

The Structure of Emulations in Classical Spin Models: Modularity and Universality

Tobias Reinhart,* Benjamin Engel, and Gemma De les Covas

Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Innsbruck, Technikerstr. 21a, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria

The theory of spin models intersects with condensed matter physics, complex systems, graph theory, combinatorial optimization, computational complexity and neural networks. Many ensuing applications rely on the fact that complicated spin models can be transformed to simpler ones. What is the structure of such transformations? Here, we provide a framework to study and construct emulations between spin models. A spin model is a set of spin systems, and emulations are efficiently computable families of simulations with arbitrary energy cut-off, where a source spin system simulates a target system if, below the cut-off, the target Hamiltonian is encoded in the source Hamiltonian. We prove that emulations preserve important properties, as they induce reductions between computational problems such as computing ground states, approximating partition functions and approximate sampling from Boltzmann distributions. Emulations are modular (they can be added, scaled and composed), and allow for universality, i.e. under emulations, certain spin models have maximal reach. We prove that a spin model is universal if and only if it is scalable, closed and functional complete. Because the characterization is constructive, it provides a step-by-step guide to construct emulations. We prove that the 2d Ising model with fields is universal, for which we also provide two new crossing gadgets. Finally, we show that simulations can be computed by linear programs. While some ideas of this work are contained in [1], we provide new definitions and theorems. This framework provides a toolbox for applications involving emulations of spin models.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1	A. Proofs for Modularity of Simulation	49
II. Spin Systems and Simulations	4	1. Simulations Can Be Composed	49
A. Spin Systems	4	2. Simulations Can Be Added	50
B. Simulations	7	References	52
C. Modularity of Simulations	15		
III. Spin Models and Emulations	18		
A. Spin Models	18		
B. Emulations	20		
C. Characterization of Universality	25		
IV. Consequences of Universality	31		
A. Ground State Energy	31		
B. Partition Function Approximation	33		
C. Approximate Sampling	35		
V. Universality of the 2d Ising Model with Fields	36		
A. Functional Completeness	36		
B. The Crossing Gadget	37		
C. Local Closure	38		
VI. Computing Simulations by Linear Programs	42		
A. Fixed Interaction Hypergraph	43		
B. Arbitrary Interaction Hypergraph	44		
C. Alternative Crossing Gadget	46		
VII. Conclusions and Outlook	47		
A. Conclusions	47		
B. Outlook	47		

I. INTRODUCTION

While spin models were introduced as toy models for magnetism and thus investigated within condensed matter physics, their study rapidly gained significance for other disciplines. Via lattice gauge theories, spin models intersect with high energy physics [2]. More recently, spin models have percolated complex systems (see e.g. [3]), neural networks via Hopfield networks and Boltzmann machines, and to a lesser extent, formal language theory (see [4, 5] and references therein, as well as [6]). The study of spin models also intersects with graph theory and computational complexity theory, originating from Barahona's proof of the NP hardness of the 2d Ising with fields [7]. The latter implies that NP-complete problems can be transformed to the ground state energy problem of the Ising model [8], and in particular that the ground state energy problem of any spin model can be transformed to that of the Ising model. This gives rise to combinatorial optimization approaches via quantum annealing (see e.g. [9, 10]). This intersection thus results in an important application, at the core of which is a notion of transformation of spin models.

Depending on the context, it is meaningful to define transformations of spin models one way or another. In condensed matter physics, such transformations may preserve the relevant properties of phase transitions, such as high to low temperature dualities (such as the Kramers-Wannier duality, see e.g. [11]). In contrast, with a com-

* tobias.reinhart@uibk.ac.at




Figure 1: A spin model (i.e. a set of spin systems) is universal if it emulates the set of all spin systems. Emulations are efficiently computable simulations with arbitrary cut-off, where simulation is defined between spin systems.

computational complexity mindset, transformations ought to be reductions that map between solutions of the ground state energy problems, allowing to compute ground states of the target model from ground states of the source. These transformations, however, need not behave well on high energy levels, so it may not be possible to recover the partition function of the target from that of the source. In other words, such notion of transformation would be too general (or: weak) for the latter purpose. Instead, with a graph theory mindset, we could consider transformations of spin models that relabel the spins, inspired by graph isomorphisms. A less strong notion of transformation could be motivated by graph minor operations (such as vertex deletion, and edge deletion and contraction). As it turns out (and we shall flesh out), such transformations would preserve several graph properties and, as a consequence, limit the reach of spin models unnecessarily, where the reach of a spin model is the set of all spin models to which it can be transformed. For example, in combinatorial optimization approaches, spin models on planar graphs could only solve optimization problems with planar connectivity. Such a notion of transformation would thus be too narrow (or: strong). Yet another mindset could be provided by neural networks, where transformations of spin models should approximately preserve Boltzmann distributions.

What is common to all these considerations is that transformations be *property-preserving*, i.e. such that in a given context, if a source spin model \mathcal{S} can be transformed to a target spin model \mathcal{T} , then in every situation \mathcal{T} can be replaced by \mathcal{S} approximately with arbitrarily small error. Clearly, the minimal set of properties that must be preserved depends on the context. We are after a definition of transformation that applies to all contexts.

A feature that appears in some of the above notions of transformations is *universality*. A spin model is called universal if it can be transformed to any other spin model. Universal spin models thus have maximal reach. Some notions of transformations allow for universality; for ex-

ample, reductions allow for certain spin models to be universal in the sense that their ground state energy problems are NP-complete. This universality is the crucial fact in combinatorial optimization via quantum annealing. Another important example of universality is enabled by the transformations of Ref. [1] (see also [12]).

An implicit requirement in many of the above contexts is a certain sense of *modularity*, meaning that transformations have a well-behaved enough structure to enable the (efficient) construction of new transformations, as well as their study and characterization. Modularity allows to construct (complicated) transformations by composing, adding and scaling (simple) transformations. Its theoretical and practical importance cannot be overstated. As we shall see, modularity allows to characterize universality.

In short, we want a notion of transformation between spin models that

- (i) is property-preserving for all contexts,
- (ii) allows for universality, and
- (iii) is modular.

In this paper, we provide a framework for *emulations* between spin models. We show that emulations are a meaningful notion of transformation between spin models, as they satisfy the above conditions. Emulations are efficiently computable families of simulations with arbitrary cut-off, where a spin model is a set of spin systems, and a simulation between spin systems is defined as follows. If a source spin system S simulates a target spin system T , then below an energy cut-off Δ the Hamiltonians of S and T agree up to a global energy shift Γ and a local encoding of configurations of T into configurations of S .

We show that emulations are property-preserving, because, among others, they induce reductions between computational problems such as computing ground




Figure 2: The simulation of a target spin system with a universal spin model can be constructed following the characterization of universality in terms of scalability, closure and functional completeness (Theorem 54). The target (right hand side) is decomposed into a linear combination of flag spin systems, each of which is simulated by a source spin system from the universal spin model (by functional completeness), whose linear combination can in turn be simulated by the universal spin model (by closure and scalability). Because of modularity, this results in the desired simulation.

states, approximating partition functions and approximate sampling from Boltzmann distributions. They also allow for universality; in fact, we characterize universality (Fig. 1) in terms of three properties of spin models: closure, scalability and functional completeness (Fig. 2). The characterization is constructive and thus provides the means to explicitly emulate arbitrary targets. Finally, emulations are modular, as they can be composed, scaled and added. In summary, emulations preserve the relevant properties, are general enough to allow for universality and strong enough for modularity.

We apply our machinery to the 2d Ising model with fields, where we do not only prove that it is universal, but provide a step-by-step guide to emulate arbitrary target models. We also provide a new crossing gadget for the Ising model. Finally, we show that simulations can be computed by linear programs, and leverage this to provide yet another (even more economic) crossing gadget.

In summary, the framework presented in this paper allows to study and construct emulations, and provides a practical toolbox to this end. Any context (implicitly) involving emulations, such as quantum annealing approaches or neural network architectures, could benefit from this toolbox. More generally, translating the results of this paper to a more abstract language (e.g. the categorical framework of Ref. [13]) may extend the reach of the present results and identify situations featuring universality with a similar characterization. This work could also shed light on the relation of this form of universality to universality classes, or more generally forms of emergence in complex systems (see e.g. [14]). We shall come back to these points in [Conclusions and Outlook](#).

This paper is structured as follows. We first study

spin systems and simulations (Section II), and then turn to spin models and emulations (Section III). We derive consequences of emulations, including universality (Section IV), and illustrate the framework by proving universality of the 2d Ising model with fields (Section V). Finally we show that simulations can be computed by linear programs (Section VI). We conclude and provide an outlook in Section VII. The modularity proofs of simulations are presented in Appendix A.

In comparison to Ref. [1], this work focuses on the mathematical structure of simulations and emulations. It goes beyond the findings of [1] generally in the thoroughness of definitions and theorems, and specifically in the following facts:

- (i) We provide a new definition of simulation (Section II B 1) and carefully study its properties. We prove that simulations preserve spectra and ground states of spin systems (Section II B 2) and approximately preserve the partition function and Boltzmann distribution (Section II B 3). We also prove that isomorphisms, weak symmetries and spin type modifications induce simulations (Section II B 4), and so do graph minors (Section II B 5). Finally, we prove that simulations are modular, i.e. can be composed, scaled and added (Section II C).
- (ii) We define emulations (Section III B 1) and prove that they can be composed and lifted to so-called hulls of spin models, implying that they are modular (Section III B 4).
- (iii) We prove that a spin model is universal if and only if it is closed, scalable and functional complete (Theorem 54). This characterization is new in two

respects: the new definition of functional completeness (Definition 45), and its use of modularity. We also define local closure and show that it implies closure (Proposition 49).

- (iv) We prove that emulations induce polytime reductions between ground state energy problems (Section IV A), partition function approximations (Section IV B) and approximate sampling (Section IV C), where the latter two are in fact PTAS reductions. We also prove that these three problems are maximally hard for universal spin models.
- (v) We apply the new characterization of universality to provide a new proof of universality of the 2d Ising with fields that is new in three respects: we prove functional completeness (Section V A), provide a new crossing gadget (Section V B) and prove local closure (Section V C). In addition, this new careful step-by-step proof can serve in practice to construct simulations.
- (vi) The results of Section VI are new, namely that simulations can be computed by linear programs, resulting in a more economic crossing gadget (Section VI C).

II. SPIN SYSTEMS AND SIMULATIONS

Here we define spin systems (Section II A), simulations (Section II B), and prove that the latter are modular (Section II C).

A. Spin Systems

We start by defining spin systems.

Definition 1 (spin system). *A spin system S is a tuple (q_S, V_S, E_S, J_S) where $q_S \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$, V_S is a finite set, $E_S \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V_S)$ and*

$$J_S: E_S \rightarrow \{f: [q_S]^W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid W \subseteq V_S\} \quad (1)$$

such that for all $e \in E_S$

$$J_S(e): [q_S]^e \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \quad (2)$$

where $[q_S] := \{1, \dots, q_S\}$, $[q_S]^W$ denotes the set of functions of type $W \rightarrow [q_S]$ and $\mathcal{P}(V_S)$ the power set of V_S .

Given a spin system S , we call q_S its *spin type*, V_S its *spins*, $G_S := (V_S, E_S)$ its *interaction hypergraph* and J_S its *local interactions* (thought of as $\{J_S(e) \mid e \in E_S\}$). We require that there are no isolated spins, that is, for any $v \in V_S$ there exists at least one $e \in E_S$ with $v \in e$. Note that, if this not the case, it can be made so by adding any such edge e with $J_S(e)$ the zero function, thereby yielding a spin system with equivalent local interactions and without isolated spins.

In essence, a spin system is a hyperedge-labelled hypergraph, where hyperedges determine which spins interact, and the hyperedge labels obtained from J_S are local functions that determine how they interact. Once the state of each spin is fixed by means of a *spin configuration*

$$\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S := [q_S]^{V_S}, \quad (3)$$

we obtain a positive real number $J_S(e)(\vec{s}|_e)$ for each hyperedge $e \in E_S$. This number can be interpreted as the local energy (or cost) of the configuration \vec{s} according to the interaction of spins in e . Adding these local energies yields a global energy (or cost) function, namely the Hamiltonian of the spin system.

Definition 2 (Hamiltonian). *A spin system S defines a Hamiltonian*

$$H_S: \mathcal{C}_S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \\ \vec{s} \mapsto H_S(\vec{s}) := \sum_{e \in E_S} J_S(e)(\vec{s}|_e) \quad (4)$$

Note that Definition 1 is restricted to $q_S \geq 2$, since for $q_S = 1$ there exists a single spin configuration, and hence H_S is a constant. Further note that the local interactions are required to be non-negative functions. This definition is equivalent to that of arbitrary local interactions, as a spin system with arbitrary local interactions can be transformed to have non-negative local interactions by shifting all local interactions. This procedure is polytime computable and hence defines a polytime reduction for all relevant computational problems that one might consider. As we shall see, non-negative local interactions are more convenient for certain operations that we will define on spin systems.

Subsequently, we might specify configurations by listing their values with respect to (w.r.t.) a fixed ordering of V_S , i.e. we write $V_S = \{i, j, k, \dots\}$ and


$$\vec{s} = (\vec{s}(i), \vec{s}(j), \vec{s}(k), \dots) = (s_i, s_j, s_k, \dots). \quad (5)$$

Example 3 (Ising system). *A well-studied class of spin systems can be obtained from Ising interactions. In the simplest case, these are pair interactions defined for 2-level spins that only depend on the parity of the two spins. Up to scaling (and relabeling the spins) there are two such interactions*

$$\pi_2(s_i, s_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_i = s_j \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \\ \bar{\pi}_2(s_i, s_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_i \neq s_j \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

An Ising spin system (see Fig. 3a) can be defined by taking an arbitrary graph (V, E) and, for each edge $e := \{i, j\}$ from E , letting $J(e)$ be either $\lambda \cdot \pi_2$ or $\lambda \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$ for some

(a)



(b)




Figure 3: An Ising system with pair interactions and spin type 2 (3a) and a generic spin system with q -level spins and many-body interactions (3b). In contrast to the single parameter λ specifying an Ising interaction, a generic k -body interaction of q -level spins requires q^k parameters.

non-negative real number λ . Additionally, one might include single-spin hyperedges $\{i\}$ in the edge set of the interaction graph. Defining

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(s_i) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_i = 2 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \\ \bar{\pi}_1(s_i) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_i = 1 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

and taking the local interaction to be either $\lambda \cdot \pi_1$ or $\lambda \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$ on these single-spin hyperedges yields a so-called Ising spin system with fields.

Several constructions on spin systems presented in this paper ought to be efficient, that is, polytime computable, where polytime refers to a runtime that is polynomial in the description of the spin system. We define the *size* of a spin system S as the length of this description, i.e. the number of real valued parameters that are required to specify it,

$$|S| := \sum_{e \in E_S} q_S^{|e|}. \quad (8)$$

Note that, strictly speaking, specifying S amounts to specifying q_S, V_S, E_S and J_S and hence

$$q_S + |V_S| + \sum_{e \in E_S} |e| + \sum_{e \in E_S} (|e| + q_S^{|e|}) \quad (9)$$

real parameters. Here we used that, for each $e \in E_S$, the space of real valued functions of type $[q_S]^e \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a $q_S^{|e|}$ dimensional real vector space, so specifying $J_S(e)$ requires specifying e together with $q_S^{|e|}$ real parameters. However, since (9) is polynomial in $|S|$, the two notions of polytime are equivalent. Further note that if the arity of local interactions of a set of spin systems with constant spin type admits an upper bound, i.e. if the set consists of q_S -level spin systems with at most k -body interactions, then

$$|S| = \text{poly}(|V_S|). \quad (10)$$

That is, polytime w.r.t. $|S|$ is equivalent to polytime w.r.t. the number of spins. While this applies to many common examples, it need not always be the case.

One of the key properties of spin systems is their local structure. Each spin system not only gives rise to a global cost function but also encodes how this global function is composed of local terms. More conceptually, each spin system can be seen as a sum of elementary spin systems.

It is important to keep this perspective in mind, as constructions might be easy when applied to the local terms but hard when applied globally. To give an example, minimizing all local terms of H_S is polytime computable, while minimizing H_S globally is in general NP-hard. In this example, minimizing H_S locally does not lead to a global minimum if S suffers from frustration, i.e. if the

sub-configurations that locally minimize H_S do not agree on the overlaps of local terms, and thus cannot be added to obtain a global configuration.

In contrast, some constructions presented in this work, most importantly that of simulations between spin systems, are compatible with the sum of spin systems. This will enable us to obtain simulations of complex spin systems by dividing them into simple building blocks, simulating each of them individually and combining the result for the global simulation.

Definition 4 (sum of spin systems). *Let S_1, S_2 be spin systems with $q := q_1 = q_2$. Their sum is the spin system*

$$S_1 + S_2 := (q, V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2, J_{1+2}) \quad (11)$$

where J_{1+2} is defined by

$$J_{1+2}(e)(\vec{s}) := \sum_{i: e \in E_i} J_i(e)(\vec{s}|_e). \quad (12)$$

In words, the interaction hypergraph of $S_1 + S_2$ is the hypergraph union of G_1 and G_2 . For edges $e \in E_1 \setminus E_2$ or $e \in E_2 \setminus E_1$, its local interactions are $J_1(e)$ or $J_2(e)$, respectively, while for those edges in the overlap of E_1 and E_2 , $e \in E_1 \cap E_2$, its local interactions are given by the sum $J_1(e) + J_2(e)$. By construction, the sum of spin systems is both associative and commutative. Moreover, it is straightforward to conclude that

$$H_{S_1+S_2}(\vec{s}) = H_{S_1}(\vec{s}|_{V_{S_1}}) + H_{S_2}(\vec{s}|_{V_{S_2}}). \quad (13)$$

Spin systems can also be scaled with non-negative real numbers.

Definition 5 (scaling of spin systems). *Let S be a spin system and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Then $\lambda \cdot S$ is the scaled spin system*

$$\lambda \cdot S := (q_S, V_S, E_S, \lambda \cdot J_S) \quad (14)$$

where $\lambda \cdot J_S$ is understood pointwise, i.e.

$$\lambda \cdot J_S(e)(\vec{s}) := \lambda \cdot (J_S(e)(\vec{s})). \quad (15)$$

The scaling of spin systems distributes over sums, i.e. $\lambda \cdot (S_1 + S_2) = \lambda \cdot S_1 + \lambda \cdot S_2$. Moreover, by construction

$$H_{\lambda \cdot S}(\vec{s}) = \lambda \cdot H_S(\vec{s}). \quad (16)$$

In thermodynamic terms, scaling a system by a positive constant can be understood as changing its temperature (cf. Definition 15). In contrast, scaling by a negative number would correspond to swapping high-energy with low-energy configurations, and hence fundamentally change a spin system.

While in general spin systems have multiple hyperedges and are thus sums of multiple local terms, given any function $f: [q]^e \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ we can define a *canonical* spin system S_f , with a single hyperedge e and corresponding local interaction $J_f(e) = f$.

Definition 6 (canonical spin system). *Let*

$$f: [q]^e \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \quad (17)$$

be any function. Then the canonical spin system corresponding to f , denoted S_f (or T_f , S'_f , etc), is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} V_f &:= e \\ E_f &:= \{e\} \\ J_f(e) &:= f. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Note that by construction $H_{S_f} = f$. Moreover, every spin system S is trivially the sum of the canonical systems corresponding to its local interactions

$$S = \sum_{e \in E_S} S_{J_S(e)}. \quad (19)$$

Note that the sum of spin systems uses the labels of spins (in V_1 and V_2) as a bookkeeping tool. More precisely, the labels determine the overlap of the sum. In order to achieve a certain overlap in the sum it might hence be necessary to change the labels of some of the spins. Similarly to how relabeling vertices in a graph leads to the notion of graph isomorphisms, relabeling spins in a spin system leads to the notion of spin system isomorphisms.

Definition 7 (isomorphism of spin systems). *Let S, T be spin systems. An isomorphism $\phi: S \xrightarrow{\sim} T$ from S to T is a bijection $\phi: V_S \rightarrow V_T$ such that for all $e \in \mathcal{P}(V_S)$*

$$e \in E_S \Leftrightarrow \phi(e) \in E_T, \quad (20)$$

and for all $e \in E_S$ and $\vec{s} \in [q_S]^e$

$$J_S(e)(\vec{s}) = J_T(\phi(e))(\vec{s} \circ \phi^{-1}). \quad (21)$$

If there exists an isomorphism $\phi: S \xrightarrow{\sim} T$ we write $S \cong T$.

Note that Eq. (21) implies that $q_S = q_T$. Isomorphic spin systems are equivalent in all aspects, in particular their Hamiltonians agree up to relabelings, i.e.

$$H_S(\vec{s}) = H_T(\vec{s} \circ \phi^{-1}) \quad (22)$$

for all configurations \vec{s} of S .

Given a spin system S and a bijection $\phi: V_S \rightarrow V'$, we denote by $S\langle\phi\rangle$ the spin system isomorphic to S with spins relabeled according to ϕ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} V_{S\langle\phi\rangle} &= V' \\ E_{S\langle\phi\rangle} &= \phi(E_S) \\ J_{S\langle\phi\rangle}(\phi(e))(\vec{s} \circ \phi^{-1}) &= J_S(e)(\vec{s}). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

If $V_S = \{1, \dots, l\}$, bijections $\phi: V_S \rightarrow V'$ are orderings of V' . We then denote ϕ by $\phi = (v_1, \dots, v_l)$ with $v_i = \phi(i)$, and the relabeled spin system by $S\langle v_1 \dots, v_l \rangle$.

B. Simulations

In the previous section we saw that isomorphic spin systems have, up to relabelings, equal Hamiltonians and hence can be seen as equivalent in all aspects. There are however situations in which two spin systems S and T can be considered at least approximately equivalent in all relevant aspects, even though they are not isomorphic. For instance, S and T may have equal Hamiltonians given a more general identification of their spins, where one spin of T is identified with multiple spins of S . Or the equality of Hamiltonians may only hold in a certain (low) energy regime. Isomorphisms are thus too strong a notion to describe these weaker kinds of equivalences, which are precisely captured by *spin system simulations*.

We shall first define spin system simulations (Section II B 1), show that they preserve spectra and ground states (Section II B 2) as well as thermodynamic properties (Section II B 3), and finally illustrate that various common transformations on spin systems (Section II B 4) as well as graph minors are special cases of simulations (Section II B 5).

1. Definition

Whenever S simulates T , every occurrence of T can be replaced by S at least in good approximation, even though S and T need not be isomorphic. More precisely, a spin system simulation specifies an energy cut-off Δ , an energy shift Γ and functions P, dec that are used to identify configurations \vec{s} of S with configurations $\text{dec} \circ \vec{s} \circ P$ of T , such that below the cut-off the Hamiltonians of S and T satisfy

$$(H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma)|_{<\Delta} = H_T(\text{dec} \circ \vec{s} \circ P)|_{<\Delta}. \quad (24)$$

That is, P and dec describe how low energy configurations \vec{s} of S are mapped to low energy configurations $\text{dec} \circ \vec{s} \circ P$ of T with equal energy up to Γ .

Definition 8 (simulation). *Let S, T be a spin systems. A simulation \mathcal{f} of type $S \rightarrow T$ consists of the following data:*

1. a positive real number Δ called cut-off
2. a real number Γ called energy shift
3. a natural number d called degeneracy
4. a function $P: V_T \rightarrow V_S^k$ called physical spin assignment
5. a function $\text{dec}: [q_S]^k \rightarrow [q_T]$ called decoding
6. a list of functions $\text{enc} = (\text{enc}_i: [q_T] \rightarrow [q_S]^k)_{i=1, \dots, m}$ called encoding.

Additionally, \mathcal{f} must satisfy the following conditions:

1. Disjoint physical spins: for all $v, w \in V_T$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$

$$P^{(i)}(v) = P^{(j)}(w) \Rightarrow i = j \text{ and } v = w \quad (25)$$

where $P^{(i)}$ denotes the i -th component of P

2. Decode-encode compatibility: for all $i = 1, \dots, m$

$$\text{dec} \circ \text{enc}_i = \text{id} \quad (26)$$

3. Disjoint encodings: for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $t \in [q_T]$

$$\text{enc}_i(t) = \text{enc}_j(t) \Rightarrow i = j \quad (27)$$

4. Constant local degeneracy: for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_T$ we define

$$\text{sim}_i(\vec{t}) := \{\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S \mid \vec{s} \circ P = \text{enc}_i \circ \vec{t}, H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma < \Delta\} \quad (28)$$

and require that

$$H_T(\vec{t}) < \Delta \Rightarrow |\text{sim}_i(\vec{t})| = d \quad (29)$$

5. Matching energies: for all $\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_T$, $\vec{s} \in \text{sim}(\vec{t}) := \bigcup_i \text{sim}_i(\vec{t})$

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma = H_T(\vec{t}), \quad (30)$$

for all $\vec{s} \notin \text{sim} := \bigcup_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_T} \text{sim}(\vec{t})$

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma \geq \Delta. \quad (31)$$

If \mathcal{f} is a simulation of type $S \rightarrow T$ we also write $\mathcal{f}: S \rightarrow T$ or $S \xrightarrow{\mathcal{f}} T$. We might also write $S \rightarrow T$ as a shorthand for “there exists a simulation $\mathcal{f}: S \rightarrow T$ ” and simply say “ S simulates T ” whenever this is the case. Whenever we distinguish between multiple simulations we index their data, i.e. we write $\Delta_{\mathcal{f}}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{q}}$, etc. If part of the data specifying a simulation is trivial, i.e. $\Gamma = 0$, $d = 1$, $|\text{enc}| = 1$ and $\text{enc} = \text{dec} = \text{id}$, or $V_T \subseteq V_S$ and P is the corresponding subset injection, we may not give it explicitly and only specify the non-trivial data.

Given a simulation $\mathcal{f}: S \rightarrow T$, we call S the *source* and T the *target* of \mathcal{f} . We call k , from V_S^k and $[q_S]^k$, the *order* of the encoding, and denote it by $\text{ord}(\text{enc}) = k$. Note that k is implicit in the data that specifies \mathcal{f} . Similarly, the number of individual functions in enc , viz. m , is implicit. We call it the *size* of the encoding, and denote it by $|\text{enc}|$.

In condition 5 we defined the function sim mapping configurations \vec{t} of T to sets of configurations $\text{sim}(\vec{t})$ of S with equal energy up to Γ . We call sim_i the i -th *simulation assignment* and say that \vec{s} simulates \vec{t} whenever $\vec{s} \in \text{sim}(\vec{t})$.

Given $v \in V_T$ we call $P(v)$ *physical spins* of v , and

$$\mathcal{P}h := \bigcup_{v \in V_T} P(v) \quad (32)$$

physical spins. The remaining spins of S are called *auxiliary spins*. If \vec{s} simulates \vec{t} , then by construction of sim , the state of $\vec{t}(v)$ can be recovered from $\vec{s}(P(v))$ according to

$$\vec{t}(v) = \text{dec} \circ \vec{s} \circ P(v). \quad (33)$$

This means that \vec{t} can be recovered from \vec{s} locally. Conversely, if \vec{t}' differs from \vec{t} in the state of a single spin v and $\vec{s}' \in \text{sim}(\vec{t}')$, then \vec{s} and \vec{s}' agree on all physical spins except for those of v . Note that \vec{s} and \vec{s}' can always differ on auxiliary spins.

Finally let us give an intuition as to why simulations use both decoding and encoding. The decoding ensures that the individual encodings are compatible. That is, if simulations only had encodings, it would not be possible to require condition 2, and hence it might happen that for $s \neq t$, $\text{enc}_i(s) = \text{enc}_j(t)$. In this case, it would not be possible to decode source configurations with energy below Δ . Secondly, the encoding ensures that whenever a target configuration \vec{t} agrees on spins v, w then any source configuration \vec{s} that simulates \vec{t} agrees on the corresponding physical spins $P(v), P(w)$. If this was not the case, target configurations \vec{t} could not be encoded locally. Specifically, given access to \vec{t} (with $H_T(\vec{t}) < \Delta$) on a subset $V \subseteq V_T$ it would not be possible to infer $\text{sim}(\vec{t})|_{P(V_T)}$. This would lead to simulation being incompatible with sums (and hence decompositions) of spin systems (cf. Theorem 27).

Let us illustrate simulations between spin systems.

Example 9 (simulation). Consider the spin system T (see right hand side of Fig. 4a) defined by

$$\begin{aligned} q_T &= 3 \\ V_T &= \{1, 2, 3\} \\ E_T &= \{\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2\}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

and local interactions

$$\begin{aligned} J_T(e_1)(t_1, t_2, t_3) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (t_1, t_2, t_3) = (1, 2, 3) \\ 1 & \text{if } t_1 = t_2 = t_3 \\ 4 & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ J_T(e_2)(t_1, t_2) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t_1 = t_2 \\ 2 & \text{else,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where $e_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $e_2 = \{1, 2\}$.

We construct a simulation with source S being an Ising spin system, target T and cut-off $\Delta = 3$. There are exactly 4 target configurations with energy below 3, $\vec{t}_1 = (1, 1, 1)$, $\vec{t}_2 = (2, 2, 2)$, $\vec{t}_3 = (3, 3, 3)$ and $\vec{t}_4 = (1, 2, 3)$,

$$H_T(\vec{t}_1) = H_T(\vec{t}_2) = H_T(\vec{t}_3) = 1, \quad H_T(\vec{t}_4) = 2. \quad (36)$$

All other configurations either have energy $E = 4$ or $E = 6$ (see right hand side of Fig. 4b). The source system S is an Ising spin system with fields, with $q_S = 2$, spins $V_S = \{1, \dots, 10\}$ and edges illustrated in the left hand side of Fig. 4a. The local interactions are listed in Table I.

Spin	Fields		Pair interactions	
	Field	Edge	Interaction	
1	$\frac{3}{4} \cdot \pi_1$	$\{1, 3\}$	$1 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
2	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \pi_1$	$\{1, 4\}$	$\frac{3}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
3	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \pi_1$	$\{1, 5\}$	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
4	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \pi_1$	$\{1, 10\}$	$\frac{3}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
5	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \pi_1$	$\{2, 4\}$	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
6	$\frac{3}{4} \cdot \pi_1$	$\{2, 5\}$	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
7	$2 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$	$\{2, 6\}$	$1 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
8	$1 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$	$\{2, 10\}$	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
9	$\frac{5}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$	$\{3, 4\}$	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
10	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \pi_1$	$\{3, 5\}$	$\frac{3}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
		$\{3, 10\}$	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
		$\{4, 6\}$	$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
		$\{4, 8\}$	$1 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
		$\{4, 9\}$	$\frac{3}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
		$\{5, 6\}$	$\frac{3}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
		$\{5, 8\}$	$1 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
		$\{5, 9\}$	$\frac{3}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
		$\{6, 10\}$	$\frac{3}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
		$\{8, 10\}$	$1 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	
		$\{9, 10\}$	$\frac{3}{4} \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$	

Table I: Local interactions of the source spin system S from Example 9. They are all Ising pair interactions $\pi_2, \bar{\pi}_2$ or Ising fields $\pi_1, \bar{\pi}_1$, both defined in Example 3.

Since S and T differ w.r.t. their spin type, the first step consists of specifying how 3-level spins from T are encoded into 2-level spins from S . Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \text{enc}: [3] &\rightarrow [2]^2 \\ \text{dec}: [2]^2 &\rightarrow [3], \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

defined by $\text{enc}(1) = (1, 1)$, $\text{enc}(2) = (1, 2)$, $\text{enc}(3) = (2, 1)$ and $\text{dec}(1, 1) = 1$, $\text{dec}(1, 2) = 2$, $\text{dec}(2, 1) = 3$, $\text{dec}(2, 2) = 1$. Clearly, $\text{dec} \circ \text{enc} = \text{id}$, so dec, enc satisfy Definition 8 2. Since enc is the single encoding, it trivially satisfies Definition 8 3.

Next we define the physical spin assignment,

$$P: V_T \rightarrow V_S^2. \quad (38)$$

We take $P(1) = (1, 2)$, $P(2) = (3, 4)$ and $P(3) = (5, 6)$. This satisfies Definition 8 1. P is illustrated in Fig. 4a.

