Efficient Optimal Control of Open Quantum Systems

Wenhao He*[1,2], Tongyang Li†[3], Xiantao Li‡[4], Zecheng Li§[5], Chunhao Wang¶[5], and Ke Wang‖[4]

[1]Center for Computational Science and Engineering, MIT
[2]School of Physics, Peking University
[3]Center on Frontiers of Computing Studies, School of Computer Science, Peking University
[4]Department of Mathematics, Pennsylvania State University
[5]Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Pennsylvania State University

Abstract

The optimal control problem for open quantum systems can be formulated as a time-dependent Lindbladian that is parameterized by a number of time-dependent control variables. Given an observable and an initial state, the goal is to tune the control variables so that the expected value of some observable with respect to the final state is maximized. In this paper, we present algorithms for solving this optimal control problem efficiently, i.e., having a poly-logarithmic dependency on the system dimension, which is exponentially faster than best-known classical algorithms. Our algorithms are hybrid, consisting of both quantum and classical components. The quantum procedure simulates time-dependent Lindblad evolution that drives the initial state to the final state, and it also provides access to the gradients of the objective function via quantum gradient estimation. The classical procedure uses the gradient information to update the control variables.

At the technical level, we provide the first (to the best of our knowledge) simulation algorithm for time-dependent Lindbladians with an ℓ_1-norm dependence. As an alternative, we also present a simulation algorithm in the interaction picture to improve the algorithm for the cases where the time-independent component of a Lindbladian dominates the time-dependent part. On the classical side, we heavily adapt the state-of-the-art classical optimization analysis to interface with the quantum part of our algorithms. Both the quantum simulation techniques and the classical optimization analyses might be of independent interest.

---

[*] wenhaohe@mit.edu
[†] tongyangli@pku.edu.cn
[‡] xiantao.li@psu.edu
[§] zxl5523@psu.edu
[¶] cwang@psu.edu
[‖] wangke.math@psu.edu

1 Introduction

The ability to control the dynamics of a quantum system to maximize its property has been a persistent pursuit in quantum physics and chemistry [18]. This endeavor has recently gained momentum, spurred by the growing interest in designing quantum information processing devices. One remarkable obstacle in controlling a quantum system's behavior stems from the reality that quantum systems typically evolve in the presence environmental noise. Consequently, the control strategy must take into account system/bath interactions. In the Markovian regime, this problem can be formulated as an optimal control problem based on the Lindblad master equation [38, 24] acting on n qubits,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho = \mathcal{L}(t)(\rho) := -i\left[H_0 + \sum_{\beta=1}^{n_c} u_\beta(t)\mu_\beta, \rho\right] + \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(L_j\rho L_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{L_j^\dagger L_j, \rho\}\right), \tag{1}$$

in conjunction with a control functions $u_\beta(t)$ that enters the system Hamiltonian through the operator μ_β, and we have n_c control functions. Here ρ is a density operator on n qubits, and the second term in Eq. (1) is a result of system/bath interactions with L_j's being the jump operators. The quantum optimal control (QOC) is then formulated as an optimization problem following [2]:

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{u}} f[\boldsymbol{u}(t)], \quad f[\boldsymbol{u}(t)] \coloneqq \operatorname{tr}\big(\mathscr{O}\rho(T)\big) - \alpha \sum_{\beta=1}^{n_c} \int_0^T |u_\beta(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t. \tag{2}$$

The Hermitian operator $\mathscr{O}$ represents the property to be maximized. The term $\boldsymbol{u}(t)$ embodies all the control variables $\{u_\beta\}$ and the last term in the objective function $f[\boldsymbol{u}(t)]$ is regarded as a regularization. It is worthwhile to point out that there are other choices of the objective function [8] in the formulation of the QOC problem. For example, one can guide the Lindblad dynamics (1) toward a target state $\bar{\rho}(T)$. In this case, one can minimize the difference between $\bar{\rho}(T)$ and $\rho(T)$,

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{u}} f[\boldsymbol{u}(t)], \quad f[\boldsymbol{u}] := \|\rho(T) - \bar{\rho}(T)\|^2 + \alpha \sum_{\beta} \int_0^T |u_\beta(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t. \tag{3}$$

Implicit in both optimization problems Eqs. (2) and (3) is that $\rho(T)$ has to be obtained from the Lindblad equation (1). Thus the main computational challenge comes from the repeated computation of the solution of the Lindblad equation. In this paper, we mainly focus on the optimal control problem with the objective function Eq. (2).

To be able to clearly illustrate the computational complexity, we assume that the Hamiltonian $H(t)$ and the jump operators $L_j(t)$'s are sparse. Moreover, the sparsity structure for each operator does not change over time (i.e., the positions of nonzero entries do not change with time). For a sparse matrix A, we assume we have access to a procedure $\mathcal{P}_A$ that can apply the following oracles:

$$\mathcal{O}_{A,\mathrm{loc}} |i,j\rangle = |i, \nu_A(i,j)\rangle, \quad \text{and} \tag{4}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{A,\mathrm{val}} |t,i,j,z\rangle = |t,i,j,z \oplus A_{i,j}(t)\rangle, \tag{5}$$

where $\nu_A(i,j)$ is the index of the j's nonzero entry of column i in A. Particularly for the optimal control problem, we assume we have access to $\mathcal{P}_{H_0}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_\beta}$, and $\mathcal{P}_{L_j}$ for all $j \in [m]$, as well as $\mathcal{P}_{\mathscr{O}}$ for the observable $\mathscr{O}$.

Main contributions We will present a hybrid quantum/classical algorithm for the QOC problem (1) and (2). The overall algorithm consists of the following elements:

1. A Lindblad simulation algorithm [14, 15, 36] that prepares $\rho(T)$ in a purification form. The complexity of our algorithm exhibits a linear scaling with respect to T with a scaling factor proportional to the L_1 norm of the Lindbladians instead of the $L_{\max}$ norm. The dependence of the complexity on the precision ϵ is only poly-logarithmic. Alternatively, we can also simulate time-dependent Lindbladian using interaction picture [41]. This algorithm applies to important models in experimental physics. For instance, in an ion trap system, it is common to have a time-independent Hamiltonian with norm much larger than the rest of the Lindbladian terms, and thus our algorithm can make the simulation more efficient.

2. The construction of a quantum phase oracle of the gradient of the function f. This is achieved by incorporating the quantum gradient computation algorithms in [21]. This phase oracle will then be interfaced with a classical optimization algorithm.

3. Having approximates of gradients $\nabla f(\boldsymbol{u}(t))$, we use an accelerated gradient descent (AGD) method [26] to solve the optimization problem. In particular, we analyze the influence of the statistical error from the gradient estimation and provide a precise complexity analysis for solving the optimization problem, which essentially characterizes the robustness of AGD for reaching second-order stationary points and may be of independent interest.

In addition to the proposed algorithms, we provide rigorous analysis of the numerical error and precise overall complexity estimates for the hybrid algorithm. Formally, we establish the following result for optimal control of open quantum systems:

Theorem 1.1 (main theorem)**.** *Assume there are* n_{c} *control functions* $u_\beta(t) \in \mathrm{C}^2([0,T])$*. Further assume*[1] *that* $\|H_0\|, \|\mathscr{O}\|, \|\mu_\beta\|, \|L_j\| \leq 1$*, and* $\alpha \geq 2/T$*. There exists a quantum algorithm that, with probability at least* $2/3$[2]*, solves problem* (2) *by:*

- *reaching a first-order stationary point* $\|\nabla f\| < \epsilon$ *with* (1) *using* $\widetilde{O}\left(\frac{n_{\mathrm{c}}\|\mathcal{L}\|_{be,1}T}{\epsilon^{23/8}}\Delta_f\right)$ *queries to* $\mathcal{P}_{H_0}$ *and* $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_\beta}$*,* $\beta = 1, 2, \ldots, n_{\mathrm{c}}$*, and* $\widetilde{O}\left(mn\frac{n_{\mathrm{c}}\|\mathcal{L}\|_{be,1}T}{\epsilon^{23/8}}\Delta_f + n\frac{T^{3/2}}{\epsilon^{9/4}}\Delta_f\right)$ *additional 1- and 2-qubit gates; or*

- *reaching a second-order stationary point using* $\widetilde{O}\left(\frac{n_{\mathrm{c}}\|\mathcal{L}\|_{be,1}T^{7/4}}{\epsilon^{5}}\Delta_f\right)$ *queries to* $\mathcal{P}_{H_0}$ *and* $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_\beta}$*,* $\beta = 1, 2, \ldots, n_{\mathrm{c}}$ *and* $\widetilde{O}\left(mn\frac{n_{\mathrm{c}}\|\mathcal{L}\|_{be,1}T^{7/4}}{\epsilon^{5}}\Delta_f + n\frac{T^{3/2}}{\epsilon^{9/4}}\Delta_f\right)$ *additional 1- and 2-qubit gates.*

Here n_{c} *and* m *are respectively the number of control variables and jump operators.*

Techniques Our technical contributions are outlined as follows.

- In Section 3, we give efficient quantum algorithms for simulating time-dependent Lindbladians with a scaling factor in time proportional to the L_1-norm of the Lindbladians instead of the $L_{\max}$-norm, as well as poly-logarithmic ϵ dependence. Our simulation algorithm is based on

---

[1] More generally, if $\|H_0\|, \|\mu\| = \Theta(\Lambda)$, it is equivalent to enlarge the time duration T by a factor $O(\Lambda)$.

[2] Using standard techniques, the success probability can be boosted to a constant arbitrarily close to 1 while only introducing a logarithmic factor in the complexity.

the higher-order series expansion from Duhamel's principle as sketched in [36]. A notable difference from [36] is that in their paper, Gaussian quadratures are used to approximate integrals; however, in our time-dependent case, Gaussian quadratures can no longer be used as, unless upper bounds on the higher-order derivatives of the operators are given in advance. The techniques for obtaining the L_1-norm dependence follow from the rescaling trick in [5], while generalized to Lindbladians. Our time-dependent Lindbladian simulation techniques might be of independent interest.

- In Section 4, we show how to simulate time-dependent Lindbladian using interaction picture [41]. This technique is suited for simulating a Lindbladian $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2$ where $\mathcal{L}_1(\cdot) = -i\,[H_1, \cdot]$ is a Hamiltonian with complexity linear in norm of $\mathcal{L}_2$ (up to poly-logarithmic factors) and similar number of simulations of the Hamiltonian H_1 . The simulation scheme is based on a mathematical treatment of the Lindblad equation as a differential equation, and the construction leverages the simulation algorithms shown in Section 3 without rescaling the evolution time. It turns out that using our simulation algorithm in the interaction picture, we obtain better gate complexity compared with directly using the simulation in Section 3 even with the ℓ_1-norm dependence. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first Lindblad simulation algorithm in the interaction picture, which can also be of independent interest.

- In Section 5, we adapt a nonconvex optimization algorithm that can reach first-order stationary points with $\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^{7/4})$ *noisy* gradient queries with ℓ_2-norm error at most $O(\epsilon^{9/8})$, and reach second-order stationary points with $\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^{7/4})$ *noisy* gradient queries with ℓ_2-norm error at most $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^3)$. Our setting is different from either gradient descent (GD) or stochastic gradient descent (SGD): Compared to GD we only have access to noisy gradients, while in standard SGD the noise can be adjusted and there is no Lipschitz condition for the noisy gradient. With this novel setting, we successfully design an optimization algorithm based on perturbed accelerated gradient descent (PAGD) [26]. We carefully analyze the error bound in different cases and it turns out that our algorithm reaches an optimal error scaling for PAGD (up to poly-logarithmic factors) in finding a first-order stationary point.

Related work In addition to the large variety of conventional applications [20], quantum optimal control problems are crucial in near-term quantum computing, because in the architecture of quantum computers, the underlying physical operations such as microwave control pulses and the modulated laser beam can be abstracted as control pulse sequences (see the survey [48] for more detailed discussions), and hence the are inherently quantum control problems. Quantum optimal control also plays a vital role in quantum computing algorithms. For instance, Magann et al. [42] studied the relationship between variational quantum algorithms (VQAs) and quantum optimal control, and showed that the performance of VQAs can be informed by quantum optimal control theory. Banchi and Crooks [4] demonstrated how gradients can be estimated in a hybrid quantum-classical optimization algorithm, and quantum control is used as one important application. In Ref. [40] the authors showed that for a quantum many-body system, if it exists an efficient classical representation, then the optimal control problems on this quantum dynamics can be solved efficiently with finite precision.

There exist heuristic classical methods for solving the quantum optimal control problem, including the monotonically convergence algorithms [49], the Krotov method [45], the GRadient Ascent Pulse Engineering (GRAPE) algorithm [28, 17], the Chopped RAndom-Basis (CRAB) algorithm [9], etc. Furthermore, such heuristics can be extended to quantum optimal control of open quantum systems [31, 32, 46, 23], including [1, 33, 6]. However, these algorithms do not establish provable guarantees for the efficiency of solving the quantum optimal control problem. Meanwhile, the landscape of the quantum control problem has been analyzed in [13, 16, 19], which suggests that for closed quantum systems, the landscape may not involve suboptimal optimizers. However, the implication to the computational complexity still remains open.

Quantum algorithms, due to their natural ability to simulate quantum dynamics, have been developed for quantum control problems [43, 34, 12, 35]. Liu and Lin [39] developed an efficient algorithm to output the integral of the observable in Eq. (2), which can potentially solve a more generalized optimal control problem. These approaches employ hybrid quantum-classical algorithms that combine a quantum algorithm for the time-dependent Schrödinger equation with a classical optimization method. However, these efforts have been focused on closed quantum systems, and quantum control algorithms for open quantum systems require separate techniques.

Open questions Our paper leaves several open questions for future investigations:

- Are there efficient quantum algorithms for the optimal control of other master equations beyond the Lindbladian equation?
- How to extend the current framework to the control problems with a target density operator $\bar{\rho}(T)$? The challenge in such a control problem (3) is the estimation of the Frobenius norm from the quantum circuit.
- Gaussian quadrature was used in the Lindblad simulation method [36], which significantly suppressed the number of terms in a Dyson-series type of approach, and implies the implementation. The extension of Gaussian quadrature to the current framework with time-dependent Lindbladians would require derivative bounds for the evolution operator from both the drift and jump terms, which is not trivial.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notations

For a positive integer m, we use $[m]$ to denote the set $\{1, \ldots, m\}$. In this paper, we use two types of notations to denote vectors. For a quantum state, we use the Dirac notation $|\cdot\rangle$ to denote the corresponding state vector. For vectors involved in classical information, e.g., the gradient vector, we use bold font, such as $\boldsymbol{u}$, to denote them. For such a vector $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, we use subscripts with a norm font to indicate its entries, i.e., $u_1, \ldots, u_d$ are the entries of $\boldsymbol{u}$. When we use subscripts with a bold font, such as, $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_k$, they are a list of vectors. For a vector $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, we use $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|$ to denote its *Euclidean norm*. For a matrix $M \in \mathbb{C}^{d\times d}$, we use $\|M\|$ to denote its *spectral norm*, and use $\|M\|_1$ to denote its *trace norm*, i.e., $\|A\|_1 = \mathrm{Tr}(\sqrt{M^\dagger M})$. We also use $[\cdot,\cdot]$ to denote the operator *commutator*, i.e., $[A, B] := AB - BA$, and use $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ to denote the *anticommutator*, i.e., $\{A, B\} := AB + BA$.

In addition, we use calligraphic fonts, such as $\mathcal{L}$, to denote *superoperators*, which is also referred to as *quantum maps*. Superoperators are linear maps that take matrices to matrices. The *induced trace norm* of a superoperator $\mathcal{M}$, denoted by $\|\mathcal{M}\|_1$, is defined as

$$\|\mathcal{M}\|_1 := \max\{\|\mathcal{M}(A)\|_1 : \|A\|_1 \leq 1\}. \tag{6}$$

The *diamond norm* of a superoperator $\mathcal{M}$, denoted by $\|\mathcal{M}\|_\diamond$, is defined as

$$\|\mathcal{M}\|_\diamond := \|\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{I}\|_1, \tag{7}$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ acts on the space with the same size as the space $\mathcal{M}$ acts on.

We denote by $\mathrm{C}^2[0,T]$ the class of twice continuously differential functions in $[0,T]$.

2.2 Algorithmic tools

2.2.1 Block-encoding and implementing completely-positive maps

Although we assume that the input of the operators of the Lindbladian are given by sparse-access oracles, it is convenient to use a more general input model when presenting the simulation algorithm. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{2^n \times 2^n}$, we say that a unitary, denoted by U_A, is an (α, b, ϵ)-block-encoding of A if

$$\left\| A - \alpha(\langle 0|^{\otimes b} \otimes I) U_A (|0\rangle^{\otimes b} \otimes I) \right\| \le \epsilon, \tag{8}$$

where the identity operator I is acting on n qubits. Intuitively, this unitary U_A is acting on $(n+b)$ qubits and A appears in the upper-left block of it, i.e.,

$$U_A = \begin{pmatrix} A/\alpha & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix}. \tag{9}$$

Here, we refer to α as the *normalizing factor*.

Our simulation algorithm relies on the following technical tool from [37] for implementing completely positive maps given the block-encodings of its Kraus operators, which generalizes a similar tool in [15] where the Kraus operators are given as linear combinations of unitaries.

Lemma 1 (Implementing completely positive maps via block-encodings of Kraus operators [37])**.** *Let $A_1, \dots, A_m \in \mathbb{C}^{2^n}$ be the Kraus operators of a completely positive map. Let $U_1, \dots, U_m \in \mathbb{C}^{2^{n+n'}}$ be their corresponding (s_j, n', ϵ)-block-encodings, i.e.,*

$$\|A_j - s_j(\langle 0| \otimes I) U_j |0\rangle \otimes I)\| \le \epsilon, \quad \textit{for all } 1 \le j \le m. \tag{10}$$

Let $|\mu\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m s_j^2}} \sum_{j=1}^m s_j |j\rangle$. Then $\left(\sum_{j=1}^m |j\rangle\langle j| \otimes U_j\right) |\mu\rangle |0\rangle \otimes I$ implements this completely positive map in the sense that

$$\left\| I \otimes \langle 0| \otimes I \left(\sum_{j=1}^m |j\rangle\langle j| \otimes U_j \right) |\mu\rangle |0\rangle |\psi\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m s_j^2}} \sum_{j=1}^m |j\rangle A_j |\psi\rangle \right\| \le \frac{m\epsilon}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m s_j^2}} \tag{11}$$

for all $|\psi\rangle$.

We also need the following lemma from [37] for obtaining a block-encoding of a linear combination of block-encodings.

Lemma 2 (Block-encoding of a sum of block-encodings [37])**.** *Suppose $A := \sum_{j=1}^m y_j A_j \in \mathbb{C}^{2^n \times 2^n}$, where $A_j \in \mathbb{C}^{2^n \times 2^n}$ and $y_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots m\}$. Let U_j be an (α_j, a, ϵ)-block-encoding of A_j, and B be a unitary acting on b qubits (with $m \le 2^b - 1$) such that $B|0\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{2^b-1} \sqrt{\alpha_j y_j / s}\, |j\rangle$, where $s = \sum_{j=1}^m y_j \alpha_j$. Then a $(\sum_j y_j \alpha_j, a+b, \sum_j y_j \alpha_j \epsilon)$-block-encoding of $\sum_{j=1}^m y_j A_j$ can be implemented with a single use of $\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} |j\rangle\langle j| \otimes U_j + ((I - \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} |j\rangle\langle j|) \otimes I_{\mathbb{C}^{2^a}} \otimes I_{\mathbb{C}^{2^n}})$ plus twice the cost for implementing B.*

2.2.2 Optimization

For the current quantum-classical hybrid algorithm, we will couple a Lindblad simulation with a classical optimization algorithm. For this purpose, we work with the PAGD algorithm [26], which is based on Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent idea [44],

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{u}_k - \eta \nabla f(\boldsymbol{u}_k) + (1-\theta)\boldsymbol{v}_k, \quad \boldsymbol{v}_{k+1} \quad = \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{u}_k. \tag{12}$$

Here $\boldsymbol{u}_k$ is the kth iterate of the control variable. The idea in PAGD is to introduce a perturbation to the iterate when $\|\nabla f\| > \epsilon$ for some iterations, along with a negative curvature exploitation step.

There are two common goals for solving (nonconvex) optimization problems:

- $\boldsymbol{x}$ is called an ϵ-approximate first-order stationary point if $\|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x})\| \leq \epsilon$.
- $\boldsymbol{x}$ is called an ϵ-approximate second-order stationary point if $\|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x})\| \leq \epsilon, \quad \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{x})) \geq -\sqrt{\varrho\epsilon}$. Here f is a ϱ-Hessian-Lipschitz function, i.e., $\|\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{x}) - \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{y})\| \leq \varrho\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}\|$ for any $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$.

