

Classifying Density Matrices of 2 and 3 Qubit States Up To LU Equivalence

Isaac Dobes and Naihuan Jing

August 15, 2024

Abstract

In this paper we present a modified version of the proof given Jing-Yang-Zhao's paper "Local Unitary Equivalence of Quantum States and Simultaneous Orthogonal Equivalence," which established the correspondence between local unitary equivalence and simultaneous orthogonal equivalence of 2-qubits. Our modified proof utilizes a hypermatrix algebra framework, and through this framework we are able to generalize this correspondence to 3-qubits. Finally, we apply a generalization of Specht's criterion (first proved in Futorny-Horn-Sergeichuk' paper "Specht's Criterion for Systems of Linear Mappings") to reduce the problem of local unitary equivalence of 3-qubits to checking trace identities and a few other easy-to-check properties. We also note that all of these results can be extended to n -qubits, however there are some practical limitations, as well as n -qudits for $d > 2$ if we relax the notion of LU equivalence to quasi-LU equivalence (as defined in the aforementioned paper by Jing et. al.).

1 Introduction

Quantum entanglement is a peculiar phenomenon that has intrigued yet also eluded researchers for nearly a century [1]. In the last few decades, however, serious interest and efforts in understanding entanglement has grown rapidly due to its applications to quantum computing [2, 3]. One important task in the study of entanglement is the classification of quantum states up to local unitary (LU) equivalence [3, 4].

Two density matrices ρ and $\hat{\rho}$ representing two quantum states in the same quantum system $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$ are *LU equivalent* if there exist $U_i \in SU(d_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, such that

$$\hat{\rho} = (U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_N) \rho (U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_N)^\dagger. \quad (1)$$

In general, it is difficult to determine LU equivalence between density matrices because one does not a priori know anything about what these unitary operators should be. To this end, in [5], Y. Makhlin provides necessary and sufficient conditions for the LU equivalence of density matrices of 2-qubit states in terms of their Bloch representation. In [4], Jing et. al. consider a similar representation of density matrices, but more generally for 2-qudits, and they establish a correspondence between simultaneous orthogonal (SO) equivalence and quasi-LU equivalence (a property that follows from and is closely related to LU equivalence). They then apply a generalization of Specht's criterion, first established in [6], to SO equivalent density matrices, proving that quasi-LU equivalence reduces to checking trace identities.

One shortcoming with the findings in [4] is that in their definition of quasi-LU equivalence, they do not require the orthogonal operators to have determinant 1. This is not ideal because in the case of 2-qubits, quasi-LU equivalence and LU equivalence are in fact equivalent if the orthogonal operators have determinant 1. In this paper, we present a modified version of the proof in [4] which establishes the correspondence between SO and quasi-LU equivalence, showing that indeed we can require that the orthogonal operators have determinant 1. This strengthens their subsequent result, showing that the problem of determining LU equivalence of density matrices representing 2-qubits reduces to checking trace identities.

An additional benefit to our modified proof is that it is written in the language of hypermatrices and their algebra, and this allows us to generalize the correspondence between SO and quasi-LU equivalence to 3-qudits (and LU equivalence in the case of 3-qubits). We then apply a more powerful generalization of Specht's criterion, first established

in [7], to reduce the problem of determining quasi-LU equivalence of density matrices representing 3-qudits (or LU equivalence in the case of 3-qubits) to trace identities. Indeed, it is apparent that our proofs can, with relative ease, be further generalized to N -qudits, however, there are computational limits to the practicality of our results, hence we stop at the 3-qudit case.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Hypermatrix Algebra

Let $A \in F^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_d}$ and $B \in F^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_e}$ be hypermatrices of order d and e respectively ($d, e \in \mathbb{N}$). Recall that the *outer product* of A and B , denoted $A \circ B$, is the hypermatrix of order $d + e$ whose $i_1, \dots, i_d, j_1, \dots, j_e$ -coordinate is given by $a_{i_1, \dots, i_d} b_{j_1, \dots, j_e}$. For a hypermatrix $A \in F^{n_1 \times n_2 \times \dots \times n_d}$ and matrices $X_1 \in F^{\bullet \times n_1}, \dots, X_d \in F^{\bullet \times n_d}$, the *multilinear matrix multiplication* of (X_1, \dots, X_d) with A is defined to be the hypermatrix $(X_1, \dots, X_d) * A =: A'$, where

$$A'_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d} = \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_d=1}^{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d} (X_1)_{i_1 j_1} \dots (X_d)_{i_d j_d} A_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_d}. \quad (2)$$

Multilinear matrix multiplication is linear in terms of the matrices in both parts; that is, if $\alpha, \beta \in F$, $X_1, Y_1 \in F^{m_1 \times n_1}, \dots, X_d, Y_d \in F^{m_d \times n_d}$, and $A, B \in F^{n_1 \times n_2 \times \dots \times n_d}$; then

$$(X_1, \dots, X_d) * (\alpha A + \beta B) = \alpha (X_1, \dots, X_d) * A + \beta (Y_1, \dots, Y_d) * B \quad (3)$$

and

$$[\alpha (X_1, \dots, X_d) + \beta (Y_1, \dots, Y_d)] * A = \alpha (X_1, \dots, X_d) * A + \beta (Y_1, \dots, Y_d) * A. \quad (4)$$

Let $k : [d] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. The outer product interacts with multilinear matrix multiplication in the following way

$$(X_{1_1}, \dots, X_{1_{k(1)}}, \dots, X_{d_1}, \dots, X_{d_{k(d)}}) * (A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_d) = (X_{1_1}, \dots, X_{1_{k(1)}}) * A_1 \circ \dots \circ (X_{d_1}, \dots, X_{d_{k(d)}}) * A_d \quad (5)$$

where $X_{i_j} \in F^{m_j^{(i)} \times n_j^{(i)}}$ and $A_i \in F^{n_1^{(i)} \times \dots \times n_{k(i)}^{(i)}}$.

In some instances, it is more convenient to view hypermatrices as matrices. The *k-mode unfolding* of a hypermatrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times \dots \times n_d}$ is the $n_k \times (n_{k+1} \dots n_d n_1 \dots n_{k-1})$ matrix, denoted $A_{(k)}$, whose (i_k, j) entry is given by (i_1, \dots, i_d) -entry of A , with

$$j = 1 + \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq k}}^d \left[(i_l - 1) \prod_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq k}}^{l-1} n_m \right], \quad (6)$$

or in the case where the index starts at 0,

$$j = \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq k}}^d \left[i_l \prod_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq k}}^{l-1} n_m \right]. \quad (7)$$

For more information on hypermatrices and their algebra, the reader is referred to [8, 9].

2.2 Quasi-LU Equivalence

Let ρ be the density matrix of a multipartite state on $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$ and let $\{\lambda_i^k : 0 \leq i \leq d_k^2 - 1; k = 1, \dots, N\}$ denote the generalized Gell-Mann basis for each partite. Then we can express ρ as the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{d_1 \cdot \dots \cdot d_N} \left(I_2^{\otimes N} + \sum_{j_1=1}^N \sum_{\alpha_1=1}^{d_{j_1}^2-1} T_{j_1}^{\alpha_1} \lambda_{\alpha_1}^{(j_1)} + \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N} \sum_{\alpha_1=1}^{d_{j_1}^2-1} \sum_{\alpha_2=1}^{d_{j_2}^2-1} T_{j_1 j_2}^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} \lambda_{\alpha_1}^{(j_1)} \lambda_{\alpha_2}^{(j_2)} + \dots \right. \\ & \dots + \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_M \leq N} \sum_{\alpha_1=1}^{d_{j_1}^2-1} \sum_{\alpha_2=1}^{d_{j_2}^2-1} \dots \sum_{\alpha_M=1}^{d_{j_M}^2-1} T_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_M}^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_M} \lambda_{\alpha_1}^{(j_1)} \lambda_{\alpha_2}^{(j_2)} \dots \lambda_{\alpha_M}^{(j_M)} + \dots \\ & \left. \dots + \sum_{\alpha_1=1}^{d_1^2-1} \dots \sum_{\alpha_N=1}^{d_N^2-1} T_{12 \dots N}^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_N} \lambda_{\alpha_1}^{(1)} \lambda_{\alpha_2}^{(2)} \dots \lambda_{\alpha_N}^{(N)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{\alpha_i}^{(j_k)} = I_2 \otimes \dots \otimes I_2 \otimes \lambda_{\alpha_i}^{j_k} \otimes I_2 \otimes \dots \otimes I_2$ (i.e. λ_{α_i} is the j_k^{th} factor in the tensor product and a basis element of the j_k^{th} partite) and

$$T_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_M}^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_M} = \text{tr}(\rho \sigma_{\alpha_1}^{(j_1)} \lambda_{\alpha_2}^{(j_2)} \dots \lambda_{\alpha_M}^{(j_M)}), \quad M \leq N, \quad (8)$$

are all real coefficients. In particular, the $T_{j_1} = [T_{j_1}^1, \dots, T_{j_1}^{d_{j_1}^2-1}]^t$ are vectors, the $T_{j_1 j_2} = [T_{j_1 j_2}^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2}]_{(d_{j_1}^2-1) \times (d_{j_2}^2-1)}$ are matrices, and in general the $T_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_M} = [T_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_M}^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_M}]_{(d_{j_1}^2-1) \times \dots \times (d_{j_M}^2-1)}$ are hypermatrices of order M . These vectors, matrices, and hypermatrices uniquely define an N -qudit state, and so we call the set

$$\{T_{j_1 \dots j_M} : 1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_M \leq N, M \leq N\}$$

the *hypermatrix representation* of ρ . For convenience, from here on out we will denote $d_k^2 - 1$ as δ_k .

