

Finite temperature quantum condensations in the space of states

Massimo Ostilli¹ and Carlo Presilla^{2,3}

¹*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, 40210-340, BA, Brazil*

²*Dipartimento di Fisica, Sapienza Università di Roma, Piazzale A. Moro 2, Roma 00185, Italy*

³*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Roma 1, Roma 00185, Italy*

(Dated: March 18, 2024)

If, for an isolated quantum system, we can find a partition of its space of states \mathbb{F} into two subspaces, \mathbb{F}_{cond} and \mathbb{F}_{norm} , such that, in the thermodynamic limit, $\dim \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}} / \dim \mathbb{F} \rightarrow 0$ and the ground state energies of the system restricted to these subspaces cross each other for some value of the Hamiltonian parameters, then, the system undergoes a first-order quantum phase transition driven by that parameter. A proof of this general class of phase transitions, which correspond to a condensation in the space of quantum states, briefly, a quantum condensing, has been provided at zero temperature. Here, we find its natural extension to finite temperature and suggest that quantum condensing can have a pivotal role in establishing quantum supremacy for optimization problems.

Quantum phase transitions (QPTs), i.e, the thermodynamic singularities emerging at zero temperature ($T = 0$) driven by some Hamiltonian parameter of the system, originate from quantum fluctuations, consequence of Heisenberg's uncertainty principle. However, an isolated system at $T = 0$ represents an abstract limit and understanding the finite temperature counterpart of a QPT (if any) is of paramount importance. Such an aim represents a quite challenging issue, from both the theoretical and experimental viewpoints since, above zero temperature, quantum and thermal fluctuations may compete in an intricate manner. Put in simple terms, in general, two kinds of scenarios are expected [1–6]: the ordered phase exists only at zero temperature; the ordered phase exists also at finite temperature, below some critical value T_c which, in turn, might signal a purely classical phase transition when the Hamiltonian parameters are set to a value rendering the system classical (e.g., the Ising model in a transverse field becomes the classical Ising model when the transverse field is set to zero). This second scenario is particularly appealing for potential applications to quantum computing protocols aimed at finding the ground state (GS) by working at finite temperature, the GS of the ordered phase being the solution of some (classical) combinatorial problem of interest, possibly hard [7–9]. Intuitively, first-order QPTs, a much less explored field when compared to second-order QPTs, might favor this scenario since, at the transition, the order parameter jumps between two very different quantum states.

Recently, we have introduced a class of first-order QPTs taking place via condensation in the space of states [10]. Let us consider a system described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = \Gamma K + V, \quad (1)$$

where K and V are two noncommuting Hermitian operators, K being dimensionless, and Γ a parameter with energy dimensions. Representing H in the eigenbasis of V , it is natural to call V potential operator, K hopping operator, and Γ hopping parameter. We will use Γ as the control parameter of the supposed QPT. Since phase transitions occur in the thermodynamic limit (TDL), we need a fair competition between K and V in this limit. Supposing that H describes a system of N par-

ticles, we assume that the eigenvalues of K and V both scale linearly with N . An important family of models to bear in mind is a collection of N qubits (spins). For these systems, the space of states \mathbb{F} can be identified with the space spanned by the $M = 2^N$ spin states indicated by $|\mathbf{n}\rangle = |n_1\rangle|n_2\rangle \dots |n_N\rangle$, where $|n_i\rangle = |\pm\rangle$ is an eigenstate of the Pauli matrix σ_i^z relative to the qubit $i = 1, \dots, N$. The potential V is a diagonal operator in the states $|\mathbf{n}\rangle$, namely, $V = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} V_{\mathbf{n}} |\mathbf{n}\rangle\langle\mathbf{n}|$. The hopping operator K is chosen as the sum of single-flip operators $K = -\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^x$. A simple yet non trivial example of this family of systems is the Grover Hamiltonian, emulating a benchmark model for quantum search [11–15], in which $V_{\mathbf{n}} = -JN\delta_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{n}_1}$, $J > 0$, and \mathbf{n}_1 represents the target of a totally unstructured (worst case scenario) search. In contrast, structured searches correspond to potentials having a smooth minima around the target and, therefore, benefit from the application of gradient-descent based methods like, e.g., the Ising model where, however, the corresponding QPTs are second-order.

We have proven the following general result at $T = 0$ [10]. If we can find a partition of the space of states \mathbb{F} of the system into two subspaces, $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}} \oplus \mathbb{F}_{\text{norm}}$, such that, in the TDL, $\dim \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}} / \dim \mathbb{F} \rightarrow 0$ and the ground state energies of H restricted to these subspaces cross each other at a finite value of Γ , then the system undergoes a first-order QPT driven by this parameter. *Condensed* and *normal*, the names attributed to the two subspaces, were motivated by the vanishing relative dimension of \mathbb{F}_{cond} in the TDL and the QPT realizing as a condensation in the space of states. Here, we find the natural extension of these quantum condensations to finite temperature. As illustrative example, we derive analytically the phase diagram of the paradigmatic Grover model [10]. More complex applications will be considered elsewhere. The proof is general and the result particularly appealing since, in contrast to quantum-gate based systems [16, 17], it unfolds the possibility to define quantum computing searching protocols for open systems working at finite temperature. More in general, our results establish rigorously the temperature limits under which quantum-annealer based systems [18] should operate.

Before recalling the $T = 0$ case, two comments are in order

about the nature of the condensation QPTs. i) They are intrinsically first-order, for they can be driven by using even one single Hamiltonian parameter. In contrast, as for the classical case, jumps of the order parameter can result when crossing the coexistence line of two different phases that originate from the critical point of a second-order QPT. Notice that, for such a scenario to take place at zero temperature, one needs that the Hamiltonian depends on at least two independent parameters (think to the 1d Ising model in the presence of both a transverse and a longitudinal magnetic field [19, 20]); ii) Condensation QPTs are far from being exotic. As we have recently shown, the renowned Wigner crystallization belongs to this class of QPTs [21].

Normal and condensed subspaces. We start by defining a proper partition of the space of states. Consider a system with Hamiltonian (1), and let $\{|\mathbf{n}_k\rangle\}_{k=1}^M$ be a complete orthonormal set of eigenstates of V , the configurations: $V|\mathbf{n}_k\rangle = V_k|\mathbf{n}_k\rangle$, $k = 1, \dots, M$. We assume ordered potential values $V_1 \leq \dots \leq V_M$. For a system of N qubits, for instance, the set of the configurations may correspond to the set of $M = 2^N$ product states of N spins along some direction, as stated above. Given an integer M_{cond} with $1 \leq M_{\text{cond}} < M$, we make a partition of the set of the configurations as $\{|\mathbf{n}_k\rangle\}_{k=1}^M = \{|\mathbf{n}_k\rangle\}_{k=1}^{M_{\text{cond}}} \cup \{|\mathbf{n}_k\rangle\}_{k=M_{\text{cond}}+1}^M$. Correspondingly, the Hilbert space of the system, $\mathbb{F} = \text{span}\{|\mathbf{n}_k\rangle\}_{k=1}^M$, equipped with standard complex scalar product $\langle u|v\rangle$, is decomposed as the direct sum of two mutually orthogonal subspaces, denoted condensed and normal, $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}} \oplus \mathbb{F}_{\text{norm}}$, where $\mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}} = \text{span}\{|\mathbf{n}_k\rangle\}_{k=1}^{M_{\text{cond}}}$, and $\mathbb{F}_{\text{norm}} = \text{span}\{|\mathbf{n}_k\rangle\}_{k=M_{\text{cond}}+1}^M = \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}}^\perp$. Finally, we define $E = \inf_{|u\rangle \in \mathbb{F}} \langle u|H|u\rangle / \langle u|u\rangle$, $E_{\text{cond}} = \inf_{|u\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}}} \langle u|H|u\rangle / \langle u|u\rangle$ and $E_{\text{norm}} = \inf_{|u\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_{\text{norm}}} \langle u|H|u\rangle / \langle u|u\rangle$, which are the GS eigenvalues, respectively, of H and of H restricted to the condensed and normal subspaces. According to the scaling properties assumed for K and V , we have that E , E_{cond} and E_{norm} increase linearly with N (at least in the TDL).

