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Abstract

It is demonstrated how to construct a Galois connection between two related systems with entropy. The construction, called the Landauer’s connection, describes coupling between two systems with entropy. It is straightforward and preserves the behaviour of change induced by entropy in physical systems given by the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Landauer’s connection simplifies description of the classical Landauer’s principle for computational systems. This results open various applications of category theory to the systems in presence of entropy.
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1 Introduction

There is various kinds of entropy describing different systems, e.g. in computations, physical, dynamical systems. In continuous thermodynamical system, e.g., ideal gases, the entropy has precise meaning of the function which provides foliation of the thermodynamical space of states \[7, 9\] which is the statement of to the Caratheodory formulation of the second law of thermodynamics. This approach requires continuous structure on the space of states of the system \[15, 10\]. The entropy can be used as comparison measure between states \[15, 10\], which will be useful later in the paper. There is also point of view that the entropy in a theory can be traced to inaccurate (as it always is) measurement that leads the theory
and the only crucial thing is the difference in entropy and not the entropy itself. In the theory of dynamical systems topological entropy is used to measure the level of dynamical complexity of the system \cite{11}. In information theory the (Shannon) entropy measures how information is produced by its (stochastic) source \cite{20}. This discussion can be largely extended, however, it is not the aim of the paper to make extensive research on the vast literature of the subject. These various interpretations shows that the notion of the entropy is not well understood.

Apart of these different approaches the bigger insight is possible when some systems with entropy are 'connected' in the following sense. In 1961 Rolf Landauer introduced the principle (Landauer’s principle) in irreversible computing in which he postulates that every act of erasing information results in expelling $Tk_B \ln(2)$ (here $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant, $T$ is the temperature of the system) heat to the environment \cite{13}, i.e. increase the physical entropy. This principle has profound implication in explaining old thermodynamical paradox of the Maxwell’s demon \cite{4,5}. There was a dispute on the validity of this principle, however careful derivations \cite{12} and experimental results, e.g. recently in quantum systems and summary measurements in \cite{24}, prove that the principle is correct. The principle bases on the assumption that every computational system (in principle computer memory) is implemented with the help of physical system and this is a link between information and physical realms.

This paper is an attempt to generalize this principle to every system that contains entropy. This generalized connection between systems is the minimal that preserves entropy-induced ordering. It is described what kind of structures from category theory \cite{18,21} are involved in the Landauer’s principle. In this view it is an extension of the paper \cite{12}, where this categorical viewpoint was abandoned. Category theory approach was used in studying entropy, e.g. in \cite{2,3}.

This paper is organized as follows: In the next section the definition of Landauer’s connection that relates systems with entropy will be given. Then explanation of the classical Landauer’s principle in terms of the Landauer’s connection will be outlined. The paper conclude with the discussion on possible implications. In two Appendixes brief overview of the mathematical notion of entropy in thermodynamics and the Galois connection is presented for the reader’s convenience.

2 Main results

In this section we use the properties of entropy \cite{15,16} and the Galois connection \cite{21} to construct connection between systems with entropy. In the first part definition of the Galois connection between entropy systems is provided and justified. From historical reasons it is named the Landauer’s connection. Then presentation of its application to implementation to computer memory and the Maxwell’s demon ‘paradox’ is provided.
2.1 Landauer’s connection

The steps from entropy to the Galois connection of systems with entropy is as follows:

1. state-space (G-Set) + entropy → total ordering,
2. total ordering → poset (G-poset) structure,
3. two posets → Galios (Landauer’s) connection between them.

**Step 1.** The main point is to introduce state-space set $\Gamma$. In the case of thermodynamical systems the scaling of the system is modelled as an action of the of multiplicative group $(\mathbb{R}^+, \cdot, 1)$ on the set $\Gamma$ that preserves ordering (as described in [15, 16] and Appendix A.1) is also assumed. Such kind of object $\{\Gamma, (\mathbb{R}^+, \cdot, 1)\}$ is the element of a G-Set category [22], namely $\mathbb{R}^+$-Set category. However in non-thermodynamical systems (e.g. information theory) with entropy there is usually no group action, and we have the following options: either the description of state-space is only within category of Set, within the category of G-Set with the trivial group $(1, \cdot, 1)$ or modelled on the $\mathbb{R}^+$-Set category with trivial group action. We select the last possibility since it gives more uniform approach.

