

ON THE STRUCTURE TENSOR OF \mathfrak{sl}_n

KASHIF K. BARI

ABSTRACT. The structure tensor of \mathfrak{sl}_n , denoted $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$, is the tensor arising from the Lie bracket bilinear operation on the set of traceless $n \times n$ matrices over \mathbb{C} . This tensor is intimately related to the well studied matrix multiplication tensor. Studying the structure tensor of \mathfrak{sl}_n may provide further insight into the complexity of matrix multiplication and the “hay in a haystack” problem of finding explicit sequences tensors with high rank or border rank. We aim to find new bounds on the rank and border rank of this structure tensor in the case of \mathfrak{sl}_3 and \mathfrak{sl}_4 . We additionally provide bounds in the case of the lie algebras \mathfrak{so}_4 and \mathfrak{so}_5 . The lower bounds on the border ranks were obtained via various recent techniques, namely Koszul flattenings, border substitution, and border apolarity. Upper bounds on the rank of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}$ are obtained via numerical methods that allowed us to find an explicit rank decomposition.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1969, Strassen presented a novel algorithm for matrix multiplication of $n \times n$ matrices. Strassen’s algorithm used fewer than the $O(n^3)$ arithmetic operations needed for the standard algorithm. This led to the question: what is the minimal number of arithmetic operations required to multiply $n \times n$ matrices, or in other words, what is the complexity of matrix multiplication [Str69] [Str83]. An asymptotic version of the problem is to determine the exponent of matrix multiplication, ω , which is the infimum of all values such that for all $\epsilon > 0$, multiplying $n \times n$ matrices can be performed in $O(n^{\omega+\epsilon})$ arithmetic operations. Any bilinear operation, including matrix multiplication, may be thought of as tensor in the following way: Let A, B , and C denote vector spaces over \mathbb{C} . Given a bilinear map $A^* \times B^* \rightarrow C$, the universal property of tensor products induces a linear map $A^* \otimes B^* \rightarrow C$. Since $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(A^* \otimes B^*, C) \simeq A \otimes B \otimes C$, then we can take our bilinear map to be a tensor in $A \otimes B \otimes C$. Let $M_{(n)}$ denote the matrix multiplication tensor arising from the bilinear operation of multiplying $n \times n$ matrices.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 15A69, 14L35, 68Q15.

Key words and phrases. bilinear complexity, structure tensor, rank, border rank, Lie algebra.

Author was supported by the Mathematics Department at Texas A&M University and NSF grant AF-1814254.

An important invariant of a tensor is its rank. For a tensor $T \in A \otimes B \otimes C$ the *rank*, denoted $\mathbf{R}(T)$, is the minimal r such that $T = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i \otimes b_i \otimes c_i$ with $a_i \in A, b_i \in B, c_i \in C$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Given precise $T_i = a_i \otimes b_i \otimes c_i$, then we call $T = \sum_{i=1}^r T_i$ a *rank decomposition* of T . Strassen also showed that the rank of the matrix multiplication tensor is a valid measure of its complexity; in particular, he proved $\omega = \inf\{\tau \in \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbf{R}(M_{(n)}) = O(n^\tau)\}$ [Str69].

For a tensor $T \in A \otimes B \otimes C$, the *border rank* of T , denoted $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T)$, is another invariant of interest and defined to be the minimal r such that $T = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} T_\epsilon$ where for

all $\epsilon > 0$, T_ϵ has rank r . Given rank decompositions of $T_\epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^r T_i(\epsilon)$, we then call $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^r T_i(\epsilon)$ a *border rank decomposition* of T . Later, in 1980, it was shown by Bini that the border rank of matrix multiplication is also a valid measure of its complexity by proving that $\omega = \inf\{\tau \in \mathbb{R} \mid \underline{\mathbf{R}}(M_{(n)}) = O(n^\tau)\}$ [Bin80].

Intimately related to the matrix multiplication tensor is the structure tensor of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{sl}_n , the set of traceless $n \times n$ matrices over \mathbb{C} equipped with the Lie bracket $[x, y] = xy - yx$. The *structure tensor* of \mathfrak{sl}_n is defined as the tensor arising from the Lie bracket bilinear operation, and we denote it by $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$. One example of how matrix multiplication is related to $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$ is by closer examination of a skew-symmetric version of the matrix multiplication tensor; consider the tensor arising from the Lie bracket bilinear operation on \mathfrak{gl}_n , (which is just M_n , but considered as a Lie algebra) [CHI⁺18]. Since $\mathfrak{gl}_n = \mathfrak{sl}_n \oplus z$, where z indicates the scalar matrices which are central in \mathfrak{gl}_n , $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$ determines the commutator action on all of \mathfrak{gl}_n . While the matrix multiplication tensor has been well studied [CHI⁺18] [CHL19], the structure tensor of \mathfrak{sl}_n has not been studied to the same extent. Currently, the only known non-trivial results are lower bounds on the rank of the structure tensor of \mathfrak{sl}_n . In [dGH86] it was shown $\mathbf{R}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}) \geq 2n^2 - n - 1$. Studying the structure tensor of \mathfrak{sl}_n may provide some further insight into two central problems in complexity theory.

In complexity theory, it is of interest to find *explicit* objects that behave generically. This type of problem is known as a “hay in a haystack” problem. Algebraic geometry tells us that a “random” tensor T in $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$ will have rank/border rank $\lceil \frac{m^3}{3m-2} \rceil$. By an *explicit* sequence of tensors, we will mean a collection of tensors $T_m \in \mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$ such that the coefficients of T_m are computable in polynomial time in m . The “hay in a haystack” problem for tensors is to find an example of an explicit sequence of tensors of high rank or border rank, asymptotically in m . Currently, there exists an explicit sequence of tensors, S_m over \mathbb{C} , such that $\mathbf{R}(S_m) \geq 3m - o(\log(m))$ [AFT11] and a different explicit sequence of tensors over \mathbb{C} , T_m , such that $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_m) \geq 2.02m - o(m)$ [LM19]. One should note that the sequence

T_m of [LM19] has border rank equal to $2m$ when $m = 13$ and has been shown to exceed $2m$ for $m > 364175$. It would be of interest to find sequences of tensors for which the border rank exceeds $2m$ for smaller values of m .

The second problem is Strassen's problem of computing of the complexity of matrix multiplication. The exponent of \mathfrak{sl}_n is defined as $\omega(\mathfrak{sl}_n) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log_n(\mathbf{R}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}))$. By Theorem 4.1 from [LY20], the exponent of matrix multiplication is equal to the exponent of \mathfrak{sl}_n . Consequently, upper bounds on the rank and even the border rank of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$ provide upper bounds on ω .

These two problems motivate our study of the border rank of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$. We prove new bounds in the case of \mathfrak{sl}_3 and \mathfrak{sl}_4 .

Theorem 1. $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}) \geq 16$

Theorem 2. $\mathbf{R}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}) \leq 20$

Theorem 3. $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}) \geq 28$

Additionally, we obtain lower bounds on the border rank of the structure tensors of \mathfrak{so}_4 and \mathfrak{so}_5 . We note that $\mathfrak{so}_4 \simeq \mathfrak{sl}_2 \times \mathfrak{sl}_2$ and $\mathfrak{so}_5 \simeq \mathfrak{sp}_4$.

Theorem 4. $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathfrak{so}_4}) \geq 9$

Theorem 5. $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathfrak{so}_5}) \geq 19$

2. PRELIMINARIES

The above definition of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$ is independent of choice of basis, but we may also write the tensor in terms of bases. Let $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^{n^2-1}$ be a basis of \mathfrak{sl}_n and $\{\alpha^i\}_{i=1}^{n^2-1}$ a dual basis. Recall that \mathfrak{sl}_n has a bilinear operation called the Lie bracket, given

by $[a_i, a_j] = a_i a_j - a_j a_i = \sum_{k=1}^{n^2-1} A_{ij}^k a_k$. The structure tensor of \mathfrak{sl}_n in this basis is

$T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n} = \sum_{i,j,k} A_{ij}^k \alpha^i \otimes \alpha^j \otimes a_k \in \mathfrak{sl}_n^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n$. Let e_i^j denote the $n \times n$ matrix with 1 in the (i, j) th entry. If we take the standard weight basis of \mathfrak{sl}_n , namely the matrices e_i^j for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ and $e_i^i - e_{i+1}^{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, then we can express the tensor $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}$ as follows.

2.1. Algebraic Geometry. The language of algebraic geometry will prove useful in studying our problems. Throughout, let A, B, C , and V be complex vector spaces. Let $\pi : V \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}V$ be the projection map from V to its projectivization. Denote $[v] := \pi(v) \in \mathbb{P}V$ for nonzero $v \in V$. For $v_1, \dots, v_k \in V$, let $\langle v_1, \dots, v_k \rangle$ denote the projectivization of the linear span of v_1, \dots, v_k .

See [Sha13] for the definitions of the Zariski topology, projective variety, and the dimension of a projective variety. For a projective variety, $X \subset \mathbb{P}V$, let $S[X]$ denote its homogeneous coordinate ring and let $I(X) \subset \text{Sym}(A^*)$ denote the ideal of X . Given $Y \subset \mathbb{P}V$ a nondegenerate projective variety, we define the r th secant variety of Y , denoted $\sigma_r(Y) \subset \mathbb{P}V$.

