

New series of multi-parametric solutions to GYBE: quantum gates and integrability

Shahane A. Khachatryan ¹

A. I. Alikhanyan National Science Laboratory (YerPhI),
Alikhanian Br. str. 2, Yerevan 36, Armenia

Abstract

We obtain two series of spectral parameter dependent solutions to the generalized Yang-Baxter equations (GYBE), for definite types of $N_1^2 \times N_2^2$ matrices with general dimensions N_1 and N_2 . Appropriate extensions are presented for the inhomogeneous GYBEs. The first series of the solutions includes as particular cases the X -shaped trigonometric braiding matrices. For construction of the second series the colored and graded permutation operators are defined, and multi-spectral parameter Yang-Baxterization is performed. For some examples the corresponding integrable models are discussed. The unitary solutions existing in these two series can be considered as generalizations of the multipartite Bell matrices in the quantum information theory.

Key words: YBE, GYBE, Yang-Baxterization, integrable models, braid groups, quantum gates, quantum information

Contents

1 Introduction	2
2 YBE and generalized YBE.	4
2.1 The differences between the usual inhomogeneous YBE and the GYBE	6
2.2 GYBE and the integrable models	9
3 The solutions to high-dimensional GYBE emerged from the usual low-dimensional solutions	
3.1 Odd dimensional representations.	16

¹e-mail:shah@mail.yerphi.am

4	Multi-spectral parametrization for the quantum gate matrices	18
5	The graded permutation matrices and multi-parametric generalizations	20
5.1	The second generalization: colored and graded permutation matrices	22
5.2	16×16 -matrices, solutions to YBE constructed with graded and colored permutation operators	25
5.2.1	$\alpha_e = \alpha$	28
5.2.2	$\alpha_0 = \alpha_a \equiv 1, \alpha_e = 0, e = b, c$	29
5.3	16×16 matrices as the solutions to GYBE $(2, 4, 1)$	29
6	Summary	30
A	Solutions to homogeneous and inhomogeneous GYBE with $2^3 \times 2^3$-matrices: $(2, 3, 1), (\{2\}, \{3, 2\})$	
A.1	Two-parametric trigonometric matrices	32
A.2	XXZ -type 8×8 matrices	34

1 Introduction

The area of the quantum exactly solvable models in recent decades admitted close relationship with the disciplines of quantum computing. The generalized Yang-Baxter equations (GYBE) are investigated intensively for depicting unitary R-matrices on the braid group representations, as candidates for complex quantum gates, used in the quantum information processing. Yang-Baxter equations (YBE), initiating as star-triangle equations for solving concrete models in statistical mechanics, have acquired an important role in solvability of the many-body systems, being key equations in the theory of quantum integrability [1]-[20]. Later YBE found applications in quantum field theory, quantum topology, string theory, quantum groups. And there are emerged numerous works ([24]-[41]), revealing the importance of YBE in the quantum information theory. Here the information is encoded in quantum states and processed by unitary evolution operators. The quantum computation process is modeled by quantum circuits, which are the sequences of the quantum gates, the quantum analogs of classical logic gates. The n-qubit quantum gates are described by unitary

matrices defined on the superpositions of the tensor products of n states-qubits (the basic unit of the quantum information, quantum two-dimensional analog of the classical binary information unit - bit). As the logical gates are basic blocks, it is natural to analyze the cases with small n -s, $n = 1, 2, 3$ [20, 24, 25]. For $n = 2$, particularly, the quantum gates can be associated with two-state unitary \check{R} -matrices which are the solutions of the YBE, relying on the revealed topological properties of the quantum gates - braid group symmetries [21]-[27]. In topological quantum computation, the unitary representations of the braid group can be described by braiding anyons [30, 31]. The $p^2 \times p^2$ (qupit [43]) generalizations of the quantum gates as braid group representations and corresponding YBE solutions are discussed in [42, 30, 35] associated with the Z_p parafermion. Generalized YBE, with \check{R} -matrices acting on the tensor product of more than two vector states, are developed in [30, 32, 26], showing, that braiding unitary solutions to GYBE can be used in quantum information processing.

In this paper we consider spectral parameter dependent solutions to inhomogeneous GYBE for arbitrary dimensional matrices of two types, which both are the extensions of 4×4 eight-vertex trigonometric solution: extension by form (the first kind - X-shaped) and by construction (the second kind). In the work [48] entire description is done of the multi-parametric solutions of YBE for the simplest case of 4×4 matrices (see also [2, 49, 50]). Here we obtain direct generalizations of all these solutions for even dimensional X-shaped [30] matrices. In this paper we present a thorough investigation for even dimensional matrices, the odd dimensional cases we describe comparably in a brief way: the main results are obtained and presented, and the detailed analysis with some peculiar solutions will be presented in the further work [55].

In Section 2 the GYB equations are analysed in the context of the integrability of 1D quantum models. The inhomogeneous extensions of GYBE are proposed, and in Subsection 2.1 we emphasize the important differences of these cases in comparison to inhomogeneous YBE. We have discussed the inhomogeneous $N_1^2 \times N_2^2$ dimensional “check” or braiding \check{R} -matrices defined on the space $V_{N_1} \otimes V_{N_2}$. The multi-parametric extensions of the known solutions to GYBE are constructed in Section 3. The general even dimensional X-shaped

solutions to GYBE, their parameterizations and the corresponding integrable models are discussed, the particular examples (for the solutions to inhomogeneous $(2, 3, 1)$ -GYBE) are presented in Appendix. The peculiarities of the odd-dimensional solutions we discuss in Subsection 3.1. Then in Section 4 we sketch also the new perspectives given by the obtained R -matrices in the quantum information theory. In Section 5 the graded and colored representations of the braid group are considered, with corresponding Yang-Baxterization, bringing to trigonometric solutions. After appropriate re-parametrization they can be considered as new second kind solutions to YBE [28]. The examples of 16×16 solutions are discussed in details in Subsections 5.2 and 5.3.

2 YBE and generalized YBE.

The generalized Yang-Baxter equations can be defined by the following relations, as in [30, 32]

$$(\check{R} \otimes I^p)(I^p \otimes \check{R})(\check{R} \otimes I^p) = (I^p \otimes \check{R})(\check{R} \otimes I^p)(I^p \otimes \check{R}), \quad (2.1)$$

Here the matrix \check{R} is defined on the product $\bigotimes^k V$, the unity operator I^p acts as an identity operator on the product of the vector states $\bigotimes^p V$. These equations are called GYBEs of type (d, k, p) , where $d = \text{Dim}[V]$. Far distanced R -matrices, which have no overlap of the acting states, are commutative. Thus, these equations reproduce the braid algebra [21, 22], representing $b_i = I \otimes \dots \check{R} \otimes I^p \dots \otimes I$, $b_{i+1} = I \otimes \dots I^p \otimes \check{R} \dots \otimes I$,

$$b_i b_{i+1} b_i = b_{i+1} b_i b_{i+1}, \quad b_i b_j = b_j b_i, \quad |i - j| > 1. \quad (2.2)$$

Here there is used the ‘‘check’’ notation for the matrices, since in the particular case of $(d, 2, 1)$ these equations coincide with the ordinary YBE [8] in check formulation. This is true for the homogeneous cases, when the states on which the \check{R} -matrix acts, are identical.

Before proceed further let us consider the generalization of the inhomogeneous YBE to the inhomogeneous GYBE at least by the following two ways.

i. The inhomogeneous GYBE - $(\{d\}, \{k, k'\}, \{p, p'\})$, $k + p = k' + p'$ can be presented in the following way:

$$(\check{R} \otimes I^p)(I^{p'} \otimes \check{R}')(\check{R} \otimes I^p) = (I^{p'} \otimes \check{R}')(\check{R} \otimes I^p)(I^p \otimes \check{R}), \quad (2.3)$$

Here the system of the equations acts on the product of the identical spaces V , with the same dimension d , and the matrix R' acts on the product $\bigotimes^{k'} V$, so that $[k + p = p' + k']$. At $k = k'$ this system coincides with the ordinary GYBE. Let us present the generalisations of the braiding relations to inhomogeneous or alternating cases: in (2.2) one can take the following realization, $b_{2i} = I \otimes \dots \check{R} \otimes I^p \dots \otimes I$, $b_{2i+1} = I \otimes \dots I^{p'} \otimes \check{R}' \dots \otimes I$.

ii. The full inhomogeneous GYBE - $(\{d_1, \dots, d_{k+p}\}, \{k, k'\}, \{p, p'\})$, $k + p = k' + p'$.

Let us extend definition of the action space to the inhomogeneous product of the vector states V_i of number $[k + p](= [k' + p'])$ with different characteristics of the vector states (in general with different dimensions d_i), and intend the following inhomogeneous matrices $\check{R} : V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_k$ and $\check{R}' : V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_{k'}$; in the discussion below we use $\check{R}_{i^1 \dots i^n}$, where the indexes $1, \dots, n$ show the position of the vector space, while the index i^n denotes the nature of the vector space

$$\begin{aligned} & (\check{R}_{i^1 \dots i^k} \otimes I_{i^{k+1}} \otimes \dots I_{i^{p+k}}) (I_{i^1} \otimes \dots I_{i^{p'}} \otimes \check{R}_{i^{p'+1} \dots i^{k'+p'}}) \times \\ & (\check{R}_{i^1 \dots i^k} \otimes I_{i^{k+1}} \otimes \dots I_{i^{p+k}}) = (I_{i^1} \otimes \dots I_{i^{p'}} \otimes \check{R}_{i^{p'+1} \dots i^{k'+p'}}) \times \\ & (\check{R}_{i^1 \dots i^k} \otimes I_{i^{k+1}} \otimes \dots I_{i^{p+k}}) (I_{i^1} \otimes \dots I_{i^{p'}} \otimes \check{R}_{i^{p'+1} \dots i^{k'+p'}}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

The unitary solutions to GYBE, constituting the braid group representations, are connecting to the quantum computing theory [27]. However, even for the inhomogeneous case, when at general $d_i \neq d_j$, the GYBE solutions can also be used to the construction of the integrable models, as we describe below. The spectral parameter dependent versions of GYBE are defined just as for the case of YBE, thus ensuring the connection with the integrable models:

$$(\check{R}(u, v) \otimes I^p)(I^p \otimes \check{R}(u))(\check{R}(v) \otimes I^p) = (I^p \otimes \check{R}(v))(\check{R}(u) \otimes I^p)(I^p \otimes \check{R}(u, v)). \quad (2.5)$$




Figure 1: GYBE of type $\{d, k, p\}$

2.1 The differences between the usual inhomogeneous YBE and the GYBE

Let us consider a graphical interpretation of GYBE, (d, k, p) , which act on the product of the states $\bigotimes^{k+p} V_d$, (Fig. 1), with notation \check{R}^k for the matrix acting on the product of the states: $\bigotimes^k V_d$.

Note, that the equations $\{d, 2p, p\}$ can also be considered as usual YBE, which act on the product of the states $V' \otimes V' \otimes V'$, with $V' = \bigotimes^p V$. From this point of view, the other cases $k \neq 2p$, can be considered as the equations on the space $V' \otimes V'' \otimes V'$, with $V' = \bigotimes^p V$, $V'' = \bigotimes^{k-p} V$.

$$[\check{R}_{V'V''} \otimes I_{V'}][I_{V'} \otimes \check{R}_{V''V'}][\check{R}_{V'V''} \otimes I_{V'}] = [I_{V'} \otimes \check{R}_{V''V'}][\check{R}_{V'V''} \otimes I_{V'}][I_{V'} \otimes \check{R}_{V'V''}]. \quad (2.6)$$

In the Fig.1 the way of this kind of the combination of the vector spaces into two big spaces, is apparent. We see that these equations are quite different from the usual inhomogeneous YBE defined on the spaces $V' \otimes V'' \otimes V'$ in the “check”-matrix formulation [14]:

$$[\check{R}_{V'V''} \otimes I_{V'}][I_{V''} \otimes \check{R}_{V'V'}][\check{R}_{V''V'} \otimes I_{V'}] = [I_{V'} \otimes \check{R}_{V''V'}][\check{R}_{V'V'} \otimes I_{V''}][I_{V'} \otimes \check{R}_{V'V''}]. \quad (2.7)$$

This is the usual braiding form of ordinary YB equations, the “check”-operation do not affair

the form of the equations, it only permutes the upper indexes of the matrices in the same YBEs. In the Fig. 2 there are shown two type of the matrices $R_{V' \otimes V''}$, acting on the space $\otimes^k V$, which appear in the equations (2.6) and (2.7).




