

# Quantum Metropolis Sampling via Weak Measurement

Jiaqing Jiang <sup>\*1</sup> and Sandy Irani <sup>†2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computing and Mathematical Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA

<sup>2</sup>Computer Science Department, University of California, Irvine, CA, USA

## Abstract

Gibbs sampling is a crucial computational technique used in physics, statistics, and many other scientific fields. For classical Hamiltonians, the most commonly used Gibbs sampler is the Metropolis algorithm, known for having the Gibbs state as its unique fixed point. For quantum Hamiltonians, designing provably correct Gibbs samplers has been more challenging. [TOV<sup>+</sup>11] introduced a novel method that uses quantum phase estimation (QPE) and the Marriot-Watrous rewinding technique to mimic the classical Metropolis algorithm for quantum Hamiltonians. The analysis of their algorithm relies upon the use of a boosted and shift-invariant version of QPE which may not exist [CKBG23]. Recent efforts to design quantum Gibbs samplers take a very different approach and are based on simulating Davies generators [CKBG23, CKG23, RWW23, DLL24]. Currently, these are the only provably correct Gibbs samplers for quantum Hamiltonians.

We revisit the inspiration for the Metropolis-style algorithm of [TOV<sup>+</sup>11] and incorporate weak measurement to design a conceptually simple and provably correct quantum Gibbs sampler, with the Gibbs state as its approximate unique fixed point. Our method uses a Boosted QPE which takes the median of multiple runs of QPE, but we do not require the shift-invariant property. In addition, we do not use the Marriott-Watrous rewinding technique which simplifies the algorithm significantly.

arXiv:2406.16023v1 [quant-ph] 23 Jun 2024

---

\*jiaqingjiang95@gmail.com

†irani@ics.uci.edu

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Overview</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Algorithm Overview . . . . .	4
2.2	Informal Statement of Results . . . . .	6
2.3	Overview of Techniques . . . . .	7
2.4	Related Work . . . . .	9
2.5	Conclusions and Future Work . . . . .	9
2.6	Structure of the manuscript . . . . .	10
<b>3</b>	<b>Preliminary and Settings</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1	Gibbs states and Assumptions . . . . .	10
3.2	Notations and Norms. . . . .	10
<b>4</b>	<b>Quantum Metropolis Algorithm in More Detail</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Main Theorems and the Effective Quantum Markov Chain</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1	Definition of Operators for the Three Cases . . . . .	14
5.2	Operator for the ACCEPT Case . . . . .	15
5.3	Operator for the ALTACCEPT Case . . . . .	15
5.4	Operator for the REJECT Case . . . . .	16
5.5	The Definition of Operator $\mathcal{L}_C$ and $\mathcal{L}$ . . . . .	16
<b>6</b>	<b>Uniqueness of the Fixed Point</b>	<b>17</b>
6.1	Lindbladian form of $\mathcal{L}$ . . . . .	17
6.2	Uniqueness of the Fixed Point . . . . .	18
<b>7</b>	<b>Gibbs States as Approximate Fixed Point</b>	<b>19</b>
7.1	Truncated Energy and Truncated Gibbs States . . . . .	19
7.2	Projected <b>BQPE</b> . . . . .	20
7.3	Projected Operators . . . . .	21
7.4	Explicit Expressions for Operators in the Accept and Reject Cases . . . . .	22
7.5	Uniform Error . . . . .	23
7.6	Gibbs state as Approximate Fixed Point . . . . .	26
<b>8</b>	<b>Proofs of Theorem 4 and Theorem 6</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Acknowledgement</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>More Details on Quantum Phase Estimation</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Matrix Norm Properties</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Bounding Mixing time w.r.t. spectral gap of <math>\mathcal{L}^{(s)}</math></b>	<b>31</b>
C.1	Properties on $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$ . . . . .	32
C.2	Proof of Theorem 7 . . . . .	33

# 1 Introduction

One of the primary motivations for building quantum computers is to simulate quantum many-body systems. While there has been significant progress in simulating quantum dynamics [BCC<sup>+</sup>14, BCK15, CW16], much less is known about preparing ground states and Gibbs states, an essential task in understanding the static properties of a system. In particular, the properties of Gibbs states, which describe the thermal equilibrium of a system at finite temperature, are closely related to central topics in condensed matter physics and quantum chemistry [Alh23], such as the electronic binding energy and phase diagrams. In addition to applications in physics, Gibbs states are widely used as generative machine learning models, such as classical and quantum Boltzmann machines [HS83, AAR<sup>+</sup>18]. Algorithms for preparing Gibbs states are also used as subroutines in other applications, such as solving semidefinite programs [BKL<sup>+</sup>19, VAGGdW17].

Typically, a good Gibbs state preparation algorithm (Gibbs sampler) should satisfy two requirements: it should have the Gibbs state as its (*unique*) *fixed point* and it should be *rapidly mixing*. The fixed point property ensures the *correctness* of the Gibbs sampler. An algorithm that keeps the Gibbs states invariant and shrinks any other state will eventually converge to the Gibbs states after a sufficiently long time. Our algorithm satisfies an approximate version of the fixed point property. The mixing time determines the *efficiency* of the algorithm. In particular, an algorithm is said to be fast mixing if it converges to Gibbs state in *poly*( $n$ ) time.

The focus of this manuscript is the correctness part, that is, designing a Gibbs sampler which satisfies the fixed point property. For classical Hamiltonians, like the Ising model, the fixed point property is easily satisfied by the celebrated Metropolis algorithm [MRR<sup>+</sup>53] which has become one of the most widely used algorithms throughout science. For quantum Hamiltonians, designing an algorithm which provably converges to the Gibbs state has been more challenging. As noticed in the pioneering work of [TOV<sup>+</sup>11] ten years ago, designing a Metropolis-type algorithm for quantum Hamiltonians is non-trivial, mainly due to two reasons:

- (1) Quantum computers with finite resources cannot distinguish eigenvalues and eigenstates with infinite precision.
- (2) Mimicking the rejection process in quantum Metropolis requires reverting a quantum measurement.

[TOV<sup>+</sup>11] eased the first challenge using a boosted version of QPE which sharpens the accuracy by taking the median of multiple runs. They addressed the second challenge using the Marriott-Watrous rewinding technique along with a shift-invariant version of QPE in the case of a rejected move. As a result, their analysis depends on a version of QPE that is both boosted and shift-invariant. Recent work [CKBG23] suggests a version of QPE with both of those properties may be impossible. While [TOV<sup>+</sup>11] provides many innovative ideas, a provably correct quantum Gibbs sampler remained elusive for some time. Recently, Chen *et.al.* [CKBG23] designed the first Gibbs sampler which provably satisfies the fixed point property for general Hamiltonians based on a significantly different approach. Their method is based on simulating quantum master equations (Lindbladians) which more closely mimics the way that systems thermalize in nature. Their algorithm approximately simulates the Davies generator [Dav76, Dav79], which describes the evolution of quantum systems coupled to a large heat bath in the weak coupling limit. It is worth mentioning that the Davies generator by itself also assumes the ability to distinguish eigenvalues with infinite precision, and thus cannot be efficiently simulated by quantum computers. To resolve this problem, [CKBG23] devised a method to smooth the Davies' generator by using a weighted operator Fourier Transform for Lindbladians.

Although [CKBG23] provides a provably correct quantum Gibbs sampler by simulating the thermalization process occurring in nature, it is natural to ask whether a Metropolis-style quantum Gibbs sampler can be designed. Are there intrinsic reasons why an algorithm based on the classical Metropolis process cannot work for quantum Hamiltonians? Or on the other hand,

Is it possible to design a provably correct quantum Gibbs sampler, which is analogous to the conceptually simple classical Metropolis algorithm?

In this manuscript, we give an affirmative answer to the above question, by designing a simple Metropolis-style Gibbs sampler. Our algorithm uses many of the components of [TOV<sup>+</sup>11], but there are some key differences: (1) We use *weak measurement* in determining whether to accept or

reject a given move. (2) We use a Boosted QPE and do not assume the shift-invariant property. (3) We do not use Marriott-Watrous Rewinding technique [MW05], which simplifies the algorithm considerably.

For (3), more precisely, recall that the mechanism that [TOV<sup>+</sup>11] uses to back up in a reject case requires a  $\text{poly}(n)$  sequence of forward and backward unitaries and complex measurements until the backing up process succeeds. In comparison, we use only *one single-qubit measurement* and *one unitary* for rewinding. This simplification is achieved by noticing that after one round of unsuccessful rewinding, the state is almost equivalent to the state in the accept case. This allows us to accept and conclude the iteration in one step instead of attempting to rewind again. We call this case an *Alternate Accept*. This observation is an essential feature of our analysis, since we would still need to perform Marriott-Watrous rewinding without the Alternate Accept case, even with the weak measurement. One remark is that while weak measurement helps in rewinding, it comes at the expense of increasing the number of iterations by a polynomial factor. Also, while our algorithm is simple, it does not have the most favorable scaling as a function of the system parameters and desired precision.

We note that weak measurement is also one of the reasons why the approaches based on the Davies generator succeed, since simulating a Lindbladian requires the use of weak measurement. Our algorithm also effectively approximates the evolution of a Lindbladian. In this sense our algorithm is conceptually similar to [CKG23]. The key difference is that our Gibbs sampler is directly designed from QPE instead of a Davies generator.

## 2 Overview

### 2.1 Algorithm Overview

Given a local Hamiltonian  $H$  and an inverse temperature  $\beta$ , the goal is to design a quantum algorithm which prepares the Gibbs states  $\rho_\beta = \exp(-\beta H)/Z$ , where  $Z = \text{tr}(\exp(-\beta H))$ .

Our quantum algorithm attempts to mimic the classical Metropolis algorithm similar to [TOV<sup>+</sup>11]. Recall that the classical Metropolis algorithm is a random walk whose states are eigenstates of a classical Hamiltonian. In each iteration, the algorithm starts in some state  $x$  with energy  $\nu_x$ . A jump operator is applied to alter  $x$  in some way to obtain a new state  $y$  with energy  $\nu_y$ . Then a randomized decision is made whether to ACCEPT the move and remain in state  $y$ , or REJECT the move and revert back to  $x$ . The acceptance probability is defined by a function  $f_{\nu_x\nu_y} \in [0, 1]$ . The Metropolis acceptance rule is designed so that the random walk converges to the Gibbs state. In particular, the rule must satisfy

$$\exp(-\beta\nu_x)f_{\nu_x\nu_y} = \exp(-\beta\nu_y)f_{\nu_y\nu_x}.$$

Metropolis sampling uses the following function  $f$ :

$$f_{\nu_x\nu_y} := \min\{1, \exp(\beta\nu_x - \beta\nu_y)\}.$$

The main obstacle in adapting the classical Metropolis algorithm to the quantum setting, is that a measurement must be performed in deciding whether to accept or reject. Then in the REJECT case, one needs to rewind back to the state before the move, thus reverting a quantum measurement, which is hard. The algorithm presented here manages this difficulty effectively by using weak measurement in determining whether to ACCEPT or REJECT. It is worth noting that, in contrast to the classical case where we can compute the energy  $\nu_x$  exactly, there are intrinsic limitations on our ability for estimating energies of quantum states (due to the energy-time uncertainty principle). Analyzing the errors incurred by imperfect quantum energy estimation is non-trivial, and is one of the most technical parts in all related works [CKBG23, CKG23, WT23, TOV<sup>+</sup>11]. We will explain more in the overview of techniques section.

The quantum algorithm uses four registers. The first is an  $n$ -qubit register which stores the current state of the algorithm. The next two each have  $gr$  qubits for integers  $g, r$  and are used to store the output of an application of the Boosted Quantum Phase Estimation (**BQPE**) algorithm, which provides an estimate of the state's eigenvalue. The last register is a single qubit register which controls whether we accept or reject the new state.

The algorithm uses three different operations outlined below. Let  $H$  be an  $n$ -qubit local Hamiltonian. We use  $\{|\psi_j\rangle, E_j\}_j$  to denote an ortho-normal eigenbasis of  $H$  and their corresponding eigenvalues.

**Boosted Quantum Phase Estimation (BQPE):** **BQPE** is a unitary on two registers of  $n$  and  $gr$  qubits respectively. If **BQPE** starts with an eigenstate of  $H$  in the first register and the second register is initialized to  $g$  copies of  $|0^r\rangle$ , then **BQPE** corresponds to performing  $g$  independent iterations of the standard Quantum Phase Estimation with respect to the first register and storing the result in each copy of  $|0^r\rangle$ . This process leaves the first register unchanged and outputs  $g$  independent estimates of  $E_j$  in the second register. Each  $r$ -bit string  $\mathbf{b}$  in the second register represents an energy  $E(\mathbf{b})$  defined as:

$$E(\mathbf{b}) := \kappa_H \sum_{j=1}^r b_j 2^{-j}. \quad (1)$$

where  $\kappa_H$  is a power of two that upper bounds  $\|H\|$ . The set  $S(r) := \{E(\mathbf{b})\}_{\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^r}$  is the set of energies that can be represented by  $r$ -bit strings, which are integer multiples of  $\kappa_H \cdot 2^{-r}$ . To ease notation, we use notation  $|E\rangle$  for  $E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}$  as the basis of the second register, instead of using strings in  $\{0,1\}^{rg}$ . Thus, **BQPE** operates as:

$$\mathbf{BQPE} |\psi_j\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle = |\psi_j\rangle \sum_{E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE} |E\rangle \quad (2)$$

The cost of **BQPE** is  $g \cdot \text{poly}(2^r, n)$ .

We write  $\bar{E}$  as the median of the  $g$  energy estimates in  $E$ . We denote  $\lfloor E_j \rfloor, \lceil E_j \rceil$  as the best two approximations of  $E_j$  in  $S(r)$ , that is the closet value to  $E_j$  which is an integer multiples of  $\kappa_H \cdot 2^{-r}$  and is smaller/greater than  $E_j$  respectively. More details on **BQPE** are given in Appendix A.

We also use a variant of **BQPE**, which we call **FBQPE** (Flipped Boosted Quantum Phase Estimation), where the amplitudes of the output of **FBQPE** are the complex conjugates of **BQPE**:

$$\mathbf{FBQPE} |\psi_j\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle = |\psi_j\rangle \sum_{E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE}^* |E\rangle.$$

The implementation of **FBQPE** is a slight modification of **BQPE** and is given in Appendix A. It is worth noting that  $\mathbf{FBQPE} \neq \mathbf{BQPE}^\dagger$ .

**Jump operators:** A set of unitaries  $\{C_j\}_j$  called *jump operators* and a distribution  $\mu$  over this set. We require that the set  $\{C_j\}_j$  is closed under adjoint. In addition, for any  $C \in \{C_j\}_j$ , we require that  $\mu$  chooses  $C$  and  $C^\dagger$  with the same probability. We use  $C \leftarrow \mu$  to denote a selection of  $C$  drawn according to distribution  $\mu$ .

To ensure the uniqueness of the fixed point, we also require that the algebra generated by  $\{C_j\}_j$  is equal to the full algebra, that is the set of all  $n$ -qubit operators. For example one can choose  $\{C_j\}_j$  to be all single-qubit Paulis.

**Acceptance Operator ( $W$ ):** Finally, we use a unitary which calculates the acceptance probability based on the two energies stored in registers 2 and 3, scaled by a factor of  $\tau^2$  and rotates the last qubit by the square root of the acceptance probability. More precisely,  $W$  operates on registers 2, 3, and 4 as:

$$W := \sum_{E, E' \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} |EE'\rangle \langle EE'| \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1 - \tau^2 f_{EE'}} & \tau \sqrt{f_{EE'}} \\ \tau \sqrt{f_{EE'}} & -\sqrt{1 - \tau^2 f_{EE'}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

where  $f_{EE'}$  is the Metropolis acceptance rate based on the median of energy estimates:

$$f_{EE'} := \min \{1, \exp(\beta \bar{E} - \beta \bar{E}')\} \quad (4)$$

We can think of  $W$  as computing the median of  $E$  and  $E'$  to get  $\bar{E}$  and  $\bar{E}'$  respectively and then rotating the last qubit by  $f_{EE'}$ . The median operation  $\bar{E}$  is used to boost the energy estimation, suppressing the probability of an incorrect estimate with Chernoff bounds. The operator  $W$  is the same as the one used in [TOV<sup>+</sup>11] with the addition of the slow-down factor of  $\tau^2$ . Note that

$$W |EE'\rangle |0\rangle = |EE'\rangle \left( \sqrt{1 - \tau^2 f_{EE'}} |0\rangle + \tau \sqrt{f_{EE'}} |1\rangle \right) \quad (5)$$

With those components defined, we can now describe an iteration of our algorithm depicted in Figure 1. The Algorithm Sketch below is a high-level overview of the algorithm. The complete pseudo-code is given in Section 4.




Figure 1: One iteration of the algorithm. The operation  $U$  is  $\text{QPE}_{1,3} \circ C \circ \text{QPE}_{1,2}$ . The two measurements are performed on the last qubit only. The  $\blacksquare$  symbol indicates that the last three registers are traced out and replaced by fresh qubits in the  $|0\rangle$  state.

**Algorithm Sketch:** In each iteration, the algorithm chooses one of  $\{\mathbf{BQPE}, \mathbf{FBQPE}\}$  with equal probability. The selected operation is called QPE. A jump operator  $C \leftarrow \mu$  is also selected. We use  $\mathcal{C}$  to denote the random choices for QPE and  $C$  made in a particular iteration. The algorithm starts an iteration with a state  $|\phi\rangle$  in register 1 and all 0's in the other three registers. Then:

- QPE is first applied to the current state, and the estimate of the eigenvalue is stored in register 2. Then the jump operator  $C$  is applied to the state in register 1 to obtain a new state. QPE is then applied to the new state in register 1 and the estimate of its eigenvalue is stored in register 3. We call the sequence of these three operations  $U_{\mathcal{C}} := \text{QPE}_{1,3} \circ C \circ \text{QPE}_{1,2}$ .
- Then  $W$  is applied to registers 2, 3, and 4, and the last qubit is measured to get **OUTCOME1**.
- If **OUTCOME1** = 1, the algorithm accepts the move (Case: **ACCEPT**) and continues.
- If **OUTCOME1** = 0, then  $W^{\dagger}$  is applied and the last qubit is measured again to get **OUTCOME2**.
  - The case in which **OUTCOME2** = 1 represents an alternative way of accepting the move (Case: **ALTAcCEPT**).
  - If **OUTCOME2** is 0, then this represents a rejection of the move (Case: **REJECT**), in which case  $U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger}$  is applied.
- Finally, registers 2, 3, and 4 are traced out and replaced by fresh qubits in all 0's states.

