Uncertainty relations in implementation of unitary operations
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The underlying mechanism in the implementation of unitary operation on a system with an external apparatus is studied. We implement the unitary time evolution in the system as a physical phenomenon that results from the interaction between the system and the apparatus. We investigate the fundamental limitation of an accurate implementation for the desired unitary time evolution. This limitation is manifested in the form of trade-off relations between the accuracy of the implementation and quantum fluctuation of energy in the external apparatus. Our relations clearly show that an accurate unitary operation requires large energy fluctuation inside the apparatus originated from quantum fluctuation.
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Introduction.—Recent technological developments have realized elaborate quantum manipulation on a microscopic level with high accuracy. In construction of quantum information devices including quantum computers, experimental techniques for qubit control have been intensively studied, and nontrivial quantum manipulation is realized [1–3]. Another important example is quantum heat engines, in which a small quantum system such as a single atom is thermodynamically operated [4–8]. Accurate unitary dynamics in such a deep quantum regime are realized by developing sophisticated experimental apparatus that controls system’s parameters.

Let us consider the implementation of some unitary transformation on the system. Let \( \rho_S \) and \( \tilde{H}_S(t) \) respectively be the initial density matrix of the system and the time-dependent Hamiltonian that leads to the desired unitary operation. Then, the density matrix at time \( \tau \) is given by the unitary transformation \( V_S \rho_S V_S^\dagger \) with the unitary operator

\[
V_S := \mathcal{T} \exp \left( -i \int_0^\tau dt \tilde{H}_S(t) \right),
\]

where \( \mathcal{T} \) represents the time-ordered product and \( \hbar \) is set to unity. To implement this unitary transformation as a physical phenomenon, we employ an external apparatus and make it physically interact with the system. Then, the desired unitary transformation \( V_S \) is physically realized as a dynamics of a composite system of the system and the external apparatus. See Fig.1 (a) and (b) for schematic examples.

This setup is generically described by the composite system of system (S) and the external system (E) depicted in the lower figure of Fig.1. The simplest example showing such a realization of a unitary time evolution is the Jayes-Cumming model, which is a model for the cavity QED [10,11]. In the cavity QED, a single atom interacts with photons in a cavity. In our setup, the atom and the cavity mode correspond to the system and the external system, respectively. In the classical field limit, the dynamics of the atom is given by the unitary time evolution with the time-dependent Hamiltonian under classical electromagnetic fields. Other important examples can be seen in studies on the autonomous heat engines [12–15]. Especially, Åberg proposed an idea of autonomous implementation of unitary operation of a system by attaching an external system that has unbounded energy levels with constant energy spacing [12]. However, most previous studies using the setup of composite systems have treated specific models, and thus the general pictures for unitary time evolution independent of the models have remained unclear.

Motivated by this background, in this letter, we investigate a general picture for the implementation of the unitary time evolution. We here focus on two quantities: The first quantity stands for a distance between the actual system’s dynamics and desired unitary time evolution, and the second one is the energy fluctuation of the external system. We derive uncertainty type inequalities.
between these two quantities which capture a fundamental limitation on the implementation of unitary operation. In particular, these inequalities show that realizing perfectly a desired unitary dynamics and vanishing energy fluctuation in an external system are incompatible. In addition, we show that the energy fluctuation must have quantum origin, i.e., as an initial state in the external system, a superposition of many energy eigenstates with a broad energy spectrum is necessary to realize a unitary transformation with high accuracy.

Setup and first uncertainty relation. — Consider a quantum system $S$ whose Hilbert space and Hamiltonian are $H_S$ and $H_S$, respectively. We set the initial state of $S$ as $\sigma_S$. Let us introduce the degree of accuracy of approximate $\Lambda_S(\rho_S)$ and that of the desired unitary time evolution $U_S\rho_SU_S^\dagger$:

$$\delta_U := \left( \max_{\rho_S} L_B(\Lambda_S(\rho_S), U_S\rho_S U_S^\dagger) \right)^{1/2},$$

where $L_B(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ is the Bures distance between the states $\rho_1$ and $\rho_2$ defined as $\| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \|_{B}$

$F(\rho_1, \rho_2) := \|1 - \rho_1 \rho_2^\dagger\|_{F},$}
the case involving no energy change in the system, where \[ ||[H_S, U_S]|| = 0. \] In this case, we can always give a proper \( \mathcal{I} \) satisfying \( \delta_E = 0 \) and \( \delta_U = 0 \) at the same time.

**Second uncertainty relation.**— Our first inequality \((7)\) does not specify the origin of the energy fluctuation in \( \sigma_E \), and thus it does not distinguish large energy fluctuation caused by the classical mixture and that by the quantum superposition of many energy eigenstates. However, many studies on the open quantum systems have shown that the classical mixture in the external system leads to not unitary but dissipative dynamics of the system, even if the energy variance is large \([20]\). This implies that to implement the unitary time evolution with high accuracy, the origin of the energy fluctuation in the external system should be a quantum superposition, not a classical mixture. To confirm this, we derive the second uncertainty relation, which is related to the quantum superposition in the initial state. To this end, we express the initial state in the following form:

\[
\sigma_E = \sum_j p_j |\phi_{E,j}\rangle \langle \phi_{E,j}|,
\]

Note that there may be arbitrariness of decompositions \( \{p_j, |\phi_{E,j}\rangle\} \) for fixed \( \sigma_E \), including the case of a non-orthogonal set of \( \{|\phi_{E,j}\rangle\} \). We define a quantity that measures the energy fluctuation in the form of a quantum superposition

\[
\delta_{EQ} := \min_{\{p_j, |\phi_{E,j}\rangle\}} \left[ \sum_j p_j \langle (H_E - \langle H_E |\phi_{E,j}\rangle)^2 |\phi_{E,j}\rangle \right]^{1/2}, \tag{10}
\]

where \( \langle \ldots |\phi_{E,j} \rangle := \langle \phi_{E,j} | \ldots |\phi_{E,j}\rangle \) and we take the minimum of all possible decompositions \( \{p_j, |\phi_{E,j}\rangle\} \) for a given \( \sigma_E \). If the origin of the fluctuation \( \delta_E \) is completely classical, namely if all of \( |\phi_{E,j}\rangle \) are energy eigenstates of the Hamiltonian \( H_E \), the quantity \( \delta_{EQ} \) is exactly zero. The finiteness of \( \delta_{EQ} \) requires that \( |\phi_{E,j}\rangle \) is a superposition of energy eigenstates with different energy. In particular, if \( \sigma_E \) is a pure state, the quantity \( \delta_{EQ} \) is equal to \( \delta_E \). Therefore, \( \delta_{EQ} \) can be interpreted as a measure of the energy fluctuation with a quantum origin. Also, it is known that the quantity \( \delta_{EQ} \) is equivalent to the quantum Fisher information \([21, 22]\).

As the second main result in this letter, we show the following uncertainty relation between \( \delta_U \) and \( \delta_{EQ} \)

\[
\delta_{EQ}\delta_U \geq \frac{||[H_S, U_S]||}{81}, \tag{11}
\]

for a regime \( \delta_U < ||[H_S, U_S]|| / (64||H_S||) \). The derivation of this relation is very similar to the first relation \((7)\), but it is lengthy, and we therefore present it in the supplemental material \([23]\). The inequality \((11)\) concludes that the mixed state composed of energy eigenstates cannot realize unitary time evolution, and a superposition of energy eigenstates with a broad energy spectrum in the external system is necessary to implement the unitary operation with high accuracy. Remarkably, the relations \((7)\) and \((11)\) are valid for any type of external system, and thus they are applicable to specific models including Jayes-Cummings model and a model in Ref.\([12]\).

