Local-in-time error in variational quantum dynamics
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The McLachlan “minimum-distance” principle for optimizing approximate solutions of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation is revisited, with a focus on the local-in-time error accompanying the variational solutions. Simple, exact expressions are provided for this error, which are then evaluated in illustrative cases, notably the widely used mean-field approach and the adiabatic quantum molecular dynamics. These findings pave the way for the rigorous development of adaptive schemes that re-size on-the-fly the underlying variational manifold and thus optimize the overall computational cost of a quantum dynamical simulation.

\textbf{Introduction.} Variational principles play a major role in quantum dynamics since they allow to devise general strategies to evolve wavefunctions on parametrized manifolds, in such a way to mimic as much as possible the exact quantum mechanical evolution. There exist at least three different time-dependent variational principles, namely the McLachlan\textsuperscript{1} variational principle (MVP), the Time-Dependent Variational Principle\textsuperscript{2} (TDVP) and the Dirac-Frenkel\textsuperscript{3,4} variational principle (DFVP), which are known to be equivalent to each other under mild conditions\textsuperscript{5}, usually satisfied in practice. However, these three variational principles have different origins and limitations and, indeed, only the first one represents a well-founded, general optimization scheme. The reason is that the DFVP

$$\langle \delta \Psi | (i\hbar \partial_t - H) | \Psi \rangle = 0 \quad (1)$$

is not, strictly speaking, a variational principle, since it is not a functional variation - in the sense that it does not refer to an action functional - but just a condition which defines an optimization problem. It closely resembles, but is stronger than, the condition

$$\Re \langle \delta \Psi | (i\hbar \partial_t - H) | \Psi \rangle = 0 \quad (2)$$

that results from the TDVP, which is indeed a stationary-action principle, $\delta S = \delta \int_{t_i}^{t_f} L[\Psi] dt = 0$, with the real Lagrangian (here for normalized wavefunctions)

$$L[\Psi_t] = \frac{i\hbar}{2} \left( \langle \Psi_t | \dot{\Psi}_t \rangle - \langle \dot{\Psi}_t | \Psi_t \rangle - \langle \Psi_t | H | \Psi_t \rangle \right)$$

This is rather appealing because of its formal resemblance with the \textit{classical} stationary-action principle (and the ensuing possibility of a Hamiltonian dynamics of the variational parameters\textsuperscript{2}) but it seems flawed due to the double ended boundary condition $|\delta \Psi_{t_i} \rangle = |\delta \Psi_{t_f} \rangle = 0$ which is incongruent with a \textit{first} order equation in time (the time-dependent Schrödinger equation) which it is meant to replace (see \textit{e.g.} Ref. \textsuperscript{6}). A similar stationarity condition,

$$\Im \langle \delta \Psi | (i\hbar \partial_t - H) | \Psi \rangle = 0 \quad (3)$$

defines the MVP which, contrary to the above two, is firmly rooted in purely geometrical ideas. Despite this, McLachlan’s principle is perhaps the least popular of the three, firstly because the presence of the time-derivative of the wavefunction variation ($\delta \dot{\Psi}$) makes it less intuitive, and secondly, because the above mentioned equivalence of the three principles led researchers to focus on the DFVP and the TDVP which admit an immediate physical interpretation. In this Letter we revisit the MVP “geometrical” principle and exploit some basic, hitherto unexplored, consequences. Specifically, we will consider the local-in-time error associated with the MVP and consider its implications for variational propagation schemes.

\textbf{The McLachlan minimum-distance principle.} Let us first introduce some notation. In the following it is assumed that the wavefunctions we deal with lie on a manifold $M \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ (the “variational manifold”) that admits a smooth parametrization, \textit{i.e.}, $|\Psi \rangle \equiv |\Psi(x)\rangle$ where $x \in \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\partial |\Psi \rangle / \partial x_i$, $\partial^2 |\Psi \rangle / \partial x_i \partial x_j$’s are well-defined vectors of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ of the system. For simplicity, we assume that $M$ contains its rays, in order to allow normalization of the wavefunction. The directional derivative along $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in $x_0$ is given by

$$|\delta_u |\Psi_0 \rangle = \left. \frac{d}{ds} |\Psi(x_0 + su)\rangle \right|_{s=0} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i \left. \frac{\partial |\Psi(x)\rangle}{\partial x_i} \right|_{x=x_0}$$

and defines a generic “variation” of $|\Psi_0 \rangle = |\Psi(x_0)\rangle$ (\textit{i.e.}, along $u$). The vectors $|\delta |\Psi_0 \rangle \equiv \partial |\Psi \rangle / \partial x_i |_{x=x_0}$ ($i = 1,..n$) span a linear space of dimension $n$, denoted as $T_0 M$, which is the space tangent to $M$ in $|\Psi_0 \rangle$. This linear space is \textit{real}, as long as the manifold coordinates are real parameters, which is the most general case. Occasionally, one may make use of complex (analytic) parametrizations, and in that case $T_0 M$ becomes a \textit{complex} linear space, a sufficient condition for the equivalence of the above variational principles\textsuperscript{2}. More generally, we say that the variation $|\delta |\Psi_0 \rangle \in T_0 M$ is \textit{complex} whenever the vector $i \delta |\Psi_0 \rangle$ is a permitted variation, too\textsuperscript{2}, \textit{i.e.}, $i |\delta |\Psi_0 \rangle \in T_0 M$.

Suppose we are given $|\Psi_0 \rangle \in M$ as an initial state for
a short-time dynamics of time $dt$. The best choice for $|\Psi_0(dt)\rangle \in M$, the time-evolved state, should minimize the error, that is the distance from the exact solution $|\Psi_0^{\text{exact}}(dt)\rangle$, $\varepsilon dt = ||\Psi_0(dt) - \Psi_0^{\text{exact}}(dt)||$ (here written in terms of error per unit time $\varepsilon$) or, equivalently,

$$\hbar \varepsilon = ||i\hbar \dot{\Psi}_0 - H\Psi_0||$$

Stationarity with respect to variations of $|\dot{\Psi}_0\rangle$ gives the McLachlan condition, Eq. [3] for $|\Psi_0\rangle$:

$$\Im \langle \delta \dot{\Psi}_0 | (i\hbar \partial_t - H) | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle = 0$$

(4)

where $|\delta \dot{\Psi}_0\rangle$ can be thought of as a limiting difference between the tangent vectors of two neighboring paths. The invariance under scalar multiplication directly leads to norm conservation, since for $|\delta \dot{\Psi}_0\rangle = \delta \lambda |\dot{\Psi}_0\rangle$ (with $\delta \lambda$ arbitrary complex) it gives

$$i\hbar \langle \Psi_0 | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle = \langle \Psi_0 | H | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle$$

(5)

which implies $2R \langle \Psi_0 | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle = d \langle \Psi_0 | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle /dt = 0$. At the same time, the gauge is fixed to $\hbar \Im \langle \dot{\Psi}_0 | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle = -\langle \dot{\Psi}_0 | H | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle$, that is, precisely that of the exact solution, $i\hbar \langle \dot{\Psi}_0^{\text{exact}} | = H | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle$. The same conclusions follow by taking $M$ a manifold of normalized wavefunctions, but with a free phase factor that is then optimized.[8]

