A universal quantum computer can naturally simulate the real time dynamics of any closed finite dimensional quantum system [1], an apparently intractable task for classical computers. While there has been tremendous progress in quantum computing hardware development, including the landmark quantum supremacy/advantage experiments with superconducting and optical systems [2, 3], state-of-the-art quantum hardware can still only control tens of noisy qubits [2, 4, 5]. That is insufficient for the implementation of fault-tolerant universal quantum computing, which can require hundreds or thousands of physical qubits per logical qubit [6]. It is more pragmatic in the near term to focus on the noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) regime and consider hybrid variational methods, which run a shallow circuit without implementing full error correction [7]. Nevertheless, most quantum simulation algorithms, whether targeting NISQ or universal quantum computers, generally require a number of physical or logical qubits no smaller than the problem size [8–10]. Given that large-scale universal quantum computers do not yet exist and there will be significant size constraints even on NISQ devices for the foreseeable future, a pressing question is how to use size-constrained devices to solve larger practical problems [11].

One possibility is to leverage the classical methods that have been developed to solve quantum many-body problems. One of the most successful methods is perturbation theory, which divides the Hamiltonian into a major but easily solved component and a weak but potentially complicated component, in which case the full dynamics can be expressed as a series expansion [22–27]. One constraint on using perturbation theory for classical numerical simulation is the need to be able to solve the major component and compute higher-order expansions. Here, we introduce perturbative quantum simulation (PQS), which uses a quantum computer to directly simulate the major component while perturbatively approximating the weak one. Since we require no assumption on the major component, PQS goes beyond conventional classical perturbative simulation and can handle classically intractable systems such as large systems with weak inter-subsystem interactions or intermediate systems with general interactions. Although PQS does not work for arbitrary problems, a major advantage compared to conventional quantum simulation algorithms is that the perturbative treatment of the weak component allows PQS to operate on smaller quantum devices than required for direct simulation. At the same time, PQS only runs a shallow circuit on a smaller number of qubits, making it more noise-robust and thus useful in benchmarking large quantum devices with smaller ones. Our experimental results on the IBM quantum cloud indeed demonstrates a significant improvement of the simulation accuracy over direct simulation.

We will now introduce the PQS formalism, briefly summarising the main ideas specialised to the case of interacting qubits and leaving most details to the Supplementary Materials. Consider a Hamiltonian $H$ acting...
Decomposition

\[ \rho_{\text{int}}(\delta t) = I + \delta t \sum_k a_k \Phi_{1,k} \otimes \Phi_{2,k} \cdots \otimes \Phi_{L,k} \]
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**FIG. 1.** Schematic diagram of the perturbative quantum simulation algorithm. (a) The decomposition of interactions into local generalised quantum operations \( \Phi_k = \Phi_{1,k} \otimes \Phi_{2,k} \otimes \cdots \otimes \Phi_{L,k} \) with \( \Phi_{i,k} = \text{Tr}_E[U_i E_i (\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0| E_i)] V_E^{-1} \) acting on the \( i \)-th subsystem. (b) The implementation of a generalised quantum operation \( \Phi(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E[U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0| E)] V_E^{-1} \) using quantum circuits, which reduces to a quantum channel when \( U = V \) in (b1) and unitary operations \( \Phi(\rho) = U \rho U^\dagger \) when there is no ancilla in (b2) (See Sec. I). (c) We can equivalently realise the discretised scheme in (a) by \( \delta t \to 0 \). The operation sequences for \( N_s \) samples are predetermined provided the decomposition in (a). We either continuously apply the local time evolution or randomly apply a generalised quantum operation. The time to apply the operations is determined by the probability \( P[\text{Jump}] \) and the \( k \)-th operation is applied with probability \( P[\Phi_k] \) (See Sec. IB). The scheme in (c) does not assume time discretisation, and on average it is proven to be equivalent to the ‘continuous’ one in (a) (Proven in Sec. IC). The number of generalised quantum operations scales as \( \mathcal{O}(\sum_k |\alpha_k| T) \). (d) illustrates the process for Sample 1 as an example. For the \( j \)-th subsystem, we evolve the state under local operations \( U \) and apply operations \( \Phi_{k,1} \) and \( \Phi_{k,2} \) at time \( t_{1,1} \) and \( t_{1,2} \), respectively. We measure the output states with a product observable \( O \) and obtain the outcomes \( O_{j,i} \) for the \( j \)-th sample. We repeat the process for \( N_s \) times. For any product input state, the expectation value of observable \( O \) under the joint evolution \( U \) in (c) can be unbiasedly approximated by \( \langle O \rangle_L \approx \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{j=1}^{N_s} \prod_i O_{j,i} \) with the overhead \( C \) and phase \( P_j \) determined by the decomposition (See Sec. IB and IC).

on a system that could be divided into \( L \) subsystems with \( H = H_{\text{loc}} + V_{\text{int}} \). Here, \( H_{\text{loc}} = \sum_j H_j \) is the local Hamiltonian with \( H_j \) acting on the \( j \)-th subsystem and \( V_{\text{int}} = \sum_j \lambda_j V_j \) is the interaction between the subsystems with real amplitudes \( \lambda_j \) and each term \( V_j \) being the perturbation interaction that depends on the subsystem division. Without loss of generality, \( V_j \) can be taken to be a product of Pauli operators. Denoting \( U(t) = e^{-iHt} \), the goal is to realise the joint time evolution channel \( U(\rho, T) = U(T) \rho U^\dagger(T) \) by acting separately on each subsystem. To do so requires the concept of local generalised quantum operations

\[ \Phi(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E \left[ U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0| E) V^{-1} \right], \]

with ancillary qubits \( |0\rangle \langle 0| E = |0\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle E_L \), unitary operators \( U = U_1 E_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_{L E_L} \) and \( V = V_1 E_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{L E_L} \). The notation \( U_j E_j \) and \( V_j E_j \) indicates that the operators act only on subsystem \( j \) and the \( j \)-th ancilla. While the operation \( \Phi(\rho) \) is nonphysical in general, it can be realised effectively using local operations and postprocessing as shown in Fig. 1 (b), which reduces to local quantum channels when \( U = V \) as illustrated in Fig. 1(b1). By choosing a spanning set of \( \{ \Phi_k \} \), we can then decompose an infinitesimal evolution \( \mathcal{V}(\delta t)[\rho] = V_{\text{int}}(\delta t) \rho V_{\text{int}}(\delta t)^\dagger \) as

\[ \mathcal{V}(\delta t)[\rho] = \mathcal{I}(\rho) + \delta t \sum_k \alpha_k \Phi_k(\rho), \]

with \( V_{\text{int}}(t) = e^{-iV_{\text{int}} \delta t} \), time \( \delta t \), and the identity channel \( \mathcal{I} \). Next, we consider a Trotterised \( \mathcal{U}(T) = (\mathcal{V}(\delta t) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{U}(\delta t))^T/\delta t \) and expand it as a series of different trajectories defined at each time by which operation acts, the local time evolution \( \mathcal{U}_j(\delta t) \) of each subsystem or a generalised quantum operation \( \Phi_j(\rho) \) that on average emulates the effect of \( V_{\text{int}} = e^{-iV_{\text{int}} \delta t} \). Taking the short time limit \( \delta t \to 0 \), we can generate each trajectory according to the decomposition in Eq. (2) and stochastically realise the joint time evolution, as illustrated in Fig. 1 (c) (See
ρ for the density and the density-density correlator ˆ\rho_{ij}^\dagger ˆ\rho_{ij}. The nearest-neighbour Lieb-Robinson bounds (dashed) capture the density spreading [5, 12, 13]. The inset shows the errors for quasiparticle excitations and the correlation functions. (c2) The dynamics of the two-body separation is offset to 0 at time t = 0. (a3) Boson spatial antibunching in QW. The normalised correlator \rho_{ij}/\rho_{ij}^{\text{max}} at different t [14, 15]. (b) Separation of charge and spin density (CSD) in a 1D Fermi-Hubbard model H = -J \sum_{j<\sigma} (\hat{c}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j+1,\sigma} + \text{h.c.}) + U \sum_j \hat{n}_{j,\uparrow} \hat{n}_{j,\downarrow} + J_{ij} \hat{\sigma}_{ij}^x \hat{\sigma}_{ij}^z: fermionic operators with spin \sigma, U = J = 0.5) [15, 16]. The separation of CSD. We characterise the separation speed from the middle as \kappa_{\text{clus}} = \sum_{j=1}^L |j - (L + 1)/2| (\langle \hat{\hat{n}}_{j,\uparrow} \rangle \pm \langle \hat{\hat{n}}_{j,\downarrow} \rangle) for charge (+) and spin (−) degrees of freedom with \langle \hat{n}_{j} \rangle = \langle \hat{c}_{j}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j} \rangle. (b2) The difference of CSD under evolution. The separation is offset to 0 at t = 0. (c) Information propagation of correlated Ising spin clusters with power law decay interactions \hat{H}_t^{\text{loc}} = \sum_{ij} \hat{J}_{ij} \hat{\sigma}_{ij}^x \hat{\sigma}_{ij}^z + h J \hat{\sigma}_{ij}^z (J_{ij} = J_0 |i - j|^{-\alpha}, \alpha = 1) in the subsystems and interaction and \hat{V}_t^{\text{int}} = J_0 \hat{\sigma}_{1,N}^x \hat{\sigma}_{2,1}^z on the boundary (J_0 = 1). The initial state is prepared as |\psi_0\rangle = \hat{\sigma}_z^N |0\rangle^{\otimes N}. (c1) The signal of quasiparticle excitations at different sites. The nearest-neighbour Lieb-Robinson bounds (dashed) does not capture all the signal for this propagation [12, 20, 21]. The inset shows the errors for quasiparticle excitations and the correlation functions. (c2) The dynamics of the two-body correlation function \hat{C}_d = \langle \hat{\sigma}_z^x \hat{\sigma}_z^{x+d} \rangle - \langle \hat{\sigma}_z^x \rangle \langle \hat{\sigma}_z^{x+d} \rangle. See Sec. V for more details.

 Sec. I B and I C). The average of different trajectories reproduces the joint evolution channel H(T). We summarise the key steps of the algorithm as follows and refer to Sec. I of Supplementary Materials for the algorithm and implementation details.

1. Given a set of generalised quantum operations, find the decomposition Eq. (2).
2. Generate a sequence of trajectories that evolve each subsystem and experience random local generalised quantum operations.
3. Sample from the trajectories. The average behaviour reproduces the joint evolution.

In quantum simulation, we usually prepare a simple initial state, such as a product state, evolve it under a
As discussed above, implementing the interaction $V$ perturbatively using generalised quantum operations introduces a sampling overhead $C$. Specifically, when we measure the output state of the perturbatively simulated state, the measurement accuracy is $\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(C\sigma/\sqrt{N_s})$ given $N_s$ samples in contrast to $\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N_s})$ given direct simulation. Here $\sigma$ is the standard deviation introduced from the expansion, which is normally less than 1. Assuming the general decomposition of Eq. (2), the overhead is $C = e^{\sum|\lambda_i|^2}$ and it is upper bounded by the explicit decomposition $C \leq e^{2|\lambda_T|}$ with $\lambda_T = \sum_i |\lambda_i|/T$. In Sec. II, Theorem 2 establishes that the explicit decomposition has the minimal simulation cost for PQS, provided that the Pauli operators of each $V_i$ satisfy a certain condition. For example, the condition holds when $V^{\text{int}} = \lambda_1 X_a Y_b Z_c + \lambda_2 Y_c Z_b X_a + \lambda_3 Z_c X_b Y_c$ with Pauli operators $X, Y,$ and $Z$ acting on three subsystems $a, b,$ and $c$ (See Sec. II B). We therefore focus on the explicit expansion in the following simulation. Compared to other recent works that simulate clustered Hamiltonians or circuits with gate decomposition [36–39], our method does not assume Trotterisation and hence could be much more efficient in general. To have a reasonable cost, the algorithm is efficient when $\lambda_T = \mathcal{O}(1)$, aligning with the spirit of perturbation theory. While the PQS algorithm cannot simulate arbitrary systems, it could tackle general strongly interacting subsystems and probe interesting many-body physics phenomena.

To demonstrate and test PQS, we apply it to interacting bosons, fermions, and quantum spin systems with different topological structures. As shown in Fig. 2, we investigated (a) the quantum walk of bosons on a one-dimensional lattice, (b) the separation of charge and spin excitations of fermions with two-dimensional topology, and (c) the correlation propagation of quantum spin systems of two clusters. We design appropriate partitioning strategies, in which the whole system consists of two subsystems and each subsystem consists of 8 qubits. Using the explicit decomposition strategy, we exploit 8 + 1 qubits to simulate each subsystem and classically emulate the quantum algorithm with numerical results shown in Fig. 2. All probed physical phenomena were detected just as if we had directly simulated the whole system. Indeed, the numerical results align with those of the exact simulation, thus verifying the reliability of the method. We refer to Sec. V of Supplementary Materials for other physical systems and simulation details.

These numerical tests were restricted to at most 16 qubits since exact simulation of larger quantum systems becomes exponentially costly. To benchmark our method for larger systems, we investigated a 1D 48-site spin chain with nearest-neighbour correlations, using the time-evolving block decimation (TEBD) method with matrix product states as the reference. As shown in Fig. 3, our simulation results coincide with those of TEBD, which again verifies the reliability of PQS for simulating multiple subsystems. Note that our method only requires control of 8 + 1 qubits to recover the joint Hamiltonian $H$, and measure an observable that could be decomposed as a linear combination of local ones. Together with our algorithm, the whole simulation process is now decomposed into the average of different processes where each one only involves operations on the subsystems. If each subsystem consists of $n$ qubits, we can effectively simulate $nL$ qubits with operations on only $\mathcal{O}(nL)$ qubits. Although our above analysis assumes Trotterisation, the local time evolution $U(t)$ could be implemented with any Hamiltonian simulation methods, such as Trotterisation [30, 31] or qubitisation [32, 33]. Our algorithm is thus compatible with both near-term devices and fault-tolerant quantum computers.

While the decomposition of Eq. (2) holds in general for a complete set of $\{\Phi_k\}$, we develop an explicit decomposition as

$$V(\delta t)[\rho] = \mathcal{I}(\rho) - i\delta t \sum_j \lambda_j (V^{\text{int}}_j \rho - \rho V^{\text{int}}_j).$$

Since all $V^{\text{int}}_j$ are tensor products of unitaries, each term $\mathcal{I}(\rho), V^{\text{int}}_j \rho,$ or $\rho V^{\text{int}}_j$ corresponds to a specific generalised quantum operation. The expansion is universal and simplifies the implementation without requiring the ancillary qubits, as shown in Fig. 1(b2). We prove in Theorem 3 that this decomposition corresponds to the infinite-order Dyson series expansion of the unitary $\{\Phi_k\}$

$$U(t) = 1 - i \int_{t_0}^t dt e^{iH^{\text{loc}}(t_1-t_0)} V^{\text{int}} e^{-iH^{\text{loc}}(t_1-t_0)} + \ldots,$$

where the algorithm effectively implements each expanded term (trajectory) with a quantum computer and sums over the expansion via the average of different trajectories. We also address the quantum simulation with a truncated expansion (See Sec. III).
evolution dynamics of the 48 qubits.

