

Non-symmetric GHZ states; weighted hypergraph and controlled-unitary graph representations

Hrachya Zakaryan, Konstantinos-Rafail Revis, and Zahra Raissi
*Department of Computer Science, Paderborn University,
Warburger Str. 100, 33098, Paderborn, Germany and
Institute for Photonic Quantum Systems (PhoQS),
Paderborn University, Warburger Str. 100, 33098 Paderborn, Germany*

Non-symmetric GHZ states (n -GHZ $_{\alpha}$), characterized by unequal superpositions of $|00\dots 0\rangle$ and $|11\dots 1\rangle$, represent a significant yet underexplored class of multipartite entangled states with potential applications in quantum information. Despite their importance, the lack of a well-defined stabilizer formalism and corresponding graph representation has hindered their comprehensive study. In this paper, we address this gap by introducing two novel graph formalisms and stabilizers for non-symmetric GHZ states. First, we provide a weighted hypergraph representation and demonstrate that non-symmetric GHZ states are local unitary (LU) equivalent to fully connected weighted hypergraphs. Although these weighted hypergraphs are not stabilizer states, we show that they can be stabilized using local operations, and an ancilla. We further extend this framework to qudits, offering a specific form for non-symmetric qudit GHZ states and their LU equivalent weighted qudit hypergraphs. Second, we propose a graph formalism using controlled-unitary (CU) operations, showing that non-symmetric qudit GHZ states can be described using star-shaped CU graphs. Our findings enhance the understanding of non-symmetric GHZ states and their potential applications in quantum information science.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Greenberger–Horne–Zeilinger (GHZ) state and its generalization to n parties are pivotal in the study of multipartite entanglement, with numerous applications in quantum sensing [1, 2], quantum secret sharing [3], and quantum communication [4–6]. GHZ states are also represented as graph states, a well-studied family of pure multipartite entangled states [7, 8]. Graph states are created by considering mathematical graphs, assigning a qudit to each vertex, and applying a controlled- Z (CZ) operation, an entangling gate, between qudits connected by an edge. It is well-known that *completely connected graphs* and *star-shaped graphs* are local unitary (LU) equivalent representations of GHZ states [8]. Additionally, graph states and the GHZ state can be described using the stabilizer formalism [8], which consists of strings of local Pauli operators [9]. This connection with the stabilizer formalism expands the uses of graph states and the GHZ state to other fields, such as quantum error correction. Graph states can also be generalized into hypergraph states, which require multi-controlled operations [10–12]. Overall, graph states have uses in quantum secret sharing [13–15], and quantum error correction [16, 17], while hypergraph states are useful for quantum algorithms [18], and as a quantum resource [19]. Both are additionally used for measurement based quantum computing [20, 21].

The importance of the GHZ states stems from their entangling properties, which are also present in what are called GHZ-like states [22, 23]. GHZ-like states include states which are local Pauli equivalent to the GHZ and states which are unequal superpositions of the $|00\dots 0\rangle$

and $|11\dots 1\rangle$ states,

$$|n\text{-GHZ}_{\alpha}\rangle = \cos \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} |00\dots 0\rangle + \sin \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} |11\dots 1\rangle.$$

We focus on the second one, which we refer to as non-symmetric GHZ states (n -GHZ $_{\alpha}$). These states are constructed in experimental settings [24] and can be used in the the study of the Unruh effect[25], as well as in quantum teleportation schemes where they can be created as entangled coherent states[26–29]. Despite their potential importance, non-symmetric GHZ states have not been extensively studied, primarily because they lack a well-defined stabilizer formalism and corresponding graph representation. This gap in the literature has limited the exploration of their properties and applications.

In our paper, we address this gap by providing a weighted hypergraph representation for non-symmetric GHZ states and using techniques developed in previous works to provide stabilizers by adding a *single ancilla*. Weighted hypergraphs [30, 31] are a generalisation of hypergraphs where each edge has an associated weight from \mathbb{R} and the operations performed for each edge are control phase operations instead of a CZ operations. Weighted graphs are useful for analysing spin chains, lattices and gases [30]. Additionally, weighted graph states are locally maximally entangled states and can be used in purification protocols [32]. We find that the non-symmetric GHZ states are LU equivalent to fully connected weighted hypergraphs. Although weighted hypergraphs are not stabilizer states, we show that it is possible to stabilize this specific weighted hypergraph using local operations and only a *single ancilla*. This novel approach extends the graph formalism typically

applied to symmetric GHZ states to their non-symmetric counterparts, thereby broadening the scope of graph-based quantum state analysis.

Additionally, we generalise this process to qudits. In the case of qudits, due to the higher degrees of freedom there are multiple ways to define non-symmetric GHZ states. We provide a specific form for the non-symmetric GHZ state, find an LU equivalent weighted qudit hypergraph and provide stabilizers by adding a single ancilla. For more general non-symmetric qudit GHZs, we extend the graph state formalism. We consider graphs with general controlled- U (CU) operations for some general unitary U . Thus, we show that non-symmetric qudit GHZ states can be described using *star-shaped* CU graphs.

In section II we outline the preliminary definitions that we will be using. In section III we define the non-symmetric GHZ state and show its equivalence to a weighted hypergraph. In section IV we provide the stabilizers by adding a single ancilla, while in section V we generalise the technique used in IV to qudits and demonstrate its application on qudit graphs. Furthermore, in section VI we consider general CU graphs in the scope of non-symmetric qudit GHZ states. Lastly, we follow up with the discussion and future outlooks in section VII.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this paper we will be considering both qubits and qudits of any dimension d . For qudits we will use Sylvester's generalised Pauli X and Z operations [33] and the discrete Fourier transform operation for the Hadamard,

$$\begin{aligned} X|k\rangle &= |k+1\rangle \\ Z|k\rangle &= \omega^k |k\rangle \\ H|k\rangle &= \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \omega^{kj} |j\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\omega = \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{d}\right)$, is the d -th root of unity, and all the arithmetic is performed modulo d . Also, we note that normalization factors are omitted to improve readability.

Additionally we will require few key concepts related to graph states. We define a graph $G(V, E)$ as a structure consisting of a set of vertices V connected by edges from the set $E \subseteq V \times V$. We will call the graph weighted if each edge has an associated weight, meaning $E \subseteq V \times V \times \mathbb{R}$.

