

Universal shortcuts to adiabaticity of finite-time and weak processes

Pierre Nazé^{1,*}

¹*Departamento de Física, Instituto de Geociências e Ciências Exatas,
Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho”, 13506-900, Rio Claro, SP, Brazil*

(Dated: June 5, 2023)

The analytical expression for shortcuts to adiabaticity for any switching time and any thermally isolated system performing a finite-time and weak process is presented. It is based on the universal solution of the optimal protocols of weak processes, where the extension to adiabatic processes was made by means of the concept of waiting time. Two examples are solved to verify the validity of such shortcuts: the typical case of oscillatory relaxation function and the transverse-field quantum Ising chain. In the end, a discussion about the limitations of the applicability of these shortcuts in quantum annealing is made.

INTRODUCTION

Although finding optimal protocols for the work spent in a thermodynamic process may be urgent, the desire to find situations where these protocols are the best ones is more urgent. These best protocols are called *shortcuts to adiabaticity*, where the driving achieves the minimal possible energy in a reasonable process time [1, 2]. The aim of this work is to find a regime where one can propose shortcuts to adiabaticity for a variety of systems.

Previous studies show that such shortcuts to adiabaticity exist in the context of finite-time and weak drivings [3, 4]. However, the solutions proposed were restricted to continuous protocols, removing therefore a class of admissible functions where the solutions are given by distributions such as Dirac deltas and their derivatives [5]. In another study, universal solutions for the optimal protocol for isothermal and weak processes were found considering these admissible functions [6]. The question is then proposed: is it possible to extend such a procedure to adiabatic processes and find universal shortcuts to adiabaticity where these admissible functions are taken into account?

The answer is positive. First, after proposing the concept of waiting time to unify the treatment of the optimal protocols for isothermal and adiabatic processes, I solved the optimal protocol problem of two important examples in order to find a structure for such a solution. The suggested universal result is proven to be a shortcut to adiabaticity for any switching time and any thermally isolated system, ever since appropriate frequencies are found.

In particular, one of these examples is the transverse-field quantum Ising chain, which is a prototype of an adiabatic quantum computer [7–16]. My result shows therefore that we can completely suppress the errors due to excitations in non-equilibrium drivings in a quantum annealing procedure if we choose such shortcuts to adiabaticity to perform the process. A discussion however of the applicability is made in the face of the necessary criteria to hold linear-response theory [17].

PRELIMINARIES

Excess work

I start defining notations and developing the main concepts to be used in this work.

Consider a quantum system with a Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}(\lambda(t))$, where $\lambda(t)$ is a time-dependent external parameter. Initially, this system is in contact with a heat bath of temperature $\beta \equiv (k_B T)^{-1}$, where k_B is Boltzmann's constant. The system is then decoupled from the heat bath and, during a switching time τ , the external parameter is changed from λ_0 to $\lambda_0 + \delta\lambda$. The average work performed on the system during this process is

$$W \equiv \int_0^\tau \langle \partial_\lambda \mathcal{H}(t) \rangle \dot{\lambda}(t) dt, \quad (1)$$

where ∂_λ is the partial derivative for λ and the superscripted dot is the total time derivative. The generalized force $\langle \partial_\lambda \mathcal{H}(t) \rangle$ is calculated using the trace over the density matrix $\rho(t)$

$$\langle A(t) \rangle = \text{tr} \{ A \rho(t) \} \quad (2)$$

where A is some observable. The density matrix $\rho(t)$ evolves according to Liouville equation

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathcal{L}\rho := -\frac{1}{i\hbar} [\rho, \mathcal{H}], \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the Liouville operator, $[\cdot, \cdot]$ is the commutator and $\rho(0) = \rho_c$ is the initial canonical density matrix. Consider also that the external parameter can be expressed as

$$\lambda(t) = \lambda_0 + g(t)\delta\lambda, \quad (4)$$

where to satisfy the initial conditions of the external parameter, the protocol $g(t)$ must satisfy the following boundary conditions

$$g(0) = 0, \quad g(\tau) = 1. \quad (5)$$

Linear response theory aims to express the average of some observable until the first order of some perturbation considering how this perturbation affects the observable and the non-equilibrium density matrix [18]. In our