Next, we consider the optimization of the path. When the time-dependence in $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ comes only from variational parameters, $|\delta \dot{\Psi}_0\rangle$ is nothing else than an arbitrary element of $T_0M$. In other words, in this case holds

$$\Im \langle \delta \dot{\Psi}_0 | (i\hbar \partial_t - H) | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle = 0$$

(6)

since $T_0M$ is a linear space and its elements are just the wavefunction variations. Eq. [6] is only apparently similar to Eq. [2] (though they both reduce to the Dirac-Frenkel condition, Eq. [1] for complex variations). This becomes clear when evaluating it for $|\delta \dot{\Psi}_0\rangle = |\dot{\Psi}_0\rangle$, the time derivative of the variational solution which is a legitimate element of $T_0M$, since Eq. [6] gives

$$\hbar \langle \dot{\Psi}_0 | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle = \Im \langle \dot{\Psi}_0 | H | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle$$

(7)

which is a genuine consequence of the McLachlan principle. The same manipulation in the TDVP gives a different (though rather important) condition, namely energy conservation, $\Re \langle \dot{\Psi}_0 | H | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \langle \dot{\Psi}_0 | H | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle = 0$. Eq. [7] gives immediately a “boundedness theorem”

$$\hbar ||\dot{\Psi}_0|| \leq ||H\Psi_0||$$

(8)

but it is actually more powerful, as is shown in the following.

**Local-in-time error.** The value of the distance at the variational minimum, denoted as $\varepsilon_M$, is a functional of $|\Psi_0\rangle$, depending on the chosen manifold $M$. It represents the distance of the manifold $M$ from the exact solution in $|\Psi_0\rangle$, i.e., a local-in-time measure of the performance of the variational method associated to $M$. Figuratively, it gives a “skin” of finite thickness to the manifold $M$ that locally measures the accuracy of the variational method associated to $M$, for the given dynamical problem. Importantly, it also sets an a posteriori upper bound to the wavefunction error[9]

$$||\Psi_0(t) - \Psi_0^{\text{exact}}(t)|| \leq \int_0^t \varepsilon M[\Psi_0(\tau)]d\tau$$

(9)

and can thus be used confidently to minimize the error over time when acting on $M$ (see Supplemental Material, SM). Using Eq. [7] one easily finds

$$\varepsilon^2_M[\Psi_0] = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \left(||H\Psi_0||^2 - \hbar^2||\dot{\Psi}_0||^2\right)$$

(10)

which is a simple, exact expression for the local-in-time error. When $T_0M$ is complex-linear, this is a simple consequence of the fact that the variational condition can be recast as an orthogonal projection[5], namely $i\hbar |\Psi_0\rangle = P_0 H |\Psi_0\rangle$ where $P_0$ is the projector onto $T_0M$; however, this condition is not necessary for Eq. [10] to hold, when the MVP is used. In the following, we show how $\varepsilon^2_M$ can be used in practice to assess quantitatively the quality of a variational approximation and how to improve it when necessary.

We first rewrite Eq. [10] in a more appealing form, since it is invariant under a shift of the Hamiltonian ($H \to H + \cdots$),
$H' = H - \epsilon$ provided, of course, the gauge is modified accordingly ($\langle |\Psi_0\rangle \to |\Psi_0\rangle = \exp(\frac{i}{\hbar}\epsilon t)|\Psi_0\rangle$). Hence, it is convenient to choose as reference energy the average energy of the state $|\Psi_0\rangle$, denoted here and in the following as $E_0$, resulting in the corresponding “standard” gauge $|\Psi_0^\text{exact}\rangle := |\Psi_0\rangle$. With this gauge, Eq. (10) takes the form

$$\varepsilon^2_{\mathcal{M}}[|\Psi_0\rangle] = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \left( \Delta E_0^2 - \hbar^2 ||\dot{\Psi}_0^\text{exact}||^2 \right)$$

(11)

where $\Delta E_0^2 = \langle (H - E_0)^2 \rangle_0$ is the energy variance and $|\dot{\Psi}_0^\text{exact}\rangle$ satisfies $\langle q|\dot{\Psi}_0^\text{exact}\rangle = 0$. Again, this admits a simple interpretation since the action of $H$ on a given vector $|\Psi_0\rangle$ can always be split into a component along $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and one orthogonal to it, $|\Psi_0^\perp\rangle$, namely

$$H|\Psi_0\rangle = E_0|\Psi_0\rangle + \Delta E_0|\Psi_0^\perp\rangle = \hbar \dot{\Psi}_0^\perp + \hbar |\dot{\Psi}_0^\perp\rangle$$

where $|\Psi_0^\perp\rangle = (H - E_0)|\Psi_0\rangle / \Delta E_0$ is a normalized vector orthogonal to $|\Psi_0\rangle$. The two components $|\Psi_0^\parallel\rangle$ and $|\Psi_0^\perp\rangle$ are, respectively, the “irrelevant” and “relevant” components of the exact time-derivative (see Fig. 3). The latter reduces to the time-derivative of the exact wavefunction in the standard gauge, $i\hbar |\dot{\Psi}_0^\text{exact}\rangle = \hbar |\dot{\Psi}_0^\parallel\rangle = \Delta E_0|\Psi_0^\perp\rangle$, and thus $\Delta E_0$ determines the “intrinsic” length of this derivative. We note that the decomposition of Eq. (11) is different from the approach of Ref. [9] where the error is written in terms of the deviation of the tangent space projection from the exact solution.

Interestingly, when the equations of motion can be recast in the form $i\hbar |\dot{\Psi}_0^\parallel\rangle = H_v |\Psi_0\rangle$, where $H_v$ is a “variational” (self-adjoint) Hamiltonian operator, the error becomes a measure of the ability of $\mathcal{M}$ to account for the energy fluctuations,

$$\varepsilon^2_{\mathcal{M}}[|\Psi_0\rangle] = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \left( \Delta E_{0,v}^2 - \Delta E_{0,0}^2 \right)$$

where $\Delta E_{0,v}^2 = \langle \Psi_0^\text{exact} | H_v^2 | \Psi_0^\text{exact}\rangle$ is the variance of the “effective” energy [11]. This variational energy variance is bounded, $\Delta E_{0,v}^2 \leq \Delta E_{0,0}^2$, and attains its maximum value for the exact solution.

Now, upon factoring out $\Delta E_{0,0}^2$, which is common to any manifold containing $|\Psi_0\rangle$, we write

$$\varepsilon^2_{\mathcal{M}}[|\Psi_0\rangle] = \frac{\Delta E_{0,0}^2}{\hbar^2} \left( 1 - r^2_{\mathcal{M}}[|\Psi_0\rangle] \right)$$

with $r^2_{\mathcal{M}}[|\Psi_0\rangle] := \frac{\hbar^2||\dot{\Psi}_0^\text{exact}||^2}{\Delta E_{0,0}^2}$

where we have introduced the dimensionless index $r_{\mathcal{M}}[|\Psi_0\rangle] \in [0, 1]$ (see Eq. [5]) with the properties

$$\mathcal{M}' \supseteq \mathcal{M} \Rightarrow r_{\mathcal{M'}}[|\Psi_0\rangle] \geq r_{\mathcal{M}}[|\Psi_0\rangle]$$

$$r_{\mathcal{M}}[|\Psi_0\rangle] = 1 \iff \dot{\Psi}_0^\text{exact} = \dot{\Psi}_0$$

We thus see that the ratio $r_{\mathcal{M}}[|\Psi_0\rangle]$ is a convenient measure of the performance of a variational method for the given dynamical problem.

