Quantum digital cooling

Stefano Polla,1 Yaroslav Herasymenko,1 and Thomas E. O’Brien1

1Instituut-Lorentz, Universiteit Leiden, P.O. Box 9506, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

We introduce a new method for digital preparation of ground states of a simulated Hamiltonians, inspired by cooling in nature and adapted to leverage the capabilities of digital quantum hardware. The cold bath is simulated by a single ancillary qubit, which is reset periodically and coupled to the system non-perturbatively. Studying this cooling method on a 1-qubit system toy model allows us to optimize two cooling protocols based on weak-coupling and strong-coupling approaches. Extending the insight from the 1-qubit system model, we develop two scalable protocols for larger systems. The LogSweep protocol extends the weak-coupling approach by sweeping energies to resonantly match any targeted transition. It demonstrates the ability to prepare an approximate ground state of transverse-field Ising chains in the ferromagnetic and critical phases, with an error that can be made polynomially small in time. The BangBang protocol extends the strong-coupling approach, and exploits a heuristics for local Hamiltonians to maximize the probability of de-exciting system transitions in the shortest possible time. Although this protocol does not promise long-time convergence, it allows for a rapid cooling to an approximation of the ground state, making this protocol appealing for near-term simulation applications.

Ground state preparation is an essential algorithm in the quantum computing toolbox. Any polynomial-time quantum algorithm can be mapped to the problem of estimating the ground state energy of an artificial Hamiltonian given an approximation to its ground state [1], and without such additional input this problem is known to be QMA-hard for even 2-local Hamiltonians [2]. Digital quantum simulation of problems in materials science and chemistry, one of the ‘killer apps’ of a quantum computer, is most often concerned with properties of ground states of the simulated systems [3, 4], and many problems in optimization may be mapped to ground state finding problems [5, 6]. This has led to a wide range of schemes for digital ground state approximation, via adiabatic evolution [5], variational methods [6–8], phase estimation [9], and approximate imaginary time evolution [10–12]. However, these algorithms suffer from large computational costs or approximation errors, making designing better schemes an active area of interest.

In nature, ground states are achieved by coupling to a large cold reservoir, which takes energy from the system in keeping with the second law of thermodynamics. Simulating an entire bath would require an impractically large quantum register, however it has long been suggested that this may be mimicked by coupling to a single qubit which may be reset to its ground state with sufficient frequency [3]. This idea has been since studied in digital quantum computing for the initialization of quantum devices [13, 14], and in analogue settings for the preparation of physical [15] and artificial [16] ground states. However, cooling an artificial system in the digital quantum setting provides a set of unique challenges — the system being studied may be completely different from the physical quantum hardware, and the digitized Hamiltonian may be only an approximation to the target of interest. Furthermore, the periodic non-unitary reset may break the unitary evolution in short time-scale chunks which do not conserve energy, implying that one may artificially reheat the system without clever protocol design. This is of critical importance in near-term devices, where limited coherence times compete against the desire for slower cooling cycles.

In this work, we detail how one may prepare ground states of an artificial Hamiltonian on a digital quantum computer via quantum digital cooling (QDC). We first present an analytic study of the cooling of a two-level system, from which two different approaches may be outlined to de-excite to the ground state whilst preventing reheating. We investigate the behaviour of both methods in the digitized setting, and find they continue to be robust. The protocols deriving from these two principles are tested in the one-qubit black-box Hamiltonian setting, where the energy gap and matrix elements are unknown. We extend these protocols to N-qubit systems, and investigate their ability to cool small-scale simulations of the transverse-field Ising model numerically. We observe that the strong-coupling BangBang protocol can prepare good fidelity approximations of few qubit Ising chains in the paramagnetic and ferromagnetic regime, but seems to perform much worse close to the critical point, where the system spectrum shows a less-ordered structure. The small number of calls to the system evolution operator needed to realize this protocol makes it attractive for near term application. The weak-coupling LogSweep protocol, conversely, needs a much larger and tunable number of steps, but can achieve better ground state approximations, even in the critical regime of the transverse-field Ising model.

