Stochastic thermodynamics with arbitrary interventions
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We extend the theory of stochastic thermodynamics in three directions: (i) instead of a continuously monitored system we consider measurements only at an arbitrary set of discrete times, (ii) we allow for imperfect measurements and incomplete information in the description, and (iii) we treat arbitrary manipulations (e.g. feedback control operations) which are allowed to depend on the entire measurement record. For this purpose we define for a driven system in contact with a single heat bath the four key thermodynamic quantities: internal energy, heat, work and entropy along a single ‘trajectory’ for a causal model. The first law at the trajectory level and the second law on average is verified. We highlight the special case of Bayesian or ‘bare’ measurements (incomplete information, but no average disturbance) which allows us to compare our theory with the literature and to derive a general inequality for the estimated free energy difference in Jarzynski-type experiments. As a mathematical tool, we prove a classical version of Stinespring’s dilation theorem, which might be of independent interest.

I. INTRODUCTION

Stochastic thermodynamics has become a very successful theory to describe the thermodynamics of small, fluctuating systems arbitrarily far from equilibrium and even along a single stochastic trajectory (see Refs. [1–6] for introductions and reviews). Its theoretical foundation rests on three pillars: (i) the system under study is continuously monitored, i.e. the time in between two observations is effectively zero; (ii) the system is perfectly measured, i.e. there is no uncertainty left in its state along a single trajectory; (iii) the system is only passively observed, i.e. no external interventions in form of disturbing measurements or feedback control operations are allowed.

To the best of the authors’ knowledge, no thorough study has been undertaken to overcome the first assumption, whereas a few interesting results have been obtained already to go beyond the second assumption, namely, incomplete information in the thermodynamic description of a stochastic system [7–13]. Beyond doubt, most progress has been achieved to incorporate feedback control, Maxwell’s demon and different sorts of information processing in the description (see Ref. [14] for an introduction).

We will show here how to overcome all three assumptions by following a recent proposal to build a consistent thermodynamic interpretation for a quantum stochastic process [15]. More precisely, for a system, which is possibly driven by an external time-dependent force and in contact with a single heat bath, we will equip a causal model with a consistent thermodynamic framework. Causal models extend the standard notion of stochastic processes where an external agent (e.g. the experimenter) is not only passively observing a system, but where she is also allowed, e.g. to actively intervene in the process. This allows for a much richer theory where correlation and causation can be distinguished [16]. We suggest to call our novel framework operational stochastic thermodynamics to emphasize the fact that, from the perspective of the external agent, the control operations performed on the system are the primary objects of interest. Here, the notion ‘control operation’ is used in a wide sense and includes measurements, state preparations and feedback control operations, among other things.

We note that first steps to combine stochastic thermodynamics and causal models have been already undertaken by Ito and Sagawa [17, 18]. There, stochastic thermodynamics was established for Bayesian networks, which are a particular representation of a causal model (here we will use a different one). A detailed comparison with their framework is postponed to later on.

Outline: As our framework requires to extend the usual notion of stochastic processes, Section II gives a brief self-contained introduction to the mathematical theory needed in the following including a classical version of Stinespring’s theorem. Section III then establishes the thermodynamic description of a causal model along a single trajectory and on average. The special case of non-disturbing measurements, which is conventionally studied in the literature, is considered in Section IV. Finally, we conclude with some remarks in Section V.

II. MATHEMATICAL PRELIMINARIES

In classical physics, it is customary to assume that a system can be perfectly observed without disturbing it. If we label the elementary states of a physical system by $x$, then – by measuring the system at an arbitrary set of discrete times $t_n > \cdots > t_1$ – we can infer the joint probability distribution $P(x_n, \ldots, x_1)$ of finding the particle in state $x_n, \ldots, x_1$ at the respective times $t_n, \ldots, t_1$. The assumption of a non-disturbing measurement implies the
consistency condition

\[ \sum_{x_k} P(x_n, \ldots, x_1, x_1) = P(x_n, \ldots, x_1), \tag{1} \]

where the joint probability on the right hand side is obtained by measuring the system only at the times \( t_n > \cdots > t_{k+1} > t_{k-1} > \cdots > t_1 \) (i.e. there is no measurement at time \( t_k \)). Based on this consistency condition, the Daniell-Kolmogorov extension theorem guarantees that there is an underlying continuous time stochastic process which generates the joint probabilities \( P(x_n, \ldots, x_1) \) as its marginals. This is the foundational cornerstone for the theory of stochastic processes, which allows to bridge the discrepancy between experimental reality (where always only a finite amount of measurement data is available) and its theoretical description (where the mathematical description is usually provided in form of a differential equation, say a master equation).

