Optimal Frobenius light cone in spin chains with power-law interactions
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In many-body quantum systems with spatially local interactions, quantum information propagates with a finite velocity, reminiscent of the “light cone” of relativity. In systems with long-range interactions which decay with distance $r$ as $1/r^\alpha$, however, there are multiple light cones which control different information theoretic tasks. We show an optimal (up to logarithms) “Frobenius light cone” obeying $t \sim r^{\min(\alpha-1,1)}$ for $\alpha > 1$ in one-dimensional power-law interacting systems with finite local dimension: this controls, among other physical properties, the butterfly velocity characterizing many-body chaos and operator growth. We construct an explicit random Hamiltonian protocol that saturates the bound and settles the optimal Frobenius light cone in one dimension.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
   1.1. Alternative choices of norms 2
   1.2. Long-range interactions 3

2. Preliminaries 4
   2.1. Long-range interactions 4
   2.2. Operator norms and operator size 4

3. Towards submultiplicativity for the Frobenius norm 5

4. Frobenius light cone 8

5. Algebraically optimal operator growth protocol 11
   5.1. Intuitive argument 11
   5.2. Explicit protocol 12
   5.3. Bound on the performance of our random protocol 14

6. Outlook 22

Acknowledgements 22

References 22

1. INTRODUCTION

The celebrated Lieb-Robinson theorem proves that for arbitrary systems with nearest-neighbor interactions (with bounded strength), the speed at which quantum information can propagate is finite [1–6]. Intuitively, the time $t$ it takes to prepare an entangled state between two qubits (in an initially unentangled state) separated by distance $r$ is lower bounded as

$$t \geq \frac{r}{v_{LR}},$$

(1.1)

with $v_{LR}$ the so-called Lieb-Robinson velocity. In many respects, $v_{LR}$ is analogous to the speed of light $c$ in special relativity – no signals can be sent faster than $v_{LR}$. For this reason, we call (1.1) the Lieb-Robinson light cone. Over the past few decades, numerous unexpected and important results have been shown to follow from the Lieb-Robinson theorem, including the exponential decay of correlation functions in a gapped ground state, together with an area law for entanglement [3] and the effectiveness of matrix product state representations [7], proofs of the ability to efficiently simulate local quantum systems [8], and demonstration of the stability of topological order [9].

* chifang@caltech.edu
† andrew.j.lucas@colorado.edu
1.1. Alternative choices of norms

In the past year, [10] realized there can be multiple light cones: mathematically they correspond to the choices of norms, which capture different physics and constrain different quantum information theoretic tasks. More concretely, we will study information propagation as diagnosed by the commutator between local operators (e.g. Pauli matrices) on lattice sites \( x \) and \( y \): 

\[
A_x(t) := e^{iHt}A_x e^{-iHt}
\]

(1.2)

denotes Heisenberg time evolution.\(^1\) Indeed, local operators commute \([A_x(0), B_y] = 0\), and a non-vanishing commutator indicates the operator \(A_x(t)\) has “grown” to a distant site \(y\).

The traditional Lieb-Robinson bounds quantify the growth in the infinity norm \(\|A\|_\infty := \|A\|\) (often simply called the operator norm), the maximal singular value of the operator \(A\). In slightly more physical terms,

\[
\|A\| = \sup_{\psi, \psi'}|\langle \psi' | A | \psi \rangle|
\]

(1.3)

is the maximal matrix element of \(A\) between any many-body states. A bound on this norm then rules out the possibility of signaling, under the extreme choices of states. For quantum technology applications, such a bound is only relevant with tailored initial and final states, and usually require precisely controlled, decoherence free time-dependent evolution.

In hindsight, it is indeed surprising that a single notion of “quantum speed limit on information” had worked so well for the diverse set of tasks and properties described above that are not intended to be “worst case”. There is no obvious reason why the typical matrix elements of \(\langle \psi' | A | \psi \rangle\) should be close to the extreme. This motivates us to considering the Frobenius norm:

\[
\|A\|_F := \sqrt{\frac{\text{Tr}(A^\dagger A)}{\text{Tr}(I)}},
\]

(1.4)

which takes a quadratic average of singular values. Here \(I\) denotes the identity matrix. This object has a natural interpretation as a (Out-of-time) correlator at infinite temperature

\[
\|[A_x(t), B_y]\|_F^2 = \frac{\text{Tr}([A_x(t), B_y]^\dagger [A_x(t), B_y])}{\text{Tr}(I)}.
\]

(1.5)

This norm has been regarded as the manifestation of “chaos” in extensive studies over the past few years. Indeed, when the Frobenius norm becomes large for any operator \(B_y\), information about the initial operator \(A_x\) cannot be retrieved via local measurements. OTOC is also commonly thought of as a closer relative to entanglement generation than the Lieb-Robinson bounds.

A simple way to define a “light cone” out of either of these two notions of operator norm is to define \(t(r)\) as the first time that qubits separated by distance \(r\) can have a large commutator norm: e.g.,

\[
t(r) := \arg\inf_t \left\{ 0 < t < \infty : \|[A_0(t), B_r]\|_A \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\}
\]

(1.6)

The notation here is simply that we look for the smallest time (arginf) at which a certain commutator norm is bigger than some \(O(1)\) number, such as \(\frac{1}{2}\). It is interesting to ask whether in all Hamiltonian dynamics consistent with various simple constraints (e.g. nearest-neighbor interactions) there are bounds on \(t(r)\). For the infinity norm, the answer is provided by the Lieb-Robinson theorem (1.1). But, is it possible that in typical states, the light cone is slower than this? Namely, if we look at the Frobenius light cone instead,

\[
t_F(r) \geq \frac{r}{v_B},
\]

(1.7)

with a butterfly velocity (named for the aforementioned relationship of Frobenius light cones to OTOCs and chaos) \(v_B < v_{LR}\)? Preliminary work [11, 12] noticed that in random unitary circuits, this was indeed the case. In other words, the choice of norm (or, more physically, task of interest) quantitatively changed the “speed limits” on quantum dynamics.

With local interactions, this change is typically quantitative (but not qualitative). With long-range interactions, however, the discrepancy between Lieb-Robinson and Frobenius bounds becomes drastic. This perhaps explains why the Frobenius norm did not draw serious attention in the study of locally interacting systems.

\(^1\) For simplicity, we assume in this equation that Hamiltonian \(H\) does not depend on time. In all main results in this paper, we will eventually relax this assumption.
1.2. Long-range interactions

We now turn to the subject of physical systems with power-law interactions. Many promising platforms for future quantum technologies do not merely contain nearest neighbor interactions: they can include trapped ion crystals [13], Rydberg atom arrays [14], polar molecules [15], etc.; each of these platforms has long-range interactions between all pairs of qubits which decay with the distance $r$ as $V(r) \propto r^{-\alpha}$. Here $\alpha$ is an exponent characterizing the system: $0 < \alpha < 3$ can approximately be achieved in trapped ion crystals, while $\alpha = 3$ for polar molecules with dipolar interactions and $\alpha = 3.6$ for Rydberg atoms. The classic Lieb-Robinson bounds were entirely ineffective at constraining information dynamics in long-range systems. Over the past few years, increasingly sophisticated methods have been developed [2, 16–23] to ultimately conclusively settle the question of how tight Lieb-Robinson-like bounds can be. In a $d$-dimensional system, the time it takes to prepare an EPR state between two qubits separated by distance $r$ scales as $t \sim r^{\min(\alpha-2d, 1)}$ for $\alpha > 2d$. This remarkable result means that even when $\alpha = 6$, in three dimensions it is possible to prepare highly entangled states in nearly constant time ($t \sim \log r$).

It was first noted in [10] that the Lieb-Robinson bounds did not effectively constrain the Frobenius norm of a commutator in models with power-law interactions. There, it was argued that the optimal bound on Frobenius norms would scale as

$$t_F^r(r) \geq r^{\min(\alpha-3d/2, 1)}, \quad (1.8)$$

a result which was proved in $d = 1$ and also shown to be “optimal”. However, strictly speaking, the OTOCs which saturate (1.8) are not of the form $\| [A_x(t), B_y] \|_F$, with $A_x$ and $B_y$ simple Pauli matrices. Instead, they are of the form (in $d = 1$, for simplicity):

$$\left\| A_x(t), \prod_{z \geq y} B_z' \right\|_F,$$

with $B_z'$ local operators on each site $z$ at least as far from $x$ as $y$. For such a “one-to-many" Frobenius light cone, (1.8) is indeed optimal. However, (1.8) is not optimal if we demand $A_x$ and $B_y$ are both local matrices in $\| [A_x(t), B_y] \|_F$: it was recently proved in any dimension $d$ that for $\alpha > d$, the Frobenius light cone for such an OTOC is of the form [24]

$$t \geq r^{2(\alpha-d)/(2\alpha-d+1)}. \quad (1.9)$$

The purpose of this paper is to reconcile the results of [10, 24], and prove an optimal Frobenius bound on OTOCs of small operators in systems with long-range interactions, in one dimensional models $(d = 1)$. We find that

$$t_F^r(r) \geq r^{\min(\alpha-1, 1)}, \quad (\alpha > 1), \quad (1.10)$$

where logarithms and absolute constants are suppressed. We also construct an explicit random dynamical protocol that saturates this scaling (up to factors of $\log r$).

Our results have a number of interesting implications. Firstly, at $\alpha = 2$ the growth of operators is hardly faster than with nearest neighbor interactions, while existing state transfer protocol may sends a single qubit in time $t \sim \log r$ [22]! This demonstrates the qualitative discrepancy between Lieb-Robinson and Frobenius light cones, and implies that any task which is controlled by the Frobenius light cone may be exponentially slower at $\alpha = 2$. We conjecture that one such task is the generation of volume law entangled states.

Secondly, the Frobenius bound we present is essentially optimal even when the Hamiltonian is drawn randomly - in fact our protocol given an ensemble of saturating Hamiltonians. In contrast, typical random Hamiltonians have sharper operator norm bounds than deterministic Hamiltonian [25]. This demonstrates that the Frobenius bounds is more robust than the operator norm, in that much less fine tuning of Hamiltonians is needed to saturate a Frobenius bound.