Definition 6. The r th secant variety of Y is $\sigma_r(Y) = \overline{\bigcup_{y_i \in Y} \langle y_1, \dots, y_r \rangle}$

The closure operation indicated in Definition 1 is the Zariski closure. As polynomials are continuous, this closure also contains the Euclidean closure of the set. In this case, we have that the Euclidean closure is in fact equal to the Zariski closure (see Theorem 3.1.6.1 in [Lan17] or Theorem 2.3.3 in [Mum95]).

Let A, B, C be vector spaces over \mathbb{C} . The Segre embedding is defined as map $\text{Seg} : \mathbb{P}A \times \mathbb{P}B \times \mathbb{P}C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(A \otimes B \otimes C)$ given by $([a], [b], [c]) \mapsto [a \otimes b \otimes c]$. Let $X = \text{Seg}(\mathbb{P}A \times \mathbb{P}B \times \mathbb{P}C)$ denote the image of the Segre embedding, which is a projective variety of dimension $\dim A + \dim B + \dim C - 3$. Note that X is the space of rank one tensors in $\mathbb{P}(A \otimes B \otimes C)$. Consequently, one can redefine the border rank, $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T)$, for $T \in A \otimes B \otimes C$ as the r such that $T \in \sigma_r(X)$ and $T \notin \sigma_{r-1}(X)$. We make a remark here that $\mathbf{R}(T) \geq \underline{\mathbf{R}}(T)$, trivially, as a tensor rank decomposition can be considered as a border rank decomposition by taking the tensor rank decomposition as a constant sequence.

For a secant variety $\sigma_r(Y) \subset \mathbb{P}V$ in general, the expected dimension will be $\min\{r \dim Y + (r - 1), \dim \mathbb{P}V\}$, since we expect to choose r points from Y and have an additional $r - 1$ parameters to span the r -plane generated by those points. The dimension of $\sigma_r(\text{Seg}(\mathbb{P}V \times \mathbb{P}V \times \mathbb{P}V))$ is the expected dimension, except when $r = 4$ and $\dim V = 3$ [Lic85].

Another variety we will make use of is the Grassmannian, denoted $G(k, V)$. Let $\Lambda^k V$ denote the k th exterior power of the vector space V . The Grassmannian variety is $G(k, V) := \mathbb{P}\{T \in \Lambda^k V \mid \exists v_1, \dots, v_k \in V \text{ such that } T = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k\}$.

2.2. Representation Theory. Recall that A, B, C , and V are complex vector spaces. A guiding principle in geometric complexity theory is to use symmetry to reduce the

problem of testing a space of tensors to testing particular representatives of families of tensors. To describe the symmetry of our tensor, we use the language of the representation theory of linear algebraic groups and Lie algebras. See [FH91] for the definitions of linear algebraic groups, semisimple Lie algebras, representations, orbits of group actions, G -modules, irreducibility of a representation/module, Borel subgroups, a maximal torus, and the correspondence between Lie groups and Lie algebras.

The group $GL(A) \times GL(B) \times GL(C)$ acts on $A \otimes B \otimes C$ by the product of the natural actions of $GL(A)$ on A , etc. Identify $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{\times 2}$ with the subgroup $\{(aId_A, bId_B, cId_C) \in GL(A) \times GL(B) \times GL(C) \mid abc = 1\}$ of $GL(A) \times GL(B) \times GL(C)$. Note that $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{\times 2}$ acts trivially on $A \otimes B \otimes C$.

Definition 7. For a tensor $T \in A \otimes B \otimes C$, define the *symmetry group of T* to be the group $G_T := \{g \in GL(A) \times GL(B) \times GL(C) / (\mathbb{C}^*)^{\times 2} \mid gT = T\}$.

In the case of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$, our symmetry group, $G_{T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}}$, is in fact isomorphic to SL_n . For any element $g \in SL_n$, we have the element $g^* \otimes g^* \otimes g$ acts on $\mathfrak{sl}_n^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n$ and leave $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$ invariant. It is always the case that for any automorphism of \mathfrak{sl}_n , we will have an automorphism of $\mathfrak{sl}_n^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n$. See [Mir85] for a proof that these are all elements of the symmetry group for $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$.

Let $B_T \subset G_T$ denote a *Borel subgroup*. In the case of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$, where our symmetry group is isomorphic to SL_n , we take B_T to be the Borel subgroup of upper triangular matrices of determinant 1. We note that Borel subgroups are not unique, but are all conjugate. For this Borel subgroup, let $N \subset B_T$ denote the group of upper triangular matrices with diagonal entries equal to 1, called the *maximal unipotent group*, and let \mathbb{T} denote the subgroup of diagonal matrices, also called the *maximal torus*.

Definition 8. A vector $v \in V^{\otimes k}$ is a *weight vector* if $\mathbb{T}[v] = [v]$. In particular, for $t \in \mathbb{T}$, where $t = \text{diag}\{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$, if $tv = t_1^{p_1} \dots t_n^{p_n} v$, then v is said to have weight $(p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.

Furthermore, call v a highest weight vector if $B_T[v] = [v]$, i.e. if $Nv = v$.

In our case where $G_T \simeq SL_n$, every irreducible G_T -module will have a highest weight line and additionally will be uniquely determined by this highest weight line.

Given a symmetry group, G_T , we also have a symmetry Lie algebra, denoted \mathfrak{g}_T , which will be more convenient to work with. Let \mathfrak{b}_T denote the Borel subalgebra and \mathfrak{h} denote the Cartan subalgebra, which will be the Lie algebras of the Borel subgroup, B_T , and maximal torus, \mathbb{T} , respectively. In the case of our symmetry Lie algebra, \mathfrak{sl}_n , we take \mathfrak{h} to be the subalgebra of traceless diagonal matrices. Additionally, for

$N \subset B_T$, we have the corresponding Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{n} \subset \mathfrak{b}_T$, which will consist of the strictly upper triangular elements of \mathfrak{sl}_n . We will refer to elements of \mathfrak{n} as raising operators.

For a Lie algebra representation, a vector is a *weight vector*, if $\mathfrak{h}[v] = [v]$. One may regard the weight of a vector v as a linear functional $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, such that for all $H \in \mathfrak{h}$, $Hv = \lambda(H)v$. Analogous to the above definition, $[v]$ is a highest weight vector if and only if $\mathfrak{n}[v] = 0$. Consider the weights $\omega_i \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ satisfying $\omega_i(h_j) = \delta_{ij}$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$, where $h_j = e_j^j - e_{j+1}^{j+1} \in \mathfrak{h}$. Call these weights $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{n-1} \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ the fundamental weights of \mathfrak{sl}_n . It is well known that the highest weight λ of an irreducible representation can be represented as an integral linear combination of fundamental weights. For notational convenience, we denote the irreducible representation with highest weight $\lambda = a_1\omega_1 + \dots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1}$ by $[a_1 \ \dots \ a_{n-1}]$ and denote its highest weight vector by $v_{[a_1 \ \dots \ a_{n-1}]}$. We note that this notation is different from the widely used diagram notation of Weyl [FH91]

Definition 9. A variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}V$ is *G-homogeneous* if it is a closed orbit of some point $x \in \mathbb{P}V$ under the action of some group $G \subset GL(V)$. If $P \subset G$ is the subgroup fixing x , write $X = G/P$.

The purpose for introducing the language of homogeneous varieties is to introduce the following Normal Form Lemma. Recall that V is a complex vector space.

Lemma 10 (Normal Form Lemma). *Let $X = G/P \subset \mathbb{P}V$ be a homogeneous variety and $v \in V$ such that $G_v = \{g \in G \mid g[v] = [v]\}$ has a single closed orbit \mathcal{O}_{min} in X . Then any border rank r decomposition of v may be modified using G_v to a border rank r decomposition $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} x_1(\epsilon) + \dots + x_r(\epsilon)$ such that there is a stationary point $x_1(t) \equiv x_1$ (i.e. x_1 is independent of t) lying in \mathcal{O}_{min} .*

If, moreover, every orbit of $G_v \cap G_{x_1}$ contains x_1 in its closure, we may further assume that for all $j \neq 1$, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} x_j(\epsilon) = x_1$.

See Lemma 3.1 in [LM17] for the proof. This Lemma allows one describe the interactions between the different G -orbits. It can be thought of as a consequence of the Lie's theorem. Lie's Theorem states that for a solvable group, H , an H -module, W , and a point $[w] \in \mathbb{P}W$, the closed orbit $\overline{H[w]}$ contains an H -fixed point [FH91].

3. METHODOLOGY

The most fruitful current techniques for finding lower bounds on the border rank of a tensor are Koszul flattenings, the border substitution method, and border apolarity. We review each of these techniques.

