

The moment polytope of matrix multiplication is not maximal

Maxim van den Berg^{1,2}, Matthias Christandl³, Vladimir Lysikov¹, Harold Nieuwboer³,
Michael Walter¹, and Jeroen Zuiddam²

¹Ruhr University Bochum, Bochum, Germany

²University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

³University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

Abstract

Moment polytopes of tensors, the study of which is deeply rooted in invariant theory, representation theory and symplectic geometry, have found relevance in numerous places, from quantum information (entanglement polytopes) and algebraic complexity theory (GCT program and the complexity of matrix multiplication) to optimization (scaling algorithms). Towards an open problem in algebraic complexity theory, we prove separations between the moment polytopes of matrix multiplication tensors and unit tensors. As a consequence, we find that matrix multiplication moment polytopes are not maximal, i.e. are strictly contained in the corresponding Kronecker polytope. As another consequence, we obtain a no-go result for a natural operational characterization of moment polytope inclusion in terms of asymptotic restriction. We generalize the separation and non-maximality to moment polytopes of iterated matrix multiplication tensors. Our result implies that tensor networks where multipartite entanglement structures beyond two-party entanglement are allowed can go beyond projected entangled-pair states (PEPS) in terms of expressivity.

Our proof characterizes membership of uniform points in moment polytopes of tensors, and establishes a connection to polynomial multiplication tensors via the minrank of matrix subspaces. As a result of independent interest, we extend these techniques to obtain a new proof of the optimal border subrank bound for matrix multiplication.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	7
2.1	Semistability, polystability, and invariants	7
2.2	Moment polytopes under restriction and degeneration	8
3	Moment polytope separation for matrix multiplication and unit tensors	9
3.1	Uniform points in the moment polytope and semistability	9
3.2	Matrix pencils and polynomial multiplication tensors	10
3.3	The minrank of a tensor	11
3.4	Minrank of degenerations of matrix multiplication	12
3.5	Proof of Theorem 1.4	13
4	Extensions, applications and further results	13
4.1	Separation for iterated matrix multiplication and unit tensors	13
4.2	Border subrank of matrix multiplication	14
4.3	Asymptotic restriction does not imply moment polytope inclusion	15

1 Introduction

Moment polytopes of tensors, the study of which is deeply rooted in invariant theory, representation theory and symplectic geometry [NM84, Bri87], have found relevance in numerous places, from algebraic complexity theory (in particular, the geometric complexity program [BI11, BCI11] and asymptotic spectra [Str05, CVZ21, WZ22]) and quantum information (quantum marginals and entanglement polytopes [CM06, Kly04, CHM07, WDG13, SOK14, Wal14]) to optimization (scaling algorithms [BFG⁺18, BFG⁺19]). These polytopes admit various descriptions, notably in terms of the types of irreducible representations that appear in the Schur–Weyl decomposition of powers of the tensor and in terms of quantum marginals of elements in the orbit closure of the tensor.

Bürgisser and Ikenmeyer [BI11, Problem 7.3], motivated by questions in algebraic complexity and quantum information, posed as a central open problem to determine the moment polytopes of the matrix multiplication tensors and the unit tensors (diagonal tensors). A construction of Bürgisser, Christandl and Ikenmeyer [BCI11, Theorem 1] implies that the moment polytope of the unit tensor contains all points which are uniform on two of the three subsystems. However, no further progress has been made on this problem since then.

We prove separations between moment polytopes of matrix multiplication and unit tensors of varying sizes. As a consequence, we find that the moment polytope of matrix multiplication is not equal to the maximal moment polytope (i.e. the Kronecker polytope). We extend this to separations and non-maximality for iterated matrix multiplication tensors, and derive implications for the expressivity of tensor network representations of quantum states (which has seen much recent interest, e.g. [CLVW20, CLS⁺24, LQY12, BDLG22]).

We summarize our main results here and discuss these in more detail in the rest of the paper:

- We prove a range of separations between moment polytopes of tensors, namely for matrix multiplication and unit tensors (diagonal tensors). These in particular imply strictness of inclusions of matrix multiplication moment polytopes in Kronecker polytopes. This constitutes the first progress towards an open problem of Bürgisser and Ikenmeyer [BI11, Problem 7.3], going beyond previous constructions of moment polytope points of Bürgisser, Christandl and Ikenmeyer [BCI11, Theorem 1].
- As a central ingredient for the above we further develop minrank of tensors and polynomial multiplication tensors. We use these ingredients to give a new proof of the optimal border subrank upper bound for matrix multiplication tensors that was previously obtained using geometric rank [Str87, KMZ23].
- As another consequence, we rule out an, *a priori* natural, asymptotic characterization of moment polytope inclusion in terms of asymptotic restriction, which originates from the study of matrix multiplication algorithms [Str87, CVZ21].
- In the context of quantum information theory, as a consequence of the above, we show there exist joint marginals realizable by pure multipartite quantum states, which are not realizable (even approximately) by matrix product states (MPS) with certain bond dimensions. This implies that projected entangled-pair states (PEPS) become more expressive when allowing genuine multipartite entanglement structures beyond the standard choice of two-party maximally entangled states.

Moment polytopes of tensors

Let $V = \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ be the space of $a \times b \times c$ tensors. The product of general linear groups $GL = GL_a \times GL_b \times GL_c$ naturally acts on V by local basis transformations.¹ To every $T \in V$ are

¹We may leave a, b, c implicit when clear from the context and just refer to GL .

naturally associated linear maps $T_1: \mathbb{C}^a \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$, $T_2: \mathbb{C}^b \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ and $T_3: \mathbb{C}^c \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b$ from which we obtain positive semidefinite matrices $T_1^*T_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{a \times a}$, $T_2^*T_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{b \times b}$ and $T_3^*T_3 \in \mathbb{C}^{c \times c}$. Let

$$\mu_i: T \mapsto \frac{T_i^*T_i}{\text{Tr}(T_i^*T_i)}. \quad (1.1)$$

The moment map $\mu: \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{a \times a} \times \mathbb{C}^{b \times b} \times \mathbb{C}^{c \times c}$ is defined by

$$\mu(T) := (\mu_1(T), \mu_2(T), \mu_3(T)). \quad (1.2)$$

Note that $\text{Tr}(T_i^*T_i) = \|T\|^2$ does not depend on i . For any positive semidefinite matrix $M \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, let $\text{spec}(M) = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \geq 0$, denote the eigenvalues of M , non-increasingly ordered. Define

$$\text{spec}(\mu(T)) := (\text{spec}(\mu_1(T)) \mid \text{spec}(\mu_2(T)) \mid \text{spec}(\mu_3(T))) \in \mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}^b \times \mathbb{R}^c,$$

where \mid separates the three components of $\mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}^b \times \mathbb{R}^c$.

Definition 1.1. For any irreducible algebraic variety $W \subseteq \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ that is closed under the action of GL , the *moment polytope* of W is defined as

$$\Delta(W) := \{ \text{spec}(\mu(S)) \mid S \in W \setminus \{0\} \} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}^b \times \mathbb{R}^c.$$

In the context of quantum information theory, the moment polytopes is also called the *entanglement polytope* of W [WDGC13].

Note that because GL can scale elements of $\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$, any algebraic variety W that is closed under GL is an (algebraic) cone. Because μ is invariant under scaling, we may equivalently work in projective space. This is the viewpoint of Ness, Mumford and Brion. We state their result in our setting.

Theorem 1.2 ([NM84, Bri87, WDGC13]²). *Let $W \subseteq \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ be an irreducible algebraic variety that is closed under the action of GL . Then $\Delta(W)$ is a (bounded convex) polytope with rational vertices.*

For any tensor $T \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$, let $\text{GL} \cdot T$ denote its GL -orbit and $\overline{\text{GL} \cdot T}$ the closure in the Euclidean topology (which is the same as the Zariski-closure³). The orbit closure $\overline{\text{GL} \cdot T}$ is also irreducible⁴. The moment polytope of T is then defined as

$$\Delta(T) := \Delta(\overline{\text{GL} \cdot T}).$$

There is a second description of the moment polytope via representation theory [NM84, Bri87, CVZ21, BFG⁺18] and a third description in terms of achievable supports of the tensor under the action of lower triangular matrices [Fra02]. The representation-theoretic characterization exhibits the moment polytope as the set of normalized highest weights of GL whose irreducible representations in $(\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c)^{\otimes n}$ have non-zero overlap with $T^{\otimes n}$ for some $n > 0$.

²To be able to apply the theorem of Mumford–Ness and Brion, we furthermore need to show that irreducibility of a variety W that is a cone is equivalent to irreducibility of the projective variety $\mathbb{P}(W) \subseteq \mathbb{P}(V)$ consisting of the lines through W , which is not hard to do.

³This is because the orbit is constructible [Bor12, Section AG.1.3, Corollary AG.10.2].

⁴The group GL is irreducible as it is connected [Bor12, Proposition I.1.2], which implies that $\overline{\text{GL} \cdot T}$ is irreducible as well.

Kronecker polytope and moment polytopes for matrix multiplication and unit tensors

The moment polytope $\Delta(\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c)$ for the whole space $\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ is called the *Kronecker polytope*. It has an alternative description in terms of the Kronecker coefficients for the symmetric group. For every tensor $T \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$, we have $\Delta(T) \subseteq \Delta(\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c)$ and it can be shown that for generic T , we have $\Delta(T) = \Delta(\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c)$.⁵ Determining $\Delta(\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c)$ is a hard problem with a long history; we give an overview below.

