We derive a thermodynamic uncertainty relation for first passage processes in quantum Markov chains. We consider first passage processes stopping after a fixed number of jumps, which contrasts with typical quantum Markov chains which end at a fixed time. We bound observables of first passage processes in quantum Markov chains by the Loschmidt echo, which quantifies the extent of irreversibility in quantum many-body systems. Considering a particular case of the bound, we show that the lower bound corresponds to the quantum Fisher information, which has played a fundamental role in uncertainty relations in quantum systems. Moreover, our bound reduces to a thermodynamic uncertainty relation for classical first passage processes when considering classical dynamics.

I. INTRODUCTION

Thermodynamic uncertainty relation (TUR) provides the fundamental limit of thermodynamic machines. It states that the precision of the machines, quantified by fluctuation of thermodynamic currents, is bounded from below by the thermodynamic cost such as entropy production and dynamical activity. TURs have been derived for classical systems [1–17] and quantum systems [18–28]. TURs become the central topic in nonequilibrium thermodynamics in these days, and, besides their theoretical significance, TURs have practical advantages in estimating the entropy production of thermodynamic machines solely from their stochastic trajectories [29–32].

First passage process is a stochastic process, extensively studied in various fields ranging from physics to finance [33, 34]. We typically consider the dynamics of stochastic processes which start at 0 and end at fixed time \( \tau (\tau > 0) \). In first passage processes, on the other hand, the dynamics stops when the system satisfies predefined conditions, thereby the end time of the dynamics, known as a first passage time, being a random variable. For instance, the predefined conditions would be the system reaching some practically meaningful states (e.g., absorbing states such as extinction) or the number of jumps surpassing a threshold. First passage processes become increasingly important in stochastic thermodynamics in recent days [35–37]. For instance, it is possible to extract work by a gambling demon, which monitors its state and determines when to stop the dynamics [38]. Regarding TURs in first passage processes, relations for classical stochastic thermodynamics were derived in Refs. [6, 39, 40], showing that the fluctuation of a first passage time is bounded from below by dynamical activity or entropy production. TURs for first passage processes are particularly important in biochemical clocks [1, 41], whose precision is ideally evaluated through a first passage time for the clocks to accomplish a single chemical reaction cycle. Although the first passage problem has been actively researched in classical stochastic thermodynamics, studies of quantum variants are in a very early stage. As in the classical thermodynamic clocks, recently, it was proposed that quantum clocks can be implemented by quantum heat engines [18, 42], which strongly demands a TUR for quantum first passage processes.

In this manuscript, we consider a TUR in quantum Markov chains stopping after a fixed number of jumps, which is a particular case of general first passage processes. Using the techniques developed in accompanying paper [43], we obtain a TUR for a first passage time in quantum Markov chains, whose lower bound comprises the Loschmidt echo. The obtained bound concerns arbitrary two dynamics, the original dynamics and the perturbed dynamics. When the perturbed dynamics is identical to the original dynamics except that the time scale of the perturbed dynamics is slightly faster or slower, the Loschmidt echo reduces to the quantum Fisher information, which plays fundamental roles in several uncertainty relations in quantum systems. Considering a classical limit of the derived TUR, we show that our relation reduces to a classical TUR for the classical first passage processes derived so far. Considering a two-level atom driven by a classical laser field as an application, we show that the fluctuation of a first passage time becomes smaller for a quantum Markov chain than its classical counterpart.

II. METHODS

Loschmidt echo is an indicator for quantum chaos in many body systems. Let \( H \) be a Hamiltonian and \( H_\tau \) be a perturbed Hamiltonian. When the systems are closed, given the initial state \( |\Psi(0)\rangle \), the Loschmidt echo \( \eta \) is...
The Loschmidt echo is the fidelity between the original and the perturbed dynamics, respectively. (a) Loschmidt echo is defined by the fidelity between \( e^{-iH\tau} |\Psi(0)\rangle \) and \( e^{-iH_\star\tau} |\Psi(0)\rangle \) at \( t = \tau \), where \( H \) and \( H_\star \) are original and perturbed Hamiltonians, respectively. (b) Loschmidt echo is the fidelity between \( \sum_m V_m |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |e_m\rangle \) and \( \sum_m V_{\star,m} |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |e_m\rangle \), where \( V_m \) and \( V_{\star,m} \) are Kraus operators of the original and the perturbed dynamics, respectively.