Thirdly, the key technical takeaway is that Frobenius norm becomes nearly submultiplicative under certain “spectral flatness" assumptions (Corollary 3.3). This result follows from standard functional analysis tools such as Riesz-Thorin interpolation and Holder’s inequality, combined with new ideas (uniform smoothness) from matrix martingale theory. These results may help to improve existing “many body quantum walk" techniques for bounding OTOCs in a variety of models [26–30].

We conjecture that in $d$ spatial dimensions, (1.10) generalizes to

$$t_F^r(r) \sim r^{\min(\alpha-d, 1)} \quad (1.11)$$

for $\alpha > d$. In fact, our random protocol saturates such a bound. However, the proof of such a result will likely rely on a more sophisticated computation; we hope to solve this problem in future work.
2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we review formalisms in operator dynamics and useful facts from non-commutative functional analysis.

2.1. Long-range interactions

We first provide a careful definition for long-range interacting systems. Let \( \Lambda \) denote the vertices of a lattice graph, consisting of some unit cell repeated periodically in \( d \) spatial dimensions.\(^2\) For vertices \( i, j \in \Lambda \), let us define the distance \( d(i,j) \) between the two vertices to be the Manhattan distance (minimal number of edges to traverse to get from \( i \) to \( j \)). For ease of presentation, let us consider a many-body Hilbert space consisting of a single qubit (two-level system) on every lattice site. The Hilbert space of operators acting on a single qubit on site \( x \) is spanned by the identity \( I_x \), and the three Pauli matrices \( X_x, Y_x, Z_x \). In what follows, we denote with \( X^a = (X, Y, Z) \) the set of all non-trivial Paulis.

Given a 2-local Hamiltonian
\[
H(t) = \sum_{x,y \in \Lambda} \sum_{a,b=1}^3 J_{xy}^{ab}(t) X_x^a X_y^b, \tag{2.1}
\]
we say that it has power-law interactions of exponent \( \alpha \) if
\[
|J_{xy}^{ab}(t)| \leq \frac{1}{d(x,y)^\alpha}. \tag{2.2}
\]
Without loss of generality, we set the prefactor above to be 1 by rescaling the Hamiltonian. In practice, it is useful to say a model has exponent \( \alpha \) if it does not have exponent \( \alpha' > \alpha \), in our bounds the only criterion necessary is (2.2).

2.2. Operator norms and operator size

In this paper, we are interested in the Heisenberg time evolution of an operator
\[
\frac{dA(t)}{dt} := i[H(t), A] := \mathcal{L}(t)[A(t)]. \tag{2.3}
\]
It will be helpful to interpret operator dynamics in a bra-ket notation on the "Hilbert space" of operators, in which case we write the above equation as
\[
\frac{d}{dt}[A(t)] := \mathcal{L}(t)[A(t)]. \tag{2.4}
\]
We define a Frobenius inner product on this space. Loosely speaking\(^3\),
\[
(A|B) := \frac{\text{tr}(A^\dagger B)}{\text{tr}(I)}. \tag{2.5}
\]
It is often helpful to define projection operators. For example, the superoperator \( \mathbb{P}_x \), defined via
\[
\mathbb{P}_x A = -\frac{1}{8} \sum_{a=1}^3 [X^a_x, [X^a_x, A]], \tag{2.6}
\]
allows us to restrict to all terms in \( A \) which act non-trivially on site \( x \). Since
\[
\|[B_y, A]\|_F = \|[B_y, \mathbb{P}_y A]\|_F \leq 2\|B_y\|_\infty \mathbb{P}_y A\|_F = 2\|B_y\|_\infty \sqrt{(A|\mathbb{P}_y|A)}, \tag{2.7}
\]
it suffices to bound the (Frobenius) norm of \( \mathbb{P}_y A \), in order to bound OTOCs.

\(^2\) Mathematically, if \( E_\Lambda \) is an edge set on \( \Lambda \), we demand that the pair \( (\Lambda, E_\Lambda) \) has an automorphism group containing a translation subgroup \( \mathbb{Z}^d \).

\(^3\) On an infinite lattice, this ratio is not well-defined. We may interpret it so long as the operators \( A \) and \( B \) have compact support, in which case the traces may be restricted to the support of \( A \) and \( B \). Taking such an operator \( A \) with compact support, we may also time-evolve it. With a Hamiltonian \( H \) without compact support, the operator \( A(t) \) will (in general) also no longer have compact support. In this case, we may define \( (A|B) \) via a limiting process: letting \( A_S \) denote the terms in \( A \) supported on compact set \( S \), the limit of \( (A_S|B_S) \) will converge as \( S \) grows; the convergence is guaranteed by Lieb-Robinson theorems.
In fact, without loss of generality, we may write any operator $A$ as

$$A = \sum_{S \subseteq \Lambda} A_S(t),$$

where

$$P_x A_S(t) = \begin{cases} A_S(t) & x \in S \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (2.8)$$

Assuming $(A|A) = 1$ is normalized, we will then refer to

$$p_S = (A|A_S) \quad (2.9)$$

as the probability that the operator is supported on subset $S$. Clearly,

$$\sum_S p_S = 1, \quad (2.10)$$

so this terminology is well-defined. This probabilistic language will be highly valuable for us as we develop a fast operator growth protocol.

While the most important operator norm in this paper is the Frobenius norm (1.4), along with the operator norm (1.3), we will also find useful the Schatten $p$-norms that interpolate in between

$$\|X\|_p := \text{Tr}[(X^\dagger X)^{p/2}]. \quad (2.11)$$

Note that we will not divide out by $\text{tr}(I)$ here.\(^4\) To show an approximate form of submultiplicativity for the Frobenius norm, we will also find useful the following standard inequality from functional analysis:

**Proposition 2.1** (non-commutative Hölder’s inequality [25]). If

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2},$$

then

$$\|AB\|_p \leq \|A\|_{p_1} \|B\|_{p_2}. \quad (2.12)$$

Additionally, we have:

**Proposition 2.2** (Riesz-Thorin interpolation). If

$$\frac{1}{q^\theta} = \frac{\theta}{q_1} + \frac{1-\theta}{q_2},$$

then

$$\|A\|_{q^\theta} \leq \|A\|_{q_1}^{\theta} \|A\|_{q_2}^{1-\theta}. \quad (2.14)$$

\(^4\) As before, one should rigorously only apply this definition on a finite dimensional Hilbert space. We will implicitly invoke the limiting process explained above in this paper, in order to make sense out of the $p$-norm on an infinite dimensional space.

3. TOWARDS SUBMULTIPLICATIVITY FOR THE FROBENIUS NORM

The following key technical result allow us to derive strong bounds on the Frobenius norms of growing operators in systems with power law interactions.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let $S_1$ and $S_2$ be disjoint subsets of $\Lambda$. If

$$H = \sum_{i \in S_1, j \in S_2} h_{ij} Z_i Z_j, \quad (3.1)$$

and $\|O\| \leq 1$, then

$$\|HO\|_F \leq 2e\|H\|_F \|O\|_F (\ln \|O\|_F + 1). \quad (3.2)$$

Before diving into the proof, let us put this result into some context and explain why this refinement is necessary. For simplicity, consider a operator $O$ of diameter $r$. We want to understand the effect of long-range interactions.
interactions with another sphere of diameter $r$, distance $O(r)$ away: see Figure 1. The leading order growth is exactly

$$e^{iHt}oe^{-iHt} \approx O + it[H, O],$$

(3.3)

and the unconditional bound would be

$$\|HO\|_F \leq \|H\|_\infty \|O\|_F,$$

(3.4)

which triggers a recursion if we keep track of $\|O\|_F$, with the price of a large $\|H\|_\infty$. Indeed, observe that between two balls of size $r$ a distance $r$ apart, [10]

$$\|H\|_\infty \lesssim \sum_{x \in \text{ball 1}} \sum_{y \in \text{ball 2}} 1/d(x, y)^\alpha \sim 1/r^{\alpha-2d},$$

(3.5a)

$$\|H\|_F \lesssim \left( \sum_{x \in \text{ball 1}} \sum_{y \in \text{ball 2}} \left(1/d(x, y)^\alpha \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \sim 1/r^{\alpha-d}.$$ \tag{3.5b}

The Frobenius norm of $H$ is much smaller, yet (3.4) implies we must always consider the worst case scenario set by the operator norm.

It was the observation in [24] that the Frobenius norm can behave multiplicatively when the other operator has bounded spectrum: as in (2.7),

$$\|HO\|_F \leq \|H\|_F \|O\|_\infty.$$ \tag{3.6}

If $\|O\|_\infty \approx \|O\|_F$, as is the case when $O$ is a simple Pauli matrix ($O^2 = 1$), then using this inequality gives us an approximate form of submultiplicativity, one time. Of course, clearly this does not feed into a recursive bound; indeed in [24] this trick was only used once. But our refined bound is written entirely in terms of the Frobenius norm (except for the global constraint $\|O\| \leq 1$ inherited from the initial operator). This is more powerful and allows us to obtain much stronger Frobenius light cone bounds. We now present the proof.

Proof. Using Proposition 2.1,

$$\|HO\|_F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{tr}(I)}} \|HO\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{tr}(I)}} \|H\|_{2/(1-\alpha)} \|O\|_{2/\alpha}. \tag{3.7}$$

We now bound each of these norms in turn.