Quantum phase transitions at $T = 0$. The Hilbert space dimension M generally diverges exponentially with N , while the dimension M_{cond} , may or may not be a growing function of N . In [10] we have shown that:

$$\text{if } \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_{\text{cond}}}{M} = 0, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{then } \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E}{N} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \min \left\{ \frac{E_{\text{cond}}}{N}, \frac{E_{\text{norm}}}{N} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

For finite sizes, up to corrections $O(1)$, Eq. (3) reads

$$E \simeq \begin{cases} E_{\text{cond}}, & \text{if } E_{\text{cond}} < E_{\text{norm}}, \\ E_{\text{norm}}, & \text{if } E_{\text{norm}} < E_{\text{cond}}. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

As a consequence of Eq. (3), by varying some parameter of the Hamiltonian we obtain a QPT, necessarily of first order, whenever a crossing takes place between E_{cond} and E_{norm} . In the TDL, the space of states splits at the critical point (critical surface, more generally) defined by

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E_{\text{cond}}}{N} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E_{\text{norm}}}{N}, \quad (5)$$

and, in correspondence with Eq. (4), for the GS $|E\rangle$ we have either $|E\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}}$ or $|E\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_{\text{norm}}$.

Apart from the necessary condition (2), M_{cond} should be properly chosen so that Eq. (5) admits a solution [21]. In addition, if we look for protocols aimed at capturing the GS of (1) for $\Gamma = 0$, we have to set M_{cond} as the degeneracy of the GS of V .

Grover model at $T = 0$. Here $V_1 = -JN$, with $J > 0$, and $V_k = 0$, for $k = 2, 3, \dots, M = 2^N$. We can assume $M_{\text{cond}} = 1$ independent of N . We find $|E_{\text{cond}}\rangle = |\mathbf{n}_1\rangle$ and $E_{\text{cond}} = V_1$. Up to a correction $O(N/M)$, we also have $E_{\text{norm}} = -\Gamma N$ [10, 22]. Therefore Eq. (4) becomes

$$E \simeq \begin{cases} -JN, & \text{if } \Gamma < \Gamma_c, \\ -\Gamma N, & \text{if } \Gamma > \Gamma_c, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where the critical value Γ_c is determined by Eq. (5), namely, $\Gamma_c = J$. For $\Gamma > \Gamma_c$ the GS of the model coincides with the GS of the hopping operator K , while for $\Gamma < \Gamma_c$ the system stays locked in the configuration $|\mathbf{n}_1\rangle$. We thus have a QPT that corresponds to a condensation in the space of states.

Order parameter. The interpretation of the above class of QPTs in terms of a condensation in the space of states holds in general, even when \mathbb{F}_{cond} contains many eigenstates of V [21]. At zero temperature, the probability for the condensed subspace to be occupied is

$$p_{\text{cond}} = \sum_{|\mathbf{n}_k\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}}} |\langle \mathbf{n}_k|E\rangle|^2. \quad (7)$$

On the other hand, in the TDL, since it is either $|E\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}}$ or $|E\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_{\text{norm}}$, we find either $p = 1$ or $p = 0$, respectively (we assume $|E\rangle$ normalized). In other words, p_{cond} represents an order parameter of these QPTs.

Finite temperature quantum condensations. Our aim is to extend the above class of condensation QPTs to finite temperature. We suppose that the system, in contact with a heat bath, is at canonical equilibrium at temperature $T = 1/(k_B\beta)$, i.e., it is in the state described by the Gibbs density matrix operator $\rho = e^{-\beta H} / \text{tr } e^{-\beta H}$.

Analogously to the $T = 0$ case, we proceed by defining the Gibbs free energies associated to the spaces \mathbb{F} , \mathbb{F}_{cond} , \mathbb{F}_{norm} ,

$$e^{-\beta F} = \text{tr } e^{-\beta H} = \sum_{|\mathbf{n}\rangle \in \mathbb{F}} \langle \mathbf{n}|e^{-\beta H}|\mathbf{n}\rangle,$$

$$e^{-\beta F_{\text{cond}}} = \text{tr}_{\text{cond}} e^{-\beta H_{\text{cond}}} = \sum_{|\mathbf{n}\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}}} \langle \mathbf{n}|e^{-\beta H_{\text{cond}}}|\mathbf{n}\rangle,$$

$$e^{-\beta F_{\text{norm}}} = \text{tr}_{\text{norm}} e^{-\beta H_{\text{norm}}} = \sum_{|\mathbf{n}\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_{\text{norm}}} \langle \mathbf{n}|e^{-\beta H_{\text{norm}}}|\mathbf{n}\rangle,$$

where H_{cond} and H_{norm} are the restrictions of H to the condensed and normal subspaces [23]. It is natural to investigate whether Eq. (3) can be generalized to finite temperature just by substituting the energies E , E_{cond} , E_{norm} with the free energies F , F_{cond} , F_{norm} , which scale linearly with N too.

For any partition $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}} \oplus \mathbb{F}_{\text{norm}}$, we will prove that (X stands for either cond or norm and Y for its complement)

$$1 \leq \frac{\langle \mathbf{n} | e^{-\beta H} | \mathbf{n} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{n} | e^{-\beta H_X} | \mathbf{n} \rangle} \leq e^{\beta \Gamma \min\{A_X^{(\text{out})}, A_Y^{(\text{out})}\}}, \quad |\mathbf{n}\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_X, \quad (8)$$

$$F \leq \min\{F_{\text{cond}}, F_{\text{norm}}\}, \quad (9)$$

$$F \geq \min\{F_{\text{cond}}, F_{\text{norm}}\} - \min\{A_{\text{cond}}^{(\text{out})}, A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}\}\Gamma, \quad (10)$$

where $A_X^{(\text{out})} = \sup_{|\mathbf{n}\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_X} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}'\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_Y} |\langle \mathbf{n} | K | \mathbf{n}' \rangle|$ represents the maximum number of outgoing links (nonzero matrix elements of K) from \mathbb{F}_X to \mathbb{F}_Y . The product $\min\{A_X^{(\text{out})}, A_Y^{(\text{out})}\}\Gamma$ determines approximately the rate of convergence to 1 of the probability for crossing the boundary between \mathbb{F}_X and \mathbb{F}_Y , see later. In the Grover model, e.g., $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})} = 1$ while $A_{\text{cond}}^{(\text{out})} = N$. The important point is that, in most of the systems of interest, the conditions $M_{\text{cond}}/M \rightarrow 0$ and $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}/N \rightarrow 0$ are equivalent [24] and, under any of these conditions, Eqs. (9) and (10), up to a $o(N)$ term, provide the natural generalization of Eq. (4)

$$F \simeq \begin{cases} F_{\text{cond}}, & \text{if } F_{\text{cond}} < F_{\text{norm}}, \\ F_{\text{norm}}, & \text{if } F_{\text{norm}} < F_{\text{cond}}. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Equation (11) extends the $T = 0$ QPT to finite temperature. The crossing between F_{cond} and F_{norm} gives rise to a first order phase transition controlled by Hamiltonian parameters and temperature, the equation for the critical surface being

