

Block-Circulant Complex Hadamard Matrices

Wojciech Bruzda*

Jagiellonian University,
Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Applied Computer Science,
ul. Łojasiewicza 11, 30-348, Kraków, Poland

May 24, 2023

Abstract

A new method of obtaining a sequence of isolated complex Hadamard matrices (CHM) for dimensions $N \geq 7$, based on block-circulant structures, is presented. We discuss, several analytic examples resulting from a modification of the Sinkhorn algorithm. In particular, we present new isolated matrices of orders 9, 10 and 11, which elements are not roots of unity, and also several new multiparametric families of order 10. We note novel connections between certain eight-dimensional matrices and provide new insights towards classification of CHM for $N \geq 7$. These contributions can find real applications in Quantum Information Theory and constructions of new families of Mutually Unbiased Bases or Unitary Error Bases.

1 Complex Hadamard Matrices

Consider a set $\mathbb{H}(N)$ of rescaled and unimodular unitary matrices H of order $N > 1$ such that $HH^\dagger = N\mathbb{I}_N$ and $H_{jk} = \exp\{2i\pi p_{jk}\}$ for $p_{jk} \in [0, 1)$ and $j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Matrix \mathbb{I}_N is the N -dimensional identity matrix while elements of $\mathbb{H}(N)$ are called *complex Hadamard matrices* (CHM) [1]. A special subset of CHM called Butson type matrices is distinguished; $\text{B}\mathbb{H}(N, q) \subsetneq \mathbb{H}(N)$ [2, 3]. Each entry of a matrix $H \in \text{B}\mathbb{H}(N, q)$ is q^{th} root of unity, that is $p_{jk} = m_{jk}/q$ for some $m_{jk} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. Complex Hadamard matrices are extension of real (with only ∓ 1 entries) Hadamard matrices [4] and can be further generalized over quaternions [5] or general groups [6, 7]. Real Hadamard matrices form a special case of Butson matrices, $\text{B}\mathbb{H}(N, 2)$. In this paper we consider mainly non-Butson type CHM.

The occurrence of complex Hadamard matrices in theoretical and experimental physics is omnipresent. It is enough to only mention the key examples like *dense coding* and *quantum teleportation schemes* [8], *mutually unbiased bases* [9, 10] (MUB), *nice error bases* [11], *quantum designs* [7, 12], *unitary error bases* [13] (UEB), *unitary depolarizers* [8, 14], and *tomography of quantum states* [15, 16]. The motivation for working on CHM can be continued over many other practical and engineering applications [17, 18], while purely mathematical aspects of such objects are presented in the recent comprehensive monograph by Banica [19].

*w.bruzda[at]uj.edu.pl

2 Classification and Invariants

It is easy to notice that $\forall N : \mathbb{H}(N) \neq \emptyset$ since such an example is provided for any dimension N by the Fourier matrix,

$$F_N = \sum_{j,k=0}^{N-1} |j\rangle\langle k| \exp \left\{ \frac{2i\pi jk}{N} \right\} \in \text{B}\mathbb{H}(N, N) \subset \mathbb{H}(N). \quad (2.1)$$

Apart from individual numerical findings, there are many systematic constructions of CHM. From simply rearranging the elements and/or expanding the size of a given matrix [20, 21], through more advanced mathematical apparatus involving tiling abelian groups [22], graph theory [23, 24], Golay sequences [25], and orthogonal maximal abelian *-subalgebras [26]. Further examples and references are summarized in the ‘‘Catalog of Complex Hadamard Matrices’’ [27]. In this paper we will follow two different paths: a numerical method based on the Sinkhorn algorithm and some specific constructions using particular symmetries inside the matrix.

CHM come in a variety of forms. We distinguish three general classes: *isolated points*, *affine* and *nonaffine families (orbits)* [1]. Two matrices $H_1, H_2 \in \mathbb{H}(N)$ are called *equivalent* [28], written $H_1 \simeq H_2$, if there exist two diagonal unitary matrices $D_1, D_2 \in \text{U}(N)$ and two permutation matrices P_1, P_2 such that

$$H_1 = D_1 P_1 H_2 P_2 D_2. \quad (2.2)$$

We say that H is an *isolated* matrix, if its neighborhood¹ contains only equivalent matrices. Otherwise, it is a part of a family of inequivalent matrices. The character of variability of phases $p_{jk} \in [0, 1)$ in $H_{jk} = e^{2i\pi p_{jk}}$ as functions of orbit parameters can be linear (*affine*) or nonlinear (*nonaffine*). We decorate a matrix with a superscript to indicate whether it is isolated, e.g. $S_6^{(0)}$, or if it represents a δ -dimensional orbit (orbit depending on $\delta \in \mathbb{N}$ independent parameters), like $T_8^{(1)}$. Plethora of examples of (non)affine families can be found in [1, 27].

The main problem concerning CHM is their classification [1, 27, 29]. Having defined equivalence relation we can introduce the quotient set

$$\mathbb{H}(N)/\simeq = [H^{(1)}] \cup [H^{(2)}] \cup \dots, \quad (2.3)$$

so the classification of CHM boils down to determining all equivalence classes $[H^{(j)}]$ with respect to the relation \simeq . The problem for low dimensions, $2 \leq N \leq 5$, has been completely described in [28, 30] and the first open problem arises at $N = 6$. It is widely believed that the set of six-dimensional CHM consists of a single isolated spectral matrix [31] $S_6^{(0)}$ and 4-parameter nonaffine family [32] $G_6^{(4)}$ that connects all other examples,

$$\mathbb{H}(6) \stackrel{?}{=} S_6^{(0)} \cup \left\{ G_6^{(4)} \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

Due to the additional degrees of freedom, there is no simple method that can tell if two matrices are equivalent or not. The diversity of forms for any $N \geq 6$ prevents us from giving a single and simple answer to the question about the structure of $\mathbb{H}(N)$ and the task of discriminating classes of CHM is not easy indeed. Nevertheless, there exist several methods [33–35] which can be used to classify or rule out a matrix from a given subset of CHM. We will briefly recall and use only two of them: *defect of a unitary matrix* and set of *Haagerup invariants* [28].

Defect of a matrix $H \in \mathbb{H}(N)$, denoted $\mathbf{d}(H)$, was introduced and investigated in [36, 37] as an algebraic tool to solve the problem of possibility of deriving a smooth family of inequivalent

¹Matrix neighborhood is a natural generalization of a standard point-like neighborhood extended over $\mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ endowed with Euclidean topology.

matrices from a given matrix. Not only $\mathbf{d}(H)$ can serve as a binary oracle that tells whether it is possible (or not) to stem an orbit out of H , but it can also assist in identifying the equivalence classes. Informally, we can treat $\mathbf{d}(H)$ as a nonnegative number associated with a matrix H , which provides the information about possible independent directions on the manifold of $\sqrt{N}\mathbf{U}(N)$ that H can follow preserving the property of being CHM. Non-zero value of $\mathbf{d}(H)$ determines the upper bound for dimension of a family that H might (but not necessarily should) belong to. In particular, we will extensively use the following fact (Lemma 3.3 in Ref. [1]):

$$\mathbf{d}(H_N) = 0 \implies H_N = H_N^{(0)}, \quad (2.5)$$

so, vanishing defect implies that H_N cannot be part of any orbit of inequivalent matrices, and it is an isolated Hadamard matrix. However, this is only one-way criterion and there are known examples of isolated matrices for which their defect does not vanish [38].

The Haagerup set [28] of H , denoted by $\Lambda(H)$ is defined by all possible products of N^4 quartets of matrix elements

$$\Lambda(H) = \left\{ H_{jk} H_{lm} H_{jm}^* H_{lk}^* : j, k, l, m \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\}, \quad (2.6)$$

where $*$ is complex conjugate. Both, defect and Haagerup set are invariant with respect to equivalence relation (2.2), which means that $\mathbf{d}(H) = \mathbf{d}(P_1 D_1 H D_2 P_2)$ and $\Lambda(H) = \Lambda(P_1 D_1 H D_2 P_2)$. Hence, we can formulate another helpful criterion

$$\Lambda(H_1) \neq \Lambda(H_2) \implies H_1 \not\sim H_2. \quad (2.7)$$

Again, the converse is not true, and it is possible to find two inequivalent matrices with perfectly coinciding sets Λ .

Finally, we will mostly present matrices in the special *dephased form* in which first row and first column consists of ones. Every CHM can be brought to a dephased form by multiplying by two diagonal unitary matrices. This *normalized* representation allows us to consider only permutation matrices in the equivalence relation, and effectively work with the $(N-1)$ -dimensional core of a given matrix.

3 Sinkhorn Algorithm Revisited

A straightforward numerical recipe to search for a new CHM is a random walk procedure, where the objective function to be optimized (minimized) reads

$$\mathcal{Z}(X) = \|X X^\dagger - N \mathbb{I}_N\|_F, \quad (3.1)$$

with subscript $_F$ denoting Frobenius norm of a matrix. For small dimensions $6 \leq N \leq 16$, almost every initial (randomly chosen) matrix X swiftly converges to H such that $\mathcal{Z}(H) \approx 0$, so H can be considered as a numerical approximation of CHM with arbitrarily high precision. Such a matrix is an input for a tedious post-processing phase of recovering its final analytical form. This method, used in the past, led to several (re)discoveries in $\mathbb{H}(N)$ for $N \leq 16$. In particular, it is very handy in the case of examination of complicated families of CHM, where one can easily fix given pattern of phases to retrieve full functional dependencies in a nonaffine orbit [39].