Figure 2: The usual $\check{R}_{ab}^{\bar{b}\bar{a}}$ ($R_{ab}^{\bar{a}\bar{b}}$)-matrix in YBE (i), $\check{R}_{ab}^{\bar{a}\bar{b}}$ -matrix in GYBE (ii)

If in (2.6) the \check{R} -matrices are acting only on the space $\otimes^k V$, for the case (2.7) there are also matrices defined on the space $\otimes^{2p} V$. Recall, that the non-check R -matrix acts as $P\check{R}$, so in the Fig. 2 (i) it appears with the permutation of the upper indexes: $R_{ab}^{\bar{b}\bar{a}}$. We see, that the given difference between the usual inhomogeneous YBE and GYBE is encoded in the definition of the “check”-matrices. For the first case it acts as the usual braiding matrix, Fig. 2 (i). In the second case, correspondingly, the graphical representation of the “check”-matrix is presented in the Fig. 2 (ii), and can be considered in some sense as “reflecting” matrix. However they both satisfy the braiding relations.

For the inhomogeneous equations, the vector states, on which the R -matrices act, can differ not only by their dimensions, also by “inner” characteristics. As example, the intertwiner R -matrices, defined in the theory of the quantum groups, satisfy to the ordinary YBE [14], and in the “check” formulation commute with the generators of the quantum group. There the vector states V constitute the representations of the quantum groups and can differ one from other by the characteristics of the representations - the eigenvalues of the center of the group [14, 49]. An interesting example is the case of two-dimensional cyclic states of the $sl_q(2)$ group at q^4 [49], where two vector spaces are of the same dimension, but have different characteristics, which bring to various kind of invariant solutions to YBE. And one can find how to operate with the inhomogeneous R -matrices in “check” formulation for the

usual Yang-Baxter equations, particularly in the works [45, 49], where we have presented the solutions with the quantum group symmetry including the permuted projection operators between the representation states.

The case $p \geq k$. In this section we have considered the non-trivial case, when $p < k$. However, one can consider also the remaining cases. As it can be easily followed from the presented equations and the Fig. 1, at $p \geq k$ the generalised YB equations factorize into two similar operator equations. The operators $[\check{R} \otimes I^p]$ and $[I^p \otimes \check{R}]$ are commutative and act non-trivially on different, non-intersecting spaces: $V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_k$ and $V_{p+1} \otimes \dots \otimes V_{p+k}$ (we use the notations introduced within the item (ii)). The right-hand and left-hand sides of GYBE act as unity operators on the vector spaces $V_{k+1} \otimes \dots \otimes V_p$. Meanwhile on the product $V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_k$ (or $V_{p+1} \otimes \dots \otimes V_{p+k}$) the spectral parameter dependent GYBEs (2.5) in the cases $p \geq k$ take the following matrix product form, with an arbitrary function $F(u, v)$:

$$\sum_{k,p} [\check{R}(u, v)]_{ij}^{kp} [\check{R}(v)]_{kp}^{i'j'} = F(u, v) [\check{R}(u)]_{ij}^{i'j'}. \quad (2.8)$$

For the particular case of $\{2, 2, p\}$, $p \geq 2$, the possible solutions (besides of the ones equivalent to unity matrices) are the following ones, with independent constants $\{\theta, \epsilon, t, q, \theta_i\}$ and a function $\bar{F}(u) \neq 0$, $F(u, v) = \frac{\bar{F}(u-v)\bar{F}(v)}{\bar{F}(u)}$, and with the difference property of the spectral parameters in GYBE $(u, v) \Rightarrow (u - v)$:

$$\frac{\check{R}_e(u)}{\bar{F}(u)} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\theta_1 u} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\theta_2 u} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{\theta_3 u} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{\theta_4 u} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \frac{\check{R}(u)}{\bar{F}(u)} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos[\theta u] & 0 & 0 & q \sin[\theta u] \\ 0 & \cos[\epsilon u] & t \sin[\epsilon u] & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{-\sin[\epsilon u]}{t} & \cos[\epsilon u] & 0 \\ \frac{-\sin[\theta u]}{q} & 0 & 0 & \cos[\theta u] \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.9)$$

When $t = \pm 1, \epsilon = \theta, q = e^{i\phi}$, $\bar{F}(u) = e^{i\gamma u}$ and $\bar{u} = \tan[\theta u]$, the second matrix is the well known unitary trigonometric solution to YBE with $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \Rightarrow (\frac{\bar{u}-\bar{v}}{1-\bar{u}\bar{v}})$ (the second kind solution to YBE [28], with relativistic rule of the summation of the spectral parameters - “velocities”),

$$\check{R}_{ij}\left(\frac{\bar{u}-\bar{v}}{1-\bar{u}\bar{v}}\right)\check{R}_{jk}(u)\check{R}_{ij}(v) = \check{R}_{jk}(\bar{v})\check{R}_{ij}(\bar{u})\check{R}_{jk}\left(\frac{\bar{u}-\bar{v}}{1-\bar{u}\bar{v}}\right), \quad (2.10)$$




Figure 3: Partition function, statistical weights

introduced and investigated as parameterized Bell matrix [30, 28], and will be considered in the next sections as well. The first diagonal check-matrix is one of the simple solutions to YBE.

2.2 GYBE and the integrable models

Sometimes there is a vision, that GYBEs in general have no connection with the integrable models. When $p \neq 2k$, the \check{R} -matrices are inhomogeneous matrices with another structure than there are used in the case of the usual Algebraic Bethe Ansatz (ABA) [2, 9]. Let us define the transfer matrix on the cyclic chain with length N and with the vector states V_{i_k} on the k -th sites, by means of the \check{R} -matrices in GYBE, in the following way

$$\tau_{i_1, \dots, i_N}^{j_1, \dots, j_N}(u) = \sum_{k_1} \dots \sum_{k_N} [\check{R}_{k_N i_1}^{j_N k_1}(u) \check{R}_{k_1 i_2}^{j_1 k_2}(u) \dots \check{R}_{k_{N-1} i_N}^{j_{N-1} k_N}(u)], \quad (2.11)$$

The matrices \check{R} are defined, as in the Fig. 2 (ii). Note, that here, in this definition, we do not have auxiliary space in it's usual sense, there are only quantum spaces which figure in the formulas. In the usual definition of the transfer matrix, there is a trace over an auxiliary space

[14], and the auxiliary space may differ from the quantum spaces by dimension, meanwhile in (2.11) the states $\{V_{i_r}, V_{k_r}, V_{j_r}\}$, for the given r , ($r \in [1, \dots, N]$), have the same nature. In the Fig.3 the transfer matrices are depicted by the rows. For simplicity, the states V_{k_r} , by which the summation is taken in the transfer matrices, are denoted by \bar{V}_r , meanwhile the states V_{i_r, j_r} - by V_r (though the vector spaces V_r and \bar{V}_r are similar). The \check{R} -matrices are presented by the shaded rectangles (rotated by 45 degrees in comparison to Fig.1,2).

For simplicity below we shall write the matrices as the functions of one spectral parameter, special cases will be discussed separately. The transfer matrices commutativity, $[\tau(u), \tau(v)] = 0$, ensures the integrability in ABA. Although now the operators $\tau(u)$ and $\tau(v)$ (2.11) in the product $\tau(u)\tau(v)$ are defined differing by a space shift on the product of the quantum states, the quantum conserved charges, produced by the transfer matrices (defined by means of the logarithmic differentials of the $\tau(u)$ -operators - $\frac{\partial^n \log[\tau(u)]}{\partial u^n} |_{u=u_0}$), are the same due to the cyclic property. The commutativity of the transfer matrices can be satisfied by solving of the generalized equations defined on the spaces $V_{i_a} \otimes V_{i_{a+1}} \otimes V_{i_{a+2}}$, $i_{N+1} = i_1$.

$$\check{R}_{i_a i_{a+1}}(u-v) \check{R}_{i_{a+1} i_{a+2}}(u) \check{R}_{i_a i_{a+1}}(v) = \check{R}_{i_{a+1} i_{a+2}}(v) \check{R}_{i_a i_{a+1}}(u) \check{R}_{i_{a+1} i_{a+2}}(u-v). \quad (2.12)$$

For the homogeneous case these coincide with the ordinary YBE.

The transfer matrix we can preset in the graphical form, which we have used in the work [47], see the rows in the Fig.3. The product of the transfer matrices on the periodic $N \times N$ square lattice (having toric periodic conditions): $Z_{N \times N} = \text{tr}_i \prod^N \tau$ constitutes the partition function in 2D statistical physics with the local weights corresponding to the matrices \check{R} . A graphical representation of the partition function is depicted on the Fig.3, too. We apply the checkerboard disposition of the matrices in the square lattice, as in [47].

We shall discuss below the solutions of the inhomogeneous GYBEs, concentrating our attention to a concrete specific structure of the R -matrices.

3 The solutions to high-dimensional GYBE emerged from the usual low-dimensional solutions to YBE

Let us consider \check{R} -matrices, which have non vanishing elements on the diagonal and anti-diagonal positions (X -shaped matrices) [30, 31, 32], explored in the context of the quantum information theory as the extensions of 4×4 braiding matrix (the braiding limits of the trigonometric matrix in Eqs. (2.9)), ensuring Bell basis.

For the general $(N_1)^2 \times (N_2)^2$ -dimensional case, there are $\mathcal{V}_{\{12\}}$ non-zero elements in such $\check{R}_{N_1 N_2}$ -matrices,

$$\mathcal{V}_{\{12\}} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 2N_1 N_2 & \text{even } N_1 \text{ or } N_2 \\ 2N_1 N_2 - 1 & \text{odd } N_1 \text{ and odd } N_2 \end{array} \right\} \quad (3.13)$$

i.e. these \check{R} -matrices can describe $\mathcal{V}_{\{12\}}$ -vertex models in 2d statistical physics. Considering the spectral parameter dependent GYB equations with such kind matrices will restrict strongly the area of the solutions.

As it is mentioned, an example of such matrices are the braid group symmetric solutions (see e.g. [11])

$$\check{R}_M(u) = \frac{1}{2}e^u M^+ + e^{-u} M^-, \quad M^\pm = I \pm M, \quad M^2 = -I, \quad (3.14)$$

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M^\pm = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \pm 1 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & \pm 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \mp 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\ \mp 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.15)$$

The matrix M itself is a solution to the rigid (without spectral parameter) GYBE, and M^\pm -matrices are the braid limits $\lim_{\pm\infty}$ of the mentioned trigonometric solution (3.14), $\check{R}(u) = \cosh[u]I + \sinh[u]M$. The more complete trigonometric parametrization of M^\pm -matrices we shall discuss in this paper, as extension of (2.9), with an detailed example of 8×8 matrix in Appendix A.1.

We construct here the most general GYBE solutions with the matrices having only diagonal and anti-diagonal non-zero elements, and it occurs, that these are natural extensions of the eight-vertex solutions to ordinary YBE for the high-dimensional matrices. And the mentioned solutions can be constructed by considering the following ansatz.

Let us consider the matrix \check{R}_{N_1, N_2} which acts on the tensor product of the vector spaces $V_{N_1} \otimes V_{N_2}$. The inhomogeneous equations we consider in the following form:

$$\check{R}_{N_1, N_2}(u, v)\check{R}_{N_2, N_3}(u)\check{R}_{N_1, N_2}(v) = \check{R}_{N_2, N_3}(v)\check{R}_{N_1, N_2}(u)\check{R}_{N_2, N_3}(u). \quad (3.16)$$

Ordinary GYBE. When $N_2 = d^{k-p}$ and $N_1 = N_3 = d^p$, then this set of the equations coincide with (d, k, p) -GYBE, providing that the the matrices $\check{R}_{N_1 N_2}$ are invariant under transposition operation, i.e. the following matrices \check{R}_{N_1, N_2} and \check{R}_{N_2, N_1} are equivalent as $(N_1 N_2) \times (N_1 N_2)$ matrices.

