An On-demand Photonic Ising Machine with Simplified Hamiltonian Calculation by Phase-encoding and Intensity Detection
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Abstract: Photonic Ising machine is a new paradigm of optical computing, which is based on the characteristics of light wave propagation, parallel processing and low loss transmission. Thus, the process of solving the combinatorial optimization problems can be accelerated through photonic/optoelectronic devices. In this work, we have proposed and demonstrated the so-called Phase-Encoding and Intensity Detection Ising Annealer (PEIDIA) to solve arbitrary Ising problems on demand. The PEIDIA is based on the simulated annealing algorithm and requires only one step of optical linear transformation with simplified Hamiltonian calculation. With PEIDIA, the Ising spins are encoded on the phase term of the optical field and only intensity detection is required during the solving process. As a proof of principle, several 20-dimensional Ising problems have been solved with high ground state probability (0.98 within 1000 iterations for antiferromagnetic cubic model and 1 within 4000 iterations for a random spin-glass model, respectively). It should be mentioned that our proposal is also potential to be implemented with integrated photonic devices such as tunable metasurfaces to achieve large-scale and on-demand photonic Ising machines.

1. Introduction

Optimization problems \cite{1} are ubiquitous in nature and human society, such as ferromagnets \cite{2,3}, phase transition \cite{4}, artificial intelligence \cite{5}, finance \cite{6}, biology \cite{7,8}, agriculture \cite{9}, etc.. Usually, combinatorial optimization problems (COPs) are non-deterministic polynomial hard (NP-hard) problems \cite{1}, in which the required resources to find the optimal solutions grow exponentially with the problem scales on conventional von-Neumann machines. To tackle such obstacles, Ising machines as specific hardware-solvers are introduced to accelerate the solving process \cite{10}, since any problem in the complexity class NP can be mapped to an Ising problem within polynomial complexity \cite{11,12,13}. The NP-hard Ising problems can be described as finding the energy ground state corresponding to a specific Ising spin vector $\sigma$, which is corresponding to the global minima of Hamiltonian in absence of the external field \cite{14}

$$H(\sigma) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j = -\frac{1}{2} \sigma^T J \sigma,$$

where $J$ is the adjacent interaction matrix, while the spin vector includes $N$ elements and each of them can take the value of $\sigma_i \in \{1, -1\}$. To implement Ising machines, various classical and quantum physical systems have been employed, including trapped atoms \cite{15,16}, magnetic tunnel junctions \cite{17,18,19}, memristor crossbar \cite{20}, CMOS hardware \cite{21}, laser networks \cite{22} and polaritons \cite{23}. Among them, optical systems are very promising due to the nature of parallel and light-speed propagation of light-wave. Moreover, advanced photonics can provide feasible and powerful platforms to encode, transmit and process information on various optic degree of freedoms (DOFs), e.g. phase, amplitude/intensity, frequency/wavelength, time slot and spatial profile/distribution. In recent years, the typical photonic Ising machines include the coherent Ising machine (CIM) \cite{24–28}, the spatially multiplexing photonic Ising machine (SM-
In this work, a photonic Ising machine is proposed and demonstrated with the simulated annealing algorithm [35,36] and simplified Hamiltonian calculation in the optical domain. Actually, such simplification corresponds to encoding the spin vector on the phase term of the light field and the intensity detection in succession so that our proposal is named as the “Phase-Encoding and Intensity Detection Ising Annealer” (PEIDIA), which will be briefly explained as follows. At the beginning, with proper treatment of the adjacent matrix $J$, the calculation of Ising Hamiltonians can be modified from the quadratic form (Eq. (1)) to the product of a transformed spin vector denoted as $A\sigma$ and its transpose $(A\sigma)^T$, where the matrix $A$ represents the linear transformation on the spin vector $\sigma$ and can be obtained with eigen-decomposition of $J$. Thus, with Ising spins encoded on the phase term of the light field, only one OVMM is required to calculate the transformed spin vector $A\sigma$. It should be noticed that the product of $(A\sigma)^T(A\sigma)$ is quite similar to the form of inner product of transformed spin vector $A\sigma$ and can be perform by the intensity detection of the transformed light field naturally. Then with a simple summation of the detected light field, the Hamiltonian can be readily calculated corresponding to Eq. (1). At last, the simulated annealing algorithm is employed to search the ground state with the obtained Hamiltonian. As aforementioned, there is only one OVMM required to calculate $A\sigma$ with our proposed PEIDIA, which is quite helpful to simplify and speedup the calculation process in the optical domain. Furthermore, the PEIDIA can serve as a kind of “on-demand” solver to solve an arbitrary but given Ising problem. For a given Ising problem, the required transformation matrix of $A$ can be explicitly determined by the known adjacent interaction matrix of $J$. Thus, by employing a programmable and universal OVMM setup to perform the linear transformation of $A\sigma$, an on-demand PEIDIA can be achieved.