**Definition 1.** System space is the element of G-Set category, i.e. $\{\Gamma, (\mathbb{R}^+, \cdot, 1)\}$, where the multiplicative group acts on state-space $\Gamma$.

The second ingredient is the entropy function $S : \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$. For example for thermodynamical systems the entropy must fulfil properties of Definition 5.

It is assumed that every point of $\Gamma$ is in the domain of the entropy function. In thermodynamical systems this assumption is called Comparison Hypothesis and not always is true as described in [15, 16]. However we will assume it (e.g. no systems with chemical reactions for thermodynamical systems).

The existence of entropy allows us to define

**Definition 2.** Total ordering $\preccurlyeq$ on $\Gamma$ is defined in the following way

$$X \preccurlyeq Y \iff S(X) \leq S(Y),$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma$.

The above construction from entropy to ordering for thermodynamical systems is the reverse of the argument from [15, 16] and sketched in Appendix A.1 below.

**Step 2.** The existence of total ordering $\preccurlyeq$ on $\Gamma$ allows us to define poset structure. However for accounts of additional group structure of scaling the more general approach will be to use G-Pos category [1], i.e. posets with a group action. The group action is needed only when the scaling is present in the system (in particular thermodynamics). In other systems without scaling the group action is trivial. Therefore we will omit the group action/scaling part when it is not important in the context and provide modifications in the presence of G-Pos structure of group action/scaling later.
Definition 3. The entropy system is the object of $G$-Pos category, which elements are $\mathcal{G} = (\Gamma, \preceq)$, with preserving ordering group $(\mathbb{R}^+, \cdot, 1)$ action\(^1\) where the (partial or) total order is given by the entropy function $S : \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$.

Step 3. The third key ingredient to formulate the Landauer’s connection is the Galois connection from category theory. The short overview of its definition and basic properties are collected in Appendix A.2 for the reader’s convenience.

The definition of the Galois connection suggest that it can relate two thermodynamical or, more generally, entropy systems with state-spaces $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$, where the existence of entropy imposes poset structure (we omit group action structure for clarity for the moment). This gives our main observation - the following definition is reformulation of the Galois connection in terms of the entropy, and from the historical reasons we call it the Landauer’s connection (or generalized Landauer’s principle)

Definition 4. The Landauer’s connection and Landauer’s functor
Entropy system $G_1 = (\Gamma_1, S_1)$ is implemented/realized/simulated in the entropy system $G_2 = (\Gamma_2, S_2)$ when there is a Galois connection between them, namely, there is a functor $F : G_1 \to G_2$ and a functor $G : G_2 \to G_1$ such that $F \dashv G$.

In terms of the entropy the condition (9) is given as

$$S_2(Fc) \leq S_2(d) \iff S_1(c) \leq S_1(Gd).$$

(2)

We name the functors $F$ and $G$ the Landauer’s functors.

In case when the group action on set-state is nontrivial, i.e. when scaling of states is present then we operate on $G$-Posets and in such situation every functor above, say $\tilde{F} = (F, \phi)$ consists of two parts

- Set part of the functor: $F : \Gamma_1 \to \Gamma_2$,
- A function $\phi$ that is a surjective group homomorphism of $(\mathbb{R}^+, \cdot, 1)$, that acts as $\tilde{F}(\lambda X) = \phi(\lambda) FX$.

We have to explain that the functorial properties holds. In the case when there is no scaling ($\phi$ is trivial), if there are mappings $f, g : \Gamma_1 \to \Gamma_1$ then they induce the mappings $Ff, Fg : FT_1 \to FT_1$ on the connected system and the composition $g \circ f$ is mapped into $F(g \circ f) = Fg \circ Ff$. In addition if there is no transition changing the entropy in $\Gamma_1$, it corresponds to the identity mapping on $\Gamma_1$ and this corresponds to the identity mapping on $FT_1$. Similarly for $G$ functor.

