

# The quantum sky of Majorana stars

Luis L. Sánchez-Soto,<sup>1,2,3</sup> Andrei B. Klimov,<sup>4</sup> Aaron Z. Goldberg,<sup>5</sup> and Gerd Leuchs<sup>2,6,7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Departamento de Óptica, Facultad de Física, Universidad Complutense, 28040 Madrid, Spain

<sup>2</sup>Max-Planck-Institut für die Physik des Lichts, 91058 Erlangen, Germany

<sup>3</sup>Institute for Quantum Studies, Chapman University, Orange, CA 92866, USA

<sup>4</sup>Departamento de Física, Universidad de Guadalajara, 44420 Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico

<sup>5</sup>National Research Council of Canada, 100 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 5A2, Canada

<sup>6</sup>Institut für Optik, Information und Photonik, Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, 91058 Erlangen, Germany

<sup>7</sup>Department of Physics, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5, Canada

Majorana stars, the  $2S$  spin coherent states that are orthogonal to a spin- $S$  state, offer an elegant method to visualize quantum states. This representation offers deep insights into the structure, symmetries, and entanglement properties of quantum states, bridging abstract algebraic formulations with intuitive geometrical intuition. In this paper, we briefly survey the development and applications of the Majorana constellation, exploring its relevance in modern areas of quantum information.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In 1932, Ettore Majorana proposed a striking construction in which an arbitrary spin- $S$  state could be represented as a superposition of  $2S$  spins  $1/2$  (or qubits, in the language of modern quantum information) [1]. Written in Italian, his paper attracted little attention and might have been forgotten altogether, had it not been stumbled upon in 1935 by a 17-year-old Julian Schwinger. What caught Schwinger’s attention was not Majorana’s stated goal—an ambitious attempt to generalize the Stern–Gerlach experiment to magnetic fields and moments of arbitrary form—but a deceptively simple line in the text: “...ogni stato sarà rappresentato da  $2S$  punti sulla sfera unitaria.” Majorana offered barely four lines of explanation, as if the statement were self-evident. Schwinger, intrigued, set about working it out for himself and soon confirmed its validity [2], though he chose not to dwell on its deeper implications [3].

Majorana disappeared in 1938, at the age of 31.<sup>1</sup> In a parallel to his personal fate, his paper and its insights also remained obscure. Schwinger returned to the subject in 1947, stimulated by a review article in which Bloch and Rabi [4] “remarked on the derivation of Majorana’s formula from the spin  $1/2$  representation.” Only in 1952 [5] did he provide a full treatment, introducing what is now called the Schwinger map, and showing how the commutation relations of angular momentum reduce elegantly to those of a two-dimensional isotropic harmonic oscillator. Surprisingly, this (unpublished) monograph cites works by Weyl, Güttinger, van der Waerden, Racah and Wigner, but contains no mention of the Majorana formula, which was subsequently revisited by Meckler [6] yet passed over in Schwinger’s own account.

In his paper, Majorana calculated the probability of nonadiabatic transitions occurring when an oriented atomic beam

passes near a point where the magnetic field vanishes, a problem previously examined by Güttinger [7]. He made a remarkable prediction: even in the absence of a magnetic field, a spin- $1/2$  particle has a nonzero probability of flipping its spin. Bloch and Rabi later generalized this result to arbitrary spin- $S$  systems [4], laying the theoretical groundwork for nuclear magnetic resonance. Decades later, the same effect reemerged in atomic physics [8], where atoms confined in quadrupole magnetic traps were found to undergo spin flips and escape—a phenomenon known as the Majorana hole. This process, directly reflecting Majorana’s original prediction, initially hindered evaporative cooling and the realization of Bose–Einstein condensation. The issue was eventually resolved by developing trap configurations with a nonzero minimum magnetic field [9, 10].

The Majorana representation gained renewed prominence through the work of Roger Penrose. In 1960, he introduced a spinor approach to general relativity [11], providing a proof of Petrov’s classification of gravitational fields based on the degeneracy of the principal null directions of a gravitational spinor [12]. Decades later, recognizing these directions as Majorana constellations, he employed the representation in a refined proof of Bell’s theorem [13] and popularized it through his influential book [14].

Subsequent research quickly expanded the scope of the representation. Hannay derived the pair correlation function of random spin states in the large- $S$  limit [15] and later obtained a general expression for Berry’s phase, applying the spin-1 case to optical polarization [16, 17].

The geometric insight offered by the Majorana picture has since inspired numerous applications. In quantum information, it has been used to characterize “the most quantum” states [18–23] and to develop powerful criteria of quantumness, such as the stellar rank [24–26].

The representation also provides a natural framework for studying entanglement. Bastin and collaborators classified symmetric  $N$ -qubit states under stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC) using the degeneracy patterns of Majorana stars [27, 28]. Markham and coworkers [29, 30] further related entanglement measures to constellation symmetries, while more recent work has explored multipartite entanglement from this perspective [31–39].

<sup>1</sup> Majorana vanished at sea in 1938 under circumstances that remain shrouded in mystery. His disappearance later gained wide public attention through Leonardo Sciascia’s 1975 novel *The Vanishing of Majorana*, which elevated the episode to the level of cultural myth and provoked a host of speculative interpretations regarding his motives.