The above result can be generalized to the case in which the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is time-dependent, $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(t)$, and the time-derivative of the wavefunction contains both a variational ($\langle |\Psi_v\rangle \in \mathcal{T}_0 M(\mathcal{M})$) and a non-variational ($\langle |\Psi_n\rangle$) contribution, i.e., $|\Psi_0\rangle = |\Psi_v\rangle + |\Psi_n\rangle$. In this case energy is not conserved

$$\frac{dE_0}{dt} = 2\Re \langle \dot{\Psi}_0 | H | \Psi_0 \rangle = 2\Re \left( \langle \dot{\Psi}_n | (H - i\hbar \delta t) | \Psi_0 \rangle \right)$$

but the error takes yet a simple form

$$\varepsilon^2_{\mathcal{M}}[|\Psi_0\rangle] = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \left( ||H|\dot{\Psi}_0^\parallel - i\hbar \dot{\Psi}_n||^2 - \hbar^2 ||\dot{\Psi}_v||^2 \right)$$

see SM for details.

**Examples.** As a first example, we consider a simple one-dimensional system whose wavefunction $|\Psi_0\rangle$ is constrained to have a Bargmann form [12, 13], $|\Psi_0\rangle = C \exp \{ sa^\dagger \} |0\rangle$, where the phonon annihilation operator $a$ reads as $a = \frac{q}{m\omega} + \frac{2\pi^2}{m\omega} \hat{q}$ and $\hat{p}$ being the usual coordinate and momentum operators and $\Delta q, \Delta p$ being two parameters satisfying $\Delta q \Delta p = \hbar / 2$, and representing, respectively, the coordinate and momentum width of the state. Finally, $|0\rangle$ is the vacuum state ($a |0\rangle = 0$) and $C, \bar{z} \in \mathbb{C}$ parametrize the vector. This is a semiclassical approximation to the dynamics, also known as Frozen Gaussian approximation (FGA) [14], since the variational equations of motion reduce to evolution laws for the average position and momentum of the wavepacket, $q_0 = 2\Delta q \mathbb{E} z$ and $p_0 = 2\Delta p \mathbb{E} z$, respectively. A straightforward calculation gives the equation of motion for $z$ (see SM for details), $\dot{z} = i\hbar^{-1} \langle |\Psi_0| [H, a] \rangle |\Psi_0\rangle / \langle \Psi_0 | \Psi_0 \rangle$, and the time-derivative of the wavefunction in the standard gauge, $|\dot{\Psi}_0^\parallel\rangle = \dot{\lambda} (a^\dagger - z^*) |\Psi_0\rangle$. Thus, the error due to the FGA to the dynamics follows as $\hbar^2 \dot{\varepsilon}^2 = \Delta E_{0,0}^2 - \hbar^2 \dot{z}^2$, where (for $H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + V$) the second term on the r.h.s. is just the variance of the following variational Hamiltonian

$$H_v = \frac{p_0}{m} \delta \hat{p} + \langle V' \rangle \delta \hat{q}$$

where $\delta \hat{p} = \hat{p} - p_0, \delta \hat{q} = \hat{q} - q_0$ and $V' = \frac{dV(q)}{dq}$. The error is easily seen to vanish when $H$ takes a harmonic form, i.e., $H = H_{HO} = \hbar \omega a^\dagger a + \lambda a^\dagger + \lambda^* a$ ($\omega \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$), and in general it reads as, to lowest order in $\Delta q$,

$$\dot{\varepsilon} \approx \Delta q^2 \sqrt{ \frac{m^2 \Delta^2}{2} + \left( \frac{|V_0^{(3)}|^2}{6} + \frac{m^2 \Delta^2}{2} V_0^{(4)} \right) }$$

where $V_0^{(n)}$ is the $n$th derivative of the potential in $q_0$, $m \Delta^2 = V_0^{(2)} - m \omega^2$, and $\omega = \hbar / 2 m \Delta q^2$ (see SM). In locally harmonic potentials ($V^{(2)} > 0$), one may set $\Delta q$ to make the first term on the r.h.s. vanishing and obtain
\[ h \varepsilon \approx \hbar^3 |V^{(3)}| / 8 \sqrt{6} |mV^{(2)}|^{3/2}, \] although this condition only holds at \( t = 0 \) if \( \Delta \theta \) is kept frozen.

As a second example, let us consider the general \( N \)-particle Hamiltonian \( H = \sum_{i=1}^{N} h_i + V \) (where \( h_i \) are one-particle operators and \( V \) is a many-body interaction potential) and the mean-field \( \text{ansatz} \) of the time-dependent Hartree method, \( |\Psi_0\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^{N} |\phi_i\rangle \) where the \( \phi_i \)'s are variational single-particle functions (spfs), subject only to the normalization condition \( \langle \phi_i|\phi_i\rangle = 1 \). Application of the DF condition, Eq. (6) gives the equations of motion of the spfs in the form (SM)

\[ i\hbar |\dot{\phi}_i\rangle = (H_i + \phi_i - \bar{E}_0) |\phi_i\rangle \]

where \( H_i = \langle \Psi^i | H | \Psi^i \rangle \) is the mean-field Hamiltonian for the \( i \)th degree of freedom (\( |\Psi^i \rangle = \prod_{j \neq i} |\phi_j\rangle \) is the \( i \)th single-hole wavefunction) and \( \phi_i = i\hbar |\phi_i\rangle |\phi_i\rangle \in \mathbb{R} \) are arbitrary gauge terms that enforce the normalization conditions. As shown in SM, the total time-derivative of the state vector in the standard gauge follows as

\[ i\hbar |\dot{\Psi}_0\rangle = H_{\text{mf}}^0 |\Psi_0\rangle \quad H_{\text{mf}}^0 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (H_i - \bar{E}_0), \quad \langle H_{\text{mf}} \rangle = 0 \]

(here \( H_{\text{mf}}^0 \) is the appropriate variational Hamiltonian for the problem) and thus it holds \( h^2||\dot{\Psi}_0^+||^2 = \Delta E_{\text{mf},0}^2 \) where \( \Delta E_{\text{mf},0} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Delta E_{i,0}^2 \) and \( \Delta E_{i,0}^2 = \langle (H_i - \bar{E}_0)^2 \rangle_0 \) are the one-particle energy fluctuations. Furthermore, since \( H - \bar{E}_0 = H_{\text{mf}} + \Delta V \), where \( \Delta V = V + (N - 1) \langle V \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i \) is the zero-mean fluctuating potential, the energy variance can be given in a simple form (here \( \Delta V_0 = \langle \Delta V \rangle_0 \))

\[ \Delta E_0^2 = \Delta E_{\text{mf},0}^2 + \Delta V_0^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Re \langle H_i \Delta V \rangle_0 \]

and \( \epsilon_{\text{mf}}^2 \equiv \Delta E_{\text{mf},0}^2 / \Delta E_0^2 \). The above expression clearly shows the key role played by the potential energy fluctuations in limiting the reliability of the mean-field approach and indicates that

\[ \epsilon_{\text{mf}} = h^{-1} \left[ \Delta V_0^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Re \langle H_i \Delta V \rangle_0 \right]^{1/2} \]

is the appropriate expression for the correlation error intrinsic to the TDH method. Notice that from the inequality \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Re \langle H_i \Delta V \rangle_0 \leq \Delta E_{\text{mf},0} \Delta V_0 \) follows a simple lower bound for the \( r \)-index, namely \( r_{\text{mf}}[|\Psi_0\rangle] \geq \Delta E_{\text{mf},0} / (\Delta E_{\text{mf},0} + \Delta V_0) \).