Defined by

\[
\eta \equiv |\langle \Psi(0) | e^{iH_\star \tau} e^{-iH\tau} |\Psi(0)\rangle|^2. \tag{1}
\]

The Loschmidt echo \( \eta \) defined in Eq. (1) can be regarded as the fidelity between \( e^{-iH\tau} |\Psi(0)\rangle \) and \( e^{-iH_\star\tau} |\Psi(0)\rangle \), which are time-evolved states at \( \tau \) induced by \( H \) and \( H_\star \), respectively (Fig. 1(a)). If the system is sensitive to the perturbation, the fidelity decays quickly to 0, indicating that the Loschmidt echo is conceptually similar to the Lyapunov exponent. Because the highly susceptible fidelity under a small perturbation is related to the irreversibility of the dynamics, the Loschmidt echo can be used to quantify the irreversibility.

The Loschmidt echo in Eq. (1) is defined for closed quantum systems. However, we can define the Loschmidt echo for open quantum systems. Let us consider a Kraus representation:

\[
\rho_S \to \sum_m V_m \rho_S V_m^\dagger, \tag{2}
\]

where \( \rho_S \) is a density operator and \( V_m \) is a Kraus operator satisfying a completeness relation \( \sum_m V_m^\dagger V_m = \mathbb{I}_S \) (\( \mathbb{I}_S \) is the identity operator in \( S \)). This time evolution induced by the Kraus representation can be expressed by a unitary time evolution in a larger space comprising the system \( S \) and the environment \( E \):

\[
U_{SE} |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |e_0\rangle = \sum_m V_m |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |e_m\rangle, \tag{3}
\]

where \( |e_m\rangle \) constitutes an orthonormal basis of \( E \), \( |\psi_S\rangle \) and \( |e_0\rangle \) are initial states of \( S \) and \( E \), respectively, and \( U_{SE} \) is a unitary operator acting on \( S + E \). Indeed, tracing out \( E \) in Eq. (3), we recover the original Kraus representation of Eq. (2). Suppose that a Kraus operator for the conjugate dynamics is \( V_{\star,m} \). Throughout the manuscript, we use \(*\) in subscripts to express the perturbed dynamics. Then the fidelity can be calculated between \( \sum_m V_m |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |e_m\rangle \) and \( \sum_m V_{\star,m} |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |e_m\rangle \) (Fig. 1(b)).

We can derive an uncertainty relation from the Loschmidt echo. Using the lower bound for the Hellinger distance in Ref. [44], we obtained the bounds for observables and the Loschmidt echo in accompanying paper [43]. Let \( |\Psi\rangle \) and \( |\Psi_\star\rangle \) be two pure states and \( F \) be an Hermitian observable that is applied to \( |\Psi\rangle \) or \( |\Psi_\star\rangle \). We define the mean and standard deviation of \( F \) by

\[
\langle F \rangle = \langle \Psi | F |\Psi\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle [F] \rangle = \sqrt{\langle (F)^2 \rangle - \langle F \rangle^2} \quad \langle \langle F \rangle_\star \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle [F]_\star \rangle \quad \text{should be evaluated for} \quad |\Psi_\star\rangle \text{instead of} \quad |\Psi\rangle. \tag{4}
\]

Then the following relation holds [43]:

\[
\frac{\langle [F] + [F]_\star \rangle^2}{\langle F - \langle F \rangle_\star \rangle^2} \geq \frac{1}{\eta^{-1} - 1}, \tag{5}
\]

where \( \eta = |\langle \Psi_\star | \Psi \rangle|^2 \). Equation (4) is a tighter version of the inequality derived in Ref. [45]. By using Eq. (4), we obtained a quantum TUR for quantum Markov chains that end at a fixed time in Ref. [24], where the observable is a counting observable and the lower bound is defined by the Loschmidt echo. The results obtained in Ref. [43] can be regarded as a quantum analog of TUR, because the entropy production in stochastic thermodynamics also characterizes the extent of irreversibility due to the time-reversal operation.