In quantum metrology, the representation has revealed the states most sensitive to small rotations around arbitrary axes [40–46], with concrete applications in polarimetry and magnetometry [47, 48].

Beyond quantum information, Majorana constellations have been employed to study geometric phases [49, 50], spinor Bose gases [51–56], the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model [57, 58], and the symmetries and properties of spin states [59–65].

The purpose of this paper is to provide a comprehensive introduction to Majorana constellations, highlighting their broad utility and explanatory power.

## II. MAJORANA CONSTELLATIONS

We consider pure spin- $S$  states living in the  $(2S + 1)$ -dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_S$ , carrier of the irreducible representation (irrep) of spin  $S$  of  $SU(2)$ . This space  $\mathcal{H}_S$  is spanned by the standard angular momentum basis  $\{|S, m\rangle \mid m = -S, \dots, S\}$ , whose elements are simultaneous eigenstates of  $\mathbf{S}^2$  and  $S_z$ . Although  $\mathcal{H}_S$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}^{2S+1}$ , physical states correspond to rays in this space (i.e., vectors differing by only a global phase represent the same state), so the set of pure spin- $S$  states forms the complex projective space  $\mathbb{C}\mathbf{P}^{2S}$  [66].

The merit of Majorana was to show that points in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbf{P}^{2S}$  are in one-to-one correspondence with unordered sets of (possibly coincident)  $2S$  points on the unit sphere  $\mathcal{S}_2$ . In other words, spin- $S$  states can be obtained as fully symmetrized states of a system of  $2S$  spins 1/2 (or qubits). There are various ways to see why this is so [67], but probably the most direct one is in terms of coherent states.

The spin (or Bloch) coherent states live in  $\mathcal{H}_S$  and are displaced versions of a fiducial state, much the same as for the canonical coherent states on the plane. This fiducial state is chosen so as to minimize the variance of the Casimir operator  $\mathbf{S}^2 = S_x^2 + S_y^2 + S_z^2$ , where  $(S_x, S_y, S_z)$  are the angular momentum operators, which generate the algebra  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ . The minimum-variance states are  $|S, \pm S\rangle$  and they guarantee that their displaced versions are the closest to classical states. The displacement operator on  $\mathcal{S}_2$  is

$$D(\theta, \phi) = e^{i\phi S_z} e^{i\theta S_y} = \exp\left[\frac{1}{2}\theta(S_+ e^{-i\phi} - S_- e^{i\phi})\right], \quad (2.1)$$

where  $S_{\pm} = S_x \pm iS_y$  are raising and lowering operators. Disentangling this displacement allows us to express the coherent states  $|\theta, \phi\rangle = D(\theta, \phi)|S, -S\rangle$  as [68, 69]

$$|\theta, \phi\rangle \equiv |z\rangle = \frac{1}{(1 + |z|^2)^S} \exp(zS_+) |S, -S\rangle, \quad (2.2)$$

where the label

$$z = \tan\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) e^{-i\phi} \quad (2.3)$$

corresponds to a stereographic projection from the south pole, mapping the point  $(\theta, \phi) \in \mathcal{S}_2$  onto the point  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  [70].

On expanding the exponential, we can write the coherent states in terms of the basis states of the irrep:

$$|z\rangle = \frac{1}{(1 + |z|^2)^S} \sum_{m=-S}^S \binom{2S}{S+m}^{\frac{1}{2}} z^{S+m} |S, m\rangle, \quad (2.4)$$

or, employing again the stereographic projection,

$$|\theta, \phi\rangle = \sum_{m=-S}^S \binom{2S}{S+m}^{\frac{1}{2}} [\sin(\theta/2)]^{S+m} [\cos(\theta/2)]^{S-m} e^{-i(S+m)\phi} |S, m\rangle. \quad (2.5)$$

The system of spin coherent states is complete, but the states are not mutually orthogonal; their overlap is

$$\langle z|z' \rangle = \frac{(1 + z^*z')^{2S}}{[(1 + |z|^2)(1 + |z'|^2)]^S}. \quad (2.6)$$

Still, they allow for a resolution of the identity in the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}} d\mu_S(z) |z\rangle \langle z| = \mathbb{1}, \quad (2.7)$$

with the invariant measure given by

$$d\mu_S(z) = \frac{2S+1}{\pi} \frac{d^2z}{(1 + |z|^2)^2}. \quad (2.8)$$

The importance of this completeness relation is that it allows one to decompose an arbitrary pure state over the coherent states. We denote such a coherent-state representation as  $\psi(z^*) = \langle z|\psi\rangle$ . In addition, we define the stellar function  $f_{\psi}(z)$  of the state  $|\psi\rangle$  as

$$f_{\psi}(z) = (1 + |z|^2)^S \psi(z) = \sum_{m=-S}^S \binom{2S}{S+m}^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi_m z^{S+m} = \sum_{k=0}^{2S} \binom{2S}{k}^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi_{k-S} z^k, \quad (2.9)$$