In our experimental implementation, the employed OVMM scheme is based on the discrete coherent spatial (DCS) mode and SLMs as our previous work [37-40]. To verify the feasibility of our proposal, the 20-dimensional antiferromagnetic Möbius-Ladder model as well as a fully connected, random spin-glass model is experimentally solved. For the Möbius-Ladder model, the ground state probability reaches 0.98 (100 runs) in the end within 1000 iterations, while that of the fully connected model reaches 1 (100 runs) within 4000 iterations. It should be mentioned that, our proposed architecture does not rely on specific optical linear transformation schemes. The main advantage of PEIDIA is the simplified Hamiltonian calculation with only one OVMM so that the parallelism and fast-speed of optical calculation can be fully exploited. Furthermore, even with the present experimental demonstration, our scheme is also potential to achieve more than one hundred Ising spins and combined with
optical cavity to realize an all-optical annealer. Thus, our proposed on-demand PEIDA would pave the way to achieve large-scale Ising machines that can solve arbitrary Ising problems on demand.

2. Methods

2.1 Architecture and operation principles of the PEIDA

In order to accelerate the solving process of the Ising problem, we proposed an on-demand photonic Ising machine and Fig. 1(a) shows the architecture design. There are three main stages: the electronic pretreatment, optical matrix multiplication and the electronic feedback. In the electronic pretreatment, the parameters for the setup of the optical system are calculated according to the adjacent matrix $J$. Then an OVM system is utilized to accelerate the calculation of the Hamiltonian following a specific Ising spin vector. At last, the optical intensities after optical matrix multiplication are detected and converted to electronic signals. With the adopted algorithm, the spin vector for the next iteration will be generated and fed to the stage of optical matrix multiplication again. The details of them are described as follows.

The main purpose of the electronic pretreatment is to simplify the calculation in the optical domain. According to Eq. (1), the Ising Hamiltonian has a quadratic form and two steps of vector-matrix multiplications are required. Actually, only one vector-matrix multiplication is needed in the optical domain with proper pretreatment. We notice that the adjacent interaction matrix $J$ is a real symmetric matrix. Hence, with eigen-decomposition [41], the Hamiltonian has the form as follows:

$$H(\sigma) = -\frac{1}{2} \sigma^T J \sigma = -\frac{1}{2} \sigma^T (Q^T \sqrt{D} Q) \sigma = -\frac{1}{2} (A \sigma)^T (A \sigma),$$

where $J = Q^T D Q$, while $Q$ is the normalized orthogonal eigenvector matrix and $D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_N)$ is the diagonal eigenvalue matrix of $J$.

In our proposal, the vector-matrix multiplication of $A \sigma$ is performed in the optical domain. Thus, the Ising spin is considered as encoded on the phase term of the optical field $E_i = E_0 \sigma_i = E_0 \exp(i(\varphi_0 + \varphi_i))$, while the term of $\varphi_i$ would correspond to the element of the spin vector with the value of $\varphi_i \in [0, \pi]$. With neglecting the constant phase term of $\exp(i\varphi_0)$, the complex amplitude of the output optical field can be written as

$$E = E_0 A \sigma,$$

where $E_0$ is the constant amplitude term. By defining the output intensity vector $I$ by $I_i = E_i^* E_i$, the Hamiltonian becomes

$$H = -\frac{E^T E}{2E_0^2} = \frac{1}{2E_0^2} \left( \sum_{i, \lambda_i < 0} I_i - \sum_{i, \lambda_i > 0} I_i \right).$$

Eq. (4) shows that the calculation of Hamiltonian turns into the simple summation of the optical intensities in a subtle way. Thus, in our proposal, the optical computation would perform the tasks of encoding spin vectors on optical field, vector-matrix multiplications of $A \sigma$ and intensity detections as shown in Fig. 1(a). It should be mentioned that although the Ising spin vector $\sigma$ is encoded on the phase term of optical field, only the measurement of the output intensity vector $I$ is required to obtain the Hamiltonian.

