

# A mathematical framework for quantum Hamiltonian simulation and duality

Harriet Apel <sup>\*</sup>      Toby Cubitt <sup>†</sup>

*Department of Computer Science, University College London, UK*

## Abstract

Analogue Hamiltonian simulation is a promising near-term application of quantum computing and has recently been put on a theoretical footing alongside experiencing wide-ranging experimental success. These ideas are qualitatively similar to the notion of duality in physics, whereby two superficially different theories are mathematically equivalent in some precise sense. However, existing characterisations of Hamiltonian simulations are not sufficiently general to extend to all dualities in physics. In particular, they cannot encompass the important cases of strong/weak and high-temperature/low-temperature dualities. In this work, we give three physically justified axiomatisations of duality, formulated respectively in terms of observables, partition functions and entropies. We prove that these axiomatisations are equivalent, and characterise the mathematical form that any duality satisfying these axioms must take. A building block is a strengthening of earlier results on entropy-preserving maps – extensions of Wigner’s celebrated theorem – to maps that are entropy-preserving up to an additive constant. We show such maps decompose as a direct sum of unitary and anti-unitary components conjugated by a further unitary, a result that may be of independent mathematical interest.

---

<sup>\*</sup> [harriet.apel.19@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:harriet.apel.19@ucl.ac.uk)

<sup>†</sup> [t.cubitt@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:t.cubitt@ucl.ac.uk)

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Previous Work . . . . .	4
1.2	Motivating example: the Kramer-Wannier duality . . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Main results</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Measurement duality . . . . .	7
2.2	Partition function duality . . . . .	8
2.3	Entropic duality . . . . .	9
2.4	Duality equivalence and characterisation . . . . .	10
<b>3</b>	<b>Proofs</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1	Notation and terminology . . . . .	12
3.2	Equivalence of measurement and partition function axiomatisations	12
3.3	Equivalence of measurement and entropic axiomatisations . . . . .	14
3.4	Characterisation of duality maps . . . . .	19
<b>4</b>	<b>Map on states</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Approximate dualities</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Properties of dualities</b>	<b>28</b>
6.1	Similar mappings . . . . .	28
6.2	Composition . . . . .	29
6.3	Physical properties . . . . .	32
6.3.1	Measurement outcomes . . . . .	33
6.3.2	Thermal properties . . . . .	33
6.3.3	Time dynamics . . . . .	34
	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Vanishing off-diagonal matrix elements</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Matching up of spectra</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Alternative convexity axiom</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Kramers-Wannier duality</b>	<b>40</b>
D.1	Low temperature expansion . . . . .	40
D.2	High temperature expansion . . . . .	40
D.3	Free energy duality . . . . .	41
D.4	In this framework . . . . .	43

# 1 Introduction

Duality is a deep straining running throughout physics. Any two systems that are related can be described as being “dual” in some sense, up to the strictest sense of duality where all information about one system is recoverable on the other. Calculations or predictions in one theory might be simplified by first mapping to the dual theory, given there is a rigorous relationship between the points of interest. Strong-weak dualities are a common example of this, allowing well-understood perturbation techniques to be leveraged in high energy regimes by considering the dual weak theory [Bax89; Hoo93; Sus95; MO77].

In the near-term, there is hope of using quantum computers as analogue simulators to study certain physical properties of quantum many-body systems. In analogue simulation the Hamiltonian of interest,  $H(t)$ , is engineered with a physical system that is then allowed to time evolve continuously. This is in contrast to digital simulation where the time evolution is mapped to quantum circuits – for example via Trotterisation – which likely requires a scalable, fault tolerant quantum computer [Llo57]. It is believed that analogue simulators without error correction could be sufficient to study interesting physics and this has seen varying experimental success with trapped ions [PC], cold atoms in optical lattices [JZ04], liquid and solid state NMR [PS10], superconducting circuits [HTK12] etc. These artificial systems allow for improved control and simplified measurements compared to in situ materials, providing a promising use for noisy intermediate scale devices.

What it means for one system to “simulate” or “be dual to” another is an important theoretical question, which has only recently begun to be explored. [BH14] and later [CMP19] gave formal definitions of simulation. Cubitt et al. used this mathematical framework of analogue simulation to demonstrate certain “universal” spin-lattice models that are able to simulate any quantum many-body system by tuning the interaction parameters. These works consider the strongest possible definition of a duality: all relevant physical properties are recoverable on the simulator system including measurement outcomes, the partition function and time evolution. While this strengthens [CMP19]’s main result – since their universal models can simulate any quantum many-body system in this strictest possible sense – it rules out potentially interesting scenarios where the relationship between the systems’ properties is more subtle.

The aim of this work is to embark on a generalised framework of analogue simulation and duality by characterising the maps that link dual systems. The constraints on these maps should be physically motivated and encompass [CMP19] as a special case, while allowing for more general types of duality. In particular, physical observables in dual systems should be allowed to be related up to a scaling factor. This direction of relaxation is inspired by considering examples of duality studied in physics including the AdS/CFT holographic duality and the Kramer-Wannier duality [Bax89]. It is also important to consider how errors in these maps will affect observable properties if this is to be applied practically.

The following section of this paper gives an overview of key previous works presents the Kramer-Wannier duality as an example of a strong-weak duality that does not fit into the framework in [CMP19] but is encompassed by this work. We then present our main results. The full mathematical proofs of the main results are given in Section 3. Section 4 characterises the corresponding

map on states before more practical dualities are considered with approximate mappings into subspaces defined in Section 5. Finally Section 6 explores the properties of the exact and approximate duality maps, including how the errors in approximate dualities translate to physical observables and propagate under composition.

## 1.1 Previous Work

This work uses some results and techniques from [CMP19] in order to build up a more general framework. This section is a brief overview of some key results and definitions that are relevant to our investigation, highlighting the constraints that this work later generalises.

Encoding maps,  $\mathcal{E}$ , are at the core of [CMP19]’s simulations. These maps encode all observables,  $A$ , on the target Hamiltonian system as observables,  $A' = \mathcal{E}(A)$ , on the simulator Hamiltonian system and are the most restrictive simulations concerning Hamiltonians in finite dimensional Hilbert spaces. The authors give a long list of operational requirements that the encoding map should satisfy in order to exactly reproduce all physical properties of the target system in the absence of errors:

- I Any observable,  $A$  on the target system corresponds to an observable on the simulator system so the map must preserve Hermiticity,  $\mathcal{E}(A) = \mathcal{E}(A)^\dagger$ ;
- II  $\mathcal{E}(A)$  preserves the outcomes, and therefore eigenvalues, of any measurement  $A$ :  $\text{spec}[\mathcal{E}(A)] = \text{spec}[A]$ ;
- III The encoding is real linear,  $\mathcal{E}(\sum_i \alpha_i h_i) = \sum_i \alpha_i \mathcal{E}(h_i)$ , for  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $h_i \in \text{Herm}$  so that individual Hamiltonian interactions are encoded separately;
- IV Measurements are correctly simulated, hence a corresponding map on states,  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{state}}$ , should exist such that  $\text{tr}[\mathcal{E}(A)\mathcal{E}_{\text{state}}(\rho)] = \text{tr}[A\rho]$  for all target observables  $A$ ;
- V The encoding preserves the partition function up to a physically unimportant constant rescaling ( $c$ ):  $Z_{H'}(\beta) = \text{tr}[e^{-\beta\mathcal{E}(H)}] = c \text{tr}[e^{-\beta H}] = cZ_H(\beta)$ ;
- VI Time evolution is correctly simulated:  $e^{-i\mathcal{E}(H)t}\mathcal{E}_{\text{state}}(\rho)e^{i\mathcal{E}(H)t} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{state}}(e^{iHt}\rho e^{iHt})$ .

Note the trivial relationships between the physical observables in the simulator and target systems in II-VI, excluding strong-weak dualities. [CMP19] showed that initially imposing just three operationally motivated conditions on the encoding will necessarily imply that I-VI hold. Furthermore, using Jordan and  $C^*$  algebra techniques a mathematical characterisation of encodings was given in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1** (Encodings; see [CMP19] Theorem 4). *For any map  $\mathcal{E}: \text{Herm}_n \mapsto \text{Herm}_m$ , the following are equivalent:*

(i). *For all  $A, B \in \text{Herm}_n$ , and all  $p \in [0, 1]$ :*

1.  $\mathcal{E}(A) = \mathcal{E}(A)^\dagger$
2.  $\text{spec}[\mathcal{E}(A)] = \text{spec}[A]$

$$3. \mathcal{E}(pA + (1-p)B) = p\mathcal{E}(A) + (1-p)\mathcal{E}(B)$$

(ii). There exists a unique extension  $\mathcal{E}': \mathcal{M}_n \mapsto \mathcal{M}_m$  such that  $\mathcal{E}'(H) = \mathcal{E}(H)$  for all  $H \in \text{Herm}_n$  and, for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}_n$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ :

- a.  $\mathcal{E}'(\mathbb{I}) = \mathbb{I}$
- b.  $\mathcal{E}'(A^\dagger) = \mathcal{E}'(A)^\dagger$
- c.  $\mathcal{E}'(A + B) = \mathcal{E}'(A) + \mathcal{E}'(B)$
- d.  $\mathcal{E}'(AB) = \mathcal{E}'(A)\mathcal{E}'(B)$
- e.  $\mathcal{E}'(xA) = x\mathcal{E}'(A)$ .

(iii). There exists a unique extension  $\mathcal{E}': \mathcal{M}_n \mapsto \mathcal{M}_m$  such that  $\mathcal{E}'(H) = \mathcal{E}(H)$  for all  $H \in \text{Herm}_n$ , with  $\mathcal{E}'$  of the form

$$\mathcal{E}'(M) = U(M^{\oplus p} \oplus \overline{M}^{\oplus q})U^\dagger \quad (1)$$

for some non-negative integers  $p, q$  and unitary  $U \in \mathcal{M}_m$ , where  $M^{\oplus p} := \bigoplus_{i=1}^p M$  and  $\overline{M}$  denotes complex conjugation.

We call a map  $\mathcal{E}$  satisfying (i) to (iii) an encoding.

Encodings describe a restricted set of exact simulations, however [CMP19] also describes two generalisations to arrive at more practical simulations. The first considers simulations that reproduce the physics of a target system up to some approximation that can be controlled. The second allows the simulator system,  $H'$ , to replicate the physics of the target system,  $H$ , only in some well isolated subspace of  $H'$ , for example the low-energy subspace. This leads to a formal notion of Hamiltonian simulation that includes exact simulation as a special case.

**Definition 2** (Analogue Hamiltonian simulation; [CMP19]). *A many-body Hamiltonian,  $H'$ , simulates a Hamiltonian,  $H$ , to precision  $(\eta, \epsilon)$  below an energy cut-off  $\Delta$  if there exists a local encoding  $\mathcal{E} = V(H \otimes P + \overline{H} \otimes Q)V^\dagger$ , where  $V = \bigotimes_i V_i$  for some isometries  $V_i$  acting on 0 or 1 qudits of the original system each, and  $P$  and  $Q$  are locally orthogonal projectors, such that:*

1. There exists an encoding  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(H) = \tilde{V}(H \otimes P + \overline{H} \otimes Q)\tilde{V}^\dagger$  such that  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbb{I}) = P_{\leq \Delta(H')}$  and  $\|\tilde{V} - V\| \leq \eta$ ;
2.  $\|H'_{\leq \Delta} - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(H)\| \leq \epsilon$ .

Where  $P_{\leq \Delta(H')}$  is the projector onto the low energy subspace of  $H'$  up to the cut-off  $\Delta$ .

An earlier work also posed a definition of simulation based on an isometric encoding map [BH14]. However [CMP19] allows anything that satisfies the conditions in (i) of Theorem 1 which includes more general maps than simple isometries. [CMP19] also largely restricts to local encodings as the physically relevant case, whereas [BH14] imposes no formal conditions on the isometry except noting it should be able to be implemented practically.

This framework was altered to consider a simulator system that only reproduces the ground state and first excited state (and hence the spectral gap) of

$H$ , in [AZ18]. The independent interest of gap simulation is demonstrated by applying the framework to the task of Hamiltonian sparsification – exploring the resources required for simplifying the Hamiltonian interaction graph. However, there has been little other follow up theoretical work exploring the mathematical foundation of analogue Hamiltonian simulation.

## 1.2 Motivating example: the Kramer-Wannier duality

A paradigmatic example of a strong-weak duality is the Kramer-Wannier duality [Bax89]. Even the isotropic case of this classical duality is not captured by the strong sense of simulation in [CMP19] with the key novel element being the strong-weak nature of the two Hamiltonians. Therefore this duality was a first benchmark for this generalisation of the theory of simulation to more broadly encompass dualities.

In Kramer-Wannier an Ising Hamiltonian on a 2d square lattice at high temperature ( $\tanh J\beta \ll 1$ ):

$$H = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sigma_i \sigma_j, \quad (2)$$

is dual to another Ising Hamiltonian on the same lattice (in the thermodynamic limit) at low temperature ( $\tilde{J}\tilde{\beta} \gg 1$ ):

$$\Phi(H) = -\tilde{J} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sigma_i \sigma_j, \quad (3)$$

in the thermodynamic limit. The two Hamiltonians are dual, in the sense that their free energies,  $f$ , are related by

$$\tilde{\beta} f_{\Phi(H)} = \beta f_H + \ln \sinh(2\beta J), \quad (4)$$

when the following duality condition relating the interaction strengths and temperature is satisfied:

$$\tilde{J}\tilde{\beta} = -\frac{1}{2} \ln \tanh(J\beta). \quad (5)$$

A more detailed description of this duality and how it arises is given in Appendix D.

This duality can be used to find the critical point for the 2d Ising model since at this point the free energies will be non-analytic. It is in some sense a very simple duality as both Hamiltonians have the same form and act on identical copies of the Hilbert space. However, it follows from the non-trivial nature of the relation between the free energies that expecting all observables to be preserved is too strong. Furthermore it is clear from the form of the duality that the energy spectrum cannot be preserved without a rescaling. These two aspects of the duality prevent it from fitting into the framework developed in [CMP19].

## 2 Main results

The first step in studying maps between operators describing a “duality” is to identify what properties these maps should preserve in general. There is potential for wide variation in how duality maps are defined. This work aims for a

minimal set of axioms that encompasses as many dualities as possible, in particular strong-weak and high-low temperature dualities, while capturing [CMP19]’s simulation as a special case. We present three (apparently) different sets of operational axiomatisations of duality, formulated in terms of different physical properties: measurements, partition functions and entropy. It will turn out that all three axiomatisations lead to identical mathematical structure and are therefore equivalent.

The first two axioms are required for basic compatibility with quantum mechanics and therefore appear in all three axiomatisations. Intuitively, all duality maps must preserve Hermiticity for observables in one theory to be associated with observables in another – this is the most straightforward of the axioms, and is the content of Axiom (i) in all three axiomatisations.

Duality maps are also constrained by the convex structure of quantum mechanics, but formulating the minimal requirements in this case is more subtle. Operationally, a convex combination of observables corresponds physically to the process of selecting an observable at random from some ensemble of observables according to some probability distribution, measuring that observable, and reporting the outcome. This is commonly described mathematically by an ensemble of observables:  $\{p_i, A_i\}$ , where  $p_i$  is the probability of measuring observable  $A_i$ . Since this is a physical operation that can be performed on the original system, there must be a corresponding procedure on the dual system that gives the same outcome. However, this does *not* imply that the dual process must necessarily be given by the convex combination of the dual observables. It would clearly be possible operationally to first rescale the probability distribution before picking the dual observable to measure, and then to rescale the outcome of that measurement in some way before reporting it. A fully general axiomatisation of duality has to allow for this possibility, and this is precisely what is captured mathematically in Axiom (ii) of all three axiomatisation.<sup>1</sup>

The final axiom in each axiomatisation captures the requirement that certain physical properties of the original system is preserved in the dual system.

## 2.1 Measurement duality

The first of the axiomatisations defines duality between systems in terms of the measurement outcomes of observables.

**Axiomatisation 1** (Measurement duality axioms). A measurement duality map,  $\Phi_s : \text{Herm}_n \mapsto \text{Herm}_m$  satisfies

$$(i) \quad \forall A \in \text{Herm}_n : \\ \Phi_s(A) = \Phi_s(A)^\dagger;$$

$$(ii) \quad \forall a_i \in \text{Herm}_n, p_i \in [0, 1] \text{ with } \sum_i p_i = 1 : \\ \Phi_s(\sum_i p_i a_i) = G(\sum_i p_i a_i) \sum_i g(a_i) h(p_i) \Phi_s(a_i);$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that Axiom (ii) is a slight abuse of notation since the map  $\Phi$  is really a function of the ensemble  $\{p_i, a_i\}$ . However the outcome should not depend on how you chose to construct the ensemble average. It will turn out later (see Lemma 13 for details) that consistency with the final axiom imposes additional constraints the allowed probability and observable rescaling functions, such that  $\Phi$  is truly only a function of the ensemble average. But this is a non-trivial consequence of the *interaction* between convexity and preservation of other physical properties; it is not required just by the duality of observable ensembles.

$$(iii) \forall A \in \text{Herm}_n : \\ \text{spec} [\Phi_s(A)] = f(A)\text{spec}[A].$$

The scaling functions  $f, G, g: \text{Herm}_n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ , are Lipschitz on any compact subset of  $\text{Herm}_n$  and map to zero iff the input is the zero operator. Where as  $h: [0, 1] \mapsto [0, 1]$  where  $\sum_i h(p_i) = 1$  iff  $\sum_i p_i = 1$ .