By direct computation, it can be verified that this defines a simulation of type $S \rightarrow T$ with cut-off $\Delta = 3$, shift $\Gamma = 3$ and degeneracy $d = 1$. More precisely, the couplings of S are chosen such that there are exactly 4 source configurations with energy below 6. These are exactly the four configurations $\vec{s}_1, \dots, \vec{s}_4$, satisfying

$$\text{sim}(\vec{t}_i) = \{\vec{s}_i\}. \quad (39)$$

These configurations are listed in Table II. This proves that Definition 8 4 is satisfied with $d = 1$.

Finally, the four source configurations \vec{s}_i satisfy

$$H_S(\vec{s}_i) - 3 = H_T(\vec{t}_i). \quad (40)$$

Thus, below the cut-off, the spectra of H_T and $H_S - \Gamma$ agree (see Fig. 4b). Hence, also Definition 8 5 is satisfied, showing that this provides a simulation of type $S \rightarrow T$.




Figure 4: Fig. 4a shows the spin systems S (left hand side) and T (right hand side) from Example 9 as well as the physical spin assignment P of the simulation $S \rightarrow T$. Each spin of T is encoded into a pair of spins of S . Fig. 4b shows the spectra of $H_S - \Gamma$ (left hand side) and H_T (right hand side). The simulation $S \rightarrow T$ has shift $\Gamma = 3$ and cut-off $\Delta = 3$. Below the cut-off, the spectra of $H_S - \Gamma$ and H_T are identical, up to identifying each low-energy target configurations \vec{t}_i with the respectively unique configuration $\vec{s}_i \in \text{sim}(\vec{t}_i)$. Above the cut-off, the two spectra are only drawn schematically.

2. Simulations Preserve Spectra and Ground States

Spin system simulations preserve important properties of spin systems: If $S \rightarrow T$, their spectra agree below the cut-off (Proposition 13) and the ground states of T can

be obtained from those of S (Proposition 14). These results follow from the crucial observation that simulation increases the degeneracy of each energy level by the same factor (Proposition 12). We first need some preparatory results.

Target configuration \vec{t}_i	Source configuration $\vec{s}_i \in \text{sim}(\vec{t}_i)$
(1,1,1)	(1,1,1,1,1,2,1,2,2)
(2,2,2)	(1,2,1,2,1,2,2,2,1)
(3,3,3)	(2,1,2,1,2,1,2,2,1)
(1,2,3)	(1,1,1,2,2,1,2,2,1,2)

Table II: Simulation assignment of Example 9: The first column contains the four target configurations \vec{t}_i with energy below $\Delta = 3$, while the second column contains the respectively unique source configuration $\vec{s}_i \in \text{sim}(\vec{t}_i)$.

Lemma 10. *Let $S \rightarrow T$ be a simulation. If $H_T(\vec{t}) \geq \Delta$ then $\text{sim}(\vec{t}) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Assume that $\vec{s} \in \text{sim}(\vec{t})$. Then by definition of $\text{sim}(\vec{t})$

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma < \Delta \quad (41)$$

but by condition 5

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma = H_T(\vec{t}) \geq \Delta. \quad (42)$$

□

This implies that $\text{sim}(\vec{t}) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $H_T(\vec{t}) < \Delta$. Similarly, $\vec{s} \in \text{sim}$ if and only if $H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma < \Delta$ (by condition 5). In the following we call such configurations *low-energy configurations* (both for target and source), where the term is understood relative to Δ and Γ . Low-energy configurations are those that either simulate a target configuration, or are simulated by a source configuration.

Lemma 11 (lowering the cut-off). *Let $\ell: S \rightarrow T$, then setting $\Delta_q \leq \Delta_\ell$ and leaving all remaining parameters unchanged defines a simulation $q: S \rightarrow T$.*

Proof. To prove the claim we need to prove condition 5 of Definition 8. The other conditions hold trivially. If $\vec{s} \in \text{sim}_q(\vec{t})$ then by definition of sim_q , $H_T(\vec{t}) < \Delta_q \leq \Delta_\ell$. Since ℓ defines a simulation with cut-off Δ_ℓ and $\Gamma := \Gamma_\ell = \Gamma_q$,

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma = H_T(\vec{t}). \quad (43)$$

If $\vec{s} \notin \text{sim}_q$ then either $\vec{s} \notin \text{sim}_\ell$ and therefore

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma > \Delta_\ell \geq \Delta_q, \quad (44)$$

or $\vec{s} \in \text{sim}_\ell(\vec{t})$ for some \vec{t} with $\Delta_\ell > H_T(\vec{t}) \geq \Delta_q$ and therefore

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma = H_T(\vec{t}) \geq \Delta_q. \quad (45)$$

□

Proposition 12 (constant degeneracy). *Let $S \rightarrow T$ and let $\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_T$ be such that $\xi := H_T(\vec{t}) < \Delta$. Then*

$$|H_S^{-1}(\{\xi + \Gamma\})| = |\text{enc}| \cdot d \cdot |H_T^{-1}(\{\xi\})|. \quad (46)$$

Proof. By Definition 8 condition 5 only configurations $\vec{s} \in \text{sim}(\vec{t})$ for some $\vec{t}' \in H_T^{-1}(\xi)$ satisfy $\vec{s} \in H_S^{-1}(\xi + \Gamma)$. Hence,

$$H_S^{-1}(\{\xi + \Gamma\}) = \bigcup_{\vec{t}' \in H_T^{-1}(\xi)} \bigcup_{i=1}^{|\text{enc}|} \text{sim}_i(\vec{t}'). \quad (47)$$

By condition 4, for each such \vec{t}' and each $i = 1, \dots, |\text{enc}|$ there are d source configurations in $\text{sim}_i(\vec{t}')$. By condition 3, if $\vec{s}_i \in \text{sim}_i(\vec{t}')$ and $\vec{s}_j \in \text{sim}_j(\vec{t}')$ then $\vec{s}_i \neq \vec{s}_j$, so $|\text{sim}(\vec{t}')| = |\text{enc}| \cdot d$. In total this proves

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{|\text{enc}|} \text{sim}_i(\vec{t}') \right| = d \cdot |\text{enc}|. \quad (48)$$

By condition 2, $\vec{s} \in \text{sim}(\vec{t})$ implies

$$\text{dec} \circ \vec{s} \circ \text{P} = \vec{t}', \quad (49)$$

so source configurations that simulate different target configurations are different, i.e. the union over $\vec{t}' \in H_T^{-1}(\{\xi\})$ is disjoint, which finishes the proof. □

Proposition 13 (preservation of spectrum). *Let $S \rightarrow T$ with cut-off Δ and shift Γ . Then*

$$\text{Im}(H_T)_{<\Delta} = \text{Im}(H_S - \Gamma)_{<\Delta}, \quad (50)$$

where

$$\text{Im}(H)_{<\Delta} := \{\xi \in \text{Im}(H) \mid \xi < \Delta\}. \quad (51)$$

Proof. Follows immediately from Proposition 12. □

Proposition 14 (preservation of ground state). *Let $S \rightarrow T$ with cut-off*

$$\Delta > \min(H_T) \quad (52)$$

and let \vec{s} be a ground state of S , that is,

$$\vec{s} \in \text{GS}(S) := H_S^{-1}(\{\min(H_S)\}). \quad (53)$$

Then $\vec{t} = \text{dec} \circ \vec{s} \circ \text{P}$ is a ground state of T .

Proof. By Proposition 13, $\min(H_S) - \Gamma = \min(H_T) < \Delta$, so $\vec{s} \in \text{sim}$. Since $\vec{t} = \text{dec} \circ \vec{s} \circ \text{P}$, it must be the case that $\vec{s} \in \text{sim}(\vec{t})$, and thus by condition 5 of Definition 8

$$H_T(\vec{t}) = H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma = \min(H_S) - \Gamma = \min(H_T). \quad (54)$$

□

3. Simulations Preserve Thermodynamic Quantities

Spin system simulations also preserve thermodynamic quantities: If $S \rightarrow T$, the partition function (Proposition 17) and Boltzmann distribution (Proposition 19) of T can be approximated by that of S .

Definition 15 (partition function). *Let S be a spin system. The partition function of S is the function*

$$\begin{aligned} Z_S: \mathbb{R}_{>0} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0} \\ Z_S(\beta) &:= \sum_{\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})} \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Various thermodynamic quantities, such as the free energy or the entropy, can be derived from the partition function. It also appears as the normalization in the Boltzmann distribution $p_{S,\beta}$, the probability distribution of configurations of S in thermal equilibrium at (inverse) temperature β .

Definition 16 (Boltzmann distribution). *Let S be a spin system and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. The Boltzmann distribution of S at β , $p_{S,\beta}$ is the probability distribution on \mathcal{C}_S , defined by*

$$p_{S,\beta}(\vec{s}) = \frac{1}{Z_S(\beta)} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})} \quad (56)$$

If we think of a spin system S as a thermodynamic system, then when coupled to a heat bath at temperature β , the probability of S being in configuration \vec{s} is precisely the Boltzmann distribution $p_{S,\beta}(\vec{s})$.

We will now see that whenever $S \rightarrow T$, both the partition function and Boltzmann distribution of T can be approximated by that of S . This means that simulations preserve most (if not all) thermodynamic properties of spin systems.

Proposition 17 (preservation of partition function). *If $S \rightarrow T$ with cut-off $\Delta > \max(H_T)$, then, for all $\beta > 0$,*

$$\left| \frac{1}{e^{-\Gamma\beta md}} \cdot Z_S(\beta) - Z_T(\beta) \right| \leq \frac{1}{md} \cdot q_S^{|V_S|} \cdot e^{-\beta\Delta} \quad (57)$$

where $m = |\text{enc}|$.

Note that increasing Δ while keeping the rest of the simulation unchanged, the right hand side of Eq. (57) becomes arbitrarily small.

Proof. First assume $S \rightarrow T$ with cut-off $\Delta > \max(H_T)$ and shift Γ , and let $\beta > 0$ be arbitrary. We rewrite the partition function $Z_S(\beta)$ by splitting the sum into those source configurations in $\mathcal{S}im$, which by Definition 8 5 have energy $H_T(\vec{t}) + \Gamma$, for some target configuration \vec{t} and those not in $\mathcal{S}im$:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_S(\beta) &= \sum_{\vec{s} \in \mathcal{S}im} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})} + \sum_{\vec{s} \notin \mathcal{S}im} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})} = \\ &= e^{-\beta\Gamma} \cdot \sum_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_T} e^{-\beta H_T(\vec{t})} \sum_{\vec{s} \in \text{sim}(\vec{t})} 1 + \sum_{\vec{s} \notin \mathcal{S}im} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})}. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Next, we use that $\Delta > \max(H_T)$, so by Proposition 12, for all target configurations \vec{t} , $|\text{sim}(\vec{t})| = md$. This leads to the following expression:

$$Z_S(\beta) = e^{-\beta\Gamma} md \cdot Z_T(\beta) + \sum_{\vec{s} \notin \mathcal{S}im} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})}, \quad (59)$$

where we inserted the definition of the partition function of T .

Second, since there are exactly $q_S^{|V_S|}$ source configurations, there must be less than $q_S^{|V_S|}$ source configurations which are not contained in $\mathcal{S}im$. Since for all those it holds that $H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma \geq \Delta$, we obtain the following upper bound for the second summand of the right hand side of Eq. (59):

$$\sum_{\vec{s} \notin \mathcal{S}im} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})} < q_S^{|V_S|} \cdot e^{-\beta(\Delta+\Gamma)}. \quad (60)$$

Inserting this into (59) results in (57). \square

The Boltzmann distribution can also be approximated. To derive this result, we first define the *simulation distribution*.

Definition 18 (simulation distribution). *Let $\mathcal{f}: S \rightarrow T$. The simulation distribution of \mathcal{f} at β , $p_{\mathcal{f},\beta}$, is the probability distribution on \mathcal{C}_T , defined as*

$$p_{\mathcal{f},\beta}(\vec{t}) = \sum_{\substack{\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S, \\ \text{deco} \circ \mathcal{P} = \vec{t}}} p_{S,\beta}(\vec{s}). \quad (61)$$

If S is at thermal equilibrium, then at temperature β it is in configuration \vec{s} with probability $p_{S,\beta}$. Now, for each such source configuration we can decode the target configuration that it corresponds to by restricting \vec{s} to the physical spins and applying dec , i.e. computing $\text{dec} \circ \vec{s} \circ \mathcal{P} = \vec{t}$. The probability of obtaining such \vec{t} is given by summing the probabilities of all \vec{s} that decode to \vec{t} . This is how the simulation distribution $p_{\mathcal{f},\beta}$ is constructed.

In more abstract terms, up to decoding, $p_{\mathcal{f},\beta}$ is constructed from $p_{S,\beta}$ by marginalizing over auxiliary spins. If dec and \mathcal{P} are trivial, then $p_{\mathcal{f},\beta}$ is the marginal distribution of the physical spins. Note that $p_{\mathcal{f},\beta}$ is normalized, so it defines a probability distribution on \mathcal{C}_T :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_T} p_{\mathcal{f},\beta}(\vec{t}) &= \sum_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_T} \sum_{\substack{\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S, \\ \text{deco} \circ \mathcal{P} = \vec{t}}} p_{S,\beta}(\vec{s}) \\ &= \sum_{\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S} p_{S,\beta}(\vec{s}) = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Proposition 19 (preservation of Boltzmann distribution). *Let S, T be spin systems, $\beta > 0$ and $\mathcal{f}: S \rightarrow T$ with cut-off $\Delta > \max(H_T)$. Then*

$$\|p_{\mathcal{f},\beta} - p_{T,\beta}\| < \frac{1}{md} \cdot q_S^{|V_S|} \cdot e^{-\beta(\Delta - \min(H_T))}, \quad (63)$$

where $m = |\text{enc}|$.

Proof. The total variation distance $\| \cdot \|$ is defined as

$$\|p_{\mathcal{f},\beta} - p_{T,\beta}\| := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_T} |p_{\mathcal{f},\beta}(\vec{t}) - p_{T,\beta}(\vec{t})|. \quad (64)$$

Similar to the proof of Proposition 17, we split the sum in the definition of $p_{\ell,\beta}$ into low energy and high energy configurations. Additionally, we use that low energy configurations \vec{s} satisfy $\text{deco} \circ \vec{s} \circ P$ are precisely configurations from $\text{sim}(\vec{t})$ and hence also satisfy $H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma = H_T(\vec{t})$. Second, by Proposition 12, for each target configuration \vec{t} there are exactly $m \cdot d$ source configurations in $\text{sim}(\vec{t})$. In total,

$$p_{\ell,\beta}(\vec{t}) = \frac{1}{Z_S(\beta)} e^{-\beta\Gamma} md \cdot e^{-\beta H_T(\vec{t})} + \frac{1}{Z_S(\beta)} \sum_{\vec{s} \notin \text{sim}(\vec{t}), \text{deco} \circ \vec{s} \circ P = \vec{t}} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})}. \quad (65)$$

We define

$$\zeta_1(\beta, \vec{t}) = \sum_{\vec{s} \notin \text{sim}(\vec{t}), \text{deco} \circ \vec{s} \circ P = \vec{t}} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})}. \quad (66)$$

From Proposition 17 we obtain

$$Z_S(\beta) = e^{-\beta\Gamma} md \cdot Z_T(\beta) + \sum_{\vec{s} \notin \mathcal{S}im} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})}. \quad (67)$$

Defining

$$\zeta_2(\beta) = \sum_{\vec{s} \notin \mathcal{S}im} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})}, \quad (68)$$

we find

$$p_{\ell,\beta}(\vec{t}) = \frac{e^{-\beta\Gamma} md e^{-\beta H_T(\vec{t})} + \zeta_1(\beta, \vec{t})}{e^{-\beta\Gamma} md Z_T(\beta) + \zeta_2(\beta)}. \quad (69)$$

Using the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |p_{\ell,\beta}(\vec{t}) - p_{T,\beta}(\vec{t})| &\leq \frac{\zeta_1(\beta, \vec{t})}{e^{-\beta\Gamma} md Z_T(\beta) + \zeta_2(\beta)} + \\ &+ \frac{\zeta_2(\beta) e^{-\beta H_T(\vec{t})}}{Z_T(\beta) (e^{-\beta\Gamma} md Z_T(\beta) + \zeta_2(\beta))}. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Observe that, in the second summand on the right hand side of (70), only the factor $e^{-\beta H_T(\vec{t})}$ depends on \vec{t} . Summing over target configurations (by definition of the total variation distance in (64)) this factor yields a contribution of $Z_T(\beta)$, which precisely cancels $Z_T(\beta)$ in the denominator.

Next observe that in the first summand of (70) only $\zeta_1(\beta, \vec{t})$ depends on \vec{t} . Inserting the definition of $\zeta_1(\beta, \vec{t})$, we can rewrite the \vec{t} dependent part of the first summand as

$$\sum_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_T} \zeta_1(\beta, \vec{t}) = \sum_{\vec{s} \notin \mathcal{S}im} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})} = \zeta_2(\beta). \quad (71)$$

Overall, we find

$$\|p_{\ell,\beta} - p_{T,\beta}\| \leq \frac{\zeta_2(\beta)}{e^{-\beta\Gamma} md Z_T(\beta) + \zeta_2(\beta)}. \quad (72)$$

Finally, since $\zeta_2(\beta)$ is non-negative, subtracting it from the denominator only increases the right hand side of (72). Additionally using that, first, $\zeta_2(\beta)$ is strictly upper bounded by $e^{-\beta(\Delta+\Gamma)} q_S^{|V_S|}$, and second, $Z_T(\beta)$ is strictly lower bounded by $e^{-\beta \min(H_T)}$ finally yields (63). \square

4. Common Transformations as Simulations

Several ‘natural’ transformations for spin systems are special cases of simulations, including graph isomorphisms (Proposition 20), weak symmetries (Proposition 21) and binary simulations (Proposition 22). To see this, note that if $S = T$, for any cut-off Δ , we obtain a trivial simulation $S \rightarrow T$. This can be relaxed to T merely being isomorphic to S , showing that simulations can be interpreted as generalized isomorphisms, as mentioned at the beginning of Section II B.

Proposition 20 (isomorphisms induce simulations). *Let $\phi: S \rightarrow T$ be an isomorphism. Then for arbitrary $\Delta > 0$, $S \rightarrow T$ with $P = \phi^{-1}$.*

Proof. Since only Δ and P are non-trivial, we only have to prove conditions 4 and 5 from Definition 8; the remaining conditions hold trivially.

Condition 4 is satisfied, since first, using that the decoding is trivial while the physical spin assignment is given by ϕ^{-1} , $\text{deco} \circ \vec{s} \circ P = \vec{t}$ is equivalent to $\vec{s} = \vec{t} \circ \phi$, and second, since ϕ is an isomorphism of spin systems it preserves the Hamiltonian, i.e. $H_S(\vec{t} \circ \phi) = H_T(\vec{t})$ and thus, for any low energy target configuration,

$$\text{sim}(\vec{t}) = \{\vec{t} \circ \phi\} \quad (73)$$

and hence $\text{deg} = 1$.

This also proves the case $\vec{s} \in \text{sim}(\vec{t})$ of condition 5. The case $\vec{s} \notin \mathcal{S}im$ is satisfied, since any source configuration \vec{s} trivially satisfies $\vec{s} = (\vec{s} \circ \phi^{-1}) \circ \phi$, so $\vec{s} \notin \mathcal{S}im$ implies that \vec{s} is a high energy configuration. \square

Another class of simulations can be obtained from *weak symmetries*. Given a bijection $\phi: V_S \rightarrow V_S$, we say that a spin system S has symmetry ϕ if for all configurations \vec{s} , $H_S(\vec{s}) = H_S(\vec{s} \circ \phi)$. While isomorphisms define symmetries, symmetries need not preserve the hyperedges and local interactions of S , as they are only required to preserve the Hamiltonian.

If a bijection ϕ on V_S only preserves the Hamiltonian for configurations with energy below a cut-off Δ , we say that S has *weak symmetry* (ϕ, Δ) . If S has weak symmetry (ϕ, Δ) and $H_S(\vec{s} \circ \phi) < \Delta$ then also $H_S(\vec{s}) < \Delta$. This is the case because V_S is finite, so ϕ has finite order, i.e. there exists a natural number n with $\phi^n = \text{id}$ and applying the weak symmetry $n - 1$ -times to $\vec{s} \circ \phi$ yields

$$H_S(\vec{s} \circ \phi) = H_S(\vec{s} \circ \phi^2) = \dots = H_S(\vec{s} \circ \phi^{n-1}) = H_S(\vec{s}). \quad (74)$$

This implies that ϕ not only maps low-energy configurations to low-energy configurations, but also high-energy

configurations to high-energy configurations. In other words, both the high energy and the low energy subspace of the configuration space \mathcal{C}_S are invariant under the action of ϕ .

Proposition 21 (weak symmetries induce simulations). *If S has weak symmetry (ϕ, Δ) then ϕ defines a simulation $S \rightarrow S$ with cut-off Δ and $P = \phi^{-1}$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Proposition 20. Condition 4 and the first case of condition 5 hold because ϕ preserves the Hamiltonian for low energy configurations, and the second case of 5 holds because ϕ maps high energy configurations to high energy configurations. \square

Simulations can also be used to change the spin type of a spin system. We explicitly show how an arbitrary spin system with spin type q can be simulated by a spin system with spin type 2 by encoding each q -level spin into $\lceil \log_2(q) \rceil$ 2-level spins, where $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer greater than or equal to x . A similar construction works for arbitrary spin type, i.e. from q - to p -level spins.

Proposition 22 (binary simulation). *Let S be any spin system. For any $\Delta \geq 0$, there exists a spin system $B(S, \Delta)$ with spin type 2 and a simulation $\mathfrak{b}(S, \Delta): B(S, \Delta) \rightarrow S$.*

Proof. Given any spin system S and $\Delta \geq 0$ we construct the required spin system $B(S, \Delta)$ and simulation $\mathfrak{b}(S, \Delta)$. To lighten the notation, we fix S, Δ and omit the (S, Δ) arguments, i.e. we write B, \mathfrak{b} instead of $B(S, \Delta), \mathfrak{b}(S, \Delta)$. Note however that the entire construction depends on (S, Δ) .

We take $\Gamma = 0$. Next, we take $k := \lceil \log_2(q) \rceil$ and fix an injection

$$\text{enc} : [q_S] \rightarrow [2]^k, \quad (75)$$

and a left inverse of enc , dec , i.e. we have $\text{dec} \circ \text{enc} = \text{id}$. dec and enc clearly satisfy condition 2 of Definition 8 and since $|\text{enc}| = 1$, enc also satisfies condition 3.

We define $V_B := V_S \times [k]$ and $P : V_S \rightarrow V_B^k$ by

$$P(v) := ((v, 1), \dots, (v, k)). \quad (76)$$

This clearly satisfies condition 1. Intuitively, $P(v)$ contains the k spins that are used to encode v .

Next, we set $E_B := \{e \times [k] \mid e \in E_S\}$ and define J_B by the following case distinction:

$$J_B(e \times [k])(\vec{s}) = J_S(e)(\text{dec} \circ \vec{s} \circ P) \quad (77)$$

if for all $v \in e$, $\vec{s} \circ P(v)$ is contained in the image of enc , and

$$J_B(e \times [k])(\vec{s}) = \Delta \quad (78)$$

otherwise.

By construction there are no auxiliary spins. This implies that

$$\vec{s}_1 \circ P = \vec{s}_2 \circ P \Rightarrow \vec{s}_1 = \vec{s}_2. \quad (79)$$

Let $\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_S$ and define $\vec{s}_{\vec{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_B$ by

$$\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}(v, i) = \text{enc}^{(i)}(\vec{t}(v)). \quad (80)$$

Then, by construction, we have

$$\vec{s}_{\vec{t}} \circ P = \text{enc} \circ \vec{t} \quad (81)$$

and by (79) $\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}$ is the unique configuration satisfying this condition. It follows that $\text{sim}(\vec{t}) \subseteq \{\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}\}$. Note that $\text{sim}(\vec{t})$ could be empty, since we have not yet taken into account the energy condition, $H_S(\vec{s}) < \Delta$. Finally, using the definition of J_B and the fact that, for all target spins v , $\vec{s}_{\vec{t}} \circ P(v)$ is contained in the image of enc , we find

$$\begin{aligned} H_B(\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}) &= \sum_{e \in E_S} J_B(e \times [k])(\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E_S} J(e)(\text{dec} \circ \vec{s}_{\vec{t}} \circ P) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E_S} J(e)(\vec{t}) = H_S(\vec{t}), \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

where the second to last equality holds by (79). Since $\Gamma = 0$, we have that if $H_S(\vec{t}) < \Delta$ then $\text{sim}(\vec{t}) = \{\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}\}$, so \mathfrak{b} satisfies condition 4 with $d = 1$.

Moreover, if $\vec{s} \notin \text{sim}$ then either $\vec{s} = \vec{s}_{\vec{t}}$ for some \vec{t} with $H_S(\vec{t}) \geq \Delta$ and hence also $H_B(\vec{s}) = H_S(\vec{t}) \geq \Delta$, or there exists no $\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_S$ with $\vec{s} = \vec{s}_{\vec{t}}$. In the latter case, there must exist at least one $v \in V_S$ with

$$\vec{s} \circ P(v) \notin \text{Im}(\text{enc}). \quad (83)$$

Then, by definition of J_B , whenever $v \in e$,

$$J_B(e \times [k])(\vec{s}|_{e \times [k]}) = \Delta, \quad (84)$$

and thus also $H_B(\vec{s}) \geq \Delta$, so \mathfrak{b} satisfies condition 5. \square

5. Graph Minors as Simulations

Finally, sequences of graph-minor operations such as deletion of edges and vertices, or contractions of edges can be realized as spin system simulations, too (Proposition 24). To this end we consider spin systems which are defined on graphs (instead of hypergraphs) but we expect that similar results also hold for the general case. Given a graph G_S , a minor G_T of G_S and a spin system T on G_T , we show how local interactions can be assigned to the edges of G_S that are contracted and deleted such that the resulting spin system S on G_S simulates T . Intuitively,

- ▷ deleting an edge is achieved by setting its coupling to zero, and
- ▷ contracting an edge is achieved by assigning it a coupling that leads to zero energy if the two adjacent spins are in equal states, and energy Δ if not.

We start by considering the case where G_T is obtained from G_S by a single edge contraction.

Lemma 23 (edge contraction as a simulation). *Consider graphs G_S, G_T such that G_T is obtained from G_S by contracting a single edge. Let T be any spin system on G_T . Then, for any $\Delta > 0$, we can construct a spin system S on G_S such that $S \rightarrow T$.*

Proof. Let us first spell out the assumption that G_T is obtained from G_S by contracting a single edge. Denote this edge $\{a, b\}$, so that vertices of G_T are precisely all vertices from V_S except for b . Edges of T are obtained by taking all edges of S except for $\{a, b\}$, and renaming all occurrences of b in these edges into a . We define $f_{b \rightarrow a}: V_S \rightarrow V_T$ that renames b to a ,

$$f_{b \rightarrow a}(c) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } c = b \\ c & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (85)$$

and further define the contraction map $f: E_S \setminus \{\{a, b\}\} \rightarrow E_T$ by

$$f(\{c, d\}) = \{f_{b \rightarrow a}(c), f_{b \rightarrow a}(d)\}. \quad (86)$$

f describes how edges of G_S are mapped to edges of G_T under the contraction of $\{a, b\}$. Note that f is surjective but not necessarily injective, i.e. different edges from G_S might be mapped to same edge in G_T (consider the contraction of one edge of a triangle).

We construct the spin system S on G_S as follows. For each edge e' of G_T , we choose one edge e in G_S that under the contraction is mapped to e' , and attach the local interaction of e' to e . This amounts to first choosing a right inverse of f , g . We now assign local interactions to E_S . We define

$$J_S(\{a, b\})(s_a, s_b) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s_a = s_b \\ \Delta & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (87)$$

For each edge $e' \in E_T$ we define

$$J_S(g(e'))(\vec{t} \circ f_{b \rightarrow a}) = J_T(e')(\vec{t}), \quad (88)$$

while for the remaining edges $e \in E_S$ not contained in the image of g and different from $\{a, b\}$, we set $J_S(e) = 0$. It is immediate to conclude that $S \rightarrow T$ with cut-off Δ .

We prove conditions 4 and 5; the rest is trivial. First, given any target configuration \vec{t} , we get a source configuration $\vec{s}_{\vec{t}} = \vec{t} \circ f_{b \rightarrow a}$. Source configurations of this are precisely those that assign the same state to a and b . Using that encoding, decoding and physical spin assignment are trivial, $\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}$ further satisfies $\vec{s}_{\vec{t}} \circ P = \text{enc} \circ \vec{t}$. Next, by definition of J_S , we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_S(\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}) &= \sum_{e \in E_S \setminus \{\{a, b\}\}} J_S(e)(\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}|_e) \\ &= \sum_{e' \in E_T} J_S(g(e'))(\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}|_{g(e')}) \\ &= \sum_{e' \in E_T} J_T(e')(\vec{t}|_{e'}) = H_T(\vec{t}) \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

where the first equality holds because $\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}$ assigns the same state to a and b , so the local interaction (87) is zero. The second equality follows from splitting the sum over remaining edges from E_S into edges e' from E_T , and for each such e' , summing over its preimage under f . By definition of J_S , the latter sum collapses to a single term, namely that corresponding to $g(e')$. The third equality follows by inserting the definition of $\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}$ and using (88). This proves that $\text{sim}(\vec{t}) = \{\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}\}$, i.e. 4 with $d = 1$, as well as the first case of condition 5.

We still need to show that if $\vec{s} \notin \text{Sim}$ then $H_S(\vec{s}) \geq \Delta$, i.e. the second case of condition 5. This holds because if $\vec{s} \notin \text{Sim}$ then either $\vec{s} = \vec{s}_{\vec{t}}$ for a target configuration \vec{t} with $H_T(\vec{t}) \geq \Delta$ and the claim follows from (89), or $\vec{s}(a) \neq \vec{s}(b)$ and the claim follows from (87). \square

Let us now consider the case where G_T is obtained from G_S via a sequence of contraction and deletion operations.

Proposition 24 (graph minors as simulations). *Let G_T be a graph minor of G_S and T be a spin system defined on G_T . For every $\Delta > 0$, we can construct a spin system S on G_S such that $S \rightarrow T$.*

Proof. We prove that each step of the transformation of G_S into G_T via edge contraction or deletion can be achieved by a simulation. For single edge contractions this is shown in Lemma 23. Deletions of edges can be achieved by setting the corresponding local interaction to zero, and deletions of isolated vertices can be achieved by an appropriate choice of P . The overall simulation can be obtained by composing all these single-step simulations. This crucially relies on the fact that simulations can be composed, shown in Theorem 25.

Now, by assumption, G_T is a minor of G_S , so there exists $E_{\text{del}} \in E_S$, $E_{\text{contr}} \in E_S \setminus E_{\text{del}}$, $V_{\text{del}} \subseteq V_S$ such that deleting edges in E_{del} from E_S , deleting isolated vertices in V_{del} and then contracting the edges in E_{contr} yields G_T .

We first consider the graph G_R obtained from G_S by delete operations only, i.e. $V_R = V_S \setminus V_{\text{del}}$, and $E_R = E_S \setminus E_{\text{del}}$. As G_T is obtained from G_R by contractions only, iteratively applying Lemma 23 we obtain a spin system R on G_R and a simulation $\ell: R \rightarrow T$. Explicitly, this simulation is constructed as follows. First, we fix an ordering of $E_{\text{contr}} = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. Note that since the result of contracting edges does not depend on the order of contractions this ordering is arbitrary. Next, construct R by iteratively applying Lemma 23. For $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ the graph G_{R_i} is obtained from G_R by contracting the edges $\{e_1, \dots, e_i\}$, so that $G_{R_0} = G_R$, $G_{R_n} = G_T$ and contracting e_i in $G_{R_{i-1}}$ yields G_{R_i} . By Lemma 23, we can construct spin systems R_i on G_{R_i} together with simulations

$$\ell_i: R_i \rightarrow R_{i+1} \quad (90)$$

with cut-off Δ and identity encoding. By Theorem 25 with $R := R_0$, their composite $\ell := \ell_0 \circ \dots \circ \ell_{n-1}$ defines

a simulation

$$\ell: R \rightarrow T, \quad (91)$$

with cut-off Δ , with $V_R = V_S \setminus V_{\text{del}}$, and $E_R = E_S \setminus E_{\text{del}}$.