2.2.3 Quantum gradient estimation

With copies of $\rho(T)$, which will be obtained from Lindblad simulation algorithms, and sparse access to $\mathscr{O}$, we can obtain an estimated gradient value of $\widetilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u})$. The high-level strategy is to construct a probability oracle first, then construct a phase oracle with the probability oracle, and finally obtain the gradient by the phase oracle. The probability oracle and the phase oracle are defined as follows.

The Lindblad simulation algorithm leads to a purification of $\rho(T)$, i.e., $\rho(T) = \operatorname{tr}(|\rho_T\rangle\langle\rho_T|)$. It is clear that the regularization term in (2) is easy to compute. With the purification, we can express the first term as,

$$\widetilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}) := \langle \rho_T | \, \mathscr{O} \otimes I \, | \rho_T \rangle \,. \tag{13}$$

Suppose $U_{\mathscr{O}}$ denotes the block encoding of $\mathscr{O}$, i.e. $\langle 0 | \langle \psi_N | U_{\mathscr{O}} | 0 \rangle | \psi_N \rangle = \langle \psi_N | \mathscr{O} | \psi_N \rangle$. Let c-$U_{\mathscr{O}}$ be the controlled $U_{\mathscr{O}}$. Applying Hadamard test circuit $(H \otimes I)\,(\text{c}{-}U_{\mathscr{O}})\,(H \otimes I)$ acting on $|\rho_T\rangle$ produces

$$\sqrt{f(\boldsymbol{u})}\,|1\rangle\,|\phi_1(u)\rangle + \sqrt{1-f(\boldsymbol{u})}\,|0\rangle\,|\phi_0(\boldsymbol{u})\rangle \tag{14}$$

where $f(\boldsymbol{u}) := -\frac{1}{2}\langle \rho_T | \mathscr{O} | \rho_T \rangle + \frac{1}{2} = -\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}) + \frac{1}{2}$. By Lemma 48 of [22], we can efficiently construct a block encoding of $\mathscr{O}$ with sparse access to $\mathscr{O}$. The $1/2$ factor does not matter because the gradient will only be multiplied by a constant factor.

Definition 1 (Probability oracle). *Consider a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,1]$. The probability oracle for f, denoted by U_f, is a unitary defined as*

$$U_f|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle|\boldsymbol{0}\rangle = |\boldsymbol{x}\rangle\left(\sqrt{f(\boldsymbol{x})}|1\rangle\,|\phi_1(\boldsymbol{x})\rangle + \sqrt{1-f(\boldsymbol{x})}|0\rangle\,|\phi_0(\boldsymbol{x})\rangle\right),$$

where $|\phi_1(\boldsymbol{x})\rangle$ and $|\phi_0(\boldsymbol{x})\rangle$ are arbitrary states.

Definition 2 (Phase oracle). *Consider a function $f\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. The phase oracle for f, denoted by $\mathcal{O}_f$, is a unitary defined as*

$$\mathcal{O}_f|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle|\boldsymbol{0}\rangle = e^{if(\boldsymbol{x})}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle|\boldsymbol{0}\rangle$$

Theorem 2.1 (Constructing phase oracle with probability oracle, Theorem 14 of [21])**.** *Consider a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,1]$. Let U_f be the probability oracle for f. Then, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1/3)$, we can implement an ϵ-approximate of the phase oracle $\mathcal{O}_f$ for f, denoted by $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_f$, such that $\|\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_f|\psi\rangle|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle - \mathcal{O}_f|\psi\rangle|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle\| \le \epsilon$, for all state $|\psi\rangle$. This implementation uses $O(\log(1/\epsilon))$ invocations to U_f and $U_f^\dagger$, and $O(\log\log(1/\epsilon))$ additional qubits.*

In order to interface the Lindblad simulation algorithm with a classical optimization method, one needs to estimate the gradient of the objective function. Similar to the approach in [35], we first represent the control variable as a piecewise linear function in time $u_\beta(t) \approx \sum_{j=1}^N u_j B_j(t)$ with $B_j(t)$ being the standard shape function and u_j being a nodal function. The total number of steps N is proportional to the time duration T. We will use the improved Jordan's algorithm [27] using high order finite difference formulas [21]. Basically, the gradient estimation in [21] produces an estimate $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{u})$, such that, $\|\nabla J_1(\boldsymbol{u}) - \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{u})\| < \epsilon$ with complexity $O(d/\epsilon)$, which is clearly better than a direct sampling approach. However, to achieve this complexity, the objective function needs to satisfy a derivative bound. Toward this end, we first establish an a priori bound for the derivative.

Lemma 3. *Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k) \in [N+1]^k$ be an index sequence*[3]*. The derivatives of the control function $\widetilde{J}_1$ with respect to the control variables satisfy:*

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \widetilde{J}_1}{\partial u_{\alpha_1} u_{\alpha_2} \cdots u_{\alpha_k}} \right\| \le (k+1)! \left(\delta t \|\mu\|\right)^k . \tag{15}$$

This smoothness provides a basis for estimating the complexity of Jordan's algorithm [21],

Lemma 4 (Rephrased from Theorem 23 of [21])**.** *Suppose the access to $f : [-1,1]^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is given via a phase oracle O_f. If f is $(2m+1)$-times differentiable and for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in [-1,1]^N$,*

$$|\partial_{\boldsymbol{r}}^{2m+1} f(\boldsymbol{x})| \le B \qquad \textit{for } \boldsymbol{r} = \boldsymbol{x}/\|\boldsymbol{x}\|, \tag{16}$$

then there exists a quantum algorithm that outputs an approximate gradient $\boldsymbol{g}$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{g} - \nabla f(\boldsymbol{0})\|_\infty \le \epsilon$ with probability at least $1-\rho$ using

$$\widetilde{O}\left(\max\left\{\frac{N^{1/2} B^{1/(2m)} N^{1/(4m)} \log(N/\rho)}{\epsilon^{1+1/(2m)}}, \frac{m}{\epsilon}\right\}\right) \tag{17}$$

queries to O_f, and $\widetilde{O}(N)$ additional 1- and 2-qubit gates.

In particular, when $f(\boldsymbol{x})$ is a polynomial of degree no greater than $2m$, the query complexity to O_f becomes,

$$\widetilde{O}\left(\frac{m}{\epsilon}\right). \tag{18}$$

After adapting this algorithm to the objective function in Eq. (13), we find that,

Lemma 5. *Let $\widetilde{J}_1$ be defined as in Eq. (13). Suppose we are given access to the phase oracle $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{J}_1}$ for $\widetilde{J}_1$. Then, there exists a quantum algorithm that outputs an approximate gradient $\boldsymbol{g}$ such that $\left\|\boldsymbol{g} - \nabla \widetilde{J}_1\right\| \le \epsilon_g$ with probability at least $1-\gamma$ using $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(n_c T \log(N/\gamma)/\epsilon_g\right)$ queries to $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{J}_1}$, and $\widetilde{O}(N)$ additional 1- and 2-qubit gates.*

---

[3] For a precise definition of an index sequence, see Definition 4 of [21].

Proof. Although the derivative bound in Lemma 3 does not fulfill the condition in [21], we can apply Theorem 23 in [21]. By choosing the optimal value m, we arrive at the complexity bound. $\square$

With the gradient estimated, we can now move to the optimization algorithm. The PAGD algorithm in [26] assumes the gradient- and Hessian-Lipschitz condition, which we will prove here for the control problem. In particular, the smoothness constant ℓ and the Hessian-Lipschitz constant ϱ can be approximated by the same technique as Lemma 3.

Lemma 6. *Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in [N+1]^k$ be an index sequence, then $\tilde{J}_1$ is l-smooth and ρ-Hessian Lipschitz continuous, i.e.*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nabla} \tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}) - \boldsymbol{\nabla} \tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{v})\| \leq l \|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{v}\|, \textit{ and } \quad \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2 \tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}) - \boldsymbol{\nabla}^2 \tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{v})\| \leq \varrho \|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{v}\|. \tag{19}$$

The smoothness parameters are given by,

$$l = 3!(N+1)\delta t^2 \|\mu\|^2 \|\mathscr{O}\|, \quad \varrho = 4!(N+1)\delta t^3 \|\mu\|^3 \|\mathscr{O}\|. \tag{20}$$

The proof of this lemma is deferred to Appendix B.

3 Simulating open quantum systems with time-dependent Lindbladian

Ref. [36, Section 6] sketched a method for simulating open quantum systems with time-dependent Lindbladian. In this section, we present the details of this simulation algorithm.

Motivated by the time scaling idea in [5], we define a change-of-variable function as

$$\mathrm{var}(t) := \int_0^t \mathrm{d}s \, \|\mathcal{L}(s)\|_{\mathrm{be}}. \tag{21}$$

By simulating the Lindblad dynamics on the new time scale, the overall complexity exhibits a better dependence on the norm of the Lindbladians in time. To this end, we need the following oracle to perform the inverse change-of-variable:

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{var}} \left|t\right\rangle \left|z\right\rangle = \left|t\right\rangle \left|z \oplus \mathrm{var}^{-1}(t)\right\rangle. \tag{22}$$

In addition, we need the following oracle to obtain the normalizing constant $\alpha_0(t)$ for $H(t)$ and $\alpha_j(t)$ for $L_j(t)$: for all $j = [m]$,

$$\mathcal{O}_{H,\mathrm{norm}} \left|t\right\rangle \left|z\right\rangle = \left|t\right\rangle \left|z \oplus \alpha_0(t)\right\rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{O}_{L_j,\mathrm{norm}} \left|t\right\rangle \left|z\right\rangle = \left|t\right\rangle \left|z \oplus \alpha_j(t)\right\rangle. \tag{23}$$

As in [36], we define the *block-encoding norm* for a Lindbladian $\mathcal{L}$, denoted by $\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be}}$ for normalization purposed:

$$\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be}} := \alpha_0 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_j^2. \tag{24}$$

The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose we are given an* $(\alpha_0(t), a, \epsilon')$*-block-encoding* $U_{H(t)}$ *of* $H(t)$*, and an* $(\alpha_j(t), a, \epsilon')$*-block-encoding* $U_{L_j(t)}$ *for each* $L_j(t)$ *for all* $0 \le t \le T$*. Let* $\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1}$ *be defined as*

$$\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1} \coloneqq \int_0^T \mathrm{d}\tau \, \|\mathcal{L}(\tau)\|_{\mathrm{be}}, \tag{25}$$

Suppose further that $\epsilon' \le \epsilon/(2t(m+1))$*. Then, there exists a quantum algorithm that outputs a purification of* $\tilde{\rho}_T$ *of* $\tilde{\rho}(T)$ *where* $\left\| \tilde{\rho}(T) - \mathcal{T} e^{\int_0^T \mathrm{d}\tau \, \mathcal{L}(\tau)}(\rho_0) \right\|_1 \le \epsilon$ *using*

$$O\left(\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1} \left(\frac{\log\left(\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1}/\epsilon\right)}{\log\log\left(\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1}/\epsilon\right)} \right)^2 \right) \tag{26}$$

queries to $U_{H(t)}$*,* $U_{L_j(t)}$*,* $\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{var}}$*,* $\mathcal{O}_{H,\mathrm{norm}}$*, and* $\mathcal{O}_{L_j,\mathrm{norm}}$*, and* $\widetilde{O}\left((m+m)\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1}\right)$ *additional 1- and 2-qubit gates, where* n *is the number of qubits the Lindbladian is acting on.*

3.1 High-level overview of the simulation algorithm

Here we briefly outline the techniques that led to the stated complexity. Let the Hamiltonian $H(t) = H_0 + \sum_\beta u_\beta(t)\mu_\beta$, we rewrite equation (1) as follows

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho = \mathcal{L}(t)(\rho) \coloneqq -i[H(t), \rho] + \sum_{j=1}^m (L_j(t)\rho L_j^\dagger(t) - \frac{1}{2}\{L_j(t)^\dagger L_j(t), \rho\}) \tag{27}$$

$$= \mathcal{L}_D(t)(\rho) + \mathcal{L}_J(t)(\rho). \tag{28}$$

Here we have decomposed the Lindbladian into a drift term $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{D}}(t)$ and a jump term $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t)$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{D}}(t)(\rho) = -i[H(t), \rho] - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^m \{L_j(t)^\dagger L_j(t), \rho\} = J(t)\rho + \rho J(t)^\dagger, \tag{29}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t)(\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^m L_j(t)\rho L_j(t)^\dagger, \tag{30}$$

where $J(t) \coloneqq -iH(t) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^m L_j(t)^\dagger L_j(t)$.

With the known initial value $\rho(0) = \rho_0$, the solution of Eq. (28) can be written as the linear combination of the following equations.

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho & = \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{D}}(t)(\rho) \\ \rho(0) & = \rho_0 \end{cases}, \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \rho & = \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{D}}(t)(\rho) + \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t)(\rho) \\ \rho(0) & = 0 \end{cases}. \tag{31}$$

Specifically, for the first part of Eq. (31), the density operator follows $\rho(t) = V(0,t)\rho_0 V(0,t)^\dagger = \mathcal{K}[V(0,t)](\rho_0)$, where $V(s,t) = \mathcal{T} e^{\int_s^t J(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau}$ is the time-ordered exponential of J. A brief introduction of time-ordered exponential can be found in Appendix A. For the second part of Eq. (31), the density operator follows $\rho(t) = \int_0^t g(t,s)\mathrm{d}s$, where the function $g(t,s)$ satisfying

$$\partial_t g(t,s) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{D}}(t)(g(t,s)), \text{ and } \lim_{t \to s} g(t,s) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(s)(\rho(s)). \tag{32}$$

By using time-ordered evolution operator and Duhamel's principle, the solution of Eq. (27) can be expressed as

$$\rho(t) = \mathcal{K}[V(0,t)](\rho_0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{K}[V(s,t)](\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(s)(\rho(s)))\,\mathrm{d}s. \tag{33}$$

The time-ordered exponential $V(0,t)$ can be approximated by the truncated Dyson series (see Appendix A.1 for details),

$$V(0,t) = \mathcal{T}e^{\int_0^t J(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau} \approx \sum_{k=0}^{K} \frac{1}{k!}\mathcal{T}\int_0^t \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\tau}\, J(\tau_k)\cdots J(\tau_1), \tag{34}$$

where $\mathcal{T}\int_0^t \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\tau}(\cdot)$ denote an integration over a k-tuple of time variables $(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_k)$ while keeping the time ordering: $\tau_1 \le \tau_2 \le \cdots \le \tau_k$. Thus,

$$V(s,t) = \mathcal{T}e^{\int_s^t J(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau} = \mathcal{T}e^{\int_0^{t-s} J(s+\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau} \tag{35}$$

$$\approx \sum_{k=0}^{K} \frac{1}{k!}\int_0^{t-s} \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\tau}\mathcal{T}[J(\tau_k)\cdots J(\tau_1)]. \tag{36}$$

As in [29], we use the rectangle rule to approximate the integral in the truncated Dyson series. Note that more efficient quadratures could be potentially used as we use later approximation the integral in Eq. (33), for instance, the scaled Gaussian quadrature; however such methods require upper bounds on higher-order derivatives of $J(t)$, which are not readily available.

By applying Duhamel's principle (see Eq. (33)) several times, we obtain the following approximation with notations introduced in [10].

$$\mathcal{G}_K(t) \coloneqq \mathcal{K}[V(0,t)] + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \int_{0\le s_1\le\cdots\le s_k\le t} \mathcal{F}_k(s_k,\ldots,s_1)\,\mathrm{d}s_1\cdots\mathrm{d}s_k, \tag{37}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_k(s_k,\ldots,s_1) \coloneqq \mathcal{K}[V(s_k,t)]\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(s_k)\cdots\mathcal{K}[V(s_1,s_2)]\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(s_1)\mathcal{K}[V(0,s_1)]. \tag{38}$$

This yields an approximation of the evolution superoperator $\rho(t) \approx \mathcal{G}_K(t)(\rho(0))$. The key observation is that $\mathcal{F}_k$ is a composition of CPTP maps. The second term of $\mathcal{G}_K(t)$ can be approximated by using truncated Dyson series.

3.2 Detailed constructions

In this subsection, we present the construction of the time-dependent Lindbladian simulation algorithm. For the sake of conciseness, we omit the convoluted details in treating the time-ordering of the truncated Dyson series. All these details are postponed to Appendix D.

The scaled evolution time Recall that we introduced the rescaled time in Eq. (21), and let define $\hat{t}$ as

$$\hat{t} = \mathrm{var}(t) = \int_0^t \mathrm{d}s\, \|\mathcal{L}(s)\|_{\mathrm{be}}. \tag{39}$$

Correspondingly, we follow the rescaled Lindblad equation, by defining $\hat{\rho}(\hat{t}) = \rho((\mathrm{var}^{-1}(\hat{t}))$, which, from Eq. (1), satisfies the equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\hat{t}}\hat{\rho}(\hat{t}) = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\hat{t})\hat{\rho}(\hat{t}), \tag{40}$$

where the rescaled Lindbladian is as,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\hat{t}) = \frac{\mathcal{L}(\mathrm{var}^{-1}(\hat{t}))}{\left\|\mathcal{L}(\mathrm{var}^{-1}(\hat{t}))\right\|_{\mathrm{be}}}. \tag{41}$$

This rescaling can be achieved by defining

$$\widehat{H}(\hat{t}) := \frac{H(\mathrm{var}^{-1}(\hat{t}))}{\left\|\mathcal{L}(\mathrm{var}^{-1}(\hat{t}))\right\|_{\mathrm{be}}}, \text{ and } \widehat{L}(\hat{t}) := \frac{L(\mathrm{var}^{-1}(\hat{t}))}{\sqrt{\left\|\mathcal{L}(\mathrm{var}^{-1}(\hat{t}))\right\|_{\mathrm{be}}}}. \tag{42}$$

The *scaled effective Hamiltonian* (not Hermitian), denoted by $\widehat{J}(\hat{t})$, is therefore defined as

$$\widehat{J}(\hat{t}) := \frac{J(\mathrm{var}^{-1}(\hat{t}))}{\left\|\mathcal{L}(\mathrm{var}^{-1}(\hat{t}))\right\|_{\mathrm{be}}}. \tag{43}$$

As a result, simulating $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ for time $\hat{t} = \mathrm{var}(t)$ is equivalent to simulating $\mathcal{L}$ for time t. Moreover, the block-encoding-norm of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ is at most 1 because of Eq. (41).

To simplify the notation, in the remainder of this section we assume the Lindbladian is already scaled so that we can drop the $\widehat{\cdot}$ notation for the scaled operators and evolution time.

LCU construction Let $U_J(t)$ be an (α, a, ϵ)-block-encoding of $J(t)$. Given the oracles as in Eqs. (4) and (5), the unitary $\sum_t |t\rangle\langle t| \otimes U_J(t)$ for discretized times t can be implemented. Using Lemma 2, a block-encoding of $V(s,t)$ can also be implemented. More specifically, we use the rectangle rule as in [29] to approximate the integrals in Eq. (36):

$$\widetilde{V}(s,t) = \sum_{k=0}^{K'} \frac{(t-s)^k}{M^k k!} \sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_k=0}^{M-1} \mathcal{T} J(t_{j_k}) \cdots J(t_{j_1}). \tag{44}$$

Here the time-ordered term is defined as follows, for each tuple $t_k, t_{k-1}, \ldots, t_1$,

$$\mathcal{T} J(t_k) \cdots J(t_1) = J(t_{j_k}) \cdots J(t_{j_1}),$$

where $t_{j_k}, \ldots, t_{j_1}$ is the permutation of $t_k, t_{k-1}, \ldots, t_1$ that is in ascending order.

The error of the above approximation is bounded by

$$\left\| V(s,t) - \widetilde{V}(s,t) \right\| \leq O\left(\frac{(t-s)^{K'+1}}{(K'+1)!} + \frac{(t-s)^2 \dot{J}_{\max}}{M} \right), \tag{45}$$

where $\dot{J}_{\max} := \max_{\tau \in [0,t]} \left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}J(\tau)}{\mathrm{d}\tau} \right\|$.

Now, we need to approximate the integrals in Eq. (37). In [36], Gaussian quadratures were used to approximate similar integrals in the time-independent case, which yields a simpler LCU construction. Unfortunately, using such efficient quadrature rules in the time-dependent case requires bounding the norm of high-order derivatives of $V(s,t)$, which is not directly given. Instead, we use the simple Riemann sums for treating the integrals, where the LCU constructions follow closely from the ones in [29].

