

# Freudenthal triple classification of three-qubit entanglement

L. Borsten\*, D. Dahanayake†, M. J. Duff‡, W. Rubens§,

*The Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London,  
Prince Consort Road, London SW7 2BZ, U.K.*

and H. Ebrahim¶.

*Theory Group, Martin Fisher School of Physics, Brandeis University,  
MS057, 415 South St., Waltham, MA 02454, U.S.A.*

April 29, 2022

## Abstract

We show that the three-qubit entanglement classes: (0) Null, (1) Separable  $A-B-C$ , (2a) Biseparable  $A-BC$ , (2b) Biseparable  $B-CA$ , (2c) Biseparable  $C-AB$ , (3)  $W$  and (4)  $GHZ$  correspond respectively to ranks 0, 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3 and 4 of a Freudenthal triple system defined over the Jordan algebra  $\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ . We also compute the corresponding SLOCC orbits.

---

\*leron.borsten@imperial.ac.uk

†duminda.dahanayake@imperial.ac.uk

‡m.duff@imperial.ac.uk

§william.rubens06@imperial.ac.uk

¶hebrahim@brandeis.edu

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Conventional three-qubit entanglement classification</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Jordan algebras and the Freudenthal triple system</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Jordan algebras . . . . .	6
3.2	The Freudenthal triple system . . . . .	8
<b>4</b>	<b>The FTS classification of qubit entanglement</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1	FTS representation of three-qubits . . . . .	9
4.2	The FTS rank entanglement classes . . . . .	10
4.2.1	Rank 0 and the class of the null state . . . . .	10
4.2.2	Rank 1 and the class of separable states . . . . .	11
4.2.3	Rank 2 and the class of biseparable states . . . . .	11
4.2.4	Rank 3 and the class of W-states . . . . .	12
4.2.5	Rank 4 and the class of GHZ-states . . . . .	12
4.3	SLOCC orbits . . . . .	12
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>The real case <math>\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}</math></b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>15</b>

# 1 Introduction

Quantum entanglement lies at the heart of quantum information theory, with applications to quantum computing, teleportation, cryptography and communication [1]. The case of three qubits (Alice, Bob, Charlie) is particularly interesting [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10] since it provides the simplest example of inequivalently entangled states. It is by now well understood that there are seven entanglement classes: (0) Null, (1) Separable  $A$ - $B$ - $C$ , (2a) Biseparable  $A$ - $BC$ , (2b) Biseparable  $B$ - $CA$ , (2c) Biseparable  $C$ - $AB$ , (3)  $W$  and (4) GHZ. We summarise this conventional classification of three-qubit entanglement in section 2.

The purpose of the present paper is to give a novel version of this classification by invoking that elegant branch of mathematics involving Jordan algebras and Freudenthal triple systems (FTS), which we briefly review in section 3. In particular we note that an FTS is characterised by its rank: 0 to 4.

By making the following direct correspondence between a three-qubit state vector  $|\psi\rangle$  and a Freudenthal triple system  $\Psi$  over the Jordan algebra  $\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ :

$$|\psi\rangle = a_{ABC}|ABC\rangle \leftrightarrow \Psi = \begin{pmatrix} a_{111} & (a_{001}, a_{010}, a_{100}) \\ (a_{110}, a_{101}, a_{011}) & a_{000} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.1)$$

we show in section 4 that the structure of the FTS naturally captures the Stochastic Local Operations and Classical Communication (SLOCC) classification described in section 2. The entanglement classes correspond to FTS ranks 0, 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3 and 4, respectively.

This also facilitates a computation of the SLOCC orbits.

## 2 Conventional three-qubit entanglement classification

The concept of entanglement is the single most important feature distinguishing classical information theory from quantum information theory. We may naturally describe and harness entanglement by the protocol of Local Operations and Classical Communication (LOCC). LOCC describes a multi-step process for transforming any input state to a different output state while obeying certain rules. Given any multipartite state, we may split it up into its relevant parts and send each of them to different labs around the world. We allow the respective scientists to perform any experiment they see fit; they may then communicate these results to each other classically (using email or phone or carrier pigeon). Furthermore, for the most general LOCC, we allow them to do this as many times as they like. Any classical correlation may be experimentally established using LOCC. Conversely, all correlations not achievable via LOCC are attributed to genuine quantum correlations.

Since LOCC cannot create entanglement, any two states which may be interrelated using LOCC ought to be physically equivalent with respect to their entanglement properties. Two states of a composite system are LOCC equivalent if and only if they may be transformed into one another using the group of *local unitaries* (LU), unitary transformations which factorise into separate transformations on the component parts [11]. In the case of  $n$  qudits, the LU group (up to a phase) is given by  $[SU(d)]^n$ . For unnormalised three-qubit states, the number of parameters [2] needed to describe inequivalent states or, what amounts to the same thing, the number of algebraically independent invariants [7] is thus given by the dimension of the space of orbits

$$\frac{\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2}{U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(2) \times SU(2)}, \quad (2.1)$$

namely  $16 - 10 = 6$ . These six invariants are given by:

**1** The norm squared:

$$|\psi|^2 = \langle \psi | \psi \rangle. \quad (2.2)$$

**2A, 2B, 2C** The local entropies:

$$\begin{aligned} S_A &= 4 \det \rho_A, \\ S_B &= 4 \det \rho_B, \\ S_C &= 4 \det \rho_C, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\rho_A, \rho_B, \rho_C$  are the doubly reduced density matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_A &= \text{Tr}_{BC}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, \\ \rho_B &= \text{Tr}_{CA}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, \\ \rho_C &= \text{Tr}_{AB}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|.\end{aligned}\tag{2.4}$$

**3** The Kempe invariant [3, 7, 12, 13]:

$$\begin{aligned}K &= \text{tr}(\rho_A \otimes \rho_B \rho_{AB}) - \text{tr}(\rho_A^3) - \text{tr}(\rho_B^3) \\ &= \text{tr}(\rho_B \otimes \rho_C \rho_{BC}) - \text{tr}(\rho_B^3) - \text{tr}(\rho_C^3) \\ &= \text{tr}(\rho_C \otimes \rho_A \rho_{CA}) - \text{tr}(\rho_C^3) - \text{tr}(\rho_A^3),\end{aligned}\tag{2.5}$$

where  $\rho_{AB}, \rho_{BC}, \rho_{CA}$  are the singly reduced density matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{AB} &= \text{Tr}_C|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, \\ \rho_{BC} &= \text{Tr}_A|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, \\ \rho_{CA} &= \text{Tr}_B|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|.\end{aligned}\tag{2.6}$$

**4** The 3-tangle [14]  $\tau_{ABC} = 4|\text{Det } a|$ , where  $\text{Det } a$  is Cayley's hyperdeterminant [15, 16]:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Det } a &:= -\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2} \varepsilon^{B_1 B_2} \varepsilon^{A_3 A_4} \varepsilon^{B_3 B_4} \varepsilon^{C_1 C_4} \varepsilon^{C_2 C_3} \\ &\quad \times a_{A_1 B_1 C_1} a_{A_2 B_2 C_2} a_{A_3 B_3 C_3} a_{A_4 B_4 C_4}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.7}$$

The LU orbits partition the Hilbert space into equivalence classes. However, for single copies of pure states this classification is both mathematically and physically too restrictive. Under LU two states of even the simplest bipartite systems will not, in general, be related [4]. Continuous parameters are required to describe the space of entanglement classes [2, 6, 7, 8]. In this sense the LU classification is too severe [4], obscuring some of the more qualitative features of entanglement. An alternative, coarser classification scheme was proposed in [11, 4]. Rather than declare equivalence when states are deterministically related to each other by LOCC, we require only that they may be transformed into one another with some non-zero probability of success.