Graphs can additionally be represented using an adjacency matrix Γ , which is a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix given




FIG. 1. Left: A star-shaped graph where each outer node is connected to a central node. Right: A fully connected graph where each node is connected to every other node. Both graphs are local unitary (LU) equivalent representations of a GHZ state.

by,

$$\Gamma_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{i, j\} \in E \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (2)$$

for unweighted graphs and,

$$\Gamma_{ij} = \begin{cases} r & \text{if } \{i, j, r\} \in E \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (3)$$

for weighted graphs.

A graph state is obtained by placing a qudit at each vertex in the state $|+\rangle = H|0\rangle$ and performing a controlled- Z (CZ) operation for each edge in G between the qudits at the two vertices,

$$|G\rangle = \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E} CZ_{ij}^{\Gamma_{ij}} |+\rangle^{\otimes n}. \quad (4)$$

Note that when the graph is weighted, the operations being applied are instead general controlled phase operations and we call these weighted graph states. However, for qudits we need to differentiate two possibilities. If the weights of the graph are from the set of reals \mathbb{R} , then controlled phase operations are applied and we call these weighted graph states, but if we restrict the weights to the set of whole numbers modulo d (\mathbb{Z}_d) for qudit level d , then the applied operations are powers of CZ , with $CZ^d = \mathbb{I}$ and we call these graph states. Examples of graphs are shown in figure 1.

We will additionally be using hypergraphs, the generalisation of graphs to edges involving more than two vertices. A k -level hypergraph is defined similar to a graph, but instead $E \subseteq \bigoplus_{k'=2}^k V^{k'}$, meaning we can have edges involving two until k vertices. Similar to graphs, we can also have weighted hypergraphs with $E \subseteq \bigoplus_{k'=2}^k V^{k'} \times \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, the elements of E will be of the form $\mathbf{e} = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k, r\}$. For hypergraphs we use an adjacency tensor instead,

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{e}} = \begin{cases} r & \text{if } \mathbf{e} = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k, r\} \in E \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (5)$$




FIG. 2. Example of a weighted hypergraph. The left three vertices are connected by a hyperedge of weight φ_1 and the rightmost four vertices are connected by a hyperedge of weight φ_2 .

where for some \mathbf{e}' , if $|\mathbf{e}'| < k$ we fill the missing indices with 0's.

To define a hypergraph state, we first define the multi-controlled-Z ($CZ_{\mathbf{e}}$) operation on qudits in the set \mathbf{e} ,

$$CZ_{\mathbf{e}} = \sum_{k_{e_1}, \dots, k_{e_m}=0}^{d-1} \omega^{\bar{k}_{\mathbf{e}}} |k_{e_1} \dots k_{e_m}\rangle \langle k_{e_1} \dots k_{e_m}|, \quad (6)$$

where $m = |\mathbf{e}|$ is the size of the set \mathbf{e} and $\bar{k}_{\mathbf{e}} = \prod_{j=1}^m k_{e_j}$.

Then, the hypergraph state is defined identical to the graph state,

$$|G\rangle = \prod_{\mathbf{e} \in E} CZ_{\mathbf{e}}^{\Gamma_{\mathbf{e}}} |+\rangle^{\otimes n}, \quad (7)$$

meaning we apply a k' -controlled-Z operation for each hyperedge of size k' .

An example of a weighted hypergraph of $k = 4$ is shown in figure 2.

III. NON-SYMMETRIC GHZ (n -GHZ $_{\alpha}$) AND WEIGHTED HYPERGRAPHS

In this section, we establish that non-symmetric GHZ states (n -GHZ $_{\alpha}$),

$$|n\text{-GHZ}_{\alpha}\rangle = \cos \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} |00 \dots 0\rangle + \sin \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} |11 \dots 1\rangle, \quad (8)$$

are local unitary (LU) equivalent to *fully connected* weighted hypergraphs. With this, we provide a new perspective on the structure and properties of non-symmetric GHZ states. We provide the connection to weighted hypergraphs in the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *For a set of vertices V let us define E_k as the set of all k element combinations from V . Then a*




$ 2\text{-GHZ}_{\alpha}\rangle = \cos \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} 00\rangle + \sin \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} 11\rangle$ 
$ 3\text{-GHZ}_{\alpha}\rangle = \cos \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} 000\rangle + \sin \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} 111\rangle$ 
$ 4\text{-GHZ}_{\alpha}\rangle = \cos \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} 0000\rangle + \sin \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} 1111\rangle$ 

TABLE I. Examples of Fully Connected Weighted Hypergraphs for Two, Three, and Four Qubits. In each diagram, all edges/hyperedges have the same weight, which is indicated below the diagram. For example, in the middle diagram representing $|4\text{-GHZ}_{\alpha}\rangle$, each hyperedge connects three qubits ($k = 3$) and has a weight of 4α .

graph state

$$|G\rangle := \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \prod_{\mathbf{e} \in E_{k+1}} CZ_{\mathbf{e}}^{(-2)^k \alpha} |+\rangle^{\otimes V}, \quad (9)$$

corresponding to a fully connected control phase hypergraph $G(V, E)$ with the weight of each edge acting on $k+1$ vertices being equal to $(-2)^k \alpha \pi$ (see Table 1 and appendix B), is equivalent to $|n\text{-GHZ}_{\alpha}\rangle$ under a local unitary transformation,

$$|G\rangle = RZ_1^{\dagger}(\alpha\pi) P^{\dagger}(\alpha\pi)^{\otimes V/\{1\}} H^{\otimes V} P_1^{\dagger}(\pi/2) |n\text{-GHZ}_{\alpha}\rangle, \quad (10)$$

where,

$$RZ(\varphi) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\varphi/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\varphi/2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad P(\varphi) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\varphi} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

and the lower index indicates the particle the operation is acting on.

Proof. First, let us define $|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\rangle = |\mathbf{x}\rangle$, where \mathbf{x} is the decimal representation of $x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$. Let us also

define $w_{\mathbf{x}} = \text{Hamming Weight}(\mathbf{x})$, where the Hamming weight is the number of 1s in \mathbf{x} .

Now we apply the $P^\dagger(\pi/2)$ and H gates.

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\otimes V} P_1^\dagger\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) |n\text{-GHZ}_\alpha\rangle &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^n-1} \left(\cos \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} - (-1)^{w_{\mathbf{x}}} i \sin \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} \right) |\mathbf{x}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^n-1} e^{(-1)^{w_{\mathbf{x}}+1} i \frac{\alpha\pi}{2}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \quad (12) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^n-1} \omega^{(-1)^{w_{\mathbf{x}}+1} \frac{\alpha}{2}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Next let us apply the $RZ^\dagger(\alpha\pi)$ on the first qubit and $P^\dagger(\alpha\pi)$ on the rest.