## 2.2 Informal Statement of Results

Let  $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$  be the map corresponding to one iteration of the algorithm. Recall that  $\tau$  is the parameter in the acceptance operator  $W$ , and  $g, r$  are the precision parameters in **BQPE**. Our main result is proving that our algorithm approximately fixes the Gibbs states:

**Theorem 1 (Informal version of theorem 4)**  $\mathcal{E}$  can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{I} + \tau^2 \mathcal{L} + \tau^4 \mathcal{J}.$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is independent of  $\tau$  and approximately fixes the Gibbs state. More precisely for any  $\delta$ , parameters  $g$  and  $r$  can be chosen so that  $g = O(n + \log 1/\delta)$  and  $r = O(\log \beta + \log \kappa_H + \log 1/\delta)$ , and

$$|\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})|_1 \leq \delta.$$

Here  $|\cdot|_1$  refers to the trace norm.

The proof that the fixed point of our algorithm is approximately the Gibbs State depends upon the assumption that  $\mathcal{L}$  is fast mixing, meaning that  $\mathcal{L}$  converges to its fixed point  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$  in  $\text{poly}(n)$  time. More precisely, we can combine the fast mixing property with the fact that  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})|_1 \approx 0$  from Theorem 1 above to establish that the fixed point of  $\mathcal{L}$  is close to the true Gibbs state:  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}} \approx \rho_{\beta}$ . The next step then is to show that starting from an arbitrary state, repeated iterations of our algorithm will result in a good approximation of  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$ . In particular, the second part of Theorem

1, which says that  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{I} + \tau^2\mathcal{L} + \tau^4\mathcal{J}$ , implies that  $\mathcal{E}^K \approx e^{K\tau^2\mathcal{L}}$ , where  $\mathcal{E}^K$  corresponds to  $K$  iterations of the algorithm. The error in the approximation scales as  $K\tau^4$ .  $K$  and  $\tau$  can be chosen so that  $K\tau^2$  is polynomial in  $n$  but the approximation error  $K\tau^4$  is still small. Assuming that  $\mathcal{L}$  is fast mixing, we can conclude that  $e^{K\tau^2\mathcal{L}}$  drives any states to  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$ . This reasoning leads to Theorem 2 below.

**Theorem 2 (Informal version of Theorem 6)** *Suppose the mixing time of  $\mathcal{L}$  is  $\text{poly}(n)$ . Assume  $\beta, \kappa_H \leq \text{poly}(n)$ . For parameters  $\tau = 1/\text{poly}(n)$ ,  $g = O(n)$ ,  $r = O(\log n)$ ,  $K = \text{poly}(n)$ , and for any initial state  $\rho$ , we have*

$$|\mathcal{E}^K(\rho) - \rho_{\beta}|_1 \leq 1/\text{poly}(n). \quad (6)$$

Theorem 2 can also be rephrased in terms of the spectral gap similarly as in the classical Metropolis algorithm. The formal statement is in Corollary 9.

For the above choice of parameters the cost of implementing  $\mathcal{E}^K$  is  $Kg \cdot \text{poly}(2^r, n) = \text{poly}(n)$ , where the  $\text{poly}(2^r, n)$  is mainly the cost of implementing one run of standard Quantum Phase Estimation.

## 2.3 Overview of Techniques

Intuitively our algorithm should approximately fix the Gibbs state, since it mimics the classical Metropolis. The approximation errors come from two resources, one is controlled by the parameter  $\tau$  in the acceptance operator  $W$ , and the other is controlled by the  $g$  and  $r$  in **BQPE**.

Let us begin with the error from  $\tau$ . According to the algorithm,  $\mathcal{E}$  can be expressed as the sum of three operators representing the three cases:  $\mathcal{E}^{(a)}$  (for ACCEPT),  $\mathcal{E}^{(b)}$  for (ALTACCEPT), and  $\mathcal{E}^{(r)}$  (for REJECT). So that  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^{(a)} + \mathcal{E}^{(b)} + \mathcal{E}^{(r)}$ . Each of these can be further expanded to represent their dependence on  $\tau$ . More specifically, in Section 5, we define additional operators,  $\mathcal{M}^{(a)}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}^{(r)}$ ,  $\mathcal{J}^{(b)}$ ,  $\mathcal{J}^{(r)}$ , all with norm bounded by a constant. We show that

$$\text{ACCEPT: } \mathcal{E}^{(a)} = \tau^2\mathcal{M}^{(a)} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{ALTACCEPT: } \mathcal{E}^{(b)} = \tau^2\mathcal{M}^{(a)} + \tau^4\mathcal{J}^{(b)} \quad (8)$$

$$\text{REJECT: } \mathcal{E}^{(r)} = \mathcal{I} - \tau^2\mathcal{M}^{(r)} + \tau^4\mathcal{J}^{(r)} \quad (9)$$

Note that the operators for the ACCEPT and ALTACCEPT cases only differ by an operator on the order of  $\tau^4$ , which means that the state in the ALTACCEPT is very close to the resulting state in the ACCEPT case. By defining  $\mathcal{L} = 2\mathcal{M}^{(a)} - \mathcal{M}^{(r)}$  and  $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}^{(b)} + \mathcal{J}^{(r)}$ , we have that

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{I} + \tau^2\mathcal{L} + \tau^4\mathcal{J}.$$

Most of the technical effort in the proof of Theorem 1 is spent showing that  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})|_1 \approx 0$ . There are two features of **BQPE** that make this fact challenging to prove. The first feature is that **BQPE** cannot be made deterministic. More precisely, recall that  $\lfloor E_j \rfloor$  and  $\lceil E_j \rceil$  are the best two approximations of  $E_j$ . Without additional assumptions on the Hamiltonian, the amplitudes  $\beta_{j\lfloor E_j \rfloor}$  and  $\beta_{j\lceil E_j \rceil}$  are both non-negligible. We use the boosted version of **BQPE** which guarantees that the probability of generating an estimate  $E$  that is different from  $\lfloor E_j \rfloor$  or  $\lceil E_j \rceil$  is negligibly small. However, the fact that the output of **BQPE** will still be a superposition of  $\lfloor E_j \rfloor$  and  $\lceil E_j \rceil$  is unavoidable and makes the process inherently different from a classical random walk. Mathematically, this means that if the algorithm begins in an eigenstate  $|\psi_j\rangle$ , after one iteration, the new state is no longer diagonal in the energy eigenbasis. In particular,  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})$  can have exponentially many non-zero off-diagonal entries when expressed in the energy eigenbasis.

The second feature of **BQPE** that makes the analysis problematic is that there are intrinsic limitations on the precision of energy estimation of quantum states. In particular, the energy/time uncertainty principle suggests that a  $\text{poly}(n)$ -time quantum algorithm (like **BQPE**) can only estimate the energy of a state within  $1/\text{poly}(n)$  precision. This means that the off-diagonal entries of  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})$  can have magnitude on the order of  $1/\text{poly}(n)$ . The fact that  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})$  can have exponentially many off-diagonal entries that have magnitude  $1/\text{poly}(n)$  rules out a brute-force approach to bounding  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})|_1$ .

To illustrate our approach in overcoming these technical difficulties, first imagine instead an ideal version of **BQPE** which deterministically maps every  $|\psi_j\rangle$  to  $\lfloor E_j \rfloor$ . The resulting process has



a fixed point which is a Gibbs state where the probability of each state is proportional to  $e^{-\beta \lfloor E_j \rfloor}$  instead of  $e^{-\beta E_j}$ . Call this truncated fixed point  $\rho_{\beta 0}$ . It's not too hard to show that  $\rho_{\beta 0} \approx \rho_{\beta}$ , which implies  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0}) \approx \mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})$ , so we will focus instead on bounding  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0})|_1$ . For the practically realizable, non-deterministic **BQPE**, our analysis effectively decomposes  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0})$  into a sum of a constant number of terms and bounds the trace norm of each term separately by a  $1/\text{poly}(n)$ . The different terms are derived by inserting different projectors that separate out the cases when **BQPE** maps a state  $|\psi_j\rangle$  to  $\lfloor E_j \rfloor$ ,  $\lceil E_j \rceil$ , or some other  $E$  entirely. We can represent the cases by defining projectors:

$$P^{(0)} = \sum_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j| \otimes \sum_{E: \bar{E} = \lfloor E_j \rfloor} |E\rangle\langle E|$$

$$P^{(1)} = \sum_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j| \otimes \sum_{E: \bar{E} = \lceil E_j \rceil} |E\rangle\langle E|.$$

When the matrix

$$\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0}) = \sum_j \frac{e^{-\beta \lfloor E_j \rfloor}}{Z} \langle \psi_m | \mathcal{L}(|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|) | \psi_n \rangle$$

is written out, there are four applications of phase estimation: **BQPE**<sub>1,2</sub> and **BQPE**<sub>1,3</sub> are applied to  $|\psi_j\rangle$ , and **BQPE**<sub>1,2</sub><sup>†</sup> and **BQPE**<sub>1,3</sub><sup>†</sup> are applied to  $\langle\psi_j|$ . This results in a total of 16 terms depending on which of the two projectors ( $P^{(0)}$  or  $P^{(1)}$ ) is applied after each occurrence of **BQPE**. Recall that  $\mathcal{L} = 2\mathcal{M}^{(a)} - \mathcal{M}^{(r)}$ . In most cases, we don't get exact cancellation between the accept and reject operators because each case may have some multiplicative error of the form  $e^{\pm\beta\delta}$ , where  $\delta = \lceil E_j \rceil - \lfloor E_j \rfloor$  is the precision of **BQPE** (which is independent of  $j$ ). The essential observation is that each separate case results in exactly the same multiplicative error. This is because in each case, all of the **BQPE** estimates are erring in exactly the same direction and by exactly the same amount. We get that  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0})$  can be expressed as a linear combination of terms  $\{N_j\}$ :

$$\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0}) \approx \sum_{j=1}^{16} \text{error}_j \cdot N_j, \quad (10)$$

where  $\text{error}_j = e^{\pm\beta\delta} - 1$  and  $|N_j|_1 = O(1)$ . In the proof we manage to reduce the number of terms from 16 to 6 by carefully clustering terms. Note that the parameters are chosen so that  $e^{\beta\delta} = (1 + 1/\text{poly}(n))$ . Equation (10) is still approximate because we have not yet taken into account the case where **BQPE** maps  $|\psi_j\rangle$  to some value other than  $\lfloor E_j \rfloor$  or  $\lceil E_j \rceil$ . For this case, we have a third projector:

$$P^{(else)} = \sum_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j| \otimes \sum_{E: \bar{E} \neq \lfloor E_j \rfloor, \lceil E_j \rceil} |E\rangle\langle E|.$$

When  $P^{(else)}$  is used, the norm of the resulting operator is exponentially small because of the use of boosted QPE. Specifically, we use the following lemma which is included in Appendix A.

**Lemma 3** *If  $|\psi_j\rangle$  is an eigenstate of  $H$  with energy  $E_j$ , then*

$$\mathbf{BQPE} |\psi_j\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle = |\psi_j\rangle \sum_{E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE} |E\rangle, \quad (11)$$

$$\text{where } \sum_{E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}: \bar{E} \neq \lfloor E_j \rfloor, \lceil E_j \rceil} |\beta_{jE}|^2 \leq 2^{-g/5}. \quad (12)$$

Our proof works for general Hamiltonians and we do not assume non-physical assumptions like rounding promise [WT23]. One more remark is that **BQPE** itself will create some biased phase in the resulting states. In our algorithm, we choose **BQPE** and **FBQPE** randomly to cancel this bias. Finally, the proof of uniqueness of the fixed point, which appears in Section 6.2, is standard, and is based on showing that  $\mathcal{L}$  is of Lindbladian form, and that the generators of the Lindbladian generate the full algebra of operators on the  $n$ -qubit Hilbert space.



## 2.4 Related Work

We have recently become aware of the concurrent, independent work of [GCDK24], which also provides a quantum generalization of Glauber/Metropolis dynamics. In contrast with our algorithm, their method does not use QPE. Instead, they construct a quantum extension of discrete and continuous-time Glauber/Metropolis dynamics, in the style of a smoothed Davies generator [CKBG23, CKG23]. They show that their construction exactly fixes the Gibbs states and can be efficiently implemented on a quantum computer. For the continuous-time case, their implementation is achieved by Lindbladian simulation [CKBG23]. For the discrete-time case, they use oblivious amplitude amplification [GSLW19] in combination with techniques based on linear combinations of unitaries and the quantum singular value transform.

Before the appearance of [CKBG23], there were many previous results on simulating Davies generators, with additional assumptions on the Hamiltonian. As mentioned before, Davies generators cannot be implemented exactly since they require the ability to estimate eigenvalues perfectly, which is impossible with quantum computers with finite resources. [WT23] circumvents this problem by assuming a rounding promise on the Hamiltonian, which disallows eigenvalues from certain sub-intervals. [RWW23] later eliminates the rounding promise by using randomized rounding, which at the same time incurs an additional resource overhead. More recently, [CKG23] designed a weighted version of Davies generator which exactly fixes the Gibbs states (before truncating the infinite integral to a finite region). [DLL24] introduces a family of quantum Gibbs samplers satisfying the Kubo-Martin-Schwinger detailed balance condition, which includes the construction of [CKG23] as a special instance. In addition to approaches based on the Davies generator, there are Grover-based approaches [PW09, CS16], which prepare a purified version of Gibbs states. The performance of those algorithms depends on the overlap between the initial and the target state.

All of the above approaches use either quantum phase estimation or quantum simulation, which involve large quantum circuits. In contrast to those approaches, [ZBC23] designs a dissipative quantum Gibbs sampler with simple local update rules. [ZBC23] differs from the ordinary Gibbs samplers in that the Gibbs state is not generated as the fixed point of the Markov Chain, but is generated on a conditionally stopped process.

All the above work is focused on satisfying the fixed point requirement. A different but important task is to bound the mixing time, which is wide open with the exception of a few special cases. In particular, [KB16] shows that for a commuting Hamiltonian on a lattice, there is an equivalence between very rapid mixing (more precisely, constant spectral gap of the Lindbladian) and a certain strong form of clustering of correlations in the Gibbs state, which generalizes the classical result [SZ92a, SZ92b] to the quantum setting. [BCG<sup>+</sup>23] proves fast mixing for 1D commuting Hamiltonian at any temperature. Recently [RFA24, BLMT24] prove fast mixing for non-commuting Hamiltonian at high temperature.

There are also many heuristic methods for preparing Gibbs states. Previous proposals include methods that emulate the physical thermalization process by repeatedly coupling the systems to a thermal bath [TD00, SN16, MMdJS20]. There are also approaches based on quantum imaginary time evolution [MST<sup>+</sup>20] and variational algorithms [WLW21, LZH<sup>+</sup>22, CSG<sup>+</sup>23].

## 2.5 Conclusions and Future Work

In this manuscript, we use weak measurement to design a quantum Gibbs sampler based on the Metropolis algorithm which satisfies the approximate fixed point property. Compared with previous work, the main advantage of our algorithm is its conceptual simplicity. Our algorithm uses a Boosted QPE which takes the median value of multiple independent runs of the standard QPE. We do not require a version of QPE that satisfies shift-invariance. In addition, our algorithm is free of Marriott-Watrous rewinding techniques and only performs single-qubit measurements. Technically, we give a new way of bounding the errors incurred by imperfect energy estimation of QPE, by grouping the error terms into finite classes. Our proof works for general Hamiltonians and we do not assume the rounding promise. It might be interesting to investigate whether this technique can be applied to prove that the existing Gibbs Sampler for Hamiltonians with rounding promise [WT23] in fact works for general Hamiltonians.

While our algorithm is simple, it comes at a cost of not having the most favorable scaling in the parameters of the system and desired precision. In particular, our algorithm effectively corresponds to directly simulating a Lindblad evolution  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  by discretizing  $t$ , where the cost is scaled as  $O(t^2/\epsilon)$  for precision parameter  $\epsilon$ . It is worth noting, however, that our algorithm itself

is designed directly from QPE, and we use  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  only in our analysis, as opposed to first designing the Lindbladian  $\mathcal{L}$  and attempting to simulate it on a quantum computer. It would be interesting to explore how more sophisticated Lindbladian simulation techniques (such as [LW22, CW16, CL16]) could be applied to our algorithmic structure to improve the dependence on parameters. Note that our  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  circumvents the problem of precision in the Davies generator, because the operator  $\mathcal{L}$  is already defined in terms of QPE of finite precision.

Another possible direction for future work is to compare the mixing time of different Gibbs samplers. In particular, it would be interesting to compare, either numerically or theoretically, the spectral gap of the Davies generator, the Davies-generator-inspired Lindbladian in [CKBG23, CKG23], and the Lindbladian  $\mathcal{L}$  in our algorithm. Since our algorithm is similar to the classical Metropolis algorithm, it might also be interesting to explore whether classical techniques for analyzing mixing times can be generalized to the quantum setting.

## 2.6 Structure of the manuscript

The manuscript is structured as follows. In Section 3 we give necessary definitions and notations. In Section 4 we give explicit pseudo-code of our algorithm and express the result of each operation more formally. We state our main results in Theorem 4 and Theorem 6 at the beginning of Section 5.

The proofs of Theorem 4 and Theorem 6 are divided into several sections. Section 5 contains the derivation of the explicit formula for  $\mathcal{L}$ . In Section 6 we show that  $\mathcal{L}$  can be written as a Lindbladian and has a unique fixed point. Section 6 is independent of Section 7 and can be skipped temporarily. In Section 7 we prove  $\mathcal{L}$  approximately fixes the Gibbs state. Finally in Section 8 we prove Theorem 4 and Theorem 6.