For the norm of $H$, we observe that due to the disjoint nature of $S_1$ and $S_2$, $H$ may be written as a sum of commuting terms:

$$H = \sum_{i \in S_1} \sum_{j \in S_2} H_{ij}, \tag{3.8}$$

with $[H_{ij}, H_{i'j'}] = 0$. Moreover, observe that products of $H_{ij}$ will always be proportional to Pauli strings of the form $Z_{i_1} Z_{i_2} \cdots$, whose trace is zero if there are any $Z$s in the string. In particular, as $Z^2 = I$, we may at
minimum demand that each Pauli matrix in $S_1$ shows up an even number of times. A simple way to achieve this (redundantly) is by introducing auxiliary iid classical Rademacher random variables $\epsilon_i$ for $i \in S_{1,2}$, with

$$P(\epsilon_i = \pm 1) = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.9}$$

We find the simple equality

$$\|H\|_p = \left[ \text{tr} \left( \left( \sum_{i \in S_1, j \in S_2} h_{ij} \epsilon_i Z_i Z_j \right)^p \right) \right]^{1/p} = \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} \text{tr} \left( \left( \sum_{i \in S_1, j \in S_2} h_{ij} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j Z_i Z_j \right)^p \right) \right]^{1/p} \tag{3.10}$$

Here $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}$ denotes the average over the Rademacher random variables. We can now use the independence of the $\epsilon_i$s to invoke the following useful matrix martingale inequality called uniform smoothness [31]:

**Proposition 3.2** (Subquadratic Averages [32, Proposition 4.3]). Consider random matrices $X, Y$ of the same dimensions that satisfy $\mathbb{E}[Y|X] = 0$. For $p \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|X + Y\|_p^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|X\|_p^2] + (p - 1)\mathbb{E}[\|Y\|_p^2]. \tag{3.11}$$

Using this proposition, we now peel off one at a time the $\epsilon_i$ for $i \in S_1$:

$$\left[ \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} \text{tr} \left( \left( \sum_{i \in S_1, j \in S_2} h_{ij} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j Z_i Z_j \right)^p \right) \right]^{2/p} \leq \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} \text{tr} \left( \left( \sum_{i \in S_1 - 1, j \in S_2} h_{ij} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j Z_i Z_j \right)^p \right) + (p - 1) \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} \text{tr} \left( \left( \sum_{j \in S_2} h_{ij} \epsilon_1 \epsilon_j Z_i Z_j \right)^p \right) \tag{3.12}$$

In the first line we have, for pedagogy, labeled the first site in $S_1$ as “1”; in the second line, we use Proposition 3.2 to split apart the expectation value into two pieces; in the third line, we iterate this process for all sites in $S_1$; in the final line, we repeat the trick for sites in $S_2$, and then trivially evaluate out the traces.

A simpler manipulation using Proposition 2.2, and $\|O\|_\infty \leq 1$, allows us to handle

$$\|O\|_{2/\theta} \leq \|O\|_2^{\frac{1}{\theta - 1}} \|O\|_\infty \leq \|O\|_2 \text{tr}(I)^{\theta/2}. \tag{3.13}$$

Now combining (3.7), (3.10), (3.12) and (3.13), we find that $p = 2/(1 - \theta)$ and

$$\|HO\|_F \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{tr}(I)}} \left( \left( \frac{2}{1 - \theta} - 1 \right) \|H\|_F \text{tr}(I)^{(1 - \theta)/2} \right) \left( \|O\|_2 \text{tr}(I)^{\theta/2} \right) \leq \frac{2}{1 - \theta} \|H\|_F \|O\|_F^\theta. \tag{3.14}$$

Now we simply choose a convenient value of $\theta$, restricting to values such that $1/(1 - \theta)$ is an integer. Let

$$n = \frac{1}{1 - \theta} := \lfloor \ln\|O\|_F \rfloor \leq \lfloor \ln\|O\|_F \rfloor + 1. \tag{3.15}$$

Then

$$\|HO\|_F \leq 2\|H\|_F \|O\|_F \times n\|O\|_F^{-1/n} = 2\|H\|_F \|O\|_F \times n e^{(\ln\|O\|_F)/n}. \tag{3.16}$$

Combining (3.15) and (3.16), we obtain (3.2).

Since the sets $S_1$ and $S_2$ are disjoint, the following corollary immediately follows from the triangle inequality:

**Corollary 3.3.** Let $S_1$ and $S_2$ be disjoint subsets of $\Lambda$. If

$$H = \sum_{a,b=1}^3 H_{a,b}, \tag{3.17}$$

$$H_{a,b} = \sum_{i \in S_1, j \in S_2} h_{i,j}^a Y_i^a X_j^b, \tag{3.18}$$

and $\|O\| \leq 1$, then

$$\|HO\|_F \leq 2e \sum_{a,b=1}^3 \|H_{a,b}\|_F (\ln\|O\|_F + 1). \tag{3.19}$$
4. FROBENIUS LIGHT CONE

Now we turn to the first main result of this paper: the Frobenius light cone for a one-dimensional system with power-law interactions. In order to do so, let us define a set of projectors \( Q_i \) for \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, R \) (here \( R \) is an integer capturing the number of sites on the chain we wish to study). On Pauli strings of the form \( X_0^{a_0} X_1^{a_1} \cdots \) with \( a_0 = 0 \) denoting \( I \) and \( a_0 = 1, 2, 3 \) denoting \( X_0, Y_0, Z_0 \), we define:

\[
Q_x[\{X_i^{a_i}\}] = \begin{cases} 
1 (a_y = 0 \text{ if } y > 0) & |X_i^{a_i}| \\
(a_y > 0) & |X_i^{a_i}| \\
(a_y = 0 \text{ if } x < y) & |X_i^{a_i}| \\
(a_y \neq 0 \text{ for some } y \geq x) & |X_i^{a_i}| 
\end{cases} \quad x = 0 \quad 0 < x < R . \tag{4.1}
\]

Here \( 1 \) denotes the indicator function which returns 1 if its argument is true, and 0 if false. The projector \( Q_x \) hence projects onto operators which act non-trivially on site \( x \), but trivially on all sites to the right of \( x \). The exceptions are \( Q_0 \) and \( Q_R \), where we simply include all operators supported on a site \( \geq R \) into \( Q_R \), and all operators supported on \( \leq 0 \) in \( Q_0 \). Note that

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{R} Q_i = 1. \tag{4.2}
\]

With these projectors defined, we may now state our main result:

**Theorem 4.1.** Let \( H(t) \) be a time-dependent Hamiltonian which has power-law exponent \( \alpha > 1 \), as defined in Section 2.1; let

\[
R = 2^{q_*} - 1 \tag{4.3}
\]

for some positive integer \( q_* \). Then for any \( \delta > 0 \), if \( Q_0[A_0] = |A_0\rangle \), and

\[
\|Q_R[A_0(t)]|F\| \geq \delta, \tag{4.4}
\]

then there exists a \( \alpha \)-dependent constant \( 0 < K_\alpha < \infty \) such that

\[
|t| \geq \delta^2 K_\alpha \times \begin{cases} 
R/\ln R & \alpha > 2 \\
R/\ln^2 R & \alpha = 2 \\
R^{\alpha-1} & 1 < \alpha < 2 
\end{cases} \tag{4.5}
\]

**Proof.** The method of proof is adapted from the “quantum walk” proofs developed in [10, 26–30]. We will in fact show

\[
\frac{d}{dt} (A_0(t)|F|A_0(t)) \leq \begin{cases} 
K_\alpha \ln R & \alpha > 2 \\
K_2 \ln^2 R & \alpha = 2 \\
K_3 R^{2-\alpha} & 1 < \alpha < 2 
\end{cases} \tag{4.6}
\]

for some \( \alpha \)-dependent constant \( K_\alpha \); here we have defined the superoperator \( F \) keeping track of the “average distance” the operator has grown:

\[
F := \sum_{i=0}^{R} iQ_i. \tag{4.7}
\]

If we could bound how quickly expectation values of \( F \) grow, then we can use Markov’s inequality:

\[
\delta^2 \leq \|Q_R[A_0(t)]\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{R} (A_0(t)|F|A_0(t)). \tag{4.8}
\]

We proceed to bound \( d/dt(A|F|A) \). Observe that (for simplicity we will drop the explicit time dependence in \( \mathcal{L} \) and \( H \))

\[
\frac{d}{dt} (A_0(t)|F|A_0(t)) = (A_0(t)|F, \mathcal{L}|A_0(t)) = 2 \sum_{R \geq j \geq i \geq 0} (A_0(t)|Q_j|F, \mathcal{L}|Q_i|A_0(t))
\]

\[
= 2 \sum_{R \geq j \geq i \geq 0} (j - i)(A_0(t)|Q_j \mathcal{L} Q_i|A_0(t)). \tag{4.9}
\]

where the factor of 2 comes from the fact that \( j > i \) is restricted in the sum, yet the terms with \( j \) and \( i \) can have either number on either side of the inner product. The antisymmetry of \( \mathcal{L} \) and symmetry of \( F \) then allow
FIG. 2. We organize a growing operator $|A_\theta(t)\rangle$ according to the site $x$ on which the right-most non-trivial Pauli acts (achieved via projectors $Q_x|A_\theta(t)\rangle$). We then regroup the Hamiltonian into scales as in [20]: in this figure, the $q = 0$ scale corresponds to purple blocks, while $q = 1$ to blue and $q = 2$ to yellow. We then study the quantum walk of the weights $Q_x|A_\theta(t)\rangle$, which are efficiently bounded.

us to say $(A||\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L}|A) = 2(A||\mathcal{F}|A)$. Our key observation is that we can do an discrete integration by parts mimicking $\mathbb{E}[X] = \int dt \; Q(X > t)$ for a real-valued random variable:

$$
\sum_{R \geq j > i \geq 0} (j - i)Q_j \mathcal{L}Q_i = \sum_{R \geq j > i \geq 0} Q_j \mathcal{L} \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} Q_k.
$$

(4.10)

In addition to combining these two results, we will want to split up the Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}$ using the same method of [20]. Let us define the following sets:

$$
S_{q,k} := \{2^q k, 2^q k + 1, \ldots, 2^q(k + 2) - 1\}.
$$

(4.11)

As shown in Fig. 2, at each scale $q$, these sets form “double partitions” of the domain $[0, R]$ at every scale $0 \leq q \leq q_*$.

We define

$$
N_q = \frac{R + 1}{2^q} - 1
$$

(4.12)

to be the largest value of $k$ in $S_{q,k}$. These sets partition the Hamiltonian naturally

$$
H_{q,k} := \sum_{i,j \in S_{q,k}} \mathbb{I}(i, j \text{ are not contained in } S_{q-1,m} \text{ for any } m)H_{i,j}.
$$

(4.13)

We define $\mathcal{L}_{q,k}$ in the obvious by denoting $\mathcal{L}_{ij} = i[H_{ij}, \cdot]$ to be the Liouvillian associated with sites $i$ and $j$. We now prove the following useful result:

**Lemma 4.2.** For any operator $O$ obeying $\|O\|_\infty \leq 1$, there exists a constant $0 < C < \infty$ such that

$$
\|\mathcal{L}_{q,k}(O)\|_F \leq C\|O\|_F (|\ln\|O\|_F| + 1) \times 2^{-q(\alpha - 1)}.
$$

(4.14)

**Proof.** Observe that for each $H_{ij}$ contained in $H_{q,k}$, we have that (if $i < j$): $i < 2^q(k + 1)$ and $j \geq 2^q(k + 1)$. This means that we may apply Corollary 3.3:

$$
\|\mathcal{L}_{q,k}(O)\|_F \leq 18 \times 2e \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} h_{ij}^2 \|O\|_F (|\ln\|O\|_F| + 1)}
$$

(4.15)
The first factor of 2 comes from considering either $HO$ or $OH$. Now observe that
\[
\sqrt{\sum_{i,j} h_{ij}^2} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=2^{n-1}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{|j-i|^\alpha}} \leq \frac{C_0}{36e} \frac{1}{2^{\alpha-1}}.
\]
where $C_0$ and $C$ are finite constants that depend on $\alpha$. Thus we obtain (4.14).

