

The Lieb-Robinson light cone for power-law interactions

Minh C. Tran,^{1,2,*} Andrew Y. Guo,^{1,2} Christopher L. Baldwin,^{1,2}
Adam Ehrenberg,^{1,2} Alexey V. Gorshkov,^{1,2} and Andrew Lucas^{3,4}

¹Joint Center for Quantum Information and Computer Science,
NIST/University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

²Joint Quantum Institute, NIST/University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

³Department of Physics, University of Colorado, Boulder CO 80309, USA

⁴Center for Theory of Quantum Matter, University of Colorado, Boulder CO 80309, USA

(Dated: March 31, 2021)

The Lieb-Robinson theorem states that information propagates with a finite velocity in quantum systems on a lattice with nearest-neighbor interactions. What are the speed limits on information propagation in quantum systems with power-law interactions, which decay as $1/r^\alpha$ at distance r ? Here, we present a definitive answer to this question for all exponents $\alpha > 2d$ and all spatial dimensions d . Schematically, information takes time at least $r^{\min\{1, \alpha-2d\}}$ to propagate a distance r . As recent state transfer protocols saturate this bound, our work closes a decades-long hunt for optimal Lieb-Robinson bounds on quantum information dynamics with power-law interactions.

Over a century ago, Einstein realized that there is a speed limit to information propagation. If no physical object or signal can travel faster than light, then the speed of light itself must constrain the dynamics of quantum information and entanglement. In ordinary quantum systems, however, *emergent* speed limits can arise that place more stringent restrictions on information propagation than does the speed of light. For example, in quantum spin systems with nearest-neighbor interactions on a lattice, Lieb and Robinson proved in 1972 that there is a *finite velocity* of information propagation [1].

Of course, most non-relativistic physical systems realized in experiments include long-range interactions such as the Coulomb interaction, the dipole-dipole interaction, or the van-der-Waals interaction. Each of these decays with distance as a power law $1/r^\alpha$ for some exponent α . What is the fundamental speed limit on the propagation of quantum information in these systems?

Despite the importance of this question in designing and constraining the operation of future quantum technologies [2–6], bounding information propagation in systems with power-law interactions has been a notoriously challenging mathematical physics problem. In 2005, Hastings and Koma [7] showed that it takes a time $t \gtrsim \log r$ to send information a distance r , for all $\alpha > d$, where d is the dimension of the lattice. By analogy to Einstein’s relativity, we say that there is at least a “logarithmic light cone” for such power-law interactions. However, it was suspected that this bound was far from tight, and ten years later it was shown that $t \gtrsim r^\gamma$, for an exponent $0 < \gamma < 1$ when $\alpha > 2d$ [8–10]. In 2019, Chen and Lucas [11] proved the existence of a linear light cone ($t \gtrsim r$) for all $\alpha > 3$ in $d = 1$; Kuwahara and Saito [12] later generalized this result to higher dimensions, finding a linear light cone for all $\alpha > 2d + 1$. These recent results prove that power-law interactions are, for all practical purposes, entirely local for sufficiently large α .

A natural question is then how small α must be in




FIG. 1. The gap in the Lieb-Robinson literature in $d > 1$ dimensions. The red solid lines represent the exponent γ of the Lieb-Robinson light cone $t \gtrsim r^\gamma$ in literature. The green solid lines correspond to the light cone exponents of best-known information-propagating protocols. Accordingly, the green region corresponds to attainable light cone exponents, whereas the red region is forbidden by the known bounds. Our result (red dashed line) closes the gap in our understanding of the Lieb-Robinson light cone.

order to *break* a linear light cone. Fast state-transfer and entanglement-generation protocols developed in the past year [12–15] have ultimately demonstrated that the time t required to send information a distance r obeys $t \lesssim r^{\min(\alpha-2d, 1)}$ for any $\alpha > 2d$ and $t \lesssim r^{o(1)}$ for $\alpha < d$, where $o(1)$ is an arbitrarily small constant. Combining all best known results in the literature leads to the diagram shown in Fig. 1, which compares known information-transfer protocols to corresponding Lieb-Robinson bounds.

In this Letter, we complete this extensive literature on Lieb-Robinson bounds for power-law interactions [7–22], by proving that quantum information is contained within the Lieb-Robinson light cone $t \gtrsim r^{\min(\alpha-2d-\varepsilon, 1)}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$. This result closes the remaining gap between bounds and protocols in Fig. 1, and concludes the fifteen-year quest to understand the fundamental speed

limit on quantum information in the presence of power-law interactions. We sketch the proof of the result in the main text and refer readers to the Supplemental Material (SM) [23] for a rigorous treatment.

Main result.—We consider a d -dimensional regular lattice Λ , a finite-level system at every site of the lattice, and a two-body power-law Hamiltonian $H(t)$ with an exponent α supported on the lattice. Specifically, we assume $H(t) = \sum_{i,j \in \Lambda} h_{ij}(t)$ is a sum of two-body terms h_{ij} supported on sites i, j such that $\|h_{ij}(t)\| \leq 1/\text{dist}(i, j)^\alpha$ for all $i \neq j$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm and $\text{dist}(i, j)$ is the distance between i, j . In the following discussion, we assume Λ is a hypercubic lattice of qubits for simplicity.

We use \mathcal{L} to denote the Liouvillian corresponding to the Heisenberg evolution under Hamiltonian H , i.e. $\mathcal{L}|O\rangle \equiv |i[H, O]\rangle$ for any operator O , and use $e^{\mathcal{L}t}|O\rangle \equiv |O(t)\rangle$ to denote the time-evolved version of the operator O . We also use $\mathbb{P}_r^{(i)}|O\rangle$ to denote an operator constructed from O by decomposing O into a sum of Pauli strings and removing strings that are supported entirely within a ball of radius r from i . Colloquially speaking, $\mathbb{P}_r^{(i)}|O\rangle$ is the component of O that has non-trivial support on sites a distance at least r from site i . If i is the origin of the lattice, we drop the superscript i and simply write \mathbb{P}_r for brevity.

Given a unit-norm operator O initially supported at the origin, our main result is a bound on how much O spreads to a distance r and beyond under the evolution $e^{\mathcal{L}t}$:

Theorem 1. For any $\alpha \in (2d, 2d+1)$ and an arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist constants $c, C \geq 0$ such that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq C \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \quad (1)$$

holds for all $1 \leq t \leq cr^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}$.

Because $\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\|$ can be both upper- and lower-bounded by linear functions of $\sup_A \| [A, e^{\mathcal{L}t} O] \|$, where A is a unit-norm operator supported at least a distance r from O , Eq. (1) is equivalent to a bound on the unequal-time commutators commonly used in the Lieb-Robinson literature.

For $\alpha \in (2d, 2d+1)$, by setting the left-hand side of Eq. (1) to a constant, Theorem 1 implies the light cone $t \gtrsim r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}$ for some ε that can be made arbitrarily small. Note that our definition does not require $\|h_{ij}\|$ to decay exactly as $1/\text{dist}(i, j)^\alpha$; it may actually decay faster than $1/\text{dist}(i, j)^\alpha$ and still satisfy the condition of a power-law interaction with an exponent α . Therefore, for $\alpha \geq 2d+1$ and power-law Hamiltonians $H = \sum_{ij} h_{ij}$ satisfying $\|h_{ij}\| \leq 1/\text{dist}(i, j)^\alpha < 1/\text{dist}(i, j)^{2d+1-\varepsilon}$, Theorem 1 implies a linear light cone $t \gtrsim r^{1-2\varepsilon}$.

Sketch of proof.—For simplicity, we assume here that the lattice diameter is $\mathcal{O}(r)$. We show in the SM [23] that interactions whose ranges are much larger than r do not

contribute significantly to the dynamics of O and, therefore, can be safely removed from the Hamiltonian. Our strategy is to group the interactions of the Hamiltonian by their ranges, prove a bound for short-range interactions, and recursively add longer-range interactions to the Hamiltonian.

Specifically, we choose $\ell_k \equiv L^k$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$, where L, n are parameters to be chosen later. We use H_k to denote those terms of H with range at most ℓ_k and use $\mathcal{L}_k \equiv i[H_k, \cdot]$ to denote the corresponding Liouvillian. We start with the standard Lieb-Robinson bound for H_1 [1]:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} |O\rangle\| \lesssim e^{\frac{v_1 t - r}{\ell_1}}, \quad (2)$$

where $v_1 \propto \ell_1 = L$ is the rescaled Lieb-Robinson velocity, and prove a bound for H_2 by adding $V_2 \equiv H_2 - H_1$, i.e., interactions of range between ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 , to the Hamiltonian H_1 .

For that, we move into the interaction picture of H_1 so that we can decompose the evolution $e^{\mathcal{L}_2 t} = e^{\mathcal{L}_2, I t} e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t}$ into two consecutive evolutions, where $e^{\mathcal{L}_2, I t}$ is the evolution under $V_{2, I} \equiv e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} V_2$. Loosely speaking, the light cone induced by H_2 will be a “sum” of the light cones induced by H_1 and $V_{2, I}$ individually (see the SM [23] for a proof.) With the light cone of H_1 given by Eq. (2), our task is to find the light cone of $V_{2, I}$.

For this purpose, we consider the structure of $V_{2, I}$ and show that, with a suitable rescaling of the lattice, the interactions in $V_{2, I}$ decay exponentially with distance. We then obtain the light cone of $V_{2, I}$ using the standard Lieb-Robinson bound on the rescaled lattice. Specifically, we divide the lattice into non-overlapping hypercubes of length ℓ_2 (see Fig. 2). Given x, y as the centers of two hypercubes, we define $\text{dist}(x, y)/\ell_2$ to be the rescaled distance between the hypercubes. We shall estimate the strength of the interaction between hypercubes under the Hamiltonian $V_{2, I}$.

We first consider the case $t = 0$ so that $V_{2, I} = V_2$. Because each interaction in V_2 has range at most ℓ_2 , no interaction h_{ij} is supported on two distinct hypercubes unless they are nearest neighbors. Therefore, only nearest-neighboring hypercubes may interact under $V_{2, I} = V_2$.

The case $t > 0$ is slightly more complicated. The support of an interaction h_{ij} in V_2 may expand under $e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t}$, and, hence, non-nearest-neighboring hypercubes may interact with each other. However, due to Eq. (2), the support of $e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} h_{ij}$ would largely remain inside the balls of radius $v_1 t$ around i, j . The interactions between hypercubes are exponentially suppressed with distance by Eq. (2). Therefore, the system of hypercubes would interact via a nearly finite-range interaction (see Fig. 2).

To apply the standard Lieb-Robinson bound for this system of hypercubes, we estimate the maximum effective interaction between any pair of nearest-neighboring hypercubes centered on x, y . In particular, assuming $v_1 t \leq \ell_2$, the primary contributions to such an interaction come from $\propto \ell_2^d \times \ell_2^d = \ell_2^{2d}$ interaction terms $e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} h_{ij}$




FIG. 2. We study the structure of $V_{2,I}$ by dividing the lattice into hypercubes of length ℓ_2 (labeled by x , y , and z for example). In the interaction picture, how much each $e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} h_{ij}$ contributes to the pair-wise “effective interaction” between two hypercubes depends on how strongly the support of $e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} h_{ij}$ (represented by the shaded area) overlaps with the hypercubes. Because of the bound in Eq. (2), the evolved operator $e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} h_{ij}$ is largely confined to the light cones induced by \mathcal{L}_1 around i and j (the smallest disks around i and j). The component of $e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} h_{ij}$ supported outside this light cone is exponentially suppressed with distance (represented by lighter shade). Consequently, the effective interaction between the hypercubes x and z is exponentially smaller than the one between x and y .

whose light cones under H_1 may overlap with the hypercubes. Because each interaction h_{ij} has norm at most $1/\ell_1^\alpha$ by our assumption, the total contribution to the interactions between the cubes x, y is $\mathcal{O}(\ell_2^{2d}/\ell_1^\alpha)$. Applying the standard finite-range Lieb-Robinson bound on the system of hypercubes, where the maximum energy per interaction is $\mathcal{O}(\ell_2^{2d}/\ell_1^\alpha)$ and the distance is rescaled by a factor ℓ_2 , we obtain the bound for the evolution under $V_{2,I}$:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} |O\rangle\| \lesssim \exp\left(\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\ell_2^{2d}}{\ell_1^\alpha}\right)t - \frac{r}{\ell_2}\right) \equiv e^{\frac{\Delta v t - r}{\ell_2}}, \quad (3)$$

where $\Delta v = \mathcal{O}(\ell_2^{2d+1}/\ell_1^\alpha)$.