In this paper we recall another method which proved to be more powerful. In 1964 Sinkhorn proposed the algorithm that was originally designed to generate random bistochastic matrices [40–42]. Suppose a matrix is characterized by at least two properties, \mathcal{P}_j ($j \geq 1$). They

need not be complementary, nor disjoint. For example, $\mathbb{H}(N)$ can be equivalently defined as the intersection of two sets: rescaled unitary matrices and unimodular matrices;

$$\mathbb{H}(N) = \sqrt{N}\mathbb{U}(N) \cap \mathbb{T}(N), \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathbb{T}(N)$ denotes a hypertorus. To get a matrix X_* having all desired properties, $X_* \in \mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_2 \cap \dots$, we can try to perform alternating mappings (projections) π_j onto \mathcal{P}_j , starting with some initial argument X , so that $\pi_j(X) \in \mathcal{P}_j$. Provided that such iterative procedure exhibits contractive behavior, it should also be convergent to an element in a not empty subset \mathcal{P} , common for all \mathcal{P}_j ,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \pi_j \right) (X) = X_* \in \mathcal{P} \subset \bigcap_j \mathcal{P}_j, \quad (3.3)$$

where the product of π_j 's above should be understood in terms of map compositions. In the particular case of CHM, the algorithm takes the following form:

- S1) draw a complex matrix (a seed) $X \in (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{(0,0)\})^{N \times N}$ at random (we exclude zeros to avoid problems in the next step),
- S2) normalize (unimodularize) each entry of X so $X \rightarrow X' = \pi_1(X) \in \mathbb{T}(N)$ such that $X'_{jk} = X_{jk}/|X_{jk}|$,
- S3) perform polar decomposition of $X' = U\sqrt{X'^{\dagger}X'}$ to obtain (nearest) unitary matrix $U = X'/\sqrt{X'^{\dagger}X'}$, so $X' \rightarrow X'' = \pi_2(X')$ such that $X'' = X'/\sqrt{X'^{\dagger}X'}$,
- S4) repeat steps S2) and S3) until $\mathcal{Z}(\pi_2(\pi_1(\dots(\pi_1(X))\dots))) \approx 0$ up to a given precision, with the objective function \mathcal{Z} defined in (3.1).

In short²: $Y = \text{sinkhorn}(X)$. The convergence of the alternating procedure is assured in the case of convexity of all components [43] \mathcal{P}_j . Despite the fact that none of the subsets determining $\mathbb{H}(N)$ is convex, the above method applied to an initial matrix with no vanishing entries can effectively produce very accurate approximations of CHM from $\mathbb{H}(N)$ for $6 \leq N \leq 16$. Hence, we will use this algorithm as a reliable tool that demonstrated its fitness in many numerical simulations. The advantage of this technique is the speed and performance. However, one seems to pay the price of losing full control over the matrix structure, as it is no longer possible to easily fix particular entries of X imposing a concrete appearance. Nevertheless, as we will see, this method can produce matrices with a surprisingly high degree of internal symmetry. Appendix A contains several examples (including isolated cases, affine and nonaffine families) of order $7 \leq N \leq 13$ obtained in this way numerically. Many of them are new examples of complex Hadamard matrices and (if possible) they are presented in an explicit analytical form.

In the next section we present a specific 9-dimensional CHM obtained by the Sinkhorn method, the form of which will trigger additional observations and further results – a more general construction that leads to special families of CHM.

4 A Novel Isolated Matrix $Y_{9C}^{(0)}$

As of 2022 all known CHM of order $N = 9$ forming $\mathbb{H}(9)$ can be listed as follows [1, 26, 44, 45]: $F_3 \otimes F_3$, $F_9^{(4)}$, $S_9^{(0)}$, $B_9^{(0)}$, $N_9^{(0)}$ and $K_9^{(2)}$. Also, a number of Butson type matrices [46, 47] $\text{BH}(9, q)$ shall be recalled here to complete the picture.

²We set the convention where X is the input, while Y is the output. Hence, many matrices will be called Y_N for some N .

We present a CHM obtained during numerical studies with the help of the Sinkhorn algorithm described in Section 3. Initially, all entries were drawn at random, according to normal distribution, and such a seed X , without any additional constraints, was supplied to the algorithm. After dephasing, the following matrix shows up³:

$$X \xrightarrow{\text{sinkhorn}} Y_{9C} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & a & d & a^* & c^* & b^* & c & b & d^* \\ 1 & b & c & b^* & a & d^* & a^* & d & c^* \\ 1 & c & b^* & c^* & d & a & d^* & a^* & b \\ 1 & b^* & c^* & b & a^* & d & a & d^* & c \\ 1 & d & a^* & d^* & b & c^* & b^* & c & a \\ 1 & a^* & d^* & a & c & b & c^* & b^* & d \\ 1 & c^* & b & c & d^* & a^* & d & a & b^* \\ 1 & d^* & a & d & b^* & c & b & c^* & a^* \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.1)$$

with:

$$a \approx -0.3396 + 0.9406i, \quad b \approx -0.9635 + 0.2676i, \quad (4.2)$$

$$c \approx -0.0365 + 0.9993i, \quad d \approx +0.8396 + 0.5432i, \quad (4.3)$$

and $x^* = \frac{1}{x}$ denoting complex conjugate of unimodular numbers. Rough analysis indicates that it does not belong to the Butson subset of CHM, and the vanishing value of its defect can be a clue that this matrix might represent a completely new class of equivalence in (2.3) for $N = 9$.

There are only four different constants a , b , c and d in Y_{9C} , which is a very favorable circumstance. To express these numbers analytically, one should solve the unitarity constraints. They form a system of five nonlinear equations with four complex variables

$$\begin{cases} a + b + c + d + c.c. = -1, \\ a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2 + c.c. = -1, \\ a/b + b/d + c/d + ac + c.c. = -1, \\ a/d + b/c + bc + ad + c.c. = -1, \\ a/c + ab + cd + bd + c.c. = -1, \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

where $c.c.$ denotes complex conjugate of the preceding terms. Possible methods of solving such systems of equations are described in Ref. [29]. Supported by numerical software, we find that out of 128 possible quadruplets (a, b, c, d) fulfilling (4.4), excluding those that do not meet the condition of unimodularity, some solutions correspond to roots of unity and the rest recover the values from Y_{9C} . After rearranging, reducing and simplifying (4.4), we observe that the numbers in (4.2) and (4.3) can be calculated as two pairs of particular roots of two monic palindromic polynomials⁴ of degree 12,

$$\mathbf{p}_1(x) = (1, -3, 9, -16, -12, 6, \underline{3}, 6, -12, -16, 9, -3, 1), \quad (4.5)$$

$$\mathbf{p}_2(x) = (1, 6, 15, 26, 3, -24, \underline{-27}, -24, 3, 26, 15, 6, 1). \quad (4.6)$$

Remaining roots are either not unimodular or do not provide a Hadamard matrix and shall be discarded. We exploit the well known fact from algebra of palindromic polynomials which says

³Subscript C that identifies this matrix will become clear in Appendix A.

⁴Monic polynomial \mathbf{p} of degree n has leading coefficient $c_n = 1$. For brevity, we write only coefficients of \mathbf{p} . For example, the standard polynomial notation $\mathbf{p}(x) = 1 + 2x + 3x^2 + 2x^3 + x^4$ corresponds to $(1, 2, \underline{3}, 2, 1)$. The middle factor is emphasised to ease confirmation that they really form a palindromic sequence: $c_j = c_{n-j}$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$.

that every such $\mathbf{p}(x)$ of even degree $2k$ can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{p}(x) = x^k \mathbf{q}(x + 1/x), \quad (4.7)$$

where \mathbf{q} is another polynomial (in variable $y = x + 1/x$) of degree k (cf. Section C.2 in [29]). Sometimes, this can shorten the form of $\mathbf{p}(x)$ significantly. Indeed, in our case the problem can be reduced to calculating the roots of polynomials of 3rd degree and, eventually, we arrive at⁵

$$a = \sqrt{\gamma_1^2 - 1} - \gamma_1, \quad b = \sqrt{\gamma_2^2 - 1} - \gamma_2, \quad (4.8)$$

$$c = \sqrt{\gamma_3^2 - 1} + \gamma_3, \quad d = \sqrt{\gamma_4^2 - 1} + \gamma_4, \quad (4.9)$$

where

$$\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{1 - \zeta_2 - \zeta_2^*} - \frac{1}{4}, \quad \gamma_2 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \sqrt{1 - \zeta_1 - \zeta_1^*} + \frac{1}{2}, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\gamma_4 = \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{1 - \zeta_2 - \zeta_2^*} + \frac{1}{4}, \quad \gamma_3 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \sqrt{1 - \zeta_1 - \zeta_1^*} - \frac{1}{2}, \quad (4.11)$$

and

$$\zeta_1 = \frac{\omega}{2^{4/3}} \left(43 - 3i\sqrt{771} \right)^{1/3}, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\zeta_2 = 2^{5/3} \omega^2 \left(43 + 3i\sqrt{771} \right)^{1/3} \quad (4.13)$$

with the phase factor

$$\omega = \exp \left\{ i\pi \frac{5}{3} \right\}. \quad (4.14)$$

Analytic expressions for a , b , c and d match perfectly numerical values in (4.2) and (4.3). This formally confirms that $Y_{9C} \in \mathbb{H}(9)$ and its defect $\mathbf{d}(Y_{9C}) = 0$, so $Y_{9C} = Y_{9C}^{(0)}$ is an isolated matrix. Obviously $Y_{9C}^{(0)} \notin \text{B}\mathbb{H}(9, q)$ for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the only known isolated matrix that is not of the Butson type is $N_9^{(0)}$ for which

$$\#\Lambda \left(N_9^{(0)} \right) = 18 < \mathbf{105} = \#\Lambda \left(Y_{9C}^{(0)} \right), \quad (4.15)$$

we can formally formally state

Proposition 1. *Isolated matrix $Y_{9C}^{(0)}$ is a 9-dimensional representative of the set of CHM.*

The elements of the Haagerup set of $Y_{9C}^{(0)}$ can be expressed analytically, however too complicated formulas prevent such presentation in any compact form. Additional material can be found on Github [48].