In reality, however, an experimenter usually also influences a physical system. This can happen actively for a number of different reasons, e.g. to manipulate a system via feedback control, to prepare a certain state of the system, or to learn something about the process by unravelling its causal structure (for instance, to test the effect of a certain drug in a clinical trial one usually splits the patients into two groups: those who receive the drug and those who receive only placebos). The experimenter can also inactively influence a physical system, for instance, when the measurement adds an unwanted amount of noise to the system, which does not vanish on average. All those examples violate in general the consistency condition (1).

In Section II A, we will review how to describe an arbitrary intervention or control operation performed at a single time. A causal model can then be seen as a set of control operations applied at different times to the system. This can be formally represented by different means and we will here briefly review the process tensor’ in Section II B: see Refs. [19–21] for more details for quantum systems. Finally, for our thermodynamic analysis it will be important that each control operation can be represented in terms of more primitive operations in a larger space. Quantum mechanically, this representation is provided by Stinespring’s theorem and in Section II C we will provide a classical analogue of it.

### A. Control operations

As emphasized above, we view the terminology control operation here in a broad sense, as any possible allowed state transformation applied to a physical system. The only requirement is that each control operation respects the statistical interpretation of the theory.

Before we come to the most general case, it is convenient to review Bayes’ theorem, which describes the limiting case of a ‘bare measurement’. By this we mean a measurement which is non-disturbing on average but not necessarily perfect. Let \( p_x(t_n^+) \) be the probability to find the system in state \( x \in X \) (we will here consider for definiteness only a finite state space \( X \)) prior to the measurement at time \( t_n \) (in general, by \( t_n^+ \) we will denote the time just before or after time \( t_n \)). Furthermore, let \( P(r_n|x) \) be the conditional probability to obtain result \( r_n \) in the measurement given that the system is in state \( x \). The conditional state of the system after the measurement is then determined by Bayes’ rule,

\[ p_x(t_n^+, r_n) = \frac{P(r_n|x)p_x(t_n^+)}{P(r_n)}, \tag{2} \]

where the normalization factor \( P(r_n) = \sum_x P(r_n|x)p_x(t_n^+) \) denotes the probability to obtain result \( r_n \). Thus, whereas our state of knowledge changes along a single trajectory, i.e. \( p_x(t_n^+, r_n) \neq p_x(t_n^-) \), it does not change on average:

\[ p_x(t_n^+) = \sum_{r_n} P(r_n)p_x(t_n^+, r_n) = p_x(t_n^-). \tag{3} \]

This is the essence of a non-disturbing measurement.

In turns out to be possible to generalize the above picture to the case where the classical control operation also changes the state of the system on average. This generalized description is indeed very close to quantum measurement theory [22]. For this purpose it is convenient to introduce the notion of a non-normalized system state \( p_x(t_n^+, r_n) \), which allows to rewrite Bayes’ rule as

\[ \tilde{p}_x(t_n^+, r_n) = \sum_{r_n} A_{x,x'}(r_n)p_{x'}(t_n^+). \tag{4} \]

Here, in accordance with the notation used below, we have introduced the matrix \( A(r_n) \) with entries \( A_{x,x'}(r_n) = \delta_{x,x'}P(r_n|x) \). In terms of the vectors \( \tilde{p}(t_n^+, r_n) \) and \( \tilde{p}(t_n^-) \) with entries \( \tilde{p}_x(t_n^+, r_n) \) and \( \tilde{p}_x(t_n^-) \), respectively, the above can be compactly expressed as

\[ \tilde{p}(t_n^+, r_n) = A(r_n)\tilde{p}(t_n^-). \]

The only difference compared to Eq. (2) is then the missing normalization factor \( P(r_n) \). This, in fact, implies that Eq. (4) is linear with respect to the initial state of the system \( p_x(t_n^+, r_n) \), which turns out to be convenient from a mathematical as well as numerical perspective. Furthermore, this step is of no harm, as the normalization factor is encoded in the non-normalized state by noting that

\[ P(r_n) = \sum_r \tilde{p}_x(t_n^+, r_n) = tr\tilde{p}(t_n^+, r_n), \]

introducing the probability sum operator (‘trace’) \( \tau \).