Let ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ be two density matrices of N -qudit states in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$. ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are *locally unitary (LU) equivalent* if there exist $U_i \in SU(d_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ such that

$$\widehat{\rho} = (U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_N) \rho (U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_N)^\dagger. \quad (9)$$

Given basis element λ_i^k , we have that

$$U_k \lambda_i^k U_k^\dagger = \sum_{j=1}^{\delta_k} X_{ij} \lambda_j^k \quad (10)$$

for some matrix $X = [X_{ij}]_{\delta_k \times \delta_k}$. Since the generalized Gell-Mann matrices are Hermitian,

$$U_k \lambda_i^k U_k^\dagger = U \lambda_i^k U_k^\dagger \quad (11)$$

from which it follows that the coefficients x_{ij} are real numbers. Moreover,

$$\text{Tr}((U_k \lambda_i^k U_k^\dagger)(U_k \lambda_j^k U_k^\dagger)) = \text{Tr}(\lambda_i^k \lambda_j^k U^\dagger U) = \text{Tr}(\lambda_i^k \lambda_j^k) = \delta_{ij}, \quad (12)$$

where δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker delta and the last equality follows from the fact that the Gell-Mann matrices are orthogonal with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product. Thus, it follows that the matrix X is orthogonal; denote it as \widehat{O}_k . Then from the linearity of the Kronecker product and the identity below:

$$(A_1 \otimes A_2 \otimes \dots \otimes A_n)(B_1 \otimes B_2 \otimes \dots \otimes B_n) = (A_1 B_1) \otimes (A_2 B_2) \otimes \dots \otimes (A_n B_n), \quad (13)$$

for each M we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_N) \left(\sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_M \leq N} \sum_{\alpha_1=1, \dots, \alpha_M=1}^{\delta_{j_1}, \dots, \delta_{j_M}} T_{j_1 \dots j_M}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_M} \lambda_{\alpha_1}^{(1)} \dots \lambda_{\alpha_M}^{j_M} \right) (U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_N)^\dagger \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_M \leq N} \sum_{\alpha_1=1, \dots, \alpha_M=1}^{\delta_{j_1}, \dots, \delta_{j_M}} T_{j_1 \dots j_M}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_M} (U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_N) \lambda_{\alpha_1}^{(1)} \dots \lambda_{\alpha_M}^{j_M} (U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_N)^\dagger \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_M \leq N} \sum_{\alpha_1=1, \dots, \alpha_M=1}^{\delta_{j_1}, \dots, \delta_{j_M}} T_{j_1 \dots j_M}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_M} (U_{j_1} \lambda_{\alpha_1} U_{j_1}^\dagger)^{(j_1)} \dots (U_{j_M} \lambda_{\alpha_M} U_{j_M}^\dagger)^{(j_M)} \quad \text{by equation (10)} \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_M \leq N} \sum_{\alpha_1=1, \dots, \alpha_M=1}^{\delta_{j_1}, \dots, \delta_{j_M}} T_{j_1 \dots j_M}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_M} \left(\sum_{k_1}^{\delta_{j_1}} (\tilde{O}_{j_1})_{\alpha_1 k_1} \lambda_{k_1} \right)^{(j_1)} \dots \left(\sum_{k_M=1}^{\delta_{j_M}} (\tilde{O}_{j_M})_{\alpha_M k_M} \lambda_{k_M} \right)^{(j_M)} \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_M \leq N} \left(\sum_{k_1=1, \dots, k_M=1}^{\delta_{j_1}, \dots, \delta_{j_M}} \right) \left(\sum_{\alpha_1=1, \dots, \alpha_M=1}^{\delta_{j_1}, \dots, \delta_{j_M}} (\tilde{O}_{j_1}^t)_{k_1 \alpha_1} \dots (\tilde{O}_{j_M}^t)_{k_M \alpha_M} T_{j_1 \dots j_M}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_M} \right) \lambda_{k_1}^{(1)} \dots \lambda_{k_M}^{(j_M)} \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_M \leq N} \left(\sum_{k_1=1, \dots, k_M=1}^{\delta_{j_1}, \dots, \delta_{j_M}} \right) ((O_{j_1}, \dots, O_{j_M}) * T_{j_1 \dots j_M})^{k_1 \dots k_M} \lambda_{k_1}^{(j_1)} \dots \lambda_{k_M}^{(j_M)}, \quad \text{setting } \tilde{O}_{j_i}^t =: O_{j_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we say that ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are *quasi-LU equivalent* if there exists $O_{j_1} \in O(\delta_{j_1}), \dots, O_{j_M} \in O(\delta_{j_M})$ such that

$$\widehat{T}_{j_1 \dots j_M} = (O_{j_1}, \dots, O_{j_M}) * T_{j_1 \dots j_M} \quad (14)$$

for $1 \leq M \leq N$. As shown above, LU equivalence implies quasi-LU equivalence. In the case of N -qubits, (10) defines a surjective map $SU(2) \rightarrow SO(3)$, and so in this instance we may assume that the matrices are special orthogonal and that the converse holds as well (i.e. quasi-LU equivalence implies LU equivalence).

3 2-Qudits

The density matrix ρ of a 2-qudit on $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$ is given by

$$\frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \left(I_2 \otimes I_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{\delta_1} T_1^i \lambda_i^1 \otimes I_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{\delta_2} T_2^i I_2 \otimes \lambda_i^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^{\delta_1, \delta_2} T_{12}^{ij} \lambda_i^1 \otimes \lambda_j^2 \right),$$

and so its matrix representation is given by $\{T_1, T_2, T_{12}\}$. We say that the matrix representations $\{T_1, T_2, T_{12}\}$ and $\{\widehat{T}_1, \widehat{T}_2, \widehat{T}_{12}\}$ of ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ (respectively) are *simultaneously orthogonal (SO) equivalent* if there exists orthogonal matrices $O_1 \in O(\delta_1), O_2 \in O(\delta_2)$ such that

$$\widehat{T}_{12} = (O_1, O_2) * T_{12} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_2 = (O_1, O_2) * (T_1 \circ T_2). \quad (15)$$

In the case of 2-qubits, we additionally assume that O_1, O_2 have determinant 1 (i.e. $O_1, O_2 \in SO(3)$).

In [4], it is shown that for 2-qudit states, quasi-LU equivalence is equivalent to SO equivalence. However, in the special case of 2-qubits, it is not assumed that $O_1, O_2 \in SO(3)$, only that they are in $O(3)$. Below, we present a modified proof of their result, showing that indeed in the case of 2-qubits quasi-LU equivalence is equivalent to SO equivalence with $O_1, O_2 \in SO(3)$, and so consequently both are equivalent to LU equivalence. Another benefit of our modified proof -as we will see later- is that it extends to 3-qudits (and indeed possibly n -qudits). Before we state the result and give our proof, we first note that if $v \in \mathbb{R}^l$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, then direct computation yields

$$(v \circ M)_{(1)} = v \circ \text{vec}(M), \quad (16)$$

where vec is the vectorization operator which transforms the matrix $M = [m_{ij}]_{m \times n}$ into the vector

$$\begin{bmatrix} m_{11} & m_{21} & \dots & m_{m1} & m_{12} & \dots & \dots & m_{mn} \end{bmatrix}^t.$$

Furthermore, by direct computation, we also have that

$$\text{vec}((X_1, X_2) * M) = (X_2 \otimes X_1) \text{vec}(M) \quad (17)$$

for any matrices $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet \times m}$ and $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet \times n}$.

Theorem 1 (quasi-LU Equivalence and SO Equivalence: 2-Qudits). *Let ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ be density matrices of 2-qudit states on $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$ with matrix representations $\{T_1, T_2, T_{12}\}$ and $\{\widehat{T}_1, \widehat{T}_2, \widehat{T}_{12}\}$ (respectively), and assume that $T_1, T_2, T_{12} \neq \mathbf{0}$. ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are quasi-LU equivalent if and only if they are SO equivalent and $\|\widehat{T}_1\| = \|T_1\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_2\| = \|T_2\|$. Furthermore, in the case of 2-qubits, they are LU equivalent.*

Proof. ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are quasi-LU equivalent if and only if there exists orthogonal matrices $O_1 \in O(\delta_1), O_2 \in O(\delta_2)$ such that

$$\widehat{T}_1 = O_1 * T_1 = O_1 T_1, \quad \widehat{T}_2 = O_2 * T_2 = O_2 T_2, \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{T}_{12} = (O_1, O_2) * T_{12} = O_1 T_{12} O_2^t. \quad (18)$$

Assuming quasi-LU equivalence, we immediately have $\widehat{T}_{12} = (O_1, O_2) * T_{12}$; moreover,

$$\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_2 = O_1 T_1 \circ O_2 T_2 = O_1 T_1 (O_2 T_2)^t = O_1 (T_1 T_2^t) O_2^t = (O_1, O_2) * T_1 \circ T_2, \quad (19)$$

and

$$\|\widehat{T}_i\| = \|O_i * T_i\| = \|O_i T_i\| = \|T_i\| \quad (20)$$

for $i = 1, 2$. Thus, forward implication is proven.