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F_{\text{cond}}}{N} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F_{\text{norm}}}{N}. \quad (12)$$

Hereafter, we assume $\min\{A_{\text{cond}}^{(\text{out})}, A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}\} = A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}$.

The probability for the condensed subspace to be occupied represents an order parameter also at finite temperature and the phase transition can be interpreted as a condensation in the space of states. In fact, due to Eqs. (8)

$$p_{\text{cond}} = \sum_{|\mathbf{n}\rangle \in \mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}}} \langle \mathbf{n} | \rho | \mathbf{n} \rangle \simeq \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta(F_{\text{norm}} - F_{\text{cond}})}}, \quad (13)$$

where the equality holds in the TDL with $p_{\text{cond}} = 1$ in the condensed phase $F_{\text{cond}} < F_{\text{norm}}$ and $p_{\text{cond}} = 0$ in the normal one $F_{\text{norm}} < F_{\text{cond}}$. At the critical surface separating the two phases we have $p_{\text{cond}} = 1/2$.

Equations (9)-(10) are easily derived from Eqs. (8). Before giving the proof of Eqs. (8), we illustrate the finite temperature condensation in the Grover model.

Grover Model at $T > 0$. Since $M_{\text{cond}} = 1$, we have $-\beta F_{\text{cond}} = -\beta V_1$ with $V_1 = -JN$. Up to corrections exponentially small in N , the free energy of the normal subspace coincides with that of the hopping operator K whose levels are $-\Gamma(N - 2j)$, $j = 0, \dots, N$, and have degeneracy $N!/(j!(N-j)!)$,

$$e^{-\beta F_{\text{norm}}} = \text{tr} e^{-\beta K} = \sum_{j=0}^N \binom{N}{j} e^{-\beta(-\Gamma(N-2j))}, \quad (14)$$




Figure 1. Phase diagram for the Grover model at thermal equilibrium, the solid line separating the two phases is drawn according to Eq. (15).

which gives $-\beta F_{\text{norm}} = N \log(2 \cosh(\beta \Gamma))$. The critical surface defined by Eq. (12) is thus given by $\log(2 \cosh(\beta \Gamma)) = \beta J$ (also found in Ref. [15] via approximate methods) which can be solved to explicitly provide $\Gamma_c = \Gamma_c(T)$ [25],

$$\Gamma_c(T) = J + k_B T \log \left(\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - e^{-2J/(k_B T)}} \right). \quad (15)$$

Note that Eq. (15) is defined only for $k_B T \leq J/\log 2$ and for $T \rightarrow 0^+$ returns the already analyzed $T = 0$ QPT. A parametric plot of $(\Gamma_c(T), T)$ is shown in Fig. 1. The shaded area is the condensed phase. No condensed phase is possible for $\Gamma > \Gamma_c(0) = J$ (point of minimal entropy). For $0 \leq \Gamma \leq \Gamma_c(0)$ the condensed phase extends to the finite temperature $T_c(\Gamma)$ obtained inverting Eq. (15). No condensed phase is possible for $T > T_c(0) = J/(k_B \log 2)$ (point of maximal entropy). Thermodynamics follows easily: internal energies $U_{\text{cond}} = -JN$ and $U_{\text{norm}} = -\Gamma N \tanh(\beta \Gamma)$; entropies $S_{\text{cond}} = 0$ and $S_{\text{norm}} = N k_B [\log(2 \cosh(\beta \Gamma)) - \beta \Gamma \tanh(\beta \Gamma)]$; specific heats $c_{\text{cond}} = 0$ and $c_{\text{norm}} = k_B (\beta \Gamma / \cosh(\beta \Gamma))^2$. Notice that, whereas the free energy F is always continuous in T , the internal energy U , the entropy S , and the specific heat c , are all discontinuous along any curve that crosses the critical surface, except for $T \rightarrow 0$. This in particular implies a null latent heat $|U_{\text{norm}} - U_{\text{cond}}|_{T=T_c}$.

Proof of Eqs. (8). The starting point is the exact probabilistic representation (EPR) of the quantum evolution introduced in [26]. According to this EPR, at imaginary time t , to be identified here with the inverse temperature β , we have ($\hbar = 1$)

$$\langle \mathbf{n} | e^{-Ht} | \mathbf{n}_0 \rangle = \mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{n}_0}^{[0,t]} \delta_{\mathbf{n}_{N_t}, \mathbf{n}} \right), \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ is the probabilistic expectation over the continuous time Markov chain of configurations $\mathbf{n}_0, \mathbf{n}_{s_1}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{s_{N_t}}$

(hereafter, named trajectory) defined by the transition matrix

$$P_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{n}'} = \frac{|\langle \mathbf{n}|K|\mathbf{n}' \rangle|}{A(\mathbf{n})}, \quad A(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}'} |\langle \mathbf{n}|K|\mathbf{n}' \rangle|, \quad (17)$$

and the sequence of jumping times s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{N_t} obtained from the Poissonian conditional probability density

$$P(s_k | s_{k-1}) = e^{-\Gamma A(\mathbf{n}_{s_{k-1}})(s_k - s_{k-1})} \Gamma A(\mathbf{n}_{s_{k-1}}), \quad (18)$$

N_t being the number of jumps occurred along the trajectory before the time t . The integer $A(\mathbf{n})$ is called the number of links, or degree, of \mathbf{n} and represents the number of non null off-diagonal matrix elements $\langle \mathbf{n}|H|\mathbf{n}' \rangle$. Starting from the configuration \mathbf{n}_0 at time $s_0 = 0$, we draw a configuration \mathbf{n}_{s_1} with probability $P_{\mathbf{n}_0, \mathbf{n}_{s_1}}$ at time s_1 drawn with probability density $P(s_1 | s_0)$, then we draw a configuration \mathbf{n}_{s_2} with probability $P_{\mathbf{n}_{s_1}, \mathbf{n}_{s_2}}$ at time s_2 drawn with probability density $P(s_2 | s_1)$, and so on until we reach the configuration \mathbf{n}_{N_t} at time s_{N_t} such that $s_{N_t+1} > t$ [27]. The stochastic functional $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{n}_0}^{[0,t]}$ is then defined as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{n}_0}^{[0,t]} = e^{\sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} [\Gamma A(\mathbf{n}_{s_k}) - V(\mathbf{n}_{s_k})](s_{k+1} - s_k)} \times e^{[\Gamma A(\mathbf{n}_{s_{N_t}}) - V(\mathbf{n}_{s_{N_t}})](t - s_{N_t})}. \quad (19)$$

Whereas a more general formulation of the EPR is possible [26], that presented above holds in the statistically manageable case in which no sign problem arises, e.g., when $\langle \mathbf{n}|K|\mathbf{n}' \rangle \leq 0$ for any \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n}' . We assume to be in this class of “bosonic” systems. In particular, for qubit systems K is the sum of single flip operators, for which $\langle \mathbf{n}|K|\mathbf{n}' \rangle = 0, -1$. If the whole set of configurations is connected by K , as we assume, the Markov chain is ergodic with invariant measure $\pi_{\mathbf{n}} = A(\mathbf{n}) / \sum_{\mathbf{n}'} A(\mathbf{n}')$. For example, in qubit systems as the Grover model, the degree of the configurations is constant, $A(\mathbf{n}) = N$, and $\pi_{\mathbf{n}} = 1/M$.

