Quantum clocks are more accurate than classical ones
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A clock is, from an information-theoretic perspective, a system that emits time information. One may therefore ask whether the theory of information imposes any constraints on the maximum precision of clocks. We find that, indeed, the accuracy of the time information generated by a clock is fundamentally limited by the clock’s size or, more precisely, the dimension $d$ of its quantum-mechanical state space. Furthermore, compared to a classical clock, whose evolution is restricted to stochastic jumps between $d$ perfectly distinguishable classical states, a genuine quantum clock can achieve a quadratically improved accuracy.

I. INTRODUCTION

The definition of units of time is traditionally based on periodic processes, such as the moon cycle, the rotation of the earth, or the transition between two energy levels of an atom [1]. However, not any system with a periodically evolving state can serve as a clock. A necessary requirement to a clock, apart from having a time-dependent internal state, is hence that it also emits information about this state to the outside — a principle formalised in [2], and employed by the Quasi-Ideal Clock used for quantum control in [3], and the thermodynamic clock in [4].

This information-theoretic viewpoint points to an inherent limitation that any clock is subject to, and which can be seen as an instance of the “information-disturbance” tradeoff [5]. According to quantum theory, the transfer of information about the clock’s internal state to the outside will in general disturb the former. As an illustration, one may think of a mechanical clock, where the time information is represented by the clock’s hands. Modelled within quantum mechanics, the state of the clock’s hands would correspond to a wave packet well localised in position and momentum space — at least as long as the clock is in normal operating mode. But if, in an attempt to measure time very precisely, we observed the position of the clock’s hands too closely, we would necessarily spread the wave packet in momentum space [6]. This, in turn, would disrupt the dynamics of the clock, thus making any future time measurement less accurate.

The example also provides intuition for what makes an accurate clock. Clearly, if the clock’s hands are massive, reading off their position will not cause much disturbance to them. Conversely, if the clock’s state was just represented by the orientation of, say, a single molecule, even a moderately precise time measurement could alter it significantly. One would therefore expect that the maximum achievable accuracy of a clock is size-dependent — small clocks cannot be as accurate as large ones.

The size of a clock can in principle be quantified in many different ways, e.g., by its mass [7]. We take here an approach that is motivated by information theory and consider the size of its state space. This is measured in terms of the number, $d$, of perfectly distinguishable states the clock can be in, i.e., the dimension of the associated Hilbert space. In other words, a clock of size $d$ is a clock that could in principle store $\log_2 d$ bits of information in its internal state.

Continuing this information-theoretic description, it is useful to distinguish between two types of devices for measuring time: timepieces that output time information on request, like a stop watch, and clocks that output time information autonomously, like a chiming clock. They serve different purposes. Stop watches are used to measure a time interval between events triggered by external process (e.g., between the event that a train leaves the station at $A$ and the event that it arrives at $B$) [8]. Conversely, chiming clocks “generate” events themselves, which may then be used to trigger external events (e.g., that the train leaves the station at $A$).1

This work is concerned with the second type of time-keeping. Hence, from now on (and with the exception of the review of earlier work at the beginning of Section II) we use the term clock for devices that output time information

---

* M.W. and R.S. contributed equally to the results.
1 A chiming clock may of course also be used to measure a time interval: simply count how many ticks generated by the clock fit into the interval. However, such a use appears to be rather wasteful in terms of the time information that needs to be generated.
autonomously. Specifically, we take a clock to be a device that generates a sequence of individual events, which we call ticks. For the purpose of this discussion, we assume that the ticks are the only information output by the clock.

Ideally, one would like to quantify the accuracy of clocks in an operational manner, and in such a way that no absolute time reference is necessary. Such an operational measure has been introduced in [2]. The idea is most easily phrased in terms of the Alternate Ticks Game. Suppose you have two copies of a clock. The task is to initialise them such that they tick in alternating order as long as possible; the number $N$ of ticks during which this order is maintained is then a measure for the clock’s accuracy (see [2] for a discussion).

Unfortunately, the operational measure $N$ is rather difficult to analyse for general quantum clocks. But, clearly, a clock has a high accuracy $N$ if the time elapsed between any two subsequent ticks does not fluctuate too much. We may thus alternatively quantify accuracy by a value $R$, which, roughly, corresponds to the number of ticks that the clock can generate until it is off by a time interval that is as large as the time between two ticks, as was introduced for thermodynamic clocks in [4]. While, intuitively, $R$ is a good approximation for $N$ and vice versa, the precise relation between these two quantities is still an open question (see also the discussion section III A 4).

We use the term quantum clocks for a clock whose dynamics is not subject to any constraints other than those imposed by quantum theory. Their internal state can therefore be represented by a density operator in a $d$-dimensional Hilbert space, and the transition from the clock’s state at a time $t_1$ to its state at time $t_2$ corresponds to a trace-preserving completely positive map. We also consider the special case of classical clocks. Their state space is, by definition, restricted to a fixed set consisting of $d$ perfectly distinguishable states and their probabilistic mixtures — the “classical” states. In this case, a state transition from time $t_1$ to $t_2$ is most generally represented by a stochastic map.

Our main results are bounds on the accuracy $R$ of clocks depending on the clock’s size $d$. On the one hand, we prove that, for any fixed $\eta > 0$, there exist quantum clocks of large enough dimension whose accuracies scale as

$$R_{\text{quantum}} \geq \Omega(d^2 - \eta).$$

That is, quantum clocks can have an accuracy that grows essentially quadratically in the clock’s size for large $d$. We prove this statement by construction, showing that the so-called Quasi-Ideal Clocks proposed in [3] achieve this bound. On the other hand, we prove that the accuracy of any classical clock is upper bounded by

$$R_{\text{classical}} \leq d,$$

and show that a simple stochastic clock, previously studied in [9] in the context of the Alternate Ticks Game, saturates this bound. Combining Eqs. (1) and (2), we conclude that for large size $d$, quantum clocks outperform classical ones quadratically in terms of their accuracy $R$.

This result allows us to add a new item to the list of tasks with a quantum-over-classical advantage — the task of time-keeping. Other items on this list come from the areas of computation and metrology. For example, Grover’s quantum algorithm exhibits a quadratic speed-up compared to any classical algorithm for database search [10]. Similarly, the number of basic measurement steps required to determine an experimental parameter to a given precision drops like a square root if one uses quantum instead of classical methods [11]. However, despite the superficial similarities between these results, they are of a fundamentally different kind, for they refer to different resources. In computation, the relevant resource is the number of computational steps, and in the case of metrology, it is the number of basic measurement steps. In contrast, for the task of time keeping considered here, the relevant resource is the size of the clock.

---

2The word “clock” derives from the Medieval Latin “clocca”, which means “bell”. The hourly ringing of the bells may be regarded as an autonomous process.

3See however [9], that analyses $N$ for certain classical clocks.

4This is an exact correspondence for clocks whose ticks form an independent sequence, see Appendix E 2 a.

5A typical example is the measurement of a distance using laser interferometry, where the relevant resource is the energy of the beam or the number of photons that are involved in the measurement process. In this case one may regard the generation and detection of a single photon as a basic measurement step.

6In particular, we are not aware of a result that would allow us to obtain statements like Eqs. (1) and (2) from known bounds in quantum metrology; see Section III A 2 for more details.
II. MODELLING CLOCKS

To motivate our framework for describing clocks, we first have a look at existing models that have been considered in the literature and discuss their limitations. (An extensive review on prior literature regarding clocks and the general issue of time in quantum mechanics can be found in [13] [19].)

Pauli regarded an “ideal clock” as a device that has an observable \( T \) whose value is in one-to-one correspondence to the time parameter \( t \) in the quantum-mechanical equation of motion. The observable \( T \) would need to satisfy \( \frac{d}{dt} T = 1 \). Furthermore, since neither \( T \) nor the Hamiltonian of the system, \( H \), should depend on time explicitly, they would need to satisfy the commutation relation \( i[H, T] = 1 \).\(^7\) Pauli then argued that this implies that \( H \) has as its spectrum the full real line \([14]\). Since such Hamiltonians are unphysical, he concluded that an observable \( T \) with the desired properties, and hence an ideal clock, cannot exist \([15, 16]\).\(^8\) As such, these objects are referred to as Idealised Clocks.

This raises the question whether one can at least approximate an Idealised Clock. Salecker and Wigner \([7]\) and Peres \([17]\) considered finite-dimensional constructions. Specifically, they showed that for any dimension \( d \) and for any fixed time interval \( \Delta \) there exists a clock, which we will refer to as the SWP Clock, whose Hamiltonian satisfies

\[
\forall k \in \{0, \ldots, d-1\} : \quad e^{iH\Delta} |\vartheta_k\rangle = |\vartheta_{k+1} \pmod{d}\rangle
\]

where \( \{ |\vartheta_i\rangle \}_{i=0}^{d-1} \) is the SWP basis — an orthonormal basis of the clock’s Hilbert space. Hence, if the clock was initialised to state \( |\vartheta_0\rangle \) and if one did read the clock at a time \( t \in \{0, \Delta, 2\Delta, \ldots \} \) by applying a projective measurement with respect to the SWP basis, the outcome would be precise time information \( n \pmod{d} \). However, in between these particular points in time, the amplitudes of the basis states are in general all non-zero \([18]\). Hence, if the clock was measured, say, at \( t = \frac{5}{2}\Delta \), the outcome would be uncertain\(^9\). In addition, such a measurement would disturb the clock’s state, effectively resetting it to a random time. This problem was resolved in recent work by Woods, Silva, and Oppenheim, who introduced a clock, called the Quasi-Ideal Clock \([3]\), which is able to approximate the dynamical behaviour of Pauli’s Idealised Clock while maintaining a finite dimension.

The constructions from \([7, 17]\) do however not include a mechanism to output time information autonomously. Hence, to use the terminology introduced earlier, they are stop watches rather than chiming clocks. To extract time information from them, one would have to apply measurements from the outside. But then the outcome depends on when and how these measurements are performed. Thus, in order to reasonably talk about their accuracy — in terms of operationally motivated quantities such as \( N \) and \( R \) — we need a more complete description. The definition of quantum clocks, as outlined in the following section, accounts for this.

A. Quantum Clocks

The modelling of clocks that we use here follows the operational approach introduced in \([2]\) with some adjustments. A \( d \)-dimensional quantum clock consists of a (generally open) quantum system \( C \) whose evolution is assumed to be time-independent.\(^10\) The transition of a clock’s state \( \rho_{C,t} \) at some time \( t \) to its state \( \rho_{C,t+\Delta} \) at a later time \( t + \Delta \) can hence most generally be described by a trace-preserving completely positive map

\[
\mathcal{M}^\Delta_{C \to C} : \quad \rho_{C,t} \mapsto \rho_{C,t+\Delta},
\]

which depends on \( \Delta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) but not on \( t \in \mathbb{R} \). Note that these maps form a family parameterised by \( \Delta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \). For the particular choice \( \Delta = 0 \) it is the identity map,

\[
\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{C \to C} = \mathcal{I}_C.
\]

\(^7\)We set \( h = 1 \), so that \( \frac{1}{i}[H, T] = i[H, T] = 1 \).

\(^8\)We note that this conclusion has been challenged and it has been argued that the relation \( i[H, T] = 1 \) can be satisfied for Hamiltonians \( H \) with semi-bounded spectrum if one considers operators with restricted domains of definition (see \([14]\) for a discussion). Such restrictions however still correspond to unphysical assumptions, such as infinite potentials to keep a particle in a confined region.

\(^9\)At intermediate time intervals, the variance of the state w.r.t. the basis states \( |\vartheta_0\rangle \) is as much as \( \sqrt{2} \).

\(^{10}\)Since any realistic clock is subject to noise, i.e., environmental perturbations that may vary over time, this assumption is not usually met perfectly. But since our aim is to explore information-theoretic constraints on a clock’s accuracy, we work here under the assumption that the clock is shielded from time-dependent perturbations. In fact, perturbations with a known time-dependence would need to be counted as an additional resource from which the clock could extract time information.
Furthermore, the maps are mutually commutative under composition, i.e.,

\[ M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\Delta + \Delta'} = M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\Delta'} \circ M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\Delta} = M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\Delta} \circ M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\Delta'}, \]

for any \( \Delta, \Delta' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \). In other words, the evolution of \( C \) is determined by a one-parameter family of maps, \( \{M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\Delta}\}_{\Delta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \), and thus Markovian.

Assuming that the energy that drives the clock’s evolution is finite, we may additionally assume that the clock’s state changes at a finite speed. This means that the function \( \Delta \mapsto \{M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\Delta}\} \) is continuous. But, using Eqs. (3) and (4), this is in turn equivalent to the requirement that

\[ \lim_{\Delta \to 0} M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\Delta} = I_{C}, \]

which may be regarded as a strengthening of Eq. (3).

Since we assumed that the clock’s evolution is time-independent, its description in terms of the entire family \( \{M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\Delta}\} \), for \( \Delta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \), is highly redundant. Indeed, using Eq. (1) we may write\(^{11}\)

\[ M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\Delta} = \lim_{\delta \to 0} (M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\delta})^{\frac{\Delta}{\delta}} \]

It thus suffices to specify the evolution map for arbitrarily small time parameters, which we will in the following denote by \( \delta \). (The evolution is thus governed by the Lindblad equation, a fact that we will exploit in Section II B.)

The maps \( M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\delta} \) describe the evolution of the state on \( C \). But, as argued above, we are generally interested in the information that the clock transmits to the outside. This can be included in our description by virtue of extensions of the maps \( M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\delta} \). That is, we consider maps \( M_{C \rightarrow CT}^{\delta} \) whose target space is a composite system, consisting of \( C \) and an additional system \( T \), such that

\[ M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\delta} = \text{tr}_T \circ M_{C \rightarrow CT}^{\delta}. \]

We call \( T \) the tick register, alluding to the idea that the basic elements of information emitted by a clock are its “ticks” \(^{[2]}\).

After these general remarks, we are now ready to state the technical definition.

**Definition 1 (\(^{[2]}\)).** A (quantum) clock is a pair \((\rho_{C}^{0}, \{M_{C \rightarrow CT}^{\delta}\})\), consisting of a density operator \( \rho_{C}^{0} \) on a \( d \)-dimensional Hilbert space \( C \) together with a family of trace preserving and completely positive maps \( M_{C \rightarrow CT}^{\delta} \) from \( C \) to \( C \otimes T \), where \( T \) is an arbitrary system, such that the following limits exist and take on the value

\[ \lim_{\Delta \to 0} \lim_{\delta \to 0} (\text{tr}_T \circ M_{C \rightarrow CT}^{\delta})^{\frac{\Delta}{\delta}} = I_{C}. \]

Using Eq. (6), it is easy to see that any family of maps whose reduction to \( C \) satisfies Eqs. (4) and (5) also satisfies Eq. (8). The converse is however not necessarily true. Nevertheless, given a family of maps \( \{M_{C \rightarrow CT}^{\delta}\} \) as in Def. 1, one may always define a family of maps

\[ \{\bar{M}_{C \rightarrow C}^{\Delta}\}_{\Delta} = \left\{ \lim_{\delta \to 0} (\text{tr}_T \circ M_{C \rightarrow CT}^{\delta})^{\frac{\Delta}{\delta}} \right\}_{\Delta}, \]

which meet both Eqs. (4) and (5). In this sense, specifying a map that satisfies Eq. (8) is indeed sufficient to define the continuous and time-independent evolution of a clock.

The definition does not yet impose any constraints on the tick register, \( T \). Since we want to compare different clocks, it will however be convenient to assume that \( T \) contains two designated orthogonal states, \( |1\rangle \) and \( |0\rangle \), which we interpret as “tick” and “no tick”, respectively. The idea is that ticks are the most basic units of time information that a clock can emit. Roughly speaking, a tick indicates that a certain time interval has passed since the last tick.

---

\(^{11}\)We use here the notation \((M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\delta})^{k} = \underbrace{M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\delta} \circ \cdots \circ M_{C \rightarrow C}^{\delta}}_{k \text{ times}}\).
To know if the clock has ticked after the application of the map $\mathcal{M}_C^{\delta} \rightarrow CT$, one has to measure the tick register in the “tick” basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. In general, this represents an additional map on the clock and register, as Def. 1 allows for the tick register to be coherent in the tick basis, and even entangled with the clock system $C$. However, in this work we are only concerned with the probability distribution of ticks (as we characterise the performance of the clock from this alone), and so we incorporate the additional measurement into the map $\mathcal{M}_C^{\delta} \rightarrow CT$ itself. This is equivalent to requiring the map to restrict the state of the clock and tick register to be block-diagonal states in the basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$.\(^{12}\)

Furthermore we consider the behaviour of the tick register in the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$. In principle, the probability of a tick in this limit need not be zero. However, such a clock would correspond to one that has a probability of ticking on every application of the map $\mathcal{M}_C^{\delta} \rightarrow CT$ independent of the state of the clock system $C$, and thus does not provide any time information.\(^{13}\) Note that the times when the clock does not tick are equally necessary for synchronization with other clocks (see Fig. 1).

Following the above considerations, we continue with clocks whose maps $\mathcal{M}_C^{\delta} \rightarrow CT$ provide states on $CT$ that are diagonal in the tick basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$, and also satisfy the limit
\[
\text{tr}_C \left( \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{M}_C^{\delta} \rightarrow CT(\rho_C) \right) = |0\rangle\langle 0|_T. \tag{10}
\]

One may feel inclined to think of a clock whose “ticks” convey additional information, such as the number of previous ticks produced by the clock. For example, often a church bell will produce different chimes to specify the passing of different hours. To treat this within our model, one may think of a (classical) counter, which merely counts the number of tick registers in the state $|1\rangle$. This way, if a tick occurs, one can read the counter and discern the time. Clearly the counter does not need any additional timing devices to function. Importantly, since such a counter only interacts with the tick registers and not the clock, it does not directly affect the evolution of the clock system $C$.\(^{14}\)

This concludes our discussion of the generic model of clocks. Real life clocks may also be subject to additional constraints, such as unavoidable de-coherence or power constraints \(^{19},\, ^{4}\).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{clock.png}
\caption{Illustration of a clock. A clock produces a continuous stream of “no-tick”, “tick” information. The “no-ticks” represent the silence between ticks. Note that the silence between ticks is just as important as the ticks themselves for the functioning of a clock.}
\end{figure}

B. Representation in Terms of Generators

As explained above, the specification of the individual maps of the family $\{\mathcal{M}_C^{\delta} \rightarrow CT\}$ is redundant. The following lemma, which is basically a variant of the Lindblad representation theorem \(^{20}\), asserts that the family can equivalently be specified in terms of generators.

\textbf{Lemma 1.} Let $(\rho^0_C, \mathcal{M}_C \rightarrow CT)$ be a clock with a classical tick register, having as a basis the states $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. Then there exists a Hermitian operator $H$ as well as two families of orthogonal operators $\{L_j\}_{j=1}^m$ and $\{J_j\}_{j=1}^m$ on $C$ such

\(^{12}\)An ideal measurement of the register in the $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ basis will remove any coherence between $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$.
\(^{13}\)More precisely, we could express such a clock via the convex combination of two maps, one that does have a zero tick probability for $\delta \rightarrow 0$, and one that does not. The second one would provide no time information, and thus only worsen the performance of the clock.
\(^{14}\)The state of the counter is independent of $C$ given the tick registers.
that
\[
\mathcal{M}_{C\rightarrow CT}^{δ}(ρ_C) = ρ_C \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_T - δ \left( i[H, ρ] + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{1}{2} \{ L_j^\dagger L_j + J_j^\dagger J_j, ρ \} - L_j ρ L_j^\dagger \right) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_T + δ \sum_{j=1}^{m} J_j ρ J_j^\dagger \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_T
\]
(11)

\[ + F_{C\rightarrow CT}^{δ}(ρ_C), \]
for δ > 0, and where \( F_{C\rightarrow CT}^{δ} = O(δ^2) \). Conversely, given any Hermitian operator \( H \) and orthogonal families of operators \( \{L_j\}_{j=1}^{m} \) and \( \{J_j\}_{j=1}^{m} \) on \( C \), Eq. (11) defines a clock \( (ρ^0_C, \{\mathcal{M}_{C\rightarrow CT}^{δ}\}) \) with a classical tick register.

In the case of classical clocks with basis \( \{|c_n\}\), \( H \) is the zero operator and the operators \( L_j \) and \( J_j \) can all be chosen to be proportional to operators of the form \( |c_n⟩⟨c_n| \).

The proof of this Lemma, which is provided in Appendix A.1, follows the description in Section 3.5.2 of [21]. We call \( ρ^0_C \) the initial state of the clock. Furthermore, the operators \( J_j \) are called tick generators. While Eq. (11) does not define a dynamical semigroup \( CT \rightarrow CT \), one can do so quite simply via the map \( e^{δ L_{CT}}(\cdot) \), where the Lindbladian on the clock and register is
\[
L_{CT}(\cdot) = -i[H, (\cdot)] + \sum_{j} \sum_{a \in 0,1} \tilde{L}_{ja}(\cdot) \tilde{L}_{ja}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{\tilde{L}_{ja}^\dagger \tilde{L}_{ja}, (\cdot)\} + \sum_{j} \tilde{J}_j(\cdot) \tilde{J}_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{\tilde{J}_j^\dagger \tilde{J}_j, (\cdot)\},
\]
(12)
where the extended operators are \( \tilde{H} = H \otimes 1_T \), \( \tilde{L}_{j0} = L_j \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_T \), \( \tilde{L}_{j1} = L_j \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_T \), and \( \tilde{J}_j = J_j \otimes |1\rangle\langle 0|_T \). The clock map is then defined via
\[
\mathcal{M}_{C\rightarrow CT}^{δ}(ρ_C) = e^{δ L_{CT}}(ρ_C \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_T).
\]
(13)

The tick generators \( J_j \) determine when the clock ticks depending on its state, and they also define the clock’s state after a tick. Clocks for which this state coincides with the initial state \( ρ^0_C \) are of special interest, for they have a particularly appealing mathematical structure and are optimal in terms of their accuracy in the case of classical clocks.\(^{15}\)

**Definition 2.** A reset clock is a quantum clock \( (ρ^0_C, \{\mathcal{M}_{C\rightarrow CT}^{δ}\}) \) whose tick generators induce a mapping to the clock’s initial state\(^{16}\), i.e.,
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{m} J_j ρ J_j^\dagger \propto ρ^0_C \quad \forall ρ \in \mathcal{S}(HC).
\]
(14)

C. The continuous limit of clocks

One may also use the Lindbladian generators to describe the evolution of the clock system \( C \) as continuous, parametrised by a real variable \( t \). From Lemma 1, the following differential equation governs the evolution of the clock,
\[
\frac{d}{dt} ρ_C(t) = \lim_{δ \to 0} \frac{\text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{M}_{C\rightarrow CT}^{δ}(ρ_C(t)) \right] - ρ_C(t)}{δ} = -i[H, ρ_C(t)] + \sum_{j=1}^{m} L_j ρ_C(t) L_j^\dagger + J_j ρ_C(t) J_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_j^\dagger L_j + J_j^\dagger J_j, ρ_C(t)\}.
\]
(15)

For the tick register, one may take the same limit to find the probability density of a tick being recorded, via the probability that the register is in the state \( |1⟩ \),
\[
P(t) = \lim_{δ \to 0} \frac{\text{tr}_{CT} \left[ |1⟩⟨1|_T \mathcal{M}_{C\rightarrow CT}^{δ}(ρ_C(t)) \right]}{δ} = \text{tr}_C \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{m} J_j ρ_C(t) J_j^\dagger \right].
\]
(16)

\(^{15}\)We expect the same is true for quantum clocks, although a proof has not yet been constructed.

\(^{16}\)More generally, the tick generators induce a mapping to some fixed state, but there is very little loss of generality setting the initial state to be the same, since only the first tick of the clock is affected, every subsequent tick behaves as if the initial state is the fixed state.
This limit and the sequence of ticks is discussed in more detail in Section 111.

Furthermore, consider the case of a clock in which one focuses on a single tick, and tracks the state of the clock only up to the first tick. In this case one can remove the “tick” channel $\sum_{j=1}^m J_j \rho_C J_j^\dagger$ from the Lindbladian of the clock in Eq. (15), as it represents the state of the clock after a tick (see Lemma 1). Thus the description of the entire family of tick generators $\{J_j\}_{j=1}^m$ is redundant. Labelling the state of the clock for just a single tick as $\rho_C^{(1)}$, its dynamics are given by (taking Eq. (15) with the tick channel removed)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \rho_C^{(1)}(t) = -i[H, \rho_C^{(1)}(t)] - \{V, \rho_C^{(1)}(t)\} + \sum_{j=1}^m L_j \rho_C^{(1)}(t) L_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_j^\dagger L_j, \rho_C^{(1)}(t)\},$$

where

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m J_j J_j^\dagger$$

is an arbitrary positive operator representing the ticking dynamics of the clock. In this case, the probability density of the first tick being recorded is, from Eq. (16)

$$P^{(1)}(t) = \text{tr}_C \left[ 2V \rho_C^{(1)}(t) \right].$$

This proves handy in the case of reset clocks. As we discuss later, the ticks of a reset clock are a sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables, and thus the first tick suffices to characterise such a clock.

D. Example

When describing a clock, one may want to distinguish between the intrinsic evolution of the state of the “clockwork” and the mechanism that transfers information about this state to the outside. A rather generic way to do this is to describe the evolution of the clock by a Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_C$ on the system $C$, and the transfer of information to the outside by a continuous measurement of the system’s state with respect to a fixed basis $\{|t_i\rangle\}_{i=0}^{d-1}$, which we will refer to as the time basis. In order to ensure that the measurement does not disturb the clock’s state too much, the coupling between clockwork and measurement mechanism must be weak. We quantify it in the following by assigning a coupling parameter $V_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ to each of the elements $|t_i\rangle$ of the time basis and consider a reset clock (Def. 2). We could then define a quantum clock $\{|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|, \{M_{C\rightarrow CT}^{\delta}\}_{\delta}\}$ with initial state $|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|$ and maps

$$M_{C\rightarrow CT}^{\delta}: \rho_C \mapsto e^{-i\delta \hat{H}_C} M_0^\delta \rho_C M_0^\delta \dagger e^{i\delta \hat{H}_C} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} e^{-i\delta \hat{H}_C} M_{1,j}^\delta \rho_C M_{1,j}^\delta \dagger e^{i\delta \hat{H}_C} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|$$

where $M_{1,j}^\delta = \sqrt{2\delta V_j} |\psi_0\rangle\langle t_j|$ and $M_0^\delta = \sqrt{1 - 2\delta V_C}$ with $V_C = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} V_i |t_i\rangle\langle t_i|$.

For sufficiently small $\delta$, the quantities $\{M_{1,j}^\delta, M_{1,j}^\delta \dagger\}_{j=1}^{d-1}$ together with $M_0^\delta \dagger M_0^\delta$ form a positive-operator valued measure (POVM), since

$$M_0^\delta \dagger M_0^\delta + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} M_{i,1}^\delta \dagger M_{i,1}^\delta = \mathbb{1}_C - 2\delta \hat{V}_C + 2\delta \hat{V}_C.$$

As such, one can interpret Eq. (20), in the following light. The initial state of the clock $\rho_C$ is measured via the POVMs, followed by allowing the clock to freely evolve according to its internal Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_C$ for an infinitesimal time step $\delta$ and repeating the process. In accordance with Eq. (20) one would then associate the outcome “no-tick” with the POVM element $M_{0,0}^\delta \dagger M_0^\delta$ and the “tick” outcome with the elements $\{M_{1,i}^\delta \dagger M_{1,i}^\delta\}_{i=1}^{d-1}$. Since the POVM defines a measurement with classical outcome, one may regard the tick as a classical value, i.e., the tick register could be assumed to be classical in this case.

Furthermore, by expanding in $\delta$, Eq. (20) can be written in the form

$$M_{C\rightarrow CT}^{\delta}: \rho_C \mapsto \rho_C \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| - \delta \left( \mathcal{L}[\hat{H}_C, \rho] + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{2} \{J_j^\dagger J_j, \rho\} \right) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + \delta \sum_{j=1}^m J_j \rho J_j^\dagger \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| + O(\delta^2),$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}[\hat{H}_C, \rho] = \frac{d}{dt} \rho - i[H, \rho] - \{V, \rho\} - \sum_{j=1}^m L_j \rho L_j^\dagger.$$
where we have defined $J_j = \sqrt{2V_j} |\psi_0\rangle\langle t_j|$. With the further identifications $H = \hat{H}_C$, and $(L_j)_{j=1}^m$, with the set of zero operators, we see that Eq. (21) is in the form prescribed by Lemma (6). This ensures that the map $M_{C\rightarrow CT}^\delta$ is indeed a clock, according to our definition (8). Consequently, it is easily verified that the $J_j$ operators satisfy Eq. (14) and the clock is thus a reset clock. It also follows from Section II C that in the continuous limit of clocks, the probability of not getting a “tick” in the time interval $[0,t]$ followed by a tick in the interval time $t,t+\delta t$ is

$$\delta t P^{(1)}(t) = \delta t \text{tr}_C \left[ 2V\rho^{(1)}_C(t) \right] = \delta t \text{tr}_C \left[ 2\hat{V}_C\rho^{(1)}_C(t) \right],$$

where $\rho^{(1)}_C(t) = |\tilde{\psi}_t\rangle\langle \tilde{\psi}_t|$, with

$$|\tilde{\psi}_t\rangle = e^{-it\hat{H}_C} |\psi_0\rangle.$$

E. Classical Clocks as a Special Case

Roughly speaking, a classical clock may be regarded as a clock that satisfies Def. (1), but whose state space is restricted to classical states. These are defined relative to a fixed orthonormal basis, $\{|c_k\rangle\}_{k=0}^{d-1}$, of the Hilbert space $C$ of the clock as

$$C_{\{|c_k\rangle\}} = \{\rho_C = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_i |c_i\rangle\langle c_i| : p_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_i = 1\}.$$

Definition 3. A clock $(\rho^0, \{M^\delta_{C\rightarrow CT}\})$ is called classical if there exists a basis $\{|c_k\rangle\}_k$ (called the classical basis) such that

$$\rho^0 \in C_{\{|c_k\rangle\}} \quad \text{and} \quad M^\delta_{C\rightarrow CT}(C_{\{|c_k\rangle\}}) \subseteq C_{\{|c_k\rangle\}}$$

for any $\delta \geq 0$.

With this definition at hand, we find that the clock generators take on a particularly simple form, namely:

Corollary 1. Let $(\rho^0, \{M_{C\rightarrow CT}\})$ be a classical clock with basis $\{|c_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^d$ and suppose that the tick register has basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. Then there exist $d \times d$-matrices $N$ and $T$ such that

$$M_{C\rightarrow CT}^\delta(\rho_C) = \rho_C \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + \delta \sum_{m,n} (c_m |\rho_C| c_m \langle c_n| \rho_C | c_n\rangle \otimes (N_{mn} |0\rangle\langle 0|_T + T_{mn} |1\rangle\langle 1|_T) + O(\delta^2),$$

with

$$\sum_{n=1}^d N_{nm} = \sum_{n=1}^d T_{nm} = 0.$$

for any $m$ and

$$N_{nm} \begin{cases} \leq 0 & \text{for } n = m \\ \geq 0 & \text{for } n \neq m \end{cases}$$

$$T_{nm} \geq 0.$$

for any $m,n$.

See Appendix A 2 for a proof of this corollary.

In the case of quantum clocks, we defined an alternative description in terms of the Lindbladian generators rather than the maps (Section II C). We can do the same for classical clocks, by taking the limit $\delta \to 0$. However, in this

\[\text{Eq. (24) will be relaxed in the appendix by replacing the "=" sign with "\leq". By doing so, we prove that our results for classical clocks hold under more general circumstances. The example of the maximally accurate classical clock in Section C 1 satisfies Eq. (23).}\]
case, since the state is always diagonal w.r.t. a fixed orthonormal basis, we only require the dynamics of the diagonal elements, which are seen to be

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle c_n | \rho_C(t) | c_n \rangle = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{\langle c_n | \text{tr}_T \circ M^\delta_{C \to CT}(\rho_C(t)) - \rho_C(t) | c_n \rangle}{\delta} = \sum_{m=1}^{d} N_{mn} \langle c_m | \rho_C(t) | c_m \rangle + \sum_{m=1}^{d} T_{mn} \langle c_m | \rho_C(t) | c_m \rangle,$$

and the probability density of a tick being recorded becomes

$$P(t) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{\text{tr}_{CT} \left[ |1\rangle \langle 1|_T \cdot M^\delta_{C \to CT}(\rho_C(t)) \right]}{\delta} = \sum_{n=1}^{d} \sum_{m=1}^{d} T_{mn} \langle c_m | \rho_C(t) | c_m \rangle.$$

A simpler description of the above is to label by $v_C(t)$, the vector of diagonal elements of $\rho_C(t)$. W.r.t. $v_C(t)$, the dynamics and tick density take on the simple form of a vector differential equation,

$$\frac{d}{dt} v_C(t) = (N + T) v_C(t),$$

$$P(t) = ||T v_C(t)||_1,$$

where $||\cdot||_1$ is the vector 1-norm, which here is the same as the sum of the elements, as both $T$ and $v_C$ are element-wise non-negative.

## F. Accuracy of Clocks

The ticks of a clock may be regarded as the most basic time information it produces, in the sense that any other time information generated by the clock could be obtained simply by a counting of ticks. We will therefore use the regularity of the ticks output by a clock as a measure for its accuracy. As described in the introduction, this could be quantified operationally, and without reference to an external time parameter, by the Alternate Ticks Game [2]. However, since an analytical study of this measure appears to be rather involved, we consider a closely related measure of accuracy, which we term $R$. We will now introduce definitions that allow us to express this quantity formally in terms of the clock maps.

A clock (Def. 1) after $N$ applications of the map $M^\delta_{C \to CT}$ gives rise to a probability distribution $P^\delta_{\text{tick}}(\{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_k\})$ of $k \leq N$ ticks occurring; the 1st of which at time $\tau_1$, the 2nd at time $\tau_2$, etc. Here we will be interested in the closure of this distribution, corresponding to the limit $\delta \to 0$ which gives rise to a probability density of ticks, such as in Eq. [16]. Formally, we have the following definition.

**Definition 4.** The tick pattern $(T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ of a clock $(\rho_0, \{M^\delta_{C \to CT}\})$ is a sequence of random variables $T_j$ over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ whose marginal probability density $P_{T_1 \ldots T_k}$, for any $k$, satisfies

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_k} \cdots \int_{t_1}^{t_k} dt_1 \cdots dt_k \cdot P_{T_1 \ldots T_k}(t_1, \ldots, t_k) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \sum_{\tau_1=0}^{\lfloor \delta \rfloor} \sum_{\tau_2=\lfloor \delta \rfloor}^{\lfloor \delta \rfloor} \cdots \sum_{\tau_k=\lfloor \delta \rfloor}^{\lfloor \delta \rfloor} P^\delta_{\text{tick}}(\{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_k\})$$

where, for any $\delta$ and for any subset $\theta$ of $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$,

$$P^\delta_{\text{tick}}(\theta) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \text{tr} \left[ (M^\delta_{C \to CT})^N (\rho_0) (1_C \otimes \pi_{1 \in \theta} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{N \in \theta}) \right],$$

with $\pi_{r \in \theta} = |1\rangle |1\rangle$ if $r \in \theta$ and $\pi_{r \in \theta} = |0\rangle |0\rangle$ otherwise.

The value of the random variable $T_j$, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, can thus be interpreted as the time of the $j$th tick. Accordingly, $P_{T_1 \ldots T_k}(t_1, \ldots, t_k) dt_1 \cdots dt_k$ is the probability that the first tick occurs in the interval $[t_1, t_1 + dt_1)$, the second in the interval $[t_2, t_2 + dt_2)$, and so on. Such probability densities are known as delay functions. In particular, $P_{T_1 \ldots T_k}(t_1, \ldots, t_k)$ can only be non-zero for $t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_k$.

The expected time distance $\mu_j$ between the $j$th and the $(j+1)th$ tick as well as the variance $\sigma^2_j$ are then given by

$$\mu_j = \langle T_j \rangle = \int_0^\infty dt_j P_{T_j}(t_j) t_j,$$

$$\sigma^2_j = \langle T_j^2 \rangle = \int_0^\infty dt_j P_{T_j}(t_j) t_j^2,$$
for any \( j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \). \( P_{T_j}(t_j) \) is the delay function associated with the \( j \)th tick. Based on these quantities, we can now define the clock accuracies \( R_j \). Note that this is different from the clock accuracy \( R \), which will be defined below for the particular case of reset clocks.