We only considered the time evolution of small and classically simulable quantum systems for benchmarking our method. However, for all the considered examples here, since the simulation cost is independent of the subsystem, the PQS algorithm would also work when considering a much larger subsystem with more complicated subsystem interactions. In practice, when we increase the subsystem size to around $n = 50$ qubits and consider general strong interactions, PQS could outstrip the capabilities of classical simulation and reliably probe the properties of quantum systems many times the size of the quantum processor.

Furthermore, since our algorithm runs a circuit on a smaller number of qubits, it could be more robust to noise than direct simulation, an advantage we verified by implementing the algorithm on the IBMQ cloud hardware. Consider the dynamical phase transition of an 8-qubit Ising model with nearest-neighbour correlations. By dividing the system into two subsystems, we used a 4 + 1-qubit processor to implement our PQS algorithm and compared the result to conventional simulation with 8 qubits, as shown in Fig. 4 (c) and (a), respectively. For a total evolution time $T = 1$, we used a first-order Trotter formula with four steps and a negligible Trotter error. As shown in Fig. 4 (d-g), the experimental results indicate a much smaller simulation error with the PQS method compared to direct simulation (with/without measurement error mitigation). In practice, such noise-robustness could be exploited to benchmark large quantum processors with smaller ones. We refer to Sec. VI for more examples and detailed discussions of the results.

Our theoretical, numerical, and experimental results indicate that quantum simulation and perturbation theory are not only compatible but complementary. The PQS algorithm leverages the quantum computer to simulate the major component of the Hamiltonian, alleviating the constraint of a classical perturbation method, and uses classical perturbation to approximate the interaction, circumventing the limited number of qubits that will be available in near-term quantum computers and early stage fault-tolerant quantum computers. While the algorithm cannot efficiently simulate arbitrary systems, especially large 2D or 3D systems, it is applicable to ones with an intermediate size, such as a square lat-
tice with tens to hundreds of qubits, and it is particularly useful for simulating large systems with weak inter-subsystem interactions, such as (quasi) one-dimensional systems and clustered subsystems. Our numerical and experimental results demonstrate the wide applicability of the PQS method for studying various many-body physical phenomena and its potential use for benchmarking large quantum processors with small ones. Our work illustrates the potential of hybrid algorithms that combine classical physics methods with quantum computing, and clears a path for studying large many-body quantum systems with near-future quantum hardware. Meanwhile, there are other classical perturbation treatment of the interaction, such as the one that expands according to the interaction strength, integrating it with quantum computing may provide a more efficient PQS. Furthermore, perturbation methods have also been applied in analogue quantum simulation for synthesising effective Hamiltonians (See [40, 41]), and analogue simulation has already discovered novel phenomena such as quantum many-body scars [42]. Whether our PQS method could be generalised to analogue simulators is an interesting future direction.
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I. Perturbative quantum simulation — general framework

A. Generalised quantum operation

In our main text, we introduced the generalised quantum operation as

$$\Phi(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E[U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_E) V^\dagger],$$

where $U$ and $V$ could be different unitary operators that applies jointly on $\rho$ and $|0\rangle_E$. We show several properties of the generalised quantum operation $\Phi(\rho)$.

- The generalised quantum operation $\Phi(\rho)$ is non-increasing jointly under the Schatten norm. Specifically, the Schatten norm of a matrix is $\|M\|_p = \text{Tr}[|M|^p]^{1/p}$ for $p \in [1, \infty)$ and we have

$$\|\Phi(\rho)\|_p \leq \|U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_E) V^\dagger\|_p = \|\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_E\|_p = \|\rho\|_p.$$  
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VI. Experimental Implementation on the IBM quantum devices

I. PERTURBATIVE QUANTUM SIMULATION — GENERAL FRAMEWORK

A. Generalised quantum operation
• The real and imaginary part of $\Phi(\rho)$ could be expressed as a linear combination of completely positive trace non-increasing quantum channels. Specifically, they could be obtained with the following circuit.

The output state before the measurement is

$$
\rho_{\text{out}} = |0\rangle_0 U\rho \otimes |0\rangle_E U^\dagger + |1\rangle_0 V\rho \otimes |0\rangle_E V^\dagger + |1\rangle_0 U\rho \otimes |0\rangle_E U^\dagger + |1\rangle_0 V\rho \otimes |0\rangle_E V^\dagger.
$$

The real and imaginary part of $\Phi(\rho)$ can be obtained from the $X$ and $Y$ measurements.

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{Re}[\Phi(\rho)] &= \text{Tr}_0[\rho_{\text{out}} X_0], \\
\text{Im}[\Phi(\rho)] &= \text{Tr}_0[\rho_{\text{out}} Y_0].
\end{align*}
$$

• The measurement of the output state is realised similarly. For example, the real and imaginary parts of $\text{Tr}[\Phi(\rho)O]$ could be realised with the following circuit.

• When $U = V$, it reduces to a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}$

$$
\mathcal{N}(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E[U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_E)U^\dagger].
$$

with circuit

When there is no ancillary $E$, it becomes

$$
\Phi(\rho) = U\rho V^\dagger,
$$

with circuit

which plays a key role in our explicit scheme.

• Given two generalised quantum operations

$$
\begin{align*}
\Phi_1(\rho) &= \text{Tr}_{E_1}[U_1(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_{E_1})V_1^\dagger], \\
\Phi_2(\rho) &= \text{Tr}_{E_2}[U_2(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_{E_2})V_2^\dagger],
\end{align*}
$$

the concatenated operation

$$
\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1(\rho) = \text{Tr}_{E_1, E_2}[U_2 U_1(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_{E_1, E_2})V_1^\dagger V_2^\dagger].
$$
is also a generalised quantum operation. The real and imaginary part of $\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1(\rho)$ could be obtained from measuring the ancillary qubit on the $X_0$ and $Y_0$ basis with the following circuit.

\[
|+\rangle_0 \xrightarrow{\rho} U_2 U_1 V_2 V_1 U_1^\dagger U_2^\dagger |+\rangle_0 \to X_0, Y_0
\]

It can be equivalently realised as follows using two ancillary qubits.

\[
|+\rangle_0 \xrightarrow{\rho} \begin{array}{l} U_1 \quad \text{\rotatebox{90}{$\to$}} \quad V_1 \quad \text{\rotatebox{90}{$\to$}} \quad U_2 \quad \text{\rotatebox{90}{$\to$}} \quad V_2 \quad \text{\rotatebox{90}{$\to$}} \quad |0\rangle_{E_1, E_2} \\
|+\rangle_{0'} \xrightarrow{\rho} \begin{array}{l} U_1 \quad \text{\rotatebox{90}{$\to$}} \quad V_1 \quad \text{\rotatebox{90}{$\to$}} \quad U_2 \quad \text{\rotatebox{90}{$\to$}} \quad V_2 \quad \text{\rotatebox{90}{$\to$}} \quad |0\rangle_{E_1, E_2} \end{array}
\end{array}
\]

In particular, the circuit factorise into two independent ones when (1) $\rho$ is a tensor product of two states $\rho = \rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$ (2) $U_1$ and $V_1$ applies on $\rho_1$ and $|0\rangle_{E_1}$; $U_2$ and $V_2$ applies on $\rho_2$ and $|0\rangle_{E_2}$.

\section*{B. Algorithm description — discrete time}

The goal of the algorithm is to simulate the dynamics of a many-body Hamiltonian, for example

\[
H = H^{\text{loc}} + V^{\text{int}},
\]

where $H^{\text{loc}}$ corresponds to the strong but local interaction and $V^{\text{int}}$ corresponds to weak perturbations. In practice, we can always divide the whole system into $L$ subsystems, and thus consider

\[
H^{\text{loc}} = \sum_i H_i
\]

as the local Hamiltonians with each $H_i$ acting on the $l$th subsystem, and

\[
V^{\text{int}} = \sum_j \lambda_j V_j^{\text{int}}
\]

as the weak perturbation interaction between the subsystems with different interactions $V_j^{\text{int}}$ and coefficients $\lambda_i$. We note that the local Hamiltonians and the perturbation interaction interactions depend on the partitioning strategy of the subsystems, and we refer to Sec. V for the partitioning for different physical systems. We assumed time independent Hamiltonian in the following discussion, however our results apply to general time dependent Hamiltonians. Since we are considering Hamiltonian simulation with a quantum computer, we assume that every $H_i$ could be decomposed as a linear combination of tensor product of Pauli operators and each $V_j^{\text{int}}$ is a tensor product of Pauli operators.

Now we describe the algorithm assuming discretised time. We show shortly how to take the limit of infinitesimal timesteps. We aim to simulate the time evolution of $H$ with time $t$,

\[
U(T) |\rho\rangle = U(T) \rho U(T)^\dagger,
\]

where $U(t) = e^{-iHt}$. Considering discrete time $\delta t$, we have

\[
U(T) = \prod_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} U_i(\delta t) = \prod_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} \left[ V^{\text{int}}(\delta t) \circ \bigotimes_{l=1}^{i} U_l(\delta t) \right] + \mathcal{O}(T\delta t),
\]

where $U_i(t) = U_i(t) \rho U_i(t)^\dagger$ with $U_i(t) = e^{-iH_i t}$ and $V^{\text{int}}(t) = V^{\text{int}}(t) \rho V^{\text{int}}(t)^\dagger$ with $V^{\text{int}}(t) = e^{-iV^{\text{int}}_j t}$. Here $\mathcal{O}(T\delta t)$ corresponds to the Trotter error, which vanishes when taking the limit of $\delta t \to 0$. Note that the evolution consists of local evolution $U_l(\delta t)$ on the $l$th subsystem term and the joint evolution $V^{\text{int}}(\delta t)$. 

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node[draw, shape=rectangle] (A) at (0,0) {
    \begin{tabular}{c}
      $|+\rangle_0$ \\
      $|0\rangle_{E_1, E_2}$
    \end{tabular}
  }
  \node[draw, shape=rectangle] (B) at (2,0) {
    \begin{tabular}{c}
      $X_0, Y_0$
    \end{tabular}
  }
  \node[draw, shape=rectangle] (C) at (2,-2) {
    \begin{tabular}{c}
      $X'_0, Y'_0$
    \end{tabular}
  }
  \node[draw, shape=rectangle] (D) at (0,-2) {
    \begin{tabular}{c}
      $E_1$ \\
      $E_2$
    \end{tabular}
  }
  \draw[->] (A) -- (B) node[midway, above] {$\rho$};
  \draw[->] (A) -- (D) node[midway, above] {$\rho$};
  \draw[->] (B) -- (C) node[midway, above] {$U_2 U_1 V_2 V_1 U_1^\dagger U_2^\dagger |+\rangle_0$};
  \draw[->] (D) -- (C) node[midway, above] {$U_1 V_1 U_1^\dagger U_2 V_2 U_2^\dagger |0\rangle_{E_1, E_2}$};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}
The next step is to decompose the joint evolution $\gamma^{\text{int}}(\delta t)$ into local operations that separately act on the subsystems. In particular, we consider a set of generalised quantum operations as

$$\Phi_k(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E \left[ U_k (\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0 |_E) V_k \right] \quad (17)$$

where we denote $U_k = U_{1E_1,k} \otimes U_{2E_2,k} \otimes \cdots \otimes U_{LE_L,k}$, $V_k = V^\dagger_{1E_1,k} \otimes V^\dagger_{2E_2,k} \otimes \cdots \otimes V^\dagger_{LE_L,k}$, and $|0\rangle \langle 0 |_E = |0\rangle \langle 0 |_E_1 \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0 |_E_2 \cdots \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0 |_E_L$, and each $U_{E_i,k}$ and $V_{E_i,k}$ is applied jointly on the $l$th subsystem and the ancilla $E_i$. Denoting $\Phi_{i,j} = \text{Tr}_E \left[ U_{1E_1,j} (\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0 |_E) V_{1E_1,j} \right]$, we thus have

$$\Phi_k = \Phi_{1,k} \otimes \Phi_{2,k} \otimes \cdots \otimes \Phi_{L,k}, \quad (18)$$

which applies separately on each subsystem. When we choose a sufficient number of $\Phi_k$, we can always decompose the instant joint evolution $\gamma^{\text{int}}(t)$ as a linear combination of local operations,

$$\gamma^{\text{int}}(\delta t) = \mathcal{I} + \delta t \sum_k \alpha_k \Phi_k = \mathcal{I} + \delta t \sum_k \alpha_k \Phi_{1,k} \otimes \Phi_{2,k} \otimes \cdots \otimes \Phi_{L,k}, \quad (19)$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ corresponds to the identity channel $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \rho$ and $\alpha_k$ are complex coefficients. For example, we can choose $\{\Phi_k\}$ to be a complete basis for all quantum channels. When the set of $\{\Phi_k\}$ is chosen, we can find the coefficients $\alpha_k$ via linear programming.

Now we can express the joint evolution as

$$\mathcal{U}(T) = \prod_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} \left( \mathcal{I} + \delta t \sum_k \alpha_k \Phi_k \right) \circ \bigotimes_{i=1}^T \mathcal{U}_i(\delta t) + \mathcal{O}(T \delta t). \quad (20)$$

Denote $\Phi_0 = \mathcal{I}$, $c(\delta t) = 1 + \sum_k |\alpha_k| \delta t$, $p_0(\delta t) = 1/c(\delta t)$, $p_k(\delta t) = |\alpha_k| \delta t/c(\delta t)$, $\theta_k = -i \ln(|\alpha_k|/|\alpha_k|)$, we can re-express the above equation as

$$\mathcal{U}(T) = \prod_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} \left[ c(\delta t) \left( \sum_k e^{i\theta_k} p_k(\delta t) \Phi_k \right) \circ \bigotimes_{i=1}^T \mathcal{U}_i(\delta t) \right] + \mathcal{O}(T \delta t),$$

$$= c(\delta t)^{T/\delta t} \sum_{k_1,k_2,\ldots,k_{T/\delta t}} \prod_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} \left[ e^{i\theta_k} p_k(\delta t) \Phi_k \circ \bigotimes_{i=1}^T \mathcal{U}_i(\delta t) \right] + \mathcal{O}(T \delta t),$$

$$= c(\delta t)^{T/\delta t} \sum_k e^{i\theta_k} p_k \prod_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} \left( \bigotimes_{i=1}^T \Phi_{l,i,k} \circ \bigotimes_{i=1}^T \mathcal{U}_i(\delta t) \right) + \mathcal{O}(T \delta t),$$

$$= c(\delta t)^{T/\delta t} \sum_k e^{i\theta_k} p_k \prod_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} \left( \prod_{i=1}^T \left( \Phi_{l,i,k} \circ \mathcal{U}_i(\delta t) \right) \right) + \mathcal{O}(T \delta t). \quad (21)$$

Here $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_{T/\delta t})$, $p_k = p_{k_1} p_{k_2} \cdots p_{k_{T/\delta t}}$, $\theta_k = \theta_{k_1} + \theta_{k_2} + \cdots + \theta_{k_{T/\delta t}}$. In the main text, we denote the phase as $\mathcal{P}_k = e^{i\theta_k}$. The whole evolution $\mathcal{U}(T)$ is now decomposed as a linear combination of operations that act locally on each subsystems. We can thus effectively realise the joint evolution using only local operations.