The Definition 4 is reasonable as from the first condition of Theorem 3 from the Appendix A.2 the realization of $G_1$ on $G_2$ preserves ordering. From the second condition we get that the mapping $GF$ and $FG$ does not give lower and respectively higher entropy states that the original ones, and the third condition shows that $FG$

\(^1\)If for $X, Y \in \Gamma$ there is $X \preceq Y$, then for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$ there is $\lambda X \preceq \lambda Y$. 
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and $GF$ preserves image of $F$ and $G$ respectively. For thermodynamical systems the Landauer’s functors preserve entropy properties given in Definition 5.

Surjectivity of $\phi$ is only a technical assumption that simplifies what follows. This assumption is added only for removing additional degree of freedom, since we can always choose group action to compensate.

It is obvious that when one system has scaling and the other has not (trivial action of the group) then the mapping $\phi$ is the trivial map. However for nontrivial group action we have the following

**Corollary 1.** For Landauer’s connected functors in the presence of scaling, if $\tilde{F} \dashv \tilde{G}$, then $\tilde{F} = (F, \phi)$, $\tilde{G} = (G, \phi^{-1})$ and $F \dashv G$. Therefore $\phi$ is an isomorphism of groups.

**Proof.** Assume that $\tilde{G} = (G, \psi)$ for the moment. In the relations $S_2(FGFc) = S_2(Fc)$, and $S_1(GFGd) = S_2(Gd)$ substitute $c \rightarrow \lambda c$ and $d \rightarrow \gamma d$, where $\lambda, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then one gets $\psi \circ \phi \circ \psi(\lambda) = \psi(\lambda)$ and likewise $\phi \circ \psi \circ \phi(\gamma) = \phi(\gamma)$. Since $\psi$ and $\phi$ are surjective (group homomorphisms), therefore $\phi^{-1} = \psi$.

The word ‘realization’ or ‘simulation’ explains that usually we are interested in simulating one, possibly abstract system which consists some kind of entropy that introduces poset structure in its state-space, e.g. binary computations, using its physical implementation in terms of electronic system, spin system or any other computing realization, where thermodynamical entropy is given. We can also consider simulation of physical system by the other physical system. If the Landauer’s connection is present the isolated system will behave as its connected counterpart following the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Therefore for such simulation the Landauer’s connection is needed, as it is minimal order preserving connection between two posets. One can note that if the physical system as one of the Galois connected category is involved, then the connection transfers the Second Law of Thermodynamics to the other category which does not have to be connected with physical world (e.g. from electronic circuits to computation described by the Shannon entropy). This issue will be described in details in the next section.

Reformulation of the properties of Landauer’s functors is given by

**Corollary 2.** The equivalent conditions to (3) are as follows

1. For $c_1, c_2 \in C$, if $c_1 \preccurlyeq c_2$ then $S_2(Fc_1) \leq S_2(Fc_2)$; analogously for $G$ functor;
2. for all $c \in C$, $d \in D$, $S_1(c) \leq S_1(GFc)$ and $S_2(FGd) \leq S_2(d);
3. for all $c \in C$, $d \in D$, $S_2(FGFc) = S_2(Fc)$, and $S_1(GFGd) = S_2(Gd)$.

The proof is repetition of the proof of Theorem 3.

From Theorem 145 of [21] we immediately have transitivity of the Galois connection, namely,
Theorem 1. The Landauer’s connection is transitive, namely, if $F : G_1 \to G_2$, $G : G_2 \to G_1$, $H : G_2 \to G_3$ and $K : G_3 \to G_2$ then if $F \dashv G$ and $H \dashv K$, then also $HF \dashv GK$.

We have also some kind of uniqueness (see Theorem 144 of [21]), that is,

Theorem 2. There is some kind of uniqueness of the Landauer’s connection: if $F \dashv G$ and $F \dashv G'$ then $G = G'$. Similarly for the other direction.