We now derive a TUR for first passage processes in quantum Markov chains using Eq. (4). In particular, we consider quantum Markov chains that stop after \( K \) jump events, where \( K \in \{1,2,3,\ldots\} \). Let \( \rho_S(t) \) be a density operator of the principal system \( S \) at time \( t \). We assume that the dynamics of \( \rho_S(t) \) is governed by the Lindblad equation:

\[
\dot{\rho}_S = \mathcal{L}\rho_S \equiv -i[H_S,\rho_S] + \sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{D}(\rho_S, L_m), \tag{5}
\]

where \( \mathcal{L} \) is a Lindblad super-operator, \( H_S \) is a system Hamiltonian, \( L_m \) is jump operators, \( M \) is the number of jump operators, and \( \mathcal{D} \) is a dissipator defined by

\[
\mathcal{D}(\rho_S, L) \equiv L\rho_S L^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \left[ L^\dagger L, \rho_S \right]. \tag{6}
\]

Here, \( \{\bullet,\bullet\} \) denotes the anti-commutator. The solution of the Lindblad equation corresponds to the dynamics when we do not measure the environment \( E \). When we measure the environment, the system exhibits stochastic dynamics depending on the measurement record. Such stochastic dynamics conditioned on the measurement record is referred to as a quantum trajectory. Figure 2 gives examples of quantum trajectories, where the system undergoes smooth continuous evolution and sudden

FIG. 1. Loschmidt echo for (a) closed and (b) open dynamics. (a) Loschmidt echo is defined by the fidelity between \( e^{-iH\tau} |\Psi(0)\rangle \) and \( e^{-iH_\star\tau} |\Psi(0)\rangle \) at \( t = \tau \), where \( H \) and \( H_\star \) are original and perturbed Hamiltonians, respectively. (b) Loschmidt echo is the fidelity between \( \sum_m V_m |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |e_m\rangle \) and \( \sum_m V_{\star,m} |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |e_m\rangle \), where \( V_m \) and \( V_{\star,m} \) are Kraus operators of the original and the perturbed dynamics, respectively.
discontinuous jumps. Let us define an effective Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{eff}} \equiv H_S - \frac{i}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M} L_m^\dagger L_m. \quad (7)$$

Suppose the state of $S$ right after a jump event is $|\psi_S\rangle$. Continuous evolution in the quantum trajectory is given by $e^{-iH_{\text{eff}}t} |\psi_S\rangle$ (note that this is not normalized) and the next jump is induced by $m$th jump operator $L_m$ after a waiting time $w$. Therefore, from the first and the second jump events, the state is transformed as

$$|\psi_S\rangle \rightarrow \frac{Y(w,m) |\psi_S\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle \psi_S | Y^\dagger(w,m) Y(w,m) |\psi_S\rangle}}. \quad (8)$$

where $Y(w,m) \equiv L_m e^{-iH_{\text{eff}}w} |\psi_S\rangle$ satisfies a completeness relation $\sum_{m=1}^{M} \int_0^\infty dw Y^\dagger(w,m) Y(w,m) = |\psi_S\rangle \langle \psi_S|$, which can be shown by using

$$\int_0^\infty dw e^{iwx} L_m^\dagger L_m e^{-iwx} = - \int_0^\infty dw \frac{d}{dw} \left[ e^{iwx} L_m^\dagger e^{-iwx} \right]. \quad (9)$$