We can enumerate the vector states $|n\rangle$ of the corresponding spaces V_N as follows- $\{|\mathcal{N}\rangle, |\mathcal{N}-1\rangle, \dots, |1\rangle, |0\rangle, \dots, |-\mathcal{N}+1\rangle, |-\mathcal{N}\rangle\}$, for $Dim[V_N] = 2\mathcal{N}$, and as $\{|\mathcal{N}\rangle, |\mathcal{N}-1\rangle, \dots, |0\rangle, \dots, |-\mathcal{N}+1\rangle, |-\mathcal{N}\rangle\}$, for the odd case: $Dim[V_N] = 2\mathcal{N}+1$. I.e., here $\mathcal{N}_i = \left\lfloor \frac{Dim[V_{N_i}]}{2} \right\rfloor$, $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the integer part of the numbers. The X -shaped matrices have the following sub-structures: at $N_1 = 2\mathcal{N}_1$ and $N_1 = 2\mathcal{N}_1 + 1$ cases correspondingly:

$$\check{R}_{2\mathcal{N}_1 N_2} = \begin{pmatrix} (\swarrow) & (\nearrow) \\ (\searrow) & (\nwarrow) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \check{R}_{2\mathcal{N}_1+1 N_2} = \begin{pmatrix} (\swarrow) & & (\nearrow) \\ & (*) & \\ (\searrow) & & (\nwarrow) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.17)$$

where the slow arrows denote diagonal and anti-diagonal $(\mathcal{N}_1) \times (N_2)$ matrices with the following matrix elements (disposed from the left to right)

$$\begin{aligned} (\swarrow) &= \text{DIAGONAL} \left(\check{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2}^{\mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2}, \check{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2-1}^{\mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2-1}, \dots, \check{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1 -\mathcal{N}_2}^{\mathcal{N}_1 -\mathcal{N}_2}, \check{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1-1 \mathcal{N}_2}^{\mathcal{N}_1-1 \mathcal{N}_2}, \dots, \check{R}_{-1 -\mathcal{N}_2}^1 \right), \\ (\nearrow) &= \text{ANTI-DIAGONAL} \left(\check{R}_{1 -\mathcal{N}_2}^{-1 \mathcal{N}_2}, \check{R}_{1 -\mathcal{N}_2+1}^{-1 \mathcal{N}_2-1}, \dots, \check{R}_{1 \mathcal{N}_2}^{-1 -\mathcal{N}_2}, \check{R}_{2 -\mathcal{N}_2}^{-2 \mathcal{N}_2}, \dots, \check{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2-1}^{-\mathcal{N}_1 -\mathcal{N}_2+1}, \check{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2}^{-\mathcal{N}_1 -\mathcal{N}_2} \right), \\ (\searrow) &= \text{ANTI-DIAGONAL} \left(\check{R}_{-\mathcal{N}_1 -\mathcal{N}_2}^{\mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2}, \check{R}_{-\mathcal{N}_1 -\mathcal{N}_2+1}^{\mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2-1}, \dots, \check{R}_{-\mathcal{N}_1+1 -\mathcal{N}_2}^{\mathcal{N}_1-1 \mathcal{N}_2}, \dots, \check{R}_{-1 -\mathcal{N}_2+1}^1, \check{R}_{-1 -\mathcal{N}_2}^1 \right), \\ (\nwarrow) &= \text{DIAGONAL} \left(\check{R}_{-1 \mathcal{N}_2}^{-1 \mathcal{N}_2}, \dots, \check{R}_{-\mathcal{N}_1+1 -\mathcal{N}_2}^{-\mathcal{N}_1+1 -\mathcal{N}_2}, \check{R}_{-\mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2}^{-\mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2}, \dots, \check{R}_{-\mathcal{N}_1 -\mathcal{N}_2+1}^{-\mathcal{N}_1 -\mathcal{N}_2+1}, \check{R}_{-\mathcal{N}_1 -\mathcal{N}_2}^{-\mathcal{N}_1 -\mathcal{N}_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here the diagonal and anti-diagonal matrix elements are indexed within the following rules. The values of the indexes $\{i, j\}$ of the diagonal \check{R}_{ij}^{ij} elements are decreasing from upper left corner to the lower right position. The first index i runs from \mathcal{N}_1 to $-\mathcal{N}_1$, and for the fixed i , the index j goes from \mathcal{N}_2 to $-\mathcal{N}_2$. The indexes $\{i, j\}$ of the anti-diagonal \check{R}_{-i-j}^{ij} elements are decreasing from the lower left corner to the upper right position. The first index i runs from \mathcal{N}_1 to $-\mathcal{N}_1$, and for fixed i the index j goes from \mathcal{N}_2 to $-\mathcal{N}_2$.

At $N_1 = 2\mathcal{N}_1 + 1$, the additional central sub-matrix has the structure $(*)_{2\mathcal{N}_2}$ or $(*)_{2\mathcal{N}_2+1}$, for the cases $N_2 = 2\mathcal{N}_2$ and $N_2 = 2\mathcal{N}_2 + 1$, respectively:

$$(*)_{2\mathcal{N}_2} = \begin{pmatrix} \check{R}_{0\ \mathcal{N}_2}^{0\ \mathcal{N}_2} & & & \check{R}_{0\ \mathcal{N}_2}^{0\ -\mathcal{N}_2} \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \check{R}_{0\ 1}^{0\ 1} & \check{R}_{0\ 1}^{0\ -1} \\ & & \check{R}_{0\ -1}^{0\ 1} & \check{R}_{0\ -1}^{0\ -1} \\ & & & \ddots \\ \check{R}_{0\ -\mathcal{N}_2}^{0\ \mathcal{N}_2} & & & \check{R}_{0\ -\mathcal{N}_2}^{0\ -\mathcal{N}_2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (*)_{2\mathcal{N}_2+1} = \begin{pmatrix} \check{R}_{0\ \mathcal{N}_2}^{0\ \mathcal{N}_2} & & & \check{R}_{0\ \mathcal{N}_2}^{0\ -\mathcal{N}_2} \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \check{R}_{0\ 0}^{0\ 0} & \\ & & & \ddots \\ \check{R}_{0\ -\mathcal{N}_2}^{0\ \mathcal{N}_2} & & & \check{R}_{0\ -\mathcal{N}_2}^{0\ -\mathcal{N}_2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.18)$$

Now let us reformulate the matrices into the superpositions, rewriting the matrix elements in the following way $[\check{R}_{N_1 N_2}]_{\pm n \pm p}^{\pm n \pm p} = [\check{r}_{n,p}]_{\pm \pm}^{\pm \pm}$, $n = \{0/1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_1\}$, $p = \{0/1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_2\}$,

$$\check{R}_{N_1, N_2} = \bigoplus_{n_i=0/1, n_j=0/1}^{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2} \check{r}_{n_i, n_j} \quad (3.19)$$

with the matrices defined on the minimal spins $\frac{1}{2}$ and 0. When $n_i, n_j \neq 0$, then the matrix

$$\check{r}_{n_i, n_j} = \begin{pmatrix} r_{n_i n_j}^{++} & 0 & 0 & r_{n_i n_j}^{--} \\ 0 & r_{n_i n_j}^{+-} & r_{n_i n_j}^{-+} & 0 \\ 0 & r_{n_i n_j}^{+-} & r_{n_i n_j}^{-+} & 0 \\ r_{n_i n_j}^{++} & 0 & 0 & r_{n_i n_j}^{--} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.20)$$

constitutes an eight-vertex model defined on the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ spaces. As the general equations (3.16) contain as separate sub-sets the YBEs for each particular matrices \check{r}_{n_i, n_j} , hence the corresponding **solutions for the general inhomogeneous eight-vertex models constitute the solutions here**. And since all the sectorial equations (the parts of the GYBE),

which contain different \check{r}_{n_i, n_j} -matrices,

$$\check{r}_{n_i, n_j}(u-v)\check{r}_{n_j, n_k}(u)\check{r}_{n_i, n_j}(v) = \check{r}_{n_j, n_k}(v)\check{r}_{n_i, n_j}(u)\check{r}_{n_j, n_k}(u-v), \quad (3.21)$$

connect the sub-matrices with different indexes $\{i, j\}$ one with other, hence all the solutions $\check{r}_{n_i, n_j}(u)$ with any i, j have the same nature (elliptic, trigonometric or rational). And only some variations are possible concerning to the constants (model's parameters), as we shall face in the considered examples. The exceptional cases, when there can be disconnected sub-sets of YBEs, are discussed in the Appendix A2, within the Statement III. The possible solutions one can classify as the general XYZ or free-fermionic inhomogeneous matrices which can be formulate by means of the $sl(2)$ operators on the fundamental spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ irreps [2, 3, 4, 48], or on the irreps of the $sl_q(2)$ quantum group at general or cyclic cases [14, 4, 49]. The examples, corresponding to the XXZ -model or XX -model in a transverse field, at $N_{1,2} = 2, 4$ are given in the Appendix A.2.

Also we can interpret the corresponding spin-chain models with the next-neighboring interactions between the sets of $\frac{1}{2}$ -spins of numbers \mathcal{N}_i and \mathcal{N}_{i+1} , as the models with the interactions between the complex spins at the sites $i, i+1 - \bigoplus^{\mathcal{N}_{i,i+1}} \frac{1}{2}$. By means of the complex spin operators - $S_i^a = \sum_{k=1}^{\mathcal{N}_i} (\sigma_i^a)_k$ and $S_{i+1}^a = \sum_{k=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{i+1}} (\sigma_{i+1}^a)_k$ (here σ_i^a are the Pauli matrices defined at the i -th sites), for the solutions corresponding, as example, to the XYZ -model's \check{r}_{ij} matrices, the appropriate 1D spin-model Hamiltonian, $H \approx \frac{d \log[\tau(u)]}{du} \Big|_{u=0}$, can be expressed as follows:

$$H_{XYZ}^{\mathcal{N}} = \sum_i H_{i,i+1} = \sum_i \sum_k \sum_r \sum_{a=x,y,z}^{\mathcal{N}_i, \mathcal{N}_{i+1}} J_a (\sigma_i^a)_k (\sigma_{i+1}^a)_r = \sum_i \sum_{a=x,y,z} J_a S_i^a S_{i+1}^a. \quad (3.22)$$

One can extend the parametrization for the all obtained solutions in this natural way, with arbitrary numbers $\gamma_{i,j}$,

$$\check{R}_{N_1, N_2}(u) = \bigoplus_{p_i = -N_1, p_j = -N_2}^{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2} e^{\gamma_{ij} u} \check{r}_{p_i, p_j}(\alpha_{ij} u). \quad (3.23)$$

Of course, there is an ambiguity, connected with the possibility of multiplying the whole \check{R} -matrix by an overall function. In the corresponding quantum chain Hamiltonian operators

these factors bring us additional diagonal summand proportional to $H_0 = \sum_k \sum_{i,j} \gamma_{ij} [I_{p_i}]_k \otimes [I_{p_j}]_{k+1}$. For the even dimensional cases we can formally rewrite it in the following form: $H_0 = \sum_k \sum_{i,j} \gamma_{ij} [(\sigma_z^2)_{p_i}]_k \otimes [(\sigma_z^2)_{p_j}]_{k+1}$.

Elucidations. One can present other even-dimensional large matrices too, emerged or induced from the well analyzed eight-vertex matrices, satisfying to inhomogeneous GYBEs. For the matrices $\check{R}_{2\mathcal{N}_1 \times 2\mathcal{N}_1}$, acting on the product state - $V_{2\mathcal{N}_1} \otimes V_{2\mathcal{N}_2}$, it is natural to propose matrices $\check{R}_{2 \times 2 \times \mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_1}$ by the following simple formula

$$\check{R}_{2 \times 2 \times \mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_2} : V_2 \otimes V_2 \otimes V_{\mathcal{N}_1} \otimes V_{\mathcal{N}_1} \rightarrow V_2 \otimes V_2 \otimes V_{\mathcal{N}_1} \otimes V_{\mathcal{N}_1}, \quad (3.24)$$

$$\check{R}_{2 \times 2 \times \mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_2} = \check{R}_{2 \times 2} \otimes I_{\mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_2}, \quad I_{\mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_2} = I_{\mathcal{N}_1} \otimes I_{\mathcal{N}_2} \quad \check{R}_{2 \times 2} : V_2 \otimes V_2 \rightarrow V_2 \otimes V_2.$$

Then the following inhomogeneous GYBEs take place, inherited just from the usual YBEs:

$$\check{R}_{2 \times 2} \check{R}_{2 \times 2 \times \mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_2} \check{R}_{2 \times 2} = \check{R}_{2 \times 2 \times \mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_2} \check{R}_{2 \times 2} \check{R}_{2 \times 2 \times \mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_2}. \quad (3.25)$$

It is apparent, that another simple definitions also are possible for the matrix $\check{R}_{2\mathcal{N}_1 \times 2\mathcal{N}_1}$, induced by one matrix $\check{R}_{2 \times 2}$ and the diagonal matrices, which will act, e.g. on the vectors spaces $V_2 \otimes V_{\mathcal{N}_1} \otimes V_2 \otimes V_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ or $V_2 \otimes V_{\mathcal{N}_1} \otimes V_{\mathcal{N}_2} \otimes V_2$. The unity matrix can be replaced by diagonal operator with diagonal matrix elements - $\{e^{i\gamma_1 u}, e^{i\gamma_2 u}, \dots, e^{i\gamma_{\mathcal{N}} u}\}$.

