

Quantum algorithm for time-dependent differential equations using Dyson series

Dominic W. Berry and Pedro C. S. Costa

School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney, New South Wales 2109, Australia

Time-dependent linear differential equations are a common type of problem that needs to be solved in classical physics. Here we provide a quantum algorithm for solving time-dependent linear differential equations with logarithmic dependence of the complexity on the error and derivative. As usual, there is an exponential improvement over classical approaches in the scaling of the complexity with the dimension, with the caveat that the solution is encoded in the amplitudes of a quantum state. Our method is to encode the Dyson series in a system of linear equations, then solve via the optimal quantum linear equation solver. Our method also provides a simplified approach in the case of time-independent differential equations.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. Form of solution	2
A. Solution to the homogeneous equation	2
B. Particular solution	3
C. The time-independent solution	4
III. Encoding in linear equations	4
A. Time-dependent equations	4
1. Encoding	4
2. Condition number	5
B. Time-independent equations	7
IV. Block encoding	8
A. Time-dependent block encoding	8
B. Time-independent block encoding	11
V. Complexity of solution	12
A. Time-dependent complexity	12
B. Time-independent complexity	15
VI. Conclusion	16
Acknowledgements	16
References	16
A. Error estimates for time discretisation	17

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum computers offer tremendous potential advantages in computing speed, but it is a long-standing challenge to find speedups to important computational tasks. A major advance for quantum algorithms was the development of a way of solving systems of linear equations by Harrow, Hassidim, and Lloyd [1]. This algorithm provides an exponential improvement in complexity in terms of the dimension as compared to classical solution, with some caveats. In particular, the matrix needs to be given in an oracular way (rather than as classical data), and the solution is encoded in amplitudes of a quantum state.

There has therefore been a great deal of follow-up work on applications of solving linear equations where the result is potentially useful despite these limitations. For example, in discretised partial differential equations (PDEs), the discretisation yields a large set of simultaneous equations. Then one may aim to obtain some global feature of the

solution which may be obtained by sampling from the prepared quantum state. This was the principle used in [2], and there have been considerable further advances since then [3, 4].

There is also the question of how to solve an *ordinary* differential equation (ODE). That is, spatial dimensions are not given explicitly (though the set of equations may have been obtained by a spatial discretization of a PDE), and the task is to solve the time evolution. The original algorithm for this task used linear multistep methods [5], and a further improvement was to use a Taylor series encoded in a larger system of linear equations to obtain complexity logarithmic in the allowable precision [6]. That then leaves open the question of how to solve time-dependent differential equations. Algorithms for time-dependent Hamiltonian evolution have been given based on a Dyson series in [7, 8].

Here we provide an algorithm for time-dependent differential equations with logarithmic dependence on the error. We combine methods from both [6] and [7, 8]. We use a block matrix similar to [6], but we do *not* use extra lines of the block matrix to implement terms in the series as in that work. Instead we construct this matrix via a block encoding using a Dyson series, in an analogous way as the block encodings in [7, 8].

In Section II we describe the form of the solution in terms of the sum of a solution to the homogeneous equation and a particular solution. Then in Section III we express the method in terms of a set of linear equations and determine the condition number. In Section IV we describe the method to block encode the linear equations. Lastly we use these results to give the overall complexity in Section V, and conclude in Section VI.

II. FORM OF SOLUTION

In this section we summarise standard methods of solving a linear differential equation via a Dyson series. A general ordinary linear differential equation has form

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = A(t)\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{b}(t), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{b}(t) \in \mathbb{C}^N$ is a vector function of t , $A(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ is a coefficient matrix and $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{C}^N$ is the solution vector as a function of variable t . We are also given an initial condition $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$. Note that we can always express a higher-order ODE as a system of first-order differential equations by defining new parameters.

We will write the general solution to (1) as

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}_H(t) + \mathbf{x}_P(t), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_H(t)$ is the solution to the homogeneous equation $\dot{\mathbf{x}}_H = A(t)\mathbf{x}_H$ and $\mathbf{x}_P(t)$ is a particular solution. In the next two subsections we show how to compute them.

A. Solution to the homogeneous equation

First we solve a differential equation of the form

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}_H = A(t)\mathbf{x}_H. \quad (3)$$

A general solution for $\mathbf{x}_H$ can be expressed in form of a Dyson series $\mathbf{x}_H(t) = W(t, t_0)\mathbf{x}_H(t_0)$ with

$$W(t, t_0) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{k-1}} dt_k \mathcal{T} A(t_1) A(t_2) \cdots A(t_k), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ indicates time ordering. We will briefly review the algorithm for the first segment. We can explicitly order the solution and truncate the infinite sum at a cutoff K to give

$$W_K(t, t_0) := \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{k-1}} dt_k A(t_1) A(t_2) \cdots A(t_k). \quad (5)$$

Note that the $k!$ disappears because the times without ordering have $k!$ permutations, so sorting them gives $k!$ multiplicity. Then, using $A_{\max} = \max_t \|A(t)\|$,

$$\|W_K(t, t_0) - W(t, t_0)\| \leq \sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} \frac{(A_{\max} \Delta t)^k}{k!}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{(A_{\max}\Delta t)^{K+1}}{(K+1)!} \exp(A_{\max}\Delta t) \\
&= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(A_{\max}\Delta t)^{K+1}}{(K+1)!}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

with $\Delta t = t - t_0$, provided Δt is chosen so $A_{\max}\Delta t$ is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Here and throughout the paper we are taking $\|\cdot\|$ to be the spectral norm.

B. Particular solution

Generalising to an inhomogeneous equation

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A(t)\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}(t), \tag{7}$$

the particular solution (i.e. with initial condition of zero) is of the form $\mathbf{x}_P(t) = \mathbf{v}(t, t_0)$ with

$$\mathbf{v}(t, t_0) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{k-1}} dt_k A(t_1)A(t_2) \cdots A(t_{k-1})\mathbf{b}(t_k). \tag{8}$$

Note that this is very similar to $W(t, t_0)$ for the homogeneous solution, except we have replaced $A(t_k)$ with $\mathbf{b}(t_k)$. Note also that, in $W(t, t_0)$ we have $k = 0$ giving a product of *none* of the A , so that term gives the identity. Here the sum starts from $k = 1$, and $k = 1$ gives the integral of $\mathbf{b}(t_1)$, so we can rewrite the solution as

$$\mathbf{v}(t, t_0) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{k-1}} dt_k A(t_1)A(t_2) \cdots A(t_{k-1})\mathbf{b}(t_k) + \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \mathbf{b}(t_1). \tag{9}$$

To see that this is the correct form of the solution, one can use

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\mathbf{x}}_P(t) &= \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t, t_0) \\
&= \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \int_{t_0}^t dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{k-1}} dt_k A(t)A(t_2) \cdots A(t_{k-1})\mathbf{b}(t_k) + \mathbf{b}(t) \\
&= A(t) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{k-1}} dt_k A(t_1) \cdots A(t_{k-1})\mathbf{b}(t_k) + \mathbf{b}(t) \\
&= A(t)\mathbf{x}_P + \mathbf{b}(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

which is the form of the differential equation. Truncating the solution, we have

$$\mathbf{v}_K(t, t_0) := \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{k-1}} dt_k A(t_1)A(t_2) \cdots A(t_{k-1})\mathbf{b}(t_k). \tag{11}$$

The complete approximate solution, as the sum of the homogeneous and particular solutions with truncations, is then

$$\mathbf{x}_K(t) = W_K(t, t_0)\mathbf{x}(t_0) + \mathbf{v}_K(t, t_0). \tag{12}$$

Defining $b_{\max} = \max_t \|\mathbf{b}(t)\|$, then the error due the truncation of the Dyson series is

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{x}_K(t) - \mathbf{x}(t)\| &\leq \|W_K(t, t_0) - W(t, t_0)\| \times \|\mathbf{x}(t_0)\| + \left\| \sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{k-1}} dt_k A(t_1)A(t_2) \cdots A(t_{k-1})\mathbf{b}(t_k) \right\| \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(A_{\max}\Delta t)^{K+1}}{(K+1)!} \|\mathbf{x}(t_0)\|\right) + \sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} \frac{A_{\max}^{k-1} \Delta t^k b_{\max}}{k!} \\
&= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(A_{\max}\Delta t)^{K+1}}{(K+1)!} \|\mathbf{x}(t_0)\| + \frac{A_{\max}^K \Delta t^{K+1} b_{\max}}{(K+1)!}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where the second norm in the first line results from $\|\mathbf{v}(t, t_0) - \mathbf{v}_K(t, t_0)\|$. Again we require that $A_{\max}\Delta t$ is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. To solve for a longer time we break the time into segments and use the truncated Dyson series on each segment. In our solution we will discretise the integrals, and to bound the overall error we also bound the error due to the discretisation; that is discussed in [Section V](#).