5 Families of Isolated CHM

In this section, we propose a systematic construction which might lead to infinite families of CHM with additional property of being isolated.

⁵The Author is indebted to Oliver Reardon-Smith for pointing out an error in earlier calculations.

As we have seen, to obtain a CHM one can a priori impose certain initial configuration on entries in a matrix, like in Eq. (4.1), and solve the associated system of equations representing unitarity constraints. However, not every configuration is valid, as there might exist some patterns for which the space of solutions yields the empty set or the result is not “physical” (when numbers are not unimodular). This technique, already presented in the previous section, gave rise to the new matrix $Y_{9C}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{H}(9)$. We will show that particularly chosen configuration of entries provides several other previously unknown CHM of orders $N \geq 9$, and additionally may set the ground for more general conjectures.

5.1 Family of Complex Hadamard Matrices L_N

Consider again the very first form of $Y_{9C}^{(0)}$ (4.1). After permuting its rows and columns we can write it equivalently as

$$Y_{9C}^{(0)} \simeq Y_{9C}'^{(0)} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc|cc|cc} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & a & a^* & b & b^* & c & c^* & d & d^* \\ 1 & a^* & a & b^* & b & c^* & c & d^* & d \\ \hline 1 & b & b^* & d & d^* & a^* & a & c & c^* \\ 1 & b^* & b & d^* & d & a & a^* & c^* & c \\ \hline 1 & c & c^* & a^* & a & d^* & d & b^* & b \\ 1 & c^* & c & a & a^* & d & d^* & b & b^* \\ \hline 1 & d & d^* & c & c^* & b^* & b & a^* & a \\ 1 & d^* & d & c^* & c & b & b^* & a & a^* \end{array} \right], \quad (5.1)$$

where grid lines additionally accent the internal structure. Suddenly, the core of the matrix resembles a coarse-grained symmetric Latin square with additional complex conjugates (*) in few places,

$$\text{core}(Y_{9C}'^{(0)}) = \left[\begin{array}{cccc} \boxed{A} & \boxed{B} & \boxed{C} & \boxed{D} \\ \boxed{B} & \boxed{D} & \boxed{A^*} & \boxed{C} \\ \boxed{C} & \boxed{A^*} & \boxed{D^*} & \boxed{B^*} \\ \boxed{D} & \boxed{C} & \boxed{B^*} & \boxed{A^*} \end{array} \right], \quad (5.2)$$

where every \boxed{X} corresponds to a 2×2 matrix

$$\boxed{X} = \begin{bmatrix} x & x^* \\ x^* & x \end{bmatrix} \quad (5.3)$$

for $(x, X) \in \{(a, A), (b, B), (c, C), (d, D)\}$. Looking at this structure, let us propose a formal construction and then test it for several dimensions.

Define

$$L_N = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{1}^{1 \times (N-1)} \\ \mathbf{1}^{(N-1) \times 1} & \text{core}(L_N) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}, \quad (5.4)$$

where $\mathbf{1}^{a \times b}$ denotes vectors of ones of size $a \times b$ and

$$\text{core}(L_N) = \text{circ} \left(\begin{bmatrix} c_0 & c_0^* \\ c_0^* & c_0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} c_1 & c_1^* \\ c_1^* & c_1 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} c_{n-1} & c_{n-1}^* \\ c_{n-1}^* & c_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} \right) : c_j \in \mathbb{C} \quad (5.5)$$

forms a submatrix being a (2×2) -block circulant array of size $N - 1$ with $n = (N - 3)/2$. By construction N must be odd, because the core always consists of even number of rows and columns. Note that we do not introduce complex conjugates in blocks, as it was in the case of $Y_{9C}^{(0)}$ (5.1). The question is: For what values of N , the matrix L_N can be a member of the set $\mathbb{H}(N)$ of complex Hadamard matrices?

Given N , we can immediately build L_N , write unitarity constraints and try to solve them. They can be rearranged to form the following system:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} \cos \alpha_j = -\frac{1}{2}, \\ \sum_{j=0}^{2k} \cos (2\alpha_j) = -\frac{1}{2}, \\ k \text{ equations with } 0 \leq i < k : \sum_{j=0}^{2k} \cos (\alpha_j + \alpha_{(j+1+i) \bmod (2k+1)}) = -\frac{1}{2}, \\ k \text{ equations with } 0 \leq i < k : \sum_{j=0}^{2k} \cos (\alpha_j - \alpha_{(j+1+i) \bmod (2k+1)}) = -\frac{1}{2}, \end{array} \right. \quad (5.6)$$

where $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}$ are phases associated with appropriate blocks in Eq. (5.5). It turns out that this particular construction stemming from the block-circulant arrays provides CHM only under one additional restriction. Namely, we can find a solution only in every second odd dimension, $N = 3 + 4k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Due to circulant symmetries, the total number of possible equations forming a nonlinear system associated with unitarity constraints can be reduced to only $2(k+1) = (N+1)/2$ trigonometric equations with $2k+1 = (N-1)/2$ real variables; $k \geq 0$. This significant simplification allows us to solve such systems numerically for N ranging from 11 to 127 with a very high precision, and initial analysis shows that in each case the defect of L_N is zero and $L_N \notin \text{BH}(N, q)$ for any $1 < q \leq 2^{16}$.

Obviously for $k = 0$ we recover the well known Fourier matrix $F_3^{(0)}$ as well as $F_7^{(0)}$ for $k = 1$. But for $k \geq 2$, which implies $N \geq 11$, all constructed matrices are believed to be new as the fact of being isolated non-Butson matrices automatically excludes them from many known families. Additionally, computer assisted proof confirms that the cardinalities of the Haagerup invariants (2.6) are unique. For $N = 11$ we have:

$$\#\Lambda \left(C_{11A}^{(0)} \right) = \#\Lambda \left(C_{11B}^{(0)} \right) = 5, \quad (5.7)$$

$$\#\Lambda \left(N_{11A}^{(0)} \right) = \#\Lambda \left(N_{11B}^{(0)} \right) = \#\Lambda \left(N_{11C}^{(0)} \right) = 10, \quad (5.8)$$

$$\#\Lambda \left(F_{11}^{(0)} \right) = 11, \quad (5.9)$$

$$\#\Lambda \left(Q_{11A}^{(0)} \right) = \#\Lambda \left(Q_{11B}^{(0)} \right) = 63, \quad (5.10)$$

$$\#\Lambda \left(L_{11}^{(0)} \right) = \mathbf{191}, \quad (5.11)$$

and similarly for $N = 15$

$$\#\Lambda \left(A_{15A}^{(0)} \right) = \#\Lambda \left(A_{15B}^{(0)} \right) = 5, \quad (5.12)$$

$$\#\Lambda \left(A_{15G}^{(0)} \right) = \#\Lambda \left(A_{15H}^{(0)} \right) = 38, \quad (5.13)$$

$$\#\Lambda \left(L_{15}^{(0)} \right) = \mathbf{463}, \quad (5.14)$$

where $C_{11A,B}$, $N_{11A,B,C}$, $Q_{11A,B}$ and $A_{11A,B,G,H}$ represent several well known classes of complex Hadamard matrices [27].

There is no need to check invariants in higher dimensions because, to the best of our knowledge, no isolated matrices of this size (apart of Butson matrices [44, 46, 47]) were ever presented in the literature. All these observations allow us to formulate

Conjecture 1. *For any $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $N = 3 + 4k$, there exists an isolated complex Hadamard matrix $L_N^{(0)} \in \mathbb{H}(N)$, which is not of the Butson type.*

Before we comment possible implications of this conjecture, in the next section we shall introduce even simpler method producing a sequence of matrices with very similar properties.

5.2 Family of Complex Hadamard Matrices V_N

Instead of struggling with a circulant core, let us simply analyze entire circulant matrix

$$V_N = \text{circ}[c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{N-1}] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N} \quad : \quad c_j \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (5.15)$$

Unusual undephased representation of V_N provides a compact form of the unitarity constraints:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \frac{c_j}{c_{(j+k) \bmod N}} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N-1\} \quad (5.16)$$

which is the equivalent representation of the well known problem of *cyclic N -roots* [49]. Equation (5.16) was investigated by Gabidulin and Shorin in the context of autocorrelation functions [50], however the authors did not relate it directly to the field of CHM. The problem of circulant matrices was also taken in details in the doctoral thesis of Szöllösi [29]. Yet another variation about circulant matrices, namely real Hadamard matrices with two circulant cores is presented in Ref. [51].

