

Autonomous quantum devices: When are they realisable without additional thermodynamic costs?

Mischa P. Woods^{1,2} and Michał Horodecki³

¹*Institute for Theoretical Physics, ETH Zurich, Switzerland*

²*University Grenoble Alpes, Inria, Grenoble, France**

³*International Centre for Theory of Quantum Technologies, University of Gdansk, Poland†*

The resource theory of quantum thermodynamics has been a very successful theory and has generated much follow up work in the community. It requires energy preserving unitary operations to be implemented over a system, bath, and catalyst as part of its paradigm. So far, such unitary operations have been considered a “free” resource in the theory. However, this is only an idealisation of a necessarily inexact process. Here, we include an additional auxiliary control system which can autonomously implement the unitary by turning “on/off” an interaction. However, the control system will inevitably be degraded by the back-action caused by the implementation of the unitary. We derive conditions on the quality of the control device so that the laws of thermodynamics do not change; and prove — by utilising a good quantum clock — that the laws of quantum mechanics allow the back-reaction to be small enough so that these conditions are satisfiable. Our inclusion of non-idealised control into the resource framework also raises interesting prospects, which were absent when considering idealised control. Among other things, the emergence of a 3rd law — without the need for the assumption of a light-cone.

Our results and framework unify the field of autonomous thermal machines with the thermodynamic quantum resource theoretic one, and lay the groundwork for all quantum processing devices to be unified with fully autonomous machines.

I. INTRODUCTION

Thermodynamics has been tremendously successful in describing the world around us. It has also been at the heart of developing new technologies, such as heat engines which powered the industrial revolution, jet and space rocket propulsion — just to name a few. In more recent times, scientists have been developing a theoretical understanding of thermodynamics for tiny systems for which often quantum effects cannot be ignored. These ongoing developments are influential in optimising current quantum technologies, or understanding important physical processes. Take for example molecular machines or nano-machines such as molecular motors [1], which are important in biological processes [2], or distant technologies such as nanorobots [3], where quantum effects on the control mechanism, and the back-reaction they incur, are likely to be significant due to their small size.

The modern quantum thermodynamics literature tends to be about two types of processes: those which are fully autonomous (i.e. the processes described by time-independent Hamiltonians) and those which assume implicit external control at no extra cost (i.e. the processes described by time-dependent Hamiltonians). An example of processes described by a constant Hamiltonian is the Brownian ratchet, popularised by Feynman [7], which simply sits between two thermal baths and extracts work in situ. There are many autonomous quantum thermal machines built on similar principles [4, 8–18]. However,

there are a number of processes, such as quantum Carnot cycles, that are described by time-dependent Hamiltonians and thus require external control. This is true both in theory [19–24] and in experiment [25]. See Fig. 1 for a comparison of autonomous and non-autonomous processes.

The non-autonomous engines of the kind depicted in Fig. 1 require an external agent that makes the changes. This does not happen in the engines used in our daily life. E.g. car engines do not require any external control — the passage via different strokes during the cycle is caused by suitable feedback mechanisms. An example of a thermal machine that requires switching between the strokes by an external agent is the quantum heat engine of [25], where alternating coupling to the hot and the cold bath is implemented by switching between two lasers — one producing thermal light of high temperature while the other one producing light at low temperature.

In this context the following problem appears. While the non-autonomous machines involve additional systems responsible for making the changes, those additional systems are by definition not considered explicitly. For microscopic engines, such systems might actually be a place where a significant amount of entropy and/or energy is being deposited. Such entropy production is actually likely to occur in microscopic regimes, due to the quantum back-reaction occurring between the controlling unit and the controlled system. There may be thus hidden thermodynamic costs, which are not accounted for.

Hence the following question can be posed: given a non-autonomous thermal machine, is it possible to provide an explicit control scheme, such that the overall (now autonomous) machine will exhibit no additional cost?

* mischa.woods@gmail.com

† michal.horodecki@ug.edu.pl




FIG. 1: **Fully autonomous thermal machines vs. a type of non-autonomous cycle-based machines**

a) Depiction of a quantum thermal absorption machine: these devices do not need external control to operate (i.e. they are governed by time-independent Hamiltonians). Given enough time, they settle into a functioning steady state where heat from a heat bath is converted via a machine (composed of fine-tuned energy levels and couplings) into a low-entropy useful state (such as a charged battery) and a high-entropy “waste” state (such as a room temperature thermal state). See [4, 5] for reviews. **b)** Schematic of a non-autonomous thermal machine. In this resource-based framework [6], an energy preserving unitary is performed over a heat bath and initial system state. The unitary is chosen so that the transformed system state is of high value (e.g. it could represent a charged battery). The control required to perform the energy-preserving unitary necessitates a time-dependent Hamiltonian and may not be thermodynamically cost-free.

This question is especially relevant in the context of the recently developed resource theory of thermodynamics [26], where any process is supposed to arise from the concatenation of basic operations which are energy preserving unitary transformations over a microscopic system of interest and a thermal bath. Thus we deal here with external control, represented by a time-dependent Hamiltonian that implements the subsequent unitaries. In such a microscopic regime, the hidden costs acquired by the control system may be indeed high, as is indicated by the phenomenon of so-called *embezzling* [27, 28] (see Sec. IIB).

The problem of the cost of making the resource theoretic thermal machines autonomous was considered in [29]. The control device was implemented by means of an idealized momentum clock. Actually, any conceivable control system that enables one to go from a time-dependent Hamiltonian description to a time-independent one must involve a clock as part of the con-

trol unit. I.e. a device for which the change in its state, due to time evolution, allows one to predict time.

E.g. in a car engine the role of the clock is played by periodic motion of the piston (arising via so-called self-oscillation [30]); or in the already mentioned single-ion heat engine of [25] the timing involved in the changing of the lasers is ultimately due to an external electronic device, which is a kind of clock.

Unfortunately the clock used in [29] requires infinite energy. It was first noted by Pauli that such clocks are unphysical [31] and we will provide more weight to Pauli’s argument in this paper.




FIG. 2: **Schematic of the autonomous quantum devices we focus on: A non-autonomous thermal machine complemented by a quantum clock.** The system in the dotted-line box is the same as in Fig. 1 b). It depicts the standard systems involved in the resource-theoretic approach to thermodynamics. If no other systems are involved, its dynamics are described by a time-dependent Hamiltonian. If one includes an additional quantum system whose state changes in a predictable fashion with the passing of time — i.e. a clock — then it can turn on and off interaction terms at specific times, leading to an autonomous implementation of the resource-theoretic approach to thermodynamics. Hence we use a clock as a control device.

In this paper the question of whether one can make the resource theoretic thermal machines autonomous, without incurring an extra thermodynamic cost is reconsidered, and positively answered.

Namely, we start with non-autonomous scenario, where an external agent performs energy preserving unitary on system plus bath. We will then examine the clock which turns on and off the interactions implementing the unitaries and derive conditions so that the change in the clock’s state due to the back-reaction on it has a vanishingly small thermodynamic cost. We will then show that clocks exist which satisfy our criterion. In particular, we will find a family of clocks with different dimensions, for which there is no change in energy while the difference in entropy relative to before and after the unitary has been performed will be vanishingly small as the clock increases in size. Importantly, since our clocks use finite energy, they avoid the issues of the clock of Ref. [29]. Our work thus demonstrates that the control needed to implement thermodynamic transformations in the resource-theoretic paradigm can indeed be neglected under certain achievable circumstances. In this way we show that non-

autonomous resource theoretic thermal machines can be recast into autonomous ones, without additional cost.

As a byproduct, our necessary conditions for the change in the clock to not have a significant additional thermodynamic cost reveal the emergence of a 3rd law: if the clock implements the unitary too quickly (relative to the free dynamics of the system and clock), it will suffer a large back-reaction and *will* represent a significant additional thermodynamic cost in addition to failing to implement correctly the required unitary. The minimum time interval in which the unitary can be implemented without the clock suffering significant back-reaction is limited by the dimension of the clock. This demonstrates the emergence of a 3rd law without the need to impose a light-cone or locality condition on how the unitary is implemented [32].

The rest of this paper is divided into five main sections: Setting II, Results III, Discussion IV, and Conclusions V. In Setting, we start by describing the thermodynamic transformations under the convention of idealised control. This is summarized in definition 1. Then in subsection IIB we describe how to explicitly implement the control via time-independent dynamics on the system of interest and an additional system called “clock”. Finally, before moving to the Results section, we show why the cost of control can be counter-intuitive by showing how it is related to the established phenomenon of catalytic embezzlement and how idealised control requires infinite energy (see Prop. 3). Our results discussed in Section III start with the simplest case possible: the control of so-called noisy operations, in which baths are a source of entropy but not heat. The result is quantified in Theorems 1 and 2. The core of the Theorem 1 is what we can call “no-embezzling conditions”. Namely, for the first time, we give a lower bound for the value of error on the catalyst that does not cause deviation from the 2nd laws, i.e. from the limitations for transitions via noisy operations at zero error on the catalyst. We then move on to consider the full paradigm of control of thermodynamic operations in which the baths are a source of entropy and heat — the so-called thermal operations. This case is summarized in Theorems 3 and 4. In both cases (i.e. noisy and thermal operations) we allow for catalysts and provide conditions under which the cost of control is neglectable. The situation is more nuanced in the case of thermal operations and has unforeseen consequences which we discuss. Finally, in the last two sections, (Discussion IV and Conclusions V), we discuss in more detail the implications of our work followed by a summary.

The proofs of our results are given in the Appendix (section A). Additional technical details required for the proofs are relegated to the Supplementary.

II. SETTING

A. Types of Thermodynamic Transformations

1. Background: Thermal Operations and variants

Resource theories have been applied to the study of quantum thermodynamics. In this setting, one considers transformations from a state ρ_A^0 to ρ_A^1 for which there exists a unitary U_{AG} over system A and a Gibbs state τ_G such that $\rho_A^1 = \text{tr}_G[U_{AG}(\rho_A^0 \otimes \tau_G)U_{AG}^\dagger]$. This setup is entropy preserving since it is a unitary transformation. In order to call it a thermal operation (TO), we further require the process to be energy preserving, namely $[U_{AG}, \hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_G] = 0$, where \hat{H}_A is the local Hamiltonian of the A system and \hat{H}_G that of the thermal bath.[33] These operations can be extended to the strictly larger class of catalytic TOs (CTOs) by considering additional “free” objects called catalysts ρ_{Cat}^0 . In this case the A system is bipartite with the requirement that the catalyst is returned to its initial state after the transformation; $\rho_S^1 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 = \text{tr}_G[U_{\text{SCatG}}(\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tau_G)U_{\text{SCatG}}^\dagger]$, with a Hamiltonian \hat{H}_A of the form $\hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{\text{Cat}}$. The bath provides a source of entropy and heat. In the special case in which its Hamiltonian is completely degenerate, its Gibbs state τ_G becomes the maximally mixed state $\tau_G \propto \mathbb{1}_G$ and the bath can now only provide entropy. These are known as catalytic noisy operations (CNOs), or simply noisy operations (NOs) when there is no catalyst involved [34, 35]. It is known that CNOs allow for transitions that are not possible by NOs [36, 37].

In these frameworks, the operations (NOs, CNOs, TOs, CTOs) are considered to be *free* from the resource perspective, since they preserve entropy and energy over system A and the bath G — the two resources in thermodynamics. However, note that there is the assumption that the external control (i.e. the ability to apply energy preserving unitaries over the setup) is “perfect”. In order to challenge this perspective, we will now introduce an auxiliary system to represent explicitly the system which implements the external control, while aiming to show to what extent it can be free, from the resource theory perspective.

2. *t*-Catalytic Thermal Operations

If the control system is a thermodynamically free resource, its final state after the transition must be as useful as the state it would have been in had it not implemented the unitary, and instead evolved unitarily according to its free Hamiltonian. One way to realise this within the resource theoretic paradigm, is to choose a control device whose free evolution is periodic and let the time taken to apply the unitary be an integer multiple of its period. In this scenario the control device fits nicely within the

resource theory framework, since when viewed at integer multiples of the period, the control device is a catalyst according to CTOs.

The downside with this approach is that the times corresponding to multiples of the period are a measure zero of all possible times. Consequently, not only would one need an idealised clock which can tell the time with zero uncertainty to discern these particular times, but one would like to be able to say whether the transition was thermodynamically allowed during proper intervals of time. Fortunately, there is a simple generalisation of CTOs,[38] which naturally resolves this issue. We introduce t-CTO which take into account that the transition is not instantaneous, but moreover occurs over a finite time interval. In the following definition, one should think of the catalyst system as playing the role of the external control device.

Definition 1 (t-CTO and t-CNO). *A transition from $\rho_S^0(t_1)$ to $\rho_S^1(t_2)$ with $t_1 \leq t_2$ is possible under t-CTO iff there exists a finite dimensional quantum state ρ_{Cat} with Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{Cat} such that*

$$\rho_S^0(0) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(0) \xrightarrow{\text{TO}} \bar{\sigma}_S(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t), \quad (1)$$

where

$$\bar{\sigma}_S(t) = \begin{cases} \rho_S^0(t) & \text{if } t \in [0, t_1] \\ \rho_S^1(t) & \text{if } t \in [t_2, t_3] \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$\rho_D^n(t) := e^{-it\hat{H}_D} \rho_D^n e^{it\hat{H}_D}$, $D \in \{S, \text{Cat}\}$, $n \in \{0, 1\}$, and t_1 is called “the time when the TO began” while t_2 “the time at which the TO was finalised”. $[0, t_1]$ and $(t_2, t_3]$ are both proper intervals called “the time before the TO began” and “the time after the TO was finalised” respectively. In the special cases where the bath can only be maximally mixed, $\tau_G \propto \mathbb{1}_G$, it will be denoted $\tilde{\tau}_G$ and we will call the transition a t-CNO.

Unless stated otherwise, we will always use the notation $\rho_D^n(t)$, $n \in \{0, 1\}$, to denote the free evolution of a normalised quantum state ρ_D^n on some Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_D according to its free Hamiltonian \hat{H}_D ; namely $\rho_D^n(t) = e^{-it\hat{H}_D} \rho_D^n e^{it\hat{H}_D}$.

Definition 1 captures two notions. On the one hand that the individual subsystems are effectively non interacting before and after the transition has taken place. On the other hand, that during the time interval (t_1, t_2) , in which the transition occurs, arbitrarily strong interactions could be realised. Note that there are two special cases for which t-CTOs reduce to CTOs at times t_1, t_2 — when the Hamiltonian of the catalyst is trivial, (i.e. if $\hat{H}_{\text{Cat}} \propto \mathbb{1}_{\text{Cat}}$), and when the catalyst is periodic with t_1, t_2 integer multiples of its period T_0 (i.e. if $\rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t_1) = \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t_2) = \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(T_0)$).

From the resource theoretic perspective, the characterisation of t-CTOs is the same as CTOs as the following proposition shows.

Proposition 2 (t-CTO & CTO operational equivalence). *A t-CTO from $\rho_S^0(t_1)$ to $\rho_S^1(t_2)$ using a catalyst $\rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(0)$, exists iff a CTO from ρ_S^0 to ρ_S^1 exists using catalyst $\rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(0)$. In other words*

$$\rho_S^0(0) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(0) \xrightarrow{\text{TO}} \bar{\sigma}_S(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t), \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{\sigma}_S(t)$ is defined in Eq. (2), if and only if

$$\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(0) \xrightarrow{\text{TO}} \rho_S^1 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(0). \quad (4)$$

Proof. It is simple. For $t \in [0, t_1]$, Eq. (3) always holds since the l.h.s. and r.h.s. only differ by an energy preserving unitary on the catalyst, which is a valid TO. Therefore the only non-trivial instance of Eq. (3) is for $t \in [t_2, t_3]$. Let us now compare Eqs. (3) and (4) for $t \in [t_2, t_3]$: the only difference is an energy preserving unitary transformation on the catalyst state on the r.h.s. However, all energy preserving unitary translations are TOs. Therefore one can always go from the r.h.s. of Eq. (4) to the r.h.s. of Eq. (3) via a TO. This proves the “if” part of the proposition. Conversely, since the inverse of an energy preserving unitary is another energy preserving unitary, one can always go from the r.h.s. of Eq. (3) to the r.h.s. of Eq. (4) via a TO. ■

While the generalisation to t-CTOs is admittedly quite trivial in nature, it is nevertheless important when considering the autonomous implementation of CTOs. So far, the t-CTOs have only allowed us to include the external control mechanism explicitly into the CTOs paradigm in such a way that they constitute a free resource. In the next section, we will see how this free resource unfortunately corresponds to unphysical time evolution governed by an idealised clock. It will however set the benchmark for what we should be aiming to achieve, if only approximately, with a more realistic control device.

B. Idealised Control, Clocks and Embezzling Catalysts

When a dynamical catalyst in a t-CTO is responsible for autonomously implementing the transition, it must have its own internal notion of time in order to implement the unitary between times t_1 and t_2 . While in practice, the clock part may only form a small part of the full dynamical catalyst system, for convenience of expression, we refer to such dynamical catalysts as a clock and denote the state of the clock with the subscript Cl. Specifically, we would require the clock to induce dynamics on a system A which corresponds to a t-CTO on A. In other words, evolution of the form $\rho_{\text{AClG}}^F(t) = e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{AClG}}} (\rho_A^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \otimes \tau_G) e^{it\hat{H}_{\text{AClG}}}$ where $\rho_{\text{AClG}}^F(t)$ satisfies [39]

$$\rho_{\text{ACl}}^F(t) = \rho_A^F(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t), \quad \rho_A^F(t) = \begin{cases} \rho_A^0(t) & \text{if } t \in [0, t_1] \\ \rho_A^1(t) & \text{if } t \in [t_2, t_3] \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Here $\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)$ denotes the free evolution of the clock,

$$\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) = e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}} \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 e^{it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}}. \quad (6)$$

In the case in which the clock aims to implement autonomously a TO, we would have that the r.h.s. of Eq. (5) satisfies $\rho_{\text{A}}^0(t) = \rho_{\text{S}}^0(t)$ and $\rho_{\text{A}}^1(t) = \rho_{\text{S}}^1(t)$, while in the case of a CTO, $\rho_{\text{A}}^0(t) = \rho_{\text{S}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t)$ and $\rho_{\text{A}}^1(t) = \rho_{\text{S}}^1(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t)$. In this latter case, we see that we have two catalysts. The 1st one, ρ_{Cat}^0 simply allows for a transition on S which would otherwise be forbidden under TOs, while the second one, ρ_{Cl}^0 is the clock which implements autonomously the transition. Furthermore, note that while the r.h.s. of Eq. (5) is evolving according to the free Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{A}} + \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}$, the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{AClG} can, in principle, be of any form such that Eq. (5) holds.

The following rules out the possibility of dynamics of the form Eq. (5) for a wide class of clock Hamiltonians even when Eq. (5) is relaxed to include correlations between system A and the clock.

Proposition 3 (Idealised Control No-Go). *Consider a time independent Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{AClG} on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{AG}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{Cl}}$ where \mathcal{H}_{AG} is finite dimensional, and \mathcal{H}_{Cl} arbitrary; which w.l.o.g. we expand in the form $\hat{H}_{\text{AClG}} = \hat{H}_{\text{AG}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\text{Cl}} + \sum_{l,m=1}^{d_{\text{A}}d_{\text{G}}} |E_l\rangle\langle E_m|_{\text{AG}} \otimes \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{(l,m)}$, where $\{|E_l\rangle_{\text{AG}}\}_{l=1}^{d_{\text{A}}d_{\text{G}}}$ are the energy eigenstates of $\hat{H}_{\text{AG}} = \hat{H}_{\text{A}} + \hat{H}_{\text{G}}$; the free Hamiltonian on \mathcal{H}_{A} and the bath. Both of the following two assertions cannot simultaneously hold:*

- 1) For all $k, l = 1, 2, \dots, d_{\text{A}}d_{\text{G}}$; $k \neq l$, the power series expansion in t

$$\text{tr} \left[e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{(k,k)}} \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 e^{it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{(l,l)}} \right] \quad (7)$$

$$= \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \text{tr} \left[\frac{(-i\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{(k,k)})^n}{n!} \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \frac{(i\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{(l,l)})^m}{m!} \right] t^{n+m} \quad (8)$$

has a radius of convergence $r > t_2$.

- 2) For some $0 < t_1 < t_2 < t_3$ there exists a TO from $\rho_{\text{A}}^0(t)$ to

$$\rho_{\text{A}}^F(t) = \begin{cases} \rho_{\text{A}}^0(t) & \text{for } t \in [0, t_1] \\ \text{tr}_{\text{G}}[U_{\text{AG}}(\rho_{\text{A}}^0(t) \otimes \tau_{\text{G}})U_{\text{AG}}^\dagger] & \text{for } t \in [t_2, t_3], \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

which is implementable via unitary dynamics of the form

$$\rho_{\text{A}}^F(t) = \text{tr}_{\text{GCl}} \left[e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{AClG}}} (\rho_{\text{A}}^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \otimes \tau_{\text{G}}) e^{it\hat{H}_{\text{AClG}}} \right], \quad (10)$$

where U_{AG} in Eq. 9 has non-degenerate spectrum, and is an energy preserving unitary, namely $[U_{\text{AG}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\text{Cl}}, \hat{H}_{\text{AClG}}] = 0$.

See Sec. A 1 for a proof by contradiction. The requirement of non degenerate spectrum in 2) for U_{AG} allows for exclusion of the trivial cases $U_{\text{AG}} \propto \mathbb{1}_{\text{AG}}$ for which 1) and 2) can simultaneously hold[40]. Furthermore, the no-go proposition also covers the more relaxed setting in which the clock (or any catalyst included in A) is allowed to become correlated with the system. The correlated scenario is also important and studied within the context of idealised control in [41–43].

Physical intuition suggests that if the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{AClG} is infinite dimensional, the dynamics it induces can be arbitrarily well approximated by replacing it by a projection onto an arbitrarily large finite dimensional subspace. However, such a projection would imply that the terms $\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{(l,m)}$ found in the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{AClG} are replaced with finite dimensional matrices and the series in line 7 would converge. Therefore, according to the above proposition if 1) holds, the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{AClG} cannot be approximated as one would expect.

On the other hand, 2) includes the desirable scenario of idealised control discussed at the beginning of Sec. IIB. Therefore, the no-go proposition tells us that if idealised control is possible, it requires infinite dimensional Hamiltonians which cannot be approximated in the way one might expect.

It can also be seen that the contradicting statements 1) and 2) in Prop. 3 are not due to a necessity to implement 2) with “abruptly changing” dynamics, since the unitary U_{AG} facilitating the TO from ρ_{A}^0 to ρ_{A}^1 can be implemented via a smooth function of t ; namely $U_{\text{AG}}(t) = \exp[-i\hat{H}_u \int_{t_1}^t \bar{\delta}(x)dx]$, with $\bar{\delta}(t)$ a normalised bump function with support on some interval $\subseteq [t_1, t_2]$ and \hat{H}_u an appropriately chosen time independent Hamiltonian.

The no-go proposition thus rules out physical implementation of idealised control for a number of cases. We now give some examples in which 1) or 2) hold. Prop. 3, case 1) holds when ρ_{Cl}^0 is an analytic vector [44]. The simplest examples of this is when ρ_{Cl}^0 has bounded support on the spectral measures of the Hamiltonians $\{\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{(k,k)}\}_{k=1}^{d_{\text{A}}d_{\text{Cl}}}$, such as in the finite dimensional clock case. One can however find examples for Prop. 3 in which 2) is fulfilled while 1) is not. This corresponds to the case of the idealised momentum clock used for control in [29]. In this case the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{AGCl} from Prop. 3 can be written in the form $\hat{H}_{\text{AGCl}} = \hat{H}_{\text{AG}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\text{Cl}} + \sum_{n=1}^{d_{\text{A}}d_{\text{G}}} \Omega_n |E_n\rangle\langle E_n|_{\text{AG}} \otimes g(\hat{x}_{\text{Cl}}) + \mathbb{1}_{\text{AG}} \otimes \hat{p}_{\text{Cl}}$, with $\hat{x}_{\text{Cl}}, \hat{p}_{\text{Cl}}$ canonical position and momentum operators of a particle on a line. When g and the initial clock state have bounded support in position, 2) in Prop. 3 is satisfied, but 1) is not. Unfortunately such a clock state is so spread out in momentum, the power series expansion $\text{Exp}[-it\hat{p}_{\text{Cl}}] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-it\hat{p}_{\text{Cl}})^n/n!$ diverges in norm when evaluated on it. This is closely related to another unphysical property of such clock states, namely that the Hamiltonian has no ground state, as 1st pointed out by

Pauli [31]. We will also see how this idealised control allows one to violate the 3rd law or thermodynamics in Sec. IIIB — something which should not be possible with control coming from a physical system. We will thus refer to dynamics for which $\rho_{\text{ACI}}^F(t)$ satisfies Eq. (5) as *idealised dynamics*.

Take home message from Proposition 3: Control devices which do not suffer any back-reaction when implementing a thermodynamic transition, arguably necessitate unphysical Hamiltonians.

At first sight, these observations may appear to be of little practical relevance, since indeed, one does not care about implementing the transition from ρ_S^0 to ρ_S^1 exactly, but only to a good approximation. Furthermore, for a sufficiently large clock, one might reasonably envisage being able to implement all transformations whose final states $\rho_S^F(t)$ are in an epsilon ball of those reachable under t-CNO (and not a larger set) to arbitrary small epsilon as long as the final clock state becomes arbitrarily close in trace distance to the idealised case, namely if $\|\rho_{\text{CI}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{CI}}^0(t)\|_1$ tends to zero as the dimension of the clock becomes large and approaches an idealised clock of infinite energy. Unfortunately, this intuitive reasoning may be false due to a phenomenon known as embezzlement. Indeed, when Eq. (5) is not satisfied the clock is disturbed by the act of implementing the unitary. As such, it is no longer a catalyst, but only an inexact one. Inexact catalysis has been studied in the literature with some counter intuitive findings. In [28] an inexact catalysis pair $\rho_{\text{Cat}}^0, \rho_{\text{Cat}}^1$ of dimension d_{Cat} were found such that for any d_S dimensional system, their trace distance vanished in the large d_{Cat} limit:

$$\|\rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 - \rho_{\text{Cat}}^1\|_1 = \frac{d_S}{1 + (d_S - 1) \log_{d_S} d_{\text{Cat}}}. \quad (11)$$

Yet the noisy operation $\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \xrightarrow{\text{NO}} \rho_S^1 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^1$ becomes valid for *all* states ρ_S^0, ρ_S^1 in the large d_{Cat} limit. In other words, they showed that the actual transition laws for the achievable state ρ_S^1 given an initial state ρ_S^0 cannot be approximated by those of CNOs — they are completely trivial, since all transformations are allowed. This paradoxical phenomena is known as work embezzlement[45] and stems from the concept of entanglement embezzlement [27].

By virtue of Prop 2, the above example shows that simply finding a clock satisfying $\|\rho_{\text{CI}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{CI}}^0(t)\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ as $d_{\text{CI}} \rightarrow \infty$ is *not* sufficient to conclude that the set of allowed transformations generated by t-CNOs (and thus CTOs) corresponds to the set of transformations which can actually be implemented with physical control systems. A thought experiment illustrating such phenomena can be found at the classical level in Fig. 3.




FIG. 3: The counter intuitive phenomenon of embezzlement. Consider a thought experiment in which an athlete who has to push a mass M a distance ΔX against a resistive force $F = Mg$ due to gravity pushing down on the weight. Suppose the distance the athlete has to push the weight is given by $\Delta X = f(M)$, where $f(M) \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$. The work done by the athlete pushing the weight is

$W = \mu_0 F \Delta X = \mu_0 g M f(M)$, for some coefficient of resistance μ_0 . One might be inclined to reason that the amount of work the athlete has to do in the limit of infinite mass M is zero, since the distance ΔX the weight has to be pushed is zero in this limit. However, a closer analysis would reveal that this is only correct if $f(M)$ decays sufficiently quickly — quicker than an inverse power. An analogous phenomenon is at play in our control setting. There, in the case of the idealised clock, Eq. (5) holds, yet this is unachievable since it requires infinite energy. However, all finite clocks, suffer a minimal back-reaction and even though this back-reaction can vanish in the large dimension/energy limit (c.f. Eq. 11), this is not sufficient to conclude that the set of implementable transformations are close to those implementable via the idealised clock. Moreover, the rate at which the error needs to vanish, and whether this is physically achievable; were (prior to this work) completely unknown.

III. RESULTS

We will start with the easier case of CNOs in Sec. IIIA before moving on to the more demanding setting of CTOs in Sec. IIIB.

A. Autonomous control for Catalytic Noisy Operations

In this section we will provide two theorems which together show that there exist clocks which are sufficiently accurate to allow the full realisation of t-CNOs to arbitrarily high precision. Our first result will give a sufficient condition on the clock so as to be guaranteed that the achieved dynamics of the system are close to a transition permitted under t-CNOs. It can be viewed as a converse theorem to the result in [28] discussed at the end of Sec.

II B.

In the following theorem, let $V_{\text{SCatClG}}(t) = e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{SCatClG}}}$ be an arbitrary unitary implemented via a time *independent* Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{SCatClG} , over $\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \otimes \tilde{\tau}_G$ and suppose that the final state at time $t \geq 0$,

$$\rho_{\text{SCatClG}}^F(t) = V_{\text{SCatClG}}(t) (\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \otimes \tilde{\tau}_G) V_{\text{SCatClG}}^\dagger(t) \quad (12)$$

deviates from the idealised dynamics by an amount

$$\|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \leq \epsilon_{\text{emb}}(t; d_S, d_{\text{Cat}} d_{\text{Cl}}), \quad (13)$$

where recall $\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)$ is the free evolution of the clock according to its free, time independent, Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{Cl} (Eq. 6) and likewise for $\rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t)$ with arbitrary Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{Cat} .

Theorem 1 (Sufficient conditions for t-CNOs). *For all states ρ_S^0 not of full rank, and for all catalysts ρ_{Cat}^0 , clocks ρ_{Cl}^0 and maximally mixed states $\tilde{\tau}_G$, there exists a state $\sigma_S(t)$ which is ϵ_{res} close to $\rho_S^F(t)$,*

$$\|\sigma_S(t) - \rho_S^F(t)\|_1 \leq \epsilon_{\text{res}}(d_S, d_{\text{Cat}} d_{\text{Cl}}, \epsilon_{\text{emb}}(t; d_S, d_{\text{Cat}} d_{\text{Cl}})), \quad (14)$$

such that for all times $t \geq 0$, a transition from

$$\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \quad \text{to} \quad \sigma_S(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) \quad (15)$$

is possible via a NO (i.e. ρ_S^0 to $\sigma_S(t)$ via t-CNO). Specifically, for fixed d_S and in the limit that $d_{\text{Cat}} d_{\text{Cl}}$ and $1/\epsilon_{\text{emb}}$ tend to infinity:

$$\epsilon_{\text{res}}(d_S, d_{\text{Cat}} d_{\text{Cl}}, \epsilon_{\text{emb}}) = 15 \sqrt{\frac{d_S \ln(d_{\text{Cat}} d_{\text{Cl}})}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{\text{emb}})}} \left(1 + d_{\text{Cat}} d_{\text{Cl}} \epsilon_{\text{emb}}^{1/7}\right). \quad (16)$$

Explicitly, one possible choice for $\sigma_S(t)$ is

$$\sigma_S(t) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}_S/d_S & \text{if } \|\rho_S^F(t) - \mathbb{1}_S/d_S\|_1 < \epsilon_{\text{res}} \\ (1 - \epsilon_{\text{res}})\rho_S^F(t) + \epsilon_{\text{res}}\mathbb{1}_S/d_S & \text{if } \|\rho_S^F(t) - \mathbb{1}_S/d_S\|_1 \geq \epsilon_{\text{res}} \end{cases}$$

See Appendix A 2 for a proof and an expression for ϵ_{res} which holds when $d_{\text{Cat}} d_{\text{Cl}}$ and ϵ_{emb} are finite. Note that this theorem also holds more generally if one replaces \hat{H}_{SCatClG} with any time dependent Hamiltonian. However, the time independent Hamiltonian case is better physically motivated.

Before we move on, let us understand the physical meaning of the terms $\epsilon_{\text{emb}}, \epsilon_{\text{res}}$. By comparing the definition of ϵ_{emb} in Eq. (13) with that of Eq. (5), we see that it is the difference in trace distance between the dynamics achieved with the idealised clock, and the actual dynamics achieved by the clock. Thus the quantity ϵ_{emb} upper bounds how much one can embezzle from the resulting unavoidable inexact catalysis of the clock. Then ϵ_{res} (which is a function of ϵ_{emb}) characterises the resolution, i.e. how far from a t-CNO transition one can




FIG. 4: Possible scenarios resulting from the physical implementation of t-CNOs. Given a state ρ_S^0 , the above blue Venn diagrams represent the set of states ρ_S^1 which can be reached under t-CNOs. The orange Venn diagrams represent possible scenarios of reachable states when attempting to implement a t-CNO, while grey represents the intersection of the two sets. Due to the apparent impossibility of perfect control and that embezzlement can occur (see Eq. (11)), all options a) to d) are in principle open.

Theorem 1 gives sufficient conditions on the control (clock) so that either a) or d) occur. Theorem 2 shows that transitions implemented via the Quasi-Ideal clock can achieve d) under reasonable circumstances.

achieve due to embezzlement from the inexact catalysis. For example, consider a hypothetical clock for which ϵ_{emb} decays as an inverse power with d_{Cl} . Then, ϵ_{res} would diverge with increasing d_{Cl} and Theorem 1 would not tell us anything useful. On the other hand, if we had a more precise clock with, for example, ϵ_{emb} exponentially small in d_{Cl} then Theorem 1 would tell us that ϵ_{res} converges to zero as d_{Cl} increases.

Take home message from Theorem 1: There is a threshold on the amount of back-reaction the control system can incur, above which the laws of thermodynamics have to be modified to include the thermodynamics of the control system. Theorem 1 provides a bound on this threshold when the bath transfers entropy but not heat.

Whether ϵ_{emb} and ϵ_{res} can both be simultaneously small, depends on both the quality of the clock used and the transition one wishes to implement. Two examples at opposite extremes are as follows. Both ϵ_{emb} and ϵ_{res} are trivially arbitrarily small (zero in fact), and conditions in Theorem 1 are satisfied, when the t-CTO transition is the identity transition (i.e. ρ_S^0 to ρ_S^0). At the opposite extreme, both ϵ_{emb} and ϵ_{res} cannot be small or vanishing when one attempts a non-trivial t-CNO transition which occurs instantaneously, i.e. one for which $\rho_S^F(t) = \rho_S^0$ for $t \in [0, t_1]$ and $\rho_S^F(t) = \rho_S^1$ for $t \in (t_1, t_3]$.

Our next theorem shows how one can implement to arbitrary approximation all t-CTO transitions, over any fixed time interval (t_1, t_2) , yet without allowing for a larger class — as the examples in Eq. (11) and Fig. 4 b) do. To achieve this, one must choose the time independent Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{SCatClG} and initial clock state ρ_{Cl}^0 appropriately. The theorem will use the *Quasi-Ideal*

clock [46] discussed in detail in Sec. A 3 a for the clock system on \mathcal{H}_{Cl} . The Quasi-Ideal clock has been proven to be optimal for some tasks related to reference frames [47–49] and clocks [50, 51], and is also believed to be optimal for others [52]. In the following, T_0 denotes the period of the Quasi-Ideal clock (when evolving under its free evolution), i.e. $\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(T_0) = \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(0)$.

Theorem 2 (Achieving t-CNOs). *Consider the Quasi-Ideal clock [46] detailed in Sec. A 3 a with a time independent Hamiltonian of the form $\hat{H}_{\text{SCatClG}} = \hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{\text{Cat}} + \hat{H}_G + \hat{I}_{\text{SCatClG}} + \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}$, giving rise to unitary dynamics*

$$\rho_{\text{SCatClG}}^F(t) = V_{\text{SCatClG}}(t) (\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \otimes \tilde{\tau}_G) V_{\text{SCatClG}}^\dagger(t).$$

For every pair ρ_S^0, ρ_S^1 for which there exists a t-CNO from ρ_S^0 to ρ_S^1 using a catalyst ρ_{Cat}^0 , there exists an interaction term \hat{I}_{SCatClG} such that the following hold.