We next discuss the measurement of non-local observable. Suppose the initial state $\rho(0)$ is decomposed as

$$\rho(0) = \sum_{k_0} \alpha_{k_0} \bigotimes_{l=1}^{k_0} \rho_{l,k_0} \quad (22)$$

and measure an observable like

$$O = \sum_{k_0} \alpha_{k_0} \prod_{l=1}^{k_0} O_{l,k_0}, \quad (23)$$

then we have

$$\text{Tr} \left[ \mathcal{U}(T)[\rho(0)]O \right] = c(\delta t)^{T/\delta t} \sum_{k_0,k_0,k} \alpha_{k_0} \alpha_{k_0} e^{i\theta_k} p_k \prod_{l=1}^{T/\delta t} \left( \prod_{i=1}^T \left( \Phi_{l,i,k} \circ \mathcal{U}_i(\delta t) \right) [\rho_{l,k_0}] O_{l,k_0} \right) + \mathcal{O}(T \delta t). \quad (24)$$

Here each term $\text{Tr} \left[ \prod_{l=1}^{T/\delta t} \left( \Phi_{l,i,k} \circ \mathcal{U}_i(\delta t) \right) [\rho_{l,k_0}] O_{l,k_0} \right]$ can be obtained from operations only on the $l$th subsystem. The expectation value of the joint state is now a linear combination of products of local measurement results.
C. Monte Carlo implementation and continuous time

1. Discrete time Monte Carlo method

The number of expanded terms is proportional to $N_V^{T/\delta t}$, with $N_V$ being the number of terms in the expansion of Eq. (19). Although $N_V^{T/\delta t}$ increases exponentially, we do not need to measure all the expanded terms and the Monte Carlo method could more efficiently obtain the measurement outcome.

In particular, the decomposition of Eq. (24) can be written in a general form of

$$\langle O \rangle = \sum_k q_k \prod_{l=1}^N \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_l (\rho_{l,k}) O_{l,k} \right] = C \sum_k e^{i\theta_k} p_k \prod_{l=1}^N \text{Tr} \left[ \Phi_l (\rho_{l,k}) O_{l,k} \right] + O(T \delta t),$$

with $k = (k_0, k, \alpha)$, $q_k = c(\delta t)^T/\delta t \alpha k_0 \alpha_k e^{i\theta_k} p_k$, $C = \sum_k q_k = c(\delta t)^T/\delta t \sum_{k_0} |\alpha_0| \sum_{k_0} |\alpha_0|$, $\theta_k = -i \ln (q_k/|q_k|)$, $p_k = |q_k|/C$, and $\Phi_l = \prod_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} \left( \Phi_{l,k_i} \circ U_c(\delta t) \right)$. To obtain the measurement $\langle O \rangle$, we can use the following Monte Carlo random sampling method,

1. Generate random numbers $k$ according to the probability $\{p_k\}$;
2. For the $l$th subsystem, prepare state $\rho_{l,k}$, apply the operation $\Phi_l$, and measure the observable $O_{l,k}$ to get $\langle O_{l,k} \rangle$.
3. Multiply all the outcomes $\langle O_{l,k} \rangle = \text{Tr}[\Phi_l(\rho_{l,k}) O_{l,k}]$ of different subsystems, as well as the phase $e^{i\theta_k}$ and $C$.
4. Ignoring the effect of Trotter error with a finite timestep, the expansion guarantees that the output is an unbiased estimation of the exact measurement outcome. Suppose each $O_{l,k}$ is a Pauli measurement, then with failure probability $\delta$, the estimation error scales as

$$\varepsilon = O \left( C \frac{\log 1/\delta}{N_s} \right).$$

Since the coefficient $C$ boosts the error, it quantifies the cost of the random sampling process. Suppose the input state is a product state, then the additional cost that the perturbative expansion introduces is $C = c(\delta t)^T/\delta t$. We will shortly give a detailed analysis of this cost in Sec. 1D.

A major caveat of the above scheme is that it assumes a small discrete timestep and requires to continuously interchange the subsystem evolution $U_l$ and $\Phi_l$ with sufficiently small time step $\delta t$. In practice, it could be challenging to ‘continuously’ interchange the subsystem evolution within a sufficiently small time step $\delta t$. We show in the next subsection that we can apply an equivalent Monte Carlo method to stochastically implement the joint evolution. As such, general Hamiltonian simulation method other than Trotterisation could be applied to reduce the algorithmic error.

2. Stochastic implementation

We first rewrite Eq. (20) as follows

$$\mathcal{U}(T) = c(\delta t)^T/\delta t \prod_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} \left( p_{i1} \mathcal{I} + p_{i1} \Phi \right) \circ \bigotimes_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} \mathcal{U}_i (\rho(0)),$$

where $p_{i1} = \sum_{k \geq 1} p_k$, $\Phi = \sum_{k \geq 1} \alpha_k \Phi_k / \sum_{k} |\alpha_k|$. We note that, at each timestep, we always evolve each subsystem according to $\mathcal{U}_k$, and with a small probability $p_{i1}$, we evolve under $\Phi$. Since the probability $p_{i1} \propto \delta t$ is negligible when taking the limit of $\delta t \to 0$, we can equivalently realise it with a continuous decaying or jump process. Specifically, we can realise the evolution $\mathcal{U}(T)$ with the following stochastic process

1. Generate a uniformly distributed random number $p_{ip} \in [0,1]$.
2. Determine $t_{ip}$ by solving $p_{ip} = Q(t)$ with $Q(t) = e^{-T(t)}, \Gamma(t) = t \sum_{k \geq 1} p_{i1}$, and $\tilde{p}_k$ is $\lim_{\delta t \to 0} p_{i1} \delta t = |\alpha_k|$. 

3. Evolve each subsystem state with $\mathcal{U}_l$ to time $t$ and update $t = t + t_{jp}$.

4. Generate another random number $q_m \in [0,1]$ to determine $\Phi_k$ and apply $\Phi_{l,k}$ to the $l$th subsystem.

5. Repeat Step 1−4 until $t = T$.

Therefore, we can stochastically realise the decomposition without assuming a discrete time. Meanwhile, other advanced Hamiltonian simulation algorithms such as Qubitisation could be used for each time evolution at step 3. We also note that the jump time $t_{jp}$ and hence the evolution could be predetermined, which makes its implementation almost as easy as conventional Hamiltonian simulation methods.

Now suppose we have a product input state $\rho(0) = \bigotimes_l \rho_l(0)$ and product measurement $O = \bigotimes_l O_l$, the stochastic Monte Carlo implementation of the general perturbative method is summarised as follows. When the input state or the measurement is not in a product form, we can similarly decompose them as we discuss above.

**Algorithm 1** Perturbative quantum simulation.

Input: initial state $\rho(0) = \bigotimes_l \rho_l(0)$, number of samples $N_s$, local evolution $\mathcal{U}_l$, decomposition of the interaction $\mathcal{V}^{\text{int}}(\delta t) = \mathcal{I} + \delta t \sum_k \alpha_k \Phi_{1,k} \otimes \Phi_{2,k} \otimes \cdots \otimes \Phi_{L,k}$ with quantum operations $\Phi_{l,j}$, measurement $O = \bigotimes_l O_l$. Output: $\bar{\rho}$.

1. Get $C$, $\{s_j\}$, $\{\bar{\rho}_l = |\alpha_k|\}$, and $\theta_l = -i \ln(\alpha_k/|\alpha_k|)$ from interaction channel $\mathcal{V}$, set $\{s_j = \sum_i^n \rho_i\}$ and $\Gamma(t) = t \sum_k \bar{p}_k$.

2. for $m = 1$ to $N_s$ do

3. Randomly generate $q_0 \in [0,1]$, set $t = 0$, $n = 0$, $\theta = 0$.

4. while $t \leq T$ do

5. Get $t_{jp}^n$ by solving $\{\delta \Gamma(t_{jp}^n)\} = q_n$.

6. Randomly generate $q_n \in [0,1]$.

7. Set $j_n = j$ if $q_n' \in [s_{j-1}, s_j]$ and update $\theta = \theta + \theta_j$.

8. Update $t = t + t_{jp}^n$ and $n = n + 1$.

9. end while

10. for $l = 1$ to $L$ do

11. Set $\rho_l = \rho_l(0)$ and $\bar{\rho} = 0$.

12. for $k = 0 : n - 1$ do

13. Evolve $\rho_l$ under $\mathcal{U}_l$ for time $t_{jp}^n$ and apply $\Phi_{l,k}$.

14. end for

15. Evolve $\rho_l$ under $\mathcal{U}_l$ for time $T - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} t_{jp}^n$.

16. Measure $O$ of $\rho_l$ to get $O_{l,m}$.

17. end for

18. Update $\bar{\rho} = \bar{\rho} + Ce^{i\theta} \prod_l O_{l,m}/N_s$.

19. end for

3. Equivalence between the two Monte Carlo methods

We now prove the equivalence between the stochastic approach and the discrete time Monte Carlo approach with $\delta t \to 0$. Following the above discussion, we can regard the discrete time Monte Carlo approach as a decaying process. Specifically, at each timestep, it has probability $p_{\geq 1}$ to apply an additional operation $\Phi$. Starting at time $t = 0$ with the limit of $\delta t \to 0$, the probability that there is no ‘decay’ event until time $t$ is

$$Q(t) = \lim_{\delta t \to 0} \left( \prod_{i=0}^{t/\delta t} \left( 1 - \sum_{k \geq 1} p_k \delta t \right) \right) = e^{-t\alpha}, \quad (28)$$

where $\alpha = \sum_k |\alpha_k|$ The probability to have a decay event in the time interval $[t, t + dt]$ is

$$P(t)dt = \alpha e^{-t\alpha}dt. \quad (29)$$

For the stochastic method, we generate a uniformly distributed random variable $q \in [0,1]$ and solve

$$q = e^{-t\alpha}, \quad (30)$$

to determine the jump time $t_{jp}$. Then the probability that jump happens at time $t_{jp}$ or in particular between $[t_{jp}, t_{jp} + dt]$ is

$$|dq| = \alpha e^{-t\alpha}dt = P(t_{jp})dt. \quad (31)$$
which agrees with Eq. (29). We can thus use the uniformly distributed random variable \( q \) to determine the jump time to equivalently simulate the discrete time Monte Carlo approach.

Now, at the jump time \( t_{jp} \), we apply the quantum operations other than the identity operation. We can determine the quantum operation by generating another uniformly distributed random number \( q' \in [0, 1] \). If \( q' \in [s_{k-1}, s_k] \), we set the quantum operation to \( B_k \), where \( s_k(t) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k} \tilde{p}_j}{\sum_j \tilde{p}_j} \) and \( N_{op} \) is the number of the quantum operations.

### D. Cost analysis

The above perturbative quantum simulation (PQS) method introduces a sampling overhead quantified by

\[
C = \lim_{\delta t \to 0} \frac{T}{\delta t} \prod_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} c(\delta t) = \lim_{\delta t \to 0} \frac{T}{\delta t} \prod_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} (1 + \alpha \delta t) = e^{\alpha T},
\]

where \( \alpha = \sum_k |\alpha_k| \). Since the simulation accuracy is now \( C \) times larger, we need to have \( C = \mathcal{O}(1) \) and hence \( \alpha T = \mathcal{O}(1) \) in order to get an accurate result. This could be satisfied when \( T \) and \( \alpha \) are not too large, i.e., when the product of the simulation time and the interaction strength is constant. While \( \alpha \) roughly measures the interaction strength, its analytical relationship to the interaction Hamiltonian \( V_{\text{int}} \) is not obvious. This is because the value of \( \alpha \) depends on the choice of the generalised quantum operations and the decomposition. We can thus define the minimal value of \( \alpha \) by optimising over all possible decompositions,

\[
\alpha_{\text{min}} = \min_{\{\Phi_k\}} \alpha(\{\alpha_k, \Phi_k\}),
\]

where we write \( \alpha(\{\alpha_k, \Phi_k\}) \) as a function of the generalised quantum operations and the minimisation is over all possible decomposition strategies. Here we give an analytical lower bound to \( \alpha_{\text{min}} \) as a function of the interaction \( V_{\text{int}} \). We show in the next section an explicit decomposition strategy that achieves this lower bound.

We consider the Choi state of the instant evolution \( V_{\text{int}}(\delta t) \) by inputting tensor products of the maximally entangled states. Specifically, inputting \( |\phi\rangle_{l,l'} = \sum_{j} |jj\rangle_{l,l'}/\sqrt{d} \) to the \( l \)th subsystem with \( d \) being the dimension, the output state \( \phi_{1,1',\ldots,L,L'}^{\text{int}} \) is the Choi state,

\[
\phi_{1,1',\ldots,L,L'}^{\text{int}} = V_{\text{int}}(\delta t) \bigotimes_l |\phi_{l,l'}\rangle.
\]

Supposing a decomposition of \( V_{\text{int}}(\delta t) \) is

\[
V_{\text{int}}(\delta t) = \sum_k \tilde{\alpha}_k \Phi_{1,k} \otimes \Phi_{2,k} \otimes \cdots \otimes \Phi_{L,k},
\]

where we have put \( \mathcal{I} \) into the summation and denote \( \tilde{\alpha}_k \) as the new coefficient incorporating \( \delta t \). The relation between \( \alpha \) and \( \tilde{\alpha} = \sum_k |\tilde{\alpha}_k| \) is

\[
\alpha = \lim_{\delta t \to 0} \frac{\tilde{\alpha} - 1}{\delta t}.
\]

Since \( \alpha \) depends linearly on \( \tilde{\alpha} \), we can equivalently minimise \( \tilde{\alpha} \).

Define isomorphisms \( S \) and \( T \) of a general matrix \( M = \sum_{i,j} M_{i,j} |i\rangle \langle j| \) as

\[
S(M) = \sum_{i,j} M_{i,j} |i\rangle |j\rangle,
\]

\[
T(M) = \sum_{i,j} M_{i,j} \langle i| \langle j|.
\]

Several useful properties of the \( S \) and \( T \) are

- The definitions of \( S(M) \) and \( T(M) \) are basis dependent.
• When applying matrices $U$ and $V$ to $M$, we have

$$
S(UMV) = U \otimes V^T \sum_{i,j} M_{i,j} |i\rangle |j\rangle = U \otimes V^T S(M),
$$

$$
T(UMV) = \sum_{i,j} M_{i,j} |i\rangle |j\rangle U^T \otimes V = T(M)U^T \otimes V. \tag{38}
$$

• $S(M)$ and $T(M)$ are related as follows

$$
S(M) = [T(M^*)]^\dagger. \tag{39}
$$

This is true because $[T(M^*)]^\dagger = \left[\sum_{i,j} M_{i,j}^* |i\rangle \langle j|\right]^\dagger = \sum_{i,j} M_{i,j} |i\rangle \langle j| = S(M)$.