In Eq. (4), the first term in the bracket is the summation of the intensities corresponding to the negative eigenvalues, while the second term corresponds to the positive eigenvalues, which is due to the difference between $E_i E_i$ and $E_i^* E_i$ when $\lambda_i < 0$. Since there are subtracting operations, the Hamiltonian is finally calculated with Eq. (4) in the electronic domain after the intensity detection. In success, the heuristic algorithm is executed to determine the spin vector for next iteration. Here, the simulated annealing algorithm [35,36] is employed to search the ground state. In the iteration $t$, a spin state $\sigma^{(t)}$ is accepted and its Hamiltonian $H^{(t)}$ is calculated. Then in the next iteration ($t + 1$), one element of the spin vector would be randomly flipped so that the spin vector $\sigma^{(t)}$ is updated to $\sigma^{(t+1)}$, which is settled on the optical field
via the electronic feedback. Then the difference between the current Hamiltonian $H^{(t+1)}$ and the previous one of $H^{(t)}$ is calculated as:

$$\Delta H = H^{(t+1)} - H^{(t)}. \quad (5)$$

If $\Delta H \leq 0$, the current sampling is accepted. With $\Delta H > 0$, the current sampling is accepted with the probability of $\exp(-\Delta H / T)$ due to the Metropolis criterion $[35,36]$, where $T$ is the annealing temperature. In a single run of the algorithm, $T$ is slowly decreased from the initial temperature of $T_0$ to zero according to the iteration number. Finally, a “frozen” state will be obtained, which may be the optimal ground state with high probability.

Fig. 1. (a) Architecture diagram of the PEIDIA. (b) Detailed demonstration of the PEIDIA with arbitrary non-unitary spatial matrix transformation of DCSMs for a 9-spin Ising problem. The input field consists of 9 Gaussian beams with equal intensities. Different colors in wavefront modulation patterns and optical fields indicate different phases according to the color bar. The black region in the spin encoding pattern denotes 0 phase delay for readability. The orange arrows denote the propagation directions of the Gaussian beams. In the shown spin-update process, a red circular region turns blue, representing a spin flip.

2.2 Optical vector-matrix multiplication

Generally, the transformation matrix $A$ in Eq. (3) is complex and non-unitary, so that the OVMM employed in our architecture should be capable to achieve such non-unitary transformation. In our previous work $[37–40]$, a matrix transformation scheme has been demonstrated with phase-coherent spatial (DCS) modes and SLMs. With such scheme, arbitrary complex vector-matrix multiplications can be implemented for both unitary and non-unitary matrices. Based on it, the architecture of the optical computation in the PEIDIA is schematically depicted in Fig. 1(b). The spin vector is encoded on the DCS mode, which consists of a group of Gaussian beams. More specifically, the elements of both the input and output vectors are defined as the complex amplitudes at the centers of the Gaussian beams. During an annealing
process, each Ising spin $\sigma_i(t)$ is encoded on the input vector through the appending spin-encoding phase pattern corresponding to the phase delay of $0/\pi$, as depicted by the red/blue circular regions in Fig. 1(b), respectively. Then the input vector passes through the beam-splitting and recombining with meticulously designed phase patterns which are determined by the transformation matrix $A$, and the details are provided in Supplementary. The output amplitude vector $E(t)$ consists of the complex amplitudes at the centers of the beams within the output plane, and the output intensity vector of $I(t)$ is detected. In succession, the Hamiltonian $H(t)$ is calculated in the electronic domain and the next sampling state $\sigma^{t+1}$ is generated and updated to the spin-encoding phase pattern. The spin flip can be simply achieved by adding a constant phase delay $\pi$ to the corresponding circular region of the spin-encoding phase pattern, as depicted in the last pattern of Fig. 1(b).