**Toy example with high quantum coherence.**— We now consider a toy model to obtain better intuition. We consider the Jayes-Cummings model, which is a composite system of a single qubit and a free photon. The Hamiltonians are given by

\[
H_S = \epsilon(\sigma_z + 1), \quad H_{SE} = \lambda(\sigma_z b + b^\dagger \sigma_z), \quad H_E = 2\epsilon b^\dagger b, \tag{12}
\]

where \( \lambda \) is the amplitude of the interaction. The operator \( \sigma_z \) is the \( z \)-component of the Pauli matrix, and \( \sigma_\pm \) flips the spin from down(up) to up(down). The operator \( b \) and \( b^\dagger \) are the annihilation and creation operators of the boson, respectively. We set the coherent state to the initial state of the external system:

\[
\sigma_E = |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha|, \quad |\alpha| = e^{\alpha(b^\dagger - b)} |0\rangle, \tag{13}
\]

where \( |0\rangle \) is the vacuum state, and the parameter \( \alpha \) is a real number. If we impose the condition \( \lambda \to +0 \) with \( \lambda \) set to a constant, the dynamics of the reduced density matrix of the system is exactly described by the unitary time-evolution \([23]\), i.e., \( \rho'_S = U_S \rho_S U_S^\dagger \) where

\[
U_S = T e^{-i \int_0^\tau dt \tilde{H}_S(t)} = e^{-i\tau \sigma_z} e^{-i\tau \alpha \lambda \sigma_z}, \quad \tilde{H}_S(t) = \epsilon \sigma_z + \lambda \alpha(\sigma_z e^{-i\epsilon t} + \sigma_+ e^{i\epsilon t}). \tag{14}
\]

The initial energy fluctuation is exactly given by \( \delta_E = 2\alpha \epsilon \). For a very large \( \alpha \), the photon state is almost a classical state that is driven solely by the Hamiltonian \( H_E \). Hence, in the large \( \alpha \) limit, the time evolution of the system is described by the effective time-dependent Hamiltonian \( \tilde{H}_S(t) \). For a finite \( \alpha \), we expect that the description with \( \tilde{H}_S(t) \) is imperfect, but the relation \((7)\) is satisfied.

In Fig\(\text{2}\) we numerically demonstrate that the uncertainty relation is satisfied in this model. We first generated more than \( 10^4 \) density matrices for \( \rho_S \) randomly, and we computed \( \delta_U \) within this sampling. The inset of Fig\(\text{2}\) shows a plot of \( \delta_U \) as a function of \( \alpha \), which clearly shows that the unitary time evolution gives a better description as \( \alpha \) increases. Because it is difficult to compute the cases of large \( \alpha \), we present data for a numerically available regime. In our proof for the present parameter set, the uncertainty relation is justified only for the regime of \( \alpha > \alpha_c \), where \( \alpha_c \sim 500 \). Nevertheless, Fig\(\text{2}\) clearly shows that the first uncertainty relation is satisfied, even in the regime of small \( \alpha \). Thus, in this example, the condition \( \delta_U \leq \frac{||[H_S, U_S]||}{(40||H_S||)} \) is much too strong, and our inequality is satisfied beyond the regime.
system labeled as bust against the change of initial states of the system.

This inequality means that if the actual time evolution is
maximizes and minimizes the energy loss in the system,

\[ \rho_{S, \text{max}} := \arg \max_{\rho_S} \text{Tr} \left( (\rho_S - U_S \rho_S U_S^\dagger) H_S \right), \]
\[ \rho_{S, \text{min}} := \arg \min_{\rho_S} \text{Tr} \left( (\rho_S - U_S \rho_S U_S^\dagger) H_S \right). \]  
(17)

Because the matrix $H_S - U_S^\dagger H_S U_S$ is a Hermitian matrix, there exist two eigenstates of this Hermitian matrix $|\psi_{\text{max}}\rangle$ and $|\psi_{\text{min}}\rangle$ $(|\psi_{\text{max}}\rangle|\psi_{\text{min}}\rangle = 0)$, with which the above two density matrices are expressed as $\rho_{S, \text{max}} = |\psi_{\text{max}}\rangle \langle \psi_{\text{max}}|$ and $\rho_{S, \text{min}} = |\psi_{\text{min}}\rangle \langle \psi_{\text{min}}|$. In other words, $\rho_{S, \text{max}}$ and $\rho_{S, \text{min}}$ are pure and orthogonal to each other. Then, by setting $A = H_E$, $\sigma_1 = \sigma_{E, \nu_1}$ and $\sigma_2 = \sigma_{E, \nu_2}$ in
[15], and $\rho_{S, \nu_1} = \rho_{S, \text{max}}$ and $\rho_{S, \nu_2} = \rho_{S, \text{min}}$ in [16], we obtain the inequality

\[ \Delta \leq 4\sqrt{\delta U} (2\delta E + \Delta), \]  
(18)

where $\delta E := \max(\delta E(\sigma_{E, \text{max}}), \delta E(\sigma_{E, \text{min}}))$.

We now consider the high-accuracy regime: $\delta U \leq ||[H_S, U_S]|/(40||H_S||)| < 1/40$. Using $\delta U < 1/40$ and the inequality (18), we obtain

\[ \delta U \delta E \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} - \frac{1}{40} \right) \Delta = \frac{10 - \sqrt{2}}{80\sqrt{2}} \Delta. \]  
(19)

Roughly speaking, the quantity $\Delta$ is close to $||H_S, U_S||$, and the quantity $\delta E$ is close to $\delta E$, although there are slight deviations. Rigorous relations for these variables read [23]

\[ ||H_S, U_S|| \leq \Delta + 4\sqrt{2}\delta U ||H_S||, \]  
(20)
\[ \delta E \leq \delta E + ||H_S||. \]  
(21)

The combination of Eq.(20) and the condition $\delta U \leq ||[H_S, U_S]|/(40||H_S||)| < 1/40$ yields $\Delta > (1 - \sqrt{3}/400)||H_S, U_S||$. By applying the above inequality to the inequality (19), we get

\[ \delta U \delta E \geq \frac{||H_S, U_S||}{20}. \]  
(22)

Finally, the combination of Eq.(21) and the condition $\delta U \leq ||[H_S, U_S]|/(40||H_S||)|$ yields $\delta U \delta E \leq \delta U \delta E + ||H_S, U_S||/40$. This inequality with Eq. (22) directly implies the uncertainty relation (7).

Discussion — In this letter, we considered the underlying mechanism in the implementation of the unitary operation. By considering a model of a composite system (Fig. 1), we derived two types of fundamental trade-off relations, i.e., (7) and (11). These relations quantitatively clarified the crucial roles of quantum superposition and a broad energy spectrum in the external system.

Although it is difficult to achieve the equalities in the inequalities (7) and (11) except for the trivial case $[H_S, U_S] = 0$, the inequalities explicitly show that the fundamental limitation in the form of the uncertainty

FIG. 2: Demonstration of the first uncertainty relation in the Jaynes-Cummings model. The inset shows $\delta U$ as a function of the parameter $\alpha$. Parameters: $\epsilon = 10, \alpha \lambda = \pi/2$ from which one gets $||[H_S, U_S]|| = 2\epsilon$. The relation (7) is justified for $\alpha > \alpha_c$, where we estimate $\alpha_c \sim 500$ from the inset. We showed the data for a numerically computable regime of $\alpha$, which is much smaller than $\alpha_c$. Nevertheless, the relation (7) is satisfied.

Outline of derivation of (7) — Here, we show the outline of the derivation of (7). To prove this, we employ two useful inequalities. The first inequality relates the Bures distance and the variance of any Hermitian operator $A$. We denote the standard deviations of $A$ in a state $\sigma$ by $\delta A(\sigma) := \sqrt{\text{Tr}[A^2\sigma] - \text{Tr}[A\sigma]^2}$, then the difference between the expectation value of $A$ for two states $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ denoted by $\Delta := |\text{Tr}[A(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)]|$ satisfies [23]:

\[ \Delta \leq \sqrt{2} L_B(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)(\delta_A(\sigma_1) + \delta_A(\sigma_2) + \Delta). \]  
(15)

This inequality suggests that if two states $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ are similar (i.e. small $L_B(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$) but $\Delta$ is large, then at least one of the standard deviations of $A$ in these two states is large. The second inequality relates the quantity $\delta U$ to the final state of the external system. We denote the reduced density matrix of the external system at time $\tau$ with the initial state of the system $\rho_{S, \nu}$ by $\sigma'_{E, \nu} := \text{Tr}_S [\rho_{S, \nu} \otimes \sigma_E]$, where $\text{Tr}_S$ is the partial trace with respect to the system. Consider two pure initial states of the system $\rho_{S, \nu_1}$ and $\rho_{S, \nu_2}$, which are orthogonal to each other. Then, for $\delta U \leq 1/4$, we have the following inequality [23]:

\[ L_B(\sigma'_{E, \nu_1}, \sigma'_{E, \nu_2}) \leq 4\delta U. \]  
(16)

This inequality means that if the actual time evolution is close to the unitary time evolution, the final reduced density matrices of the external system starting from different initial states of the system are similar to each other. This implies that the states in the external system is robust against the change of initial states of the system.