3.1. Koszul flattenings. For $T \in A \otimes B \otimes C$, we may consider it as a linear map $T_B : B^* \rightarrow A \otimes C$. We have analogous maps T_A, T_B, T_C , which are called the *coordinate flattenings* of T . Consider the linear map obtained by composing the map $T_B \otimes Id_{\Lambda^p A} : B^* \otimes \Lambda^p A \rightarrow \Lambda^p A \otimes A \otimes C$ with the map $\pi \otimes Id_C : \Lambda^p A \otimes A \otimes C \rightarrow \Lambda^{p+1} A \otimes C$. Note that $\pi \otimes Id_C$ is the tensor product of the exterior multiplication map with the identity on C . Denote this composition by $T_A^{\wedge p}$. Let *rank* denote the rank of a linear map.

Proposition 11 (Landsberg-Ottaviani). *Let $T \in A \otimes B \otimes C$ and $t = a \otimes b \otimes c \in A \otimes B \otimes C$, then*

$$\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T) \geq \frac{\text{rank}(T_A^{\wedge p})}{\text{rank}(t_A^{\wedge p})} = \frac{\text{rank}(T_A^{\wedge p})}{\binom{\dim A - 1}{p}}$$

See [LO15] for the proof. One should note that we achieve the best bounds when $\dim A = 2p + 1$. Thus, if $\dim A > 2p + 1$, we may restrict T to subspaces $A' \subset A$ of dimension $2p + 1$, since border rank is upper semi-continuous with respect to restriction i.e. for a restriction T' of T , $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T') \leq \underline{\mathbf{R}}(T)$. Koszul flattenings alone are insufficient to prove $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}) \geq 2(n^2 - 1)$, as the limit of the method for $T \in \mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$ is below $2m - 3$ (m even) and $2m - 5$ (m odd). See [LO15] for more on this method.

3.2. Border Substitution. The only known technique for computing lower bounds on the rank of a tensor is the *substitution method*. A tensor T is *A-concise* if the coordinate flattening map T_A is injective, and define similarly for *B-concise* and *C-concise*. If a tensor is *A-concise*, *B-concise*, and *C-concise*, then we simply call it *concise*. We remark that $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$ is in fact a concise tensor, since \mathfrak{sl}_n is a simple Lie algebra and the coordinate flattening maps do not send everything to 0.

The substitution method is a standard technique for obtaining lower bounds on the rank of a tensor [AFT11]. This technique can be extended to border rank.

Proposition 12 (Landsberg-Michalek). *Let $T \in A \otimes B \otimes C$ be A-concise. Let $\dim A = m$ and let $k < m$. Then*

$$\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T) \geq \min_{A' \in G(k, A^*)} \underline{\mathbf{R}}(T|_{A' \otimes B^* \otimes C^*}) + (m - k)$$

See [LM19] for proof. Note that the notation $T|_{A' \otimes B^* \otimes C^*}$ is a restriction of T when considering T as a trilinear form $T : A^* \otimes B^* \otimes C^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. If we let $\tilde{A} = A/(A')^\perp$ then our restricted tensor will be an element of $\tilde{A} \otimes B \otimes C$.

Also note that in the border substitution proposition, we are minimizing over all elements in the Grassmannian. In practice, applying border substitution uses tensors with large symmetry groups G_T . The utility is that one may restrict to looking at representatives of closed G_T -orbits in the Grassmannian, rather than by examining all elements of the Grassmannian. One often achieves the best results on the rank of a tensor by using border substitution in conjunction with Koszul flattenings. Naively, the largest lower bound obtainable by the method, i.e. the limit of the method, is at most $\dim A + \dim B + \dim C - 3$, however, the limit is in fact slightly less. For tensors $T \in \mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$, the limit of the method is $3m - 3\sqrt{3m + \frac{9}{4} + \frac{9}{2}}$. See [LM17] for a proof of this and more on this method. The best lower bound achieved on the border rank that is mentioned in the introduction is achieved using this method [LM19].

3.3. Border Apolarity. In order to establish larger lower bounds on $\mathbf{R}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3})$ than can be achieved by Koszul flattenings and border substitution for $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}$, we will use border apolarity, as developed in [BB20] and [CHL19].

Suppose T has a border rank r decomposition, $T = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} T_\epsilon$, where $T_\epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^r T_i(\epsilon)$. If the rank summands $T_i(\epsilon)$ are in general position in $A \otimes B \otimes C$, then we may identify the border rank decomposition with a curve E_ϵ in the Grassmannian variety $G(r, A \otimes B \otimes C)$, by taking the exterior product of the $T_i(\epsilon)$, i.e. $E_\epsilon = [T_1(\epsilon) \wedge \cdots \wedge T_r(\epsilon)]$.

Now we define a \mathbb{Z}^3 -grading on ideals of subsets of $\mathbb{P}A \times \mathbb{P}B \times \mathbb{P}C$ (i.e. the Segre variety) from the natural \mathbb{Z}^3 -grading of $\text{Sym}(A \oplus B \oplus C)^*$. Let $\text{Irrel} := \{0 \oplus B \oplus C\} \cup \{A \oplus 0 \oplus C\} \cup \{A \oplus B \oplus 0\} \subset A \oplus B \oplus C$. Since $\mathbb{P}A \times \mathbb{P}B \times \mathbb{P}C \simeq (A \oplus B \oplus C \setminus \text{Irrel}) / (\mathbb{C}^*)^{\times 3}$, then we may consider the quotient map $q : (A \oplus B \oplus C) \setminus \text{Irrel} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}A \times \mathbb{P}B \times \mathbb{P}C$, which will be invariant under the action of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{\times 3}$. Therefore, for a set $Z \subset \mathbb{P}A \times \mathbb{P}B \times \mathbb{P}C$, the ideal of this set $I(Z) = I(q^{-1}(Z)) \subset \text{Sym}(A \oplus B \oplus C)^*$ will have a \mathbb{Z}^3 grading. In particular, for a single point $([a], [b], [c]) \in \mathbb{P}A \times \mathbb{P}B \times \mathbb{P}C$, corresponding to a rank one tensor $([a \otimes b \otimes c] \in \mathbb{P}(A \otimes B \otimes C))$, we are considering the ideal in $\text{Sym}(A \oplus B \oplus C)^*$ of polynomials vanishing along the lines a, b , and c .

Let I_ϵ denote the \mathbb{Z}^3 -graded ideal of the set of the r points $[T_i(\epsilon)]$, i.e. $I_{ijk,\epsilon} \subset S^i A^* \otimes S^j B^* \otimes S^k C^*$. Since the r points are in general position, then $\text{codim } I_{ijk,\epsilon} = r$. Define $I_{ijk} := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} I_{ijk,\epsilon}$ as the limit of points in the Grassmannian $G(\dim(S^i A^* \otimes S^j B^* \otimes S^k C^*) - r, \dim(S^i A^* \otimes S^j B^* \otimes S^k C^*))$. I_{ijk} will exist, since the Grassmannian is compact, however, the resulting ideal I may not be saturated. See [BB20] for further discussion on this.

Recall that a tensor T is concise if all the coordinate flattening maps T_A, T_B, T_C are injective. For a subspace $U \subset V$, define $U^\perp := \{\alpha \in V^* \mid \alpha(u) = 0 \ \forall u \in U\}$.

In a nutshell, border apolarity gives us some necessary conditions on the possible limiting ideals, I , that can arise from a border rank decomposition.

Theorem 13. (*Weak Border Apolarity*) *Let $X = \mathbb{P}A \times \mathbb{P}B \times \mathbb{P}C$ and $S[X]$ be its coordinate ring. Suppose a tensor T has $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T) \leq r$. Then there exists a (multi)homogeneous ideal $I \subset S[X]$ such that*

- $I \subset \text{Ann}(T)$
- For each multidegree ijk , the ijk th graded piece, I_{ijk} , of I has $\text{codim } I_{ijk} = \min\{r, \dim S[X]_{ijk}\}$

In addition, if G_T is a group acting on X and preserving T , then there exists an I as above which in addition is invariant under a Borel subgroup of G_T .

In [BB20], see Theorems 3.15 (Border Apolarity) for proof of the first part and see Theorem 4.3 (Fixed Ideal Theorem) for a proof of the second part. Theorem 3.15 and 4.3 of [BB20] are not stated here as they are stated in greater generality than we require using the language of schemes. We remark that the Weak Border Apolarity Theorem provides sufficiency that if a border rank r decomposition exists, then there will exist another border rank r decomposition satisfying the given conditions.

We note that the second condition says that we may in fact take the r points of the border rank decomposition to be in general position, and so our initial supposition that the r points are in general position is justified. Lie's Theorem and the Normal Form Lemma allow us to take I_{111} to be B_T -fixed. The Fixed Ideal Theorem of [BB20] uses the same reasoning to generalize this to prove B_T -invariance for all multigraded components I_{ijk} , not just a finite number of multigraded components.