• The norms of $S$ and $T$ are the same

$$
S(M)^\dagger \cdot S(M) = T(M) \cdot T(M)^\dagger = \text{Tr}[M^\dagger M] = ||M||_2^2, \tag{40}
$$

which corresponds to Schatten-2 norm of $M$. This is because $S(M)^\dagger \cdot S(M) = \sum_{i',j'} M_{i',j'}^* \langle i'| \sum_{i,j} M_{i,j} |i\rangle |j\rangle = \sum_{i,j} M_{i,j}^* M_{i,j} = \text{Tr}[M^\dagger M]$. The proof is similar for $T(M)$.

• Suppose we denote $|M\rangle = S(M)$ then $T(M) = [S(M^*)]^\dagger = (M^*)$.

By applying $S$ to the $l, l'$ systems and $T$ to the rest systems, we get a matrix

$$
\psi_{l,l'}^{\text{int}} = S_{l,l'} \circ \bigotimes_{j \neq l, j' \neq l'} T_{j,j'}(\phi_{1,1}', ..., L,L'). \tag{41}
$$

We can thus lower bound $\tilde{\alpha}$ as follows.

**Theorem 1.** Given a decomposition of Eq. (35) with generalised quantum operations \{$\Phi_{l,k}$\}, we have

$$
\tilde{\alpha} \geq \max_l \|\psi_{l,l'}^{\text{int}}\|_1, \tag{42}
$$

where $\|A\|_1 = \text{Tr}[\sqrt{AA^\dagger}]$ is the trace norm.

**Proof.** Given the above decomposition, the Choi state of $\psi^{\text{int}}(\delta t)$ is

$$
\phi_{1,1}', ..., L,L' = \sum_k \tilde{\alpha}_k \Phi_{1,k}(\phi_{1,1}') \otimes \Phi_{2,k}(\phi_{2,2}') \otimes \cdots \otimes \Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'}). \tag{43}
$$

Considering $\psi_{1,1'}^{\text{int}}$ as an example, we have

$$
\psi_{1,1'}^{\text{int}} = \sum_k \tilde{\alpha}_k |\Phi_{1,k}(\phi_{1,1}')\rangle \langle \Phi_{2,k}(\phi_{2,2}')^*\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'}^*)\rangle, \tag{44}
$$

where $|\Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'})\rangle = S_{l,l'}(\Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'}))$ and $\langle \Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'})^*\rangle = T_{l,l'}(\Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'}))$. Based on the triangle inequality of the trace norm, we have

$$
\|\psi_{1,1'}^{\text{int}}\|_1 \leq \sum_k |\tilde{\alpha}_k| \left\| |\Phi_{1,k}(\phi_{1,1}')\rangle \langle \Phi_{2,k}(\phi_{2,2}')^*\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'}^*)\rangle\right\|_1, \tag{45}
$$

The trace norm of each term is

$$
\left\| |\Phi_{1,k}(\phi_{1,1}')\rangle \langle \Phi_{2,k}(\phi_{2,2}')^*\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'}^*)\rangle\right\|_1
$$

$$
= \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\langle \Phi_{1,k}(\phi_{1,1}') | \Phi_{1,k}(\phi_{1,1}') \rangle \langle \Phi_{2,k}(\phi_{2,2}')^* | \Phi_{2,k}(\phi_{2,2}')^* \rangle \cdots \langle \Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'}^*) | \Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'}^*) \rangle} \right].
$$

Note that

$$
\langle \Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'}) | \Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'})^* \rangle = \text{Tr}[\Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'})^\dagger \Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'})] = (\Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'})^\dagger \Phi_{L,k}(\phi_{L,L'})). \tag{46}
$$
Here we used the norms of $S$ and $T$. Based on the monotonicity of generalised quantum operations $\Phi_{l,k}$, we have
\[
\text{Tr}[\Phi_{l,k}(\phi_{l,l'})\dagger \Phi_{l,k}(\phi_{l,l'})] = \|\Phi_{l,k}(\phi_{l,l'})\|^2 \leq \|\phi_{l,l'}\|^2 = 1.
\] (47)
Combining the above results, we thus have
\[
\|\psi_{l,l'}^{\text{int}}\|_1 \leq \sum_k |\tilde{\alpha}_k| = \tilde{\alpha}.
\] (48)
Since the inequality holds for any $\psi_{l,l'}^{\text{int}}$, we have
\[
\tilde{\alpha} \geq \max_l \|\psi_{l,l'}^{\text{int}}\|_1,
\] (49)
which completes the proof.

Now consider the specific form of $V^{\text{int}}(\delta t)[\rho] = \rho + \delta t(-iV^{\text{int}} \rho + i\rho V^{\text{int}})$ and define the interaction part as
\[
\tilde{V}^{\text{int}}[\rho] = -iV^{\text{int}} \rho + i\rho V^{\text{int}}.
\] (50)
We can then similarly define the Choi state of $\tilde{V}^{\text{int}}$ as
\[
\tilde{\phi}_{1,1',...,L,L'}^{\text{int}} = \tilde{V}^{\text{int}} \left[ \bigotimes_l \phi_{l,l'} \right],
\] (51)
and the matrices
\[
\tilde{\psi}_{l,l'}^{\text{int}} = S_{l,l'} \circ \bigotimes_{j \neq l, j' \neq l'} T_{j,j'}(\tilde{\phi}_{1,1',...,L,L'}).
\] (52)
Then consider the decomposition Eq. (19), we have

**Corollary 1.** *Given a decomposition of Eq. (19) with generalised quantum operations $\{\Phi_{l,k}\}$, we have
\[
\alpha \geq \max_l \|\tilde{\psi}_{l,l'}^{\text{int}}\|_1,
\] where $\|A\|_1 = \text{Tr}[\sqrt{AA^\dagger}]$ is the trace norm.*

In the next section, we will consider a specific decomposition strategy and show how to use the analytical lower bound to prove its optimality.

**E. A complete basis operation set**

We can choose the generalised quantum operations to be a complete set of basis operations. In particular, every single qubit operation can be decomposed into a linear combination of 16 basis operations. This is because every single qubit operation (including projective measurements) can be expressed with square matrices with $4 \times 4 = 16$ elements by using the Pauli transfer representation [43]. Therefore, 16 linearly independent operations are sufficient to emulate arbitrary single qubit operations. In Table I, we show one efficient set of basis operations for a single qubit in Ref. [44].

Here, we denote the complete basis operations as $\{B_i\}$. For multiple qubit systems, tensor products of single qubit operations, e.g., $B_i \otimes B_j$ also forms a complete basis set for composite systems. Therefore, we can decompose any $n$-qubit interaction into the basis $\{B_i\}^\otimes n$. While the decomposition is universal, it may produce a large decomposition coefficient, making it inefficient to implement. We can thus consider an over-complete basis with generalised quantum operations and find an optimised decomposition. Specifically, consider a set of over-complete basis $\{\Phi_k\}$ which includes the identity channel, our target is to solve the following problem.

\[
\min C_1 = \sum_k \alpha_k^+ - \sum_{k'} \alpha_{k'}^-,
\]
such that $V^{\text{int}}(\delta t) = \sum_k \alpha_k^+ \Phi_k - \sum_{k'} \alpha_{k'}^- \Phi_{k'}$, (54)
\[
\alpha_k^+, \alpha_{k'}^- \geq 0.
\]
Here each \( \tilde{\rho} \) denotes an identity operation (no operation), \( [\sigma^\gamma] \) \((\gamma = x, y, z)\) corresponds to operations applying Pauli matrices. \([\pi]\) corresponds to projective measurements.

There are a few problems here. First, the optimisation becomes exponentially costly when the channel acts on a large \( n \) qubits. Second, the basis operation also contains measurement and state preparation, which might be challenging in experiment. In the next section, we give another explicit decomposition strategy that resolves these problems. The explicit decomposition could be optimal under mild conditions and it only requires unitary operations without measurements or state preparation.

II. AN EXPLICIT DECOMPOSITION METHOD

A. Method description

In this section, we consider an explicit decomposition which only involves unitary operations. Supposing \( V^{\text{int}} = \sum_j \lambda_j V_j^{\text{int}} \) with each \( V_j^{\text{int}} \) being a tensor product of Pauli operators, we consider the expansion

\[
V^{\text{int}}(\delta t)[\rho] = \mathcal{I}(\rho) - i\delta t(V^{\text{int}}\rho I - \rho V^{\text{int}}) + O(\delta t^2),
\]

\[
= \mathcal{I}(\rho) - i\delta t \sum_j \lambda_j (V_j^{\text{int}}\rho - \rho V_j^{\text{int}}) + O(\delta t^2),
\]

where both \( V_j^{\text{int}}\rho \) and \( \rho V_j^{\text{int}} \) are generalised quantum operations. Suppose \( V_j^{\text{int}} = \bigotimes_i V_{i,j}^{\text{int}} \) and the input state is a product state \( \rho = \bigotimes_i \rho_i \) the above decomposition could be expressed generally as

\[
V^{\text{int}}(\delta t) \left[ \bigotimes_i \rho_i \right] = e^{i\delta t} \left[ \bigotimes_k e^{i\theta_k} \rho_k \bigotimes_l U_{l,k}\rho_l \tilde{V}_{l,k} \right] + O(\delta t^2).
\]

Here each \( \tilde{U}_{l,k} \) and \( \tilde{V}_{l,k} \) could be \( I \) and \( V_{i,j}^{\text{int}} \), \( c(\delta t) = 1 + 2\delta t \sum_j |\lambda_j| \), \( p_k \) and \( \theta_k \) are defined correspondingly. Denoting the unitary evolution of the \( l \)th subsystem as \( U_l(\delta t) \) and following the notation of the above discussion, the joint evolution of all the subsystems is

\[
U(T) \left[ \bigotimes_i \rho_i \right] = C \sum_k e^{i\theta_k} \rho_k \bigotimes_l \left[ \tilde{U}_{l,k}^{T/\delta t} U_l(\delta t) \ldots \tilde{U}_{l,k}^{T/\delta t} U_l(\delta t)\rho_l U_l^{\dagger}(\delta t)\tilde{V}_{l,k} \ldots U_l^{\dagger}(\delta t)\tilde{V}_{l,k} \right],
\]

where \( C = e^{i\delta t}T/\delta t = e^{2T\lambda} \) with \( \lambda = \sum_j |\lambda_j| \). Now we have decoupled the joint evolution as a linear combination of independent evolution of each subsystem. When we further implement the stochastic Monte Carlo method, the evolution of each subsystem looks like

\[
\rho_{l,k} = \tilde{U}_{l,k,N_{l,p}} U_l(t_{N_{l,p}}) \ldots \tilde{U}_{l,k} U_l(t_1)\rho_l U_l^{\dagger}(t_1)\tilde{V}_{l,k} \ldots U_l^{\dagger}(t_{N_{l,p}})\tilde{V}_{l,k,N_{l,p}},
\]

where \( N_{l,p} \) is the number of jumps or decay events and \( t_1 + t_2 + \cdots + t_{N_{l,p}} = T \). Here each \( \tilde{U}_{l,k} \) is either \( I \) or one of \( \{V_{i,j}^{\text{int}}\} \). When we measure \( O_i \), it becomes

\[
\text{Tr}[\rho_{l,k}O_i] = \text{Tr}[\tilde{U}_{l,k,N_{l,p}} U_l(t_{N_{l,p}}) \ldots \tilde{U}_{l,k} U_l(t_1)\rho_l U_l^{\dagger}(t_1)\tilde{V}_{l,k} \ldots U_l^{\dagger}(t_{N_{l,p}})\tilde{V}_{l,k,N_{l,p}} O_i],
\]

which could be implemented with the following circuit

\[
\begin{array}{c}
|+\rangle \\
\downarrow U_l(t_1) \\
\downarrow \tilde{U}_{l,k_1} \tilde{V}_{l,k_1}^{\dagger} \\
\ldots \\
\downarrow \tilde{U}_{l,k_{N_{l,p}}} \tilde{V}_{l,k_{N_{l,p}}}^{\dagger} \\
\downarrow O_i \\
X,Y
\end{array}
\]
The measurement result of the whole evolution state is

$$\text{Tr} \left[ U(T) \left( \bigotimes_i \rho_i \right) \cdot \bigotimes_{i,j} O_{ij} \right] = C \sum_k e^{i\theta_k p_k} \prod_l \text{Tr}[\rho_{l,k} O_l].$$

(60)

Therefore, after measuring each $\text{Tr}[\rho_{l,k} O_l]$, we can obtain the exact measurement result.

**B. Cost analysis**

According to the above discussion, the cost associated to the explicit expansion is

$$C = e^{2T\lambda},$$

(61)

with $\lambda = \sum_j |\lambda_j|$. We show that the expansion is optimal, i.e., with the smallest cost when $V^{\text{int}}$ satisfies the following condition.

**Condition 1.** Suppose $V^{\text{int}}$ acts nontrivially on the set of subsystems $S$. Given $V^{\text{int}} = \sum_j \lambda_j V_j^{\text{int}}$ with each $V_j^{\text{int}} = \bigotimes_i V_{i,j}^{\text{int}}$ and $V_{i,j}^{\text{int}}$ being a tensor product of Pauli operators, we have

$$\text{Tr} \left[ V_{i,j}^{\text{int}} \right] = 0, \forall j, \forall l \in S,$n

$$\text{Tr} \left[ V_{i,j}^{\text{int}} V_{i,j'}^{\text{int}} \right] = 0, \forall j \neq j', \forall l \in S.$$

(62)

The first condition requires that each $V_{i,j}^{\text{int}}$ is non-identity and the second condition requires two interaction terms of the same system are orthogonal. We say $V^{\text{int}}$ acts nontrivially on subsystems $S$, it means that for any $l \in S$, at least one of $V_j^{\text{int}}$ has non-identity Pauli operators on subsystem $l$.

We summarise the result as follows.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose the interaction $V^{\text{int}}$ satisfies Condition 1. The explicit expansion of Eq. (55) has the minimal cost under all possible decomposition strategies.