This coarse graining goes by the name of Stochastic LOCC or SLOCC for short. Stochastic LOCC includes, in addition to LOCC, those quantum operations that are not trace-preserving on the density matrix, so that we no longer require that the protocol always succeeds with certainty. It is proved in [4] that for  $n$  qudits, the SLOCC equivalence group is (up to an overall complex factor)  $[SL(d, \mathbb{C})]^n$ . Essentially, we may identify two states if there is a non-zero probability that one can be converted into the other and vice-versa, which means we get  $[SL(d, \mathbb{C})]^n$  orbits rather than the  $[SU(d)]^n$  kind of LOCC. This generalisation may be physically motivated by the fact that any set of SLOCC equivalent states may be used to perform the same non-classical operations, only with varying likelihoods of success. Further, under the coarser SLOCC classification, Dür et al. [4] used simple arguments concerning the conservation of ranks of reduced density matrices to show that there are only six three-qubit equivalence classes (or seven if we count the null state); only two of which show *genuine* tripartite entanglement. They are:

**Null:** The trivial zero entanglement orbit corresponding to vanishing states,


$$\text{Null} : \quad 0.\tag{2.8}$$

**Separable:** Another zero entanglement orbit for completely factorisable product states,

$$A\text{-}B\text{-}C : \quad |000\rangle.\tag{2.9}$$



(a) Onion structure



(b) Hierarchy

Figure 1: (a) Onion-like classification of SLOCC orbits. (b) Stratification. The arrows are non-invertible SLOCC transformations between classes that generate the entanglement hierarchy. The partial order defined by the arrows is transitive, so we may omit e.g.  $\text{GHZ} \rightarrow \text{A-B-C}$  and  $\text{A-BC} \rightarrow \text{Null}$  arrows for clarity.

Table 1: The values of the local entropies  $S_A, S_B,$  and  $S_C$  and the hyperdeterminant  $\text{Det } a$  are used to partition three-qubit states into entanglement classes.

Class	Representative	Condition				
		$\psi$	$S_A$	$S_B$	$S_C$	$\text{Det } a$
Null	0	= 0	= 0	= 0	= 0	= 0
$A-B-C$	$ 000\rangle$	$\neq 0$	= 0	= 0	= 0	= 0
$A-BC$	$ 010\rangle +  001\rangle$	$\neq 0$	= 0	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	= 0
$B-CA$	$ 100\rangle +  001\rangle$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	= 0	$\neq 0$	= 0
$C-AB$	$ 010\rangle +  100\rangle$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	= 0	= 0
W	$ 100\rangle +  010\rangle +  001\rangle$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	= 0
GHZ	$ 000\rangle +  111\rangle$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$

**Biseparable:** Three classes of bipartite entanglement

$$\begin{aligned} A-BC &: |010\rangle + |001\rangle, \\ B-CA &: |100\rangle + |001\rangle, \\ C-AB &: |010\rangle + |100\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

**W:** Three-way entangled states that do not violate Bell's inequalities. These are robust in the sense that tracing out a subsystem results in a maximally bipartite entangled state,

$$W : |100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle. \tag{2.11}$$

**GHZ:** Genuinely tripartite entangled Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger [17] states. These maximally violate Bell's inequalities but, in contrast to class W, are fragile under the tracing out of a subsystem since the resultant state is completely unentangled,

$$\text{GHZ} : |000\rangle + |111\rangle. \tag{2.12}$$

These classes and the above representative states from each class are summarised in Table 1. They are characterised [4] by the vanishing or not of the invariants listed in the table. Note that the Kempe invariant is redundant in this SLOCC classification. A visual representation of these SLOCC orbits is provided by the onion-like classification [16] of Figure 1a.

These SLOCC equivalence classes are then stratified by *non-invertible* SLOCC operations into an entanglement hierarchy [4] as depicted in Figure 1b. Note that no SLOCC operations (invertible or not) relate the GHZ and W classes; they are genuinely distinct classes of tripartite entanglement. However, from either the GHZ class or W class one may use non-invertible SLOCC transformations to descend to one of the biseparable or separable classes and hence we have a hierarchical entanglement structure.

## 3 Jordan algebras and the Freudenthal triple system

### 3.1 Jordan algebras

Typically an FTS is defined by an underlying *Jordan algebra*. A Jordan algebra  $\mathfrak{J}$  is vector space defined over a ground field  $\mathbb{F}$  equipped with a bilinear product satisfying,

$$x \circ y = y \circ x, \quad x^2 \circ (x \circ y) = x \circ (x^2 \circ y), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathfrak{J}. \tag{3.1}$$

For our purposes the relevant Jordan algebra is an example of the class of *cubic* Jordan algebras. A cubic Jordan algebra comes equipped with a cubic form  $N : \mathfrak{J} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ , satisfying  $N(\lambda x) = \lambda^3 N(x)$ ,  $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{F}, x \in \mathfrak{J}$ . Additionally, there is an element  $c \in \mathfrak{J}$  satisfying  $N(c) = 1$ , referred to as a *base point*. There is a very general prescription for constructing cubic Jordan algebras, due to Springer [18, 19, 20], for which all the properties of the Jordan algebra are essentially determined by the cubic form. We sketch this construction here, following closely the conventions of [21].

Let  $V$  be a vector space, defined over a ground field  $\mathbb{F}$ , equipped with both a cubic norm,  $N : V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ , satisfying  $N(\lambda x) = \lambda^3 N(x)$ ,  $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{F}, x \in V$ , and a base point  $c \in V$  such that  $N(c) = 1$ . If  $N(x, y, z)$ , referred to as the full *linearisation* of  $N$ , defined by

$$N(x, y, z) := \frac{1}{6}(N(x + y + z) - N(x + y) - N(x + z) - N(y + z) + N(x) + N(y) + N(z)) \tag{3.2}$$

is trilinear then one may define the following four maps,

1. The trace,

$$\text{Tr} : V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}, \quad \text{Tr}(x) = 3N(c, c, x), \tag{3.3a}$$

2. A quadratic map,

$$S : V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}, \quad S(x) = 3N(x, x, c), \quad (3.3b)$$

3. A bilinear map,

$$S : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}, \quad S(x, y) = 6N(x, y, c), \quad (3.3c)$$

4. A trace bilinear form,

$$\text{Tr} : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}, \quad \text{Tr}(x, y) = \text{Tr}(x) \text{Tr}(y) - S(x, y). \quad (3.3d)$$

A cubic Jordan algebra  $\mathfrak{J}$ , with multiplicative identity  $\mathbf{1} = c$ , may be derived from any such vector space if  $N$  is *Jordan cubic*, that is:

1. The trace bilinear form (3.3d) is non-degenerate.

2. The quadratic adjoint map,  $\sharp : \mathfrak{J} \rightarrow \mathfrak{J}$ , uniquely defined by  $\text{Tr}(x^\sharp, y) = 3N(x, x, y)$ , satisfies

$$(x^\sharp)^\sharp = N(x)x, \quad \forall x \in \mathfrak{J}. \quad (3.4)$$

The Jordan product is then defined using,

$$x \circ y = \frac{1}{2}(x \times y + \text{Tr}(x)y + \text{Tr}(y)x - S(x, y)\mathbf{1}), \quad (3.5)$$

where,  $x \times y$  is the linearisation of the quadratic adjoint,

$$x \times y = (x + y)^\sharp - x^\sharp - y^\sharp. \quad (3.6)$$

Important examples include the sets of  $3 \times 3$  Hermitian matrices, which we denote as  $J_3^\mathbb{A}$ , defined over the four division algebras  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{H}$  or  $\mathbb{O}$  (or their split signature cousins) with Jordan product  $x \circ y = \frac{1}{2}(xy + yx)$ , where  $xy$  is just the conventional matrix product. See [22] for a comprehensive account. In addition there is the infinite sequence of *spin factors*  $\mathbb{F} \oplus Q_n$ , where  $Q_n$  is an  $n$ -dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{F}$  [23, 22, 21, 19, 24]. The relevant example with respect to three qubits, which we denote as  $\mathfrak{J}_\mathbb{C}$ , is simply the threefold direct sum of  $\mathbb{C}$ , i.e.  $\mathfrak{J}_\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ , the details of which are given in section 4.1.