Now, we combine this lemma with (4.9) and (4.10):
\[
\frac{d}{dt}(A_0(t)|F|A_0(t)) = 2 \sum_{q=0}^{N_q} \sum_{n=0}^{N_q} (A_0(t)|Q_j L Q_k|A_0(t)) = \left( \sum_{q=0}^{N_q} \sum_{n=0}^{N_q} \sum_{i=0}^{R-1} \sum_{j=1}^{R-1} (A_0(t)|Q_j L Q_k|A_0(t)) \right)
\leq \sum_{q=0}^{N_q} \sum_{n=0}^{N_q} \left( \sum_{j=i+1}^{R-1} (A_0(t)|Q_j L Q_k|A_0(t)) \right)
\leq 2C q N_q \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \ln p_{q,n} \right) 2^{-q(\alpha-2)}.
\]
In the first line we absorb the factor of 2 into the double partition of $0 \leq i \leq R - 1$; in the second line, we have used the fact that $Q_j L L Q_k$ is non-vanishing only on operators with support in $S_{q,n}$, and that if it extends a Pauli string to the right, that Pauli string has rightmost site in $S_{q,n}$. In the third line, we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, keeping in mind that our inner product is already normalized to the Frobenius norm. Now, we wish to further simplify this expression. Now, we apply Lemma 4.2:
\[
\frac{d}{dt}(A_0(t)|F|A_0(t)) \leq C \sum_{q=0}^{N_q} \sum_{n=0}^{N_q} \left( \sum_{j=i+1}^{R-1} (A_0(t)|Q_j L Q_k|A_0(t)) \right)
\leq 2C q N_q \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \ln p_{q,n} \right) 2^{-q(\alpha-2)}.
\]
In the second line, we used that the function $x(1 - \ln x)$ is increasing in the domain $x \in [0, 1]$, and that the Frobenius norm of a projected operator monotonically increases if we add orthogonal projectors $Q_j$ to the sum. In the third line, we explicitly carried out the sum over $i \in S_{q,n}$, and defined
\[
p_{q,n} := \left\| \sum_{j \in S_{q,n}} Q_j |A_0(t)\rangle \right\|_F^2.
\]
Namely, $p_{q,n}$ is the probability that the operator has its rightmost support in $S_{q,n}$. Note that
\[
\sum_{n=0,1,3,4,...} p_{q,n} \leq 1, \quad \sum_{n=1,3,5,...} p_{q,n} \leq 1.
\]
At this point, we first use the fact that for fixed $q$, the maximal value of the entropy like quantity (4.18) is attained when $p_{q,n} = 2/(N_q + 1)$:
\[
\frac{d}{dt}(A_0(t)|F|A_0(t)) \leq 2C q N_q \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \ln 2 \right) 2^{-q(\alpha-2)} \leq 2C q N_q \left( 2 + \frac{1 + q_* - q_* \ln 2}{2} \right) 2^{-q(\alpha-2)}.
\]
In the last step, we have evaluated the sum over $q$ explicitly. Hence we see that there exists an $\alpha$-dependent constant $K_\alpha$ such that
\[
\frac{d}{dt}(A_0(t)|F|A_0(t)) \leq \begin{cases} K_\alpha \ln R & \alpha > 2 \\ K_2 \ln^2 R & \alpha = 2 \\ K_2 & 1 < \alpha < 2 \end{cases}.
\]
Combining (4.22) and (4.8) we obtain (4.5).
5. Algebraically Optimal Operator Growth Protocol

Having established the Frobenius light cone rigorously in $d = 1$, and with a conjecture on how it generalizes to higher dimensions $d$, let us now describe a protocol which we claim (and will subsequently prove) achieves these speed limits (up to sub-algebraic corrections). Our approach is loosely inspired by the optimally fast single-qubit state transfer protocol developed in [22]: as in [22], we will develop our protocol via “recursive” intuition.

5.1. Intuitive argument

To begin, let us assume that we have a system with tunable and time-dependent power-law interactions of exponent $d < \alpha < d + 1$ on the standard hypercubic lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$. We divide up this lattice into a partition of hypercubes at multiple scales $q = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. For intuitive purposes, we can say that the scale $q = 0$ corresponds to each lattice site being in its own cube; scale $q = 1$ corresponds to a partition of the lattice into hypercubes of side length $m_1$ in all dimensions; scale $q = 2$ corresponds to a partition into hypercubes of side length $m_1 m_2$ in all dimensions, and so on. (Note that the $q = 2$ cubes contain $m_2 q = 1$ cubes within them, etc.).

Now, suppose that we have a quantum protocol – a unitary matrix $U$ – which is capable of taking a single-site Pauli matrix $W$ (somewhere in a $q$-cube $C_q$), and evolving it into an operator $U_q W U_q \dagger$ which has a large operator size:

$$\sum_{x \in C_q} \| P_x U_q W U_q \dagger \|_F^2 \propto R_q^d,$$  \(5.1\)

with $R_q^d$ denoting the number of sites in $C_q$, and

$$R_q = m R_{q-1} = m^q.$$  \(5.2\)

In the construction above, clearly any $q$-cube $C_q$ lies entirely within a $(q + 1)$-cube $C_{q+1}$. How can we find a unitary $U_{q+1}$ such that (5.1) continues to hold at scale $q + 1$? One possible way to do this would be:

$$U_{q+1} = U_q V_{q+1} U_q,$$  \(5.3\)

where $V_{q+1}$ is a unitary that takes an operator supported in a single $q$-cube, and evolves it to have support on only a single site in each other $q$-cube in $C_{q+1}$. The three-step process is best accompanied by Fig. 3.

The key observation is that this “recursive” construction is quite natural to implement with power-law interactions. As we will see that the scale $q = 0 \rightarrow 1$ unitary $U_1$ is quite easy to implement (even using only nearest neighbor interactions), let us focus on how $V_{q+1}$ might effectively be implemented with power-law interactions. Suppose that as an idealistic cartoon, we found that

$$U_q W U_q = \prod_{x \in C_q} X_x.$$  \(5.4\)

Now let us consider

$$V_{q+1} = \exp \left[ -i \tau_{q+1} \sum_{x,y \in C_{q+1}} \frac{Z_x Z_y}{(dR_{q+1})^\alpha} \right].$$  \(5.5\)

Clearly, this Hamiltonian is compatible with (2.2). When $\tau_{q+1}$ is small, we may estimate that the fraction of the operator with support outside of the original $C_q$ is given by the first order expansion

$$\left\| \tau_{q+1} \left[ \sum_{x,y \in C_{q+1}} \frac{Z_x Z_y}{(dR_{q+1})^\alpha} \prod_{x \in C_q} X_x \right] \right\|_F^2 \approx \left\| \sum_{x \in C_q, y \in C_{q+1} - C_q} \frac{2 \tau_{q+1} Y_x Z_y}{(dR_{q+1})^\alpha} \prod_{x \in C_{q+1} - x} X_x \right\|_F^2 = \frac{4 \tau^2_{q+1}}{(dR_{q+1})^\alpha} R_q^d (R_{q+1}^d - R_q^d).$$  \(5.6\)

Taking

$$\tau_{q+1} \gtrsim R_q^{-\alpha - d},$$  \(5.7\)

we can estimate that our protocol may have substantial weight outside of $C_q$(and thus have some seeds in each new $C_q$). The runtime of the overall $U_{q+1}$ is, recursively,

$$t_{q+1} = t_{q+1} + 2 t_q.$$  \(5.8\)

And indeed,

$$t_q \propto R_q^{-\alpha - d}$$  \(5.9\)

does appear consistent with (5.8). This suggests that our recursive approach will be capable of growing an operator at the provably optimal rate in $d = 1$, and conjectured optimal rate in $d > 1$. 

\[ U_{q-2} \to V_{q-2} \to U_{q-1} \to \mathcal{U} \to U_{q-1} \to U_{q-2} \to C_q \quad \]

\[ R_q = m_q R_{q-1} \]

FIG. 3. The recursive step in the idealized protocol, constructing \( U_q \) from \( U_{q-1} \). The new sites are colored red. (1) grow a single Pauli \( W \) to have support on \( \sim |\mathcal{C}_q| \) sites using the first \( U_{q-1} \). (2) "seed" a single Pauli matrix (e.g. \( Z_x \)) on one site \( x \) in each other \( q \)-cube \( \mathcal{C}'_q \subset \mathcal{C}_q \) using \( V_q \). (3) run again the \( U_{q-1} \) protocol on each remaining \( q \)-cube \( \mathcal{C}'_q \) to "bloom" the seeded single operator into a finite fraction of sites. On the left is the description of \( U_{q-1} \).

5.2. Explicit protocol

Having gone through the intuitive argument, let us now present an explicit random Hamiltonian protocol that achieves this result – at the expense of a logarithmically increased runtime (which we will "justify" at the end of this section). The protocol is built using the same \( q \)-cube structure outlined above. In a nutshell, our \((q + 1)\)-scale protocol takes the form

\[ U_{q+1} = U'_q V_{q+1} U_q, \tag{5.10} \]

where \( U_q \) and \( U'_q \) are random \( q \)-scale protocols drawn from an ensemble that we will state below, and

\[ V_{q+1} = V_{q+1} D, \tag{5.11} \]

where \( D \) is a depolarizing unitary drawn uniformly at random from a discrete ensemble (to be described below) and \( V_{q+1} \) is a random unitary, built out of power-law interactions, that will mimic (5.5).