Let us indicate by $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ ($\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$) the set of configurations defining the states in \mathbb{F}_{cond} (\mathbb{F}_{norm}). A generic configuration of $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ ($\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$) will be indicated by $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ ($\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$). For any configuration $\mathbf{n} = \hat{\mathbf{n}}$ or $\mathbf{n} = \tilde{\mathbf{n}}$ we can always split its degree as

$$A(\mathbf{n}) = A^{(\text{in})}(\mathbf{n}) + A^{(\text{out})}(\mathbf{n}), \quad (20)$$

where $A^{(\text{in})}(\mathbf{n})$ and $A^{(\text{out})}(\mathbf{n})$ represent the number of links connecting \mathbf{n} with configurations inside or outside its membership subset, $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ or $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ [28].

Consider trajectories beginning and ending at a configuration $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$ of $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$. Introducing the random variable K_t counting the number of times a trajectory of this type transits throughout $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ in the interval $[0, t]$, we decompose the expectation in (16) as the following sum of two constrained expectations

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{n}} | e^{-Ht} | \tilde{\mathbf{n}} \rangle &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t]} \delta_{\mathbf{n}_{N_t}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}}; K_t = 0 \right) \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t]} \delta_{\mathbf{n}_{N_t}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}}; K_t \geq 1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Each trajectory contributing to the expectation with $K_t = 0$ is characterized by 0 jumps via the outgoing links of its configurations $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}_2, \dots$ occurring at the jumping times $0, s_1, s_2, \dots$. The probability of such an event is $e^{-\Gamma[A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})s_1 + A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_1)(s_2 - s_1) + \dots]}$. On the other hand, according to Eq. (19) the same trajectory has hopping weight $e^{\Gamma[A(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})s_1 + A(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_1)(s_2 - s_1) + \dots]}$. Hence, by using Eq. (20) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t]} \delta_{\mathbf{n}_{N_t}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}}; K_t = 0 \right) &= \mathbb{E} \left(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t]} \delta_{\mathbf{n}_{N_t}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}} \right) \\ &= \langle \tilde{\mathbf{n}} | e^{-H_{\text{norm}} t} | \tilde{\mathbf{n}} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t]}$ is the stochastic functional defined in terms of H_{norm} [28] and Eq. (16) has been used again (now applied to the system governed by H_{norm}) to get the second equality. Since $\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t]} > 0$, Eqs. (21) and (22) give

$$\langle \tilde{\mathbf{n}} | e^{-Ht} | \tilde{\mathbf{n}} \rangle \geq \langle \tilde{\mathbf{n}} | e^{-H_{\text{norm}} t} | \tilde{\mathbf{n}} \rangle. \quad (23)$$

Considering trajectories beginning and ending at a configuration $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ of $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$, we get a similar relation with $\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{n}}$ and $H_{\text{norm}} \rightarrow H_{\text{cond}}$. This completes the proof of the first inequality in (8).

Proving the second inequality of (8) requires the analysis of the term $K_t \geq 1$ in Eq. (21), which is quite more involved. Here, we provide only the key ideas while the detailed proof is reported in [24].

Due to a decorrelation, becoming effective in the TDL, between norm-cond border crossing and evolution of a trajectory inside $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$, the expectation with $K_t \geq 1$ in Eq. (21) can be upper bounded by $\langle \tilde{\mathbf{n}} | e^{-Ht} | \tilde{\mathbf{n}} \rangle \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1)$, where $\mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1)$ stands for the probability that, within the time t and starting from a given configuration $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$, a trajectory transits through $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ at least once. According to what seen before, $\inf_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\mathbb{F}}} \mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t = 0) = e^{-\Gamma A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})} t}$, where $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})} = \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\mathbb{F}}} A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})$, and therefore

$$\sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\mathbb{F}}} \mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1) \leq 1 - e^{-\Gamma A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})} t}. \quad (24)$$

Equation (24) shows that, despite the probability to cross the boundary goes to 1 exponentially in t , it occurs with a rate non extensive in N . In fact, in regular qubit systems $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})} = O(1)$; more in general it could be $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})} = o(N)$ [24]. Combining the above equations, we obtain the upper bound (8) for $X = \text{norm}$. For $X = \text{cond}$ a similar, yet different, conclusion holds. In fact, since $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ is small compared to $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$, the rate to cross the boundary $\hat{\mathbb{F}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{F}}$, namely, $A_{\text{cond}}^{(\text{out})} = O(N)$, is large. The bottleneck lies in the reverse border crossing which still takes place with rate $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}$, namely, what matters is the smallest border crossing rate.

Conclusions. Besides many possible applications in condensed matter physics (e.g., analyzing Wigner crystallization at finite temperature), Eqs. (11-13) suggest a novel approach to optimization problems. Quantum annealers [18] are a class of physical devices aimed at exploiting the quantum adiabatic

theorem [29]: an initial disordered quantum state of the system, e.g., the GS of K in Eq. (1), by gradually reducing Γ evolves toward the desired GS of V within a time τ roughly given by the inverse of the minimal gap. Therefore, the presence of a first-order QPT at Γ_c implies that τ may grow exponentially with N [14, 15, 22, 30]. This is the case of the Grover model where the minimal gap is $2JN2^{-N/2}$, thus resulting in a protocol with the same complexity of Grover's algorithm [11–13]. In fact, in terms of complexity, adiabatic and quantum-gate based protocols turn equivalent [31]. However all these protocols require the system to be isolated and at $T = 0$. Of course, such ideal conditions are never satisfied and, although they are often tacitly assumed and/or supposed to be tackled by more and more robust and scalable technologies, they still represent the most severe obstacle to the advance of actual quantum computers. Our results envisage a different opportunity. According to Eq. (13), a quantum condensation allows to apply quantum-adiabatic and, more in general, quantum-annealer protocols, directly to the open system at finite T , provided this is brought at equilibrium with a thermal bath *inside* the condensed region. In fact, Eq. (13) tells us that, in such a case, a read out of the N spins provides the target state with a probability exponentially close to 1 in N . Moreover, this condensation can be realized by either lowering Γ or T , or both. These are quantum nonequilibrium protocols still largely unexplored [32–35]. The equilibration of Grover's model or similar systems with a blackbody radiation can be tackled within the theory presented in [36]. We look forward to reporting the relative results.

