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The dissipation generated during a quasistatic thermodynamic process can be characterised by introducing a metric on the space of Gibbs states, in such a way that minimally-dissipating protocols correspond to geodesic trajectories. Here, we show how to generalize this approach to open quantum systems by finding the thermodynamic metric associated to a given Lindblad master equation. The obtained metric can be understood as a perturbation over the background geometry of equilibrium Gibbs states, which is induced by the Kubo-Mori-Bogoliubov (KMB) inner product. We illustrate this construction on two paradigmatic examples: an Ising chain and a two-level system interacting with a bosonic bath with different spectral densities.

Introduction: A central task in finite-time thermodynamics is to design protocols that maximise the extracted work while minimising the dissipation to the surrounding environment. In the slow driving regime, a powerful approach consists in equipping the space of thermodynamic states with a metric whose geodesics correspond to minimally dissipative processes. This geometrical construction was first developed in the 80s for macroscopic endoreversible thermodynamics in a series of seminal papers [1–7], and more recently it was extended to the microscopic regime [8–11], leading to several applications in, e.g., molecular motors [12] and small-scale information processing [13, 14]. While this approach is well established for classical systems, the quantum regime has remained less explored. Linear-response theory naturally allows for endowing the thermodynamic space with a metric for equilibrium states [15–19], which however does not take into account dynamical features that are of crucial importance in finite-time protocols. On the other hand, geometric approaches applicable to arbitrary out-of-equilibrium evolutions assume full knowledge of the global unitary evolution [20, 21], making them difficult to apply in common situations where the size of the thermal bath enables only an effective description of the dynamics.

The goal of this article is to provide a general framework to construct a thermodynamic metric whose geodesics correspond to minimally dissipative evolutions during the process and that explicitly depends on the path. It is useful for what follows to rewrite the work in terms of the non equilibrium free energy, which is defined by the formula

$$F(\rho, H) = \langle H \rangle_\rho - \beta^{-1} S(\rho),$$

where we use the notation $\langle A \rangle_\rho = \text{Tr}[A\rho]$, and we denote by $S(\rho)$ the von Neumann entropy of the state. The non equilibrium free energy is connected to the equilibrium one by the equality

$$F(\rho, H) = F(\omega_\beta(H), H) + \beta^{-1} S(\rho\|\omega_\beta(H))$$

(1)

where $S(\rho\|\omega_\beta(H))$ is the relative entropy. This quantity is positive definite and it can be understood as a measure of how statistically different $\rho$ and $\omega_\beta(H)$ are.

We consider thermodynamic processes where the Hamiltonian of the system is driven between two fixed endpoints, say $H_A$ and $H_B$, while being in contact with a thermal bath. Each protocol is then defined by a path $\gamma$ in the space of controllable parameters, and by its duration $\tau$. The work extracted is defined as

$$W = -\int_\gamma \text{Tr}\left[\rho_t \dot{H}_t\right].$$

(2)

It is useful for what follows to rewrite the work in terms of the non equilibrium free energy. Using the insight coming from (1), we integrate equation (2) by parts and obtain (see the Appendix A for details):

$$W = -\Delta F - \beta^{-1} \int_\gamma \text{dt} [\partial_{\rho_t} S(\rho_t\|\omega_\beta(H_t))],$$

(3)

where $\Delta F$ is the difference in the non equilibrium free energy at the endpoints, and $\partial_{\rho_t} S(\rho_t\|\omega_\beta(H_t))$ is given by the limit $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \epsilon^{-1}[S(\rho_{t+\epsilon}\|\omega_\beta(H_t))-S(\rho_t\|\omega_\beta(H_t))]$. The importance of (3) is to make evident that we can isolate a term which only depends on the endpoints of the protocol, and a contribution, $W_{\text{diss}}(\gamma) = W + \Delta F$, which accounts for the dissipation during the process and that explicitly depends on the path $\gamma$. The quantity inside the integral can be identified with the entropy production rate, which is positive definite whenever one has Markovian dynamics.

If the duration of the protocol is bigger than the equilibrium timescales of the system, it is sensible to assume that the entropy production rate depends only on the base point $H_t$ and on the velocity $\dot{H}_t$. The key idea of the classical papers [3–6] is to reduce the task of finding the path minimising $W_{\text{diss}}(\gamma)$ to the problem of finding the geodesic of the metric induced by the entropy production rate on the thermodynamic space.

Work extraction for quantum systems: Let us start by introducing some basic quantities in quantum thermodynamics. A thermodynamic system is described by the density matrix of the system $\rho$ and by its Hamiltonian $H$. When $\rho$ is a Gibbs state we use the notation $\rho = \omega_\beta(H) \equiv e^{-\beta H}/\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H})$, where $\beta$ is the inverse temperature of the surrounding bath. A functional of key importance is the non equilibrium free energy, which is defined by the formula

$$F(\rho, H) = \langle H \rangle_\rho - \beta^{-1} S(\rho),$$

where we use the notation $\langle A \rangle_\rho = \text{Tr}[A\rho]$, and we denote by $S(\rho)$ the von Neumann entropy of the state. The non equilibrium free energy is connected to the equilibrium one by the equality

$$F(\rho, H) = F(\omega_\beta(H), H) + \beta^{-1} S(\rho\|\omega_\beta(H))$$

(1)

where $S(\rho\|\omega_\beta(H))$ is the relative entropy. This quantity is positive definite and it can be understood as a measure of how statistically different $\rho$ and $\omega_\beta(H)$ are.

We consider thermodynamic processes where the Hamiltonian of the system is driven between two fixed endpoints, say $H_A$ and $H_B$, while being in contact with a thermal bath. Each protocol is then defined by a path $\gamma$ in the space of controllable parameters, and by its duration $\tau$. The work extracted is defined as

$$W = -\int_\gamma \text{Tr}\left[\rho_t \dot{H}_t\right].$$

(2)

It is useful for what follows to rewrite the work in terms of the non equilibrium free energy. Using the insight coming from (1), we integrate equation (2) by parts and obtain (see the Appendix A for details):

$$W = -\Delta F - \beta^{-1} \int_\gamma \text{dt} [\partial_{\rho_t} S(\rho_t\|\omega_\beta(H_t))],$$

(3)

where $\Delta F$ is the difference in the non equilibrium free energy at the endpoints, and $\partial_{\rho_t} S(\rho_t\|\omega_\beta(H_t))$ is given by the limit $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \epsilon^{-1}[S(\rho_{t+\epsilon}\|\omega_\beta(H_t))-S(\rho_t\|\omega_\beta(H_t))]$. The importance of (3) is to make evident that we can isolate a term which only depends on the endpoints of the protocol, and a contribution, $W_{\text{diss}}(\gamma) = W + \Delta F$, which accounts for the dissipation during the process and that explicitly depends on the path $\gamma$. The quantity inside the integral can be identified with the entropy production rate, which is positive definite whenever one has Markovian dynamics.