Therefore, the Kraus representation describing the evolution between two consecutive jump events is given by

$$Z(\bullet) \equiv \sum_{m=1}^{M} \int_0^\infty dw Y(w,m) \bullet Y^\dagger(w,m). \quad (10)$$

We employ an input-output formalism for the first passage process with the fixed number of jumps following Ref. [46]. If we replace $V_m \rightarrow Y(w,m)$ in Eq. (2), the Kraus representation of Eq. (10) can be represented as an interaction between the principal system $S$ and the environment $E$ as follows:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \int_0^\infty dw Y(w,m) |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |w,m\rangle, \quad (11)$$

where $|w,m\rangle$ constitutes an orthonormal basis in the environment $E$ as $\langle w',m' | w,m \rangle = \delta(w'-w)\delta_{m'm}$. Figure 2 is an example of the process, where (a) and (b) stop when they undergo $K = 4$ jump events. As can be seen, a first passage time is a random variable and is different for these two cases.

We consider a quantum Markov chain which stops after $K$ jump events. Let $|\Psi_K\rangle$ be a composite state in $S + E$ after $K$ jump events. Let $m_i$ be an output of $i$th jump, $t_i$ be a time stamp of $i$th jump ($t_0 = 0$), and $w_i$ be waiting time between $i$th and $(i+1)$th jump events (i.e., $w_{i} \equiv t_i - t_{i-1}$) (Fig. 2). Repeating Eq. (11) $K$ times, $|\Psi_K\rangle$ is expressed by

$$|\Psi_K\rangle = \sum_{m_K,\ldots,m_1} \int_0^\infty dw Y(w_K,m_K) \cdots Y(w_1,m_1) |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |w_K, m_K\rangle, \cdots, |w_1, m_1\rangle, \quad (12)$$

where $\int_0^\infty^\infty dw$ is an abbreviation for $\int_0^\infty dw_1 \int_0^\infty dw_2 \cdots \int_0^\infty dw_K$. In accompanying paper [43], we have used Eq. (5) in Ref. [43] for expressing the input-output state for constant time quantum Markov chains. Equation (12) is a constant jump case of Eq. (5) in Ref. [43].

When we perform a continuous measurement, we obtain records of jump events $m \equiv \{n_1, m_2, \ldots, m_K\}$ and their time stamp $t \equiv \{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_K\}$ (Fig. 2). Because knowing the waiting time $w \equiv \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_K\}$ is equivalent to the time stamp $t$ and $m$ can be obtained by applying the projector $|w,m\rangle \langle w,m|$, where $|w,m\rangle \equiv \{|w_K,m_K\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |w_1,m_1\rangle\}$, to $|\Psi_K\rangle$ in Eq. (12). We consider the following Hermitian observable on the environment $E$.

$$O \equiv \sum_{m} \int_0^\infty dw h(w,m) \langle w,m| \langle w,m|, \quad (13)$$

where $h(w,m)$ can be an arbitrary function of $w$ and $m$. We may define a first passage time observable $O_f$, which is a subset of $O$, by

$$O_f \equiv \sum_{m} \int_0^\infty dw \ h_f(w) \langle w,m| \langle w,m|, \quad (14)$$

where $h_f(w)$ is an arbitrary function of $w$ (the subscript $f$ denotes the capital of first-passage time). For instance, when $h_f(w) = \sum_{i=1}^{K} w_i = t_K$, the observable corresponds to the first passage time to reach $K$ jump events.