Grant CNPq 307622/2018-5 - PQ (Brazil) is acknowledged. M. O. thanks the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Roma 1, and the Department of Physics of Sapienza University of Rome for financial support and hospitality.

[1] S. L. Sondhi, S. M. Girvin, J. P. Carini, and D. Shahar, “Continuous quantum phase transitions”, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **69**, 315 (1997).
[2] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, “Quantum phase transitions in electronic systems”, in *Electron Correlations in the Solid State* ed. by N. H. March, (Imperial College Press, London 1999).
[3] T. Vojta, “Quantum phase transitions in electronic systems”, *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **9**, 403 (2000).
[4] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000).
[5] L. D. Carr, “Understanding Quantum Phase Transitions”, (CRC Press, Taylor & Francis 2010).
[6] A. Plastino and E. M. F. Curado, “Finite temperature approach to quantum phase transitions”, *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos* **20**, 397 (2010).
[7] A. B. Finilla, M. A. Gomez, C. Sebenik, and D. J. Doll, “Quantum annealing: A new method for minimizing multidimensional functions”, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **219**, 343 (1994).
[8] T. Kadowaki and H. Nishimori, “Quantum annealing in the transverse Ising model”, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 5355 (1998).
[9] G. E. Santoro and E. Tosatti, “Optimization using quantum me-

chanics: quantum annealing through adiabatic evolution”, *J. Phys. A* **39**, R393 (2006).
[10] M. Ostilli and C. Presilla, “First-order quantum phase transitions as condensations in the space of states”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **54**, 055005 (2021).
[11] L. K. Grover, “A fast quantum-mechanical search algorithm for database search”, *Proceedings, 28th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC)*, May 1996, pages 212-219; “Quantum Mechanics Helps in Searching for a Needle in a Haystack”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 325 (1997); “From Schrödinger's equation to the quantum search algorithm”, *Am. J. Phys.* **69**, 769 (2001).
[12] E. Farhi and S. Gutmann, “Analog analogue of a digital quantum computation”, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 2403 (1998).
[13] J. Roland and N. J. Cerf, “Quantum search by local adiabatic evolution”, *Phys. Rev. A*, **65**, 042308 (2002).
[14] T. Jörg, F. Krzakala, J. Kurchan, and A. C. Maggs, “Simple glass models and their quantum annealing”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 147204 (2008).
[15] T. Jörg, F. Krzakala, J. Kurchan, A. C. Maggs, and J. Pujos, “Energy gaps in quantum first-order mean-field-like transitions: The problems that quantum annealing cannot solve”, *Europhysics Letters* **89**, 40004 (2010).
[16] M. A. Nielsen and I. Chuang, “Quantum Computation and Quantum Information” (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2010).
[17] C. Figgatt, D. Maslov, K. A. Landsman, N. M. Linke, S. Debnath, and C. Monroe “Complete 3-Qubit Grover search on a programmable quantum computer”, *Nature Communications* **8**, 1918 (2017).
[18] T. Lanting et al., “Entanglement in a Quantum Annealing Processor”, *Phys. Rev. X* **4**, 021041 (2014).
[19] M. A. Continentino and A. S. Ferreira, “First-order quantum phase transitions”, *J. Magnetism and Magnetic Materials* **310**, 828 (2007).
[20] M. Campostrini, J. Nespolo, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, “Finite-Size Scaling at First-Order Quantum Transitions” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 070402 (2014).
[21] M. Ostilli and C. Presilla, “Wigner crystallization of electrons in a one-dimensional lattice: a condensation in the space of states”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 040601 (2021).
[22] C. Presilla and M. Ostilli, “Phase transitions and gaps in quantum random energy models”, *Physica A* **515**, 57 (2019).
[23] In the representation of the eigenstates of V , H_{cond} corresponds to a null matrix except for the block $\langle \mathbf{n}_k | H_{\text{cond}} | \mathbf{n}_{k'} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{n}_k | H | \mathbf{n}_{k'} \rangle$, $k, k' = 1, \dots, M_{\text{cond}}$. Analogously, H_{norm} corresponds to a null matrix except for the block $\langle \mathbf{n}_k | H_{\text{norm}} | \mathbf{n}_{k'} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{n}_k | H | \mathbf{n}_{k'} \rangle$, $k, k' = M_{\text{cond}} + 1, \dots, M$. Note that $H_{\text{cond}} + H_{\text{norm}} \neq H$.
[24] Supplemental Material.
[25] On posing $x = e^{\beta\Gamma}$, we are left with the reciprocal equation $\log(x + x^{-1}) = \beta J$ that can, in turn, be transformed into a quadratic equation for x having two real and positive roots: one with $x > 1$, which corresponds to a positive Γ (Eq. 15), and the other one with $x < 1$, which corresponds to a negative Γ .
[26] M. Beccaria, C. Presilla, G. F. De Angelis, and G. Jona-Lasinio, “An exact representation of the fermion dynamics in terms of Poisson processes and its connection with Monte Carlo algorithms”, *Europhys. Lett.* **48**, 243 (1999).
[27] Note that the Poisson processes associated to each jump are defined left continuous [26], as a consequence, the configuration \mathbf{n}_{N_t} is the one realized by the Markov chain just before the final time t .
[28] Note that $A^{(\text{in})}(\hat{\mathbf{n}})$ and $A^{(\text{in})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})$ represent the number of

non null off-diagonal matrix elements $\langle \tilde{\mathbf{n}} | H_{\text{cond}} | \tilde{\mathbf{n}}' \rangle$ and $\langle \tilde{\mathbf{n}} | H_{\text{norm}} | \tilde{\mathbf{n}}' \rangle$, respectively.

- [29] T. Kato, “On the adiabatic theorem of quantum mechanics”, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **5**, 435 (1950).
- [30] J. Adame and S. Warzel, “Exponential vanishing of the ground-state gap of the quantum random energy model via adiabatic quantum computing”, Journal of Mathematical Physics **56**, 113301 (2015).
- [31] D. Aharonov, W. van Dam, J. Kempe, Z. Landau, S. Lloyd, and O. Regev, “Adiabatic quantum computation is equivalent to standard quantum computation” SIAM Review **50**, 755–787 (2008).
- [32] A. Mishra, T. Albash, and D. A. Lidar, “Finite temperature quantum annealing solving exponentially small gap problem with non-monotonic success probability”, Nat. Commun. **9**, 2917 (2018).
- [33] G. Passarelli, G. De Filippis, V. Cataudella, and P. Lucignano, “Dissipative environment may improve the quantum annealing performances of the ferromagnetic p-spin model”, Phys. Rev. A **97**, 022319 (2018).
- [34] G. Passarelli, V. Cataudella, and P. Lucignano, “Improving quantum annealing of the ferromagnetic p-spin model through pausing”, Phys. Rev. B **100**, 024302 (2019).
- [35] E. J. Crosson and D. A. Lidar, “Prospects for quantum enhancement with diabatic quantum annealing”, Nat. Rev. Phys. **3**, 466 (2021).
- [36] M. Ostilli and C. Presilla, “Thermalization of noninteracting quantum systems coupled to blackbody radiation: A Lindblad-based analysis”, Phys. Rev. A **95**, 062112 (2017).