**Proof.** We assume that $V^{\text{int}}$ acts nontrivially on all the systems. The proof is similar for the general case. The Choi state of the interaction part $V^{\text{int}}[\rho] = -iV^{\text{int}} \rho + i \rho V^{\text{int}}$ is

$$\tilde{\phi}_{1,1',\ldots,l,L'}^{\text{int}} = \text{V}^{\text{int}} \left[ \bigotimes_i \phi_{l,i'} \right] = -i \sum_j \lambda_j \left[ \bigotimes_i V_{i,j}^{\text{int}} |\phi_{1,i'}\rangle \langle \phi_{l,i'}| - \bigotimes_i |\phi_{l,i'}\rangle \langle \phi_{1,i'}| V_{i,j}^{\text{int}} \right].$$

(63)

Focusing on $\tilde{\psi}_{1,1}'$ for example, we have

$$\tilde{\tilde{\psi}}_{1,1}' = -i \sum_j \lambda_j \left[ V_{1,j}^{\text{int}} |\phi_{1,1'}\rangle \otimes |\phi_{1,1'}\rangle \bigotimes \left( V_{1,j}^{\text{int}} \right)^T \otimes |\phi_{1,1'}\rangle - |\phi_{1,1'}\rangle \otimes \left( V_{1,j}^{\text{int}} \right)^T \otimes |\phi_{1,1'}\rangle \right].$$

(64)

Denoting

$$|\psi_{1,j,a}\rangle = V_{1,j}^{\text{int}} |\phi_{1,1'}\rangle \otimes |\phi_{1,1'}\rangle,$n

$$|\psi_{1,j,b}\rangle = |\phi_{1,1'}\rangle \otimes \left( V_{1,j}^{\text{int}} \right)^T |\phi_{1,1'}\rangle,$n

$$\langle \psi_{1,j,a}| = \langle \phi_{1,1'} \left( V_{1,j}^{\text{int}} \right)^T \otimes |\phi_{1,1'}\rangle,$n

$$\langle \psi_{1,j,b}| = \langle \phi_{1,1'} \otimes \left( V_{1,j}^{\text{int}} \right)^T,$$

(65)

we can express $\tilde{\tilde{\psi}}_{1,1}'$ as

$$\tilde{\tilde{\psi}}_{1,1}' = -i \sum_j \lambda_j \c C \left[ |\psi_{1,j,a}\rangle \bigotimes \left( |\psi_{1,j,a}| - |\psi_{1,j,b}| \right) \right].$$

(66)

When $\{ V_{i,j} \}$ satisfies Condition 1, elements in $\{|\psi_{1,j,a}\rangle, |\psi_{1,j,b}\rangle\}$ are mutually orthogonal, i.e.,

$$\langle \psi_{1,j,a}| \psi_{1,j',b}\rangle = 0, \forall j \neq j',$$

(67)
Similarly elements in \( \{ \langle \psi_{l,j,a} |, \langle \psi_{l,j,b} | \} \) are mutually orthogonal. Therefore, Eq. (66) is a singular value decomposition of \( \tilde{\psi}_{1,1}^{\text{int}} \) and we have
\[
\| \tilde{\psi}_{1,1}^{\text{int}} \|_1 = 2 \sum_j |\lambda_j|.
\] (68)

The above proof holds for all other \( \tilde{\psi}_{l,j}^{\text{int}} \).

Here, we give several examples of \( V^{\text{int}} \) that satisfy the condition. First, the condition is satisfied when there is only one interaction term \( V_{1}^{\text{int}} \).

**Corollary 2.** The decomposition is optimal when \( V^{\text{int}} \) only has one term (a tensor product of Pauli matrices).

The Condition 1 could also hold when the interaction \( V^{\text{int}} \) has multiple terms. For example, consider three subsystems and denote \((i,m)\) to be the \(m\)th qubit of the \(i\)th subsystem. The following example interactions satisfy Condition 1.

\[
V^{\text{int}} = aX_{1,1} \cdot X_{2,1} \cdot X_{3,1} + bX_{1,2} \cdot X_{2,2} \cdot X_{3,2} + cX_{1,3} \cdot X_{2,3} \cdot X_{3,3},
\]

\[
V^{\text{int}} = aX_{1,1} \cdot X_{2,1} \cdot X_{3,1} + bY_{1,1} \cdot Y_{2,1} \cdot Y_{3,1} + cZ_{1,1} \cdot Z_{2,1} \cdot Z_{3,1},
\]

\[
V^{\text{int}} = aX_{1,1} Y_{1,2} \cdot X_{2,2} \cdot Z_{3,2} \cdot Y_{3,2} + bX_{1,1} Z_{1,2} \cdot Z_{2,1} \cdot Y_{3,1} \cdot Y_{3,1}
+ cZ_{1,1} Y_{1,2} \cdot X_{2,2} \cdot Y_{3,2} \cdot Z_{3,2} + dZ_{1,1} Z_{1,1} \cdot Z_{2,1} Y_{2,2} \cdot X_{3,1} Z_{3,1}.
\] (69)

Since Condition 1 requires that the interaction terms of each subsystem are mutually orthogonal, it limits the number of interaction terms.

**Proposition 1.** When \( V^{\text{int}} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{int}}} \bigotimes_j V_{i,j}^{\text{int}} \) satisfies Condition 1 with \( N_{\text{int}} \) being the number of terms and \( n \) being the minimal number of qubits of each subsystem. Suppose the minimal weight of each \( V_{i,j}^{\text{int}} \) is \( k \), and we have

\[
N_{\text{int}} \leq 3^k \binom{n}{k}.
\] (70)

In particular, when \( k = 1 \), i.e., the interaction on each subsystem only act on one qubit, Condition 1 requires \( V^{\text{int}} \) to have at most \( 3n \) terms. We leave the detailed condition for an optimal decomposition to a future work.

**III. DYSON SERIES METHOD**

We show in this section that the above explicit expansion method could be reformulated via the Dyson series expansion.

**A. Method description**

We first introduce the general method. Consider the time evolution with Hamiltonian \( H = H^{\text{loc}} + V^{\text{int}} \),
\[
[H^{\text{loc}} + V^{\text{int}}] |\psi(t)\rangle = i \frac{\partial |\psi(t)\rangle}{\partial t},
\] (71)

with \( H^{\text{loc}} = \sum_l H_l \) and \( V^{\text{int}} = \sum_j \lambda_j V_{j}^{\text{int}} = \sum_j \lambda_j \prod_l V_{l,j}^{\text{int}} \). It becomes
\[
\lambda e^{iH^{\text{loc}}(t-t_0)} V^{\text{int}} e^{-iH^{\text{loc}}(t-t_0)} |\psi(t)\rangle = i \frac{\partial |\psi(t)\rangle}{\partial t}.
\] (72)

under the interaction picture with
\[
|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iH^{\text{loc}}(t-t_0)} |\psi(t)\rangle.
\] (73)
A solution with Dyson series is

$$\psi_I(t) = \left[ 1 - i \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 e^{iH_{loc}(t_1-t_0)} V^{\text{int}} e^{-iH_{loc}(t_1-t_0)} \right. $$

$$\left. - \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 e^{iH_{loc}(t_1-t_0)} V^{\text{int}} e^{-iH_{loc}(t_1-t_0)} e^{iH_{loc}(t_2-t_0)} V^{\text{int}} e^{-iH_{loc}(t_2-t_0)} \cdots \right] \psi(t_0) \right]$$

(74)

To measure any observable $O = \otimes_i O_i$ with $O_I = e^{iH_{loc}(t-t_0)} O e^{-iH_{loc}(t-t_0)}$, we have

$$\langle \psi_I(t)|O_I|\psi_I(t) \rangle = \langle \psi(t_0)|e^{iH_{loc}(t-t_0)} O e^{-iH_{loc}(t-t_0)}|\psi(t_0) \rangle,$$

$$- 2(t-t_0) \int_{t_0}^t \frac{dt_1}{t-t_0} \Re \left[ i \langle \psi(t_0)|e^{iH_{loc}(t-t_0)} O e^{-iH_{loc}(t_1-t_0)} V^{\text{int}} e^{-iH_{loc}(t_1-t_0)}|\psi(t_0) \rangle \right],$$

(75)

up to the first order expansion. Supposing $|\psi(t_0)\rangle = |\psi_1(t_0)\rangle \cdots |\psi_L(t_0)\rangle$, the first term is

$$\langle \psi(t_0)|e^{iH_{loc}(t-t_0)} O e^{-iH_{loc}(t-t_0)}|\psi(t_0) \rangle = \prod_i \langle \psi_i(t_0)|e^{iH_I(t-t_0)} O e^{-iH_I(t-t_0)}|\psi_i(t_0) \rangle,$$

(76)

where each term can be easily measured by evolving each subsystem state with the Hamiltonian $H_I$ and measure $O_I$. To measure the second term, we can uniformly sample $t_1$ from $t_0$ to $t$ and use the following circuit

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
|0\rangle + |1\rangle & & & \text{X, Y} \\
& |\psi(t_0)\rangle & e^{-iH_I(t_1-t_0)} & V^{\text{int}} \\
& & \text{e}^{-iH_I(t_1-t_1)} & O \\
\end{array}
\]

(77)

We can also randomly measure the first term or the second term, as well as each term of the above summation. The cost is now

$$C_1 = 1 + 2T\lambda,$$

(78)

with $\lambda = \sum_j |\lambda|$. Due to the first order expansion, the approximation error is

$$\varepsilon_1 = O\left( e^{V^{\text{int}} T(1)} |V^{\text{int}} T|^2 \right).$$

(79)

We can similarly consider expansion to the $k$th order, then the cost and the expansion error are

$$C_k = \sum_{n=0}^k (2T\lambda)^n / n!,$$

$$\varepsilon_k = O\left( e^{V^{\text{int}} T(1)} |V^{\text{int}} T|^{k+1/(k+1)} \right).$$

(80)

With the limit of $k \to \infty$, we have

$$C_\infty = e^{2T\lambda},$$

$$\varepsilon_\infty = 0.$$

(81)

In this case, we note that the cost is the same as the one for the explicit expansion. In the next subsection, we show that they are actually equivalent.
**B. Relation to the perturbative quantum simulation method**

The algorithm using Dyson series implements each expanded term (trajectory) with a quantum computer and sums over the expansion via the average of different trajectories. This is very similar to the above perturbative quantum simulation method. We show that they are actually equivalent.

**Theorem 3.** The infinite-order Dyson series method is equivalent to the perturbative quantum simulation method with the explicit decomposition.

**Proof.** To see the equivalence, we first consider a pure state formalism for the perturbative quantum simulation method with the explicit decomposition.

\[
V^{\text{int}}(\delta t)|\rho\rangle = T(\rho) - i\delta t \sum_j \lambda_j (V_j^{\text{int}} \rho - \rho V_j^{\text{int}}) + O(\delta t^2).
\]

(82)

Suppose \( \rho \) is a pure state \( \rho = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| \), then

\[
V^{\text{int}}(\delta t)[|\psi\rangle \langle \psi|] = T(\rho) - i\delta t \sum_j \lambda_j (V_j^{\text{int}} |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| - |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| V_j^{\text{int}}) + O(\delta t^2),
\]

(83)

Then the whole time evolution with a pure input state \( |\psi(t_0)\rangle \) is

\[
U(T)|\psi(t_0)\rangle = \left[e^{-i H^{\text{loc}} \delta t} \left(I - i\delta t V^{\text{int}}\right)\right]^{T/\delta t} |\psi(t_0)\rangle + O(\delta t^2),
\]

(84)

and we have

\[
U(T)|\psi(t_0)\rangle = U(T)|\psi(t_0)\rangle \langle \psi(t_0)|U(T)^\dagger.
\]

(85)

Then each expanded term in \( U(T)|\psi(t_0)\rangle \) corresponds to the expanded terms in \( U(T)|\psi(t_0)\rangle \) and \( \langle \psi(t_0)|U(T)^\dagger \). Now we expand the product of Eq. (84) and group the terms according to the number of \( V^{\text{int}} \) as

\[
U(T)|\psi(t_0)\rangle = \left[e^{-i H^{\text{loc}} T} - i\delta t \sum_{i=1}^{T/\delta t} e^{-i H^{\text{loc}} (T-i\delta t)} V^{\text{int}} e^{-i H^{\text{loc}} i\delta t},
\]

\[
- \delta t^2 \sum_{i_1 \geq i_2 = 1} e^{-i H^{\text{loc}} (T-i_1\delta t)} V^{\text{int}} e^{-i H^{\text{loc}} (i_1-i_2)\delta t} V^{\text{int}} e^{-i H^{\text{loc}} i_2\delta t}\right] |\psi(t_0)\rangle + O(\delta t^2).
\]

(86)

Multiplying \( e^{i H^{\text{loc}} T} \) and taking the limit of \( \delta t \to 0 \) we have

\[
\lim_{\delta t \to 0} e^{i H^{\text{loc}} T} U(T)|\psi(t_0)\rangle = \left[1 - i \int_{t_0}^{T} dt_1 e^{i H^{\text{loc}} (t_1-t_0)} V^{\text{int}} e^{-i H^{\text{loc}} (t_1-t_0)}
\]

\[
- \int_{t_0}^{T} dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 e^{i H^{\text{loc}} (t_1-t_0)} V^{\text{int}} e^{-i H^{\text{loc}} (t_1-t_0)} e^{i H^{\text{loc}} (t_2-t_0)} V^{\text{int}} e^{-i H^{\text{loc}} (t_2-t_0)} + \ldots\right] |\psi(t_0)\rangle,
\]

(87)

which coincides with the Dyson series expansion.

**IV. HIGHER-ORDER MOMENTS ANALYSIS**

In the above discussion, we showed how to use the perturbative quantum simulation (PQS) method to get linear observable measurements. Here we show that the PQS method applies to measurements on higher-order moments of the state. We take the subsystem purity as an example, and we note that the result applies to general measurements.
Without loss of generality, we consider the purity $\text{Tr}[\rho_1(T)^2]$ of the first subsystem, and we denote the set without the first system as $S = \{2, \ldots, L\}$. Following the PQS method with the explicit expansion in Eq. (57), we have
\[
U(T) \left[ \bigotimes_{l} \rho_l \right] = C \sum_{k} e^{i\delta k} p_k \bigotimes_{l} \left[ \hat{U}_{1,k_T/\delta t} U_1(\delta t) \ldots \hat{U}_{1,k_l} U_1(\delta t) \rho_l U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_l} \ldots U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_T/\delta t} \right],
\]
where the input state is $\bigotimes_l \rho_l$, $\hat{U}_{l,k}$ and $\hat{V}_{l,k}$ are either $I$ or $V_{l,i}^{\text{int}}$. Now we calculate the reduced density matrix of the first subsystem,
\[
\rho_1(T) = \text{Tr}_S[U(T) \left[ \bigotimes_{l} \rho_l \right]],
\]
where
\[
\beta_k = C e^{i\delta k} p_k \prod_{l \in S} \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{U}_{1,k_T/\delta t} U_1(\delta t) \ldots \hat{U}_{1,k_l} U_1(\delta t) \rho_l U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_l} \ldots U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_T/\delta t} \right],
\]
which could be measured for each $k$. For the purity of the first subsystem, we have
\[
\rho_1^2(T) = \sum_{k,k'} \beta_k \beta_{k'} \hat{U}_{1,k_T/\delta t} U_1(\delta t) \ldots \hat{U}_{1,k_l} U_1(\delta t) \rho_l U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_l} \ldots U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_T/\delta t}
\]
\[
\cdot \hat{U}_{1,k_T'/\delta t} U_1(\delta t) \ldots \hat{U}_{1,k_l'} U_1(\delta t) \rho_l U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_l'} \ldots U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_T'/\delta t}.
\]
Suppose the initial state is pure $\rho_1 = |\psi_1\rangle \langle \psi_1|$, we have
\[
\text{Tr}[\rho_1^2(T)] = \sum_{k,k'} \beta_k \beta_{k'} |\psi_1\rangle U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_l} \ldots U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_T/\delta t} U_1(\delta t) \ldots \hat{U}_{1,k_l'} U_1(\delta t) |\psi_1\rangle
\]
\[
\times |\psi_1\rangle U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_l'} \ldots U_1^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{V}_{1,k_T'/\delta t} U_1(\delta t) \ldots \hat{U}_{1,k_l} U_1(\delta t) |\psi_1\rangle.
\]
We note that the two overlap terms could be evaluated with circuits that are similar to the ones used for measuring linear observables. In practice, we can use the Monte Carlo method to estimate the purity. The sample complexity for the purity estimation is related to $\sum_{k,k'} |\beta_k | |\beta_{k'}| \propto C^2$.