In quantum mechanics measurement outcomes are associated with the spectra of the Hermitian operators, hence the final axiom requires a relation between the spectra of dual operators. Again, operationally, we have to allow for the possibility of rescaling the measurement outcomes. Even a simple change of measurement units, which has no *physical* content, induces such a rescaling mathematically. But more general rescalings that interchange large and small eigenvalues are possible, indeed required to encompass strong-weak dualities (see Appendix D for a concrete example for the classic Kramer-Wannier duality).

This is captured mathematically in Axiom(iii) of 1 by the scaling function,  $f$ , which is observable-dependent. Furthermore, Axiom (iii) imposes a relation on the *set* eigenvalues, but not on their ordering or multiplicities. Thus which particular dual measurement outcome corresponds to which outcome on the original system can vary. Since the scaling functions depend on the operator, the form of the duality for different physical measurements is free to vary for different observables.

The only constraints imposed on the scaling functions  $f, g, G$  are those we argue are physically necessary: the range must be restricted to real numbers since all measurement outcomes in quantum mechanics must be real; they are required to satisfy a very weak Lipschitz condition to exclude unphysical discontinuities; and non-vanishing for a non-zero input ensures every observable has a corresponding dual.

These axioms can in fact be further relaxed without changing their physical content (see Appendix C). But the formulation given in Axiomatisation 1 is sufficient to restrict to mappings that represent meaningful dualities, yet be a substantial generalisation of Theorem 1.

## 2.2 Partition function duality

Examples of physical dualities suggest that it is common for a duality to be defined in terms of partition functions (or equivalently free energy), rather than observables, particularly when considering classical thermodynamics. This motivates considering a different definition of duality, formulated in terms of preserving partition functions rather than measurement outcomes:

**Axiomatisation 2** (Thermal duality axioms). A thermal duality map,  $\Phi_t : \text{Herm}_n \mapsto \text{Herm}_m$  satisfies

$$(i) \forall A \in \text{Herm}_n : \\ \Phi_t(A) = \Phi_t(A)^\dagger;$$

$$(ii) \forall a_i \in \text{Herm}_n, p_i \in [0, 1] \text{ with } \sum_i p_i = 1 : \\ \Phi_t(\sum_i p_i a_i) = G(\sum_i p_i a_i) \sum_i g(a_i) h(p_i) \Phi_t(a_i);$$

$$(iii) \forall A \in \text{Herm}_n \text{ and all } J_A > 0, J_A \in \mathbb{R} : \\ \alpha \text{tr} [e^{-J_A f(A)A}] = \text{tr} [e^{-J_A \Phi_t(A)}] \text{ for some constant } \alpha > 0.$$



The scaling functions  $f, G, g: \text{Herm}_n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ , are Lipschitz on any compact subset of  $\text{Herm}_n$  and map to zero iff the input is the zero operator. Where as  $h: [0, 1] \mapsto [0, 1]$  where  $\sum_i h(p_i) = 1$  iff  $\sum_i p_i = 1$ .

As discussed, the first two axioms are the same as before. The third axiom captures how the thermal physics of the two systems are related. The simplest physical example of this is the Hamiltonian of the system,  $H$ , with inverse temperature,  $\beta$ , acting as the corresponding charge  $J_H$ . However, if the duality is to be complete, this relationship should also hold for other source terms in the partition function  $\text{tr}[-\beta H + \sum_i J_{A_i} A_i]$  to relate both the thermal properties and correlations of the two systems. We must again allow the freedom of rescaling the values of the charges in the dual system by an operator-dependent scaling function  $f$ , since this is something that could be done operationally. Equating these generalised partition functions for all values of the charges is mathematically equivalent to (iii), since trivially all but one selected charge can be set to 0 in tern.

### 2.3 Entropic duality

A third and final viewpoint is to consider entropic dualities. Entropies in quantum information theory express the information content or entanglement of systems. For example, in holographic dualities such as AdS/CFT there are relationships between the entropy of corresponding states (the Ryu-Takayanagi formula [RT06])<sup>2</sup>.

**Axiomatisation 3** (Entropic duality axioms). An entropic duality map,  $\Phi_e: \text{Herm}_n \mapsto \text{Herm}_{\alpha n}$  and  $\Phi_e: \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \mapsto \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\oplus \alpha})$  satisfies

- (i)  $\forall A \in \text{Herm}_n$  :  
 $\Phi_e(A) = \Phi_e(A)^\dagger$ ;
- (ii)  $\forall a_i \in \text{Herm}_n, p_i \in [0, 1]$  with  $\sum_i p_i = 1$  :  
 $\Phi_e(\sum_i p_i a_i) = \sum_i p_i \Phi_e(a_i)$ ;
- (iii)  $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  :  
 $S(\Phi_e(\rho)) = S(\rho) + \log \alpha$ ;
- (iv)  $\Phi_e(0) = 0$ .

The justification for (i)-(ii) is unchanged. However, the map is additionally constrained to map states to states (positive operators with unit trace) to meaningfully examine the behaviour of dual entropies. An immediate consequence of this is a simplification of the previously allowed generalised convexity to standard convexity.

The third axiom captures how the entropies of corresponding states are related. In trivial examples of dual states in different sized spaces, there is additional entropy arising from the additional degrees of freedom in the larger state space. This gives an additive offset that depends on the Hilbert space dimension in the entropy relation. For example, if states  $\rho$  are mapped to the

---

<sup>2</sup>Note however that the *state dependent* additive entropy that appears in the Ryu-Takayanagi formula does not contradict the *state independent* additive entropy we assert in axiom (iii), since the latter does not refer to the entropy of a reduced state but rather a state on the full Hilbert space.

(trivially) dual states  $\Phi(\rho) = \rho \otimes 1/d$ , the entropy of the dual state picks up an additional additive contribution:  $S(\Phi(\rho)) = S(\rho) + d$ .

More generally, for a  $d_1$ -dimensional maximally mixed state to be dual to the maximally mixed state in  $d_2 > d_1$  dimensions, the required entropy relation is

$$S\left(\frac{1}{d_2}\mathbb{I}_{(d_2 \times d_2)}\right) = \log d_2 \quad (6)$$

$$= \log \frac{d_2 d_1}{d_1} \quad (7)$$

$$= S\left(\frac{1}{d_1}\mathbb{I}_{(d_1 \times d_1)}\right) + \log \frac{d_2}{d_1}. \quad (8)$$

Then  $\alpha = d_2/d_1$  and we can identify  $\log \alpha$  as a constant entropy offset arising from the different Hilbert space dimensions.

## 2.4 Duality equivalence and characterisation

A priori, the different duality maps,  $\Phi_s$ ,  $\Phi_t$  and  $\Phi_e$ , have separate characterisations and there could exist maps that lie in one set but not another. However, the first two main results of this work demonstrates that despite separate motivations, these axiomatisations are essentially equivalent. Thus a duality relationship on any one of these physical levels, implies a consistent duality on the other physical levels.

**Theorem 3.** *Axiomatisation 1 and Axiomatisation 2 are equivalent.*

**Theorem 4.** *If a map  $\Phi_e$  satisfies Axiomatisation 3, then it equivalently satisfies Axiomatisation 1 and Axiomatisation 2 with  $f(A) = 1/\alpha$  for all  $A \in \text{Herm}_n$ . Conversely if  $\Phi$  satisfies Axiomatisation 1 or Axiomatisation 2 then the related map*

$$\Phi'_e(A) := \begin{cases} \frac{\Phi(A)}{\alpha f(A)} & \text{for } A \in \text{Herm}_n \neq 0 \\ \Phi(A) & \text{for } A = 0, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

*will satisfy Axiomatisation 3.*

The entropic formulation is only slightly less general than the others. This originates from the normalisation of states, which fixes the rescalings when interpreting the Hermitian operators corresponding to states as observables. The final main result gives a characterisation of the form of the duality maps that satisfy these axioms:

**Theorem 5 (Characterisation).** *Let  $\Phi$  be a duality map satisfying Axiomatisation 1, Axiomatisation 2 or Axiomatisation 3 with the scale function  $f(\cdot)$ . Define the related map  $\mathcal{E}(A) := \frac{\Phi(A)}{f(A)}$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is an encoding in the sense of Theorem 1, and hence  $\Phi$  has the form:*

$$\Phi(A) = f(A)U\left(A^{\oplus p} \oplus \bar{A}^{\oplus q}\right)U^\dagger, \quad (10)$$

*where  $p, q$  are non-negative integers,  $U$  is a unitary transformation and  $\bar{A}$  represents the complex conjugate of  $A$ . Equivalently,*

$$\Phi(A) = f(A)U\left(A \otimes P + \bar{A} \otimes Q\right)U^\dagger, \quad (11)$$

where  $P$  and  $Q$  are orthogonal complement projectors.

This result indicates that the axioms are stronger than they may appear. After multiple relaxations from the encodings introduced in Theorem 1 the only additional freedom in the form of the map is a single scaling function. During the proof of these results, the three scaling functions are found to be related, such that the conditions can be equivalently rewritten using only  $f$ . Explicitly,  $\forall A, a \in \text{Herm}_n$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$G(A) = f(A), \quad g(a) = \frac{1}{f(a)}, \quad (12)$$

and

$$h(t) = t. \quad (13)$$

It is also clear from this characterisation that duality maps satisfying the axioms only exist between Hilbert spaces where  $m = \alpha n$  with  $\alpha$  integer.

Theorem 5 asserts that a map between dual systems, where dual can be taken in any of the three senses laid out above, has the known form of Eq. (11). Local dualities are a special case of this where we restrict the mapping to preserve some local structure following [CMP19]

**Definition 6** (Local duality map). *A local duality map  $\Phi : \text{Herm}_n \mapsto \text{Herm}_m$  is a duality map i.e. of the form  $\Phi(A) = f(A)\mathcal{E}(A)$ , where the corresponding encoding  $\mathcal{E}$  is a local encoding in the sense of [CMP19] definition 13.*

The connection between entropy preserving and spectrum preserving axioms in Theorem 4 is perhaps surprising, and leads to a novel result concerning the characterisation of entropy preserving maps up to an additive constant. While it is well-known that a unitary or antiunitary<sup>3</sup> transformation leaves the entropy invariant, the reverse implication is false without additional information. Previous work, that traces its origins back to Wigner's celebrated theorem [Mol08; HHL12; HYH15; KP17; Wig31], has shown that by demanding additional constraints on entropy preserving maps, they are entirely characterised by either a unitary or antiunitary transformation. However, maps preserving entropy up to an additive constant do not appear to have been studied in the literature. These maps are important in physics, for example in quantum many body systems where the additive entropy is related to topological order. By restating Theorem 5 with a focus on Axiomatisation 3 a natural strengthening of these previous generalisations of Wigner's theorem arises:

**Corollary 7** (Extension of Wigner's Theorem). *Let  $\Phi : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \mapsto \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\oplus \alpha})$  be convex,*

$$\Phi\left(\sum_i p_i \rho_i\right) = \sum_i p_i \Phi(\rho_i), \quad (14)$$

*and preserve entropy up to an additive constant,*

$$S(\Phi(\rho_i)) = S(\rho_i) + \log \alpha, \quad (15)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>An antiunitary operator is a bijective antilinear map  $W : \mathcal{H} \mapsto \mathcal{H}$  of a complex Hilbert space such that  $\langle Wx, Wy \rangle = \overline{\langle x, y \rangle}$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$  where the overline denotes complex conjugation. Theorem 5 can be translated into this language by noting that for any antiunitary operator  $W$ , the operator  $WK$ , where  $K$  is the complex conjugation operator, is unitary.

for all  $\rho_i \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ ,  $p_i \in [0, 1]$  with  $\sum_i p_i = 1$ , where  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Then  $\Phi$  is of the form,

$$\Phi(\rho) = U \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^p V_i \rho V_i^\dagger \oplus \bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{p+q} W_i \rho_i W_i^\dagger \right) U^\dagger \quad (16)$$

for some unitaries  $U, V_i$  and antiunitaries  $W_i$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ , where  $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $p + q = \alpha$ .

Whereas previous characterisations of entropy preserving maps reduce to Wigner's theorem, by taking a different route via Jordan and  $C^*$  algebra techniques we show that the entropic additive constant is precisely the additional freedom that allows the maps to admit a direct sum of both unitary and antiunitary parts.

Building on the above, we also generalise all our results beyond the case of perfect dualities stated here, to dualities restricted to a subspace, locality-preserving dualities, and approximate dualities. In all these cases, again maps are shown to compose well and errors translate to physical properties (e.g. measurement outcomes, thermal properties, time dynamics) in a controlled way.

## 3 Proofs

### 3.1 Notation and terminology

Let  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  be the set of positive operators with unit trace acting in the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  the set of all linear operators acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $P_1(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  be the set of pure states. The notation  $\mathcal{M}_n(F)$  is used for the set of all  $(n \times n)$  matrices with entries in the field  $F$ , for conciseness we sometimes use  $\mathcal{M}_n$  to denote the set of  $(n \times n)$  matrices with complex entries.  $\text{Herm}_n$  denotes the subset of all  $(n \times n)$  Hermitian matrices. We will sometimes use  $\mathbf{0}$  to denote the zero matrix and unless otherwise stated  $\bar{A}$  denotes the complex conjugate of  $A$ .

$\text{spec}[A]$  for  $A \in \mathcal{M}_n$  denotes the set of eigenvalues of  $A$  not counting degeneracies. A Hamiltonian is  $k$ -local,  $H \in \mathcal{B}((\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n})$ , if it can be written as  $H = \sum_i h_i \otimes \mathbb{I}$  where  $h_i \in \mathcal{B}((\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes k})$  and the identity in each term acts on the subsystems where  $h_i$  does not. Finally  $S(\rho)$  denotes the *von Neumann entropy* of a state  $\rho$ .

### 3.2 Equivalence of measurement and partition function axiomatisations

Theorem 3 concerns the equivalence of duality defined by preserving measurement outcomes and by preserving partition functions,

**Theorem 3.** *Axiomatisation 1 and Axiomatisation 2 are equivalent.*

*Proof.* (i) and (ii) from Axiomatisation 1 and Axiomatisation 2 are identical. Therefore this result hinges on proving the equivalence of the respective third axioms.

Initially let  $\text{spec}[A] = \{\lambda_i\}$  and  $\text{spec}[\Phi_t(A)] = \{\mu_i\}$  and relate their “partition functions” using axiom (iii) of Axiomatisation 2

$$\alpha \sum_i e^{-Jf(A)\lambda_i} = \alpha \text{tr} \left[ e^{-Jf(A)A} \right] = \text{tr} \left[ e^{-J\Phi_t(A)} \right] = \sum_j e^{-J\mu_j}. \quad (17)$$

Expanding the exponential using the Maclaurin series,  $e^x = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{k!}$ , which converges for all  $x$ , gives

$$\alpha \sum_i^{\dim[A]} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-Jf(A)\lambda_i)^k}{k!} = \sum_j^{\dim[\Phi_t(A)]} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-J\mu_j)^k}{k!}. \quad (18)$$

For the above polynomials to be equal at all values of the charge  $J$ , the coefficients for each power of  $J$  must be equal<sup>4</sup>. Equating the  $J^0$  coefficients fixes the relationship between the dimensions:

$$\alpha \dim[A] = \dim[\Phi_t(A)]. \quad (19)$$

Therefore the operators  $A$  and  $\Phi_t(A)$  may act on Hilbert spaces of different dimension. However, Eq. (19) implies  $\alpha$  is a positive rational so we set  $\frac{x}{y} := \alpha$  with  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  coprime in the following.

For a given  $A$ , the remaining equalities generate an infinite system of polynomials in  $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^{\dim[\Phi_t(A)]}$ ,

$$\forall p \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : \frac{x}{y} \sum_{i=1}^{\dim[A]} (f(A)\lambda_i)^p = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim[\Phi_t(A)]} \mu_i^p.$$

Manipulating the sum to remove the multiplicative factors we have  $\forall p \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{x \dim[A]} (f(A)\lambda'_i)^p = \sum_{i=1}^{y \dim[\Phi_t(A)]} \mu'_i{}^p, \quad (20)$$

where we define new vectors  $\lambda', \mu'$  with elements  $\{\lambda'_{(i-1)x+n}\}_{n=1}^x = \lambda_i$  and  $\{\mu'_{(i-1)y+n}\}_{n=1}^y = \mu_i$ , indexing the elements of all vectors in non-decreasing order.