Motivated by geometric complexity theory (and in particular the study of the matrix multiplication exponent), Bürgisser and Ikenmeyer [BCI11] posed the problem of determining the moment polytopes of the unit tensors and matrix multiplication tensors. For $r \in \mathbb{N}$, the unit tensor of rank r is defined as $U_r := \sum_{i=1}^r e_i \otimes e_i \otimes e_i$. For $n_1, n_2, n_3 \in \mathbb{N}$, the matrix multiplication tensors are defined as

$$M_{n_1, n_2, n_3} := \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_3} e_{i,j} \otimes e_{j,k} \otimes e_{k,i} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 n_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_2 n_3} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_3 n_1},$$

where $e_{i,j}$ denote standard basis vectors. We take $e_{i,j}$ to equal the standard basis matrix (of the correct size) with a 1 at position (i, j) , flattened to a vector along the rows. We define $M_n = M_{n,n,n} \in \mathbb{C}^{n^2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n^2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n^2}$.

Problem 1.3 ([BCI11]). Determine $\Delta(U_n)$ and $\Delta(M_n)$.

There is much previous work on characterizations of the Kronecker polytope in various formats. We provide a brief overview. See also [Wal14, Chapter 3] for a detailed account. Various complete mathematical descriptions of the Kronecker polytope of arbitrary formats have been found using different techniques [NM84, BS00, Fra02, Res10, Res11, VW17]. They, among other techniques, have been used to determine explicit descriptions of the inequalities (i.e. as concrete lists of numbers) for the following formats: $3 \times 3 \times 3$ [Fra02], $2 \times 2 \times 4$ [Bra04], $2 \times 2 \times \dots \times 2$ [HSS03], $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 8$, $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 16$, $3 \times 3 \times 9$, $2 \times n \times 2n$, $2 \times 2 \times 3 \times 12$ [Kly04] (based on [BS00] and the connection to Kronecker coefficients), and $4 \times 4 \times 4$ [VW17] (using techniques related to those in [Res10]). For all results, the formats with system-wise lesser or equal dimensions can also be obtained, as can permutations of the formats.

For moment polytopes $\Delta(T)$ of specific tensors T much less is known. Bürgisser, Christandl and Ikenmeyer [BCI11] used methods from quantum information theory to construct a large class of points in the Kronecker polytopes and unit tensor moment polytopes. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ let $u_m = (1/m, \dots, 1/m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be the uniform probability vector of length m . They proved that for any non-increasing probability vector $q = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{n^2})$ the point $(q \mid u_n \mid u_n)$ is in $\Delta(\mathbb{C}^{n^2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$. In fact, their construction gives that for any non-increasing probability vector $q = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n)$ the point $(q \mid u_n \mid u_n)$ is in $\Delta(U_n)$.⁶ The moment polytopes of every tensor of format $2 \times 2 \times 2$ and $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ were determined in [HZG04, SWK13] and [WDGC13] respectively.

Using the tensor scaling algorithm from [BFG⁺18], there are numerical methods to determine whether $\Delta(T) = \Delta(\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c)$, whenever $\Delta(\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c)$ is known. More precisely, tensor scaling algorithms decide the membership problem: whether a given point p is in $\Delta(T)$. Although not efficient in general, yes-instances are determined fast in practice. Letting p range over the vertices of $\Delta(\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c)$, we can determine whether they also lie in $\Delta(T)$.

⁵That is, there is a non-empty Zariski-open subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ such that for every $T \in U$, $\Delta(T) = \Delta(\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c)$. In particular, it holds for a random tensor T with probability one.

⁶The statement of Theorem 1 in [BCI11] is about the Kronecker polytope for format (n^2, n, n) , but their construction for points in (n, n, n) only requires tensors of rank $\leq n$. Given a probability distribution q on n outcomes, the point $p = (q \mid u_n \mid u_n)$ arises from the tensor $T = \sum_{k=1}^n (\sum_{j=1}^n \sqrt{q_j} \zeta_n^{jk}) e_j \otimes e_k \otimes e_k$, where ζ_n is a primitive n -th root of unity. This tensor T is in the GL-orbit closure of $\langle n \rangle$, as it has rank at most n .

Moment polytope separations

Our first result is a range of separations between moment polytopes of matrix multiplication and unit tensors. Recall that $u_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the uniform probability vector. We implicitly pad this vector with zeroes so that $u_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for any $m \geq n$ is the uniform probability vector on the first n coefficients.

Theorem 1.4. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Delta(\mathbf{U}_{n^2}) \not\subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{M}_n)$. More generally, for every $c, n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $n^2 - n + 1 < c \leq n^2$, then $\Delta(\mathbf{U}_c) \not\subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{M}_n)$. Namely, the point $p_c := (u_2 \mid u_{c-1} \mid u_c)$ satisfies $p_c \in \Delta(\mathbf{U}_c)$ and $p_c \notin \Delta(\mathbf{M}_n)$.*

From symmetries of the tensors \mathbf{U}_c and \mathbf{M}_n , it follows from [Theorem 1.4](#) that for every $\pi \in S_3$ we have that $\pi \cdot p_c \in \Delta(\mathbf{U}_c)$ and $\pi \cdot p_c \notin \Delta(\mathbf{M}_n)$, where the symmetric group S_3 naturally acts on $\mathbb{R}^{n^2} \times \mathbb{R}^{n^2} \times \mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ by permuting the three components.⁷

[Theorem 1.4](#) in particular implies that the matrix multiplication tensor \mathbf{M}_n does not have maximal moment polytope, as follows.

Corollary 1.5. *The inclusion $\Delta(\mathbf{M}_n) \subseteq \Delta(\mathbb{C}^{n^2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n^2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n^2})$ is a strict inclusion.*

Proof. $\Delta(\mathbf{U}_{n^2})$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{M}_n)$ are both contained in $\Delta(\mathbb{C}^{n^2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n^2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n^2})$. From [Theorem 1.4](#) we have $\Delta(\mathbf{U}_{n^2}) \not\subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{M}_n)$, so the claim follows. \square

[Theorem 1.4](#) leaves open whether the inclusion $\Delta(\mathbf{M}_n) \subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{U}_{n^2})$ holds. More generally, while it is known that $\Delta(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^m) = \Delta(\mathbf{U}_m)$ for every $m \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, this equality is open for all larger m . If true, then $\Delta(\mathbf{M}_n) \subsetneq \Delta(\mathbf{U}_{n^2})$.

The separating point in [Theorem 1.4](#) for $n = 2, c = 4$ we first observed using an algorithm that we developed to compute moment polytopes [[vdBCL⁺25](#)], which in turn inspired the theorem. Namely, we found computationally that $p_4 = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0, 0 \mid \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, 0 \mid \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$, which is an element of $\Delta(\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4)$, is not an element of $\Delta(\mathbf{M}_2)$. Moreover, $\Delta(\mathbf{U}_4)$ equals $\Delta(\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4)$, as can be seen using the tensor scaling algorithm [[BFG⁺18](#)] and knowledge of the vertices of $\Delta(\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4)$, which were determined in [[VW17](#)].

Our approach to proving [Theorem 1.4](#) is to show that \mathbf{M}_n cannot degenerate to polynomial multiplication tensors of certain shapes. For shape $2 \times (c-1) \times c$, such a degeneration is required to have $(u_2 \mid u_{c-1} \mid u_c)$ as an element of the moment polytope. We achieve this by upper bounding the *minrank* of \mathbf{M}_n under degenerations. Minrank is defined as the smallest rank among the non-zero matrices in the slice span.

Higher-order tensors

We extend [Theorem 1.4](#) to iterated matrix multiplication tensors and unit tensors of order k , for any $k \geq 3$. The definition of moment polytopes generalizes naturally to the space of tensors of order k , $V = \mathbb{C}^{n_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_k}$, with the action of $\text{GL} = \text{GL}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \text{GL}_{n_k}$. Let $\mathbf{U}_r^k = \sum_{j=1}^r e_j \otimes \cdots \otimes e_j \in (\mathbb{C}^r)^{\otimes k}$ denote the unit tensor of rank r and order k . Let $\mathbf{M}_n^k \in (\mathbb{C}^{n^2})^{\otimes k}$ be the iterated matrix multiplication tensor of order k for $n \times n$ matrices, which is defined as

$$\mathbf{M}_n^k := \sum_{i \in [n]^k} \bigotimes_{\ell=1}^k e_{i_\ell, i_{\ell+1}},$$

where we set $i_{k+1} = i_1$.

⁷The argument is as follows. The symmetric group S_3 acts on any tensor space $\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ by permuting the factors, and similarly acts on any moment polytope by permuting the three components of its ambient space $\mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}^b \times \mathbb{R}^c$. The unit tensor \mathbf{U}_c is S_3 -invariant. The matrix multiplication tensor \mathbf{M}_n , although not S_3 -invariant, has the property that $\pi \cdot \mathbf{M}_n \in \text{GL} \cdot \mathbf{M}_n$ for every $\pi \in S_3$. As a result, the moment polytopes $\Delta(\mathbf{U}_c)$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{M}_n)$ are S_3 -invariant. From [Theorem 1.4](#) it thus follows that for every $\pi \in S_3$ we have $\pi \cdot p_c \in \Delta(\mathbf{U}_c)$ and $\pi \cdot p_c \notin \Delta(\mathbf{M}_n)$.

Theorem 1.6. *For every n and c such that $n^2 - n + 1 < c \leq n^2$, we have that $\Delta(\mathbf{U}_c^k) \not\subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{M}_n^k)$.*

In the language of tensor networks, [Theorem 1.6](#) can be interpreted as follows.