There are three groups of particular importance related to cubic Jordan algebras. The set of automorphisms,  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{J})$ , is composed of all linear transformations on  $\mathfrak{J}$  that preserve the Jordan product,

$$x \circ y = z \quad \Rightarrow \quad g(x) \circ g(y) = g(z), \quad \forall g \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{J}). \quad (3.7)$$

The Lie algebra of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{J})$  is given by the set of derivations,  $\text{Der}(\mathfrak{J})$ , that is, all linear maps  $D : \mathfrak{J} \rightarrow \mathfrak{J}$  satisfying the Leibniz rule,

$$D(x \circ y) = D(x) \circ y + x \circ D(y). \quad (3.8)$$

For any Jordan algebra all derivations may be written in the form  $\sum_i [L_{x_i}, L_{y_i}]$ , where  $L_x(y) = x \circ y$  is the left multiplication map [25].

The *structure* group,  $\text{Str}(\mathfrak{J})$ , is composed of all linear bijections on  $\mathfrak{J}$  that leave the cubic norm  $N$  invariant up to a fixed scalar factor,

$$N(g(x)) = \lambda N(x), \quad \forall g \in \text{Str}(\mathfrak{J}). \quad (3.9)$$

Finally, the *reduced structure* group  $\text{Str}_0(\mathfrak{J})$  leaves the cubic norm invariant and therefore consists of those elements in  $\text{Str}(\mathfrak{J})$  for which  $\lambda = 1$  [25, 22, 26].

Table 2: The Lie group and the dimension of its representation given by the Freudenthal construction defined over the cubic Jordan algebra  $\mathfrak{J}$ . The case  $\mathfrak{J} = \mathbb{F} \oplus \mathbb{F} \oplus \mathbb{F}$  with  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$  will be the FTS used to represent three qubits.

Jordan algebra $\mathfrak{J}$	$\dim \mathfrak{J}$	$\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}))$	$\dim \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J})$
$\mathbb{F}$	1	$SL(2)$	4
$\mathbb{F} \oplus \mathbb{F}$	2	$SL(2) \times SL(2)$	6
$\mathbb{F} \oplus \mathbb{F} \oplus \mathbb{F}$	3	$SL(2) \times SL(2) \times SL(2)$	8
$J_3^{\mathbb{R}}$	6	$C_3$	14
$J_3^{\mathbb{C}}$	9	$A_5$	20
$J_3^{\mathbb{H}}$	15	$D_6$	32
$J_3^{\mathbb{O}}$	27	$E_7$	56
$\mathbb{F} \oplus Q_n$	$n + 1$	$SL(2) \times SO(n + 2)$	$2n + 4$

### 3.2 The Freudenthal triple system

In general, given a cubic Jordan algebra  $\mathfrak{J}$  defined over a field  $\mathbb{F}$ , one is able to construct an FTS by defining the vector space  $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J})$ ,

$$\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}) = \mathbb{F} \oplus \mathbb{F} \oplus \mathfrak{J} \oplus \mathfrak{J}. \quad (3.10)$$

An arbitrary element  $x \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J})$  may be written as a “ $2 \times 2$  matrix”,

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & A \\ B & \beta \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{where } \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F} \quad \text{and} \quad A, B \in \mathfrak{J}. \quad (3.11)$$

The FTS comes equipped with a non-degenerate bilinear antisymmetric quadratic form, a quartic form and a trilinear triple product [27, 26, 28, 29, 21]:

1. Quadratic form  $\{x, y\}: \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}) \times \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$

$$\begin{aligned} \{x, y\} &= \alpha\delta - \beta\gamma + \text{Tr}(A, D) - \text{Tr}(B, C), \\ \text{where } \quad x &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & A \\ B & \beta \end{pmatrix}, \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & C \\ D & \delta \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12a)$$

2. Quartic form  $q: \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$

$$q(x) = -2[\alpha\beta - \text{Tr}(A, B)]^2 - 8[\alpha N(A) + \beta N(B) - \text{Tr}(A^\sharp, B^\sharp)]. \quad (3.12b)$$

3. Triple product  $T: \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}) \times \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}) \times \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J})$  which is uniquely defined by

$$\{T(x, y, w), z\} = q(x, y, w, z) \quad (3.12c)$$

where  $q(x, y, w, z)$  is the full linearisation of  $q(x)$  such that  $q(x, x, x, x) = q(x)$ .

Note that all the necessary definitions, such as the cubic and trace bilinear forms, are inherited from the underlying Jordan algebra  $\mathfrak{J}$ .

Of particular importance to our discussion is the *automorphism group*  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}))$ , which is given by the set of all transformations which leave both  $\{x, y\}$  and  $q(x, y, w, z)$  invariant [26]. Following [21], the Freudenthal triple systems, defined by the various Jordan algebras mentioned here, and their associated automorphism groups are summarised in Table 2. The conventional concept of matrix rank may be generalised to Freudenthal triple systems in a natural and  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}))$  invariant manner. The rank of an arbitrary element  $x \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J})$  is uniquely defined using the relations in Table 3 [29, 21]. The rank of any element is invariant under  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}))$ . Further, for our particular example,  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}))$  acts transitively on the sets of elements of rank 1, 2 or 3 and on elements of a given norm  $q$  in the rank 4 case<sup>1</sup>. The orbits, union the zero element  $x = 0$ , partition the whole space  $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J})$  [21].

<sup>1</sup>This is actually true for a broad class Freudenthal triple systems defined over cubic Jordan algebras as discussed in [21].

Table 3: Partition of the space  $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J})$  into five orbits of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}))$  or ranks.