In [CHL19], using Weak Border Apolarity Theorem, they assert that for T a concise tensor with a border rank r decomposition, there will exist an ideal I satisfying the following:

- (1) I_{ijk} is B_T -stable (I_{ijk} is a Borel fixed weight space)
- (2) $I \subset \text{Ann}(T)$ i.e. $I_{110} \subset T(C^*)^\perp \subset A^* \otimes B^*$, etc. and $I_{111} \subset T^\perp \subset A^* \otimes B^* \otimes C$
- (3) For all i, j, k such that $i + j + k > 1$, then $\text{codim } I_{ijk} = r$, i.e. the condition that we may take the r points of the border rank decomposition to be in general position.
- (4) Since I is an ideal, the image of the multiplication map $I_{i-1,j,k} \otimes A^* \oplus I_{i,j-1,k} \otimes B^* \oplus I_{i,j,k-1} \otimes C^* \rightarrow S^i A^* \otimes S^j B^* \otimes S^k C^*$ is contained in I_{ijk}

We note that the last condition is simply the condition that I is an ideal where the multiplication respects the grading. The border apolarity algorithm presented in [CHL19] makes use of these conditions and attempts to iteratively construct all

possible ideals, I , in each multidegree. In particular, if at any multidegree ijk , there does not exist an I_{ijk} satisfying the above, then we may conclude that $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T) > r$. We remark that the candidate ideals, I , do not necessarily correspond to an actual border rank decomposition of the tensor. We describe the algorithm of [CHL19] precisely below:

Algorithm 1 Border Apolarity Algorithm of Conner, Harper, Landsberg

Input: $T \in A \otimes B \otimes C$, r

Output: Candidate ideals or $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T) > r$

- (1) For each B_T -fixed space F_{110} of codim $r - \dim C$ in $T(C^*)^\perp$ (i.e. codim r in $A^* \otimes B^*$) compute ranks of maps $F_{110} \otimes A^* \rightarrow S^2 A^* \otimes B^*$ and $F_{110} \otimes B^* \rightarrow A^* \otimes S^2 B^*$
 If both have images of codim at least r , then F_{110} is possible I_{110} . These are called the (210) and (120) tests.
 - (2) Perform analogously for possible $I_{101} \subset T(B^*)^\perp$ and $I_{011} \subset T(A^*)^\perp$ for candidate F_{101} and F_{011}
 - (3) For each triple $F_{110}, F_{101}, F_{011}$, compute rank of map $(F_{110} \otimes C^*) \oplus (F_{101} \otimes B^*) \oplus (F_{011} \otimes A^*) \rightarrow A^* \otimes B^* \otimes C^*$
 If codim of image is at least r , then have a candidate triple. F_{111} is candidate for I_{111} if it is codim r , it is contained in T^\perp and contains image of above map.
 - (4) Analogous higher degree tests
 - (5) If at any point there are no such candidates $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T) > r$, otherwise stabilization of candidate ideals will occur at worst multi-degree (r, r, r)
-

The condition that I_{ijk} is B_T -fixed allows us to greatly reduce the search for possible candidate ideals. The B_T -fixed spaces are easier to list than trying to list all possible I_{ijk} . This condition allows the algorithm of [CHL19] to be feasible for tensors with large symmetry groups. Then, using the assumption that our points are in general position, one has rank conditions on the multiplication maps, as the images must have codim at least r .

3.3.1. Implementation of Border Apolarity for $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}$. We show how to implement the algorithm of [CHL19] for $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$ by describing how to compute all possible B_T -fixed I_{110} . Additionally, we can leverage the skew-symmetry of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$ to reduce the amount of computation involved for determining potential $I_{110}, I_{101}, I_{011}$.

Let $T = T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3} \in \mathfrak{sl}_3^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_3^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_3 = A \otimes B \otimes C$. The first and third condition from border apolarity tells us to compute all B_T -fixed weight subspaces $F_{110} \subset A^* \otimes B^*$ of codimension r ; however, since T is concise with $\dim T(C^*) = \dim \mathfrak{sl}_3 = 8$ and

$F_{110} \subset T(C^*)^\perp$ by the second condition of border apolarity, we compute all B_T -fixed weight spaces $F_{110} \subset T(C^*)^\perp$ of codimension $r - 8$.

Standard computational methods, see [FH91], yield that the irreducible decomposition of $A^* \otimes B^*$ as \mathfrak{sl}_n -modules is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} A^* \otimes B^* &= \mathfrak{sl}_n \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n \\ &\simeq [2 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0 \ 2] \oplus [2 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0 \ 1 \ 0] \oplus [0 \ 1 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0 \ 2] \oplus [0 \ 1 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0 \ 1 \ 0] \oplus 2[1 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0 \ 1] \oplus [0 \ \cdots \ 0] \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for \mathfrak{sl}_3 , we have the following decomposition into \mathfrak{sl}_3 -modules.

$$\mathfrak{sl}_3 \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_3 \simeq [2 \ 2] \oplus [3 \ 0] \oplus [0 \ 3] \oplus 2[1 \ 1] \oplus [0 \ 0]$$

Using this decomposition and the conciseness of T , we have the \mathfrak{sl}_3 -module decomposition $T(C^*)^\perp \simeq [2 \ 2] \oplus [3 \ 0] \oplus [0 \ 3] \oplus [1 \ 1] \oplus [0 \ 0]$ (Note that $\dim T(C^*)^\perp = 56$). Using this \mathfrak{sl}_3 -module decomposition, we can obtain a decomposition of $T(C^*)^\perp$ into weight spaces (decomposition into \mathfrak{h} -modules) by combining the weight space decompositions of each \mathfrak{sl}_3 -module into one poset. The result is the Figure 1. Each node represents a weight space of weight λ labeled by $(\lambda, \text{dimension of weight space in } T(C^*)^\perp)$. Also note that arrows go from lower weights to higher weights, so the highest weight occurring in $T(C^*)^\perp$ is $[2 \ 2]$. The weight space $[3 \ 0]$ is of dimension 2, where one of the basis elements for this weight space is the highest weight vector of the \mathfrak{sl}_3 -module $[3 \ 0]$ and the other basis element for this weight space is the vector arising from lowering the highest weight vector of the \mathfrak{sl}_3 -module $[2 \ 2]$.

The utility of this decomposition is that we can generate all B_T -fixed weight subspaces F_{110} by taking a collection of weight vectors v_i from the poset such that $v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{56-(r-8)}$ is a highest weight vector in $G(56 - (r - 8), T(C^*)^\perp)$ and consequently is closed under the raising operators. One should note that if v_i comes from a weight space of dimension greater than 1 then one needs to include linear combinations of basis vectors of that weight space.

Example 14. We show a few small examples of possible F_{110} B_T -fixed subspaces to provide intuition of how these spaces are computed.

For $r = 63$, we have that F_{110} will be of the form v_1 . Since it must be closed under raising operators, it will necessarily be a highest weight vector. Therefore, our choices will be $v_1 = v_\lambda$ where v_λ is a highest weight vector of weight $\lambda = [2 \ 2], [3 \ 0], [0 \ 3], [1 \ 1]$, or $[0 \ 0]$.

For $r = 62$, F_{110} will be of the form $v_1 \wedge v_2$. Necessarily, we must have that v_1 must be a highest weight vector. The second vector v_2 may either be another highest




FIGURE 1. Weight Decomposition of $T(C^*)^\perp$

weight vector, a weight vector that can be raised to v_1 , or a linear combination of the two previous cases if they are vectors of the same weight. For example, if we take $v_1 = v_{[2\ 2]}$ to be the highest weight vector of $[2\ 2]$. Let $v_{[3\ 0]}$ and $u_{[3\ 0]}$ be a weight basis for $[3\ 0]$ with v being a highest weight vector. Assume similarly for $[0\ 3]$ weight space. The possible choices for v_2 are weight vectors of the following types: $v_{[3\ 0]}$, $sv_{[3\ 0]} + tu_{[3\ 0]}$, $v_{[0\ 3]}$, $sv_{[0\ 3]} + tu_{[0\ 3]}$, $v_{[1\ 1]}$, $v_{[0\ 0]}$ with s, t parameters. Applying all possible raising operators to $v_1 \wedge v_2$ where v_2 has parameters will provide equations for what values of s, t give us a highest weight vector.

For smaller values of r , the number of possible Borel fixed spaces is much larger and more difficult to list by hand without the aide of a computer. The computationally difficult step in this algorithm lies in computing the ranks of the multiplication maps such as $F_{110} \otimes A^* \rightarrow S^2 A^* \otimes B^*$. In some cases there are many parameters which arise from choosing weight vectors from high dimensional weight spaces, such

as the $[0\ 0]$ weight space in Figure 1. Recall that a linear map has rank at most k if the $(k+1)$ minors all vanish. In order to determine whether the multiplication map has image codimension r , we look at the appropriate minors of this linear map. When there are no parameters involved, this is a simple linear algebra calculation. However, in some cases, the entries of the multiplication map are linear polynomials in the parameters coming from choosing a linear combination of weight vectors. In order to determine whether the multiplication map has image of codimension r , one needs to look at the ideal of these minors, as well as some polynomial equations in the parameters that are needed for the space to be Borel fixed. One must do a Groebner Basis computation on this ideal to determine whether all the minors vanish or not. This can become an unfeasible computation if there are too many parameters and/or equations.

4. NEW BOUNDS

It is known that $\mathbf{R}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_2}) = 5$ [dGH86], so we aim to find bounds on $\mathbf{R}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n})$ for $n = 3$ and 4 using the above techniques. Additionally, we provide new lower bounds on $\mathbf{R}(T_{\mathfrak{so}_n})$ for $n = 4$ and 5 .