## 3 Preliminary and Settings

### 3.1 Gibbs states and Assumptions

For any  $n$ -qubit Hamiltonian  $H$ , we always use  $\{|\psi_j\rangle, E_j\}_j$  to denote an ortho-normal set of (eigenstate, eigenvalue) for  $H$ . We use symbols different from  $|\psi_j\rangle$  to denote other states. For any inverse temperature  $\beta \geq 0$ , we denote the Gibbs state as

$$\rho_\beta(H) := \exp(-\beta H) / \text{tr}(\exp(-\beta H)) \quad (13)$$

$$= \sum_j p_j |\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j|, \quad (14)$$

$$\text{where } p_j := \exp(-\beta E_j) / \text{tr}(\exp(-\beta H)). \quad (15)$$

We assume  $H \geq 0$ , and its spectrum norm is bounded by  $\|H\| \leq \text{poly}(n)$ . Note that one can always add multiples of identity matrices to  $H$  to ensure  $H \geq 0$  and this operation does not change the Gibbs state. To ease notation, we will fix  $H$  and abbreviate  $\rho_\beta(H)$  as  $\rho_\beta$ .

$\kappa_H = \text{poly}(n)$  is a power of two that upper bounds  $\|H\|$ . For example, for local Hamiltonian  $H = \sum_{i=1}^m H_i, \|H_i\| \leq 1$ , one can set  $\kappa_H$  to be the least integer which is a power of two and is greater than  $m$ . Then  $\kappa_H \leq 2m$ .

For simplicity, in this manuscript we assume that we can implement arbitrary 2-qubit gates exactly. Note that this assumption does not influence the generality of our results, since the error analysis can be easily generalized to the practical case where we approximate arbitrary 2-qubit gate to  $1/\text{poly}(n)$  precision, by noticing that the  $l_2$  norm  $\|(U - V)|\psi\rangle\|_2$  is bounded by the spectrum norm  $\|U - V\|$  for any  $|\psi\rangle$ .

### 3.2 Notations and Norms.

We use  $\log$  for  $\log_2$ . For a complex value  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ , we use  $a^*$  to represent its complex conjugate. For two numbers  $x, y$ , we use  $\delta_{xy}$  to denote the function which equals to 1 if  $x = y$  and 0 otherwise. For a matrix  $M$ , we use  $M^\dagger$  to denote its complex conjugate transpose. For two matrices  $M, N$ , we use  $\{M, N\}_+$  to denote their anti-commutator:  $MN + NM$ . We use  $\|M\|$  to denote the spectrum norm of  $M$ . For a vector  $|\phi\rangle$  we use  $\| |\phi\rangle \|_2$  to denote the  $l_2$  norm.  $|\phi\rangle$  can be normalized or

unnormalized. When it is necessary, we will use number subscripts to denote the name of the quantum registers. For example,  $|\phi\rangle_1$  means the state is in register 1.

We use  $\Xi(m)$  to denote the set of linear operators on an  $m$ -qubit Hilbert space. We use  $\mathcal{H}(m)$  to denote the set of *Hermitian* linear operators on an  $m$ -qubit Hilbert space. We say  $\rho \in \mathcal{H}(m)$  is an  $m$ -qubit quantum state if  $\rho \geq 0, \rho = \rho^\dagger$  and  $\text{tr}(\rho) = 1$ . We use  $I_m$  to denote the identity matrix on  $m$  qubits. When  $m$  is clear we abbreviate  $I_m$  as  $I$ . Given a set of linear operators  $S = \{M_1, M_2, \dots\} \subseteq \Xi(m)$ , the algebra generated by  $S$  is the set of linear operators which is a finite sum  $\sum_k \alpha_k P_k$ , where  $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $P_k$  is a product of finite operators in  $S$ .

We use symbols  $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F} \dots$  to represent linear maps from  $\Xi(m)$  to  $\Xi(m)$ . We use  $\mathcal{I}$  to denote the identity map. We say a linear map  $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{H}(m) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(m)$  is Completely Positive and Trace Preserving (CPTP) if there exists a set of linear operators  $\{A_u\}_u$  such that  $\forall M \in \mathcal{H}(m), \mathcal{E}(M) = \sum_u A_u M A_u^\dagger$ , where  $\sum_u A_u^\dagger A_u = I$ .

The trace norm of  $M \in \mathcal{H}(m)$  is defined to be  $|M|_1 := \text{tr}(\sqrt{M^\dagger M})$ . The trace norm induces a norm on linear maps  $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{H}(m) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(m)$ , which quantifies how much  $\mathcal{R}$  can scale the trace norm:

$$|\mathcal{R}|_\star := \max_{M \in \mathcal{H}(m); |M|_1=1} |\mathcal{R}(M)|_1. \quad (16)$$

## 4 Quantum Metropolis Algorithm in More Detail

The algorithm takes in seven input parameters:

- An  $n$ -qubit local Hamiltonian  $H$ .
- Inverse temperature  $\beta$ .
- $\tau$ , which is a small  $1/\text{poly}(n)$  real value that controls the weak measurement.
- $K \in \mathbb{N}$ , which is the number of iterations in the main loop.
- $\rho$ , which is an arbitrary initial state.
- $r, g \in \mathbb{N}$ , which controls the precision of QPE.

The jump operators  $\{C_j\}_j$ , the acceptance operator  $W$ , and the Boosted Quantum Phase Estimation (**BQPE**, **FBQPE**) are described in Section 2.1. For QPE  $\in \{\mathbf{BQPE}, \mathbf{FBQPE}\}$ , we use QPE<sub>a,b</sub> for applying QPE on register  $a, b$  of  $n$  and  $gr$  qubits respectively.

The pseudo-code for the main algorithm is given in Algorithm 1. All measurements are done in the computational basis. The outline of each iteration is given in Figure 1.

To illustrate the result of each step of the algorithm, we give explicit formulas for the contents of the registers throughout one iteration. Assume that the version of QPE chosen is **BQPE**. Let  $C$  be the chosen jump operator, which can be expressed in the energy eigenbasis of  $H$  as:

$$C |\psi_j\rangle = \sum_k c_{jk} |\psi_k\rangle. \quad (17)$$

Assume we begin with the state  $|\psi_j\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle |0\rangle$ , where  $|\psi_j\rangle$  is an eigenstate of  $H$ . Recall that:

$$\mathbf{BQPE} |\psi_j\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle = |\psi_j\rangle \sum_{E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE} |E\rangle.$$

Then:

$$\mathbf{BQPE}_{1,2} |\psi_j\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle |0\rangle = \sum_{E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE} |\psi_j\rangle |E\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle |0\rangle, \quad (18)$$

$$C \cdot \mathbf{BQPE}_{1,2} |\psi_j\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle |0\rangle = \sum_{k; E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE} \cdot c_{jk} |\psi_k\rangle |E\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle |0\rangle, \quad (19)$$

$$\mathbf{BQPE}_{1,3} \cdot C \cdot \mathbf{BQPE}_{1,2} |\psi_j\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle |0\rangle = \sum_{k; E, E' \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE} \cdot c_{jk} \cdot \beta_{kE'} |\psi_k\rangle |E\rangle |E'\rangle |0\rangle, \quad (20)$$

---

**Algorithm 1** QMetropolis( $H, \beta, \tau, K, \rho, r, g$ )

---

```
1: Initialize Register 1 to  $\rho$ . ▷ For example one can set  $\rho = |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|$ 
2: for  $iter = 1$  to  $K$  do
3:   QPE  $\leftarrow \{\mathbf{BQPE}, \mathbf{FBQPE}\}$  (with equal probability.)
4:   Sample  $C \leftarrow \mu$ ,
5:   Append (fresh) Registers 2, 3, 4 in state  $|0^{gr}\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle |0\rangle$ ,
6:   Define  $U := \text{QPE}_{1,3} \circ C \circ \text{QPE}_{1,2}$ .
7:   Apply  $U$ , then apply  $W$ 
8:   Measure register 4 to get OUTCOME1
9:   if (OUTCOME1 = 1) then
10:    Case ACCEPT: do nothing.
11:   else (OUTCOME1 = 0)
12:    Apply  $(W^\dagger)$ , and measure register 4 to get OUTCOME2.
13:    if (OUTCOME2 = 1) then
14:     Case ALTAACCEPT: do nothing.
15:    else (OUTCOME2 = 0)
16:     Case REJECT: Apply  $U^\dagger$ 
17:    end if
18:   end if
19:   Trace out (throw away) registers 2, 3, 4.
20: end for
```

---

Finally, when  $W$  is applied, the result is

$$\sum_{k; E, E' \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE} \cdot c_{jk} \cdot \beta_{kE'} |\psi_k\rangle |E\rangle |E'\rangle (\sqrt{1 - \tau^2 f_{EE'}} |0\rangle + \tau \sqrt{f_{EE'}} |1\rangle) \quad (21)$$

Note that if **FBQPE** is chosen instead of **BQPE**, the result is:

$$\sum_{k; E, E' \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE}^* \cdot c_{jk} \cdot \beta_{kE'}^* |\psi_k\rangle |E\rangle |E'\rangle (\sqrt{1 - \tau^2 f_{EE'}} |0\rangle + \tau \sqrt{f_{EE'}} |1\rangle) \quad (22)$$

Then for the state in Eq. (21) we measure register 4 in computational basis. If we get measurement outcome 1, the (unnormalized) state becomes

$$\sum_{k; E, E' \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \tau \sqrt{f_{EE'}} \beta_{jE} \cdot c_{jk} \cdot \beta_{kE'} |\psi_k\rangle |E\rangle |E'\rangle |1\rangle. \quad (23)$$

## 5 Main Theorems and the Effective Quantum Markov Chain

In this section, we state formal versions of the main theorems that we will prove about the performance of Algorithm 1. Note that each iteration in Algorithm 1 corresponds to a quantum channel which maps  $n$ -qubit states to  $n$ -qubit states. We denote this quantum channel as  $\mathcal{E}[\tau]$ . We will expand  $\mathcal{E}[\tau]$  as power series of  $\tau$ . The performance of Algorithm 1 can be analyzed by studying the term of order  $\sim \tau^2$ , which is  $\mathcal{L}$  defined below. To ease notation, define

$$r_{\beta H} := 1 + \log \kappa_H + \log \beta. \quad (24)$$

**Theorem 4** For any  $n$ -qubit state  $\rho$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}[\tau](\rho) = (\mathcal{I} + \tau^2 \mathcal{L} + \tau^4 \mathcal{J}[\tau]) (\rho). \quad (25)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{J}[\tau] : \mathcal{H}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(n)$  are linear maps on operators.  $\mathcal{L}$  is independent of  $\tau$ . Assuming  $r \geq r_{\beta H}$  we have

- (**Fixed point**)  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_\beta)|_1 \leq 2^{-g/10+2n+4} + 40\beta \cdot \kappa_H \cdot 2^{-r}$ .
- (**Error terms**)  $|\mathcal{J}[\tau]|_* \leq 4$ .

- **(Uniqueness and Relaxation)** There is a unique  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$ . Besides,  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$  is a full-rank quantum state and for any quantum state  $\rho$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho) = \rho_{\mathcal{L}}. \quad (26)$$

To make  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})|_1 \leq \delta$  parameters  $g$  and  $r$  are chosen so that  $g = O(n + \log 1/\delta)$  and  $r = O(\log \beta + \log \kappa_H + \log 1/\delta)$ . The constant in the bound of  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})|_1$  might be improved by a finer analysis. To ease notation, we will abbreviate  $\mathcal{E}[\tau]$  as  $\mathcal{E}$ .

Theorem 4 suggests that Algorithm 1 effectively approximates a continuous-time chain  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  with a step-size of  $\tau^2$ . The divergence between the output of our algorithm and  $\rho_{\beta}$  depends on the mixing time of  $\mathcal{L}$ , which depends on the choice of the jump operators  $\{C_j\}_j$ .

**Definition 5 (Mixing time)** Let  $\epsilon$  be a precision parameter. The mixing time w.r.t  $(\mathcal{L}, \epsilon)$  is defined to be the time needed for driving any initial state  $\epsilon$ -close to its fixed point

$$t_{mix}(\mathcal{L}, \epsilon) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : |e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho) - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}|_1 \leq \epsilon, \text{ for any quantum state } \rho\}. \quad (27)$$

**Theorem 6 (Error bounds w.r.t Mixing time)** Let  $\tau, \epsilon$  be parameters. Assume  $r \geq r_{\beta H}$ . For integer<sup>1</sup>  $K := t_{mix}(\mathcal{L}, \epsilon)/\tau^2$ , we have for any quantum state  $\rho$ ,

$$|\mathcal{E}^K(\rho) - \rho_{\beta}|_1 \leq 2\epsilon + \left(2^{-g/10+2n+4} + 40\beta \cdot \kappa_H \cdot 2^{-r} + 2e^4\tau^2\right) t_{mix}(\mathcal{L}, \epsilon).$$

Abbreviate  $t_{mix}(\mathcal{L}, \epsilon)$  as  $t_{mix}$ . For parameters

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^2 &= O(\epsilon/t_{mix}) \\ g &= O(n + \log t_{mix} + \log 1/\epsilon) \\ r &= O(\log \beta + \log \kappa_H + \log t_{mix} + \log 1/\epsilon). \\ K &= t_{mix}/\tau^2 = O(t_{mix}^2/\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

we have  $|\mathcal{E}^K(\rho) - \rho_{\beta}|_1 \leq 3\epsilon$ . The total runtime of the algorithm is

$$K \cdot 4g \cdot \text{poly}(2^r, n) = O(\text{poly}(t_{mix}, \beta, \kappa_H, 1/\epsilon, n)),$$

which is  $\text{poly}(n, 1/\epsilon)$  assuming  $t_{mix} = \text{poly}(n)$ ,  $\beta \leq \text{poly}(n)$  and  $\kappa_H \leq \text{poly}(n)$ . The  $\text{poly}(2^r, n)$  in the above formula is mainly the cost of implementing one run of standard Quantum Phase estimation. Theorem 4 and Theorem 6 will be proved in Section 8.

Instead of mixing time, as in the classical Metropolis algorithm, one can also bound the error  $|\mathcal{E}^K(\rho) - \rho_{\beta}|_1$  in terms of the spectral gap of  $\mathcal{L}$ . More precisely, since  $\mathcal{L}$  may not be Hermitian, we need to define a symmetrized version of  $\mathcal{L}$  in order for the spectral gap to be well-defined. Note that  $\sigma := \rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$  is well-defined since  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$  is full rank. Define  $\mathcal{L}^*$  to be dual map w.r.t inner product

$$\langle M, N \rangle_{\sigma} := \text{tr}(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} M^{\dagger} \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} N).$$

Define the symmetrized map  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}^*)$ . Then by definition  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$  is Hermitian w.r.t.  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\sigma}$  and is diagonalizable, thus its spectral gap, denoted as  $\Upsilon$ , is well-defined. Furthermore one can prove  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$  has a unique fixed point thus the spectral gap  $\Upsilon$  is strictly greater than 0. The following Theorem 7 implies  $t_{mix}$  can be bounded in terms of  $\Upsilon$ . Thus one can translate Theorem 6 in terms of  $\Upsilon$  to get Corollary 9. For completeness, we put a more detailed explanation of the dual map  $\mathcal{L}^*$ , the symmetrized map  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$ , their properties and a proof for Theorem 7 in Appendix C.

**Theorem 7 (Bounding mixing time w.r.t spectral gap)** Define  $\sigma := \rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$ . For any quantum state  $\rho$ , we have

$$|e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho) - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}|_1 \leq 2^{n/2} \cdot \sqrt{\text{tr}(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho)} \cdot \exp(-\Upsilon t).$$

<sup>1</sup>For simplicity, here we assume  $K := t_{mix}(\mathcal{L}, \epsilon)/\tau^2$  is an integer. Otherwise we set  $K$  to be the least integer which is greater than  $t_{mix}(\mathcal{L}, \epsilon)/\tau^2$  and the error bounds can be analyzed similarly.

**Corollary 8** Define  $\sigma := \rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$ , we have

$$t_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{L}, \epsilon) \leq \frac{1}{\Upsilon} \left( \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{n \ln 2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \text{tr}(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho) \right)$$

**Corollary 9 (Error bounds w.r.t Spectral gap)** Let  $\tau, \epsilon$  be two parameters. Let  $\Upsilon$  be the spectral gap of  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$ . Assume  $r \geq r_{\beta H}$ . Define  $\sigma := \rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$ . Then for any quantum state  $\rho$ , we have

$$|\mathcal{E}^K(\rho) - \rho_{\beta}|_1 \leq 2\epsilon + \left( 2^{-g/10+2n+4} + 40\beta \cdot \kappa_H \cdot 2^{-r} + 2e^4\tau^2 \right) \frac{1}{\Upsilon} \left( \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{n \ln 2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \text{tr}(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho) \right). \quad (28)$$

$$\text{for } K := \frac{1}{\tau^2} \frac{1}{\Upsilon} \left( \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{n \ln 2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \text{tr}(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho) \right) \quad (29)$$

**Outline of this section.** In Section 5.1 we will define the operators corresponding to the three cases of the algorithm. In Section 5.2 to Section 5.5 we will derive the evolution equation Eq. (25). In particular, we separate  $\mathcal{E}$  into a sum of terms according to their dependence on  $\tau$ . This defines the operator  $\mathcal{L}$  which we will analyze in later sections. Subsection 6.1 then writes  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}$  in the Lindbladian form. In Section 6.2 we prove the fixed point of  $\mathcal{L}$  is unique.