Conversely, suppose ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are SO equivalent and without loss of generality assume that $\|\widehat{T}_1\| = \|T_1\|$. First, note that $T_i, T_{12} \neq \mathbf{0}$ implies that $\widehat{T}_i, \widehat{T}_{12} \neq \mathbf{0}$; consequently, for $i = 1, 2$ we have:

$$0 < \|\widehat{T}_i\|^2 \|\widehat{T}_{12}\|^2 = (\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i) (\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})) \quad (21)$$

$$= \widehat{T}_i^t (\widehat{T}_i \circ \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})) \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12}) \quad (22)$$

$$= \widehat{T}_i^t (\widehat{T}_i \circ \widehat{T}_{12})_{(1)} \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12}) \quad \text{by equation (16)} \quad (23)$$

$$= \widehat{T}_i^t ((O_i * T_i) \circ ((O_1, O_2) * T_{12}))_{(1)} \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12}) \quad \text{by assumption} \quad (24)$$

$$= \widehat{T}_i^t (O_i T_i \circ \text{vec}((O_1, O_2) * T_{12})) \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12}) \quad \text{by equation (16)} \quad (25)$$

$$= \widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{12})^t (O_2 \otimes O_1)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12}) \quad \text{by equation (17)} \quad (26)$$

Now, $\widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i$ and $\text{vec}(T_{jk})^t (O_2 \otimes O_1)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})$ are just numbers, so equations (21) and (26) imply that

$$\alpha_i := \frac{\widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i}{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i} = \frac{\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})}{\text{vec}(T_{12})^t (O_2 \otimes O_1)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})} \neq 0. \quad (27)$$

By assumption and (5) we also have that

$$(\widehat{T}_i \circ \widehat{T}_{12})_{(1)} = ((O_i, O_1, O_2) * T_i \circ T_{12})_{(1)}. \quad (28)$$

The left-hand side of the above equation can be written as $\widehat{T}_i \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})^t$, and by equations (24) and (26) the right hand side is equal to $O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{12}) (O_2 \otimes O_1)^t$. Therefore,

$$\underbrace{\widehat{T}_i \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})}_{>0} = O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{12})^t (O_2 \otimes O_1)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12}) \quad (29)$$

Hence,

$$\widehat{T}_i = \frac{O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{12})^t (O_2 \otimes O_1)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})}{\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})} \quad (30)$$

and so consequently by (27)

$$\alpha_i \widehat{T}_i = \frac{\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})}{\text{vec}(T_{12})^t (O_2 \otimes O_1)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})} \cdot \frac{O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{12})^t (O_2 \otimes O_1)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})}{\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})} = O_i T_i.$$

Similarly,

$$\underbrace{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i}_{>0} \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})^t = \widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{12})^t (O_2 \otimes O_1)^t \quad (31)$$

and so

$$\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12})^t = \frac{\widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{12})^t (O_2 \otimes O_1)^t}{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i} \Rightarrow \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12}) = \frac{(O_2 \otimes O_1) \text{vec}(T_{12}) T_i^t O_i^t \widehat{T}_i}{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i}; \quad (32)$$

therefore by (27)

$$\alpha_i^{-1} \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{12}) = \frac{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i}{\widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i} \cdot \frac{(O_2 \otimes O_1) \text{vec}(T_{12}) T_i^t O_i^t \widehat{T}_i}{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i} = (O_2 \otimes O_1) \text{vec}(T_{12}), \quad (33)$$

or equivalently,

$$\alpha_i^{-1} \widehat{T}_{12} = (O_1, O_2) * T_{12}. \quad (34)$$

By assumption, either $\|\widehat{T}_i\| = \|T_i\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_{12}\| = \|T_{12}\|$, and in either case it follows that $|\alpha_i| = 1$, hence $\alpha_i = \pm 1$ since the T_i and T_{12} are real, proving SO equivalence for 2-qudits ($d > 2$).

Now in the case of qubits, since by assumption $\widehat{T}_{12} = (O_1, O_2) * T_{12}$, it must be the case that $\alpha_i = 1$, for otherwise we would have $\widehat{T}_{12} = -\widehat{T}_{12}$ implying $\widehat{T}_{12} = \mathbf{0}$, contradicting the assumption that $\widehat{T}_{12} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Thus, $\alpha_i = 1$ and this proves that SO equivalence for 2-qubits is equivalent to quasi-LU equivalence, and thus LU equivalence. \square

3.1 SO Equivalence and Trace Identities for 2-Qudits

In [6, Theorem 3.4], Jing generalizes Specht's criterion, showing that for any two sets $\{A_i\}$ and $\{B_i\}$ of (real) $m \times n$ matrices, the following are equivalent:

1. $\{A_i\}$ is simultaneously orthogonal equivalent to $\{B_i\}$ (i.e. for each i , $B_i = O A_i P^t$ for some orthogonal matrices O and P);
2. $\{A_i A_i^t : i \leq j\}$ is simultaneously orthogonal similar to $\{B_i B_i^t : i \leq j\}$ (i.e. for each i and j , $B_i B_j = O A_i A_j O^t$ for some orthogonal matrix O);
3. $\text{Tr}(w\{A_i A_j^t\}) = \text{Tr}(w\{B_i B_j^t\})$ for any word w in respective alphabets.

In general, it is difficult to show that two states are quasi-LU equivalent because we do not a priori know anything about the orthogonal matrices that relate the two states. However, the result above and the previous theorem imply the following:

Theorem 2 (Characterization of quasi-LU Equivalence: 2-Qudits). *Suppose ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ be two bipartite density matrices over the same Hilbert space with respective matrix representations $\{T_1, T_2, T_{12}\}$ and $\{\widehat{T}_1, \widehat{T}_2, \widehat{T}_{12}\}$. Let $\{A_1, A_2\} = \{T_1 \circ T_2, T_{12}\}$ and $\{B_1, B_2\} = \{\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_2, \widehat{T}_{12}\}$. Then ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are quasi-LU equivalent if and only if*

$$\text{Tr}(A_{i_1} A_{j_1}^t \dots A_{i_k} A_{j_k}^t) = \text{Tr}(B_{i_1} B_{j_1}^t \dots B_{i_k} B_{j_k}^t)$$

for any compositions i_1, \dots, i_k and j_1, \dots, j_k such that $1 \leq i_1 \leq j_1 \leq 2, \dots, 1 \leq i_k \leq j_k \leq 2$, and $\|T_1\| = \|\widehat{T}_1\|$ or $\|T_2\| = \|\widehat{T}_2\|$. Furthermore, in the case of 2-qubits, they are LU equivalent.

Thus, the problem of quasi-LU equivalence, or LU equivalence in the case of 2-qubits, reduces to checking trace identities, which are easy to compute and requires only finitely many calculations (in particular is sufficient to check the trace identities for words of length at most $16(\delta_1 + \delta_2)^2$; see appendix or [7]).

4 3-Qudits

The density matrix ρ of a 3-qudit on $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_3}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{d_1 d_2 d_3} \left(I_2 \otimes I_2 \otimes I_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{\delta_1} T_1^i \lambda_i \otimes I_2 \otimes I_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{\delta_2} T_2^i I_2 \otimes \lambda_i \otimes I_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{\delta_3} T_3^i I_2 \otimes I_2 \otimes \lambda_i \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{i,j=1}^{\delta_1, \delta_2} T_{12}^{ij} \lambda_i \otimes \lambda_j \otimes I_2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^{\delta_1, \delta_3} T_{13}^{ij} \lambda_i \otimes I_2 \otimes \lambda_j + \sum_{i,j=1}^{\delta_2, \delta_3} T_{23}^{ij} I_2 \otimes \lambda_i \otimes \lambda_j + \sum_{i,j,k=1}^{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3} T_{123}^{ijk} \lambda_i \otimes \lambda_j \otimes \lambda_k \right) \end{aligned}$$

and so its hypermatrix representation is given by $\{T_1, T_2, T_3, T_{12}, T_{13}, T_{23}, T_{123}\}$. For convenience set $T := T_{123}$ and denote the (i, j, k) entry of T as t_{ijk} . Then by unfolding T , we may view it as any one of the following three matrices