If the duration of the protocol is bigger than the equilibrium timescales of the system, it is sensible to assume that the entropy production rate depends only on the base point $H_t$ and on the velocity $\dot{H}_t$. The key idea of the classical papers [3–6] is to reduce the task of finding the path minimising $W_{\text{diss}}(\gamma)$ to the problem of finding the geodesic of the metric induced by the entropy production rate on the thermodynamic space.
We now show how to apply this idea to open quantum systems.

**Metric structure in open quantum systems:** We assume that the dissipative dynamics is described by a time-dependent Lindblad equation,

\[ \dot{\rho}_t = L_t[\rho_t] \quad (4) \]

Since a Markovian evolution can always be expressed by a Lindblad master equation [22], this assumption is necessary in order to ensure the positivity of the entropy production rate. Furthermore, we assume that the Lindbladian operator has a unique zero eigenstate, given by the instantaneous Gibbs state \( (L_t[J_{\omega}(H_t)] = 0) \), and that all the other eigenvalues have strictly negative real part. This type of dynamics are known as relaxing or mixing [23], since these two assumptions are sufficient to ensure that given any initial conditions the system will thermalise,

\[ \lim_{\tau \to \infty} e^{\tau L_t} \rho = \omega_{\beta}(H_t). \quad (5) \]

If the duration of the protocol is much bigger than the relaxation timescales of the system, we can assume that \( \rho_t \) is always close to a thermal state: \( \rho_t = \omega_{\beta}(H_t) + \delta \omega_t \). Plugging this expansion in (4), we obtain an equation for \( \delta \omega_t \) as [24]:

\[ (L_t - \frac{d}{dt}) [\delta \omega_t] = \frac{d}{dt} \omega_{\beta}(H_t) \quad (6) \]

It is useful to express the derivative on the right hand side using the Dyson series for the exponential, obtaining \( \dot{\omega}_{\beta}(H_t) = -\beta [J_{\omega_{\beta}}(H_t),H_t] \), where we defined the operator:

\[ J_{\omega} := \int_0^1 ds \rho^{1-s}(A - Tr[\rho A]1) \rho^s. \quad (7) \]

In order to solve equation (6) we need to introduce the Drazin inverse of the Lindbladian operator \( L_t^+ \) [25] (and see [26, 27] for classical analogues)

\[ L_t^+[A] := \int_0^\infty dv e^{v L_t} (\omega_{\beta}(H_t)Tr[A] - A). \quad (8) \]

which is the unique operator satisfying the three conditions: (i) commutation with the Lindbladian \( (L_t^+ L_t[A] = L_t^+ L_t[A] = A - \omega_{\beta}(H_t)Tr[A]) \), (ii) invariance of the thermal state \( (L_t^+[\omega_{\beta}(H_t)] = 0) \) and (iii) tracelessness \( (Tr[L_t^+[A]] = 0) \). An alternative expression of \( L_t^+ \) can be constructed in finite dimensions as follows [24]: consider the space of traceless states, that is \( \rho_t := \rho_t - \omega_{\beta}(H_t) \), where \( \rho_t \) is a state and \( d \) is the dimension of the Hilbert space. Then, equation (4) can be rewritten as: \( \dot{\rho}_t = \Lambda_t[\rho] \). Since the only zero eigenstate of the Lindbladian is traceful, \( \Lambda_t \) is invertible and we have \( L_t^+ \equiv \Lambda_t^{-1} \), thanks to the uniqueness of the Drazin inverse.

We can proceed to solve equation (6): multiplying both sides by \( L_t^+ \) and inverting \( (1 - L_t^+ \frac{d}{dt}) \) we obtain

\[ \rho_t = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( L_t^+ \frac{d}{dt} \right)^n \omega_{\beta}(H_t) = \omega_{\beta}(H_t) - \beta L_t^+ [J_{\omega_{\beta}}(H_t),\dot{H}_t] + \ldots \quad (9) \]

Since we are in the slow driving limit, each \( \dot{H}_t \) is of order \( O(1/T) \), so that we can truncate the perturbative expansion above at the second term, with corrections of order \( O(1/T^2) \). Plugging expression (9) into \( \dot{\rho}_t, S(\rho_t|\omega(H_t)) \) gives the following formula for the dissipation:

\[ W_{\text{diss}} = -\beta \int \gamma dt Tr [\dot{H}_t L_t^+ [J_{\omega_{\beta}}(H_t),\dot{H}_t]]. \quad (10) \]

Note that this expression can be obtained directly from equation (2), but we preferred to keep the discussion independent of the particular expansion (9), underlining the connection between \( W_{\text{diss}} \) and the entropy production rate.

We now show how to introduce a metric structure on the thermodynamic space. Without loss of generality, we decompose the system Hamiltonian as \( H = \sum \lambda_i X_i \), where \( \{ \lambda_i \} \) are the time-dependent externally controllable parameters of the system, and \( \{ X_i \} \) are the corresponding conjugate forces. Then, equation (10) can be rewritten as:

\[ W_{\text{diss}} = \beta \int \gamma dt \lambda_i m_{\omega_{\beta}}(X_i, X_j) \dot{\lambda}_i \quad (11) \]

where we introduced the bilinear form:

\[ m_{\omega_{\beta}}(A, B) = -\frac{1}{2} Tr \left[ A L_t^+ [J_{\omega_{\beta}}, B] + B L_t^+ [J_{\omega_{\beta}}, A] \right] \quad (12) \]

which is symmetric by construction, positive definite thanks to the positivity of the entropy production rate, and it depends smoothly on the base point \( \omega \). These are the defining properties of a metric.

In order to get an intuition on the metric (E8), let us first consider a system whose dynamics is described by a Gibbs mixing channel,

\[ \rho_t = \tau^{-1}(\omega_t - \rho_t). \quad (13) \]

In absence of driving, the master equation (13) leads to an exponential relaxation in a time-scale \( \tau \), hence capturing a standard relaxation in which no details on the dissipative dynamics are known. In this case, the operator \( L_t^+ \) in (E8) is given by \( -\tau 1 \), so that the whole expression reduces to the Kubo-Mori-Bogoliubov (KMB) inner product [28, 29],

\[ \frac{m_{\omega_{\beta}}(A, B)}{\tau} = \text{cov}_{\omega}(A, B) = Tr \left[ A J_{\omega} [B] \right] \quad (14) \]

also known as generalised covariance in the context of linear response theory. Plugging (14) in (11), we recover an expression for \( W_{\text{diss}} \) that had been obtained in different contexts [30–33]. It also becomes clear that for non-trivial relaxation dynamics beyond (13), \( L_t^+ \) encodes the additional structure coming from the presence of different equilibration timescales in the system. In fact, since observables closer to their equilibrium value dissipate less when they are manipulated, the introduction of \( L_t^+ \) can be interpreted as a way to favour parameters which thermalise faster. Incidentally, a similar geometrical framework was obtained for classical systems [11, 12] and the construction presented here is the natural generalisation to the quantum regime.
Another aspect worth discussing is what is genuinely quantum in these results. When $[H, H_t] = 0$, that is when the protocol does not generate coherence between different energy levels, the generalised covariance (14) reduces to the standard covariance for classical systems, $(AB)_{\omega} - \langle A \rangle_{\omega} \langle B \rangle_{\omega}$, see Eq. (6) of [8]. Hence, it is only in non-commuting protocols where $[H_t, H_t] \neq 0$ that we expect qualitatively different results with respect to classical systems.