It should be mentioned that with our scheme, the mapping relations between the Ising problem and the experimental parameters (the phase patterns according to the matrix $A$) are simple and explicit. The beam-splitting and recombining scheme can directly conduct the non-unitary matrix transformation, without utilizing the cascade structure as shown in Ref. [37,38].

2.3 Experiment demonstration

The experimental setup of the PEIDIA with 20 spins is illustrated in Fig. 2. A Gaussian beam at 1550nm (ORION 1550nm Laser Module) with the fiber collimator is injected to a linear polarizer and a half-wave plate, which align the polarization according to the operation of three phase-only reflective SLMs (Holoeye PLUTO-2.1-TELCO-013). Each SLM has 1920×1080 pixels with the pixel pitch of 8μm, serving as the reconfigurable wavefront modulator. SLM0 is employed to split the single incident beam into 20 Gaussian beams without overlap as the initial DCS mode, and the position distribution in the transverse plane is shown in the inset (1) of Fig. 2. The beams are arranged in a hexagonal lattice in order to encode more spins on a single SLM, and the radius of each beam is ~560μm. Both phase patterns for spin-encoding and
beam-splitting are applied on SLM1, while the beam-recombining phase pattern is applied on SLM2. SLM1 and SLM2 would perform the OVMM of \( A \sigma \). The splitting ratio of each region on SLM1 is consistent with the corresponding column of \( A \). The recombining ratio of each region on SLM2 is an all-one vector, which sums up the incident optical complex amplitudes. For example, one of the twenty \((N = 20)\) circular beam-recombining phase pattern is shown in the inset (2) of Fig. 2. It should be mentioned that the phase patterns on SLM0 and SLM2 only depend on the dimensionality and the position distribution of the DCS mode, \( \text{i.e.} \) 20 beams in a hexagonal lattice in this work, and keep constant during the solving process. Moreover, the radius of the phase pattern is settled as 1.16mm to conveniently align each Gaussian beam. Actually, the diameter of the phase pattern could be reduced to the same as that of the Gaussian beam so that more Gaussian beams can be utilized to encode the Ising spins. After the SLM2, there is a pinhole to filter out the unwanted diffraction components. Before the CCD camera, a lens would align the beams along the direction of the optical axis. Finally, the DCS mode is detected by an InGaAs camera (Hamamatsu InGaAs Camera C12741-03). The methods for calibrating the optical system and generating the phase patterns are provided in Supplementary. Additionally, a CPU is employed to perform the required process in the electronic domain, including pretreating the adjacent matrix, generating the phase patterns on SLMs, flipping the spins, calculating the Hamiltonians and those included in the simulated annealing algorithm.

3. Results

To verify our proposed PEIDIA, several models with different complexities have been experimentally solved. The first model is the antiferromagnetic Möbius-Ladder model with \( N = 20 \), in which the nonzero entries are \( J_{ij} = -1 \) as illustrated as the inset in Fig. 3(a). Finding the ground state of such model can also be regarded as solving a MAX-CUT problem [26]. First, a single run of the PEIDIA is conducted, where a final accepted state is obtained after 1000 iterations. Fig. 3(a) shows the measured CCD image and the beam intensities of the output field according to a randomly generated initial state in a certain run, while those of the final accepted state is shown in Fig. 3(b). In Fig. 3(a) and (b), the intensity of each beam is represented by the average power of central 9 pixels inferred from the grayscale. In the eigenvalue matrix \( D \) of the 20-dimensional Möbius-Ladder model, the first 11 eigenvalues are negative while the last 9 eigenvalues are positive. Thus, the beams with number 1-11 are marked as “negative” beams corresponding to the negative eigenvalues, while the rest are denoted as “positive” beams in Fig. 3(a) and (b). In Fig. 3(a), the intensity mainly concentrates on the “negative” beams, indicating that the initial state is an excited state with a higher Hamiltonian. Actually, Eq. (4) indicates that the optical intensities are expected to be more concentrated on the “positive” beams to achieve lower Hamiltonians. Fig. 3(b) shows that the intensity finally concentrates on the “positive” beams 19 and 20, while there are almost no signals on the “negative” beams, which corresponds to a low value of the Hamiltonian. Such results indicate that the PEIDIA indeed minimizes the Hamiltonian.