C. The time-independent solution

We are also going to look at the case where $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ is time-independent, which gives our usual ODE to solve

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = A\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{b}. \quad (14)$$

In [6] this was solved by using the Taylor series. Here we apply a similar principle, except that we will encode into the block matrix in a simpler way. Here we summarise the Taylor series solution, then give the encoding into the matrix in the next section.

The solution can easily be seen by substituting a constant A into the solution for the time-varying A . We obtain

$$W_K(t, t_0) = \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{(A\Delta t)^k}{k!}, \quad (15)$$

and

$$\mathbf{v}_K(t, t_0) = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(A\Delta t)^{k-1}}{k!} \mathbf{b}. \quad (16)$$

The error in the solution can be bounded as

$$\|\mathbf{x}_K(t) - \mathbf{x}(t)\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(\|A\|\Delta t)^{K+1}}{(K+1)!} \|\mathbf{x}(t_0)\| + \frac{\|A\|^K \Delta t^{K+1} \|\mathbf{b}\|}{(K+1)!}\right). \quad (17)$$

III. ENCODING IN LINEAR EQUATIONS

Next we describe how the Dyson series (or Taylor series) for the solution may be encoded into block matrices which can then be solved via the quantum algorithm for solving linear systems. The preceding section described how the series may be applied to accurately approximate the solution over a short time. In the usual way, for solving the solution over a longer time we divide the total time T into r steps of length $\Delta t = T/r$. The solution for the shorter times is obtained by a series, and all time steps are encoded in a block matrix.

A. Time-dependent equations

1. Encoding

First we describe the more complicated case of the block encoding of the Dyson series solution. This step shares many similarities with techniques for time-independent equations [6] but elements of the block matrix $\mathcal{A}^{-1}$ will need to be computed through integration described in the preceding section. The initial time for the multiple steps will be taken to be zero without loss of generality, since it is always possible to apply a time shift in the definitions. Then we can use notation t_0 for the starting time for individual steps of the Dyson series.

To illustrate the method, we first give the example of three time steps, where the encoding is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -V_1 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -V_2 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -V_3 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(0) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\Delta t) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(2\Delta t) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(3\Delta t) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(3\Delta t) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(3\Delta t) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(3\Delta t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(0) \\ \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \mathbf{v}_3 \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

where

$$\mathbf{v}_m := \mathbf{v}_K(m\Delta t, (m-1)\Delta t), \quad (19)$$

$$V_m := W_K(m\Delta t, (m-1)\Delta t), \quad (20)$$

and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ indicates the approximate solution for $\mathbf{x}$. The top row (numbered as 0 here) sets the initial condition and rows 1 to 3 give steps of the solution for time Δt as described by Eq. (12). These rows all describe forward evolution as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(m\Delta t) = V_m \mathbf{x}((m-1)\Delta t) + \mathbf{v}_m \quad (21)$$

for $m \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. In rows 4 to 6, the system is constant in time, $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(m\Delta t) = \mathbf{x}((m-1)\Delta t)$. Including rows after the final evolution steps might appear unnecessary, but these additional rows will boost the success probability of the resulting quantum algorithm [9]. Note that $\mathbf{v}_m$ and V_m involve multiple integrals over times, which would need to be addressed via the block encoding which is described in Section IV. This is a major departure from the method for time-independent differential equations from [6], where it was possible to encode the terms of the sum via extra lines in the block matrix.

In general, we can define the system of linear equations as

$$\mathcal{A}\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}, \quad (22)$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ is a block matrix, $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{NR \times NR}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are vectors $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{NR}$. Here R is the number of time steps, including those steps at the end where the solution is held constant. Taking $R - r \propto r$ will give a success probability roughly corresponding to the square of the amplitude of the solution. If the solution has not decayed too much, then this success probability will give an acceptable overhead to the complexity.

The individual blocks in $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}$ can be given explicitly as

$$\mathcal{B}_m = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(0), & m = 0 \\ \mathbf{v}_m, & 0 < m \leq r \\ 0, & m > r \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_m = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(0), & m = 0 \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(m\Delta t), & 0 < m \leq r \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(r\Delta t), & m > r \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{mn} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}, & m = n \\ -V_n, & (m = n + 1) \wedge (n \leq r) \\ -\mathbb{1}, & (m = n + 1) \wedge (n > r) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

It is easily checked that this is a general form of the example given above. By construction, this a lower bidiagonal matrix which will be useful for computing its properties.

2. Condition number

The complexity of solving the system of linear equations is proportional to the condition number of $\mathcal{A}$. To bound the condition number of $\mathcal{A}$, we just need to bound the norm of $\mathcal{A}$ and its inverse. The norm of $\mathcal{A}$ is easily bounded as $\mathcal{O}(1)$, but the norm of the inverse will depend on how much the approximate solution $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ can grow as compared to the initial condition $\mathbf{x}(0)$ and driving $\mathbf{v}_m$.

This means that the condition number can be well-bounded provided the differential equations are stable. That can be obtained provided the real parts of the eigenvalues of $A(t)$ are non-positive. This was the approach applied in [6], where a diagonalisation was used so the complexity was also dependent on the condition number of the matrix that diagonalises A . It has been pointed out in [10] that the complexity of this approach can be bounded in a number of other ways which do not depend on the diagonalisability of A .

As discussed in [10], a useful way to describe the stability of the differential equation is in terms of the logarithmic norm of $A(t)$, which can be given as the maximum eigenvalue of $[A(t) + A^\dagger(t)]/2$. A standard property of the logarithmic norm $\mu(A(t))$ is that

$$\|W(t, t_0)\| \leq \exp \left(\int_{t_0}^t \mu(A(t)) dt \right). \quad (26)$$

This means that, if the logarithmic norm is non-positive, then $\|W(t, t_0)\| \leq 1$. That is, this approach can be used to bound the norm of the time-ordered exponential, in a similar way as the exponential is bounded in the time-independent case in [10]. In the following we will require that the logarithmic norm is non-positive for stability, though other conditions bounding the norm of the time-ordered exponential can be used.

Starting with $\mathcal{A}$ from Eq. (25), it can be separated into a sum of the identity (the main diagonal) and a matrix which is just the $-V_n$ and $\mathbb{1}$ on the offdiagonal. Using the triangle inequality, the norm can therefore be upper bounded as

$$\|\mathcal{A}\| \leq 1 + \max_m \|V_m\|. \quad (27)$$

Here $\max_m \|V_m\|$ is obtained because the spectral norm of the block-diagonal matrix can be given as the maximum of the spectral norms of the blocks. The maximum is over the values of m from 1 to M . Now, V_m is defined in terms of W_K which is an approximation of the exact evolution over time Δt . We will require that the overall solution is given to accuracy $\epsilon < 1$, so the norm of W_K cannot deviate by more than ϵ from the norm for W , which is upper bounded by 1 according to our stability requirement on the logarithmic norm. That means $\max_m \|V_m\| = \mathcal{O}(1)$, and so $\|\mathcal{A}\| = \mathcal{O}(1)$. An alternative bound that does not depend on the stability is

$$\begin{aligned} \|V_m\| &= \|W_K(m\Delta t, (m-1)\Delta t)\| \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{(A_{\max}\Delta t)^k}{k!} \right\| \\ &< \|\exp(A_{\max}\Delta t)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

We choose the number of steps such that $A_{\max}\Delta t = \mathcal{O}(1)$, which again gives the upper bound $\|\mathcal{A}\| = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Next, we bound the norm of the inverse. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a lower bidiagonal matrix, it has the explicit form of the inverse [11]

$$(\mathcal{A}^{-1})_{mn} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}, & m = n \\ \prod_{\ell=n}^{m-1} V_\ell, & (m > n) \wedge (m \leq r+1) \wedge (n \leq r) \\ \prod_{\ell=n}^r V_\ell, & (m > n) \wedge (m > r+1) \wedge (n \leq r) \\ \mathbb{1}, & (m > n) \wedge (n > r) \\ 0, & m < n. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

