

# Evolved Quantum Boltzmann Machines

Michele Minervini,<sup>1</sup> Dhrumil Patel,<sup>2</sup> and Mark M. Wilde<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Electrical and Computer Engineering,  
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850, USA*

(Dated: January 8, 2025)

We introduce evolved quantum Boltzmann machines as a variational ansatz for quantum optimization and learning tasks. Given two parameterized Hamiltonians  $G(\theta)$  and  $H(\phi)$ , an evolved quantum Boltzmann machine consists of preparing a thermal state of the first Hamiltonian  $G(\theta)$  followed by unitary evolution according to the second Hamiltonian  $H(\phi)$ . Alternatively, one can think of it as first realizing imaginary time evolution according to  $G(\theta)$  followed by real time evolution according to  $H(\phi)$ . After defining this ansatz, we provide analytical expressions for the gradient vector and illustrate their application in ground-state energy estimation and generative modeling, showing how the gradient for these tasks can be estimated by means of quantum algorithms that involve classical sampling, Hamiltonian simulation, and the Hadamard test. We also establish analytical expressions for the Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori information matrix elements of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines, as well as quantum algorithms for estimating each of them, which leads to at least three different general natural gradient descent algorithms based on this ansatz. Along the way, we establish a broad generalization of the main result of [Luo, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* 132, 885 (2004)], proving that the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices of general parameterized families of states differ by no more than a factor of two in the matrix (Loewner) order, making them essentially interchangeable for training when using natural gradient descent.

## CONTENTS

I. Introduction	2	V. Applications of information matrices of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	16
A. Motivation	2	A. Natural gradient for evolved quantum Boltzmann machine learning	16
B. Main results	2	B. Fundamental limitations on estimating time-evolved thermal states	17
C. Paper organization	3	VI. Quantum Boltzmann machines and quantum evolution machines as special cases	18
II. Gradient of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	5	VII. Conclusion	19
A. Ground-state energy estimation	5	A. Summary and discussion	19
B. Generative modeling	6	B. Future directions	19
III. Definitions and properties of quantum generalizations of Fisher information	7	Acknowledgments	20
A. Defining quantum generalizations of Fisher information from smooth divergences	7	Author contributions	20
B. Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori information matrices	9	References	21
C. Pure-state families, Wigner–Yanase information, and canonical purifications	10	A. Proof of Theorem 1	23
IV. Information matrices for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	11	B. Hadamard tests for expected values of commutators, anticommutators, and nestings	24
A. General considerations for the information matrices of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	11	C. Ground-state energy estimation using evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	28
B. Fisher–Bures information matrix of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	12	1. Gradient of the expected energy of an evolved quantum Boltzmann machine	28
C. Wigner–Yanase information matrix of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	12	a. Quantum algorithm for estimating the partial derivative with respect to $\theta$	29
1. Evaluating the first term of the $\theta$ -Wigner–Yanase information matrix	14	b. Quantum algorithm for estimating the partial derivative with respect to $\phi$	29
D. Kubo–Mori information matrix of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	14		

D. Evolved quantum Boltzmann machines for generative modeling	30
1. Gradient of the quantum relative entropy	30
a. Quantum algorithm for estimating the partial derivative with respect to $\phi$	31
E. Proof of Theorem 7	31
1. Proof of Equations (56) and (57)	31
2. Proof of Equations (58) and (59)	34
3. Proof of Equations (60) and (61)	37
F. Proof of Equation (71)	39
G. Alternative proof of Proposition 9	40
H. Information matrix elements for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	42
1. Fisher–Bures information matrix elements for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	42
a. Proof of Theorem 10	42
b. Proof of Theorem 11	42
c. Proof of Theorem 12	45
2. Wigner–Yanase information matrix elements for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	45
a. Proof of Theorem 13	45
b. Proof of Theorem 14	46
c. Canonical purification of quantum Boltzmann machines and thermofield double state	48
d. Proof of Theorem 15	48
e. Proof of Theorem 16	49
3. Kubo–Mori information matrix elements for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	50
a. Proof of Theorem 17	50
b. Proof of Theorem 18	52
c. Proof of Theorem 19	53
I. Quantum algorithms for estimating information matrix elements	55
1. Quantum algorithms for estimating Fisher–Bures information matrix elements	55
a. Elements with respect to $\theta$	55
b. Elements with respect to $\phi$	55
c. Elements with respect to $\theta$ and $\phi$	56
2. Quantum algorithms for estimating Wigner–Yanase information matrix elements	57
a. Elements with respect to $\theta$	57
b. Elements with respect to $\phi$	58
c. Elements with respect to $\theta$ and $\phi$	58
3. Quantum algorithms for estimating Kubo–Mori information matrix elements	59
a. Elements with respect to $\theta$	59
b. Elements with respect to $\phi$	59
c. Elements with respect to $\theta$ and $\phi$	60

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Motivation

Quantum computers offer a promising solution for various computational challenges [1]. In particular, there is growing interest in how quantum computation can provide a speedup over classical algorithms in optimization and learning tasks or if it can be useful for purely quantum tasks in these areas [2]. The potential for quantum utility in these domains relies on efficiently representing quantum states, which requires the design of both expressive and tractable ansatzes. These representations not only determine the computational efficiency of an algorithm but also affect its ability to explore the solution space effectively.

In this context, several variational quantum ansatzes have been proposed [3–6], with parameterized quantum circuits (PQCs) having emerged as a prominent heuristic [3, 7, 8]. PQCs have been considered for solving practical problems such as ground-state energy estimation [3, 9, 10], approximate combinatorial optimization [11–13], and even machine-learning tasks like clustering [14], classification [15–17], and generative modeling [18–20] (see [21] for a review). However, PQCs face significant hurdles, including the barren plateau problem [22–25], where gradient magnitudes decay exponentially with system size, making training infeasible for larger systems. These challenges underscore the importance of exploring alternative ansatzes that maintain expressivity while mitigating such optimization difficulties.

Quantum Boltzmann machines have emerged as an alternative ansatz, being an expressive and trainable model that incorporates ideas from both variational algorithms and statistical physics [4, 26, 27]. They have furthermore been bolstered by recent breakthroughs in thermal-state preparation [28–35]. Other recent works have shown how quantum Boltzmann machines can be used in quantum machine learning tasks, such as generative modeling [36, 37] and ground-state energy estimation [38]. The geometry of parameterized thermal states has also been investigated, alongside quantum algorithms for estimating their information matrix elements [39], opening up applications like geometry-aware gradient descent algorithms.

### B. Main results

In this paper, our first fundamental contribution is to establish a new ansatz for parameterizing quantum states. For doing so, we consider general parameterized Hamiltonians of the form

$$G(\theta) := \sum_{j=1}^J \theta_j G_j, \quad (1)$$

$$H(\phi) := \sum_{k=1}^K \phi_k H_k, \quad (2)$$

where  $\theta_j \in \mathbb{R}$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$ ,  $\phi_k \in \mathbb{R}$  for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ , and  $G_j$  and  $H_k$  are Hermitian operators. For Hamiltonians of physical interest,  $G_j$  and  $H_k$  act non-trivially on only a constant number of qubits. We define the *evolved quantum Boltzmann machine* ansatz to be as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\theta, \phi) &:= e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)}, \quad (3) \\ \rho(\theta) &:= \frac{e^{-G(\theta)}}{Z(\theta)}, \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where  $Z(\theta) := \text{Tr}[e^{-G(\theta)}]$  is the partition function. Given that the parameterized thermal state  $\rho(\theta)$  is known as a quantum Boltzmann machine [4, 26, 27] and  $e^{-iH(\phi)}$  represents a unitary evolution, the state  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$  is indeed an evolved quantum Boltzmann machine. In order for the Hamiltonian  $H(\phi)$  to play a non-trivial role, it is necessary that  $[H(\phi), G(\theta)] \neq 0$ . The main idea behind introducing the parameter  $\phi$  via  $H(\phi)$  is that it can enrich the representational capacity of quantum Boltzmann machines, enabling evolved quantum Boltzmann machines to explore a broader class of quantum states.

Another contribution of our paper consists of analytic formulas for the gradient of (3) with respect to the parameter vectors  $\theta$  and  $\phi$ , as well as quantum algorithms for estimating the elements of the gradient vector. Similar to previously reported algorithms from [38, 39], these algorithms involve a combination of classical random sampling, Hamiltonian simulation [40, 41], and the Hadamard test [42]. These results support using evolved quantum Boltzmann machines for optimization and learning tasks, such as ground-state energy estimation, constrained Hamiltonian optimization [43], and generative modeling tasks. Table I summarizes these findings.

We then explore various quantum generalizations of Fisher information (i.e., Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori), establishing elegant expressions for the corresponding information matrix elements for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. Of practical relevance, we prove that these matrix elements can be efficiently estimated by various quantum algorithms, again via a combination of the Hadamard test [42], classical random sampling, and Hamiltonian simulation [40, 41]. Table II summarizes our analytical findings for the Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori information matrix elements of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines.

These developments pave the way for further applications of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. In this paper, we introduce two of them. Our first application is to develop a natural gradient descent algorithm applied specifically to evolved quantum Boltzmann machine learning. Notably, the gradient update step in our approach can be performed efficiently on a quantum computer. Our second application is to the problem of esti-

imating a Hamiltonian when given access to time-evolved thermal-state samples of the form in (3).

Before moving on, let us note that fixing  $\phi$  and varying  $\theta$  leads to quantum Boltzmann machines as a special case, for which it is already known how to evaluate analytic gradients [36, 38] and information matrix elements [39]. Alternatively, fixing the parameter vector  $\theta$  and allowing the parameter vector  $\phi$  to vary in the Hamiltonian evolution  $e^{-iH(\phi)}$  leads to a special case of an evolved quantum Boltzmann machine, which we refer to as a *quantum evolution machine*. It can be seen as an alternative parameterized ansatz itself, differing from the more common layered parameterized circuits. By Trotterization, a quantum evolution machine is related to the earlier proposed Hamiltonian variational ansatz [13, 44], but there is a strong distinction in how one evaluates analytic gradients and information matrix elements for quantum evolution machines, as seen later on in (10) of Theorem 1 and Theorems 11, 15, 18, respectively, when compared to how it is done for the Hamiltonian variational ansatz. Quantum evolution machines are related to the general ansatz considered in [45, Section 2] and to [46, Eq. (2)], but again there are distinctions in how we evaluate analytic gradients for them, and the initial state of a quantum evolution machine is a thermal state. Additionally, here we derive analytical expressions for quantum generalizations of Fisher information for this ansatz, and we establish quantum algorithms for estimating them.

### C. Paper organization

The rest of our paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we present our analytical expressions for the gradient of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines, along with two applications for optimization and learning tasks. See Table I for a summary of these findings and Figure 1 for quantum circuits that estimate elements of the gradient for ground-state energy estimation and generative modeling. Section III provides background on quantum generalizations of the Fisher information and their connections to smooth divergences. In particular, we introduce the Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori information matrices, each of which is associated with Uhlmann fidelity [47], Holevo fidelity [48], and quantum relative entropy [49], respectively. Therein, we also establish a broad generalization of [50, Theorem 2], proving that the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices of general parameterized families of states differ by no more than a factor of two in the matrix (Loewner) order (Corollary 8). In Section IV A, we present general considerations regarding the geometry of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. After that, we provide our formulas for the elements of the Fisher–Bures (Section IV B), Wigner–Yanase (Section IV C), and Kubo–Mori (Section IV D) information matrices for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines, only

Application	Gradient formula	Equation	Quantum Circuit
Ground-state energy estimation	$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \text{Tr}[O\omega(\theta, \phi)] = -\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} + \langle O \rangle_{\omega(\theta, \phi)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$	Equation (13)	Figure 1a
	$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \text{Tr}[O\omega(\theta, \phi)] = i \langle [\Psi_\phi(H_k), O] \rangle_{\omega(\theta, \phi)}$	Equation (14)	Figure 1b
Generative modeling	$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} D(\eta    \omega(\theta, \phi)) = \langle G_j \rangle_{\eta(\phi)} - \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$	Equation (20)	
	$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} D(\eta    \omega(\theta, \phi)) = i \left\langle [G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_k)] \right\rangle_{\eta(\phi)}$	Equation (21)	Figure 1c

TABLE I: Summary of our analytical results for various gradients of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines, which includes quantum Boltzmann machines (rows 1 and 3) and quantum evolution machines (rows 2 and 4) as special cases.

Quantity	Formula	Theorem	Quantum Circuit
Fisher–Bures $\theta$	$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \{ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \Phi_\theta(G_j) \} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$	Theorem 10	Figure 2a
Fisher–Bures $\phi$	$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\phi) = \left\langle \left[ [\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta)], \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i))] \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$	Theorem 11	Figure 2b
Fisher–Bures $\theta, \phi$	$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta, \phi) = i \left\langle \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$	Theorem 12	Figure 2c
Wigner–Yanase $\theta$	$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right]$	Theorem 14	Figure 3a
	$+ \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$		Figure 3b
Wigner–Yanase $\phi$	$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\phi) = 2 \left\langle \left\{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - 4 \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$	Theorem 15	Figure 3c
Wigner–Yanase $\theta, \phi$	$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta, \phi) = \frac{i}{2} \left\langle \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$	Theorem 16	Figure 3d
Kubo–Mori $\theta$	$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \{ G_i, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$	Theorem 17	Figure 4a
Kubo–Mori $\phi$	$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\phi) = \left\langle \left[ [\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta)], \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$	Theorem 18	Figure 4b
Kubo–Mori $\theta, \phi$	$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta, \phi) = \frac{i}{2} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_\theta(G_i), [G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j)] \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$	Theorem 19	Figure 4c

TABLE II: Summary of our analytical results for the matrix elements of the Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori information matrices for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines, which includes as special cases quantum Boltzmann machines (rows 1, 4, and 7) and quantum evolution machines (rows 2, 5, and 8).

sketching the idea behind their proofs in the main text while including detailed proofs in the appendices. See Table II for a summary of these findings. The quantum circuits involved in the quantum algorithms for estimating each matrix element are outlined in the respective sections corresponding to each information matrix (see Figures 2, 3, and 4 also). In Section V, we finally delve into more detail about our two applications of the results related to the information matrices of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines: a natural gradient method for evolved quantum Boltzmann machine learning (Section V A) and estimating the parameters of a Hamiltonian from copies of a time-evolved thermal state (Section V B). Section VI briefly discusses how quan-

tum Boltzmann machines and quantum evolution machines are special cases of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. Furthermore, this section discusses how it is favorable to use the Wigner–Yanase information matrix over the Fisher–Bures information matrix for natural gradient descent with quantum evolution machines, but the situation is the opposite for quantum Boltzmann machines. We conclude in Section VII with a summary and some directions for future work.

## II. GRADIENT OF EVOLVED QUANTUM BOLTZMANN MACHINES

For the purposes of optimization, we are interested in determining the elements of the gradient vector  $\nabla_{\theta, \phi} \omega(\theta, \phi)$ . As we show in what follows, the following quantum channels appear in the expressions for the gradient:

$$\Phi_{\theta}(X) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) e^{-iG(\theta)t} X e^{iG(\theta)t}, \quad (5)$$

$$\Psi_{\phi}(X) := \int_0^1 dt e^{-iH(\phi)t} X e^{iH(\phi)t}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$p(t) := \frac{2}{\pi} \ln \left| \coth \left( \frac{\pi t}{2} \right) \right| \quad (7)$$

is a probability density function known as the *high-peak-tent* density [38]. We also make use of the Hilbert–Schmidt adjoint of (6), which is given by

$$\Psi_{\phi}^{\dagger}(X) = \int_0^1 dt e^{iH(\phi)t} X e^{-iH(\phi)t}. \quad (8)$$

These channels also appear later on in various expressions for quantum generalizations of Fisher information (see, e.g., Table II).

The channel  $\Phi_{\theta}$  was previously shown to be relevant for ground-state energy estimation [38] and for natural gradient descent [39] using quantum Boltzmann machines, and related, it is relevant for the same tasks when using evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. It also appeared in prior work on generative modeling [36], Hamiltonian learning [51], and quantum belief propagation [52, 53].

As far as we are aware, the use of the channel  $\Psi_{\phi}$  for general quantum machine learning tasks is original to the present paper. However, the technique behind the derivations that lead to the channel  $\Psi_{\phi}$  (i.e., Duhamel’s formula) is the same technique used in the derivations of [45]. Furthermore, our quantum algorithms that make use of the channel  $\Psi_{\phi}$  are, in a broad sense, similar to the algorithms proposed in [45], in that they both make use of classical random sampling. The channel  $\Psi_{\phi}$  has also appeared in the context of evaluating the Fisher–Bures information matrix of time-evolved pure states on quantum computers [54], with applications to quantum metrology. In Section VB, we consider the same task but for general time-evolved states, representing a significant generalization of the task considered in [54]. This builds upon our expressions for the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices for general time-evolved states (Theorems 11 and 15).

Observe that the channel  $\Phi_{\theta}$  can be realized by picking  $t$  at random from  $p(t)$  and then applying the Hamiltonian evolution  $e^{-iG(\theta)t}$ . Similarly,  $\Psi_{\phi}$  can be realized by picking  $t$  uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$  and then applying the Hamiltonian evolution  $e^{-iH(\phi)t}$ . These observations

play a role later on in our quantum algorithms for estimating the elements of the gradient and information matrices, as they require realizing them on a quantum computer.

Theorem 1 below presents our expressions for the gradient of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines:

**Theorem 1** *The partial derivatives for the parameterized family in (3) are as follows:*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) = -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_{\theta}(G_j) e^{iH(\phi)}, \omega(\theta, \phi) \right\} + \omega(\theta, \phi) \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}, \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \omega(\theta, \phi) = i [\omega(\theta, \phi), \Psi_{\phi}(H_k)]. \quad (10)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix A. For a proof of (10), see also [54, Eq. (5)]. ■

Theorem 1 serves as a key result for implementing gradient-based optimization techniques when using evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. For a general parameterized family  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$ , let  $\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$  denote a loss function, which is a function of the parameter vector  $\gamma$ . The goal of an optimization algorithm is to minimize  $\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$ . The standard gradient descent algorithm does so by means of the following update rule:

$$\gamma_{m+1} := \gamma_m - \mu \nabla_{\gamma} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_m), \quad (11)$$

where  $\mu > 0$  is the learning rate or step size and  $\nabla_{\gamma} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_m)$  is the gradient, indicating the direction of the steepest descent. Thus, access to the gradient is essential for optimization when using gradient descent.

The following subsections present two examples of problems for which Theorem 1 is useful.

### A. Ground-state energy estimation

The goal of ground-state energy estimation is to minimize the following objective function:

$$\inf_{\theta, \phi} \text{Tr}[O\omega(\theta, \phi)], \quad (12)$$

where  $O$  is an observable that is efficiently measurable. Theorem 1 implies that the gradient of (12) is given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \text{Tr}[O\omega(\theta, \phi)] = \langle O \rangle_{\omega(\theta, \phi)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_{\theta}(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}, \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \text{Tr}[O\omega(\theta, \phi)] = i \langle [\Psi_{\phi}(H_k), O] \rangle_{\omega(\theta, \phi)}. \quad (14)$$

See Appendix C for proofs of (13)–(14).

Supposing that each  $G_j$  in (1) and each  $H_k$  in (2) are Hermitian, unitary, and efficiently realizable, both the

partial derivatives can be efficiently estimated using a quantum computer. As in prior work [38, 39], we note that the circuit constructions presented throughout our paper can straightforwardly be generalized beyond the case of each  $G_j$  and  $H_k$  being a Pauli string, if they instead are Hermitian operators block encoded into unitary circuits [55, 56]. Additionally, similar to prior work on quantum Boltzmann machines [36, 38, 39], we assume here and throughout our paper that samples of the thermal state  $\rho(\theta)$  in (4) are available, for every possible choice of  $\theta$ . Based on the assumption that both  $H(\phi)$  and  $G(\theta)$  are local Hamiltonians, one can efficiently implement the unitary evolutions  $e^{-iH(\phi)t}$  and  $e^{-iG(\theta)t}$ , where  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  [41].

The first term of (13) can be straightforwardly estimated by a quantum algorithm described in detail in [38, Algorithm 2]. The quantum circuit that plays a role in the procedure for estimating the second term in (13) is depicted in Figure 1a. The procedure is described in detail in Appendix C1a as Algorithm 1. The quantum circuit used in the algorithm for estimating (14) is shown in Figure 1b, with  $S$  denoting the phase gate

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

The corresponding algorithm is given in Appendix C1b as Algorithm 2. Note that one can alternatively use the quantum algorithm presented in [45] to evaluate the expression in (14).

## B. Generative modeling

Generative modeling involves learning a target quantum state  $\eta$  by approximating it with states from a parameterized family. Here, we use the parameterized family  $(\omega(\theta, \phi))_{\theta, \phi}$  representing the evolved quantum Boltzmann machine states defined in (3). A natural measure of closeness between the target state  $\eta$  and the model state  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$  is the quantum relative entropy, which is defined for general positive-definite states  $\omega$  and  $\tau$  as [49]

$$D(\omega \parallel \tau) := \text{Tr}[\omega(\ln \omega - \ln \tau)]. \quad (16)$$

This is indeed a natural measure because it satisfies several properties discussed later on in (22)–(24). For the states  $\eta$  and  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$ , the quantum relative entropy can be written as follows:

$$D(\eta \parallel \omega(\theta, \phi)) := \text{Tr}[\eta \ln \eta] + \text{Tr}[G(\theta)\eta(\phi)] + \ln Z(\theta), \quad (17)$$

where we have introduced the evolved target state

$$\eta(\phi) := e^{iH(\phi)} \eta e^{-iH(\phi)}. \quad (18)$$

See Appendix D for a derivation of (17). From (17) or unitary invariance of the quantum relative entropy [57, Exercise 11.8.6], it follows that

$$D(\eta \parallel \omega(\theta, \phi)) = D(\eta(\phi) \parallel \rho(\theta)). \quad (19)$$

Thus, using evolved quantum Boltzmann machines for generative modeling can be seen as allowing the target state to evolve unitarily according to  $e^{iH(\phi)}$ , potentially improving the learning process when compared to standard quantum Boltzmann machines [36].

The quantum relative entropy in (16) can be minimized using gradient descent, as defined by the update rule in (11), which requires computing its derivatives with respect to the parameters of the model state. To this end, we now show the gradient expressions for the generative modeling problem when using evolved quantum Boltzmann machines.

**Theorem 2** *The  $j$ th element of the gradient of the quantum relative entropy in (16) with respect to the  $\theta$  parameter vector is as follows:*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} D(\eta \parallel \omega(\theta, \phi)) = \langle G_j \rangle_{\eta(\phi)} - \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (20)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix D1. ■

For standard quantum Boltzmann machines, the gradient with respect to the parameter vector  $\theta$  is equal to the difference between the target  $\eta$  and model  $\rho(\theta)$  expectation values of the operators in the Hamiltonian (1) of the ansatz [36, Eq. (4)]. However, for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines, it is equal to the difference between the expectation values of the same operators but evaluated for the evolved target  $\eta(\phi)$  and the thermal state  $\rho(\theta)$ .


**Theorem 3** *The  $k$ th element of the gradient of the quantum relative entropy in (16) with respect to the  $\phi$  parameter vector is as follows:*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} D(\eta \parallel \omega(\theta, \phi)) = i \left\langle \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_k) \right] \right\rangle_{\eta(\phi)}. \quad (21)$$


**Proof.** See Appendix D1. ■

The quantum circuit depicted in Figure 1c can be used for estimating the quantity in (21). The algorithm for estimating (21) involves running this circuit multiple times, with the time  $t$  sampled uniformly from the interval  $[0, 1]$  for each run. More details about the algorithm can be found in Appendix D1a. Note that one can alternatively use the quantum algorithm presented in [45] to evaluate the expression in (21).


An additional motivation behind choosing quantum relative entropy as a measure of closeness for generative modeling is that, for fixed  $\phi$ , it is strictly convex in the parameter vector  $\theta$ . The claim about strict convexity follows from [58, Lemma 6] and the unitary invariance of the objective function with respect to  $\phi$  (see (19)). In practice, searching is often restricted to a subspace of the full Hilbert space that corresponds to some space of efficiently preparable thermal states. Now, if the global optimum lies within this subspace, then it can be reached using just the standard quantum Boltzmann machine as an ansatz. Otherwise, one can use evolved quantum Boltzmann machines as an ansatz because it provides access to a larger search space, which may include the global minimum.



(a) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $-\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$ . For each run of the circuit, the time  $t$  is sampled at random from the probability density  $p(t)$  in (7). For details of the algorithm, see Appendix C1a.



(b) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{i}{2} \left\langle [\Psi_\phi(H_k), O] \right\rangle_{\omega(\theta, \phi)}$ . For each run of the circuit, the time  $t$  is sampled uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$ . For details of the algorithm, see Appendix C1b.



(c) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{i}{2} \left\langle [G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_k)] \right\rangle_{\eta(\phi)}$ . For each run of the circuit, the time  $t$  is sampled uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$ . For details of the algorithm, see Appendix D1a.

FIG. 1: Quantum circuits involved in estimating the gradient of the objective functions for the ground-state energy estimation problem and the generative modeling problem. (a) Quantum circuit involved in the estimation of  $\partial_{\theta_j} \text{Tr}[O\omega(\theta, \phi)]$ ; (b) quantum circuit involved in the estimation of  $\partial_{\phi_k} \text{Tr}[O\omega(\theta, \phi)]$ ; (c) quantum circuit involved in the estimation of  $\partial_{\phi_k} \mathcal{D}(\eta \parallel \omega(\theta, \phi))$ .