In the experiment, the PEIDIA has been run for 100 times, and the corresponding Hamiltonian evolutions are depicted in Fig. 3(c). For each run, the initial state of the spin vector is randomly generated. Most of the curves converge to the low Hamiltonians within 600 iterations, and the finally obtained Hamiltonians fluctuate around the ground state Hamiltonian \( H = -26 \) which is denoted as the black dashed line in Fig. 3(c). Such fluctuations are due to the systematic error and the detection noise. Actually, the target of the PEIDIA is to obtain the spin vector of the ground state, rather than the actual value of the Hamiltonian. Thus, the sampled spin vectors in each iteration corresponding to all curves in Fig. 3(c) are extracted to calculate the theoretical Hamiltonians with Eq. (1). The results are shown in Fig. 3(d), indicating that most curves converge to the theoretical minimum \( H = -26 \) (black dashed line) in the end. According to the data in Fig. 3(d), the ground state probability can also be obtained by counting the proportion of the ground state Hamiltonian for each iteration within all 100 runs. The ground state probability versus the iteration number is plotted as the red curve in Fig.
3(e). It can be seen that as the initial states are randomly generated, the ground state probability is almost 0 in the range of the iteration number less than 50. Then the probability would experience a rapid growth from the iteration number 100 to 400, and gradually converge in the end. The final ground state probability is around 0.98 after 600 iterations, indicating that almost all of the 100 runs can successfully obtain the ground states. For comparison, the simulated annealing algorithm has also been carried out for 10000 times on a computer with the same parameters as the experimental settings, and the ground state probability versus the iteration number is plotted as the black curve in Fig. 3(e). It can be seen that the experimental curve matches very well with the simulation curve.

As shown in the Fig. 3(c), the experimental Hamiltonians fluctuate around the ground state Hamiltonian in the final stage of searching, indicating that the systematic error and the detection noise cannot be ignored due to the limited performance of the experimental devices. Such factors would cause the actual transformation matrix and the input vector to deviate slightly from the theoretical ones. To quantify the influence of these two factors, the parameter of fidelity $f$ is introduced with

$$f = \frac{|I^T I_{\text{theo}}|}{|I||I_{\text{theo}}|}. \quad (6)$$

In Eq. (6), $I$ is the intensity vector measured by the CCD and $I_{\text{theo}} = (A\sigma)^* \circ (A\sigma)$ ($\circ$ denotes the Hadamard product) is the theoretical output intensity vector, which is calculated by the target transformation matrix $A$ and the sampled spin vector $\sigma$. Thus, $f$ could be adopted to evaluate the accuracy of the optical output vectors, since both the accuracy of the OVMM and the detection noise are included. According to Eq. (6), $f$ is normalized within $[0, 1]$ and $f = 1$ represents the ideally accurate calculation within the optical domain. The fidelities of all $10^5$ experimental samples are calculated and counted. The probability distribution of $f$ is illustrated in Fig. 3(f), and the average value is $0.9996\pm0.0007$, indicating that our transformation scheme is quite accurate.
Fig. 3. Results of the ground state search for the 20-dimensional Möbius-Ladder model. (a) The output CCD image and the corresponding beam power of a randomly generated initial state with a high Hamiltonian. The right inset shows the Ising model. (b) The output CCD image and the corresponding beam intensities of a final accepted state converged from the state in (a) with a low Hamiltonian. (c) The 100 experimental curve of the Hamiltonian evolution. The black dashed line denotes the theoretical ground state Hamiltonian $H = -26$. (d) 100 curves of the theoretical Hamiltonian evolution, obtained by calculating the theoretical Hamiltonians of the accepted states in every iteration number for all curves in Fig. 3(c). The black dashed line denotes the theoretical ground state Hamiltonian $H = -26$. (e) The ground state Hamiltonian versus the iteration number in the experiment and simulation. (f) The fidelity distribution for all $10^5$ experimental output intensity vectors obtained via the OVMM.

