Convergence of numerical approximations to non-Markovian bosonic gaussian environments
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Non-Markovian effects are important in modeling the behavior of open quantum systems arising in solid-state physics, quantum optics as well as in study of biological and chemical systems. A common approach to the analysis of such systems is to approximate the non-Markovian environment by discrete bosonic modes thus mapping it to a Lindbladian or Hamiltonian simulation problem. While systematic constructions of such modes have been proposed in previous works [D. Tamascelli et al, PRL (2012), A. W. Chin et al, J. of Math. Phys (2010)], the resulting approximation lacks rigorous convergence guarantees. In this paper, we initiate a rigorous study of the convergence properties of these methods. We show that under some physically motivated assumptions on the system-environment interaction, the finite-time dynamics of the non-Markovian open quantum system computed with a sufficiently large number of modes is guaranteed to converge to the true result. Furthermore, we show that, for most physically interesting models of non-Markovian environments, the approximation error falls off polynomially with the number of modes. Our results lend rigor to numerical methods used for approximating non-Markovian quantum dynamics and allow for a quantitative assessment of classical as well as quantum algorithms in simulating non-Markovian quantum systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum systems invariably interact with their environment, and any simulation technique used to model their behavior needs to capture this interaction. Traditionally, such interactions are analyzed within the Markovian approximation, wherein the system dynamics is described by the Lindbladian master equation [1]. However, a number of quantum systems arising in solid-state physics [2–5], quantum optics [6–10] as well as quantum biology and chemistry [11–14] cannot be modelled accurately within the Markovian approximation and the non-Markovian nature of the environment needs to be explicitly taken into account.

One of the key difficulties with simulating non-Markovian open quantum systems is that it is usually not possible to write a master equation that captures the dynamics of this system from a given physical model of the system-environment interactions. While it is generically expected that non-Markovian open quantum systems satisfy a master equation of the Nakajima-Zwanzig form [13, 15], or the time-convolutionless form [16–18], it is usually hard to obtain an explicit form of such a master equation except for when the system is only weakly coupled to its environment in which case a perturbative treatment is possible [19–22]. Another line of work considers the time-evolution of non-Markovian open quantum systems as the process of updating a tensor on the joint state-space of the system and its past copies [23–27]. Several techniques from tensor networks can be imported to efficiently performing this update, which allows for a numerically exact simulation of the non-Markovian effects in the system [28–31].

An alternative approach to simulating the dynamics of the non-Markovian open quantum systems is to keep track of the state of the environment [32–35]. Since keeping track of the entire environment state is computationally inefficient in most cases, these methods start by identifying the most important modes in the environment and reducing the simulation of the non-Markovian open quantum system to a Hamiltonian simulation or Lindbladian simulation problem. The resulting problem can then be efficiently solved using standard classical [36–40] or quantum algorithms [41–46] for Hamiltonian or Lindbladian simulation problems. For gaussian bosonic environments [47, 48], there are two prominent approaches to identifying these environment modes. First is to use the pseudomode theory [49–54], wherein the non-Markovian environment is approximated by a finite number of discrete bosonic modes individually coupling to Markovian reservoirs yielding an effective Lindbladian simulation problem. The second method is to use Wilson’s start-to-delta transformation [33, 34, 55], which uses the Lanczos iteration to identify discrete bosonic modes that approximate the environment and map the problem of computing non-Markovian quantum dynamics to a Hamiltonian simulation problem.

While previous works have outlined a systematic construction of these approximations, a rigorous theoretical study of their convergence properties is lacking. In this paper, we develop a convergence theory of both the pseudomode approximation as well as Wilson’s star-to-delta transformation when applied to non-Markovian open quantum systems. We show that, for a large class of non-Markovian systems with a Gaussian bosonic environment, the finite-time dynamics of the quantum system can always be described, to a specified accuracy, by either of these methods with a sufficiently large number of discrete bosonic modes. Furthermore, we argue that for most non-Markovian systems encountered in practice, the approximation error incurred falls off polynomially with the number of environment modes. Our theoretical results lend rigor to using these methods to approximate non-Markovian quantum dynamics on classical, or quantum computers.

In order to perform this convergence study, there are several theoretical challenges that our work resolves. First, since it is intuitively expected that any approximation to a non-Markovian environment with only a finite number of modes
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can only describe it within a finite bandwidth, we rigorously argue that high energy components of the environment’s quantum state can be neglected while studying finite-time dynamics of the quantum system. While this would be relatively trivial to show for problems where the system-environment couplings vanish at high energies, a number of models considered in practice have non-vanishing couplings with arbitrarily high energy modes in the environment [6, 56] and it is the magnitude of these couplings that limit the energies of the environment modes that are excited. Furthermore, there is also a possibility of an ultraviolet divergence, such as a diverging Lamb shift [57] in the system’s resonances, for several environment models which makes a rigorous convergence study of the pseudomode approximation difficult. We resolve these issues by identifying a set of physically motivated sufficient mathematical conditions on the system-environment dynamics (assumptions 1 and 2 in section II B) that allow for neglecting the high energy components of the environment’s quantum state (theorem 1 in section II C). Building on this result, we provide a bound on the error incurred in approximating the dynamics of a non-Markovian quantum system, with system-environment couplings that don’t necessarily vanish at high energies, through the dynamics of a non-Markovian quantum system wherein the system-environment couplings vanish at high energies.

Next, we rigorously study the pseudomode approximation, and provide explicit upper bounds on the error incurred in approximating a non-Markovian model with pseudomodes. We show that this approximation becomes increasingly accurate with the number of pseudomodes, thereby providing a convergence guarantee for the pseudomode approximation (theorem 2 in section II C). Furthermore, we argue that for most models occurring in practice the rate of convergence is polynomial with the number of pseudomodes used i.e. the approximation error falls off polynomially with the number of pseudomodes. We derive a similar set of results providing a convergence guarantee as well as an upper bound on the approximation error for Wilson’s star-to-delta transformation (theorem 3 in section II C).

II. SETUP AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A. Notation and mathematical preliminaries

Function spaces and analysis: For $v \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$, we will denote by $\{v, u\}$ a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{N+M}$ whose first $N$ entries are elements of $v$ and the next $M$ entries are elements of $u$.

All the integrals in this paper are Lebesgue integrals and with respect to the Lebesgue measure over $\mathbb{R}^N$. For a measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$, given a measurable map $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, we define its essential supremum via $\text{esssup}_{x \in \Omega} f(x) = \inf \{a \in \mathbb{R} \mid \mu(\{x \mid f^{-1}([a, \infty)) \}) = 0\}$. The essential supremum can be interpreted as the supremum of a function obtained on ignoring subsets of its domain with zero measure. A propositional function $P : \Omega \to \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$ is said to be True almost everywhere in $\Omega$ if the $\mu(\{x \mid P(x) \text{ is False}\}) = 0$. This will be denoted as $\forall x \in a.e. \ \Omega : P(x) \text{ is True}$.

We will denote by $L^2(\mathbb{R}^D)$ the set of complex-valued square integrable functions over $\mathbb{R}^D$. We will denote by $B(\mathbb{R}^D)$ the set of bounded functions over $\mathbb{R}^D$. For $f \in B(\mathbb{R}^D)$, we denote by $\|f\|_\infty$ the maximum magnitude of the function i.e. $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^D} |f(x)|$. For a closed interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, we will denote by $C^k(I)$ the set of functions $f : I \to \mathbb{C}$ which are $k$-continuously differentiable. In particular, $C^0(I)$ is the set of continuous complex-valued functions with domain $I$. We will also denote by $C^k_b(I)$ the space of bounded $k$-times continuously differentiable functions — on compact intervals $I$, this will coincide with $C^k(I)$. Finally, for any $\alpha > 0$, rect$_\alpha : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ to denote the rectangular windowing function defined by

$$\text{rect}_\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |x| \leq \alpha \\ 0 & \text{if } |x| > \alpha. \end{cases}$$

For $a < b$, we will denote by $AC([a, b])$ the space of all functions $f : [a, b] \to \mathbb{C}$ that are absolutely continuous. We recall that $f \in C^0([a, b])$ is absolutely continuous if $\exists g : [a, b] \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $g$ is integrable and

$$\forall x \in [a, b] : f(x) = f(a) + \int_a^x g(x') dx'.$$

An immediate consequence of this definition is that the function $f$ has a derivative, which we denote by $\partial_x f$, almost everywhere on $[a, b]$. Furthermore, we can define a norm $||f||_{[a, b]} : AC([a, b]) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\forall f \in AC([a, b])$

$$||f||_{[a, b]} = \sup_{x \in [a, b]} |f(x)| + (b - a) \text{esssup}_{x \in [a, b]} |\partial_x f(x)|.$$ (1)

A map $f : [a, b]^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ will be called symmetric if $\forall s_1, s_2 \in [a, b] : f(s_1, s_2) = f^t(s_2, s_1)$. We will denote by $AC_{sym}([a, b]^2)$ the space of symmetric, continuous functions $f : [a, b]^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ which satisfy the following two conditions

1. $f$ is absolutely continuous in either of its arguments i.e. $\forall y \in [a, b]$, the map $\varphi_y : [a, b] \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by $\varphi_y(x) = f(x, y)$ is absolutely continuous.
2. For $y \in a.e. [a, b]$, $\partial_y f(x, y)$ exists $\forall x \in [a, b]$ and the map $\varphi^y : [a, b] \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by $\varphi^y(x) = \partial_y f(x, y)$ is absolutely continuous.

We note that the partial derivatives of $f$ with respect to either and both of its arguments, $\partial_x f, \partial_y f, \partial^2_{x,y} f$, exists almost everywhere on $[a, b]^2$. Finally, we define a norm $||f||_{[a, b]^2} : AC_{sym}([a, b]^2) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\forall f \in AC_{sym}([a, b]^2)$

$$||f||_{[a, b]^2} = \sup_{x,y \in [a, b]} |f(x, y)| + (b - a) \left( \text{esssup}_{x,y \in [a, b]} |\partial_x f(x, y)| + \text{esssup}_{x,y \in [a, b]} |\partial_y f(x, y)| \right) + (b - a)^2 \text{esssup}_{x,y \in [a, b]} |\partial^2_{x,y} f(x, y)|.$$ (2)
A symmetric map $K$ is also positive if
\[ \forall f \in C^0([a, b]) : \int_{s_1, s_2 = a}^{b} K(s_1, s_2) f^*(s_1) f(s_2) ds_1 ds_2 \geq 0. \]

**Norms:** For a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, the Banach space of bounded operators over $\mathcal{H}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. For elements of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|\psi\|$ will denote the norm induced by $\mathcal{H}$'s inner product. For a bounded operator $O : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, we will denote by $\|O\|$ the operator norm induced by the norm on $\mathcal{H}$ i.e. $\|O\| = \sup_{|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}} \langle O | \psi \rangle / \|\psi\|$. For a bounded and trace-class operator $O : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, its trace-norm is given by $\|O\|_tr = \text{tr}(|O|^2)$. The trace-norm will be used to quantify distance between two density operators. It is useful to note that given two states $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ with unit norm, then the operator $|\psi_1\rangle \langle \psi_1| - |\psi_2\rangle \langle \psi_2|$ is bounded and trace-class and its trace-norm satisfies
\[ \| |\psi_1\rangle \langle \psi_1| - |\psi_2\rangle \langle \psi_2| \|_tr \leq \sqrt{2} \| |\psi_1\rangle - |\psi_2\rangle \|. \] (3)

This property, together with the contractivity of the trace-norm under partial trace, allows us to translate an error in between two states of a composite quantum system to an error between the density operators of a subsystem of the composite quantum system.

**Error analysis:** Given two functions $f, g : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ of parameter $h$ then the notation $f = O(g)$ as $h \to h_0$ implies $\exists c > 0 : f(h) \leq c g(h)$ as $h \to h_0$. The notation $f = \Theta(g)$ as $h \to h_0$ as $\exists c_+, c_- > 0 : c_- g(h) \leq f(h) \leq c_+ g(h)$ as $h \to h_0$. Furthermore, $f = O(g_1) + O(g_2)$ as $h \to h_0$ if $\exists f_1, f_2$ such that $f = f_1 + f_2$ and $f_1 = O(g_1)$ as $h \to h_0$ and $f_2 = O(g_2)$ as $h \to h_0$.

### B. Model and assumptions

We consider an open quantum system model, where a finite-dimensional quantum system with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_S = \mathbb{C}^B$ (referred to as a ‘local system’) interacting with a Gaussian environment whose Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_B$ is assumed to be a fock space over $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. We denote by $a_\omega$ the annihilation operator for this Fock space and consider hamiltonians of the form
\[ H(t) = H_S(t) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \omega a_\omega^* a_\omega d\omega + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( v(\omega) a_\omega L^\dagger + v^*(\omega) a_\omega^* L \right) d\omega, \] (4)

where $L : \mathcal{H}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_S$ is the operator describing the coupling of the system with the environment, and $v \in C^0(\mathbb{R})$ is the frequency dependent coupling function between the environment and the system. We point out that the Hamiltonian in Eq. 4 is only a provably (essentially) self-adjoint operator if $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ — however, several problems in quantum optics (e.g. systems with point coupling) are described by $v$ that are tempered distributions. To the best of our knowledge, there exists no mathematically rigorous delineation of coupling functions $v$ that are not square integrable but still result in a self-adjoint Hamiltonian, although several such models are used in practice. A rigorous description of such systems is likely to be constructed as some limit of systems described by Hamiltonians of the form of Eq. 4 with $v$ being in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, but is outside the scope of this paper and left for future work. In this paper, we will assume without proof that the Hamiltonian being considered has well defined dynamics.