Corollary 1.7. *For $k \geq 3$ parties and $n, c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n^2 - n + 1 < c \leq n^2$, there are marginals that can be realized by applying local maps to a GHZ state with c levels, but are not realizable as a matrix product state with bond dimension n and periodic boundary conditions.*

In the language of [[CLVW20](#), [CLS⁺24](#)], a matrix product state with periodic boundary conditions is precisely a projected entangled-pair state (PEPS) on the k -cycle graph C_k . This entanglement structure is described by pairwise level- n maximally entangled states for every edge of C_k (\mathbf{M}_n^k). We may replace this by the entanglement structure described by the hypergraph on k vertices with a single hyper-edge containing all the vertices, which is the level- c GHZ state shared between all parties (\mathbf{U}_c^k). Then the above means that this replacement alters the expressivity (on the level of joint one-body marginal spectra) of the tensor network whenever $n^2 - n + 1 < c \leq n^2$, in particular showing that allowing multipartite entanglement structures beyond two-party entanglement can increase expressiveness in tensor networks. Analogous separations can be derived for different graphs and hypergraphs governing tensor networks.

Degeneration obstructions and border subrank of matrix multiplication

For any two tensors S and T we say that S is a restriction of T and write $S \leq T$ if there are linear maps A, B, C such that $S = (A \otimes B \otimes C) \cdot T$. We say S is a degeneration of T and write $S \trianglelefteq T$ if there is a sequence of tensors T_i that converges to S and such that $T_i \leq T$ for every i .

Moment polytope separations, like the separations $\Delta(\mathbf{U}_c) \not\subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{M}_n)$ for $n^2 - n + 1 < c \leq n^2$ that we proved in [Theorem 1.4](#), are obstructions (in the spirit of geometric complexity theory [[BI11](#)]) for degenerations. Indeed, if $S \trianglelefteq T$, then $\Delta(S) \subseteq \Delta(T)$ ([Proposition 2.7](#)). Thus, if $\Delta(S) \not\subseteq \Delta(T)$, then $S \not\trianglelefteq T$. From [Theorem 1.4](#) we thus get that $\mathbf{U}_{n^2-n+2} \not\trianglelefteq \mathbf{M}_n$.

Statements of the form $\mathbf{U}_r \not\trianglelefteq T$ correspond to upper bounds on Strassen's notion of border subrank [[Str87](#)], which plays a central role in the study of matrix multiplication algorithms [[Blä13](#)]. The border subrank $\underline{Q}(T)$ of a tensor T is defined as the largest number r such that $\mathbf{U}_r \trianglelefteq T$, so that $\mathbf{U}_r \not\trianglelefteq T$ corresponds to $\underline{Q}(T) < r$. Strassen proved that $\lceil \frac{3}{4}n^2 \rceil \leq \underline{Q}(\mathbf{M}_n)$. This was shown to be an equality:

Theorem 1.8 ([[KMZ23](#)]). $\underline{Q}(\mathbf{M}_n) \leq \lceil \frac{3}{4}n^2 \rceil$.

From our moment polytope separation ([Theorem 1.4](#)) it follows that $\underline{Q}(\mathbf{M}_n) \leq n^2 - n + 1$, which is not optimal. We slightly alter the proof of the moment polytope separation to reprove the optimal upper bound $\underline{Q}(\mathbf{M}_n) \leq \lceil \frac{3}{4}n^2 \rceil$, obtaining a proof that is more direct than the previous proof of [[KMZ23](#)], shedding new light on this result. We leave as an open problem whether a moment polytope separation can prove the optimal bound.

Characterizing moment polytope inclusion

What is the operational meaning of moment polytope inclusion? If $S \trianglelefteq T$, then $\Delta(S) \subseteq \Delta(T)$ ([Proposition 2.7](#)). The reverse implication is known to be false (as can be seen for instance by considering non-equivalent generic tensors in $\mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$). What preorders on tensors imply moment polytope inclusion?

We consider asymptotic restriction, a preorder that is implied by degeneration (i.e. a larger preorder) that plays a central role in algebraic complexity theory. For tensors S and T we say that S is an asymptotic restriction of T , denoted by $T \lesssim S$, if for every n we have $S^{\boxtimes n} \leq T^{\boxtimes(n+o(n))}$ where $o(n)$ denotes some function $f(n)$ such that $f(n)/n \rightarrow 0$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Replacing restriction by degeneration does not change the notion of asymptotic restriction [[Str87](#), Prop. 5.10]. Here \boxtimes denotes the Kronecker product on 3-tensors.

We show that asymptotic restriction does not imply moment polytope inclusion:

Theorem 1.9. *There exist tensors S, T such that $S \lesssim T$ and $\Delta(S) \not\subseteq \Delta(T)$.*

We prove [Theorem 1.9](#) by providing two counterexamples. Both were found via to the aforementioned algorithm for computing moment polytopes [[vdBCL⁺25](#)] (in fact, the first example uses the separation from [Theorem 1.4](#)).

From the perspective of quantum information theory, [Theorem 1.9](#) implies that existence of asymptotic SLOCC interconversion is not an entanglement monotone relation, in the sense that $S \lesssim T$ does not imply that all marginal spectra that can be reached starting from the state S (using SLOCC transformations) can also be reached starting from the state T .

In algebraic complexity theory, the above result is especially interesting in light of a family of \lesssim -monotone functions mapping tensors to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ called the *quantum functionals* [[CVZ21](#)]. These functions are defined as an entropy maximizations over the moment polytope $\Delta(T)$. The quantum functionals comprise all known elements of the *asymptotic spectrum* of 3-tensors, which is the set \mathcal{X} of functions mapping 3-tensors to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that are monotone under \geq , additive under direct sum, multiplicative under the Kronecker product, and map U_r to r . Strassen showed that $T \lesssim S$ if and only if $\varphi(T) \leq \varphi(S)$ for all functions $\varphi \in \mathcal{X}$, and that the asymptotic tensor rank of T equals the maximum of $\varphi(T)$ over $\varphi \in \mathcal{X}$ [[Str88](#)]. It is an important open question to determine all of \mathcal{X} explicitly. It is also open whether \mathcal{X} consists of just the quantum functionals. If true, this would in particular imply that the matrix multiplication exponent is equal to 2.

A natural question to ask is: is the map $T \mapsto \Delta(T)$ itself monotone under \lesssim , or do the quantum functionals pick out only some special information from $\Delta(T)$? [Theorem 1.9](#) shows that the latter is the case.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we recall background material on geometric invariant theory and basic properties of moment polytopes. We continue where we left off in the introduction.

2.1 Semistability, polystability, and invariants

We will need some basic concepts from geometric invariant theory (for an introduction, see e.g. [[DK13](#), [Wal17](#)]). Let $\mathrm{SL}_n \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_n$ denote the special linear group consisting of $n \times n$ -matrices with determinant one. Let $\mathrm{SL} := \mathrm{SL}_a \times \mathrm{SL}_b \times \mathrm{SL}_c \subseteq \mathrm{GL}$. We call a tensor $T \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ *SL-unstable* when $0 \in \overline{\mathrm{SL} \cdot T}$, and *SL-semistable* otherwise. The subset of SL-unstable tensors is called the *null cone*. If V is any (rational) SL-representation, then SL acts on the ring of polynomials $\mathbb{C}[V]$ by $g \cdot f = f \circ g^{-1}$. We denote by $\mathbb{C}[V]^{\mathrm{SL}}$ the SL-invariant polynomials on V .

Theorem 2.1 ([[DK13](#), Lemma 2.5.2]). *Let V be a rational SL-representation. The subset of SL-unstable elements of V is equal to the subset of elements $v \in V$ such that $f(v) = 0$ for every non-constant homogeneous $f \in \mathbb{C}[V]^{\mathrm{SL}}$.*

We now turn our attention to the Kempf–Ness theorem, which relates SL-stability to the moment map. Recall the definition of the moment map μ as given in [Eq. \(1.2\)](#). Denote with $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\|\cdot\|$ the standard Euclidean inner product and norm on $\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$. A tensor such that $\mathrm{SL} \cdot T$ is closed is called *SL-polystable* (this also implies T is SL-semistable if T is non-zero). Denote with I_a the $a \times a$ identity matrix.

Theorem 2.2 (Kempf–Ness theorem [[Wal17](#), Theorem 3.26]⁸). *Let $T \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c \setminus \{0\}$. The tensor T is SL-polystable if and only if $\mu(S) = (I_a/a, I_b/b, I_c/c)$ for some $S \in \mathrm{SL} \cdot T$.*

⁸To apply the statement as given in [[Wal17](#), Theorem 3.26], we need to show that $\mu(T) = (I_a/a, I_b/b, I_c/c)$ is equivalent to T being “critical”. In our setting, this translates to the requirement that $\langle (A \otimes I \otimes I)T, T \rangle + \langle (I \otimes B \otimes I)T, T \rangle + \langle (I \otimes I \otimes C)T, T \rangle = 0$ for all Hermitian matrices A, B, C each of trace zero. A simple computation shows that these two requirements are equivalent. For more information, see [[BFG⁺19](#), Example 1.4] [[BFG⁺18](#), [vdBCL⁺25](#)].

Using the Kempf–Ness theorem (Theorem 2.2) combined with Theorem 2.1, we can prove that whenever a tensor T has a tensor with uniform marginals in its orbit closure, it is SL-semistable, as was also observed in [BGO⁺18, Theorem 3.2] and [CVZ21, Lemma 4.34].⁹

Theorem 2.3 (Uniform marginals [BGO⁺18, Theorem 3.2]). *Let $T \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c \setminus \{0\}$. The tensor T is SL-semistable if and only if $\mu(S) = (I_a/a, I_b/b, I_c/c)$ for some non-zero $S \in \overline{\text{GL}} \cdot T$.*

In other words, Theorem 2.3 says that T is SL-semistable if and only if $(u_a, u_b, u_c) \in \Delta(T)$, where $u_n = (1/n, \dots, 1/n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the uniform probability vector of length n .