After getting the light cone for the evolution under $V_{2,I}$, we now combine it with the evolution under H_1 to obtain the light cone of H_2 . Intuitively, the evolutions under H_1 and $V_{2,I}$ for time t may each grow the support radius of an operator by $v_1 t$ and $\Delta v t$ respectively. Therefore, one would expect an operator evolved under H_1 and $V_{2,I}$ consecutively, each for time t , may have the support radius at most $(v_1 + \Delta v)t$. In the SM [23], we show that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_2 t} |O\rangle\| = \|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_2, t} e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} |O\rangle\| \lesssim e^{\frac{v_2 t - r}{\ell_2}}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$v_2 \propto \log(r)v_1 + \Delta v = \log(r)v_1 + \frac{\ell_2^{2d+1}}{\ell_1^\alpha} \quad (5)$$

and r is the diameter of the lattice Λ . The additional factor of $\log(r)$ (compared to our intuition) comes from the enhancement to the operator spreading due to the increased support size after the first evolution $e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t}$.

Up to this point, we have used the bound Eq. (2) for H_1 to prove a bound for H_2 [Eq. (4)], which has the same form. Repeating this process, we arrive at similar bounds for H_k ($k = 3, 4, \dots, n$):

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} |O\rangle\| \lesssim e^{\frac{v_k t - r}{\ell_k}}, \quad (6)$$

where the velocity v_k is defined iteratively:

$$v_k \propto \log(r)v_{k-1} + \frac{\ell_k^{2d+1}}{\ell_{k-1}^\alpha}. \quad (7)$$

Increasing k makes the bound in Eq. (6) applicable for longer and longer interactions. However, doing so also increases ℓ_k , resulting in weaker and weaker bounds. In particular, if $\ell_k > r$, Eq. (6) becomes trivial even for $t \leq r/v_k$. Therefore, we stop the iteration at $k = n$ such that ℓ_n is slightly smaller than r . Specifically, we choose n such that $\ell_n = L^n = r/\chi(t, r)$, where $\chi(t, r) > 1$ is a function of t, r . For $v_n t \leq r/2$, the right-hand side of Eq. (6) becomes

$$e^{\frac{v_n t - r}{\ell_n}} \lesssim e^{-\frac{r}{2\ell_n}} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi(t, r)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\chi(t, r)^\omega}, \quad (8)$$

where we upper-bound an exponentially decaying function of $\chi(t, r)$ by a power-law decaying function of $\chi(t, r)$ with an exponent $\omega > 0$. Choosing $\chi(t, r) = (r^{\alpha-2d}/t)^\zeta$, where $\zeta > 0$ is an arbitrarily small constant, and $\omega = \frac{\alpha-d}{\zeta(\alpha-2d)}$, we obtain the desired bound

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_n t} |O\rangle\| \lesssim \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}}. \quad (9)$$

Note that Eq. (9) only holds for $t \leq r/2v_n$. To maximize the range of validity of Eq. (9), we aim to choose L such that v_n is as small as possible. Without the second term in Eq. (7), we would expect v_k to increase by a factor of $\log r$ between iterations. Meanwhile, given $\ell_k = L^k$, the second term in Eq. (7) also increases by a factor $L^{2d+1-\alpha}$ in every iteration. Choosing $L^{2d+1-\alpha} \propto \log r$ so that the two terms in Eq. (7) have roughly equal contributions to v_k , we expect

$$v_n \propto (\log r)^n \propto L^{n(2d+1-\alpha)} = \left(\frac{r}{\chi(t, r)}\right)^{2d+1-\alpha} \quad (10)$$

up to a small logarithmic correction in r . Substituting the earlier choice of $\chi(t, r)$, we have

$$v_n t \propto r \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}}\right)^{1+o(1)} \leq r, \quad (11)$$

where $o(1)$ represents an arbitrarily small constant, for all $t \leq r^{\alpha-2d}$. Therefore, the bound in Eq. (9) holds as long as $t \lesssim r^{\alpha-2d}$.

The bound in Eq. (9) applies to the Hamiltonian H_n constructed from H by taking interactions of range at

most ℓ_n , which is slightly smaller than r for all $t \lesssim r^{\alpha-2d}$. To add interactions of range larger than ℓ_n to the bound, we use the identity [24]:

$$e^{\mathcal{L}t} = e^{\mathcal{L}_n t} + \sum_{i,j:\text{dist}(i,j) > \ell_n} \int_0^t ds e^{\mathcal{L}(t-s)} \mathcal{L}_{h_{ij}} e^{\mathcal{L}_n s}, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{h_{ij}} = i[h_{ij}, \cdot]$ is the Liouvillian corresponding to the interaction h_{ij} . We will argue that the contribution from the second term of the right-hand side to the bound on $\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\|$ is small.

Note that $\mathcal{L}_{h_{ij}} e^{\mathcal{L}_n s} |O\rangle$ vanishes if $e^{\mathcal{L}_n s} |O\rangle$ has no support on the sites i, j . Suppose site i is closer to the origin than site j . Then, most contributions to the right-hand side of Eq. (12) come from terms h_{ij} where i lies within the light cone of $e^{\mathcal{L}_n s} |O\rangle$. Let \mathcal{V} be the volume inside this light cone at time t . Using the triangle inequality on Eq. (12), we would arrive at

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \lesssim \|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_n t} |O\rangle\| + \frac{\mathcal{V}t}{\ell_n^{\alpha-d}}, \quad (13)$$

where \mathcal{V} is the result of the sum over i inside the light cone, summing over j where $\text{dist}(i, j) > \ell_n$ gives a factor proportional to $1/\ell_n^{\alpha-d}$, and the integral over time in Eq. (12) gives the factor t .

Suppose we can apply the desired light cone $t \gtrsim r^{\alpha-2d}$. Then we can estimate the volume inside the light cone $\mathcal{V} \lesssim t^{d/(\alpha-2d)}$. Substituting it into the above bound together with the value of ℓ_n , we would arrive at

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \lesssim \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}}, \quad (14)$$

which gives about the same light cone as in Theorem 1.

However, we are proving Theorem 1 and so cannot yet apply the light cone $t \gtrsim r^{\alpha-2d}$. Instead, we use the light cone from Ref. [8], which is weaker than Theorem 1, to estimate \mathcal{V} . Substituting this value of \mathcal{V} into Eq. (13), we obtain a *tighter* light cone than that of Ref. [8]. Iteratively using the resulting light cone to estimate \mathcal{V} (see the SM [23] for a more detailed derivation), we obtain tighter and tighter bounds. These bounds converge to a stable point that is exactly Eq. (14). Therefore, we obtain Theorem 1.

Discussion.—Theorem 1 implies a light cone that can be made arbitrarily close to $t \gtrsim r^{\alpha-2d}$ for all $\alpha \in (2d, 2d+1)$. In addition, Theorem 1 also implies a linear light cone $t \gtrsim r^{1-o(1)}$ for $\alpha \geq 2d+1$, providing an alternative proof to Refs. [11, 12] for two-body Hamiltonians. Together with Refs. [7, 11, 12], we have the final Lieb-Robinson light cone for power-law interactions:

$$t \gtrsim \begin{cases} \log r & \text{if } d < \alpha \leq 2d \\ r^{\alpha-2d-o(1)} & \text{if } 2d < \alpha \leq 2d+1, \\ r & \text{if } \alpha > 2d+1 \end{cases}, \quad (15)$$

which we can saturate, up to subpolynomial corrections, using the protocol for state transfer and entanglement generation in Ref. [15].

Additionally, at any fixed time, our bound decays with distance as $1/r^{\alpha-d-o(1)}$. Because the total strength of the interactions between the origin and all sites that are at distance at least r from the origin already scales as $1/r^{\alpha-d}$, this so-called ‘‘tail’’ of our bound is also optimal.

Our result tightens the constraints on various quantum information tasks in power-law systems, including the growth of connected correlation functions, the generation of topological order, and the digital simulation of local observables. Intuitively, as a local operator evolves, it is mostly constrained to lie within a light cone defined by a Lieb-Robinson bound, with total leakage outside this light cone constrained by the tail of this bound. To simulate the dynamics of such observables, it is sufficient to simulate only the dynamics inside the light cone [10, 14, 25], resulting in a more efficient simulation than simulating the entire lattice. Similarly, the connected correlator between initially local observables remains small during the dynamics if their corresponding light cones have little overlap [14, 18, 26]. Topologically ordered states—those that cannot be distinguished by local observables—would also remain topologically ordered until local observables have enough time to substantially grow their supports [14, 26]. Crucially, then, Theorem 1, which has a provably optimal light cone and tail, provides the best-known asymptotic constraints for the dynamics of these quantities. The mathematical details of precisely how they are bounded and the improvements that our new bound provides are detailed in the SM.

While we assume that the Hamiltonian is two-body throughout the paper, we expect the result extends to general many-body interactions. Specifically, we conjecture that Theorem 1 holds for all Hamiltonians $H = \sum_{X \subset \Lambda} h_X$, where the sum is over all subsets of the lattice and $\sum_{X \ni i, j} \|h_X\| \leq 1/\text{dist}(i, j)^\alpha$ for all $i \neq j$.

Lastly, while Theorem 1 demonstrates the optimality of the single-particle state transfer protocol of [15], other information-theoretic tasks are constrained by tighter light cones. Our techniques may help extend recent progress [14, 27, 28] in constraining the remaining light cone hierarchy that has been demonstrated with power law interactions.

Acknowledgments.—We thank Abhinav Deshpande, Dhruv Devulapalli, Michael Foss-Feig, and Zhe-Xuan Gong for helpful discussions. MCT, AYG, AE, and AVG acknowledge funding by the DoE ASCR Quantum Testbed Pathfinder program (award No. DE-SC0019040), AFOSR MURI, NSF PFCQC program, AFOSR, DoE ASCR Accelerated Research in Quantum Computing program (award No. DE-SC0020312), U.S. Department of Energy Award No. DE-SC0019449, and ARO MURI. MCT acknowledges additional support from the Princeton Center for Complex Materi-

als, a MRSEC supported by NSF grant DMR 1420541. AYG is supported by the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE-1840340. AL was supported by a Research Fellowship from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. This research was performed while CLB held an NRC Research Associateship award at the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