More specifically, we uniformly divide the evolution time t into q intervals, and let $t_j = tj/q$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, M-1\}$. Assuming $V(s,t)$ is implemented perfectly, we consider the following superoperator,

$$\frac{t^k}{k!q^k} \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_k=0}^{q} \mathcal{T}\mathcal{F}_k(t_{j_k}, \dots, t_{j_1}), \tag{46}$$

which approximates the integrals in Eq. (37). To bound the quality of this approximation, we need to bound the derivative of $\mathcal{F}_k$. We begin by bounding $\|V(0,t)\|$, which can be deduced from the stability of the differential equation $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\boldsymbol{y} = J(t)\boldsymbol{y}$, which can be studied by examining the eigenvalues of the Hermitian part of $J(t)$ [7, Lemma 1]. Since the Hermitian part of $J(t)$ is semi-negative definite, one has $\|\boldsymbol{y}(t)\| \le \|\boldsymbol{y}(0)\|$, which implies that

$$\|V(0,t)\| \le 1. \tag{47}$$

Since $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}V(0,t) = J(t)V(0,t)$, the derivative of $V(0,t)$ can be bounded by

$$\left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} V(0,t) \right\| \le \dot{J}_{\max}. \tag{48}$$

We further consider $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{K}[V(0,t)]$. For any operator A with $\|A\|_1 = 1$, we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{K}[V(0,t)](A) = \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}V(0,t)\right) A V(0,t)^\dagger + V(0,t) A \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} V(0,t)^\dagger. \tag{49}$$

We then have

$$\left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{K}[V(0,t)](A) \right\|_1 \le 2\dot{J}_{\max}, \tag{50}$$

which follows from Eqs. (47) and (48) and the fact that $\|BAC\|_1 \le \|B\|\|A\|_1\|C\|$ for matrices A, B, C. This bound easily extends to the diamond norm by tensoring the Kraus operator with an identity operator to extend it to a larger space. Hence, we have

$$\left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{K}[V(0,t)](A) \right\|_\diamond \le 2\dot{J}_{\max}. \tag{51}$$

Let $\dot{L}_{j,\max}$ be defined as $\dot{L}_{j,\max} \coloneqq \max_{\tau\in[0,t]} \left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\tau} L_j(\tau) \right\|$. Then, using similar arguments, we can bound the derivative of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t)$ as

$$\left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t) \right\|_\diamond \le 2\sum_{j=1}^{m} \dot{L}_{j,\max}, \tag{52}$$

where we have assumed that the Lindbladian is scaled as in Eq. (41), i.e., $\|L_j\| \leq 1$. For the derivative of $\mathcal{F}_k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t_j}\mathcal{F}_k \\
&= \mathcal{K}[V(t_k,t)]\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_k)\cdots\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t_j}\left(\mathcal{K}[V(t_j,t_{j+1})]\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_j)\mathcal{K}[V(t_{j-1},t_j)]\right)\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_{j-1})\cdots\mathcal{K}[V(0,t_1)] \\
&= \mathcal{K}[V(t_k,t)]\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_k)\cdots\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t_j}(\mathcal{K}[V(t_j,t_{j+1})])\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_j)\mathcal{K}[V(t_{j-1},t_j)]\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_{j-1})\cdots\mathcal{K}[V(0,t_1)] \\
&+ \mathcal{K}[V(t_k,t)]\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_k)\cdots\mathcal{K}[V(t_j,t_{j+1})]\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t_j}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_j))\mathcal{K}[V(t_{j-1},t_j)]\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_{j-1})\cdots\mathcal{K}[V(0,t_1)] \\
&+ \mathcal{K}[V(t_k,t)]\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_k)\cdots\mathcal{K}[V(t_j,t_{j+1})]\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_j)\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t_j}(\mathcal{K}[V(t_{j-1},t_j)])\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(t_{j-1})\cdots\mathcal{K}[V(0,t_1)].
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Again, assume the Lindbladian is scaled as in Eq. (41), the above expression of $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t_j}\mathcal{F}_k$ together with Eqs. (51) and (52) implies that

$$\left\|\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t_j}\mathcal{F}_k\right\|_\diamond \leq 4\dot{J}_{\max} + 2\sum_{j=1}^m \dot{L}_{j,\max}. \tag{54}$$

This implies that the error for using the Riemann sums can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathcal{G}_K - \mathcal{K}[V(0,t)] - \frac{t^k}{k!q^k}\sum_{k=1}^K\sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_k=0}^q \mathcal{T}\mathcal{F}_k(t_{j_k},\ldots,t_{j_1})\right\|_\diamond \\
&= \left\|\sum_{k=1}^K\int_{0\leq s_1\leq\cdots\leq s_k\leq t}\mathcal{F}_k(s_k,\ldots,s_1)\,\mathrm{d}s_1\cdots\mathrm{d}s_k - \frac{t^k}{k!q^k}\sum_{k=1}^K\sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_k=0}^q \mathcal{T}\mathcal{F}_k(t_{j_k},\ldots,t_{j_1})\right\|_\diamond \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{t^2}{q}\cdot\left(4\dot{J}_{\max} + 2\sum_{j=1}^m \dot{L}_{j,\max}\right) \qquad (55) \\
&= \frac{Kt^2}{q}\cdot\left(4\dot{J}_{\max} + 2\sum_{j=1}^m \dot{L}_{j,\max}\right). \qquad (56)
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, it is easy to see that the error caused by using Duhamel's principle is

$$\left\|e^{\mathcal{T}\int_0^t \mathrm{d}\tau\,\mathcal{L}(\tau)} - \mathcal{G}_K\right\|_\diamond \leq \frac{(2t)^{K+1}}{(K+1)!}. \tag{57}$$

It follows from Eqs. (56) and (57) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|e^{\mathcal{T}\int_0^t \mathrm{d}\tau\,\mathcal{L}(\tau)} - \mathcal{K}[V(0,t)] - \frac{t^k}{k!q^k}\sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_k=0}^q \mathcal{T}\mathcal{F}_k(t_{j_k},\ldots,t_{j_1})\right\|_\diamond \\
\leq &\frac{(2t)^{K+1}}{(K+1)!} + \frac{Kt^2}{q}\left(4\dot{J}_{\max} + 2\sum_{j=1}^m \dot{L}_{j,\max}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

Finally, we have the following LCU form:

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_K := \mathcal{K}[\widetilde{V}(0,t)] + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{t^k}{q^k} \sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_k=0}^{q} \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_k(t_{j_k},\ldots,t_{j_1}), \tag{59}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_K$ is an approximation of Eq. (38) by using $\widetilde{V}(s,t)$ instead of $V(s,t)$, i.e.,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_k(s_k,\ldots,s_1) := \mathcal{K}[\widetilde{V}(s_k,t)]\mathcal{L}_J(s_k)\mathcal{K}[\widetilde{V}(s_{k-1},s_k)]\cdots\mathcal{K}[\widetilde{V}(s_1,s_2)]\mathcal{L}_J(s_1)\mathcal{K}[\widetilde{V}(0,s_1)]. \tag{60}$$

We use the same compression scheme as in [29] to deal with the time-ordering in Eqs. (44) and (59). Note that implementing the LCU requires additional $O(KK'm(\log M + \log q + n))$ 1- and 2-qubit gates.

Complexity analysis We first analyze the normalizing constant for the LCU implementation. Recall that we are working with scaled operators, so the normalizing factors are at most 1. For the implement of $V(0,\hat{t})$, we can use, for example, the LCU construction involving quantum sort as in [29] for implement Eq. (44). If we further assume the implementation uses an infinite Dyson series, the normalizing constants of the block-encoding $\mathcal{K}[V(0,t)]$ is upper bounded by

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} = e^t. \tag{61}$$

As a result, the sum-of-squares of the normalizing constants of the Kraus operators of $\mathcal{F}_k(\hat{t}_k,\ldots,\hat{t}_1)$ can be bounded by

$$\sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_k=0}^{m} e^{2(t-s_k)}e^{2(s_k-s_{k-1})}\ldots e^{2(s_1-0)} = e^{2t}. \tag{62}$$

Recall that the normalizing constant for L_j is 1 since the Lindbladian is rescaled. For the second term in Eq. (37), the sum-of-squares of the normalizing constants of the Kraus operators can be bounded by

$$e^{2t}\frac{t^k}{k!q^k}q^k = e^{2t}\frac{t^k}{k!}. \tag{63}$$

By Eqs. (61) and (63), we have that the sum-of-squares of the normalizing constants of the Kraus operators of the LCU in Eq. (37) can then be bounded by

$$e^{2t} + \sum_{k=1}^{K} e^{2t}\frac{t^k}{k!} \le e^{2t} + e^{3t}. \tag{64}$$

Therefore, it suffices to set

$$t = \Omega(1) \tag{65}$$

to achieve constant success probability when using Lemma 1. Then, we use the oblivious amplitude amplification for channels [15] to boost the success probability to 1 with constant applications of

Lemma 1. For the error bound in Eq. (58), assume for now that the second error term is dominated by the first (by some choice of q to be determined). It suffices to set $K = \frac{\log(1/\epsilon)}{\log\log(1/\epsilon)}$ to make the total error at most $\epsilon/2$, because of the choice of t in Eq. (65). The choice of q satisfies

$$q = \Theta\left(\frac{2K}{\epsilon}\left(4\dot{J}_{\max} + 2\sum_{j=1}^{m}\dot{L}_{j,\max}\right)\right). \tag{66}$$

Now, we deal with the error from truncated Dyson series and Riemann sum to implement $V(s,t)$. By Eq. (44), we can choose M large enough (determined later) so that the second error term is dominated by the first. Then, using [36, Lemma 7], we have

$$\left\|\mathcal{F}_k(s_k,\ldots,s_1) - \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_k(s_k,\ldots,s_1)\right\|_\diamond \leq \frac{8e^t}{(K'+1)!}2^{k+1}t^{K'+1}. \tag{67}$$

Further, using the analysis as in [36], we can bound the total approximation error (with appropriate choice of M to be determined later) as

$$\left\|\mathcal{T}e^{\int_0^t \mathcal{L}(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau} - \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_K\right\|_\diamond \leq \frac{32e^{5t}t^{K'+2}}{(K'+1)!}. \tag{68}$$

With the choice of t in Eq. (65), we can choose

$$K' = \frac{\log(1/\epsilon)}{\log\log(1/\epsilon)} \tag{69}$$

so that the total error is bounded by ϵ. For the choice of M, we need to make sure the second error term in Eq. (44) is dominated by the first term. Hence we can choose

$$M = \Theta\left(\frac{\dot{J}_{\max}}{\epsilon}\right). \tag{70}$$

It remains to analyze the cost for the LCU implementation, which is the same as the analyses in [36] and [29]. Note that the dependence on M is logarithmic if the compressed scheme is used in [29] for implementing $\widetilde{V}(s,t)$. The total gate cost is now upper bounded by $O(KK'm(\log M + \log q + n))$. Further note that the error ϵ' brought by the block-encoding can be eventually transferred to $\mathcal{L}$ causing an $(m+1)\epsilon'$ error on $\mathcal{L}$ in terms of the diamond norm, and the accumulated error for evolution time t is then at most $t(m+1)\epsilon'$. As a result, choosing $\epsilon' \leq \epsilon/(2t(m+1))$ suffices to ensure the total error is at most ϵ.

Recall that the above analysis is based on the scaled version of $\mathcal{L}$ defined in Eq. (41), and the evolution time is scaled as in Eq. (39). For arbitrary evolution time $\hat{t}$, we apply the above procedure $O(\hat{t})$ times with precision $\epsilon' = \epsilon/\hat{t}$. This gives the desired complexity in Theorem 3.1. Lastly, it is important to note that the LCU circuit yields a purification of $\rho(t)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Note that the above analysis easily extends to the simulation of the original Lindbladian without any scaling, where the complexity depends linearly on the product of evolution time and the maximum of the block-encoding norm of the Lindbladian. More specifically, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Suppose we are given an* $(\alpha_0(t), a, \epsilon')$*-block-encoding* $U_{H(t)}$ *of* $H(t)$*, and an* $(\alpha_j(t), a, \epsilon')$*-block-encoding* $U_{L_j(t)}$ *for each* $L_j(t)$ *for all* $t \geq 0$*. Let* $\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},\infty}$ *be defined as*

$$\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},\infty} \coloneqq \max_{\tau\in[0,T]} \|\mathcal{L}(\tau)\|_{\mathrm{be}}, \tag{71}$$

Suppose further that $\epsilon' \leq \epsilon/(2T(m+1))$*. Then, there exists a quantum algorithm that outputs a purification of* $\tilde{\rho}_T$ *of* $\tilde{\rho}(T)$ *where* $\left\|\tilde{\rho}(T) - e^{\mathcal{T}\int_0^T \mathrm{d}\tau\, \mathcal{L}(\tau)}(\rho_0)\right\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ *using*

$$O\left(T\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},\infty}\left(\frac{\log\left(T\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},\infty}/\epsilon\right)}{\log\log\left(T\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},\infty}/\epsilon\right)}\right)^2\right) \tag{72}$$

queries to $U_{H(t)}$*,* $U_{L_j(t)}$*,* $\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{var}}$*,* $\mathcal{O}_{H,\mathrm{norm}}$*, and* $\mathcal{O}_{L_j,\mathrm{norm}}$*, and*

$$\widetilde{O}\left((m+n)T\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},\infty}\right) \tag{73}$$

additional 1- and 2-qubit gates, where n *is the number of qubits the Lindbladian is acting on.*

4 Simulations in the Interaction Picture

Many control problems involve a system Hamiltonian that contains a time-independent Hamiltonian that dominates the spectral norm $H(t)$, and thus the overall computational complexity. Motivated by the interaction picture approach for Hamiltonian simulations [41], we devise an approach to simulate the Lindblad dynamics. To formulate the problem, we assume that the Lindbladian admits the following decomposition:

$$\mathcal{L}(\cdot) = -i\left[H_1 + H_2(t), \cdot\right] + \sum_j L_j(\cdot)L_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\left\{L_j^\dagger L_j, \cdot\right\}, \tag{74}$$

where H_1 is a time-independent free Hamiltonian, $H_2(t)$ is the coupling Hamiltonian which contains the control variables, and the dissipative terms still come from the interaction with the environment.

One such example is the control of an ion trap system [25], in which the model Hamiltonian consists of the following terms,

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= \hbar\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\omega_{01}|1\rangle_i\left\langle 1\right| + \omega_{0e}\left|e\right\rangle_i\left\langle e\right|\right) + \hbar\sum_k \omega_k a_k^\dagger a_k && (75)\\ H_2(t) &= \hbar\Omega_1\cos\left(\boldsymbol{k}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{r}_j - \omega_1 t - \varphi_1\right)\left(|0\rangle_j\langle e| + |e\rangle_j\langle 0|\right) && (76)\\ &\quad + \hbar\Omega_2\cos\left(\boldsymbol{k}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{r}_j - \omega_2 t - \varphi_2\right)\left(|1\rangle_j\langle e| + |e\rangle_j\langle 1|\right), && (77) \end{aligned}$$

and L_js includes $\lambda_{\mathrm{heat}}a_j^\dagger$, $\lambda_{\mathrm{damp}}a_j$ and $\lambda_{\mathrm{dephase}}n_j$. The observation in [25] is that

$$\omega_{0e} \gg |\Omega_1|, |\Omega_2| \gg \lambda_{\mathrm{heat}}, \lambda_{\mathrm{damp}}, \lambda_{\mathrm{dephase}}. \tag{78}$$

Motivated by such applications, we assume that in Eq. (74),

$$\|H_1\| \gg \|H_2(t)\| \gg \|L_j\|. \tag{79}$$

In the interaction approach, e.g., [41], one simulates the density operator in the interaction picture, where the large magnitude of H_1 is absorbed into the slow Hamiltonian $H_2(t)$ and the jump operators. In this section, we provide detailed quantum algorithms for simulating the Lindbladian Eq. (74) in the interaction picture.

4.1 Lindbladian simulation in interaction picture

In light of Eq. (74), we first write the Lindbladian into two parts

$$\mathcal{L}(t) = \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2(t) \tag{80}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_1$ contains a time-independent Hamiltonian term and $\mathcal{L}_2(t)$ can be a general Lindbladian term

$$\mathcal{L}_1(\cdot) = -i\left[H_1, \cdot\right] \tag{81}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2(t)(\cdot) = -i\left[H_2(t), \cdot\right] + \sum_j L_j(\cdot)L_j^\dagger - \left\{L_j^\dagger L_j, \cdot\right\}. \tag{82}$$

Then the Lindblad master equation in Eq. (1) is equivalent to:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} V_1\dagger(t_0,t)\rho V_1(t_0,t) = V_1^\dagger(t_0,t)\mathcal{L}_2(t)V_1(t_0,t)V_1^\dagger(t_0,t)\rho V_1(t_0,t), \tag{83}$$

where $V_1(t_0,t) = e^{-iH_1(t-t_0)}$, and $t \geq t_0$.

We can define $\rho_{\mathrm{I}} = V_1^\dagger(t_0,t)\rho V_1(t_0,t)$ as the density operator in the interaction picture, and it satisfies the Lindblad equation, $\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{\mathrm{I}}(t) = \mathcal{L}_{2,\mathrm{I}}(t)\rho_{\mathrm{I}}(t)$, where $\mathcal{L}_{2,\mathrm{I}}(t) \coloneqq V_1^\dagger(t_0,t)\mathcal{L}_2(t)V_1(t_0,t)$. Effectively, this transforms H_2 and $L_j(t)$ in Eq. (82) into an interaction picture as well.

By simulating the time evolution in the interaction picture and transforming it back to the original picture at last, we have

$$\rho(t) = \left(e^{\mathcal{L}_1(t-t_0)}\right)\left(\mathcal{T}e^{\int_{t_0}^{t}\mathcal{L}_{2,\mathrm{I}}(s)\mathrm{d}s}\rho(t_0)\right), \tag{84}$$

where $\left(e^{\mathcal{L}_1(b-a)}\right)(\cdot) = V_1\left(a,b\right)(\cdot)V_1^{-1}\left(a,b\right)$. We can further decompose this evolution into N Trotter steps (with $\tau = (t-t_0)/N$),

$$\rho(t) = \prod_{i=0}^{N-1}\left(e^{\mathcal{L}_1\tau}\mathcal{T}e^{\int_{t_0+i\tau}^{t_0+(i+1)\tau}\mathcal{L}_{2,\mathrm{I}}(s)\mathrm{d}s}\right)\rho(t_0). \tag{85}$$

At a high level, Eq. (85) summarizes our simulation strategy in the interaction picture. The total time complexity is determined by the number of time steps N, and the time complexity in each step, which follows from our Lindbladian simulation algorithm in Section 3.

Theorem 4.1 (Modified from Corollary 1)**.** *Suppose we are given an (α_0, a, ϵ')-block-encoding U_H of H, and an (α_j, a, ϵ')-block-encoding U_{L_j} for each L_j. For all $\tau, \epsilon' \geq 0$ and $t\|\mathcal{L}(\tau)\|_{\mathrm{be},\infty} = \Theta(1)$, there exists a quantum algorithm for simulating $e^{\mathcal{L}\tau}$ using*

$$O\left(\frac{\log\left(1/\epsilon'\right)}{\log\log\left(1/\epsilon'\right)}\right)$$

queries to U_H *and* U_{L_j} *and*

$$O\left(m\left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon')}{\log\log(1/\epsilon')}\right)^2\right)$$

additional 1-and 2-qubit gates.

Lemma 7 (Error accumulation)**.** *Given that* $A_j = W_j$ *and* $B_j = \mathcal{T}\left[e^{\int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j}\mathcal{L}_1(s)\mathrm{d}s}\right]$ *are bounded* $\|W_j\| \leq 1$, $\|B_j\| \leq 1$, *and error in each segment is bounded by* δ

$$\|A_j - B_j\| \leq \delta. \tag{86}$$

Then the accumulated error is

$$\left\|\prod_j^L W_j - \mathcal{T}\left[e^{\int_0^t \mathcal{L}(s)\mathrm{d}s}\right]\right\| \leq L\delta. \tag{87}$$

Proof. The lemma holds by applying the triangle inequality

$$\left\|\prod_{j=1}^L A_j - \prod_{j=1}^L B_j\right\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^L \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\|A_j\|\right)\|A_k - B_k\|\left(\prod_{j=k+1}^L \|B_j\|\right). \tag{88}$$

□

These results imply the following result for Lindbladian simulation in the interaction picture:

Theorem 4.2 (Query complexity of Lindbladian simulation in the interaction picture)**.** *Let* $\mathcal{L}(t) = \mathcal{L}_1(t) + \mathcal{L}_2(t)$, *with* $\mathcal{L}_1(t)$ *and* $\mathcal{L}_2(t)$ *defined by Eqs.* (81) *and* (82) *respectively. Assume the existence of a unitary oracle that implements the Hamiltonian and Lindbladian within the interaction picture, denoted* U_{H^I} *and* $U_{L_j^I}$ *which implicitly depends on the time-step size* $\tau \in \mathcal{O}\left(||\mathcal{L}_2||_{be}^{-1}\right)$ *and number of quadrature points* q, *such that*

$$(\langle 0|_a \otimes \mathbf{1}_s)\, U_{H^I}\, (|0\rangle_a \otimes \mathbf{1}_s) = \sum_{j_k=1}^q |j_k\rangle\langle j_k| \otimes \frac{e^{iH_1\tau\hat{x}_{(j_k)}}H_2 e^{-iH_1\tau\hat{x}_{(j_k)}}}{\alpha_H} \tag{89}$$

$$(\langle 0|_a \otimes \mathbf{1}_s)\, U_{L_j^I}\, (|0\rangle_a \otimes \mathbf{1}_s) = \sum_{j_k=1}^q |j_k\rangle\langle j_k| \otimes \frac{e^{iH_1\tau\hat{x}_{(j_k)}}L_j e^{-iH_1\tau\hat{x}_{(j_k)}}}{\alpha_{L_j}}, \tag{90}$$

For $t \geq ||\mathcal{L}_2(t)||_{\mathrm{be}}\tau$, *the time-evolution operator* $\mathcal{T}e^{\int_0^t \mathcal{L}_1(s)+\mathcal{L}_2(s)\mathrm{d}s}$ *may be approximated to error* ϵ *with the following cost.*

1. *Simulations of* $e^{-iH_1\tau}$: $\mathcal{O}\left(t||\mathcal{L}_2(t)||_{\mathrm{be},\infty}\right)$,
2. *Queries to* U_{H^I} *and* $U_{L_j^I}$: $\mathcal{O}\left(t||\mathcal{L}_2(t)||_{be,\infty}\frac{\log(t||\mathcal{L}_2(t)||_{be,\infty}/\epsilon)}{\log\log(t||\mathcal{L}_2(t)||_{be,\infty}/\epsilon)}\right)$,
3. *Primitive gates:* $\mathcal{O}\left(mt||\mathcal{L}_2(t)||_{\mathrm{be},\infty}(\frac{\log(t||\mathcal{L}_2(t)||_{\mathrm{be},\infty}/\epsilon)}{\log\log(t||\mathcal{L}_2(t)||_{\mathrm{be},\infty}/\epsilon)})^2\right)$.