The Loschmidt echo considers the fidelity between the original $|\Psi_K\rangle$ and the conjugate $|\Psi_{\ast,K}\rangle$ composite states in $S + E$ (Fig. 1(b)). Let $H_{s}, L_{s}, H_{\ast}$, and $L_{\ast}$ be perturbed Hamiltonian and jump operators, respectively. The perturbed state $|\Psi_{\ast,K}\rangle$ is expressed by Eq (12), where $Y(w,m)$ should be replaced by the perturbed operator $Y_{\ast}(w,m) \equiv L_{\ast}^\dagger \sum_{m} e^{-iH_{\ast}w} H_{s} e^{-iH_{\ast}w} |w,m\rangle$. Then the Loschmidt echo $\eta$ becomes

$$\eta = \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ Z_{\ast}^K (\rho_S(0)) \right]^2}{\text{Tr} \left[ \rho_S(0) \right]^2}, \quad (15)$$

where $\rho_S(0)$ is the initial state in $S$ and $Z_{\ast}$ is a mapping.
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attain \( K \) and the quantumness does not come into play. There-
fore, we let \( \rho = (1 + \varepsilon) L(\rho_S) \), the conjugate dynamics is the same as the original one except the time scale. Because the time scale of conjugate dynamics is \((1 + \varepsilon)\) times faster than that of the original dynamics, when considering a first passage time observable \( O_f \) in Eq. (14), it scales as \( \langle O_f \rangle^* = (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} \langle O_f \rangle \) and \( \| O_f \|_* = (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} \| O_f \| \). With this scaling relation, the left hand side of Eq. (18) becomes

\[
\frac{\| O_f \| + \| O_f \|_*}{\langle O_f \rangle - \langle O_f \rangle^*} = \frac{\varepsilon + 2 \| O_f \|}{\varepsilon \langle O_f \rangle}.
\]

Next, we evaluate the right hand side of Eq. (18). When we employ the perturbed Hamiltonian and jump operators of Eqs. (20) and (19), respectively, \( \varepsilon \) dependence of the composite state of the perturbed dynamics can be expressed as

\[
| \Psi_{\varepsilon,k} \rangle = | \Psi_k(\varepsilon) \rangle,
\]

where \( \varepsilon = 0 \) case reduces to the unperturbed state, \( | \Psi_k(\varepsilon = 0) \rangle = | \Psi_k \rangle \). Let us consider the quantum Fisher information \([49, 50]\), obtained by the following calculation:

\[
\mathcal{J}_K(\alpha) = 4 \langle \partial_\alpha \Psi(\alpha) \partial_\alpha \Psi_K(\alpha) \rangle + 4(\langle \partial_\alpha \Psi(\alpha) | \Psi(\alpha) \rangle)^2
\]

where \( \partial_\alpha \Psi_K(\alpha) \equiv (d/d\alpha)| \Psi_K(\alpha) \rangle \). It is known that the fidelity and the quantum Fisher information are related via \([51]\)

\[
\mathcal{J}_K(\alpha) = \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2} [1 - | \langle \Psi_K(\alpha + \varepsilon) | \Psi_K(\alpha) \rangle |],
\]

where we are considering \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) limit. Substituting Eqs. (21) and (24) into Eq. (18), we obtain

\[
\frac{\| O_f \|^2}{\langle O_f \rangle^2} \geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{J}_K(0)}.
\]

Equation (25) provides a TUR for first passage time in quantum Markov chains. As will be shown later, when we only consider classical stochastic processes, we obtain \( \mathcal{J}_K(0) \to K \). The quantum Fisher information gives the fundamental limit of quantum parameter estimation \([49, 50, 52, 53]\). Moreover, it plays central roles in quantum speed limit \([54–56]\) and a quantum TUR \([24]\). Once we measure quantum systems and obtain a measurement output, the obtained output can be treated classically and the quantumness does not come into play. Therefore, we let \( \mathcal{I}_K(\alpha; M_{SE}) \) be a classical Fisher information, which is obtained by applying a positive operator-valued measure (POVM) \( M_{SE} \) to \( | \Psi_K(\alpha) \rangle \). It is known that \( \mathcal{J}_K(\alpha) \) has a variational representation:

\[
\mathcal{J}_K(\alpha) = \max_{M_{SE}} \mathcal{I}_K(\alpha; M_{SE}),
\]
where the maximization is performed for any possible POVM $\mathcal{M}_{SE}$ in $S + E$. Moreover, we can think of a classical Fisher information $I_K^c(\alpha)$ for continuous measurement. Because a measurement record of continuous measurement can be obtained by measuring $|\Psi_K(\alpha)\rangle$ by the projector $|w, m\rangle \langle w, m|$, $I_K^c(\alpha)$ is represented by