By generalizing this picture, every possible intervention will be described by a set of matrices \( \{ A(r_n) = [A_{x,x'}(r_n)] \} \), which we call control operations. Each matrix \( A(r_n) \) describes the action of the experimenter based on a (generalized) measurement result \( r_n \) according to Eq. (4). To preserve the positivity of the unnormalized state, every control operation is required to satisfy \( A_{x,x'}(r_n) \geq 0 \), but it does no longer need to be diagonal. Moreover, the average effect of the control operation is described by a single matrix \( A \equiv \sum_r A(r_n), \)
i.e. \( p(t_n^+) = A p(t_n^-) \), because

\[
p_x(t_n^+) = \sum_{r_n} P(r_n)p_x(t_n^+, r_n) = \sum_{x'} A_{x,x'} p_{x'}(t_n^-). \tag{5}
\]

To preserve the statistical interpretation of the theory, \( A \) is required to be a stochastic matrix (meaning that each column is also normalized: \( \sum_{x'} A_{x,x'} = 1 \) for all \( x' \)). This describes the most general state transformation at the ensemble averaged level. Note that, in general, \( p_x(t_n^+) \neq p_x(t_n^-) \).

Hence, to conclude, classical systems which are described by probability vectors can be manipulated by an arbitrary set of positive matrices \( \{A(r_n)\} \) with the sole requirement that they sum up to a stochastic matrix \( A \equiv \sum r_n A(r_n) \).

**B. Representation of a causal model in the form of the process tensor**

As for stochastic processes, we now allow the experimenter to intervene at an arbitrary discrete set of times \( t_n > \cdots > t_1 \), obtaining at each step some result \( r_k \), \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \). In the following we denote the entire sequence of measurement results by \( r_n = (r_n, \ldots, r_1) \). Given the outcome \( r_k \), we assume that the experimenter knows which control operation \( A(r_k) \) she has implemented at time \( t_k \). Moreover, we allow the experimenter to change her plan of interventions depending on the previous results \( r_{k-1} \) and thus, we will write \( A(r_k|r_{k-1}) \) for the chosen control operation. We will now briefly review how to describe such a process on a formal level, a more physical account can be also found at the beginning of Section III. The less mathematically inclined reader can therefore continue reading in Section II C.

We can define an object \( \mathcal{T} \), which describes the effect of the control operations on the system for a given measurement record \( r_n \) and which generalizes the joint probability \( P(x_n, \ldots, x_1) \) of a stochastic process. Similarly to its quantum counterpart [20], we call it the ‘process tensor’. Its variable inputs are the control operations themselves (and not the initial state of the system) and the output is the unnormalized state of the system conditioned on the measurement record. Formally,

\[
\mathcal{P}(t_n^+, r_n) = \mathcal{T}[A(r_n|r_{n-1}), \ldots, A(r_2|r_1), A(r_1)], \tag{6}
\]

where we used the boldface notation \( \mathcal{P} \) from before for the entire probability vector. The probability to obtain outcomes \( r_n \) is given by \( P(r_n) = \tau \mathcal{P}(t_n^+; r_n) = \sum_x \mathcal{P}(t_n^+; r_n) \). Furthermore, the process tensor is linear in each of its entries, so it is well-defined by measuring the multi-time statistics for a linearly independent set of control operations. Unfortunately, this tomographic reconstruction scales quite unfavourably with the number of discrete times involved (if the system has \( d \) states, then we need to statistically reconstruct \( d^{Dn} \) different events in principle). Hence, as for standard stochastic processes, the process tensor will often remain a formal object which can be easier accessed given appropriate theoretical input. Nevertheless, the process tensor contains all possible multi-time probabilities as well as all marginals for any possible set of control operations. In addition, it is possible to prove a generalized extension theorem for it and to show that its construction is equivalent to providing a causal model [21].

Thus, in a nutshell, the process tensor \( \mathcal{T} \) generalizes the notion of the joint probability \( P(x_n, \ldots, x_1) \) of a stochastic process by moving one dimension higher: instead of outputting a number based on bare measurements [which can be represented by measurement ‘vectors’, cf. Eq. (2)], it outputs a vector based on a set of matrices, which describe generalized interventions of an external agent.