Proof. Consider simulation strategy shown in Eq. (85), we uniformly divide the evolution time $[0,t]$ into $M = \lceil t \left\| \mathcal{L}_2(t) \right\|_{be,\infty} \rceil$, time step $\tau = t/M$. Then $\tau \left\| \mathcal{L}_2(t) \right\|_{be,\infty} = \Theta(1)$, which satisfies the pre-condition of Theorem 4.1. Therefore, using Theorem 4.1, the time and gate complexity of each time interval is $O\left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon')}{\log\log(1/\epsilon')}\right)$ and $O\left(m\left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon')}{\log\log(1/\epsilon')}\right)^2\right)$, respectively. Furthermore, by the error accmulation in Lemma 7, we choose $\epsilon' = \epsilon/t\,(\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be}})$ in order to bound the overall error by ϵ.

In addition, since we need to invoke $e^{-iH_1\tau}$ once every step, the invoking number equals to M and is hence bounded as claimed. ☐

4.2 Comparison of the simulation complexity with and without interaction picture

In this subsection, we compare the complexity with simulations of Lindblad dynamics with and without the interaction picture. For the Lindbladian decomposition shown in Eq. (80), suppose we have access to the oracles U_{H_1},$U_{H_2(t)}$, and U_{L_j}. According to Theorem 3.1, a direct simulation involves a time complexity

$$C_{\mathrm{direct}} = O\left(t(C_1 + C_2)(\alpha_{L_1} + \alpha_{L_2})(\frac{\log\left(t(\alpha_{L_1} + \alpha_{L_2})/\epsilon\right)}{\log\log\left(t(\alpha_{L_1} + \alpha_{L_2})/\epsilon\right)})^2\right) \tag{91}$$

where $\alpha_1 = \left\|\mathcal{L}_1(t)\right\|_{\mathrm{be},1}, \alpha_{L_2} = \left\|\mathcal{L}_2(t)\right\|_{\mathrm{be},1}$; C_1 and C_2 representing the gate complexity of implement U_{H_1} and the maximum gate complexity of implement $U_{H_2(t)}, U_{L_j}$ respectively.

Meanwhile for the simulation algorithm in interaction picture, the time complexity is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3 (Gate complexity of Lindbladian simulation in the interaction picture)**.** *Suppose we are given* U_{H_1},$U_{H_2(t)}$ *and* U_{L_j} *block encoding of* $H_1, H_2(t)$ *and* L_j *respectively, such that* e^{-iHs} *is approximated to error* ϵ *using* $C_{e^{-iH_1 s}}[\epsilon] \in \mathcal{O}\left(|s| \log^{\gamma}(s/\epsilon)\right)$ *gates for some* $\gamma > 0$ *and any* $|s| \geq 0$.

For all $t > 0$*, the time-evolution Eq. (85) may be approximated to error* ϵ *with gate complexity*

$$\begin{aligned} &C_{\mathrm{interact}} \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_{L_2} t \left(C_2 + C_{e^{-iA/\alpha_{L_2}}}\left[\frac{\epsilon}{\alpha_{L_2} t \log\left(\alpha_{L_2}\right)}\right] \log\left(\frac{t\left(\alpha_{L_1} + \alpha_{L_2}\right)}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \frac{\log\left(\alpha_{L_2} t/\epsilon\right)}{\log\log\left(\alpha_{L_2} t/\epsilon\right)}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_{L_2} t \left(C_2 + C_{e^{-iA/\alpha_{L_2}}}[\epsilon]\right) \mathrm{polylog}\left(t\left(\alpha_{L_1} + \alpha_{L_2}\right)/\epsilon\right)\right) \end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

where $\alpha_1 = \left\|\mathcal{L}_1(t)\right\|_{\mathrm{be},\infty}, \alpha_{L_2} = \left\|\mathcal{L}_2(t)\right\|_{\mathrm{be},\infty} = \left\|\mathcal{L}_{2,I}(t)\right\|_{\mathrm{be},\infty}$.

The proof follows by using $\alpha_{L_1}, \alpha_{L_2,I}$ to substitute α_A and α_B in Theorem 7 in [41], respectively.

We highlight that the assumption $C_{e^{-iH_1 s}}[\epsilon] = O\left(|s| \log^{\gamma}(s/\epsilon)\right)$ imposes strong requirement on simulating the H_1 dynamics. With Hamiltonian simulation algorithm [5], gate complexity should be $C_{e^{-iH_1 s}}[\epsilon] = \tilde{O}(||H_1||s)$. But here the assumption removes the $||H_1||$ dependence. This implies that the simulation of H_1 is supposed to be easy, the dynamics can be fast-forwarded. Nevertheless this assumption is valid in some common settings [41], for instance when H_1 is diagonal. Another assumption is Eq. (79), which implies that $\alpha_2 \ll \alpha_1$. By comparing Eq. (91) and Eq. (92) with this relation, we find the simulation strategy using the interacting picture has a better gate complexity. As long as these two assumptions hold, the simulation algorithm in the interaction picture can serve as an alternative to reduce the simulation complexity.

5 The Optimization Algorithm for Quantum Optimal Control

In this section, we present our main results for finding first- and second-order stationary points of the optimization problem induced by the quantum optimal control problem (2), which in general is nonconvex. We consider the accelerated gradient descent (AGD) method [26]. A key departure from a direct implement of AGD is that the gradient has to be estimated using the quantum algorithm [21], in which case, the gradient input is subject to noise. We believe that this result may be of general interest to the optimization community.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that the function $f(\cdot)$ is ℓ-smooth and ϱ-Hessian Lipschitz. There exists an absolute constant $c_{\max}$ such that for any $\delta > 0, \epsilon \leq \frac{\ell^2}{\varrho}, \Delta_f \geq f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f^\star$, if $\chi = \max\left\{1, \log \frac{d\ell\Delta_f}{\varrho\epsilon\delta}\right\}$, $c \geq c_{\max}$ and such that if we run modified PAGD (Algorithm 2) with the choice of parameters in Appendix C.1 using an approximate gradient $\hat{\nabla} f(x)$ with error bounded at every step: $\left\|\nabla f(x) - \hat{\nabla} f(x)\right\| \leq \epsilon_g$ with*

$$\epsilon_g = \frac{\varrho^{1/8}}{\sqrt{2}\ell^{1/4}\chi^{3/2}c^{3/2}}\epsilon^{9/8}, \tag{93}$$

then with probability at least $1-\delta$, one of the iterates $\mathbf{x}_t$ will be an ϵ-first order stationary point in the following number of iterations:

$$O\left(\frac{\ell^{1/2}\varrho^{1/4}\left(f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f^*\right)}{\epsilon^{7/4}} \log^6\left(\frac{d\ell\Delta_f}{\varrho\epsilon\delta}\right)\right). \tag{94}$$

Furthermore, if the error bound of the gradient is chosen as,

$$\epsilon_g = \frac{\delta\chi^{-11}c^{-16}}{64\ell}\frac{\epsilon^3}{\sqrt{d}}\frac{1}{\Delta_f}, \tag{95}$$

then with probability at least $1-\delta$, one of the iterates $\mathbf{x}_t$ will be an ϵ-second order stationary point.

The proof of this theorem is deferred to Appendix C.7. Note that the complexity $\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^{7/4})$ in [26] is the currently best-known result for finding first- and second-order stationary points using only gradient queries, and there is not much space to improve as [11] proved a lower bound $\Omega(1/\epsilon^{12/7})$ for deterministic algorithms with gradient queries when the function is gradient- and Hessian-Lipschitz. Our error bound $\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^{9/8})$ in (93) is optimal (up to poly-logarithmic factors) for PAGD because up to a concentration inequality, it can give an algorithm for stochastic gradient descent with complexity $\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^{7/4} \cdot (1/\epsilon^{9/8})^2) = \tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^4)$, which is optimal as there is a matching lower bound $\Omega(1/\epsilon^4)$ [3]. In other words, if the error $\epsilon^{9/8}$ can be further improved, it implies an algorithm for finding stationary points with better convergence than [26], the current state-of-the-art work on this.

The AGD algorithm relies on an estimate of the gradient. Toward this end, we first show that the objective function (13) from the quantum control problem is essentially a polynomial. The polynomial nature of the objective function allows us to use high-order finite difference methods to compute the gradient. In particular, a centered difference scheme with $2m+1$ points will produce an exact gradient for a polynomial of degree $2m$.

Lemma 8. *Assume that the control function is expressed as a linear combination of shape function* $b_j(t)$*:* $u(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} u_j b_j(t)$ *and let* $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_N)$*. Then the expectation in Eq. (13) from the Lindblad simulation algorithms from the previous section is a polynomial with degree* $d = O\left(T \operatorname{polylog}\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$*.*

Proof. We begin by examining the time-dependent unitary $V(0,t)$ in Duhamel's representation. Specifically, from Eq. (34), we see that the Dyson series approximation yields a polynomial of degree at most K. In addition, in the Kraus form approximation in Eq. (37), the operators $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{J}}(s)$ do not involve the control variable $\boldsymbol{u}$. Overall, the approximation $\mathcal{G}_K(t)$ in Eq. (37) constitutes a polynomial of degree at most K^2. Therefore, after applying $\mathcal{G}_K(\delta)$ for T/δ times to approximate the density operator at time T, we obtain a polynomial of degree at most $T\operatorname{polylog}\frac{1}{\epsilon}$. Here we have used the fact that $K = \frac{\log(1/\epsilon)}{\log\log(1/\epsilon)}$. Furthermore, when the gradient estimation algorithm in Lemma 4 is applied, the query complexity (18) becomes $\widetilde{O}(T/\epsilon)$. ☐

6 Proof of Main Theorem

Finally, we outline the proof of our main theorem (Theorem 1.1). We first summarize our quantum algorithm as follows,

Algorithm 1 Quantum Algorithm for Open System Quantum Control

```
Given $k_{\max}, \epsilon_g$ as in Theorem 5.1; set $u(t) = 0$
for t = 0,1,...,$k_{\max}$ do
    Use Theorem 3.1 and strategy in Section 2.2.3 to construct the phase oracle for $\widetilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u})$;
    Use Lemma 5 to estimate $\boldsymbol{g}^{(k)} \approx \nabla J\left(\boldsymbol{u}^{(k)}\right)$ with $\|\boldsymbol{g}^{(k)} - J\left(\boldsymbol{u}^{(k)}\right)\| \le \epsilon_g$;
    Update control variable with one step of modified PAGD, as shown in Algorithm 2
end for
```

Now, we restated the main theorem and give its proof:

Theorem 6.1 (main theorem, restated)**.** *Assume there are* n_{c} *control functions* $u_\beta(t) \in \mathrm{C}^2([0,T])$*. Further assume*[4] *that* $\|H_0\|, \|\mathscr{O}\|, \|\mu_\beta\|, \|L_j\| \le 1$*, and* $\alpha \ge 2/T$*. There exists a quantum algorithm that, with probability at least* $2/3$[5]*, solves problem (2) by:*

- *reaching a first-order stationary point* $\|\nabla f\| < \epsilon$ *with (1) using* $\widetilde{O}\left(\frac{n_{\mathrm{c}}\|\mathcal{L}\|_{be,1}T}{\epsilon^{23/8}}\Delta_f\right)$ *queries to* $\mathcal{P}_{H_0}$ *and* $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_\beta}$*,* $\beta = 1, 2, \dots, n_{\mathrm{c}}$*, and* $\widetilde{O}\left(mn\frac{n_{\mathrm{c}}\|\mathcal{L}\|_{be,1}T}{\epsilon^{23/8}}\Delta_f + n\frac{T^{3/2}}{\epsilon^{9/4}}\Delta_f\right)$ *additional 1- and 2-qubit gates; or*
- *reaching a second-order stationary point using* $\widetilde{O}\left(\frac{n_{\mathrm{c}}\|\mathcal{L}\|_{be,1}T^{7/4}}{\epsilon^{5}}\Delta_f\right)$ *queries to* $\mathcal{P}_{H_0}$ *and* $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_\beta}$*,* $\beta = 1, 2, \dots, n_{\mathrm{c}}$ *and* $\widetilde{O}\left(mn\frac{n_{\mathrm{c}}\|\mathcal{L}\|_{be,1}T^{7/4}}{\epsilon^{5}}\Delta_f + n\frac{T^{3/2}}{\epsilon^{9/4}}\Delta_f\right)$ *additional 1- and 2-qubit gates.*

Here n_{c} *and* m *are respectively the number of control variables and jump operators.*

---

[4] More generally, if $\|H_0\|, \|\mu\| = \Theta(\Lambda)$, it is equivalent to enlarge the time duration T by a factor $O(\Lambda)$.

[5] Using standard techniques, the success probability can be boosted to a constant arbitrarily close to 1 while only introducing a logarithmic factor in the complexity.

Proof. We denote gate complexity of control $U_{\mathscr{O}}$ by $C_{\mathrm{c}-U_{\mathscr{O}}}$, gate complexity of U_H, U_{L_j} by $C_{U_H,U_{L_j}}$, and gate complexity of quantum simulation by $C_{\varrho(t)}$.

The gate complexity of preparing a state after Lindblad evolution is given by Theorem 3.1,

$$C_{\varrho(t)} = O\left(\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1} \frac{\log\left(\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1}/\epsilon\right)}{\log\log\left(\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1}/\epsilon\right)}\right) C_{U_H,U_{L_j}} + \tilde{O}\left(m\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1} n\right). \tag{96}$$

With copies of states $\varrho(t)$ and access to control $U_{\mathscr{O}}$ oracle, we can construct the gradient following Section 2.2.3. According to that section, we can construct the probability oracle with $\varrho(t)$, construct the phase oracle with probability oracle, and calculate the gradient with the phase oracle. The corresponding complexity is listed below:

$$C_{U_{J_1}} = C_{\varrho(t)} + O(1) + C_{c-U_O}, \tag{97}$$

$$C_{\mathcal{O}_{J_1}} = O(\log 1/\epsilon) C_{U_{J_1}}, \tag{98}$$

$$C_{\nabla J} = \tilde{O}(n_{\mathrm{c}} T \log(N/\gamma)/\epsilon) C_{\mathcal{O}_{J_1}} + \tilde{O}(N), \tag{99}$$

where $1-\gamma$ is the successful probability of obtaining a gradient, n_{c} is the number of parameters, and N is the time steps $N = O\left(t^{3/2}/\epsilon^{1/2}\right)$ as in [35, Corollary 2.2]. Here we define $\gamma = \nu/k$, where ν is a small finite number and k is the iteration steps, which we will give below. Combining them together, we have

$$C_{\nabla J} = \tilde{O}\left(n_{\mathrm{c}} \frac{\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1} T \log\frac{N}{\gamma}}{\epsilon}\right) C_{U_H,U_{L_j}} + \tilde{O}(n_{\mathrm{c}} \frac{T\log\frac{N}{\gamma}}{\epsilon}) C_{\mathrm{c}-U_O}$$
$$+\tilde{O}(mnn_{\mathrm{c}} \frac{\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1} T \log\frac{N}{\gamma}}{\epsilon} + N). \tag{100}$$

Here we reassign the gradient noise ϵ with ϵ_g to distinguish from the other errors.

$$C_{\nabla J} = \tilde{O}\left(n_{\mathrm{c}} \frac{\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1} T \log\frac{N}{\gamma}}{\epsilon_g}\right) C_{U_H,U_{L_j}} + \tilde{O}(n_{\mathrm{c}} \frac{T\log\frac{N}{\gamma}}{\epsilon_g}) C_{\mathrm{c}-U_O}$$
$$+ \tilde{O}(mnn_{\mathrm{c}} \frac{\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be},1} T \log\frac{N}{\gamma}}{\epsilon_g} + N). \tag{101}$$

With modified PAGD method(Algorithm 2), we can find a first or second order ϵ-stationary point within

$$k = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\ell^{1/2}\varrho^{1/4}\left(f\left(\mathbf{x}_0\right) - f^*\right)}{\epsilon^{7/4}}\right) \tag{102}$$

iterations by Theorem 5.1. For first ϵ-order stationary point, the gradient noise tolerance is

$$\epsilon_g = \frac{\varrho^{1/8}}{\sqrt{2}\ell^{1/4}\chi^{3/2}c^{3/2}} \epsilon^{9/8}. \tag{103}$$

For second order ϵ-order stationary point, it is

$$\epsilon_g = \frac{\delta\chi^{-11}c^{-16}}{64\ell} \frac{\epsilon^3}{\sqrt{d}} \frac{1}{\Delta_f}. \tag{104}$$

In each iteration, we need to calculate ∇J once and calculate J once. Noticing that $C_J = O(C(\varrho(t)))$, we have

$$C_{\text{total}} = k \times (C_{\nabla J} + C_{\varrho(t)}). \tag{105}$$

Substitute Eqs. (96) and (101), (102) into Eq. (105) we finish the proof. Notice that in optimization, dimension $d = N$, and here we regard ℓ and ϱ as constants. $\square$

Acknowledgments

TL was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Numbers 62372006 and 92365117), and The Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, Peking University. CW acknowledges support from from National Science Foundation grant CCF-2312456. XL was supported by National Science Foundation grant CCF-2312456 and DMS-2111221.

References

[1] Mohamed Abdelhafez, David I. Schuster, and Jens Koch. Gradient-based optimal control of open quantum systems using quantum trajectories and automatic differentiation. *Physical Review A*, 99(5):052327, 2019.

[2] Claudio Altafini. Coherent control of open quantum dynamical systems. *Physical Review A*, 70(6):062321, 2004.

[3] Yossi Arjevani, Yair Carmon, John C. Duchi, Dylan J. Foster, Nathan Srebro, and Blake Woodworth. Lower bounds for non-convex stochastic optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 199(1-2):165–214, 2023.

[4] Leonardo Banchi and Gavin E Crooks. Measuring analytic gradients of general quantum evolution with the stochastic parameter shift rule. *Quantum*, 5:386, 2021.

[5] Dominic W Berry, Andrew M Childs, Yuan Su, Xin Wang, and Nathan Wiebe. Time-dependent Hamiltonian simulation with L^1-norm scaling. *Quantum*, 4:254, 2020.

[6] Samuel Boutin, Christian Kraglund Andersen, Jayameenakshi Venkatraman, Andrew J. Ferris, and Alexandre Blais. Resonator reset in circuit QED by optimal control for large open quantum systems. *Physical Review A*, 96(4):042315, 2017.

[7] Fred Brauer. Perturbations of nonlinear systems of differential equations. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 14(2):198–206, 1966.

[8] Constantin Brif, Raj Chakrabarti, and Herschel Rabitz. Control of quantum phenomena: past, present and future. *New Journal of Physics*, 12(7):075008, 2010.

[9] Tommaso Caneva, Tommaso Calarco, and Simone Montangero. Chopped random-basis quantum optimization. *Physical Review A*, 84(2):022326, 2011.

[10] Yu Cao and Jianfeng Lu. Structure-preserving numerical schemes for Lindblad equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.01194*, 2021.

[11] Yair Carmon, John C. Duchi, Oliver Hinder, and Aaron Sidford. Lower bounds for finding stationary points II: first-order methods. *Mathematical Programming*, 185(1-2):315–355, 2021.