Throughout this paper, we will be interested in approximating the dynamics of the reduced state of the local system — we restrict ourselves to the case where the environment is initially in a vacuum state, although an extension to an initially excited environment state is easily possible. More explicitly, starting from an initial state $|\psi(0)\rangle = |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle$, where $|\sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$ and $|\text{vac}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_B$ is the vacuum state of the environment, we are interested in computing $\rho(t) = \text{Tr}_B[|\psi(t)\rangle \langle \psi(t)|]$ where $|\psi(t)\rangle = T \exp(-i \int_0^t H(s) ds) |\psi(0)\rangle$.

An immediate issue with performing a rigorous theoretical analysis on the convergence of pseudo-mode theory in approximating $\rho(t)$ that pseudomodes can only approximate the environment within a finite frequency window. For most physically relevant models, we expect that the local system cannot excite arbitrarily high frequencies in the environment in finite amount of time even if it has a non-vanishing coupling with all frequencies in the environment. Below we outline two physically motivated assumptions that we make on the model under consideration, which can also be proved for a number of physically interesting problems, that are sufficient conditions to allow us to neglect high frequencies in the environment. While the first assumption is on the coupling function, and can consequently be easily verified, the second assumption is on the joint dynamics of the local system and the environment.

**Assumption 1** The coupling function $v$ is smooth and bounded i.e. $v \in C^0(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, $\forall t \geq 0$ and $K \in AC^{sym}([0, t]^2)$ such that $K$ is positive.
where \( V(\omega, t) \) is a function that vanishes as \( \omega \to \infty \) \( \forall t \geq 0 \).

From a physical standpoint, this assumption ensures that the dynamics of the model described by Eq. 4 do not suffer from an ultraviolet divergence arising due to the environment being able to support arbitrarily high frequencies. We point out that it is unclear if this assumption, by itself, is a necessary or sufficient condition to ensure that the dynamics generated by the Hamiltonian in Eq. 4 are well defined, and we leave this investigation for future work. However, a number of models commonly considered in practice do satisfy this condition:

1. **Environments with square-integrable coupling functions:** environments for which the coupling function \( v \), in addition to being smooth and bounded, is square integrable i.e. \( v \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}) \) satisfy assumption 1 (proposition 1 in appendix A). Physically important examples of such environments include environments with a Lorentzian coupling function which is typically used to model an atomic system interacting with an optical cavity [58].

2. **Markovian environments:** Environments described by frequency-independent coupling functions, i.e. \( v(\omega) = v_0 \), which are known to effectively generate Markovian dynamics in the local system [56], also satisfy assumption 1 (proposition 2 in appendix A).

3. **Environments modelling retardation effects:** environments described by frequency-dependent coupling constants of the form \( v(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} v_i e^{i\omega \tau_i} \), are commonly used to model retardation effects [59]. These environments also satisfy the conditions of assumption 1 (proposition 2 in appendix A).

The second assumption that we introduce is related to the joint dynamics of the local system and the environment. To state this assumption mathematically, we introduce the \( N \)-point Green’s function of the localized system evaluated at \( s \in [0, t] \), \( G_N(s; t) \in \mathcal{L}(|\mathcal{H}_S|) \) via

\[
G_N(s; t) = \langle \text{vac} | U(t, 0) \mathcal{T} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{N} L(s_i) \right] | \text{vac} \rangle , \quad (5)
\]

where \( U(\tau_1, \tau_2) \) is the propagator corresponding to the Hamiltonian in Eq. 4 and \( L(\tau) = U(0, \tau)U(\tau, 0) \) is the operator \( L \) in the Heisenberg picture. It can be immediately noted that the Green’s function is a bounded operator, and satisfies the estimate

\[
\forall s \in [0, t]^N : \| G_N(s; t) \|_2 \leq \| L \|_2^N . \quad (6)
\]

The physical significance of the \( N \)-point Green’s function is that it determines the projection of the environment state on the \( N \)-particle subspace. More explicitly, consider a setting where the system is initialized in a state \( |\sigma \rangle \) and the environment is in its vacuum state \( |\text{vac} \rangle \), then the state of the system at time \( t \) can be expressed (see appendix B for a derivation):

\[
|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} |\psi^N(t)\rangle , \quad (7a)
\]

where

\[
|\psi^N(t)\rangle = \frac{1}{N!} \int_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} F_N(\omega; t) \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{N} v^*(\omega_i) a_{\omega_i}^\dagger \right] |\sigma \rangle \otimes |\text{vac} \rangle \, d\omega , \quad (7b)
\]

and \( \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}^N \)

\[
F_N(\omega; t) = \int_{s \in [0, t]^N} G_N(s; t) \overline{e^{i\omega \cdot (t-s)}} \, ds . \quad (7c)
\]

Furthermore, the bound on the \( N \)-point Green’s function (Eq. 6) implies the following bound on the norm of \( |\psi^N(t)\rangle \) \( \forall t \geq 0, N \geq 0 \):

\[
\| |\psi^N(t)\rangle \|_2^2 \leq \| v \|_{2}^{2N} \| L \|_2^N \left( \frac{2\pi t}{N!} \right)^N . \quad (8)
\]

**Assumption 2** \( \forall t \geq 0, \forall s \in [0, t]^{N-1} \), the map \( G_N(\cdot, s; t) : [0, t] \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_S) \) is absolutely continuous and \( \exists \gamma(t) > 0 \) such that

\[
\text{esssup}_{s_0 \in [0, t]} \| \partial_{s_0} G_N(\cdot, s_0; t) \|_2 \leq \| L \|_2 \gamma(t) .
\]

This assumption can be interpreted as a bound on the rate at which the local system can emit an excitation into the environment, despite its non-negligible couplings with arbitrarily high frequencies in the environment modes. While we expect this assumption to be true for all physically reasonable open quantum system models, this assumption can be proved for two cases:

1. **A Markovian environment**, i.e. environments with a frequency independent coupling constant: \( v(\omega) = v_0 \). In this case, an application of the quantum regression theorem can be used to show that assumption 2 is satisfied for such environments (proposition 3 in appendix C).

2. **A environment with a square integrable coupling constant:** Environments with a bounded and square integrable coupling constant \( v \), assumption 2 can again be rigorously proven (proposition 4 in appendix C).

**C. Summary of results**

With these two assumptions, we can now prove the convergence of the pseudomode theory [49] and Wilson’s start-to-delta transformation [33] for simulating non-Markovian quantum systems. Our first result rigorously shows that in a finite amount of time, the localized system cannot excite arbitrarily high frequencies in the environment. More precisely,
Theorem 1 Suppose \( v \in C^b_b(\mathbb{R}) \) is a coupling function such that assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied. Denoting by \( \rho(t) \) the reduced density matrix of the local system at time \( t \) when an initial state \( |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle \) is evolved under the Hamiltonian in Eq. 4 and by \( \rho_{\omega_c}(t) \) the reduced density matrix of the local system at time \( t \) when the same initial state is evolved under the Hamiltonian
\[
H_{\omega_c}(t) = H_S(t) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \omega_a a_\omega^\dagger d\omega + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( v(\omega) a_\omega L^1 + v^*(\omega) a_\omega^\dagger L \right) \text{rect}_{\omega_c}(\omega) d\omega.
\]
then
\[
\|\rho(t) - \rho_{\omega_c}(t)\|_b \leq \epsilon(\omega_c, t),
\]
where \( \epsilon(\omega_c, t) \) is the cutoff error given by
\[
\epsilon(\omega_c, t) = \frac{f_1(t)}{\sqrt{\omega_c}} + \int_0^t f_2(\tau) \sqrt{V(\omega_c, \tau)} d\tau.
\]
Here \( V(\omega_c, t) \) is defined in assumption 1 and
\[
\begin{align*}
    f_1(\tau) &= \sqrt{2} \|v\|_\infty \|L\|_2 (2 + \gamma(\tau)\tau) e^{\|v\|_2^2 \|L\|_2^2 \tau/2}, \\
    f_2(\tau) &= \sqrt{2} \|L\|_2^2 (1 + \gamma(\tau)\tau) e^{\|v\|_2^2 \|L\|_2^2 \tau/2},
\end{align*}
\]
where \( \gamma(t) \) is introduced in assumption 2.

Consequently, the environment can be approximated by its restriction within a finite frequency window. While we will make use of this result in proving the convergence of the pseudomode approximation below, we point out that this result also lends theoretical rigor to a number of other numerical methods used in practice which either explicitly introduce a frequency cutoff on the environment modes [33, 34], or implicitly introduce a frequency cutoff by discretizing the environment modes in position-domain [35].

We point out that the bounds that we provide in theorem 1 grow exponentially with time \( t \)—this is a consequence of the fact that the local system can in principle emit an arbitrarily large number of excitations into the environment, and the only bound on the probability of emission of \( N \) particles that can be derived generally, as given by Eq. 8, is poissonian in \( N \) with a parameter that grows with \( t \). In practice, we expect the errors to not grow exponentially with \( t \) and the scaling of this error with \( t \) to depend on the number of particles that the local system is emitting into the environment.

Next, we consider a concrete approximation method based on pseudo-mode theory. Here, for a given coupling function \( v \), we approximate \( |v|^2 \) by a sum of lorentzians within a finite frequency window, and each Lorentzian can be described as an independent discrete bosonic mode coupling to a Markovian environment. It thus approximates the dynamics of the local system when evolved according to the Hamiltonian in Eq. 4 by the dynamics of a larger Markovian system. More precisely, for a pseudomode description with \( M \) bosonic modes, we consider an effective system whose Hilbert space is \( \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}} \) where \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}} \) is a Fock space over \( \mathbb{C}^M \), with a Hamiltonian \( \tilde{H}(t) \) given by
\[
\tilde{H}(t) = H_S(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i a_i^\dagger a_i + \sum_{i=1}^{M} g_i (a_i L^1 + a_i^\dagger L).
\]
Here \( \omega_i \) and \( g_i \) for \( i \in \{1, 2 \ldots M\} \) are parameters of the pseudomode description. The time-evolution of the effective system is governed by a Lindbladian master equation for its density matrix \( R(t) \):
\[
\frac{dR(t)}{dt} = i[\tilde{H}(t), R(t)] + \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{\kappa_i}{2} (2a_i R(t)a_i^\dagger - (a_i a_i^\dagger, R(t))),
\]
where \( a_i \) are the annihilation operators corresponding to the introduced bosonic modes and \( \kappa_i \) for \( i \in \{1, 2 \ldots M\} \) are their decay rates which are also parameters of the pseudomode description. This pseudomode description effectively computes the dynamics of the local system coupling to a bath with a coupling constant \( \tilde{v} \) where [49]
\[
|\tilde{v}|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{\kappa_i}{2\pi} \frac{g_i^2}{(\omega - \omega_i)^2 + \kappa_i^2/4}.
\]
To setup the pseudomode description for a coupling constant \( v \), we choose the parameters \( \omega_i, g_i, \kappa_i \) for \( i \in \{1, 2 \ldots M\} \) to best approximate \( |v|^2 \) with \( |\tilde{v}|^2 \) within a sufficiently large frequency window. The reduced state of the local system at time \( t \), obtained on evolving an initial state \( |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle, |\sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S \), can then be computed by evolving an initial density matrix \( R(0) = |\sigma\rangle \langle \sigma| \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle \langle \text{vac}| \in \mathcal{H}_S \) using this master equation and finally tracing over the auxiliary system.

We show that, for coupling functions that satisfy the two assumptions laid out in the previous subsection, pseudomode approximation of the non-Markovian system for computing its finite-time dynamics is guaranteed to converge for sufficiently large number of pseudomodes. Furthermore, we also characterize the rate of convergence i.e. how fast does the error incurred in the pseudomode approximation decrease with the number of pseudomodes used in the approximation. The convergence of the pseudomode approximation will, in general, depend on the details of the coupling function \( v \)—in particular, on how fast its derivative \( v'(\omega) \) can grow with \( \omega \), as well as how the cutoff error introduced in theorem 1 decreases with the cutoff frequency. For typical coupling functions encountered in practice, we expect a polynomial growth in the derivative of the coupling function with frequency and a polynomial fall off in the cutoff error with the cutoff frequency. Under these assumptions, as detailed in theorem below, we can show that the error incurred in the pseudomode approximation falls over polynomially in the number of pseudomodes.

Theorem 2 (Pseudomode approximation) Suppose \( v \in C^b_b(\mathbb{R}) \) is a coupling function such that assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied and let \( \rho(t) \) be the reduced state of the local system after evolving an initial state \( |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle \) using the
Hamiltonian in Eq. 4. Then, there exists a pseudomode description of the non-Markovian system with $M$ bosonic modes which provides an approximation $\hat{\rho}(t)$ to the reduced state of the local system such that $\|\rho(t) - \hat{\rho}(t)\|_\infty \to 0$ as $M \to \infty$. Furthermore, if $|v'\omega| = O(\text{poly}(\omega))$ and the cutoff error $\epsilon(\omega_c, t) = O(\text{poly}(t)\exp(O(t))\text{poly}(\omega_c^{-1}))$, then there exists a pseudomode description of the non-Markovian system with $M$ bosonic modes such that the trace-norm error in approximating the reduced local system state at time $t$ scales as $O(\text{poly}(t)\exp(O(t))\text{poly}(M^{-1}))$.