**C. A classical version of Stinespring’s theorem**

This paper aims at providing a minimal, but consistent thermodynamic description for an arbitrary set of control operations. Obviously, as the control operations can be any possible state transformation, the resulting framework will on the most general level appear quite abstract. For instance, it is a priori not clear how to split the energetic changes caused by the action of some control operation \( A(r) \) into work and heat. We will see that the following theorem helps us fix this issue, based only on the knowledge of \( A(r) \). Clearly, if additional knowledge about the experiment is available, telling us how the control operations are generated physically (knowledge which we assume not to have here), the present description should not necessarily be taken literally.

Moreover, we believe that the following theorem could be also useful for other applications. It tells us that any stochastic dynamics always arises from a reversible evolution in a larger space about which we have incomplete information. It is now commonly known as Stinespring’s theorem [23], but – to the best of our knowledge – there is no precise corresponding classical statement in the literature. We stress that the theorem, despite its similarity, does not automatically follow from its quantum version.

**Theorem II.1.** Every stochastic matrix \( A : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \) can be represented as

\[
A p = ((\text{id} \otimes \tau) \circ \Pi) p \otimes q,
\]

where \( q \in \mathbb{R}^D \) is a probability vector with a dimension \( D \leq d(d^2 - d + 1) \) and \( \Pi : \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^D \to \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^D \) is a permutation matrix. Recall that \( \tau \) is the marginal (‘trace’) operator. In terms of the matrix elements, the above equation expands to

\[
A_{x,x'} = \sum_{y,y'=1}^{D} \Pi_{x,y,x'y} q_{y'}.
\]

Moreover, for an arbitrary decomposition of \( A \) into a set of control operations, \( A(r) \) such that \( A_{x,x'}(r) \geq 0 \) for all
where $B(r)$ describes the effect of a bare measurement: all $B(r)$ are diagonal, non-negative matrices, whose sum is the identity matrix. The permutation matrix $P$ completely positive and trace-preserving (cptp) map. In tum mechanically, instead of using a stochastic matrix, classical with the quantum version of the theorem. Quantum mechanically, instead of using a stochastic matrix, one describes the dissipative evolution of a system by a completely positive and trace-preserving (cptp) map. In the extended system-ancilla space, $P$ becomes a unitary matrix and the dimension $D$ can be fixed to be $d^2$ (where $d$ denotes the dimension of the system Hilbert space). Crucially, the initial state of the ancilla can be always chosen to be a pure state, in which case the minimum $D$ is the so-called Kraus rank of the cptp map, which coincides with the matrix rank of its Choi matrix. Especially the last point is in strong contrast to the classical version of the theorem, where a pure ancilla state can never suffice.

### III. OPERATIONAL STOCHASTIC THERMODYNAMICS

We now turn to the physical situation we wish to study and understand thermodynamically. We consider systems described by a finite set of states $\{x\}$, whose dynamics is described by a rate master equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} p_x(t) = \sum_{x',x} W_{x,x'}(\lambda_t) p_{x'}(t).$$

Here, $W(\lambda_t)$ is a rate matrix obeying $\sum_x W_{x,x'}(\lambda_t) = 0$ and $W_{x,x'}(\lambda_t) \geq 0$ for all $x \neq x'$. In terms of the probability vector $p(t)$, the above can be stated compactly as $\frac{d}{dt} p(t) = W(\lambda_t) p(t)$.

As evidenced in the notation, $W$ is allowed to depend on an external control parameter $\lambda_t$, which can change in time. Physically speaking, such a time-dependence arises from manipulating the free energy landscape of the system. To each state $x$ we will thus associate a (free) energy $E_x(\lambda_t)$. Furthermore, we assume that the rates satisfy local detailed balance,

$$\frac{W_{x,x'}(\lambda_t)}{W_{x',x}(\lambda_t)} = e^{-\beta[E_x(\lambda_t) - E_{x'}(\lambda_t)]},$$

where $\beta$ denotes the inverse temperature of the surrounding heat bath. This condition allows us to link energetic changes in the system to entropic changes in the bath. We define the following key thermodynamic quantities. First, the internal energy is

$$U(t) \equiv \sum_x E_x(\lambda_t)p_x(t) = E(\lambda_t) \cdot p(t),$$

which we have expressed as a scalar product for later convenience. Then, the heat flux and power are