### III. DEFINITIONS AND PROPERTIES OF QUANTUM GENERALIZATIONS OF FISHER INFORMATION

In this section, we provide an overview of various quantum generalizations of Fisher information, which we employ in the remaining sections of our paper. The approach that we adopt is information-theoretic in nature, viewing Fisher information as quantifying the distinguishability between infinitesimally close states chosen from a parameterized family. As such, our starting point is the information-theoretic notion of a divergence, which quantifies the distinguishability of two states, and then we develop definitions and properties of quantum generalizations of Fisher information from this perspective. See [59–65] for various reviews, related notions, and background on quantum generalizations of Fisher information.

#### A. Defining quantum generalizations of Fisher information from smooth divergences

To begin with, let us define a smooth divergence  $\mathcal{D}$  to be a smooth function  $\mathcal{D}: \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H}) \times \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H}) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  (i.e., from two positive-definite states  $\omega$  and  $\tau$  to the reals) such that the following properties hold for all states  $\omega$  and  $\tau$  and every quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}$ :

$$\text{Faithfulness: } \mathcal{D}(\omega \parallel \tau) = 0 \iff \omega = \tau, \quad (22)$$

$$\text{Data-processing: } \mathcal{D}(\omega \parallel \tau) \geq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N}(\omega) \parallel \mathcal{N}(\tau)). \quad (23)$$

Here we focus nearly exclusively on positive-definite states because the exposition is much simpler, and this assumption is satisfied for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. Due to (22) and (23), the inequality

$$\mathcal{D}(\omega \parallel \tau) \geq 0 \quad (24)$$

holds for every pair of states, by considering the trace and replace channel  $\mathcal{R}_\xi(X) := \text{Tr}[X]\xi$ , where  $\xi$  is a state. Indeed, consider that

$$\mathbf{D}(\omega\|\tau) \geq \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{R}_\xi(\omega)\|\mathcal{R}_\xi(\tau)) = \mathbf{D}(\xi\|\xi) = 0. \quad (25)$$

Thus, it follows that the minimum value of the divergence  $\mathbf{D}$  is equal to zero, a property used later on in arriving at (36). It is also a direct consequence of the data-processing inequality in (23) that the smooth divergence  $\mathbf{D}$  is invariant under the action of a unitary channel  $\mathcal{U}$ :

$$\mathbf{D}(\omega\|\tau) = \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{U}(\omega)\|\mathcal{U}(\tau)). \quad (26)$$

Particular examples of smooth divergences include the quantum relative entropy [49] (defined already in (16)), the Petz–Rényi relative entropy [66, 67], and the sandwiched Rényi relative entropy [68, 69], which are respectively defined as follows:

$$D_\alpha(\omega\|\tau) := \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \ln \text{Tr}[\omega^\alpha \tau^{1-\alpha}], \quad (27)$$

$$\tilde{D}_\alpha(\omega\|\tau) := \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \ln \text{Tr}\left[\left(\tau^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \omega \tau^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\right)^\alpha\right]. \quad (28)$$

The quantum relative entropy indeed obeys the data-processing inequality [70], the Petz–Rényi relative entropy obeys it for  $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2]$  [66, 67], and the sandwiched Rényi relative entropy obeys it for  $\alpha \in [1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$  [71] (see also [72]). We especially focus on the case  $\alpha = 1/2$  for both the Petz– and sandwiched Rényi relative entropies, which are given by

$$D_{1/2}(\omega\|\tau) := -\ln F_H(\omega, \tau), \quad (29)$$

$$\tilde{D}_{1/2}(\omega\|\tau) := -\ln F(\omega, \tau). \quad (30)$$

We have written the quantities in (29)–(30) in terms of the Holevo [48] and Uhlmann [47] fidelities, respectively, which are defined as

$$F_H(\omega, \tau) := (\text{Tr}[\sqrt{\omega}\sqrt{\tau}])^2, \quad (31)$$

$$F(\omega, \tau) := \text{Tr}\|\sqrt{\omega}\sqrt{\tau}\|_1^2. \quad (32)$$

Interestingly, the following inequalities relate the Holevo and Uhlmann fidelities:

$$F_H(\omega, \tau) \leq F(\omega, \tau) \leq \sqrt{F_H(\omega, \tau)}, \quad (33)$$

with the first one following from the variational characterization of the trace norm [57, Property 9.1.6] and the second one by adapting [73, Theorem 6] with the choice  $s = 1/2$ ,  $A = \rho$ , and  $B = \sigma$ . They directly imply the following inequalities:

$$-2 \ln F_H(\omega, \tau) \geq -2 \ln F(\omega, \tau) \geq -\ln F_H(\omega, \tau), \quad (34)$$

which we use later on in Corollary 8 to relate the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices (defined later in Definition 6).

Now suppose that  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  is a parameterized, differentiable family of states such that  $\gamma$  is an  $L$ -dimensional parameter vector, where  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ . Letting  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^L$  be such that  $\|\varepsilon\|$  is small (i.e.,  $\|\varepsilon\| \ll 1$ ), the following smooth divergence  $\mathbf{D}$  characterizes the distinguishability of the nearby states  $\sigma(\gamma)$  and  $\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)$ :

$$\mathbf{D}(\sigma(\gamma)\|\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)). \quad (35)$$

Since the divergence  $\mathbf{D}$  is assumed to be smooth, it has a Taylor expansion of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}(\sigma(\gamma)\|\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)) &= \mathbf{D}(\sigma(\gamma)\|\sigma(\gamma)) + \varepsilon^T \nabla \mathbf{D} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^T I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma) \varepsilon + O(\|\varepsilon\|^3) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^T I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma) \varepsilon + O(\|\varepsilon\|^3), \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where the gradient  $\nabla \mathbf{D}$  is defined as the  $L \times 1$  vector with the following components:

$$[\nabla \mathbf{D}]_i = \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \mathbf{D}(\sigma(\gamma)\|\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \quad (37)$$

and  $I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma)$  is an  $L \times L$  Hessian matrix defined in terms of its matrix elements as

$$[I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma)]_{ij} := \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \mathbf{D}(\sigma(\gamma)\|\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)) \right|_{\varepsilon=0}. \quad (38)$$

We call  $I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma)$  the  $\mathbf{D}$ -based Fisher information matrix. If we would like to denote the dependence of the matrix  $I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma)$  on the family  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$ , then we employ the notation

$$I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma; (\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}) := I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma). \quad (39)$$

The equality in (36) is a direct consequence of the faithfulness assumption in (22) and the assumed smoothness of  $\mathbf{D}$ . Indeed, it is evident from (22) that the zeroth order term  $\mathbf{D}(\sigma(\gamma)\|\sigma(\gamma))$  vanishes, and the first order term  $\varepsilon^T \nabla \mathbf{D}$  vanishes because we have expanded the function  $\varepsilon \mapsto \mathbf{D}(\sigma(\gamma)\|\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))$  about the critical point  $\varepsilon = 0$ , i.e., where  $\mathbf{D}$  takes its minimum value. Eq. (36) thus establishes a pivotal connection between a smooth divergence  $\mathbf{D}$  and its  $\mathbf{D}$ -based Fisher information matrix. The main divergences on which we focus are the quantum relative entropy, twice the negative logarithm of the Holevo fidelity, and twice the negative logarithm of the Uhlmann fidelity, which respectively lead to the Kubo–Mori, Wigner–Yanase, and Fisher–Bures information matrices.

The basic properties of a smooth divergence  $\mathbf{D}$  imply related basic properties of the  $\mathbf{D}$ -based Fisher information matrix  $I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma)$ , which we state formally in Proposition 4 below. These properties include non-negativity of  $I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma)$ , the data-processing inequality, and an ordering property.



**Proposition 4** Let  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  be a parameterized, differentiable family of states, and let  $I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma)$  be the  $\mathbf{D}$ -based Fisher information matrix, as defined in (38). Then the following matrix inequalities hold for all  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L$ , corresponding to non-negativity and data-processing under a quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}$ , respectively:

$$I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma) \geq 0, \quad (40)$$

$$I^{\mathbf{D}}\left(\gamma; (\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}\right) \geq I^{\mathbf{D}}\left(\gamma; (\mathcal{N}(\sigma(\gamma)))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}\right). \quad (41)$$

Furthermore, if  $\mathbf{D}^1$  and  $\mathbf{D}^2$  are smooth divergences for which the following inequality holds for all states  $\omega$  and  $\tau$ :

$$\mathbf{D}^1(\omega \parallel \tau) \geq \mathbf{D}^2(\omega \parallel \tau), \quad (42)$$

then the following matrix inequality holds for all  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L$ :

$$I^{\mathbf{D}^1}(\gamma) \geq I^{\mathbf{D}^2}(\gamma). \quad (43)$$

**Proof.** The proofs are short and based directly on (36). Let  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , and let  $\hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^L$  be a unit vector. Then, as mentioned previously, consider that (22), (24), and (36) imply that the following holds for all such  $\delta$ ,  $\hat{u}$ , and  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L$ :

$$\frac{\delta^2}{2} \hat{u}^T I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma) \hat{u} + O(\delta^3) = \mathbf{D}(\sigma(\gamma) \parallel \sigma(\gamma + \delta \hat{u})) \geq 0. \quad (44)$$

Dividing by  $\delta^2$  and taking the limit  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  then implies that the following inequality holds for all  $\hat{u}$  and  $\gamma$ :

$$\hat{u}^T I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma) \hat{u} \geq 0, \quad (45)$$

which is equivalent to (40).

Similarly, Eq. (36) and the data-processing inequality in (23) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\delta^2}{2} \hat{u}^T I^{\mathbf{D}}\left(\gamma; (\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}\right) \hat{u} + O(\delta^3) \\ &= \mathbf{D}(\sigma(\gamma) \parallel \sigma(\gamma + \delta \hat{u})) \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

$$\geq \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{N}(\sigma(\gamma)) \parallel \mathcal{N}(\sigma(\gamma + \delta \hat{u}))) \quad (47)$$

$$= \frac{\delta^2}{2} \hat{u}^T I^{\mathbf{D}}\left(\gamma; (\mathcal{N}(\sigma(\gamma)))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}\right) \hat{u} + O(\delta^3). \quad (48)$$

Dividing by  $\delta^2$  and taking the limit  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  then implies that the following inequality holds for all  $\hat{u}$  and  $\gamma$ :

$$\hat{u}^T I^{\mathbf{D}}\left(\gamma; (\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}\right) \hat{u} \geq \hat{u}^T I^{\mathbf{D}}\left(\gamma; (\mathcal{N}(\sigma(\gamma)))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}\right) \hat{u}, \quad (49)$$

which is equivalent to (41).

Finally, the proof of (43) proceeds quite similarly by making use of the assumption in (42). ■

The following corollary is a direct consequence of the data-processing inequality in (41) and is also a consequence of the unitary invariance of the smooth divergence  $\mathbf{D}$ :

**Corollary 5** Let  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  be a parameterized, differentiable family of states, and let  $I^{\mathbf{D}}(\gamma)$  be the  $\mathbf{D}$ -based Fisher information matrix, as defined in (38). Then the following matrix equality holds for all  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L$  and every unitary channel  $\mathcal{U}$ :

$$I^{\mathbf{D}}\left(\gamma; (\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}\right) = I^{\mathbf{D}}\left(\gamma; (\mathcal{U}(\sigma(\gamma)))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}\right). \quad (50)$$

## B. Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori information matrices

Throughout the rest of our paper, we consider three key quantum generalizations of the Fisher information: the Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori information matrices. As mentioned previously, they are defined in terms of the Uhlmann fidelity, Holevo fidelity, and quantum relative entropy, respectively (see (32), (31), and (16), respectively, for definitions of the latter). These connections have been known for some time since [74], [75], and [76], respectively. Specifically, we define them as follows:

**Definition 6** For  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  a parameterized, differentiable family of states, the Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori information matrix elements are defined as follows, respectively:

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\gamma) := 2 \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \tilde{D}_{1/2}(\sigma(\gamma) \parallel \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \quad (51)$$

$$= 2 \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [-\ln F(\sigma(\gamma), \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))] \right|_{\varepsilon=0}, \quad (52)$$

$$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\gamma) := 2 \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} D_{1/2}(\sigma(\gamma) \parallel \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \quad (53)$$

$$= 2 \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [-\ln F_H(\sigma(\gamma), \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))] \right|_{\varepsilon=0}, \quad (54)$$

$$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\gamma) := \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} D(\sigma(\gamma) \parallel \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)) \right|_{\varepsilon=0}. \quad (55)$$

The particular prefactors used in the above definitions are related to those made when relating Rényi relative entropies to Fisher information (see [77, Eq. (50)], [78, Section 11], and [79, 80, Section 6.4]).

These matrix elements have explicit expressions, which are given in Theorem 7 below. Let us note that these expressions are well known (see, e.g., [61, 64]), and for completeness of the exposition in this section, we provide explicit (and, in some cases, brief) proofs that connect the expressions in Definition 6 to those in Theorem 7 below.

**Theorem 7** For  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  a parameterized, differentiable family of states, the following equalities hold:

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\gamma) = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{F}(\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) \partial_j \sigma(\gamma)] \quad (56)$$

$$= \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{2}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \partial_i \sigma(\gamma) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \partial_j \sigma(\gamma) | k \rangle, \quad (57)$$

$$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\gamma) = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{W}(\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) \partial_j \sigma(\gamma)] \quad (58)$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{4}{(\sqrt{\lambda_k} + \sqrt{\lambda_\ell})^2} \langle k | \partial_i \sigma(\gamma) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \partial_j \sigma(\gamma) | k \rangle, \quad (59)$$

$$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\gamma) = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{K}(\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) \partial_j \sigma(\gamma)] \quad (60)$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \partial_i \sigma(\gamma) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \partial_j \sigma(\gamma) | k \rangle, \quad (61)$$

where an eigendecomposition of  $\sigma(\gamma)$  is given by  $\sigma(\gamma) = \sum_k \lambda_k |k\rangle\langle k|$  and we have employed the shorthand  $\partial_i \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i}$ . Also, the superoperators  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}$ , and  $\mathcal{K}$  are defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}(X) := 2 \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)} X e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)}, \quad (62)$$

$$\mathcal{W}(X) := 4 \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty ds dt e^{-(s+t)\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} X e^{-(s+t)\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}, \quad (63)$$

$$\mathcal{K}(X) := \int_0^\infty dt (\sigma(\gamma) + tI)^{-1} X (\sigma(\gamma) + tI)^{-1}. \quad (64)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix E. ■

Based on (34), (43), and the definitions in (52) and (54), we arrive at the following corollary relating the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices, representing a broad generalization of the inequalities reported in [50, Theorem 2]:

**Corollary 8** For  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  a parameterized, differentiable family of states, the following inequalities hold:

$$2I^{\text{WY}}(\gamma) \geq I^{\text{FB}}(\gamma) \geq I^{\text{WY}}(\gamma). \quad (65)$$

As a consequence of Corollary 8, we see that the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices differ only by a constant in the matrix order. As such, they are essentially exchangeable when employing an optimization algorithm like natural gradient descent. This point is discussed further in Section V A. Furthermore, if there are scenarios in which the Wigner–Yanase information matrix is much simpler to compute than the Fisher–Bures information matrix, then Corollary 8 is useful. In Section VI, we discuss specific examples for which it is indeed easier to estimate the Wigner–Yanase information matrix rather than the Fisher–Bures information matrix and vice versa.

Corollary 8 also has implications for estimation theory and the multiparameter Cramer–Rao bound (see, e.g., [61, Section V]), in particular implying that the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices provide essentially the same fundamental limitations on an estimation scheme, up to a factor of two. See Section VB for further discussions.

### C. Pure-state families, Wigner–Yanase information, and canonical purifications

Let us recall the known formula for a pure, parameterized, differentiable family  $(\psi(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  of states and connect to the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices above. In particular, due to the fact that

$$F(\psi, \varphi) = \sqrt{F_H(\psi, \varphi)} = |\langle \psi | \varphi \rangle|^2 \quad (66)$$

for pure states  $\psi$  and  $\varphi$ , the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices, as defined in (52) and (54), respectively, are proportional and expressed in terms of the state vector  $|\psi(\gamma)\rangle$  as follows:

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\gamma) \quad (67)$$

$$= 2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [-\ln F(\psi(\gamma), \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon))] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \quad (68)$$

$$= 2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [-\ln |\langle \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) \rangle|^2] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0}. \quad (69)$$

Explicitly calculating (69) for  $(\psi(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  then leads to the following well known expression (see, e.g., [61, Eq. (129)]):

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\gamma) \quad (70)$$

$$= 4 \text{Re}[\langle \partial_i \psi(\gamma) | \partial_j \psi(\gamma) \rangle - \langle \partial_i \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \langle \psi(\gamma) | \partial_j \psi(\gamma) \rangle]. \quad (71)$$

We detail this calculation in Appendix F.

We can furthermore establish an explicit connection between the Wigner–Yanase information of a parameterized family  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  and the Fisher–Bures information of the pure parameterized family  $(\varphi^\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$ , where  $\varphi^\sigma(\gamma)$  is a canonical purification of  $\sigma(\gamma)$ , defined as

$$\varphi^\sigma(\gamma) := \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \otimes I \right) \Gamma \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \otimes I \right), \quad (72)$$

and  $\Gamma$  is the standard maximally entangled operator:

$$\Gamma := \sum_{k,\ell} |k\rangle\langle \ell| \otimes |k\rangle\langle \ell|. \quad (73)$$

In particular, the following proposition holds:

**Proposition 9** For a parameterized, differentiable family  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  of positive-definite states, the following equality holds:

$$I^{\text{WY}}(\gamma; (\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}) = I^{\text{FB}}(\gamma; (\varphi^\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}), \quad (74)$$

where  $\varphi^\sigma(\gamma)$  is defined in (72).

**Proof.** Defining  $|\Gamma\rangle := \sum_k |k\rangle \otimes |k\rangle$ , the following equalities hold for all states  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$ :

$$F_H(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = (\text{Tr}[\sqrt{\sigma_1}\sqrt{\sigma_2}])^2 \quad (75)$$

$$= (\langle \Gamma | (\sqrt{\sigma_1}\sqrt{\sigma_2} \otimes I) | \Gamma \rangle)^2 \quad (76)$$

$$= (\langle \varphi^{\sigma_1} | \varphi^{\sigma_2} \rangle)^2 \quad (77)$$

$$= |\langle \varphi^{\sigma_1} | \varphi^{\sigma_2} \rangle|^2 \quad (78)$$

$$= F(\varphi^{\sigma_1}, \varphi^{\sigma_2}). \quad (79)$$

So this implies that

$$-2 \ln F_H(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = -2 \ln F(\varphi^{\sigma_1}, \varphi^{\sigma_2}). \quad (80)$$

By the definitions in (52) and (54), the claim follows. See Appendix G for an alternative proof. ■

#### IV. INFORMATION MATRICES FOR EVOLVED QUANTUM BOLTZMANN MACHINES

In this section, we detail some further contributions of our paper, namely, analytical expressions for and quantum circuits and algorithms to estimate the matrix elements of the Fisher–Bures (Section IV B), Wigner–Yanase (Section IV C), and Kubo–Mori (Section IV D) information matrices for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. As mentioned previously, these results are summarized in Table II. The main applications of these findings are to natural gradient descent algorithms for quantum machine learning tasks (Section V A) and fundamental limitations on estimating time-evolved thermal states (Section V B).

Before delving into the results of Sections IV B–IV D, we first present, in Section IV A, some general considerations that apply to all of the information matrices for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines.

##### A. General considerations for the information matrices of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines

Let us first recall the parameterization in (3). The state  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$  is parameterized by  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^J$  and  $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^K$ . Thus,  $\gamma = (\theta, \phi)$ ,  $L = J + K$ , and each information matrix is a block matrix of the following form

$$I(\gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I(\theta) \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} I(\theta, \phi) \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} I(\phi, \theta) \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} I(\phi) \end{bmatrix} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (81)$$

where the top left matrix is a  $J \times J$  information matrix for the parameter vector  $\theta$ , the bottom right matrix is a  $K \times K$  information matrix for the parameter vector  $\phi$ , and the other  $J \times K$  and  $K \times J$  matrices capture cross terms between  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  (here note that  $I(\phi, \theta) = I(\theta, \phi)^T$ ).

For the parameterized states  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$ , the information matrices in Definition 6 and Theorem 7 have multiple components because the parameter vectors  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  are independent. For the parametrized state  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$ , we denote the various information matrices as follows:

$$I_{ij}(\theta) := \sum_{k, \ell} c(\lambda_k, \lambda_\ell) \langle k | \partial_{\theta_i} \omega(\theta, \phi) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \partial_{\theta_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) | k \rangle,$$

$$I_{ij}(\phi) := \sum_{k, \ell} c(\lambda_k, \lambda_\ell) \langle k | \partial_{\phi_i} \omega(\theta, \phi) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \partial_{\phi_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) | k \rangle,$$

$$I_{ij}(\theta, \phi) := \sum_{k, \ell} c(\lambda_k, \lambda_\ell) \langle k | \partial_{\theta_i} \omega(\theta, \phi) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \partial_{\phi_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) | k \rangle, \quad (82)$$

where  $c(\lambda_k, \lambda_\ell)$  is one of the functions in Theorem 7,  $\partial_{\theta_i} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i}$ ,  $\partial_{\phi_i} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i}$ , and we used the spectral decomposition

$$\omega(\theta, \phi) = \sum_k \lambda_k |k\rangle \langle k|. \quad (83)$$

In the latter notation, we have suppressed the dependence of the eigenvalue  $\lambda_k$  and the eigenvector  $|k\rangle$  on the parameter vectors  $\theta$  and  $\phi$ . In accordance with (3) and (83), the spectral decomposition for the parameterized thermal state  $\rho(\theta)$  is as follows:

$$\rho(\theta) = \sum_k \lambda_k |\tilde{k}\rangle \langle \tilde{k}|, \quad (84)$$

where the eigenvalues  $\lambda_k$  are the same as those of  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$ , while the eigenvectors  $|k\rangle$  of  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$  and  $|\tilde{k}\rangle$  of  $\rho(\theta)$  are related as follows:  $|k\rangle = e^{-iH(\phi)} |\tilde{k}\rangle$ .

By inspecting (57), (59), and (61), it is clear that the following calculations are helpful for evaluating all of the information matrix elements in Theorem 7 for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines with respect to the  $\theta$  parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle k | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | \ell \rangle \\ &= \langle k | \left( -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_j) e^{iH(\phi)}, \omega(\theta, \phi) \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \omega(\theta, \phi) \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right) | \ell \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\frac{1}{2} \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_j) e^{iH(\phi)} \omega(\theta, \phi) | \ell \rangle \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \langle k | \omega(\theta, \phi) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_j) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle \\ & \quad + \langle k | \omega(\theta, \phi) | \ell \rangle \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\frac{1}{2} (\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k) \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_j) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle \\ & \quad + \delta_{k\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} (\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k) \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle + \delta_{k\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}, \quad (88)$$

and with respect to the  $\phi$  parameters:

$$\langle k | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | \ell \rangle$$

$$= \langle k|i[\omega(\theta, \phi), \Psi_\phi(H_i)]|\ell\rangle \quad (89)$$

$$= i\langle k|(\omega(\theta, \phi)\Psi_\phi(H_i) - \Psi_\phi(H_i)\omega(\theta, \phi))|\ell\rangle \quad (90)$$

$$= i(\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell)\langle k|\Psi_\phi(H_i)|\ell\rangle. \quad (91)$$

These calculations follow by direct substitution using Theorem 1 and applying (83).

Before proceeding to the forthcoming subsections, let us note that the expressions given for  $I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta)$ ,  $I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta)$ , and  $I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta)$  in Theorems 10, 14, and 17 below, respectively, generalize the classical formulas presented in [81, Eq. (6)].

### B. Fisher–Bures information matrix of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines

The main results of this section are Theorems 10, 11, and 12, which provide explicit analytical expressions for the Fisher–Bures information matrix elements of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. Additionally, we give quantum circuits that play a key role in efficiently estimating the terms in these expressions (see Figure 2).

**Theorem 10** *For the parameterized family in (3), the Fisher–Bures information matrix elements, with respect to the  $\theta$  parameters, are as follows:*

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \{\Phi_\theta(G_i), \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (92)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix H 1 a. ■

This is the same result obtained in [39] in the case of using the parameterized family of thermal states.  $I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta)$  can be efficiently estimated on a quantum computer (under the assumption that each  $G_j$  is a local operator, acting on a constant number of qubits) [39]. Supposing that each  $G_j$  in (1) is not only Hermitian but also unitary, as it is for the common case in which each  $G_j$  is a tensor product of Pauli operators, we can use the quantum circuit shown in Figure 2a for estimating the first term of (92). Also, the second term  $\langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$  in (92) can be estimated by means of a quantum algorithm. Since it can be written as

$$\langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} = \text{Tr}[(G_i \otimes G_j)(\rho(\theta) \otimes \rho(\theta))], \quad (93)$$

a procedure for estimating it is to generate the state  $\rho(\theta) \otimes \rho(\theta)$  and then measure the observable  $G_i \otimes G_j$  on these two copies. Through repetition, the estimate of  $\langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$  can be made as precise as desired. This procedure is described in detail as [38, Algorithm 2].

The elements of the Fisher–Bures information matrix for the parameter vector  $\phi$  are as follows:

**Theorem 11** *For the parameterized family in (3), the Fisher–Bures information matrix elements, with respect to the  $\phi$  parameters, are as follows:*

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\phi) = \left\langle \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (94)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix H 1 b. ■

The quantity in (94) can be estimated on a quantum computer by a generalisation of the single-qubit Hadamard test circuit, which is useful for evaluating the expectation value of nested commutators [82, Algorithm 3]. The quantum circuit used in this case is depicted in Figure 2b.