Finally, we consider the Wilson star-to-delta transformation, which utilizes a Lanczos recurrence [60] to approximate the non-Markovian environment. The approximation first introduces a frequency cutoff $\omega_c$ on the environment modes. Then, starting from an initial mode $A_0 \propto \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} v(\omega) a_\omega d\omega$, the Lanczos iteration with respect to the environment Hamiltonian is used to generate modes $A_1, A_2, A_3, \ldots$ with which the environment can be modelled by a 1D nearest neighbour model with non-uniform coupling strengths

$$H^E_{\omega_c} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \omega_i A_i^\dagger A_i + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} g_i (A_i A_{i+1}^\dagger + A_i^\dagger A_{i+1}),$$

where the parameters $\omega_i$ and $g_i$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ are obtained from the Lanczos iteration (see section III C for details). Furthermore, accounting for the frequency cutoff, the interaction Hamiltonian in between the local system and the environment is $\propto (A_0 L^\dagger + L A_0^\dagger)$. If all the (infinite number of) modes $A_0, A_1, A_2, \ldots$ are accounted for, then within the frequency cutoff, the dynamics of the non-Markovian system are captured exactly. However, if only a finite number of modes are accounted for (as in a practical numerical simulation), then an error will be incurred. We show that, given assumptions 1 and 2 hold, the Wilson star-to-delta transformation will converge for sufficiently large number of modes and that the convergence rate is polynomial in the number of modes.

**Theorem 3 (Wilson star-to-delta transformation)** Suppose $v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is a coupling function such that assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied and let $\hat{\rho}(t)$ be the reduced state of the local system after evolving an initial state $|\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle$ using the Hamiltonian in Eq. 4. Then, using Wilson’s star-to-delta transformation with $M$ modes provides an approximation $\hat{\rho}(t)$ to the reduced state of the local system such that $\|\rho(t) - \hat{\rho}(t)\|_\infty \to 0$ as $M \to \infty$. Furthermore, if the cutoff error $\epsilon(\omega_c, t) = O(\text{poly}(t)\exp(O(t))\text{poly}(\omega_c^{-1}))$, then the trace-norm error in approximating the reduced local system state at time $t$ scales as $O(\text{poly}(t)\exp(O(t))\text{poly}(M^{-1}))$.

Our proof of this convergence result relies on the connection between the Wilson’s star-to-delta transformation and orthogonal polynomials that has been previously established [33, 61].

The remainder of this paper contains detailed proofs of theorems 1–3. We only prove the most important results in the main text, and relegate longer calculations to the appendices.

### III. DETAILED PROOFS

#### A. Introducing a frequency cut-off on the environment

We first show rigorously that, subject to the assumptions 1 and 2 stated in Section II B, a frequency cutoff can be introduced in the environment without significantly impacting the dynamics of the local system. For a given frequency cutoff $\omega_c > 0$, we introduce an operator, $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} : H_S \otimes H_B \to H_S \otimes H_B$, that projects the joint system and environment state onto a state with no environment excitations at frequencies $|\omega| \geq \omega_c$ — more rigorously, $\forall N \geq 0, \sigma \in H_S, \psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} \int_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^N} \psi(\omega) \prod_{i=1}^{N} a_i^\dagger |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle d\omega = \int_{\omega \in [-\omega_c, \omega_c]^N} \psi(\omega) \prod_{i=1}^{N} a_i^\dagger |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle d\omega. \quad (11)$$

Furthermore, we define $Q_{\omega_c} = 1 - \mathcal{P}_{\omega_c}$. It is straightforward to see that the Hamiltonians defined in Eqs. 4 and 9 satisfy $H_{\omega_c}(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} H(t) \mathcal{P}_{\omega_c}$. We now study the error introduced by evolving an initial state under the Hamiltonian $H_{\omega_c}(t)$ instead of the Hamiltonian $H(t)$. This is made explicit in the following lemma.

**Lemma 1** Given an initial state $|\psi_0\rangle$ that satisfies $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} |\psi_0\rangle = |\psi_0\rangle$, and denoting by $U(t_1, t_2)$ and $U_{\omega_c}(t_1, t_2)$ the propagators corresponding to $H(t)$ and $H_{\omega_c}(t)$ respectively, the states $|\psi(t)\rangle = U(t, 0) |\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_{\omega_c}(t)\rangle = U_{\omega_c}(t, 0) |\psi_0\rangle$ satisfy

$$||\psi(t)\rangle - |\psi_{\omega_c}(t)\rangle|| \leq \int_0^t \|\mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} H(s) Q_{\omega_c} |\psi(s)\rangle\| ds$$

**Proof:** Note that $|\psi(t)\rangle = \mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} |\psi(t)\rangle + Q_{\omega_c} |\psi(t)\rangle$. From the Schrödinger’s equation for $|\psi(t)\rangle$, it then follows that

$$i \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} |\psi(t)\rangle = \mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} H(t) |\psi(t)\rangle,$$

$$= H_{\omega_c}(t) \mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} |\psi(t)\rangle + \mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} H(t) Q_{\omega_c} |\psi(t)\rangle,$$

which can be integrated to obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} |\psi(t)\rangle = |\psi_{\omega_c}(t)\rangle - i \int_0^t U_{\omega_c}(t, s) \mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} H(s) Q_{\omega_c} |\psi(s)\rangle ds.$$

Consequently

$$|\psi(t)\rangle - |\psi_{\omega_c}(t)\rangle = Q_{\omega_c} |\psi(t)\rangle - i \int_0^t U_{\omega_c}(t, s) \mathcal{P}_{\omega_c} H(s) Q_{\omega_c} |\psi(s)\rangle ds,$$

from which the statement of the lemma follows. $\square$

The two terms in the error estimate provided in this lemma can be respectively interpreted as the error introduced in quantum state of the system on ignoring the high-frequency components of the environment state, and the error introduced by
not accounting for the coupling of the high-frequency components of the environment state to the low-frequency components by virtue of their interaction with the local system. In the following lemmas, we show that both of these errors are bounded by a factor that goes to 0 as the frequency cutoff $\omega_c$ is made increasingly larger.

**Lemma 2** If assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied, it follows that for $t > 0$,

$$\|Q_{\omega_c}|\psi(t)\|_2 \leq \frac{\|v\|\|L\|}{\sqrt{\omega_c}} (2 + \gamma(t)t)e^{\pi\|v\|_\infty^2\|L\|^2 t},$$

where $\gamma(t)$ is introduced in assumption 2.

**Proof:** It follows from the definition of $Q_{\omega_c}$ that

$$\|Q_{\omega_c}|\psi(t)\|_2 = \sqrt{\langle \psi(t) | (I - P_{\omega_c}) | \psi(t) \rangle}.$$

Using Eq. 7, we obtain

$$\langle \psi(t) | \psi(t) \rangle = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle \sigma | F_N^t(\omega; t) F_N(\omega; t) | \sigma \rangle \prod_{i=1}^N |v(\omega_i)|^2 d\omega$$

and

$$\langle \psi(t) | P_{\omega_c} | \psi(t) \rangle = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N!} \int_{[-\omega_c, \omega_c]^N} \langle \sigma | F_N^t(\omega; t) F_N(\omega; t) | \sigma \rangle \prod_{i=1}^N |v(\omega_i)|^2 d\omega.$$

Therefore,

$$\langle \psi(t) | Q_{\omega_c} | \psi(t) \rangle \leq \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{\|v\|^{2N}}{(N - 1)!} \int_{|\omega_1| \geq \omega_c \ldots |\omega_N| \geq \omega_c} \langle \sigma | F_N^t(\omega; t) F_N(\omega; t) | \sigma \rangle d\omega = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2\pi \|v\|^{2N}}{2\pi(N - 1)!} \int_{|\omega| \geq \omega_c} \langle \sigma | H_N^t(\omega, s; t) H_N(\omega, s; t) | \sigma \rangle d\omega ds,$$

where, for $N \geq 1$ and $s \in [0, t]^{N-1}$, $H_N(\omega, s; t)$ is given by

$$H_N(\omega, s; t) = \int_{s'} G_N([s', s]; t) e^{-i\omega(t-s')} ds'.$$

Using integration by parts, together with assumption 2, we immediately obtain that

$$\|H_N(\omega, s; t)\| \leq \frac{(2 + \gamma(t)t)}{\omega} L^2,$$

and therefore

$$\langle \psi(t) | Q_{\omega_c} | \psi(t) \rangle \leq \frac{\|v\|_\infty^2 \|L\|^2}{\sqrt{\omega_c}} (2 + \gamma(t)t)^2 e^{\pi\|v\|_\infty^2\|L\|^2 t},$$

from which the lemma immediately follows $\square$.

**Lemma 3** If assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied, it follows that for $t > 0$,

$$\int_0^t \|P_{\omega_c} H(\tau) Q_{\omega_c} |\psi(\tau)\|_2 d\tau \leq \int_0^t \|L\|^2 (1 + \gamma(\tau)\tau)^{1/2} e^{\pi\|v\|_\infty^2\|L\|^2 t} d\tau,$$

where $\gamma(t)$ is introduced in assumption 2.

**Proof:** Using the definitions of $P_{\omega_c}$ and $Q_{\omega_c}$, it follows that

$$P_{\omega_c} H(\tau) Q_{\omega_c} |\psi(\tau)\rangle = \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(N - 1)!} \int_{|\omega_1| \geq \omega_c \ldots |\omega_N| \geq \omega_c} \langle \sigma | F_N^t(\omega; t) F_N(\omega; t) | \sigma \rangle d\omega.$$

Therefore,

$$\|P_{\omega_c} H(\tau) Q_{\omega_c} |\psi(\tau)\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2\pi \|v\|^{2N}}{(N - 1)!} \int_{|\omega| \geq \omega_c} \langle \sigma | H_N^t(\omega, s; t) H_N(\omega, s; t) | \sigma \rangle d\omega ds.$$

To proceed further, we make use of assumption 1. For $\tau > 0, N \geq 1, s \in [0, t]^{N-1}$, we construct a positive kernel $K \in AC_{sym}([0, \tau]^2)$ from the $N$–point Green’s function via $K(t', t'') = \langle \sigma | G_N^t([t', t''); \tau) LL^t G_N([t'', \tau); \tau] | \sigma \rangle$. An application of the assumption 1 using this kernel yields $\forall s \in [0, t]^{N-1}$

$$\int_{|\omega| \geq \omega_c} \langle \sigma | H_N^t(\omega, s; t) H_N(\omega, s; t) | \sigma \rangle d\omega ds \leq V(\omega_c, t) \int_{[0, t]^{N-1}} \langle \sigma | G_N^t([t', s); \tau) LL^t G_N([t', \tau); \tau] | \sigma \rangle^2 d\tau,$$

where $V(\omega_c, t)$ is the function introduced in assumption 1. Using assumption 2, we immediately obtain that $\forall s \in [0, t]^{N-1}$

$$\|\langle \sigma | G_N^t([t', s); \tau) LL^t G_N([t', \tau); \tau] | \sigma \rangle\|^2 \leq \|L\|^2 (1 + \gamma(t)t)^2.$$

It thus follows that

$$\|P_{\omega_c} H(\tau) Q_{\omega_c} |\psi(\tau)\| \leq \|L\|^2 (1 + \gamma(t)\tau)^{1/2} e^{\pi\|v\|_\infty^2\|L\|^2 t}.$$

Using this bound, the lemma statement follows $\square$. 
Proof of theorem 1: Let $|\sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$ be an arbitrary local system state, and denote by $|\psi(t)\rangle$ the joint state of the system and the environment obtained on evolving $|\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle$ under the Hamiltonian $H(t)$. Similarly, we denote by $|\psi_{\omega_i}(t)\rangle$ the joint state of the system and environment obtained on evolving $|\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle$ under the Hamiltonian $H_{\omega_i}(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\omega_i} H(t) \mathcal{P}_{\omega_i}$. We denote by $\rho(t)$ and $\rho_{\omega_i}(t)$ the reduced state of the local system at time $t$ i.e. $\rho(t) = \text{Tr}_{H_{\omega}} |\psi(t)\rangle \langle \psi(t)|$ and $\rho_{\omega_i}(t) = \text{Tr}_{H_{\omega}} |\psi(t)\rangle \langle \psi(t)|$. We can then use the contractivity of the partial trace, as well as the relationship between the trace-norm distance and the norm distance between two pure states (Eq. 3), we obtain
\begin{equation}
\|\rho(t) - \rho_{\omega_i}(t)\|_\text{tr} \leq \|\langle \psi(t)| - |\psi_{\omega_i}(t)\rangle\| \langle \psi(t)|\rangle - |\psi_{\omega_i}(t)\rangle\rangle.
\end{equation}

An application of lemmas 1, 2 and 3 allows us to bound $\|\langle \psi(t)| - |\psi_{\omega_i}(t)\rangle\|\langle \psi(t)|\rangle - |\psi_{\omega_i}(t)\rangle\rangle$ and obtain the result in theorem □.