Next we construct a spin system S on (V_S, E_S) together with a simulation

$$g: S \rightarrow R \quad (92)$$

with cut-off Δ and identity encoding. We define $J_S(e) := J_R(e)$ for $e \in E_R$, and $J_S(e) := 0$ for $e \in E_{\text{del}}$. We let P be the inclusion of V_R into V_S . This satisfies Definition 8.

In total we have $g: S \rightarrow R$ and $\ell: R \rightarrow T$. Using Theorem 25 we obtain

$$g \circ \ell: S \rightarrow T \quad (93)$$

with cut-off Δ . \square

Note that the construction of S in Proposition 24 is implicit, as its explicit form depends on the choice of right inverses for the contraction maps in each application of Lemma 23. In general, though, S has the following form:

1. On edges $e \in E_{\text{del}}$, $J_S(e) := 0$;
2. A sequence of contractions gives rise to a contraction map F describing how edges from E_S (that are not deleted) are mapped to edges from E_T . Given a right inverse F' of this contraction map, J_S is constructed analogously to the single edge contraction case. For each edge from E_T we attach its local interaction to $F'(e)$, i.e.

$$J_S(F'(e'))(\vec{s} \circ F) = J_T(e')(\vec{s}), \quad (94)$$

3. For all edges not in the image of F' , $J_S(e) = 0$, and for all edges that are contracted, J_S is given by (87).

In Proposition 24, F is the composite of single edge contraction maps and F' is the composite of their right inverses. However, given F one might also specify its right inverse F' directly, without specifying right inverses for each single edge contraction involved in the sequence. We remark that whenever we use Proposition 24 throughout the paper, especially in Section V, we will explicitly illustrate the choice of F' .

C. Modularity of Simulations

We now define several operations that can be used to modify or combine simulations. Specifically, we prove that simulations can be composed (Theorem 25), scaled (by non-negative real numbers, Theorem 26) and added (Theorem 27).

Composition of simulations is defined in the obvious way,

$$(S \xrightarrow{g} R) \circ (R \xrightarrow{\ell} T) = S \xrightarrow{g \circ \ell} T. \quad (95)$$

We denote the composition of emulations in diagrammatic order. Scaling and addition of simulations are such that a positive linear combination of simulations yields a simulation between the corresponding positive linear combinations of the source and target systems, i.e. for $\ell_i: S_i \rightarrow T_i$,

$$\sum_i \lambda_i \cdot \ell_i: \left(\sum_i \lambda_i \cdot S_i \right) \rightarrow \left(\sum_i \lambda_i \cdot T_i \right). \quad (96)$$

This implies that we can not only obtain complex spin systems as linear combinations of simple ones, but also complex simulations as linear combinations and compositions of simple ones, leading to a modular framework for the construction of spin system simulations. We term this concept *modularity of simulation* (see Fig. 5).

Theorem 25 (composition of simulations). *Let $\ell: R \rightarrow T$ and $g: S \rightarrow R$ be simulations. Then, the following data defines a simulation $g \circ \ell: S \rightarrow T$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{g \circ \ell} &= \min(\Delta_\ell, \Delta_g - \Gamma_\ell) \\ \Gamma_{g \circ \ell} &= \Gamma_\ell + \Gamma_g \\ d_{g \circ \ell} &= d_g \cdot d_\ell \\ P_{g \circ \ell}^{(m,n)} &= P_g^{(m)} \circ P_\ell^{(n)} \\ \text{dec}_{g \circ \ell}(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_{k_1}) &= \text{dec}_\ell(\text{dec}_g(\vec{x}_1), \dots, \text{dec}_g(\vec{x}_{k_1})) \\ (\text{enc}_{g \circ \ell})_{i,j}^{(m,n)} &= (\text{enc}_g)_i^{(m)} \circ (\text{enc}_\ell)_j^{(n)}, \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

where k_1, k_2 are the orders of the encodings $\text{enc}_\ell, \text{enc}_g$, respectively.

Proof. See Appendix A 1. \square

In the above definition, we identified $V_S^{k_2 \cdot k_1}$ with $V_S^{k_2 \times k_1}$ and similarly for $[q_S]^{k_2 \cdot k_1}$, where \vec{x}_r is the r th column vector of a matrix in $[q_S]^{k_2 \times k_1}$. The key idea of the construction of $g \circ \ell$ is to first use ℓ to encode each spin of T into k_1 physical spins of R , and then use g to encode each of these into k_2 physical spins of S , yielding, in total, for each spin of T , an $k_2 \times k_1$ matrix of physical spins of S . Also dec, enc are defined w.r.t. this matrix of physical spins, in particular $|\text{enc}_{g \circ \ell}| = |\text{enc}_g| \cdot |\text{enc}_\ell|$. It follows that

$$(\text{sim}_{g \circ \ell})_{i,j}(\vec{t}) = \{ \vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r}) \mid \vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t}) \}. \quad (98)$$

That is, given any low energy target configuration \vec{t} , we construct a source configuration \vec{s} that simulates \vec{t} w.r.t. to $g \circ \ell$ by first taking any \vec{r} that simulates \vec{t} w.r.t. ℓ , and then taking \vec{s} that simulates \vec{r} w.r.t. g . Equation (98) is proven in Appendix A 1.

Note that the composition of simulations is denoted in diagrammatic order, i.e. thinking of simulations as transformations between spin systems, $g \circ \ell$ means first applying g and then ℓ . The reason for this is that, in practice, we often construct simulations starting from the target, that is, given a target system T we first construct R and




Figure 5: Given simulations $S_i \rightarrow T_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and a spin system T that contains T_1, T_2, T_3 as subsystems (right hand side), we locally replace each T_i with the corresponding S_i and thereby construct a spin system S (left hand side) and a simulation $S \rightarrow T$ (by Theorem 27). Note that $S \rightarrow T$ is a sum of the simulations $S_i \rightarrow T_i$ and the identity simulation for remaining subsystem of T .

$\ell: R \rightarrow T$, and then given R (and possibly information over ℓ) we construct S and g . In this sense, the diagrammatic order corresponds to the operational order of constructing simulations. This is also reflected in the fact that the encoding of configurations, specified by P , enc and ultimately sim , is composed in this way. That is, configurations of T are first encoded into configurations of R (as specified by ℓ), which are then encoded into configurations of S (as specified by g).

Finally, since in the low energy sector (up to encoding configurations) we have $H_S - \Gamma_g = H_R$ and $H_R - \Gamma_\ell = H_T$, the shift of $g \circ \ell$ is necessarily of the form $\Gamma_\ell + \Gamma_g$. Since low energy target configurations \vec{t} are precisely those which can be simulated by a configuration \vec{r} such that \vec{r} itself can be simulated by a source configuration \vec{s} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_R(\vec{r}) - \Gamma_\ell &= H_T(\vec{t}) < \Delta_\ell \\ H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma_g &= H_R(\vec{r}) < \Delta_g. \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

In total, the cut-off of the composite simulation is of the form $\min(\Delta_\ell, \Delta_g - \Gamma_\ell)$.

Theorem 26 (scaling of simulations). *Let $\ell: S \rightarrow T$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Then*

$$\lambda \cdot \ell: \lambda \cdot S \rightarrow \lambda \cdot T \quad (100)$$

where

$$\Delta_{\lambda \cdot \ell} = \lambda \cdot \Delta_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_{\lambda \cdot \ell} = \lambda \cdot \Gamma_\ell \quad (101)$$

and $\lambda \cdot \ell$ agrees with ℓ on the remaining data.

Proof. Only condition 4 and condition 5 of Definition 8 are affected by changing Δ and Γ . These hold since

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma_\ell < \Delta_\ell \Leftrightarrow \lambda \cdot H_S(\vec{s}) - \lambda \cdot \Gamma_\ell < \lambda \cdot \Delta_\ell \quad (102)$$

and hence also $\text{sim}_\ell(\vec{t}) = \text{sim}_{\lambda \cdot \ell}(\vec{t})$. \square

Theorem 27 (addition of simulations). *Let $\ell: S_1 \rightarrow T_1$ and $g: S_2 \rightarrow T_2$ such that*

1. $\text{dec}_\ell = \text{dec}_g$
2. $P_\ell|_{V_{T_1} \cap V_{T_2}} = P_g|_{V_{T_1} \cap V_{T_2}}$
3. $\text{Im}(P_\ell|_{V_{T_1} \cap V_{T_2}}) = V_{S_1} \cap V_{S_2}$
4. $(\text{enc}_\ell) \cap (\text{enc}_g) \neq \emptyset$
5. *if $(\text{enc}_\ell)_i(s) = (\text{enc}_g)_j(s)$ for some $s \in [q_S]$ then $(\text{enc}_\ell)_i = (\text{enc}_g)_j$*

Then $\ell + g: S_1 + S_2 \rightarrow T_1 + T_2$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\ell+g} &= \min(\Delta_\ell, \Delta_g) \\ \Gamma_{\ell+g} &= \Gamma_\ell + \Gamma_g \\ d_{\ell+g} &= d_\ell \cdot d_g \\ P_{\ell+g}(t) &= \begin{cases} P_\ell(t) & \text{if } t \in V_{T_1} \\ P_g(t) & \text{else} \end{cases} \\ \text{dec}_{\ell+g} &= \text{dec}_\ell \\ \text{enc}_{\ell+g} &= \text{enc}_\ell \cap \text{enc}_g \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where in the above

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}(P_\ell|_{V_{T_1} \cap V_{T_2}}) &= \\ &= \{P_\ell^{(i)}(t) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \text{ord}(\text{enc}_\ell), t \in V_{T_1} \cap V_{T_2}\} \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

and $\text{enc}_\ell \cap \text{enc}_g$ denotes the list of encodings that are contained in both enc_ℓ and enc_g , ordered according to enc_ℓ .

Proof. See Appendix A 2. \square

Note that simulations can be added only if they satisfy the compatibility conditions stated in Theorem 27.




Figure 6: Simulations are modular (Theorem 27): If $\ell : S_1 \rightarrow T_1$ and $g : S_2 \rightarrow T_2$, then $S_1 + S_2 \rightarrow T_1 + T_2$ provided certain compatibility conditions are fulfilled. The left hand side shows $V_{S_1+S_2}$ and the physical spin sets $\mathcal{P}h_\ell$ and $\mathcal{P}h_g$ of the simulations ℓ, g , whereas the right hand side shows $V_{T_1+T_2}$ and a low energy configuration \vec{t} of $T_1 + T_2$. The constructed configurations \vec{s}_1, \vec{s}_2 agree on the overlap $V_{S_1} \cap V_{S_2}$ and, once combined, simulate \vec{t} .

In essence, conditions 1 and 4 are necessary to construct a decoding and encoding of the sum simulation $\ell + g$. Condition 5 requires that the encodings enc_ℓ and enc_g satisfy a condition similar to 3 in Definition 8, which prevents the existence of low energy source configurations $\vec{s}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{S_i}$ that agree on the overlap $V_{S_1} \cap V_{S_2}$ but stem from different encodings. Such configurations would have low energy but would not be included in Sim , thus preventing $\ell + g$ from defining a simulation.

The remaining conditions, 2 and 3, ensure that the physical spin assignments agree on the overlap of target systems while auxiliary spins do not overlap. They allow us to construct configurations in $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_{\ell+g})_i(\vec{t})$ with encoding $\text{enc}_i \in \text{enc}_\ell \cap \text{enc}_g$ by combining configurations $\vec{s}_1 \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_i(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_1}})$, and $\vec{s}_2 \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_2}})$. Since \vec{s}_1, \vec{s}_2 are simulating configurations which are constructed with the same encoding, enc_i , we have

$$\vec{s}_1 \circ P_\ell|_{V_{T_1} \cap V_{T_2}} = \text{enc}_i \circ \vec{t}|_{V_{T_1} \cap V_{T_2}} = \vec{s}_2 \circ P_g|_{V_{T_1} \cap V_{T_2}}. \quad (105)$$

Inserting conditions 2 and 3 this implies

$$\vec{s}_1|_{V_{S_1} \cap V_{S_2}} = \vec{s}_2|_{V_{S_1} \cap V_{S_2}}. \quad (106)$$

Thus, \vec{s}_1, \vec{s}_2 can be combined to a configuration \vec{s} on $S_1 + S_2$. The crucial part of the proof of Theorem 27, provided in Appendix A 2, shows that all configurations \vec{s} obtained this way in fact simulate the target configuration \vec{t} , i.e.

they satisfy

$$H_{S_1+S_2}(\vec{s}) - \Gamma_{\ell+g} = H_{T_1+T_2}(\vec{t}), \quad (107)$$

while all other configurations of $S_1 + S_2$ not obtained this way have high energy (see Fig. 6). Note that conditions 2 and 3 can always be achieved by relabeling spins in S_1 and S_2 .

Finally, observe that when adding simulations, their cut-offs are not added, but $\Delta_{\ell+g} = \min(\Delta_\ell, \Delta_g)$. This guarantees that whenever $H_{T_1+T_2}(\vec{t}) < \Delta_{\ell+g}$, both $H_{T_1}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_1}}) < \Delta_\ell$ and $H_{T_2}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_2}}) < \Delta_g$ hold.

Next we show that Theorem 27 can be applied iteratively to construct sums of more than two simulations.

Corollary 28 (finite sums of simulations). *If $\ell_i : S_i \rightarrow T_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ such that*

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{enc}_{\ell_i} \neq \emptyset \quad (108)$$

and the remaining conditions of Theorem 27 are satisfied pairwise, then there is a simulation

$$\ell := \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i : \sum_{i=1}^n S_i \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n T_i \quad (109)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_\ell &= \min(\{\Delta_{\ell_i} \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}) \\
\Gamma_\ell &= \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\ell_i} \\
d_\ell &= \prod_{i=1}^n d_{\ell_i} \\
P_\ell &= P_{\ell_{i_t}}(t) \text{ with } i_t = \min(\{i \mid t \in V_{T_{i_t}}\}) \\
\text{dec}_\ell &= \text{dec}_{\ell_1} \\
\text{enc}_\ell &= \bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{enc}_{\ell_i}.
\end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction over n . The case $n = 2$ follows from Theorem 27. Assume the claim holds for $n - 1$. We start by writing

$$\sum_{i=1}^n S_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} S_i + S_n. \tag{111}$$

By assumption, we have simulations

$$\ell_{<n} := \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \ell_i : \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} S_i \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} T_i \tag{112}$$

and

$$\ell_n : S_n \rightarrow T_n. \tag{113}$$

We now prove that these two simulations satisfy the conditions of Theorem 27 and hence can be summed to obtain ℓ .

Condition 1 and 5 follow from the assumption that $\{\ell_i \mid i \leq n\}$ satisfy these conditions pairwise. Condition 4 holds by (108). To see that condition 2 holds too, we write

$$\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} V_{T_i} \right) \cap V_{T_n} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} (V_{T_i} \cap V_{T_n}). \tag{114}$$

Given any $v \in \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} V_{T_i} \right) \cap V_{T_n}$, then $v \in V_{T_{i_v}} \cap V_{T_n}$ and by construction

$$P_{\ell_{<n}}(v) = P_{\ell_{i_v}}(v). \tag{115}$$

Thus, condition 2 holds since the original simulations $\{\ell_i \mid i \leq n\}$ satisfy it pairwise. Finally, for condition 3, by (114) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Im}\left(P_{\ell_{<n}} \Big|_{\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} V_{T_i}\right) \cap V_{T_n}}\right) &= \\
&= \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \text{Im}\left(P_{\ell_{<n}} \Big|_{V_{T_i} \cap V_{T_n}}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

Since $\{\ell_i \mid i \leq n\}$ pairwise satisfy condition 2,

$$P_{\ell_{<n}} \Big|_{V_{T_i} \cap V_{T_n}} = P_{\ell_i} \Big|_{V_{T_i} \cap V_{T_n}}. \tag{117}$$

Using this together with the assumption that $\{\ell_i \mid i \leq n\}$ also satisfy condition 3 pairwise, the right hand side of (116) equals

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} (V_{S_i} \cap V_{S_n}) = \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} V_{S_i} \right) \cap V_{S_n}. \tag{118}$$

In total, the simulations $\ell_{<n}$ and ℓ_n satisfy the conditions of Theorem 27. They can thus be added to yield

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \ell_i \right) + \ell_n : \sum_{i=1}^n S_i \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n T_i, \tag{119}$$

which satisfies the requirements of Theorem 27. \square

III. SPIN MODELS AND EMULATIONS

In this section we define and study spin models (Section III A), emulations (Section III B), and finally characterize universal spin models (Section III C).

A. Spin Models

A spin model is a set of spin systems that is closed under isomorphisms and has constant spin type.

Definition 29 (spin model). *A spin model \mathcal{M} is a set of spin systems such that for all $S, T \in \mathcal{M}$,*

1. $q_S = q_T$,
2. if $S' \cong S$ then $S' \in \mathcal{M}$.

Given a spin model \mathcal{M} , we denote its *spin type* by $q_{\mathcal{M}}$. It is worth noting that many of the following considerations work for general sets of spin systems. Only for some constructions we need the assumptions of Definition 29. To distinguish an unrestricted set of spin systems from a spin model, in the following we denote sets of spin systems by $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, \dots$ and reserve $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}', \dots$ for spin models.

In practice, we often define spin models by specifying a set of spin systems \mathcal{S} with constant spin type and consider its closure under isomorphisms. The latter is denoted by $[\cdot]$, i.e. $[\mathcal{S}]$ defines a spin model with $S \in [\mathcal{S}]$ if and only if $S \cong S'$ for some $S' \in \mathcal{S}$. We can think of $[\mathcal{S}]$ as the spin model generated by \mathcal{S} .

We might also define spin models by restricting the available local interactions and interaction hypergraphs. For example, allowing only Ising pair-interactions on square-grid graphs gives rise to the 2d-Ising model (cf. Example 34).

Definition 30. *Let $q \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$, \mathcal{G} be a set of hypergraphs and \mathcal{F} be a set of functions of type*

$$\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{[q]^{\{1, \dots, l\}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid l \in \mathbb{N}\}. \tag{120}$$

We define the spin model $[\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}]$ as the set containing all spin systems S which, up to isomorphism, have interaction graph G_S from \mathcal{G} and local interactions $J_S(e)$ from \mathcal{F} .

In words, if $S \in [\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}]$ then G_S is isomorphic to some $G \in \mathcal{G}$. In addition, for all $e \in E_S$, there exists a $j \in \mathcal{F}$ such that, up to isomorphism, i.e. up to relabeling spins from e , it holds that $J_S(e) = j$.

Conversely, given a spin model \mathcal{M} we can recover its set of local interactions, resulting in the *local spin model* of \mathcal{M} .

Definition 31 (local spin model). *Let \mathcal{M} be a spin model. The local spin model of \mathcal{M} , denoted $J(\mathcal{M})$, is defined by*

$$J(\mathcal{M}) = \{S_{J_S(e)} \mid S \in \mathcal{M}, e \in E_S\}. \quad (121)$$

This defines a spin model, as both closure under isomorphisms and constant spin type of $J(\mathcal{M})$ follow from the respective properties of \mathcal{M} .

Let us now see examples of spin models.

Example 32 (flags). *Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\vec{x} \in [2]^{\{1, \dots, l\}}$. We define*

$$f_{\vec{x}}: [2]^{\{1, \dots, l\}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ f_{\vec{x}}(\vec{s}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \vec{s} = \vec{x} \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (122)$$

The space of functions of type $[2]^{\{1, \dots, l\}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a 2^l dimensional real vector space and $(f_{\vec{x}})_{\vec{x} \in [2]^{\{1, \dots, l\}}}$ is its canonical basis. According to Definition 6, $f_{\vec{x}}$ defines a spin system $S_{f_{\vec{x}}}$. We call $f_{\vec{x}}$ the flag function on \vec{x} and $S_{f_{\vec{x}}}$ the flag system on \vec{x} .

The spin model containing all flag systems of order l is given by

$$\mathfrak{B}_l := [\{S_{f_{\vec{x}}} \mid \vec{x} \in [2]^{\{1, \dots, l\}}\}], \quad (123)$$

and the spin model containing all flag systems by

$$\mathfrak{B} := \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{B}_l. \quad (124)$$

Flag systems and models will play a crucial role in the characterization of universality (Theorem 54), as generic spin systems will be decomposed into non-negative linear combinations of flag systems.

Example 33 (generalized Ising model with fields). *The Ising pair interactions from Example 3 can be generalized to j -body interactions, for arbitrary $j \in \mathbb{N}$, as follows:*

$$\pi_j: [2]^{\{1, \dots, j\}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \\ \pi_j(\vec{s}) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |\vec{s}^{-1}(\{1\})| \in 2\mathbb{N} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (125)$$

and

$$\bar{\pi}_j: [2]^{\{1, \dots, j\}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \\ \bar{\pi}_j(\vec{s}) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |\vec{s}^{-1}(\{1\})| \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}. \quad (126)$$

Note that these are parity interactions, as their energy only depends on the number of spins in state 1.

Finally, letting

$$\Pi_j := \{\lambda \cdot \pi_j \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\} \cup \{\lambda \cdot \bar{\pi}_j \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\} \quad (127)$$

and leveraging Definition 30, we define the j -body Ising model as

$$\mathcal{F}_j := [\mathcal{G}_j, \Pi_j] \quad (128)$$

where \mathcal{G}_j is the set of j -uniform hypergraphs, that is, for each $G \in \mathcal{G}_j$, all of its hyperedges have cardinality j . Similarly, the j -body Ising model with fields is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_{j,f} := [\mathcal{G}_{j,f}, \Pi_j \cup \Pi_1] \quad (129)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{j,f}$ is obtained by adding all single vertex hyperedges to all hypergraphs in \mathcal{G}_j .

Example 34 (2d Ising model with fields). *To define the 2d Ising model with fields we restrict the interaction graphs of $\mathcal{F}_{2,f}$ to 2 dimensional grid graphs, that is, graphs with vertices $[m] \times [n]$ and edges between those vertices that are separated by distance 1, either in the vertical or horizontal direction. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$,*

$$V_{m,n} := [m] \times [n], \quad (130)$$

and

$$E_{m,n} := \{\{v, w\} \mid v, w \in V_{m,n}, \\ w = v + (0, 1) \text{ or } w = v + (1, 0)\}. \quad (131)$$

We define the $m \times n$ grid graph

$$G_{m,n} := (V_{m,n}, E_{m,n}), \quad (132)$$

the set of all such grid graphs

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{grid}} := \{G_{m,n} \mid m, n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}\}, \quad (133)$$

and, similar to Example 33, the set of all grid graphs that additionally contain all hyperedges of cardinality 1, as $\mathcal{G}_{\text{grid},f}$. We now define the 2d Ising model as

$$\mathcal{F}_{2d} := [\mathcal{G}_{\text{grid}}, \Pi_2], \quad (134)$$

and the 2d Ising model with fields

$$\mathcal{F}_{2d,f} := [\mathcal{G}_{\text{grid},f}, \Pi_2 \cup \Pi_1]. \quad (135)$$

B. Emulations

While previously we were only interested in the existence of spin system simulations, often they do not only exist but can be efficiently computed. The latter may be a crucial property, for example when the simulations ought to serve to construct reductions between computational problems over spin models, such as computing ground states. We capture the idea of efficiently computable spin system simulations with *spin model emulations*.

We shall first define them (Section III B 1), illustrate how binary simulations can be promoted to emulations (Section III B 2) and then turn to their transformations: after defining hulls of spin models (Section III B 3), we will show that emulations can be composed and lifted (Section III B 4).

1. Definition

Emulations are efficient algorithms that compute spin system simulations. More precisely, a spin model emulation of type $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ is a polytime computable function which, for each spin system $T \in \mathcal{T}$ and non-negative real δ as input, computes a spin system $S \in \mathcal{S}$ together with a spin system simulation of type $S \rightarrow T$ with cut-off δ .

Definition 35 (emulation). *Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} be sets of spin systems. A emulation of type $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$, denoted $\text{EMU}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$, is an algorithm that, on input (T, δ) with $T \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, outputs a pair*

$$\text{EMU}(T, \delta) = (\text{EMU}^{(1)}(T, \delta), \text{EMU}^{(2)}(T, \delta)), \quad (136)$$

where $\text{EMU}^{(1)}(T, \delta)$ is a spin system from \mathcal{S} , and $\text{EMU}^{(2)}(T, \delta)$ is a spin system simulation of type $\text{EMU}^{(1)}(T, \delta) \rightarrow T$, such that the following conditions are satisfied:

1. $\text{EMU}^{(2)}(T, \delta)$ has cut-off δ ;
2. EMU is efficient, i.e. on input (T, δ) EMU has runtime $\text{poly}(|T|)$;
3. EMU is uniform, i.e. for any $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the interaction graphs of $\text{EMU}^{(1)}(T, \delta_1)$ and $\text{EMU}^{(1)}(T, \delta_2)$ are equal and the simulations $\text{EMU}^{(2)}(T, \delta_1)$ and $\text{EMU}^{(2)}(T, \delta_2)$ can only differ in their energy shift; and
4. the decoding and encoding of $\text{EMU}^{(2)}(T, \delta)$ only depend on q_T .

Condition 3 states that part of the output of EMU can be computed independently of the second input, δ . More precisely, for each $T \in \mathcal{T}$, changing δ may only affect the local interactions of the output spin system and the energy shift of the output simulation.

Condition 4 ensures that systems with the same spin type are simulated by systems with the same spin type. This condition is needed for emulations to be compatible with addition of spin systems (see Theorem 41), similarly to simulations. If \mathcal{T} is a spin model condition 4 means that both decoding and encoding are constant.

Finally, similarly to Definition 8, we might write $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ as shorthand for “there exists an emulation $\text{EMU}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ ” and call \mathcal{T} the *target (model)* and \mathcal{S} the *source (model)* of the emulation. The first input of an emulation is called the *input spin system* and the second input, the *input cut-off*. The first output is called the *output spin system* and the second, the *output simulation*.

While simulations capture the idea of approximately reproducing the properties of a single target system within a source system, emulations capture the idea of efficiently doing so for an entire range of target systems, namely those contained in the target model. However, there is another interesting aspect in which emulations differ from simulation, which is best illustrated by considering a target spin model generated by a single spin system T . Then, a simulation of T has a single, fixed cut-off and thus approximates properties of T with constant error (see for instance Proposition 13, Proposition 17, etc). In contrast, an emulation of $[T]$ gives rise to a *family of simulations*

$$\mathcal{f}^\delta: \mathcal{S}^\delta \rightarrow T \quad (137)$$

indexed by their cut-off δ . By uniformity (condition 3), only the local interactions of S and the shift of \mathcal{f}^δ are affected by the cut-off. There is thus a sense in which \mathcal{f}^δ approximates T with arbitrary precision. If we interpret a simulation of T as capturing some aspects of the system, an emulation of $[T]$ captures essentially all aspects of T . This is explored in more detail in Section IV.

The source of an emulation, \mathcal{S} , can be interpreted as providing the resources for the construction of simulations of spin systems from the target \mathcal{T} . It is straightforward to see that increasing the source or decreasing the target also yields an emulation. That is, if $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ then $\mathcal{S}' \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'$. Further note that by Proposition 20, for any set of spin systems \mathcal{S} we obtain a trivial emulation $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ that on input (T, δ) simply outputs T together with the identity simulation with cut-off δ . Combined with the previous observation, we conclude that whenever $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, there is a trivial emulation $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$.

Remark 36 (polytime computability). *Polytime computability means polytime w.r.t. the number of real parameters that specify the input, assuming that basic, real arithmetic is of zero cost, similar to the real ram model [15]. More precisely, in Definition 35, we assume that spin systems in the input and output of EMU are presented such that their data can be directly read off. That is, the input (T, δ) of EMU consists of a list containing V_T, E_T and, for each $e \in E_T$, the function graph of $J_T(e)$, as well as the cut-off δ , and similar for the output system. Furthermore, we assume that the output simulation*

is given by a list containing its entire data (according to Definition 8), where again all functions are presented explicitly in terms of their function graphs. Polytime computability is always understood w.r.t. this presentation of input and output. Recall from (9) that this is equivalent to requiring a runtime that is polynomial in the size of the input system, $|T|$.

Moreover, we assume that arithmetic of real numbers, addition and scaling of spin systems (see Definition 4, Definition 5), elementary functions of real numbers including those in Theorem 40, Theorem 39, Theorem 41, as well as exponentials and logarithms, are polytime computable. Most of these assumptions could be circumvented by working with rational numbers and/or approximations in the theorems of Section IV.

2. Common Transformations as Emulations

Many of the examples of spin system simulations of Section II B can be promoted to spin model emulations, essentially because they are polytime computable. We illustrate this for spin system simulations that transform q -level to 2-level spins, i.e. we extend Proposition 22.

Proposition 37 (binary spin model emulation). *Let \mathcal{S} be any set of spin systems. Define*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{bin}} := \{B(S, \delta) \mid S \in \mathcal{S}, \delta \geq 0\}, \quad (138)$$

where $B(S, \Delta)$ is defined in Proposition 22. Then

$$\text{EMU}_{\text{bin}} : \mathcal{S}_{\text{bin}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}, \quad (139)$$

with

$$\text{EMU}_{\text{bin}}(S, \delta) = (B(S, \delta), \mathfrak{b}(S, \delta)), \quad (140)$$

where $\mathfrak{b}(S, \delta)$ is defined in Proposition 22.

Proof. We have to prove that EMU_{bin} satisfies the conditions of Definition 35. Conditions 1, 3 and 4 hold by construction (cf. Proposition 22). We thus only have to prove condition 2, namely polytime computability of EMU_{bin} .

By Proposition 22, we have that $V_{B(S, \delta)}$, $E_{B(S, \delta)}$ as well as enc , dec , Γ and P of $\mathfrak{b}(S, \delta)$ can be constructed in polytime. We still need to see that $J_{B(S, \delta)}$ can be constructed in polytime. First, recall that for any $e \in E_S$, $J_{B(S, \delta)}(e \times [k])$ is defined in terms of the following case distinction:

$$J_{B(S, \delta)}(e \times [k])(\vec{s}) = J_S(e)(\text{dec} \circ \vec{s} \circ P) \quad (141)$$

if for all $v \in e$, $\vec{s} \circ P(v)$ is contained in the image of enc , and

$$J_{B(S, \delta)}(e \times [k])(\vec{s}) = \delta \quad (142)$$

otherwise.

The first case consists of those configurations \vec{s} that satisfy $\vec{s} = \vec{s}_{\vec{t}}$ for some $\vec{t} \in [q]^e$, where $\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}$ is defined by

$\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}(v, i) = \text{enc}^{(i)}(\vec{t}(v))$. In particular, given \vec{t} , we have that $\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}$ can be constructed in polytime. We iterate over all $\vec{t} \in [q]^e$: for each we compute $\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}$ and $J_S(e)(\vec{t})$ and append the resulting configuration-energy pair, $(\vec{s}_{\vec{t}}, J_S(e)(\vec{t}))$, to a list. For each $e \in E_T$ this iteration consists of $q^{|e|}$, i.e. polynomially many steps, each of which is polytime computable, and thus it is itself polytime computable.

For the second case, we iterate over the remaining configurations \vec{s} , i.e. those not contained in $C_1 := \{\vec{s}_{\vec{t}} \mid \vec{t} \in [q]^e\}$. For each such, we add (\vec{s}, δ) to the previously constructed list. The set of configurations not contained in C_1 is denoted C_2 . The complexity of constructing the second part of $J_S(e \times [k])$ thus amounts to the complexity of constructing C_2 . Since for the first case we have constructed C_1 , for C_2 we construct all $2^{|e| \cdot k}$ configurations and test membership in C_1 for each of them. This amounts to $2^{|e| \cdot k}$ membership tests in a set of $2^{|e|}$ elements, which is polytime computable. Hence, the entire construction of $J_S(e \times [k])$ is polytime computable.

Finally, since there are polynomially many edges $e \in E_T$, the construction of J_B and hence that of $\mathfrak{b}(S, \delta)$ is polytime computable. \square

3. Hulls of Spin Models

In Section II C we proved that simulations are compatible with addition and scaling of spin systems. We will now prove analogous results for emulations. To this end, we first need to extend addition and scaling to spin models.