These operators differ by dispositions of the matrix elements from those X -shaped solutions, for which all the sub-matrices \check{r}_{ij} , discussed in this section, coincide one with another, up to overall exponential functions. However by the resulting chain models, they are similar operators (and have the same eigenvalues), so can be connected by unitary operations. One can check, that the corresponding unitary matrices are not separable/factorisable, and thus promote to more entangling of the states, generated by evolution operators produced by X -shaped \check{R} -matrices [27].

So, we come to the following

Statement I. The X -shaped even-dimensional matrices, being the solutions of GYBE, are simply the superpositions of the general eight-vertex solutions. The known trigonometric solutions are the particular cases.

And, as an extension regarding to another low-dimensional solutions (e.g. 9×9 chiral Potts models [16]-[20], general 15-vertex models [50]) we can make such

Proposition. The matrices of dimensions $(p\mathcal{N})^2 \times (p\mathcal{K})^2$, constructed by means of $p^2 \times p^2$ solutions \check{r}^{pp} to YBE, (and in matrix form reproducing via multiplicative form the shape of these matrices), via the following representations:

$$\check{R}_{p\mathcal{N},p\mathcal{K}} = \bigoplus_{n_i=1, k_j=1}^{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{K}} \check{r}_{n_i, k_j}^{pp} \quad (3.26)$$

can be considered as solutions to GYBE. Here instead of the indexes $\{\pm\}$ used in the case of $p = 2$, we can use the numbers $\{1, \dots, p\}$. Then, the matrix indexes of the big matrix $[\check{R}_{p\mathcal{N},p\mathcal{K}}]_{ij}^{i'j'}$ are disposed in the following way:

$$i, i' \in \{1\mathcal{N}, 1(\mathcal{N} - 1), \dots, 11, 2\mathcal{N}, 2(\mathcal{N} - 1), \dots, 21, \dots, p\mathcal{N}, p(\mathcal{N} - 1), \dots, p1\},$$

$$j, j' \in \{1\mathcal{K}, 1(\mathcal{K} - 1), \dots, 11, 2\mathcal{K}, 2(\mathcal{K} - 1), \dots, 21, \dots, p\mathcal{K}, p(\mathcal{K} - 1), \dots, p1\}.$$

3.1 Odd dimensional representations.

The case, when one of the spaces on which the $\check{R}_{N_1 N_2}$ -matrix acts, has odd dimension, the situation is changed. Here there are specific equations containing the indexes 0. In comparison to even dimensional cases, there is an additional sector in the set of GYBEs, which includes the matrices $\check{r}_{n_i, 0}$, \check{r}_{0, n_j} and $\check{r}_{0, 0}$ and can be formulated as follows:

$$\check{r}_{n_i, 0}(u - v)\check{r}_{0, n_k}(u)\check{r}_{n_i, 0}(v) = \check{r}_{0, n_k}(v)\check{r}_{n_i, 0}(u)\check{r}_{0, n_k}(u - v), \quad (3.27)$$

$$\check{r}_{0, 0}(u - v)\check{r}_{0, n_k}(u)\check{r}_{0, 0}(v) = \check{r}_{0, n_k}(v)\check{r}_{0, 0}(u)\check{r}_{0, n_k}(u - v), \quad (3.28)$$

$$\check{r}_{0, 0}(u - v)\check{r}_{n_k, 0}(u)\check{r}_{0, 0}(v) = \check{r}_{n_k, 0}(v)\check{r}_{0, 0}(u)\check{r}_{n_k, 0}(u - v), \quad (3.29)$$

$$\check{r}_{0, 0}(u - v)\check{r}_{0, 0}(u)\check{r}_{0, 0}(v) = \check{r}_{0, 0}(v)\check{r}_{0, 0}(u)\check{r}_{0, 0}(u - v), \quad (3.30)$$

The matrices $\check{r}_{0, n_i}(u)$ and $\check{r}_{n_i, 0}(u)$ have the following 2×2 -matrix form

$$\check{r}_{0, n_i} = \begin{pmatrix} [r_{0n_i}]_+^+ & [r_{0n_i}]_+^- \\ [r_{0n_i}]_-^+ & [r_{0n_i}]_-^- \end{pmatrix}, \quad \check{r}_{n_i, 0} = \begin{pmatrix} [r_{n_i, 0}]_+^+ & [r_{n_i, 0}]_+^- \\ [r_{n_i, 0}]_-^+ & [r_{n_i, 0}]_-^- \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.31)$$

The solution of the equation (3.30), taking into account the requirement at the point $u = 0$ (coming from the locality of the models)

$$\check{R}_{N_1 N_2}(0) = I_{N_1} \otimes I_{N_2} \quad (3.32)$$

can be easily represented as a function with one arbitrary constant α

$$\check{r}_{0,0}(u) = e^{\alpha u}. \quad (3.33)$$

Since the equations (3.28, 3.29) present the following scattering relations on the matrices $[r_{n_i 0}]$ and $[r_{0 n_j}]$ (below we omit the indexes $\{n_i 0, 0 n_i\}$)

$$\begin{aligned} r_+^+(u) &= r_+^+(v)r_+^+(u-v) + r_-^+(v)r_+^+(u-v), \\ r_-^-(u) &= r_-^-(v)r_-^-(u-v) + r_+^-(v)r_-^-(u-v), \\ r_+^-(u) &= r_+^-(v)r_+^-(u-v) + r_-^-(v)r_+^-(u-v), \\ r_-^+(u) &= r_-^+(v)r_-^+(u-v) + r_+^-(v)r_-^+(u-v). \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

Then the solutions are simply trigonometric functions

$$r_+^+(u) = r_-^-(u) = \cos[\theta u], \quad r_+^-(u) = p \sin[\theta u], \quad r_-^+(u) = -\frac{1}{p} \sin[\theta u]. \quad (3.35)$$

The parameters p and θ here are arbitrary numbers (and particularly can be imaginary numbers).

Now it is natural to look for the solutions $[\check{r}_{ik}]_{\pm\pm}^{\pm\pm}$ to the remained equations (3.21) as trigonometric ones. And indeed, the solutions for $[\check{r}_{ij}]$ coincide with the inhomogeneous two-parametric solutions as in (2.9). Below we prefer to deal with the hyperbolic parameterizations, which has been also used for ordinary YBE brought in [48]:

$$\check{r}_{ij}(u) = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh[\gamma u] & 0 & 0 & q \sinh[\beta u] \\ 0 & \cosh[\beta u] & t \sinh[\gamma u] & 0 \\ 0 & t_1 \sinh[\gamma u] & \cosh[\beta u] & 0 \\ \frac{t_2}{q} \sinh[\beta u] & 0 & 0 & \cosh[\gamma u] \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.36)$$

Here the parameters $\{\gamma, \beta, q\}$ are independent ones, meanwhile the constants $\{t, t_1, t_2\}$ are the signs, and the permissible configurations for being the solutions to YBE are the following ones:

$$\{t, t_1, t_2\} = \{\pm 1, \pm 1, 1\}, \quad \{t, t_1, t_2\} = \{\pm 1, \mp 1, -1\}. \quad (3.37)$$

So, the results of this sub-section can be formulate in the following

Statement II The X-shaped odd-dimensional spectral parameter dependent solutions to GYBE have trigonometric nature.

All these solutions correspond to the 1D quantum Ising model's like spin systems, i.e. free fermionic 1D quantum chains [48], after the Jordan-Wigner transformations [10]. From the other hand, the particular case of the matrix (3.36), when $\gamma = \epsilon$, is the well observed Bell matrix [28, 30].

4 Multi-spectral parametrization for the quantum gate matrices

In the quantum information theory the spectral parameter dependent GYBE-solutions realize time evolution $U(t)$ of the quantum states, and it is important to obtain the unitary operator solutions [27]. Note, that the two-parametric trigonometric unitary matrix in (2.9) at $t = 1$, $q = e^{i\alpha}$ just follows from the unitary form of the YBE solution (3.36):

$$\check{R}_U(u) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\cosh[2\gamma u] + \cosh[2\beta u]}} \check{R}(u), \quad t = 1, t_1 = -1, t_2 = -1, \quad (4.38)$$

after the following transformations of the parameters,

$$\begin{aligned} \cos[\theta \tilde{u}] &= \frac{\sqrt{2} \cosh[\gamma u]}{\sqrt{\cosh[2\gamma u] + \cosh[2\beta u]}}, & \sin[\theta \tilde{u}] &= \frac{\sqrt{2} \sinh[\beta u]}{\sqrt{\cosh[2\gamma u] + \cosh[2\beta u]}}, \\ \cos[\epsilon \tilde{u}] &= \frac{\sqrt{2} \cosh[\beta u]}{\sqrt{\cosh[2\gamma u] + \cosh[2\beta u]}}, & \sin[\epsilon \tilde{u}] &= \frac{\sqrt{2} \sinh[\gamma u]}{\sqrt{\cosh[2\gamma u] + \cosh[2\beta u]}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

The action of that matrix on the direct product states $|\pm\rangle \otimes |\pm\rangle \equiv |\pm\pm\rangle$, brings to the entangled states

$$\check{R}_U \begin{pmatrix} |++\rangle \\ |+-\rangle \\ |-+\rangle \\ |--\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos[\theta\tilde{u}] |++\rangle + e^{i\alpha} \sin[\theta\tilde{u}] |--\rangle \\ \cos[\epsilon\tilde{u}] |+-\rangle + \sin[\epsilon\tilde{u}] |-+\rangle \\ \cos[\epsilon\tilde{u}] |-+\rangle - \sin[\epsilon\tilde{u}] |+-\rangle \\ \cos[\theta\tilde{u}] |--\rangle - e^{i\alpha} \sin[\theta\tilde{u}] |++\rangle \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.40)$$

In contrast to the known homogeneous case, when $\epsilon = \theta$ (or $\gamma = \beta$), here there are two kind of entangled paired states, with the independent “concurrences” - degrees of the entanglement [13], equal to $|\sin[2\theta\tilde{u}]|$ and $|\sin[2\epsilon\tilde{u}]|$.

The higher generalizations for these matrices $\check{R}_{N_1 N_2}$, in case, if $N_i = 2^{d_i}$, can be considered as complex gates on the tensor products of two-qubit states $\bigotimes^n |\pm\rangle$, $n = d_1 + d_2$, so called n-qubit states, for obtaining entangled states (such as maximally entangled - Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states or linear cluster states [29, 33, 46, 38]).

At $\theta\tilde{u} = \epsilon\tilde{u} = \pm\pi/4$, $\alpha = 0$ ($\check{R} = M^\pm$) the resulting states constitute the known Bell states - maximal entangled states [12]. And, as it is noted already, the homogeneous case $\gamma = \beta$; $\epsilon = \theta$, after re-parametrization, corresponds to the second type solutions (2.10).