We consider the two initial density matrices for the system labeled as $\rho_{S, \text{max}}$ and $\rho_{S, \text{min}}$, which respectively maximizes and minimizes the energy loss in the system,
type relations actually exist in implementation of unitary operations. The aim of this letter is to show the existence of a novel type of fundamental limitation. There is much room to improve the tightness of our inequalities. In fact, tighter bounds can be derived by using alternatively a more sophisticated but less standard quantifier with the entanglement fidelity [19]. We explain the results in the supplementary material [23].

In our setup, we assumed $[H_S + H_E, e^{-iH\tau}] = 0$ in the Hamiltonian for simplicity. However, we can consider wider classes of Hamiltonian by introducing the deviation $\chi := \|[H_S + H_E, e^{-iH\tau}]\|$ [24]. Then, one can derive the following inequalities [23]:

\[
\delta_E \delta_U \geq \frac{\|[U_S, H_S]\| - \chi}{40}, \quad (23)
\]

\[
\delta_{EQ} \delta_U \geq \frac{\|[U_S, H_S]\| - \chi}{81}. \quad (24)
\]

These inequalities imply that the relations (7) and (11) are continuously connected to the results for the general coupling form.

Our setup is relevant to quantum heat engines, particularly when one considers a work storage, which is a physical object for storing work [25][37]. Applying our theory to problems on quantum coherence and the measurement procedure of quantum work [38][39] will be an intriguing future research subject. We must consider time-evolution of quantum work [38, 39] will be an intriguing procedure of quantum work [38, 39].
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[9] Note that the conservation of total energy provides a thermodynamically consistent picture when performing unitary operation on quantum heat engines. In quantum heat engines, the work done by the system during the unitary operation is defined as an energy decrease of the system [29][39]. In our setup, it is clear that the work done by the system is transferred to the experimental apparatus.


[16] We can easily extend our results to the case that $\Lambda_{SE}$ is a general energy preserving map. In that case, we impose the following condition as the $H_S + H_E$-preserving law:

\[
\text{Tr}[(H_S + H_E)(\rho_{SE} - \Lambda_{SE}(\rho_{SE}))] = 0, \quad (25)
\]

for any state $\rho_{SE}$ on the composite system $SE$. Note that this extended version of our results includes the case with an arbitrary time-dependent interaction Hamiltonian, as long as this commutation relation is satisfied. Here, time-dependence in $H_{SE}$ stands for the switch on and off of the connection between (S) and (E). Also, we can extend our results to the transient case that the final Hamiltonian of (S) is different from the initial one with using the controller trick in [29].

[17] In the case of general energy-preserving CPTP $\Lambda_{SE}$, the implementation $T$ becomes $(H_E, H_E, \sigma_E, \Lambda_{SE})$.
A detailed calculation to derive the relation (7) and (11), the derivation of the unitary time evolution in the Jaynes-Cummings model, generalization of the results and for quantifier with entanglement fidelity are shown in the supplemental material.

This result also can be extended to the case of general CPTP-map whose energy-preserving is weakly broken.
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In this supplementary, we refer to the vector representation of a pure state $\rho$ as $|\rho\rangle$. We write a product state of two systems $|\phi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$ as $|\phi \otimes \psi\rangle$.

**PROOF OF EQ.(15)**

In this section, we derive (15) in the main text, which reappears below:

$$\Delta \leq \sqrt{2} L_B(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)(\delta_A(\sigma_1) + \delta_A(\sigma_2) + \Delta). \tag{S.1}$$

**Proof.** Using eigenstates of $A (A = \sum_i a_i |i\rangle \langle i|)$, we define the probability distribution $P$ and $Q$ as

$$p_i := \text{Tr}[|i\rangle \langle i| \sigma_1], \tag{S.2}$$

$$q_i := \text{Tr}[|i\rangle \langle i| \sigma_2]. \tag{S.3}$$

The variances of $A$ in $P$ ($Q$) are equal to that in $\sigma_1$ ($\sigma_2$). It is known that the quantum Bures distance for two quantum states is always larger than the classical Bures distance (the Hellinger distance) for the distributions of the diagonal elements of the two states with any fixed basis [18], which reads

$$L_B(P,Q) := \sqrt{1 - \sum_i \sqrt{p_i q_i}} \leq L_B(\sigma_1, \sigma_2). \tag{S.4}$$

Noting this relation, we see that the desired relation (15) follows from the following inequality:

$$\Delta \leq \sqrt{2} L_B(P,Q)(\delta_A(P) + \delta_A(Q) + \Delta). \tag{S.5}$$

This inequality is obtained as a special case of the following inequality for an arbitrary real number $X$:

$$\Delta = |\sum_i (p_i - q_i)(a_i - X)|$$

$$= |\sum_i (\sqrt{p_i} - \sqrt{q_i})(\sqrt{p_i} + \sqrt{q_i})(a_i - X)|$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\sum_i (\sqrt{p_i} - \sqrt{q_i})^2} \sqrt{\sum_i (\sqrt{p_i} + \sqrt{q_i})^2(a_i - X)^2}$$

$$= \sqrt{2} L_B(P,Q) \sqrt{\sum_i (p_i + q_i + 2\sqrt{p_i q_i})(a_i - X)^2}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{2} L_B(P,Q) \sqrt{\sum_i p_i(a_i - X)^2 + \sum_i q_i(a_i - X)^2 + 2\sqrt{\sum_i p_i(a_i - X)^2 \sum_i q_i(a_i - X)^2}}$$

$$= \sqrt{2} L_B(P,Q)(\sqrt{\sum_i p_i(a_i - X)^2} + \sqrt{\sum_i q_i(a_i - X)^2}). \tag{S.6}$$

In the third and fifth lines, we used the Schwarz inequality. By substituting $\text{Tr}[\sigma_1 A]$ into $X$, we obtain Eq. (S.5). $\square$

**PROOF OF EQ.(16)**

The inequality (16) is derived as a corollary of the following theorem:
Theorem 1. Consider a composite system of two quantum systems $A$ and $B$ (see Fig. 3). Let $\rho_{A,\nu_1}$ and $\rho_{A,\nu_2}$ be two arbitrary pure states on $A$, which are orthogonal to each other. We introduce their superposition denoted by $\rho_{A,\nu_1,\nu_2} := (|\rho_{A,\nu_1}\rangle + |\rho_{A,\nu_2}\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. The initial state of $B$ denoted by $\sigma_B$ is supposed to be a pure state. We consider the unitary time evolution $V_{AB}$ of the composite system from the initial state $\rho_{A,\nu} \otimes \sigma_B$ ($\nu = \nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_{1+2}$). The final states of $A$ and $B$ are written as $\rho'_{A,\nu} := \text{Tr}_B[V_{AB}(\rho_{A,\nu} \otimes \sigma_B)V_{AB}^\dagger]$ and $\sigma'_{B,\nu} := \text{Tr}_B[V_{AB}(\rho_{A,\nu} \otimes \sigma_B)V_{AB}^\dagger]$, respectively. We fix a unitary operator $U_A$ on $A$, and define $\delta_{U,\nu} := [L_B(\rho'_{A,\nu}, U_{A,\nu} U_A^\dagger)]^{1/2}$. Then, for any $\rho_{A,\nu_1}$, $\rho_{A,\nu_2}$, $V_{AB}$, and $U_A$, the following inequality holds:

$$L_B(\sigma'_{B,\nu_1}, \sigma'_{B,\nu_2}) \leq 2\delta_{U,\nu_1} + \delta^2_{U,\nu_2} + \sqrt{2(\delta^2_{U,\nu_1} + \delta^2_{U,\nu_2}) + 2\sqrt{2}\delta_{U,\nu_1,\nu_2} + \delta^2_{U,\nu_1} + \delta^2_{U,\nu_2}}.$$  \hfill (S.7)

