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Abdul-Rahman et al. in arXiv:1901.09297 \(^1\) provided an elegant approach and proved analytically the existence of a nonzero spectral gap for the AKLT models on the decorated honeycomb lattice (for the number \(n\) of spin-1 decorated sites on each original edge no less than 3). We perform calculations for the decorated square lattice and show that the corresponding AKLT models are gapped if \(n \geq 4\). Combining both results, we also show that a family of decorated hybrid AKLT models, whose underlying lattice is of mixed vertex degrees 3 and 4, are also gapped for \(n \geq 4\). We develop a numerical approach that extends beyond what was accessible previously. Our numerical results further improve the nonzero gap to \(n \geq 2\), including the establishment of the gap for \(n = 2\) in the decorated triangular and cubic lattices. The latter case is interesting, as this shows the AKLT states on the decorated cubic lattices are not Néel ordered, in contrast to the state on the un-decorated cubic lattice.

I. INTRODUCTION

Affleck, Kennedy, Lieb, and Tasaki (AKLT) constructed a one-dimensional spin-1 chain whose Hamiltonian is rotation-invariant in the spin degree of freedom \(^2\), but has a spectral gap above the unique ground state, in contrast to the spin-1/2 antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model. This provided strong support for Haldane's conjecture \(^3\) \(^4\) regarding the relation between the spectral gap and spin magnitudes in quantum magnetism. They also generalized the construction to two dimensions \(^5\), and showed, in particular, that the spin-spin correlation function of the ground-state wavefunction decays exponentially in the honeycomb and the square lattice models. The uniqueness of the ground state in these models was further analyzed by Kennedy, Lieb and Tasaki \(^6\). There have been a few useful techniques for showing uniqueness of the ground state and gap \(^6\) \(^8\), which work well in one dimension, but the proof of the nonzero spectral gap has not been established for either of the two 2D AKLT models, even more than three decades after their construction.

Unexpectedly, 2D AKLT states have recently emerged as resource for universal quantum computation in the framework of the measurement-based quantum computation (MBQC) \(^9\) \(^12\). The spin-3/2 AKLT state on the honeycomb lattice was first shown to provide the appropriate entanglement structure for universal QC \(^13\) \(^14\), a result subsequently generalized to other trivalent lattices \(^15\). Before the demonstration of the computation universality of the spin-2 AKLT state on the square lattice \(^16\), a few decorated lattice structures (with mixed vertex degrees) and the corresponding AKLT states were first considered in Ref. \(^17\). A partially emerged picture of quantum computation universality in the family of AKLT states is as follows. Any AKLT state involving spin-2 and other lower spin entities are universal if they reside on a two- or three-dimensional frustration-free regular lattice (no loop with odd number of sites) with any combination of spin-2, spin-3/2, spin-1, and spin-1/2 that is consistent with the lattice. The hinderance of going beyond spin-2 entities is mainly due to technicalities \(^16\).

Regarding the gap, tensor network methods were employed and the value of the gap in the thermodynamic limit was estimated \(^18\) \(^19\). A recent breakthrough in the analytic proof was given by Abdul-Rahman et al. \(^1\), who considered a family of decorated honeycomb lattices and proved that the corresponding AKLT models are gapped for the number \(n\) of decorated sites being greater than 2; see e.g. Fig. 1a. The associated AKLT states, according to the results of Ref. \(^17\), are also universal for MBQC, and hence are also of interest, as the non-zero gap implies that preparation of these states via cooling is useful. Additional progress in analytics has also been made by Lemm, Sandvik and Yang on hexagonal chains \(^20\), where the quasi-1D AKLT models are also gapped.

We note that the results of Ref. \(^1\), as argued below, apply directly to other trivalent lattices with decoration, such as the square-octagon \((4,8^2)\), the cross \((4,6,12)\), and the star \((3,12^2)\); see e.g. Fig. 1b,c,d. Although the AKLT Hamiltonians are frustration-free, some features in generalized measurement display some frustration, e.g. on the star lattice \(^15\). The decoration renders the frustrated star lattice non-frustrated and removes the frustration features in measurement. AKLT states on all these decorated lattices are also universal for MBQC \(^15\) \(^17\).

Here we prove that AKLT models on 2D decorated square lattices possess nonzero spectral gap for \(n \geq 4\), where \(n\) is the number of spin-1 decorated sites added to each original edge (see e.g. Fig. 2a). This result also implies, in addition to the decorated kagome and \((3,4,6,4)\) lattices (see e.g. Fig. 1e,f), the decorated 3D diamond lattices host AKLT models with nonzero spectral gap. AKLT states on the 3D diamond lattice and...
the associated decorated ones are also universal [16, 17], and the significance is that these 3D resource states are likely to provide fault-tolerance similar to the 3D cluster state [21]. Moreover, proving the spectral gap and knowing its value will be crucial in state preparation and validation protocols.

Using the results from both the decorated honeycomb and square lattice, we also show that AKLT models on decorated lattices whose underlying lattice is of mixed vertex degrees 3 and 4 are also gapped for \( n \geq 4 \). We also provide a numerical approach that allows us to study the parameters which bound the gap for \( n > 1 \), previously thought inaccessible. Our numerical results further improve the nonzero gap to \( n \geq 2 \), including the establishment of the gap for \( n = 2 \) in the decorated triangular and cubic lattices, i.e. those whose underlying lattices vertex degree 6. We also provide much improved lower bounds on the spectral gap for some of the AKLT models. Below, in Sec. II we first review methods used in Ref. [1]. Then in Sec. III we perform the same detailed calculations for the AKLT models on the decorated square lattices. In Sec. IV we make some comments on the other decorated lattices. In Sec. V we describe our numerical methods and they improve the above gappedness scenarios to \( n \geq 2 \). Finally in Sec. VI we make some concluding remarks.