with  $\psi_m = \langle S, m|\psi\rangle$ ; in the second line we have made the relabeling  $S + m \mapsto k$ . Interestingly, in this representation the wave function is a polynomial in  $z$  of order  $r \leq 2S$ . In consequence, the roots  $z_k \in \mathbb{C}$  of  $f_{\psi}$  fully characterize the state:

$$f_{\psi}(z) = \mathcal{N} \prod_{k=1}^r (z - z_k), \quad (2.10)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}$  is an unessential global constant. These roots define, via an inverse stereographic map,  $2S$  points on the unit sphere  $\mathcal{S}_2$ . This is the Majorana constellation, and each one of these points constitutes one star in the constellation. An  $SU(2)$  transformation corresponds to a rigid rotation of the constellation; therefore, states with the same constellation, irrespective of their orientation, have the same physical properties.

The stellar function is directly related to the Husimi  $Q$  function [71, 72]:

$$Q_{\psi}(z) = (1 + |z|^2)^{-2S} |f_{\psi}(z^*)|^2, \quad (2.11)$$

which clearly shows that the zeros of the Husimi  $Q_{\psi}$  function are the complex conjugates of the zeros of  $f_{\psi}$ .

### III. EXTRACTING INFORMATION FROM THE CONSTELLATION

So far, we have shown how to compute the constellation when the state is given. In this section, we attack the inverse problem; that is, what information can we extract from a given constellation? To this end, we first recall that every polynomial  $P(z)$  of degree  $n$  can be represented in terms of its zeros  $z_k$  using the classical Vieta formulas [73], which can be expressed in the form

$$P(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k z^k = a_n \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^{n-k} e_{n-k}(z) z^k, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $e_j(z) \equiv e_j(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$  are the elementary symmetric polynomials [74] defined as

$$\begin{aligned} e_0(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) &= 1, \\ e_1(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) &= \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} z_j, \\ e_2(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) &= \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} z_j z_k, \\ &\vdots \\ e_n(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) &= z_1 z_2 \dots z_n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Using this fundamental result, the Majorana stellar function can be expressed in the compact form

$$f_\psi(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{2S} \mathfrak{f}_k(z) z^k, \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{f}_k(z) = (-1)^{2S-k} \psi_S e_{2S-k}(z), \quad (3.4)$$

and the coefficient  $\psi_S$  is fixed by the normalization condition

$$\psi_S(z) = \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{2S} \frac{|e_{2S-k}(z)|^2}{\binom{2S}{k}} \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.5)$$

In this way, the state coefficients are simply related to the coefficients of the Majorana polynomial, and we can calculate them as a function of the stars:

$$\psi_{k-S}(z) = \frac{\mathfrak{f}_k(z)}{\binom{2S}{k}^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (3.6)$$

### IV. CONSTELLATIONS AND QUANTUMNESS

Let us examine a few relevant examples to illustrate how these constellations look. For a spin coherent state  $|z_0\rangle$ , the stellar representation is direct from Eq. (2.6):

$$f_{z_0}(z) = \frac{(1 + z_0 z)^{2S}}{(1 + |z_0|^2)^S}, \quad (4.1)$$

so it has a single zero at  $z = -1/z_0$  with multiplicity  $2S$ . In consequence, the constellation collapses in this case to a single point diametrically opposed to the maximum  $z_0$ .

Next, we consider the time-honored NOON states [75], which, when expressed in the  $|S, m\rangle$  basis, take the form

$$|\psi_{\text{NOON}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|S, S\rangle + |S, -S\rangle). \quad (4.2)$$

They are known to have the highest sensitivity for a fixed excitation  $S$  to small rotations about the  $z$ -axis [76]. The associated stellar function reads

$$f_{\text{NOON}}(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (z^{2S} - 1). \quad (4.3)$$

The zeros are thus the  $2S$  roots of unity, so the Majorana constellations have  $2S$  stars placed around the equator with equal angular separation between each star (that is, a regular  $2S$ -gon on the equator). A rotation around the  $z$  axis of angle  $\pi/(2S)$  renders the state orthogonal to itself, justifying their optimality.

These two examples suggest that the most classical states correspond to the most concentrated constellations. As the stars spread out and form more symmetric patterns, the state acquires a more pronounced quantum character. In other words, the geometry and symmetry of the constellation directly encode the quantumness of the state.

To quantify this connection, it is convenient to use the concept of state multipoles, which are the coefficients  $\varrho_{Kq}$  in the expansion of the density matrix  $\varrho$  in terms of irreducible tensors [77, 78]  $T_{Kq}$  (where  $K = 0, \dots, 2S$  and  $q = -K, \dots, K$ ). These tensors form an orthonormal basis and have the correct transformation properties under  $SU(2)$  actions. However, we do not need the whole machinery of irreducible tensor analysis to grasp their physical meaning. Indeed, one can show that [47]

$$\varrho_{Kq} = C_K \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} d\Omega Q(\theta, \phi) Y_{Kq}(\theta, \phi), \quad (4.4)$$

where  $C_K$  is a constant,  $d\Omega = \sin \theta d\theta d\phi$  is the invariant measure on  $\mathcal{S}_2$  and  $Y_{Kq}(\theta, \phi)$  are the spherical harmonics [79], which form an orthonormal basis for square-integrable functions defined on the sphere. The key point is that the state multipoles appear as the familiar multipoles in electrostatics [80], except that the charge density is replaced by  $Q(\theta, \phi)$  and distances are replaced by directions.