From two Landauer’s connected entropy systems we can isolate those parts that are order isomorphic (see Appendix A.2 for definition). We can define an order isomorphism in the following way (see Definition 118 and Theorem 150 of [21]):

Construction 1. Take images of the functors $\Gamma_1^4 = G[\Gamma_2]$ and $\Gamma_2^4 = F[\Gamma_1]$ and define new subcategories of posets $G_1^4 = (\Gamma_1^4, S_1)$ and $G_2^4 = (\Gamma_2^4, S_2)$. Then these last categories are order isomorphic by $F$ and $G$.

The order-isomorphism allows us to introduce classes of equivalences between entropy systems or their subcategories and therefore introduce in the category of entropy systems (sets of all entropy systems without any arrows apart of identity arrow) the quotient category whose objects are equivalence classes of order-isomorphism. In addition order-isomorphism allows us to construct a subsystem of Landauer’s connected systems that can be used to implement the other entropy system faithfully.

We can also close \footnote{The closure of $G_1$ (Definition 119 of [21]) is an endofunctor $K : G_1 \to G_1$, such that for all $c, c' \in G_1$ we have 1) $c \preceq Kc$, 2) $K$ is monotone, 3) $K$ is idempotent, i.e., $KKc = Kc$,} the poset $G_1$ (see Theorem 151 of [21]) using the functor $K = GF$ for $F \dashv G$, where $F : G_1 \to G_2$. This closure gives the biggest subcategory of $G_1$ that can be used to simulate/realize $F[G_1]$.

The above construction of Landauer connection for entropy systems shows that it is ‘weakest’ relation between them in the sense that it allows only to preserve the entropy ordering between them, since the Galois connection is the ‘weakest’ connection between posets.

In the next subsection we cast the original Landauer’s principle in the term of the Landauer’s connection.

2.2 Landauer’s functors and Maxwell’s demon

In this subsection we describe how the above abstract language can be applied to describe original Landauer’s principle of irreversible computations and then well-known the Maxwell’s Demon paradox resolution. This is use of new and more powerful language to the know solution described in details in [12].

Let us first explain the classical Landauer’s principle in therms of the Landauer’s connection introduced in the previous section. Consider first computer
memory $M$ that bases on binary logic, and its implementation in some physical system $D$. In both cases they are entropic systems (see Fig. 2.2). We can therefore build posets using entropy as ordering, namely construct $(M, S)$ and $(D, \bar{S})$, where $S$ and $\bar{S}$ are corresponding entropies. Then we can define Landauer’s functors that define Landauer’s connections. Sometimes implementation of one logical state involves many physical states physically indistinguishable, and we can make it into order-isomorphism by making a quotient object from $D$ with respect to the functor, and in addition remove all states from $D$ that are not in the image of the functor $G : M \rightarrow D$. The opposite functor should not have such problems, since the number of physical states that simulate binary memory is usually bigger that the number of memory states. Therefore we have the Landauer’s connection $F \dashv G$. If there is irreversible operation in memory $M$ given by transition $f : M \rightarrow M$, then by the connection it induces irreversible operation on the device $D$ given by $Ff : FM \rightarrow FM$, and this, by the Second Law of Thermodynamics generates heat that is expelled to the environment. The amount of emitted heat depends on the realization (i.e. on properties of $F$ and $G$), however Landauer showed the lower bound for it.

The next part is to use this memory as a Demon’s memory in the Maxwell’s Demon ‘paradox’. In the experiment there is connect the physical system - the box with an ideal gas and the partition that can selectively open $E$ with the memory $M$, which notes the fact of gas particles separation. Call this connection $H \dashv K$, where $K : E \rightarrow M$. Using the transitivity of the Galois connection we obtain a new connection $HF \dashv GK$, i.e. the functor $GK : E \rightarrow D$ and the functor $HF$ in the opposite direction. Therefore a (physical) transition (endomorphism) $g : E \rightarrow E$ (of gas separation) is mapped into the memory $M$ and therefore to its implementation $D$ as $GKg$. See Fig. 2.2 for explanation. As long as we keep these systems Galois-Landauer connected, in the parts of physical systems any irreversible process induces the generation of the heat according to the second law of thermodynamics. This heat is visible in the connected system memory $M$ and its implementation $D$ as a heat generated during the erase of the memory, however it is generated by $D$ part of this connection.
3 Discussion

The Galois connection was originally invented to model the relationship between semantic and syntax [14] of mathematical theories - the relation between set of axioms and classes of models that implements such axioms. It is a great coincidence that the same structure is met in systems governed by entropy and describing realization/simulation of one system by the other. It can be understood in the terms that simulated system gives a set of axioms that have to be met and a simulation system is a model that is used to restore the behaviour of this simulated system.