Finally, as a last example we consider the error intrinsic to the adiabatic (Born-Oppenheimer) dynamics, a common strategy to tackle molecular problems where the electronic degrees of freedom are averaged out with the well-known \( \text{ansatz} \)

\[ |\Psi_0\rangle = \int dX |\phi(X)| |\Phi_n(X)\rangle |X\rangle \]

Here \( X \) represents the nuclear degrees of freedom, and \( |\Phi_n(X)\rangle \) is the \( n \)th eigenstate of the electronic Hamiltonian with clamped nuclei at \( X \), i.e., the electronic operator \( h_{el}(X) \) defined by \( \langle X | H - T | X \rangle = h_{el}(X) \delta(X - X') \), \( H \) being the total Hamiltonian and \( T \) the kinetic energy of the nuclei. Application of the variational principle gives the equation of motion for the “nuclear wavefunction” \( \psi(X) \) in the \( n \)th electronic state

\[ H_n \psi = i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t}, \quad H_n = \langle T \rangle_n + E_n(X) \]

where \( E_n(X) \) is the electronic energy and

\[ \langle T \rangle_n = T - i \sum_i \frac{\hbar}{M_i} \left( \frac{\partial \Phi_n}{\partial R_i} \right)_{el} P_i + \sum_i \frac{\hbar^2}{2M_i} \left( \frac{\partial \Phi_n}{\partial R_i} \right)_{el} \]

is a self-adjoint operator, the nuclear kinetic energy operator averaged over the electronic state \( |\Phi_n\rangle \). This gives the rate of variation of the wavefunction in the standard gauge as

\[ h^2||\dot{\Psi}_0^+||^2 = \int dX \psi^*(X) \left( \langle T \rangle_n + (E_n(X) - \bar{E}_0) \right) \psi(X) \]

while the energy variance reads as

\[ \Delta E_0^2 = \int dX \psi^*(X) \left( \langle T \rangle_n - \langle T \rangle_n^2 \right) \psi(X) \]

Hence, the local-in-time error in the adiabatic approximation takes the form of a nuclear kinetic energy fluctuation term

\[ \epsilon^2[|\Psi_0\rangle] = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int dX \psi^*(X) \left( \langle T \rangle_n - \langle T \rangle_n^2 \right) \psi(X) \]

This can also be put in a form that makes explicit the contributions of electronic transitions, that is, upon introducing \( \phi_{m\rightarrow n}(X) = \langle \Phi_m | \Phi_n \rangle_{el} \psi(X) \),

\[ \epsilon^2[|\Psi_0\rangle] = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \sum_{m \neq n} \int dX |\phi_{m\rightarrow n}(X)|^2 \]

Here, the amplitudes read explicitly as

\[ \phi_{m\rightarrow n}(X) = -\sum_{i,\alpha} \frac{\hbar^2}{2M_i} \left[ F_{i,m}^{\alpha}(X) \frac{\partial \psi(X)}{\partial x_{i,\alpha}} + B_{i,m}^{\alpha}(X) \psi(X) \right] \]

where \( \Delta E_{mn} = E_m - E_n \), \( i \) and \( \alpha \) label the nuclei and their coordinates, respectively, \( F_{i,m}^{\alpha} = \langle \Phi_m | F^{\alpha \dagger} | \Phi_n \rangle \) where \( F^{\alpha \dagger} \) is the operator for the \( \alpha \) component of the force acting on the nucleus \( i \), and \( B_{i,m}^{\alpha} = \langle \Phi_m | \partial^2 \Phi_n / \partial x_{i,\alpha}^2 \rangle \).

**Adaptive propagation schemes.** Eq. (11) represents a rigorous criterion to optimize on-the-fly the computational cost of a quantum dynamical simulation, as it
can be used to re-size the underlying variational manifold in order to keep the error below a specified “tolerable” value (see also Eq. [9]). We sketch here its application to a rather popular and quite efficient variational method for high-dimensional systems, the multiconfiguration time-dependent Hartee (MCTDH) method [10–19]. In this method the wavefunction takes the form $|\Psi_0\rangle = \sum C_I |\Phi_I\rangle$ where $C_I$’s are complex coefficients, $I = (i_1, i_2, \ldots , i_N)$ is a multi-index and $|\Phi_I\rangle = |\phi_{i_1} \phi_{i_2} \cdots \phi_{i_N}\rangle$ (where $i_k = 1, \ldots , n_K$) are configurations of fully flexible spfs. Of interest here is the possibility of changing on-the-fly the number of spfs, which means varying both the size of the secular problem for the amplitude coefficients and the number of spfs to be optimized. Notice that this would solve from the outset the problem of regularizing solutions that contain configurations with vanishing weight. We focus on the “spawning” process[20], i.e. the generation of new spfs and related configurations, which becomes necessary when, in the course of the dynamics, the local error $\varepsilon$ exceeds some given threshold, thereby signaling the need for a more flexible manifold. If the main correction comes from single excitations of the “occupied” configurations $|\Phi_I\rangle$, the “best” sfp $|\eta\rangle$ to add to the $k^{th}$ degree of freedom is the one that maximizes the expectation value of a certain reduced, self-adjoint “rate” operator $\Gamma^{(k)}$ for the $k^{th}$ mode (see SM), among those single-particle states that lie in the orthogonal complement of both the occupied spfs for the $k^{th}$ mode ($|\phi_{i_k}\rangle$, $i_k = 1, n_k$) and their time-derivatives. The reduced operator reads as

$$\Gamma^{(k)} = \sum_{I(k)} \langle \Phi_{I(k)} | H | \Psi_0 \rangle \langle \Psi_0 | H | \Phi_{I(k)} \rangle$$

where $\Phi_{I(k)}$ is a $k^{th}$ hole configuration and the scalar products are taken over all modes except the $k^{th}$. Then, the reduction of the local-in-time (squared) error when adding such sfp is given by $\langle \eta | \Gamma^{(k)} | \eta \rangle / h^2$ (see SM for details).

**Conclusions.** Variational solutions of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation have an intrinsic measure of their reliability, a local-in-time error that measures the departure from the instantaneous exact solution. Simple expressions have been provided for this error in some relevant cases, with the aim of showing how the error helps to assess quantitatively the reliability of the variational method for a given dynamical problem. Future applications involve the development of adaptive propagation schemes that re-size on-the-fly the variational manifold, and optimize the computational cost for a target accuracy.
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SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

A posteriori error bound

Following Ref. [3], let $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ and $|\tilde{\Psi}(t)\rangle$ be, respectively, an approximate and the exact solution of the TDSE with the same initial state, $|\Psi(0)\rangle = |\tilde{\Psi}(0)\rangle \equiv |\Psi_0\rangle$ and $|\Delta \Psi\rangle = |\Psi(t)\rangle - |\tilde{\Psi}(t)\rangle$. From the identity
\[ i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\Delta \Psi\rangle = H |\Delta \Psi\rangle - H |\Psi\rangle \]
it follows
\[ \hbar \Re \langle \Delta \Psi | \Delta \Psi \rangle = \Im \langle \Delta \Psi | i\hbar \dot{\Psi} - H \Psi \rangle \]
Here, $\Re \langle \Delta \Psi | \Delta \Psi \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} ||\Delta \Psi||^2 = ||\Delta \Psi|| \frac{d||\Delta \Psi||}{dt}$ and thus
\[ \hbar \frac{d}{dt} ||\Delta \Psi|| = \Im \langle \Delta \Psi | i\hbar \dot{\Psi} - H \Psi \rangle \leq ||\Delta \Psi|| ||i\hbar \dot{\Psi} - H \Psi|| \]
\[ \text{i.e.,} \]
\[ \frac{d}{dt} ||\Delta \Psi|| \leq \frac{1}{\hbar} ||i\hbar \dot{\Psi} - H \Psi|| \]
which integrated gives
\[ ||\Delta \Psi|| \leq \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^t \left\| i\hbar \dot{\Psi}(\tau) - H \Psi(\tau) \right\| d\tau \]
When $|\Psi(t)\rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ is a variational solution the integrand on the r.h.s. takes at any time its minimum value and it is just the local-in-time error $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{M}}[\Psi(t)]$ defined in the main text, Eq. [10].