The summations in Eq. (20) now each contain the same number of terms and thus, for even  $p = 2n$ , we can interpret the above as equating the  $p$ -norms of two  $(x \dim[A] = y \dim[\Phi_t(A)])$ -dimensional vectors:

$$\left( \sum_{i=1}^{x \dim[A]} |f(A)\lambda'_i|^{2n} \right)^{1/2n} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{y \dim[\Phi_t(A)]} |\mu'_i|^{2n} \right)^{1/2n}. \quad (21)$$

Taking the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , this converges to the  $\ell_\infty$  norm of both sides, i.e. we can equate the elements of maximum absolute value in each vector:  $\max_i |f(A)\lambda'_i| = \max_i |\mu'_i|$ .

Now, subtracting  $(\max_i f(A)\lambda'_i)^{2n} = (\max_i \mu'_i)^{2n}$  from both sides of Eq. (21), we obtain an analogous set of  $p$ -norm equalities but for vectors with length

<sup>4</sup>Since Eq. (18) is an analytic function, see e.g. [AW] p133.

reduced by 1, with the maximum elements removed. Applying this argument recursively, we conclude that the vectors  $f(A)\lambda'$  and  $\mu'$  must have identical components up to signs.

The linear variant of Eq. (20) rules out the case where the components  $\lambda'$  and  $\mu'$  have different signs:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{x \dim[A]} f(A)\lambda'_i = \sum_{i=1}^{y \dim[\Phi_t(A)]} \mu'_i = \sum_{i=1}^{x \dim[A]} \pm f(A)\lambda'_i. \quad (22)$$

This follows as Eq. (17) must hold for all Hermitians  $A$ , including those with only positive eigenvalues. Any term in the sum being negated on the right hand side of Eq. (22) would produce a strictly smaller total than that of the left hand side, therefore,

$$\mu' = f(A)\lambda'. \quad (23)$$

It remains to use  $\lambda'$  and  $\mu'$  to find the relation between the original eigenvalue vectors  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  (potentially of different lengths). Choose an  $A$  with non-degenerate spectrum, and consider the two smallest eigenvalues of  $A$ . We have

$$\lambda_1 = \lambda'_x = \frac{\mu'_x}{f(A)} \quad (24)$$

$$\lambda_2 = \lambda'_{x+1} = \frac{\mu'_{x+1}}{f(A)}. \quad (25)$$

Since  $A$  has non-degenerate spectrum, we have  $\mu'_x \neq \mu'_{x+1}$ . But  $\{\mu'_{(i-1)y+n}\}_{n=1}^y$  are equal for all  $i$  by definition of  $\mu'$ . Thus  $x \geq y$  and  $y = 1$ , since  $x$  and  $y$  are coprime. Hence  $\dim \Phi_t(A)$  must be at least as large as  $\dim A$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .

Eq. (23) and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  implies the set equality  $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^{\alpha \dim[A]} = f(A)\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^{\dim[A]}$ , where each element of  $\mu$  is alpha-fold degenerate. The two spectra are thus proportional,  $\Phi_t$  necessarily satisfies Axiomatisation 1 and the two sets of axioms are equivalent.  $\square$

### 3.3 Equivalence of measurement and entropic axiomatisations

The axiomatisation motivated by entropy is equivalent in a slightly weaker sense to the other two viewpoints considered. This is due to the fact that the duality of Axiomatisation 3 maps states to states ( $\Phi_e : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \mapsto \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\oplus \alpha})$ ), hence imposing  $|f(A)| = 1$ . However, up to normalisation an equivalence can be defined.

**Theorem 4.** *If a map  $\Phi_e$  satisfies Axiomatisation 3, then it equivalently satisfies Axiomatisation 1 and Axiomatisation 2 with  $f(A) = 1/\alpha$  for all  $A \in \text{Herm}_n$ . Conversely if  $\Phi$  satisfies Axiomatisation 1 or Axiomatisation 2 then the related map*

$$\Phi'_e(A) := \begin{cases} \frac{\Phi(A)}{\alpha f(A)} & \text{for } A \in \text{Herm}_n \neq 0 \\ \Phi(A) & \text{for } A = 0, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

*will satisfy Axiomatisation 3.*

To show this result we first need some technical lemmas regarding entropy.

**Lemma 8** (Entropy of mixtures of mixed states). *Given a density operator,  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}} = \sum_{x=1}^k p_x \rho_x$ , that is a probabilistic mixture of mixed states  $\rho_x$ , with  $p_x \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_x p_x = 1$ . The von Neumann entropy of  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}$  obeys the following equality,*

$$S(\rho_{\mathcal{A}}) = \sum_x p_x S(\rho_x) - \sum_x p_x \log p_x, \quad (26)$$

*if and only if  $\rho_x$  have orthogonal support. I.e.  $\text{tr}[\rho_x \rho_y] = 0$  for all  $x \neq y$ .*

*Proof.* Write each mixed state as a sum of pure states:

$$\rho_x = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^{(x)} |\phi_j^{(x)}\rangle \langle \phi_j^{(x)}|, \quad (27)$$

where  $\{|\phi_j^{(x)}\rangle\}_{j=1}^m$  form an orthogonal basis for a given  $x$ , but in general  $\langle \phi_i^{(x)} | \phi_j^{(y)} \rangle \neq 0$  for  $x \neq y$ . The full density operator with these expansions reads:

$$\rho_{\mathcal{A}} = \sum_{x=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^m p_x \lambda_j^{(x)} |\phi_j^{(x)}\rangle \langle \phi_j^{(x)}|. \quad (28)$$

Introduce a Hilbert space,  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{R}}$ , with  $\dim(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{R}}) = mk$  and an orthonormal basis labeled by  $|xj\rangle_{\mathcal{R}}$ . Consider a purification of  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}$ ,

$$|\mathcal{AR}\rangle = \sum_{x,j} \sqrt{p_x \lambda_j^{(x)}} |\phi_j^{(x)}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes |xj\rangle_{\mathcal{R}}, \quad (29)$$

where

$$\rho_{\mathcal{A}} = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{R}} [|\mathcal{AR}\rangle \langle \mathcal{AR}|] = \sum_{x,j} p_x \lambda_j^{(x)} |\phi_j^{(x)}\rangle \langle \phi_j^{(x)}|, \quad (30)$$

and

$$\rho_{\mathcal{R}} = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} [|\mathcal{AR}\rangle \langle \mathcal{AR}|] \quad (31)$$

$$= \sum_{x,j,x',j'} \sqrt{p_x \lambda_j^{(x)}} \sqrt{p_{x'} \lambda_{j'}^{(x')}} \langle \phi_j^{(x)} | \phi_{j'}^{(x')} \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} |xj\rangle \langle x'j'|. \quad (32)$$

Also define

$$\rho_{\mathcal{R}'} := \sum_{x,j} p_x \lambda_j^{(x)} |xj\rangle \langle xj|. \quad (33)$$

The relative entropy between the two reservoir states is given by

$$S(\rho_{\mathcal{R}} || \rho_{\mathcal{R}'}) := \text{tr} \rho_{\mathcal{R}} \log \rho_{\mathcal{R}} - \text{tr} \rho_{\mathcal{R}} \log \rho_{\mathcal{R}'} \quad (34)$$

$$= -S(\rho_{\mathcal{R}}) - \text{tr} \rho_{\mathcal{R}} \log \rho_{\mathcal{R}'} \quad (35)$$

$$= -S(\rho_{\mathcal{A}}) - \text{tr} \rho_{\mathcal{R}} \log \rho_{\mathcal{R}'}. \quad (36)$$

Where the last line uses  $S(\rho_{\mathcal{R}}) = S(\rho_{\mathcal{A}})$ . Since  $|xj\rangle$  forms an orthogonal basis  $\log \rho_{\mathcal{R}'} = \sum_{x,j} \log(p_x \lambda_j^{(x)}) |xj\rangle \langle xj|$ . Further algebraic manipulation of the last

term results in,

$$\mathrm{tr} [\rho_{\mathcal{R}} \log \rho_{\mathcal{R}'}] = \sum_{j,x} \log \left( p_x \lambda_j^{(x)} \right) \mathrm{tr} (\rho_{\mathcal{R}} |xj\rangle \langle xj|) \quad (37)$$

$$= \sum_{x,j} \log \left( p_x \lambda_j^{(x)} \right) \langle xj | \rho_{\mathcal{R}} | xj \rangle \quad (38)$$

$$= \sum_{x,j} p_x \lambda_j^{(x)} \log \left( p_x \lambda_j^{(x)} \right) \quad (39)$$

$$= \sum_{x,j} p_x \lambda_j^{(x)} \log p_x + \sum_{x,j} p_x \lambda_j^{(x)} \log \left( \lambda_j^{(x)} \right) \quad (40)$$

$$= \sum_x p_x \log p_x + \sum_x p_x \sum_j \lambda_j^{(x)} \log \lambda_j^{(x)} \quad (41)$$

$$= \sum_x p_x \log p_x - \sum_x p_x S(\rho_x). \quad (42)$$

We arrive at an expression for the entropy of our mixture of mixed states,

$$S(\rho_A) = \sum_x p_x S(\rho_x) - \sum_x p_x \log p_x - S(\rho_{\mathcal{R}} || \rho_{\mathcal{R}'}). \quad (43)$$

Since the relative entropy  $S(\rho_{\mathcal{R}} || \rho_{\mathcal{R}'}) = 0$  if and only if  $\rho_{\mathcal{R}} = \rho_{\mathcal{R}'}$ , the expressions for  $\rho_{\mathcal{R}}$  and  $\rho_{\mathcal{R}'}$  in Eq. (32), Eq. (33) respectively, imply that the two density matrices are equal if and only if the corresponding vectors  $|\phi_j^{(x)}\rangle$  form an orthogonal set (given  $j, x$  such that  $\lambda_j^{(x)} \neq 0$ ). This is equivalent to stating that the mixed states  $\rho_x$  must have orthogonal support.  $\square$

**Lemma 9** (Pure states mapped to orthogonal density matrices). *Let  $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^d$  be a set of orthogonal pure states that forms a basis in  $\mathcal{H}$ , with  $\sigma_i \in P_1(\mathcal{H})$ . Let the map  $\Phi_e : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \mapsto \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\oplus \alpha})$ , be*

(a) *entropy preserving up to an additive constant,  $S(\Phi_e(\rho)) = S(\rho) + \log \alpha$ ;*

(b) *convex,  $\Phi_e(t\rho + (1-t)\sigma) = t\Phi_e(\rho) + (1-t)\Phi_e(\sigma)$ . Where  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ .*

*The image of this set under the map is a new set,  $\{\Phi_e(\sigma_i)\}_{i=1}^d$ , with orthogonal support.*

*Proof.* Any state in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  can be written as a linear combination of the set of pure states. The map  $\Phi_e$  obeys entropy relation (a) so,

$$S \left( \Phi_E \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sigma_i \right) \right) = S \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sigma_i \right) + \log \alpha. \quad (44)$$

Since  $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^d$  have orthogonal support, Lemma 8 can be applied to the first term:

$$S \left( \Phi_e \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sigma_i \right) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i S(\sigma_i) - \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \log \lambda_i + \log \alpha. \quad (45)$$



Reusing the entropy preserving property of  $\Phi_e$ , this time with a sum over pure states with  $S(\sigma_i) = 0$ ,  $S(\Phi_e(\sigma_i)) = \log \alpha$  for all  $i$ . Since  $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i = 1$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i S(\Phi_e(\sigma_i)) = \log \alpha$ , thus

$$S\left(\Phi_e\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sigma_i\right)\right) = -\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \log \lambda_i + \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i S(\Phi_e(\sigma_i)). \quad (46)$$

Since there is an equality, the only if direction of Lemma 8 implies that  $\{\Phi_e(\sigma_i)\}$  must have orthogonal support.  $\square$

**Lemma 10** (Entropy preserving implies spectrum preserving). *A map  $\Phi_e : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \mapsto \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\oplus \alpha})$ , that is*

(a) *entropy preserving up to an additive constant:  $S(\Phi_e(\rho)) = S(\rho) + \log \alpha$ ;*

(b) *convex:  $\Phi_e(t\rho + (1-t)\sigma) = t\Phi_e(\rho) + (1-t)\Phi_e(\sigma)$ . Where  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$*

*will transform the spectrum of the density operator in the following way*

$$\text{spec}[\rho] = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d\} \quad (47)$$

$$\text{spec}[\Phi_e(\rho)] = \left\{ \frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha}, \dots, \frac{\lambda_d}{\alpha} \right\} \quad (48)$$

*where every eigenvalue in the spectrum of  $\Phi_e(\rho)$  has multiplicity  $\alpha$ .*

*Proof.* The first step is to show that the image of the pure states  $\{\Phi_e(\sigma_i)\}_{i=1}^d$  – which by Lemma 9 is known to have orthogonal support – has  $\alpha$  non-zero eigenvalues all equal to  $1/\alpha$ . Using the entropy preserving property of the map:  $S(\Phi_e(\sigma_i)) = \log \alpha$ . Since  $\log \alpha$  is the maximal entropy of a Hilbert space of dimension  $\alpha$ , it follows that  $\Phi_e(\sigma_i)$  must have at least  $\alpha$  non-zero eigenvalues, i.e.  $\text{Rank}[\Phi_e(\sigma_i)] \geq \alpha$  for all  $i$ .

As a consequence of orthogonality, the rank summation of  $d$  mixed states,  $\Phi_e(\sigma_i)$ , will be upper bounded by the dimension of the Hilbert space the density matrices act in:

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \text{Rank}[\Phi_e(\sigma_i)] \leq \alpha d. \quad (49)$$

It follows that  $\text{Rank}[\Phi_e(\sigma_i)] = \alpha$  for all  $i$ . Together with the entropy  $S(\Phi_e(\sigma_i)) = \log \alpha$  it follows that the non-zero eigenvalues must be flat and  $\text{spec}[\Phi_e(\sigma_i)] = \{1/\alpha, 0\}$ .

It is then simple to extend to the full result. Any state in  $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  can be written as a linear combination of pure states  $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sigma_i$  where due to normalisation  $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i = 1$ . Using the convexity property of the map

$$\Phi_e\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sigma_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \Phi_e(\sigma_i). \quad (50)$$

From Lemma 8  $\{\Phi_e(\sigma_i)\}$  have orthogonal support and therefore  $\text{spec}[\Phi_e(\sigma_i)] = \{1/\alpha, 0\}$ . Therefore the spectrum of  $\Phi_e(\rho)$  will be  $\{\lambda_1/\alpha, \lambda_2/\alpha, \dots, \lambda_d/\alpha\}$  each with multiplicity  $\alpha$ .  $\square$

Now we are in a position to prove the second main result,

*Proof.* (of Theorem 4) The first two axioms of Axiomatisation 3 and Axiomatisation 1 are identical, taking the more constrained version of (ii) from Lemma 13 and setting  $f(A) = 1/\alpha$  for all  $A \in \text{Herm}_n$ . All that is left to do for the first statement is to show that a map obeying (ii)-(iv) from Axiomatisation 3 is spectrum preserving for all Hermitians.

The first step is to show that (iii)-(iv) implies the map,  $\Phi_e$ , obeying Axiomatisation 3 is real linear. This follows from the same argument laid out in the proof of [CMP19] Theorem 4. For any real negative  $\lambda$  set  $p = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1} > 0$ ,  $A \in \text{Herm}_n$  and  $B = \frac{pA}{(p-1)} = \lambda A$ . Using (iii) and (iv) together:

$$\Phi_e(pA + (1-p)B) = \Phi_e(0) = 0 \quad (51)$$

$$= p\Phi_e(A) + (1-p)\Phi_e(\lambda A). \quad (52)$$

Therefore  $\lambda\Phi_e(A) = \Phi_e(\lambda A)$ . Repeating this logic for  $\lambda A$  gives  $\lambda^2\Phi_e(A) = \Phi_e(\lambda^2 A)$  and hence homogeneity for all real scalars. Then combining axiom (ii) of Axiomatisation 3 with homogeneity gives real linearity of  $\Phi_e$ , i.e.

$$\Phi_e\left(\sum_i p_i \lambda a_i\right) = \sum_i p_i \Phi_e(\lambda a_i) = \sum_i \lambda p_i a_i, \quad (53)$$

for  $(\lambda p_i) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $a_i \in \text{Herm}_n$ .