The elements of the Fisher–Bures information matrix for the cross terms involving  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  are as follows:

**Theorem 12** *For the parameterized family in (3), the Fisher–Bures information matrix elements, with respect to the  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  parameters, are as follows:*

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta, \phi) = i \left\langle \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (95)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix H 1 c. ■

The term in (95) can be estimated by means of the quantum circuit depicted in Figure 2c.

### C. Wigner–Yanase information matrix of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines

The main results of this section are Theorems 14, 15, and 16, which provide explicit analytical expressions for the Wigner–Yanase information matrix elements of the parameterized family in (3). Additionally, we give quantum circuits that play a key role in efficiently estimating the terms in these expressions (see Figure 3). We also provide a unique quantum algorithm for estimating the first term of (100), which makes use of the canonical purification of a quantum Boltzmann machine.

In order to obtain our findings here, we appeal to Proposition 9 and, as such, we consider the canonically purified evolved quantum Boltzmann machine, defined as

$$|\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle := \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle, \quad (96)$$

where  $\rho(\theta)$  is the parameterized thermal state defined in (4),  $H(\phi)$  is defined in (2), and  $|\Gamma\rangle := \sum_k |k\rangle |k\rangle$  is the maximally entangled vector. Observe that  $|\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle$  indeed purifies  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$  because

$$\omega(\theta, \phi) = \text{Tr}_2[|\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle\langle\psi(\theta, \phi)|]. \quad (97)$$


We have the following result for the partial derivatives of (96):

**Theorem 13** *The partial derivatives for the parameterized family of canonically purified evolved quantum Boltzmann machines in (96) are as follows:*


$$|\partial_{\theta_j} \psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle = -\frac{1}{4} \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle, \quad (98)$$

$$|\partial_{\phi_i} \psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle = -i(\Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes I) |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle, \quad (99)$$


where we used the shorthands  $\partial_{\theta_j} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j}$  and  $\partial_{\phi_i} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i}$ .



(a) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{1}{2} \langle \{\Phi_\theta(G_i), \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$ . For each run of the circuit, the times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are sampled independently at random from the probability density  $p(t)$  in (7). For details of the algorithm, see Appendix I 1 a.



(b) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{1}{4} \langle \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \right] \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$ . For each run of the circuit, the times  $t_1$  and  $t_3$  are sampled uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$ , and the time  $t_2$  is sampled independently at random from the probability density  $p(t)$  in (7). For details of the algorithm, see Appendix I 1 b.



(c) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{i}{2} \langle \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$ . For each run of the circuit, the time  $t_1$  is sampled independently at random from the probability density  $p(t)$  in (7), and  $t_2$  is sampled uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$ . For details of the algorithm, see Appendix I 1 c.

FIG. 2: Quantum circuits involved in the estimation of the Fisher–Bures information matrix elements of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. (a) Quantum circuit involved in the estimation of  $I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta)$ ; (b) quantum circuit involved in the estimation of  $I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\phi)$ ; (c) quantum circuit involved in the estimation of  $I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta, \phi)$ .

**Proof.** See Appendix H 2 a. ■

The elements of the Wigner–Yanase information matrix for the parameter vector  $\theta$  are as follows:

**Theorem 14** For the parameterized family in (3), the Wigner–Yanase information matrix elements, with respect to the  $\theta$  parameter vector, are as follows:

$$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] + \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (100)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix H 2 b. ■

Note that we can rewrite the Wigner–Yanase information matrix with respect to the parameter vector  $\theta$  as

$$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} \left[ \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \right] - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (101)$$

The last two terms of (100) can be easily estimated via a combination of classical sampling, Hamiltonian evolution, and the Hadamard test. The quantum circuit for estimating the second term of (100) is depicted in Figure 3b, and the complete algorithm used to estimate this term is given in Appendix I 2 a. We defer the estimation of the first term of (100) to Section IV C 1 below.

The elements of the Wigner–Yanase information matrix for the parameter vector  $\phi$  are as follows:

**Theorem 15** *For the parameterized family in (3), the Wigner–Yanase information matrix elements, with respect to the  $\phi$  parameter vector, are as follows:*

$$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\phi) = 2 \left\langle \left\{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - 4 \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (102)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix H 2 d. ■

The quantity in (102) can be estimated on a quantum computer via a combination of classical sampling, Hamiltonian evolution, and the Hadamard test. The quantum circuit that plays a role in estimating the first term of (102) is depicted in Figure 3c.

The elements of the Wigner–Yanase information matrix for the cross terms involving  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  are as follows:

**Theorem 16** *For the parameterized family in (3), the Wigner–Yanase information matrix elements, with respect to the  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  parameter vectors, are as follows:*

$$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta, \phi) = \frac{i}{2} \left\langle \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (103)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix H 2 e. ■

The quantity in (103) can be estimated by means of the quantum circuit depicted in Figure 3d.

### 1. Evaluating the first term of the $\theta$ -Wigner–Yanase information matrix

In order to estimate the first term of (100), we assume that one has access to the canonical purification  $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$  of a quantum Boltzmann machine, defined as

$$|\psi(\theta)\rangle := \left( \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle. \quad (104)$$

This is also known as a thermofield double state [83, Eq. (1.4)]. Since many quantum algorithms for thermal-state preparation actually prepare this canonical purification [28, 33, 84] (see Appendix H 2 c for further details of this point), this assumption is just as reasonable as our assumption of having sample access to the thermal state  $\rho(\theta)$ . Under this assumption, the following identity implies that one can estimate the first term of (100) efficiently:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] &= \\ \langle \psi(\theta) | \left( \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \otimes \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T \right) | \psi(\theta) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

The identity in (105) follows because

$$\langle \psi(\theta) | \left( \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \otimes \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T \right) | \psi(\theta) \rangle$$

$$= \langle \Gamma | \left( \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T \right) | \Gamma \rangle \quad (106)$$

$$= \langle \Gamma | \left( \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \otimes I \right) | \Gamma \rangle \quad (107)$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right]. \quad (108)$$

The second equality follows from the transpose trick [57, Exercise 3.7.12]. Thus, in order to estimate the right-hand side of (105), we need to be able to measure the expectation of the operator  $\left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T$ . Consider that

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T &= \\ = \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) e^{-iG(\theta/2)t} G_j e^{iG(\theta/2)t} \right]^T & \quad (109) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) \left[ e^{-iG(\theta/2)t} G_j e^{iG(\theta/2)t} \right]^T \quad (110)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) \left( e^{iG(\theta/2)t} \right)^T G_j^T \left( e^{-iG(\theta/2)t} \right)^T \quad (111)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) e^{iG^T(\theta/2)t} G_j^T e^{-iG^T(\theta/2)t}. \quad (112)$$

If each  $G_j$  is a Pauli string, this is easy to implement by noting that  $I^T = I$ ,  $\sigma_X^T = \sigma_X$ ,  $\sigma_Y^T = -\sigma_Y$ , and  $\sigma_Z^T = \sigma_Z$ . Then, adopting the shorthand  $\psi(\theta) \equiv |\psi(\theta)\rangle\langle\psi(\theta)|$  and applying the definition of  $\Phi_\theta$  in (5) and cyclicity and linearity of trace, consider that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi(\theta) | \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \otimes \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T | \psi(\theta) \rangle &= \\ = \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \otimes \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T \right) \psi(\theta) \right] & \quad (113) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\tau_1, \tau_2} \left[ \text{Tr} \left[ (G_i \otimes G_j^T) \mathcal{U}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(\psi(\theta)) \right] \right], \quad (114)$$


where  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  are independent random variables each chosen according to the high-peak tent probability density  $p(t)$  in (7) and  $\mathcal{U}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}$  is the following unitary channel:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(Y) &:= \left( e^{iG(\frac{\theta}{2})\tau_1} \otimes e^{-iG^T(\frac{\theta}{2})\tau_2} \right) Y \\ &\quad \times \left( e^{-iG(\frac{\theta}{2})\tau_1} \otimes e^{iG^T(\frac{\theta}{2})\tau_2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$


Thus, a quantum algorithm for estimating the first term of (100) consists of repeating the following steps and averaging: prepare the canonical purification  $\psi(\theta)$  in (104), pick  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  independently at random according to (7), apply the Hamiltonian evolution  $\mathcal{U}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}$  to  $\psi(\theta)$ , and measure the observable  $G_i \otimes G_j^T$ . The respective quantum circuit is shown in Figure 3a.

## D. Kubo–Mori information matrix of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines


The main results of this section are Theorems 17, 18, and 19, which provide explicit analytical expressions for




(a) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\text{Tr}\left[\Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i)\sqrt{\rho(\theta)}\Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j)\sqrt{\rho(\theta)}\right]$ . For each run of the circuit, the times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are sampled independently at random from the probability density  $p(t)$  in (7).



(b) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{1}{2}\left\langle\left\{\Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j)\right\}\right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$ . For each run of the circuit, the times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are sampled independently at random from the probability density  $p(t)$  in (7). For details of the algorithm, see Appendix I 2 a.



(c) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{1}{2}\left\langle\left\{\Psi_{\phi}^{\dagger}(H_i), \Psi_{\phi}^{\dagger}(H_j)\right\}\right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$ . For each run of the circuit, the times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are sampled uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$ . For details of the algorithm, see Appendix I 2 b.



(d) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{i}{2}\left\langle\left[\Psi_{\phi}^{\dagger}(G_j), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(H_i)\right]\right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$ . For each run of the circuit, the time  $t_1$  is sampled independently at random from the probability density  $p(t)$  in (7), and the time  $t_2$  is sampled uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$ . For details of the algorithm, see Appendix I 2 c.

FIG. 3: Quantum circuits involved in the estimation of the Wigner–Yanase information matrix elements. (a)–(b) Quantum circuits involved in the estimation of  $I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta)$ ; (c) quantum circuit involved in the estimation of  $I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\phi)$ ; (d) quantum circuit involved in the estimation of  $I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta, \phi)$ .

the Kubo–Mori information matrix elements of the parameterized family in (3). Additionally, we give quantum circuits that play a key role in efficiently estimating the terms in these expressions (see Figure 4).

**Theorem 17** For the parameterized family in (3), the

Kubo–Mori information matrix elements, with respect to the  $\theta$  parameters, are as follows:

$$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2}\left\langle\left\{G_i, \Phi_{\theta}(G_j)\right\}\right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (116)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix H3a. ■

This is the same result obtained in [39] in the case of using parameterized thermal states.  $I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta)$  can be efficiently estimated on a quantum computer (under the assumption that each  $G_i$  is a local operator, acting on a constant number of qubits) [39]. We can use the quantum circuit shown in Figure 4a for estimating the first term in (116). The second term in (116) is the same as the second term in (92). As such, we can use the same procedure delineated in the paragraph surrounding (93) in order to estimate it.

The elements of the Kubo–Mori information matrix for the parameter vector  $\phi$  are as follows:

**Theorem 18** *For the parameterized family in (3), the Kubo–Mori information matrix elements, with respect to the  $\phi$  parameter vector, are as follows:*

$$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\phi) = \left\langle \left[ \left[ \Psi_{\phi}^{\dagger}(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Psi_{\phi}^{\dagger}(H_i) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (117)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix H3b. ■

The quantity in (117) can be estimated on a quantum computer by a generalization [82, Algorithm 3] of the standard Hadamard test, which evaluates the expectation value of nested commutators. The quantum circuit used in this case is depicted in Figure 4b.

The elements of the Kubo–Mori information matrix for the cross terms involving  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  are as follows:

**Theorem 19** *For the parameterized family in (3), the Kubo–Mori information matrix elements, with respect to  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  parameter vectors, are as follows:*

$$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta, \phi) = \frac{i}{2} \left\langle \left\{ \left[ \Phi_{\theta}(G_i), \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_{\phi}^{\dagger}(H_j) \right] \right] \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (118)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix H3c. ■

The quantity in (118) can also be estimated on a quantum computer by a generalization [82, Algorithm 3] of the standard Hadamard test, which evaluates the expectation value of nested anticommutators and commutators. The quantum circuit used in this case is depicted in Figure 4c.

## V. APPLICATIONS OF INFORMATION MATRICES OF EVOLVED QUANTUM BOLTZMANN MACHINES

### A. Natural gradient for evolved quantum Boltzmann machine learning

The quantum generalizations of the Fisher information matrix considered in Section IV provide the foundation for a metric-aware optimization algorithm, known as natural gradient descent, which can be effectively applied to evolved quantum Boltzmann machine learning.

This type of optimization algorithm was introduced in the classical setting [85] and has been generalized to the quantum setting to account for various quantum generalizations of Fisher information [39, 64, 86–88]. A convergence analysis of quantum natural gradient under certain assumptions has been presented in [88].

Standard gradient descent, whose update rule is shown in (11), relies on the Euclidean geometry of the parameter space. However, this geometry is typically not suited for the space of quantum states (see [39, Section II.A]), resulting in slow convergence and difficulty escaping saddle points in the optimization landscape. To address these limitations, the natural gradient descent algorithm incorporates the geometry induced by the parameterization of quantum states [85]. For a parameterized family  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  and a loss function  $\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$ , the update rule of a quantum natural descent algorithm is given as follows:


$$\gamma_{m+1} := \gamma_m - \mu [I^{\mathcal{D}}(\gamma_m)]^{-1} \nabla_{\gamma} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_m), \quad (119)$$

where  $I^{\mathcal{D}}(\gamma_m)$  is the  $\mathcal{D}$ -based Fisher information matrix defined in (38), which encodes the curvature of the parameter space, and  $\mu$  is the learning rate. By incorporating the inverse of  $I^{\mathcal{D}}(\gamma_m)$ , the gradient is rescaled to account for the underlying geometry, enabling the optimization steps to align with the steepest descent direction with respect to the geometry defined by the smooth divergence  $\mathcal{D}$ , rather than the Euclidean geometry. This helps to navigate the optimization landscape more effectively, potentially avoiding getting trapped in local minima.


Applying natural gradient to evolved quantum Boltzmann machines involves estimating information matrices and computing their inverses. While this additional computation introduces some overhead, it is often offset by the improved convergence and ability to escape saddle points, potentially leading to fewer iterations and a faster overall optimization process [89]. We have shown in Section IV how to evaluate the Fisher–Bures  $I^{FB}(\gamma)$  (Section IV B), Wigner–Yanase  $I^{WY}(\gamma)$  (Section IV C), and Kubo–Mori  $I^{KM}(\gamma)$  (Section IV D) information matrix elements for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. Thus, each of these quantum generalizations of the Fisher information matrix can be directly applied in the quantum natural gradient descent algorithm for evolved quantum Boltzmann machine learning by incorporating the chosen matrix into the update rule in (119).

Let us also note that, due to Corollary 8, the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices yield optimization steps that differ only by a constant factor. This equivalence makes these two information matrices essentially interchangeable for practical implementations of quantum natural gradient, offering flexibility in choosing the metric without affecting the overall optimization trajectory. Such flexibility is particularly valuable when computational constraints favor one metric over the other, as discussed further in Section VI.






(a) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{1}{2} \langle \{G_i, \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$ . For each run of the circuit,  $t$  is sampled independently at random from the probability density  $p(t)$  in (7). For details of the algorithm, see Appendix 13a.



(b) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{1}{4} \langle \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$ . For each run of the circuit,  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are sampled uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$ . For details of the algorithm, see Appendix 13b.



(c) Quantum circuit that realizes an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{i}{4} \langle \left\{ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right\} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}$ . For each run of the circuit,  $t_1$  is sampled independently at random from the probability density  $p(t)$  in (7), and  $t_2$  is sampled uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$ . For details of the algorithm, see Appendix 13c.

FIG. 4: Quantum circuits involved in the estimation of the Kubo–Mori information matrix elements. (a) Quantum circuit involved in the estimation of  $I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta)$ ; (b) quantum circuit involved in the estimation of  $I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\phi)$ ; (c) quantum circuit involved in the estimation of  $I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta, \phi)$ .

## B. Fundamental limitations on estimating time-evolved thermal states

In this section, we discuss how our findings are relevant for multiparameter estimation, in particular, to estimating the parameters of a time-evolved thermal state of the form in (3). Previous studies have focused on parameter estimation of time-evolved states [54, 90] or thermal states [91, 92], but to the best of our knowledge, the problem of estimating the parameters of time-evolved thermal states has not been studied previously.

To briefly review the problem and similar to the review provided in [39, Section I-C-2], consider that the

following multiparameter Cramer–Rao bound holds for an arbitrary unbiased estimator and for a general parameterized family  $(\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$  of states:

$$\text{Cov}^{(n)}(\hat{\gamma}, \gamma) \geq \frac{1}{n} [I^{\text{FB}}(\gamma)]^{-1}, \quad (120)$$

where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is the number of copies of the state  $\sigma(\gamma)$  available,  $\hat{\gamma}$  is an estimate of the parameter vector  $\gamma$ , the matrix  $I^{\text{FB}}(\gamma)$  denotes the Fisher–Bures information matrix, and the covariance matrix  $\text{Cov}^{(n)}(\hat{\gamma}, \gamma)$  measures errors in estimation and is defined in terms of its matrix elements as

$$[\text{Cov}^{(n)}(\hat{\gamma}, \gamma)]_{k,\ell} := \sum_m \text{Tr}[M_m^{(n)} \sigma(\gamma)^{\otimes n} (\hat{\gamma}_k(m) - \gamma_k)(\hat{\gamma}_\ell(m) - \gamma_\ell)]. \quad (121)$$

In (121),  $(M_m^{(n)})_m$  is an arbitrary positive operator-value measure used for estimation, i.e., satisfying  $M_m^{(n)} \geq 0$  for all  $m$  and  $\sum_m M_m^{(n)} = I^{\otimes n}$ . This measurement acts, in general, collectively on all  $n$  copies of the state  $\sigma(\gamma)^{\otimes n}$ . Additionally,

$$\hat{\gamma}(m) := (\hat{\gamma}_1(m), \hat{\gamma}_2(m), \dots, \hat{\gamma}_J(m)) \quad (122)$$

is a function that maps the measurement outcome  $m$  to an estimate  $\hat{\gamma}(m)$  of the parameter vector  $\gamma$ . The inequality in (120) exploits the additivity of the Fisher–Bures information matrix, as reviewed in [39, Appendix A]. As noted in [64, Eq. (C11)], the multiparameter Cramer–Rao bound in (120) can be written as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \text{Cov}^{(n)}(\hat{\gamma}, \gamma) & I \\ I & nI^{\text{FB}}(\gamma) \end{pmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (123)$$

which is a direct consequence of the Schur complement lemma.

There are several implications of our findings for parameter estimation of time-evolved thermal states:

1. Our analytical expressions for the Fisher–Bures information matrix from Theorems 10, 11, and 12 can be plugged directly into (120) in order to obtain fundamental limits on the performance of an arbitrary scheme for estimating time-evolved thermal states. Future work could conduct numerical studies of various schemes and examples of time-evolved thermal states in order to determine how close such schemes come to the fundamental limits established here. Moreover, one could explore the estimation of time-evolved bosonic Gaussian thermal states, as a generalization of the setting recently considered in [93].
2. Similar in spirit to the main application of [54], it could be the case that the analytical expressions might be difficult to evaluate or even difficult computationally for a classical algorithm to approximate. In this case, our quantum algorithms could be helpful: one could perform them on time-evolved thermal states in order to estimate their Fisher–Bures information matrix elements, in order to have an understanding of the fundamental limits. Here our results also imply a broad generalization of the main findings and application of [54], given that our expressions and algorithms apply to time-evolved mixed states (i.e., quantum evolution machines), whereas the results of [54] apply exclusively to time-evolved pure states.

3. Corollary 8 is useful for parameter estimation, because it indicates that the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices differ only by a factor of two in the matrix (Loewner) order, and thus one can be used as a substitute for the other while giving similar bounds in the low-error regime. This is also advantageous in the case that the Fisher–Bures information matrix elements are difficult to evaluate but the Wigner–Yanase information matrix elements are not (see Section VI for a concrete example of this scenario).
4. As discussed in [64, Appendix D] (specifically, Theorem D.4 therein) by building on findings from the classical case [85, Theorem 2], the natural gradient descent algorithm, under certain conditions, attains the Cramer–Rao bound asymptotically and thus is an optimal algorithm for asymptotic parameter estimation. Here we also note the similarity of natural gradient descent and the iterative scoring algorithm mentioned in [61, Eq. (121)]. As such, one could investigate certain classes of time-evolved thermal states to determine whether the Cramer–Rao bound could be attained asymptotically for them, by means of natural gradient descent. However, based on [39, Theorem 3], we do not expect the aforementioned conditions for asymptotic optimality to be satisfied generally. Regardless, one could still possibly make effective use of our analytical expressions and quantum algorithms in order to devise an estimation strategy for time-evolved thermal states.

## VI. QUANTUM BOLTZMANN MACHINES AND QUANTUM EVOLUTION MACHINES AS SPECIAL CASES

In this section, we remark briefly on how quantum Boltzmann machines and quantum evolution machines are special cases of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines, and we point out how these special cases provide examples for which Corollary 8 is useful.

By fixing the parameter vector  $\phi$  and allowing  $\theta$  to vary, we obtain the following parameterized family of states:

$$(\omega(\theta, \phi))_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^J}, \quad (124)$$

where the state  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$  is defined in (3). When  $\phi = 0$ , the resulting state is a parameterized thermal state or, equivalently, a quantum Boltzmann machine. As such, all of our findings in this paper apply to quantum Boltzmann machines. Even if  $\phi \neq 0$ , the resulting state is essentially a quantum Boltzmann machine, up to a fixed unitary evolution  $e^{-iH(\phi)}$ . All of our previous developments apply to this special case and recover previously reported results from [38, 39]. As such, one can perform gradient descent using the gradients reported in (9), (13),

and (20). Also, one can perform natural gradient descent by using the information matrices in (92), (100), or (116) (see also the caption of Table II). Furthermore, we notice that all of the information matrices in these last referenced equations have no dependence on the parameter vector  $\phi$ , consistent with the fact that they are unitarily invariant under the action of a unitary channel (Corollary 5), which in this case is  $(\cdot) \rightarrow e^{-iH(\phi)}(\cdot)e^{iH(\phi)}$ .

By fixing the parameter vector  $\theta$  and allowing  $\phi$  to vary, we obtain the following parameterized family of states:

$$(\omega(\theta, \phi))_{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^K}, \quad (125)$$

where the state  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$  is defined in (3). We refer to this family as quantum evolution machines because they arise from the action of the parameterized unitary evolution  $e^{-iH(\phi)}$  acting on the fixed state  $\rho(\theta)$ . All of our previous developments apply to this special case. As such, one can perform gradient descent with quantum evolution machines by using the gradients reported in (10), (14), and (21). Also, one can perform natural gradient descent with quantum evolution machines by using the information matrices in (94), (102), or (117) (see also the caption of Table II).

Interestingly, these special cases provide examples that illustrate the value of Corollary 8. By comparing the quantum circuits in Figures 2b and 3c, we observe that, for quantum evolution machines, it is easier to estimate the Wigner–Yanase information matrix elements rather than those for the Fisher–Bures information matrix. By Corollary 8, these matrices differ by no more than a factor of two, and thus it seems reasonable to perform natural gradient descent using the Wigner–Yanase information matrix. On the other hand, by comparing the quantum circuits in Figure 2a and Figures 3a and 3b, we observe that, for quantum Boltzmann machines, it is easier to estimate the Fisher–Bures information matrix elements rather than those for the Wigner–Yanase information matrix. As such, by Corollary 8, it is reasonable to perform natural gradient descent using the Fisher–Bures information matrix.

## VII. CONCLUSION

### A. Summary and discussion

In this paper, we proposed evolved quantum Boltzmann machines as a variational ansatz for quantum optimization and learning. The main idea is captured by (3): beginning with two parameterized Hamiltonians  $G(\theta)$  and  $H(\phi)$ , prepare a thermal state of  $G(\theta)$  and then time-evolve it according to  $H(\phi)$ . One can alternatively think of it as imaginary time evolution according to  $G(\theta)$ , followed by real time evolution according to  $H(\phi)$ . Theorem 1 provides expressions for the gradient of the state  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$  in (3). We subsequently applied them

for the task of ground-state energy estimation in Section II A, therein providing quantum algorithms for estimating the gradient (see Figure 1). We also considered the task of generative modeling (Section II B) and established expressions for the gradient for this task, as well as quantum algorithms for estimating it. As summarized in Table II, we then established analytical expressions for the Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori information matrices of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. Figures 2, 3, and 4 depict quantum algorithms that play an essential role in efficiently estimating their matrix elements, respectively. These results have applications in natural gradient descent algorithms when using evolved quantum Boltzmann machines—these algorithms are general purpose and can thus be employed for a broad variety of quantum optimization and learning tasks. Along the way, we also proved a broad generalization of the main finding of [50], showing that the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices differ by no more than a factor of two in the matrix Loewner order, and are thus essentially interchangeable in natural gradient-descent algorithms.

Given that our paper develops full details of three different information matrices for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines, i.e., Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori, a question arises as to which one is most suitable for a given application. While we have left this question somewhat open, at the least Corollary 8 indicates that the Fisher–Bures and Wigner–Yanase information matrices are essentially interchangeable for an algorithm like natural gradient descent. Given this, one would then employ whichever one of these is simpler to estimate. As discussed in Section VI, it is easier to estimate the Wigner–Yanase information matrix for quantum evolution machines, while it is easier to estimate the Fisher–Bures information for quantum Boltzmann machines (at least when using the algorithms developed here). For the application of generative modeling, one might favor using the Kubo–Mori information matrix because the objective function is the quantum relative entropy, coinciding with the divergence that defines the Kubo–Mori information matrix (see Definition 6). Furthermore, the Kubo–Mori information matrix in this case is equal to the Hessian of the objective function in (17), as observed from [39, Theorem 2] and [58, Eq. (33)], indicating that natural gradient is equivalent to a second-order Newton search in this case. As such, the Kubo–Mori information matrix seems quite well aligned with the generative modeling problem, when compared to the other two information matrices.