B. Convergence of pseudomode approximation

Having established that, for the class of open quantum systems under consideration, high frequencies of the environment modes can be safely neglected, we next consider approximating the environment by pseudomodes within a sufficiently large bandwidth. In order to rigorously show that this is possible, we first develop bounds on the error incurred on approximating one bounded and square integrable coupling constant with another one which are precisely stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 4 Let $v_1, v_2 \in C^\infty_b(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R})$ be coupling functions and let $H_1(t), H_2(t)$ denote the Hamiltonians corresponding to these coupling functions as given by Eq. 4. Denoting by $|\psi_i(t)\rangle$ as the joint state of the local system and environment when an initial state $|\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle$, with $|\sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$, is evolved under the Hamiltonian $H_i(t), i \in \{1, 2\}$, then
\begin{equation}
\|\psi_1(t) - \psi_2(t)\| \leq g(t) d_{\omega_i}(v_1, v_2),
\end{equation}
where $g(t) = \int_0^t \left( \sqrt{1 + \|v_1\|_\infty^2} \int \|L\|_2^2 e^{2\pi i v_1 \int \|L\|_2^2} + \|v_1\|_\infty^2 \int \|L\|_2^2 e^{2\pi i v_1 \int \|L\|_2^2} \right) d\tau$ and $d(v_1, v_2) = \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |v_1(\omega) - v_2(\omega)|^2 d\omega \right)^{1/2}$, quantifies a distance between the two coupling functions.

Proof: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we denote by $U_i(t, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ the propagator corresponding to the Hamiltonian $H_i$. Furthermore, let $|\psi_i(t)\rangle = U_i(t, 0)|\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle$, where $|\sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$. It can be seen that
\begin{equation}
\|\psi_1(t) - \psi_2(t)\| = \|\phi(t) - |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle\|,
\end{equation}
where
\begin{equation}
\phi(t) = U_2^\dagger(t, 0)|\psi_1(t)\rangle.
\end{equation}

An integral equation can easily be derived by differentiating this equation, followed by integrating it from 0 to $t$ to obtain
\begin{equation}
\frac{d}{dt}\|\phi(t)\| = \|\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle + i \int_0^t U_2(t, \tau)(H_2(\tau) - H_1(\tau))|\psi_1(\tau)\rangle d\tau,
\end{equation}
from which we obtain the bound
\begin{equation}
\|\psi_1(t) - \psi_2(t)\| \leq \int_0^t \|H_2(\tau) - H_1(\tau)\| |\psi_1(\tau)\| d\tau.
\end{equation}

We note from the definition of the Hamiltonians $H_i(t)$ that $H_2(t) - H_1(t) = \Delta^+ L + L^\dagger \Delta^-$ where
\begin{align*}
\Delta^+ &= \int_0^\infty (v_1^\dagger(\omega) - v_2^\dagger(\omega)) a_\omega^\dagger d\omega, \\
\Delta^- &= \int_{-\infty}^0 (v_1(\omega) - v_2(\omega)) a_\omega d\omega.
\end{align*}

Therefore,
\begin{equation}
\|\psi_1(t) - \psi_2(t)\| \leq \| L \|_2 \left( \int_0^t \|\Delta^+ |\psi_1(\tau)\rangle\| d\tau + \int_0^t \|\Delta^- |\psi_1(\tau)\rangle\| d\tau \right).
\end{equation}

Note that the operators $\Delta^\pm$ are unbounded, and consequently the norms in the above equations cannot be estimated trivially by introducing the operator norms of $\Delta^\pm$. However, $\Delta^\pm$ are bounded when restricted to only the $N$-particle subspaces of the environment’s Hilbert space. In particular, for a $N$-particle state $|\psi_N\rangle$
\begin{align*}
\|\Delta^+ |\psi_N\rangle\|^2 &\leq \|\psi_N\|^2 (N + 1) d^2(v_1, v_2), \\
\|\Delta^- |\psi_N\rangle\|^2 &\leq \|\psi_N\|^2 N d^2(v_1, v_2).
\end{align*}

Furthermore, the $N$-particle component of the state $|\psi_1(t)\rangle$ has a bounded norm, with Eq. 8 providing the explicit bound. It thus immediately follows that
\begin{align*}
\|\Delta^+ |\psi_1(t)\rangle\|^2 &\leq \int_0^\infty |v_1(\omega)|^2 \|L\|_2^2 e^{2\pi i v_1 \int \|L\|_2^2} d\omega \leq \|v_1\|^2 \|L\|_2^2 e^{2\pi i v_1 \int \|L\|_2^2} d^2(v_1, v_2) \\
\|\Delta^- |\psi_1(t)\rangle\|^2 &\leq \int_0^\infty |v_1(\omega)|^2 \|L\|_2^2 e^{2\pi i v_1 \int \|L\|_2^2} d\omega \leq \|v_1\|^2 \|L\|_2^2 e^{2\pi i v_1 \int \|L\|_2^2} d^2(v_1, v_2)
\end{align*}

These estimates, along with Eq. 14, proves the statement of the lemma. □.

While this estimate allows for an assessment of the error incurred in approximating one coupling function with another, if only the state of the local system is of interest, the phase of the coupling function is irrelevant. This is easily seen from
the fact that the transformation \( a_\omega \rightarrow a_\omega e^{i\theta(\omega)} \) and \( v(\omega) \rightarrow v(\omega)e^{-i\theta(\omega)} \), for any \( \theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), leaves both the Hamiltonian in Eq. 4 and the initial state (provided the environment is in the vacuum state) unchanged. Consequently, a bound can be provided on the error in the reduced density matrix of the local system that only depends on the magnitude of the coupling constant, as made explicit by the following lemma.

**Lemma 5** Let \( v_1, v_2 \in C_\infty^2(\mathbb{R}) \) be coupling functions and let \( H_1(t), H_2(t) \) denote the Hamiltonians corresponding to these coupling functions as given by Eq. 4. Denoting by \( \rho(t) \) the reduced state of the local system when an initial state \( |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle \), with \( |\sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S \), is evolved under the Hamiltonian \( H_1(t) \), \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), then

\[
\|\rho_1(t) - \rho_2(t)\|_F \leq \sqrt{2}g(t)\left[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| |v_1(\omega)|^2 - |v_2(\omega)|^2\right|d\omega \right]^{1/2}
\]

where \( g(t) \) is the function defined in lemma 4.

**Proof:** Denote by \( \theta(\omega) \) the phase of the coupling coefficient \( v_i(\omega) \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}, i \in \{1, 2\} \). Applying the transformation \( a_\omega \rightarrow a_\omega e^{-i\theta(\omega)} \) to the Hamiltonian \( H_i \), we obtain

\[
\tilde{H}_i(t) = H_S(t) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \omega a_\omega^\dagger a_\omega d\omega + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |v_i(\omega)|^2 (a_\omega L^\dagger + a_\omega^\dagger L)d\omega.
\]

For \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), denote by \( |\psi_i(t)\rangle \) the state obtained by evolving \( |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle \) under the Hamiltonian \( \tilde{H}_i(t) \). While these states, in their entirety, will be different from the ones obtained on evolving the system under the Hamiltonian \( H_i(t), i \in \{1, 2\} \), the reduced density matrix of the local system will be the same. Consequently, we can bound the error in the reduced density matrix of the local system by simply bounding the error between the states \( |\psi_1(t)\rangle \) and \( |\psi_2(t)\rangle \), which can be done with an application of lemma 4:

\[
\||\psi_1(t)\rangle - |\psi_2(t)\rangle\|| \leq g(t)d(|v_1|, |v_2|),
\]

where \( g(t) \) and \( d(v_1, v_2) \) are defined in lemma 4. Furthermore, we note that

\[
d^2(|v_1|, |v_2|) \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| |v_1(\omega)|^2 - |v_2(\omega)|^2\right|d\omega,
\]

and thus we obtain

\[
\||\psi_1(t)\rangle - |\psi_2(t)\rangle\|| \leq g(t)\left[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| |v_1(\omega)|^2 - |v_2(\omega)|^2\right|d\omega \right]^{1/2}
\]

Finally, using Eq. 3 together with the fact that partial trace is contractive, we obtain the bound provided in the lemma □.

We next consider the pseudomode approximation for non-Markovian dynamics the coupling constant \( v(\omega) \) by a sum of lorentzians, and solving a Markovian master equation for the resulting approximation. This procedure, can be made precise with the following result from Ref. [49].

**Lemma 6** [Pseudomodes from Ref. [49]] Given a coupling constant \( |v(\omega)|^2 \) which satisfies

\[
|v(\omega)|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{V_i}{(\omega - \omega_i)^2 + \kappa_i^2/4} \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R},
\]

where \( V_i \geq 0 \) and \( \omega_i \in \mathbb{R} \forall i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M\} \), then the reduced state \( \rho(t) \) of the local system obtained in evolving an initial state \( |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle \) under the Hamiltonian given by Eq. 4 can be computed exactly by solving the following problem: Consider a system with Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{aux} \), where \( \mathcal{H}_{aux} \) is the Fock space over \( \mathbb{C}^M \), and Hamiltonian

\[
\tilde{H}(t) = H_S(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i a_i^\dagger a_i + \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left( \frac{2\pi V_i}{\kappa_i} \right)^{1/2} \left( a_i L^\dagger + L a_i^\dagger \right),
\]

with \( H_S(t) \) being the Hamiltonian of the local system introduced in Eq. 4 and \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_M \) being the annihilation operators for the Fock space \( \mathcal{H}_{aux} \). Compute the state \( \rho(t) \) obtained on evolving an initial state \( |\sigma\rangle \otimes |0\rangle^M \) under the master equation

\[
\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = -i[\tilde{H}(t), \rho(t)] + \kappa_i \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left( \frac{1}{2} (a_i^\dagger a_i + a_i a_i^\dagger \rho(t)) + a_i \rho(t) a_i^\dagger \right),
\]

then \( \rho(t) = \text{Tr}_{aux}[\rho(t)] \).

Consequently, to use pseudomodes to simulate the dynamics of a non-Markovian quantum system, we would need to approximate the magnitude-square of the coupling function, \( |v(\omega)|^2 \), by a sum of Lorentzian. Since, as shown in theorem 1, the dynamics of local system is only impacted by the coupling function within a finite frequency window, a natural procedure to obtain the sum of Lorentzian decomposition would be to choose a frequency cutoff \( \omega_c > 0 \), an integer \( M \) indicating the number of Lorentzians and solve the following optimization problem:

\[
\min_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^M, \kappa_i \in \mathbb{R}^+} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| |v(\omega)|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{V_i}{(\omega - \omega_i)^2 + \kappa_i^2/4} \right|d\omega.
\]

While in practice this optimization problem can be solved numerically, a theoretical analysis of the resulting approximation error as quantified by the solution of this problem is hard since it is a non-convex problem. However, as is made concrete in the following lemma (proved in appendix D), an upper bound on the approximation error can be provided by an explicit Lorentzian construction.

**Lemma 7** Given a differentiable function \( \Gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty) \) which is also bounded, then for \( \omega_c, \gamma \in (0, \infty) \), \( M \in \mathbb{N} \),

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \Gamma(\omega) \text{rect}_{\omega_c}(\omega) - \tilde{\Gamma}(\omega)\right|d\omega \leq \varepsilon(\omega_c, \kappa, M)
\]
where $\hat{\Gamma} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a lorentzian approximation to $\Gamma$ given by

$$
\hat{\Gamma}(\omega) = \sum_{n=1}^{M} \frac{\kappa \delta \Gamma(\omega_n)}{(\omega - \omega_n)^2 + \kappa^2},
$$

with $\delta = 2\omega_c/(M - 1)$ and $\omega_n = -\omega_c + (n - 1)\delta$ and $\varepsilon(\omega_c, \kappa, M)$ is the approximation error which satisfies the scaling

$$
\varepsilon(\omega_c, \kappa, M) = O\left( F_{\text{max}} \kappa \log \frac{\kappa}{\omega_c} \right) + O\left( \omega_c \kappa F_{\text{max}}(\omega_c) \log \frac{\kappa}{\omega_c} \right) + \frac{\omega_c^3}{\kappa^3} F_{\text{max}}(\omega_c) + O\left( \frac{\Gamma_{\text{max}}}{M} \right),
$$

where $F_{\text{max}} = \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} \Gamma(\omega)$ and $F_{\text{max}}^d(\omega_c) = \sup_{\omega \in [-\omega_c, \omega_c]} |\Gamma'(\omega)|$.

Equipped with this error bound on the lorentzian approximation of the magnitude square of the coupling function $v$, we can now show that the pseudomode approximation is guaranteed to converge as well as provide a scaling of the resulting approximation error with the number of pseudomodes.

**Proof of theorem 2:** For a coupling function $v \in \mathcal{C}_b^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, we denote by $\rho(t)$ the true reduced state of the local system at time $t$ i.e. the reduced state obtained when evolved as per the Hamiltonian in Eq. 4. First we introduce a frequency cutoff $\omega_c$ — we denote by $\rho_{\omega_c}(t)$ the reduced state of the local system obtained when evolved as per Hamiltonian in Eq. 9. Second, we approximate $v \cdot \text{rect}_{\omega_c}$ by a sum of lorentzians by using the construction of lemma 7 to obtain a pseudomode approximation to the non-Markovian system (lemma 6). Let $\hat{\rho}(t)$ be the true reduced state of the local system at time $t$ obtained on using the pseudomode approximation. We estimate the error between the true reduced state $\rho(t)$ and the reduced state using the pseudomode approximation $\hat{\rho}(t)$ via

$$
\|\rho(t) - \hat{\rho}(t)\|_v \leq \|\rho(t) - \rho_{\omega_c}(t)\|_v + \|\rho_{\omega_c}(t) - \hat{\rho}(t)\|_v.
$$

From theorem 1, it follows that the cutoff error decreases as $\omega_c \to \infty$. To estimate the Lorentzian approximation error, we use lemmas 5 and 7, which allows us to relate this error to the frequency cutoff $\omega_c$, number of pseudomodes $M$ as well as the linewidths of the pseudomodes $\kappa$. The key idea behind showing that the sum total of these two errors goes to 0 as $M \to \infty$ is to choose $\kappa$ and $\omega_c$ as a function of $M$ such that (i) the Lorentzian approximation error decreases with $M$ and (ii) $\omega_c$ increases with $M$ (as a consequence of which the cutoff error decreases with $M$). Below, we show that this choice can always be made for any coupling function $v$.