When expressed in a Cartesian basis these multipoles appear in a very transparent form. For instance, the three dipole ( $\varrho_{1q}$ ) and the five quadrupole ( $\varrho_{2q}$ ) terms can be written, respectively, as

$$\mathfrak{p}_i = \langle n_i \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{q}_{ij} = \langle 3n_i n_j - \delta_{ij} \rangle, \quad (4.5)$$

where  $i, j \in \{x, y, z\}$ ,  $\mathbf{n}$  is a unit vector in  $\mathcal{S}_2$ , and the expectation values of a function  $f(\mathbf{n})$  are calculated with respect the  $Q$ -function

$$\langle f(\theta, \phi) \rangle = \frac{\int_{\mathcal{S}_2} d\Omega f(\theta, \phi) Q(\theta, \phi)}{\int_{\mathcal{S}_2} d\Omega Q(\theta, \phi)}. \quad (4.6)$$




FIG. 1. Density plots of the  $Q$  functions for the optimal Kings of Quantumness for the cases  $S = 3, 5, 6$ , and  $10$  (from left to right, blue indicates the zero values and red maximal ones). On top, we sketch the Majorana constellations.

This confirms that the multipoles correspond to the  $K$ th directional moments of the state, resolving progressively finer angular features. The dipole term, as the first-order moment, reproduces the classical picture, while higher-order multipoles describe finer quantum fluctuations. The vanishing of a given  $K$ th multipole signals that the associated fluctuations are isotropic.

We note that the length of  $\varrho_{Kq}$ , defined as

$$\mathfrak{w}_K = \sum_{q=-K}^K |\varrho_{Kq}|^2, \quad (4.7)$$

is just the state overlapping with the  $K$ th multipole pattern. For most states only a limited number of multipoles play a substantive role and the rest of them have an exceedingly small contribution. Therefore, it seems that a convenient way to embody the information is to look at the cumulative distribution

$$\mathcal{A}_M = \sum_{K=1}^M \mathfrak{w}_K = \sum_{K=1}^M \sum_{q=-K}^K |\varrho_{Kq}|^2, \quad (4.8)$$

which conveys the whole information up to order  $M$ . The monopole term  $|\varrho_{00}|^2$  is excluded, for it is just a constant term. As with any cumulative distribution,  $\mathcal{A}_M$  is a monotone nondecreasing function of the multipole order.

This aggregated multipole strength  $\mathcal{A}_M$  is a good measure of quantumness. It has been proven [21] that is maximal for coherent states. It is thus irresistible to ask which states attain the minimum of this magnitude, as they can be considered in a sense as “the opposite” of SU(2) coherent states and so the most quantum ones. For a given  $S$  one cannot find pure states that have isotropic moments up to order  $M = 2S$ . Only the completely mixed states have this property [81–83]. Thus, for each  $S$  there exists a set of pure states that are maximally unpolarized and the task is to find what the maximal degree  $M$  of “unpolarization” can be, and what these states are. The resulting states are called the Kings of Quantumness and have been fully described in Ref. [84] and experimentally generated [40, 45]. A few associated constellations appear in Fig. 1.

In the framework of the Majorana representation, the search for the most quantum states can be reformulated as the problem of distributing  $N$  points on a sphere in the “most symmetric” possible way. This problem has a long history and has inspired a variety of approaches, depending on the particular cost function one aims to optimize [85, 86]. This is closely related to relevant problems, such as spherical  $t$ -designs [87–89], the Thomson problem [90–93], or the notion of  $k$ -maximally mixed states [94].

## V. STELLAR DYNAMICS

It is well established that the group  $SU(2)$  acts on the vector space  $\mathcal{F}_S(\mathbb{C})$  of complex polynomials of degree at most  $2S+1$  via the differential realization [95]

$$S_+ \mapsto 2Sz - z^2 \partial_z, \quad S_- \mapsto \partial_z, \quad S_z \mapsto z\partial_z - S, \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\partial_z$  denotes derivative with respect to  $z$ . Accordingly, the action of an operator  $A$  on this space can be expressed as

$$A \mapsto A(z, \partial_z) = \sum_n a_n(z) \partial_z^n, \quad (5.2)$$

with  $a_n(z)$  being polynomial functions that depend on the operator  $A$ . This representation is valid for a broad class of operators and, in particular, for all the elements in the enveloping algebra of  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ . The highest meaningful order  $n$  in this equation is  $2S$  since  $\partial_{z^*}^n \psi(z^*) = 0$  for  $n > 2S$ .