$$\dot{Q}(t) \equiv E(\lambda_t) \cdot \frac{d p(t)}{dt},$$

$$\dot{W}(t) \equiv \frac{d E(\lambda_t)}{dt} \cdot p(t).$$

Finally, the system entropy is

$$S_{\text{Sh}}[p(t)] = S_{\text{Sh}} \{[p_x(t)]_x \} \equiv - \sum_x p_x(t) \ln p_x(t),$$

where $S_{\text{Sh}}$ denotes the Shannon entropy. This allows us to confirm the conventional first and second law of nonequilibrium thermodynamics:

$$\frac{d}{dt} U(t) = \dot{Q}(t) + \dot{W}(t),$$

$$\dot{\Sigma}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} S_{\text{Sh}}[p(t)] - \beta Q(t) \geq 0.$$
be explicitly modelled within our framework, no further ‘hidden’ knowledge is used. A ‘single trajectory’ is therefore defined by the sequence of measurement results $r_n$, which, in general, refers to a discrete set of times and can include arbitrary generalized measurements. Mathematically, we represent such a single trajectory as follows:

$$\tilde{p}(t_n^+, r_n) = \mathbb{T}[A(r_n|r_{n-1}), \ldots, A(r_2|r_1), A(r_1)]$$

(17)

$$= A(r_n|r_{n-1})T_{n,n-1} \ldots A(r_2|r_1)T_{2,1}A(r_1)p(t_1).$$

Here, $T_{k,j} \equiv T_k \exp[\int_{t_j}^{t_k} W(\lambda_t) dt]$ with the time-ordering operator $\mathbb{T}$ denotes the transition matrix from time $t_j$ to $t_k$ corresponding to the time evolution of the master equation (9). The initial state of the system is denoted by $p(t_1)$. The set of applied control operations is $\{A(r_n|r_{n-1}), \ldots, A(r_2|r_1), A(r_1)\}$, which give outcome $r_n$ at time $t_n$ and which are allowed to explicitly depend on all previous outcomes $r_{n-1}$. Furthermore, albeit implicit in the notation, we also allow the control protocol $\lambda_t = \lambda(t) \ (t \geq t_n)$ to depend on all previous measurement outcomes. Thus, we can treat all conceivable feedback scenarios within our framework. Finally, the object $\mathbb{T}$, which depends linearly on every control operation, is the ‘process tensor’ introduced in Section II B. Recall that the probability to measure the sequence $r_n$ is encoded in the unnormalized system state $\tilde{p}(t_n^+, r_n)$ via $P(r_n) = \sum_x \tilde{p}_x(t_n^+, r_n) = \mathbb{T}\tilde{p}(t_n^+, r_n)$.

The sole assumptions behind the dynamical description (17) are that the system as described by Eq. (9) is Markovian (this assumption can easily be lifted dynamically), and that the external agent effectively implements the control operations instantaneously, which ensures that she has full control over them. To derive a consistent thermodynamic interpretation for Eq. (9), we will use Theorem II.1 and model explicitly the stream of ancilla systems interacting sequentially with the system [24].

### A. First law

In between two control operations, the first law is simply given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} U(t, r_{n-1}) = \dot{Q}(t, r_{n-1}) + \dot{W}(t, r_{n-1}).$$

(18)

This is essentially Eq. (15), only that here we have explicitly emphasized that all quantities can depend on the entire measurement record $r_{n-1}$, either because the state at time $t_{n-1}$ or the control protocol $\lambda_t$ (or both) depend on it. This time-interval of validity, $t_{n-1} < t < t_n$, is unambiguously indicated by the index on the sequence $r_{n-1}$.

Through the control operation at time $t_n$, non-trivial changes may happen, as the internal energy can jump:

$$\Delta U^{ctrl}(r_n) = E(\lambda_t) \cdot \left[ \frac{A(r_n|r_{n-1})}{p(r_n|r_{n-1})} - \text{id} \right] p(t_n^-, r_{n-1}).$$

(19)

Notice that we are careful to use the normalized system state here. Hence, we needed to normalize the system state after the control operation by using the conditional probability $p(r_n|r_{n-1}) = p(r_n)/p(r_{n-1})$. To attribute to each control operation a meaningful heat and work, we make use of Theorem II.1. The representation (8), where the action of an arbitrary control operation is split into a reversible, deterministic part (the permutation matrix $\Pi$) and an irreversible, non-deterministic part (the bare measurement $B$), strongly suggest to associate changes caused by the first part as work and changes caused by the second part as heat [15, 25]. Here we follow this logic and define the work invested in the control operation as

$$W^{ctrl}(t_n, r_{n-1}) \equiv E(\lambda_t) \cdot \{ (\text{id} \otimes \tau) \circ \Pi \} p(t_n^-, r_{n-1}) \otimes q - p(t_n^+, r_{n-1})$$