[12] Davide Castaldo, Marta Rosa, and Stefano Corni. Quantum optimal control with quantum computers: A hybrid algorithm featuring machine learning optimization. *Physical Review A*, 103(2):022613, 2021.

[13] Raj Chakrabarti and Herschel Rabitz. Quantum control landscapes. *International Reviews in Physical Chemistry*, 26(4):671–735, 2007.

[14] Andrew M Childs and Tongyang Li. Efficient simulation of sparse Markovian quantum dynamics. *Quantum Information & Computation*, 17(11-12):901–947, 2017.

[15] Richard Cleve and Chunhao Wang. Efficient quantum algorithms for simulating Lindblad evolution. In *44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2017)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2017.

[16] Pierre De Fouquieres and Sophie G Schirmer. A closer look at quantum control landscapes and their implication for control optimization. *Infinite dimensional analysis, quantum probability and related topics*, 16(03):1350021, 2013.

[17] Pierre de Fouquieres, Sophie G. Schirmer, Steffen J. Glaser, and Ilya Kuprov. Second order gradient ascent pulse engineering. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance*, 212(2):412–417, 2011.

[18] Domenico d'Alessandro. *Introduction to quantum control and dynamics*. CRC press, 2021.

[19] Xiaozhen Ge, Rebing Wu, and Herschel Rabitz. Optimization landscape of quantum control systems. *Complex System Modeling and Simulation*, 1(2):77–90, 2021.

[20] D Geppert, L Seyfarth, and R de Vivie-Riedle. Laser control schemes for molecular switches. *Applied Physics B*, 79:987–992, 2004.

[21] András Gilyén, Srinivasan Arunachalam, and Nathan Wiebe. Optimizing quantum optimization algorithms via faster quantum gradient computation. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1425–1444. SIAM, 2019.

[22] András Gilyén, Yuan Su, Guang Hao Low, and Nathan Wiebe. Quantum singular value transformation and beyond: exponential improvements for quantum matrix arithmetics. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. ACM, jun 2019.

[23] Michael H. Goerz. *Optimizing robust quantum gates in open quantum systems*. PhD thesis, Universitä"t Kassel, 2015.

[24] Vittorio Gorini, Andrzej Kossakowski, and Ennackal Chandy George Sudarshan. Completely positive dynamical semigroups of N-level systems. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 17(5):821–825, 1976.

[25] Hartmut Häffner, Christian F. Roos, and Rainer Blatt. Quantum computing with trapped ions. *Physics Reports*, 469(4):155–203, 2008.

[26] Chi Jin, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Michael I. Jordan. Accelerated gradient descent escapes saddle points faster than gradient descent, 2017.

[27] Stephen P. Jordan. Fast quantum algorithm for numerical gradient estimation. *Physical Review Letters*, 95(5), jul 2005.

[28] Navin Khaneja, Timo Reiss, Cindie Kehlet, Thomas Schulte-Herbrüggen, and Steffen J. Glaser. Optimal control of coupled spin dynamics: design of NMR pulse sequences by gradient ascent algorithms. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance*, 172(2):296–305, 2005.

[29] Mária Kieferová, Artur Scherer, and Dominic W. Berry. Simulating the dynamics of time-dependent Hamiltonians with a truncated Dyson series. *Physical Review A*, 99(4):042314, 2019.

[30] Mária Kieferová, Artur Scherer, and Dominic W Berry. Simulating the dynamics of time-dependent hamiltonians with a truncated dyson series. *Physical Review A*, 99(4):042314, 2019.

[31] Christiane P. Koch. Controlling open quantum systems: tools, achievements, and limitations. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 28(21):213001, 2016.

[32] Christiane P. Koch, Ugo Boscain, Tommaso Calarco, Gunther Dirr, Stefan Filipp, Steffen J. Glaser, Ronnie Kosloff, Simone Montangero, Thomas Schulte-Herbrüggen, Dominique Sugny, and Frank K. Wilhelm. Quantum optimal control in quantum technologies. strategic report on current status, visions and goals for research in europe. *EPJ Quantum Technology*, 9(1):19, 2022.

[33] Jr-Shin Li, Justin Ruths, and Dionisis Stefanatos. A pseudospectral method for optimal control of open quantum systems. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 131(16), 2009.

[34] Jun Li, Xiaodong Yang, Xinhua Peng, and Chang-Pu Sun. Hybrid quantum-classical approach to quantum optimal control. *Physical review letters*, 118(15):150503, 2017.

[35] Xiantao Li and Chunhao Wang. Efficient quantum algorithms for quantum optimal control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19982–19994. PMLR, 2023.

[36] Xiantao Li and Chunhao Wang. Simulating Markovian open quantum systems using higher-order series expansion. In *50th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2023)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.

[37] Xiantao Li and Chunhao Wang. Succinct description and efficient simulation of non-Markovian open quantum systems. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 401(1):147–183, jan 2023.

[38] Goran Lindblad. On the generators of quantum dynamical semigroups. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 48(2):119–130, 1976.

[39] Jin-Peng Liu and Lin Lin. Dense outputs from quantum simulations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.14441*, 2023.

[40] Seth Lloyd and Simone Montangero. Information theoretical analysis of quantum optimal control. *Physical Review Letters*, 113(1):010502, 2014.

[41] Guang Hao Low and Nathan Wiebe. Hamiltonian simulation in the interaction picture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.00675*, 2018.

[42] Alicia B. Magann, Christian Arenz, Matthew D. Grace, Tak-San Ho, Robert L. Kosut, Jarrod R. McClean, Herschel A. Rabitz, and Mohan Sarovar. From pulses to circuits and back again: A quantum optimal control perspective on variational quantum algorithms. *PRX Quantum*, 2(1):010101, 2021.

[43] Alicia B Magann, Matthew D Grace, Herschel A Rabitz, and Mohan Sarovar. Digital quantum simulation of molecular dynamics and control. *Physical Review Research*, 3(2):023165, 2021.

[44] Yurii Evgen'evich Nesterov. A method of solving a convex programming problem with convergence rate $o(1/k^2)$. *Doklady Akademii Nauk*, 269(3):543–547, 1983.

[45] José P Palao and Ronnie Kosloff. Optimal control theory for unitary transformations. *Physical Review A*, 68(6):062308, 2003.

[46] Daniel M. Reich. *Efficient Characterisation and Optimal Control of Open Quantum Systems-Mathematical Foundations and Physical Applications.* PhD thesis, Universitä"t Kassel, 2015.

[47] Mary Beth Ruskai. Beyond strong subadditivity? improved bounds on the contraction of generalized relative entropy. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics*, 6(05a):1147–1161, 1994.

[48] Yunong Shi, Pranav Gokhale, Prakash Murali, Jonathan M. Baker, Casey Duckering, Yongshan Ding, Natalie C. Brown, Christopher Chamberland, Ali Javadi-Abhari, Andrew W. Cross, David I. Schuster, Kenneth R. Brown, Margaret Martonosi, and Frederic T. Chong. Resource-efficient quantum computing by breaking abstractions. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 108(8):1353–1370, 2020.

[49] Wusheng Zhu, Jair Botina, and Herschel Rabitz. Rapidly convergent iteration methods for quantum optimal control of population. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 108(5):1953–1963, 1998.

A Time-ordered Exponential

The ordered exponential is a math concept defined in non-commutative algebras, which is a counterpart of exponential of integral in commutative algebras. The ordered exponential of J is denoted as

$$\begin{aligned} OE[a](t) = \mathcal{T}\{e^{\int_0^t J(t')\mathrm{d}t'}\} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \int_0^t \cdots \int_0^t \mathcal{T}\{J(t_1') \cdots J(t_n')\} \mathrm{d}t_1' \cdots \mathrm{d}t_n' \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_0^t \int_0^{t_n'} \cdots \int_0^{t_2'} J(t_n') \cdots J(t_1') \mathrm{d}t_1' \cdots \mathrm{d}t_n'. \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

From this definition we can observe that $t_1' \leq t_2' \leq \cdots \leq t_n' \leq t$ and it shows the ordered time property.

A.1 Dyson Series

Consider a Schrödinger equation with time-dependent Hamiltonian

$$\partial_t \psi = J(t)\psi, \quad \psi(0) = \psi_0 \tag{107}$$

Let $U(t_0, t)$ be the fundamental solution satisfying

$$\partial_t U(t, t_0) = J(t)U(t, t_0), \quad U(t_0, t_0) = I \tag{108}$$

and $\psi(t) = U(t, t_0)\psi_0$ by the definition of fundamental solution. Using fundamental theorem of calculus, we know that

$$U(t, t_0) = I + \int_{t_0}^{t} J(t_1)U(t_1, t_0)\mathrm{d}t_1 \tag{109}$$

Applying the expression again for $U(t_1, t_0)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U(t, t_0) &= I + \int_{t_0}^{t} J(t_1)\mathrm{d}t_1 + \int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{t_0}^{t_1} J(t_1)J(t_2)U(t_2, t_0)\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}t_1 \\ &\vdots \\ U(t, t_0) &= I + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{t_0}^{t_1}\cdots\int_{t_0}^{t_{n-1}} J(t_1)\cdots J(t_n)\mathrm{d}t_n\cdots\mathrm{d}t_1 \end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

The time-order operator $\mathcal{T}$ can change the order of product such that

$$\mathcal{T}(J(t_1)J(t_2)) = \begin{cases} J(t_1)J(t_2) & \text{if } t_1 \geq t_2 \\ J(t_2)J(t_1) & otherwise \end{cases} \tag{111}$$

so that

$$\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{t_0}^{t_1} J(t_1)J(t_2)\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}t_1 = \frac{1}{2}\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{t_0}^{t} \mathcal{T}[J(t_1)J(t_0)]\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}t_1 \tag{112}$$

In general, the time-ordered operator is defined as

$$\mathcal{T}[J(t_1)J(t_2)\cdots J(t_n)] = J(t_{i_1})J(t_{i_2})\cdots J(t_{i_n}) \tag{113}$$

where the subscript $i_1, \cdots, i_n$ is a reordering of $1, 2, \cdots, n$ such that $t_{i_1} \geq t_{i_2} \geq \cdots \geq t_{i_n}$. Then the fundamental solution can be written as

$$U(t, t_0) = I + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n!}\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{t_0}^{t}\cdots\int_{t_0}^{t} \mathcal{T}[J(t_1)\cdots J(t_n)]\mathrm{d}t_n\cdots\mathrm{d}t_1 = \mathcal{T}e^{\int_{t_0}^{t} J(s)\mathrm{d}s}. \tag{114}$$

B Upper bounds for the gradients

In this section, we prove Lemma 6 that gives an upper bound on the gradient of $\widetilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u})$ in Equation (13).

Consider the Lindblad master equation 1. For simplicity, we consider a single control variable, expressed as a piecewise linear function in terms of the shape (or hat) functions: $\sum_{\beta=0}^{N} u_\beta b_\beta(t)$,

$$\partial_t \varrho = -i[H_0 + \sum_{\beta=0}^{N} u_\beta b_\beta(t)\mu, \varrho] + \sum_j L_j \varrho L_j^\dagger - \{L_j^\dagger L_j, \varrho\} = \mathcal{L}\varrho. \tag{115}$$

Let the first order derivative $\Gamma = \frac{\partial \varrho}{\partial u_{\alpha_1}} = \Gamma^{\alpha_1}$, it follows the equation,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \Gamma &= -i[H_0 + \sum_{\beta=0}^{N} u_\beta b_\beta(t)\mu, \Gamma] + \sum_j L_j \Gamma L_j^\dagger - \{L_j^\dagger L_j, \Gamma\} - i[b_{\alpha_1}\mu, \varrho] \\ &= \mathcal{L}\Gamma - i[b_{\alpha_1}\mu, \varrho], \\ \Gamma(0) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

We first make the observation that the operator $\mathcal{L}$ is the generator of a Markovian dynamics, and $\|e^{t\mathcal{L}}\|$ is a completely positive map, satisfying the property that [47],

$$\|e^{t\mathcal{L}_I} A\| \le \|A\|, \quad \forall A \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}.$$

Using the Duhamel's principle, this implies that,

$$\|\Gamma(t)\| \le \int_0^t \|[b_\alpha \mu, \varrho]\| \mathrm{d}\tau \le \delta t \|\mu\|. \tag{117}$$

Similarly, one can differentiate Eq. (116), and let $\Gamma_2 = \frac{\partial^2 \varrho}{\partial u_{\alpha_1} \partial u_{\alpha_2}} = \Gamma_2^{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)}$, which satisfies the equation,

$$\partial_t \Gamma_2 = \mathcal{L}\Gamma_2 - i[b_{\alpha_1}\mu, \Gamma^{\alpha_2}] - i[b_{\alpha_2}\mu, \Gamma^{\alpha_1}]. \tag{118}$$

The same argument leads to the bound,

$$\|\Gamma_2(t)\| \le 2\int_0^t \|[b_\alpha \mu, \Gamma(\tau)]\| \mathrm{d}\tau \le 2\delta t^2 \|\mu\|^2. \tag{119}$$

More generally, for $\Gamma_k = \frac{\partial^k \varrho}{\partial u_{\alpha_1} \cdots \partial u_{\alpha_k}}$, it satisfies

$$\partial \Gamma_k = \mathcal{L}\Gamma_k - i\sum_{l=1}^{k} [b_{\alpha_l}\mu, \Gamma_{k-1}] \tag{120}$$

Then by induction

$$\|\Gamma_k\| \le k\int_0^t \|[b_{\alpha_l}\mu, \Gamma_{k-1}]\| \mathrm{d}\tau \le k!\delta t^k \|\mu\|^k. \tag{121}$$

Using these bounds, the derivative of the objective function $\tilde{J}_1(\mathbf{u})$ can be bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\frac{\partial^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\tilde{J}_1}{\partial u_{\alpha_1}u_{\alpha_2}\cdots u_{\alpha_k}}\right\| &\le \sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{k}{l}\|\Gamma_l\|\|O\otimes I\|\|\Gamma_{k-l}\| \\ &\le \sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{k}{l} l!\delta t^l\|\mu\|^l(k-l)!\delta t^{k-l}\|\mu\|^{k-l}\|O\otimes I\| \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{k} k!\delta t^k\|\mu\|^k\|O\| = (k+1)!\delta t^k\|\mu\|^k\|O\|.\end{aligned} \tag{122}$$

Using similar techniques, we can show that $\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u})$ is ℓ-smooth and ϱ-Hessian Lipschitz such that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u})-\boldsymbol{\nabla}\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{v})\|\le \ell\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}\|,\quad \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u})-\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{v})\|\le\varrho\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}\|, \tag{123}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is l_2-norm for vectors and spectral norm for matrices. For smoothness, with the observation that there exist second order derivatives of $\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u})$, it is sufficient to show that $\nabla^2\tilde{J}_1(u)$ is bounded, which can be obtained directly from Eq. (122). To show that $J_1(\boldsymbol{u})$ is ϱ-Hessian Lipschitz, we utilize the property of induced matrix norm,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u})-\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{v})\| = \sup_{\boldsymbol{w}\in\mathbb{R}^{N+1}}\frac{\|(\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u})-\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{v}))\boldsymbol{w}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{w}\|} \\ &= \sup_{\boldsymbol{w}\in\mathbb{R}^{N+1}}\frac{\|(\int_0^1\partial_\lambda\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}+\lambda(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}))\mathrm{d}\lambda)\boldsymbol{w}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{w}\|} \\ &\le \sup_{\boldsymbol{w}\in\mathbb{R}^{N+1}}\frac{\int_0^1\|\partial_\lambda\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}+\lambda(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}))\|\mathrm{d}\lambda\|\boldsymbol{w}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{w}\|}\le\max_{\lambda\in[0,1]}\|\partial_\lambda\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}+\lambda(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}))\|.\end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

Consider the general form Eq. (13), the derivatives can be calculated as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_i\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}) &= \langle\varrho_N|\,O\otimes I\,|\partial_i\varrho_N\rangle + c.c. \\ \partial^2_{i,j}\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}) &= \langle\varrho_N|\,O\otimes I\,\left|\partial^2_{i,j}\varrho_N\right\rangle + \langle\partial_j\varrho_N|\,O\otimes I\,|\partial_i\varrho_N\rangle + c.c. \\ \partial_\lambda\partial^2_{i,j}\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}+\lambda(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})) &= \langle\partial_\lambda\varrho_N(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})|\,O\otimes I\,\left|\partial^2_{i,j}\varrho_N\right\rangle + \langle\partial_\lambda\partial_j\varrho_N(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})|\,O\otimes I\,|\partial_i\varrho_N\rangle \\ &\quad + \langle\varrho_N|\,O\otimes I\,\left|\partial_\lambda\partial^2_{i,j}\varrho_N(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})\right\rangle + \langle\partial_j\varrho_N|\,O\otimes I\,|\partial_\lambda\partial_i\varrho_N(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})\rangle + c.c. \\ |\partial_\lambda\partial^2_{i,j}\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}+\lambda(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}))| &\le 6\|\Gamma_1\|\|O\|\|\Gamma_2\|\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}\| + 2\|\varrho_N\|\|O\|\|\Gamma_3\|\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}\| \\ &\le 4!\delta t^3\|\mu\|^3\|O\|\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}\|.\end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

These bounds show that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_\lambda\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}+\lambda(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}))\| &\le \|\partial_\lambda\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}+\lambda(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}))\|_\infty = \max_i\sum_j|\partial_\lambda\partial^2_{i,j}\tilde{J}_1(\boldsymbol{u}+\lambda(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}))| \\ &\le (N+1)4!\delta t^3\|\mu\|^3\|O\|\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}\| =: \varrho\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}\|,\end{aligned} \tag{126}$$

which gives Eq. (122) when $k=3$. The Hessian Lipschitz coefficients $\varrho = 4!(N+1)\delta t^3\|\mu\|^3\|O\|$ and smooth coefficients $\ell = 3!(N+1)\delta t^2\|\mu\|^2\|O\|$.

C Perturbed Accelerated Gradient Descent with Noisy Gradients

In this section, we are going to prove that Perturbed Accelerated Gradient Descent (PAGD) [26] can be used in our scheme, which implies that the step for optimization can be $\widetilde{O}\left(1/\epsilon^{7/4}\right)$ instead of $\widetilde{O}\left(1/\epsilon^{2}\right)$. Because gradient obtained by Jordan's algorithm [27] is noisy, here we present a proof that as long as the error of gradient is bounded in every step, the asymptotic complexity $\widetilde{O}\left(1/\epsilon^{7/4}\right)$ still holds. To distinguish from the real gradient $\nabla f(x)$, we denote the noisy gradient calculated by Jordan's algorithm [21] as $\hat{\nabla} f(x)$, and denote the corresponding noise as $e(x)$:

$$\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{x}\right) = \nabla f(x) - \hat{\nabla} f(x). \tag{127}$$

We denote the upper bound of this noise as ϵ_g,

$$\max_{\tau} ||\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{x}_\tau)|| \leq \epsilon_g, \tag{128}$$

where τ iterates all time steps in the optimization process. Substituting $\nabla f(x)$ with $\hat{\nabla} f(x)$ to accommodate our scheme, we get a modified PAGD, as shown in Algorithm 2.

The major theorem in original paper [26] is its Theorem 3, which bounds the time complexity by showing that when encountering no ϵ-second-order stationary point, the Hamiltonian will decrease by $\mathscr{E}$ in at most $2\mathscr{T}$ steps. In this Appendix, we prove Theorem 5.1 with a similar strategy.

The proof is divided into three cases according to gradient, Hessian, and whether the negative curvature exploitation (NCE) step is invoked:

1. Large gradient scenario: gradient is larger than ϵ in $\mathscr{T}$ steps. We are going to prove that $E_{\mathscr{T}} - E_0 \leq -\mathscr{E}$. Gradient noise is bounded by $\epsilon_g \leq \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{1.125})$.

2. Negative curvature scenario: at some step, we stuck in an saddle point, we use perturbation to escape from it. We are going to prove that we have high probability to escape from the saddle point. Gradient noise is bounded by $\epsilon_g \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{\sqrt{\varrho}}{\ell}\frac{\epsilon^3}{\sqrt{d}}\Delta_f)$.

3. NCE: we are going to prove that if NCE step is invoked, Hamiltonian decreases by $\mathscr{E}$ in the next step. Gradient noise is bounded by $\epsilon_g \leq \tilde{O}(\epsilon)$.

The choices of these parameters are given in Appendix C.1. We first prove that improve or localize theorem still holds with $\epsilon_g = O(\epsilon)$ in Appendix C.2. This theorem serves as a key ingredient in following parts. Then we show that gradient error accumulation does not affect the performance of our algorithm in all three cases cases listed above in Appendix C.3, C.4, C.5 respectively. Our main technical contribution in this section is Appendix C.6, which gives a detailed analysis of accumulated gradient noise in PAGD. Finally in Appendix C.7, we put together the final complexity.