From Lemma 10 the map on states transforms the spectra of density operators as Eq. (48). The transformation of the spectra of  $M \notin \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  by  $\Phi_e$  is shown by building up from  $\sigma, \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  using  $\Phi_e(a\rho + b\sigma) = a\Phi_e(\rho) + b\Phi_e(\sigma)$ . First note that any Hermitian operator can be written in a spectral decomposition  $M = \sum_i \nu_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ . Splitting the decomposition up into two sums over the positive and negative eigenvalues respectively,

$$M = \sum_{\nu_i > 0} \nu_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| + \sum_{\nu_i < 0} \nu_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \quad (54)$$

$$= M_+ + M_- \quad (55)$$

$$= c_+ \rho_+ + c_- \rho_-, \quad (56)$$

where  $\rho_{+/-} = \frac{M_{+/-}}{\text{tr}(M_{+/-})}$  and  $c_{+/-} = \text{tr}(M_{+/-})$ . Therefore

$$\Phi_e(M) = c_+ \Phi_e(\rho_+) + c_- \Phi_e(\rho_-). \quad (57)$$

Since  $\rho_+$  and  $\rho_-$  are orthogonal it follows from Lemmas 9 and 10 that the spectrum of  $M$ ,  $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^d$  transforms as

$$\text{spec}[\Phi_e(M)] = \frac{1}{\alpha} \{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d\}, \quad (58)$$

where every eigenvalue in the new spectrum has multiplicity  $\alpha$ .

The converse statement is simple to demonstrate. For all  $A \in \text{Herm}_n$ ,  $\Phi(A) = \Phi(A)^\dagger$  and since  $f(A) \in \mathbb{R}$  it follows that  $\Phi'_e$  also preserves Hermiticity. Using the simplified axiom (ii) from Lemma 13, and substituting for  $\Phi'_e$ , it is

easy to see that this map is convex as in axiom (ii) of Axiomatisation 3. Finally using spectrum preservation of  $\Phi$ ,

$$\text{spec}[\Phi'_e(\rho)] = \frac{1}{\alpha} \text{spec}[\rho], \quad (59)$$

for a state  $\rho \in \text{Herm}_n$ , where each eigenvalue has  $\alpha$  copies.  $S(\rho) = \sum_i \eta_i \log \eta_i$  where  $\{\eta_i\}$  are the eigenvalues of  $\rho$ . Therefore the entropy of the mapped state is,

$$S(\Phi'_e(\rho)) = -\alpha \sum_i \left(\frac{\eta_i}{\alpha}\right) \log \left(\frac{\eta_i}{\alpha}\right) \quad (60)$$

$$= -\sum_i \eta_i \log \eta_i + \sum_i \eta_i \log \alpha \quad (61)$$

$$= S(\rho) + \log \alpha, \quad (62)$$

and the third axiom of Axiomatisation 3 is satisfied by the map. The fourth axiom follows immediately from  $\Phi'_e(0) := \Phi(0) = 0$ , giving the converse statement.  $\square$

### 3.4 Characterisation of duality maps

Since Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 show how the different axiomatisations equivalently constrain the duality map, it remains to prove the characterisation of the form of these maps.

**Theorem 5** (Characterisation). *Let  $\Phi$  be a duality map satisfying Axiomatisation 1, Axiomatisation 2 or Axiomatisation 3 with the scale function  $f(\cdot)$ . Define the related map  $\mathcal{E}(A) := \frac{\Phi(A)}{f(A)}$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is an encoding in the sense of Theorem 1, and hence  $\Phi$  has the form:*

$$\Phi(A) = f(A)U \left( A^{\oplus p} \oplus \bar{A}^{\oplus q} \right) U^\dagger, \quad (10)$$

where  $p, q$  are non-negative integers,  $U$  is a unitary transformation and  $\bar{A}$  represents the complex conjugate of  $A$ . Equivalently,

$$\Phi(A) = f(A)U \left( A \otimes P + \bar{A} \otimes Q \right) U^\dagger, \quad (11)$$

where  $P$  and  $Q$  are orthogonal complement projectors.

This result relies on relating duality maps to the encodings characterised in [CMP19]. To demonstrate this, we examine the necessary relations between the different scaling functions. We will use the spectral decomposition of Hermitian operators and therefore will first need to establish how the map transforms orthogonal projectors. The following lemma shows that a duality map will take orthogonal complement projectors to objects proportional to two new orthogonal complement projectors in the new Hilbert space.

**Lemma 11** (Mapping orthogonal complement projectors). *Let  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  be orthogonal complement projectors ( $Q_1 Q_2 = Q_2 Q_1 = 0$  and  $Q_1 + Q_2 = \mathbb{I}$ ). Under a duality map  $\Phi$  these projectors are mapped to:*

$$\Phi(cQ_1) \propto \Sigma_1 \quad \Phi(cQ_2) \propto \Sigma_2. \quad (63)$$

Where  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2$  are themselves orthogonal complement projectors, i.e.  $\Sigma_1^2 = \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2^2 = \Sigma_2, \Sigma_1 \Sigma_2 = \Sigma_2 \Sigma_1 = 0$  and  $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 = \mathbb{I}$ .

*Proof.* Since a general projector  $P_i$  has  $\text{spec}[P_i] \in \{0, 1\}$ , by axiom (iii) of Axiomatisation 1 the mapped operator has  $\text{spec}[\Phi(cP_i)] = f(cP_i)\text{spec}[cP_i] = cf(cP_i)\text{spec}[P_i] \in cf(cP_i)\{0, 1\}$ . The map also preserves Hermiticity via axiom (i), so projectors are mapped to operators proportional to projectors. In particular, given orthogonal complement projectors:

$$\Phi(cQ_1) = cf(cQ_1)\Sigma_1 \quad (64)$$

$$\Phi(cQ_2) = cf(cQ_2)\Sigma_2, \quad (65)$$

it only remains to show that  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2$  are also orthogonal complement projectors.

The identity is a special case since  $\text{spec}[\mathbb{I}] \in \{1\}$  so  $\text{spec}[\Phi(\mathbb{I})] \in \{f(\mathbb{I})\}$ . Therefore,

$$\Phi\left(\frac{c}{2}(Q_1 + Q_2)\right) = \Phi(c\mathbb{I}/2) = \frac{c}{2}f(c\mathbb{I}/2)\mathbb{I}. \quad (66)$$

Applying axiom (ii) to the sum of operators gives,

$$\Phi\left(\frac{c}{2}(Q_1 + Q_2)\right) = G(c\mathbb{I}/2)h(1/2)[g(cQ_1)\Phi(cQ_1) + g(cQ_2)\Phi(cQ_2)] \quad (67)$$

$$= G(c\mathbb{I}/2)h(1/2)[g(cQ_1)cf(cQ_1)\Sigma_1 + g(cQ_2)cf(cQ_2)\Sigma_2]. \quad (68)$$

Note that while  $c$  is a general real, (ii) has to be applied with  $\sum_i p_i = 1$  and  $p_i \in [0, 1]$ , in this case  $t_1, t_2 = 1/2$  and  $c$  has been absorbed into the Hermitian operators.

Equating Eq. (66) and Eq. (68),

$$G(c\mathbb{I}/2)h(1/2)[g(Q_1)cf(cQ_1)\Sigma_1 + g(Q_2)cf(cQ_2)\Sigma_2] = \frac{c}{2}f(c\mathbb{I}/2)\mathbb{I} \quad (69)$$

$$2\frac{G(c\mathbb{I}/2)}{f(c\mathbb{I}/2)}h(1/2)[g(cQ_1)f(cQ_1)\Sigma_1 + g(cQ_2)f(cQ_2)\Sigma_2] = \mathbb{I} \quad (70)$$

$$\alpha\Sigma_1 + \beta\Sigma_2 = \mathbb{I}, \quad (71)$$

where the notation is simplified by defining:

$$\alpha := \frac{2G(c\mathbb{I}/2)h(1/2)g(cQ_1)f(cQ_1)}{f(c\mathbb{I}/2)}, \quad \beta := \frac{2G(c\mathbb{I}/2)h(1/2)g(cQ_2)f(cQ_2)}{f(c\mathbb{I}/2)}. \quad (72)$$

Rewriting the matrices in Eq. (71) in the  $\{\Sigma_1, \Sigma_1^\perp\}$  basis,

$$\alpha\left(\frac{\mathbb{I}}{0} \middle| \frac{0}{0}\right) + \beta\left(\frac{A}{C} \middle| \frac{B}{D}\right) = \left(\frac{\mathbb{I}}{0} \middle| \frac{0}{\mathbb{I}}\right). \quad (73)$$

Equating the off-diagonal quadrants gives that  $\beta B = \beta C = 0$ . Since the initial properties of the scaling functions imply that  $\beta \neq 0$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  must vanish and  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2$  are simultaneously diagonalisable with  $[\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2] = 0$ . Equating diagonal quadrants gives:

$$\alpha\mathbb{I} + \beta A = \mathbb{I} \quad (74)$$

$$\beta D = \mathbb{I}. \quad (75)$$

In order for  $\Sigma_2$  to be a valid projector  $D^2 = D$  and  $A^2 = A$ . This together with the expression for  $D = \frac{1}{\beta}\mathbb{I}$  from Eq. (75) implies that  $\beta = +1$  and  $D = \mathbb{I}$ . Finally, rearranging Eq. (74),

$$A = (1 - \alpha)\mathbb{I} = A^2 = (1 - \alpha)^2\mathbb{I}, \quad (76)$$

together with  $\alpha \neq 0$  implies that  $\alpha = +1$ ,  $A = 0$ . In both the above cases, the solutions  $\beta = -1$  and  $\alpha = -2$  are discarded since  $\Sigma_2$  must be a positive definite operator. In the  $\{\Sigma_1, \Sigma_1^\perp\}$  basis

$$\Sigma_1 = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \mathbb{I} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \quad \Sigma_2 = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \mathbb{I} \end{array} \right), \quad (77)$$

so  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2$  are orthogonal complement projectors.  $\square$

The expressions for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  give some initial relations between the scale functions appearing in the axioms:

$$h(1/2)g(Q_1)f(cQ_1) = h(1/2)g(cQ_2)f(cQ_2) = \frac{f(c\mathbb{I}/2)}{2G(c\mathbb{I}/2)}. \quad (78)$$

Since for any projector  $P_i$  there exists its complement  $P_i^\perp$ , it follows that the above applies generally for any projector:  $h(1/2)g(cP_i)f(cP_i) = \frac{f(c\mathbb{I}/2)}{2G(c\mathbb{I}/2)}$ .

Now a statement concerning how a duality map acts on two orthogonal projectors that only span a subspace of the initial Hilbert space can be made.

**Lemma 12** (Mapping orthogonal projectors). *Let  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  be orthogonal projectors such that  $P_1P_2 = P_2P_1 = 0$ . Under a duality map,  $\Phi$ , these projectors are mapped to:*

$$\Phi(cP_1) \propto \Pi_1 \quad \Phi(cP_2) \propto \Pi_2, \quad (79)$$

where  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\Pi_1, \Pi_2$  are themselves orthogonal projectors.

*Proof.* Again spectrum preservation stipulates that projectors are mapped to objects proportional to projectors:

$$\Phi(cP_1) = cf(cP_1)\Pi_1 \quad (80)$$

$$\Phi(cP_2) = cf(cP_2)\Pi_2 \quad (81)$$

$$\Phi\left(\frac{c}{2}(P_1 + P_2)\right) = \frac{c}{2}f\left(\frac{c}{2}(P_1 + P_2)\right)\Pi_{12}, \quad (82)$$

where the final equation holds since the sum of two orthogonal projectors is another projector. Applying axiom (ii) to the sum and substituting the above:

$$\Phi\left(\frac{c}{2}(P_1 + P_2)\right) = G\left(\frac{c}{2}(P_1 + P_2)\right)h(1/2)[g(cP_1)\Phi(cP_1) + g(cP_2)\Phi(cP_2)] \quad (83)$$

$$= G\left(\frac{c}{2}(P_1 + P_2)\right)h(1/2)[g(cP_1)cf(cP_1)\Pi_1 + g(cP_2)cf(cP_2)\Pi_2]. \quad (84)$$

Equating Eq. (82) and Eq. (84) in the same way as in Lemma 11 gives:

$$\alpha(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2) = \Pi_{12} \quad (85)$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{2G(c/2(P_1 + P_2))h(1/2)g(cP_1)f(cP_1)}{f(c/2(P_1 + P_2))} \quad (86)$$

$$= \frac{2G(1/2(P_1 + P_2))h(1/2)g(cP_2)f(cP_2)}{f(c/2(P_1 + P_2))} \quad (87)$$

$$= \frac{G(c/2(P_1 + P_2))f(c\mathbb{I}/2)}{f(c/2(P_1 + P_2))G(c\mathbb{I}/2)}. \quad (88)$$

In the above, the scale factor relation for projectors from Eq. (78) is used to equate  $g(cP_1)f(cP_1) = g(cP_2)f(cP_2)$ .

Writing the matrices in Eq. (85) in the  $\{\Pi_{12}, \Pi_{12}^\perp\}$  basis:

$$\alpha \left[ \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_1 & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array} \right) + \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_2 & -B \\ \hline -C & -D \end{array} \right) \right] = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \mathbb{I} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right). \quad (89)$$

Since  $\Pi_1, \Pi_2$  are projectors, they must be positive semi-definite matrices. Let  $|x\rangle$  be a vector only with support on the  $\Pi_{12}^\perp$  subspace. The positive semi-definite property requires that

$$\langle x | \Pi_1 | x \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x \end{pmatrix} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_1 & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x \end{pmatrix} = Dx^2 \geq 0 \quad (90)$$

$$\langle x | \Pi_2 | x \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x \end{pmatrix} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_2 & -B \\ \hline -C & -D \end{array} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x \end{pmatrix} = -Dx^2 \geq 0. \quad (91)$$

Only  $D = 0$  can satisfy the above simultaneously. Once the lower right block is set to 0, the off-diagonal blocks must also vanish for  $\Pi_i$  to be valid projectors (see Appendix A),

$$\Pi_1 = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right), \quad \Pi_2 = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_2 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right). \quad (92)$$

Therefore Eq. (85) reduces to the same form as Eq. (73) when examining the top left quadrant only,

$$\alpha(A_1 + A_2) = \mathbb{I}, \quad (93)$$

identifying that  $\alpha = 1$  since  $A_1, A_2$  are projectors. Applying Lemma 11 gives  $A_1A_2 = A_2A_1 = 0$ . The result is that  $\Pi_1\Pi_2 = \Pi_2\Pi_1 = 0$ .  $\square$

A consequence of  $\alpha = 1$  is that,

$$\frac{G(c/2(P_1 + P_2))}{f(c/2(P_1 + P_2))} = \frac{G(c\mathbb{I}/2)}{f(c\mathbb{I}/2)}, \quad (94)$$

for all orthogonal projectors  $P_1, P_2$ . The above relation can be shown to hold in a more general case which leads to a restatement of the axiom describing the behaviour of the map acting on convex combinations.

**Lemma 13** (Constrained scale functions). *A duality map,  $\Phi$ , satisfies*

$$(iv) \quad \Phi(\sum_i p_i a_i) = f(\sum_i p_i a_i) \sum_i \frac{p_i}{f(a_i)} \Phi(a_i)$$

for all  $a_i \in \text{Herm}_n$  and  $p_i \in [0, 1]$  with  $\sum_i p_i = 1$ .

*Proof.* This proof follows by demonstrating various relationships between the (in principle) general scaling functions  $f, g, G$  that must hold as a consequence of Axiomatisation 1.

First, for all Hermitian operators  $A$ , the ratio of  $f(A)$  to  $G(A)$  is proven to be a constant independent of  $A$ . The spectral decomposition of a general Hermitian operator  $A$  is given by

$$A = \sum_i \lambda_i P_i, \quad (95)$$

where  $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$  and in the case of degenerate eigenvalues we are free to chose  $\{P_i\}$  to form a set of orthogonal projectors. In order to apply axiom (ii) of Axiomatisation 1 the summation is rearranged to read,

$$A = \sum_i \mu_i (c_i P_i), \quad (96)$$

where now  $\mu_i \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_i \mu_i = 1$ , whereas  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mu_i c_i = \lambda_i$ . Note that while clearly this choice of  $\mu_i c_i$  is not unique, this does not affect the following argument.

By axiom (ii) of Axiomatisation 1,

$$\Phi(A) = G(A) \sum_i h(\mu_i) g(c_i P_i) \Phi(c_i P_i). \quad (97)$$

Using Lemma 12 this can be written as a spectral decomposition over orthogonal projectors,

$$\Phi(A) = G(A) \sum_i h(\mu_i) g(c_i P_i) f(c_i P_i) c_i \Pi_i. \quad (98)$$

However since the spectral decomposition is unique (up to degenerate eigenvalues where we continue to chose an orthogonal basis) it can also be expressed using the spectrum preserving axiom as

$$\Phi(A) = f(A) \sum_i \mu_i c_i \Pi_{\sigma(i)}, \quad (99)$$

where  $\sigma(i)$  denotes some permutation of indices.