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle &= P^\dagger(\alpha\pi)^{\otimes V/\{1\}} RZ_1^\dagger(\alpha\pi) \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^n-1} \omega^{(-1)^{w_{\mathbf{x}}+1} \frac{\alpha}{2}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^n-1} \omega^{\alpha \left(\frac{(-1)^{w_{\mathbf{x}}+1}}{2} - w_{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{1}{2} \right)} |\mathbf{x}\rangle. \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the fully connected hypergraph state,

$$\begin{aligned} |G\rangle &= \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \prod_{\mathbf{e} \in E_{k+1}} CZ_{\mathbf{e}}^{(-2)^k \alpha} |+\rangle^{\otimes V} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^n-1} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \prod_{\mathbf{e} \in E_{k+1}} CZ_{\mathbf{e}}^{(-2)^k \alpha} |\mathbf{x}\rangle. \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

For a given $|\mathbf{x}\rangle$ and k , upon the application of the CZ s for all $\mathbf{e} \in E_{k+1}$ we get

$$|\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow \omega^{\beta_k} |\mathbf{x}\rangle, \quad (15)$$

where $\beta_k = (-2)^k \alpha \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in E_{k+1}} \prod_{j \in \mathbf{e}} x_j$.

As only $w_{\mathbf{x}}$ of the x_j 's are 1 there are only $\binom{w_{\mathbf{x}}}{k+1}$ non zero terms in the sum and the non zero ones all have a value of 1. Therefore, we can simplify the exponent to,

$$\beta_k = (-2)^k \binom{w_{\mathbf{x}}}{k+1} \alpha. \quad (16)$$

We now can perform the product over all k , which will give us the following sum in the exponent of ω ,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \beta_k = \alpha \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (-2)^k \binom{w_{\mathbf{x}}}{k+1}. \quad (17)$$

We can simplify this further by noticing that $\binom{w_{\mathbf{x}}}{k} = 0$ if

$k > w_{\mathbf{x}}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (-2)^k \binom{w_{\mathbf{x}}}{k+1} &= -\frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{k=2}^{w_{\mathbf{x}}} (-2)^k \binom{w_{\mathbf{x}}}{k} \\ &= -\frac{\alpha}{2} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{w_{\mathbf{x}}} (-2)^k \binom{w_{\mathbf{x}}}{k} - 1 + 2w_{\mathbf{x}} \right) \\ &= -\frac{\alpha}{2} ((1-2)^{w_{\mathbf{x}}} - 1 + 2w_{\mathbf{x}}) \\ &= \alpha \left(\frac{(-1)^{w_{\mathbf{x}}+1}}{2} - w_{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the binomial theorem to obtain the 3rd line.

Writing the graph state using the above, we find it equal to $|\psi\rangle$,

$$|G\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^n-1} \omega^{\alpha \left(\frac{(-1)^{w_{\mathbf{x}}+1}}{2} - w_{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{1}{2} \right)} |\mathbf{x}\rangle = |\psi\rangle. \quad (19)$$

Therefore,

$$|G\rangle = RZ_1^\dagger(\alpha\pi) P^\dagger(\alpha\pi)^{\otimes V/\{1\}} H^{\otimes V} P_1^\dagger(\pi/2) |n\text{-GHZ}_\alpha\rangle, \quad (20)$$

proving the proposition. \square

Let us consider the case of $\alpha = 1/2$. For $k = 1$ the applied operations become CZ s, while for $k \geq 2$ the powers become multiples of 2 and hence the applied operations are simply identities. Consequently, the weighted hypergraph transforms to a *fully connected graph* (see figure 1), which is LU equivalent to the GHZ state. Hence, the proposition demonstrates a proper LU equivalence between n -GHZ $_\alpha$ and weighted hypergraphs, providing a robust framework for analyzing these states. By establishing this equivalence, we pave the way for utilizing graph-based techniques to study and manipulate non-symmetric GHZ states. This insight is particularly valuable for practical applications in quantum information processing, where understanding the structure and stabilizers of these states can lead to more efficient quantum algorithms and protocols. Therefore, in the next section, we will provide the stabilizer formalism for these states by adding a single ancilla.

IV. STABILIZERS FOR WEIGHTED HYPERGRAPHS FOR NON-SYMMETRIC GHZ STATES

An important feature of graph states is that they are stabilizer states. Unfortunately, weighted graph/hypergraph states are no longer stabilizer states. However, in this section, we demonstrate stabilizers for the *fully connected weighted hypergraph* that is LU equivalent to the non-symmetric GHZ state (see

Eq. (9)), by employing a *single ancilla*. Importantly, the number of ancillas remains fixed and does not depend on n , the number of particles in the non-symmetric GHZ state. The stabilizers for this weighted hypergraph are constructed using local operators. This approach is advantageous as it simplifies the implementation and analysis of the stabilizers compared to joint operators. In the following proposition we present the stabilizers and discuss the proof.

Proposition 2. *Given the weighted hypergraph state of $n = |V|$ qubits,*

$$|G\rangle = \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \prod_{e \in E_{k+1}} CZ_e^{(-2)^k \alpha} |+\rangle^{\otimes V}, \quad (21)$$

and a single ancilla, it is possible to stabilize the $n + 1$ qubit state, if the ancilla is connected to each of the n qubits through a CZ operation. The stabilizers are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} K_{G'}^{(1)} &= X \otimes Z \otimes Z \dots \otimes Z \\ K_{G'}^{(2)} &= X^\alpha Z X^{-\alpha} \otimes P^\dagger(\alpha\pi) X P(\alpha\pi) \otimes I \dots \otimes I \\ K_{G'}^{(3)} &= X^\alpha Z X^{-\alpha} \otimes I \otimes P^\dagger(\alpha\pi) X P(\alpha\pi) \dots \otimes I \\ &\dots \\ K_{G'}^{(n+1)} &= X^\alpha Z X^{-\alpha} \otimes I \otimes I \dots \otimes P^\dagger(\alpha\pi) X P(\alpha\pi), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where

$$X^\alpha := \frac{1}{2}((1 - e^{i\pi\alpha})I + (1 + e^{i\pi\alpha})X), \quad (23)$$

the first qubit is the ancilla and G' is the graph with the ancilla.