$$I_K^c(\alpha) = I_K(\alpha; I_S \otimes \{ |w, m\rangle \langle w, m| \}).$$

It is easy to show that

$$I_K^c(\alpha) \leq I_K(\alpha),$$

which simply follows from Eq. (26). We have derived Eq. (25) using the lower bound of the Hellinger distance and considering a particular perturbed dynamics specified by Eqs. (19) and (20). As shown in Appendix C, Eq. (25) can also be derived through the Cramér–Rao inequality.

We next obtain a classical limit of Eq. (25). We consider a classical Markov chain with $N_S$ states, $B_1, B_2, ..., B_{N_S}$, and let $\gamma_{ji}$ be a time-independent transition rate from $B_i$ to $B_j$. Then we find that Eq. (25) reduces to the following simple relation (Appendix B):

$$\frac{\| \mathcal{O}_f \|^2}{\langle \mathcal{O}_f \rangle^2} \geq \frac{1}{K}.$$  

Equation (29) corresponds to a specific case of the result reported in Ref. [40]. Equation (29) shows that, when we consider first passage processes that stop after $K$ jumps, the lower bound does not depend on the details of dynamics nor the initial distribution.

### III. Example

We apply the main result of Eq. (18) to a two-level atom driven by a classical laser field. Let $|\epsilon_e\rangle$ and $|\epsilon_g\rangle$ be excited and ground states, respectively. A Hamiltonian $H_S$ and a jump operator $L$ are given by

$$H_S = \Delta |\epsilon_e\rangle \langle \epsilon_e| + \frac{\Omega}{2} [|\epsilon_e\rangle \langle \epsilon_g| + |\epsilon_g\rangle \langle \epsilon_e|],$$

$$L = \sqrt{\kappa} |\epsilon_g\rangle \langle \epsilon_e|,$$

where $\Delta$ is a detuning between the laser-field and the atomic-transition frequencies, $\Omega$ is the Rabi-oscillation frequency, and $\kappa$ is the decay rate. $L$ induces a jump from $|\epsilon_e\rangle$ to $|\epsilon_g\rangle$. We first calculate the parameter dependence of the quantum Fisher information $J_K(0)$ in Eq. (25) on the decay rate $\kappa$. Figure 3(a) shows $J_K(0)$ as a function of $\kappa$ (the other parameters are shown in the caption of Figure 3(a)). The dashed line denotes $J_K(0)$ and the solid line shows $K$, which is the classical limit of the lower bound as shown in Eq. (29). We see that $J_K(0)$ reduces to $K$ for $\kappa \to \infty$. Because jumps in the Lindblad dynamics become dominant compared to dynamics induced by $e^{-iH_{\text{att}}t}$, the dynamics becomes closed to a classical Markov process. Moreover, we observe that $J_K(0)$ is larger than $K$, indicating that the lower bound of the TUR is smaller for this quantum Markov chain.