### B. Future directions

Going forward from here, there are several open directions and questions to address. First, we have left it open to simulate the performance of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines for tasks of interest, such as ground-

state energy estimation and generative modeling, with our main focus here being on developing the aforementioned fundamental theoretical findings. We plan to address this direction in future work. It is also open to employ evolved quantum Boltzmann machines as an ansatz for other optimization tasks, such as constrained Hamiltonian optimization or other semi-definite programming problems considered in [43].

Next, it is an open question to determine whether evolved quantum Boltzmann machines suffer from the barren plateau problem [22–25]. The results of [36] indicate that quantum Boltzmann machines are not subject to this problem for the generative modeling task, and so one should not encounter it when optimizing evolved quantum Boltzmann machines with respect to the  $\theta$  parameter vector. It is open to determine whether the problem applies when optimizing with respect to the  $\phi$  parameter vector. At the least, the standard unitary two-design argument [22] for the onset of barren plateaus in parameterized quantum circuits does not seem to apply to evolved quantum Boltzmann machines, given that picking the elements of  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  randomly according to a multivariate Gaussian does not clearly lead to an averaged state that is maximally mixed. Further investigation is certainly required to determine whether this is the case, both for the generative modeling task, as well as for the ground-state energy estimation task.

Interestingly, our quantum algorithms for estimating the Fisher–Bures, Wigner–Yanase, and Kubo–Mori information matrix elements of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines are efficient, under the assumption that one can efficiently prepare samples of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines or, for the first term in (100), their purifications. As mentioned in (41), the aforementioned information matrices obey the data-processing inequality for arbitrary quantum channels. These results stand in distinction to the complexity-theoretic barriers [94, 95] in place for estimating other distinguishability measures like fidelity and trace distance, which obey the data-processing inequality but are not efficiently estimable in general. Thus, we have found distinguishability measures that both 1) obey the data-processing inequality and 2) are efficiently estimable on a quantum computer for a large class of states. As a future direction, we wonder whether there is an efficient algorithm for estimating distinguishability measures like quantum relative entropy, trace distance, and fidelity of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. It seems like this might be difficult, given that the partition function  $Z(\theta)$  appears in analytical expressions for each of these distinguishability measures. However, there do exist quantum algorithms for estimating various distinguishability measures that depend on the condition number of the underlying states [96–98], and one could investigate whether these would be efficient for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines.

Given the ubiquitous role that time-evolved thermal

states play in physics and the increasing relevance of quantum generalizations of Fisher information in various areas of physics like high energy and condensed matter, there is a distinct possibility that the findings of our paper could find applications well beyond those presented here. For example, in the AdS/CFT correspondence, the Kubo–Mori information of a perturbation in the conformal field theory is dual to the bulk canonical energy of the linearized gravitational perturbation [99] (see also [100] for a review). Additionally, in condensed matter physics, quantum generalizations of Fisher information have played an essential role in understanding and detecting phase transitions [101–103]. We suspect that our quantum algorithms for estimating information matrix elements should find use in both of these settings, and we leave such investigations to future work.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Alvaro Alhambra, Pierre-Luc Dallaire-Demers, Zoe Holmes, James Watson, and Nicole Yunger Halpern for helpful discussions. MMW is also grateful to Francesco Buscemi for bringing [104, Theorem 1.1] to his attention.

MM and DP acknowledge support from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under agreement no. FA2386-24-1-4069. DP and MMW acknowledge support from Air Force Research Laboratory under agreement no. FA8750-23-2-0031.

The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation thereon. The views and conclusions contained herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies or endorsements, either expressed or implied, of Air Force Research Laboratory or the United States Air Force or the U.S. Government.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

**Author Contributions:** The following describes the different contributions of the authors of this work, using roles defined by the CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) project [105]:

**MM:** Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

**DP:** Formal analysis, Investigation, Validation, Writing – review & editing.

**MMW:** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

- 
- [1] A. Montanaro, Quantum algorithms: An overview, *npj Quantum Information* **2**, 15023 (2016).
- [2] J. Biamonte, P. Wittek, N. Pancotti, P. Rebentrost, N. Wiebe, and S. Lloyd, Quantum machine learning, *Nature* **549**, 195–202 (2017).
- [3] A. Peruzzo, J. McClean, P. Shadbolt, M.-H. Yung, X.-Q. Zhou, P. J. Love, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and J. L. O’Brien, A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor, *Nature Communications* **5**, 4213 (2014).
- [4] M. H. Amin, E. Andriyash, J. Rolfe, B. Kulchytskyi, and R. Melko, Quantum Boltzmann machine, *Physical Review X* **8**, 021050 (2018).
- [5] G. Verdon, J. Marks, S. Nanda, S. Leichenauer, and J. Hidary, *Quantum Hamiltonian-based models and the variational quantum thermalizer algorithm* (2019), [arXiv:1910.02071 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.02071).
- [6] R. R. Ferguson, L. Dellantonio, A. A. Balushi, K. Jansen, W. Dür, and C. A. Muschik, Measurement-based variational quantum eigensolver, *Physical Review Letters* **126**, 220501 (2021).
- [7] J. R. McClean, J. Romero, R. Babbush, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, The theory of variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 023023 (2016).
- [8] K. Mitarai, M. Negoro, M. Kitagawa, and K. Fujii, Quantum circuit learning, *Physical Review A* **98**, 032309 (2018).
- [9] T. Jones, S. Endo, S. McArdle, X. Yuan, and S. C. Benjamin, Variational quantum algorithms for discovering Hamiltonian spectra, *Physical Review A* **99**, 062304 (2019).
- [10] M. Cerezo, K. Sharma, A. Arrasmith, and P. J. Coles, Variational quantum state eigensolver, *npj Quantum Information* **8**, 113 (2022).
- [11] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, and S. Gutmann, *A quantum approximate optimization algorithm* (2014), [arXiv:1411.4028 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.4028).
- [12] Z. Wang, S. Hadfield, Z. Jiang, and E. G. Rieffel, Quantum approximate optimization algorithm for MaxCut: A fermionic view, *Physical Review A* **97**, 022304 (2018).
- [13] S. Hadfield, Z. Wang, B. O’Gorman, E. G. Rieffel, D. Venturelli, and R. Biswas, From the quantum approximate optimization algorithm to a quantum alternating operator ansatz, *Algorithms* **12**, 34 (2019).
- [14] P. Bermejo and R. Orús, Variational quantum and quantum-inspired clustering, *Scientific Reports* **13**, 13284 (2023).
- [15] P. Rebentrost, M. Mohseni, and S. Lloyd, Quantum support vector machine for big data classification, *Physical Review Letters* **113**, 130503 (2014).
- [16] V. Havlíček, A. D. Córcoles, K. Temme, A. W. Harrow, A. Kandala, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, Supervised learning with quantum-enhanced feature spaces, *Nature* **567**, 209–212 (2019).
- [17] M. Schuld, A. Bocharov, K. M. Svore, and N. Wiebe, Circuit-centric quantum classifiers, *Physical Review A* **101**, 032308 (2020).
- [18] M. Benedetti, E. Lloyd, S. Sack, and M. Fiorentini, Parameterized quantum circuits as machine learning models, *Quantum Science and Technology* **4**, 043001 (2019).
- [19] C. Leadbeater, L. Sharrock, B. Coyle, and M. Benedetti, F-divergences and cost function locality in generative modelling with quantum circuits, *Entropy* **23**, 1281 (2021).
- [20] A. Abbas, D. Sutter, C. Zoufal, A. Lucchi, A. Figalli, and S. Woerner, The power of quantum neural networks, *Nature Computational Science* **1**, 403–409 (2021).
- [21] M. Cerezo, A. Arrasmith, R. Babbush, S. C. Benjamin, S. Endo, K. Fujii, J. R. McClean, K. Mitarai, X. Yuan, L. Cincio, and P. J. Coles, Variational quantum algorithms, *Nature Reviews Physics* **3**, 625–644 (2021).
- [22] J. R. McClean, S. Boixo, V. N. Smelyanskiy, R. Babbush, and H. Neven, Barren plateaus in quantum neural network training landscapes, *Nature Communications* **9**, 4812 (2018).
- [23] M. Cerezo, A. Sone, T. Volkoff, L. Cincio, and P. J. Coles, Cost function dependent barren plateaus in shallow parametrized quantum circuits, *Nature Communications* **12**, 1791 (2021).
- [24] Z. Holmes, K. Sharma, M. Cerezo, and P. J. Coles, Connecting ansatz expressibility to gradient magnitudes and barren plateaus, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 010313 (2022).
- [25] C. O. Marrero, M. Kieferová, and N. Wiebe, Entanglement-induced barren plateaus, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040316 (2021).
- [26] M. Benedetti, J. Realpe-Gómez, R. Biswas, and A. Perdomo-Ortiz, Quantum-assisted learning of hardware-embedded probabilistic graphical models, *Physical Review X* **7**, 041052 (2017).
- [27] M. Kieferova and N. Wiebe, Tomography and generative data modeling via quantum Boltzmann training, *Physical Review A* **96**, 062327 (2017), [arXiv:1612.05204 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.05204).
- [28] C.-F. Chen, M. J. Kastoryano, and A. Gilyén, *An efficient and exact noncommutative quantum Gibbs sampler* (2023), [arXiv:2311.09207 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.09207).
- [29] C.-F. Chen, M. J. Kastoryano, F. G. S. L. Brandão, and A. Gilyén, *Quantum thermal state preparation* (2023), [arXiv:2303.18224 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.18224).
- [30] J. Rajakumar and J. D. Watson, *Gibbs sampling gives quantum advantage at constant temperatures with O(1)-local Hamiltonians* (2024), [arXiv:2408.01516 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.01516).
- [31] T. Bergamaschi, C.-F. Chen, and Y. Liu, *Quantum computational advantage with constant-temperature Gibbs sampling* (2024), [arXiv:2404.14639 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.14639).
- [32] H. Chen, B. Li, J. Lu, and L. Ying, *A randomized method for simulating Lindblad equations and thermal state preparation* (2024).
- [33] C. Rouzé, D. S. França, and Álvaro M. Alhambra, *Efficient thermalization and universal quantum computing with quantum Gibbs samplers* (2024), [arXiv:2403.12691 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.12691).
- [34] A. Bakshi, A. Liu, A. Moitra, and E. Tang, *High-temperature Gibbs states are unentangled and efficiently preparable* (2024), [arXiv:2403.16850 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.16850).
- [35] Z. Ding, B. Li, L. Lin, and R. Zhang, *Polynomial-time preparation of low-temperature Gibbs states for 2D toric code* (2024), [arXiv:2410.01206 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.01206).
- [36] L. Coopmans and M. Benedetti, On the sample complexity of quantum Boltzmann machine learning, *Com-*

- munications Physics **7**, 274 (2024).
- [37] C. Tüysüz, M. Demidik, L. Coopmans, E. Rinaldi, V. Croft, Y. Haddad, M. Rosenkranz, and K. Jansen, [Learning to generate high-dimensional distributions with low-dimensional quantum Boltzmann machines](#) (2024).
- [38] D. Patel, D. Koch, S. Patel, and M. M. Wilde, [Quantum Boltzmann machine learning of ground-state energies](#) (2024), [arXiv:2410.12935 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [39] D. Patel and M. M. Wilde, [Natural gradient and parameter estimation for quantum Boltzmann machines](#) (2024), [arXiv:2410.24058 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [40] S. Lloyd, Universal quantum simulators, *Science* **273**, 1073 (1996).
- [41] A. M. Childs, D. Maslov, Y. Nam, N. J. Ross, and Y. Su, Toward the first quantum simulation with quantum speedup, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**, 9456 (2018).
- [42] R. Cleve, A. Ekert, C. Macchiavello, and M. Mosca, Quantum algorithms revisited, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **454**, 339 (1998).
- [43] J. Chen, H. Westerheim, Z. Holmes, I. Luo, T. Nuradha, D. Patel, S. Rethinasamy, K. Wang, and M. M. Wilde, [Qslack: A slack-variable approach for variational quantum semi-definite programming](#) (2023), [arXiv:2312.03830 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [44] D. Wecker, M. B. Hastings, and M. Troyer, Progress towards practical quantum variational algorithms, *Physical Review A* **92**, 042303 (2015).
- [45] L. Banchi and G. E. Crooks, Measuring analytic gradients of general quantum evolution with the stochastic parameter shift rule, *Quantum* **5**, 386 (2021).
- [46] R. Wiersema, D. Lewis, D. Wierichs, J. Carrasquilla, and N. Killoran, Here comes the SU(N): multivariate quantum gates and gradients, *Quantum* **8**, 1275 (2024).
- [47] A. Uhlmann, The ‘transition probability’ in the state space of a  $*$ -algebra, *Reports on Mathematical Physics* **9**, 273 (1976).
- [48] A. S. Holevo, On quasiequivalence of locally normal states, *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics* **13**, 1071 (1972).
- [49] H. Umegaki, Conditional expectations in an operator algebra IV (entropy and information), *Kodai Mathematical Seminar Reports* **14**, 59 (1962).
- [50] S. Luo, Wigner-Yanase skew information vs. quantum Fisher information, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **132**, 885 (2004).
- [51] A. Anshu, S. Arunachalam, T. Kuwahara, and M. Soleimanifar, Sample-efficient learning of interacting quantum systems, *Nature Physics* **17**, 931–935 (2021).
- [52] M. B. Hastings, Quantum belief propagation: An algorithm for thermal quantum systems, *Physical Review B* **76**, 201102 (2007).
- [53] I. H. Kim, Perturbative analysis of topological entanglement entropy from conditional independence, *Physical Review B* **86**, 245116 (2012).
- [54] L. B. Ho, A stochastic evaluation of quantum Fisher information matrix with generic Hamiltonians, *EPJ Quantum Technology* **10**, 37 (2023).
- [55] G. H. Low and I. L. Chuang, Hamiltonian simulation by qubitization, *Quantum* **3**, 163 (2019).
- [56] A. Gilyén, Y. Su, G. H. Low, and N. 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*, STOC 2019 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019) pp. 193–204.
- [57] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2017) [arXiv:1106.1445](#).
- [58] L. Coopmans and M. Benedetti, [On the sample complexity of quantum Boltzmann machine learning](#) (2024), [arXiv:2306.14969v4 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [59] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement* (Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- [60] J. Liu, H. Yuan, X.-M. Lu, and X. Wang, Quantum Fisher information matrix and multiparameter estimation, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 023001 (2019).
- [61] J. S. Sidhu and P. Kok, Geometric perspective on quantum parameter estimation, *AVS Quantum Science* **2**, 014701 (2020).
- [62] M. Jarzyna and J. Kolodynski, Geometric approach to quantum statistical inference, *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory* **1**, 367 (2020).
- [63] J. J. Meyer, Fisher information in noisy intermediate-scale quantum applications, *Quantum* **5**, 539 (2021).
- [64] F. M. Sbahi, A. J. Martinez, S. Patel, D. Saberi, J. H. Yoo, G. Roeder, and G. Verdon, [Provably efficient variational generative modeling of quantum many-body systems via quantum-probabilistic information geometry](#) (2022), [arXiv:2206.04663v1 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [65] M. Scandi, P. Abiuso, J. Surace, and D. D. Santis, [Quantum Fisher information and its dynamical nature](#) (2024), [arXiv:2304.14984 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [66] D. Petz, Quasi-entropies for states of a von Neumann algebra, *Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences* **21**, 787 (1985).
- [67] D. Petz, Quasi-entropies for finite quantum systems, *Reports in Mathematical Physics* **23**, 57 (1986).
- [68] M. Müller-Lennert, F. Dupuis, O. Szechr, S. Fehr, and M. Tomamichel, On quantum Rényi entropies: a new generalization and some properties, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **54**, 122203 (2013), [arXiv:1306.3142](#).
- [69] M. M. Wilde, A. Winter, and D. Yang, Strong converse for the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking and Hadamard channels via a sandwiched Rényi relative entropy, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **331**, 593 (2014), [arXiv:1306.1586](#).
- [70] G. Lindblad, Completely positive maps and entropy inequalities, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **40**, 147 (1975).
- [71] R. L. Frank and E. H. Lieb, Monotonicity of a relative Rényi entropy, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **54**, 122201 (2013), [arXiv:1306.5358](#).
- [72] M. M. Wilde, Optimized quantum  $f$ -divergences and data processing, *Journal of Physics A* **51**, 374002 (2018), [arXiv:1710.10252](#).
- [73] K. M. R. Audenaert, M. Nussbaum, A. Szkoła, and F. Verstraete, Asymptotic error rates in quantum hypothesis testing, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **279**, 251 (2008), [arXiv:0708.4282](#).
- [74] M. Hubner, Explicit computation of the Bures distance for density matrices, *Physics Letters A* **163**, 239 (1992).
- [75] P. Gibilisco and T. Isola, Wigner–Yanase information on quantum state space: The geometric approach, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **44**, 3752 (2003).

- [76] D. Petz and G. Toth, The Bogoliubov inner product in quantum statistics, *Letters in Mathematical Physics* **27**, 205 (1993).
- [77] T. van Erven and P. Harremoës, Rényi divergence and Kullback-Leibler divergence, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **60**, 3797 (2014).
- [78] K. Matsumoto, Reverse test and quantum analogue of classical fidelity and generalized fidelity (2010), [arXiv:1006.0302](https://arxiv.org/abs/1006.0302).
- [79] K. Matsumoto, A new quantum version of f-divergence (2013), [arXiv:1311.4722](https://arxiv.org/abs/1311.4722).
- [80] K. Matsumoto, A new quantum version of f-divergence, in *Reality and Measurement in Algebraic Quantum Theory*, Vol. 261, edited by M. Ozawa, J. Butterfield, H. Halvorson, M. Rédei, Y. Kitajima, and F. Buscemi (Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2018) pp. 229–273, series Title: Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics.
- [81] G. E. Crooks, Measuring thermodynamic length, *Physical Review Letters* **99**, 100602 (2007).
- [82] D. Li, D. Dulal, M. Ohorodnikov, H. Wang, and Y. Ding, Efficient quantum gradient and higher-order derivative estimation via generalized Hadamard test (2024), [arXiv:2408.05406](https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.05406).
- [83] W. Cottrell, B. Freivogel, D. M. Hofman, and S. F. Lokhande, How to build the thermofield double state, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2019**, 58 (2019).
- [84] Z. Holmes, G. Muraleedharan, R. D. Somma, Y. Subasi, and B. Şahinoğlu, Quantum algorithms from fluctuation theorems: Thermal-state preparation, *Quantum* **6**, 825 (2022).
- [85] S.-I. Amari, Natural gradient works efficiently in learning, *Neural Computation* **10**, 251 (1998).
- [86] J. Stokes, J. Izaac, N. Killoran, and G. Carleo, Quantum Natural Gradient, *Quantum* **4**, 269 (2020).
- [87] B. Koczor and S. C. Benjamin, Quantum natural gradient generalized to noisy and nonunitary circuits, *Physical Review A* **106**, 062416 (2022).
- [88] M. A. Sohail, M. H. Khoozani, and S. S. Pradhan, Quantum natural stochastic pairwise coordinate descent (2024), [arXiv:2407.13858](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.13858) [quant-ph].
- [89] B. van Straaten and B. Koczor, Measurement cost of metric-aware variational quantum algorithms, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 030324 (2021).
- [90] T. Baumgratz and A. Datta, Quantum enhanced estimation of a multidimensional field, *Physical Review Letters* **116**, 030801 (2016).
- [91] L. P. García-Pintos, K. Bharti, J. Bringewatt, H. Dehghani, A. Ehrenberg, N. Yunger Halpern, and A. V. Gorshkov, Estimation of Hamiltonian parameters from thermal states, *Physical Review Letters* **133**, 040802 (2024).
- [92] P. Abiuso, P. Sekatski, J. Calsamiglia, and M. Perarnau-Llobet, Fundamental limits of metrology at thermal equilibrium (2024), [arXiv:2402.06582](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.06582) [quant-ph].
- [93] Z. Huang and M. M. Wilde, Information geometry of bosonic gaussian thermal states (2024), [arXiv:2411.18268](https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.18268) [quant-ph].
- [94] J. Watrous, Limits on the power of quantum statistical zero-knowledge, in *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (2002) pp. 459–468, [arXiv:quant-ph/0202111](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0202111).
- [95] J. Watrous, Zero-knowledge against quantum attacks, in *Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '06 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2006) p. 296–305.
- [96] Q. Wang, J. Guan, J. Liu, Z. Zhang, and M. Ying, New quantum algorithms for computing quantum entropies and distances, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **70**, 5653 (2024).
- [97] Q. Wang and Z. Zhang, Fast quantum algorithms for trace distance estimation, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **70**, 2720 (2024).
- [98] N. Liu, Q. Wang, M. M. Wilde, and Z. Zhang, Quantum algorithms for matrix geometric means (2024), [arXiv:2405.00673](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.00673) [quant-ph].
- [99] N. Lashkari and M. Van Raamsdonk, Canonical energy is quantum Fisher information, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2016**, 153 (2016).
- [100] T. Kibe, P. Mandayam, and A. Mukhopadhyay, Holographic spacetime, black holes and quantum error correcting codes: a review, *The European Physical Journal C* **82**, 463 (2022).
- [101] L. Campos Venuti and P. Zanardi, Quantum critical scaling of the geometric tensors, *Physical Review Letters* **99**, 095701 (2007).
- [102] P. Zanardi, P. Giorda, and M. Cozzini, Information-theoretic differential geometry of quantum phase transitions, *Physical Review Letters* **99**, 100603 (2007).
- [103] A. Carollo, D. Valenti, and B. Spagnolo, Geometry of quantum phase transitions, *Physics Reports* **838**, 1 (2020), geometry of quantum phase transitions.
- [104] P. Del Moral and A. Niclas, A Taylor expansion of the square root matrix function, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **465**, 259 (2018).
- [105] NISO, Credit – contributor roles taxonomy, <https://credit.niso.org/>, accessed: 2024-10-28.
- [106] A. Anshu, S. Arunachalam, T. Kuwahara, and M. Soleimanifar, Sample-efficient learning of quantum many-body systems (2020), [arXiv:2004.07266v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.07266v1) [quant-ph].
- [107] J. Feldman, Duhamel’s formula, Lecture notes (2007), <https://personal.math.ubc.ca/~feldman/m428/duhamel.pdf>.

## Appendix A: Proof of Theorem 1

From previous work [38, Eq. (10)], it is known that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) = e^{-iH(\phi)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \rho(\theta) \right) e^{iH(\phi)} \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$= e^{-iH(\phi)} \left( -\frac{1}{2} \{ \Phi_\theta(G_j), \rho(\theta) \} + \rho(\theta) \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right) e^{iH(\phi)} \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_j) e^{iH(\phi)}, e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \right\} + e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_j) e^{iH(\phi)}, \omega(\theta, \phi) \right\} + \omega(\theta, \phi) \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

See also [52, Eq. (9)], [106, Proposition 20], and [36, Lemma 5]. Now we consider the derivative with respect the variable  $\phi_k$ :

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \omega(\theta, \phi) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \right) \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$= \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} e^{-iH(\phi)} \right) \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} + e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho(\theta) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} e^{iH(\phi)} \right). \quad (\text{A6})$$

According to Duhamel's formula [107], the partial derivative of a matrix exponential  $e^{A(x)}$  with respect to some parameter  $x$  is given as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} e^{A(x)} = \int_0^1 e^{(1-t)A(x)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} A(x) \right) e^{tA(x)} dt \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$= \int_0^1 e^{tA(x)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} A(x) \right) e^{(1-t)A(x)} dt. \quad (\text{A8})$$

From Duhamel's formula, consider that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} e^{-iH(\phi)} = \int_0^1 dt e^{t(-iH(\phi))} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} (-iH(\phi)) \right) e^{(1-t)(-iH(\phi))} \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$= \left[ \int_0^1 dt e^{-itH(\phi)} (-iH_k) e^{itH(\phi)} \right] e^{-iH(\phi)} \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$= -i \left[ \int_0^1 dt e^{-itH(\phi)} H_k e^{itH(\phi)} \right] e^{-iH(\phi)} \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$= -i \Psi_\phi(H_k) e^{-iH(\phi)}. \quad (\text{A12})$$

Also, we have that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} e^{iH(\phi)} = \int_0^1 dt e^{(1-t)iH(\phi)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} iH(\phi) \right) e^{itH(\phi)} \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$= i e^{iH(\phi)} \left[ \int_0^1 dt e^{-itH(\phi)} H_k e^{itH(\phi)} \right] \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$= i e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_k). \quad (\text{A15})$$

Then we find that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \omega(\theta, \phi) = \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} e^{-iH(\phi)} \right) \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} + e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho(\theta) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} e^{iH(\phi)} \right) \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$= -i \Psi_\phi(H_k) e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} + i e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_k) \quad (\text{A17})$$


$$= -i \Psi_\phi(H_k) \omega(\theta, \phi) + i \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_k) \quad (\text{A18})$$

$$= i [\omega(\theta, \phi), \Psi_\phi(H_k)]. \quad (\text{A19})$$


## Appendix B: Hadamard tests for expected values of commutators, anticommutators, and nestings

In this appendix, we present a generalized Hadamard test for estimating the expectation values of commutators and anticommutators of two operators. We then show how to extend this method to nested commutators and anticommutators involving multiple operators. These circuits form the foundation of the algorithms developed for estimating the gradient and the information matrix elements of evolved quantum Boltzmann machines.