For any sets A, B , define the following operations:

1. $A + B := \{(a, b) \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$,
2. $\Sigma(A) := \{(a_1, \dots, a_k) \mid a_i \in A, k < \infty\}$,
3. $\text{Scale}(A) := \{(\lambda, a) \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, a \in A\}$,
4. $\text{Cone}(A) := \Sigma \circ \text{Scale}(A)$.

We are interested in the case where A, B are sets of spin systems \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} , so that we can use these operations to lift addition and scaling to spin models and emulations. We interpret $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{T}$ as containing formal, i.e. non-evaluated sums of spin systems S and T from \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} . Similarly, $\Sigma(\mathcal{S})$ is interpreted as containing all finite, formal sums of spin systems (S_1, \dots, S_k) from \mathcal{S} ; $\text{Scale}(\mathcal{S})$ as containing all finite, formal, non-negative scalings of spin systems S from \mathcal{S} ; and $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{S})$ as containing all finite, formal, non-negative linear combinations of spin systems $((\lambda_1, S_1), \dots, (\lambda_k, S_k))$ from \mathcal{S} .

We term id , Σ , Scale , Cone and arbitrary compositions of these *hull operators*, and write hull as shorthand for any such composition. This terminology is motivated by the fact that, up to emulations, id , Σ , Scale and Cone operators are idempotent, i.e. define hull operators in the mathematical sense. Further, we term the elements of $\text{hull}(\mathcal{S})$ *formal expressions*, and write expr as shorthand

for such. Formal expressions are formal, non-negative linear combinations of spin systems, possibly with all coefficients equal to one (in the case of Σ), or only one summand (in the case of Scale). We define an *evaluation* of such expressions, $\text{eval}(\text{expr})$, to be the result of computing the linear combination defined by expr , i.e. the actual spin system obtained by adding and scaling spin systems according to expr .

We now extend the definition of emulation, Definition 35, to the case $\text{hull}_1(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \text{hull}_2(\mathcal{T})$.

Definition 38 (emulation and hull operations). *Let S, T be sets of spin systems and $\text{hull}_1, \text{hull}_2$ be hull operators. We extend the definition of spin model emulation to*

$$\text{EMU}: \text{hull}_1(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \text{hull}_2(\mathcal{T}), \quad (143)$$

by modifying Definition 35 as follows:

1. *inputs of EMU are pairs containing a formal expressions $\text{expr}_2 \in \text{hull}_2(\mathcal{T})$ and a cut-off δ ;*
2. *outputs of EMU are pairs containing a formal expressions $\text{expr}_1 \in \text{hull}_1(\mathcal{S})$ and a simulation of type $\text{eval}(\text{expr}_1) \rightarrow \text{eval}(\text{expr}_2)$; and*
3. *polytime is understood w.r.t. the total size of the input expression.*

Similarly, we modify emulation to cover the cases where source and/or target are of the form $\mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}$.

Consider for example the case $\text{hull}_1 = \text{hull}_2 = \Sigma$. An emulation with target $\Sigma(\mathcal{T})$ is a polytime algorithm that, given finitely many spin systems (T_1, \dots, T_k) from \mathcal{T} , computes a simulation with target $\sum_{i=1}^k T_i$. While the input to such an emulation is a formal expression, e.g. (T_1, \dots, T_k) , its output simulation is a simulation whose target is the evaluation of this expression, i.e. the spin system $\sum_{i=1}^k T_i$. This distinction is crucial for the compatibility of emulation and hull operator (cf. Theorem 40, Theorem 41, Corollary 42). Similarly, an emulation with source $\Sigma(\mathcal{S})$ is a polytime algorithm that as first output returns a formal expressions (S_1, \dots, S_k) from $\Sigma(\mathcal{S})$ while its second output is a simulation with source being the evaluation of this formal expression, i.e. the spin system $\sum_{i=1}^k S_i$.

It is straightforward to see that for any \mathcal{S} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Scale}(\mathcal{S}) &\rightarrow \text{Scale}^2(\mathcal{S}) \\ \Sigma(\mathcal{S}) &\rightarrow \Sigma^2(\mathcal{S}) \\ \text{Cone}(\mathcal{S}) &\rightarrow \text{hull}(\mathcal{S}), \end{aligned} \quad (144)$$

where the last emulation exists for arbitrary hull operators on the right hand side.

These emulations can be constructed by bringing the input expression to normal form, i.e. simplifying it with distributivity and associativity until it is a formal sum of formal scalings of spin systems. Normal forms can be computed in polytime. Given any expression from any

$\text{hull}(\mathcal{S})$, its normal form is from $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{S})$. If the expression is from $\text{Scale}^2(\mathcal{S})$ or $\Sigma^2(\mathcal{S})$, its normal form is from $\text{Scale}(\mathcal{S})$ or $\Sigma(\mathcal{S})$, respectively. By construction, any expression evaluates to the same spin system as its normal form, as scaling and addition of spin systems satisfy the usual distributivity and associativity laws. In total, the above emulations can simply be defined by returning the normal form of their input expression together with the identity simulation.

4. Emulations Can Be Composed and Lifted to Hulls

We shall now see that emulations can be composed (Theorem 39) and are compatible with hull operators, in the sense that we can *lift* any emulation $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ to an emulation $\text{hull}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{hull}(\mathcal{N})$ via applying Scale (Theorem 40), Σ (Theorem 41), and Cone (Corollary 42).

These results are the spin model counterparts of the *modularity* of simulations, Theorem 25, Theorem 26 and Theorem 27, and heavily rely on their spin system cousins. They imply that complicated spin model emulations can be constructed by composing and lifting simpler ones, a fact that will be leveraged to prove Theorem 54.

Theorem 39 (composition of emulations). *Let $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}$ be sets of spin systems, $\text{hull}_1, \text{hull}_2, \text{hull}_3$ be hull operators, and $\text{EMU}_\ell: \text{hull}_2(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \text{hull}_3(\mathcal{T})$ and $\text{EMU}_g: \text{hull}_1(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \text{hull}_2(\mathcal{R})$ be emulations. Then we can construct the composite emulation*

$$\text{EMU}_{g \circ \ell}: \text{hull}_1(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \text{hull}_3(\mathcal{T}). \quad (145)$$

Proof. We only prove the case where all hull operators are the identity, i.e. we have emulations $\text{EMU}_\ell: \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ and $\text{EMU}_g: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$. The case where $\text{hull}_1, \dots, \text{hull}_3$ are generic hull operators works similarly.

We construct the composite emulation $\text{EMU}_{g \circ \ell}$ from EMU_ℓ and EMU_g , together with Theorem 25. Say

$$\text{EMU}_\ell(T, \delta) = (R(T, \delta), \ell(T, \delta)) \quad (146)$$

and

$$\text{EMU}_g(R, \delta) = (S(R, \delta), g(R, \delta)). \quad (147)$$

Then we define $\text{EMU}_{g \circ \ell}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EMU}_{g \circ \ell}^{(1)}(R, \delta) &= S(R(T, \delta), \delta + \Gamma_{\ell(T, \delta)}), \\ \text{EMU}_{g \circ \ell}^{(2)}(R, \delta) &= g(R(T, \delta), \delta + \Gamma_{\ell(T, \delta)}) \circ \ell(T, \delta). \end{aligned} \quad (148)$$

In words and omitting all arguments of S, T, ℓ, g , given $T \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\delta \geq 0$ we first run EMU_ℓ on input (T, δ) . This yields a spin system R and a simulation $\ell: R \rightarrow T$. We then run EMU_g on input $(R, \delta + \Gamma_\ell)$. This yields a spin system S and a simulation $g: S \rightarrow R$. Finally, $\text{EMU}_{g \circ \ell}$ returns S and the composite simulation $g \circ \ell: S \rightarrow T$. Since g has cut-off $\delta + \Gamma_\ell$, by Theorem 25, $g \circ \ell$ has cut-off δ .

Finally, we need to see that $\text{EMU}_{g \circ f}$ satisfies the conditions of Definition 35. We have already argued that condition 1 holds by Theorem 25. Conditions 3 and 4 hold since they are satisfied by both EMU_f and EMU_g . Thus, we only have to show that $\text{EMU}_{g \circ f}$ is polytime computable, i.e. satisfies condition 2.

Computing $\text{EMU}_{g \circ f}(R, \delta)$ requires running both EMU_f and EMU_g once. Since both are polytime computable by assumption, this is polytime computable. Therefore, to see that $\text{EMU}_{g \circ f}$ is polytime computable, we have to argue that given g and f , their composite $g \circ f$ is polytime computable. By Theorem 25 computing the data of $g \circ f$ amounts to applying basic manipulations, such as composition of functions or arithmetic of real numbers, to the data of g and f .

Finally, in the generic case, $\text{EMU}_{g \circ f}$ is defined in the same way, i.e. by (148). By the same reasoning, this defines an emulation, i.e. satisfies Definition 38. \square

Next, we prove that emulations can be lifted to hull operators. We only prove the case where the original emulation is of the form $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$, as the results easily extend to the generic case $\text{hull}_1(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{hull}_2(\mathcal{N})$ (see Remark 43).

Theorem 40 (lifting emulations to Scale). *Let \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} be sets of spin systems and $\text{EMU}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ be an emulation. Then we can construct*

$$\text{EMU}_{\text{Scale}}: \text{Scale}(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \text{Scale}(\mathcal{T}). \quad (149)$$

Proof. We prove the claim by leveraging Theorem 26. Given $T \in \mathcal{T}$, $\lambda, \delta \geq 0$ we first compute $\text{EMU}(T, \delta/\lambda)$ to obtain $S(T, \delta/\lambda) \in \mathcal{S}$ and

$$f(T, \delta/\lambda): S(T, \delta/\lambda) \rightarrow T. \quad (150)$$

By construction this simulation has cut-off δ/λ . Then, we set

$$\text{EMU}_{\text{Scale}}(\lambda, T, \delta) = (\lambda, S(T, \delta/\lambda), \lambda \cdot f(T, \delta/\lambda)). \quad (151)$$

By Theorem 26, $\lambda \cdot f$ defines a simulation of type $\lambda \cdot S \rightarrow \lambda \cdot T$ with cut-off δ . Hence, $\text{EMU}_{\text{Scale}}$ satisfies Definition 38. Finally, since EMU defines an emulation, i.e. satisfies the conditions of Definition 35, so does $\text{EMU}_{\text{Scale}}$. In particular, polytime computability of $\text{EMU}_{\text{Scale}}$ follows from polytime computability of EMU and the fact that $\lambda \cdot f$ can be efficiently computed from λ and f by Theorem 26. \square

Theorem 41 (lifting emulations to Σ). *Let \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} be spin models and let $\text{EMU}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be an emulation. Then we can construct an emulation*

$$\text{EMU}_{\Sigma}: \Sigma(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \Sigma(\mathcal{N}). \quad (152)$$

Proof. We explicitly construct EMU_{Σ} and prove that it satisfies Definition 35. The construction relies on Corollary 28, where we achieve the compatibility conditions of Corollary 28 by using that spin models are closed under

isomorphism (cf. Definition 29) and that isomorphisms define spin system simulations (Proposition 20).

On input $(T_1, \dots, T_k, \delta)$, for each $i \leq k$, we first compute $\text{EMU}(T_i, \delta)$. This yields k spin systems $S(T_i, \delta)$ and k simulations

$$f(T_i, \delta): S(T_i, \delta) \rightarrow T_i. \quad (153)$$

For simplicity, we omit the dependencies of $S(T_i, \delta), f(T_i, \delta)$ and write S_i, f_i . To apply Corollary 28, we modify the simulations f_i such that they satisfy the conditions of Corollary 28. By Definition 29 and Definition 35, for any $i, j \leq k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_{S_i} &= q_{S_j} \\ \text{dec}_{f_i} &= \text{dec}_{f_j} \\ \text{enc}_{f_i} &= \text{enc}_{f_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

We need to show the simulations satisfy, pairwise, condition 2 and condition 3 of Corollary 28, that is, that

$$P_{f_i}|_{V_{T_i} \cap V_{T_j}} = P_{f_j}|_{V_{T_i} \cap V_{T_j}} \quad (155)$$

and

$$\text{Im}(P_{f_i}|_{V_{T_i} \cap V_{T_j}}) = V_{S_i} \cap V_{S_j}. \quad (156)$$

Both conditions can be achieved by relabeling the spins of the source systems S_1, \dots, S_k . Namely, for $i = 1, \dots, k$, we first relabel all spins such that $V_{S_i} \cap V_{S_j} = \emptyset$. Then we iterate over spins $v \in \bigcup_{i=1}^k V_{T_i}$. For each v we determine

$$i_v = \min\{i \mid v \in V_{T_i}\} \quad (157)$$

and iterate over $j \in \{i_v + 1, \dots, k\}$. Whenever $v \in V_{T_j}$ we relabel the corresponding physical spins $P_{f_j}(v)$ from V_{S_j} to $P_{f_{i_v}}(v)$. Thereby, after relabeling, all source systems intersect precisely on the physical spins corresponding to target spins from intersections of target systems. Moreover, on the intersections of target systems, the physical spin assignments agree. That is, after relabeling, (155) and (156) are satisfied. Note that these relabelings can be performed in polytime.

In total the relabelings define isomorphisms (see Definition 7)

$$\phi_i: R_i \rightarrow S_i, \quad (158)$$

where R_i is the relabeled version of S_i . According to Proposition 20, the ϕ_i induce simulations

$$g_i: R_i \rightarrow S_i \quad (159)$$

with arbitrary cut-off. We pick the cut-off

$$\Delta_{g_i} = \delta + \Gamma_{f_i}. \quad (160)$$

Then, by Theorem 25, we obtain simulations

$$g_i \circ f_i: R_i \rightarrow T_i \quad (161)$$

with cut-off δ . By construction, these satisfy the compatibility conditions of Corollary 28, and by this result we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^k (\mathbf{g}_i \circ \mathbf{f}_i) : \sum_{i=1}^k R_i \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^k T_i. \quad (162)$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EMU}_\Sigma(T_1, \dots, T_k, \delta) &= \\ &= \left((R_1, \dots, R_k), \sum_{i=1}^k (\mathbf{g}_i \circ \mathbf{f}_i) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (163)$$

Note that all spin systems R_i , as well as simulations $\mathbf{f}_i, \mathbf{g}_i$ depend on δ . However, for the simulations \mathbf{g}_i this dependency is only due to the choice of cut-off, as by uniformity of emulation (condition 3 of Definition 8) the isomorphisms ϕ_i do not depend on δ .

To finish the proof, we need to show that this satisfies Definition 38.

First, by construction, all simulations $\mathbf{g}_i \circ \mathbf{f}_i$ have cut-off δ , so their sum has cut-off δ , as well. Thus, EMU_Σ satisfies condition 1.

Second, we prove that EMU_Σ is efficient, i.e. satisfies condition 2. By assumption, the spins systems S_i and simulations \mathbf{f}_i are polytime constructable, namely by using the emulation EMU. We have previously argued that the relabelings ϕ and hence both the spin systems R_i as well as the simulations \mathbf{g}_i are polytime constructable. As argued in Theorem 39, composing simulations (according to Theorem 25) is polytime computable and thus also the simulations $\mathbf{g}_i \circ \mathbf{f}_i$ can be computed in polytime. Similarly, the addition of spin system simulations (according to Theorem 27) is polytime computable since it amounts to applying basic manipulations to the individual simulations, which hence implies that also adding the simulations $\mathbf{g}_i \circ \mathbf{f}_i$ is polytime computable. In total, this proves that EMU_Σ is polytime computable and hence satisfies condition 2.

To see that EMU_Σ is uniform, i.e. satisfies condition 3, first, note that by assumption EMU is uniform, so the spin systems S_i satisfy condition 3. Second, as argued before, the isomorphisms ϕ_i do not depend on the cut-off. Thus, also the spin systems R_i satisfy condition 3, and by Proposition 20, also the corresponding simulations \mathbf{g}_i satisfy condition 3. Finally, by Theorem 25 and Theorem 27, the also $\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{g}_i \circ \mathbf{f}_i$ and therefore also EMU_Σ satisfy condition 3.

Condition 4 holds because all simulations \mathbf{f}_i have the same encoding enc and by Proposition 20 all simulations \mathbf{g}_i have encoding id. Therefore, by Theorem 25 and Theorem 27 all output simulations of EMU_Σ have encoding enc and thus EMU_Σ satisfies condition 4. \square

Corollary 42 (lifting emulations to Cone). *Let \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} be spin models and let $\text{EMU} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be an emulation, then we can construct*

$$\text{EMU}_{\text{Cone}} : \text{Cone}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{Cone}(\mathcal{N}). \quad (164)$$

Proof. The claim follows by first applying Theorem 40 to EMU and then Theorem 41 to the resulting emulation. Using that $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{M}) = \Sigma \circ \text{Scale}(\mathcal{M})$, this yields an emulation of type $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{Cone}(\mathcal{N})$. This construction amounts to applying Theorem 41 to an emulation $\text{Scale}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{Scale}(\mathcal{N})$, which, strictly speaking, is not covered by Theorem 41. We illustrate in Remark 43 why this nevertheless works. \square

Remark 43 (lifting emulations to arbitrary hulls). *Theorems 40 and 41 and Corollary 42 can be generalized as follows: Given $\text{EMU} : \text{hull}_1(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{hull}_2(\mathcal{N})$, for arbitrary hull operators $\text{hull}_1, \text{hull}_2$ we can construct emulations*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EMU}_{\text{Scale}} &: \text{Scale} \circ \text{hull}_1(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{Scale} \circ \text{hull}_2(\mathcal{N}) \\ \text{EMU}_\Sigma &: \Sigma \circ \text{hull}_1(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \Sigma \circ \text{hull}_2(\mathcal{N}) \\ \text{EMU}_{\text{Cone}} &: \text{Cone} \circ \text{hull}_1(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{Cone} \circ \text{hull}_2(\mathcal{N}). \end{aligned} \quad (165)$$

EMUScale can be constructed as in Theorem 40. In particular, EMUScale can be constructed for sets of spin systems \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} instead of spin models \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} .

EMUSigma can be constructed by following the proof of Theorem 41. However, now EMU returns formal expressions $\text{expr}_1, \dots, \text{expr}_k$ instead of spin systems S_1, \dots, S_k . In order to construct the relabelings ϕ_i we first have to evaluate these formal expressions. Note, however, that since EMU_Σ must return formal expressions from $\Sigma \circ \text{hull}_1(\mathcal{M})$, we must apply the relabelings to the formal expressions expr_i , or more precisely the spin systems contained therein, instead of their evaluations. The rest of the construction is analogous to that of Theorem 41.

Proceeding in this way, the formal expression returned by EMU_Σ ultimately evaluates to the source of the output simulation of EMU_Σ . That is, EMU_Σ satisfies Definition 38 2 due to the following compatibility between relabelings and evaluations. Assume that expr_i contains spin systems $S_{i,1}, \dots, S_{i,r}$ (we write $\text{expr}_i(S_{i,1}, \dots, S_{i,r})$). Further assume that expr_i evaluates to S_i , which after relabeling will be denoted by R_i , while by relabeling $S_{i,1}$ accordingly, the resulting spin system will be denoted by $R_{i,1}$. Then the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \xrightarrow{\text{relabel}} & R \\ \text{evaluate} \uparrow & & \uparrow \text{evaluate} \\ \text{expr}_i(S_{i,1}, \dots, S_{i,r}) & \xrightarrow{\text{relabel}} & \text{expr}_i(R_{i,1}, \dots, R_{i,r}). \end{array}$$

Since evaluating formal expressions amounts to computing sums and scalings of spin systems, it is polytime computable. Thus, polytime computability of EMU_Σ follows from 41.

Finally, EMUCone can be constructed as described in Corollary 42.

C. Characterization of Universality

Given a spin model \mathcal{M} , it is natural to consider its reach w.r.t. spin model emulations, i.e. the maximal set of spin systems that \mathcal{M} emulates. Surprisingly, there exist fairly simple spin models with maximal reach, i.e. that emulate (the set of) all spin systems. Such spin models are called *universal spin models*.

We shall first define universality as well as other properties of spin models Section III C 1, and then show how to simulate high order flags with flags of order two (Section III C 2), to finally characterize universality (Section III C 3).

1. Universality and Other Properties of Spin Models

Definition 44 (universal). *A spin model \mathcal{M} is universal if it emulates the set of all spin systems.*

Universal spin models, in some sense, can approximate arbitrary spin systems, or more precisely their spectrum (Proposition 13), their partition function (Proposition 17) and their Boltzmann distribution (Proposition 19) to arbitrary precision. Moreover, by Definition 35, these approximations can be computed in poly-time. We explore consequences of universality in Section IV.

We now introduce several properties of spin models which shall be used to fully characterize spin model universality.

Definition 45 (functional complete). *A spin model \mathcal{M} is functional complete (f.c.) if*

$$\text{Cone}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}_2. \quad (166)$$

Recall from Example 32 that \mathfrak{B}_2 contains all flag systems corresponding to canonical basis functions on the space of functions of type $[2]^{\{v_1, v_2\}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for arbitrary labels v_1, v_2 . Functional completeness states that positive linear combinations of spin systems from \mathcal{M} suffice to emulate all such basis spin systems.

Since we merely require that positive linear combinations of spin systems from \mathcal{M} emulate all such basis spin systems, we interpret functional completeness as a condition on the local interactions contained in \mathcal{M} . In other words, Definition 45 takes into account restrictions that might arise from the interaction hypergraphs allowed by \mathcal{M} , and thereby prevent linear combinations of spin systems from \mathcal{M} from being included in \mathcal{M} .

Definition 46 (closed). *A spin model \mathcal{M} is closed if*

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Sigma(\mathcal{M}). \quad (167)$$

Closed spin models contain (at least up to emulation) the sums of their spin systems. We shall refer to the property of being closed as closure.

In contrast to Definition 45, closure is a condition on the interaction hypergraphs of \mathcal{M} . Clearly, any sum of spin systems from \mathcal{M} will only contain local interactions from \mathcal{M} , but since the interaction hypergraph of the sum is the union of the individual interaction hypergraphs, it might violate the conditions that \mathcal{M} poses on its interaction hypergraphs. Consider for instance the case where \mathcal{M} only contains 2d grids as interaction graphs (see Example 34); depending on the chosen overlap, the union of two 2d grids might not constitute a 2d grid itself. This does not imply that the sum of two 2d Ising systems cannot be simulated by a 2d Ising system, but only that this simulation cannot be trivial.

Definition 47 (scalable). *A spin model \mathcal{M} is scalable if*

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Scale}(\mathcal{M}). \quad (168)$$

That \mathcal{M} is scalable means that, up to emulation, \mathcal{M} contains its spin systems scaled by non-negative real numbers. Many spin models are trivially scalable because they have scalable local interactions (see e.g. Example 34).

Definition 48 (locally closed). *A spin model \mathcal{M} is locally closed if*

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M}) \quad (169)$$

with identity encoding.

Recall from Definition 31 that $J(\mathcal{M})$ contains all local interactions of \mathcal{M} . Local closure weakens closure as follows: instead of requiring that \mathcal{M} emulates arbitrary sums of its spin systems, it merely requires that \mathcal{M} emulates sums of the form $S + R_{J_T(e)}$, where S, T are spin systems from \mathcal{M} and $R_{J_T(e)}$ is the canonical spin system corresponding to a single local interaction $J_T(e)$ of T . Note, however, that local closure requires the emulation to use the identity encoding while closure does not restrict the encoding.

Proposition 49. *If \mathcal{M} is locally closed then \mathcal{M} is closed.*

Proof. We construct the required emulation

$$\text{EMU}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Sigma(\mathcal{M}) \quad (170)$$

by, given (T_1, \dots, T_k) from $\Sigma(\mathcal{M})$, first decomposing T_2, \dots, T_k into sums of canonical spin systems and then iteratively applying local closure of \mathcal{M} , together with additivity and compositionality of spin model emulations (Theorem 41, Theorem 39).

First, on input $(T_1, \dots, T_k, \delta)$, for $i \in \{2, \dots, k\}$ we decompose T_i into canonical spin systems, that is, we fix an enumeration $E_{T_i} = \{e_1, \dots, e_{n_i}\}$ and write

$$T_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} T_{J_{T_i}(e_j)}, \quad (171)$$

where $T_{J_{T_i}(e_j)}$ is the canonical spin system with e_j as the only hyperedge and $J_{T_i}(e_j)$ as the only local interaction. Let us write $T_{i,j} := T_{J_{T_i}(e_j)}$. We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k T_i = T_1 + \sum_{i=2}^k \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} T_{i,j}. \quad (172)$$

To simplify the notation for the rest of the proof we rename the spin systems $T_{i,j}$ such that with $n := \sum_{i=2}^k n_i$, we have

$$T = T_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n R_i. \quad (173)$$

Now, since \mathcal{M} is locally closed, there exists a spin model emulation

$$\text{LC}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M}), \quad (174)$$

that uses identity encoding. We first apply LC to (T_1, R_1, δ) to obtain a spin system $S_1 \in \mathcal{M}$ and a spin system simulation

$$\ell_1: S_1 \rightarrow T_1 + R_1. \quad (175)$$

Note that both S_1 and ℓ_1 depend on T and δ but in order to lighten the notation we omit these dependencies.

Next, by Proposition 20, the identity isomorphism induces a trivial simulation $g_2: R_2 \rightarrow R_2$ with cut-off δ . Similar to the proof of Theorem 41, we now relabel spins in S_1 and redefine ℓ_1 accordingly, such that conditions 2 and 3 of Theorem 27 are satisfied. Note that by definition of local closure, ℓ_1 has identity encoding and by construction so does g_2 . Therefore, conditions 1, 4 and 5 of Theorem 27 are satisfied. By Theorem 27 we thus get a simulation

$$\ell_1 + g_2: S_1 + R_2 \rightarrow T_1 + R_1 + R_2. \quad (176)$$

Note that $\ell_1 + g_2$ has cut-off δ and shift Γ_{ℓ_1} .

We now apply LC to $(S_1, R_2, \delta + \Gamma_{\ell_1})$ to obtain a spin system $S_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ and a spin system simulation

$$\ell_2: S_2 \rightarrow S_1 + R_2. \quad (177)$$

Using compositionality of spin system simulations (Theorem 25) we thus have

$$\ell_2 \circ (\ell_1 + g_2): S_2 \rightarrow T_1 + R_1 + R_2. \quad (178)$$

This simulation, by construction, has cut-off

$$\min(\delta, \delta + \Gamma_{\ell_1} - \Gamma_{\ell_1}) = \delta. \quad (179)$$

Proceeding iteratively, we obtain the required simulation with target T .

To finish the proof we show that this construction defines a spin model emulation, i.e. satisfies Definition 35. Condition 1 is satisfied by construction.

Condition 2 holds because, first, decomposing each T_i into $T_i = \sum_j T_{i,j}$ can simply be read off from the description of T_i . Second, LC is polytime by assumption. We need a total of n applications of LC, where n is the number of hyperedges in T_2, \dots, T_k . In particular, $n \leq \sum_{i=2}^k |T_i|$, i.e. the above construction needs polynomially many applications of LC which thus can also be computed in polytime. Third, by Theorem 39 and Theorem 41, composition and addition of spin system simulation is polytime computable and the above construction requires n compositions and n compositions, which thus are also polytime computable.

Condition 3 is satisfied because it is satisfied by LC, and condition 4 is satisfied because the final simulation has identity encoding, independently of the target spin system T . \square

We shall characterize universal spin models as those spin models which are closed, scalable and functional complete (Theorem 54). The first step of this characterization consists of proving that closed, scalable and functional complete spin models emulate arbitrary, non-negative linear combinations of flag functions systems from \mathcal{B}_2 .

Lemma 50. *If \mathcal{M} is closed, scalable and functional complete then*

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2). \quad (180)$$

Proof. By assumption of \mathcal{M} being functional complete, we have an emulation

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2. \quad (181)$$

Using Theorem 40 we lift it to

$$\text{Scale}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{Scale}(\mathcal{B}_2). \quad (182)$$

We then use scalability of \mathcal{M} and compositionality of emulations (Theorem 39) to obtain

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Scale}(\mathcal{B}_2). \quad (183)$$

By Theorem 41 (see Remark 43) we lift this emulation to

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \Sigma \circ \text{Scale}(\mathcal{B}_2) = \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2), \quad (184)$$

and finally we use closure of \mathcal{M} together with Theorem 39 to construct

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2). \quad (185)$$

\square

The proof is illustrated in the following diagram, with \rightarrow representing emulations that by Theorem 39 can be composed and \Rightarrow representing lifts of emulations:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{closed}} & \Sigma(\mathcal{M}) & \xrightarrow{41} & \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) \\
& & \uparrow \Sigma & & \uparrow \Sigma \\
& & \mathcal{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{scalable}} & \text{Scale}(\mathcal{M}) & \xrightarrow{40} & \text{Scale}(\mathcal{B}_2) \\
& & & & \uparrow \text{Scale} & & \uparrow \text{Scale} \\
& & & & \mathcal{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{f.c.}} & \mathcal{B}_2.
\end{array}$$

The second step to characterize universality (Theorem 54) consists of proving that non-negative linear combinations of flag systems, each acting on two spins, suffice to simulate arbitrary flag systems acting on arbitrarily many spins. More precisely, we construct a spin model emulation

$$\text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}. \quad (186)$$

This situation is reminiscent to Boolean logic, where certain sets of Boolean functions such as {not, and}, involving only functions of arity 1 and 2 suffice to generate all Boolean functions, including those of higher arity. Indeed, we construct $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ by constructing spin systems from $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2)$ that, in their ground state, compute the Boolean functions not, nor, and over some of their spins. Generic flag systems from \mathcal{B} can be constructed by combining these spin systems in an appropriate way.

Since the previous construction involves the explicit definition of several spin systems, while it often suffices to define them up to isomorphism, we introduce the following graphical notation.

Remark 51 (Graphical notation of spin systems). *In Lemma 52 as well as in Section V we define spin systems by (graphically) defining their interaction graphs. Their local interactions are represented as colors of the edges, subject to the colour coding provided in Fig. 7. Coloured edges without an attached number represent local interactions scaled by δ , while those with an attached number represent local interactions scaled by that number.*

Note that all spin systems defined in this way have 2-level spins and only pair interactions and fields. In addition, in the interaction graphs, we only label those spins which are important to understand the (ground state) behaviour of the corresponding spin system. In most cases these, spin systems simulate certain target systems with physical spin assignment the identity embedding and identity encoding, in which case we only label the physical spins explicitly. Thus, the labels implicitly define the physical spin assignment of the corresponding simulation.

We repeatedly use some of the spin systems defined in Lemma 52 and Section V to construct new spin systems by adding them. To simplify this process we introduce symbols for some of the spin systems, and addition is represented by building graphs out of these symbols (see Fig. 10). In the symbols, only physical spins are drawn explicitly; auxiliary spins, in some sense, are internal to the symbols. The graphical representation of addition is

understood such that all involved spin systems have pairwise disjoint auxiliary spins, ensuring that the conditions of Theorem 27 are always satisfied.














Symbol	Meaning
	physical spin
	auxiliary spin
	$\delta \cdot \pi_1$
	$\delta \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$
	$\delta \cdot \pi_2$
	$\delta \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$
	$\delta \cdot f_{(1,1)}$
	$\delta \cdot f_{(1,2)}$
	$\delta \cdot f_{(2,1)}$
	$\delta \cdot f_{(2,2)}$
	arbitrary interactions
	sum of interactions: $J_1 + J_2$
	scaling of interactions: $\lambda \cdot J$

Figure 7: Color coding of local interactions for the graphical definition of spin systems. Note that for $i \neq j$, $f_{(i,j)}$ is not symmetric w.r.t. swapping the spins. In the graphical notation, the order of spins for these interactions is understood left to right (top to bottom).

2. Simulating High Order Flags

In analogy to Boolean functions of arbitrary arity being simulated by Boolean functions of arity two, we now show

that high order flags can be simulated by flags of order two.