Equating Eq. (97) and Eq. (99) gives,

$$\frac{G(A)}{f(A)} \sum_i h(\mu_i) g(c_i P_i) f(c_i P_i) c_i \Pi_i = \sum_i \mu_i c_i \Pi_{\sigma(i)}. \quad (100)$$

Multiplying by  $\Pi_k$  selects for a given projector,

$$\frac{G(A)}{f(A)} h(\mu_{\sigma(j)}) g(c_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) f(c_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) c_{\sigma(j)} = \mu_j c_j, \quad (101)$$

where  $\sigma(j) = k$ . Appendix B demonstrates that in fact  $\sigma(k) = k \forall k$  is the only allowed permutation for any map  $\Phi$  and operator  $A$ . Therefore we can equate

$$h(\mu_i) g(c_i P_i) = \frac{f(A)}{G(A)} \frac{\mu_i}{f(c_i P_i)}. \quad (102)$$

Since  $h(\mu_i) g(c_i P_i)$  cannot depend on the other eigenvalues and vectors of  $A$  the ratio of  $f(A)$  to  $G(A)$  must be constant for any given Hermitian, i.e.

$$\frac{f(A)}{G(A)} = x, \quad \forall A \in \text{Herm}, \quad (103)$$

for some  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Applying (ii) of Axiomatisation 1 to the trivial sum  $\Phi(A) = G(A) h(t) g(A) \Phi(A)$  gives another useful relation,

$$g(A) = \frac{1}{G(A)} = \frac{x}{f(A)}, \quad \forall A \in \text{Herm}, \quad (104)$$

since  $h(1) = 1$  by definition.

The next step is to investigate the function  $h$  by relating  $h(t)g(A)$  and  $g(A)$ . Let  $A_1, A_2$  be any two Hermitian operators with spectral decompositions,

$$A_1 = \sum_i \lambda_i P_i \quad (105)$$

$$A_2 = \sum_i \mu_i Q_i, \quad (106)$$

where  $\lambda_i, \mu_i \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\{P_i, Q_i\}$  form an orthogonal set of projectors, i.e.  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  must have orthogonal support. Consider a convex combination,

$$A = tA_1 + (1-t)A_2, \quad (107)$$

with  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Since  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  have orthogonal support and the map obeys axiom (iii) of Axiomatisation 1, the spectrum of the mapped convex combination is:

$$\text{spec}[\Phi(A)] = f(A)\{t\lambda_i, (1-t)\mu_i\}. \quad (108)$$

On the other hand, applying axiom (ii) of Axiomatisation 1 to  $A$  gives,

$$\Phi(A) = G(A)[h(t)g(A_1)\Phi(A_1) + h(1-t)g(A_2)\Phi(A_2)]. \quad (109)$$

By Lemma 12,  $\Phi(A_1)$  and  $\Phi(A_2)$  have orthogonal support, and  $\{\Phi(\lambda_i P_i), \Phi(\mu_i Q_i)\}$  is an orthogonal set. Together with axiom (iii) of Axiomatisation 1, this implies that

$$\text{spec}[\Phi(A)] = \{G(A)h(t)g(A_1)\text{spec}[\Phi(A_1)], G(A)h(1-t)g(A_2)\text{spec}[\Phi(A_1)]\} \quad (110)$$

$$= \{G(A)h(t)g(A_1)f(A_1)\lambda_i, G(A)h(1-t)g(A_2)f(A_2)\mu_i\}. \quad (111)$$

Again using the result from Appendix B that the permutation is trivial, we can equate the elements of  $\text{spec}[\Phi(A)]$  that correspond to  $A_1$ :

$$f(A)t\lambda_i = G(A)h(t)g(A_1)f(A_1)\lambda_i. \quad (112)$$

Using Eq. (103) and Eq. (104),

$$h(t)g(A_1) = \frac{tx}{f(A_1)}, \quad (113)$$

for all  $A_1 \in \text{Herm}$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

Finally, substituting for  $g, G$  using Eq. (103) and Eq. (224), (ii) of Axiomatisation 1 becomes,

$$\Phi\left(\sum_i p_i A_i\right) = G\left(\sum_i p_i A_i\right) \sum_i h(p_i)g(A_i)\Phi(A_i) \quad (114)$$

$$= \frac{f(\sum_i p_i A_i)}{x} \sum_i \frac{p_i x}{f(A_i)} \Phi(A_i) \quad (115)$$

$$= f\left(\sum_i p_i A_i\right) \sum_i \frac{p_i}{f(A_i)} \Phi(A_i) \quad (116)$$

for all  $A_i \in \text{Herm}$  and  $p_i \in [0, 1]$  where  $\sum_i p_i = 1$ .  $\square$



This constraint on how the map acts on convex combinations of operators enables the link between duality maps and the encodings in Theorem 1 to be made.

*Proof.* (of Theorem 5) For  $\mathcal{E}$  to be an encoding it is sufficient to show that it satisfies the 3 conditions given in point (i) of Theorem 1.

(i) of Axiomatisation 1 states  $\Phi(A)^\dagger = \Phi(A)$ , therefore

$$\mathcal{E}(A)^\dagger = \frac{\Phi(A)^\dagger}{f(A)} = \frac{\Phi(A)}{f(A)}. \quad (117)$$

However,  $\overline{f(A)} = f(A)$  since it is defined by a real function. Therefore  $\mathcal{E}(A)^\dagger = \mathcal{E}(A)$  and the first encoding axiom is satisfied.

Using (iii) of Axiomatisation 1, it quickly follows that  $\mathcal{E}$  is spectrum preserving:

$$\text{spec}[\mathcal{E}(A)] = \text{spec}\left[\frac{\Phi(A)}{f(A)}\right] \quad (118)$$

$$= \frac{1}{f(A)} \text{spec}[\Phi(A)] \quad (119)$$

$$= \frac{1}{f(A)} f(A) \text{spec}[A] \quad (120)$$

$$= \text{spec}[A]. \quad (121)$$

The final encoding axiom is shown using (ii) of Axiomatisation 1 and Lemma 13 to demonstrate that  $\mathcal{E}$  is convex,

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\sum_i p_i a_i\right) = \frac{\Phi\left(\sum_i p_i a_i\right)}{f\left(\sum_i p_i a_i\right)} \quad (122)$$

$$= \frac{1}{f\left(\sum_i p_i a_i\right)} f\left(\sum_i p_i a_i\right) \sum_i \frac{p_i}{f(a_i)} \Phi(a_i) \quad (123)$$

$$= \sum_i \frac{p_i}{f(a_i)} f(a_i) \mathcal{E}(a_i) \quad (124)$$

$$= \sum_i p_i \mathcal{E}(a_i). \quad (125)$$

The mathematical form follows directly from  $\Phi(A) = f(A)\mathcal{E}(A)$  and Theorem 1.  $\square$

## 4 Map on states

A map on Hamiltonians and observables is not enough to fully characterise the duality, since a state in one theory should also have a corresponding state in the other. The set of states is just a subset of Hermitian operators, however when considering states the physical motivation for axiomatisations 1–2 is no longer relevant. Instead, when we consider maps on states, we need them to be compatible with the map on operators such that measurement outcomes and time dynamics behave as expected. This section characterises the mathematical form of the map on states given the form of duality maps on operators.

**Definition 14** (Compatible duality state map). *Given a duality map,  $\Phi$ , on operators, we say that a map on states,  $\Phi_{\text{state}} : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_n) \mapsto \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_m)$ , is compatible with  $\Phi$  if it satisfies the following properties:*

1. *convexity: for all  $p_i \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_i p_i = 1$ ,*

$$\Phi_{\text{state}}\left(\sum_i p_i \rho_i\right) = \sum_i p_i \Phi_{\text{state}}(\rho_i); \quad (126)$$

2. *measurement outcomes are preserved up to the scaling function,*

$$\text{tr}[\Phi(A)\Phi_{\text{state}}(\rho)] = f(A) \text{tr}[A\rho] \quad (127)$$

*for all  $A \in \text{Herm}_n$ ,  $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_n)$ ;*

3. *time dynamics is consistent at rescaled times,*

$$\Phi_{\text{state}}\left(e^{-iHt} \rho e^{iHt}\right) = e^{-i\Phi(H)t/f(H)} \Phi_{\text{state}}(\rho) e^{i\Phi(H)t/f(H)}. \quad (128)$$

**Proposition 15** (Form of state map). *Given a duality map,  $\Phi(A) = f(A)U \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^p A \oplus \bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{p+q} \bar{A}\right) U^\dagger$ , on operators, the compatible duality map on states,  $\Phi_{\text{state}} : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_n) \mapsto \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_m)$ , as in Definition 14, is necessarily of the form:*

$$\Phi_{\text{state}}(\rho) = U \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^p \alpha_i \rho\right) U^\dagger, \quad (129)$$

*where  $\alpha_i \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Setting  $B = e^{iHt}$  and conjugating Eq. (128) with  $U^\dagger$

$$U^\dagger \Phi_{\text{state}}(B\rho B^\dagger) U = U^\dagger e^{i\Phi(H)t/f(H)} \Phi_{\text{state}}(\rho) e^{-i\Phi(H)t/f(H)} U \quad (130)$$

$$= (B^{\oplus p} \oplus \bar{B}^{\oplus q}) U^\dagger \Phi_{\text{state}}(\rho) U ((B^\dagger)^{\oplus p} \oplus (\bar{B}^\dagger)^{\oplus q}). \quad (131)$$

Since  $B$  represents time evolution for general  $t$  and  $H$ , the above shows that the conjugated state map must have the same block diagonal structure as  $\Phi$ , i.e.

$$U^\dagger \Phi_{\text{state}}(\rho) U = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{p+q} X_i(\rho). \quad (132)$$

We now substitute this structure of the state map into Eq. (127):

$$\text{tr}(A\rho) = \text{tr} \left[ U \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^p A \oplus \bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{p+q} \bar{A}\right) U^\dagger U \bigoplus_{i=1}^{p+q} X_i(\rho) U^\dagger \right] \quad (133)$$

$$= \text{tr} \left[ \bigoplus_{i=1}^p AX_i(\rho) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{p+q} \bar{A}X_i(\rho) \right] \quad (134)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^p \text{tr}[AX_i(\rho)] + \sum_{i=p+1}^q \text{tr}[\bar{A}X_i(\rho)]. \quad (135)$$

Since Eq. (135) is true for all  $A$  we can differentiate with respect to  $A$ ,

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^p X_i(\rho), \quad (136)$$

and separately with respect to  $\bar{A}$ ,

$$0 = \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+q} X_i(\rho). \quad (137)$$

Note that  $A$  and  $\bar{A}$  are independent for the purpose of differentiation.

The fact that  $\Phi_{\text{state}}$  maps states to states implies that  $X_i(\rho)$  is a positive operator for all  $i$  and  $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_n)$ . Apply  $X_i$  to a pure state  $|\psi_0\rangle$  and assume for contradiction that the image has some support on a distinct pure state which wlog we call  $|\psi_1\rangle$ ,

$$X_i(|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|) = \alpha_i |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| + \beta_i |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + \text{else}, \quad (138)$$

where “else” has no overlap with  $|\psi_0\rangle$  or  $|\psi_1\rangle$ .  $0 \leq \alpha_i, \beta_i \leq 1$  since  $X_i(\rho)$  is a positive operator. From Eq. (136),

$$|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| = \sum_{i=1}^p X_i(|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|) \quad (139)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| + \beta_i |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + \text{else}. \quad (140)$$

Therefore  $\sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i = 1$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i = 0 \implies \beta_i = 0$  for all  $i$ . Hence when applied to any pure state each  $X_i$  for  $i \in [1, p]$  acts as,

$$X_i(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \alpha_i |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i = 1. \quad (141)$$

It follows from Eq. (126) that each  $X_i$  is individually convex. Explicitly

$$U \bigoplus_{i=1}^{p+q} X_i \left( \sum_j t_j \rho_j \right) U^\dagger = \sum_j t_j U \bigoplus_{i=1}^{p+q} X_i(\rho_j) U^\dagger \quad (142)$$

implies that for all  $i$  the following is true

$$X_i \left( \sum_j t_j \rho_j \right) = \sum_j t_j X_i(\rho_j). \quad (143)$$

This combined with Eq. (141) gives for any state  $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_n)$ ,

$$X_i(\rho) = \alpha_i \rho \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i = 1. \quad (144)$$

By normalisation,  $X_i(\rho) = 0$  for  $i \in [p+1, q]$  which can also be seen from Eq. (137) by applying a similar argument as for  $b_i = 0$ .

Eq. (144) combined with Eq. (132) gives the quoted form of the map.  $\square$

## 5 Approximate dualities

So far only exact dualities have been considered. However, more general definitions of duality are needed in order for this framework to be practical. This section defines how to extend the ideas of exact duality maps to allow for approximations and restrictions to a subspace.

**Definition 16** ( $(\mathcal{S}, \epsilon)$ -Duality).  $\tilde{\Phi}: \text{Herm}_n \mapsto \text{Herm}_m$  is a  $(\mathcal{S}, \epsilon)$ -approximate duality map if  $\exists$  a duality map  $\Phi$  such that  $\forall A \in \text{Herm}_n$ , the action of  $\tilde{\Phi}$  restricted to the subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  is close to the action of  $\Phi$ :

$$\left\| \tilde{\Phi}(A) \Big|_{\mathcal{S}} - \Phi(A) \right\| \leq k(A)\epsilon, \quad (145)$$

for some constant  $\epsilon$ , where  $k: \text{Herm}_n \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . The duality map is:

- (i.) **exact** if  $\epsilon = 0$ ;
- (ii.) **unital** if  $f(A) = 1$  for all  $A \in \text{Herm}_n$ .

[CMP19] places a large emphasis on local simulations given the focus on Hamiltonian simulation. Since many-body Hamiltonians of interest are often local, a local encoding will preserve this local structure. Due to the close relation between duality maps and encodings, we can extend the above definition to focus on approximately local duality maps.

**Definition 17** ( $(\mathcal{S}, \epsilon, \eta)$ -Local duality).  $\tilde{\Phi}: \text{Herm}_n \mapsto \text{Herm}_m$  is a  $(\mathcal{S}, \epsilon, \eta)$ -approximately local duality map if it is an  $(\mathcal{S}, \epsilon)$ -approximate duality map and the exact duality map  $\Phi(M) = f(M)V \left( M^{\oplus p} \oplus \overline{M}^{\oplus q} \right) V^\dagger$  in Definition 16 is close to a local duality map (Definition 6),  $\Phi'(M) = f(M)V' \left( M^{\oplus p} \oplus \overline{M}^{\oplus q} \right) V'^\dagger$ , such that  $\|V - V'\| \leq \eta$ . The duality is **exactly-local** if  $\eta = 0$ .

Locality is a natural property to consider, but similar definitions could be equivalently formulated for some other desirable properties, for example particle number conserving. How these error parameters translate to errors in the physically relevant properties is explored in Section 6.3.

## 6 Properties of dualities

This section demonstrates that the definition of duality mappings (and their approximate counterparts), arising from physically motivated axioms, have several desirable properties. In particular, exact and approximate dualities are shown to compose well. The choice of extension to approximate mappings is further motivated since the errors defined are shown propagate to physically relevant properties in a controlled way.

### 6.1 Similar mappings

As expected, if two exact duality maps are close the results of applying the maps to the same operator are also close. Furthermore applying the same mapping to two close operators gives outputs that are close. This was formalised for encodings in Lemma 19 of [CMP19], here we show a similar result for duality

maps where, unsurprisingly, the ‘‘closeness’’ now also depends on the scaling functions of the maps involved.

First we restate Lemma 18 of [CMP19], a technical result used in the following proof.

**Lemma 18.** *Let  $A, B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$  and  $C : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be linear maps. Let  $\|\cdot\|_a$  be the trace or operator norm. Then,*

$$\|ACA^\dagger - BCB^\dagger\|_a \leq (\|A\| + \|B\|)\|A - B\| \|C\|_a. \quad (146)$$

**Proposition 19** (Similar exact dualities). *Consider two duality maps  $\Phi$  and  $\Phi'$  defined by  $\Phi(M) = f(M)V \left( M^{\oplus p} \oplus \overline{M}^{\oplus q} \right) V^\dagger$ ,  $\Phi'(M) = f'(M)V' \left( M^{\oplus p} \oplus \overline{M}^{\oplus q} \right) V'^\dagger$ , for some isometries  $V, V'$ . Then for any operators  $M$  and  $M'$ :*

- (i)  $\|\Phi(M) - \Phi'(M)\| \leq \left( \left| \sqrt{f(M)} \right| + \left| \sqrt{f'(M)} \right| \right) \left\| \sqrt{f(M)}V - \sqrt{f'(M)}V' \right\| \|M\|$ ;
- (ii)  $\|\Phi(M) - \Phi(M')\| = \|f(M)M - f(M')M'\|$ .

