

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: **QUANTUM ROUTING FOR
ARCHITECTURE-RESPECTING
CIRCUIT TRANSFORMATIONS**

Eddie Schoute
Doctor of Philosophy, 2021

Dissertation Directed by: **Professor Andrew M. Childs**
Department of Computer Science

My abstract for this dissertation.

QUANTUM ROUTING FOR ARCHITECTURE-RESPECTING CIRCUIT TRANSFORMATIONS

by

Eddie Schoute

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2021

Advisory Committee:

Professor Andrew M. Childs, Chair/Advisor

Professor Mohammad Hafezi, Dean's Representative

Professor Alexey V. Gorshkov

Professor Michael Hicks

Professor Yi-Kai Liu

Acknowledgements

My acknowledgements.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Table of contents	iii
1 Introduction	1
2 Background	2
3 My Chapter	3
4 Conclusion	11
Bibliography	12

Chapter 1

Introduction

My introduction.

Chapter 2

Background

Hi Eddie [1]

Chapter 3

My Chapter

In non-relativistic quantum mechanics, Lieb-Robinson bounds provide a notion of causality [2], limiting the speed of information propagation (or signaling) to a finite value in lattice systems with short-range interactions. This bounded signaling speed has strong implications for quantum information and condensed matter physics, leading to entanglement area laws [3] and the existence of topological order [4]. [However, it remains an open question whether the signaling speed must be finite if interactions are long-ranged and decay as an inverse power-law $1/r^\alpha$ in the inter-particle distance r .] Such power-law interacting systems arise in experimental platforms for quantum computation and quantum simulation, including Rydberg atoms [5], trapped ions [6], polar molecules [7], defect centers in solids [8], and atoms trapped along photonic crystals [9].

For power-law interacting systems with α greater than the lattice dimension D , a finite signaling speed has been shown to persist to some intermediate distance and time [10].

In this work, we focus on the regime of *strongly long-range* interacting systems, where interaction energy per site diverges, thus implying $\alpha \leq D$ [11, 12, 13, 14]. Note that even if one normalizes the interaction strength to make energy *extensive* (i.e., proportional to the number of lattice sites), these systems are still fundamentally different from those with $\alpha > D$ (as energy is in general no longer additive for subsystems [15]). To avoid confusion, we will not perform any normalization of interaction strength throughout this paper, as such normalization can be performed later by rescaling time without changing the physics implied by our results [13].

Apart from their existence in experimental platforms [16, 6, 17, 7, 18], strongly long-range interacting systems have received much theoretical interest due to their applications in spin squeezing [19], novel behavior in dynamical critical scaling [20, 21], divergent equilibration time [11], and close relation to fast quantum-information scrambling [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. The phenomenology of these systems differs from that of their short-range counterparts at a fundamental level, and thus require new theoretical understandings. Two fundamental questions about these systems are (1) what is the shortest time t_{si} needed to send a signal from one site to a site located an extensive distance away, and (2) what is the shortest time t_{sc} needed to scramble the information stored in the system¹?

There have been a number of attempts to answer the above two questions, with limited

¹We will define the quantities t_{si} and t_{sc} rigorously later in the paper

success. For the first question, Refs. [29, 30, 31] show that in certain strongly long-range interacting systems with $\alpha \leq D$, information and correlations can spread across the entire system in a finite time that is independent of the number of sites, N . (For certain systems not engineered for fast signaling or scrambling, information propagation may even be suppressed [32].) The Lieb-Robinson-type bound derived in Ref. [13], however, suggests that the signaling time can vanish in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit, and does not rule out the possibility of t_{si} scaling as $\log(N) N^{2\alpha/D}/N^2$ for $\alpha < D$. No protocol that we know of comes close to achieving such fast signaling. As for scrambling, Ref. [33] shows that the scrambling time can be lower-bounded by $t_{\text{sc}} \gtrsim 1/N$ for $\alpha = 0$, whereas the fastest-known scramblers are conjectured to be able to scramble in time $t_{\text{sc}} \propto \log(N)/\sqrt{N}$ [26].

While the definitive answers to these two questions remain to be found, we present several advances in this paper. First, we prove a new bound for systems that can be mapped to free bosons or fermions with $1/r^\alpha$ hopping strength, which leads to a signaling-time bound of $t_{\text{si}} \gtrsim N^{\alpha/D}/\sqrt{N}$. While no previous bound has been given specifically for free-particle systems, the best existing result for interacting systems yields a significantly looser bound of $t_{\text{si}} \gtrsim \log(N) N^{2\alpha/D}/N^2$ [13]². Notably, our free-particle bound is tight for $\alpha \leq D/2$, as we show that it can be saturated by a new quantum state transfer protocol.