**Constructing minimally-dissipating trajectories.** In order to find optimal thermodynamic protocols, we note that expression (11) can be interpreted as the energy functional, or the action, of the curve $\{ \lambda_t \}$. Using the Euler-Lagrange equations of motion [34, 35], one can then construct curves in the space of parameters that minimize $W_{\text{dis}}$ at first order in $O(1/T)$. More precisely, optimal trajectories can be obtained by solving the geodesic equation:

$$\ddot{\lambda}^i_t + \Gamma^i_{j,k} |_{\lambda_t} \dot{\lambda}^j_t \dot{\lambda}^k_t = 0,$$

where $\Gamma$ denotes the Christoffel symbols which can be computed from the formula:

$$\Gamma^i_{j,k} |_{\lambda_t} = \frac{1}{2} m^{i,l} \left( \partial_j m_{l,k} + \partial_k m_{j,l} - \partial_l m_{j,k} \right) |_{\lambda_t}$$

where $m$ is the metric, e.g. (E8). It is worth stressing that in the case of partial control over the Hamiltonian, the metric $m_{i,j}$ will be of the same dimension as the number of controllable parameters $\{ \lambda^i_t \}$. This makes this approach particularly useful in many-body systems where only a few parameters can be experimentally controlled while the Hilbert space dimension is exponentially large, as we will later illustrate for an Ising chain (19).

Moreover, in the case of the master equation (13), we can use that the KMB inner product (14) is directly related to the partition function $Z_H = \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H})$ by:

$$\beta^2 m^{-1}_{i,j} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda_i \partial \lambda_j} \log Z_H$$

This makes this approach particularly relevant when an analytical expression for $Z_H$ is known. For non-trivial Lindbladians beyond (13), we provide in Appendix E explicit expressions for $m^{AB}_m$ in the eigenbasis of $H_t$, where in particular we show how to integrate out (7).

**Applications.** We now illustrate the construction presented for an Ising chain in a transverse field, which equilibrates by a Gibbs mixing channel (13) with $\tau = 1$, and for a qubit in contact with a bosonic bath with different spectral densities. We first consider the Hamiltonian:

$$H_I = -J \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\sigma^z_i \sigma^z_{i+1} + g \sigma^x_i)$$

with periodic boundary conditions and $n \to \infty$. We assume control only over $g$, so that the metric and the Christoffel symbols become a scalar, which we name $m$ and $\Gamma$, respectively.

The spectrum and the partition function of (19) can be computed analytically in the thermodynamic limit, allowing us to find $m$ and $\Gamma$ as in (17); details are provided in Appendix F. Both $m$ and $\Gamma$ are shown in Fig. 1 for different temperatures. Because they are intimately connected to $Z_{H_t}$, they are clearly affected by the presence of a phase transition at $g = 1$ at zero temperature. In particular, note that $m$ increases close to $g = 1$ as the temperature is decreased, indicating that dissipation increases in the presence of a phase transition. In turn, $H_t$ decreases close to the phase transition for the geodesic trajectories in order to compensate for the larger dissipation (see also in Fig. 1). Overall, comparing $m$, $\Gamma$ and the geodesics with the phase diagram of (19), we see that the change in behaviour of these geometrical quantities retrace a change in the underlying physical properties.

We now move to treat an example in which $Z^{+}_t$ is non-trivial, a two level system in contact with a bosonic bath with spectral density $J(\omega) = g_{0}(\omega)$. The parameter $\alpha$ characterises the ohmicity of the environment, and we have that for $\alpha = 1$, $\alpha > 1$, $\alpha < 1$, the bath is ohmic, superohmic and subohmic, respectively. We assume full control on the Hamiltonian of the two-level system, which is parametrised by spherical coordinates

$$H = r \cos \varphi \sin \theta \hat{\sigma}_x + r \sin \varphi \sin \theta \hat{\sigma}_y + r \cos \theta \hat{\sigma}_z,$$

where $(r, \varphi, \theta)$ are the control parameters. Thanks to the convenient choice of coordinates, the metric takes the particularly simple form (see the $G$ for details)

$$m^{\text{AB}}_m = \frac{1}{r^2} \text{diag} \{ \lambda_d, \lambda_q r^2, \lambda_q r^2 \sin^2 \theta \},$$

where we can identify the expression of the Euclidean metric in spherical coordinates (\text{diag} \{1, r^2, r^2 \sin^2 \theta\}), and the two
The eigenvalues are given by:

\[ \lambda_d = \frac{\tanh(r)}{\cosh^2(r)}, \quad \lambda_q = \frac{2\tanh^2(r)}{r}. \] (22)

The existence of different eigenvalues for the radial direction and the solid angle reflects the physical fact that the system dissipates differently if only the energy spacing is moved, or if coherence between the two levels is created. Moreover, it is straightforward to verify that the ratio \( \lambda_q/\lambda_d \) diverges as \( r \to \infty \). This illustrates a general behaviour: the existence of exponentially more dissipative parameters in thermodynamic systems. In this case, there is a simple physical explanation: changing the energy spacing only affects an exponentially small fraction of the population, whereas the whole system has to be manipulated in order to create coherence. This example however illustrates the fact that inspecting the metric eigenvalues provides us with a powerful description of the physics of dissipation, which is crucial in more complex systems where a simple intuitive understanding is out of reach.

Regarding the ohmicity of the bath, we see that it contributes to the metric with a factor \( r^{-\alpha} \), which is the overall dependence of the equilibration timescales on the energy spacing \( r \). Owing to this dependence, optimal protocols will tend to spend more time in the region with low \( r \). This effect is illustrated in the right top panel of Fig. 2, where we construct optimal trajectories in the radial direction. As expected, this effect is more pronounced for higher \( \alpha \).

Our results also allow for constructing optimal trajectories between non-commuting endpoints. Then we necessarily have that \( [H_1, H_2] \neq 0 \), so that quantum coherence between energy levels is created along the protocol. Optimal non-commuting trajectories are shown in the bottom left figure of 2. Interestingly, we see that the ohmicity of the bath qualitatively changes the behaviour of the optimal trajectories.