## 5.1 Definition of Operators for the Three Cases

We will use the subscript  $\mathcal{C}$  to denote a particular choice for  $\{C, \text{QPE}\}$ . So, for example,

$$U_{\mathcal{C}} = \text{QPE}_{1,3} \circ C \circ \text{QPE}_{1,2}. \quad (30)$$

We use  $(\Delta_0, \Delta_1)$  to denote measurement on register 4 in the computational basis, where

$$\Delta_0 := I_n \otimes I_{gr} \otimes I_{gr} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|. \quad (31)$$

$$\Delta_1 := I_n \otimes I_{gr} \otimes I_{gr} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|. \quad (32)$$

If the state at the beginning of an iteration is  $\rho$ , then the operations performed on  $\rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle\langle 0^{2gr+1}|$  in each of the three cases (before the last three registers are traced out) can be summarized as:

$$\text{ACCEPT: } O_{a,\mathcal{C}} := \Delta_1 W \Delta_0 \circ U_{\mathcal{C}} \quad (33)$$

$$\text{ALTACCEPT: } O_{b,\mathcal{C}} := \Delta_1 W^\dagger \Delta_0 \circ \Delta_0 W \Delta_0 \circ U_{\mathcal{C}} \quad (34)$$

$$\text{REJECT: } O_{r,\mathcal{C}} := U_{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger \circ \Delta_0 W^\dagger \Delta_0 \circ \Delta_0 W \Delta_0 \circ U_{\mathcal{C}} \quad (35)$$

The initial  $\Delta_0$  is added in for symmetry and has no effect since the last register is always initialized as  $|0\rangle$  at the start of each iteration. For  $s \in \{a, b, r\}$  which represents ACCEPT, ALTACCEPT and REJECT, the corresponding operator which includes tracing out the last three registers is:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(s)}(\rho) = \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( O_{s,\mathcal{C}} \left[ \rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle\langle 0^{2gr+1}| \right] O_{s,\mathcal{C}}^\dagger \right) \quad (36)$$

Where  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^{(a)} + \mathcal{E}^{(b)} + \mathcal{E}^{(r)}$  is the operator representing one iteration. In each of the next three subsections, we will derive alternative expressions for the operators in the three cases, as a sum of terms with different dependencies on the parameter  $\tau$ . Recall the definition of  $W$ :

$$W := \sum_{E, E' \in S(\tau)^{\otimes g}} |EE'\rangle\langle EE'| \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1 - \tau^2 f_{EE'}} & \tau \sqrt{f_{EE'}} \\ \tau \sqrt{f_{EE'}} & -\sqrt{1 - \tau^2 f_{EE'}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (37)$$

Note that  $W$  is Hermitian.

## 5.2 Operator for the ACCEPT Case

**Definition 10** [Operators for the ACCEPT Case]

$$W^{(10)} := \sum_{E, E' \in \mathcal{S}(r)^{\otimes g}} \sqrt{f_{EE'}} |EE'\rangle \langle EE'| \otimes |1\rangle \langle 0| \quad (38)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)}(\rho) := \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( W^{(10)} U_{\mathcal{C}} \left[ \rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}| \right] U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} (W^{(10)})^{\dagger} \right). \quad (39)$$

**Lemma 11**

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)}(\rho) = \tau^2 \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)} \text{ where } \left| \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)} \right|_{\star} \leq 1.$$

**Proof:** The main observation in proving the lemma is that  $\Delta_1 W \Delta_0 = \tau W^{(10)}$ . Therefore

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)}(\rho) = \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( O_{a,\mathcal{C}} \left[ \rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}| \right] O_{a,\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} \right) \quad (40)$$

$$= \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( \Delta_1 W \Delta_0 \circ U_{\mathcal{C}} \left[ \rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}| \right] U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} \circ \Delta_0 W^{\dagger} \Delta_1 \right) \quad (41)$$

$$= \tau^2 \cdot \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( W^{(10)} \circ U_{\mathcal{C}} \left[ \rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}| \right] U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} \circ (W^{(10)})^{\dagger} \right) \quad (42)$$

$$= \tau^2 \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)}(\rho). \quad (43)$$

Using Lemma 37 in Appendix B, we can observe that  $\left| \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)} \right|_{\star} \leq 1$ . ■

## 5.3 Operator for the ALTACCEPT Case

**Lemma 12**

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(b)}(\rho) = \tau^2 \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)} + \tau^4 \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(b)}[\tau],$$

where  $\left| \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(b)}[\tau] \right|_{\star} \leq 3$  for  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ .

**Proof:** Define the function  $W^{(00)}$  to be

$$W^{(00)} = \sum_{E, E' \in \mathcal{S}(r)^{\otimes g}} \frac{f_{EE'}}{\sqrt{1 - \tau^2 f_{EE'} + 1}} |EE'\rangle \langle EE'| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|,$$

Note that  $f_{EE'}/(\sqrt{1 - \tau^2 f_{EE'} + 1}) \in [0, 1]$  since both  $\tau$  and  $f_{EE'}$  are in  $[0, 1]$ . With this definition in place, observe that

$$\Delta_0 W \Delta_0 = \Delta_0 - \tau^2 W^{(00)},$$

and

$$\Delta_1 W^{\dagger} \Delta_0 \circ \Delta_0 W \Delta_0 = \tau W^{(10)} (\Delta_0 - \tau^2 W^{(00)}) = \tau W^{(10)} - \tau^3 W^{(10)} W^{(00)}$$

Now we can express  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(b)}(\rho)$  as

$$\text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( \left( \tau W^{(10)} - \tau^3 W^{(10)} W^{(00)} \right) U_{\mathcal{C}} \left[ \rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}| \right] U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} \left( \tau W^{(10)} - \tau^3 W^{(10)} W^{(00)} \right)^{\dagger} \right)$$

In multiplying out the terms, there is one  $\tau^2$  term:

$$\tau^2 \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( W^{(10)} U_{\mathcal{C}} \left[ \rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}| \right] U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} (W^{(10)})^{\dagger} \right),$$

which is equal to  $\tau^2 \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)}$ . There are two  $\tau^4$  terms:

$$-\tau^4 \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( W^{(10)} W^{(00)} U_{\mathcal{C}} \left[ \rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}| \right] U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} (W^{(10)})^{\dagger} \right)$$

$$-\tau^4 \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( W^{(10)} U_{\mathcal{C}} \left[ \rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}| \right] U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} (W^{(10)} W^{(00)})^{\dagger} \right)$$

Finally, there is one  $\tau^6$  term:

$$\tau^6 \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( W^{(10)} W^{(00)} U_{\mathcal{C}} \left[ \rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}| \right] U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} (W^{(10)} W^{(00)})^{\dagger} \right)$$

The sum of the two  $\tau^4$  term and the  $\tau^6$  term is denoted as  $\tau^4 \cdot \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(b)}[\tau]$ . Using Lemma 37 in Appendix B, we can observe that  $\left| \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(b)}[\tau] \right|_{\star} \leq 3$  for  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ . ■



## 5.4 Operator for the REJECT Case

**Definition 13** [Operators for the REJECT Case]

$$W^{(000)} := \sum_{E, E' \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} f_{EE'} |EE'\rangle \langle EE'| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0| = (W^{(10)})^\dagger W^{(10)} \quad (44)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_C^{(r)}(\rho) := \langle 0^{2gr+1} | U_C^\dagger W^{(000)} U_C | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle \cdot \rho + \rho \cdot \langle 0^{2gr+1} | U_C^\dagger W^{(000)} U_C | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle \quad (45)$$

**Lemma 14**

$$\mathcal{E}_C^{(r)}(\rho) = \mathcal{I} - \tau^2 \mathcal{M}_C^{(r)} + \tau^4 \mathcal{J}_C^{(r)},$$

where  $|\mathcal{M}_C^{(r)}|_* \leq 2$  and  $|\mathcal{J}_C^{(r)}|_* \leq 1$ .

**Proof:** First observe that

$$\Delta_0 W \Delta_0 \circ \Delta_0 W \Delta_0 = \Delta_0 - \tau^2 W^{(000)}.$$

Also  $W^{(000)}$  is Hermetian. Now we can express  $\mathcal{E}_C^{(r)}(\rho)$  as

$$tr_{2,3,4} \left( U_C^\dagger \left( \Delta_0 - \tau^2 W^{(000)} \right) U_C \quad [\rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}|] \quad U_C^\dagger \left( \Delta_0 - \tau^2 W^{(000)} \right)^\dagger U_C \right)$$

There is one term independent of  $\tau$  which is the identity since  $\Delta_0$  and  $U_C$  commute:

$$tr_{2,3,4} \left( U_C^\dagger \Delta_0 U_C \quad [\rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}|] \quad U_C^\dagger \Delta_0 U_C \right) = \mathcal{I}(\rho) = \rho$$

There are two  $\tau^2$  terms:

$$-\tau^2 tr_{2,3,4} \left( U_C^\dagger W^{(000)} U_C \quad [\rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}|] \right) = -\tau^2 \langle 0^{2gr+1} | U_C^\dagger W^{(000)} U_C | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle \cdot \rho$$

$$-\tau^2 tr_{2,3,4} \left( [\rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}|] U_C^\dagger W^{(000)} U_C \right) = -\tau^2 \rho \cdot \langle 0^{2gr+1} | U_C^\dagger W^{(000)} U_C | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle$$

The sum of the  $\tau^2$  terms is equal to  $-\tau^2 \mathcal{M}_C^{(r)}(\rho)$ . Finally there is a  $\tau^4$ :

$$\tau^4 tr_{2,3,4} \left( U_C^\dagger W^{(000)} U_C \quad [\rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}|] \quad U_C^\dagger W^{(000)} U_C \right)$$

This last term is defined to be  $\mathcal{J}_C^{(r)}$ . Using Lemma 37 in Appendix B, we can observe that  $|\mathcal{M}_C^{(r)}|_* \leq 2$  and  $|\mathcal{J}_C^{(r)}|_* \leq 1$  for  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ .  $\blacksquare$

## 5.5 The Definition of Operator $\mathcal{L}_C$ and $\mathcal{L}$

**Definition 15** [The Operators  $\mathcal{L}_C$ ,  $\mathcal{J}_C$  and  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $\mathcal{J}$ ]

$$\mathcal{L}_C := 2\mathcal{M}_C^{(a)} - \mathcal{M}_C^{(r)} \quad (46)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_C[\tau] := \mathcal{J}_C^{(b)}[\tau] + \mathcal{J}_C^{(r)} \quad (47)$$

Averaging the random choices for QPE and the jump operator  $C$ ,

$$\mathcal{L} := \sum_{C=\{C, \text{QPE}\}} \frac{1}{2} \mu(C) \mathcal{L}_C. \quad (48)$$

where the  $\frac{1}{2}$  comes from the fact that QPE is chosen uniformly from  $\{\mathbf{BQPE}, \mathbf{FBQPE}\}$ . Define  $\mathcal{M}^{(a)}, \mathcal{M}^{(r)}$  and  $\mathcal{J}[\tau]$  from  $\mathcal{M}_C^{(a)}, \mathcal{M}_C^{(r)}$  and  $\mathcal{J}_C[\tau]$  similarly.

**Lemma 16**

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{I} + \tau^2 \mathcal{L} + \tau^4 \mathcal{J}[\tau], \quad (49)$$

where  $|\mathcal{L}|_* \leq 4$ , and  $|\mathcal{J}[\tau]|_* \leq 4$  for  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ .

**Proof:** By Lemmas 11, 12, and 14,

$$\mathcal{E}_C = \mathcal{E}_C^{(a)} + \mathcal{E}_C^{(b)} + \mathcal{E}_C^{(r)} \quad (50)$$

$$= \tau^2 \mathcal{M}_C^{(a)} + (\tau^2 \mathcal{M}_C^{(a)} + \tau^4 \mathcal{J}_C^{(b)}[\tau]) + (\mathcal{I} - \tau^2 \mathcal{M}_C^{(r)} + \tau^4 \mathcal{J}_C^{(r)}) \quad (51)$$

$$= \mathcal{I} + \tau^2 (2\mathcal{M}_C^{(a)} - \mathcal{M}_C^{(r)}) + \tau^4 (\mathcal{J}_C^{(b)}[\tau] + \mathcal{J}_C^{(r)}) \quad (52)$$

$$= \mathcal{I} + \tau^2 \mathcal{L}_C + \tau^4 \mathcal{J}_C[\tau]. \quad (53)$$

Since  $\mathcal{J}_C = \mathcal{J}_C^{(b)}[\tau] + \mathcal{J}_C^{(r)}$ ,  $|\mathcal{J}_C^{(b)}[\tau]|_* \leq 3$ , and  $|\mathcal{J}_C^{(r)}|_* \leq 1$ , the bound on  $|\mathcal{J}_C[\tau]|_*$  follows by triangle inequality. Similarly  $|\mathcal{L}_C|_* \leq 2|\mathcal{M}_C^{(a)}|_* + |\mathcal{M}_C^{(r)}|_* \leq 4$ . The equation for  $\mathcal{E}$  comes from linearity. The bounds for  $|\mathcal{J}[\tau]|_*$  and  $|\mathcal{L}|_*$  come from triangle inequality.  $\blacksquare$

## 6 Uniqueness of the Fixed Point

In this section, we rewrite  $\mathcal{L}$  in the Lindbladian form, and prove that  $\mathcal{L}$  has a unique fixed point if the jump operators  $\{C_j\}_j$  generate the full algebra. This section is independent of Section 7 which proves  $\mathcal{L}$  approximately fixes the Gibbs state, and can be skipped temporarily.

### 6.1 Lindbladian form of $\mathcal{L}$

**Lemma 17**  $\mathcal{L}_C$  can be written in Lindbladian form, that is defining

$$S_C(EE'z) := \langle EE'z | W^{(10)} \circ U_C | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle$$

we have

$$\mathcal{L}_C(\rho) = \sum_{EE'z} 2 \cdot S_C(EE'z) \cdot \rho \cdot S_C(EE'z)^\dagger - \{S_C(EE'z)^\dagger S_C(EE'z), \rho\}_+. \quad (54)$$

**Proof:** One can check that

$$\mathcal{L}_C(\rho) = 2\mathcal{M}_C^{(a)}(\rho) - \mathcal{M}_C^{(r)}(\rho) \quad (55)$$

$$= \sum_{EE'z} 2 \cdot S_C(EE'z) \cdot \rho \cdot S_C(EE'z)^\dagger \quad (56)$$

$$- \sum_{EE'z} (S_C(EE'z)^\dagger \cdot S_C(EE'z) \cdot \rho + \rho \cdot S_C(EE'z)^\dagger S_C(EE'z)). \quad (57)$$

$$= \sum_{EE'z} 2 \cdot S_C(EE'z) \cdot \rho \cdot S_C(EE'z)^\dagger - \{S_C(EE'z)^\dagger S_C(EE'z), \rho\}_+ \quad (58)$$

In the following we give a sketch that  $\mathcal{L}_C$  and the Davies generator  $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(w)$  have similar forms. This observation is just for intuition and will not be used in any proof. Due to the in-deterministic and imperfect energy estimation of **BQPE**, it is unclear whether the proof techniques used for Davies-generator-based Gibbs sampler [CKBG23, DLL24] can be adapted to show that our  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfying  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_\beta) \approx 0$ . These proof techniques [CKBG23, DLL24] are based on bounding the approximation error by truncating the infinite integral in the (weighted) Davies generator to a finite region.

Recall that the canonical form of Davies generator  $\mathcal{D}$  w.r.t. jump operators  $\{A_\alpha\}_\alpha$ , in the Schrodinger picture, is given by

$$\mathcal{D}(\rho) = -i[H, \rho] + \sum_{w, \alpha} \mathcal{D}_\alpha(w)(\rho) \quad (59)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha(w)(\rho) = G^\alpha(w) \left( 2 \cdot A_\alpha(w) \cdot \rho \cdot A_\alpha(w)^\dagger - \{A_\alpha(w)^\dagger A_\alpha(w), \rho\}_+ \right) \quad (60)$$

$$A_\alpha(w) := \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{iwt} e^{-iHt} A_\alpha e^{iHt} dt. \quad (61)$$

Here  $G^\alpha(w)$  is the acceptance rate,  $A_\alpha$  is the jump operator, and  $A_\alpha(w)$  is an operator which maps a state of energy  $\nu$  to energy  $\nu + w$ . The summation  $\sum_w$  sums over all possible energy difference

$\{E_j - E_k\}_{j,k}$ . The  $S_C(EE'z)$  in our  $\mathcal{L}$  is a conceptual analog of  $\sqrt{G^\alpha}A_\alpha(w)$ , which map states with energy approximately  $\bar{E}$  to states with energy approximately  $\bar{E}'$ . The jump operator  $C$  is an analog of  $A_\alpha$ .

## 6.2 Uniqueness of the Fixed Point

In this subsection, we prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 18** [*Uniqueness of full-rank fixed point*] Suppose that in Algorithm 1, the algebra generated by jump operators  $\{C_j\}_j$  is equal to the full algebra, that is, the set of all  $n$ -qubit operators. Then there is a unique  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Xi(n)$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$ . In addition,  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$  is a full-rank quantum state, and for any quantum state  $\rho$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho) = \rho_{\mathcal{L}}. \quad (62)$$

We first prove a Lemma.

**Lemma 19**  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  is CPTP for any  $t \geq 0$ .

**Proof:** Note that

$$e^{t\mathcal{L}} = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}[\delta]^{t/\delta^2}. \quad (63)$$

where the limit is taking by decreasing  $\delta \geq 0$  to 0. Since  $\mathcal{E}[\delta]$  is CPTP for any  $\delta \in [0, 1]$ ,  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  is also CPTP. An alternative proof can be obtained by noticing that Lemma 17 implies that  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies Theorem 40 in Appendix C. ■

We invoke the following Theorems to prove the uniqueness of the fixed point, which can be adapted from Corollary 7.2 of [Wol12] or Lemma 2 in [DLL24].

**Theorem 20** ([Wol12, DLL24]) Suppose  $e^{P_t} : \Xi(n) \rightarrow \Xi(n)$  is a CPTP map for any  $t \geq 0$ , with generator

$$\mathcal{P}(\rho) = -i[H_{system}, \rho] + \sum_{k \in S} \left( V_k \rho V_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{V_k^\dagger V_k, \rho\}_+ \right). \quad (64)$$

If the algebra generated by operators  $\{V_k\}_k$  is the full algebra  $\Xi(n)$ . Then there exists a unique  $\rho_{\mathcal{P}}$  such that  $\mathcal{P}(\rho_{\mathcal{P}}) = 0$ . In addition,  $\rho_{\mathcal{P}}$  is a full-rank quantum state, and for any quantum state  $\rho$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{t\mathcal{P}}(\rho) = \rho_{\mathcal{P}}. \quad (65)$$

We use the above Theorem to prove that  $\mathcal{L}$  has a unique fixed point.