1) $\sigma_S(t)$ satisfies Eq. (15) and is of the form:

$$\sigma_S(t) = \begin{cases} \rho_S^0(t) & \text{for times } t \in [0, t_1] \text{ (i.e. "before" the transition)} \\ \rho_S^1(t) & \text{for times } t \in [t_2, T_0] \text{ (i.e. "after" the transition)} \end{cases}$$

2) ϵ_{emb} (satisfying Eq. (13)) is given by

$$\epsilon_{\text{emb}} = \left(2 + 3\sqrt{d_S d_{\text{Cat}}}\right) \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{Cl}}(d_{\text{Cl}})}, \quad (17)$$

for all $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, T_0]$, where $\epsilon_{\text{Cl}}(\cdot)$ is independent of d_S, d_{Cat}, d_G and is of order

$$\epsilon_{\text{Cl}}(d_{\text{Cl}}) = \mathcal{O}\left(\text{poly}(d_{\text{Cl}}) \exp\left[-cd_{\text{Cl}}^{1/4}\right]\right), \quad (18)$$

as $d_{\text{Cl}} \rightarrow \infty$, with $c = c(t_1, t_2, T_0) > 0$ for all $0 < t_1 < t_2 < T_0$; and is independent of d_{Cl} .

See Sec. A 4 a for a proof.

As a direct consequence of Theorem 1, in the scenario described in Theorem 2, ϵ_{res} is of power law decay in d_{Cl} as $d_{\text{Cl}} \rightarrow \infty$ and thus both ϵ_{emb} and ϵ_{res} are simultaneously small. Therefore the Quasi-Ideal clock allows all t-CNOs to be implemented without additional costs not captured by the resource theory.

Take home message from Theorem 2: There exist control systems whose incurred back-reaction is small enough that one is below the threshold mentioned in the previous box. Hence, in conjunction with Theorem 1, it implies that the laws of thermodynamics (for baths that transfer only entropy and not heat) do not need to be modified by taking into account the control device.

The property that $\tilde{\tau}_G$ is a maximally mixed state for CNOs is at the heart of two important aspects involved in proving Theorems 1 and 2. On the one hand, all CNOs (and hence all t-CNOs by virtue of Prop. 2), which are implemented via an arbitrary finite dimensional catalyst ρ_{Cat} can be done so with maximally mixed states $\tilde{\tau}_G$ of *finite* dimension[53] [54]. The other relevant aspect is that they are the only states which are not “disturbed” by the action of a unitary, namely $U_G \tilde{\tau}_G U_G^\dagger = \tilde{\tau}_G$ for all unitaries U_G . Together these mean that the clock only needed to control a system of finite size, and thus the back-reaction it experiences is limited and independent of the dimension d_G . [55]

One would like to prove analogous theorems to Theorems 1 and 2 for t-CTOs. Unfortunately, their Gibbs states satisfy neither of these two aforementioned properties. Indeed, there exists CTOs on finite dimensional systems \mathcal{H}_S which require infinite dimensional Gibbs states of infinite mean energy to implement them [32, 54, 56]. This observation, combined with the fact that Gibbs states are also generally disturbed by the CTO in the sense that $U_G \tau_G U_G^\dagger \neq \tau_G$ for some U_G , suggests that a theorem like Theorem 2 for which ϵ_{res} from Theorem 1 vanishes, is not possible; since the back-reaction on any finite energy or dimensional clock would be infinite in some cases. Furthermore, there is a technical problem which prevents such theorems. The proof of Theorem 1 uses the known, necessary and sufficient transformation laws for noisy operations (the non increase of the so-called Rényi α -entropies). However, only necessary (but not sufficient) 2nd laws are known for CTOs (the most well-know of which are the non increase of the so-called Rényi α -divergences [6]).

B. Autonomous control for Catalytic Thermal Operations

In order to circumvent the dilemma explained at the end of the previous section, we now examine how well the energy preserving unitary of t-CTOs can be implemented when one restricts to attempting to implement t-CTOs which can be implemented with finite baths. We will also allow for some uncertainty in our knowledge — or ability to prepare — the time independent Hamiltonian which implements the transition. Specifically we consider

$$\hat{H}_{\text{SCatClG}} = \hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{\text{Cat}} + \hat{H}_G + \hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}} \otimes \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}} + \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\left[\hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{\text{Cat}} + \hat{H}_G, \hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}\right] = 0 \quad (20)$$

and normalisation chosen such that the interaction term has eigenvalues bounded by π : $\|\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}\|_\infty \leq \pi$. With the interaction term $\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}$ in the Hamiltonian Eq. (19),

and the aid of the thermal bath and clock, we are targeting to implement the joint system-catalyst state

$$\rho_{\text{SCat}}^1 := \text{tr}_G \left[e^{-i\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}} (\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tau_G) e^{i\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}} \right]. \quad (21)$$

From Eq. (21), we can observe that the interaction term $\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}$ already allows for potential Hamiltonian engineering imperfections, since ideally, the interaction term should leave the final state σ_{SCat}^1 in Eq. (21) in a product state of the form $\rho_S^1 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0$. To capture these imperfections in $\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}$, we introduce $\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}$ which, for the initial state $\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tau_G$, implements an uncorrelated system-catalyst state:

$$\rho_S^1 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 = \text{tr}_G \left[e^{-i\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}} (\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tau_G) e^{i\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}} \right]. \quad (22)$$

Here ρ_S^1 is an arbitrary state that can be produced by such a transformation, i.e. it is an arbitrary state that can be obtained from ρ_S^0 via a CTO. Note that the evolution according to the total Hamiltonian in Eq. (19) would not produce such a transformation through time evolution even if we had the term $\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}$ instead of $\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}$, since the clock is not ideal.

If we denote the difference between the states in Eqs. (21) and (22), by

$$\epsilon_H := \|\sigma_{\text{SCat}}^1 - \rho_S^1 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0\|_1, \quad (23)$$

then Proposition 45 states that ϵ_H is upper bounded by

$$\epsilon_H \leq 2\|\delta\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}\|_\infty + \|\delta\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}\|_\infty^2, \quad (24)$$

where $\|\delta\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}\|_\infty$ denotes the largest eigenvalue in magnitude of the imperfection in the Hamiltonian preparation: $\delta\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}} := \hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}} - \hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}$. Note that there is also some freedom in the definition of $\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}$ in Eq. (22) since the final state of the bath is traced-out and hence irrelevant. One can minimise $\|\delta\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}\|_\infty$ over this degree of freedom, reducing the control requirements over the bath degrees of freedom and improving the bounds on ϵ_H .

We now introduce a state $\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}}(t)$, which we call the *target state*. It is the state which we would be able to implement with the Hamiltonian in Eq. (19) if we had access to an idealized clock. Hence any deviations from this will be due to using physical clocks in the control. It is given by

$$\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}}(t) := U_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}}(t) (\rho_S^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \tau_G) U_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}\dagger}(t) \quad (25)$$

where $U_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}}(t) = e^{-i\theta(t)\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}}$ with

$$\theta(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } t \in [0, t_1] \\ 1 & \text{for } t \in [t_2, t_3]. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

(Recall that the physical meaning of t_1, t_2 and t_3 can be found in Def. 1). Therefore, tracing out the bath we have for $t \in [0, t_1]$

$$\rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}}(t) = \rho_S^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \quad (27)$$

while for $t \in [t_2, t_3]$

$$\rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}}(t) = e^{-it(\hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{\text{Cat}})} \sigma_{\text{SCat}}^1 e^{it(\hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{\text{Cat}})}. \quad (28)$$

We now define a quantity $\Delta(t; x, y)$ which *only* depends on properties of the clock system:

$$\Delta(t; x, y) := \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 | \hat{\Gamma}_{\text{Cl}}^\dagger(x, t) \hat{\Gamma}_{\text{Cl}}(y, t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle, \quad (29)$$

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\text{Cl}}(x, t) := e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}} + ix(\theta(t)\mathbb{1}_{\text{Cl}} - t\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}})}, \quad x, t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (30)$$

The following theorem states that if $\Delta(t; x, y)$ is small for all $x, y \in [-\pi, \pi]$, and the dimension of the bath d_G is not too large, then the clock can implement a unitary over the system, catalyst and clock which is close to a t-CTO using the time independent Hamiltonian in Eq. (19). Furthermore, the clock itself is not disturbed much during the process.

Theorem 3 (Sufficient conditions for t-CTOs). *For all states ρ_S^0 and ρ_{Cat}^0 , consider unitary dynamics $V_{\text{SCatClG}}(t) = e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{SCatClG}}}$ implemented via any Hamiltonian of the form Eq. (19), with an initial pure clock state $\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 = |\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0\rangle\langle\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0|$. Namely, $\rho_{\text{SCatClG}}^F(t) = V_{\text{SCatClG}}(t)(\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \otimes \tau_G) V_{\text{SCatClG}}^\dagger(t)$. Then the following hold:*

1) *The deviation from the idealised dynamics is bounded by*

$$\|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \leq 2\epsilon_H \theta(t) + 6\sqrt{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G \text{tr}[\tau_G^2]} \sqrt{\max_{x, y \in [-\pi, \pi]} |1 - \Delta^2(t; x, y)|}. \quad (31)$$

2) *The final state $\rho_S^F(t)$ is*

$$\|\rho_S^F(t) - \rho_S^{\text{target}}(t)\|_1 \leq \epsilon_H \theta(t) + \sqrt{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G \text{tr}[\tau_G^2]} \max_{x, y \in [-\pi, \pi]} |1 - \Delta^2(t; x, y)| \quad (32)$$

close to one which can be reached via t-CTO: For all $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, t_3]$ the transition

$$\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \quad \text{to} \quad \rho_S^{\text{target}}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) \quad (33)$$

is possible via a TO i.e. ρ_S^0 to ρ_S^{target} via a t-CTO.

A proof can be found in Appendix A 5.

Since the definition of the target state in Eq. (25) allows one to reach all t-CTOs which are implementable with a d_G dimensional bath, [57] Theorem 3 provides sufficient conditions for the implementation of *all* t-CTOs which are implementable via such baths. As long as the set of CTOs with finite bath size is a dense subset of the

set of all CTOs, Theorem 3 provides sufficient conditions for implementing a dense subset of CTOs. While the TO in Eq. (33) for $t \in [0, t_1]$ is “trivial” in the sense that it does not involve interactions between the subsystems nor requires the thermal bath, it is nevertheless important since it captures the notion of “turning on” the unitary — an essential step in the implementation of any unitary operation.

Intuitively, in order for $\Delta(t; x, y) \approx 1$ for all $x, y \in [-\pi, \pi]$, we see from Eq. (30) that we want the initial clock state $|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0\rangle$ to be orthogonal to the interaction term $\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}}$ initially, and subsequently the dynamics of the clock according to its free Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{Cl} to “rotate” the initial clock state $|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0\rangle$ to a state which is no longer orthogonal to $\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}}$ after a time t_1 when the interaction starts to happen. Similarly, the evolution induced by \hat{H}_{Cl} should make the state $|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0\rangle$ orthogonal to $\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}}$ after time t_2 . Meanwhile, the interaction term $\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}}$ should have imprinted a phase of approximately e^{-ix} onto the state $|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0\rangle$ during the time interval (t_1, t_2) to cancel out the phase factor $e^{ix\theta(t)}$ in Eq. (30). So we can think of the quantity $\Delta(t, x, y)$ as a formal mathematical expression which quantifies the intuitive physical picture of “turning on and off an interaction”.

The Quasi-Ideal clock, which recall is of dimension d_{Cl} and period T_0 (when evolving under its free evolution), can realise the above intuition to a very good approximation. Indeed, the following theorem bounds the quantities on the r.h.s. of Eqs. 31, 32, up to engineering errors ϵ_H , by setting $t_3 = T_0$ in Theorem 3:

Theorem 4 (Achieving t-CTOs). *For the Quasi-Ideal clock, we have:*

$$\max_{x, y \in [-\pi, \pi]} |1 - \Delta^2(t; x, y)| \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\text{poly}(d_{\text{Cl}}) \exp\left[-cd_{\text{Cl}}^{1/4}\right]\right) \quad (34)$$

as $d_{\text{Cl}} \rightarrow \infty$ for all $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, T_0]$, where $\Delta^2(t; x, y)$ is defined in (30) and where $c = c(t_1, t_2, T_0) > 0$ for all $0 < t_1 < t_2 < T_0$; and is independent of d_{Cl} .

See Appendix E for proof. On the other hand, it turns out that the idealised momentum clock discussed in Sec. II B, satisfies $\Delta(t; x, y) = 1$ for all $x, y \in [-\pi, \pi]$ for an appropriate parameter choice in which case 1) in Prop. 3 fails (see Sec. A 6 in appendix). Thus the r.h.s. of Eqs. (31), (32) are *exactly* zero for all $t_1 < t_2$ in this case. This observation highlights another point of failure for this clock: it allows for the violation of the 3rd law of thermodynamics. The 3rd law states that any system cannot be cooled to absolute zero (its ground state) in finite time. In [54, 56], it was shown that under CTOs, both the mean energy and dimension d_G of the bath need to diverge in order to cool a d_S dimensional system to the ground state. The inability to do this in finite time by any realistic control system on \mathcal{H}_{Cl} manifests itself

in that $\max_{x, y \in [-\pi, \pi]} |1 - \Delta^2(t; x, y)|$ cannot be exactly zero in this case, so that the r.h.s. of Eq. (32) becomes large due to the factor $d_G \text{tr}[\tau_G^2]$ diverging.[58] However, for the idealised momentum clock, the r.h.s. of Eqs. (31), (32) are exactly zero even in the limit $d_G \text{tr}[\tau_G^2] \rightarrow \infty$, thus allowing one to cool the system on \mathcal{H}_S to absolute zero in any finite time interval $[t_1, t_2]$. Finally, it is also worth noting that the change in Von Neumann entropy of the clock between before and after the unitary is implemented is vanishingly small for the Quasi-Ideal clock as its dimension increases. This follows from applying the Fannes inequality to the results of Theorems 3 and 4. This is because the Fannes inequality implies that the change in Von Neumann entropy between two states approaches zero when the trace distance between said states decreases faster than $1/\log(d)$, where d is the dimension of the system in question.

Take home message from Theorem 3: The result provides bounds which characterise the back-reaction incurred on any control device implementing an arbitrary thermodynamic transition i.e. with baths which transfer both entropy and heat. It includes and quantifies engineering imperfections, and has important physical consequences for nonequilibrium physics and the 3rd law.

Take home message from Theorem 4: There exists a control device, such that the bounds in Theorem 3 for the incurred back-reaction are, up-to engineering inaccuracies, exponentially small in the device’s dimension. Thus Theorems 3 and 4 together imply the existence of control devices such that the laws of thermodynamics are not modified for baths that can transmit both entropy and heat.

IV. DISCUSSION

Other than the fact that Theorem 1 provides necessary conditions for implementation of t-CNOs while Theorem 3 for implementation of t-CTOs, there are two main differences between them. The first is that Theorem 1 applies to any time independent Hamiltonian while Theorem 3 to Hamiltonians of a particular form. The other main difference, is that Theorem 1 provides bounds in terms of how close the catalyst and clock are in *trace distance* to their desired states, while Theorem 3 provides bounds in terms of how close $\Delta(t; x, y)$ is to unity. While the latter condition implies small trace distance between the clock and its free evolution, the converse is not necessarily true. Fortunately, while $\Delta(t; x, y) \approx 1$ is a stronger constraint, we have shown that it can be satisfied by the Quasi-Ideal clock (This is Theorem 4). However, from a practical point of view, its fulfilment is likely harder to

verify experimentally, since quantum measurements can be used to evaluate trace distances, while the ability to experimentally determine $\max_{x,y \in [-\pi,\pi]} \Delta(t; x, y)$ is less clear.

Observe how the bounds in Theorems 1 and 3 increase with d_{Cat} , the dimension of the catalyst. This aspect of the bound is also relevant in some important cases. Most exemplary is the setting of the important results of [41] which show that if one allows the catalysts to become correlated, then — up to an arbitrarily small error ϵ — there exists a catalyst and energy preserving unitary which achieves any TO between states block diagonal in the energy basis if and only if the second law (non increase of von Neumann free energy) is satisfied. Here, the dimension of the catalyst diverges as ϵ converges to zero. The setting considered was that of idealised control, and thus the divergence of the catalyst did not affect the implementation of transitions. However, if one were to consider realistic control such as in our paradigm, the rate at which the catalyst diverges would be an important factor in determining how much back-reaction the clock would receive and consequently how large it would have to be to counteract this effect, and achieve small errors in the implementation of the control.

There are various results regarding the costs of implementing unitary operations [59–67]. These all have in common the assumption of implicit external control, while only restricting the set of allowed unitaries which is implemented by the external control. The allowed set of unitaries is motivated physically by demanding that they obey conservation laws (such as energy conservation), or by comparing unitaries which allow for coherent vs. incoherent operations. So while these works consider interesting paradigms, the questions they can address are of a very different nature to those posed and answered in this paper. In particular, the assumption of perfect control on the allowed set of unitaries means that effects such as back-reaction or degradation of the control device are neglected.

While other bounds do impose limitations arising from dynamics, these bounds are not of the right form to address the problem at hand in the paper. Perhaps one of the most well-known results in this direction is the so-called quantum speed limit which characterises the minimum time required for a quantum state to become orthogonal to itself or more generally, to within a certain trace-distance of itself. Indeed, such results have been applied to thermodynamics, metrology and the study of the rate at which information can be transmitted from a quantum system to an observer [68, 69]. In our context, the promise is of a different form, namely rather than the final state being a certain distance away from the initial state, we need it to be a state which is close to one permissible via the transformation laws of the resource theory (t-CNOs or t-CTOs). Similar difficulties arise when aiming to apply other results from the literature. Perhaps most markedly is [70]. Here necessary

conditions in terms of bounds on the fidelity to which a unitary can be performed on a system, via a control device, is derived. Unfortunately, this result is unsuitable for our purposes for two reasons. Firstly, their bounds become trivial in the case that the unitary over the system to be implemented commutes with the Hamiltonian of the system (as is the case in this paper). Secondly, since catalysis is involved in our setting, bounds in trace distance for the clock precision of how well the unitary was implemented, are not meaningful, due to the embezzling problem discussed in Sec. II B. The latter problem is also why one cannot arrive at the conclusions of this paper from [46] alone.

This work opens up interesting new questions for future research. In macroscopic thermodynamics, the 2nd law applies to transitions between states which are in thermodynamic equilibrium. Such a notion is not present in the CTOs, since the 2nd laws governing transitions apply always, regardless of the nature of the state. One intriguing possibility which comes in to view with the results in this paper is that the CTOs actually only hold in equilibrium, and the apparent absence of this property had been hidden in the unrealistic assumption of idealised control. To see why, observe that we have only proven that the transition laws for t-CTOs hold for times $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, t_3]$ where the unitary implementing the transition occurs within the time interval (t_1, t_2) . It would appear that CTOs are not satisfied for the state during the transition period (t_1, t_2) . If this can be confirmed and proven to hold in general, then this would suggest that the CTOs actually only hold in equilibrium. A potential physical mechanism explaining this could be that at times around t_1 the clock sucks up entropy from the system it is controlling — allowing it to become more pure — after finally releasing entropy back around the t_2 time — so that the system can then become mixed enough to satisfy the 2nd laws.

Another aspect which the introduction of the paradigm of physical control into the paradigm of CTOs has given rise naturally to, is the variant of the 3rd law of thermodynamics stating that one cannot cool to absolute zero in finite time. It is noticeably absent from the CTO formalism. Future work could now investigate this property in more depth. Previous characterisations of the 3rd law [32] had to assume that the spatial area which the unitaries in the idealised control could act upon, satisfied a light-cone bound. While this is indeed a realistic assumption, it did not arise from the mathematics. Here it arises naturally even without the need for a light-cone bound assumption.

Introducing similar non idealised control for other resource theories [71, 72] could allow us to understand the requirements of these paradigms.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The resource theory approach to quantum thermodynamics has been immensely popular over the last few years. However, to date the conditions under which its underlying assumptions of idealised external control can be fulfilled, have not been justified. While it is generally appreciated that they cannot be achieved perfectly, to what extent and under what circumstances they can be approximately achieved, remained elusive. Our paper addresses this issue, providing sufficient conditions which we prove are satisfiable. In doing so, our work has united two very popular yet starkly different paradigms: fully autonomous thermal machines and resource theoretic non-autonomous ones. Our approach and methods set the groundwork for future unifications of generic quantum processing machines — of which resource theoretic thermal machines can be seen as a particular example — with generic autonomous quantum processes.

Not only could these results be instrumental for future experimental realisations of the 2nd laws of quantum thermodynamics, but they can also open up new avenues of research into the 3rd law of thermodynamics and the role of non-equilibrium physics.

In particular, we have introduced a paradigm in which the cost of control in the resource theory approach of quantum thermodynamics using CNOs and CTOs can be characterised. This was achieved via the introduction of t-CNOs and t-CTOs in which control devices fit naturally into this thermodynamic setting as dynamic catalysts.

We have then derived sufficient conditions on how much the global dynamics including the control device can deviate from the idealised case, in order for the achieved state transition to be close to one permissible via CNOs. This is followed by examples of a control device which achieves this level of precision.

Finally, we introduced Hamiltonians which led us to a criteria for all CTOs with a finite dimensional bath. The bound captures the requirement of better quality control, as the bath size needed to implement the CTO gets larger.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Jonathan Oppenheim for stimulating discussions and pointing out the control problem in the resource theory approach to quantum thermodynamics. We thank Gian Michele Graf for discussions regarding functional analysis for Prop. 3 and Elisa Bäumer for physically demonstrating the embezzling phenomenon in Fig. 3. M.W. acknowledges support from the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) via an AMBIZIONE Fellowship (PZ00P2_179914) in addition to the National Centre of Competence in Research QSIT. M.H. acknowledges support from the National Science Centre, Poland, through grant OPUS 9. 2015/17/B/ST2/01945 and the Foundation for Polish Science through IRAP project co-financed by EU within the Smart Growth Operational Programme (contract no. 2018/MAB/5).

Unless stated otherwise, the below commonly used notation has the indicated meaning:

- Abbreviations for transformations: NO = *Noisy Operation*, CNO = *Catalytic Noisy Operation*, TO = *Thermal operation*, CTO = *Catalytic Thermal Operation*. The prefix “t-” can be added to any of these abbreviations, and stands for *time*. See Sec. II A for their definitions.
- Subscripts: the following subscripts are added to states to indicate the subsystem they belong to. Subscript _S is the *system*, _{Cat} is the *catalyst*, _{C1} is the *clock*, _G is the *bath*. A result with a subscript _A means the result holds for both cases A = S and A = SCat.
- Partial trace: we use the quantum information notation for partial trace: for a generic bipartite quantum state $\rho_{X_1 X_2}$, we denote the state on subsystem x_1 after tracing out subsystem x_2 , by ρ_{X_1} .
- Time dependency: ρ_X^0 or σ_X^0 is the initial state on subsystem X. ρ_X^1 or σ_X^1 is the state on subsystem X, after the application of a fixed transformation to the initial state ρ_X^0 or σ_X^0 respectively. $\rho_X^n(t)$ or $\sigma_X^n(t)$ for $n = 0, 1$ is the dynamically evolved state ρ_X^n or σ_X^n according to its local Hamiltonian: $\rho_X^n(t) = e^{it\hat{H}_X} \rho_X^n e^{-it\hat{H}_X}$ or $\sigma_X^n(t) = e^{it\hat{H}_X} \sigma_X^n e^{-it\hat{H}_X}$. These definitions are introduced in Sec. II A. The notation $\rho_{X_1 \dots X_l}^F(t)$ refers to a state on subsystems $X_1 \dots X_l$ at time t whose time evolution is not given (in general) by the sum of the local Hamiltonians $\hat{H}_{X_1} + \dots + H_{X_l}$. Its exact definition is context dependent and given locally in the text.
- Dimensions: d_X is the Hilbert space dimension of subsystem X.
- Thermal states: τ_X is the Gibbs state of subsystem X, i.e. $\tau_X = e^{-\hat{H}_X/T}/Z$, where Z is the partition function, and T is temperature in appropriate units. The *maximally mixed state* denoted $\tilde{\tau}_X$, is a special Gibbs state corresponding to when \hat{H}_X is proportional to the identity $\mathbb{1}_X$. It takes on the form $\tilde{\tau}_X = \mathbb{1}_X/d_X$.

Appendix A: Proof Overviews

In this appendix we will provide the proofs of the results in the main text. Owing to the complexity of some of these proofs, with the exception of Proposition 3, the others will have a high level overview of the proof here, with details relegated to the Supplementary.

1. Proof of Proposition 3

We will here prove Proposition 3. We will assume the assertions under both bullet points in the proposition, and culminate in a contradiction hence showing that the assertions cannot simultaneously hold. To start with, we denote the unitary transformation implementing the TO from $\rho_{AG}^0(t)$ to $\rho_{AG}^1(t)$ by $U_{AG}(t) = e^{-i\delta(t)\hat{H}_u}$ where

$$\delta(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t \in [0, t_1] \\ 1 & \text{if } t \in [t_2, t_3]. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A1})$$

By definition of TOs, $U_{AG}(t)$ is an energy preserving unitary which must commute with $\hat{H}_{AG} = \hat{H}_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_G + \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \hat{H}_G = \sum_{n=1}^{d_A d_G} E_n |E_n\rangle\langle E_n|_{AG}$ and can therefore be chosen to be of the form $\hat{H}_u = \sum_{n=0}^{d_A d_G} \Omega_n |E_n\rangle\langle E_n|_{AG}$ with $\Omega_n \in [-\pi, \pi)$. In order to avoid trivial unitaries, we have also assumed that the phases are non-degenerate, $\Omega_n \neq \Omega_p$ for $n \neq p$. It then follows from $[U_{AG} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{Cl}, \hat{H}_{AGCl}] = 0$ that

$$\hat{H}_{Cl}^{(k,l)} = 0, \quad (\text{A2})$$

for $k \neq l$. Using the expansion of \hat{H}_{AGCl} from the preposition, it then follows that

$$\hat{H}_{AGCl} = \hat{H}_{AG} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{Cl} + \sum_{n=1}^{d_A d_G} |E_n\rangle\langle E_n|_{AG} \otimes \hat{H}_{Cl}^{(n,n)}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Expanding the state ρ_{AG} in the energy basis, $\rho_{AG} = \sum_{l,m=1}^{d_A d_G} A_{l,m} |E_l\rangle\langle E_m|_{AG}$, we find from the definition of $\rho_{AGCl}^F(t)$

$$\langle E_l | \rho_{AG}^F(t) | E_m \rangle = A_{l,m}(t) \text{tr} \left[e^{-it\hat{H}_{Cl}^{(l,l)}} \rho_{Cl}^0 e^{it\hat{H}_{Cl}^{(m,m)}} \right], \quad (\text{A4})$$

where the time dependency of the coefficients $A_{l,m}(t)$ is defined via $\rho_{AG}(t) = e^{-it\hat{H}_{AG}} \rho_{AG} e^{it\hat{H}_{AG}} = \sum_{l,m=1}^{d_A d_G} A_{l,m}(t) |E_l\rangle\langle E_m|_{AG}$. On the other hand,

$$\langle E_l | U_{AG}(t) \rho_{AG}(t) U_{AG}^\dagger(t) | E_m \rangle = A_{l,m}(t) e^{-it(\Omega_m - \Omega_l)\delta(t)}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

We will now proceed to show the contradicting statement. Let us assume we can equate Eqs. (9), (10) and furthermore assume that the power series in Eq. (8) is

convergent in the neighbourhood of either t_1 or t_2 . Since Eq. (A5) holds in the case of Eq. (9), and Eq. (A4) holds in the case of Eq. (10), we find by equating these equations for all $m \neq l$, $m, l = 1, 2, \dots, d_A d_G$:

$$e^{-it(\Omega_m - \Omega_l)\delta(t)} = \text{tr} \left[e^{-it\hat{H}_{Cl}^{(l,l)}} \rho_{Cl}^0 e^{it\hat{H}_{Cl}^{(m,m)}} \right]. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Hence if the power series expansion Eq. 8 holds,

$$e^{-it(\Omega_m - \Omega_l)\delta(t)} = \sum_{n,p=0}^{\infty} \text{tr} \left[\frac{(-i\hat{H}_{Cl}^{(l,l)})^n}{n!} \rho_{Cl}^0 \frac{(i\hat{H}_{Cl}^{(m,m)})^p}{p!} \right] t^{n+p}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

However, for $t \in [0, t_1]$ we have that $\delta(t) = 0$, thus since $0 < t_1 < r$, with r the radius of convergence of the power series, for any $\tilde{t} \in (0, t_1)$, we find [73]

$$\left. \frac{d^q}{dt^q} e^{-it(\Omega_m - \Omega_l)\delta(t)} \right|_{t=\tilde{t}} = 0 \quad \text{for } q \in \mathbb{N}^+. \quad (\text{A9})$$

If we take derivatives of the r.h.s. of Eq. (A8), evaluate at $t = \tilde{t}$ and set to zero, we find

$$\text{tr} \left[\frac{(-i\hat{H}_{Cl}^{(l,l)})^n}{n!} \rho_{Cl}^0 \frac{(i\hat{H}_{Cl}^{(m,m)})^p}{p!} \right] = \delta_{0,n} \delta_{0,p}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

where $\delta_{n,p}$ denotes the Kronecker-Delta function. Yet if we plug this solution into the r.h.s. of (A8), we find a contradiction for $t \in [t_2, r) \neq \emptyset$.

2. Proof of Theorem 1

In this section we prove Theorem 1. We will also need the results from sections A 1 a to A 5 to aid the proof.

The below theorem, is a slightly more general version of Theorem 1 in three ways:

- 1) In the below theorem no time dependency is assumed, since while it is physically reasonable to do so, it is not necessary from a mathematical perspective to prove our theorem.
- 2) We denote by ρ_{Cat}^0 a generic catalyst of dimension D_{Cat} . To achieve the version Theorem 1 in the main text, one makes the identification ρ_{Cat}^0 in the below theorem with $\rho_{Cat}^0 \otimes \rho_{Cl}^0$ in Theorem 1, and letting $D_{Cat} = d_{Cat} d_{Cl}$. The motivation for this relabelling, is that for the purposes of this proof, there is no point in distinguishing between the clock catalyst (which controls the interaction) and the other catalyst, which allows for thermodynamic transitions, which would otherwise not be permitted under TOs. In other words, it is only in later theorems that we care about actual dynamics where the distinction between the two types of catalysts is important.
- 3) The bound on $\epsilon_{res}(\epsilon_{emb}, d_S, D_{Cat})$ in Eq. A14 is a more general version than that stated in Theorem 1 in the main text. A proof that Eq. A14 implies the version stated in the main text can be found in Corollary 33.

Theorem 5 (Sufficient conditions for implementing CNOs). *Consider arbitrary initial state ρ_S^0 of not full rank and arbitrary catalyst ρ_{Cat}^0 . Consider arbitrary unitary V_{SCatG} over $\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tilde{\tau}_G$, and suppose that the final state, $\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^F = V_{\text{SCatG}}(\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tilde{\tau}_G) V_{\text{SCatG}}^\dagger$ satisfies*

$$\|\rho_{\text{SCat}}^F - \rho_S^F \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0\|_1 \leq \epsilon_{\text{emb}}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

Then there exists a state σ_S which is close to ρ_S^F

$$\|\sigma_S - \rho_S^F\|_1 \leq \epsilon_{\text{res}} \quad (\text{A12})$$

such that

$$\rho_S^0 \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{\text{Cat}} \succ \sigma_S \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{\text{Cat}}, \quad (\text{A13})$$

for some finite dimensional catalyst $\tilde{\rho}_{\text{Cat}}$. Here $\epsilon_{\text{res}} = \epsilon_{\text{res}}(\epsilon_{\text{emb}}, d_S, D_{\text{Cat}})$ where d_S, D_{Cat} are the dimensions of system ρ_S^0 and catalyst ρ_{Cat}^0 respectively. Specifically,

$$\epsilon_{\text{res}}(\epsilon_{\text{emb}}, d_S, D_{\text{Cat}}) = 5 \sqrt{\frac{d_S^{5/3} + 4(\ln d_S D_{\text{Cat}}) \ln d_S}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{\text{emb}})}} + d_S D_{\text{Cat}} \epsilon_{\text{emb}}^{1/6} + 5 \left((d_S D_{\text{Cat}})^2 \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{\text{emb}}}{d_S D_{\text{Cat}}}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{d_S D_{\text{Cat}}}{\epsilon_{\text{emb}}}} \right)^{2/3}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

Explicitly one possible choice for σ_S is

$$\sigma_S = \begin{cases} \mathbb{I}_S/d_S & \text{if } \|\rho_S^F - \mathbb{I}_S/d_S\|_1 < \epsilon_{\text{res}} \\ (1 - \epsilon_{\text{res}})\rho_S^F + \epsilon_{\text{res}} \mathbb{I}_S/d_S & \text{if } \|\rho_S^F - \mathbb{I}_S/d_S\|_1 \geq \epsilon_{\text{res}} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A15})$$

Overview of the proof. We shall show that catalytic majorization holds, by using Klimesh conditions given in Theorem 6. Since we assume that the initial state is not of full rank, and the final state σ_S by definition is of full rank, it is enough to show that for $\alpha > 0$, $g_\alpha(\rho_S^0)$ is strictly larger than $g_\alpha(\sigma_S)$. In terms of simpler functions f_α given by (A4), we need to show that

$$\begin{aligned} f_\alpha(\rho_S^0) &> f_\alpha(\sigma_S) \quad \text{for } \alpha > 1 \\ f_\alpha(\rho_S^0) &< f_\alpha(\sigma_S) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A16})$$

In particular f_1 is the Shannon entropy, so the condition for $\alpha = 1$ can also be written as

$$S_1(\rho_S^0) < S_1(\sigma_S). \quad (\text{A17})$$

There are other equivalent ways of writing the conditions using the Tsallis-Aczel-Daroczy entropy (in short Tsallis entropy) defined in Eq. (A6), or Renyi entropy of Def. 8

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < T_\alpha(\sigma_S) \quad \text{for } \alpha > 0, \quad (\text{A18})$$

$$S_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < S_\alpha(\sigma_S) \quad \text{for } \alpha > 0. \quad (\text{A19})$$

It is in one way more convenient than the condition in terms of f_α . Namely, the case $\alpha = 1$ is not given by a separate formula. Indeed, $T_1 = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} T_\alpha$ (same for S_α). Note here that for each single α , the inequality with Renyi entropy S_α is equivalent to inequality for T_α . Thus for some α 's we may show the inequality for T_α while for others for S_α . Now, let us sketch how we will approach this problem.

1) *Showing the inequalities (A18) for states ρ_S^0 and ρ_S^F up to term η_α .*

By assumption the initial state $\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \rho_G^0$ is unitarily transformed into ρ_{SCatG}^F . This transformation does not change functions like $f_\alpha, T_\alpha, S_\alpha$. Then, going back and forth between f_α 's and T_α 's, and using the continuity of T_α from Theorem 7 we obtain

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) \leq T_\alpha(\rho_S^F) + \eta_\alpha D_{\text{Cat}}^\alpha \quad \text{for } \alpha > 0 \quad (\text{A20})$$

with η_α satisfying

$$\eta_\alpha \geq 6D \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\text{emb}}}{D} \right)^\alpha \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1/2] \quad (\text{A21})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\alpha &\geq -32D \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{\text{emb}}}{D}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{\text{emb}}}{D}} \quad \text{for } \epsilon_{\text{emb}} \leq \frac{1}{32D^2}, \alpha \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 2 \right) \\ \eta_\alpha &\geq 6\sqrt{D\epsilon_{\text{emb}}} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in [2, \infty), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A22})$$

where $D = d_S D_{\text{Cat}}$. Anticipating that there may be problems with α around ∞ (this will become clear later) we also obtain a similar inequality for the Renyi S_∞ entropy:

$$S_\infty(\rho_S^0) \leq S_\infty(\rho_S^F) + \eta_\infty, \quad (\text{A23})$$

with

$$\eta_\infty = D_{\text{Cat}} \epsilon_{\text{emb}}. \quad (\text{A24})$$

2) *Removing term η_α by replacing ρ_S^F with its approximated version σ_S .*

The inequalities (A20) are not yet satisfactory, since we need strict inequalities, while the above ones are not only not strict, but also there are terms η_α . Fortunately, we want to show the strict inequality not for the state ρ_S^F itself, but for its approximated version σ_S . The state σ_S is just ρ_S^F with admixture of the maximally mixed state when it is far from it, and it is just the maximally mixed state, when it is close to it.