Supplemental Material for “Finite temperature quantum condensations in the space of states”

Massimo Ostilli and Carlo Presilla

Detailed proof of Eqs. (8)

In the following, we prove the lower and upper bounds of Eq. (8). Introducing the random variable $K_t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ counting the number of times the Markov chain transits throughout $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ in the interval $[0, t)$, we decompose the expectation as a sum of two constrained expectations as follows

$$\langle \tilde{\mathbf{n}} | e^{-Ht} | \tilde{\mathbf{n}} \rangle = \mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t)} \delta_{\mathbf{n}_{N_t}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}}; K_t = 0 \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t)} \delta_{\mathbf{n}_{N_t}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}}; K_t \geq 1 \right). \quad (\text{S1})$$

Consider the term $K_t = 0$. Each trajectory contributing to this event is characterized by a sequence of N_t jumping times s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{N_t} extracted along a sequence of configurations $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}_2, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{N_t}$. Hence, regardless of any other detail, such a trajectory is realized if none of the associated out links jump, which occurs with probability $\exp\{-\Gamma[A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})s_1 + A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_1)(s_2 - s_1) + \dots + A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{N_t-1})(s_{N_t} - s_{N_t-1}) + A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{N_t})(t - s_{N_t})]\}$. On the other hand, Eq. (19) shows that along the same trajectory the hopping term provides the weight $\exp\{\Gamma[A(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})s_1 + A(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_1)(s_2 - s_1) + \dots + A(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{N_t-1})(s_{N_t} - s_{N_t-1}) + A(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{N_t})(t - s_{N_t})]\}$. By using $A(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}) - A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}) = A^{(\text{in})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})$ and Eq. (16), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t)} \delta_{\mathbf{n}_{N_t}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}}; K_t = 0 \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t)} \delta_{\mathbf{n}_{N_t}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}} \right) = \langle \tilde{\mathbf{n}} | e^{-\tilde{H}t} | \tilde{\mathbf{n}} \rangle, \quad (\text{S2})$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t)}$ is the stochastic functional defined in terms of $\tilde{H} = H_{\text{norm}}$ [28] and Eq. (16) has been further used, applied to the system governed by H_{norm} , to get the second equality. The analogous of Eq. (S2) for the set $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ can be derived by using identical steps. Finally, from Eq. (S1) and by using $\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t)} > 0$, we get the first inequality in Eq. (8).

Now, let us consider the contributions associated to $K_t \geq 1$, i.e., the second term of Eq. (S1). We have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t)} \delta_{\mathbf{n}_{N_t}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}}; K_t \geq 1 \right) = \sum_{\xi} \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t)}(\xi) \mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \xrightarrow{\xi} \tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1), \quad (\text{S3})$$

where the sum runs over the “space-time” trajectories ξ , and $\mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \xrightarrow{\xi} \tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1)$ stands for the probability that, starting from $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$, ξ ends in $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$ by transiting throughout $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ at least once within the time t . Apart from K_t , each ξ has a probability obtained via the sequence of jumping links and jumping times according to Eqs. (17) and (18). In qubit systems, $A(\mathbf{n}) = N$ is constant, which implies that the trajectories have no preferential directions and, therefore, no correlation with the random variable K_t . In more general systems, the correlations with K_t are expected to be negligible in the TDL. We then have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t)} \delta_{\mathbf{n}_{N_t}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}}; K_t \geq 1 \right) \simeq \sum_{\xi} \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}}^{[0,t)}(\xi) \mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \xrightarrow{\xi} \tilde{\mathbf{n}}) \mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1) = \langle \tilde{\mathbf{n}} | e^{-Ht} | \tilde{\mathbf{n}} \rangle \mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1), \quad (\text{S4})$$

where $\mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1)$ stands for the total probability that, within the time t and starting from a given configuration $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$, we transit through $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ at least once. It is clear that, given N , $\mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1) \rightarrow 1$ for $t \rightarrow \infty$. However, we are interested in the other order of limits and, actually, here t must be kept finite. In fact, we want a bound for $\mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1)$ in the TDL. We have

$$\mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1) \leq 1 - \mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t = 0). \quad (\text{S5})$$

Notice that $\mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t = 0)$ represents the probability to remain in $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ during the time t and it does not coincide with the complement of $\mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1)$. In fact, by definition, if $K_t \geq 1$, K_t counts how many times a trajectory that starts from $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$, transits through $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$, and eventually goes back to $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$, while the complement of the event $K_t \geq 1$ contains also all the trajectories that, starting from $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$, transit through $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ a certain number of times but eventually do not terminate in $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$. Let $\tilde{\partial}$ be the boundary set between $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ belonging to $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$:

$$\tilde{\partial} = \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \widehat{\mathbb{F}} : \exists \hat{\mathbf{n}} \in \widehat{\mathbb{F}} \text{ such that } \langle \tilde{\mathbf{n}} | K | \hat{\mathbf{n}} \rangle \neq 0 \right\}. \quad (\text{S6})$$

Clearly, $\tilde{\partial}$ represents the set of configurations having the smallest probability of remaining in $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ and such a probability corresponds to the event where no jump occurs through the outgoing links of these boundary configurations. Therefore, according to Eq. (18) and to the definition (20) we have

$$\mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t = 0) \geq \inf_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}} \mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t = 0) = \inf_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}} e^{-\Gamma A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})t} = e^{-\sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}} \Gamma A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})t}. \quad (\text{S7})$$

In conclusion, we have

$$\sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_t \geq 1) \leq 1 - e^{-\sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}} \Gamma A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})t}. \quad (\text{S8})$$

Eq. (S8) shows that the probability we are interested in has an upper bound that still goes to 1 exponentially in the TDL but with a rate that is not extensive in N , in fact, $A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})$ is not extensive in N . Typically, in qubit systems it is $O(1)$, but for our aims it could be also $o(N)$, as it occurs in system of fermions or hard-core bosons. Combining Eqs. (S2) and (S8), we have proven the second inequality in (8) for $X = \text{norm}$.

To prove the second inequality in Eq. (8) for $X = \text{cond}$, we have to proceed in a slightly different way. Notice, in fact, that the analogous of Eq. (S8) for the set $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ also holds, but it is of little use because, in general, whereas $A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})$ is not extensive in N , $A^{(\text{out})}(\hat{\mathbf{n}})$ can be extensive in N . In fact, this is just the case of the Grover model previously analyzed, as well as the case of regular qubit systems. Therefore, we avoid using Eq. (S8) for $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ directly. The main idea here is that, due to the fact that $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ is a small portion of the whole set of configurations, the probability for a trajectory starting from $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ to reach $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$, approaches 1 exponentially (in both t and N) with a large rate, but once it is in $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$, the probability that it goes back to $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ approaches 1 with the same identical small rate of Eq. (S8). Let us make concrete this idea by explicitly taking into account just one jump into $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ as follows