In our example for $r = 3$, $\mathcal{A}^{-1}$ takes the form

$$\mathcal{A}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ V_1 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ V_2 V_1 & V_2 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ V_3 V_2 V_1 & V_3 V_2 & V_3 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ V_3 V_2 V_1 & V_3 V_2 & V_3 & \mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 \\ V_3 V_2 V_1 & V_3 V_2 & V_3 & \mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ V_3 V_2 V_1 & V_3 V_2 & V_3 & \mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (30)$$

Again we can use the triangle inequality. We express $\mathcal{A}^{-1}$ as a sum of matrices, each of which contains one of the diagonals. For each of the block diagonal matrices, the spectral norm is given by the maximum spectral norm of the blocks on the diagonal. More explicitly, we expand $\mathcal{A}^{-1}$ in the sum of block-diagonal matrices

$$\mathcal{A}^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{R-1} \mathcal{A}_k^{\text{inv}} \quad (31)$$

where

$$(\mathcal{A}_k^{\text{inv}})_{mn} = \begin{cases} \prod_{\ell=n}^{\min(m-1, r)} V_\ell, & m = n + k \\ 0, & m < n, \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

and we take the convention that a product with no factors gives the identity. We have by the triangle inequality

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{-1}\| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{R-1} \|\mathcal{A}_k^{\text{inv}}\|. \quad (33)$$

Then

$$\|\mathcal{A}_k^{\text{inv}}\| \leq \max_n \left\| \prod_{\ell=n}^{\min(n+k-1, r)} V_\ell \right\|, \quad (34)$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{A}^{-1}\| &\leq R \max_k \|\mathcal{A}_k^{\text{inv}}\| \\ &\leq R \max_{m \geq n} \left\| \prod_{\ell=n}^{m-1} V_\ell \right\|.\end{aligned}\tag{35}$$

The bound in (35) can be interpreted as R times the norm of the largest block of $\mathcal{A}^{-1}$. This will be an identity or some products of V_ℓ s corresponding to an approximation of the time-evolution operator over a period of time within the interval $[t_0, T]$. We will choose the parameters such that the approximation is within ϵ of the exact operator, and so the norm is within ϵ of the exact operator. According to our condition on the stability in terms of the logarithmic norm, the time-ordered exponential has its spectral norm upper bounded by 1, and the spectral norm of the product of V_ℓ cannot be more than $\epsilon < 1$ larger than this. Hence the spectral norm of the inverse is upper bounded as

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{-1}\| \leq R(1 + \epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(R).\tag{36}$$

and so the condition number of $\mathcal{A}$ is

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{A}} = \|\mathcal{A}\| \times \|\mathcal{A}^{-1}\| = \mathcal{O}(R).\tag{37}$$

B. Time-independent equations

The encoding of the time-dependent case is exactly the same of the independent case, except that now the V_m are independent of m , so we can write for example

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -V & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -V & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -V & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} \end{bmatrix},\tag{38}$$

where now we have

$$V = W_K(m\Delta t, (m-1)\Delta t) = \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{(A\Delta t)^k}{k!},\tag{39}$$

which is independent of m . Similarly, the $\mathbf{v}_m$ are replaced with

$$\mathbf{v} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{A^{k-1} \Delta t^k}{k!} \mathbf{b}.\tag{40}$$

We can write the general form in a similar way as for the time-dependent case, except that the $V_m, \mathbf{v}_m$ are replaced with the time-independent $V, \mathbf{v}$.

In exactly the same way as for the time-dependent case, the spectral norm can be upper bounded by expressing the matrix as a sum of block-diagonal matrices and using the triangle inequality

$$\|\mathcal{A}\| \leq 1 + \|V\|.\tag{41}$$

Again $\|V\|$ will be an accurate approximation of the exponential, which is upper bounded by 1 according to the stability criterion, and so $\|\mathcal{A}\| = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Similarly to the time-dependent case, the spectral norm of $\mathcal{A}^{-1}$ can be upper bounded by using the triangle inequality on the explicit expression for the inverse. Again the stability condition guarantees that the norm of the exponential is no larger than 1, and the condition on the approximation of the solution being with error ϵ implies that the norm of the powers of V is within ϵ of 1. Since there is a sum over R of these norms, we again have $\mathcal{A}^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(R)$ and so

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{A}} = \|\mathcal{A}\| \times \|\mathcal{A}^{-1}\| = \mathcal{O}(R).\tag{42}$$

IV. BLOCK ENCODING

A. Time-dependent block encoding

Here we address how to give a block encoding of the matrix in order to apply the quantum linear equation solver. The block encoding is not trivial, because the blocks we have given above are composed of multiple integrals. For our result we just assume that the matrix $A(t)$ is given by a block encoding, rather than considering how it would specifically be done for a particular encoding (such as sparse matrix oracles). Similarly, we will assume that there is a block encoding for a preparation of the state corresponding to $\mathbf{b}(t)$ as well as the initial state $\mathbf{x}_0$. We assume that the block encoding can be given the time register as a quantum input. The overall complexity is then in terms of the number of calls to these block encodings.

More specifically, given the target system of dimension N , a time register of dimension N_t and ancillas of dimension N_A, N_b , there are unitaries U_A , U_b , and U_x such that

$${}_A\langle 0| U_A |0\rangle_A |n_t\rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda_A} A(t) |n_t\rangle, \quad (43)$$

$${}_b\langle 0| U_b |0\rangle_b |n_t\rangle |0\rangle_s = \frac{1}{\lambda_b} |n_t\rangle |\mathbf{b}(t)\rangle_s, \quad (44)$$

$$U_x |0\rangle_s = \frac{1}{\lambda_x} |\mathbf{x}_0\rangle_s, \quad (45)$$

where n_t is a binary encoding of the time t , the subscripts A, b on the state indicate the ancillas for the block encodings of $A(t)$ and $\mathbf{b}(t)$, and the subscript s indicates the target system. The operator $A(t)$ acts upon the target system, which is omitted in the first line for simplicity. The value of λ_x is just that needed to normalisation. The value of λ_b also ensures normalisation, but since the norm of $\mathbf{b}(t)$ can vary over time we define the oracle in terms of a block encoding so that λ_b can be taken to be independent of time. It would also be possible to define an oracle with a unitary preparation and time-dependent λ_b , but that would make the later algorithms much more complicated. We apply the standard encoding of the vector in amplitudes of the state so, for example,

$$|\mathbf{x}(t)\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} x_n(t) |n\rangle, \quad (46)$$

for computational basis states $|n\rangle$. Note that this state is not defined in a normalised way, which is why we have, for example, division by λ_x above. We also use the standard assumption that the block-encoding unitaries can be applied in a controlled way and we can also apply their inverses.

There are standard methods for combining block encodings of matrices we will use. When we are multiplying operations in a block encoding the general procedure is that if

$$\langle 0| U |0\rangle = A, \quad \langle 0| V |0\rangle = B, \quad (47)$$

then we have

$$\langle 0| \langle 0| VU |0\rangle |0\rangle = BA, \quad (48)$$

where the understanding is that U and V are acting on different ancillas. That is, we need the ancilla space for both when multiplying. In adding operations, we would build a controlled operation that performs

$$P = |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes U + |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes V \quad (49)$$

controlled by a qubit ancilla. Then we obtain

$$\langle 0| \langle 0| HPH |0\rangle |0\rangle = (A + B)/2. \quad (50)$$

The first H puts the qubit ancilla in a superposition, then P applies either U or V controlled on that ancilla, and H flips the ancilla back again. Similar procedures are used for sums of operators with more general weightings. These primitives mean that whenever we have a polynomial in something that is block encoded we can construct a block encoding for the polynomial. In particular, we use ancilla registers with times to give an approximation of the time integral in the Dyson series, in a similar way as was done for Hamiltonian simulation.

Here we want to block encode an operation of the following form, given for the example of three time steps

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -V_1 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -V_2 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -V_3 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (51)$$

This matrix can be written in the form

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & V_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & V_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (52)$$

Here there are two operations that are trivial to implement. One is the identity, and the other is an increment on the time register. It is not unitary, because the top row is zero. It can easily be block encoded by incrementing the register in a non-modular way, and using the carry qubit. That is, recall that the block encoding involves a projection onto the $|0\rangle$ state, so if the carry qubit is flipped to $|1\rangle$ then that part is eliminated in the block encoding.