(20)

This describes the change in system energy due to the reversible and deterministic permutation. Note that we suppressed in the notation that the choice of the ancilla state $q = q(r_{n-1})$ and of the permutation matrix $\Pi = \Pi(r_{n-1})$ can depend on previous measurement results $r_{n-1}$. However, due to causality they can not depend on the actual outcome $r_n$ obtained at time $t_n$, and therefore the work does not depend on it, either. In contrast, the heat injected during the control operation does depend on $r_n$:

$$Q^{ctrl}(t_n, r_n) = \Delta U^{ctrl}(r_n) - W^{ctrl}(t_n, r_{n-1}).$$

(21)

Whereas the heat contribution is non-negligible at the trajectory level, it vanishes on average:

$$\sum_{r_n} p(r_n|r_{n-1}) Q^{ctrl}(t_n, r_n) = 0.$$  

(22)

This can be confirmed by direct calculation. Thus, on average every control operation amounts to a work source, which reflects the fact that a control operation does not happen spontaneously, but requires an active intervention of the external agent. Finally, we remark that here we have assumed that the states $y$ of the ancilla are energetically neutral and thus do not contribute to the energy balance. This is indeed the conventional choice when considering Maxwell demon feedbacks, where – as we will see – the memory of the demon can be identified with the ancilla. The generalization to energetically non-neutral ancillas is straightforward [15] and will not be considered here.

To summarize, over an interval denoted by a superscript $(n)$, which starts at time $t_{n-1}^-$, just after the $(n-1)$-st control operation and ends at time $t_n^+$, just after the
The first term describes nothing but the remaining uncertainty about the state of the ancilla responsible for the measurement record \(r_{n-1}\) as we are working at the trajectory level:

\[
\dot{\Sigma}(t, r_{n-1}) = \frac{d}{dt} S_{\text{Sh}}[p(t, r_{n-1})] - \beta Q(t, r_{n-1}) \geq 0. \tag{24}
\]

Note that we evaluate the Shannon entropy with respect to the system state \(p(t, r_{n-1})\) conditioned on all previous observations \(r_{n-1}\).

In order to have a second law also during the control operation, it turns out to be important to redefine the entropy of the system, explicitly taking into account the external ancillas and the generated measurement record, too. In fact, as we allow our control protocol to depend on the entire measurement record, it is important to store also all available information about the past. Thus, let us denote by \(p_{x,y_n}(t, r_n)\) the joint probability, conditioned on \(r_n\), to find the system in state \(x\) and the stream of ancillas in state \(y_n = (y_n, \ldots, y_1)\), where \(y_k\) denotes the state of the ancilla responsible for the \(k\)-th control operation. Then, we define

\[
S(t, r_n) \equiv S_{\text{Sh}} \left\{ p_{x,y_n}(t, r_n) \right\}_{x,y_n} - \ln P(r_n). \tag{25}
\]

The first terms describes nothing but the remaining uncertainty about the system and ancilla state, which is quantified by the Shannon entropy, as usual. The second term describes the stochastic uncertainty left about the measurement outcomes \(r_n\). When averaged over the probability \(P(r_n)\) to obtain the results \(r_n\), it gives the usual Shannon entropy of the measurement outcomes. Notice that a similar construction is also used in conventional stochastic thermodynamics where the stochastic entropy is defined as \(-\ln p(x)\) with the probability \(p(x)\) to find the system in state \(x\) at time \(t\) [26]. Since we do not know the exact system state in general, we replace this expression by what we know exactly (the measurement record \(r_n\)) plus all the remaining uncertainty associated to the state \(p_{x,y_n}(t, r_n)\). It therefore appears quite natural to use definition (25) in the presence of incomplete information. Furthermore, we remark that the terms in Eq. (25) can often be simplified significantly. For instance, when the final measurement of the ancilla system is perfect, then the information content stored in all ancillas is identical to the information content of the measurement results because

\[
p_{x,y_n}(t, r_n) = p_x(t, r_n)\delta_{y_n,r_n} \ldots \delta_{y_1,r_1} \tag{26}
\]