* minhtran@umd.edu

- [1] E. H. Lieb and D. W. Robinson, The Finite Group Velocity of Quantum Spin Systems, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **28**, 251 (1972).
- [2] D. J. Wineland, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, F. L. Moore, and D. J. Heinzen, Spin squeezing and reduced quantum noise in spectroscopy, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, R6797 (1992).
- [3] M. Foss-Feig, Z.-X. Gong, A. V. Gorshkov, and C. W. Clark, Entanglement and spin-squeezing without infinite-range interactions (2016), [arXiv:1612.07805](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.07805).
- [4] N. M. Linke, D. Maslov, M. Roetteler, S. Deb Nath, C. Figgatt, K. A. Landsman, K. Wright, and C. Monroe, Experimental comparison of two quantum computing architectures, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 3305 (2017).
- [5] A. Deshpande, B. Fefferman, M. C. Tran, M. Foss-Feig, and A. V. Gorshkov, Dynamical Phase Transitions in Sampling Complexity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 030501 (2018).
- [6] K. A. Landsman, C. Figgatt, T. Schuster, N. M. Linke, B. Yoshida, N. Y. Yao, and C. Monroe, Verified quantum information scrambling, *Nature* **567**, 61 (2019).
- [7] M. B. Hastings and T. Koma, Spectral Gap and Exponential Decay of Correlations, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **265**, 781 (2006).
- [8] M. Foss-Feig, Z.-X. Gong, C. W. Clark, and A. V. Gorshkov, Nearly Linear Light Cones in Long-Range Interacting Quantum Systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 157201 (2015).
- [9] D. V. Else, F. Machado, C. Nayak, and N. Y. Yao, Improved lieb-robinson bound for many-body hamiltonians with power-law interactions, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 022333 (2020).
- [10] M. C. Tran, A. Y. Guo, Y. Su, J. R. Garrison, Z. Eldredge, M. Foss-Feig, A. M. Childs, and A. V. Gorshkov, Locality and Digital Quantum Simulation of Power-Law Interactions, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 031006 (2019).
- [11] C.-F. Chen and A. Lucas, Finite speed of quantum scrambling with long range interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 250605 (2019).
- [12] T. Kuwahara and K. Saito, Strictly linear light cones in long-range interacting systems of arbitrary dimensions, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 031010 (2020).
- [13] Z. Eldredge, Z.-X. Gong, J. T. Young, A. H. Moosavian, M. Foss-Feig, and A. V. Gorshkov, Fast quantum state transfer and entanglement renormalization using long-range interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* , 170503.
- [14] M. C. Tran, C.-F. Chen, A. Ehrenberg, A. Y. Guo, A. Deshpande, Y. Hong, Z.-X. Gong, A. V. Gorshkov, and A. Lucas, Hierarchy of Linear Light Cones with Long-Range Interactions, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 031009 (2020).
- [15] M. C. Tran, A. Deshpande, A. Y. Guo, A. Lucas, and A. V. Gorshkov, Optimal State Transfer and Entanglement Generation in Power-law Interacting Systems (2020), [arXiv:2010.02930](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.02930) [quant-ph].
- [16] B. Nachtergaele, Y. Ogata, and R. Sims, Propagation of Correlations in Quantum Lattice Systems, *J. Stat. Phys.* **124**, 1 (2006).
- [17] B. Nachtergaele and R. Sims, Lieb-Robinson Bounds and the Exponential Clustering Theorem, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **265**, 119 (2006).
- [18] Z.-X. Gong, M. Foss-Feig, S. Michalakis, and A. V. Gorshkov, Persistence of Locality in Systems With Power-Law Interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 030602 (2014).
- [19] D.-M. Storch, M. V. D. Worm, and M. Kastner, Interplay of Soundcone and Supersonic Propagation in Lattice Models With Power Law Interactions, *New J. Phys.* **17**, 063021 (2015).
- [20] B. Nachtergaele, H. Raz, B. Schlein, and R. Sims, Lieb-robinson bounds for harmonic and anharmonic lattice systems, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **286**, 1073 (2009).
- [21] I. Prémont-Schwarz, A. Hamma, I. Klich, and F. Markopoulou-Kalamara, Lieb-robinson bounds for commutator-bounded operators, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 040102 (2010).
- [22] I. Prémont-Schwarz and J. Hnybida, Lieb-robinson bounds on the speed of information propagation, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 062107 (2010).
- [23] In the Supplemental Material, we provide a rigorous proof of Theorem 1 and mathematical details for the applications of the bound.
- [24] C.-F. Chen and A. Lucas, Operator growth bounds from graph theory, [arXiv:1905.03682](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.03682) [hep-th, physics:math-ph, physics:quant-ph] (2019), [arXiv:1905.03682](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.03682) [hep-th, physics:math-ph, physics:quant-ph].
- [25] A. M. Childs, Y. Su, M. C. Tran, N. Wiebe, and S. Zhu, Theory of trotter error with commutator scaling, *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 011020 (2021).
- [26] S. Bravyi, M. B. Hastings, and F. Verstraete, Lieb-Robinson Bounds and the Generation of Correlations and Topological Quantum Order, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 050401 (2006).
- [27] T. Kuwahara and K. Saito, Polynomial growth of out-of-time-order correlator in arbitrary realistic long-range interacting systems, [arXiv:2009.10124](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.10124) (2020).
- [28] C.-F. Chen, Concentration of otoc and lieb-robinson velocity in random hamiltonians (2021), [arXiv:2103.09186](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.09186) [quant-ph].

Supplemental Material for “The Lieb-Robinson light cone for power-law interactions”

(Dated: March 31, 2021)

In this Supplemental Material, we provide a rigorous proof of Theorem 1 in the main text (Sec. S1) and details on the applications of the bound to connected correlators, topologically ordered states, and simulations of local observables (Sec. S2).

CONTENTS

S1. Proof of Theorem 1	1
A. Proof of Lemma S1	3
1. Proof of Lemma S3	6
2. Proof of Corollary 1	7
B. Proof of Lemma S2	8
C. Removing the dependence on the lattice size	12
S2. Applications of Theorem 1	13
References	14

S1. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

In this section, we provide a rigorous proof of Theorem 1. We first summarize the lemmas we use in the proof of the theorem, followed by the proofs of the lemmas in Secs. S1 A to S1 C.

For convenience, we first recall the definitions from the main text. We consider a d -dimensional lattice of qubits Λ and, acting on this lattice, a two-body power-law Hamiltonian $H(t)$ with exponent α . Specifically, we assume $H(t) = \sum_{i,j \in \Lambda} h_{ij}(t)$ is a sum of two-body terms h_{ij} supported on sites i, j such that $\|h_{ij}(t)\| \leq 1/\text{dist}(i, j)^\alpha$ for all $i \neq j$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm and $\text{dist}(i, j)$ is the distance between i, j . In this paper, we assume $2d < \alpha < 2d + 1$.

We use \mathcal{L} to denote the Liouvillian corresponding to the Hamiltonian H , i.e. $\mathcal{L}|O\rangle \equiv i|[H, O]$ for all operators O , and use $e^{\mathcal{L}t}|O\rangle \equiv |O(t)\rangle$ to denote the time evolved version of the operator O . Similarly to the main text, we use $\mathbb{P}_r^{(i)}|O\rangle$ to denote the projection of O onto sites that are at least a distance r from site i . In particular, if i is the origin of the lattice, we may also drop the superscript i and simply write \mathbb{P}_r for brevity.

Given a unit-norm operator O initially supported at the origin, $\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t}|O\rangle$ provides the fraction of the time-evolved version of the operator O that is supported at least a distance r from the origin at time t . The identity [S1]

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t}|O\rangle\|}{\sup_A \|[A, e^{\mathcal{L}t}O]\|} \leq 2, \quad (\text{S1})$$

where the supremum is taken over all unit-norm operators A supported at least a distance r from O , establishes the equivalence between the projector and the unequal-time commutator commonly used in the Lieb-Robinson literature.

Theorem 1. For any $\alpha \in (2d, 2d + 1)$ and $\varepsilon \in \left(0, \frac{(\alpha-2d)^2}{(\alpha-2d)^2 + \alpha - d}\right)$, there exist constants $c, C_1, C_2 \geq 0$ such that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t}|O\rangle\| \leq C_1 \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} + C_2 \frac{t}{r^{\alpha-d}} \quad (\text{S2})$$

holds for all $t \leq cr^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}$.

Our strategy is to divide the terms of the Hamiltonian by their interaction range and prove a Lieb-Robinson-like bound recursively for each range. Specifically, let $\ell_0 = 0$ and $\ell_k \equiv L^k$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, where $L > 1$ to be chosen later,

$$n = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\log L} \log \left[r \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}} \right)^\eta \right] \right\rfloor, \quad (\text{S3})$$

and $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{\alpha-d})$ is an arbitrary small constant. For our convenience, we set $\ell_{n+1} = r_*$, where r_* is the diameter of the lattice. We then divide the Hamiltonian into $H = \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} V_k$, where $V_k = \sum_{i,j: \ell_{k-1} < \text{dist}(i,j) \leq \ell_k} h_{ij}$ consists of terms h_{ij} such that the distance between i, j is between ℓ_{k-1} and ℓ_k . We also use $H_k = \sum_{j=1}^k V_j$ to denote the sum of interactions whose lengths are at most ℓ_k and $\mathcal{L}_k = i[H_k, \cdot]$ are the corresponding Liouvillians. Note that $H_{n+1} = H$ contains every interaction of the Hamiltonian.

We start with a standard Lieb-Robinson bound for H_1 [S2, S3], i.e.

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} |O\rangle\| \leq \exp\left[\frac{v_1 t - r}{\ell_1}\right], \quad (\text{S4})$$

where $v_1 = 4e\tau\ell_1$ is proportional to ℓ_1 and $\tau = \max_i \sum_{j \in \Lambda, j \neq i} 1/\text{dist}(i, j)^\alpha$ is a constant for all $\alpha > d$, and recursively prove bounds for H_2, H_3, \dots, H_n using the following lemma:

Lemma S1. Suppose for $\ell_k \geq 1$, we have

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} |O\rangle\| \leq \exp\left[\frac{v_k t - r}{\ell_k}\right], \quad (\text{S5})$$

for some unit-norm operator O supported at the origin. Then for $\ell_{k+1} > \ell_k$, we have

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_{k+1} t} |O\rangle\| \leq \exp\left[\frac{v_{k+1} t - r}{\ell_{k+1}}\right]. \quad (\text{S6})$$

where

$$v_{k+1} = \xi \log(r_*) v_k + \nu \lambda \frac{\ell_{k+1}^{2d+1}}{\ell_k^\alpha} \quad (\text{S7})$$

and ξ, ν, λ are constants that may depend only on d .

Note that each of the bounds in the series has a logarithmic dependence on the diameter r_* of the lattice. We later show that this dependence on r_* can be replaced by a similar logarithmic dependence on r , leading to a logarithmic correction in the light cone. After applying Lemma S1 $n-1$ times, we arrive at a bound for the evolution under H_n :

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_n t} |O\rangle\| \leq \exp\left[\frac{v_n t - r}{\ell_n}\right], \quad (\text{S8})$$

where

$$v_n = x^{n-1}(v_1 - L^{2d+1}\nu\lambda) + x^{n-1}L^{2d+1}\nu\lambda \left[1 + \frac{L^{2d+1-\alpha}}{x} + \dots + \left(\frac{L^{2d+1-\alpha}}{x}\right)^{n-1}\right] \quad (\text{S9})$$

and $x \equiv \xi \log r_*$. We now choose $L = x^{1/(2d+1-\alpha)}$ so that

$$v_n = x^{n-1}[v_1 + (n-1)L^{2d+1}\nu\lambda]. \quad (\text{S10})$$

At this point, we have a bound for the evolution under H_n , which contains most terms of the Hamiltonian except for those with range larger than ℓ_n . With the value of n in Eq. (S3), we eventually show that the bound Eq. (S8) has the desired light cone $t \gtrsim r/v_n \sim r^{\alpha-2d}$.

Next, we add the remaining long-range interactions in $H - H_n$, i.e. those with range larger than ℓ_n , to the bound. The result is the following lemma, which we prove in Sec. S1B.

Lemma S2. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist constants C, c, κ, δ such that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L} t} |O\rangle\| \leq C \log^\kappa r_* \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\varepsilon} \quad (\text{S11})$$

holds for all $t \leq cr^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}/\log^\delta r_*$.

The bound at this point still has an undesirable feature: it depends on the size of the lattice r_* . Finally, we show in Sec. S1C that we can remove this dependence on r_* at the cost of adding additional terms to the bound. The result is Theorem 1 presented in the main text.

A. Proof of Lemma S1

In this section, we prove Lemma S1.

Proof. For simplicity, let $V \equiv V_{k+1} = H_{k+1} - H_k$ in this section. We shall move into the interaction picture of H_k and write the time evolution under H_{k+1} as a product

$$\mathcal{T} \exp \left(-i \int_0^t ds H_{k+1}(t) \right) = \mathcal{T} \exp \left(-i \int_0^t ds H_k(t) \right) \cdot \mathcal{T} \exp \left(-i \int_0^t ds e^{\mathcal{L}_k s} V \right) \quad (\text{S12})$$

of an evolution under H_k , for which Eq. (S5) applies, and an evolution $e^{\mathcal{L}_I t}$ under the $V_I(t) = e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} V$.