The idea now is to show that due to this admixture, σ_S will have larger values of entropies than ρ_S^F by such

an amount, that it will allow one to bypass the η 's, and obtain the needed strict inequalities. A crucial step is done in Prop. 19, where for $\epsilon_{emb} \leq \frac{1}{32D^2}$ we obtain the following inequalities

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < T_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\tilde{\epsilon}_T(\alpha))) \quad \text{for } \alpha > 0 \quad (\text{A25})$$

where

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_T(\alpha) \leq \begin{cases} \left(96D \frac{\epsilon_{emb}^\alpha}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} =: \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmin}(\alpha) & \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1/2] \\ \left(-1024D^2 \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} =: \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmid} & \text{for all } \alpha \in (1/2, 2] \\ (96\sqrt{D\epsilon_{emb}}D^\alpha)^{\frac{1}{3}} =: \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmax}(\alpha) & \text{for } \alpha \in (2, \infty). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A26})$$

It may appear like the end of the story is near. We would need just to choose some ϵ_{res} which is larger than all of three values above — the Tsallis entropies on the right hand side will then just grow (as the entropies grow when we increase the admixture with identity, or if we replace with identity; see Lemma 20), hence the inequalities will be still satisfied. Thus for so chosen ϵ_{res} we will obtain (A18) (where recall that σ_F depends on ϵ_{res} as in (A15)).

However, there is a problem with α around 0 and around ∞ . For those α 's the above bounds for $\tilde{\epsilon}_T$ become large, while we want them to tend to zero for ϵ_{emb} going to zero. In other words, we do not have a uniform bound for $\tilde{\epsilon}_T$ for all α 's at the moment.

For α lying in those regions, we shall turn to Renyi entropies, and will prove inequality (A19) rather than (A18). To deal with large values of α we shall use Eq. (A23) in conjunction with Prop. 19 to show that for $\alpha > 1$

$$S_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < S_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\epsilon_\infty(\alpha))) \quad (\text{A27})$$

with

$$\epsilon_\infty(\alpha) \leq 4\sqrt{\frac{\ln d_S}{\alpha}} + D\epsilon_{emb} =: \bar{\epsilon}_\infty(\alpha). \quad (\text{A28})$$

To deal with values of α around zero, we prove in Prop. 19 that for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$S_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < S_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\epsilon_0(\alpha))) \quad (\text{A29})$$

for

$$\epsilon_0(\alpha) \leq \left(\frac{d_S - 1}{d_S}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}} =: \bar{\epsilon}_0(\alpha). \quad (\text{A30})$$

In this latter case we had to use our assumption that the rank of the initial state ρ_S^0 was not full. Note that the above ϵ 's behave reasonably for large (or small) values of α . The $\bar{\epsilon}_0(\alpha)$ goes to zero as α goes to zero, and $\bar{\epsilon}_\infty$ tends to $4\sqrt{D\epsilon_{emb}}$. We shall then choose some α_{min} and

α_{max} , and below α_{min} as well as above α_{max} we shall use the inequalities for Renyi entropies (A19) while between α_{min} and α_{max} , we shall use inequalities for Tallis entropy (A18). The rest of the proof is to choose α_{min} and α_{max} in such a way that the resulting common bound ϵ_{res} for all five types of ϵ 's (i.e. three coming from (A26), the other two from Eqs. (A28) and (A30)) is the smallest possible. Finally, one may ask why we have not used the Renyi entropy everywhere. We did not use it, because it was easier to deal with Tsallis entropies for this region of α in Prop. 19.

Now we are ready to present the full proof of the theorem, with most of the technical lemmas relegated to the Supplementary.

Proof. Since ρ_S^0 is not of full rank, and the final state σ_S is by definition of full rank, we need only to consider Klimesh conditions from Theorem 6 for $\alpha > 0$. Consider first $\alpha > 0$, $\alpha \neq 1$. If for some unitary U we have

$$U\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0 \otimes \tilde{\tau}_G U^\dagger = \rho_{SCatG}^F \quad (\text{A31})$$

then

$$f_\alpha(\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0 \otimes \tilde{\tau}_G) = f_\alpha(\rho_{SCatG}^F), \quad (\text{A32})$$

where f_α is defined in Sec. A1a. Due to convexity/concavity of f_α and their multiplicativity, by lemma 11, putting $A = \text{SCat}$ and $B = G$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_\alpha(\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0) &\geq f_\alpha(\rho_{SCat}^F), \quad \text{for } \alpha > 1 \\ f_\alpha(\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0) &\leq f_\alpha(\rho_{SCat}^F), \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A33})$$

This implies, by definition of Tsallis entropy T_α [Eq. (A6)], that for all $\alpha > 0$, $\alpha \neq 1$ we have

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0) \leq T_\alpha(\rho_{SCat}^F). \quad (\text{A34})$$

We now use $\|\rho_{SCat}^F - \rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0\|_1 \leq \epsilon_{emb}$ and the continuity lemma 21 to find for $\alpha > 0$

$$T_\alpha(\rho_{SCat}^F) \leq T_\alpha(\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0) + \eta_\alpha, \quad (\text{A35})$$

for all η_α satisfying

$$\eta_\alpha \geq 6D \left(\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D} \right)^\alpha \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1/2] \quad (\text{A36})$$

$$\eta_\alpha \geq -32D \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}} \quad \text{for } \epsilon_{emb} \leq \frac{1}{32D^2}, \alpha \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 2 \right) \quad (\text{A37})$$

$$\eta_\alpha \geq 6\sqrt{D\epsilon_{emb}} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in [2, \infty), \quad (\text{A38})$$

where $D = d_S D_{\text{Cat}}$. We rewrite the above equation back in terms of functions f_α , which gives

$$\begin{aligned} f_\alpha(\rho_{\text{SCat}}^F) &\geq f_\alpha(\rho_S^F \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0) - (\alpha - 1)\eta_\alpha \quad \text{for } \alpha > 1 \quad (\text{A39}) \\ f_\alpha(\rho_{\text{SCat}}^F) &\leq f_\alpha(\rho_S^F \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0) - (\alpha - 1)\eta_\alpha \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Then by using Eq. (A33) followed by the multiplicativity of the f_α 's, we obtain from the above equations

$$f_\alpha(\rho_S^0) \geq f_\alpha(\rho_S^F) - \frac{(\alpha - 1)}{f_\alpha(\rho_{\text{Cat}}^0)} \eta_\alpha \quad \text{for } \alpha > 1 \quad (\text{A40})$$

$$f_\alpha(\rho_S^0) \leq f_\alpha(\rho_S^F) - \frac{(\alpha - 1)}{f_\alpha(\rho_{\text{Cat}}^0)} \eta_\alpha \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1) \quad (\text{A41})$$

Finally using $f_\alpha(p) \geq d^{1-\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 1$ and $f_\alpha(p) \geq 1$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (These inequalities follow from setting $r = 1, p = \alpha$ and $r = \alpha, p = 1$ respectively in Eq. (A268), in Lemma (29)) rewriting back in terms of T_α 's we obtain

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) \leq T_\alpha(\rho_S^F) + \eta_\alpha D_{\text{Cat}}^{\alpha-1} \quad \text{for } \alpha \geq 1 \quad (\text{A42})$$

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) \leq T_\alpha(\rho_S^F) + \eta_\alpha \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (\text{A43})$$

Here we have included the case $\alpha = 1$, which is obtained by taking the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$. [74] We can somewhat crudely unify this equation into

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) \leq T_\alpha(\rho_S^F) + \eta_\alpha D_{\text{Cat}}^\alpha \quad \text{for } \alpha > 0. \quad (\text{A44})$$

Furthermore, (A33) implies that for $\alpha > 1$

$$S_\alpha(\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0) \leq S_\alpha(\rho_{\text{SCat}}^F) \quad (\text{A45})$$

and by taking limit $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ we get

$$S_\infty(\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0) \leq S_\infty(\rho_{\text{SCat}}^F) \quad (\text{A46})$$

which by Lemma 21 and additivity of S_∞ gives

$$S_\infty(\rho_S^0) \leq S_\infty(\rho_S^F) + \eta_\infty, \quad (\text{A47})$$

where

$$\eta_\infty = D_{\text{Cat}} \epsilon_{emb}. \quad (\text{A48})$$

Let us now define as in Proposition 19

$$\sigma_S^F(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}_S/d_S & \text{when } \|\rho_S^F - \mathbb{1}_S/d_S\|_1 < \epsilon \\ (1 - \epsilon)\rho_S^F + \epsilon\mathbb{1}_S/d_S & \text{when } \|\rho_S^F - \mathbb{1}_S/d_S\|_1 \geq \epsilon. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A49})$$

Eqs. (A44) and (A47) by using Proposition 19 lead to the following conclusion: for

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_T(\alpha) = \begin{cases} (16\eta_\alpha D_{\text{Cat}}^\alpha d_S^{\alpha-1})^{\frac{1}{3}} & \text{for } \alpha \geq 1 \\ (16\eta_\alpha D_{\text{Cat}}^\alpha d_S^{\alpha-1} \alpha^{-1})^{\frac{1}{3}} & \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1) \end{cases} \quad (\text{A50})$$

$$\epsilon_\infty(\alpha) = 4\sqrt{\frac{\ln d_S}{\alpha}} + \eta_\infty \quad \text{for } \alpha > 1 \quad (\text{A51})$$

$$\epsilon_0(\alpha) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{d_S} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1), \quad (\text{A52})$$

we have

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) \leq T_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\tilde{\epsilon}_T(\alpha))) \quad (\text{A53})$$

$$- \min \{ D_{\text{Cat}}^\alpha \eta_\alpha, T_\alpha(\mathbb{1}/d_S) - T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) \} \quad \text{for } \alpha > 0$$

$$S_\alpha(\rho_S^0) \leq S_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\epsilon_\infty(\alpha))) \quad (\text{A54})$$

$$- \min \{ D_{\text{Cat}}^\alpha \eta_\alpha, \ln d_S - S_1(\rho_S^0) \} \quad \text{for } \alpha > 1$$

$$S_\alpha(\rho_S^0) \leq S_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\epsilon_0(\alpha))) \quad (\text{A55})$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{d_S}{d_S - 1} \right) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1), \quad (\text{A56})$$

from which we achieve

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < T_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\tilde{\epsilon}_T(\alpha))) \quad \text{for } \alpha > 0 \quad (\text{A57})$$

$$S_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < S_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\epsilon_\infty(\alpha))) \quad \text{for } \alpha > 1 \quad (\text{A58})$$

$$S_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < S_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\epsilon_0(\alpha))) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (\text{A59})$$

Let us now insert explicitly the η 's from Eqs. (A36)-(A38) and Eq. (A48) into Eqs. (A50)-(A52). For

$$\epsilon_{emb} \leq \frac{1}{32D^2}, \quad (\text{A60})$$

we achieve the upper bounds

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_T(\alpha) \leq \left(96D \frac{\epsilon_{emb}^\alpha}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} =: \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmin}(\alpha) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1/2] \quad (\text{A61})$$

$$\left(-1024D^2 \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} =: \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmid} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (1/2, 2] \quad (\text{A62})$$

$$(96\sqrt{D\epsilon_{emb}}D^\alpha)^{\frac{1}{3}} =: \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmax}(\alpha) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (2, \infty) \quad (\text{A63})$$

$$\epsilon_\infty(\alpha) \leq 4\sqrt{\frac{\ln d_S}{\alpha} + D\epsilon_{emb}} =: \bar{\epsilon}_\infty(\alpha) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in [1, \infty) \quad (\text{A64})$$

$$\epsilon_0(\alpha) \leq \left(\frac{d_S - 1}{d_S}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}} =: \bar{\epsilon}_0(\alpha) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1), \quad (\text{A65})$$

where $D = d_S D_{\text{Cat}}$. We now divide the set $(0, \infty)$ into five subintervals (some of which may be empty). For $\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha_{\max} \in [2, \infty)$, we have $(0, \infty) = (0, \alpha_{\min}] \cup (\alpha_{\min}, 1/2] \cup (1/2, 2] \cup [2, \alpha_{\max}] \cup (\alpha_{\max}, \infty)$. For each of these intervals, we compute upper bounds on our epsilons. Specifically, from Eqs. (A61), (A64),

(A65), we observe that:

$$\epsilon_0(\alpha) \leq \bar{\epsilon}_0(\alpha_{\min}) \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, \alpha_{\min}), \forall \alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1) \quad (\text{A66})$$

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_T(\alpha) \leq \begin{cases} \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmin}(\alpha_{\min}) & \forall \alpha \in (\alpha_{\min}, 1/2], \forall \alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1/2] \\ \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmid} & \forall \alpha \in (1/2, 2] \\ \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmax}(\alpha_{\max}) & \forall \alpha \in [2, \alpha_{\max}], \forall \alpha_{\max} \in [2, \infty) \end{cases} \quad (\text{A67})$$

$$\epsilon_\infty(\alpha) \leq \bar{\epsilon}_\infty(\alpha_{\max}) \quad \forall \alpha \in (\alpha_{\max}, \infty), \forall \alpha_{\max} \in [1, \infty). \quad (\text{A68})$$

Now we define ϵ_{res} as any value satisfying

$$\epsilon_{res}(\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}) \geq \max\{\epsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min}), \epsilon_{\max}(\alpha_{\max}), \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmid}\} \quad (\text{A69})$$

where

$$\epsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min}) = \max\{\bar{\epsilon}_{Tmin}(\alpha_{\min}), \bar{\epsilon}_0(\alpha_{\min})\} \quad (\text{A70})$$

$$\epsilon_{\max}(\alpha_{\max}) = \max\{\bar{\epsilon}_{Tmax}(\alpha_{\max}), \bar{\epsilon}_\infty(\alpha_{\max})\}. \quad (\text{A71})$$

Thus using Lemma 20, we have

$$S_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < S_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\bar{\epsilon}_0(\alpha_{\min}))) < S_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\epsilon_{res}(\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}))) \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, \alpha_{\min}) \quad (\text{A72})$$

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < T_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\bar{\epsilon}_{Tmin}(\alpha_{\min}))) < T_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\epsilon_{res}(\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}))) \quad \forall \alpha \in (\alpha_{\min}, 1/2) \quad (\text{A73})$$

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < T_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\bar{\epsilon}_{Tmid})) < T_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\epsilon_{res}(\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}))) \quad \forall \alpha \in [1/2, 2] \quad (\text{A74})$$

$$T_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < T_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\bar{\epsilon}_{Tmax}(\alpha_{\max}))) < T_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\epsilon_{res}(\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}))) \quad \forall \alpha \in [2, \alpha_{\max}) \quad (\text{A75})$$

$$S_\alpha(\rho_S^0) < S_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\bar{\epsilon}_\infty(\alpha_{\max}))) < S_\alpha(\sigma_S^F(\epsilon_{res}(\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}))) \quad \forall \alpha \in [\alpha_{\max}, \infty) \quad (\text{A76})$$

holds for all $\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha_{\max} \in (2, \infty)$. [75]

Thus for any particular choice of $\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha_{\max} \in (2, \infty)$, $\epsilon_{res}(\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max})$ is such that the Klimesh conditions are satisfied, so that for any ρ_S^0 there exists

catalyst $\tilde{\rho}_{\text{Cat}}$ such that

$$\rho_S^0 \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{\text{Cat}} \succ \sigma_S^F(\epsilon_{res}) \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{\text{Cat}} \quad (\text{A77})$$

Our next aim is to find an explicit expression for $\epsilon_{res}(\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max})$ with the aim of choosing the param-

ters $\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}$, so that $\epsilon_{res}(\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max})$ is not too large. In lemma 22 we show that the ϵ_{res} given in the statement of the theorem upper bounds $\epsilon_{res}(\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max})$ for some α_{\min} and α_{\max} . This finalises the proof. ■

To see how to write Theorem 5 in the form of Theorem 1, see Corollary 33 in the Supplementary.

3. Introduction to the Quasi-Ideal Clock and Proof of Theorem 2

In the following subsection (A 3 a), we start with a brief overview of the properties of the Quasi-Ideal Clock. These are necessary for the proof of Theorem 2, which is in subsection A 4 a.

a. Brief overview of the Quasi-Ideal Clock

In this section we will recall the clock construction from [46] which will be subsequently used to prove Proposition 4, which in turn will lead to the proof of Theorem 2.

The time independent total Hamiltonian over system $\rho_A \otimes \rho_{Cl}$ is

$$\hat{H}_{ACl} = \hat{H}_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_{Cl} + \hat{H}_A^{\text{int}} \otimes \hat{V}_d + \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \hat{H}_{Cl}, \quad (\text{A78})$$

where \hat{H}_A is the system Hamiltonian which commutes with the target unitary U_A^{target} . The term \hat{H}_A^{int} encodes the target unitary via the relation $U_A^{\text{target}} = e^{-i\hat{H}_A^{\text{int}}}$, with

$$H_A^{\text{int}} = \sum_{n=1}^{d_A} \Omega_n |n\rangle\langle n|. \quad (\text{A79})$$

The clock's free Hamiltonian, \hat{H}_{Cl} is a truncated harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian. Namely, $\hat{H}_{Cl} = \sum_{n=0}^{d-1} \omega n |n\rangle\langle n|$. The free evolution of any initial clock state under this Hamiltonian has a period of $T_0 = 2\pi/\omega$, specifically, $e^{-iT_0 \hat{H}_{Cl}} \rho_{Cl} e^{iT_0 \hat{H}_{Cl}} = \rho_{Cl}$ for all ρ_{Cl} . The clock interaction term \hat{V}_d , takes the form,

$$\hat{V}_d = \frac{d}{T_0} \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} V_d(k) |\theta_k\rangle\langle\theta_k|, \quad (\text{A80})$$

where the basis $\{|\theta_k\rangle\}_{k=0}^{d-1}$ is the Fourier transform of the energy eigenbasis $\{|n\rangle\}_{n=0}^{d-1}$. The function $V_d : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ will be called potential and is defined by

$$V_d(y) = \frac{2\pi}{d} V_0 \left(\frac{2\pi}{d} (y - y_0) \right), \quad (\text{A81})$$

where V_0 is an infinitely differentiable periodic function of period 2π centered around 0 (so that V_d has period d and is centered around y_0). A lot of results hold for this

general form of potential. To obtain all the results we shall need a specialized form of potential given by

$$V_0(x) = A_c \cos^{2n} \left(\frac{x}{2} \right), \quad \text{with} \quad A_c = \frac{2^{2n}}{2\pi \binom{2n}{n}}, \quad (\text{A82})$$

and where n will be later be taken to be a suitable function of clock dimension (specifically, later we shall take $n \sim d^{1/4}$). Here A_c is normalization constant so that $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} V_0(x) dx = 1$. It is important that V_0 has exponentially decaying tails

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_V := \int_{-2\pi(1-\delta_V)}^{-2\pi\delta_V} V_0(x) dx \leq \frac{1}{\delta_V} e^{-\delta_V^2 n}, \quad \text{for } \delta_V \in (0, \pi). \quad (\text{A83})$$

The bound in [46] is tighter and does not diverge as $\delta_V \rightarrow 0^+$, but the present one is just enough — as we anyway care just about scaling for the proof (see lemma 36).

Recall that for the Quasi-Ideal clock, the initial state is pure $\rho_{Cl} = |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle\langle\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)|$, where

$$|\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_d(k_0)} \psi(k_0; k) |\theta_k\rangle, \quad (\text{A84})$$

$$\psi(k_0; x) = A e^{-\frac{\pi}{\sigma^2}(x-k_0)^2} e^{i2\pi n_0(x-k_0)/d}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (\text{A85})$$

with $\sigma \in (0, d)$, $n_0 \in (0, d-1)$, $k_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and $\mathcal{S}_d(k_0)$ is the set of d integers closest to k_0 , defined as

$$\mathcal{S}_d(k_0) = \left\{ k : k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } -\frac{d}{2} \leq k_0 - k < \frac{d}{2} \right\}. \quad (\text{A86})$$

Note that for k larger than $d-1$ or smaller than 0, we define θ_k as $\theta_{k \bmod d}$. The quantity A is defined so that the state is normalised, namely

$$A = A(\sigma; k_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_d(k_0)} e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\sigma^2}(k-k_0)^2}}} = \mathcal{O} \left(\left(\frac{2}{\sigma^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \right). \quad (\text{A87})$$

The parameter n_0 is approximately the mean energy of the clock, and for a good clock performance, it should be not too close to 0 nor to d . We will later set it to $(d-1)/2$ as suggested in [46]; see Def. 1.

4. Small error on the clock

Here we prove a proposition that is crucial to prove Theorem 2. The proposition states that for the clock described above, the state of the clock acquires a small error.

Proposition 4. *Consider the Quasi-Ideal clock described above. Consider times t_1, t_2 satisfying $0 < t_1 < t_2 < T_0$. Then for the potential V_d determined by Eqs. (A81) and (A82) with $y_0 = (t_1 - t_2)d/T_0$ and $n = \lceil d^{1/4} \rceil$, we have:*

$$\|\rho_{Cl}^F(t) - \rho_{Cl}^0(t)\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \text{poly}(d) e^{-c_2 d^{1/4}} \quad (\text{A88})$$

where $c_2 = \min\{\frac{1}{64\pi}, (t_2 - t_1)^2/(32T_0^2)\}$.




FIG. 5: **Dynamics of the clock.** The Circumference of the circle is d . The red profile represents the amplitudes of the clock state (called pointer) with the weight concentrated within $\pm\delta_\psi d$ from the center. It moves around approximately with speed d/T_0 . The potential V_d has peak at y_0 . The positions y_1 and y_2 are determined by the times t_1 and t_2 and denote places which the peak of the clock state will reach at times t_1 and t_2 .

Remark 5. The unbounded from above factor $1/(t_2 - t_1)$ is not necessary, and in the original paper [46] it did not appear. Here it is a price for a simpler proof of potential concentration properties.

Proof. Let us set arbitrary times t_1 and t_2 . We want to show that we can choose the potential in the clock described in Sec. A 3 a so that, apart from times near the boundaries (i.e. those *not* satisfying $0 < t_1 < t_2 < T_0$), it will be close to the free evolution of the clock state. In other words, the evolution may be different in the “interaction zones”. The potential has been already determined, with two free parameters — the peak position y_0 and n , determining the concentration of the potential around the peak. As will be later argued, the clock state (we shall call it pointer) will approximately travel around the circle with linear speed d/T_0 , so that to times t_1 and t_2 there correspond positions $y_1 = t_1 d/T_0$ and $y_2 = t_2 d/T_0$ (see Fig. 5). Since the interaction can take place on the interval where potential is non-negligible, we shall aim to have potential concentrated in the area between y_1 and y_2 . To this end we choose the peak of potential to be in the middle between y_1 and y_2 :

$$y_0 = \frac{y_1 + y_2}{2} = \frac{t_1 + t_2}{2} \frac{d}{T_0} \quad (\text{A89})$$

The concentration parameter n will be chosen to be chosen later. With such potential we want to estimate the

following quantity:

$$\|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1. \quad (\text{A90})$$

To this end we shall evaluate fidelity and will use $\|\rho - \sigma\| \leq 2\sqrt{1 - F(\rho, \sigma)^2}$. In [46], (see the proof of Lemma 10.0.3; page 192) after a bit of algebra, the following was obtained

$$\rho_{\text{Cl}}(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{d_A} \rho_{n,n}(0) |\bar{\Phi}_n(t)\rangle\langle\bar{\Phi}_n(t)|_{\text{Cl}}, \quad (\text{A91})$$

where $\{\rho_{n,n}(0)\}_n$ are the eigenvalues of the initial system state ρ_A , and thus also constitute a set of normalised probabilities. $|\bar{\Phi}_n(t)\rangle_{\text{Cl}}$ is defined by,

$$|\bar{\Phi}_n(t)\rangle_{\text{Cl}} = \hat{\Gamma}_n(t) |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle_{\text{Cl}}, \quad (\text{A92})$$

$$\hat{\Gamma}(t, \Omega_n) = e^{-it(\Omega_n \hat{V}_d + \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}})}, \quad (\text{A93})$$

where $\{\Omega_n \in [-\pi, \pi]\}_{n=1}^{d_A}$ are a set of phases which determine the target unitary one wishes to apply (see Eq. (A79)). Using $F(\rho, \psi) = \langle\psi|\rho|\psi\rangle$ we get

$$F(\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t), \rho_{\text{Cl}}(t)) \quad (\text{A94})$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{d_{\text{Cl}}} \rho_{n,n}(0) \left| \langle\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)| e^{it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}} \hat{\Gamma}(t, \Omega_n) |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle \right|^2$$

$$\geq \min_{\Omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \left| \langle\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)| e^{it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}} \hat{\Gamma}(t, \Omega) |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle \right|^2. \quad (\text{A95})$$

We thus aim to show that the following states

$$e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}} |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Gamma}(t, \Omega) |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle \quad (\text{A96})$$

have overlap close to 1, irrespectively of phase Ω . To this end we shall use core theorems in [46] (Theorems: VIII.1, page 19 and IX.1, page 35). They say that

- (i) under evolution $e^{it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}}$ the state $|\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle$ up to a small correction evolves in a trivial way - namely its peak undergoes translation.
- (ii) under evolution $\Gamma(\Omega, t)$ the above translation occurs too, but in addition the k -th amplitude of the state acquires phase equal to the potential integrated over the interval that k travelled.

More specifically for $n_0 = (d - 1)/2$ (c.f. Def. 2 in [46]) which means that n_0 which has interpretation of average energy, is not too close to 0 or to the maximal energy, we have

$$e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}} |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle \quad (\text{A97})$$

$$= |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0)\rangle + |\varepsilon_c\rangle \quad (\text{A98})$$

$$= \sum_{k \in S_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} \psi(k_0 + td/T_0; k) |\theta_k\rangle + |\varepsilon_c\rangle, \quad (\text{A99})$$

$$\Gamma(t, \Omega) |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle \quad (\text{A100})$$

$$= |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0, td/T_0)\rangle + |\varepsilon_\nu\rangle \quad (\text{A101})$$

$$= \sum_{k \in S_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} e^{-i\phi_k(t)} \psi(k_0 + td/T_0; k) |\theta_k\rangle + |\varepsilon_\nu\rangle, \quad (\text{A102})$$

where the phase acquired by k 'th amplitude is given by

$$\phi_k(t) = \Omega \int_{k-td/T_0}^k dy V_d(y). \quad (\text{A103})$$

Now, for $\sigma = \sqrt{d}$ and for $n = \frac{1}{2} \lceil d^{1/4} \rceil$ in the potential form of Eq. (A82) we have (see Lemma 37)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varepsilon_\nu\|_2 &= \varepsilon_\nu \lesssim t \text{poly}(d) e^{-\frac{1}{16\pi} d^{1/4}} \\ \|\varepsilon_c\|_2 &= \varepsilon_c = \mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(d_{C1}) e^{-\frac{\pi}{4} d_{C1}}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A104})$$

Actually, only estimate on ε_ν depends on the potential form. The bound for ε_c holds for arbitrary periodic V_0 .

Now, since for normalized $|\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle$ and $|x\rangle, |y\rangle$ such that $\|x\|, \|y\| \leq 1$ we have $|\langle\psi| + \langle x|)(|\phi\rangle + |y\rangle)|^2 \geq |\langle\psi|\phi\rangle|^2 - 3\|x\| - 3\|y\|$, we obtain from (A94)

$$F(\rho_{C1}^0(t), \rho_{C1}(t)) \geq \quad (\text{A105})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\Omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} & |\langle \Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0) | \bar{\Psi}_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0, td/T_0) \rangle|^2 \\ & - 3\varepsilon_\nu - 3\varepsilon_c \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A106})$$

We thus have the situation, that $\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0)$ and $\bar{\Psi}_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0)$ have the peak moving around with speed d/T_0 , while $\bar{\Psi}_{\text{nor}}$ in addition acquires phase. We now write explicitly the above inner product

$$\Delta(\Omega) := \langle \Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0) | \bar{\Psi}_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0, td/T_0) \rangle = \quad (\text{A107})$$

$$\sum_{k \in S_d(k_0 + td/T_0)} e^{-i\Omega \int_{k-td/T_0}^k dy V_d(y)} |\psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0; k)|^2. \quad (\text{A108})$$

and the goal is to show that it is close to 1 independently of Ω for all times before t_1 and after t_2 .

The idea to prove this (along the lines of [46]) is the following way (see also Fig. 5). Let us denote the position of the peak of the pointer by $k_0(t) = k_0 + td/T_0$. We shall set the initial pointer's peak to be at 12 O'clock, i.e. $k_0 = 0$. First, since Gaussians have rapidly decaying tails we have (see Lemma 35)

$$\varepsilon_{LR} := \sum_{k: |k-k_0| \geq \delta_\psi d} |\psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k)|^2 \leq \text{poly}(d) e^{-\delta_\psi^2 d}, \quad (\text{A109})$$

for $\delta_\psi > 0$. We can restrict the sum in (A107) and leave only k 's lying within the interval $k_0(t) \pm \delta_\psi d$. Since the pointer's peak travels with speed d/T_0 , i.e. $k_0(t) = td/T_0$, for times "before the interaction", i.e. $t \leq t_1$, those k 's will be to the left of $y_1 + \delta_\psi d$, and for times "after interaction", i.e. $t \geq t_2$ they will be to the right of $y_2 - \delta_\psi d$.

The potential is strongly peaked around y_0 which sits between those two positions. Thus for times $t \leq t_1$ those k 's were travelling within the tail of the potential, while for times $t \geq t_2$, all those k 's have passed the "body"

of the potential. Now, according to (A103) acquired by $|\theta_k\rangle$ are given by Ω times the integral of the potential over the interval the k travelled. Thus for times $t \leq t_1$, the acquired phase for all those k 's will be close to zero (less than $\Omega \tilde{\epsilon}_V$, where ϵ_V is the area of the tail) while for times $t \geq t_2$, the phase will be close to Ω (larger than $\Omega(1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_V)$, since the total integral of the potential is 1).

We shall now write it rigorously. First of all, we shall cut the tails of the pointer. We split $\Delta(\Omega)$ as

$$\Delta(\Omega) = \Delta_C(\Omega) + \Delta_{LR}(\Omega) \quad (\text{A110})$$

with

$$\Delta_C(\Omega) := \quad (\text{A111})$$

$$\sum_{|k-td/T_0| \leq \delta_\psi d} e^{-i\Omega \int_{k-td/T_0}^k dy V_d(y)} |\psi_{\text{nor}}(td/T_0; k)|^2, \quad (\text{A112})$$

$$\Delta_{LR}(\Omega) := \quad (\text{A113})$$

$$\sum_{\delta_\psi d < |k-td/T_0| \leq d/2} e^{-i\Omega \int_{k-td/T_0}^k dy V_d(y)} |\psi_{\text{nor}}(td/T_0; k)|^2. \quad (\text{A114})$$

We then have

$$|\Delta_{LR}(\Omega)| \leq \quad (\text{A115})$$

$$\sum_{k: |k-k_0| \geq \delta_\psi d} |\psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0; k)|^2 = \varepsilon_{LR} \leq \text{poly}(d) e^{-\delta_\psi^2 d}, \quad (\text{A116})$$

where the tail bound is, for completeness, given in lemma 35. By the tail estimate (A115), for $\varepsilon_{LR} \leq 1$ we then get

$$|\Delta(\Omega)|^2 \geq |\Delta_C(\Omega)|^2 - 2\varepsilon_{LR}, \quad (\text{A117})$$

so that it is enough to show that $\Delta_C(\Omega)$ is close to 1 irrespective of Ω .

We shall now bound the phase $\phi_k(t)$ for our restricted set of k 's.

Times "before interaction". Consider time $t \leq t_1$, and as said we are restricting to k such that $|k-td/T_0| \leq \delta_\psi d$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} k &\leq td/T_0 + \delta_\psi d \leq t_1 d/T_0 + \delta_\psi d = y_1 + \delta_\psi d, \\ k - td/T_0 &\geq -\delta_\psi d, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A118})$$

which gives (see Fig. 6)

$$\phi_k(t) = \Omega \int_{k-td/T_0}^k V_d(y) dy \leq \Omega \int_{-\delta_\psi d}^{y_1 + \delta_\psi d} V_d(y) dy \quad (\text{A119})$$

$$\leq \Omega \int_{y_0 + \delta_V d - d}^{y_0 - \delta_V d} V_d(y) dy = \Omega \int_{-2\pi(1-\delta_V)}^{-2\pi\delta_V} V_0(x) dx = \tilde{\epsilon}_V \quad (\text{A120})$$

where δ_V is determined by $\delta_V d = y_0 - y_1 - \delta_\psi d$. Denoting $t_2 - t_1 = \Delta t$, we have $\delta_V + \delta_\psi = \Delta t/T_0$, and we may




FIG. 6: **Acquiring phase by the clock states $|\theta_k\rangle$.** The quantities $\text{Area}(\text{orange hatched})$ and $\text{Area}(\text{blue hatched})$ are the areas of the orange and blue regions respectively. a) Times $t \leq t_1$. For such times, the peak of the pointer will travel with speed d/T_0 up to y_1 , so that, the “body” of the pointer (i.e. the part within $\pm \delta_\psi d$ from the peak) will be always within the blue area. We consider arbitrary k within the body of the pointer at time t (the left dashed pointer), and its past position $k - td/T_0$. The phase $\phi_k(t)$ acquired by $|\theta_k\rangle$ is proportional to yellow area, which is contained in the blue one, which in turn is the tail of the potential and therefore small. b) Times $t \geq t_2$. In this case, the pointer is initially before the blue area (the “body” of the potential) and ends up after it. Thus any k from the body of the pointer at time t had to travel through the blue area from its past position $k - td/T_0$. The acquired phase $\phi_k(t)$ is proportional to the yellow area. The latter, for any k is larger than the blue one (body of the potential) and therefore the phase is close to Ω .

choose $\delta_V = \delta_\psi = \Delta t / (4T_0)$. We know from (A83) that $\tilde{\epsilon}_V$ decays exponentially in the concentration parameter n of the potential.

Times “after interaction”. Now we consider $t \geq t_2$. Similarly as before, the condition $|k - td/T_0| \leq \delta_\psi$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} k &\geq td/T_0 - \delta_\psi d \geq t_2 d/T_0 - \delta_\psi d = y_2 - \delta_\psi d, \\ k - td/T_0 &\leq \delta_\psi d, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A121})$$

hence

$$\phi_k(t) = \Omega \int_{k-td/T_0}^k V_d(y) dy \geq \Omega \int_{\delta_\psi d}^{y_2 - \delta_\psi d} V_d(y) dy \quad (\text{A122})$$

$$\geq \Omega \int_{y_0 - \delta_V d}^{y_0 + \delta_V d} V_d(y) dy = \Omega \int_{-2\pi\delta_V}^{2\pi\delta_V} V_0(x) dx \quad (\text{A123})$$

$$= \Omega(1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_V). \quad (\text{A124})$$

Altogether, for times $t \leq t_1$ and $t \geq t_2$, respectively, we have obtained

$$|\phi_k - 0| \leq \Omega \tilde{\epsilon}_V, \quad |\phi_k - \Omega| \leq \Omega \tilde{\epsilon}_V. \quad (\text{A125})$$

We can now come back to the estimation of Δ_C . Denoting

$$a_k = |\psi_{\text{nor}}(td/T_0; k)|^2, \quad (\text{A126})$$

we have

$$\Delta_C = \sum_{|k-td/T_0| \leq \delta_\psi d} e^{-i\phi_k} a_k. \quad (\text{A127})$$

Due to normalization and the tail estimate of (A115), we have

$$1 - \varepsilon_{LR} \leq \sum_{|k-td/T_0| \leq \delta_\psi d} a_k \leq 1. \quad (\text{A128})$$

Thus we have an expression where the a_k 's are almost normalized, and the ϕ_k 's almost equal to each other, hence the expression must be close to one. Indeed Lemma 34 implies that

$$|\Delta_C(\Omega)| \geq 1 - \varepsilon_{LR} - \pi \tilde{\epsilon}_V \quad (\text{A129})$$

irrespectively of whether we are before or after the interaction, (i.e. whether $t \leq t_1$ or $t \geq t_2$), because we have only used the fact that the phase is approximately equal, which happens in both cases as in Eq. (A125).