We make the choice $\kappa = \Theta(M^{-1/4})$. Furthermore, consider the increasing functions $f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5 : [0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ of the cutoff frequencies that appear in the error estimate $f_1(\omega_c) = \log \omega_c$, $f_2(\omega_c) = \omega_c \Gamma_{\text{max}}(\omega_c)$, $f_3 = \omega_c \log(\omega_c) F_{\text{max}}^d(\omega_c)$, $f_4(\omega_c) = \omega_c^2$ and $f_5(\omega_c) = \omega_c^3 F_{\text{max}}(\omega_c)$. We note that since by definition $F_{\text{max}}^d(\omega_c)$ is an increasing non-negative function, $f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4 = O(f_5) \omega_c \to \infty$. We choose $\omega_c = \Theta(f_5^{-1}(M^{1/5}))$ — we note that since $f_5^{-1}$ is an increasing function, $f_1(\omega_c), f_2(\omega_c), f_3(\omega_c), f_4(\omega_c) = O(M^{1/8})$ as $M \to \infty$. Using these choices of $\kappa$ and $\omega_c$, the error in approximating $|v|^2$ with a sum of lorentzians, as calculated in Lemma 7, is $O(M^{-1/8})$ and thus goes to 0 as $M \to \infty$. Furthermore, since $\omega_c$ grows with $M$, it follows from theorem 1 that the cutoff error goes to 0 as $M \to \infty$.

To show that, under the assumption of a polynomial growth in $|v'(\omega)|$ with $\omega$ and a polynomial fall off of the cutoff error with $\omega$, the total approximation error decreases polynomially with the number of pseudomodes, we simply have to note that in the above proof, $f_5^{-1}(M^{1/5})$ will be poly($M$) and consequently the construction of theorem 3 yields a cutoff frequency $\omega_c$ which grows polynomially with $M$. It is already shown in the proof of theorem 3 that the error in approximating the magnitude square of the coupling function with a sum of Lorentzian reduces polynomially with the number of pseudomodes, and with this choice of $\omega_c$ the cutoff error also reduces polynomially with the number of pseudomodes $\square$.

**C. Convergence of Wilson’s star-to-delta transformation**

Finally, we consider the Wilson’s star-to-delta transformation for simulating non-Markovian quantum systems. This transformation maps the simulation of the non-Markovian quantum system to a Hamiltonian simulation problem via the Lanczos iteration.

We first introduce a frequency cutoff $\omega_c$ into the problem — in order to apply Lanczos iteration, we need to define a Hamiltonian which would generate the Lanczos chain and an initial mode which serves as the starting point for the Lanczos iteration. The Hamiltonian generating the Lanczos chain is simply the Hamiltonian of the environment with a frequency cutoff i.e.

$$
H_{\text{env}} = \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} \omega a_\omega^{\dagger} a_\omega d\omega,
$$

and the initial mode $A_0$ is constructed from the coupling function $v$:

$$
A_0 = \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} v(\omega) a_\omega d\omega \sqrt{\int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} |v(\omega)|^2 d\omega}.
$$

The Lanczos iteration then generates a sequence of modes, $A_0, A_1, A_2, A_3 \ldots$ which can be expressed as

$$
A_i = \frac{\int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} p_i(\omega)v(\omega) a_\omega d\omega}{\sqrt{\int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} p_i^2(\omega)|v(\omega)|^2 d\omega}},
$$

where $p_i(\omega)$ is the $i$th orthogonal polynomial generated from $p_0(\omega) = 1$ and which satisfy the recurrence

$$
p_{i+1}(\omega) = (\omega - \alpha_i)p_i(\omega) - \beta_i p_{i-1}(\omega),
$$

(16a)
with $\beta_0 = 0$ and

$$\alpha_i = \frac{\int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} p_i^2(\omega)|v(\omega)|^2d\omega}{\int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} p_i^2(\omega)|v(\omega)|^2d\omega} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_i = \frac{\int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} p_i^2'\omega(\omega)|v(\omega)|^2d\omega}{\int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} p_i^2(\omega)|v(\omega)|^2d\omega}.$$  

(16b)

The operators $A_i$ satisfy $[A_i, A_j^\dagger] = \delta_{i,j}$ and the Hamiltonian $H_{E_{\omega_c}}^E$ can be expressed as

$$H_{E_{\omega_c}}^E = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \alpha_i A_i^\dagger A_i + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\beta_{i+1}} (A_i A_{i+1}^\dagger + A_{i+1} A_i^\dagger).$$  

(17)

Furthermore, with this representation of the environment, the full local system-environment Hamiltonian, with a frequency cutoff, can be expressed as

$$H_{\omega_c}(t) = H_S(t) + H_{E_{\omega_c}}^E + (L^\dagger B + B^\dagger L),$$  

(18)

where $B = \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} v(\omega) a_\omega d\omega = (\int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} |v(\omega)|^2d\omega)^{1/2} A_0$.

The representation of the Hamiltonian in Eqs. 17 and 18 with the (infinite sequence of) Lanczos modes is exact within the frequency cutoff. To perform a numerical simulation, we need to approximate the infinite sequence of Lanczos modes with a finite number of modes. With $N$ modes, the environment Hamiltonian can be approximated as

$$H_{E_{\omega_c},N}^E = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \alpha_i A_i^\dagger A_i + \sum_{i=0}^{N-2} \sqrt{\beta_{i+1}} (A_i A_{i+1}^\dagger + A_{i+1} A_i^\dagger),$$  

(19)

and the full Hamiltonian can be approximated by

$$H_{\omega_c,N}(t) = H_S(t) + H_{E_{\omega_c},N}^E + (L^\dagger B + B^\dagger L).$$  

(20)

In order to assess the convergence and accuracy of the approximation, it is of interest to compare the quantum state obtained on separately evolving the local system with $H_{\omega_c}(t)$ and $H_{\omega_c,N}(t)$. It is easier to do this in the interaction picture with respect to the environment Hamiltonian, as made concrete in the following lemma.

**Lemma 8** Let $|\psi_{\omega_c}(t)\rangle$ and $|\psi_{\omega_c,N}(t)\rangle$ be the joint state of the local system and environment obtained on evolving an initial state $|\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle$, with $|\sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$, with respect to $H_{\omega_c}(t)$ and $H_{\omega_c,N}(t)$ respectively, then

$$\|\rho_{\omega_c}(t) - \rho_{\omega_c,N}(t)\|_0 \leq \sqrt{2g(t)} \left( \sup_{s \in [0,t]} \|\delta B_{\omega_c,N}(s), \delta B_{\omega_c,N}^\dagger(s)\| \right)^{1/2},$$

$$g(t) = \int_0^t \left( \sqrt{1 + \|v\|_{\infty}^2 \tau} \|L\|_2^2 e^{2\pi\|v\|_{\infty}^2 \|L\|_2^2 \tau} + \|v\|_{\infty} \sqrt{\tau} \|L\|_2 e^{\pi\|v\|_{\infty}^2 \|L\|_2^2 \tau} \right) dt,$$

and

$$\delta B_{\omega_c,N}(s) = e^{isH_{\omega_c}^E} B e^{-isH_{\omega_c}^E} - e^{isH_{\omega_c}^E} B e^{-isH_{\omega_c}^E}. $$

**Proof:** The proof of this lemma is very similar to that of lemma 4, but repeating the analysis in the interaction picture with respect to the Hamiltonian of the environment ($H_{E_{\omega_c}}^E$ or $H_{E_{\omega_c},N}^E$ for the two models under consideration). The two Hamiltonians under consideration, after moving into the interaction picture, denoted by $\tilde{H}_{\omega_c}(t)$ and $\tilde{H}_{\omega_c,N}(t)$ are given by

$$\tilde{H}_{\omega_c}(t) = H_S(t) + (B_{\omega_c}(t) L^\dagger + B_{\omega_c}(t) L),$$

$$\tilde{H}_{\omega_c,N}(t) = H_S(t) + (B_{\omega_c,N}(t), L^\dagger + B_{\omega_c,N}(t) L),$$

where $B_{\omega_c}(t) = e^{itH_{\omega_c}^E} B e^{-itH_{\omega_c}^E}$ and $B_{\omega_c,N}(t) = e^{itH_{\omega_c,N}^E} B e^{-itH_{\omega_c,N}^E}$. We denote by $|\psi_{\omega_c}(t)\rangle$ and $|\psi_{\omega_c,N}(t)\rangle$ as the solution of the Schrodinger equation with Hamiltonians $\tilde{H}_{\omega_c}(t)$ and $\tilde{H}_{\omega_c,N}(t)$ and with the initial state being $|\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle$. We note that the norm of the $N$-particle component of $|\psi_{\omega_c}(t)\rangle$ will satisfy the bound in Eq. 8 since it corresponds to the quantum state obtained from a Hamiltonian of the form Eq. 4 with coupling function $v \cdot \text{rect}_{\omega_c}$, and translating this state into the interaction picture does not change these norms. Consequently, we obtain

$$\|\|\psi_{\omega_c,N}(t)\| - |\psi_{\omega_c}(t)\|\|_0 \leq \int_0^t \left( \|\tilde{H}_{\omega_c}(s) - \tilde{H}_{\omega_c,N}(s)\| |\psi_{\omega_c}(s)\| \right) ds,$$

$$\leq \|L\|_2 \int_0^t \left( \|\delta B_{\omega_c,N}(s), \psi_{\omega_c}(s)\| + \|\delta B_{\omega_c,N}(s), \psi_{\omega_c}(s)\| \right) ds.$$

Noting that for an $N$-particle wave-packet $|\psi^N\rangle$ and for all $s \in [0, t]$

$$\|\delta B_{\omega_c,N}(s), \psi^N\|_2^2 \leq \|\psi^N\|_2^2 \|B_{\omega_c,N}(s), B_{\omega_c,N}^\dagger(s)\|,$$

$$\|\delta B_{\omega_c,N}(s), \psi^N\|_2^2 \leq \|\psi^N\|_2^2 (N + 1) \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\delta B_{\omega_c,N}(s), \delta B_{\omega_c,N}(s)\|.$$
Finally, the lemma follows using the contractivity of the partial trace together with Eq. 3 □.

An explicit dependence of the error bound in lemma 8 on the number of modes \( N \) can be obtained by utilizing the connection between orthogonal polynomials and the gauss quadrature method for approximating integrals with summations. This is provided in the following lemma and proved explicitly in appendix E.

Lemma 9 Let \( \delta B_{\omega_c,N}(s) \) be as defined in lemma 8, then

\[
\left| \delta B_{\omega_c,N}(s) - \delta B_{\omega_c,N}(s) \right| \leq C \left( \frac{\|v\|^2}{2^{N+2} s^{N+1}} \right).
\]

Equipped with this error bound, we can now show that for sufficiently large frequency cutoff and sufficiently large number of modes, the Wilson star-to-delta transformation is guaranteed to converge to the correct result.

Proof of theorem 3: The proof of this theorem parallels that of theorem 2. For a coupling function \( v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \), we denote by \( \rho(t) \) the true reduced state of the local system at time \( t \) i.e. the reduced state obtained when evolved as per the Hamiltonian in Eq. 4. First we introduce a frequency cutoff \( \omega_c \) — we denote by \( \rho_{\omega_c}(t) \) the reduced state of the local system obtained when evolved as per Hamiltonian in Eq. 9. Second, we use the Wilson’s star-to-delta transformation with \( M \) modes to obtain an approximation \( \hat{\rho}(t) \) to \( \rho_{\omega_c}(t) \). We estimate the error between the true reduced state \( \rho(t) \) and the reduced state using the pseudomode approximation \( \hat{\rho}(t) \) via

\[
\|\rho(t) - \hat{\rho}(t)\| \leq \|\rho(t) - \rho_{\omega_c}(t)\| + \|\rho_{\omega_c}(t) - \hat{\rho}(t)\|.
\]

From theorem 1, it follows that the cutoff error decreases as \( \omega_c \to \infty \). To estimate \( \|\rho_{\omega_c}(t) - \hat{\rho}(t)\| \), we use lemmas 8 and 9, which allows us to relate this error to the frequency cutoff \( \omega_c \) and the number of modes \( M \). We note that choosing \( \omega_c \) to increase sublinearly with \( M \), both the cutoff error \( \|\rho(t) - \rho_{\omega_c}(t)\| \) and \( \|\rho_{\omega_c}(t) - \hat{\rho}(t)\| \) go to 0 as \( M \to \infty \), thus providing a convergence guarantee for Wilson star-to-delta transformation. Furthermore, with this choice of \( \omega_c \) and under the assumption that the cutoff error falls polynomially with \( \omega_c \), it immediately follows that the approximation error decreases polynomially with the number of modes \( M \) □.