We decompose every term h_{ij} in V into a sum of products of two single-site operators $u_i^{(\mu)}$:

$$h_{ij} = \sum_{\mu} J_{ij}^{(\mu)} u_i^{(\mu)} u_j^{(\mu)}, \quad (\text{S13})$$

where $u_i^{(\mu)}$ have unit norms, $J_{ij}^{(\mu)}$ are nonnegative, and $\sum_{\mu} J_{ij}^{(\mu)} \leq 1/\text{dist}(i, j)^{\alpha}$. In doing so, we can reduce the evolution of h_{ij} into the evolutions of single-site operators $u_i^{(\mu)}$:

$$e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} h_{ij} = \sum_{\mu} J_{ij}^{(\mu)} \left[e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} u_i^{(\mu)} \right] \left[e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} u_j^{(\mu)} \right]. \quad (\text{S14})$$

We then pick a parameter $R \geq \ell_k$ and divide the lattice around i into shells of width R . Specifically, let $\mathcal{B}_r^{(i)}$ denote the ball of radius r centered on i . Let $\mathcal{S}_r^{(i)} = \mathcal{B}_r^{(i)} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{r-R}^{(i)}$ denote the shell of inner radius $r - R$ and outer radius r centered on i . For each μ , we have

$$e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} u_i^{(\mu)} = \left[(\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{P}_R^{(i)}) + (\mathbb{P}_R^{(i)} - \mathbb{P}_{2R}^{(i)}) + (\mathbb{P}_{2R}^{(i)} - \mathbb{P}_{3R}^{(i)}) + \dots \right] e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} u_i^{(\mu)} \equiv \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} u_{i,q}^{(\mu)}(t), \quad (\text{S15})$$

where the distance in the subscript of the projectors is with respect to i and $u_{i,q}^{(\mu)}$ is supported on $\mathcal{B}_{(q+1)R}^{(i)}$ for $q = 0, 1, 2, \dots$.

Using Eq. (S5) and the triangle inequality, we can show that

$$\left\| u_{i,q}^{(\mu)}(t) \right\| \leq \left\| \mathbb{P}_{qR}^{(i)} e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} u_i^{(\mu)} \right\| + \left\| \mathbb{P}_{(q+1)R}^{(i)} e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} u_i^{(\mu)} \right\| \leq \exp \left(\frac{v_k t - qR}{\ell_k} \right) + \exp \left(\frac{v_k t - (q+1)R}{\ell_k} \right). \quad (\text{S16})$$

Choosing $R \geq v_k t$ and $R \geq (1 + \varepsilon)\ell_k$ for some positive constant ε , we have

$$\left\| u_{i,q}^{(\mu)}(t) \right\| \leq e^{-\frac{(q-1)R}{\ell_k}} + e^{-\frac{qR}{\ell_k}} \leq e^{-(q-1)(1+\varepsilon)} + e^{-q(1+\varepsilon)} \leq (1 + e^{1+\varepsilon})e^{-q(1+\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{S17})$$

for all $q = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. By combining the two legs of h_{ij} together, we arrive at a decomposition $e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} h_{ij} = \sum_{p,q} w_{i,p;j,q}(t)$, where $w_{i,p;j,q}(t) = \sum_{\mu} J_{ij}^{(\mu)} u_{i,p}^{(\mu)}(t) u_{j,q}^{(\mu)}(t)$ and

$$\|w_{i,p;j,q}(t)\| \leq \frac{(1 + e^{1+\varepsilon})^2}{\text{dist}(i, j)^{\alpha}} e^{-(p+q)(1+\varepsilon)}. \quad (\text{S18})$$

Next, we divide the lattice into complementary hypercubes of length R . We shall prove that $V_I(t)$ actually consists of exponentially decaying interactions between hypercubes. We shall index the hypercubes by their centers, i.e. \mathcal{C}_x denotes the hypercube center at x . Given x, y as the centers of two hypercubes,

$$\tilde{h}_{xy}(t) \equiv \sum_{\substack{i,j,p,q \\ \mathcal{B}_{(p+1)R}^{(i)} \cap \mathcal{C}_x \neq \emptyset \\ \mathcal{B}_{(q+1)R}^{(j)} \cap \mathcal{C}_y \neq \emptyset}} w_{i,p;j,q}(t) \quad (\text{S19})$$

defines the effective interaction between the cubes \mathcal{C}_x and \mathcal{C}_y . Note that $\sum_{x,y} \tilde{h}_{xy} \neq V_I$ because some $w_{i,p;j,q}$ might be double counted. The conditions $\mathcal{B}_{(p+1)R}^{(i)} \cap \mathcal{C}_x \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{B}_{(q+1)R}^{(j)} \cap \mathcal{C}_y \neq \emptyset$ ensure that we account for all terms $w_{i,p;j,q}(t)$ whose support might overlap with the cubes $\mathcal{C}_x, \mathcal{C}_y$ (Fig. S1). These conditions, together with $\text{dist}(i, j) \leq \ell_{k+1}$, can be relaxed to




FIG. S1. The effective interaction between two hypercubes \mathcal{C}_x and \mathcal{C}_y comes from the terms $w_{i,p;j,q}$ whose support (the shaded area) overlaps with the cubes.

1. $\text{dist}(i, x) \leq (p+1)R + R\frac{\sqrt{d}}{2}$,
2. $\text{dist}(j, y) \leq (q+1)R + R\frac{\sqrt{d}}{2}$, and
3. $\text{dist}(x, y) \leq (p+1)R + R\frac{\sqrt{d}}{2} + \ell_{k+1} + (q+1)R + R\frac{\sqrt{d}}{2}$,

where $(p+1)R$ and $(q+1)R$ are the radii of the balls around i and j , $R\sqrt{d}/2$ is the maximum distance between the center and the corner of a hypercube, and the middle term ℓ_{k+1} comes from the maximum distance between i and j .

We bound the norm of $\tilde{h}_{xy}(t)$ using the triangle inequality and relax the conditions for i, j, p, q as we discussed above:

$$\left\| \tilde{h}_{xy}(t) \right\| \leq \sum_{\substack{p,q,i,j \\ (1),(2),(3)}} \|w_{i,p;j,q}(t)\| \leq \sum_{\substack{p,q,i,j \\ (1),(2),(3)}} \frac{(1 + e^{1+\varepsilon})^2}{\text{dist}(i, j)^\alpha} e^{-(p+q)(1+\varepsilon)}, \quad (\text{S20})$$

where the subscript (1), (2), (3) of the sum refers to the three conditions above, respectively. Since $\text{dist}(i, j) \geq \ell_k$, we can simplify the bound and carry out the sums over i, j :

$$\left\| \tilde{h}_{ij}(t) \right\| \leq \frac{(1 + e^{1+\varepsilon})^2}{\ell_k^\alpha} \sum_{\substack{p,q,i,j \\ (1),(2),(3)}} e^{-(p+q)(1+\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{S21})$$

$$\leq \frac{(1 + e^{1+\varepsilon})^2}{\ell_k^\alpha} \sum_{\substack{p,q \\ (3)}} 4^d \left(R + pR + R\frac{\sqrt{d}}{2} \right)^d \left(R + qR + R\frac{\sqrt{d}}{2} \right)^d e^{-(p+q)(1+\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{S22})$$

$$= \frac{(1 + e^{1+\varepsilon})^2}{\ell_k^\alpha} (2R)^{2d} \sum_{\substack{p,q \\ (3)}} \left(p + 1 + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{2} \right)^d \left(q + 1 + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{2} \right)^d e^{-(p+q)(1+\varepsilon)}. \quad (\text{S23})$$

We then use the following identity to simplify the expression: For every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$x^d \leq g_\varepsilon e^{\varepsilon x} \quad (\text{S24})$$

holds for all $x \geq 0$, where $g_\varepsilon = d!/\varepsilon^d$. Therefore, we can bound

$$\left(p + 1 + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{2} \right)^d \leq g_\varepsilon e^{\varepsilon + \varepsilon \frac{\sqrt{d}}{2}} e^{\varepsilon p}. \quad (\text{S25})$$

Substituting back to the earlier equation, we have

$$\left\| \tilde{h}_{xy}(t) \right\| \leq g_\varepsilon^2 e^{2\varepsilon + 2\varepsilon \frac{\sqrt{d}}{2}} \frac{(1 + e^{1+\varepsilon})^2}{\ell_k^\alpha} (2R)^{2d} \sum_{\substack{p,q \\ (3)}} e^{-(p+q)(1+\varepsilon-\varepsilon)} \leq \frac{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}{\ell_k^\alpha} R^{2d} \sum_{\substack{p,q \\ (3)}} e^{-(p+q)}, \quad (\text{S26})$$

where \tilde{g}_ε absorbs all constants that depend only on ε and d . Recall that condition (3) is equivalent to

$$p + q \geq \frac{\text{dist}(x, y)}{R} - 2 - \sqrt{d} - \frac{\ell_{k+1}}{R} \equiv a. \quad (\text{S27})$$

We consider two cases. For $q \geq a$, the sum over p can be taken from 0 to ∞ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}{\ell_k^\alpha} R^{2d} \sum_{q \geq a} \sum_{p \geq 0} e^{-(p+q)} &\leq \frac{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}{\ell_k^\alpha} R^{2d} e^{-a+1} \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} e^{-(p+q)} = \frac{e^3 \tilde{g}_\varepsilon}{(e-1)^2 \ell_k^\alpha} R^{2d} e^{-a} \\ &= \frac{e^3 \tilde{g}_\varepsilon}{(e-1)^2} e^{2+\sqrt{d}} e^{-\frac{\ell_{k+1}}{R}} \frac{R^{2d}}{\ell_k^\alpha} e^{-\frac{\text{dist}(i, j)}{R}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S28})$$

For $q < a$, we sum over $p \geq a - q$:

$$\frac{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}{\ell_k^\alpha} R^{2d} \sum_{q < a} \sum_{p \geq a-q} e^{-(p+q)} \leq \frac{e^2}{e-1} \frac{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}{\ell_k^\alpha} R^{2d} g_\varepsilon e^{-(1-\varepsilon)a} \leq \frac{e^2 \tilde{g}_\varepsilon g_\varepsilon e^{2+\sqrt{d}}}{e-1} e^{-\frac{\ell_{k+1}}{R}} \frac{R^{2d}}{\ell_k^\alpha} e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\frac{\text{dist}(i, j)}{R}}, \quad (\text{S29})$$

where we have used the identity Eq. (S24) again with $d \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ having the same value as before.

Combining Eqs. (S28) and (S29), we have

$$\left\| \tilde{h}_{xy}(t) \right\| \leq \underbrace{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon \frac{e^2}{e-1} e^{2+\sqrt{d}} \left(\frac{e}{e-1} + g_\varepsilon \right) e^{-\frac{\ell_{k+1}}{R}} \frac{R^{2d}}{\ell_k^\alpha}}_{=\mathcal{E}_0} e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\frac{\text{dist}(x, y)}{R}}. \quad (\text{S30})$$

Note that $\frac{\text{dist}(x, y)}{R}$ is the rescaled distance between the hypercubes \mathcal{C}_x and \mathcal{C}_y . Therefore, the interaction between the hypercubes decays exponentially with the rescaled distance between them. Using the standard Lieb-Robinson bound for exponentially decaying interactions, there exists a constant ν such that

$$\left\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle \right\| \leq \exp \left(\nu \mathcal{E}_0 t - \frac{(1-\varepsilon)r}{R} \right) \quad (\text{S31})$$

for any unit-norm operator O supported on a single hypercube (including operators supported on single sites.) We now choose $R = (1-\varepsilon)\ell_{k+1}$ and rewrite

$$\mathcal{E}_0 = \underbrace{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon \frac{e^2}{e-1} e^{2+\sqrt{d}} \left(\frac{e}{e-1} + g_\varepsilon \right) e^{\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}} (1-\varepsilon)^{2d} \frac{\ell_{k+1}^{2d}}{\ell_k^\alpha}}_{\equiv \lambda}, \quad (\text{S32})$$

where the constant λ depends only on ε and d . Plugging this expression into the earlier bound, we get

$$\left\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle \right\| \leq \exp \left(\frac{\nu \lambda \frac{\ell_{k+1}^{2d+1}}{\ell_k^\alpha} t - r}{\ell_{k+1}} \right) = \exp \left(\frac{\Delta v t - r}{\ell_{k+1}} \right), \quad (\text{S33})$$

where

$$\Delta v \equiv \nu \lambda \frac{\ell_{k+1}^{2d+1}}{\ell_k^\alpha}. \quad (\text{S34})$$

Note that we assume $R = (1-\varepsilon)\ell_{k+1} \geq (1+\varepsilon)\ell_k$. A constant ε satisfying this condition exists as long as $\ell_{k+1} > \ell_k$.