We can now come back to the fidelity. From estimates (A105), (A117) and (A129) we have

$$F(\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t), \rho_{\text{Cl}}(t)) \geq \min_{\Omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} |\Delta(\Omega)|^2 - 6\varepsilon_\nu \quad (\text{A130})$$

$$\geq \min_{\Omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} |\Delta_C(\Omega)|^2 - 2\varepsilon_{LR} - 6\varepsilon_\nu \quad (\text{A131})$$

$$\geq 1 - \varepsilon_{LR} - \pi \tilde{\epsilon}_V - 2\varepsilon_{LR} - 3\varepsilon_\nu - 3\varepsilon_\nu. \quad (\text{A132})$$

We now use the exponential bounds on all those ϵ 's. Recall that ε_{LR} and $\tilde{\epsilon}_V$ were tails of the pointer shape and the potential, and that ε_ν , ε_c describe deviations of the pointer evolution from the simple picture of movement and phase acquisition. We write here bounds for those quantities given by Eqs. (A104), (A115) and (A83):

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_\nu &\lesssim t \text{poly}(d) e^{-\frac{1}{32\pi} d^{1/4}}, \\ \varepsilon_c &\lesssim \text{poly}(d_{\text{Cl}}) e^{-\frac{\pi}{4} d_{\text{Cl}}}, \\ \varepsilon_{LR} &\leq \text{poly}(d) e^{-\delta_\psi^2 d}, \\ \tilde{\epsilon}_V &\leq \frac{1}{\delta_V} e^{-\delta_V^2 n}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A133})$$

where we have chosen $\delta_\psi = \delta_V = (t_2 - t_1)/(4T_0)$, and to get the estimate for ε_ν , we have chosen the potential concentration parameter n to be $n = \lceil d^{1/4} \rceil$ hence we also have

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_V \leq \frac{1}{\delta_V} e^{-\delta_V^2 d^{1/4}}. \quad (\text{A134})$$

We thus have

$$F(\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t), \rho_{\text{Cl}}(t)) \lesssim 1 - \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \text{poly}(d) e^{-c_1 d^{1/4}} \quad (\text{A135})$$

where $c_1 = \min\{\frac{1}{32\pi}, (t_2 - t_1)^2/(16T_0^2)\}$. We now use

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{1 - F(\rho, \sigma)^2} \quad (\text{A136})$$

so that $F \geq 1 - \epsilon$ implies $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\epsilon}$. Using this we obtain that for times t satisfying $t \leq t_1$ or $t \geq t_2$

$$\|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t), \rho_{\text{Cl}}(t)\| \lesssim \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \text{poly}(d) e^{-c_2 d^{1/4}} \quad (\text{A137})$$

where $c_2 = \min\{\frac{1}{64\pi}, (t_2 - t_1)^2/(32T_0^2)\}$. (We can put $t_2 - t_1$ instead of $\sqrt{t_2 - t_1}$ in front of poly , as the differences is bounded from above by T_0 , so for scaling, the small values of the different are relevant, so this rough estimate is legitimate). ■

a. Proof of Theorem 2

We will start with a definition and proposition whose usefulness will soon become apparent in the proof of Theorem 2 below.

Definition 6 (Autonomous Control device error). *Let $\rho_{\text{A}}^{\text{target}}(t)$ denote the idealised/targeted control of system A, namely*

$$\rho_{\text{A}}^{\text{target}}(t) = \begin{cases} \rho_{\text{A}}^0 & \text{for } t \in [0, t_1] \\ U_{\text{A}}^{\text{target}} \rho_{\text{A}}^0 U_{\text{A}}^{\text{target}\dagger} & \text{for } t \in [t_2, T_0], \end{cases} \quad (\text{A138})$$

where we associate the time interval $[t_1, t_2]$ with the time in which the CPTP map is being implemented in the ideal

case. Furthermore, let $\rho_{\text{ACl}}^F(t)$ denote the autonomous evolution of A and the control system (the clock Cl),

$$\rho_{\text{ACl}}^F(t) = e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{ACl}}}(\rho_A \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}})e^{it\hat{H}_{\text{ACl}}}. \quad (\text{A139})$$

Let $\varepsilon_A(t, d_{\text{Cl}}, d_A)$, and $\varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t, d_{\text{Cl}})$ be defined by the relations

$$\|\rho_A^F(t) - \rho_A^{\text{target}}(t)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_A(t, d_{\text{Cl}}, d_A), \quad (\text{A140})$$

$$\|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t, d_{\text{Cl}}), \quad (\text{A141})$$

where $\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)$ is the free evolution of the clock,

$$\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) := e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}} \rho_{\text{Cl}} e^{it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}}. \quad (\text{A142})$$

Proposition 7. *There exists a clock state ρ_{Cl} and time independent Hamiltonian, called the Quasi-Ideal Clock [46] such that for all $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, T_0]$ and for all fixed $0 < t_1 < t_2 < T_0$, the error terms ε_A , ε_{Cl} are given by*

$$\varepsilon_A(t, d_{\text{Cl}}, d_A) = \sqrt{d_A \text{tr}[\rho_A^2(0)]} \varepsilon(d_{\text{Cl}}), \quad (\text{A143})$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t, d_{\text{Cl}}) = \varepsilon(d_{\text{Cl}}), \quad (\text{A144})$$

where $\varepsilon(d_{\text{Cl}})$ is independent of the system A parameters, and is of order

$$\varepsilon(d_{\text{Cl}}) = \mathcal{O}\left(\text{poly}(d_{\text{Cl}}) \exp\left[-cd_{\text{Cl}}^{1/4}\right]\right), \quad \text{as } d_{\text{Cl}} \rightarrow \infty \quad (\text{A145})$$

where the constant $c > 0$ depends on t_1, t_2 and $\text{poly}(d_{\text{Cl}})$ is a polynomial in d_{Cl} .

Proof. This proposition is a direct consequence of Proposition 4 and the results in [46]. Proposition 4 proves estimate (A144) with constant in exponent given by c_2 , i.e., the constant used in estimate (A88) in Prop. 4. In [46] (see Section *Examples: 2) System error faster than power-law decay*, page 47) the following estimate is proven

$$\frac{\|\rho_A(t) - \sigma_A(t)\|_1}{\sqrt{d_A \text{tr}[\rho_A^2(0)]}} = \mathcal{O}\left(t \text{poly}(d_{\text{Cl}}) e^{-2c_0 d_{\text{Cl}}^{1/4} \sqrt{\ln d_{\text{Cl}}}}\right), \quad (\text{A146})$$

for all $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, T_0]$ and for all fixed $0 < t_1 < t_2 < T_0$. Here we have defined $2c_0 := \frac{\pi}{4} \alpha_0^2 \chi^2$, where α_0, χ are constants defined in [46]. So this proves (A143) with constant c_0 . Taking $c = \min\{2c_0, c_2\}$ finalises the proof. ■

This proposition is a generalisation of the results from [46]. Specifically, these results were proven for the special case in which $t = T_0$ in Eq. (A144).

We are now ready to provide the proof of Theorem 2 located in the main text. We will precede the proof with a short overview.

Overview of the proof of Theorem 2. The aim of the theorem is to show that in our autonomous setup, the

final state of the system, catalyst and clock is close to product. Indeed, now that the catalyst and clock play the role of the total catalyst state, in order to prevent embezzling, we have to make sure that the total catalyst will not be polluted too much. Of course the final state on the system is to be close to the required state. Proposition 4 implies that on the system and catalyst we get a state close to the required state, and we have a small error on the clock.

To pass from this outcome to what we want, we note that the initial clock state is pure. Thus having a small error on the clock means also that the total state stays approximately product between the system-catalyst state and the clock. In the proof we express this in terms of fidelity.

We now present the full proof.

Proof. We start by demonstrating part 1) of the theorem. Define

$$U_{\text{SCatG}}(t) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}_{\text{SCatG}} & \text{if } t \in [0, t_1] \\ U'_{\text{SCatG}} & \text{if } t \in [t_2, T_0] \end{cases} \quad (\text{A147})$$

where U'_{SCatG} satisfies

$$\text{tr}_G \left[U'_{\text{SCatG}} (\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tilde{\tau}_G) U'^{\dagger}_{\text{SCatG}} \right] = \rho_S^1 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0. \quad (\text{A148})$$

Define

$$\sigma_{\text{SCatG}}(t) := U'_{\text{SCatG}}(t) (\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tilde{\tau}_G) U'^{\dagger}_{\text{SCatG}}(t). \quad (\text{A149})$$

It follows by the definition of t-CNO (Def. 1 and Prop. 2) that for every pair ρ_S^0, ρ_S^1 for which there exists a t-CNO from ρ_S^0 to ρ_S^1 , there exists a unitary U_{SCatG} satisfying the above criteria. Since the catalyst ρ_{Cat}^0 is arbitrary, this is true iff Eq. (15) holds. Therefore $\sigma_S(t)$ in Eq. (A149) fulfils part 1) of the theorem.

We now proceed with proving part 2) of the theorem. Recalling Def. 6 and Prop. 7, and using the identifications $A = \text{SCatG}$, $U_A^{\text{target}} = U'_{\text{SCatG}}$, for every unitary U_{SCatG} above, there exists an interaction term \hat{I}_{SCatClG} such that using the Quasi-Ideal Clock we have

$$\|\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^F(t) - \sigma_{\text{SCatG}}(t)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_A \quad (\text{A150})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sqrt{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \sqrt{\text{tr}[(\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tilde{\tau}_G)^2]} \varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(d_{\text{Cl}}) \\ &\leq \sqrt{d_S d_{\text{Cat}}} \varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(d_{\text{Cl}}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A151})$$

$$\|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(d_{\text{Cl}}), \quad (\text{A152})$$

where in the last line of (A150) we have taken into account that $\tilde{\tau}_G = \mathbb{1}/d_G$. Recall that an expression for $\varepsilon(d_{\text{Cl}})$ is given by Eq. (A145). We now apply Prop. 14 with the identifications

$$\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^F(t) =: \rho_A, \quad \rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t) =: \rho_B, \quad \rho_{\text{SCatGCl}}^F(t) =: \rho_{AB} \quad (\text{A153})$$

$$\sigma_{\text{SCatG}}(t) =: \sigma_A, \quad \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) =: \sigma_B, \quad (\text{A154})$$

$$\sigma_{\text{SCatG}}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) =: \sigma_{AB}, \quad (\text{A155})$$

hence

$$\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_A, \quad \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_{Cl}, \quad \epsilon_3 = 0, \quad (\text{A156})$$

(ϵ_3 vanishes because $\rho_{Cl}^0(t)$ is a pure state) to achieve

$$\|\rho_{SCatGCl}^F(t) - \sigma_{SCatG}(t) \otimes \rho_{Cl}^0(t)\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon_{Cl}} + \epsilon_A, \quad (\text{A157})$$

for all $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, T_0]$, and where $\epsilon_A, \epsilon_{Cl}$ are given in Eqs. (A150), (A152). Applying the data processing inequality, we find

$$\|\rho_{SCatCl}^F(t) - \sigma_{SCat}(t) \otimes \rho_{Cl}^0(t)\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon_{Cl}} + \epsilon_A, \quad (\text{A158})$$

for all $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, T_0]$. Using the triangle inequality, we have

$$\|\rho_{SCatCl}^F(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0 \otimes \rho_{Cl}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A159})$$

$$\leq \|\rho_{SCatCl}^F(t) - \sigma_{SCat}(t) \otimes \rho_{Cl}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A160})$$

$$+ \|\sigma_{SCat}(t) \otimes \rho_{Cl}^0(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0 \otimes \rho_{Cl}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A161})$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon_{Cl}(t)} + \epsilon_A(t) + \|\sigma_{SCat}(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0\|_1. \quad (\text{A162})$$

Now we note that by definition, it follows that $\sigma_{SCat}(t) = \sigma_S(t) \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0$ for all $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, T_0]$. Plugging into Eq. (A162) we achieve

$$\|\rho_{SCatCl}^F(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0 \otimes \rho_{Cl}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A163})$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon_{Cl}} + \epsilon_A + \|\sigma_S(t) - \rho_S^F(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A164})$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon_{Cl}} + 2\epsilon_A, \quad (\text{A165})$$

for all $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, T_0]$ and where in the last line, we have used Eq. (A150) after applying the data processing inequality to it. W.l.o.g. assume that $\epsilon_{Cl} \leq 2$ (If this does not hold, then the following bound holds anyway since the trace distance between any two states is upper bounded by 2), so that $\epsilon_{Cl} \leq \sqrt{2\epsilon_{Cl}}$ and using (A150) we achieve

$$\|\rho_{SCatCl}^F(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0 \otimes \rho_{Cl}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A166})$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon_{Cl}} + 2\sqrt{d_S d_{Cat} \epsilon_{Cl}} \quad (\text{A167})$$

$$\leq \left(2 + 2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{d_S d_{Cat}}\right) \sqrt{\epsilon_{Cl}} \quad (\text{A168})$$

$$\leq \left(2 + 3\sqrt{d_S d_{Cat}}\right) \sqrt{\epsilon_{Cl}} \quad (\text{A169})$$

$$= \epsilon_{emb}, \quad (\text{A170})$$

for all $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, T_0]$. Now, recalling that ϵ_{Cl} is independent of d_S, d_{Cat}, d_G , and only a function of d_{Cl}, t_1, t_2, T_0 , we obtain estimate (17) of part 2) of the theorem. Next, the formula (A145) from Proposition 7 gives the estimate 18 concluding the proof of theorem 2. ■

5. Proof of Theorem 3

In this section we prove Theorem 3 in the main text.

Proof of Theorem 3. The proof will be divided into two parts labelled A and B.

Part A consists in proving that the theorem statements 1) and 2) hold under a different set of conditions than those of the theorem. Namely, that 1) and 2) hold when the following two conditions both simultaneously hold:

a) the final joint system-catalyst-bath state is very close to that of the target joint system-catalyst-bath state.

b) the final clock state is very close to its free state. The proof of part A uses basic relationships between quantum states (such as trace distance and fidelity), but does not take into account any dynamical properties.

Part B consists in proving that the conditions in the Theorem from which 1) and 2) should follow, do indeed imply conditions a) and b) from part A. The proof uses the dynamical properties of the states.

a. Part A of proof of Theorem 3

We start with a comment on notation and a few immediate consequences. We will denote $U_{SCatG}^{\text{target}}(t) = e^{-i\theta(t)\hat{H}_{SCatG}^{\text{int}}}$ from the main text by $U_{SCatG}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) = e^{-i\theta(t)\hat{H}_{SCatG}^{\text{int}}}$ here to remind ourselves that $\hat{H}_{SCatG}^{\text{int}}$ induces a small error ϵ_H onto the final catalyst and system state (see Eqs. (21), (23)). We will also denote $U_{SCatG}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) := e^{-i\theta(t)\hat{H}_{SCatG}^{\text{int}}}$, since $\hat{H}_{SCatG}^{\text{int}}$ corresponds to the case of no error, i.e. $\epsilon_H = 0$, (see Eq. (22)). Accordingly we shall denote

$$\rho_{SCatG}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) := \quad (\text{A171})$$

$$U_{SCatG}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) (\rho_S^0(t) \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0(t) \otimes \tau_G) U_{SCatG}^{\text{target}(0)\dagger}(t). \quad (\text{A172})$$

$$\rho_{SCatG}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) := \quad (\text{A173})$$

$$U_{SCatG}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) (\rho_S^0(t) \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0(t) \otimes \tau_G) U_{SCatG}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)\dagger}(t). \quad (\text{A174})$$

Recall that

$$\theta(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t \in [0, t_1] \\ 1 & \text{if } t \in [t_2, t_3], \end{cases} \quad (\text{A175})$$

Therefore, similarly to as in Eqs. (27) and (28) we have for $t \in [0, t_1]$

$$\rho_{SCat}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) = \rho_S^0(t) \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0(t), \quad (\text{A176})$$

while for $t \in [t_2, t_3]$

$$\rho_{SCat}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) = e^{-it(\hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{Cat})} \rho_S^1 \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0 e^{it(\hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{Cat})} \quad (\text{A177})$$

$$= \rho_S^1(t) \otimes \rho_{Cat}^0(t). \quad (\text{A178})$$

Hence, Eqs. (A176), (A177) together imply

$$\rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) = \rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t), \quad (\text{A179})$$

for $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, t_3]$.

Part A will consist in proving that the following holds. Let $\varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t) > 0$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t) > 0$ satisfy

$$\|\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t), \quad (\text{A180})$$

$$\|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t). \quad (\text{A181})$$

It follows that:

- 1) The deviation from the idealised dynamics is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 & \quad (\text{A182}) \\ & \leq 2\varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t) + 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t)} + 2\epsilon_H \theta(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A183})$$

- 2) The final state $\rho_S^F(t)$ is

$$\|\rho_S^F(t) - \rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t) + \epsilon_H \theta(t) \quad (\text{A184})$$

close to one which can be reached via t-CTO: For all $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, t_3]$ the transition

$$\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \quad \text{to} \quad \rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) \quad (\text{A185})$$

is possible via a TO i.e. ρ_S^0 to $\rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}$ via a t-CTO.

We begin with proving item 2). To prove the Eqs. (A184), (A185), we start by extending the definitions of $\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t)$ and $\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(0)}(t)$ in (A176), (A177) to include the clock system:

$$\rho_{\text{SCatGCl}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) = \rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t), \quad (\text{A186})$$

$$\rho_{\text{SCatGCl}}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) = \rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t), \quad (\text{A187})$$

where $\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)$ is the free evolution of the clock defined in Eq. 6. Therefore, from Eq. (A179), it follows that the reduced state after tracing out the Gibbs state on G is

$$\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) = \rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t), \quad (\text{A188})$$

for $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, t_3]$. Thus taking into account property Eq. (20) it follows by definition of CTOs and t-CTOs that a transition from ρ_S^0 to $\rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t)$ is possible via a t-CTO. Finally, applying the data processing inequality to Eq. (A180), we achieve

$$\|\rho_S^F(t) - \rho_S^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t), \quad (\text{A189})$$

while applying the data processing inequality to Eqs. (A172), (A174) we find $\|\rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t) - \rho_S^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t)\|_1 = 0$

for $t \in [0, t_1]$ while from Eqs. (21), (22), (23), we see $\|\rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t) - \rho_S^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t)\|_1 \leq \epsilon_H$ for $t \in [t_2, t_3]$. Hence, combining both equations, we have $\|\rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t) - \rho_S^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t)\|_1 \leq \epsilon_H \theta(t)$ for $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, t_3]$. Then Eq. (A184) in 2) above follows from the triangle inequality:

$$\|\rho_S^F(t) - \rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t)\|_1 \leq \|\rho_S^F(t) - \rho_S^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A190})$$

$$+ \|\rho_S^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) - \rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t) \quad (\text{A191})$$

$$+ \epsilon_H \theta(t). \quad (\text{A192})$$

We now prove the above item 1) (i.e. the estimate (A183)). We begin by using the triangle inequality followed by the identity $\rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) = \rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t)$ which follows from Eq. (A188).

$$\|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A193})$$

$$= \|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A194})$$

$$+ \|\rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A195})$$

$$\leq \|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A196})$$

$$+ \|\rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) - \rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A197})$$

$$+ \|\rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(0)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A198})$$

$$= \|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A199})$$

$$+ \|\rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) - \rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(0)}(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A200})$$

$$+ \|\rho_S^{\text{target}(0)} \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t)\|_1$$

$$\leq \|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A201})$$

$$+ \epsilon_H \theta(t) + \|\rho_S^{\text{target}(0)} - \rho_S^F(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A202})$$

$$\leq \|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{SCat}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A203})$$

$$+ 2\epsilon_H \theta(t) + \varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t). \quad (\text{A204})$$

where we have applied the data processing inequality to Eq. (A180) and used the resultant equation in the last line. Now we make the following identifications, noting that $\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)$ all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is pure by assumption of the theorem.

$$\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^F(t) =: \rho_A, \quad \rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t) =: \rho_B, \quad \rho_{\text{SCatGCl}}^F(t) =: \rho_{AB} \quad (\text{A205})$$

$$\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) =: \sigma_A, \quad \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) =: \sigma_B, \quad (\text{A206})$$

$$\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) =: \sigma_{AB} \quad (\text{A207})$$

and apply Prop. 14 with use of (A180), (A181) arriving at

$$\epsilon_1 = \varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t), \quad \epsilon_2 = \varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t), \quad \epsilon_3 = 0, \quad (\text{A208})$$

and thus

$$\|\rho_{\text{SCatGCl}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A209})$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t)} + \varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t). \quad (\text{A210})$$

Applying the data processing inequality to the above equation, followed by substituting into Eq. (A204), gives

$$\|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A211})$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t)} + \varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t) + \varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t) + 2\epsilon_H \theta(t)$$

$$= 2\varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t) + 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t)} + 2\epsilon_H \theta(t). \quad (\text{A212})$$

b. Part B of proof of Theorem 3

We now set out to prove the second part, which consists in deriving expressions for $\varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t)$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t)$

such that the contents of sections 1) and 2) above are consistent with the claims in 1) and 2) of the theorem.

To start with, since $\hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{\text{Cat}} + \hat{H}_G$ and $\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}$ commute, they share a common eigenbasis which we denote $\{|E_j\rangle\}_j$. We can write the interaction term in terms of this basis as follows, $\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}} = \sum_{j=1}^{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \Omega_j |E_j\rangle\langle E_j|$ with eigenvalues Ω_j in the range $\Omega_j \in [-\pi, \pi]$ since $\|\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}\|_\infty \leq \pi$. We can also expand the state $\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tau_G$ in the energy eigenbasis $\{|E_j\rangle\}_j$. Doing so allows one to simplify the expression for $\rho_{\text{SCatGCl}}^F(t)$. We find

$$\rho_{\text{SCatGCl}}^F(t) = e^{-it(\hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{\text{Cat}} + \hat{H}_G + \hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}} \otimes \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}} + \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}})} \rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tau_G \otimes |\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0\rangle\langle\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0| e^{it(\hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{\text{Cat}} + \hat{H}_G + \hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}} \otimes \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}} + \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}})} \quad (\text{A213})$$

$$= \sum_{j,j'=1}^{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} e^{-it(\hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{\text{Cat}} + \hat{H}_G + \Omega_j \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}} + \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}})} \rho_{\text{SCatG},j,j'}^0 |E_j\rangle\langle E_{j'}| \otimes |\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0\rangle\langle\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0| e^{it(\hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_{\text{Cat}} + \hat{H}_G + \Omega_{j'} \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}} + \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}})} \quad (\text{A214})$$

$$= \sum_{j,j'=1}^{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \rho_{\text{SCatG},j,j'}^0(t) |E_j\rangle\langle E_{j'}| \otimes |\rho_{\text{Cl},j}^0(t)\rangle\langle\rho_{\text{Cl},j'}^0(t)|, \quad (\text{A215})$$

where

$$\sum_{j,j'=1}^{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \rho_{\text{SCatG},j,j'}^0(t) |E_j\rangle\langle E_{j'}| = \rho_S(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \tau_G, \quad (\text{A216})$$

$$|\rho_{\text{Cl},j}^0(t)\rangle = e^{-it(\Omega_j \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}} + \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}})} |\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0\rangle. \quad (\text{A217})$$

We thus have by taking partial traces

$$\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^F(t) \quad (\text{A218})$$

$$= \sum_{j,j'=1}^{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \rho_{\text{SCatG},j,j'}^0(t) |E_j\rangle\langle E_{j'}| \langle\rho_{\text{Cl},j'}^0(t)|\rho_{\text{Cl},j}^0(t)\rangle, \quad (\text{A219})$$

$$\rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \rho_{\text{SCatG},j,j}^0(t) |\rho_{\text{Cl},j}^0(t)\rangle\langle\rho_{\text{Cl},j}^0(t)|. \quad (\text{A220})$$

Similarly

$$\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) \quad (\text{A221})$$

$$= U_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t) (\rho_S^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \tau_G) U_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)\dagger}(t) \quad (\text{A222})$$

$$= e^{-it\theta(t)\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}} \quad (\text{A223})$$

$$\left(\sum_{j,j'=1}^{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \rho_{\text{SCatG},j,j'}^0(t) |E_j\rangle\langle E_{j'}| \right) e^{it\theta(t)\hat{H}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}} \quad (\text{A224})$$

$$= \sum_{j,j'=1}^{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \rho_{\text{SCatG},j,j'}^0(t) e^{-it(\Omega_j - \Omega_{j'})\theta(t)} |E_j\rangle\langle E_{j'}|. \quad (\text{A225})$$

Noting that the Frobenious norm $\|\cdot\|_F$ upper bounds the trace distance by the inequality $\|\cdot\|_F \geq \|\cdot\|_1/\sqrt{d}$ for a d dimensional space, we find

$$\|\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t)\|_1 \leq \sqrt{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \|\rho_{\text{SCatG}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{target}(\epsilon_H)}(t)\|_F \quad (\text{A226})$$

$$= \sqrt{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \sqrt{\sum_{j,j'=1}^{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \left| \rho_{\text{SCatG},j,j'}^0(t) \right|^2 \left| e^{-it(\Omega_j - \Omega_{j'})\theta(t)} - \langle \rho_{\text{Cl},j'}^0(t) | \rho_{\text{Cl},j}^0(t) \rangle \right|^2} \quad (\text{A227})$$

$$\leq \sqrt{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \sqrt{\sum_{j,j'=1}^{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \left| \rho_{\text{SCatG},j,j'}^0(t) \right|^2 \left(\max_{m,n} \left| e^{-it(\Omega_m - \Omega_n)\theta(t)} - \langle \rho_{\text{Cl},n}^0(t) | \rho_{\text{Cl},m}^0(t) \rangle \right|^2 \right)} \quad (\text{A228})$$

$$\leq \sqrt{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \sqrt{\text{tr}[\rho_S^0(t)^2 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t)^2 \otimes \tau_G^2] \left(\max_{m,n} \left| e^{-it(\Omega_m - \Omega_n)\theta(t)} - \langle \rho_{\text{Cl},n}^0(t) | \rho_{\text{Cl},m}^0(t) \rangle \right|^2 \right)} \quad (\text{A229})$$

$$= \sqrt{d_S \text{tr}[\rho_S^{0,2}] d_{\text{Cat}} \text{tr}[\rho_{\text{Cat}}^{0,2}] d_G \text{tr}[\tau_G^2]} \max_{m,n} \left| e^{-it(\Omega_m - \Omega_n)\theta(t)} - \langle \rho_{\text{Cl},n}^0(t) | \rho_{\text{Cl},m}^0(t) \rangle \right| \quad (\text{A230})$$

$$\leq \sqrt{d_S \text{tr}[\rho_S^{0,2}] d_{\text{Cat}} \text{tr}[\rho_{\text{Cat}}^{0,2}] d_G \text{tr}[\tau_G^2]} \max_{x,y \in [-\pi, \pi]} \left| 1 - \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 | \hat{\Gamma}^\dagger(x, t) \hat{\Gamma}(y, t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle \right| \quad (\text{A231})$$

$$= A \max_{x,y \in [-\pi, \pi]} |1 - \Delta(t; x, y)|, \quad (\text{A232})$$

where we have denoted

$$\Delta(t; x, y) := \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 | \Gamma^\dagger(x, t) \Gamma(y, t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle, \quad (\text{A233})$$

$$A := \sqrt{d_S \text{tr}[\rho_S^{0,2}] d_{\text{Cat}} \text{tr}[\rho_{\text{Cat}}^{0,2}] d_G \text{tr}[\tau_G^2]}. \quad (\text{A234})$$

(Note here, that since $d \text{tr}[\rho^2] \geq 1$ for any d -dimensional state, we have $A \geq 1$.) Thus $\varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t)$, from (A180), we set as

$$\varepsilon_{\text{SCatG}}(\epsilon_H; t) = A \max_{x,y \in [-\pi, \pi]} |1 - \Delta(t; x, y)|. \quad (\text{A235})$$

Noting that the fidelity F between a pure state $|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\rangle = e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}} |\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0\rangle$ and a state $\rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t)$ is given by $F = \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) \rangle$, using Eq. (A220) and the usual bound for the trace distance in terms of the fidelity, we

find

$$\|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t) - \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A236})$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{1 - F(\rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t), |\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\rangle)} \quad (\text{A237})$$

$$= 2\sqrt{1 - \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^F(t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) \rangle} = \quad (\text{A238})$$

$$2\sqrt{1 - \sum_{j=1}^{d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G} \rho_{\text{SCatG},j,j}^0 \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) | \rho_{\text{Cl},j}^0(t) \rangle \langle \rho_{\text{Cl},j}^0(t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) \rangle} \quad (\text{A239})$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{1 - \min_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} \left| \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t) | e^{-ix\theta(t)} \Gamma(x, t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle \right|^2} \quad (\text{A240})$$

$$= 2\sqrt{1 - \min_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} \left| \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 | \Gamma^\dagger(0, t) \Gamma(x, t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle \right|^2} \quad (\text{A241})$$

$$\leq 2 \max_{x,y \in [-\pi, \pi]} \sqrt{1 - |\langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 | \Gamma^\dagger(y, t) \Gamma(x, t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle|^2} \quad (\text{A242})$$

$$= 2 \max_{x,y \in [-\pi, \pi]} \sqrt{1 - |\Delta(t; x, y)|^2}, \quad (\text{A243})$$

so that we can set $\varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t)$, from (A181), to

$$\varepsilon_{\text{Cl}}(t) = 2 \max_{x,y \in [-\pi, \pi]} \sqrt{1 - |\Delta(t; x, y)|^2}. \quad (\text{A244})$$

Inserting (A244) and (A235) into Eqs. (A183), (A184),

we conclude

$$\|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A245})$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{A} \max_{x,y \in [-\pi, \pi]} \sqrt{|1 - \Delta(t; x, y)|} \quad (\text{A246})$$

$$+ 4 \max_{x,y \in [-\pi, \pi]} \sqrt{1 - |\Delta(t; x, y)|^2} + 2\epsilon_H \theta(t), \quad (\text{A247})$$

and

$$\|\rho_S^F(t) - \rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A248})$$

$$\leq \epsilon_H \theta(t) + 2 \max_{x,y \in [-\pi, \pi]} \sqrt{1 - |\Delta(t; x, y)|^2}. \quad (\text{A249})$$

Finally, to finish the proof we need find some simplifying upper bounds to the r.h.s. of Eqs. (A247) and (A249) to conclude the bounds stated in Theorem 3.

To this end we apply lemma 38 which implies, by identifying $c = \Delta(t; x, y)$

$$1 - |\Delta(t; x, y)|^2 \leq |1 - \Delta(t; x, y)^2|, \quad (\text{A250})$$

$$|1 - \Delta(t; x, y)| \leq |1 - \Delta(t; x, y)^2| \quad (\text{A251})$$

Observe that we can make the identification $c = \Delta(t; x, y)$ since $|\Delta(t; x, y)| \leq 1$ follows from unitarity and $|1 - c| = |1 - \Delta(t; x, y)| \leq 1$ can be assumed w.l.o.g.. Indeed, if $|1 - \Delta(t; x, y)| > 1$, then the bounds would be greater than 2 (see Eqs. (A247), (A249) and recall $A \geq 1$), hence not relevant, since trace norm is always no greater than 2.

We then obtain

$$\|\rho_{\text{SCatCl}}^F(t) - \rho_S^F(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0(t)\|_1 \quad (\text{A252})$$

$$\leq 2\epsilon_H \theta(t) + 6\sqrt{A} \max_{x,y \in [-\pi, \pi]} |1 - \Delta^2(t; x, y)| \quad (\text{A253})$$

where we used $A \geq 1$, and

$$\|\rho_S^F(t) - \rho_S^{\text{target}(0)}(t)\|_1 \leq \epsilon_H \theta(t) \quad (\text{A254})$$

$$+ \sqrt{A} \max_{x,y \in [-\pi, \pi]} |1 - \Delta^2(t; x, y)|. \quad (\text{A255})$$

■

where A and $\Delta(t; x, y)$ are given by (A233). Finally, since $\text{tr}[\rho^2] \leq 1$ for any normalised density matrix ρ , we have

$$A \leq d_S d_{\text{Cat}} d_G \text{tr}[\tau_G^2]. \quad (\text{A256})$$

Inserting this into Eqs. (A253), (A255) we get the thesis of Theorem 3.

6. Calculating $\Delta(t; x, y)$ for the Idealised Momentum Clock

In the case of the idealised momentum clock, we have $\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}} = \hat{p}$, $\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}} = g(\hat{x})$, where \hat{x} and \hat{p} are the position and momentum operators of a particle in one dimension satisfying the Weyl form of the canonical commutation relations, $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i$, while g is an integrable function from the reals to the reals, normalised such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) dx = 1$. [76]

Therefore, we find for the idealised momentum clock, for $z, y \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\Delta(t; z, y) \quad (\text{A257})$$

$$= \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 | \hat{\Gamma}_{\text{Cl}}^\dagger(z, t) \hat{\Gamma}_{\text{Cl}}(y, t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle \quad (\text{A258})$$

$$= e^{-i(z-y)\theta(t)} \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 | e^{it\hat{p}+iztg(\hat{x})} e^{-it\hat{p}-iytg(\hat{x})} | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle \quad (\text{A259})$$

$$= e^{-i(z-y)\theta(t)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 | e^{it\hat{p}+iztg(\hat{x})} | x \rangle \langle x | e^{-it\hat{p}-iytg(\hat{x})} | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle. \quad (\text{A260})$$

We can now use the relation $\hat{p} = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ and solve the 1st order 2 variable differential equation resulting from the Schrödinger eq. for the Hamiltonian $\hat{p} + yg(\hat{x})$ and initial wave-function $\langle x | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle$. Plugging the solution into the above, we arrive at

$$\Delta(t; z, y) = e^{-i(z-y)\theta(t)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx |\langle x | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle|^2 e^{-i(y-z) \int_x^{x+t} g(x') dx'}. \quad (\text{A261})$$

We now choose the support of the initial wave-function $\langle x | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle$ to be $x \in [x_{\psi l}, x_{\psi r}]$ and the support of $g(x)$ to be $x \in [x_{gl}, x_{gr}]$. Noting that

$$\int_x^{x+t} g(x') dx' = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x+t \leq x_{gl} \\ 1 & \text{if } x \leq x_{gl} \text{ and } x+t \geq x_{gr}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A262})$$

and taking into account the support interval of $\langle x | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle$, we conclude

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} dx |\langle x | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle|^2 e^{-i(y-z) \int_x^{x+t} g(x') dx'} \quad (\text{A263})$$

$$= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \leq x_{gl} - x_{\psi r} \\ e^{i(z-y)} & \text{if } t \geq x_{gr} - x_{\psi l} \end{cases}. \quad (\text{A264})$$

Therefore, choosing $t_1 = x_{gr} - x_{\psi l}$ and $t_2 = x_{gr} - x_{\psi l}$, from Eq. (A261) we arrive at

$$\Delta(t; x, y) = 1 \quad \forall x, y \in [-\pi, \pi], \quad (\text{A265})$$

as claimed in Sec. IIIB of the main text. Furthermore, note that the derivation holds for all $t_1 < t_2$ by appropriately choosing the parameters $x_{gr}, x_{\psi l}, x_{gr}, x_{\psi l}$.