$$\begin{aligned} T_{(1)} &:= \begin{bmatrix} t_{111} & t_{121} & \dots & t_{1\delta_2 1} & t_{112} & t_{122} & \dots & t_{1\delta_2 2} & t_{113} & t_{123} & \dots & \dots & t_{1\delta_2 \delta_3} \\ t_{211} & t_{221} & \dots & t_{1\delta_2 1} & t_{212} & t_{222} & \dots & t_{2\delta_2 2} & t_{213} & t_{223} & \dots & \dots & t_{2\delta_2 \delta_3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_{\delta_1 11} & t_{\delta_1 21} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 \delta_2 1} & t_{\delta_1 12} & t_{\delta_1 22} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 \delta_2 2} & t_{\delta_1 13} & t_{\delta_1 23} & \dots & \dots & t_{\delta_1 \delta_2 \delta_3} \end{bmatrix}_{\delta_1 \times \delta_2 \delta_3}, \\ T_{(2)} &:= \begin{bmatrix} t_{111} & t_{211} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 11} & t_{112} & t_{212} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 12} & t_{113} & t_{213} & \dots & \dots & t_{\delta_1 1 \delta_3} \\ t_{121} & t_{221} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 21} & t_{122} & t_{222} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 22} & t_{123} & t_{223} & \dots & \dots & t_{\delta_1 2 \delta_3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_{1\delta_2 1} & t_{2\delta_2 1} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 \delta_2 1} & t_{1\delta_2 2} & t_{2\delta_2 2} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 \delta_2 2} & t_{1\delta_2 3} & t_{2\delta_2 3} & \dots & \dots & t_{\delta_1 \delta_2 \delta_3} \end{bmatrix}_{\delta_2 \times \delta_1 \delta_3}, \\ T_{(3)} &:= \begin{bmatrix} t_{111} & t_{211} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 11} & t_{121} & t_{221} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 21} & t_{131} & t_{231} & \dots & \dots & t_{\delta_1 \delta_2 1} \\ t_{112} & t_{212} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 12} & t_{122} & t_{222} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 22} & t_{132} & t_{232} & \dots & \dots & t_{\delta_1 \delta_2 2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_{11\delta_3} & t_{21\delta_3} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 1\delta_3} & t_{12\delta_3} & t_{22\delta_3} & \dots & t_{\delta_1 2\delta_3} & t_{13\delta_3} & t_{23\delta_3} & \dots & \dots & t_{\delta_1 \delta_2 \delta_3} \end{bmatrix}_{\delta_3 \times \delta_1 \delta_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Given $\delta_i \times \delta_i$ matrices A_i ($1 \leq i \leq 3$), direct computation yields

$$((A_1, A_2, A_3) * T)_{(1)} = A_1 T_{(1)} (A_3 \otimes A_2)^t \quad (35)$$

$$((A_1, A_2, A_3) * T)_{(2)} = A_2 T_{(2)} (A_3 \otimes A_1)^t \quad (36)$$

$$((A_1, A_2, A_3) * T)_{(3)} = A_3 T_{(3)} (A_2 \otimes A_1)^t. \quad (37)$$

As before, if $v \in \mathbb{R}^{\delta_1}$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}^{\delta_2 \delta_3}$, then direct computation yields

$$(v \circ M)_{(1)} = v \circ \text{vec}(M) \quad (38)$$

and additionally, we have

$$(M \circ v)_{(3)}^t = \text{vec}(M) \circ v \quad (39)$$

as well as

$$\text{vec}((A_1, A_2) * M) = (A_2 \otimes A_1) \text{vec}(M). \quad (40)$$

Now, if ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are density matrices for 3-qubit states with hypermatrix representations $\{T_1, T_2, T_3, T_{12}, T_{13}, T_{23}, T_{123}\}$ and $\{\widehat{T}_1, \widehat{T}_2, \widehat{T}_3, \widehat{T}_{12}, \widehat{T}_{13}, \widehat{T}_{23}, \widehat{T}_{123}\}$, then we say they are *simultaneously orthogonal (SO) equivalent* if there exists $O_i \in O(\delta_i)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{T}_{123} &= (O_1, O_2, O_3) * T_{123} \\ \widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_{23} &= (O_1, O_2, O_3) * (T_1 \circ T_{23}) \\ \widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_{13} &= (O_2, O_1, O_3) * (T_2 \circ T_{13}) \\ \widehat{T}_{12} \circ \widehat{T}_3 &= (O_1, O_2, O_3) * (T_{12} \circ T_3). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

As in the case of Theorem 1, we will establish that quasi-LU equivalence and SO equivalence are nearly equivalent notions. This will then allow us to apply a broader generalization of Specht's criterion to reduce quasi-LU equivalence to checking trace identities.

Theorem 3 (quasi-LU Equivalence and SO Equivalence: 3-Qudits). *Let ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ be density matrices of 3-qudit states on $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_3}$ with hypermatrix representations $\{T_1, T_2, T_3, T_{12}, T_{13}, T_{23}, T_{123}\}$ and $\{\widehat{T}_1, \widehat{T}_2, \widehat{T}_3, \widehat{T}_{12}, \widehat{T}_{13}, \widehat{T}_{23}, \widehat{T}_{123}\}$ respectively, and assume that T_1, T_2, T_3 and T_{12}, T_{13}, T_{23} are nonzero. Then ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are quasi-LU equivalent if and only if they are SO equivalent and $\|\widehat{T}_1\| = \|T_1\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_{23}\| = \|T_{23}\|$, $\|\widehat{T}_2\| = \|T_2\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_{13}\| = \|T_{13}\|$, and $\|\widehat{T}_3\| = \|T_3\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_{12}\| = \|T_{12}\|$.*

Additionally, in the case of 3-qubits, if we assume that one of $\widehat{T}_1\widehat{T}_{12}\widehat{T}_2$, $\widehat{T}_2\widehat{T}_{23}\widehat{T}_3$, or $\widehat{T}_3\widehat{T}_{13}\widehat{T}_1$ has the same sign as $T_1^t T_{12} T_2$, $\widehat{T}_2^t T_{23} T_3$, or $T_3^t T_{13} T_1$ (respectively), and $\det(\widehat{T}_{jk}) = \det(T_{jk}) \neq 0$ for $(j, k) = (1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3)$, then ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are LU equivalent.

Proof. If ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are quasi-LU equivalent, then there exists $O_i \in O(\delta_i)$ such that

$$\widehat{T}_i = O_i * T_i, \quad \widehat{T}_{jk} = (O_j, O_k) * T_{jk}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{T}_{123} = (O_1, O_2, O_3) * T_{123} \quad (42)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq 3$ and $1 \leq j < k \leq 3$. It immediately follows that $\|\widehat{T}_i\| = \|T_i\|$ and $\|\widehat{T}_{jk}\| = \|T_{jk}\|$. Moreover,

$$\widehat{T}_i \circ \widehat{T}_{jk} = (O_i * T_i) \circ ((O_j, O_k) * T_{jk}) = (O_i, O_j, O_k) * (T_i \circ T_{jk}), \quad (43)$$

showing that ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are SO-equivalent.

Conversely, similar to as before, for $(i, j, k) = (1, 2, 3)$ and $(i, j, k) = (2, 1, 3)$ we have

$$0 < \|\widehat{T}_i\|^2 \|\widehat{T}_{jk}\|^2 = (\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i) (\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})) \quad (44)$$

$$= \widehat{T}_i^t (\widehat{T}_i \circ \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})) \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk}) \quad (45)$$

$$= \widehat{T}_i^t ((\widehat{T}_i \circ \widehat{T}_{jk})_{(1)}) \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk}) \quad \text{by equation (38)} \quad (46)$$

$$= \widehat{T}_i^t \left(((O_i, O_j, O_k) * (T_i \circ T_{jk}))_{(1)} \right) \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk}) \quad \text{by assumption} \quad (47)$$

$$= \widehat{T}_i^t \left(((O_i * T_i) \circ ((O_j, O_k) * T_{jk}))_{(1)} \right) \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk}) \quad \text{by equation (5)} \quad (48)$$

$$= \widehat{T}_i^t ((O_i * T_i) \circ \text{vec}((O_j, O_k) * T_{jk})) \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk}) \quad \text{by equation (38)} \quad (49)$$

$$= \widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{jk})^t (O_k \otimes O_j)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk}) \quad \text{by equation (40)} \quad (50)$$

Again, note that $\widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i$ and $\text{vec}(T_{jk})^t (O_k \otimes O_j)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})$ are just numbers, so equations (44) and (50) imply that

$$\alpha_i := \frac{\widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i}{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i} = \frac{\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})}{\text{vec}(T_{jk})^t (O_k \otimes O_j)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})} \neq 0. \quad (51)$$

By assumption, we also have that

$$(\widehat{T}_i \circ \widehat{T}_{jk})_{(1)} = ((O_i, O_j, O_k) * (T_i \circ T_{jk}))_{(1)} \quad (52)$$

The left-hand side of the above equation can be expressed as $\widehat{T}_i \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})^t$, and from equations (47) and (50) the right hand side is equal to $O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{jk})^t (O_k \otimes O_j)^t$, and so therefore

$$\underbrace{\widehat{T}_i \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})}_{>0} = O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{jk})^t (O_k \otimes O_j)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk}) \quad (53)$$

hence

$$\widehat{T}_i = \frac{O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{jk})^t (O_k \otimes O_j)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})}{\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})}. \quad (54)$$

Therefore by (51)

$$\alpha_i \widehat{T}_i = \frac{\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})}{\text{vec}(T_{jk})^t (O_k \otimes O_j)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})} \cdot \frac{O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{jk})^t (O_k \otimes O_j)^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})}{\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})^t \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})} = O_i T_i. \quad (55)$$