Lemma 52 (simulation of flags). *There exists a spin model emulation*

$$\text{BASIS: Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}. \quad (187)$$

Proof. We divide the target spin model \mathcal{B} into three disjoint subsets,

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2 \cup \mathcal{B}_{\geq 3}, \quad (188)$$

where \mathcal{B}_1 consists of flag systems of order 1 (i.e. that act on a single spin), \mathcal{B}_2 consists of flag systems of order 2 and $\mathcal{B}_{\geq 3}$ consists of flag systems of order at least 3. We then construct separate emulations for these three cases,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BASIS}_1 &: \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_1 \\ \text{BASIS}_2 &: \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2 \\ \text{BASIS}_3 &: \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\geq 3}. \end{aligned} \quad (189)$$

They can be easily combined to obtain the emulation with target spin model \mathcal{B} . Given (T, δ) as input, we simply first check the cardinality of V_T to decide the subset to which T belongs. Depending on the result apply either BASIS_1 , BASIS_2 or BASIS_3 .

While the construction of BASIS_1 and BASIS_2 is straightforward, that of BASIS_3 is more involved. To construct the latter, we leverage that non-negative linear combinations of spin systems from \mathcal{B}_2 suffice to encode Boolean logic in their ground state. More precisely we construct spin systems that subject to the identification $1 = \text{TRUE}$, $2 = \text{FALSE}$ compute the Boolean functions {not, and} in their ground state. Since {not, and} is functionally complete for Boolean logic, this suffices to compute arbitrary Boolean functions in the ground state. We construct spin systems $S_{\vec{x}}^\delta$ that, in their ground state, flag configurations $\vec{x} \in [2]^{\{1, \dots, l\}}$ in the state of a single spin u_{l-1} , that is, in the ground state of $S_{\vec{x}}^\delta$, $\vec{s}(u_{l-1}) = 1$ if and only if for all i , $\vec{s}(v_i) = \vec{x}(i)$. We then add interactions to $S_{\vec{x}}^\delta$ that yield an energy contribution of +1 if and only if $\vec{s}(u_{l-1}) = 1$. This finally results in the required simulation $S_{\vec{x}}^\delta \rightarrow T_{f_{\vec{x}}}$.

Let us explain in more detail the constructions of the simulations and prove that they indeed define simulations. All sources of these simulations will be explicitly constructed as non-negative linear combinations of spin systems from \mathcal{B}_2 . For simplicity, we write $S \in \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2)$ or state that BASIS_i returns S ; according to Definition 38 we actually mean the formal expression obtained from the construction of S .

First, we construct BASIS_1 . A generic spin system in \mathcal{B}_1 is of the form $T_{f_x}(v_1)$ (see Definition 6), for some $x \in [2] \cong [2]^{\{1\}}$. Deciding if $x = 1$ or $x = 2$ can simply be done by reading off the local interaction of $T_{f_x}(v_1)$ from the input.

Consider first the case $x = 1$. We define the spin system

$$S_1(v_1, v_2) := S_{f_{(1,2)}}(v_1, v_2) + S_{f_{(1,1)}}(v_1, v_2). \quad (190)$$

Clearly, $S_1 \in \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B})$. Moreover, by construction,

$$H_{S_1(v_1, v_2)}(\vec{s}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \vec{s}(v_1) = 1. \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (191)$$

Consequently, for an arbitrary cut-off δ , the physical spin assignment given by the identity injection of v_1 into $\{v_1, v_2\}$ yields a simulation $S_1(v_1, v_2) \rightarrow T_{f_1}(v_1)$ with degeneracy 2.

The second case, $x = 2$, can be treated analogously, by defining

$$S_2(v_1, v_2) := S_{f_{(2,1)}}(v_1, v_2) + S_{f_{(2,2)}}(v_1, v_2). \quad (192)$$

Combining these two cases defines the emulation BASIS_1 . Clearly, BASIS_1 satisfies the four conditions of Definition 35.

The emulation BASIS_2 can be trivially constructed by noting that, according to Proposition 20, identity isomorphisms define simulations with arbitrary cut-off. We simply take BASIS_2 to be the identity emulation, returning the corresponding identity simulation for each target system and cut-off.

To finish the proof, we construct BASIS_3 by constructing spin systems that implement Boolean logic in the ground state.




Figure 8: Definition of S_{not}^δ .

Let $\delta > 0$. We first construct the spin system S_{not}^δ (see Fig. 8) implementing the logical negation in its ground state:

$$S_{\text{not}}^\delta(v_1, v_2) = \delta \cdot S_{f_{(1,1)}}(v_1, v_2) + \delta \cdot S_{f_{(2,2)}}(v_1, v_2). \quad (193)$$

This yields a Hamiltonian

$$H_{S_{\text{not}}^\delta(v_1, v_2)}(\vec{s}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \vec{s}(v_1) \neq \vec{s}(v_2) \\ \delta & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (194)$$

That is, in its ground state, $\vec{s}(v_1) = \text{not}(\vec{s}(v_2))$.

Next, we construct S_{and}^δ , implementing the logical and (see Fig. 9b) in two steps. We first build S_{nor}^δ , which implements the logical nor in its ground state (see Fig. 9a). We then use

$$\text{and}(x, y) = \text{nor}(\text{not}(x), \text{not}(y)) \quad (195)$$

to build S_{and}^δ out of S_{not}^δ and S_{nor}^δ .

By definition (see Fig. 9a), it is clear that $S_{\text{nor}}^\delta \in \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2)$. Let $\vec{s} \in [2]^{\{v_1, v_2, v_3, a_1, \dots, a_7\}}$, where a_1, a_2 correspond to the two internal spins of S_{nor}^δ , i.e. those connected with a $2\delta \cdot f_{(1,1)}$ interaction and a_3, \dots, a_7 correspond to the 5 additional spins drawn on the RHS of




Figure 9: Definition and symbolic representation of spin systems S_{nor}^δ (9a) and S_{and}^δ (9b).

the $\delta \cdot (f_{(2,1)} + f_{(2,2)})$ interactions. It can easily be seen that the ground state of S_{nor}^δ consists of the following configurations

$$\text{GS}_{S_{\text{nor}}^\delta} := \left\{ (2, 2, 1, 2, 1, \dots), (2, 1, 2, 1, 2, \dots), \right. \\ \left. (1, 2, 2, 2, 1, \dots), (1, 1, 2, 2, 2, \dots) \right\}, \quad (196)$$

where the first 5 numbers in each tuple correspond to the states of $(v_1, v_2, v_3, a_1, a_2)$ and \dots indicates that in the ground state the states of a_3, \dots, a_7 can be chosen arbitrarily, yielding a total of $4 \cdot 2^5$ ground states. Note that, in the ground state,

$$\vec{s}(v_3) = \text{nor}(\vec{s}(v_1), \vec{s}(v_2)). \quad (197)$$

Furthermore, the ground state energy of S_{nor}^δ equals 3δ , while all other configurations have energy at least 4δ .

Next, we construct S_{and}^δ from S_{not}^δ and S_{nor}^δ (see Fig. 9b). Denote the top two physical spins of S_{nor}^δ in Fig. 9b by e_1 and e_2 . Then

$$S_{\text{and}}^\delta(v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots) = \\ = S_{\text{nor}}^\delta(e_1, e_2, v_3, \dots) + S_{\text{not}}^\delta(v_1, e_1) + S_{\text{not}}^\delta(v_2, e_2). \quad (198)$$

Thus, in the ground state of S_{and}^δ , the states of v_1 and v_2 satisfy $\vec{s}(v_i) = \text{not}(\vec{s}(e_i))$. By (197) (with $v_{1,2}$ replaced by $e_{1,2}$) and (195),

$$\vec{s}(v_3) = \text{nor}(\text{not}(\vec{s}(v_1)), \text{not}(\vec{s}(v_2))) \\ = \text{and}(\vec{s}(v_1), \vec{s}(v_2)). \quad (199)$$

Note that $S_{\text{and}}^\delta \in \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2)$. The ground state energy of S_{and}^δ is 3δ and all other configurations have energy at least 4δ .

We now use S_{not}^δ and S_{and}^δ to construct the emulation BASIS₃. A generic spin system from $\mathcal{B}_{\geq 3}$ is of the form $T_{f_{\vec{x}}}(v_1, \dots, v_l)$ for some $\vec{x} \in [2]^{\{1, \dots, l\}}$ and some $l \geq 3$. We

shall now construct a spin system $S_{\vec{x}}^\delta$, which will be used as the source of a simulation of $T_{f_{\vec{x}}}(v_1, \dots, v_l)$. Without loss of generality (w.l.o.g.) we restrict to the case $\vec{x} = \vec{x}_1$, where \vec{x}_1 denotes the all one configuration, i.e. $\vec{x}_1(i) = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. The generic case can be treated by modifying the following construction such that all spins in state 2, i.e. all i with $\vec{x}(i) = 2$, are first negated. More precisely, for all such i , we add $S_{\text{not}}^\delta(v_i, f_i)$ and replace all occurrences of v_i by f_i as shown in Fig. 10. The resulting ground state satisfies that $\vec{s}(f_i) = 1$.

$S_{\vec{x}_1}^\delta$ is obtained by, first, adding spin systems S_{and}^δ as shown in Fig. 10a. Denoting the top physical spins of the various copies of S_{and}^δ in Fig. 10a by u_1, \dots, u_{l-1} , from left to right, in the ground state $S_{\vec{x}_1}^\delta$ satisfies

$$\vec{s}(u_1) = \text{and}(\vec{s}(v_1), \vec{s}(v_2)) \\ \vec{s}(u_i) = \text{and}(\vec{s}(u_{i-1}), \vec{s}(v_{i+1})). \quad (200)$$

In total,

$$\vec{s}(u_{l-1}) = \text{and}(\vec{s}(v_1), \dots, \vec{s}(v_l)), \quad (201)$$

i.e. in the ground state $\vec{s}(u_{l-1}) = 1$ if and only if $\vec{s}(v_1, \dots, v_l) = (1, \dots, 1)$.

So far we have constructed a sum of $l-1$ copies of S_{and}^δ , each having a ground state energy of 3δ and an energy gap (between ground state energy and non-groundstate energy) of δ . For this reason, all ground state configurations of $S_{\vec{x}_1}^\delta$ have energy $(l-1) \cdot 3\delta$, while all other configurations have energy at least $(l-1) \cdot 3\delta + \delta$.

To finish the construction of $S_{\vec{x}_1}^\delta$, we add $S_1(u_{l-1}, b)$. This leads to an energy contribution of $+1$ whenever $\vec{s}(u_{l-1}) = 1$. Overall, in the ground state

$$H_{S_{\vec{x}_1}^\delta}(\vec{s}) = \begin{cases} (l-1) \cdot 3\delta + 1 & \text{if } \vec{s}(v_1, \dots, v_l) = (1, \dots, 1) \\ (l-1) \cdot 3\delta & \text{if } \vec{s}(v_1, \dots, v_l) \neq (1, \dots, 1). \end{cases} \quad (202)$$

It is straightforward to conclude that letting the physical spin assignment be the identity injection of $\{v_1, \dots, v_l\}$




Figure 10: Definition of spin systems $S_{\vec{x}_1}^\delta$ (10a) and $S_{\vec{x}}^\delta$ for a generic $\vec{x} \in [2]^{\{1, \dots, l\}}$ (10b). The generic case differs from the \vec{x}_1 case in terms of the additional spin systems S_{not}^δ which are added for all i with $\vec{x}(i) = 2$, i.e. $i \in \{1, 3\}$ in the specific case of Fig. 10b.

and the energy shift be $(l-1) \cdot 3\delta$ results in a simulation of type $S_{\vec{x}_1}^\delta \rightarrow T_{f_{\vec{x}_1}}$ with cut-off δ . The degeneracy of this simulation can be obtained from the individual degeneracies of S_{and}^δ and S_1 as $2 \cdot (4 \cdot 2^5)^{l-1}$.

We now define the emulation BASIS_3 as follows: On input $(T_{f_{\vec{x}}}\langle v_1, \dots, v_l \rangle, \delta)$ we return $S_{\vec{x}}^\delta$ and the simulation constructed above, both subject to the modifications necessary to cover the generic case instead of the special case $\vec{x} = \vec{x}_1$, outlined above and shown in Fig. 10b.

It can easily be checked that this defines an emulation. By construction, $S_{\vec{x}}^\delta \in \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2)$. The simulation has cut-off δ and hence satisfies Definition 35 1. Moreover, this construction is polytime computable and hence satisfies Definition 35 2. Changing the target cut-off of the simulation amounts to modifying the parameter δ ; hence, BASIS_3 satisfies Definition 35 3. Finally, the constructed simulation has identity encoding, independent of the target, showing that BASIS_3 satisfies Definition 35 4.

Finally, all three emulations, BASIS_1 , BASIS_2 and BASIS_3 use identity encoding. Hence, they indeed can be combined to obtain the required emulation

$$\text{BASIS}: \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}. \quad (203)$$

□

Now consider the spin model containing all spin sys-

tems of spin type 2, \mathcal{M}_2 . We now prove that $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ by decomposing a generic spin system with spin type 2 into a non-negative linear combination of spin systems from \mathcal{B} .

Lemma 53 (decomposing into flag basis).

$$\text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2. \quad (204)$$

Proof. Given a spin system T from \mathcal{M}_2 , we first decompose it into canonical spin systems

$$T = \sum_{e \in E_T} T_{J_T(e)}. \quad (205)$$

This decomposition holds by definition. Now recall that $J_T(e): [2]^e \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Thus, given $e \in E_T$, $\vec{x} \in [2]^e$, defining $\lambda_{e, \vec{x}} := J_T(e)(\vec{x})$ we obtain

$$T = \sum_{e \in E_T} \sum_{\vec{x} \in [2]^e} \lambda_{e, \vec{x}} \cdot T_{f_{\vec{x}}}. \quad (206)$$

Since $T_{f_{\vec{x}}} \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\lambda_{e, \vec{x}} \geq 0$ the required emulation can be constructed as follows: given (T, δ) , return the formal linear combination corresponding to Eq. (206) and the identity simulation $T \rightarrow T$. This trivially satisfies Definition 35. □

3. Characterization of Universality

We are finally ready to characterize universal spin models.

Theorem 54 (characterization of universality). *A spin model \mathcal{M} is universal if and only if it is closed, scalable and functional complete.*

Proof. First, by Proposition 37,

$$(\mathcal{S}_{\text{all}})_{\text{bin}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{all}}. \quad (207)$$

Since $(\mathcal{S}_{\text{all}})_{\text{bin}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_2$, and by Lemma 53 $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$, we have

$$\text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{S}_{\text{all}})_{\text{bin}}. \quad (208)$$

Next, recall from Lemma 52 that

$$\text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}. \quad (209)$$

Applying Corollary 42 (see also Remark 43) to this emulation yields

$$\text{Cone}^2(\mathcal{B}_2) \rightarrow \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}). \quad (210)$$

By (144) for any \mathcal{S} , $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \text{Cone}^2(\mathcal{S})$. Together with Theorem 39 we obtain

$$\text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) \rightarrow \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}). \quad (211)$$

Finally, recall from Lemma 50, that since \mathcal{M} is closed, scalable and functional complete,

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2). \quad (212)$$

Composing the four emulations (207) (208), (211) and (212) (by applying Theorem 39) yields

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{all}}. \quad (213)$$

The situation is illustrated in the following diagram, with \rightarrow representing emulations (that can be composed by Theorem 39) and the arrows \Rightarrow representing the Cone-lift (according to Corollary 42).

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{M} & \xrightarrow{50} & \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) & \xrightarrow{42} & \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{53} & (\mathcal{S}_{\text{all}})_{\text{bin}} & \xrightarrow{37} & \mathcal{S}_{\text{all}} \\ & & \uparrow \text{Cone} & & \uparrow \text{Cone} & & & & \\ & & \text{Cone}(\mathcal{B}_2) & \xrightarrow{52} & \mathcal{B} & & & & \end{array}$$

Conversely, if \mathcal{M} is universal then by definition

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{all}}. \quad (214)$$

Since $\mathcal{B}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\text{all}}$ we trivially have $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$ and hence functional completeness of \mathcal{M} .

In order to conclude that \mathcal{M} is closed we construct $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Sigma(\mathcal{M})$. Given spin systems (T_1, \dots, T_k) from \mathcal{M} and a cut-off δ , we first evaluate their sum, $T := \sum_{i=1}^k T_i$. Note that this is polytime computable and that $T \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{all}}$ trivially. We then run the emulation $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{all}}$ on input (T, δ) to obtain a spin system from \mathcal{M} and a simulation with target T . Similarly, scalability of \mathcal{M} follows by given (λ, T, δ) , running $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{all}}$ on $(\lambda \cdot T, \delta)$, using that also $\lambda \cdot T$ is polytime computable. \square

Corollary 55. *If \mathcal{M} is locally closed, scalable, and functional complete then \mathcal{M} is universal.*

Proof. By Proposition 49 \mathcal{M} is closed, and by Theorem 54 universal. \square

IV. CONSEQUENCES OF UNIVERSALITY

In this section we derive several consequences of spin model emulations and universality. Building on the results of Section III B, we show that if $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$ then, from the emulation we can construct the following polytime computable reductions:

- ▷ From the ground state energy problem of \mathcal{M}' to that of \mathcal{M} (Section IV A);
- ▷ From the partition function problem of \mathcal{M}' to that of \mathcal{M} (Section IV B); and
- ▷ From the approximate sampling problem of \mathcal{M}' to that of \mathcal{M} (Section IV C).

That is, if \mathcal{M} emulates \mathcal{M}' and we have an algorithm that solves one of the above problems for \mathcal{M} , then we can construct an algorithm that solves that problem for \mathcal{M}' . The benefit is twofold. First, emulations serve as tools to solve these computational problems. Secondly, hardness results for the above problems immediately extend to all universal spin models: If there exists a spin model for which one of the above problems is hard then this problem must be hard for all universal spin models. It follows that for universal spin models, the complexity of the above problems is maximal, i.e. there do not exist spin models of greater complexity.

A. Ground State Energy

We start by considering the ground state energy problem in its decision form.

Definition 56 (ground state energy problem). *Let \mathcal{M} be a spin model. The ground state energy problem of \mathcal{M} , $\text{GSE}_{\mathcal{M}}$, is the decision problem*

$$\text{GSE}_{\mathcal{M}} := \{(S, k) \mid S \in \mathcal{M}, k \in \mathbb{R}, \min(H_S) < k\}. \quad (215)$$

In words, $\text{GSE}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the following decision problem:

Given a spin system $S \in \mathcal{M}$ and a real number k , is the ground state energy of S smaller than k ?

We follow the convention of defining decision problems in terms of their yes instances.

Theorem 57. *Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'$ be spin models. An emulation $\text{EMU}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$ induces a polytime reduction*

$$r: \text{GSE}_{\mathcal{M}'} \rightarrow \text{GSE}_{\mathcal{M}}. \quad (216)$$

Proof. Given an instance (T, k) of $\text{GSE}_{\mathcal{M}'}$, we compute $\text{EMU}(T, k)$. This yields a spin system $S(T, k) \in \mathcal{M}$ and a simulation

$$\ell(T, k): S(T, k) \rightarrow T \quad (217)$$

with cut-off k . We construct the reduction r as

$$r(T, k) := (S(T, k), k + \Gamma_{\ell(T, k)}). \quad (218)$$

By Proposition 13, below the cut-off k the spectra of H_T and $H_{S(T, k)} - \Gamma_{\ell(T, k)}$ agree. In particular, T has a configuration with energy less than k if and only if $S(T, k)$ has a configuration with energy less than $k + \Gamma_{\ell(T, k)}$. Finally, r is polytime since so is EMU . \square

Note that we do not only prove the existence of a reduction, but given an emulation $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$, we construct the reduction r . In fact, the construction of r in the proof of Theorem 57 works for any emulations. This will also be the case for further reductions that build on spin model emulations (see Theorem 60, Theorem 63, Theorem 66).

Corollary 58. *If \mathcal{M} is universal then $\text{GSE}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is NP-hard.*

Proof. By [7], $\text{GSE}_{\mathcal{J}_{2d}}$ is NP-hard. Since \mathcal{M} is universal, $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_{2d}$, which by Theorem 57 yields a reduction from $\text{GSE}_{\mathcal{J}_{2d}}$ to $\text{GSE}_{\mathcal{M}}$. \square

We now derive a similar result for the function problem of computing ground state configurations.

Definition 59 (ground state function problem). *Let \mathcal{M} be a spin model. The ground state function problem of \mathcal{M} , $\text{FGSE}_{\mathcal{M}}$, is the following function problem: Given $S \in \mathcal{M}$, compute a configuration from*

$$\text{GS}(S) := H_S^{-1}(\min(H_S)). \quad (219)$$

A solution to $\text{FGSE}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is an algorithm that takes $S \in \mathcal{M}$ as input and outputs a ground state configuration of S .

Theorem 60. *Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'$ be spin models. An emulation $\text{EMU}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$ induces a polytime reduction*

$$(f, g): \text{FGSE}_{\mathcal{M}'} \rightarrow \text{FGSE}_{\mathcal{M}}. \quad (220)$$

Note that a reduction between function problems consists of two functions (f, g) . In a reduction between decision problems, a single function r sufficed, as the output of a solution consists of a single bit (yes or no). For function problems, the output of a solution is non-trivial, and there is freedom in modifying the output, which is exactly the role of g . Other than this, reductions between function problems work similarly as between decision problems. If (f, g) is a reduction from function problem A to function problem B , then a solution for B can be turned into a solution for A : On input a we apply the solution for B to $f(a)$ to obtain an output s that solves $f(a)$, then by construction $g(a, s)$ solves a .

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 57. We construct two polytime computable functions f and g ,

$$f: \mathcal{M}' \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \quad (221)$$

and

$$g: \mathcal{M}' \times \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}'}, \quad (222)$$

that satisfy

$$\vec{s} \in \text{GS}(f(T)) \Rightarrow g(T, \vec{s}) \in \text{GS}(T), \quad (223)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}} := \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{C}_S$.

Given $T \in \mathcal{M}'$ we first compute an upper bound k_T on H_T by defining

$$k_T := \sum_{e \in E_T} \max(J_T(e)). \quad (224)$$

While computing the exact maximum (or minimum) of H_T might be NP-hard, computing an upper (or lower) bound for H_T by maximization (or minimization) of local terms is polytime computable, as the latter amounts to an iteration over $e \in E_T$, where each step consists of a search over $|[q]^e|$ parameters and by definition of $|T|$,

$$\sum_{e \in E_T} |[qT]^e| < |T|. \quad (225)$$

Now we compute $\text{EMU}(T, k_T)$. This yields a spin system $S(T, k_T) \in \mathcal{M}$ and a simulation

$$\ell(T, k_T): S(T, k_T) \rightarrow T \quad (226)$$

with cut-off $k_t \geq \max(H_T)$. By Proposition 14, we have for $\vec{s} \in \text{GS}_{\mathcal{M}}(S(T, k_T))$,

$$\text{dec}_{\ell(T, k_T)} \circ \vec{s} \circ \text{P}_{\ell(T, k_T)} \in \text{GS}_{\mathcal{M}'}(T). \quad (227)$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} f(T) &:= S(T, k_T), \\ g(T, \vec{s}) &:= \text{dec}_{\ell(T, k_T)} \circ \vec{s} \circ \text{P}_{\ell(T, k_T)}. \end{aligned} \quad (228)$$

This is polytime computable, since k_T , EMU and composing \vec{s} with $\text{dec}_{\ell(T, k_T)}$ and $\text{P}_{\ell(T, k_T)}$ are too. Moreover, by Proposition 14 this satisfies Eq. (223). Thus, (f, g) yields a reduction.

Finally note that, strictly speaking, the right hand side of the definition of g is only defined for \vec{s} being a configuration on $V_{S(T, k_T)}$. If this is not the case, the left hand side of the implication of (223) evaluates to wrong, and thus we can define g arbitrarily on such inputs (T, \vec{s}) . Since $S(T, k_T)$ can be computed in polytime, checking whether \vec{s} is a configuration on $V_{S(T, k_T)}$ and hence the modified definition of g are polytime computable, too. \square

Corollary 61. *If \mathcal{M} is universal then $\text{FGSE}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is FNP-hard.*

Proof. By [7], $\text{FGSE}_{\mathcal{J}_{2d}}$ is FNP-hard: A polytime solution for $\text{FGSE}_{\mathcal{J}_{2d}}$ would induce a polytime solution for $\text{GSE}_{\mathcal{J}_{2d}}$. (But the antecedent does not exist unless $\text{P} = \text{NP}$, a caveat that applies to the conclusions throughout). Since \mathcal{M} is universal, $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_{2d}$. By Theorem 60 we obtain a reduction from $\text{FGSE}_{\mathcal{J}_{2d}}$ to $\text{FGSE}_{\mathcal{M}}$. \square

Theorem 57 and Theorem 60 state that ground states of arbitrary spin systems can be efficiently encoded into ground states of a universal spin model. Since many NP problems can be phrased as ground state energy problems (see [8]), universal spin models, together with Theorem 54 could serve as tools to look for solutions of such problems. Not surprisingly, by Corollary 58 and Corollary 61 their ground state energy problems are themselves NP-hard.

One way of circumvent this problem may be to use quantum computing protocols. For example, [9] and [10] consider specific spin models and describe, first, how generic NP problems can be encoded into its ground state, and, second, how its ground states can be computed via quantum annealing. The framework developed in this work could serve to construct novel quantum annealing protocols (by constructing appropriate emulations), as well as analyze the (dis)advantages of existing protocols. It would be interesting to study what properties of the emulation determine the performance of adiabatic quantum annealing, i.e. the adiabatic time scale (see [10, 16]). We shall come back to this point in the [Conclusions and Outlook](#).

B. Partition Function Approximation

In this section we study the complexity of approximating the partition function of a spin system from a spin model \mathcal{M} .

Definition 62 (partition function problem). *Let \mathcal{M} be a spin model. The partition function problem of \mathcal{M} , $\text{PART}_{\mathcal{M}}$, is the following function problem: Given $S \in \mathcal{M}$, $\beta > 0$, compute*

$$\text{Part}_{\mathcal{M}}(S, \beta) := Z_S(\beta). \quad (229)$$

In certain cases it suffices to compute $\text{PART}_{\mathcal{M}}$ approximately. An *approximate solution* of $\text{PART}_{\mathcal{M}}$ consists of an algorithm that, given $S \in \mathcal{M}$, $\beta > 0$ and an error parameter $\epsilon > 0$, returns a real number z that satisfies

$$|z - \text{Part}_{\mathcal{M}}(S, \beta)| < \epsilon \cdot \text{Part}_{\mathcal{M}}(S, \beta). \quad (230)$$

If the runtime is polynomial in the size of the input (S, β) it is called a *polynomial time approximation scheme* (PTAS). If it is polynomial in both the size of the input and the inverse approximation error, ϵ^{-1} , it is called a *fully polynomial time approximation scheme* (FPTAS). If it is polynomial in both the size of input and the inverse approximation error, but the algorithm uses randomness and returns a valid approximation with probability at

least $3/4$, it is called a *fully polynomial randomized approximation scheme* (FPRAS) [17].

For approximation problems, a common notion of reduction is that of PTAS reductions [18]. They can be used to transform approximate solutions of any of the above introduced types, that is, PTAS, FPTAS and FPRAS.

Theorem 63. *Let \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}' be spin models. An emulation $\text{EMU}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$ induces a PTAS reduction*

$$(f, g, \alpha): \text{PART}_{\mathcal{M}'} \rightarrow \text{PART}_{\mathcal{M}}. \quad (231)$$

A PTAS reduction $(f, g, \alpha): A \rightarrow B$ between function problems A and B consist of polytime computable functions f, g, α that transform an approximate solution for B into an approximate solution for A . Given an instance a of A and an error parameter ϵ , the approximate solution for B is applied to $(f(a, \epsilon), \alpha(\epsilon))$. This yields an output s that is an $\alpha(\epsilon)$ approximation of the solution for $f(a, \epsilon)$. By construction, $g(a, s, \epsilon)$ is an ϵ approximation of the solution for a .

Proof. We need to construct polytime computable functions

$$f: \mathcal{M}' \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}, \quad (232)$$

$$g: \mathcal{M}' \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0} \quad (233)$$

and

$$\alpha: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (234)$$

such that if z is an $\alpha(\epsilon)$ approximation of $\text{Part}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(T, \beta, \epsilon))$ then $g(T, \beta, z, \epsilon)$ is an ϵ approximation of $\text{Part}_{\mathcal{M}'}(T, \beta)$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} |z - \text{Part}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(T, \beta, \epsilon))| &< \alpha(\epsilon) \cdot \text{Part}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(T, \beta, \epsilon)) \\ \Rightarrow |g(T, \beta, z, \epsilon) - \text{Part}_{\mathcal{M}'}(T, \beta)| &< \epsilon \cdot \text{Part}_{\mathcal{M}'}(T, \beta). \end{aligned} \quad (235)$$

By Proposition 17, whenever $\ell: S \rightarrow T$ with cut-off $\Delta_{\ell} > \max(H_T)$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{e^{-\Gamma_{\ell} \beta} m d_{\ell}} \cdot Z_S(\beta) - Z_T(\beta) \right| \leq \frac{1}{m d_{\ell}} \cdot q_S^{|V_S|} \cdot e^{-\beta \Delta_{\ell}}, \quad (236)$$

where $m = |\text{enc}_{\ell}|$.

In particular, if $S = S(T, \delta)$ and $\ell = \ell(T, \delta)$ are the output of $\text{EMU}(T, \delta)$ then $q_S = q_{\mathcal{M}}$, and by Definition 35 condition 3 the parameters $|\text{enc}_{\ell}|, d_{\ell}, |V_S|$ only depend on T , not on δ . Thus, for fixed T , increasing δ makes the right hand side of (236) arbitrary small. This is the key idea to construct the reduction (f, g, α) .

We start with f . Given (T, β, ϵ) we first compute $\text{EMU}(T, \delta')$, where δ' is arbitrary. This yields $S(T, \delta') \in \mathcal{M}$ and a simulation

$$\ell(T, \delta'): S(T, \delta') \rightarrow T. \quad (237)$$

From this, we read off $|\text{enc}_{\ell(T,\delta')}|$, $d_{\ell(T,\delta')}$ and $|V_{S(T,\delta')}|$. By Definition 35 condition 3, these parameters are independent of the cut-off δ' . Henceforth we write

$$\begin{aligned} m_T &:= |\text{enc}_{\ell(T,\delta')}| \\ d_T &:= d_{\ell(T,\delta')} \\ v_T &:= |V_{S(T,\delta')}|. \end{aligned} \quad (238)$$

We now evaluate H_T on an arbitrary configuration \vec{t} to obtain $\xi_T := H_T(\vec{t})$. By construction it satisfies

$$e^{-\beta\xi_T} \leq Z_T(\beta). \quad (239)$$

We compute

$$\xi_1 := \sum_{e \in E_T} \max(J_T(e)) \quad (240)$$

and

$$\xi_2(\epsilon, \beta) = \frac{1}{\beta} \cdot \ln\left(\frac{2}{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{(\frac{\epsilon}{2} + 1)q_{\mathcal{M}}^{v_T}}{m_T d_T}\right) + \xi_T \quad (241)$$

and define

$$\delta_{\epsilon, \beta} := \max(\xi_1, \xi_2(\epsilon, \beta)). \quad (242)$$

We use EMU to obtain a spin system $S(T, \delta_{\epsilon, \beta})$ and a simulation

$$\ell(T, \delta_{\epsilon, \beta}): S(T, \delta_{\epsilon, \beta}) \rightarrow T, \quad (243)$$

with cut-off $\delta_{\epsilon, \beta}$. We now define (f, g, α) by

$$\begin{aligned} f(T, \beta, \epsilon) &= (S(T, \delta_{\epsilon, \beta}), \beta) \\ g(T, \beta, z, \epsilon) &= \frac{1}{e^{-\beta\Gamma_{\ell(T, \delta_{\epsilon, \beta})}} m_T d_T} \cdot z \\ \alpha(\epsilon) &= \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (244)$$

Note that these three functions are polytime computable (see Remark 36). In particular, they require two executions of EMU, a first one with arbitrary cut-off δ' to obtain m_T, d_T, v_T and thereby compute $\delta_{\epsilon, \beta}$, and a second one with cut-off $\delta_{\epsilon, \beta}$ to compute $S(T, \delta_{\epsilon, \beta})$ and $\ell_{T, \delta_{\epsilon, \beta}}$, which are used to define the reduction.