If the phase $\alpha = 0$ and the parameter θ is time-dependent, then the evaluation of two sub-sets of the vector states $\{| \pm\pm\rangle\}$ and $\{| \pm\mp\rangle\}$ can be described by two independent oscillations with different frequencies, constituting so *Lissajous figures* in the corresponding parametric spaces. Meanwhile, there are different visions, how to choose the time-parameter. The Hamiltonian operator follows just from the Shrödinger equation, $H = i\hbar \frac{\partial(U(t))}{\partial t} U^\dagger$. Second type YBE solutions (2.10), $\check{R}(u) = (I + uM)/(\sqrt{1 + u^2})$, with time-parameter u , give time-dependent Hamiltonian (with time-dependent eigenvalues and time-independent eigenvectors) (e.g. [38]). The trigonometric parametrization [38, 28] gives time-independent Hamiltonian operator equivalent to operator M , with additional deformation parameter q [38, 27, 6]. However, one can take into account that here (4.40) there are two independent spectral parameters, and it is possible to define their time dependence by two arbitrary

different functions, say as

$$\epsilon\tilde{u} \approx \frac{\pi}{4}[t], \quad \theta\tilde{u} \approx \frac{\pi}{4}[t-1]. \quad (4.41)$$

This choice shows apparently the possibility of independent time-evolutions for two couples of states $[|++\rangle, |--\rangle]$ and $[|+-\rangle, |-+\rangle]$. For the case (4.41) at $t = 2n + 1$ (n is an integer number) the first states are entirely decoupled, meanwhile the second couple is maximally entangled (for $t = 2n$ there is an opposite situation).

Another Hamiltonian operator is defined by the authors of the work [29], taking the deformation parameter as time-dependent, and the usual spectral parameter as time-independent. In the case of two-parametric solutions, considered in this paper, if to take time is connected with the parameter q , then H is not changed in comparison with the discussions in [29], and the Berry's phases and Berry's sphere for the eigen-states of the Hamiltonian operators are described in the same way.

5 The graded permutation matrices and multi-parametric generalizations

Let us define the following graded permutation matrices: P_g and P_g^τ ,

$$[P_g]_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1 j_2} |i_1\rangle |i_2\rangle = (-1)^{(i_1+j_1)i_1} |j_2\rangle |j_1\rangle, \quad (5.42)$$

$$[P_g^\tau]_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1 j_2} |i_1\rangle |i_2\rangle = (-1)^{(i_1+j_1)i_1} |j_2\rangle^\tau |j_1\rangle^\tau \quad (5.43)$$

Here we use together with the ordinary permutation matrix P (of disposition) of the states, also the colored permutation P^τ , realizing the permutation of the states' "colors" (types), which for the case $N = 2$ means:

$$\{1, 2\}^\tau = \{2, 1\}. \quad (5.44)$$

The sign-gradation of the matrix elements could be explained in a consistent way, introducing the graded vector spaces (super-spaces) and graded tensor products (see, as example, the work [44] and the references therein). Then the basic definitions of the ABA need

re-consideration, such as YB equations, R -matrices, algebraic relations with monodromy matrices, Lax operators, transfer matrices. However, YBEs in the “check” formulations, and hence the GYBEs, remain unchanged. But in this paper we use the “grading” term only regarding to the “check” matrices, without notion of the (anti-)commutation features of the vector states. Formally, we exploit below the notion “parity” used for the super-spaces, but the fractional numbers in the last sub-section hints that the spaces here may have richer structure (can include para-fermions). The deep understanding of the underlying symmetries we shall leave for further investigation [55], giving here only the receipt of the construction of the large matrices.

Note, that at $N = 2$ the two-parametric 4×4 -matrix (3.36) consists of the sum of the above graded permutation operators.

$$P_g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & 1 & & \\ & -1 & & \\ & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_g^\tau = \begin{pmatrix} & & & 1 \\ & 1 & & \\ & & 1 & \\ -1 & & & \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.45)$$

The group relations of these graded colored operators reflect braiding algebra properties

$$\begin{aligned} [P_g]_{12}[P_g]_{23}[P_g]_{12} &= [P_g]_{23}[P_g]_{12}[P_g]_{23}, & (5.46) \\ [P_g^\tau]_{12}[P_g^\tau]_{23}[P_g^\tau]_{12} &= [P_g^\tau]_{23}[P_g^\tau]_{12}[P_g^\tau]_{23}, \\ [P_g]_{12}[P_g]_{23}^\tau[P_g]_{12} &= [P_g]_{23}[P_g^\tau]_{12}[P_g]_{23}, \\ [P_g^\tau]_{12}[P_g]_{23}[P_g^\tau]_{12} &= [P_g^\tau]_{23}[P_g]_{12}[P_g^\tau]_{23}, \\ [P_g^\tau]_{12}[P_g^\tau]_{23}[P_g]_{12} &= [P_g]_{23}[P_g^\tau]_{12}[P_g^\tau]_{23}. \end{aligned}$$

which means that we have graded and colored representations of the braiding algebra.

Using the described relations let us present the following multi-spectral parametric solution to the GYBE, for the homogeneous spaces - also to the usual YBE:

$$\check{R}(u; u') = e^u P_g + e^{-u} P_g^\dagger + e^{u'} P_g^\tau + e^{-u'} P_g^{\tau\dagger}, \quad (5.47)$$

$$\check{R}_{12}(u - v; u' - v') \check{R}_{23}(u; u') \check{R}_{12}(v; v') = \check{R}(v; v')_{23} \check{R}(u; u')_{12} \check{R}(u - v; u' - v')_{23}. \quad (5.48)$$

The operation \dagger here denotes the hermitian conjugation. The spectral parameters $\{u, u'\}$ can be presented by means of two constant parameters and one spectral parameter: $\{u, u'\} \rightarrow \{\alpha u, \alpha' u\}$. The generalization of these matrices for the X -shaped matrices \check{R}_{NK} , when the large matrices are the combinations of 4×4 -matrices, is described in Section 3. As for the case of 4×4 matrix (2.9), the GYB equations ($d, k, p \geq k$), with $d^k = NK$, give the general X -shaped \check{R}_{NK} trigonometric solution with independent parameters $\{u, u', \dots\}$ of number NK . However the braiding solutions to GYBEs ($d, k, p < k$) bring to restrictions on the spectral parameters. And the resulting $(N)^2 \times (K)^2$ matrices depend on two spectral parameters (see the examples in the Appendix A.1), and also on additional overall parameters ($\alpha_{ij}u$):

$$\check{R}_{N,K}(u) = \bigoplus_{p_i, p_j}^{N, K} e^{\alpha_{ij}u} \check{r}_{p_i, p_j}(u_i; u_j); \quad \{u_i, u_j\} = \{u, u'\} \quad \text{or} \quad \{u', u\} \quad (5.49)$$

Another generalization, developed for the homogeneous matrices of $N \times N$ dimensions, we present in the following subsection.

5.1 The second generalization: colored and graded permutation matrices

The basic trigonometric matrix \check{R} (3.36) consists of two YBE solutions \check{R}^0 and \check{R}^τ , with different spectral parameters:

$$\check{R}(u; u') = \check{R}^0(u) + \check{R}^\tau(u'). \quad (5.50)$$

The graded permutation matrix P_g in

$$\check{R}^0(u) = \frac{1}{2}(e^u P_g + e^{-u} P_g^\dagger) = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh u & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sinh u & 0 \\ 0 & -\sinh u & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cosh u \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.51)$$

as one of the basic components of such decomposition can be extended to $N \times N$ matrices

$$P_g^{i_2 j_2}_{i_1 j_1} = \delta_{i_1}^{j_2} \delta_{i_2}^{j_1} (-1)^{p_{12}}, \quad \text{with an undefined parity } p_{12}.$$

The next summand \check{R}^τ consists of the colored graded permutation operators. If the vector space V has the states of the number N , i.e. has N colors, then it is possible to construct the colored permutation operators P_{ij}^τ with the corresponding $^\tau$ -permutations of the states: $\{i_1, \dots, i_N\} \rightarrow \{i_1^\tau, \dots, i_N^\tau\}$, $P^\tau = P \cdot I^\tau$:

$$I_{ij}^\tau : V_i \otimes V_j \rightarrow V_i^\tau \otimes V_j^\tau, \quad P_{ij}^\tau : V_i \otimes V_j \rightarrow V_j^\tau \otimes V_i^\tau. \quad (5.52)$$

This means, that the permutation operator permutes not only the disposition of the states in the tensor product, but also the colors of the states. For the simple $N = 2$ case there is one such possibility (5.44):

$$\check{R}^\tau(u) = \frac{1}{2}(e^u P_g^\tau + e^{-u} P_g^{\tau\dagger}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \sinh u \\ 0 & \cosh u & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cosh u & 0 \\ -\sinh u & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.53)$$

One can verify, that together with the ordinary permutation operators, the general colored P^τ -operators, $P_{ij i_1 j_1}^{\tau i_2 j_2} = \delta_{i_1}^{j_1} \delta_{i_2}^{j_2}$ also satisfy to the braid group relations.

$$P_{ij}^\tau P_{jk}^\tau P_{ij}^\tau = P_{jk}^\tau P_{ij}^\tau P_{jk}^\tau. \quad (5.54)$$

This is the consequence of the fact, that the colored permutations just are connecting with the representations of the symmetric group S_N (including the subgroup of permutations) and the partition algebra [23, 26].

Now let us denote the different colored permutations for N -dimensional vector spaces as τ_i , $P^{\tau_i} P^{\tau_j} = I^{\tau_i + \tau_j}$. Note, that the permutation operation of the colors can be either a full permutation, which means that $V_i^\tau \neq V_i$ for each state, or a partial permutation for the remaining cases. Here we discuss only the simple case, when the colored permutations are identically invertible, i.e. $(P^{\tau_i})^2 = I$, ensuring unitary \check{R}^{τ_i} -operators. The grading operation can be formally introduced in the standard way, by means of the parities: $[P_{ij}^{\tau_i}]_{i_1 j_1}^{i_2 j_2} = (-1)^{p_{12}} \delta_{i_1}^{j_1} \delta_{i_2}^{j_2}$. Here we do not discuss the question of the gradation of the representation states, as well the question of underlying symmetries (super-symmetries),

as it needs separate deep consideration. We can see below, that for the parities there are permissible not only integer numbers, but also fractional values, i.e. in general case, the factors $(-1)^{p_{12}}$ just are phases (we are interested mainly with the unitary operators). And for general N also, the matrices constructed by the Yang-Baxterizations, as in the formulas (5.51) and (5.53), are the solutions to YBE (or GYBE).

Now we can generalize the superposition form of the solution (5.50). The possible trigonometric solutions must be:

$$\check{R}^a(u) = \frac{1}{2}(e^{\alpha_a u} P_g^{\tau_a} + e^{-\alpha_a u} P_g^{\tau_a \dagger}), \quad (5.55)$$

$$\check{R}^{ab}(u) = \frac{1}{2}(e^{\alpha_a u} P_g^{\tau_a} + e^{-\alpha_a u} P_g^{\tau_a \dagger}) + \frac{1}{2}(e^{\alpha_b u} P_g^{\tau_b} + e^{-\alpha_b u} P_g^{\tau_b \dagger}) \equiv \check{R}_a(u) + \check{R}_b(u), \quad (5.56)$$

...

$$\check{R}^{a\dots c} = \check{R}^a(u) + \dots + \check{R}^c(u). \quad (5.57)$$

The constraints followed from the GYBE give the relations only on the grading rules and also on the parameters $\alpha_a, \alpha_b, \dots$, which in some cases coincide one with another. There can be also situation, that for the given combination of the colored matrices $\{a, \dots, a'\}$ the corresponding matrix $\check{R}^{a\dots a'}$ will not have appropriate set of the parameters and parities satisfying to YB or GYBE equations. We can extend our research for the cases, when the colored permutations satisfy to $P^{\tau_1} \dots P^{\tau_k} = I$. Then in order to check that the unitary operators, constructed by linear superpositions of these operators, satisfy the braid relations (or GYBE), it must be analyzed the appropriate *sequence of the colored multiple braiding relations*.

At $N = 2$ the solution can contain two arbitrary spectral parameters, i.e two independent parameters $\alpha_{a,b}$. For the general case of N the situation is much more complicated, there are different possibilities of the gradings, but less rich possibilities for the multi-parametric parameterizations.

The examples of the solutions with the full permutation operators for $4^2 \times 4^2$ -matrix one can find in the next Subsections. We shall see, that the permissible parities are different for different kind of GYBEs.

5.2 16×16 -matrices, solutions to YBE constructed with graded and colored permutation operators

In this subsection we consider of 16×16 -matrices, which can be considered as the solutions to GYBE $(2, 4, 2)$, (which is just the ordinary YBE $(4, 2, 1)$, as we are considering the homogeneous matrices), or GYBE $(2, 4, 1)$, as well GYBE $(2, 4, 3)$.