**Definition 5.** The clock accuracies \((R_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}\) of a clock \((\rho_0, \{M^{\rho_0}_{\text{C} \to \text{CT}}\})\) is a sequence of real numbers, where the \( j \)th element \( R_j \) is the accuracy of the \( j \)th tick,

\[
R_j = \frac{\mu_j^2}{\sigma_j^2}.
\]

We will use this definition to define a partial ordering of clocks. For any two clocks \( A \) and \( B \), with clock accuracies \((R^A_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}\) and \((R^B_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}\) respectively, we will say that \( A \) is more accurate than \( B \) if every tick of \( A \) is more accurate than the corresponding tick of \( B \), i.e., iff \( R^A_j > R^B_j \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \). It is this definition that we refer to when we later prove that quantum clocks are more accurate than classical ones.

The characterisation of clocks provided by definition 5 has a number of nice properties. Firstly, it is scale invariant, meaning that the values \( R_j \) are invariant under the mapping \( t \to t/a \), for constants \( a > 0 \). In other words, it is a measure of the accuracy of each tick, and is not affected by whether these ticks took place over a short or long time scale. Physically, this means that for every clock with accuracies \((R_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}\), and mean tick times \( \mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \ldots \), there is another clock with the same accuracy, but with the ticks occurring on average at times \( a\mu_1, a\mu_2, a\mu_3, \ldots \). The new clock is constructed from the old clock by mapping \( t \to t/a \), which is equivalent to rescaling the generators \( \{L_j\}_{j=1}^m \), \( \{J_j\}_{j=1}^m \) and the Hamiltonian \( H \), introduced in Lemma 1 by constant factors.

Furthermore, we can now appreciate the simplicity of reset clocks (Def. 2). Since every time such a clock produces a tick, it is reset to its initial state, the ticks represent a sequence of independent events, which are identically distributed. It thus follows that the delay function of the \( j \)th tick, \( P_{T_j}(t_j) \), is the convolution of the delay function associated with the 1st tick \( P_{T_1}(t_1) \), with itself \( j \) times. This in turn, gives rise to a simple relationship between the accuracies \((R_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}\) of reset clocks, (see appendix B 1 a and Remark 6 for a detailed argument)

\[
R_j = jR_1,
\]

and takes on a particularly satisfactory interpretation. Namely, the accuracy of the 1st tick \( R_1 \), is the number of ticks the clock generates (on average), before the next tick has a standard deviation equal to the mean time between ticks, \( \mu_1 \). As such, roughly speaking, the clock’s useful lifetime is \( \mu_1 R_1 \), beyond which one can no-longer distinguish between subsequent ticks. To compare two reset clocks, it follows that one only needs to compare their \( R_1 \) values. Given the special significance of \( R_1 \), we will sometimes simply refer to it as \( R \).

A similar interpretation is also possible for the \( R_j \) value of later ticks. For the purpose of illustration, suppose that the mean time between ticks, \( \mu_1 \) is one second. Then \( R_{60} \) corresponds to the number of minutes (on average) that the clock can generate until the tick corresponding to the next minute has a standard deviation equal to the mean time between ticks, \( \mu_1 \). As such, while according to Eq. (29), \( R_{60} \) is 60 times larger than \( R_1 \), this is not to say that “the 60th tick is more accurate than the 1st tick.”

### III. FUNDAMENTAL LIMITATIONS FOR CLASSICAL AND QUANTUM CLOCKS

In this section, we will state our findings and explain their relevance and connection to related fields. There are two main theorems. The following one, which is about limitations on classical clocks, and Theorem 2 which shows how quantum clocks can outperform classical clocks.

**Theorem 1** (Upper bound for classical clocks). For every \( d \)-dimensional classical clock, the clock accuracies \((R_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}\) satisfy

\[
R_j \leq j d
\]

for all \( d \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \). Furthermore, for every dimension \( d \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \), there exists a reset clock whose accuracies \((R_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}\) saturate the bound Eq. (30),

\[
R_j = j d.
\]

*Proof.* See Section 5 for a proof of the above inequalities and Section C 1 for an explicit construction of an optimal \( d \)-dimensional reset clock which saturates bound Eq. (30). This clock is further discussed in Fig. 3 a).
FIG. 2: Comparison of the distribution of three clocks at time $0 < t < t_{\text{tick}}$. 

**a)** An optimal $d$-dimensional classical clock. 

**b)** Pauli’s Idealised Quantum Clock. 

**c)** The Quasi-Ideal Quantum Clock. In a nutshell, the purpose of these figures, is to highlight how classical clocks disperse more than quantum clocks, and that Idealised Clocks do not disperse at all. Intuitively, this is why quantum clocks can be more accurate than classical ones.

**a)** The $d$-dimensional probability vector $V_0(t) \in \mathcal{P}_d$ associated with the clock having not ticked, starts off at $t = 0$ with certainty at the 1st site, $V_0(0) = e_1$ (red plot). Its mean $\mu(t)$ then moves with uniform velocity towards the right with a standard deviation $\sigma(t)$ increasing with $\sqrt{t}$ (orange plot). The tick generator $T$, is chosen so that the clock can only “tick” from the last site, $e_d$ and the clock is re-set (blue plot). This clock, whose full details are reserved for the appendix C, will “tick” once it has reached the site $n = d$, at which point it will have dispersed considerably, and as such, its accuracy is limited to $R_1 = d$. Furthermore, since it is a reset clock, later ticks are optimally accurate, $R_j = jd$.

**b)** The Idealised Clock of Pauli starts with an arbitrarily highly peaked wave-function at position $x = 0$ (red plot). It then moves according to $\psi(t, x) = \psi(0, x - t)$; towards $x = x_{\text{tick}}$ (orange plot). At all times, its standard deviation is a constant $\epsilon > 0$, which can be chosen to be arbitrarily small. It is not disturbed at all by time measurements, and “ticks” exactly at time $t_{\text{tick}} = x_{\text{tick}}$ (blue plot), resulting in perfect accuracy $R_1 = \infty$. Furthermore, one can add additional Dirac-delta distributions to the potential centred around $2x_{\text{tick}}, 3x_{\text{tick}}, \ldots$ without effecting the standard deviation of the Idealised Clock. This results in perfect accuracy for all later ticks; $R_2 = R_3 = \ldots = \infty$.

**c)** The Quasi-Ideal Clock starts in a distribution in the time basis which is highly peaked around $|\vartheta_0\rangle$, resulting in a small standard deviation $\delta_0$ in the time basis (red plot). The amplitudes of its distribution shift/move in time towards a large concentration around $|\vartheta_{d-1}\rangle$, where a “tick” is measured with high probability and the clock is reset (blue plot). During the time intervals between ticks, unlike the Idealised Clock b), this clock will disperse; but less than the classical clock in a) due to quantum interference. This results in a small standard deviation $\sigma(t)$ than in a) (orange plot). Furthermore, it will also be disturbed by time measurements, causing further unwanted dispersion. However, there is a trade-off — the smaller the standard deviation of the initial state, the more precise initial time measurements will be, but the larger the dispersion due to dynamics and measurements will be too, making later time measurements less reliable. Even still, due to quantum constructive/destructive interference, quantum mechanics allows for a $d$-dimensional state to disperse less as it travels to where a tick has the highest probability of occurring, than an optimal $d$ dimensional classical clock, such as in a). As such, this quantum clock can surpass the classical bound; see Theorem 2.

While the proof is a bit involved, there is an intuitive explanation to why reset clocks are optimal. If the clock is reset to its initial state after the 1st tick, then one can simply choose the initial state and dynamical map which has the highest possible accuracy for the 1st tick. Intuitively, the only way a non-reset clock could have a superior accuracy for later ticks than this one, would be for one to adjust the mean time of the following tick in the sequence to be longer or shorter than the previous one to make up for any lost or gained time due to the previous tick being “early” or “late”. However, determining whether the clock ticked too early or late would require an additional clock, which is not available within the model.

The optimal reset clocks which saturate the bound in Eq. (30) provide insight into our results. For these classical
clock examples, the clock starts at one end of a length \( d \) nearest neighbour chain, with the tick generator’s support region located at the other end. The clock dynamics produce a classical continuous biased random walk along this chain, see Fig. 2a) for details. The error in telling the time is a consequence of the state dispersing as it travels along the chain. Indeed, for these clocks, the standard result from random walk theory which predicts that the standard deviation in a state is proportional to the square root of the distance travelled, approximately holds. This dispersive behaviour achieves \( R_1 = d \) in the optimal case.

Before making a comparison with the quantum clocks described in this manuscript, it is illustrative to compare this result with a recent clock in the literature, 4. Here a quantum clock is powered by two thermal baths, at different temperatures. This temperature difference drives a classical random walk of an atomic particle up a \( d \)-dimensional ladder, which spontaneously decays back to the initial state when reaching the top of the ladder, emitting a “tick” in the decay process. As such, it is a reset clock whose accuracy \( R_1 \) depends on the entropy generated by the clock. Interestingly, in the limit of weak coupling and vanishing frequency of ticks, it is found 4 that clock dynamics becomes classical, represented by a biased random walk up the ladder. The accuracy of the clock is then

\[
R \approx d \left( \frac{p_1 - p_k}{p_1 + p_k} \right) \approx d \left( \frac{e^{\Delta S/d} - 1}{e^{\Delta S/d} + 1} \right) \tag{32}
\]

where \( p_1, p_k \) are the probabilities of moving up/down the ladder, induced by the thermal baths, and \( \Delta S \) is the entropy generated by the clock for each instance that it ticks. As such, as far as the criterion of dimensionality is concerned, this classical thermodynamic clock is always less accurate than the optimal classical clock in Theorem 1 by a constant factor, and only approaches optimal accuracy in the limit of infinite entropy generation \( \Delta S \to \infty \).

On the other hand, we can also compare the classical clock in Fig. 2a) with the behaviour of the Idealised Clock of Pauli, introduced in Section II. Here the clock Hamiltonian is the generator of translations, and it is not disturbed by continuous measurements, thus leading to no dispersion, and a clock accuracy of \( R_1 = \infty \), see Fig. 2b). Of course, as previously discussed, this high accuracy is unfortunately an artefact of requiring infinite energy.

The important question is whether one can do better than the classical clock, and achieve higher accuracy with a quantum clock. We will now show that this is indeed possible. To start with, the Quasi-Ideal Clock introduced in Section II is formed by taking a complex Gaussian amplitude superposition of the SWP clocks, namely

\[
|\Psi_{\text{Quasi-Ideal}} \rangle := \sum_{k \in S_d(0)} A e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 (k-k_0)^2} e^{i2\pi n_0(k-k_0)/d} |\vartheta_k \rangle , \tag{33}
\]

where \( S_d(0) \) is a set of \( d \) consecutive integers centred about \( k_0 \in \mathbb{R} \), \( n_0 \in (0,d) \) determines the mean energy of the clock state and \( \sigma_0 \) its width in the \(|\vartheta_k \rangle \) basis. Its clock Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_C \) is the 1st \( d \)-levels of a quantum harmonic oscillator with level spacing \( \omega \): \( \hat{H}_C = \sum_{n=0}^{d-1} n\omega \langle E_n|E_n \rangle \). The dynamics of the clock according to the total Hamiltonian \( \hat{H} = \hat{H}_C + \hat{V}_C \), where \( \hat{V}_C = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} V_i |\vartheta_i \rangle \langle \vartheta_i | \) with, \(|\vartheta_i \rangle \rangle \) the complementary basis to \(|\vartheta_i \rangle \rangle \). Of course, this high accuracy is unfortunately an artefact of requiring infinite energy.

Due to constructive/destructive quantum interference in the complex Gaussian amplitude tails in Eq. 33, the Quasi-Ideal Clock is able to mimic approximately the dynamical behaviour of the Idealised Clock, while maintaining finite energy and dimension 5, see Fig. 2c). The following theorem shows that the Quasi-Ideal Clock can exceed the classically permitted bound.

**Theorem 2.** Consider Quasi-Ideal Clocks 3 with \( n_0 = (d-1)/2 \) and \(|\vartheta_i \rangle \rangle \) and the setup described in Section II D. For all fixed constants \( 0 < \eta \leq 1 \), and \( \sigma_0 \) bounded by \( d^{\eta/2} \leq \sigma_0 < d \), there exists \( \hat{V}_C \) such that the Quasi-Ideal Clock’s accuracy satisfies

\[
R_1 \geq \frac{d^2 - \eta}{\sigma_0^2} + o \left( \frac{d^2 - \eta}{\sigma_0^2} \right) , \tag{34}
\]

in the large \( d \) limit, where we have used little-o notation. Furthermore, since it is a reset clock; the accuracies \( (R_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N} \geq 0} \) of later ticks satisfy

\[
R_j = j R_1 , \tag{35}
\]
for all \( j, d \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \).

**Proof.** See Section F. The main difficulty of the proof is to come up with a potential \( \hat{V}_C \) which satisfies all the necessary properties — if its derivatives are too large, the clock dynamics are too disturbed by the continuous measurements, yet if they are not large enough, the measurements will not capture enough time information from the clock. ■

In Section F we give an explicit construction of \( \hat{V}_C \) and a slightly more general version of the theorem. When the complex Gaussian amplitudes in the superposition are highly peaked in the time basis, namely \( \sigma_0 = \frac{d \eta}{2} \), the clock will have an accuracy of effectively order \( d^2 \) while for Quasi-Ideal Clocks whose width in the time and energy basis are the same, namely when \( \sigma_0 = \sqrt{d} \); \( R_1 \) is only of order \( d \), saturating the bound of the optimal classical clock.

**A. Discussion of the Quantum Bound: relationship to related fields and open problems**

In this section, we discuss the relationship of the quantum bound to other concepts and fields which have been associated with time and clocks in quantum mechanics in the past. We finalise the section with a discussion of some open problems.

**FIG. 3:** Comparison of the Quasi-Ideal and SWP Clocks. a) Standard deviations in the time basis as a function of time. b) \( R_1 \) as a function of clock dimension \( d \).

**a)** Standard deviation of clock states in the time basis \( \Delta C(t) \) for different clocks as a function of time \( t \), when time evolved according to their clock Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_C = \sum_{n=0}^{d-1} \omega_n |E_n\rangle\langle E_n| \). Time runs from zero to one clock period \( T_0 = 1 \) with clock dimension \( d = 13 \). Initial states are: Quasi-Ideal Clock states for \( \sigma_0 = \sqrt{d} \approx 3.61 \) (orange), \( \sigma_0 = 1.8 \) (blue), and a SWP state (green).

**b)** Numerical optimization of \( R_1 \) for the Quasi-Ideal Quantum Clock (Red data points) and SWP quantum clock (Blue data points) for a set of potentials. Both Quasi-Ideal and SWP achieve \( R_1 = 4 \) for \( d = 2 \), however, for large dimensions, the Quasi-Ideal Clock achieves higher accuracy. Red and Orange solid lines \( (R_1 = d^2 \text{ and } R_1 = d \text{ respectively}) \) are guides to the eye which represent the lower asymptotic bound for the Quasi-Ideal Clock and the upper bounds for the optimal classical clock respectively. C.F. Theorems 2, 1.

**1. Time-energy uncertainty relation**

The time–energy uncertainty relation,

\[
\Delta t \Delta E \geq \frac{1}{2},
\]  

(36)

has been a controversial concept ever since its conception during the early days of quantum theory, with Bohr, Heisenberg, Pauli and Schrödinger giving it different interpretations and meanings. It still remains a controversial issue to this day, and multiple interpretations have been found [22, 23]. Often, at the heart of the controversy, is that in quantum mechanics, as explained in the introduction Section [4], time is usually associated with a parameter, rather than an operator.

Since in the present context, we do have operators for time, a lot of this controversy can be circumvented. Indeed, Peres introduced a time operator, \( \hat{t}_c := \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} (T_0/d) k | \partial_k \rangle \langle \partial_k | \), where \( T_0 = 2\pi/\omega \) is the period of the clock Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_C \) [17]. In [3] it was shown that the standard deviation of the initial clock state Eq. 33 saturates a time-energy
uncertainty relation: $\Delta E \Delta t = 1/2$,\(^{18}\) where the standard deviations $\Delta t$, $\Delta E$ are calculated using the operators $\hat{t}_c$ and $\hat{H}_C$, respectively. One may be inclined to believe that one can increase the accuracy of the clock, by decreasing $\Delta t$ as a consequence of a larger $\Delta E$. While indeed decreasing $\sigma_0$ does have this effect, it would be na"ive to believe this paints the full picture.

To study this effect as the clock moves around the clock-face, let $\Delta E(t)$ be the standard deviation of the clock coefficients de-phased in the energy basis, $\{\langle E_n|\rho_C(t)|E_n\rangle\}_{n=0}^{d-1}$. We will define the standard deviation in the time basis similarly, but here one has to be careful since the time basis has circular boundary conditions, meaning $|\theta_d\rangle = |\theta_{d+1}\rangle$. Consequently, the state will “jump” from the state $|\theta_{d-1}\rangle$ to $|\theta_0\rangle$ as it completes on period of its motion. We are not interested in the jumps due to the boundary effects, and therefore will denote $\Delta C$ in the energy basis, but here one has to be careful since the time basis has circular boundary conditions replaced with open boundaries\(^{19}\).

This way, we mimic the hands of a real clock, which visually do not suddenly “jump” at 12 O’clock. The quantity $\Delta C(t)$ is plotted for the Quasi-Ideal Clock and SWP clocks in Fig. a)\(^{20}\).

Firstly, if $\sigma_0$ is too small, the clock will disperse too much due to its dynamics and time measurements. Secondly, another way to decrease $\Delta t$ and increase $\Delta E$, is via reducing $T_0$, yet this has no effect on the accuracy of the clock. This latter observation is also related to how our measure of accuracy $R_1$, is invariant under a re-scaling of time, as discussed in Section I. In other words, for the lower bound in Eq. 34 to exceed the classically permitted value of $d$, the clock uncertainty in the time basis $\Delta t$, must be smaller than the uncertainty in the energy basis $\Delta E$ during the time in which the clock is running. In Fig. 3 a), the orange plot has $\Delta C(t) \approx \Delta E(t) \approx \sqrt{1/2}$. This is suboptimal, since the POVMs used to measure ticks are diagonal in the time basis $\{|\theta_k\rangle\}$. Furthermore, the blue curve has a smaller $\Delta C(t)$, and according to Theorem 2 can achieve $R_1 > d$. However, if we continue to choose initial clock states with smaller $\Delta C(0)$, we run into a problem, namely in the limit $\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0^+$, we recover the SWP clock state (green), which has a very large $\Delta C(t)$ at later times.

Another interesting aspect regarding time and energy, is what is the internal energy of the clock. We can easily answer this question for the Quasi-Ideal Clock. Note that for $\nu_0 = (d-1)/2$, the mean energy of the Quasi-Ideal Clock is $\omega d/2 + o(d)$, thus Theorem 2 implies that high accuracy can be achieved with a modest linear increase in internal energy.

2. Quantum metrology

Metrology is the science of measuring unknown parameters. Here, like in other areas of quantum science, it has been shown that allowing for quantum effects can vastly improve the precision of measurements in comparison with the optimal classical protocols. Quantum metrology is now a mature discipline with a vast literature\(^{21}\); and as such, it is appropriate to compare our results about clocks with them.

The basic setup in metrology is as follows. When attempting to measure an unknown parameter in a physical system, we prepare a probe state, let it evolve, and finally measure the evolved system. The evolution stage is according to the unitary operator $U_x := e^{-i x \hat{H}}$, where $\hat{H}$ is a known Hamiltonian. Since the physical mechanism which governs the dynamics is known, we can deduce the value of the unknown parameter $x$ by comparing the input and output states of the probe. Furthermore, by repeating the experiment $N$ times, and taking the average value for $x$, we can reduce the uncertainty in our measurements. According to this framework, the total error satisfies $\delta x \geq 1/\sqrt{N(\lambda_M - \lambda_m)}$, where $\lambda_M, \lambda_m$ are the maximum and minimum eigenvalues of $\hat{H}$ respectively, and equality is achievable. This is also in accordance with the central limit theorem which predicts the same scaling with the number of copies. Furthermore, even if we prepared the $N$ copies of the input probe at once; run the $N$ experiments in parallel, and allow them to become classically correlated (separable), this result still holds. However, if the input copies of the probe are entangled, the total error can decrease more quickly with the number of copies, namely

$$\delta x \geq 1/[N(\lambda_M - \lambda_m)], \quad (37)$$

Equality is achievable even when one is only allowed to make local quantum measurements, rather than global measurements on all $N$ output probe states. This is known as the Heisenberg limit and is a fundamental upper bound

---

\(^{18}\)The saturation of the bound $\Delta E \Delta t = 1/2$ by the Quasi-Ideal Clock, is up to an additive correction term which decays faster than any polynomial in $d$.

\(^{19}\)When the population $\langle \theta_k|\rho_C(t)|\theta_k\rangle$ reaches the position $d - 1$, rather than subsequently appearing at position 0, it will be assigned to position $d$, and subsequently to position $d + 1$, etc.
to the possible reduction of error in metrology. Indeed, even this parallel metrology protocol cannot be improved upon by more general so-called *sequential (or multi-round)* strategies. As demonstrated in [25], such strategies also satisfy the bound [37].

One could of course use metrology to measure time. So for the point of comparison, imagine one took $N$ copies of a fixed $D$ dimensional re-set clock with a total dimension of $d = D^N$. These are entangled and then evolved according to local Hamiltonians. as discussed in Section II F, $R_1$ is invariant under a rescaling of the continuous parameter $t$. Therefore, we can choose $a$ so that the average time at which the 1st tick occurs is unity; $\mu_1 = 1$, without changing the accuracy, such that $R_1 = 1/\sigma_1^2$. If one naively associated the standard deviation of when the 1st tick occurred; $\sigma_1$, to $\delta \hat{x}$, quantum metrology would suggest $R_1 \propto N^2 = \log_2 d$ is the best scaling with $d$ that could be achieved. However, Theorem 2 states that $R_1$ proportional to $d^2$ is effectively achievable for the Quasi-Ideal Clock of the same overall dimension $d$. This large discrepancy is not so surprising since our clock protocol is less constrained than the metrology protocol in that we do not constrain the clock initial state to an entangled copy structure, and the Hamiltonian (the 1st $d$ levels of a Harmonic oscillator), is not a direct sum of local Hamiltonians. One may suspect that the discrepancy between the naive metrological scaling and the actual scaling of the clock, is due to the eigenstate degeneracy of the total Hamiltonian used in metrology, $\hat{H}^\otimes N$. Yet this is not the case since the degeneracy of the Hamiltonian is irrelevant in metrology. Indeed, if one were to replace $\hat{H}^\otimes N$ with a non-degenerate Hamiltonian $\hat{H}(N)$ with the same number of eigenvectors, and whose maximum and minimum eigenvectors are also $N\lambda_M$, $N\lambda_m$ respectively; then bound Eq. (37) still holds.

Another important difference is that the initial probe state that saturates the bound of Eq. (37) is $|\psi(0)^{\otimes N}\rangle = \left( |\lambda_M^{\otimes N} + |\lambda_m^{\otimes N}\right)$, which is the state which maximises the uncertainty in the energy basis. Due to the time-energy uncertainty relation Eq. (36), this allows the state to achieve a small uncertainty in time. However, while good quantum clocks require low uncertainty in the time basis, other properties such as their resilience to the back-action of the continuous measurements is crucial, while in metrology the states are usually only measured once, and thus the back-action on the states is therefore irrelevant.

We have already pointed out some differences between our clock results and what one might naively expect from metrology. We will now explain what is perhaps the most important difference of all. For the purpose of illustration, imagine you were told to perform a particular task after 5 seconds. If you had a clock you could wait for 5 ticks to pass according to it, and perform your designated task. However, in the case of the metrology set-up one can only estimate the time when one happened to measure the probe. As discussed in Section 11, this marks an important division between time keeping devices, and those based on the standard metrology set-ups described here, fall into the category of stop watches and not clocks, according to our definitions.

3. Quantum speed limit

The quantum speed limit, $\tau_{\text{QSL}}$ is the minimum time $t_{\text{QSL}}$ required for a state $|\psi(0)\rangle$ to become orthogonal to itself, $\langle \psi(0)|\psi(t_{\text{QSL}})\rangle = 0$ under unitary time evolution, $|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-i\hat{H}t} |\psi(0)\rangle$. The celebrated Margolus-Levitin and Mandelstam-Tamm bounds, impose a tight lower limit in terms of the mean and standard deviation of $\hat{H}$ w.r.t. the initial state $|\psi(0)\rangle$ [26]. It has found many applications in the field of thermodynamics, metrology, and the study of the rate at which information can be transmitted from a quantum system to an external observer [27, 28].

One may also be inclined to think that the fundamental limitations on the accuracy of clocks is related to how quickly the initial clock state becomes perfectly distinguishable to itself, when measured by an external observer. Indeed, the quicker states become distinguishable, the faster one can extract timing information from the clock state. Unfortunately, a simple example will reveal how the situation of a clock is too subtle to be captured by such simple arguments. The quantum speed limit $t_{\text{QSL}}$ of the SWP clock is precisely $T_0/d = 2\pi/(\omega d)$, since the states satisfy $e^{-i\hat{H}C\tau_0/d} |\varphi_k\rangle = |\varphi_{k+1}\rangle$. On the other hand, the Quasi-Ideal Clock has a quantum speed limit of much larger than $T_0$. Yet, as described in Fig. 3 b), numerics predict that while the SWP clock has a higher accuracy than the optimal classical clock, it is less accurate than the Quasi-Ideal Clock. The explanation of this is that, contrary to the Quasi-Ideal Clock, the SWP clock — at the expense of a shorter quantum speed limit time — becomes highly spread-out in the time basis for times in-between becoming orthogonal to itself; thus incurring large $\Delta C(t)$ during these times [see green plot in Fig. 3 a)]. In summary, the quantum speed limit only tells us about how long it takes for a clock state to become distinguishable to itself, but fails to quantify the behaviour in-between. Since a clock has to produce a continuous stream of “tick”, “no-tick” information, the nature of dynamics of the clock at all times is of high importance.
4. Directly related open problems

There are many open questions regarding the nature of time and clocks in quantum mechanics. Two questions directly relating to this work are:

1) The relationship between the clock accuracy measure $R$ (used here) and the measure $N$ defined by the Alternate Ticks Game [2]. On an intuitive level, we expect them to have a similar value for the same clock. This would be compatible with a result in [9], where a scaling of $N \propto d$ is proven for a certain class of classical clocks. Indeed, there are results from ongoing work [29] that suggest an explicit connection between $R$ and $N$.

2) Here we have shown that the Quasi-Ideal Clock [3] achieves an accuracy of essentially $R = \Theta(d^2)$. We expect that these clocks are optimal for large $d$, but it would be interesting to prove that quantum mechanics does not permit more accurate clocks.

IV. CONCLUSION

The clock is one of the oldest inventions of mankind, dating back millennia to ancient civilisations where they provided a means to organise society. Advancements in clocks aided revolutionary capabilities such as maritime navigation, and the industrial revolution by permitting necessary timing on the railroads. Today, highly accurate atomic clocks are so sophisticated that they need to measure unimaginably small energy shifts within individual atoms; and now require a quantum-mechanical description to understand how they work. Just like pendulum clocks aided the industrial revolution, the next generation atomic clocks will be part of a new technological age, brought on by devices harnessing the power of quantum mechanics in a new quantum technology revolution. These technologies include faster telecommunications, non-satellite based GPS equivalences, powerful scanners, in addition to fundamental physics applications, such as improved sensitivity of gravitational wave detectors.

A clock can be understood as a subtle interplay between two themes; measurement and dynamics — measure the time marked by the clock too strongly, and its dynamics will be very disturbed, adversely affecting later measurements of time. Yet measure too weakly, and you will not gain much information about time at all. Larger dimension allows the clock to carry more bits (quantum or classical) of information about time (e.g. can distinguish between more seconds), and for less measurement disturbance. Furthermore, the optimal state for minimising measurement disturbance, may possess a suboptimal dynamical evolution for distinguishing between different times — this poses another trade-off. Finding the optimal clock under measurements and dynamics is a deep and highly mathematically challenging problem.

Yet given the real-life importance of clocks, it is worth asking some very natural and valuable questions: What are the fundamental limitations to this progress? Will we hit a fundamental limit which is unsurpassable? Are quantum clocks more accurate than classical ones? Astonishing as it might seem, while the nature of time is an age-old problem for physicists and philosophers alike, we still did not know the answers to these basic questions. In this manuscript, we have proven that there are fundamental limits to time keeping as a function of the size $d$ of the clock. What is more, we have proven that quantum clocks (in particular the Quasi-Ideal Clocks) can outperform their classical counterparts, by proving that they have an accuracy of essentially $d^2$ and $d$ respectively; where the accuracy $R$ is a number between one (clock that never ticks) and infinity (clock that ticks forever with zero error). This means that any classical clock of dimension $d$ may be replaced by a quantum clock of dimension $\sqrt{d}$ that achieves the same accuracy.

A quantum-over-classical advantage characterised quantitatively by a square root is known for other tasks, in particular database search (where Grover’s algorithm provides an advantage over any classical algorithm) or quantum metrology (where joint measurements provide an advantage over individual measurements). We stress however that these results are all of a different kind. In the case of database search, the relevant quantity is the number of blackbox accesses to the database. In the case of metrology, it is the number of systems that are measured. Here, in the case of clocks, the relevant quantity is the size of the clock. Perhaps even more importantly, the time keeping devices that one typically encounters in metrology, can only predict the time when they happened to be measured; and thus are more akin to stop watches than clocks, which emit a periodic time reference.

Traditionally, quantum metrology and concepts such as the time-energy uncertainty relation, and quantum speed limits; have been associated with characterising how precisely different physical processes involving time can be carried-out. Here we see that while these concepts have a role to play, a more discerning feature between the accuracy of classical and quantum clocks is how continuous-time quantum walks, under the right circumstances, allow for
a smaller spread in the mean distribution, compared to classical standard walks which are limited to a standard deviation which is proportional to the square root of the mean distance travelled.

In light of the focus of most of today’s research on the often conflicting goals of making clocks smaller, more portable, more energy efficient, more accurate, and more reliable; our results, while perhaps unpractical, do present fundamental limitations to this process of minimization and improved accuracy of clocks. In this sense, our results are to present-day clock theory what Carnot’s results\textsuperscript{20} are to heat engine theory — fundamental limitations which, while impractical to achieve in the real world, are nevertheless of importance as a guiding principle.
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Appendix A: Modelling of Clocks

1. Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Consider an operator-sum representation of the map $\mathcal{M}_{C \rightarrow CT}^\delta$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{M}_{C \rightarrow CT}^\delta(\rho_C) = \sum_{j=0}^m M_j \rho_C M_j^\dagger \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_T + \sum_{j=1}^n N_j \rho_C N_j^\dagger \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|_T, \quad (A1)$$

where $\{M_j\}_{j=0}^m$ and $\{N_j\}_{j=1}^n$ are families of operators on $C$. We will assume without loss of generality that the labelling of the operators $M_j$ is such that $\|M_0\| \geq \|M_j\|$ for any $j \neq 0$. Define furthermore Hermitian operators $H$ and $K$ such that

$$K - iH = \frac{1}{\delta}(M_0 - 1) \quad (A2)$$

and

$$L_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} M_j, \quad J_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} N_j. \quad (A3)$$

Furthermore, we can assume without loss of generality that $n = m$. The operators $M_j$ and $N_j$ can be chosen such that $K$, $H$, $L_j$ and $J_j$ are independent of $\delta$ w.l.o.g., which one can prove as follows. From Eq. (A1) it follows that

$$\mathcal{M}_{C \rightarrow C}^\delta(\rho_C) = \sum_{j=0}^m M_j \rho_C M_j^\dagger + \sum_{j=1}^n N_j \rho_C N_j^\dagger. \quad (A4)$$

Given the defining properties stated in Section [II A], Lindblad proved \cite{20} that the map $\mathcal{M}_{C \rightarrow C}^\delta(\rho_C)$ can be written as a Lindbladian with semi-group parameter $\delta$. By Taylor expanding the generic expression for $\mathcal{M}_{C \rightarrow C}^\delta(\rho_C)$ when expressed in Lindblad form to 1st order in $\delta$, and equating 0th and 1st order terms with the R.H.S. of (A4), the dependency on $\delta$ in Eqs. (A2), (A3) follows.

Eq. (A1) then reads

$$\mathcal{M}_{C \rightarrow CT}^\delta(\rho_C) = (1_C + \delta K - \delta iH) \rho_C (1_C + \delta K + \delta iH) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_T + \sum_{j=1}^m \delta L_j \rho_C L_j^\dagger \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_T + \sum_{j=1}^n \delta J_j \rho_C J_j^\dagger \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|_T. \quad \text{(A5)}$$

We then have to first order in $\delta$

$$\mathcal{M}_{C \rightarrow CT}^\delta(\rho_C) = \rho_C \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_T + \delta \left(\{K, \rho\} - i[H, \rho]\right) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0| + \delta \sum_{j=1}^m \left(L_j \rho_C L_j^\dagger \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_T + J_j \rho_C J_j^\dagger \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|_T\right) + O(\delta^2). \quad \text{(A6)}$$

The requirement that $\mathcal{M}_{C \rightarrow CT}^\delta$ be trace-preserving furthermore implies that

$$(1_C + \delta K - \delta iH)(1_C + \delta K + \delta iH) + \delta \sum_{j=1}^m \left(L_j^\dagger L_j + J_j^\dagger J_j\right) = 1_C. \quad \text{(A7)}$$

Hence, again to first order in $\delta$, we have

$$2\delta K = -\delta \sum_{j=1}^m \left(L_j^\dagger L_j - J_j^\dagger J_j\right) + O(\delta^2). \quad \text{(A8)}$$

\footnote{For the axiomatic definitions of a dynamical semi-group see Definition 2 in \cite{20}. In \cite{20}, Lindblad states these conditions on the adjoint map, which is equivalent to the conditions stated here since the clock is finite dimensional.}
Inserting this into the above yields the claim.

Finally, to prove the converse part of the Lemma, we first note that for any Hermitian operator $H$ and families of orthogonal operators $\{L_j\}_{j=1}^m, \{J_j\}_{j=1}^m$ from $\mathcal{H}_C$ to $\mathcal{H}_C$, the reduced map $M^\delta_{C\to C}()$ in Eq. (11) takes on the following form

$$M^\delta_{C\to C}() = \text{tr}_T \circ M^\delta_{C\to CT}() = e^{\delta \mathcal{L}}() + O(\delta^2),$$  
(A5)

with the Lindbladian

$$\mathcal{L}(\cdot) = -\left(i[H,()] + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{2}(L_j^j L_j + J_j^j J_j) - L_j() J_j^j \right) + \sum_{j=1}^m J_j() J_j^j.$$  
(A6)

We thus have

$$\lim_{\Delta \to 0} \lim_{\delta \to 0} (\text{tr}_T \circ M^\delta_{C\to CT})\left|_{\Delta=\delta} \right. = \lim_{\Delta \to 0} \lim_{\delta \to 0} (e^{\delta \mathcal{L}} + O(\delta^2))\left|_{\Delta=\delta} \right. = \lim_{\Delta \to 0} \lim_{\delta \to 0} \left( e^{\mathcal{L}} + O(|\Delta/\delta|^2) \right) = \lim_{\Omega \to 0} e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{I}_C,$$  
(A7)

thus proving that the map $M^\delta_{C\to CT}()$ satisfies Eq. (8) in Def. 1 and thus is a clock. 

\[\blacksquare\]

2. Proof of Corollary 1

Proof. Let $L_j$ and $J_j$ be the operators defined by Lemma 1 and set

$$N_{nm} = -\delta_{n,m} \langle c_n | (L_j^j L_j + J_j^j J_j) | c_n \rangle + \sum_j \langle c_n | L_j | c_m \rangle |^2,$$

$$T_{nm} = \sum_j \langle c_n | J_j | c_m \rangle |^2.$$  

It is then straightforward to verify the claimed expression for the map. Furthermore, for any $m \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^d (N_{nm} + T_{nm}) = -\langle c_m | (L_j^j L_j + J_j^j J_j) | c_n \rangle + \sum_{j,m} \langle c_m | L_j^j | c_n \rangle \langle c_n | L_j | c_n \rangle \langle c_n | J_j | c_m \rangle = 0,$$

which proves (24). The non-negativity conditions for $N_{nm}$ (for $n \neq m$) and $T_{nm}$ (for any $n, m$) hold trivially. Together with (24) they also imply that $N_{nm} \leq 0$ for $n = m$.  

\[\blacksquare\]

Appendix B: Delay functions, accuracy, and i.i.d sequences

The appendix is structured as follows. In B1 we define a delay function, that characterises the probability distribution, w.r.t. time, of when an event occurs. This will eventually be applied to the ticks of the clock. We define the moments of the delay function, and introduce the accuracy $R$. We discuss the special case of a convolution of delay functions and the scaling of the accuracy in this case (Remark 6). Finally, in B2 we prove a number of important lemmas concerning the accuracy, including one for sequences (i.e. convolutions) of delay functions (Lemma 2) and another for mixtures (Lemma 4).