Next, we use the following lemma to “merge” this bound for $e^{\mathcal{L}t}$ with the bound in Eq. (S5) for $e^{\mathcal{L}_k t}$.

Lemma S3. Let H_1, H_2 be two possibly time-dependent Hamiltonians and $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2$ be the corresponding Liouvillians. Suppose that for all unit-norm, single-site operators O and for all times $t \leq \Delta t$ for some Δt ,

$$\left\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} |O\rangle \right\| \leq c_1 r^{\xi_1} e^{\frac{v_1 t - r}{\ell_1}}, \quad (\text{S35})$$

$$\left\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_2 t} |O\rangle \right\| \leq c_2 r^{\xi_2} e^{\frac{v_2 t - r}{\ell_2}}, \quad (\text{S36})$$

for some $\ell_2 \geq \ell_1$ and $c_1, c_2 \geq 1; \xi_1, \xi_2 \geq 0$ are constants. We have

$$\left\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_2 t} e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} |O\rangle \right\| \leq 2^{d+5} c_1 c_2 r^{\xi_1 + \xi_2 + d+1} e^{\frac{(v_1 + v_2)t - r}{\ell_2}}, \quad (\text{S37})$$

for all $t \leq \Delta t$.

We prove Lemma S3 in Sec. S1 A 1. Using the lemma, we obtain a bound for the evolution under H_{k+1} :

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_{k+1}t} |O\rangle\| = \|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_r t} e^{\mathcal{L}_k t} |O\rangle\| \leq 2^{d+5} r^{d+1} e^{\frac{(v_k + \Delta v)t - r}{\ell_{k+1}}}. \quad (\text{S38})$$

However, because we assume $v_k t \leq R$ in deriving Eq. (S33), Eq. (S38) is only valid for small time $t \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\ell_{k+1}/v_k \equiv \Delta t$. To extend the bound to all time, we use a corollary of Lemma S3:

Corollary 1. Suppose we have a single-site, unit-norm operator O , a Hamiltonian H with a corresponding Liouvillian \mathcal{L} , a constant Δt , and

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq c_0 r^{\xi_0} e^{(vt-r)/\ell} \quad (\text{S39})$$

holds for all $t \leq \Delta t$. Then, for all $t \leq 2^k \Delta t$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq c_k r^{\xi_k} e^{(vt-r)/\ell}, \quad (\text{S40})$$

where $c_k = 2^{(d+5)(2^k-1)} c_0^{2^k}$, $\xi_k = (2^k - 1)(d + 1) + 2^k \xi_0$ are constants. In particular,

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq e^{\frac{\chi t}{\Delta t} + \frac{vt-r}{\ell}}, \quad (\text{S41})$$

where $\chi = 2[\log(2^{d+5} c_0) + (d + 1 + \xi_0) \log r]$, holds for all time t .

We prove the corollary in Sec. S1 A 2. Using the corollary, we can extend Eq. (S38) to a bound for all time:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_{k+1}t} |O\rangle\| \leq \exp\left(\frac{\chi t}{\Delta t} + \frac{(v_k + \Delta v)t - r}{\ell_{k+1}}\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\chi_* v_k t}{(1 - \varepsilon)\ell_{k+1}} + \frac{(v_k + \Delta v)t - r}{\ell_{k+1}}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{v_{k+1}t - r}{\ell_{k+1}}\right), \quad (\text{S42})$$

where we have upper bounded χ by $\chi_* = 4(d + 5) \log 2 + 4(d + 1) \log r_*$, $r_* \geq r$ is the diameter of the lattice, and

$$v_{k+1} = \left(\frac{\chi_*}{1 - \varepsilon} + 1\right) v_k + \nu \lambda \frac{\rho^{2d+1}}{\ell_k^\alpha} \leq 4(4d + 13) \log(r_*) v_k + \nu \lambda \frac{\rho^{2d+1}}{\ell_k^\alpha}. \quad (\text{S43})$$

Here, we have assumed that $r_* \geq 2$ and $\varepsilon \leq 1/2$ so that $1/(1 - \varepsilon) \leq 2$, $\chi_* \leq 4(2d + 6) \log r_*$, and $1 \leq 4 \log r_*$. Therefore, Lemma S1 holds with $\xi = 4(4d + 13)$. \square

1. Proof of Lemma S3

In this section, we prove Lemma S3.

Proof. The bound is trivial for $r < vt$, where $v = v_1 + v_2$. Therefore, we will consider $r \geq vt$ in the rest of the proof.

The strategy is to apply Eqs. (S35) and (S36) consecutively. A technical difficulty comes from the fact that after the first evolution $e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t}$, the operator has spread to more than one site. Therefore, we cannot directly apply Eq. (S36), which assumes that the operator is single-site. Instead, we need to use [S4, Lemma 4] to extend the bound for single-site operators to multi-site operators. In particular, given the assumed bound Eq. (S36) and an unit-norm operator O_X supported on a ball X of radius $x \leq r$, we have

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_2 t} |O_X\rangle\| \leq \frac{9}{2} |X| c_2 r^{\xi_2} e^{(v_2 t - r + x)/\ell_2}. \quad (\text{S44})$$

With that in mind, we divide the lattice into:

1. A ball of radius $v_1 t$ around the origin,
2. Shells of inner radius $v_1 t + (q - 1)\ell_1$ and outer radius $v_1 t + q\ell_1$ for $q = 1, \dots, \frac{r - v_1 t}{\ell_1}$,
3. The rest of the lattice, i.e. sites at least a distance r from the origin.

We then project $e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} |O\rangle$ into these regions:

$$e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} |O\rangle = \left[(\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{P}_{v_1 t}) + \sum_{q=1}^{(r - v_1 t)/\ell_1} (\mathbb{P}_{v_1 t + (q-1)\ell_1} - \mathbb{P}_{v_1 t + q\ell_1}) + \mathbb{P}_r \right] e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} |O\rangle \quad (\text{S45})$$

$$\equiv |O_0\rangle + \sum_{q=1}^{q_*} |O_q\rangle + |O_*\rangle, \quad (\text{S46})$$

where $q_* = (r - v_1 t)/\ell_1$. We then apply the other evolution, i.e. $e^{\mathcal{L}_2 t}$, on each term of the above expansion.

First, we consider $|O_0\rangle$, which has norm at most three and is supported on at most $(2v_1 t)^d = (2v_1 t)^d \leq (2r)^d$ sites that are at least a distance $r - v_1 t$ from the outside. Using the assumed bound, we have

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_2 t} |O_0\rangle\| \leq \frac{27}{2} (2r)^d c_2 r^{\xi_2} e^{(v_2 t - r + v_1 t)/\ell_2} = \frac{27}{2} 2^d c_2 r^{\xi_2 + d} e^{(vt-r)/\ell_2}. \quad (\text{S47})$$

Next, we consider $|O_*\rangle$. Because $\|O_*\| \leq c_1 r^{\xi_1} e^{(v_1 t - r)/\ell_1}$,

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_2 t} |O_*\rangle\| \leq 2 \|O_*\| \leq 2c_1 r^{\xi_1} e^{(v_1 t - r)/\ell_1} \leq 2c_1 c_2 r^{\xi_1 + \xi_2} e^{(vt-r)/\ell_1} \leq 2c_1 c_2 r^{\xi_1 + \xi_2} e^{(vt-r)/\ell_2}. \quad (\text{S48})$$

Finally, we consider $|O_q\rangle$. Note that O_q is supported on a ball of volume at most $2^d (v_1 t + q\ell_1)^d \leq (2r)^d$, $\|O_q\| \leq (1 + e)c_1 r^{\xi_1} e^{-q}$ and the distance between O_q and \mathbb{P}_r is $r - v_1 t - q\ell_1 \leq r$. Therefore, we have

$$\sum_q \|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_2 t} |O_q\rangle\| \leq \sum_q \frac{9}{2} (2r)^d \|O_q\| c_2 r^{\xi_2} e^{(v_2 t - (r - v_1 t - q\ell_1))/\ell_2} \quad (\text{S49})$$

$$\leq \sum_q \frac{9}{2} (2r)^d (1 + e) c_1 r^{\xi_1} e^{-q} c_2 r^{\xi_2} e^{(vt-r)/\ell_2} e^{q\frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2}} \quad (\text{S50})$$

$$\leq \sum_q 17 \times 2^d c_1 c_2 r^{\xi_1 + \xi_2 + d} e^{(vt-r)/\ell_2} \quad (\text{S51})$$

$$\leq 17 \times 2^d c_1 c_2 r^{\xi_1 + \xi_2 + d + 1} e^{(vt-r)/\ell_2}, \quad (\text{S52})$$

where we have used $\ell_1 \leq \ell_2$ and the fact that there are at most $\frac{r - v_1 t}{\ell_1} \leq r$ different q .

Combining Eqs. (S47), (S48) and (S52) with $c_1, c_2 \geq 1$, $d \geq 1$ and $\xi_1, \xi_2 \geq 0$, we have

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_2 t} e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} |O\rangle\| \leq 2^{d+5} c_1 c_2 r^{\xi_1 + \xi_2 + d + 1} e^{(vt-r)/\ell_2}, \quad (\text{S53})$$

with $v = v_1 + v_2$. Therefore, the lemma follows. \square

2. Proof of Corollary 1

In this section, we prove Corollary 1, an application of Lemma S3 which extends the validity of a bound from $t \leq \Delta t$ to arbitrary time.

Proof. The lemma clearly holds for $k = 0$. So we will prove it by induction. Suppose Eq. (S40) holds for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We will prove that it holds for $k + 1$.

The strategy is to apply the assumed bound for k [Eq. (S40)] twice:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L} t} |O\rangle\| = \left\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L} t/2} e^{\mathcal{L} t/2} |O\rangle \right\|, \quad (\text{S54})$$

where the evolutions under $e^{\mathcal{L} t/2}$ can be bounded by the assumed bound because $t/2 \leq 2^k \Delta t$. We then use Lemma S3 to merge the two identical bounds with $v_1 = v_2 \rightarrow v/2$, $\ell_1 = \ell_2 \rightarrow \ell$, $c_1 = c_2 \rightarrow c_k$, $\xi_1 = \xi_2 \rightarrow \xi_k$:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L} t} |O\rangle\| \leq 2^{d+5} c_k^2 r^{2\xi_k + d + 1} e^{(vt-r)/\ell}. \quad (\text{S55})$$

We choose

$$c_{k+1} = 2^{d+5} c_k^2 \quad \Rightarrow c_k = 2^{(d+5)(2^k-1)} c_0^{2^k} \quad (\text{S56})$$

$$\xi_{k+1} = 2\xi_k + d + 1 \quad \Rightarrow \xi_k = (2^k - 1)(d + 1) + 2^k \xi_0. \quad (\text{S57})$$

Therefore, by induction, Eq. (S40) holds for $k + 1$.