In this particular case the whole set of the colored g-permutations consists of the following four full permutation operators $(P^e)^2 = 1$, acting on the four-dimensional space with the vectors states $|v_i\rangle$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and equipped with corresponding parities p_e :

$$[P_g^0]_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1 j_2} = (-1)^{p_0} \delta_{i_1}^{j_2} \delta_{i_2}^{j_1}, \quad \{|v_i\rangle\}^0 = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}, \quad (5.58)$$

$$[P_g^a]_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1 j_2} = (-1)^{p_a} \delta_{i_1}^{j_2 a} \delta_{i_2}^{j_1 a}, \quad \{|v_i\rangle\}^a = \{v_2, v_1, v_4, v_3\}, \quad (5.59)$$

$$[P_g^b]_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1 j_2} = (-1)^{p_b} \delta_{i_1}^{j_2 b} \delta_{i_2}^{j_1 b}, \quad \{|v_i\rangle\}^b = \{v_3, v_4, v_1, v_2\}, \quad (5.60)$$

$$[P_g^c]_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1 j_2} = (-1)^{p_c} \delta_{i_1}^{j_2 c} \delta_{i_2}^{j_1 c}, \quad \{|v_i\rangle\}^c = \{v_4, v_3, v_2, v_1\}. \quad (5.61)$$

For the homogeneous case the parity matrices $(-1)^{p_e}$, $e = 0, a, b, c$, are just the signs, and here they are chosen in a rather general form, only keeping the requirement that the diagonal matrix elements must be 1,

$$[p_e]_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1 j_2} = \{0, 1\}, \quad [p]_{i_1 i_2}^{i_1 i_2} = 0. \quad (5.62)$$

The matrices P_g^e satisfy to constant YBE (or GYBE). The simplest spectral dependent matrices with the constructed permutation matrices are the following ones

$$\check{R}^e(u) = \frac{1}{2} (e^u P_g^e + e^{-u} P_g^{e\dagger}), \quad (5.63)$$

where the sign parameters are not fixed (they are arbitrary ones). The next matrices are $\check{R}^{e'e''}(u, v) = R^{e'}(u) + R^{e''}(v)$. For such double cases $\{e', e''\}$ the GYBE put definite constraints on the parameters $[p_e]_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1 j_2}$, (in most cases the second indexes $\{i_2, j_2\}$ in $[p_e]_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1 j_2}$ for the given permutation matrices can be omitted).

Let us construct linear superposition of the operators $\check{R}^e(u)$, applicable in the integrable

models:

$$\check{R}^{4 \times 4}(\alpha_0, \alpha_a, \alpha_b, \alpha_c; u) = \check{R}^0(\alpha_0 u) + \check{R}^a(\alpha_a u) + \check{R}^b(\alpha_b u) + \check{R}^c(\alpha_c u), \quad \check{R}^{4 \times 4}(0) = I. \quad (5.64)$$

The checking of the YBEs, which turn into the constraints on the parities p_e for such linear combination of the permutation matrices, shows that there are many possibilities for the solutions of p_e -s. The choice of the signs or phases are different in different configurations of the GYBEs. As example, the elements of the p_e -matrices are different for the solutions to $(2, 4, 2)$ and $(2, 4, 1)$. One set of the solutions, which we consider in this section, has rather symmetric constraints on p_e , which look like as:

$$\begin{aligned} [p_e]_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1 j_2} &\equiv [p_e]_{i_1}^{j_1}, & [p_e]_{j_1}^{i_1} &= [p_e]_{i_1}^{j_1} + 1, & i_1 &\neq j_1, \\ & & [p_e]_{j_1}^{i_1} &= [p_{e'}]_{j_1}^{i_1}, & \forall \{e, e'\}, \\ [p_e]_4^1 &= [p_e]_3^2 + 1, & [p_e]_2^1 &= [p_e]_4^3 + 1, & [p_e]_3^1 &= [p_e]_4^2 + 1. \end{aligned} \quad (5.65)$$

Let us represent the operator $R^{4 \times 4}(\alpha_0, \alpha_a, \alpha_b, \alpha_c; u)$ with a proper sign configuration, satisfying to (5.65), in general 16×16 matrix form, with arbitrary parameters α_e ,

$$f_u^e = \sinh[\alpha_e u], \quad g_u^e = \cosh[\alpha_e u], \quad \check{R}^{4 \times 4}(\alpha_0, \alpha_a, \alpha_b, \alpha_c; u) = \quad (5.66)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix}
g_u^0 & & & f_u^a & & f_u^b & & & -f_u^c \\
& g_u^a & & f_u^0 & & & f_u^c & & -f_u^b \\
& & g_u^b & & f_u^c & f_u^0 & & & -f_u^a \\
& & & g_u^c & & f_u^b & f_u^a & & -f_u^0 \\
-f_u^0 & & & g_u^a & & & f_u^b & & f_u^c \\
-f_u^a & & & & g_u^0 & & f_u^c & & f_u^b \\
& & -f_u^b & & g_u^c & & f_u^0 & & f_u^a \\
& & -f_u^c & & & g_u^b & f_u^a & & f_u^0 \\
& & -f_u^0 & & -f_u^a & g_u^b & & & -f_u^c \\
& & -f_u^a & & -f_u^0 & & g_u^c & & -f_u^b \\
-f_u^b & & & -f_u^c & & & g_u^0 & & -f_u^a \\
& -f_u^c & & -f_u^b & & & & g_u^a & -f_u^0 \\
& & f_u^0 & & -f_u^a & & f_u^b & & g_u^c \\
& & f_u^a & & & -f_u^0 & f_u^c & & g_u^b \\
& f_u^b & & -f_u^c & & & & f_u^0 & g_u^a \\
f_u^c & & & -f_u^b & & & & f_u^a & g_u^0
\end{pmatrix}$$

These matrices, taking into account the normalizing factor $\left(\sqrt{1+(f_u^0)^2+(f_u^a)^2+(f_u^b)^2+(f_u^c)^2}\right)^{-1}$, are unitary for independent values of the parameters α_e , but however the GYBEs (YBEs) put the restrictions on their values. Then one can directly check that the following operators are solutions to YBE.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \check{R}(\alpha, \alpha, \alpha, \alpha; u), \quad \check{R}(\alpha, 0, \alpha, 0; u), \quad \check{R}(0, \alpha, 0, \alpha; u), \quad \check{R}(\alpha, 0, 0, \alpha; u), \\
& \check{R}(0, \alpha, \alpha, 0; u), \quad \check{R}(\alpha, \alpha, 0, 0; u), \quad \check{R}(0, 0, \alpha, \alpha; u)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.67}$$

We differentiate two type of the solutions. The first type, considered above, admits the property $\check{R}(0) = I$. For these solutions, the integrable local models can be constructed by standard way (see the next subsection).

Exceptional solutions $\sum_e \rho_e \check{R}^e(u)$, $\prod_e \rho_e = 0$. The next possible 16×16 solutions can be considered by partial sums of the matrices $\check{R}^e(u)$, $e = \{0, a, b, c\}$. By direct derivation

it is easy to verify, that each matrix $\check{R}^e(u)$ is a solution to YBE. Moreover, matrices with the non-vanishing elements, disposed so, as in the matrices $\check{R}^e(u)$, are the solutions to YBE with any constants or functions. That is, the generalized matrices

$$\check{R}_G^e(u) = [r^e]_{i_1 i_2}(u) \delta_{i_1}^{j_2 e} \delta_{i_2}^{j_1 e},$$

with any functions $[r^e(u)]_{i_1 i_2} = [r^e(u)]_{i_1 e, j_2 e}$, are the solutions to YBE. But already any combination of two operators $[\check{R}^e(u) + \check{R}^{e'}(u')]$ brings to definite functions and signs. Thus, any matrix (5.66), with two sets of vanishing elements $\{f_{e''} = 0, g_{e''} = 0\}, \{f_{e'''} = 0, g_{e'''} = 0\}, e'', e''' \neq e, e'$, satisfies to YBE, with the following possible values of the parameters $\{\alpha_e, \alpha_{e'}\} = \{\alpha, \alpha\}, \{\alpha_e, \alpha_{e'}\} = \{\alpha, 0\}$ or $\{\alpha_e, \alpha_{e'}\} = \{0, \alpha\}$.

Let us present some exact solutions and the corresponding four-dimensional spin-spin Hamiltonian operators.

5.2.1 $\alpha_e = \alpha$

For the homogeneous solutions, all parameters α_e equal one to another: $\alpha_e = \alpha$. We fix $\alpha = 1$. We can represent this large matrix in the following form, by means of 4×4 -operators: by Z_4 -operators $\bar{M}_{x,y,z}$, ($\check{M}^4 = 1$), and by Z_2 -operators $\bar{M}_{x,y,z}$, ($\check{M}^2 = 1$) (below I_n is the $n \times n$ unity operator, and the signs $\varepsilon_{x,y,z}^2 = 1$ reproduce the solutions for the parity matrices permissible by the relations (5.65):

$$\check{R}_{44}(u) = \cosh [u] I_4 \otimes I_4 + \sinh [u] (\varepsilon_x \check{M}_x \otimes \bar{M}_x + \varepsilon_y \check{M}_y \otimes \bar{M}_y + \varepsilon_z \check{M}_z \otimes \bar{M}_z), \quad (5.68)$$

$$\check{R}_{44}(u) = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh [u] I_4 & \varepsilon_x \sinh [u] \bar{M}_x & \varepsilon_y \sinh [u] \bar{M}_y & -\varepsilon_z \sinh [u] \bar{M}_z \\ -\varepsilon_x \sinh [u] \bar{M}_x & \cosh [u] I_4 & \varepsilon_z \sinh [u] \bar{M}_z & \varepsilon_y \sinh [u] \bar{M}_y \\ -\varepsilon_y \sinh [u] \bar{M}_y & -\varepsilon_z \sinh [u] \bar{M}_z & \cosh [u] I_4 & -\varepsilon_x \sinh [u] \bar{M}_x \\ \varepsilon_z \sinh [u] \bar{M}_z & -\varepsilon_y \sinh [u] \bar{M}_y & \varepsilon_x \sinh [u] \bar{M}_x & \cosh [u] I_4 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.69)$$

$$\bar{M}_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{M}_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{M}_z = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.70)$$

$$\check{M}_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \check{M}_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \check{M}_z = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.71)$$

The matrix (5.66) corresponds to the case with the signs $\varepsilon_{x,y,z} = 1$. We see, that the all matrices \check{M}_i have only two eigenvalues, so the matrices are constructed rather by the generators of $Z_2 \otimes Z_2$ (or $sl_2 \times sl_2$) and not Z_4 . The matrices \check{M} , \check{M} can be presented by means of the tensor product of the Pauli matrices $\sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$:

$$\bar{M}_x = I_2 \otimes \sigma_x, \quad \bar{M}_y = \sigma_x \otimes I_2, \quad \bar{M}_z = \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x, \quad (5.72)$$

$$\check{M}_x = i\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_y, \quad \check{M}_y = i\sigma_y \otimes I_2, \quad \check{M}_z = -i\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y. \quad (5.73)$$

We see, that \bar{M} -operators are commutative, and the operators $i\check{M}$ reproduce the algebra of sl_2 . Then the corresponding quantum spin-chain Hamiltonian operator for the matrix $\check{R}_{44}(u)$ reads as

$$H_{44} \approx J \sum_k ([\sigma_z]_k \otimes [\sigma_y]_k \otimes [I_2]_{k+1} \otimes [\sigma_x]_{k+1} + [\sigma_y]_k \otimes [I_2]_k \otimes [\sigma_x]_{k+1} \otimes [I_2]_{k+1} - [\sigma_x]_k \otimes [\sigma_y]_k \otimes [\sigma_x]_{k+1} \otimes [\sigma_x]_{k+1}). \quad (5.74)$$

The model is invariant under $Z_2 \otimes Z_2$ symmetry: there is a conserved charge - $\prod_k [\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z]_k$.