1. Delay functions: Definition, and behaviour of the accuracy

Definition 6. By a delay function, we refer to a non-negative integrable function of time $t \geq 0$, $\tau : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$, that is normalised or sub-normalised,

$$\int_0^{\infty} \tau(t)dt = Q \leq 1.$$  
(B1)
Definition 7. We define the **mean (first moment)**, **second moment**, and **variance** of a delay function with respect to the normalized version of the delay function. That is, given a delay function $\tau(t)$ that integrates to $Q$ (see Eq. [B1]), the moments are calculated from $\tau(t)/Q$ which is a normalised probability distribution,

\[
Q = \langle t^0 \rangle = \int_0^\infty \tau(t)dt, \tag{B2a}
\]
\[
\mu = \langle t^1 \rangle = \int_0^\infty t \frac{\tau(t)}{Q} dt, \tag{B2b}
\]
\[
\chi = \langle t^2 \rangle = \int_0^\infty t^2 \frac{\tau(t)}{Q} dt, \tag{B2c}
\]

while the variance, denoted by $\sigma$, is defined in the usual manner,

\[
\sigma = \sqrt{\chi - \mu^2}. \tag{B3}
\]

**Remark 1.** Note that the first and second moments may diverge.

Definition 8. The accuracy of a delay function $\tau(t)$ is defined by

\[
R[\tau] = \frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}, \tag{B4}
\]

if the first moment $\mu$ of the delay function is finite, and $R = 0$ if it diverges.

For simplicity of expression, we will often omit the functional notation $R[\cdot]$, referring to the accuracy by simply $R$, augmented with a subscript or superscript when necessary.

**Remark 2.** This definition is discussed in the main text (Section II F), in the context of sequences of independent events all described by the same delay function. There we see that the ratio above is the average number of events before the uncertainty in the occurrence of the next event equals the average interval between events. For a discussion of the same, see Appendix E 2 a.

**Remark 3.** There are delay functions of arguably high precision, whose accuracy is not reflected well by $R (\mathbb{R})$. Consider, for example, the following pathological delay functions parametrised by $\epsilon > 0$,

\[
\tau(t) = (1 - \epsilon) \delta(t - 1) + \epsilon \delta(t - 1/\epsilon^2), \tag{B5}
\]

where $\delta(x)$ is the Dirac-Delta function. This delay function corresponds to a large probability of an event occurring at precisely $t = 1$, and a small probability $\epsilon$ of the event occurring much later, at $t = 1/\epsilon^2$. For small $\epsilon$, the accuracy $R$ is of the order of $\epsilon$, and goes to zero in the limit $\epsilon \to 0$, even though the limiting delay function, $\delta(t - 1)$, is very accurate. Other notions of accuracy, such as the operational number of alternate ticks “$N$” [2] may be better suited to characterize these types of delay functions. The precise relationship between $R$ and $N$ is dealt with in detail in [29] (from which this delay function is sourced).

**Remark 4 (The accuracy and $\gamma$-value).** The accuracy can alternatively be expressed as

\[
R = \frac{1}{\mu^2 - 1} = \frac{1}{\gamma - 1}, \quad \text{where} \quad \gamma = \frac{\chi}{\mu^2}. \tag{B6}
\]

$\gamma$ has been introduced because it is usually easier to deal with than $R$, being the ratio between two moments of the delay function. Note that the relationship is bijective, and inverted (the smaller $\gamma$ is, the higher the value of $R$). The range of the accuracy is $R \in [0, \infty)$, corresponding to $\gamma \in (1, \infty)$.

**Remark 5 (The accuracy is invariant under re-normalisation).** As the accuracy $R$ is defined via the first and second moments of the normalised version of the delay function, changing the normalisation of $\tau(t)$ by multiplying it by a positive constant does not affect $R$.

---

22Pathological in the sense that such a function cannot be generated by the dynamics of finite-dimensional systems of bounded energy.
Consider an arbitrary sequence of delay functions \( \{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^M \). Then the following convolution of a subsequence

\[
\tau^{(m)}(t) = \int_0^t dt_{m-1} \int \cdots \int dt_2 \int dt_1 \tau_1(t_1) \tau_2(t_2 - t_1) \cdots \tau_m(t - t_{m-1})
\]

\[= (\tau_1 \ast \tau_2 \ast \cdots \ast \tau_m)(t), \quad \text{(B7a)}
\]

where \( \ast \) denotes convolution, is also a delay function. To see this, note that the integrand above is always non-negative, and thus \( \tau^{(m)} \) is also non-negative. Furthermore, one may calculate, by direct integration, that the moments of \( \tau^{(m)} \) are given by

\[
Q^{(m)}(t) = (t^0) = \prod_{i=1}^m Q_i,
\]

where \( Q_i = \int_0^\infty \tau_i(t) dt \),

\[
\mu^{(m)} = \frac{(t^1)}{Q^{(m)}} = \sum_{i=0}^m \mu_i,
\]

and \( \chi^{(m)} = \frac{(t^2)}{Q^{(m)}} = \left( \sum_{i=0}^m \chi_i + \sum_{i,j=0, i \neq j}^m \mu_i \mu_j \right) \),

where \( \chi_i = \int_0^\infty t^2 \tau_i(t) dt \).

Since each \( Q_i \) is within \([0, 1] \), it follows that \( Q^{(m)} \) is as well, and thus \( \tau^{(m)} \) is a delay function (see Def. 6). Note that \( \{\mu^{(m)}, \chi^{(m)}\} \) refer to the moments of the normalized version of the delay function (see Def. 7), and are finite if and only if every one of the corresponding moments of the individual delay functions do not diverge.

**Remark 6.** A convolution of delay functions describes the case of a sequence of independent distributed events, and in the particular case of clocks, corresponds to reset clocks, those that go to a fixed state after ticking. In this case, each tick of the clock has an identical delay function w.r.t. the previous tick, (all of the \( \tau_i \) are the same and equal to \( \tau_1 \)) and one can use Eq. B8 to calculate the moments, and thus the accuracy of the \( m \)th tick,

\[
Q^{(m)} = Q_1^m
\]

\[
\mu^{(m)} = m \mu_1
\]

\[
\chi^{(m)} = m \chi + m(m-1)\mu^2
\]

\[
\sigma^{(m)} = \sqrt{m} \sigma_1
\]

from which we find that the accuracy \( R^{(m)} = m R_1 \).

2. **Lemmas on the accuracy of sequences, mixtures, and scaled delay functions**

**Lemma 2** (The accuracy of a convolution of delay functions is limited by the sum of the accuracies). If a delay function \( \tau^{(m)} \) is formed out of the convolution of a sequence of delay functions as in Eq. B7 then its accuracy \( R[\tau^{(m)}] \) (Def. 8) is upper bounded by the sum of the accuracies of the individual delay functions that form the sequence, i.e.

\[
R[\tau^{(m)}] \leq \sum_{i=1}^m R_i,
\]

where \( R_i \) is the accuracy of the \( i \)th delay function \( \tau_i \) in the sequence. Furthermore, this optimal accuracy is achieved if and only if the individual delay functions satisfy

\[
\frac{\mu_i}{R_i} = \frac{\mu_j}{R_j} \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, 2, ..., m\},
\]

or equivalently, that they satisfy

\[
\frac{\sigma_i^2}{\mu_i} = \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\mu_j} \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, 2, ..., m\},
\]

where \( \mu_i \) and \( \sigma_i \) are the mean and variance of the \( i \)th delay function, Eq. B8.
Proof. We prove the lemma by induction. Consider that we express the delay function of the convolution as

$$
\tau^{(m)} = \tau^{(m-1)} * \tau_m,
$$

(B16)

where $$\tau^{(m-1)} = \tau_1 * \tau_2 * ... \tau_{m-1}.$$ (B17)

Calculating the moments of $$\tau^{(m)}$$ w.r.t. the above subdivision, via Eq. [B8] we get

$$
\mu^{(m)} = \mu^{(m-1)} + \mu_m, \quad (B18)
$$

$$
\chi^{(m)} = \chi^{(m-1)} + \chi_m + 2\mu^{(m-1)}\mu_m
$$

(B19)

$$
= \left( \frac{1}{R^{(m-1)}} + 1 \right) [\mu^{(m-1)}]^2 + \left( \frac{1}{R_m} + 1 \right) \mu_m^2 + 2\mu^{(m-1)}\mu_m, \quad (B20)
$$

where we have used Eq. [B6] to re-express the second moments w.r.t. the accuracies $$R.$$ Calculating the accuracy for $$\tau^{(m)},$$ using Eq. [B6] again,

$$
R^{(m)} = \frac{1}{\mu^{(m-1)}} - 1 = \left( 1 + \frac{\mu^{(m-1)}}{\mu_m} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{R_m} + \frac{1}{R^{(m-1)}} \left( \frac{\mu^{(m-1)}}{\mu_m} \right)^2 \right)^{-1}. \quad (B21)
$$

To find the optimal accuracy $$R^{(m)}$$ given the sub-accuracies $$R^{(m-1)}, R_m,$$ we optimize the above expression w.r.t. the ratio of means $$\mu^{(m-1)}/\mu_m,$$ which lies in $$(0, \infty).$$ At the limit points of the ratio, when $$\mu^{(m-1)}/\mu_m \to 0,$$ one recovers $$R^{(m)} \to R_m,$$ whereas when $$\mu^{(m-1)}/\mu_m \to \infty,$$ one recovers $$R^{(m)} \to R^{(m-1)}.$$ In between, there is a single extremal (maximum) value, found by differentiating w.r.t. $$\mu^{(m-1)}/\mu_m,$$ corresponding to

$$
R^{(m)} = R^{(m-1)} + R_m, \quad (B22)
$$

when the means satisfy

$$
\frac{\mu^{(m-1)}}{R^{(m-1)}} = \frac{\mu_m}{R_m} = \frac{\mu^{(m-1)} + \mu_m}{R^{(m-1)} + R_m} = \frac{\mu^{(m)}}{R^{(m)}}. \quad (B23)
$$

Thus in general $$R^{(m)} \leq R^{(m-1)} + R_m.$$ One continues by induction, maximizing the accuracy of $$R^{(m-1)}$$ by splitting $$\tau^{(m-1)}$$ into the convolution of $$\tau^{(m-2)}$$ and $$\tau_{m-1}.$$ Analogously to the above, one obtains that

$$
R^{(m)} \leq R^{(m-2)} + R_{m-1} + R_m, \quad (B24)
$$

with equality if and only if

$$
\frac{\mu^{(m-2)}}{R^{(m-2)}} = \frac{\mu_{m-1}}{R_{m-1}} = \frac{\mu_m}{R_m}. \quad (B25)
$$

Proceeding in the same manner, one recovers the lemma.

Definition 9. We define the partial norm $$P_t[\tau]$$ of a delay function $$\tau$$ (Def. 6) to be the finite integral

$$
P_t[\tau] = \int_0^t \tau(t')dt'. \quad (B26)
$$

Thus $$P_t[\tau] \leq Q \leq 1$$ for all $$t.$$

Lemma 3. Given a delay function $$\tau^{(m)},$$ that is a convolution of a sequence of delay functions (Eq. B7) the partial norm (Def. 9) of $$\tau^{(m)}$$ is upper bounded by the products of the corresponding partial norms of the individual delay functions in the sequence, i.e.

$$
P_t \left[ \tau^{(m)} \right] \leq \prod_{i=0}^{m} P_t \left[ \tau_i \right]. \quad (B27)
$$
Proof. Proof by induction. For a sequence of a single delay function, the statement of the lemma holds trivially (and is an equality). Next consider that the statement is proven for a sequence of \( m \) arbitrary delay functions. Appending a single delay function \( \tau_{m+1} \), we have that the convolution and its partial norm are given by

\[
\tau^{(m+1)}(t) = \left( \tau^{(m)} * \tau_{m+1} \right)(t),
\]

\[
P_t\left[ \tau^{(m+1)} \right] = \int_0^t \left( \int_0^{t'} \tau_{m+1}(t' - t'') \tau^{(m)}(t'') dt'' \right) dt'.
\]

(B28)

(B29)

In the integral above, the argument of \( \tau^{(m)} \) runs within the interval \([0, t']\), which is contained in \([0, t]\), as \( t' \) itself runs within \([0, t]\). Furthermore, the argument of \( \tau_{m+1} \), which is \((t' - t'')\), is also constrained to be within the interval \([0, t]\). Thus we can upper bound the above integral by

\[
P_t\left[ \tau^{(m+1)} \right] \leq \int_0^t \int_0^{t'} \tau_{m+1}(x) \tau^{(m)}(y) dy dx
\]

\[
\therefore \quad P_t\left[ \tau^{(m+1)} \right] \leq P_t\left[ \tau_{m+1} \right] P_t\left[ \tau^{(m)} \right]
\]

\[
\leq P_t\left[ \tau_{m+1} \right] \prod_{i=0}^m P_t\left[ \tau_i \right] = \prod_{i=0}^{m+1} P_t\left[ \tau_i \right].
\]

(B30)

(B31)

(B32)

\[\blacksquare\]

a. Combining delay functions in mixtures

Another manner in which one can combine delay functions is by mixing them in a convex combination.

**Lemma 4** (The accuracy of a mixture is bounded by the best accuracy from among its components). Let a delay function be given by a sum of delay functions,

\[
\tau(t) = \sum_{i=1}^m \tau_i(t),
\]

(B33)

where each \( \tau_i \) is a sub-normalized delay function (with non-zero zeroth moment), and the sum is also either normalised or sub-normalised. Then the accuracy \( R \) of the mixture is upper bounded by

\[
R[\tau] \leq \max R_i,
\]

(B34)

where \( R_i \) is the accuracy of the \( i \)th delay function \( \tau_i \). Furthermore, this inequality is only saturated in the case that every delay function \( \tau_i \) has the same mean and accuracy, i.e.

\[
\mu_i = \mu_j \quad \text{and} \quad R_i = R_j \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, 2, ..., m\}.
\]

(B35)

Proof. We prove the statement by induction. Split the set of delay functions that comprise the mixture into two subsets, and label the partial sums as \( \tau^{(1)}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^k \tau_i(t) \) and \( \tau^{(2)}(t) = \sum_{i=k+1}^m \tau_i(t) \), thus

\[
\tau(t) = \tau^{(1)}(t) + \tau^{(2)}(t).
\]

(B36)

We label the zeroth and (normalised) first moments of the two delay functions as \( \{Q^{(1)}, \mu^{(1)}\} \) and \( \{Q^{(2)}, \mu^{(2)}\} \) respectively (Eq. B2), and take their respective \( \gamma \)-values (ref. Eq. B6) to be \( \{\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}\} \). Note that both \( Q^{(1)}, Q^{(2)} > 0 \). Thus for the composite delay function, calculating the moments explicitly from Eq. B2

\[
Q = \langle t^0 \rangle = Q^{(1)} + Q^{(2)},
\]

\[
\mu = \frac{\langle t^1 \rangle}{Q} = \frac{Q^{(1)} \mu^{(1)} + Q^{(2)} \mu^{(2)}}{Q^{(1)} + Q^{(2)}},
\]

(B37)

(B38)

\[
\chi = \frac{\langle t^2 \rangle}{Q} = \frac{Q^{(1)} \chi^{(1)} + Q^{(2)} \chi^{(2)}}{Q^{(1)} + Q^{(2)}} = \frac{Q^{(1)} \mu^{(1)} \gamma^{(1)} + Q^{(2)} \mu^{(2)} \gamma^{(2)}}{Q^{(1)} + Q^{(2)}},
\]

(B39)
Calculating the $\gamma$-value of the composite delay function,
\[
\gamma = \left( Q^{(1)} + Q^{(2)} \right) \frac{Q^{(1)}[\mu^{(1)}]^2 \gamma^{(1)} + Q^{(2)}[\mu^{(2)}]^2 \gamma^{(2)}}{(Q^{(1)} \mu^{(1)} + Q^{(2)} \mu^{(2)})^2}.
\]
(B40)

Denote $q^{(1)} = Q^{(1)}/(Q^{(1)} + Q^{(2)})$ and $q^{(2)} = Q^{(2)}/(Q^{(1)} + Q^{(2)})$, so that $q^{(1)}, q^{(2)} > 0$ and $q^{(1)} + q^{(2)} = 1$,
\[
\gamma = \frac{q^{(1)}[\mu^{(1)}]^2 \gamma^{(1)} + q^{(2)}[\mu^{(2)}]^2 \gamma^{(2)}}{(q^{(1)} \mu^{(1)} + q^{(2)} \mu^{(2)})^2} \geq \frac{q^{(1)}[\mu^{(1)}]^2 \gamma^{(1)} + q^{(2)}[\mu^{(2)}]^2 \gamma^{(2)}}{q^{(1)}[\mu^{(1)}]^2 + q^{(2)}[\mu^{(2)}]^2}.
\]
(B41)

by the convexity of the square. Next, denote $p^{(1)} = q^{(1)}[\mu^{(1)}]^{-2}/(q^{(1)}[\mu^{(1)}]^2 + q^{(2)}[\mu^{(2)}]^2)$ and $p^{(2)} = q^{(2)}[\mu^{(2)}]^{-2}/(q^{(1)}[\mu^{(1)}]^2 + q^{(2)}[\mu^{(2)}]^2)$, so that $p^{(1)}, p^{(2)} > 0$ and $p^{(1)} + p^{(2)} = 1$, 
\[
\gamma \geq p^{(1)} \gamma^{(1)} + p^{(2)} \gamma^{(2)} \geq \min\{\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}\}
\]
(B42)

As $\gamma$ is inversely related to $R$ (Eq. [6]), it follows that
\[
R \leq \max\{R^{(1)}, R^{(2)}\}.
\]
(B43)

To saturate the upper bound, note that the inequality in Eq. [B41] is only an equality if
\[
\left(q^{(1)} \mu^{(1)} + q^{(2)} \mu^{(2)}\right)^2 = q^{(1)}[\mu^{(1)}]^2 + q^{(2)}[\mu^{(2)}]^2,
\]
(B44)

which by the strict convexity of the square function, is only satisfied when $\mu^{(1)} = \mu^{(2)}$. In this case, one has that
\[
\gamma = q^{(1)} \gamma^{(1)} + q^{(2)} \gamma^{(2)},
\]
(B45)

which is equal to the minimum from among $\{\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}\}$ if and only if $\gamma^{(1)} = \gamma^{(2)}$. Thus to saturate the upper bound, both the mean and the accuracy of both delay functions must be equal, in which case, the mixture has the same mean and accuracy.

Proceeding by further splitting $\tau^{(1)}$ and $\tau^{(2)}$ until one recovers the original mixture, one arrives at the statement of the lemma.

\[\blacksquare\]

\textbf{b. Scaling the time-scale of a delay function - the invariance of the accuracy}

\textbf{Lemma 5.} If $\tau(t)$ is a delay function (Def. [6]), then so is 
\[
\tau'(t) = a \tau(at), \quad a > 0.
\]
(B46)

Furthermore, the zeroth moment of $\tau'$ is the same as that of $\tau$, the (normalised) first and second moments (ref. Eq. [B3]) scale as $\{\mu/a, \chi/a^2\}$, and the accuracy $R$ is left unchanged.

\textbf{Proof.} Since $a > 0$, $\tau'(t)$ is a non-negative function. Calculating the zeroth moment,
\[
Q' = \int_0^\infty a \tau(at) dt = \int_0^{\infty} \tau(s) ds, \quad \text{where } s = at
\]
(B47)
\[
= Q \leq 1.
\]
(B48)

Thus $\tau'$ is also a delay function. For arbitrary moments, via the same change of variable, one finds that
\[
\frac{\langle t^n \rangle'}{Q'} = \frac{1}{a^n} \frac{\langle t^n \rangle}{Q}.
\]
(B50)

Thus $\mu' = \mu/a$ and $\chi' = \chi/a^2$. Finally, with respect to the $\gamma$-value (ref Eq. [B6]),
\[
\gamma' = \frac{\chi'}{\mu'^2} = \frac{\chi/a^2}{(\mu/a)^2} = \frac{\chi}{\mu^2} = \gamma,
\]
(B51)

from which it follows that the accuracy $R' = R$.

\[\blacksquare\]

\textbf{Remark 7.} The above lemma implies that the accuracy is independent of how quickly the event takes place, as would be measured by its frequency/resolution. In other words, the accuracy of a delay function is measured w.r.t. the natural timescale of the delay function itself, rather than an external reference.
Appendix C: An optimal classical clock - The Ladder Clock

1. The Ladder Clock achieves accuracy \( R_j = jd \)

Here we discuss a simple classical clock that saturates the upper bound for the accuracy \( R \) of classical clocks, and as far as we know, is the only one to do so. This is the classical clock used in Fig. 2a). This clock, more precisely, the discrete version of the continuous clock we discuss below, was introduced in [9]. There it was shown to perform with a similar linear scaling in the dimension \( d \), but for the alternative definition of accuracy via the Alternate Ticks Game [2]. This optimal clock may also be approached thermodynamically as in [1], in the limit of semi-classical dynamics, and of infinite entropy cost.

As discussed in Corollary 1, a classical clock is completely specified by a pair \( N, T \in \mathbb{R}^{(d \times d)} \) of stochastic generators and the initial state of the clock, \( V_0 \in \mathcal{P}_d \). In the case of the Ladder Clock, these are

\[
N = \begin{bmatrix}
-1 & 0 & \ldots & \ldots & 0 \\
1 & -1 & 0 & \ldots & \ldots \\
0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \ldots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & 1 & -1 \\
0 & \ldots & \ldots & 0 & 1 & -1 \\
\end{bmatrix}, \quad [T]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } i = 1, j = d \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

(C1)

and the initial state is chosen to be the vector of probabilities \( [V_0(0)]_i = \delta_{i,1} \). Physically, the choice of tick generator means that we can only tick from the \( d \)th site, while the choice of initial state \( V_0(0) \) means that the clock starts out with all its population on the 1st site. Furthermore, \( N \) generates movement from the basis state \( i \) to the basis state \( i + 1 \), and thus we call this clock the Ladder Clock.

As the tick generator \( T \) is rank-1, it follows that the clock is a reset clock (Def. 2). Each tick is thus identical and independent of the others, and the delay function of the \( n \)th tick of the clock is just the convolution of that of the first tick with itself \( n \) times (for more details, see Appendix E and specifically E2a). From Remark 6 we conclude that the accuracy of the \( n \)th tick is \( nR_1 \), where \( R_1 \) is the accuracy of a single tick.

Furthermore, one can understand a single tick itself as a sequence of \( d \) identical and independent events, that of moving from site 1 to site 2, 2 to 3, and so on, with the final event being the tick moving the state from site \( d \) back to site 1. The accuracy of a single tick is thus \( d \) times the accuracy of the delay function of a single site jump, which turns out to be \( R = 1 \). In turn, the accuracy of a single tick of the clock is \( R_1 = d \), and that of the \( n \)th tick is \( R_n = nd \).

We proceed to prove these statements from the analytical form of the clock state and delay function of the tick.

2. The time evolution of the Ladder clock

The unnormalised state of the ladder clock corresponding to the case in which no tick is generated during the time interval \([0, t]\) is given by the equation (for a more detailed discussion on this, see Section E).

\[
V_0(t) = e^{tN}V_0(0) = e^{-t}
\]

\[
f_2(t) \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad 0 \\
f_3(t) \quad f_2(t) \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \\
\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \\
\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \\
f_d(t) \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad f_3(t) \quad f_2(t) \quad 1 \quad 0 \\
\begin{bmatrix}
1 \\
0 \\
\vdots \\
0 \\
0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
f_2(t) \\
f_3(t) \\
\vdots \\
f_d(t) \\
\end{bmatrix} = e^{-t}
\]

(C2)
A direct calculation of the mean $\mu(t)$ and standard deviation $\sigma(t)$ associated with the population at time $t$ in the limit $0 \leq t \ll d$, using Eq. (C2) yields

$$
\mu(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{d} n [V_0(t)]_n
$$

$$
\sigma(t) = \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{d} (n - \mu(t))^2 [V_0(t)]_n}
$$

From these expressions we see that

$$
\mu(t) \approx \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n [V_0(t)]_n = t + 1,
$$

$$
\sigma(t) \approx \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (n - \mu(t))^2 [V_0(t)]_n} = \sqrt{t}.
$$

In other words, the mean is approximately proportional to the distance travelled by the initial state, while the standard deviation is proportional to the square root of the distance travelled by the initial state. Physically, the reason why this is only approximately true for short times, is because when population reaches the last site $n = d$, the population is “lost” from the no-tick space due to a tick happening.

From Eqs. (C1), (C2), it follows that the delay function associated with the 1st tick, $P_{T_1}(t)$ (Def. 4) is

$$
P_{T_1}(t) = \|TV_0(t)\|_1 = e^{-t t^{d-1} (d-1)!}.
$$

A direct calculation of the mean $\mu_1$, standard deviation $\sigma_1$, and accuracy $R_1$; for these classical clocks according to the delay function Eq. (C6), yields

$$
\mu_1 = d,
\sigma_1 = \sqrt{d},
R_1 = \frac{\mu_1^2}{\sigma_1^2} = d.
$$

Since the Ladder Clock is a re-set clock, it follows (see Section E for a proof) that the accuracy of the $j^{th}$ tick is $R_j = jR_1$, and thus this completes the proof of Eq. (31) in Theorem 1.

**Appendix D: Classically generated Markovian sequences**

In this appendix we discuss Markovian dynamics of classical systems. We begin in D1 by discussing classical finite-dimensional states, the differential equations that govern the generation of events, and their associated delay functions. We demonstrate the properties of the dynamical generators that we will require later in the proof. In D2 we discuss sequences of events generated by Markovian dynamics, and some of their properties, continuing in D3 to differentiate between general sequences of events and independent sequences, those in which each event is independent of the dynamics of the prior event. Finally in D4 we prove that the accuracy of general sequences is upper bound by that of independent sequences, a result that will translate directly to the case of clocks, in which case reset clocks will upper bound the accuracy of general clocks.

1. Events generated by classical (stochastic) dynamics

a. Classical states are population vectors

Here we define the state space for classical Markovian dynamics, of which clocks are a special case. In the main text (Section II.E), we argued that classical clocks, which are a special case of quantum clocks restricted to a fixed orthonormal basis, may be described by stochastic dynamics on the vector of diagonal elements of the quantum state w.r.t. the restricted basis. In light of this description, we define classical states accordingly.

**Definition 10.** The canonical basis is a preferred orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}_{i=0}^{d}$ for a real vector space of finite dimension $d$. Each $e_i$ is referred to as a canonical state.
Definition 11. A **classical state**, or **population vector**, is a vector \( v \in \mathbb{R}^d \) all of whose elements w.r.t. the canonical basis (Def. 10) are greater or equal to zero, and whose sum of the elements in the canonical basis is less or equal to one. Thus \( v = \sum_{i=1}^{d} v_i e_i \) is a population vector if and only if

\[
\begin{align*}
    v_i &\geq 0 \quad \forall i, \\
    \sum_i v_i &\leq 1.
\end{align*}
\]

(D1)

(D2)

**Remark 8.** In this appendix, we only deal with classical states, and so will omit the prefix classical for simplicity.

Definition 12. For this appendix, we define the **e-sum** (that stands for “element-sum”) of a real vector \( v \in \mathbb{R}^d \) as the sum of its elements w.r.t. the canonical basis (Def. 10). Thus if \( v = \sum_{i=1}^{d} v_i e_i \), then

\[
\|v\|_{\Sigma} = \sum_{i=1}^{d} v_i.
\]

(D3)

**Remark 9.** Note that for population vectors, the e-sum coincides with the 1-norm, as all of the elements in said basis are non-negative. We use the simple sum because we will deal with negative vectors as well, and the e-sum has the advantage of commuting with other finite sums and finite integrals.

b. Generators of stochastic (Markovian) dynamics

From standard probability theory, the differential equation for Markovian dynamics is given by

\[
\frac{d}{dt} V(t) = \hat{M} V(t),
\]

(D4)

where \( V(t) \) is the state at time \( t \) and \( \hat{M} \) is a time-independent linear operator, referred to as the Kolmogorov generator of forward dynamics. If the dynamics are also responsible for the generation of events, then the generator \( \hat{M} \) is split into

\[
\hat{M} = \mathcal{N} + \mathcal{T},
\]

(D5)

where \( \mathcal{T} \) is associated with the generation of events, and the probability density (probability per unit time) that the event occurs at a time \( t \) is given by

\[
P(t) = \|TV(t)\|_{\Sigma}.
\]

(D6)

We proceed to discuss the precise properties of these generators that we require in the proof.

Definition 13. By a **pair of stochastic generators**, we mean a pair of linear operators \( \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{T}\} \) on a finite dimensional real-valued vector space \( \mathbb{R}^d \), that we refer to as the **non-event generator and event generator** respectively, such that the following conditions are satisfied:

- \( \mathcal{N} \) is an endomorphism, i.e. it takes vectors from \( \mathbb{R}^d \) to \( \mathbb{R}^d \), and when expressed as a matrix w.r.t. the canonical basis,

\[
\mathcal{N}_{ij} \begin{cases} 
\leq 0 & \text{for } i = j, \\
\geq 0 & \text{for } i \neq j.
\end{cases}
\]

(D7)

- \( \mathcal{T} \) takes vectors from \( \mathbb{R}^d \) to a real vector space of possibly different dimension \( \mathbb{R}^{d'} \). Expressed as a matrix w.r.t. the canonical bases of both (input and output) spaces, \( \mathcal{T} \) has \( d' \) rows and \( d \) columns, and must be element-wise non-negative, i.e.

\[
\mathcal{T}_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall i,j.
\]

(D8)

- The pair of generators must satisfy

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{d'} \mathcal{T}_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mathcal{N}_{ij} \leq 0 \quad \forall j.
\]

(D9)
Remark 10. The non-negative nature of $T$ follows from the requirement that the probability density of the event (Eq. D6) must be non-negative, and the state following the event must also be a population vector. The off-diagonal elements of both $N$ and $T$ represent transition probabilities between different canonical states, and are therefore also non-negative. Finally, the condition on the column sums (Eq. D9) is necessary for the $e$-sum norm of the state to be non-increasing, from which the condition on the diagonal elements of $N$ follows.

Remark 11. We use the more general norm non-increasing rather than norm-preserving generators in the appendix because 1) the results apply to the more general case anyway, and 2) we will require results on norm non-increasing dynamics later in the proof.

Corollary 2. If $\{N, T\}$ are a pair of stochastic generators, then so is $\{N, \hat{0}\}$, where $\hat{0}$ is the zero operator with the same input and output spaces as $T$.

Proof. The zero operator clearly satisfies Eq. D8. Furthermore, we verify that Eq. D9 is satisfied for the new pair,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} N_{ij} \leq -\left( \sum_{i=1}^{d} T_{ij} \right) < 0 \quad \forall j,$$

as all of the elements of $T$ are non-negative.

Remark 12. Given a linear endomorphism $N$, we consider it to be a non-event generator if it forms a pair of stochastic generators with the zero operator, which is equivalent to requiring it to for a pair of stochastic generators with at least one element wise generator $T$. On the other hand, every linear operator $T$ that is element-wise non-negative w.r.t. the canonical bases for the input and output space is an event generator, as one can always find a non-event generator with diagonal elements that are negative enough so that the two taken together form a pair of stochastic generators.

Corollary 3. If $\{N, T\}$ are a pair of stochastic generators (Def. 13) and $T$ is an endomorphism, i.e. it takes vectors from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$, then the pair $\{N + T, \hat{0}\}$ is also a pair of stochastic generators. Equivalently, $N + T$ is a non-event generator.

Proof. Eq. D9 is trivially satisfied, while the zero operator by definition satisfies Eq. D8. The off-diagonal elements of $N$ and $T$ are individually non-negative, and thus the same holds for the sum, satisfying the second condition in Eq. D7.

Finally, to verify the condition on the diagonal elements (first line of Eq. D7),

$$N_{jj} + T_{jj} = \sum_{i=1}^{d} (N_{ij} + T_{ij}) - \sum_{i \neq j} (N_{ij} + T_{ij}) < 0 \quad \forall j,$$

as the first sum on the right is non-positive by Eq. D9, and the second (subtracted) sum comprises solely non-negative numbers, by Eqs. D7 and D8.

Corollary 4. If $\{N, T\}$ are a pair of stochastic generators, then so are all of the pairs $\{N, T_j\}$, where $T_j$ is constructed by setting all of the rows in $T$ to zero, save the $j$th one.

Proof. Eq. D7 is satisfied trivially as the non-event generator $N$ is left unchanged. Setting rows to zero in $T$ also maintains Eq. D8. Finally, for Eq. D9 for the $j$th column, the modified LHS of the expression is missing some non-zero elements from the original event generator $T$, and is therefore less or equal than the original expression, still satisfying the inequality.

Corollary 5. If $\{N, T\}$ are a pair of stochastic generators, then so is $\{aN, aT\}$, where $a > 0$.

Proof. By direct substitution into Def. 13 one verifies that all of the inequalities are maintained as the scaling factor $a$ is positive.

Lemma 6 (From infinitesimal generators to finite-time transition matrices). Given any stochastic non-event generator $N$, and a population vector $V$,
$e^{Nt}$ is a transition matrix \[31\] for all $t \geq 0$, i.e. If $\mathcal{M} = e^{Nt}$, then

\[
\mathcal{M}_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall i, j, \tag{D12a}
\]
\[
\sum_i \mathcal{M}_{ij} \leq 1 \quad \forall j. \tag{D12b}
\]

$e^{Nt}V$ is a population vector (Def. \[11\]) for all $t \geq 0$, and its norm (e-sum) is non-increasing in time.

Proof. One of the definitions of the exponential function is via

\[
e^{Nt} = \lim_{m \to \infty} \left( I + \frac{Nt}{m} \right)^m \tag{D13}
\]

The matrix within the parentheses has non-negative off-diagonal entries since $N_{ij} > 0$ for $i \neq j$. Furthermore, for the diagonal entries, one can always pick $m$ large enough so that $1 + tN_{ii}/m > 0$, and thus for large enough $m$, the above expression is a positive power of a matrix with non-negative entries, which must thus be non-negative element-wise. Thus $e^{Nt}$ is element-wise non-negative.