case, we consider that the parameter does not considerably changes during the process, $|g(t)\delta\lambda/\lambda_0| \ll 1$, for all $t \in [0, \tau]$. Using the framework of linear-response theory [18], the generalized force $\langle \partial_\lambda \mathcal{H}(t) \rangle$ can be approximated until the first-order as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_\lambda \mathcal{H}(t) \rangle &= \langle \partial_\lambda \mathcal{H} \rangle_0 + \delta\lambda \langle \partial_{\lambda\lambda}^2 \mathcal{H} \rangle_0 g(t) \\ &\quad - \delta\lambda \int_0^t \phi_0(t-t')g(t')dt', \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the $\langle \cdot \rangle_0$ is the average over the initial canonical density matrix. The quantity $\phi_0(t)$ is the so-called response function [18], which can be conveniently expressed as the derivative of the relaxation function $\Psi_0(t)$ [18]

$$\phi_0(t) = -\frac{d\Psi_0}{dt}, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\Psi_0(t) = \beta \langle \partial_\lambda \mathcal{H}(t) \partial_\lambda \mathcal{H}(0) \rangle_0 + \mathcal{C}, \quad (8)$$

being the constant \mathcal{C} calculated via the final value theorem [18]. In this manner, the generalized force, written in terms of the relaxation function, is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_\lambda \mathcal{H}(t) \rangle &= \langle \partial_\lambda \mathcal{H} \rangle_0 - \delta\lambda \tilde{\Psi}_0 g(t) \\ &\quad + \delta\lambda \int_0^t \Psi_0(t-t')\dot{g}(t')dt', \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\tilde{\Psi}_0(t) \equiv \Psi_0(0) - \langle \partial_{\lambda\lambda}^2 \mathcal{H} \rangle_0$. Combining Eqs. (1) and (9), the average work performed at the linear response of the generalized force is

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \delta\lambda \langle \partial_\lambda \mathcal{H} \rangle_0 - \frac{\delta\lambda^2}{2} \tilde{\Psi}_0 \\ &\quad + \delta\lambda^2 \int_0^\tau \int_0^t \Psi_0(t-t')\dot{g}(t')\dot{g}(t)dt'dt. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

We remark that in thermally isolated systems, the work is separated into two contributions: the quasistatic work W_{qs} and the excess work W_{ex} . We observe that only the double integral on Eq. (10) has ‘‘memory’’ of the trajectory of $\lambda(t)$. Therefore the other terms are part of the contribution of the quasistatic work. Thus, we can split them as

$$W_{\text{qs}} = \delta\lambda \langle \partial_\lambda \mathcal{H} \rangle_0 - \frac{\delta\lambda^2}{2} \tilde{\Psi}_0, \quad (11)$$

$$W_{\text{ex}} = \delta\lambda^2 \int_0^\tau \int_0^t \Psi_0(t-t')\dot{g}(t')\dot{g}(t)dt'dt. \quad (12)$$

In particular, the excess work can be rewritten using the symmetry property of the relaxation function, $\Psi(t) = \Psi(-t)$ (see Ref. [18]),

$$W_{\text{ex}} = \frac{\delta\lambda^2}{2} \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \Psi_0(t-t')\dot{g}(t')\dot{g}(t)dt'dt. \quad (13)$$

We remark that such treatment can be applied to classic systems, by changing the operators to functions, and the commutator by the Poisson bracket [18].

Optimal excess work

Consider the excess work rewritten in terms of the protocols $g(t)$ instead of its derivative

$$W_{\text{ex}} = \frac{\delta\lambda^2}{2} \Psi(0) + \delta\lambda^2 \int_0^\tau \dot{\Psi}_0(\tau-t)g(t)dt \quad (14)$$

$$- \frac{\delta\lambda^2}{2} \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \ddot{\Psi}(t-t')g(t)g(t')dt'dt'. \quad (15)$$

Using calculus of variations, we can derive the Euler-Lagrange equation that furnishes the optimal protocol $g^*(t)$ of the system that will minimize the excess work

$$\int_0^\tau \ddot{\Psi}_0(t-t')g^*(t')dt' = \dot{\Psi}_0(\tau-t). \quad (16)$$

In particular, the optimal excess work will be [19]

$$W_{\text{ex}}^* = \frac{\delta\lambda^2}{2} \Psi(0) + \frac{\delta\lambda^2}{2} \int_0^\tau \dot{\Psi}_0(\tau-t)g^*(t)dt. \quad (17)$$