Rank	Condition			
	$x$	$3T(x, x, y) + \{x, y\}x$	$T(x, x, x)$	$q(x)$
0	$= 0$	$= 0 \forall y$	$= 0$	$= 0$
1	$\neq 0$	$= 0 \forall y$	$= 0$	$= 0$
2	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$= 0$
3	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$
4	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$

## 4 The FTS classification of qubit entanglement

### 4.1 FTS representation of three-qubits

The Jordan algebra underlying our FTS representation of three qubits is simply a direct sum of three copies of  $\mathbb{C}$  (equivalently we could use  $\mathbb{C} \oplus Q_2$  in the infinite sequence of spin factors). From Table 2 the automorphism group  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}))$  then coincides with the group of invertible SLOCC transformations, namely  $SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ . Take  $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$  and define the cubic form

$$N(A) = A_1 A_2 A_3 \quad \text{where} \quad A = (A_1, A_2, A_3) \in \mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}. \quad (4.1)$$

Clearly  $c = (1, 1, 1)$  is a base point and hence one finds, using (3.3),

$$\text{Tr}(A, B) = A_1 B_1 + A_2 B_2 + A_3 B_3, \quad (4.2)$$

for  $A = (A_1, A_2, A_3) \in \mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}$  and  $B = (B_1, B_2, B_3) \in \mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}$ . Then, using  $\text{Tr}(A^\sharp, B) = 3N(A, A, B)$ , the quadratic adjoint is given by

$$A^\sharp = (A_2 A_3, A_1 A_3, A_1 A_2), \quad (4.3)$$

and therefore

$$(A^\sharp)^\sharp = (A_1 A_2 A_3 A_1, A_1 A_2 A_3 A_2, A_1 A_2 A_3 A_3) = N(A)A. \quad (4.4)$$

It is not hard to check  $\text{Tr}(A, B)$  is non-degenerate and so  $N$  is Jordan cubic (3.4). Hence, we have a Jordan algebra  $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$  with product given by

$$\begin{aligned} A \circ B &= \frac{1}{2}(A \times B + \text{Tr}(A)B + \text{Tr}(B)A - S(A, B)c) \\ &= (A_1 B_1, A_2 B_2, A_3 B_3). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

The structure and reduced structure groups are given by  $[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^3$  and  $[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^2$  respectively.

We are now in a position to employ our FTS  $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}) = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}$  as the representation space of three qubits. There is a simple correspondence between an arbitrary three-qubit state  $|\psi\rangle = a_{ABC}|ABC\rangle$  and an element in  $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}})$ , which we denote  $\Psi$ , given by:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle &\leftrightarrow \Psi \\ a_{ABC}|ABC\rangle &\leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} a_{111} & (a_{001}, a_{010}, a_{100}) \\ (a_{110}, a_{101}, a_{011}) & a_{000} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Using (3.12b) one finds that the quartic norm  $q(\Psi)$  is related to Cayley's hyperdeterminant by

$$q(\Psi) = \{T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi), \Psi\} = 2 \det \gamma^A = 2 \det \gamma^B = 2 \det \gamma^C = -2 \text{Det } a, \quad (4.7)$$

where, following [30, 31, 32] we have defined the three matrices  $\gamma^A, \gamma^B$ , and  $\gamma^C$

$$\begin{aligned}(\gamma^A)_{A_1 A_2} &= \varepsilon^{B_1 B_2} \varepsilon^{C_1 C_2} a_{A_1 B_1 C_1} a_{A_2 B_2 C_2}, \\(\gamma^B)_{B_1 B_2} &= \varepsilon^{C_1 C_2} \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2} a_{A_1 B_1 C_1} a_{A_2 B_2 C_2}, \\(\gamma^C)_{C_1 C_2} &= \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2} \varepsilon^{B_1 B_2} a_{A_1 B_1 C_1} a_{A_2 B_2 C_2}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.8}$$

transforming respectively as  $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}), (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}), (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3})$  under  $SL(2) \times SL(2) \times SL(2)$ . Explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma^A &= \begin{pmatrix} 2(a_0 a_3 - a_1 a_2) & a_0 a_7 - a_1 a_6 + a_4 a_3 - a_5 a_2 \\ a_0 a_7 - a_1 a_6 + a_4 a_3 - a_5 a_2 & 2(a_4 a_7 - a_5 a_6) \end{pmatrix}, \\ \gamma^B &= \begin{pmatrix} 2(a_0 a_5 - a_4 a_1) & a_0 a_7 - a_4 a_3 + a_2 a_5 - a_6 a_1 \\ a_0 a_7 - a_4 a_3 + a_2 a_5 - a_6 a_1 & 2(a_2 a_7 - a_6 a_3) \end{pmatrix}, \\ \gamma^C &= \begin{pmatrix} 2(a_0 a_6 - a_2 a_4) & a_0 a_7 - a_2 a_5 + a_1 a_6 - a_3 a_4 \\ a_0 a_7 - a_2 a_5 + a_1 a_6 - a_3 a_4 & 2(a_1 a_7 - a_3 a_5) \end{pmatrix},\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

where we have made the decimal-binary conversion 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 for 000, 001, 010, 011, 100, 101, 110, 111. The  $\gamma$ 's are related to the local entropies of section 2 by

$$S_A = 4 \left[ \text{tr } \gamma^{B\dagger} \gamma^B + \text{tr } \gamma^{C\dagger} \gamma^C \right],\tag{4.10}$$

$$\text{tr } \gamma^{A\dagger} \gamma^A = \frac{1}{8} [S_B + S_C - S_A]\tag{4.11}$$

and their cyclic permutations.

The triple product maps a state  $\Psi$ , which transforms as a  $(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})$  of  $[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3$ , to another state  $T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi)$ , cubic in the state vector coefficients, also transforming as a  $(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})$ . Explicitly,  $T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi)$  may be written as

$$T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi) = T_{ABC} |ABC\rangle\tag{4.12}$$

where  $T_{ABC}$  takes one of three equivalent forms

$$\begin{aligned}T_{A_3 B_1 C_1} &= \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2} a_{A_1 B_1 C_1} (\gamma^A)_{A_2 A_3} \\ T_{A_1 B_3 C_1} &= \varepsilon^{B_1 B_2} a_{A_1 B_1 C_1} (\gamma^B)_{B_2 B_3} \\ T_{A_1 B_1 C_3} &= \varepsilon^{C_1 C_2} a_{A_1 B_1 C_1} (\gamma^C)_{C_2 C_3}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.13}$$

This definition permits us to link  $T$  to the norm, local entropies and the Kempe invariant of section 2:

$$\langle T|T \rangle = \frac{2}{3} (K - |\psi|^6) + \frac{1}{16} |\psi|^2 (S_A + S_B + S_C).\tag{4.14}$$

Having couched the three-qubit system within the FTS framework we may assign an abstract FTS rank to an arbitrary state  $\Psi$  as in Table 3.

Strictly speaking, the automorphism group  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}))$  is not simply  $SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{C})$  but includes a semi-direct product with the interchange triality  $A \leftrightarrow B \leftrightarrow C$ . The rank conditions of Table 3 are invariant under this triality. However, as we shall demonstrate, the set of rank 2 states may be subdivided into three distinct classes which are inter-related by this triality. In the next section we show that these rank conditions give the correct entanglement classification of three qubits as in Table 4.

## 4.2 The FTS rank entanglement classes

### 4.2.1 Rank 0 and the class of the null state

Rank 0 trivially corresponds to the vanishing state as in Table 4. Since this implies vanishing norm, it is usually omitted from the entanglement discussion.

Table 4: The entanglement classification of three qubits as according to the FTS rank system.