*Proof.* For (i) applying Lemma 18 gives

$$\|\Phi(M) - \Phi'(M)\| = \|f(M)V\mathbf{M}V^\dagger - f'(M)V'\mathbf{M}V'^\dagger\| \quad (147)$$

$$\leq \left( \left\| \sqrt{f(M)}V \right\| + \left\| \sqrt{f'(M)}V' \right\| \right) \left\| \sqrt{f(M)}V - \sqrt{f'(M)}V' \right\| \|M\| \quad (148)$$

$$= \left( \left| \sqrt{f(M)} \right| + \left| \sqrt{f'(M)} \right| \right) \left\| \sqrt{f(M)}V - \sqrt{f'(M)}V' \right\| \|M\|, \quad (149)$$

where  $\mathbf{M} = M^{\oplus p} \oplus \overline{M}^{\oplus q}$ . The second part is simply

$$\|\Phi(M) - \Phi(M')\| = \left\| f(M)V \left( M^{\oplus p} \oplus \overline{M}^{\oplus q} \right) V^\dagger - f(M')V \left( M'^{\oplus p} \oplus \overline{M'}^{\oplus q} \right) V^\dagger \right\| \quad (150)$$

$$= \left\| f(M)V \left( \left( M - \frac{f(M')}{f(M)}M' \right)^{\oplus p} \oplus \left( \overline{M} - \frac{f(M')}{f(M)}\overline{M'} \right)^{\oplus q} \right) V^\dagger \right\| \quad (151)$$

$$= \|f(M)M - f(M')M'\|. \quad (152)$$

□

## 6.2 Composition

It follows almost directly from [CMP19] Lemma 17 that the composition of two exact duality maps,  $\Phi = \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1$  will itself be an exact duality map, therefore we first restate their result.

**Lemma 20.** *If  $\mathcal{E}_1$  and  $\mathcal{E}_2$  are encodings, then their composition  $\mathcal{E}_1 \circ \mathcal{E}_2$  is also an encoding. Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{E}_1$  and  $\mathcal{E}_2$  are both local, then their composition  $\mathcal{E}_1 \circ \mathcal{E}_2$  is local.*

**Proposition 21** (Exact duality map composition). *Let  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$  be duality maps. The composition of these maps,  $\Phi = \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1$  is also a duality map with the valid duality scaling function  $f(\cdot) = f_2(\Phi_1(\cdot))f_1(\cdot)$ . Furthermore if the initial dualities were both local, the composition is also local.*

*Proof.* The two duality maps necessarily have the form

$$\Phi_1(M) = f_1(M)V_1 (M \otimes P_1 + \overline{M} \otimes Q_1) V_1^\dagger, \quad (153)$$

$$\Phi_2(M) = f_2(M)V_2 (M \otimes P_2 + \overline{M} \otimes Q_2) V_2^\dagger, \quad (154)$$

where  $V_i$  are isometries,  $f_i$  are real functions and  $P_i, Q_i$  are orthogonal projectors. This leads to a composition of the form,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1)(M) &= f_2(f_1(M)V_1 (M \otimes P_1 + \overline{M} \otimes Q_1) V_1^\dagger)f_1(M) \times \\ &\quad V_2 \left[ V_1 (M \otimes P_1 + \overline{M} \otimes Q_1) V_1^\dagger \otimes P_1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \overline{V_1 (M \otimes P_1 + \overline{M} \otimes Q_1) V_1^\dagger \otimes P_1} \right] V_2^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (155)$$

Lemma 20 tells us this can be rewritten as,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1)(M) &= f_2(f_1(M)V_1 (M \otimes P_1 + \overline{M} \otimes Q_1) V_1^\dagger)f_1(M) \times \\ &\quad U [M \otimes P + \overline{M} \otimes Q] U^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (156)$$

where  $U = V_2(V_1 \otimes P_2 + \overline{V_1} \otimes Q_2 + \mathbb{I} \otimes (\mathbb{I} - P_2 - Q_2))V_2^\dagger$  is an isometry and  $P = P_1 \otimes P_2 + \overline{Q_1} \otimes Q_2$ ,  $Q = Q_1 \otimes P_2 + \overline{P_1} \otimes Q_2$  are new orthogonal projectors.

All that remains is to identify a new scaling function,

$$f(M) = f_2(f_1(M)V_1 (M \otimes P_1 + \overline{M} \otimes Q_1) W^\dagger)f(M), \quad (157)$$

and note that it satisfies the three prerequisites from the definition of a duality map. The first two are immediate: it maps operators to real scalars and doesn't map to zero unless the operator is zero. Checking the function is also Lipschitz on compact sets requires slightly more work.

We would like to show for all  $B, B'$  in any compact subset there exists a constant  $L$  such that,

$$|f_2(\Phi_1(B))f_1(B) - f_2(\Phi_1(B'))f_1(B')| \leq L\|B - B'\|. \quad (158)$$

Breaking this down and using knowledge of  $f_1, f_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &|f_2(\Phi_1(B))f_1(B) - f_2(\Phi_1(B'))f_1(B')| \\ &\leq |f_2(\Phi_1(B))||f_1(B) - f_1(B')| + |f_1(B')||f_2(\Phi_1(B)) - f_2(\Phi_1(B'))| \end{aligned} \quad (159)$$

$$\leq |f_2(\Phi_1(B))|L_1\|B - B'\| + |f_1(B')|L_2\|\Phi_1(B) - \Phi_1(B')\|. \quad (160)$$

Using result (ii) from Proposition 19,

$$\|\Phi_1(B) - \Phi_1(B')\| \leq |f_1(B')|\|B - B'\| + |f_1(B) - f_1(B')|\|B\| \quad (161)$$

$$\leq |f_1(B')|\|B - B'\| + L_1\|B\|\|B - B'\|. \quad (162)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &|f_2(\Phi_1(B))f_1(B) - f_2(\Phi_1(B'))f_1(B')| \\ &\leq (|f_2(\Phi_1(B))|L_1 + |f_1(B')|L_2(|f_1(B')| + L_1\|B\|))\|B - B'\| \end{aligned} \quad (163)$$

$$\leq L\|B - B'\|. \quad (164)$$

The function is then a valid rescaling since for all  $B, B$  in a compact set there exists a constant  $L$  such that,

$$|f_2(\Phi_1(B))|L_1 + |f_1(B')|L_2 (|f_1(B')| + L_1\|B\|) \leq L, \quad (165)$$

as compactness implies  $\|B\|, f_2(\Phi_1(B)), f_1(B)$  can be upper bounded by a constant.

The scale factor is independent of the locality structure so it follows directly from Lemma 20 that if the initial dualities were both local the composition is also local.  $\square$

This can now be extended to consider how the error parameters translate when two approximately-local duality maps are composed.

**Proposition 22** (Approximate duality composition). *Let  $\tilde{\Phi}_1, \tilde{\Phi}_2$  be  $(\mathcal{S}_i, \epsilon_i, \eta_i)$ -approximately local duality maps with corresponding close exact duality maps  $\Phi_1(\cdot) = f_1(\cdot)\mathcal{E}_1(\cdot)$ ,  $\Phi_2 = f_2(\cdot)\mathcal{E}_2(\cdot)$  respectively. Their composition  $\tilde{\Phi} = \tilde{\Phi}_2 \circ \tilde{\Phi}_1$  is a  $(\mathcal{S}, \epsilon, \eta)$ -approximately local duality map on any compact subset where,*

$$\epsilon = \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \quad (166)$$

$$\eta \leq \eta_1 + \eta_2, \quad (167)$$

$$k(A) = k_2 \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right) + L_2 k_1(A)^2 \epsilon_1 + \Lambda_2 |f_1(A)| \|A\| k_1(A) + |f_2(\Phi_1(A))| k_1(A). \quad (168)$$

Here,  $L_2$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $f_2$ . Moreover the exact duality that is close to the approximate composition is the composition of exact dualities,  $\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1$ .  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_2$  is the subspace given by the domain of  $\Phi_2$  when the range is restricted to  $\mathcal{S}_1$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\tilde{\Phi}_1$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}_2$  are approximate dualities,

$$\left\| \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} - \Phi_1(A) \right\| \leq k_1(A)\epsilon_1 \quad (169)$$

$$\left\| \tilde{\Phi}_2(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_2} - \Phi_2(A) \right\| \leq k_2(A)\epsilon_2. \quad (170)$$

For  $\tilde{\Phi}$  to be an approximate duality it must satisfy an inequality of the following form,

$$\left\| \tilde{\Phi}_2 \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{S}_2} - \Phi(A) \right\| \leq k(A)\epsilon, \quad (171)$$

for some exact duality  $\Phi$ , where we have used knowledge of  $\mathcal{S}$  to rewrite the restriction. Exact dualities compose to give a valid exact duality  $\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1(A) = f_2(\Phi_1(A))f_1(A)\mathcal{E}_2 \circ \mathcal{E}_1(A)$  (see Proposition 21). So we take this as  $\Phi$  in Eq. (171) and show that the norm difference is bounded by something of the form of the right hand side of Eq. (171).

Using the knowledge of the composite dualities and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_2 \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{S}_2} - \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1(A) \right\| \\ & \leq k_2 \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right) \epsilon_2 + \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_2 \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right) - \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1(A) \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (172)$$

The second term in Eq. (172) can be broken down using the similar exact dualities result (ii) from Proposition 19,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \Phi_2 \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right) - \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1(A) \right\| \\ &= \left\| f_2(\tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1}) \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} - f_2(\Phi_1(A)) \Phi_1(A) \right\| \end{aligned} \quad (173)$$

$$\leq \left\| \left( f_2(\tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1}) - f_2(\Phi_1(A)) + f_2(\Phi_1(A)) \right) \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} - \Phi_1(A) + \Phi_1(A) \right) - f_2(\Phi_1(A)) \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right\| \quad (174)$$

$$\leq \left| f_2(\tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1}) - f_2(\Phi_1(A)) \right| \left( \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} - \Phi_1(A) \right\| + \|\Phi_1(A)\| \right) + \left| f_2(\Phi_1(A)) \right| \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} - \Phi_1(A) \right\| \quad (175)$$

$$\leq \left| f_2(\tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1}) - f_2(\Phi_1(A)) \right| \left( k_1(A)\epsilon_1 + |f_1(A)|\|A\| \right) + |f_2(\Phi_1(A))| k_1(A)\epsilon_1. \quad (176)$$

Substituting this back gives,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_2 \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{S}_2} - \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1(A) \right\| \\ & \leq k_2 \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right) \epsilon_2 + \left| f_2(\tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1}) - f_2(\Phi_1(A)) \right| \\ & \quad \times \left( k_1(A)\epsilon_1 + |f_1(A)|\|A\| \right) + |f_2(\Phi_1(A))| k_1(A)\epsilon_1. \end{aligned} \quad (177)$$

Since  $f_2$  is Lipschitz on any compact subset,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_2 \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{S}_2} - \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1(A) \right\| \\ & \leq k_2 \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right) \epsilon_2 + L_2 k_1(A)\epsilon_1 \left( k_1(A)\epsilon_1 + |f_1(A)|\|A\| \right) \\ & \quad + |f_2(\Phi_1(A))| k_1(A)\epsilon_1, \end{aligned} \quad (178)$$

and all terms on the right hand side are of order  $\epsilon_1$  or  $\epsilon_2$ . One choice of  $\epsilon$  and  $k(A)$  is then,

$$\epsilon = \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 \quad (179)$$

$$k(A) = k_2 \left( \tilde{\Phi}_1(A)|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \right) + L_2 k_1(A)^2 \epsilon_1 + L_2 |f_1(A)|\|A\| k_1(A) + |f_2(\Phi_1(A))| k_1(A). \quad (180)$$

The scaling of  $\eta$  is simplified by the definition of the subspace  $\mathcal{S}$ , since  $\Phi_1/\Phi_2$  are  $\eta_1/\eta_2$  close to local dualities  $\Phi'_1/\Phi'_2$ . Therefore by Lemma 20 and triangle inequality we have  $\|V - V'\| \leq \eta_1 + \eta_2$ .  $\square$

### 6.3 Physical properties

This section walks through how the parameters in the definition of approximate and approximately-local duality translates to different physical properties.



### 6.3.1 Measurement outcomes

Axiomatisation 1 includes a spectrum preserving statement motivated by considering that dual measurement outcomes should be related. This included a scaling factor relating the spectra which is associated with a possible unit rescaling. Now considering approximate duality maps, the rescaled eigenvalues of corresponding observables are approximately equal with a controlled error.

**Proposition 23** (Approximate eigenvalues). *Let the Hermitian operator  $A$  act on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}$  be a  $(\mathcal{S}, \epsilon, \eta)$ -approximately local duality map. Let  $\lambda_i(A)$ ,  $\lambda_i(\tilde{\Phi}(A)|_{\mathcal{S}})$  be the  $i$ 'th smallest eigenvalues of  $A$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}(A)|_{\mathcal{S}}$  respectively. Then for all  $1 \leq i \leq d^n$  and all  $j$  such that  $(i-1)(p+q)+1 \leq j \leq i(p+q)$ ,*

$$\left| \lambda_j(\tilde{\Phi}(A)|_{\mathcal{S}}) - f(A)\lambda_i(A) \right| \leq k(A)\epsilon. \quad (181)$$

Where the integers  $p$ ,  $q$  and  $f(\cdot)$  is the function appearing the corresponding exact duality map.

*Proof.* Let  $\Phi$  be the exact duality map which is  $\epsilon$ -close to the restricted  $\tilde{\Phi}$  as in Eq. (145) and  $\eta$ -close to the local duality. For any  $i, j$  satisfying the above inequalities,  $\lambda_j(\Phi(A)) = f(A)\lambda_i(A)$  from axiom (iii) of Axiomatisation 1 of exact dualities. Combining Eq. (145) with Weyl's inequality ( $|\lambda_j(A) - \lambda_j(B)| \leq \|A - B\|$ ) gives,

$$\left| \lambda_j(\tilde{\Phi}(A)|_{\mathcal{S}}) - f(A)\lambda_i(A) \right| = \left| \lambda_j(\tilde{\Phi}(A)|_{\mathcal{S}}) - \lambda_j(\Phi(A)) \right| \quad (182)$$

$$\leq \left\| \tilde{\Phi}(A)|_{\mathcal{S}} - \Phi(A) \right\| \quad (183)$$

$$\leq k(A)\epsilon. \quad (184)$$

□

### 6.3.2 Thermal properties

Similarly Axiomatisation 2 includes a partition-function-like statement motivated by requiring dual thermal properties. Approximate duality mappings preserve partition functions of a given Hamiltonian up to a controllable error, when the restricted subspace is taken to be the low-energy subspace of the Hamiltonian in question.

**Proposition 24** (Approximate partition functions). *Let the Hamiltonian  $H$  act on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}$  be the  $(\mathcal{S}, \epsilon, \eta)$ -duality map into  $(\mathbb{C}^{d'})^{\otimes m}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the low energy subspace of  $H$  with energy less than  $\Delta$ . The relative error in the dual partition functions is given by,*

$$\frac{\left| \mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{\Phi}(H)}(\beta) - (p+q)\mathcal{Z}_H(f(H)\beta) \right|}{(p+q)\mathcal{Z}_H(f(H)\beta)} \leq \frac{(d')^m e^{-\beta\Delta}}{(p+q)d^n e^{-\beta f(H)\|H\|}} + \left( e^{\beta k(H)\epsilon} - 1 \right), \quad (185)$$

where the integers  $p$ ,  $q$  and  $f(\cdot)$  is the function in the corresponding exact duality map.

*Proof.* By axiom (iii) Axiomatisation 2 of an exact duality

$(p+q) \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta f(H)H}] = \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \Phi(H)}]$ . Therefore,

$$\frac{\left| \mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{\Phi}(H)}(\beta) - (p+q) \mathcal{Z}_H(f(H)\beta) \right|}{(p+q) \mathcal{Z}_H(f(H)\beta)} = \frac{\left| \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \tilde{\Phi}(H)}] - (p+q) \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta f(H)H}] \right|}{(p+q) \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta f(H)H}]}$$
(186)

$$= \frac{\left| \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \tilde{\Phi}(H)}] - \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \Phi(H)}] \right|}{(p+q) \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta f(H)H}]}$$
(187)

$$\leq \frac{\left| \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \tilde{\Phi}(H)}] - \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \tilde{\Phi}(H)}|_S] \right|}{(p+q) \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta f(H)H}]} + \frac{\left| \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \tilde{\Phi}(H)}|_S] - \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \Phi(H)}] \right|}{\operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \Phi(H)}]}$$
(188)

Bounding the numerator and denominator of the first term:

$$\left| \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \tilde{\Phi}(H)}] - \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \tilde{\Phi}(H)}|_S] \right| \leq (d')^m e^{-\beta \Delta}.$$
(189)

$$\operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta f(H)H}] \geq d^m e^{-\beta f(H)\|H\|}.$$
(190)

The second term is bounded by considering eigenvalues. Let  $\lambda_l$  be the  $l$ 'th eigenvalue of  $H'|_S$  in non-decreasing order. Then by the argument in Proposition 23 the  $l$ 'th eigenvalue of  $\Phi(H)$  (in the same order) is given by  $\lambda_l + k(H)\epsilon_l$  where  $|\epsilon_l| \leq \epsilon$  for all  $l$ . Hence,

$$\left| \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \tilde{\Phi}(H)}|_S] - \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \Phi(H)}] \right| \leq \sum_l \left| e^{-\beta \lambda_l} - e^{-\beta(\lambda_l + k(H)\epsilon_l)} \right|$$
(191)

$$= \sum_l e^{\beta(\lambda_l + k(H)\epsilon_l)} \left| e^{\beta k(H)\epsilon_l} - 1 \right|$$
(192)

$$\leq (e^{\beta k(H)\epsilon} - 1) \operatorname{tr} [e^{-\beta \Phi(H)}].$$
(193)

Combining the above with Eq. (189) and Eq. (190) gives the result.  $\square$

### 6.3.3 Time dynamics

Definition 14 demanded consistent time dynamics for exact duality mappings as a constraint to specify the form of the corresponding state map. As expected when considering approximate duality maps this statement is relaxed, such that time dynamics of the two systems is close up to an error that increases with time.