II. REVIEW OF METHODS IN REF. [1]

Here we briefly review the key points that enable the proof of the spectral gap for AKLT models on the decorated honeycomb lattice in Ref. [1]; see Fig. 1h for one such illustration with \( n = 1 \), as well as other lattices. We will try to use the same symbols in Ref. [1] as much as possible, but may have some slight differences. Consider an original lattice \( \Lambda \) (e.g. honeycomb or square lattice) and its decorated version \( \Lambda^{(n)} \) in which each edge of \( \Lambda \) has been decorated with \( n \) spin-1 sites. Let \( \mathcal{E}_{\Lambda^{(n)}} \) denote the edge set of the decorated lattice. The AKLT model Hamiltonian defined on \( \Lambda^{(n)} \) is

\[
H^{\text{AKLT}}_{\Lambda^{(n)}} = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_{\Lambda^{(n)}}} P^{(z(e)/2)}_e,
\]

where \( P^{(z(e)/2)}_e \) is a projection onto the total spin \( s = z(e)/2 \) subspace of the two spins linked by the edge \( e \), and \( z(e) \) denotes the sum of the coordination numbers (i.e. vertex degrees \( z_a \) and \( z_b \)) of the two spins \( a \) and \( b \) linked by edge \( e \).

Instead of directly using the AKLT Hamiltonian, Ref. [1] first considers a slightly modified one:

\[
H_Y \equiv \sum_{v \in \Lambda} \tilde{h}_v = \sum_{v \in \Lambda} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_{Y_v}} P^{(z(e)/2)}_e,
\]

where \( h_v \) is the AKLT Hamiltonian on the set \( Y_v \) of \( (2n + 1) \) vertices of the decorated lattice \( \Lambda^{(n)} \), \( z \) is the coordination number (\( z = 3 \) for the honeycomb) and \( \mathcal{E}_{Y_v} \) denotes the edges connecting vertices in \( Y_v \); see Fig. 2 for illustration. It has a few terms in \( H^{\text{AKLT}}_{\Lambda^{(n)}} \) missing, i.e., those terms on the edges containing the last spin-1 site on edge \( e \in Y_v \) and the next site \( v' \in \Lambda \). So we have an inequality

\[
H^{\text{AKLT}}_{\Lambda^{(n)}} \leq H_Y \leq 2H^{\text{AKLT}}_{\Lambda^{(n)}}.
\]

However, instead of \( H_Y \), Ref. [1] also considers a slight modification

\[
\tilde{H}_{\Lambda^{(n)}} \equiv \sum_{v \in \Lambda} P_v,
\]

where \( P_v \) is the orthogonal projection onto the range of \( h_v \). The kernel of \( P_v \) is the ground space of \( h_v \), i.e., \( \ker P_v = \ker h_v \). Then it is shown that

\[
\frac{\gamma_Y}{2} \tilde{H}_{\Lambda^{(n)}} \leq H^{\text{AKLT}}_{\Lambda^{(n)}} \leq \|h_v\| \tilde{H}_{\Lambda^{(n)}},
\]

where \( \gamma_Y \) is the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of \( h_v \) (or equivalently the spectral gap of the small system \( Y_v \)) and \( \|h_v\| \) is the usual operator norm of \( h_v \) (or equivalently the largest eigenvalue of \( h_v \), since \( h_v \) is non-negative).

The strategy is to prove \( \tilde{H}_{\Lambda^{(n)}} \) is gapped. By squaring \( \tilde{H}_{\Lambda^{(n)}} \), we find that

\[
(\tilde{H}_{\Lambda^{(n)}})^2 = \tilde{H}_{\Lambda^{(n)}} + \sum_{v \neq w} (P_v P_w + P_w P_v)
\geq \tilde{H}_{\Lambda^{(n)}} + \sum_{(v, w) \in \mathcal{E}_{\Lambda}} (P_v P_w + P_w P_v),
\]

In Sec. II, we first review methods used in Ref. [1]. Then in Sec. III, we perform the same detailed calculations for the AKLT models on the decorated square lattices. In Sec. IV, we make some comments on the other decorated lattices. In Sec. V, we describe our numerical methods and they improve the above gappedness scenarios to \( n \geq 2 \). Finally in Sec. VI, we make some concluding remarks.
where for those \( v \) and \( w \) not on the same edge \( P_v P_w \) is non-negative and is dropped, resulting in the last inequality. If one can find the minimum positive number \( \eta > 0 \) such that \( P_v P_w + P_w P_v \geq -\eta(P_v + P_w) \), then

\[
(\tilde{H}_{A(\alpha)})^2 = \tilde{H}_{A(\alpha)} - \sum_{v \neq w} (P_v + P_w) \geq (1 - z\eta_n)\tilde{H}_{A(\alpha)} = \gamma \tilde{H}_{A(\alpha)},
\]

where \( \gamma \equiv 1 - z\eta_n \) (the subscript \( n \) is added to \( \eta \)) and \( z \) is the coordination number of the underlying lattice \( \Lambda \) (e.g. \( z = 3 \) for the honeycomb and \( z = 4 \) for the square lattice). If \( \gamma > 0 \), then one proves that \( \tilde{H}_{A(\alpha)} \) has a spectral gap above the ground state(s).

Therefore, most of effort goes into finding \( \eta \) or an upper bound. A relation that was used to this end in Ref. [1] is Lemma 6.3 from Ref. [2] for a pair of projectors \( E \) and \( F \):

\[
EF + FE \geq -\|EF - E \wedge F\|(E + F),
\]

where \( E \wedge F \) denotes the projection onto the joint space \( EH \cap FH \). When we apply this relation to \( [\dagger] \), \( \varepsilon_n = \|EF - E \wedge F\| \) becomes an upper bound on \( \eta_n \), i.e., \( \eta_n \leq \varepsilon_n \). In particular, in Prop. [3] below, we determine that \( \eta_n = \varepsilon_n \). In Sec. [4] below we will additionally develop techniques to compute \( \eta_n \) exactly.