**Proof:**[Proof of Theorem 18] By Lemma 19 we know that  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  is CPTP. Then we verify the conditions in Theorem 20. Recall that in Lemma 17 we have written  $\mathcal{L}_C$  in Lindbladian form in terms of  $S_C(EE'z)$ . By definition

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{C=\{C, \text{QPE}\}} \frac{1}{2} \mu(C) \cdot \mathcal{L}_C. \quad (66)$$

Define

$$H_{system} = 0 \quad (67)$$

$$V_C(EE'z) := \sqrt{\mu(C)} \cdot S_C(EE'z). \quad (68)$$

One can check that

$$\mathcal{L} = -i[H_{system}, \rho] + \sum_{C, EE'z} \left( V_C(EE'z) \rho V_C(EE'z)^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{V_C(EE'z)^\dagger V_C(EE'z), \rho\}_+ \right). \quad (69)$$

Recall that in Section 4 Eq. (23) we have computed

$$|\eta_{j\{C, \mathbf{BQPE}\}}\rangle := \tau \cdot W^{(10)} \circ U_{C, \mathbf{BQPE}} |\psi_j, 0^{2gr+1}\rangle \quad (70)$$

$$= \sum_{k; E, E' \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \tau \sqrt{f_{EE'}} \beta_{jE} \cdot c_{jk} \cdot \beta_{kE'} |\psi_k\rangle |E\rangle |E'\rangle |1\rangle. \quad (71)$$

One can check that

$$V_{\{C, \mathbf{BQPE}\}}(EE'z) = \sqrt{\mu(C)} \cdot S_C(EE'z) \quad (72)$$

$$= \sqrt{\mu(C)} \cdot \langle EE'z | W^{(10)} \circ U_{\{C, \mathbf{BQPE}\}} \sum_j |\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j| \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \quad (73)$$

$$= \sqrt{\mu(C)} \cdot \sum_j \frac{1}{\tau} \langle EE'z | \eta_{j\{C, \mathbf{BQPE}\}} \rangle \langle \psi_j| \quad (74)$$

$$= \sqrt{\mu(C) f_{EE'}} \cdot \delta_{z1} \sum_{j,k} \beta_{jE} \cdot c_{jk} \cdot \beta_{kE'} |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_j| \quad (75)$$

Define a matrix  $B_E \in \Xi(n)$  such that

$$B_E |\psi_j\rangle = \beta_{jE} |\psi_j\rangle, \quad (76)$$

From Eq. (75) one can check that

$$V_{\{C, \mathbf{BQPE}\}}(EE'1) = \sqrt{\mu(C) f_{EE'}} \cdot B_{E'} \cdot C \cdot B_E \quad (77)$$

From Eq. (170) in Appendix A we know that

$$\sum_E B_E = I_n, \quad (78)$$

$$\sum_{E'} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu(C) f_{EE'}}} V_{\{C, \mathbf{BQPE}\}}(EE'1) = \left( \sum_{E'} B_{E'} \right) \cdot C \cdot \left( \sum_E B_E \right) = C. \quad (79)$$

Since the algebra generated by  $\{C_j\}_j$  is the full algebra  $\Xi(n)$ , thus the algebra generated by  $\{V_C(EE'z)\}_{C, E, E', z}$  is the full algebra  $\Xi(n)$ . We can then use Theorem 20 we complete the proof.  $\blacksquare$

## 7 Gibbs States as Approximate Fixed Point

In this section, we will prove  $\mathcal{L}$  approximately fixes the Gibbs state, that is

**Lemma 21** *If  $r \geq r_{\beta H}$ , we have*

$$|\mathcal{L}(\rho_\beta)|_1 \leq 2^{-g/10+2n+4} + 40\beta \cdot \kappa_H \cdot 2^{-r}.$$

The outline of the proof is as follows. In section 7.1 we define a truncated Gibbs states  $\rho_{\beta 0}$  where  $|\rho_\beta - \rho_{\beta 0}|_1 \approx 0$ , thus  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_\beta)|_1 \approx |\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0})|_1$  since  $|\mathcal{L}|_*$  is bounded. The remaining subsections then focus on bounding  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0})|_1$ . Then in Section 7.2 and Section 7.3 we define projected operators which will be used as auxiliary notations in the following proofs. In 7.5 we show that  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0})$  can be written as the sum of constant number of matrices, where each matrix has small trace norm. Finally in Section 7.6 we complete the proof of Lemma 21.

### 7.1 Truncated Energy and Truncated Gibbs States

Recall that from Section 2.1, that Boosted Quantum Phase Estimation acts as:

$$\mathbf{BQPE} |\psi_j\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle = |\psi_j\rangle \sum_{E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE} |E\rangle$$

where  $S(r)$  is the set of energy estimations that are integer multiples of

$$w := \kappa_H \cdot 2^{-r}.$$

We have defined  $r_{\beta H} = 1 + \log \kappa_H + \log \beta$ , so for  $r \geq r_{\beta H}$ , we have  $2\beta w \leq 1$ . For any real value  $\nu \geq 0$ ,  $\lfloor \nu \rfloor$  denotes the closet value to  $\nu$  which is an integer multiple of  $w$  and is smaller or equal to  $\nu$ . For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$\nu^{(k)} := \lfloor \nu \rfloor + kw. \quad (80)$$

$$\text{in particular } E_j^{(k)} := \lfloor E_j \rfloor + kw. \quad (81)$$

Recall that  $Z = \text{tr}(\exp(-\beta H))$  is the partition function of  $\rho_\beta$ , and  $p_j = \exp(-\beta E_j)/Z$  is the corresponding probability. Define the truncated probability and truncated Gibbs states as:

$$p_{jk} := \exp(-\beta E_j^{(k)})/Z, \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (82)$$

$$\rho_{\beta 0} := \sum_j p_{j0} |\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j|. \quad (83)$$

One can check that

**Lemma 22** *If  $2\beta w \leq 1$ , then  $|p_j - p_{j0}| \leq p_j \cdot 2\beta w$  and  $|\rho_{\beta 0} - \rho_\beta|_1 \leq 2\beta w$ .*

Lemma 16 proves that  $|\mathcal{L}|_* \leq 4$ . Using this fact, along with the triangle inequality and Lemma 22, we have

**Lemma 23**

$$|\mathcal{L}(\rho_\beta)|_1 \leq |\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0})|_1 + |\mathcal{L}(\rho_\beta - \rho_{\beta 0})|_1 \leq |\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0})|_1 + 4 \cdot 2\beta w.$$

The remainder of this section focuses on bounding  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta 0})|_1$ .

## 7.2 Projected BQPE.

From Lemma 3, we know that the median estimation from **BQPE** almost always maps to one of two possible values:  $E_j^{(0)} = \lfloor E_j \rfloor$  or  $E_j^{(1)} = \lceil E_j \rceil$ . A remark is that the number ‘‘two’’ is not important in the analysis as long as it is a constant. We define the following projections that separate out the cases depending on the output of **BQPE**:

$$P^{(k)} := \sum_j |\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j| \otimes \sum_{E \in S(r) \otimes \mathcal{E}: \bar{E} = E_j^{(k)}} |E\rangle \langle E|, \quad \text{for } k \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (84)$$

$$P^{(else)} := I - P^{(0)} - P^{(1)}. \quad (85)$$

To analyze the performance of our algorithm, we decompose **BQPE** into three operators, according to the above projections. That is

$$T := \{0, 1, \text{‘‘else’’}\}. \quad (86)$$

$$\mathbf{BQPE} = \sum_{k \in T} \mathbf{BQPE}^{(k)} \quad (87)$$

$$\text{where } \mathbf{BQPE}^{(k)} := P^{(k)} \cdot \mathbf{BQPE}. \quad (88)$$

$$\mathbf{BQPE}^{(k)} |\psi_j\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle = |\psi_j\rangle \sum_E \beta_{jE}^{(k)} |E\rangle, \quad (89)$$

$$\beta_{jE}^{(k)} := \begin{cases} \beta_{jE}, & \text{if } \bar{E} = E_j^{(k)}, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } k \in \{0, 1\} \quad (90)$$

$$\beta_{jE}^{(else)} := \begin{cases} \beta_{jE}, & \text{if } \bar{E} \notin \{E_j^{(0)}, E_j^{(1)}\}. \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (91)$$

For convenience, for any subset  $A \subseteq T$ , we also define

$$P^{(A)} := \sum_{k \in A} P^{(k)}. \quad (92)$$

and define  $\mathbf{BQPE}^{(A)}$ ,  $\beta_{jE}^{(A)}$  accordingly. For **FBQPE** we similarly define  $\mathbf{FBQPE}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{FBQPE}^{(A)}$ .

### 7.3 Projected Operators

Recall that the  $\mathcal{L}$  for our algorithm is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}} = 2\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)} - \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(r)}.$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)}(\rho) = \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( W^{(10)} U_{\mathcal{C}} [\rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}|] U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} (W^{(10)})^{\dagger} \right)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(r)}(\rho) = \langle 0^{2gr+1} | U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} (W^{(10)})^{\dagger} W^{(10)} U_{\mathcal{C}} | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle \rho + \rho \langle 0^{2gr+1} | U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} (W^{(10)})^{\dagger} W^{(10)} U_{\mathcal{C}} | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle.$$

where

$$W^{(10)} = \sum_{E, E' \in \mathcal{S}(r)^{\otimes g}} \sqrt{f_{EE'}} |EE'\rangle \langle EE'| \otimes |1\rangle \langle 0|. \quad (93)$$

$$U_{\mathcal{C}} = \text{QPE}_{1,3} \circ \mathbb{C} \circ \text{QPE}_{1,2}. \quad (94)$$

For convenience, we divide  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(r)}$  into ‘‘right’’ and ‘‘left’’ terms

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(rr)}(\rho) = \langle 0^{2gr+1} | U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} (W^{(10)})^{\dagger} W^{(10)} U_{\mathcal{C}} | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle \rho \quad (95)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(rl)}(\rho) = \rho \langle 0^{2gr+1} | U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\dagger} (W^{(10)})^{\dagger} W^{(10)} U_{\mathcal{C}} | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle \quad (96)$$

By the following Lemma it suffices to only analyze the right term  $\mathcal{M}^{(rr)}$ .

**Lemma 24** *For any Hermitian  $\rho$ ,*

$$|\mathcal{L}(\rho)|_1 \leq 2 \left| \mathcal{M}^{(a)}(\rho) - \mathcal{M}^{(rr)}(\rho) \right|_1. \quad (97)$$

**Proof:** Note that  $\mathcal{M}^{(a)}(\rho) = \mathcal{M}^{(a)}(\rho)^{\dagger}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}^{(rl)}(\rho) = \mathcal{M}^{(rr)}(\rho)^{\dagger}$ . Since  $|N^{\dagger}|_1 = |N|_1$  for any matrix  $N$ , we have

$$\left| \mathcal{M}^{(a)}(\rho) - \mathcal{M}^{(rl)}(\rho) \right|_1 = \left| \mathcal{M}^{(a)}(\rho) - \mathcal{M}^{(rr)}(\rho) \right|_1.$$

Thus

$$|\mathcal{L}(\rho)|_1 \leq \left| \mathcal{M}^{(a)}(\rho) - \mathcal{M}^{(rl)}(\rho) \right|_1 + \left| \mathcal{M}^{(a)}(\rho) - \mathcal{M}^{(rr)}(\rho) \right|_1 \leq 2 \left| \mathcal{M}^{(a)}(\rho) - \mathcal{M}^{(rr)}(\rho) \right|_1. \quad \blacksquare$$

We can now use the decomposition of **BQPE** to decompose the accept and reject operators.

**Definition 25 (Projected Operators)** *For any subsets  $A, B \subseteq T$ , we define  $U_{\mathcal{C}}^{(AB)}$  by substituting QPE with corresponding operators:*

$$U_{\mathcal{C}}^{(AB)} := \text{QPE}_{1,3}^{(A)} \circ \mathbb{C} \circ \text{QPE}_{1,2}^{(B)}. \quad (98)$$

Accordingly for subsets  $A, B, X, Y \subseteq T$ , we define

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a, ABXY)}(\rho) := \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( W^{(10)} U_{\mathcal{C}}^{(AB)} [\rho \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}|] (U_{\mathcal{C}}^{(XY)})^{\dagger} (W^{(10)})^{\dagger} \right) \quad (99)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(rr, ABXY)}(\rho) := \langle 0^{2gr+1} | (U_{\mathcal{C}}^{(BA)})^{\dagger} (W^{(10)})^{\dagger} W^{(10)} U_{\mathcal{C}}^{(YX)} | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle \rho. \quad (100)$$

Note that in Eq. (100) we use  $U_{\mathcal{C}}^{(BA)}$ ,  $U_{\mathcal{C}}^{(YX)}$  instead of  $U_{\mathcal{C}}^{(AB)}$ ,  $U_{\mathcal{C}}^{(XY)}$ .

One can directly check that the following Lemma are true, which we omit the proofs.

**Lemma 26**

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)} = \sum_{u,v,s,t \in T} \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(a, uvst)}, \quad \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(rr)} = \sum_{u,v,s,t \in T} \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(rr, uvst)}. \quad (101)$$

Similarly after averaging over the random selection of  $\mathcal{C}$ , we get

$$\mathcal{M}^{(a)} = \sum_{u,v,s,t \in T} \mathcal{M}^{(a, uvst)}, \quad \mathcal{M}^{(rr)} = \sum_{u,v,s,t \in T} \mathcal{M}^{(rr, uvst)}. \quad (102)$$

## 7.4 Explicit Expressions for Operators in the Accept and Reject Cases

The following two lemmas give explicit representations for the operators  $\mathcal{M}^{(a,ABXY)}$  and  $\mathcal{M}^{(rr,ABXY)}$  in terms of the energy eigenstates  $\{|\psi_j\rangle\}_j$ . To ease notations, we write  $(\beta_{jE}^{(\cdot)})^*$  as  $\beta_{jE}^{(\cdot)*}$ .

**Lemma 27** For any subsets  $A, B, X, Y \subseteq T$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(a,ABXY)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle &= \sum_j p_{j0} \sum_{E, E'} f_{EE'} \sum_C \mu(C) (c_{jm} c_{jk}^*) \cdot \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*}). \\ \langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(rr,ABXY)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle &= p_{k0} \sum_{j; E, E'} f_{E'E} \sum_C \mu(C) (c_{jm} c_{jk}^*) \cdot \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*})\end{aligned}$$

where  $\Re(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha + \alpha^*)$  is the real part of a complex number.

**Proof:** Recall that

$$\rho_{\beta 0} = \sum_j p_{j0} |\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j|. \quad (103)$$

Suppose the gates chosen in the algorithm are  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{BQPE}, C\}$ . Similarly as how we derive Eq. (23) in Section 4, one can check that,

$$W^{(10)} U_C^{(AB)} |\psi_j\rangle |0^{2gr+1}\rangle = \sum_{l; E, E'} \sqrt{f_{EE'}} c_{jl} \cdot \beta_{jE}^{(B)} \cdot \beta_{lE'}^{(A)} |\psi_l\rangle |E\rangle |E'\rangle |1\rangle. \quad (104)$$

(a) ACCEPT Case:

The whole operator  $\mathcal{M}_C^{(a,ABXY)}$  then looks like:

$$\mathcal{M}_C^{(a,ABXY)}(|\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j|) = \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( W^{(10)} U_C^{(AB)} [|\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j| \otimes |0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle 0^{2gr+1}|] (U_C^{(XY)})^\dagger (W^{(10)})^\dagger \right) \quad (105)$$

$$= \sum_{l, h; E, E'} f_{EE'} (c_{jl} c_{jh}^*) (\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*}) (\beta_{lE'}^{(A)} \beta_{hE'}^{(X)*}) |\psi_l\rangle \langle \psi_h|. \quad (106)$$

Then

$$\langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}_C^{(a,ABXY)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle = \sum_j p_{j0} \sum_{E, E'} f_{EE'} (c_{jm} c_{jk}^*) (\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*}) (\beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*}). \quad (107)$$

When we average over the choice of **BQPE** and **FBQPE**, the  $(\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*}) (\beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*})$  term will become:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*} + \beta_{jE}^{(B)*} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)*} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)} \right) = \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*}). \quad (108)$$

We also average over the choice of  $C$  and finally get:

$$\langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(a,ABXY)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle = \sum_j p_{j0} \sum_{E, E'} f_{EE'} \sum_C \mu(C) (c_{jm} c_{jk}^*) \cdot \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*}).$$

(b) REJECT Case: Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle 0^{2gr+1} | \langle \psi_m | (U_C^{(BA)})^\dagger (W^{(10)})^\dagger W^{(10)} U_C^{(YX)} | \psi_k \rangle | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle & \\ = \sum_{l; E, E'} f_{EE'} (c_{ml}^* c_{kl}) \left( \beta_{lE'}^{(B)*} \beta_{lE'}^{(Y)} \right) \left( \beta_{mE}^{(A)*} \beta_{kE}^{(X)} \right) & \\ = \sum_{j; E, E'} f_{E'E} (c_{mj}^* c_{kj}) \left( \beta_{jE}^{(B)*} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)} \right) \left( \beta_{mE'}^{(A)*} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)} \right). &\end{aligned} \quad (109)$$



where the last equality comes from changing the name  $l, E, E'$  to  $j, E', E$ . Use the definition of  $\mathcal{M}^{(rr, ABXY)}$ , we further have

$$\langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}_C^{(rr, ABXY)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle = p_{k0} \langle 0^{2gr+1} | \langle \psi_m | (U_C^{(BA)})^\dagger (W^{(10)})^\dagger W^{(10)} U_C^{(YX)} | \psi_k \rangle | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle \quad (110)$$

$$= p_{k0} \sum_{j; E, E'} f_{E'E} (c_{mj}^* c_{kj}) \left( \beta_{jE}^{(B)*} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)} \right) \left( \beta_{mE'}^{(A)*} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)} \right) \quad (111)$$

Note that in Eq. (111), the term  $\left( \beta_{jE}^{(B)*} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)} \right) \left( \beta_{mE'}^{(A)*} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)} \right)$  is the complex conjugate of the corresponding term in Eq. (107). This is why in our algorithm we use **BQPE** and **FBQPE** randomly to cancel this phase: when we average over the choice of **BQPE** and **FBQPE**, the  $\left( \beta_{jE}^{(B)*} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)} \right) \left( \beta_{mE'}^{(A)*} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)} \right)$  term will become:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \beta_{jE}^{(B)*} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)*} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)} + \beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*} \right) = \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*}). \quad (112)$$

We also average over the choice of  $C$  and get:

$$\langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(rr, ABXY)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle = p_{k0} \sum_{j; E, E'} f_{E'E} \sum_C \mu(C) (c_{mj}^* c_{kj}) \cdot \Re \left( \beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*} \right).$$

Further note that  $\mu$  chooses  $C$  and  $C^\dagger$  with the same probability, thus

$$\sum_C \mu(C) c_{jm} c_{jk}^* = \sum_C \mu(C^\dagger) c_{mj}^* c_{kj} = \sum_C \mu(C) c_{mj}^* c_{kj}.$$

where the amplitudes for  $C^\dagger$  are obtained from  $C$  by swapping the indices and taking the complex conjugate. Thus we conclude the proof.  $\blacksquare$

## 7.5 Uniform Error

Before we analyze the errors, we first prove a Lemma which bound the trace norm of certain matrices.