4.1. Koszul flattenings. In the case of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}$, we achieve the best results when $p = 3$ and we restrict to a generic 7 dimensional subspace of \mathfrak{sl}_3 , since $\dim \mathfrak{sl}_3 = 8$. The best bound achieved is $\mathbf{R}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}) \geq 14$ (See Table 2).

TABLE 1. $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}$ Results

p	Dimensions of Linear Map	Dimension of Kernel	Koszul Bound
1	(64,224)	0	10
2	(224,448)	1	11
3	(448,560)	8	13

TABLE 2. $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}$ Restriction to a generic subspace of dim k Results

p	k	Dimensions of Linear Map	Dimension of Kernel	Koszul Bound
1	3	(24,24)	0	12
2	5	(80,80)	4	13
3	7	(280,280)	7	14

In the case of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}$, we achieve the best lower bound of 27 when $p = 4$ or 5 while restricting to a subspace (See Table 4).

TABLE 3. $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}$ Results

p	Dimensions of Linear Map	Dimension of Kernel	Koszul Bound
1	(225,1575)	0	17
2	(1575,6825)	1	18
3	(6825,20475)	15	19
4	(20475,45045)	106	21
5	(45045,75075)	470	23
6	(75075,96525)	2680	25
7	(96525,96525)	11039	25

TABLE 4. $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}$ Restriction to a generic subspace of dim k Results

p	k	Dimensions of Linear Map	Dimension of Kernel	Koszul Bound
1	3	(45,45)	0	23
2	5	(150,150)	2	25
3	7	(525,525)	7	26
4	9	(1890,1890)	38	27
5	11	(6930,6930)	176	27
6	13	(25740,25740)	2254	26

As stated above, Koszul flattenings alone are insufficient to obtain border rank lower bounds exceeding $2m$, i.e. Koszul flattenings will not prove $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}) \geq 16$ and $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}) \geq 30$.

In addition to lower bounds on these tensor, we computed lower bounds on $T_{\mathfrak{so}_4}$ and $T_{\mathfrak{so}_5}$.

TABLE 5. $T_{\mathfrak{so}_4}$ Results

p	Dimensions of Linear Map	Rank	Koszul Bound
1	(90,36)	36	8
2	(120,90)	78	8
3	(90,120)	78	8

TABLE 6. $T_{\mathfrak{so}_4}$ Restriction to a generic subspace of dim k Results

p	k	Dimensions of Linear Map	Rank	Koszul Bound
1	3	(18,18)	18	9
2	5	(60,60)	48	8

From [Mir85], it is shown that for the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}_n = \mathfrak{sl}_2^{\times n}$ that $\mathbf{R}(T_{\mathfrak{g}_n}) = 5n$, so $\mathbf{R}(T_{\mathfrak{so}_4}) = 10$. Therefore, $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathfrak{so}_4})$ will either be 9 or 10.

TABLE 7. $T_{\mathfrak{so}_5}$ Results

p	Dimensions of Linear Map	Rank	Koszul Bound
1	(450,100)	100	12
2	(1200,450)	449	13
3	(2100,1200)	1190	15
4	(2520,2100)	1971	16
5	(2100,2520)	1971	16

TABLE 8. $T_{\mathfrak{so}_5}$ Restriction to a generic subspace of dim k Results

p	k	Dimensions of Linear Map	Rank	Koszul Bound
1	3	(30,30)	30	15
2	5	(100,100)	98	17
3	7	(350,350)	343	18
4	9	(1260,1260)	1136	17

4.2. Border Substitution. For $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n} \in \mathfrak{sl}_n^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n^* \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n$, we may identify the space \mathfrak{sl}_n^* with \mathfrak{sl}_n (by sending an element to its negative transpose). Therefore, we may identify $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$ as an element of $\mathfrak{sl}_n \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n$. As a first step in applying border substitution, we restrict $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n} \in A \otimes B \otimes C$ in the A tensor factor. Since we may restrict to looking at representatives of closed $G_{T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}}$ -orbits, then the only planes we need to check are the highest weight planes in $G(k, \mathfrak{sl}_n)$. In order to compute the border rank of the restricted tensor, we use Koszul flattenings on the restricted tensor. Once again, let v_λ denote the unique weight vector in weight space λ .

For $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}$, border substitution did not generate a better lower bound than the Koszul flattenings. However, we were able to obtain a better lower bound for $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}$.

Let A' , as in Proposition 15, be \tilde{A}^\perp where we take \tilde{A} to be a space of dimension $m - k$. If we restrict our tensor by a one dimensional subspace, then the only choice for \tilde{A} will be the space spanned by $v_{[1\ 0\ 1]}$, which is the highest weight vector of \mathfrak{sl}_n .

TABLE 9. $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}$ with Restriction $\tilde{A} = v_{[1\ 0\ 1]}$

p	k	Dimensions of Linear Map	Dimension of Kernel	Koszul Bound
1	3	(45,45)	0	23
2	5	(150,150)	2	25
3	7	(525,525)	7	26
4	9	(1890,1890)	38	27
5	11	(6930,6930)	248	27
6	13	(25740,25740)	2254	26

Restricting by a two dimensional subspace, we have one choice for \tilde{A} up to symmetry in the weight space decomposition for \mathfrak{sl}_4 , namely $v_{[1\ 0\ 1]} \wedge v_{[-1\ 1\ 1]}$.

TABLE 10. $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}$ with Restriction $\tilde{A} = v_{[1\ 0\ 1]} \wedge v_{[-1\ 1\ 1]}$

p	k	Dimensions of Linear Map	Dimension of Kernel	Koszul Bound
1	3	(45,45)	0	23
2	5	(150,150)	2	25
3	7	(525,525)	7	26
4	9	(1890,1890)	78	26
5	11	(6930,6930)	498	26

Restricting by a three dimensional subspace, we have three choices for \tilde{A} up to symmetry. \tilde{A} may be $v_{[1\ 0\ 1]} \wedge v_{[1\ 1\ -1]} \wedge v_{[-1\ 1\ 1]}$, $v_{[1\ 0\ 1]} \wedge v_{[1\ 1\ -1]} \wedge v_{[2\ -1\ 0]}$, or $v_{[1\ 0\ 1]} \wedge v_{[1\ 1\ -1]} \wedge v_{[-1\ 2\ -1]}$.

TABLE 11. $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}$ with Restriction $\tilde{A} = v_{[1 \ 0 \ 1]} \wedge v_{[1 \ 1 \ -1]} \wedge v_{[-1 \ 1 \ 1]}$

p	k	Dimensions of Linear Map	Dimension of Kernel	Koszul Bound
1	3	(45,45)	0	23
2	5	(150,150)	2	25
3	7	(525,525)	31	25
4	9	(1890,1890)	168	25
5	11	(6930,6930)	755	25

TABLE 12. $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}$ with Restriction $\tilde{A} = v_{[1 \ 0 \ 1]} \wedge v_{[1 \ 1 \ -1]} \wedge v_{[2 \ -1 \ 0]}$

p	k	Dimensions of Linear Map	Dimension of Kernel	Koszul Bound
1	3	(45,45)	0	23
2	5	(150,150)	2	25
3	7	(525,525)	7	25
4	9	(1890,1890)	72	25
5	11	(6930,6930)	498	25

TABLE 13. $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}$ with Restriction $\tilde{A} = v_{[1 \ 0 \ 1]} \wedge v_{[1 \ 1 \ -1]} \wedge v_{[-1 \ 2 \ -1]}$

p	k	Dimensions of Linear Map	Dimension of Kernel	Koszul Bound
1	3	(45,45)	3	21
2	5	(150,150)	14	23
3	7	(525,525)	42	25
4	9	(1890,1890)	254	24
5	11	(6930,6930)	1072	24

The best bound we obtain is $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}|_{(v_{[1 \ 0 \ 1]})^\perp \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_n}) \geq 27$ (See Table 9). By Proposition 15, this proves Theorem 3, $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}) \geq 28$. After restricting in the A tensor factor, we cannot restrict by the highest weight vector of \mathfrak{sl}_n in the B or C factor as the symmetry group of the restricted tensor will have a different symmetry group.

Additionally, border substitution gives a better lower bound on $\underline{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathfrak{so}_5})$. Restricting by a two dimension subspace (See Table 14) and using Proposition 15 proves Theorem 5.