We also prove a bound of $t_{\text{si}} \gtrsim \log(N) N^{\alpha/D}/N$ for general interacting spin systems, which—while improving significantly over the previous best bound mentioned above [13]—is still not known to be tight. Building on this second result, we prove a tight bound for “many-site signaling” (from one site to an extensive part of the system). This many-site signaling bound leads to a scrambling-time bound of $t_{\text{sc}} \gtrsim N^{\alpha/D}/N$, which generalizes the result in Ref. [33] of $t_{\text{sc}} \gtrsim 1/N$ to all $\alpha < D$.

Tight bound for free particles.—We first prove a Lieb-Robinson-type bound for non-interacting bosons/fermions on a lattice. Consider the following free-particle Hamiltonian $H(t)$ defined on a D -dimensional lattice Λ with N sites:

$$H(t) = \sum_{\substack{i,j \in \Lambda \\ i < j}} (J_{ij}(t) c_i^\dagger c_j + \text{h.c.}) + \sum_{i \in \Lambda} B_i(t) c_i^\dagger c_i, \quad (3.1)$$

where c_i^\dagger (c_i) represents the creation (annihilation) operator. The hopping strength $J_{ij}(t)$ and chemical potential $B_i(t)$ can depend on time and we do not impose any constraint on them for now. We denote an operator A at time t in the Heisenberg picture as $A(t) = U^\dagger(t) A U(t)$, where $U(t) \equiv \mathcal{T} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^t H(t') dt'}$ is the time evolution operator ($\hbar = 1$). The operator norm of A will be denoted by $\|A\|$.

Theorem 1. For the Hamiltonian defined in Eq. (3.1) and any pair of distinct sites $X, Y \in \Lambda$,

$$\left\| [c_X(t), c_Y^\dagger] \right\| \leq \int_0^t d\tau \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \Lambda} |J_{iX}(\tau)|^2}. \quad (3.2)$$

We use $[\cdot, \cdot]$ to denote the commutator for bosons and anti-commutator for fermions.

²While the original bound in Ref. [13] was stated in terms of n -body interactions, here we cite the bound on the interaction time as it applies to the specific case of two-body interactions.

Roughly speaking, the quantity $\| [c_X(t), c_Y^\dagger] \|$ measures the overlap between the support of the operator $c_X(t)$ (which expands from site X due to hopping terms) and the site Y . As a result, it also quantifies the amount of information that can be sent between X and Y in a given time t . Indeed, we define the signaling time t_{si} as the minimal time required to achieve $\| [c_X(t), c_Y^\dagger] \| > \delta$ for some positive constant δ . Note that we do not expect the chemical potential strength $B_i(t)$ to show up in the bound, as on-site Hamiltonian terms do not change the support of $c_X(t)$.

If the hopping terms in the Hamiltonian are short-ranged (e.g., nearest-neighbor), one might expect $\| [c_X(t), c_Y^\dagger] \|$ to decay exponentially in the distance r_{XY} between X and Y , due to the strong notion of causality that follows from the Lieb-Robinson bound [2]. Additionally, if the hopping strength decays as a power law ($|J_{ij}(t)| \leq 1/r^\alpha$) with $\alpha > D$, intuition would suggest that $\| [c_X(t), c_Y^\dagger] \|$ decays algebraically in r_{XY} [34, 10], indicating a weak notion of causality. However, the right-hand side of Eq. (3.2) has no dependence on r_{XY} . This is because the bound is tailored to strongly long-range hoppings with $\alpha < D$, which makes it loose for shorter-ranged long-range hoppings.

Assuming that $|J_{ij}(t)| \leq 1/r^\alpha$, we can simplify Eq. (3.2) to

$$\| [c_X(t), c_Y^\dagger(0)] \| \leq t \times \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}(1) & \alpha > D/2, \\ \mathcal{O}(N^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha/D}) & 0 \leq \alpha \leq D/2. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

where N is the number of lattice sites and \mathcal{O} is the asymptotic “big- \mathcal{O} ” notation [35]. Therefore, for $\alpha \leq D/2$, it takes a time $t_{\text{si}} = \Omega(N^{\alpha/D}/\sqrt{N})$ [35] to signal from site X to site Y , independent of the distance between X and Y .

In the next section, we show that for $\alpha \leq D/2$, the bound in Eq. (3.2) can be saturated (up to a factor of 2) by engineered free-particle Hamiltonians. This leads to the conclusion that causality can completely vanish—in the sense that signals can be sent arbitrarily fast given large enough N —for a strongly long-range hopping system with $\alpha < D/2$. It remains an open question whether such a statement can be generalized to systems with $D/2 \leq \alpha < D$ for either free or interacting particles.