Similarly,

$$\underbrace{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i}_{>0} \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})^t = \widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{jk})^t (O_k \otimes O_j)^t \quad (56)$$

and so

$$\text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk})^t = \frac{\widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i \text{vec}(T_{jk})^t (O_k \otimes O_j)^t}{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i} \Rightarrow \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk}) = \frac{(O_k \otimes O_j) \text{vec}(T_{jk}) T_i^t O_i^t \widehat{T}_i}{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i}. \quad (57)$$

Therefore by (51)

$$\alpha_i^{-1} \text{vec}(\widehat{T}_{jk}) = \frac{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i}{\widehat{T}_i^t O_i T_i} \cdot \frac{(O_k \otimes O_j) \text{vec}(T_{jk}) T_i^t O_i^t \widehat{T}_i}{\widehat{T}_i^t \widehat{T}_i} = (O_k \otimes O_j) \text{vec}(T_{jk}) \quad (58)$$

which implies that

$$\alpha_i^{-1} \widehat{T}_{jk} = (O_j, O_k) * T_{jk} \quad (59)$$

By assumption, either $\|\widehat{T}_i\| = \|T_i\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_{jk}\| = \|T_{jk}\|$, and in either case it follows that $|\alpha_i| = 1$, hence $\alpha_i = \pm 1$ since the T_i and T_{jk} are real. The calculations required to verify the case when $(i, j, k) = (3, 1, 2)$ are almost identical to that above (the only difference is that equation (39) will be needed instead of (38)), so for the sake of brevity we omit them. Thus, for $(i, j, k) = (1, 2, 3), (2, 1, 3), (3, 1, 2)$ we have that

$$\widehat{T}_i = \alpha_i^{-1} O_i * T_i, \quad \widehat{T}_{jk} = \alpha_i (O_j, O_k) * T_{jk}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{T}_{123} = (O_1, O_2, O_3) * T_{123}, \quad (60)$$

with $\alpha_i = \pm 1$ and $O_i \in O(\delta_i)$, proving SO equivalence for 3-qudits ($d > 2$).

Now lastly, in the case of 3-qubits, if in addition we assume (without loss of generality) that $\widehat{T}_1^t \widehat{T}_{12} \widehat{T}_2$ has the same sign as $T_1^t T_{12} T_2$ and that $\det(\widehat{T}_{jk}) = \det(T_{jk}) \neq 0$ for $(j, k) = (1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3)$, then since

$$\widehat{T}_1^t \widehat{T}_{12} \widehat{T}_2 = (\alpha_1^{-1} O_1 T_1)^t (\alpha_3 O_1 T_{12} O_2^t) (\alpha_2^{-1} O_2 T_2) = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3 T_1^t T_{12} T_2 \quad (61)$$

it follows that $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3$ is positive. Thus, we have two possible cases:

1. all of the α_i are positive and hence 1, proving LU equivalence, or
2. exactly two of the α_i are negative and hence -1 .

In the latter case, if $\alpha_i, \alpha_j = -1$ and $\alpha_k = 1$, then

$$\det(\widehat{T}_{jk}) = \det(\alpha_i O_j T_{jk} O_k^t) = \alpha_i^3 \det(O_j T_{jk} O_k^t) = \alpha_i \det(T_{jk}) = -\det(T_{jk}) \quad (62)$$

which contradicts the assumption that $\det(\widehat{T}_{jk}) = \det(T_{jk}) \neq 0$. Consequently, we must have the first case, in which LU equivalence is established. This completes the proof. \square

There was a different approach to local unitary invariants of 3-qubits in [14, ?], and our current studies are suitable for generalizations.

4.1 SO-Equivalence and Trace Identities for 3-Qudits

We would now like to apply Theorem 3.4 from [6] like how we did in the 2-qubit case, reducing the quasi-LU equivalence to checking trace identities; however, there are some issues. Suppose ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are 3-qubit density matrices with hypermatrix representations $\{T_1, T_2, T_3, T_{12}, T_{13}, T_{23}, T_{123}\}$ and $\{\widehat{T}_1, \widehat{T}_2, \widehat{T}_3, \widehat{T}_{12}, \widehat{T}_{13}, \widehat{T}_{23}, \widehat{T}_{123}\}$ respectively. Define

$$\{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4\} := \{(T_{123})_{(1)}, (T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}, (T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(2)}, (T_{12} \circ T_3)_{(3)}\}$$

and similarly

$$\{B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4\} := \{(\widehat{T}_{123})_{(1)}, (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_{23})_{(1)}, (\widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_{13})_{(2)}, (\widehat{T}_{12} \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(3)}\}$$

(note that these are all $\delta_1 \times \delta_2 \delta_3$ matrices). Then by Theorem 3.4 in [6], there exists $O_1 \in O(\delta_1)$ and $\tilde{O} \in O(\delta_2 \delta_3)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{T}_{123})_{(1)} &= O_1(T_{123})_{(1)}\tilde{O}^t \\ (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_{23})_{(1)} &= O_1(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}\tilde{O}^t \\ (\widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_{13})_{(2)} &= O_1(T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(2)}\tilde{O}^t \\ (\widehat{T}_{12} \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(1)} &= O_1(T_{12} \circ T_3)_{(1)}\tilde{O}^t \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

if and only if

$$\text{Tr}(A_{i_1} A_{j_1}^t \dots A_{i_k} A_{j_k}^t) = \text{Tr}(B_{i_1} B_{j_1}^t \dots B_{i_k} B_{j_k}^t) \quad (64)$$

for any compositions i, \dots, i_k and j_1, \dots, j_k such that $1 \leq i_1 \leq j_1 \leq 4, \dots, \leq i_k \leq j_k \leq 4$ and $\|T_1\| = \|\widehat{T}_1\|$ or $\|T_{23}\| = \|\widehat{T}_{23}\|$, $\|T_2\| = \|\widehat{T}_2\|$ or $\|T_{13}\| = \|\widehat{T}_{13}\|$, and $\|T_3\| = \|\widehat{T}_3\|$ or $\|T_{12}\| = \|\widehat{T}_{12}\|$. But this is not good enough!

Indeed, we need \tilde{O}^t to be a tensor product of a $\delta_2 \times \delta_2$ orthogonal matrix with a $\delta_3 \times \delta_3$ orthogonal matrix; otherwise, we do not have SO equivalence and hence neither quasi-LU equivalence. To guarantee that $\tilde{O}^t \in O(\delta_2) \otimes O(\delta_3)$, we need some additional assumptions and a more powerful generalization of Specht's criterion.

4.1.1 Applying the Partial Trace and Futorny et al's Theorem

Let ρ be the density matrix of a 3-qudit state over $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_3}$ with hypermatrix representation $\{T_1, T_2, T_3, T_{12}, T_{13}, T_{23}, T_{123}\}$. The partial trace over the first system denoted Tr_1 , is defined as


$$\text{Tr}_1(\rho) := \sum_{i=0}^{d_3-1} (|i\rangle \otimes I_{d_2} \otimes I_{d_3} \rho(|i\rangle \otimes I_{d_2} \otimes I_{d_3}))$$

where $\{|i\rangle\}$ forms a basis for \mathbb{C}^{d_1} . This reduces to a density matrix of the following 2-qubit state:

$$\frac{1}{d_2 d_3} \left(I_{d_2} \otimes I_{d_3} + \sum_{i=1}^{d_2^2-1} T_1^i \lambda_i^2 \otimes I_{d_3} + \sum_{i=1}^{d_3^2-1} T_2^i I_{d_2} \otimes \lambda_i^3 + \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_2^2-1, d_3^2-1} T_{12}^{ij} \lambda_i^2 \otimes \lambda_j^3 \right) =: \rho_{23}.$$

The partial traces over the second and third subsystems, Tr_2 and Tr_3 are analogously defined. Note that it is immediately clear that if two states ρ and $\hat{\rho}$ are quasi-LU equivalent, then their partial traces must also be quasi-LU equivalent.

In [7, Corollary 1], Futorny et. al. apply the theory of quiver representations to generalize Theorem 3.4 in [6]. We present their result and the necessary notions from quiver representation theory to understand it in the appendix. In particular, if we consider the following quiver:



which has $k > 0$ arrows from 1 to 3 and $l - k > 0$ arrows from 2 to 3, and we assign to it a matrix representation A with dimension $\dim(n_1, n_2, m)$, then by Corollary 1 from [7] we obtain the following result:

Lemma 1. *If $A_1, \dots, A_k, A_{k+1}, \dots, A_l$ and $B_1, \dots, B_k, B_{k+1}, \dots, B_l$ are real matrices each with m rows, and with $A_1, \dots, A_k, B_1, \dots, B_k$ having n_1 columns and with $A_{k+1}, \dots, A_l, B_{k+1}, \dots, B_l$ having n_2 columns, then the following two statements are equivalent*

- *there exists orthogonal matrices $O \in O(m)$, $\tilde{O}_1 \in O(n_1)$, and $\tilde{O}_2 \in O(n_2)$ such that*

$$(B_1, \dots, B_k, B_{k+1}, \dots, B_l) = (OA_1\tilde{O}_1, \dots, OA_k\tilde{O}_1, OA_{k+1}\tilde{O}_2, \dots, OA_l\tilde{O}_2) \quad (65)$$

•

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr}(w\{A_{i_1}A_{j_1}^t, A_{i_2}A_{j_2}^t \mid 1 \leq i_1 \leq j_1 \leq k, k+1 \leq i_2 \leq j_2 \leq l\}) \\ &= \text{Tr}(w\{B_{i_1}B_{j_1}^t, B_{i_2}B_{j_2}^t \mid 1 \leq i_1 \leq j_1 \leq k, k+1 \leq i_2 \leq j_2 \leq l\}) \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

for every word w in noncommuting variables.