Next, to prove Eq. (S41), we choose $k = \lceil \log_2(t/\Delta t) \rceil$ so that $t \leq 2^k \Delta t$. We also have $2^k \leq \frac{2t}{\Delta t}$. Therefore, $c_k \leq (2^{d+5} c_0)^{\frac{2t}{\Delta t}}$, $\xi_k \leq (d + 1 + \xi_0) \frac{2t}{\Delta t}$. Plugging them into Eq. (S40), we have

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathbb{P}_r t} |O\rangle\| \leq (2^{d+5} c_0)^{\frac{2t}{\Delta t}} r^{(d+1+\xi_0) \frac{2t}{\Delta t}} e^{\frac{vt-r}{\ell}} = e^{\chi \frac{t}{\Delta t} + \frac{vt-r}{\ell}}, \quad (\text{S58})$$

with $\chi = 2[\log(2^{d+5} c_0) + (d + 1 + \xi_0) \log r]$. \square

B. Proof of Lemma S2

In this section, we prove Lemma S2.

Proof. First, we need the following lemma, which uses an existing bound to prove a tighter bound. We will use the lemma recursively to prove the nearly optimal bound in Lemma S2.

Lemma S4. Let $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{\alpha-d})$ be an arbitrary constant and

$$\delta = \frac{2d+1}{(2d+1-\alpha)(1+\eta(2d+1-\alpha))} \quad (\text{S59})$$

be another constant. Suppose there exist constants $\gamma, C, c \geq 0$, $\kappa \geq \delta$, and $\beta > d$ such that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq C \log^\kappa r_* \frac{t^\gamma}{r^\beta}, \quad (\text{S60})$$

holds for all $t^\gamma \leq cr^\beta / \log^\delta r_*$. Then, there exist constants $C', c' > 0$, and $\kappa' > \delta$ such that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq C' \log^{\kappa'} r_* \frac{t^{\gamma'}}{r^{\beta'}}, \quad (\text{S61})$$

holds for all $t^{\gamma'} \leq c'r^{\beta'} / \log^\delta r_*$, where

$$\kappa' = \max \left\{ \kappa - \frac{\delta(\beta-d)}{\beta} + \frac{\alpha-d}{2d+1-\alpha}, \delta \right\}, \quad (\text{S62})$$

$$\gamma' = \gamma d / \beta + 1 - \eta(\alpha-d), \quad (\text{S63})$$

$$\beta' = \alpha - d - \eta(\alpha-2d)(\alpha-d) > d. \quad (\text{S64})$$

Proof. Let $V = H - H_n$ to be the sum over interactions of range more than ℓ_n . We have [S3]

$$e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle = e^{\mathcal{L}_n t} |O\rangle + \sum_{h_{ij}} \int_0^t ds e^{\mathcal{L}(t-s)} \mathcal{L}_{h_{ij}} e^{\mathcal{L}_n s} |O\rangle, \quad (\text{S65})$$

where the sum is over all h_{ij} in V . The first term is the evolution under H_n , which we can bound using Eq. (S8). Our task is to bound the second term.

Without loss of generality, we assume $i \leq j$. Because $\mathcal{L}_{h_{ij}} |O\rangle$ only acts nontrivially on the part of O supported at least a distance $\text{dist}(i, 0)$ from the origin, we can insert $\mathbb{P}_{\text{dist}(i, 0)}$ in the middle of the intergrand and use the triangle inequality:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq \|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_n t} |O\rangle\| + \left\| \mathbb{P}_r \sum_{h_{ij}} \int_0^t ds e^{\mathcal{L}(t-s)} \mathcal{L}_{h_{ij}} \mathbb{P}_{\text{dist}(i, 0)} e^{\mathcal{L}_n s} |O\rangle \right\| \quad (\text{S66})$$

$$\leq \|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_n t} |O\rangle\| + 4 \sum_{h_{ij}} \int_0^t ds \|h_{ij}\| \|\mathbb{P}_{\text{dist}(i, 0)} e^{\mathcal{L}_n s} |O\rangle\|. \quad (\text{S67})$$

Because $\|h_{ij}\| \leq 1/\text{dist}(i, j)^\alpha$ and $\text{dist}(i, j) > \ell_n$, there exist a constant K_1 such that $\sum_{j: \text{dist}(i, j) > \ell_n} \|h_{ij}\| \leq K_1 / \ell_n^{\alpha-d}$ for all $i \in \Lambda$. Therefore, we have

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq \|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_n t} |O\rangle\| + \frac{4K_1}{\ell_n^{\alpha-d}} \int_0^t ds \sum_i \|\mathbb{P}_{\text{dist}(i, 0)} e^{\mathcal{L}_n s} |O\rangle\|, \quad (\text{S68})$$

We then consider two cases for the sum over i . If $\text{dist}(i, 0)^\beta \leq \frac{1}{c} \log^\delta(r_*) s^\gamma$, we use a trivial bound on the projection:

$$\sum_{i: \text{dist}(i, 0)^\beta \leq \frac{1}{c} \log^\delta(r_*) s^\gamma} \|\mathbb{P}_{\text{dist}(i, 0)} e^{\mathcal{L}_n s} |O\rangle\| \leq (2c^{-1/\beta} (\log r_*)^{\delta/\beta} s^{\gamma/\beta})^d \times 2 = 2^{d+1} c^{-d/\beta} (\log r_*)^{\delta d/\beta} s^{\gamma d/\beta}. \quad (\text{S69})$$

Otherwise, if $\text{dist}(i, 0)^\beta > \frac{1}{c} \log^\delta(r_*) s^\gamma$, we apply Eq. (S60):

$$\sum_{i: \text{dist}(i, 0)^\beta > \frac{1}{c} \log^\delta(r_*) s^\gamma} \left\| \mathbb{P}_{\text{dist}(i, 0)} e^{\mathcal{L}_n s} |O\rangle \right\| \leq C \log^\kappa r_* \sum_{i: \text{dist}(i, 0)^\beta > \frac{1}{c} \log^\delta(r_*) s^\gamma} \frac{s^\gamma}{\text{dist}(i, 0)^\beta} \quad (\text{S70})$$

$$\leq CK_2 \log^\kappa r_* \frac{s^\gamma}{[c^{-1/\beta} (\log r_*)^{\delta/\beta} s^{\gamma/\beta}]^{\beta-d}} \quad (\text{S71})$$

$$\leq CK_2 c^{\frac{\beta-d}{\beta}} (\log r_*)^{\kappa - \frac{\delta(\beta-d)}{\beta}} s^{\gamma d/\beta}, \quad (\text{S72})$$

where K_2 is a constant such that

$$\sum_{i: \text{dist}(i, 0) > a} \frac{1}{\text{dist}(i, 0)^\beta} \leq \frac{K_2}{a^{\beta-d}}, \quad (\text{S73})$$

for all $a > 0$. Such a constant K_2 exists because $\beta > d$ by assumption.

Combining Eqs. (S69) and (S72) and accounting for $\kappa \geq \delta$, we can upper bound

$$\frac{4K_1}{\ell_n^{\alpha-d}} \int_0^t ds \sum_i \left\| \mathbb{P}_{\text{dist}(i, 0)} e^{\mathcal{L}_n s} |O\rangle \right\| \leq K (\log r_*)^{\kappa - \frac{\delta(\beta-d)}{\beta}} t^{\frac{\gamma d}{\beta} + 1} \frac{1}{\ell_n^{\alpha-d}}, \quad (\text{S74})$$

where we absorb all constants into $K = 4K_1(2^{d+1}c^{-d/\beta} + CK_2/c^{\frac{\beta-d}{\beta}}) \frac{\beta}{\gamma d + \beta}$. Substituting Eq. (S74) in Eq. (S68), we have a bound for the evolution under H :

$$\left\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle \right\| \leq e^{\frac{v_n t - r}{\ell_n}} + K (\log r_*)^{\kappa - \frac{\delta(\beta-d)}{\beta}} t^{\frac{\gamma d}{\beta} + 1} \frac{1}{\ell_n^{\alpha-d}} \quad (\text{S75})$$

We now substitute the values of v_n and ℓ_n into the bound. Recall from Eq. (S3) that

$$n = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\log L} \log \left[r \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}} \right)^\eta \right] \right\rfloor, \quad (\text{S76})$$

where $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{\alpha-d})$ is an arbitrary small constant. With this choice, we can bound ℓ_n from both above and below:

$$r \geq r \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}} \right)^\eta \geq \ell_n = L^n \geq \frac{r}{L} \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}} \right)^\eta = \frac{r}{(\xi \log r_*)^{1/(2d+1-\alpha)}} \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}} \right)^\eta. \quad (\text{S77})$$

With $v_1 = 4e\tau\ell_1$, $x = \xi \log r_* = L^{2d+1-\alpha}$, we also have a bound for v_n from Eq. (S10):

$$v_n \leq r^{2d+1-\alpha} \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}} \right)^{\eta(2d+1-\alpha)} \frac{4e\tau x^{1/(2d+1-\alpha)} + \nu\lambda(n-1)x^{(2d+1)/(2d+1-\alpha)}}{x}. \quad (\text{S78})$$

Assuming that $r_* \geq e^{2d+1-\alpha}/\xi$ so that $\log L \geq 1$ and $x \geq 1$, we have $n \leq \log r / \log L \leq \log r_* = x/\xi$. We can then crudely upper bound

$$v_n \leq (4e\tau + \nu\lambda/\xi) (\xi \log r_*)^{\frac{2d+1}{2d+1-\alpha}} \frac{r}{t} \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}} \right)^{1+\eta(2d+1-\alpha)} = K_3 (\log r_*)^{\frac{2d+1}{2d+1-\alpha}} \frac{r}{t} \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}} \right)^{1+\eta(2d+1-\alpha)}. \quad (\text{S79})$$

where K_3 is a constant. Assuming

$$t \leq r^{\alpha-2d} / [2K_3 (\log r_*)^{\frac{2d+1}{2d+1-\alpha}}]^{1+\eta(2d+1-\alpha)} \quad (\text{S80})$$

so that $v_n t \leq r/2$, we can simplify the first term of Eq. (S75):

$$e^{\frac{v_n t - r}{\ell_n}} \leq e^{-\frac{r}{2\ell_n}} \leq \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r^{\alpha-2d}}{t} \right)^\eta \right]. \quad (\text{S81})$$

Similarly, the second term of Eq. (S75) can be simplified to

$$K(\log r_*)^{\kappa - \frac{\delta(\beta-d)}{\beta}} \frac{t^{\gamma d/\beta + 1}}{\ell_n^{\alpha-d}} \leq K(\log r_*)^{\kappa - \frac{\delta(\beta-d)}{\beta}} t^{\gamma d/\beta + 1} \left[\frac{r}{(\xi \log r_*)^{1/(2d+1-\alpha)}} \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}} \right)^\eta \right]^{d-\alpha} \quad (\text{S82})$$

$$= K \xi^{(\alpha-d)/(2d+1-\alpha)} (\log r_*)^{\kappa - \frac{\delta(\beta-d)}{\beta} + \frac{\alpha-d}{2d+1-\alpha}} \frac{t^{\gamma d/\beta + 1 - \eta(\alpha-d)}}{r^{\alpha-d - \eta(\alpha-2d)(\alpha-d)}} \quad (\text{S83})$$

$$= K_4 \log^{\kappa'} r_* \frac{t^{\gamma'}}{r^{\beta'}}, \quad (\text{S84})$$

where K_4, κ', γ' are constants. In particular, $\gamma' = \gamma d/\beta + 1 - \eta(\alpha - d)$ and $\beta' = \alpha - d - \eta(\alpha - 2d)(\alpha - d) > d$. Combining Eqs. (S81) and (S84), we get a bound for the evolution under H .