-
- [1] J. Howard, Molecular motors: structural adaptations to cellular functions, *Nature* **389**, 561 (1997).
- [2] J. Frank, ed., *Molecular Machines in Biology* (Cambridge University Press, 2011) cambridge Books Online.
- [3] S. M. Douglas, I. Bachelet, and G. M. Church, A logic-gated nanorobot for targeted transport of molecular payloads, *Science* **335**, 831 (2012).
- [4] M. T. Mitchison, Quantum thermal absorption machines: refrigerators, engines and clocks, *Contemp. Phys.* **0**, 1 (2019).
- [5] G. Benenti, G. Casati, K. Saito, and R. S. Whitney, Fundamental aspects of steady-state conversion of heat to work at the nanoscale, *Physics Reports* **694**, 1 (2017).
- [6] F. Brandão, M. Horodecki, N. Ng, J. Oppenheim, and S. Wehner, The second laws of quantum thermodynamics, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **112**, 3275 (2015).
- [7] R. P. Feynman, R. B. Leighton, and M. Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, Vol. 1 (Addison-Wesley, 1963) Chap. Ratchet and pawl, p. 46.
- [8] N. Linden, S. Popescu, and P. Skrzypczyk, How small can thermal machines be? The smallest possible refrigerator, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 130401 (2010).
- [9] D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, R. Alicki, and G. Kurizki, Work and energy gain of heat-pumped quantized amplifiers, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **103**, 60005 (2013).
- [10] J. B. Brask, G. Haack, N. Brunner, and M. Huber, Autonomous quantum thermal machine for generating steady-state entanglement, *New J. Phys* **17**, 113029 (2015).
- [11] M. T. Mitchison, M. P. Woods, J. Prior, and M. Huber, Coherence-assisted single-shot cooling by quantum absorption refrigerators, *New J. Phys* **17**, 115013 (2015).
- [12] M. T. Mitchison, M. Huber, J. Prior, M. P. Woods, and M. B. Plenio, Realising a quantum absorption refrigerator with an atom-cavity system, *Quantum Science and Technology* **1**, 015001 (2016).
- [13] G. Maslennikov, S. Ding, R. Hahlützel, J. Gan, A. Roulet, S. Nimmrichter, J. Dai, V. Scarani, and D. Matsukevich, *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 2041 (2019).
- [14] J. Monsel, C. Elouard, and A. Auffèves, An autonomous quantum machine to measure the thermodynamic arrow of time, *njp Quantum Inf.* **4**, 10.1038/s41534-018-0109-8 (2018).
- [15] P. Erker, M. T. Mitchison, R. Silva, M. P. Woods, N. Brunner, and M. Huber, Autonomous quantum clocks: Does thermodynamics limit our ability to measure time?, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031022 (2017).
- [16] R. Uzdin, A. Levy, and R. Kosloff, Equivalence of quantum heat machines, and quantum-thermodynamic signatures, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 031044 (2015).
- [17] A. Hewgill, J. O. González, J. P. Palao, D. Alonso, A. Ferraro, and G. De Chiara, Three-qubit refrigerator with two-body interactions, *Phys. Rev. E* **101**, 012109 (2020).
- [18] P. P. Hofer, M. Perarnau-Llobet, J. B. Brask, R. Silva, M. Huber, and N. Brunner, Autonomous quantum refrigerator in a circuit QED architecture based on a Josephson junction, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 235420 (2016).
- [19] R. Alicki, The quantum open system as a model of the heat engine, *J. Phys. A* **12**, L103 (1979).
- [20] D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky and G. Kurizki, Heat-machine control by quantum-state preparation: From quantum engines to refrigerators, *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 022102 (2014).
- [21] J. E. Geusic, E. O. Schulz-DuBios, and H. E. D. Scovil, Quantum equivalent of the carnot cycle, *Phys. Rev.* **156**, 343 (1967).
- [22] M. P. Woods, N. Ng, and S. Wehner, The maximum efficiency of nano heat engines depends on more than temperature, *Quantum* **3**, 10.22331/q-2019-08-19-177 (2019).
- [23] N. Ng, M. P. Woods, and S. Wehner, Surpassing the Carnot efficiency by extracting imperfect work, *New Journal of Physics* **19**, 113005 (2017).
- [24] N. Yunger Halpern and D. T. Limmer, Fundamental limitations on photoisomerization from thermodynamic resource theories, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 042116 (2020).
- [25] J. Roßnagel, S. T. Dawkins, K. N. Tolazzi, O. Abah, E. Lutz, F. Schmidt-Kaler, and K. Singer, A single-atom heat engine, *Science* **352**, 325 (2016).
- [26] D. Janzing, P. Wocjan, R. Zeier, R. Geiss, and T. Beth, Thermodynamic Cost of Reliability and Low Temperatures: Tightening Landauer's Principle and the Second Law, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **39**, 2717 (2000).
- [27] W. van Dam and P. Hayden, Universal entanglement transformations without communication, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 060302 (2003).
- [28] N. Ng, L. Mančinska, C. Cirstoiu, J. Eisert, and S. Wehner, Limits to catalysis in quantum thermodynamics, *New J. Phys* **17**, 085004 (2015).
- [29] A. S. L. Malabarba, A. J. Short, and P. Kammerlander, Clock-driven quantum thermal engines, *New J. Phys* **17**, 045027 (2015).
- [30] A. Jenkins, Self-oscillation, *Physics Reports* **525**, 167 (2013).
- [31] W. Pauli, Die allgemeinen prinzipien der wellenmechanik, *Handbuch der Physik* **5**, 1 (1958).
- [32] L. Masanes and J. Oppenheim, A general derivation and quantification of the third law of thermodynamics, *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 10.1038/ncomms14538 (2017).
- [33] We often omit tensor products with the identity when adding operators on different spaces, e.g. $\hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_G \equiv \hat{H}_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_G + \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \hat{H}_G$.
- [34] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, Reversible transformations from pure to mixed states and the unique measure of information, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 062104 (2003).
- [35] K. Życzkowski and I. Bengtsson, On duality between quantum maps and quantum states, *Open Systems & Information Dynamics* **11**, 3 (2004).
- [36] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio, Entanglement-assisted local manipulation of pure quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3566–3569 (1999).
- [37] G. Gour, M. P. Müller, V. Narasimhachar, R. W. Spekkens, and N. Y. Halpern, The resource theory of informational nonequilibrium in thermodynamics, *Phys. Rep.* **583**, 1 (2015).
- [38] Note that this generalisation also generalises NOs, CNOs and CTOs by allowing for the inclusion of a catalyst in the initial and final state of the transition and or specialising to the case of a maximally mixed Gibbs state.
- [39] For any bipartite state ρ_{AB} , we use the notation of reduced states $\rho_A := \text{tr}_B(\rho_{AB})$, $\rho_B := \text{tr}_A(\rho_{AB})$.
- [40] It is likely that the no-go theorem holds for all non-trivial U_{AG} , i.e. all cases for which there exists $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, t_3]$

- such that $\rho_A^F(t) \neq \rho_A^0(t)$. However, the point of the no-go theorem is simply to show that the problem is non-trivial for most cases of interest.
- [41] M. P. Müller, Correlating Thermal Machines and the Second Law at the Nanoscale, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 041051 (2018).
 - [42] A. M. Alhambra, S. Wehner, M. M. Wilde, and M. P. Woods, Work and reversibility in quantum thermodynamics, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 062114 (2018).
 - [43] P. Boes, J. Eisert, R. Gallego, M. P. Müller, and H. Wilming, Von Neumann Entropy from Unitarity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 210402 (2019).
 - [44] M. Reed and B. Simon, *II: Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness*, Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics (Elsevier Science, 1975).
 - [45] This is because in order for all states in the system Hilbert space to be reachable by an initial state under CNOs, the initial state needs to be supplemented with a work bit which is depleted in the process.
 - [46] M. P. Woods, R. Silva, and J. Oppenheim, Autonomous Quantum Machines and Finite-Sized Clocks, *Annales Henri Poincaré* 10.1007/s00023-018-0736-9 (2018).
 - [47] M. P. Woods and Á. M. Alhambra, Continuous groups of transversal gates for quantum error correcting codes from finite clock reference frames, *Quantum* **4**, 245 (2020).
 - [48] P. Faist, S. Nezami, V. V. Albert, G. Salton, F. Pastawski, P. Hayden, and J. Preskill, Continuous symmetries and approximate quantum error correction, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 041018 (2020).
 - [49] Y. Yang, Y. Mo, J. M. Renes, G. Chiribella, and M. P. Woods, Optimal universal quantum error correction via bounded reference frames, *Phys. Rev. Research* **4**, 023107 (2022).
 - [50] M. P. Woods, R. Silva, G. Pütz, S. Stupar, and R. Renner, Quantum clocks are more accurate than classical ones, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 010319 (2022).
 - [51] Y. Yang and R. Renner, Ultimate limit on time signal generation (2020), arXiv:2004.07857.
 - [52] S. Bolebnane, M. P. Woods, and J. M. Renes, Waveform estimation from approximate quantum nondemolition measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 010502 (2021).
 - [53] More precisely, the dimension d_G is uniformly upper bounded for all t-CNOs on a fixed d_S -dimensional system Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_S .
 - [54] J. Scharlau and M. P. Mueller, Quantum Horn's lemma, finite heat baths, and the third law of thermodynamics, *Quantum* **2**, 54 (2018).
 - [55] Indeed, observe how the dimension d_G does not enter in either of the bounds in Theorems 1 or 2.
 - [56] H. Wilming and R. Gallego, Third law of thermodynamics as a single inequality, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 041033 (2017).
 - [57] This is by construction, c.f. Eq. (25) and definitions of CTO and t-CTO in Sec. II A.
 - [58] Note that the only case in which $d_G \text{tr}[\tau_G^2]$ does not diverge in the large d_G limit, is when the purity of the Gibbs state τ_G converges (in purity) to the maximally mixed state, since in that case $\text{tr}[\tau_G^2] = 1/d_G$. This is not the case for the baths needed to cool to absolute zero in which $\text{tr}[\tau_G^2]$ converges to a positive constant [54].
 - [59] M. Ozawa, Conservative quantum computing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 057902 (2002).
 - [60] J. Gea-Banacloche and M. Ozawa, Minimum-energy pulses for quantum logic cannot be shared, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 060301 (2006).
 - [61] J. Åberg, Catalytic coherence, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 150402 (2014).
 - [62] P. Skrzypczyk, A. J. Short, and S. Popescu, Extracting work from quantum systems, (2013), arXiv:1302.2811 [preprint].
 - [63] H. Tajima, N. Shiraishi, and K. Saito, Coherence cost for violating conservation laws, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 043374 (2020).
 - [64] R. Takagi and H. Tajima, Universal limitations on implementing resourceful unitary evolutions, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 022315 (2020).
 - [65] G. Chiribella, Y. Yang, and R. Renner, Fundamental energy requirement of reversible quantum operations, *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 021014 (2021).
 - [66] F. Clivaz, R. Silva, G. Haack, J. B. Brask, N. Brunner, and M. Huber, Unifying paradigms of quantum refrigeration: Fundamental limits of cooling and associated work costs, *Phys. Rev. E* **100**, 042130 (2019).
 - [67] F. Clivaz, R. Silva, G. Haack, J. B. Brask, N. Brunner, and M. Huber, Unifying paradigms of quantum refrigeration: A universal and attainable bound on cooling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 170605 (2019).
 - [68] S. Deffner and S. Campbell, Quantum speed limits: from Heisenberg's uncertainty principle to optimal quantum control, *J. Phys. A* **50**, 453001 (2017).
 - [69] J. D. Bekenstein and M. Schiffer, Quantum limitations on the storage and transmission of information, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. C* **01**, 355 (1990).
 - [70] H. Tajima, N. Shiraishi, and K. Saito, Uncertainty relations in implementation of unitary operations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 110403 (2018).
 - [71] Z. Liu and A. Winter, Resource theories of quantum channels and the universal role of resource erasure, (2019), arXiv:1904.04201 [preprint].
 - [72] C. Sparaciari, L. del Rio, C. M. Scandolo, P. Faist, and J. Oppenheim, The first law of general quantum resource theories, *Quantum* **4**, 259 (2020).
 - [73] Note that in order to make this conclusion, we interchange derivatives with the infinite sum, which is well known to hold for power series.
 - [74] This extension of the domain of α for which the inequality holds, follows trivially using proof by contradiction and noting that the functions in Eq. (A40) are continuous for $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$.
 - [75] Note that the range of α for which Eq. (A73) holds is the empty set if α_{\min} is large enough. Under such circumstances, this equation contains no information.
 - [76] One can also come to the same conclusions for the idealised momentum clock on a circle, rather than a line. In this case, $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}]$ still satisfy the Heisenberg form of the canonical commutation relations, but not the Weyl form. See [77] for details.
 - [77] J. C. Garrison and J. Wong, Canonically conjugate pairs, uncertainty relations, and phase operators, *J. Math. Phys.* **11**, 2242 (1970).
 - [78] A. Rényi, *On Measures of Entropy and Information*, Vol. 1 (Proceedings of the 4th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematics, Statistics and Probability, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1960) pp. 547–561.
 - [79] J. O. M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, Reversible transformations from pure to mixed states, and the unique measure of information, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 062104 (2014).
 - [80] R. F. Streater, *Statistical Dynamics: A Stochastic Ap-*

proach to Nonequilibrium Thermodynamics (Imperial College Press, 2009).

- [81] M. Klimesh, Inequalities that collectively completely characterize the catalytic majorization relation (2007), arXiv:0709.3680 [quant-ph].
- [82] S. Turgut, Catalytic transformations for bipartite pure states, J. Phys. A **40**, 12185 (2007).
- [83] This choice is so that we can use lemma 23, but one could make other choices if one made a different version of the bound.
- [84] E. P. Hanson and N. Datta, Tight uniform continuity bound for a family of entropies (2017), arXiv:1707.04249 [quant-ph].
- [85] One can easily prove this by contradiction. Imagine that the bound Eq. (A202) does not hold for $\alpha = 1$. Then there must exist an $\epsilon > 0$ such that it also does not hold for $\alpha = 1 - \epsilon$, but this would be a contradiction.
- [86] Note that the upper bound Eq. (A218) is non-negative. Therefore, if assumption $\|p^{-1}\|_{|\alpha|}/\|p'^{-1}\|_{|\alpha|} \geq 0$ does not hold, the bound will be trivially true since $S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p')$ will be negative.
- [87] Here it will be assumed that $g_\alpha(p, p')$ is differentiable w.r.t. α on the interval $(1, \alpha)$ for $\alpha \geq 1$ and $(\alpha, 1)$ for $\alpha \leq 1$. Later we will calculate explicitly its derivative, thus verifying this assumption.
- [88] Recall that $S_1(x) = -\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i| \ln |x_i|$.
- [89] T. van Erven and P. Harremoës, Renyi Divergence and Kullback-Leibler Divergence, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory. **60**, 3797 (2014).
- [90] N. Bourbaki, H. Eggleston, and S. Madan, *Topological Vector Spaces: Chapters 1-5*, 20. Jh.- (Springer, 2002).
- [91] M. Fannes, A continuity property of the entropy density for spin lattice systems, Commun. Math. Phys. **31**, 291 (1973).
- [92] K. Audenaert, A sharp continuity estimate for the von neumann entropy, J. Phys. A **40**, 8127 (2007).
- [93] A. Winter, Tight uniform continuity bounds for quantum entropies: Conditional entropy, relative entropy distance and energy constraints, Commun. Math. Phys. **347**, 291 (2016).
- [94] R. Vyborny, Mean value theorems and a taylor theorem for vector valued functions, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **24**, 69 (1981).
- [95] T. Wazewski, Une generalisation des theoremes sur les accroissements finis au cas des espaces de Banach et application a la generalisation du theoreme de l'Hospital, Ann. Soc. Polon. Math **24**, 132 (1951).
- [96] R. M. McLeod, Mean value theorems for vector valued functions, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. **14**, 197 (1965).
- [97] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, 1991).

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. Setting	3
A. Types of Thermodynamic Transformations	3
1. Background: Thermal Operations and variants	3
2. t-Catalytic Thermal Operations	3
B. Idealised Control, Clocks and Embezzling Catalysts	4
III. Results	6
A. Autonomous control for Catalytic Noisy Operations	6
B. Autonomous control for Catalytic Thermal Operations	8
IV. Discussion	10
V. Conclusions	12
Acknowledgments	12
A. Proof Overviews	14
1. Proof of Proposition 3	14
2. Proof of Theorem 1	14
3. Introduction to the Quasi-Ideal Clock and Proof of Theorem 2	19
a. Brief overview of the Quasi-Ideal Clock	19
4. Small error on the clock	19
a. Proof of Theorem 2	23
5. Proof of Theorem 3	25
a. Part A of proof of Theorem 3	25
b. Part B of proof of Theorem 3	27
6. Calculating $\Delta(t; x, y)$ for the Idealised Momentum Clock	29
References	30
A. Additional Information for Proof of Theorem 1	34
1. Preliminaries for proof of Theorem 1	34
a. Entropies, divergences: definitions and properties	34
b. Noisy operations, catalytic noisy operations, majorization and trumping	35
2. Lemmas on norms and fidelity	36
3. From approximate to strict inequalities	37
a. Main lemmas	37
b. Auxiliary lemmas	47
4. Tsallis continuity Theorem	49
5. Rényi entropy continuity theorem	53
a. Proof of 0). $\alpha \in [-\infty, -1]$	53
b. Proof of 1). $\alpha \in (0, 1)$	54
c. Proof of 2). $\alpha \in [\epsilon_0, \infty]$	54
d. Proof of 3.1) and 3.2). $\alpha \in [1/2, 2]$	55
6. Miscellaneous Lemmas and Theorems used in the proofs to the entropy continuity Theorems 7 and 8.	58
7. Refinement of Theorem 5.	60
B. Miscellaneous lemmas for the proof of Theorem 2	61
C. Miscellaneous lemma for the proof of Theorem 3	63
D. Continuity for perturbations: proof of Proposition 45	63
E. Proof of Theorem 4	65

Supplementary Material

Supplementary A: Additional Information for Proof of Theorem 1

In this section we provide the additional detailed steps of the proof of Theorem 1 which supplement section A 2.

1. Preliminaries for proof of Theorem 1

a. Entropies, divergences: definitions and properties

In this section (and throughout this appendix unless stated otherwise), \mathcal{P}_d will denote the set of normalised probability vectors in dimension d . Vectors $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_d$ will have entries denoted p_k, q_k respectively. We will also let $I_d \in \mathcal{P}_d$ be the uniform probability vector, namely $[I_d]_k = 1/d$, for $k = 1, \dots, d$.

Definition 8 (Rényi α -entropies). *The Rényi α -entropies for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ are defined to be*

$$S_\alpha(p) = \frac{\text{sgn}(\alpha)}{1-\alpha} \ln \sum_{k=1}^d p_k^\alpha, \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\text{sgn}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } \alpha \geq 0 \\ -1 & \text{for } \alpha < 0 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A2})$$

where the singular point at $\alpha = 1$ is defined by demanding that the Rényi α -entropies are continuous in $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and we use the conventions $\frac{a}{0} = \infty$, for $a > 0$ and $0 \ln 0 = 0$, $0^0 = 0$.

We will use the Rényi entropies evaluated on quantum states ρ in d dimensions. In which case $S_\alpha(\rho) := S_\alpha(p_\rho)$, where $p_\rho \in \mathcal{P}_d$ denotes the eigenvalues of ρ . This convention for extending the definition of functions evaluated on \mathcal{P}_d to functions evaluated on quantum states of dimension d , will be used throughout.

The $\alpha = 1$ value is of particular interest, since it corresponds to the Shannon entropy, namely

$$S_1(p) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} S_\alpha(p) = - \sum_{k=1}^d p_k \ln p_k. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Note that the Rényi α -entropies were originally defined in [78] for $\alpha \geq 0$ only, but later extended to $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ for convenience in [6]. Note that $S_\alpha(p)$ can be infinite. The other functions defined in this section also have this property.

For $p \in \mathcal{P}_d$ define

$$f_\alpha(p) = \sum_{i=1}^d p_i^\alpha, \quad (\text{A4})$$

for $\alpha \notin \{0, 1\}$ and

$$f_0(p) = - \sum_{i=1}^d \ln p_i, \quad f_1(p) = S_1(p) = - \sum_{i=1}^d p_i \ln p_i. \quad (\text{A5})$$

If some of p_k is equal to zero, the value of f_α for $\alpha \leq 0$ is set to infinity. For $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ these functions are concave, and for $\alpha > 1$ convex.

Definition 9 (Tsallis Entropy). *Tsallis-Aczel-Daroczy entropy is as follows.*

$$T_\alpha(p) = \text{sgn}(\alpha) \frac{1 - \sum_i p_i^\alpha}{\alpha - 1}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

for $\alpha \neq 0, 1$ and $\alpha > 0$.

The Tsallis Entropy is convex, subadditive (but not additive), and for $\alpha = 1$, through a limit, it gives Shannon entropy.

Definition 10 (Hellinger Relative Entropy). *Hellinger divergence for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is as follows*

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(p|q) = \frac{\text{sgn}(\alpha)}{\alpha - 1} \left(\sum_i p_i^\alpha q_i^{1-\alpha} - 1 \right), \quad (\text{A7})$$

where the singular points are defined by continuity and, in addition to the conventions in Def. (8), we have $\frac{0}{0} = 0$.

We have

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \mathcal{H}_\alpha(p|q) = D(p|q) \quad (\text{A8})$$

where

$$D(p|q) = \sum_i p_i \ln \frac{p_i}{q_i} \quad (\text{A9})$$

is *Kulback-Leibler entropy*. Moreover \mathcal{H}_α is monotonically increasing in α for $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$. In particular For $\alpha \geq 1$ we have

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(p|q) \geq D(p|q). \quad (\text{A10})$$

We have also Pinsker inequality

$$D(p|q) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|p - q\|_1^2 \quad (\text{A11})$$

We have

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(p|I_d/d) = d^{\alpha-1} (T_\alpha(I_d/d) - T_\alpha(p)), \quad (\text{A12})$$

for $\alpha \neq 0, 1$ and $\alpha > 0$.

Lemma 11 (Poor Subadditivity). *Let f be Schur convex, i.e. $x \succ y$ implies $f(x) \geq f(y)$. Then*

$$f(\rho_{AB}) \geq f\left(\rho_A \otimes \frac{\mathbb{1}_B}{d_B}\right), \quad (\text{A13})$$

where $\mathbb{1}_B$ is the identity operator on B .

Proof. Note that the state

$$\rho_A \otimes \frac{\mathbb{1}_B}{d_B} \quad (\text{A14})$$

can be obtained from ρ_{AB} by a mixture of unitaries (applying Haar random or discrete 2-design family) unitary on subsystem B). Thus by Uhlmann, the spectrum of original state ρ_{AB} majorizes the spectrum of the state (A14). Thus by Schur convexity of f we get (A13). \blacksquare

b. Noisy operations, catalytic noisy operations, majorization and trumping

So called noisy operations [79] are a subclass of thermal operations introduced earlier in [26, 80]. As explained in Sec. IIA of the main text, these are all operations that can be composed of: (i) adding the free resource with a maximally mixed state. (ii) applying an arbitrary unitary transformation. (iii) taking the partial trace.

It was shown that when the input and output state belong to a Hilbert space of the same dimension, the class of noisy operations is equivalent to mixture of unitaries. Therefore the condition that ρ can be transformed into σ is equivalent to majorization: ρ can be transformed into σ iff the spectrum p of ρ majorizes the spectrum q of σ . We say that $p \in \mathcal{P}_d$ majorizes $q \in \mathcal{P}_d$ if for all $l = 1, \dots, d$

$$\sum_{i=1}^l p_i^\downarrow \geq \sum_{i=1}^l q_i^\downarrow, \quad (\text{A15})$$

where p^\downarrow is a vector obtained by arranging the components of p in decreasing order: $p^\downarrow = (p_1^\downarrow, \dots, p_k^\downarrow)$ where $p_1^\downarrow \geq \dots \geq p_k^\downarrow$. We now explain how catalytic noisy operations can be understood in terms of so called “trumping”. As mentioned in Sec. II A of the main text, these are the noisy operations for which one is allowed to use an additional system as a catalyst — namely the additional system has to be returned to its initial state after the process. This idea, was first introduced to quantum information theory in the context of entanglement transformations [36].

Namely, we say that $p \in \mathcal{P}_d$ can be trumped into $q \in \mathcal{P}_d$ (or, that p catalytically majorizes q) if there exists some $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $r \in \mathcal{P}_k$ such that

$$p \otimes r \succ q \otimes r. \quad (\text{A16})$$

Klimesh [81] and Turgut [82] provided necessary and sufficient conditions for p to be trumped into q . Here we present conditions in the form provided by Klimesh.

Theorem 6 (Klimesh [81]). *Consider $p \in \mathcal{P}_d$ and $q \in \mathcal{P}_d$ which do not both contain components equal to zero (i.e. at least one of them is full rank), and let $p \neq q$. Then p can be trumped into q if and only if for all $\alpha \in (-\infty, \infty)$ we have*

$$g_\alpha(p) > g_\alpha(q) \quad (\text{A17})$$

where the functions g_α are given by

$$g_\alpha(p) = \begin{cases} \ln \sum_{i=1}^d p_i^\alpha & \text{for } \alpha > 1 \\ \sum_{i=1}^d p_i \ln p_i & \text{for } \alpha = 1 \\ -\ln \sum_{i=1}^d p_i^\alpha & \text{for } 0 < \alpha < 1 \\ -\sum_{i=1}^d \ln p_i & \text{for } \alpha = 0 \\ \ln \sum_{i=1}^d p_i^\alpha & \text{for } \alpha < 0 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A18})$$

2. Lemmas on norms and fidelity

This lemma says that if a state is close to a product, then it is also close to a product of its reductions.

Lemma 12. *We have for arbitrary states ρ_{AB} , η_A , η_B and pure state ψ_B ,*

$$\|\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \eta_B\|_1 \leq 2\|\rho_{AB} - \eta_A \otimes \eta_B\|_1 \quad (\text{A19})$$

and

$$\|\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_B\|_1 \leq 3\|\rho_{AB} - \eta_A \otimes \eta_B\|_1 \quad (\text{A20})$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \eta_B\|_1 &\leq \|\rho_{AB} - \eta_A \otimes \eta_B\|_1 + \|\eta_A \otimes \eta_B - \rho_A \otimes \eta_B\|_1 = \\ &= \|\rho_{AB} - \eta_A \otimes \eta_B\|_1 + \|\eta_A - \rho_A\|_1 \leq 2\|\rho_{AB} - \eta_A \otimes \eta_B\|_1 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A21})$$

The second inequality we prove in a similar way. ■

Next lemma says that, if a reduced state is close to a pure state then the total state is close to a product (of its reduction tensored with the pure state)

Lemma 13. *We have*

$$\|\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \psi_B\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\|\rho_B - \psi_B\|_1} \quad (\text{A22})$$

Proof. Consider $F(\rho_B, \psi_B)$. We have

$$F(\rho_B, \psi_B) = F(\phi_{ABC}, \psi_{AC} \otimes \psi_B) \quad (\text{A23})$$

where ϕ_{ABC} is a purification of ρ_B which we are free to choose the way we want, and ψ_{AC} is some pure state. By data processing we have

$$F(\phi_{ABC}, \psi_{AC} \otimes \psi_B) \leq F(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_A \otimes \psi_B) \quad (\text{A24})$$

where σ_A is reduction of ψ_{AC} . Using it and twice Fuchs-Graaf we thus get:

$$\|\rho_{AB} - \sigma_A \otimes \psi_B\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{1 - F^2(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_A \otimes \psi_B)} \leq 2\sqrt{1 - F^2(\rho_B, \psi_B)} \leq 2\sqrt{\|\rho_B - \psi_B\|_1} \quad (\text{A25})$$

Now, the proposition says that if two states have closed corresponding reductions, and one of the reductions is close to a pure state, then the states are close to one another. ■

Proposition 14. *Suppose that $\|\rho_A - \sigma_A\|_1 \leq \epsilon_1$, $\|\rho_B - \sigma_B\|_1 \leq \epsilon_2$, $\|\sigma_B - \psi_B\|_1 \leq \epsilon_3$. Then*

$$\|\rho_{AB} - \sigma_{AB}\|_1 \leq \epsilon_1 + 2\sqrt{\epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon_3}. \quad (\text{A26})$$

Proof. By triangle inequality we have

$$\|\rho_B - \psi_B\|_1 \leq \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3. \quad (\text{A27})$$

By lemma 13 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma_{AB} - \sigma_A \otimes \psi_B\|_1 &\leq 2\sqrt{\|\sigma_B - \psi_B\|_1} \\ \|\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \psi_B\|_1 &\leq 2\sqrt{\|\rho_B - \psi_B\|_1} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A28})$$

Sandwiching $\|\rho_{AB} - \sigma_{AB}\|_1$ with the above, we finish the proof. ■

3. From approximate to strict inequalities

a. Main lemmas

Lemma 15 (From approximate to strict inequalities through smoothing). *Let f be a concave, non negative function of $p \in \mathcal{P}_d$ such that $f(p) < f(I_d/d)$ for any $p \neq I_d/d$. Suppose that for some $\eta > 0$ we have*

$$f(p) \leq f(q) + \eta \quad (\text{A29})$$

Then for ϵ satisfying $\epsilon \leq 1/2$ and

$$\epsilon \geq \min_{\delta > 0} \max \left\{ \delta, \frac{2\eta}{f(I_d/d) - \max_{\|p - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \delta/2} f(p)} \right\} \quad (\text{A30})$$

we have

$$f(p) \leq f(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) - \min\{\eta, f(I_d/d) - f(p)\} \quad (\text{A31})$$

where $\tilde{q}(\epsilon)$ is given by

$$\tilde{q}(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} I_d/d & \text{when } \|q - I_d/d\|_1 < \epsilon \\ (1 - \epsilon)q + \epsilon I_d/d & \text{when } \|q - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \epsilon, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A32})$$

Proof. If state q satisfies $\|q - I_d/d\|_1 < \epsilon$ then $\tilde{q}(\epsilon) = I_d/d$. Then,

$$f(p) = f(I_d/d) + f(p) - f(I_d/d) = f(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) + (f(p) - f(I_d/d)). \quad (\text{A33})$$

Thus trivially

$$f(p) \leq f(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) - (f(I_d/d) - f(p)) \leq f(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) - \min\{\eta, f(I_d/d) - f(p)\}. \quad (\text{A34})$$

Now suppose that

$$\|q - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \epsilon. \quad (\text{A35})$$

From concavity of f we have

$$f(\tilde{q}_\epsilon) \geq (1 - \epsilon)f(q) + \epsilon f(I_d/d) \quad (\text{A36})$$

hence

$$f(q) \leq \frac{f(\tilde{q}_\epsilon)}{1 - \epsilon} - \frac{\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon} f(I_d/d). \quad (\text{A37})$$

Then from (A29)

$$f(p) \leq f(q) + \eta \leq \frac{f(\tilde{q}_\epsilon)}{1 - \epsilon} - \frac{\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon} f(I_d/d) + \eta = f(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) + \frac{\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon} (f(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) - f(I_d/d)) + \eta \leq f(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) + \epsilon (f(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) - f(I_d/d)) + \eta. \quad (\text{A38})$$

Thus it remains to show that the ϵ satisfying (A30) and $\epsilon \leq 1/2$ satisfies

$$\epsilon (f(I_d/d) - f(\tilde{q}(\epsilon))) \geq 2\eta. \quad (\text{A39})$$

To this end, note that (A30) implies

$$\epsilon \geq \frac{2\eta}{f(I_d/d) - \max_{\|\rho - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \epsilon/2} f(\rho)}. \quad (\text{A40})$$

Then, note that

$$\|\tilde{q}(\epsilon) - I_d/d\|_1 = \|(1 - \epsilon)q + \epsilon I_d/d - I_d/d\|_1 = (1 - \epsilon)\|q - I_d/d\|_1 \geq (1 - \epsilon)\epsilon. \quad (\text{A41})$$

Thus, for $\epsilon \leq 1/2$ we have $\|\tilde{q}_\epsilon - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \epsilon/2$, so that

$$f(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) \leq \max_{\|\rho - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \epsilon/2} f(\rho), \quad (\text{A42})$$

hence (A40) implies

$$\epsilon \geq \frac{2\eta}{f(I_d/d) - f(\tilde{q}(\epsilon))}, \quad (\text{A43})$$

which is equivalent to (A39). ■

Lemma 16. *Let g be convex, non-negative function with the domain $D \in \mathbb{R}$. Let also g be multiplicative, i.e. $g(xy) = g(x)g(y)$ and $g(1) = 1$. Let us denote $f_g(p) = \sum_{i=1}^d g(p_i)$. Then for any probability distribution $p \in \mathcal{P}_d$ satisfying $\|p - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \delta$ we have*

$$f_g(p) - f_g(I_d/d) \geq \frac{f_g(I_d/d)}{f_g(I_2/2)} \left(f_g(p_{(2)}^\delta) - f_g(I_2) \right), \quad (\text{A44})$$

where

$$p_{(2)}^\delta = \left\{ \frac{1 + \delta/2}{2}, \frac{1 - \delta/2}{2} \right\}. \quad (\text{A45})$$

If g is concave, and otherwise satisfies all the above assumptions we have

$$f_g(I_d/d) - f_g(p) \geq \frac{f_g(I_d/d)}{f_g(I_2/2)} \left(f_g(I_2/2) - f_g(p_{(2)}^\delta) \right). \quad (\text{A46})$$

Remark 17. Lemma 16 applies to $g(x) = x^\alpha$ for $\alpha > 0$. The function f_g for such g we will denote by \tilde{f}_α . We then obtain:

$$\tilde{f}_\alpha(p) - \tilde{f}_\alpha(I_d/d) \geq \frac{d^{1-\alpha}}{2^{1-\alpha}} \left(\tilde{f}_\alpha(p_{(2)}^\delta) - \tilde{f}_\alpha(I_2/2) \right) \quad (\text{A47})$$

for $\alpha > 1$ (i.e. when x^α is convex), and

$$\tilde{f}_\alpha(I_d/d) - \tilde{f}_\alpha(p) \geq \frac{d^{1-\alpha}}{2^{1-\alpha}} \left(\tilde{f}_\alpha(I_2/2) - \tilde{f}_\alpha(p_{(2)}^\delta) \right) \quad (\text{A48})$$

for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (i.e. when x^α is concave). From these, one gets:

$$T_\alpha(I_d/d) - T_\alpha(p) \geq \frac{d^{(1-\alpha)}}{2^{(1-\alpha)}} \left(T_\alpha(I_2/2) - T_\alpha(p_{(2)}^\delta) \right) \quad (\text{A49})$$

for all $\alpha > 0$ (for $\alpha = 1$ it is obtained by continuity, and gives inequality for Shannon entropies).

Proof of Lemma 16. Let g be concave. Then $f_g(p)$ is concave as a function of probability distribution $p \in \mathcal{P}_d$. For any distribution p we consider its twirled version, that depends on just two parameters: the number k of p_i 's greater than or equal to $1/d$ and $\delta = \|p - I_d/d\|_1$.

$$\tilde{p} = \left\{ \underbrace{\frac{1}{d} + \frac{\delta/2}{k}, \dots, \frac{1}{d} + \frac{\delta/2}{k}}_k, \underbrace{\frac{1}{d} - \frac{\delta/2}{d-k}, \dots, \frac{1}{d} - \frac{\delta/2}{d-k}}_{d-k} \right\}. \quad (\text{A50})$$

The \tilde{p} can be obtained from p by mixture of permutations (we consider two subset of p_i 's: those larger than $1/d$ and those smaller than or equal to $1/d$, and randomly permute elements within each of the subsets. Hence by concavity we have

$$f_g(p) \leq f_g(\tilde{p}) = d(r_1 g(x_1) + r_2 g(x_2)) \quad (\text{A51})$$

where we denoted $r_1 = k/d, r_2 = (d-k)/d$ and $x_1 = 1/d + \delta/2d, x_2 = 1/d - \delta/(2(d-k))$. Note that $r_1 + r_2 = 1$, $r_1 x_1 + r_2 x_2 = 1/d$. One finds (see Fig. 7) that if $x_2 \leq \tilde{x}_2 \leq 1/d \leq \tilde{x}_1 \leq x_1$ then, due to concavity of the function f_g ,




FIG. 7: Geometric proof of the inequality (A52). Due to concavity of f the interval A between the points $(x_1, f(x_1))$ and $(x_2, f(x_2))$ together with the part of the graph of the function laying between these two points enclose a convex body (indicated in red). Therefore the interval \tilde{A} between the points $(\tilde{x}_1, f(\tilde{x}_1))$ and $(\tilde{x}_2, f(\tilde{x}_2))$ must lie within the body. By assumption, the latter interval has nonempty intersection \tilde{a} with the line $x = 1/d$. This intersection must be therefore above the intersection a of the latter line with the interval A , which means that inequality (A52) holds.

we have

$$r_1 f_g(x_1) + r_2 f_g(x_2) \leq \tilde{r}_1 f_g(\tilde{x}_1) + \tilde{r}_2 f_g(\tilde{x}_2) \quad (\text{A52})$$

provided $\tilde{r}_1 + \tilde{r}_2 = 1$, $\tilde{r}_1 \tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{r}_2 \tilde{x}_2 = 1/d$. In Fig. 7 a graphical proof is given. The analytical argument is as follows. One can first easily prove by concavity that the interval \tilde{A} is above the interval A . Namely, it is enough to prove that the ends of the interval \tilde{A} are above interval A , which in turn, follows directly from concavity. Now, the left hand side of (A52) is the second argument of the point from interval A with first argument being $1/d$, while the right hand side is the second argument of the point from the interval \tilde{A} (first argument being $1/d$), hence the inequality follows.