Using the above Lemma and employing tensor-network approaches, the authors of Ref. [1] show elegantly that

\[
\varepsilon_n \leq \frac{4 \cdot 3^{-n}}{\sqrt{1 - b_{LR}(n)}} + \left( \frac{16 \cdot 3^{-2n}}{1 - b_{LR}(n)} \right) (1 + b_G(n)),
\]

where

\[
b_G(n) = \frac{4 \cdot 3^{-n}}{q_L(n) q_R(n)} \|E_L\| \|E_R\|, \\
b_L(n) = \frac{8 \cdot 3^{-n}}{q_L(n)} \|E_L\|, \\
b_R(n) = \frac{4 \cdot 3^{-n}}{q_R(n)} \|E_R\|, \\
b_{LR}(n) = b_L(n) + b_R(n) - b_L(n) b_R(n).
\]

In the above expressions, \( E_L \) is the quantum channel, or equivalently the transfer matrix, obtained from the tensors \( T^L \) associated with the ‘left’ set of vertices \( Y_v \setminus Y_w \) and \( E_R \) (via tensors \( T^R \)) is associated with the ‘right’ set of vertices \( Y_w \setminus Y_v \). See also Figs. [2] and [3] for illustration. More precisely, the channels are defined as follows,

\[
E_L(B) = \sum_l (T_l^L)\dagger BT_l^L, \quad E_R(C) = \sum_r T_r^R C(T_r^R)\dagger.
\]

Note that by examining the derivations in Ref. [1], the operator norms associated with \( \|E_L\| \) and \( \|E_R\| \) holds both for the norm with respect to \( C^*\)-norm of \( B \) and \( C \) and for that w.r.t. the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of matrices. However, since the latter norm is larger for the former, the former norm presents a better bound.

Moreover, two specific matrices are introduced: \( Q_L \equiv E_L(\dagger I) \) and \( Q_R \equiv E_R^T(\rho_1) \) (\( \rho_1 \) here equaling \( \dagger I/2 \), and \( q_L \) and \( q_R \) are their respective minimum eigenvalues. For the proof, we highly recommend Ref. [1] to the readers.

III. ANALYSIS OF SPECTRAL GAP

The spin-2 entity residing on each square lattice site is composed of four virtual qubits projected onto their symmetric subspace, and the mapping between the physical spin-2 degrees of freedom and the those in the symmetric
subspace is as follows,

\[ P_{\text{sym}} = |2\rangle\langle\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow| + |2\rangle\langle\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow| + |1\rangle\langle\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow| + |1\rangle\langle\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow| + |0\rangle\langle\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow| + |0\rangle\langle\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow|. \]

where \(|m\rangle\)'s are eigenstates of spin-2 \(S_z\) operators with eigenvalue \(m\)'s. If we consider one square lattice site on the left, then there are corresponding tensors for \(P_m^L\), which are

\[ P_2 = |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow|, \quad P_{-2} = |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow|, \]
\[ P_1 = \frac{1}{2}|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow| + \frac{1}{2}|\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow|, \]
\[ P_{-1} = \frac{1}{2}|\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow| + \frac{1}{2}|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow|, \]
\[ P_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow|. \]

Because the AKLT state is formed from projecting virtual singlet pairs via symmetric projectors, we obtain the local tensors describing the spin-2 site on the left as \(W^L_k = \sqrt{2}KP_k\), where \(K = (|\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| - |\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|)/\sqrt{2}\), and they are given as follows,

\[ W^L_2 = -|\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow|, \quad W^L_{-2} = |\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow|, \]
\[ W^L_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow| - \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}|\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow|, \]
\[ W^L_{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}|\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow|, \]
\[ W^L_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow|. \]

See also Fig. 3 for illustration of the local lattice structure and the corresponding tensors. From these, one can easily check that

\[ \sum_k W^L_k (W^L_k)^\dagger = \frac{5}{2} \mathds{1}_{C^2}, \tag{17} \]

and one can define a quantum channel

\[ E^\sigma(B) \equiv \sum_i (W^L_i)^\dagger BW^L_i. \tag{18} \]

(We note that one could re-scale \(W^L_i\)'s so as to make the right hand side of Eq. (17) be \(\mathds{1}\), but we won’t do that here.) One also finds that

\[ E^\sigma(\mathds{1}) = \frac{5}{4} \Pi^\text{sym}_{s=3/2}, \tag{19} \]

where \(\Pi^\text{sym}_{s=3/2}\) is the projector to the 3-qubit symmetric subspace. At this point it is useful to introduce the two W states used in quantum information so as to simplify the notation,

\[ |w\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow| + |\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow| + |\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow|), \tag{20} \]
\[ |\bar{w}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow| + |\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow| + |\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow|). \tag{21} \]

The associated dual quantum channel is defined as \(E^{\sigma^t}(B) \equiv \sum_i W^L_i^t B (W^L_i)^\dagger\), which maps any three-qubit density matrix to a one-qubit density matrix, and can be written as (assuming \(B\) is hermitian for simplicity)

\[ E^{\sigma^t}(B) = c_0(B) \mathds{1} + c_x(B) \sigma_x + c_y(B) \sigma_y + c_z(B) \sigma_z, \tag{22} \]

where the four coefficients \(c\)'s are

\[ c_0(B) = \frac{5}{8} \left( |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| - |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| \right), \]
\[ c_x(B) = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{8} \left( |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| - |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| \right), \]
\[ c_y(B) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{8} \left( |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| + |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| \right), \]
\[ c_z(B) = -\frac{1}{4} \left( |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| + |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| \right). \]