We now simplify the bound by considering t such that

$$t^{\gamma'} \leq \frac{c' r^{\beta'}}{(\log r_*)^{\delta \gamma'}} \quad (\text{S85})$$

for some constant c' and $\delta = \frac{2d+1}{(2d+1-\alpha)(1+\eta(2d+1-\alpha))}$. Since $\beta/\gamma \leq \alpha - 2d$ by assumption, we also have

$$\frac{\beta'}{\gamma'} = \frac{\alpha - d - \eta(\alpha - 2d)(\alpha - d)}{\frac{\gamma d}{\beta} + 1 - \eta(\alpha - d)} \leq \frac{\alpha - d - \eta(\alpha - 2d)(\alpha - d)}{\frac{d}{\alpha - 2d} + 1 - \eta(\alpha - d)} = \alpha - 2d. \quad (\text{S86})$$

Therefore, with $c' = (2K_3)^{\frac{-\gamma'}{(1+\eta(2d+1-\alpha))}}$, Eq. (S85) satisfies the condition in Eq. (S80). In addition, for $r^{\alpha-2d} \geq t$, there exists a constant K_5 such that

$$\exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r^{\alpha-2d}}{t} \right)^\eta \right] \leq K_5 \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d}} \right)^{\gamma'} \leq K_5 \frac{t^{\gamma'}}{r^{\beta'}}, \quad (\text{S87})$$

where we have again used $\gamma'(\alpha - 2d) \geq \beta'$ in the last inequality. Replacing Eq. (S81) by Eq. (S87) and combining with Eq. (S84), we arrive at a bound

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq C' \log^{\kappa'} r_* \frac{t^{\gamma'}}{r^{\beta'}}, \quad (\text{S88})$$

for all $t^{\gamma'} \leq c' r^{\beta'} / \log^\delta r_*$, where $C' \geq K_4 + K_5$ and c' are constants,

$$\kappa' = \kappa - \frac{\delta(\beta-d)}{\beta} + \frac{\alpha-d}{2d+1-\alpha}, \quad (\text{S89})$$

$$\gamma' = \gamma d/\beta + 1 - \eta(\alpha - d), \quad (\text{S90})$$

$$\beta' = \alpha - d - \eta(\alpha - 2d)(\alpha - d) > d. \quad (\text{S91})$$

If $\kappa' < \delta$, we simply replace κ' by δ in Eq. (S88). Such replacement can only increase the bound in Eq. (S88). Therefore, Lemma S4 follows. \square

We now use Lemma S4 to prove Lemma S2. To satisfy the assumption of Lemma S4, we start with the bound in Ref. [S5]: There exist constants K_6, K_7 , and v_F such that

$$\|[O', e^{\mathcal{L}t} O]\| \leq K_6 \exp \left(v_F t - \frac{r}{t^{(1+d)/(\alpha-2d)}} \right) + K_7 \frac{t^{\frac{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)}{\alpha-2d}}}{r^\alpha}, \quad (\text{S92})$$

for all single-site, unit-norm operators O' supported a distance r from O . We consider the regime

$$t^{\frac{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)}{\alpha-2d}} \leq c r^{\alpha-d} / \log^\delta r_* \leq c r^{\alpha-d} \leq c r^\alpha, \quad (\text{S93})$$

where we choose $c = (2v_F)^{-\alpha}$ so that

$$v_F t \leq \frac{r}{2t^{(1+d)/(\alpha-2d)}}. \quad (\text{S94})$$

Therefore, there exists a constant K_8 such that

$$K_6 \exp\left(v_F t - \frac{r}{t^{(1+d)/(\alpha-2d)}}\right) \leq K_6 \exp\left(-\frac{r}{2t^{(1+d)/(\alpha-2d)}}\right) \leq K_8 \left(\frac{t^{(1+d)/(\alpha-2d)}}{r}\right)^{\frac{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)}{1+d}} \leq K_8 \frac{t^{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)/(\alpha-2d)}}{r^\alpha} \quad (\text{S95})$$

holds for all t satisfying Eq. (S93). In the last inequality, we have used $\alpha - d + 1 \geq d + 1$ to lower bound the exponent of r . Substituting Eq. (S95) into Eq. (S92), we get a simplified version of the bound in Ref. [S5]:

$$\| [O', e^{\mathcal{L}t} O] \| \leq K_9 \frac{t^{\frac{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)}{\alpha-2d}}}{r^\alpha}, \quad (\text{S96})$$

where $K_9 = K_7 + K_8$. Applying Lemma 4 in Ref. [S4], there exists a constant K_{10} such that:

$$\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle \| \leq K_{10} \frac{t^{\frac{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)}{\alpha-2d}}}{r^{\alpha-d}} < K_{10} \log^\delta r_* \frac{t^{\frac{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)}{\alpha-2d}}}{r^{\alpha-d}}, \quad (\text{S97})$$

where the additional factor $-d$ in the exponent of r comes from ‘‘integrating’’ over sites that are at least a distance r from the origin. Equation (S97) satisfies the assumption of Lemma S4, with $C \rightarrow K_{10}$, $c \rightarrow (2v_F)^{-\alpha}$, $\kappa \rightarrow \delta$, $\gamma \rightarrow \frac{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)}{\alpha-2d}$, $\beta \rightarrow \alpha - d$. Therefore, by the lemma, there exist constants C_1, c_1, κ_1 such that

$$\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}r} |O\rangle \| \leq C_1 \log^{\kappa_1} r_* \frac{t^{\gamma_1}}{r^{\beta_1}} \quad (\text{S98})$$

holds for all $t^{\gamma_1} \leq c_1 r^{\beta_1} / \log^\delta r_*$, where

$$\gamma_1 = \frac{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)}{\alpha-2d} \frac{d}{\alpha-d} + 1 - \eta(\alpha-d), \quad (\text{S99})$$

$$\beta_1 = \alpha - d - \eta(\alpha-2d)(\alpha-d). \quad (\text{S100})$$

Equation (S98) again satisfies the assumption of Lemma S4. Applying the lemma again with $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma_1, \beta \rightarrow \beta_1$, we obtain

$$\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}r} |O\rangle \| \leq C_2 \log^{\kappa_2} r_* \frac{t^{\gamma_2}}{r^{\beta_2}} \quad (\text{S101})$$

for some constants $C_2, \kappa_2, \beta_2 = \beta_1$, and

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{\gamma_1 d}{\beta_1} + 1 - \eta(\alpha-d) \equiv f(\gamma_1). \quad (\text{S102})$$

After applying Lemma S4 for m times, we obtain

$$\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}r} |O\rangle \| \leq C_m \log^{\kappa_m} r_* \frac{t^{\gamma_m}}{r^{\beta_m}} = C_m \log^{\kappa_m} r_* \left(\frac{t}{r^{\beta_m/\gamma_m}}\right)^{\gamma_m} \quad (\text{S103})$$

for some constants $C_m, \kappa_m, \beta_m = \beta_1$, and

$$\gamma_m = f^{\circ(m-1)}(\gamma_1), \quad (\text{S104})$$

where $f^{\circ(m-1)}$ denotes the $(m-1)$ -th composition of the function f . It is straightforward to show that

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_m = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\alpha - d - \eta(\alpha - 2d)(\alpha - d)}{\alpha - 2d} = \frac{\alpha - d}{\alpha - 2d}, \quad (\text{S105})$$

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_m}{\gamma_m} = \alpha - 2d. \quad (\text{S106})$$

Therefore, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $m \geq 1, \eta \in (0, \frac{1}{\alpha-d})$ such that $\beta_m/\gamma_m \geq \alpha - 2d - \varepsilon$ and $\gamma_m \geq \frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d} - \varepsilon$. We obtain

$$\| \mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}r} |O\rangle \| \leq C_m \log^{\kappa_m} r_* \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\varepsilon}, \quad (\text{S107})$$

which holds for all $t \leq c_m^{1/\gamma_m} r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon} / (\log r_*)^{\delta/\gamma_m} \leq r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}$. Lemma S2 thus follows. \square

C. Removing the dependence on the lattice size

In this section, we use Lemma S2 to prove Theorem 1 by removing the dependence on r_* .

Proof. Let $H_{\text{out}} = \mathbb{P}_{r_0} H$ denote the terms of the Hamiltonian H that have support outside a distance r_0 from the origin, $H_{\text{in}} = H - H_{\text{out}}$ be the rest of the Hamiltonian, and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{out}}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{in}}$ are the corresponding Liouvillians. Using the triangle inequality, we have

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq \|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}_{\text{in}}t} |O\rangle\| + \sum_{h_{ij}} \left\| \mathbb{P}_r \int_0^t ds e^{\mathcal{L}(t-s)} \mathcal{L}_{h_{ij}} e^{\mathcal{L}_{\text{in}}s} |O\rangle \right\|, \quad (\text{S108})$$

where the sum is taken over terms h_{ij} in H_{out} . Without loss of generality, we assume $\text{dist}(i, 0) \leq \text{dist}(j, 0)$, which implies $\text{dist}(j, 0) \geq r_0$. In addition, since $e^{\mathcal{L}_{\text{in}}s} |O\rangle$ is supported entirely within the radius r_0 from the origin, only terms where $\text{dist}(i, 0) \leq r_0$ contribute to the above sum. We consider two cases: $\text{dist}(i, 0) > r_0/2$ and $\text{dist}(i, 0) \leq r_0/2$.

In the former case, we insert $\mathbb{P}_{\text{dist}(i,0)}$ in the middle of the integrand and bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{h_{ij}: \text{dist}(i,0) \in (\frac{r_0}{2}, r_0]} \left\| \mathbb{P}_r \int_0^t ds e^{\mathcal{L}(t-s)} \mathcal{L}_{h_{ij}} \mathbb{P}_{\text{dist}(i,0)} e^{\mathcal{L}_{\text{in}}s} |O\rangle \right\| \leq 4 \sum_{h_{ij}: \text{dist}(i,0) \in (\frac{r_0}{2}, r_0]} \|h_{ij}\| \int_0^t ds \|\mathbb{P}_{\text{dist}(i,0)} e^{\mathcal{L}_{\text{in}}s} |O\rangle\| \\ & \leq 4K_1 C \log^\kappa(2r_0) \sum_{i: \text{dist}(i,0) \in (\frac{r_0}{2}, r_0]} \int_0^t ds \left(\frac{t}{\text{dist}(i,0)^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\varepsilon} \leq K_2 r_0^d t \left(\frac{t}{r_0^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\varepsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S109})$$

where K_2 is a constant. We have used Lemma S2 to bound the evolution under $e^{\mathcal{L}_{\text{in}}s}$, which is supported entirely within a truncated lattice of diameter $2r_0$, and used the fact that the interaction h_{ij} decays as a power law with an exponent $\alpha > 2d$ to bound the sum over j by a constant. We require $t \leq c_1 r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon} / \log^\delta(2r_0)$, for some constant c_1, δ , to satisfy the conditions of Lemma S2.

On the other hand, when $\text{dist}(i, 0) \leq r_0/2$, we have $\text{dist}(i, j) \geq r_0/2$. Therefore, there exists a constant c_2 such that $\sum_j \|h_{ij}\| \leq c_2 / r_0^{\alpha-d}$ for all i . We can then bound

$$\sum_{h_{ij}: \text{dist}(i,0) \leq \frac{r_0}{2}} \left\| \mathbb{P}_r \int_0^t ds e^{\mathcal{L}(t-s)} \mathcal{L}_{h_{ij}} e^{\mathcal{L}_{\text{in}}s} |O\rangle \right\| \leq 4 \sum_{i: \text{dist}(i,0) \leq \frac{r_0}{2}} \frac{c_2}{r_0^{\alpha-d}} \int_0^t ds \leq K_3 \frac{t}{r_0^{\alpha-2d}}, \quad (\text{S110})$$

for some constant K_3 .