We checked that the above $N-1$ nonlinear equations for $c_j \in \mathbb{C}$ can be solved in any dimension $6 \leq N \leq 64$, which results in a sequence of isolated and non-Butson matrices. We also claim that this can be solved in any dimension $N \in \{6, 7, 8, \dots, 64, \dots\}$ yielding such objects. As we mentioned at the very beginning, all solutions reproducing Butson type matrices are intentionally discarded. Instead we focus on checking how far we can go with N still getting isolated matrices, to draw

Conjecture 2. *For any $N \geq 6$ the solution of Eq. (5.16) contains at least one isolated CHM matrix $V_N^{(0)}$, which is not of the Butson type.*

While for the previous sequence of L_N numerical simulations suggest that each (proper) solution leads only to an isolated matrix, for V_N the defect is not strictly restricted to zero. We observed such a situation already for $N = 8$, and also for some slightly higher orders. However, the bigger N , the less chance of hitting any potential representative of a multidimensional family. The case of $N = 8$ will be explained in details in Appendix A.

6 Summary

In this paper we extended the set of complex Hadamard matrices, which can be used for diverse purposes in constructing novel and crucial objects relevant for quantum theory. Using the Sinkhorn algorithm adapted to the realm of CHM, we introduced several isolated points

including $Y_{9A,B,C}^{(0)}$, $Y_{10A}^{(0)}$, $L_{11}^{(0)}$, and families, e.g. $T_{8A}^{(1)}$, $T_{8B,C}^{(3)}$, $Y_{10C}^{(1)}$, $Y_{10D}^{(2)}$, $Y_{10E}^{(3)}$ and $Y_{10F}^{(4)}$ – see Appendix A. We also mentioned numerical examples calculated with high precision, which may serve as potential candidates for further examination.

Based on the numerical evidence we put forward two conjectures concerning existence of a sequence of isolated CHM in infinitely many dimensions. In each conjecture we consider only two possible patterns of CHM. Certainly, this does not exhaust the whole range of other possibilities, in particular those, which can be enriched with additional internal symmetries. For a moment we cannot see how the immensity of possible configurations could be classified into any systematic or coherent way.

Classification of complex Hadamard matrices in large dimensions must be conducted methodically. As the problem rapidly complicates for $N \geq 16$, it is necessary to impose some regularities in order to reduce the available space on the manifold of (rescaled) unitary matrices. Presented approach allows one to simply examine the following procedure: given a structure with predefined symmetries, one can solve the associated system of unitarity constraints to check whether this provides a CHM. Equivalently, one can use the Sinkhorn algorithm to obtain (generally) the same result numerically. In Appendix A we discuss only a narrow excerpt of many possible ways.

The particular curiosity of this work is that the vast majority of resulting matrices are isolated. There are roughly three different methods of construction isolated CHM known to us. The first one is based purely on numerical approach. Second one follows from the theorem, which says that for any prime dimension p the Fourier matrix is isolated [1];

$$N = p \implies F_p = F_p^{(0)}. \quad (6.1)$$

The third one has its source in the construction described by McNulty and Weigert in Theorem 3 in Ref. [44]. If the postulated conjectures were proven, a new way to get an infinite sequence of isolated CHM would be found. But even if they fail to be true, we are left with two manageable constructions that so far generated dozens of genuinely new examples of CHM in a number of dimensions $N \geq 8$.

One possible physical motivation for searching isolated matrices is the straightforward connection of CHM with mutually unbiased bases (MUB). It is much easier to examine multidimensional families and check if their representatives form possible sets of MUB. However, it is not known whether the complete set of MUB in \mathbb{C}^6 or \mathbb{C}^{10} can be built of (yet unknown) isolated⁶ CHM. Having a straightforward method of obtaining many new such objects one can significantly widen the possible area of research. Presented facts may also find applications in several branches of modern physics, including creation of unitary error bases [13] (UEB) or being used in entanglement detection [52, 53]. As it has been recently shown, even incomplete (unextendible) set of MUB can be more effective to detect entanglement [54].

7 Acknowledgments

Author thanks Veit Elser, Markus Grassl, Dardo Goyeneche, Wojciech Tadej and Karol Życzkowski for many inspiring discussions. This work is partially funded by Foundation for Polish Science under the Team-Net project No. POIR.04.04.00-00-17C1/18-00.

A Comments on $\mathbb{H}(N)$ for some initial dimensions

In the appendix we include several observations concerning the structure of the set of complex Hadamard matrices in a few initial dimensions, where it was possible to find something allegedly

⁶Actually, it is unlikely that for $N = 6$ new isolated matrices will be discovered.

new, which additionally allowed us to make a concise presentation. Due to algebraic complications, we restrict in some cases only to numerical considerations or implicit solutions. If not stated differently, one should assume that the method used to obtain a given matrix was the Sinkhorn algorithm. In every case in the following sections the seed set as a starting point was a random Gaussian matrix, without imposing any additional internal symmetries. As we will observe, even in dimensions as small as $8 \leq N \leq 11$, still there are many gaps and unknowns. Concerned Reader should check the Github repository [48] for scripts (Matlab and Mathematica) generating all the matrices described below, also including those which are not necessarily new.

In Tables: 1, 2, 3 and 4 we shortly summarize particular dimensions exposing the most interesting objects. They certainly do not saturate all possibilities and do not even pretend to be any attempt to a full classification. Even the selected matrices are not going to be examined in details. For each matrix being a result of the Sinkhorn algorithm or a solution of L_N or V_N family, we provide its generic values of defect, cardinality of Haagerup set, and possible or actual relations with other matrices.

A.1 Set $\mathbb{H}(7)$

For $N = 7$ we can recover all known [27] 7-dimensional CHM: $F_7^{(0)}$, $P_7^{(1)}$, $C_{7A,B,C,D}^{(0)}$ and $Q_7^{(0)}$. In particular, during examination of numerical data, we readily discovered what we believe is an alternative analytical approach to the circulant matrix C_{7D} found previously by Haagerup [28].

Let x_* be the maximal real root of the polynomial $1+12x+18x^2-64x^3-96x^4+45x^5+43x^6 = 0$. Define

$$a = \frac{-1}{2x_*} + i \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2\sqrt{21} + 6} \cos \frac{3\pi}{14} - \sqrt{2\sqrt{21} - 6} \sin \frac{3\pi}{14} - \frac{3}{4} \sqrt{2\sqrt{21} - 6} \right) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and consider a special pair (b, c) of unimodular solutions of the following system

$$\begin{cases} 1 + a + b + c + \frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} + \frac{1}{c} = 0, \\ 1 + c + \frac{1}{c} + ab + \frac{1}{ab} + bc + \frac{1}{bc} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

which approximate values are $b = \exp\{1.3562i\}$ and $c = \exp\{1.9006i\}$ – compare with Eq.(112) and Eq.(113) in Ref. [1]. Writing auxiliary variables

$$p = \frac{-a}{a + b + ab(1 + a + b + c)}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$q = \frac{1}{1 + a} \left(1 + a + \frac{a^2}{c} - \frac{a}{bc} + \frac{1}{b^2c} - \frac{a^2}{c^2} - \frac{1}{bc^2} + \frac{a}{b^2c^2} \right), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$r = \frac{-1}{1 + a} \left(1 + a + \frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{bc} + \frac{1}{b^2c} \right), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

the symmetric core of the isolated matrix $C_{7D}'^{(0)}$ becomes

$$\text{core} \left(C_{7D}'^{(0)} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} a^2 & ab & ac & a & ac^* & ab^* \\ ab & bc & c & c^* & (bc)^* & (ab)^* \\ ac & c & b^* & acr & cr & (b^2)^* \\ a & c^* & acr & r & ar & (bc)^* \\ ac^* & (bc)^* & cr & ar & cq & b^* \\ ab^* & (ab)^* & (b^2)^* & (bc)^* & b^* & p \end{bmatrix} = \text{core} \left(C_{7D}'^{(0)\text{T}} \right). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Changing variables from a, b, c to $A = a, B = ab$ and $C = abc$ we can express $C'_{7D}{}^{(0)}$ in a generic and fully circulant form as it originally emerged as an output from the Sinkhorn routine; $C'_{7D}{}^{(0)} = \text{circ}([1, A, B, C, C, B, A])$. Matrix $C'_{7D}{}^{(0)}$ is probably the well known example of $C_{7D}^{(0)} \simeq C'_{7D}{}^{(0)}$.

A.2 Set $\mathbb{H}(8)$

Veit Elser found the matrix $V_8^{(0)}$ quite accidentally as a by-product of computations with a completely different purpose [55]. It has been identified as an isolated point, put into the Catalog of CHM [27] and apparently forgotten for years. Its nice undephased structure reads

$$V_8^{(0)} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & b & b & c & c & a & a \\ -1 & b & -1 & c & b & a & c & -a \\ b & -1 & c & -1 & a & b & -a & c \\ b & c & -1 & a & -1 & -a & b & -c \\ c & b & a & -1 & -a & -1 & -c & b \\ c & a & b & -a & -1 & -c & -1 & -b \\ a & c & -a & b & -c & -1 & -b & -1 \\ a & -a & c & -c & b & -b & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

The shape of the characteristic bands of symbols/numbers revolving symmetrically around the diagonals reflects the obscure properties of the Sinkhorn algorithm that was used to find this matrix. The only difference in the Elser's version of the routine was that, to get a projection onto the set of unitary matrices of order eight, $\mathbb{U}(8)$, QR decomposition was used instead of the polar one.