There is also even more important interpretation in the view of the entropy as an information loss we have when we formulate a physical model from incomplete measurement data [17]. In this context this information loss is propagating via Landauer’s connection to the other related systems.

Likewise, from the Maxwell’s Demon example we observe that the Second Law of Thermodynamics propagates along the Landauer-Galois’ connection and for proper thermodynamical description of the system every connected parts have to considered together.

The Landauer’s connection and information interpretation of entropy have some connotation with MUH (Mathematical Universe Hypothesis) invented by Max Tegmark [23]. The observations in this paper may be a reminiscence of computational/information principles which our universe is based on. The Landauer’s connection can be relation between encoding physical laws and its ‘equivalence class of descriptions’ [23].

One of the basic questions that arise from the Landauer’s connection is if there are (ultimate) computations that are not connected with its physical realizations, or more generally, is every entropy system connected with some other entropy system, i.e. if we can group every entropy systems in pairs without no one left out.

From the above connection some insight on the black hole entropy and information loss after crossing the event horizon could be anticipated when the realization of such information via the Landauer’s connection is taken into account. This deserves another paper.

4 Conclusions

In the paper it was shown that the well-known and experimentally confirmed Landauer’s principle is a reflection of a general connection between entropy systems, called the Galois connection. This connection was cast into systems where entropy exists naturally. The result of entropy-induced ordering was used to provide poset structure in such systems (defined as entropy systems) and this gives link between Galois connection and Landauer’s principle.
The original Landauer’s principle was restricted to the connected information-
physical systems, however, the general form of the Landauer’s connection presented
in this paper can be applied to every pair of systems in which there is entropy,
which, by its properties, induces poset structure.

In the discussion it was argued that this connection can be a reminiscence of
more fundamental principle which our universe is based on.
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A Appendix

The Appendix summarize the important facts from entropy theory of thermody-
ynamical systems (based on [15, 16]) and the definition and property of the Galois
connection (mainly following [21]).

A.1 Entropy and ordering in thermodynamics

This subsection presents the poset (pre-ordered set) structure constructed on the
state-space of thermodynamical system, however some parts are also valid for other
types of systems with entropy. We will closely follow [15, 16].

Thermodynamical system is associated with a point (equilibrium state) \(X\) in
the state-space \(\Gamma\). This space can be topologized and coordinates that describe
physical quantities like energy, volume etc. can be introduced, however we do not
need it for what follows (for details see [16]). Equilibrium state is attained when
system is left to itself.

Crucial operation that can be introduced on the thermodynamical system is the
scaling \(\Gamma^\lambda\) or for the state \(\lambda X\), which is an action of abelian multiplicative group
\(\lambda \in (\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}, \cdot)\) on the state-space. It fulfils composition law \((\Gamma^\lambda)\mu = \Gamma^{\lambda\mu}\) and
\(\mu(\lambda X) = (\mu\lambda)X\) with obvious unity \(\Gamma^1 = \Gamma\) and \(1X = X\). This scaling multiplies
extensive properties (coordinates) of the system and do not alter intensive ones. It
allows us to build bigger system from the small similar pieces. Similar construction
is a composition of two systems \(X \in \Gamma_1\) and \(Y \in \Gamma_2\) that is \((X,Y) \in \Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2\).

Adiabatic transition/process is a change of state which is done without influence
from outside of the system. It can occur abruptly or slow. This allows us to,
according to [15], to introduce partial ordering as follows: If \(Y\) can be reached by
adiabatic process (is adiabatically accessible) from the state \(X\) then we denote it as

\[X \preceq Y.\] (3)
We can define adiabatic equivalence (which is antisymmetry relation for \( \preceq \)) saying that \( X \) is adiabatically equivalent with \( Y \), in symbols \( X \sim Y \), if \( X \preceq Y \) and \( Y \preceq X \). The classes of equivalence are called adiabats. Obviously, there is reflexivity of \( \preceq \) since identity process is also an adiabatic process - system is in equilibrium.