Similar to the decorated honeycomb case, \(E^{\sigma^t}(B)\) is invariant in permuting \(a, b\) and \(c\) in the special form \(B = a \otimes b \otimes c\), and this can be used to simplify some calculations. Let us use the lower-case s to denote the spin-1/2 operators \(s^u \equiv s^u/2\) and \(\rho_1 \equiv \mathds{1}/2\). One can then by direct calculation show that

\[ E^{\sigma^t}(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_1 \otimes \rho_1) = \frac{5}{8} \rho_1, \tag{27a} \]
\[ E^{\sigma^t}(s^u \otimes s^u \otimes s^u) = -\frac{1}{8} s^u, \tag{27b} \]
\[ E^{\sigma^t}(s^u \otimes s^v \otimes s^u) = -\frac{1}{8} s^u, \quad \text{for } u \neq v, \tag{27c} \]
\[ E^{\sigma^t}(s^u \otimes s^v \otimes s^w) = 0, \quad \text{for } u \neq v \neq w, \tag{27d} \]
\[ E^{\sigma^t}(\rho_1 \otimes s^u \otimes s^u) = \frac{5}{24} \delta_{uv} \rho_1, \tag{27e} \]
\[ E^{\sigma^t}(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_1 \otimes s^u) = -\frac{5}{24} s^u. \tag{27f} \]
It is convenient to introduce
\[ \Lambda^u \equiv \mathbb{1} \otimes s^u \otimes s^u + s^u \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes s^u + s^u \otimes s^u \otimes \mathbb{1}, \tag{28} \]
and by direct calculation one can re-write Eq. (19) as
\[ E^\sigma(\mathbb{1}) = \frac{5}{4}\Pi_{\text{sym}}^{S=1/2} = \frac{5}{8}(\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} + \frac{4}{3} \sum_{u=x,y,z} \Lambda^u), \tag{29} \]
which will allow us later to deduce \( E^\sigma \) from the actions of \( (E^\sigma)^t \) in Eqs. (27) by fixing the overall scale.

It is convenient to express the channel and its dual in the form of a matrix, sometimes called the superoperator form or the Liouville formalism. Thus, any matrices, such as \( \sigma \), that the channels act on will be written in terms of vectors, such as \( |\sigma\rangle \). Moreover the inner product between two such ‘vectors’ becomes \( \langle \sigma|\rho \rangle \equiv \text{Tr}(\sigma|\rho \rangle \tag{30} \)

Note that in this definition \( \langle \{1|\rho \rangle = 1 \). Then exploiting the permutation invariance of \( E^\sigma(\mathbb{1}) \), one can use the trick used in Ref. [1], by using the action of the dual channel \( (E^\sigma)^t \) in Eq. (27) and fixing the overall scale via Eq. (29), to deduce the action of \( E^\sigma \) and write it in the ‘superoperator’ form as
\[ E^\sigma = 5|\rho_1 \otimes \rho_1 \otimes \rho_1 \rangle\langle \rho_1 | - \sum_{u=x,y,z} |s^u s^u s^u \rangle \langle s^u | \tag{31} \]

where we have suppressed the \( \otimes \) symbols. It is also possible to calculate \( E^\sigma \) directly from its definition in Eq. (18), but the trick above helps to express \( E^\sigma \) in terms of the sum of the product forms.

From the results of Ref. [1], the channel \( E^n \) along \( n \) decorated spin-1 sites,
\[ E^n(B) = \sum_{s' \cdots s} V^\dagger_{s_n} \cdots V^\dagger_{s_1} B V_{s_1} \cdots V_{s_n} \tag{31} \]
is calculated to be
\[ E^n = |1\rangle\langle 1 | + \frac{2(-1)^n}{3^n} \sum_{u} |s^u \rangle \langle s^u | \tag{32} \]
and thus the combined channel from the left is
\[ E_L = (E^n \otimes E^n \otimes E^n) E^\sigma \tag{33} \]
\[ = \frac{5}{8}|111\rangle \langle 111| - \frac{(-1)^n}{3^n} \sum_{u} |s^u s^u s^u \rangle \langle s^u | \tag{34} \]
\[ + \frac{5}{6} \cdot \frac{3^n}{2} \sum_{u} |s^u s^u s^u \rangle \langle s^u | \tag{35} \]
\[ - \frac{5}{6} \cdot \frac{3^n}{2} \sum_{u} |s^u s^u s^u \rangle \langle s^u | \tag{36} \]
\[ - \frac{5}{6} \cdot \frac{3^n}{2} \sum_{u} |s^u s^u s^u \rangle \langle s^u | \tag{37} \]
where \( \Lambda^u \) was introduced in Eq. (28) and here we introduce its vectorized form \( |\Lambda^u \rangle \equiv |s^u s^u s^u \rangle + |s^u s^u s^u \rangle + |s^u s^u s^u \rangle \), as well as \( |\Omega^u \rangle \equiv |s^u s^u s^u \rangle + |s^u s^u s^u \rangle + |s^u s^u s^u \rangle \) and \( |\Theta^u \rangle \equiv \sum_{u \neq u} |s^u s^u s^u \rangle + |s^u s^u s^u \rangle + |s^u s^u s^u \rangle \). We note that the transfer operator or the quantum channel \( E_L \) is completely positive [22], since it is constructed from Kraus operators via Eqs. (18), (31) and (33).