Let us quickly present its analytic form. Unitarity constraints for $V_8^{(0)}$,

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{1}{b} - b + \frac{b}{c} + \frac{c}{b} + \frac{c}{a} + \frac{a}{c} = 0, \\ -\frac{1}{b} - b - \frac{1}{c} - c - \frac{c}{a} - \frac{a}{c} + \frac{b}{a} + \frac{a}{b} = 0, \\ \frac{1}{c} + c + \frac{1}{a} + a + \frac{b}{a} + \frac{a}{b} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

can be rearranged as in the case of $Y_{9C}^{(0)}$ (4.1) and presented in the form of a monic palindromic polynomial \mathbf{p} , so the set of roots of \mathbf{p} contains parameters $\{a, b, c\}$. Polynomial \mathbf{p} appears to be a bit complicated and its degree is as much as 16. Thus, to save space, we show only the first half of its 17 coefficients (using the polynomial notation introduced in Section 4)

$$\mathbf{p}(x) = (1, 16, 64, 16, -332, -1040, -1984, -2832, \underline{-3194}, \dots). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Fortunately, it can be reduced to an octic polynomial

$$\mathbf{q}(x) = (-16, 256, -96, -896, -696, -96, 56, 16, 1), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

which can be further factorized into the product

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}(x) &= (x^4 + 8x^3 + \alpha_0x^2 + \beta_0x + \gamma_0) \times \\ &\quad \times (x^4 + 8x^3 + \alpha_1x^2 + \beta_1x + \gamma_1), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where

$$\alpha_\mu = -4 + 2(-1)^\mu \sqrt{116 - 2\sqrt{2}}, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$\beta_\mu = -16 + 8(-1)^\mu \sqrt{10 - \sqrt{2}}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$\gamma_\mu = -4\sqrt{2} + 4 - 4(-1)^\mu \sqrt{4 - 2\sqrt{2}}, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

and $\mu \in \{0, 1\}$. Applying formulas for roots of a quartic polynomial and taking into account all changes of variables, we can obtain analytically all the triplets that fully determine $V_8^{(0)}$. We conclude with the following

Observation 2. $V_8^{(0)}$ is an isolated point such that $V_8^{(0)} \notin \text{BH}(8, q)$ for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$.

Moreover, the sequence V_N presented⁷ in Section 5.2 tightly relates $V_8^{(0)}$ with other 8-dimensional matrices. The unitarity constraints (5.16) for $N = 8$ include the solution for matrices equivalent to $V_8^{(0)}$, $A_8^{(0)}$, possibly [22] $S_8^{(4)}$ and perhaps some other elements of $\mathbb{H}(8)$. Before $A_8^{(0)}$ was recognised as the solution of the system (5.16), it was found numerically using a random walk procedure over symmetric matrices [39], $A_8^{(0)} = A_8^{(0)\text{T}}$.

matrix	\mathbf{d}	$\#\Lambda$	source	comment	status
$Y_{8A}^{(0)}$	0	10	SV	$\simeq A_8^{(0)}$	known
$Y_{8B}^{(0)}$	0	70	SV	$\simeq V_8^{(0)}$	known
$T_{8A}^{(1)}(p_1)$	3	10	S	$\overset{?}{\subset} T_8^{(1)}$, $T_{8A}^{(1)} = T_{8A}^{(1)\text{T}}$	unknown
$T_{8B}^{(3)}(p_1, p_2, p_3)$	3	74	S	$\overset{?}{\supset} T_8^{(1)}$	new
$T_{8C}^{(3)}(p_1, p_2, p_3)$	3	130	S	$\overset{?}{\supset} T_8^{(1)}$	new
$G_{8A}^{(3)}(p_1, p_2, p_3)$	5	42	S	$\subset F_8^{(5)}$	known
$G_{8B}^{(5)}(p_1, \dots, p_5)$	5	74	S	$\simeq F_8^{(5)}$	known
$G_{8C}^{(5)}(p_1, \dots, p_5)$	5	82	S	$\simeq F_8^{(5)}$	known
...

Table 1: Selected outputs for $N = 8$ obtained from the Sinkhorn algorithm (S) and V_N family (V) defined in Section 5.2.

Another matrix called $T_{8B}^{(3)}$ has the form

$$T_{8B}^{(3)}(p_1, p_2, p_3) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & c & -c & d & -d & cd & -cd \\ 1 & a & -a & -1 & ad & d & -d & -ad \\ 1 & -a & -ac & c & a & -1 & -c & ac \\ 1 & b & -c & -bc & -1 & -b & c & bc \\ 1 & -b & -1 & b & -d & bd & d & -bd \\ 1 & ab & ac & bc & -ad & -bd & -cd & -abcd \\ 1 & -ab & a & -b & -a & b & -1 & ab \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where $a = \exp\{2i\pi p_1\}$, $b = \exp\{2i\pi p_2\}$, $c = \exp\{2i\pi p_3\}$ and $d = \frac{1+ab+bc+ca}{a+b+c+abc}$. Provided that phases $p_j \in [0, 1)$ are chosen so that d is a valid unimodular number, matrix $T_{8B}^{(3)} \in \mathbb{H}(8)$. Generic

⁷Coincidence of the family name V_N and the matrix $V_8^{(0)}$ is intentional.

value of defect might suggest the intersection of $T_{8B}^{(3)}$ with $T_8^{(1)}$ – a one-parameter nonaffine family described in Ref. [39], where we anticipated that this might be a part of a bigger three-parameter structure, what is potentially allowed by the value of its defect.

Next matrix reads

$$T_{8C}^{(3)}(p_1, p_2, p_3) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & c_1 & c_3 & -c_3 & e & -1 & -c_1 & -e \\ 1 & a & c_2 & c_3 & b & a/c_1 & c & d \\ 1 & a/b & a & a/d & a/c_2 & a/c_3 & c_1 & a/c \\ 1 & a/c_2 & b & f & eg & g & eg/f & e \\ 1 & a/d & c & -a/d & g & -g & -c & -1 \\ 1 & a/c & a/c_1 & -f & f & -a/c_1 & -1 & -a/c \\ 1 & a/c_3 & d & -1 & eg/f & -a/c_3 & -eg/f & -d \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

with a , b and c as above, and

$$d = -(c_3 + a + c + b + 1 + c_2 + a/c_1), \quad (\text{A.17})$$

$$e = (c_3/c_2 - c_1/c)/(1/d - 1/b), \quad (\text{A.18})$$

$$f = (a/c_2 - a/c)/(c_1/c_3 - d/b), \quad (\text{A.19})$$

$$g = -(1 + a/c_2 + b + f + e)/(e/f + e + 1) \quad (\text{A.20})$$

where c_1 , c_2 and c_3 are three additional unimodular variables. Irrespective of how c_j are fixed, one can always find numerically such a triplet $(a, b, c) = (a(c_j), b(c_j), c(c_j))$ that $T_{8C}^{(3)} \in \mathbb{H}(8)$ with generic defect $\mathbf{d} = 3$ and $\#\Lambda = 130$. There is yet another variant of $T_{8C}^{(3)}$, not included here, with the same characteristics, $(\mathbf{d}, \#\Lambda) = (3, 130)$, however with much more complicated internal dependencies between entries. One can also numerically recover a sequence of matrices with cardinalities of their Λ -sets being close (or equal) to 170, 178, 242, and several bigger values – all of them having $\mathbf{d} = 3$. These matrices can be generated by the Sinkhorn algorithm alas cannot be presented in any simple form, so they are left for a possible future investigation. All the matrices $T_{8\dots}^{(3)}$ support the claim that $T_8^{(1)}$ might intersect or even be included in some $T_{8\dots}^{(3)}$, which is yet to be fully recognized.

A.3 Set $\mathbb{H}(9)$

Numerical data suggests that we are also far from a complete description of $\mathbb{H}(9)$.