Furthermore, it suffices to check (66) for all words of length at most $[(r+2)(n_1+n_2+m)]^2$ where r is the smallest positive integer such that $\frac{r(r+1)}{2} \geq \max\{k, l-k\}$.

Therefore, is we set

$$(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, A_6) := ((T_{123})_{(1)}, (T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}, (T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(2)}, (T_{12} \circ T_3)_{(1)}, (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}, T_1)$$

and

$$(B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4, B_5, B_6) := ((\hat{T}_{123})_{(1)}, (\hat{T}_1 \circ \hat{T}_{23})_{(1)}, (\hat{T}_2 \circ \hat{T}_{13})_{(2)}, (\hat{T}_{12} \circ \hat{T}_3)_{(1)}, (\hat{T}_1 \circ \hat{T}_2 \circ \hat{T}_3)_{(1)}, \hat{T}_1),$$

then by lemma 1 there exists $O_1 \in O(\delta_1)$, $\tilde{O} \in O(\delta_2\delta_3)$, and $O \in O(1)$ (hence $O = [\pm 1]$ and without loss of generality we may assume that $O = [1]$) such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{T}_{123})_{(1)} &= O_1(T_{123})_{(1)}\tilde{O}^t \\ \hat{T}_1 \circ \hat{T}_{23})_{(1)} &= O_1(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}\tilde{O}^t \\ (\hat{T}_2 \circ \hat{T}_{13})_{(2)} &= O_1(T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(2)}\tilde{O}^t \\ \hat{T}_{12} \circ \hat{T}_3)_{(1)} &= O_1(T_{12} \circ T_3)_{(1)}\tilde{O}^t \\ (\hat{T}_1 \circ \hat{T}_2 \circ \hat{T}_3)_{(1)} &= O_1(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}\tilde{O}^t \\ \hat{T}_1 &= O_1T_1 \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

if and only if

$$\text{Tr}(w\{A_iA_j^t, A_6A_6^t\}) = \text{Tr}(w\{B_iB_j^t, B_6B_6^t\}) \quad (68)$$

with $1 \leq i \leq j \leq 5$, for every word w in noncommuting variables of length at most $25(1 + \delta_1 + \delta_2\delta_3)^2$.

Suppose (68) holds for all such words. If in addition we assume that $\text{Tr}_1(\rho)$ is quasi-LU equivalent to $\text{Tr}_1(\hat{\rho})$, then there exists $O_2 \in O(\delta_2)$ and $O_3 \in O(\delta_3)$ such that

$$\hat{T}_2 = O_2 * T_2, \quad \hat{T}_3 = O_3 * T_3, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{T}_{23} = (O_2, O_3) * T_{12}. \quad (69)$$

Therefore,

$$(\hat{T}_1 \circ \hat{T}_{23})_{(1)} = O_1(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}(O_3 \otimes O_2)^t, \quad (70)$$

and

$$(\hat{T}_1 \circ \hat{T}_2 \circ \hat{T}_3)_{(1)} = O_1(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}(O_3 \otimes O_2)^t, \quad (71)$$

hence

$$(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}^t(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}\tilde{O}^t = (T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}^t(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}(O_3 \otimes O_2)^t, \quad (72)$$

and

$$(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}^t (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)} \tilde{O}^t = (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}^t (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)} (O_3 \otimes O_2)^t. \quad (73)$$

If either $(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}^t (T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}$ or $(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}^t (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}$ is invertible, then it follows that

$$\tilde{O} = O_3 \otimes O_2. \quad (74)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{T}_{123})_{(1)} &= O_1 (T_{123})_{(1)} (O_3 \otimes O_2)^t \\ (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_{23})_{(1)} &= O_1 (T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)} (O_3 \otimes O_2)^t \\ (\widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_{13})_{(2)} &= O_1 (T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(2)} (O_3 \otimes O_2)^t \\ (\widehat{T}_{12} \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(1)} &= O_1 (T_{12} \circ T_3)_{(1)} (O_3 \otimes O_2)^t \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Proving that ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are SO equivalent (and hence quasi-LU equivalent). Thus, we have the following theorem which characterizes quasi-LU equivalence:

Theorem 4 (Characterizing quasi-LU Equivalence: Version 1). *Suppose ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are tripartite density matrices over the same Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_3}$ with respective matrix representations $\{T_1, T_2, T_3, T_{12}, T_{13}, T_{23}, T_{123}\}$ and $\{\widehat{T}_1, \widehat{T}_2, \widehat{T}_3, \widehat{T}_{12}, \widehat{T}_{13}, \widehat{T}_{23}, \widehat{T}_{123}\}$. Let*

$$(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, A_6) := ((T_{123})_{(1)}, (T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}, (T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(2)}, (T_{12} \circ T_3)_{(1)}, (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}, T_1)$$

and

$$(B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4, B_5, B_6) := ((\widehat{T}_{123})_{(1)}, (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_{23})_{(1)}, (\widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_{13})_{(2)}, (\widehat{T}_{12} \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(1)}, (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(1)}, \widehat{T}_1).$$

Then ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are quasi-LU equivalent if the following conditions are met:

1. $\|\widehat{T}_1\| = \|T_1\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_{23}\| = \|T_{23}\|$, $\|\widehat{T}_2\| = \|T_2\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_{13}\| = \|T_{13}\|$, and $\|\widehat{T}_3\| = \|T_3\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_{12}\| = \|T_{12}\|$;
2. $(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}^t (T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}$ or $(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}^t (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}$ is invertible;
3. The partial traces $\text{Tr}_1(\rho)$ and $\text{Tr}_1(\widehat{\rho})$ are quasi-LU equivalent; and lastly
4. $\text{Tr}(w\{A_i A_j^t, A_6 A_6^t\}) = \text{Tr}(w\{B_i B_j^t, B_6 B_6^t\})$ with $1 \leq i \leq j \leq 5$, for all words w in noncommuting variables of length at most $25(1 + \delta_1 + \delta_{23})^2$

Moreover in the case of 3-qubits, if in addition to the above conditions we also assume that one of $\widehat{T}_1^t \widehat{T}_{12} \widehat{T}_2$, $\widehat{T}_2^t \widehat{T}_{23} \widehat{T}_3$, or $\widehat{T}_3^t \widehat{T}_{13} \widehat{T}_1$ has the same sign as $T_1^t T_{12} T_2$, $T_2^t T_{23} T_3$, or $T_3^t T_{13} T_1$ (respectively), and $\det(\widehat{T}_{jk}) = \det(T_{jk}) \neq 0$ for $(j, k) = (1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3)$, then ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are LU equivalent.

With this theorem, we have reduced the difficult problem of determining quasi-LU equivalence between 3-qudit states (or LU equivalence in the case of 3-qubit states) to checking norms, traces, the invertibility of a matrix, and quasi-LU equivalence of partial traces, which from theorem 2 just reduces to checking norms and traces. That is, with our result, we have shown that determining LU/quasi-LU equivalence *nearly* reduces to checking norms and traces, which are easy to compute and are LU invariants.

The only potential issue is the invertibility assumption of $(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}^t (T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}$ or $(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}^t (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}$. Not all density matrices of 3-qudit states possess the property that $(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}^t (T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}$ or $(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}^t (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(1)}$ is invertible, and furthermore this is not an LU/quasi-LU invariant (and so there may be some states which are LU/quasi-LU invariant but for which our theorem does not apply to). One, albeit incomplete, remedy to this potential issue is to instead define

$$(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, A_6) := ((T_{123})_{(2)}, (T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(2)}, (T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(1)}, (T_{12} \circ T_3)_{(2)}, (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(2)}, T_2)$$

and

$$(B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4, B_5, B_6) := ((\widehat{T}_{123})_{(2)}, (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_{23})_{(2)}, (\widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_{13})_{(1)}, (\widehat{T}_{12} \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(2)}, (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(2)}, \widehat{T}_2).$$