**Lemma 28** *If  $2\beta w \leq 1$ , for any four subsets  $A, B, X, Y \subseteq T$ , we have*

$$\left| \mathcal{M}_C^{(a, ABXY)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) \right|_1 \leq 2, \quad \left| \mathcal{M}^{(a, ABXY)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) \right|_1 \leq 2. \quad (113)$$

**Proof:** To ease notation, we abbreviate  $|\psi_j\rangle | 0^{2gr+1} \rangle$  as  $|\psi_j 0^{2gr+1}\rangle$ . Recall that

$$\mathcal{M}_C^{(a, ABXY)}(|\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j|) = \text{tr}_{2,3,4} \left( W^{(10)} U_C^{(AB)} |\psi_j 0^{2gr+1}\rangle \langle \psi_j 0^{2gr+1}| (U_C^{(XY)})^\dagger (W^{(10)})^\dagger \right) \quad (114)$$

$$\|U_C^{(AB)}\| \leq \|P^{(A)}\| \cdot \|\text{QPE}_{1,3}\| \cdot \|C\| \cdot \|P^{(B)}\| \cdot \|\text{QPE}_{1,2}\| \leq 1. \quad (115)$$

where in the last inequality we use that  $P^{(A)}, P^{(B)}$  are projections thus their spectrum norm is bounded by 1. Besides,  $\|W^{(10)}\| \leq 1$  by definition. Thus by Corollary 35 in Appendix B we get

$$\left| \mathcal{M}_C^{(a, ABXY)}(|\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j|) \right|_1 \leq 1. \quad (116)$$

Then when  $2\beta w \leq 1$ , by Lemma 22 we have  $p_{j0} \leq p_j \cdot (1 + 2\beta w) \leq 2p_j$ . By triangle inequality we have

$$\left| \mathcal{M}_C^{(a, ABXY)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) \right|_1 \leq \sum_j 2p_j \left| \mathcal{M}_C^{(a, ABXY)}(|\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j|) \right|_1 \leq 2. \quad (117)$$

When averaging over the random selection of  $\mathcal{C}$ , we can get the bound for  $\mathcal{M}^{(a, uvst)}$  by triangle inequality.  $\blacksquare$

The following is a key lemma in the analysis which clusters the projected operators and bounds the norm of each cluster separately. While  $\langle \psi_m | (\mathcal{M}^{(a, AvsY)} - \mathcal{M}^{(rr, AvsY)})(\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle$  may not cancel exactly to 0, the error for each cluster is independent of  $m$  and  $k$ , which allows us to factor out the error term over the entire matrix.

**Lemma 29** Recall that  $T = \{0, 1, \text{"else"}\}$ . Consider four subsets  $A, B, X, Y \subseteq T$ . If  $2\beta w \leq 1$

(1) For any  $v, s \in \{0, 1\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_m | (\mathcal{M}^{(a, AvsY)} - \mathcal{M}^{(rr, AvsY)}) (\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle &= (1 - e^{\beta(s-v)w}) \langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(a, AvsY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle. \\ \left| (\mathcal{M}^{(a, AvsY)} - \mathcal{M}^{(rr, AvsY)}) (\rho_{\beta 0}) \right|_1 &\leq 4\beta w. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the error  $e^{\beta(s-v)w}$  in the first equality is uniform and independent of  $m, k$ .

(2) If one of  $A, B, X, Y$  equal to  $\{\text{"else"}\}$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{M}^{(a, ABXY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) \right|_1 &\leq 2 \cdot 2^{-g/10+2n}. \\ \left| \mathcal{M}^{(rr, ABXY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) \right|_1 &\leq 2 \cdot 2^{-g/10+2n}. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof:** Recall that from Lemma 27 we have for any  $m, k$ ,

$$\langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(a, ABXY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle = \sum_j p_{j0} \sum_{E, E'} f_{EE'} \sum_C \mu(C) (c_{jm} c_{jk}^*) \cdot \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*}). \quad (118)$$

$$\langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(rr, ABXY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle = p_{k0} \sum_{j; E, E'} f_{E'E} \sum_C \mu(C) (c_{jm} c_{jk}^*) \cdot \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*})$$

Recall that

$$p_{js} = \exp(-\beta E_j^{(s)}) / Z.$$

With some abuse of notation, we use  $f$  for both

$$f_{EE'} = \min \{1, \exp(\beta \bar{E} - \beta \bar{E}')\} \quad (119)$$

$$f_{E_k^{(s)} E_j^{(v)}} = \min \left\{ 1, \exp \left( \beta E_k^{(s)} - \beta E_j^{(v)} \right) \right\} \quad (120)$$

In other words, if  $E$  is a vector of  $g$  energies from  $S(r)$ , the function  $f$  implicitly takes the median value in determining  $\min \{1, \exp(\beta \bar{E} - \beta \bar{E}')\}$ .

For (1): Suppose  $v, s \in \{0, 1\}$ . The key thing to notice is that, by definition  $\beta_{jE}^{(v)}$  is non-zero only if  $\bar{E} = E_j^{(v)}$ . Similarly for  $\beta_{kE'}^{(s)*}$ . Thus  $\langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(a, AvsY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle$  is a sum of terms, where all the non-zero terms  $f_{EE'}$  take a uniform value as  $f_{E_j^{(v)} E_k^{(s)}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(a, AvsY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle &= \sum_j p_{j0} \sum_{\substack{E, E': \bar{E} = E_j^{(v)} \\ \bar{E}' = E_k^{(s)}}} f_{EE'} \sum_C \mu(C) (c_{jm} c_{jk}^*) \cdot \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(v)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(s)*}) \\ &= \sum_j p_{j0} \cdot f_{E_j^{(v)} E_k^{(s)}} \sum_{\substack{E, E': \bar{E} = E_j^{(v)} \\ \bar{E}' = E_k^{(s)}}} \sum_C \mu(C) (c_{jm} c_{jk}^*) \cdot \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(v)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(s)*}) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(rr, AvsY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle &= p_{k0} \sum_j \sum_{\substack{E, E': \bar{E} = E_j^{(v)} \\ \bar{E}' = E_k^{(s)}}} f_{E'E} \sum_C \mu(C) (c_{jm} c_{jk}^*) \cdot \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(v)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(s)*}) \\ &= \sum_j p_{k0} \cdot f_{E_k^{(s)} E_j^{(v)}} \sum_{\substack{E, E': \bar{E} = E_j^{(v)} \\ \bar{E}' = E_k^{(s)}}} \sum_C \mu(C) (c_{jm} c_{jk}^*) \cdot \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(v)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(s)*}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that by definition of  $f$  and  $p_{ks}$  we always have

$$p_{ks} \cdot f_{E_k^{(s)} E_j^{(v)}} = p_{jv} \cdot f_{E_j^{(v)} E_k^{(s)}} \quad (121)$$

$$p_{ks} = p_{k0} \cdot e^{-\beta s w} \quad (122)$$

Thus

$$p_{k0} \cdot f_{E_k^{(s)} E_j^{(v)}} = e^{\beta s w} p_{ks} \cdot f_{E_k^{(s)} E_j^{(v)}} \quad (123)$$

$$= e^{\beta s w} p_{jv} \cdot f_{E_j^{(v)} E_k^{(s)}} \quad (124)$$

$$= e^{\beta(s-v)w} p_{j0} \cdot f_{E_j^{(v)} E_k^{(s)}} \quad (125)$$

Note that the “error”  $e^{\beta(s-v)w}$  is independent of  $j, m, k$ , thus

$$\langle \psi_m | \left( \mathcal{M}^{(a, AvsY)} - \mathcal{M}^{(rr, AvsY)} \right) (\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle \quad (126)$$

$$= (1 - e^{\beta(s-v)w}) \sum_j p_{j0} \cdot f_{E_j^{(v)} E_k^{(s)}} \sum_{\substack{E, E': \bar{E} = E_j^{(v)} \\ \bar{E}' = E_k^{(s)}}} \sum_C \mu(C) (c_{jm} c_{jk}^*) \cdot \Re(\beta_{jE}^{(v)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(s)*}) \quad (127)$$

$$= (1 - e^{\beta(s-v)w}) \langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(a, AvsY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle \quad (128)$$

Thus

$$\left( \mathcal{M}^{(a, AvsY)} - \mathcal{M}^{(rr, AvsY)} \right) (\rho_{\beta 0}) = (1 - e^{\beta(s-v)w}) \cdot \mathcal{M}^{(a, AvsY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}). \quad (129)$$

$$\left| \left( \mathcal{M}^{(a, AvsY)} - \mathcal{M}^{(rr, AvsY)} \right) (\rho_{\beta 0}) \right|_1 \leq 4\beta w. \quad (130)$$

where for the last inequality, we use Lemma 28 and the fact that since  $v, s \in \{0, 1\}$ , we have  $|s - v| \leq 1$  and  $|1 - e^{\beta(s-v)w}| \leq 2\beta w$ .

For (2). W.o.l.g. assume  $X = \{\text{“else”}\}$ . Other cases are similar. Note that

$$\left( \sum_j |c_{jm} c_{jk}^*| \right)^2 \leq \left( \sum_j |c_{jm}|^2 \right) \left( \sum_j |c_{jk}^*|^2 \right) \leq 1. \quad (131)$$

$$\left( \sum_E |\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*}| \right)^2 \leq \left( \sum_E |\beta_{jE}^{(B)}|^2 \right) \left( \sum_E |\beta_{jE}^{(Y)*}|^2 \right) \leq 1 \cdot 1 \quad (132)$$

$$\left( \sum_{E'} |\beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*}| \right)^2 \leq \left( \sum_{E'} |\beta_{mE'}^{(A)}|^2 \right) \left( \sum_{E'} |\beta_{kE'}^{(X)*}|^2 \right) \leq 2^{-g/5} \cdot 1. \quad (133)$$

where the first equality comes from the fact that  $C$  is a unitary. The second equality comes from  $\{\beta_{jE}^{(B)}\}_E$  is a subset of  $\{\beta_{jE}\}_E$ , and  $\{\beta_{jE}\}_E$  is the amplitude of a quantum state. For the third equality, recall that  $X = \{\text{“else”}\}$ , notice that for any non-zero  $\beta_{mE'}^{else}$ , by definition we have  $\bar{E}' \notin \{E_j^{(0)}, E_j^{(1)}\}$ . Then the third equality comes from property of **BQPE**, that is Lemma 3.

Besides, note that

$$|\Re(\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*})| \leq |\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*} \beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*}|. \quad (134)$$

Since  $2\beta w \leq 1$ , by Lemma 22 we have  $p_{j0} \in [0, 2]$ . Note that  $f_{E E'} \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_C \mu(C) = 1$ , then from Eq. (118) we have for any  $m, k$ ,

$$|\langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(a, ABXY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle| \leq 2 \sum_C \mu(C) \sum_j |c_{jm} c_{jk}^*| \cdot \sum_E |\beta_{jE}^{(B)} \beta_{jE}^{(Y)*}| \cdot \sum_{E'} |\beta_{mE'}^{(A)} \beta_{kE'}^{(X)*}| \quad (135)$$

$$\leq 2 \cdot 2^{-g/10}. \quad (136)$$

Then by triangle inequality,

$$\left| \mathcal{M}^{(a, ABXY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) \right|_1 \leq \sum_{m, k} |\langle \psi_m | \mathcal{M}^{(a, ABXY)} (\rho_{\beta 0}) | \psi_k \rangle| \cdot \|\psi_m\| \|\psi_k\|_1 \leq 2 \cdot 2^{-g/10+2n} \quad (137)$$

The proof for  $|\mathcal{M}^{(rr, ABXY)} (\rho_{\beta 0})|_1$  is similar. ■

## 7.6 Gibbs state as Approximate Fixed Point

We are ready now to complete the proof of Lemma 21, which provides an upper bound on  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_\beta)|_1$ .

**Proof:**[of Lemma 21] If  $r \geq r_{\beta H}$ , we have  $2\beta w \leq 1$ . From Lemma 23 and Lemma 24 we have

$$|\mathcal{L}(\rho_\beta)|_1 \leq 2 \left| \mathcal{M}^{(a)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) - \mathcal{M}^{(rr)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) \right|_1 + 4 \cdot 2\beta w \quad (138)$$

Note that for any matrices  $\{N^{(uvst)}\}_{uvst}$ , by triangle inequality we have

$$\left| \sum_{u,v,s,t \in T} N^{(uvst)} \right|_1 \leq \left| \sum_{\substack{v=else \\ u,s,t \in T}} N^{(uvst)} \right|_1 + \left| \sum_{\substack{v \in \{0,1\}, s=else \\ u,t \in T}} N^{(uvst)} \right|_1 + \sum_{v,s \in \{0,1\}} \left| \sum_{u,t \in T} N^{(uvst)} \right|_1$$

Then by Lemma 26 and Lemma 29, we have

$$\left| \mathcal{M}^{(a)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) - \mathcal{M}^{(rr)}(\rho_{\beta 0}) \right|_1 \leq 2 \cdot (2 \cdot 2^{-g/10+2n} + 2 \cdot 2^{-g/10+2n}) + 4 \cdot 4\beta w. \quad (139)$$

Substituting  $w = \kappa_H \cdot 2^{-r}$ , we complete the proof.  $\blacksquare$

## 8 Proofs of Theorem 4 and Theorem 6

**Proof:**[of Theorem 4] The fact that one step of the algorithm can be expressed as  $\mathcal{E}[\tau](\rho) = (\mathcal{I} + \tau^2 \mathcal{L} + \tau^4 \mathcal{J}[\tau])(\rho)$ , where  $|\mathcal{J}[\tau]|_* \leq 4$  is proven in Lemma 16 in Section 5.5. The bound on  $|\mathcal{L}(\rho_\beta)|_1$  is proved in Lemma 21 in Section 7. The Uniqueness and Relaxation property is proved in Theorem 18 in Section 6.  $\blacksquare$

Before proving theorem 6 we give a bound for the evolution.

**Lemma 30 (Evolution)** *For any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\tau \in (0, 1]$ . If  $K = t/\tau^2$  is an integer, then*

$$|\mathcal{E}^K - e^{t\mathcal{L}}|_* \leq 2e^4 K \tau^4. \quad (140)$$

**Proof:** Note that

$$\mathcal{E}^K - (e^{\tau^2 \mathcal{L}})^K = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (e^{\tau^2 \mathcal{L}})^k (\mathcal{E} - e^{\tau^2 \mathcal{L}}) \mathcal{E}^{K-k-1}. \quad (141)$$

Note that  $\mathcal{E}$  is CPTP by definition. By Lemma 19 we know  $e^{\tau^2 \mathcal{L}}$  is also CPTP. Thus  $|\mathcal{E}|_*$  and  $|e^{\tau^2 \mathcal{L}}|_*$  are bounded by 1 by Lemma 38 in Appendix B. Then we have

$$\left| \mathcal{E}^K - (e^{\tau^2 \mathcal{L}})^K \right|_* \leq K \cdot 1 \cdot \left| \mathcal{E} - e^{\tau^2 \mathcal{L}} \right|_* \cdot 1 \leq K \cdot \tau^4 2e^4. \quad (142)$$

where for the last inequality, recall that  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{I} + \tau^2 \mathcal{L} + \tau^4 \mathcal{J}[\tau]$  and the Taylor expansion of  $e^{\tau^2 \mathcal{L}}$ , we get

$$\left| \mathcal{E} - e^{\tau^2 \mathcal{L}} \right|_* \leq |\mathcal{J}[\tau]|_* \tau^4 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{\tau^{2k} |\mathcal{L}|_*^k}{k!} \leq \tau^4 2e^4. \quad (143)$$

where we use  $|\mathcal{J}|_* \leq 4$  and  $|\mathcal{L}|_* \leq 4$  from Lemma 16.  $\blacksquare$

We then prove that the distance between  $\rho_\beta$  and  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$  can be bounded in terms of the mixing time.

**Lemma 31**

$$|\rho_{\mathcal{L}} - \rho_\beta|_1 \leq \epsilon + |\mathcal{L}(\rho_\beta)|_1 \cdot t_{mix}(\mathcal{L}, \epsilon)$$

**Proof:** We abbreviate  $t_{mix}(\mathcal{L}, \epsilon)$  as  $t$ . Let  $\tau > 0$  be a parameter such that  $K = t/\tau^2$  is an integer. We have

$$|\rho_{\mathcal{L}} - \rho_{\beta}|_1 \leq |\rho_{\mathcal{L}} - e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho_{\beta})|_1 + |e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho_{\beta}) - \rho_{\beta}|_1 \leq \epsilon + |e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho_{\beta}) - \rho_{\beta}|_1. \quad (144)$$

where the last inequality comes from the definition of mixing time. Besides, from Lemma 16 we have  $|\mathcal{L}|_{\star} \leq 4$ . Expand  $e^{\tau^2\mathcal{L}}$  as Taylor series in  $\tau$ , and use triangle inequality we get

$$\left| \left( e^{\tau^2\mathcal{L}} - \mathcal{I} \right) (\rho_{\beta}) \right|_1 \leq \tau^2 |\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})|_1 + \tau^4 \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{|\mathcal{L}|_{\star}^k}{k!} \quad (145)$$

$$\leq \tau^2 |\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})|_1 + \tau^4 e^4. \quad (146)$$

Thus

$$\left| e^{K\tau^2\mathcal{L}}(\rho_{\beta}) - \rho_{\beta} \right|_1 \leq \sum_{k=K}^1 \left| e^{(k-1)\tau^2\mathcal{L}} \left( e^{\tau^2\mathcal{L}} - \mathcal{I} \right) (\rho_{\beta}) \right|_1 \quad (147)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=K}^1 \left| \left( e^{\tau^2\mathcal{L}} - \mathcal{I} \right) (\rho_{\beta}) \right|_1 \quad (148)$$

$$\leq K\tau^2 |\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\beta})|_1 + K\tau^4 e^4. \quad (149)$$

where the second inequality comes from  $e^{(K-1)\tau^2\mathcal{L}}$  is CPTP by Lemma 19, thus its  $|\cdot|_{\star}$  is bounded by 1 by Lemma 38 in Appendix B. Thus we finish the proof by substituting  $K\tau^2$  with the mixing time  $t$  and take the limit  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ . ■

**Proof:**[of Theorem 6] In the proof we abbreviate  $t_{mix}(\mathcal{L}, \epsilon)$  as  $t$  and  $K = t/\tau^2$ . We will analyze the following terms

$$|\mathcal{E}^K(\rho) - \rho_{\beta}|_1 \leq |\mathcal{E}^K(\rho) - e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho)|_1 + |e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho) - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}|_1 + |\rho_{\mathcal{L}} - \rho_{\beta}|_1. \quad (150)$$

By Lemma 30 we can bound the first term by  $2e^4 K\tau^4$ . By the definition of mixing time, we can bound the second term by  $\epsilon$ . The bound for last term comes from Lemma 31 and Theorem 4. Thus we get the desired error bounds by substituting  $K\tau^2$  with the mixing time  $t$ . ■

## 9 Acknowledgement

Part of this work was conducted while the author was visiting the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing. We thank Yu Tong for the helpful discussion on analyzing mixing time by spectral gap of  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$ .