A symmetric matrix $Y_{9A}^{(0)}$ can be implicitly presented in the following form.

$$\text{core}\left(Y_{9A}^{(0)}\right) = \begin{bmatrix} a & b & b & \frac{x}{y} & \frac{x}{y} & -\frac{x^2}{yz} & \frac{x^2}{byz} & \frac{x^2}{byz} \\ b & x & y & \frac{x}{y} & z & -x & -1 & \frac{x}{z} \\ b & y & x & z & \frac{x}{y} & -x & \frac{x}{z} & -1 \\ \frac{x}{y} & \frac{x}{y} & z & \frac{x^2}{y^2} & -z & -\frac{x^2}{yz} & \frac{x}{y} & \frac{x^2}{y^2z} \\ \frac{x}{y} & z & \frac{x}{y} & -z & \frac{x^2}{y^2} & -\frac{x^2}{yz} & \frac{x^2}{y^2z} & \frac{x}{y} \\ -\frac{x^2}{yz} & -x & -x & -\frac{x^2}{yz} & -\frac{x^2}{yz} & C & -\frac{x^2}{y^2z^2} & -\frac{x^3}{y^2z^2} \\ \frac{x^2}{byz} & -1 & \frac{x}{z} & \frac{x}{y} & \frac{x^2}{y^2z} & -\frac{x^3}{y^2z^2} & \frac{x^3}{y^2z^2} & \frac{x^2}{y^2z^2} \\ \frac{x^2}{byz} & \frac{x}{z} & -1 & \frac{x^2}{y^2z} & \frac{x}{y} & -\frac{x^3}{y^2z^2} & \frac{x^2}{y^2z^2} & \frac{x^3}{y^2z^2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

where

$$a = 2(y + z) + x(2 + x/y)/z + 2x^2/((y + z)(x + yz)) - 1, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

$$b = -x/y - y - x/z - z, \quad (\text{A.23})$$

$$c = 2x + x^2(2x/y/z + 3)/y/z - 1. \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Constant values of the triplet (x, y, z) can be obtained as a solution of the system of nonlinear equations:

$$\begin{cases} x - 3yz/x + y^2z^2(1 - 2x)/x^3 - 2 = 0, \\ 1/y + x/y/z^2 + 1/z + x/y^2/z - x/(y + z)/(x + yz) = 0, \\ 3 + x(1 - y + z)/y/z + (y + (y - 1)z)/x = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

Similarly, the second symmetric matrix $Y_{9B}^{(0)}$ reads

$$\text{core}\left(\overline{Y_{9B}^{(0)}}\right) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{c^2}{b} & a & b & c^2 & \frac{c^2}{d} & c & \frac{c^2}{a} & d \\ a & \frac{a^2d^2}{c^4} & \frac{abd}{c^3} & \frac{ad}{bc^3} & \frac{ad}{bc^2} & \frac{abd}{c^2} & \frac{ad^2}{c^4} & \frac{ad}{c^2} \\ b & \frac{abd}{c^3} & \frac{cb^2}{d} & \frac{bc^3}{ad} & \frac{bc}{d} & b^2 & \frac{bd}{c} & \frac{d}{c} \\ c^2 & \frac{ad}{bc} & \frac{bc^3}{ad} & \frac{c^3}{d} & c & \frac{bc^2}{d} & \frac{d}{c} & \frac{d}{b} \\ \frac{c^2}{d} & \frac{ad}{bc^2} & \frac{bc}{d} & c & \frac{1}{d} & \frac{bc^2}{ad} & \frac{d}{bc} & \frac{d}{c^2} \\ c & \frac{abd}{c^2} & b^2 & \frac{bc^2}{d} & \frac{bc^2}{ad} & \frac{b^2}{c} & b & \frac{bd}{c^2} \\ \frac{c^2}{a} & \frac{ad^2}{c^4} & \frac{bd}{c} & \frac{d}{c} & \frac{d}{bc} & b & \frac{d^2}{bc^2} & \frac{d^2}{c^2} \\ d & \frac{ad}{c^2} & \frac{d}{c} & \frac{d}{b} & \frac{d}{c^2} & \frac{bd}{c^2} & \frac{d^2}{c^2} & \frac{d}{a} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.26})$$

where constant values of (a, b, c, d) can be obtained as a solution of the system of nonlinear equations:

$$\begin{cases} 1 + a + b + c + c^2 + c^2/a + c^2/b + c^2/d + d = 0, \\ (c + d)/c + b^2(c + d)/d + b(1 + c/d + c^3/a/d + ad/c^3 + d/c) = 0, \\ 1 + 1/a + bd/c^3 + d(1 + 1/b + b)/c^2 + d/b/c + (1 + a)d^2/c^4 = 0, \\ 1 + d^2/c^4 + d/c + b/c + d/c^3 + ad^2/b/c^4 + b/a + d^2/b/c^3 + d/c^2 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.27})$$

Besides, the Sinkhorn procedure can precisely generate isolated matrices Y_9 with $\#\Lambda(Y_9) \in \{201, 625\}$ and many other with much bigger cardinalities of the Λ -set. Currently, they are analytically intractable.

matrix	\mathbf{d}	$\#\Lambda$	source	comment	status
$B_9^{(0)}$	0	6	S	BH(9, 6)	known
$Y_{9A}^{(0)}$	0	76	S	$Y_{9A}^{(0)} = Y_{9A}^{(0)\text{T}}$	new
$Y_{9B}^{(0)}$	0	89	SV	$Y_{9B}^{(0)} = Y_{9B}^{(0)\text{T}}$	new
$Y_{9C}^{(0)}$	0	105	S	$Y_{9C}^{(0)} = Y_{9C}^{(0)\text{T}}$ cf. (4.1)	new
...

Table 2: Selected outputs for $N = 9$ obtained from the Sinkhorn algorithm (S) and V_N family (V) defined in Section 5.2.

A.4 Set $\mathbb{H}(10)$

Complex Hadamard matrices of order $N = 10$ reveal even more diversity of new examples.

matrix	\mathbf{d}	$\#\Lambda$	source	comment	status
$B_{10}^{(0)}$	0	6	S	BH(10, 6)	known
$N_{10A}^{(0)}$	0	9	S	-	known
$V_{10A}^{(0)}$	0	109	V	-	new
$V_{10B}^{(0)}$	0	134	V	-	new
$V_{10C}^{(0)}$	0	251	V	-	new
$Y_{10A}^{(0)}$	0	99	S	$Y_{10A}^{(0)} = Y_{10A}^{(0)\text{T}}$	new
$Y_{10B}^{(0)}$	0	143	S	-	new
$Y_{10C}^{(1)}(p_1)$	1	472	S	nonaffine family	new
$Y_{10D}^{(2)}(p_1, p_2)$	2	76	S	affine family	new
$Y_{10E}^{(3)}(p_1, p_2, p_3)$	3	278	S	nonaffine family	new
$Y_{10F}^{(4)}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$	4	114	S	nonaffine family	new
...

Table 3: Selected outputs for $N = 10$ obtained from the Sinkhorn algorithm (S) and V_N family (V) defined in Section 5.2. As in the previous cases there are new representatives from $\mathbb{H}(10)$ and the table is vastly incomplete.

Symmetric and isolated matrix $Y_{10A}^{(0)}$ reads

$$Y_{10A}^{(0)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & f & \frac{1}{d} & \frac{1}{d} & a & a & ba & c & c & 1 \\ 1 & \frac{1}{d} & \frac{1}{ad^2} & \frac{1}{d^2} & \frac{1}{d} & a & \frac{e}{c^2d^2} & \frac{c^2}{e} & \frac{c}{d} & \frac{1}{cd} \\ 1 & \frac{1}{d} & \frac{1}{d^2} & \frac{1}{cd^2} & \frac{a}{cd} & \frac{ac}{e} & \frac{b}{d} & c & \frac{bc^2}{e} & \frac{1}{d} \\ 1 & a & \frac{1}{d} & \frac{a}{cd} & \frac{ae}{bc} & a^2 & a^2b & a & \frac{e}{b} & \frac{1}{b} \\ 1 & a & a & \frac{ac}{e} & a^2 & \frac{a^2}{c} & \frac{ae}{c} & ac & c & \frac{a}{c} \\ 1 & ba & \frac{e}{c^2d^2} & \frac{b}{d} & a^2b & \frac{ae}{c} & \frac{e^2f}{c^2d^2} & e & ba & b \\ 1 & c & \frac{c^2}{e} & c & a & ac & e & \frac{c^2}{a} & c^2 & \frac{c}{a} \\ 1 & c & \frac{c}{d} & \frac{bc^2}{e} & \frac{e}{b} & c & ba & c^2 & \frac{e^3d}{e} & cd \\ 1 & 1 & \frac{1}{cd} & \frac{1}{d} & \frac{1}{b} & \frac{a}{c} & b & \frac{c}{a} & cd & d \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.28})$$

with $e = abcd$ and $f = -a(2+b) - 2(1+d+cd)/d$, where constant values of (a, b, c, d) can be obtained as a solution of the system of nonlinear equations:

$$\begin{cases} 1 + a + cd/b + ad(2 + 1/c + c + d) + a^2d(b + cd)/c = 0, \\ 2 + 1/b + b + a/c + c/a + 1/d + 1/c/d + d + cd = 0, \\ a^2bcd(1 + b + d) + c(b + d + bd) + ab(1 + cd)^2 = 0, \\ c + bd((1 + a)(1 + c)(a + c) + a^2bcd) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.29})$$

In turn, matrix $Y_{10B}^{(0)}$ is slightly more complicated. One must solve a system with at most eight unknowns to obtain an isolated point with exactly 143 Haagerup invariants. Interestingly, the solution space contains also matrices whose defects and $\#\Lambda$'s exhibit a close resemblance [27] to D_{10} , N_{10A} and $N_{10B}^{(3)}$.