Let us now carefully define the \( q \)-cube partitions of the lattice \( \mathbb{Z}^d \). We define the \( q \)-cubes

\[ C_q(k_1, \ldots, k_d) := \{(n_1, \ldots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : R_q k_i \leq n_i < R_q (k_i + 1)\}. \tag{5.12} \]

The set of all such \( q \)-cubes will be denoted with

\[ \mathcal{B}_q := \{C_q(k) : k \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}. \tag{5.13} \]

\( R_q \) is defined via (5.2), where

\[ m := \left\lceil e^{\sqrt{\ln(r)}} \right\rceil. \tag{5.14} \]
The random depolarizing unitary $D$ is chosen as follows:

$$D := \bigotimes_{x \in A} D_x,$$

(5.15)

where $D_x$ are $2 \times 2$ unitary matrix acting on qubit $x$, independent and identically distributed (iid) for each $x$. Each $D_x$ is chosen uniformly at random (via the discrete Haar measure) from the group

$$G = \left\{ \pm 1, \frac{1 \pm i X^a}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1 \pm i Y^b}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1 \pm i Z^c}{2} \right\}$$

(5.16)

In the above equation, $X^a$ and $X^b$ denote distinct Pauli matrices $(X, Y, Z)$. Each $D_x$ can be generated using a single-site Hamiltonian of (operator) norm 1 in a time

$$t_D < \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

(5.17)

The growth unitary

$$V_q = \exp[-i \tau_q H^{ZZ}_q],$$

(5.18)

where the Hamiltonian

$$H^{ZZ}_q := \frac{1}{(dR_q)^a} \sum_{C \in B_q} \sum_{x,y \in C} J_{xy} Z_x Z_y,$$

(5.19)

where $J_{xy}$ are iid random variables uniformly distributed on the interval $[-1, 1]$. This clearly mimics what we intuitively introduced above; however, we will see that the randomness in the couplings is beneficial in allowing us to neglect possible quantum interference phenomena (among growing operators) that might ruin our protocol. The times $\tau_q$ will be chosen explicitly in (5.45) below, but note for now that it obeys

$$\tau_q :< 120^9 m^d R_q^{\alpha-d}.$$

(5.20)

The protocol will stop at scale

$$q_* := \left\lfloor \sqrt{\ln r} \right\rfloor.$$

(5.21)

At this scale, at least half of the operator (as measured by the Frobenius norm) will have size $r^{d-\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon$ (Proposition 5.2). In order to demonstrate that the Frobenius light cone is saturated (up to subalgebraic prefactors), we must calculate the total runtime of the protocol $U_q$. Using the inductive identity (5.10), along with (5.20), we see that if $t_q$ is the total runtime of $U_q$, and $t_D < \tau_q$ is the runtime of $D$, then

$$t_q = 2t_{q-1} + t_D + \tau_q < 2t_{q-1} + 2\tau_q = \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \tau_{q-1} 2^q < 2^{\epsilon+1} \tau_q,$$

$$< 480 \cdot (240e)^{\ln r} \left(1 + e^{\ln r}\right)^{\alpha-d} (1 + e^{\ln r})^{\alpha-d} < 480 \cdot (240e^{\alpha-d+1} \cdot q^{\alpha-d})^{\ln r} r^{\alpha-d}.$$

(5.22)

We thus conclude a lower bound on the Frobenius light cone in any dimension. To be more precise, given the decomposition of an operator defined in (2.8), let us define the projector

$$P_{\geq L} A := \sum_{S \subset A : \text{diam}(S \cup \{0\}) \geq L} |A_S \rangle \langle A_S|.$$

(5.23)

Theorem 5.1. Let $X_0$ be the Pauli $X$-matrix supported at the origin $(0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, define $r(L) := L^{3+\epsilon/2}$. Then there exists a sufficiently large $L$, such that there exists a power-law Hamiltonian protocol of the form (5.10) which achieves:

$$\|P_{\geq L} (U_q^t X_0 U_q)\|_F \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

(5.24)

Moreover, the shape of the Frobenius light cone is bounded by

$$L(t) \geq K e^{\ln r \tau_a}$$

(5.25)

for some constant $0 < K \epsilon < \infty$. The asymptotic bound of Theorem 4.1 cannot be improved by an algebraic factor.

---

5 This condition will always be assured at sufficiently large $r$. We can shrink the prefactor of $H^{ZZ}_q$ to ensure this at small $r$. 
5.3. Bound on the performance of our random protocol

The last thing we need to do is to prove that our protocol in fact does grow a finite fraction of an initial small operator to be large. This result is captured by the following key technical proposition:

**Proposition 5.2.** For sufficiently large $L$, there exists a Hamiltonian in the random ensemble of Section 5.2 in which $(5.24)$ holds.

**Proof.** The proof of this proposition, of course, corresponds to the overwhelming majority of the proof of Theorem 5.1. As it is rather technically involved, let us first outline the key steps in the proof. (1) We will first develop a “super-operator density matrix” perspective for bounding the Frobenius light cone. (2) This notation will prove highly useful, since we will show that the “super-depolarizing channel” (conjugation by $D$) destroys all (unwanted) quantum coherence, and leaves us with an effectively classical problem to analyze. (3) We will then describe the inductive hypothesis required to achieve $(5.24)$, and reduce the quantum mechanical problem of bounding operator growth to the bounds on a classical stochastic process. (4) We will then show that (in the language of the effective stochastic process), with very high probability the $V_q$ unitary “seeds” enough Pauli matrices in new cubes. (5) Analogously, we will show that with very high probability, these seeds in turn grow into large Pauli strings upon applying another $U_{q-1}$. (6) We will show that at every possible step of the protocol, the collective failure probability is small and decreases sufficiently fast that there is a finite success probability to grow a large operator. Upon converting back to the quantum mechanical language, that will imply $(5.24)$.

**Step 1:** We begin by developing the “super-density matrix” picture of operator growth, following [33]. If $\mathcal{H}$ is the quantum mechanical Hilbert space, and (with a slight abuse of notation) $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ is a Hilbert space of all normalizable operators on $\mathcal{H}$ (in what follows, we will restrict to Hermitian operators), the super-density matrix is a normalizable element of $(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}) \otimes (\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$. It is easier to visualize with bra-ket notation: using the operator ket $|A\rangle$ introduced above, the pure super-density matrix corresponding to $A$ becomes $|A\rangle\langle A|$. It is straightforward to build a good basis for super-operators. Using the fact that the space of Hermitian operators acting on a single qubit is spanned by the orthonormal basis

$$|X^a\rangle \quad (a = 0, 1, 2, 3) := |I\rangle, |X\rangle, |Y\rangle, |Z\rangle \in \mathbb{R}^{1+3} \quad (5.26)$$

endowed with the canonical inner product in $\mathbb{R}^{1+3}$, a basis for super-operators on a single qubit is evidently $|X^a\rangle|X^b\rangle$ for $a, b = 0, 1, 2, 3$. The standard tensor product between lattice sites then allows us to build up a good basis for our super-operator space.

Observe that the Frobenius norm is now simply (up to square) the super-operator trace

$$\text{Tr}||A||^2 := \langle A|A \rangle = \|A\|_F^2. \quad (5.27)$$

The latter equality follows from $(2.5)$. As a consequence, evaluating the Frobenius norms of projected operators in this super-operator language will be particularly simple – we simply pick out the basis operators which we wish to keep, and sum the coefficients of the diagonal elements of the pure super-density matrix. In particular, given the growing operator $X_0(t)$, we can define the probabilities $p_S(t)$ (for subsets $S \subseteq \Lambda$) as (recall $(2.9)$)

$$|X_0(t)\rangle\langle X_0(t)| := \sum_{S \subseteq \Lambda} p_S(t)|X_0(t)_S\rangle\langle X_0(t)_S| + \text{off-diagonal terms.} \quad (5.28)$$

Much of the proof that follows will amount to bounding (sums of) $p_S(t)$ throughout the protocol. In what follows, it is also useful to define a bit of terminology. We define the adjoint operation

$$\text{Adj}_{i_A} := i[A, -], \quad (5.29)$$

and the conjugation operation

$$\text{Conj}(B) \cdot X = B^\dagger XB. \quad (5.30)$$

We define the super-depolarizing channel as

$$\mathcal{D} := \mathbb{E}_D [\text{Conj}(\text{Conj}(D))] \quad (5.31)$$

and the $q$-scale growth channel as

$$V_q := \mathbb{E}_F [\text{Conj}(\text{Conj}(V_q))]. \quad (5.32)$$

Expectation values are taken over the random $D_x$ in $(5.15)$, and random $J_{xy}$ in $(5.19)$, respectively. We thus see that our (averaged) protocol as a deterministic “quantum super-channel”, defined via the analogue of $(5.10)$

$$\mathcal{M}_q := \mathcal{M}_{q-1} \mathcal{D} V_q \mathcal{M}_{q-1}. \quad (5.33)$$
Step 2: We now turn to the analysis of the super-depolarizing channel \( \mathcal{D} \). Let us define the “maximally mixed non-trivial operator” (on a single site)

\[
\mu := \frac{|X)(X| + |Y)(Y| + |Z)(Z|}{3}.
\]

(5.34)

In a nutshell, the essence of this proof is that all we need to keep track of is whether or not each site has a \( \mu \) or the trivial operator

\[
\mathcal{I} = |I)(I|
\]

(5.35)
on it: namely, we will show that after each step of the random protocol,

\[
\mathcal{D}|I\rangle\langle I| = |I\rangle\langle I|,
\]

(5.36a)

\[
\mathcal{D}|X^a\rangle = |X^a\rangle = |X\rangle = 0,
\]

(5.36b)

\[
\mathcal{D}|W^a\rangle(W^b\rangle = \delta^{ab}\mu.
\]

(5.36c)

The depolarizing channel is what makes this simplification possible, as formalized via the following:

**Proposition 5.3.** For any \( a, b = 1, 2, 3 \) (and on every site independently),

\[
\mathcal{D}|I\rangle\langle I| \Rightarrow |I\rangle\langle I|,
\]

(5.37a)

\[
\mathcal{D}|X^a\rangle = |X^a\rangle = |X\rangle = 0,
\]

(5.37b)

\[
\mathcal{D}|W^a\rangle(W^b\rangle = \delta^{ab}\mu.
\]

(5.37c)

**Proof.** The key idea behind this proof is to use the group theoretic structure of the random unitaries \( D_x \) (for simplicity in what follows, we drop the \( x \) subscript, since \( \mathcal{D} \) is simply a tensor product of the channel defined via (5.37) on every site anyway). By definition in our protocol,

\[
\mathcal{D} := \frac{1}{48} \sum_{D \in G} \text{Conj} \text{Conj}(D)
\]

(5.38)
as as 48 is the number of group elements in \( G \), defined in (5.16). By construction, \( \mathcal{D} \) takes any \( 4 \times 4 \) matrix \( M \) acting on the space of operators on a qubit, defined in (5.26), and projects it onto \( G \)-invariant maps.