C.1 Choices of parameters

Due to the complexity behind the analysis of the global convergence, numerous hyper parameters have to be introduced, and they are summarized as follows:

- ϵ: condition of sufficiently small gradient $||\nabla f|| < \epsilon$

- η: learning rate $x_{t+1} \leftarrow y_t - \eta \nabla f(y_t)$
- $1-\theta$: rate of momentum: $y_t \leftarrow x_t + (1-\theta) v_t$
- γ: condition of large non-convex: $f\left(\mathbf{x}_t\right) \leq f\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right)+\left\langle\hat{\nabla} f\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right), \mathbf{x}_t-\mathbf{y}_t\right\rangle-\frac{\gamma}{2}\left\|\mathbf{x}_t-\mathbf{y}_t\right\|^2$
- ℓ: gradient Lipschitz: $\left\|\nabla f\left(\mathbf{x}_1\right)-\nabla f\left(\mathbf{x}_2\right)\right\| \leq \ell\left\|\mathbf{x}_1-\mathbf{x}_2\right\| \quad \forall \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$.
- ϱ: Hessian Lipschitz: $\left\|\nabla^2 f\left(\mathbf{x}_1\right)-\nabla^2 f\left(\mathbf{x}_2\right)\right\| \leq \varrho\left\|\mathbf{x}_1-\mathbf{x}_2\right\| \quad \forall \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$
- $\kappa := \ell / \sqrt{\varrho \epsilon}$
- s: NCE step length
- c, χ: two large enough constants
- $\mathscr{T} = \sqrt{\kappa} \cdot \chi c$: a period
- $\mathscr{E} := \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon^3}{\varrho}} \cdot \chi^{-5} c^{-7}$: scale of accumulated error in $\mathscr{T}$ steps
- $\mathscr{S} := \sqrt{\frac{2\eta \mathscr{T} \mathscr{E}}{\theta}} = \sqrt{\frac{2\epsilon}{\varrho}} \cdot \chi^{-2} c^{-3}$
- $\mathscr{M} := \frac{\epsilon\sqrt{\kappa}}{\ell} c^{-1}$: small momentum condition $\|\mathbf{v}_0\| \leq \mathscr{M}$
- $\Delta_f := f(y_0) - f(y^*)$: the difference between initial function value and the minimum function value.
- $r = \eta\epsilon \cdot \chi^{-5} c^{-8}$: the radius for perturbation in escaping the saddle point.

Settings of hyper parameters:

- $\eta = \frac{1}{4\ell}$
- $\theta = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{\kappa}}$
- $\gamma = \frac{\theta^2}{\eta}$
- $s = \frac{\gamma}{4\varrho}$
- $\mathcal{S}$: the subspace with eigenvalues in $\left(\theta^2 / \left[\eta(2-\theta)^2\right], \ell\right]$
- $\mathcal{S}^c$: the subspace with eigenvalues in $\left[-\ell, \theta^2 / \left[\eta(2-\theta)^2\right]\right]$

It is noticed that $\theta^2 / \left[\eta(2-\theta)^2\right] = \Theta(\sqrt{\varrho\epsilon})$.

C.2 Improve or localize theorem

[Modified from lemma 4 in [26]; Hamiltonian decreases monotonically]

Lemma 9. *Assume that the function $f(\cdot)$ is ℓ-smooth and set the learning rate to be $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2\ell}, \theta \in \left[2\eta\gamma, \frac{1}{2}\right]$ in AGD (Algorithm 1). Then, for every iteration t where NCE condition $f(\mathbf{x}_t) \leq f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \left\langle \hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\rangle - \frac{\gamma}{2}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t\|^2$ does not hold, we have:*

$$E_{t+1} \leq E_t - \frac{\theta}{2\eta}\left|\left|\mathbf{v}_t\right|\right|^2 - \frac{\eta}{4}\left\|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 + \eta\left\|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 \tag{129}$$

$$E_{t+1} \leq E_t - \frac{\theta}{2\eta}\left|\left|\mathbf{v}_t\right|\right|^2 - \frac{\eta}{8}\left\|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 + \frac{5}{4}\eta\left\|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 \tag{130}$$

Proof.

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq f(\mathbf{y}_t) - \eta\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t)\cdot\hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \frac{\ell\eta^2}{2}\left\|\hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 \tag{131}$$

$$f(\mathbf{x}_t) \geq f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \left\langle \hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\rangle - \frac{\gamma}{2}\left\|\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{x}_t\right\|^2 \tag{132}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\right\|^2 &= \left\|\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{x}_t - \eta\hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 &(133)\\ &= \left[(1-\theta)^2\left\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_{t-1}\right\|^2 - 2\eta\left\langle \hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{x}_t\right\rangle + \eta^2\left\|\hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2\right] &(134)\end{aligned}$$

so we have

$$\begin{aligned}&f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + \frac{1}{2\eta}\left\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\right\|^2 &(135)\\ \leq& f(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{1}{2\eta}\left\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_{t-1}\right\|^2 - \frac{\theta}{2\eta}\left\|\mathbf{v}_t\right\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{4}\left\|\hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 - \eta\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)\cdot\hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{y}_t) &(136)\\ =& f(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{1}{2\eta}\left\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_{t-1}\right\|^2 - \frac{\theta}{2\eta}\left\|\mathbf{v}_t\right\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{4}\left\|\hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{y}_t) + 2\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 + \eta||\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)||^2 &(137)\\ =& f(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{1}{2\eta}\left\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_{t-1}\right\|^2 - \frac{\theta}{2\eta}\left\|\mathbf{v}_t\right\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{4}\left\|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 + \eta||\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)||^2. &(138)\end{aligned}$$

We can further simplified the inequality with

$$\left\|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\left\|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 - \left\|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2, \tag{139}$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned}&f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + \frac{1}{2\eta}\left\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\right\|^2\\ &\leq f(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{1}{2\eta}\left\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_{t-1}\right\|^2 - \frac{\theta}{2\eta}\left\|\mathbf{v}_t\right\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{8}\left\|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2 + \frac{5}{4}\eta\left\|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)\right\|^2. &(140)\end{aligned}$$

□

Algorithm 2 modified perturbed AGD

```
$\boldsymbol{v}_0 \leftarrow 0$
for t = 0,1,... do
    if $||\hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}_t)|| \leq \epsilon$ and no perturbation in last $\mathscr{T}$ steps then
        $\mathbf{x}_t \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_t + \xi_t \quad \xi_t \sim \text{Unif}\left(\mathbb{B}_0\left(r\right)\right)$
    end if
    $\mathbf{y}_t \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_t + (1-\theta)\mathbf{v}_t$
    $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{y}_t - \eta \hat{\nabla} f\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right)$
    $\mathbf{v}_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t$
    if $f\left(\mathbf{x}_t\right) \leq f\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right) + \left\langle \hat{\nabla} f\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right), \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\rangle - \frac{\gamma}{2}\left\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t\right\|^2$ then
        $\left(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{v}_{t+1}\right) \leftarrow$ Negative-Curvature-Exploitation $\left(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{v}_t, s\right)$
    end if
end for
```

Theorem C.1 (Modified from Corollary 6 of [26]). *Under the same setting as in Lemma 9, we have:*

$$\sum_{\tau=t+1}^{t+T} ||\mathbf{x}_\tau - \mathbf{x}_{\tau-1}||^2 \leq \frac{2\eta}{\theta}\left(E_t - E_{t+T}\right) + \frac{2\eta^2}{\theta} \sum_{t+1}^{t+T} ||\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right)||^2 \tag{141}$$

Proof. Eq. (141) can be directly obtained by Lemma 9 □

Proposition 1. *Suppose that* $\max_\tau ||\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau\right)|| < \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\epsilon$*. Then the following inequality holds,*

$$\sum_{\tau=t+1}^{t+\mathscr{T}} ||\mathbf{x}_\tau - \mathbf{x}_{\tau-1}||^2 \leq \frac{2\eta}{\theta}\left(E_t - E_{t+\mathscr{T}}\right) + \frac{\eta}{\theta}\mathscr{E}. \tag{142}$$

Proof. Noticed that

$$\frac{2\eta^2}{\theta} \sum_{t+1}^{t+\mathscr{T}} ||\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right)||^2 \leq \frac{2\eta^2}{\theta}\mathscr{T} \max_\tau ||\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau\right)||^2 \leq \frac{2\eta^2}{\theta}\mathscr{T}\frac{\epsilon^2}{8} \leq \frac{\eta}{\theta}\mathscr{E} \tag{143}$$

Substitute it into Eq. (141) □

In modified PAGD, we can define

$$\hat{\delta}_\tau = \delta_\tau + e\left(y_\tau\right) \tag{144}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\nabla} f\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau\right) &= \nabla f(\mathbf{0}) + \mathcal{H}\mathbf{y}_\tau + \delta_\tau + e\left(y_\tau\right) \qquad (145) \\ &= \nabla f(\mathbf{0}) + \mathcal{H}\mathbf{y}_\tau + \hat{\delta}_\tau \qquad (146) \end{aligned}$$

C.3 Large gradient scenario

In this subsection, we suppose that gradient is large,

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_\tau)\| \geq \epsilon \text{ for } \tau \in [0, \mathscr{T}] \tag{147}$$

Lemma 10 (Modified from Lemma 15 in [26])**.** *if* $\|\mathbf{v}_t\| \geq \mathscr{M}$ *or* $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\| \geq 2\ell\mathscr{M}$*, and* $e(\mathbf{y}_t) < \frac{1}{c^2}\epsilon$*,and at time step t only modified AGD is used without NCE or perturbation, then:*

$$E_{t+1} - E_t \leq -4\mathscr{E}/\mathscr{T}. \tag{148}$$

Proof. When $\|\mathbf{v}_t\| \geq \frac{\epsilon\sqrt{\kappa}}{10\ell}$, by Lemma 9, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{t+1} - E_t &\leq -\frac{\theta}{2\eta}\|\mathbf{v}_t\|^2 + \frac{5}{4}\eta\|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 && (149)\\
&\leq -\Omega\left(\frac{\ell}{\sqrt{\kappa}}\frac{\epsilon^2\kappa}{\ell^2}c^{-2}\right) + \frac{5}{4}\eta(\frac{\epsilon}{c^2})^2 = -\Omega\left(\frac{\epsilon^2\sqrt{\kappa}}{2\ell}c^{-2}\right) + O(c^{-4}\epsilon^2/\ell) && (150)\\
&\leq -\Omega\left(\frac{\mathscr{E}}{\mathscr{T}}c^6\right) + O(\frac{\mathscr{E}}{\mathscr{T}}c^4/\sqrt{\kappa}) && (151)\\
&\leq -\frac{4\mathscr{E}}{\mathscr{T}}. && (152)
\end{aligned}$$

In last step, we choose c to be large enough . When $\|\mathbf{v}_t\| \leq \mathscr{M}$ but $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\| \geq 2\ell\mathscr{M}$, by the gradient Lipschitz assumption, we have:

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t)\| \geq \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\| - (1-\theta)\ell\|\mathbf{v}_t\| \geq \ell\mathscr{M}.$$

Similarly, by Lemma 9, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_{t+1} - E_t \leq -\frac{\eta}{4}\|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 + \frac{5}{4}\eta\|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2\\
&\leq -\Omega\left(\frac{\epsilon^2\kappa}{\ell}c^{-2}\right) + O\left(c^{-4}\epsilon^2\ell^{-1}\right) \leq -\Omega\left(\frac{\mathscr{E}}{\mathscr{T}}c^6\right) + O\left(\frac{\mathscr{E}}{\mathscr{T}}c^4\kappa^{-1}\right) \leq -\frac{4\mathscr{E}}{\mathscr{T}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Again we choose c to be large enough, and thus finish the proof. □

Lemma 11 (Modified from Lemma 16 in [26])**.** *Under the setting of Theorem* **S***, if* $\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}^c}\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, $\|\mathbf{v}_0\| \leq \mathscr{M}, \mathbf{v}_0^\top\left[\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{S}^\top\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}_0)\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{S}\right]\mathbf{v}_0 \leq 2\sqrt{\varrho\epsilon}\mathscr{M}^2$, $\max_\tau\|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\| < \epsilon/\chi c\sqrt{2\mathscr{T}} = \frac{\varrho^{1/8}}{\sqrt{2}\ell^{1/4}(\chi c)^{3/2}}\epsilon^{9/8}$*, and for* $t \in [0, \mathscr{T}/4]$ *only modified AGD steps are used without NCE or perturbation, then:*

$$E_{\mathscr{T}/4} - E_0 \leq -\mathscr{E}. \tag{153}$$

Proof. The proof is almost the same as in [26], the only difference is that every δ_τ should be replaced by $\hat{\delta}_\tau = \delta_\tau + e(y_\tau)$, i.e. the last equation in page 22 and the first two equations in page 23 should be re-evaluate:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\hat{\tilde{\delta}}^{(j)}\right| &= \left|\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} \hat{\delta}_\tau^{(j)}\right| \\
&\leq \left|\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} \delta_\tau^{(j)}\right| + |\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_\tau\right)| \\
&\leq \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} \left(\left|\delta_0^{(j)}\right| + \left|\delta_\tau^{(j)} - \hat{\delta}_0^{(j)}\right|\right) + |\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_\tau\right)| \\
&\leq \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} \left(\left|\hat{\delta}_0^{(j)}\right| + \left|\hat{\delta}_\tau^{(j)} - \hat{\delta}_0^{(j)}\right|\right) + |\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_\tau\right)| \\
&\leq \left[\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)}\right] \left(\left|\delta_0^{(j)}\right| + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \left|\delta_\tau^{(j)} - \delta_{\tau-1}^{(j)}\right|\right) + |\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_\tau\right)| \\
&\leq \left|\delta_0^{(j)}\right| + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \left|\delta_\tau^{(j)} - \delta_{\tau-1}^{(j)}\right| + |\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_\tau\right)|
\end{aligned} \tag{154}$$

Similar to Lemma 16 in [26], we know

$$\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \tilde{\delta}\right\|^2 \tag{155}$$

$$= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} \left|\hat{\tilde{\delta}}^{(j)}\right|^2 \tag{156}$$

$$\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} \left(\left|\delta_0^{(j)}\right| + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \left|\delta_\tau^{(j)} - \delta_{\tau-1}^{(j)}\right| + \left|\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_\tau\right)\right|\right)^2 \tag{157}$$

$$\leq 2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} \left(\left|\delta_0^{(j)}\right| + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \left|\delta_\tau^{(j)} - \delta_{\tau-1}^{(j)}\right|\right)^2 + \left|\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_\tau\right)\right|^2 \tag{158}$$

$$\leq 4\left\|\delta_0\right\|^2 + 4t \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \left\|\delta_\tau - \delta_{\tau-1}\right\|^2 + 2 \sum_j \left|\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_\tau\right)\right|^2 \tag{159}$$

and

$$\sqrt{4\left\|\delta_0\right\|^2 + 4t \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \left\|\delta_\tau - \delta_{\tau-1}\right\|^2} \leq O\left(\varrho \mathscr{S}^2\right) \leq O\left(\epsilon \cdot c^{-6}\right) \leq \epsilon / 10 \tag{160}$$

By Lemma 15, the third term is also bounded by ϵ^2, so we have

$$\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \tilde{\delta}\right\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2. \tag{161}$$

□

Lemma 12 (Modified from Lemma 17 in [26]). *Under the setting of Theorem G, suppose* $\|\mathbf{v}_0\| \le \mathscr{M}$ *and* $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \le 2\ell\mathscr{M}, E_{\mathscr{T}/2} - E_0 \ge -\mathscr{E}$, $\max_\tau \|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\| < \epsilon/c\sqrt{2\mathscr{T}} = \frac{\rho^{1/8}}{\sqrt{2}\ell^{1/4}\chi^{1/2}c^{3/2}}\epsilon^{9/8}$, *and for* $t \in [0, \mathscr{T}/2]$ *only modified AGD steps are used, without NCE or perturbation. Then* $\forall t \in [\mathscr{T}/4, \mathscr{T}/2]$*:*

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}}\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\| \le \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_t^\top \left[\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}}^\top \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}_0)\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}}\right]\mathbf{v}_t \le \sqrt{\varrho\epsilon}\mathscr{M}^2.$$

Proof. In our case, the expression of $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)$ and $\mathbf{v}_t$ should each have one more term representing the effect of gradient error.

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) = \boldsymbol{g}_1 + \boldsymbol{g}_2 + \boldsymbol{g}_3 + \boldsymbol{g}_4 + \boldsymbol{g}_5, \tag{162}$$

$$\boldsymbol{g}_5 = -\eta\mathcal{H}\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix}\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1}\mathbf{A}^{t-1-\tau}\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_\tau) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{163}$$

where $\boldsymbol{g}_1$,$\boldsymbol{g}_2$,$\boldsymbol{g}_3$, and $\boldsymbol{g}_4$ are defined as in Lemma 17 in [26].

$$\mathbf{v}_t = \boldsymbol{m}_1 + \boldsymbol{m}_2 + \boldsymbol{m}_3 + \boldsymbol{m}_4, \tag{164}$$

$$\boldsymbol{m}_4 = -\eta\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1}\mathbf{A}^{t-1-\tau}\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_\tau) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{165}$$

where $\boldsymbol{m}_1$,$\boldsymbol{m}_2$, $\boldsymbol{m}_3$, and $\boldsymbol{m}_3$ are defined as in Lemma 17 in [26].

We will prove that

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{g}_5\|^2 < \epsilon^2/64, \tag{166}$$

and

$$\left\|\left[\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}}^\top \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}_0)\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{m}_4\right\|^2 < \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\varrho\epsilon}\mathscr{M}^2 = \frac{1}{3}\frac{\epsilon^2\ell}{c^2}, \tag{167}$$

so that the proof still holds. The proof is in Lemma 16 and 17 ☐

C.4 Negative curvature scenario

Lemma 13 (Modified from Lemma 18 of [26]). *Under the same setting as Theorem $, suppose* $\|\nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\| \le \epsilon$, $\lambda_{\min}\left(\nabla^2 f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\right) \le -\sqrt{\varrho\epsilon}$ *and* $\max_\tau \|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\| \le \frac{\theta}{8\eta\mathscr{T}}\frac{\delta\mathscr{E}}{2\Delta_f}\frac{r}{\sqrt{d}} = \frac{\delta\sqrt{\rho}\chi^{-11}c^{-16}}{64l}\frac{\epsilon^3}{\sqrt{d}}\Delta_f x$. *Let* $\mathbf{x}_0$ *and* $\mathbf{x}'_0$ *be at distance at most* r *from* $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. *Let* $\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}'_0 = r_0 \cdot \mathbf{e}_1$ *and let* $\mathbf{v}_0 = \mathbf{v}'_0 = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ *where* $\mathbf{e}_1$ *is the minimum eigen-direction of* $\nabla^2 f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$. *Let* $r_0 \ge \frac{\delta\mathscr{E}}{2\Delta_f} \cdot \frac{r}{\sqrt{d}}$. *Then, running PAGD starting at* $(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{v}_0)$ *and* $(\mathbf{x}'_0, \mathbf{v}'_0)$ *respectively, we have:*

$$\min\left\{E_{\mathscr{T}} - \widetilde{E}, E'_{\mathscr{T}} - \widetilde{E}\right\} \le -\mathscr{E},$$

where $\widetilde{E}, E_{\mathscr{T}}$ *and* $E'_{\mathscr{T}}$ *are the Hamiltonians at* $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}), (\mathbf{x}_{\mathscr{T}}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathscr{T}})$ *and* $(\mathbf{x}'_{\mathscr{T}}, \mathbf{v}'_{\mathscr{T}})$ *respectively.*

Proof. The only difference from original proof is the treatment of

$$\min\left\{E_{\mathscr{T}} - E_0, E'_{\mathscr{T}} - E'_0\right\}, \tag{168}$$

in our case, because we have a modified improve or localize theorem C.1, We can show that with $e_{\nabla f} < \epsilon$ and A_1 smaller enough, we have

$$\max\left\{\left\|\mathbf{x}_t - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\right\|, \left\|\mathbf{x}_t' - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\right\|\right\} \leq r + \max\left\{\left\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_0\right\|, \left\|\mathbf{x}_t' - \mathbf{x}_0'\right\|\right\} \leq r + \sqrt{9\eta\mathscr{T}\mathscr{E}/\theta} \leq 3\mathscr{S}. \tag{169}$$

And in our case, the expression of $\mathbf{w}_t$ should each have one more term representing the effect of gradient error

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{w}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}^t \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}_0 \\ \mathbf{w}_0 \end{pmatrix} - \eta \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{A}^{t-1-\tau} \begin{pmatrix} \delta_\tau \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ -\eta \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{A}^{t-1-\tau} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau\right) - \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_{\tau-1}\right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

This holds if we can prove that

$$\left\|\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}^t \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}_0 \\ \mathbf{w}_0 \end{pmatrix}\right\| - \left\|\eta \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{A}^{t-1-\tau} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau\right) - \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau'\right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right\| \geq \Omega\left(\frac{\theta}{4}(1+\Omega(\theta))^t r_0\right). \tag{170}$$