(a) Quantum circuit for estimating  $-\frac{1}{2}\langle\{U, H\}\rangle_\rho$  when  $U$  is unitary and Hermitian and  $H$  is Hermitian.



(b) Quantum circuit for estimating  $\frac{i}{2}\langle[U, H]\rangle_\rho$  when  $U$  is unitary and Hermitian and  $H$  is Hermitian.

FIG. 5: Quantum circuits for estimating the expected value of anticommutator and commutator of operators.

Let us start with the case of two operators  $U$  and  $H$ . We assume that  $U$  is both unitary and Hermitian and that  $H$  is Hermitian. We now present a quantum circuit used to estimate the following quantity:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\langle\{U, H\}\rangle_\rho, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $\rho$  is a generic quantum state, illustrated in Figure 5a. The circuit consists of two quantum registers:

- a control register, initialized in the state  $|1\rangle\langle 1|$ ,
- a system register, initialized in the state  $\rho$ .

To demonstrate that the output matches the desired quantity, let us track the state of the circuit in Figure 5a as it progresses through the various steps:

$$|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \rho \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \rho \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$\rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes U^j \rho U^k. \quad (\text{B3})$$

Given that  $X = (\text{Had})Z(\text{Had})$ , where  $X$  and  $Z$  are Pauli matrices, the final step is equivalent to determining the expectation of the observable  $X \otimes H$ . This expectation is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} \left[ (X \otimes H) \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes U^j \rho U^k \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}} \text{Tr}[(X \otimes H) ((-1)^{j+k} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes U^j \rho U^k)] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k} \langle k|X|j\rangle \text{Tr}[HU^j \rho U^k] \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}; j \neq k} (-1)^{j+k} \langle k|X|j\rangle \text{Tr}[HU^j \rho U^k] \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} (\text{Tr}[HU^0 \rho U^1] + \text{Tr}[HU^1 \rho U^0]) \quad (\text{B7})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} (\text{Tr}[H\rho U] + \text{Tr}[HU\rho]) \quad (\text{B8})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} (\text{Tr}[UH\rho] + \text{Tr}[HU\rho]) \quad (\text{B9})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \langle\{U, H\}\rangle_\rho. \quad (\text{B10})$$

Analogously, we can construct a related quantum circuit to estimate the expected value of the commutator of  $U$  and  $H$ . If  $U$  is unitary and Hermitian and  $H$  is Hermitian, then the following quantity is of interest:

$$\frac{i}{2}\langle[U, H]\rangle_\rho. \quad (\text{B11})$$

The quantum circuit for estimating this quantity is shown in Figure 5b. The setup is essentially the same as in the anticommutator case: we have a control qubit initially in the state  $|1\rangle$  and a system register initialized in the state  $\rho$ . The only difference compared to the circuit in Figure 5a is the addition of an  $S$  gate applied to the control qubit immediately after the first Hadamard gate. To demonstrate that the output matches the desired quantity, let us track the state of the circuit in Figure 5b as it progresses through the various steps:

$$|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \rho \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \rho \quad (\text{B12})$$

$$\rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k} i^j (-i)^k |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \rho \quad (\text{B13})$$

$$\rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k} i^j (-i)^k |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes U^j \rho U^k. \quad (\text{B14})$$

As before, the final step is equivalent to determining the expectation of the observable  $X \otimes H$ . This expectation is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} \left[ (X \otimes H) \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k} i^j (-i)^k |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes U^j \rho U^k \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k} i^j (-i)^k \text{Tr}[(X \otimes H) (|j\rangle\langle k| \otimes U^j \rho U^k)] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B15})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k} i^j (-i)^k \langle k|X|j\rangle \text{Tr}[HU^j \rho U^k] \quad (\text{B16})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \{0,1\}; j \neq k} (-1)^{j+k} i^j (-i)^k \langle k|X|j\rangle \text{Tr}[HU^j \rho U^k] \quad (\text{B17})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} (i \text{Tr}[HU^0 \rho U^1] - i \text{Tr}[HU^1 \rho U^0]) \quad (\text{B18})$$

$$= \frac{i}{2} (\text{Tr}[H \rho U] - \text{Tr}[HU \rho]) \quad (\text{B19})$$

$$= \frac{i}{2} (\text{Tr}[UH \rho] - \text{Tr}[HU \rho]) \quad (\text{B20})$$

$$= \frac{i}{2} \langle [U, H] \rangle_\rho. \quad (\text{B21})$$

Thus, by repeatedly running the quantum circuits shown in Figures 5a and 5b with independent copies of  $\rho$ , one can obtain unbiased estimators for (B1) and (B11).

A generalisation of this single-control-qubit Hadamard test circuit using multiple control qubits can be used to estimate the expectation of nested commutators and anticommutators [82, Algorithm 3]. We show here the quantum circuits that can be used to estimate the expected values of two nested commutators and of nested commutator and anticommutator, of interest for their application in this paper. The quantum circuit shown in Figure 6a is used for estimating the following quantity


$$\frac{1}{4} \langle [[U_1, H], U_0] \rangle_\rho, \quad (\text{B22})$$

where  $U_0$  and  $U_1$  are Hermitian unitaries,  $H$  is Hermitian and  $\rho$  is a generic quantum state. The quantum circuit shown in Figure 6b is used for estimating the following quantity

$$\frac{i}{4} \langle \{U_0, [H, U_1]\} \rangle_\rho, \quad (\text{B23})$$

with the same requirements for  $U_0$ ,  $U_1$ , and  $H$  as in the previous circuit. The approach to obtaining unbiased estimators of (B22) and (B23) follows a similar procedure described previously for estimating (B1). For completeness, below we detail justifications of the claims in (B22) and (B23). Let us track the state of the circuit in Figure 6a, as it progresses through the various steps:

$$|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \rho \rightarrow \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle m| \otimes \rho \quad (\text{B24})$$



(a) Quantum circuit for estimating  $\frac{1}{4} \langle [[U_1, H], U_0] \rangle_\rho$  when  $U_0$  and  $U_1$  are unitary and Hermitian and  $H$  is Hermitian.

(b) Quantum circuit for estimating  $\frac{i}{4} \langle \{U_0, [H, U_1]\} \rangle_\rho$  when  $U_0$  and  $U_1$  are unitary and Hermitian and  $H$  is Hermitian.

FIG. 6: Quantum circuits for estimating expected values of nested commutators and anticommutator-commutators.

$$\rightarrow \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^{j+\ell} (-i)^{k+m} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle m| \otimes \rho \quad (\text{B25})$$

$$\rightarrow \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^{j+\ell} (-i)^{k+m} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle m| \otimes U_1^\ell U_0^j \rho U_0^k U_1^m. \quad (\text{B26})$$

Given that  $X = (\text{Had}) Z (\text{Had})$ , where  $X$  and  $Z$  are Pauli matrices, the final step is equivalent to determining the expectation of the observable  $X \otimes X \otimes H$ . This expectation is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} \left[ (X \otimes X \otimes H) \left( \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^{j+\ell} (-i)^{k+m} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle m| \otimes U_1^\ell U_0^j \rho U_0^k U_1^m \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^{j+\ell} (-i)^{k+m} \text{Tr} \left[ (X \otimes X \otimes H) \left( |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle m| \otimes U_1^\ell U_0^j \rho U_0^k U_1^m \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B27})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^{j+\ell} (-i)^{k+m} \langle k|X|j\rangle \langle m|X|\ell\rangle \text{Tr} \left[ H U_1^\ell U_0^j \rho U_0^k U_1^m \right] \quad (\text{B28})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\} \\ j \neq k, \ell \neq m}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^{j+\ell} (-i)^{k+m} \text{Tr} \left[ H U_1^\ell U_0^j \rho U_0^k U_1^m \right] \quad (\text{B29})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left[ (-1)^{0+1+0+1} i^{0+0} (-i)^{1+1} \text{Tr} [H U_1^0 U_0^0 \rho U_0^1 U_1^1] + (-1)^{0+1+1+0} i^{0+1} (-i)^{1+0} \text{Tr} [H U_1^1 U_0^0 \rho U_0^0 U_1^0] \right. \\ \left. + (-1)^{1+0+0+1} i^{1+0} (-i)^{0+1} \text{Tr} [H U_1^0 U_0^1 \rho U_0^0 U_1^1] + (-1)^{1+0+1+0} i^{1+1} (-i)^{0+0} \text{Tr} [H U_1^1 U_0^1 \rho U_0^0 U_1^0] \right] \quad (\text{B30})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} [-\text{Tr}[H \rho U_0 U_1] + \text{Tr}[H U_1 \rho U_0] + \text{Tr}[H U_0 \rho U_1] - \text{Tr}[H U_1 U_0 \rho]] \quad (\text{B31})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}[[[U_1, H], U_0] \rho] \quad (\text{B32})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \langle [[U_1, H], U_0] \rangle_\rho. \quad (\text{B33})$$

We do the same for the circuit depicted in Figure 6b. Again, tracking the state as it progress through the circuit, consider that

$$|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \rho \rightarrow \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle m| \otimes \rho \quad (\text{B34})$$

$$\rightarrow \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^\ell (-i)^m |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle m| \otimes \rho \quad (\text{B35})$$

$$\rightarrow \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^\ell (-i)^m |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle m| \otimes U_1^\ell U_0^j \rho U_0^k U_1^m. \quad (\text{B36})$$

The expectation of the observable  $X \otimes X \otimes H$  is then as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} \left[ (X \otimes X \otimes H) \left( \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^\ell (-i)^m |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle m| \otimes U_1^\ell U_0^j \rho U_0^k U_1^m \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^\ell (-i)^m \text{Tr} \left[ (X \otimes X \otimes H) \left( |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle m| \otimes U_1^\ell U_0^j \rho U_0^k U_1^m \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B37})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^\ell (-i)^m \langle k|X|j\rangle \langle m|X|\ell\rangle \text{Tr} \left[ H U_1^\ell U_0^j \rho U_0^k U_1^m \right] \quad (\text{B38})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{j,k,\ell,m \in \{0,1\}: \\ j \neq k, \ell \neq m}} (-1)^{j+k+\ell+m} i^\ell (-i)^m \text{Tr} \left[ H U_1^\ell U_0^j \rho U_0^k U_1^m \right] \quad (\text{B39})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left[ \begin{aligned} & (-1)^{0+1+0+1} i^0 (-i)^1 \text{Tr} [H U_1^0 U_0^0 \rho U_0^1 U_1^1] + (-1)^{0+1+1+0} i^1 (-i)^0 \text{Tr} [H U_1^1 U_0^0 \rho U_0^1 U_1^0] \\ & + (-1)^{1+0+0+1} i^0 (-i)^1 \text{Tr} [H U_1^0 U_0^1 \rho U_0^0 U_1^1] + (-1)^{1+0+1+0} i^1 (-i)^0 \text{Tr} [H U_1^1 U_0^1 \rho U_0^0 U_1^0] \end{aligned} \right] \quad (\text{B40})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} [-i \text{Tr} [H \rho U_0 U_1] + i \text{Tr} [H U_1 \rho U_0] - i \text{Tr} [H U_0 \rho U_1] + i \text{Tr} [H U_1 U_0 \rho]] \quad (\text{B41})$$

$$= \frac{i}{4} [-\text{Tr} [U_0 U_1 H \rho] + \text{Tr} [U_0 H U_1 \rho] - \text{Tr} [U_1 H U_0 \rho] + \text{Tr} [H U_1 U_0 \rho]] \quad (\text{B42})$$

$$= \frac{i}{4} \text{Tr} [\{U_0, [H, U_1]\} \rho] \quad (\text{B43})$$

$$= \frac{i}{4} \langle \{U_0, [H, U_1]\} \rangle_\rho. \quad (\text{B44})$$

## Appendix C: Ground-state energy estimation using evolved quantum Boltzmann machines

### 1. Gradient of the expected energy of an evolved quantum Boltzmann machine

Let us start by giving detailed calculations on how to obtain (13), that is, the partial derivative of the objective function in (12) with respect to the parameter vector  $\theta$ . Using (9), we find that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \text{Tr} [O \omega(\theta, \phi)] = \text{Tr} \left[ O \left( -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_j) e^{iH(\phi)}, \omega(\theta, \phi) \right\} + \omega(\theta, \phi) \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right) \right] \quad (\text{C1})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ O \left\{ e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_j) e^{iH(\phi)}, \omega(\theta, \phi) \right\} \right] + \text{Tr} \left[ O \omega(\theta, \phi) \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right] \quad (\text{C2})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)} \{ \Phi_\theta(G_j), \rho(\theta) \} \right] + \text{Tr} \left[ O \omega(\theta, \phi) \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right] \quad (\text{C3})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \rho(\theta) \right] + \text{Tr} [O \omega(\theta, \phi) \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}] \quad (\text{C4})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} + \langle O \rangle_{\omega(\theta, \phi)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{C5})$$

Using (10), it is straightforward to prove the partial derivative of the cost function with respect to the parameter vector  $\phi$  shown in (14):

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \text{Tr} [O \omega(\theta, \phi)] = i \text{Tr} [O [\omega(\theta, \phi), \Psi_\phi(H_k)]] \quad (\text{C6})$$

$$= i \text{Tr} [[\Psi_\phi(H_k), O] \omega(\theta, \phi)] \quad (\text{C7})$$

$$= i \langle [\Psi_\phi(H_k), O] \rangle_{\omega(\theta, \phi)}. \quad (\text{C8})$$

a. Quantum algorithm for estimating the partial derivative with respect to  $\theta$

Here we show how to estimate the second term appearing in (13). Consider that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \rho(\theta) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C9})$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) \left( -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)}, e^{-iG(\theta)t} G_j e^{iG(\theta)t} \right\} \rho(\theta) \right] \right). \quad (\text{C10})$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm (Algorithm 1) to estimate the second term of (13) using its equivalent form shown in (C10). At the core of our algorithm lies the quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of the anticommutator of two operators,  $-\frac{1}{2} \langle \{H, U\} \rangle_\rho$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian and  $U$  is Hermitian and unitary (refer to Appendix B and Figure 5a). In this case, we choose  $\rho = \rho(\theta)$ ,  $U = e^{-iG(\theta)t} G_j e^{iG(\theta)t}$ ,  $H = e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)}$ . We then make some further simplifications that follow because  $\rho(\theta)$  commutes with  $e^{-iG(\theta)t}$ . Accordingly, the quantum circuit that estimates the integrand of (C10) is depicted in Figure 1a.

---

**Algorithm 1** `gradient_theta_ground_state_energy(j, theta, {G_ell}_{ell=1}^J, phi, {H_m}_{m=1}^K, p(.), epsilon, delta)`

---

- 1: **Input:** Index  $j \in [J]$ , parameter vectors  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_J)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^J$  and  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_K)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , Gibbs local Hamiltonians  $\{G_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^J$  and  $\{H_m\}_{m=1}^K$ , probability distribution  $p(t)$  over  $\mathbb{R}$ , precision  $\varepsilon > 0$ , error probability  $\delta \in (0, 1)$
  - 2:  $N \leftarrow \lceil 2 \ln(2/\delta) / \varepsilon^2 \rceil$
  - 3: **for**  $n = 0$  to  $N - 1$  **do**
  - 4:   Initialize the control register to  $|1\rangle\langle 1|$
  - 5:   Prepare the system register in the state  $\rho(\theta)$
  - 6:   Sample  $t$  at random with probability  $p(t)$  (defined in (7))
  - 7:   Apply the Hadamard gate to the control register
  - 8:   Apply the following unitaries to the control and system registers:
    - 9:   • Controlled- $G_j$ :  $G_j$  is a local unitary acting on the system register, controlled by the control register
    - 10:   •  $e^{-iG(\theta)t}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t$  on the system register
    - 11:   •  $e^{-iH(\phi)}$ : Hamiltonian simulation on the system register
  - 12:   Apply the Hadamard gate to the control register
  - 13:   Measure the control register in the computational basis and store the measurement outcome  $b_n$
  - 14:   Measure the system register in the eigenbasis of  $O$  and store the measurement outcome  $\lambda_n$
  - 15:    $Y_n^{(\theta)} \leftarrow (-1)^{b_n} \lambda_n$
  - 16: **end for**
  - 17: **return**  $\bar{Y}^{(\theta)} \leftarrow \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Y_n^{(\theta)}$
- 

**Remark 20** *If it is not straightforward to measure in the eigenbasis of  $O$ , but instead  $O$  is a linear combination of simpler observables that are each easy to measure, then one can adopt a sampling approach along the lines of [38, Algorithm 1]. See Remark 21 for further discussions of this point.*

b. Quantum algorithm for estimating the partial derivative with respect to  $\phi$

Here we show how to estimate the quantity in (14). Consider that

$$\begin{aligned} i \langle [\Psi_\phi(H_k), O] \rangle_{\omega(\theta, \phi)} &= i \text{Tr} [[\Psi_\phi(H_k), O] \omega(\theta, \phi)] \\ &= \int_0^1 dt \left( i \text{Tr} \left[ \left[ e^{-iH(\phi)t} H_k e^{iH(\phi)t}, O \right] \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C11})$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm (Algorithm 2) to estimate (14) using its equivalent form shown in (C11). At the core of our algorithm lies the quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of the commutator of two operators,  $\frac{i}{2} \langle [U, H] \rangle_\rho$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian and  $U$  is Hermitian and unitary (refer to Appendix B and Figure 5b). In this case, we choose  $\rho = \omega(\theta, \phi)$ ,  $U = e^{-iH(\phi)t} H_k e^{iH(\phi)t}$ ,  $H = O$ . Accordingly, the quantum circuit that estimates the integrand of (C11) is depicted in Figure 1b.

---

**Algorithm 2** `gradient_φ_ground_state_energy`( $j, \theta, \{G_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^J, \phi, \{H_m\}_{m=1}^K, \varepsilon, \delta$ )

---

```

1: Input: Index  $k \in [K]$ , parameter vectors  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_J)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^J$  and  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_K)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , Gibbs local Hamiltonians
    $\{G_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^J$  and  $\{H_m\}_{m=1}^K$ , precision  $\varepsilon > 0$ , error probability  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ 
2:  $N \leftarrow \lceil 2 \ln(2/\delta)/\varepsilon^2 \rceil$ 
3: for  $n = 0$  to  $N - 1$  do
4:   Initialize the control register to  $|1\rangle\langle 1|$ 
5:   Prepare the system register in the state  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$ 
6:   Sample  $t$  uniformly at random from the interval  $[0, 1]$ 
7:   Apply the Hadamard gate and the phase gate  $S$  to the control register
8:   Apply the following unitaries to the control and system registers:
9:     •  $e^{iH(\phi)t}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t$  on the system register
10:    • Controlled- $H_k$ :  $H_k$  is a local unitary acting on the system register, controlled by the control register
11:    •  $e^{-iH(\phi)t}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t$  on the system register
12:   Apply the Hadamard gate to the control register
13:   Measure the control register in the computational basis and store the measurement outcome  $b_n$ 
14:   Measure the system register in the eigenbasis of  $O$  and store the measurement outcome  $\lambda_n$  (see Remark 20)
15:    $Y_n^{(\phi)} \leftarrow (-1)^{b_n} \lambda_n$ 
16: end for
17: return  $\bar{Y}^{(\phi)} \leftarrow 2 \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Y_n^{(\phi)}$ 

```

---

### Appendix D: Evolved quantum Boltzmann machines for generative modeling

Here we prove the alternative formulation of the quantum relative entropy in (17). Consider that

$$D(\eta \parallel \omega(\theta, \phi)) = \text{Tr}[\eta \ln \eta] - \text{Tr}[\eta \ln \omega(\theta, \phi)] \quad (\text{D1})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\eta \ln \eta] - \text{Tr} \left[ \eta \ln \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \right) \right] \quad (\text{D2})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\eta \ln \eta] - \text{Tr} \left[ \eta e^{-iH(\phi)} \ln \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \right] \quad (\text{D3})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\eta \ln \eta] - \text{Tr} \left[ e^{iH(\phi)} \eta e^{-iH(\phi)} (-G(\theta)) \right] - \text{Tr} \left[ e^{iH(\phi)} \eta e^{-iH(\phi)} (-\ln Z(\theta)) \right] \quad (\text{D4})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\eta \ln \eta] + \text{Tr} \left[ G(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \eta e^{-iH(\phi)} \right] + \ln Z(\theta) \quad (\text{D5})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\eta \ln \eta] + \text{Tr}[G(\theta) \eta(\phi)] + \ln Z(\theta), \quad (\text{D6})$$

where in (D3) we used the fact that  $\ln(UAU^\dagger) = U (\ln A) U^\dagger$  when  $A$  is a positive semidefinite matrix and  $U$  is a unitary matrix.

#### 1. Gradient of the quantum relative entropy

We first prove Theorem 2, that is, how to obtain the  $j$ th element of the gradient of the quantum relative entropy with respect to the  $\theta$  parameter. Using (17), we find that

$$\partial_{\theta_j} D(\eta \parallel \omega(\theta, \phi)) = \partial_{\theta_j} \text{Tr}[G(\theta) \eta(\phi)] + \partial_{\theta_j} \ln Z(\theta) \quad (\text{D7})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[G_j \eta(\phi)] - \text{Tr}[G_j \rho(\theta)] \quad (\text{D8})$$

$$= \langle G_j \rangle_{\eta(\phi)} - \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}, \quad (\text{D9})$$

concluding the proof of Theorem 2.

Now, we prove Theorem 3, that is, the analytical expression of the  $k$ th element of the gradient of the quantum relative entropy with respect to  $\phi$ . Using (17), we find that

$$\partial_{\phi_k} D(\eta \parallel \omega(\theta, \phi)) = \partial_{\phi_k} \text{Tr} \left[ e^{iH(\phi)} \eta e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{D10})$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \partial_{\phi_k} e^{iH(\phi)} \right) \eta e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) + e^{iH(\phi)} \eta \left( \partial_{\phi_k} e^{-iH(\phi)} \right) G(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{D11})$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ i e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_k) \eta e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) - i e^{iH(\phi)} \eta \Psi_\phi(H_k) e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{D12})$$

$$= i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_k) \eta e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) \right] - i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ e^{iH(\phi)} \eta \Psi_\phi(H_k) e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{D13})$$

$$= i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_k) e^{-iH(\phi)} e^{iH(\phi)} \eta e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) \right] \\ - i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ e^{iH(\phi)} \eta e^{-iH(\phi)} e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_k) e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{D14})$$

$$= i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_k) \eta(\phi) G(\theta) \right] - i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \eta(\phi) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_k) G(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{D15})$$

$$= i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_k) \eta(\phi) \right] - i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_k) G(\theta) \eta(\phi) \right] \quad (\text{D16})$$

$$= i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_k) \right] \eta(\phi) \right] \quad (\text{D17})$$

$$= i \left\langle \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_k) \right] \right\rangle_{\eta(\phi)}, \quad (\text{D18})$$

where, in (D12), we have used the facts that  $\partial_{\phi_k} e^{iH(\phi)} = i e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_k)$  and  $\partial_{\phi_k} e^{-iH(\phi)} = -i \Psi_\phi(H_k) e^{-iH(\phi)}$ , as derived in (A9)–(A15).

*a. Quantum algorithm for estimating the partial derivative with respect to  $\phi$*

Here we show how to estimate the quantity in (21). Consider that

$$i \left\langle \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_k) \right] \right\rangle_{\eta(\phi)} = i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_k) \right] \eta(\phi) \right] \quad (\text{D19})$$

$$= \int_0^1 dt \left( i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left[ G(\theta), e^{iH(\phi)t} H_k e^{-iH(\phi)t} \right] \eta(\phi) \right] \right). \quad (\text{D20})$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm to estimate (21) using its equivalent form shown in (D20). The algorithm is similar to Algorithm 2, so here we provide a high-level description of how it works. At its core, the algorithm relies on a quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of the commutator of two operators (see Appendix B). Specifically, if the control register in Figure 5b is initialized in the state  $|0\rangle$  instead of  $|1\rangle$ , the output of the circuit is  $\frac{i}{2} \langle [H, U] \rangle_\rho$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian and  $U$  is Hermitian and unitary. In this case, we choose  $U = e^{iH(\phi)t} H_k e^{-iH(\phi)t}$ ,  $H = G(\theta)$ , and  $\rho = \eta(\phi)$ , where  $\eta(\phi)$  is obtained by applying  $e^{iH(\phi)}$  to  $\eta$ . Accordingly, the quantum circuit that plays a role in estimating the integrand of (D20) is depicted in Figure 1c. The algorithm involves running this circuit  $N$  times, where  $N$  is determined by the desired precision and error probability. During each run, the time  $t$  for the Hamiltonian evolution is sampled uniformly at random from the interval  $[0, 1]$ . The final estimation of (21) is obtained by averaging the outputs of the  $N$  runs and multiplying the result by  $2 \|\theta\|_1$ . For measuring  $G(\theta)$ , we adopt a sampling approach (see Remark 21).