Since, as we have discussed before, the coherent-state wave function  $\psi(z^*)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_S(\mathbb{C})$ , the Schrödinger equation can be recast as (setting  $\hbar = 1$ )

$$i\partial_t \psi(z^*, t) = H(z^*, \partial_{z^*}) \psi(z^*, t). \quad (5.3)$$

If at time  $t$ , the state has a zero at some complex point  $z_k^*$ , then the condition that the zero persists under an infinitesimal time evolution,  $\psi(z_k^* + \delta z_k^*, t + \delta t) = 0$ , implies

$$\dot{z}_k^* = \frac{\delta z_k^*}{\delta t} = -\left. \frac{\partial_t \psi}{\partial_{z^*} \psi} \right|_{z_k^*}, \quad (5.4)$$

which, after using (5.3), becomes

$$\dot{z}_k^* = i \left. \frac{H(z^*, \partial_{z^*}) \psi(z^*)}{\partial_{z^*} \psi(z^*)} \right|_{z_k^*}, \quad (5.5)$$

These equations determine the dynamics of each of the Majorana stars associated with a given state [96, 97]. However, they are not yet closed, as the wave function  $\psi(z^*, t)$  still appears explicitly when calculating  $\dot{z}_k^*$ . To eliminate this dependence, we write

$$\left. \frac{H(z^*, \partial_{z^*}) \psi(z^*)}{\partial_{z^*} \psi(z^*)} \right|_{z_k^*} = \sum_n h_n(z_k^*) \left. \frac{\partial_{z^*}^n \psi}{\partial_{z^*} \psi} \right|_{z_k^*}, \quad (5.6)$$

where  $h_n$  are the polynomial coefficients associated with the Hamiltonian [see Eq. (5.2)]. Using the factorization property (2.10), the ratio of derivatives can be expressed as

$$\left. \frac{\partial_{z^*}^n \psi}{\partial_{z^*} \psi} \right|_{z_k^*} = \sum_{k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_{n-1}} \frac{n!}{(z_k^* - z_{k_1}^*) \dots (z_k^* - z_{k_{n-1}}^*)}, \quad (5.7)$$

where the sum runs over terms with all  $k_i \neq k$ . The final form for the equations of motion thus reads

$$\dot{z}_k^* = i \sum_n h_n(z_k^*) \sum_{k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_{n-1}}^{2S} \frac{n!}{(z_k^* - z_{k_1}^*) \dots (z_k^* - z_{k_{n-1}}^*)}, \quad (5.8)$$

The equilibrium configurations for the zeros are determined by the conditions  $\dot{z}_k^* = 0$ . This gives an algebraic system of  $2S$  nonlinear coupled equations for the  $2S$  variables  $\{z_k^*\}$ .

Each term in the sum corresponds to an effective  $n$ -body interaction: the  $k$ th star interacts with  $n - 1$  of the remaining stars. The number of such contributions is  $C(2S - 2, n - 2)$ , where  $C(n, k)$  denotes a binomial coefficient. Then the coefficient  $h_n$  can be seen as a position-dependent *charge*. However, this charge depends only on the position of the  $k$ th zero, and not on the position of the remaining zeros.

For degenerate stars, both  $\partial_{z^*} \psi$  and  $\partial_t \psi$  vanish. The evolution equations for the stars are then found from higher-order expansions in  $\delta z^*$  and  $\delta t$ , yielding coupled equations for  $m$ th-order degenerate stars

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^m z^{*\ell} \binom{m}{\ell} \partial_{z^*}^\ell [-iH(z^*, \partial_{z^*})^{m-\ell}] \psi \Big|_{z_k^*} = 0. \quad (5.9)$$

We now illustrate our approach with a few simple examples. We begin with the linear Hamiltonian  $H = \omega_0 S_z$ . In the coherent-state representation, the symbol of this Hamiltonian reads

$$H = \omega_0 (z^* \partial_{z^*} - S). \quad (5.10)$$

Applying now (5.4), the dynamics of the stars is governed by

$$\dot{z}_k^* = i \omega_0 z_k^*, \quad (5.11)$$

which leads to the straightforward solution

$$z_k^*(t) = z_k^* e^{i \omega_0 t}. \quad (5.12)$$

This means that the all the stars rotate around the  $z$  axis with the same velocity, exactly as a classical state.

Next, we consider the Kerr Hamiltonian  $H = \chi S_z^2$  [95], with analytic realization

$$H = \chi [z^{*2} \partial_{z^*}^2 - (2S - 1) z^* \partial_{z^*} + S^2]. \quad (5.13)$$

Again (5.4) immediately yields

$$\dot{z}_k^* = i \chi \left[ z_k^{*2} \sum_{k \neq \ell}^{2S} \frac{1}{z_k^* - z_\ell^*} - \left( S - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right]. \quad (5.14)$$

This nonlinear Hamiltonian induces interactions between the stars: points located at different latitudes move with different velocities and/or in different directions, producing a deformation of the constellation [97].

## VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Majorana stellar representation stands out as an elegant and insightful way to visualize quantum states beyond the spin-1/2 case. By expressing a spin- $S$  state as a constellation of  $2S$  points on the Bloch sphere, it transforms the abstract structure of high-dimensional Hilbert spaces into an intuitive geometric picture. This geometric perspective deepens our understanding of quantum superposition, coherence, and symmetry, providing a natural language to discuss phenomena such as spin squeezing, entanglement, and state evolution. Moreover, the motion and arrangement of the Majorana stars reveal subtle features of quantum dynamics and interference that are often hidden in algebraic formulations.