Finally, we present only one representative of four families $Y_{10C,D,E,F}^{(\delta)}$, namely the affine one. Due to purely practical reasons, it is more convenient that the remaining complex examples are only published in the form of Matlab and Mathematica scripts on Github [48] and in the Catalog of CHM [27]. Hence, matrix $Y_{10C}^{(2)}(p_1, p_2)$ reads

$$\text{core}\left(Y_{10C}^{(2)}(p_1, p_2)\right) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -i & i & i & -i & \omega^4 & \omega^4 & \omega^8 & \omega^8 \\ 1 & i & -1 & -1 & i & \omega^{11} & \omega^{11} & \omega^7 & \omega^7 \\ i & \omega^8 & \omega^{10} & \omega^7 & \omega^{11} & a & -a & \omega^4 & \omega^4 \\ i & \omega^4 & \omega^2 & \omega^{11} & \omega^7 & \omega^8 & \omega^8 & b & -b \\ -i & \omega^8 & \omega^4 & \omega^7 & \omega^5 & ai & -ai & \omega & \omega \\ -i & \omega^4 & \omega^8 & \omega^{11} & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^5 & bi & -bi \\ -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & a\omega^{11} & -a\omega^{11} & b\omega^7 & -b\omega^7 \\ -1 & -i & -i & i & i & a\omega^7 & -a\omega^7 & b\omega^{11} & -b\omega^{11} \\ -1 & i & 1 & -1 & -i & -a & a & -b & b \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.30})$$

where $\omega = \exp\{i\pi/6\}$ and $a = \exp\{2i\pi p_1\}$, $b = \exp\{2i\pi p_2\}$ are two independent parameters with phases $p_j \in [0, 1)$.

A.5 Set $\mathbb{H}(11)$

Complex Hadamard matrices of order $N = 11$ are exceptional. So far there is no known any single example of a nonisolated CHM in $\mathbb{H}(11)$ and no reasonable explanation has been proposed that such a thing should not exist. Here we confirm this interesting character of $\mathbb{H}(11)$ presenting several potentially new isolated matrices.

Additionally, every known $H \in \mathbb{H}(11)$, that is: $F_{11}^{(0)}$, $C_{11\Sigma}^{(0)}$, $N_{11\Sigma}^{(0)}$ and [29] $Q_{11\Sigma}^{(0)}$ can be brought to the symmetric form $H = H^T$. Generic symmetric matrix of dimension N in its dephased form depends on $\tau(N-1)$ unimodular parameters, where $\tau(N) = \binom{N}{2}$ is a triangular number. Maximal number of different Haagerup invariants for such a matrix reads $\max\{\#\Lambda\} = 1 + \tau(N) + \tau^2(N)$. For $N = 11$ it is 3081, and this number also appears among the others in the set of discovered matrices.

Similarly as in the case of $N = 7$, random seeds supplied to the `sinkhorn` procedure recover the Fourier matrix $F_{11}^{(0)}$, $Q_{11}^{(0)}$, a Butson matrix $\text{BH}(11, 22)$ and probably other aforementioned 11-dimensional CHM. Apart from these matrices, we can also observe two inequivalent isolated solutions from the family V_N (5.16) characterized by $\#\Lambda(V_{11\Sigma}) \in \{161, 331\}$, both persymmetric (it is enough to change the order of columns to restore symmetry). Moreover, the Sinkhorn algorithm finds plenty of other examples with

$$\#\Lambda(Y_{11\Sigma}) \in \{191, 323, 425, 751, 975, 1457, 1561, \dots, 3081\}, \quad (\text{A.31})$$

all of them being symmetric too. Both families are symbolically identified by $\Sigma \in \{A, B, C, \dots\}$. Peculiar values of the Haagerup sets tentatively qualify each $V_{11\Sigma}^{(0)}$ and $Y_{11\Sigma}^{(0)}$ as new isolated and non-Butson candidates for the elements of the set $\mathbb{H}(11)$. As another open problem, we leave all of them for a future analytic investigation, along with two questions to be resolved; does there exist any family in $\mathbb{H}(11)$, or is it possible to find a new class which cannot be symmetrized?

There is one more example that can be described analytically. This is the matrix $L_{11}^{(0)}$, a member of the family (5.4), which also can be brought to the symmetric form by reshuffling its columns. With some effort, one can strictly solve the unitarity constraints for this matrix; Eq. (5.6), and write

Proposition 3. *Matrix $L_{11}^{(0)}$ being a solution of the system of equations (5.6) is an isolated example of a non-Butson CHM for $N = 11$.*

At this stage we do not know how to simplify the formulas describing $L_{11}^{(0)}$. They are too complicated to be listed in any legible form. Again, we refer the Reader to [48].

A.6 Set $\mathbb{H}(N)$ for $N > 11$

Analytical approach beyond $N = 11$ seems to be out of reach. Already for $N = 9, 10$ and 11 the formulas are ridiculously overcomplex and classification of matrices of this order requires entirely new methods. Let us only mention about few possible candidates of orders up to $N = 16$.

Family V_{12} (5.16) contains at least four inequivalent and isolated solutions: $\#\Lambda(V_{12A}^{(0)}) = 58$, $\#\Lambda(V_{12B}^{(0)}) = 78$, $\#\Lambda(V_{12C}^{(0)}) = 189$ and $\#\Lambda(V_{12D}^{(0)}) = 230$.

From V_{13} one obtains $\#\Lambda(V_{13A}^{(0)}) = 49$, $\#\Lambda(V_{13B}^{(0)}) = 95$, $\#\Lambda(V_{13C}^{(0)}) = 265$ and $\#\Lambda(V_{13D}^{(0)}) = 547$. Additionally, postulating the matrix Y_{13} to have the following block core with circulant blocks

$$\text{core}(Y_{13}) = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} A & B & C & D & E & F \\ B & C & A & E & F & D \\ C & A & B & F & D & E \\ \hline D & E & F & C^* & A^* & B^* \\ E & F & D & A^* & B^* & C^* \\ F & D & E & B^* & C^* & A^* \end{array} \right], \quad (\text{A.32})$$

where, each letter $\{A, B, C, D, E, F\}$ corresponds to a structure defined in (5.3), one can write unitarity constraints that can be reduced to only six nonlinear equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2 + e^2 + f^2 + c.c. = -1, \\ a/c + b/a + c/b + d/f + e/d + f/e + c.c. = -1, \\ ac + ab + bc + df + de + ef + c.c. = -1, \\ ae + bf + cd + d/a + e/b + f/c + c.c. = -1, \\ ad + be + cf + a/e + b/f + c/d + c.c. = -1, \\ af + bd + ce + d/b + e/c + f/a + c.c. = -1, \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{A.33})$$

with *c.c.* denoting complex conjugate of the preceding terms. This gives rise to at least two matrices; one is equivalent to the symmetric variant of Fourier $F_{13}^{(0)}$, while another isolated case will be called $Y_{13}^{(0)}$, such that $Y_{13}^{(0)} \notin \text{B}\mathbb{H}(13, q)$ for any $1 < q \leq 2^{16}$, and $\#\Lambda(Y_{13}^{(0)}) = 301$. This, in comparison with other (isolated) matrices [24, 28]: $\#\Lambda(M_{13A}^{(0)}) = 6$ and $\#\Lambda(C_{13A}^{(0)}) = \#\Lambda(C_{13B}^{(0)}) = 9$, classifies $Y_{13}^{(0)}$ as a new isolated element of $\mathbb{H}(13)$. Exactly the same matrix can be found in the set $\{\text{sinkhorn}(X)\}$ for a random $X \in \mathbb{C}^{13 \times 13}$.

Table 4 briefly summarizes all new examples from the last two sections including new cases for $N \in \{14, 15, 16\}$.

References

- [1] W. Tadej, K. Życzkowski; “A Concise Guide to Complex Hadamard Matrices”, *Open Syst. Inf. Dyn.* **13**(02), 133–177 (2006).
- [2] A.T. Butson; “Generalized Hadamard Matrices”, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **13**, 894–898 (1962).

matrix	# Λ	source	matrix	# Λ	source	matrix	# Λ	source
$L_{11A}^{(0)}$	191	SL	$V_{13A}^{(0)}$	49	V	$L_{15}^{(0)}$	463	L
$Y_{11B}^{(0)}$	425	S	$V_{13B}^{(0)}$	95	V	$V_{15A}^{(0)}$	343	V
$Y_{11C}^{(0)}$	975	S	$V_{13C}^{(0)}$	265	V	$V_{15B}^{(0)}$	407	V
$V_{11A}^{(0)}$	161	V	$V_{13D}^{(0)}$	547	V	$V_{15C}^{(0)}$	841	V
$V_{11B}^{(0)}$	331	V	$Y_{13}^{(0)}$	301	S
$V_{12A}^{(0)}$	58	V	$V_{14A}^{(0)}$	297	V	$V_{16A}^{(0)}$	449	V
$V_{12B}^{(0)}$	78	V	$V_{14B}^{(0)}$	330	V	$V_{16B}^{(0)}$	538	V
$V_{12C}^{(0)}$	189	V	$V_{14C}^{(0)}$	362	V	$V_{16C}^{(0)}$	1025	V
$V_{12D}^{(0)}$	230	V	$V_{14D}^{(0)}$	687	V
...

Table 4: Exemplary outputs for $11 \leq N \leq 16$ obtained from the Sinkhorn algorithm (S), and families V_N (V) and L_N (L). This is a selection of only isolated objects. Family V_N provides also matrices with non-zero defect. All matrices are new, however most of them cannot be presented in any compact form, yet.