To prove that the column sums of $\mathcal{M}$ are less or equal to 1, we first prove the properties of $e^{Nt}V$. As $V$ is a population vector, all of its elements are non-negative, and thus the elements of $e^{Nt}V$ are also non-negative. Labelling this vector as $V(t) = \sum_i V_i(t)e_i$, where each $V_i(t) \geq 0$, we may calculate the rate of change of its e-sum (Def. \[12\]),

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \|V(t)\|_\Sigma = \left\| \frac{d}{dt} e^{Nt}V \right\|_\Sigma
\]
\[
= \left\| N V(t) \right\|_\Sigma \geq \sum_i N_{ii} V_i(t) \tag{D15}
\]
\[
= \sum_j \left( \sum_i N_{ij} \right) V_j \leq 0 \tag{D17}
\]

as each of the column sums of $N$ is non-positive (Eq. \[D7\]). Thus $V(t)$ is also a population vector for all $t \geq 0$, with non-increasing norm. Finally take $V = e_j$. As the norm of $V(t)$ is less or equal to 1 for all $t \geq 0$, one has for the transition matrix $\mathcal{M} = e^{Nt}$ that

\[
\|V(t)\|_\Sigma = \| Me_j \|_\Sigma
\]
\[
= \sum_i \mathcal{M}_{ij} \leq 1. \tag{D19}
\]

\[\blacksquare\]

2. Sequences of events

Definition 14. By a Markovian sequence of events, we mean a sequence, finite or infinite, of time-dependent population vectors $\{V^{(n)}(t) : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^{d(n)}\}$ together with a corresponding sequence of pairs of stochastic generators $\{N^{(n)} : \mathbb{R}^{d(n)} \to \mathbb{R}^{d(n)}, T^{(n)} : \mathbb{R}^{d(n)} \to \mathbb{R}^{d(n+1)}\}$, the dynamics of which are given by

\[
\frac{d}{dt} V^{(n)}(t) = \begin{cases} N^{(0)}(t) V^{(0)}(t) & \text{for } n = 0, \\ N^{(n)}(t) V^{(n)}(t) + T^{(n-1)} V^{(n-1)}(t) & \text{for } n \geq 1, \end{cases} \tag{D20}
\]

and that satisfy the initial conditions

- $V^{(0)}(0)$ is a normalised population vector,
- $V^{(n)}(0) = 0$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Furthermore, we define the delay function of the $n$th event as

\[
\tau^{(n)}(t) = \left\| T^{(n-1)} V^{(n-1)}(t) \right\|_\Sigma, \tag{D21}
\]

for $n \geq 1$. For $n = 0$, the delay function is $\tau^{(0)}(t) = \delta(t)$, the Dirac-delta distribution.
Remark 13. Note that the fact that the \( V^{(n)} \) are population vectors and that the \( \tau^{(n)} \) are delay functions is not immediate from the above definition, but is nevertheless implied, as the following lemmas will establish.

**Lemma 7** (Events in a Markovian sequence are recursive convolutions). For a Markovian sequence of events (Def. 14), each vector in the sequence can be expressed as a convolution w.r.t. the previous one, i.e. for \( n \geq 1 \),

\[
V^{(n)}(t) = \int_0^t e^{N^{(n)}(t-t')} \tau^{(n-1)} V^{(n-1)}(t') \, dt',
\]  

(D22)

and for \( n = 0 \),

\[
V^{(0)}(t) = e^{N^{(0)}} V^{(0)}(0).
\]  

(D23)

**Proof.** Proof by induction. Consider we define the sequence \( f^{(n)}(t) \) by

\[
f^{(n)}(t) = \begin{cases} e^{N^{(0)}} V^{(0)}(0) & \text{for } n = 0, \\ \int_0^t e^{N^{(n)}(t-t')} \tau^{(n-1)} f^{(n-1)}(t') \, dt' & \text{for } n \geq 1. \end{cases}
\]

(D24)

For \( n = 0 \), by construction, \( f^{(0)}(t) \) has the same initial conditions and obeys the same differential equation as \( V^{(0)}(t) \), and is thus equal to \( V^{(0)}(t) \).

Proceeding, let \( f^{(n-1)}(t) = V^{(n-1)}(t) \) for some \( n \geq 1 \). Then differentiating \( f^{(n)}(t) \) from Eq. (D24) using Leibniz’s rule, we find that

\[
\frac{d}{dt} f^{(n)}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t e^{N^{(n)}(t-t')} \tau^{(n-1)} f^{(n-1)}(t') \, dt' = N^{(n)} \int_0^t e^{N^{(n)}(t-t')} \tau^{(n-1)} f^{(n-1)}(t') \, dt' + \tau^{(n-1)} f^{(n-1)}(t)
\]

(D25)

\[
= N^{(n)} f^{(n)}(t) + \tau^{(n-1)} V^{(n-1)}(t),
\]

(D26)

and thus \( f^{(n)}(t) \) obeys the same differential equation as \( V^{(n)}(t) \). Their initial conditions are also the same as \( f^{(n)}(0) = 0 = V^{(n)}(0) \) for \( n \geq 1 \). Thus \( f^{(n)}(t) = V^{(n)}(t) \), and the rest follows by induction. 

\[ \blacksquare \]

**Lemma 8** (States and delay functions of a Markovian sequence of events). For a Markovian sequence of events (Def. 14),

- Every vector \( V^{(n)}(t) \) in the sequence is a population vector (Def. 14).
- Every \( \tau^{(n)}(t) \) is a delay function (Def. 6).

**Proof.** We first prove by induction that the elements of every \( V^{(n)}(t) \) w.r.t. the canonical basis are non-negative. At \( t = 0 \), this is true by definition. Furthermore, by Lemma 7, \( V^{(0)}(t) \) evolves via the transition operator \( e^{N^{(0)}t} \), and is thus always non-negative, by Lemma 6. Proceeding to \( V^{(n)}(t) \) from Eq. (D22)

\[
V^{(n)}(t) = \int_0^t e^{N^{(n)}(t-t')} \tau^{(n-1)} V^{(n-1)}(t') \, dt',
\]

(D28)

note that if \( V^{(n-1)}(t) \) is non-negative for all \( t \), then so is \( \tau^{(n-1)} V^{(n-1)}(t) \) as the elements of \( \tau^{(n-1)} \) are all non-negative (Def. 13), and since this is multiplied by another transition matrix (Lemma 6), whose elements are all non-negative, the integrand is non-negative, and thus \( V^{(0)}(t) \) is also non-negative w.r.t. the canonical basis for \( t \geq 0 \).

To prove that each vector is a population vector, i.e. has an e-sum (Def. 12) less or equal to 1, we prove the
statement for the sum of e-sums $\sum_{n=0}^{m} \|V^{(n)}(t)\|_{\Sigma}$, $m \geq 0$, from which the weaker statement follows.

$$
\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{n=0}^{m} \|V^{(n)}(t)\|_{\Sigma} = \sum_{n=0}^{m} \frac{d}{dt} \|V^{(n)}(t)\|_{\Sigma}
$$

$$
= \|\mathcal{N}(0) V^{(0)}(t)\|_{\Sigma} + \sum_{n=1}^{m} \left( \|\mathcal{N}(n) V^{(n)}(t)\|_{\Sigma} + \|\mathcal{T}^{(n-1)} V^{(n-1)}(t)\|_{\Sigma} \right)
$$

$$
= \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \left( \|\mathcal{N}(n) V^{(n)}(t)\|_{\Sigma} + \|\mathcal{T}^{(n)} V^{(n)}(t)\|_{\Sigma} \right) + \|\mathcal{N}(m) V^{(m)}(t)\|_{\Sigma}
$$

$$
= \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d(n)} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{d(n)} \mathcal{N}(n)_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{d(n)} \mathcal{T}(n)_{ij} \right) \left[ V^{(n)}(t) \right]_{j} + \sum_{j=1}^{d(m)} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{d(m)} \mathcal{N}(m)_{ij} \right) \left[ V^{(m)}(t) \right]_{j},
$$

where we have used the definition of the e-sum, Def. 12. The RHS of the above equation is non-positive, as the two column sums in parentheses above are non-positive (see Def. 13 and Corollary 2). Thus

$$
\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{n=0}^{m} \|V^{(n)}(t)\|_{\Sigma} \leq 0,
$$

and thus the sum of the norms is non-increasing. At $t = 0$ the sum is 1 by definition (Def. 14), and thus the sum is less or equal to unity for $t \geq 0$, from which it follows that each term in the sum, which is also non-negative, must also be between 0 and 1. Thus every $V^{(n)}$ is a population vector for all $t \geq 0$.

To prove that every $\tau^{(m)}$ is a delay function, note in Eq. D21 that as $\mathcal{T}^{(m-1)}$ and $V^{(m-1)}$ are element-wise non-negative and bounded, it follows that $\tau^{(m)}$ is non-negative and bounded as well. To prove integrability, we add up Eq. D21 (with $n = m + 1$) and Eq. D32 to get

$$
\tau^{(m+1)}(t) + \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{n=0}^{m} \|V^{(n)}(t)\|_{\Sigma} = \sum_{n=0}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{d(n)} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{d(n)} \mathcal{N}(n)_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{d(n)} \mathcal{T}(n)_{ij} \right) \left[ V^{(n)}(t) \right]_{j},
$$

where $m \geq 0$. The RHS is non-positive from the properties of the column sums of the generators, (Eq. D9), and we label it as the function $g(t)$. Thus $g(t) \leq 0$.

Integrating from $t = 0$ to $t = T$, one obtains

$$
\int_{0}^{T} \tau^{(m+1)}(t)dt = - \int_{0}^{T} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{n=0}^{m} \|V^{(n)}(t)\|_{\Sigma} dt + \int_{0}^{T} g(t) dt
$$

$$
= \sum_{n=0}^{m} \|V^{(n)}(0)\|_{\Sigma} - \|V^{(n)}(T)\|_{\Sigma} + \int_{0}^{T} g(t) dt
$$

$$
= 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{m} \|V^{(n)}(T)\|_{\Sigma} + \int_{0}^{T} g(t) dt,
$$

using the initial conditions for the sequence of states (Def. 14). As $g(t) \leq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, the RHS of the above expression is less or equal to 1 for all $T$. However, the integrand on the LHS is non-negative, and thus the integral is non-decreasing w.r.t. $T$. It follows from the monotone convergence theorem that the limit $\lim_{T \to \infty} \int_{0}^{T} \tau^{(m+1)}(t)dt$ exists and is less or equal to 1.

Thus every $\tau^{(m+1)}$ for $m \geq 0$, or equivalently, every $\tau^{(m)}$ for $m \geq 1$, is a delay function.

**Corollary 6.** Given a single pair of stochastic generators \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{T}\} acting on $\mathbb{R}^{d}$, together with an arbitrary population vector $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$, the following is a delay function,

$$
\tau(t) = \|\mathcal{T} e^{\mathcal{N}t} V\|_{\Sigma},
$$

(D38)
Proof. Take an arbitrary Markovian sequence (Def. 14) with the choice of $V(0)(0) = V$, $T(0) = T$, and $N(0) = N$. Apply Lemma 8 to deduce that $\tau^{(1)}$ is a delay function, and substitute the solution for the time-evolved state $V(0)(t)$ from Lemma 7 to the expression of $\tau^{(1)}(t)$ from Def. 14.

Lemma 9 (Invariance of the dynamics of an event w.r.t. the following event.). For any Markovian sequence of events, the state and delay function of the $n^{th}$ event in the sequence (as well as those of every previous event) is invariant w.r.t. a change in the $n^{th}$ event generator $T^{(n)}$ that leaves its column sums unchanged, i.e. if $T^{(n)'}$ is chosen such that its matrix elements satisfy

$$\sum_i [T^{(n)'}]_{ij} = \sum_i [T^{(n)}]_{ij} \quad \forall j. \quad (D39)$$

Proof. From Lemma 7, it is clear that the state $V^{(n)}(t)$ corresponding to the $n^{th}$ event is independent of $T^{(n)}$, and does not affect the states and delay functions of any of the events prior to the $n^{th}$. The independence of the $V^{(i)}(t)$ and $\tau^{(i)}(t)$, where $i < n$ follows from the fact that the initial conditions and differential equations for all of the $i < n$ are independent of $i \geq n$.

As for the delay function of the $n^{th}$ event, from Eq. D21

$$\tau^{(n)}(t) = \|T^{(n-1)}V^{(n-1)}(t)\|_\Sigma \quad (D40)$$

$$= \sum_{ij} [T^{(n-1)}]_{ij} V^{(n-1)}(t)_j = \sum_j \left(\sum_i [T^{(n-1)}]_{ij}\right) V^{(n-1)}(t)_j, \quad (D41)$$

and is thus invariant under any operation that leaves the column sums of $T^{(n-1)}$ unchanged.

Remark 14. Lemma 8 reflects the fact that the tick generator $T^{(n)}$ encodes both the amount of probability of the event being generated from each canonical state (as reflected by each of the column sums) as well as the state following the generation of an event (encoded in the individual elements of $T^{(n)}$), the first of which affects the dynamics of the $n^{th}$ event, while the second only affects subsequent events.

3. Independent sequences of events

Here we discuss a special class of Markovian sequences, those in which the state of the system immediately following an event is a fixed state, invariant w.r.t. the state of the system prior to the event. Such sequences have useful properties that we use later in the proof.

Definition 15. A Markovian sequence of events (Def. 14) is called an independent Markovian sequence of events if every one of its event generators $T^{(n)}$ is a rank-1 linear operator.

Remark 15 (Properties of an independent sequence). If $T$ is a rank-1 linear operator, then all of its columns are proportional to one non-zero column, and therefore, given any vector $V$ in the domain of $T$, the product $TV$ is also proportional to the same fixed column. For a Markovian sequence of events, the term in the dynamical equation $T^{(n-1)}V^{(n-1)}(t)$ (see Eqs. D20 and D21) represents the state following the occurrence of the $n^{th}$ event, and thus an independent sequence is one in which this product is proportional to some fixed state for all $t \geq 0$.

Definition 16. For an independent Markovian sequence of events (Def. 14), we define the sequence of event reset states $\{V^{(n)}_R\}$ as follows: for each $n$, $V^{(n)}_R$ is the unique normalised vector that every column of $T^{(n)}$ is proportional to.

Remark 16. Note that as every element of $T^{(n)}$ is non-negative, it follows that every event reset state is a normalised population vector (Def. 17).

Lemma 10. For an independent Markovian sequence,

$$T^{(n-1)}V^{(n-1)}(t) = \tau^{(n)}(t)V^{(n)}_R. \quad (D42)$$

Proof. The proof follows from the definition of the event reset state, Def. 16 and the event delay function, Def. 14.
Definition 17. A canonical independent Markovian sequence of events is an independent sequence (Def. 15) in which the initial state and every reset state (Def. 16) in the sequence is a canonical state (Def. 10). Alternatively, it is a sequence in which the initial state is a canonical state, and every event generator $T^{(n)}$ has a single non-zero row.

Definition 18. For an independent sequence of Markovian events (Def. 15), one defines the sub-event delay function as

$$\nu^{(n)}(t) = \left\| T^{(n-1)} e^{N^{(n-1)} t} V^{(n-1)}_R \right\|_{\Sigma}. \quad (D43)$$

Remark 17. The $n^{th}$ sub-event delay function refers to the delay function of the $n^{th}$ event from the time of occurrence of event $n - 1$, as opposed to the $n^{th}$ delay function, which is constructed w.r.t. the initial time $t = 0$.

Remark 18. That $\nu^{(n)}$ is indeed a delay function follows from Corollary 6. Note that $\nu^{(n)}(t)$ is independent of all other quantities in the sequence other than those that determine the occurrence of the $n^{th}$ event, namely the stochastic generators $\{N^{(n-1)}, T^{(n-1)}\}$ and the event reset state $V^{(n-1)}_R$.

Lemma 11 (The states and delay functions of an independent Markovian sequence). For an independent Markovian sequence of events (Def. 15), every vector and delay function in the sequence can be expressed recursively for $n \geq 1$ as

$$V^{(n)}(t) = \int_0^t e^{N^{(n)}(t-t')} V^{(n)}_R(t') dt' \quad (D44)$$

$$\tau^{(n)}(t) = \left( \tau^{(n-1)} * \nu^{(n)} \right)(t), \quad (D45)$$

where $\nu^{(n)}(t)$ is the $n^{th}$ sub-event delay function, Def. 18. Note that $\tau^{(0)}(t) = \delta(t)$ by definition (Def. 14), and we equate the reset state for the zeroth event $V^{(0)}_R$ to the initial state $V^{(0)}(0)$.

It follows that the delay function of the $n^{th}$ event is the sequential convolution of the delay function of all previous events,

$$\tau^{(n)}(t) = \left( \nu^{(1)} * \nu^{(2)} * ... * \nu^{(n)} \right)(t), \quad (D46)$$

and the state of the $n^{th}$ event is similarly given by the sequential convolution

$$V^{(n)}(t) = \int_0^t e^{N^{(n)}(t-t')} \nu^{(n)}(t') dt'. \quad (D47)$$

Proof. The first statement of the Lemma, Eq. D44, follows from Lemmas 7 and 10. For the second statement (Eq. D45), we take the definition of the delay function (Eq. D21). For $n \geq 1$,

$$\tau^{(n)}(t) = \left\| T^{(n-1)} \int_0^t e^{N^{(n-1)}(t-t')} V^{(n-1)}_R(t') \right\|_{\Sigma} \quad (D48)$$

$$= \int_0^t \left\| T^{(n-1)} e^{N^{(n-1)}(t-t')} V^{(n-1)}_R \right\|_{\Sigma} \tau^{(n-1)}(t') dt' \quad (D49)$$

$$= \int_0^t \nu^{(n)}(t-t') \tau^{(n-1)}(t') dt' \quad (D50)$$

$$= \left( \tau^{(n-1)} * \nu^{(n)} \right)(t), \quad (D51)$$

where $\nu^{(n)}$ is the sub-event delay function, Def. 18. Proceeding by induction, one recovers Eqs. D46 and D47.

Lemma 12. In an independent Markovian sequence of events (Def. 15), if a pair of stochastic generators is scaled as

$$\{N^{(n)}, T^{(n)}\} \rightarrow \{aN^{(n)}, aT^{(n)}\}, \quad (D52)$$
where $a > 0$, the delay function of the $m^{th}$ event in the sequence, where $m > n$, is modified to be
\[
\tau^{(m)}(t) = \left( \nu^{(1)} \ast \nu^{(2)} \ast \ldots \ast \nu^{(n+1)} \ast \ldots \ast \nu^{(m)} \right)(t),
\]
(D53)
where \( \nu^{(n+1)}(t) = a \cdot \nu^{(n+1)}(at) \).
(D54)

For $m \leq n$, the delay function is left unchanged.

**Proof.** The sequence is still independent, as scaling up the event generator $T^{(n)}$ by a positive constant does not change its rank. Thus Lemma 11 still applies, and by Eq. (D46) one only has to consider the modification to the ($n+1)^{th}$ sub-event delay function, (see Def. 18).

\[
\nu^{(n+1)} = \left\| a \cdot T^{(n-1)} e^{a \cdot N^{(n-1)} T} V^{(n-1)} \right\|_{\Sigma}
\]
(D55)
\[
= a \left\| T^{(n-1)} e^{a \cdot N^{(n-1)} (at)} V^{(n-1)} \right\|_{\Sigma}
\]
(D56)
\[
= a \cdot \nu^{(n+1)}(at).
\]
(D57)

**Lemma 13** (The delay function of a sequence in terms of canonical independent sequences). Given a Markovian sequence (Def. 14), the $n^{th}$ delay function and state (for $n \geq 1$ in the sequence may be expressed in terms of convolutions of sub-event delay functions (Def. 18) as follows:

\[
\tau^{(n)}(t) = \sum_{i_0=1}^{d^{(n)}} \sum_{i_1=1}^{d^{(n)}} \ldots \sum_{i_n=1}^{d^{(n)}} v_{i_0} \left( \nu^{(1)}_{i_0 i_1} \ast \nu^{(2)}_{i_1 i_2} \ast \ldots \ast \nu^{(1)}_{i_{n-1} i_n} \right)(t),
\]
(D58)
\[
V^{(n)}(t) = \int_0^t e^{N(t-t')} \sum_{i_0=1}^{d^{(n)}} \sum_{i_1=1}^{d^{(n)}} \ldots \sum_{i_n=1}^{d^{(n)}} e^{(n)}_{i_0} v_{i_0} \left( \nu^{(1)}_{i_0 i_1} \ast \nu^{(2)}_{i_1 i_2} \ast \ldots \ast \nu^{(1)}_{i_{n-1} i_n} \right)(t') dt',
\]
(D59)
where $v_{i_0}$ are the coefficients of the initial state in its canonical basis,
\[
V^{(0)}(0) = \sum_{i_0}^{d^{(0)}} v_{i_0} e^{(0)}_{i_0},
\]
(D60)

the canonical sub-event delay functions $\nu^{(n)}_{i_{j-1} i_j}$ are defined as
\[
\nu^{(n)}_{i_{j-1} i_j}(t) = \left\| T^{(j-1)}_{i_j} e^{a \cdot N^{(j-1)} T} e^{(j-1)}_{i_{j-1}} \right\|_{\Sigma}, \quad i_{j-1} \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d^{(j-1)}\}, \quad i_j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d^{(j)}\},
\]
(D61)

and in turn the canonical event generators $T^{(j-1)}_{i_j}$ are defined to be the original generator $T^{(j-1)}$ with all the rows except row $i_j$ set to zero. Thus
\[
T^{(j-1)} = \sum_{i_j=1}^{d^{(j)}} T^{(j-1)}_{i_j},
\]
(D62a)
where $\left[ T^{(j-1)} \right]_{kl} = \delta_{ij,k} \left[ T^{(j-1)} \right]_{kl}$.
(D62b)

**Remark 19. Explanation of Lemma 13.**

The difference between a canonical independent Markovian sequence (Def. 17) and a general Markovian sequence (Def. 14) is as follows. In the first case, the initial state and the states following the occurrence of every event in the sequence are canonical states, which is equivalent to every event generator in the sequence having a single non-zero row. For a general sequence, this is not the case.

However, even in the case of a general sequence, one can split each event generator into the sum of matrices with single non-zero rows, each corresponding to a single canonical state (hence the term canonical generators). Note from Lemma 4 that the states and delay functions of every event are linear w.r.t. the event generators, and thus by splitting the event generators of a general sequence into canonical generators, we find that states and delay functions may be expressed as a linear combination of each of the terms in the split. Thus the general sequence turns into a
tree-like graph, where each event corresponds to branching out w.r.t. all the possible canonical states after the event has occurred.

In other words, we decompose a Markovian sequence into the sum of all the possible canonical independent Markovian sequences that occur within it, and the above lemma expresses the states and delay functions of the original sequence as the same sum over the canonical sequences.

Proof. Proof by induction. Consider the case of \( n = 1 \). For the delay function \( \tau^{(1)} \), from Eq. (D21)

\[
\tau^{(1)} = \left\| T^{(0)} V^{(0)}(t) \right\| \Sigma.
\]  

(D63)

We may use the solution for \( V^{(0)}(t) \) from Lemma 7, and the decomposition of the initial state in the canonical basis (Eq. (D60),

\[
V^{(0)}(t) = \sum_{i_0=1}^{d^{(0)}} e^{N^{(0)}t} v_{i_0} e^{(0)}_{i_0}.
\]  

(D64)

We also split the event generator \( T^{(0)} \) into the sum of canonical generators (Eq. (D62),

\[
T^{(0)} = \sum_{i_1=1}^{d^{(1)}} T^{(0)}_{i_1}.
\]  

(D65)

Substituting these back into the delay function of the first event (Eq. (D63), one obtains

\[
\tau^{(1)} = \sum_{i_0=1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1=1}^{d^{(1)}} v_{i_0} \left\| T^{(0)}_{i_1} e^{N^{(0)}t} e^{(0)}_{i_0} \right\| \Sigma
\]  

(D66)

\[
= \sum_{i_0=1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1=1}^{d^{(1)}} v_{i_0} \nu^{(1)}_{i_0 i_1},
\]  

(D67)

using the definition of the canonical sub-event delay function (Eq. (D61)). Thus \( \tau^{(1)} \) satisfies the statement of the lemma.

For the state \( V^{(1)} \), we apply Lemma 7,

\[
V^{(1)}(t) = \int_0^t e^{N^{(1)}(t-t')} \left( T^{(0)} V^{(0)}(t') \right) dt',
\]  

(D68)

and follow the same procedure of decomposing the state and event generator, resulting in

\[
V^{(1)}(t) = \int_0^t e^{N^{(1)}(t-t')} \sum_{i_0=1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1=1}^{d^{(1)}} v_{i_0} \left( T^{(0)}_{i_1} e^{N^{(0)}t'} e^{(0)}_{i_0} \right) dt'.
\]  

(D69)

The term in parentheses above is proportional to \( e^{(1)}_{i_1} \), as the generator \( T^{(0)}_{i_1} \) has only a single non-zero row, which is row \( i_1 \), corresponding to the canonical state \( e^{(1)}_{i_1} \). Furthermore, the e-sum of the term has already been defined as the canonical sub-event delay function (Eq. (D61)), and thus we can express it as

\[
T^{(0)}_{i_1} e^{N^{(0)}t'} e^{(0)}_{i_0} = e^{(1)}_{i_1} \nu^{(1)}_{i_0 i_1}(t').
\]  

(D70)

Substituting this back into Eq. (D69),

\[
V^{(1)}(t) = \int_0^t e^{N^{(1)}(t-t')} \sum_{i_0=1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1=1}^{d^{(1)}} v_{i_0} e^{(1)}_{i_1} \nu^{(1)}_{i_0 i_1}(t') dt',
\]  

(D71)

which satisfies the statement of the lemma.
Proceeding, assume that the lemma is satisfied up to and including \( n = k \). For the next delay function \( \tau^{(k+1)} \), from Eq. [D21]

\[
\tau^{(k+1)} = \left\| T^{(k)} V^{(k)} (t) \right\|_\Sigma \tag{D72}
\]

\[
= \left\| \sum_{i_{k+1} = 1}^{d^{(k+1)}} T^{(k)}_{i_{k+1}} \int_0^t e^{N^{(k)}(t-t')} \sum_{i_0 = 1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1 = 1}^{d^{(1)}} \ldots \sum_{i_{k-1} = 1}^{d^{(k-1)}} \sum_{i_k = 1}^{d^{(k)}} e_{i_k}^{(k)} v_{i_0}^{(1)} \nu_{i_0 i_1}^{(2)} \ldots \nu_{i_{k-1} i_k}^{(k)} (t') dt' \right\|_\Sigma \tag{D73}
\]

\[
= \sum_{i_0 = 1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1 = 1}^{d^{(1)}} \sum_{i_{k+1} = 1}^{d^{(k+1)}} v_{i_0}^{(1)} \nu_{i_0 i_1}^{(2)} \ldots \nu_{i_{k-1} i_k}^{(k)} \left\| T^{(k)}_{i_{k+1}} e^{N^{(k)}(t-t')} e_{i_k}^{(k)} \right\|_\Sigma \left( \nu_{i_0 i_1}^{(2)} \nu_{i_{12} i_{22}}^{(2)} \ldots \nu_{i_{k-1} i_k}^{(k)} \right) (t') dt', \tag{D74}
\]

where we have applied the lemma for the state \( V^{(k)} (t) \), and then simply rearranged terms (all of the states, sums are finite, and so is the integral).

Identifying the term in the e-sum as another canonical sub-event delay function (Eq. [D61]), we get

\[
\tau^{(k+1)} = \sum_{i_0 = 1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1 = 1}^{d^{(1)}} \ldots \sum_{i_{k+1} = 1}^{d^{(k+1)}} v_{i_0}^{(1)} \nu_{i_0 i_1}^{(2)} \ldots \nu_{i_{k-1} i_k}^{(k)} \left( \int_0^t T^{(k)}_{i_{k+1}} e^{N^{(k)}(t-t')} e_{i_k}^{(k)} (t') dt' \right) \tag{D75}
\]

\[
= \sum_{i_0 = 1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1 = 1}^{d^{(1)}} \sum_{i_{k+1} = 1}^{d^{(k+1)}} v_{i_0}^{(1)} \nu_{i_0 i_1}^{(2)} \ldots \nu_{i_{k-1} i_k}^{(k)} \left( \int_0^t \nu_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} (t') dt' \right) \tag{D76}
\]

Thus \( \tau^{(k+1)} \) also satisfies the lemma.

Finally, we express \( V^{(k+1)} \) using Lemma [7]

\[
V^{(k+1)} (t) = \int_0^t e^{N^{(k+1)}(t-t')} T^{(k)} V^{(k)} (t') dt' \tag{D77}
\]

\[
= \int_0^t e^{N^{(k+1)}(t-t')} T^{(k)} \int_0^t e^{N^{(k)}(t'-t'')} \sum_{i_0 = 1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1 = 1}^{d^{(1)}} \ldots \sum_{i_k = 1}^{d^{(k)}} e_{i_k}^{(k)} v_{i_0}^{(1)} \nu_{i_0 i_1}^{(2)} \ldots \nu_{i_{k-1} i_k}^{(k)} (t') dt' \tag{D78}
\]

where we have applied the lemma to \( V^{(k)} \). Once again, we can split the generator \( T^{(k)} \) into canonical generators (Eq. [D62]), and rearrange the integral and sums appropriately,

\[
V^{(k+1)} (t) = \int_0^t e^{N^{(k+1)}(t-t')} \sum_{i_0 = 1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1 = 1}^{d^{(1)}} \ldots \sum_{i_k = 1}^{d^{(k)}} T^{(k)}_{i_{k+1}} e^{N^{(k)}(t'-t'')} e_{i_k}^{(k)} v_{i_0}^{(1)} \nu_{i_0 i_1}^{(2)} \ldots \nu_{i_{k-1} i_k}^{(k)} (t') dt' \tag{D79}
\]

Once again, we can associate one of the terms above to a canonical sub-event delay function (Eq. [D61]), as we did in Eq. [D70]

\[
T^{(k)}_{i_{k+1}} e^{N^{(k)}(t'-t'')} e_{i_k}^{(k)} = e_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} \nu_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} (t' - t''), \tag{D80}
\]

which results in

\[
V^{(k+1)} (t) = \int_0^t e^{N^{(k+1)}(t-t')} \sum_{i_0 = 1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1 = 1}^{d^{(1)}} \ldots \sum_{i_k = 1}^{d^{(k)}} \int_0^t e_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} \nu_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} (t' - t'') v_{i_0}^{(1)} \nu_{i_0 i_1}^{(2)} \ldots \nu_{i_{k-1} i_k}^{(k)} (t') dt' \tag{D81}
\]

\[
= \int_0^t e^{N^{(k+1)}(t-t')} \sum_{i_0 = 1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1 = 1}^{d^{(1)}} \ldots \sum_{i_k = 1}^{d^{(k)}} e_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} v_{i_0}^{(1)} \nu_{i_0 i_1}^{(2)} \ldots \nu_{i_{k-1} i_k}^{(k)} \left( \nu_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} + \nu_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} \right) (t') dt', \tag{D82}
\]

which also satisfies the lemma. By induction, the lemma applies for all \( n \geq 1 \).
4. Result on the accuracy of Markovian sequences

Theorem 3. Given a Markovian sequence (Def. 14), there exists a canonical independent Markovian sequence (Def. 17) such that

- the vectors and generators of the canonical sequence are of the same dimension as the original sequence, i.e. $d^{(n)}$ remain the same for all $n$, and
- the accuracies (Def. 8) of every event in the canonical sequence, i.e. the accuracies of each of the event delay functions (Eq. D21) upper bounds those of the original sequence.

Furthermore, one such canonical independent Markovian sequence can be explicitly constructed from the original sequence by

- changing the initial state to a well chosen canonical state,
- making all of the event generators $\mathcal{T}^{(n)}$ into rank-1 matrices by keeping only a single non-zero row, possibly shifted to a different row, and
- scaling each pair of event generators $\{\Lambda^{(n)}, \mathcal{T}^{(n)}\}$ by well chosen positive constants.

Remark 20. The major implication of this theorem is that if one’s interest is in upper bounding the accuracy of Markovian sequences, then it suffices to optimize over the much smaller subset of canonical independent Markovian sequences, which are far more tractable.

Our main use for this theorem is to straightforwardly apply it to imply that “reset” clocks, i.e. those that go to a fixed state every time they tick, are the most accurate. However, the content of this theorem is more general than its application to clocks.

Proof. We begin by taking restating the first part of Lemma 13, which states that each of the delay functions of a Markovian sequence of events may be expressed as

$$
\tau^{(n)}(t) = \sum_{i_0=1}^{d^{(0)}} \sum_{i_1=1}^{d^{(1)}} \ldots \sum_{i_n=1}^{d^{(n)}} v_{i_0} \left( \nu_1^{(i_0)} \ast \nu_2^{(i_1)} \ast \ldots \ast \nu_n^{(i_n)} \right)(t),
$$

where the canonical sub-event delay functions $v_{i_0}$ are defined in Eq. D61 with the associated canonical event generators subsequently in Eq. D62.

Applying Lemma 4 regarding the accuracy of mixtures of delay functions to Eq. D83,

$$
R \left[ \tau^{(n)} \right] \leq \max_{i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_n} \left( R \left[ \nu_1^{(i_0)} \right] + R \left[ \nu_2^{(i_1)} \right] + \ldots + R \left[ \nu_n^{(i_n)} \right] \right),
$$

where the range of each $i_j$ above (and in what follows) is $\{1, 2, \ldots, d^{(j)}\}$. We follow by applying Lemma 2 regarding the accuracy of convolutions of delay functions, and find that

$$
R \left[ \tau^{(n)} \right] \leq \max_{i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_n} \left( R \left[ \nu_1^{(i_0)} \right] + R \left[ \nu_2^{(i_1)} \right] + \ldots + R \left[ \nu_n^{(i_n)} \right] \right).
$$

In the maximization above, each $i_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq n-1$ appears twice, in $\nu_{i_{j-1} i_j}^{(j)}$ and $\nu_{i_{j-1} i_{j+1}}^{(j+1)}$. Relaxing the maximization to allow for independent maximization of each accuracy, we end up with

$$
R \left[ \tau^{(n)} \right] \leq \max_{i_0, i_1, i_2, i_3, \ldots, i_{n-1}, i_n} \left( R \left[ \nu_1^{(i_0)} \right] + R \left[ \nu_2^{(i_1)} \right] + \ldots + R \left[ \nu_{i_{n-2} i_{n-1}}^{(n)} \right] + R \left[ \nu_{i_{n-1} i_n}^{(n)} \right] \right).
$$

In other words, if we label by $R_{j}^{max}$ the best accuracy from among the sub-event delay functions of the $j^{th}$ event,

$$
R_{j}^{max} = \max_{i_{j-1}, i_j} \left[ \nu_{i_{j-1} i_j}^{(j)} \right],
$$

then the accuracy of the $n^{th}$ event in the sequence is bounded by

$$
R \left[ \tau^{(n)} \right] \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} R_{j}^{max}.
$$
To complete the proof, we construct a canonical independent Markovian sequence from the original sequence, that saturates the above inequality.

Consider that one performs the maximization in Eq. [D87] for every event \( j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \). Doing so for the \( j^{th} \) event will return the optimal indices \( i_{j-1} \) and \( i_j \), that we label as \( l_{j-1} \) and \( m_j \) respectively. We also label the optimal canonical sub-event delay function as \( \zeta^{(j)} \),

\[
\zeta^{(j)} = \nu \left( l_{j-1} \right) m_j.
\]

In other words, the optimal canonical sub-event delay function for the \( j^{th} \) event is obtained by starting in the canonical state \( e^{(j-1)}_l \), and associated with the canonical event generator \( T^{(j)}_{m_j} \) (Eq. [D62]) that results in the state \( e^{(j)}_m \) when the event occurs.

Our first step in the construction of the new independent sequence is to take the original Markovian sequence, and change all of the event generators \( T^{(j)} \) into the optimal generators \( T^{(j)}_{m_j} \), by setting all of the rows except row \( m_j \) to zero. The new sequence is now a canonical independent Markovian sequence (Def. 15).

However, this is not enough, as we note that \( m_j \neq l_j \) in general, i.e. the optimal canonical generator for the \( j^{th} \) event may not correspond to the optimal initial canonical state for event \( j+1 \). However, by Lemma 9, a delay function is left unchanged under operations that leave the column sums of its event generator the same. Since \( T^{(j)}_{m_j} \) has a single non-zero row, we shift the row from the \( m_j \) position to the \( l_j \) position, to obtain a new canonical generator \( \tilde{T}^{(j)} \), that is both optimal w.r.t. its own event as well as the initial canonical state for the next event.

By construction, we now have a canonical independent Markovian sequence, whose individual sub-event delay functions (Def. 18) are the ones with the optimal accuracy, i.e. the \( \zeta^{(j)} \) from Eq. [D89]. From Lemma 11, the delay function of the \( n^{th} \) event in the new sequence is now

\[
\tilde{\tau}^{(n)}(t) = \left( \zeta^{(1)} \ast \zeta^{(2)} \ast \ldots \ast \zeta^{(n)} \right)(t).
\]

Applying Lemma 2 to the above delay function, we get that the accuracy is bounded by

\[
R \left( \tilde{\tau}^{(n)} \right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} R \left( \zeta^{(j)} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} R^{max}_j.
\]

From Lemma 2 equality holds only if the mean \( \mu \) of each optimal delay function \( \zeta^{(j)} \) satisfies

\[
\frac{\mu \left( \zeta^{(j)} \right)}{R \left( \zeta^{(j)} \right)} = \frac{\mu \left( \zeta^{(j)} \right)}{R \left( \zeta^{(j)} \right)} \quad \forall j, k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}.
\]

This is not automatically true from our construction so far. However, from Lemma 12, we can scale the \( j^{th} \) pair of event generators by a positive constant \( a_j \) in the sequence to change the sub-event delay function from \( \zeta^{(j)}(t) \) to \( a_j \zeta^{(j)}(at) \), leaving every other sub-event delay function unchanged. Furthermore, by Lemma 3, such a scaling operation does not affect the accuracy of the sub-event delay function, but does scale its mean (the new mean is divided by \( a_j \)).

