states. To observe this let us consider the following state:

$$\left|\Psi_{1-\text{uni}}^{d}\right\rangle\!\left|\Psi_{1-\text{uni}}^{d}\right| = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\mu=1}^{d^{2}} g_{\mu}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes g_{\mu}^{(N)}.$$
(78)

It is easy to see that the fidelity between a density matrix ρ and $|\Psi_{1-uni}^d\rangle$ is given by

Now, let us also derive the bound on such a fidelity for states with a given entanglement-dimensionality vector \mathbf{v} . As we explained earlier, we have to maximize the overlap between $|\Psi_{1-\text{uni}}^d\rangle$ and any pure state $|\Phi_r\rangle$ with ordered Schmidt rank vector given by \mathbf{v} and this is obtained by considering the Schmidt decompositions of $|\Psi_{1-\text{uni}}^d\rangle$ for all bipartitions.

We consider here for simplicity the case in which the state is invariant under permutation of the particles. This is obtained when the matrices $g_{\mu}^{(n)}$ are equal for all the parties. Thus, to understand its Schmidt rank across different bipartitions what matters is just the number of particles in each given party. For example, let us consider the bipartition $\alpha = (1|2...N)$. The vector of squared Schmidt coefficients of $|\Psi_{1-\text{uni}}^d\rangle$ across this bipartition is given by:

$$\lambda^{(\alpha=1)}(\Psi^{d}_{1-\text{uni}}) = \left(\frac{1}{d}, \dots, \frac{1}{d}, 0, \dots, 0\right),\tag{80}$$

where the number of coefficients equal to 1/d is d. The same vector of squared Schmidt coefficients we would get for every partition that is of the form (1|N-1), i.e., one particle is on party a and N-1 particles are on party b. Actually the same vector of squared Schmidt coefficients arises for every bipartition, i.e., there are always just d nonzero values of $\lambda_k^{(\alpha)}$, which are all equal to 1/d. Thus, the Schmidt number vector of such a state is given by

$$\mathbf{v}(\Psi_{1-\mathrm{uni}}^d) = (d, \dots, d). \tag{81}$$

Now, let us look for the maximal fidelity of such a state with any pure *N*-qu*d* it state that is such that its Schmidt rank across the bipartition labelled by α (e.g., $\alpha = (1|2...N)$) is equal to r_{α} . Again, this is given by

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r_{\alpha}} \lambda_k^{(\alpha)} = \frac{r_{\alpha}}{d},\tag{82}$$

and the same expression is obtained for all partitions. Thus, we have that the maximal overlap between $|\Psi_{1-\text{uni}}^d\rangle$ and any pure state $|\Phi_r\rangle$ with Schmidt rank vector given by $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_N)$ is given by

$$\left|\left\langle \Phi_{\mathbf{r}} \middle| \Psi_{1-\mathrm{uni}}^{d} \right\rangle\right|^{2} \leq \min_{\alpha} \sum_{k=1}^{r_{\alpha}} \lambda_{k}^{(\alpha)} = \min_{\alpha} \frac{r_{\alpha}}{d},\tag{83}$$

which then leads to the fidelity bound:

$$\operatorname{tr}\left(\varrho \left| \Psi_{1-\operatorname{uni}}^{d} \right\rangle \Psi_{1-\operatorname{uni}}^{d} \right| \right) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\mu=1}^{d^{2}} \langle g_{\mu}^{\otimes N} \rangle_{\varrho} \le \min_{\alpha} \frac{r_{\alpha}}{d}.$$
(84)

Here in the equality we used the expression in Eq. (79). We have thus observed that Eq. (76) is equivalent to a fidelity bound with respect to a 1-uniform state, of which the GHZ state is an example. Note also that, for a given ρ one can consider many possible bases $g_{\mu}^{(n)}$ and thus many possible corresponding fidelities to target 1-uniform states. The optimal case is given by a basis of this type that is also such that the matrix $X_{\rho}^{(\alpha)}$ with $\alpha = (n|1...n - 1n + 1...N)$ is in its singular value decomposition. Hence, this can be obtained by performing a singular value decomposition of the different $X_{\rho}^{(n)}$ for all the bipartitions of the form (n|1...n - 1n + 1...N).