To present the “on-demand” ability of our proposal, we have considered a randomly generated and fully connected 20-dimensional spin-glass model, in which nonzero entries are equally distributed in $J_{ij} \in \{-1, 1\}$ as shown in the inset of Fig. 4(a). The evolution curves of the theoretical Hamiltonians for 100 runs are presented in Fig. 4(b), where the theoretical ground state Hamiltonian $H = -66$ is shown as the black dashed lines. Here, the number of iterations for each run is increased to $4 \times 10^3$ since this model is more complex than the antiferromagnetic Möbius-Ladder model. It can be seen that most of the curves converge within 2500 iterations. The ground state probability versus the iteration number is also calculated and plotted in Fig. 4(c). The final ground state probability is 1, which indicates that our PEIDIA is capable of solving such complex and fully connected model. It should be mentioned that the final ground state probability in the experiment is even larger than that in the simulation, indicating that the noise may enhanced the ground state search [30,32,33]. Furthermore, the fidelity distribution of the output vectors is also calculated and shown in Fig. 4(d). The average fidelity of the total $4 \times 10^5$ samples of the output intensity vectors is $0.9997 \pm 0.0008$, which is very close to that in the antiferromagnetic Möbius-Ladder model.
Fig. 4. Results of the fully connected 20-dimensional spin-glass model with $J_{ij} \in \{-1, 1\}$. (a) The 100 experimental Hamiltonian evolution curves. The inset shows the connectivity of the randomly generated Ising model. The black dashed line ($H_{\text{min}} = -66$) indicates the theoretical ground state Hamiltonian. (b) The 100 curves of the theoretical Hamiltonian evolution, obtained by calculating the theoretical Hamiltonians of the accepted states in every iteration number for all curves in Fig. 4(a). The black dashed line denotes the theoretical ground state Hamiltonian $H = -66$. (c) The ground state probabilities versus the iteration number over 100 runs. (c) The ground state Hamiltonian versus the iteration number in the experiment and simulation. (d) The fidelity distribution between the experimental and the theoretical output intensity vectors over $4 \times 10^5$ samples.

4. Discussion

Here, we have proposed and demonstrated an on-demand photonic Ising machine that can handle arbitrary Ising problems based on the simulated annealing algorithm. With proper pretreatments, only one non-unitary vector-matrix multiplication in the optical domain and the intensity measurement are required. In this section, we will evaluate the scalability and operating speed of our architecture and compare them with those of other Ising annealers including the SM-PIM and PRIS.

Both the SM-PIM and our demonstration of PEIDIA are based on spatial light systems. In the SM-PIM, the number of the reconfigurable parameters is $2N$, which is contributed by the amplitude modulation and the target intensity pattern as shown in [29]. It should be noticed that an Ising interaction matrix without external field has the independent entries of $N(N - 1)/2$. Therefore, the SM-PIM can not handle arbitrary Ising problems. Compared with the SM-PIM, where each spin is encoded by a single SLM pixel, we have utilized more pixels to form a spin for arbitrary matrix transformations, hence it can solve arbitrary Ising problems — that is to say, our demonstration trades the number of implementable spins for the on-demand
characteristic. According to our previous work [37,38], each pattern on SLM is the superposition of a series of phase gratings, hence abundant pixels have to be employed to perform such complex pattern with enough accuracy. In this work, the radius of each beam-splitting or recombining pattern on SLM1 and SLM2 is 1.18mm and the average pixel number to split the incident beam to each direction is $S=3389$. Since the total pixels of the SLMs is $\text{Pixel}=1920 \times 1080$, our 20-spin demonstration does not fully exploit all of the pixels on SLMs. Actually, the beam radius incident on SLM1 is $\sim 560\mu m$, which is much smaller than the pattern radius and helpful for optical alignment. Actually, the pattern radius on SLM can be reduced to the beam radius and the corresponding pixels for each split/combined beam is $S=848$. Thus, as an estimation, the spin number can achieve $\sim 50$ if the pattern radius matches with the beam radius ($M=848$) according to $\text{Pixel} \approx N^2 \cdot S$. Furthermore, if 4K SLMs ($S=3840 \times 2160$) are adopted, the spin number can be increased to $\sim 100$ with the same arrangement as our present setup. Actually, forming DCS modes by so many pixels is to keep the input and output modes exactly the same. Although the implementable spins of our demonstration is lower than the SM-PIM, our employed OVMM is more suitable to realize a CIM-like optical feedback. Recently, a spatial coherent Ising machine based on an optical resonant cavity is proposed with numerical simulations [42]. In this work, SLMs are used to conduct coherent OVMM and feedback. Our OVMM scheme is also appropriate to build such optical resonant cavity, since both the input and the output mode are the DCS modes. Inspired by these works, we may realize an all-optical Ising annealer based on the spatial optical resonant cavity in the future work.