Before proving this theorem, we first show how (16) is derived from Theorem 1. As a simple case, we first derive (16) for the case where $\Lambda_{SE}$ is a unitary dynamics $\Lambda_{SE}$ and $\sigma_E$ is a pure state. In this case, by setting $S$ and $E$ to $A$ and $B$ in Theorem 1, the condition $\delta_{U,\nu} \leq \delta_U \leq 1/8 (\nu = \nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_{1+2})$ suggests Eq. (16)

$$L_B(\sigma'_{E,\nu_1}, \sigma'_{E,\nu_2}) \leq \left(2\sqrt{\frac{1}{32} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{2} + 2}{8}}\right) \delta_U \leq 4\delta_U.$$  \hfill (S.8)

Next, we consider the general case where $\Lambda_{SE}$ is a general CPTP map, and $\sigma_E$ is a mixed state. Note that an arbitrary CPTP map $\Lambda_{SE}$ can be written as unitary dynamics $\Lambda_{SE}$ and an extra system $E'$. In other words, there exists a proper extra system $E'$, an initial state $\rho_{E'}$ of $E'$, and a unitary $V_{SE'E'}$ on $SEE'$ such that the CPTP map $\Lambda_{SE}$ is reproduced as

$$\Lambda_{SE}(\rho_{S,\nu} \otimes \sigma_E) := \text{Tr}_E[V_{SE'E'}(\rho_{S,\nu} \otimes \sigma_E \otimes \rho_{E'})V_{SE'E'}^\dagger].$$  \hfill (S.9)

By performing the purification of $\sigma_E \otimes \rho_{E'}$, we have a reference system $R$ and a pure state $\sigma_{EE'R}$ such that

$$\text{Tr}_R[\sigma_{EE'R}] = \sigma_E \otimes \rho_{E'}.$$  \hfill (S.10)

Setting $S$ and $EE'R$ to $A$ and $B$ in Theorem 1, we obtain

$$L_B(\sigma'_{EE'R,\nu_1}, \sigma'_{EE'R,\nu_2}) \leq 4\delta_U.$$  \hfill (S.11)

Because the Bures distance does not increase using a CPTP map and the partial trace is a CPTP map, the above inequality reduces to (16).

Proof of Theorem 1 We refer to the final state of $AB$ as $|\Psi_{AB,\nu}\rangle := V_{AB} |\rho_{A,\nu} \otimes \sigma_B\rangle$. Because $\rho'_{A,\nu} := U_A \rho_{A,\nu} U_A^\dagger$ is a pure state, we can define the pure state of $B$ as

$$|\sigma''_{B,\nu}\rangle := \frac{\sum_i |\psi_i\rangle \langle \rho'_{A,\nu} \otimes \psi_i|\Psi_{AB,\nu}\rangle}{\sum_i \langle \rho'_{A,\nu} \otimes \psi_i|\Psi_{AB,\nu}\rangle^2}.$$  \hfill (S.12)

![FIG. 3: A schematic diagram of the setup of Theorem 1](Image 165x116 to 451x232) In this supplementary, we refer to the vector representation of a pure state $\rho$ as $|\rho\rangle$. 

---

**Mathematical Notations**

- $\Lambda_{SE}$: General CPTP map
- $\sigma_E$: Mixed state
- $\rho_{S,\nu}$: Initial state of system $S$
- $\rho_{E'}$: Initial state of extra system $E'$
- $V_{SE'E'}$: Unitary operator
- $\Lambda_{SE}(\rho_{S,\nu} \otimes \sigma_E)$: Reproduction of CPTP map
- $\text{Tr}_R[\sigma_{EE'R}]$: Partial trace
- $\delta_U$: Bures distance
- $\rho'_{A,\nu}$: Purified state
- $|\sigma''_{B,\nu}\rangle$: Basis of system $B$
- $\text{Tr}_B$: Trace over system $B$
- $U_A$: Unitary operator on system $A$
- $V_{AB}$: Unitary dynamics
- $|\Psi_{AB,\nu}\rangle$: Final state of system $AB$
where \( \{ \psi_i \} \) is a basis of \( B \). Note that the above definition of \( |\sigma''_{B,\nu}\rangle \) is well-defined and independent of the choice of the basis \( \{ \psi_i \} \).

First, we calculate the Bures distance between \( \sigma''_{B,\nu} \) and \( \sigma''_{B'} \). The monotonicity of the Bures distance under a partial trace leads to

\[
L_B(\rho''_{A,\nu}, \sigma''_{B,\nu}) \leq L_B(\rho''_{A,\nu} \otimes \sigma''_{B,\nu}) = L_B(\rho''_{A,\nu} \otimes \delta''_{U,\nu}) = \delta''_{U,\nu}.
\]  

(S.13)

Next, we calculate the Bures distance between \( \sigma''_{B,\nu_1} \) and \( \sigma''_{B,\nu_2} \). To do this, we focus on the following quantity

\[
\sqrt{1 - \left| \langle \sigma''_{B,\nu_1} \mid \sigma''_{B,\nu_1} + \sigma''_{B,\nu_2} \rangle \right|^2} = L_B\left( \frac{\sigma''_{B,\nu_1} + \sigma''_{B,\nu_2}}{2}, \frac{\sigma''_{B,\nu_1} + \sigma''_{B,\nu_2}}{2} \right),
\]

(S.14)

which is evaluated as

\[
L_B\left( \frac{\sigma''_{B,\nu_1} + \sigma''_{B,\nu_2}}{2} \right) \leq L_B\left( \frac{\rho''_{A,\nu_1} + \rho''_{A,\nu_2}}{2}, \frac{\rho''_{A,\nu_1} + \rho''_{A,\nu_2}}{2} \right) + \delta''_{U,\nu_1} + \delta''_{U,\nu_2}
\]

(S.15)

In the first line, we used the triangle inequality. In the second line, we used (S.13). In the third line, we used the monotonicity of the Bures distance through the partial trace. Owing to the relation \( F(\rho, \sigma) = |\langle \rho \mid \sigma \rangle| \) for pure states \( \rho \) and \( \sigma \), the first term of the right-hand side is evaluated as

\[
L_B\left( \left| \Psi_{AB,\nu_1} \right|, \left| \rho''_{A,\nu_1} \otimes \sigma''_{B,\nu_1} \right| + \left| \rho''_{A,\nu_2} \otimes \sigma''_{B,\nu_2} \right| \right)
\]

(S.16)

The transformations in the third and fourth lines are confirmed by applying \( |\rho''_{A,\nu} \otimes \sigma''_{B,\nu} | \Psi_{AB,\nu} \rangle = 1 - \delta''_{U,\nu} \) and \( |\rho''_{A,\nu_1} \otimes \sigma''_{B,\nu_2} | |\sigma''_{B,\nu_2} \rangle = 0 \) into the relation that if \( \langle a | b \rangle = 0 \) and \( \langle a | \bar{a} \rangle \geq 1 - \delta \), then \( \langle a | b \rangle \leq \sqrt{2 \delta - \delta^2} \leq 2 \delta \). Combining the above result and the following relation, which comes from \( L_B^2 \leq 1 \),

\[
\left| \langle \sigma''_{B,\nu_1} \mid \sigma''_{B,\nu_1} + \sigma''_{B,\nu_2} \rangle \right|^2 \leq \left( 1 - L_B^2(\sigma''_{B,\nu_1} \otimes \sigma''_{B,\nu_1}) \right)^2 + \left( 1 - L_B^2(\sigma''_{B,\nu_1} \otimes \sigma''_{B,\nu_2}) \right)^2
\]