**Proposition 25** (Approximate time dynamics). *Let  $\tilde{\Phi}$  be a  $(S, \epsilon, \eta)$ -approximately local duality map with corresponding exact duality  $\Phi(\cdot) = f(\cdot)\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$ . Given a Hamiltonian  $H$  such that  $S$  is the low energy subspace with eigenvalues  $< \Delta$ . Then for any density matrix  $\rho$  in the encoded subspace, such that  $\Phi(\mathbb{I})\rho = \rho$ , the time dynamics of the approximate duality mapping is close to that of the exact mapping:*

$$\left\| e^{-i\tilde{\Phi}(H)t} \rho e^{i\tilde{\Phi}(H)t} - e^{-i\Phi(H)t} \rho e^{i\Phi(H)t} \right\|_1 \leq 2\epsilon k(H)t + \eta.$$
(194)

This follows from an identical argument as Proposition 29 from [CMP19], applying instead  $\left\| \tilde{\Phi}(H) \Big|_{\mathfrak{s}} - \Phi(H) \right\| \leq k(H)\epsilon$  at the final step.

## Acknowledgements

TSC is supported by the Royal Society. HA is supported by EPSRC DTP Grant Reference: EP/N509577/1 and EP/T517793/1. We thank Nikolas Breuckmann for interesting discussions that led to the initial idea for this work and QIP 2023 reviewers for helpful comments and suggestions. This work has been supported in part by the EPSRC Prosperity Partnership in Quantum Software for Simulation and Modelling (grant EP/S005021/1), and by the UK Hub in Quantum Computing and Simulation, part of the UK National Quantum Technologies Programme with funding from UKRI EPSRC (grant EP/T001062/1).

# Appendices

## Appendix A Vanishing off-diagonal matrix elements

This appendix demonstrates that if a Hermitian projector,  $\Pi = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array} \right)$ , has  $D = \mathbf{0}$  then necessarily  $B = C = \mathbf{0}$ .

To show this, two properties of  $\Pi$  are useful,

1. Projectors are idempotent,  $\Pi^2 = \Pi$ :

$$\left( \begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & 0 \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A^2 + BC & AB \\ \hline CA & CB \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & 0 \end{array} \right), \quad (195)$$

therefore  $CB = \mathbf{0}$ .

2. Hermitian operators are self-adjoint,  $\Pi^\dagger = \Pi$ :

$$\left( \begin{array}{c|c} A^\dagger & C^\dagger \\ \hline B^\dagger & 0 \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & 0 \end{array} \right), \quad (196)$$

therefore  $B^\dagger = C$ .

Putting these together gives  $BB^\dagger = \mathbf{0}$ . The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of adjoint matrices are related by  $Bv_i = \lambda_i v_i$  and  $B^\dagger v_i = \overline{\lambda_i} v_i$ . Therefore since  $|\lambda_i| = 0$  for all  $i$  in the diagonal basis,  $B = C = \mathbf{0}$ .

## Appendix B Matching up of spectra

The proof of Lemma 13 claims that the trivial permutation  $\sigma(k) = k$  is the only allowed case for

$$\frac{G(A)}{f(A)} h(\mu_{\sigma(j)}) g(c_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) f(c_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) c_{\sigma(j)} = \mu_j c_j. \quad (197)$$

Note that there are  $\dim(A)$  such equations corresponding to selecting for the different spectral projectors.

One could conceive that the permutation depends on the operator as well as the map, so that for a different operator  $B$ ,

$$\frac{G(B)}{f(B)} h\left(\mu_{\nu(j)}^{(B)}\right) g\left(c_{\nu(j)}^{(B)} P_{\nu(j)}^{(B)}\right) f\left(c_{\nu(j)}^{(B)} P_{\nu(j)}^{(B)}\right) c_{\nu(j)}^{(B)} = \mu_j^{(B)} c_j^{(B)}, \quad (198)$$

where  $\sigma(j) \neq \nu(j)$ . However, the spectral projectors are analytic functions of the matrix [Kat95] (assuming for now that the matrices are non-degenerate). Any two matrices  $A$  and  $B$  can be connected by a smooth path, ruling out a change in the permutation which would require a discontinuous jump. Therefore the permutation must be consistent for all inputs to the map. The exception to this case is where there are degeneracies, but as we are only interested in equating eigenvalues, a permutation of degenerate eigenvalues within the degenerate spectral projectors has no affect.

To justify that the permutation must be trivial everywhere we show by contradiction that it must be trivial for any  $A$ . Consider the following analytic change to the operator  $A \rightarrow A'$ : one eigenvalue is changed  $\mu'_k c'_k = \mu_k c_k + \delta$  ( $\delta > 0$ ), whilst all other eigenvalues  $\mu'_{j \neq k} c'_{j \neq k} = \mu_{j \neq k} c_{j \neq k}$ , and all spectral projectors  $P'_j = P_j$  are held unchanged. For this new operator, a similar set of equations hold with the same permutation:

$$\frac{G(A')}{f(A')} h(\mu'_{\sigma(j)}) g(c'_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) f(c'_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) c'_{\sigma(j)} = \mu'_j c'_j. \quad (199)$$

For all  $j \neq 1$  such that  $\sigma(j) \neq 1$

$$\frac{G(A)}{f(A)} \frac{f(A')}{G(A')} = \frac{h(\mu_{\sigma(j)}) g(c_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) f(c_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) c_{\sigma(j)}}{h(\mu_{\sigma(j)}) g(c_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) f(c_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) c_{\sigma(j)}} = 1. \quad (200)$$

Assume for contradiction that  $\sigma(k) = j \neq k$ , so that there is some non-trivial permutation and dual spectral projectors are not paired with eigenvalues related by  $f(A)$ . Then

$$\frac{G(A)}{f(A)} h(\mu_j) g(c_j P_j) f(c_j P_j) c_j = \mu_k c_k \quad (201)$$

$$\frac{G(A')}{f(A')} h(\mu_j) g(c_j P_j) f(c_j P_j) c_j = \mu_k c_k + \delta. \quad (202)$$

Therefore,  $\frac{G(A')}{f(A')} \frac{f(A)}{G(A)} \mu_k c_k = \mu_k c_k + \delta$  and  $\delta = 0$ , contradicting  $\delta > 0$  and the trivial permutation is the only allowed case.

## Appendix C Alternative convexity axiom

Section 2 physically motivates three axiomatisations of duality maps Axiomatisation 1, Axiomatisation 2 and Axiomatisation 3. Axiom (ii) is justified via preserving the convex structure of quantum mechanics through the duality, where the probability distribution and operators can be rescaled. In this appendix we consider a more general convexity axiom,

(ii)\*  $\forall a_i \in \text{Herm}_n, t_i \in [0, 1]$  with  $\sum_i t_i = 1$  :

$$\Phi(\sum_i t_i a_i) = \tilde{G}(\sum_i t_i a_i) \sum_i \tilde{g}(t_i, a_i) \Phi(a_i),$$

where the scaling functions  $\tilde{G} : \text{Herm}_n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  and  $\tilde{g} : ([0, 1], \text{Herm}_n) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ , are Lipschitz on any compact subset of  $\text{Herm}_n$  and map to zero iff the input is the zero operator.

The above operational form is less clearly related to physically implementing a convex combination of observables in a dual system which is why we state the more constrained form in our main results. We define Axiomatisation 1\* and Axiomatisation 2\* to be Axiomatisation 1 and Axiomatisation 2 respectively, with axiom (ii) replaced with axiom (ii)\*. We can show equivalent results to Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 with the starred axiomatisations. This modification does not disrupt the proof techniques of these two results: convexity is not utilised in the proof of Theorem 3; the proof of Theorem 4 uses Lemma 13 and an equivalent result can be shown for axiom (ii)\*.

**Lemma 26** (Constrained scale functions for amended convexity). *A duality map,  $\Phi$ , that satisfies Axiomatisation 1\* equivalently satisfies*

$$(iv) \Phi(\sum_i t_i a_i) = f(\sum_i t_i a_i) \sum_i \frac{t_i}{f(a_i)} \Phi(a_i)$$

for all  $a_i \in \text{Herm}_n$  and  $t_i \in [0, 1]$  with  $\sum_i t_i = 1$ .

*Proof.* This proof largely follows the same idea as that of Lemma 13, therefore we just highlight the differences here.

The proof of Lemma 11 follows for a duality map obeying Axiomatisation 1\* where we instead have

$$\tilde{\alpha} := \frac{2\tilde{G}(c\mathbb{I}/2)\tilde{g}(1/2, cQ_1)f(cQ_1)}{f(c\mathbb{I}/2)}, \quad \tilde{\beta} := \frac{2\tilde{G}(c\mathbb{I}/2)\tilde{g}(1/2, cQ_2)f(cQ_2)}{f(c\mathbb{I}/2)}, \quad (203)$$

and therefore obtain the relations,

$$\tilde{g}(1/2, Q_1)f(cQ_1) = \tilde{g}(1/2, cQ_2)f(cQ_2) = \frac{f(c\mathbb{I}/2)}{2\tilde{G}(c\mathbb{I}/2)}. \quad (204)$$

Using Eq. (204) the proof of Lemma 12 then also follows for a duality map obeying Axiomatisation 1\*. Where we find,

$$\frac{\tilde{G}(c/2(P_1 + P_2))}{f(c/2(P_1 + P_2))} = \frac{\tilde{G}(c\mathbb{I}/2)}{f(c\mathbb{I}/2)}, \quad (205)$$

for all orthogonal projectors  $P_1, P_2$ .

Again, for all Hermitian operators  $A$ , the ratio of  $f(A)$  to  $\tilde{G}(A)$  is proven to be a constant independent of  $A$ . The spectral decomposition of a general Hermitian operator  $A$  is given by

$$A = \sum_i \lambda_i P_i, \quad (206)$$

where  $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$  and in the case of degenerate eigenvalues we are free to chose  $\{P_i\}$  to form a set of orthogonal projectors. In order to apply axiom (ii)\* the summation is rearranged to read,

$$A = \sum_i \mu_i (c_i P_i), \quad (207)$$

where now  $\mu_i \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_i \mu_i = 1$ , whereas  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mu_i c_i = \lambda_i$ .

By axiom (ii)\*,

$$\Phi(A) = \tilde{G}(A) \sum_i \tilde{g}(\mu_i, c_i P_i) \Phi(c_i P_i). \quad (208)$$

Using the equivalent of Lemma 12 this can be written as a spectral decomposition over orthogonal projectors,

$$\Phi(A) = \tilde{G}(A) \sum_i \tilde{g}(\mu_i, c_i P_i) f(c_i P_i) c_i \Pi_i. \quad (209)$$

However since the spectral decomposition is unique (up to degenerate eigenvalues where we continue to chose an orthogonal basis) it can also be expressed using the spectrum preserving axiom as

$$\Phi(A) = f(A) \sum_i \mu_i c_i \Pi_{\sigma(i)}, \quad (210)$$

where  $\sigma(i)$  denotes some permutation of indices.

Equating Eq. (208) and Eq. (210) gives,

$$\frac{\tilde{G}(A)}{f(A)} \sum_i \tilde{g}(\mu_i, c_i P_i) f(c_i P_i) c_i \Pi_i = \sum_i \mu_i c_i \Pi_{\sigma(i)}. \quad (211)$$

Multiplying by  $\Pi_k$  selects for a given projector,

$$\frac{\tilde{G}(A)}{f(A)} \tilde{g}(\mu_{\sigma(j)}, c_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) f(c_{\sigma(j)} P_{\sigma(j)}) c_{\sigma(j)} = \mu_j c_j, \quad (212)$$

where  $\sigma(j) = k$ . By the same argument as Appendix B  $\sigma(k) = k \forall k$  is the only allowed permutation for any map  $\Phi$  and operator  $A$ . Therefore we can equate

$$\tilde{g}(\mu_i, c_i P_i) = \frac{f(A)}{\tilde{G}(A)} \frac{\mu_i}{f(c_i P_i)}. \quad (213)$$

Since  $\tilde{g}(\mu_i, c_i P_i)$  cannot depend on the other eigenvalues and vectors of  $A$  the ratio of  $f(A)$  to  $\tilde{G}(A)$  must be constant for any given Hermitian, i.e.

$$\frac{f(A)}{\tilde{G}(A)} = x, \quad \forall A \in \text{Herm}, \quad (214)$$

for some  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Applying (ii)\* to the trivial sum  $\Phi(A) = \tilde{G}(A) \tilde{g}(1, A) \Phi(A)$  gives another useful relation,

$$\tilde{g}(1, A) = \frac{1}{\tilde{G}(A)} = \frac{x}{f(A)}, \quad \forall A \in \text{Herm}. \quad (215)$$

The next step is to investigate the dependency of the function  $\tilde{g}$  by relating  $\tilde{g}(t, A)$  and  $\tilde{g}(1, A)$ . Let  $A_1, A_2$  be any two Hermitian operators with spectral decompositions,

$$A_1 = \sum_i \lambda_i P_i \quad (216)$$

$$A_2 = \sum_i \mu_i Q_i, \quad (217)$$

where  $\lambda_i, \mu_i \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\{P_i, Q_i\}$  form an orthogonal set of projectors, i.e.  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  must have orthogonal support. Consider a convex combination,

$$A = tA_1 + (1-t)A_2, \quad (218)$$

with  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Since  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  have orthogonal support and the map obeys axiom (iii), the spectrum of the mapped convex combination is:

$$\text{spec}[\Phi(A)] = f(A)\{t\lambda_i, (1-t)\mu_i\}. \quad (219)$$

On the other hand, applying axiom (ii)\* to  $A$  gives,

$$\Phi(A) = \tilde{G}(A) [\tilde{g}(t, A_1)\Phi(A_1) + \tilde{g}((1-t), A_2)\Phi(A_2)]. \quad (220)$$

By the equivalent of Lemma 12,  $\Phi(A_1)$  and  $\Phi(A_2)$  have orthogonal support, and  $\{\Phi(\lambda_i P_i), \Phi(\mu_i Q_i)\}$  is an orthogonal set. Together with axiom (iii) of Axiomatisation 1\*, this implies that

$$\text{spec}[\Phi(A)] = \{\tilde{G}(A)\tilde{g}(t, A_1)\text{spec}[\Phi(A_1)], \tilde{G}(A)\tilde{g}((1-t), A_2)\text{spec}[\Phi(A_2)]\} \quad (221)$$

$$= \{\tilde{G}(A)\tilde{g}(t, A_1)f(A_1)\lambda_i, \tilde{G}(A)\tilde{g}(t, A_2)f(A_2)\mu_i\}. \quad (222)$$

We can equate the elements of  $\text{spec}[\Phi(A)]$  that correspond to  $A_1$ :

$$f(A)t\lambda_i = \tilde{G}(A)\tilde{g}(t, A_1)f(A_1)\lambda_i. \quad (223)$$

Using Eq. (214) and Eq. (224),

$$\tilde{g}(t, A_1) = t\tilde{g}(1, A_1) = \frac{tx}{f(A_1)}, \quad (224)$$

for all  $A_1 \in \text{Herm}$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

Finally, substituting for  $\tilde{g}, \tilde{G}$  using Eq. (214) and Eq. (224), (ii)\* becomes,

$$\Phi\left(\sum_i t_i A_i\right) = \tilde{G}\left(\sum_i t_i A_i\right) \sum_i \tilde{g}(t_i, A_i)\Phi(A_i) \quad (225)$$

$$= \frac{f(\sum_i t_i A_i)}{x} \sum_i \frac{t_i x}{f(A_i)} \Phi(A_i) \quad (226)$$

$$= f\left(\sum_i t_i A_i\right) \sum_i \frac{t_i}{f(A_i)} \Phi(A_i) \quad (227)$$

for all  $A_i \in \text{Herm}$  and  $t_i \in [0, 1]$  where  $\sum_i t_i = 1$ .  $\square$

Once we have the above lemma, the characterisation proof showing  $\Phi$  that obeys Axiomatisation 1\* is necessarily of the form,

$$\Phi(A) = f(A)U\left(A^{\oplus p} \oplus \overline{A}^{\oplus q}\right)U^\dagger, \quad (228)$$

follows by the argument presented in the proof of Theorem 5

## Appendix D Kramers-Wannier duality

The Kramer-Wannier duality links two 2d Ising models, one at low temperature (strong interaction strength) with another at high temperature (weak interaction strength). The duality is identified by computing the partition function of both systems in their respective limits. This appendix outlines the Kramer-Wannier duality and how it arises, based on [Bax89; Karri]. Finally we show explicitly how it lies outside the original simulation framework of [CMP19] and how can be placed in our more general framework of duality.