Class	Rank	FTS rank condition	
		vanishing	non-vanishing
Null	0	$\Psi$	–
<i>A-B-C</i>	1	$3T(\Psi, \Psi, \Phi) + \{\Psi, \Phi\}\Psi$	$\Psi$
<i>A-BC</i>	2a	$T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi)$	$\gamma^A$
<i>B-CA</i>	2b	$T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi)$	$\gamma^B$
<i>C-AB</i>	2c	$T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi)$	$\gamma^C$
W	3	$q(\Psi)$	$T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi)$
GHZ	4	–	$q(\Psi)$

#### 4.2.2 Rank 1 and the class of separable states

A non-zero state  $\Psi$  is rank 1 if

$$\Upsilon := 3T(\Psi, \Psi, \Phi) + \{\Psi, \Phi\}\Psi = 0, \quad \forall \Phi \quad (4.15)$$

which implies, in particular,

$$T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi) = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

For the case  $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma^A)_{A_1 A_2} (\gamma^C)_{C_1 C_2} &= \varepsilon^{B_1 B_2} \varepsilon^{Z_1 Z_2} a_{A_1 B_1 Z_1} a_{A_2 B_2 Z_2} (\gamma^C)_{C_1 C_2} \\ &= \varepsilon^{B_2 B_1} a_{A_1 B_1 C_1} T_{A_2 B_2 C_2} + \varepsilon^{B_1 B_2} a_{A_2 B_2 C_1} T_{A_1 B_1 C_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

and similarly for  $(\gamma^B)_{B_1 B_2} (\gamma^A)_{A_1 A_2}$  and  $(\gamma^C)_{C_1 C_2} (\gamma^B)_{B_1 B_2}$ . So the weaker condition (4.16) means that at most only one of the gammas is non-vanishing. From (4.7), moreover, it has vanishing determinant. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_{A_3 B_1 C_1} &= \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2} \varepsilon^{B_2 B_3} \varepsilon^{C_2 C_3} [ a_{A_1 B_1 C_1} a_{A_2 B_2 C_2} b_{A_3 B_3 C_3} + a_{A_1 B_1 C_1} b_{A_2 B_2 C_2} a_{A_3 B_3 C_3} \\ &\quad + b_{A_1 B_1 C_1} a_{A_2 B_2 C_2} a_{A_3 B_3 C_3} - a_{A_1 B_2 C_2} b_{A_2 B_3 C_3} a_{A_3 B_1 C_1} ] \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

or

$$-\Upsilon_{A_1 B_1 C_1} = \varepsilon^{A_2 A_3} b_{A_3 B_1 C_1} (\gamma^A)_{A_1 A_2} + \varepsilon^{B_2 B_3} b_{A_1 B_3 C_1} (\gamma^B)_{B_1 B_2} + \varepsilon^{C_2 C_3} b_{A_1 B_1 C_3} (\gamma^C)_{C_1 C_2} \quad (4.19)$$

where

$$|\phi\rangle = b_{ABC} |ABC\rangle \leftrightarrow \Phi = \begin{pmatrix} b_{111} & (b_{001}, b_{010}, b_{100}) \\ (b_{110}, b_{101}, b_{011}) & b_{000} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.20)$$

So the stronger condition (4.15) means that all three gammas must vanish. Using (4.10) it is then clear that all three local entropies vanish.

Conversely, from (4.11),  $S_A = S_B = S_C = 0$  implies that each of the three  $\gamma$ 's vanish and the rank 1 condition is satisfied. Hence FTS rank 1 is equivalent to the class of separable states as in Table 4.

#### 4.2.3 Rank 2 and the class of biseparable states

A non-zero state  $\Psi$  is rank 2 or less if and only if  $T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi) = 0$ . To not be rank 1 there must exist some  $\Phi$  such that  $3T(\Psi, \Psi, \Phi) + \{\Psi, \Phi\}\Psi \neq 0$ . It was shown in section 4.2.2 that this is equivalent to only one non-vanishing  $\gamma$  matrix.

Using (4.10) it is clear that the choices  $\gamma^A \neq 0$  or  $\gamma^B \neq 0$  or  $\gamma^C \neq 0$  give  $S_A = 0, S_{B,C} \neq 0$  or  $S_B = 0, S_{C,A} \neq 0$  or  $S_C = 0, S_{A,B} \neq 0$ , respectively. These are precisely the conditions for the biseparable class *A-BC* or *B-CA* or *C-AB* presented in Table 1.

Conversely, using (4.10), (4.11) and the fact that the local entropies and  $\text{tr}(\gamma^\dagger \gamma)$  are positive semidefinite, we find that all states in the biseparable class are rank 2, the particular subdivision being given by the corresponding non-zero  $\gamma$ . Hence FTS rank 2 is equivalent to the class of biseparable states as in Table 4.

#### 4.2.4 Rank 3 and the class of W-states

A non-zero state  $\Psi$  is rank 3 if  $q(\Psi) = -2\text{Det } a = 0$  but  $T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi) \neq 0$ . From (4.13) all three  $\gamma$ 's are then non-zero but from (4.7) all have vanishing determinant. In this case (4.10) implies that all three local entropies are non-zero but  $\text{Det } a = 0$ . So all rank 3  $\Psi$  belong to the W-class.

Conversely, from (4.10) it is clear that no two  $\gamma$ 's may simultaneously vanish when all three  $S$ 's  $> 0$ . We saw in section 4.2.2 that  $T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi) = 0$  implied at least two of the  $\gamma$ 's vanish. Consequently, for all W-states  $T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi) \neq 0$  and, therefore, all W-states are rank 3. Hence FTS rank 3 is equivalent to the class of W-states as in Table 4.

#### 4.2.5 Rank 4 and the class of GHZ-states

The rank 4 condition is given by  $q(\Psi) \neq 0$  and, since for the three-qubit FTS  $q(\Psi) = -2\text{Det } a$ , we immediately see that the set of rank 4 states is equivalent to the GHZ class of genuine tripartite entanglement as in Table 4.

Note,  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}))$  acts transitively only on rank 4 states with the same value of  $q(\Psi)$  as in the standard treatment. The GHZ class really corresponds to a continuous space of orbits parametrised by  $q$ .

In summary, we have demonstrated that each rank corresponds to one of the entanglement classes described in section 2. The fact that these classes are truly distinct (no overlap) follows immediately from the manifest invariance of the rank conditions.

### 4.3 SLOCC orbits

We now turn our attention to the coset parametrisation of the entanglement classes. The coset space of each orbit ( $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ) is given by  $G/H_i$  where  $G = [SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3$  is the SLOCC group and  $H_i \subset [SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3$  is the stability subgroup leaving the representative state of the  $i$ th orbit invariant. We proceed by considering the infinitesimal action of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}))$  on the representative states of each class. The subalgebra annihilating the representative state gives, upon exponentiation, the stability group  $H$ .

For the class of Freudenthal triple systems considered here the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J}))$  is given by

$$\mathfrak{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{J})) = \mathfrak{J} \oplus \mathfrak{J} \oplus \mathfrak{Str}(\mathfrak{J}), \quad (4.21)$$

where  $\mathfrak{Str}(\mathfrak{J})$  is the Lie algebra of  $\text{Str}(\mathfrak{J})$  given by  $\mathfrak{Str}(\mathfrak{J}) = L_{\mathfrak{J}} \oplus \text{Der}(\mathfrak{J})$  [22, 33].  $L_{\mathfrak{J}}$  is the set of left Jordan multiplications by elements in  $\mathfrak{J}$ , i.e.  $L_X(Y) = X \circ Y$  for  $X, Y \in \mathfrak{J}$ . Its centre is given by scalar multiples of the identity and we may decompose  $\mathfrak{Str}(\mathfrak{J}) = L_{\mathbb{1}}\mathbb{F} \oplus \mathfrak{Str}_0(\mathfrak{J})$ . Here,  $\mathfrak{Str}_0(\mathfrak{J})$  is the reduced structure group Lie algebra which is given by  $\mathfrak{Str}_0(\mathfrak{J}) = L_{\mathfrak{J}'} \oplus \text{Der}(\mathfrak{J})$ , where  $\mathfrak{J}'$  is the set of traceless Jordan algebra elements.