Proof of Theorem 1.—Let us first go into the interaction picture of $\sum_i B_i(t) c_i^\dagger c_i$ to eliminate the on-site terms from the Hamiltonian in Eq. (3.1). (This imparts a time-dependent phase $e^{i\phi_{jk}(t)}$ onto the hopping term $J_{jk}(t)$ for some $\phi_{jk}(t) \in [0, 2\pi)$ and $j \neq k$, which—since it does not change the value of $|J_{jk}(t)|$ —does not affect the overall bound.) We now have a pure hopping Hamiltonian $H_I(t) = \sum_{ij} \tilde{J}_{ij}(t) c_i^\dagger c_j$ with $|\tilde{J}_{ij}(t)| \equiv |J_{ij}(t)|$. Because $H_I(t)$ is a quadratic Hamiltonian, $c_X(t)$ is a time-dependent linear combination of annihilation operators on every site, and we can write $[c_X(t), c_Y^\dagger] \equiv f_{XY}(t) \mathbb{1}$, where $f_{XY}(t)$ is a number and $\mathbb{1}$ represents the identity operator. Given that $U_I(t) |0\rangle = |0\rangle$, where $U_I(t)$ is the time-evolution operator corresponding to $H_I(t)$, and $c_X(t) |0\rangle = 0$, we have

$$f_{XY}(t) = \langle 0 | [c_X(t), c_Y^\dagger] | 0 \rangle = \langle 0 | c_X(0) U_I(t) c_Y^\dagger | 0 \rangle. \quad (3.4)$$

For convenience, we define the (normalized) states $|\psi_X\rangle \equiv c_X^\dagger(0) |0\rangle$ and $|\psi_Y(t)\rangle \equiv$




Figure 3.1: A fast quantum state transfer protocol for a long-range Hamiltonian acting on a lattice of dimension $D = 1$ with $N = 7$ sites. The strengths of the hopping terms are bounded by a power-law $1/r^\alpha$ in the distance r . The active interactions in each time-step are depicted as directed edges with uniform weights. (a) The site X is initially in the state $|\psi\rangle$ (gray circle), with the other (unoccupied) sites in state $|0\rangle$. Time-evolving by the Hamiltonian H_1 for time $\mathcal{O}(N^{\alpha/D-1/2})$ (indicated by gray arrows) yields a superposition of the $|0\rangle^{\otimes N}$ state and a symmetric $|W\rangle$ state over the remaining $N - 2$ sites. (b) Applying the Hamiltonian H_2 for the same duration of time completes the state transfer of $|\psi\rangle$ to the target site Y .

$U_I(t)c_Y^\dagger|0\rangle$. Taking the time derivative of Eq. (3.4) gives

$$\frac{df_{XY}}{dt} = -i \langle \psi_X | H_I(t) | \psi_Y(t) \rangle. \quad (3.5)$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\left\| \frac{df_{XY}}{dt} \right\| \leq \|H_I(t) |\psi_X\rangle\| \| |\psi_Y(t)\rangle \| \quad (3.6)$$

$$= \|H_I(t) |\psi_X\rangle\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \Lambda} |\tilde{J}_{iX}(t)|^2}. \quad (3.7)$$

The last equality follows from $|\psi_X\rangle$ being a single excitation localized on site X and $H_I(t)$ consisting only of hopping terms $\tilde{J}_{ij}(t)c_i^\dagger c_j$. Applying the fundamental theorem of calculus yields the bound on $f_{XY}(t)$ and hence Theorem 1.

Saturating the free-particle bound.—We now show that the bound in Theorem 1 can be saturated by engineered Hamiltonians that can also be used to perform fast quantum state transfer. In particular, the protocol presented here has a state transfer time of $T = \mathcal{O}(N^{\alpha/D}/\sqrt{N})$, which—for $\alpha \leq D/2$ —improves over the fastest-known state transfer

protocol using long-range interactions [31].

Our setup for the state transfer task is depicted in Fig. 3.1. We initialize a lattice with N sites in a tensor product of unoccupied states $|0\rangle$ and some unknown normalized bosonic/fermionic state $|\psi\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$ on a single site X . The goal of state transfer is to move $|\psi\rangle$ to the target site Y after the system time-evolves by a $|\psi\rangle$ -independent (but possibly time-dependent) Hamiltonian $H(t)$ [36, 37].

The unitary time-evolution operator $U(T)$ can be said to implement state transfer in time T if it satisfies the following condition:

$$\left| \langle 0|_X \langle 0|^{\otimes N-2} \langle \psi|_Y U(T) |\psi\rangle_X |0\rangle^{\otimes N-2} |0\rangle_Y \right| = 1. \quad (3.8)$$

We refer to the left-hand side of Eq. (3.8) as the *fidelity* of the state transfer, which can be bounded directly by a Lieb-Robinson-type bound on $H(t)$ such as Eq. (3.2) [37].