Universal optimal protocol

To derive the universal solution of Eq. (16), I will basically use the symmetric property of the optimal protocol [19]

$$g^*(t) = 1 - g^*(\tau - t), \quad (18)$$

First, I open the right-hand side of Eq. (16) in the appropriate integrals

$$\int_0^t \ddot{\Psi}(t-t')g^*(t')dt' + \int_t^\tau \ddot{\Psi}(t-t')g^*(t')dt' = \dot{\Psi}(\tau-t) \quad (19)$$

Using the symmetric property (18) in the second term of the right-hand side of Eq. (19), one can show that

$$\int_0^t \ddot{\Psi}(t-t')g^*(t')dt' = \int_0^{\tau-t} \ddot{\Psi}(\tau-t-t')g^*(t')dt'. \quad (20)$$

Therefore, Eq. (20) must be equal to a symmetric function $h(t)$, such that, $h(t) = h(\tau-t)$. Using the solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation, the above result is equal to

$$\int_0^t \ddot{\Psi}(t-t')g^*(t')dt' = \int_0^t \ddot{\Psi}(t-t')(1-g^*(\tau-t'))dt', \quad (21)$$

which is another way to express the symmetry of the optimal protocol. Consider, by simplicity, a function $g_0(t)$, such that

$$\int_0^t \ddot{\Psi}(t-t')g_0(t')dt' = C_0, \quad (22)$$

where C_0 is a constant in time. Applying the convolution theorem we have

$$g_0(t) = \mathcal{L}_s^{-1} \left\{ \frac{C_0}{s\mathcal{L}_t\{\ddot{\Psi}(t)\}(s)} \right\} (t), \quad (23)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_t\{\cdot\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_s^{-1}\{\cdot\}$ are respectively the Laplace and inverse Laplace transform. Assuming that $\mathcal{L}_t\{\Psi(t)\}(s)$ can be expressed as a Taylor series in $s = 0$, we have by applying Horner-Ruffini method

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}_t\{\ddot{\Psi}(t)\}(s)} = \frac{1}{s^2\mathcal{L}_t\{\Psi(t)\}(s) - s\Psi(0)} = \sum_{n=-2}^{\infty} a_n s^n. \quad (24)$$

We have then as solution

$$g_0(t) = C_0 \left(a_{-2}t + a_{-1} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \delta^{(n)}(t) \right). \quad (25)$$

We demand that the constant C_0 must be equal to a number where it holds the time-reversal symmetry

$$g_0(t) - C_0 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \delta^{(n)}(\tau - t) = 1 - g_0(\tau - t) + C_0 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \delta^{(n)}(t). \quad (26)$$

Since the Dirac deltas and their derivatives will cancel out, the constant will be

$$C_0 = \frac{1}{a_{-2}\tau + 2a_{-1}}. \quad (27)$$

In this manner, the optimal protocol, by construction, will be

$$g^*(t) = \frac{1}{2} (g_0(t) + 1 - g_0(\tau - t) + \quad (28)$$

$$C_0 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n (\delta^{(n)}(t) - \delta^{(n)}(\tau - t))), \quad (29)$$

in which, by substituting Eq. (25) and (27), we will have

$$g^*(t) = -\frac{t - a_{-1}}{a_{-2}\tau + 2a_{-1}} - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n (\delta^{(n)}(t) - \delta^{(n)}(\tau - t))}{a_{-2}\tau + 2a_{-1}}, \quad (30)$$

which is the universal optimal protocol. In particular, the first terms when calculated are

$$a_{-2} = -1, \quad a_{-1} = -\mathcal{L}_t \left\{ \frac{\Psi(t)}{\Psi(0)} \right\} (0). \quad (31)$$

Also, to preserve the time-reversal symmetry in the points $t = 0$ and $t = \tau$, one must define $\delta^{(n)}(0) = \delta^{(n)}(\tau) = 0$, for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$.