For more information on these theorems, we refer to [BFG⁺19, FW22, vdBCL⁺25].

2.2 Moment polytopes under restriction and degeneration

We review some basic properties of moment polytopes that we will use throughout the text.

We say a tensor T *restricts* to a tensor $T' \in \mathbb{C}^{a'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{b'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{c'}$ whenever there exist triples of matrices $(A, B, C) \in \mathbb{C}^{a' \times a} \times \mathbb{C}^{b' \times b} \times \mathbb{C}^{c' \times c}$ (not necessarily invertible) such that $(A \otimes B \otimes C)T = T'$. We then write $T \geq T'$. When $T \geq T'$ and $T' \geq T$, we say T and T' are equivalent and write $T \sim T'$. Whenever $T' \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$, we have that $T \sim T'$ if and only if $T' \in \overline{\text{GL}} \cdot T$, in which case we say T and T' are isomorphic. We say T *degenerates* to T' if $\overline{\text{GL}} \cdot T$ contains a tensor equivalent to T' , and write $T \succeq T'$. Restriction implies degeneration, and both are transitive relations. We say a tensor is *concise* whenever it can not be embedded into a smaller space. That is, T is concise when it is not equivalent to a tensor $T' \in \mathbb{C}^{a'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{b'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{c'}$ with $a' < a$ or $b' < b$ or $c' < c$.

Moment polytopes behave well under equivalence of tensors. First we show that embedding T into a larger space does not change the moment polytope apart from padding it with zeros. Denote with $0_{x,y,z} \in \mathbb{C}^x \otimes \mathbb{C}^y \otimes \mathbb{C}^z$ the zero tensor. Given $p = (p_1 \mid p_2 \mid p_3) \in \Delta(T)$, we denote the padding of p with zeros on each system by

$$(p_1 \mid p_2 \mid p_3) \oplus (0_x \mid 0_y \mid 0_z) := (p_1 \oplus 0_x \mid p_2 \oplus 0_y \mid p_3 \oplus 0_z) \in \mathbb{R}^{a+x} \times \mathbb{R}^{b+y} \times \mathbb{R}^{c+z}. \quad (2.1)$$

Lemma 2.4. $\Delta(T \oplus 0_{x,y,z}) = \Delta(T) \oplus (0_x \mid 0_y \mid 0_z)$.

Proof. \subseteq . Write $S = T \oplus 0_{x,y,z}$. Let $q = (q_1, q_2, q_3) \in \Delta(S)$. Then there is an element $S' \in \overline{\text{GL}} \cdot S$ with $\text{spec } \mu(S') = q$. By applying some element in GL , we may assume that $\mu_i(S') = \text{diag}(q_i)$ for every i . Then $q = p \oplus (0_x \mid 0_y \mid 0_z)$ for some $p \in \mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}^b \times \mathbb{R}^c$: to see this, note that each q_i is non-increasing, and that $\text{rank } \mu_i(S') = \text{rank } S'_i \leq \text{rank } S_i$. Now let $P_1: \mathbb{C}^{a \times (a+x)}$ be the projection onto the first a coordinates. Similarly define P_2 and P_3 . Then $(P_1 \otimes P_2 \otimes P_3)S' \in \overline{\text{GL}} \cdot T$, and we find that $\mu_i((P_1 \otimes P_2 \otimes P_3)S') = P_i \mu_i(S') P_i^* = \text{diag}(p_i)$ for every i , so $p \in \Delta(T)$.

\supseteq . We have $(\text{GL}_a \times \text{GL}_b \times \text{GL}_c \cdot T) \oplus 0_{x,y,z} \subseteq \text{GL}_{a+x} \times \text{GL}_{b+y} \times \text{GL}_{b+z} \cdot (T \oplus 0_{x,y,z})$. The inclusion follows. \square

Proposition 2.5. *Let T and T' be equivalent tensors. Then $\Delta(T)$ and $\Delta(T')$ are equal up to padding with zeros.*

Proof. Pad T and T' with zeros such that the resulting tensors \hat{T} and \hat{T}' both lie in the same tensor space. Then \hat{T} and \hat{T}' are still equivalent tensors, and because they live in the same tensor space we have $\hat{T} \in \text{GL} \cdot \hat{T}'$. This implies that $\Delta(\hat{T}) = \Delta(\hat{T}')$. The result is then given by Lemma 2.4. \square

Remark 2.6. By Proposition 2.5, we can write statements such as $\Delta(T) = \Delta(T')$, $\Delta(T) \supseteq \Delta(T')$ and $p \in \Delta(T)$ even when T and T' are tensors of different dimensions and p is a vector not in $\mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}^b \times \mathbb{R}^c$. We understand the statements to concern the polytopes and points after

⁹In [BGO⁺18] a self-contained proof (without assuming the Kempf–Ness theorem) is also provided.

appropriate padding or removal of zeros on each of the three systems, such that both live in the same space.

Importantly, the notion of SL-semistability does depend on the embedding of the tensor T (in fact, SL-semistable tensors must always be concise). So in contrast to the above, statements about SL-semistability will always be with respect to a fixed format.

Degeneration implies inclusion of moment polytopes:

Proposition 2.7. *If $T \succeq T'$ then $\Delta(T) \supseteq \Delta(T')$.*

Proof. Degeneration is a transitive relation, so after embedding in a large enough space, it follows that $\overline{\text{GL} \cdot T} \supseteq \overline{\text{GL} \cdot T'}$. The result then follows directly from the definition of the moment polytope (Definition 1.1). \square

Moreover, almost all restrictions of a tensor T of shape (x, y, z) to a tensor T' of shape (a, b, c) will result in a moment polytope $\Delta(T')$ given by intersecting $\Delta(T)$ with $\mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}^b \times \mathbb{R}^c$.

Proposition 2.8 ([BFG⁺18, Corollary 3.7]). *Let $T \in \mathbb{C}^x \otimes \mathbb{C}^y \otimes \mathbb{C}^z$ and $(a, b, c) \leq (x, y, z)$ entry-wise. Denote with $P_a \otimes P_b \otimes P_c$ the restriction from $\mathbb{C}^x \otimes \mathbb{C}^y \otimes \mathbb{C}^z$ to $\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ that projects onto the first a, b and c coordinates in the respective system. Then for generic $(A, B, C) \in \text{GL}$,*

$$\Delta((P_a \otimes P_b \otimes P_c)(A \otimes B \otimes C)T) = \Delta(T) \cap (\mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}^b \times \mathbb{R}^c).$$

In particular, there exists a restriction $T' \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ of T such that $\Delta(T') = \Delta(T) \cap (\mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}^b \times \mathbb{R}^c)$.

3 Moment polytope separation for matrix multiplication and unit tensors

We will now work towards the proof of Theorem 1.4.

3.1 Uniform points in the moment polytope and semistability

We will show that inclusion of any ‘‘uniform’’ point $(u_a \mid u_b \mid u_c)$ in the moment polytope of a tensor T is characterized by the existence of a restriction of T to an SL-semistable tensor of shape $a \times b \times c$. We will then use this to prove Theorem 1.4 by showing that M_n cannot restrict to any SL-semistable tensor in $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^{c-1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$.

Lemma 3.1 (Uniform points and semistability). *Let $1 \leq a \leq a', 1 \leq b \leq b', 1 \leq c \leq c'$ be integers. Let $T \in \mathbb{C}^{a'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{b'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{c'}$. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $(u_a \mid u_b \mid u_c) \in \Delta(T)$.
- (2) *There exists an SL-semistable tensor $S \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ such that $T \geq S$.*
- (3) *There exists an SL-semistable tensor $S \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ such that $T \succeq S$.*

Proof. We first prove (1) \Rightarrow (2). There is a sequence $(A_i, B_i, C_i) \in \text{GL}$ where $i \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $(A_i, B_i, C_i) \cdot T$ converges to a tensor $S'_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{a'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{b'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{c'}$ and $\text{spec}(\mu(S'_0)) = (u_a \mid u_b \mid u_c) \in \mathbb{R}^{a'} \times \mathbb{R}^{b'} \times \mathbb{R}^{c'}$. Then by Proposition 2.8, there exists a restriction $S_0 \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ of S'_0 which contains $(u_a \mid u_b \mid u_c) \in \mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}^b \times \mathbb{R}^c$ in its moment polytope. By Theorem 2.3, S_0 is SL-semistable. Let (P_1, P_2, P_3) be the restriction map satisfying $(P_1, P_2, P_3) \cdot S'_0 = S_0$. Then $S_i = (P_1 A_i, P_2 B_i, P_3 C_i) \cdot T \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ is a sequence of tensors converging to S_0 . The set of SL-semistable tensors in $\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ is Euclidean-open. To see this, note that the tensors that are not SL-semistable are precisely the simultaneous zero-set of a finite set of polynomials

We combine the above lemmas.

Corollary 3.5. *The GL-orbit of P_c consists of all the SL-semistable tensors in $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^{c-1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.3, the SL-orbit of P_c is closed, and hence P_c is also SL-semistable. Then Lemma 3.4 tells us that the boundary of $\text{GL} \cdot P_c$ contains only SL-unstable tensors. By Lemma 3.2, the GL-orbit of P_c is dense. Hence all tensors outside of the GL-orbit lie on its boundary, and are therefore SL-unstable. We conclude $\text{GL} \cdot P_c$ contains all SL-semistable tensors. Moreover, as P_c itself is SL-semistable, every tensor in $\text{GL} \cdot P_c$ is semistable (as they are in the SL-orbits of some scalar multiples of P_c). \square

The tensor P_c has a computational interpretation, namely as the structure tensor of multiplication of univariate polynomials with degrees 1 and $c - 1$, respectively. Hence it is a special case of the structure tensors describing multiplications of two polynomials of given degrees.