Next, we consider the operator \( Q_L \equiv E_L(\mathbb{1}) \), and obtain it in the matrix form (instead of \( \cdots \))
\[ Q_L = \frac{5}{8} |111 \rangle \langle 111| + \frac{5}{6} \cdot \frac{3^n}{2} \sum_{u} \Lambda^u. \tag{35} \]
One can diagonalize \( Q_L \) and obtain its spectrum (noting \( \sum_{u} \Lambda^u \) has eigenvalues \( \pm 3/4 \))
\[ \text{spec}(Q_L) = \left\{ \frac{5}{8} \pm \frac{3}{8} \cdot \frac{3^n}{2} \right\}. \tag{35} \]
Therefore, the smallest eigenvalue \( q_L \) of \( Q_L \) is
\[ q_L = \frac{5}{8} - \frac{5}{8} \cdot \frac{3^n}{2}. \tag{37} \]
The transfer operator \( E_L \) is completely positive [22], since it is constructed from Kraus operators via Eqs. (18), (31) and (33). Hence, it is also 2-positive, and from a Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for 2-positive maps [23], we have that
\[ \| E_L \| = \| E_L(\mathbb{1}) \| \tag{38} \]
\[ = \| Q_L \| = \frac{5}{8} + \frac{5}{8} \cdot \frac{3^n}{2}. \tag{39} \]
From this we can calculate the associated \( b_L(n) = 8a(n)\| E_L \| /q_L \) and obtain
\[ b_L(n) = \frac{8 \cdot 3^n - 1}{1 - 3^{-2n}}, \tag{40} \]
where $a(n) = \|E^n - |1\rangle\langle\rho_1|\|$ was previously obtained in Ref. [1], and one can also calculate $a(n)$ directly from Eq. (32).

Next, we examine the channel coming from the right square-lattice site. The onsite tensors are defined as $W^R_k = 2\sqrt{2}(K \otimes K \otimes K)^T_k$, and one finds that

$$W^R_k = -(W^L_{-2})^\dagger, \quad W^L_{-2} = -(W^L_{-2})^\dagger,$$

$$W^R_1 = (W^L_{-1})^\dagger, \quad W^L_{-1} = (W^L_{-1})^\dagger,$$

$$W^R_0 = -(W^L_{0})^\dagger.$$  

From these, we see that $E^\pi_R(B) = \sum_k (W_k^R)^\dagger B W_k^L$ is dual to the channel $E^\pi_L$, i.e., $E^\pi_R = (E^\pi_L)^T$. Therefore, using the superoperator formalism, $E_R = E^\pi \circ (E^n \otimes E^n \otimes E^n)$ is dual to $E_L$, i.e., $E_R = (E_L)^T$; this shows that $\|E_R\| = \|E_L\|$. Moreover, the operator $Q_R = E_R(\rho_1) = E_L(\rho_1) = Q_L/2$, and therefore we have that the relation between the minimum eigenvalues of $Q_R$ and $Q_L$ is $q_R = q_L/2$. We therefore obtain

$$b_R(n) = 4a(n)/\|E_L\|/\|q_R = b_L(n),$$

$$b_G(n) = 4a(n)/\|E_L\|/\|E_R\|/(q_L q_R) = 8a(n)/\|E_L\|^2/q_L^2.$$  

The injectivity of the mappings $\Gamma_{GL/R-C_n}$ and $\Gamma_G$ for the corresponding matrices $B$, $C$, $D$ to the respective quantum states,

$$\Gamma_{GL-C_n}(B) = \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n} Tr[B V_n \cdots V_n T^L_i]|l\rangle_L \otimes |i_1,\ldots,i_n\rangle,$$

$$\Gamma_{GR-C_n}(C) = \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n,\sigma} Tr[C T^R_n V_n \cdots V_n]|i_1,\ldots,i_n\rangle \otimes |\sigma\rangle_R,$$

$$\Gamma_G(D) = \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n,\sigma} Tr[D T^R_n V_n \cdots V_n T^L_i]|l\rangle_L \otimes |i_1,\ldots,i_n\rangle \otimes |\sigma\rangle_R,$$

depends on whether $1 - b_{L/R}(n) > 0$ and $1 - b_G(n) > 0$, respectively; see Ref. [1]. In the above equations, $T^L_i$ and $T^R$ denote tensors from the left and right sides, respectively, $|l\rangle_L$ and $|\sigma\rangle_R$ are basis states for the left and right sides, respective, and $V_n$ denotes the tensor for one spin-1 site that decorates the edge (n is the total number of such sites); see Fig. 2. We have checked that $\Gamma_{GL-C_n}$, $\Gamma_{GR-C_n}$, and $\Gamma_G$ are injective for $n \geq 2$. From Ref. [1],

$$b_{GR}(n) = b_L(n) + b_R(n) - b_G(n) = 2b_L(n) - b_L(n)^2,$$

and it was shown that the important quantity $\varepsilon_n$ is upper bounded by

$$\varepsilon_n \leq d(n) = \frac{4a(n)}{\sqrt{1 - b_{L/R}(n)}} \left[ \frac{4a(n)}{\sqrt{1 - b_{L/R}(n)}} \right]^2 (1 + b_G(n)).$$  

Here, if $d(n) < 1/4$ then the corresponding AKLT model has a finite gap, whereas if $d(n) > 1/4$ it is undecided. Thus, we have

$$d(n) = \frac{4a(n)}{\|1 - b_L(n)\|} + \left( \frac{4a(n)}{\|1 - b_L(n)\|} \right)^2 (1 + b_G(n)).$$  

We can thus prove that the AKLT models on the decorated square lattice are gapped with $n \geq 4$, as shown in Fig. 6. But the analytics cannot say anything about $n < 4$.

Since $d(n)$ is only an upper bound on $\varepsilon_n$, we also performed numerical calculations directly for $\varepsilon_n$ for both the decorated honeycomb and square lattice (as well as one
FIG. 6. The function $d(n) - 1/4$ vs. $n$. It is an indicator of a nonzero spectral gap if negative for the decorated square lattice.