Several questions broadly of interest to open quantum system theory are left open in this work. One of the questions that we leave unanswered is to study the class of coupling functions for which the resulting system-environment dynamics is well defined. For instance, a number of models in practice use a point-coupling model in between the local system and a gaussian bosonic environment which cannot be described by a square integrable coupling function yet generate physically reasonable dynamics. The theory of single point coupling (which generates Markovian local system dynamics) can be rigorously dealt with using the machinery of quantum stochastic calculus, however it is unclear if extensions to multiple point couplings (which generates non-Markovian local system dynamics) is possible. A rigorous study of this problem would be relevant to advancing the mathematical understanding of non-Markovian open quantum system models, and could lead to a general proof of assumption 2 made in section II B.

Second, as we mentioned in the previous sections, our error estimates grow exponentially with time. This appears to be a consequence of the fact that the local system can emit arbitrarily large number of excitations into the environment, and the only generally provable bound on the probability of emission of \( N \)—particles is poissonian in \( N \) with parameter that grows with \( t \). However, for practically useful problems, we expect that the approximation error will grow only polynomially with time (for e.g. if the environment was finite dimensional, it can be trivially shown that the error grows linearly with time) and leave a possible improvement in this bound for future work.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK
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Appendix A: Systems for which assumption 1 is provable

**Proposition 1** Assumption 1 is true for coupling functions $v$ that are bounded and square integrable, $v \in B(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

**Proof:** Square-integrable coupling constants: We consider constants $v : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ that are smooth, bounded and square integrable. We note that in this case, for a symmetric and positive kernel $K : [0, t]^2 \to \mathbb{C}$,

$$
\lim_{\Omega \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|v(\omega_1)|^2 |v(\omega_2)|^2}{2} \left( \int_{s_1, s_2 = 0}^t K(s_1, s_2) e^{i\omega_2(t-s_2)} e^{-i\omega_1(t-s_1)} ds \right) d\omega_1 d\omega_2 = 
$$

By noting that $\sup_{s_1, s_2 \in [0, t]} |K(s_1, s_2)| \leq |K|_{[0, t]^2}$, it follows that square-integrable coupling constants satisfy the conditions of assumption 1 with $V(\omega, t)$ being given by

$$V(\omega, t) = t^2 \int_{|\omega| \geq \omega_c} |\omega|^2 d\omega \quad \Box$$

We note that the case of a square integrable coupling constant contains the physically important case of a lorentzian coupling function, which often arises in studying the interaction of quantum systems with lossy resonators. Next, we show that assumption 1 is also true for environments whose coupling function is a sum of a discrete number of harmonic terms. Such coupling functions arise in models that consider a local quantum system with point couplings to a one-dimensional propagating field. We first provide a bound on the error incurred in approximating a delta function by a sinc function.

**Lemma 10** Let $f \in AC([0, a])$, then $\forall p > 0$

$$
\left| \frac{\pi}{2} f(0) - \int_0^a \frac{\sin px}{x} f(x) dx \right| \leq O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{ap}} \right) \|f\|_{[0, a]}.
$$

**Proof:** We begin by using the Dirichlet integral, $\int_0^\infty \sin x/x dx = \pi/2$, from which it follows that

$$
\left| \frac{\pi}{2} f(0) - \int_0^a \frac{\sin px}{x} f(x) dx \right| \leq \left| \int_0^a (f(x) - f(0)) \frac{\sin px}{x} dx \right| + |f(0)| \left| \int_a^\infty \frac{\sin px}{x} dx \right|.
$$

The second term is easily bounded

$$
|f(0)| \left| \int_a^\infty \frac{\sin px}{x} dx \right| \leq \left( \sup_{x \in [0, a]} |f(x)| \right) \left| -\frac{\cos px}{pa} + \int_a^\infty \frac{\cos px}{px^2} dx \right|
$$

$$
\leq \left( \sup_{x \in [0, a]} |f(x)| \right) \left( \frac{1}{pa} + \int_a^\infty \frac{1}{px^2} dx \right) = \left( \sup_{x \in [0, a]} |f(x)| \right) \frac{2}{pa}.
$$

To bound the first term, we split the integral at $b(p) \in [0, a]$, where $b(p)$, to be specified later, vanishes as $p \to \infty$:

$$
\left| \int_0^a (f(x) - f(0)) \frac{\sin px}{x} dx \right| \leq \int_0^{b(p)} |f(x) - f(0)| \frac{dx}{x} + \int_{b(p)}^a (f(x) - f(0)) \frac{\sin px}{x} dx.
$$

Noting that $|f(x) - f(0)| \leq |x| \text{esssup}_{x \in [0, a]} |f'(x)|$, we obtain

$$
\int_0^{b(p)} |f(x) - f(0)| \frac{dx}{x} \leq b(p) \text{esssup}_{x \in [0, a]} |f'(x)|.
$$
Furthermore, using integration by parts, we obtain
\[
\left| \int_{b(p)}^{a} \left( f(x) - f(0) \right) \frac{\sin px}{x} dx \right| = \left| \frac{f(b(p)) \cos(pb(p))}{pb} - \frac{f(a) \cos pa}{pa} + \frac{1}{p} \int_{b(p)}^{a} \left( \frac{f'(x)}{x} - \frac{f(x) - f(0)}{x^2} \right) \cos px dx \right|,
\]
\[
\leq \frac{3}{p} \left( \frac{1}{b(p)} + \frac{1}{a} \right) \sup_{x \in [0,a]} |f(x)| + \frac{\log(a/b(p))}{p} \sup_{x \in [0,a]} |f'(x)|.
\]
Using these estimates and noting that \( \sup_{x \in [0,a]} |f(x)| \leq \|f\|_{[0,a]}^S \) and \( \esssup_{x \in [0,a]} |f'(x)| \leq \|f\|_{[0,a]}^S / a \), we obtain
\[
\left| \frac{\pi}{2} f(0) - \int_{0}^{a} \sin px \ f(x) dx \right| \leq \left( \frac{b(p)}{a} + \frac{3}{p} \frac{1}{b(p)} + \frac{5}{a} \right) \frac{\log(a/b(p))}{p} \|f\|_{[0,a]}^S.
\]
Since this bound holds for any \( b(p) \in [0,a] \), we choose \( b(p) = \Theta(\sqrt{a/p}) \) which proves the lemma \( \square \).

**Lemma 11** Let \( f \in AC([a,b]) \) for \( 0 < a < b \), then \( \forall p > 0 \)
\[
\left| \int_{a}^{b} \frac{\sin px}{x} f(x) dx \right| \leq \mathcal{O}\left( \frac{\log(b/a)}{ap} \right) \|f\|_{[a,b]}^S.
\]

**Proof:** This follows straightforwardly from integration by parts.
\[
\int_{a}^{b} \frac{\sin px}{x} f(x) dx = \frac{f(a) \cos pa}{pa} - \frac{f(b) \cos pb}{pb} + \frac{1}{p} \int_{a}^{b} \left( \frac{f'(x)}{x} - \frac{f(x)}{x^2} \right) \cos px dx,
\]
and consequently
\[
\left| \int_{a}^{b} \frac{\sin px}{x} f(x) dx \right| \leq \left( \frac{2}{pa} + \frac{2}{pb} + \frac{\log(b/a)}{ap} \right) \|f\|_{[a,b]}^S,
\]
from which the lemma statement follows \( \square \).

**Lemma 12** Let \( f \in AC([a,b]) \), then for \( p > 0 \) and \( y \in \mathbb{R} \)
\[
\left| \int_{a}^{b} \left( \pi \delta(x - y) - \frac{\sin p(x - y)}{x - y} \right) f(x) dx \right| \leq \xi(a, b, y, p) \|f\|_{[a,b]}^S.
\]
where \( \xi(a, b, y, p) \to 0 \) as \( p \to \infty \) and \( \delta(\cdot) \) is the dirac-delta function, whose action on a continuous function \( f \) within an interval \( [a, b] \) is given by
\[
\int_{a}^{b} \delta(x - y) f(x) dx = \begin{cases} f(y) & \text{if } y \in (a, b) \\ f(y)/2 & \text{if } y \in \{a, b\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.
\]

**Proof:** We consider three different cases

1. If \( y \in \{a, b\} \), then it follows from lemma 10 that
\[
\left| \int_{a}^{b} \left( \pi \delta(x - y) - \frac{\sin p(x - y)}{x - y} \right) f(x) dx \right| \leq \mathcal{O}\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|a - b| p}} \right) \|f\|_{[a,b]}^S.
\]
2. If \( y < a \) or \( y > b \), then it follows from lemma 11 that
\[
\left| \int_{a}^{b} \left( \pi \delta(x - y) - \frac{\sin p(x - y)}{x - y} \right) f(x) dx \right| \leq \mathcal{O}\left( \frac{1}{p \min(|y - a|, |y - b|)} \right) \|f\|_{[a,b]}^S.
\]
3. If \( y \in (a, b) \), then
\[
\left| \int_a^b \left( \pi \delta(x - y) - \frac{\sin p(x - y)}{x - y} \right) f(x) \, dx \right| \\
\leq \frac{\pi}{2} f(y) - \int_a^y \frac{\sin p(x - y)}{x - y} f(x) \, dx + \frac{\pi}{2} f(y) - \int_y^b \frac{\sin p(x - y)}{x - y} f(x) \, dx \\
\leq O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|y - a|}} \right) \| f \|_{a,y}^S + O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|y - b|}} \right) \| f \|_{y,b}^S \\
\leq O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\min(|y - a|, |y - b|)}} \right) \| f \|_{a,b}^S.
\]

Here we have used lemma 10 and the fact that \( \forall y \in (a, b) : \| f \|_{a,y}^S \leq \| f \|_{a,b}^S \) and \( \| f \|_{y,b}^S \leq \| f \|_{a,b}^S \). □

**Lemma 13** For \( K \in \mathcal{AC}_{sym}([a, b]^2) \) and \( y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R} \), then \( \forall p > 0 \)
\[
\left| \int_{x_1, x_2 = a}^b \left( \pi \delta(x_1 - y_1) - \frac{\sin p(x_1 - y_1)}{x_1 - y_1} \right) \left( \pi \delta(x_2 - y_2) - \frac{\sin p(x_2 - y_2)}{x_2 - y_2} \right) K(x_1, x_2) \, dx_1 \, dx_2 \right| \\
\leq \xi(a, b, y_1, p) \xi(a, b, y_2, p) \| K \|_{a,b^2}^S.
\]

**Proof:** For \( y \in [a, b] \), we define \( \varphi_y : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \) via
\[
\varphi_y(x) = \int_a^b \left( \pi \delta(x' - y) - \frac{\sin p(x' - y)}{x' - y} \right) K(x, x') \, dx',
\]
such that
\[
\int_{x_1, x_2 = a}^b \left( \pi \delta(x_1 - y_1) - \frac{\sin p(x_1 - y_1)}{x_1 - y_1} \right) \left( \pi \delta(x_2 - y_2) - \frac{\sin p(x_2 - y_2)}{x_2 - y_2} \right) K(x_1, x_2) \, dx_1 \, dx_2 = \\
\int_a^b \left( \pi \delta(x_1 - y_1) - \frac{\sin p(x_1 - y_1)}{x_1 - y_1} \right) \varphi_{y_2}(x_1) \, dx_1.
\]

Since \( \varphi_y \) is absolutely continuous, it follows from lemma 12 that
\[
\left| \int_a^b \left( \pi \delta(x_1 - y_1) - \frac{\sin p(x_1 - y_1)}{x_1 - y_1} \right) \varphi_{y_2}(x_1) \, dx_1 \right| \leq \xi(a, b, y_1, p) \| \varphi_{y_2} \|_{a,b}^S. \quad (A1)
\]

Furthermore, it also follows from lemma 12 and the fact that \( K \) was absolutely continuous in either of its arguments that
\[
\sup_{x \in [a, b]} |\varphi_{y_2}(x)| \leq \xi(a, b, y_2, p) \| K \|_{a,b^2}^S.
\]

Similarly, for \( x \) almost everywhere in \([a, b]\), \( \varphi'_{y_2}(x) \) exists and consequently from lemma 12 it follows that
\[
\text{For } x \in a.c.e. \ [a, b], \ (b - a)|\varphi'_{y_2}(x)| \leq \xi(a, b, y_2, p) \| K \|_{a,b^2}^S.
\]

Consequently, \( \| \varphi_{y_2} \|_{a,b}^S \leq 2\xi(a, b, y_2, p) \| K \|_{a,b^2}^S \). Using this along with Eq. A1 completes the proof □.

**Proposition 2** For \( V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_N \in \mathbb{C}, \tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_N \in \mathbb{R} \), define a coupling function \( v \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \) by \( v(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^N V_i e^{i\omega \tau_i}, \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R} \), then assumption 1 is satisfied for \( v \).