We label the sites that are not X or Y by $1, \dots, N-2$ and denote the furthest distance between any pair of sites by $L = \mathcal{O}(N^{1/D})$. Our state transfer protocol is given by the following piece-wise time-independent Hamiltonian:

$$H(t) = \begin{cases} H_1 = \frac{1}{L^\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{N-2} c_X^\dagger c_i + \text{h.c.} & 0 < t < \frac{T}{2}, \\ H_2 = \frac{1}{L^\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{N-2} c_i^\dagger c_Y + \text{h.c.} & \frac{T}{2} < t < T, \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

where $T = \pi L^\alpha / \sqrt{N-2}$ is the total time for the protocol. Note that while $H(t)$ satisfies the constraint $|J_{ij}(t)| \leq 1/r_{ij}^\alpha$ assumed in Eq. (3.3), the corresponding $J_{ij}(t)$ terms do not actually vary with the distances between sites.

Evolving the initial state $|\Psi\rangle \equiv |\psi\rangle_X |0\rangle^{\otimes N-2} |0\rangle_Y$ by H_1 for time $T/2$ yields the intermediate state

$$e^{-iH_1 T/2} |\Psi\rangle = a |0\rangle^{\otimes N} + b |0\rangle_X |W\rangle |0\rangle_Y. \quad (3.10)$$

Here, $|W\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N-2} c_i^\dagger |0\rangle^{\otimes N-2}$ is the W state over the $N-2$ remaining sites. Further evolving the state by H_2 for time $T/2$ yields the final state:

$$e^{-iH_2 T/2} e^{-iH_1 T/2} |\Psi\rangle = |0\rangle_X |0\rangle^{\otimes N-2} (a |0\rangle_Y + b |1\rangle_Y). \quad (3.11)$$

Thus we have achieved perfect quantum state transfer in time $T = \mathcal{O}(N^{\alpha/D} / \sqrt{N})$. Note that the distance between X and Y on the lattice does not appear in the state transfer time. Setting $b = 1$ in the above protocol leads to

$$\langle \Psi | [c_X^\dagger(T), c_Y] | \Psi \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T d\tau \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \Lambda} |J_{iX}(\tau)|^2}. \quad (3.12)$$

Thus, the bound in Eq. (3.2) is saturated up to a factor of 2.

It should be pointed out that, for $\alpha > D/2$, the above protocol requires a time that increases with N , which is slower than for the previous result in Ref. [31]. While that protocol has a state transfer time that is constant for $\alpha \leq D$, it uses an engineered Hamiltonian with interactions, and therefore cannot be applied to systems of non-interacting particles.

In general, allowing interactions may increase the rate of information propagation, and proving a Lieb-Robinson-type bound in these situations requires a different approach.

Improved bound for general interacting systems.—We now derive bounds on the signaling time that extend beyond free-particle Hamiltonians. Without loss of generality, we study a generic interacting spin Hamiltonian $H(t) = \sum_{i<j} h_{ij}(t)$ where $\|h_{ij}(t)\| \leq 1/r_{ij}^\alpha$ and on-site interactions have been eliminated by going into an interaction picture. We will bound the quantity $\|[A(t), B]\|$, where A and B are arbitrary operators supported on sets of sites X and Y respectively, using the following Lieb-Robinson series [34]:

$$\|[A(t), B]\| \leq 2\|A\|\|B\||X||Y| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2t)^k}{k!} \mathcal{J}^k(X, Y), \quad (3.13)$$

$$\mathcal{J}^k(X, Y) \equiv \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}} J_{Xi_1} J_{i_1 i_2} \dots J_{i_{k-1} Y}. \quad (3.14)$$

Here, $|X|$ stands for the number of sites X acts on. Each term in Eq. (3.14) represents a sequence of k directed hops in the lattice that originates at site X and ends at site Y . For distinct sites i and j , $J_{ij} = 1/r_{ij}^\alpha$ represents a directed hop from i to j . For technical reasons, we set $J_{ii} = \sum_{j \neq i} J_{ij}$ ³.

Since J_{ij} decays slowly in r_{ij} for $\alpha < D$, our improved bound on $\|[A(t), B]\|$ requires bounding each term in Eq. (3.14) using a new summation technique [38] absent in previous efforts [34, 13]. This technique is particularly effective for tightening existing Lieb-Robinson bounds for strongly long-range interacting systems. The result (assuming $\alpha < D$) is:

$$\|[A(t), B]\| \leq 2\|A\|\|B\||X||Y| \left(\frac{e^{\Theta(N^{1-\alpha/D})t} - 1}{\Theta(N^{1-\alpha/D})r_{XY}^\alpha} \right). \quad (3.15)$$

The factor $\Theta(N^{1-\alpha/D})$ [35] comes from the total interaction energy per site given by J_{ii} .