Other higher order moments can be derived similarly and we leave it to the dedicated readers.

V. APPLICATIONS AND NUMERICAL SIMULATION

In this section, we discuss potential applications and practical implementations of the PQS algorithm. We explore the application of our perturbative approach in simulating the dynamics of quantum many-body physics problems with operations on a small quantum computer or quantum simulator. We focus on the algorithm with the explicit decomposition, and numerically test our algorithm in simulating several interacting physics with different topologies as examples. Fig. 5 illustrates four different topological structures and the explicit partitioning strategies considered in this work. In the following, we show how to simulate different dynamics of the interacting systems using maximally $8 + 1$ qubits.

A. Interacting bosons

We consider the physics of interacting spinless bosons on a lattice [15], which could be described by the extended Bose-Hubbard Hamiltonian
\[
H = - \sum_{(i,j)} t_{ij} \hat{b}_i^\dagger \hat{b}_j + \frac{U}{2} \sum_i \hat{n}_i (\hat{n}_i - 1) + \sum_i h_i \hat{n}_i,
\]
where \( b_i \) and \( b_i^\dagger \) are the bosonic annihilation and creation operators, \( \hat{n}_i = b_i^\dagger b_i \) gives the number of particles on the site \( i \), \( t_{ij} \) describes the hopping strength, \( U \) describes the on-site interaction, and \( h_i \) is the on-site chemical potential that can be tuned in various quantum systems. The model reduces to the Bose-Hubbard model \( H_{BHM} \) when only nearest-neighbour hopping is allowed, i.e., \( t_{ij} = \delta_{|i-j|,1} \). While the Bose-Hubbard model is not exactly solvable for finite values of \( U \) and \( t \), in the large \( U/t \) limit \( U/t \to +\infty \), this model reduces to the Tomonaga-Luttinger gas Hamiltonian, which describes the collective behaviour of hard-core bosons [15]. Using the Holstein and Primakoff transformation, the Bose-Hubbard model is mapped onto the XX spin chain model

\[
H_{BHM} = J \sum_j (\hat{\sigma}_j^x \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^x + \hat{\sigma}_j^y \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^y) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_j h_j (\hat{I}_j - \hat{\sigma}_j^z)
\]

with \( \hat{\sigma}_j \) representing the Pauli operator on the \( j \)th site and the effective interaction \( J = -2t \). The hard-core bosons can also be related to the one-dimensional free spinless fermions using the Jordan-Wigner transformation.

The quantum walks of the 1D translationally invariant bosons was experimentally demonstrated in Ref. [13]. The device system, a 12-qubit superconducting processor, can be well described by the hard-core boson Hamiltonian in Eq. (94). In our numerical simulation, we break the translational invariance and investigate the collective excitations including the density distribution and correlations of bosons with several reduced interaction strength. We consider two clusters of the interacting bosons with tunable hopping strength \( t_{ij} = t' \) on the boundary of subsystems. The Hamiltonian can be expressed as \( H = H_1 + H_2 + V^{\text{int}} \) with the local Hamiltonian and interactions on the boundary as

\[
H_1^{\text{loc}} = J \sum_j (\hat{\sigma}_j^x \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^x + \hat{\sigma}_j^y \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^y) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_j h_j (\hat{I}_j - \hat{\sigma}_j^z),
\]

\[
V^{\text{int}} = J' (\sigma_{1,N}^x \sigma_{2,1}^x + \sigma_{1,N}^y \sigma_{2,1}^y).
\]

Here, \( \sigma_{l,i} \) represents Pauli operators acting on the \( i \)th site of \( l \)th subsystem, and the interactions at the boundary is \( J' = -2t' \). We note that this reduces to the Bose-Hubbard model when \( t = t' \).

Now, we divide the whole systems into two parts and simulate the dynamics of interacting bosons using our perturbative algorithm with the explicit decomposition. Our method thus enables the simulation of the 16-qubit problem with only 8+1 qubits. It is worth noting that the explicit decomposition is optimal with respect to all possible decomposition strategies, as proven in Theorem 2. We first demonstrate the dynamics after local perturbation under the interacting Hamiltonian. Previous work has extensively studied the propagation speed of quantum information in quantum many-body systems with finite range couplings, which is limited by a maximal group speed, known as the Lieb-Robinson velocity \( v_g \) [12, 20]. Information propagates faster than \( v_g \) is exponentially suppressed, which exhibits a light-cone-like information propagation analogous to the relativistic theory. One can consider a local perturbation to the initial state \( |\psi_0\rangle \) as \( |\psi(t = 0)\rangle = O_A |\psi_0\rangle \) in the region \( A \). As proven in Ref. [12], the change of the expectation of the observable \( O_B \) in the region \( B \) under time evolution can be bounded by

\[
|\langle \psi(t)|O_B|\psi(t)\rangle - \langle \psi_0|O_B|\psi_0\rangle| = |\langle \psi|O_A^\dagger [O_B(t), O_A]|\psi\rangle| \leq \|O_B(t), O_A\|.
\]

FIG. 5. Four different topological geometries and the partitioning strategies corresponding to Bose Hubbard model, Fermi Hubbard model, long-range spin chain and correlated spin cluster considered in this work.
where $O_A(t)$ represents the operator in the Heisenberg picture. This establishes how local operations $O_B$ affect the observables $O_B$ under time evolution. If the interactions decrease exponentially with distance, one can bound the unequal time commutator by

$$
\|\|\|O_B(t), O_A\|\| \leq C\|O_A\|\|O_B\| \exp \left[ -\frac{d - v_g t}{\xi} \right],
$$

(97)

where $d$ is the distance of between the region $A$ and $B$ (shortest path connecting $A$ and $B$), and $c$, $v_g$, and $\xi$ are positive constants depending on $g = \max_{i,j} |J_{ij}|$. For the nearest-neighbour interaction, one can have a tighter bound by $|\langle \psi(t)|O_B|\psi(t)\rangle - \langle \psi|O_B|\psi\rangle| \leq I_d(4H)$, where $d$ is the distance of between the site $A$ and $B$, $c$ and $v$ are the velocity constant, and $I_d$ is the modified Bessel function of the first kind [20]. In our simulation, the particle number...
is conserved, and we consider the observable as the occupation number operator $O_A = \hat{n}_j$ and local perturbation as $O_B = \prod_{j \in B} \hat{\sigma}_j^\dagger \hat{\sigma}_j^\tau |\psi_0\rangle$.

Now, we study the propagation of density distribution and non-local two-body correlations after local excitations. We first excite one boson at the centre by $|\psi_0\rangle = |\vec{b}_j\rangle |0\rangle$, where $|0\rangle$ is the vacuum, and then show the density spreading of the boson under the interacting Hamiltonian with interaction strength $J = 0.5$ and $J' = 0.8J$. As shown in Fig. 6(a1), the evolution of density $\hat{n}_j = \langle \hat{b}_j^\dagger \hat{b}_j \rangle$ indicates a light-cone-like propagation. The propagation is well captured by the nearest-neighbour Lieb-Robinson bound (dashed line), as shown in Fig. 6(a3). Next, we study the distribution of correlations after the single-particle excitation. We consider the averaged non-local correlations as

$$C_d(t) = \frac{1}{N-d} \sum_{\pm} C_{j,j+d}(t)$$

with the two-body correlation function $C_{ij}(t) = \langle \sigma_i^\tau \sigma_j^\tau \rangle - \langle \sigma_i^\tau \rangle \langle \sigma_j^\tau \rangle$. We see the correlation grows nonlocally under evolution and it also exhibits a clean light cone propagation, as shown in Fig. 6(a4). The exact dynamics are shown in Fig. 6(a2, a5) for comparison.

Next, we show the results for the strong correlation effects with two bosons excitations. The two adjacent bosons display spatial bunching effects in the non-interacting case while it gradually transform to spatial antibunching in the large $U$ case, which is similar to non-interacting spinless fermions [14]. The fermionisation phenomenon of the 1D translationally invariant bosons in the large $U$ limit was experimentally demonstrated in Ref. [13]. Here, we consider the correlated Hamiltonian in Eq. (95) with reduced interaction strength $J' = 0.5J$ on the boundary. At $t = 0$, we excite two adjacent indistinguishable particles at the centre $|\psi_0\rangle = |\vec{b}_j^\dagger \vec{b}_j^\dagger \vec{b}_j \vec{b}_j\rangle$. We first show the density spreading in Fig. 6(b1, b3), which exhibits similar propagation as the single particle excitation case. The dynamics of two particle excitation can be sensitive to the particle statistics due to interference. As proposed in Ref. [14], the fermionisation or bosonisation of the particle statistics can be distinguished by measuring the two-body density-density correlators

$$\hat{\rho}_{ij} = \langle \hat{b}_i^\dagger \hat{b}_j^\dagger \hat{b}_j \hat{b}_i \rangle$$

In Fig. 6(c), we show the time evolution of the density operator $\hat{n}_j$ and density-density correlators of two bosons placed at the adjacent centre. The long-range anticorrelations appearing in the off-diagonal pattern reveal the fermionisation of strongly correlated bosons with reduced interaction strength. We can also see the interference pattern in Fig. 6(c) during the evolution as an indication of interactions between the bosons.

### B. Interacting fermions

In this section, we consider the one-dimensional interacting fermions with spin degrees of freedom, which is described by the Fermi-Hubbard Hamiltonian as

$$H = -J \sum_{j,\sigma} \left( \hat{c}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j+1,\sigma} + \text{h.c.} \right) + U \sum_j \hat{n}_{j,\uparrow} \hat{n}_{j,\downarrow} + \sum_{j,\sigma} \hat{h}_{j,\sigma} \hat{n}_{j,\sigma}$$

where $\hat{c}_j$ ($\hat{c}_j^\dagger$) is the fermionic annihilation (creation) operators on the $j$th site and spin state $\sigma \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$, and $\hat{n}_j = \hat{c}_j^\dagger \hat{c}_j$ is the particle density operator. One-dimensional interacting fermions can be well captured by the Luttinger liquid theory, which shows that spin and charge of the electrons disintegrate into two separate collective excitations, spinon (holon) excitations with only spin (charge) degrees of freedom. For self-consistency, we briefly review the theory of bosonisation [23] and separation of spin and charge excitations in the following.

The Fermi surface of interacting electrons in 1D only has two points, and therefore it could be reduced to the effective Hamiltonian describing the excitation from one point to the other. The effective Hamiltonian ignoring spins can be expressed as $H = H_{\text{loc}} + V_{ee}$, where $H_0 = \sum_{\xi=\pm1} \sum_{q} v_F q \xi q \hat{c}_q^\dagger \hat{c}_q$ and $V_{ee} = \frac{1}{\pi^2} \sum_{q,k} V_{ee}(q) \hat{c}_{k+q}^\dagger \hat{c}_k$, which describes the allowed scattering near the Fermi surface. Here, $\xi = \pm 1$ represents the left or the right side of the Fermi surface, and $v_F$ is the Fermi velocity. For one-dimensional electrons, the density modulation is the elementary excitation, and thus it is natural to introduce the bosonic operator as

$$\hat{b}_q^\dagger = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{L q}} \sum_k \xi k \hat{c}_{-q+k}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k}$$

(101)

to map the interacting fermions to the free bosons, where $L$ is normalisation constant. The creation and annihilation operations of bosons satisfy the commutation relation as

$$[\hat{b}_{q,\xi}, \hat{b}_{q',\xi'}^\dagger] = \delta_{\xi\xi'} \delta_{qq'}$$

(102)
Therefore, the full interacting Hamiltonian can be mapped to the non-interacting Hamiltonian in terms of the bosonic operators as

$$H = \sum_{q>0,\sigma,\sigma',\zeta=\pm 1} \left[ v_F q \delta_{\sigma\sigma'} \hat{b}_{q\sigma}^\dagger \hat{b}_{q\sigma'} + \frac{q g_2}{4\pi} \left( \hat{b}_{q\sigma}^\dagger \hat{b}_{q\sigma} - \hat{b}_{q\sigma} \hat{b}_{q\sigma}^\dagger \right) + \frac{q g_4}{2\pi} \hat{b}_{q\sigma}^\dagger \hat{b}_{q\sigma} \right],$$

(103)

where $g_2$ and $g_4$ measure the strength of the interaction in the vicinity of the Fermi points as conventionally used in the literature, and $\sigma$ denotes the spin degrees of freedom. We can write the above Hamiltonian into the bosonic operator of charges and spins $\hat{b}_{q\sigma}^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \hat{b}_{q\uparrow}^\dagger + \hat{b}_{q\downarrow}^\dagger \right)$ and $\hat{b}_{q\sigma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \hat{b}_{q\uparrow} - \hat{b}_{q\downarrow} \right)$ with $c$ ($s$) denoting charge (spin), and then diagonalize the Hamiltonian by a Bogoliubov transformation as

$$H = \sum_{q>0,\zeta=\pm 1} \left[ V_c \left( \hat{c}_{q\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{q\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} \right) + V_s \hat{c}_{q\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{q\sigma} \right],$$

(104)

with the velocities $v_c = q \sqrt{v_F^2 + \frac{2g_2}{q^2}}$ and $v_s = q v_F$. This clearly shows that the spin and charge density has different velocity near the Fermi surface, as predicted by the theory of Luttinger liquid. This observation has been numerically and experimentally investigated [16, 17, 45], and Arute et al. reported this simulation using a programmable superconducting quantum processor with high gate accuracy [17].