Notice that $\mathbf{w}_0 = r_0 \cdot \mathbf{e}_1$, where subscript 1 represents the minimum eigenvalue direction, we have

$$\left\|\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}^t \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}_0 \\ \mathbf{w}_0 \end{pmatrix}\right\| = \left(a_\tau^{(1)} - b_\tau^{(1)}\right) r_0. \tag{171}$$

For the second term, we use Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\eta \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{A}^{t-1-\tau} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau\right) - \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau'\right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right\| &\leq \eta \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \left\|\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}^{t-1-\tau} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau\right) - \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau'\right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right\| \\ &\leq \eta \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \left\|\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}^{t-1-\tau} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right\| \left\|\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau\right) - \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau'\right)\right\|.\end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 18 and Lemma 32 in [26], $(\mathbf{I}, 0)\mathbf{A}^{t-\tau} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ achieves its spectral norm along the first coordinate which corresponds to the eigenvalue $\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{H})$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\eta \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{A}^{t-1-\tau} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau\right) - \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau'\right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right\| &\leq \eta \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} a_{t-1-\tau}^{(1)} \left\|\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau\right) - \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau'\right)\right\| \\ &\leq 2\eta \max_\tau \left\|\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_\tau\right)\right\| \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} a_\tau^{(1)} \\ &\leq \frac{\theta r_0}{4\mathscr{T}} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} a_\tau^{(1)} \\ &\leq \frac{\theta r_0}{4} a_{\mathscr{T}}^{(1)}.\end{aligned}$$

In last equality, we use $a_{\tau}^{(1)} \leq a_{\tau+1}^{(1)}$. Combining these results together, we have

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}^{t} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}_0 \\ \mathbf{w}_0 \end{pmatrix} \right\| - \left\| \eta \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{A}^{t-1-\tau} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_{\tau}\right) - \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}'_{\tau}\right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\| \tag{172}$$

$$\geq \left((1 - \frac{\theta}{4}) a_{\mathscr{T}}^{(1)} - b_{\mathscr{T}}^{(1)} \right) r_0. \tag{173}$$

Following Lemma 18 and Lemma 32 in [26], we have finished the proof. ☐

C.5 Negative curvature exploitation

Lemma 14 (Modified from Lemma 5 in [26])**.** *Assume that $f(\cdot)$ is ℓ-smooth and ϱ-Hessian Lipschitz. For every iteration t of Algorithm where NCE condition $f\left(\mathbf{x}_t\right) \leq f\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right) + \left\langle \hat{\nabla} f\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right), \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\rangle - \frac{\gamma}{2} \left\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t\right\|^2$ holds (thus running NCE), we have:*

$$E_{t+1} \leq E_t - \min \left\{ \frac{s^2}{2\eta}, \frac{1}{2}(\gamma - 2\varrho s)s^2 - s||\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right)|| \right\}.$$

Proof. When $\|\mathbf{v}_t\| \geq s$, the same; when $\|\mathbf{v}_t\| < s$, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right), \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t\right)^{\top} \nabla^2 f\left(\zeta_t\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t\right) \leq -\frac{\gamma}{2} \left\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t\right\|^2 \tag{174}$$

$$E_{t+1} \leq E_t - \frac{1}{2}(\gamma - 2\varrho s)s^2 - \langle \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right), \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle \tag{175}$$

$$\leq E_t - \frac{1}{2}(\gamma - 2\varrho s)s^2 + s||\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right)|| \tag{176}$$

Then we evaluate the min function value. Note that,

$$\frac{1}{2}(\gamma - 2\varrho s)s^2 = \frac{1}{2}\theta^2 \frac{s^2}{2\eta}. \tag{177}$$

☐

Thus we have

$$\min \left\{ \frac{s^2}{2\eta}, \frac{1}{2}(\gamma - 2\varrho s)s^2 - s\left\|\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right)\right\| \right\} = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma - 2\varrho s)s^2 - s\left\|\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right)\right\| = O(\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon^3}{\varrho}} - \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{\varrho}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right)\right\|) \tag{178}$$

so we require $\|\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_t\right)\| = A^{-1}\epsilon$ where A is large enough. Then the following arguments in [26] still holds.

C.6 Detailed analysis of accumulated gradient noise

In this subsection, we provide the proof of some lemmas we used above.

Lemma 15. *Suppose that* $\max_\tau \|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\| < \epsilon/\chi c\sqrt{2\mathscr{T}}$, $1 < \theta \leq 1/4$, *we have*

$$\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}^c}\left|\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}(y_\tau)\right|^2 \leq \epsilon^2, \tag{179}$$

where index j *sums over all eigen-direction of* $\mathcal{H} = \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{0})$ *satisfying* $\lambda_j \in \left[-\ell, \theta^2/\left[\eta(2-\theta)^2\right]\right]$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}^c}\left|\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}(y_\tau)\right|^2 &\leq \mathscr{T}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}^c}\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}\left(p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}(y_\tau)\right)^2 &(180)\\
&\leq \mathscr{T}\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}^c}(\max_j p_\tau^{(j)})^2(e^{(j)}(y_\tau))^2 &(181)\\
&= \mathscr{T}\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}(\max_j p_\tau^{(j)})^2\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}^c}(e^{(j)}(y_\tau))^2 &(182)\\
&\leq \mathscr{T}\left(\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}(\max_j p_\tau^{(j)})^2\right)\max_\tau\|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\|^2 &(183)\\
&\leq \frac{2\epsilon^2}{\chi^2 c^2}\left(\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}(\max_j p_\tau^{(j)})^2\right). &(184)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we try to bound the summation $\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}(\max_j p_\tau^{(j)})^2$. By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
p_\tau^{(j)} &= \frac{a_{\mathscr{T}-1-\tau}^{(j)}}{\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} a_\tau^{(j)}}, &(185)\\
a_\tau^{(j)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\mathbf{A}_j^\tau\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, &(186)\\
&= \frac{\mu_1^{\tau+1} - \mu_2^{\tau+1}}{\mu_1 - \mu_2}. &(187)
\end{aligned}$$

where μ_1 and $\mu_2 (\mu_1 \geq \mu_2)$ are two roots satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu^2 - (2-\theta)(1-x)\mu + (1-\theta)(1-x) = 0, &(188)\\
&x = \eta\lambda_j. &(189)
\end{aligned}$$

It is noticed that μ_1 and μ_2 are dependent of eigen-direction j, and they are real numbers when $j \in \mathcal{S}^c$.

Combining Eq. (185) and Eq. (187), we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_\tau^{(j)} &= \frac{\mu_1^{\mathscr{T}-\tau} - \mu_2^{\mathscr{T}-\tau}}{\sum_{\tau_0=1}^{\mathscr{T}} \mu_1^{\tau_0} - \mu_2^{\tau_0}} && (190) \\ &\le \frac{\mu_1^{\mathscr{T}-\tau} - \mu_2^{\mathscr{T}-\tau}}{\sum_{\tau_0=\mathscr{T}-\tau}^{\mathscr{T}} \mu_1^{\tau_0} - \mu_2^{\tau_0}} && (191) \\ &\le \frac{\mu_1^{\mathscr{T}-\tau}}{\sum_{\tau_0=\mathscr{T}-\tau}^{\mathscr{T}} \mu_1^{\tau_0}} && (192) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sum_{\tau_0=0}^{\tau} \mu_1^{\tau_0}}. && (193) \end{aligned}$$

Noticed that the reciprocal sum of μ_1 and μ_2 is independent of the eigen-direction j,

$$\frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\mu_2} = \frac{2-\theta}{1-\theta}, \tag{194}$$

and $\mu_1 \ge \mu_2$, we have

$$\mu_1 \ge 1 - \frac{\theta}{1-\theta} \ge 1 - 2\theta. \tag{195}$$

Combining Eq. (193) and Eq. (195), we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_\tau^{(j)} &\le \frac{1}{\sum_{\tau_0=0}^{\tau} (1-2\theta)^{\tau_0}} && (196) \\ &= \frac{2\theta}{1-(1-2\theta)^{\tau+1}} && (197) \\ &\le \frac{2\theta}{1-\frac{1}{1+2(\tau+1)\theta}} && (198) \\ &= \frac{1+2(\tau+1)\theta}{\tau+1} && (199) \\ &\le \frac{1+2(\mathscr{T}+1)\theta}{\tau+1} && (200) \\ &\le \frac{\chi c}{\tau+1}. && (201) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left(\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} \left(\max_j p_\tau^{(j)} \right)^2 \right) \le (\chi c)^2 \sum_\tau \frac{1}{(1+\tau)^2} \le 2(\chi c)^2. \tag{202}$$

Then we get $\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}^c} \left| \sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} p_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}(y_\tau) \right|^2 \le \epsilon^2$. $\square$

Lemma 16. *Suppose that* $\max_\tau \|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\| < \epsilon/\sqrt{2\mathscr{T}}$, *we have*

$$\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}} \left|\eta\lambda_j \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} a_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_{t-1-\tau}\right)\right|^2 < \epsilon^2/64, \tag{203}$$

where index j sums over all eigen-direction of $\mathcal{H} = \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{0})$ satisfying $\lambda_j \in \left(\theta^2/\left[\eta(2-\theta)^2\right], \ell\right]$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}} \left|\eta\lambda_j \sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} a_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_{t-1-\tau}\right)\right|^2 &\le \mathscr{T} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}} \sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} \left(x a_\tau^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_{t-1-\tau}\right)\right)^2 &(204)\\
&\le \mathscr{T} \sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}} \left(\max_j x a_\tau^{(j)}\right)^2 \left(e^{(j)}\left(y_{t-1-\tau}\right)\right)^2 &(205)\\
&= \mathscr{T} \sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} \left(\max_j x a_\tau^{(j)}\right)^2 \sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}} \left(e^{(j)}\left(y_{t-1-\tau}\right)\right)^2 &(206)\\
&\le \mathscr{T} \left(\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} \left(\max_j x a_\tau^{(j)}\right)^2\right) \max_\tau \|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\|^2 &(207)\\
&\le \epsilon^2 \left(\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} \left(\max_j x a_\tau^{(j)}\right)^2\right). &(208)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$(x a_\tau^{(j)})^2 = \left(x \frac{r^\tau \sin[(\tau+1)\phi]}{\sin[\phi]}\right)^2, \tag{209}$$

where

$$r = \sqrt{(1-\theta)(1-x)}, \quad \sin\phi = \sqrt{\left((2-\theta)^2 x - \theta^2\right)(1-x)}/2r. \tag{210}$$

To proceed, we split $x \in \left(\frac{\theta^2}{(2-\theta)^2}, \frac{1}{4}\right]$ into two cases

Case 1:$x \in \left(\frac{\theta^2}{(2-\theta)^2}, \frac{2\theta^2}{(2-\theta)^2}\right]$.Using $|\frac{\sin[(\tau+1)\phi]}{\sin[\phi]}| \le \tau$

$$\left(x a_\tau^{(j)}\right)^2 = (O(x(1-\theta)^{\tau/2}\tau))^2 = O(x^2\tau^2(1-\theta)^\tau) = O(\theta^4\tau^2(1-\theta)^\tau). \tag{211}$$

Case 2: $x \in \left(\frac{2\theta^2}{(2-\theta)^2}, \frac{1}{4}\right]$. We have $|\sin[(\tau+1)\phi]| \le 1$ and $x = \Theta\left(\sin^2\phi\right)$, then we have

$$\left(x a_\tau^{(j)}\right)^2 = O\left(\left(x \frac{r^\tau \sin[(\tau+1)\phi]}{\sin[\phi]}\right)^2\right) = O((\sqrt{x} r^\tau)^2) = O((1-\theta)^\tau x(1-x)^\tau) < O((1-\theta)^\tau/\tau), \tag{212}$$

where we make use of $x(1-x)^\tau < O(1/\tau)$.

From these cases we deduce that

$$\left(xa_{\tau}^{(j)}\right)^2 \leq \max\{O\left(\theta^4\tau^2(1-\theta)^{\tau}\right), O\left((1-\theta)^{\tau}/\tau\right)\} \leq O\left(\theta^4\tau^2(1-\theta)^{\tau}\right) + O\left((1-\theta)^{\tau}/\tau\right), \quad (213)$$

implying that

$$\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}\left(\max_j xa_{\tau}^{(j)}\right)^2 \leq \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty}\left(\max_j xa_{\tau}^{(j)}\right)^2 \leq \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} O\left(\theta^4\tau^2(1-\theta)^{\tau}\right) + O\left((1-\theta)^{\tau}/\tau\right) = O(\theta) < O(1), \quad (214)$$

where we make use of $\sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty}(1-\theta)^{\tau}/\tau = \log(1-\theta)$, and $\sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty}\tau^2(1-\theta)^{\tau} = O(1/\theta^3)$.

Gathering these bounds, we find that,

$$\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}}\left|\eta\lambda_j\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1} xa_{\tau}^{(j)} e^{(j)}\left(y_{t-1-\tau}\right)\right|^2 < O(\epsilon^2), \quad (215)$$

□

Lemma 17. *Suppose that* $\max_{\tau}\|\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{y}_{\tau})\| < \epsilon/c\sqrt{\mathscr{T}}$, *we have*

$$\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}}\left|\eta\lambda_j^{\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1}\left(a_{\tau}-a_{\tau-1}\right)e^{(j)}\left(y_{t-1-\tau}\right)\right|^2 < \frac{1}{3}\frac{\epsilon^2\ell}{c^2}, \quad (216)$$

where index j sums over all eigen-direction of $\mathcal{H} = \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{0})$ *satisfying* $\lambda_j \in \left(\theta^2/\left[\eta(2-\theta)^2\right], \ell\right]$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}}\left|\eta\lambda_j^{\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1}\left(a_{\tau}-a_{\tau-1}\right)e^{(j)}\left(y_{t-1-\tau}\right)\right|^2 &\leq \mathscr{T}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}}\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}\left(\eta\lambda_j^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(a_{\tau}-a_{\tau-1}\right)e^{(j)}\left(y_{t-1-\tau}\right)\right)^2 \\
&\leq \mathscr{T}\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}}\left(\max_j \eta\lambda_j^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(a_{\tau}-a_{\tau-1}\right)\right)^2\left(e^{(j)}\left(y_{t-1-\tau}\right)\right)^2 \\
&= \mathscr{T}\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}\left(\max_j \eta\lambda_j^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(a_{\tau}-a_{\tau-1}\right)\right)^2\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}}\left(e^{(j)}\left(y_{t-1-\tau}\right)\right)^2 \\
&\leq \mathscr{T}\left(\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}\left(\max_j \eta\lambda_j^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(a_{\tau}-a_{\tau-1}\right)\right)^2\right)\max_{\tau}\|\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_{\tau}\right)\|^2 \\
&\leq \eta\epsilon^2/c^2\left(\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}\left(\max_j \sqrt{x}\left(a_{\tau}-a_{\tau-1}\right)\right)^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We notice that

$$\sqrt{x}\left(a_{\tau}-a_{\tau-1}\right) = \sqrt{x}\left(\frac{r\cos\phi-1}{r\sin\phi}\cdot r^{\tau}\sin[\tau\phi] + r^{\tau}\cos[\tau\phi]\right), \quad (217)$$

and the second term can be bounded as follows

$$|\sqrt{x}r^\tau \cos[\tau\phi]| \le \sqrt{x}r^\tau \le \sqrt{(1-\theta)^\tau}\sqrt{x(1-x)^\tau} \le \sqrt{\frac{(1-\theta)^\tau}{1+\tau}}, \tag{218}$$

where we make use of $x(1-x)^\tau \le \frac{1}{1+\tau}(1-\frac{1}{1+\tau})^\tau \le \frac{1}{1+\tau}$.

For the first term, we also split $x \in \left(\frac{\theta^2}{(2-\theta)^2}, \frac{1}{4}\right]$ into two cases

Case 1: $x \in \left(\frac{\theta^2}{(2-\theta)^2}, \frac{2\theta^2}{(2-\theta)^2}\right]$.

$$|\sqrt{x}\frac{r\cos\phi - 1}{r\sin\phi} \cdot r^\tau \sin[\tau\phi]| \le O(\sqrt{x}(\theta+x)r^{\tau-1}\tau) \le O(\theta^2\tau(1-\theta)^{\tau-1}), \tag{219}$$

where we use $|\sin[\tau\phi]/\sin\phi| \le \tau$,$r \le O(1-\theta)$ and $|r\cos\phi - 1| \le O(\theta + x)$.

Case 2: $x \in \left(\frac{2\theta^2}{(2-\theta)^2}, \frac{1}{4}\right]$.

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\sqrt{x}\frac{r\cos\phi - 1}{r\sin\phi} \cdot r^\tau \sin[\tau\phi]\right| &\le O((\theta+x)r^{\tau-1}) \le O((1-\theta)^{\frac{\tau-1}{2}}(\theta+x)(1-x)^{\frac{\tau-1}{2}}) &(220)\\ &\le O((1-\theta)^{\frac{\tau-1}{2}}\theta) + O(\frac{(1-\theta)^{\tau/2}}{1+\tau}), &(221)\end{aligned}$$

where we used $|\sin[\tau\phi]| \le 1$, $x = \Theta\left(\sin^2\phi\right)$, $|r\cos\phi - 1| \le O(\theta + x)$, $(1-x)^{\frac{\tau-1}{2}} < 1$ and $x(1-x)^{\frac{\tau-1}{2}} < O(\frac{1}{\tau+1})$.

Thus we have the following bound,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\max_j \sqrt{x}\left(a_\tau - a_{\tau-1}\right)\right)^2\\ &\le 2(\left|\sqrt{x}r^\tau \cos[\tau\phi]\right|^2 + |\sqrt{x}\frac{r\cos\phi - 1}{r\sin\phi} \cdot r^\tau \sin[\tau\phi]|^2)\\ &\le 2(\frac{(1-\theta)^\tau}{1+\tau} + \max\{|O\left(\theta^2\tau(1-\theta)^{\tau-1}\right)|^2, |O\left((1-\theta)^{\frac{\tau-1}{2}}\theta\right) + O\left(\frac{(1-\theta)^{\tau/2}}{1+\tau}\right)|^2\})\\ &\le 2(\frac{(1-\theta)^\tau}{1+\tau} + \left|O\left(\theta^2\tau(1-\theta)^{\tau-1}\right)\right|^2 + 2(|O\left((1-\theta)^{\frac{\tau-1}{2}}\theta\right)|^2 + |O\left(\frac{(1-\theta)^{\tau/2}}{1+\tau}\right)|^2)).\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 16, we obtain

$$\left(\sum_{\tau=0}^{\mathscr{T}-1}\left(\max_j \sqrt{x}\left(a_\tau - a_{\tau-1}\right)\right)^2\right) < O(\theta) < O(1). \tag{222}$$

□

C.7 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Proof. Combining Lemma 10, Lemma 11, Lemma 12, Lemma 13, and Lemma 14, we know that when gradient noise satisfies

$$\max_{\tau} \|\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_{\tau}\right)\| \leq \min\{\frac{1}{c^2}\epsilon, \frac{\rho^{1/8}}{\sqrt{2}\ell^{1/4}\chi^{1/2}c^{3/2}}\epsilon^{9/8}, \frac{\rho^{1/8}}{\sqrt{2}\ell^{1/4}\chi^{3/2}c^{3/2}}\epsilon^{9/8}, \frac{\delta\chi^{-11}c^{-16}}{64\ell}\frac{\epsilon^3}{\sqrt{d}}\frac{1}{\Delta_f}, \epsilon\} \tag{223}$$

$$= \frac{\delta\chi^{-11}c^{-16}}{64\ell}\frac{\epsilon^3}{\sqrt{d}}\Delta_f, \tag{224}$$

Lemma 15, Lemma 16, Lemma 17, Lemma 18, Lemma 5 in [26] still hold. And thus the proof of theorem 3 in [26] applies here.