(S.17)

we arrive at the desired inequality on \( L_B^2(\sigma''_{B,\nu_1} \otimes \sigma''_{B,\nu_2}) \):

\[
L_B(\sigma''_{B,\nu_1} \otimes \sigma''_{B,\nu_2}) \leq 2 \sqrt{\delta''_{U,\nu_1} + \delta''_{U,\nu_2} + \sqrt{2}(\delta''_{U,\nu_1} + \delta''_{U,\nu_2}) + 2\sqrt{2}\delta''_{U,\nu_1} + \delta''_{U,\nu_2}}.
\]  

(S.18)
Finally, using the triangle inequality, we have Eq. (S.7):
\[
L_B(\sigma'_{B,\nu_1}, \sigma'_{B,\nu_2}) \leq L_B(\sigma''_{B,\nu_1}, \sigma''_{B,\nu_2}) + L_B(\sigma''_{B,\nu_1}, \sigma'_{B,\nu_2})
\]
\[
\leq 2\sqrt{\delta_{U,\nu_1}^2 + \delta_{U,\nu_2}^2} + \sqrt{2(\delta_{U,\nu_1}^2 + \delta_{U,\nu_2}^2) + 2\sqrt{2}\delta_{U,\nu_1+2}^2 + \delta_{U,\nu_1}^2 + \delta_{U,\nu_2}^2}
\]
(S.19)

**COMPLETE PROOF OF EQ. (7)**

In the outline of the proof of (7) in the body of the text, we postponed the proof of Eqs. (15), (16), (20), and (21). Because we have shown the proof of Eqs. (15), (16), here, we show the proof of Eqs. (20) and (21), which completes the proof of (7).

**Proof of Eq. (20).** First, we define the following energy differences:
\[
\Delta_{\text{max}} := \text{Tr}[H_E(\sigma_{E,\text{max}}' - \sigma_E)] = \text{Tr}[H_S(\rho_{S,\text{max}} - \rho_{S,\text{max}}')],
\]
(S.20)
\[
\Delta_{\text{min}} := \text{Tr}[H_E(\sigma_{E,\text{min}}' - \sigma_E)] = \text{Tr}[H_S(\rho_{S,\text{min}} - \rho_{S,\text{min}}')],
\]
(S.21)
\[
\Delta_{U,\text{max}} := \text{Tr}[H_S(\rho_{S,\text{max}} - U_S\rho_{S,\text{max}}U_S^\dagger)],
\]
(S.22)
\[
\Delta_{U,\text{min}} := \text{Tr}[H_S(\rho_{S,\text{min}} - U_S\rho_{S,\text{min}}U_S^\dagger)].
\]
(S.23)

Then,
\[
\Delta = \Delta_{\text{max}} - \Delta_{\text{min}},
\]
(S.24)
\[
\|[H_S, U_S]|| = \max(\|\Delta_{U,\text{max}}\|, \|\Delta_{U,\text{min}}\|),
\]
(S.25)
\[
|\Delta_i - \Delta_{U,i}| \leq \|\rho_{S,i}' - U_S\rho_{S,i}U_S^\dagger\|_1 ||H_S||
\]
\[
\leq 2\sqrt{2}L_B(\rho_{S,i}' - U_S\rho_{S,i}U_S^\dagger) ||H_S|| \leq 2\sqrt{2}\delta_{S,i} ||H_S||.
\]
(S.26)

where \(i \in \{\text{max}, \text{min}\} \), \(\|X\|_1 := \text{Tr}\sqrt{X^\dagger X}\), and we used \(\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{1 - F^2(\rho, \sigma)} \leq 2\sqrt{2}L_B(\rho, \sigma) \) [19] in the fourth line.

Because \(\text{Tr}[H_S(U_S1_SU_S^\dagger - 1_S)] = 0\), the signs of \(\text{Tr}[H_S(U_S\rho_{S,\text{max}}U_S^\dagger - \rho_{S,\text{max}})]\) and \(\text{Tr}[H_S(U_S\rho_{S,\text{min}}U_S^\dagger - \rho_{S,\text{min}})]\) are different. Therefore, we have
\[
\max(\|\Delta_{U,\text{max}}\|, \|\Delta_{U,\text{min}}\|) \leq |\Delta_{U,\text{max}} - \Delta_{U,\text{min}}|
\]
(S.27)

Combining (S.24)–(S.27), we obtain the desired inequality:
\[
\|[H_S, U_S]|| = \max(\|\Delta_{U,\text{max}}\|, \|\Delta_{U,\text{min}}\|)
\]
\[
\leq |\Delta_{U,\text{max}} - \Delta_{U,\text{min}}|
\leq |\Delta_{\text{max}} - \Delta_{\text{min}}| + 4\sqrt{2}\delta_{S,i} ||H_S||
\]
\[
= \Delta + 4\sqrt{2}\delta_{S,i} ||H_S||.
\]
(S.28)

**Proof of (21).** The energy-preserving property of \(\Lambda_{SE}\) gives
\[
\delta_{S}(\rho_{S,\nu}) + \delta_{E}(\sigma_{E}) = \delta_{S}(\rho_{S,\nu}') + \delta_{E}(\sigma_{E}') + 2\text{Cov}_{SE}(\Lambda_{SE}(\rho_{S,\nu} \otimes \sigma_{E})),
\]
(S.29)

where \(\delta_{S}(\rho)\) is the standard deviation of the energy in \(\rho\), and \(\text{Cov}_{SE}(\sigma)\) is the energy covariance of the state of \(\sigma\) on \(SE\). Because \(-\delta_{S}(\rho_{S,\nu})\delta_{E}(\sigma_{E}') \leq \text{Cov}_{SE}(\Lambda_{SE}(\rho_{S,\nu} \otimes \sigma_{E}))\) (this is a basic feature of the covariance), we obtain
\[
\delta_{E}(\sigma_{E}') - \delta_{S}(\rho_{S,\nu}) \leq \sqrt{\delta_{S}^2(\rho_{S,\nu}) + \delta_{E}^2(\sigma_{E}') - 2\delta_{S}(\rho_{S,\nu})\delta_{E}(\sigma_{E}')} \leq \sqrt{\delta_{S}^2(\sigma_{E}) + \delta_{S}^2(\rho_{S,\nu})} \leq \delta_{E}(\sigma_{E}) + \delta_{S}(\rho_{S,\nu}).
\]
(S.30)

Because the standard deviation of the energy in \(S\) is always smaller than \(||H_S||/2\), we obtain Eq. (21).
COMPLETE PROOF OF EQ.(11)

Here, we demonstrate the complete proof of (11). Without loss of generality, we can assume that the expression of the initial state of the external system $\sigma_E := \sum_j p_j |\phi_{E,j}\rangle \langle \phi_{E,j}|$ given in Eq. (9) satisfies $\delta_{EQ} = \sum_j p_j \delta_{E}(\langle \phi_{E,j}\rangle)$. Using the expression, we define

$$
\sigma'_{E,j} := \text{Tr}_S [\Lambda_{SE}(\rho_S \otimes |\phi_{E,j}\rangle \langle \phi_{E,j}|)] ,
$$

$$
\sigma'_{E,\nu} := \text{Tr}_S [\Lambda_{SE}(\rho_{S,\nu} \otimes \sigma_E)] ,
$$

$$
\sigma'_{E,(\nu,j)} := \text{Tr}_S [\Lambda_{SE}(\rho_{S,\nu} \otimes |\phi_{E,j}\rangle \langle \phi_{E,j}|)] ,
$$

where $\nu$ takes “max” or “min”, as in $\rho_{S,j}, \rho_{S,\nu}$, and $\rho_{S,(\nu,j)}$ are defined in a similar manner. We consider the degree of closeness to the unitary operator $U_S$, which is quantified as

$$
\delta_U(\rho_S) = L_B \left( \rho'_S, U_S(\rho_S \otimes \sigma_E) U_S^\dagger \right) ,
$$

$$
\delta_{U,j}(\rho_S) := L_B \left( \rho'_{S,j}, U_S(\rho_S \otimes |\phi_{E,j}\rangle \langle \phi_{E,j}|) U_S^\dagger \right) ,
$$