To simulate the dynamics of the interacting fermions carrying spins on a quantum computer, we can use the Jordan-Wigner transformation to map the fermionic operators $\hat{c}_j$ on each site to the qubit Pauli operators as

$$\hat{c}_j \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \left( \hat{\sigma}_j^x + i \hat{\sigma}_j^y \right) \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \hat{\sigma}_i^z.$$  

(105)

with Pauli operators $\hat{\sigma}_j^\alpha, \alpha = (x, y, z)$ acting on the $j$th site. It is straightforward to have $\hat{n}_j \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \left( \hat{I} - \hat{\sigma}_j^z \right)$ and $\hat{n}_j \hat{n}_k \mapsto \frac{1}{4} \left( \hat{I} + \hat{\sigma}_j^x \hat{\sigma}_k^x - \hat{\sigma}_j^y \hat{\sigma}_k^y - \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_k^z \right)$. The experimental setting after the qubit mapping has the 2D topology. We consider an 8-site interacting 1D Fermi-Hubbard model, which requires $N = 16$ qubits to encode the spin up and spin down at each site. According to the topology of interactions, we have two partitioning strategies, by regarding either the nearest hopping or on-site Coulomb interactions as the $V^{\text{int}}$. Therefore, depending on the relative strength of $t$ and $U$, we can cut the full interacting systems along either longitudinal or transverse direction. We discuss how to implement our algorithms for this topology setting by using two partitioning strategies in Fig. 7 in the following. We will then show how to apply our perturbative quantum simulation method to use 8 + 1 qubits to simulate the dynamics of the 16 qubit system.

We first prepare the initial state as the ground state of an non-interacting Hamiltonian. In the non-interacting limit, Hamiltonian commutes with the total number operators $[H, \sum_j \hat{n}_j] = 0$. For a one-dimensional chain, one find that the Hamiltonian in one-particle sector moves occupied site to the left or right, and thus can be expanded in the one-particle basis as a tridiagonal matrix. The interacting Hamiltonian has the elements $H_{ij} = \langle i | H | j \rangle$ and $|j\rangle = \hat{c}_j^\dagger |0\rangle$ with $|0\rangle$ representing the vacuum. We can use unitary transformation $U = [u_{ij}]_{ij}$ to diagonalise the interacting Hamiltonian and get the eigenstates and eigenenergies in terms of the non-interacting fermionic operators $\hat{a}_j$ and $\hat{a}_j^\dagger$, which we refer as the rotated basis. The rotated basis is related to the original basis by the unitary transformation as

$$\hat{a}_j^\dagger = \sum_i u_{ij} \hat{c}_i^\dagger.$$  

(106)

In the two particle sector, there are $\binom{N}{2}$ occupation number basis states, and we can similarly diagonalise the matrix of Hamiltonian to obtain the eigenstates and eigenenergies. For the ground state with general occupied numbers $N_f$ (relatively small $N_f$), we can get the subspace of $N_f$ particle numbers and use the transformation from the original basis $\hat{c}_j^\dagger$ to the rotated basis $\hat{a}_j^\dagger$. Refs. [18, 19] discussed the algorithm that we can use linear depth circuit to prepare the ground state of a non-interacting Hamiltonian. We briefly review the procedure to prepare the initial state using the linear depth circuit. We denote the operators in the rotated basis that diagonalize the non-interacting Hamiltonian as $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{a}^\dagger$. We can apply a particle-conserving rotation $U$ of the single particle basis to the rotated basis as $U \hat{c}_j^\dagger U^\dagger = \hat{a}_j^\dagger$. Then we obtain the ground state of the non-interacting Hamiltonian from the easy-to-prepare state as

$$|\phi\rangle = U \hat{c}_1^\dagger \cdots \hat{c}_{N_f}^\dagger |0\rangle,$$  

(107)
the same as in Ref. [17] for comparison. The state is initialised with quarter filling $N_\uparrow = N_\downarrow = 2$, which are generated at the middle of the chain at $t = 0$. (a1) and (a3). The time evolution of separation speed $\kappa$ for charge (square and blue) and spin (diamond and red) with the interaction $U = J/2$ (a1) and $U = J$ (a3), respectively. Solid lines represent the exact results for comparison. The figure inset show the errors of $\kappa$ compared to the exact results over time. (a2) and (a4). The difference of charge and spin densities $\rho_j^\sigma(t) - \rho_j^\sigma(0) = \text{const} = \rho_j^\sigma(0)$ of non-interacting Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ where $j = 0 \text{ to } N - 1$ and $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$. (c) and (d) show the time evolution density spreading of both charge and spin at different $T$ for $U = J$ to $T = 2.0$. We set the sampling number as $5 \times 10^5$.

where $|0\rangle$ is the vacuum. The two bases are related by a unitary transformation that transforms the original operators $\hat{c}$ ($\hat{c}^\dagger$) of the interacting Hamiltonian to the new operators $\hat{a}$ ($\hat{a}^\dagger$) of non-interacting Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0 = \sum_{ij} u_{ij} \hat{c}_i^\dagger \hat{c}_j$ where $u$ is a $N \times N$ matrix. The basis change unitary is given by $U(u) = \exp \left( \sum_{ij} [\log u]_{ij} (\hat{c}_i^\dagger \hat{c}_j - \hat{c}_j^\dagger \hat{c}_i) \right)$ which can be implemented by $O(N)$ depth circuits using Given rotations in parallel [18]. In the numerical simulation, we set the hopping strength $J = 0.5$, and the on-site interaction $U = 0.5J$ or $U = J$. We set the local potential for spin up in a Gaussian distribution $h_{j,\uparrow} = -\lambda_\uparrow \exp \left( \frac{-(j - (L + 1)/2)^2}{2\nu^2} \right)$ with $L = 8$, $\lambda_\uparrow = 4$ and $\nu = 1$ while $h_{j,\downarrow} = 0$ for spin down, the same as in Ref. [17] for comparison. The state is initialised with quarter filling $N_\uparrow = N_\downarrow = 2$, in which the charge and spin density are generated in the middle of the chain at $t = 0$ in Fig. 7.

Next, we evolve the two-particle system under the Fermi-Hubbard Hamiltonian with different strength of on-site interaction $U$. The charge and spin densities characterise the collective excitations, which are defined as the sum and difference of the spin-up and -down particle densities over all sites, respectively,

$$\rho_j^\eta = \langle \hat{n}_{j,\eta} \rangle \pm \langle \hat{n}_{j,\bar{\eta}} \rangle$$

where $\eta = c$ or $s$ represents charge or spin degrees of freedom. We show the density spreading of both charge and spin in Fig. 7 (c) and (d) at different $t$. We plot the difference of charge and spin density in Fig. 7 (a2) and (a4) for $U = J/2$ and $U = J$, respectively. Here, the separation of charge density and spin density are offset as 0 at $t = 0$ to make the difference comparable.
The excitations spreading from the middle can be quantitatively distinguished by introducing the separation speed

$$\kappa = \sum_{j=1}^{L} |j - (L + 1)/2| \rho_j^y.$$  \hspace{1cm} (109)

Under time evolution, we observe a clear separation of spin density and charge density as shown in Fig. 7(a1) and (a3). As \( U \) increases to \( U = J \), the separation of spin density and charge density becomes much faster. The error for the separation speed \( \kappa_\eta (\eta = c/s) \) are shown in the figure inset. In the large interaction regime, the initial state considered here is a mixture of excited states, and therefore the effective physics can not be well captured by the Luttinger liquid theory \[23\].

While this effective model can only capture the low-energy excitation in the weakly coupled regime, our method can simulate the dynamics in the highly excited regime with medium or large interaction. The interactions for this 1D interacting fermions have two parts: (1) kinetic terms due to nearest hopping \( t \) (2) on-site spin interaction \( U \). According to the topology of interactions, we have two strategies, by regarding either the nearest hopping or on-site spin interactions as the \( V^{\text{int}} \). Therefore, depending on the relative strength of \( t \) and \( U \), we can cut the full interacting systems along either longitudinal or transverse direction. This enables the simulation in both regime. We note that to prepare the general entangled state, we can decompose it into a linear combination of local states, which might introduce an additional sampling cost for the state preparation.

We remark that this enables the quantum simulation for the two opposite regime, which aligns with the view from the perturbation theory that applies to the weakly-interacting and strongly-interacting limit. Our method could be used to simulate the dynamics of interacting phenomena with quasi-1D or 2D geometry. In the case of Fermi-Hubbard model considered above, the explicit decomposition for both geometries are optimal with respect to the resource cost for the simulation of non-local correlations.

C. Quantum spin systems

In this section, we consider to apply our perturbative approach with the explicit decomposition to simulate several emergent quantum phenomena in quantum spin systems.

1. Dynamical quantum phase transitions

Quantum spin models have been investigated to capture or predict some typical emergent quantum phenomena in the condensed matter, such as phase transitions and collective transitions. While many theoretical and numerical methods have been proposed to solve the effective spin models in exact or approximate solutions, a long-range spin chain with general interaction strength could be hard to solve classically. In this section, We consider a long-range spin chain, which is described by

$$H = \sum_{ij} J_{ij} \hat{\sigma}_i^x \hat{\sigma}_j^x + h \sum_j \hat{\sigma}_j^x$$  \hspace{1cm} (110)

with the interactions obeying the power law decay rule \( J_{ij} = |i - j|^{-\alpha} \). We study the dynamical quantum phase transitions (DQPT) in the long-range spin chains.

We show the dynamical criticality of many-qubit spin chains with fully connected topology using the local order parameters and the Loschmidt amplitude. The state is first initialised as the eigenstate \( |1\rangle^{\otimes n} \) of the non-interacting Hamiltonian with \( h = 0 \), and the system is quenched by suddenly adding the transverse field \( h \) along \( x \) direction. In the limit of \( \alpha = 0 \), the Hamiltonian in Eq. (110) reduces to the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick (LMG) model. LMG model has the analytical solution as it can be regarded as a classical model, of which the dynamical behaviour can be predicted by the semiclassical limit. The Hamiltonian \( H \) preserves the magnitude of the total spin and has the spin flip symmetry, i.e., \([H, S^z] = 0\) and \([H, \prod_j \hat{\sigma}_j^z] = 0\). We can write the Hamiltonian as \( H = N/2(\Sigma^x)^2 + h\Sigma_x \) using collective spin operators \( \sum^x = \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^x \) with \( \alpha = x, y, z \). We can use the mean-field approach to represent the spin as a classical spin vector \( (\Sigma^x, \Sigma^y, \Sigma^z) = N(\cos \theta, \sin \theta \sin \phi, \sin \theta \cos \phi) \) that can be determined by the equation of motion. In Ref. \[29\], the authors considered the spin Hamiltonian with the external field along the \( z \) direction and showed analytically that the spatially averaged two-point correlation shows a DQPT when \( B_z/J_0 \) crosses unity. One can similarly use the analytical method to analyse the dynamical behaviour of Eq. 110 with small \( \alpha \) near to zero.

Refs. \[28, 29\] experimentally demonstrated the DQPT and various dynamical results for the long-range spin model with \( \alpha \) close to zero with a trapped ion platform \[29\] and a superconducting processor \[28\]. Here, we focus on the
weakly coupled regime, i.e. large $\alpha$ for comparison. In the numerical simulation, we set $J_0 = 1$, and the decay rate $\alpha = 3$. We partition the full systems into 2 or 3 subsystems with each subsystem consisting of at most 8 qubits. We use the explicit decomposition to simulate the large system. Note that the explicit decomposition for this example might be not optimal as it involves too many Pauli terms at each site. Other decomposition methods within the framework of generalised quantum operations could be numerically searched to obtain the minimal resource cost. We first show the evolution of order parameters of 16-site quantum spin chain. In Fig. 8 (c), we show the magnetisation $M_x(t)$ and $M_y(t)$ rapidly oscillate across 0 when the external field is large, while the magnetisation decays slowly in the low field. The motion of spin can be illustrated in a Bloch sphere in Fig. 8. These order parameters provide an evidence for two phases: ferromagnetic phase and paramagnetic phase.

The dynamical quantum phase transitions in the out-of-equilibrium phase could be observed using the Loschmidt amplitude as

$$G(t) = |\langle \psi_0 | e^{-iHt} | \psi_0 \rangle|^2 \quad (111)$$

as an indicator to characterise the dynamical echo back to the initial state in the out-of-equilibrium phases. A DQPT occurs with a nonanalytical behaviour of rate function

$$\gamma(t) = -N^{-1} \log (G(t)) \quad (112)$$

in the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$, which can be regarded as a dynamic counterpart to a free energy density up to a normalisation $N$. In the LMG model, the system undergoes the DQPT in the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$. We consider the weakly-coupled regime and present the dynamical behaviour of Loschmidt amplitude $G(t)$ for different external field $h$ in Fig. 8 (a). We clearly see that the Loschmidt amplitude decays rapidly to zero when the external field $h$ is above the critical field. The nonanalytical behaviour of rate function $\gamma(t)$ for a large external field $h$ reveals a dynamical phase transitions to the paramagnetic phases. The minimal of Loschmidt amplitude is above zero for small $h$, which indicates the system persists a ferromagnetic phase under evolution. Fig. 8 (b) shows the system size dependence of minimal Loschmidt amplitude for various $h_x$. We can see that the minimal Loschmidt amplitude appears much earlier with the increasing system size. We note that the decay rate $\alpha$ of the trapped ions quantum simulator can be tuned in the region of $0 \leq \alpha \leq 3$ due to the physical interaction, while PQS method could be leveraged to compensate these limitations.

2. Propagation of correlations

Collective behaviour emerges from interacting quantum systems is essential to understand the many-body physics and is a core theme of physics. These elementary excitations can be described in the quasiparticles picture. In quantum systems with finite range interactions, the quantum dynamics exhibit a light-cone-like information propagation, and the speed of information propagation is governed by the interactions of the systems. In the nearest-neighbour interactions, like the results presented in Sec. V A, the propagation of information has a finite maximal velocity $v_g$, the so-called Lieb-Robinson velocity. If the interactions exponentially decays with increasing distance, from Eq. (97), one observe that the change of the expectation of observables under the time evolution is exponentially decreased with the distance $d$, which indicates that information propagates faster than $v_g$ is exponentially suppressed with the distance $d$. This statement exhibits a light-cone-like information propagation analogous the relativistic theory. The speed of information propagation for power law decay interactions has been experimentally investigated in Ref. [20], which is beyond the light-cone picture. Understanding the effective model to describe quasiparticle excitations and the propagation of information for general interactions is an interesting direction. In this section, we show the quasiparticle excitations of correlated spin clusters with various interaction strengths using our algorithms.