UNIVERSAL SHORTCUT TO ADIABATICITY

To find a universal shortcut to adiabaticity, consider that the excess work should be null. Therefore, it holds

$$\int_0^\tau \dot{\Psi}(\tau - t) g^*(t) dt = -\Psi(0). \quad (32)$$

Applying the Laplace transform for τ , the optimal protocol should be

$$\mathcal{L}_\tau\{g^*(\tau)\}(s) = -\frac{1}{s\mathcal{L}_\tau\{\dot{\Psi}(\tau)\}(s)}, \quad (33)$$

where we took $\Psi(0) = 1$ without loss of generality. Observe that this expression can be rewritten in terms of the function g_0 since it was constructed by symmetry with it

$$\mathcal{L}_\tau\{g(\tau)\}(s) = -\frac{s\mathcal{L}_\tau\{g_0(\tau)\}(s)}{C_0}, \quad (34)$$

or still

$$g(\tau) = -\frac{\dot{g}_0(\tau)}{C_0}. \quad (35)$$

Using the expressions for $g(t)$ and $g_0(t)$ calculated in τ in Eq. (35), we have

$$\frac{a_{-2}\tau + a_{-1}}{a_{-2}\tau + 2a_{-1}} = -a_{-2}. \quad (36)$$

Since $a_{-2} = -1$, we must have

$$a_{-1} = 0. \quad (37)$$

Therefore, ever since the system presents $a_{-1} = 0$, the optimal protocol is a shortcut to adiabaticity. Observe that the examples calculated in Ref. [6] have $a_{-1} = -\tau_R \neq 0$, which implies that such systems do not present a shortcut to adiabaticity.

EXAMPLES

Cosine relaxation function

First I solve the optimal protocol problem of a typical relaxation function of thermally isolated systems performing an adiabatic process [20]

$$\Psi(t) = \Psi_0 \cos \omega t. \quad (38)$$

Applying the method, the terms a_n will be

$$a_{-2} = -1, \quad a_{-1} = 0, \quad a_0 = 1/\omega^2 \quad (39)$$

and

$$a_n = 0, \quad (40)$$

with $n \geq 1$. The optimal protocol will be

$$g^*(t) = \frac{t}{\tau} + \frac{\delta(t) - \delta(\tau - t)}{\tau\omega^2}. \quad (41)$$

As predicted, the optimal protocol is a shortcut to adiabaticity for any switching time. Indeed, calculating the excess work (12), one has

$$W_{\text{ex}}(\tau) = 0. \quad (42)$$

It is interesting that in comparison with the other results presented in Ref. [6] an interpretation of the relaxation time of thermally isolated systems can be made in this case. Indeed, one can assume by comparison that in this case

$$\tau_R = 0. \quad (43)$$

But what does that mean and how one can bring it into line with the concept of relaxation time in an isothermal process? First of all, calling such quantity ‘‘relaxation time’’

for thermally isolated systems is technically wrong, since the relaxation function does not decorrelate as systems performing the isothermal processes do with the heat bath. This new timescale must have an interpretation that coincides with the relaxation time for isothermal processes and must be zero for thermally isolated systems. I propose then the following interpretation: this new timescale, which I will call “waiting time”, is nothing more than the average time necessary for the system to achieve its final state if the process is stopped along the process. In this manner, systems performing isothermal processes will equilibrate with the heat bath, having therefore a positive waiting time, while the ones performing adiabatic processes are already in their final states once their processes are stopped, meaning that their waiting time is null. In particular, for isothermal processes, the waiting time will coincide with the relaxation time. This interpretation also makes sense with the time competition in a non-equilibrium process, where the whole process is characterized by the ratio between the switching time, which brings the system out of equilibrium, and the waiting time, which leads the system to its final state. At this point, in order to unify such interpretation for both cases, I propose the following mathematical definition for the waiting time

$$\tau_w = \mathcal{L}_t \left\{ \frac{\Psi(t)}{\Psi(0)} \right\} (0), \quad (44)$$

whose derivation comes from the explicit calculation of the term $-a_{-1}$. The universal solution, valid for isothermal and adiabatic processes, becomes

$$g^*(t) = \frac{t - \tau_w}{\tau + 2\tau_w} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n(\delta^{(n)}(t) - \delta^{(n)}(\tau - t))}{\tau + 2\tau_w}. \quad (45)$$

Since it is expected that $\tau_w = 0$ to any thermally isolated systems, they have as optimal protocols shortcuts to adiabaticity.