In this proof, we first follow the derivation of Eq. (7) for each $|\phi_{E,j}\rangle \langle \phi_{E,j}|$, and we then sum it with $j$. The inequality [18] for $\sigma'_{E,(\text{max},j)}$ and $\sigma'_{E,(\text{min},j)}$ reads

$$
\Delta_j \leq M_j (2\delta'_{E,j} + \Delta_j) ,
$$

where $M_j := L_B(\sigma'_{E,(\text{max},j)}), \sigma'_{E,(\text{min},j)}), \Delta_j := |\text{Tr}[H_E(\sigma'_{E,(\text{max},j)} - \sigma'_{E,(\text{min},j)})]|$ and $\delta'_{E,j}$ is the larger of $\delta_{E}(\sigma'_{E,(\text{max},j)})$ or $\delta_{E}(\sigma'_{E,(\text{min},j)})$. Combining (20), (21), (S.33), $\Delta_j \leq \|H_S\|$ and $\delta_U \leq 1/64$, we obtain

$$
\| [H_S, U_S] \| \leq \Delta + \delta_U \|H_S\|
= \sum_j p_j \Delta_j + \delta_U \|H_S\|
\leq \sum_j p_j M_j (2\delta'_{E,j} + \Delta_j) + \delta_U \|H_S\|
\leq \sum_j p_j M_j (2\delta_{E,j} + 3\|H_S\|) + \delta_U \|H_S\|
\leq \sqrt{\sum_j p_j M_j^2} \left( 2 \sqrt{\sum_j p_j \delta_{E,j}^2} + 3\|H_S\| \right) + \delta_U \|H_S\|
= \sqrt{\sum_j p_j M_j^2} (2\delta_{EQ} + 3\|H_S\|) + \delta_U \|H_S\|
$$

where we used (21) and $\Delta_j \leq \|H_S\|$ in the fourth line, and we used the Schwarz inequality in the fifth line. If $\sigma_E$ is a pure state, then $\sqrt{\sum_j p_j M_j^2} = L_B(\sigma'_{E,(\text{max})}, \sigma'_{E,(\text{min})}) \leq 4\delta_U$, and the above inequality is transformed into $\mathcal{E}_{\text{max}} \leq 8U\delta_{EQ} + 13\delta_U \|H_S\|$, for which we have seen a similar relation in the derivation of (17).

Below, we investigate the upper bound of $\sum_j p_j M_j^2$ in the form of $\sum_j p_j M_j^2 \leq a\delta_{U}^2$. We first show the bound of $M_j$:

$$
M_j \leq 3\sqrt{2} \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{max}}) + 3\sqrt{2} \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{min}}) + 2\sqrt{2} \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{max}+\text{min}}) ,
$$

where we defined $|\rho_{S,\text{max}+\text{min}}| := (|\rho_{S,\text{max}}| + |\rho_{S,\text{min}}|)/\sqrt{2}$.

**Proof of (S.35)**. We first consider the case where $\Lambda_{SE}$ is a unitary dynamics $\Lambda_{SE}$. In this case, setting $S$ and $E$ to $A$ and $B$, and substituting $|\psi_{E,j}\rangle \langle \psi_{E,j}|$ into $\sigma_E$ in Theorem 1, we obtain the desired inequality

$$
M_j \leq 2\sqrt{2} \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{max}}) + \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{min}}) + \sqrt{2} (\delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{max}}) + \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{min}})) + 2\sqrt{2} \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{max}+\text{min}}) + \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{max}}) + \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{min}})
\leq \left( 2\sqrt{1 + \sqrt{2} + 1} \right) \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{max}}) + \left( 2\sqrt{1 + \sqrt{2} + 1} \right) \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{min}}) + 2\sqrt{2} \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{max}+\text{min}})
\leq 3\sqrt{2} \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{max}}) + 3\sqrt{2} \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{min}}) + 2\sqrt{2} \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\text{max}+\text{min}}) .
$$

(S.36)
In the second line, we used $0 \leq \delta_{U,j}(\rho_{S,\nu}) \leq 1 \ (\nu = \max, \min, \max + \min)$. We can handle the general case where $\Lambda_{SE}$ is a general CPTP map in a similar manner to that of [15].

Next, we introduce the following inequality for any pure state $\rho_S$

$$\sum_j p_j \delta_{U,j}^4(\rho_S) \leq 2\delta_U^4(\rho_S). \tag{S.37}$$

which follows from

$$1 - 2\delta_U^4(\rho_S) \leq (1 - \delta_U^4(\rho_S))^2 = \langle \rho_S'' \| \rho_S' \| \rho_S'' \rangle = \sum_j p_j \langle \rho_S'' \| \rho_{S,j} \| \rho_S'' \rangle = \sum_j p_j (1 - \delta_U^4(\rho_{S,j}))^2 \leq \sum_j p_j (1 - \delta_U^4(\rho_{S,j})). \tag{S.38}$$

Here, $|\rho_S''\rangle$ is the vector representation of $U_S \rho_S U_S^\dagger$. Combining [S.37], [S.35], and $(A + B + C)^2 \leq 3(A^2 + B^2 + C^2)$, we arrive at the desired upper bound

$$\sum_j p_j M_j^2 \leq 3 \sum_j p_j \left( 18\delta_{U,j}^2(\rho_{S,\max}) + 18\delta_{U,j}^2(\rho_{S,\min}) + 8\delta_{U,j}^2(\rho_{S,\max + \min}) \right) \leq 54 \sqrt{\sum_j p_j \delta_{U,j}^4(\rho_{S,\max}) + 54 \sqrt{\sum_j p_j \delta_{U,j}^4(\rho_{S,\min}) + 24 \sqrt{\sum_j p_j \delta_{U,j}^4(\rho_{S,\max + \min})}} \leq 132 \sqrt{2}\delta_U^2. \tag{S.39}$$

Substituting [S.39] into [S.34] and noting $\delta_U \leq ||[H_S, U_S]|/(64\|H_S||)$, we obtain our main result [11]:

$$||[H_S, U_S]|| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{132\sqrt{2}}}{63} \leq 64\delta_U\delta_{EQ} \leq 81\delta_U\delta_{EQ}. \tag{S.40}$$

\section*{JAYES-CUMMINGS MODEL}

We consider the Jayes-Cummings Hamiltonian

$$H = \epsilon \sigma_z + \lambda (\sigma_+ b + b^\dagger \sigma_-) + 2eb^\dagger b. \tag{S.41}$$

We derive the following time-dependent Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}_S(t)$ for the initial state $|\psi_{\text{ini}}\rangle = |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |\alpha\rangle$ with the limit of $\lambda \to +0$, keeping $\lambda \alpha$ constant:

$$\tilde{H}_S(t) = \epsilon \sigma_z + \lambda \alpha (\sigma_+ e^{-i2\epsilon t} + \sigma_- e^{i2\epsilon t}). \tag{S.42}$$

We start with the expression of the bosonic operator at time $t$ in the form

$$b(t) = e^{-2i\epsilon t} b - i\lambda \int_0^t ds \ e^{-2i\epsilon (t-s)} \sigma_-(s). \tag{S.43}$$

The equations of motion for the spin operators are given by

$$\frac{\partial \sigma_-}{\partial t} = -2i\epsilon \sigma_- + i\lambda \sigma_z b, \quad \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial t} = -2i\lambda (\sigma_+ b - b^\dagger \sigma_-). \tag{S.44}$$