Then by applying Lemma 1 to these matrices, there exists $O_2 \in O(\delta_2)$, $\widetilde{O} \in O(\delta_1 \delta_3)$, and $O \in O(1)$ (hence $O = [\pm 1]$) and so without loss of generality we may assume that $O = [1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{T}_{123})_{(2)} &= O_2(T_{123})_{(2)}\widetilde{O}^t \\ (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_{23})_{(2)} &= O_2(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(2)}\widetilde{O}^t \\ (\widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_{13})_{(1)} &= O_1(T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(1)}\widetilde{O}^t \\ (\widehat{T}_{12} \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(2)} &= O_1(T_{12} \circ T_3)_{(2)}\widetilde{O}^t \\ (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(2)} &= O_1(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(2)}\widetilde{O}^t \\ \widehat{T}_1 &= O_2 T_2 \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

if and only if

$$\text{Tr}(w\{A_i A_j^t, A_6 A_6^t\}) = \text{Tr}(w\{B_i B_j^t, B_6 B_6^t\}) \tag{77}$$

with $1 \leq i \leq j \leq 5$, for every word w in noncommuting variables of length at most $25(1 + \delta_2 + \delta_1 \delta_3)^2$. Additionally if we assume that $\text{Tr}_2(\rho)$ is quasi-LU equivalent to $\text{Tr}_2(\widehat{\rho})$, then there exists $O_1 \in O(\delta_1)$ and $O_3 \in O(\delta_3)$ such that

$$\widehat{T}_1 = O_1 * T_1, \quad \widehat{T}_3 = O_3 * T_3, \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{T}_{13} = (O_1, O_3) * T_{13}. \tag{78}$$

It then follows from calculations similar to those in equations (70) to (74), that if $(T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(1)}^t (T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(1)}$ or $(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(2)}^t (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(2)}$ is invertible, then

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{T}_{123})_{(2)} &= O_2(T_{123})_{(2)}(O_3 \otimes O_1)^t \\ (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_{23})_{(2)} &= O_2(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(2)}(O_3 \otimes O_1)^t \\ (\widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_{13})_{(1)} &= O_2(T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(1)}(O_3 \otimes O_1)^t \\ (\widehat{T}_{12} \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(2)} &= O_2(T_{12} \circ T_3)_{(1)}(O_3 \otimes O_1)^t, \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

proving that ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are SO equivalent (and hence quasi-LU equivalent). Thus, we have the following theorem, which gives an alternative characterization of quasi-LU equivalence:

Theorem 5 (Characterizing quasi-LU Equivalence: Version 2). *Suppose ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are tripartite density matrices over the same Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_3}$ with respective matrix representations $\{T_1, T_2, T_3, T_{12}, T_{13}, T_{23}, T_{123}\}$ and $\{\widehat{T}_1, \widehat{T}_2, \widehat{T}_3, \widehat{T}_{12}, \widehat{T}_{13}, \widehat{T}_{23}, \widehat{T}_{123}\}$. Let*

$$(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, A_6) := ((T_{123})_{(2)}, (T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(2)}, (T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(1)}, (T_{12} \circ T_3)_{(2)}, (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(2)}, T_1)$$

and

$$(B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4, B_5, B_6) := ((\widehat{T}_{123})_{(2)}, (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_{23})_{(2)}, (\widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_{13})_{(1)}, (\widehat{T}_{12} \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(2)}, (\widehat{T}_1 \circ \widehat{T}_2 \circ \widehat{T}_3)_{(2)}, \widehat{T}_1).$$

Then ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are quasi-LU equivalent if the following conditions are met:

1. $\|\widehat{T}_1\| = \|T_1\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_{23}\| = \|T_{23}\|$, $\|\widehat{T}_2\| = \|T_2\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_{13}\| = \|T_{13}\|$, and $\|\widehat{T}_3\| = \|T_3\|$ or $\|\widehat{T}_{12}\| = \|T_{12}\|$;
2. $(T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(1)}^t (T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(1)}$ or $(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(2)}^t (T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(2)}$ is invertible;
3. The partial traces $\text{Tr}_2(\rho)$ and $\text{Tr}_2(\widehat{\rho})$ are quasi-LU equivalent; and lastly
4. $\text{Tr}(w\{A_i A_j^t, A_6 A_6^t\}) = \text{Tr}(w\{B_i B_j^t, B_6 B_6^t\})$ with $1 \leq i \leq j \leq 5$, for all words w in noncommuting variables of length at most $25(1 + \delta_1 + \delta_{23})^2$

Moreover in the case of 3-qubits, if in addition to the above conditions we also assume that one of $\widehat{T}_1\widehat{T}_{12}\widehat{T}_2$, $\widehat{T}_2\widehat{T}_{23}\widehat{T}_3$, or $\widehat{T}_3\widehat{T}_{13}\widehat{T}_1$ has the same sign as $T_1T_{12}T_2$, $T_2T_{23}T_3$, or $T_3T_{13}T_1$ (respectively), and $\det(\widehat{T}_{jk}) = \det(T_{jk}) \neq 0$ for $(j, k) = (1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3)$, then ρ and $\widehat{\rho}$ are LU equivalent.

This does not solve the issue of needing invertibility of a matrix, but it at least gives us more options since now we only need one of $(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}^t(T_1 \circ T_{23})_{(1)}$, $(T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(1)}^t(T_2 \circ T_{13})_{(1)}$, or $(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(k)}^t(T_1 \circ T_2 \circ T_3)_{(k)}$ ($k \in \{1, 2\}$) to be invertible. Indeed, by choosing a different subset and/or matrix unfolding of the tensors in the hypermatrix representation, it may be possible to derive other characterizations of quasi-LU equivalence similar to that of the previous two theorems. This flexibility minimizes the burden caused by the invertibility assumption.

5 Conclusion

Our proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 can be further generalized to the 4-qudits and beyond, thus establishing a near equivalence of quasi-LU and SO equivalence for N -qudits. Furthermore, due to the broad scope of Futorny's generalization of Specht's criterion, similar reasoning to that given in the establishment of Theorems 4 and 5 can theoretically be applied to reduce the problem of determining quasi-LU equivalence of N -qudits (or LU equivalence in the case of N -qubits) to checking trace identities and possibly a few other easy-to-check properties. Nonetheless, the number of trace identities grows rapidly each time we go up in several qudits, and so as a matter of practicality, we stop at 3-qudits since this seems to be the case where our results would be most useful.

While there have been other approaches to classifying density matrices of n -qubits up to LU equivalence such as in [10], their methods require solving potentially very large and complex systems of nonlinear equations. Our methods may potentially be less computationally demanding, at least in the case of 3-qubit/qudit states.

A Specht's Criterion and Generalizations

The following results in this appendix are valid in complex inner product spaces and complex Euclidean spaces, however, for our purposes, we will only consider real Euclidean spaces. We note, however, that the following results can be extended to the aforementioned spaces by replacing "real" with "complex", "orthogonal" with "unitary", and in the case of complex inner product spaces, " t " with " \dagger ".

The original version of Specht's criterion can be found in [11]. For our purposes, we only need the real version of Specht's criterion, which was proven by Carl Pearcy in [12]. It is stated below:

Proposition 1 (Specht's criterion (real version)). *If A and B are real $n \times n$ matrices, then they are orthogonally similar, i.e. $B = O^t A O$ for some $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix O , if and only if*

$$\text{Tr}(w\{A, A^t\}) = \text{Tr}(w\{B, B^t\}) \quad (80)$$

for every word $w(x, y)$ in two noncommuting variables.

One issue with Specht's Criterion is that as it is stated, it requires infinitely many trace identities to check. However, in 1962 C. Pearcy proved in [12] that it suffices to verify conditions (80) for all words of length at most $2n^2$, and in 1986 T. Laffey showed in [13] that it suffices to verify conditions (80) for all words of length at most $\frac{2}{3}(n^2 + 2)$. Other tighter upper bounds have been derived, but note that $\frac{2}{3}(n^2 + 2) < n^2$ for all positive integers $n > 2$, so for our purposes we conclude that (by Laffey's upper bound) it is enough to check (80) for all words of length at most n^2 .

In this paper we utilize two generalizations of Specht's Criterion, due to Jing [6] and Futorny et. al. [7]. Jing's generalization is in fact a special case of Futorny's, so the rest of this appendix will be dedicated to reviewing Futorny's result. To better understand what Futorny et. al. proved, we first review the basics of quiver representation theory.

A.1 Quiver Representations and Futorny's Theorem

A *quiver* is a directed graph (loops and multiple arrows are allowed) used to represent vector spaces and algebras. A *representation* $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_\alpha, \mathcal{U}_v)$ of a quiver Q over a field F is given by assigning to each vertex v a vector space \mathcal{U}_v

over F to each arrow $\alpha : u \rightarrow v$ a linear transformation $\mathcal{A}_\alpha : \mathcal{U}_u \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_v$. The vector $\dim(\mathcal{A}) := (\dim(\mathcal{U}_1), \dots, \dim(\mathcal{U}_t))$ is called the *dimension* of the representation \mathcal{A} .

An *oriented cycle* π of length $l \geq 1$ in a quiver Q is a sequence of arrows of the form

$$\pi : \quad v_1 \xleftarrow{\alpha_1} v_2 \xleftarrow{\alpha_2} \dots \xleftarrow{\alpha_{l-1}} v_l \xrightarrow{\alpha_l} v_1$$

That is, it is a closed-directed walk (note that some vertices and arrows may repeat due to possible loops). For each representation \mathcal{A} of a quiver Q and any cycle π , we define $\mathcal{A}(\pi)$ to be the cycle of linear transformations

$$\mathcal{A}(\pi) : \quad \mathcal{U}_{v_1} \xleftarrow{\mathcal{A}_{\alpha_1}} \mathcal{U}_{v_2} \xleftarrow{\mathcal{A}_{\alpha_2}} \dots \xleftarrow{\mathcal{A}_{\alpha_{l-1}}} \mathcal{U}_{v_l} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}_{\alpha_l}} \mathcal{U}_{v_1}$$

The *trace* of $\mathcal{A}(\pi)$ is defined as $\text{trace}(\mathcal{A}(\pi)) := \text{trace}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha_1} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha_2} \dots \mathcal{A}_{\alpha_l})$. Note that $\text{trace}(\mathcal{A}(\pi))$ does not depend on the choice of the initial vertex v_1 in the cycle since the trace is invariant under cyclic permutations.