To confirm that the fluctuation of the first passage observable $\mathcal{O}_f$ is smaller for the quantum Markov chain, we perform a computer simulation. We randomly generate $\Delta, \Omega$, and $\kappa$ and calculate $\| \mathcal{O}_f \|^2 / \langle \mathcal{O}_f \rangle^2$. Specifically, we consider $\mathcal{O}_f$ with $h_f(w) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} w_i = t_K$, which gives the first passage time to undergo $K$ jump events. In Fig. 3(b), we plot $\| \mathcal{O}_f \|^2 / \langle \mathcal{O}_f \rangle^2$ as a function of the quantum Fisher information $J_K(0)$ with triangles, where the dashed line denotes the lower bound. We confirm that all realizations are above the dashed line, which numerically verifies Eq. (25). We have shown that Eq. (25) reduces to Eq. (29) in a classical case, where the lower bound is given by $1/K$. Therefore, we also check whether $\| \mathcal{O}_f \|^2 / \langle \mathcal{O}_f \rangle^2$ can be bounded from below by $1/K$. In Fig. 3(b), we plot $\| \mathcal{O}_f \|^2 / \langle \mathcal{O}_f \rangle^2$ as a function of $K$ with circles, where the dashed line now describes $1/K$. We can see that some triangles are below the dashed line, indicating that the observable $\mathcal{O}_f$ cannot be bounded from below by $1/K$. This shows that the quantum nature of the system can enhance the precision of the first passage time observable. Quantum-induced precision enhancement has been reported for quantum Markov chains with the fixed end time [20, 24]. Recently, it was reported that quantum coherence can improve the precision of a quantum heat engine [28].
IV. CONCLUSION

In this manuscript, we have derived a TUR for a first passage time in quantum Markov processes. We have used a derivation technique developed in accompanying paper [43], where the fluctuation of observables is bounded from below by the Loschmidt echo. Our approach is quite general and can be applied to many quantum systems where the previous derivations cannot handle. We expect that it is possible to derive other uncertainty relations using our technique.
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Appendix A: Liouville space representation

Mapping $Z_*$ in the Hilbert space is shown in Eq. (16). Because calculation of $Z^K_*$ is computationally expensive task, we can use the Liouville space representation of $Z_*$. The Liouville space representation is advantageous in the sense that the mapping can be realized via matrix multiplication. In the Hilbert space, the density operator is

$$\rho = \sum_{i,j} \theta_{ij} |i\rangle \langle j|,$$

where $|i\rangle$ is an orthonormal basis. It can be represented in the Liouville space as follows:

$$\text{vec}(\rho) = \sum_{i,j} \theta_{ij} |j\rangle \otimes |i\rangle.$$ \hspace{1cm} (A1)

Let $A$, $B$, and $C$ be arbitrary matrices in the Hilbert space. Then the following relation holds:

$$\text{vec}(ABC) = (C^T \otimes A)\text{vec}(B),$$ \hspace{1cm} (A2)

where $T$ denotes the transpose. When the dimension of operators in the Hilbert space is $d \times d$, their corresponding Liouville space representations have the dimension of $d^2 \times d^2$. Using Eq. (A2), we obtain $Z_*$ [Eq. (16)] in the Liouville space as follows:

$$\tilde{Z}_* = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \int_0^\infty dw Y_*(w, m) \otimes Y(w, m),$$ \hspace{1cm} (A4)

where a superscript $\dagger$ denotes complex conjugate. Then exponentiation of a mapping, $Z^K_*(\rho_S)$, is simply realized by a matrix power $\tilde{Z}^K_*$ vec($\rho_S$).

Appendix B: Classical bound

We derive a classical limit of Eq. (25). When emulating classical Markov chains with quantum Markov chains, we consider the following Hamiltonian and jump operators in the Lindblad equation:

$$H_S = 0,$$

$$L_{ji} = \sqrt{\gamma_{ji}} |b_j\rangle \langle b_i| \quad (i \neq j).$$ \hspace{1cm} (B1)

Let $\varepsilon$ be a small perturbation parameter as defined in Eqs. (19) and (20). The Hamiltonian and the jump operators of the perturbed dynamics become

$$H_{*,S} = 0,$$

$$L_{*,ji} = \sqrt{1 + \varepsilon \gamma_{ji}} |b_j\rangle \langle b_i| \quad (i \neq j).$$ \hspace{1cm} (B3)