Using Lemma S2 on the first term of Eq. (S108) and combining with Eqs. (S109) and (S110), we have:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq C \log^\kappa(2r_0) \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\varepsilon} + K_2 r_0^d t \left(\frac{t}{r_0^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\varepsilon} + K_3 \frac{t}{r_0^{\alpha-2d}}. \quad (\text{S111})$$

We choose $r_0 = r^\xi$, where

$$\xi = \left(1 + \frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d} - \varepsilon \right) \frac{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon \frac{(\alpha-2d)^2 + \alpha-d}{\alpha-2d} + \varepsilon^2} \geq \frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}, \quad (\text{S112})$$

and we require $\varepsilon \leq (\alpha-2d)^2 / [(\alpha-2d)^2 + \alpha-d]$ so that the lower bound on ξ holds. Under this choice,

$$K_2 r_0^d t \left(\frac{t}{r_0^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\varepsilon} = K_2 \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}} \right)^{1 + \frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\varepsilon} \leq K_4 \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\varepsilon}, \quad (\text{S113})$$

for all $t \leq c_1 r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}$, where K_4 is a constant. In addition, for $\varepsilon \leq (\alpha-2d)^2 / [(\alpha-2d)^2 + \alpha-d]$, $\xi \geq (\alpha-d) / (\alpha-2d)$ and, therefore,

$$K_3 \frac{t}{r_0^{\alpha-2d}} \leq K_3 \frac{t}{r^{\alpha-d}}. \quad (\text{S114})$$

Combining Eqs. (S112) to (S114), we have

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq K_5 \log^\kappa(r) \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\varepsilon} + K_6 \frac{t}{r^{\alpha-d}}, \quad (\text{S115})$$

which holds for all $t \leq c_1 r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon} / \log^\delta(2r^\xi)$ for some constants K_5, K_6 independent of t, r .

Next, we simplify Eq. (S115) by “hiding” the factor $\log^\kappa r$ inside the constant ε . Specifically, there exist a constant K_7 such that $\log^\kappa r \leq K_7 r^{\varepsilon'}$, where $\varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)$, and constants K_8, K_9 such that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_r e^{\mathcal{L}t} |O\rangle\| \leq K_8 \log^\kappa(r) \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon/2}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} + K_9 \frac{t}{r^{\alpha-d}} \leq K_7 K_8 \left(\frac{t}{r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} + K_9 \frac{t}{r^{\alpha-d}}, \quad (\text{S116})$$

which holds for all $t \leq c_1 r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon/2} / \log^\delta(2r^\xi)$. In addition, there exists a constant K_{10} such that $K_{10} \log^\delta(2r^\xi) \leq r^{\varepsilon/2}$ for all $r \geq 1$. By requiring that $t \leq K_{10} c_1 r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon}$, we also ensure $t \leq c_1 r^{\alpha-2d-\varepsilon/2} / \log^\delta(2r^\xi)$. Therefore, Theorem 1 follows with $c \rightarrow c_1 K_{10}, C_1 \rightarrow K_7 K_8$, and $C_2 \rightarrow K_9$. \square

S2. APPLICATIONS OF THEOREM 1

We discussed in the main text that the tightened light cone and nearly optimal tail in Theorem 1 improved the scaling for various applications of Lieb-Robinson bounds to problems of physical interest in the regime $2d < \alpha < 2d+1$. Here we provide some mathematical details to justify those assertions. We also provide a table briefly summarizing the bounds we will use to compare, where we consider each bound to take the form $\|[A(t), B]\| \leq ct^\gamma/r^\beta$ for some constants c, γ and β , where A is single-site, but B may generally be some large multi-site operator.

Bound	Light cone	Tail	γ	β	γ'	β'
This work (B1)	$t \gtrsim r^{\alpha-2d}$	$1/r^{\alpha-d}$	$\frac{\alpha-d}{\alpha-2d}$	$\alpha-d$	$\gamma+1$	β
Ref. [S5] (B2)	$t \gtrsim r^{\frac{(\alpha-d)(\alpha-2d)}{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)}}$	$1/r^{\alpha-d}$	$\frac{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)}{\alpha-2d}$	$\alpha-d$	$\gamma+1$	β
Ref. [S6] (B3)	$t \gtrsim r^{\frac{\alpha-2d}{\alpha-d}}$	$1/r^{\alpha-2d}$	$\alpha-d$	$\alpha-2d$	γ	β

TABLE S1. Comparison of Lieb-Robinson bounds for $2d < \alpha < 2d+1$. We name the bounds B1, B2, and B3 for brevity. We ignore the arbitrarily small parameter ε in B1 for simplicity, as it does not affect the conclusions.

We first consider the application of the bound on the growth of connected correlators. Consider two unit-norm, single-site observables A and B initially supported on sites x and y , respectively, such that x and y are separated by a distance r . Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a product state between $\mathcal{B}_{r/2}(x)$ and $\mathcal{B}_{r/2}(y)$, where $\mathcal{B}_{r/2}(x)$ is the ball of radius $r/2$ around x . The connected correlator is defined by

$$C(r, t) \equiv \langle A(t)B(t) \rangle - \langle A(t) \rangle \langle B(t) \rangle, \quad (\text{S117})$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle \equiv \langle \psi | \cdot | \psi \rangle$. Define $\tilde{A}(t) \equiv \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}_{r/2}^c(x)}[A(t)]$ and \tilde{B} similarly. It is elementary to bound $C(r, t)$ by

$$C(r, t) \leq 2 \left\| A(t) - \tilde{A}(t) \right\| + 2 \left\| B(t) - \tilde{B}(t) \right\|. \quad (\text{S118})$$

That is, the connected correlator is controlled by the error in truncating $A(t)$ and $B(t)$ to within a ball of radius $r/2$ around their initial support. A simple result from Ref. [S7] allows us to bound this error

$$\left\| A(t) - \tilde{A}(t) \right\| \leq \int_{\mathcal{B}_{r/2}^c(x)} dU \|[U, A(t)]\| \leq c \frac{t^\gamma}{(r/2)^\beta}, \quad (\text{S119})$$

where dU is the Haar measure on unitaries supported outside a ball of radius $r/2$ around x . Thus, for a given Lieb-Robinson bound

$$C(r, t) \leq 2^{\beta+2} c \frac{t^\gamma}{r^\beta}. \quad (\text{S120})$$

Ignoring constants and focusing on the asymptotics with respect to t and r , we see that

$$R_{12} \equiv \frac{\text{B1}}{\text{B2}} \sim \left(\frac{t^{\alpha-d}}{t^{\alpha(\alpha-d+1)}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-2d}}, \quad (\text{S121})$$

$$R_{13} \equiv \frac{\text{B1}}{\text{B3}} \sim \left(\frac{t^{\frac{1}{\alpha-2d}}}{t} \right)^{\alpha-d} r^{-d}. \quad (\text{S122})$$

Thus, as t increases, the tighter light cone of B1 leads to significant improvement in bounding the connected correlator as compared to B2. While B1 has a slightly worse time-dependence than B3 (as $0 < \alpha - 2d < 1$), it has a much better r -dependence. And, of course, when taken together, B1 follows a tighter light cone than B3, leading to an overall more useful bound. Thus, while B3 may strictly have a better time-dependence, B1 provides the tightest holistic bound on the growth of connected correlators.

A nearly identical calculation allows us to place stricter bounds on the time required to generate topologically ordered states from topologically trivial ones. We define topologically ordered states as follows: consider a lattice Λ with diameter L and $O(L^d)$ sites. We say that a set of orthonormal states $\{|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_k\rangle\}$ are topologically ordered if there exists a constant δ such that

$$\varepsilon \equiv \sup_O \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq k} \{|\langle \psi_i | O | \psi_j \rangle - \langle \psi_j | O | \psi_i \rangle|, 2|\langle \psi_i | O | \psi_j \rangle|\} \quad (\text{S123})$$

is bounded $\varepsilon = O(L^{-\delta})$. The supremum is taken over operators O supported on a subset of the lattice with diameter $\ell' < L$, so ε essentially measures the ability to distinguish between states $|\psi_i\rangle$ using an operator O supported on only a fraction of the lattice. In contrast, we say the states are topologically trivial if ε is independent of L . Given a set of topologically trivial states $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}_i$ and a set of topologically ordered states $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_i$, the question is how long it takes to generate a unitary U such that $U|\phi_i\rangle = |\psi_i\rangle$ for all i using a power-law Hamiltonian. Ref. [S4] proves that this time is controlled by the time it takes $\|O(t) - O(t, \ell')\|$ to become non-vanishing in L , where $O(t, \ell')$ is the truncation of the time evolution of O to a radius ℓ' . This expression is bounded in the exact same way as the connected correlator was, and so we see the same improvement from B1 as compared to both B2 and B3.

Finally, we consider the task of simulating the evolution of a local observable under a power-law Hamiltonian H using quantum simulation algorithms. In contrast to the earlier applications, it is not sufficient to simply truncate the time-evolved observable to the light cone. Instead, to simulate the observable, we need to construct the Hamiltonian that generates the dynamics of the observable inside the light cone.

Let A be a unit-norm, single-site observable originally supported on site x , and consider $A(t)$ its evolution under a 2-local power-law Hamiltonian H . Define H_r to be the Hamiltonian constructed by taking terms of H that are fully supported within $\mathcal{B}_r(x)$, and let $\tilde{A}(t)$ be $A(0)$ evolved under H_r (note that this is different than our previous definition of \tilde{A}). The question is how large r must be (i.e., how many terms of H must we simulate) for $\|A(t) - \tilde{A}(t)\|$ to have small error. Intuitively, this observable should be constrained to lie mostly within the light cone of a Lieb-Robinson bound for H as long as the tail of the bound decays sufficiently quickly, so we expect r to be related to the lightcone of our bounds. Refs. [S4, S6] make this intuition rigorous and yield

$$\|A(t) - \tilde{A}(t)\| \lesssim \frac{t^{\gamma'}}{r^{\beta'}}, \quad (\text{S124})$$

where γ' and β' are listed in Table S1. In particular, in order to ensure only a constant error, we must choose $r \sim t^{\gamma'/\beta'}$, which corresponds to simulating about $r^2 \sim t^{2\gamma'/\beta'}$ terms of the Hamiltonian. We can compare this exponent $\phi \equiv \gamma'/\beta'$ between bounds:

$$\phi_{\text{B1}} - \phi_{\text{B2}} = -\frac{(\alpha - 1)(\alpha - d) + \alpha}{(\alpha - d)(\alpha - 2d)}, \quad (\text{S125})$$

$$\phi_{\text{B1}} - \phi_{\text{B3}} = -\frac{(\alpha - d)^2 + d}{(\alpha - 2d)(\alpha - d)}. \quad (\text{S126})$$

These differences are all negative for $2d < \alpha < 2d + 1$, meaning the current work provides the tightest bound on how many terms must be kept to get constant error when simulating the evolution of local observables in this regime.

-
- [S1] C.-F. Chen and A. Lucas, Finite speed of quantum scrambling with long range interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 250605 (2019).
- [S2] M. B. Hastings and T. Koma, Spectral Gap and Exponential Decay of Correlations, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **265**, 781 (2006).
- [S3] C.-F. Chen and A. Lucas, Operator growth bounds from graph theory, arXiv:1905.03682 [hep-th, physics:math-ph, physics:quant-ph] (2019), arXiv:1905.03682 [hep-th, physics:math-ph, physics:quant-ph].
- [S4] M. C. Tran, C.-F. Chen, A. Ehrenberg, A. Y. Guo, A. Deshpande, Y. Hong, Z.-X. Gong, A. V. Gorshkov, and A. Lucas, Hierarchy of Linear Light Cones with Long-Range Interactions, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 031009 (2020).
- [S5] M. Foss-Feig, Z.-X. Gong, C. W. Clark, and A. V. Gorshkov, Nearly Linear Light Cones in Long-Range Interacting Quantum Systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 157201 (2015).
- [S6] M. C. Tran, A. Y. Guo, Y. Su, J. R. Garrison, Z. Eldredge, M. Foss-Feig, A. M. Childs, and A. V. Gorshkov, Locality and Digital Quantum Simulation of Power-Law Interactions, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 031006 (2019).

- [S7] S. Bravyi, M. B. Hastings, and F. Verstraete, Lieb-Robinson Bounds and the Generation of Correlations and Topological Quantum Order, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 050401 (2006).