I. COOLING A SYSTEM WITH A SINGLE FRIDGE QUBIT

In nature, gapped physical systems cool down to a state with high overlap to the ground state when interacting with a bath that is cold and large, under the condition of ergodicity. We define the bath cold if its temperature $T_B$ is small compared to the ground state
gap $\Delta_S$ of the system to be cooled, $k_B T_b \ll \Delta_S$. Ergodicity is intended as the lack of symmetries that prevent excitations to be transferred from the system to the bath, or that reduce the size of the accessible bath Hilbert space. Given a system with Hamiltonian $H_S$ and eigenstates $H_S |E_j\rangle = E_j |E_j\rangle$, energy conservation implies that the bath must have states at energies $E_j - E_0$ to allow de-excitation of the eigenstates $E_j$. This is typically achieved by having a bath with a continuous or near-continuous low-energy spectrum [Fig. 1(a)]. The bath need not cool all states immediately to the ground state. Instead, a bath typically absorbs single quanta of energy $\epsilon = E_i - E_f$ that correspond to local excitations of the states $|E_i\rangle \rightarrow |E_f\rangle$, at a rate given by Fermi’s golden rule:

$$\frac{dP_{i\rightarrow f}}{dt} = \frac{2}{\hbar} \int_0^\infty d\epsilon \langle E_f, \epsilon | H_C | E_i, 0 \rangle^2 \rho_B(\epsilon) \times \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sin[(E_i - E_f - \epsilon) t]}{E_i - E_f - \epsilon},$$

where $H_C$ is the coupling between the system and the bath, and $\rho_B$ is the density of states of the bath. This requires the bath to be large enough to prevent reexcitation of these states as the system continues cooling. In other words, the bath must have a large Hilbert space compared to the one of the system. This ensures that, at equilibrium, most of the entropy is distributed in the bath. To represent such a large bath with an ancillary register on a quantum device would be impractically costly.

In this work, we approximate the presence of a much larger bath with a single ancilla qubit [Fig. 1(b)], with bath Hamiltonian $H_B = \epsilon Z/2$. The coupling between the bath and the system takes the form $H_C = \gamma X \otimes V_S/2$, where $\gamma$ is the coupling strength, and $V_S$ a coupling term that acts on the system alone. A key advantage of the digital approach is that we are free to choose $V_S$ as desired to optimize the cooling protocols. The Hamiltonian of the entire system and bath then takes the form

$$H = H_S + H_B + H_C,$$

This has an immediate problem, as the bath can only absorb a single quantum of energy $\epsilon$, but we may circumvent this by periodically resetting the ancilla qubit to $|0\rangle$. The non-unitary reset in effect extracts energy and entropy from the ancilla to a much larger external bath (the experimenter’s environment). For this reason we call the ancilla qubit a ‘fridge’ qubit. The non-unitarity introduced in the process is necessary to dissipate entropy, allowing to prepare the ground state from an arbitrary starting state. As the time between resets is finite, the $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit in Eq. (1) is no longer justified and energy is no longer conserved. This is both a blessing and a curse — we need not precisely guess the energy gap $\Delta = E_i - E_f$ of the transition that we need to de-excite, but we run the risk of reheating the system at each cooling round. Balancing these competing factors is key to the successful design of QDC protocols.

$$\text{FIG. 1.} \quad \text{The de-excitation of the system transition } |E_i\rangle_S \rightarrow |E_0\rangle_S \text{ mediated by: (a) a continuous-spectrum natural bath, where an excitation } |\epsilon\rangle_B \text{ at energy } \epsilon \text{ is produced, and (b) a single-qubit digital fridge, which can be excited if } \epsilon = \Delta.$$ 

II. DE-EXCITING A SINGLE TRANSITION: THE 1+1 MODEL

In order to design some basic protocols for QDC, we turn to a toy ‘1+1’ model. We take a single-qubit system with Hamiltonian $H_S = \Delta Z/2$, and couple it to a single fridge qubit with coupling term $V_S = X$. Although this model is simple, it can for instance represent a pair of levels being targetted for cooling in a much larger quantum system. We will make use of this interpretation when extending these cooling protocols in section III.