- [3] A.T. Butson; “Relations Among Generalized Hadamard Matrices, Relative Difference Sets, and Maximal Length Linear Recurring Sequences”, *Can. J. Math.* **15**, 42–48 (1963).
- [4] J.S. Hadamard; Résolution d’une question relative aux déterminants, *Bull. Sci. Math.* **17**, 240–246, (1893).
- [5] O. Chterental, D.Ž. Đoković; “On Orthostochastic, Unistochastic and Quostochastic Matrices”, *Linear Alg. Appl.* **428**(4), 1178–1201 (2008).
- [6] B.W. Brock; “Hermitian Congruence and the Existence and Completion of Generalized Hadamard Matrices”, *J. Comb. Theory A* **49**(2), 233–261 (1988).
- [7] J.L. Hayden; “Generalized Hadamard Matrices”, *Des. Codes Crypt.* **12**, 69–73 (1997).
- [8] R.F. Werner; “All Teleportation and Dense Coding Scheme”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34**(35), 7081–7094 (2001).
- [9] T. Durt, B.-G. Englert, I. Bengtsson, K. Życzkowski; “On Mutually Unbiased Bases”, *Int. J. Quantum Inf.* **8**(4), 535–640 (2010).
- [10] I. Bengtsson, W. Bruzda, Å. Ericsson, J.-Å. Larsson, W. Tadej, K. Życzkowski; “Mutually Unbiased Bases and Hadamards of Order Six”, *J. Math. Phys.* **48**(5), 052106 (2007).
- [11] E. Knill; “Group Representations, Error Bases and Quantum Codes”, *LANL report LAUR-96-2807* (1996).
- [12] A.V. Geramita, J. Seberry; “Orthogonal Designs: Hadamard Matrices and Quadratic Forms”, M. Dekker Press – Taylor & Francis US (1979).
- [13] B. Musto, J. Vicary; “Quantum Latin Squares and Unitary Error Bases”, *Quant. Inf. Comput.* **16**(15–16), 1318–1332 (2016).
- [14] A. Klappenecker, M. Rötteler; “Constructions of Mutually Unbiased Bases”, *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.* **2948**, 137–144 (2004).

- [15] I.D. Ivanović; “Geometrical Description of Quantal State Determination”, *J. Phys A: Math. Gen.* **14**(12), 3241–3245 (1981).
- [16] W.K. Wootters, B.D. Fields; “Optimal State-Determination by Mutually Unbiased Measurements”, *Ann. Phys.* **191**(2), 363–381 (1989).
- [17] H. Evangelaras, Ch. Koukouvinos, J. Seberry; “Applications of Hadamard matrices”, *J. Telecom. Inf. Tech.* **2**, 1 (2003).
- [18] K. J. Horadam; *Hadamard Matrices and Their Applications*, Princeton University Press (2007).
- [19] T. Banica; “Complex Hadamard Matrices and Applications”, [hal-02317067v2](#) (2021).
- [20] J. Williamson; “Hadamard’s Determinant Theorem and the Sum of Four Squares”, *Duke Math. J.* **11**(1), 65–81 (1944).
- [21] P. Diță; “Some Results on the Parametrization of Complex Hadamard Matrices”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37**, 5355–5374 (2004).
- [22] M. Matolcsi, J. Réffy, F. Szöllősi; “Constructions of Complex Hadamard Matrices via Tiling Abelian Groups”, *Open Syst. Inf. Dyn.* **14**(3), 247–263 (2007).
- [23] J.M. Goethals, J.J. Seidel; “Strongly Regular Graphs Derived from Combinatorial Designs”, *Canad. J. Math.* **22**(3), 597–614 (1970).
- [24] A.J. LaClair; “A Survey on Hadamard Matrices”, *Chancellor’s Honors Program Projects*, University of Tennessee, Knoxville (2016).
- [25] P. Lampio, F. Szöllősi, P. Östregård; “The Quaternary Complex Hadamard Matrices of Orders 10, 12 and 14”, *Discr. Math.* **313**(2), 189–206 (2013).
- [26] K. Beauchamp, R. Nicoară; “Orthogonal Maximal Abelian *-Subalgebras of the 6×6 Matrices”, *Linear Alg. Appl.* **428**(8–9), 1833–1853 (2006).
- [27] W. Bruzda, W. Tadej, K. Życzkowski; Catalog of Complex Hadamard Matrices, <https://chaos.if.uj.edu.pl/~karol/hadamard/> (access: 2023/04/11).
- [28] U. Haagerup; *Operator Algebras and Quantum Field Theory* (Rome 1996), Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 296–322 (1997).
- [29] F. Szöllősi; “Construction, Classification and Parametrization of Complex Hadamard Matrices”, *Ph.D. Thesis, Central European University, Budapest* (2011).
- [30] R. Craigen; “Equivalence Classes of Inverse Orthogonal and Unit Hadamard Matrices”, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **44**(1), 109–115 (1991).
- [31] T. Tao; “Fuglede’s Conjecture is False in 5 and Higher Dimensions”, *Math. Res. Lett.* **11**(2), 251–258 (2004).
- [32] F. Szöllősi; “Complex Hadamard Matrices of Order 6: a Four-Parameter Family”, *J. London Math. Soc.* **85**(3), 616–632, (2012).
- [33] K.-T. Fang, G. Ge; “A Sensitive Algorithm for Detecting the Inequivalence of Hadamard Matrices”, *J. Math. Comp.* **73**(246), 843–851 (2003).

- [34] R. Nicoară; “A Finiteness Result for Commuting Squares of Matrix Algebras”, *J. Operator Theory* **55**(2), 295–310 (2006).
- [35] F. Szöllősi; “Exotic Complex Hadamard Matrices and Their Equivalence”, *Cryptogr. Commun.* **2**, 187–198 (2010).
- [36] W. Tadej, K. Życzkowski; “Defect of a Unitary Matrix”, *Linear Alg. Appl.* **429**(2–3), 447–481 (2008).
- [37] W. Tadej; “Defect and Equivalence of Unitary Matrices. The Fourier Case. Part I”, *Open Syst. Inf. Dyn.* **25**(4), 1850020 (2018).
- [38] F.C. Motta, P.D. Shipman; “Informing the Structure of Complex Hadamard Matrix Spaces Using a Flow”, *Discr. Cont. Dyn. Sys. S* **12**(8), 2349–2364 (2019).
- [39] W. Bruzda; “Extension of the Set of Complex Hadamard Matrices of Size 8”, *Math. Comput. Sci.* **12**, 459–464 (2018).
- [40] R. Sinkhorn; “A Relationship Between Arbitrary Positive Matrices and Doubly Stochastic Matrices”, *Ann. Math. Statist.* **35**(2), 876–879 (1964).
- [41] R. Sinkhorn, P. Knopp; “Concerning Nonnegative Matrices and Doubly Stochastic Matrices”, *Pacific Journal of Math.* **21**(2), 343–348 (1967).
- [42] V. Cappellini, H.-J. Sommers, W. Bruzda, K. Życzkowski; “Random Bistochastic Matrices”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **42**, 365209 (2009).
- [43] H.H. Bauschke, J.M. Borwein; “On Projection Algorithms for Solving Convex Feasibility Problems”, *SIAM Rev.* **38**(3), 367–426 (1996).
- [44] D. McNulty, S. Weigert; “Isolated Hadamard Matrices from Mutually Unbiased Product Bases”, *J. Math. Phys.* **53**, 122202 (2012).
- [45] B.R. Karlsson; “*BCCB* Complex Hadamard Matrices of Order 9, and MUBs”, *Linear Alg. Appl.* **504**(1), 309–324 (2016).
- [46] P. Östregård, P. Lampio, F. Szöllősi; “Orderly Generation of Butson Hadamard Matrices”, *Math. Comp.* **89**, 313–331 (2020).
- [47] Butson Home; <https://wiki.aalto.fi/display/Butson/Butson+Home>, Online supplement to [46] maintained by P. Lampio (access: 2023/04/11).
- [48] <https://github.com/matrix-toolbox/CHM>; zipped package can be downloaded from: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7589985> (access: 2023/04/11).
- [49] G. Björck, R. Fröberg; “A Faster Way to Count the Solutions of Inhomogeneous Systems of Algebraic Equations, with Applications to Cyclic n -roots”, *J. Symbolic Comp.* **12**, 329–336 (1991).
- [50] E.M. Gabidulin, V.V. Shorin; “New Sequences with Zero Autocorrelation”, *Problems of Information Transmission*, **38**, 255–267 (2002).
- [51] I.S. Kotsireas, C. Koukouvinos, J. Seberry; “Hadamard ideals and Hadamard matrices with two circulant cores”, *Eur. J. Comb.*, **27**(5), 658–668. (2006).

- [52] C. Spengler, M. Huber, S. Brierley, T. Adaktylos, B.C. Hiesmayr; “Entanglement Detection via Mutually Unbiased Bases”, [Phys. Rev. A **86**\(2\), 022311 \(2012\)](#).
- [53] B.C. Hiesmayr, W. Löffler; “Mutually Unbiased Bases and Bound Entanglement”, [Phys. Scr. **2014**, T160, 014017 \(2014\)](#).
- [54] B. C. Hiesmayr, D. McNulty, S. Baek, S. Singha Roy, J. Bae, D. Chruściński; “Detecting Entanglement can be More Effective with Inequivalent Mutually Unbiased Bases”, [New J. Phys. **23**, 093018 \(2021\)](#).
- [55] V. Elser; *private communication* (2011).