**Proof:** We note that it is possible to express \( |v|^2 \) as a finite sum of harmonics:
\[
|v(\omega)|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{V}_i e^{i\omega T_i}.
\]
For any $K \in AC_{sym}(\{0, t\}^2)$, we obtain
\[
\lim_{\Omega \to \infty} \int_{\omega_1, \omega_2 \leq \Omega} |v(\omega_1)|^2 |v(\omega_2)|^2 \left( \int_{s_1, s_2 = 0}^t K(s_1, s_2) e^{i\omega_2(t-s_2)} e^{-i\omega_1(t-s_1)} ds_1 ds_2 \right) d\omega_1 d\omega_2
\]
\[
= 4 \left| \sum_{i,j=1}^N \tilde{V}_{ij}^* \int_{s_1, s_2 = 0}^t \left( \pi \delta(s_2 - t - T_i) - \frac{\sin \omega_i(s_2 - t - T_i)}{s_2 - t - T_i} \right) \left( \pi \delta(s_1 - t - T_j) - \frac{\sin \omega_i(s_1 - t - T_j)}{s_1 - t - T_j} \right) K(s_1, s_2) ds_1 ds_2 \right|
\]
\[
\leq 4 \left| \sum_{i,j=1}^N \tilde{V}_{ij}^* \right| \left| \int_{s_1, s_2 = 0}^t \left( \pi \delta(s_2 - t - T_i) - \frac{\sin \omega_i(s_2 - t - T_i)}{s_2 - t - T_i} \right) \left( \pi \delta(s_1 - t - T_j) - \frac{\sin \omega_i(s_1 - t - T_j)}{s_1 - t - T_j} \right) K(s_1, s_2) ds_1 ds_2 \right|.
\]
Applying lemma 13, we immediately obtain
\[
\lim_{\Omega \to \infty} \int_{\omega_1, \omega_2 \leq \Omega} |v(\omega_1)|^2 |v(\omega_2)|^2 \left( \int_{s_1, s_2 = 0}^t K(s_1, s_2) e^{i\omega_2(t-s_2)} e^{-i\omega_1(t-s_1)} ds_1 ds_2 \right) d\omega_1 d\omega_2
\]
\[
\leq \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^N 8 \left| \tilde{V}_{ij}^* \right| \langle \xi(0, t + T_i, \omega_c) \xi(0, t + T_j, \omega_c) \rangle \right) \| K \|_{[0, t]^2},
\]
which proves that assumption 1 is satisfied $\Box$.

We point out that proposition 2 shows that assumption 1 is satisfied for both the Markovian model as well as models that model retardation effects.

Appendix B: $N$-point Green’s function and the environment state

In this appendix, we relate the $N$—point Green’s function defined in section II B to the joint state of the local system and environment. We assume that the initial state to be $|\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle$, where $|\sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$ and let $|\psi(t)\rangle = U(t, 0) |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle$, where $U(t_1, t_2)$ is the propagator corresponding to the Hamiltonian in Eq. 4. It immediately follows that
\[
|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} |\psi^N(t)\rangle = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N!} \int_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^N} \psi^N_i(\omega; t) \left( \prod_{j=1}^N a_{\omega_j}^\dagger \right) |e_i\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle,
\]
where $\{ |e_i\rangle, i \in \{1, 2 \ldots D\} \}$ is a basis for the $D$—dimensional local system and
\[
\psi^N_i(\omega; t) = \langle e_i | \langle \text{vac} | \left( \prod_{i=1}^M a_{\omega_i} \right) U(t, 0) |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle = \langle e_i | \langle \text{vac} | U(t, 0) \mathcal{T} \left( \prod_{i=1}^M a_{\omega_i}(t) \right) |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle,
\]
where $a_{\omega}(t) = U(0, t)a_{\omega}U(t, 0)$ and the time-ordering operator can be trivially introduced since all the operators are evaluated at the same time. From Heisenberg equations of motion, it immediately follows that
\[
a_{\omega}(t) = a_{\omega}(0) e^{-i\omega t} - i\omega e^{-i\omega t} \int_0^t L(s) e^{-i\omega(t-s)} ds,
\]
from which it immediately follows that
\[
\psi^N_i(\omega; t) = (-i)^N \left( \prod_{j=1}^N \hat{v}^j(\omega_j) \right) \langle e_i | \langle \text{vac} | F_N(\omega; t) |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle,
\]
where $F_N(\omega; t)$ is defined in Eq. 7. Substituting Eq. B2 into Eq. B1 and using $\sum_{i=1}^D |e_i\rangle \langle e_i| = 1$, we obtain the result in Eq. 7.
Appendix C: Settings where assumption 2 is provable

In this appendix, we consider two classes of open quantum systems wherein assumption 2 can be proven rigorously. The first is the case of a Markovian coupling function, and the second is the a non-Markovian coupling constant with a bounded square-integrable coupling function.

**Proposition 3** Consider a coupling function \( v \) which is a constant i.e. \( \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R} : v(\omega) = v_0 \) for some constant \( v_0 \), then assumption 2 is satisfied.

**Proof:** We begin by noting that constant coupling functions imply Markovian dynamics for the local system, in which case the quantum regression theorem implies that the \( N \)-point Green’s function can be expressed entirely evolving the local system under a non-Hermitian effective Hamiltonian. More specifically,

\[
G_N(s_1, s_2 \ldots s_N; t) = U_{\text{eff}}(t, 0) T (L_{\text{eff}}(s_1) L_{\text{eff}}(s_2) \ldots L_{\text{eff}}(s_N)),
\]

where \( U_{\text{eff}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \) is the propagator corresponding to the Hamiltonian \( H_{\text{eff}}(t) = H_S(t) - i \pi |v_0|^2 L^1 L/2 \) and \( L_{\text{eff}}(s) = U_{\text{eff}}(0, s) L U_{\text{eff}}(s, 0) \). We note that \( \partial_s L_{\text{eff}}(s) = -i [L_{\text{eff}}(s), H_{\text{eff}}(s)] \) and consequently \( \forall s \in [0, t] \) : \( \| \partial_s L_{\text{eff}}(s) \| \leq \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \| [L_{\text{eff}}(s), H_{\text{eff}}(s)] \|_2 \). Noting that for \( s_2, s_3 \ldots s_N \in [0, t] \), as a function of \( s_1 \in [0, t] \) \( G_N(s_1, s_2 \ldots s_N; t) \) is differentiable at all points except at \( s_1 \in \{ s_2, s_3 \ldots s_N \} \), we obtain

\[
\| \partial_s G_N(s, s_2 \ldots s_N; t) \|_2 \leq \| L \|_2^{N-1} \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \| [L_{\text{eff}}(s), H_{\text{eff}}(s)] \|_2 \quad \text{for} \ s \in [a.e.] [0, t],
\]

wherein we have used that since \( \| U_{\text{eff}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \|_2 \leq 1 \), \( \| L_{\text{eff}}(s) \|_2 \leq \| L \|_2 \quad \forall s \in [0, t] \).

**Proposition 4** Consider a coupling function \( v \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}) \), then assumption 2 is satisfied.

**Proof:** Let \( s \in [0, t]^{N-1} \) and without loss of generality, we assume that, \( s_1 \leq s_2 \ldots \leq s_{n-1} \) since the \( N \)-point Green’s function is a symmetric function of its arguments. We consider the \( N \)-point Green’s function \( G_N(\{ s_0, s \}; t) \) as a function of \( s_0 \). Consider the case where for some \( i \in \{ 0, 1 \ldots N-2 \}, s \in (s_i, s_{i+1}) \) (where \( s_0 = -\infty \) and \( s_N = \infty \)) in which case the explicitly applying the time-ordering operator we obtain

\[
G_N(\{ s_0, s \}; t) = \langle \text{vac} | U(t, 0) L(s_{N-1}) \ldots L(s_{i+1}) L(s_0) L(s_i) \ldots L(s_1) | \text{vac} \rangle
\]

and therefore \( \forall | \sigma \rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S \)

\[
\| \partial_{s_0} G_N(\{ s_0, s \}; t) | \sigma \rangle \|_2 \leq \| L \|_2^{N-1} \| L, H_{\text{eff}}(s_0) U(s_0, 0) L(s_i) \ldots L(s_1) | \sigma \rangle \otimes | \text{vac} \rangle \|.
\]

Noting that

\[
[L, H(s_0)] = [L, H_S(s_0)] + [L, L^1] \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} v(\omega) a_\omega d\omega,
\]

we obtain

\[
\| \partial_{s_0} G_N(\{ s_0, s \}; t) | \sigma \rangle \|_2 \leq \| L \|_2^{N-1} \| L, H_S(s) \|_2 + \| [L, L^1] \|_2 \| L \|_2^{N-1} \| \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} v(\omega) a_\omega d\omega \right) U(s_0, 0) L(s_i) \ldots L(s_1) | \sigma \rangle \otimes | \text{vac} \rangle \|_2.
\]

To proceed further, we provide a bound on the second term in the above estimate. Denote by \( | \phi \rangle = U(s, 0) L(s_i) \ldots L(s_1) | \sigma \rangle \otimes | \text{vac} \rangle \), we can write \( | \phi \rangle \) as a superposition of its \( N \)-particle components:

\[
| \phi \rangle = \sum_{M=0}^{\infty} \sum_{M_0=0}^{D} \sum_{i=1}^{D} \frac{1}{M!} \int_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^M} \phi_{M}^i(\omega) \left( \prod_{j=1}^{M} a_{\omega_j}^\dagger \right) | e_i \rangle \otimes | \text{vac} \rangle,
\]

where \( \{ | e_i \rangle, i \in \{1, 2 \ldots D\} \} \) is a basis for the \( D \)-dimensional local system and

\[
\phi_{M}^i(\omega) = \langle e_i | \otimes \langle \text{vac} | \prod_{j=1}^{M} a_{\omega_j} | \phi \rangle = \langle e_i | \otimes \langle \text{vac} | U(s_0, 0) T \left( \prod_{j=1}^{M} a_{\omega_j}(s_0) \prod_{i=2}^{M} L(s_j) \right) | \sigma \rangle \otimes | \text{vac} \rangle.
\]
where \(a_\omega(s) = U(0, s)a_\omega U(s, 0)\) and we have used \(s_0 \geq s_i \geq s_{i-1} \cdots \geq s_1\) to introduce the time-ordering operator. We then use the Heisenberg equations of motion for \(a_\omega(s)\) to express

\[
a_\omega(s_0) = a_\omega(0) e^{-i\omega s} - i\nu^* (\omega) \int_0^{s_0} L(\tau) e^{-i\omega (s_0 - \tau)} d\tau.
\]

We thus obtain

\[
\phi_i^M(\omega) = (-i)^M \left( \prod_{j=1}^M \nu^*(\omega_j) \right) \int_{\tau \in [0, s]^M} \langle \sigma \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle U(s, 0) T \left[ \prod_{j=1}^M L(\tau_j) \prod_{j=2}^M L(s_j) \right] |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle e^{-i\omega (s_0 - \tau)} d\tau.
\]

This immediately allows us to bound the norm of the \(M\)-particle component of \(|\phi\rangle\):

\[
||\phi^M||^2 \leq \frac{(2\pi)^M ||v||^{2M}}{M!} \int_{\tau \in [0, s]^M} \langle \sigma | G_{M+i}^i([\tau, s_2 \cdots s_i]; s) G_{M+i}^i([\tau, s_2 \cdots s_i]; s) |\sigma\rangle d\tau \leq \frac{||v||^{2M} (2\pi s)^M}{M!} ||L||^{2(M+i)}.
\]

Finally, noting that the restriction of the operator \(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} v(\omega) a_\omega d\omega\) on the \(M\)-particle subspace is \(\sqrt{M} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |v(\omega)|^2 d\omega\)^{1/2}, we obtain that

\[
\left\| \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} v(\omega) a_\omega d\omega \right) U(s, 0) L(s_{i-1}) \ldots L(s_2) |\sigma\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle \right\|^2 \leq \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |v(\omega)|^2 d\omega \right) \sum_{M=0}^\infty M \left\| \phi^M \right\|^2 \\
\leq ||L||^{2(i+1)} 2\pi s ||v||^2 \pi e^{2\pi ||v||^2_H ||L||^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |v(\omega)|^2 d\omega.
\]

and consequently we obtain that \(\forall \sigma \in \mathcal{H}_S, s_0 \in (s_i, s_{i+1})\),

\[
\|\partial_n G_N (\{s_0, s\}; t) |\sigma\rangle\|_2 \leq ||L||_2^N \left( \sup_{s_0 \in [0, t]} \frac{||L_s H_S(s_0)||_2}{||L||_2} + ||L_s L^\tau||_2 \sqrt{2\pi t \pi e^{2\pi ||v||^2_H ||L||^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |v(\omega)|^2 d\omega} \right).
\]

Since this bound holds for every \(i \in \{0, 1 \ldots N - 2\}\), it proves that assumption 2 holds for square integrable coupling functions \(\square\).

**Appendix D: Proof of Lemma 7**

**Proof:** Our goal is to develop a Lorentzian approximation to a function \(\Gamma\) which is bounded and differentiable. We develop such an approximation in two steps:

1. We first use the fact that Lorentzians are mollifiers to construct an approximation \(\Gamma_1 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) to \(\Gamma\) within the frequency window \([-\omega_c, \omega_c]\)

\[
\Gamma_1(\omega) = \frac{\kappa}{\pi} \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} \frac{\Gamma(\nu)}{(|\omega - \nu|^2 + \kappa^2)} d\nu \quad (D1)
\]

Note that as \(\kappa \to 0\), \(\Gamma_1(\omega)\) is expected to converge to \(\Gamma(\omega)\) for \(\omega \in (-\omega_c, \omega_c)\). For a non-zero value of \(\kappa\), an error will be incurred in approximating \(\Gamma\) by \(\Gamma_1\).