Owing to its unifying and visual character, the Majorana representation continues to inspire new insights across quantum optics, quantum information, and the broader study of many-body and topological quantum systems.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The ideas presented in this paper have been shaped and enriched through the questions, suggestions, criticism, and advice of numerous colleagues. We extend our special gratitude to G. Björk, P. de la Hoz, M. Grassl, H. de Guise, A. Muñoz, and J. L. R. Hervás for their valuable contributions in various ways. This work is supported by the Spanish Agencia Estatal de Investigación (Grant PID2021-127781NB-I00) and the Mexican Consejo Nacional de Humanidades, Ciencias y Tecnologías (Grant CBF2023-2024-50).

---

[1] E. Majorana, Atomi orientati in campo magnetico variabile, *Nuovo Cimento* **9**, 43 (1932).

[2] J. Schwinger, On nonadiabatic processes in inhomogeneous fields, *Phys. Rev.* **51**, 648 (1937).

[3] J. Schwinger, The Majorana formula, *Trans. N.Y. Acad. Sci.* **38**, 170 (1977).

[4] F. Bloch and I. I. Rabi, Atoms in variable magnetic fields, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **17**, 237 (1945).

[5] J. Schwinger, *On angular momentum*, Tech. Rep. (US Atomic Energy Commission, 1952).

[6] A. Meckler, Majorana formula, *Phys. Rev.* **111**, 1447 (1958).

[7] P. Güttinger, Das Verhalten von Atomen im magnetischen Drehfeld, *Z. Phys.* **73**, 169 (1932).

[8] M. Inguscio, Oriented atoms in a variable magnetic field (Springer, Berlin, 2006) pp. 113–136.

[9] E. A. Cornell and C. E. Wieman, Nobel lecture: Bose-Einstein condensation in a dilute gas, the first 70 years and some recent experiments, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 875 (2002).

[10] W. Ketterle, Nobel lecture: When atoms behave as waves: Bose-Einstein condensation and the atom laser, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**,

1131 (2002).

[11] R. Penrose, A spinor approach to general relativity, *Ann. Phys.* **10**, 171 (1960).

[12] R. Penrose and W. Rindler, *Spinors and Space-Time*, Vol. I (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984).

[13] J. Zimba and R. Penrose, On Bell's non-locality without probabilities: More curious geometry, *Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci. A* **24**, 697 (1993).

[14] R. Penrose, *The Emperor's New Mind (Oxford)* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989).

[15] J. H. Hannay, Chaotic analytic zero points: exact statistics for those of a random spin state, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **29**, L101 (1996).

[16] J. H. Hannay, The Berry phase for spin in the Majorana representation, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **31**, L53 (1998).

[17] J. H. Hannay, The Majorana representation of polarization, and the Berry phase of light, *J. Mod. Opt.* **45**, 1001 (1998).

[18] J. Zimba, "Anticoherent" spin states via the Majorana representation, *EJTP* **3**, 143 (2006).

[19] O. Giraud, P. Braun, and D. Braun, Quantifying quantumness and the quest for queens of quantum, *New J. Phys.* **12**, 063005 (2010).

[20] O. Giraud, D. Braun, D. Baguette, T. Bastin, and J. Martin, Tensor representation of spin states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 080401 (2015).

[21] G. Bjork, A. B. Klimov, P. de la Hoz, M. Grassl, G. Leuchs, and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, Extremal quantum states and their Majorana constellations, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 031801 (2015).

[22] G. Björk, M. Grassl, P. de la Hoz, G. Leuchs, and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, Stars of the quantum universe: extremal constellations on the Poincaré sphere, *Phys. Scr.* **90**, 108008 (2015).

[23] A. Z. Goldberg, A. B. Klimov, M. Grassl, G. Leuchs, and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, Extremal quantum states, *AVS Quantum Sci.* **2**, 044701 (2020).

[24] U. Chabaud, D. Markham, and F. Grosshans, Stellar representation of non-Gaussian quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 063605 (2020).

[25] U. Chabaud, G. Roeland, M. Walschaers, F. Grosshans, V. Parigi, D. Markham, and N. Treps, Certification of non-Gaussian states with operational measurements, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020333 (2021).

[26] A. Motamedi, Y. Yao, K. Nielsen, U. Chabaud, J. E. Bourassa, R. N. Alexander, and F. M. Miatto, The stellar decomposition of Gaussian quantum states, *Quantum* **10**, 1971 (2026).

[27] T. Bastin, S. Krins, P. Mathonet, M. Godefroid, L. Lamata, and E. Solano, Operational families of entanglement classes for symmetric  $n$ -qubit states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 070503 (2009).

[28] P. Mathonet, S. Krins, M. Godefroid, L. Lamata, E. Solano, and T. Bastin, Entanglement equivalence of  $n$ -qubit symmetric states, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 052315 (2010).

[29] M. Aulbach, D. Markham, and M. Murao, The maximally entangled symmetric state in terms of the geometric measure, *New J. Phys.* **12**, 073025 (2010).