## Appendix E: Proof of Theorem 7

### 1. Proof of Equations (56) and (57)

Consider that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [-2 \ln F(\sigma(\gamma), \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))] = -2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \ln \left( \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right] \right)^2 \quad (\text{E1})$$

$$= -4 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \ln \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right] \quad (\text{E2})$$

$$= -4 \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \ln \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right] \right) \quad (\text{E3})$$

$$= -4 \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]}{\operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]} \right). \quad (\text{E4})$$

Recalling from [104, Theorem 1.1] that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} = \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}, \quad (\text{E5})$$

now consider that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right] \\ &= \text{Tr} \left[ \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right) e^{-t\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E6})$$

$$= \int_0^\infty dt \text{Tr} \left[ e^{-2t\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] \quad (\text{E7})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right]. \quad (\text{E8})$$

Substituting (E8) into the numerator of (E4), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [-2 \ln F(\sigma(\gamma), \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))] \\ &= -4 \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E9})$$

$$= -2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]} \right) \quad (\text{E10})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= 2 \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right] \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]^2} \\ &\quad - 2 \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E11})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{\left( \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] \right)}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]^2} \\ &\quad - 2 \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]} \\ &\quad - 2 \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E12})$$



Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [-2 \ln F(\sigma(\gamma), \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\
&= \frac{\left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] \times \\ \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] \end{array} \right)}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]^2} \\
&\quad - 2 \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]} \\
&\quad - 2 \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]} \tag{E13}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \right] \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \right] \\
&\quad - 2 \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] \\
&\quad - 2 \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \right] \tag{E14}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= -2 \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right]. \tag{E15}$$

In the transition to the last line above, we observed that

$$\text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \text{Tr}[\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = 0, \tag{E16}$$

$$\text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \right] = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \text{Tr}[\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = 0. \tag{E17}$$

So then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [-2 \ln F(\sigma(\gamma), \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\
&= -2 \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right]. \tag{E18}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, recalling that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} (\sigma(\gamma)^{-1}) = -\sigma(\gamma)^{-1} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) \sigma(\gamma)^{-1}, \tag{E19}$$

which follows from applying  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j}$  to the equation  $I = \sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma)^{-1}$  and solving for  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} (\sigma(\gamma)^{-1})$ , consider that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right]^{-1} \tag{E20}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= -\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}^{-1} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right) \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}^{-1} \quad (\text{E21})$$

$$= -\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}^{-1} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right) \times e^{-t\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}} \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}^{-1} \quad (\text{E22})$$

$$= -\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}^{-1} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon) \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \times e^{-t\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}} \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}^{-1}, \quad (\text{E23})$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= -\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}^{-1} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \times \\ & \quad \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} e^{-t\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}} \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)}\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E24})$$

$$= -\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}^{-1} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}^{-1} \quad (\text{E25})$$

$$= -\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}^{-1} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}^{-1}. \quad (\text{E26})$$

Substituting (E26) into (E18), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [-2 \ln F(\sigma(\gamma), \sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon))] \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= -2 \text{Tr} \left[ \left( -\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}^{-1} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}^{-1} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E27})$$

$$= 2 \int_0^\infty dt \text{Tr} \left[ e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) \right], \quad (\text{E28})$$

thus establishing (56).

Now let us consider substituting in the eigenbasis of  $\sigma(\gamma)$ , taken as  $\sum_k \lambda_k |k\rangle\langle k|$ . Then we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \int_0^\infty dt \text{Tr} \left[ e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-t\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) \right] \\ &= 2 \int_0^\infty dt \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sum_k e^{-t\lambda_k} |k\rangle\langle k| \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sigma(\gamma) \right) \left( \sum_\ell e^{-t\lambda_\ell} |\ell\rangle\langle \ell| \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E29})$$

$$= 2 \sum_{k,\ell} \left( \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t(\lambda_k+\lambda_\ell)} \right) \text{Tr} \left[ |k\rangle\langle k| \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sigma(\gamma) \right) |\ell\rangle\langle \ell| \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) \right] \quad (\text{E30})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{2}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k| (\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) |\ell\rangle\langle \ell| (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) |k\rangle, \quad (\text{E31})$$

thus establishing (57).

## 2. Proof of Equations (58) and (59)

Consider that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [-2 \ln F_H(\sigma(\gamma), \sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon))] = -2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \ln \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon)} \right]^2 \quad (\text{E32})$$

$$= -4 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \ln \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \right] \quad (\text{E33})$$

$$= -4 \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \ln \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \right] \right) \quad (\text{E34})$$

$$= -4 \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \right]} \right) \quad (\text{E35})$$

$$= -4 \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left( \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \right]} \right) \quad (\text{E36})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{4 \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \right] \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \right]}{\left( \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \right] \right)^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{4 \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \right]}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E37})$$

Then we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} (-2 \ln F_H(\sigma(\gamma), \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \frac{4 \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right]}{\left( \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] \right)^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{4 \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right]} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E38})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= 4 \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] \\ &\quad - 4 \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E39})$$

Recalling from [104, Theorem 1.1] that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} = \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}}, \quad (\text{E40})$$

now consider that

$$\text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] = \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \right) e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] \quad (\text{E41})$$

$$= \int_0^\infty dt \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right] \quad (\text{E42})$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-2t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \right] \quad (\text{E43})$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}^{-1} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \right] \quad (\text{E44})$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] \quad (\text{E45})$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] \quad (\text{E46})$$

$$= 0. \quad (\text{E47})$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} (-2 \ln F_H(\sigma(\gamma), \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = -4 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] \quad (\text{E48})$$

$$= -4 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right], \quad (\text{E49})$$

where we used that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}. \quad (\text{E50})$$

Now observe that

$$0 = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \operatorname{Tr}[\sigma(\gamma)] \quad (\text{E51})$$

$$= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] \quad (\text{E52})$$

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \right] \quad (\text{E53})$$

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} + \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \right] \quad (\text{E54})$$

$$= 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] \quad (\text{E55})$$

$$= 2 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} + \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \right] \quad (\text{E56})$$

$$= 2 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] + 2 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{E57})$$

So we conclude that

$$- \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right] = \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \right], \quad (\text{E58})$$

which in turn implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} (-2 \ln F_H(\sigma(\gamma), \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= 4 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E59})$$

$$= 4 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( \int_0^\infty dt_1 e^{-t_1 \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-t_1 \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right) \left( \int_0^\infty dt_2 e^{-t_2 \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-t_2 \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right) \right] \quad (\text{E60})$$

$$= 4 \int_0^\infty dt_1 \int_0^\infty dt_2 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ e^{-t_1 \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-t_1 \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} e^{-t_2 \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-t_2 \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right] \quad (\text{E61})$$

$$= 4 \int_0^\infty dt_1 \int_0^\infty dt_2 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ e^{-(t_1+t_2) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-(t_1+t_2) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) \right], \quad (\text{E62})$$

thus establishing (58).

We can derive (59) by considering a spectral decomposition for  $\sigma(\gamma)$  as

$$\sigma(\gamma) = \sum_k \lambda_k |k\rangle\langle k|, \quad (\text{E63})$$

where we have suppressed the dependence of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors on the parameter vector  $\gamma$ . Then we find that

$$4 \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dt_1 dt_2 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ e^{-(t_1+t_2) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-(t_1+t_2) \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) \right]$$

$$= 4 \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dt_1 dt_2 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sum_k e^{-(t_1+t_2)\sqrt{\lambda_k}} |k\rangle\langle k| (\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) \sum_\ell e^{-(t_1+t_2)\sqrt{\lambda_\ell}} |\ell\rangle\langle \ell| (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) \right] \quad (\text{E64})$$

$$= 4 \sum_{k,\ell} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dt_1 dt_2 e^{-(t_1+t_2)(\sqrt{\lambda_k}+\sqrt{\lambda_\ell})} \langle k | (\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) | k \rangle \quad (\text{E65})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{4}{(\sqrt{\lambda_k} + \sqrt{\lambda_\ell})^2} \langle k | (\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) | k \rangle, \quad (\text{E66})$$

thus establishing (59). In the last line, we made use of the integral

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dt_1 dt_2 e^{-(t_1+t_2)x} = \frac{1}{x^2}, \quad (\text{E67})$$

holding for  $x > 0$ .

### 3. Proof of Equations (60) and (61)

Consider that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [D(\sigma(\gamma) \| \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))] &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} (\operatorname{Tr}[\sigma(\gamma) (\ln \sigma(\gamma) - \ln \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))]) \\ &= -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \operatorname{Tr}[\sigma(\gamma) \ln \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon)] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E68})$$

$$= -\operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sigma(\gamma) \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \ln \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \right) \right], \quad (\text{E69})$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} [D(\sigma(\gamma) \| \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon))] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = -\operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sigma(\gamma) \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \ln \sigma(\gamma + \varepsilon) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \right] \quad (\text{E70})$$

$$= -\operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sigma(\gamma) \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \ln \sigma(\gamma) \right) \right]. \quad (\text{E71})$$

Observe that the logarithm has the following integral representation for  $x > 0$ :

$$\ln x = \int_0^\infty dt (1+t)^{-1} - (x+t)^{-1}, \quad (\text{E72})$$

which implies the following integral representation for the matrix logarithm of a positive definite operator  $\sigma$ :

$$\ln \sigma = \int_0^\infty dt (1+t)^{-1} I - (\sigma + tI)^{-1}. \quad (\text{E73})$$

It then follows from (E73) and the following

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} (\sigma(\gamma))^{-1} = -\sigma(\gamma)^{-1} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) \sigma(\gamma)^{-1} \quad (\text{E74})$$

that the derivative of the matrix logarithm is as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \ln \sigma(\gamma) = \int_0^\infty dt (\sigma(\gamma) + tI)^{-1} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) (\sigma(\gamma) + tI)^{-1}. \quad (\text{E75})$$

Then, by making use of the following integral for  $x > 0$ ,

$$\int_0^\infty dt (x+t)^{-2} = \frac{1}{x}, \quad (\text{E76})$$

consider that

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma(\gamma)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\ln\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right] = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma(\gamma)\left(\int_0^\infty dt(\sigma(\gamma)+tI)^{-1}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\sigma(\gamma)\right)(\sigma(\gamma)+tI)^{-1}\right)\right] \quad (\text{E77})$$

$$= \int_0^\infty dt \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma(\gamma)(\sigma(\gamma)+tI)^{-2}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right] \quad (\text{E78})$$

$$= \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma(\gamma)\left(\int_0^\infty dt(\sigma(\gamma)+tI)^{-2}\right)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right] \quad (\text{E79})$$

$$= \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma(\gamma)\sigma(\gamma)^{-1}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right] \quad (\text{E80})$$

$$= \mathrm{Tr}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\sigma(\gamma)\right] \quad (\text{E81})$$

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\mathrm{Tr}[\sigma(\gamma)] \quad (\text{E82})$$

$$= 0. \quad (\text{E83})$$

It then follows that

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_i}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma(\gamma)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\ln\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right] \quad (\text{E84})$$

$$= \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_i}\sigma(\gamma)\right)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\ln\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right] + \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma(\gamma)\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\gamma_i\partial\gamma_j}\ln\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right], \quad (\text{E85})$$

which is equivalent to

$$-\mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma(\gamma)\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\gamma_i\partial\gamma_j}\ln\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right] = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_i}\sigma(\gamma)\right)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\ln\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right]. \quad (\text{E86})$$

Substituting (E86) into (E71) and again making use of (E75), we find that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\varepsilon_i\partial\varepsilon_j}[D(\sigma(\gamma)\|\sigma(\gamma+\varepsilon))]\Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_i}\sigma(\gamma)\right)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\ln\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right] \quad (\text{E87})$$

$$= \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_i}\sigma(\gamma)\right)\left(\int_0^\infty dt(\sigma(\gamma)+tI)^{-1}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\sigma(\gamma)\right)(\sigma(\gamma)+tI)^{-1}\right)\right] \quad (\text{E88})$$

$$= \int_0^\infty dt \mathrm{Tr}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_i}\sigma(\gamma)(\sigma(\gamma)+tI)^{-1}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\sigma(\gamma)\right)(\sigma(\gamma)+tI)^{-1}\right], \quad (\text{E89})$$

which establishes (60).

Finally, by making use of the following integral for  $x, y > 0$ :

$$\int_0^\infty dt \frac{1}{(x+t)(y+t)} = \frac{\ln x - \ln y}{x - y}, \quad (\text{E90})$$

consider that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty dt \mathrm{Tr}\left[(\sigma(\gamma)+tI)^{-1}(\partial_i\sigma(\gamma))(\sigma(\gamma)+tI)^{-1}(\partial_j\sigma(\gamma))\right] \\ &= \int_0^\infty dt \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_k \frac{1}{\lambda_k+t}|k\rangle\langle k|\right)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_i}\sigma(\gamma)\right)\left(\sum_\ell \frac{1}{\lambda_\ell+t}|\ell\rangle\langle\ell|\right)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E91})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \left(\int_0^\infty dt \frac{1}{(\lambda_k+t)(\lambda_\ell+t)}\right) \mathrm{Tr}\left[|k\rangle\langle k|\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_i}\sigma(\gamma)\right)|\ell\rangle\langle\ell|\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\sigma(\gamma)\right)\right] \quad (\text{E92})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \left[\frac{\ln\lambda_k - \ln\lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell}\right] \langle k|\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_i}\sigma(\gamma)\right)|\ell\rangle\langle\ell|\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_j}\sigma(\gamma)\right)|k\rangle, \quad (\text{E93})$$

thus establishing (61).



So consider that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left[ \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) \rangle \langle \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right] \\ &= \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) \rangle \langle \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \\ & \quad + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F11})$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & -2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \left[ \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) \rangle \langle \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= -2 \left[ \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \langle \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F12})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -2 \left[ \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F13})$$

$$= -4 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right]. \quad (\text{F14})$$

Now consider that

$$0 = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \langle \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \quad (\text{F15})$$

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \left[ \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right] \quad (\text{F16})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \\ & \quad + \langle \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle + \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F17})$$

$$= 2 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right] + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right]. \quad (\text{F18})$$

So this implies that

$$- \operatorname{Re} \left[ \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right] = \operatorname{Re} \left[ \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right]. \quad (\text{F19})$$

Substituting (F19) into (F14), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_i \partial \varepsilon_j} \left[ -\ln |\langle \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma + \varepsilon) \rangle|^2 \right] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= 4 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle - \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F20})$$

$$= 4 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle - \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \psi(\gamma) | \psi(\gamma) \rangle \langle \psi(\gamma) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \psi(\gamma) \rangle \right]. \quad (\text{F21})$$

### Appendix G: Alternative proof of Proposition 9

To evaluate the expression in (71) for the parameterized family  $(\varphi^\sigma(\gamma))_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^L}$ , we need to compute  $|\partial_j \varphi^\sigma(\gamma)\rangle$ . To this end, consider that

$$|\partial_j \varphi^\sigma(\gamma)\rangle = \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} |\varphi^\sigma(\gamma)\rangle \quad (\text{G1})$$



$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{G2})$$

$$= \left( \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \right) \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{G3})$$

$$= \left( \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j} \sigma(\gamma) \right) e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{G4})$$

$$= \left( \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle, \quad (\text{G5})$$

where we made use of [104, Theorem 1.1] in the penultimate line. Now consider that

$$\langle \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) | \partial_j \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) \rangle = \langle \Gamma | \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \otimes I \right) \left( \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{G6})$$

$$= \int_0^\infty dt \langle \Gamma | \left( \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{G7})$$

$$= \int_0^\infty dt \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right] \quad (\text{G8})$$

$$= \int_0^\infty dt \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} e^{-2t\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) \right] \quad (\text{G9})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)} \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}^{-1} (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) \right] \quad (\text{G10})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)] \quad (\text{G11})$$

$$= 0. \quad (\text{G12})$$

In the second-to-last line, we made use of the integral

$$\int_0^\infty dt e^{-2tx} = \frac{1}{2x}. \quad (\text{G13})$$

So this implies that the second term in (71) is equal to zero.

Now consider that

$$\langle \partial_i \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) | \partial_j \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) \rangle \quad (\text{G14})$$

$$= \langle \Gamma | \left( \int_0^\infty dt_1 e^{-t_1\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-t_1\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \otimes I \right) \left( \int_0^\infty dt_2 e^{-t_2\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-t_2\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{G15})$$

$$= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dt_1 dt_2 \langle \Gamma | \left( e^{-t_1\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-t_1\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} e^{-t_2\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-t_2\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{G16})$$

$$= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dt_1 dt_2 \text{Tr} \left[ e^{-t_1\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-t_1\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} e^{-t_2\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-t_2\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} \right] \quad (\text{G17})$$

$$= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dt_1 dt_2 \text{Tr} \left[ e^{-(t_1+t_2)\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) e^{-(t_1+t_2)\sqrt{\sigma(\gamma)}} (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) \right] \quad (\text{G18})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{\lambda_k} + \sqrt{\lambda_\ell})^2} \langle k | (\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) | k \rangle, \quad (\text{G19})$$

where the last equality follows from (59). Putting everything together, we find that the Fisher–Bures information matrix elements of the parameterized family  $(\varphi^\sigma(\gamma))_\gamma$  are given by

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta) = 4 \text{Re} [\langle \partial_i \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) | \partial_j \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) \rangle - \langle \partial_i \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) | \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) \rangle \langle \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) | \partial_j \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) \rangle] \quad (\text{G20})$$

$$= 4 \text{Re} [\langle \partial_i \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) | \partial_j \varphi^\sigma(\gamma) \rangle] \quad (\text{G21})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{4}{(\sqrt{\lambda_k} + \sqrt{\lambda_\ell})^2} \langle k | (\partial_i \sigma(\gamma)) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | (\partial_j \sigma(\gamma)) | k \rangle. \quad (\text{G22})$$

This concludes the alternative proof of Proposition 9.

## Appendix H: Information matrix elements for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines

### 1. Fisher–Bures information matrix elements for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines

#### a. Proof of Theorem 10

Using (88), consider that

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta) = \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{2}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | k \rangle \quad (\text{H1})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{2}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \left( -\frac{1}{2} (\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k) \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle + \delta_{k\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right) \left( -\frac{1}{2} (\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k) \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle + \delta_{\ell k} \lambda_k \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right) \quad (\text{H2})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,\ell} (\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k) \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle + \sum_k \lambda_k \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \sum_k \lambda_k \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{k} \rangle \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \sum_k \lambda_k \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \quad (\text{H3})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\Phi_\theta(G_i) \rho(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_j)] + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\Phi_\theta(G_j) \rho(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_i)] + \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \text{Tr}[\Phi_\theta(G_i) \rho(\theta)] \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \text{Tr}[\Phi_\theta(G_j) \rho(\theta)] \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \quad (\text{H4})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\{\Phi_\theta(G_i), \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rho(\theta)] - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \quad (\text{H5})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \langle \{\Phi_\theta(G_i), \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{H6})$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 10. Note that the first term of (H6) can also be written as  $\text{Re}[\text{Tr}[\Phi_\theta(G_i) \Phi_\theta(G_j) \rho(\theta)]]$ .

#### b. Proof of Theorem 11

Using (91), consider that

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\phi) = \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{2}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | k \rangle \quad (\text{H7})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{2}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} (i(\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell) \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle) (i(\lambda_\ell - \lambda_k) \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle) \quad (\text{H8})$$

$$= 2 \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{(\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell)^2}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \quad (\text{H9})$$

$$= 2 \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{(\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell)^2 - 4\lambda_k \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \quad (\text{H10})$$

$$= 2 \sum_{k,\ell} (\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell) \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle - 8 \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{\lambda_k \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \quad (\text{H11})$$

$$= 2 \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_k \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle + 2 \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle - 8 \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{\lambda_k \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \quad (\text{H12})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 2 \operatorname{Tr}[\omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_i) \Psi_\phi(H_j)] + 2 \operatorname{Tr}[\Psi_\phi(H_i) \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j)] \\
&\quad - 8 \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\lambda_k \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{H13}$$

$$= 2 \langle \{ \Psi_\phi(H_i), \Psi_\phi(H_j) \} \rangle_{\omega(\theta, \phi)} - 8 \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\lambda_k \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \tag{H14}$$

$$= 2 \left\langle \left\{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - 8 \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\lambda_k \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle. \tag{H15}$$

Now let us recall that  $|k\rangle = e^{-iH(\phi)} |\tilde{k}\rangle$ , and define the spectral decomposition

$$\rho(\theta) = \sum_k \lambda_k |\tilde{k}\rangle \langle \tilde{k}| = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_k e^{-\mu_k} |\tilde{k}\rangle \langle \tilde{k}|, \tag{H16}$$

where a spectral decomposition of  $G(\theta) = \sum_k \mu_k |\tilde{k}\rangle \langle \tilde{k}|$ , so that the key quantity in the second term in (H15) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\lambda_k \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\lambda_k \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle \tilde{k} | e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_i) e^{-iH(\phi)} | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} | \tilde{k} \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{H17}$$

$$= \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\lambda_k \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle \tilde{k} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \tag{H18}$$

$$= \operatorname{Re} \left[ \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\lambda_k \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle \tilde{k} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \right] \tag{H19}$$

$$= \operatorname{Re} \left[ \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\lambda_k \frac{e^{-\mu_k}}{Z}}{\frac{e^{-\mu_k}}{Z} + \frac{e^{-\mu_\ell}}{Z}} \langle \tilde{k} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \right] \tag{H20}$$

$$= \operatorname{Re} \left[ \sum_{k, \ell} \lambda_k \frac{1}{e^{-(\mu_k - \mu_\ell)} + 1} \langle \tilde{k} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \right]. \tag{H21}$$

Now observe that, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{e^{-x} + 1} = \frac{e^{x/2}}{e^{x/2} + e^{-x/2}} \tag{H22}$$

$$= \frac{e^{x/2}}{e^{x/2} + e^{-x/2}} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \tag{H23}$$

$$= \frac{e^{x/2}}{e^{x/2} + e^{-x/2}} - \frac{\frac{1}{2}e^{x/2} + \frac{1}{2}e^{-x/2}}{e^{x/2} + e^{-x/2}} + \frac{1}{2} \tag{H24}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^{x/2} - e^{-x/2}}{e^{x/2} + e^{-x/2}} + \frac{1}{2} \tag{H25}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \tanh(x/2) + \frac{1}{2} \tag{H26}$$

$$= \frac{x}{4} \frac{\tanh(x/2)}{x/2} + \frac{1}{2}. \tag{H27}$$

Substituting above, we find that

$$\operatorname{Re} \left[ \sum_{k, \ell} \lambda_k \frac{1}{e^{-(\mu_k - \mu_\ell)} + 1} \langle \tilde{k} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \right]$$

$$= \text{Re} \left[ \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_k \left( \frac{\mu_k - \mu_\ell \tanh((\mu_k - \mu_\ell)/2)}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \langle \tilde{k} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \right] \quad (\text{H28})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \text{Re} \left[ \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_k (\mu_k - \mu_\ell) \frac{\tanh((\mu_k - \mu_\ell)/2)}{(\mu_k - \mu_\ell)/2} \langle \tilde{k} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} \text{Re} \left[ \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_k \langle \tilde{k} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \right] \quad (\text{H29})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \text{Re} \left[ \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_k (\mu_k - \mu_\ell) \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) e^{-i(\mu_k - \mu_\ell)t} \langle \tilde{k} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} \text{Re} \left[ \text{Tr} \left[ \rho(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right] \quad (\text{H30})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \text{Re} \left[ \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_k (\mu_k - \mu_\ell) \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) e^{-i(\mu_k - \mu_\ell)t} \langle \tilde{k} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \right] \\ + \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \left\{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{H31})$$

The third equality above follows from [38, Lemma 12]. Consider now that the key quantity in the first term above can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_k (\mu_k - \mu_\ell) \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) e^{-i(\mu_k - \mu_\ell)t} \langle \tilde{k} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \\ = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_k (\mu_k - \mu_\ell) \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) e^{i\mu_\ell t} | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) e^{-i\mu_k t} | \tilde{k} \rangle \langle \tilde{k} | \right] \quad (\text{H32})$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) \sum_{k,\ell} \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) e^{i\mu_\ell t} | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \lambda_k \mu_k e^{-i\mu_k t} | \tilde{k} \rangle \langle \tilde{k} | \right] \\ - \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) \sum_{k,\ell} \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \mu_\ell e^{i\mu_\ell t} | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \lambda_k e^{-i\mu_k t} | \tilde{k} \rangle \langle \tilde{k} | \right] \quad (\text{H33})$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) e^{iG(\theta)t} \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) G(\theta) e^{-iG(\theta)t} \right] \\ - \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) G(\theta) e^{iG(\theta)t} \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) e^{-iG(\theta)t} \right] \quad (\text{H34})$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \rho(\theta) \right] - \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) \right]. \quad (\text{H35})$$

Putting everything together, we find that

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\phi) = 2 \left\langle \left\{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\ - 8 \left( \frac{1}{4} \left( \begin{aligned} & \text{Re} \left[ \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \rho(\theta) \right] \right] \\ & - \text{Re} \left[ \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) \right] \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \left\{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \end{aligned} \right) \right) \quad (\text{H36}) \\ = 2 \left\langle \left\{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \rho(\theta) \right] \\ + \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) \right] \\ - \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \rho(\theta) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] + \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \rho(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \right]$$

$$-2 \left\langle \left\{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \quad (\text{H37})$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) \right] - \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \rho(\theta) \right] \\ + \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \rho(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \right] - \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \rho(\theta) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \quad (\text{H38})$$

$$= \left\langle \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{H39})$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 11.