The difficult operation to block encode is the one with V_m on the diagonal. To block encode that matrix, we use the intermediate matrix

$$\mathcal{A}(\delta t) = \begin{bmatrix} A(\delta t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A(\Delta t + \delta t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A(2\Delta t + \delta t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (53)$$

where δt is used to index an offset between 0 and Δt . This matrix can be block encoded using the block encoding of A with a time register as input. This may be achieved simply by using a number of time intervals for each Δt that is a power of 2. Then we may use the qubits encoding δt , and the qubits encoding the line in the block matrix, together to give the time input for the block encoding of $A(t)$. For the zeros in the lower-right of $A(\delta t)$ we can flip an ancilla qubit to eliminate that part in the block encoding. That is most easily performed when M is a power of 2 as well, so a single qubit will flag the lower-right part of the matrix.

Then we use this matrix as input to a truncated Dyson series of the form

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\Delta t} dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{k-1}} dt_k \mathcal{A}(t_1) \mathcal{A}(t_2) \cdots \mathcal{A}(t_k). \quad (54)$$

In order to block encode the Dyson series, the same procedure as in [7] or [8] can be used. To be more specific on the complexity, there are K time registers which are generated in equal superposition states and then sorted via a sorting network (as is needed for quantum algorithms). The sort has an optimal complexity of $\mathcal{O}(K \log K)$ steps, each of which has a complexity corresponding to the number of bits used to store δt . Using M for the number of these time steps, the number of bits is $\log M$, and so the gate complexity is $\mathcal{O}(K \log K \log M)$. The block encoding of each of the K applications of $\mathcal{A}(\delta t)$ is used, which has complexity of K calls to the block encoding of $A(t)$.

If the inequality testing approach of [8] is used then the complexity of the preparation of the time register is $\mathcal{O}(K \log M)$, because there are $K - 1$ inequality tests on registers of size $\log M$. despite this, in practice it is preferable to use the sorting approach because it provides an improved constant factor in the complexity (which is ignored here in the order scaling).

The preparation of the register with values of k can be performed simply using a unary representation and controlled rotations. The precision of the truncated Dyson series needs to be $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon/r)$, and since there are K rotations each needs precision $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon/(Kr))$, and therefore has complexity $\mathcal{O}(\log(Kr/\epsilon))$. Here $\log(r/\epsilon)$ is at least as large as K , and so

the K in the log can be ignored, giving complexity $\mathcal{O}(\log(r/\epsilon))$. That gives a complexity $\mathcal{O}(K \log(r/\epsilon))$ for the K rotations.

It is also possible to perform the preparation of k using the improved approach of [12] based on inequality testing. That yields similar complexity for the order scaling because the number of bits needed is $\mathcal{O}(K \log K)$. In the method of [8] for preparing time registers, the preparation over k only needs an equal superposition, which may be prepared with trivial $\mathcal{O}(\log K)$ complexity [13].

Choosing $\lambda_A \Delta t \leq 1$ (and the sorting approach for time registers), the Dyson series in Eq. (54) is block encoded with a factor of at least $1/e$. There is a further constant factor in the block encoding of the sum for $\mathcal{A}$ in Eq. (52), which may be ignored in our analysis because we are providing the order scaling.

The linear equations to solve are of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -V_1 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -V_2 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -V_3 & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(0) \\ \mathbf{x}(\Delta t) \\ \mathbf{x}(2\Delta t) \\ \mathbf{x}(3\Delta t) \\ \mathbf{x}(3\Delta t) \\ \mathbf{x}(3\Delta t) \\ \mathbf{x}(3\Delta t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_0 \\ \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \mathbf{v}_3 \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (55)$$

so we need to block encode the integrals in $\mathbf{b}(t)$. Here the integral to encode is of the form

$$\mathbf{v}_K(t_0 + \Delta t, t_0) = \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \Delta t} dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{k-1}} dt_k A(t_1) A(t_2) \cdots A(t_{k-1}) \mathbf{b}(t_k). \quad (56)$$

The block encoding of this vector can be applied in almost an identical way as for the block encoding of the truncated Dyson series, except the initial block encoding of $A(t_k)$ is replaced with the block encoding of the preparation of $|\mathbf{b}(t_k)\rangle$. Therefore, the gate complexity of preparing and sorting the time registers is again $\mathcal{O}(K \log K \log M)$, or $\mathcal{O}(K \log M)$ if one were simply to perform inequality testing as in [8]. There are $K - 1$ calls to block encodings of $A(t)$, as well as a single call to the block encoding of $\mathbf{b}(t_k)$.

For the block encoding of Eq. (56), the choice $\lambda_A \Delta t \leq 1$ means that there is a factor of at least $1/(e - 1)$ in the block encoding. This factor will not be exactly $1/(e - 1)$, but we will use this expression below for the simplicity of the explanation. (The amplitude for success will be lower bounded by that using $1/(e - 1)$.) This constant will be omitted when giving the complexity, because we are giving it in terms of the order scaling.

A further subtlety is that we are assuming that $\mathbf{b}(t_k)$ is prepared via a block encoding with a time-independent factor of $1/\lambda_b$. These factors result in there being an amplitude for failure in the preparation. Ignoring discretisation of the time integrals, the preparation of the state corresponding to $\mathbf{v}_K(t_0 + \Delta t, t_0)$ has a factor of $1/((e - 1)\lambda_b \Delta t)$ rather than $1/\|\mathbf{v}_K(t_0 + \Delta t, t_0)\|$, so the amplitude for success is $\|\mathbf{v}_K(t_0 + \Delta t, t_0)\|/((e - 1)\lambda_b \Delta t)$.

For the complete preparation, it is necessary to prepare $\mathbf{x}(0)$ as well. We would initially prepare a state on the time registers

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_x^2 + (e - 1)^2 r \lambda_b^2 \Delta t^2}} \left[\lambda_x |0\rangle + (e - 1) \lambda_b \Delta t \sum_{m=1}^r |m\rangle \right]. \quad (57)$$

Then a preparation of $|\mathbf{x}(t_0)\rangle$ controlled on $|0\rangle$ and a preparation of $|\mathbf{v}_m\rangle$ controlled on $|m\rangle$ gives a state of the form

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_x^2 + (e - 1)^2 r \lambda_b^2 \Delta t^2}} \left[|0\rangle |\mathbf{x}(t_0)\rangle + \sum_{m=1}^r |m\rangle |\mathbf{v}_m\rangle \right]. \quad (58)$$

The amplitude for success is then

$$\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_x^2 + \sum_{m=1}^r \|\mathbf{v}_m\|^2}{\lambda_x^2 + (e - 1)^2 r \lambda_b^2 \Delta t^2}} \geq \frac{\min_m \|\mathbf{v}_m\|}{(e - 1) \lambda_b \Delta t}. \quad (59)$$

Because the actual factor was *at least* $1/(e - 1)$, the expression on the right provides a lower bound in general. The expression here is in terms of $\mathbf{v}_m$, which will be constructed with the truncated series and discretised integrals, but the parameters will be chosen so that the error in each is no more than $\epsilon x_{\max}/r$. As a result

$$\|\mathbf{v}_m\| \geq \|\mathbf{v}(m\Delta t, (m - 1)\Delta t)\| - \epsilon x_{\max}/r. \quad (60)$$

It would be expected that the correction here would typically be small enough to ignore. If the norm of $\mathbf{b}$ does not vary too much and there are not cancellations in the integral, then the expression is proportional to $b_{\max}\Delta t$. Since it would be expected that λ_b is comparable to $b_{\max}$, in such a case the amplitude for success would be at least a constant.

In order to account for the probability of failure in the preparation of the state, we can use a flag qubit for success that is unaffected by the solution of the linear equations, then perform amplitude amplification on the success over the entire procedure. We will also perform amplitude amplification to obtain the state at the final time, so amplitude amplification for these two successes can be combined.

A few minor details on the complexity are as follows. The time may need to be chosen smaller than $1/\lambda_A$ in order to account for a final time step to obtain the exact desired time, or to properly bound the error for the series for the driving. In that case the preparation of the register for k can be prepared by a different sequence of controlled rotations, but the complexity will be no more than $K \log(1/\epsilon)$, which will be less than that needed to perform arithmetic on the time registers and can be ignored.