### D.1 Low temperature expansion

The Ising model on an  $N$  site lattice is governed by the Hamiltonian  $H = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sigma_i \sigma_j$ . Consider the isotropic case where the interaction strength  $J$  is the same across both horizontal and vertical directions,  $K := \beta J$ . If  $K > 0$  the model is ferromagnetic and the ground state will have all spins aligned. In the low temperature regime the system is dominated by its ground state. The expansion for the partition function at low temperature is given by the ground state configuration plus low energy fluctuations – i.e. 1, 2, 3, ... spins aligned anti-parallel. The additional energy cost of one flipped spin in a 2d lattice is  $4 \times 2K$  and that of two flipped spins in a block is  $6 \times 2K$ . Counting the degeneracies of these states the partition function is given by,

$$Z \approx 2e^{\text{no. bonds total} \times K} [1 + Ne^{-4 \times 2K} + 2Ne^{-6 \times 2K} + \dots]. \quad (229)$$

The energy cost comes from the domain wall boundary between the regions of anti-parallel spins. In the thermodynamic limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  the multiplicities become insignificant and the partition function can be written as

$$Z \approx 2e^{\text{no. bonds total} \times K} \sum_{\text{islands of -ve spins}} e^{-2K \times \text{perimeter of island}}. \quad (230)$$

The terms in this summation can be represented graphically by creating islands of increasingly large regions of anti-aligned spin.

### D.2 High temperature expansion

The high temperature expansion starts instead with independent spins and the partition function is expanded in powers of  $\beta$ . A convenient simplification is to expand in powers of  $\tanh K$  instead. This is equivalent to doing a high temperature expansion since  $\tanh K$  is less than 1 (except when  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ ) so in the high temperature region powers of  $\tanh K$  are increasingly small. Since  $(\sigma_i \sigma_j)^2 = 1$  the bond  $\langle i, j \rangle$  Boltzmann factor can be rewritten as

$$e^{K \sigma_i \sigma_j} = \frac{e^K + e^{-K}}{2} + \frac{(e^K - e^{-K})}{2} \sigma_i \sigma_j \quad (231)$$

$$= \cosh K (1 + \tanh K \sigma_i \sigma_j). \quad (232)$$



Applying this transformation to the partition function gives

$$Z = \sum_{\{\sigma_i\}} e^{K \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sigma_i \sigma_j} \quad (233)$$

$$= (\cosh K)^{\text{no. bonds}} \sum_{\{\sigma_i\}} \prod_{\langle i,j \rangle} (1 + \tanh K \sigma_i \sigma_j). \quad (234)$$

The product  $\prod_{\langle i,j \rangle} (1 + \tanh K \sigma_i \sigma_j) = (1 + \tanh K \sigma_a \sigma_b)(1 + \tanh K \sigma_a \sigma_c)(1 + \tanh K \sigma_a \sigma_d) \dots$  generates  $2^{N_b}$  terms where  $N_b$  is the number of bonds in the lattice. Each term in the sum can again be represented as a graph: for all edges in the lattice draw a line on the edge  $(i, j)$  if there is a factor of  $\tanh K \sigma_i \sigma_j$  (an occupied bond) and draw no line if the term in the expansion is 1 (an unoccupied bond). Each term in the expansion of the product is of the form

$$(\tanh K)^{\text{no. occupied bonds}} \sigma_1^{p_1} \sigma_2^{p_2} \sigma_3^{p_3} \dots \sigma_N^{p_N}. \quad (235)$$

Now we perform the sum over each spin being  $\pm 1$ . Summing over  $\sigma_i$  gives a factor of 2 if  $p_i$  even and 0 if  $p_i$  odd. Therefore only graphs where every site has an even number of occupied legs is non-vanishing. These graphs form closed paths on the lattice. The high temperature series expansion is then given by

$$Z = 2^N \times (\cosh K)^{\text{no. bonds total}} \sum_{\text{closed graphs}} (\tanh K)^{\text{no. occupied bonds in the graph}}. \quad (236)$$

### D.3 Free energy duality

Taking the thermodynamic limit so  $N \rightarrow \infty$  the total number of bonds in the lattice becomes  $\approx 2N$ . Make the couplings strengths for the models in the different temperature regimes distinct:  $K$  in the high temperature expansion,  $\tilde{K}$  in the low temperature expansion. The duality is identified by comparing the low and high temperature series expansions:

$$\text{Low temp: } Z(\tilde{K}) = 2e^{2N\tilde{K}} \sum_{\text{islands of -ve spin}} e^{-2\tilde{K} \times \text{perimeter of islands}} \quad (237)$$

$$\text{High temp: } Z(K) = 2^N (\cosh K)^{2N} \sum_{\text{closed graphs}} \tanh K^{\text{length of graph}}. \quad (238)$$

There is a correspondence between the two sums since islands of sites can be considered as closed graphs and vice versa. They differ only at the boundaries, but in the thermodynamic limit this difference becomes negligible. Defining the function,

$$g(x) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \ln \sum_{\text{closed graphs}} x^{\text{no. lines in the graph}}, \quad (239)$$

the arguments of  $g$  in each of the above sum are related by the duality condition

$$e^{-2\tilde{K}} \leftrightarrow \tanh K \quad \tilde{K} = D(K) = -\frac{1}{2} \ln \tanh K. \quad (240)$$

With the above function  $g$  the free energies per particle can be written as:

$$\text{Low temp: } -\beta f_H = \frac{\ln Z(K)}{N} = 2K + \ln \left\{ e^{-4 \times 2K} + 2e^{-4 \times 6K} - \frac{5}{2}e^{-8 \times 2K} + \dots \right\} \quad (241)$$

$$\text{High temp: } -\tilde{\beta} f_{\tilde{H}} = \frac{\ln Z(\tilde{K})}{N} = \ln 2 + 2 \ln \cosh K + \ln \{ (\tanh K)^4 + \dots \}. \quad (242)$$

The duality condition, Eq. (240), then relates the two free energies by:

$$\tilde{\beta} f_{\tilde{H}} = \beta f_H + 2\beta J - \ln \left[ 2 \cosh^2 (\tilde{\beta} \tilde{J}) \right]. \quad (243)$$

Some algebra manipulates the free energy relation into a simpler form:

$$2\beta J - \ln \left[ 2 \cosh^2 (\tilde{\beta} \tilde{J}) \right] = \ln \left[ \frac{e^{2\beta J}}{2 \cosh^2 (\ln \tanh^{-1/2} J\beta)} \right] \quad (244)$$

$$= \ln \left[ \frac{e^{2\beta J}}{2 \times (1/4) \times (\tanh^{-1/2} J\beta + \tanh^{1/2} J\beta)^2} \right] \quad (245)$$

$$= \ln \left[ \frac{e^{2\beta J}}{2 \times (1/4) \times (\tanh^{-1} J\beta + \tanh J\beta + 2)} \right] \quad (246)$$

$$= \ln \left[ \frac{e^{2\beta J}}{(1/2) \times \left( \frac{\cosh J\beta}{\sinh J\beta} + \frac{\sinh J\beta}{\cosh J\beta} + 2 \right)} \right] \quad (247)$$

$$= \ln \left[ \frac{e^{2\beta J}}{\left( \frac{\cosh^2 J\beta + \sinh^2 J\beta + 2 \sinh J\beta \cosh J\beta}{2 \sinh J\beta \cosh J\beta} \right)} \right] \quad (248)$$

$$= \ln \left[ \frac{e^{2\beta J}}{\left( \frac{\cosh 2J\beta + \sinh 2J\beta}{\sinh 2J\beta} \right)} \right] \quad (249)$$

$$= \ln \left[ \frac{e^{2\beta J}}{\left( \frac{e^{2J\beta}}{\sinh 2J\beta} \right)} \right] \quad (250)$$

$$= \ln [\sinh 2J\beta] \quad (251)$$

From the free energy the partition functions can be related using  $-\beta f = \ln Z$ :

$$Z_{\tilde{H}}(\tilde{\beta}) = \exp \left[ -N \tilde{\beta} f_{\tilde{H}} \right] \quad (252)$$

$$= \exp \left[ -N \beta f_H - N \ln \sinh(2\beta J) \right] \quad (253)$$

$$= e^{\ln \sinh(2\beta J) \cdot N} Z_H(\beta) \quad (254)$$

$$= [\sinh(2\beta J)]^{-N} Z_H(\beta). \quad (255)$$

## D.4 In this framework

We consider the map on operators that relates the two dual Hamiltonians. The encoding part of the duality is simple as the Hilbert space is the same size so there are no copies ( $p = 1$ ) and the form of the operators is the same so the unitary is simply the identity. The more interesting part of the duality appears in the scale factor, which should be a function of the initial Hamiltonian only. In the partition function and time evolution operator, temperature and the Hamiltonian always appear as a product ( $\beta H$ ). Since in the Ising model the Hamiltonian is proportional to the coupling constant  $J$ , for Ising type Hamiltonians there is a trivial duality condition  $J\beta = J'\beta'$ . We therefore have additional freedom in how we chose to construct the set of maps that correspond to different physical scenarios if one were to engineer this duality. The first choice is consistent with how the duality framework in this paper has been set out, however the different approaches are mathematically equivalent.

In the first instance we will view Kramer-Wannier through the lens of a strong-weak duality: equating the temperatures of the dual systems  $\beta = \tilde{\beta}$ . A strongly interacting Ising model with interaction strength  $J$  is dual to a weakly interacting Ising model with interaction strength  $\tilde{J} \neq J$  at the same temperature. This leads to a non-trivial scaling function for the map on operators that depends both on the operator and the temperature of the system:

$$\Phi_H(H) = -\frac{1}{2J\beta} \ln \tanh(J\beta) \times \mathbb{I}(H) \quad (256)$$

$$= f(H, \beta) \times \mathcal{E}(H), \quad (257)$$

where  $\mathcal{E}(H) = \mathbb{I}(H)$  is an encoding satisfying the axioms 1-3 from Theorem 1 and  $f(H, \beta) = -\frac{1}{2J\beta} \ln \tanh(J\beta)$ . The coupling strength,  $J$ , can be written as a function of the Hamiltonian norm and  $n$  the number of lattice sites:  $J = \frac{\|H\|}{2n(n-1)}$ .

Another approach could be to fix the interaction strength  $J = \tilde{J}$  and consider a high-low temperature duality where physical properties of the two dual systems are evaluated at different temperatures  $\beta \neq \tilde{\beta}$ . This does not allow the duality to be manipulated into our framework since we do not allow a temperature map. Here the map on operators is independent of temperature with a trivial scaling function,  $f(H) = 1$ :

$$\Phi(H) = \mathbb{I}(H). \quad (258)$$

This viewpoint introduces the necessity of a temperature map,  $\Phi_\beta$ , should map positive reals to positive reals and be compatible with the Hamiltonian map such that the duality condition is satisfied. We will allow the temperature map to additionally depend on Hamiltonian parameters so there is a consistent set of maps for one system. In order to satisfy Eq. (5), the temperature map is

$$\Phi_\beta(\beta) = -\frac{1}{2J} \ln \tanh(J\beta). \quad (259)$$

This is perhaps the more immediate viewpoint from the Kramer-Wannier literature but both approaches are mathematically equivalent. In fact using any interpolation of these two cases is also valid. We could consider two Ising models with different interaction strengths at different temperatures, as long

as the product obeys Eq. (5). Furthermore neither case fit into the original simulation framework in [CMP19] for differing reasons. The first has a non-trivial scaling function so that the spectra of two dual operators is not equal. The second has a non-trivial temperature map so that the systems are only dual if considered at the appropriate temperature.

We can complete the description by providing a compatible map on states. Again we have choices. We could require the Born rule with respect to energy measurements should be preserved, or we could alternatively demand that thermal states map to thermal states. Starting with energy measurement outcomes, the expected behaviour

$$\text{tr}[H\rho] = \frac{1}{f(H)} \text{tr}[\Phi_H(H)\Phi_{\text{state}}(\rho)] \quad (260)$$

is achieved by a trivial mapping on states  $\Phi_{\text{states}}(\rho) = \rho$ . If instead we propose preserving Gibbs states,

$$\Phi_{\text{state}}\left(\frac{e^{-\beta H}}{Z_H(\beta)}\right) = \frac{e^{-\Phi_\beta(\beta)\Phi_H(H)}}{Z_{\Phi_H(H)}(\Phi_\beta(\beta))}, \quad (261)$$

then another choice for a map on states is  $\Phi_{\text{state}}(\rho) = \frac{\epsilon(\rho)}{\text{tr}(\epsilon(\rho))}$  with  $\epsilon(\rho) = \rho^{\frac{1}{2J\beta} \ln \tanh(J\beta)}$ . These state mappings will preserve measurement outcomes and thermal states respectively paired with either the strong-weak or high-low formulations described earlier.

## References

- [Bax89] Rodney J. Baxter. *Exactly Solved Model in Statistical Mechanics*. 1989.
- [Hoo93] Gerard 't Hooft. “Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity”. In: *Conf.Proc.C* 930308 (1993), pp. 284–296.
- [Sus95] Leonard Susskind. “The world as a hologram”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 36.11 (Nov. 1995), pp. 6377–6396.
- [MO77] C. Montonen and D. Olive. “Magnetic monopoles as gauge particles?” In: *Physics Letters B* 72.1 (1977), pp. 117–120.
- [Llo57] S Lloyd. *Universal Quantum Simulators*. Tech. rep. 1957, pp. 1073–1078.
- [PC] D Porras and J I Cirac. “Effective Quantum Spin Systems with Trapped Ions”. In: 80 ().
- [JZ04] D Jaksch and P Zoller. *The cold atom Hubbard toolbox*. Tech. rep. 2004.
- [PS10] Xin-Hua Peng and Dieter Suter. “Spin qubits for quantum simulations”. In: *Front. Phys. China* 5.1 (2010), pp. 1–25.
- [HTK12] Andrew A Houck, Hakan E Türeci, and Jens Koch. “On-chip quantum simulation with superconducting circuits”. In: *Nature Physics* (2012).

- [BH14] Sergey Bravyi and Matthew Hastings. *On complexity of the quantum Ising model*. Tech. rep. 2014. arXiv: [1410.0703v1](#).
- [CMP19] Toby Cubitt, Ashley Montanaro, and Stephen Piddock. *Universal quantum Hamiltonians*. Tech. rep. 2019. arXiv: [1701.05182v4](#).
- [AZ18] Dorit Aharonov and Leo Zhou. *Hamiltonian Sparsification and Gap-Simulations*. Tech. rep. 2018. arXiv: [1804.11084v2](#).
- [RT06] Shinsei Ryu and Tadashi Takayanagi. “Aspects of Holographic Entanglement Entropy”. In: (2006).
- [Mol08] Lajos Molnár. “Maps on states preserving the relative entropy”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 49.3 (2008).
- [HHL12] Kan He, Jinchuan Hou, and Ming Li. “A von Neumann entropy condition of unitary equivalence of quantum states”. In: *Applied Mathematics Letters* 25.8 (2012), pp. 1153–1156.
- [HYH15] Kan He, Qing Yuan, and Jinchuan Hou. “Entropy-preserving maps on quantum states”. In: *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* 467 (2015), pp. 243–253.
- [KP17] Mahdi Karder and Tatjana Petek. “Maps on states preserving generalized entropy of convex combinations”. In: *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* 532 (2017), pp. 86–98.
- [Wig31] E.P. Wigner. *Gruppentheorie und ihre Anwendung auf die Quantenmechanik der Atomspektren (in German)*. Germany: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1931, pp. 251,254.
- [AW] Kendall E Atkinson and John Wiley. *An Introduction to Numerical Analysis, Second Edition Kendall E. Atkinson*.
- [Kat95] Tosio Kato. *Perturbation Theory of Linear Operators*. Springer-Verlag Berlin and Heidelberg GmbH & Co. KG, 1995.
- [Karri] Mehran Kardar. *8.334 Statistical Mechanics II: Statistical Physics of Fields*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology: MIT OpenCourseWare. License: Creative Commons BY-NC-SA. <https://ocw.mit.edu>. Spring 2014.