5.2.2 $\alpha_0 = \alpha_a \equiv 1, \quad \alpha_e = 0, \quad e = b, c$

Let us represent the expression by means of the spin operators for one of the next unitary matrices (5.67, 5.66), with non vanishing parameters $\alpha_0 = \alpha_a = 1$ ($\alpha_b = \alpha_c = 0$).

$$\check{R}_{44}(1, 1, 0, 0; u) = \frac{(\cosh[u] + 1)}{2} I_2 \otimes I_2 \otimes I_2 \otimes I_2 + \frac{(\cosh[u] - 1)}{2} \sigma_z \otimes I_2 \otimes \sigma_z \otimes I_2 + \frac{i \sinh[u]}{2} (\sigma_y \otimes I_2 \otimes \sigma_x \otimes I_2 - \sigma_x \otimes I_2 \otimes \sigma_y \otimes I_2 + \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_y \otimes I_2 \otimes \sigma_x + I_2 \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_x) \quad (5.75)$$

5.3 16×16 matrices as the solutions to GYBE (2, 4, 1)

For these cases the parities may have fractional values, i.e.

$$[p_e]_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1 j_2} = \{0, 1/2, 1\}, \quad [p]_{i_1 i_2}^{i_1 i_2} = 0. \quad (5.76)$$

One of the trigonometric solutions to GYBE $(2, 4, 1)$ can be taken in the matrix form (5.68) (unitary properties need careful consideration), with the constraints as in Eqs. (5.65), only the phase factors now have the property:

$$\varepsilon_x^2 = 1, \quad \varepsilon_y^2 = -1, \quad \varepsilon_z^2 = -1. \quad (5.77)$$

The corresponding operators are

$$\begin{aligned} \check{R}_{2222}(u) = \cosh [u] I_2 \otimes I_2 \otimes I_2 \otimes I_2 + \sinh [u] (\pm i \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_y \otimes I_2 \otimes \sigma_x + \\ \pm \sigma_y \otimes I_2 \otimes \sigma_x \otimes I_2 \pm \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.78)$$

In the inhomogeneous GYBE formulation (2.6) these matrices act as $\check{R}_{2^3 2}(u)$ and $\check{R}_{2 2^3}(u)$.

6 Summary

We have investigated the generalized Yang-Baxter equations, developed for deriving the unitary quantum gates. The main goal of this paper is the construction of new solutions to GYBE, which could be interesting also in the theory of the integrable models.

Two kind of the multi-state operators of arbitrary dimensions are considered. The first version (X-shaped) of the solutions, for even dimensional $(2\mathcal{N}_1)^2 \times (2\mathcal{N}_2)^2$ matrices, just turns into the consideration of $\mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_2$ YBEs with eight-vertex type solutions. The odd dimensional cases for the first version admit only trigonometric spectral parametric solutions. The obtained large matrices correspond to the mixed interactions between the sets of the $\frac{1}{2}$ -spins (only including even-dimensional states) and 0-spins (including also odd-dimensional cases) situated on the sites of the cyclic chains. Here, in contrast to the integrable models on the composite representations of the quantum algebras, discussed in [45, 51], the Hamiltonian operators are completely separable on direct sums of independent identical interactions. This series is discussed in Section 3 and Appendix (with even dimensional examples), the odd dimensional case (as well more non-homogeneous solutions to GYBE) in details will be separately investigated in [55].

The second versions of the solutions, which are constructed by means of the graded and colored permutation operators, also admit trigonometric Yang-Baxterization, and here the GYBEs become the equations on the parity-matrices. The possibility of the choosing of the parities, we see, that is not unique. The second kind extensions can also be formulated in terms of the spin interactions. Apparently, such Hamiltonian operators do not possess ordinary $sl(2)$ -symmetry, but however can have symmetries of the algebra's deformations. Such questions we are addressing to the next works. In the same time the topological properties of the underlying integrable models could be investigated, especially the obtained fractional parities may be related to the anyon (parafermion) statistic, considering in topological quantum computation [24, 25, 53]. Also the connection with the higher dimensional integrable models needs to be considered [52, 54].

And another novelty of our research is the multi-spectral parameter Yang-Baxterization of unitary X -shaped series of the rigid GYBE solutions M^\pm (extensions of the known quantum Bell type matrices [38]), examples are presented in Appendix A.1. For the usual two-qubit gates the evolution of the states by such unitary transformations is briefly discussed in Section 4, which brings to two kind of entanglement's degrees, relying on two independent spectral-parameters. Note, that the spectral-parameter dependent Bell matrices just are the multi-parametric solutions of separable GYBEs (d, k, p) , $p \geq k$ (2.9), the equations with $k > p$ put restrictions on the possible sets of the independent parameters, see Appendix A.1.

Acknowledgements. The work was supported by the Science Committee of RA, in the frames of research projects 20TTAT-QTa009, 20TTWS-1C035 and 21AG-1C024.

A Solutions to homogeneous and inhomogeneous GYBE with $2^3 \times 2^3$ -matrices: $(2, 3, 1)$, $(\{2\}, \{3, 2\}, \{1, 2\})$.

Here we are considering X -shaped spectral parameter dependent solutions defined on the space $V_2 \otimes V_2 \otimes V_2$ in the usual GYBE formulation $(2, 3, 1)$ and $(2, 3, 2)$. In the inhomogeneous

ii-type GYBE formulation these are the equations $(\{2, 4, 2\}, \{2\}, \{1\})$ or $(\{4, 2, 4\}, \{2\}, \{2\})$ with the matrices \check{R}_{24} and \check{R}_{42} acting on the spaces $V_2 \otimes V_4$ or $V_4 \otimes V_2$. Such matrices satisfy to the following inhomogeneous equations:

$$\begin{aligned}\check{R}_{24}(u-v)\check{R}_{42}(u)\check{R}_{24}(v) &= \check{R}_{42}(v)\check{R}_{24}(u)\check{R}_{42}(u-v), \\ \check{R}_{42}(u-v)\check{R}_{24}(u)\check{R}_{42}(v) &= \check{R}_{24}(v)\check{R}_{42}(u)\check{R}_{24}(u-v).\end{aligned}\tag{A.1}$$

These matrices also can be considered together with the matrices defined on $V_2 \otimes V_2$ in the inhomogeneous GYBEs of ii-type $(\{2, 2, 4\}, \{2\}, \{1\})$ and $(\{4, 2, 2\}, \{2\}, \{1\})$

$$\begin{aligned}\check{R}_{22}(u-v)\check{R}_{24}(u)\check{R}_{22}(v) &= \check{R}_{24}(u-v)\check{R}_{22}(u-v)\check{R}_{24}(u-v), \\ \check{R}_{42}(u-v)\check{R}_{22}(u)\check{R}_{42}(v) &= \check{R}_{22}(u-v)\check{R}_{42}(u-v)\check{R}_{22}(u-v).\end{aligned}\tag{A.2}$$

These equations also can be formulated as the type-i inhomogeneous GYBEs $(\{2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 1\})$ or $(\{2\}, \{3, 2\}, \{1, 2\})$

If 4×4 -matrix constitutes one of the known eight-vertex model's solutions, these 8×8 -matrices consist of two eight-vertex type solutions with the same structure. Below we consider explicitly two type solutions, for which there are unitary parameterizations (one-parametric 4×4 -matrices are detailed considered in [28]), so these matrices can be used both in the theory of integrable models, and in the quantum information theory.

A.1 Two-parametric trigonometric matrices

As example, for the trigonometric two-parametric matrix $\check{R}_{22}(\alpha_0 u, \alpha_x u)$, the possible solutions are the following ones - $\check{R}_{42}(u)$ (A.3) and $\check{R}_{24}(u)$ (A.4), where for simplicity we defined

$\{u_i = \alpha_i u\}, i = 1, 2, 3, 4:$

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cosh u_1 & & & & & & \sinh u_2 \\ & \cosh u_2 & & & & & \sinh u_1 \\ & & e^{\alpha u} \cosh u_3 & & & & e^{\alpha u} \sinh u_4 \\ & & & e^{\alpha u} \cosh u_4 & e^{\alpha u} \sinh u_3 & & \\ & & & -e^{\alpha u} \sinh u_3 & e^{\alpha u} \cosh u_4 & & \\ & & -e^{\alpha u} \sinh u_4 & & & e^{\alpha u} \cosh u_3 & \\ -\sinh u_2 & -\sinh u_1 & & & & \cosh u_2 & \\ & & & & & & \cosh u_1 \end{array} \right) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cosh u_1 & & & & & & \sinh u_2 \\ & e^{\alpha u} \cosh u_3 & & & & & e^{\alpha u} \sinh u_4 \\ & & e^{\alpha u} \cosh u_4 & & & & e^{\alpha u} \sinh u_3 \\ & & & \cosh u_2 & \sinh u_1 & & \\ & & & -\sinh u_1 & \cosh u_2 & & \\ & & -e^{\alpha u} \sinh u_3 & & & e^{\alpha u} \cosh u_4 & \\ -\sinh u_2 & -e^{\alpha u} \sinh u_4 & & & & e^{\alpha u} \cosh u_3 & \\ & & & & & & \cosh u_1 \end{array} \right) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The permissible values of the solutions' parameters are the followings:

$$\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\} = \{\alpha_0, \alpha_x, \alpha_0, \alpha_x\}, \quad \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\} = \{\alpha_0, \alpha_x, \alpha_x, \alpha_0\}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\} = \{\alpha_x, \alpha_0, \alpha_0, \alpha_x\}, \quad \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\} = \{\alpha_x, \alpha_0, \alpha_x, \alpha_0\}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The possible variations of the positions of the parameters come from the fact, that in general for the two-parametric 4×4 matrix the following non-homogeneous YBE take place:

$$\check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x; u - v) \check{R}(\alpha_x, \alpha_0; u) \check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x; v) = \check{R}(\alpha_x, \alpha_0; v) \check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x; u) \check{R}(\alpha_x, \alpha_0; u - v) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

together with usual homogeneous equations

$$\check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x; u - v) \check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x; u) \check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x; v) = \check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x; v) \check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x; u) \check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x; u - v). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

As the constants of YBE solutions like q in (2.9) play definite role as in the theory of integrable models, also in the quantum information theory (and define the deformations of the braiding operators) [6, 36], let us present the richer version of the solutions to (A.7), with different independent deformation constants (q, q', t) :

$$\check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x, q, t; u) = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh[\alpha_0 u] & 0 & 0 & q \sinh[\alpha_x u] \\ 0 & \cosh[\alpha_x u] & t \sinh[\alpha_0 u] & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{-\sinh[\alpha_0 u]}{t} & \cosh[\alpha_x u] & 0 \\ \frac{-\sinh[\alpha_x u]}{q} & 0 & 0 & \cosh[\alpha_0 u] \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x, q, t; u-v) \check{R}(\alpha_x, \alpha_0, q', \frac{q}{q't}; u) \check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x, q, t; v) = \\ \check{R}(\alpha_x, \alpha_0, q', \frac{q}{q't}; v) \check{R}(\alpha_0, \alpha_x, q, t; u) \check{R}(\alpha_x, \alpha_0, q', \frac{q}{q't}; u-v) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

In the solutions (A.4, A.3) we have omitted the constants like q, t , (deformation parameters of braid group) but in general case they also exist.

A.2 XXZ -type 8×8 matrices

As another example let us present the matrices $\check{R}_{24}(u)^\pm$ and $\check{R}_{42}(u)^\pm$ induced from the homogeneous XXZ -model's matrix ($\check{R}_{22}^+(u)$) and the matrix $\check{R}_{22}^-(u)$ describing the XX -model at the transverse field [2, 28, 48]

$$\check{R}_{22}^\pm(u, u_0, \gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sinh[u+u_0]}{\sinh[u_0]} & & & \\ & 1 & \frac{e^\gamma \sinh[u]}{\sinh[u_0]} & \\ & \frac{e^{-\gamma} \sinh[u]}{\sinh[u_0]} & 1 & \\ & & & \frac{\sinh[u_0 \pm u]}{\sinh[u_0]} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

independent equations. However here the matrices \check{R}_{24} and \check{R}_{42} are different in forms (and can not be presented as one operator \check{R}_{222} even for the identical parameters), meanwhile for the case of the previous subsection, even the multi-parametric solutions for two matrices \check{R}_{24} and \check{R}_{42} can coincide one with another, and thus can be considered as solutions to ordinary GYBEs (2, 3, 1).