The above bound also constrains the error in autocorrelation functions (here and below $||\Psi_0|| = 1$)
\[ ||\langle \Psi(t)|\Psi_0\rangle - \langle \tilde{\Psi}(t)|\Psi_0\rangle || = ||\langle \Delta \Psi|\Psi_0\rangle || \leq ||\Delta \Psi|| \]
and in the average values of any bounded observable,
\[ ||\langle \Psi(t)|A|\Psi_0\rangle - \langle \tilde{\Psi}(t)|A|\tilde{\Psi}(t)\rangle || = \]
\[ = ||\langle \Delta \Psi|A|\Psi(t)\rangle + \langle \tilde{\Psi}(t)|A|\Delta \Psi\rangle || \]
\[ \leq ||\Delta \Psi|| \left( ||A|\Psi(t)\rangle + ||A|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle \right) \]
\[ \leq 2 ||A||_{\infty} ||\Delta \Psi|| \]
where $||A||_{\infty}$ is the operator norm.

Error and energy drift with time-dependent manifolds

We address here in some detail the situation where the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is time-dependent and the time-derivative of the wavefunction contains both a variational and a non-variational contribution
\[ |\tilde{\Psi}_0\rangle = |\tilde{\Psi}_0^T\rangle + |\Phi_0\rangle \]
(here the superscript $T$ reminds us that $|\tilde{\Psi}_0^T\rangle \in \mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{M}$, the space tangent to $\mathcal{M}(t)$ at $t = 0$). This may happen, for instance, when the manifold is described by a set of variational parameters $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N$ and a number of additional time-dependent parameters $y_1, y_1, \ldots, y_M$ which, for computational efficiency, are evolved according to some physically sound law ("guided" parameters), simpler than the variational equations of motion. In such circumstances, the (partial) variational condition $\Re \langle \tilde{\Psi}_0^T | (i\hbar \partial_t - H) \tilde{\Psi}_0 \rangle = 0$ leads to
\[ h \langle \tilde{\Psi}_0^T | \tilde{\Psi}_0^T \rangle = \Re \langle \tilde{\Psi}_0^T | H \Psi_0 - i\hbar \Phi_0 \rangle \]
which generalizes Eq. [7]. Hence, for the error it follows
\[ \langle \left( (i\hbar \tilde{\Phi}_0 - H \Psi_0) + i\hbar \tilde{\Psi}_0^T \right) \left( (i\hbar \tilde{\Phi}_0 - H \Psi_0) + i\hbar \tilde{\Psi}_0^T \right) \rangle = \]
\[ = ||i\hbar \tilde{\Phi}_0 - H \Psi_0||^2 + h^2 ||\tilde{\Psi}_0^T||^2 - 2 \hbar \Im \langle \tilde{\Psi}_0^T | i\hbar \tilde{\Phi}_0 - H \Psi_0 \rangle \]
and thus
\[ \varepsilon_{\mathcal{M}}[\Psi_0] = \frac{1}{h^2} \left( ||H \Psi_0 - i\hbar \Phi_0||^2 - h^2 ||\tilde{\Psi}_0^T||^2 \right) \]
(cfr. Eq. [10]) and the inequality
\[ h ||\tilde{\Psi}_0^T|| \leq ||H \Psi_0 - i\hbar \Phi_0|| \]
that can be considered a generalization of the boundedness theorem above to the case in which the manifold is time-dependent. Here, the appearance of $i\hbar \tilde{\Phi}_0$ on the r.h.s. of the inequality can be understood in the limiting case where the non-variational-time-derivative comes from an effective Hamiltonian, i.e. $i\hbar |\Phi_0\rangle = H^{\text{eff}} |\Psi_0\rangle$, since in such case the above inequality reduces to
\[ h ||\tilde{\Psi}_0^T|| \leq ||(H - H^{\text{eff}}) \Psi_0|| \]
a rather reasonable result.

It is instructive at this point to consider these results in view of the energy conservation since when the wavefunction contains "guided" parameters energy is no longer conserved. Thus in the following we assume that three variational principles are equivalent to each other on $\mathcal{M}$ and consider the energy change per unit time
\[ W_0 = \frac{dE_0}{dt} = 2 \Re \langle \tilde{\Psi}_0^T | H |\Psi_0\rangle \]
\[ = 2 \Re \langle \tilde{\Psi}_0^T | H |\Psi_0\rangle + 2 \Re \langle \tilde{\Phi}_0 | H |\Psi_0\rangle \]
\[ = 2 \Re \langle \tilde{\Phi}_0 | (H - i\hbar \partial_t) |\Psi_0\rangle \]
where the last equality follow from the Dirac-Frenkel condition $\langle \tilde{\Psi}_0^T | (i\hbar \partial_t - H) |\Psi_0\rangle = 0$, namely from
\[ \langle \tilde{\Psi}_0^T | H |\Psi_0\rangle = i\hbar \langle \tilde{\Psi}_0^T | \Phi_0 \rangle = i\hbar \langle \tilde{\Psi}_0^T | \Phi_0 \rangle - i\hbar \langle \tilde{\Psi}_0^T | \Phi_0 \rangle \]
When optimizing also w.r.t. $|\tilde{\Phi}_0\rangle$, the above equation shows that the (magnitude of the) energy drift is stationary at the variational minimum
\[ \delta W_0 = -2 \Re \left( \delta \tilde{\Phi}_0 \langle (i\hbar \partial_t - H) |\Psi_0\rangle \right) = 0 \]
a trivial result because we already known that $|W_0|$ is actually at its minimum under such circumstances ( $|W_0| = 0$ ), but, in general, it shows that optimizing the guide (under given constraints) minimizes the energy drift. In this context it is worth noticing that for a variational solution it must hold

$$|W_0| \leq 2||\Phi_0|| \cdot ||(i\hbar \partial_t - H)\Psi_0|| = 2\hbar \varepsilon_{\mathcal{M}}[\Psi_0]||\Phi_0||$$

that can be converted into a lower bound on the variational solution in terms of energy drift,

$$\varepsilon_{\mathcal{M}}[\Psi_0] \geq \frac{|W_0|}{2\hbar||\Phi_0||}$$

Thus, optimization of the guide (minimization of $|W_0|$) effectively lowers the bound by reducing the error contribution due to the non-conservation of the energy.