We consider the out-of-equilibrium dynamics of a one-dimensional interacting spins with the Hamiltonian $H = H^{\text{loc}} + V^{\text{int}}$ with the local Hamiltonian and interactions on the boundary as

$$H^{\text{loc}}_i = \sum_{ij} J_{ij} \sigma_i^x \sigma_j^x + h \sum_j \sigma_i^z, \quad V^{\text{int}} = J_0 \sigma_i^x \sigma_N^x. \quad (113)$$

Here, $\sigma_i^x$ represents Pauli operators acting on the $i$th site of $l$th subsystem, and the interactions obey the power law decay rule as $J_{ij} = J_0 |i - j|^{-\alpha}$. In the regime of sufficiently large field $h \gg \max(|J_{ij}|)$, the Hamiltonian conserves the total magnetisation and thus could be mapped to the XX model $H = \sum_{ij} J_{ij} (\sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z + \text{h.c.})$, similar to the hard-core bosons which conserves the particle numbers with the effective Hamiltonian as $H = \sum_{ij} J_{ij} (\hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_j + \text{h.c.})$. For the system with (continuous) transitional symmetry, we can Fourier transform the real-space operator into the operators that are diagonal in momentum space, written as $H = \sum_k \omega_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_{-k}$ where the modes with energies $\omega_k$ has well-defined
quasimomentum $k$. Here, the operator $\hat{a}_k^\dagger$ creates an excitation with momentum $k$ in the momentum space, and it is related to the original operator by $\hat{a}_k^\dagger = \sum_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}} \hat{a}_i^\dagger$. In our simulation, we consider a spin-cluster system and first excite the system by local perturbation, which creates a magnon quasiparticle. For the system with nearest-neighbour interactions, the energy spectrum has a well-known quadratic dispersion $\omega_k \propto k^2$ in the low energy excitation regime. While for the spin cluster system, the mode does not have a well-defined momentum, one can determine the energy dispersion $\omega_k$ provided the boundary condition and the interaction $J_{ij}$.

In our numerical simulation, we consider an intermediate regime where the external field is much larger than the maximum interaction strength $J_0$ while it is comparable to the total interaction strength $J = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{j}} J_{ij}$. In this case, the field effects cannot be fully negligible when mapped to the XX model and it drives the system to an excited regime. In the numerical simulation, we set $J_0 = 1$, while the external field is set as $h = 2N J_0$ with $N$ being the total sites in the full system. As can be seen from the simulation results shown below, the total magnetisation is nearly a constant. Here, we mainly focus on the magnetisation conserved regime, while we can similarly simulate the highly excited regime using the same method. We note that in the highly excited regime, i.e., $h \sim J_0$, the quasiparticle picture does not hold and the collective excitations could be very different. The investigation of the interacting physics of the spin clusters is an interesting direction.

Now, we study the dynamics of quantum information. We first initialised the state as the eigenstate $|\psi_0\rangle = |1\rangle^{\otimes N}$ of non-interacting $H$ with $J_{ij} = 0$. We perturb the systems at the centre (8th site) of the spin chain, i.e. $|\psi_0\rangle = \hat{\sigma}_z^8 |\psi_0\rangle$ at $t = 0$, and suddenly quench the system by turning on the interaction $J_{ij}$. We show the information propagation with different decay rate $\alpha = 0.5$, $\alpha = 1$ and $\alpha = 2$ in Fig. 9 (a), (b) and (c), respectively. In our numerical experiments, we consider the magnetic moment of each spin and set the sampling number as $2 \times 10^5$. We show the magnetic moment distribution over each site in Fig. 9 (a1)-(c1), and the distribution of several neighbour sites $Q_4$ to $Q_7$ in (a2)-(c2) with three interaction strengths. The effective model was discussed to describe the long-range physics and short-range physics in Refs. [20, 21]. The maximum group velocity is predicted to show a divergent behaviour for the power law decay interactions. We clearly see that the quasiparticle excitations in the first subsystem propagate
FIG. 9. Correlated spin clusters with power law decay interactions $\alpha$ in the subsystems and interactions on the boundary. We perturb the systems at the 8th site as $|\psi_0\rangle = \hat{\sigma}_x^8 |\psi_0\rangle$ at $t = 0$, and suddenly turn on the interaction $J_{ij}$. Here, we set $J_0 = 1$. (a), (b) and (c) show $\alpha = 0.5, 1, 2$, respectively. (a1), (b1) and (c1) Dynamics of magnon quasiparticle excitations $\langle \hat{n}_j \rangle$, related to the local magnetic moment by $\langle \hat{n}_j \rangle = (1 - \langle \hat{\sigma}_j \rangle)/2$. (a2)-(c2) and (a3)-(c3) shows the signal of the magnetisation distribution at 4th-7th sites and 8th-12th sites respectively. The nearest-neighbour Lieb-Robinson bounds (dashed) do not capture all the signals for this propagation. (a4)-(c4) shows the averaged two-body correlation functions $C_d$ from the 8th site. (a5)-(c5) shows the errors for magnetisation and the correlation functions.

much faster as the interaction strength increases ($\alpha$ decreases). The quasiparticle excitations for small $\alpha$ (strongly coupled) appear to be much localised compared to the weakly coupled regime. Also, the propagation speed violates the Lieb-Robinson bounds, when considering the nearest-neighbour interaction max $J_{ij}$ or renormalised interaction $\sum_{ij} J_{ij}$, which indicates that long-range physics cannot be well described by the light-cone propagation with finite group velocity. While, for the other subsystem unperturbed at the beginning, we observe a different propagation under time evolution, as shown in Fig. 9 (a3), (b3) and (c3). This shows a intermediate behaviour of short- and long-range
physics of the spin cluster system, which might be captured by the model of nearest-neighbour interactions \(J_{ij}\). We can compare the maximum group velocity in Fig. 9 with the divergent behaviour as predicted in Ref. [20]. We also note that we can study the dynamical phase transition from the quasiparticle distribution provided the conservation of magnetisation, as inferred from the line of \(Q_8\). We next present the two-body correlation functions \(C_d\) with the spin at the centre, which is expressed as

\[
C_d = \langle \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+d}^z \rangle - \langle \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle \langle \hat{\sigma}_{j+d}^z \rangle
\]  

(114)

with \(j = 8\) at the centre in Fig. 9 (a4), (b4) and (c4), showing a quasiparticle picture explained above. We leave detailed discussions on the quasiparticle propagation to a future work.

D. Multiple subsystems

Finally, we show that our method could be extended to simulate systems consisting of multiple clusters. We consider the out-of-equilibrium dynamics of a one-dimensional interacting spin clusters with the Hamiltonian \(H = H_{\text{loc}} + V_{\text{int}}\) with the local Hamiltonian and interactions on the boundary as

\[
H_{\text{loc}}^l = J_l \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_{l,i}^x \hat{\sigma}_{l,i+1}^x + h \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_{l,i}^z, \quad V_{\text{int}}^l = f_l \hat{\sigma}_{l,N}^x \hat{\sigma}_{l+1,1}^x.
\]

(115)

Here, \(\hat{\sigma}_{l,i}\) represents Pauli operators acting on the \(i\)th site of \(l\)th subsystem. The interactions in each subsystem are identical \(J_l = J_0 = 1\), while interactions between subsystems \(f_l\) are generated randomly from \([0, 0.5]\). The external field is set as \(h = 1\). This Hamiltonian could be interpreted as a toy model representing certain features of holographic dual bulk in the 2 + 1 dimension. The model captures properties of charged black holes. For instance, the Penrose diagram of the Reissner-Nordström or the Kerr black hole in four dimensions is a chain of black or white holes, old or new universes, while quantum information is propagating among different patches of the spacetime.

In the numerical simulation, we consider the spin cluster model consisting of 6 clusters. We simulate up to 48 qubits with operations only on \(8 + 1\) qubits. We show the averaged time-evolved magnetisation \(M_z = \sum_i \langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \rangle\) and the nearest-neighbour correlation function \(C_1 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_i \langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_{i+1}^z \rangle\) and long-range correlations with the first site \(C_2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_i \langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_{1}^z \rangle\) and the Loschmidt echo \(G(t)\) in Fig. 10 (b).

To benchmark our algorithms, we compare our results with the time-evolving block decimation (TEBD) method, which is a commonly used numerical method to simulate the dynamics of quantum many-body systems based on the matrix product states formalism. Fig. 10 (c) shows that the simulation error can be achieved below \(10^{-2}\) at intermediate time scale. We remark that according to Corollary 2, the explicit decomposition for the example of Eq. 115 is optimal.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL IMPLEMENTATION ON THE IBM QUANTUM DEVICES

We implement our perturbative quantum simulation algorithm on the IBM quantum cloud. We consider the 8-qubit one-dimensional Ising Hamiltonians

\[
H = \sum_{i=1}^{7} \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_{i+1}^z + h \sum_{j=1}^{8} \hat{\sigma}_j^x,
\]

(116)

with nearest-neighbour interaction and a transverse magnetic field with different strength \(h\). Starting from an eigenstate of \(H\) with \(h = 0\), \(|\psi(0)\rangle = |0\rangle^{\otimes 8}\), we evolve the state from time \(T = 0\) to 1 and observe the dynamical quantum phase transition. At time \(t \in [0, 1]\), we focus on the expectation value of the spin operator \(M_z = \sum_{j=1}^{8} \hat{\sigma}_j^z / 8\) and the Loschmidt amplitude \(G(t) = |\langle \psi(0)| e^{-iHt} |\psi(0)\rangle|^2\), which is equivalent to evaluating the state overlap between \(|\psi(0)\rangle\) and \(|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iHt} |\psi(0)\rangle\).

To get the exact time-evolved state, we consider the Trotterisation product formula with four timesteps. Specifically, we have

\[
|\psi(t)\rangle = \left( \prod_{j=1}^{8} e^{-ih\hat{\sigma}_j^x} \right) \left( \prod_{j=1}^{7} e^{-i\hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z} \right)^{t/\delta t},
\]

(117)
with \( t \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1\} \) and \( \delta t = 0.25 \). Each term \( e^{-i\delta t \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z} = CX_{j,j+1} R_z(2\delta t, j + 1) CX_{j,j+1} \) could be realised with a single qubit rotation gate \( R_z(2\delta t, j + 1) = e^{-i\delta t \hat{\sigma}_j^z} \) sandwiched by two controlled-X gates \( CX_{j,j+1} \) and each \( e^{-i\delta t \hat{\sigma}_j^z} = R_z(2\hbar \delta t, j) \) is a single qubit gate. As shown in Fig. 11 (c), for each step, all the single qubits gates are implemented in parallel and the two qubit gates are realised with depth \( d = 2 \). We note that the Trotter error is negligible (much less than \( 10^{-2} \)).

With our perturbative quantum simulation method, we only need to apply operations on \( 4 + 1 \) qubits. We truncate the maximal number of decay events to four and we can see that the truncation error is small. When a decay event happens at time \( t \), say \( t = 0.1 \), we further divide the Trotter step from 0 to 0.25 into two steps, i.e., \([0, 0.1] \) and \([0.1, 0.25] \). Then we insert a controlled-Z operation with control qubit being the ancilla and the target being the first (last) qubit. As shown in Fig. 11 (b), we design the circuit in a similar way if we have multiple decay events. While the quantum circuit could be further optimised with fewer gates, it is sufficient for demonstrating the power of our PQS method.

We implement the direct 8-qubit simulation and our 5-qubit PQS method using the IBM Q Experience. The processor employed to conduct the direct 8-qubit simulation is ‘ibmq_{16,melbourne}’, which has 16 qubits with \( T_2 \) time ranging from \( 18 \sim 105 \mu s \), CNOT gate error \( 3.3 \times 10^{-2} \) and read-out error \( 4.7 \times 10^{-2} \). The processor employed to conduct the 5-qubit PQS method is ‘ibmq_{santiago}’, which has 5 qubits with \( T_2 \) time ranging from \( 66.9 \sim 143 \mu s \), CNOT gate error \( 7.1 \times 10^{-3} \) and read-out error \( 1.7 \times 10^{-2} \). The circuits are implemented through Qiskit [46], a python-based software development kit for working with OpenQASM and the IBM Q processors. The IBM cloud admits multiple job submissions with each job consisting a maximal of 72 circuits, where each circuit is fixed and allows 8192 single shot measurements.

We show the experimental results in Fig. 11(e, f). We consider the external field along the \( x \) direction with \( h = 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 5 \), and compare the results of exact simulation (dashed line), PQS (numerics, circle), PQS using IBMQ (5 qubits in Fig. 11 (b), upper triangle) and the direct simulation using IBMQ (8 qubits in Fig. 11 (a), lower triangle). For each data point of the direct simulation, we run 16 circuits with 8192 \( \times \) 16 single-shot measurements. For the PQS method, we consider 1024 trajectories with each trajectory corresponding to a circuit measured 8192 times. We note that even though the number of samples of the PQS method is much larger than the number of samples for the direction simulation method, the shot noise is much smaller than the error caused by device imperfections. We could also use a smaller number of samples (128 samples) for each trajectory of the PQS method, and we observe...
FIG. 11. Implementing perturbative quantum simulation on the IBM quantum cloud. We consider the DQPT of 8 interacting spins with nearest-neighbour interactions. The initial state $|0\rangle^{\otimes 8}$ is evolved under the Hamiltonian $H = \sum_j \hat{\sigma}_z^j \hat{\sigma}_z^{j+1} + h \sum_j \hat{\sigma}_x^j$.

(a) Quantum circuit implementation for 8-qubit simulation based on Trotterisation. (b) An example for the implementation of PQS to simulate 8-qubit system with operations on 4 + 1-qubits. (c) The circuit block for single-step evolution. (d) The topological geometry for the spin system and the partitioning strategy. (e1-e4) The magnetisation along the $z$ direction with $h = 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2.5$. (f1-f4) The Loschmidt amplitude with $h = 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2.5$. We compare the results of exact simulation (dashed line), PQS (numerics, circle), PQS using IBMQ (5 qubits in (c), upper triangle) and the direct simulation using IBMQ (8 qubits in (a), lower triangle). We also show the results using error mitigation for measurement both for PQS (solid square) and direct simulation (solid diamond). We run $10^3$ samples for PQS and collect 8192 counts each samples.

We note that the simulation results are not the same because we run a less optimised circuit of the IBM processor at a different time. We also apply error mitigation for measurements which increases the simulation accuracy. The measurement error mitigation is implemented by running a set of circuits with different computational basis input states and computational basis measurement. Then we obtain the calibration matrix and apply its inverse to correct measurement errors. From our simulation result, we observe that the PQS method outperforms the direct simulation. This is because the five-qubit ‘ibmq_santiago’ processor has more accurate operations than the ‘ibmq_16_melbourne’ processor. Since our method requires to run on a small quantum computer with a relatively low circuit depth, it could be applied to benchmarking the large-scale quantum devices, which may have more errors.
FIG. 12. Implementing perturbative quantum simulation on the IBM quantum cloud with less samples and less optimised quantum circuit. We run $10^3$ samples for PQS and collect 128 counts each samples. The quantum circuit for each time evolution block is different from Fig. 11 (c), where we apply the two qubit gates sequentially with 7 depth. (a1-a4) The magnetisation along the $z$ direction with $h = 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2.5$. (b1-b4) The Loschmidt amplitude with $h = 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2.5$. We compare the results of exact simulation (dashed line), PQS (numerics, circle), PQS using IBMQ (5 qubits in (c), upper triangle). We also show the results using error mitigation for measurement both for PQS (solid square).