There is also the initial preparation needed for the time register for the state. This can be performed as follows. First perform a rotation on an ancilla qubit to obtain the appropriate weighting between $m = 0$ and $m = 1, \dots, r$. If r is a power of 2, then controlled on this qubit being $|0\rangle$ we perform Hadamards on the $\log r$ qubits for the time, giving values from 0 to $r - 1$. In the more general case where r is not a power of 2, one can perform a controlled preparation over a number of basis states that is not a power of 2, which has complexity $\mathcal{O}(\log r)$ [13].

We can perform CNOTs from the ancilla qubit to the remaining qubits for the time, so that if this control qubit was $|1\rangle$ then we have all ones. Then adding 1 in a modular way with the ancilla as the most significant bit, if the ancilla was $|1\rangle$ then we get all zeros, and if it was $|0\rangle$ we get values from 1 to r . The complexity of this procedure is $\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\epsilon))$ for the initial rotation, and $\mathcal{O}(\log r)$ for the remaining steps. This complexity can be disregarded because it is smaller than many other parts of the procedure.

B. Time-independent block encoding

The time-independent case is substantially simplified over the time-dependent case. First, the block encodings are simplified to

$${}_A\langle 0|U_A|0\rangle_A = \frac{1}{\lambda_A}, \quad (61)$$

$$U_b|0\rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda_b}|\mathbf{b}\rangle, \quad (62)$$

$$U_x|0\rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda_x}|\mathbf{x}_0\rangle, \quad (63)$$

where there is now no time register for the input and the preparation of $|\mathbf{b}\rangle$ is just via a unitary operation. We now omit the s subscript because there is just the one register. This means that now $\lambda_b = \|\mathbf{b}\|$. Again the block encoding can use Eq. (52), except with V_m replaced with the Taylor series V as given in Eq. (39), and $\mathbf{v}_m$ replaced with $\mathbf{v}$ given in Eq. (40).

The block encoding proceeds in exactly the same way as before, except that there is no need for the time integrals. This means that we need to prepare a register with k for both the Taylor series and the series for $\mathbf{v}$. Again, if $\lambda_A\Delta t \leq 1$, then the Taylor series is block encoded with a factor of at least $1/e$.

We can also circumvent the problem we have in the time-dependent case that there are possible cancellations in $\mathbf{v}_m$. That is, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}\| &\geq \|\mathbf{b}\|\Delta t \left\{ 1 - \sum_{k=2}^K \frac{(\|A\|\Delta t)^{k-1}}{k!} \right\} \\ &> \|\mathbf{b}\|\Delta t \left\{ 1 - \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\|A\|\Delta t)^{k-1}}{k!} \right\} \\ &= \|\mathbf{b}\|\Delta t \left\{ 1 - \frac{[\exp(\|A\|\Delta t) - (1 + \|A\|\Delta t)]}{\|A\|\Delta t} \right\} \\ &\geq (3 - e)\|\mathbf{b}\|\Delta t, \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where we have used $\|A\|\Delta t \leq \lambda_A \Delta t \leq 1$. We would then find that the amplitude for success of the state preparation would, using Eq. (59), be given by

$$\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_x^2 + \sum_{m=1}^r \|\mathbf{v}\|^2}{\lambda_x^2 + (e-1)^2 r \lambda_b^2 \Delta t^2}} \geq \frac{(3-e)\|\mathbf{b}\|\Delta t}{(e-1)\lambda_b \Delta t} = \frac{3-e}{e-1}. \quad (65)$$

Thus the amplitude for success of the state preparation is at least a constant here, so cannot affect the scaling of the complexity and can be omitted in the $\mathcal{O}$ expressions.

V. COMPLEXITY OF SOLUTION

A. Time-dependent complexity

The overall complexity of the quantum algorithm for the time-dependent differential equations can be described as in the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *We are given an ordinary linear differential equation of the form*

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = A(t)\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{b}(t), \quad \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0, \quad (66)$$

where $\mathbf{b}(t) \in \mathbb{C}^N$ is a vector function of t , $A(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ is a coefficient matrix with non-positive logarithmic norm, and $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{C}^N$ is the solution vector as a function of t . The parameters of the differential equation are provided via unitaries U_A , U_b , and U_x such that

$${}_A\langle 0|U_A|0\rangle_A |n_t\rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda_A} A(t) |n_t\rangle, \quad (67)$$

$${}_b\langle 0|U_b|0\rangle_b |n_t\rangle |0\rangle_s = \frac{1}{\lambda_b} |n_t\rangle |\mathbf{b}(t)\rangle_s, \quad (68)$$

$$U_x |0\rangle_s = \frac{1}{\lambda_x} |\mathbf{x}_0\rangle_s. \quad (69)$$

A quantum algorithm can provide an approximation $|\hat{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ of the solution $|\mathbf{x}(T)\rangle$ satisfying $\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - |\mathbf{x}(T)\rangle\| \leq \epsilon x_{\max}$ using an average number

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon)) \quad \text{calls to } U_b, U_x, \quad (70)$$

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\mathcal{R}\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon) \log\left(\frac{\lambda T}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \quad \text{calls to } U_A, \quad (71)$$

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\mathcal{R}\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon) \log\left(\frac{\lambda T}{\epsilon}\right) \left[\log\left(\frac{T\mathcal{D}}{\lambda\epsilon}\right) + \log\left(\frac{\lambda T}{\epsilon}\right)\right]\right) \quad \text{additional gates}, \quad (72)$$

where $\lambda = \max(\lambda_A, b_{\max}/x_{\max})$, given constants satisfying

$$\mathcal{R} \geq \frac{x_{\max}}{\|\mathbf{x}(T)\|} \frac{\lambda_b/\lambda}{\min_m \|\mathbf{v}(m\Delta t, (m-1)\Delta t)\| - \epsilon x_{\max}/(\lambda T)}, \quad (73)$$

$$\mathcal{D} \geq \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|A'(t)\| + \frac{\max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{b}'(t)\|}{x_{\max}}, \quad (74)$$

$$x_{\max} \geq \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{x}(t)\|, \quad (75)$$

$$b_{\max} \geq \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{b}(t)\|. \quad (76)$$

Here

$$\mathbf{v}(t, t_0) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{k-1}} dt_k A(t_1) A(t_2) \cdots A(t_{k-1}) \mathbf{b}(t_k). \quad (77)$$

and

$$\Delta t = \frac{T}{\left\lceil \frac{T}{\min\left(\frac{1}{2\lambda_A}, \frac{x_{\max}}{b_{\max}}\right)} \right\rceil}. \quad (78)$$

We use the convention that state vectors such as $|\mathbf{x}_0\rangle_s$ are the unnormalised form with amplitudes exactly equal to the coefficients of the corresponding complex vector. For the unnormalised solution state $|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$, this is defined in the sense that for the normalised quantum state, there exists some constant that we can multiply it by to give $|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ that satisfies the accuracy constraint.

We require that we are given upper bounds $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{D}$, and so on, because it may be too difficult to determine the maxima and minima required exactly. For completeness we have given a complicated expression for $\mathcal{R}$ to account for the steps of amplitude amplification needed, but in practice if the solution does not decay significantly, and $\mathbf{b}(t)$ does not vary such that it cancels and gives small $\mathbf{v}$, then it can be expected that $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and can be ignored in the scaling of the complexity.

For the count of additional gates, we are not allowing arbitrary precision rotations. Instead it would be for a fixed set of gates, such as Toffolis (or T gates) plus Clifford gates. The complexity would be equivalent (up to a constant factor) to the non-Clifford count that is often used in quantifying complexities for algorithms intended for error-corrected quantum computers with magic-state factories.

Proof. The complexity of solving the linear equations to within error ϵ is equal to $\mathcal{O}(\kappa_{\mathcal{A}} \log(1/\epsilon))$, in terms of calls to the block-encoded matrix $\mathcal{A}$ and the block encoding of the initial vector $\mathcal{B}$ [14]. The procedure uses solution via an adiabatic algorithm, followed by filtering, and needs to repeat on average $\mathcal{O}(1)$ times in order to obtain success of the filtering. In our procedure we will use amplitude amplification on the result of the solution of linear systems, which would be incompatible with that procedure based on measurement.