To finish the proof, we prove that this defines a PTAS reduction, namely satisfies Eq. (235). We shall omit the $(T, \delta_{\epsilon, \beta})$ arguments and write S instead of $S(T, \delta_{\epsilon, \beta})$, and similarly for ℓ , as well as the subscripts of the simulation parameters of ℓ . Assume

$$|z - Z_S(\beta)| < \alpha(\epsilon) \cdot Z_S(\beta) = \frac{\epsilon}{2} \cdot Z_S(\beta). \quad (245)$$

We insert the definition of g into the right hand side of Eq. (235):

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{e^{-\beta\Gamma} m_T d_T} z - Z_T(\beta) \right| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{e^{-\beta\Gamma} m_T d_T} z - \frac{1}{e^{-\beta\Gamma} m_T d_T} Z_S(\beta) \right| + \left| \frac{1}{e^{-\beta\Gamma} m_T d_T} Z_S(\beta) - Z_T(\beta) \right| \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{2e^{-\beta\Gamma} m_T d_T} Z_S(\beta) + \left| \frac{1}{e^{-\beta\Gamma} m_T d_T} Z_S(\beta) - Z_T(\beta) \right| \\ &= \frac{\epsilon}{2} Z_T(\beta) + \frac{\epsilon}{2e^{-\beta\Gamma} m_T d_T} \sum_{\vec{s} \notin \text{Sim}} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})} + \frac{1}{e^{-\beta\Gamma} m_T d_T} \sum_{\vec{s} \notin \text{Sim}} e^{-\beta H_S(\vec{s})} \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} Z_T(\beta) + \frac{\frac{\epsilon}{2} + 1}{m_T d_T} \cdot q_{\mathcal{M}}^{v_T} e^{-\beta\delta_{\epsilon, \beta}}, \end{aligned} \quad (246)$$

where the first inequality follows from the triangle inequality, the second from the left hand side of Eq. (235), the equality from Proposition 17 (which can be applied since $\delta_{\epsilon, \beta} > \max(H_T)$), and the last inequality since $H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma \geq \delta_{\epsilon, \beta}$ for configurations $\vec{s} \notin \text{Sim}$, and the number of such configurations is less than the total number of configurations of S , $q_{\mathcal{M}}^{v_T}$.

Next, we use

$$e^{-\beta\delta_{\epsilon, \beta}} = e^{-\beta(\delta_{\epsilon, \beta} - \xi_T)} \cdot e^{-\beta\xi_T} \leq e^{-\beta(\delta_{\epsilon, \beta} - \xi_T)} \cdot Z_T(\beta). \quad (247)$$

Inserting this into (246) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{e^{-\beta\Gamma} m_T d_T} z - Z_T(\beta) \right| &< \\ &< \left[\frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{(\frac{\epsilon}{2} + 1)q_{\mathcal{M}}^{v_T}}{m_T d_T} \cdot e^{-\beta(\delta_{\epsilon, \beta} - \xi_T)} \right] \cdot Z_T(\beta) \end{aligned} \quad (248)$$

By construction of $\delta_{\epsilon, \beta}$,

$$e^{-\beta(\delta_{\epsilon, \beta} - \xi_T)} \leq e^{-\beta(\xi_2(\epsilon, \beta) - \xi_T)} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \cdot \frac{m_T d_T}{(\frac{\epsilon}{2} + 1)q_{\mathcal{M}}^{v_T}}. \quad (249)$$

Inserting this into (248) finally yields

$$\left| \frac{1}{e^{-\beta \Gamma_{\vec{t}} m_T d_T}} z - Z_T(\beta) \right| < \epsilon \cdot Z_T(\beta). \quad (250)$$

□

Corollary 64. *If \mathcal{M} is universal, there does not exist a FPRAS for $\text{PART}_{\mathcal{M}}$.*

Proof. In [19] it is proven that there does not exist a FPRAS for the partition function problem of the homogeneous Ising model on regular graphs with degree at most 3, where the homogeneous couplings are restricted to below a certain threshold. We denote this spin model by $\mathcal{J}_{\text{hom},3}$, details regarding its precise definition can be found in [19]. Since \mathcal{M} is universal it emulates $\mathcal{J}_{\text{hom},3}$. By Theorem 63, an FPRAS that approximates the partition function of \mathcal{M} would induce an FPRAS that approximates the partition function $\mathcal{J}_{\text{hom},3}$. Since such a FPRAS does not exist, the FPRAS for the partition function of \mathcal{M} cannot exist in the first place. □

The natural class of problems that can be rephrased as partition functions are counting problems, #P. With a universal spin model \mathcal{M} we can approximate arbitrary partition functions by Theorem 63, and thus approximately solve arbitrary counting problems. However, partition functions in \mathcal{M} cannot be approximated in polynomial time by Corollary 64. Similarly to the ground state energy case, quantum computing protocols may help circumvent the hardness of approximating partition functions from \mathcal{M} .

C. Approximate Sampling

In this section we consider the problem of approximately sampling configurations from the Boltzmann distribution of spin systems from a spin model \mathcal{M} .

Definition 65 (approximate sampling problem). *Let \mathcal{M} be a spin model. The approximate sampling problem of \mathcal{M} $\text{ASP}_{\mathcal{M}}$, is the following problem: Given $S \in \mathcal{M}$, $\beta > 0$ and an error parameter $\epsilon > 0$, compute a configuration $\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S$ drawn from a probability distribution $q_{S,\beta,\epsilon}$ on \mathcal{C}_S that satisfies*

$$\|p_{S,\beta} - q_{S,\beta,\epsilon}\| < \epsilon. \quad (251)$$

A solution to the approximate sampling problem is a probabilistic algorithm that, on input (S, β, ϵ) , samples configurations from a probability distribution which is ϵ -close to $p_{S,\beta}$ w.r.t. the total variation distance $\| \cdot \|$ (defined in (64)).

Theorem 66. *An emulation $\text{EMU}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$ induces a PTAS reduction*

$$(f, g, \alpha): \text{ASP}_{\mathcal{M}'} \rightarrow \text{ASP}_{\mathcal{M}}. \quad (252)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 63. First, assume $\ell: S \rightarrow T$ is a simulation and let q be a probability distribution on \mathcal{C}_S . Similar to Definition 18, we let

$$q_{\ell}(\vec{t}) := \sum_{\substack{\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S, \\ \text{deco} \circ \vec{s} \circ P = \vec{t}}} q(\vec{s}). \quad (253)$$

Then, for any $\beta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_{\ell} - p_{\ell,\beta}\| &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_T} \left| \sum_{\substack{\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S, \\ \text{deco} \circ \vec{s} \circ P = \vec{t}}} (q(\vec{s}) - p_{S,\beta}(\vec{s})) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{C}_T} \sum_{\substack{\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S, \\ \text{deco} \circ \vec{s} \circ P = \vec{t}}} |q(\vec{s}) - p_{S,\beta}(\vec{s})| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S} |q(\vec{s}) - p_{S,\beta}(\vec{s})| \\ &= \|q - p_{S,\beta}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (254)$$

where $p_{\ell,\beta}$ is given in Definition 18. The first equality follows from the definition of the total variation distance, q_{ℓ} and $p_{\ell,\beta}$, the next line from the triangle inequality, and the last two equalities from combining the two sums into one sum over all configurations \vec{s} .

Second, recall that by Proposition 19, whenever $\ell: S \rightarrow T$ with cut-off $\Delta > \max(H_T)$, then

$$\|p_{\ell,\beta} - p_{T,\beta}\| < \frac{1}{md} \cdot q_S^{|\mathcal{V}_S|} \cdot e^{-\beta(\Delta + \min(H_T))}, \quad (255)$$

where $m = |\text{enc}|$. Following the proof of Theorem 63, given $T \in \mathcal{M}'$ and $\epsilon, \beta > 0$ we define $\delta_{\epsilon,\beta}$ such that the right hand side of (255) becomes smaller than $\epsilon/2$. By the same arguments as in Theorem 63 this can be computed in polytime.

Next, we compute $\text{EMU}(T, \delta_{\epsilon,\beta})$ to obtain a spin system $S(T, \delta_{\epsilon,\beta})$ and a simulation $\ell(T, \delta_{\epsilon,\beta}): S(T, \delta_{\epsilon,\beta}) \rightarrow T$. In the following we omit the arguments of S and ℓ . Note that all simulation parameters refer to the computed simulation ℓ and hence depend on T, β and ϵ . We define the reduction (f, g, α) by

$$\begin{aligned} f(T, \beta, \epsilon) &= (S, \beta) \\ g(T, \beta, \vec{z}, \epsilon) &= \text{dec} \circ \vec{z} \circ P \\ \alpha(\epsilon) &= \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (256)$$

Finally, let us show that this defines a PTAS reduction. By assumption, \vec{z} is distributed according to q , with

$$\|q - p_{S,\beta}\| < \epsilon/2. \quad (257)$$

By definition of g , $g(T, \beta, \vec{z}, \epsilon)$ is distributed according to q_{ℓ} . The total variation distance satisfies

$$\|q_{\ell} - p_{T,\beta}\| \leq \|q_{\ell} - p_{\ell,\beta}\| + \|p_{\ell,\beta} - p_{T,\beta}\|. \quad (258)$$

Now, by (257) and (254) the first summand is smaller than $\epsilon/2$, and by construction of $\delta_{\epsilon,\beta}$, the second summand too. In total,

$$\|q_f - p_{T,\beta}\| < \epsilon. \quad (259)$$

□

Corollary 67. *If \mathcal{M} is universal then there does not exist a FPRAS for $\text{ASP}_{\mathcal{M}}$.*

Proof. To prove the claim, we use the irreducibility between approximate counting (such as approximating the partition function) and approximate sampling for self-reducible problems (see [20, 21]), and then apply Corollary 64.

In [22] (see also [23]) it is proven that a FPRAS for approximate sampling of the homogeneous Ising model on arbitrary interaction graphs induces a FPRAS for approximating its partition function. Now assume there exists a FPRAS for approximate sampling from \mathcal{M} . Then by Theorem 66 we obtain a FPRAS for approximate sampling from $\mathcal{J}_{\text{hom},3}$, by Corollary 64. This, by [22], induces a FPRAS for approximating the partition function of $\mathcal{J}_{\text{hom},3}$, which by [19], does not exist. Hence, the FPRAS for approximate sampling from \mathcal{M} cannot exist in the first place. □

Similarly to the previous section, the hardness result of Corollary 67 prevents us from directly using Theorem 54 to construct algorithms that sample from arbitrary spin models.

In practice, sampling from spin systems is done by constructing Markov chains on the configuration space that have the corresponding Boltzmann distribution as stationary distribution. A common choice of Markov chain is the so-called *Glauber dynamics* [24]. For most interesting examples (and, by Corollary 67, for universal spin models) this approach suffers from exponential *mixing times*, that is, the convergence of the Markov chain to its stationary distribution is exponentially slow [25]. However, it seems that the properties of a spin model that determine its mixing time are not fully understood [26]. Theorem 66 implies that whenever \mathcal{M}' has exponential mixing times and $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$, then so does \mathcal{M} . This seems to indicate that the properties that lead to exponential mixing times are preserved by emulations.

Thus, it could be interesting to apply Theorem 66 to cases where the mixing time of the target model is either not known at all, or known to be not exponential. This could yield, depending on the mixing time of the source model of the emulation, a novel, efficient, approximate sampling algorithm for this target model. It could also help us understand what properties of spin models determine their mixing times, and reveal which of them are preserved by emulations.

Theorem 66 is very reminiscent of the universal approximation theorem of restricted Boltzmann machines

[27, 28]. We shall return to this point in [Conclusions and Outlook](#).

V. UNIVERSALITY OF THE 2D ISING MODEL WITH FIELDS

Universality of a spin model is satisfied by a widely studied model, the 2d Ising model with fields \mathcal{F}_{2d} , defined in Example 34.

Theorem 68. *The 2d Ising model with fields is universal.*

The goal of this section is to prove this theorem. Because of Corollary 55 and the fact that \mathcal{F}_{2d} is trivially scalable, we only need to show that \mathcal{F}_{2d} is functional complete and locally closed. We prove functional completeness in Section V A. In Section V B we construct a crossing gadget, which is the essential piece to prove local closure in Section V C.

A. Functional Completeness

In this subsection we prove functional completeness of \mathcal{F}_{2d} .

Lemma 69. *The 2d Ising model with fields is functional complete.*

Proof. We construct an emulation $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{F}_{2d}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$. A generic spin system from \mathcal{B}_2 is of the form $T_{f^{(i,j)}} \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle$, for $i, j \in [2]$. First, we consider the case $i = j = 1$. By Lemma 11, w.l.o.g. we construct the required simulation for $\delta > 3$. $S_{1,1}^\delta$, defined in Fig. 11, has the following 3 ground states with energy $+1/2$:

$$\{(2, 2, 1, 1), (2, 1, 1, 1), (1, 2, 1, 1)\}. \quad (260)$$

Configuration $(1, 1, 1, 1)$ has energy $+3/2$, and all other configurations have energy $\geq \delta$. Hence, it yields a simulation $S_{1,1}^\delta \rightarrow T_{f^{(1,1)}}$ with cut-off $\delta - 1/2$ and shift $+1/2$. Note that the cut-off can be arbitrarily high by modifying δ .




Figure 11: Definition of $S_{1,1}^\delta$.

The remaining cases $(i, j) \neq (1, 1)$ can be treated similarly, by defining

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{1,2}^\delta \langle v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(S_{\pi_2} \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle + S_{\pi_2} \langle v_2, w_2 \rangle + S_{\pi_2} \langle v_1, w_1 \rangle \right) + \delta \cdot S_{\pi_1} \langle w_1 \rangle + \delta \cdot S_{\pi_2} \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle \\
S_{2,1}^\delta \langle v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(S_{\pi_2} \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle + S_{\pi_2} \langle v_2, w_2 \rangle + S_{\pi_2} \langle v_1, w_1 \rangle \right) + \delta \cdot S_{\pi_1} \langle w_1 \rangle + \delta \cdot S_{\pi_2} \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle \\
S_{2,2}^\delta \langle v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(S_{\pi_2} \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle + S_{\pi_2} \langle v_2, w_2 \rangle + S_{\pi_2} \langle v_1, w_1 \rangle \right) + \delta \cdot S_{\pi_1} \langle w_1 \rangle + \delta \cdot S_{\pi_2} \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{261}$$

This construction satisfies Definition 35. \square

B. The Crossing Gadget

Here we define the crossing gadget I_\times^δ , which we shall use to prove of local closure of \mathcal{F}_{2d} in Section VC. To this end, we shall first explain why non-planarity is unavoidable in the construction of the emulation $\mathcal{F}_{2d} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{2d} + J(\mathcal{F}_{2d})$, which is necessary to prove local closure. We shall then construct the crossing gadget and explain how it can be used to simulate arbitrary non-planar spin systems with planar source systems.

A graph is planar if it can be embedded into the 2d plane such that none of its edges cross. Planar graphs can be fully characterized in terms of their graph minors: According to Wagner's theorem, a graph is planar if and only if it does not contain the complete graph on 5 vertices, K_5 , or the complete, bipartite graph on 3 + 3 vertices, $K_{3,3}$, as minor.

Clearly, all interaction graphs from \mathcal{F}_{2d} , i.e. all 2d lattices, are planar. But adding a single edge to a 2d lattice, as in $\mathcal{F}_{2d} + J(\mathcal{F}_{2d})$, generally leads to non-planarity (see Fig. 12). Spin systems over non-planar graphs can be simulated with spin systems over planar graphs by means of the crossing gadget.

To construct the crossing gadget, we leverage that 2d Ising systems with fields can encode Boolean logic in their ground state (cf. Lemma 69). First, we construct an Ising system I_{nor}^δ (defined in Fig. 13a) which in the ground state computes the logical nor of the states of two of its spins v_1, v_2 and stores the result in the state of a third spin v_3 . It is obtained by replacing the \mathcal{B}_2 interactions in S_{nor}^δ (see Fig. 9a) with the corresponding Ising interactions. More precisely, by Lemma 69, $S_{1,1}^\delta$ (defined in Fig. 11) simulates $f_{(1,1)}$ with cut-off $\delta - 1/2$ and shift $1/2$. Thus, by Theorem 26,

$$2\delta \cdot S_{1,1}^\delta \rightarrow 2\delta \cdot f_{1,1} \tag{262}$$

with cut-off $2\delta(\delta - 1/2)$ and shift δ .

We now replace all $2\delta \cdot f_{(1,1)}$ interactions by $2\delta \cdot S_{1,1}^\delta$ spin systems, and all $\delta \cdot f_{(2,1)} + \delta \cdot f_{(2,2)}$ by $\delta \cdot \pi_1$ fields. In the following we assume that $2\delta^2 > 10\delta$, which guarantees that in the ground state of I_{nor}^δ the subsystems $2\delta \cdot S_{1,1}^\delta$ correctly simulate $2\delta \cdot f_{1,1}$ interactions. Then, similarly to S_{nor}^δ , the ground state of I_{nor}^δ satisfies

$$\vec{s}(v_3) = \text{nor}(\vec{s}(v_1), \vec{s}(v_2)). \tag{263}$$

Its ground state energy is 9δ , and all other configurations have energy greater than 10δ . Note that while S_{nor}^δ has

$4 \cdot 2^5$ ground states, I_{nor}^δ only has 4 ground states, one for each possibility of satisfying Eq. (263). This results from replacing the 5 copies of $\delta \cdot f_{(2,1)} + \delta \cdot f_{(2,2)}$ each of which has a 2-fold degenerate ground state, with $\delta \cdot \pi_1$ which has a non-degenerate ground state.

Next, we construct an Ising system I_{iff}^δ (defined in Fig. 13b) that in its ground state implements the logical bidirectional \Leftrightarrow , also called xnor. It is constructed from S_{nor}^δ , using the fact that $x \Leftrightarrow y$ can be expressed in terms of nor as

$$(x \Leftrightarrow y) = \text{nor}(\text{nor}(x, \text{nor}(x, y)), \text{nor}(y, \text{nor}(x, y))). \tag{264}$$

In the ground state of I_{iff}^δ , $\vec{s}(v_3) = (\vec{s}(v_1) \Leftrightarrow \vec{s}(v_2))$, which can also be stated as

$$\vec{s}(v_3) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \vec{s}(v_1) = \vec{s}(v_2) \\ 2 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{265}$$

Its ground state energy is 36δ , and all other configurations have energy at least 37δ . Note that I_{iff}^δ has 4 ground states only, one for each possibility of satisfying (265).

Finally, the crossing gadget I_\times^δ (defined in Fig. 14) is constructed from I_{iff}^δ . From the identity

$$x = (x \Leftrightarrow (x \Leftrightarrow y)) \tag{266}$$

we conclude that in the ground state of I_\times^δ ,

$$\vec{s}(v_3) = \vec{s}(v_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{s}(v_4) = \vec{s}(v_1). \tag{267}$$

Its ground state energy is 108δ , and all other configurations have energy at least 109δ . Note that I_\times^δ has precisely 4 ground states, one for each possibility of satisfying (267).

So, in the ground state, I_\times^δ copies the state of v_2 to v_3 and the state of v_1 to v_4 . Since both I_{nor}^δ and I_{iff}^δ are planar, so is I_\times^δ . We will now show how to simulate two crossing edges with a planar source system by means of I_\times^δ (see Fig. 14b).

Lemma 70 (crossing gadget). *Let T be a spin system consisting of two edges $\{v_1, v_3\}$ and $\{v_2, v_4\}$ with arbitrary local interactions. Then Fig. 14b defines a simulation with cut-off δ and shift 108δ .*

Proof. It follows from the ground state behavior of I_\times^δ . \square

By Theorem 27, the crossing gadget can simulate an arbitrary non-planar spin system T (containing only pair




Figure 12: Graph G consisting of a 13×10 lattice with an additional edge between vertex $(3, 4)$ and vertex $(9, 4)$ drawn in red (12a). Proof that G is non-planar (12b): merging along the black edges and deleting all other edges and isolated vertices yields $K_{3,3}$ as minor of G (cf. Wagner's theorem), namely each of the three red vertices on the left is connected to each of the three red vertices on the right. Here colors just highlight elements and do not refer to the graphical notation for spin systems of Fig. 7.




Figure 13: Definition and symbolic notation of I_{nor}^δ (13a) and I_{iff}^δ (13b).

interactions and fields) with a planar source system. One ought to iterate over all crossings of T (w.r.t. some embedding into the plane), and locally replace the two crossing edges according to Fig. 14b while keeping the rest of T unchanged (see Fig. 5 for $S_i \rightarrow T_i$ being the simulation from Lemma 70).

C. Local Closure

In this subsection we prove local closure of \mathcal{F}_{2d} and thereby finish the proof of its universality. To this end we construct an emulation $\mathcal{F}_{2d} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{2d} + J(\mathcal{F}_{2d})$ by means of the crossing gadget defined in Fig. 14.

Lemma 71. *The 2d Ising model with fields is locally closed.*




Figure 14: Definition and symbolic notation of I_x^δ (14a), where I_{\leftrightarrow} is defined in Fig. 13. Simulation of two crossing edges with arbitrary local interactions by I_x^δ (14b).

Proof. Given as input spin systems $T \in \mathcal{J}_{2d}$ and $K \in J(\mathcal{J}_{2d})$, as well as a positive real number δ , we provide a polytime construction of a spin system $S \in \mathcal{J}_{2d}$ and a simulation $S \rightarrow T + K$ with cut-off δ .

First, a generic spin system T from \mathcal{J}_{2d} is isomorphic to a spin system \tilde{T} with interaction graph $G_{m,n}$ (cf. (132)) for some $m, n \geq 2$. We now argue that w.l.o.g. we can assume that T has interaction graph $G_{m,n}$. By [29], we can construct a graph isomorphism between V_T and $G_{m,n}$ in polytime. This induces a spin system isomorphism ϕ between \tilde{T} and T , which by Proposition 20 induces a simulation $\tilde{T} \rightarrow T$. By Theorem 27 we therefore obtain a simulation

$$\mathcal{r}: \tilde{T} + \tilde{K} \rightarrow T + K, \quad (268)$$


where \tilde{K} is obtained by relabeling spins in $V_K \cap V_T$ according to ϕ . Thus, if the interaction graph of T is not of the form $G_{m,n}$, we simply work with \tilde{T} , use it to construct the simulation of $\tilde{T} + \tilde{K}$ and finally compose the result with the simulation \mathcal{r} . We henceforth call spins from T with degree 2 or 3 the boundary spins, and those with degree 4 the interior, where the degree of a spin is the number of edges it is included in.

A spin system K from $J(\mathcal{J}_{2d})$ consists either of a single spin v with local interaction given by an Ising field $\pi_1, \bar{\pi}_1$, or of two spins v, w sharing an edge with local interaction given by an Ising pair interaction $\pi_2, \bar{\pi}_2$.

1. Single Spin v

We first consider the case of K consisting of a single spin v . There are two sub-cases, either $v \in V_T$ or $v \notin V_T$.

Sub-case $v \in V_T$. We start with $v \in V_T$. We further distinguish the two sub-sub-cases of $J_T(\{v\})$ and $J_K(\{v\})$ being of the same type, i.e. both scalar multiples of π_1 or $\bar{\pi}_1$, or $J_T(\{v\})$ and $J_K(\{v\})$ being of different types.



If they are of the same type, say $J_T(\{v\}) = \lambda_1 \cdot \pi_1$ and $J_K(\{v\}) = \lambda_2 \cdot \pi_1$, then their sum equals $(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \cdot \pi_1$ and thus is itself an Ising field. Hence, $T + K \in \mathcal{J}_{2d}$, and we take $S = T + K$ together with the identity simulation.

If they are of different types then their sum is not an Ising interaction. We construct an Ising interaction that equals their sum up to a constant shift. Say $J_T(\{v\}) = \lambda_1 \cdot \pi_1$ and $J_K(\{v\}) = \lambda_2 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2$, then

$$(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \cdot \pi_1 + \lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \cdot \pi_1 + \lambda_2 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1. \quad (269)$$

Let S be equal to T except for the local interaction $J_S(\{v\})$ which we take to be $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \cdot \pi_1$. This yields a simulation $S \rightarrow T + K$ which is trivial except for the non-trivial shift of $-\lambda_2$.

Sub-case $v \notin V_T$. Consider now the sub-case $v \notin V_T$. We define S by taking $G_{m+1,n+1}$ as interaction graph (where $G_{m,n}$ is the interaction graph of T) and defining

$$J_S(e) = \begin{cases} J_T(e) & \text{if } e \in E_T \\ J_K(e) & \text{if } e = \{(m+1, 1)\} \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (270)$$

i.e. on hyperedges from $G_{m,n}$, S has the same interactions as T , the field $J_K(\{v\})$ acts on the additional spin $(m+1, 1)$, and all other additional interactions are zero. This yields a simulation $S \rightarrow T + K$ with physical spin assignment $P(v) = (m+1, n)$.

This can also be interpreted as follows. First, we extend the interaction grid graph of T by one row and one column only containing zero interactions. This defines a spin systems T_+ . By Proposition 24 we trivially get a simulation $T_+ \rightarrow T$. Then we apply an isomorphism to K that identifies v with the border spin $(m+1, n)$ of T_+ . This defines a simulation $\tilde{K} \rightarrow K$. By Theorem 27 we have $T_+ + \tilde{K} \rightarrow T + K$ and by construction T_+, \tilde{K} belong to the sub-case $v \in V_T$. This effectively reduces the sub-case $v \notin V_T$ to the sub-case $v \in V_T$.




Figure 15: If K consists of two interacting spins, we consider four sub-cases: sub-case 1 (15a), the two sub-sub-cases of sub-case 2 (15b), sub-case 3 (15c), and sub-case 4 (15d).

2. Two spins v, w

Next, we consider the case of K consisting of two spins $V_K = \{v, w\}$ that interact via $\lambda \cdot \pi_2$ or $\lambda \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$. We distinguish 4 sub-cases (see Fig. 15):

1. $\{v, w\} \in E_T$
2. $\{v, w\} \cap V_T = \emptyset$ or $\{v, w\} \cap V_T = \{v\}$ (or $\{w\}$) and v (or w) is part of the boundary of T
3. $\{v, w\} \cap V_T = \{v\}$ (or $\{w\}$) and v (or w) is part of the interior of T
4. $\{v, w\} \subseteq V_T$ but $\{v, w\} \notin E_T$.

Sub-cases 1 and 2. Sub-cases 1 and 2 can be treated similarly to the sub-cases of K consisting of a single spin. In sub-case 1 we let S be equal to T and change the local interaction $J_T(\{v, w\})$. Similarly to $\pi_1, \bar{\pi}_1$, also $\pi_2, \bar{\pi}_2$ satisfy

$$(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \cdot \pi_2 + \lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \cdot \pi_2 + \lambda_2 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2. \quad (271)$$

In sub-case 2 we construct S by enlarging the interaction graph of T by one row and one column and take all additional local interactions equal to zero, except for the local interaction corresponding to $J_K(\{v, w\})$.

Sub-case 3. Sub-case 3 reduces to sub-case 4 by enlarging the interaction graph of T by one row and one column, and identifying w with a border spin of the so defined spin system T_+ .

Sub-case 4. Sub-case 4 is the only non-trivial sub-case. We assume w.l.o.g. that $v = (i, j)$ and $w = (i + r, j + s)$ for $r, s > 0$; all other possibilities can be treated similarly. We construct S and the simulation $S \rightarrow T + K$ in four steps, namely spin systems $S, S_{\text{deg}}, S_{\text{cross}}$ and S_{part} , as well as simulations

$$S \rightarrow S_{\text{deg}} \rightarrow S_{\text{cross}} \rightarrow S_{\text{part}} \rightarrow T + K. \quad (272)$$

More precisely, starting from $T + K$ and proceeding ‘backwards’, we construct S_{part} by partitioning the additional edge $\{v, w\}$ into a sequence of edges, each of which crosses precisely one edge of T . We construct S_{cross} by

replacing each such crossing with a crossing gadget, resulting in a planar interaction graph. We construct S_{deg} by introducing additional vertices such that the interaction graph has degree ≤ 4 . Finally, S is obtained by embedding this interaction graph of degree ≤ 4 into a large enough grid graph. In the following, we devote one paragraph to each of these four steps.




Figure 16: The simulation $S_{\text{part}} \rightarrow T + K$ for $r = 3, s = 2$. By introducing two spins, v_1, v_2 , the edge $\{v, w\}$ is partitioned into 3 edges, the first of which carries the original interaction, while the other two carry $\delta \cdot \pi_2$ interactions which, below the cut-off, force the two interacting spins to be in equal states. Note that drawing the additional spins and edges as illustrated leads to precisely one crossing for each of the three additional edges.

Step 1: S_{part} . First, we partition the edge $\{v, w\}$ into a path of $r + s - 2$ edges (Fig. 16), each of which crosses precisely one edge from T . This amounts to modifying the interaction graph of T by removing edge $\{v, w\}$ and introducing $r + s - 3$ additional vertices v_1, \dots, v_{r+s-3} and $r + s - 2$ additional edges, $\{v, v_1\}, \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, r + s - 4$ and $\{v_{r+s-3}, w\}$. We denote the resulting graph by G_{part} .

We now construct a spin system S_{part} with interaction graph G_{part} , by choosing the local interaction attached to the first additional edges, $\{v, v_1\}$, as $J_K(\{v, w\})$. We choose $\delta \cdot \pi_2$ for all other additional edges, and $J_T(e)$ for all edges e which are contained in T . By Proposition 24, we obtain a simulation

$$S_{\text{part}} \rightarrow T + K \quad (273)$$

with cut-off δ and shift 0. Note that the edges with $\delta \cdot \pi_2$ interactions are precisely those that must be contracted

to recover $T + K$ from S_{part} . The $\delta \cdot \pi_2$ interactions implement this contraction by forcing the two interaction spins to be equal whenever a configuration has energy below the cut-off.

Step 2: S_{cross} . We replace each pair of crossing edges with the crossing gadget (see Fig. 14). For a single crossing this is illustrated in Fig. 17. This defines a spin system S_{cross} , and using the simulation of Fig. 14b (see also Lemma 70) together with Theorem 41, a simulation

$$S_{\text{cross}} \rightarrow S_{\text{part}} \quad (274)$$

with cut-off δ and shift $\Gamma_{\text{cross}} := 108\delta \cdot (r + s - 2)$. Note that S_{cross} is a planar spin system with interactions from \mathcal{F}_{2d} .

Observe that we can compute the $r + s - 2$ crossings of S_{part} in polytime. By construction, the horizontal distance between v and w is r . This means that the first $r - 1$ of the additional edges cross vertical edges of T , i.e. the first additional edge $\{v, v_1\}$ crosses edge $\{(i + 1, j), (i + 1, j + 1)\}$, and for $k = 1, \dots, r - 2$, edge $\{v_k, v_{k+1}\}$ crosses $\{(i + k + 1, j), (i + k + 1, j + 1)\}$. The remaining $s - 1$ additional edges cross vertical edges of T , i.e. for $l = 1, \dots, s - 2$, edge $\{v_{r+l-2}, v_{r+l-1}\}$ crosses $\{(i + r - 1, j + l), (i + r, j + l)\}$ and the last additional edge $\{v_{r+s-3}, w\}$ crosses edge $\{(i + r - 1, j + s - 1), (i + r, j + s - 1)\}$. Therefore, also S_{cross} and the simulation (274) can be computed in polytime.

Step 3: S_{deg} . For the construction of S_{deg} , we start by noting that there are three mechanisms that might lead to vertices of S_{cross} having degree > 4 :

- (a) Vertices of the crossing gadget Fig. 14 of degree > 4 ;
- (b) External vertices of the crossing gadget (v_1, \dots, v_4 in Fig. 14a) of degree > 1 (note that in Fig. 17b such external vertices are connected to vertices which have degree at most 3); and
- (c) The two vertices v, w belonging to the additional edge from K .

We construct S_{deg} by distributing the edges of these spins with degree > 4 over multiple spins which are connected amongst each other with $\delta' \cdot \pi_2$ interactions. The latter ensure that in the low energy sector, the spins have equal states and thus mimic a single spin. Since the previous simulation has shift Γ_{cross} , the relevant low energy sector is below $\Gamma_{\text{cross}} + \delta$. We thus pick

$$\delta' := \delta + \Gamma_{\text{cross}} \quad (275)$$

to achieve this.