[30] D. J. H. Markham, Entanglement and symmetry in permutation-symmetric states, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 042332 (2011).

[31] P. Ribeiro and R. Mosseri, Entanglement in the Symmetric Sector of  $n$  Qubits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 180502 (2011).

[32] W. Ganczarek, M. Kuś, and K. Życzkowski, Barycentric measure of quantum entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 032314 (2012).

[33] A. R. U. Devi, Sudha, and A. K. Rajagopal, Majorana representation of symmetric multiqubit states, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **11**, 685 (2012).

[34] A. Mandilara, T. Coudreau, A. Keller, and P. Milman, Entanglement classification of pure symmetric states via spin coherent states, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 050302 (2014).

[35] H. D. Liu and L. B. Fu, Berry phase and quantum entanglement in Majorana's stellar representation, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 022123 (2016).

[36] C.-F. Kam and R.-B. Liu, Three-tangle of a general three-qubit state in the representation of majorana stars, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 032318 (2020).

[37] C. Chryssomalakos, L. Hanotel, E. Guzmán-González, D. Braun, E. Serrano-Ensástiga, and K. Życzkowski, Symmetric multiqudit states: Stars, entanglement, and rotosensors, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 012407 (2021).

[38] A. Z. Goldberg, M. Grassl, G. Leuchs, and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, Quantumness beyond entanglement: The case of symmetric states, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 022433 (2022).

[39] M. Rudziński, A. Burchardt, and K. Życzkowski, Orthonormal bases of extreme quantumness, *Quantum* **8**, 1234 (2024).

[40] F. Bouchard, P. de la Hoz, G. Bjork, R. W. Boyd, M. Grassl, Z. Hradil, E. Karimi, A. B. Klimov, G. Leuchs, J. Rehacek, and L. L. Sanchez-Soto, Quantum metrology at the limit with extremal Majorana constellations, *Optica* **4**, 1429 (2017).

[41] C. Chryssomalakos and H. Hernández-Coronado, Optimal quantum rotosensors, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 052125 (2017).

[42] A. Z. Goldberg and D. F. V. James, Quantum-limited Euler angle measurements using anticoherent states, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 032113 (2018).

[43] J. Martin, S. Weigert, and O. Giraud, Optimal Detection of Rotations about Unknown Axes by Coherent and Anticoherent States, *Quantum* **4**, 285 (2020).

[44] A. Z. Goldberg, A. B. Klimov, G. Leuchs, and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, Rotation sensing at the ultimate limit, *J. Phys.: Photonics* **3**, 022008 (2021).

[45] A. Z. Goldberg, J. R. Hervas, A. S. Sanz, A. B. Klimov, J. Řeháček, Z. Hradil, M. Hiekkämäki, M. Eriksson, R. Fickler, G. Leuchs, and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, Robust quantum metrology with random Majorana constellations, *Quantum Sci. Technol.* **10**, 015053 (2025), 2112.01612.

[46] J. Denis, C. Read, and J. Martin, Coherent generation and protection of anticoherent spin states, *SciPost Phys. Core* **9**, 001 (2026).

[47] A. Z. Goldberg, P. de la Hoz, G. Björk, A. B. Klimov, M. Grassl, G. Leuchs, and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, Quantum concepts in optical polarization, *Adv. Opt. Photon.* **13**, 1 (2021).

[48] A. Z. Goldberg, Quantum polarimetry, *Prog. Opt.* **67**, 185 (2022).

[49] P. Bruno, Quantum geometric phase in Majorana's stellar representation: Mapping onto a many-body Aharonov-Bohm phase, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 240402 (2012).

[50] H. D. Liu and L. B. Fu, Representation of Berry phase by the trajectories of Majorana stars, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 240403 (2014).

[51] R. Barnett, A. Turner, and E. Demler, Classifying novel phases of spinor atoms, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 180412 (2006).

[52] R. Barnett, A. Turner, and E. Demler, Classifying vortices in  $s = 3$  Bose-Einstein condensates, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 013605 (2007).

[53] H. Mäkelä and K. A. Suominen, Inert states of spin- $s$  systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 190408 (2007).

[54] B. Lian, T.-L. Ho, and H. Zhai, Searching for non-Abelian phases in the Bose-Einstein condensate of dysprosium, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 051606 (2012).

[55] X. Cui, T.-L. Lian, B. and Ho, B. L. Lev, and H. Zhai, Synthetic gauge field with highly magnetic lanthanide atoms, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 011601 (2013).

[56] E. Serrano-Ensástiga and F. Mireles, Phase characterization of spinor Bose-Einstein condensates: A Majorana stellar representation approach, *Phys. Lett. A* **492**, 129188 (2023).

[57] P. Ribeiro, J. Vidal, and R. Mosseri, Thermodynamical limit of the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 050402 (2007).

[58] P. Ribeiro, J. Vidal, and R. Mosseri, Exact spectrum of the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model in the thermodynamic limit and finite-size corrections, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 021106 (2008).

[59] P. Kolenderski and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, Optimal state for keeping reference frames aligned and the platonic solids, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 052333 (2008).