Definition 3.6 (Polynomial multiplication tensor). The structure tensor $P_{a,b} \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a+b-1}$ describing the multiplication of two univariate polynomials, the first of degree $a - 1$ and the second of degree $b - 1$, is given by

$$P_{a,b} := \sum_{i \in [a]} \sum_{j \in [b]} e_i \otimes e_j \otimes e_{i+j-1} \quad (3.4)$$

$$= e_1 \otimes [I_b \mid 0_{a-1}] + e_2 \otimes [0_1 \mid I_b \mid 0_{a-2}] + \cdots + e_a \otimes [0_{a-1} \mid I_b], \quad (3.5)$$

where $0_t \in \mathbb{C}^{b \times t}$ denotes the $b \times t$ zero matrix.

Clearly, we have $P_c = P_{2,c-1}$. We shall use the tensors $P_{a,b}$ in Section 4.2. In particular, we will use that they have low tensor rank:¹⁰

Lemma 3.7 ([BCS97, Proposition 14.47]). $U_{a+b-1} \geq P_{a,b}$.

3.3 The minrank of a tensor

For the proof of Theorem 1.4 we will use the notion of *minrank* of a tensor (see also [BCL⁺24, BIL⁺19]). To define the minrank for a tensor $T \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$, we “slice” T into an a -tuple of $b \times c$ matrices $([T_{1,j,k}]_{j,k}, [T_{2,j,k}]_{j,k}, \dots, [T_{a,j,k}]_{j,k})$. Then the minrank is the smallest nonzero matrix rank of any linear combination of these slices. For 3-tensors there are three ways to do this, one for each index, and hence T has three different “minranks”. We will only need the one with above slicing, which we simply denote by $\text{minrank}(T)$. In other words:

Definition 3.8. Let $T \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ be a non-zero tensor. Then we define its *minrank* by

$$\text{minrank}(T) := \min(\{\text{rank}((\beta \otimes I_b \otimes I_c)T) \mid \beta \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times a}\} \setminus \{0\}).$$

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose $T_1, T_2, T_3, \dots \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ converge to a concise $T \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$. Then $\text{minrank}(T) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{minrank}(T_i)$.*

Proof. Let $r = \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{minrank}(T_i)$. Since minrank is integer valued, we may pass to a subsequence such that $\text{minrank}(T_i) = r$ for every i . Let $\beta_i \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times a}$ be such that $\text{minrank}(T_i) = \text{rank}((\beta_i \otimes I_b \otimes I_c)T_i)$ for every i . Replace the β_i 's by $\beta_i / \|\beta_i\|$, so that their norm is 1. By compactness of the unit sphere, we may pass to a subsequence of $(T_i, \beta_i)_i$ such that $\beta_i \rightarrow \beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times a}$ with $\|\beta\| = 1$. Define $f: \mathbb{C}^{1 \times a} \times \mathbb{C}^{a \times b \times c} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{b \times c}: (\gamma, S) \mapsto (\gamma \otimes I_b \otimes I_c)S$. Then we find by continuity of f that

$$(\beta \otimes I_a \otimes I_c)T = f(\beta, T) = f\left(\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (\beta_i, T_i)\right) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} f((\beta_i, T_i)) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (\beta_i \otimes I_a \otimes I_c)T_i.$$

¹⁰In fact, the tensor rank of $P_{a,b}$ is minimal for concise tensors in $\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a+b-1}$.

Hence, $\text{rank}((\beta \otimes I_b \otimes I_c)T) \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{rank}((\beta_i \otimes I_b \otimes I_c)T_i)$, since matrix rank cannot go up in the limit. Since $\text{rank}((\beta_i \otimes I_b \otimes I_c)T_i) = r$ for all i , we find that $\text{rank}((\beta \otimes I_b \otimes I_c)T) \leq r$. Moreover $(\beta \otimes I_b \otimes I_c)T \neq 0$ by conciseness of T and since β is nonzero, so that its rank is not 0, and hence $\text{minrank}(T) \leq \text{rank}((\beta \otimes I_b \otimes I_c)T)$. Therefore $\text{minrank}(T) \leq r$. \square

For the proof of [Theorem 1.4](#) we will also use the following:

Lemma 3.10. $\text{minrank}(P_{a,b}) = b$.

Proof. Every nonzero matrix $(\beta \otimes I_b \otimes I_{a+b})P_{a,b}$, where $\beta \in \mathbb{C}^a$, has a $b \times b$ submatrix that is upper triangular with non-zero diagonal entries. These matrices have rank b and hence $\text{minrank}(P_{a,b}) = b$. \square

3.4 Minrank of degenerations of matrix multiplication

The next important ingredient for [Theorem 1.4](#) is the following lemma:

Lemma 3.11. *Let $T \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ be a non-zero and concise tensor. If $M_n \succeq T$, then we have $\text{minrank}(T) \leq n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor)$.*

We will use the following lemma, which follows from the fact that projective varieties of complementary dimension must intersect and a computation of the dimension of the variety of $n \times n$ matrices with rank at most r , see, for instance, [[CMW08](#), Proposition 6] or [[DGMS10](#)].

Lemma 3.12. *Every d -dimensional subspace of $n \times n$ matrices contains a nonzero matrix of rank at most $n - \lfloor \sqrt{d-1} \rfloor$.*

Proof of Lemma 3.11. Suppose $M_n \succeq T$ with T concise. Then there exist linear maps A, B, C such that $(A \otimes B \otimes C)M_n = T$. Recall that $M_n = \sum_{i,j} e_{i,j} \otimes \sum_k e_{j,k} \otimes e_{k,i}$. Let $E_{j,i} = e_j \otimes e_i$, which we may think of as an $n \times n$ matrix. Let $E_{j,i} \boxtimes I_n$ denote the matrix Kronecker product with the $n \times n$ identity matrix. Then after a permutation of basis elements we may write

$$M_n = \sum_{i,j} e_{i,j} \otimes (E_{j,i} \boxtimes I_n). \quad (3.6)$$

By applying the linear map $A: \mathbb{C}^{n^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^a$ we take linear combinations of these slices:

$$(A \otimes I_{n^2} \otimes I_{n^2})M_n = \sum_{\ell=1}^a e_{\ell} \otimes (M_{\ell} \boxtimes I_n), \quad (3.7)$$

for some matrices $M_{\ell} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ (namely, $M_{\ell} = \sum_{i,j} A_{\ell,(i,j)} E_{j,i}$). Then M_1, \dots, M_a are linearly independent, as otherwise $(A \otimes I_{n^2} \otimes I_{n^2})M_n$ and hence T would not be concise. By [Lemma 3.12](#), there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{C}^a \setminus \{0\}$ such that the rank of $\sum_{\ell} \beta_{\ell} M_{\ell} \neq 0$ is at most $n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor$. It follows that the rank of $\sum_{\ell} \beta_{\ell} (M_{\ell} \boxtimes I_n) = (\sum_{\ell} \beta_{\ell} M_{\ell}) \boxtimes I_n$ is at most $n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor)$.

Next, we observe that applying $I \otimes B \otimes C$ corresponds to left- and right-multiplication of $\sum_{\ell} \beta_{\ell} (M_{\ell} \boxtimes I_n)$ with B and C , which can only make rank go down. By conciseness of T , $(\beta A \otimes B \otimes C)M_n = (\beta \otimes I \otimes I)T$ is non-zero. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minrank}((A \otimes B \otimes C)M_n) &\leq \text{rank}((\beta A \otimes B \otimes C)M_n) \\ &\leq \text{rank}((\beta A \otimes I_{n^2} \otimes I_{n^2})M_n) \\ &\leq n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor). \end{aligned}$$

This yields $\text{minrank}(T) \leq n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor)$.

We now extend the proof to concise T such that $M_n \succeq T$. This implies that there exists a sequence of T_i 's in the same format as T such that $M_n \succeq T_i$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_i = T$. As conciseness is an open condition, we may pass to a subsequence such that the T_i are concise. The above proof shows that $\text{minrank}(T_i) \leq n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor)$ for every $i \geq 1$. [Lemma 3.9](#) then shows that $\text{minrank}(T) \leq n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor)$. \square

3.5 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Now that we have all the ingredients in place, we prove the moment polytope separation:

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let T be any tensor. By Lemma 3.1, we have $p_c = (u_2 \mid u_{c-1} \mid u_c) \in \Delta(T)$ if and only if there exists an SL-semistable tensor $S \in \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^{c-1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ such that $T \geq S$. By Corollary 3.5, S is in the GL-orbit of $P_c = P_{2,c-1}$. So $p_c \in \Delta(T)$ if and only if $T \geq P_c$.

We have $p_c \in \Delta(U_c)$, because $U_c \geq P_c$ (Lemma 3.7).

To prove $p_c \notin \Delta(M_n)$, we will show that $M_n \not\geq P_c$. Suppose $M_n \geq P_c$. Then by Lemma 3.11, $\text{minrank}(P_c) \leq n(n-1)$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.10, $\text{minrank}(P_c) = c-1$. This contradicts the assumption that $n^2 - n + 1 < c$. \square

4 Extensions, applications and further results

4.1 Separation for iterated matrix multiplication and unit tensors

We will prove Theorem 1.6 using the projection relation between $\Delta(M_n^k)$ and $\Delta(M_n^{k-1})$ given in Lemma 4.2, which will allow us to reduce to the case $k = 3$ (Theorem 1.4). First we prove a lemma that will help us translate specific restrictions from M_n^k to M_n^{k-1} .