A. Elementary approaches to digital cooling: strong and weak-coupling

Let us first assume $\Delta$ is known, in which case resonant cooling ($\epsilon = \Delta$) can be seen to be the most effective choice of $\epsilon$. With this fixed, the transition probabilities after time $t$ may be calculated analytically to be

$$P_{1\rightarrow 0} = \sin^2 \left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}\right), \quad P_{0\rightarrow 1} = \frac{\gamma^2 \sin^2(4\Omega t)}{4\Omega^2},$$

where $\Omega = \sqrt{\gamma^2/4 + \epsilon^2}$. We wish to maximise the cooling probability $P_{1\rightarrow 0}$ while minimizing the reheating probability $P_{0\rightarrow 1}$ by optimizing the remaining free parameters: the coupling strength $\gamma$ and the cooling time $t$. To maximize the cooling rate $P_{1\rightarrow 0} = 1$, we must set

$$t = \pi \gamma^{-1}.$$ 

We assume this constraint throughout this paper. This goes beyond the perturbative regime $\gamma t \ll 1$ in which Eq. (1) is formulated. However, we can take two very different approaches to minimize reheating, based on strong
or weak coupling. The weak-coupling approach is based on the observation that the off-resonant transition $P_{0\rightarrow1}$ is bounded by $\gamma^2/4\Omega^2$. As such, we may suppress reheating to an arbitrary level by choosing sufficiently small $\gamma$. The time-cost for Hamiltonian simulation of $e^{iHt}$ scales at best linearly in $t$ [17], so this implies one may obtain the ground state with failure probability $p$ in time $O(p^{-1})$, regardless of the initial state of the qubit. The strong-coupling approach consists of tuning $\gamma$ so that $\Omega t = \pi$, which is achieved when $\gamma = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}\epsilon$. This fixes the reheating exactly to 0, guaranteeing the qubit to be in the ground state in the shortest possible time, but at the cost of requiring fine-tuning.

Unlike in analog quantum simulation, digital devices cannot exactly implement the dynamics of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (3), and must approximate it digitally instead. A common approach to such digitization is that of the Suzuki-Trotter expansion [18, 19], which we now explore for the two cooling paradigms. We apply the (first-order) expansion of the coupled system-bath evolution with Trotter number $M$

$$e^{-i(H_S+H_B+H_C)t} \sim e^{-iH_C \frac{\pi}{M}} \left[ e^{-i(H_S+H_B)\frac{\pi}{M}} e^{-iH_C \frac{\pi}{M}} \right]^M. \quad (6)$$

If we restrict to the subspace containing the states involved in the cooling transition $|10\rangle_{SF} \rightarrow |01\rangle_{SF}$, at resonant cooling we have $H_S + H_B \propto \frac{\pi}{2}$. Thus, the Trotterized evolution behaves exactly like the continuous one with regards to the cooling transition. We study reheating probabilities as a function of $t$ for different values of $M$ in the weak-coupling regime. We observe (Fig. 2) that the digitized evolution approximates well the behavior of the continuum limit whenever $t\Omega/\pi \lesssim M$ (i.e., for the first $M$ Rabi oscillations with pulse $\Omega$). For longer times $t\Omega/\pi \gtrsim M$, the first-order Trotter approximation fails, leading to reheating rates far larger than in the continuum limit. This allows us to define a practical choice of $M$ to avoid reheating due to digitization. For the weak-coupling case, we choose $M \geq 2\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2/\gamma^2}$, which sets the working point $t = \pi \gamma^{-1}$ before the $M/2$ Rabi oscillation. However, in the strong-coupling case $t\Omega/\pi = \sqrt{3}$, which implies that a single step is sufficient. Indeed, digitized cooling with probability 1 and no reheating can be realized by a bang-bang approach (inspired by similar approach in variational methods [20, 21]). This consists in defining the evolution as in Eq. (6) with $M = 1$, as long as the coupling strength is adjusted to $\gamma = 2\epsilon$. With this choice, the digitized evolution implements resonant Ramsey interference on the cooling transition $|10\rangle_{SF} \rightarrow |01\rangle_{SF}$ and anti-resonant Ramsey interference on the reheating transition $|00\rangle_{SF} \rightarrow |11\rangle_{SF}$. The short depth of the circuit that implements this bang-bang cooling approach makes it attractive for near-term applications. Note, that for the $N$-qubit $H_S$ the digital implementation of the unitary $\exp[-iH_S t]$ may require further Trotterization, bringing additional costs and errors. For the sake of simplicity, in this work we will ignore these and use expansion Eq. (6) also in section III.