FIG. 7. The function $d_{HC}(n) - 1/3$ vs. $n$ for the decorated honeycomb lattice. It is an indicator of a nonzero spectral gap if negative, due to the expression from Ref. [1].

with mixed degrees), and confirmed that for both $n = 2$ and $n = 3$ the AKLT models are also gapped. The numerical results are shown in Table I. We describe our methods in Sec. V.

IV. COMMENTS ON OTHER LATTICES CASE

A. Other trivalent lattices

Since the proof in the decorated honeycomb case [1] only relies on the local structure of the two vertices on the underlying lattice and the corresponding tensors (see Fig. 3 for illustration), a moment of thought will convince one that it also holds exactly for other trivalent lattices with decoration on their edges; see Fig. 1 for illustration of other lattices. (However, this does not necessarily mean that the actual values of the gap will be identical.) Therefore for all trivalent lattices, which can be of any dimensions, such as 3D, the AKLT models on the corresponding decorated lattices will also be gapped if $n \geq 3$ (using the results on the decorated honeycomb in Ref. [1]), where again $n$ is the number of spin-1 sites added to decorate an edge. In fact, for each undecorated edge, the number of decorated sites $n_e$ can be different, and the corresponding AKLT model will still be gapped as long as $n_e \geq 3$. Numerically these bounds are improved to $n \geq 2$; see below.

B. Other lattices of vertex degree 4

By the same token, since we have proven that the AKLT models on the decorated square lattices are gapped if $n \geq 4$, this will also hold for any other decorated lattices, whose undecorated vertex degree is 4; see Fig. 1h for illustration of such other lattices. Numerically these bounds are also improved to $n \geq 2$. AKLT states on the 3D diamond lattice (also four-valent) and the associated decorations are also universal [16, 17], and the significance is that these 3D resource states are likely to provide fault tolerance similar to the 3D cluster state [21]. Therefore, the decorated diamond lattices host AKLT models that are gapped for $n \geq 2$, and the corresponding ground states are also universal and provides topological protection for MBQC.

C. Other lattices of fixed vertex degree

We conjecture that for any lattices of fixed vertex degree, the AKLT models on the corresponding decorated lattices will be gapped, as long as $n$ is large enough. The intuition comes from that for large $n$, it is essentially many long spin-1 AKLT chains incident on some vertices, which act as local perturbations. For $n$ sufficiently large, the perturbation is of measure zero as $n \to \infty$.

D. Lattices of mixed vertex degrees

A natural question to ask is for AKLT models residing on decorated lattices whose underlying lattice is of mixed
vertex degrees. It is likely that they will be gapped as long as \( n \) is sufficiently large.

Let us consider the lattice (i) in Fig. 1 whose underlying lattice has mixed vertex degrees of 3 and 4. Take the left original site to be of degree 3 and the right original site of degree 4. We have to evaluate these are improved to part (2) of the Lemma. In doing so, we will diverge from the source by not quotienting out \( EH \cap F \) and \( EH^\perp \cap F \) (i.e. setting \( E \land F = 0 \) and \( E \lor F = \infty \), as we ultimately will be working partly within those spaces. We consider the eigenvalue equation

\[
(\beta + F)\Upsilon = (1 - \alpha)\Upsilon.
\]

(57)

Clearly, as \( E \) and \( F \) are Hermitian operators whose eigenvalues belong to \( \{0, 1\} \), the range of possible values of \( \alpha \) is \([-1, 1]\). Moreover, we note that \( \alpha = -1 \) corresponds exactly to the subspace \( EH \cap F \), whereas \( \alpha = 1 \) corresponds exactly to the subspace \( EH^\perp \cap F \). Therefore, for \( \alpha \neq \pm 1 \), we can uniquely write \( \Upsilon = \varphi + \psi \) for

\[
\varphi \in V_E \equiv EH \cap (EH \cap F),
\]

\[
\psi \in V_F \equiv F \cap (EH \cap F)\perp.
\]

(58)

(i.e. as within the direct sum of two subspaces \( V_E \subset EH \) and \( V_F \subset F \) which, while nonintersecting, will not generically be orthogonal.) We therefore can rewrite Eq. (57) as

\[
(\beta + F)(\varphi + \psi) = (1 - \alpha)(\varphi + \psi),
\]

(59)

and arrive at

\[
(\varphi + E\psi) + (\psi + F\varphi) = (\varphi - \alpha \varphi) + (\psi - \alpha \psi).
\]

(60)

From the aforementioned uniqueness of the decomposition, this implies \( E\psi = -\alpha \varphi \) and \( F\varphi = -\alpha \psi \). From this we can directly compute

\[
(EF + FE)(\varphi + \psi) = -\alpha(1 - \alpha)(\varphi + \psi).
\]

(61)

Moreover we note that direct calculation gives us \( EF + FE|_{EH \cap F} = 2 \) and \( EF + FE|_{EH^\perp \cap F} = 0 \). That is, consideration of individual eigenspaces gives us

\[
EF + FE \geq -\max(\{\alpha\} \setminus \{1\})(E + F).
\]

(62)

We will then follow the original proof of part (1) of the Lemma in demonstrating

**Proposition 1** The inequality

\[
EF + FE \geq -\varepsilon(E + F)
\]

(63)

is optimized by \( \varepsilon = \max(\{\alpha\} \setminus \{1\}) = \|EF - E \land F\|. \)

In particular, \( 1 - \varepsilon \) is the least nontrivial eigenvalue of \( E + F \).