We consider now the case of signaling between subsystems X and Y of a system Λ with $|X|, |Y| = \mathcal{O}(1)$. We formally define t_{si} —the signaling time from X to Y —as the smallest time t such that for a fixed constant $\delta = \Theta(1)$, there exist unit-norm operators A and B supported on X and Y respectively such that $\|[A(t), B]\| > \delta$ [33]. If we further assume that X and Y are separated by an extensive distance $r_{XY} = \Theta(N^{1/D})$, then the following lower bound holds for the signaling time:

$$t_{\text{si}} = \Omega\left(\frac{\log(N)}{N^{1-\alpha/D}}\right). \quad (3.16)$$

This bound supersedes the naive signaling-time bound of $t_{\text{si}} = \Omega(1/N^{1-\alpha/D})$ one would obtain via normalization of interaction energy per site. While we do not know of any examples that saturate this bound, it is the tightest-known signaling-time bound for strongly long-range interacting systems. Indeed, the bound is close to being saturated in the limit

³The strength of the on-site hop J_{ii} is defined this way for technical reasons that we explain in the Supplemental Material.

of $\alpha \rightarrow D^-$, as the state transfer protocol in Ref. [31] shows that $t_{\text{si}} = \mathcal{O}(\log(N))$ can be achieved at $\alpha = D$. Unfortunately, generalizing our bound in Eq. (3.15) to the case of $\alpha = D$ leads to $t_{\text{si}} = \Omega(1)$ [38], which is not saturated by Ref. [31].

Many-site signaling and scrambling bounds.—Of recent interest in the fields of theoretical high-energy and condensed matter physics has been the phenomenon of quantum information scrambling [33, 39, 26, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47]. Previous work on scrambling in power-law interacting systems has focused primarily on numerical analysis [48, 49], whereas general mathematical results are lacking. Only in all-to-all interacting systems (which can be treated as the limit $\alpha = 0$) have Lieb-Robinson-type bounds been used to bound the scrambling time [33]. Using the bound derived in Eq. (3.15), we can prove a scrambling-time bound for systems with $0 < \alpha < D$, a regime for which no better result is known.

To derive a bound on the scrambling time, we first derive a bound on the many-site signaling time. We define the “many-site signaling time” t_{ms} to be the smallest t required to signal from X to a Y that has extensive size. Lieb-Robinson-type bounds such as Eq. (3.15) naturally limit the time for many-site signaling. However, a direct application of Eq. (3.15) to many-site signaling leads to a loose bound. Instead, a more refined technique that sums over all sites within the subsets X and Y yields a tighter bound [50]:

$$\|[A(t), B]\| \leq 2\|A\|\|B\| \sum_{i \in X, j \in Y} \frac{e^{\Theta(N^{1-\alpha/D})t} - 1}{\Theta(N^{1-\alpha/D})r_{ij}^\alpha}. \quad (3.17)$$

This bound reduces to Eq. (3.15) when $|X|, |Y| = 1$.

The scrambling time t_{sc} corresponds to the minimal time required for a system of N spins on a lattice Λ to evolve from a product state to a state that is nearly maximally entangled on all subsystems of size kN for some constant $0 < k < \frac{1}{2}$ [33]. From this definition, it can be shown that any information initially contained in a finite-sized subsystem $S \subset \Lambda$ is no longer recoverable from measurements on S alone [33]. That information is not lost, however, but can be recovered from the complement $\bar{S} = \Lambda \setminus S$ of S [40, 51]. As a result, scrambling implies the ability to signal from S to \bar{S} [33]. Thus, t_{sc} is lower bounded by the time it takes to signal from a subset S with size $\Theta(1)$ to its complement with size $\Theta(N)$, which corresponds to the many-site signaling time.

Using Eq. (3.17), we obtain the following scrambling-time bound for $0 \leq \alpha < D$:

$$t_{\text{sc}} \geq t_{\text{ms}} = \Omega\left(\frac{1}{N^{1-\alpha/D}}\right). \quad (3.18)$$

Note that this bound differs from Eq. (3.16) by a $\log(N)$ factor. Additionally, although the bound on t_{si} in Eq. (3.16) may allow further tightening, the bound on t_{ms} in Eq. (3.18) cannot be generically improved for $0 \leq \alpha < D$. To see this, we consider a long-range Ising Hamiltonian $H = \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z$, with $J_{ij} = 1/r_{ij}^\alpha$. For simplicity, we consider the subset S to be a single site indexed by i and construct operators $A = \sigma_i^+$ and $B = \bigotimes_{j \neq i} \sigma_j^+$ that are supported on S and \bar{S} respectively. We can analytically calculate the expectation value

of $[A(t), B]$ in an initial state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|0\rangle^{\otimes N} + |1\rangle^{\otimes N}]$ [50]:

$$\langle\psi|[A(t), B]|\psi\rangle = \sin\left(2t \sum_{j \neq i} J_{ij}\right). \quad (3.19)$$

Using $J_{ij} = 1/r_{ij}^\alpha$, we find that the signaling time of this protocol is $t = \mathcal{O}(N^{\alpha/D-1})$ for $0 \leq \alpha < D$, which saturates the many-site signaling-time bound in Eq. (3.18)⁴. This does not, however, imply that the corresponding scrambling-time bound is tight. In fact, previous work suggests that fast scramblers in all-to-all interacting systems ($\alpha = 0$) can scramble in time $t_{\text{sc}} = \mathcal{O}(\log(N)/\sqrt{N})$ [33]⁵. This suggests that future improvements to the scrambling-time bound may be possible.