If we want to search an ϵ-first order stationary point instead, only large gradient scenario needs to be taken into consideration, then

$$\max_{\tau} \|\mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{y}_{\tau}\right)\| \leq \min\{\frac{1}{c^2}\epsilon, \frac{\rho^{1/8}}{\sqrt{2}\ell^{1/4}\chi^{1/2}c^{3/2}}\epsilon^{9/8}, \frac{\rho^{1/8}}{\sqrt{2}\ell^{1/4}\chi^{3/2}c^{3/2}}\epsilon^{9/8}\} = \frac{\rho^{1/8}}{\sqrt{2}\ell^{1/4}\chi^{3/2}c^{3/2}}\epsilon^{9/8}. \tag{225}$$

□

D Detailed constructions of time-dependent Lindbladian simulation

In this section, we present the details of the simulation algorithm for simulating time-dependent Lindblad evolution. Recall in Section 3 that we aim to implement the superoperator defined by Eq. (37). If we use time ordering operator for this, it becomes

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{K}}(t) = \mathcal{K}[V(0,t)] + \sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{1}{k!}\int_{0\leq s_1\leq t}\int_{0\leq s_2\leq t}\cdots\int_{0\leq s_k\leq t}\mathcal{T}[\mathcal{F}_k(s_k,\ldots,s_1)]\mathrm{d}s_1\cdots\mathrm{d}s_k, \tag{226}$$

where $\mathcal{T}[\mathcal{F}_k(s_k,\ldots,s_1)] := \mathcal{F}_k(\tau_k,\ldots,\tau_1)$, such that $\tau_k \leq \cdots \leq \tau_1$. Then applying the Riemann sum, we have

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{K}}(t) = \mathcal{K}[V(0,t)] + \sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{t^k}{k!q^k}\sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_k=0}^{q}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{F}_k(t_{j_k},\ldots,t_{j_1}) \tag{227}$$

$$= \mathcal{K}[V(0,t)] + \sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{t^k}{q^k}\sum_{0\leq j_1\leq,\ldots,\leq j_k\leq q}\mathcal{F}_k(t_{j_k},\ldots,t_{j_1}). \tag{228}$$

Recall Eq. (38). The superoperator $\mathcal{F}_k$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_k(s_k,\ldots.s_1) = \mathcal{K}[V(s_k,t)]\mathcal{L}_J(s_k)\mathcal{K}[V(s_{k-1},s_k)]\mathcal{L}_J(s_{k-1})\cdots\mathcal{K}[V(s_1,s_2)]\mathcal{L}_J(s_1)\mathcal{K}[V(0,s_1)]. \tag{229}$$

Applying $\mathcal{F}_k$ to ρ yields

$$\mathcal{F}_k(s_k,\ldots.s_1)(\rho) = \sum_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_k=1}^{m}[V(s_k,t)L_{\ell_k}(s_k)V(s_{k-1},s_k)L_{\ell_k}(s_{k-1})\cdots L_{\ell_1}(s_1)V(0,s_1)]\rho \tag{230}$$

$$[V(s_k,t)L_{\ell_k}(s_k)V(s_{k-1},s_k)L_{\ell_k}(s_{k-1})\cdots L_{\ell_1}(s_1)V(0,s_1)]^{\dagger}. \tag{231}$$

To simplify the notation, we define

$$A_{\ell_k,\dots,\ell_1}(s_k,\dots,s_1) := V(s_k,t)L_{\ell_k}(s_k)V(s_{k-1},s_k)L_{\ell_k}(s_{k-1})\cdots L_{\ell_1}(s_1)V(0,s_1). \tag{232}$$

Then $\mathcal{F}_k$ can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{F}_k(s_k,\dots s_1)(\rho) = \sum_{\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k=1}^{m} A_{\ell_k,\dots,\ell_1}(s_k,\dots,s_1)\rho A^\dagger_{\ell_k,\dots,\ell_1}(s_k,\dots,s_1). \tag{233}$$

Now, rewriting Eq. (228) using Eq. (232), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{K}}(t)(\rho) = V(0,t)\rho V^\dagger(0,t) + \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{0\le j_1\le\cdots\le j_k\le q}\sum_{\ell_1,\ell_2,\dots,\ell_k=1}^{m}\frac{t^k}{q^k}A_{\ell_k,\dots,\ell_1}(t_{j_k},\dots,t_{j_1})\\ \rho A^\dagger_{\ell_k,\dots,\ell_1}(t_{j_k},\dots,t_{j_1}).\end{aligned} \tag{234}$$

We define the index sets $\mathscr{J}$ as

$$\mathscr{J} := \{k,\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k,j_1,\dots,j_k : k\in[K],\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k\in[m],j_1,\dots,j_k\in[q]\}. \tag{235}$$

With $A_{\hat{0}} := V(0,t)$, and for all $\hat{j}\in\mathscr{J}$, define

$$A_{\hat{j}} := A_{\ell_k,\dots,\ell_1}(j_k t/q,\dots,j_1 t/q). \tag{236}$$

Then, Eq. (234) can be further rewritten as

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{K}}(t)(\rho) = A_0(t)\rho A_0^\dagger(t) + \sum_{\hat{j}\in\mathscr{J}}\frac{t^k}{q^k}A_{\hat{j}}(t)\rho A^\dagger_{\hat{j}}(t). \tag{237}$$

To implement the above completely positive map, we need to first construct the block-encoding $U_{A_{\hat{j}}}$ for each $A_{\hat{j}}$'s, namely,

$$\sum_{\hat{j}}|\hat{j}\rangle\langle\hat{j}|\otimes U_{A_{\hat{j}}}, \tag{238}$$

where

$$U_{A_{\hat{j}}} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{\hat{j}}/s_{\hat{j}} & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix}. \tag{239}$$

To apply Lemma 1, we also need the following state.

$$|\mu\rangle = \sum_{\hat{j}} s_{\hat{j}}|\hat{j}\rangle = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k=1}^{m}\sum_{0\le j_1<\cdots<j_k\le q} s_{\hat{j}}\sqrt{\frac{t^k}{q^k}}|k\rangle|j_1,\dots,j_k\rangle|\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k\rangle, \tag{240}$$

where $s_{\ell_k},\dots,s_{\ell_1}$ are normalization constant for block-encodings of $L_{\ell_k},\dots,L_{\ell_1}$. It is straightforward that the block-encoding $U_{A_{\hat{j}}}$ can be implemented by the block-encodings of $A_{\ell_k,\dots,\ell_1}$ $(j_k t/q,\dots,j_1 t/q)$ what was defined in Eq. (232).

By the time-dependent Hamiltonian simulation algorithm [29], we can simulate $V(s,t)$ by truncated Dyson series. Note that

$$V(s,t) := \mathcal{T} e^{\int_s^t J(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau}, \tag{241}$$

where

$$J(t) := -iH(t) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{m} L_j^{\dagger}(t) L_j(t). \tag{242}$$

Assume that we are given an $(\alpha_0(t), a, \epsilon')$-block-encoding $U_{H(t)}$ of $H(t)$, and an $(\alpha_j(t), a, \epsilon')$-block-encoding $U_{L_j(t)}$ for each $L_j(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. That is, we have

$$U_{H(t)} = \sum_t |t\rangle\langle t| \otimes \begin{bmatrix} H(t)/\alpha_0(t) & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix}, \tag{243}$$

and

$$U_{L_j(t)} = \sum_t |t\rangle\langle t| \otimes \begin{bmatrix} L_j(t)/\alpha_j(t) & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix}. \tag{244}$$

Then by Lemma 2, we can get a $(\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}}, a, 2\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}}\epsilon')$-block-encoding of $J(t)$. Where $\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}}$ is defined in Eq. (24). We denote this block-encoding by $U_{J(t)}$.

More specifically, we first multiply $U_{L_j^{\dagger}}$ with U_{L_j} and get an $(\alpha_j^2(t), a, 2\epsilon')$-block-encoding of each $L_j(t)^{\dagger} L_j(t)$, this requires $O(1)$ implementations to each $U_{L_j}(t)$'s and additional $O(m)$ elementary gates. Then we apply Lemma 2 with each $L_j(t)^{\dagger} L_j(t)$'s and $H(t)$ to get an $(\alpha_0(t) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\alpha_j^2(t), a, (\alpha_0 + \sum_j \alpha_j^2)\epsilon')$-block-encoding of $J(t)$. This requires $O(1)$ implementations of $U_{H(t)}$ and additional $O(1)$ elementary gates. So the total gate complexity for implementing $U_{J(t)}$ is $O(m)$. For any input state $|\psi\rangle$, the effect of $U_{J(t)}$ is

$$U_{J(t)}|0\rangle|t\rangle|\psi\rangle = |0\rangle|t\rangle \frac{J(t)}{\alpha_0(t) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\alpha_j^2(t)}|\psi\rangle + |0^{\perp}\rangle, \tag{245}$$

or equivalently, we can write it as

$$U_{J(t)} = \sum_t |t\rangle\langle t| \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \frac{J(t)}{\alpha_0(t)+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\alpha_j^2(t)} & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix}. \tag{246}$$

Regarding the normalizing constant and the approximation error, it is a $(\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}}, a, 2\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}}\epsilon')$-block-encoding of $J(t)$.

Noticing that the evolution time has been rescaled, we can assume our $\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}}$ at each time t to be

$$\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}} = 1, \tag{247}$$

and

$$\alpha_0(t) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\alpha_j^2(t) \leq 1. \tag{248}$$

For each $V(s,t)$, consider its Dyson series expansion:

$$\tilde{V}(s,t)=\sum_{k=1}^{K'}\frac{(t-s)^k}{M^k k!}\sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_k=0}^{M-1}\mathcal{T}J(t_{j_k})\cdots J(t_{j_1}). \tag{249}$$

Then we use the LCU method as in [29] to simulate the above operator, by $O(K')$ invocations of $U_{J(t)}$, where each invocation requires $O(m)$ gates. We also need additional $O(K'(\log M+\log K'))$ gates for LCU state preparation. So our total gate complexity for preparing each $\tilde{V}(s,t)$ is

$$O(K'(\log M+\log K'+m)). \tag{250}$$

So the gate complexity for implementing each Kraus operator in Eq. (234) is

$$O(KK'(\log M+\log K'+m)). \tag{251}$$

The normalizing constant for $\tilde{V}(s,t)$ is then

$$\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K'}\frac{(t-s)^k\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\text{be}}^k}{k!}\right)^2\leq e^{2(t-s)\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\text{be}}}\leq e^{2(t-s)}. \tag{252}$$

Next, by multiplying the block-encodings of each operator in Eq. (232), we can get a block-encoding of $A_{\ell_k,\ldots,\ell_1}(s_k,\ldots,s_1)$ with normalizing constant $s_{\hat{j}}$, which can be bounded by

$$s_{\hat{j}}\leq e^{2(t-s_k)}\alpha_{\ell_k}(t)e^{2(s_k-s_{k-1})}\alpha_{\ell_{k-1}}(t)\cdots\alpha_{\ell_1}(t)e^{2s_1}=e^{2t}\alpha_{\ell_k}(t)\alpha_{\ell_{k-1}}(t)\cdots\alpha_{\ell_1}(t). \tag{253}$$

For $t=O(1)$, we have

$$e^{2t}=O(1). \tag{254}$$

Then $s_{\hat{j}}$ can be bounded by

$$s_{\hat{j}}\leq c_0\alpha_{\ell_k}(t)\alpha_{\ell_{k-1}}(t)\cdots\alpha_{\ell_1}(t), \tag{255}$$

where $c_0=O(1)$ is some constant.

For the third register of Eq. (240), we need to prepare

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_1(t)}\sum_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_k=1}^{m}\alpha_{\ell_k}(t)\alpha_{\ell_{k-1}}(t)\cdots\alpha_{\ell_1}(t)|\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_k\rangle, \tag{256}$$

corresponding to

$$\sum_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_k=1}^{m}s_{\hat{j}}|\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_k\rangle. \tag{257}$$

Basically, we prepare each subregister $\alpha_\ell|\ell\rangle$ separately, controlled by a unary register $|k\rangle$ (we will discuss how to prepare $|k\rangle$ later). That is we assign K registers for $|\ell_k\rangle$, then we do control state preparation. If the control register is $|k\rangle$, we prepare $\alpha_{\ell_1}|\ell_1\rangle, \alpha_{\ell_2}|\ell_2\rangle, \ldots, \alpha_{\ell_k}|\ell_k\rangle$ for only the first k registers, while keeping the rest of them unchanged. The normalizing constant $\mathcal{N}_1$ is then

$$\mathcal{N}_1(t) = \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \alpha_\ell^2(t)\right)^{k/2} \leq (2\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}})^{k/2} \leq 2^{k/2}, \tag{258}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}} = O(1)$. The gate complexity for preparing each of $\alpha_{\ell_1}|\ell_1\rangle, \alpha_{\ell_2}|\ell_2\rangle, \ldots, \alpha_{\ell_k}|\ell_k\rangle$ is $O(m)$, since k can be as large as K, the total time complexity for preparing the third register is $O(Km)$.

For the second register of Eq. (240), we aim to prepare the state

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_2(t)} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{0 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_k \leq q} \sqrt{\frac{(2\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}})^k t^k}{q^k}} |k\rangle |j_1, \ldots, j_k\rangle. \tag{259}$$

We add $(2\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}})^k$ term to absorb the normalizing constant $\mathcal{N}_1(t)$ in our previous step. The normalizing constant $\mathcal{N}_2(t)$ is

$$\mathcal{N}_2(t) = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{0 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_k \leq q} \frac{(2\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}})^k t^k}{q^k}} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{q^k}{k!} \frac{(2\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}})^k t^k}{q^k}} \leq e^{t\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}}} \leq e^t. \tag{260}$$

For $t = O(1)$, the normalizing constant will be a constant, so the number of steps in the amplitude amplification is $O(1)$. As in [29], there are two methods to prepare Eq. (259). In the next subsection, we present the method based on a compressed encoding scheme, and in Appendix D.2, we present the method based on quantum sorting.

D.1 State preparation by compressed encoding scheme

We first initialize q qubits to $|0\rangle^{\otimes q}$, then we rotate each qubits by a small angle, to give

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{|0\rangle + \sqrt{\zeta}|1\rangle}{\sqrt{1+\zeta}}\right)^{\otimes q} &= (1+\zeta)^{-q/2} \sum_x \zeta^{|x|/2}|x\rangle \\ &= (1+\zeta)^{-q/2} \sum_{x,|x|\leq K} \zeta^{|x|/2}|x\rangle + (1+\zeta)^{-q/2} \sum_{x,|x|>K} \zeta^{|x|/2}|x\rangle \\ &= \sqrt{1-\mu^2}|\mathtt{time}\rangle + \nu|\nu\rangle,\end{aligned} \tag{261}$$

where $\zeta := \frac{2\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{be}} t}{q}$, and

$$|\mathtt{time}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{S}} \sum_{|x|\leq K} \zeta^{|x|/2}|x\rangle. \tag{262}$$

The amplitude ν satisfies

$$\nu^2 = (1+\zeta)^{-q} \sum_{x,|x|>K} \zeta^{|x|} = O\left(\frac{(2\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}} t)^{K+1}}{(K+1)!}\right). \tag{263}$$

For $t\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{\mathrm{be}} = O(1)$, by setting $K = O\left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon)}{\log\log(1/\epsilon)}\right)$, we can get $\nu^2 = O(\epsilon)$. Then we compress each string x. For a string $x = 0^{s_1}10^{s_2}10^{s_3}\cdots 0^{s_k}10^t$, we represent it with $s_1 s_2 \dots s_k$. We define the encoding operator C_q^K as

$$C_q^K|x\rangle := |s_1, \dots, s_k, q, \dots, q\rangle. \tag{264}$$

By applying encoding operator C_q^K to [261], we get

$$|\Xi_q^K\rangle = \sqrt{1-\mu^2}C_q^K|\mathtt{time}\rangle + \nu|\nu'\rangle, \tag{265}$$

where $|\nu'\rangle$ is defined as

$$|\nu'\rangle = C_q^K|\nu\rangle. \tag{266}$$

But this only gives the interval between different time. We still need to compute the absolute time and the Hamming weight for each string x. We first count the number times q appears to determine k, which has complexity $O(K\log q)$. Then we increment registers 2 to k to give $|s_1, s_2+1, \dots, s_k+1, q, \dots, q\rangle|k\rangle$. Note that, here our k takes unary form. Then we add register 1 to register 2, register 2 to register 3, and so on to give $|j_1, \dots, j_k, q, \dots, q\rangle|k\rangle$.

However, in practice, we can't construct encoding operator C_q^K by really "counting" 0's in state (262). The detailed construction follows from [30]. The idea is that we first prepare a state

$$|\phi_p\rangle = \sum_{s=0}^{p-1}\beta\alpha^s|s\rangle + \alpha^p|p\rangle, \tag{267}$$

where $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{1+\zeta}$ and $\beta = \sqrt{\zeta}\alpha$. We choose p to be

$$\log p = \Theta(\log M + \log\log(1/\delta)). \tag{268}$$

Taking a tensor product of $K+1$ of the state $|\phi_p\rangle$ gives a state similar to $|\Xi_q^K\rangle$.

According to [29], to prepare the above state within trace distance $O(\epsilon)$, the total gate complexity for preparing $|\mu\rangle$ is

$$O(K(m + \log q + \log\log(1/\epsilon))). \tag{269}$$

Note that the total gate complexity for preparing

$$\sum_{\hat{j}}|\hat{j}\rangle\langle\hat{j}| \otimes U_{A_{\hat{j}}} \tag{270}$$

is

$$O(KK'(\log M + \log K' + n)). \tag{271}$$

So the total gate complexity for simulating (234) is

$$O(KK'(\log M + \log q + m + n + \log\log(1/\epsilon))). \tag{272}$$

And the total query complexity is

$$O(KK'). \tag{273}$$

To make our error to be within ϵ, also by our analysis in the main text, it suffices to take

$$K = \frac{\log(1/\epsilon)}{\log\log(1/\epsilon)}, \tag{274}$$

$$q = \Theta\left(\frac{2K}{\epsilon}\left(4J_{\max} + 2\sum_{j=1}^{m}\dot{L}_{j,\max}\right)\right), \tag{275}$$

$$K' = \frac{\log(1/\epsilon)}{\log\log(1/\epsilon)}, \tag{276}$$

$$M = \Theta\left(\frac{\dot{J}_{\max}}{\epsilon}\right). \tag{277}$$

By substituting these back, we can rewrite the total gate complexity as

$$O\left(\left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon)}{\log\log(1/\epsilon)}\right)^2 \cdot (m + n + \log(1/\epsilon))\right). \tag{278}$$

D.2 State Preparation by Quantum Sort

We use the scheme in [29] to sort the time index. For quantum sort scheme, we use Eq. (227) to simulate our target operator. Now we define A_j as

$$A_j = \sqrt{\frac{t^k}{k!q^k}} A_{l_k,\dots,l_1}(\frac{j_k t}{q}, \dots, \frac{j_1 t}{q}). \tag{279}$$

Then we use quantum sort scheme to prepare $|\mu\rangle$, such that

$$|\mu\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k=1}^{m} \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_k=0}^{q} \sqrt{\frac{t^k}{q^k}} s_{\hat{j}} |k\rangle |\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k\rangle \mathrm{SORT}|j_1,\dots,j_k\rangle. \tag{280}$$

Here SORT operator is defined as

$$\mathrm{SORT}|\tau_1,\dots,\tau_k\rangle = |s_1,\dots,s_k\rangle, \tag{281}$$

such that $s_1 \le s_2 \le \dots \le s_k$. To discuss the details for preparing $|\mu\rangle$, first we need to prepare

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}} \sum_{\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k=1}^{m} \alpha_{\ell_k}\alpha_{\ell_{k-1}}\cdots\alpha_{\ell_1}|\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k\rangle. \tag{282}$$

The state preparation process is the same as in Compression Scheme. Its gate complexity is $O(Km)$. For the rest of them, we first prepare a superposition over k in unary form

$$|0\rangle^{\otimes K} \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \sum_{k=0}^{K} \sqrt{\frac{t^k}{k!}} |1^k 0^{K-k}\rangle. \tag{283}$$

Then we do control rotation to K subregisters, that is we do the following

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \sum_{k=0}^{K} \sqrt{\frac{t^k}{k!}} |1^k 0^{K-k}\rangle |0\rangle \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \sum_{k=0}^{K} \sqrt{\frac{t^k}{q^k k!}} |1^k 0^{K-k}\rangle \sum_{j_1=0}^{q-1} \sum_{j_2=0}^{q-1} \cdots \sum_{j_k=0}^{q-1} |j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_k\rangle. \tag{284}$$

The gate complexity for the above operation is $O(K \log q)$. Then we apply SORT to $|j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_k\rangle$ as in [29]. We use a sequence of comparison operation COMPARE which acts on two multi-qubit registers storing the values q_1 and q_2 and an ancillary qubit initialized to $|0\rangle$

$$\text{COMPARE}|q_1\rangle|q_2\rangle|0\rangle = |q_1\rangle|q_2\rangle|\theta(q_1 - q_2)\rangle, \tag{285}$$

where θ is the Heaviside step function ($\theta(0) = 0$). Then we apply a SWAP gate to $|q_1\rangle$ and $|q_2\rangle$ controlled by our ancillary qubit. Then the overall effect is, if $q_1 \leq q_2$, we do nothing; otherwise, we swap the first two registers. Then we apply such sorting network to all registers $|j_1\rangle, \ldots, |j_k\rangle$ and by certain sorting algorithm, we make $j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \cdots \leq j_k$. We also swap qubits in register $|k\rangle$ to keep their correspondence. Readers may refer to [30] for an example of a sorting circuit.

The gate complexity for quantum sort network is $O(K \log K)$. So the total gate complexity for preparing μ is $O(K(\log q + \log K + m))$. Since we take $K = O\left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon)}{\log\log(1/\epsilon)}\right)$, the gate complexity is the same as the compressed encoding scheme.