The precise replacement rules in the construction of S_{deg} are listed in Fig. 18. By Proposition 24, applying any number of such rules results in a simulation, in our case of type $S_{\text{deg}} \rightarrow S_{\text{cross}}$.

We first explain how to modify the crossing gadget so that it has no vertices of degree > 4 and its external

vertices have degree 1, thereby treating cases (a) and (b) of high degree vertices of S_{cross} . Recall that the crossing gadget is constructed from three copies of I_{iff}^δ , each of which is constructed from four copies of I_{nor}^δ (see Fig. 13 and Fig. 14).

I_{nor}^δ contains one internal spin with degree > 4 . We apply rule 18a to this spin. On top of that, the upper two external spins v_1, v_2 of I_{nor}^δ have degree 4 and the lower external spin v_3 has degree 6. We apply rule 18b to the upper external spins and rule 18c to the lower external spin. In total, the modified spin system $\tilde{I}_{\text{nor}}^\delta$ has no spin with degree > 4 and all of its external spins have degree 1.

Next, we construct $\tilde{I}_{\text{iff}}^\delta$ by first following the construction of Fig. 13b but replacing each I_{nor}^δ with the corresponding $\tilde{I}_{\text{nor}}^\delta$. This leads to the upper external spins having degree 2. We apply rule 18d to those. The resulting spin system, $\tilde{I}_{\text{iff}}^\delta$, has the same functionality as I_{iff}^δ , but all of its internal spins have degree < 4 and its three external spins v_1, v_2, v_3 have degree 1.

Finally, we construct \tilde{I}_\times^δ by first following Fig. 17a, but replacing I_{iff}^δ with $\tilde{I}_{\text{iff}}^\delta$ and then again, applying rule 18d to the two upper external spin. This ultimately yields a crossing gadget with no spin of degree > 4 . Additionally, all of its external spins have degree 1. Hence, connecting this modified crossing gadget as illustrated in Fig. 17 does not create additional spin of degree > 4 .

Since this modification concerns the crossing gadget itself, i.e. is independent of the input spin systems T, K , it can be computed in constant time. As the number of crossing gadgets in S_{cross} , $r + s - 2$ is clearly polynomial in $|T|$, applying the resulting modifications to S_{cross} is polytime computable.

We finish the construction of S_{deg} by applying rule 18e to v and w . Since this modification does not depend on the size of the input either, it is polytime computable too. Finally, using Proposition 24 we obtain

$$S_{\text{deg}} \rightarrow S_{\text{cross}} \quad (276)$$

with cut-off δ' .

Step 4: S . Finally, we construct $S \in \mathcal{F}_{2d}$, together with $S \rightarrow S_{\text{deg}}$, by embedding S_{deg} into a large enough grid graph $G_{m', n'}$. Specifically, we use the linear time grid embedding algorithm presented in [30]. Given a planar graph G of degree at most 4 as input, this algorithm identifies vertices of G with grid coordinates, and edges of G with lattices paths between the appropriate grid coordinates. We apply this algorithm to the interaction graph of S_{deg} and denote by $G_{m', n'}$ the minimal 2-dimensional grid graph that contains all obtained coordinates of vertices of $G_{S_{\text{deg}}}$. By construction S_{deg} is planar and has degree 4, i.e. meets the requirements of the grid embedding algorithm.

We now construct the 2d Ising system S by first choosing the fields $J_S(\{v\})$ of S to be $J_S(\{w\})$ whenever the embedding algorithm maps w to v , and zero for all those spins in S that do not correspond to spins from S_{deg} .




Figure 17: The simulation $S_{\text{cross}} \rightarrow S_{\text{part}}$ to replace the first (17a) and second (17b) crossing with a crossing gadget (see Fig. 14). The full simulation is obtained by treating every crossing this way, where for the last $s - 1$ crossings, i.e. those that cross horizontal edges, the construction must be rotated. Only the spins v, v_1, v_2 are labelled explicitly.




Figure 18: Replacement rules used in the construction of S_{deg} . Each rule defines a simulation with cut-off δ' , by Proposition 24.

Second, we choose pair interactions of S such that for each edge $\{v, w\}$ in S_{deg} , one edge of the lattice path corresponding to $\{v, w\}$ has interaction $J_{S_{\text{deg}}}(\{v, w\})$ while all other edges of the lattice path have interaction $\delta' \cdot \pi_2$. Moreover, for all those edges in $G_{m', n'}$ that are not part of the lattice paths representing the edges of S_{deg} we pick the local interaction to be zero. By Proposition 24 we obtain a simulation

$$S \rightarrow S_{\text{deg}} \quad (277)$$

with cut-off δ' . Note that the physical spin assignment of this simulation is precisely the map assigning grid coordinates to the spin from S_{deg} obtained from the algorithm. The situation is illustrated in Fig. 19.

Combining the four steps. Finally, combining the four constructed simulations yields the desired simulation $S \rightarrow T + K$. Note that $S \rightarrow S_{\text{deg}}$ and $S_{\text{deg}} \rightarrow S_{\text{cross}}$ have cut-off $\delta' = \delta + \Gamma_{\text{cross}}$, while all other simulations have cut-off δ . Moreover, $S_{\text{cross}} \rightarrow S_{\text{part}}$ has shift Γ_{cross} while all other simulations have shift 0. By Theorem 25, $S \rightarrow T + K$ has cut-off δ . As argued above, each step of the construction of $S \rightarrow T + K$ is polytime computable, and hence by Theorem 39 the construction itself is polytime computable. Further note that δ is merely a parameter in this construction, and changing the cut-off amounts to changing this parameter, so the constructed emulation satisfies Definition 35 3. Finally, by construction $S \rightarrow T + K$ has identity encoding. We conclude that the construction of S and $S \rightarrow T + K$ satisfies Definition 35, finishing the proof. \square

VI. COMPUTING SIMULATIONS BY LINEAR PROGRAMS

Many of the problems studied in this work are of the form: Given a target spin system T , construct a simulation $S \rightarrow T$ with source S with certain properties, often specified by requiring that $S \in \mathcal{M}$ for a spin model \mathcal{M} . While our modular framework for simulations can be used to construct $S \rightarrow T$ from simpler simulations, we have so far constructed these simpler simulations by hand — e.g. I_{nor}^δ in Fig. 13.

Yet, this is not necessary: Simulations can be computed by linear programs, as we show in this section.

We consider the problem:

Given a target system T , a cut-off δ , and a finite set of local interactions $\mathcal{J} := \{J_1, \dots, J_n\}$ of spin type q , construct a simulation $S \rightarrow T$ where, up to isomorphism, the local interactions of S are non-negative linear combinations of those from \mathcal{J} .

We show how such spin systems S and simulations $S \rightarrow T$ can be constructed via linear programs, first, for fixed interaction hypergraph of S (Section VIA) and then for an arbitrary one (Section VIB). We then illustrate the power of this approach by constructing an alternative crossing gadget for the 2d Ising model with fields (Section VIC).

For simplicity, we consider simulations with $d = |\text{enc}| = 1$ and where all interactions in \mathcal{J} are invariant under permutation of spins. If this is not the case, each




Figure 19: Example of simulation obtained from the grid embedding algorithm (see [30]). Black edges represent arbitrary interactions. For simplicity, the original spin system (right) has no fields.

local interaction acting on k spins (via relabellings) gives rise to up to $k!$ ways to be attached to a hyperedge of order k , increasing the number of variables associated to each hyperedge in the linear program. We write “ S has local interactions from $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{F})$ ” for “up to isomorphisms, the local interactions of S are non-negative linear combinations from \mathcal{F} ”.

A. Fixed Interaction Hypergraph

We first consider the case where S has fixed interaction hypergraph G_S .

Theorem 72. *Let T, \mathcal{F}, δ and G_S be as above. A spin system S on G_S with local interactions from $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{F})$ and a simulation $S \rightarrow T$ with cut-off δ can be computed by solving a system of linear inequalities.*

Systems of linear equations can be solved by a linear program.

Proof. We construct the system of linear inequalities. For each natural number $a \geq 1$, denote by \mathcal{F}_a the subset of local interactions from \mathcal{F} which have arity a . Denote by I_a the set of indices of local interactions from \mathcal{F} which are contained in \mathcal{F}_a , i.e. $\mathcal{F}_a = \{J_i \mid i \in I_a\}$. For each $e \in E_S$, $\mathcal{F}_{|e|}$ are those local interactions that could potentially be used for the construction of $J_S(e)$. Thus, a general $J_S(e)$ is a non-negative linear combination of local interactions from $\mathcal{F}_{|e|}$. For each $e \in E_T$ and for each $i \in I_{|e|}$ we introduce a variable $\lambda_{e,i}$ corresponding to the scalar coefficient of $J_i \in \mathcal{F}_{|e|}$ in $J_S(e)$. That is, we define

$$J_S(e) := \sum_{i \in I_{|e|}} \lambda_{e,i} \cdot J_i. \quad (278)$$

This way, for each source configuration \vec{s} , $H_S(\vec{s})$ is a linear expression containing variables $\{\lambda_{e,i} \mid e \in E_S, i \in I_{|e|}\}$. Adjusting the local interactions of S such that $S \rightarrow T$ amounts to computing appropriate values for these variables.

Next we choose an arbitrary encoding, compatible decoding and physical spin assignment. Each low energy target configuration \vec{t} determines by $\vec{s} \circ P = \text{enc} \circ \vec{t}$ a corresponding sub-configuration of physical spins, and extending \vec{s} to auxiliary spins yields the configuration of S which simulates \vec{t} . This extension can be done arbitrarily. This defines a function sim mapping low energy target configurations \vec{t} to source configurations \vec{s} , which satisfy $\vec{s} \circ P = \text{enc} \circ \vec{t}$. Note that we have not yet imposed the energy condition (Definition 8 5) necessary for sim to define a simulation assignment. We denote the set of source configurations in the image of sim by \mathcal{Sim} .

Finally, imposing the energy conditions amounts to requiring that the variables $\{\lambda_{e,i}\}$ and Γ satisfy the inequalities:

$$\lambda_{e,i} \geq 0 \quad \forall e \in E_S, i \in I_{|e|} \quad (279)$$

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma = H_T(\text{dec} \circ \vec{s} \circ P) \quad \forall \vec{s} \in \mathcal{Sim} \quad (280)$$

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma \geq \delta \quad \forall \vec{s} \notin \mathcal{Sim}. \quad (281)$$

In total, the simulation $S \rightarrow T$ can be computed by solving this system of linear inequalities. \square

The first condition ensures that the local interactions of S are non-negative functions—this condition should be omitted if one used a definition of a spin system with arbitrary interactions.

The objective function of this linear program can be chosen such that additional properties of the simulation $S \rightarrow T$ are imposed. For instance, one can minimize the absolute value of Γ to obtain a spin system S whose ground state energy is maximally close to the ground state energy of the target spin system, or minimize the sum of variables $\lambda_{e,i}$ to force a large number of them to be equal to zero and obtain a sparser connectivity in S .

Other choices in the above construction, such as that of enc , dec , P and sim , are arbitrary. They might, however, determine whether the resulting linear program has a solution. In practice, one may need to set up linear programs for several of these choices.

B. Arbitrary Interaction Hypergraph

We now consider the case where the interaction hypergraph of S is not fixed. The task is thus:

Given a set of local interactions \mathcal{F} and a target system, construct a simulation $S \rightarrow T$ such that S has interactions from $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{F})$ but can have any interaction graph.

The construction I_{nor}^δ from Fig. 13 is of this type.

The lack of restrictions on the interaction hypergraph (and hence on the number of spins of S) gives rise to an infinite search space for S . Inspired by [31, Lemma 3.7] we show how this infinite search space can be restricted to a finite one, and thereby reduce the case of unfixed G_S to that of fixed G_S .

We assume that the local interactions \mathcal{F} are such that, for every $J \in \mathcal{F}$ acting on spins e with $|e| \geq 2$ and every pair of distinct spins $s_i, s_j \in e$, there exists an interaction $J_{s_i, s_j} \in \mathcal{F}$ acting on spins $e' := e \setminus \{s_j\}$ such that for all configurations \vec{s} on e that satisfy $\vec{s}(s_i) = \vec{s}(s_j)$,

$$J_{s_i, s_j}(\vec{s}|_{e'}) = J(\vec{s}). \quad (282)$$

Restricting a local interaction with arity k to configurations that agree on two fixed spins s_i, s_j effectively defines a local interaction of arity $k - 1$. The above condition then states that \mathcal{F} is closed under such restrictions, i.e. if $J \in \mathcal{F}$ then all of its restrictions are contained in \mathcal{F} , too. Following [31], we term sets of local interactions satisfying the above condition *hereditary*. This is for instance satisfied for Ising interactions of arbitrary arity.

We will prove that for hereditary \mathcal{F} the search space is finite, by showing that, given T and δ , we can compute the number of auxiliary spins needed to simulate T . This allows us to fix the interaction hypergraph of S and resort to the case of Section VIA.

For simplicity, we restrict to enc and P trivial. We expect similar considerations to apply for the general case.

We start by introducing terminology. Assume the target system T has r spins s_1, \dots, s_r and k low energy configurations $\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_k$. Since enc and P are trivial, the physical spins of S are given by s_1, \dots, s_r . Denote the auxiliary spins of S by s_{r+1}, \dots, s_{r+a} . Specifying sim amounts to giving the states of these a auxiliary spins for each of the k low energy target configurations. The states of physical spins of sim are fixed by the requirement $\vec{s} \circ \text{P} = \text{enc} \circ \vec{t}_i$. We denote the state of spin s_j w.r.t. configuration $\text{sim}(\vec{t}_i)$ by $\text{state}_i(s_j)$. We define

$$\text{state}(s_j) := (\text{state}_1(s_j), \dots, \text{state}_k(s_j)), \quad (283)$$

and call $\text{state}(s_j)$ the *low-energy vector* of spin s_j . Specifying sim amounts to giving the low-energy vectors of all auxiliary spins.

The relation between $\text{sim}(\vec{t}_i)$ and $\text{state}(s_j)$ can be given as follows: sim is fully determined by a $k \times (r+a)$ matrix

with rows being the individual values $\text{sim}(\vec{t}_i)$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} - & \text{sim}(\vec{t}_1) & - \\ & \vdots & \\ - & \text{sim}(\vec{t}_k) & - \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} & | & & | \\ \text{state}(s_1) & \dots & \text{state}(s_{r+a}) & \\ & | & & | \end{pmatrix}. \quad (284)$$

The columns of this matrix are the low-energy vectors.

Finally, two source spins s_i, s_j are termed *indistinguishable* if their low-energy vectors are equal, and *distinguishable* otherwise. The former correspond to equal columns in sim (cf. (284)). In the low energy sector, indistinguishable spins have equal states. The number of indistinguishable physical spins is denoted by i_s . Since enc, P are trivial, i_s is determined by the low energy target configurations \vec{t}_i . In the presence of symmetries of the local interactions \mathcal{F} , it might suffice to call spins indistinguishable if their low-energy vectors agree up to this symmetry.

Lemma 73 (bounding the search space). *Let T be a spin system and \mathcal{F} a hereditary set of local interactions. If there exists a simulation $S \rightarrow T$ where S has local interactions from $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{F})$, then there exists a simulation $S' \rightarrow T$ with equal cut-off, where S' has local interactions from $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{F})$ and at most $q^k - i_s$ auxiliary spins (and hence $q^k - i_s + r$ total spins).*

Proof. We follow [31, Lemma 3.7]. Assume there exists a simulation with more than $q^k - i_s$ auxiliary spins. This has a simulation assignment sim which determines the low-energy vectors for all spins of S . Since each low-energy vector consists of k numbers from $[q]$, there exist q^k different low-energy vectors. By assumption, i_s of these are associated to physical spins. Since S has more than $q^k - i_s$ auxiliary spins, at least one low-energy vector appears at least twice in sim. That is, there exists an auxiliary spin s_j such that $\text{state}(s_j) = \text{state}(s_i)$ for some source spin s_i different from s_j . Note that s_i might be an auxiliary or a physical spin.

We now construct a spin system S' with spins $V_S \setminus \{s_j\}$. First, we explain how $E_{S'}$ is constructed. Given any edge $e \in E_S$, we define an edge $r_j(e)$ by distinguishing the following three cases:

1. If e does not contain s_j then $r_j(e)$ equals e ;
2. If e contains s_j but does not contain s_i then $r_j(e)$ is obtained from e by relabeling s_j with s_i ;
3. If e contains both s_j and s_i then $r_j(e)$ equals $e \setminus \{s_j\}$.

We now define

$$E_{S'} := \{r_j(e) \mid e \in E_S\}. \quad (285)$$

Next, we construct $J_{S'}$. By assumption, local interactions from S are non-negative linear combinations from \mathcal{F} . Given any local interaction $J_S(e) = \sum_i \lambda_i \cdot J_i$ from S we first define a local interaction $R_j(J_S(e))$ by again distinguishing the same three cases

1. If e does not contain s_j then $R_j(J_S(e))$ equals $J_S(e)$;
2. If e contains s_j but does not contain s_i then $R_j(J_S(e))$ is obtained from $J_S(e)$ by relabeling s_j to s_i (as in Definition 7);
3. If e contains both s_i and s_j then $R_j(J_S(e))$ equals $\sum_i \lambda_i \cdot (J_i)_{s_i, s_j}$.

First, note that by construction $R_j(J_S(e))$ defines a local interaction on $r_j(e)$. Second, since \mathcal{F} is hereditary, $R_j(J_S(e))$ is a local interaction from $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{F})$.

Now, given any $e' \in E_{S'}$, we define

$$J_{S'}(e') = \sum_{e \in r_j^{-1}(\{e'\})} R_j(J_S(e)), \quad (286)$$

which clearly defines a local interaction from $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{F})$, acting on hyperedge e' . Note that since r_j is not necessarily injective, the preimage of e' , $r_j^{-1}(\{e'\})$ might contain multiple edges from E_S . Consider for instance

$$r_j(\{a, b, s_j\}) = r_j(\{a, b, s_i, s_j\}) = \{a, b, s_i\}. \quad (287)$$

Finally, using Eq. (282), for any $e' \in E_{S'}$ and any configuration $\vec{s} \in \mathcal{C}_S$ that agrees on s_i and s_j the following holds:

$$J_{S'}(e')(\vec{s}|_{e'}) = \sum_{e \in r_j^{-1}(\{e'\})} J_S(e)(\vec{s}|_e). \quad (288)$$

This implies for such configurations

$$H_{S'}(\vec{s}|_{V_{S'}}) = H_S(\vec{s}). \quad (289)$$

Since all configurations from Sim agree on s_i and s_j , defining

$$\text{sim}'(\vec{t}) = \text{sim}(\vec{t})|_{V_{S'}}, \quad (290)$$

implies that $H_{S'}$ satisfies Eq. (280). Note that this definition of sim' precisely corresponds to removing the column $\text{state}(s_j)$ from sim .

Since for each $\vec{s}' \notin \text{Sim}'$ there exists a configuration $\vec{s} \notin \text{Sim}$ that agrees on s_i, s_j and restricts to \vec{s}' , $H_{S'}$ also satisfies Eq. (281). Finally, since the construction of $J_{S'}$ does not change the coefficients of linear combinations of local interactions and S satisfies Eq. (279), so does S' .

By Theorem 72 we have constructed a simulation $S' \rightarrow T$ such that S' has one spin less than S . The simulation assignment of this simulation in its matrix form is obtained by removing the column containing the low-energy vector $\text{state}(s_j)$ from sim . As long as the resulting spin system S' still has at least $q^k - i_s + r$ spins we are guaranteed the existence of another auxiliary spins $s_{j'}$ indistinguishable from some other spin $s_{i'}$. Thus, the claim follows by applying this construction iteratively, until the number of auxiliary spins equals $q^k - i_s$. \square

We now use Lemma 73 to prove that also simulations with arbitrary interaction hypergraph G_S can be computed by linear programs. Denote by n_a the number of local interactions from \mathcal{F} of arity a and by a_{\max} the maximum arity of local interactions from \mathcal{F} .

Theorem 74 (simulation as a linear program). *Let T be a target system with r spins, $\delta > 0$ and \mathcal{F} a hereditary set of local interactions. If there exists a spin system S with local interactions from $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{F})$ that simulates T with cut-off δ and with trivial enc, P , then such a spin system can be computed by a linear program with*

$$1 + \sum_{a=1}^{a_{\max}} n_a \cdot \binom{q^k - i_s + r}{a} \quad (291)$$

variables.

Proof. By Lemma 73, we can restrict to source spin systems S with no more than $q^k - i_s + r$ spins. By Theorem 72, any choice of interaction hypergraph G_S and simulation assignment sim determines a system of linear inequalities whose solutions are simulations $S \rightarrow T$.

In the following we construct the most general interaction hypergraph and simulation assignment compatible with the assumptions. Denoting the corresponding system of linear inequalities by L_{gen} , any solution of L_{gen} yields a simulation which satisfies the requirements. We then argue that any other interaction hypergraph and simulation assignment amounts to adding equations to L_{gen} . Thus, if there exists a spin system S that simulates T (with the required properties), then by Theorem 72 the linear system containing L_{gen} plus the corresponding additional equations corresponding, has a solution. Hence, L_{gen} must have a solution, too. The claim then follows by counting the number of variables of L_{gen} .

Let us construct L_{gen} . Given the target system T and cut-off δ , we first compute all k low energy target configurations \vec{t}_i . Since enc and P are trivial, from the low energy target configurations we can read off the low-energy vectors of physical spins, $\text{state}(s_1), \dots, \text{state}(s_r)$. In particular, we can read off the number of different such vectors, i_s . By Lemma 73, we thus can compute the number of spins necessary for S' , $q^k - i_s + r$.

We construct the simulation assignment sim' by assigning each of the $q^k - i_s$ low-energy vectors not corresponding to a physical spin to one auxiliary spin. In other words, sim' , in its matrix form, contains each of the q^k possible low-energy vectors as a column-vector. We define $G_{S'}$ to be the hypergraph with vertices $s_1, \dots, s_{q^k - i_s + r}$ and all possible hyperedges of order $\leq a_{\max}$. Given this, we set up the linear program described in Theorem 72.

Next, we count the number of variables of L_{gen} . $G_{S'}$ contains

$$\binom{q^k - i_s + r}{a} \quad (292)$$

hyperedges of order a , and \mathcal{F} contains n_a local interactions of arity a . Following Theorem 72, each hyperedge

e of order a thus yields n_a variables $\lambda_{e,i}$. Including the final variable, Γ , we obtain the total number of variables of (291). Solving this linear program yields a spin system S' and simulation $S' \rightarrow T$ with the desired properties.

To finish the proof, we argue that any other choice of interaction hypergraph G_S and simulation assignment sim amounts to adding equations to the linear program L_{gen} and thus, assuming that there exists some spin system S such that $S \rightarrow T$ with the desired properties then also L_{gen} must have a solution.

First, any choice of interaction hypergraph with no more than $q^k - i_s + r$ spins can be obtained from $G_{S'}$ by removing hyperedges. This can be achieved by adding equations to the linear program that set the corresponding variables to zero. Second, by Lemma 73, any choice of simulation assignment sim , w.l.o.g. has a minimum number of indistinguishable spins. Since sim' contains all possible low-energy vectors, sim can only differ from sim' by missing some low-energy vectors. Since low-energy vectors of physical spins are determined by the low-energy target configurations, the missing low-energy vectors must correspond to auxiliary spins. Imposing this constraint amounts to adding equations to the linear program that set the variables corresponding to hyperedges containing these auxiliary spins to zero. \square

Let us see an example of computing simulations by linear programs, where we solved the system of linear inequalities with the tools of [32].

Example 75 (revisiting Ising). *Let us revisit the simulation provided in Example 9. Since \mathcal{J} contains all Ising fields and Ising pair interactions, it is hereditary. Due to the symmetry of Ising interactions, we consider spins indistinguishable if their low-energy vectors are equal up to flipping all states, i.e. exchanging states, $1 \rightarrow 2, 2 \rightarrow 1$. Fixing the encoding, decoding and physical spin assignment as described in Example 9 leads to 4 different low-energy vectors which are associated to physical spins (see Table II). Accounting for the Ising symmetry of local interactions, since T has 4 low energy configurations, there exists a total of 8 different low-energy vectors, which implies that the simulation requires 4 auxiliary spins.*

The interaction graph of S and simulation assignment are chosen as described in Theorem 74, i.e. G_S is the complete graph on 10 vertices (including all single vertex hyperedges to allow for fields) and sim is provided on the right hand side of Table II. The solution of the resulting linear program is provided in Table I, where we used Eq. (269) and Eq. (271) to rewrite linear combinations of Ising interactions in terms of a single Ising interaction. The shift of the constructed simulation is 3. Even though G_S is chosen to be the complete graph on 10 vertices, after solving the linear program several variables are set to zero. We hence removed the corresponding edges from Fig. 4a.




Figure 20: The alternative crossing gadget, namely S in Section VI C. Its interactions are listed in Table III.

C. Alternative Crossing Gadget

Let us put these ideas in practice: We shall provide a new crossing gadget for the Ising model with fields, with the same functionality as I_{\times}^{δ} (cf. Fig. 14), but notably simpler.

We construct the alternative crossing gadget for cut-off $\delta = 1$; arbitrary cut-offs can be obtained by scaling local interactions and the shift according to Theorem 26.

Consider the spin system T acting on four two-level spins 1, 2, 3, 4, which in the zero energy ground state imposes

$$\vec{t}(1) = \vec{t}(4) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{t}(2) = \vec{t}(3), \quad (293)$$

while all other configurations have energy $\geq \delta = 1$. Any spin system that simulates T with identity encoding and cut-off $\delta = 1$ also satisfies Lemma 70. Given that it also satisfies certain planarity requirements, it can be used as an alternative crossing gadget. Thus, computing an alternative crossing gadget amounts to constructing a simulation of T .

We apply Theorem 72 to construct an Ising system with fields S that simulates T . We choose the interaction graph G_S such that applying S according to Fig. 17 leads to planar interaction graphs. We pick trivial encoding and physical spin assignment. Eq. (293) gives rise to 4 low energy configurations of T which contain 2 of the (up to Ising symmetries) 8 possible low-energy vectors. We thus take S to have 10 spins, 4 physical and 6 auxiliary. Moreover, we define sim as described in Theorem 74, i.e. such that it contains all of the 8 indistinguishable low-energy vectors:

$$\text{sim} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (294)$$

The interaction graph of S is shown in Fig. 20; its local interactions, obtained from solving the corresponding linear program (by [32]) are listed in Table III, where we again used Eq. (269) and Eq. (271). The shift of the resulting simulation is $\Gamma = 36$. Again, we have removed

Fields		Pair interactions	
Spin	Field	Edge	Interaction
1	$2 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$	$\{1, 2\}$	$2 \cdot \pi_2$
2	$4 \cdot \pi_1$	$\{1, 3\}$	$2 \cdot \pi_2$
3	$4 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$	$\{1, 6\}$	$6 \cdot \pi_2$
4	$2 \cdot \pi_1$	$\{1, 9\}$	$2 \cdot \pi_2$
5	$2 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$	$\{2, 7\}$	$6 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$
6	$8 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$	$\{2, 8\}$	$2 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$
7	$8 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$	$\{2, 9\}$	$4 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$
8	$2 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$	$\{3, 4\}$	$2 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$
9	$6 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$	$\{3, 6\}$	$4 \cdot \pi_2$
10	$6 \cdot \bar{\pi}_1$	$\{3, 10\}$	$4 \cdot \pi_2$
		$\{4, 7\}$	$2 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$
		$\{4, 8\}$	$2 \cdot \pi_2$
		$\{4, 10\}$	$4 \cdot \bar{\pi}_2$
		$\{6, 7\}$	$4 \cdot \pi_2$
		$\{6, 9\}$	$6 \cdot \pi_2$
		$\{6, 10\}$	$2 \cdot \pi_2$
		$\{7, 9\}$	$8 \cdot \pi_2$
		$\{7, 10\}$	$2 \cdot \pi_2$

Table III: Local interactions of the alternative crossing gadget of Fig. 20 for cut-off $\delta = 1$. For a simulation with arbitrary cut-off δ , every field and interaction must be multiplied by δ .

those edges which after solving the linear program have zero interactions. Further note that spin 5, in the low energy sector, merely contributes a constant shift. We could thus further simplify S by removing spin 5 and removing its low-energy vector $(2, 2, 2, 2)$ from sim.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

Let us now summarize our main findings (Section VII A), and discuss applications and extensions of the work (Section VII B).

A. Conclusions

Spin system simulations (Definition 8) capture the idea of encoding the low-energy behavior of a target spin system T into the low energy behavior of a source spin system S . Below the cut-off, simulations preserve spectra (Proposition 13) with constant degeneracy (Proposition 12) as well as ground states (Proposition 14). Additionally, simulations approximately preserve thermodynamic quantities, such as the partition function (Proposition 17) and the Boltzmann distribution (Proposition 19). Crucially, the approximation error scales as $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\Delta})$, so that increasing the cut-off allows for arbitrary precision. In addition, common transformations for spin systems (or graphs, in general) are simulations, such as generalized symmetries (Proposition 20, Proposition 21), modifications of spin type (Proposition 22) and graph minor relations (Proposition 24). Finally, simulations are modular, i.e. can be composed (Theorem 25),

scaled (Theorem 26) and added (Theorem 27), so that complicated simulations can be constructed from simple ones.

Spin models (Definition 29) are sets of spin systems and spin model emulations (Definition 35) are efficiently computable simulations between spin models. Most results for simulations extend to emulations; for example, they can also modify the spin type (Proposition 37). Most importantly, they are modular, i.e. can be composed (Theorem 39), scaled (Theorem 40) and added (Theorem 41). We define three properties of spin models: functional completeness (Definition 45), closure (Definition 46 and Definition 48) and scalability (Definition 47) and characterize universality (Definition 44) in terms of them (Theorem 54). Since the characterization is constructive, it provides a step-by-step recipe for the efficient construction of a simulation with arbitrary target spin system T by an arbitrary universal spin model \mathcal{M} . The recipe consists of three parts: (i) we decompose T into a linear combination of flag systems (Lemma 53), (ii) we use Boolean algebra to simulate arbitrary flag systems with linear combinations of flag systems of order 2 (Lemma 52), and (iii) leverage functional completeness, closure and scalability to simulate linear combinations of order 2 flag systems with spin systems from \mathcal{M} (Theorem 54). It heavily relies on the modularity of emulations.

As for the consequences of universality, we show that emulations induce polytime computable reductions for the problems of computing ground states, approximating partition functions, and approximate sampling from Boltzmann distributions (Theorem 57, Theorem 60, Theorem 63, Theorem 66). This means that emulations can be used to construct efficient solutions for these problems, but also that universal spin models are maximally hard for these problems (Corollary 58, Corollary 61, Corollary 64, Corollary 67).

We then show that the 2d Ising model with fields is universal, because it is scalable, functional complete (Lemma 69), locally closed and thus closed (Proposition 49). The main challenge to prove closure are non-planar target systems (Fig. 12), for which we construct a crossing gadget (Lemma 70). This again relies on the modularity of simulations/emulations.

Finally, simulations can be computed by linear programs (Theorem 74). This allows us to construct an alternative, more frugal crossing gadget for the Ising model with fields (Section VI C).

B. Outlook

This framework for simulations/emulations opens several questions, which can be divided into those concerning applications and those concerning extensions.

1. Applications

Quantum annealing. As mentioned in Section IV A, Theorem 57 and Theorem 60 could be applied to quantum optimization. Quantum annealing protocols essentially correspond to emulations $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$, where \mathcal{N} is chosen to correspond to the optimization problem to be solved, $\text{GSE}_{\mathcal{N}}$ (e.g. by following [8]), and \mathcal{M} is chosen so that one can compute $\text{GSE}_{\mathcal{M}}$ via quantum annealing.