### c. Proof of Theorem 12

Using (91) and (87), consider that

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta, \phi) \\ = \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{2}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | k \rangle \quad (\text{H40})$$

$$= \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{2}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \left( -\frac{1}{2} (\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k) \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle + \delta_{k\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right) (i (\lambda_\ell - \lambda_k) \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle) \quad (\text{H41})$$

$$= \sum_{k, \ell} -i (\lambda_\ell - \lambda_k) \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \quad (\text{H42})$$

$$= \sum_{k, \ell} -i \lambda_\ell \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle + \sum_{k, \ell} i \lambda_k \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \quad (\text{H43})$$

$$= -i \text{Tr} \left[ e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right] + i \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi(H_j) \omega(\theta, \phi) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \right] \quad (\text{H44})$$

$$= -i \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] + i \text{Tr} \left[ e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_j) \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] \quad (\text{H45})$$

$$= -i \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \right] + i \text{Tr} \left[ e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \right] \quad (\text{H46})$$

$$= -i \text{Tr} \left[ e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) \rho(\theta) \right] + i \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{H47})$$

$$= -i \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \Phi_\theta(G_i) \rho(\theta) \right] + i \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{H48})$$

$$= i \text{Tr} \left[ \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \rho(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{H49})$$

$$= i \left\langle \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{H50})$$

The third equality above follows because

$$\sum_{k, \ell} \frac{2}{\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell} \delta_{k\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} (i (\lambda_\ell - \lambda_k) \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle) = 0. \quad (\text{H51})$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 12. Note that the final expression in (H50) can also be written as  $-2 \text{Im} \left[ \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) \right] \right]$ .

## 2. Wigner–Yanase information matrix elements for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines

### a. Proof of Theorem 13

Using the notations in the statement of Theorem 13, consider that

$$|\partial_j \psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{H52})$$

$$= \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right) \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{H53})$$

$$= \left[ e^{-iH(\phi)} \left( -\frac{1}{4} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right) \otimes I \right] |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{H54})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{4} \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle. \quad (\text{H55})$$

The third equality follows because

$$\sqrt{\rho(\theta)} = \sqrt{\frac{e^{-G(\theta)}}{Z(\theta)}} = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}G(\theta)}}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}} = \frac{e^{-G(\theta/2)}}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}}, \quad (\text{H56})$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \left( \frac{e^{-G(\theta/2)}}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \left( e^{-G(\theta/2)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H57})$$

$$= \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} e^{-G(\theta/2)} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}} + e^{-G(\theta/2)} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}} \right) \quad (\text{H58})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{4} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), e^{-G(\theta/2)} \right\} \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}} - \frac{1}{2} e^{-G(\theta/2)} \left( \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} Z(\theta)}{Z(\theta)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \quad (\text{H59})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{4} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), e^{-G(\theta/2)} \right\} \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}} + \frac{1}{2} e^{-G(\theta/2)} \left( \frac{\langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}}{Z(\theta)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \quad (\text{H60})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{4} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{H61})$$

To arrive at (H59), we applied [38, Lemma 10].

Furthermore,

$$|\partial_i \psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{H62})$$

$$= \left( \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} e^{-iH(\phi)} \right) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{H63})$$

$$= -i \left( \Psi_\phi(H_i) e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle, \quad (\text{H64})$$

$$= -i \left( \Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes I \right) |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle, \quad (\text{H65})$$

where we applied (A9)–(A12).

#### b. Proof of Theorem 14

Here we employ the shorthands  $\partial_i \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i}$  and  $\partial_j \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j}$ . Using Proposition 9 and (98), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \partial_i \psi(\theta, \phi) | \partial_j \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \\ &= \left( \begin{array}{c} -\frac{1}{4} \left( |\Gamma\rangle \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} e^{iH(\phi)} \otimes I \right) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} -\frac{1}{4} \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \\ + \frac{1}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \end{array} \right) \quad (\text{H66}) \\ &= \frac{1}{16} \langle \Gamma | \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} e^{iH(\phi)} e^{-iH(\phi)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{8} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \Gamma | \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} e^{iH(\phi)} \otimes I | \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{8} \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | e^{-iH(\phi)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{4} \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}
\end{aligned} \tag{H67}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& = \frac{1}{16} \langle \Gamma | \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle \\
& - \frac{1}{8} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \Gamma | \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle \\
& - \frac{1}{8} \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \Gamma | \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{4} \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}
\end{aligned} \tag{H68}$$

$$= \frac{1}{16} \langle \Gamma | \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle - \frac{1}{4} \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \tag{H69}$$

The last equality follows because

$$\langle \Gamma | \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle = \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \right] \tag{H70}$$

$$= 2 \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \rho(\theta) \right] \tag{H71}$$

$$= 2 \text{Tr} [G_j \rho(\theta)] \tag{H72}$$

$$\langle \Gamma | \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle = \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \right] \tag{H73}$$

$$= 2 \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \rho(\theta) \right] \tag{H74}$$

$$= 2 \text{Tr} [G_j \rho(\theta)]. \tag{H75}$$

Also, consider that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \Gamma | \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle \\
& = \langle \Gamma | \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle + \langle \Gamma | \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle \\
& \quad + \langle \Gamma | \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle + \langle \Gamma | \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{H76}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& = \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] + \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] \\
& \quad + \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right] + \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{H77}$$

$$= 2 \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] + \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \tag{H78}$$

So we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \partial_i \psi(\theta, \phi) | \partial_j \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \\
& = \frac{1}{16} \left[ 2 \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] + \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right] - \frac{1}{4} \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}
\end{aligned} \tag{H79}$$

$$= \frac{1}{8} \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] + \frac{1}{16} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \frac{1}{4} \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \tag{H80}$$

Additionally, consider that

$$\langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \partial_j \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle = \langle \Gamma | \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} e^{iH(\phi)} \left( -\frac{1}{4} e^{-iH(\phi)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I | \Gamma \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} | \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \right) \tag{H81}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{4} \langle \Gamma | \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} | \Gamma \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \Gamma | \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} | \Gamma \rangle \tag{H82}$$

$$= 0. \tag{H83}$$

So the final expression for the Wigner–Yanase information is given by

$$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta) = 4 \text{Re} \left[ \frac{1}{8} \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] + \frac{1}{16} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \frac{1}{4} \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right] \tag{H84}$$

$$= 4 \left[ \frac{1}{8} \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] + \frac{1}{16} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \frac{1}{4} \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right] \quad (\text{H85})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] + \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{H86})$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 14.

*c. Canonical purification of quantum Boltzmann machines and thermofield double state*

Let us note that the state in (104) is what is prepared by various quantum algorithms (see, e.g., [28, 33, 84]). Here we show briefly how this is the case. Writing an eigendecomposition of  $G(\theta)$  as  $G(\theta) = \sum_k g_k |\phi_k\rangle\langle\phi_k|$ , the state prepared by thermal-state preparation algorithms is

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}} \sum_k e^{-g_k/2} |\phi_k\rangle \otimes |\phi_k^*\rangle, \quad (\text{H87})$$

where  $|\phi_k^*\rangle$  is the complex conjugate of  $|\phi_k\rangle$  and is defined with respect to the computational basis  $\{|k\rangle\}_k$  as  $|\phi_k^*\rangle := \sum_{k'} \langle\phi_k|k'\rangle|k'\rangle$ . See, e.g., [84, Eq. (37)]. To see why the state in (H87) is equal to the canonical purification in (104), consider the following steps:

$$|\psi(\theta)\rangle = \left( \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{H88})$$

$$= \left( \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) \sum_{k'} |k'\rangle \otimes |k'\rangle \quad (\text{H89})$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}} \left( \sum_k e^{-g_k/2} |\phi_k\rangle\langle\phi_k| \otimes I \right) \sum_{k'} |k'\rangle \otimes |k'\rangle \quad (\text{H90})$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}} \sum_k e^{-g_k/2} |\phi_k\rangle \otimes \sum_{k'} \langle\phi_k|k'\rangle|k'\rangle \quad (\text{H91})$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z(\theta)}} \sum_k e^{-g_k/2} |\phi_k\rangle \otimes |\phi_k^*\rangle. \quad (\text{H92})$$

*d. Proof of Theorem 15*

Here we employ the shorthands  $\partial_i \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_i}$  and  $\partial_j \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_j}$ . Using Proposition 9 and (99), we find that

$$\langle\partial_i\psi(\theta, \phi)|\partial_j\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle = \langle\psi(\theta, \phi)| (i\Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes I) (-i\Psi_\phi(H_j) \otimes I) |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \quad (\text{H93})$$

$$= \langle\psi(\theta, \phi)|\Psi_\phi(H_i)\Psi_\phi(H_j) \otimes I|\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \quad (\text{H94})$$

$$= \langle\Gamma| \left( \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} e^{iH(\phi)} \otimes I \right) \Psi_\phi(H_i)\Psi_\phi(H_j) \otimes I \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{H95})$$

$$= \langle\Gamma| \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_i)\Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{H96})$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_i)\Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] \quad (\text{H97})$$

$$= \langle e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_i)\Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \quad (\text{H98})$$

$$= \langle e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_i) e^{-iH(\phi)} e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \quad (\text{H99})$$

$$= \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}, \quad (\text{H100})$$

$$\langle\partial_i\psi(\theta, \phi)|\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \langle\psi(\theta, \phi)|\partial_j\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle = \langle\psi(\theta, \phi)| (i\Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes I) |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle\langle\psi(\theta, \phi)| (-i\Psi_\phi(H_j) \otimes I) |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \quad (\text{H101})$$

$$= \langle\Gamma| \left( \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_i) e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \times \langle\Gamma| \left( \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \quad (\text{H102})$$

$$= \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{H103})$$



Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\phi) &= 4 \operatorname{Re}[\langle \partial_i \psi(\theta, \phi) | \partial_j \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle - \langle \partial_i \psi(\theta, \phi) | \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \partial_j \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle] \\ &= 4 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H104})$$

$$= 2 \langle \{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - 4 \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{H105})$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 15.

*e. Proof of Theorem 16*

Here we employ the shorthands  $\partial_i \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i}$  and  $\partial_j \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j}$ . Using Proposition 9 and Theorem 13, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \partial_i \psi(\theta, \phi) | \partial_j \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \\ &= (i \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | (\Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes I) \rangle \left( \begin{array}{c} -\frac{1}{4} \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{g}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \\ + \frac{1}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \end{array} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H106})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\frac{i}{4} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \left( \Psi_\phi(H_i) e^{-iH(\phi)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{g}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | (\Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes I) |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H107})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\frac{i}{4} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \left( \Psi_\phi(H_i) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_{\frac{g}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{4} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \left( \Psi_\phi(H_i) e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{g}{2}}(G_j) \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \Gamma | \left( \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_i) e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H108})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\frac{i}{4} \langle \Gamma | \left( \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_i) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_{\frac{g}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{4} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \left( \Psi_\phi(H_i) e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes \left[ \Phi_{\frac{g}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T \right) |\Gamma\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_i) e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H109})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\frac{i}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \Phi_{\frac{g}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{4} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \left( \Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes \left[ \Phi_{\frac{g}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T \right) |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H110})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\frac{i}{4} \left\langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \Phi_{\frac{g}{2}}(G_j) \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{4} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \left( \Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes \left[ \Phi_{\frac{g}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T \right) |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \left\langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H111})$$

Now consider that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \partial_i \psi(\theta, \phi) | \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \partial_j \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \\ &= i \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | (\Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes I) |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \left( \begin{array}{c} -\frac{1}{4} \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{g}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I \right) |\Gamma\rangle \\ + \frac{1}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} |\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \end{array} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H112})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\frac{i}{4} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | (\Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes I) | \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right\} \otimes I \right) | \Gamma \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{i}{2} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | (\Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes I) | \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \tag{H113}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\frac{i}{4} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | (\Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes I) | \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \otimes I \right) | \Gamma \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{i}{4} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | (\Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes I) | \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \otimes I \right) | \Gamma \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{i}{2} \left\langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \tag{H114}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= 0. \tag{H115}$$

So this means that

$$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta, \phi) = 4 \operatorname{Re}[\langle \partial_i \psi(\theta, \phi) | \partial_j \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle - \langle \partial_i \psi(\theta, \phi) | \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \partial_j \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle] \tag{H116}$$

$$= 4 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \begin{aligned} &-\frac{i}{4} \left\langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \frac{i}{4} \langle \psi(\theta, \phi) | \left( \Psi_\phi(H_i) \otimes \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T \right) | \psi(\theta, \phi) \rangle \\ &+ \frac{i}{2} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \left\langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \end{aligned} \right] \tag{H117}$$

$$= 4 \operatorname{Re} \left[ -\frac{i}{4} \left\langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right] \tag{H118}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \left[ i \left\langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - i \left\langle \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right] \tag{H119}$$

$$= \frac{i}{2} \left\langle \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \tag{H120}$$

The third equality follows due to the fact that the operators  $\Psi_\phi(H_i)$ ,  $\left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right]^T$ ,  $G_j$ , and  $\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)$  are Hermitian operators. Therefore, the second and third terms in (H117) are imaginary numbers, so that their real part is equal to zero. This concludes the proof of Theorem 16.

### 3. Kubo–Mori information matrix elements for evolved quantum Boltzmann machines

#### a. Proof of Theorem 17

Using (88), consider that

$$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta) = \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | k \rangle \tag{H121}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} \left( -\frac{1}{2} (\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k) \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle + \delta_{k\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right) \\
&\quad \times \left( -\frac{1}{2} (\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k) \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle + \delta_{\ell k} \lambda_k \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right) \tag{H122}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{1}{4} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} (\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k)^2 \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \\
&\quad + \sum_{k, \ell} -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} (\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k) \delta_{k\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k, \ell} -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} (\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k) \delta_{k\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} \delta_{k\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \delta_{k\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \tag{H123}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{4} \frac{(\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell)(\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k)^2}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle - \sum_k \lambda_k \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{k} \rangle \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\
&\quad - \sum_k \lambda_k \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} + \sum_k \lambda_k \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \tag{H124}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{4} \frac{(\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell)(\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k)^2}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle - \text{Tr}[\rho(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_i)] \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\
&\quad - \text{Tr}[\rho(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_j)] \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} + \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \tag{H125}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{4} \frac{(\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell)(\lambda_\ell + \lambda_k)^2}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \tag{H126}
\end{aligned}$$

The (H124) equality is a consequence of the following fact:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow y} \frac{\ln x - \ln y}{x - y} = \frac{1}{y}. \tag{H127}$$

Now let us focus on the first term of (H126). Let a spectral decomposition of  $G(\theta)$  be given by  $G(\theta) = \sum_k \mu_k |\tilde{k}\rangle\langle\tilde{k}|$ . This implies that for all  $k$ , the eigenvalues of  $\omega(\theta, \phi)$ , and so the eigenvalues of  $\rho(\theta)$ , are  $\lambda_k = \frac{e^{-\mu_k}}{Z}$ , where  $Z$  is the partition function. Plugging this into the first term of (H126), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{4} \frac{(\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell)(\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell)^2}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{4} \frac{(\ln \frac{e^{-\mu_k}}{Z} - \ln \frac{e^{-\mu_\ell}}{Z})(\frac{e^{-\mu_k}}{Z} + \frac{e^{-\mu_\ell}}{Z})^2}{\frac{e^{-\mu_k}}{Z} - \frac{e^{-\mu_\ell}}{Z}} \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{4Z} \frac{(-\mu_k + \mu_\ell)(e^{-\mu_k} + e^{-\mu_\ell})^2}{e^{-\mu_k} - e^{-\mu_\ell}} \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{4Z} \frac{(-\mu_k + \mu_\ell)(e^{-\mu_k} + e^{-\mu_\ell})}{\frac{e^{-\mu_k} - e^{-\mu_\ell}}{e^{-\mu_k} + e^{-\mu_\ell}}} \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{4Z} \frac{(-\mu_k + \mu_\ell)(e^{-\mu_k} + e^{-\mu_\ell})}{\frac{1 - e^{\mu_k - \mu_\ell}}{1 + e^{\mu_k - \mu_\ell}}} \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{4Z} \frac{(-\mu_k + \mu_\ell)(e^{-\mu_k} + e^{-\mu_\ell})}{-\tanh\left(\frac{\mu_k - \mu_\ell}{2}\right)} \langle \tilde{k} | \Phi_\theta(G_i) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k,\ell} -\frac{1}{4Z} \frac{(-\mu_k + \mu_\ell)(e^{-\mu_k} + e^{-\mu_\ell})}{\tanh\left(\frac{\mu_k - \mu_\ell}{2}\right)} \langle \tilde{k} | \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) e^{-iG(\theta)t} G_i e^{iG(\theta)t} | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \tag{H128}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k,\ell} -\frac{1}{4Z} \frac{(-\mu_k + \mu_\ell)(e^{-\mu_k} + e^{-\mu_\ell})}{\tanh\left(\frac{\mu_k - \mu_\ell}{2}\right)} \langle \tilde{k} | \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) \left( \sum_m |\tilde{m}\rangle\langle\tilde{m}| e^{-i\mu_m t} \right) G_i \left( \sum_n |\tilde{n}\rangle\langle\tilde{n}| e^{i\mu_n t} \right) | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \tag{H129}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k,\ell} -\frac{1}{4Z} \frac{(-\mu_k + \mu_\ell)(e^{-\mu_k} + e^{-\mu_\ell})}{\tanh\left(\frac{\mu_k - \mu_\ell}{2}\right)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) e^{-i\mu_k t} \langle \tilde{k} | G_i | \tilde{\ell} \rangle e^{i\mu_\ell t} \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \tag{H130}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k,\ell} -\frac{1}{4Z} \frac{(-\mu_k + \mu_\ell)(e^{-\mu_k} + e^{-\mu_\ell})}{\tanh\left(\frac{\mu_k - \mu_\ell}{2}\right)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) e^{-i(\mu_k - \mu_\ell)t} \langle \tilde{k} | G_i | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \tag{H131}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k,\ell} -\frac{1}{4Z} \frac{(-\mu_k + \mu_\ell)(e^{-\mu_k} + e^{-\mu_\ell}) \tanh\left(\frac{\mu_k - \mu_\ell}{2}\right)}{\frac{\mu_k - \mu_\ell}{2}} \langle \tilde{k} | G_i | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \tag{H132}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{2Z} (e^{-\mu_k} + e^{-\mu_\ell}) \langle \tilde{k} | G_i | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \tag{H133}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{e^{-\mu_k}}{Z} + \frac{e^{-\mu_\ell}}{Z} \right) \langle \tilde{k} | G_i | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \quad (\text{H134})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell) \langle \tilde{k} | G_i | \tilde{\ell} \rangle \langle \tilde{\ell} | \Phi_\theta(G_j) | \tilde{k} \rangle \quad (\text{H135})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\Phi_\theta(G_j) \rho(\theta) G_i] + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[G_i \rho(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_j)] \quad (\text{H136})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\{G_i, \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rho(\theta)] \quad (\text{H137})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \langle \{G_i, \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{H138})$$

The equality in (H132) follows from [38, Lemma 12]. When combining (H138) with (H126), the proof is concluded.

### b. Proof of Theorem 18

Using (91), consider that

$$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\phi) = \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | k \rangle \quad (\text{H139})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} [i (\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell) \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle] [i (\lambda_\ell - \lambda_k) \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle] \quad (\text{H140})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} (\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell)^2 \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \quad (\text{H141})$$

$$= \sum_{k,\ell} (\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell) (\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell) \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \quad (\text{H142})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_k \ln \lambda_k \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \\ &\quad - \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_\ell \ln \lambda_k \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \\ &\quad - \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_k \ln \lambda_\ell \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_\ell \ln \lambda_\ell \langle k | \Psi_\phi(H_i) | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H143})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \text{Tr}[(\omega(\theta, \phi) \ln \omega(\theta, \phi)) \Psi_\phi(H_i) \Psi_\phi(H_j)] \\ &\quad - \text{Tr}[(\ln \omega(\theta, \phi)) \Psi_\phi(H_i) \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j)] \\ &\quad - \text{Tr}[\omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_i) (\ln \omega(\theta, \phi)) \Psi_\phi(H_j)] \\ &\quad + \text{Tr}[\Psi_\phi(H_i) (\omega(\theta, \phi) \ln \omega(\theta, \phi)) \Psi_\phi(H_j)] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H144})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\{\Psi_\phi(H_i), \Psi_\phi(H_j)\} (\omega(\theta, \phi) \ln \omega(\theta, \phi))] - 2 \text{Re}[\text{Tr}[(\ln \omega(\theta, \phi)) \Psi_\phi(H_i) \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j)]] \quad (\text{H145})$$

Now consider that

$$\ln \omega(\theta, \phi) = \ln \left[ e^{-iH(\phi)} \frac{e^{-G(\theta)}}{Z(\theta)} e^{iH(\phi)} \right] \quad (\text{H146})$$

$$= e^{-iH(\phi)} \ln \left[ \frac{e^{-G(\theta)}}{Z(\theta)} \right] e^{iH(\phi)} \quad (\text{H147})$$

$$= -e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} - I \ln Z(\theta). \quad (\text{H148})$$

So then we find that

$$= \text{Tr}[\{\Psi_\phi(H_i), \Psi_\phi(H_j)\} (\omega(\theta, \phi) \ln \omega(\theta, \phi))]$$

$$- 2 \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{Tr}[(\ln \omega(\theta, \phi)) \Psi_\phi(H_i) \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j)]] \quad (\text{H149})$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left\{ \Psi_\phi(H_i), \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right\} \left( \omega(\theta, \phi) \left( -e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} - I \ln Z(\theta) \right) \right) \right] \\ - 2 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( -e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} - I \ln Z(\theta) \right) \Psi_\phi(H_i) \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right] \right] \quad (\text{H150})$$

$$= - \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left\{ \Psi_\phi(H_i), \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right\} \left( \omega(\theta, \phi) \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \right) \right) \right] \\ - \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left\{ \Psi_\phi(H_i), \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right\} \omega(\theta, \phi) \ln Z(\theta) \right] \\ + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \operatorname{Tr} \left[ e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_i) \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right] \right] \\ + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi(H_i) \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right] \ln Z(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{H151})$$

$$= - \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left\{ \Psi_\phi(H_i), \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right\} \left( \omega(\theta, \phi) \left( e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \right) \right) \right] \\ + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \operatorname{Tr} \left[ e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_i) \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right] \right] \quad (\text{H152})$$

$$= - \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left\{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right\} \rho(\theta) G(\theta) \right] + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \operatorname{Tr} \left[ G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \rho(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right] \quad (\text{H153})$$

$$= - \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) G(\theta) \right] - \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \rho(\theta) G(\theta) \right] \\ + \operatorname{Tr} \left[ G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \rho(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] + \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) G(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{H154})$$

$$= - \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \rho(\theta) \right] - \operatorname{Tr} \left[ G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \rho(\theta) \right] \\ + \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \rho(\theta) \right] + \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{H155})$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( -\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) - G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) + \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) + \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right) \rho(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{H156})$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left( \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] - \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right) \rho(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{H157})$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right] \rho(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{H158})$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \rho(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{H159})$$

$$= \left\langle \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}, \quad (\text{H160})$$

where in (H155) we used that  $[G(\theta), \rho(\theta)] = 0$ . This concludes the proof of Theorem 18.

### c. Proof of Theorem 19

Using (91) and (87), consider that

$$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta, \phi) \\ = \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} \langle k | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_j} \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] | k \rangle \quad (\text{H161})$$

$$= \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell}{\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell} \left( -\frac{1}{2} (\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell) \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle + \delta_{k\ell} \lambda_\ell \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \right) i (\lambda_\ell - \lambda_k) \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \quad (\text{H162})$$

$$= \frac{i}{2} \sum_{k, \ell} (\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_\ell) (\lambda_k + \lambda_\ell) \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \quad (\text{H163})$$

$$= \frac{i}{2} \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{i}{2} \lambda_k \ln \lambda_k \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \\ + \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{1}{2} i \lambda_\ell \ln \lambda_k \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{i}{2} \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_k \ln \lambda_\ell \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle \\
& -\frac{i}{2} \sum_{k,\ell} \lambda_\ell \ln \lambda_k \langle k | e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} | \ell \rangle \langle \ell | \Psi_\phi(H_j) | k \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{H164}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& = \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \omega(\theta, \phi) \ln \omega(\theta, \phi) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right] \\
& + \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \ln \omega(\theta, \phi) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right] \\
& - \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi(H_j) \omega(\theta, \phi) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \ln \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] \\
& - \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \omega(\theta, \phi) \ln \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{H165}$$

Now consider that

$$\ln \omega(\theta, \phi) = \ln \left[ e^{-iH(\phi)} \frac{e^{-G(\theta)}}{Z(\theta)} e^{iH(\phi)} \right] \tag{H166}$$

$$= e^{-iH(\phi)} \ln \left[ \frac{e^{-G(\theta)}}{Z(\theta)} \right] e^{iH(\phi)} \tag{H167}$$

$$= -e^{-iH(\phi)} G(\theta) e^{iH(\phi)} - I \ln Z(\theta). \tag{H168}$$

So, plugging this into (H165), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
& = \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \omega(\theta, \phi) \ln \omega(\theta, \phi) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right] \\
& + \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \ln \omega(\theta, \phi) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j) \right] \\
& - \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi(H_j) \omega(\theta, \phi) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \ln \omega(\theta, \phi) \right] \\
& - \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \omega(\theta, \phi) \ln \omega(\theta, \phi) \Psi_\phi(H_j) e^{-iH(\phi)} \Phi_\theta(G_i) e^{iH(\phi)} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{H169}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& = -\frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \rho(\theta) G(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_i) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] - \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \rho(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_i) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \ln Z(\theta) \\
& - \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ G(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_i) \rho(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] - \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i) \rho(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \ln Z(\theta) \\
& + \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_i) G(\theta) \right] + \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_i) \right] \ln Z(\theta) \\
& + \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \rho(\theta) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \Phi_\theta(G_i) \right] + \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \rho(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \Phi_\theta(G_i) \right] \ln Z(\theta)
\end{aligned} \tag{H170}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& = -\frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \rho(\theta) \right] - \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_i) \rho(\theta) \right] \\
& + \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rho(\theta) \right] + \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \Phi_\theta(G_i) \rho(\theta) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{H171}$$

$$= \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \left( -\Phi_\theta(G_i) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) + \Phi_\theta(G_i) G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) - \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) G(\theta) \Phi_\theta(G_i) + G(\theta) \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \Phi_\theta(G_i) \right) \rho(\theta) \right] \tag{H172}$$

$$= \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \left( -\Phi_\theta(G_i) \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right] - \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right] \Phi_\theta(G_i) \right) \rho(\theta) \right] \tag{H173}$$

$$= -\frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \left\{ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right] \right\} \rho(\theta) \right] \tag{H174}$$

$$= -\frac{i}{2} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right] \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \tag{H175}$$

$$= \frac{i}{2} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}, \tag{H176}$$

where in (H171) we used that  $[G(\theta), \rho(\theta)] = 0$ . This concludes the proof of Theorem 19.