TABLE 14. $T_{\mathfrak{so}_5}$ with Restriction $\tilde{A} = v_{[0\ 1]} \wedge v_{[1\ 0]}$

p	k	Dimensions of Linear Map	Dimension of Kernel	Koszul Bound
1	3	(30,30)	0	15
2	5	(100,100)	4	16
3	7	(350,350)	28	17
4	9	(1260,1260)	194	16

4.3. Border Apolarity. We use border apolarity to disprove that $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}$ has rank $r = 15$. We first compute candidate F_{110} spaces which passed the (210)-test. There were a total of 5 candidate F_{110} subspaces out of a total of more than 1245 possible F_{110} spaces. The candidate F_{110} spaces came in three types of weight space decompositions:

TABLE 15. Two candidate F_{110} planes have the following weight decomposition

Weight	Dimension of weight space in $A^* \otimes B^*$	Dimension of weight space in F_{110}
[2, 2]	1	1
[3, 0]	2	2
[4, -2]	1	1
[0, 3]	2	2
[1, 1]	5	5
[2, -1]	5	5
[3, -3]	2	2
[-2, 4]	1	1
[-1, 2]	5	5
[0, 0]	8	8
[1, -2]	5	5
[2, -4]	1	1
[-3, 3]	2	2
[-2, 1]	5	4
[-1, -1]	5	4
[0, -3]	2	1

TABLE 16. One candidate F_{110} plane has the following weight decomposition

Weight	Dimension of weight space in $A^* \otimes B^*$	Dimension of weight space in F_{110}
[2, 2]	1	1
[3, 0]	2	2
[4, -2]	1	1
[0, 3]	2	2
[1, 1]	5	5
[2, -1]	5	5
[3, -3]	2	2
[-2, 4]	1	1
[-1, 2]	5	5
[0, 0]	8	8
[1, -2]	5	5
[2, -4]	1	1
[-3, 3]	2	2
[-2, 1]	5	5
[-1, -1]	5	3
[-4, 2]	1	1

TABLE 17. Two candidate F_{110} planes have the following weight decomposition

Weight	Dimension of weight space in $A^* \otimes B^*$	Dimension of weight space in F_{110}
[2, 2]	1	1
[3, 0]	2	2
[4, -2]	1	1
[0, 3]	2	2
[1, 1]	5	5
[2, -1]	5	5
[3, -3]	2	2
[-2, 4]	1	1
[-1, 2]	5	5
[0, 0]	8	8
[1, -2]	5	5
[2, -4]	1	1
[-3, 3]	2	2
[-2, 1]	5	5
[-1, -1]	5	4
[-4, 2]	1	1
[-3, 0]	2	1

The computation to produce these 5 candidate F_{110} planes took extensive time in some cases, due to the parameters creating a difficult groebner basis computation when determining whether an F_{110} plane passes (210)-test. The large number of candidates was not as much of a computational issue as all the (210)-tests can be parallelized. Some of these computations were done on Texas A&M's High Performance Research Cluster as well as Texas A&M's Math Department Cluster.

Using the skew-symmetry of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$, we are able to produce F_{011} and F_{101} candidate weight spaces from the candidate F_{110} spaces. A computer calculation verified that for each candidate triple $F_{110}, F_{011}, F_{101}$, the rank condition is not met for the (111)-test and consequently, there are no candidate F_{111} spaces. Therefore, the rank of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}$ is greater than 15 and this proves Theorem 1, $\mathbf{R}(T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}) \geq 16$. This result is significant as it is the first example of an explicit tensor such that the border rank is at least $2m$ when $m < 13$.

4.4. Upper Bounds. A numerical computer search has given a rank 20 decomposition of $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}$. The technique used was a combination of Newton's Method and Lenstra–Lenstra–Lovász Algorithm to find rational approximations [CLGV20]. This

technique formulated the problem as a nonlinear optimization problem that was solved to machine precision and then subsequently modified using the Lenstra-Lenstra-Lovász Algorithm to generate a precise solution with algebraic numbers given the numerical solution. As $T_{s_{13}} \in \mathbb{C}^8 \otimes \mathbb{C}^8 \otimes \mathbb{C}^8$, a rank 20 decomposition consists of finding $a_i, b_i, c_i \in \mathbb{C}^8$ such that $T = \sum_{i=1}^{20} a_i \otimes b_i \otimes c_i$. We take each vector a_i, b_i, c_i to be a vector 8 variables, and using properties of elements of tensor products, we can multiply out the right hand side and have a system of equations for each entry of the tensor. This amounts to solving a system of 512 polynomial equations of degree 3 in 480 variables. We then use Newton's method to find roots to this system of equations. If it appears to converge to a solution, then we compute it to machine precision and use Lenstra-Lenstra-Lovász to find an algebraic solution that satisfies the initial polynomial conditions. Therefore, this decomposition proves Theorem 2, $\mathbf{R}(T_{s_{13}}) \leq 20$.

Let ζ_6 denote a primitive 6th root of unity. The following is the rank 20 decomposition of $T_{s_{13}}$. One may verify that this is in fact a rank decomposition by showing that it satisfies the polynomial equations described above. We note that the below decomposition has some local symmetry. For example, the first three terms share

$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \zeta_6 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ as a common factor with standard cyclic \mathbb{Z}_3 -symmetry, i.e. this element

occurs once in each tensor factor in the first three terms. We have grouped terms in the below presentation of the decomposition by this local symmetry. We were unable to determine any global symmetry in this presentation of this decomposition.

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3} = & \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^4 2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \zeta_6 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -6 & -4\zeta_6^2 & -6\zeta_6 \\ 9\zeta_6 & 18 & 0 \\ 6\zeta_6^2 & 0 & -12 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 6\zeta_6 & -4 & 0 \\ 9\zeta_6^2 & 0 & -9 \\ 0 & 4\zeta_6^2 & -6\zeta_6 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^4 2^3}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -6 & -4\zeta_6^2 & -6\zeta_6 \\ 9\zeta_6 & 18 & 0 \\ 6\zeta_6^2 & 0 & -12 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \zeta_6 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -6\zeta_6 & 4 & -6\zeta_6^2 \\ 0 & 6\zeta_6 & 9 \\ -6 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^4 2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 6 & 4\zeta_6^2 & 0 \\ 9\zeta_6 & 0 & 9\zeta_6^2 \\ 0 & 4\zeta_6 & -6 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 12\zeta_6 & -4 & 6\zeta_6^2 \\ 0 & -18\zeta_6 & -9 \\ 6 & 0 & 6\zeta_6 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \zeta_6 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{\zeta_6}{3^5 2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 6\zeta_6 \\ -18\zeta_6 & -18\zeta_6^2 & -9 \\ -6 & -4\zeta_6 & 18\zeta_6^2 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 18\zeta_6^2 & 0 & 6\zeta_6 \\ 9\zeta_6 & -18\zeta_6^2 & 18 \\ -6 & -4\zeta_6 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \zeta_6^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^4 2^2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -6\zeta_6 & 4\zeta_6^2 & -6 \\ 9 & 18\zeta_6 & 0 \\ -6\zeta_6^2 & 0 & -12\zeta_6 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \zeta_6^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -12\zeta_6 & 0 & -6 \\ -9 & 6\zeta_6 & 18\zeta_6^2 \\ -6\zeta_6^2 & 4 & 6\zeta_6 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{\zeta_6}{3^4}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \zeta_6 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -3\zeta_6^2 & -2 & -3\zeta_6 \\ 0 & 9\zeta_6^2 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -6\zeta_6^2 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 6\zeta_6 & 0 & -6 \\ 1 & 6\zeta_6 & -9\zeta_6^2 \\ -6\zeta_6^2 & 4 & -12\zeta_6 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^4 2^3}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -12 & -4\zeta_6^2 & -6\zeta_6 \\ 0 & 18 & -9\zeta_6^2 \\ 6\zeta_6^2 & 0 & -6 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -6\zeta_6^2 & 4\zeta_6 & 0 \\ 9 & 0 & 9\zeta_6 \\ 0 & 4 & 6\zeta_6^2 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -4 & 6\zeta_6^2 \\ -9\zeta_6^2 & -6\zeta_6 & 0 \\ 6 & 0 & 6\zeta_6 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^5 2^3}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -18 & 0 & 6\zeta_6^2 \\ 9\zeta_6^2 & 18 & 18\zeta_6 \\ -6\zeta_6 & -4\zeta_6^2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -6\zeta_6^2 \\ 18\zeta_6^2 & -18 & 9\zeta_6 \\ 6\zeta_6 & 4\zeta_6^2 & 18 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 4\zeta_6 & 6\zeta_6^2 \\ -9\zeta_6^2 & 6 & 0 \\ -6\zeta_6 & 0 & -6 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^3 2^3}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -12\zeta_6 & 8 & -6\zeta_6^2 \\ 0 & 18\zeta_6 & 9 \\ -6 & -4\zeta_6^2 & -6\zeta_6 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -2\zeta_6^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 3\zeta_6 \\ 0 & 0 & 2\zeta_6^2 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -6\zeta_6 \\ 9\zeta_6 & 6 & 0 \\ 6\zeta_6^2 & 4\zeta_6 & -6 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^5 2^3}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 18\zeta_6^2 & 12 & 6\zeta_6 \\ 9\zeta_6 & -18\zeta_6^2 & 18 \\ -6 & 8\zeta_6 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -6 & -6\zeta_6 \\ 18\zeta_6 & 18\zeta_6^2 & 9 \\ 6 & -2\zeta_6 & -18\zeta_6^2 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 6\zeta_6 \\ -9\zeta_6 & -6\zeta_6^2 & 0 \\ -6 & -4\zeta_6 & 6\zeta_6^2 \end{bmatrix} +
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{1}{3^4 2^3}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 12 & 4 & -6 \\ 0 & -18 & 9 \\ -6 & 0 & 6 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -6 & 4 & 0 \\ 9 & 0 & -9 \\ 0 & -4 & 6 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 6 \\ -9 & 6 & 0 \\ 6 & -4 & -6 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^3 2^3}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -12 & 0 & 6 \\ 0 & 18 & -9 \\ 6 & -4 & -6 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 4 & -6 \\ 9 & -6 & 0 \\ -6 & 0 & 6 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^3 2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 12 & 0 & -6 \\ 0 & -18 & 9 \\ -6 & 4 & 6 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^4 2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 6 & 4 & -6 \\ 9 & -18 & 0 \\ -6 & 0 & 12 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 6 & 0 & -6 \\ 0 & -6 & 9 \\ -6 & 4 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^3 2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -6 & -4 & 6 \\ -9 & 18 & 0 \\ 6 & 0 & -12 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^3 2^5}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -4 & -6 & -6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 9 & 4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -4 & 6 & -6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -9 & 4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -4 & -6 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 9 & -4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^3 2^5}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 4 & -6 & -6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 9 & 4 & -4 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -4 & -6 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 9 & -4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 4 & -6 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 9 & -4 & -4 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^3 2^5}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -4 & -6 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 9 & -4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -4 & 6 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -9 & -4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 6 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -9 & -4 & -4 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{1}{3^3 2^5}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -4 & 6 & -6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -9 & 4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -4 & -6 & -6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 9 & 4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 4 & -6 & -6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 9 & 4 & -4 \end{bmatrix} + \\
& \left(\frac{2}{3^2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