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose $T = (A_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_k)M_n^k$ is a restriction such that $\text{rank}(A_k) = 1$. Then $T = S \otimes w$ with $M_n^{k-1} \geq S$, where S is a tensor of order $k-1$ and w is a vector.*

Proof. Because A_k has rank 1, we may write it as $A_k = wu^*$ for some $u \in \mathbb{C}^{n^2}$ and vector w . Then we find that

$$\begin{aligned} T &= (A_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{k-1} \otimes wu^*)M_n^k \\ &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} A_1 e_{i_1, i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{k-1} e_{i_{k-1}, i_k} \otimes wu^* e_{i_k, i_1} \\ &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} A_1 e_{i_1, i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{k-1} e_{i_{k-1}, i_k} \otimes wu_{i_k, i_1} \\ &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}} A_1 e_{i_1, i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{k-1} \sum_{i_k} u_{i_k, i_1} e_{i_{k-1}, i_k} \otimes w \\ &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}} A_1 e_{i_1, i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{k-1} U e_{i_{k-1}, i_1} \otimes w, \end{aligned}$$

where $U: \mathbb{C}^{n^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n^2}$ is the linear map that maps e_{i_{k-1}, i_1} to $\sum_{i_k} u_{i_k, i_1} e_{i_{k-1}, i_k}$. We find that $T = S \otimes w$ with $S = (A_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{k-1} U)M_n^{k-1}$, and we are done. \square

We use Lemma 4.1 to relate the moment polytopes of M_n^{k-1} and M_n^k .

Lemma 4.2. *Let $k \geq 3$. Then*

$$\{q \in \Delta(M_n^k) \mid q_k = (1, 0, \dots, 0)\} = \Delta(M_n^{k-1}) \times \{(1, 0, \dots, 0)\}.$$

Proof. \subseteq . Let $q \in \Delta(M_n^k)$ be such that $q_k = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Let $T \in \overline{\text{GL} \cdot M_n^k}$ be such that $\text{spec } \mu(T) = q$. Then the k -th flattening of T has rank 1, so $T = S \otimes w$ for some $(k-1)$ -tensor S and $w \in \mathbb{C}^{n^2}$. Let $T_i = (A_1^{(i)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_k^{(i)})M_n^k$ be restrictions such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_i = T$. Then also $(I \otimes \cdots \otimes I \otimes ww^*)T_i$ converges to T . Because $ww^*A_k^{(i)}$ has rank 1, we may apply Lemma 4.1 for each i . We find that $T_i = S_i \otimes w_i$ with $S_i \leq M_n^{k-1}$ and $w_i \in \mathbb{C}^{n^2}$. Therefore,

$$\text{spec } \mu(T_i) = (\text{spec } \mu(S_i), (1, 0, \dots, 0)) \in \Delta(M_n^{k-1}) \times \{(1, 0, \dots, 0)\}$$

for all i . Then $q = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{spec } \mu(T_i) \in \Delta(M_n^{k-1}) \times \{(1, 0, \dots, 0)\}$ because of closedness.

\supseteq . The tensor M_n^k restricts to $M_n^{k-1} \otimes e_1$ by applying to the k th factor of M_n^k the linear map that maps $e_{i,i}$ to $\frac{1}{n}e_1$ for all $i \in [n]$, and $e_{i,j}$ to 0 if $i \neq j$. Thus $\Delta(M_n^k) \supseteq \Delta(M_n^{k-1} \otimes e_1)$. Note that $\Delta(M_n^{k-1} \otimes e_1) = \Delta(M_n^{k-1}) \times \{(1, 0, \dots, 0)\}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.6. By Theorem 1.4, $p_c = (u_2 \mid u_{c-1} \mid u_c) \in \Delta(U_c^3)$ and $p_c \notin \Delta(M_n^3)$. The tensor U_c^k restricts to $U_c^3 \otimes e_1^{\otimes k-3}$. Therefore, $(u_2 \mid u_{c-1} \mid u_c \mid u_1 \mid \dots \mid u_1) \in \Delta(U_c^k)$. Suppose that $(u_2 \mid u_{c-1} \mid u_c \mid u_1 \mid \dots \mid u_1) \in \Delta(M_n^k)$. Then $(u_2 \mid u_{c-1} \mid u_c) \in \Delta(M_n^3)$ by Lemma 4.2, which is a contradiction. \square

4.2 Border subrank of matrix multiplication

We now revisit the proof techniques of Theorem 1.4 and push them to prove the border subrank upper bound $\underline{Q}(M_n) \leq \lceil \frac{3}{4}n^2 \rceil$, Theorem 1.8. The core idea is to show that the matrix multiplication tensor cannot degenerate to polynomial multiplication tensors $P_{a,b}$ (Definition 3.6) for certain choices of a and b . Since $U_{a+b-1} \supseteq P_{a,b}$, this prevents $M_n \supseteq U_{a+b-1}$ by transitivity of degeneration. Hence $\underline{Q}(M_n) < a + b - 1$. For the optimal choices of a and b we obtain $a + b - 1 = \lceil \frac{3}{4}n^2 \rceil + 1$.

Proof of Theorem 1.8 (using polynomial multiplication tensors). Let $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that we have $b > n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor)$. Then we claim that $M_n \not\supseteq U_{a+b-1}$. Since $U_{a+b-1} \supseteq P_{a,b}$ (Lemma 3.7), it suffices to prove that $M_n \not\supseteq P_{a,b}$. Suppose that $M_n \supseteq P_{a,b}$. Then by Lemma 3.11 we have $\text{minrank}(P_{a,b}) \leq n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor)$. By Lemma 3.10, $\text{minrank}(P_{a,b}) = b$, so we find that $b \leq n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor)$, which is a contradiction.

It remains to find $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that we have $b > n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor)$ and $a + b - 1 = \lceil \frac{3}{4}n^2 \rceil + 1$. Indeed, then $M_n \not\supseteq U_{\lceil \frac{3}{4}n^2 \rceil + 1}$, so $\underline{Q}(M_n) \leq \lceil \frac{3}{4}n^2 \rceil$.

Suppose that n is even. Let $a = \frac{1}{4}n^2 + 1$ and $b = \frac{1}{2}n^2 + 1$. Then $\sqrt{a-1} = \frac{1}{2}n = \lfloor \frac{1}{2}n \rfloor$, and we indeed have $b > \frac{1}{2}n^2 = n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor)$ and $a + b - 1 - 1 = \frac{3}{4}n^2 = \lceil \frac{3}{4}n^2 \rceil$.

Suppose that n is odd. Let $a = \frac{1}{4}(n-1)^2 + 1$ and $b = \frac{1}{2}n(n+1) + 1$. Then $\sqrt{a-1} = \frac{1}{2}(n-1) = \lfloor \frac{1}{2}(n-1) \rfloor$, and we indeed have $b > \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{1}{2}n = n(n - \lfloor \sqrt{a-1} \rfloor)$ and $a + b - 1 - 1 = \frac{3}{4}n^2 + \frac{1}{4} = \lceil \frac{3}{4}n^2 \rceil$. \square

Remark 4.3. We note that the tensor $P_{a,b}$ is SL-semistable (extending Corollary 3.5). This can be deduced using the *semistability test* as given in [CLZ23, Lemma 23], as adapted from [Kem78, Corollary 5.1]. It states that for any group Γ and irreducible Γ -representations V_1, V_2 and V_3 , whenever $S \in V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes V_3$ is non-zero and invariant under the diagonal action of Γ , then S is SL-semistable. We consider the group $\Gamma = \text{SL}_2$. Then Γ acts by basis transformations on the space $\mathbb{C}[x, y]_d$ of homogeneous degree d polynomials in variables x and y . This is an irreducible representation. We map from $\mathbb{C}[x, y]_d$ to the univariate polynomials of degree at most d by setting $y = 1$. In the other direction we homogenize the univariate polynomials in x using y . This identifies $\mathbb{C}[x, y]_d \cong \mathbb{C}^{d+1}$. Using this identification, $P_{a,b}$ describes the bilinear multiplication map $\mathbb{C}[x, y]_{a-1} \times \mathbb{C}[x, y]_{b-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[x, y]_{a+b-2}$. This map is Γ -equivariant. Hence $P_{a,b} \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]_{a-1} \otimes \mathbb{C}[x, y]_{b-1} \otimes \mathbb{C}[x, y]_{a+b-2}^*$ is Γ -invariant. The semistability test then implies $P_{a,b}$ is SL-semistable.

However, unlike for P_c (Corollary 3.5), the tensor $P_{a,b}$ for $a \geq 3$ is not necessarily the only SL-semistable tensor of its shape. Indeed, using tensor scaling [BFG⁺18], we observe numerically for $n \in \{4, \dots, 13\}$ and the optimal choices of a, b such that $M_n \not\supseteq P_{a,b}$ from the proof of Theorem 1.8, that (u_a, u_b, u_{a+b-1}) is in fact an element of $\Delta(M_n)$. By Lemma 3.1, this means M_n must restrict to some semistable tensor of shape $a \times b \times (a + b - 1)$ that is not equivalent to $P_{a,b}$. Thus this analysis does not directly lead to an extension of Theorem 1.4.

4.3 Asymptotic restriction does not imply moment polytope inclusion

We prove [Theorem 1.9](#) by giving two examples, [Example 4.4](#) and [Example 4.8](#). The first example uses matrix multiplication tensors.