2. Next, we numerically discretize the integral in Eq. (D1) to obtain the approximation \(\Gamma_n : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) to \(\Gamma\). Denoting by the number of Lorentzians (i.e. number of points used in discretizing the integral) by \(M\), the discretization used in approximating the integral is \(\delta = 2\omega_c/(M - 1)\) and thus

\[
\Gamma_n(\omega) = \sum_{n=1}^M \frac{\kappa \delta}{\pi} \frac{\Gamma(\omega_n)}{(|\omega - \omega_n|^2 + \kappa^2)} \quad (D2)
\]
We now consider the error incurred in approximating $\Gamma$ within a frequency window $[-\omega_c, \omega_c]$ by $\hat{\Gamma}$. The relevant error of interest is the $L^1$ norm error between $\Gamma \cdot \text{rect}_{\omega_c}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$, which can be upper bounded by

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \Gamma(\omega) \text{rect}_{\omega_c}(\omega) - \hat{\Gamma}(\omega) \right| d\omega \leq \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} |\Gamma(\omega) - \Gamma(\omega_c)| d\omega + \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} |\Gamma(\omega) - \hat{\Gamma}(\omega) - \hat{\Gamma}(\omega_c)| d\omega + \int_{|\omega| \geq \omega_c} |\hat{\Gamma}(\omega)| d\omega.$$  

We can estimate each of these terms individually.

**Error between $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma_1$:** It follows from the definition of $\Gamma_1$ that

$$|\Gamma_1(\omega) - \Gamma(\omega)| = \frac{\kappa}{\pi} \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} \frac{\Gamma(\nu)}{(\omega - \nu)^2 + \kappa^2} d\nu - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(\omega)}{(\omega - \nu)^2 + \kappa^2} d\nu \leq \frac{\gamma}{\pi} \int_{|\nu| \geq \omega_c} \left| \frac{\Gamma(\omega)}{(\omega - \nu)^2 + \kappa^2} \right| d\nu + \frac{\kappa}{\pi} \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} \left| \frac{\Gamma(\omega) - \Gamma(\nu)}{(\omega - \nu)^2 + \kappa^2} \right| d\nu.$$  

The first integral can analytically integrated to obtain:

$$\frac{\gamma}{\pi} \int_{|\nu| \geq \omega_c} \frac{\Gamma(\omega)}{(\omega - \nu)^2 + \kappa^2} d\nu = \Gamma(\omega) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \tan^{-1} \frac{\omega - \omega_c}{\kappa} - \frac{1}{\pi} \tan^{-1} \frac{\omega + \omega_c}{\kappa} \right).$$

To estimate the second integral, we make use of Taylor’s theorem: $\forall \nu \in [-\omega_c, \omega_c]: |\Gamma(\omega) - \Gamma(\nu)| \leq \Gamma^d(\omega_c) |\omega - \nu|$ where $\Gamma^d(\omega_c) = \sup_{\omega \in [-\omega_c, \omega_c]} |\Gamma'(\omega)|$. It then follows that $\forall \omega \in [-\omega_c, \omega_c]$ that

$$\frac{\kappa}{\pi} \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} \frac{\Gamma(\omega) - \Gamma(\nu)}{(\omega - \nu)^2 + \kappa^2} d\nu \leq \frac{\kappa \Gamma^d(\omega_c)}{2\pi} \left( \log \frac{(\omega - \omega_c)^2 + \kappa^2}{\kappa^2} + \log \frac{(\omega + \omega_c)^2 + \kappa^2}{\kappa^2} \right).$$

We thus obtain that

$$\int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} |\Gamma_1(\omega) - \Gamma(\omega)| d\omega \leq \omega_c \kappa \Gamma^d(\omega_c) \xi \left( \frac{\kappa}{\omega_c} \right) + \omega_c^2 \Gamma^d(\omega_c) \xi^d \left( \frac{\kappa}{\omega_c} \right),$$

where

$$\xi(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \tan^{-1} \frac{x}{2} - \frac{x}{\pi} \log \left( 1 + \frac{4}{x^2} \right),$$

$$\xi^d(x) = 4x \log \left( 1 + \frac{4}{x^2} \right) - 4x + 4x \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{2}{x} \right).$$

We note that $\xi, \xi^d = O(x \log(1/x))$ and therefore

$$\int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} |\Gamma_1(\omega) - \Gamma(\omega)| d\omega \leq O \left( \kappa \Gamma^d(\omega_c) \log \frac{\kappa}{\omega_c} \right) + O \left( \omega_c \kappa \Gamma^d(\omega_c) \log \frac{\kappa}{\omega_c} \right).$$

**Error between $\Gamma_1$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$:** Next, to obtain $\hat{\Gamma}$ from $\Gamma_1$, we simply discretize the integral in the definition of $\Gamma_1$ — the Taylor’s theorem can again be used to bound the resulting discretization error. In particular,

$$\int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} |\Gamma_1(\omega) - \hat{\Gamma}(\omega)| d\omega \leq \frac{2 \omega_c^3}{\pi (M - 1)} \left( \frac{\Gamma^d(\omega_c)}{\kappa} + \frac{3 \sqrt{3} \Gamma^d(\omega_c)}{8 \kappa^2} \right) = O \left( \frac{\omega_c^3 \Gamma^d(\omega_c)}{\kappa M} \right) + O \left( \frac{\omega_c^3 \Gamma^d(\omega_c)}{\kappa^2 M} \right).$$
Error due to tails: This error can be explicitly evaluated.

\[
\int_{|\omega| \geq \omega_c} |\hat{\Gamma}(\omega)|d\omega \leq \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{M} \kappa_\text{max} \delta \Gamma_n}{\pi} \int_{|\omega| \geq \omega_c} \frac{1}{(\omega - \omega_n)^2 + \kappa^2} d\omega,
\]
\[
= \sum_{n=1}^{M} \frac{\delta \Gamma_n}{\pi} \left( \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\kappa}{\omega_c - \omega_n} \right) + \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\kappa}{\omega_c + \omega_n} \right) \right),
\]
\[
= \delta \Gamma \text{max} + \frac{2\delta \Gamma \text{max}}{\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{M} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\kappa}{n\theta} \right).
\]

Noting that for \( x > 0 \), \( \tan^{-1}(1/x) \) is convex upwards, it follows that for any \( \theta > 0 \)

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{M} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n\theta} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\theta} \int_{0}^{(M-1)\theta} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{x} \right) dx = (M - 1) \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{(M - 1)\theta} \right) + \frac{1}{2\theta} \log \left( 1 + (M - 1)^2 \theta^2 \right).
\]

Consequently,

\[
\int_{|\omega| \geq \omega_c} |\hat{\Gamma}(\omega)|d\omega \leq O \left( \frac{\Gamma \text{max}}{M} \right) + O \left( \kappa \Gamma \text{max} \log \frac{\kappa}{\omega_c} \right).
\]

This proves the lemma \( \Box \).

Appendix E: Proof of lemma 9

**Proof:** We start by noting that \( H_{\omega_c}^E = \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} \omega a_0^\dagger a_\omega d\omega \) and therefore

\[
e^{isH_{\omega_c}^E} B e^{-isH_{\omega_c}^E} = \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} v(\omega) a_\omega e^{-i\omega s} d\omega.
\]

Evaluating \( e^{isH_{\omega_c,N}^E} B e^{-isH_{\omega_c,N}^E} \) is more involved since we need to diagonalize \( H_{\omega_c,N}^E \). It is convenient to introduce the polynomial \( \pi_i \), which is \( p_i \) after normalization

\[
\pi_i(\omega) = \frac{p_i(\omega) \left( \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} |v(\omega)|^2 d\omega \right)^{1/2}}{\left( \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} (\omega)|v(\omega)|^2 d\omega \right)^{1/2}}
\]

Suppose \( \Phi = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \phi_i A_i \) is an eigenmode at eigenfrequency \( \Omega \). i.e. \([\Phi, H_{\omega_c,N}^E] = \Omega \Phi\). Using Eq. 19, we obtain

\[
(\alpha_i - \Omega) \phi_i + \sqrt{\beta_i} \phi_{i-1} + \sqrt{\beta_{i+1}} \phi_{i+1} = 0.
\]

It then follows that for \( i \in \{0, 1, 2 \ldots N-1\} \), \( \phi_i = \pi_i(\omega) \phi_0 \) and \( \rho_N(\Omega) = 0 \). Thus the possible eigenenergies of \( H_{\omega_c,N}^E \), denoted by \( \Omega_0, \Omega_1 \ldots \Omega_N-1 \), are roots of the \( N \)th orthogonal polynomial. For \( i \in \{0, 1, 2 \ldots N-1\} \), the eigenmode \( \Phi_i \) associated with \( \Omega_i \) can be written as \( \Phi_i = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \phi_i^j A_j \) where

\[
\phi_i^j = \frac{\pi_i(\Omega_j)}{N_j} \text{ where } N_j = \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \pi_i^2(\Omega_j) \right]^{1/2}.
\]  

(E1)

We note that from the orthogonality of the eigenmodes \( \phi_i \), it follows that

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \pi_i(\Omega_j) \pi_i(\Omega_{j'}) = N_j^2 \delta_{j,j'} \text{ and } \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \pi_i(\Omega_j) \pi_i(\Omega_{j'}) = N_j^2 \delta_{i,i'}.
\]  

(E2)
Finally, consider evaluating $e^{isH_{ω_c,N}} B e^{-isH_{ω_c,N}} = \left( \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 dω \right)^{1/2} \left( e^{isH_{ω_c,N}} A_0 e^{-isH_{ω_c,N}} \right)$. Noting that $A_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} φ_j^2 φ_i$, we obtain

$$e^{isH_{ω_c,N}} B e^{-isH_{ω_c,N}} = \left( \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 dω \right)^{1/2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} φ_j^2 e^{-iΩ_j s}.$$  

Finally, we evaluate the commutator $[δB_N(s), δB_N^†(s)]$ — with straightforward computation, it follows that

$$[δB_N(s), δB_N^†(s)] = 2 \int_{-∞}^{∞} |v(ω)|^2 dω - 2 \sum_{i,j=0}^{N-1} φ_0^i φ_0^j \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 π_1(ω) \cos((ω - Ω_j)s) dω$$  

(E3)

Next we use the Gauss quadrature theorem, from which it would follow that for a given $N > 0$, $∃w_0, w_1 \ldots w_{N-1} > 0$ with $\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} w_i = 1$ such that for all polynomials $P$ of degree $≤ 2N - 1$,

$$\int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} P(ω)|v(ω)|^2 dω = \left( \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 dω \right) \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} w_i P(Ω_i).$$

To use this result, we note that from Taylor’s theorem it follows that the cosine in Eq. E3 can be expanded into the sum of a degree $N$ polynomial and a remainder i.e. $∀j \in \{0, 1, 2 \ldots N - 1\}, ∀ω \in [-ω_c, ω_c] : \cos((ω - Ω_j)s) = C_N(ω - Ω_j) + R_N(ω - Ω_j)$ where $C_N$ is a degree $N$ polynomial with $C_N(0) = 1$ and $R_N$ is the remainder which satisfies the estimate $∥R_N∥_∞ ≤ (2ω_c s)^{N+1}/(N + 1)!$. With this decomposition of the cosine function, Eq. E3 reduces to

$$[δB_N(s), δB_N^†(s)] = 2 \int_{-∞}^{∞} |v(ω)|^2 dω - 2 \sum_{i,j=0}^{N-1} φ_0^i φ_0^j \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 π_1(ω) C_N(ω - Ω_j) dω - 2 \sum_{i,j=0}^{N-1} φ_0^i φ_0^j \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 R_N(ω - Ω_j) π_1(ω) dω.$$

Noting that for $i ≤ N - 1$, $π_i(ω) C_N(ω - Ω_j)$ is a polynomial of degree $≤ 2N - 1$, we obtain by an application of the Gauss quadrature theorem and using Eq. E1 that

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^{N-1} φ_0^i φ_0^j \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 π_i(ω) C_N(ω - Ω_j) dω$$

$$= \left( \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 dω \right) \sum_{i,j,k=0}^{N-1} w_k \frac{π_i(Ω_j) π_i(Ω_k)}{N^2_j} C_N(Ω_k - Ω_j)$$

$$= \left( \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 dω \right) \sum_{i,k=0}^{N-1} w_k \delta_{i,k} C_N(Ω_k - Ω_j) = \left( \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 dω \right) \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} w_k = \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 dω.$$

Consequently, it follows that

$$[δB_N(s), δB_N^†(s)] = -2 \sum_{i,j=0}^{N-1} φ_0^i φ_0^j \int_{-ω_c}^{ω_c} |v(ω)|^2 R_N(ω - Ω_j) π_i(ω) dω.$$
Noting $|\phi_i^j| \leq 1$ for $i, j \in \{0, 1, 2 \ldots N - 1\}$, we then obtain the following estimate

$$\left|\delta B_N(s), \delta B_N^j(s)\right| \leq 2 \sum_{i,j=0}^{N-1} \left| \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} |v(\omega)|^2 R_N(\omega - \Omega_j) \pi_i(\omega) d\omega \right|$$

$$\leq 2N \|v\|_\infty \|R_N\|_\infty \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left| \int_{-\omega_c}^{\omega_c} |v(\omega)| \pi_i(\omega) d\omega \right|$$

$$\leq 2N \|v\|_\infty \left(\frac{2\omega_c}{N+1}\right)^{N+1} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left( \frac{2\omega_c}{N+1} \right)^{N+1} \pi_i(\omega) d\omega \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\leq 4\omega_c \|v\|_\infty^2 \left(\frac{(2\omega_c)^{N+1}}{(N-1)!} \right)^{1/2}$$

wherein in the last step we have used the fact that the polynomial $\pi_i(\omega)$ is normalized. This completes the proof $\square$. 

[60] P. Van Dooren, in Short Course, Benelux Meeting on Systems and Control, Vol. 120 (Citeseer, 1995).