The operator norm \( \|O\| \) is equivalent to the supremal real value of \( \langle O|O\rangle \) for unit \( \Psi \); \( \Phi \); in particular optimizing \( \Phi \) and \( \Psi \) implies that \( O\Psi = \|O\|\Phi \) and \( O\Phi = \|O\|\Psi \). In finding \( \Psi \), we note that \( EF - E \land F \) vanishes on both \( F \) and \( E \); i.e. \( \Psi \) is orthogonal to these spaces and in particular \( \Psi \in V_E \). Likewise, the Hermitian transposes vanish on \( E \) and \( F \), so that we should find \( (EF - E \land F)\Psi \in V_E \); in particular, \( \Phi \in V_E \). Thus we can write \( EF\Psi = E\Psi = \varepsilon\Phi \) and \( (EF)\Phi = F\Phi = \varepsilon\Phi \). It follows that

\[
(\varepsilon^2 - \varepsilon)(\Psi - \Phi) = \varepsilon(E + F)(\Psi - \Phi)
\]

(64)
Moreover for any eigenvector $\Upsilon$ of $E + F$ with eigenvalue $1 - \alpha \in (0, 2)$, decomposed as above into $\varphi + \psi$, $(EF - E \wedge F) \psi = EF \psi = -\alpha \varphi$. This implies that $|EF - E \wedge F| \geq |\alpha|$ for $\alpha \neq \pm 1$; that is $\varepsilon = \max\{|\alpha| \setminus \{1\}\}$. □

Therefore, determining $\varepsilon$ is equivalent to determining the least nontrivial eigenvalue of $E + F$. We now demonstrate that we can simplify $E + F$ and, by extension, reduce the complexity of this calculation.

Consider a projector $A$, with the properties $EA = AE = E$ (i.e. $AH \supset EH$) and $[A, F] = 0$. (In particular, we will be interested in a projector defined on the sites $Y_v \setminus Y_w$.)

**Proposition 2** For an eigenvector $\Upsilon$ of $E + F$ with eigenvalue $1 - \alpha$, $\alpha \notin \{-1, 0, +1\}$, $\Upsilon^\dagger \Upsilon = \Upsilon$.

As above, we write $\Upsilon = \varphi + \psi$ with $\varphi \in V_E$ and $\psi \in V_F$, so that $E\psi = -\alpha \varphi$ and $F\varphi = -\alpha \psi$; in particular $E\varphi \psi = \alpha^2 \psi$. Manifestly $A\varphi = \varphi$ as $\varphi \in EH$; meanwhile, since $\alpha \neq 0$ we can write

$$A\psi = \alpha^{-2} AFE\psi = \alpha^{-2} FAE\psi = \alpha^{-2} FE\psi = \psi.$$ □

We use $A$ to project onto a lower-dimensional subspace $\mathcal{H}'$; that is we take $U_A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$, for $U_A^\dagger U_A = A$ and $U_A U_A^\dagger = 1$. We set $E' = U_A E U_A^\dagger$ and $F' = U_A F U_A^\dagger$. That $E'$ and $F'$ are projectors follows directly from the fact that $E$ and $F$ commute with $A$. Moreover,

**Proposition 3** $\|E'F' + E' \wedge F'\| = \|EF + E \wedge F\|$, \[ (E + F) U_A^\dagger \Upsilon' = (E + F) U_A^\dagger (U_A U_A^\dagger) \Upsilon' = A(E + F) U_A^\dagger \Upsilon' = U_A^\dagger (E' + F') \Upsilon'; \]

that is, for any eigenvector $\Upsilon'$ of $E' + F'$, $U_A^\dagger \Upsilon'$ is an eigenvector of $E + F$ with the same eigenvalue. Put otherwise, the spectrum of $E' + F'$ is a subset of that of $E + F$. Then, by Prop. 2 only the degeneracies of eigenvectors 0, 1, and 2 are affected; in particular the least nontrivial eigenvector is preserved. □

We additionally note that, for a fourth projector $B$ commuting with $E$ and $A$ and satisfying $FB = BF = F$, $B' = U_A BU_A^\dagger$ satisfies the same hypotheses for $F'$ and $E'$. Decomposing $B' = U_B^\dagger U_B$, $U_B U_B^\dagger = 1$, we can therefore move to a still smaller space $\mathcal{H}' \approx B' \mathcal{H}'$ and perform our analysis on $E'' = U_B E' U_B^\dagger$ and $F'' = U_B F' U_B^\dagger$. The method we use to efficiently exploit these conclusions is as follows:

1. Determine $E = 1 - P_v$, as follows:

   (a) Collect the physical and virtual indices, in order to turn the representation into a matrix $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{virt}}$.

   (b) Collect the physical and virtual indices of the honeycomb-lattice case, containing both physical and virtual indices (in the honeycomb-lattice case, $3n + 1$ physical and 3 virtual; in the square-lattice case, $4n + 1$ physical and 4 virtual indices).

2. Taking $U_E = W_1^\dagger$, we can repeat this process to define isometries $U_F$ on $Y_w, U_A$ on $Y_v \setminus Y_w$, and $U_B$ on $Y_w \setminus Y_v$.$$

3. Write $U_E' = U_A^\dagger U_E$ and $U_F' = U_B^\dagger U_F$ (as it may be prohibitively memory-intensive to represent even $E$ and $F$ in full).

4. Then $E'' = U_E' U_E^\dagger$ and $F'' = U_F' U_F^\dagger$ can be used to extract $\varepsilon$ by diagonalizing $E'' + F''$.

We applied the above procedure to four different types of lattices, and we found that the AKLT models are gapped for $n \geq 2$ for the decorated lattices, as shown in Table 1. This includes those whose underlying lattices are of degree 6, such as the triangular lattice and even the cubic lattice. The AKLT model on the cubic lattice is interesting, as the ground state, i.e. the AKLT state, is Néel ordered 24. By decorating the cubic lattice with a few spin-1 sites on every edge, the Néel order is removed, as gapless Goldstone modes must be present in the antiferromagnetic case. The results in Ref. 17 about quantum computational universality for the AKLT family only apply to lattices of vertex degrees equal to or less than 4. But for these 3D decorated AKLT states, we suspect that they are also universal for MBQC.