To find these irreducible representations, we first observe that \( G \) is isomorphic to the “double cover” of the group of rotations which leave invariant a three-dimensional cube, which is in turn isomorphic to \( S_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \) (a subgroup of \( \text{SU}(2) \)). By standard representation-theoretic computation, we find that \( \mathbb{R}^{1+3} \) decomposes into two irreducible representations of \( G \):

\[
\text{span}(I, X, Y, Z) = \text{span}(I) \oplus \text{span}(X, Y, Z)
\]

(5.39)

By Schur’s Lemma, the only \( G \)-invariant matrices obeying \( \mathcal{D}M = M \) are therefore of the form

\[
M = a|I\rangle\langle I| + b|X\rangle\langle X| + b|Y\rangle\langle Y| + b|Z\rangle\langle Z| = aI + 3b\mu.
\]

(5.40)

We then obtain (5.37) by using the fact that \( \mathcal{D} \) is a probability-weighted linear sum of unitary operators, and therefore is completely positive and trace preserving. This condition fixes \( a = 1 \) and \( b = \frac{1}{3} \).

Combining this proposition with (5.33), we immediately find:

**Corollary 5.4.** For any super-operator \( \rho \),

\[
\mathcal{D}\rho = \sum_{S \subseteq \Lambda} p_S \mu^{S_T \otimes S_c}.
\]

(5.41)

In our random protocol, (5.36) holds, even in intermediate protocol steps, after any application of \( \mathcal{D} \).

Step 3: Corollary 5.4 shows that the only information we need to keep track of, after depolarizing, is the probability \( p_S \) that our growing operator is supported on the subset \( S \). We define the number super-operators:

\[
\bar{N} = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \bar{N}_x,
\]

(5.42a)

\[
\bar{N}_x := (|X)(X| + |Y)(Y| + |Z)(Z|)_x = 3\mu_x.
\]

(5.42b)

However, due to Corollary 5.4, we can actually think of each of these as classical random variables. In particular, after applying (averaged) super-channel \( \mathcal{DU} \) (for any \( \mathcal{U} \)), the probability distribution \( \hat{\mathcal{P}} \) on the variables \( \bar{N}_x \in \{0, 1\} \) can be defined (with a slight abuse of notation) via

\[
\hat{\mathcal{P}}[\bar{N}_{x_1} = \bar{N}_{x_2} = \cdots = \bar{N}_{x_m} = 1, \bar{N}_{y_1} = \cdots = \bar{N}_{y_n} = 0]
\]

\[
:= \text{Tr} \left[ \bar{N}_{x_1} \cdots \bar{N}_{x_m} (1 - \bar{N}_{y_1}) \cdots (1 - \bar{N}_{y_n}) \mathcal{DU} \rho(x_0)(x_0) \right].
\]

(5.43)
FIG. 4. The rigorous operator growth protocol, in which we no longer guarantee full occupancy of all sites. Instead, we only get to keep a fraction of occupancy at each recursion, albeit with high probability. Using the central limit theorem, the failure probabilities $1 - \eta$ is suppressed by rate of expansion $e^{-\mathcal{O}(m)}$. The choice of $m \sim \exp(\sqrt{\ln r})$ is large enough to render these probabilities mild, and leave us with (5.24).

The well-posedness of $\hat{P}$ is guaranteed by the fact that $D U$ is completely positive and trace preserving. Knowing the classical probabilities $p_S$ (corresponding to the probability that $\hat{N}_x = 1$ if and only if $x \in S$) is enough to know $D U|_{X_0}(X_0)$.

Armed with this knowledge, we are ready to lay out the foundations for the remainder of our inductive proof. The induction hypothesis we begin with is that for any set $S \subset C_0 \in B_{q-1}$, with $C_0$ the $(q-1)$-scale cube containing the origin,

$$\hat{P} \left( \hat{N} M_{q-1} \otimes \mu_i \geq \lambda_{1,q-1} R_{q-1}^i \right) \geq \eta_{1,q-1}. \quad (5.44)$$

Here $0 < \eta_{1,q-1}, \eta_{1,q-1} < 1$ are constants that we will obtain a little later; in particular though, $\eta_{1,q-1}$ will be interpreted as a lower bound on the success probability of $M_{q-1}$ - namely, the probability that it grows an operator to have support on $S \subset C_0$ with $S$ containing fraction $\geq \lambda_{1,q-1}$ of all sites in $C_0$.

Next, we condition on the assumption that at least $s := \lambda_{1,q-1} R_{q-1}$ sites are occupied. This throws away a fraction of at most $1 - \eta_{1,q-1}$ of the operator (an amount that we will see is small). We will then show that if we run the unitary $V_q$ for sufficiently long time, we will seed more than $3.3\%$ of the $(q-1)$-cubes in the $q$-cube containing the origin, with probability $\eta_{2,q-1}$: see Lemma 5.5. We note that $1 - \eta_{2,q-1}$ decays exponentially with $m^d$ and $s$.

Lastly, we apply $M_{q-1}$, which will attempt to grow the operators in $(q-1)$-cubes $C_{q-1}(k)$ that we seeded above into large Pauli strings. Conditioned on there are at least $n_s$ seeded blocks $C_{q-1}$, we will show in Proposition 5.7 that with probability $\eta_{3,q-1}$, a rather large number of sites (to be quantified later) will be occupied (when considering all $(q-1)$-cubes together). This proves the inductive hypothesis. We summarize the way that operators grow throughout this process in Figure 4.

**Step 4.** We now analyze the $V_q$ operator growth step of our protocol in detail. The key observation is that,
upon averaging over all possible \( V_q \), the superchannel \( V_q \) takes an arbitrary operator of sufficient size in any \((q - 1)\)-cube \( C_{q-1} \subset C_q \), and “seeds” new \( \mu \)s in a finite fraction of the remaining \((q - 1)\)-cubes \( C'_{q-1} \subset C_q \) which are contained within the \( q \)-cube \( C_q \) (see Figure 4). More precisely, we have:

**Lemma 5.5.** Let \( C_q \in B_q \). For any subset \( S \subseteq C_q \) of size \(|S| = s \), set the time

\[
\tau_q := \frac{R^α_q}{\sqrt{2sR^d_{q-1}}}. \tag{5.45}
\]

Define the superoperator

\[
\rho' = V_q \left( \mu^{\otimes S} |(C_q - S) \right). \tag{5.46}
\]

Let \( C \in B_{q-1} \) denotes one of the \((q - 1)\)-cubes contained within \( C_q \), and define the classical random variables

\[
\hat{\gamma}_C := \frac{1}{\bar{C}} \left( \sum_{x \in \bar{C}} \hat{N}_x > 0 \right). \tag{5.47}
\]

Then

\[
1 - \eta_{2, q-1} := \hat{P}_ρ \left[ \sum_{C=1}^{m^d} \hat{\gamma}_C \leq \frac{m^d}{30} \right] \leq \exp \left( \frac{-m^d}{120} \right) + \exp \left( -\frac{s}{72} \right) \tag{5.48}
\]

where \( \hat{P}_ρ \) denotes the probability distribution obtained from (5.46). For notational simplicity, we have labeled the \( m^d \) \((q - 1)\)-cubes in \( C_q \) as \( C = 1, \ldots, m^d \).

**Proof.** First, we re-write \( V_q \) in a more elegant way, using the fact that all \( ZZ \) terms in \( H_q^{ZZ} \) commute with each other:

\[
\mathcal{V}_q = \mathbb{E}_J \left[ \exp \left[ \frac{R^α_q}{\tau_q} \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset C_q} J_{ij} \text{Adj}_{Z_iZ_j} \right] \right] \left( \exp \left[ \frac{R^α_q}{\tau_q} \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset C_q} J_{ij} \text{Adj}_{Z_iZ_j} \right] \right)^\dagger
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_J \prod_{\{i,j\} \subset C_q} \text{Conj} \left( \exp \left[ \frac{R^α_q}{\tau_q} J_{ij} \text{Adj}_{Z_iZ_j} \right] \right), \tag{5.49}
\]

Since \( Z \) terms commute with \( Zs \), but not with \( Xs \) or \( Ys \), let us define

\[
\nu = \frac{|X|X + |Y|Y}{2}, \quad \overline{Z} = |Z|Z \tag{5.50}
\]

such that

\[
\mu = \frac{2}{3}\nu + \frac{1}{3}\overline{Z}. \tag{5.51}
\]

From (5.49), we can first calculate what a single \( Z_iZ_j \) coupling does to \( \mu_i \) or \( \mu_j \); the application of \( \mathcal{V}_q \) will then correspond to repeating this procedure on all pairs of sites in the cube \( C_q \). It is straightforward to show that (temporarily denoting \( \theta_{ij} := J_{ij} \tau_q R^α_q \))

\[
\text{Conj}(\exp[\theta \text{Adj}_{Z_iZ_j}])I_iI_j = I_iI_j, \tag{5.52a}
\]

\[
\text{Conj}(\exp[\theta \text{Adj}_{Z_iZ_j}])\nu_i\nu_j = \nu_i\nu_j. \tag{5.52b}
\]