Transverse-field quantum Ising chain

The relaxation function of the transverse-field quantum Ising chain taken initially at equilibrium with $T = 0$ and periodic boundary conditions is [17]

$$\Psi_N(t) = \frac{16}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N/2} \frac{J^2}{\epsilon^3(n)} \sin^2 \left(\left(\frac{2n-1}{N} \right) \pi \right) \cos \left(\frac{2\epsilon(n)}{\hbar} t \right), \quad (46)$$

where

$$\epsilon(n) = 2\sqrt{J^2 + \Gamma_0^2 - 2J\Gamma_0 \cos \left(\left(\frac{2n-1}{N} \right) \pi \right)}, \quad (47)$$

where J is the coupling energy of the system, Γ_0 the initial magnetic field and N is a even number of spins. Calculating the coefficients a_n , we have

$$a_{-2} = -1, \quad a_{-1} = 0, \quad a_{2n} \neq 0, \quad a_{2n+1} = 0. \quad (48)$$




FIG. 1. Optimal excess work calculated for the transverse-field quantum Ising chain. Indeed, it is a shortcut to adiabaticity for any switching time. It was used $\hbar = 1, J = 1, \Gamma_0 = 0.95, \delta\Gamma = 0.1, N = 10$.

with $n \geq 0$. Since $\tau_w = 0$, the shortcut to adiabaticity will be

$$g^*(t) = \frac{t}{\tau} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_{2n}(\delta^{(2n)}(t) - \delta^{(2n)}(\tau - t))}{\tau}. \quad (49)$$

To verify if it is indeed a shortcut, we calculate the excess work for driving with the following parameters: $\hbar = 1, J = 1, \Gamma_0 = 0.95, \delta\Gamma = 0.1, N = 10$. In order to avoid a calculation of an extensive series, we use the fact that the solution of the optimal protocol is global [21], so any solution found by alternative methods is an optimal protocol. We proceed as follows: choosing a number of Dirac delta and its derivatives equal to $N/2$, I let the coefficients a_n free of choice. I calculate the Euler-Lagrange equation and constructed a linear equation system of those coefficients in order to nullify the result. Since the number of frequencies in the relaxation function is $N/2$, the system will have a solution. After solving it, I found positive “frequencies” Ω_n for each one of the derivatives of the Dirac delta. The calculation of the excess work result for such a solution is depicted in Fig. 1. Indeed, as predicted, we were able to completely suppress any excitation of the non-equilibrium driving.

DISCUSSION

Continuous part

For all examples treated here, the continuous part of the shortcut to adiabaticity $g_C^*(t)$ was given by

$$g_C^*(t) = \frac{t}{\tau}. \quad (50)$$

Such a solution is consistent with previous results for extreme cases where $\tau \gg \tau_w$ [19]. Also, this continuous part

is restrained

$$0 \leq g_C^*(t) \leq 1, \quad (51)$$

for all $t \in [0, \tau]$, $0 \leq \tau/\tau_w \leq \infty$, meaning that it can be used in linear-response theory. Therefore, the shortcut is physically consistent.

Singular part

For all examples treated here, the singular part of the optimal protocol $g_S^*(t)$ was given by

$$g_S^*(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{N/2} \frac{\delta^{(2(n-1))}(t) - \delta^{(2(n-1))}(\tau - t)}{\tau \Omega_n^{2n}}, \quad (52)$$

where Ω_n were positive numbers, independent of τ and related to the parameters of the system. Therefore, for the extreme cases where $\tau \gg \tau_w$, we have

$$\lim_{\tau \gg \tau_w} g_S^*(t) = 0, \quad (53)$$

which corresponds again to the prediction in such case [19].

Quantum annealing

In particular, the transverse-field quantum Ising chain has direct applicability to quantum annealing, since this system is a basic prototype of an adiabatic quantum computer. In this manner, for any switching time, one can find a solution that spends the minimal possible energy, avoiding errors that come from the excitability of non-equilibrium drivings. However, such a result is possible only on the regime where linear-response theory holds, which implies weak drivings of the magnetic field and a small number of spins [17]. Effects when the Kibble-Zurek mechanism starts to manifest with its diverging timescale may break down such a result. Another possible challenge is the implementation of Dirac deltas in the protocols, which as far as I know has not been implemented in experiments [6].