[60] J. Crann, R. Pereira, and D. W. Kribs, Spherical designs and anticoherent spin states, *J. Phys. A* **43**, 255307 (2010).

[61] E. Bannai and M. Tagami, A note on anticoherent spin states, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **44**, 342002 (2011).

[62] D. Baguette, T. Bastin, and J. Martin, Multiqubit symmetric states with maximally mixed one-qubit reductions, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 032314 (2014).

[63] H.-D. Liu, L.-B. Fu, and X.-G. Wang, Coherent-state approach for Majorana representation, *Commun. Theo. Phys.* **67**, 611 (2017).

[64] C. Chryssomalakos, E. Guzmán-González, and E. Serrano-Ensástiga, Geometry of spin coherent states, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **51**, 165202 (2018).

[65] M. Wang and Y. Zhu, Anticoherent spin-2 states and spherical designs, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **55**, 425304 (2022).

[66] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017).

[67] H. Bacry, *Group Theory and Constellations* (Publbook, Paris, 2004).

[68] A. Perelomov, *Generalized Coherent States and their Applications* (Springer, Berlin, 1986).

[69] J.-P. Gazeau, *Coherent States in Quantum Physics* (Wiley, New York, 2009) p. 360.

[70] H. S. M. Coxeter, *Introduction to Geometry* (Wiley, New York, 1969).

[71] K. Husimi, Some formal properties of the density matrix, *Proc. Phys. Math. Soc. Jpn.* **22**, 264 (1940).

[72] Y. Kano, A new phase-space distribution function in the statistical theory of the electromagnetic field, *J. Math. Phys.* **6**, 1913 (1965).

[73] H. G. Finkhouser, A short account of the history of symmetric functions of roots of equations, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **37**, 357 (1930).

[74] B. van der Waerden, *Algebra*, Vol. I (Springer, Berlin, 1991).

[75] J. P. Dowling, Quantum optical metrology—the lowdown on high-NOON states, *Contemp. Phys.* **49**, 125 (2008).

[76] J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, D. J. Wineland, and D. J. Heinzen, Optimal frequency measurements with maximally correlated states, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, R4649 (1996).

[77] U. Fano and G. Racah, *Irreducible Tensorial Sets* (Academic, 1959).

[78] K. Blum, *Density Matrix Theory and Applications* (Plenum, New York, 1981).

[79] D. A. Varshalovich, A. N. Moskalev, and V. K. Khersonskii, *Quantum Theory of Angular Momentum* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1988).

[80] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 3rd ed. (Wiley, New York, 1999).

[81] H. Prakash and N. Chandra, Density operator of unpolarized radiation, *Phys. Rev. A* **4**, 796 (1971).

[82] G. S. Agarwal, On the state of unpolarized radiation, *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* **1**, 53 (1971).

[83] J. Söderholm, G. Björk, and A. Trifonov, Unpolarized light in quantum optics, *Opt. Spectrosc.* **91**, 532 (2001).

[84] <http://polarization.markus-grassl.de>.

[85] J. H. Conway, R. H. Hardin, and N. J. A. Sloane, Packing lines, planes, etc.: Packings in Grassmannian spaces, *Exp. Math.* **5**, 139 (1996).

[86] E. B. Saff and A. B. J. Kuijlaars, Distributing many points on a sphere, *Math. Intell.* **19**, 5 (1997).

[87] P. Delsarte, J. M. Goethals, and J. J. Seidel, Spherical codes and designs, *Geom. Dedicata* **6**, 363 (1977).

[88] R. H. Hardin and N. J. A. Sloane, New spherical 4-designs, *Discrete Math.* **106/107**, 255 (1992).

[89] R. H. Hardin and N. J. A. Sloane, McLaren's improved snub cube and other new spherical designs in three dimensions, *Discrete Comp. Geom.* **15**, 429 (1996).

[90] J. J. Thomson, On the structure of the atom: an investigation of the stability and periods of oscillation of a number of corpuscles arranged at equal intervals around the circumference of a circle; with application of the results to the theory of atomic structure, *Philos. Mag. Ser. 6* **7**, 37265 (1904).

[91] N. Ashby and W. E. Brittin, Thomson's problem, *American Journal of Physics*, *Am. J. Phys.* **54**, 776 (1986).

[92] J. R. Edmundson, The distribution of point charges on the surface of a sphere, *Acta Cryst.* **A48**, 46 (1992).

[93] T. H. Melnyk, O. Knop, and W. R. Smith, Extremal arrangements of points and unit charges on a sphere: equilibrium configurations revisited, *Can. J. Chem.* **55**, 1745 (1977).

[94] L. Arnaud and N. J. Cerf, Exploring pure quantum states with maximally mixed reductions, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 012319 (2013).

[95] A. B. Klimov and S. M. Chumakov, *A Group-Theoretical Approach to Quantum Optics* (Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 2009).

[96] P. Leboeuf and A. Voros, Chaos-revealing multiplicative representation of quantum eigenstates, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **23**, 1765 (1990).

[97] P. Leboeuf, Phase space approach to quantum dynamics, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **24**, 4575 (1991).