Now let us exploit (A52). Since $1 \leq k \leq d$ we can choose

$$\tilde{x}_1 = \frac{1}{d} + \frac{\delta/2}{d}, \quad \tilde{x}_2 = \frac{1}{d} - \frac{\delta/2}{d} \quad (\text{A53})$$

and $\tilde{r}_1 = \tilde{r}_2 = \frac{1}{2}$. We thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_g(p) &\leq d \left[\frac{1}{2} g \left(\frac{1}{d} + \frac{\delta/2}{d} \right) + \frac{1}{2} g \left(\frac{1}{d} - \frac{\delta/2}{d} \right) \right] = \\ &= \frac{d}{2} \frac{g(2)}{g(d)} \left[g \left(\frac{1+\delta/2}{2} \right) + g \left(\frac{1-\delta/2}{2} \right) \right] = \\ &= \frac{f_g(I_d/d)}{f_g(I_2/2)} f_g(p_{(2)}^\delta) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A54})$$

where multiplicativity of g was used. From this we obtain (A48). Eq. (A47) is proven similarly. \blacksquare

Lemma 18. *Let $p_{\min}(p) = \min_i p_i$ and $p_{\max}(p) = \max_i p_i$. Then for arbitrary p such that $\|p - I_d/d\|_1 = \delta$ we have*

$$p_{\min}(p) \leq \frac{p_{\min}(I_d/d)}{p_{\min}(I_2/2)} p_{\min}(p_{(2)}^\delta) = \frac{2}{d} p_{\min}(p_{(2)}^\delta) \quad (\text{A55})$$

and

$$p_{\max}(p) \geq \frac{p_{\max}(I_d/d)}{p_{\max}(I_2/2)} p_{\max}(p_{(2)}^\delta) = \frac{2}{d} p_{\max}(p_{(2)}^\delta) \quad (\text{A56})$$

where

$$p_{(2)}^\delta = \left\{ \frac{1+\delta/2}{2}, \frac{1-\delta/2}{2} \right\}. \quad (\text{A57})$$

Proof. We use again the twirled version of p of Eq. (A50). By convexity of p_{\max} , we have

$$p_{\max}(p) \geq p_{\max}(\tilde{p}) \geq \frac{1}{d} + \frac{\delta/2}{d} = \frac{2}{d} p_{\max} \quad (\text{A58})$$

Similarly one proves for p_{\min} . \blacksquare

Proposition 19. *Let $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_d$ and define*

$$\tilde{q}(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} I_d/d & \text{when } \|q - I_d/d\|_1 < \epsilon \\ (1-\epsilon)q + \epsilon I_d/d & \text{when } \|q - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \epsilon \end{cases} \quad (\text{A59})$$

Denote also

$$\epsilon_T(\alpha) = (16 \eta_\alpha d^{\alpha-1})^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad \text{for } \alpha \geq 1 \quad (\text{A60})$$

$$\epsilon_T(\alpha) = (16 \eta_\alpha d^{\alpha-1} \alpha^{-1})^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1) \quad (\text{A61})$$

$$\epsilon_\infty(\alpha) = 4 \sqrt{\frac{\ln d}{\alpha}} + \eta_\infty \quad \text{for } \alpha > 1 \quad (\text{A62})$$

$$\epsilon_0(\alpha) = \left(\frac{d-1}{d} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (\text{A63})$$

Now assuming, that all the above epsilons $(\epsilon_T, \epsilon_\infty, \epsilon_0)$ are no greater than $1/2$ we have

(i) for $\alpha > 1$

$$S_\infty(p) \leq S_\infty(q) + \eta_\infty, \quad \text{implies} \quad S_\alpha(p) \leq S_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon_\infty(\alpha))) - \min \{ \eta_\infty, \ln d - S_1(p) \} \quad (\text{A64})$$

(ii) For $\alpha > 0$

$$T_\alpha(p) \leq T_\alpha(q) + \eta_\alpha, \quad \text{implies} \quad T_\alpha(p) \leq T_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon_T(\alpha))) - \min \{ \eta_\alpha, T_\alpha(I_d/d) - T_\alpha(p) \} \quad (\text{A65})$$

(iii) For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, for p not full rank we have

$$S_\alpha(p) \leq S_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon_0(\alpha))) - \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{d}{d-1} \quad (\text{A66})$$

Proof. Proof of (i). Fix some ϵ , and consider $\tilde{q}(\epsilon)$ given by (A59). Consider first the case when $\|q - I_d/d\|_1 \leq \epsilon$. Let us show, that in this case, (i) holds for any ϵ . Indeed, we have $\tilde{q}(\epsilon) = I_d/d$, hence

$$S_\alpha(p) = S_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) - (\ln d - S_\alpha(p)). \quad (\text{A67})$$

Since S_α is monotonically decreasing in α , we can replace on the right-hand-side $S_\alpha(p)$ with $S_1(p)$

$$S_\alpha(p) \leq S_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) - (S(I_d/d) - S_1(p)) \quad (\text{A68})$$

which is what we want. Now we turn to less trivial case when $\|q - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \epsilon$. We write

$$S_\infty(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) - S_\infty(q) = -\ln((1-\epsilon)q_{\max} + \epsilon/d) + \ln q_{\max} = -\ln\left((1-\epsilon) + \frac{\epsilon}{dq_{\max}}\right). \quad (\text{A69})$$

By lemma 18 and $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x$ we bound it further as follows

$$S_\infty(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) - S_\infty(q) \geq -\ln\left(1 - \epsilon\left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon/2}\right)\right) \geq \epsilon \frac{\epsilon/2}{1 + \epsilon/2} \geq \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \quad (\text{A70})$$

We now use the fact that for $\alpha > 1$

$$S_\alpha(p) \leq \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} S_\infty(p). \quad (\text{A71})$$

We get

$$S_\alpha(q_\epsilon) \geq S_\infty(q_\epsilon) \geq S_\infty(q) + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \geq S_\infty(p) + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} - \eta_\infty \geq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} S_\alpha(p) + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} - \eta_\infty \geq S_\alpha(p) - \frac{\ln d}{\alpha} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} - \eta_\infty, \quad (\text{A72})$$

where the second inequality holds by assumption of (i), while the last inequality comes from $S_\alpha(p) \leq \ln d$ for any $p \in \mathcal{P}_d$. Thus, provided

$$-\frac{\ln d}{\alpha} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} > 2\eta_\infty, \quad (\text{A73})$$

we have $S_\alpha(q_\epsilon) > S_\alpha(p) + \eta_\infty$. If we now take $\epsilon = \epsilon_\infty(\alpha)$ we see that (A73) is satisfied, hence we obtain that for $\|q - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \epsilon_\infty(\alpha)$

$$S_\alpha(p) \leq S_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) - \eta_\infty. \quad (\text{A74})$$

Using this and (A68) we get that for arbitrary q we have

$$S_\alpha(p) \leq S_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) - \min\{\eta_\infty, \ln d - S_1(p)\}. \quad (\text{A75})$$

This ends the proof of part (i).

Proof of (ii). Since T_α is concave function (in probability distributions) for all $\alpha > 0$ from lemma 15 we obtain that for ϵ given by

$$\epsilon = \min_{\delta} \max \left\{ \delta, \frac{2\eta}{T_\alpha(I_d/d) - \max_p T_\alpha(p)} \right\}, \quad (\text{A76})$$

where maximum is taken over all $p \in \mathcal{P}_d$ satisfying $\|p - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \delta/2$, we have

$$T_\alpha(p) \leq T_\alpha(\tilde{q}_\epsilon) - \min\{\eta_\alpha, T_\alpha(I_d/d) - T_\alpha(p)\}. \quad (\text{A77})$$

By Eq. A49 (a consequence of lemma 16) we have for such p

$$T_\alpha(I_d/d) - \max_p T_\alpha(p) \geq \left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{1-\alpha} \left(T_\alpha(I_2/2) - T_\alpha(p_{(2)}^\delta)\right) \quad (\text{A78})$$

for all $\alpha > 0$. The right hand side can be expressed in terms of Hellinger relative entropy (Eq. A7) by virtue of Eq. (A12)

$$\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{1-\alpha} (T_\alpha(I_2/2) - T_\alpha(p_{(2)}^\delta)) = d^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{H}_\alpha(p_{(2)}^\delta | I_2/2). \quad (\text{A79})$$

We thus obtained that for all $\alpha > 0$

$$\epsilon \leq \min_{\delta} \max \left\{ \delta, \frac{2\eta}{d^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(p_{(2)}^{\delta} | I_2/2)} \right\}. \quad (\text{A80})$$

Now from lemma 25 we have

$$\mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(p_{(2)}^{\delta} | I_2/2) \geq \frac{\alpha}{8} \delta^2 \quad (\text{A81})$$

for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and

$$\mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(p_{(2)}^{\delta} | I_2/2) \geq \frac{1}{8} \delta^2 \quad (\text{A82})$$

for $\alpha > 1$. Thus for $\alpha > 1$

$$\epsilon \leq \min_{\delta} \left\{ \delta, (16\eta d^{\alpha-1})/\delta^2 \right\} = (16\eta d^{\alpha-1})^{1/3} \quad (\text{A83})$$

and for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$\epsilon \leq \min_{\delta} \left\{ \delta, (16\eta d^{\alpha-1} \alpha^{-1})/\delta^2 \right\} = (16\eta d^{\alpha-1} \alpha^{-1})^{1/3}. \quad (\text{A84})$$

The case $\alpha = 1$ we get by taking the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$.

Proof of (iii). For $\alpha > 1$ for all full rank distributions $p \in \mathcal{P}_d$ we have

$$S_{\alpha}(p) \geq d p_{\min}^{\alpha} \quad (\text{A85})$$

where p_{\min} is the minimal element of p . For distribution $\tilde{q}(\epsilon_0) = (1 - \epsilon_0)q + \epsilon_0 I_d/d$, since $p_{\min}(\tilde{q}(\epsilon_0)) \geq \epsilon_0/d$, irrespectively of what was q we obtain

$$S_{\alpha}(\tilde{q}(\epsilon_0)) \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln \left(d \left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{d} \right)^{\alpha} \right) \quad (\text{A86})$$

Now, since p was assumed to be not full rank, we have

$$S_{\alpha}(p) \leq \ln(d-1) \quad (\text{A87})$$

Now, (A63) assures that

$$\frac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln \left(d \left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{d} \right)^{\alpha} \right) - \ln(d-1) \geq \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{d}{d-1} \quad (\text{A88})$$

for $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$. Using it, we then get

$$S_{\alpha}(p) = S_{\alpha}(\tilde{q}(\epsilon_0)) - (S_{\alpha}(\tilde{q}(\epsilon_0)) - S_{\alpha}(p)) \leq S_{\alpha}(\tilde{q}(\epsilon_0)) - \left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln \left(d \left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{d} \right)^{\alpha} \right) - \ln(d-1) \right) \leq S_{\alpha}(\tilde{q}(\epsilon_0)) - \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{d}{d-1} \quad (\text{A89})$$

i.e. $S_{\alpha}(p) \geq S_{\alpha}(\tilde{q}) + \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{d}{d-1}$. ■

Lemma 20. For all probability distributions q , and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon'$, $\epsilon, \epsilon' \in (0, 1)$ the Renyi and Tsallis entropies satisfy

$$T_{\alpha}(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) \leq T_{\alpha}(\tilde{q}(\epsilon')) \quad (\text{A90})$$

$$S_{\alpha}(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) \leq S_{\alpha}(\tilde{q}(\epsilon')) \quad (\text{A91})$$

for all $\alpha \geq 0$, where $\tilde{q}(\epsilon)$ (introduced in Prop. 19), is given by

$$\tilde{q}(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} I_d/d & \text{if } \|q - I_d/d\|_1 < \epsilon \\ (1-\epsilon)q + \epsilon I_d/d & \text{if } \|q - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \epsilon \end{cases} \quad (\text{A92})$$

Proof. We will start by proving Eq. (A91) first.

The proof of Eq. (A91) will be divided into two sub cases. We start with the easiest case.

Case 1: $\|q - I_d/d\|_1 < \epsilon$

It follows that $S_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) = S_\alpha(I_d/d)$ and also since $\|q - I_d/d\|_1 < \epsilon'$ we have $S_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon')) = S_\alpha(I_d/d)$ and thus Eq. (A91) holds for this case.

Case 2: $\|q - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \epsilon$.

It follows that $S_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon)) = S_\alpha((1 - \epsilon)q + \epsilon I_d/d)$. We now have to further sub-divide into two possibilities.

Case 2.1: $\|q - I_d/d\|_1 < \epsilon' \implies S_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon')) = S_\alpha(I_d/d)$

Case 2.2: $\|q - I_d/d\|_1 \geq \epsilon' \implies S_\alpha(\tilde{q}(\epsilon')) = S_\alpha((1 - \epsilon')q + \epsilon' I_d/d)$.

Therefore, for Case 2 we have to prove that

$$S_\alpha((1 - \epsilon)q + \epsilon I_d/d) \leq S_\alpha((1 - \epsilon')q + \epsilon' I_d/d) \quad (\text{A93})$$

$$S_\alpha((1 - \epsilon)q + \epsilon I_d/d) \leq S_\alpha(I_d/d) \quad (\text{A94})$$

both hold under the quantifies stated in the Lemma. We first observe that Eq. (A93) implies Eq. (A94) by setting $\epsilon' = 1$. Thus we only need to prove Eq. (A93). For this, we first observe that

$$(1 - \epsilon')q + \epsilon' I_d/d = \gamma((1 - \epsilon)q + \epsilon I_d/d) + (1 - \gamma)I_d/d, \quad (\text{A95})$$

where $\gamma := (1 - \epsilon')/(1 - \epsilon) \in [0, 1]$. Hence the vector $(1 - \epsilon')q + \epsilon' I_d/d$ is a mixture of $(1 - \epsilon)q + \epsilon I_d/d$ with the uniform distribution I_d/d . As such $(1 - \epsilon)q + \epsilon I_d/d$ majorises $(1 - \epsilon')q + \epsilon' I_d/d$, and since the Renyi entropy is Schur concave for all $\alpha \geq 0$, Eq. (A93) follows by Schur concavity.

We now need to prove Eq. (A90) to complete the proof of the lemma. From the definitions of the Renyi and Tsallis entropy, it follows

$$T_\alpha(S_\alpha) = \frac{\exp\left(\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\right) S_\alpha\right) - 1}{1 - \alpha}, \quad (\text{A96})$$

which is manifestly a non-decreasing function for all $\alpha > 0$, thus $S_\alpha(p) \leq S_\alpha(p')$ iff $T_\alpha(p) \leq T_\alpha(p')$, and Eq. (A90) follows from Eq. (A91). \blacksquare

Lemma 21. *Let $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}_d$ Denote $\epsilon = \|p - p'\|_1$. Then*

- For $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$ we have

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq 6d \left(\frac{\epsilon}{d}\right)^\alpha \quad (\text{A97})$$

- for $\alpha \in [1/2, 2]$ we have

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq -32d \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{d}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{d}} \quad \text{if } \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{32d^2} \quad (\text{A98})$$

- for $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$ we have

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq 6\sqrt{d\epsilon} \quad (\text{A99})$$

- We have

$$|S_\infty(p) - S_\infty(p')| \leq d\epsilon \quad (\text{A100})$$

Proof. We will prove Eqs. (A97) to (A100) individual.

Proof of (A97). from (A165) we have for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq 2 \frac{[\alpha]}{[\alpha - 1]} d \left(\frac{\epsilon}{d}\right)^{\alpha/[\alpha]} \quad (\text{A101})$$

We then estimate for $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$

$$2 \frac{[\alpha]}{[\alpha-1]} d \left(\frac{\epsilon}{d} \right)^{\alpha/[\alpha]} \leq 4d \left(\frac{\epsilon}{d} \right)^\alpha \quad (\text{A102})$$

Proof of (A98). From (A167) we have for $\alpha > 1$ and $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2e^{1/\alpha}d^\alpha}$

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq 8 \left[\epsilon \ln \left(\frac{d^{3/2}}{4} \right) - \epsilon \ln \epsilon \right] \quad (\text{A103})$$

We then have

$$8 \left[\epsilon \ln \left(\frac{d^{3/2}}{4} \right) - \epsilon \ln \epsilon \right] \leq -12d \frac{\epsilon}{d} \ln \frac{\epsilon}{d} \quad (\text{A104})$$

so that for $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{8d^2}$ and $1 \leq \alpha \leq 2$

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq -12d \frac{\epsilon}{d} \ln \frac{\epsilon}{d} \quad (\text{A105})$$

We now combine it with (A166) which for $\alpha \in [1/2, 1]$ implies that for $\epsilon \leq d \left(\frac{1}{2ed} \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{30d}$,

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq 4d \left[\left(\frac{3}{2\alpha} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{\epsilon}{d} \right)^\alpha \ln d - \left(\frac{\epsilon}{d} \right)^\alpha \ln \epsilon \right] \quad (\text{A106})$$

$$\leq -32d \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{d}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{d}}. \quad (\text{A107})$$

Taking worse of the two bounds we get that for $\alpha \in [1/2, 2]$ and $\epsilon \leq 1/(32d^2)$

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq -32d \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{d}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{d}}. \quad (\text{A108})$$

Proof of (A99). From (A165) for all $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ we have

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq 2 \frac{[\alpha]}{[\alpha-1]} d \left(\frac{\epsilon}{d} \right)^{\alpha/[\alpha]} \quad (\text{A109})$$

Using $\alpha \geq 2$ and $\epsilon/d \leq 1$ (always true, since $d \geq 2$ and $\epsilon \leq 2$) we have

$$2 \frac{[\alpha]}{[\alpha-1]} d \left(\frac{\epsilon}{d} \right)^{\alpha/[\alpha]} \leq 6d \left(\frac{\epsilon}{d} \right)^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)} \leq 6d \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{d}} = 6\sqrt{\epsilon d} \quad (\text{A110})$$

Proof of (A100).

$$|\ln p_{\max} - \ln p'_{\max}| = \left| \ln \left(\frac{|p_{\max} - p'_{\max}|}{\min\{p_{\max}, p'_{\max}\}} + 1 \right) \right| \leq \frac{|p_{\max} - p'_{\max}|}{\min\{p_{\max}, p'_{\max}\}} \leq d\epsilon \quad (\text{A111})$$

■

Lemma 22. *Under the notation from the proof of Theorem 5 consider the expression*

$$\max \{ \varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min}), \varepsilon_{\max}(\alpha_{\max}), \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmid} \} \quad (\text{A112})$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min}) = \max \{ \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmin}(\alpha_{\min}), \bar{\epsilon}_0(\alpha_{\min}) \} \quad (\text{A113})$$

$$\varepsilon_{\max}(\alpha_{\max}) = \max \{ \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmax}(\alpha_{\max}), \bar{\epsilon}_\infty(\alpha_{\max}) \}. \quad (\text{A114})$$

There exists $\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha_{\max} \in (2, \infty)$ such that

$$\max \{ \varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min}), \varepsilon_{\max}(\alpha_{\max}), \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmid} \} \leq \epsilon_{res}(\epsilon_{emb}, d_S, D_{Cat}) \quad (\text{A115})$$

where $\epsilon_{res}(\epsilon_{emb}, d_S, D_{Cat})$ is given by Eq. (A14), i.e.,

$$\epsilon_{res}(\epsilon_{emb}, d_S, D_{Cat}) := 5 \sqrt{\frac{d_S^{5/3} + 4(\ln d_S D_{Cat}) \ln d_S}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})}} + d_S D_{Cat} \epsilon_{emb}^{1/6} + 5 \left((d_S D_{Cat})^2 \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{d_S D_{Cat}}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{d_S D_{Cat}}{\epsilon_{emb}}} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (\text{A116})$$

Proof. We will start with what appears to be the most significant term, $\varepsilon_{\max}(\alpha_{\max})$. Writing it explicitly, using Eqs. (A61), (A64) we have

$$\varepsilon_{\max}(\alpha_{\max}) = \max \left\{ (96\sqrt{D\epsilon_{emb}}D^{\alpha_{\max}})^{\frac{1}{3}}, 4\sqrt{\frac{\ln d_S}{\alpha_{\max}}} + D\epsilon_{emb} \right\}. \quad (\text{A117})$$

We now re-parametrizing α_{\max} in terms of a parameter $\beta_0 > 0$ via $\alpha_{\max} = -\beta_0(\ln \epsilon_{emb})/(2 \ln D)$, to find

$$\max \left\{ (96\sqrt{D\epsilon_{emb}}D^{\alpha_{\max}})^{\frac{1}{3}}, 4\sqrt{\frac{\ln d_S}{\alpha_{\max}}} + D\epsilon_{emb} \right\} = \max \left\{ (96)^{1/3} D^{1/6} \epsilon_{emb}^{(1-\beta_0)/6}, 4\sqrt{\frac{2(\ln D)(\ln d_S)}{-\beta_0 \ln \epsilon_{emb}}} + D\epsilon_{emb} \right\}. \quad (\text{A118})$$

With this parametrisation, we see that we need $(1 - \beta_0) > 0$ if the 1st term in the square brackets is to tend to zero as ϵ_{emb} goes to zero. Taking this and the requirement $\alpha_{\max} \geq 2$ into account we have

$$\frac{4 \ln D}{-\ln \epsilon_{emb}} \leq \beta_0 < 1. \quad (\text{A119})$$

From Eqs. (A119) and (A118) we see that we need ϵ_{emb} to decay faster than any power of D . Specifically, it has to be of the form $\epsilon_{emb}(D) = e^{-f(D)(\ln D)}$ where $\lim_{D \rightarrow +\infty} f(D) = +\infty$. Taking this into account, a reasonably good bound can be deduced by observing

$$(96)^{1/3} D^{1/6} \epsilon_{emb}^{(1-\beta_0)/6} \leq 5\sqrt{D} \sqrt{\epsilon_{emb}^{(1-\beta_0)/3}} < 5\sqrt{\frac{2(\ln D)(\ln d_S)}{-\beta_0 \ln \epsilon_{emb}}} + D\epsilon_{emb}^{(1-\beta_0)/3} \quad (\text{A120})$$

and

$$4\sqrt{\frac{2(\ln D)(\ln d_S)}{-\beta_0 \ln \epsilon_{emb}}} + D\epsilon_{emb} < 5\sqrt{\frac{2(\ln D)(\ln d_S)}{-\beta_0 \ln \epsilon_{emb}}} + D\epsilon_{emb}^{(1-\beta_0)/3}. \quad (\text{A121})$$

Given the constraints which β_0 must satisfy, its exact choice is of little relevance. We therefore set it to $\beta_0 = 1/2$. Thus we have for the appropriate α_{\max} ,

$$\varepsilon_{\max}(\alpha_{\max}) \leq 5\sqrt{\frac{2(\ln D)(\ln d_S)}{-\beta_0 \ln \epsilon_{emb}}} + D\epsilon_{emb}^{(1-\beta_0)/3} = 5\sqrt{\frac{4(\ln D)(\ln d_S)}{-\ln \epsilon_{emb}}} + D\epsilon_{emb}^{1/6}, \quad \text{if} \quad \frac{8 \ln D}{-\ln \epsilon_{emb}} \leq 1. \quad (\text{A122})$$

We will now deal with the term $\varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min})$ which plunging in Eqs. (A61) and (A65), reads

$$\varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min})^3 = \max \left\{ 96D \frac{\epsilon_{emb}^{\alpha_{\min}}}{\alpha_{\min}}, \left[\left(\frac{d_S - 1}{d_S} \right)^{3/2} \right]^{1/\alpha_{\min}} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_{\min}} \max \left\{ 96D \epsilon_{emb}^{\alpha_{\min}}, \left[\left(\frac{d_S - 1}{d_S} \right)^{3/2} \right]^{1/\alpha_{\min}} \right\}. \quad (\text{A123})$$

We will now solve for α_{\min} the equation

$$96D \epsilon_{emb}^{\alpha_{\min}} = \left[\left(\frac{d_S - 1}{d_S} \right)^{3/2} \right]^{1/\alpha_{\min}}, \quad (\text{A124})$$

which can be written as

$$\alpha_{\min}^2 \ln(\epsilon_{emb}) + \alpha_{\min} \ln(96D) - \frac{3}{2} \ln \left(\frac{d_S - 1}{d_S} \right). \quad (\text{A125})$$

Noting that $\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1)$ we take only the non-negative root, namely

$$\alpha_{\min}^* = \frac{\ln(96D) + \sqrt{\ln^2(96D) + 6(\ln \epsilon_{emb})(\ln(1 - 1/d_S))}}{-2 \ln(\epsilon_{emb})}. \quad (\text{A126})$$

Now note that the l.h.s. of Eq. (A124) is monotonically increasing with α_{\min} while the r.h.s. is monotonically decreasing with α_{\min} . Therefore, since $\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1)$, we conclude

$$\varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min})^3 \leq \frac{96D\epsilon_{emb}^\gamma}{\gamma}, \quad \gamma = \begin{cases} \alpha_{\min}^* & \text{if } \alpha_{\min}^* < 1 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A127})$$

Finally we will derive conditions for when $\alpha_{\min}^* < 1$. To do so, we generalise the constraint in Eq. A122 to

$$\frac{\beta_1 \ln D}{-\ln \epsilon_{emb}} \leq 1, \quad 8 \leq \beta_1. \quad (\text{A128})$$

Eq. (A126) can now be upper bounded by

$$\alpha_{\min}^* = \frac{\ln(96D)}{-2 \ln \epsilon_{emb}} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\ln(96D)}{\ln \epsilon_{emb}} \right)^2 + 6 \frac{\ln(1-1/d_S)}{\ln \epsilon_{emb}}} \leq \frac{\ln(96D)}{2\beta_1 \ln D} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\ln(96D)}{\beta_1 \ln D} \right)^2 - 6 \frac{\ln(1-1/d_S)}{\beta_1 \ln D}} \quad (\text{A129})$$

$$= \frac{\ln(96)}{2\beta_1 \ln(D_{\text{Cat}} d_S)} + \frac{1}{2\beta_1} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\ln(96)}{\beta_1 \ln(D_{\text{Cat}} d_S)} + \frac{1}{\beta_1} \right)^2 - 6 \frac{\ln(1-1/d_S)}{\beta_1 \ln(D_{\text{Cat}} d_S)}} \quad (\text{A130})$$

Thus recalling $D = D_{\text{Cat}} d_S$ and noting that Eq. (A130) is monotonically decreasing in D and d_S , we conclude that for all $D_{\text{Cat}} \geq D_{\text{Cat}}^*$ and $d_S \geq d_S^*$,

$$\alpha_{\min}^* \leq \frac{\ln(96)}{2\beta_1 \ln(D_{\text{Cat}}^* d_S^*)} + \frac{1}{2\beta_1} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\ln(96)}{\beta_1 \ln(D_{\text{Cat}}^* d_S^*)} + \frac{1}{\beta_1} \right)^2 - 6 \frac{\ln(1-1/d_S^*)}{\beta_1 \ln(D_{\text{Cat}}^* d_S^*)}}. \quad (\text{A131})$$

Therefore, for $\beta_1 = 10$, $D_{\text{Cat}}^* = 1$, $d_S^* = 2$; Eq. (A131) gives $\alpha_{\min}^* \leq 0.921 \dots$. For larger values of D_{Cat}^* , d_S^* , we can use $\beta_1 = 8$ and still achieve $\alpha_{\min}^* \leq 1$. We will thus assume

$$\frac{10 \ln D}{-\ln \epsilon_{emb}} \leq 1 \quad (\text{A132})$$

in the rest of this proof. We can now write Eq. (A127) in the form

$$\varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min})^3 \leq \frac{96D\epsilon_{emb}^{\alpha_{\min}^*}}{\alpha_{\min}^*} = \frac{96D(-2) \ln(\epsilon_{emb})}{\ln(96D) + \sqrt{\ln^2(96D) + 6(\ln \epsilon_{emb})(\ln(1-1/d_S))}} e^{-\alpha_{\min}^* \ln \epsilon_{emb}} \quad (\text{A133})$$

$$= \frac{96D(-2) \ln(\epsilon_{emb})}{\ln(96D) + \sqrt{\ln^2(96D) + 6(\ln \epsilon_{emb})(\ln(1-1/d_S))}} \sqrt{e^{-\ln(96D)} e^{-\sqrt{\ln^2(96D) + 6(\ln \epsilon_{emb})(\ln(1-1/d_S))}}}. \quad (\text{A134})$$

We now observe that in the large D limit, if $\ln^2(96D) + 6(\ln \epsilon_{emb})(\ln(1-1/d_S)) \approx \ln^2(96D)$ then the upper bound Eq. (A134) is approximately proportional to $(-\ln \epsilon_{emb})/\ln D$. This quantity is necessarily greater than 10 due to constraint Eq. (A132), and thus cannot be arbitrarily small. We will thus demand

$$(\ln \epsilon_{emb})(\ln(1-1/d_S)) \geq \ln^2(D), \quad (\text{A135})$$

in order to have a non-trivial bound.[83] Thus using Lemma 23, it follows from Eq. (A134),

$$\varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min})^3 \leq \frac{96D(-2) \ln(\epsilon_{emb})}{\sqrt{6(\ln \epsilon_{emb})(\ln(1-1/d_S))}} \sqrt{e^{-\ln(96D)} e^{-\sqrt{\ln^2(96D) + 6(\ln \epsilon_{emb})(\ln(1-1/d_S))}}} \quad (\text{A136})$$

$$\leq \frac{96D(-2) \ln(\epsilon_{emb})}{\sqrt{6(\ln \epsilon_{emb})(\ln(1-1/d_S))}} \sqrt{e^{-\ln(96D)} \frac{5^6 e^{-\sqrt{\ln^2(96D)}}}{((\ln \epsilon_{emb})(\ln(1-1/d_S)))^4}} \quad (\text{A137})$$

$$= 2 \frac{5^3}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{1}{(-\ln(1-1/d_S))^{5/2} (-\ln \epsilon_{emb})^{3/2}}. \quad (\text{A138})$$

$$(\text{A139})$$

Furthermore, we can use the standard inequality $\ln(1-x) \leq -x$ for all $x < 1$ (which is sharp for small x .) with the identification $x = 1/d_S$, to achieve

$$\varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min})^3 \leq 2 \frac{5^3}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{d_S^{5/2}}{(-\ln \epsilon_{emb})^{3/2}}. \quad (\text{A140})$$

Thus

$$\varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min}) \leq 5 \frac{d_S^{5/6}}{\sqrt{-\ln \epsilon_{emb}}}. \quad (\text{A141})$$

Therefore, by comparing Eqs.(A122) and (A141), we see that

$$\max\{\varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min}), \varepsilon_{\max}(\alpha_{\max})\} \leq 5 \sqrt{\frac{f(D_{\text{Cat}}, d_S)}{-\ln \epsilon_{emb}}} + D \epsilon_{emb}^{1/6}, \quad (\text{A142})$$

where

$$f(D_{\text{Cat}}, d_S) := \max\left\{4 \ln(D_{\text{Cat}} d_S) \ln d_S, d_S^{5/3}\right\} = \begin{cases} 4 \ln(D_{\text{Cat}} d_S) \ln d_S & \text{if } D_{\text{Cat}} \geq \frac{1}{d_S} \exp\left[\frac{d_S^{5/3}}{4 \ln d_S}\right] \\ d_S^{5/3} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A143})$$

as long as constraints Eqs. (A132), (A135) are both satisfied. Taking into account the expression for $\bar{\epsilon}_{Tmid}$ in Eq. (A61), have the bound,

$$\max\{\varepsilon_{\min}(\alpha_{\min}), \varepsilon_{\max}(\alpha_{\max}), \bar{\epsilon}_{Tmid}\} \leq 5 \sqrt{\frac{f(D_{\text{Cat}}, d_S)}{-\ln \epsilon_{emb}}} + D \epsilon_{emb}^{1/6} + 5^{-2} \left(-1024 D^2 \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \quad (\text{A144})$$

$$< 5 \sqrt{\frac{f(D_{\text{Cat}}, d_S)}{-\ln \epsilon_{emb}}} + D \epsilon_{emb}^{1/6} + 5 \left(D^2 \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{D}{\epsilon_{emb}}} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \quad (\text{A145})$$

$$< 5 \sqrt{\frac{d_S^{5/3} + 4(\ln D) \ln d_S}{-\ln \epsilon_{emb}}} + D \epsilon_{emb}^{1/6} + 5 \left(D^2 \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{D}{\epsilon_{emb}}} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}, \quad (\text{A146})$$

if constraints Eqs. (A132), (A135) are satisfied. Thus if we set ϵ_{res} (defined via Eq. A69) to

$$\epsilon_{res} = 5 \sqrt{\frac{d_S^{5/3} + 4(\ln D) \ln d_S}{-\ln \epsilon_{emb}}} + D \epsilon_{emb}^{1/6} + 5 \left(D^2 \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{D}{\epsilon_{emb}}} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}, \quad (\text{A147})$$

we conclude the proof. ■

b. Auxiliary lemmas

Lemma 23. *Let $x \geq \ln^2(D)$, then for all $D \geq 2$,*

$$e^{-\sqrt{\ln^2(96D)+6x}} \leq 5^6 \frac{e^{-\sqrt{\ln^2(96D)}}}{x^4}. \quad (\text{A148})$$

Proof. We have that for all $D \geq 2$,

$$\frac{x^4}{5^6} e^{-\sqrt{\ln^2(96D)+6x}+\ln(96)+\ln(D)} \leq \frac{x^4}{5^6} e^{-\sqrt{\ln^2(96 \cdot 2)+6x}+\ln(96)+\sqrt{x}} \leq \frac{96}{5^6} x^4 e^{-\sqrt{27+6x}+\sqrt{x}} \quad (\text{A149})$$

$$= \frac{96}{5^6} F(x). \quad (\text{A150})$$

We now aim to find the maximum of $F(x) := x^4 e^{-\sqrt{27+6x}+\sqrt{x}}$ with domain $x \in [0, \infty)$. Since the extremal points are both zero, namely $F(0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} F(x) = 0$, the maximum will be one of the stationary points, we therefore want the solutions to

$$\frac{d}{dx} F(x) = \frac{e^{\sqrt{x}-\sqrt{6x+27}} x^3 (-2\sqrt{3x} + \sqrt{x}\sqrt{2x+9} + 8\sqrt{2x+9})}{2\sqrt{2x+9}} = 0. \quad (\text{A151})$$

The only solution to $-2\sqrt{3x} + \sqrt{x}\sqrt{2x+9} + 8\sqrt{2x+9} = 0$ can be found analytically by hand (or using Mathematica's *Solve* routine) giving

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 := & \frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{\sqrt[3]{1719926784\sqrt{1149814} + 17320375304957}}{60 \cdot 5^{2/3}} - \frac{1}{300} \sqrt[3]{86601876524785 - 8599633920\sqrt{1149814}} + \frac{354075648}{625} \times \right. \\ & \times \sqrt{\frac{3}{25 \sqrt[3]{5(1719926784\sqrt{1149814} + 17320375304957)} + 25 \sqrt[3]{86601876524785 - 8599633920\sqrt{1149814}} + 2754793}} \\ & \left. + \frac{2754793}{3750} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{941}{100} + \frac{1}{100 \sqrt{\frac{3}{25 \sqrt[3]{5(1719926784\sqrt{1149814} + 17320375304957)} + 25 \sqrt[3]{86601876524785 - 8599633920\sqrt{1149814}} + 2754793}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A152})$$

since x_0 is within the end points, namely $0 < x_0 < \infty$ and F evaluated at x_0 is larger than at the end points, i.e. $F(x_0) > F(0) = 0$, and $F(x_0) > \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} F(x) = 0$; it must be a global maximum. Thus to conclude the proof, we use Eq. (A150) to find

$$\frac{x^4}{56} e^{-\sqrt{\ln^2(96D)+6x+\ln(96)}+\ln(D)} < \frac{96}{56} F(x_0) = 0.707818 \dots < 1, \quad (\text{A153})$$

for all $D \geq 2$ and for all $x \geq \ln^2(D)$. ■

Conjecture 24. $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(p|q)$ is convex in α for $\alpha < 0$ and $\alpha > 1$ and concave in α for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Remark. From the plot it follows at least for $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(p|I/2)$ for binary distributions, which is enough for us. We have not proven the conjecture, but we are able to prove the following

Lemma 25. *For arbitrary binary probability distribution $p \in \mathcal{P}_2$.*

- For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(p|I/2) \geq \alpha D(p|I/2) \geq \frac{\alpha}{8} \delta^2 \quad (\text{A154})$$

- For $\alpha > 1$

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(p|I/2) \geq D(p|I/2). \quad (\text{A155})$$

Proof. The inequality (A154) comes from the lemma 26 below and Pinsker inequality (A11). The inequality (A155) comes from (A10) and Pinsker inequality. ■

Lemma 26. *For any probability distributions $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_d$ and for all $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ we have*

$$H_\alpha(p|I/2) \geq \alpha D(p|I/2) \quad (\text{A156})$$

Equivalently for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta < 1$ we have

$$\frac{(1+\delta)^\alpha + (1-\delta)^\alpha - 2}{\alpha - 1} \geq \alpha((1+\delta) \ln(1+\delta) + (1-\delta) \ln(1-\delta)) \quad (\text{A157})$$

Proof. We will prove that

$$G(\alpha, \delta) := (1 + \delta)^\alpha + (1 - \delta)^\alpha - 2 - \alpha(\alpha - 1)((1 + \delta) \ln(1 + \delta) + (1 - \delta) \ln(1 - \delta)) \geq 0. \quad (\text{A158})$$

For $|x| < 1$ we have

$$(1 + x)^\alpha = 1 + \alpha x + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{a_n(\alpha)}{n!} x^n, \quad \ln(1 + x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} x^n \quad (\text{A159})$$

where

$$a_n(\alpha) = \alpha(\alpha - 1) \dots (\alpha - (n - 1)). \quad (\text{A160})$$

One then finds that

$$(1 + \delta)^\alpha + (1 - \delta)^\alpha = 2 + 2 \sum_{n=2, \text{ even}}^{\infty} \frac{a_n(\alpha)}{n!} \delta^n, \quad (1 + \delta) \ln(1 + \delta) + (1 - \delta) \ln(1 - \delta) = 2 \sum_{n=2, \text{ even}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \delta^n \quad (\text{A161})$$

Then

$$G(\alpha, \delta) = 2 \sum_{n=2, \text{ even}}^{\infty} \left(\frac{a_n(\alpha)}{n!} - \alpha(\alpha - 1) \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \right) \delta^n. \quad (\text{A162})$$

Now, it is enough to show that

$$(\alpha - 2) \dots (\alpha - (n - 1)) \geq (n - 2)!, \quad (\text{A163})$$

for all $n \geq 2$ and even. Since there is even number of terms on the left hand side, all negative, the above inequality can be rewritten as

$$(2 - \alpha)(3 - \alpha) \dots (n - 1 - \alpha) \geq (n - 2)! \quad (\text{A164})$$

Since $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, left hand side is no smaller than $(n - 2)!$ and therefore the inequality holds. ■

4. Tsallis continuity Theorem

Theorem 7 (Tsallis uniform continuity). *Let $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}_d$ have entries denoted p_k . For the following parameters, we have the following Tsallis entropy (Eq. A6) continuity bounds:*

0) For $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty]$,

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq \frac{2^{\lceil \alpha \rceil}}{|\alpha - 1|} d^{1 - \alpha / \lceil \alpha \rceil} (\|p - p'\|_1)^{\alpha / \lceil \alpha \rceil} \leq 2 \frac{(\alpha + 1)}{|\alpha - 1|} d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^{\alpha / (1 + \alpha)}. \quad (\text{A165})$$

1) For $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq d \left(\frac{1}{2e} \right)^{1/\alpha}$,

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq 4 d^{1 - \alpha} \left[\left(\frac{3}{2\alpha} + 1 \right) (\|p - p'\|_1)^\alpha \ln d - (\|p - p'\|_1)^\alpha \ln \|p - p'\|_1 \right]. \quad (\text{A166})$$

2) For $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$ and $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2e^{\lceil \alpha \rceil} d^\alpha}$,

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq 8 \left[\|p - p'\|_1 \ln \left(\frac{d^{3/2}}{4} \right) - \|p - p'\|_1 \ln (\|p - p'\|_1) \right]. \quad (\text{A167})$$

Remark 27. Eqs. A165, (A166), (A167), provide continuity bounds for the Tsallis entropy, which are uniform in $\alpha > 0$ bounded away from zero. For α near zero Eq. (A165) is best, while for α in the vicinity of 1, Eqs. (A166), (A167) are optimal. For large α one can either use Eq. A165 or Eq. (A167) depending on the circumstances. If the condition $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2e^{\lceil \alpha \rceil d^\alpha}}$ is fulfilled (which becomes more stringent the larger α is), then it is likely to be preferable to use Eq. (A167) which only grows logarithmically with d . On the other hand, if $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2e^{\lceil \alpha \rceil d^\alpha}}$ cannot be guaranteed to be fulfilled (such as in the limiting case $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$), then Eq. A165, with sub-linear scaling with d , is the only option. For related, but less explicit, continuity bounds see [84].