Instead we will combine the flag for success of the filtering there together with the other successes in the procedure (obtaining the final time and correctly preparing the initial state). The amplitude amplification can then be performed in a unified way on all three parts. The success of the filtering in solving linear systems has amplitude for success on the order of a constant, so can be ignored in the later analysis. Note also that the filtering in [14] uses measurements. Those can easily be replaced with a completely coherent linear combinations of unitaries procedure, or use filtering via quantum signal processing, so do not cause a problem.

Because the solution is a normalised state vector, and the solution state gives $|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(T)\rangle$ for as many time steps as $|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t)\rangle$ for $t \in [0, T]$, it is in the form of $|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(T)\rangle$ divided by a normalisation factor that is no larger than $\sqrt{2}x_{\max}$. If the quantum solution of linear equations is accurate to within $\epsilon/\sqrt{2}$, then

$$\frac{\| |\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(T)\rangle - |\mathbf{x}(T)\rangle \|}{\sqrt{2}x_{\max}} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (79)$$

and so $\| |\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(T)\rangle - |\mathbf{x}(T)\rangle \| \leq \epsilon x_{\max}$.

The factor of $\sqrt{2}$ in the error still yields $\mathcal{O}(\kappa_{\mathcal{A}} \log(1/\epsilon))$ for the complexity. Note that we also have sources of error from the solution of linear equations as well as from the discretisation of the differential equation, so the exact solution of the linear equations does not give the exact solution of the differential equation. Because we are providing a result in terms of the order scaling, to simplify the analysis it is sufficient to allow error ϵ in each part.

Provided $A(t)$ satisfies the stability condition that the logarithmic norm is non-positive, the solution is not exponentially increasing, and we have $\kappa_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{O}(R)$, with R the total number of block rows in the matrix $\mathcal{A}$. We will choose $R = \mathcal{O}(r)$, which is the number of time steps for the evolution. We also choose $\lambda_{\mathcal{A}} \Delta t = 1/2$ to ensure that the block encoding of the Dyson series is well-behaved. That choice also ensures that the error from the first term in Eq. (13) is no larger than $\epsilon \|\mathbf{x}(t_0)\|/r$ provided K is chosen proportional to $\log(r/\epsilon)/\log \log(r/\epsilon)$. Here $t_0 = (m-1)\Delta t$ is the initial time for this step of the Dyson series. Multiplying by r time steps where the Dyson series is applied, the first term in Eq. (13) gives error no more than $\epsilon x_{\max}$ as required.

Then for the second term in Eq. (13), to similarly bound the error we would require

$$b_{\max} \Delta t \leq \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{x}(t)\|. \quad (80)$$

That implies we should take

$$\Delta t \leq \min \left(\frac{1}{2\lambda_{\mathcal{A}}}, \frac{x_{\max}}{b_{\max}} \right), \quad (81)$$

and so

$$r = \frac{T}{\Delta t} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda T) \quad (82)$$

with λ defined as in the statement of the theorem. To be more specific, to ensure r is an integer we should take

$$\Delta t = \frac{T}{\left\lceil \frac{T}{\min\left(\frac{1}{2\lambda_A}, \frac{x_{\max}}{b_{\max}}\right)} \right\rceil}. \quad (83)$$

Using this result for r for the condition number then gives the average number of block encodings of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ needed to solve the system of linear equations as $\mathcal{O}(\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon))$. In order to obtain the state for the solution at time T , we then need to amplify the solution. Since we use as many blocks in the matrix for time T as for the r steps from 0 to T , the proportion of the amplitude of the state for time T is

$$\Omega\left(\frac{\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(T)\|}{\max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t)\|}\right), \quad (84)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ is the approximate solution obtained taking into account the error in the solution of linear equations as well as the discretisation of the differential equation. This amplitude would indicate a factor

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t)\|}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(T)\|}\right), \quad (85)$$

for the number of steps of amplitude amplification. Here we can replace the numerator with $x_{\max}$, because the condition on the error means that it is within a constant factor of $x_{\max}$.

The denominator is a little more subtle, but we can consider solving with sufficient accuracy that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(T)\| \geq \|\mathbf{x}(T)\| - \epsilon x_{\max}/2$. Then, if $\|\mathbf{x}(T)\| \geq \epsilon x_{\max}$ we are guaranteed that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(T)\|$ is within a factor of 2 of $\|\mathbf{x}(T)\|$, and we can replace it in the denominator. If $\|\mathbf{x}(T)\| < \epsilon x_{\max}$ then for any output state, we can multiply it by zero to give $|\hat{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ that satisfies the accuracy constraint.

For the algorithm we require that we are given $\mathcal{R}$ which governs the number of steps of amplitude amplification to use. Normally there would be a success flag for the amplitude amplification which would indicate success with the number of steps on average. In this pathological case the solution would technically be given with the required average number of steps, because any state can be regarded as the solution. The subtlety is that in this case there would not be a flag to indicate that the state has been given (which is not required for the statement of the complexity).

In addition to this amplitude, we have an amplitude for success of the preparation of the state for $\mathcal{B}$ at least

$$\frac{\min_m \|\mathbf{v}_m\|}{(e-1)\lambda_b \Delta t}. \quad (86)$$

For the scaling we can replace Δt with $1/\lambda$, and ignore $(e-1)$. We lower bound $\|\mathbf{v}_m\|$ in terms of $\|\mathbf{v}(t_0 + \Delta t, t_0)\|$ minus $\epsilon x_{\max}/r$, because we are approximating the exact sum to that precision. Then we replace r with λT .

The overall amplitude for the desired state is then the product of these amplitudes, and the number of steps of amplitude amplification needed is proportional to the inverse of the product of amplitudes, which is no more than $\mathcal{R}$ in the statement of the theorem. We consider the average cost, which means that it is not necessary to know the exact amplitude, and it is sufficient to use $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R})$ iterations. That is in contrast to costing with an upper bound for success of amplitude amplification, which would give a logarithmic factor of the success probability. The number of block encodings of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ in order to get the state $|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(T)\rangle$ is then $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon))$.

The overall complexity in terms of the calls to the oracles for $A(t)$, $\mathbf{b}(t)$, $\mathbf{x}_0$ can then be obtained by considering the block encoding used. In the block encoding used for $\mathcal{B}$, there are single calls to the oracles for $\mathbf{b}(t)$ and $\mathbf{x}_0$, as well as $K-1$ calls to the oracle for $A(t)$. In the block encoding for $\mathcal{A}$, there are K calls to the oracle for $A(t)$, and no calls to the other oracles. Therefore the number of calls to the oracles for $\mathbf{b}(t)$ and $\mathbf{x}_0$ are just $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon))$. The number of calls to the oracles for $A(t)$ is $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon)K)$.

As explained above, we should choose K as $\mathcal{O}(\log(r/\epsilon)/\log \log(r/\epsilon))$. Using r as order λT , and omitting the division by $\log \log$ for simplicity, we get the value of K as $\mathcal{O}(\log(\lambda T/\epsilon))$, so the number of calls to the oracle for $A(t)$ is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\mathcal{R}\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon) \log\left(\frac{\lambda T}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \quad (87)$$

as required.

Lastly, the majority of the complexity for the additional gates is in constructing the registers for the time. We need to construct K registers for the time, and sort in order to obtain the correctly ordered time registers. The

complexity of these steps is then $\mathcal{O}(K \log K \log M)$ for the number of steps for the sort times the number of qubits in the registers. Taking $K = \mathcal{O}(\log(r/\epsilon)/\log \log(r/\epsilon))$, we have $K \log K = \mathcal{O}(\log(r/\epsilon)) = \mathcal{O}(\log(\lambda T/\epsilon))$.