Proof. To prove this, we will be using a technique developed in [34], which shows local unitary equivalence between hypergraph states and specific weighted hypergraph states. Consider a hypergraph G' , and a real power α of X defined as,

$$X^\alpha := \frac{1}{2}((1 - e^{i\pi\alpha})I + (1 + e^{i\pi\alpha})X), \quad (24)$$

The application of X^α upon any vertex v_i of G' leads to a weighted hypergraph given by the following rules,

1. For each \mathbf{e} in $A_i = \{\mathbf{e} | \mathbf{e}/v_i \in E\}$ add a weight α to \mathbf{e} .
2. For each $k \leq n$, $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \dots, \mathbf{e}_k \in A_i$, $\mathbf{e}_1 \neq \mathbf{e}_2 \dots \neq \mathbf{e}_k$ add weight $(-2)^k \alpha$ to the edge $\mathbf{e}_1 \cup \mathbf{e}_2 \dots \cup \mathbf{e}_k$.

Now let us consider the star-shape graph of $n + 1$ qubits (see figure 1), for which we have,

$$E = \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \dots, \{1, n + 1\}\}. \quad (25)$$

Let us apply X^α on the central qubit, i.e. qubit 1. Then, A_1 will be,

$$A_1 = \{\{2\}, \{3\}, \dots, \{n + 1\}\}. \quad (26)$$

Hence, rule 1 tells us that local phase gates are applied on all the qubits except the central one. The second rule tells us that for each k combinations of the n qubits in A_1 , we add a hyperedge of weight $(-2)^k$ between those k particles. However, if we ignore the central qubit this is exactly the construction of the weighted hypergraph in Eq. (9). Therefore, if we consider the central qubit as an ancilla we get the construction given in the proposition. To get the stabilizers we simply consider the standard form of the stabilizers of a graph state,

$$K_G^{(j)} = X_j \prod_{k \in V} Z_k^{\Gamma_{jk}}, \quad (27)$$

and for our case consider the Γ matrix of the star-shape graph. We then conjugate the stabilizers with the operator,

$$X^\alpha \otimes P^\dagger(\alpha\pi) \otimes \dots \otimes P^\dagger(\alpha\pi), \quad (28)$$

where X^α is due to the original application and the phase gates are due to rule 1, which gives the stabilizers in the proposition for our weighted hypergraph with a single ancilla. \square

This approach not only provides a clear and practical method for stabilizing non-symmetric GHZ states but also provides a set of stabilizers which are commuting. Additionally, the construction always requires a single ancilla, and only CZ operations equal to the number of particles.

V. GENERALIZATION TO QUDITS

For qubits there is only one way to define a non-symmetric GHZ state as there are only two elements in the superposition. However, this is not the case for qudits, where the GHZ state is

$$|\text{GHZ}^d\rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} |kk\dots k\rangle. \quad (29)$$

Therefore, we have more degrees of freedom compared with the qubit case.

We would like to find a good candidate for a non-symmetric qudit GHZ state which also is connected to weighted hypergraphs. To this end we first generalize the application of X^α (see Eq. (23)) from qubits to qudits, using which we propose a candidate for non-symmetric qudit GHZ.

Let us first consider the commutation of X with the general CZ_e operation (see Eq. (6)). We find that (see Appendix A),

$$X_{e_1} CZ_e = CZ_e (\mathbb{I}_{e_1} \otimes CZ_{e/\{e_1\}}^\dagger) X_{e_1}. \quad (30)$$

Next let us generalise X^α to qudits. Using

$$X^\alpha = H^\dagger Z^\alpha H, \quad (31)$$

we find that (see Appendix A),

$$X^\alpha = \sum_{k,l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{l(\alpha-k)} X^k. \quad (32)$$

Similar to the qubit case we consider a qudit hypergraph $G(V, E)$ with

$$|G\rangle = \prod_{e \in E} CZ_e |+\rangle^{\otimes n} = CZ_G |+\rangle^{\otimes n}. \quad (33)$$

Additionally, we define the graph $\Delta_i G(V, \Delta_i E)$, where

$$\Delta_i E = \{\mathbf{e}/i | i \in \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e} \in E\}. \quad (34)$$

Using the commutation relation from Eq. (30),

$$\begin{aligned} X_i^\alpha |G\rangle &= \sum_{k,l} \omega^{l(\alpha-k)} X_i^k CZ_G |+\rangle^{\otimes n} \\ &= CZ_G \sum_{k,l} \omega^{l(\alpha-k)} CZ_{\Delta_i G}^\dagger X_i^k |+\rangle^{\otimes n} \\ &= \sum_{k,l} \omega^{l(\alpha-k)} CZ_{\Delta_i G}^\dagger CZ_G |+\rangle^{\otimes n} \\ &= CZ_{\Delta_i G}^{-\alpha} |G\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Therefore, like in the qubit case the action of X^α has introduced new weighted hyperedges to our hypergraph.

Similar to the qubit case we consider the qudit *star-shape graph* $G(V, E)$ (see figure 1),

$$E = \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \dots, \{1, n+1\}\}. \quad (36)$$

We apply X^α on the central qudit, i.e. qudit 1, which gives us,

$$\Delta_1 E = \{\{2\}, \{3\}, \dots, \{n+1\}\}. \quad (37)$$

Therefore, the additional weighted hypergraph added is,

$$CZ_{\Delta_1 G}^{-\alpha} = (Z_2 Z_3 \dots Z_{n+1})^{-\alpha}, \quad (38)$$

as an edge with a single vertex is simply a local operation. This does not look like a weighted hypergraph as Z is a local operation, however, in general (see Appendix C),

$$(Z_2 Z_3 \dots Z_{n+1})^{-\alpha} \neq Z_2^{-\alpha} Z_3^{-\alpha} \dots Z_{n+1}^{-\alpha}. \quad (39)$$

To expand the brackets we need to include non-local operations. For example in the qubit case those non-local operations are what give rise to the weighted hypergraph in Eq. (9). However, in the case of qudits, we find that the non-local operations are not of the form of CZ_e^α but are of the form,

$$CP_e(\vec{\alpha}) = \sum_{k_{e_1}, \dots, k_{e_m}=0}^{d-1} \omega^{\vec{\alpha} k_e} |k_{e_1} \dots k_{e_m}\rangle \langle k_{e_1} \dots k_{e_m}|, \quad (40)$$

where k_e is the decimal representation of $k_{e_1} k_{e_2} \dots k_{e_m}$. Therefore, $CP_e(\vec{\alpha})$ is diagonal matrix of phases decided by the vector $\vec{\alpha}$. These don't follow a pattern like the qubit case, and therefore we need to use an algorithm to find the exact operations to apply (see Appendix C).