The Lie algebra action on a generic FTS element  $(\alpha, \beta, A, B)$  is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\alpha \text{tr } C + \text{Tr}(X, B) & L_C(A) + D(A) + \beta X + Y \times B \\ -L_C(B) + D(B) + \alpha Y + X \times A & \beta \text{tr } C + \text{Tr}(Y, A) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.22)$$

where  $L_C \in L_{\mathfrak{J}}$  and  $D \in \text{Der}(\mathfrak{J})$  come from the action of  $\mathfrak{Str}(\mathfrak{J}) = L_{\mathfrak{J}} \oplus \text{Der}(\mathfrak{J})$  [27, 34, 33, 35, 36, 37]. The product  $X \times Y$  is defined in (3.6).

Let us now focus on the relevant example for three qubits,  $\mathfrak{J} = \mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}$ . In this case  $\text{Der}(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}})$  is empty due to the associativity of  $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}$ . Consequently,  $\mathfrak{Str}(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}) = L_{\mathbb{1}}\mathbb{F} \oplus \mathfrak{Str}_0(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}})$  has complex dimension 3, while  $\mathfrak{Str}_0(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}})$  is now simply  $L_{\mathfrak{J}'}$  and has complex dimension 2. Recall,  $\mathfrak{Str}(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}})$  and  $\mathfrak{Str}_0(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}})$  generate  $[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^3$  and  $[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^2$ , respectively the structure and reduced structure groups of  $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}$ . The Lie algebra action transforming a state  $(\alpha, \beta, A, B) \rightarrow (\alpha', \beta', A', B')$  may now be summarised by:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha' &= -\alpha \text{tr } C + \text{Tr}(X, B), \\ \beta' &= \beta \text{tr } C + \text{Tr}(Y, A), \\ A' &= L_C(A) + \beta X + Y \times B, \\ B' &= -L_C(B) + \alpha Y + X \times A. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

**Separable/rank 1**  $|\psi\rangle = |111\rangle \Leftrightarrow \Psi = (1, 0, (0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0))$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha' &= -\operatorname{tr} C \Rightarrow \operatorname{tr} C = 0, \\ \beta' &= 0, \\ A' &= 0, \\ B' &= Y \Rightarrow Y = 0.\end{aligned}\tag{4.24}$$

So  $H_1$  is parameterised by 5 complex numbers, two of which belong to  $L_{C'} \in L_{\mathfrak{J}} = \mathfrak{Str}_0(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}})$  and so generate  $[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^2$ . The remaining three complex parameters from  $X \in \mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}}$  generate translations. Hence, denoting semi-direct product by  $\ltimes$ ,

$$\frac{G}{H_1} = \frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^2 \ltimes \mathbb{C}^3}.\tag{4.25}$$

with complex dimension 4.

**Biseparable/rank 2**  $|\psi\rangle = |111\rangle + |001\rangle \Leftrightarrow \Psi = (1, 0, (1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0))$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha' &= -\operatorname{tr} C \Rightarrow \operatorname{tr} C = 0, \\ \beta' &= \operatorname{Tr}(Y, A) \Rightarrow Y_1 = 0, \\ A' &= L_C(A) \Rightarrow C_1 = 0, \\ B' &= Y + X \times A \Rightarrow Y_1 = Y_2 + X_3 = Y_3 + X_2 = 0,\end{aligned}\tag{4.26}$$

where  $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$ ,  $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)$  and we have used  $X \times A = (X_2 A_3 + A_2 X_3, X_1 A_3 + A_1 X_3, X_1 A_2 + A_1 X_2)$ . So  $H_2$  is parameterised by 4 complex numbers. Three parameters, the one of  $L_C$  and two of  $Y$ , combine to generate  $O(3, \mathbb{C})$ . The remaining parameter  $X_1$ , a singlet under the  $O(3, \mathbb{C})$ , generates a translation. Hence,

$$\frac{G}{H_2} = \frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{O(3, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C}}.\tag{4.27}$$

with complex dimension 5.

**W/rank 3**  $|\psi\rangle = |010\rangle + |001\rangle + |100\rangle \Leftrightarrow \Psi = (0, 0, (1, 1, 1), (0, 0, 0))$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha' &= 0, \\ \beta' &= \operatorname{Tr}(Y, A) \Rightarrow \operatorname{Tr}(Y) = 0, \\ A' &= L_C(A) \Rightarrow C \circ A = C = 0, \\ B' &= X \times A \Rightarrow -X + \operatorname{Tr}(X)A = 0 \Rightarrow X = 0,\end{aligned}\tag{4.28}$$

where we have used the identity

$$X \times A = X \circ A - \frac{1}{2}[\operatorname{Tr}(X)A + \operatorname{Tr}(A)X] + \frac{1}{2}[\operatorname{Tr}(X)\operatorname{Tr}(A) + \operatorname{Tr}(X, A)]\mathbb{1}.\tag{4.29}$$

See, for example, [22, 33]. So  $H_3$  is parameterised by 2 complex numbers, namely the traceless part of  $Y$  which generates 2-dimensional translations. Hence,

$$\frac{G}{H_3} = \frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{\mathbb{C}^2}.\tag{4.30}$$

with complex dimension 7.

**GHZ/rank 4**  $|\psi\rangle = |000\rangle + |111\rangle \Leftrightarrow \Psi = (1, 1, (0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0))$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha' &= -\operatorname{tr} C \Rightarrow \operatorname{tr} C = 0, \\ \beta' &= \operatorname{tr} C \Rightarrow \operatorname{tr} C = 0, \\ A' &= X \Rightarrow X = 0, \\ B' &= Y \Rightarrow Y = 0.\end{aligned}\tag{4.31}$$

Table 5: Coset spaces of the orbits of the 3-qubit state space  $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$  under the action of the SLOCC group  $[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3$ .

Class	FTS Rank	Orbits	dim	Projective orbits	dim
Separable	1	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3}$	4	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{[SO(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C}]^3}$	3
Biseparable	2	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{O(3, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C}}$	5	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{O(3, \mathbb{C}) \times (SO(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C})}$	4
W	3	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{\mathbb{C}^2}$	7	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{SO(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C}^2}$	6
GHZ	4	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^2}$	7	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^2}$	7

So  $H_4$  is parameterised by 2 complex numbers, the traceless part of  $L_C$ , which spans  $L_{\mathfrak{J}} = \mathfrak{Stt}_0(\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}})$  and therefore generates  $[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^2$ . Hence,

$$\frac{G}{H_4} = \frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^3}{[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^2}. \quad (4.32)$$

with complex dimension 7. Note, the GHZ class is actually a continuous space of orbits parameterised by one complex number, the quartic norm  $q$ .

These results are summarised in Table 5. To be clear, in the preceding analysis we have regarded the three-qubit state as a point in  $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$ , the philosophy adopted in, for example, [2, 6, 7]. We could have equally well considered the projective Hilbert space regarding states as rays in  $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$ , that is, identifying states related by a global complex scalar factor, as was done in [16, 38, 10]. The coset spaces obtained in this case are also presented in Table 5, the dimensions of which agree with the results of [16, 39]. Note that the three-qubit separable projective coset is just a direct product of three individual qubit cosets  $SL(2, \mathbb{C})/SO(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C}$ . Furthermore, the biseparable projective coset is just the direct product of the two entangled qubits coset  $[SL(2, \mathbb{C})]^2/O(3, \mathbb{C})$  and an individual qubit coset. The case of real qubits is treated in Appendix A.