That accounts for the factors before the square brackets given for the number of additional gates. Next we consider the contribution to the complexity from the factor of $\log M$. The value of M needs to be chosen to be large enough such that the error from discretisation of the integrals in the Dyson series is no larger than ϵ/r for each of the r time segments. Exactly the same derivation as for the time-dependent Hamiltonian in Ref. [7] holds, which implies that the error in each of the r time segments scales as

$$\left\| W_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) - \widetilde{W}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) \right\| \|\mathbf{x}(\delta)\| \in \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{(T/r)^2}{M} \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|A'(t)\| x_{\max} \right) \quad (88)$$

where $W_K(t_\alpha, t_\beta)$ is given by Eq. (5), $t_\alpha - t_\beta = T/r$ and

$$\widetilde{W} = \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{(T/r)^k}{M^k k!} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_k=0}^{M-1} \mathcal{T} A(t_{j_k}) \cdots A(t_{j_1}). \quad (89)$$

This expression corresponds to discretising the integral over each time variable to approximate it by a sum with M terms. In Eq. (88) we also have $A'(t)$ which is the time derivative of $A(t)$. The extra factor of $x_{\max}$ over the result given in [7] is because the time evolution operator W is multiplied by $\mathbf{x}$. Similarly, it is easy to see that

$$\|\mathbf{v}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha)\| \in \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{(T/r)^2}{M} \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{b}'(t)\| + \frac{(T/r)^3 b_{\max}}{M} \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|A'(t)\| \right), \quad (90)$$

for the error in the integral for the driving term due to time discretisation of Eq. (8). The first term in Eq. (90) comes from $k = 1$, and the second comes from $k = 2$. See Appendix A for details of the derivation. We are choosing Δt such that $b_{\max} \Delta t \leq x_{\max}$, and so the second term above is no larger than that in Eq. (88). As a result we can take

$$M = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{T^2 \mathcal{D}}{r \epsilon} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{T \mathcal{D}}{\lambda \epsilon} \right). \quad (91)$$

Taking the log of this expression gives the first term in square brackets for the number of additional gates in the theorem.

Lastly, we consider the complexity of the rotations used for preparing the k register. As explained above, these give complexity $\mathcal{O}(K \log(r/\epsilon))$. We give the simplified scaling $\mathcal{O}(\log(\lambda T/\epsilon))$ for K , then $\mathcal{O}(\log(r/\epsilon))$ gives another factor of $\mathcal{O}(\log(\lambda T/\epsilon))$, which is given as the second term in the square brackets for the gate complexity. In practice it would be expected that this term is smaller.

There are also operations needed on the approximately $\log r$ qubits for the preparing the time registers, but this complexity is no more than $\mathcal{O}(K)$ for each time step. That is smaller than the other complexities so can be omitted in the order scaling. $\square$

B. Time-independent complexity

In the time-independent case the complexity becomes as follows.

Theorem 2. *We are given an ordinary linear differential equation of the form*

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = A\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{b}, \quad \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0, \quad (92)$$

where $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ is a vector function of t , $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ is a coefficient matrix with non-positive logarithmic norm, and $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{C}^N$ is the solution vector as a function of t . The parameters of the differential equation are provided via unitaries U_A , U_b , and U_x such that

$${}_A \langle 0 | U_A | 0 \rangle_A = \frac{1}{\lambda_A} A, \quad (93)$$

$$U_b | 0 \rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda_b} |\mathbf{b}\rangle, \quad (94)$$

$$U_x | 0 \rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda_x} |\mathbf{x}_0\rangle. \quad (95)$$

A quantum algorithm can provide an approximation $|\hat{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ of the solution $|\mathbf{x}(T)\rangle$ satisfying $\| |\hat{\mathbf{x}}\rangle - |\mathbf{x}(T)\rangle \| \leq \epsilon x_{\max}$ using an average number

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon)) \quad \text{calls to } U_b, U_x, \quad (96)$$

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\mathcal{R}\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon) \log\left(\frac{\lambda T}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \quad \text{calls to } U_A, \quad (97)$$

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\mathcal{R}\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon) \log^2\left(\frac{\lambda T}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \quad \text{additional gates}, \quad (98)$$

where $\lambda = \max(\lambda_A, \lambda_b/x_{\max})$, given constants satisfying

$$\mathcal{R} \geq \frac{x_{\max}}{\|\mathbf{x}(T)\|}, \quad (99)$$

$$x_{\max} \geq \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{x}(t)\|. \quad (100)$$

Proof. The proof proceeds in exactly the same way as for the time-dependent case, except for a few minor amendments. First, the state preparation succeeds with probability at least a constant, to the factor from this amplitude does not appear in $\mathcal{R}$. The other difference in the proof is that the number of additional gates is greatly reduced. We no longer need to perform any arithmetic on time registers, so the $\log(T\mathcal{D}/\lambda\epsilon)$ factor from the time-dependent cost is removed. However, we do still need to perform rotations and controlled rotations to prepare the register with k . As a result, we still have the extra factor of $\log(\lambda T/\epsilon)$, which combines with the first (from K) to give the square. $\square$

VI. CONCLUSION

We have given a quantum algorithm to solve a time-dependent differential equation in the sense that it outputs a quantum state with amplitudes encoding the solution vector. This is a distinct method than that used for the time-independent case in [6], where different orders of the sum were encoded in successive lines of the block matrix. In our approach the block matrix has each successive line encoding a new time step, and employs a block encoding of the Dyson series in a similar way as for Hamiltonian simulation in [7].

This approach makes the analysis of the complexity simpler than in [6], because it is not necessary to account for the extra lines in the encoding. As in [10], the expression for the complexity is simplified by using a condition on the logarithmic norm of $A(t)$. This approach avoids needing $A(t)$ to be diagonalisable. These techniques also give a significantly simplified result for the complexity in the time-independent case.

The complexity is, up to logarithmic factors, linear in the total evolution time T and the constant λ in the block encoding of $A(t)$. By applying the optimal quantum linear equation solver of [14], we obtain excellent scaling of the complexity in $\log(1/\epsilon)$. The number of calls to encodings of the driving and initial state is linear in $\log(1/\epsilon)$, whereas the number of calls to the block encoding of $A(t)$ is quadratic in $\log(1/\epsilon)$.

The complexity only depends logarithmically on the derivatives of $A(t)$ and the driving. We have expressed the complexity in terms of maxima of these quantities. It is also possible to express the complexity in terms of averages via the approach in [8], though the derivation is considerably more complicated.

The way the result for the complexity is expressed is complicated by the need to account for the number of steps of amplitude amplification, which in turn depends on the norms of the $\mathbf{v}$ vectors. This full expression is to account for pathological cases, which could potentially be ruled out by a more careful analysis to give a simplified expression.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Maria Kieferova for helpful discussions. DWB worked on this project under a sponsored research agreement with Google Quantum AI. DWB is also supported by Australian Research Council Discovery Projects DP190102633, DP210101367, and DP220101602.

-
- [1] A. W. Harrow, A. Hassidim, and S. Lloyd, *Physical Review Letters* **103**, 150502 (2009).
 - [2] B. D. Clader, B. C. Jacobs, and C. R. Sprouse, *Physical Review Letters* **110**, 250504 (2013).
 - [3] A. Montanaro and S. Pallister, *Physical Review A* **93**, 032324 (2016).

- [4] A. M. Childs, J.-P. Liu, and A. Ostrander, [Quantum](#) **5**, 574 (2021).
- [5] D. W. Berry, [Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical](#) **47**, 105301 (2014).
- [6] D. W. Berry, A. M. Childs, A. Ostrander, and G. Wang, [Communications in Mathematical Physics](#) **356**, 1057 (2017).
- [7] M. Kieferová, A. Scherer, and D. W. Berry, [Physical Review A](#) **99**, 042314 (2019).
- [8] G. H. Low and N. Wiebe, [arXiv:1805.00675](#) (2018).
- [9] D. W. Berry, [Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical](#) **47**, 105301 (2014).
- [10] H. Krovi, [arXiv:2202.01054](#) (2022).
- [11] E. Kılıç and P. Stanica, [Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics](#) **237**, 126 (2013).
- [12] Y. Su, D. W. Berry, N. Wiebe, N. Rubin, and R. Babbush, [PRX Quantum](#) **2**, 040332 (2021).
- [13] Y. R. Sanders, D. W. Berry, P. C. S. Costa, L. W. Tessler, N. Wiebe, C. Gidney, H. Neven, and R. Babbush, [PRX Quantum](#) **1**, 020312 (2020).
- [14] P. C. S. Costa, D. An, Y. R. Sanders, Y. Su, R. Babbush, and D. W. Berry, [arXiv:2111.08152](#) (2021).