The corresponding Hamiltonian operators for XXZ -type solutions are the following ones, providing that

$$S_{2k+1}^{x,y,z} = \sigma_{2k+1;1}^{x,y,z} + \xi \sigma_{2k+1;2}^{x,y,z} :$$

$$H_{24/42}^+ = J_0 \sum_k (S_{2k}^x \sigma_{2k+1}^x + S_{2k}^y \sigma_{2k+1}^y + J_z S_{2k}^z \sigma_{2k+1}^z + \sigma_{2k-1}^x S_{2k}^x + \sigma_{2k-1}^y S_{2k}^y + J_z \sigma_{2k-1}^z S_{2k}^z + J_\alpha [\sigma_{2k-1;1}^z]^2 [\sigma_{2k}^z]^2 + J_{\alpha'} [\sigma_{2k}^z]^2 [\sigma_{2k+1;1}^z]^2), \quad (\text{A.17})$$

$$H_{24/42}^- = J_0 \sum_k (S_{2k}^x \sigma_{2k+1}^x + S_{2k}^y \sigma_{2k+1}^y + J_z [S_{2k}^z + \sigma_{2k+1}^z] + \sigma_{2k-1}^x S_{2k}^x + \sigma_{2k-1}^y S_{2k}^y + J_z [\sigma_{2k-1}^z + S_{2k}^z] + J_\alpha [\sigma_{2k-1;1}^z]^2 [\sigma_{2k}^z]^2 + J_{\alpha'} [\sigma_{2k}^z]^2 [\sigma_{2k+1;1}^z]^2), \quad (\text{A.18})$$

The constants J, ξ are easily can be connected with constants of the R -matrices. In the last summands we have taken into account the diagonal terms, induced by the terms with α, α' (here for simplicity we omitted some constants, as example $\gamma = 0$). The similar inhomogeneous 1D lattice Hamiltonian operators emerged from the XYZ and other solutions with Jacobi elliptic functions is straightforward.

Statement III The inhomogeneous GYBEs in the form

$$\check{R}_{N_1 N_2}(u, v) \check{R}_{N_2 N_3}(u) \check{R}_{N_1 N_2}(v) = \check{R}_{N_2 N_3}(v) \check{R}_{N_1 N_2}(u) \check{R}_{N_2 N_3}(u, v) \quad (\text{A.19})$$

when $\mathcal{N}_2 > \mathcal{N}_1 \geq \mathcal{N}_3$ consist of at least $[\mathcal{N}_2 - \mathcal{N}_1]$ independent YBE defined on 4×4 submatrices $r_{n_i n_j}(u)$, thus they have independent solutions, i.e. the corresponding matrices can contain different eight-vertex kind solutions simultaneously and even with different spectral parameters. However these matrices can not be used for constructing integrable chains, as

for transfer matrices commutations, together with the equations (A.19), one must consider also the equations:

$$\check{R}_{N_2 N_3}(u, v) \check{R}_{N_3 N_1}(u) \check{R}_{N_2 N_3}(v) = \check{R}_{N_3 N_1}(v) \check{R}_{N_2 N_3}(u) \check{R}_{N_3 N_1}(u, v) \quad (\text{A.20})$$

$$\check{R}_{N_3 N_1}(u, v) \check{R}_{N_1 N_2}(u) \check{R}_{N_3 N_1}(v) = \check{R}_{N_1 N_2}(v) \check{R}_{N_3 N_1}(u) \check{R}_{N_1 N_2}(u, v) \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Consideration of all the equations (A.19, A.20, A.21) brings to similar type YBE-solutions (with the same parameters) for all the sub-matrices.

Note, that the spin quantities indexed by $p = \{1, \dots, P\}$ at the site i , $\sigma_{i;p}$, can be considered as the spins situated at the sub-chains with the indexes $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_P\}$. However, taking into account, that there is no interaction between the spins $\sigma_{i;p}$ with the same i , there is preferable to keep the previous notations $\sigma_{i;p}$, which indicates that at each site i there is a set of $\frac{1}{2}$ -spins of number P .

References

- [1] C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett., **19** (1967) p.10; Phys. Rev. **168**, p. 1920 (1968);
A. Onsager, Phys.Rev. 65 (1944) pp.117-149.
- [2] R. J. Baxter, *Exactly Solvable Models in Statistic Mechanics*, New York: Academic (1982) ;
L.D. Faddeev, Soviet Sci. Rev. Sect. C: Math. Phys. Rev., 1, p. 107 (1981).
- [3] L. A. Takhtadzhian and L. Faddeev, Russ. Math. Surv. **34(5)**, (1979) pp. 11-68.
- [4] P. P. Kulish and E. K. Sklyanin, J.Soviet Math., **19** (1982b) pp. 1596–1620.
- [5] H. R. Morton and P. Strickland Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **109** (1991) 83.
- [6] M. Jimbo, (eds.) *Yang–Baxter Equations in Integrable Systems*, Singapore: World Scientific (1990) ;

- C. N. Yang and M. L. Ge, (eds.) *Braid Group, Knot Theory and Statistical Mechanics*, Singapore: World Scientific (1990);
- M. Wadati, T. Deguchi and Y. Akutsu, Phys. Rep. **180**, (1989) pp. 247-332.
- [7] A. Zamolodchikov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **79**, p. 641 (1980); [English translation: Soviet Phys. JETP 52, 325 (1980)]; A. Zamolodchikov, Commun.Math.Physics **79** p. 489 (1981).
- [8] V. G. Turaev, Invent. Math. **92** (1988) pp. 527-553.
- [9] V. E. Korepin, N. M. Bogoliubov, A. G. Izergin, *Quantum Inverse Scattering Method and Correlation Functions*, Cambridge University Press, (1993).
- [10] P. Jordan, E. P. Wigner, Z.Phys. **47** (1928) pp. 631-651.
- [11] M. L. Ge, K. Xue and Y-S. Wu, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 6**, (1991) pp. 3735-3779.
- [12] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. **A 54**, p. 3824 (1996).
- [13] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
- [14] C. Gomez, M. Ruiz-Altaba, G. Sierra, *Quantum groups in two-dimensional physics*, Cambridge, University Press (1993).
- [15] H. A. Dye, Quantum Information Processing, 2(2003), Nos. 1-2, pp. 117—151, arXiv:quant-ph/0211050;
J. Hietarinta, J. Math. Phys. **34**, No. **5**, (1993) pp. 1725—1756.
- [16] R. Baxter, J. H. Perk and H. Au-Yang, Phys. Lett. **A 128** (1988) pp. 138-142.
- [17] R. Baxter, H. Au-Yang, B. McCoy, J. H. Perk, Yu. Stroganov, Commun. Math. Phys. **138** (1988) pp. 393-408.
- [18] V. Bazhanov, Yu. Stroganov, J. Stat. Phys. 59, 799817 (1990).

- [19] A. P. Isaev, Preprint MPIM (Bonn), MPI 2004-132 (2004).
- [20] J. H. H. Perk and H. Au-Yang, “Yang–Baxter Equation”, in: Franoise, J. P., Naber, G. L. and Tsou, S. T. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Mathematical Physics*, (2006) pp. 465–473.
- [21] E. Artin, *Theorie der zöpfe* **4(1)**: pp. 47–72, 1925.
- [22] V. F. R. Jones, *Ann. Math.* **126**, (1987), pp. 335-388.
- [23] L. Kauffman, *Knots ad Physics*, World Scientific (1991); Al. G. Kurosh, *Higher algebra*, Mir Publishers (1972).
- [24] M. H. Freedman, A. Kitaev, M.J. Larsen, Zh. Wang, (2003), *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, **40 (1)**: 31–38, arXiv:quant-ph/0101025.
- [25] A. Y. Kitaev, *Phys. Usp.* **44**, p. 131 (2001);
- [26] P. Padmanabhan, F. Sugino, D. Trancanellic, *Quantum* **4** (2020) p. 311, ArXiv:2003.00244v3.
- [27] Louis H. Kauffman and Samuel J. Lomonaco Jr., *New Journal of Physics*, **4** (2002) 73.173.18; *New Journal of Physics* **6**, (2004) pp. 134-139.
- [28] Y. Zhang, L. H. Kauffman and M L. Ge, *Quant. Inf. Proc.* **4** (2005) pp. 159-197, Arxiv: quant-ph/0502015.
- [29] J. L. Chen, K. Xue and M. L. Ge, *Physical Review*, **A 76**, (2007) 042324; J. L. Chen, K. Xue and M. L. Ge, *Annals of Physics* **323** (2008) p. 2614.
- [30] E. Rowell, Y. Zhang, Y.-S. Wu and M.-L. Ge, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **10** (2010) no. 7-8, 0685-0702, arXiv:quant-ph/0706.1761.
- [31] C. Galindo, S.-M. Hong, E. Rowell, *Int. Mathematics Research Not.*, Volume 2013, Issue **3** (2013) pp. 693-731, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imrn/nrn269>, arXiv:1105.5048.1.
- [32] R. S. Chen, *J. Knot Theory Ramification* **21** (2012) 1250087, arXiv:1108.5215.

- [33] T. Hu, K. Xue. and C. Wu, Journal of Mathematical Physics, **50(8)** (2009).
- [34] E. C. Rowell, Quantum Inf. Comput. **16** (2016) 0105–0114.
- [35] G. Wang, C. Sun, C. Wu, B. Liu, Y. Zhang and K. Xue, Europhys. Lett. **108**, (2014) 10001; A. Wójcik, A. Grudka and R. W. Chhajlany, Quantum Inf. Process. **2** 201–206 (2003);
- [36] J. L. Chen, K. Xue, M. L. Ge, Phys.Rev. **A 76**, (2007) p. 042324;
- [37] Y. Zhang, N. Jing, and M.L. Ge, J. Phys.A: Math. Theor. **41** (2008) 055310; arXiv:math-ph/0610036.
- [38] Y. Zhang, M. L. Ge, Quantum Inf. Proc. **6** (2007), 363-379; arXiv:quant-ph/0701244v1.
- [39] G. Wang, K. Xue, C. Wu, H. Liang, C. H. Oh, J. Phys. A Math. Theor. **42**, (2009) pp. 125-207; G. Wang, K. Xue, C. Sun, T. Hu, C. Zhou and G. Du, International Journal of Theoretical Physics, **49(1)**, (2010) pp. 2499-2505.
- [40] S. M. Hong, Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications **22** (10) (2012) ArXiv:1202.3945v1[Math.GT].
- [41] L. W. Yu and M. L. Ge, Phys. Lett. A **381** (2017) 958–963, ArXiv:1810.09813v1
- [42] C. S. Nayak, H. Simon, A. Stern, M. Freedman and S. Das Sarma, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80** (2008) pp.1083.
- [43] D. Aharonov, M. Ben-Or, SIAM Journal on Computing, Vol **38**, **4** (2008), ArXiv:quant-ph/9611025; I. L. Chuang, D. w. Leung, Y. Yamamoto Phys. Rev. **A 56**, 1114 (1997); E. Knill, Lanl report, LAUR-96-2717, DArXiv:quant-ph/9608048.
- [44] F. Gohmann, Sh. Murakami, J. Phys. **A 31** (1998) 7729.

- [45] D. Karakhanyan, Sh. Khachatryan, *Nucl. Phys. B* **808** [FS] (2009) 525-545, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2008.09.001; ArXiv:0806.278.
- [46] R. Raussendorf, D. E. Browne and H. J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. A* **68** (2003) 022312.
- [47] Sh. A. Khachatryan, A. G. Sedrakyan, *Phys. Rev. B* **80** (2009) 125128.
- [48] Sh. Khachatryan, A. Sedrakyan, *J. Stat. Phys.* **150** (2013) 130;
- [49] D. Karakhanyan, Sh. Khachatryan, *Nucl. Phys. B* **868** (2013) 328;
- [50] Sh. A. Khachatryan, *Nucl. Phys. B* **883C** (2014), pp. 629-655;
- [51] Sh. A. Khachatryan, *Nucl. Phys. B* **936** (2018) 215-238;
- [52] Sh. Khachatryan, A. Sedrakyan, *Annals of Physics* **936** (2022) 215-238.
- [53] H. Topchyan, V. Iugov, M. Mirumyan, Sh. A. Khachatryan, T. S. Hakobyan, T. A. Sedrakyan, ArXiv:2210.01187.
- [54] Sh. A. Khachatryan, ArXiv:2210.16573[nls].
- [55] Sh. Khachatryan, *in preparation*.