With the above results we are ready to define a non-symmetric qudit GHZ. First we note that for qubits,

$$|n\text{-GHZ}_\alpha\rangle = \omega^{\alpha/2} \prod_{k=2}^n CX_{1k} X_1 X_1^\alpha |0\rangle^{\otimes n}. \quad (41)$$

Therefore, we define the non-symmetric GHZ state, $|n\text{-GHZ}_\alpha^d\rangle$, for qudits as,

$$\begin{aligned} |n\text{-GHZ}_\alpha^d\rangle &:= \prod_{k=2}^n CX_{1k} X_1^\alpha |0\rangle^{\otimes n} \\ &= \sum_{k,l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{l(\alpha-k)} |kk \dots k\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Now let us show that this state is indeed local unitary equivalent to the weighted hypergraph from Eq. (38). We apply Hadamards on all qudits,

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\otimes n} |n\text{-GHZ}_\alpha^d\rangle &= \sum_{k,l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{l(\alpha-k)} H^{\otimes n} |kk \dots k\rangle \\ &= \sum_{k,l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{l(\alpha-k)} \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^d-1} \omega^{k w_{\mathbf{x}}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Writing $w_{\mathbf{x}} = dq_{\mathbf{x}} + r_{\mathbf{x}}$ for some integers $q_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $0 \leq r_{\mathbf{x}} \leq d-1$ the state can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^d-1} \sum_{k,l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{l\alpha} \omega^{k(r_{\mathbf{x}}-l)} |\mathbf{x}\rangle &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^d-1} \sum_{l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{l\alpha} \delta_{r_{\mathbf{x}},l} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^d-1} \omega^{r_{\mathbf{x}}\alpha} |\mathbf{x}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

We can show that this is exactly the state for the

weighted hypergraph $\Delta_1 G$. We consider the following

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1 Z_2 \dots Z_n |+\rangle^{\otimes n} &= \sum_{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n=0}^{d-1} \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \omega^{x_j} |x_j\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^d-1} \omega^{w_{\mathbf{x}}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^d-1} \omega^{r_{\mathbf{x}}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Therefore, as $Z_1 Z_2 \dots Z_n$ is diagonal we get,

$$(Z_1 Z_2 \dots Z_n)^\alpha = \sum_{\mathbf{x}=0}^{2^d-1} \omega^{\alpha r_{\mathbf{x}}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle. \quad (46)$$

And hence the weighted hypergraph obtained from applying $X^{-\alpha}$ on the central qudit of a *star-shaped graph* and then tracing out the central qudit, is equivalent to $|n\text{-GHZ}_\alpha^d\rangle$.

The stabilizers are given similarly to the qubit case,

$$\begin{aligned} K_{G'}^{(1)} &= X \otimes Z \otimes Z \dots \otimes Z \\ K_{G'}^{(2)} &= X^{-\alpha} Z X^\alpha \otimes P^\dagger(\alpha\pi) X P(\alpha\pi) \otimes I \dots \otimes I \\ K_{G'}^{(3)} &= X^{-\alpha} Z X^\alpha \otimes I \otimes P^\dagger(\alpha\pi) X P(\alpha\pi) \dots \otimes I \\ &\dots \\ K_{G'}^{(n+1)} &= X^{-\alpha} Z X^\alpha \otimes I \otimes I \dots \otimes P^\dagger(\alpha\pi) X P(\alpha\pi). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

The stabilizer formalism for non-symmetric GHZ states in qudit systems is highly analogous to that in qubit systems, as described in Eq. (22). The key difference between the qudit and qubit cases is the sign of the parameter α in the power of X . This distinction arises due to the Hermitian conjugate in the commutation relation between the generalized X operator and the CZ_e , as discussed in Eq. (30). This subtle variation ensures that the stabilizer formalism accurately reflects the underlying algebraic structure of the qudit system, while maintaining the overall framework established for qubits.

VI. CONTROLLED-UNITARY (CU) GRAPH STATES

In this section, we extend the formalism of graph states by incorporating controlled unitary U operations as entangling gates rather than the traditional diagonal operators such as controlled-Z (CZ) for graph and hypergraph states and controlled-phase (CZ^α) gates for weighted graph states. This formalism not only broadens the scope of graph states but also provides a versatile framework for representing non-symmetric GHZ states. It allows us to represent the most general non-symmetric qudit GHZ




FIG. 3. Controlled-Unitary (CU) Star-Shaped Graph. In this graph, the central vertex is the target, and all other vertices are the controls. The non-symmetric GHZ state, Eq. (48), is local unitary (LU) equivalent to this CU graph

state,

$$|n\text{-GHZ}_{\vec{a}}\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} a_j |jj \dots j\rangle, \quad (48)$$

where $\vec{a} = \{a_0, a_2, \dots, a_{d-1}\} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, as a *star-shaped graph* with controlled- U (CU) operations. In the following proposition we present the graph and the LU transformation, and discuss the proof.

Proposition 3. *Given the general non-symmetric qudit GHZ,*

$$|n\text{-GHZ}_{\vec{a}}\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} a_j |jj \dots j\rangle, \quad (49)$$

there exists a LU transformation that takes $|n\text{-GHZ}_{\vec{a}}\rangle$ to a star-shaped controlled-unitary- U graph (see figure 3), for

$$U = H A^\dagger Z A H^\dagger, \quad (50)$$

where the operator A is defined as,

$$A |0\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} a_j |j\rangle. \quad (51)$$

Proof. First let us consider the construction of $|n\text{-GHZ}_{\vec{a}}\rangle$ using the A operator above and control- X (CX) operations $n-1$ times,

$$|n\text{-GHZ}_{\vec{a}}\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} a_j |jj \dots j\rangle = \prod_{k=2}^n C X_{1k} A_1 |00 \dots 0\rangle. \quad (52)$$

Now let us apply Hadamards on all the qudits except the first one.