A key difference between the two approaches to digital cooling is in their behavior off-resonance, i.e., when the energy gap is mistargetted or not precisely known. For the bang-bang approach, detuning reduces the cooling efficiency while symmetrically boosting reheating [Fig. 3(a)]. The wide resonance peak around zero detuning makes this approach ideal to quickly cool transitions which energy is known up to a small error. In the weak-coupling approach the resonance peak becomes steeper and the reheating gets more suppressed as the coupling is made smaller [Fig. 3(b)], approaching the energy conservation limit. Detuning makes cooling inefficient, but thanks to the arbitrarily low reheating this weak-coupling cooling can be iterated while changing $\epsilon$ to try to match the transition energy, without destroying the cooling effect.

FIG. 2. Effects of Trotterization on cooling and reheating probabilities as a function of the coupling time $t$, for different numbers of Trotter steps $M$ per cooling cycle. Vertical dotted lines indicate the $M$-th reheating oscillation, at which point the Trotter approximation fails.

FIG. 3. Effect of fridge-system detuning $\delta = \Delta - \epsilon$ on the cooling (solid) and reheating (dashed lines) probabilities for (a) the bang-bang cooling approach, and (b) the weak-coupling cooling approach, where colors indicate different coupling strengths.
B. Common symmetries and the coupling alternation method

For a complex Hamiltonian, we may not have full information on the system eigenbasis. Therefore, common symmetries $S$ between the system Hamiltonian $H_S$ and the coupling operator $V_S$ (i.e., $[S, H_S] = [S, V_S] = 0$) may arise that compromise the cooling procedure. In the 1+1 qubit model we can simulate this by considering the system Hamiltonian $H_S = h \vec{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$, characterized by a random unit vector $\vec{n}$. For any given coupling operator $V_S$, there is a risk that $[H_S, V_S] \approx 0$. When this is the case, the off-diagonal elements of $V_S$ in the system eigenbasis are zero, and no cooling occurs. To prevent this, we alternate between different coupling terms $V_S^j \in \{X_S, Y_S, Z_S\}$ during the cooling protocol, as no non-trivial Hamiltonian can commute with all such coupling terms. The effectiveness of this scheme is demonstrated in Fig. 4: the probability of failure of the weak coupling approach ($t \epsilon = 10$) is reduced to below 3% for all choices of $\vec{n}$ after the third cooling step iteration. (Similar results are seen for the strong-coupling approach.) The strategy of alternating between $X$, $Y$ and $Z$ coupling terms becomes useful in what follows for our $N$-qubit protocols, where potential common symmetries between $V_S$ and $H_S$ are hard to control.

![Fig. 4: Probabilities $P_{1\to0}$ of transitioning from $|1\rangle$ to $|0\rangle$ after three iterations of the weak-coupling ($t \epsilon = 10$) cooling procedure, with coupling potentials $V_S^3 = X, X, X$ (left), $V_S^3 = X, Y, X$ (center), $V_S^3 = X, Y, Z$ (center), on a system qubit with Hamiltonian $H_S = h \vec{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ and known energy splitting $h$. The orientation of the unit vector $\vec{n}$ is represented on spherical surfaces. The average, standard deviation and minimum of $P_{1\to0}$ are shown above each panel.](image)

III. SCALABLE QDC PROTOCOLS

We now look to use the insight obtained for cooling in the 1+1 toy model to develop QDC schemes for larger systems. The sub-additivity of entropy places a rough lower bound on the number of cooling steps required to cool an $N$-qubit system. This limits the entropy $\Delta S_S$ that the system can transfer to the fridge qubit before the non-unitary reset to $\Delta S_S \geq -\Delta S_F \geq -1$ bit. If we demand the ability to cool an arbitrary state, a DQC protocol must also be able to cool the maximally-mixed state, which has entropy $S_S = N$. We then require $N$ repetitions of an optimal coupling-and-reset step to reach the pure ground state (which has entropy $S_S = 0$). This can be obtained in the simple example of cooling $N$ non-interacting qubits with known energies, by simply repeating the protocols of the 1+1 model. However, this cannot be generalised to arbitrary strongly-correlated systems, as cooling is complicated by irregular and unknown energy gaps and coupling terms between eigenstates. This is to be expected, as preparing ground states of arbitrary Hamiltonians is a known QMA-hard problem [2]. However, as cooling is a physically-motivated process, we hope QDC to be able to achieve polynomial scalings for systems of physical interest, and focus for the rest of the work on exploring this thesis.