Moreover, we consider the following initial density operator which emulates classical probability distribution:

$$\rho_S(t) = \sum_i p_i(t) |b_i\rangle \langle b_i|,$$ \hspace{1cm} (B5)

where $p_i(t)$ is a classical probability distribution of being $|b_i\rangle$ at time $t$. Let $Y(w, i, j) \equiv L_{ji} e^{-iH_{*,S}w} \langle Y_*(w, i, j)$ is defined in the same way. Substituting Eqs. (B1)–(B5) into Eq. (16), $\tilde{Z}_*$ in Eq. (16) becomes

$$\tilde{Z}_*(\rho_S) = \int_0^\infty dw \sum_{i \neq j} Y(w, i, j) \rho_S Y_*(w, i, j)$$

$$\times \exp \left[ -\frac{w}{2} \left( 2 + \varepsilon \right) \sum_{k(\neq i)} \gamma_{ki} \right] p_i |b_j\rangle \langle b_j|$$

$$= \sum_{i, k(\neq i)} \sum_{j} \frac{2\sqrt{1 + \varepsilon}}{(2 + \varepsilon)} \frac{\gamma_{ji}}{\gamma_{ki}} p_i |b_j\rangle \langle b_j|$$

$$\times \exp \left[ -\frac{w}{2} \left( 2 + \varepsilon \right) \sum_{k(\neq i)} \gamma_{ki} \right] p_i |b_j\rangle \langle b_j|.$$ \hspace{1cm} (B6)

where $p = [p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_N]^T$ and $B$ is a matrix defined by

$$B_{ij} = \begin{cases} 0 & i = j \\ \frac{\gamma_{ij}}{\sum_{k(\neq i)} \gamma_{ki}} & i \neq j \end{cases}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (B7)

Therefore we obtain

$$\text{Tr}_S \left[ \tilde{Z}_*^K(\rho_S) \right] = \sum_j \left( \frac{2\sqrt{1 + \varepsilon}}{2 + \varepsilon} \right)^K [B^K p]_j.$$ \hspace{1cm} (B8)

From Eq. (B7), $B$ is a stochastic matrix $\sum_i B_{ij} = 1$, yielding

$$\text{Tr}_S \left[ \tilde{Z}_*^K(\rho_S) \right] = \left( \frac{2\sqrt{1 + \varepsilon}}{2 + \varepsilon} \right)^K.$$ \hspace{1cm} (B9)
$O_f$ in the classical systems also satisfies the scaling condition of Eq. (21). From Eqs. (21) and (B9), Eq. (18) becomes

$$\frac{\|O_f\|^2}{\langle O_f \rangle^2} \geq \frac{1}{(1 + \varepsilon)^2 \left(1 + \frac{2}{2 + \varepsilon}\right)^{-2K} - 1} \quad \varepsilon \to 0 \frac{1}{K}.$$  (B10)

where we used l’Hôpital’s rule for calculating the limit. Equation (B10) is a classical case of the main result [Eq. (29)].

**Appendix C: Derivation based on Cramér–Rao inequality**

Equation (25), which is a particular case of the main result [Eq. (18)], can be derived through the Cramér–Rao inequality as well. The basic derivation follows that in Refs. [10, 24]. The Cramér–Rao inequality states

$$\frac{\|\langle O \rangle\|^2}{\langle \partial_\alpha \langle O \rangle \rangle^2} \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{J}_K^\alpha (\alpha)}.$$  (C1)

where $O$ is defined in Eq. (13), and $\langle O \rangle_\alpha = \langle \Psi_K (\alpha) | O | \Psi_K (\alpha) \rangle$ and $\|O\|_\alpha = \sqrt{\langle O^2 \rangle_\alpha - \langle O \rangle^2_\alpha}$. When we only consider the first-passage time observable $O_f$ in Eq. (14), the left hand side of Eq. (C1) becomes

$$\frac{\|O_f\|^2}{\langle \partial_\alpha \langle O_f \rangle \rangle^2} = \frac{1}{\langle \partial_\alpha \langle O_f \rangle \rangle^2} \geq (1 + \alpha)^2 \frac{\|O_f\|^2}{\langle O_f \rangle^2}.$$  (C2)

Using Eqs. (28) and (C2), we obtain Eq. (25).