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{l=2}^n H_l |n\text{-GHZ}_{ns}\rangle &= \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} a_j |j\rangle \sum_{k=0}^{d^{n-1}-1} \omega^{j(k_1+\dots+k_{n-1})} |k\rangle \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} a_j |j\rangle \sum_{k=0}^{d^{n-1}-1} \omega^{jw_k} |k\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Next we apply CZ^\dagger operators $n-1$ times with the control on the first qudit and the targets as the rest.

$$\prod_{l=2}^n CZ_{1l}^\dagger \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} a_j |j\rangle \sum_{k=0}^{d^{n-1}-1} \omega^{jw_k} |k\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} a_j |j\rangle \sum_{k=0}^{d^{n-1}-1} |k\rangle. \quad (54)$$

Lastly we apply HA^\dagger to the first qudit,

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 A_1^\dagger \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} a_j |j\rangle \sum_{k=0}^{d^{n-1}-1} |k\rangle &= \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} |j\rangle \sum_{k=0}^{d^{n-1}-1} |k\rangle \\ &= \sum_{k'=0}^{d^n-1} |k'\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where k' is the decimal representation of $jk_1k_2\dots k_{n-1}$. Hence, we have found that the operation,

$$H_1 A_1^\dagger \prod_{l=2}^n CZ_{1l}^\dagger H_l. \quad (56)$$

Takes $|n\text{-GHZ}_{\bar{a}}\rangle$ to $|+\rangle^{\otimes n}$. We can rewrite this operation as,

$$H_1 A_1^\dagger \prod_{l=2}^n CZ_{1l}^\dagger H_l A_1 H_1^\dagger H_1 A_1^\dagger = \prod_{l=2}^n CU_{1l}^\dagger H_l H_1 A_1^\dagger, \quad (57)$$

where

$$U = HA^\dagger ZAH^\dagger. \quad (58)$$

Therefore, a CU star-shaped graph state is LU equivalent to $|n\text{-GHZ}_{\bar{a}}\rangle$, proving the proposition. \square

Note that in general the CU operations are non-commuting, however in this case as the targets are all on the central qudit and the graph is *star-shaped*, the edges still commute for any U .

As an example we can consider the qubit situation with $A = XX^\alpha$, which gave rise to the weighted hypergraph in Eq. (9). We find that in this case,

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\alpha\pi} \\ e^{-i\alpha\pi} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (59)$$

With this formalism it is now possible to consider different candidates for A and find if any give rise to

reasonable and implementable CU operations.

The introduction of controlled unitary U operations as entangling gates in graph states offers a powerful and flexible method for constructing and analyzing non-symmetric GHZ states. By leveraging this generalized formalism, we can achieve a deeper understanding of the entanglement dynamics and develop more efficient quantum algorithms and protocols.

VII. DISCUSSION

In this paper, we have explored the representation and stabilization of non-symmetric GHZ states using graph and hypergraph formalisms. We demonstrated that non-symmetric GHZ states, which are not local unitary (LU) equivalent to traditional graph states, can be represented as *fully-connected* weighted hypergraphs. We discussed that the weight of each edge depends on the number of vertices it connects. Furthermore, we have demonstrated that it is possible to stabilize these weighted hypergraph states using local operations and only adding a *single ancilla qubit*. We also extended our formalism to qudit systems, providing a generalization of the non-symmetric GHZ state to qudits. We presented the corresponding weighted hypergraph for the qudit states and the stabilizers involving a *single qudit ancilla*.

In addition, we introduced a generalized graph state formalism incorporating controlled unitary (CU) operations as entangling gates rather than the traditional diagonal operators such as CZ and CP gates. This formalism allows for constructing the most general form of a non-symmetric qudit GHZ state and provides a versatile framework for representing and analyzing these states. Notably, the CU part provides a graph representation for the non-symmetric GHZ states in a *star-shape*. This is similar to the two graph states that represent GHZ states with equal coefficients: the *fully-connected* and *star-shaped graphs*.

In the future, we would like to investigate whether non-symmetric versions of other important quantum states are equivalent to weighted hypergraphs or CU graphs. Additionally, exploring the practical applications of these generalized graph states in quantum algorithms and protocols could lead to significant advancements. Leveraging these insights and techniques will help achieve a deeper understanding of entanglement dynamics and enhance the development of efficient quantum technologies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would thank Otfried Gühne, Géza Tóth, and Karol Życzkowski for the fruitful discussions.

Appendix A: Commutation of X with the general CZ_e operator and X^α operator

In this appendix, we delve into the commutation properties of the generalized CZ_e operator with the X operator for qudits. This analysis extends the discussion presented in the reference [34] for qubits to qudit systems. We begin by considering the general form of the CZ_e operation and its interaction with the X operator for a specific vertex. This commutation relation will allow us to consider the action of X^α for qudits on qudit hypergraphs.

We consider the general CZ_e operation

$$CZ_e = \sum_{k_{e_1}, \dots, k_{e_m}=0}^{d-1} \omega^{\bar{k}_e} |k_{e_1} \dots k_{e_m}\rangle \langle k_{e_1} \dots k_{e_m}|, \quad (\text{A1})$$

and its commutation with X_{e_1} for some vertex e_1

$$X_{e_1} CZ_e X_{e_1}^\dagger = \sum_{k_{e_1}, \dots, k_{e_m}=0}^{d-1} \omega^{\bar{k}_e} |k_{e_1} + 1, \dots, k_{e_m}\rangle \langle k_{e_1} + 1, \dots, k_{e_m}|, \quad (\text{A2})$$