$$\sup_{\hat{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbb{P}_t(\hat{\mathbf{n}}; L_t \geq 1) = \sup_{\hat{\mathbf{n}} \in \hat{\partial}} \mathbb{P}_t(\hat{\mathbf{n}}; L_t \geq 1) \simeq \sup_{\hat{\mathbf{n}} \in \hat{\partial}} \sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \mathcal{A}^{(\text{out})}(\hat{\mathbf{n}})} \int_0^t ds \Gamma e^{-\Gamma A(\hat{\mathbf{n}})s} \mathbb{P}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}; K_{t-s} \geq 1) \quad (\text{S9})$$

where L_t and $\hat{\partial}$ are the analogous of K_t and $\tilde{\partial}$ for $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$, $\mathcal{A}^{(\text{out})}(\hat{\mathbf{n}})$ is the set of configurations in $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ which are first neighbors of $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ (whose number is $A^{(\text{out})}(\hat{\mathbf{n}})$), and s is a random time at which a jump toward one configuration $\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \mathcal{A}^{(\text{out})}(\hat{\mathbf{n}}) \subset \tilde{\partial}$ takes place. For the last factor in the rhs we can now use Eq. (S8) and we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \mathcal{A}^{(\text{out})}(\hat{\mathbf{n}})} \int_0^t ds \Gamma e^{-\Gamma A(\hat{\mathbf{n}})s} \left(1 - e^{-\sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}} \Gamma A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})(t-s)} \right) \\ &= \frac{A^{(\text{out})}(\hat{\mathbf{n}})}{A(\hat{\mathbf{n}})} \left(1 - e^{-\Gamma A(\hat{\mathbf{n}})t} \right) - A^{(\text{out})}(\hat{\mathbf{n}}) e^{-\sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}} \Gamma A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})t} \frac{\left(1 - e^{-\Gamma [A(\hat{\mathbf{n}}) - \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}} A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})]t} \right)}{A(\hat{\mathbf{n}}) - \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}} A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})} \\ &\leq 1 - e^{-\sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}} \Gamma A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})t}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S10})$$

where, in the last inequality, we have used $A^{(\text{out})}(\hat{\mathbf{n}})/[A(\hat{\mathbf{n}}) - \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}} A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})] \leq 1$ in the TDL, assumed valid for any $\hat{\mathbf{n}} \in \hat{\partial}$. In conclusion

$$\sup_{\hat{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbb{P}_t(\hat{\mathbf{n}}; L_t \geq 1) \leq 1 - e^{-\sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}} \Gamma A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})t}. \quad (\text{S11})$$

Combining Eq. (S11) with the analogous of Eq. (S2) for $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$, we have thus proven the second inequality in (8) for $X = \text{cond}$.

In general, the above derivation cannot be considered totally rigorous because we have neglected correlations in Eq. (S4) and neglected higher order contributions in Eq. (S9). However, as we have previously discussed, the former approximation becomes exact for regular qubit systems, where $A(\mathbf{n})$ is constant, moreover, as we discuss in a moment, the latter approximation also becomes exact in the case of the Grover model, as well as in its generalizations.

Equivalence of the conditions $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}/N \rightarrow 0$ and $M_{\text{cond}}/M \rightarrow 0$

In the present work we have proved that Eqs. (11) are valid under the condition that $\sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}} A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})/N \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand, from [10] we know that Eqs. (11) at $T = 0$ are valid under the condition that $M_{\text{cond}}/M \rightarrow 0$. It is hence important to understand what is the relation, if any, between these two apparently independent conditions.

We recall that the matrix elements of the hopping operator K induce in \mathbb{F} a graph with M nodes represented by the configurations, where the degree of a configuration \mathbf{n} is given by its number of links $A(\mathbf{n})$. In the following, we shall focus only on regular qubit systems of N qubits so that $M = 2^N$, and “regular” here means that the hopping operator K is made by the usual sum of N single-flip operators, so that $A(\mathbf{n}) = N$. Note that, since $A(\mathbf{n})/M \rightarrow 0$, the graph associated to \mathbb{F} is a regular sparse graph [S1].

Let us first consider the Grover model. This model is characterized by the fact that there exist only two possible values of the potential, $V = -JN$ e $V = 0$, and that the former is realized by just one configuration (for example the one in which all the spins are up) so that $M_{\text{cond}} = 1$. For this model we have $A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}) \leq 1$ and also $M_{\text{cond}}/M = 1/2^N \rightarrow 0$. We can generalize the Grover model by allowing the value $V = -JN$ to be $M_{\text{cond}} > 1$ degenerate provided that we still have $M_{\text{cond}}/M \rightarrow 0$. It is clear that, as far as the M_{cond} configurations associated to $V = -JN$ are sufficiently separated, we keep having $A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}) \leq 1$. More precisely, it is easy to see that, as far as the M_{cond} configurations associated to $V = -JN$ differ for the values of at least three spins (i.e., in the graph, the configurations of $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ are at least three links far apart among each other), we still have $A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}) \leq 1$ for any $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$. It should be however clear that the condition $M_{\text{cond}}/M \rightarrow 0$ alone in general does not imply the condition $A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}) = O(1)$. As a counter-example, if we define $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ as the set of the N configurations first neighbors of a given one $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$, we see that by construction $M_{\text{cond}}/M \rightarrow 0$ but now $A^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}) = N$ (indeed, the M_{cond} configurations associated to $V = -JN$ differ for the direction of two spins here).

The above counter example, however, is rather nonphysical as it does not take into account how the structure of a physical potential operator V acts on the definition of \mathbb{F}_{cond} . The definition of \mathbb{F}_{cond} is in principle arbitrary but the most interesting cases are those in which \mathbb{F}_{cond} is defined directly from the structure of the operator V as prescribed in the main paper. The idea is to define \mathbb{F}_{cond} through the configurations $|\mathbf{n}\rangle$ having potential levels $V(\mathbf{n}) = \langle \mathbf{n} | V | \mathbf{n} \rangle$ not larger than some threshold value $\max V_{\text{cond}}$, namely, $\hat{\mathbb{F}} = \{\mathbf{n} : V(\mathbf{n}) \leq \max V_{\text{cond}}\}$. For given N , if V has some physical origin, M_{cond} is expected to be a fast growing function of $\max V_{\text{cond}}$, typically exponential. Notice however that this assumption holds true for not too large values of $\max V_{\text{cond}}$, being M_{cond} limited by M . In fact, it holds true as far as $M_{\text{cond}}/M \ll 1$. As a consequence, if $M_{\text{cond}}/M \ll 1$, the subgraph induced by K on the set $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$, can effectively be treated as a regular Cayley tree of size M_{cond} and degree N , i.e., a finite graph without loops where each node has degree N , except for its boundary, where the nodes have degree 1. This assumption corresponds to the usual tree-like approximation that holds true locally in many sparse graphs. By contrast, the subgraph induced by K on the set $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ cannot be treated as a tree. In fact, we have to take into account that the total graph induced by K in \mathbb{F} , is a regular graph without boundary; it is not a tree and, as a consequence, the complement of a tree in the total graph, i.e., the subgraph induced by K on the set $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$, cannot be treated as a tree either, see Fig. S1. More precisely, in the graphs associated to \mathbb{F} and $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ there are loops whose shortest length l is of the order $l = \log(M)/\log(N)$.