## A More Details on Quantum Phase Estimation

**(1) Adapting quantum phase estimation to estimating Hamiltonian eigenvalues.** Firstly we recall the standard quantum phase estimation in Section 5.2 in [NC10]: Suppose a unitary  $V$  has an eigenstate  $|\phi\rangle$  with eigenvalue  $e^{2\pi\mu}$ , where  $\mu \in [0, 1)$  is unknown. Quantum Phase estimation is a quantum algorithm which has access to  $|\phi\rangle$  and  $V$ , and outputs an estimate of  $\mu$ .

More precisely, let  $|\phi\rangle := |\psi_j\rangle$ ,  $U := e^{iHt}$ ,  $t := \frac{2\pi}{\kappa_H}$ , where  $\kappa_H = \text{poly}(n)$  is a power of two that upper bounds  $\|H\|$ . For example, for local Hamiltonian  $H = \sum_{i=1}^m H_i$ ,  $\|H_i\| \leq 1$ , one can set  $\kappa_H$  to be the least integer which is a power of two and is greater than  $m$ . Then  $|\psi_j\rangle$  is an eigenstate of  $U$  with eigenvalue  $e^{2\pi\mu}$ , for

$$\mu := \frac{E_j t}{2\pi} = \frac{E_j}{\kappa_H} \in [0, 1).$$

Let  $r$  be an integer. For any  $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}^r$ , with some abuse of notations, we use  $\mathbf{b}$  both for the binary string and the integer  $\sum_{j=1}^r b_j 2^{j-1}$ . Denote  $\mathbf{b}^{(j)} \in \{0, 1\}^r$  be the integer such that  $\mathbf{b}^{(j)}/2^r$  is the best  $r$  bit approximation to  $\frac{E_j}{\kappa_H}$  which is less than  $\frac{E_j}{\kappa_H}$ . Then if  $\mathbf{b}$  is a good approximation to  $\mathbf{b}^{(j)}$ , we have  $E(\mathbf{b})$  defined below is a good approximation of  $E_j$ :

$$E(\mathbf{b}) := \kappa_H \cdot \mathbf{b}/2^r. \quad (151)$$

Note that since  $\kappa_H$  is a power of 2, the binary representation of  $\mathbf{b}$  can also be viewed as the binary representation of  $E(\mathbf{b})$  by shifting the decimal point by  $\log(\kappa_H)$  bits.

The quantum phase estimation w.r.t precision  $r$  in [NC10] is a unitary, denoted as **QPE**, which outputs a distribution highly peaked at  $\mathbf{b}^{(j)}$ ,

$$\mathbf{QPE} |\psi_j\rangle |0^r\rangle = |\psi_j\rangle \sum_{l=-2^{r-1}+1}^{2^{r-1}} \gamma_{jl} \left| \mathbf{b}^{(j)} + l \bmod 2^r \right\rangle; \quad (152)$$

$$\text{where } \gamma_{jl} := \frac{1}{2^r} \sum_{k=0}^{2^r-1} \left( e^{2\pi i(\epsilon_j - l/2^r)} \right)^k = \frac{1}{2^r} \left( \frac{1 - e^{2\pi i(2^r \epsilon_j - l)}}{1 - e^{2\pi i(\epsilon_j - l/2^r)}} \right). \quad (153)$$

$$\epsilon_j := E_j / \kappa_H - b^{(j)} / 2^r. \quad (154)$$

**Lemma 32** *Note that*

$$|\gamma_{j0}|^2 + |\gamma_{j1}|^2 \geq 0.8. \quad (155)$$

**Proof:** By definition of  $\mathbf{b}^{(j)}$  and  $\epsilon_j$  we have that  $\epsilon_j \in [0, 2^{-r})$ . Note that if  $\epsilon_j = 0$ , then  $|\gamma_{j0}|^2 = 1$ , so for the remainder of the proof, we will assume  $\epsilon_j \in (0, 2^{-r})$ . Define  $\theta = 2^r \epsilon_j \in (0, 1)$ . Note that

$$\gamma_{jl} = \frac{1}{2^r} \left( \frac{1 - e^{2\pi i(\theta - l)}}{1 - e^{2\pi i(\theta - l)/2^r}} \right) = \frac{1}{2^r} \frac{e^{\pi i(\theta - l)}}{e^{\pi i(\theta - l)/2^r}} \cdot \frac{\sin(\pi(\theta - l))}{\sin(\pi(\theta - l)/2^r)}. \quad (156)$$

So the goal is to lower bound:

$$|\gamma_{j0}|^2 + |\gamma_{j1}|^2 = \frac{1}{4^r} \frac{\sin^2(\theta\pi)}{\sin^2(\theta\pi/2^r)} + \frac{1}{4^r} \frac{\sin^2((\theta - 1)\pi)}{\sin^2((\theta - 1)\pi/2^r)}. \quad (157)$$

Since  $\sin(\theta) \leq \theta$  for  $\theta \geq 0$ , we can use this lower bound in the denominator for each term:

$$|\gamma_{j0}|^2 + |\gamma_{j1}|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4^r} \frac{\sin^2(\theta\pi)}{(\theta\pi/2^r)^2} + \frac{1}{4^r} \frac{\sin^2((\theta - 1)\pi)}{((\theta - 1)\pi/2^r)^2} \quad (158)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi^2} \left( \frac{\sin^2(\theta\pi)}{\theta^2} + \frac{\sin^2((\theta - 1)\pi)}{(\theta - 1)^2} \right). \quad (159)$$

Note that as shown in Figure 2 for  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , the function in Eq. (159) is symmetric around  $\theta = 1/2$  and is minimized for  $\theta = 1/2$ . The value obtained by plugging  $\theta = 1/2$  into Eq. (159) is at least 0.8.




Figure 2: The function shown in Equation (159) is minimized for  $\theta = 1/2$ . ■

Note that  $\gamma_{j0}$  and  $\gamma_{j1}$  are the amplitudes of  $\mathbf{b}^{(j)}$  and  $\mathbf{b}^{(j)} + 1$ , that are the best two  $r$ -bit approximation to  $\frac{E_j}{\kappa_H}$ . Denote the best two  $r$ -bit approximation to  $E_j$  as

$$[E_j] := E(\mathbf{b}^{(j)}), \quad [E_j] := E(\mathbf{b}^{(j)} + 1). \quad (160)$$

Since there is a one-to-one correspondence between  $r$ -bit string  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $E(\mathbf{b}) \in S(r)$ , to ease notations, we rewrite Eqs. (152)(155) as

$$\mathbf{QPE} |\psi_j\rangle |0^r\rangle = |\psi_j\rangle \sum_{\nu \in S(r)} \beta_{j\nu} |\nu\rangle, \quad (161)$$

$$\text{where } |\beta_{j\lfloor E_j \rfloor}|^2 + |\beta_{j\lceil E_j \rceil}|^2 \geq 0.8. \quad (162)$$

In addition, one can check that  $\forall j$ ,

$$\sum_{\nu \in S(r)} \beta_{j\nu} = \sum_{l=-2^{r-1}+1}^{2^{r-1}} \gamma_{jl} \quad (163)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^r} \sum_{k=0}^{2^r-1} \sum_{l=-2^{r-1}+1}^{2^{r-1}} (e^{2\pi i \epsilon_j})^k (e^{2\pi i (-l/2^r)})^k \quad (164)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^r} \sum_{k=0}^{2^r-1} (e^{2\pi i \epsilon_j})^k \cdot 2^r \delta_{k0} \quad (165)$$

$$= 1. \quad (166)$$

**(2) Boosted Quantum Phase Estimation.** Let  $r, g$  be two integer parameters. Taking input as  $|\psi_j\rangle |0^{rg}\rangle$ , the Boosted quantum phase estimation (**BQPE**) in this manuscript is just viewing the  $|0^{rg}\rangle$  as  $g$  copies of  $|0^r\rangle$ , and sequentially perform the standard Quantum Phase Estimation **QPE** w.r.t.  $|\psi_j\rangle$  and each copy of  $|0^r\rangle$ ,

$$\mathbf{BQPE} |\psi_j\rangle |0^{gr}\rangle = |\psi_j\rangle \sum_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_g \in S(r)} \beta_{j\nu_1} \dots \beta_{j\nu_g} |\nu_1 \dots \nu_g\rangle. \quad (167)$$

$$= |\psi_j\rangle \sum_{E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE} |E\rangle. \quad (168)$$

where in the last equality to ease notations we write  $E := \nu_1 \dots \nu_g$  and  $\beta_{jE} := \beta_{j\nu_1} \dots \beta_{j\nu_g}$ . We use  $\bar{E}$  to denote the median of  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_g$ . By Eq. (162) and Chernoff bound, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}: \\ \bar{E} \neq \lfloor E_j \rfloor, \bar{E} \neq \lceil E_j \rceil}} |\beta_{jE}|^2 \leq 2^{-g/5}. \quad (169)$$

Besides, by Eq. (166) we have

$$\sum_{E \in S(r)^{\otimes g}} \beta_{jE} = \left( \sum_{\nu \in S(r)} \beta_{j\nu} \right)^g = 1. \quad (170)$$

**(3) Flipped Boosted Quantum Phase Estimation.** As explained in Section 5.2 of [NC10], the circuit for the standard Quantum Phase Estimation **QPE** is, (a) First applying a layer of Hadamard gates. (b) Then apply a sequence controlled- $U$  operators, with  $U$  raised to successive powers of 2. Denote the operator as  $CU$ . (c) Then apply inverse quantum Fourier transform.

The Flipped Quantum Phase Estimation **FQPE** is similar to **QPE**, with the difference that each time **FQPE** adds a conjugate phase: (a) First applying a layer of Hadamard gate. (b) Then apply  $(CU)^\dagger$ . (c) Then apply quantum Fourier transform rather than inverse quantum Fourier transform. It is worth noting that **FQPE**  $\neq$  **QPE** $^\dagger$ .

Recall that from (2) the Boosted Quantum Phase estimation is just running **QPE** for  $g$  times. The Flipped Boosted Quantum Phase estimation (**FBQPE**) is just running **FQPE** for  $g$  times.

## B Matrix Norm Properties

In this section we list properties on matrix norms.

**Lemma 33 (Cauchy-Schwarz inequality)** For any  $M, N \in \Xi(m)$ ,

$$|\text{tr}(A^\dagger B)| \leq \sqrt{\text{tr}(A^\dagger A)} \sqrt{\text{tr}(B^\dagger B)}. \quad (171)$$



Lemma 33 is a well-known fact thus we skip the proof.

**Lemma 34 (Variational Characterization of Trace Norm)** For  $M \in \Xi(m)$ , the following variational characterization of the trace norm holds

$$|M|_1 = \max_U |\text{tr}(MU)|, \quad (172)$$

where the maximization is over all  $m$ -qubit unitary operators  $U$ .

**Proof:** Consider singular value decomposition of  $M$  as  $WDV$ , with  $W, V$  unitaries and  $D$  a diagonal matrix of singular values. Using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality Lemma 33 one gets

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{tr}(MU)| &= |\text{tr}(\sqrt{D}\sqrt{D}VUW)| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\text{tr}(\sqrt{D}\sqrt{D})} \sqrt{\text{tr} \left\{ \left( \sqrt{D}VUW \right)^\dagger \left( \sqrt{D}VUW \right) \right\}} \\ &= \text{tr}(D). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\text{tr}(D) = |M|_1$ . On the other hand,  $|M|_1$  can be obtained by choosing  $U = V^\dagger W^\dagger$ . ■

**Corollary 35** Let  $|\phi\rangle, |\varphi\rangle$  be two unit vectors on registers  $a, b$ . Let  $P, Q$  be linear operators on registers  $a, b$  with spectrum norm bounded by 1. Then

$$|\text{tr}_b(P|\phi\rangle\langle\varphi|Q)|_1 \leq 1. \quad (173)$$

In particular, let  $P = Q = I$  we get

$$|\text{tr}_b(|\phi\rangle\langle\varphi|)|_1 \leq 1. \quad (174)$$

**Proof:** By Lemma 34, we have that

$$|\text{tr}_b(P|\phi\rangle\langle\varphi|Q)|_1 = \max_{\text{unitary } U \text{ on register } a} |\text{tr}_a(\text{tr}_b(P|\phi\rangle\langle\varphi|Q)U)| \quad (175)$$

$$= |\text{tr}_{a,b}(P|\phi\rangle\langle\varphi|QU)| \quad (176)$$

$$= |\langle\varphi|QU P|\phi\rangle| \quad (177)$$

$$\leq 1. \quad (178)$$

■

**Lemma 36** Let  $\mathcal{E} : \Xi(m) \rightarrow \Xi(m)$  be a linear map. If for any unit vector  $|u\rangle, |v\rangle$ , we have  $|\mathcal{E}(|u\rangle\langle v|)|_1 \leq c$ . Then  $|\mathcal{E}|_* \leq c$ .

**Proof:** Given any  $N \in \Xi(m)$  with  $|N|_1 \leq 1$ , consider its spectrum decomposition

$$N = \sum_i \gamma_i |u_i\rangle\langle v_i|. \quad (179)$$

where  $\gamma_i \geq 0$  are singular values.  $|u_i\rangle, |v_i\rangle$  are unit vectors.  $\sum_i \gamma_i \leq |N|_1 = 1$ . Then by triangle inequality we have that

$$|\mathcal{E}(N)|_1 \leq \sum_i \gamma_i \cdot |\mathcal{E}(|u_i\rangle\langle v_i|)|_1 \leq c \quad (180)$$

■

**Lemma 37** Let  $P, Q$  be operators on register 1, 2, 3, 4 with spectrum norm bounded by 1. Let  $|w\rangle$  be a unit vector on register 2, 3, 4. For any operator  $N$  on register 1, define

$$\mathcal{F}(N) := \text{tr}_{2,3,4}(P[N \otimes |w\rangle\langle w|]Q). \quad (181)$$

Then  $|\mathcal{F}|_* \leq 1$ .

**Proof:** By Lemma 36 it suffices to assume  $N = |u\rangle\langle v|$  for unit vectors  $|u\rangle, |v\rangle$  and prove  $|\mathcal{F}(N)|_1 \leq 1$ . Since  $|u\rangle|w\rangle$  and  $|v\rangle|w\rangle$  are unit vectors on register 1, 2, 3, 4. By Corollary 35 we have  $|\mathcal{F}|_* \leq 1$ . ■

**Lemma 38** [Trace-Norm non-increasing of CPTP] Let  $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{H}(m) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(m)$  be a CPTP map. We have  $|\mathcal{E}|_* \leq 1$ . That is for any Hermitian operator  $M \in \mathcal{H}(m)$ ,  $|\mathcal{E}(M)|_1 \leq |M|_1$ .

**Proof:** Consider the spectrum decomposition of  $M = \sum_j \lambda_j |\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j|$ . We have that

$$|\mathcal{E}(M)|_1 \leq \sum_j |\lambda_j| \cdot |\mathcal{E}(|\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j|)|_1 = \sum_j |\lambda_j| = |M|_1. \quad (182)$$

where the first equality comes from the fact that  $\mathcal{E}(|\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j|)$  is a quantum mixed state thus its trace norm is equal to 1. ■

**Lemma 39 (Connecting trace norm and  $\sigma$ -norm)** Let  $\sigma$  be a Hermitian matrix where  $\sigma \geq I$ . Then  $\forall M \in \Xi(n)$ , we have that  $|M|_1^2 \leq 2^n |M|_\sigma^2$ .

**Proof:** Note that for any two positive Semi-definite Hermitian matrices  $A \geq 0, B \geq 0$ , we have  $\text{tr}(AB) \geq 0$ . Further note that  $\sigma^{1/2} - I \geq 0$ ,  $M^\dagger \sigma^{1/2} M \geq 0$ , and both of them are Hermitian. Thus we have

$$|M|_\sigma^2 = \text{tr}(IM^\dagger IM) + \text{tr}(IM^\dagger (\sigma^{1/2} - I) M) + \text{tr}((\sigma^{1/2} - I) \cdot M^\dagger \sigma^{1/2} M) \quad (183)$$

$$\geq \text{tr}(IM^\dagger IM). \quad (184)$$

Denote the singular values of  $M$  as  $\{a_j\}_j$ . (By definition  $a_j \geq 0$ ). By Cauchy inequality

$$\left( \sum_j a_j \right)^2 \leq 2^n \sum_j a_j^2 \Rightarrow |M|_1^2 \leq 2^n \text{tr}(IM^\dagger IM) \leq 2^n |M|_\sigma^2. \quad (185)$$

■

## C Bounding Mixing time w.r.t. spectral gap of $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$

This section is based on [Wol12] and private communication with Yu Tong. This section is primarily for the  $\mathcal{L}$  in our algorithm, while here we write a slightly more general proof for Lindbladian  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfying the following assumptions:

**Assumption 1** We assume  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  is CPTP for  $t \geq 0$  and satisfies

- $\mathcal{L}(\rho) = \sum_j L_j \rho L_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ L_j^\dagger L_j, \rho \right\}_+$  for some matrices  $\{L_j\}_j \subseteq \Xi(n)$ .
- $\{L_j\}_j$  generates the full algebra  $\Xi(n)$ . There exists a unique  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$  satisfying  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$ . Besides, this  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$  is a full-rank quantum state.