Conclusions and Outlook.—In this paper, we make several advances in bounding the signaling and scrambling times in strongly long-range interacting systems. Our results suggest a number of possible future directions. One is to find the optimal signaling-time bound for general strongly long-range interacting systems. Previously, this has been an outstanding challenge; we now know of a free-particle bound that is tight for $\alpha \in [0, D/2]$ and a general bound that is nearly tight as $\alpha \rightarrow D^-$. The search for the optimal bound for $\alpha \in [0, D]$ has thus been narrowed down significantly. Another direction is to investigate how interactions can speed up signaling. We expect weakly interacting systems to possess a similar signaling-time bound to our free-particle bound, as the dynamics in such systems can often be treated using spin-wave analysis [52]. But for strongly interacting systems, it remains unclear how much speedup one can obtain over non-interacting systems.

Additionally, our bound for signaling to an extensive numbers of sites hints at a strategy for achieving a better scrambling bound. In particular, the protocol that saturates our many-site signaling bound relies on an initial entangled state, whereas the definition of scrambling assumes that the system begins in a product state. It may be possible to improve the scrambling-time bound by explicitly restricting our attention, when bounding t_{ms} , to initial product states.

Finally, we expect that the improved Lieb-Robinson-type bounds derived in this work may lead to a better understanding of the spreading of out-of-time-order correlators [53], the growth of entanglement entropy [50], and thermalization timescales [54] in strongly long-range interacting systems.

In addition, there are connections between Lieb-Robinson-type bounds and the critical scaling of the defects appearing in a quantum system driven across its quantum critical point (the celebrated Kibble-Zurek (KZ) mechanism). It remains an open question whether the KZ hypothesis can be shown to hold for strongly long-range systems.

⁴A different protocol for many-site signaling was given in [29]. That result yields a many-site signaling time of $t_{\text{ms}} = \mathcal{O}(N^{\alpha/D-1/2})$, which does not saturate the bound in Eq. (3.18).

⁵We note that the example of a fast scrambler given in [33] does not strictly obey the normalization condition $\|h_{ij}(t)\| \leq 1/r_{ij}^\alpha$. This does not, however, weaken the claim that there is gap between our scrambling-time bound and the scrambling times of fast-scrambling systems

Chapter 4

Conclusion

My conclusion.

Bibliography

- [1] Eddie Schoute. “Quantum Routing for Architecture-Respecting Circuit Transformations”. PhD thesis. University of Maryland College Park, 2021.
- [2] Elliott H. Lieb and Derek W. Robinson. “The Finite Group Velocity of Quantum Spin Systems”. In: 28.3 (1972), pp. 251–257.
- [3] M B Hastings. “An Area Law for One-Dimensional Quantum Systems”. In: *J. Stat. Mech: Theory Exp.* 2007.08 (Aug. 2007), P08024–P08024. DOI: [10.1088/1742-5468/2007/08/p08024](https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/2007/08/p08024).
- [4] Sergey Bravyi, Matthew B. Hastings, and Spyridon Michalakis. “Topological Quantum Order: Stability under Local Perturbations”. In: 51.9 (2010), p. 093512. DOI: [10.1063/1.3490195](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3490195).
- [5] M. Saffman, T. G. Walker, and K. Mølmer. “Quantum Information with Rydberg Atoms”. In: 82.3 (Aug. 2010), pp. 2313–2363. DOI: [10.1103/RevModPhys.82.2313](https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.82.2313).
- [6] Joseph W. Britton et al. “Engineered Two-Dimensional Ising Interactions in a Trapped-Ion Quantum Simulator with Hundreds of Spins”. In: *Nature* 484 (Apr. 2012), p. 489.
- [7] Bo Yan et al. “Observation of Dipolar Spin-Exchange Interactions with Lattice-Confined Polar Molecules”. In: *Nature* 501 (Sept. 2013), p. 521.
- [8] N. Y. Yao et al. “Scalable Architecture for a Room Temperature Solid-State Quantum Information Processor”. In: 3 (2012/04/24/online, 2012-04-24), p. 800.
- [9] J. S. Douglas et al. “Quantum Many-Body Models with Cold Atoms Coupled to Photonic Crystals”. In: *Nat. Photonics* 9 (Apr. 2015), p. 326.
- [10] Zhe-Xuan Gong et al. “Persistence of Locality in Systems with Power-Law Interactions”. In: 113.3 (July 2014), p. 030602. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.030602](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.030602).
- [11] Michael Kastner. “Diverging Equilibration Times in Long-Range Quantum Spin Models”. In: 106.13 (Mar. 2011), p. 130601. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.130601](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.130601).
- [12] Michael Kastner. “Long-Time Asymptotics of the Long-Range Emch-Radin Model.” In: *Central Eur. J. Phys* 10.3 (2012), pp. 637–644. DOI: [10.2478/s11534-011-0122-4](https://doi.org/10.2478/s11534-011-0122-4).