By substituting Eq. (S.43) into these equations, we have

$$\frac{\partial \sigma_-}{\partial t} = -2i\epsilon \sigma_-(t) + i\lambda \left( e^{-2i\epsilon t} \sigma_z(t)b - i\lambda \int_0^t ds \ e^{-2i\epsilon (t-s)} \sigma_z(t) \sigma_-(s) \right), \tag{S.45}$$

$$\frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial t} = -2i\lambda \left( e^{-2i\epsilon t} \sigma_+(t)b - e^{-2i\epsilon t} b^\dagger \sigma_-(t) \right) - 2\lambda^2 \int_0^t ds \ e^{2i\epsilon (t-s)} \left\{ \sigma_+(s) \sigma_-(s) + \sigma_+(s) \sigma_-(s) \right\}. \tag{S.46}$$
Now, we consider the average over the initial state $|\psi_{ini}\rangle = |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |\alpha\rangle$. Noting the relation $b|\alpha\rangle = \alpha|\alpha\rangle$, we find the following expression:

$$\frac{\partial (\sigma_-)}{\partial t} = -2i \epsilon \langle \sigma_- (t) \rangle + i \lambda \alpha e^{-2i\epsilon t} \langle \sigma_z (t) \rangle + \lambda^2 \int_0^t ds \, e^{-2i\epsilon (t-s)} \langle \sigma_z (t) \sigma_- (s) \rangle,$$

$$\frac{\partial (\sigma_z)}{\partial t} = -2i \left( \lambda e^{-2i\epsilon \tau} \langle \sigma_+ (t) \rangle - e^{2i\epsilon \tau} \lambda^* \langle \sigma_- (t) \rangle \right) - 2\lambda^2 \int_0^t ds \, e^{2i\epsilon (t-s)} \left\{ \langle \sigma_+ (t) \sigma_- (s) \rangle + \langle \sigma_+ (s) \sigma_- (t) \rangle \right\}, \tag{S.48}$$

where $\langle \ldots \rangle = \langle \psi_{ini} | \ldots | \psi_{ini} \rangle$. Note here the following expression

$$\langle \sigma_a (t) \sigma_b (s) \rangle = \langle \psi_{ini} | U_i^\dagger \sigma_a U_i U_i^\dagger \sigma_b U_i | \psi_{ini} \rangle,$$

where $U_i$ is the time-evolution operator. Note that the time-evolution operator can be expanded as

$$U_i = e^{-iH_0 t} + e^{-iH_0 t} \int_0^t (\sigma_+ (u) \tilde{b} (u) + \tilde{b}^\dagger (u) \sigma_- (u)) + \cdots. \tag{S.50}$$

We used the interaction picture, i.e., $\tilde{A} (u) := e^{iH_0 u} A e^{-iH_0 u}$, where $H_0 := \epsilon \sigma_z + 2\epsilon \tilde{b} \tilde{b}^\dagger$. From the expressions (S.49) and (S.50), we recognize that the quantity $\langle \sigma_a (t) \sigma_b (s) \rangle$ is a function of $\alpha \lambda$.

Now, we impose the following condition

$$\lambda \rightarrow +0 \text{ with } \alpha \lambda = \text{constant} \tag{S.51}.$$

From Eqs. (S.47) and (S.48) as well as the observation that the quantity $\langle \sigma_a (t) \sigma_b (s) \rangle$ is a function of $\alpha \lambda$, this condition justifies the following approximation for the equations of motion for spin variables:

$$\frac{\partial (\sigma_-)}{\partial t} \sim -2i \epsilon \langle \sigma_- (t) \rangle + i \lambda \alpha e^{-2i\epsilon t} \langle \sigma_z (t) \rangle,$$

$$\frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial t} \sim -2i \left( \lambda e^{-2i\epsilon \tau} \langle \sigma_+ (t) \rangle - e^{2i\epsilon \tau} \lambda^* \langle \sigma_- (t) \rangle \right), \tag{S.53}$$

which is consistent with the description that has the desired time-dependent Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}_S (t)$. We assumed that the time-integration terms in Eqs. (S.47) and (S.48) never diverge. Note that the equations (S.52) and (S.53) are exactly derived from the effective Hamiltonian (S.42).

**RESULTS FOR THE CASES WHERE $[H_S + H_E, e^{-iH_\tau}] = 0$ DOES NOT HOLD**

In this letter, we assume $[H_S + H_E, e^{-iH_\tau}] = 0$ as the energy conservation law. This is the energy conservation excluding $H_{SE}$, and thus it does not hold in general. Therefore, in this section, we give generalized versions of our results which are valid for the case where $H_S + H_E$ energy conservation is not satisfied.

Let us remove the assumption $[H_S + H_E, e^{-iH_\tau}] = 0$ from our setup. (We do not make other changes. Therefore, we treat the time-independent $H_{SE}$. We can easily extend the results in this section to the case where $H_{SE}$ is time-dependent by substituting $U_{tot} = T \left[ \exp (-i \int_0^\tau H_S + H_E + H_{SE} (s) ds) \right]$ for $e^{-iH_\tau}$.) Then, we give the following inequalities with using $\chi := \|[H_S + H_E, e^{-iH_\tau}]\|$, which is an index of breaking of $H_S + H_E$ energy conservation:

**Theorem 2.**

$$\delta_E \delta_U \geq \frac{\|[U_S, H_S]\| - \chi}{40}, \tag{S.54}$$

$$\delta_EQ\delta_U \geq \frac{\|[U_S, H_S]\| - \chi}{81} \tag{S.55}$$

for $\delta_U < \frac{\|[U_S, H_S]\| - \chi}{128 \max \{\|[H_S]\|, |\chi|\}}$.

The quantity $\chi = \|[H_S + H_E, e^{-iH_\tau}]\|$ is the maximum change in the expectation value of $H_S + H_E$:

$$\|[H_S + H_E, e^{-iH_\tau}]\| = \max_\rho |\text{Tr} [(\rho - e^{-iH_\tau} \rho e^{iH_\tau}) (H_S + H_E)]|,$$
where \( \max_\rho \) is the maximization through \( \rho \) on the composite system \( SE \). Thus, we can interpret \( \chi \) as an indicator describing how the \( H_S + H_E \)-energy conservation breaks in the meaning of the expectation value. As we have pointed out in the main text, \( ||(U_S,H_S)|| \) is the maximum change of the expectation value of \( H_S \) caused by the desired unitary dynamics \( U_S \). Therefore, Theorem 2 means that our uncertainty relations are qualitatively valid as long as the maximum change in the expectation value of \( H_S + H_E \) is smaller than that of \( H_S \).

We show the above theorem with using the following lemma:

**Lemma 1.** The following inequalities hold:

\[
||U_S,H_S|| \leq \Delta + 4\sqrt{2}\delta^2 \parallel H_S \parallel + \chi, \quad \text{(S.57)}
\]

\[
\delta_E \leq \delta_E + 2 \max\{\parallel H_S \parallel, \chi\} \quad \text{(S.58)}
\]

The inequality (S.57) is the inequality (20) with \( \chi \) in righthand side. The inequality (S.58) is the inequality (21) whose \( ||H_S|| \) is substituted by \( 2\max\{\parallel H_S \parallel, \chi\} \). In the proof of Theorem 2, we will use (S.57) and (S.58) instead of (20) and (21).

**Proof.** We firstly show (S.57). We define

\[
\Delta^S_{\max} := \text{Tr}[H_S(\rho_{S,\max} - \rho'_{S,\max})],
\]

\[
\Delta^S_{\min} := \text{Tr}[H_S(\rho_{S,\min} - \rho'_{S,\min})],
\]

Then, clearly \( |\Delta^S_{\max} - \Delta^S_{\min}| \leq \Delta + \chi \). In the same manner as the derivation of (S.28), we obtain

\[
||H_S, U_S|| \leq |\Delta^S_{\max} - \Delta^S_{\min}| + 4\sqrt{2}\delta^2 \parallel H_S \parallel. \quad \text{(S.61)}
\]

Therefore, we obtain (S.57).

Next, we derive (S.58). We use the following important fact:

*Let us take an arbitrary positive operator \( A \) and arbitrary unitary \( U \). When \( ||[U,A]|| \leq \chi \) holds, the following inequality holds for an arbitrary state \( \rho \):

\[
|\delta^2_{U\dagger AU}(\rho) - \delta^2_{U\dagger AU}(\rho)| \leq \chi(2\delta_A(\rho) + \chi), \quad \text{(S.62)}
\]

where \( \delta_A(\rho) \) is the standard deviation of \( A \) in \( \rho \).