**Mean-field approximation**

Let us consider the general $N$-particle Hamiltonian $H = \sum_{i=1}^{N} h_i + V$, where $h_i$ are one-particle operators and $V$ is a many-body interaction potential, and the mean-field ansatz of the time-dependent Hartree method,

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^{N} |\phi_i\rangle$$

where $\phi_i$s are variational single-particle functions, subjected only to the normalization condition $\langle \phi_i|\phi_i\rangle = 1$ that is enforced through the gauge terms $i\hbar \langle \phi_i|\phi_i\rangle = g_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Application of the DF condition, Eq. 8, gives the equations of motion of the spf’s. To this end, it is worth noticing that it suffices to consider only the special (complex) spf’s variations satisfying $\langle \delta \phi_i|\phi_i\rangle = 0$ (i.e., $|\delta \phi_i\rangle \in V_{\theta} = \{ |\phi_i\rangle \}^\perp$) along with the Dirac-Frenkel condition (Eq. 9) since the general stationary condition adds nothing (this is evident upon introducing the projector $P_i = |\phi_i\rangle \langle \phi_i|$ and noticing that $\Re \langle \delta \Psi_0|P_i (i\hbar \partial_t - H)|\Psi_0\rangle = 0$ when $\Re \langle \delta \phi_i|\phi_i\rangle = 0$ and $i\hbar \langle \phi_k|\phi_k\rangle = g_k \in \mathbb{R}$).

Thus, the requirement $(i\hbar |\dot{\phi}_i\rangle - H_i |\phi_i\rangle) \in V_{\theta} = \{ |\phi_i\rangle \}^\perp$ gives $i\hbar |\dot{\phi}_i\rangle - H_i |\phi_i\rangle = \alpha |\phi_i\rangle$, where $\alpha$ is easily found to be $\alpha = i\hbar \langle \phi_i|\phi_i\rangle - \bar{E}_0 \equiv g_i - \bar{E}_0$, and the equations of motion take the form

$$i\hbar |\dot{\phi}_i\rangle = (H_i + g_i - \bar{E}_0) |\phi_i\rangle$$

where $H_i = \langle \Psi|H|\Psi\rangle$ is the mean-field Hamiltonian for the $i$th degree of freedom ($\{ |\Psi\rangle \} = \prod_{j \neq i} |\phi_j\rangle$ is the $i$th single-hole wavefunction) and $E = \langle \Psi|H|\Psi\rangle \equiv (H_i)$. It follows that the total time-derivative of the state vector satisfies

$$i\hbar |\dot{\Psi}\rangle = H_{mf} |\Psi\rangle$$

where the mean-field (total) Hamiltonian $H_{mf}$ reads as

$$H_{mf} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (H_i + g_i - \bar{E}_0)$$

The optimal gauge condition on the total wavefunction requires $\sum_i g_i = 0$ and thus, introducing now the initial time $t = 0$,

$$i\hbar |\dot{\Psi}_0\rangle = H_{mf}^0 |\Psi_0\rangle \quad H_{mf}^0 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (H_i - \bar{E}_0) , \quad \langle H_{mf}\rangle = 0$$

Now, the mean-field Hamiltonians $H_i$ read as $H_i = h_i + \sum_j \epsilon_j - \epsilon_i + v_i$ (where $\epsilon_i = \langle \phi_i|h_i|\phi_i\rangle$ is the average one-particle energy on the $i$th degree and $v_i = \langle \Psi|V|\Psi\rangle$ is the $i$th mean-field potential) hence it is easy to check that it holds $H - \bar{E}_0 = H_{mf} + \Delta V$ where

$$\Delta V = V + (N - 1)\bar{V} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i$$

is the zero-mean fluctuating potential ($\bar{V} = \langle V \rangle \equiv \langle v_i \rangle$ for any $i$). Thus,

$$\Delta E_{0}^2 = \Delta E_{mf,0}^2 + \langle \Delta V^2 \rangle_0 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Re \langle H_i \Delta V \rangle_0$$

and

$$r_{mf}^2 = \frac{\Delta E_{mf,0}^2}{\Delta E_{mf,0}^2 + \Delta V_0^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Re \langle H_i \Delta V \rangle_0}$$

where $\Delta V_0^2 = \langle \Delta V^2 \rangle_0$ and $\Delta E_{mf,0}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Delta E_{i,0}^2$, being $\Delta E_{i,0}^2 = \langle (H_i - \bar{E}_0)^2 \rangle_0$ the one-particle energy fluctuations (one may further notice that they consist of both a “kinetic” and a “potential” term, since $H_i - E = (h_i - \epsilon_i) + (v_i - \bar{V})$).

**Coherent state (or Frozen Gaussian) approximation**

We detail here the case of a coherent state approximation to the dynamics by considering a situation slightly more general than the one presented in the main text, namely a system with two degrees of freedom to which we apply the mean-field approximation

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle |\phi_2\rangle$$

and force the single particle function of the second degree to take the form of a normalized coherent-state (CS)

$$|\phi_2\rangle \equiv |\theta, z\rangle = \exp \left( i\theta - \frac{|z|^2}{2} + za^\dagger \right) |0\rangle$$

This wavefunction is a “precursor” of the Ehrenfest method, with $|\phi_1\rangle$ describing an “electronic” system and
a “semiclassical” nuclear degree of freedom. The equation of motion for $|\phi_2\rangle$ (or, better, $z$) can be derived either from the Dirac-Frenkel condition, Eq. [1] or from the McLachlan minimum-distance condition, Eq. [3]. For illustrative purposes we follow the second route, and consider

$$\langle \phi_1 \delta \phi_2 | i \hbar \delta \phi_2 + i \hbar | \phi_1 \phi_2 \rangle - H | \phi_1 \phi_2 \rangle = 0$$

which is the appropriate condition for optimizing $|\phi_2\rangle$. Notice that, though not evident from the chosen parametrization, the CS variations can be considered complex, as seen by considering the unnormalized Bargmann vectors $C \exp(za^\dagger) |0\rangle$ and the complex analytic parametrization $(C, z) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ (as mentioned in the main text). Some lengthy but simple algebra leads to

$$\begin{align*}
- \delta z = i \hbar \dot{\theta} + \hbar \Im (zh^*) + g - \bar{E}_0 \\
\delta \dot{z} = \frac{z^*}{2} \left[ - \hbar \dot{\theta} - \hbar \Im (zh^*) + g + \bar{E}_0 \right] - \langle \phi_2 | aH_{cl} | \phi_2 \rangle + \frac{\bar{E}_0}{2} \left[ \hbar \dot{\theta} + \hbar \Im (zh^*) - g + \bar{E}_0 \right] = 0
\end{align*}$$

where $g = i \hbar \langle \phi_1 | \dot{\phi}_1 \rangle$, $H_{cl} = \langle \phi_1 | H | \phi_1 \rangle$ and $\bar{E}_0 = \langle \Psi_0 | H | \Psi_0 \rangle$. Hence, the optimal gauge $\theta$ (a concept that only becomes meaningful in view of computing an error) is such that

$$\hbar \dot{\theta} = - \hbar \Im (zh^*) + g - \bar{E}_0$$

and the stationary condition reduces to

$$i \hbar \dot{z} + \bar{E}_0 - \langle \phi_2 | aH_{cl} | \phi_2 \rangle = 0$$

i.e.,

$$\dot{z} = \frac{i}{\hbar} \langle \phi_2 | [H_{cl}, a] | \phi_2 \rangle$$

It follows

$$i \hbar \dot{\Psi}_0 = \left[ H_q + g - \bar{E}_0 + (- \hbar \dot{\theta} - i \hbar \Re (zh^*) + i \hbar \dot{a}^\dagger) \right] | \Psi_0 \rangle$$