For each linear transformation $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ between (real) Euclidean spaces \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} , the *adjoint map* $\mathcal{A}^* : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is given by $\langle \mathcal{A}x, y \rangle = \langle x, \mathcal{A}^*y \rangle$ for all $x \in \mathcal{U}$ and $y \in \mathcal{V}$. For a quiver Q with vertices v_1, \dots, v_t , a (real) *Euclidean representation* $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_\alpha, \mathcal{U}_v)$ is given by assigning to each vertex v a real Euclidean space \mathcal{U}_v , and to each arrow $\alpha : u \rightarrow v$ a linear transformation $\mathcal{A}_\alpha : \mathcal{U}_u \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_v$. Two (real) Euclidean representations $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_\alpha, \mathcal{U}_v)$ and $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_\alpha, \mathcal{V}_v)$ of Q are *isometric* if there exists a family isometries (i.e. linear isomorphisms that preserve inner products) $\varphi_1 : \mathcal{U}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \varphi_t : \mathcal{U}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_t$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{U}_u & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}_\alpha} & \mathcal{U}_v \\ \varphi_u \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi_v \\ \mathcal{V}_u & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{B}_\alpha} & \mathcal{V}_v \end{array}$$

commutes (i.e. $\varphi_v \mathcal{A}_\alpha = \mathcal{B}_\alpha \varphi_u$) for each arrow $\alpha : u \rightarrow v$.

Now, for each quiver Q , we denote \tilde{Q} to be the quiver with double the number of arrows in Q , obtained from Q by attaching the arrow $\alpha^* : v \rightarrow u$ for each arrow $\alpha : u \rightarrow v$ in Q . For each (real) Euclidean representation \mathcal{A} of Q , we define the (real) Euclidean representation $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ of \tilde{Q} that coincides with \mathcal{A} on $Q \subset \tilde{Q}$ and that assigns to each new arrow $\alpha^* : v \rightarrow u$ the linear transformation $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\alpha^*} := \mathcal{A}_\alpha^* : \mathcal{U}_v \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_u$ (i.e. the adjoint of \mathcal{A}_α). For example, if Q is given by

$$Q : \quad \beta \curvearrowright u \xrightarrow{\alpha} v$$

and \mathcal{A} is a representation on Q given by

$$\mathcal{A} : \quad \mathcal{A}_\beta \curvearrowright \mathcal{U}_u \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}_\alpha} \mathcal{U}_v$$

then \tilde{Q} is given by

$$\tilde{Q} : \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & & \alpha \\ & & \curvearrowright \\ \beta \curvearrowright & u & v \\ & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ & \beta^* & \alpha^* \end{array}$$

then $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} : \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{A}_\alpha \\ & & \curvearrowright \\ \mathcal{A}_\beta \curvearrowright & \mathcal{U}_u & \mathcal{U}_v \\ & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ & \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\beta^*} & \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\alpha^*} \end{array}$$

Representations of quivers can be expressed in terms of matrices. If $[x]$ is the coordinate vector of $x \in \mathcal{U}$ in some orthonormal basis, then $\langle x, y \rangle = [x]^T [y]$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{U}$. Furthermore, if A is the matrix of the linear transformation $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ in some orthonormal bases for \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} , then A^t is the matrix of the adjoint transformation $\mathcal{A}^* : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. A matrix representation A of dimension (d_1, \dots, d_t) of a quiver Q is given by assigning to each arrow $\alpha : u \rightarrow v$ a matrix A_α of size $d_v \times d_u$ (note that we take $d_i := 0$ if the vertex i does not have arrows). Two (real) Euclidean matrix representations A and B of Q are *isometric* if there exists orthogonal matrices O_1, \dots, O_t such that

$$B_\alpha = O_v^{-1} A_\alpha O_u = O_v^t A_\alpha O_u \quad (81)$$

for every arrow $\alpha : u \rightarrow v$. Note that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are isometric if and only if A and B are isometric. Furthermore, if $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is the corresponding representation obtained from a representation \mathcal{A} as described in the previous paragraph, then \tilde{A} is the matrix form of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Lastly, for each oriented cycle π in a quiver Q and each matrix representation A of Q , we denote $A(\pi) := A_{\alpha_1} A_{\alpha_2} \dots A_{\alpha_l}$.

With this quiver representation framework, Futorny et. al. then prove [7] the following important theorem.

Theorem 6. *Two (real) Euclidean matrix representations A and B of a quiver Q are isometric if and only if*

$$\text{trace}(\tilde{A}(\pi)) = \text{trace}(\tilde{B}(\pi)) \quad (82)$$

for each oriented cycle π in the quiver \tilde{Q} . Moreover, it suffices to verify (82) for all cycles π of length at most

$$\varphi((r+2)(d_1 + \dots + d_t)),$$

where $\varphi(n)$ is any bound for the sufficient word length in Specht's criterion (e.g. $\varphi(n) = n^2$) and r is the minimal natural number such that

$$\frac{r(r+1)}{2} \geq \max\{m_{ij} \mid i \text{ and } j \text{ are vertices of } Q\}$$

in which m_{ij} is the number of arrows from j to i in Q .

Note that if we assign a matrix representation A of dimension n to the following quiver

$$Q : \quad \curvearrowright 1$$

and then apply Theorem 6, then we obtain Specht's Criterion. In [6], the author proves the following generalization of Specht's Criterion:

Proposition 2. *Let (A_1, \dots, A_k) and (B_1, \dots, B_k) be two k -tuples of $m \times n$ matrices. Then there exists orthogonal matrices O and P such that*

$$(B_1, \dots, B_k) = (OA_1P, \dots, OA_kP) \quad (83)$$

if and only if


$$\text{Tr}(w\{A_1^t A_1, \dots, A_i^t A_j, \dots, A_k^t A_k\}) = \text{Tr}(w\{B_1^t B_1, \dots, B_i^t B_j, \dots, B_k^t B_k\}) \quad (84)$$

for every word $w(x_{11}, \dots, x_{ij}, \dots, x_{kk})$ in k^2 noncommuting variables.

Indeed, if we assign two matrix representations A and B of dimension (n, m) on the following quiver

$$1 \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \curvearrowright \\ \vdots \\ \curvearrowright \end{array} 2$$

and then apply Theorem 6, then we precisely get Jing's generalization of Specht's Criterion. Lastly, we note that in our proof of Theorem's 5 and 6, we apply Futorny et al's Theorem to the following quiver



attaching two different pairs of matrix representations A and B of dimensions $(\delta_2\delta_3, 1, \delta_1)$ and $(\delta_1\delta_3, 1, \delta_2)$ (respectively) to it.

References

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?, *Physical review* 47 (1935).
- [2] I. L. Chuang and M. A. Nielsen, *Quantum computation and quantum information*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000.
- [3] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of quantum states: an introduction to quantum entanglement*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2017.
- [4] N. Jing, M. Yang, H. Zhao, Local unitary equivalence of quantum states and simultaneous orthogonal equivalence, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 57, 062205 (2016).
- [5] Y. Makhlin, Nonlocal properties of two-qubit gates and mixed states, and the optimization of quantum computations, *Quantum Information Processing* 1 (2002).
- [6] N. Jing, Unitary and orthogonal equivalence of sets of matrices, *Linear algebra Appl.* 481 (2015).
- [7] V. Futorny, R. A. Horn, V. V. Sergeichuk, Specht's Criterion for Systems of Linear Mappings, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 519C (2017).
- [8] L. H. Lim. Tensors and hypermatrices. In: *Handbook of linear algebra* ed. by L. Hogben, pp.231-260, 2013.
- [9] T. G. Kolda and B. W. Bader, *Tensor Decompositions and Applications*, *SIAM Review*, Vol. 51, n. 3, pages 455-500, 2009.
- [10] J. L. Li and C. F. Qiao, Classification of arbitrary multipartite entangled states under local unitary equivalence, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 46 (2013), 075301.
- [11] W. Specht, Zur Theorie der Matrizen II, *Jahresber. Deutsch. Math.- Verein.* 50 (1940) 19–23.
- [12] C. Percy, A complete set of unitary invariants for operators generating finite W^* -algebras of type I, *Pacific J. Math.* 12 (1962) 1405–1414.
- [13] T. J. Laffey, Simultaneous reduction of sets of matrices under similarity, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 84 (1986) 123–138.
- [14] N. Jing, S. M. Fei, M. Li, X. Li-Jost, and T. Zhang, Local unitary invariants for generic multiqubit quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* 92, No. 2, 022306 (2015).