*Proof of (S.62):* Because of \( ||[A,U]|| = ||A - U\dagger AU|| \), the Hermitian \( X := A - U\dagger AU \) satisfies \( ||X|| \leq \chi \). With using \( X \), we can express \( \delta^2_{U\dagger AU}(\rho) \) as follows:

\[
\delta^2_{U\dagger AU}(\rho) = \langle (A - X)^2 \rangle_\rho - \langle A \rangle_\rho - \langle X \rangle_\rho
\]

\[
= \delta^2_A(\rho) + 2\text{Cov}_{A,X}(\rho) + \delta^2_X(\rho), \quad \text{(S.63)}
\]

where \( \text{Cov}_{A,X}(\rho) := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\rho (AX + XA)] - \langle A \rangle_\rho \langle X \rangle_\rho \). Because of \( \delta_X(\rho) \leq ||X|| \leq \chi \) and the quantum correlation coefficient is lower than or equal to 1, we obtain

\[
|\delta^2_{U\dagger AU}(\rho) - \delta^2_A(\rho)| \leq 2|\text{Cov}_{A,X}(\rho)| + \delta^2_X(\rho) \leq 2\delta_X(\rho)\delta_A(\rho) + \delta^2_A(\rho) \leq \chi(2\delta_A(\rho) + \chi). \quad \text{(S.64)}
\]

(Proof end)

Let us show (S.58). With using (S.62), we firstly show that the variances of \( H_S + H_E \) in the initial and the final states are very close to each other. The variance of \( H_S + H_E \) in the initial state is \( \delta^2_S(\rho_{S,\nu}) + \delta^2_E(\sigma_E) \), and corresponds to \( \delta_A(\rho) \) in (S.62). The variance of \( H_S + H_E \) in the final state is \( \delta^2_S(\rho'_{S,\nu}) + \delta^2_E(\sigma'_{E,\nu}) + 2\text{Cov}_{SE}(e^{-i\delta\tau}(\rho_{S,\nu} \otimes \sigma_E)e^{i\delta\tau}) \), and corresponds to \( \delta^2_{U\dagger AU}(\rho) \) in (S.62). Substituting \( H_S + H_E, e^{-i\delta\tau} \) and \( \rho_{S,\nu} \otimes \sigma_E \) for \( A, U \) and \( \rho \) of (S.62), we obtain

\[
\delta^2_S(\rho_{S,\nu}) + \delta^2_E(\sigma_E) \geq \delta^2_S(\rho'_{S,\nu}) + \delta^2_E(\sigma'_{E,\nu}) + 2\text{Cov}_{SE}(e^{-i\delta\tau}(\rho_{S,\nu} \otimes \sigma_E)e^{i\delta\tau}) - \chi(2\sqrt{\delta^2_S(\rho_{S,\nu}) + \delta^2_E(\sigma_E) + \chi}), \quad \text{(S.65)}
\]

where \( \delta_S(\rho) \) is the standard deviation of the energy in \( \rho \), and \( \text{Cov}_{SE}(\sigma) \) is the energy covariance of the state of \( \sigma \) on \( SE \). Because \( -\delta_S(\rho'_{S,\nu})\delta_E(\sigma'_{E,\nu}) \leq \text{Cov}_{SE}(e^{-i\delta\tau}(\rho_{S,\nu} \otimes \sigma_E)e^{i\delta\tau}) \) (this is a basic feature of the covariance) and \( \delta_S(\rho) \leq ||H_S||/2 \) for any \( \rho \), we obtain

\[
\delta_E(\sigma'_{E,\nu}) - \delta_S(\rho_{S,\nu}) \leq \sqrt{\delta^2_S(\rho_{S,\nu}) + \delta^2_E(\sigma'_{E,\nu}) - 2\delta_S(\rho_{S,\nu})\delta_E(\sigma'_{E,\nu})} \leq \sqrt{\delta^2_E(\sigma_E) + \delta^2_S(\rho_{S,\nu}) + \chi(2\sqrt{\delta^2_S(\rho_{S,\nu}) + \delta^2_E(\sigma_E) + \chi})} \leq \delta_E + 1.5\max\{||H_S||, \chi\}. \quad \text{(S.66)}
\]

Therefore, we obtain (S.58). 

\[ \square \]
Next, we prove Theorem 2.

Proof. We firstly show the inequality \((S.54)\). Note that the inequality \((22)\) is shown by combining \((15)\), \((16)\) and \((20)\). Because we do not use the assumption \([H_S + H_E, e^{-iH\tau}] = 0\) in the proofs of the inequalities \((15)\) and \((16)\), they are valid even when \([H_S + H_E, e^{-iH\tau}] \neq 0\). Thus, substituting \((S.57)\) for \((20)\) in the derivation of \((22)\), we obtain
\[
\delta U \delta E \geq \frac{\| [H_S, U_S] \| - \chi}{20}.
\] (S.67)

Combining \((S.58)\), \((S.67)\) and \(\delta U < \frac{\| [U_S, H_S] \| - \chi}{128 \max\{\| H_S \|, \chi\}}\), we obtain \((S.54)\).

Secondly, we show the inequality \((S.55)\). Note that the inequality \((11)\) is shown by combining \((S.34)\) and \((S.39)\). The inequality \((S.39)\) is derived from Theorem 1. Because we do not use the assumption \([H_S + H_E, e^{-iH\tau}] = 0\) in the proof of Theorem 1, the inequality \((S.39)\) is valid even when \([H_S + H_E, e^{-iH\tau}] \neq 0\). In the same manner as the derivation of \((S.34)\), we derive the following inequality by combining \((S.57)\), \((S.58)\), \((S.33)\), \(\Delta_j \leq \| H_S \| + \chi\) and \(\delta U \leq 1/128\):
\[
\| [H_S, U_S] \| - \chi \leq \sqrt{\sum_j p_j M_j^2 (2\delta EQ + 4 \max\{\| H_S \|, \chi\} + \chi) + \delta U \| H_S \|}.
\] (S.68)

Combining \((S.39)\) and \((S.68)\) and \(\delta U < \frac{\| [U_S, H_S] \| - \chi}{128 \max\{\| H_S \|, \chi\}}\), we obtain \((S.55)\).

\[\square\]

RESULTS WITH USING ENTANGLEMENT FIDELITY

As we have pointed out in the discussion in the main text, we can improve our inequality \((7)\) with using entanglement fidelity. In this section, we show the explicit expression of the improved inequality.

As the setup, we use the same one as the main text. (We can use the energy-nonpreserving setup used in the previous section. But for simplicity, we don’t use it here.) As the index of the degree of accuracy of approximating the desired unitary \(U_S\), we introduce the entanglement-Bures length:
\[
\delta_U e := \max_{\rho_S} L_e(\Lambda_S, U_S, \rho_S).
\] (S.69)

Here, \(\Lambda_S(\ldots) := \text{Tr}_E[\Lambda_{SE}(\ldots \otimes \sigma_E)]\) is the CPTP-map that describes the true dynamics of \(S\), and \(L_e(\Lambda_S, U_S, \rho)\) is the entanglement Brues length, which is defined by the entanglement fidelity \(F_e(\Lambda_S, U_S, \rho_S)\) \([19]\) as follows:
\[
L_e(\Lambda_S, U_S, \rho_S) := \arccos F_e(\Lambda_S, U_S, \rho_S),
\] (S.70)
\[
F_e(\Lambda_S, U_S, \rho_S) := \sqrt{\langle \psi | S_R (1_R \otimes \Lambda_{U_S}^* \circ \Lambda_S(\ket{\psi}_{SR} \langle \psi |_{SR})) | \psi \rangle_{SR}},
\] (S.71)

where \(R\) is a reference system, and \(\ket{\psi}_{SR}\) is the purification of \(\rho_S\) on \(SR\), and \(\Lambda_{U_S}^*(\rho) := U_S^\dagger \rho U_S\). The symbol \(a \circ b\) means that we successively perform the operation \(a\) after \(b\). Then, we obtain the relation:
\[
\delta_U e \delta_E \geq \frac{\| [H_S, U_S] \|}{8}
\] (S.72)
for \(\delta_U e \leq \frac{\| [H_S, U_S] \|}{16 \| H_S \|}\). The details will be reported elsewhere.