As mentioned above, our PEIDIA only requires one non-unitary OVMM with proper pretreatment. Besides, the spins are encoded on the phase term of the optical field and only intensity measurement is needed to calculate the Hamiltonian. In the PRIS, two cascaded Reck schemes are utilized since only unitary matrix transformations can be performed by the Reck scheme. Each Reck scheme requires $N(N-1)/2$ Mach–Zehnder interferometers (MZIs) [34]. For example, a 20-dimensional Reck scheme totally needs 190 MZIs, which consist of 380 beam splitters and 380 phase shifters. Such cascaded structure would impede its high-dimensional implementations. Nevertheless, the primary advantage of the PRIS is the achievement of the Ising machine on a photonic chip. It should be mentioned that our architecture is also potential to be implemented on chip, since the SLMs could be replaced with tunable metasurfaces [43,44].

The time cost of our demonstration of the PEIDIA consists of the pretreatment cost in the electronic domain and the iteration cost during the annealing process. In the pretreatment stage, the time complexity of the eigen-decomposition is $O(N^3)$ [41] and the generation of the phase patterns on the SLMs is $O(N^2)$. In fact, the pattern on SLM0 is a beam-splitting pattern and that on SLM2 is a beam-recombining pattern, which could be pre-generated before the annealing process. Different beam-splitting patterns on SLM1 would correspond to different Ising problems, and the generation of each pattern takes about 10min in the 20-spin experiment. Such pre-generation could be done while solving the previous problem, hence the time cost is primarily determined by the optoelectronic iterations. The iteration cost in optical domain depends on the propagation time of light, along with the frame rates of the SLM and the CCD camera. The distance between the SLM1 and the CCD camera is $\sim 1.5m$ in the experiment, hence the time cost of the lightwave propagation in a single iteration is $T_o = 5ns$. Besides, the switching time of the SLM and the exposure time of the CCD camera are denoted as $T_s$ and $T_c$, respectively. Hence, the time cost of a single iteration in our implementation is

$$T = \max(T_o, T_s, T_c).$$

(6)

In our experiment, $T_s = T_c = 16.67ms$. The rest operations in an iteration includes the Hamiltonian calculation, Metropolis criterion and spin update, which can be omitted compared with the time cost in optical domain. Hence, the iteration cost is mainly determined by the operations in optical domain and 1000 iterations takes $\sim 16.67s$. The energy consumption mainly depends on the sensitivity of the CCD Camera. With our employed Hamamatsu InGaAs camera C12741-03, the laser power incident into the PEIDIA is $\sim 20\mu W$ to achieve enough SNR.
on CCD and the corresponding energy consumption is ~400fJ/FLOP. By employing the state-of-the-art phase shifters (>100GHz) [45] and photodetectors (>100GHz) [46], the time cost of our implementation would mainly limited by the light-wave propagation ($T_D = 5$ns) and may reach the energy consumption of ~0.12fJ per FLOP. In this consideration, the field-programmable gate arrays (FPGAs) should be employed instead of the CPU to ensure that the time cost is still determined by the operations in optical domain [26]. Moreover, an on-chip implementation of the PEIDIA could be much faster and more energy-efficient.

In summary, our proposed PEIDIA provides an architecture to concisely map arbitrary Ising problems to the photonic system. The experimental demonstration is based on the high-dimensional and high-fidelity OVMM and several models have been solved with high ground state probability. Our architecture could be further improved to achieve all-optical, large-scale on-demand Ising machines, or utilized in other optical computation system that involves calculations with quadratic forms.
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