In the rest of this text, we introduce two scalable QDC protocols for $N$-qubit systems: the strong-coupling-based BangBang protocol and the weak-coupling-based LogSweep protocol. These extend and generalize the two approaches we established for the 1+1 toy model of section II A. Each protocol iterates over a sequence of cooling steps, each of which consists of coupling the fridge qubit to part of the system for a short time evolution, and then resetting the fridge qubit to its ground state. The protocols differ in the choice of coupling strengths $\gamma_i$, coupling terms $V_S^i$ and fridge energies $\epsilon_i$ at each $i$-th cooling step. The coupling time for each cooling step is fixed by Eq. (5).

A. The BangBang protocol

For a local Hamiltonian, one may approximate the gap between locally coupled eigenstates, which in turn allows one to estimate the energy to target in a single-shot cooling step. In perturbation theory, the rate of a transition between eigenstates $|E_i\rangle \rightarrow |E_j\rangle$ depends on the matrix element of the coupling $V_S$:

$$V_{ij} := \langle E_i | V_S | E_j \rangle = \frac{\langle E_i | [H_S, V_S] | E_j \rangle}{E_i - E_j}. \quad (7)$$

If $V_S$ is local and bounded, $[H_S, V_S]$ is as well, so the matrix element $V_{ij}$ will be bounded proportionally to $(E_i - E_j)^{-1}$. The matrix element is additionally bounded by $\|V\|$; this bound is achieved approximately when $E_i - E_j$ falls below the maximum off-diagonal element of $[H, V]$ in any basis, which we define with the notation $\| [H, V] \|_\perp$:

$$\|O\|_\perp = \max_{\langle \phi | \psi \rangle = 0} \langle \phi | O | \psi \rangle = \max_{|\Phi \rangle, |\Psi \rangle} \frac{\langle \Phi | O | \Phi \rangle - \langle \Psi | O | \Psi \rangle}{2}. \quad (8)$$

We use this energy scale to set the fridge energy:

$$\epsilon_i = \| [V_S^i, H_S] \|_\perp \quad (9)$$

for any coupling potential $V_S^i$. This way, the maximum-energy transitions accessible by $V_S$ are on resonance,
while smaller energy ones (which are less important for cooling) still have a higher probability of cooling than that of reheating [see Fig. 3(a)]. This defines the BangBang protocol: we iterate over coupling to each qubit, with \( \epsilon_i \) fixed by Eq. (9). As this protocol does not attempt to suppress reheating, we choose a single coupling \( V_S = Y_n \) for the \( n \)-th qubit, instead of iterating over \( V_S = X_n, Y_n, Z_n \) (as was suggested in Sec.IIIB). We repeat the entire procedure \( R \) times, resulting in a total of \( RN \) cooling steps.

![Energy change diagram](image)

**FIG. 5.** Change in energy expectation value for the application of a single cooling step to the maximally mixed state of a \( N = 8 \) qubit transverse field Ising chain Eq. (10), depending on the fridge energy \( \epsilon \). The coupling potential is \( V_S = Y_3 \), the Pauli \( Y \) on the third qubit. The relation \( B^2 + J^2 = 1 \) fixes the energy scale.

To test the BangBang protocol, we study the cooling of a \( N \)-qubit transverse-field Ising chain

\[
H_S = \sum_{i=0}^{N} B X_i + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} J Z_i Z_{i+1}.
\]

The relative coupling strength \( J/B \) dictates whether the system is in the paramagnetic \( (J/B \ll 1) \), ferromagnetic \( (J/B \gg 1) \), or critical \( (J/B \sim 1) \) phases. This ability to simply tune between three phases of matter with significantly different physical properties make the TFIM a good benchmark model to investigate the ability of different QDC schemes in various scenarios.

We first demonstrate that our choice for the fridge energy Eq. (9) is appropriate. In Fig. 5, we plot the effect of a single cooling step on the maximally-mixed state. We observe that cooling is maximized around where Eq. (9) is satisfied for all phases of the TFIM. We find this behaviour to hold for all other (local) choices of coupling potential \( V_S \) used in this work, as predicted.