If there is no symmetry between \( X \) and \( Y \) we say that \( X \precsim Y \) if \( X \not\preceq Y \) and \( Y \not\preceq X \). In this case the (isolated) transition between these states is called irreversible adiabatic process.

Two states are comparable if there is \( \preceq \) relation between them. Not every pair of states is comparable since, e.g., they have different chemical composition. In addition, the relation \( \preceq \) is transitive, i.e., if \( X \preceq Y \) and \( Y \preceq Z \) then \( X \preceq Z \). Reflexivity, antisymmetry and transitivity shows that the relation \( \preceq \) is a partial ordering on \( \Gamma \).

We want to transfer the ordering to the real line ordering and this can be done using the entropy function:

**Definition 5.** [15, 16] This reorder structure induces the entropy function which is a mapping \( S : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) that fulfils:

- **Monotonicity:** For any two comparable states \( X \) and \( Y \)
  \[ X \preceq Y \iff S(X) \leq S(Y); \] (4)

- **Additivity:** For two states \( X \) and \( Y \) the entropy of compound state \((X, Y)\) is
  \[ S(X, Y) = S(X) + S(Y); \] (5)

- **Extensivity:** For \( \lambda > 0 \) and a state \( X \)
  \[ S(\lambda X) = \lambda S(X). \] (6)

The properties of entropy allows us to transfer the relation \( \preceq \) to the \( \leq \) relation. Therefore the above definitions of processes can be rewritten as:

- **Reversible adiabatic process:**
  \[ X \sim Y \iff S(X) = S(Y); \] (7)

- **Irreversible adiabatic process:**
  \[ X \precsim Y \iff S(X) < S(Y). \] (8)

If in addition addition all states are comparable in state-space \( \Gamma \) (Comparison Hypothesis [15, 16]) then there exists unique up to affine transformation entropy that agrees with above properties of \( \preceq \) supplied with some additional conditions (see axioms A1-A6 of [15]). This property says that \( \preceq \) is total order on \( \Gamma \) and \( S \) function transfers total order on \( \Gamma \) to the total order on \( \mathbb{R} \). We will be assuming Comparison Hypothesis.

These ingredients are minimal for our purposes. The reader interested in full axiomatization of the entropy is refereed to [15, 16] and references therein.
A.2 Galois connection

Let us also recall the definition of the Galois connection between two posets following [21], and a few its properties from the vast literature on this subject and its various applications, e.g., [8 10 6 19 18 21].

First, the three definitions of functors that preserve ordering have to be given [21]. Let $C = (C, \preceq)$ and $D = (D, \sqsubseteq)$ are two poset$^3$ then the mapping (functor) $F : C \to D$ is

- a monotone if for any $x, y \in C$, if $x \preceq y$ then $Fx \sqsubseteq Fy$;
- an order-embedding if for all $x, y \in C$, $x \preceq y \iff Fx \sqsubseteq Fy$;
- an order-isomorphism iff $F$ is surjective order-embedding;

Next, following [21], Definition 116, the Galois connection is given as

**Definition 6.** [21] Suppose that $C = (C, \preceq)$ and $D = (D, \sqsubseteq)$ are two posets, and let $F : C \to D$ and $G : D \to C$ be a pair of functors such that for all $c \in C$, $d \in D$,

$$Fc \sqsubseteq d \iff c \preceq Gd. \quad (9)$$

Then $F$ and $G$ form a Galois connection between $C$ and $D$. When this holds, we write $F \dashv G$, and $F$ is said to be the left adjoint of $G$, and $G$ is right adjoint of $F$.

There is alternative to the condition to (9) given by (Theorem 144 of [21])

**Theorem 3.** [21] In the assumptions of Def. 6, $F \dashv G$ if and only if

1. $F$ and $G$ are both monotone, and
2. for all $c \in C$, $d \in D$, $c \preceq GFc$ and $FGd \sqsubseteq d$, and
3. $FGF = F$ and $GFG = G$.
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