In an attempt to find a smaller rank decomposition, we found numerical evidence suggesting that $\mathbf{R}(T_{s_{13}}) \leq 18$. The above method was unable to determine exact algebraic numbers for it to be an honest border rank decomposition. We include the approximate border rank decomposition, which was obtained as a numerical solution

to machine precision using Newton's method, in Appendix A. This decomposition satisfies the equation $T_{\mathfrak{sl}_3} = \sum_{k=1}^{18} a_k(t) \otimes b_k(t) \otimes c_k(t) + O(t)$ to a maximum error in each entry of $3.88578058618805 \cdot 10^{-16}$ (ℓ_0 error). It also is satisfied with a sum of squares error of $1.85900227125328 \cdot 10^{-15}$ (ℓ_2 error), which is the square root of the sum of the squares of all errors in each entry.

APPENDIX A. APPENDIX

```

## Approximate Border Rank 18 Decomposition for sl3. B is list of length
  18,
## Each element of B is 3 lists, one for each tensor factor

t = var('t')
decomp_sl3_br18 = [
[[0.8582131228193816*t^4, 1.0*t^3, -0.656183917735616, 0,
  -0.6991867952664118*t^4, 0.48158077142326267*t, 0, 0],
[0.4276000554886944, 0, -0.18145759099190728*t^4, -0.615151864463497*t,
  0.3663065358105463, 0.41017982352375143*t^-3, 0.32919233217347255*t^4,
  -0.37760897344619454*t^3],
[-0.1349207590097993*t^4, -0.6002859548136603*t^-3, 1.0,
  0.5115159306456755*t^-5, -0.1595527810915205*t^-4,
  -0.6048099252034903*t^-1, -0.7277947872836206*t^-8,
  -0.40421722543545996*t^-7]],
[[-1.0*t^4, 0.35415463745033937*t^3, 0.0064263290832379735, 0,
  -0.36545526641405424*t^4, -0.07853056373003943*t,
  -0.032960816562400096*t^8, 0],
[0, 0, 1.0*t^-4, -0.2566348901375672*t, -0.22472886423613508, 0,
  -1.5211311526049585*t^4, 0],
[0.8999601061346961*t^-4, 0, -0.9891997951816988,
  0.7757989654047442*t^-5, 0.6720573676204581*t^-4, 0,
  -0.7680275258871294*t^-8, 0.23098457888352464*t^-7]],
[[1.4652283519838352*t^4, 0, -0.49981037975335263,
  -0.1095789691297215*t^5, 0, -0.39151017186719006*t,
  -0.0035109361876165053*t^8, 0],
[-0.0370198277154002, -0.4868421872551675*t^-1, -0.6112939642144736*t^-4,
  1.0*t, 0, -0.2400052666531245*t^-3, 0.3994050510000636*t^4,
  0.38578320751551654*t^3],
[-0.976481792017985*t^-4, -0.6067214925499242*t^-3, 0,
  -0.723941360626237*t^-5, -1.0*t^-4, 0.5548674236521388*t^-1,
  0.43144009347718587*t^-8, 0]],
[[0, 0, 0, 0.7384182957633163*t^5, 0, 0.644445145257651*t, 1.0*t^8,
  0.14298165951600136*t^7],

```

$[0.48917042278155703, -1.1676021066814524*t^{-1}, 0.0742778280974771*t^{-4},$
 $0, 0, 0.43490564244204044*t^{-3}, 0, -0.35107756870823037*t^3],$
 $[0.35864016315209*t^{-4}, 0.08753789324397686*t^{-3}, 0.09745671407220928,$
 $0.8747382868849779*t^{-5}, -0.08844676171127677*t^{-4}, 0, 1.0*t^{-8},$
 $0.26767660269283405*t^{-7}],$
 $[[0, 0.7154062494455652*t^3, 0.753065093225573, 0.25916815694138623*t^5,$
 $1.0*t^4, -0.13328651389721624*t, -0.43754268152319187*t^8,$
 $0.33712746822644685*t^7],$
 $[0.31175249346291917, 0.4893435772426664*t^{-1}, -0.6750030230291015*t^{-4},$
 $0, 0, 0, -1.0*t^4, 0.2730200083141182*t^3],$
 $[-0.48768995751368266*t^{-4}, 0.3666405285647919*t^{-3}, -0.509119354246841,$
 $-0.4700930934822484*t^{-5}, -0.22797281366964972*t^{-4},$
 $-0.35924834770877284*t^{-1}, 0.21574925698409564*t^{-8},$
 $-0.4457498667959218*t^{-7}],$
 $[[[-0.3726117655275953*t^4, -0.6850149555795361*t^3, -0.47485190359116686,$
 $-0.3845493471094187*t^5, 1.3294054010695648*t^4, 0, 0,$
 $-0.360876333169775*t^7],$
 $[-0.20585599800494148, 0.14163424899135532*t^{-1},$
 $-0.07154541239160381*t^{-4}, 0, 0, 0.6161959625923827*t^{-3}, -1.0*t^4,$
 $1.1951737645411018*t^3],$
 $[0.32862886361063015*t^{-4}, -1.0*t^{-3}, 0.02421044619636145,$
 $-0.10037637090787854*t^{-5}, 0.8394716140987267*t^{-4},$
 $0.6969300342438073*t^{-1}, 0.33915176005821984*t^{-8},$
 $-0.8710663402014699*t^{-7}],$
 $[[[-0.26018060869681375*t^4, -0.5986510147484245*t^3, 0, 0,$
 $0.34975430620458303*t^4, 0.6295753676920407*t,$
 $-0.008909285185907506*t^8, -1.0*t^7],$
 $[0.1869896012120452, 0.21074450964709926*t^{-1}, 0.15931993306826575*t^{-4},$
 $-0.5916688936748106*t, -1.0, 0.4704225477242227*t^{-3},$
 $0.4764298640490715*t^4, 0],$
 $[-0.11381180152788646*t^{-4}, 0, -0.6321964884450085,$
 $1.1046891281785145*t^{-5}, 0, 1.0*t^{-1}, -0.39603240282608254*t^{-8},$
 $0.9263232781144852*t^{-7}],$
 $[[0.5249458233325552*t^4, 0.48647993414509433*t^3, 0.288317913855889,$
 $-0.6006289011129895*t^5, -0.43339360309318065*t^4,$
 $-0.9021189701254521*t, -0.3580507322918174*t^8, 0],$
 $[0, -0.6140778368802516*t^{-1}, 0, 0.3157042904634412*t, 1.0,$
 $0.3354809468306432*t^{-3}, -0.4344836650252679*t^4,$
 $0.3640820338419208*t^3],$
 $[0, 0.021642017184031522*t^{-3}, 0, 1.0*t^{-5}, -0.16272749957295446*t^{-4}, 0,$
 $0.3302270185683934*t^{-8}, -0.5277803864906128*t^{-7}],$
 $[[0, 0.5078943260216121*t^3, -0.8437068467257393,$
 $-0.16779079767696245*t^5, 0, -0.22773097773605452*t, 1.0*t^8, 0],$