multiplying on the left by CZ_e^\dagger we find,

$$\begin{aligned} CZ_e^\dagger X_{e_1} CZ_e X_{e_1}^\dagger &= \sum_{l_{e_1}, \dots, l_{e_m}=0}^{d-1} \sum_{k_{e_1}, \dots, k_{e_m}=0}^{d-1} \omega^{\bar{k}_e - \bar{l}_e} |l_{e_1}, \dots, l_{e_m}\rangle \langle l_{e_1}, \dots, l_{e_m} | k_{e_1} + 1, \dots, k_{e_m}\rangle \langle k_{e_1} + 1, \dots, k_{e_m}| \\ &= \sum_{l_{e_1}, \dots, l_{e_m}=0}^{d-1} \sum_{k_{e_1}, \dots, k_{e_m}=0}^{d-1} \omega^{\bar{k}_e - \bar{l}_e} \delta_{l_{e_1}-1, k_{e_1}} \prod_{j=2}^m \delta_{l_{e_j}, k_{e_j}} |l_{e_1}, \dots, l_{e_m}\rangle \langle k_{e_1} + 1, \dots, k_{e_m}| \\ &= \sum_{l_{e_1}=1}^{d-1} \sum_{l_{e_2}, \dots, l_{e_m}=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-\bar{l}_e / \{e_1\}} |l_{e_1} \dots l_{e_m}\rangle \langle l_{e_1} \dots l_{e_m}| + \sum_{l_{e_2}, \dots, l_{e_m}=0}^{d-1} \omega^{(d-1)\bar{l}_e / \{e_1\}} |0 \dots l_{e_m}\rangle \langle 0 \dots l_{e_m}| \\ &= \sum_{l_{e_1}=0}^{d-1} |l_{e_1}\rangle \langle l_{e_1}| \otimes \sum_{l_{e_2}, \dots, l_{e_m}=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-\bar{l}_e / \{e_1\}} |l_{e_2} \dots l_{e_m}\rangle \langle l_{e_2} \dots l_{e_m}| = \mathbb{I}_{e_1} \otimes CZ_{e/\{e_1\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where to get the last line we used that $\omega^d = 1$. Therefore, we have,

$$X_{e_1} CZ_e = CZ_e (\mathbb{I}_{e_1} \otimes CZ_{e/\{e_1\}}) X_{e_1}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Next, we use the following to write down X^α

$$H = \sum_{j,k=0}^{d-1} \omega^{jk} |j\rangle \langle k| \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$H^\dagger = \sum_{j,k=0}^{d-1} \omega^{jk} |j\rangle \langle k| \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$Z = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \omega^j |j\rangle \langle j| \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$X = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} |j+1\rangle \langle j| \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$X = H^\dagger Z H \quad (\text{A9})$$


$$X^\alpha = H^\dagger Z^\alpha H. \quad (\text{A10})$$

Using the above equations we can write,

$$\begin{aligned}
X^\alpha &= \sum_{j',k',j,k,l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{jk} \omega^{-j'k'} \omega^{\alpha l} |j'\rangle \langle k'|l\rangle \langle l|j\rangle \langle k| \\
&= \sum_{j',k',j,k,l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{jk} \omega^{-j'k'} \omega^{\alpha l} \delta_{k',l} \delta_{j,l} |j'\rangle \langle k| \\
&= \sum_{j',k,l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{lk} \omega^{-j'l} \omega^{\alpha l} |j'\rangle \langle k| \\
&= \sum_{j,k,l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{l(j-(k+j)+\alpha)} |j+k\rangle \langle j| \\
&= \sum_{j,k,l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{l(\alpha-k)} |j+k\rangle \langle j| \\
&= \sum_{k,l=0}^{d-1} \omega^{l(\alpha-k)} X^k.
\end{aligned} \tag{A11}$$

By deriving the form of X^α for qudits, we have laid the groundwork for describing non-symmetric qudit GHZ states using weighted hypergraphs.

Appendix B: Fully connected weighted hypergraph for 5 qubits



Hence we require the higher order correcting terms. The higher order terms need to be calculated using an algorithm, which we provide here. We would like to be able to split the higher order correcting terms based on the number of qudits that they act on. Hence, we do the following,

1. Consider a $d^2 \times d^2$ identity matrix I_{ij} acting on two particles i and j . For the state $|x_i x_j\rangle$, calculate the number k of ω^d s in the phase of the state upon the application of $Z_1^\alpha Z_2^\alpha \dots Z_n^\alpha$. Add a phase $\omega^{-k d \alpha}$ to the $|x_i x_j\rangle \langle x_i x_j|$ element of I_{ij} .
2. Repeat for all possible values of x_i and x_j such that $x_i, x_j \neq 0$. The obtained matrices I_{ij} are the correction that needs to be applied between all possible two qudit combinations i and j .
3. Consider a $d^3 \times d^3$ identity matrix I_{ijl} acting on three particles i, j, l . For the state $|x_i x_j x_l\rangle$, calculate the number k of ω^d s in the phase of the state upon the application of $Z_1^\alpha Z_2^\alpha \dots Z_n^\alpha$. Add a phase $\omega^{-k d \alpha}$ to the $|x_i x_j x_l\rangle \langle x_i x_j x_l|$ element of I_{ijl} .
4. For the state $|x_i x_j x_l\rangle$, consider the phase ω^p upon the application of $I_{ij} I_{il} I_{jl}$, i.e. all possible combinations of 2 from i, j, l . Add a phase ω^{-p} to the to the $|x_i x_j x_l\rangle \langle x_i x_j x_l|$ element of I_{ijl} .
5. Repeat for all possible values of x_i, x_j and x_l such that $x_i, x_j, x_l \neq 0$. The obtained matrices I_{ijl} are the correction that needs to be applied between all possible three qudit combinations i, j and l .
6. Repeat the above recursively until the number of qudits being applied on is n .

The resultant matrices $I_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_r}$ for $2 \leq r \leq n$ are the higher order correcting terms which give rise to the weighted hypergraph upon the application of X^α on the qudit star-shape graph.