Many quantum annealing protocols suffer from exponential, adiabatic time scales [10, 16]. However, it seems to be unclear what precise properties of the emulation lead to such exponential scales. For example, it seems unclear if for fixed target model \mathcal{N} the exponential time scales can be avoided by a clever choice of other data of the emulation, or, conversely, if certain properties of \mathcal{N} unavoidably lead to exponential timescales. In the latter case, such properties are probably preserved by emulations. It would be interesting to use our framework to shed light on these properties. For example, if lattices of large connectivity can be efficiently simulated by 2d lattices and ‘exotic’ many-body interactions can be efficiently simulated by Ising pair interactions and fields the relevant properties cannot solely depend on the connectivity or the type of local interactions since these are clearly not preserved by emulations. Emulations may provide the correct notion of transformation of spin models to extract the relevant properties.

Sampling algorithms. As explained in Section IV C, Theorem 66 may allow to construct algorithms that sample from Boltzmann distributions. Such algorithms are often obtained from Markov chains, which often suffer from exponential mixing times. Yet, what properties of spin models lead to exponential mixing times seems to be poorly understood. Theorem 66 seems to indicate that such properties are preserved by emulation; the latter could thus be used to isolate these properties.

Weaker types of universality. Not surprisingly, universal spin models are computationally maximally hard (Section IV), so we cannot expect to solve a computational problem of \mathcal{N} by simulating it with a universal model. We might however consider the converse situation: Given a spin model \mathcal{M} and an algorithm to solve a computational problem of \mathcal{M} , we can extend this algorithm to all spin models $\mathcal{N} \in \text{Reach}(\mathcal{M})$, i.e. all those spin models that can be emulated by \mathcal{M} .

While $\text{Reach}(\mathcal{M})$ may be hard to characterize for a generic \mathcal{M} , we may be able to lower bound it by considering weaker types of universality, as follows. For a set of spin systems $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\text{all}}$, call \mathcal{M} α -universal if $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}$, and characterize it similarly to Theorem 54, i.e. by properties weaker than functional completeness, closure and scalability. Deciding whether $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha} \subseteq \text{Reach}(\mathcal{M})$ amounts to checking if \mathcal{M} is α -universal which then could be done by this characterization. If the characterization of α -universality is constructive, this yields algorithms for all spin models \mathcal{N} which are subsets of \mathcal{S}_{α} .

2. Extensions

Emulation and universality classes. Spin models are often used to describe phase transitions. In many cases, the nature of their thermodynamic quantities at the phase transition does not depend on details of their definition, but can be grouped in so-called universality classes [33].

Several of the thermodynamic quantities which might determine the universality class of a spin model can be obtained from its partition functions. Since emulation approximately preserves partition functions, it would be interesting to study if it also preserves universality classes. Given an emulation $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$, denote by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ the submodel of \mathcal{M} consisting of those systems which are used in the emulation of \mathcal{N} . If \mathcal{N} belongs to universality class ι , does $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}}$ also belong to ι ?

If this is the case, it would follow that a universal spin model contains submodels from all universality classes. We would thereby obtain a new theory of universality classes in terms of submodels of \mathcal{M} . In addition, studying if emulation preserves universality classes may lead to a refinement of the very notion of emulation.

A related question is how our notion of emulation extends to the thermodynamic limit. Particularly, one could study the approximation errors of the partition function and Boltzmann distribution in this limit.

Alternative gadgets. In the proof of closure of the 2d Ising model with fields, the crossing gadget is essential to overcome the constraint of planar interaction graphs. What gadgets are required to overcome other constraints on the interaction hypergraphs of a spin model?

Consider a spin model \mathcal{M} defined by a set of local interactions \mathcal{J} and a set of allowed interaction graphs \mathcal{G} . Assume that \mathcal{G} is specified in terms of a graph property P , namely \mathcal{G} contains all graphs that satisfy P , e.g. all planar graphs or all loop-free graphs. Then proving closure of \mathcal{M} amounts to constructing a set of gadgets S_1, \dots, S_n from \mathcal{M} that suffice to overcome the constraint P . If \mathcal{J} stands for Ising interactions and P for planarity, the relevant gadget is the crossing gadget from Section V. For other graph properties such as loop-free interaction graphs, it is less clear how the corresponding gadgets can be characterized.

We expect that the relevant gadgets can be characterized as follows: Given the graph property P , one can derive a set of graphs G_1, \dots, G_n that encode how a generic graph fails to satisfy P . The gadgets are precisely simulations of all spin systems (with interactions from \mathcal{J}) which can be defined on these graphs. For example, for planarity, G_1 is the graph containing two (crossing) edges, and the crossing gadget from Section V suffices for closure since it can be used to simulate all Ising system defined on G_1 (Lemma 70). We also expect that G_1, \dots, G_n can be extracted from the forbidden minor characterization (by the Robertson–Seymour theorem) of P . This would allow to characterize closure in terms of the existence of

gadgets for the appropriate graph property, and thereby improve the characterization of universality.

Widening the scope. It should be possible to reproduce the characterization of universality of Theorem 54 in contexts other than spin systems/models, possibly by first translating it to a more abstract language [13]. These could include continuous spin variables, quantum spin systems (cf. [34]) and spin systems with couplings drawn from a probability distribution, as in spin glasses. This would allow to study emulations in other contexts as well as their potential modularity and universality. Ultimately, it may shed light on our understanding of the (surprising) nature and scope of universality.

Acknowledgements. We thank Sebastian Stengele for discussions on the early stages of this work. We also thank William Slofstra for bringing [15] to our attention, and Roger Melko for pointing out high to low temperature dualities. We acknowledge support of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) via the START Prize (project Y1261-N). For open access purposes, the authors have applied a CC BY public copyright license to any accepted manuscript version arising from this submission.

Appendix A: Proofs for Modularity of Simulation

In Section II C we stated that simulations can be composed (Theorem 25) and added (Theorem 25). Let us prove these claims, respectively, in Appendix A 1 and Appendix A 2.

1. Simulations Can Be Composed

To prove Theorem 25 we show that the definition of $g \circ f$ satisfies the five conditions of Definition 8.

1. Disjoint physical spins. We need to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{g \circ f}^{(m_2, m_1)}(v) &= P_{g \circ f}^{(n_2, n_1)}(v') \Rightarrow \\ &\Rightarrow m_i = n_i \text{ and } v = v'. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Inserting the definition of $P_{g \circ f}$ the left hand side of this implication becomes

$$P_g^{(m_2)} \circ P_f^{(m_1)}(v) = P_g^{(n_2)} \circ P_f^{(n_1)}(v'). \quad (\text{A2})$$

Since g has disjoint physical spins, this implies that $m_2 = n_2$ and

$$P_f^{(m_1)}(v) = P_f^{(n_1)}(v'). \quad (\text{A3})$$

Since also f has disjoint physical spins, we conclude that $m_1 = n_1$ and $v = v'$, which proves the claim.

2. Decode-encode compatibility. We need to prove that

$$\text{dec}_{g \circ f} \circ (\text{enc}_{g \circ f})_{i,j} = \text{id}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Inserting the definition of $\text{dec}_{g \circ f}$ and $\text{enc}_{g \circ f}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dec}_{g \circ f} \circ (\text{enc}_{g \circ f})_{i,j} &= \text{dec}_f(\text{dec}_g \circ (\text{enc}_g)_i \circ (\text{enc}_f)_j^{(1)}, \\ &\dots, \text{dec}_g \circ (\text{enc}_g)_i \circ (\text{enc}_f)_j^{(k_1)}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Using decode-encode compatibility of g the right hand side becomes

$$\text{dec}_f((\text{enc}_f)_j^{(1)}, \dots, (\text{enc}_f)_j^{(k_1)}) = \text{dec}_f \circ (\text{enc}_f)_j, \quad (\text{A6})$$

which by decode-encode compatibility of f equals id.

3. Disjoint encodings. We need to prove that

$$(\text{enc}_{g \circ f})_{i,j}(s) = (\text{enc}_{g \circ f})_{k,l}(s) \Rightarrow (i, j) = (k, l). \quad (\text{A7})$$

By definition of $\text{enc}_{g \circ f}$ the left hand side implies that for all $n \in [k_1]$

$$(\text{enc}_g)_i \circ (\text{enc}_f)_j^{(n)}(s) = (\text{enc}_g)_k \circ (\text{enc}_f)_l^{(n)}(s). \quad (\text{A8})$$

Applying dec_g to both sides implies

$$(\text{enc}_f)_j(s) = (\text{enc}_f)_l(s). \quad (\text{A9})$$

Since f has disjoint encodings this implies $j = l$. Reinserting this into Eq. (A8) and using that g has disjoint encodings finally implies $i = k$.

4. Constant degeneracy. We have to prove if $H_T(\vec{t}) < \Delta_{g \circ f}$, then for all i, j , $|(\text{sim}_{g \circ f})_{i,j}(\vec{t})| = d_{g \circ f}$. We split the proof in two parts. First, we prove that

$$(\text{sim}_{g \circ f})_{i,j}(\vec{t}) = \{\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r}) \mid \vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_f)_j(\vec{t})\} \quad (\text{A10})$$

and then, prove that for low-energy configurations $|(\text{sim}_{g \circ f})_{i,j}(\vec{t})| = d_{g \circ f}$.

Starting with the first part, let $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r})$ with $\vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_f)_j(\vec{t})$. Then by definition of $P_{g \circ f}^{(m,n)}$ we have

$$\vec{s} \circ P_{g \circ f}^{(m,n)} = \vec{s} \circ P_g^{(m)} \circ P_f^{(n)} = (\text{enc}_g)_i^{(m)} \circ \vec{r} \circ P_f^{(n)}, \quad (\text{A11})$$

where the last equality holds since $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r})$. Similarly, since $\vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_f)_j(\vec{t})$ we get

$$(\text{enc}_g)_i^{(m)} \circ \vec{r} \circ P_f^{(n)} = (\text{enc}_g)_i^{(m)} \circ (\text{enc}_f)_j^{(n)} \circ \vec{t}, \quad (\text{A12})$$

which in total shows that

$$\vec{s} \circ P_{g \circ f} = (\text{enc}_{g \circ f})_{i,j} \circ \vec{t}. \quad (\text{A13})$$

Moreover, since $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r})$ we have

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma_g = H_R(\vec{r}) < \Delta_g \quad (\text{A14})$$

and since $\vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t})$

$$H_R(\vec{r}) - \Gamma_\ell = H_T(\vec{t}) < \Delta_\ell \quad (\text{A15})$$

and hence

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma_{g \circ \ell} = H_T(\vec{t}) < \min(\Delta_\ell, \Delta_g - \Gamma_\ell) = \Delta_{g \circ \ell}. \quad (\text{A16})$$

Thus, we have shown that

$$(\text{sim}_{g \circ \ell})_{i,j}(\vec{t}) \supseteq \{\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r}) \mid \vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t})\} \quad (\text{A17})$$

Conversely, if $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_{g \circ \ell})_{i,j}(\vec{t})$ then

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma_{g \circ \ell} < \Delta_{g \circ \ell}, \quad (\text{A18})$$

which implies that

$$H_S(\vec{s}) - \Gamma_g < \Delta_g \quad (\text{A19})$$

and hence that $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r})$ for some i and \vec{r} . Note that this \vec{r} can be obtained via

$$\vec{r} = \text{dec}_g \circ \vec{s} \circ \text{P}_g \quad (\text{A20})$$

Since \vec{s} satisfies

$$\vec{s} \circ \text{P}_g^{(m)} \circ \text{P}_\ell^{(n)} = (\text{enc}_g)_i^{(m)} \circ (\text{enc}_\ell)_j^{(n)} \circ \vec{t}, \quad (\text{A21})$$

applying dec_g to both sides and inserting (A20) we find

$$\vec{r} \circ \text{P}_\ell^{(n)} = (\text{enc}_\ell)_j^{(n)} \circ \vec{t}. \quad (\text{A22})$$

Finally, (A18) also implies that

$$H_R(\vec{r}) - \Gamma_\ell < \Delta_\ell \quad (\text{A23})$$

and hence $\vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t})$, which shows that

$$(\text{sim}_{g \circ \ell})_{i,j}(\vec{t}) \subseteq \{\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r}) \mid \vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t})\}. \quad (\text{A24})$$

This completes the proof of the first part, Eq. (A10).

We continue with the second part, proving that for low-energy configurations $|(\text{sim}_{g \circ \ell})_{i,j}(\vec{t})| = d_{g \circ \ell}$. First, the right hand side of (A10) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r}) \mid \vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t})\} = \\ & = \bigcup_{\vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t})} (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A25})$$

where by Eq. (A20) the union is disjoint so

$$|(\text{sim}_{g \circ \ell})_{i,j}(\vec{t})| = \sum_{\vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t})} |(\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r})|. \quad (\text{A26})$$

As argued before, for $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r})$ with $\vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t})$ and $H_T(\vec{t}) < \Delta_\ell$ we have $H_R(\vec{r}) < \Delta_g$ so since ℓ and g satisfy condition 4

$$|(\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t})| = d_\ell \quad (\text{A27})$$

and for all $\vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t})$

$$|(\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r})| = d_g, \quad (\text{A28})$$

so in total

$$|(\text{sim}_{g \circ \ell})_{i,j}(\vec{t})| = d_\ell \cdot d_g = d_{g \circ \ell}. \quad (\text{A29})$$

5. Matching energies. By Eq. (A10), if $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_{g \circ \ell})_{i,j}(\vec{t})$ then $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r})$ for some $\vec{r} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_j(\vec{t})$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} H_S(\vec{s}) &= H_R(\vec{r}) + \Gamma_g = \\ &= H_T(\vec{t}) + \Gamma_\ell + \Gamma_g = H_T(\vec{t}) + \Gamma_{g \circ \ell}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A30})$$

What remains to be shown is that $\forall \vec{s} \notin \text{Sim}_{g \circ \ell}$,

$$H_S(\vec{s}) \geq \Delta_{g \circ \ell} + \Gamma_{g \circ \ell}. \quad (\text{A31})$$

First, note that $\vec{s} \notin \text{Sim}_{g \circ \ell}$ if and only if either $\vec{s} \notin \text{Sim}_g$ or $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{r})$ with $\vec{r} \notin \text{Sim}_\ell$. In the first case, we have

$$H_S(\vec{s}) \geq \Delta_g + \Gamma_g = \Delta_g - \Gamma_\ell + \Gamma_{g \circ \ell} \geq \Delta_{g \circ \ell} + \Gamma_{g \circ \ell}. \quad (\text{A32})$$

In the second case, we have

$$H_S(\vec{s}) = H_R(\vec{r}) + \Gamma_g \geq \Delta_\ell + \Gamma_\ell + \Gamma_g = \Delta_{g \circ \ell} + \Gamma_{g \circ \ell}, \quad (\text{A33})$$

which finishes the proof.

2. Simulations Can Be Added

We prove Theorem 27 by showing that the definition of $\ell + g$ satisfies the five conditions of Definition 8.

1. Disjoint physical spins. We have to prove that

$$\text{P}_{\ell+g}^{(i)}(t) = \text{P}_{\ell+g}^{(j)}(t') \Rightarrow i = j \text{ and } t = t'. \quad (\text{A34})$$

By definition of $\text{P}_{\ell+g}$ we have

$$\text{P}_{\ell+g}|_{V_{T_1}} = \text{P}_\ell. \quad (\text{A35})$$

Since by assumption 2, $\text{P}_\ell, \text{P}_g$ agree on the overlap of T_1 and T_2 we also have

$$\text{P}_{\ell+g}|_{V_{T_2}} = \text{P}_g. \quad (\text{A36})$$

Hence, if either $t, t' \in V_{T_1}$ or $t, t' \in V_{T_2}$, $\text{P}_{\ell+g}$ satisfies condition 1, since so do P_ℓ and P_g . We finish proof of condition 1 by proving that there is no third case, i.e. by proving that t, t' satisfy the left hand side of Eq. (A34) only if either $t, t' \in V_{T_1}$ or $t, t' \in V_{T_2}$. More precisely, we show that

$$\text{Im}(\text{P}_{\ell+g}|_{V_{T_1} \setminus V_{T_2}}) \subseteq V_{S_1} \setminus V_{S_2} \quad (\text{A37})$$

and

$$\text{Im}(\text{P}_{\ell+g}|_{V_{T_2} \setminus V_{T_1}}) \subseteq V_{S_2} \setminus V_{S_1}. \quad (\text{A38})$$

To prove Eq. (A37), assume there exists $t \in V_{T_1} \setminus V_{T_2}$ with

$$\text{P}_{\ell+g}^{(i)}(t) = \text{P}_\ell^{(i)}(t) \in V_{S_1} \cap V_{S_2}. \quad (\text{A39})$$

By assumption 3, there exists $r \in V_{T_1} \cap V_{T_2}$ and $l \in \{1, \dots, k_1\}$ with

$$P_\ell^{(l)}(r) = P_\ell^{(i)}(t) \quad (\text{A40})$$

Since $t \notin V_{T_2}$ it must hold that $t \neq r$ but since P_ℓ has disjoint physical spins, i.e. satisfies Definition 8 1 it must be that $t = r$. Thus there exist no such t . Similarly, Eq. (A38) holds since P_g satisfies Definition 8 1.

2. *Decode-encode compatibility.* We have to prove that

$$\text{dec}_{\ell+g} \circ (\text{enc}_{\ell+g})_i = \text{id}. \quad (\text{A41})$$

By definition $\text{dec}_{\ell+g} = \text{dec}_\ell$ and $\text{enc}_{\ell+g} = \text{enc}_\ell \cap \text{enc}_g$. Since $\text{dec}_\ell, \text{enc}_\ell$ satisfy condition 2, so do $\text{dec}_{\ell+g}, \text{enc}_{\ell+g}$.

3. *Disjoint encodings.* We have to prove that

$$(\text{enc}_{\ell+g})_i(s) = (\text{enc}_{\ell+g})_j(s) \Rightarrow i = j. \quad (\text{A42})$$

Since $\text{enc}_{\ell+g} = \text{enc}_\ell \cap \text{enc}_g$ and enc_ℓ satisfies condition 3 so does $\text{enc}_{\ell+g}$.

4. *Constant degeneracy.* We have to prove that if $H_{T_1+T_2}(\vec{t}) < \Delta_{\ell+g}$ then $|\text{sim}_{\ell+g}(\vec{t})| = d_{\ell+g}$. We split the proof into two parts. First, we characterize $(\text{sim}_{\ell+g})_i(\vec{t})$ for low energy configurations \vec{t} and then, using this characterization, we prove that $|(\text{sim}_{\ell+g})_i(\vec{t})| = d_{\ell+g}$.

Let $q_S := q_{S_1} = q_{S_2}$ and $\vec{s}_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{S_1}, \vec{s}_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{S_2}$, we define $\vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{S_1+S_2}$ by

$$(\vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2)(v) := \begin{cases} \vec{s}_1(v) & \text{if } v \in V_{S_1} \\ \vec{s}_2(v) & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A43})$$

Furthermore, for $(\text{enc}_{\ell+g})_i \in \text{enc}_{\ell+g}$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{t}) &:= \{\vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2 \mid \\ &\vec{s}_1 \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_{i_1}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_1}}), \vec{s}_2 \in (\text{sim}_g)_{i_2}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_2}})\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A44})$$

where i_1, i_2 are such that

$$(\text{enc}_\ell)_{i_1} = (\text{enc}_{\ell+g})_i = (\text{enc}_g)_{i_2}. \quad (\text{A45})$$

We now prove that if $H_{T_1+T_2}(\vec{t}) < \Delta_{\ell+g}$ then

$$(\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{t}) = (\text{sim}_{\ell+g})_i(\vec{t}). \quad (\text{A46})$$

We start with the \subseteq inclusion. Let $\vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2 \in (\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{t})$ and $v \in V_{T_1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} (\vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2) \circ P_{\ell+g}(v) &= \vec{s}_1 \circ P_\ell(v) = \\ &= (\text{enc}_\ell)_{i_1} \circ \vec{t}(v) = (\text{enc}_{\ell+g})_i \circ \vec{t}(v), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A47})$$

where the last equality holds since $\vec{s}_1 \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_{i_1}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_1}})$.

Similarly, for $v \in V_{T_2} \setminus V_{T_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2) \circ P_{\ell+g}(v) &= \vec{s}_2 \circ P_g(v) = \\ &= (\text{enc}_g)_{i_2} \circ \vec{t}(v) = (\text{enc}_{\ell+g})_i \circ \vec{t}(v), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A48})$$

where for the first equality, we additionally used by Eq. (A38) in this case $P_{\ell+g}(v) \in V_{S_2} \setminus V_{S_1}$. Therefore, in total

$$(\vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2) \circ P_{\ell+g} = (\text{enc}_{\ell+g})_i \circ \vec{t}. \quad (\text{A49})$$

Next, if $v \in V_{S_1} \cap V_{S_2}$ then, by assumption,

$$v = P_\ell^{(l)}(t) = P_g^{(l)}(t) \quad (\text{A50})$$

for some $t \in V_{T_1} \cap V_{T_2}$ and $l \in \{1, \dots, k_1\}$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} (\vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2)(v) &= \vec{s}_1(v) = \vec{s}_1 \circ P_\ell^{(l)}(t) = \\ &= (\text{enc}_{\ell+g})_i^{(l)} \circ \vec{t}(t) = \vec{s}_2 \circ P_g^{(l)}(t) = \vec{s}_2(v), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A51})$$

i.e. \vec{s}_1 and \vec{s}_2 agree on the overlap $V_{S_1} \cap V_{S_2}$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} H_{S_1+S_2}(\vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2) &= H_{S_1}(\vec{s}_1) + H_{S_2}(\vec{s}_2) \\ &= H_{T_1}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_1}}) + \Gamma_\ell + H_{T_2}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_2}}) + \Gamma_g \\ &= H_{T_1+T_2}(\vec{t}) + \Gamma_{\ell+g} \\ &< \Delta_{\ell+g} + \Gamma_{\ell+g}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A52})$$

In total this proves that

$$(\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{t}) \subseteq ((\text{sim}_{\ell+g})_i(\vec{t})). \quad (\text{A53})$$

Next, we prove the \supseteq inclusion. Let $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_{\ell+g})_i(\vec{t})$ and $t \in V_{T_1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{s}|_{V_{S_1}} \circ P_\ell(t) &= \vec{s} \circ P_{\ell+g}(t) = \\ &= (\text{enc}_{\ell+g})_i \circ \vec{t} = (\text{enc}_\ell)_{i_1} \circ \vec{t}|_{V_{T_1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A54})$$

Similarly, if $t \in V_{T_2}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{s}|_{V_{S_2}} \circ P_g(t) &= \vec{s} \circ P_{\ell+g}(t) = \\ &= (\text{enc}_{\ell+g})_i \circ \vec{t} = (\text{enc}_g)_{i_2} \circ \vec{t}|_{V_{T_2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A55})$$

Since by assumption $H_{S_1+S_2}(\vec{s}) < \Delta_{\ell+g} + \Gamma_{\ell+g}$ we in particular find that

$$H_{S_1}(\vec{s}|_{V_{S_1}}) < \Delta_\ell + \Gamma_\ell, \quad (\text{A56})$$

where we used that by Proposition 13

$$H_{S_2} - \Gamma_g > 0. \quad (\text{A57})$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$H_{S_2}(\vec{s}|_{V_{S_2}}) < \Delta_g + \Gamma_g. \quad (\text{A58})$$

Thus, we have shown that $\vec{s}|_{V_{S_1}} \in (\text{sim}_\ell)_{i_1}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_1}})$ and $\vec{s}|_{V_{S_2}} \in (\text{sim}_g)_{i_2}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_2}})$ Finally, by definition

$$\vec{s} = \vec{s}|_{V_{S_1}} + \vec{s}|_{V_{S_2}}, \quad (\text{A59})$$

so we conclude

$$\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_g)_i(\vec{t}) \quad (\text{A60})$$

and hence

$$(\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_q)_i(\vec{t}) \supseteq (\text{sim}_{\ell+q})_i(\vec{t}). \quad (\text{A61})$$

In contrast to (A53), this inclusion is independent of the assumption $H_{T_1+T_2}(\vec{t}) < \Delta_{\ell+q}$.

To finish the prove of condition 4, using Eq. (A46) we prove that for low energy configurations $|(\text{sim}_{\ell+q})_i(\vec{t})| = d_{\ell+q}$. First, by Eq. (A46) we have

$$|(\text{sim}_{\ell+q})_i(\vec{t})| = |(\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_q)_i(\vec{t})|. \quad (\text{A62})$$

Note that two configurations

$$\vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2, \vec{s}'_1 + \vec{s}'_2 \in (\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_q)_i(\vec{t}) \quad (\text{A63})$$

are different if and only if either $\vec{s}_1 \neq \vec{s}'_1$ or $\vec{s}_2 \neq \vec{s}'_2$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |(\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_q)_i(\vec{t})| &= \\ &= |(\text{sim}_\ell)_{i_1}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_1}})| \cdot |(\text{sim}_q)_{i_2}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_2}})| = d_{\ell+q}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A64})$$

5. Matching energies. By (A61), if $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_{\ell+q})_i(\vec{t})$ for any target configuration \vec{t} , then $\vec{s} = \vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2$ for some

$\vec{s}_1 + \vec{s}_2 \in (\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_q)(\vec{t})$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} H_{S_1+S_2}(\vec{s}) &= H_{S_1}(\vec{s}_1) + H_{S_2}(\vec{s}_2) \\ &= H_{T_1}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_1}}) + \Gamma_\ell + H_{T_2}(\vec{t}|_{V_{T_2}}) + \Gamma_q \quad (\text{A65}) \\ &= H_{T_1+T_2}(\vec{t}) + \Gamma_{\ell+q} \end{aligned}$$

If, on the other hand, $\vec{s} \notin \text{Sim}_{\ell+q}$, then either $\vec{s} \in (\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_q)_i(\vec{t})$ for $H_{T_1+T_2}(\vec{t}) \geq \Delta_{\ell+q}$ or for all i, \vec{t} , $\vec{s} \notin (\text{sim}_\ell + \text{sim}_q)_i(\vec{t})$. In the first case we have

$$H_{S_1+S_2}(\vec{s}) = H_{T_1+T_2}(\vec{t}) + \Gamma_{\ell+q} \geq \Delta_{\ell+q} + \Gamma_{\ell+q}. \quad (\text{A66})$$

In the second case, either $\vec{s}|_{V_{S_1}} \notin \text{Sim}_\ell$ and/or $\vec{s}|_{V_{S_2}} \notin \text{Sim}_q$. If $\vec{s}|_{V_{S_1}} \notin \text{Sim}_\ell$, since ℓ satisfies condition 5, $H_{S_1}(\vec{s}|_{V_{S_1}}) - \Gamma_\ell \geq \Delta_\ell$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} H_{S_1+S_2}(\vec{s}) - \Gamma_{\ell+q} &\geq \Delta_\ell + H_{S_2}(\vec{s}|_{V_{S_2}}) - \Gamma_q > \\ &> \Delta_\ell \geq \Delta_{\ell+q}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A67})$$

using again that by Proposition 13, $H_{S_2} - \Gamma_q > 0$. The other cases, $\vec{s}|_{V_{S_2}} \notin \text{Sim}_q$, can be treated similarly. In total, if $\vec{s} \notin \text{Sim}_{\ell+q}$ then $H_{S_1+S_2}(\vec{s}) > \Delta_{\ell+q} + \Gamma_{\ell+q}$.

-
- [1] G. De las Cuevas and T. S. Cubitt, Simple universal models capture all classical spin physics, *Science* **351**, 1180 (2016).
- [2] J. B. Kogut, An introduction to lattice gauge theories and spin systems, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **51**, 659 (1979).
- [3] R. Solé and S. F. Elena, *Viruses as complex adaptive systems* (Princeton University Press, 2019).
- [4] S. Stengele, D. Drexel, and G. De las Cuevas, Classical spin Hamiltonians are context-sensitive languages, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **479**, 20220553 (2023), 2006.03529.
- [5] T. Reinhart and G. De las Cuevas, The grammar of the Ising model: A new complexity hierarchy, (2022), arXiv:2208.08301.
- [6] E. DeGiuli, Random Language Model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 128301 (2019).
- [7] F. Barahona, On the computational complexity of ising spin glass models, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **15**, 3241 (1982).
- [8] A. Lucas, Ising formulations of many NP problems, *Frontiers in Physics* **2**, 1 (2014).
- [9] W. Lechner, P. Hauke, and P. Zoller, A quantum annealing architecture with all-to-all connectivity from local interactions, *Science Advances* **1**, e1500838 (2015).
- [10] M.-T. Nguyen, J.-G. Liu, J. Wurtz, M. D. Lukin, S.-T. Wang, and H. Pichler, Quantum Optimization with Arbitrary Connectivity Using Rydberg Atom Arrays, *Physical Review X Quantum* **4**, 010316 (2023).
- [11] F. J. Wegner, Duality in Generalized Ising Models and Phase Transitions without Local Order Parameter, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **12**, 2259 (1971).
- [12] T. Kohler and T. S. Cubitt, Translationally invariant universal classical Hamiltonians, *JSTAT* **176**, 228.
- [13] T. Gonda, T. Reinhart, S. Stengele, and G. De les Coves, A framework for universality in physics, computer science and beyond, *Compositionality* (to appear) (2024), arXiv:2307.06851.
- [14] R. V. Solé and B. Goodwin, *Signs of Life: How Complexity Pervades Biology* (Basic Books, 2000).
- [15] M. Shamos, *Computational Geometry*, Ph.D. thesis, Yale University (1978).
- [16] S. Ebadi, A. Keesling, M. Cain, T. T. Wang, H. Levine, D. Bluvstein, G. Semeghini, A. Omran, J.-G. Liu, R. Samajdar, X.-Z. Luo, B. Nash, X. Gao, B. Barak, E. Farhi, S. Sachdev, N. Gemelke, L. Zhou, S. Choi, H. Pichler, S.-T. Wang, M. Greiner, V. Vuletić, and M. D. Lukin, Quantum optimization of maximum independent set using Rydberg atom arrays, *Science* **376**, 1209 (2022).
- [17] C. Moore and S. Mertens, *The Nature of Computation* (Oxford University Press, 2011).
- [18] R. Pruim and I. Wegener, *Complexity Theory: Exploring the Limits of Efficient Algorithms* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005).
- [19] A. Sly and N. Sun, The computational hardness of counting in two-spin models on d-regular graphs, in *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 2012) p. 361.
- [20] M. R. Jerrum, L. G. Valiant, and V. V. Vazirani, Random generation of combinatorial structures from a uniform distribution, *Theoretical Computer Science* **43**, 169 (1986).
- [21] A. Sinclair and M. Jerrum, Approximate counting, uniform generation and rapidly mixing markov chains, *Information and Computation* **82**, 93 (1989).

- [22] V. Kolmogorov, A faster approximation algorithm for the Gibbs partition function, in *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*, Vol. 75 (PMLR, 2018) p. 228.
- [23] D. Stefankovic, S. Vempala, and E. Vigoda, Adaptive simulated annealing: A near-optimal connection between sampling and counting, in *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'07)* (2007) p. 183.
- [24] R. J. Glauber, Time-Dependent Statistics of the Ising Model, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **4**, 294 (1963).
- [25] J. Ding, E. Lubetzky, and Y. Peres, The Mixing Time Evolution of Glauber Dynamics for the Mean-Field Ising Model, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **289**, 725 (2009).
- [26] J. Ding and Y. Peres, Mixing time for the Ising model: A uniform lower bound for all graphs, *Annales De L Institut Henri Poincare-probabilites Et Statistiques* **47**, 1020 (2009).
- [27] N. Le Roux and Y. Bengio, Representational power of restricted Boltzmann machines and deep belief networks, *Neural Computation* **20**, 1631 (2008).
- [28] T. Reinhart and G. De les Coves, Spin model universality implies universal approximation of restricted boltzmann machines, in preparation (2024).
- [29] G. Burosch and J.-M. Laborde, Characterization of grid graphs, *Discrete Mathematics* **87**, 85 (1991).
- [30] R. Tamassia and I. Tollis, Planar grid embedding in linear time, *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems* **36**, 1230 (1989).
- [31] L. Trevisan, G. B. Sorkin, M. Sudan, and D. P. Williamson, Gadgets, approximation, and linear programming, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **29**, 2074 (2000).
- [32] Google or-tools glop solver v9.9 (2024-05-07).
- [33] H. Nishimori and G. Ortiz, *Elements of Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena* (Oxford University Press, USA, 2011).
- [34] T. S. Cubitt, A. Montanaro, and S. Piddock, Universal quantum Hamiltonians, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **38**, 9497 (2018).