We next turn to the ability of the BangBang protocol to prepare an approximation \( \rho_0 \) to the true ground state \( |E_0\rangle \), as measured by the ground state fidelity

\[
F = \text{Trace}[|E_0\rangle\langle E_0|\rho].
\]

In Fig. 6(a), we plot how \( F \) evolves with each cooling step when starting from the maximally-mixed state (solid lines). We see that in the paramagnetic and ferromagnetic phases this is brought to a steady state with significant but imperfect ground state overlap, as the refrigeration power balances out with unwanted reheating. To verify convergence, we simulate pure reheating of the true ground state (dashed lines), and observe that this converges similarly to the steady state. In the paramagnetic regime, this convergence is achieved with one cooling step per site, for a total of \( N \) cooling steps \( (R = 1) \). By contrast, in the ferromagnetic regime we require closer to \( N^2 \) cooling steps \( (R = N) \). The BangBang protocol performs significantly worse in the critical regime. This is to be expected, as in this regime the spectrum is no longer banded, and excitations are not as uniform as in the paramagnetic or ferromagnetic regimes. The steady-state fidelity [Fig. 6(b)] decays slowly with the increasing size of the system, but it still manages to achieve high overlap at \( N \sim 10 \) Ising chains (far from criticality). Given the low cost of the protocol, we suggest that this is of particular interest for near-term experiments, and may be further refined by other cooling protocols, (or methods such as quantum phase estimation) in the long term.

**B. The LogSweep protocol**

Refrigeration at weak-coupling suppresses reheating, but only allows for the cooling of transitions within a narrow energy band [as shown in Fig. 3(a)]. We may take advantage of this in a larger system, where a wide range of energy gaps are present, by sweeping the fridge energy \( \epsilon_j \) from high to low as we iterate over cooling steps. As we are less worried about reheating at the beginning of the protocol, we may choose a larger cooling linewidth \( \delta_j = t^{-1}_j = \pi \gamma_j \) here, which then requires us to sweep over fewer fridge energies. This allows us to give a logarithmic gradation of the target band of fridge energies \( (E_{\text{min}}, E_{\text{max}}) \) to sweep over in the LogSweep protocol.

![Overlap to ground state](image)

**FIG. 6.** Simulations of BangBang protocol applied to a \( N \) qubit transverse Ising chain. The coupling potentials are \( V_S = Y_i \). (a) Overlap with the ground state manifold of the state of the qubit register during the application of the protocol, for \( N = 5 \), with initial state \( \rho_0 \) the maximally mixed state (solid lines) or the system ground state (dashed lines). (b) Overlap with the final state after the full \( N^2 \)-steps protocol \( (R = N) \), depending on the size of the system \( N \).
For a fixed gradation number $K$, we set
\[ \epsilon_j = \frac{\epsilon_j - \epsilon_{j+1}}{E_{\min}^{-1} - E_{\max}^{-1}}, \]
and choose $\gamma_j$ in agreement with the condition $\epsilon_{j+1} + \delta_j = \epsilon_j$. As we wish for a controlled cooling protocol, we further iterate the couplings $V_S$ over $\{X_i, Y_i, Z_i\}$ for each qubit $N$ (cf. Sec. II B), for a total of $3NK$ cooling steps. The number of Trotter steps $M_j$ for each cooling step is chosen following section II A, but taking into consideration that the true transition energy can be off-resonant with $\epsilon_j$ and as high as $E_{\max}$. We find that a good balance between avoiding reheating and minimizing circuit length may be found by setting
\[ M_j = 2 \left( 1 + \frac{1}{E_{\max}^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \]

We first test the LogSweep protocol as applied to the 1+1 model defined in Sec. II A, with the system gap $\Delta$ now taking an unknown value between $E_{\min}$ and $E_{\max}$ (Fig. 7). We desire that an full protocol remain efficient, both in the cooling of transitions $\Delta \sim \epsilon_j$ at each $j$, and in the minimization of reheating during latter steps. As demonstrated by the black dashed curve in Fig. 7, when $E_{\max}/E_{\min} = 5$ this can be achieved well with only $K \approx 5$ steps. However, the bandwidth of single cooling steps grows smaller as $E_{\min} \to 0$, implying that the required $K$ would blow up in this limit.