-
- [1] C. L. Degen, F. Reinhard, and P. Cappellaro. Quantum sensing. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 89:035002, Jul 2017. doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.89.035002. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.89.035002>.
- [2] Nathan Shettell and Damian Markham. Graph states as a resource for quantum metrology. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 124:110502, Mar 2020. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.110502. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.110502>.
- [3] Mark Hillery, Vladimír Bužek, and André Berthiaume. Quantum secret sharing. *Phys. Rev. A*, 59:1829–1834, Mar 1999. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.59.1829.
- [4] T Gao, F L Yan, and Z X Wang. Deterministic secure direct communication using ghz states and swapping quantum entanglement. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 38(25):5761, jun 2005. doi:10.1088/0305-4470/38/25/011.
- [5] She-Xiang Jiang, Ri-Gui Zhou, Ruiqing Xu, and Gaofeng Luo. Cyclic hybrid double-channel quantum communication via bell-state and ghz-state in noisy environments. *IEEE Access*, 7:80530–80541, 2019. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2923322.
- [6] Ahmed Farouk, J. Batle, M. Elhoseny, Mosayeb Naseri, Muzaffar Lone, Alex Fedorov, Majid Alkhambashi, Syed Hassan Ahmed, and M. Abdel-Aty. Robust general n user authentication scheme in a centralized quantum communication network via generalized ghz states. *Frontiers of Physics*, 13(130306), nov 2017. doi: 10.1007/s11467-017-0717-3.
- [7] M. Hein, J. Eisert, and H. J. Briegel. Multiparty entanglement in graph states. *Phys. Rev. A*, 69:062311, Jun 2004. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.69.062311.
- [8] M. Hein, Dür W., Eisert J., Raussendorf R., Van den Nest M., and Briegel H. J. Entanglement in graph states and its applications. 2006. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0602096>.
- [9] Daniel Gottesman. Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction, 1997. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9705052>.
- [10] M Rossi, M Huber, D Bruß, and C Macchiavello. Quantum hypergraph states. *New Journal of Physics*, 15(11): 113022, nov 2013. doi:10.1088/1367-2630/15/11/113022.
- [11] Ri Qu, Juan Wang, Zong-shang Li, and Yan-ru Bao. Encoding hypergraphs into quantum states. *Phys. Rev. A*, 87:022311, Feb 2013. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.87.022311.
- [12] Otfried Gühne, Martí Cuquet, Frank E S Steinhoff, Tobias Moroder, Matteo Rossi, Dagmar Bruß, Barbara Kraus, and Chiara Macchiavello. Entanglement and non-classical properties of hypergraph states. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 47(33):335303, aug 2014. doi:10.1088/1751-8113/47/33/335303.
- [13] Damian Markham and Barry C. Sanders. Graph states for quantum secret sharing. *Phys. Rev. A*, 78:042309, Oct 2008. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.78.042309.
- [14] Adrian Keet, Ben Fortescue, Damian Markham, and Barry C. Sanders. Quantum secret sharing with qudit graph states. *Phys. Rev. A*, 82:062315, Dec 2010. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.82.062315.
- [15] B. A. Bell, D. Markham, D. A. Herrera-Martí, A. Marin, W. J. Wadsworth, J. G. Rarity, and M. S. Tame. Experimental demonstration of graph-state quantum secret sharing. *Nature Communications*, 5(5480), nov 2014. doi: 10.1038/ncomms6480.
- [16] M. Grassl, A. Klappenecker, and M. Rotteler. Graphs, quadratic forms, and quantum codes. In *Proceedings IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 45–, 2002. doi:10.1109/ISIT.2002.1023317.
- [17] D. Schlingemann and R. F. Werner. Quantum error-

- correcting codes associated with graphs. *Phys. Rev. A*, 65:012308, Dec 2001. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.65.012308.
- [18] M Rossi, D Bruß, and C Macchiavello. Hypergraph states in grover’s quantum search algorithm. *Physica Scripta*, 2014(T160):014036, apr 2014. doi:10.1088/0031-8949/2014/T160/014036.
- [19] Jieshan Huang, Xudong Li, Xiaojiong Chen, Chonghao Zhai, Yun Zheng, Yulin Chi, Yan Li, Qiongyi He, Qihuang Gong, and Jianwei Wang. Demonstration of hypergraph-state quantum information processing. *Nature Communications*, 15(2601), mar 2024. doi:10.1038/s41467-024-46830-7.
- [20] Maarten Van den Nest, Akimasa Miyake, Wolfgang Dür, and Hans J. Briegel. Universal resources for measurement-based quantum computation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 97:150504, Oct 2006. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.150504.
- [21] Mariami Gachechiladze, Otfried Gühne, and Akimasa Miyake. Changing the circuit-depth complexity of measurement-based quantum computation with hypergraph states. *Phys. Rev. A*, 99:052304, May 2019. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.99.052304.
- [22] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac. Three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways. *Phys. Rev. A*, 62:062314, Nov 2000. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.62.062314.
- [23] Sudha, Usha Devi A R, Akshata Shenoy H, Karthik H S, Humera Talath, Govindaraja B P, and Rajagopal A K. Entanglement and volume monogamy features of permutation symmetric n-qubit pure states with n-distinct spinors: Ghz and wvbar states, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.06369>.
- [24] Laura Serino, Werner Ridder, Abhinandan Bhattacharjee, Jano Gil-Lopez, Benjamin Brecht, and Christine Silberhorn. Orchestrating time and color: a programmable source of high-dimensional entanglement, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.04909>.
- [25] Tinggui Zhang, Hong Yang, and Shao-Ming Fei. System–environment dynamics of ghz-like states in noninertial frames. *Quantum Information Processing*, 22(331), sep 2023. doi:10.1007/s11128-023-04081-3.
- [26] Hyunseok Jeong and Nguyen Ba An. Greenberger-horne-zeilinger–type and w -type entangled coherent states: Generation and bell-type inequality tests without photon counting. *Phys. Rev. A*, 74:022104, Aug 2006. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.74.022104.
- [27] S. J. van Enk and O. Hirota. Entangled coherent states: Teleportation and decoherence. *Phys. Rev. A*, 64:022313, Jul 2001. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.64.022313.
- [28] Ba An Nguyen and Jaewan Kim. Multimode cat-state entanglement and network teleportation, 2003. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0303149>.
- [29] H. Prakash, N. Chandra, R. Prakash, and Shivani. Improving the teleportation of entangled coherent states. *Phys. Rev. A*, 75:044305, Apr 2007. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.75.044305.
- [30] L Hartmann, J Calsamiglia, W Dür, and H J Briegel. Weighted graph states and applications to spin chains, lattices and gases. *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics*, 40(9):S1, apr 2007. doi:10.1088/0953-4075/40/9/S01.
- [31] Mark A. Webster, Benjamin J. Brown, and Stephen D. Bartlett. The XP Stabiliser Formalism: a Generalisation of the Pauli Stabiliser Formalism with Arbitrary Phases. *Quantum*, 6:815, September 2022. ISSN 2521-327X. doi:10.22331/q-2022-09-22-815.
- [32] Tatjana Carle, Barbara Kraus, Wolfgang Dür, and Julio I. de Vicente. Purification to locally maximally entangleable states. *Phys. Rev. A*, 87:012328, Jan 2013. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.87.012328.
- [33] D. M. Appleby. Symmetric informationally complete–positive operator valued measures and the extended Clifford group. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 46(5):052107, 04 2005. ISSN 0022-2488. doi:10.1063/1.1896384.
- [34] Nikoloz Tsimakuridze and Otfried Gühne. Graph states and local unitary transformations beyond local clifford operations. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 50(19):195302, apr 2017. doi:10.1088/1751-8121/aa67cd.