Moreover, since

\[
\exp[\theta \text{Adj}_{Z_iZ_j}] \left( \begin{array}{c} |X_iI_j\rangle \\ |Y_iZ_j\rangle \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{cc} \cos(2\theta) & \sin(2\theta) \\ -\sin(2\theta) & \cos(2\theta) \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} |X_iI_j\rangle \\ |Y_iZ_j\rangle \end{array} \right), \tag{5.53}
\]

we conclude that

\[
\mathbb{E}[\text{Conj}(\exp[\theta \text{Adj}_{Z_iZ_j}]) \left( \begin{array}{c} |X_iI_j\rangle(X_iI_j) \\ |Y_iZ_j\rangle(Y_iZ_j) \end{array} \right)] = \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 - p_1 & p_1 \\ p_1 & 1 - p_1 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} |X_iI_j\rangle(X_iI_j) \\ |Y_iZ_j\rangle(Y_iZ_j) \end{array} \right) \tag{5.54}
\]

where

\[
p_1 = \mathbb{E}[\cos^2(2\theta_{ij})] = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{4iJ_{ij}\tau_q / R^α_q} \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 - F \left( \frac{4\tau_q}{R^α_q} \right) \right]. \tag{5.55}
\]
where

\[ F(x) := \frac{\sin x}{x}. \]  

(5.56)

The following Taylor expansion estimate for \( F(x) \) will prove useful:

\[ 1 - \frac{x^2}{6} \leq F(x) \leq 1 - \frac{x^2}{6} + \frac{x^4}{120} \]  

(5.57)

Combining (5.54) and (5.57), we obtain

\[ \mathbb{E}[\text{Conj exp}\{\theta \text{Adj}_{Z_i, Z_j}\}] \left( \nu_i Z_j, \nu_j Z_j \right) = \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 - p_1 & p_1 \\ p_1 & 1 - p_1 \end{array} \right) \left( \nu_i Z_j, \nu_j Z_j \right) \]  

(5.58)

where, upon plugging in for \( \theta_{ij} \), we obtain

\[ \frac{4}{3} R_q^2 > p_1 > \frac{4}{3} R_q^2 - \frac{16}{15} R_q^4. \]  

(5.59)

An important consequence of all of these identities is that if we write out an initial operator density in the form

\[ \hat{\rho} = \prod_{i \in S_i} \nu_i \prod_{j \in S_Z} Z_j \prod_{k \in C_{\bar{c}} - S} I_k, \]  

(5.60)

where \( S_i \) and \( S_Z \) form a partition of \( S \), then this tensor product structure is preserved under the average of the time evolution. This is because \( \nu_i \) are invariant, while \( Z_s \) and \( I_s \) convert between each other in a Markovian fashion independently on each site. Using the independence of the \( J_{ij}s \), we see that if \( \ell = |S_i| \), then

\[ V_q \hat{\rho} = \prod_{i \in S_i} \nu_i \prod_{j \in S_Z} \left[ (1 - p_\ell) Z_j + p_\ell I_j \right] \prod_{k \in C_{\bar{c}} - S} \left[ (1 - p_\ell) I_k + p_\ell Z_k \right], \]  

(5.61)

where we define \( p_\ell \) via

\[ \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 - p_1 & p_1 \\ p_1 & 1 - p_1 \end{array} \right)^\ell = \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 - p_\ell & p_\ell \\ p_\ell & 1 - p_\ell \end{array} \right). \]  

(5.62)

More concretely, we may bound \( p_\ell \) as follows:

\[ p_\ell = \sum_{j=1,3,5,...}^\ell \binom{\ell}{j} p_1^j (1 - p_1)^{\ell - j} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ (1 - p_1 + p_1)^\ell - (1 - p_1 - p_1)^\ell \right] \geq 1 - e^{-2p_\ell}. \]  

(5.63)

Now, of the \( m^q \) cubes \( C_{q-1}(k) \subset C_q \), we must count how many of them contain either a \( \nu \) or a \( Z \) on at least one site, after applying \( \mathbb{E}[V_q] \hat{\rho} \). Consider Bernoulli random variables \( \hat{x}_j \in \{0,1\} \) on sites \( j \in C_q \), with

\[ \hat{P}[\hat{x}_j = 1] := \begin{cases} 1 & j \in S_i \\ 1 - p_\ell & j \in S_Z \\ p_\ell & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \]  

(5.64)

The interpretation of \( \hat{x}_j \) is the probability that we find a non-identity operator on site \( j \) in \( \mathbb{E}[V_q] \hat{\rho} \). Since \( p_\ell \leq 1/2 \), we can easily see that for any \( (q-1)\)-cube \( C \subset C_q \),

\[ \hat{P} \left[ \sum_{k \in C} \hat{x}_k = 0 \right] = \hat{P} \left[ \hat{y}_C = 0 \right] \leq \mathbb{E}[\hat{y}_C] = 1 - p_\ell \]  

(5.65)

where \( Q \) is any subset of \( C_q \), which will be taken as \( C_{q-1}(k) \subset C_q \). This inequality follows from the independence of \( \hat{x}_k \), regardless of the set \( Q \). We can now bound the probability that at least \( \lambda_{2,q-1} m_q^q \) of the cubes \( C_{q-1} \) have at least one operator in them using the standard Chernoff bounds:

**Proposition 5.6** (Chernoff bounds). **Let** \( A \) **be a discrete set. For** \( i \in A \), **let** \( x_i \in \{0,1\} \) **be independent Bernoulli random variables. If**

\[ S := \sum_{i \in A} x_i, \]  

(5.66)

**then**

\[ \mathbb{P}(S \leq (1 - \delta) \mathbb{E}[S]) \leq \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \delta^2 \mathbb{E}[S] \right). \]  

(5.67)
In our calculation, the Bernoulli random variables of interest are $\tilde{y}_C$, which obey $\operatorname{E}[\tilde{y}_C] \geq p_\star$. Choosing
\[
\lambda_{2,q-1} := p_\star / 2,
\]
we arrive at
\[
\hat{P} \left[ \sum_C \tilde{y}_C \leq \frac{p_\star m^d}{2} \right] \leq \exp \left( -\frac{p_\star m^d}{8} \right). 
\] (5.69)

To conclude the proof, note that the above calculation was based on the number of $\tilde{y}_s$. By our initial assumption, the initial operator will have $\geq s \mu$, which can be anywhere in cube $C_q$. Breaking up $\mu$ into $\nu$ and $\mathcal{Z}(5.51)$, we see that our initial operator is binomial distributed: on each of (at least) $s$ sites, the probability of $\nu$ is $2/3$. Using Chernoff bounds on an initial operator of $s \mu$, the probability of having $\ell \geq s/2$ is extremely high when $s$ is large:
\[
\hat{P} \left( \ell \geq \frac{s}{2} \right) \geq 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{s}{72} \right). 
\] (5.70)

This inequality holds regardless of the number of sites in the set $S$ on which our operator is initially supported, so long as $|S| \geq s$.

Now, we proceed as follows. Using the simple fact that in classical probability theory, for any two events $A$ and $B$, $\Pr(\mathcal{A}) \geq \Pr(\mathcal{A} \text{ and } B)$, we will lower bound the probability $\eta_{2,q-1}$ by calculating
\[
\hat{P}_{\rho'} \left[ \sum_{C=1}^{m^d} \tilde{y}_C \leq \frac{m^d}{30} \right] \geq \hat{P}_{\rho'} \left[ \sum_{C=1}^{m^d} \tilde{y}_C \leq \frac{m^d}{30} \text{ and } \ell \geq \frac{s}{2} \right]
\geq \hat{P}_{\rho'} \left[ \sum_{C=1}^{m^d} \tilde{y}_C \leq \frac{m^d}{30} \right] \hat{P}_{\rho'} \left[ \ell \geq \frac{s}{2} \right]. 
\] (5.71)

To bound the conditional probability above, we start with (5.63) and (5.65):
\[
 p_\star = 1 - (1 - p_\nu) R_{q-1}^d \geq 1 - \exp \left( -p_\nu R_{q-1}^d \right) \geq 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{1 - e^{-p_\nu s}}{2} R_{q-1}^d \right)
\] (5.72)

Note that we have used that $\ell \geq s/2$. Now, observe that for $x < 1$, $e^{-x} \leq 1 - \frac{x}{2}$. Since
\[
 p_1 s \leq \frac{4s \tau^2}{3 R_q^{2\alpha}} \leq \frac{2}{3 R_{q-1}^d} \leq 1,
\] (5.73)

we may further simplify (5.72) to
\[
 p_\star \geq 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{p_1 s R_{q-1}^d}{6} \right) \geq \frac{p_1 s R_{q-1}^d}{6}, 
\] (5.74)

noting that (5.73) implies the argument of exp above is $\leq 1/6$, in which case $1 - e^{-x} \geq \frac{2}{3} x$. Now using (5.45) and (5.59), we find
\[
 p_\star \geq \frac{s R_{q-1}^d}{6} \left( \frac{2}{3 s R_q^{d-1}} - \frac{4}{15 s^4 R_q^{2(d-1)}} \right) \geq \frac{s R_{q-1}^d}{6} \frac{2}{15 s^4 R_q^{2(d-1)}} \left( 1 - \frac{2}{5 s R_{q-1}^d} \right) \geq \frac{1}{15}.
\] (5.75)

Combining (5.69) and (5.75), we find that
\[
\hat{P}_{\rho'} \left[ \sum_{C=1}^{m^d} \tilde{y}_C \leq \frac{m^d}{30} \right] \geq 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{m^d}{120} \right). 
\] (5.76)

Combining (5.70), (5.71) and (5.76), we obtain (5.48). 