Appendix A: Error estimates for time discretisation

First we consider the error in the sum approximation of the integrals in the definition of W_K . We can write W_K as

$$W_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) = \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{1}{k!} \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} A(t_1) A(t_2) \cdots A(t_k), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ reorders the A matrices in descending time order, and we are taking $t_\alpha \in \{0, \Delta t, 2\Delta t, \dots, T - \Delta t\}$ and $t_\beta = t_\alpha + \Delta t$. The sum approximation of W_K is then

$$\widetilde{W}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) = \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\delta t^k}{k!} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_k=0}^{M-1} \mathcal{T} A(t_{j_1}) \cdots A(t_{j_{k-1}}) A(t_{j_k}), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\delta t = \Delta t/M$. The sum can be rewritten as

$$\widetilde{W}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) = \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{1}{k!} \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} A(t_{j_1}) A(t_{j_2}) \cdots A(t_{j_k}), \quad (\text{A3})$$

where t_{j_ℓ} is t_ℓ rounded down to the nearest multiple of δt as

$$t_{j_\ell} = t_\alpha + \delta t \lfloor (t_\ell - t_\alpha)/\delta t \rfloor. \quad (\text{A4})$$

This integral form of the sum is obvious, because each t_{j_ℓ} is constant over the interval δt .

Then we can write the error due to the time discretisation as

$$\begin{aligned} \|W_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) - \widetilde{W}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha)\| &= \left\| \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{1}{k!} \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} [A(t_1) A(t_2) \cdots A(t_k) - A(t_{j_1}) A(t_{j_2}) \cdots A(t_{j_k})] \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{1}{k!} \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} \|A(t_1) A(t_2) \cdots A(t_k) - A(t_{j_1}) A(t_{j_2}) \cdots A(t_{j_k})\|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

where the convention is taken that the same ordering of t_{j_ℓ} is used as for t_ℓ . For each term for a given k , we can upper bound it as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} \|A(t_1) \cdots A(t_\ell) A(t_{j_{\ell+1}}) \cdots A(t_{j_k}) - A(t_1) \cdots A(t_{\ell-1}) A(t_{j_\ell}) \cdots A(t_{j_k})\| \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} \|A(t_1) \cdots [A(t_\ell) - A(t_{j_\ell})] A(t_{j_{\ell+1}}) \cdots A(t_{j_k})\| \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} \left\| A(t_1) \cdots \left[\int_{t_{j_\ell}}^{t_\ell} ds A'(s) \right] A(t_{j_{\ell+1}}) \cdots A(t_{j_k}) \right\| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq A_{\max}^{k-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \int_{t_{j_\ell}}^{t_\ell} ds \|A'(s)\| \\
&\leq A_{\max}^{k-1} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \int_{t_{j_\ell}}^{t_\ell} ds \\
&\leq A_{\max}^{k-1} \frac{\delta t \Delta t^k}{2} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{A6}$$

We can therefore upper bound the error as

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| W_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) - \widetilde{W}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) \right\| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K A_{\max}^{k-1} \frac{\delta t \Delta t^k}{k!} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| \\
&< \delta t \Delta t \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{[A_{\max} \Delta t]^k}{k!} \\
&= \delta t \Delta t \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| [\exp(A_{\max} \Delta t) - 1].
\end{aligned} \tag{A7}$$

Because we choose $A_{\max} \Delta t \leq 1$, the error due to the discretisation can be upper bounded as

$$\left\| W_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) - \widetilde{W}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) \right\| = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{(T/r)^2}{M} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| \right). \tag{A8}$$

This gives the bound used in Eq. (88).

Next we bound the error of the particular solution Eq. (8) when the truncated Dyson series

$$\mathbf{v}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{k!} \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} A(t_1) A(t_2) \cdots A(t_{k-1}) \mathbf{b}(t_k), \tag{A9}$$

is approximated by the discretised integrals

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) = \sum_{k=2}^K \frac{\delta t^k}{k!} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_k=0}^{M-1} \mathcal{T} A(t_{j_1}) \cdots A(t_{j_{k-1}}) \mathbf{b}(t_{j_k}) + \frac{\Delta t}{M} \sum_{j=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{b}(t_j). \tag{A10}$$

Here the time ordering operator $\mathcal{T}$ is used to mean that the times are sorted in ascending order, *not* that the order of A and $\mathbf{b}$ is changed, because $\mathbf{b}$ must always go on the right.

Again we can express the summation in the form of an integral

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{k!} \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} A(t_{j_1}) A(t_{j_2}) \cdots A(t_{j_{k-1}}) \mathbf{b}(t_k), \tag{A11}$$

with the times t_{j_ℓ} rounded down to the nearest multiple of δt . Now we can upper bound the error in the discretised integrals for each k as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} \|A(t_1) A(t_2) \cdots A(t_{k-1}) \mathbf{b}(t_{j_k}) - A(t_{j_1}) A(t_{j_2}) \cdots A(t_{j_{k-1}}) \mathbf{b}(t_{j_k})\| \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} \|A(t_1) \cdots A(t_\ell) A(t_{j_{\ell+1}}) \cdots A(t_{j_{k-1}}) \mathbf{b}(t_{j_k}) - A(t_1) \cdots A(t_{j_\ell}) \cdots A(t_{j_{k-1}}) \mathbf{b}(t_{j_k})\| \\
&\quad + \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} \|A(t_1) \cdots A(t_{k-1}) \mathbf{b}(t_k) - A(t_1) \cdots A(t_{k-1}) \mathbf{b}(t_{j_k})\| \\
&= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} \left\| A(t_1) \cdots \int_{t_{j_\ell}}^{t_\ell} ds A'(s) A(t_{j_{\ell+1}}) \cdots A(t_{k-1}) \mathbf{b}(t_{j_k}) \right\| \\
&\quad + \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \mathcal{T} \left\| A(t_1) \cdots A(t_{k-1}) \int_{t_{j_k}}^{t_k} ds \mathbf{b}'(s) \right\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq A_{\max}^{k-2} b_{\max} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \int_{t_{j_\ell}}^{t_\ell} ds \|A'(s)\| + A_{\max}^{k-1} \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_1 \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_\alpha}^{t_\beta} dt_k \int_{t_{j_k}}^{t_k} ds \|\mathbf{b}'(s)\| \\
&\leq A_{\max}^{k-2} b_{\max} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \frac{\Delta t^k \delta t}{2} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| + A_{\max}^{k-1} \frac{\Delta t^k \delta t}{2} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|\mathbf{b}'(s)\|. \tag{A12}
\end{aligned}$$

Now summing over k we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathbf{v}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha) - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_K(t_\beta, t_\alpha)\| \\
&< \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{\max}^{k-2} b_{\max} \frac{k-1}{k!} \frac{\Delta t^k \delta t}{2} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{\max}^{k-1} \frac{\Delta t^k \delta t}{2k!} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|\mathbf{b}'(s)\| \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{\max}^{k-2} b_{\max} \frac{\Delta t^k \delta t}{2(k-1)!} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{\max}^{k-2} b_{\max} \frac{\Delta t^k \delta t}{2k!} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{\max}^{k-1} \frac{\Delta t^k \delta t}{2k!} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|\mathbf{b}'(s)\| \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A_{\max}^{k-1} b_{\max} \frac{\Delta t^{k+1} \delta t}{2k!} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| - b_{\max} \frac{\delta t}{2A_{\max}^2} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| [\exp(A_{\max} \Delta t) - 1] \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta t}{2A_{\max}} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|\mathbf{b}'(s)\| [\exp(A_{\max} \Delta t) - 1] \\
&= b_{\max} \frac{\Delta t \delta t}{2A_{\max}} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| \exp(A_{\max} \Delta t) - b_{\max} \frac{\delta t}{2A_{\max}^2} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| [\exp(A_{\max} \Delta t) - 1] \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta t}{2A_{\max}} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|\mathbf{b}'(s)\| [\exp(A_{\max} \Delta t) - 1] \\
&= b_{\max} \frac{\delta t}{2A_{\max}^2} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| [1 - (1 - A_{\max} \Delta t) \exp(A_{\max} \Delta t)] + \frac{\delta t}{2A_{\max}} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|\mathbf{b}'(s)\| [\exp(A_{\max} \Delta t) - 1]. \tag{A13}
\end{aligned}$$

Now with the choice that $A_{\max} \Delta t \leq 1$, the upper bound on the error becomes

$$\mathcal{O} \left(b_{\max} \frac{\Delta t^3}{M} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|A'(s)\| + \frac{\Delta t^2}{M} \max_{s \in [t_\alpha, t_\beta]} \|\mathbf{b}'(s)\| \right), \tag{A14}$$

which is equivalent to the upper bound on the error in Eq. (90).