In order to illustrate the improvement obtained by using geodesic trajectories, we compare them to a naive choice where the parameters are linearly modified in time. We consider boundary conditions \( H_A = 0 \) and \( H_B = E_f \sigma_z \) (energy is measured in units of \( \beta \)). Restricting to Gibbs mixing dynamics, which allow for a simple analytic solution, we find at first order in \( O(1/T) \):

\[ W_{\text{dis}}^{\text{opt}} = E_f \tanh E_f, \quad W_{\text{dis}}^{\text{lin}} = \frac{1}{4} \left( \pi - 2\tan^{-1}(\text{csch}(E_f)) \right)^2. \] (23, 24)

In the limit of \( E_f \gg 1 \) the first term diverges linearly in \( E_f \), while \( W_{\text{dis}}^{\text{opt}} \approx \frac{\pi^2}{4} \). This difference makes evident how for big energy gaps or, equivalently, at low temperature, using a geodesic trajectory gives an increasingly bigger advantage, making the use of optimal trajectories particularly relevant in the quantum regime. These considerations are also relevant for experiments, as current demonstrations of the Landauer principle rely on a linear increase of \( E(t) \) [37–40].

Comparison to other approaches. Whereas the presented results are valid in the slow driving limit, exact solutions for minimising dissipation also exist in the literature [3, 4, 41, 43]. Indeed, optimal finite-time protocols for two-level systems have been treated in a variety of settings [3, 4, 43, 45]. Besides specific solvable systems, a general approach for minimising dissipation based on optimal control theory has been put forward in [4, 43], which requires solving a system of \( D \) differential equations, where \( D \) is the Hilbert space dimension (see [4, 43] and Appendix H for details). On the other hand, the geometric approach provides an approximation of the optimal solution (which becomes exact in the slow driving limit) by a set of \( d \) differential equations, where \( d \) is the number of controllable parameters in the Hamiltonian (see Eq. (15)). This becomes particularly useful in many-body systems, where \( d \ll D \), as we have illustrated in the Ising chain example where \( d = 1 \) and \( D \to \infty \). This gives the geometric approach a wide range of applicability, which has also been illustrated in classical systems of different nature and complexity [3–6, 12–14, 46–49]. Moreover, the introduction of a Riemannian structure in the space of parameters provides an automatic way to infer the dissipative properties of the system, just by inspecting the eigenvalues of the metric. Finally, in Appendix H we also quantitatively compare the geometric approach with exact approaches for a two-level system finding good agreement between them even when the total time \( T \) of the protocol is similar to the time scale of relaxation, reaching similar conclusions than [33].

Conclusions: We developed a general framework to define a thermodynamic metric for systems that evolve under a Lindblad master equation, in such a way that geodesics correspond to minimally-dissipative paths in the quasistatic regime. An extension to more general settings (e.g., strong coupling [50–57], generalised Gibbs ensembles [58–61], non equilibrium steady states [62]) appears realistic and as interesting future work.
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Appendix A: Non equilibrium free energy and work extraction

In this section we give the details on how to derive equation (1) and (3) of the main text. First, it is straightforward to show, using the defining formula $F(\rho, H) = \langle H \rangle_\rho - \beta^{-1} S(\rho)$, that the free energy of a thermal state $\omega_\beta(H)$ is given by

$$F(\omega, H) = \langle H \rangle_\rho - \beta^{-1} \langle \beta \langle H \rangle_\rho + \log Z_H \rangle = -\beta^{-1} \log Z_H$$

(A1)

in complete analogy with classical thermodynamics. Then, equation (1) is obtained by direct computation, rewriting the relative entropy as:

$$\beta^{-1} S(\rho||\omega_\beta(H)) = \beta^{-1} \text{Tr} \left[ \rho (\log \rho - \log \omega_\beta(H)) \right] =$$

$$= \left( -\beta^{-1} S(\rho) + \langle H \rangle_\rho \right) + \beta^{-1} \log Z_H =$$

$$= F(\rho, H) - F(\omega_\beta(H), H),$$

(A2)
which gives the result after rearranging the terms. For what regards equation (3), it is useful to first give the expression of the total derivative of the non equilibrium free energy along a trajectory \((\rho_t, H_t)\). This can be decomposed in the two terms:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} F(\rho_t, H_t) = (\text{Tr} [\dot{\rho}_t H_t] + \beta^{-1} \frac{d}{dt} \text{Tr} [\rho_t \log \rho_t]) + \text{Tr}[\rho_t \dot{H}_t].
\]  
(A3)

The last trace can be rewritten as:

\[
\text{Tr}[\rho_t \dot{H}_t] = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{F(\rho_{t+\varepsilon}) - F(\rho_t, H_t)}{\varepsilon} =: \partial_{H_t} F(\rho_t, H_t).
\]  
(A4)

For what regards the term inside the parenthesis, it should be first noticed that we can rewrite:

\[
\text{Tr} [\dot{\rho}_t H_t] = -\beta^{-1} \left( \text{Tr} [\dot{\rho}_t \log e^{-\beta H_t}] - \log Z_H \text{Tr} [\rho_t] \right) =
\]

\[
= -\beta^{-1} \text{Tr} [\dot{\rho}_t \log \omega_\beta(H_t)],
\]  
(A5)

where in the first equality we use the fact that the derivative of a state is traceless. Then, we obtain for the whole expression:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \text{Tr} [\rho_t \log \rho_t] - \text{Tr} [\dot{\rho}_t \log \omega_\beta(H_t)] = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{S(\rho_{t+\varepsilon}|\omega_\beta(H_t)) - S(\rho_t|\omega_\beta(H_t))}{\varepsilon} =: \partial_{\rho_t} S(\rho_t|\omega_\beta(H_t))
\]  
(A6)

In this way equation (A3) can be expressed in the compact form:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} F(\rho_t, H_t) = \partial_{H_t} F(\rho_t, H_t) + \beta^{-1} \partial_{\rho_t} S(\rho_t|\omega_\beta(H_t))
\]  
(A7)

This equality then can be used to obtain equation (4). In fact, starting from the definition of the work in (3), a simple integration by parts gives:

\[
W = -\int_\gamma dt \text{Tr} [\rho_t \dot{H}_t] = -\int_\gamma dt \partial_{H_t} F(\rho_t, H_t) =
\]

\[
= -\Delta F_{\text{eq}} - \beta^{-1} \int_\gamma dt [-\partial_{\rho_t} S(\rho_t|\omega_\beta(H_t))]
\]  
(A8)

This concludes the derivation of (3).