## 5 Conclusions

We have provided an alternative way of classifying three-qubit entanglement based on the rank of a Freudenthal triple system defined over the Jordan algebra  $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ . Some of the advantages are:

1. Since  $\Psi$ ,  $T(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi)$ ,  $\gamma_A$ ,  $\gamma_B$ ,  $\gamma_C$  and  $q(\Psi)$  are all tensors under  $SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ , the classification of Table 4 is manifestly SLOCC invariant. Contrast this with the conventional classification of Table 1 which, although SLOCC invariant, is not manifestly so since only  $\psi$  and  $\text{Det } a$  are tensors. The  $S_A$ ,  $S_B$  and  $S_C$  are only LOCC invariants.
2. The FTS approach facilitates the computation of the SLOCC cosets of Table 5, which, as far as we are aware, were hitherto unknown.
3. Jordan algebras and the FTS appearing in Table 2 have previously entered the physics literature through ‘‘magic’’ and extended supergravities [40, 41, 42], and their ranks through the classification of the corresponding black hole solutions [43, 44, 45]. Indeed, although it is logically independent of it, the present work was inspired by the black-hole/qubit correspondence [46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 45, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 32, 63]. The possible role of Jordan algebras and/or FTS in the context

Table 6: Coset spaces of the orbits of the real case  $\mathfrak{J}_R = \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$  under  $[SL(2, \mathbb{R})]^3$ .

Class	FTS Rank	$q(\Psi)$	Orbits	dim
Separable	1	$= 0$	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{R})]^3}{[SO(1, 1)]^2 \times \mathbb{R}^3}$	4
Biseparable	2	$= 0$	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{R})]^3}{O(2, 1) \times \mathbb{R}}$	5
W	3	$= 0$	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{R})]^3}{\mathbb{R}^2}$	7
GHZ	4	$< 0$	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{R})]^3}{[SO(1, 1)]^2}$	7
GHZ	4	$< 0$	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{R})]^3}{[U(1)]^2}$	7
GHZ	4	$> 0$	$\frac{[SL(2, \mathbb{R})]^3}{[U(1)]^2}$	7

of entanglement was already mentioned in some of these discussions [47, 45, 50, 51, 52, 54, 59, 60, 32], but we hope the explicit construction of the present paper opens the door to a quantum information interpretation of the other FTS of Table 2 [32].

## Acknowledgments

We thank Peter Levay for useful discussions. This work was supported in part by the STFC under rolling grant ST/G000743/1 and by the DOE under grant No. DE-FG02-92ER40706.

## A The real case $\mathfrak{J}_R = \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$

As noted in [5, 48], the case of real qubits or “rebits” is qualitatively different from the complex case. An interesting observation is that on restricting to real states the GHZ class actually has two distinct orbits, characterised by the sign of  $q(\Psi)$ . This difference shows up in the cosets in the different possible real forms of  $[SO(2, \mathbb{C})]^2$ . For positive  $q(\Psi)$  one always has  $[SL(2, \mathbb{R})]^3/[U(1)]^2$ , while for negative  $q(\Psi)$  one may either have  $[SL(2, \mathbb{R})]^3/[U(1)]^2$  or  $[SL(2, \mathbb{R})]^3/[SO(1, 1)]^2$  depending on the sign of the eigenvalues of the three  $\gamma$ 's, as shown in Table 6. This phenomenon also has its counterpart in the black-hole context [43, 44, 53, 61, 32].

## References

- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2000.
- [2] N. Linden and S. Popescu, “On multi-particle entanglement,” *Fortschr. Phys.* **46** (1998) no. 4–5, 567–578, [arXiv:quant-ph/9711016](#).
- [3] J. Kempe, “On multi-particle entanglement and its applications to cryptography,” *Phys. Rev.* **A60** (1999) no. 2, 910–916, [arXiv:quant-ph/9902036](#).

- [4] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, “Three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways,” *Phys. Rev.* **A62** (2000) no. 6, 062314, [arXiv:quant-ph/0005115](#).
- [5] A. Acín, A. Andrianov, L. Costa, E. Jané, J. I. Latorre, and R. Tarrach, “Generalized Schmidt decomposition and classification of three-quantum-bit states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** (2000) no. 7, 1560–1563, [arXiv:quant-ph/0003050](#).
- [6] H. Carteret and A. Sudbery, “Local symmetry properties of pure three-qubit states,” *J. Phys.* **A33** (2000) no. 28, 4981–5002, [arXiv:quant-ph/0001091](#).
- [7] A. Sudbery, “On local invariants of pure three-qubit states,” *J. Phys.* **A34** (2001) no. 3, 643–652, [arXiv:quant-ph/0001116](#).
- [8] H. Carteret, A. Higuchi, and A. Sudbery, “Multipartite generalisation of the Schmidt decomposition,” *J. Math. Phys.* **41** (2000) no. 12, 7932–7939, [arXiv:quant-ph/0006125](#).
- [9] P. Lévy, “Geometry of three-qubit entanglement,” *Phys. Rev.* **A71** (2005) no. 1, 012334, [arXiv:quant-ph/0403060](#).
- [10] D. C. Brody, A. C. T. Gustavsson, and L. P. Hughston, “Entanglement of three-qubit geometry,” *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **67** (2007) 012044, [arXiv:quant-ph/0612117](#).
- [11] C. H. Bennett, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, “Exact and asymptotic measures of multipartite pure-state entanglement,” *Phys. Rev.* **A63** (2000) no. 1, 012307, [arXiv:quant-ph/9908073](#).
- [12] A. Osterloh and D. Z. Djokovic, “Polynomial invariants of qubits via the comb approach to multipartite entanglement,” [arXiv:0804.1661 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [13] A. Osterloh, “Classification of qubit entanglement:  $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$  versus  $SU(2)$  invariance,” [arXiv:0809.2055 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [14] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, “Distributed entanglement,” *Phys. Rev.* **A61** (2000) no. 5, 052306, [arXiv:quant-ph/9907047](#).
- [15] A. Cayley, “On the theory of linear transformations.” *Camb. Math. J.* **4** (1845) 193–209.
- [16] A. Miyake and M. Wadati, “Multipartite entanglement and hyperdeterminants,” *Quant. Info. Comp.* **2 (Special)** (2002) 540–555, [arXiv:quant-ph/0212146](#).
- [17] D. M. Greenberger, M. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, *Bell’s Theorem, Quantum Theory and Conceptions of the Universe*. Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1989.
- [18] T. A. Springer, “Characterization of a class of cubic forms,” *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A* **24** (1962) 259–265.
- [19] K. McCrimmon, “The Freudenthal-Springer-Tits construction of exceptional Jordan algebras.” *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **139** (1969) 495–510.
- [20] K. McCrimmon, *A Taste of Jordan Algebras*. Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York, 2004.
- [21] S. Krutelevich, “Jordan algebras, exceptional groups, and Bhargava composition,” *J. Algebra* **314** (2007) no. 2, 924977, [arXiv:math/0411104](#).
- [22] N. Jacobson, *Structure and Representations of Jordan Algebras*, vol. 39. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 1968.
- [23] N. Jacobson, “Some groups of transformations defined by Jordan algebras,” *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **207** (1961) 61–85.