\hfill \Box

\textit{Step 5.} Now that we know at least $1/30\text{th}$ of the $(q-1)$-cubes in a $q$-cube are seeded after the first application of $V_q$, we must now ask what happens after applying $\mathcal{M}_{q-1}$ again (recall Figure 4). The answer is provided by the following proposition:
Proposition 5.7. Consider a tensor product superoperator of the form

$$\rho = \mu^{\otimes S} I^{\otimes S^c},$$

where $S \subset \Lambda$ is finite. Then

$$1 - \eta_{1,q-1} := \hat{p} \left[ \hat{N} \leq \frac{w \eta_{1,q-1} R^d_{q-1}}{2} \sum_{C \in B_{q-1}} \hat{y}_C = w \right] \leq \exp \left( -\frac{w \eta_{1,q-1}}{8} \right)$$

(5.78)

Proof. By our inductive hypothesis (5.44), for any $C \in B_{q-1},$

$$\hat{p} \left[ \sum_{x \in C} \hat{N}_x \mathcal{M}_{q-1} \rho \geq \lambda_{1,q-1} R^d_{q-1} \left| \Tr (\hat{y}_C \rho) = 1 \right] \right] \geq \eta_{1,q-1}. \quad (5.79)$$

So, letting $\hat{x}_C$ denote a Bernoulli random variable denoting whether or not the criterion above is satisfied, we observe that $E[\hat{x}_C] \geq \eta_{1,q-1}$. Moreover, $\hat{x}_C$ form independent Bernoulli random variables for each cube $C$. So again, we may use the Chernoff bounds to show that

$$\hat{p} \left[ \sum_{C \in B_{q-1}} \hat{x}_C \leq \frac{w \eta_{1,q-1}}{2} \right] \leq \exp \left( -\frac{w \eta_{1,q-1}}{8} \right). \quad (5.80)$$

Since we are guaranteed that the event in (5.78) does not occur if the event in (5.80) does not occur (since for each $\hat{x}_C \geq 1$, we get a contribution of at least $\lambda_{1,q-1} R^d_{q-1}$ to $\hat{N}$), (5.80) implies (5.78). \hfill \square

Step 6. We now must combine the results from the previous two steps to prove that we may choose $\eta_{1,q}$ such that (5.44) continues to hold at scale $q$. As in Figure 4, we can conclude from our discussion above that if we choose

$$\lambda_{1,q} := \frac{\eta_{1,q-1} \lambda_{1,q-1}}{60},$$

(5.81)

then the success probability at scale $q$ is given by

$$\eta_{1,q} := \hat{p} \left[ \Tr \left( \hat{N} \mathcal{M} \bigotimes_{i \in S \subset C_q} \mu_i \right) \geq \lambda_{1,q} R^d_q \right] \geq \eta_{1,q-1} \eta_{2,q-1} \eta_{3,q-1},$$

(5.82)

where $\eta_{1,q-1}$ is the probability that the first $\mathcal{M}_{q-1}$ is successful (namely, the induction event in (5.44) has occurred), $\eta_{2,q-1}$ is the probability that the first $\mathcal{D}V_q$ is successful (given in Lemma 5.5), and $\eta_{3,q-1}$ is the probability that the second $\mathcal{M}_{q-1}$ is successful (given in Proposition 5.7).

To start off this recursive relation, we first discuss what happens at scale $q = 1$. This scale is somewhat special, since the operator starts off with probability 1 being a Pauli $X$ at the origin. Because it is a Pauli $X$, the bound in Lemma 5.5 can be simplified (only for this very first application of $V_1$, before any depolarizing channel!). It is in fact simplest to convert $|X_0 \rangle (X_0)$, the initial super-operator, into $v_0$ (this simplifies some equations, but does not change the protocol’s performance). Using (5.61), we see that

$$\mathcal{V}_1 |X_0 \rangle (X_0) = v_0 \prod_{x \in C_1} \left( (1 - p_1) I_x + p_1 Z_x \right). \quad (5.83)$$

where $C_1$ denotes the 1-cube containing the origin, and, using (5.59),

$$p_1 > \frac{2}{3} - \frac{4}{15} = \frac{6}{15}. \quad (5.84)$$

Using the Chernoff bounds, we can easily see that

$$1 - \eta_{2,0} = \hat{p} \left[ \Tr \left( \hat{N} \mathcal{M}_1 v_0 \right) \leq \frac{m^d}{30} \right] \leq \exp \left( -\frac{m^d}{120} \right). \quad (5.85)$$

(5.85)

Note also that $\eta_{1,0} = \eta_{3,0} = 1$, since there is no $\mathcal{M}_0$, so

$$\eta_{1,1} = \eta_{2,0} \geq 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{m^d}{120} \right). \quad (5.86)$$

This corresponds to the base case of our inductive proof.

Given this base case, the following lemma demonstrates that $\eta_{1,q}$ is indeed (for all $q \leq q_*$) finite.
Lemma 5.8. For large enough $r$, the recursion relation
\[ \eta_{1,q} = \eta_{1,q-1}\eta_{2,q-1}\eta_{3,q-1} \]
admits a solution obeying, for all $1 \leq q \leq q_*$,
\[ \eta_{1,q} \geq \frac{1}{2} \]
(5.88)

Proof. The key idea of this proof is that $m$ is (perhaps surprisingly) sufficiently large so that $\eta_{2,k}$ and $\eta_{3,k}$ are so close to 1 that the repeated multiplication of $\eta$ probabilities above converges to a non-zero result (for $q \leq q_*$). To see this concretely, let us use Lemma 5.5 and Proposition 5.7 to note that
\[ \alpha_{q-1} := \eta_{2,q-1}\eta_{1,q-1} \geq \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{480}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{120}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{2160}\right)\right). \]
(5.89)

We wish to analyze the nonlinear recursion relation
\[ \eta_{1,q} = \eta_{1,q-1}\alpha_{q-1}. \]
(5.90)

Happily, to demonstrate the lemma, we can assume that (5.88) holds when evaluating $\alpha_{q-1}$. The reason for this is that $\alpha_{q-1}$ monotonically increases with $\eta_{1,q-1}$; hence setting $\eta_{1,q-1} = 1/2$ when evaluating $\alpha_{q-1}$ gives us a lower bound on $\alpha_{q-1}$, and in turn on $\eta_{1,q}$. From (5.81) and (5.85), we can bound
\[ \lambda_{1,q} \geq \lambda_{1,1}120^{1-q} = \frac{4}{120^q}. \]
(5.91)

We thus find that for $q > 1$,
\[ \alpha_{q-1} \geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{480}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{120}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{2160}\right). \]
(5.92)

We conclude that for all $q \leq q_*$,
\[ \eta_{1,q} \geq \left[1 - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{480}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{120}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{2160}\right)\right]^{q_*}. \]
(5.93)

Let us now show that (5.93) is compatible with (5.88). To do this, we simply recall the definitions of $m \sim \exp(\sqrt{\ln r})$ in (5.14), and $q_* \sim \sqrt{\ln r}$ in (5.21). In fact, since for sufficiently (and not very) large $r$, $\sqrt{\ln r} > \ln(\ln r)$,
\[ \exp(-m^d) \leq \exp(-e^{d\sqrt{\ln r}}) \leq \exp(-e^{d\ln(\ln r)}) \leq \exp(-1) \leq \frac{1}{r}. \]
(5.94)

Thus we observe that for sufficiently large $m$ (and hence $r$),
\[ \left[1 - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{480}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{120}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{2160}\right)\right]^{q_*} > 1 - 3q_* \exp\left(-\frac{m^d}{2160}\right) > 1 - \frac{3(1+\sqrt{\ln r})}{r^{1/2160}}. \]
(5.95)

For sufficiently large $r$, this is larger than 1/2. This ensures (5.88).

The final step in the proof of Proposition 5.2 is very simple. We have shown that on average, we can take a single Pauli $X_0$ supported on one site, and have half of the operator weight supported on a fraction of sites
\[ \hat{N} \geq \lambda_{1,q} R_{q_*}^d \geq \left(\frac{m^d}{120}\right)^{q_*} \geq \left(\frac{e^{d\sqrt{\ln r}}}{120}\right)^{\sqrt{\ln r}}. \]
(5.96)

Setting $r = L^{1+\epsilon/2}$, we find
\[ \hat{N} \geq L^d \cdot \frac{L^{de/2}}{120^{(1+\epsilon/2)\ln L}} > L^d \]
(5.97)

for sufficiently large $r$ and $L$. Combining (5.88) with (5.97), we obtain that (5.24) holds on average in the ensemble. Obviously, there must then exist at least one Hamiltonian in the ensemble where $\|P_{\geq L}|X_0(t)|F\|$ is at least as large as its average value.
Having completed this somewhat lengthy algebra, it is worthwhile to take a step back and comment on a few interesting implications of our protocol. The fact that typical protocols actually are effective at growing operators at the Frobenius light cone suggests a certain robustness of this notion of light cone. At the same time, for chaotic systems, the light cone is linear above \( \alpha > d + \frac{1}{2} \) \[25, 34\]. The reason why our random protocol is faster for other models, such as random chaotic circuits, is that our protocol utilizes constructive quantum interference during the \( \mathcal{V}_q \) steps—this interference allows us to saturate the Frobenius light cone.

Remarkably, our protocol also saturates both the Frobenius light cone of this paper (proven in \( d = 1 \) and conjectured for \( d > 1 \)), and that in typical random Hamiltonians in \( d = 1 \), which was proved (Theorem 7, \[25\]) to be very similar to \( (4.5) \). Namely, the Frobenius light cones—upper and lower bounds—are essentially the same, whether one fine tunes the Hamiltonian or just draws one randomly. We anticipate these conclusions generalize to higher dimensions, though a formal proof is not known.

6. OUTLOOK

We have shown constraints on the dynamics of growing operators, measured by the Frobenius norm. In particular, we have proved that in one dimensional spin chains with long-range interactions, it is possible for the Frobenius light cone to be exponentially slower than the Lieb-Robinson light cone (\( \alpha = 2 \)). Such a result is based on the key insight that Frobenius norm becomes approximately submultiplicative, proven by combining standard and new functional analysis tools (uniform smoothness) with the quantum walk formalism.

Moreover, we demonstrated that our Frobenius light cone in one dimension is essentially optimal (up to subalgebraic corrections). Our protocol features the first comprehensive analysis of an explicit random Hamiltonian; in contrast, where existing results relied instead on Brownian Hamiltonian dynamics \[34\]. Our usage of super-density operator and super-channel may find further applications in studying operator growth and Frobenius light cones in other systems.

In the near future, we hope to prove our conjecture that the Frobenius light cone in higher dimensional models with long-range interactions looks (schematically like) \( t \gtrsim r^{\alpha-d} \) (for \( d < \alpha < d + 1 \)). Beyond that obvious generalization, we anticipate that novel methods will find use in a broad variety of other challenging problems, such as bounding fast scrambling and chaos in quantum simulators, including trapped ion crystals and cavity quantum electrodynamics \[29, 35, 36\]; this work may help to constrain when it is possible (or not) to mimic quantum gravity in an experiment \[37–42\]. A more practical possible application of the Frobenius light cone may be to constrain the generation of (volume-law) entanglement. Lastly, we hope to develop a more general toolkit (perhaps based on the quantum walk methods) to control Frobenius light cones in arbitrary many-body models.
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