Thus we can pick a series of positive constants \( \{a_j\} \) to scale each pair of generators in the independent sequence we have constructed so that every sub-event delay function has the same ratio of mean to accuracy, and thus satisfies Eq. [D92].

As a result, we are left with the canonical independent sequence satisfying the statement of the lemma, whose accuracy saturates Eq. [D88] which itself is an upper bound to the accuracy of the original sequence.

\[\Box\]

**Appendix E: Classical clocks**

In this part of the appendix, we review the behaviour of classical clocks, showing that reset clocks (those with a fixed state after ticking) can reach the highest accuracy, and that, for a classical clock of dimension \( d \), the accuracy is upper bound by its dimension. Finally, we discuss a simple classical clock that saturates this bound.

In fact, the dynamics of classical clocks, at least those that are self-contained, is a subset of more general Markovian dynamics, described by the Kolmogorov equation [33]. The ticks of a finite-dimensional clock may be understood as a sequence of events generated by Markovian dynamics on a finite-dimensional vector space. As such, we have included Appendix D that introduces the mathematics of Markovian sequences that we require to prove our main results on
clocks. Furthermore, we will draw on some lemmas on the behaviour of the accuracy of mixtures and sequences of delay functions, which are covered in Appendix B 1 (where delay functions and the accuracy $R$ are discussed).

Appendices B 1 and D 1 derive from standard theory on stochastic process and random variables, and are included here to place clocks within the larger context of the theory of stochastic processes, and for ease of reading and understanding of the proofs of our main results, which rely on multiple lemmas within this theory. For an in depth discussion on stochastic processes, see for example [31].

In Appendix E 1, we introduce classical clocks and they were discussed in the main text, and relate them to Markovian sequences. Reset clocks, those that tick to a fixed state, are discussed and shown to be the same as independent Markovian sequences.

In Appendix E 2, we first apply Theorem 3 to clocks to obtain our first result on clocks, that for every classical clock, there is a reset clock of at least as high accuracy. Furthermore, in Appendix E 2 a, by focusing on the accuracy of reset clocks, we find that the quantity $R$ that we have denoted as the accuracy is in fact a good quantifier of how long the clock can run before being in error.

Our final result on classical clocks, that their accuracy $R$ is upper bound by their dimension, is stated and proven in Appendix E 3.

1. Classical clocks

Definition 19. As discussed in the main text (Section II E, a self-contained stochastic finite-dimensional classical clock, or for simplicity, a classical clock, is represented by a time-dependent vector $V(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, that represents the state of the clock, such that $V(0)$ is a population vector (Def. 11), together with a pair of time-independent stochastic generators $\{N, T\}$ (Def. 13), that generate the dynamics of the clock via the relation

$$\frac{d}{dt} V(t) = (N + T) V(t),$$

(E1)

and where the probability per unit time of a tick being observed, that we label the “tick density” and denote by $p_{\text{tick}}(t)$, is given by

$$p_{\text{tick}}(t) = \|TV(t)\|_\Sigma.$$

(E2)

Remark 21. The clock is self-contained because its generators are time-independent, and finite-dimensional as the vector space of clock states is taken to be finite dimensional. Finally, the clock is stochastic/classical, as the states are population vectors evolving under stochastic generators, which is equivalent, in the context of quantum theory, to restricting the initial state to be diagonal in some preferred basis, and restricting the dynamical generators to Lindbladian operators that keep the states diagonal in the same basis, as discussed in Section II E of the main text.

In the entirety of this work, we only consider self-contained and finite-dimensional clocks. For simplicity, we continue for the remainder of this appendix by shortening the term to simply classical clocks, with the implicit understanding that they are also self-contained, and finite-dimensional, and that the term classical implies stochastic.

Remark 22. In the context of classical clocks, since $T$ is associated to the generation of ticks, we shall refer to it as the tick generator, and to $N$ as the non-tick generator.

a. Tick-states and tick delay functions

The state $V(t)$ and tick density $p_{\text{tick}}(t)$ in the above description of classical clocks (Def. 19) do not contain any information about how many times the clock has already ticked in the past. In order to distinguish between each tick, one can split the state into a sequence $\{V^{(n)}(t)\}$ of “tick-states”, each corresponding to a fixed number of ticks.

Definition 20. The tick-states of a classical clock (Def. 19 are a sequence of states $\{V^{(n)}(t)\}, n \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$, where the initial conditions and dynamics for each state in the sequence are determined w.r.t. the pair of stochastic generators $\{N, T\}$ of the clock as

$$V^{(n)}(0) = \begin{cases} V(0) & \text{for } n = 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } n > 0. \end{cases}$$

(E3a)

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} V^{(n)}(t) = \begin{cases} NV_0(t) & \text{for } n = 0, \\ NV^{(n)}(t) + TV^{(n-1)}(t) & \text{for } n > 0. \end{cases}$$

(E3b)
Remark 23. The choice of initial conditions (Eq. E3a) corresponds to the fact that the clock has not ticked yet, and thus the entire state of the clock is associated with $V^{(0)}$, the state corresponding to no ticks. For $t > 0$, in every infinitesimal time interval, the tick generator moves probability from a state in the sequence to the next, while the non-tick generator keeps the probability within the same tick subspace (albeit moving it around, and possibly decreasing it). Thus each $V^{(n)}(t)$ evolves due to only two contributions: firstly, its own evolution, as $N V^{(n)}(t)$, and because of a tick, from $TV^{(n-1)}(t)$.

In an analogous manner to the state, one can split the tick density (Eq. E2) of the clock into the contributions of the first, second, and following ticks.

Definition 21. We define the tick delay function of the $n^{th}$ tick to be

$$\tau^{(n)}(t) = \left\| TV^{(n-1)}(t) \right\|_\Sigma.$$ (E4)

Remark 24. The expression for the $n^{th}$ tick delay function reflects the fact that the $n^{th}$ tick can only occur after $n-1$ ticks, and the corresponding state of the clock is $V^{(n-1)}(t)$.

Remark 25. By construction, the tick states (Def. 20) and the tick delay functions (Def. 21) of a classical clock form a Markovian sequence of events (Def. 14). In the case of clocks however, the dynamics of every event (tick) is identical to the previous one, featuring the same pair of generators on the same vector space.

b. Reset clocks

In our discussion on Markovian sequences of events, it was useful to discuss independent Markovian sequences (Def. 15), those that had fixed states following the occurrence of each event. The equivalent for clocks is a “reset clock”, which we now characterize.

Definition 22. A classical reset clock, (in this appendix simply a reset clock), is a classical clock (Def. 19) for which the event of ticking always causes the clock to return to a fixed state which is also the initial state, i.e.

$$TV \propto V(0) \quad \forall V \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$ (E5)

Equivalently, a reset clock is one for which the tick generator $T$ is a rank-1 operator, all of whose columns are proportional to the initial state $V(0)$.

Remark 26. By definition, the tick states and tick delay functions of a reset clock form an independent Markovian sequence of events, Def. 15. Since the events in the case of clocks are ticks, and the dynamics of each tick is generated identically to all the others, the ticks of a reset clock correspond to an i.i.d. sequence, i.e. a sequence of independent and identically distributed events [31].

2. The accuracy of reset clocks

a. The accuracy $R$ quantifies the average run-time of reset clocks

If we apply Lemma 11 to the case of reset clocks (Def. 22), we find that the delay function of the $n^{th}$ tick of the clock is given by the $n$-fold convolution of the delay function of the first tick,

$$\tau^{(n)}(t) = (\tau_1 * \tau_1 * ... * \tau_1)(t).$$ (E6)

If we denote the zeroth moment, first moment, second moment, variance and accuracy (Defs. 7, 8) of a single tick of a reset clock (i.e. the delay function of a single tick) by $Q, \mu, \sigma, R$ respectively, and those of the $n^{th}$ tick by $Q^{(n)}, \mu^{(n)}, \chi^{(n)}, \sigma^{(n)}, R^{(n)}$, we find from the application of Eq. B8 for the moments of a convolution of delay functions, and Eq. B6 for the accuracy of a delay function, that

$$\begin{pmatrix} Q^{(n)} \\ \mu^{(n)} \\ \chi^{(n)} \\ \sigma^{(n)} \\ R^{(n)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Q^n \\ n\mu \\ n\chi + n(n-1)\mu^2 \\ \sqrt{n} \cdot \sigma \\ nR \end{pmatrix}.$$ (E7)
Consider that one asks the question “How many ticks can the clock produce until the uncertainty in the time of occurrence of the next tick has grown to be equal to the time interval between ticks?”, which is a universally accepted mark of a clock’s accuracy.

For reset clocks, the average time interval between ticks is \( \mu(n) - \mu(n-1) = \mu \), and is independent of which tick we are at. On the other hand, the uncertainty in the time of occurrence of the \( n \)th tick, \( \sigma(n) = \sqrt{n} \sigma \), grows with the number of ticks. If we denote the average number of ticks before the uncertainty equals the interval between ticks as \( N \),

\[
\sigma(n) = \mu(n) - \mu(n-1) \quad (E8)
\]

\[
\therefore \sqrt{N} \sigma = \mu \quad (E9)
\]

\[
\therefore N = \frac{n^2}{\sigma^2} = R. \quad (E10)
\]

b. Result: The accuracy of all classical clocks is bound by that of reset classical clocks

**Theorem 4.** For every classical clock (Def. 19), there exists a reset clock (Def. 22) of the same dimension such that the accuracies of the delay functions of every tick of the original clock are upper bounded by the corresponding accuracies of the reset clock. Furthermore, such a reset clock can be obtained from the original clock by

- picking a single well chosen canonical state to be the initial state,
- setting all but one of the rows of the tick generator \( T \) to be zero, and shifting the single non-zero row to the location corresponding to the initial canonical state.

**Proof.** The theorem follows from the direct application of Theorem 3 to the case of classical clocks, when one identifies the tick-states (Def. 20) and tick delay functions (Def. 21) as a Markovian sequence of events (Def. 14), while those of a reset clock (Def. 22) are an independent Markovian sequence (Def. 15).

\[\blacksquare\]

### 3. An upper bound on the accuracy of classical clocks

**Theorem 5.** For a classical clock of dimension \( d \) (Def. 19), where \( d \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), the accuracy of its \( n \)th tick, i.e. the accuracy \( R \) (Def. 8) of the delay function of the \( n \)th tick (Def. 21), is upper bound by

\[
R \left[ \tau^{(n)} \right] \leq nd, \quad (E11)
\]

In particular, for reset clocks of dimension \( d \), which upper bound the accuracies of the ticks of arbitrary \( d \)-dimensional clocks (see Theorem 4), the accuracy of every single tick w.r.t. the previous one is upper bound by

\[
R [\tau] \leq d, \quad (E12)
\]

which, as discussed in Sec. E2a, is a quantifier for the number of ticks outputted before the clock is expected to fail.

**Proof.** The rest of this section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 5. We prove the theorem by fixing the dimension \( d \) and optimizing the accuracy over classical clocks of that dimension. From Theorem 4, we know that the accuracies of the ticks of any clock are upper bound by that of at least one reset clock with a canonical initial (and reset) state, and thus we may restrict our optimization to the case of reset clocks of dimension \( d \) whose initial and reset state is the same canonical state.

Furthermore, as discussed in Sec. E2a, the accuracy of the \( n \)th tick of a reset clock is simply \( n \) times the accuracy of the first tick, and the delay functions of every tick w.r.t. the time of occurrence of the previous tick are identical to each other, and equal to the delay function of the first tick.

Thus the quantity we are left to optimize is simply the accuracy of the first tick, and the restricted set we optimize over is that of reset clocks with a canonical initial state, and a canonical tick generator chosen so that the reset state is the initial state.

More precisely, we work in a \( d \)-dimensional real vector space, spanned by the canonical basis \( e_i \), where \( i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, d-1\} \). Since the initial and reset state must be a canonical state, we label this as \( e_0 \) without loss of generality. Thus the
tick generator $T$ has only one non-zero row, i.e. its first row, that corresponds to $e_0$. On the other hand, the non-tick generator $N$ is arbitrary. The state and corresponding delay function of a single tick of the clock are thus
\[ V(t) = e^{Nt}e_0, \quad \text{(E13a)} \]
\[ \tau(t) = \|Te^{Nt}e_0\|_\Sigma. \quad \text{(E13b)} \]

To prove that the accuracy of the above delay function is bounded by the dimension $d$ for all $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we employ the method of induction, starting with the case $d = 1$. In this case, both $N$ and $T$ are real numbers, that we label $N = -p$ and $T = g$ respectively, where $p \geq g > 0$ in order to ensure that $\{N, T\}$ are a pair of stochastic generators (Def. 13). The delay function is thus
\[ \tau(t) = ge^{-pt}. \quad \text{(E14)} \]

One can calculate all of the moments (Def. 7) explicitly,
\[ Q = \langle t^0 \rangle = \frac{g}{p} \quad \text{(E15b)} \]
\[ \mu = \langle t^1 \rangle = \frac{1}{p} \quad \text{(E16b)} \]
\[ \chi = \langle t^2 \rangle = \frac{2}{p^2} \quad \text{(E17b)} \]
from which the $\gamma$-value (Eq. B6) is $\gamma = \chi/\mu^2 = 2$, and the accuracy is
\[ R[\tau] = \frac{1}{\gamma - 1} = 1, \quad \text{(E18b)} \]
which satisfies the statement of the theorem.

We continue by assuming the theorem applies for dimensions $\{1, 2, ..., d - 1\}$, and prove that it applies to a $d$-dimensional clock.

The rest of the proof is structured as follows. In Sec. E 3 a we divide the $d$ dimensional vector space of the clock into two subspaces, a one-dimensional space corresponding to the initial (canonical) state, and the complementary $d - 1$ dimensional space, and define sequences of states and delay functions that correspond to this division. In Sec. E 3 b we prove that we can recover the dynamics of the state $V(t)$ and the delay function $\tau(t)$ of a single tick from these defined sequences. In Sec. E 3 c we calculate the moments of the delay function $\tau(t)$ explicitly using the defined sequences, and upper bound the accuracy of $\tau(t)$.

a. Dividing the vector space of the clock into a sum of one-dimensional and $d - 1$ dimensional spaces

In order to use the result for $d - 1$ dimensional clocks, we divide the $d$-dimensional space of states into the direct sum of two subspaces, firstly, the one-dimensional space corresponding to the initial state $e_0$, that we label $S_0$, and its complement, that is spanned by the rest of the canonical basis, that we label $S_1$. Thus $S_0$ is one-dimensional, while $S_1$ is $d - 1$ dimensional. We denote the projectors onto these spaces as $\Pi_0$ and $\Pi_1$. In matrix form w.r.t. the canonical basis, these projectors are
\[ \Pi_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Pi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{d-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{(E19)} \]
where $1_{d-1}$ represents the identity operator on a $d - 1$ dimensional real vector space. Note that $\Pi_0 + \Pi_1 = 1_d$, corresponding to $S_0 \oplus S_1 = \mathbb{R}^d$.

One may split the non-tick generator $N$ into the corresponding sum of four matrices, w.r.t. the subspaces $S_0$ and $S_1$,
\[ N = (\Pi_0 + \Pi_1)N(\Pi_0 + \Pi_1) \quad \text{(E20a)} \]
\[ = N_{00} + N_{01} + N_{10} + N_{11}, \quad \text{(E20b)} \]
where $N_{xy} = \Pi_x N_{\Pi_y}$. 

\[ N = (\Pi_0 + \Pi_1)N(\Pi_0 + \Pi_1) \quad \text{(E20a)} \]
\[ = N_{00} + N_{01} + N_{10} + N_{11}, \quad \text{(E20b)} \]
where $N_{xy} = \Pi_x N_{\Pi_y}$. 

\[ N = (\Pi_0 + \Pi_1)N(\Pi_0 + \Pi_1) \quad \text{(E20a)} \]
\[ = N_{00} + N_{01} + N_{10} + N_{11}, \quad \text{(E20b)} \]
where $N_{xy} = \Pi_x N_{\Pi_y}$. 

\[ N = (\Pi_0 + \Pi_1)N(\Pi_0 + \Pi_1) \quad \text{(E20a)} \]
\[ = N_{00} + N_{01} + N_{10} + N_{11}, \quad \text{(E20b)} \]
where $N_{xy} = \Pi_x N_{\Pi_y}$.
Visually, this corresponds to the expressing $\mathcal{N}$ w.r.t. the canonical basis as

$$
\mathcal{N} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix},
$$

(E21)

where $*$ denote the original elements, and the matrices above are respectively $\mathcal{N}_{00}, \mathcal{N}_{01}, \mathcal{N}_{10}, \mathcal{N}_{11}$.

One may understand each of the above generators $\mathcal{N}_{xy}$ as the part of the non-tick generator that is responsible for moving the state from the subspace $S_y$ into the subspace $S_x$. More precisely, given the state of the clock at some time is $V(t)$, the part of the state that is in the subspace $S_y$ is given by the projection $\Pi_y V(t)$. On this part of the state, the infinitesimal change generated by the non-tick generator is $\mathcal{N}_{y0} V(t)$. Finally, the part of this infinitesimal state-change that is in the space $S_x$ is the projection $\Pi_x \mathcal{N}_{y0} V(t)$.

We follow the same procedure for the tick generator $\mathcal{T}$. However, $\mathcal{T}$ only takes states to the reset state $e_0$, i.e. for all $V \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$
\mathcal{T} V \propto e_0 \iff \mathcal{T} V \in S_0 \iff \Pi_1 \mathcal{T} = 0,
$$

(E22)

and thus

$$
\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{00} + \mathcal{T}_{01},
$$

(E23)

where $\mathcal{T}_{xy} = \Pi_x \mathcal{T} \Pi_y$,

(E24)

and $\mathcal{T}_{10} = \mathcal{T}_{11} = 0$.

At this point, we have split both of the generators into components that describe the movement of the state within and between the subspaces $S_0$ and $S_1$. We proceed to do the same for the state of the clock, and construct an independent Markovian sequence of states and corresponding delay functions that does this. Each state in the sequence must be distinguished by two indices, first, an $x \in \{0, 1\}$ to denote that the state belongs to $S_x$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}^0 = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ to mean that the state corresponds to population having moved from the initial state $e_0 \in S_0$ to the space $S_1$ and back $n$ times.

**Definition 23.** We define the set of path-specific clock states $v_{n,x}(t)$, where $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}$, by the initial conditions

$$
v_{n,x}(0) = \begin{cases} e_0 & \text{if } n = x = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
$$

(E26)

and the dynamics

$$
\frac{d}{dt} v_{n,x}(t) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}_{00} v_{0,0}(t) & \text{if } n = x = 0, \\ \mathcal{N}_{xx} v_{n,x}(t) + \mathcal{N}_{\bar{x}\bar{x}} v_{n-\bar{x},\bar{x}}(t), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
$$

(E27)

where $\bar{x} = x \oplus 1$ is the complement of $x$.

**Remark 27.** Roughly speaking, $v_{n,x}(t)$ is the part of the state of the clock (of the first tick) corresponding to being in the subspace $S_x$ and having gone from $S_0$ to $S_1$ and back $n$ times.

**Definition 24.** We define the set of path-specific delay functions $\xi_{n,x}(t)$, where $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}$, barring $n = x = 0$, by

$$
\xi_{n,x}(t) = \|N_{\bar{x}\bar{x}} v_{n-\bar{x},\bar{x}}(t)\|_\Sigma,
$$

(E28)

**Remark 28.** $\xi_{n,x}(t)$ refers to the delay function of arriving at the $\{n, x\}$ state $v_{n,x}$ at time $t$.

In anticipation of dividing the delay function of a single tick of the clock using the above sequences, we define the following “component delay functions”.

**Definition 25.** We define the set of component delay functions $\tau_{n,x}(t)$, where $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}$, barring $n = x = 0$, by

$$
\tau_{n,x}(t) = \|T_{\bar{x}\bar{x}} v_{n-\bar{x},\bar{x}}(t)\|_\Sigma.
$$

(E29)
Remark 29. The term “delay function” (Def. 6) for the above is appropriate. We will shortly show that the \( v_{n,x}(t) \) are an independent Markovian sequence of states, and the event generator \( T_{x\bar{x}} \), taken together with \( N_{\bar{x}x} \), which is the relevant non-event generator for the state \( v_{n-\bar{x},x}(t) \), form a pair of stochastic generators \( \{N_{\bar{x}x},T_{x\bar{x}}\} \) (Def. 13). From Corollary 6, we conclude that the \( \tau_{n,x}(t) \) are delay functions.

Finally, as we will eventually prove, the sequences above are found to involve repetitive convolutions of a small set of delay functions, which we proceed to define.

Definition 26. We define the pair of path-generating reset states \( u_x \), where \( x \in \{0,1\} \) in the following manner. \( u_0 = e_0 \), and \( u_1 \) is constructed by taking the single non-zero column of \( N_{10} \) (Eq. E21), and normalising it.

Definition 27. We define the pair of path-generating delay functions \( \Theta_x \), where \( x \in \{0,1\} \) by

\[
\Theta_x = \|N_{xx} \epsilon^{N_{xx}} u_x \|_{\Sigma},
\]

where \( u_x \), are the path-generating reset states (Def. 26).

Definition 28. We define the pair of tick-generating delay functions \( \Gamma_x \), where \( x \in \{0,1\} \) by

\[
\Gamma_x = \|T_{0x} \epsilon^{N_{xx}} u_x \|_{\Sigma},
\]

where \( u_x \), are the path-generating reset states (Def. 26).

Remark 30. Put very simply, \( \Theta_x \) is the delay function of the event of moving from \( S_{\bar{x}} \) to \( S_x \), while \( \Gamma_x \) is the delay function of ticking from the subspace \( S_{\bar{x}} \).

Remark 31. The above two definitions are justified in using the terminology “delay function” as both the pair \( \{N_{xx},N_{\bar{x}x}\} \) as well as the pair \( \{N_{\bar{x}x},T_{x\bar{x}}\} \) can be proven to be pairs of stochastic generators, and from Corollary 6, it follows that the \( \Theta_x \) and \( \Gamma_x \) defined above satisfy the requirements of a delay function (Def. 6).

b. Proving the necessary properties of the path-specific states and delay functions.

Lemma 14. The set of path-specific clock states (Def. 23) and delay functions (Def. 24) form an independent Markovian sequence of events (Defs. 14 15) w.r.t. the ordering where the event \( \{n,x\} \) is followed by \( \{n+x,\bar{x}\} \), corresponding to \( \{0,0\}, \{0,1\}, \{1,0\}, \{1,1\}, \{2,0\}, \{2,1\}, \{3,0\}, \ldots \} \); and via the identification of \( \{N_{xx},N_{\bar{x}x}\} \) as the pair of event and non-event stochastic generators for the event \( \{n,x\} \).

Furthermore, the state \( v_{n,x}(t) \in S_x \) for all \( t \geq 0 \), i.e.

\[
\Pi_0 v_{n,0}(t) = v_{n,0}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_1 v_{n,1}(t) = v_{n,1}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_0 v_{n,1}(t) = \Pi_1 v_{n,0}(t) = 0.
\] (E32)

Proof. Following the definition of a Markovian sequence of events, Def. 14 we note that the definition of the initial states in the sequence satisfy the definition by construction. In addition, we require the pair of event generators for each event in the sequence, \( \{N_{xx},N_{\bar{x}x}\} \) to be a pair of stochastic generators, Def. 13.

First off, to prove that \( N_{xx} \) is a non-event generator, note that since \( N_{xx} = \Pi_x N \Pi_x \), each element of \( N_{xx} \) is equal to either the original value of the element in \( N \) or to zero. Thus Eq. D7 is still satisfied because \( N \) is a non-event generator. On the other hand, \( N_{\bar{x}x} = \Pi_x N \Pi_x \), and thus all of its diagonal elements are zero. Its off-diagonal elements are either equal to those of \( N \) which are non-negative, or zero. Thus Eq. D8 is satisfied, proving that \( N_{xx} \) is an event generator. Finally, the sum of the generators satisfies (from Eq. E20)

\[
N_{xx} + N_{\bar{x}x} = \Pi_x N \Pi_x + \Pi_x N \Pi_x = N \Pi_x, \quad \text{because} \quad \Pi_x + \Pi_{\bar{x}} = 1.
\] (E33)

Thus the sum of the two generators is the original non-event generator \( N \) with some of its columns set to zero (those outside the support of \( \Pi_x \)). Thus adding the column sums of \( N_{xx} \) and \( N_{\bar{x}x} \) gives either the corresponding column sum of \( N \), or zero. In either case, Eq. D9 is satisfied, completing the conditions that determine that \( \{N_{xx},N_{\bar{x}x}\} \) is a pair of stochastic generators.

To prove that the sequence is an independent one (Def. 15), one has to show that both of the non-event generators in the sequence, the \( N_{\bar{x}x} \), are rank-1. From Eq. E21 one observes that \( N_{01} \) has a single non-zero row, while \( N_{10} \) has a single non-zero column. Thus Def. 15 is satisfied.
To demonstrate that each $v_{n,x}(t) \in S_x$, we express them as (for all cases except $n = x = 0$) the solution to their differential equations (Eq. E27).

$$v_{n,x}(t) = v_{n,x}(t = 0) + \int_0^t \frac{d}{dt} v_{n,x}(t') dt'$$

(E34)

$$= \int_0^t N_{xx} v_{n,x}(t') + N_{xz} v_{n-z,x}(t') dt'$$

(E35)

$$= \int_0^t \Pi_x \Pi_x v_{n,x}(t') + \Pi_x \Pi_x \nu v_{n-z,x}(t') dt'$$

(E36)

using the definition of the $N_{xy}$ (Eq. E20) and since the initial states are all zero vectors except for $n = x = 0$. Left-multiplying the above expression by the projections $\Pi_x$ and $\Pi_z$ respectively recovers the statement of the lemma.

For the special case $n = x = 0$, the initial state $v_{0,0}(0)$ is the canonical state $e_0$ and thus satisfies the lemma. Furthermore, the derivative of the state is proportional only to $N_{00} = \Pi_0 \Pi_0$. The proof thus follows in an analogous manner.

\[\square\]

Lemma 15 (Decomposing the path-specific delay functions w.r.t. the path-generating delay functions). The path-specific delay functions $\xi_{n,x}(t)$ (Def. 24) are sequential convolutions of the path-generating delay functions $\Theta_x$ (Def. 27).

$$\xi_{n,x}(t) = (\Theta_1 * \Theta_0 * \Theta_1 * \Theta_0 * ... * \Theta_x)(t),$$

(E37)

where $\Theta_1$ appears $n + x$ times and $\Theta_0$ appears $n$ times.

Proof. As Lemma 14 has proven that $\xi_{n,x}(t)$ are the delay functions of an independent Markovian sequence, we may apply Lemma 11 to express them as

$$\xi_{n,x}(t) = (\nu_{0,1} * \nu_{1,0} * \nu_{1,1} * \nu_{2,0} * ... * \nu_{n,x})(t),$$

(E38)

where the sub-event delay functions $\nu_{n,x}$ are defined in Def. 18 and for the present sequence, take on the form

$$\nu_{n,x}(t) = \|N_{xx} e^{N_{xx} t} w_{n,x} \|_{\Sigma},$$

(E39)

where $w_{n,x}$ is the reset state (Def. 16) for the event $\{n, x\}$ in the sequence.

Consider the reset state $w_{n,0}$. This is defined to be (Def. 16) the unique normalised state that is proportional to every column of the corresponding generator in the sequence, which in this case is $N_{01}$ (see Lemma 14). From the definition of $N_{xy}$ (see Eq. E21), we conclude that this is simply the canonical state $e_0$, and thus $w_{n,0} = u_0$, the path-generating reset state defined in Def. 26.

In a similar manner, the reset state $w_{n,1}$ is the unique normalised state proportional to every column of $N_{10}$. This operator has only a single non-zero column, and the corresponding normalised state has already been defined to be the other path-generating reset state, $u_1$ (Def. 26).

Thus, returning to Eq. (E39), we see that the sub-event delay functions $\nu_{n,x}(t)$ are in fact, independent of $n$, and equal to the path-generating delay functions $\Theta_x$ defined in Def. 27. Substituting these back into Eq. (E37) we recover the statement of the lemma.

\[\square\]

Lemma 16 (Explicit form and properties of the path-generating delay function $\Theta_1$ (Def. 27) and tick-generating delay function $\Gamma_1$ (Def. 28)).

$$\Theta_1(t) = Ae^{-gt},$$

(E40)

$$\Gamma_1(t) = Be^{-gt},$$

(E41)

where $A \geq 0$ is the sum of the first (and only non-zero) column of $N_{10}$, $B \geq 0$ is the only (possibly) non-zero element of $T_{00}$, and $g \geq 0$ is the negation of the singular non-zero element in $N_{00}$. (see Eq. E21). If $g = 0$, then $\Theta_1(t) = \Gamma_1(t) = 0$ for all $t$. Denoting the moments (Def. 7) of $\Theta_1$ by $\{Q_1, \mu_1, \chi_1\}$ and those of $\Gamma_1$ by $\{Q_3, \mu_3, \chi_3\}$,
they are (in the case $g > 0$)

\[
Q_1 = \frac{A}{g}, \quad Q_3 = \frac{B}{g},
\]

(E42a)
\[
\mu_1 = \mu_3 = \frac{1}{g}, \quad \chi_1 = \chi_3 = \frac{2}{g^2},
\]

(E42b)

and their $\gamma$-values and accuracies $R$ (Def. 8 and Eq. B6) are therefore

\[
\gamma_1 = \gamma_3 = 2,
\]

(E43)
\[
R[\Theta_1] = R[\Gamma_1] = 1.
\]

(E44)

**Proof.** Via the definition of $\Theta_1$ in Def. 27 and since $u_0 = e_0$ (Def. 26)

\[
\Theta_1(t) = \|N_{10} e^{gt} e_0\|_\Sigma.
\]

(E45)

However, the operator $N_{00}$, (see Eq. E21), has only a single non-zero element, on the diagonal, and corresponding to $e_0$. We label this element by $e^0_0$, where $g \geq 0$ (recall that the diagonal elements of $N$ are non-positive (Def. 13). One thus simplifies the action of $e^{gt} e_0$ on $e_0$, obtaining

\[
\Theta_1(t) = \left\|N_{10} e^{-gt} e_0\right\|_\Sigma
\]

(E46)
\[
= A e^{-gt},
\]

(E47)

where $A = \|N_{10} e_0\|_\Sigma$ is the sum of the first column of $N_{10}$.

If $g = 0$, then from the definition of stochastic generators, Def. 13 and Corollary 2, it follows that the entire first column of $N$ is zero, and thus $A$ is also zero, leading to $\Theta_1$ being the zero function.

In a similar manner, using the definition of $\Gamma_1$ (Def. 28),

\[
\Gamma_1 = \left\|T_{00} e^{N_{00} t} e_0\right\|_\Sigma = B e^{-gt},
\]

(E48)

where $B$ is the single (possibly) non-zero element in $T_{00}$. If $g = 0$, then it follows from the fact that $\{N_{00}, T_{00}\}$ is also a pair of stochastic generators (Def. 13), that $B = 0$ as well, and therefore $\Gamma_1$ is the zero function in this case.

The rest of the lemma follows from the direct application of the definition of the moments (Def. 7), the accuracy $R$ (Def. 8), and the $\gamma$-value (Eq. B6), in the case that $g > 0$.

**Corollary 7.** The partial norm (Def. 9) of the path-generation delay function $\Theta_1$ is strictly smaller than 1 for all $t \geq 0$.

**Proof.** From the explicit form of $\Theta_1$ (Lemma 16), we can calculate its partial norm (Def. 9) explicitly,

\[
P_t[\Theta_1] = \int_0^t \Theta_1(t) dt = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g = 0, \\ \frac{A}{g} (1 - e^{-gt}) & \text{if } g > 0. \end{cases}
\]

(E49)

The case $g = 0$ satisfies the corollary trivially. For the case $g > 0$, note that

\[
P_t[\Theta_1] = \frac{A}{g} (1 - e^{-gt}) = Q_1 (1 - e^{-gt}) < Q_1 \quad \forall t,
\]

(E50)

where $Q_1$ is the zeroth moment of $\Theta_1$ (Lemma 16), and is itself upper bounded by 1 (see Def. 6). Thus the partial norm is strictly less than 1 for all $t$.

**Lemma 17.** The delay functions $\Theta_0$ (Def. 27) and $\Gamma_0$ (Def. 28) can be generated by $d - 1$ dimensional clocks.
Proof. We prove the statement for $\Theta_0$, the proof for $\Gamma_0$ is analogous. From Def. 27

$$\Theta_0(t) = \|N_{01}e^{N_{11}t}u_1\|_{\Sigma}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (E51)

While the expression above appears to involve the entire vector space $\mathbb{R}^d$, in fact, one can generate the same delay function with only $d-1$ dimensional objects, as we proceed to show.

First off, take the event generator $N_{01}$. From Eq. [22] we observe that only the first row is non-zero, and of this row, the first element is zero. Consider the modified event generator $N'_{01}$, formed by swapping the first row with any other. By Lemma 9, this leaves the delay function $\Theta_0(t)$ unchanged. The entire first row and column of the modified generator are zero. Next, we note that $N_{11}$ by construction (see Eq. [E21]) already has a zero first row and column. Thus both $N_{11}$ and $N'_{01}$ act trivially on the canonical state $e_0$.

Finally, $u_1$ (Def. 26) is constructed from the first column of $N_{10}$, that has a zero element at the top (see Eq. [E21]), and thus $u_1$ has no component from the canonical state $e_0$. Thus we may simply remove this space entirely from $u_1$, and correspondingly from the operators $N_{11}$ and $N'_{01}$, and still generate the same delay function $\Theta_0$.

Corollary 8. Assuming that the accuracy of a single tick of a $d-1$ dimensional clock is upper bound by $R \leq d-1$, as is done during this proof, one can lower bound the second moments of $\Theta_0$ and $\Gamma_0$ w.r.t. their first moments,

$$\chi_0 \geq \mu_0^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{d-1}\right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (E52a)

$$\chi_2 \geq \mu_2^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{d-1}\right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (E52b)

if the first moments $\mu_0$ and $\mu_2$ do not diverge.

Proof. From Lemma 14 we know that both $\Theta_0$ and $\Gamma_0$ can be generated by $d-1$ dimensional clocks, but we have assumed the accuracy $R$ (Def. 8) of these clocks to be upper bound by $R \leq d-1$. The corollary then follows from the definition of the $\gamma$-value (Eq. B6) and its relationship with the accuracy $R$.

Lemma 18 (Recovering the clock state and delay function from the path-specific states and component delay functions). The state of the clock $V(t)$ corresponding to the first tick (Eq. [E13]) is the series sum of the path-specific states (Def. 23).

$$V(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} v_{n,x}(t).$$  \hspace{1cm} (E53)

Furthermore, the delay function $\tau(t)$ of a single tick of the clock (Eq. [E13]) is the series sum of the component delay functions (Def. 27).

$$\tau(t) = \tau_{0,1}(t) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \tau_{n,x}(t).$$  \hspace{1cm} (E54)

Proof. Consider the following sequence of states, $\{v_{n,x}^{(M)}(t)\}$, defined for $x \in \{0,1\}$ and $n \in \{0,1,...,M\}$, where $M \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and whose initial states and dynamics are identical to those of the path-specific states $v_{n,x}(t)$ (see Def. 23) except for the last one $v_{M,1}^{(M)}(t)$, that evolves as

$$\frac{d}{dt} v_{M,1}^{(M)} = N_{10}v_{M,0}^{(M)} + N_{11}v_{M,1}^{(M)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (E55)

where the last term above differentiates it from the dynamics of the original sequence, by including the entire non-event generator $N$ rather than only $N_{11}$. Intuitively this corresponds to interrupting the sequence at $n = M, x = 1$ by stopping the flow of of population to further states. It is straightforward to verify that this too is an independent Markovian sequence of events (Def. 15).