Proof. We start by proving Eq. (A165). From the definition of the Tsallis entropy, Eq. (A6), it follows

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| = \frac{1}{|1 - \alpha|} \left| \sum_i p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha \right| \leq \frac{1}{|1 - \alpha|} \sum_i |p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha|. \quad (\text{A168})$$

We now apply Lemma 32 to find

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq \frac{2^{\lceil \alpha \rceil}}{|1 - \alpha|} d^{(1 - \alpha/\lceil \alpha \rceil)} (\|p - p'\|_1)^{\alpha/\lceil \alpha \rceil}, \quad (\text{A169})$$

from which the bound follows by noting $\lceil \alpha \rceil \leq \alpha + 1$, and $\|p - p'\|/d \leq 1$. We will now prove Eqs. (A166), (A167). To start with,

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| = \frac{1}{|1 - \alpha|} \left| \sum_i p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha \right| \leq \frac{1}{|\alpha - 1|} |G_\alpha(p, p')|, \quad (\text{A170})$$

where we have defined

$$G_\alpha(p, p') = \|p\|_\alpha^\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha. \quad (\text{A171})$$

From the definition of $\|\cdot\|_p$ we see that for all $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$, $G_\alpha(p, p')$ is continuous. Furthermore, from Eq. (A241) we observe that $G_\alpha(p, p')$ is differentiable for $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$. As such, we can apply the mean value theorem to it as follows.

Using the notation a, b, c , from the mean value theorem 9, we have

1) For $a = 1, b = \alpha, \alpha > 1$

$$G_\alpha(p, p') = G_1(p, p') + G'_c(p, p')(\alpha - 1) = G'_c(p, p')(\alpha - 1), \quad \text{for some } c \in (1, \alpha). \quad (\text{A172})$$

2) For $b = 1, a = \alpha, 0 \leq \alpha < 1$

$$G_\alpha(p, p') = G_1(p, p') + G'_c(p, p')(-1 + \alpha) = G'_c(p, p')(\alpha - 1), \quad \text{for some } c \in (\alpha, 1). \quad (\text{A173})$$

Where in both cases we have used $\|p\|_1 = \|p'\|_1 = 1$. We thus conclude

$$g_\alpha(p, p') = g'_c(p, p')(\alpha - 1), \quad \text{for some } c \in \begin{cases} (\alpha, 1) & \text{if } 0 \leq \alpha < 1 \\ (1, \alpha) & \text{if } \alpha > 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A174})$$

Plugging in to Eq. (A170), we thus have for all $\alpha > 0$,

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq \left| \frac{d}{d\alpha} \|p\|_\alpha^\alpha - \frac{d}{d\alpha} \|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha \right|_{\alpha=c} = c \left| \|p\|_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \frac{d}{d\alpha} \|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \frac{d}{d\alpha} \|p'\|_\alpha \right|_{\alpha=c}. \quad (\text{A175})$$

Now plugging in Eq. A244,

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq \frac{1}{c} \left| \|p\|_\alpha^\alpha S_1(q_\alpha(p)) - \|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha S_1(q_\alpha(p')) \right|_{\alpha=c}, \quad (\text{A176})$$

where

$$[q_\alpha(x)]_i := \frac{|x_i|^\alpha}{\|x\|_\alpha^\alpha}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, d. \quad (\text{A177})$$

Thus we find,

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq \frac{1}{c} \|p\|_c^c \left| \left(\frac{\|p'\|_c^c}{\|p\|_c^c} - 1 \right) S_1(q_c(p')) + S_1(q_c(p')) - S_1(q_c(p)) \right| \quad (\text{A178})$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{c} \|p\|_c^c \left(\left| \frac{\|p'\|_c^c}{\|p\|_c^c} - 1 \right| |S_1(q_c(p'))| + |S_1(q_c(p')) - S_1(q_c(p))| \right) \quad (\text{A179})$$

$$= \frac{1}{c} \left(|S_1(q_c(p'))| \left| \|p'\|_c^c - \|p\|_c^c \right| + \|p\|_c^c |S_1(q_c(p')) - S_1(q_c(p))| \right) \quad (\text{A180})$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{c} \left(\left(\max_{q \in \mathcal{P}_d} |S_1(q)| \right) \left| \|p'\|_c^c - \|p\|_c^c \right| + \|p\|_c^c |S_1(q_c(p')) - S_1(q_c(p))| \right) \quad (\text{A181})$$

$$= \frac{1}{c} \left(\ln d \left| \|p'\|_c^c - \|p\|_c^c \right| + \|p\|_c^c |S_1(q_c(p')) - S_1(q_c(p))| \right). \quad (\text{A182})$$

Applying the Fannes inequality (Lemma 30), we find

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq \frac{1}{c} \left(\left| \|p'\|_c^c - \|p\|_c^c \right| \ln d + \|p\|_c^c \left(\|q_c(p) - q_c(p')\|_1 \ln d - \|q_c(p) - q_c(p')\|_1 \ln (\|q_c(p) - q_c(p')\|_1) \right) \right) \quad (\text{A183})$$

$$(\text{A184})$$

We now pause a moment to bound $\|q_\alpha(p) - q_\alpha(p')\|_1$. Using the definition of $q_\alpha(p)$, we have

$$\|q_\alpha(p) - q_\alpha(p')\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d \left| \frac{p_i^\alpha}{\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha} + \frac{p_i'^\alpha}{\|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha} \right| = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha} \left| p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha + p_i'^\alpha \left(1 - \frac{\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha}{\|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha} \right) \right| \quad (\text{A185})$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha} \left(|p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha| + p_i'^\alpha \left| 1 - \frac{\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha}{\|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha} \right| \right) = \frac{1}{\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha} \left(\left| \|p\|_\alpha^\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha \right| + \sum_{i=1}^d |p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha| \right) \quad (\text{A186})$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d |p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha| \right) = \frac{\Delta_\alpha(p, p')}{\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha}, \quad (\text{A187})$$

where in the last line, we have used Lemma 32 and defined,

$$\Delta_\alpha(p, p') := 2 \sum_{i=1}^d |p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha|. \quad (\text{A188})$$

Plugging this into Eq. (A182), we find for $\|q_c(p) - q_c(p')\|_1 \leq 1/e \approx 0.37$,

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq \frac{1}{c} \left(\left| \|p'\|_c^c - \|p\|_c^c \right| \ln d + \|p\|_c^c \left(\frac{\Delta_c(p, p')}{\|p\|_c^c} \ln d - \frac{\Delta_c(p, p')}{\|p\|_c^c} \ln \left(\frac{\Delta_c(p, p')}{\|p\|_c^c} \right) \right) \right) \quad (\text{A189})$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{c} \left(\frac{\Delta_c(p, p')}{2} \ln d + \Delta_c(p, p') \ln d - \Delta_c(p, p') \ln \left(\frac{\Delta_c(p, p')}{\|p\|_c^c} \right) \right), \quad (\text{A190})$$

$$= \frac{1}{c} \left(\Delta_c(p, p') \ln \left(d^{3/2} \|p\|_c^c \right) - \Delta_c(p, p') \ln \Delta_c(p, p') \right). \quad (\text{A191})$$

We now find bounds for $\Delta_c(p, p')$. To start with, from Lemma 32 we have

$$\Delta_c(p, p') \leq 4 \lceil c \rceil d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^{c/\lceil c \rceil}, \quad (\text{A192})$$

where $\|p - p'\|_1/d \leq 1$ since $d \geq 2$ and $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq 2$ holds for all $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}_d$.

For $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, $c \in (\alpha, 1)$ we find

$$\Delta_c(p, p') \leq 4d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^c \leq 4d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^\alpha \quad \forall c \in (\alpha, 1). \quad (\text{A193})$$

For $\alpha > 1$, $c \in (1, \alpha)$ and we find

$$\Delta_c(p, p') \leq 4\lceil c \rceil d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right) = 4\lceil c \rceil \|p - p'\|_1 \quad \forall c \in (1, \alpha). \quad (\text{A194})$$

We will now upper bound $\|p\|_c^c$ using Eq. (A268) from Lemma 29.

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $c \in (\alpha, 1)$:

1) Noting that $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$ for all i ,

$$\|p\|_c^c = \sum_{i=1}^d p_i^c \leq \lim_{c \rightarrow 0^+} \sum_{i=1}^d p_i^c \leq d \quad \forall c \in (\alpha, 1) \quad (\text{A195})$$

2) Setting $r = c$, $p = 1$, in Eq. (A268), we have

$$1 = \|p\|_1 \leq \|p\|_c \implies 1 \leq \|p\|_c^c \quad (\text{A196})$$

For $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$, $c \in (1, \alpha)$:

1) Setting $r = 1$, $p = c$, in Eq. (A268), we have

$$\|p\|_c \leq \|p\|_r = 1 \quad \forall c \in (1, \alpha) \implies \ln \|p\|_c^c = c \ln \|p\|_c \leq 0. \quad (\text{A197})$$

2) Setting $r = c$, $p = \infty$, in Eq. (A268), and noting that $\max_i \{p_i\} \geq 1/d$ we have

$$\|p\|_\infty = \max_i \{p_i\} \leq \|p\|_c \quad \forall c \in (1, \alpha) \implies \left(\frac{1}{d} \right)^c \leq \|p\|_c^c \quad (\text{A198})$$

Plugging Eqs. A193, A195 into Eq. (A191), we find for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and for all $c \in (\alpha, 1)$,

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq \frac{1}{c} \left[4d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^\alpha \ln(d^{3/2}d) - 4d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^\alpha \ln \left(4d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^\alpha \right) \right] \quad (\text{A199})$$

$$\leq 4 \frac{d}{\alpha} \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^\alpha \ln \left(\frac{d^{3/2}}{4} \right) - 4d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^\alpha \ln \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right) \quad (\text{A200})$$

$$\leq 4 \frac{d}{\alpha} \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^\alpha \ln(d^{3/2}) - 4d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^\alpha \ln \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right) \quad (\text{A201})$$

$$= 4d^{1-\alpha} \left[\left(\frac{3}{2\alpha} + 1 \right) (\|p - p'\|_1)^\alpha \ln d - (\|p - p'\|_1)^\alpha \ln \|p - p'\|_1 \right]. \quad (\text{A202})$$

Since the above equation is continuous around $\alpha = 1$, it must also hold for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ [85] which is Eq. (A166) of the theorem. For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we can also find an appropriate bound on $\|p - p'\|_1$ so that the constraint $\|q_c(p) - q_c(p')\|_1 \leq 1/e$ is satisfied. Using Eqs, (A187), (A193), (A196), we find

$$\|q_c(p) - q_c(p')\|_1 \leq \frac{\Delta_c(p, p')}{\|p\|_c^c} \leq \frac{2d(\|p - p'\|_1/d)^\alpha}{\|p\|_c^c} \leq 2d(\|p - p'\|_1/d)^\alpha. \quad (\text{A203})$$

Thus imposing the constraint $2d(\|p - p'\|_1/d)^\alpha \leq 1/e$ we achieve the condition

$$\|p - p'\|_1 \leq d \left(\frac{1}{2ed} \right)^{1/\alpha}, \quad (\text{A204})$$

which is the condition in the text above Eq. (A166) in the theorem.

Similarly, plugging Eqs. A194, A197 into Eq. (A191), we find for $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$

$$|T_\alpha(p) - T_\alpha(p')| \leq \frac{1}{c} \left(\Delta_c(p, p') \ln d^{3/2} - \Delta_c(p, p') \ln \Delta_c(p, p') \right) \quad (\text{A205})$$

$$\leq \frac{4\lceil c \rceil}{c} \left(\|p - p'\|_1 \ln d^{3/2} - \|p - p'\|_1 \ln(4\lceil c \rceil \|p - p'\|_1) \right) \quad (\text{A206})$$

$$\leq \frac{4(c+1)}{c} \left(\|p - p'\|_1 \ln \left(\frac{d^{3/2}}{4} \right) - \|p - p'\|_1 \ln(\|p - p'\|_1) - \|p - p'\|_1 \ln(\lceil c \rceil) \right) \quad (\text{A207})$$

$$\leq 8 \left(\|p - p'\|_1 \ln \left(\frac{d^{3/2}}{4} \right) - \|p - p'\|_1 \ln(\|p - p'\|_1) \right), \quad \forall c \in (1, \alpha) \quad (\text{A208})$$

which is Eq. (A167) in the theorem. Similarly to above, for $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ we can also find an appropriate bound on $\|p - p'\|_1$ so that the constraint $\|q_c(p) - q_c(p')\|_1 \leq 1/e$ is satisfied. Using Eqs, (A187), (A198), we find

$$\|q_c(p) - q_c(p')\|_1 \leq \frac{\Delta_c(p, p')}{\|p\|_c^c} \leq \frac{2\lceil c \rceil \|p - p'\|_1}{\left(\frac{1}{d}\right)^c} = 2\lceil c \rceil d^c \|p - p'\|_1 \quad \forall c \in (1, \alpha). \quad (\text{A209})$$

Thus imposing the constraint $2\lceil c \rceil d^c \|p - p'\|_1 \leq 1/e$ for all $c \in (1, \alpha)$. We observe that this is satisfied for all $c \in (1, \alpha)$ if

$$\|p - p'\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2e^{\lceil \alpha \rceil} d^\alpha} \quad (\text{A210})$$

which is the condition in the text above Eq. (A167) in the theorem. ■

5. Rényi entropy continuity theorem

Theorem 8 (Rényi uniform continuity). *Let $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}_d$ have entries denoted p_k . For the following parameters, we have the following Rényi entropy (Eq. A1) continuity bounds:*

0) For $\alpha \in [-\infty, -1]$, we have

$$\frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \ln \left(\frac{\min_k \{p_k\}}{\min_l \{p_l p'_l\}} \|p - p'\|_1 + 1 \right) \leq S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p') \leq \frac{|\alpha|}{1 - \alpha} \ln \left(\frac{\min_k \{p'_k\}}{\min_l \{p_l p'_l\}} \|p - p'\|_1 + 1 \right) \quad (\text{A211})$$

and

$$\frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \ln \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{\min_l \{p'_l\}} + 1 \right) \leq S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p') \leq \frac{|\alpha|}{1 - \alpha} \ln \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{\min_l \{p_l\}} + 1 \right) \quad (\text{A212})$$

1) For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$|S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p')| \leq \frac{e^{(\alpha-1)S_\alpha(p)}}{1 - \alpha} d^{(1-\alpha)} \left(\|p - p'\|_1 \right)^\alpha. \quad (\text{A213})$$

2) Let $\epsilon_0 > 1$. Then for all $\alpha \in [\epsilon_0, \infty]$, we have

$$|S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p')| \leq \frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon_0 - 1} \ln(1 + \|p - p'\|_1 d). \quad (\text{A214})$$

3.1) Let $\alpha \in [1/2, 1)$, and $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq 1/[(4e)^2 d]$, then

$$|S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p')| \leq 8d(6 \ln d - \ln 2) \sqrt{\|p - p'\|_1} - 4d \sqrt{\|p - p'\|_1} \ln \sqrt{\|p - p'\|_1} \quad (\text{A215})$$

3.2) Let $\alpha \in [1, 2]$, and $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq d/(8e)^2$, then

$$|S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p')| \leq 2\sqrt{d} \left(\|p - p'\|_1 \ln d + \sqrt{\|p - p'\|_1} 4d \ln(d/64) - 8d \sqrt{\|p - p'\|_1} \ln \sqrt{\|p - p'\|_1} \right). \quad (\text{A216})$$

Proof. This proof is divided into subsections, one for each α regime, 0), 1), 2), 3).

a. *Proof of 0).* $\alpha \in [-\infty, -1]$

For $\alpha < 0$, we have

$$S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p') = \frac{-\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \ln \|p\|_\alpha - \frac{-\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \ln \|p'\|_\alpha = \frac{|\alpha|}{1 - \alpha} \ln \left(\frac{\|p^{-1}\|_{|\alpha|}}{\|p'^{-1}\|_{|\alpha|}} \right), \quad (\text{A217})$$

where $\|x^{-1}\|_\alpha := \sum_{i=1}^d (1/x_i)^\alpha$. Therefore,

$$S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p') \geq 0 \quad (\text{A218})$$

iff $\|p^{-1}\|_\alpha / \|p'^{-1}\|_\alpha \geq 0$.

We will now provide a proof for $\alpha \in [-\infty, -1]$ and finalise the proof for the remaining negative interval afterwards. Assume $\|p^{-1}\|_\alpha / \|p'^{-1}\|_\alpha \geq 0$, [86] we then have using the p -norm triangle inequality (Lemma 29),

$$S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p') = \frac{|\alpha|}{1-\alpha} \ln \left(\frac{\|p^{-1} - p'^{-1} + p'^{-1}\|_\alpha}{\|p'^{-1}\|_\alpha} \right) \leq \frac{|\alpha|}{1-\alpha} \ln \left(\frac{\|p^{-1} - p'^{-1}\|_\alpha}{\|p'^{-1}\|_\alpha} + 1 \right). \quad (\text{A219})$$

Also from Lemma 29, it follows

$$\|p^{-1} - p'^{-1}\|_\alpha \leq \|p^{-1} - p'^{-1}\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{|p_i - p'_i|}{p_i p'_i} \leq \frac{1}{\min_k p_k p'_k} \|p - p'\|_1 \quad (\text{A220})$$

$$\|p'^{-1}\|_\alpha \geq \|p'^{-1}\|_\infty = \max_i \{1/p'_i\} = 1/\min_i \{p'_i\}. \quad (\text{A221})$$

Therefore, by plugging in the above inequalities,

$$S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p') \leq \frac{|\alpha|}{1-\alpha} \ln \left(\frac{\min_k \{p'_k\}}{\min_l \{p_l p'_l\}} \|p - p'\|_1 + 1 \right) \quad (\text{A222})$$

which is the R.H.S. of Eq. (A211). For the proof of the L.H.S. of Eq. (A211), we note that this term is negative. Therefore, it is trivially true if $S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p') \geq 0$. When $S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p') < 0$, we can write $S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p') = -(S_\alpha(p') - S_\alpha(p))$, where the term in brackets is positive. Thus from Eq. (A218), we can use upper bound Eq. (A222) with $p \mapsto p'$, $p' \mapsto p$ to achieve the L.H.S. of Eq. (A211). Eqs. (A212) follow from noting $\min_k \{p_k p'_k\} \geq \min_k \{p_k\} \min_k \{p'_k\}$.

b. Proof of 1). $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

From notes from old bound [delete old notes and just put that section here], we have

$$|S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p')| \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^d p_i^\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^d |p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha| = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^d |p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha|. \quad (\text{A223})$$

Eq. (A213) now follows directly by bounding $\sum_{i=1}^d |p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha|$ using Lemma 32, and the relationship between Rényi entropies, and $\|p\|_\alpha$, namely $(1-\alpha)S_\alpha(p) = \ln \|p\|_\alpha^\alpha$.

c. Proof of 2). $\alpha \in [\epsilon_0, \infty]$

We start with proving Eq. (A214).

$$|S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p')| = \left| \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \ln \|p'\|_\alpha - \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \ln \|p\|_\alpha \right| = \left| \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \right| \left| \ln \left(\frac{\|p'\|_\alpha}{\|p\|_\alpha} \right) \right| \quad (\text{A224})$$

$$= \begin{cases} \left| \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \right| \ln \left(\frac{\|p'\|_\alpha - \|p\|_\alpha}{\|p\|_\alpha} + 1 \right), & \text{for } \|p'\|_\alpha - \|p\|_\alpha \geq 0, \\ \left| \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \right| \ln \left(\frac{\|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha}{\|p'\|_\alpha} + 1 \right), & \text{for } \|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A225})$$

$$= \left| \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \right| \ln \left(\frac{|\|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha|}{\|p''\|_\alpha} + 1 \right), \quad (\text{A226})$$

where

$$\|p''\|_\alpha = \begin{cases} \|p\|_\alpha & \text{if } \|p'\|_\alpha - \|p\|_\alpha \geq 0 \\ \|p'\|_\alpha & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A227})$$

For $\alpha > 1$, from Lemma 32, we have $|\|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha| \leq \|p - p'\|_1$. Furthermore, using Eq. (A268), we have $\|p''\|_\alpha \geq \|p''\|_\infty$. However, we also have that $\|p''\|_\infty = \max_i \{p''_i\} \geq 1/d$. Thus Eq. (A214) follows since the logarithm is an increasing function.

d. Proof of 3.1) and 3.2). $\alpha \in [1/2, 2]$

We now move on to the proof of Eqs. (A216),(A215). To start with, we define the function F to be any upper bound to

$$\left| \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \frac{\|p'\|_\alpha - \|p\|_\alpha}{\|p''\|_\alpha} \right| \leq F_\alpha(p, p'). \quad (\text{A228})$$

Using Eq. (A224), we can now write

$$|S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p')| = \left| \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \right| \ln \left(\frac{\|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha}{\|p''\|_\alpha} + 1 \right) \leq \frac{\alpha}{|\alpha - 1|} \ln (|\alpha - 1| F_\alpha(p, p') + 1) \quad (\text{A229})$$

$$\leq \alpha F_\alpha(p, p'). \quad (\text{A230})$$

where in the last line we have used the inequality $\ln(x + 1) \leq x$ for $x \geq 0$.

We now set out to find an appropriate expression for $F_\alpha(p, p')$. For this we will use the mean value theorem, Theorem 9. We start by finding two separate expressions for the function[87]

$$g_\alpha(p, p') := \|p'\|_\alpha - \|p\|_\alpha. \quad (\text{A231})$$

Using the notation a, b, c , from the mean value theorem (Thm. 9), we have

1) $a = 1, b = \alpha, \alpha \geq 1$

$$g_\alpha(p, p') = g_1(p, p') + g'_c(p, p')(\alpha - 1) = g'_c(p, p')(\alpha - 1), \quad \text{for some } c \in (1, \alpha). \quad (\text{A232})$$

2) $b = 1, a = \alpha, \alpha \leq 1$

$$g_\alpha(p, p') = g_1(p, p') + g'_c(p, p')(-1 + \alpha) = g'_c(p, p')(\alpha - 1), \quad \text{for some } c \in (\alpha, 1). \quad (\text{A233})$$

Where in both cases we have used $\|p\|_1 = \|p'\|_1 = 1$. We thus conclude

$$g_\alpha(p, p') = g'_\beta(p, p')(\alpha - 1), \quad \text{for some } \beta \in \begin{cases} (\alpha, 1) & \text{if } \alpha < 1 \\ (1, \alpha) & \text{if } \alpha \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A234})$$

We thus have

$$\left| \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \frac{\|p'\|_\alpha - \|p\|_\alpha}{\|p''\|_\alpha} \right| = \frac{|g'_\beta(p, p')|}{\|p''\|_\alpha} = \frac{1}{\|p''\|_\alpha} \left| \frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\|p'\|_\beta - \|p\|_\beta \right) \right| := F_\beta(p, p'). \quad (\text{A235})$$

We thus have taking into account eq. (A229),

$$|S_\alpha(p) - S_\alpha(p')| \leq \alpha \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{I}} F_\beta(p, p'), \quad (\text{A236})$$

where $\mathcal{I} = [1/2, 1]$ when $\alpha \leq 1$, and $\mathcal{I} = [1, 2]$ when $\alpha \geq 1$. We have so-far managed to remove the singularity at $\alpha = 1$ in our upper bound to the Rényi entropies. We will now set out to prove a relationship between this upper bound and the distance $\|p - p'\|_1$. We start by find the derivative. For convenience, note that for $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$,

$$\|x\|_\alpha = \exp \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \ln \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha \right). \quad (\text{A237})$$

Hence the derivative is

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha} \|x\|_\alpha = \|x\|_\alpha \frac{d}{d\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \ln \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha \right) = \left(\left(\frac{d}{d\alpha} \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \ln \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{d}{d\alpha} \ln \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha \right) \quad (\text{A238})$$

$$= \|x\|_\alpha \left(\frac{-1}{\alpha^2} \ln \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha} \frac{d}{d\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha \right). \quad (\text{A239})$$

However, $\frac{d}{d\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha = \frac{d}{d\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} e^{\alpha \ln |x_i|} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha \ln |x_i|$, therefore

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha} \|x\|_\alpha = \|x\|_\alpha \left(\frac{-1}{\alpha^2} \ln \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^\alpha \ln |x_i| \right) \quad (\text{A240})$$

$$= \frac{\|x\|_\alpha}{\alpha} \left(-\ln \|x\|_\alpha + \frac{1}{\|x\|_\alpha^\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^d |x_i|^\alpha \ln |x_i| \right). \quad (\text{A241})$$

Now, by direct calculation we observe that the above line can be written in terms of the S_1 , Shannon entropy for a probability distribution which depends on α , namely[88]

$$S_1(q_\alpha(x)) = -\alpha \left(-\ln \|x\|_\alpha + \frac{1}{\|x\|_\alpha^\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^d |x_i|^\alpha \ln |x_i| \right), \quad (\text{A242})$$

where the components of the normalised probability vector $q_\alpha(x)$ are

$$[q_\alpha(x)]_i := \frac{|x_i|^\alpha}{\|x\|_\alpha^\alpha}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, d. \quad (\text{A243})$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha} \|x\|_\alpha = -\frac{\|x\|_\alpha}{\alpha^2} S_1(q_\alpha(x)). \quad (\text{A244})$$

From Eq. (A235),

$$\beta^2 \|p''\|_\alpha F_\beta(p, p') = \beta^2 \left| \frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\|p'\|_\beta - \|p\|_\beta \right) \right| = \left| \|p'\|_\beta S_1(q_\alpha(p')) - \|p\|_\beta S_1(q_\alpha(p)) \right|, \quad (\text{A245})$$

Thus,

$$\beta^2 \|p''\|_\alpha F_\beta(p, p') = \|p\|_\beta \left| \left(\frac{\|p'\|_\beta}{\|p\|_\beta} - 1 \right) S_1(q_\alpha(p')) + S_1(q_\alpha(p')) - S_1(q_\alpha(p)) \right| \quad (\text{A246})$$

$$\leq \|p\|_\beta \left(\left| \frac{\|p'\|_\beta}{\|p\|_\beta} - 1 \right| |S_1(q_\alpha(p'))| + |S_1(q_\alpha(p')) - S_1(q_\alpha(p))| \right) \quad (\text{A247})$$

$$= |S_1(q_\alpha(p'))| \left| \|p'\|_\beta - \|p\|_\beta \right| + \|p\|_\beta |S_1(q_\alpha(p')) - S_1(q_\alpha(p))| \quad (\text{A248})$$

$$\leq \left(\max_{q \in \mathcal{P}_d} |S_1(q)| \right) \left| \|p'\|_\beta - \|p\|_\beta \right| + \|p\|_\beta |S_1(q_\beta(p')) - S_1(q_\beta(p))|. \quad (\text{A249})$$

Therefore, noting that the Shannon entropy is maximized for the uniform distribution and applying the Fannes inequality (Lemma 30), we achieve

$$\beta^2 \|p''\|_\alpha F_\beta(p, p') \leq \ln d \left| \|p'\|_\beta - \|p\|_\beta \right| + \|p\|_\beta \left(\|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1 \ln d - \|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1 \ln (\|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1) \right). \quad (\text{A250})$$

We now pause a moment to bound $\|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1$. Using the definition of $q_\alpha(p)$, we have

$$\|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d \left| \frac{p_i^\beta}{\|p\|_\beta^\beta} + \frac{p_i'^\beta}{\|p'\|_\beta^\beta} \right| = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{\|p\|_\beta^\beta} \left| p_i^\beta - p_i'^\beta + p_i'^\beta \left(1 - \frac{\|p\|_\beta^\beta}{\|p'\|_\beta^\beta} \right) \right| \quad (\text{A251})$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{\|p\|_\beta^\beta} \left(\left| p_i^\beta - p_i'^\beta \right| + p_i'^\beta \left| 1 - \frac{\|p\|_\beta^\beta}{\|p'\|_\beta^\beta} \right| \right) = \frac{1}{\|p\|_\beta^\beta} \left(\left| \|p\|_\beta^\beta - \|p'\|_\beta^\beta \right| + \sum_{i=1}^d \left| p_i^\beta - p_i'^\beta \right| \right) \quad (\text{A252})$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{\|p\|_\beta^\beta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \left| p_i^\beta - p_i'^\beta \right| \right) = \frac{\Delta(p, p')}{\|p\|_\beta^\beta}, \quad (\text{A253})$$

where in the last line, we have used Lemma 32 and defined,

$$\Delta(p, p') := 2 \sum_{i=1}^d |p_i^\beta - p_i'^\beta|. \quad (\text{A254})$$

Therefore, for $\|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1 \leq 1/e$,

$$\beta^2 \|p''\|_\alpha F_\beta(p, p') \leq \left| \|p'\|_\beta - \|p\|_\beta \right| \ln d + \|p\|_\beta^{1-\beta} \left(\Delta(p, p') \ln d - \Delta(p, p') \ln \Delta(p, p') + \beta \Delta(p, p') \ln \|p\|_\beta \right). \quad (\text{A255})$$

We will now proceed to bound Eq. (A254) separately for $\beta \in [1/2, 1)$, and $\beta \in [1, 2]$. We start with the easier of the two.

For $\beta \in [1, 2]$:

Setting $r = 1$, $p = \beta$ in Eq. (A268), and recalling $\|p\|_1 = 1$, it follows

$$d^{1/\beta-1} \leq \|p\|_\beta \leq 1. \quad (\text{A256})$$

Similarly, from Lemma 32, and assuming $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq d$, we have

$$\Delta(p, p') \leq 8 d^{1-\beta/2} \left(\|p - p'\|_1 \right)^{\beta/2} \leq 8 d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^{\beta/2} \leq 8 \sqrt{d} \|p - p'\|_1 \quad (\text{A257})$$

$$\left| \|p'\|_\beta - \|p\|_\beta \right| \leq \|p - p'\|_1. \quad (\text{A258})$$

Furthermore more, from Eq. (A256) it follows

$$\|p\|_\beta^{1-\beta} \leq \frac{1}{(d^{1/\beta-1})^{\beta-1}} \leq \sqrt{d}. \quad (\text{A259})$$

We will now see which of the two constraints, $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq d$, and $\|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1 \leq 1/e$ is more demanding.

$$\|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1 \leq \frac{8}{d} \sqrt{d} \|p - p'\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{e} \implies \|p - p'\|_1 \leq \frac{d}{(8e)^2} \leq d. \quad (\text{A260})$$

therefore $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq d$, and $\|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1 \leq 1/e$ are both satisfied if $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq d/(8e)^2$. From these bounds, Eq. (A216) follows.

For $\beta \in [1/2, 1)$:

Setting $r = \beta$, $p = 1$ in Eq. (A268), and recalling $\|p\|_1 = 1$, it follows

$$1 \leq \|p\|_\beta \leq d^{1/\beta-1}. \quad (\text{A261})$$

From Eq. (A261)

$$\|p\|_\beta^{1-\beta} \leq \left(d^{1/\beta-1} \right)^{1-\beta} = d^{-2+\beta+1/\beta} \leq \sqrt{d}. \quad (\text{A262})$$

Similarly, from Lemma 32, and assuming $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq d$, we have

$$\Delta(p, p') \leq 4 d^{1-\beta} \left(\|p - p'\|_1 \right)^\beta \leq 4 d \left(\frac{\|p - p'\|_1}{d} \right)^\beta \leq 4 \sqrt{d} \|p - p'\|_1, \quad (\text{A263})$$

$$\left| \|p'\|_\beta - \|p\|_\beta \right| \leq 8 d^{1/\beta-1/(2\beta)+1/2-\beta} (\|p - p'\|_1)^{1/2} \leq 8 d \sqrt{\|p - p'\|_1}. \quad (\text{A264})$$

We will now see which of the two constraints, $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq d$, and $\|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1 \leq 1/e$ is more demanding.

$$\|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1 \leq \frac{\Delta(p, p')}{\|p\|_\beta^\beta} \leq 4 \sqrt{d} \|p - p'\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{e} \implies \|p - p'\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{(4e)^2 d} \leq d. \quad (\text{A265})$$

therefore $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq d$, and $\|q_\beta(p) - q_\beta(p')\|_1 \leq 1/e$ are both satisfied if $\|p - p'\|_1 \leq 1/(4e)^2 d$.

Plugging this all into Eq. (A255) and simplifying the resultant expression, followed by plugging into Eq. (A236), we arrive at Eq. (A215). ■

6. Miscellaneous Lemmas and Theorems used in the proofs to the entropy continuity Theorems 7 and 8.

Lemma 28. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then $\forall x, y \geq 0, \epsilon > 0$,*

$$|x^\alpha - y^\alpha| \leq \epsilon^\alpha + \epsilon^{\alpha-1}|x - y| \quad (\text{A266})$$

Proof. See Lemma 5 in [89]. ■

Lemma 29 (p -norm inequalities). *For $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $p \in (0, \infty]$, define*

$$\|x\|_p := \left(\sum_{q=1}^n |x_q|^p \right)^{1/p}. \quad (\text{A267})$$

For $p \geq 1$, this is a norm, known as the p -norm.

For $0 < r \leq p$ we have the p -norm interchange inequalities

$$\|x\|_p \leq \|x\|_r \leq n^{(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{p})} \|x\|_p. \quad (\text{A268})$$

Furthermore, for $p \in [1, \infty]$, we have the p -norm triangle inequality,

$$\|x + y\|_p \leq \|x\|_p + \|y\|_p \quad (\text{A269})$$

Proof. See [90]. ■

Lemma 30 (Fannes inequality [91]). *For any $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}_d$, the following continuity bounds hold.*

$$|S_1(p) - S_1(p')| \leq \begin{cases} \|p - p'\|_1 \ln(d) - \|p - p'\|_1 \ln(\|p - p'\|_1), & \text{for all } \|p - p'\|_1 \\ \|p - p'\|_1 \ln(d) + 1/(e \ln(2)), & \text{if } \|p - p'\|_1 \leq 1/(2e), \end{cases} \quad (\text{A270})$$

where S_1 is the Shannon entropy.