- [13] David-Maximilian Storch, Mauritz van den Worm, and Michael Kastner. “Interplay of Soundcone and Supersonic Propagation in Lattice Models with Power Law Interactions”. In: *New J. Phys.* 17.6 (2015), p. 063021.
- [14] Michael Kastner. “N-Scaling of Timescales in Long-range N-body Quantum Systems”. In: *J. Stat. Mech: Theory Exp.* 2017.1 (Jan. 2017), p. 014003. DOI: [10.1088/1742-5468/aa5119](https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/aa5119).
- [15] Thierry Dauxois et al. *Dynamics and Thermodynamics of Systems with Long-Range Interactions: An Introduction*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2002, pp. 1–19. ISBN: 978-3-540-45835-7. DOI: [10.1007/3-540-45835-2_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45835-2_1).
- [16] R. Islam et al. “Emergence and Frustration of Magnetism with Variable-Range Interactions in a Quantum Simulator”. In: *Science* 340.6132 (2013), pp. 583–587. ISSN: 0036-8075. DOI: [10.1126/science.1232296](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1232296).
- [17] R. Blatt and C. F. Roos. “Quantum Simulations with Trapped Ions”. In: *Nature Physics* 8 (2012/04/02/online, 2012-04-02), 277 EP -.
- [18] Soonwon Choi et al. “Observation of Discrete Time-Crystalline Order in a Disordered Dipolar Many-Body System”. In: *Nature* 543 (2017/03/08/online, 2017-03-08), p. 221.
- [19] Michael Foss-Feig et al. “Entanglement and Spin-Squeezing without Infinite-Range Interactions”. In: (2016). arXiv: [1612.07805](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.07805).
- [20] Nicolò Defenu et al. “Dynamical Critical Scaling of Long-Range Interacting Quantum Magnets”. In: 121.24 (Dec. 2018), p. 240403. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.240403](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.240403).
- [21] O. L. Acevedo et al. “New Dynamical Scaling Universality for Quantum Networks across Adiabatic Quantum Phase Transitions”. In: 112.3 (Jan. 2014), p. 030403. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.030403](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.030403).
- [22] Subir Sachdev and Jinwu Ye. “Gapless Spin-Fluid Ground State in a Random Quantum Heisenberg Magnet”. In: 70.21 (May 1993), pp. 3339–3342. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.70.3339](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.70.3339).
- [23] Martin Gärttner et al. “Measuring Out-of-Time-Order Correlations and Multiple Quantum Spectra in a Trapped-Ion Quantum Magnet”. In: 13 (May 2017), p. 781.
- [24] Alexei Kitaev. “A Simple Model of Quantum Holography”. In: *KITP Strings Seminar and Entanglement 2015 Program*. Feb. 12, April 7, and May 27, 2015.
- [25] Juan Maldacena, Stephen H. Shenker, and Douglas Stanford. “A Bound on Chaos”. In: *J. High Energy Phys.* 2016.8 (Aug. 2016), p. 106. ISSN: 1029-8479. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP08\(2016\)106](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2016)106).
- [26] Yasuhiro Sekino and L Susskind. “Fast Scramblers”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2008.10 (Oct. 2008), pp. 065–065. DOI: [10.1088/1126-6708/2008/10/065](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2008/10/065).
- [27] Gregory Bentsen, Yingfei Gu, and Andrew Lucas. “Fast Scrambling on Sparse Graphs”. In: *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 116.14 (2019), pp. 6689–6694. ISSN: 0027-8424. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1811033116](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1811033116).