Figure S1. A regular graph of degree $A=3$ drawn from the perspective of the “central” red node. The subgraphs having a boundary at the distances $l = 1$ or $l = 2$ from the central node, i.e., those obtained by removing all the nodes at distance larger than l as well as all the links emanating from these removed nodes, are Cayley trees of degree $A=3$ (except for the boundary, where the nodes have degree 1). However, the complements of these subgraphs are not trees. In particular, the complement of the case $l = 2$ is a regular graph of degree 2.

As is known, one peculiar feature of the Cayley tree is the fact that its boundary constitutes a finite portion of its total number nodes (see for example [S2]). Moreover, we have to take into account the constraint that the total number of outgoing links from $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ to $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$, must be equal to the total number of outgoing links from $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ to $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}$. Finally, by accounting for the regular character of the two subgraphs, we are allowed to make use of the mean outgoing connectivities $\overline{A}_{\text{cond}}^{(\text{out})}$ and $\overline{A}_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}$, as the actual values along the boundaries of $\widehat{\partial}$ and $\widetilde{\partial}$, respectively, have small fluctuations. We have

$$\overline{A}_{\text{cond}}^{(\text{out})} |\widehat{\partial}| = \overline{A}_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})} |\widetilde{\partial}|, \quad (\text{S12})$$

which, if we call α_{cond} the coefficient providing $|\widehat{\partial}| = \alpha_{\text{cond}} M_{\text{cond}}$ and use $|\widetilde{\partial}| \leq M - M_{\text{cond}}$, gives

$$\overline{A}_{\text{cond}}^{(\text{out})} \alpha_{\text{cond}} M_{\text{cond}} \leq \overline{A}_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})} (M - M_{\text{cond}}). \quad (\text{S13})$$

For a regular Cayley tree of degree N it is easy to see that $\alpha_{\text{cond}} \rightarrow 1^-$ so that Eq. (S13) gives

$$\frac{M_{\text{cond}}}{M} \leq \frac{\overline{A}_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}}{\overline{A}_{\text{cond}}^{(\text{out})}}. \quad (\text{S14})$$

Finally, since $\overline{A}_{\text{cond}}^{(\text{out})} = O(N)$, Eq. (S14) proves that the condition $\overline{A}_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}/N \rightarrow 0$ implies the condition $M_{\text{cond}}/M \rightarrow 0$.

The above Eq. (S14) is exact but it does not allow to prove the converse. Nevertheless, for most of the systems of interest Eq. (S14) leads us to make the following ansatz

$$\frac{\overline{A}_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}}{\overline{A}_{\text{cond}}^{(\text{out})}} \sim -1/\log\left(\frac{M_{\text{cond}}}{M}\right), \quad (\text{S15})$$

which in turn implies that $M_{\text{cond}}/M \rightarrow 0$ if and only if $\overline{A}_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}/N \rightarrow 0$.

The ansatz (S15) is compatible with Eq. (S14) and is clearly satisfied in the case of the Grover model and its generalizations. To make concrete the ansatz with a more physical example, let us consider the interaction potential of the one-dimensional Ising model with periodic boundary conditions. If we represent the configurations by products of single spin states along the z axis, $|\mathbf{n}\rangle = |\sigma_1^z\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\sigma_N^z\rangle$, with $\sigma_i^z = \pm 1$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{n} | V | \mathbf{n} \rangle = V(\mathbf{n}) = -J \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^z \sigma_{i+1}^z. \quad (\text{S16})$$

We assume $J > 0$. We are free to define $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ (and then $\mathbb{F}_{\text{cond}} = \text{span}\{\widehat{\mathbb{F}}\}$) in several ways, and we want to see to what extent the conditions $M_{\text{cond}}/M \rightarrow 0$ and $\overline{A}_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}/N \rightarrow 0$ are equivalent. We can start by including in $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ the two lowest ground states with all parallel spins. Then we can enlarge $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ by including all the states in which one spin is reversed with respect to all the other $N - 1$ parallel ones and so on. Alternatively and more effectively, we can characterize any configuration by the number of cuts q in it, where a cut is present if, reading the sequence of the pointers σ_i^z for example from left to right, we meet an inversion. In terms of q Eq. (S16) reads (we can have at most $N - 1$ number of cuts and we start by considering the two ground states in which all the spins are parallel)

$$V_q = -JN + 2Jq, \quad D(q) = 2 \binom{N-1}{q}, \quad q = 0, \dots, N-1, \quad (\text{S17})$$

where $D(q)$ is the number of configurations \mathbf{n} having potential $V(\mathbf{n}) = V_q$. We define $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ by introducing a threshold $\max V_{\text{cond}}$ as the maximum allowed potential value of its configurations. If we choose $\max V_{\text{cond}} = V_k$, we have $\widehat{\mathbb{F}} = \widehat{\mathbb{F}}(k)$ with

$$\widehat{\mathbb{F}}(k) = \{\mathbf{n} : V(\mathbf{n}) \leq V_k\}, \quad M_{\text{cond}} = 2 \sum_{q=0}^k \binom{N-1}{q}. \quad (\text{S18})$$

By recalling that $\binom{N}{k}/2^N$ tends, for $N \rightarrow \infty$, to a Dirac delta function centered at $k = N/2$, we see that

$$\frac{M_{\text{cond}}}{M} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as soon as} \quad \frac{k}{N} < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{S19})$$

On the other hand, we can verify that the condition on $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}$ is satisfied whenever $k/N < 1/2$ as follows. Given k , let us consider the boundary of $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$:

$$\tilde{\partial} = \{\mathbf{n} : V(\mathbf{n}) = V_{k+1}\}. \quad (\text{S20})$$

Given $\tilde{\mathbf{n}} \in \tilde{\partial}$, by inverting one of its spins located at a cut, we can remove the cut, and therefore lowering by $2J$ the potential energy and enter $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$, only if both the spins adjacent to the spin to be inverted are antiparallel to it (notice that at least one spin is antiparallel by definition of cut). There are two regimes where such cuts clearly appear: k very small, and k very large. The former regime occurs when $k \ll N$ so that a few isolated spins are antiparallel to the others. In this case we have $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}) = O(k)$. The other regime occurs when there are nearly half spins up and half spins down, i.e., when $k \sim N/2$, where $M_{\text{cond}}/M = O(1)$, and here we have $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}) = O(N)$. In the intermediate regime we have $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}) = o(N)$, i.e., non-extensive. This example shows that the conditions $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}/N \rightarrow 0$ and (S19) are essentially equivalent and that the ansatz (S15) is realized with $M_{\text{cond}}/M \sim \exp(k - N)$. We warn however that, as we have shown in [10], in the case of the Ising model, Eq. (5) has no solution, whatever k , so that our theory turns out to be not useful in such a case (as it is always the case when the QPT is second-order). Yet, the above picture is very general and can be similarly applied to many models, as in the particularly important case of interacting fermions [21] (where the QPT is first-order). We have directly checked that in all these models the condition $A_{\text{norm}}^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})/N \rightarrow 0$ turns out to be satisfied and that the ansatz (S15) holds true.

[S1] B. Bollobás, “Random Graphs” (2nd ed.), (Cambridge University Press 2001).

[S2] M. Ostilli, “Cayley Trees and Bethe Lattices: A concise analysis for mathematicians and physicists”, *Physica A* **391**, 3417 (2012).