**Appendix B: The entropy production rate**

We now study the main features of the entropy production rate. Equation (A8) suggests that the definition of the instantaneous entropy production rate is [1]:

\[
\dot{\sigma}(\rho_t) := -\partial_{\rho_t} S(\rho_t|\omega_\beta(H_t)) = -\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{S(\rho_{t+\varepsilon}|\omega_\beta(H_t)) - S(\rho_t|\omega_\beta(H_t))}{\varepsilon}.
\]  
(B1)

Before investigating the positivity of this quantity, it is useful to show a weaker equation for \(\rho_t\) which are induced by CPTP maps. In particular, assuming the system is initially uncorrelated with the environment \((\rho_{UNIV}(0) = \rho_0^S \otimes \rho_0^E)\), and that the Gibbs state is stationary under the evolution, one has that:

\[
S(\rho_t|\omega_\beta(H)) = S(\text{Tr}_E \left[ U_t (\rho_0^S \otimes \rho_0^E) U_t^{\dagger} \right] || \text{Tr}_E \left[ U_t (\omega_\beta(H) \otimes \rho_0^E) U_t^{\dagger} \right]) \leq
\]

\[
\leq S(U_t (\rho_0^S \otimes \rho_0^E) U_t^{\dagger}) || U_t (\omega_\beta(H) \otimes \rho_0^E) U_t^{\dagger}) = S(\rho_0^S \otimes \rho_0^E|\omega_\beta(H) \otimes \rho_0^E) =
\]

\[
= S(\rho_0^S|\omega_\beta(H)) + S(\rho_0^E|\rho_0^E),
\]  
(B2)

where we used the fact that the relative entropy decreases when one traces out part of the system, together with its invariance under unitary evolution. Denoting with \(V_t\) the dynamical map which bring the reduced density matrix of the system from the original state \(\rho_0^S\) to \(\rho_t\), we can rewrite the equation as:

\[
S(\rho_0^S|\omega_\beta(H)) - S(V_t \rho_0^S|\omega_\beta(H)) \geq 0,
\]  
(B3)

which ensures that on any finite time the integral of \(-\partial_{\rho_t} S(\rho_t|\omega_\beta(H_t))\) is positive. Unfortunately, this result does not give any information about the monotonicity of the change of entropy: it is sufficient to consider an exactly recurrent system, with periodicity \(T\), for which the the quantity \(-\partial_{\rho_t} S(\rho_t|\omega_\beta(H_t))\) will first decrease, to only go back to its initial value at time \(T\).
Nonetheless, when $V_t$ is a dynamical semigroup, meaning that the identity $V_{t+s} = V_t V_s$ holds for any $t, s \geq 0$, one can further prove that:

$$S(V_{t'} \rho || \omega_\beta (H)) = S(V_{t'-t} V_t \rho || \omega_\beta (H)) \leq S(V_t \rho || \omega_\beta (H)) \quad \text{for } t' \geq t. \quad (B4)$$

This result implies that the quantity in (B1) is positive. As it was stated above, this result is true in general only if the dynamics can be described by a dynamical semigroup, that is, if the evolution is Markovian.

### Appendix C: Drazin inverse of the Lindblad operator

Here we derive the integral expression for the Drazin inverse $\mathcal{L}_t^+$ in the space of trace-class operators. We first recall the three conditions needed to define the inverse:

$$(C1) \quad \mathcal{L}_t \mathcal{L}_t^+[A] = \mathcal{L}_t^+ \mathcal{L}_t[A] = A - \omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [A];$$

$$(C2) \quad \mathcal{L}_t^+ [\omega_\beta (H_t)] = 0;$$

$$(C3) \quad \text{Tr} [\mathcal{L}_t^+ [A]] = 0.$$  

We introduce the following trial solution

$$\Lambda_t^+[A] := \int_0^\infty d\nu \ e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t} (\omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [A] - A). \quad (C4)$$

We first check (C2), which gives

$$\Lambda_t^+ [\omega_\beta (H_t)] = \int_0^\infty d\nu \ e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t} (\omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [\omega_\beta (H_t)] - \omega_\beta (H_t)) = 0, \quad (C5)$$

which follows from the normalisation of $\omega_\beta (H_t)$. For (C3) we find

$$\text{Tr} [\Lambda_t^+[A]] = \int_0^\infty d\nu \ Tr [\Lambda_t^+ (\omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [A] - A)] =$$

$$= \int_0^\infty d\nu \ (\text{Tr} [\omega_\beta (H_t)] \text{Tr} [A] - \text{Tr} [A]) = 0, \quad (C6)$$

where we used the fact that the propagator $e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t}$ is trace-preserving. Regarding (C1), we first find the following:

$$\mathcal{L}_t \Lambda_t^+[A] = \int_0^\infty d\nu \frac{d}{d\nu} e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t} (\omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [A] - A) = \int_{\nu=0}^{\nu=\infty} d(e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t}) (\omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [A] - A),$$

$$= A - \omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [A] + \lim_{\nu \to \infty} e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t} (\omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [A] - A) = A - \lim_{\nu \to \infty} e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t} A =$$

$$= A - \omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [A], \quad (C7)$$

where we used the fact that $\forall t \lim_{\nu \to \infty} e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t} [B] = \omega_\beta (H_t)$, for any normalised operator $B$. Finally, it also follows that

$$\Lambda_t^+ \mathcal{L}_t[A] = \int_0^\infty d\nu \ e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t} (\omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [\mathcal{L}_t[A]] - \mathcal{L}_t[A]) = - \int_0^\infty d\nu \ e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t} \mathcal{L}_t[A] =$$

$$= - \int_{\nu=0}^{\nu=\infty} d(e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t}) A = A - \lim_{\nu \to \infty} e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_t} A =$$

$$= A - \omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [A]. \quad (C8)$$

We thus conclude that $\Lambda_t^+ = \mathcal{L}_t^+$. In fact, assume that there exists another $\tilde{\Lambda}_t^+ \neq \Lambda_t^+$ satisfying conditions (B1-3). Then, $\forall A$ we would have:

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_t^+[A] \overset{(C2)}{=} \tilde{\Lambda}_t^+ [A - \omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [A]] \overset{(C1)}{=} \tilde{\Lambda}_t^+ [\mathcal{L}_t \Lambda_t^+[A]] = \tilde{\Lambda}_t^+ \mathcal{L}_t [\Lambda_t^+[A]] \overset{(C1)}{=} \Lambda_t^+ [A - \omega_\beta (H_t) \text{Tr} [\Lambda_t^+[A]]] \overset{(C3)}{=} \Lambda_t^+[A], \quad (C9)$$

which is in contradiction with the assumption that $\tilde{\Lambda}_t^+ \neq \Lambda_t^+$. This completes the derivation of equation (8).
Appendix D: Metric in open quantum systems

We show here how to obtain equation (11) of the main text from the expression of the entropy production rate in (A8) and (B1). Before starting, it is useful to introduce the derivative of the logarithm of a density matrix \( \rho \):

\[
\mathbb{J}^{-1}[\rho] := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\log(\rho + \varepsilon \delta \rho) - \log(\rho)}{\varepsilon} = \int_0^\infty dx \frac{1}{(x + \rho)^2} \delta \rho(x + \rho)^{-1}. \tag{D1}
\]

It is interesting to notice that this operator is exactly the inverse of \( \mathbb{J}_{\rho} \) defined in the main text, when one restricts to density matrices.

We can now pass to express equation (B1) for a Lindbladian evolution, and then plug expansion (10) in the expression we get. First notice that we can split at first order matrices.