- [28] Chi-Fang Chen and Andrew Lucas. “Operator Growth Bounds from Graph Theory”. In: (2019). eprint: [arXiv:1905.03682](#).
- [29] Jens Eisert et al. “Breakdown of Quasilocality in Long-Range Quantum Lattice Models”. In: 111.26 (Dec. 2013), p. 260401. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.260401](#).
- [30] P. Hauke and L. Tagliacozzo. “Spread of Correlations in Long-Range Interacting Quantum Systems”. In: 111.20 (Nov. 2013), p. 207202. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.207202](#).
- [31] Zachary Eldredge et al. “Fast Quantum State Transfer and Entanglement Renormalization Using Long-Range Interactions”. In: 119.17 (Oct. 2017), p. 170503. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.170503](#).
- [32] Lea F. Santos, Fausto Borgonovi, and Giuseppe Luca Celardo. “Cooperative Shielding in Many-Body Systems with Long-Range Interaction”. In: 116.25 (June 2016), p. 250402. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.250402](#).
- [33] Nima Lashkari et al. “Towards the Fast Scrambling Conjecture”. In: *J. High Energy Phys.* 2013.4 (Apr. 2013), p. 22. ISSN: 1029-8479. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP04\(2013\)022](#).
- [34] M. B. Hastings and T. Koma. “Spectral Gap and Exponential Decay of Correlations”. In: 265 (Aug. 2006), pp. 781–804. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-006-0030-4](#).
- [35] .
- [36] Georgios M. Nikolopoulos and Igor Jex. *Quantum State Transfer and Network Engineering*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2014. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-39937-4](#).
- [37] Jeffrey M. Epstein and K. Birgitta Whaley. “Quantum Speed Limits for Quantum-Information-Processing Tasks”. In: 95.4 (Apr. 2017), p. 042314. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.95.042314](#).
- [38] .
- [39] Daniel A. Roberts and Brian Swingle. “Lieb-Robinson Bound and the Butterfly Effect in Quantum Field Theories”. In: 117.9 (Aug. 2016), p. 091602. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.091602](#).
- [40] Patrick Hayden and John Preskill. “Black Holes as Mirrors: Quantum Information in Random Subsystems”. In: *J. High Energy Phys.* 2007.09 (Sept. 2007), pp. 120–120. DOI: [10.1088/1126-6708/2007/09/120](#).
- [41] Shenglong Xu and Brian Swingle. “Locality, Quantum Fluctuations, and Scrambling”. In: 9.3 (Sept. 2019), p. 031048. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevX.9.031048](#).
- [42] Stephen H. Shenker and Douglas Stanford. “Black Holes and the Butterfly Effect”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2014.3 (Mar. 2014), p. 67. ISSN: 1029-8479. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP03\(2014\)067](#).
- [43] Pavan Hosur et al. “Chaos in Quantum Channels”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2016.2 (Feb. 2016), p. 4. ISSN: 1029-8479. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP02\(2016\)004](#).

- [44] Adam Nahum, Sagar Vijay, and Jeongwan Haah. “Operator Spreading in Random Unitary Circuits”. In: 8.2 (Apr. 2018), p. 021014. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevX.8.021014](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.8.021014).
- [45] C. W. von Keyserlingk et al. “Operator Hydrodynamics, OTOCs, and Entanglement Growth in Systems without Conservation Laws”. In: 8.2 (Apr. 2018), p. 021013. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevX.8.021013](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.8.021013).
- [46] Daniel A. Roberts, Douglas Stanford, and Alexandre Streicher. “Operator Growth in the SYK Model”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2018.6 (June 2018), p. 122. ISSN: 1029-8479. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2018\)122](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2018)122).
- [47] Yingfei Gu, Xiao-Liang Qi, and Douglas Stanford. “Local Criticality, Diffusion and Chaos in Generalized Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev Models”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2017.5 (May 2017), p. 125. ISSN: 1029-8479. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP05\(2017\)125](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP05(2017)125).
- [48] Silvia Pappalardi et al. “Scrambling and Entanglement Spreading in Long-Range Spin Chains”. In: 98.13 (Oct. 2018), p. 134303. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.98.134303](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.98.134303).
- [49] Xiao Chen and Tianci Zhou. “Quantum Chaos Dynamics in Long-Range Power Law Interaction Systems”. In: 100.6 (Aug. 2019), p. 064305. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.100.064305](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.100.064305).
- [50] Zhe-Xuan Gong et al. “Entanglement Area Laws for Long-Range Interacting Systems”. In: 119.5 (July 2017), p. 050501. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.050501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.050501).
- [51] Jordan Cotler et al. “Quantum Causal Influence”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2019.7 (2019), p. 42. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2019\)042](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2019)042).
- [52] Lorenzo Cevolani et al. “Universal Scaling Laws for Correlation Spreading in Quantum Systems with Short- and Long-Range Interactions”. In: 98.2 (July 2018), p. 024302. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.98.024302](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.98.024302).
- [53] David J. Luitz and Yevgeny Bar Lev. “Emergent Locality in Systems with Power-Law Interactions”. In: 99.1 (Jan. 2019), 010105(R). DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.99.010105](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.99.010105).
- [54] Rahul Nandkishore and David A. Huse. “Many-Body Localization and Thermalization in Quantum Statistical Mechanics”. In: *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* 6.1 (2015), pp. 15–38. DOI: [10.1146/annurev-conmatphys-031214-014726](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-conmatphys-031214-014726).