### A. Lower bounds on the gap

The lower bound on the gap of the AKLT model on the decorated honeycomb can be estimated via Eq. (5) and is given by

$$\text{gap}(H_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{KLT}}) \geq \frac{\gamma_{\varepsilon}(n)}{2} (1 - 3\varepsilon_n), \quad (65)$$

shown in Ref. 11. The analytic bound of $\varepsilon_3 < 0.2683$ was used, and together with $\gamma_{\varepsilon}(n = 3) \approx 0.2966$ this yielded a lower bound of gap: $\text{gap}(H_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{KLT}}) > 0.0289$ for the decorated honeycomb lattice. Of course, this can be improved by using the numerical value of $\varepsilon_3$ from Table 1 and we obtain $\text{gap}(H_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{KLT}}) > 0.131199$, which is four times more than originally found.

An additional improvement can be made by using a slightly different inequality from Eq. (5):

$$\Delta Y\bar{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{KLT}} \leq \text{gap}(H_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{KLT}}) \leq \|h_{Y, v}'\| \bar{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{KLT}}, \quad (66)$$

where $\Delta Y_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{KLT}}(\varepsilon)$ is defined to be the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of $h_{Y, v}'$, which is similar to $h_v$ in Eq. (2), but is instead defined as

$$h_{Y, v}' = \sum_{e \in E_v \setminus E_{\mathcal{A}}} P_e^{(\varepsilon)} + \sum_{e \in E_{\mathcal{A}}} P_e^{(\varepsilon)} , \quad (67)$$
where $E_v$ denotes the set of edges incident on the site $v$ on the original, undecorated lattice. The inequalities of Eq. (66) arrive naturally due to the fact that

$$H_{\Lambda(n)}^{\text{AKLT}} = \sum_{v \in \Lambda} h_{Y,v}.$$  

Thus the new lower bound on the gap is

$$\text{gap}(H_{\Lambda(n)}^{\text{AKLT}}) \geq \gamma(n) \equiv \Delta_Y(n)(1 - z \varepsilon_n),$$

where $z$ is the appropriate coordination number from the underlying lattice (one should take the largest one if the lattice is of mixed degree). We show in Table II a few lower bounds on the gap. For the decorated honeycomb example considered above, the lower bound on the gap is improved to $\text{gap}(H_{\Lambda(n=3)}^{\text{AKLT}}) > 0.183265$.

At this point, we would like to entertain the idea of extrapolating the lower bound from $n = 3$ & $n = 2$ linearly to $n = 1$ and $n = 0$. Doing this, we would obtain $\text{gap}(H_{\Lambda(n=1)}^{\text{AKLT}}) > 0.1262096$ (extrapolated) and $\text{gap}(H_{\Lambda(n=0)}^{\text{AKLT}}) > 0.097682$ (extrapolated). The latter value is interesting, as it is consistent with the numerical gap value of the model on the honeycomb lattice 0.10, obtained in Ref. [13] using tensor-network methods. Of course, there is no basis for why such an extrapolation should be valid.

### VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have followed the elegant approach by Abdul-Rahman et al. [1] and proved analytically that the decorated square lattices with $n \geq 4$ host AKLT models with finite spectral gap, similar to the results of the decorated honeycomb case. Our numerical approach extends beyond what was accessible previously and allows to show that the AKLT models on both decorated lattices are gapped even for $n = 2$ and $n = 3$. The results of a nonzero spectral gap also hold for any other decorated lattices of which the underlying lattices are of fixed vertex degree 3 or 4. But we have also commented on other lattices. In particular, using the results from both the decorated honeycomb and square lattice, we also show analytically that AKLT models on decorated lattices where the underlying lattice has mixed vertex degrees 3 and 4, are also gapped for $n \geq 4$. This is improved numerically to $n \geq 2$. Regarding the spectral gap for the AKLT models on the undecorated honeycomb or square lattice, we also share the same view as the authors of Ref. [1], i.e. to establish their spectral gap will require a different and maybe novel approach. However, some insight may be obtained if one can make progress analytically on the cases of $n = 1, 2$ and in particular whether $n = 1$ case is gapped or not, for which we strongly suspect that it is gapped.

Our numerical results also show the nonzero gap for $n = 2$ in the decorated triangular and cubic lattices. Observing the decaying trend of $\varepsilon_n$ on $n$ in the previous analysis, we believe that the nonzero gap should exist for all $n \geq 2$. One can carry out the analytic procedure for the degree-6 case. The calculations are expected to be more tedious but likely straightforward. Such a result is interesting for the cubic lattice, as this shows the AKLT states on the decorated cubic lattices are not Néel ordered, in contrast to the state on the un-decorated cubic lattice. Naively, decoration using spin-1 sites introduces more quantum fluctuations than those from spin-3 sites and destroys the Néel order. In contrast, the ground state of the spin-1/2 Heisenberg model on the cubic lattice is antiferromagnetically ordered, despite the seemingly larger quantum fluctuations from such low-spin magnitude entities. The phenomena of the suppression of order, as well as the other kind of suppression—of frustration, as mentioned in the Introduction, may be of interest for further exploration.

The AKLT models have spin rotational symmetry but deformation that breaks the full SO(3) symmetry were considered, such as the deformed AKLT models in Refs. [25, 26]. Can we employ similar approach to prove the spectral gap for the deformed models on the decorated lattices? It is also possible that ideas from tensor network can be useful, such as those in Refs. [27, 28]. Some deformed AKLT states were also previously shown to provide a universal resource for MBQC within some finite range of deformation [29, 30]. These deformed models also have interesting phase diagrams [25, 26]. It is worth mentioning that some related 2D Hamiltonians interpolating the AKLT and the cluster-state models were also shown to have finite spectral gap [25], but the spectral gap in the exact AKLT limit is still not proved.
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