$[-0.6816689949383756, 0, -0.5858467479048473*t^{-4}, 0.4936500799168931*t,$
 $-1.0, -0.06688550512654293*t^{-3}, 0, 0],$
 $[0, 0.6059010244748405*t^{-3}, 0, 1.3353428165296193*t^{-5}, 0, 0,$
 $-0.6434299512786738*t^{-8}, -0.4609346348556645*t^{-7}]],$
 $[[0.5342376006675218*t^4, -0.6086422770257539*t^3, 0,$
 $0.4884368142723877*t^5, -0.718333221563019*t^4, 0, 0, -1.0*t^7],$
 $[0.4628574417338272, 0.8309327397168714*t^{-1}, 0.21142383552160535*t^{-4},$
 $-1.0560448029801677*t, 0, -1.0*t^{-3}, 0, 0.5907349063234486*t^3],$
 $[-0.19068598535726494*t^{-4}, 1.251113151532601*t^{-3}, 0,$
 $0.801440153916977*t^{-5}, -0.4621883155369931*t^{-4},$
 $0.649922008892636*t^{-1}, 0.4517624031930135*t^{-8},$
 $0.6177441885560955*t^{-7}]],$
 $[[-0.46119950535589427*t^4, 0.7406376078020875*t^3, 0.29057187128303724,$
 $0, 0.6143929403505343*t^4, 0.4568692437943906*t, 1.0*t^8,$
 $0.36703376745263416*t^7],$
 $[0, 1.080760392781858*t^{-1}, -0.14934226596262576*t^{-4}, 0,$
 $0.463851046688496, -0.5286724400096557*t^{-3}, 0,$
 $-0.5122850384466106*t^3],$
 $[0, -0.17675493191050737*t^{-3}, -0.7935243857498888,$
 $1.0525678466492765*t^{-5}, 0, 0, 0.8232503249794846*t^{-8}, 1.0*t^{-7}]],$
 $[[-0.1128613231857281*t^4, -1.004601481243395*t^3, -0.18790258087897918,$
 $0.40149916700646043*t^5, -0.14415337265479422*t^4, 0, 0, 1.0*t^7],$
 $[-0.6862576195287183, 0.5664746389899703*t^{-1}, 0.2908675685084361*t^{-4},$
 $1.3714715312276369*t, 1.0, -0.5713223321771269*t^{-3},$
 $0.5522456890804313*t^4, 0],$
 $[-0.3006833454545763*t^{-4}, -1.5673937490149197*t^{-3}, 0, 0,$
 $0.38713909105007405*t^{-4}, 0.9955939462610987*t^{-1},$
 $0.5677563588587456*t^{-8}, 0.5353436694572539*t^{-7}]],$
 $[[-0.6245100623794343*t^4, 0, -1.0, 0.5065225347182659*t^5,$
 $0.5317253204886139*t^4, 0, 0, -0.3719669835035259*t^7],$
 $[0.5699237870531472, -0.2500784148082814*t^{-1}, 0.442945128286494*t^{-4},$
 $0.45638933734578824*t, 1.3973251849132609, 0, 0, 0],$
 $[0, 0.5427787886626944*t^{-3}, 0.6987561651998788, 1.0*t^{-5}, 0,$
 $0.20324504499293194*t^{-1}, -0.21496324065341224*t^{-8},$
 $-0.35477523806474964*t^{-7}]],$
 $[[0, -0.8732161724035096*t^3, -0.2040186481697669,$
 $-1.2010646422303124*t^5, -0.23508531984800027*t^4,$
 $0.5654807700289866*t, 0, 1.0788666817176849*t^7],$
 $[-1.0, 0.23352368487408065*t^{-1}, 0.2848223349469312*t^{-4},$
 $0.1768073101741446*t, 1.1645543351076657, 0, 0, 0],$
 $[0.4548846200775119*t^{-4}, 0, -1.0, 0.7165423092004359*t^{-5},$
 $-0.2616313451578387*t^{-4}, -1.2932734528263643*t^{-1},$
 $-0.30361754210884495*t^{-8}, 0.12055753515645255*t^{-7}]],$

```

[[-0.36174656010597567*t^4, 0, 0, 1.0*t^5, 0, -0.9529930944532633*t, 0,
0],
[-0.249684891380413, -0.48049270284391143*t^-1, 0.27222663948587644*t^-4,
0.06402554598955673*t, 0.32897469345165686, -0.29230508678584777*t^-3,
0.3854984554913255*t^4, 1.084386049943073*t^3],
[0.5943543096084136*t^-4, 0, -0.4586866892423329, -1.0*t^-5,
-0.2869864460438895*t^-4, 0.7692509696955846*t^-1,
-0.5902387210012353*t^-8, -0.10600670730550378*t^-7]],
[[0.2878925845174677*t^4, 0.5281046432775963*t^3, -0.2234313203594912, 0,
-0.14791845243016916*t^4, -0.33262458187432487*t,
1.108538091915835*t^8, 0.2489733522919065*t^7],
[-0.19980163401634468, -0.4519313364099573*t^-1,
-0.9400278789365702*t^-4, 1.7023099438662026*t, 0.47743291480661737,
0.40637104558436565*t^-3, -0.9678003132293527*t^4, -1.0*t^3],
[1.0*t^-4, 0.391031885184312*t^-3, 0, -1.0*t^-5, 0.8654063566747124*t^-4,
0, 0, 0]],
[[1.0110775513705723*t^4, -0.3307689454870473*t^3, -0.45870287159609613,
0, -0.2918463909613691*t^4, 0.30167345561087666*t,
0.582399773106054*t^8, 0],
[0, -1.0*t^-1, 0.7191039431350641*t^-4, 0.5392536432576923*t,
-0.39197591630294476, -0.7143544436146056*t^-3, 0,
0.8086746481540814*t^3],
[0.4561800893644289*t^-4, -0.7356641704491395*t^-3, 0.4710082951189216,
0, 0, 0.7109669616748934*t^-1, -1.0*t^-8, 0]],
[[-0.41687446856120663*t^4, 0.3197337020122604*t^3, 0.3753986532686001,
0, -0.40495125990774045*t^4, 0.2979428965247865*t,
-0.6344817450528121*t^8, -0.212014762523078*t^7],
[-0.2396929297153146, 0.7894128907681753*t^-1, 0, 0, 0.2995112979592937,
1.0*t^-3, 0.09278089610904368*t^4, 0.5160805291028968*t^3],
[0.4011063039077983*t^-4, 0, 0, 0.2503035377295029*t^-5, 1.0*t^-4,
-0.9730216219558445*t^-1, 0.6637049194937615*t^-8,
-0.5073657590422873*t^-7]]
]

```

REFERENCES

- [AFT11] Boris Alexeev, Michael A. Forbes, and Jacob Tsimerman. Tensor rank: some lower and upper bounds. In *26th Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 283–291. IEEE Computer Soc., Los Alamitos, CA, 2011.
- [BB20] Weronika Buczyńska and Jarosław Buczyński. Apolarity, border rank and multigraded hilbert scheme, 2020, arXiv: 1910.01944 [math.AG].

- [Bin80] D. Bini. Relations between exact and approximate bilinear algorithms. Applications. *Calcolo*, 17(1):87–97, 1980.
- [CHI⁺18] Luca Chiantini, Jonathan D. Hauenstein, Christian Ikenmeyer, Joseph M. Landsberg, and Giorgio Ottaviani. Polynomials and the exponent of matrix multiplication. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 50(3):369–389, 2018.
- [CHL19] Austin Conner, Alicia Harper, and J. M. Landsberg. New lower bounds for matrix multiplication and the 3x3 determinant, 2019, arXiv: 1911.07981 [math.AG].
- [CLGV20] Austin Conner, Joseph M. Landsberg, Fulvio Gesmundo, and Emanuele Ventura. Kronecker Powers of Tensors and Strassen’s Laser Method. In Thomas Vidick, editor, *11th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2020)*, volume 151 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 10:1–10:28, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2020. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.
- [dGH86] Hans F. de Groote and Joos Heintz. A lower bound for the bilinear complexity of some semisimple Lie algebras. In *Algebraic algorithms and error correcting codes (Grenoble, 1985)*, volume 229 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 211–222. Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [FH91] William Fulton and Joe Harris. *Representation theory*, volume 129 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991. A first course, Readings in Mathematics.
- [Lan17] J. M. Landsberg. *Geometry and complexity theory*, volume 169 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017.
- [Lic85] Thomas Lickteig. Typical tensorial rank. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 69:95–100, 1985.
- [LM17] J. M. Landsberg and Mateusz Michałek. On the geometry of border rank decompositions for matrix multiplication and other tensors with symmetry. *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom.*, 1(1):2–19, 2017.
- [LM19] J. M. Landsberg and Mateusz Michałek. Towards finding hay in a haystack: explicit tensors of border rank greater than $2.02m$ in $c^m \otimes c^m \otimes c^m$, 2019, arXiv: 1912.11927 [cs.CC].
- [LO15] Joseph M. Landsberg and Giorgio Ottaviani. New lower bounds for the border rank of matrix multiplication. *Theory Comput.*, 11:285–298, 2015.
- [LY20] Lek-Heng Lim and Ke Ye. Ubiquity of the exponent of matrix multiplication. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, ISSAC ’20*, page 8–11, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Mir85] Roland Mirwald. The algorithmic structure of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, k)$. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Algebraic Algorithms and Error-Correcting Codes, AAEC-3*, page 274–287, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1985. Springer-Verlag.
- [Mum95] David Mumford. *Algebraic geometry. I*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. Complex projective varieties, Reprint of the 1976 edition.
- [Sha13] Igor R. Shafarevich. *Basic algebraic geometry. 1*. Springer, Heidelberg, third edition, 2013. Varieties in projective space.
- [Str69] Volker Strassen. Gaussian elimination is not optimal. *Numer. Math.*, 13:354–356, 1969.
- [Str83] V. Strassen. Rank and optimal computation of generic tensors. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 52/53:645–685, 1983.

Email address: kashbari@math.tamu.edu