Since the initial states and dynamical equations of all but the last state in the sequence $v_{n,x}^{(M)}$ are identical to those of the sequence $v_{n,x}$, and because the dynamics of every state in a Markovian sequence only depend on the previous states in the sequence, it follows that $v_{n,x}^{(M)}(t) = v_{n,x}(t)$ for all $x$ and $M$ except for the final state $v_{M,1}^{(M)}(t)$. Furthermore, this
that we proceed to show is equal to $\xi$ (Def. [24]), up to and including $n = M, x = 1$. Consider the vector $V^{(M)}$, defined as the sum

$$V^{(M)}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{M} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} v^{(M)}_{n,x}(t), \quad (E56)$$

that we proceed to show is equal to $V(t)$, the state of the clock for a single tick (Eq. E13). For $t = 0$, by construction $V^{(M)}(0) = V(0)$. For $t \geq 0$, the dynamics of the sum is given by (Eqs. E27 and E55)

$$\frac{d}{dt} V^{(M)}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{M} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \frac{d}{dt} v^{(M)}_{n,x}(t) \quad (E57)$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} (\mathcal{N}_{xx} + \mathcal{N}_{xx}) v^{(M)}_{n,x}(t) + (\mathcal{N}_{00} + \mathcal{N}_{10}) v^{(M)}_{M,0}(t) + \mathcal{N} v^{(M)}_{M,1}(t) \quad (E58)$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} (\mathcal{N}_{xx} + \mathcal{N}_{xx}) v_{n,x}(t) + (\mathcal{N}_{00} + \mathcal{N}_{10}) v_{M,0}(t) + \mathcal{N} v^{(M)}_{M,1}(t). \quad (E59)$$

We may use the fact that each $v_{n,x}(t) \in S_x$ for all $t \geq 0$ (Lemma [14]), together with the definition of the generators $\mathcal{N}_{xy}$ (Eq. E20), to conclude that for all $n$ and $x$,

$$(\mathcal{N}_{xx} + \mathcal{N}_{xx}) v_{n,x}(t) = 0. \quad (E60)$$

Adding these trivial zeros to Eq. (E59), and using the decomposition of $\mathcal{N}$, (Eq. E20),

$$\frac{d}{dt} V^{(M)}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{M} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \mathcal{N} v^{(M)}_{n,x}(t) \quad (E61)$$

$$= \mathcal{N} V^{(M)}(t). \quad (E62)$$

$$\therefore V^{(M)}(t) = e^{\mathcal{N}t} V^{(M)}(0) = e^{\mathcal{N}t} V(0) = V(t). \quad (E63)$$

Finally, we investigate the limit $M \to \infty$ of $V^{(M)}(t)$,

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} V^{(M)}(t) = \lim_{M \to \infty} \left( \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} v_{n,x}(t) + v_{M,0}(t) + v^{(M)}_{M,1}(t) \right) \quad (E64)$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} v_{n,x}(t) + \lim_{M \to \infty} v^{(M)}_{M,1}(t). \quad (E65)$$

To prove that the state $v^{(M)}_{M,1}(t)$ goes to zero, we first apply Lemma [11] to express it as

$$v^{(M)}_{M,1}(t) = \int_0^t e^{\mathcal{N}(t-t')} w_{M,1} \xi_{M,1}(t')(t')dt'. \quad (E66)$$

where $w_{M,1}$ is the event reset state (Def. [16]) for the $n = M, x = 1$ event, that has already been proven to be equal to $u_1$ (see discussion after Eq. E39). Calculating the norm (Def. [12]) of the above,

$$\|v_{M,1}(t)\|_\Sigma = \int_0^t \|e^{\mathcal{N}(t-t')} u_1\|_\Sigma \xi_{M,1}(t')(t')dt'. \quad (E67)$$

However the term in the e-sum above is a population vector for all $t - t' \geq 0$ (see Lemma [6]), and thus the norm is upper bounded by 1, leading to

$$\|u_{M,1}(t)\|_\Sigma \leq \int_0^t \xi_{M,1}(t')dt' = P_1 [\xi_{M,1}] . \quad (E68)$$
where the partial norm $P_1[]$ is defined in Def. 9. As $\xi_{n,x}$ is itself a convolution of delay functions (Lemma 15), we can apply Lemma 3 to obtain

$$\|v_{M,1}(t)\|_\Sigma \leq (P_1[\Theta_1])^{M+1} (P_1[\Theta_0])^M$$

(E69)

$$\leq (P_1[\Theta_1])^{M+1},$$

(E70)

using the fact that the partial norm is upper bounded by 1.

However, from Corollary 7, the partial norm of $\Theta_1$ is strictly less than 1 for all $t \geq 0$, and thus

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} \|v_{M,1}(t)\|_\Sigma = 0,$$

(E71)

which in turn implies that every element of $v_{M,1}(t)$ must individually go to zero. Combining this with Eqs. (E63) and (E65), we recover

$$V(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} v_{n,x}(t).$$

(E72)

The proof of the second statement of the lemma, concerning the delay function, proceeds in an analogous manner. Consider the following sequence of delay functions, $\{\tau(M)(t)\}$, defined w.r.t. the sequence of states $v^{(M)}_{n,x}(t)$ as

$$\tau_{n,x}(t) = \|T_{0x}v_{n-\bar{x},\bar{x}}(t)\|_\Sigma,$$

for all $n, x$ from $n = 0, x = 1$ up to and including $n = M, x = 1$. Finally, the end delay function of the sequence is defined as

$$\tau_{M+1,0}(t) = \|T_{1,0}v_{M+1,0}(t)\|_\Sigma.$$

(E73)

(E74)

Note immediately that since $v^{(M)}_{n,x}(t) = v_{n,x}(t)$ for all the states except $v^{(M)}_{M,1}(t)$, it follows that $\tau_{n,x}(t) = \tau_{n,x}(t)$ (Def. 24) except for the final delay function $\tau_{M+1,0}(t)$.

Consider the sum

$$f(M)(t) = \tau_{0,1}(t) + \sum_{n=1}^{M} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \tau_{n,x}(t) + \tau_{M+1,0}(t),$$

(E75)

which we proceed to show is equal to the delay function $\tau(t)$ of a single tick of the clock, Eq. (E13)

$$f(M)(t) = \|T_{00}v_{0,0}(t)\|_\Sigma + \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \|T_{0x}v_{n-\bar{x},\bar{x}}(t)\|_\Sigma + \|T_{00}v_{M,0}(t)\|_\Sigma + \|T_{1,0}v_{M+1,0}(t)\|_\Sigma$$

(E76)

$$= \|T_{00}v_{0,0}(t)\|_\Sigma + \sum_{n=1}^{M} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \|T_{0x}v_{n-\bar{x},\bar{x}}(t)\|_\Sigma + \|T_{00}v_{M,0}(t)\|_\Sigma + \|T_{1,0}v_{M+1,0}(t)\|_\Sigma$$

(E77)

Using the definition of $T_{xy} = \Pi_x \Pi_y$ (Eq. (E23), and also the fact that each $v_{n,x} \in S_x$ (Lemma 14), we can trivially add $T_{0x}v^{(M)}_{n,x} = 0$ to any expression, and doing so to the above equation results in

$$f(M)(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} (T_{0x} + T_{0x}) v^{(M)}_{n,x}(t)\|_\Sigma + \|T_{0x} + T_{0x}\|_\Sigma + \|T_{0}v^{(M)}_{M,1}\|_\Sigma \|_\Sigma$$

(E78)

$$= \|TV^{(M)}(t)\|_\Sigma = \|TV(t)\|_\Sigma = \tau(t).$$

(E79)

Thus $f(M)(t)$ is the delay function of a single tick of the clock (Eq. (E13)). To complete the proof, we investigate
the limit as $M \to \infty$, 

$$
\lim_{M \to \infty} f^{(M)} = \lim_{M \to \infty} \left( \tau_{0,1}^{(M)}(t) + \sum_{n=1}^{M} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \tau_{n,x}^{(M)}(t) + \tau_{M+1,0}^{(M)}(t) \right) 
$$

(E80)

$$
= \lim_{M \to \infty} \left( \tau_{0,1}(t) + \sum_{n=1}^{M} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \tau_{n,x}(t) \right) + \lim_{M \to \infty} \tau_{M+1,0}^{(M)}(t) 
$$

(E81)

$$
= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \tau_{n,x}(t) + \lim_{M \to \infty} \|Tv_{M,1}^{(M)}(t)\|_{\Sigma}. 
$$

(E82)

But the remaining term on the right goes to zero, as we have already proved that $v_{M,1}^{(M)}(t)$ goes to zero (see Eq. E71), and $T$ is a bounded linear operator. From the above expression and Eq. E79, we recover

$$
\tau(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \tau_{n,x}(t), 
$$

(E83)

which completes the proof of the lemma.

\[ \blacksquare \]

c. The moments of the delay function of a single tick of the clock

We proceed by calculating the moments of the delay function of a single tick of a clock by using the path-specific delay functions and component delay functions.

Consider the component delay function (Def. 25),

$$
\tau_{n,x}(t) = \left\| T_{0,x}v_{n-x,x}(t) \right\|_{\Sigma} \right) 
$$

(E84)

$$
= \left\| \int_{0}^{t} T_{0,x}e^{N_{x}x(t-t')}u_{x}x_{n-x,x}(t')dt' \right\|_{\Sigma}, 
$$

(E85)

where we have applied Lemma 11 to express the path-specific state $v_{n-x,x}(t)$ w.r.t. its corresponding path-specific delay function, as they form an independent Markovian sequence (Lemma 14). Continuing, we simplify the above to

$$
\tau_{n,x}(t) = \left\| \int_{0}^{t} T_{0,x}e^{N_{x}x(t-t')}u_{x}x_{n-x,x}(t')dt' \right\|_{\Sigma}, 
$$

(E86)

$$
= \int_{0}^{t} \Gamma_{x}(t-t')x_{n-x,x}(t')dt', 
$$

(E87)

using the definition of the tick-generating delay functions $\Gamma_{x}$ (Def. 28). Finally,

$$
\tau_{n,x}(t) = (\Gamma_{x} * \xi_{n-x,x})(t) 
$$

(E88)

$$
= (\Gamma_{x} * \Theta_{1} * \Theta_{0} * \Theta_{1} * ... * \Theta_{2})(t), 
$$

(E89)

using Lemma 15. In the above convolution, $\Theta_{1}$ appears $n$ times, and $\Theta_{0}$ appears $n - \bar{x}$ times.

We can now calculate the moments of the component delay function $\tau_{n,x}$ using Eq. 18 for a convolution of a sequence of delay functions. The moments (Def. 7) of $\Theta_{1}$ and $\Gamma_{1}$ have already been labelled and calculated in Lemma 16. For now, we label them (in order of zeroth, first and second moments) as $\{Q_{1}, \mu_{1}, \chi_{1}\}$ for $\Theta_{1}$ and $\{Q_{2}, \mu_{2}, \chi_{2}\}$ for $\Gamma_{1}$ (the first and second moments of these two delay functions were proven equal in Lemma 16). The moments of $\Theta_{0}$ (Def. 27) are denoted as $\{Q_{0}, \mu_{0}, \chi_{0}\}$ and the moments of $\Gamma_{0}$ (Def. 28) by $\{Q_{2}, \mu_{2}, \chi_{2}\}$.

Finally, denoting the zeroth, first and second moments of the component delay function $\tau_{n,x}(t)$ by $Q_{n,x}, \mu_{n,x}$ and
\[\chi_{n,x} \text{ respectively, from Eq. [B8]}
\]

\[Q_{n,0} = Q_0^n Q_0^{n-1} Q_0 \quad (E90)
\]

\[\mu_{n,0} = n\mu_1 + (n-1)\mu_0 + \mu_2 \quad (E91)
\]

\[\chi_{n,0} = n\chi_1 + (n-1)\chi_0 + \chi_2 + n(n-1)\mu_1^2 + (n-1)(n-2)\mu_0^2 + 2n(n-1)\mu_1\mu_0 + 2n\mu_1\mu_2 + 2(n-1)\mu_0\mu_2 \quad (E92)
\]

\[Q_{n,1} = Q_0^n Q_0^3 \quad (E93)
\]

\[\mu_{n,1} = (n+1)\mu_1 + n\mu_0 \quad (E94)
\]

\[\chi_{n,1} = (n+1)\chi_1 + n\chi_0 + n(n+1)\mu_1^2 + n(n-1)\chi_0^2 + 2n(n+1)\mu_1\mu_0. \quad (E95)
\]

We are now in a position to calculate the accuracy of a single tick of the clock. First off, we split the delay function of a single tick of the clock into two parts, w.r.t. the sum over component delay functions, \[\chi\]

\[\tau(t) = \tau_{0,1}(t) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \tau_{n,x}(t) \quad (E97)
\]

\[= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_{n,0}(t) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tau_{n,1}(t) \quad (E98)
\]

\[= \tau^{(1)}(t) + \tau^{(0)}(t). \quad (E99)
\]

We may understand the above division in the following manner. The component delay function \(\tau_{n,x}\) is generated by \(T_{U^x}\) (see Def. [25]), and thus represents a tick being generated from the \(S_x\) subspace of the clock vector space. Thus the two \(\tau^{(x)}(t)\) above each correspond to the delay function of a single tick generated from \(S_x\).

From Lemma [4], the accuracy of the sum of two delay functions is upper bound by the maximum accuracy from among the two, and we proceed to bound each of the accuracies individually.

For \(\tau^{(0)}\), (that corresponds to the tick arising from the \(S_0\) subspace), we find the zeroth, first and second moments of the entire tick density to be (on application of Def. [7]).

\[Q^{(0)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Q_{n,1} = \frac{Q_0}{1 - Q_1 Q_0} \quad (E100)
\]

\[\mu^{(0)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{Q_{n,1}\mu_{n,1}}{Q^{(0)}} = \frac{Q_0 Q_1 \mu_0 + \mu_1}{1 - Q_0 Q_1} \quad (E101)
\]

\[\chi^{(0)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{Q_{n,1}\chi_{n,1}}{Q^{(0)}} = \frac{(Q_0 Q_1 \mu_0 + \mu_1)^2 + Q_0 Q_1 \chi_0 (1 - Q_0 Q_1)}{(1 - Q_0 Q_1)^2}, \quad (E102)
\]

where we have replaced \(\chi_1 = 2\mu_1^2\) (Eq. [E42]) to simplify the expressions. Proceeding, we find that the accuracy is given by (Eq. [B6])

\[R\left[\tau^{(0)}\right] = \left(\frac{\chi^{(0)}}{\left(\mu^{(0)}\right)^2} - 1\right)^{-1} = \frac{(Q_0 Q_1 \mu_0 + \mu_1)^2}{(Q_0 Q_1 \mu_0 + \mu_1)^2 + Q_0 Q_1 \chi_0 (1 - Q_0 Q_1)}. \quad (E103)
\]

As \(Q_0 Q_1\) is the product of the zeroth moments of delay functions and thus \(\leq 1\), we see that the accuracy decreases monotonically w.r.t. \(\chi_0\). As such, we may upper bound it by replacing \(\chi_0\) by its minimum value using Corollary [8]. Furthermore, noting that the moments \(Q_0\) and \(Q_1\) only appear as the product, and that \(\mu_0\) and \(\mu_1\) only affect the accuracy via their relative ratio, we can simplify the expression to

\[R\left[\tau^{(0)}\right] \leq \frac{(d - 1)(1 + pr)^2}{d + dpr(2 + r) - (1 + pr)^2}, \quad (E104)
\]

where \(p = Q_0 Q_1 \in [0,1]\) and \(r = \mu_0 / \mu_1 \in (0, \infty)\). One can analytically optimize the above expression w.r.t. \(p\) and \(r\), and we find that the maximal value of the accuracy is

\[R\left[\tau^{(0)}\right] \leq 1, \quad (E105)
\]

which is only the accuracy of a one-dimensional clock, and not very interesting.
On the other hand, consider the delay function $\tau^{(1)}(t)$, that corresponds to the tick being generated from $S_1$. We find the moments of the delay function to be

$$Q^{(1)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Q_{n,0} = \frac{Q_1 Q_2}{1 - Q_0 Q_1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (E106)$$

$$\mu^{(1)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Q_{n,0} \mu_{n,0} = \frac{Q_0 Q_1 \mu_0 + \mu_1 + \mu_2}{1 - Q_0 Q_1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (E107)$$

$$\chi^{(1)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Q_{n,0} \chi_{n,0} = \frac{2 \left( Q_0 Q_1 (\mu_1 + Q_0 Q_1 (\mu_0 - \mu_2) + \mu_2) + (1 - Q_0 Q_1) (Q_0 Q_1 \chi_0 + (1 - Q_0 Q_1) \chi_2) \right)}{(1 - Q_0 Q_1)^2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (E108)$$

Here too, the second moment is seen to increase monotonically w.r.t both $\chi_0$ and $\chi_2$. As the accuracy itself is inversely related to the second moment, we may substitute the minimum $\chi$ since they will form the starting point of the proof. Furthermore, we replace $Q_0 Q_1 = p \in (0, 1)$, $\mu_0/\mu_1 = r \in (0, \infty)$ and $\mu_2/\mu_1 = s \in (0, \infty)$ to find that the bound on the accuracy takes on the form

$$R \left[ \tau^{(1)} \right] = \left( \frac{\chi^{(1)}}{\mu^{(1)}} \right)^{-1} = \frac{(d - 1)(1 + pr - s)}{d + dpr(2 + r) - (1 - pr)^2 + (1 - p)^2 s^2}. \hspace{1cm} (E109)$$

One may analytically optimize the above expression w.r.t. $\{p, r, s\}$, and doing so returns the maximal value

$$R \left[ \tau^{(1)} \right] \leq d. \hspace{1cm} (E110)$$

Thus the accuracy of $\tau^{(1)}$, and thus $\tau$, the delay function of a single tick of a $d$-dimensional reset clock, is upper bound by $d$. By induction the result follows for all $d$. From Sec. F 2 a we can then conclude that the accuracy of the $n$th tick of the reset clock (and thus any clock, from Theorem 4) is upper bound by $nd$, completing the statement of the theorem.

Appendix F: Quantum Clocks — Proof of Theorem 2

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 2 in the main text. For the sake of generality, the version of the theorem which we will derive, Theorem 5, is more general than Theorem 2 which has not been stated in the main text since it requires some more technical definitions. After summarising the setup in the example section IID we will start by introducing the Quasi-Ideal Clock and stating the necessary theorems about its dynamical properties from [3]. Then we will summarise the exact form of the potential to which Theorem 6 applies. Then we will proceed by proving the necessary lemmas, and mathematical statements before proving Theorem 6 in Section F 8.

1. Setup

In this section, we will briefly recall the important results from the example of a quantum clock in Section IID since they will form the starting point of the proof. The probability of not getting a tick in time interval $[0, t]$, is $\text{tr}[\rho(t)]$, where $|\psi_t\rangle$ is given by Eq. (23), namely

$$\rho(t) := |\psi_t\rangle \langle \psi_t| = e^{-itH} \rho_0 e^{itH^*}, \hspace{1cm} (F1)$$

where $\rho_0 = |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0|$ is the initial state, and

$$H = \hat{H}_C - i\hat{V}_C, \hspace{1cm} (F2)$$

describes the evolution of the system with $\hat{H}_C$ being the Hamiltonian and $\hat{V}_C$ the potential. The probability of getting the 1st tick in the infinitesimal time step $\delta > 0$ is then

$$P(t) = 2 \text{tr}[\hat{V}_C \rho(t)] = \frac{d}{dt} (1 - \text{tr}[\rho(t)]) = -\frac{d}{dt} \text{tr}[\rho(t)], \hspace{1cm} t \geq 0, \hspace{1cm} (F3)$$
where the last equality follows by taking the derivative inside the trace and noting that
\[
d\frac{d}{dt}\rho(t) = -i\hat{H}\rho(t) + i\rho(t)\hat{H}^\dagger.
\] (F4)

The mean and standard deviation of the tick distribution is
\[
\mu := \int_0^\infty tP(t)dt, \quad \sigma := \sqrt{\int_0^\infty (t - \mu)^2P(t)dt}.
\] (F5)

Since this example of a quantum clock is a reset clock, we are only interested in the accuracy of the 1st tick, \(R_1\), since the accuracy of later ticks is determined solely from it; \(R_j = jR_1\) (see Section II F, or appendix B 1 a, and Remark 6 for a detailed argument). Namely, we are interested in bounding the quantity
\[
R_1 := \frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}.
\] (F6)

2. Overview of the Quasi-Ideal Clock

In this section, we will recall some of the definitions and the core theorem from [3] which we will need in this appendix. This section will set some of the terminology and definitions needed for the proof of Theorem 6.

a. The generator of dynamics and potential function \(\hat{V}_0\)

We start by introducing a generator of dynamics for the Quasi-Ideal Clock.
\[
\hat{H}_C = \hat{V}_d + \hat{H}_C,
\] (F7)

The clock’s free Hamiltonian, \(\hat{H}_C\) is a truncated Harmonic Oscillator Hamiltonian. Namely, \(\hat{H}_C = \sum_{n=0}^{d-1} \omega_n |n\rangle\langle n|\). The free evolution of any initial clock state under this Hamiltonian has a period of \(T_0 = \frac{2\pi}{\omega}\), specifically,
\[
e^{-i\hat{T}_0\hat{H}_C}\rho_C e^{iT_0\hat{H}_C} = \rho_C \text{ for all } \rho_C.
\]

The clock interaction term \(\hat{V}_d\), takes the form,
\[
\hat{V}_d = \frac{d}{T_0} \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} V_d(k) |\theta_k\rangle\langle \theta_k|,
\] (F8)

where the basis \(|\theta_k\rangle\}_{k=0}^{d-1}\) is the Fourier transform of the energy eigenbasis \(|n\rangle\}_{n=0}^{d-1}\), specifically,
\[
|\theta_k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{n=0}^{d-1} e^{-i2\pi nk/d} |E_n\rangle.
\] (F9)

In other words, we choose \(|\theta_k\rangle\) to be the time basis. It will also be useful later to have the range of \(k\) extended to \(\mathbb{Z}\).23 Extending the range of \(k\) in Eq. (F9) it follows that \(|\theta_k\rangle = |\theta_k \text{ mod. } d\rangle\) for \(k \in \mathbb{Z}\). It is this basis which we identify with the time basis, i.e., we set \(|\theta_k\rangle = |t_k\rangle, k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}\). The function \(V_d : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{H}^-\) (where \(\mathbb{H}^- := \{a_0 + ib_0 : a_0 \in \mathbb{R}, b_0 < 0\}\) denotes the lower-half complex plane) is defined by
\[
V_d(x) = \frac{2\pi}{d} V_0 \left(\frac{2\pi}{d} x\right),
\] (F10)

where \(V_0\) is any infinitely differentiable periodic function of period \(2\pi\). We will only be interested in a specialised case, and from here on will choose \(V_d\) to map \(\mathbb{R} \to -1\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\). As one might imagine, it will be more convenient to work

\[23\] Note that \(k\) will belong to a set of only \(d\) consecutive integers so that \(|\theta_k\rangle\) form a complete orthonormal basis without repetition.
with a real function. We will also want to make explicit the normalisation. We will thus write the potential function in terms of an explicitly positive, normalised function by defining $\bar{V}_d : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $V_0 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$,

$$-i\delta \bar{V}_d(x) := V_d(x), \quad \text{F11}$$

$$-i\delta \bar{V}_0(x) := V_0(x), \quad \int_0^{2\pi} dx \bar{V}_0(x) = 1, \quad \bar{V}_0(x) > 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{F12}$$

where we will specialise to the case $\delta \geq 1$. The last constraint ensures that $\bar{V}_0$ has full support. Secondly, it will be useful to let $V_0$ have a unique global maximum in the interval $x \in [0, 2\pi]$ at $x = x_0$. Let the parameters $\bar{c}_V, x_{vl}, x_{vr}$ be such that

$$1 - \bar{c}_V = \int_{x_{vl}}^{x_{vr}} dx \bar{V}_0(x + x_0) \quad \text{F13}$$

for some $-\pi \leq x_{vl} < 0 < x_{vr} \leq \pi$, where, for simplicity, we set $x_{vl} = -x_{vr}$ Furthermore, we will find that it is convenient to set $x_0 = \pi + x_{vr} + \gamma$. These are all the properties of $\bar{V}_0$ which we will need for the lemmas in Sections F3, F4, F5, F6. In Section F7 we will find explicit parametrisations of $x_{vr}$ and $\gamma$ in terms of $d$.

b. Explicit form on the potential $\bar{V}_0$

In Section F7 we will need to introduce an explicit function for the potential $\bar{V}_0$ satisfying the criteria from Section F2a. The function will be written in terms of parameters $\delta \geq 1, n \geq 1, N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Specific values for these parameters will be chosen in Section F7 in order to satisfy specific conditions. Here we summarise the final form of the potential $\bar{V}_0$ to which Theorem 6 applies.

For $d \geq 3$, let

$$\bar{V}_0(x) := \frac{1}{\delta d^2} + n A_0 \sum_{p = -\infty}^{\infty} V_B(n(x - x_0 - 2\pi p)), \quad \text{F14}$$

where

$$A_0 = \frac{1 - 2\pi/(\delta d^2)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx V_B(x)}, \quad \text{F15}$$

is a normalization parameter chosen such that

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \bar{V}_0(x) dx = 1, \quad \text{F16}$$

and

$$V_B(x) := \text{sinc}^{2N}(x) := \left(\frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\pi x}\right)^{2N}, \quad \text{F17}$$

where $V_B(0) = 1$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. $N$ is given by

$$N = \left\lfloor \frac{3 - 4\epsilon_5 - \epsilon_9}{2(\epsilon_7 - \epsilon_8 - \epsilon_6)} \right\rfloor, \quad \text{F18}$$

with $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ the ceiling function, and where $\epsilon_7 = \eta/4, \; \epsilon_5 = \epsilon_8 = \eta/16, \; \text{and} \; \epsilon_9 = \eta/2$, and the role of $\eta \in (0, 1)$ becomes apparent in Theorem 14. The parameter $\delta$ is given by

$$\delta = d^{\eta^5}. \quad \text{F19}$$

Let $C_0 : \mathbb{N}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be any function which is only a function of $N$, (i.e. independent of $n, d,$ and $k$), such that

$$\max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \left| \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \bar{V}_0(x) \right| \leq n^{k+1} C_0^{k+1}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}, \forall n \geq 1, \quad \text{F20}$$
holds. We will prove later by explicitly construction that such functions exist. We now define \( n \) to be

\[
n = \frac{\ln(\pi \alpha_0 \sigma^2)}{2\pi C_0 \alpha_0 \kappa} \delta \sigma,
\]

where \( \kappa = 0.792 \) and \( \alpha_0 \in (0, 1] \) depends on the mean energy of the initial Quasi-Ideal Clock state and is defined in Section F2c. Finally, the location of the peak of the potential, \( x_0 \), is given by \( x_0 = \pi + x_{vr} + \pi \gamma \), where

\[
x_{vr} = \frac{d \sigma}{\pi d}, \quad \gamma = \frac{m - 2}{d},
\]

where

\[
m = \begin{cases} 2 \lfloor \bar{m} \rfloor & \text{if } d = 2, 4, 6, \ldots, \\ 2 \lfloor \bar{m} \rfloor + 1 & \text{if } d = 3, 5, 7, \ldots,
\end{cases} \quad \bar{m} = \begin{cases} \frac{\eta}{2} - \sigma + 1 & \text{if } d = 2, 4, 6, \ldots, \\ \frac{\eta}{2} - \sigma + \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } d = 3, 5, 7, \ldots.
\end{cases}
\]

With the above definitions, one can write the function \( \bar{V}_0(x) \) solely in terms of parameters \( d, \eta, \sigma, \) and \( \alpha_0 \).

c. The Quasi-Ideal Clock states

Recall that for the quasi-ideal clock, the initial state is pure \( \rho_C = |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle \langle \Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)| \), where

\[
|\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle = \sum_{k \in S_d(k_0)} \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) |\theta_k\rangle,
\]

\[
\psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; x) = A e^{-\frac{x}{\sigma^2} (x - k_0)^2} e^{i 2 \pi n_0 (x - k_0) / d}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},
\]

with \( \sigma \in (0, d), n_0 \in (0, d - 1), k_0 \in \mathbb{R}, A \in \mathbb{R}^+, \) and \( S_d(k_0) \) is the set of \( d \) integers closest to \( k_0 \), defined as

\[
S_d(k_0) = \left\{ k : k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } -\frac{d}{2} \leq k_0 - k < \frac{d}{2} \right\}.
\]

\( A \) is defined so that the state is normalised, namely

\[
A = A(\sigma; k_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{k \in S_d(k_0)} e^{-\frac{2 \pi}{\sigma^2} (k - k_0)^2}}},
\]

which is of order \( A = \mathcal{O} \left( \left( \frac{2}{d^2} \right)^{1/4} \right) \) as \( d \to \infty \) for all \( k_0 \in \mathbb{R} \). \( \omega n_0 \) is approximately the mean energy of the initial clock state. We use \( n_0 \) to define \( \alpha_0 \in (0, 1] \). It is defined in Def. 1 in [3] as

\[
\alpha_0 = \min \{ n_0, (d - 1) - n_0 \} = 1 - \left| 1 - n_0 \left( \frac{2}{d - 1} \right) \right| \in (0, 1].
\]

Physically, it is a measure of the distance of the mean energy from the edge of the energy spectrum, and has its maximum value \( \alpha = 1 \) when the the mean energy is in the midpoint of the spectrum, namely when \( n_0 = (d - 1)/2 \). We pick \( \alpha_0 \) to be a fixed constant thought this manuscript. This means that \( n_0 \) takes on the value \( n_0 = \tilde{n}_0 (d - 1) \) with \( \tilde{n}_0 \in (0, 1) \) fixed constant.

In the proof of Theorem 2, we will need the core theorem in [3] (Theorem IX.1, page 35). For brevity, we will state it in a slightly reduced which is nevertheless adequate for our purposes. Intuitively, the theorem states that the evolution of Quasi-Ideal Clock states under the generator \( \hat{H} \) (Eq. F27) mimics the evolution of the Idealised clock to a good approximation. In order to state it, we need to recall some definitions from [3]. Namely Definitions 8 and 9 on page 21 [3]:
Let $b$ be any real number satisfying
\[ b \geq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}^+} \left( 2 \max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \left| V_0^{(k-1)}(x) \right| \right)^{1/k}, \]  
where $V_0^{(p)}(x)$ is the $p$th derivative with respect to $x$ of $V_0(x)$ and $V_0^{(0)} := V_0$. We can use $b$ to define $N \in \mathbb{N}^0$ as follows
\[ N = \left\lfloor \frac{\pi \alpha_0^2}{2(\bar{\nu} + \frac{d}{\sigma})^2} \left( \frac{d}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right\rfloor, \]  
where $\kappa = 0.792$ and
\[ \bar{\nu} = \frac{\pi \alpha_0 \kappa}{\ln(\pi \alpha_0 \sigma^2)} b. \]  
The theorem states that for all $t \geq 0, k_0 \in \mathbb{R}$,
\[ e^{-it(V_0 + \bar{H}_C)} |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle = |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0, td/T_0)\rangle + |\nu\rangle \]  
\[ = \sum_{k \in S_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} e^{-i \int_{k-td/T_0}^{k+td/T_0} d\psi_\text{nor}(y) \psi_\text{nor}(k_0 + td/T_0; k)} |\theta_k\rangle + |\nu\rangle, \]  
where $|\nu\rangle = |\nu\rangle(t, d)$. The important question is, how small can the error term be, namely how does
\[ \nu(t, d) := \| [\nu]\|_2 \]  
scale with the properties of the Quasi-Ideal Clock and generator. The theorem puts bounds on this scaling. Namely if
\[ \bar{\nu} \geq 0, \quad N \geq 8, \]  
are both satisfied, the theorem tells us that in the limits $d \to \infty, (0, d) \ni \sigma \to \infty$,
\[ \nu(t, d) = |t| \frac{d}{T_0} \left( \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\sigma^3}{\bar{\nu} \sigma^2 / d + 1} \right) \right)^{1/2} + \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{d^2}{\sigma^2} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\alpha_0}{4 \left( \frac{d}{\sigma} + \bar{\nu} \right)} \right)^2 + \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{d^2}{\sigma^2} + 1 \right) e^{-\frac{\pi^2}{\sigma^2}} + \frac{1}{2}, \]  
\[ d. \text{ An expression for } R_1 \text{ for the Quasi-Ideal Clock} \]
In this section, we will show how to express $\text{tr}[\rho(t)]$ from Section F.1 in terms of the Quasi-Ideal Clock from $F.2$ discussed in Sections F.2a, F.2c. Recalling the initial state of the Quasi-Ideal Clock, namely $\rho_0 = |\psi_0\rangle\langle \psi_0| = |\psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle\langle \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)|$. From Eq. (F.33) if follows
\[ \text{tr}[\rho(t)] = \sum_{k \in S_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} \left| \langle \theta_k | e^{-it} H | \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0) \rangle \right|^2 \]  
\[ = \sum_{k \in S_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} \left| e^{-i \int_{k-td/T_0}^{k+td/T_0} d\psi_\text{nor}(y) \psi_\text{nor}(k_0; k-td/T_0) + \langle \theta_k | \nu\rangle(t, d) \right|^2, \]  
where we have used that $\psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0; k) = \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k - td/T_0)$ which follows directly from Eq. (F.26). Due to the normalisation of $|\psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle$, we have
\[ \sum_{k \in S_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} |\psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k - td/T_0)\rangle^2 = 1. \]
3. Approximating $R_1$

We will now proceed to lower bound $R_1$ in terms of dimension and mean clock energy for the Quasi-Ideal Clock. Specifically in this section, up to additive error terms, the aim will be to express $R_1$ in terms of the 1st and 2nd moments of $\text{tr}[\rho(t)]$ with integration range limited to one period of the free clock Hamiltonian, namely to the interval $[0, T_0]$.

a. A more useful expression for $R_1$

**Lemma 19.** Let $\Delta(0)$ and $\Delta(1)$ satisfy

$$
\Delta^2(0) \leq \left( \int_0^{T_0} dt \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \right)^2, \quad \Delta(1) \geq \int_0^{T_0} dt \, t \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \geq 0. 
$$

then

$$
R_1 \geq \frac{\Delta^2(0) + \epsilon_2}{2\Delta(1) - \Delta^2(0) + \epsilon_1},
$$

where the epsilon terms $\epsilon_2$, $\epsilon_1$ are defined by

$$
\epsilon_2 := 2\mu_0\mu_e + \mu_e^2,
$$

with

$$
\mu_0 := \int_0^{T_0} dt \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)],
$$

$$
\mu_e := -\lim_{t \to \infty} t \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)] + \int_{T_0}^{\infty} dt \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)],
$$

and

$$
\epsilon_1 := -2\mu_0\mu_e - \mu_e^2 + 2\int_{T_0}^{\infty} dt \, t \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)] - \lim_{t \to \infty} (2\mu t + (t - \mu)^2) \text{tr}[\rho(t)].
$$

**Proof.** By integration by parts,

$$
\mu = \int_0^{\infty} t \, P(t) dt = -\left( t \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \right) \bigg|_0^\infty + \int_0^{\infty} dt \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)]
$$

$$
= \mu_0 + \mu_e.
$$

Similarly,

$$
\sigma^2 = \int_0^{\infty} (t - \mu)^2 P(t) dt = -\left( (t - \mu)^2 \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \right) \bigg|_0^\infty + 2 \int_0^{\infty} dt \, (t - \mu) \text{tr}[\rho(t)]
$$

$$
= -\lim_{t \to \infty} (t - \mu)^2 \text{tr}[\rho(t)] + \mu^2 + 2 \int_0^{\infty} dt \, t \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)] - 2\mu (\mu + \lim_{t \to \infty} t \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)])
$$

$$
= -\mu^2 + 2 \int_0^{\infty} dt \, t \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)] - \lim_{t \to \infty} (2\mu t + (t - \mu)^2) \text{tr}[\rho(t)]
$$

$$
= -\mu_0^2 + 2 \int_0^{T_0} dt \, t \, \text{tr}[\rho(t)] + \epsilon_1 \leq -\mu_0^2 + 2\Delta(1) + \epsilon_1
$$

$$
\leq -\Delta^2(0) + 2\Delta(1) + \epsilon_1
$$

From Eqs. (F51), (F49), we find

$$
R_1 = \frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2} \geq \frac{\mu_0^2 + 2\mu_0\mu_e + \mu_e^2}{-\Delta^2(0) + 2\Delta(1) + \epsilon_1}
$$

$$
\geq \frac{\Delta^2(0) + 2\mu_0\mu_e + \mu_e^2}{-\Delta^2(0) + 2\Delta(1) + \epsilon_1}.
$$

$\blacksquare$
We will now bound $\epsilon_1$ and $\epsilon_2$ appearing in Lemma \[19\]. These terms are negligible in the large $d$ limit and originate from the tails of the integrals in the definition of $\mu$ and $\sigma$.