- [24] J. C. Baez, “The octonions,” *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **39** (2002) 145–205, [arXiv:math/0105155](#).
- [25] R. Schafer, *Introduction to Nonassociative Algebras*. Academic Press Inc., New York, 1966.
- [26] R. B. Brown, “Groups of type  $E_7$ ,” *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **236** (1969) 79–102.
- [27] H. Freudenthal, “Beziehungen der  $E_7$  und  $E_8$  zur oktavenebene I-II,” *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser.* **57** (1954) 218–230.
- [28] J. R. Faulkner, “A Construction of Lie Algebras from a Class of Ternary Algebras.” *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **155** (1971) no. 2, 397–408.
- [29] C. J. Ferrar, “Strictly Regular Elements in Freudenthal Triple Systems.” *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **174** (1972) 313–331.
- [30] M. J. Duff, “Hidden symmetries of the Nambu-Goto action,” *Phys. Lett.* **B641** (2006) 335–337, [arXiv:hep-th/0602160](#).
- [31] F. Toumazet, J. Luque, and J. Thibon, “Unitary invariants of qubit systems,” *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **17** (2006) no. 6, 1133–1151, [arXiv:quant-ph/0604202](#).
- [32] L. Borsten, D. Dahanayake, M. J. Duff, H. Ebrahim, and W. Rubens, “Black Holes, Qubits and Octonions,” *Phys. Rep.* **471** (2009) no. 3–4, 113–219, [arXiv:0809.4685 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [33] N. Jacobson, *Exceptional Lie algebras*. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1971.
- [34] M. Koecher, “Imbedding of Jordan algebras into Lie algebras I.” *Amer. J. Math.* **89** (1967) no. 3, 787–816.
- [35] I. L. Kantor, “Models of exceptional Lie algebras,” *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **14** (1973) 254258.
- [36] O. Shukuzawa, “Explicit classifications of orbits in Jordan algebra and Freudenthal vector space over the exceptional Lie groups,” *Commun. Algebra* **34** (2006) no. 1, 197–217.
- [37] J. Gutt, “Special riemannian geometries and the magic square of lie algebras,” [arXiv:0810.2138 \[math.DG\]](#).
- [38] A. Miyake, “Classification of multipartite entangled states by multidimensional determinants,” *Phys. Rev.* **A67** (2003) no. 1, 012108, [arXiv:quant-ph/0206111](#).
- [39] I. M. Gelfand, M. M. Kapranov, and A. V. Zelevinsky, *Discriminants, Resultants and Multidimensional Determinants*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 1994.
- [40] M. Günaydin, G. Sierra, and P. K. Townsend, “The geometry of  $N = 2$  Maxwell-Einstein supergravity and Jordan algebras,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B242** (1984) 244.
- [41] M. Günaydin, G. Sierra, and P. K. Townsend, “Exceptional supergravity theories and the MAGIC square,” *Phys. Lett.* **B133** (1983) 72.
- [42] M. Günaydin, G. Sierra, and P. K. Townsend, “Gauging the  $d = 5$  Maxwell-Einstein supergravity theories: More on Jordan algebras,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B253** (1985) 573.
- [43] S. Ferrara and J. M. Maldacena, “Branes, central charges and U-duality invariant BPS conditions,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15** (1998) 749–758, [arXiv:hep-th/9706097](#).
- [44] S. Ferrara and M. Günaydin, “Orbits of exceptional groups, duality and BPS states in string theory,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A13** (1998) 2075–2088, [arXiv:hep-th/9708025](#).

- [45] B. Pioline, “Lectures on on black holes, topological strings and quantum attractors,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) S981, [arXiv:hep-th/0607227](#).
- [46] M. J. Duff, “String triality, black hole entropy and Cayley’s hyperdeterminant,” *Phys. Rev.* **D76** (2007) no. 2, 025017, [arXiv:hep-th/0601134](#).
- [47] R. Kallosh and A. Linde, “Strings, black holes, and quantum information,” *Phys. Rev.* **D73** (2006) no. 10, 104033, [arXiv:hep-th/0602061](#).
- [48] P. Lévay, “Stringy black holes and the geometry of entanglement,” *Phys. Rev.* **D74** (2006) no. 2, 024030, [arXiv:hep-th/0603136](#).
- [49] S. Ferrara and R. Kallosh, “On  $N = 8$  attractors,” *Phys. Rev.* **D73** (2006) no. 12, 125005, [arXiv:hep-th/0603247](#).
- [50] M. J. Duff and S. Ferrara, “ $E_7$  and the tripartite entanglement of seven qubits,” *Phys. Rev.* **D76** (2007) no. 2, 025018, [arXiv:quant-ph/0609227](#).
- [51] P. Lévay, “Strings, black holes, the tripartite entanglement of seven qubits and the Fano plane,” *Phys. Rev.* **D75** (2007) no. 2, 024024, [arXiv:hep-th/0610314](#).
- [52] M. J. Duff and S. Ferrara, “Black hole entropy and quantum information,” [arXiv:hep-th/0612036](#). Published in *Lect. Notes Phys.* **755** (2008) 93-114 and *Supersymmetric Mechanics - Vol. 3*, pp. 1-22, Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2008.
- [53] S. Bellucci, S. Ferrara, and A. Marrani, “Attractor horizon geometries of extremal black holes,” [arXiv:hep-th/0702019](#). Contribution to the Proceedings of the XVII SIGRAV Conference, Turin, Italy, 47 Sep 2006.
- [54] M. J. Duff and S. Ferrara, “ $E_6$  and the bipartite entanglement of three qutrits,” *Phys. Rev.* **D76** (2007) no. 12, 124023, [arXiv:0704.0507 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [55] S. Bellucci, A. Marrani, E. Orazi, and A. Shcherbakov, “Attractors with vanishing central charge,” *Phys. Lett.* **B655** (2007) 185–195, [arXiv:0707.2730 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [56] P. Lévay, “A three-qubit interpretation of BPS and non-BPS  $STU$  black holes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D76** (2007) no. 10, 106011, [arXiv:0708.2799 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [57] L. Borsten, D. Dahanayake, M. J. Duff, W. Rubens, and H. Ebrahim, “Wrapped branes as qubits,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** (2008) no. 25, 251602, [arXiv:0802.0840 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [58] S. Ferrara, K. Hayakawa, and A. Marrani, “Lectures on attractors and black holes,” *Fortschr. Phys.* **56** (2008) 993–1046.
- [59] L. Borsten, “ $E_{7(7)}$  invariant measures of entanglement,” *Fortschr. Phys.* **56** (2008) no. 7–9, 842–848.
- [60] P. Lévay and P. Vrana, “Three fermions with six single-particle states can be entangled in two inequivalent ways,” *Phys. Rev.* **A78** (2008) no. 2, 022329, [arXiv:0806.4076 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [61] S. Bellucci, S. Ferrara, A. Marrani, and A. Yeranyan, “ $STU$  black holes unveiled,” *Entropy* **10** (2008) no. 4, 507–555, [arXiv:0807.3503 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [62] P. Lévay, M. Saniga, and P. Vrana, “Three-qubit operators, the split Cayley hexagon of order two and black holes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D78** (2008) no. 12, 124022, [arXiv:0808.3849 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [63] L. Borsten, D. Dahanayake, M. J. Duff, and W. Rubens, “Black holes admitting a Freudenthal dual,” [arXiv:0903.5517 \[hep-th\]](#).