\[ \beta_i = 1 + \frac{1}{E_{\max}^2} \]

We now investigate the performance of the LogSweep protocol on different phases of the transverse-field Ising model. In Fig. 8(a), we plot the fidelity of the prepared state $\rho$ to the ground state $|E_0\rangle$ [Eq. (11)], as a function of the gradation number $K$, starting from the maximally mixed state. We observe polynomial convergence to the ground state in both the critical and the strong-coupling phase, attaining an error of $1 - F = \epsilon$ in approximately $O(\epsilon^{-3})$ cooling steps. (As we require more Trotter steps at low energy, the computational complexity to attain an error $\epsilon$ scales as $O(\epsilon^{-2})$.) For the paramagnetic chain, we find that the protocol fails to converge as a function of $K$. We interpret this by noting that the local excitations of the paramagnetic chain (to which the fringe couples directly thanks to the local Pauli coupling potentials) have well-defined and regular energies. This implies that a finer energy gradation does not help with matching the energies of more transitions. Instead, finer gradation results in an over-compression of the linewidths, which hinders some cooling paths. We observe a similar trend to the BangBang protocol in the fidelity of the LogSweep protocol with the chain length $N$ [Fig. 8(b)]. In the critical and strong-coupling phases, this may be in turn countered by increasing the gradation number $K$ (at the cost of increased run-time). Unfortunately, the small system sizes studied prevent an estimation of the resulting scaling with $N$.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

In this paper, we investigated how cooling can be simulated on a digital quantum computer, and demonstrated that this can be exploited for the design of scalable algorithms for preparing ground states of $N$-qubit systems. We identified how one can meet many of the fundamental challenges that the digital approach to cooling raises and use the leverage offered exclusively by digital quantum hardware, namely the freedom of choice in the coupling strength and fringe energy. We laid out a general approach of simulating a cold bath with a single ancilla qubit, which is iteratively coupled to various locations in the system and reset periodically to extract entropy and energy. We studied how to digitize the system-fringe coupling simulation without causing additional re-
heating, and how to avoid symmetries which produce non-ergodic behavior that hinders cooling. By tuning coupling parameters beyond the perturbative regime described by Fermi’s golden rule, efficient cooling of targeted transitions can be realized. Following these principles we proposed two protocols for preparing approximate ground states of N-qubit systems — the Bang-Bang protocol and the LogSweep protocol. The Bang-Bang protocol operates in the regime of strong coupling and extreme digitization, thus requiring a short circuit depth. It relies on analytical estimates of transition energies, and gives best results for systems with banded energy spectra. The LogSweep protocol, on the contrary, operates at weak coupling and ensures vanishing Trotter error, while systematically scanning the energy spectrum to match transitions resonantly. We studied numerically how these protocols perform when applied to short quantum Ising chains in different regimes, and we showed that the BangBang protocol efficiently cools the system in the paramagnetic and in the ferromagnetic regime, while the LogSweep protocol shows good performance in the critical and ferromagnetic regime.

The introduction of quantum digital cooling opens future research directions related to the characterization of proposed protocols, their optimization, and their extension beyond ground state preparation. A study of the effect of noise on currently proposed QDC protocols, and the optimization of such protocols for noise resilience, are in order to establish their applicability on near-term devices. Applying QDC to more complex physical systems, in areas such as quantum spin liquids, many-body localization and quantum chemistry, would bring new challenges to the protocol construction. A thorough study of the role in the cooling process played by the symmetries and locality of coupling could lead to the design of more optimized protocols. Furthermore, various extensions to the QDC protocols proposed in this work can be suggested. In a parallelized version of QDC, the use of multiple fridge qubits coupled to various locations in the system might allow to trade space complexity for time complexity. A modification in the fridge reset paradigm might allow a QDC-like algorithm to prepare Gibbs thermal states, which are useful e.g. for semi-definite programming [22]. A variationally-optimized QDC protocol might be devised, that can efficiently prepare a state in the ground state manifold of some Hamiltonian starting from an arbitrary initial state — differently from the variational quantum eigensolver [7] which requires the preparation of a fiducial state at every iteration. The principles of QDC might inspire a new class of efficient non-unitary quantum algorithms, where non-unitary operations are mediated by a single ancillary qubit, with possible application e.g. in the simulation of open quantum system dynamics.
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