We can now pass to give the quasi-static expansion of the entropy production rate. Recall that the in this limit the state is traceless. We will now show that the last term is actually zero. In fact, since for \( \varepsilon \ll 1 \) \( \rho_{t+\varepsilon} \simeq \rho_t + \varepsilon \mathcal{L}[\rho_t] + \ldots \), we can expand the logarithm as:

\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\mathcal{L}[\rho_t] - \rho_t}{\varepsilon} = \mathcal{L}[\rho_t], \tag{D2}
\]

where we used the Lindblad equation \( \dot{\rho}_t = \mathcal{L}[\rho_t] \). We will now show that the last term is actually zero. In fact, since for \( \varepsilon \ll 1 \) \( \rho_{t+\varepsilon} \simeq \rho_t + \varepsilon \mathcal{L}[\rho_t] + \ldots \), we can expand the logarithm as:

\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\mathcal{L}[\rho_t] - \rho_t}{\varepsilon} = \mathcal{L}[\rho_t], \tag{D3}
\]

where in the second line we used the fact that \( \mathcal{J}^{-1} \) is self-adjoint with respect to the trace inner product, meaning that: \( \text{Tr}[\mathcal{J}^{-1}[B]] = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{J}^{-1}[A][B]] \). This property can be inferred directly from the definition (D1) and the cyclicity of the trace. Moreover, it’s just a matter of computation to see that \( \mathbb{J}_{\rho}^{-1}[\rho] = \mathbb{I} \). Finally, in the last equality we used the fact that \( \mathcal{L}_t[\rho] \) is traceless.

We can now pass to give the quasi-static expansion of the entropy production rate. Recall that the in this limit the state is given by:

\[
\rho_t = \omega_\beta(H_t) - \beta \mathcal{L}_t^+ \mathbb{J}_\beta(H_t) [\hat{H}_t] + \ldots \tag{D4}
\]

at first order in \( \mathcal{O}(1/T) \). Plugging this expression in (D2), we can obtain the result presented in the main text:

\[
\dot{\sigma}(\rho_t) = -\text{Tr} \left[ \mathcal{L}_t[\rho_t] \left( \log \rho_t - \log \omega_\beta(H_t) \right) \right] = \\
\beta \text{Tr} \left[ \mathcal{L}_t[\rho_t] \mathcal{J}_{\beta}^{-1}[\mathcal{L}_t[\rho_t]] \right] = \\
-\beta^2 \text{Tr} \left[ \mathcal{J}_{\omega_\beta(H_t)}[\hat{H}_t] \mathcal{J}_{\omega_\beta(H_t)} \left[ \mathcal{J}_{\omega_\beta(H_t)}[\hat{H}_t] \right] \right] = \\
-\beta^2 \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{H}_t \mathcal{L}_t^+ \mathcal{J}_{\omega_\beta(H_t)}[\hat{H}_t] \right] \tag{D5}
\]

where in the second line we used the expansion of the logarithm, in the third line we plugged in the expansion of the state and used the property of the Drazin inverse, and in the last line the fact that \( \mathcal{J}^{-1} \) is self adjoint. This conclude the derivation of (11).

Appendix E: Expression of the metric in coordinates

In this section we explain how to get an explicit expression of the metric for general Lindbladian evolutions. As a preliminary remark, it should be notice that any operator \( \hat{A} \) can be treated as a vector in a linear space via the identification:

\[
A = \sum_{l,m} A_{lm} |l\rangle \langle m| \rightarrow \hat{A} = \sum_{l,m} A_{lm} |l\rangle \langle m|, \tag{E1}
\]

where \( |i\rangle \) is some orthogonal basis. In particular, since any Hermitian operator can be expressed as a linear combination of:

\[
\Delta_l = |l\rangle \langle l|, \quad \Sigma_{lm}^{x} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|l\rangle \langle m| + |m\rangle \langle l|), \quad \Sigma_{lm}^{y} = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} (|l\rangle \langle m| - |m\rangle \langle l|), \tag{E2}
\]
we can interpret these operators as an orthonormal basis of the corresponding real vector space. Moreover, we can lift the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product on the operator space and define a scalar product in the vector space as

$$\langle A | B \rangle = \text{Tr}[A^\dagger B].$$  \hfill (E3)$$

This construction can be used to rewrite any linear superoperator as a $d^2 \cdot d^2$, matrix, where $d$ is the dimension of the original Hilbert space.

Using this identification, we can give an explicit expression for the Drazin inverse of a mixing Lindbladian. As it was said in the main text, Lindbladians of this type have a unique zero eigenvector, which we will denote by $|\omega_{\beta}(H)\rangle$, and all the other eigenvalues $\lambda_\alpha$ (corresponding to the eigenvectors $|\alpha\rangle$) have negative real part. Moreover, since $\mathcal{L}_\omega$ is trace preserving, all the corresponding operators $\alpha$ must be traceless. We can give an explicit expression of $\mathcal{L}_\omega^+$ as:

$$\mathcal{L}_\omega^+ = \sum_\alpha (\mathcal{L}_\omega^+)_\alpha |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha | = - \sum_\alpha \left( \int_0^\infty d\nu \langle \alpha | e^{\nu \mathcal{L}_\omega} | \alpha \rangle \right) |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha | = - \sum_\alpha \int_0^\infty d\nu e^{\nu \lambda_\alpha} |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha | = \sum_\alpha \frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha} |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha |$$  \hfill (E4)$$

This explicit construction is a further proof of the fact that the Drazin inverse simply corresponds to the usual inverse restricted to the traceless subspace.

We can now pass to the explicit computation of the metric. For simplicity, we choose as a basis on the original Hilbert space the eigenbasis $|i\rangle$ of $H$. The only non-zero matrix element of $\mathbb{J}_{\omega_{\beta}(H)}^{ij}$ in the basis defined in (E1) can be explicitly evaluated as:

$$\mathbb{J}_{\omega_{\beta}(H)}^{ij} = \int_0^1 ds \int_0^1 ds' e^{-(1-s-s')\beta \epsilon_i} \left( \delta_m^i \delta_m^j - \frac{e^{-\beta \epsilon_i}}{Z_H} \delta_m^i \right) e^{-s\beta \epsilon_j} = \left( \frac{1}{Z_H} \frac{e^{-\beta \epsilon_i} - e^{-\beta \epsilon_j}}{\beta \epsilon_j - \beta \epsilon_i} \right) \delta_m^j \delta_m^i.$$  \hfill (E5)$$

Moreover, since we can rewrite the eigenbasis of $\mathcal{L}_\omega$ as:

$$|\alpha\rangle = u_{\alpha,ij} |ij\rangle,$$  \hfill (E6)$$

where $u$ is a unitary matrix, $\mathcal{L}_\omega^+$ is expressed in this basis simply as:

$$\mathcal{L}_\omega^+ = \sum_\alpha \frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha} |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha | = \sum_{\alpha, i, j} \frac{u_{\alpha,ij}^* u_{\alpha,lm}}{\lambda_\alpha} |ij\rangle \langle lm |.$$  \hfill (E7)$$

Now, assuming control only on a set of observables $\{X^{(i)}\}$, we can then finally compute the metric entries as:

$$(m_\omega^X)_{ij} = m_\omega^X (X^{(i)}, X^{(j)}) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{lm, kn} X_{lm}^{(i)} X_{kn}^{(j)} \left( \mathcal{L}_\omega^+(\mathbb{J}_{\omega_{\beta}(H)}^{lm} X_{xy}^{(j)} \mathbb{J}_{\omega_{\beta}(H)}^{kn}) + \mathbb{J}_{\omega_{\beta}(H)}^{lm} \mathcal{L}_\omega^+(\mathbb{J}_{\omega_{\beta}(H)}^{kn} X_{xy}^{(j)}) \right).$$  \hfill (E8)$$

However cumbersome at a first look, this expression corresponds to a simple matrix product of the operator specified in coordinates in (E5) and (E7). In this way, one gets a matrix expression of $m_\omega^X$ of the same dimension as the one of controllable parameters.