We use  $\sigma$  to denote  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{L}$  in our algorithm satisfies Assumption 1 by Lemma 17 and proofs in Section 6.2.

**Notations.** Here we define two different inner products on  $\Xi(n)$ , that is the Schmidt-Hilbert inner product and the weighted inner product w.r.t.  $\sigma$ : For any  $M, N \in \Xi(n)$ ,

$$\langle M, N \rangle := \text{tr}(M^\dagger N), \quad (186)$$

$$\langle M, N \rangle_\sigma := \text{tr}(\sigma^{1/2} M^\dagger \sigma^{1/2} N). \quad (187)$$

We use  $\mathcal{L}^\diamond$  to denote the dual map w.r.t. Schmidt inner product. We use  $\mathcal{L}^*$  to denote the dual map w.r.t.  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\sigma$ . That is

$$\langle M, \mathcal{L}^\diamond(N) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{L}(M), N \rangle, \quad (188)$$

$$\langle M, \mathcal{L}^*(N) \rangle_\sigma = \langle \mathcal{L}(M), N \rangle_\sigma. \quad (189)$$

$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\sigma$  induces a norm where  $|N|_\sigma^2 := \langle N, N \rangle_\sigma$ . One can check that for any  $N \in \Xi(n)$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}^*(N) = \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{L}^\diamond \left( \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} N \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (190)$$

$$\mathcal{L}^\diamond(N) = \sum_j L_j^\dagger N L_j - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ L_j^\dagger L_j, N \right\}_+ . \quad (191)$$

Define the symmetrized version of  $\mathcal{L}$  as

$$\mathcal{L}^{(s)} := \frac{\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}^*}{2} .$$

By definition  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$  is Hermitian w.r.t.  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\sigma$ , thus is diagonalizable and has a real spectrum.

### C.1 Properties on $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$ .

In this section, we prove some basic properties of  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$ . We use the following theorem.

**Theorem 40 (Generators for Semigroup of quantum channels, Theorem 7.1 in [Wol12])**  
*Consider a linear map  $\mathcal{P} : \Xi(n) \rightarrow \Xi(n)$ . Then for any  $t \geq 0$ ,  $e^{t\mathcal{P}}$  is CPTP if there exists a set of matrices  $\{P_j \in \Xi(n)\}_j$  and a Hermitian  $H_{system}$  such that*

$$\mathcal{P}(\rho) = i[\rho, H_{system}] + \sum_j P_j \rho P_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ P_j^\dagger P_j, \rho \right\}_+ . \quad (192)$$

**Theorem 41** *For any  $t \geq 0$ ,*

(i)  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$ ,  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  is CPTP and  $\mathcal{L}^\diamond(I) = 0$ .

(ii)  $e^{t\mathcal{L}^*}$  and  $e^{t\mathcal{L}^{(s)}}$  are CPTP.

(iii)  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$  has a unique fixed point, that is  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$ .

(iv) The spectrum of  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$  lies in  $[-\infty, 0]$ .

(v) The spectral gap of  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$  is strictly greater than 0, which is denoted as  $\Upsilon$  and equals to

$$\Upsilon(\mathcal{L}^{(s)}) = \min_{\substack{\langle N, N \rangle_\sigma = 1 \\ \langle N, \rho_{\mathcal{L}} \rangle_\sigma = 0}} -\langle N, \mathcal{L}^{(s)}(N) \rangle_\sigma > 0. \quad (193)$$

Since  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$  is clear in the context we abbreviate  $\Upsilon(\mathcal{L}^{(s)})$  as  $\Upsilon$ .

**Proof:** For (i): Besides, by Assumption 1 we have  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$ . Besides

$$\mathcal{L}(N) = \sum_j L_j N L_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ L_j^\dagger L_j, N \right\}_+ . \quad (194)$$

$$\mathcal{L}^\diamond(N) = \sum_j L_j^\dagger N L_j - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ L_j^\dagger L_j, N \right\}_+ . \quad (195)$$

One can directly check  $\mathcal{L}^\diamond(I) = 0$ . Besides  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  is CPTP by Theorem 40 by setting  $H_{system} = 0$ .

For (ii): we have

$$\mathcal{L}^*(N) = \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{L}^\diamond \left( \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} N \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (196)$$

$$= \sum_j \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} L_j^\dagger \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot N \cdot \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} L_j \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2} \left\{ L_j^\dagger L_j, \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} N \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_+ \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (197)$$

$$= \sum_j \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} L_j^\dagger \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot N \cdot \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} L_j \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} L_j^\dagger L_j \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot N + N \cdot \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} L_j^\dagger L_j \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right). \quad (198)$$

We will prove by properly defining a Hermitian  $H_{system}$ , the  $\mathcal{L}^*$  can be written in the form of Eq. (192) in Theorem 40, which will imply  $\mathcal{L}^*$  is CPTP. Denote

$$O_j := \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} L_j^\dagger \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad K := \frac{1}{2} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} L_j^\dagger L_j \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (199)$$

$$V := \frac{1}{2} \sum_j O_j^\dagger O_j, \quad H_{system} := \frac{1}{2i} (K - K^\dagger) \quad (200)$$

Recall that  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$  and  $\sigma = \rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$ , we have

$$\sum_j L_j \sigma^{-1} L_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \left( L_j^\dagger L_j \sigma^{-1} + \sigma^{-1} L_j^\dagger L_j \right) = 0. \quad (201)$$

$$\Rightarrow \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_j L_j \sigma^{-1} L_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \left( L_j^\dagger L_j \sigma^{-1} + \sigma^{-1} L_j^\dagger L_j \right) \right) \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0. \quad (202)$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_j \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} L_j \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} L_j^\dagger \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} L_j^\dagger L_j \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} L_j^\dagger L_j \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) = 0. \quad (203)$$

Thus

$$V = \frac{1}{2} (K^\dagger + K) \quad \Rightarrow \quad K = V + iH_{system}. \quad (204)$$

where the  $\Rightarrow$  we use  $H_{system} := \frac{1}{2i} (K - K^\dagger)$ . One can verify

$$\mathcal{L}^*(N) = \sum_j O_j N O_j^\dagger - (KN + NK^\dagger) \quad (205)$$

$$= \sum_j O_j N O_j^\dagger - (VN + NV) + i[N, H_{system}] \quad (206)$$

$$= i[N, H_{system}] + \sum_j O_j N O_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ O_j^\dagger O_j, N \right\}_+ \quad (207)$$

where the first equality comes from Eqs. (198)(199)(200), the second equality comes from (204), and the last equality comes from definition of  $V$  in Eq. (200). One can check that  $H_{system}$  is Hermitian. Since  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}^*)$ , from Eqs. (194)(207) we know that  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$  can also be written as Eq. (192), where the Lindbladian jump operator is  $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}L_j\} \cup \{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}O_j\}$ . Thus by Theorem 40 we conclude that  $e^{t\mathcal{L}^{(s)}}$  is CPTP for  $t \geq 0$ .

For (iii): From Assumption 1 we already have  $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}L_j\}$  generates the full algebra. Thus so does  $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}L_j\} \cup \{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}O_j\}$ . By Theorem 20 we conclude that there exists a unique  $\rho$  such that  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}(\rho) = 0$ . Besides, from Eq. (198) one can directly verify that  $\mathcal{L}^*(\rho_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$  thus  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}(\rho_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$ .

For (iv): By definition of  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}: \mathcal{H}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(n)$  it is Hermitian w.r.t.  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\sigma$ . Thus  $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}$  is diagonalizable and the spectrum is real. With contradiction assume there exists an eigenstate  $N \in \mathcal{H}(n)$ ,  $N \neq 0$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda > 0$ . Then  $\left| e^{t\mathcal{L}^{(s)}}(N) \right|_1 = e^{\lambda t} |N|_1$  goes to infinity as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , which contradicts with the fact that  $e^{t\mathcal{L}^{(s)}}$  is CPTP from (ii), where CPTP map does not increase trace norm of Hermitian operators (Lemma 38 in Appendix B).

For (v): By (iii)(iv) we know the spectral gap is strictly greater than 0, and the minimum eigenvector is  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$  and has eigenvalue 0. Then Eq. (193) is just by definition of spectral gap.  $\blacksquare$

## C.2 Proof of Theorem 7

**Proof:**[of Theorem 7] All the properties of  $\mathcal{L}$  we use are summarized in Assumption 1. Define

$$h_t = e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho) - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$ , one can check that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle h_t, h_t \rangle_\sigma = 2 \langle h_t, \mathcal{L}^{(s)}(h_t) \rangle_\sigma. \quad (208)$$

Further note that since  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  is trace-preserving from Theorem 41 (i), we have  $\text{tr}(e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho)) = 1$ . One can verify that  $\langle h_t, \rho_{\mathcal{L}} \rangle_{\sigma} = 0$ . Then by Eq. (208) and Eq. (193), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle h_t, h_t \rangle_{\sigma} = 2 \left\langle \frac{h_t}{|h_t|_{\sigma}}, \mathcal{L}^{(s)} \left( \frac{h_t}{|h_t|_{\sigma}} \right) \right\rangle_{\sigma} \cdot \langle h_t, h_t \rangle_{\sigma} \quad (209)$$

$$\leq -2\Upsilon \cdot \langle h_t, h_t \rangle_{\sigma}. \quad (210)$$

Then by Gronwall's inequality we have

$$\langle h_t, h_t \rangle_{\sigma} \leq \langle h_0, h_0 \rangle_{\sigma} \cdot \exp(-2\Upsilon t). \quad (211)$$

Recall that  $h_0 = \rho - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}$ . Thus we have

$$|e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho) - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}|_1 \leq 2^{n/2} |e^{t\mathcal{L}}(\rho) - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}|_{\sigma} \quad (212)$$

$$\leq 2^{n/2} |\rho - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}|_{\sigma} \cdot \exp(-\Upsilon t) \quad (213)$$

$$\leq 2^{n/2} \cdot \sqrt{\text{tr}(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho)} \cdot \exp(-\Upsilon t). \quad (214)$$

where the first inequality comes from connecting trace-norm and  $|\cdot|_{\sigma}$  by Lemma 39 in Appendix B. Note that  $\sigma \geq I$  since  $\sigma = \rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$  and  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$  is a quantum state. The second inequality comes from Eq. (211). The last inequality comes from  $\sigma = \rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$  and  $\text{tr}(\rho - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$  since both  $\rho$  and  $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$  are quantum states, and

$$|\rho - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}|_{\sigma}^2 = \text{tr}(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho - \rho_{\mathcal{L}})\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho - \rho_{\mathcal{L}})) = \text{tr}(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho) - 1. \quad (215)$$

■

## References

- [AAR<sup>+</sup>18] Mohammad H Amin, Evgeny Andriyash, Jason Rolfe, Bohdan Kulchytskyy, and Roger Melko. Quantum boltzmann machine. *Physical Review X*, 8(2):021050, 2018.
- [Alh23] Álvaro M Alhambra. Quantum many-body systems in thermal equilibrium. *PRX Quantum*, 4(4):040201, 2023.
- [BCC<sup>+</sup>14] Dominic W Berry, Andrew M Childs, Richard Cleve, Robin Kothari, and Rolando D Somma. Exponential improvement in precision for simulating sparse hamiltonians. In *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 283–292, 2014.
- [BCG<sup>+</sup>23] Ivan Bardet, Ángela Capel, Li Gao, Angelo Lucia, David Pérez-García, and Cambyse Rouzé. Rapid thermalization of spin chain commuting hamiltonians. *Physical Review Letters*, 130(6):060401, 2023.
- [BCK15] Dominic W Berry, Andrew M Childs, and Robin Kothari. Hamiltonian simulation with nearly optimal dependence on all parameters. In *2015 IEEE 56th annual symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 792–809. IEEE, 2015.
- [BKL<sup>+</sup>19] Fernando GSL Brandão, Amir Kalev, Tongyang Li, Cedric Yen-Yu Lin, Krysta M Svore, and Xiaodi Wu. Quantum sdp solvers: Large speed-ups, optimality, and applications to quantum learning. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2019)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
- [BLMT24] Ainesh Bakshi, Allen Liu, Ankur Moitra, and Ewin Tang. High-temperature gibbs states are unentangled and efficiently preparable. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16850*, 2024.
- [CKBG23] Chi-Fang Chen, Michael J Kastoryano, Fernando GSL Brandão, and Andrés Gilyén. Quantum thermal state preparation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18224*, 2023.

- [CKG23] Chi-Fang Chen, Michael J Kastoryano, and András Gilyén. An efficient and exact noncommutative quantum gibbs sampler. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09207, 2023.
- [CL16] Andrew M Childs and Tongyang Li. Efficient simulation of sparse markovian quantum dynamics. arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.05543, 2016.
- [CS16] Anirban Narayan Chowdhury and Rolando D Somma. Quantum algorithms for gibbs sampling and hitting-time estimation. arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.02940, 2016.
- [CSG<sup>+</sup>23] Mirko Consiglio, Jacopo Settimo, Andrea Giordano, Carlo Mastroianni, Francesco Plastina, Salvatore Lorenzo, Sabrina Maniscalco, John Goold, and Tony JG Apollaro. Variational gibbs state preparation on nisq devices. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11276, 2023.
- [CW16] Richard Cleve and Chunhao Wang. Efficient quantum algorithms for simulating lindblad evolution. arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.09512, 2016.
- [Dav76] Edward Brian Davies. Quantum theory of open systems. (No Title), 1976.
- [Dav79] E Brian Davies. Generators of dynamical semigroups. Journal of Functional Analysis, 34(3):421–432, 1979.
- [DLL24] Zhiyan Ding, Bowen Li, and Lin Lin. Efficient quantum gibbs samplers with kubo–martin–schwinger detailed balance condition. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05998, 2024.
- [GCDK24] András Gilyén, Chi-Fang Chen, Joao F. Doriguello, and Michael J and Kastoryano. Quantum generalizations of glauber and metropolis dynamics. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20322, 2024.
- [GSLW19] 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, pages 193–204, 2019.
- [HS83] Geoffrey E Hinton and Terrence J Sejnowski. Optimal perceptual inference. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, volume 448, pages 448–453. Citeseer, 1983.
- [KB16] Michael J Kastoryano and Fernando GSL Brandao. Quantum gibbs samplers: The commuting case. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 344:915–957, 2016.
- [LW22] Xiantao Li and Chunhao Wang. Simulating markovian open quantum systems using higher-order series expansion. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.02051, 2022.
- [LZH<sup>+</sup>22] Chee Kong Lee, Shi-Xin Zhang, Chang-Yu Hsieh, Shengyu Zhang, and Liang Shi. Variational quantum simulations of finite-temperature dynamical properties via thermofield dynamics. arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.05571, 2022.
- [MMdJS20] Mekena Metcalf, Jonathan E Moussa, Wibe A de Jong, and Mohan Sarovar. Engineered thermalization and cooling of quantum many-body systems. Physical Review Research, 2(2):023214, 2020.
- [MRR<sup>+</sup>53] Nicholas Metropolis, Arianna W Rosenbluth, Marshall N Rosenbluth, Augusta H Teller, and Edward Teller. Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. The journal of chemical physics, 21(6):1087–1092, 1953.
- [MST<sup>+</sup>20] Mario Motta, Chong Sun, Adrian TK Tan, Matthew J O’Rourke, Erika Ye, Austin J Minnich, Fernando GSL Brandao, and Garnet Kin-Lic Chan. Determining eigenstates and thermal states on a quantum computer using quantum imaginary time evolution. Nature Physics, 16(2):205–210, 2020.
- [MW05] Chris Marriott and John Watrous. Quantum arthur–merlin games. computational complexity, 14(2):122–152, 2005.

- [NC10] Michael A Nielsen and Isaac L Chuang. Quantum computation and quantum information. Cambridge university press, 2010.
- [PW09] David Poulin and Pawel Wocjan. Sampling from the thermal quantum gibbs state and evaluating partition functions with a quantum computer. arXiv preprint arXiv:0905.2199, 2009.
- [RFA24] Cambyse Rouzé, Daniel Stilck França, and Álvaro M Alhambra. Efficient thermalization and universal quantum computing with quantum gibbs samplers. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12691, 2024.
- [RWW23] Patrick Rall, Chunhao Wang, and Pawel Wocjan. Thermal state preparation via rounding promises. Quantum, 7:1132, 2023.
- [SN16] Alireza Shabani and Hartmut Neven. Artificial quantum thermal bath: Engineering temperature for a many-body quantum system. Physical review A, 94(5):052301, 2016.
- [SZ92a] Daniel W Stroock and Boguslaw Zegarlinski. The equivalence of the logarithmic sobolev inequality and the dobrushin-shlosman mixing condition. Communications in mathematical physics, 144:303–323, 1992.
- [SZ92b] Daniel W Stroock and Boguslaw Zegarlinski. The logarithmic sobolev inequality for discrete spin systems on a lattice. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 149:175–193, 1992.
- [TD00] Barbara M Terhal and David P DiVincenzo. Problem of equilibration and the computation of correlation functions on a quantum computer. Physical Review A, 61(2):022301, 2000.
- [TOV<sup>+</sup>11] Kristan Temme, Tobias J Osborne, Karl G Vollbrecht, David Poulin, and Frank Verstraete. Quantum metropolis sampling. Nature, 471(7336):87–90, 2011.
- [VAGGdW17] Joran Van Apeldoorn, András Gilyén, Sander Gribling, and Ronald de Wolf. Quantum sdp-solvers: Better upper and lower bounds. In 2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), pages 403–414. IEEE, 2017.
- [WLW21] Youle Wang, Guangxi Li, and Xin Wang. Variational quantum gibbs state preparation with a truncated taylor series. Physical Review Applied, 16(5):054035, 2021.
- [Wol12] Michael M Wolf. Quantum channels and operations-guided tour. 2012.
- [WT23] Pawel Wocjan and Kristan Temme. Szegedy walk unitaries for quantum maps. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 402(3):3201–3231, 2023.
- [ZBC23] Daniel Zhang, Jan Lukas Bosse, and Toby Cubitt. Dissipative quantum gibbs sampling. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04526, 2023.