Proof. See [91]. ■

Remark 31. Also see [92] for a nice tightening of the bound and [93] for bounds for the infinite dimensional case.

Theorem 9 (Mean Value Theorem). *Let $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function on the closed interval $[a, b]$, and differentiable on the open interval (a, b) , where $a < b$. Then there exists some $c \in (a, b)$ such that*

$$f'(c) = \frac{f(b) - f(a)}{b - a}, \quad (\text{A271})$$

where $f'(c) := \left. \frac{d}{dx} f(x) \right|_{x=c}$.

Proof. See any introductory book to calculus. ■

Lemma 32 (Sum difference upper bounds). *Let $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}_d$.*

1) *For all $\alpha > 0$:*

$$|\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha| \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |p_i^\alpha - p_i'^\alpha| \leq 2^{\lceil \alpha \rceil} \left(\|p - p'\|_{\alpha/\lceil \alpha \rceil} \right)^{\alpha/\lceil \alpha \rceil} \leq 2^{\lceil \alpha \rceil} d^{(1-\alpha/\lceil \alpha \rceil)} (\|p - p'\|_1)^{\alpha/\lceil \alpha \rceil} \quad (\text{A272})$$

2)

$$|\|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha| \leq \begin{cases} 4^{\lceil \alpha^{-1} \rceil} d^{(\alpha^{-1} - \alpha^{-1}/\lceil \alpha^{-1} \rceil + 1/\lceil \alpha^{-1} \rceil - \alpha)} (\|p - p'\|_1)^{1/\lceil \alpha^{-1} \rceil} & \text{for } 0 < \alpha < 1 \\ \|p - p'\|_1 & \text{for } \alpha \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A273})$$

Proof. It will be partitioned into two subsections, one for Eq. (A272), the other for Eq. (A273).

Proof of 1)

The first line in Eq. (A272) follows directly from the triangle inequality. The remainder of this subsection will refer to the proof of (A272) for $\alpha > 0$. For the second line, start by defining $\alpha_1 := \alpha/\lceil\alpha\rceil \leq 1$ where $\lceil x \rceil := \min y \in \mathbb{Z}$ s.t. $y > x$. Now using the identity $(x^n - y^n) = (x - y) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} x^k y^{n-1-k}$ for $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, we have

$$|p_k^\alpha - p_k'^\alpha| = \left| (p_k^{\alpha_1})^{\lceil\alpha\rceil} - (p_k'^{\alpha_1})^{\lceil\alpha\rceil} \right| = |p_k^{\alpha_1} - p_k'^{\alpha_1}| \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\lceil\alpha\rceil-1} (p_k^{\alpha_1})^n (p_k'^{\alpha_1})^{\lceil\alpha\rceil-1-n} \right| \leq \lceil\alpha\rceil |p_k^{\alpha_1} - p_k'^{\alpha_1}|. \quad (\text{A274})$$

If $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^+$ the proof of the second inequality in Eq. (A272) is complete. Otherwise $\alpha_1 < 1$ and we can employ Lemma 28 with $\epsilon = |p_k - p_k'|$ to achieve

$$|p_k^\alpha - p_k'^\alpha| \leq 2 \lceil\alpha\rceil |p_k - p_k'|^{\alpha_1} = 2 \lceil\alpha\rceil |p_k - p_k'|^{\alpha/\lceil\alpha\rceil}, \quad (\text{A275})$$

from which the proof of second inequality in Eq. (A272) follows. To achieve the third inequality, we employ Lemma 29 with $r = \alpha/\lceil\alpha\rceil$, $p = 1$.

Proof of 2)

For $\alpha \geq 1$, this is easy. Using the p -norm triangle inequality, Eq. (A269), twice we have

$$-\|p - p'\|_\alpha \leq \|p\|_\alpha - \|p' - p + p\|_\alpha = \|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha = \|p - p' + p'\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha \leq \|p - p'\|_\alpha. \quad (\text{A276})$$

Therefore, from the monotonicity of the p -norm, Eq. (A268), we find

$$|\|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha| \leq \|p - p'\|_\alpha \leq \|p - p'\|_1. \quad (\text{A277})$$

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have to do a bit more work since the p -triangle inequality does not apply. Define $\beta_1 := \beta^{-1}/\lceil\beta^{-1}\rceil \leq 1$. We can write

$$|\|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha| = \left| \left[(\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} \right]^{\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil} - \left[(\|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} \right]^{\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil} \right| \quad (\text{A278})$$

$$= \left| (\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} - (\|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} \right| \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil-1} \left[(\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} \right]^n \left[(\|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} \right]^{\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil-1-n} \right|, \quad (\text{A279})$$

where in the last line we have applied the identity $(x^n - y^n) = (x - y) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} x^k y^{n-1-k}$ for $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Applying Eq. (A268) for $r = \alpha$, $p = 1$, and noting $\|p\|_1 = 1$, we find

$$(\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} \leq \left(d^{\alpha^{-1}-1} \right)^{\alpha\beta_1} = d^{(\alpha^{-1}-1)/\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil}. \quad (\text{A280})$$

Therefore, plugging in this upper bound we find

$$|\|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha| \leq \left| (\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} - (\|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} \right| \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil-1} \left[d^{(\alpha^{-1}-1)/\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil} \right]^n \left[d^{(\alpha^{-1}-1)/\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil} \right]^{\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil-1-n} \right| \quad (\text{A281})$$

$$\leq \left| (\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} - (\|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} \right| \lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil \left[d^{(\alpha^{-1}-1)/\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil} \right]^{\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil-1} \quad (\text{A282})$$

$$\leq \left| (\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} - (\|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} \right| \lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil d^{\alpha^{-1}-\alpha^{-1}/\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil+1/\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil-1}. \quad (\text{A283})$$

Now for $\beta_1 < 1$ apply Lemma 28, with $\epsilon = \|p - p'\|_\alpha$, $x = \|p\|_\alpha^\alpha$, $y = \|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha$ to achieve

$$|\|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha| \leq \left| (\|p\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} - (\|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\beta_1} \right| \lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil d^{\alpha^{-1}-\alpha^{-1}/\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil+1/\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil-1} \quad (\text{A284})$$

$$\leq \left| \|p\|_\alpha^\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha^\alpha \right|^{\beta_1} 2 \lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil d^{\alpha^{-1}-\alpha^{-1}/\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil+1/\lceil\alpha^{-1}\rceil-1}. \quad (\text{A285})$$

By inspection, we observe that the inequality also holds when $\beta_1 = 1$. We now plug in Eq. (A273), to find

$$\left| \|p\|_\alpha - \|p'\|_\alpha \right| \leq (\|p - p'\|_1)^{1/(\lceil \alpha \rceil \lceil \alpha^{-1} \rceil)} (2\lceil \alpha \rceil)^{\beta_1} 2\lceil \alpha^{-1} \rceil d^{\alpha^{-1} - \alpha^{-1}/\lceil \alpha^{-1} \rceil + 1/\lceil \alpha^{-1} \rceil - 1}. \quad (\text{A286})$$

Thus noting that $(2\lceil \alpha \rceil)^{\beta_1} \leq 2$, we achieve Eq. (A273) for $0 < \alpha < 1$. ■

7. Refinement of Theorem 5.

The following corollary allows one to write Theorem 5 in the form of Theorem 1.

Corollary 33. *For all fixed d_S , and in the limits $\epsilon_{emb} \rightarrow 0^+$, $D_{\text{Cat}} \rightarrow \infty$, Theorem 5 holds under the replacement of Eq. (A14) by*

$$\epsilon_{res}(\epsilon_{emb}, d_S, D_{\text{Cat}}) = 15 \sqrt{\frac{d_S \ln D_{\text{Cat}}}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})} \left(1 + D_{\text{Cat}} \epsilon_{emb}^{1/7}\right)} \quad (\text{A287})$$

Proof. The proof consists in upper bounding line A146 in the proof of Theorem 5 before setting ϵ_{emb} equal to it. Continuing from line A146 but now taking D to be large and ϵ_{emb} to be small followed by neglecting higher order terms, one finds

$$5 \sqrt{\frac{d_S^{5/3} + 4(\ln D) \ln d_S}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})} + D \epsilon_{emb}^{1/6} + 5 \left(D^2 \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{emb}}{D}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{D}{\epsilon_{emb}}} \right)^{2/3}} \quad (\text{A288})$$

$$\leq 5 \sqrt{\frac{4(\ln D_{\text{Cat}}) \ln d_S}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})} + D \epsilon_{emb}^{1/6} + 5D (\ln \sqrt{D})^{2/3} \left(\sqrt{\epsilon_{emb}} + \sqrt{\epsilon_{emb}} \ln \sqrt{\frac{1}{\epsilon_{emb}}} \right)^{2/3}} \quad (\text{A289})$$

$$\leq 5 \sqrt{\frac{4(\ln D_{\text{Cat}}) \ln d_S}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})} + D \epsilon_{emb}^{1/6} + 5D \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{2/3} (\ln D)^{2/3} \left(\sqrt{\epsilon_{emb}} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon_{emb}} \right)^{2/3}} \quad (\text{A290})$$

$$\leq 5 \sqrt{\frac{4(\ln D_{\text{Cat}}) \ln d_S}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})} + D \epsilon_{emb}^{1/7} \epsilon_{emb}^{1/42} + 4D (\ln D) \epsilon_{emb}^{1/7} \epsilon_{emb}^{4/21} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon_{emb}} \right)} \quad (\text{A291})$$

$$\leq 5 \sqrt{\frac{4(\ln D_{\text{Cat}}) \ln d_S}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})} + D \frac{\epsilon_{emb}^{1/7}}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})} + \frac{4D (\ln D) \epsilon_{emb}^{1/7}}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})}} \quad (\text{A292})$$

$$\leq 5 \sqrt{\frac{4(\ln D_{\text{Cat}}) d_S}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})} + \frac{5D (\ln D) \epsilon_{emb}^{1/7}}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})}} \quad (\text{A293})$$

$$\leq 5 \sqrt{\frac{4(\ln D_{\text{Cat}}) d_S}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})} + \frac{5d_S D_{\text{Cat}} (\ln d_S + \ln D_{\text{Cat}}) \epsilon_{emb}^{1/7}}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})}} \quad (\text{A294})$$

$$\leq 15 \sqrt{\frac{d_S \ln D_{\text{Cat}}}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})} \left(1 + D_{\text{Cat}} \epsilon_{emb}^{1/7}\right)}, \quad (\text{A295})$$

where in line A292, we have used the observation

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{x^p}{\ln^2(1/x)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{x^p}{\ln(1/x)} = 0 \quad (\text{A296})$$

for all $p > 0$ and thus $x^p \leq \ln^2(1/\epsilon_{emb})$ for all fixed $p > 0$ and sufficiently small ϵ_{emb} . Thus if we set ϵ_{res} (defined via Eq. A69) to

$$15 \sqrt{\frac{d_S \ln D_{\text{Cat}}}{\ln(1/\epsilon_{emb})} \left(1 + D_{\text{Cat}} \epsilon_{emb}^{1/7}\right)}, \quad (\text{A297})$$

we conclude the proof. ■

Supplementary B: Miscellaneous lemmas for the proof of Theorem 2

Lemma 34. *Let $a_k \geq 0$ satisfy $1 - \epsilon_2 \leq \sum_k a_k \leq 1$, and ϕ_k satisfy $|\phi_k - \phi| \leq \epsilon_1$ for some ϕ . Let $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \leq 1$. Then we have*

$$\left| \sum_k e^{-i\phi_k} a_k \right| \geq 1 - \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_2 \quad (\text{B1})$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_k e^{-i\phi_k} a_k \right| &= \left| \sum_k e^{-i(\phi + \phi_k - \phi)} a_k \right| = \left| \sum_k e^{-i(\phi - \phi_k)} a_k \right| \geq \operatorname{Re} \sum_k e^{-i(\phi - \phi_k)} a_k = \sum_k \cos(\phi - \phi_k) a_k \geq \\ &\sum_k \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_1^2}{2} \right) a_k = \sum_k a_k - \frac{\epsilon_1^2}{2} \sum_k a_k \geq 1 - \epsilon_2 - \frac{\epsilon_1^2}{2} \geq 1 - \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

where we have used $\cos x \geq 1 - x^2/2$ and $\epsilon_2 \leq 1$. ■

Lemma 35. *For $\delta > 0$, and $d \geq 1/(2\delta)$, and for $\sigma = 1/\sqrt{d}$ we have*

$$\sum_{|k| > \delta d} |(\psi(0, k))|^2 \leq \operatorname{poly}(d) e^{-\delta^2 d} \quad (\text{B3})$$

Proof. We have

$$\sum_{|k| > \delta d} |(\psi(0, k))|^2 = A \sum_{|k| > \delta d} e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\sigma^2} k^2} = 2A \sum_{k \geq \delta d} e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\sigma^2} k^2} \leq 2A \int_{\delta d-1}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\sigma^2} k^2} dk. \quad (\text{B4})$$

We now use exponential bound for gaussian tails:

$$\int_r^{\infty} dx e^{-b^2 x^2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{b} e^{-b^2 r^2} \quad (\text{B5})$$

and the assumption $d \geq 1/(2\delta)$ to bound our expression further by

$$2A\sigma e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\sigma^2}(\delta d-1)^2} \leq A\sigma e^{-\frac{\pi\delta^2}{2\sigma^2}d^2}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Now using estimate on A and putting $\sigma = \sqrt{d}$ we get

$$\sum_{|k| > \delta d} |(\psi(0, k))|^2 \leq \operatorname{poly}(d) e^{-\delta^2 d}. \quad (\text{B7})$$

■

Here we prove lemma which bounds potential tail, giving rise to the estimate (A83):

Lemma 36. *For V_0 given by*

$$V_0(x) = A_c \cos^{2n} \left(\frac{x}{2} \right), \quad \text{with} \quad A_c = \frac{2^{2n}}{2\pi \binom{2n}{n}}. \quad (\text{B8})$$

We have the following estimate for potential tail for $0 < \delta \leq 1/2$

$$\int_0^{\pi-2\pi\delta} V_d(x) dx \leq \frac{1}{\delta} e^{-n\delta^2}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

Proof. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{2\delta\pi}^{\pi} V_0(x) dx &= A_c \int_{2\delta\pi}^{\pi} \cos^{2n}(x/2) dx \leq A_c \frac{1}{\sin(\delta\pi)} \int_{2\delta\pi}^{\pi} \cos^{2n}(x/2) \sin(x/2) dx = \\ &= A_c \frac{1}{\sin(\delta\pi)} \frac{2}{2n+1} \cos^{2n+1}(\delta\pi) \leq \frac{1}{\sin(\delta\pi)} \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{2n+1}(\delta\pi) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B10})$$

where in the last inequality we have used

$$\binom{2n}{n} \geq 2^{2n} \frac{2^{2n}}{2n+1}. \quad (\text{B11})$$

Finally we use $\sin x \geq x/\pi$ as well as $\cos x \leq 1 - x^2/(2\pi)$ for $0 \leq x \leq \pi$ to arrive at

$$\int_{2\delta\pi}^{\pi} V_0(x) dx \leq \frac{1}{\pi\delta} \left(1 - \frac{\pi}{2}\delta^2\right)^{2n+1} \leq \frac{1}{\delta} e^{-n\delta}, \quad (\text{B12})$$

where in the second inequality we have used $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x$ for $x \geq 0$, and have dropped some unnecessary terms. ■

In the following lemma, we reproduce bound for ε_ν the quantity reporting for deviation of pointer's evolution from the simple picture of acquiring phase.

Lemma 37. *For the potential V_0 as in Eq. (A82) with $n = \lceil d^{1/4} \rceil$ we have the following estimate on $\|\varepsilon_\nu\|$ given by (A102)*

$$\|\varepsilon_\nu\| \sim t \text{poly}(d) e^{-cd^{1/4}} \quad (\text{B13})$$

where $c = 1/(32\pi)$.

Proof. In [46] it is proven that (see Section 4.3. *Quasi-canonical Commutation*; page 135)

$$\|\varepsilon_\nu\|_2 = \varepsilon_\nu(t, d_{\text{Cl}}) = \mathcal{O}\left(t \text{poly}(d) e^{-\frac{\pi}{4}\frac{d}{\zeta}}\right) \text{ as } d \rightarrow \infty, \quad (\text{B14})$$

where $\zeta \geq 1$ is a measure of the size of the derivatives of $V_0(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &= \left(1 + \frac{0.792\pi}{\ln(\pi d)} b\right)^2, \quad \text{for any} \\ b &\geq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}^+} \left(2 \max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} \left|\Omega_n V_0^{(k-1)}(x)\right|\right)^{1/k}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B15})$$

where $V_0^{(k)}(x)$ is the k^{th} derivative with respect to x of $V_0(x)$. (Depending on how one chooses the potential V_0 , the lower bound on b may or may not depend on d_{Cl}).

For the specialised potential V_0 of the form (A82) in [46] the value of b was calculated (in Section 9.2. *Examples of Potential Functions: The Cosine Potential*; page 177), and it follows that that b satisfies

$$b \leq n\sqrt{n}. \quad (\text{B16})$$

We also see that for $b \geq \ln(d)$, and $d \geq 3$

$$\zeta \leq \left(\frac{2\pi}{b \ln d}\right)^2 \leq (2\pi b)^2 = 4\pi^2 n^3 \quad (\text{B17})$$

Plugging the last estimate into (B14) we obtain

$$\varepsilon_\nu(t, d_{\text{Cl}}) \sim t \text{poly}(d) e^{-\frac{\pi}{4} \frac{d}{4\pi^2 n^3}} \quad (\text{B18})$$

Choosing $n = \lceil d^{1/4} \rceil$ so that $n \leq 2d^{1/4}$ we obtain the required estimate. ■

Supplementary C: Miscellaneous lemma for the proof of Theorem 3

Here is the lemma used in the proof of Theorem 3 located in Section A 5.

Lemma 38. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - |c|^2 &\leq |1 - c^2| \\ |1 - c| &\leq |1 - c^2|, \end{aligned} \tag{C1}$$

for all $c \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $|c| \leq 1$ and $|1 - c| \leq 1$.

Proof. Write c in terms of real and imaginary parts: $c = a + ib$. The constraints $|c| \leq 1$ and $|1 - c| \leq 1$ imply that a satisfies $0 \leq a \leq 1$. We find $(1 - |c|^2)^2 = (1 - a^2)^2 - 2(1 - a^2)b^2 + b^4$ while $|1 - c^2|^2 = (1 - a^2)^2 + 2(1 - a^2)b^2 + b^4 + 4a^2b^2$, thus concluding the 1st inequality in (C1). For the second inequality in Eq. C1, we start by observing that $(1 - a^2)^2 \leq (1 - a)^2$ and $b^2 \leq (2 + 2a^2)b^2 + b^4 = 2(1 - a^2)b^2 + 4a^2b^2 + b^4$, and thus $(1 - a^2)^2 + b^2 \leq (1 - a)^2 + 2(1 - a^2)b^2 + 4a^2b^2 + b^4$. On the other hand, we find $|1 - c|^2 = (1 - a)^2 + b^2$ and $|1 - c^2|^2 = (1 - a^2)^2 + 2(1 - a^2)b^2 + 4a^2b^2 + b^4$, thus proving the 2nd inequality in Eq. (C1). ■

Supplementary D: Continuity for perturbations: proof of Proposition 45

In this section we evaluate the norm of the difference between $e^{i(H+V)}$ and e^{iH} for Hermitian H and V , along the lines of [94]. For completeness we shall prove the result basing our proof solely on the version of mean value theorem for vector valued functions of [95], in the form taken from [96]:

Proposition 39. *Let f be defined on interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$ with values in a d -dimensional linear space. Let f be continuous on $[a, b]$ and differentiable on (a, b) . Then there exist numbers $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^d$ with $c_k \in (a, b)$ and $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^d$ satisfying $\sum_k \lambda_k = 1$ such that*

$$f(b) - f(a) = (b - a) \sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k f'(c_k). \tag{D1}$$

Using this we shall prove a version of Taylor's reminder theorem:

Proposition 40. *Let F a function defined on interval $[0, 1]$ with values in a d -dimensional linear space. Let F be $n + 1$ times differentiable on interval $(0, 1)$ and continuous on $[0, 1]$. We then have*

$$F(1) - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{F^{(k)}(0)}{k!} = \sum_{l=1}^d \lambda_l \frac{(1 - t_l)^n}{n!} F^{(n+1)}(t_l), \tag{D2}$$

for some λ_l 's satisfying $\sum_{l=1}^d \lambda_l = 1$ and some $t_l \in (0, 1)$, where $F^{(k)}(x) := \frac{d^k}{dx^k} F(x)$.

Proof. Following [94] we consider function G defined as

$$G(t) = F(t) + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{(1 - t)^k}{k!} F^{(k)}(t). \tag{D3}$$

We see that

$$G(1) = F(1), \quad G(0) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{F^{(k)}(0)}{k!} \tag{D4}$$

and G satisfies assumptions of Prop. 39. Applying this Proposition to G for $a = 0$, $b = 1$, we obtain the desired result. ■

We can apply the above proposition to the case $n = 1$ and get

$$F(1) - F(0) = F'(0) + \sum_{l=1}^d \lambda_l \frac{(1 - t_l)^2}{2} F''(t_l) \tag{D5}$$

which implies (by convexity of norm, and triangle inequality):

$$\|F(1) - F(0)\|_\infty \leq \|F'(0)\|_\infty + \frac{1}{2} \max_{t \in (0,1)} \|F''(t)\|_\infty. \quad (\text{D6})$$

Consider now $F(t) = e^{i(H+tV)}$. We obtain the following.

Lemma 41. *Let $F(t) = e^{i(H+tV)}$ for Hermitian matrices H, V . We then have*

$$\|F'(t)\|_\infty \leq \|V\|_\infty, \quad \|F''(t)\|_\infty \leq \|V\|_\infty^2 \quad (\text{D7})$$

for $t \in (0,1)$.

Proof. We use the following general formula

$$\frac{d}{dt} e^{X(t)} = \int_0^1 e^{\alpha X(t)} \frac{dX(t)}{dt} e^{(1-\alpha)X(t)} d\alpha. \quad (\text{D8})$$

For $X = i(H + Vt)$ we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} e^{i(H+Vt)} = \int_0^1 e^{i\alpha(H+Vt)} iV e^{(1-\alpha)i(H+Vt)} d\alpha = \int_0^1 U_1 V U_2 d\alpha \quad (\text{D9})$$

with U_1, U_2 unitaries. Using convexity and multiplicativity of operator norm, and $\|U\|_\infty = 1$ for unitaries we get

$$F'(t) \leq \int_0^1 \|V\|_\infty d\alpha = \|V\|_\infty. \quad (\text{D10})$$

Similarly we have

$$\begin{aligned} F''(t) &= \frac{d^2}{dt^2} e^{i(H+Vt)} = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} \left(e^{i\alpha(H+Vt)} iV e^{(1-\alpha)i(H+Vt)} + e^{i\alpha(H+Vt)} iV \frac{d}{dt} \left(e^{(1-\alpha)i(H+Vt)} \right) d\alpha \right. \\ &= \int_0^1 \left\{ \int_0^1 e^{i\beta\alpha(H+Vt)} i\alpha V e^{(1-\beta)\alpha(H+Vt)} iV e^{(1-\alpha)i(H+Vt)} d\beta \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^1 e^{i\alpha(H+Vt)} iV e^{i\beta\alpha(H+Vt)} i\alpha V e^{(1-\beta)\alpha(H+Vt)} d\beta \right\} d\alpha \\ &= \int_0^1 d\alpha \left\{ \int_0^1 i^2 \alpha V_1 V V_2 V V_3 d\beta + \int_0^1 i^2 \alpha W_1 V W_2 V W_3 d\beta \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D11})$$

with V_i and W_j being unitary. As before, passing to norms, using convexity of norm, multiplicativity of norm and triangle inequality, we arrive at

$$\|F''(t)\|_\infty \leq 2\|V\|_\infty^2 \int_0^1 \alpha d\alpha = \|V\|_\infty^2. \quad (\text{D12})$$

■

Remark 42. Similarly one can prove that $\|F^{(k)}(t)\|_\infty \leq \|V\|_\infty^k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now, combining Lemma 41 with formula (D6) we obtain

Proposition 43. *We have*

$$\|e^{i(H+V)} - e^{iH}\|_\infty \leq \|V\|_\infty + \frac{1}{2} \|V\|_\infty^2. \quad (\text{D13})$$

Proof. We obtain the above equation by noting that for $F(t) = e^{i(H+tV)}$ we have $F(1) = e^{i(H+V)}$, $F(0) = e^{iH}$, and inserting these into (D6) and using (D7). ■

To obtain bounds on states, we need the following well known fact (a special case of Hölder type inequalities [97]).

Lemma 44. *For arbitrary operators A, B in finite dimensional Hilbert space we have*

$$\|AB\|_1 \leq \|A\|_1 \|B\|_\infty, \quad (\text{D14})$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ denotes the infinity norm and $\|\cdot\|_1$ the one norm.

For the following proposition, we need to recall Eqs. (22), (21), (23) from the main text. We reproduce them here for convenience:

$$\rho_S^1 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 = \text{tr}_G \left[e^{-i\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}} (\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tau_G) e^{i\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}} \right], \quad (\text{D15})$$

$$\sigma_{\text{SCat}}^1 := \text{tr}_G \left[e^{-i(\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}} + \delta\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}})} (\rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tau_G) e^{i(\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}} + \delta\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}})} \right], \quad (\text{D16})$$

$$\epsilon_H := \|\sigma_{\text{SCat}}^1 - \rho_S^1 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0\|_1. \quad (\text{D17})$$

Proposition 45. *For all states $\rho_S^0, \sigma_S^1, \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0$ and Gibbs states τ_G , and for all Hermitian operators $\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}, \delta\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}$ satisfying Eq. (D15), the following bound on ϵ_H , defined in Eq. (D17), holds:*

$$\epsilon_H \leq 2\|\delta\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}\|_\infty + \|\delta\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}\|_\infty^2. \quad (\text{D18})$$

Proof. Let $U = e^{i(H+V)}$ and $U_0 = e^{iH}$. Then for any state ρ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U\rho U^\dagger - U_0\rho U_0^\dagger\|_1 &= \|U\rho U^\dagger - U\rho U_0^\dagger + U\rho U_0^\dagger - U_0\rho U_0^\dagger\|_1 \leq \|U\rho U^\dagger - U\rho U_0^\dagger\|_1 + \|U\rho U_0^\dagger - U_0\rho U_0^\dagger\|_1 \leq \\ &\leq \|\rho(U^\dagger - U_0^\dagger)\|_1 + \|(U - U_0)\rho\|_1 \leq \|\rho\|_1\|U^\dagger - U_0^\dagger\|_\infty + \|\rho\|_1\|U - U_0\|_\infty = 2\|U - U_0\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D19})$$

We have here used triangle inequality for first inequality, invariance of trace norm under unitaries for the second one, and Eq. (D14) for the third one. Next, using Prop. 43 we obtain the needed relation

$$\|U\rho U^\dagger - U_0\rho U_0^\dagger\|_1 \leq 2\|V\|_\infty + \|V\|_\infty^2. \quad (\text{D20})$$

Now in the above equation, set $\rho = \rho_S^0 \otimes \rho_{\text{Cat}}^0 \otimes \tau_G$ and $U_0 = e^{-i\theta(t)\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}}}$, $U = e^{-i(\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}} + \delta\hat{I}_{\text{SCatG}}^{\text{int}})}$. The bound Eq. (D18) now follows by applying the data processing inequality. ■

Supplementary E: Proof of Theorem 4

Since the proof of Theorem 4 is similar to that of Theorem 2, we have relegated it to this supplementary. For its proof, we need the following proposition. Furthermore, the following proposition will require calculations which are also performed in the proof of Proposition 4. We will refer the reader to the proof of Proposition 4 and not replicate them here.

Proposition 46. *Consider the potential $\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}} = \hat{V}_d$ of Eq. (A80) and Quasi-Ideal clock described in Subsection A 3 a. Set $k_0 = 0$. Then for $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, T_0]$, and provided that $|\Delta(t; \omega, \omega')| \leq 2$, $\tilde{\epsilon}_V \leq 1$ and $\varepsilon_\nu \leq 1$, we have*

$$\max_{\omega, \omega' \in [-\pi, \pi]} |1 - \Delta(t; \omega, \omega')^2| \leq 12(\varepsilon_{LR} + \varepsilon_\nu + 12\tilde{\epsilon}_V) \quad (\text{E1})$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_V$ is given by Eq. (A83), ε_{LR} by Eq. (A109) and $\varepsilon_\nu = \varepsilon_\nu(t, d_{\text{Cl}})$ by Eq. (A104).

Proof. Let us repeat here useful definitions from Eqs. (30):

$$\Delta(t; \omega, \omega') := \langle \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 | \hat{\Gamma}_{\text{Cl}}^\dagger(\omega, t) \hat{\Gamma}_{\text{Cl}}(\omega', t) | \rho_{\text{Cl}}^0 \rangle, \quad (\text{E2})$$

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\text{Cl}}(\omega, t) := e^{-it\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}} + i\omega(\theta(t)\mathbb{1}_{\text{Cl}} - t\hat{H}_{\text{Cl}}^{\text{int}})}, \quad \omega, t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (\text{E3})$$

Recall that $\theta(t)$ is defined as

$$\theta(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } t \in [0, t_1] \\ 1 & \text{for } t \in [t_2, T_0]. \end{cases} \quad (\text{E4})$$

The initial state of the clock is the state of Eq. (A84)

$$|\rho_{\text{Cl}}^0\rangle = |\Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0)\rangle. \quad (\text{E5})$$

we then have

$$\Delta(t; \omega, \omega') = e^{-i(\omega' - \omega)\theta(t)} \langle \Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0) | e^{-it(\omega\hat{V}_d + \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}})} e^{it(\omega'\hat{V}_d + \hat{H}_{\text{Cl}})} | \Psi_{\text{nor}}(k_0) \rangle. \quad (\text{E6})$$

Using (A102) we write

$$\Delta(t; \omega, \omega') = e^{-i(\omega' - \omega)\theta(t)} (\langle \psi_\omega | \psi_{\omega'} \rangle + \langle \psi_\omega | \varepsilon_\nu \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_\nu | \psi_{\omega'} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_\nu | \varepsilon_\nu \rangle) \quad (\text{E7})$$

with

$$|\psi_\omega\rangle = |\bar{\Psi}_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0, td/T_0)\rangle \quad (\text{E8})$$

where in definition of $|\bar{\Psi}_{\text{nor}}(k_0 + td/T_0, td/T_0)\rangle$ we take ω in place of Ω_n . Due to (A104) the last three terms in (E7) are small, hence we need to consider

$$\tilde{\Delta} := e^{-i(\omega' - \omega)\theta(t)} \langle \psi_\omega | \psi_{\omega'} \rangle = e^{-i(\omega' - \omega)\theta(t)} \sum_{k: |k - td/T_0| \leq d/2} e^{-i(\omega - \omega') \int_k^{k+td/T_0} dy V_d(y)} |\psi_{\text{nor}}(td/T_0; k)|^2, \quad (\text{E9})$$

where we have set $k_0 = 0$ as in the proof of Prop. 4. As in (A110) we write

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \tilde{\Delta}_C + \tilde{\Delta}_{LR}. \quad (\text{E10})$$

and as in (A115) we obtain

$$|\tilde{\Delta}_{LR}| \leq 2\varepsilon_{LR} \quad (\text{E11})$$

So we have to estimate

$$\tilde{\Delta}_C := e^{-i(\omega' - \omega)\theta(t)} \sum_{k: |k - td/T_0| \leq \delta_\psi d} e^{-i(\omega - \omega') \int_k^{k+td/T_0} dy V_d(y)} |\psi_{\text{nor}}(td/T_0; k)|^2. \quad (\text{E12})$$

As in proof of Proposition 4 we introduce real numbers ϕ_k, a_k given by

$$\phi_k = \begin{cases} (\omega - \omega') \int_k^{k+td/T_0} dy V_d(y) & \text{for } t \in [0, t_1] \\ (\omega - \omega') \left(1 - \int_k^{k+td/T_0} dy V_d(y)\right) & \text{for } t \in [t_2, T_0]. \end{cases} \quad (\text{E13})$$

and

$$a_k = |\psi_{\text{nor}}(td/T_0; k)|^2, \quad (\text{E14})$$

so that

$$\tilde{\Delta}_C = \sum_{k: |k - td/T_0| \leq \delta_\psi d} a_k e^{-i\phi_k}. \quad (\text{E15})$$

Since the state (A84) was normalized, and due to estimates (A115) we know that

$$1 - 2\varepsilon_{LR} \leq \sum_{k: |k - td/T_0| \leq \delta_\psi d} a_k \leq 1. \quad (\text{E16})$$

Similarly as in Prop. 4 we obtain that for k satisfying $|k - td/T_0| \leq \delta_\psi d$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_k^{k+td/T_0} dy V_d(y) &\leq \tilde{\epsilon}_V \quad \text{for } t \in [0, t_1] \\ 1 - \int_k^{k+td/T_0} dy V_d(y) &\leq \tilde{\epsilon}_V \quad \text{for } t \in [t_2, T_0]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E17})$$

hence, since $\omega, \omega' \in [-\pi, \pi]$, we have

$$|\phi_k| \leq 2\pi\tilde{\epsilon}_V \quad (\text{E18})$$

Thus, using $\cos x \geq 1 - x^2$ and $|\sin x| \leq |x|$ as well as plugging in estimates (E16), (E18) we obtain bounds for real and imaginary parts of $\tilde{\Delta}_C$:

$$\Re(\tilde{\Delta}_C) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_{LR})(1 - 4\pi^2\tilde{\epsilon}_V) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_{LR} - 4\pi^2\tilde{\epsilon}_V, \quad |\Im(\tilde{\Delta}_C)| \leq 2\pi\tilde{\epsilon}_V. \quad (\text{E19})$$

We are now in position to deal with $\Delta(t; \omega, \omega')$. Using (E7) and (E10) we obtain

$$\Delta(t; \omega, \omega') = \Re(\tilde{\Delta}_C) + z, \quad (\text{E20})$$

where

$$z = i\Im(\Delta_c) + \tilde{\Delta}_L + \tilde{\Delta}_R + e^{-i(\omega' - \omega)\theta(t)} \left(\langle \psi_\omega | \varepsilon_\nu \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_\nu | \psi_{\omega'} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_\nu | \varepsilon_\nu \rangle \right). \quad (\text{E21})$$

Since $\psi_\omega, \psi_{\omega'}$ are normalized, we have

$$\left| e^{-i(\omega' - \omega)\theta(t)} \left(\langle \psi_\omega | \varepsilon_\nu \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_\nu | \psi_{\omega'} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_\nu | \varepsilon_\nu \rangle \right) \right| \leq 2\varepsilon_\nu + |\varepsilon_\nu|^2 \quad (\text{E22})$$

so that

$$|z| \leq 2\pi\tilde{\epsilon}_V + 2\varepsilon_{LR} + 2\varepsilon_\nu + |\varepsilon_\nu|^2. \quad (\text{E23})$$

Now, using assumption that $\Delta(t; \omega, \omega') \leq 2$ and estimates (E19) and (E23) we get

$$|1 - \Delta(t; \omega, \omega')^2| \leq 3|1 - \Delta(t; \omega, \omega')| \leq 3(|1 - \Re(\tilde{\Delta}_C)| + |z|) \leq 3(2\varepsilon_{LR} + 4\pi^2\tilde{\epsilon}_V^2 + 2\pi\tilde{\epsilon}_V + 2\varepsilon_{LR} + 2\varepsilon_\nu + |\varepsilon_\nu|^2) \quad (\text{E24})$$

Using the assumption that $\tilde{\epsilon}_V \leq 1$ and $\varepsilon_\nu \leq 1$ we obtain

$$|1 - \Delta(t; \omega, \omega')^2| \leq 12(\varepsilon_{LR} + \varepsilon_\nu + 12\tilde{\epsilon}_V). \quad (\text{E25})$$

We have thus obtained a bound that is independent of the choice of ω and ω' ; this proves the required estimate. ■

We can now prove Theorem 4:

Proof. Due to Prop. 46 we have to provide an upper bound for

$$12(\varepsilon_{LR} + \varepsilon_\nu + 12\tilde{\epsilon}_V). \quad (\text{E26})$$

The appropriate bounds for the above epsilons are given by Eqs. (A133) hence the needed scaling follows ■