**Lemma 20.** $\epsilon_1$ and $\epsilon_2$, defined in Eqs. \[(F47)\] and \[(F44)\] respectively, are bounded by

\[\begin{align*}
|\epsilon_1| &\leq \left( a^2 \left( e^{-\delta} + \epsilon_2(T_0, d) \right)^2 + 2(2aT_0 + a^2) \left( e^{-\delta} + \epsilon_2(T_0, d) \right)^2, \\
0 &\leq \epsilon_2 \leq \left( 2T_0a + a^2 \left( e^{-\delta} + \epsilon_2(T_0, d) \right)^2 \right) \left( e^{-\delta} + \epsilon_2(T_0, d) \right)^2,
\end{align*}\]

where $a$ is any parameter satisfying

\[a \geq \frac{T_0}{4\pi \delta} \left( \min_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \widehat{V}_0(x) \right)^{-1}.
\]

and $\epsilon_2(T_0, d)$ is defined by Eq. \[(F36)\]. Note that since we have chosen $\widehat{V}_0$ to have full support, $a$ is finite.

**Proof.** We will start by bounding $\text{tr}[\rho(t)]$. We find

\[\text{tr}[\rho(t)] = \text{tr}[e^{-it\hat{H}} \rho e^{it\hat{H}}] \leq \|e^{-it\hat{H}}\|_\infty \|e^{it\hat{H}}\|_\infty \leq \|e^{-it\hat{H}}\|_\infty \|e^{it\hat{H}}\|_\infty,\]

where $\| \cdot \|_\infty$ is the Schatten $p = \infty$ norm also called the operator norm. Recalling $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_C - i\hat{V}_C$, and applying the Golden-Thompson inequality, which holds for the operator norm \[34\] it we find

\[\text{tr}[\rho(t)] \leq 2\|e^{-it\hat{H}_C}\|_\infty \|e^{it\hat{H}_C}\|_\infty \|e^{-it\hat{V}_C}\|_\infty = 2\|e^{-it\hat{V}_C}\|_\infty = 2 \exp \left[ -\frac{2\pi}{T_0} \left( \min_{k \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, d-1\}} \widehat{V}_0 \left( \frac{2\pi k}{d} \right) \right) \right],\]

where we have used $\hat{V}_C = i\hat{V}_d := \frac{d}{T_0} \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \hat{V}_d(k) |\theta_k \rangle \langle \theta_k|$, where $\frac{d}{T_0} \widehat{V}_d(k) = \frac{2\pi}{T_0} \widehat{V}_0 \left( \frac{2\pi k}{d} \right)$. Now, in this manuscript, $\widehat{V}_0$ is positive (Eq. \[(F12)\]). As such, for all $d \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$

\[\min_{k \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, d-1\}} \widehat{V}_0 \left( \frac{2\pi k}{d} \right) > 0\]

and thus

\[\lim_{t \to \infty} t^n \text{tr}[\rho(t)] = 0\]

for all $n \geq 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Our next task will be to bound the two integrals $\int_{T_0}^{\infty} dt \text{tr}[\rho(t)]$ and $\int_{T_0}^{\infty} dt t \text{tr}[\rho(t)]$. We will start by finding a $t$ independent parameter $a > 0$ such that $\text{tr}[\rho(t)] \leq aP(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$, where $P(t) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \text{tr}[\rho(t)]$ was defined in Eq. \[(F3)\].

\[\begin{align*}
\frac{\text{tr}[\rho(t)]}{P(t)} &= \frac{\text{tr}[\rho(t)]}{\text{itr}[\hat{H}\rho(t)] - \text{itr}[\hat{H}^\dagger \rho(t)]} &= \frac{\text{tr}[\rho(t)]}{\text{itr}[(\hat{H}_C - i\hat{V}_C)\rho(t)] - \text{itr}[(\hat{H}_C + i\hat{V}_C)\rho(t)]} = \frac{1}{2 \text{tr}[\hat{V}_C \rho(t)]} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \inf_{|\psi\rangle \in S_{\rho}} \text{tr}[(\hat{V}_C |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|)] \right)^{-1}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\end{align*}\]

where $\rho(t) := \rho(t)/\text{tr}[\rho(t)]$ is a normalised rank one density matrix for all $t \geq 0$ and $S_{\rho}$ is the set of normalised pure quantum states (rank one density matrices). Crucially, note that $P(t) > 0$ since $\text{tr}[\hat{V}_C \rho(t)] > 0$ because $\hat{V}_C$ is positive-definite since $\widehat{V}_0$ has full support. Hence taking the trace in the orthonormal basis $\{|\theta_k\rangle\}_{k=0}^{d-1}$,

\[\begin{align*}
\frac{\text{tr}[\rho(t)]}{P(t)} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \min_{k \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, d-1\}} \langle \theta_k | \hat{V}_C | \theta_k \rangle \right)^{-1} = \frac{T_0}{4\pi \delta} \left( \min_{k \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, d-1\}} \widehat{V}_0 \left( \frac{2\pi k}{d} \right) \right)^{-1} \\
&\leq \frac{T_0}{4\pi \delta} \left( \min_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \widehat{V}_0(x) \right)^{-1} \leq a, \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\end{align*}\]

Using Eq. \[(F67)\] can now bound the first integral:

\[\int_{T_0}^{\infty} dt \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \leq a \int_{T_0}^{\infty} dt P(t) = -a \left[ \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \right]_{T_0}^{\infty} = a \left( \text{tr}[\rho(T_0)] - \lim_{t \to \infty} \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \right) = a \text{tr}[\rho(T_0)].\]
For the second integral, we will additionally have to integrate by parts and recall $T_0 > 0$:

$$\int_{T_0}^{\infty} dt t \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \leq -a \int_{T_0}^{\infty} dt t \frac{d}{dt} \text{tr}[\rho(t)] = -a \left( \left[ t \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \right]_{T_0}^{\infty} - \int_{T_0}^{\infty} dt \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \right) = aT_0 \text{tr}[\rho(T_0)] + a \int_{T_0}^{\infty} dt \text{tr}[\rho(t)]$$

$$\leq (aT_0 + a^2)\text{tr}[\rho(T_0)],$$

where to achieve the last line, we have used Eq. (F68). In order for Eqs. (F68) and Eq. (F69) to be useful, we need to bound $\text{tr}[\rho(T_0)]$. This can be achieved using Eq. (F69). One finds

$$\text{tr}[\rho(T_0)] = |e^{-\delta} + (\theta_k|\nu) (T_0, d)|^2 \leq (e^{-\delta} + \epsilon_{\nu}(T_0, d))^2.\quad (F71)$$

Finally, recalling that $-\frac{d}{dt} \text{tr}[\rho(t)] > 0$, we have

$$\mu_0 = \int_{0}^{T_0} dt \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \leq T_0 \max_{t \in [0, T_0]} \text{tr}[\rho(t)] = T_0 \text{tr}[\rho(0)] = T_0.\quad (F72)$$

Thus using Eqs. (F63), (F68), (F69), (F71) and (F72), it follows that $\epsilon_1$ defined in Eq. (F47) is bounded by

$$|\epsilon_1| \leq 2T_0 \mu_{\epsilon} + \mu_{\epsilon}^2 + 2(aT_0 + a^2) (e^{-\delta} + \epsilon_{\nu}(T_0, d))^2.\quad (F73)$$

Similarly, we find that $\mu_{\epsilon}$ defined in Eq. (F45) is bounded by

$$\mu_{\epsilon} \leq a (e^{-\delta} + \epsilon_{\nu}(T_0, d))^2.\quad (F74)$$

Thus using the definition of $\epsilon_2$ in Eq. (F44), we complete the proof.  

4. Upper and lower bounds for $\text{tr}[\rho(t)]$

Lemma 21.

$$\left( \sum_{k \in S_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} \Delta_k \right) - \epsilon_0 \leq \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \leq \left( \sum_{k \in S_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} \Delta_k \right) + \epsilon_0,\quad (F75)$$

where

$$\Delta_k := e^{-2\delta \int_{-td/T_0}^{td/T_0} dy \bar{\psi}_{\nu_{\text{av}}}(y) |\psi_{\text{av}}(k_0; k - td/T_0)|^2}, \quad \epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(t, d) := \epsilon_{\nu}(t, d) (\epsilon_{\nu}(t, d) + 2) d,\quad (F76)$$

and $\epsilon_{\nu}(t, d)$ is defined by Eq. (F36).

Proof. Here we will use the core theorem in [3] discussed in Section F 2 a. Using Eq. (F39), Eq. (F75) follows from noting $|a + \epsilon|^2 = |a|^2 + |\epsilon|^2 + 2 \Re(a \epsilon)$, $\Re(a) \leq |a|$ for $a, \epsilon \in \mathbb{C}$, and $|\langle \theta_k|\nu_{\text{av}} \rangle (t, d)| \leq \epsilon_{\nu}(t, d)$ for all $k$.  

We will now calculate time dependent upper and lower bounds for $\sum_{k \in S_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} \Delta_k$, where $\Delta_k$ is defined in Lemma 21.

Lemma 22. Let $k_0 = 0$. There exists $\Delta_L \geq 0$, $\Delta_R \geq 0$, $\Delta_C \geq 0$ such that

$$\sum_{k \in S_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} \Delta_k = \Delta_L + \Delta_C + \Delta_R,\quad (F77)$$

where $\Delta_L$, $\Delta_R$ satisfy the bounds

$$\Delta_L, \Delta_R \leq A^2 \frac{e^{-2\delta \gamma d/2 - \tilde{k}(t)^2}}{1 - e^{-4\pi \gamma d/2 - \tilde{k}(t)^2}/\sigma^2},\quad (F78)$$

where $\tilde{k}(t) := [-d/2 + td/T_0 + 1] + d/2 - td/T_0 \in [0, 1]$ and
\[ \gamma = \gamma(m) := \frac{m - 2}{d} \in (0, 1), \quad m = \begin{cases} 4, 6, 8, \ldots, d + 2 & \text{if } d = 2, 4, 6, \ldots \\ 3, 5, 7, \ldots, d + 2 & \text{if } d = 3, 5, 7, \ldots \end{cases} \] (F79)

Furthermore, there exists \( \Delta_C^{(-)} \geq 0, \Delta_C^{(+) \geq 0} \), such that \( \Delta_C \) satisfies the bounds

\[ \Delta_C^{(-)} - \epsilon_C \leq \Delta_C \leq \Delta_C^{(+)}, \] (F80)

where

\[ \epsilon_C = \epsilon_C(t) := 2A^2 \frac{e^{-\frac{\pi^2}{d} (\gamma d/2 - \bar{k}(t))^2}}{1 - e^{-4\pi|\gamma d/2 - \bar{k}(t)|/\sigma^2}}, \] (F81)

and if \( x_0 \) (defined in Section F2a) satisfies \( x_0 + \pi \gamma \leq x_0 \leq 2\pi - x_0 - \pi \gamma \), then

\[ \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\epsilon^{-28\epsilon_v} \leq \Delta_C^{(-)}(t) \leq \Delta_C^{(+)}(t) \leq 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq \frac{2\pi}{T_0} \leq x_0 - x_0 - \pi \gamma, \\
0 \leq \Delta_C^{(-)}(t) \leq \Delta_C^{(+)}(t) \leq e^{-28(1-\epsilon_v)} & \text{if } x_0 + \pi \gamma + x_0 \leq \frac{2\pi}{T_0}.
\end{array} \right. \] (F82)

When the value of \( t \) is such that the above bounds do not hold, we can also use the bounds

\[ 0 \leq \Delta_C(t) \leq 1, \quad \forall \ t \geq 0, \ x_0 \in \mathbb{R}. \] (F83)

**Proof.**

\[ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} \Delta_k = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} e^{-\delta f_{k, -td/T_0} \int dy \psi_0(k_0; k - td/T_0)} \] (F84)

\[ = \sum_{k = \min\{k_0 + td/T_0, \bar{k}(t)\} - td/T_0}^{k_0 + td/T_0} e^{-\delta f_{k, +td/T_0} \int dy \psi_0(k_0; k)} \] (F85)

\[ = \sum_{k = \bar{k}(t) - 1}^{k_0 + d/2 + \bar{k}(t)} e^{-\delta f_{k, +td/T_0} \int dy \psi_0(k_0; k)} \] (F86)

where recall \( \bar{k}(t) = [-d/2 + k_0 + td/T_0 + 1] + d/2 - k - td/T_0 \in [0, 1] \). This follows from noting that \( \bar{k}(t) \) is a solution to both equations \([-d/2 + k_0 + td/T_0 + 1] - td/T_0 = k_0 - d/2 + \bar{k}(t) \) and \([d/2 + k_0 + td/T_0] - td/T_0 = k_0 + d/2 + \bar{k}(t) - 1 \), since we can use the identity \( 1 = [-x + y + 1] - [x + y] + 2x, \) for \( 2x \in \mathbb{Z}, \ y \in \mathbb{R} \) and set \( x = d/2, \ y = k_0 + td/T_0 \). For simplicity, we will now take into account that \( k_0 = 0 \). We will now break the sum up into three contributions where the first two will correspond to the “Gaussian tails” to the “left” (\( \Delta_L \)) and “right” (\( \Delta_R \)) of \( k = k_0 = 0 \), and a “central term” (\( \Delta_C \)) corresponding to the region \( k \approx k_0 = 0 \). Namely,

\[ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} \Delta_k = \Delta_L + \Delta_C + \Delta_R. \] (F88)

We introduce \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \) and start with bounding \( \Delta_L \):

\[ \Delta_L := \sum_{k = -d/2 + \bar{k}(t)}^{\bar{k}(t) - \gamma d/2} e^{-\delta f_{k, +td/T_0} \int dy \psi_0(k_0; k)} \leq \sum_{k = -d/2 + \bar{k}(t)}^{\bar{k}(t) - \gamma d/2} |\psi_0(k_0; k)|^2 = \sum_{y = \gamma d/2 - k(t)}^{d/2 - k(t)} A^2 e^{-\frac{\pi^2}{d^2}(-y)^2} \] (F89)

\[ \leq \sum_{y = \gamma d/2 - k(t)}^{\infty} A^2 e^{-\frac{\pi^2}{d^2}(-y)^2} \leq A^2 \frac{e^{-\frac{\pi^2}{d^2}(\gamma d/2)^2}}{1 - e^{-4\pi|\gamma d/2|/\sigma^2}}, \] (F90)
where the summations are defined as,
\[ \sum_{y=a}^{b} f(y) = f(a) + f(a+1) + \ldots + f(b), \]  
where \( a, b \in \mathbb{R} \), \( b - a \in \mathbb{Z} \) and the sum is defined to be zero if \( b - a \leq 0 \). We will use this convention throughout. We will constrain \( \gamma \) appropriately later in Eq. (F96). In the last line of Eq. (F90) we have used Lemma J.0.1, page 59 from [3]. Similarly, for \( \Delta_R \),
\[ \Delta_R := \sum_{k=k(t)+d/2}^{k(t)+d/2} e^{-2\delta f_k^{t+d/T_0}} dV_d(y) \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2 \leq \sum_{k=k(t)+\gamma d/2}^{k(t)+d/2} \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2 \leq \sum_{k=k(t)+\gamma d/2}^{\infty} \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2 \]  
(F92)
\[ \leq \sum_{k=k(t)-\gamma d/2}^{\infty} \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2 \leq A^2 \frac{e^{-2\pi(k(t)-\gamma d/2)^2}}{1 - e^{-4\pi|k(t)-\gamma d/2|/\sigma^2}} = A^2 \frac{e^{-2\pi(\gamma d/2-k(t))^2}}{1 - e^{-4\pi|\gamma d/2-k(t)|/\sigma^2}}. \]  
(F93)

For \( \Delta_C \), we have
\[ \Delta_C := \sum_{k=k(t)-\gamma d/2+1}^{k(t)+d/2-1} e^{-2\delta f_k^{t+d/T_0}} dV_d(y) \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2 \]  
(F94)
\[ \leq \left( \max_{y \in I_\gamma} \left\{ e^{-2\delta f_y^{t+d/T_0}} dx V_d(x) \right\} \right) \sum_{k=k(t)-\gamma d/2+1}^{k(t)+d/2-1} \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2, \]  
\[ \geq \left( \min_{y \in I_\gamma} \left\{ e^{-2\delta f_y^{t+d/T_0}} dx V_d(x) \right\} \right) \sum_{k=k(t)-\gamma d/2+1}^{k(t)+d/2-1} \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2, \]  
(F95)
where \( I_\gamma := \{ k(t) - \gamma d/2 + 1, k(t) - \gamma d/2 + 2, \ldots, k(t) + \gamma d/2 - 1 \} \). In order for the summation in the definitions of \( \Delta_L, \Delta_C, \Delta_R \) to be well defined, we need the constraints, \(-d\gamma/2 + k(t) - (d\gamma/2 + k(t)) = n_1, d\gamma/2 + k(t) - 1 - (d\gamma/2 + k(t) + 1) = n_2, d\gamma/2 + k(t) - (d/2 + k(t)) = n_3 \), for \( n_1, n_2, n_3 \in \mathbb{Z} \). A solution for \( \gamma \) is
\[ \gamma = \gamma(m) = \frac{m-2}{d} \in (0, 1), \quad \text{where} \quad m = \begin{cases} 4, 6, \ldots, d+2 \text{ if } d = 2, 4, 6, \ldots \\ 3, 5, \ldots, d+2 \text{ if } d = 3, 5, 7, \ldots \end{cases} \]  
(F96)

Before proceeding to bound the maximization and minimization in Eq. (F95), we will bound the common factor term which is approximately one. We find
\[ \sum_{k=k(t)-\gamma d/2+1}^{k(t)+d/2-1} \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2 = \sum_{k \in S_4(k_0+td/T_0)} \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k-td/T_0) \right|^2 - \sum_{k=k(t)-d/2}^{k(t)-\gamma d/2} \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2 - \sum_{k=k(t)+\gamma d/2}^{k(t)+d/2} \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2 \]  
(F97)
\[ = 1 - \sum_{k=k(t)-d/2}^{k(t)-\gamma d/2} \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2 - \sum_{k=k(t)+\gamma d/2}^{k(t)+d/2} \left| \psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k) \right|^2. \]  
(F98)

where in the last line we have used Eq. (F41). The remaining two terms in Eq. (F97) have been bounded in Eqs. (F89), (F92). Noting that \( 0 \leq e^{-2\delta f_y^{t+d/T_0}} dx V_d(x) \leq 1 \), we can thus simplify Eq. (F95), to find
\[ \Delta_C \leq \Delta_C^{(+) - \epsilon_C}, \]  
(F99)
where \( \epsilon_C \) is defined in the statement of the Lemma and
\[ \Delta_C^{(+)} := \max_{y \in I_\gamma} \left\{ e^{-2\delta f_y^{t+d/T_0}} dx V_d(x) \right\}, \quad \Delta_C^{(-)} := \min_{y \in I_\gamma} \left\{ e^{-2\delta f_y^{t+d/T_0}} dx V_d(x) \right\}. \]  
(F100)
FIG. 4: Depiction of the periodic potential function $\bar{V}_0(x + x_0)$ with the parameters $x_{vl}, x_{vr}$ and $\bar{\epsilon}_V$ introduced in Eq. [F13]. Observe that the area under the potential $\bar{V}_0(x + x_0)$ (i.e. its integral) between $x = x_{vr} - 2\pi$ and $x = x_{vl}$ is $\bar{\epsilon}_V$ due to symmetry. The quantities $\frac{2\pi}{d} y - x_0$ and $\frac{2\pi}{d} y + \frac{2\pi}{T_0} - x_0$ are the lower and upper integration limits in Eq. [F101].

Our next aim will be to find bounds on $t$ which determine whether $\Delta C$ is approximately 1 or $e^{-2\delta}$. First note,

$$\int_{y}^{y+t/T_0} dx \bar{V}_d(x) = \frac{2\pi}{d} \int_{y}^{y+t/T_0} dx \bar{V}_0 \left( \frac{2\pi}{d} x \right) = \int_{2\pi y/d - x_0}^{2\pi y/d + t/T_0 - x_0} dx \bar{V}_0 (x + x_0).$$  \hspace{1cm} (F101)

We can now use Eq. [F101] to find conditions for the time “before a tick is measured”, namely conditions for which

$$\int_{y}^{y+t/T_0} dx \bar{V}_d(x) \leq 1 - (1 - \bar{\epsilon}_V) = \bar{\epsilon}_V.$$  \hspace{1cm} (F102)

From Fig. 4 and Eq. [F101] we observe that Eq. [F102] is satisfied for all $y \in I_\gamma$ if

$$x_{vr} - \frac{2\pi}{d} y - x_0 \leq 1 - \frac{2\pi}{d} y - x_0 \quad \text{(F103)}$$

$$\frac{2\pi}{d} y + \frac{2\pi}{T_0} - x_0 \leq x_{vl} = -x_{vr}, \quad \text{(F104)}$$

for all $y \in I_\gamma$. Or equivalently, if

$$\frac{2\pi}{d} \min\{y\} \geq x_{vr} - \frac{2\pi}{d} y + x_0 \quad \text{(F105)}$$

$$\frac{2\pi}{d} \max\{y\} \leq x_0 - \frac{2\pi}{T_0} t - x_{vr}, \quad \text{(F106)}$$

from which it follows,

$$x_0 \leq 2\pi - x_{vr} - \pi \gamma + \frac{2\pi}{d} (\bar{k}(t) + 1) \quad \text{(F107)}$$

$$0 \leq \frac{2\pi}{T_0} t \leq x_0 - x_{vr} - \pi \gamma - \frac{2\pi}{d} (\bar{k}(t) - 1). \quad \text{(F108)}$$

Thus recalling that $\bar{k}(t) \in [0, 1]$, sufficient conditions on $x_0$ and $t$ for Eq. [F102] to be satisfied are

$$x_0 \leq 2\pi - x_{vr} - \pi \gamma$$

$$0 \leq \frac{2\pi}{T_0} t \leq x_0 - x_{vr} - \pi \gamma. \quad \text{(F109, F110)}$$

Similarly, we can work out conditions for the time “after a tick has occurred”, i.e.

$$\int_{y}^{y+t/T_0} dx \bar{V}_d(x) \geq 1 - \bar{\epsilon}_V,$$  \hspace{1cm} (F111)
for all \( y \in \mathcal{I} \), if
\[
\frac{2\pi}{d} y - x_0 \leq -x_{vr}
\] (F112)
\[
x_{vr} \leq \frac{2\pi}{d} y + \frac{2\pi}{T_0} - x_0
\] (F113)
for all \( y \in \mathcal{I}_\gamma \). Or equivalently, if
\[
x_{vr} + \max\{y\}_{y \in \mathcal{I}_\gamma} \frac{2\pi}{d} \leq x_0
\] (F114)
\[
x_{vr} + \frac{2\pi}{d} \max\{-y\}_{y \in \mathcal{I}_\gamma} + x_0 \leq t \frac{2\pi}{T_0}
\] (F115)
from which it follows
\[
x_{vr} + \frac{2\pi}{d} (\bar{k}(t) - 1) + \pi \gamma \leq x_0
\] (F116)
\[
x_{vr} - \frac{2\pi}{d} (\bar{k}(t) + 1) + \pi \gamma + x_0 \leq t \frac{2\pi}{T_0}
\] (F117)
Thus recalling that \( \bar{k}(t) \in [0, 1] \), sufficient conditions on \( x_0 \) and \( t \) for Eq. (F111) to be satisfied are
\[
x_{vr} + \pi \gamma \leq x_0,
\] (F118)
\[
x_{vr} + \pi \gamma + x_0 \leq t \frac{2\pi}{T_0}.
\] (F119)
Thus from Eqs. (F109), (F110), (F118), and recalling \( \tilde{V}_0 \geq 0 \), we conclude that if \( x_0 \) satisfies
\[
x_{vr} + \pi \gamma \leq x_0 \leq 2\pi - x_{vr} - \pi \gamma,
\] (F120)
then
\[
e^{-2\delta} \leq \Delta_C^{(-)}(t) \leq \Delta_C^{(+)}(t) \leq 1 \text{ if } 0 \leq t \frac{2\pi}{T_0} \leq x_0 - x_{vr} - \pi \gamma,
\] (F121)
\[
0 \leq \Delta_C^{(-)}(t) \leq \Delta_C^{(+)}(t) \leq e^{-2\delta(1-\epsilon_v)} \text{ if } x_{vr} + \pi \gamma + x_0 \leq t \frac{2\pi}{T_0}.
\] (F122)

5. Calculating \( \Delta(0) \) and \( \Delta(1) \) and an explicit lower bound on \( R_1 \)

Define
\[
t_1 := (x_0 - x_{vr} - \pi \gamma) \frac{T_0}{2\pi}, \quad t_2 := (x_0 + x_{vr} + \pi \gamma) \frac{T_0}{2\pi}, \quad \Delta t := t_2 - t_1 = (x_{vr} + \pi \gamma) \frac{T_0}{\pi}.
\] (F123)

Furthermore, we will want \( t_1 \) to be in the centre of the range \([0, T_0]\). As such, we set \( t_1 = T_0/2 \) which taking into account the definition of \( t_1 \) in Eq. (F123) implies
\[
x_0 = \pi + x_{vr} + \pi \gamma.
\] (F124)
Physically, Eq. (F124) means that the potential is peaked near the mid point \( \pi \) and thus that the continuous measurements will occur approximately at a time \( T_0/2 \). Note that Eq. (F124) is consistent with Eq. (F120) as long as \( x_{vr} + \pi \gamma \leq \pi/2 \). As we will see later, both \( \gamma \) and \( x_{vr} \) will be parametrized such that \( \gamma, x_{vr} \to 0 \) as \( d \to \infty \). As such, this constraint will always be satisfied for sufficiently large \( d \).\(^{25}\)

\(^{24}\)See Eqs. (F149), (F151), (F232) for explicit parametrization.
\(^{25}\)It is expected that one could actually weaken the constraint imposed on \( x_{vr} \) and \( \gamma \) if one choose a slightly different parametrization of \( t_1 \), say \( t_1 = T_0/2 - (x_{vr} + \pi \gamma)T_0/\pi \). But for simplicity, we will not do this here.
Lemma 23. $R_1$ satisfies the bound

$$R_1 \geq \frac{-(2T_0\delta_0(T_0) + \int_0^{T_0} dt |\epsilon_C(t)|) (\epsilon_1 e^{-2\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} + \Delta t) + \Delta t^2}{\epsilon_4 + \epsilon_3 + 3e^{-\delta(1-\bar{t}\epsilon)} + (1 - e^{-4\delta\bar{t}\epsilon})/4 + \frac{2}{T_0^2} (t_2 - t_1 e^{-2\delta\bar{t}\epsilon}) \Delta t + \left(\frac{\Delta t}{T_0}\right)^2},$$

where we have defined

$$\epsilon_3 := \frac{2}{T_0^2} \int_0^{T_0} dt (\Delta_L(t) + \Delta_R(t)), \quad \epsilon_4 := \epsilon_0(T_0) + \frac{1}{T_0} \left(2T_0\epsilon_0(T_0) + \int_0^{T_0} dt \epsilon_C(t)\right) (t_1 e^{-2\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} + \Delta t) + \epsilon_1/T_0^2.$$  

Proof. Using Lemma \ref{Lemma21} followed by Lemma \ref{Lemma22}

$$\int_0^{T_0} dt \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \geq \int_0^{T_0} dt (\Delta_L(t) + \Delta_C(t) + \Delta_R(t) - \epsilon_0) \quad \geq -T_0\epsilon_0(T_0) - \int_0^{T_0} dt \epsilon_C(t) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \Delta_C(t) + \int_{t_2}^{T_0} dt \Delta_C(t)$$

$$\geq -T_0\epsilon_0(T_0) - \int_0^{T_0} dt \epsilon_C(t) + t_1 e^{-2\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \Delta_C(t).$$

Thus,

$$\left(\int_0^{T_0} dt \text{tr}[\rho(t)]\right)^2 \geq \left(\int_0^{T_0} dt \epsilon_C(t) + t_1 e^{-2\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \Delta_C(t)\right)^2$$

$$\geq \left(-T_0\epsilon_0(T_0) - \int_0^{T_0} dt \epsilon_C(t)\right)^2 - \left(2T_0\epsilon_0(T_0) + \int_0^{T_0} dt \epsilon_C\right) \left(t_1 e^{-2\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \Delta_C(t)\right)$$

$$+ \left(t_1 e^{-2\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \Delta_C(t)\right)^2$$

$$\geq - \left(2T_0\epsilon_0(T_0) + \int_0^{T_0} dt \epsilon_C(t)\right) (t_1 e^{-2\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} + \Delta t) + t_1^2 e^{-4\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} + 2e^{-2\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} t_1 \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \Delta_C(t)$$

$$+ \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \Delta_C(t)\right)^2$$

$$\geq - \left(2T_0\epsilon_0(T_0) + \int_0^{T_0} dt \epsilon_C(t)\right) (t_1 e^{-2\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} + \Delta t) + t_1^2 e^{-4\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} + 2e^{-2\delta\bar{t}\epsilon} t_1 \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \Delta_C(t) - \Delta t^2$$

$$= \Delta^2(0),$$

where we have used Definition (F123) and Lemma \ref{Lemma22}. Similarly,

$$\int_0^{T_0} dt t \text{tr}[\rho(t)] \leq \int_0^{T_0} dt (\Delta_L(t) + \Delta_C(t) + \Delta_R(t) + \epsilon_0)$$

$$\leq \frac{T_0^2}{2} (\epsilon_0(T_0) + \epsilon_3) + \int_0^{T_0} dt t \Delta_C(t) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt t \Delta_C(t) + \int_{t_2}^{T_0} dt t \Delta_C(t)$$

$$\leq \frac{T_0^2}{2} (\epsilon_0(T_0) + \epsilon_3) + \frac{t_1^2}{2} + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt t \Delta_C(t) + e^{-\delta(1-\bar{t}\epsilon)} \frac{T_0^2 - t_2^2}{2}$$

$$= \Delta(1),$$
where $\epsilon_3$ is defined in Eq. (F126). Setting $t_1 = T_0/2$ and simplifying Eq. (F43), we achieve

\begin{equation}
R_1 \geq \frac{\Delta^2(0) + \epsilon_2}{2\Delta(1) - \Delta^2(0) + \epsilon_1} (t_1 \epsilon^{-2\delta\epsilon_V} + \Delta t) / T_0^2 + \left(2e^{-2\delta\epsilon_V} t_1 \int_t^T dt \Delta_C(t) + \epsilon_2 \right) / T_0^2
\end{equation}

where $\epsilon_4$ is defined in Eq. (F126).

6. $R_1$ to leading order

Lemma 24. Assume $\epsilon_V \to 0$, $\epsilon(T_0, d) \to 0$, $\delta \to \infty$, $a \to \infty$, and $\delta \epsilon_V \to 0$, in the limit $d \to \infty$, then using Big-O notation, $\mathcal{O}$, to leading order in $e^{-\delta \epsilon_V}$, $\Delta t$, and $\delta \epsilon_V$, $R_1$ is lower bounded by

\begin{equation}
R_1 \geq \frac{1/4 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon(T_0, d) d) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2)}{\mathcal{O} \left( A^2 \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma^{1/2}} + 1 \right) e^{\frac{-2}{\Delta^2(0)}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(a^2 d \epsilon(T_0, d)) + \mathcal{O}(a^2 e^{-\delta}) + \mathcal{O}(\delta \epsilon_V) + 3 \left( \frac{\Delta t}{\sigma} \right)^2},
\end{equation}

for all fixed constants $\eta > 0$ and $\sigma, d$ satisfying $4/\sigma < d^{1/2} \leq d/\sigma$.

Proof. We start with a technical definition which allows us to upper and lower bound $\gamma$ (defined in terms of the integer $m$ in Eq. (F79)) in terms of $\sigma$ and a power of $d^{1/2}$, which will be crucial for the rest of the proof.

For $\eta > 0$ with $4/\sigma < d^{1/2} \leq d/\sigma$, parametrize $m$ by

\begin{equation}
m = \begin{cases} 
2 |\tilde{m}| & \text{if } d = 2, 4, 6, \ldots, \\
2 |\tilde{m}| + 1 & \text{if } d = 3, 5, 7, \ldots,
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

where

\begin{equation}
\tilde{m} := \begin{cases} 
\frac{d^{1/2}}{\sigma} + 1 \in (3, d/2 + 1] & \text{if } d = 2, 4, 6, \ldots, \\
\frac{d^{1/2}}{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} \in (5/2, (d + 1)/2] & \text{if } d = 3, 5, 7, \ldots.
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

Note the consistency of the domains of $\tilde{m}$ and $m$: the domain of $\tilde{m}$ (which follows from the constraint $4/\sigma < d^{1/2} \leq d/\sigma$) in Eq. (F148) implies (via Eq. (F147)) a range for $m$ of $m \in \{6, 8, 10, \ldots, d + 2\}$ for $d = 2, 4, 6, \ldots$, and $m \in \{5, 7, 9, \ldots, d + 2\}$ for $d = 3, 5, 7, \ldots$, which is within the domain of $m$ defined in Eq. (F79).

From the bound $x - 1 \leq |x| \leq x$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, it follows $2\tilde{m} - 2 \leq m \leq 2\tilde{m}$ and thus from Eqs. (F79), (F147), (F148) it follows

\begin{equation}
\gamma = \frac{m - 2}{d} \leq \frac{2\tilde{m} - 2}{d} = \frac{d^{1/2} \sigma}{d} \quad \text{for } d = 2, 4, 6, \ldots,
\end{equation}

and

\begin{equation}
\gamma = \frac{m - 2}{d} \geq \frac{2\tilde{m} - 4}{d} = \frac{d^{1/2} \sigma}{d} - \frac{2}{d} \quad \text{for } d = 2, 4, 6, \ldots
\end{equation}
Similarly, we find
\[
d^{n/2} \frac{\sigma}{d} - \frac{1}{d} \leq \gamma \leq d^{n/2} \frac{\sigma}{d} \quad \text{for } d = 1, 3, 5,
\]
We will now bound \(\epsilon_3\) using Eqs. (F150), (F151),
\[
\epsilon_3 = 2 \int_0^{T_0} dt t (A^2_\mathcal{L} + A^2_\mathcal{R}(t)) \leq \left( \frac{2A_\mathcal{L}}{T_0} \right)^2 \int_0^{T_0} dt t e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\sigma} (\gamma d/2 - 1)}^2 \leq \left( \frac{2A_\mathcal{L}}{T_0} \right)^2 \int_0^{T_0} dt t e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\sigma^2} (\gamma d/2 - 1)^2}
\]
where the denominator of line \(\text{(F153)}\) is finite since \(d^{n/2} - 4/\sigma > 0\) and we have used the observation that \(1/(1-e^{-x})\) is monotonic decreasing in \(x\) for \(x > 0\). In the \(d \to \infty\) limit, there are a number of possibilities, depending on whether \(d^{n/2} / \sigma\) tends to infinity, zero or a positive constant. By calculating these cases separately,

1) If \(\lim_{d \to \infty} d^{n/2} / \sigma = \infty\) we find
\[
\epsilon_3 = \mathcal{O} \left( A^2 e^{\frac{\sigma}{d^{n/2}} d^{n/2}} \right).
\]

2) If \(\lim_{d \to \infty} d^{n/2} / \sigma\) converges to a constant, we find
\[
\epsilon_3 = \mathcal{O} \left( A^2 e^{-\frac{\sigma}{d^{n/2}} d^{n/2}} \right).
\]

Thus recalling that Big-O notation captures the worse case scenario (i.e. it is an upper bound in the limit), combining the conclusions from 1) and 2) above we find for arbitrary \(d^{n/2} / \sigma\),
\[
\epsilon_3 = \mathcal{O} \left( A^2 \left( \frac{\sigma}{d^{n/2}} + 1 \right) e^{-\frac{\sigma}{d^{n/2}} d^{n/2}} \right).
\]

Similarly, we find that \(\epsilon_C\) defined in Eq. (F81) is of order
\[
\epsilon_C = \mathcal{O} \left( A^2 \left( \frac{\sigma}{d^{n/2}} + 1 \right) e^{-\frac{\sigma}{d^{n/2}} d^{n/2}} \right).
\]

Recalling the definition of \(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \text{ and } \epsilon_4\), we find
\[
\epsilon_0 = \mathcal{O}(d \epsilon(T_0, d)), \quad \epsilon_1 = \mathcal{O}(a^2 e^{-\delta}) + \mathcal{O}(a^2 \epsilon(T_0, d)), \quad \epsilon_4 = \mathcal{O}(d \epsilon(T_0, d)) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\delta}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_C),
\]
Thus concluding the proof.

\[\square\]

**Corollary 9.** Recall that \(\Delta t / T_0 = \pi + \gamma\). Let the conditions in Lemma 24 be satisfied. In addition, if \(x_{vr}\) is of higher order than \(\gamma\), \((x_{vr} = o(\gamma))\); and the order terms in Eq. (F146) are of higher order than \(\gamma^2\), \((i.e. A^2 (\sigma/d^{n/2} + 1)e^{-\frac{\sigma}{d^{n/2}} d^{n/2}} = o(\gamma), a^2 d \epsilon(T_0, d) = o(\gamma), a^2 e^{-\delta} = o(\gamma), \delta \epsilon_V = o(\gamma))\) it follows from Eqs. (F149), (F151), that
\[
R_1 \geq \frac{1}{12} \gamma^{-2} + o(\gamma^{-2}) \geq \frac{1}{12} \frac{d^{2-n}}{\sigma^2} + o \left( \frac{d^{2-n}}{\sigma^2} \right),
\]
where \(o\) is little-o notation.