**Appendix F: Ising chain in a transverse field**

We consider a chain of $N$ spins. Each particle interacts only with the nearest neighbour, or with an external field modulated by the parameter $g$. For simplicity, we assume periodic boundary conditions. In particular, the Hamiltonian of the system takes the form:

$$H_1 = -J \sum_i (\sigma_i^z \sigma_{i+1}^z + g \sigma_i^x)$$  \hfill (F1)$$
In the following we will set $J = 1$, simply by measuring the energies in units of $Js$. It is a standard result that this system can be mapped through a Jordan-Wigner transformation to the free fermions model given by:

$$H_I = \sum_k \varepsilon_k (\gamma_k^\dagger \gamma_k - \frac{1}{2}) \quad (F2)$$

where $\gamma_k^\dagger/\gamma_k$ are fermionic creation/annihilation operators and the corresponding energy is given by:

$$\varepsilon_k = 2\sqrt{1 + g^2 - 2g \cos k} \quad (F3)$$

$k$ is evenly spaced in the interval $[0, 2\pi]$. Due to the fermionic nature of the system, the partition function can be directly written as:

$$Z = \sum_{\sigma_k} \prod_k \exp(-\beta \varepsilon_k \sigma_k) = \prod_k 2 \cosh \left(\frac{\beta \varepsilon_k}{2}\right) \quad (F4)$$

In particular, in the thermodynamic limit we have that:

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log Z = \int_0^{2\pi} dk \log \left[2 \cosh \left(\frac{\beta \varepsilon_k}{2}\right)\right]. \quad (F5)$$

Comparing this formula with (17) and (18), we see that it is sufficient to differentiate (F5) with respect to $g$ twice, which gives:

$$m(g) = \int_0^{2\pi} dk \left(\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_k}{2} \tanh \left(\frac{\beta \varepsilon_k}{2}\right) + \left(\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_k}{2} \text{sech} \left(\frac{\beta \varepsilon_k}{2}\right)^2\right)^2\right), \quad (F6)$$

where we indicate by the dot the differentiation with respect to $g$.

**Appendix G: Two level system coupled to a bosonic bath**

In this section the details about the Lindblad master equation of a qubit in contact with a bosonic bath. We choose the basis of the Hilbert space in such a way that the Hamiltonian can be rewritten as:

$$H = \frac{1}{2} r \sigma_z. \quad (G1)$$

The dynamics induced by a bosonic bath with spectral density $J(r) \propto r^\alpha$ is described by the master equation [1]:

$$\dot{\rho}_t = \gamma_r (P_r + 1) \left(\sigma_- \rho_t \sigma_+ - \frac{1}{2} \{\sigma_+ \sigma_-, \rho_t\}\right) + \gamma_r P_r \left(\sigma_+ \rho_t \sigma_- - \frac{1}{2} \{\sigma_- \sigma_+, \rho_t\}\right), \quad (G2)$$

where $\gamma_r$ and $P_r$ are given by:

$$\gamma_r = \tilde{\gamma}_0 r^\alpha \quad P_r = \frac{1}{e^{2\beta r} - 1}. \quad (G3)$$

For simplicity, the proper equilibration timescale $\tilde{\gamma}_0^{-1}$ is assumed to be one. Additionally, for bookkeeping reasons it is useful to define the quantity $\Gamma_r = \gamma_r (2P_r + 1)$. As it was argued in the main text, we can divide the density matrix of the system in a traceful and traceless component $\rho = \omega_\beta(H) + \tilde{\rho}$, so that the Lindblad equation can be rewritten as $\dot{\rho}_t = \Lambda_t [\tilde{\rho}]$. In this simple case, we can use the Pauli matrices to parametrize the traceless space:

$$\begin{pmatrix} z & x + iy \\ x - iy & -z \end{pmatrix} \to (x, y, z). \quad (G4)$$

and plugging this expansion into (G2) we obtain:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}(t) \\ \dot{y}(t) \\ \dot{z}(t) \end{pmatrix} = \Lambda_r (\tilde{\rho}(t) - \tilde{\omega}(t)) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\Gamma_r}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{\Gamma_r}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\Gamma_r \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x(t) \\ y(t) \\ z(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (G5)$$
In this way we obtained a definition for $\Lambda_\epsilon$, and consequently for its Drazin inverse.

We now pass to show how to quickly show how to obtain the metric in this case starting from the parametrisation in spherical coordinates:

$$H = r \cos \varphi \sin \theta \hat{\sigma}_x + r \sin \varphi \sin \theta \hat{\sigma}_y + r \cos \theta \hat{\sigma}_z.$$  \hfill (G6)

Using the parametrisation (G4) the metric could be directly computed by plugging the Pauli matrices in equation (13). In spherical coordinates, though, one needs to first find the basis of the tangent space induced by the parametrisation, which can be computed by simple differentiation of the coordinate chart:

$$\begin{align*}
\partial_r &= \cos \varphi \sin \theta \sigma_x + \sin \varphi \sin \theta \sigma_y + \cos \theta \sigma_z \\
\partial_\theta &= r \cos \varphi \cos \theta \sigma_x + r \sin \varphi \cos \theta \sigma_y - r \sin \theta \sigma_z \\
\partial_\varphi &= -r \sin \varphi \sin \theta \sigma_x + r \cos \varphi \sin \theta \sigma_y.
\end{align*}$$  \hfill (G7)

Then, the matrix form of the metric is simply given by: $m_{i,j} = m(\partial_i, \partial_j)$, we obtain the metric presented in the main text.

**Appendix H: Comparison with optimal control optimisation**

The geometric approach provides an approximate solution which becomes exact in the limit of slow driving. In this appendix we compare it with the exact solutions reported in [3, 4]. First, we compare in general terms the present method to the approach presented in [4] to minimise dissipation in open quantum systems, discussing how complex the two optimisation procedures are. Then, we focus on a specific protocol involving a driven qubit and compare both approaches quantitatively.