## Appendix I: Quantum algorithms for estimating information matrix elements

### 1. Quantum algorithms for estimating Fisher–Bures information matrix elements

#### a. Elements with respect to $\theta$

Let us first recall from the statement of Theorem 10 the expression for the  $(i, j)$ -th element of the Fisher–Bures information matrix  $I^{\text{FB}}(\theta)$ :

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \{\Phi_\theta(G_i), \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{I1})$$

Estimating the second term of the right-hand side of the above equation is relatively straightforward. So, in what follows, we present an algorithm for estimating the first term of the above equation in greater detail.

Consider the following:

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle \{\Phi_\theta(G_i), \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\{\Phi_\theta(G_i), \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rho(\theta)] \quad (\text{I2})$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt_1 dt_2 p(t_1) p(t_2) \left( \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \left\{ e^{-iG(\theta)t_1} G_i e^{iG(\theta)t_1}, e^{-iG(\theta)t_2} G_j e^{iG(\theta)t_2} \right\} \rho(\theta) \right] \right). \quad (\text{I3})$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm (Algorithm 3) to estimate the first term of (I1) by using its equivalent form shown in (I3). At the core of our algorithm lies the quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of the anticommutator of two operators (see Appendix B). In particular, one can notice that when initializing the control register in the state  $|0\rangle$  instead of  $|1\rangle$ , the quantum circuit shown in Figure 5a allows to estimate the quantity  $\frac{1}{2} \langle \{U, H\} \rangle_\rho$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian and  $U$  is Hermitian and unitary. In this case, we choose  $\rho = \rho(\theta)$ ,  $U = e^{-iG(\theta)t_1} G_i e^{iG(\theta)t_1}$ , and  $H = e^{-iG(\theta)t_2} G_j e^{iG(\theta)t_2}$ . We then make some further simplifications that follow because  $\rho(\theta)$  commutes with  $e^{-iG(\theta)t_1}$ . Accordingly, the quantum circuit that estimates the integrand of (I3) is depicted in Figure 2a.

---

#### Algorithm 3 estimate\_first\_term\_FB\_θ(i, j, θ, {G<sub>ℓ</sub>}<sub>ℓ=1</sub><sup>J</sup>, p(·), ε, δ)

---

- 1: **Input:** Indices  $i, j \in [J]$ , parameter vector  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_J)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^J$ , Gibbs local Hamiltonians  $\{G_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^J$ , probability distribution  $p(t)$  over  $\mathbb{R}$ , precision  $\varepsilon > 0$ , error probability  $\delta \in (0, 1)$
  - 2:  $N \leftarrow \lceil 2 \ln(2/\delta) / \varepsilon^2 \rceil$
  - 3: **for**  $n = 0$  to  $N - 1$  **do**
  - 4:   Initialize the control register to  $|0\rangle\langle 0|$
  - 5:   Prepare the system register in the state  $\rho(\theta)$
  - 6:   Sample  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  independently at random with probability  $p(t)$  (defined in (7))
  - 7:   Apply the Hadamard gate to the control register
  - 8:   Apply the following unitaries to the control and system registers:
    - 9:     • Controlled- $G_i$ :  $G_i$  is a local unitary acting on the system register, controlled by the control register
    - 10:    •  $e^{-iG(\theta)(t_1-t_2)}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t_1 - t_2$  on the system register
  - 11:   Apply the Hadamard gate to the control register
  - 12:   Measure the control register in the computational basis and store the measurement outcome  $b_n$
  - 13:   Measure the system register in the eigenbasis of  $G_j$  and store the measurement outcome  $\lambda_n$
  - 14:    $Y_n^{(\text{FB}(\theta))} \leftarrow (-1)^{b_n} \lambda_n$
  - 15: **end for**
  - 16: **return**  $\bar{Y}^{(\text{FB}(\theta))} \leftarrow \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Y_n^{(\text{FB}(\theta))}$
- 

#### b. Elements with respect to $\phi$

Let us first recall from the statement of Theorem 11 the expression for the  $(i, j)$ -th element of the Fisher–Bures information matrix  $I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\phi)$ :

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\phi) = \left\langle \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{I4})$$

Consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\ &= \text{Tr} \left[ \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Phi_\theta(\Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i)) \right] \rho(\theta) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$$= \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^1 dt_1 dt_2 dt_3 p(t_2) \left( \text{Tr} \left[ \left[ \left[ e^{iH(\phi)t_1} H_j e^{-iH(\phi)t_1}, G(\theta) \right], e^{-iG(\theta)t_2} e^{iH(\phi)t_3} H_i e^{-iH(\phi)t_3} e^{iG(\theta)t_2} \right] \rho(\theta) \right] \right). \quad (16)$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm (Algorithm 4) to estimate (14) using its equivalent form shown in (16). At the core of our algorithm lies the quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of two nested commutators of three operators,  $\frac{1}{4} \langle [ [U_1, H], U_0] \rangle_\rho$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian, and  $U_0$  and  $U_1$  are both Hermitian and unitary (refer to Appendix B and Figure 6a). In this case, we choose  $\rho = \rho(\theta)$ ,  $U_1 = e^{iH(\phi)t_1} H_j e^{-iH(\phi)t_1}$ ,  $H = G(\theta)$ , and  $U_0 = e^{-iG(\theta)t_2} e^{iH(\phi)t_3} H_i e^{-iH(\phi)t_3} e^{iG(\theta)t_2}$ . We then make some further simplifications where possible. Specifically, the quantum circuit that plays a role in estimating the integrand of (16) is depicted in Figure 2b.

**Remark 21** *In Algorithm 4 below, note that we adopt a sampling approach to measuring  $G(\theta)$ , similar to that used in [38, Algorithm 1]. This seems to be necessary, as it is not obvious how to measure directly in the eigenbasis of  $G(\theta)$ . We adopt a similar approach in other circuits that involve measuring  $G(\theta)$ .*

---

**Algorithm 4** estimate\_FB\_φ(i, j, θ, {G<sub>ℓ</sub>}<sub>ℓ=1</sub><sup>J</sup>, φ, {H<sub>m</sub>}<sub>m=1</sub><sup>K</sup>, p(·), ε, δ)

---

```

1: Input: Indices  $i, j \in [K]$ , parameter vectors  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_J)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^J$  and  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_K)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , Gibbs local Hamiltonians
   { $G_\ell$ }ℓ=1J and { $H_m$ }m=1K, probability distribution  $p(t)$  over  $\mathbb{R}$ , precision  $\varepsilon > 0$ , error probability  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ 
2:  $N \leftarrow \lceil 2 \|\theta\|_1^2 \ln(2/\delta) / \varepsilon^2 \rceil$ 
3: for  $n = 0$  to  $N - 1$  do
4:   Initialize the first control register to  $|1\rangle\langle 1|$ 
5:   Initialize the second control register to  $|1\rangle\langle 1|$ 
6:   Prepare the system register in the state  $\rho(\theta)$ 
7:   Sample  $t_1$  and  $t_3$  independently and uniformly at random from the interval  $[0, 1]$ , and sample  $t_2$  independently at random
   with probability  $p(t)$  (defined in (7))
8:   Apply the Hadamard gate and the phase gate  $S$  to the first and second control registers
9:   Apply the following unitaries to the control and system registers:
10:    •  $e^{-iH(\phi)t_3}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t_3$  on the system register
11:    • Controlled- $H_i$ :  $H_i$  is a local unitary acting on the system register, controlled by the first control register
12:    •  $e^{iH(\phi)t_3}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t_3$  on the system register
13:    •  $e^{-iG(\theta)t_2}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t_2$  on the system register
14:    •  $e^{-iH(\phi)t_1}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t_1$  on the system register
15:    • Controlled- $H_j$ :  $H_j$  is a local unitary acting on the system register, controlled by the second control register
16:    •  $e^{iH(\phi)t_1}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t_1$  on the system register
17:   Apply the Hadamard gate to the first and second control registers
18:   Measure the two control registers in the computational basis and store the measurement outcomes  $b_n$  and  $c_n$ 
19:   Sample  $\ell$  according to the probability distribution  $|\theta_\ell| / \|\theta\|_1$ , measure the system register in the eigenbasis of  $\text{sign}(\theta_\ell) G_\ell$ 
   and store the measurement outcome  $\lambda_n$ 
20:    $Y_n^{(\text{FB}(\phi))} \leftarrow (-1)^{b_n} (-1)^{c_n} \lambda_n$ 
21: end for
22: return  $\bar{Y}^{(\text{FB}(\phi))} \leftarrow 4 \|\theta\|_1 \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Y_n^{(\text{FB}(\phi))}$ 

```

---

### c. Elements with respect to $\theta$ and $\phi$

Let us first recall from the statement of Theorem 12 the expression for the  $(i, j)$ -th element of the Fisher–Bures information matrix  $I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta, \phi)$ :

$$I_{ij}^{\text{FB}}(\theta, \phi) = i \left\langle \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (17)$$

Consider the following:

$$i \left\langle \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} = i \left[ \text{Tr} \left[ \left[ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \rho(\theta) \right] \right] \quad (18)$$



$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^1 dt_1 dt_2 p(t_1) \left( i \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left[ e^{-iG(\theta)t_1} G_i e^{iG(\theta)t_1}, e^{iH(\phi)t_2} H_j e^{-iH(\phi)t_2} \right] \rho(\theta) \right] \right), \quad (19)$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm (Algorithm 5) to estimate (17) using its equivalent form shown in (19). At the core of our algorithm lies the quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of the commutator of two operators (see Appendix B). In particular, one can notice that when initializing the control register in the state  $|0\rangle$  instead of  $|1\rangle$ , the quantum circuit shown in Figure 5b allows to estimate the quantity  $\frac{i}{2} \langle [H, U] \rangle_{\rho}$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian and  $U$  is Hermitian and unitary. In this case, we choose  $\rho = \rho(\theta)$ ,  $H = e^{-iG(\theta)t_1} G_i e^{iG(\theta)t_1}$ , and  $U = e^{iH(\phi)t_2} H_j e^{-iH(\phi)t_2}$ . We then make some further simplifications where possible. Accordingly, the quantum circuit that plays a role in estimating the integrand of (19) is depicted in Figure 2c.

---

**Algorithm 5** estimate\_FB\_θ\_φ( $i, j, \theta, \{G_{\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^J, \phi, \{H_k\}_{k=1}^K, p(\cdot), \varepsilon, \delta$ )

---

- 1: **Input:** Indices  $i \in [J]$ ,  $j \in [K]$ , parameter vectors  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_J)^{\top} \in \mathbb{R}^J$  and  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_K)^{\top} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , sets of local Hamiltonians  $\{G_{\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^J$  and  $\{H_k\}_{k=1}^K$ , probability distribution  $p(t)$  over  $\mathbb{R}$ , precision  $\varepsilon > 0$ , error probability  $\delta \in (0, 1)$
  - 2: Set  $N \leftarrow \lceil 2 \ln(2/\delta) / \varepsilon^2 \rceil$
  - 3: **for**  $n = 0$  to  $N - 1$  **do**
  - 4:   Initialize the control register to  $|0\rangle\langle 0|$
  - 5:   Prepare the system register in the state  $\rho(\theta)$
  - 6:   Sample  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  independently and at random,  $t_1$  with probability  $p(t)$  (defined in (7)),  $t_2$  uniformly from the interval  $[0, 1]$
  - 7:   Apply the Hadamard gate and the phase gate  $S$  to the control register
  - 8:   Apply the following unitaries to the control and system registers:
  - 9:     •  $e^{-iH(\phi)t_2}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t_2$  on the system register
  - 10:    • Controlled- $H_j$ :  $H_j$  is a local unitary acting on the system register, controlled by the control register
  - 11:    •  $e^{iH(\phi)t_2}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t_2$  on the system register
  - 12:    •  $e^{iG(\theta)t_1}$ : Hamiltonian simulation for time  $t_1$  on the system register
  - 13:   Apply the Hadamard gate to the control register
  - 14:   Measure the control register in the computational basis and store the measurement outcome  $b_n$
  - 15:   Measure the system register in the eigenbasis of  $G_i$  and store the measurement outcome  $\lambda_n$
  - 16:    $Y_n^{(\text{FB}(\theta, \phi))} \leftarrow (-1)^{b_n} \lambda_n$
  - 17: **end for**
  - 18: **return**  $\bar{Y}^{(\text{FB}(\theta, \phi))} \leftarrow 2 \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Y_n^{(\text{FB}(\theta, \phi))}$
- 

## 2. Quantum algorithms for estimating Wigner–Yanase information matrix elements

### a. Elements with respect to $\theta$

Let us first recall from the statement of Theorem 14 the expression for the  $(i, j)$ -th element of the Wigner–Yanase information matrix  $I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta)$ :

$$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \sqrt{\rho(\theta)} \right] + \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (110)$$

Estimating the third term of the right-hand side of the above equation is relatively straightforward. Details on the estimation of the first term are provided in Section IV C 1. Therefore, the focus here is on estimating the second term of (110). Consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left\{ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_i), \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j) \right\} \rho(\theta) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt_1 dt_2 p(t_1) p(t_2) \left( \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \left\{ e^{-iG(\theta/2)t_1} G_i e^{iG(\theta/2)t_1}, e^{-iG(\theta/2)t_2} G_j e^{iG(\theta/2)t_2} \right\} \rho(\theta) \right] \right). \quad (112)$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm to estimate the second term of (110) using its equivalent form shown in (112). The algorithm is similar to Algorithm 3, so here we provide a high-level description of how it works. At its core, the algorithm relies on a quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of the anticommutator of two

operators (see Appendix B). Specifically, if the control register in Figure 5a is initialized in the state  $|0\rangle$  instead of  $|1\rangle$ , the output of the circuit is  $\frac{1}{2} \langle \{H, U\} \rangle_\rho$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian and  $U$  is Hermitian and unitary. Accordingly, the quantum circuit that plays a role in estimating the integrand of (I12) is depicted in Figure 3b. In this case, we choose  $\rho = \rho(\theta)$ ,  $H = e^{-iG(\theta/2)t_1} G_i e^{iG(\theta/2)t_1}$ , and  $U = e^{-iG(\theta/2)t_2} G_j e^{iG(\theta/2)t_2}$ . We then make some further simplifications where possible. The algorithm involves running this circuit  $N$  times, where  $N$  is determined by the desired precision and error probability. During each run, the times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  for the Hamiltonian evolution are sampled independently at random with probability  $p(t)$  (defined in (7)). The final estimation of the second term of (I10) is obtained by averaging the outputs of the  $N$  runs and dividing the result by 2.

*b. Elements with respect to  $\phi$*

Let us first recall from the statement of Theorem 15 the expression for the  $(i, j)$ -th element of the Kubo–Mori information matrix  $I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\phi)$ :

$$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\phi) = 2 \langle \{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - 4 \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{I13})$$

Estimating the second term of the right-hand side of the above equation is relatively straightforward. So, in what follows, we present an algorithm for estimating the first term of (I13) in greater detail. Consider the following:

$$2 \left\langle \left\{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} = 2 \text{Tr} \left[ \left\{ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right\} \rho(\theta) \right] \quad (\text{I14})$$

$$= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 dt_1 dt_2 \left( 2 \text{Tr} \left[ \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)t_1} H_i e^{-iH(\phi)t_1}, e^{iH(\phi)t_2} H_j e^{-iH(\phi)t_2} \right\} \rho(\theta) \right] \right). \quad (\text{I15})$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm to estimate the first term of (I13) using its equivalent form shown in (I15). The algorithm is similar to Algorithm 3, so here we provide a high-level description of how it works. At its core, the algorithm relies on a quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of the anticommutator of two operators (see Appendix B). In particular, if the control register in Figure 5a is initialized in the state  $|0\rangle$  instead of  $|1\rangle$ , the output of the circuit is  $\frac{1}{2} \langle \{H, U\} \rangle_\rho$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian and  $U$  is Hermitian and unitary. In this case, we choose  $\rho = \rho(\theta)$ ,  $H = e^{iH(\phi)t_1} H_i e^{-iH(\phi)t_1}$ , and  $U = e^{iH(\phi)t_2} H_j e^{-iH(\phi)t_2}$ . We then make some further simplifications where possible. Accordingly, the quantum circuit that plays a role in estimating the integrand of (I15) is depicted in Figure 3c. The algorithm involves running this circuit  $N$  times, where  $N$  is determined by the desired precision and error probability. During each run, the times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  for the Hamiltonian evolution are sampled independently and uniformly at random from the interval  $[0, 1]$ . The final estimation of the second term of (I13) is obtained by averaging the outputs of the  $N$  runs and multiplying the result by 4.

*c. Elements with respect to  $\theta$  and  $\phi$*

Let us first recall from the statement of Theorem 16 the expression for the  $(i, j)$ -th element of the Kubo–Mori information matrix  $I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta, \phi)$ :

$$I_{ij}^{\text{WY}}(\theta, \phi) = \frac{i}{2} \left\langle \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{I16})$$

Here, we show how to estimate (I16). Consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{i}{2} \left\langle \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \left[ \Phi_{\frac{\theta}{2}}(G_j), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \rho(\theta) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I17})$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^1 dt_1 dt_2 p(t_1) \left( \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \left[ e^{-iG(\theta/2)t_1} G_j e^{iG(\theta/2)t_1}, e^{iH(\phi)t_2} H_i e^{-iH(\phi)t_2} \right] \rho(\theta) \right] \right). \quad (\text{I18})$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm to estimate (I16) using its equivalent form shown in (I18). The algorithm is similar to Algorithm 5, so here we provide a high-level description of how it works. At its core, the algorithm relies on a quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of the commutator of two operators (see

Appendix B). In particular, if the control register in Figure 5b is initialized in the state  $|0\rangle$  instead of  $|1\rangle$ , the output of the circuit is  $\frac{1}{2} \langle [H, U] \rangle_\rho$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian and  $U$  is Hermitian and unitary. In this case, we choose  $\rho = \rho(\theta)$ ,  $H = e^{-iG(\theta/2)t_1} G_j e^{iG(\theta/2)t_1}$ , and  $U = e^{iH(\phi)t_2} H_i e^{-iH(\phi)t_2}$ . We then make some further simplifications where possible. Accordingly, the quantum circuit that estimates the integrand of (I18) is depicted in Figure 3d. The algorithm involves running this circuit  $N$  times, where  $N$  is determined by the desired precision and error probability. During each run, the times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  for the Hamiltonian evolution are sampled independently at random,  $t_1$  with probability  $p(t)$  (defined in (7)) and  $t_2$  from the interval  $[0, 1]$ . The final estimation of the second term of (I16) is obtained by averaging the outputs of the  $N$  runs.

### 3. Quantum algorithms for estimating Kubo–Mori information matrix elements

#### a. Elements with respect to $\theta$

Let us first recall from the statement of Theorem 17 the expression for the  $(i, j)$ -th element of the Kubo–Mori information matrix  $I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta)$ :

$$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \{G_i, \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} - \langle G_i \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{I19})$$

Here, we show how to estimate the first term of (I19). Consider the following:

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle \{G_i, \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rangle_{\rho(\theta)} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\{G_i, \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rho(\theta)] \quad (\text{I20})$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt p(t) \left( \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\{G_i, e^{-iG(\theta)t} G_j e^{iG(\theta)t}\} \rho(\theta)] \right). \quad (\text{I21})$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm to estimate the first term of (I19) using its equivalent form shown in (I21). The algorithm is similar to Algorithm 3, so here we provide a high-level description of how it works. At its core, the algorithm relies on a quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of the anticommutator of two operators (see Appendix B). In particular, one can notice that when initializing the control register in the state  $|0\rangle$  instead of  $|1\rangle$ , the quantum circuit shown in Figure 5a allows to estimate the quantity  $\frac{1}{2} \langle \{H, U\} \rangle_\rho$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian and the  $U$  is Hermitian and unitary. In this case, we choose  $\rho = \rho(\theta)$ ,  $H = G_i$ , and  $U = e^{-iG(\theta)t} G_j e^{iG(\theta)t}$ . We then make some further simplifications that follow because  $\rho(\theta)$  commutes with  $e^{-iG(\theta)t}$ . Accordingly, the quantum circuit that plays a role in estimating the integrand of (I21) is depicted in Figure 4a. The algorithm involves running this circuit  $N$  times, where  $N$  is determined by the desired precision and error probability. During each run, the time  $t$  for the Hamiltonian evolution is sampled at random with probability  $p(t)$  (defined in (7)). The final estimation of the first term of (I19) is obtained by averaging the outputs of the  $N$  runs.

#### b. Elements with respect to $\phi$

Let us first recall from the statement of Theorem 18 the expression for the  $(i, j)$ -th element of the Kubo–Mori information matrix  $I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\phi)$ :

$$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\phi) = \left\langle \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{I22})$$

Consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\ &= \text{Tr} \left[ \left[ \left[ \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j), G(\theta) \right], \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_i) \right] \rho(\theta) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I23})$$

$$= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 dt_1 dt_2 \left( \text{Tr} \left[ \left[ \left[ e^{iH(\phi)t_1} H_j e^{-iH(\phi)t_1}, G(\theta) \right], e^{iH(\phi)t_2} H_i e^{-iH(\phi)t_2} \right] \rho(\theta) \right] \right). \quad (\text{I24})$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm to estimate the first term of (I22) using its equivalent form shown in (I24). The algorithm is similar to Algorithm 4, so here we provide a high-level description of how it works.

At its core, the algorithm relies on a quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of nested commutators of three operators,  $\frac{1}{4} \langle [ [U_1, H], U_0 ] \rangle_\rho$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian, and  $U_0$  and  $U_1$  are both Hermitian and unitary (refer to Appendix B and Figure 6a). In this case, we choose  $\rho = \rho(\theta)$ ,  $U_1 = e^{iH(\phi)t_1} H_j e^{-iH(\phi)t_1}$ ,  $H = G(\theta)$ , and  $U_0 = e^{iH(\phi)t_2} H_i e^{-iH(\phi)t_2}$ . We then make some further simplifications where possible. Specifically, the quantum circuit that plays a role in estimating the integrand of (I24) is depicted in Figure 4b. The algorithm involves running this circuit  $N$  times, where  $N$  is determined by the desired precision and error probability. During each run, the times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  for the Hamiltonian evolutions are sampled independently and uniformly at random from the interval  $[0, 1]$ . The final estimation of the first term of (I19) is obtained by averaging the outputs of the  $N$  runs and multiplying the result by  $4 \|\theta\|_1$ . For measuring  $G(\theta)$ , we again adopt a sampling approach (see Remark 21).

### c. Elements with respect to $\theta$ and $\phi$

Let us first recall from the statement of Theorem 19 the expression for the  $(i, j)$ -th element of the Fisher–Bures information matrix  $I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta, \phi)$ :

$$I_{ij}^{\text{KM}}(\theta, \phi) = \frac{i}{2} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)}. \quad (\text{I25})$$

Consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{i}{2} \left\langle \left\{ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho(\theta)} \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \left\{ \Phi_\theta(G_i), \left[ G(\theta), \Psi_\phi^\dagger(H_j) \right] \right\} \rho(\theta) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I26})$$

$$= \frac{i}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^1 dt_1 dt_2 p(t_1) \left( \text{Tr} \left[ \left\{ e^{-iG(\theta)t_1} G_i e^{iG(\theta)t_1}, \left[ G(\theta), e^{iH(\phi)t_2} H_j e^{-iH(\phi)t_2} \right] \right\} \rho(\theta) \right] \right). \quad (\text{I27})$$

We are now in a position to present an algorithm to estimate (I25) using its equivalent form shown in (I27). The algorithm is similar to Algorithm 4, so here we provide a high-level description of how it works. At its core, the algorithm relies on a quantum circuit that estimates the expected value of nested anticommutator and commutator of three operators,  $\frac{1}{4} \langle \{ U_0, [H, U_1] \} \rangle_\rho$ , where  $H$  is Hermitian, and  $U_0$  and  $U_1$  are both Hermitian and unitary (refer to Appendix B and Figure 6b). In this case, we choose  $\rho = \rho(\theta)$ ,  $U_0 = e^{-iG(\theta)t_1} G_i e^{iG(\theta)t_1}$ ,  $H = G(\theta)$ , and  $U_1 = e^{iH(\phi)t_2} H_j e^{-iH(\phi)t_2}$ . We then make some further simplifications where possible. Specifically, the quantum circuit that plays a role in estimating the integrand of (I27) is depicted in Figure 4c. The algorithm involves running this circuit  $N$  times, where  $N$  is determined by the desired precision and error probability. During each run, the times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  for the Hamiltonian evolutions are sampled independently and at random,  $t_1$  with probability  $p(t)$  (defined in (7)) and  $t_2$  from the interval  $[0, 1]$ . The final estimation of (I25) is obtained by averaging the outputs of the  $N$  runs and multiplying the result by  $2 \|\theta\|_1$ . For measuring  $G(\theta)$ , we again adopt a sampling approach (see Remark 21).