**Proof.** Follows directly from Lemma 24 by keeping leading order terms only.

\[\square\]

7. Showing that the limit requirements of Corollary 9 can be met

The difficulty in proving the conditions given in Lemma 24 can be satisfied, and that \(x_{vr}\) can be of higher order than \(\gamma\), consists in finding a potential \(V_0\) which can be parametrized in terms of \(d\) adequately. In this section, we will demonstrate via a particular \(V_0\) that this can indeed be achieved. Recall that the potential \(V_0\) which we will introduce here, has been summarised in Section 2 along with the particular parametrizations which we will pick in this section, as need be.
a. Definition of $\bar{V}_0$

We start by defining $\bar{V}_0 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ appropriately. Let\(^{26}\)

$$\bar{V}_0(x) := \frac{1}{\delta d^2} + n A_0 \sum_{p=-\infty}^{\infty} V_B \left( n(x - x_0 - 2\pi p) \right), \quad (F160)$$

where $n \geq 1$ is a free parameter, $A_0$ a normalization constant such that

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \bar{V}_0(x) \, dx = 1, \quad (F161)$$

and

$$V_B(x) := \text{sinc}^{2N}(x) := \left( \frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\pi x} \right)^{2N}, \quad (F162)$$

where $V_B(0) = 1$ (defined by continuity in $x$) and $N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ is another free parameter. In the following if statements about $\bar{V}_0$ or $V_B$ are made without mentioning either $n$ or $N$, it is to be understood that these properties hold for all $n \geq 1$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.

We will now show some useful properties of $\bar{V}_0$. Later we will parameterize $n$ in terms of $d$, while $N$ will be a constant dependent on the small ($d$ independent) parameter $\eta$ introduced in Lemma 24.

b. Finding a value for $a$

It will now become apparent why we included the term $1/(\delta d^2)$ in the definition of the potential $\bar{V}_0$.

**Corollary 10.** The constant $a$ defined in Eq. (F59) can be set equal to the following

$$a = \frac{T_0}{4\pi} d^2. \quad (F163)$$

**Proof.** Since all the terms in the definition of $\bar{V}_0$ are non-negative, it follows $\min_{x \in [0,2\pi]} \bar{V}_0(x) \geq 1/(\delta d^2)$. Hence

$$\frac{T_0}{4\pi} \min_{x \in [0,2\pi]} \bar{V}_0(x) \leq \frac{T_0}{4\pi} d^2, \quad (F164)$$

Eq. (F163) is thus a direct consequence of Eq. (F59). $\blacksquare$

c. Properties of $\bar{V}_0$

First note that $\bar{V}_0$ is periodic with period $2\pi$, and is infinitely differentiable. The first of these properties is clear from Eq. (F160) while the second will be demonstrated in Lemma 28. These two properties are required by definition in [3]. We will now show some additional properties, specific to this particular choice of potential function $\bar{V}_0$.

**Lemma 25 (Normalization).** $A_0$ is $n$ independent. In particular, it satisfies $A_0 < A_0$, where $A_0$ is only a function of $N$.

**Proof.** Since for all $x \in [0,2\pi]$,

$$\sum_{p=-\infty}^{\infty} \left| V_B(n(x - x_0 - 2\pi p)) \right| \leq 1 + \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{p^{2N}} < \infty, \quad (F165)$$

\(^{26}\)One could also exchange the term $1/(\delta d^2)$ with $1/(\delta d^K)$ for some constant $K > 0$ and the main result, Theorem would still go through.
it follows from the Weierstrass M-test (see Theorem 7.10 in [32]), that the sum in Eq. (F160) converges uniformly for all \( x \in [0, 2\pi] \). We will use this in the following to exchange summation and integration limits over a finite interval. Using Eq. (F161), we have

\[
1 = \int_0^{2\pi} dx V_0(x) = \int_0^{2\pi} dx V_0(x + x_0) = A_0 n \int_0^{2\pi} dx \sum_{p=-\infty}^0 V_B(n(x - 2\pi p)) + \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{dx}{\delta d^2} \tag{F166}
\]

\[
= A_0 n \sum_{p=-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} dx V_B(n(x - 2\pi p)) + \frac{2\pi}{\delta d^2} = A_0 n \sum_{p=-\infty}^0 \int_{-2\pi p}^{2\pi(1-p)} dx V_B(nx) + \frac{2\pi}{\delta d^2} = A_0 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx V_B(x) + \frac{2\pi}{\delta d^2} \tag{F167}
\]

Hence,

\[
A_0 = \frac{1 - 2\pi/(\delta d^2)}{\frac{1}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx V_B(x)}} =: A_0, \tag{F169}
\]

which is \( n \) independent, since \( V_B \) is, and well defined since \( V_B \in L^1 \) with a non-zero integral.

**Lemma 26** (Technical Lemma needed for Lemma 28).

\[
d^k dx^k \sum_{p=-\infty}^0 V_B(xn - 2\pi np) = \sum_{p=-\infty}^0 d^k dx^k V_B(xn - 2\pi np), \tag{F170}
\]

for all \( k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \) and \( x \in [0, 2\pi] \).

**Proof.** For \( p = \pm 2, \pm 3, \pm 4, \ldots, x \in [0, 2\pi] \) and for all \( k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \),

\[
\left| \frac{d^k dx^k V_B(xn - 2\pi np)}{dx^k} \right| \leq \left| \frac{n^k}{(\pi n(x - 2\pi p))^{2N}} \sum_{q=0}^k \binom{k}{q} \left(\frac{-2N}{n^q(x - 2\pi p)}\right) \left(\sin^{2N}(\pi z)\right)_{z=n(x-2\pi p)} \right| \tag{F171}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{n^k}{(\pi^2 n |p|)^{2N}} \sum_{q=0}^k \binom{k}{q} \left|\left(\frac{-2N}{n^q(2\pi)^q}\right)\right| D_{k-q} := M^k_p, \tag{F172}
\]

where we have defined \( D_k := \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |d^k dx^k \sin^{2N}(\pi z)| < \infty \) for \( k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0} \). Hence, since

\[
\sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}, |p| \geq 2} M^k_p < \infty, \tag{F174}
\]

from the Weierstrass M-test (see Theorem 7.10 in [32]), uniform convergence of \( d^k dx^k V_B(xn - 2\pi np) \) follows for all \( k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \).

If \( f_n : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) is a sequence of differentiable functions with domain \([a, b], a, b \in \mathbb{R} \) with derivatives \( f'_n \), and \( \sum_{n=0}^\infty f'_n \) converges uniformly on \([a, b] \), then if we define \( f := \sum_{n=0}^\infty f_n \) and \( |f| < \infty \), it follows that \( f' = \sum_{n=0}^\infty f'_n \), where \( f' \) is the derivative of \( f \). This is a well known Theorem and can be found in e.g. Theorem 7.17 [32]. Thus from Eq. (F174) for \( k = 1 \), Eq. (F170) follows immediately for \( k = 1 \). Proceeding inductively, we prove Eq. (F170) for all \( k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \).

**Lemma 27** (Technical Lemma needed for Lemma 28). Let \( f \) denote the Triangle function, namely

\[
f(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| \geq 1 \\ 1 - |x| & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{F175}
\]

and let \( * \) denote Convolution. Then,

\[
f^{*N} := f * f * \ldots * f \in L^1, \tag{F176}
\]

is a continuous function which is infinitely differentiable on the intervals \((-N, -N+1) \cup \ldots \cup (N-1, N)\) and zero on the intervals \((-\infty, -N) \cup (N, +\infty)\) for all \( N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \).
Proof. The proof is by induction. Let us start by defining the continuous functions \( g_n : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) for \( n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \),

\[
g_n(x) := P_{n,m}(x) \quad \text{if} \quad m \leq x \leq m + 1 \quad \text{for} \quad m \in \mathbb{Z},
\]

where

\[
P_{n,m}(x) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad m \in (-\infty, -n - 1) \cup [n, +\infty),
\]

and \( \{P_{n,m}(x)\} \) are a set of real polynomials in \( x \). Continuity of \( g \) implies

\[
P_{n,m}(m + 1) = P_{n,m+1}(m + 1) \quad \text{for all} \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]

We denote the set of such functions \( g_n \) by \( S_q \). Note that \( f \) in Eq. \((F175)\) belongs to \( S_1 \). We will start by showing that \((g_1 \ast g_n)(y) \in S_{n+1}\) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \), \( g_n \in S_n \) and \( g_1 \in S_1 \). For this we will calculate \((g_1 \ast g_n)(y)\) for \( y \in [q, q+1] \); for \( q \in \mathbb{Z} \) and define \( \delta_y := y - q \), \( 0 \leq \delta_y \leq 1 \). We find

\[
(g_1 \ast g_n)(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx g_1(x)g_n(x-y) = \sum_{m=-1,0}^{m+1} \int_{m}^{m+1} dx P_{1,m}(x)g_n(x-y)
\]

\[
= \sum_{m=-1,0}^{m+1} \left( \int_{m}^{m+\delta_y} dx P_{1,m}(x)g_n(x-q-\delta_y) + \int_{m+\delta_y}^{m+1} dx P_{1,m}(x)g_n(x-q-\delta_y) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{m=-1,0}^{m-\delta_y+y} \left( \int_{m}^{m-q+y} dx P_{1,m}(x)P_{n,m-q-1}(x-y) + \int_{m-q+y}^{m+1} dx P_{1,m}(x)P_{n,m-q}(x-y) \right)
\]

\[
= P'(n,q,y),
\]

where \( P'(n,q;y) \) is a polynomial in \( y \) with coefficient depending on \( n \) and \( q \). This follows by noting: 1) the integral of \( P_{1,m}(x)P_{n,m-q-1}(x-y) \) and \( P_{1,m}(x)P_{n,m-q}(x-y) \) w.r.t. \( x \) are polynomials in both \( x \) and \( y \) (this is trivial to see by a formal power-law expansion). 2) The \( x \) variable is then evaluated at a linear function in \( y \) which leaves us with a polynomial in \( y \). 3) these polynomials are then summed over the coefficients in \( m \), which again is another polynomial in \( y \). \((g_1 \ast g_n)(y)\) is continuous in \( y \in \mathbb{R} \), since both \( g_1 \) and \( g_n \) are continuous and the convolution of two continuous functions is continuous.

All that is left to show, to prove that \((g_1 \ast g_n)(y) \in S_{n+1}\), is to show that \( P'(n,q;y) = P_{n+1,q}(y) \) for some \( P_{n+1,q}(y) \) obeying Eqs. \((F177), (F178)\). That \( P'(n,q;y) \) obeys Eq. \((F177)\) follows from the relationship between \( y \) and \( q \), namely \( y \in [q, q+1] \). Eq. \((F178)\) is true for \( P'(n,q;y) \) if

\[
P'(n,q;y) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad q \in (-\infty, -(n-2)] \cup [n+1, \infty).
\]

We now verify that Eq. \((F184)\) is satisfied. \( q \leq -n - 2 \) implies \( m - q - 1 \geq m + n + 1 \geq n \) for \( m = -1,0 \). Thus it follows using Eq. \((F178)\) that the term \( P_{n,m-q-1} \) in line \((F182)\) is zero for \( q \leq -n - 2 \). Furthermore \( q \leq -n - 2 \) implies \( m - q \geq m + n + 2 \geq n + 1 \) for \( m = -1,0 \). Thus it follows using Eq. \((F178)\) that the term \( P_{n,m-q} \) in line \((F182)\) is zero for \( q \leq -n - 2 \). Similarly we can verify that \( P'(n,q;y) = 0 \) for \( q \geq n + 1 \). This concludes the proof that \((g_1 \ast g_n)(y) \in S_{n+1}\) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \), \( g_n \in S_n \) and \( g_1 \in S_1 \).

Now work inductively to conclude that \( g_1^{*N} \in S_N \). Thus recalling that \( f \in S_1 \) and noting that all functions in \( S_N \) satisfy the conditions on \( f^{*N} \) of the Lemma, we conclude the proof.

**Lemma 28.** There exists \( C_0 = C_0(N) > 0 \) which is only a function of \( N \), i.e. independent of \( n, d, \) and \( k \), such that

\[
\max_{x \in [0,2x]} \left| \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \hat{V}_0(x) \right| \leq n^{k+1} C_0^{k+1}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq0}, \forall n \geq 1.
\]

**Proof.** The proof will consist in writing the \( k \)-th derivative in Fourier space and using properties of the Fourier Transform to calculate and upper bound the resultant expression.

We will start by simplifying the expression for the derivative.

We start by noting that the Fourier Transform of \( V_B \in L^1 \) can be computed via the Convolution theorem,

\[
\mathcal{F}(V_B)(y) = \mathcal{F}((\text{sinc}^2)^N)(y) = [\mathcal{F}(\text{sinc}^2) \ast \mathcal{F}(\text{sinc}^2) \ast \ldots \ast \mathcal{F}(\text{sinc}^2)](y),
\]

\( N \)-times convolution product
which is well-defined, since the Convolution Theorem maps two $L^1$ functions to an $L^1$ function, and $\text{sinc}^2 \in L^1$. By direct calculation, we have that

$$F(\text{sinc}^2)(y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |y| \geq 1 \\ 1 - |y| & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (F187)$$

thus since the Convolution of two finite support functions, has finite support, we conclude by induction from Eq. (F186) that $F(V_B)(y)$ has finite support. We denote the finite interval containing the support of $F(V_B)(y)$ by $[y_{\min}, y_{\max}]$. Furthermore, note that $F(\text{sinc}^2)$ has a discontinuous derivative at three points on its domain $(0, y_{\min}, y_{\max})$. When $F(\text{sinc}^2)$ is convoluted with itself, the resultant function might also have a finite set of points in its support interval at which it is not differentiable (see Lemma 27). Similarly due to Eq. (F186), $F(V_B)(y)$ may have a finite set of points contained in $[y_{\min}, y_{\max}]$ at which the function is not differentiable.

Using Lemma 26 and the change of variable $z = n x - 2\pi p$, we have for $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$

$$\max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \left| \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \tilde{V}_0(x) \right| = \max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \left| \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \tilde{V}_0(x + x_0) \right| = n A_0 \max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \left| \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \sum_{p = -\infty}^{\infty} V_B(xn - 2\pi np) \right| = n A_0 \max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \left| \sum_{p = -\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d^k}{dx^k} V_B(xn - 2\pi np) \right| = n^{k + 1} A_0 \max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \left| \sum_{p = -\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{d^k}{dx^k} V_B(z) \right]_{x = n x - 2\pi np} \right| = n^{k + 1} A_0 \max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \left| \sum_{p = -\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d^k}{dx^k} V_B(z) \right|_{x = n x - 2\pi np} = n^{k + 1} A_0 \max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \left| \sum_{p = -\infty}^{\infty} \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} dy (2\pi i y)^k \cos(4\pi^2 npy) F(V_B)(y) e^{-2\pi i (nx - 2\pi np)y} \right| \leq 2n^{k + 1} A_0 \max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \left| \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} dy (2\pi i y)^k \cos(4\pi^2 npy) F(V_B)(y) e^{-2\pi i nxy} \right| \quad (F189)$$

Note that the inverse Fourier Transform is well defined on the domain $L^2$. Thus line (F192) is well justified since $(2\pi i y)^k F(V_B) \in L^2 \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$, because $F(V_B)$ has finite support.

For the term $p = 0$ we have

$$\left| \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} dy (2\pi i y)^0 F(V_B)(y) e^{-2\pi i nxy} \right| \leq (y_{\max} - y_{\min}) |2\pi y_{\max}| \max_{x \in [y_{\min}, y_{\max}]} |F(V_B)(x)| \leq y_{\max} (2\pi y_{\max}) \left| F^{(0)}_{\text{max}}(V_B) \right| \quad (F195)$$

where we have introduced the notation $\max\{|y_{\min}, y_{\max}, 1\} = N =: y_{\max}$, $d^k/dy^k F(V_B)(y) =: F^{(k)}(V_B)(y)$, and $\sup_{y \in [y_{\min}, y_{\max}]} |F^{(k)}(V_B)(y)| =: F^{(k)}_{\text{max}}(V_B)$. We will now bound the other terms $p \neq 0$. In the following we will denote, $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} F^{(k)}(V_B)(y_0 \pm \varepsilon) = F^{(k)}(V_B)(y_0)$, and use primes to denote 1st derivatives w.r.t. $y$. We will proceed by integration by parts twice, after splitting the integral up into sections in which $F(V_B)(y)$ has

\textit{27In fact, it is not differentiable at these points, but we will not need to prove this for our purposes.}
continuous derivatives. We find
\[
\left| \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} dy (2\pi iy)^k \cos(4\pi^2 npy) F(V_B)(y)e^{-2\pi i n x y} \right| = \frac{1}{16\pi^4 n^2 p^2} \left( 2\pi y_M \right)^{k-1} 4\pi (2N + 1) F_{\max}^{(1)}(V_B) \]
\[
+ (y_{\max} - y_{\min}) 2\pi (2\pi y_M)^{k-1} \left[ ((k - 1)(2\pi y_M)^{-1} + nx)((k + 2\pi y_M n x + 1) F_{\max}(V_B) + y_M F_{\max}^{(1)}(V_B))2\pi \\
+ 2\pi nx F_{\max}(V_B) + (k + 2\pi n x + 2) F_{\max}^{(1)}(V_B) + y_M F_{\max}^{(2)}(V_B) \right].
\]

Note the dependency on $n$ of the expression on the R.H.S. of the inequality line (F204). It is of the form $(c_0 + n c_0 + n^2 c_0)/n^2$, where $c_0 \geq 0$, $c_0 \geq 0$, $c_0 \geq 0$ are $n$ independent. Thus since $n \in [1, \infty)$, the R.H.S. of line (F204) is upper bounded uniformly in $n$ by setting $n = 1$. Similarly, the coefficients $c_0 \geq 0$, $c_0 \geq 0$ are upper bounded in $x \in [0, 2\pi]$, by setting $x = 2\pi$. We thus have for $|p| \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$,
\[
\left| \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} dy (2\pi iy)^k \cos(4\pi^2 npy) F(V_B)(y)e^{-2\pi i n x y} \right| \leq \frac{(2\pi N)^{k-1}}{16\pi^4 p^2} \left( 4\pi (2N + 1) F_{\max}^{(1)}(V_B) \right) \\
+ N 2\pi \left[ ((k + 1)(2\pi N)^{-1} + 2\pi)((k + (2\pi)^2 N + 1) F_{\max}(V_B) + N F_{\max}^{(1)}(V_B))2\pi \\
+ (2\pi)^2 F_{\max}(V_B) + (k + (2\pi)^2 + 2) F_{\max}^{(1)}(V_B) + N F_{\max}^{(2)}(V_B) \right].
\]
where we have used \( y_M = N \). The R.H.S. of the inequality Eq. (F205) can be written as
\[
\frac{(2\pi N)^k}{16\pi^4 p^2} \left( c_{03} + c_{04} k + c_{05} k^2 \right),
\]
with the coefficients \( c_{03} \geq 0, c_{04} \geq 0, c_{05} \geq 0 \) are \( k, x \) and \( p \) independent. Thus from Eqs. (F188), (F195), (F205),
\[
\max_{x \in [0,2\pi]} \left| \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \tilde{V}_0(x) \right| = \max_{x \in [0,2\pi]} \left| \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \tilde{V}_0(x + x_0) \right|
\]
\[
\leq 2n^{k+1} A_0 \left( N \left( 2\pi N \right)^k \mathcal{F}^{(0)}_{\max} (V_B) + \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{(2\pi N)^k}{16\pi^4 p^2} \left( c_{03} + c_{04} k + c_{05} k^2 \right) \right)
\]
\[
= 2n^{k+1} A_0 \left( 2\pi N \right)^k \left( N \mathcal{F}^{(0)}_{\max} (V_B) + \frac{1}{16\pi^4} \frac{2\pi^2}{6} \left( c_{03} + c_{04} e^{ln k} + c_{05} e^{2ln k} \right) \right)
\]
\[
\leq 2n^{k+1} A_0 \left( 2\pi N \right)^k \left( N \mathcal{F}^{(0)}_{\max} (V_B) + \frac{1}{48\pi^2} \left( c_{03} + c_{04} e^k + c_{05} e^{2k} \right) \right),
\]
for \( k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \). Thus recalling from Lemma 25 that \( A_0 \) is upper bounded by \( A_0 \) which is only a function of \( N \), from Eq. (F212), it follows that there exists a coefficient \( C_0 \) which only depends on \( N \) such that Eq. (F185) holds.

\[\Box\]

\[d.\] Determining a parametrization of \( n \) in terms of \( d \) such that \( \epsilon(T_0, d) \to 0 \) quicker than any polynomial in \( d \).

Let us start by introducing the constraint
\[
\frac{d}{\sigma} = d^\epsilon, \quad \text{for some fixed constant } 0 < \epsilon_5.
\]

It will also be useful to introduce the variable \( \epsilon_6 \) which is a function of \( d \) and \( \sigma \) via
\[
\sigma = d^{\epsilon_6},
\]
where \( \epsilon_6 \) uniformly bounded to the interval\(^{28} \) \( \epsilon_5 < \epsilon_6 < 1 \). We can re-write Eq. (F32) as
\[
\mathcal{N} = \left[ \frac{\alpha_0^3 \pi}{2} \frac{d^{2-2\epsilon_6}}{d^{2} + d^{2-4\epsilon_6} + d^{2-\epsilon_5 - 3\epsilon_6}} \right] = \left[ \frac{\alpha_0^3 \pi}{2} \frac{1}{d^{2-2\epsilon_5} + d^{2-4\epsilon_6} + d^{2-\epsilon_5 - \epsilon_6}} \right].
\]

Thus recalling that \( \alpha_0 \in (0,1] \) is a fixed constant, it follows that \( \mathcal{N} \to \infty \) and \( \bar{v} \to 0 \) in \( d \to \infty \) limit. Hence Eqs. (F37) are satisfied for sufficiently large \( d \) and Eq. (F38) holds for the parameterisations considered in this proof in the limit \( d \to \infty \). We can now re-write eq. (F38) as
\[
\epsilon(t,d) = |t| \frac{d}{T_0} \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma^3}{\sigma d^{\epsilon_5} + 1} \right)^{1/2} + O \left( \frac{d^2}{\sigma^2} + b \right) \exp \left( -\frac{\pi}{4} \left( 1 + d^{\epsilon_6} / \sigma \right)^2 d^{2\epsilon_5} \right) + O \left( \frac{|t| d^2}{\sigma^2} + 1 \right) e^{-\frac{\bar{v}^2}{2\sigma^2}} + O \left( e^{-\frac{\bar{v}^2}{2\sigma^2}} \right).
\]

thus since (as we will soon show), \( b \) grows at most polynomially in \( d \), \( \epsilon(t,d) \) decays quicker than any polynomial in \( d \) in the limit \( d \to \infty \). We will now workout the implications of Eq. (F213). From Eq. (F31) and the relation \(-i \hat{V}_0(x) = V_0(x)\) stated in Eq. (F12), we have that \( b \) is any non-negative number satisfying
\[
\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \left( 2 \max_{x \in [0,2\pi]} \left| \delta \hat{V}_0^{(k-1)}(x) \right| \right)^{1/k} \leq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \left( 2\delta n^k C_0^k \right)^{1/k} = 2\delta n C_0,
\]
Thus from Lemma 28, it follows
\[
\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \left( 2 \max_{x \in [0,2\pi]} \left| \delta \hat{V}_0^{(k-1)}(x) \right| \right)^{1/k} \leq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \left( 2\delta n^k C_0^k \right)^{1/k} = 2\delta n C_0,
\]

\(^{28}\)By “uniformly bounded”, it is meant that \( \epsilon_5 < \lim_{d \to \infty} \epsilon_6 < 1 \)
hence we will set $b = 2\delta n C_0$. Using definition the of $\bar{v}$ (Eq. (F33)), we have

$$d^s = \frac{d}{\bar{v}\sigma} = \frac{d \ln(\pi \alpha_0 \sigma^2)}{\sigma} \frac{1}{b} = \frac{d \ln(\pi \alpha_0 \sigma^2)}{\sigma} \frac{1}{2\pi C_0 \alpha_0 \kappa} \frac{\delta \eta}{\delta \sigma},$$

(F219)

with $\kappa = 0.792$ from which we find the constraint on $n$,

$$n = \frac{\ln(\pi \alpha_0 \sigma^2)}{2\pi C_0 \alpha_0 \kappa} \frac{d^{1-\epsilon}}{\delta \sigma}.$$

(F220)

e. Determining the constant $N$ and parametrization of $\delta$ in terms of $d$ such that conditions of Corollary 9 are satisfied

From Eq. (F13) and using elementary properties of the potential $\bar{V}_0$ in Eq. (F160) (namely, integrates to unity over one period and is symmetric w.r.t. $x_0$, i.e. that $\bar{V}_0(x + x_0) = \bar{V}_0(-x + x_0)$ we find

$$\hat{v} = 1 - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dx \bar{V}_0(x + x_0)$$

(F221)

$$= 1 - \left( \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dx \bar{V}_0(x + x_0) - \int_{-\pi}^{-x_{vr}} dx \bar{V}_0(x + x_0) - \int_{x_{vr}}^{\pi} dx \bar{V}_0(x + x_0) \right)$$

(F222)

$$= 1 - \left( 1 - \int_{x_{vr}}^{\pi} dx \bar{V}_0(x + x_0) - \int_{x_{vr}}^{\pi} dx \bar{V}_0(x + x_0) \right)$$

(F223)

$$= 2 \int_{x_{vr}}^{\pi} dx \bar{V}_0(x + x_0)$$

(F224)

$$\leq 2(\pi - x_{vr}) \max_{x \in [x_{vr}, \pi]} \{\bar{V}_0(x + x_0)\}$$

(F225)

$$\leq 2A_0 n(\pi - x_{vr}) \sum_{p = -\infty}^{\infty} \max_{x \in [x_{vr}, \pi]} \{ |V_{12}(nx - 2\pi pn)| \} + 2 \frac{(\pi - x_{vr})}{\delta d^2}$$

(F226)

$$\leq 2A_0 n(\pi - x_{vr}) \sum_{p = -\infty}^{\infty} \max_{x \in [x_{vr}, \pi]} \{ |\pi(nx - 2\pi pn)|^{-2N} \} + 2 \frac{(\pi - x_{vr})}{\delta d^2}$$

(F227)

$$\leq 2A_0 n(\pi - x_{vr}) \left( (n\pi x_{vr})^{-2N} + (2\pi^2 n)^{-2N} \left( \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} p^{-2N} \right) \right) + 2 \frac{(\pi - x_{vr})}{\delta d^2}$$

(F228)

$$\leq 2A_0 n \left( \frac{n}{(n\pi x_{vr})^{2N}} + \frac{2n\zeta(2N)}{(2\pi^2 n)^{2N}} + \frac{2\pi}{\delta d^2} \right)$$

(F229)

$$\leq 2A_0 n (1 + \zeta(2N)) \frac{n}{(n\pi x_{vr})^{2N}} + \frac{2\pi}{\delta d^2}.$$

(F230)

Now recall Corollary 9. One of the conditions needed for this Corollary to be satisfied is $x_{vr} = o(\gamma)$. Recalling the bound

$$d^{n/2} \sigma \frac{d}{d} - 2 \frac{2}{d} \leq \gamma \leq d^{n/2} \sigma \frac{d}{d},$$

(F231)

which was derived in Eqs. (F149), (F151), we will find that the following parametrization of $x_{vr}$ and $\delta$ allows us to achieve this scaling and the other conditions introduced in Corollary 9. Let

$$\pi x_{vr} = \frac{d^{n/2} \sigma}{d}, \quad \delta = d^s,$$

(F232)

for some fixed constants $0 < \epsilon_7 < \eta/2$, $0 < \epsilon_8$. We will now show that indeed Eq. (F221) permits the existence of constants $N$, $\epsilon_7$, $\epsilon_8$ such that Eqs. (F232) are satisfied.
Substituting expressions for $\pi x_{vr}$ and $n$ from Eq. (F232), and Eq. (F220) into (F221), we find,

$$
\delta \tilde{e}_V \leq 2 \Delta_0 \pi (1 + \delta(2N)) \frac{\delta n}{(n \pi x_{vr})^{2N}} + \frac{2\pi}{d^2}
$$

(F233)

$$
= 2 \Delta_0 \pi (1 + \delta(2N)) \frac{\ln(\pi \alpha_0 \sigma^2)}{2 \pi C_0 \alpha_0 \kappa} \frac{\delta d^{1-\varepsilon_5}}{\delta \sigma} \frac{2 \pi C_0 \alpha_0 \kappa}{\delta^2 \ln(\pi \sigma^2)} \frac{\delta d}{d^2}
$$

(F234)

$$
= 2 \Delta_0 \pi (1 + \delta(2N)) \left( \frac{2 \pi C_0 \alpha_0 \kappa}{\ln(\pi \sigma^2)} \right)^{2N-1} \frac{\delta d^{1-\varepsilon_5 + (\varepsilon_8 + \varepsilon_5 - \varepsilon_7)2N}}{\sigma} + \frac{2\pi}{d^2}
$$

(F235)

Now define a constant $\epsilon_9$ such that $0 < \epsilon_9 < \eta$, and impose the constraints $\epsilon_7 > \epsilon_5 + \epsilon_8$ and

$$
\frac{d^{1-\varepsilon_5 + (\varepsilon_8 + \varepsilon_5 - \varepsilon_7)2N}}{\sigma} \leq d^\sigma \left( \frac{\sigma}{d} \right)^2.
$$

Recalling $\sigma = d^\epsilon$, it follows from Eq. (F236),

$$
-3\epsilon_6 - \epsilon_9 + 2 \leq -1 + \epsilon_5 + (\epsilon_7 - \epsilon_8 - \epsilon_5) 2N
$$

(F237)

$$
\implies N \geq \frac{-3\epsilon_6 - \epsilon_9 - \epsilon_5 + 3}{2(\epsilon_7 - \epsilon_8 - \epsilon_5)}.
$$

(F238)

Therefore, since $-\epsilon_5 > -\epsilon_6$, we set the constant $N$ to be

$$
N := \left[ \frac{3 - 4\epsilon_5 - \epsilon_9}{2(\epsilon_7 - \epsilon_8 - \epsilon_5)} \right] > \frac{3 - \epsilon_5 - \epsilon_9 - 3\epsilon_6}{2(\epsilon_7 - \epsilon_8 - \epsilon_5)},
$$

(F239)

with $3 - 4\epsilon_5 - \epsilon_9 > 0$ and $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ denoting the Ceiling function. Thus from Eqs. (F221), (F236), it follows

$$
\delta \tilde{e}_V \leq 2 \Delta_0 \pi (1 + \delta(2N)) \left( \frac{2 \pi C_0 \alpha_0 \kappa}{\ln(\pi \sigma^2)} \right)^{2N-1} d^\sigma \left( \frac{\sigma}{d} \right)^2 + \frac{2\pi}{d^2}.
$$

(F240)

Thus all the conditions for Corollary 9 are satisfied as long as all the constraints on the epsilon terms we have introduced can simultaneously be satisfied. We will show this in the proof of Theorem 6.

8. Final Theorem

**Theorem 6.** Consider the setup described in Section F1 for Quasi-Ideal Clocks and potential functions $\bar{V}_0$ introduced in Section F2 with constant $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$, and $k_0 = 0$. For all fixed constants $0 < \eta \leq 1$, and $\sigma$ satisfying

$$
d^{\eta/2} \leq \sigma < d,
$$

(F241)

the clock accuracy $R_1$ is lower bounded by

$$
R_1 \geq \frac{d^{2-\eta}}{\sigma^2} + o \left( \frac{d^{2-\eta}}{\sigma^2} \right),
$$

(F242)

in the large $d$ limit.

**Proof.** The bound

$$
R_1 \geq \frac{1}{12} \frac{d^{2-\eta}}{\sigma^2} + o \left( \frac{d^{2-\eta}}{\sigma^2} \right),
$$

(F243)

follows directly from Corollary 9 and the results from Section F7, so long as the constraints on the epsilon terms can all be simultaneously satisfied. We will check this here. The constraints introduced are:

$$
0 < \epsilon_5 < \epsilon_6 < 1, \quad 0 < \epsilon_7 < \frac{\eta}{2}, \quad 0 < \epsilon_8, \quad \epsilon_5 + \epsilon_8 < \epsilon_7, \quad 0 < \epsilon_9 < \eta, \quad 0 < 3 - 4\epsilon_5 - \epsilon_9,
$$

(F244)
and

$$\frac{4}{\sigma} < d^{\eta/2} \leq \frac{d}{\sigma}. \quad (F245)$$

Let $\epsilon_7 = \eta/4$, $\epsilon_5 = \epsilon_8 = \eta/16$, and $\epsilon_9 = \eta/2$. As long as

$$\frac{\eta}{16} < \epsilon_6 < 1 - \frac{\eta}{6}, \quad 0 < \eta < 4 \quad (F246)$$

are satisfied, all constraints are met in Eq. (F244). Similarly, Eq. (F245) is satisfied if

$$\frac{\ln 4}{\ln d} - \frac{\eta}{2} < \epsilon_6 \leq 1 - \frac{\eta}{2}. \quad (F247)$$

Hence Eqs. (F244), (F246) are satisfied for sufficiently large $d$ if

$$\eta < \epsilon_6 \leq 1 - \frac{\eta}{2}, \quad (F248)$$

for $\eta > 0$. Now make the substitution $\eta = \eta'/2$. Eq. (F243) becomes

$$R_1 \geq \frac{d^{3\eta'/4}}{12} \left( \frac{d^{2-\eta'}}{\sigma^2} + o \left( \frac{d^{2-\eta'}}{\sigma^2} \right) \right) \geq \frac{d^{2-\eta'}}{\sigma^2} + o \left( \frac{d^{2-\eta'}}{\sigma^2} \right), \quad (F249)$$

with constraint

$$d^{\frac{\eta'}{2}} \lesssim \sigma \leq d^{1-\frac{\eta'}{2}}, \quad \eta' > 0, \quad (F250)$$

where we have used Eq. (F248) and recalled $\sigma = d^{\epsilon_6}$. Finally, note that w.l.o.g., we can replace the upper bound on $\sigma$ in Eq. (F250) by $< d$. This is because of two observations: 1) by choosing $\eta'$ arbitrarily close to zero, $\sigma$ is upper bounded by a number arbitrarily close to $d$. 2) The lower bound on $R_1$ in Eq. (F249) is monotonically decreasing w.r.t. $\eta'$. To finalise the proof, we simply re-name $\eta'$ by $\eta$.  ■