Example 4.4. We take $S = \mathbf{U}_{m^2}$ and $T = \mathbf{M}_m$. Strassen [[Str88](#), Equation 4.6] proved that $\mathbf{U}_{m^2} \lesssim \mathbf{M}_m$. On the other hand, our [Theorem 1.4](#) gives $\Delta(\mathbf{U}_{m^2}) \not\subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{M}_m)$.

The second example will use the unique non-zero skew-symmetric tensor in $\Lambda^3(\mathbb{C}^3) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$. We will need some ingredients to discuss it.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $a, b \geq 1$. The orbit $\mathrm{GL} \cdot \mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}$ is dense in $\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^{ab}$ and equals the subset of SL-semistable tensors in $\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^{ab}$.*

Proof. Let $S \in \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^{ab}$. We may write $S = \sum_{i,k=1}^a \sum_{j,\ell=1}^b S_{i,j,(k,\ell)} e_i \otimes e_j \otimes e_{k,\ell}$ for some coefficients $S_{i,j,(k,\ell)}$. Let M be the $ab \times ab$ matrix with coefficients $M_{(k,\ell),(i,j)} = S_{i,j,(k,\ell)}$. Then $S = \sum_{i,j} e_i \otimes e_j \otimes M e_{i,j} = (I_a \otimes I_b \otimes M) \mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}$. Therefore, S is a restriction of $\mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}$. Thus S is also a degeneration of $\mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}$. We conclude that $\overline{\mathrm{GL} \cdot \mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}} = \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^{ab}$.

A straightforward computation shows that $\mu(\mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}) = (I_a/a, I_b/b, I_{ab}/ab)$. By the Kempf–Ness theorem ([Theorem 2.2](#)), this means $\mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}$ is semistable and has closed SL orbit. In particular, all tensors in $\mathrm{GL} \cdot \mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}$ are semistable. Moreover, we may apply [Lemma 3.4](#) to obtain that all tensors in the border of $\mathrm{GL} \cdot \mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}$ are unstable. Because this orbit is dense, these are all tensors outside the orbit, and we are done. \square

Corollary 4.6. $\Delta(\mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}) = \Delta(\mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^{ab})$.

Proof. [Proposition 4.5](#) implies that $\overline{\mathrm{GL} \cdot \mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}} = \mathbb{C}^a \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^{ab}$, after which the definition of Δ ([Definition 1.1](#)) directly implies the result. \square

Corollary 4.7. *Let $a, b \geq 1$. Then for any tensor T the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathbf{M}_{a,1,b} \leq T$,
- (2) $\mathbf{M}_{a,1,b} \preceq T$,
- (3) $\Delta(\mathbf{M}_{a,1,b}) \subseteq \Delta(T)$,
- (4) $(u_a \mid u_b \mid u_{ab}) \in \Delta(T)$.

Proof. This follows from combining [Proposition 4.5](#) with [Lemma 3.1](#). \square

Example 4.8. Let $S = \mathbf{M}_{1,1,3}$ and $T = e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge e_3 = e_{1,2,3} - e_{1,3,2} + e_{2,3,1} - e_{2,1,3} + e_{3,1,2} - e_{3,2,1}$, where we write $e_{i,j,k} = e_i \otimes e_j \otimes e_k$.

We claim $\Delta(\mathbf{M}_{1,1,3}) \not\subseteq \Delta(T)$. Let $\mathrm{maxrank}(T)$ be the largest rank of any element in the matrix subspace $\{(\beta \otimes I \otimes I) \cdot T \mid \beta \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times n}\}$. Then $\mathrm{maxrank}(T)$ equals the largest r such that $T \geq \mathbf{M}_{1,1,r}$. We prove $\mathrm{maxrank}(T) = 2$. Indeed, viewed as a matrix,

$$(\beta \otimes I \otimes I) \cdot T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \beta_3 & -\beta_2 \\ -\beta_3 & 0 & \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 & -\beta_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The determinant of this matrix equals 0 for every β . Therefore, $\mathrm{maxrank}(T) \leq 2$. It follows that $T \not\geq \mathbf{M}_{1,1,3}$ and thus $\Delta(\mathbf{M}_{1,1,3}) \not\subseteq \Delta(T)$ by [Corollary 4.7](#).

We claim $T \gtrsim \mathbf{U}_3$. Then $T \gtrsim \mathbf{M}_{1,1,3}$ since $\mathbf{U}_3 \geq \mathbf{M}_{1,1,3}$. The inequality $T \gtrsim \mathbf{U}_3$ follows from the characterization of asymptotic subrank for tight tensors of Strassen [[Str91](#), Lemma 5.1, Proposition 5.4] (see also [[CVZ21](#), Theorem 4.4, Corollary 4.5]). For any tensor $S \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_3}$ the support $\mathrm{supp}(S)$ is called tight if there exist injective maps $f_\ell: [n_\ell] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such

that $f_1(i) + f_2(j) + f_3(k) = 0$ for every $(i, j, k) \in \text{supp}(S)$. The characterization states: Suppose $\text{supp}(S)$ is tight and let $r = \max_p \min\{2^{H(p_1)}, 2^{H(p_2)}, 2^{H(p_3)}\}$, where p goes over all probability distributions on $\text{supp}(T)$, and p_1, p_2, p_3 denote its marginal distributions. Then $S^{\boxtimes n} \geq U_{r^{n-o(n)}}$. Note that $\text{supp}(T)$ is tight by taking $f_\ell(1) = f_\ell(2) = 1$ and $f_\ell(3) = -2$. Choosing $p(i, j, k) = 1/6$ for all $(i, j, k) \in \text{supp}(T)$ gives $r \geq 3$. We conclude $T \gtrsim \langle 3 \rangle$.

Acknowledgements MvdB, VL, and MW acknowledge support by the European Research Council (ERC Grant Agreement No. 101040907). MvdB also acknowledges financial support by the Dutch National Growth Fund (NGF), as part of the Quantum Delta NL visitor programme. MC and HN acknowledge financial support from the European Research Council (ERC Grant Agreement No. 818761), VILLUM FONDEN via the QMATH Centre of Excellence (Grant No. 10059) and the Novo Nordisk Foundation (grant NNF20OC0059939 ‘Quantum for Life’). MC also thanks the National Center for Competence in Research SwissMAP of the Swiss National Science Foundation and the Section of Mathematics at the University of Geneva for their hospitality. Part of this work was completed while MC was Turing Chair for Quantum Software, associated to the QuSoft research center in Amsterdam, acknowledging financial support by the Dutch National Growth Fund (NGF), as part of the Quantum Delta NL visitor programme. HN also acknowledges support by the European Union via a ERC grant (QInteract, Grant No. 101078107). MW also acknowledges the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy - EXC 2092 CASA - 390781972, the BMBF (QuBRA, 13N16135; QuSol, 13N17173) and the Dutch Research Council (NWO grant OCENW.KLEIN.267). JZ was supported by NWO Veni grant VI.Veni.212.284. Views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

References

- [BCI11] Peter Bürgisser, Matthias Christandl, and Christian Ikenmeyer. Nonvanishing of Kronecker coefficients for rectangular shapes. *Advances in Mathematics*, 227(5):2082–2091, August 2011. [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2011.04.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2011.04.012). 2, 4
- [BCL⁺24] Jop Briët, Matthias Christandl, Itai Leigh, Amir Shpilka, and Jeroen Zuiddam. Discreteness of asymptotic tensor ranks. In *15th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2024)*, volume 287, pages 20:1–20:14, 2024. [doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2024.20](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2024.20). 11
- [BCS97] Peter Bürgisser, Michael Clausen, and Mohammad Amin Shokrollahi. *Algebraic complexity theory*, volume 315 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. [doi:10.1007/978-3-662-03338-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-03338-8). 10, 11
- [BDLG22] Alessandra Bernardi, Claudia De Lazzari, and Fulvio Gesmundo. Dimension of tensor network varieties. *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, 25(10), September 2022. [doi:10.1142/s0219199722500596](https://doi.org/10.1142/s0219199722500596). 2
- [BFG⁺18] Peter Bürgisser, Cole Franks, Ankit Garg, Rafael Oliveira, Michael Walter, and Avi Wigderson. Efficient algorithms for tensor scaling, quantum marginals, and moment polytopes. In *2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2018)*, pages 883–897. IEEE, 2018. [doi:10.1109/FOCS.2018.00088](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2018.00088). 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 14
- [BFG⁺19] Peter Bürgisser, Cole Franks, Ankit Garg, Rafael Oliveira, Michael Walter, and Avi Wigderson. Towards a theory of non-commutative optimization: Geodesic 1st and