The main idea of [4] is to use the Pontryagins minimum principle (PMP) to minimise the dissipation given a general Lindbladian master equation. In particular, using the decomposition of the system Hamiltonian $H = \sum \lambda_i X_i$, we denote by $d$ the number of externally controllable parameters and by $D$ the dimension of the Hilbert space. Then, following [4], one needs to solve a differential system of $2D$ equations (see Eq. 16 in [4]), constraint by $d$ algebraic equations. This should be contrasted to the geometric approach reported here, which only requires the solution of $d$ differential equations (see Eqs. 12, 15 and 16 in the main text). In general, in the optimal control theory there is no systematic way to reduce the number of differential equations from $2D$ to $d$. This is possible in particular systems, e.g., when the problem can be linearised; however, in thermodynamics the control parameters usually appear both in $H$ and $e^{-\beta H}$, making such a linearisation not possible. Hence, while the complexity of the solution will of course depend on the specific system under considerations, it seems reasonable to say that the geometric approach will be considerably simpler in mesoscopic/many-body systems, in which usually $d \ll D$. An extreme case is shown for the Ising chain in the main text, where $d = 1$ and $D \to \infty$. Another advantage of the geometric approach is that it allows to easily identify the less dissipating transformations of $H_i$ by simple inspection of the eigenvalues of the metric. This was illustrated in the qubit case, where the effect of quantum coherence or of different timescales in the Lindbladian could be read out from the metric.

It should however be kept in mind that the geometric approach provides an approximate solution, which becomes only exact in the slowly driven limit. To quantitatively analyse how good the approximation is, we now compare it to the exact solution for a quantum dot presented in [3] (the same results can be obtained using [4]) with the one provided by the geodesic equation we notice that the two actually coincide.

In this way we obtained a definition for $\Lambda_\epsilon$, and consequently for its Drazin inverse.

We now pass to show how to quickly show how to obtain the metric in this case starting from the parametrisation in spherical coordinates:

$$H = r \cos \varphi \sin \theta \hat{\sigma}_x + r \sin \varphi \sin \theta \hat{\sigma}_y + r \cos \theta \hat{\sigma}_z.$$  \hfill (G6)

Using the parametrisation (G4) the metric could be directly computed by plugging the Pauli matrices in equation (13). In spherical coordinates, though, one needs to first find the basis of the tangent space induced by the parametrisation, which can be computed by simple differentiation of the coordinate chart:

$$\begin{align*}
\partial_r &= \cos \varphi \sin \theta \sigma_x + \sin \varphi \sin \theta \sigma_y + \cos \theta \sigma_z \\
\partial_\theta &= r \cos \varphi \cos \theta \sigma_x + r \sin \varphi \cos \theta \sigma_y - r \sin \theta \sigma_z \\
\partial_\varphi &= -r \sin \varphi \sin \theta \sigma_x + r \cos \varphi \sin \theta \sigma_y.
\end{align*}$$  \hfill (G7)

Then, the matrix form of the metric is simply given by: $m_{i,j} = m(\partial_i, \partial_j)$, we obtain the metric presented in the main text.

**Appendix H: Comparison with optimal control optimisation**

The geometric approach provides an approximate solution which becomes exact in the limit of slow driving. In this appendix we compare it with the exact solutions reported in [3, 4]. First, we compare in general terms the present method to the approach presented in [4] to minimise dissipation in open quantum systems, discussing how complex the two optimisation procedures are. Then, we focus on a specific protocol involving a driven qubit and compare both approaches quantitatively.

The main idea of [4] is to use the Pontryagins minimum principle (PMP) to minimise the dissipation given a general Lindbladian master equation. In particular, using the decomposition of the system Hamiltonian $H = \sum \lambda_i X_i$, we denote by $d$ the number of externally controllable parameters and by $D$ the dimension of the Hilbert space. Then, following [4], one needs to solve a differential system of $2D$ equations (see Eq. 16 in [4]), constraint by $d$ algebraic equations. This should be contrasted to the geometric approach reported here, which only requires the solution of $d$ differential equations (see Eqs. 12, 15 and 16 in the main text). In general, in the optimal control theory there is no systematic way to reduce the number of differential equations from $2D$ to $d$. This is possible in particular systems, e.g., when the problem can be linearised; however, in thermodynamics the control parameters usually appear both in $H$ and $e^{-\beta H}$, making such a linearisation not possible. Hence, while the complexity of the solution will of course depend on the specific system under considerations, it seems reasonable to say that the geometric approach will be considerably simpler in mesoscopic/many-body systems, in which usually $d \ll D$. An extreme case is shown for the Ising chain in the main text, where $d = 1$ and $D \to \infty$. Another advantage of the geometric approach is that it allows to easily identify the less dissipating transformations of $H_i$ by simple inspection of the eigenvalues of the metric. This was illustrated in the qubit case, where the effect of quantum coherence or of different timescales in the Lindbladian could be read out from the metric.

It should however be kept in mind that the geometric approach provides an approximate solution, which becomes only exact in the slowly driven limit. To quantitatively analyse how good the approximation is, we now compare it to the exact solution for a quantum dot presented in [3] (the same results can be obtained using [4]) with the one obtained solving the geodesic equation with the same Lindbladian as above and a varying Hamiltonian of the form: $H = \frac{\epsilon(t)}{2} (\mathbb{1} + \sigma_z)$. For simplicity of notation, we will measure the energy in units of $\gamma$ and the times in $\gamma^{-1}$. In [3] it is shown that optimal protocols will present a quench in the Hamiltonian at the beginning and at the protocol when $T$ is small. The size of the jumps is proportional to the duration of the process, and goes to zero for $T \to \infty$. This behaviour is illustrated on the left hand side of figure 3. Comparing the asymptotic solution for $T \to \infty$ with the one provided by the geodesic equation we notice that the two actually coincide. As expected, this implies that geodesics become optimal in the limit of big $T$, that is, in the regime in which the quenches at the beginning and at the end of the protocol becomes negligible. This trend is confirmed by the plot on the right hand side of figure 3, where we plot the total work necessary to excite the quantum dot from $\epsilon(0) = -2\beta$ to $\epsilon(1) = 2\beta$ in function of the duration of the protocol. In fact, the two minimisation protocols give results which are reasonably similar already for times of order $T \approx \gamma^{-1}$, diverging by $\sim 10\%$ when $T = \gamma^{-1}$.

Summarising, both the approach reported here and in [4] allow for minimising dissipation given a Lindbladian master equation, and they appear to be complementary: [4] provides exact solutions, whereas the geometric approach provides approximate solutions (which become exact in the slow driving limit) with a considerably simpler minimisation. The latter approach appears particularly suited for mesoscopic/many-body systems, where the number of control parameters in the Hamiltonian is small but the Hilbert space dimension is exponentially large.
FIG. 3. On the left hand side of the picture optimal protocols between $\epsilon(0) = -2\beta$ and $\epsilon(1) = 2\beta$ are presented for different times. These results are obtained with the technique presented in [3]. As it can be seen, for short times the trajectories present a quench at the beginning and at the end of the protocol. In the large time limit, instead, the optimal protocols become equivalent to the one obtained with the thermodynamic length. This behaviour is illustrated on the left hand side, where we plot the work required for trajectories obtained by exact minimisation or by solving the geodesic equation in function of time.