FINAL REMARKS

In this work, I presented a universal solution for shortcuts to adiabaticity for any thermally isolated system performing a weak process. It relies only on the structure of the universal solution of the optimal protocol of the excess work. Two examples are solved in order to find such a structure: The cosine relaxation function, which encompasses a variety of systems, and the transverse-field quantum Ising chain, which is a prototype of an adiabatic quantum computer. The concept of waiting time is introduced in order to unify the description of the universal solution for isothermal and adiabatic processes as well. Also, although

the result suggests that errors that come from the excitability of non-equilibrium drivings can be completely suppressed, this only holds for regimes where linear-response theory holds, that is, weak drivings of the magnetic field and a small number of particles. When the Kibble-Zurek mechanism starts to appear with its diverging timescale may break down such a result.

* pierre.naze@unesp.br

- [1] E. Torrontegui, S. Ibáñez, S. Martínez-Garaot, M. Modugno, A. del Campo, D. Guéry-Odelin, A. Ruschhaupt, X. Chen, and J. G. Muga, in *Advances in atomic, molecular, and optical physics*, Vol. 62 (Elsevier, 2013) pp. 117–169.
- [2] D. Guéry-Odelin, A. Ruschhaupt, A. Kiely, E. Torrontegui, S. Martínez-Garaot, and J. G. Muga, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **91**, 045001 (2019).
- [3] T. V. Acconcia and M. V. Bonança, *Physical Review E* **91**, 042141 (2015).
- [4] T. V. Acconcia, M. V. Bonança, and S. Deffner, *Physical Review E* **92**, 042148 (2015).
- [5] D. E. Kirk, *Optimal control theory: an introduction* (Courier Corporation, 2004).
- [6] P. Nazé, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08597* (2023).
- [7] S. Deffner and S. Campbell, *Quantum Thermodynamics: An introduction to the thermodynamics of quantum information* (Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2019).
- [8] S. Morita and H. Nishimori, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **49**, 125210 (2008), [arXiv:0806.1859](https://arxiv.org/abs/0806.1859).
- [9] P. Hauke, H. G. Katzgraber, W. Lechner, H. Nishimori, and W. D. Oliver, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **83**, 054401 (2020), [arXiv:1903.06559](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.06559).
- [10] B. K. Chakrabarti, H. Leschke, P. Ray, T. Shirai, and S. Tanaka, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **381**, 10.1098/RSTA.2021.0419 (2023).
- [11] P. R. Hegde, G. Passarelli, A. Scocco, and P. Lucignano, *Physical Review A* **105**, 012612 (2022), [arXiv:2108.03185](https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.03185).
- [12] M. Khezri, X. Dai, R. Yang, T. Albash, A. Lupascu, and D. A. Lidar, *Physical Review Applied* **17**, 044005 (2022), [arXiv:2103.06461](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.06461).
- [13] A. D. King, S. Suzuki, J. Raymond, A. Zucca, T. Lanting, F. Altomare, A. J. Berkley, S. Ejtemaee, E. Hoskinson, S. Huang, E. Ladizinsky, A. J. MacDonald, G. Marsden, T. Oh, G. Poulin-Lamarre, M. Reis, C. Rich, Y. Sato, J. D. Whittaker, J. Yao, R. Harris, D. A. Lidar, H. Nishimori, and M. H. Amin, *Nature Physics* **2022** 18:11 **18**, 1324 (2022), [arXiv:2202.05847](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.05847).
- [14] A. Soriani, P. Nazé, M. V. Bonança, B. Gardas, and S. Deffner, *Physical Review A* **105**, 42423 (2022), [arXiv:2112.08490](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.08490).
- [15] L. P. Yulianti and K. Surendro, *IEEE Access* **10**, 73156 (2022).
- [16] A. Soriani, P. Nazé, M. V. Bonança, B. Gardas, and S. Deffner, *Physical Review A* **105**, 052442 (2022).
- [17] P. Nazé, M. V. S. Bonança, and S. Deffner, *Entropy* **24**, 666 (2022).

- [18] R. Kubo, M. Toda, and N. Hashitsume, *Statistical physics II: nonequilibrium statistical mechanics*, Vol. 31 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2012).
- [19] P. Nazé, S. Deffner, and M. V. Bonança, *Journal of Physics Communications* **6**, 083001 (2022).
- [20] P. Nazé, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.16116* (2022).
- [21] P. Nazé, *Phys. Rev. E* **107**, 024120 (2023).