- 2nd order methods for moment maps and polytopes. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2019)*, pages 845–861, 2019. doi:[10.1109/FOCS.2019.00055](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2019.00055). 2, 7, 8
- [BGO⁺18] Peter Bürgisser, Ankit Garg, Rafael Oliveira, Michael Walter, and Avi Wigderson. Alternating minimization, scaling algorithms, and the null-cone problem from invariant theory. In *9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2018)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018. doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2018.24](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2018.24). 8
- [BI11] Peter Bürgisser and Christian Ikenmeyer. Geometric complexity theory and tensor rank. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2011)*, pages 509–518, New York, NY, USA, 2011. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:[10.1145/1993636.1993704](https://doi.org/10.1145/1993636.1993704). 2, 4, 6
- [BI17] Peter Bürgisser and Christian Ikenmeyer. Fundamental invariants of orbit closures. *Journal of Algebra*, 477:390–434, 2017. doi:[10.1016/j.jalgebra.2016.12.035](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2016.12.035). 10
- [BIL⁺19] Markus Bläser, Christian Ikenmeyer, Vladimir Lysikov, Anurag Pandey, and Frank-Olaf Schreyer. Variety membership testing, algebraic natural proofs, and geometric complexity theory, 2019. arXiv:[1911.02534](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.02534). 11
- [Blä13] Markus Bläser. *Fast Matrix Multiplication*. Number 5 in Graduate Surveys. Theory of Computing Library, 2013. doi:[10.4086/toc.gs.2013.005](https://doi.org/10.4086/toc.gs.2013.005). 6
- [Bor12] Armand Borel. *Linear Algebraic Groups*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 2012. doi:[10.1007/978-1-4612-0941-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0941-6). 3
- [Bra04] Sergey Bravyi. Requirements for compatibility between local and multipartite quantum states. *Quantum Information & Computation*, 4(1):12–26, January 2004. arXiv:[quant-ph/0301014](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0301014). 4
- [Bri87] Michel Brion. Sur l’image de l’application moment. In *Séminaire d’algèbre Paul Dubreil et Marie-Paule Malliavin (Paris, 1986)*, volume 1296 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 177–192. Springer, Berlin, 1987. doi:[10.1007/BFb0078526](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0078526). 2, 3
- [BS00] Arkady Berenstein and Reyer Sjamaar. Coadjoint orbits, moment polytopes, and the Hilbert-Mumford criterion. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 13(2):433–466, 2000. doi:[10.1090/S0894-0347-00-00327-1](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-00-00327-1). 4
- [CHM07] Matthias Christandl, Aram W. Harrow, and Graeme Mitchison. Nonzero kronecker coefficients and what they tell us about spectra. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 270(3):575–585, January 2007. doi:[10.1007/s00220-006-0157-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-006-0157-3). 2
- [CLS⁺24] Matthias Christandl, Vladimir Lysikov, Vincent Steffan, Albert H. Werner, and Freek Witteveen. The resource theory of tensor networks. *Quantum*, 8:1560, December 2024. doi:[10.22331/q-2024-12-11-1560](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2024-12-11-1560). 2, 6
- [CLVW20] Matthias Christandl, Angelo Lucia, Péter Vrana, and Albert H. Werner. Tensor network representations from the geometry of entangled states. *SciPost Physics*, 9(3):042, September 2020. doi:[10.21468/SciPostPhys.9.3.042](https://doi.org/10.21468/SciPostPhys.9.3.042). 2, 6
- [CLZ23] Matthias Christandl, Vladimir Lysikov, and Jeroen Zuiddam. Weighted slice rank and a minimax correspondence to Strassen’s spectra. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 172:299–329, 2023. doi:[10.1016/j.matpur.2023.02.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpur.2023.02.006). 14

- [CM06] Matthias Christandl and Graeme Mitchison. The spectra of quantum states and the Kronecker coefficients of the symmetric group. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 261(3):789–797, 2006. doi:[10.1007/s00220-005-1435-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-005-1435-1). 2
- [CMW08] Toby Cubitt, Ashley Montanaro, and Andreas Winter. On the dimension of subspaces with bounded Schmidt rank. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 49(2):022107, February 2008. doi:[10.1063/1.2862998](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2862998). 12
- [CVZ21] Matthias Christandl, Péter Vrana, and Jeroen Zuiddam. Universal points in the asymptotic spectrum of tensors. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 36(1):31–79, November 2021. arXiv:[1709.07851](https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.07851), doi:[10.1090/jams/996](https://doi.org/10.1090/jams/996). 2, 3, 7, 8, 15
- [DGMS10] Jean-Guillaume Dumas, Rod Gow, Gary McGuire, and John Sheekey. Subspaces of matrices with special rank properties. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 433(1):191–202, 2010. doi:[10.1016/j.laa.2010.02.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2010.02.015). 12
- [DK13] Harm Derksen and Gregor Kemper. *Computational Invariant Theory*. Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013. doi:[10.1007/978-3-662-48422-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48422-7). 7
- [Fra02] Matthias Franz. Moment polytopes of projective G -varieties and tensor products of symmetric group representations. *Journal of Lie Theory*, 12(2):539–549, 2002. URL: https://www.emis.de/journals/JLT/vol.12_no.2/16.html. 3, 4
- [FW22] Cole Franks and Michael Walter. Minimal length in an orbit closure as a semiclassical limit, 2022. arXiv:[2004.14872](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.14872). 8
- [HSS03] Atsushi Higuchi, Anthony Sudbery, and Jason Szulc. One-qubit reduced states of a pure many-qubit state: Polygon inequalities. *Physical Review Letters*, 90:107902, March 2003. doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.107902](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.107902). 4
- [HZG04] Yong-Jian Han, Yong Sheng Zhang, and Guang Can Guo. Compatible conditions, entanglement, and invariants. *Physical Review. A. Third Series*, 70(4):042309, 9, 2004. doi:[10.1103/PhysRevA.70.042309](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.70.042309). 4
- [Kem78] George R. Kempf. Instability in invariant theory. *Annals of Mathematics*, 108(2):299–316, 1978. doi:[10.2307/1971168](https://doi.org/10.2307/1971168). 14
- [Kly04] Alexander Klyachko. Quantum marginal problem and representations of the symmetric group, September 2004. arXiv:[quant-ph/0409113](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0409113). 2, 4
- [KMZ23] Swastik Kopparty, Guy Moshkovitz, and Jeroen Zuiddam. Geometric rank of tensors and subrank of matrix multiplication. *Discrete Analysis*, April 2023. doi:[10.19086/da.73322](https://doi.org/10.19086/da.73322). 2, 6
- [LQY12] Joseph M. Landsberg, Yang Qi, and Ke Ye. On the geometry of tensor network states. *Quantum Information & Computation*, 12(3-4):346–354, 2012. arXiv:[1105.4449](https://arxiv.org/abs/1105.4449). 2
- [NM84] Linda Ness and David Mumford. A stratification of the null cone via the moment map. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 106(6):1281, December 1984. doi:[10.2307/2374395](https://doi.org/10.2307/2374395). 2, 3, 4
- [Pok86] Andrzej Pokrzywa. On perturbations and the equivalence orbit of a matrix pencil. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 82:99–121, 1986. doi:[10.1016/0024-3795\(86\)90144-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795(86)90144-8). 10

- [Res10] Nicolas Ressayre. Geometric invariant theory and the generalized eigenvalue problem. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 180(2):389–441, 2010. doi:[10.1007/s00222-010-0233-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-010-0233-3). 4
- [Res11] Nicolas Ressayre. Geometric Invariant Theory and Generalized Eigenvalue Problem II. *Annales de l'Institut Fourier*, 61(4):1467–1491, 2011. doi:[10.5802/aif.2647](https://doi.org/10.5802/aif.2647). 4
- [SOK14] Adam Sawicki, Michał Oszmaniec, and Marek Kuś. Convexity of momentum map, morse index, and quantum entanglement. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics*, 26(03):1450004, April 2014. doi:[10.1142/s0129055x14500044](https://doi.org/10.1142/s0129055x14500044). 2
- [Str87] Volker Strassen. Relative bilinear complexity and matrix multiplication. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 1987(375-376):406–443, January 1987. doi:[10.1515/crll.1987.375-376.406](https://doi.org/10.1515/crll.1987.375-376.406). 2, 6
- [Str88] Volker Strassen. The asymptotic spectrum of tensors. *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik.*, 384:102–152, 1988. doi:[10.1515/crll.1988.384.102](https://doi.org/10.1515/crll.1988.384.102). 7, 15
- [Str91] Volker Strassen. Degeneration and complexity of bilinear maps: Some asymptotic spectra. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 413:127–180, 1991. doi:[10.1515/crll.1991.413.127](https://doi.org/10.1515/crll.1991.413.127). 15
- [Str05] Volker Strassen. Komplexität und Geometrie bilinearer Abbildungen. *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, 107(1):3–31, 2005. 2
- [SWK13] Adam Sawicki, Michael Walter, and Marek Kuś. When is a pure state of three qubits determined by its single-particle reduced density matrices? *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 46(5):055304, 2013. doi:[10.1088/1751-8113/46/5/055304](https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/46/5/055304). 4
- [vdBCL⁺25] Maxim van den Berg, Matthias Christandl, Vladimir Lysikov, Harold Nieuwboer, Michael Walter, and Jeroen Zuiddam. Computing moment polytopes of tensors. To appear, 2025. 5, 7, 8
- [VW17] Michèle Vergne and Michael Walter. Inequalities for moment cones of finite-dimensional representations. *Journal of Symplectic Geometry*, 15:1209–1250, January 2017. doi:[10.4310/JSG.2017.v15.n4.a8](https://doi.org/10.4310/JSG.2017.v15.n4.a8). 4, 5
- [Wal14] Walter, Michael. *Multipartite Quantum States and their Marginals*. PhD thesis, ETH Zurich, 2014. doi:[10.3929/ETHZ-A-010250985](https://doi.org/10.3929/ETHZ-A-010250985). 2, 4
- [Wal17] Nolan R. Wallach. *Geometric Invariant Theory*. Universitext. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017. doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-65907-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65907-7). 7
- [WDGC13] Michael Walter, Brent Doran, David Gross, and Matthias Christandl. Entanglement polytopes: Multiparticle entanglement from single-particle information. *Science*, 340(6137):1205–1208, 2013. doi:[10.1126/science.1232957](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1232957). 2, 3, 4
- [WZ22] Avi Wigderson and Jeroen Zuiddam. Asymptotic spectra: Theory, applications and extensions, 2022. URL: <https://staff.fnwi.uva.nl/j.zuiddam/papers/convexity.pdf>. 2