(where $H_q = \langle \phi_2 | H | \phi_2 \rangle$) and thus, upon replacing $\dot{\theta}$ with its optimal value,

$$i \hbar \dot{\Psi}_0 = \left[ H_q + i \hbar \dot{a}^\dagger (a + z^*) \right] | \Psi_0 \rangle$$

in such a way that it holds $i \hbar \langle \Psi_0 | \dot{\Psi}_0 \rangle = \bar{E}_0$ as required by the minimum-distance principle. Note that the gauge term $\theta$ is irrelevant for the parameter dynamics, and can be safely neglected when deriving the equation of motion for $z$ from the Dirac-Frenkel condition. However, such a term is needed in order to make $|\Psi_0\rangle$ appropriate for computing the error, and needs to be obtained separately when using the Dirac-Frenkel principle.

Finally, with the Hamiltonian referenced to $E$, we write the variational error using Eq. [11] where now

$$i \hbar \dot{|\Psi_0\rangle} = \left[ H_q - \bar{E}_0 + i \hbar \dot{z} (a + z^*) \right] | \Psi_0 \rangle$$

leads to the simple expression

$$\hbar^2 |\dot{\Psi}_0\rangle^2 = \langle \Psi_0 \left( H_q - \bar{E}_0 \right)^2 | \Psi_0 \rangle + \hbar^2 |\dot{z}|^2$$

By comparing this expression with the above obtained for the general TDH case one finds that

$$\varepsilon_2^2 = \langle \Psi_0 \left( \frac{H_{cl} - \bar{E}_0}{\hbar} \right)^2 | \Psi_0 \rangle - |\dot{z}|^2 \geq 0$$

is the genuine error due to the coherent-state approximation. The case considered in the main text can be obtained by setting $|\phi_1\rangle \equiv 1$, $g = 0$, $H_q = \bar{E}_0$ and $H_{cl} = H$.

**Local-in-time error in the FGA**

The local-in-time error derived above, $\hbar^2 \varepsilon_2^2 = \Delta E_0^2 - \hbar^2 |\dot{z}|^2$, is easily seen to vanish when the Hamiltonian takes a harmonic oscillator (HO) form, $H = H_{HO} = \hbar \omega a^\dagger a + 2 \hbar \Re (\lambda a^\dagger)$. This rather general result in this context follows easily by observing that, on the one hand, it holds

$$\dot{z}_{HO} = - i (\omega a + \lambda)$$

and, on the other hand,

$$(H_{HO} - E_{HO}) |z\rangle = \hbar (\omega z + \lambda) (a - z^*) |z\rangle$$

In view of the above, we write $H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + V = H_{HO} + W$, where $W$ is assumed to be local, $W = W(q)$ (see below). We find, on the one hand, $\dot{z} = \dot{z}_{HO} - \frac{\lambda}{2m} \langle W' \rangle$ and, on the other hand,

$$\Delta E_0^2 = \Delta E_{HO}^2 + \Delta W^2 + 2 \Re \langle z \rangle \langle W - \langle W \rangle \rangle (H_{HO} - E_{HO}) |z\rangle$$

The last term on the r.h.s. can be rearranged into

$$\Re \langle z \rangle \langle W - \langle W \rangle \rangle (H_{HO} - E_{HO}) |z\rangle = \hbar \Re \left[ (\omega z + \lambda) \langle z \rangle \langle W - \langle W \rangle \rangle a^\dagger |z\rangle \right]$$

where $\langle z \rangle \langle W - \langle W \rangle \rangle a^\dagger |z\rangle \equiv \frac{\hbar}{2m} \langle W' \rangle$. It follows

$$\Delta E_{HO}^2 - \hbar^2 |\dot{z}|^2 = \Delta W^2 - \Delta z^2 (\langle W' \rangle)^2$$

Next, we choose $H_{HO}$ such that $H = H_{HO}$ is a purely local potential. To this end we set $\Delta q^2 = \hbar/2m\omega^2$ and, for $H_{HO}$ in the form $H_{HO} = \frac{p^2}{2m} + \frac{m\omega^2}{2} (q - \bar{q})^2$, we obtain $W = V - \frac{m\omega^2}{2} (q - \bar{q})^2$ and then fix $\bar{q}$ by enforcing the condition $\langle W' \rangle = 0$, i.e.,

$$\bar{q} = q_0 - \frac{\langle V' \rangle}{m\omega^2}$$
where \( q_0 = \langle z|\hat{q}|z \rangle \). This reduces the problem of finding the error to that of computing \( \Delta W^2 \). Upon using the condition above \( \Delta W^2 (q_0 - \hat{q}) = \langle \hat{V}' \rangle \), we readily find

\[
W - \langle W \rangle = V - \langle V' \rangle \delta \hat{q} - \frac{\Delta W^2}{2} (\delta \hat{q}^2 - \Delta q^2)
\]

where \( \delta \hat{q} = q - q_0 \). Finally, expanding the potential around \( q_0 \), squaring and averaging

\[
\Delta W^2 \approx \frac{m^2 \Delta^4}{2} \Delta q^4 + \left( \frac{|V_0^{(3)}|^2}{6} + \frac{m^2 \Delta^2}{2} |V_0^{(4)}|^2 \right) \Delta q^6
\]

where \( m^2 \Delta := \langle q_0 | - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2} | q_0 \rangle \), and \( \delta q = (q - q_0)^{2n} \). The error to that of computing \( \langle \hat{V}' \rangle \delta \hat{q} \) is a kind of Hamiltonian linearized around the average position and momentum of the wavepacket.

In closing this section, we notice that from the variational equation of motion it follows

\[
i \hbar \dot{\Psi}_{\hat{a}}^\dagger = (\langle a, H \rangle (a^\dagger - z^\ast) |\Psi_0 \rangle
\]

and thus

\[
H_v = \langle [a, H] (a^\dagger - z^\ast) - \langle [a^\dagger, H] (a - z)
\]

is the appropriate “variational” Hamiltonian. Introducing \( \delta \hat{q} \) and \( \delta \hat{p} = \hat{p} - p_0 \), and using the expression of \( H \) above, one easily finds

\[
H_v = \frac{p_0}{m} \delta \hat{p} + \langle V' \rangle \delta \hat{q}
\]

which is a kind of Hamiltonian linearized around the average position and momentum of the wavepacket.

### Adiabatic approximation

A key quantity in the adiabatic approximation is the kinetic energy operator “reduced” with respect to the electronic coordinates, \( \langle T \rangle_{nm} = \langle \Phi_n(X) | T | \Phi_m(X) \rangle \). Using \( i \) to label the nuclear coordinates with mass \( M_i \) we obtain

\[
\langle T \rangle_{nm} = \delta_{nm} T - i \hbar \sum_i \frac{1}{M_i} \left\langle \Phi_n(X) \frac{\partial \Phi_m}{\partial X_i^\ast} \right\rangle P_i + \hbar^2 \sum_i \frac{1}{2M_i} \left\langle \Phi_n(X) \frac{\partial^2 \Phi_m}{\partial X_i^2} \right\rangle
\]

where \( P_i \) is a nuclear momentum operator. Here, for \( m \neq n \) the second term can also be written in a form that makes explicit the energy differences, since it holds

\[
\left\langle \Phi_n \right\rangle \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial X_i^\ast}, h_{el}(X) \right] |\Phi_m \rangle = \Delta E_{mn}(X) \left\langle \Phi_n \right| \frac{\partial \Phi_m}{\partial X_i^\ast}
\]

and, on the other hand, \( \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial X_i^\ast}, h_{el}(X) \right] = -F^i \) where \( F^i \) is the one-electron operator representing the force acting on \( X_i \). The operators \( \langle T \rangle_{nm} \) satisfy

\[
\langle T \rangle_{nm} = \langle T \rangle_{nm}^\dagger
\]

as can be readily checked by either its definition or a direct calculation. In the latter case, notice that one needs the identities

\[
\langle \Phi_n | \frac{\partial \Phi_m}{\partial X_i^\ast} \rangle + \left\langle \Phi_m \right| \frac{\partial \Phi_n}{\partial X_i^\ast} |\Phi_m \rangle = 0
\]

\[
2 \left\langle \Phi_n | \frac{\partial^2 \Phi_m}{\partial X_i^2} \right\rangle + \left\langle \Phi_m | \frac{\partial \Phi_m}{\partial X_i} \right\rangle + \left\langle \Phi_n | \frac{\partial \Phi_n}{\partial X_i^\ast} \right\rangle = 0
\]

that follow from the orthonormality of the electronic states (the first make also the diagonal term \( \langle \Phi_n | h_{el} | \Phi_n \rangle \) vanishing in the presence of time-reversal invariance).

Finally, in the main text, we have used

\[
\langle T^2 \rangle_{nm} - \langle T \rangle_{nm}^2 = \sum_{m \neq n} \langle T \rangle_{nm} \langle T \rangle_{mn} = \sum_{m \neq n} \langle T \rangle_{mn}^\dagger \langle T \rangle_{mn}
\]

to rewrite the error in terms of contributing electronic transitions \( ||\langle T \rangle_{mn} \psi||^2 \).

### Spawning in MCTDH

We sketch here a possible “spawning” algorithm in propagating high-dimensional wavepackets of the multiconfiguration time-dependent Hartree (MCTDH) type using the error expression provided by Eq. \[11\]. In this method the wavefunction takes the form \( |\Psi \rangle = \sum_I C_I |\Phi_I \rangle \) where \( C_I \)'s are complex coefficients, \( I = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_N) \) is a multi-index and \( |\Phi_I \rangle = |\phi_{i_1} \phi_{i_2} \ldots \phi_{i_N} \rangle \) (where \( i_k = 1, \ldots, n_K \) are configurations of fully flexible single-particle functions. We call \( |\phi_{i_k} \rangle \) \( (i_k = 1, n_k) \) the “occupied” spfs for the \( k \)th mode, and \( |\Phi_I \rangle \) the “occupied” configurations. The scalar product over the \( k \)th degree of freedom

\[
\langle \phi_{i_k} | \Phi_J \rangle = \frac{1}{J} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i_k \notin J \\ |\Phi_{J_k}^{(k)} \rangle & \text{if } i_k \in J \end{cases}
\]

defines the single-hole configuration \( |\Phi_{J_k}^{(k)} \rangle \) (and the \( N - 1 \) dimensional multi-index \( J_k = j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_{k-1}, j_{k+1}, \ldots, j_N \)) with the spf for the \( k \)th mode removed. When “spawning” is required (i.e., when the error \( \varepsilon \) exceeds some given threshold) new spfs are introduced and the set of configurations enlarged,

\[
|\Psi_0 \rangle \rightarrow |\Psi' \rangle = |\Psi_0 \rangle + |\delta \Psi_0 \rangle \\
|\delta \Psi_0 \rangle = \sum_J D_J |\delta \Phi_J \rangle
\]

where \( |\delta \Phi_J \rangle \)’s have one or more occupied spfs replaced by newly generated ones. At the time of spawning, however, such an addition does not modify the wavefunction.
\((D_J \equiv 0)\) but only its time-derivative

\[ |\dot{\Psi}_0\rangle \rightarrow |\dot{\Psi}'_0\rangle = |\dot{\Psi}_0\rangle + |\delta \dot{\Psi}_0\rangle = \sum_j \dot{D}_j |\delta \Phi_j\rangle \]

We consider one additional spf per mode at a time, call it \(|\eta_k\rangle\) for the \(k^{th}\) mode, and assume that the main contribution comes through single excitations, i.e.,

\[ |\delta \dot{\Psi}_0\rangle \approx \sum_k |\delta \dot{\Psi}^k_0\rangle = \sum_j \dot{D}_j |\eta_k \Phi^{(k)}_j\rangle \]

where \(J\) is now a \(N - 1\) dimensional index and \(|\Phi^{(k)}_j\rangle\) a \(k^{th}\)-single-hole configuration. If \(|\eta_k\rangle\) is chosen to be orthogonal to both the occupied spfs \((|\phi_i\rangle, i_k = 1, n_k)\) and their time-derivative \((|\dot{\phi}_i\rangle, i_k = 1, n_k)\) the above time-derivative is orthogonal to

\[ |\dot{\Psi}_0\rangle = \sum_I \dot{C}_I |\Phi_I\rangle + \sum_k \sum_j \dot{D}_j |\eta_k \Phi^{(k)}_j\rangle \]

and thus

\[ ||\dot{\Psi}_0'||^2 = ||\dot{\Psi}_0||^2 + \sum_k ||D^{(k)}||^2 \]

where \(||D^{(k)}||^2 = \sum_j ||\dot{D}_j^{(k)}||^2\)

On the other hand, the amplitude coefficients of the newly introduced configurations follow from the secular problem

\[ i\hbar \dot{D}_j^{(k)} = \langle \eta_k \Phi^{(k)}_j | H | \Psi_0 \rangle \]

hence

\[ \hbar^2 ||D^{(k)}||^2 = \sum_j \langle \eta_k \Phi^{(k)}_j | H | \Psi_0 \rangle \langle \Psi_0 | H | \eta_k \Phi^{(k)}_j \rangle \]

This suggests to introduce a reduced, self-adjoint operator for the \(k^{th}\) mode

\[ \Gamma^{(k)} = \sum_j \langle \Phi^{(k)}_j | H | \Psi_0 \rangle \langle \Psi_0 | H | \Phi^{(k)}_j \rangle \]

(where the scalar products are now over all modes except the \(k^{th}\) one) in such a way that it holds

\[ \hbar^2 ||D^{(k)}||^2 = \langle \eta_k \Gamma^{(k)} | \eta_k \rangle = \gamma_k \]

Accordingly, the original local-in-time error \(\hbar^2 \varepsilon^2 = \Delta E_0^2 - ||\dot{\Psi}_0||^2\) transforms, upon spawning, into

\[ \hbar^2 \varepsilon'^2 = \hbar^2 \varepsilon^2 - \sum_k \gamma_k \]

(notice that the added spfs do not modify \(|\Psi_0\rangle\), hence neither the average energy nor its variance). One can thus maximize the error reduction by choosing, for each mode, the eigenvectors of maximum value of the operator \(\Gamma^{(k)}\) (in the appropriate residual space of the \(k^{th}\) mode).