for \(t > t_n\). For \(t_{n-1} < t < t_n\) instead, the state of the \(n\)-th ancilla is given by \(\{q_{y_n}\}_{y_n}\). Hence, the stochastic entropy can be simplified to \(S(t, r_n) = S_{\text{Sh}}[p(t, r_n)] - \ln P(r_n)\) if \(t > t_n\), and \(S(t, r_{n-1}) = S_{\text{Sh}}[p(t, r_{n-1})] + S_{\text{Sh}}[\{q_{y_n}\}_{y_n}] - \ln P(r_{n-1})\) if \(t_{n-1} < t < t_n\).

Having introduced a generalized notion for system entropy, we define the entropy production during the control step as

\[
\Sigma^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_n) \equiv \Delta S^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_n) - \beta Q^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_n), \quad (27)
\]

where \(\Delta S^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_n) \equiv S(t^+_n, r_n) - S(t^-_n, r_{n-1})\) denotes the change in entropy due to the control operation. It remains to be shown that this entropy production is positive on average, i.e.,

\[
\sum_{r_n} P(r_n|r_{n-1})\Sigma^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_n) \geq 0. \tag{28}
\]

This then implies \(\sum_{r_n} P(r_n)\Sigma^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_n) \geq 0\), too. To prove Eq. (28), we first notice that due to Eq. (22) and \(-\ln P(r_n) + \ln P(r_{n-1}) = \ln P(r_n|r_{n-1})\), we have

\[
\sum_{r_n} P(r_n|r_{n-1})\Sigma^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_n) = \sum_{r_n} P(r_n|r_{n-1})S_{\text{Sh}} \left\{ p_{x,y_n}(t^+_n, r_n) \right\}_{x,y_n} + S_{\text{Sh}} \left\{ P(r_n|r_{n-1}) \right\}_{r_n} - S_{\text{Sh}} \left\{ p_{x,y_n}(t^-_n, r_{n-1}) \right\}_{x,y_n}. \tag{29}
\]

We use Eqs. (7) and (8) to write the unnormalized state of the system and all ancillas after the control operation as

\[
\tilde{p}_{x,y_n}(t^+_n, r_n) = \frac{P(r_n|r_{n-1})p_{x,y_n}(t^+_n, r_n)}{\sum_{x',y_n'} B_{y_n,y_n}(r_n|r_{n-1})\Pi_{y_n,x',y_n'}(r_{n-1})p_{x',y_n'}(t^-_n, r_{n-1})} \tag{30}
\]

Note that both the permutation matrix \(\Pi\) and the bare measurement \(B(r_n)\) can depend on \(r_{n-1}\) if \(A_{r_n}\) depends.
on it. Now recall that the Shannon entropy is invariant under permutations and that the bare measurement in Eq. (30), when summed over the outcomes $r_n$, has no effect. Thus,

$$S_{Sh} \left[ \{p_{x,y_n}(t_n, r_{n-1}) \} \right]_{x,y_n} = S_{Sh} \left[ \left\{ \sum_{x', y_n'} \Pi_{x,y_n,x',y_n'}(r_{n-1})p_{x',y_n'}(t_{n-1}, r_{n-1}) \right\} \right]_{x,y_n} = S_{Sh} \left[ \left\{ \sum_{r_n} P(r_n | r_{n-1})p_{x,y_n}(t_n^+, r_n) \right\} \right]_{x,y_n}. \quad (31)$$

The term $P(r_n | r_{n-1})p_{x,y_n}(t_n^+, r_n)$ can be viewed as a joint probability distribution over the probability space of the system, the ancilla and the $n$-th measurement record. But for any bipartite probability distribution $S$ proved by noting that $S_{Sh}(\{p_o\}) \leq S_{Sh}(\{p_{ab}\})$. Hence, Eq. (28) is proved by noting that

$$S_{Sh} \left[ \{p_{x,y_n}(t_n, r_{n-1}) \} \right]_{x,y_n} \leq S_{Sh} \left[ \left\{ P(r_n | r_{n-1})p_{x,y_n}(t_n^+, r_n) \right\} \right]_{x,y_n, r_n} = S_{Sh} \left[ \left\{ P(r_n | r_{n-1}) \right\} \right]_{r_n} + \sum_{r_n} P(r_n | r_{n-1})S_{Sh} \left[ \left\{ p_{x,y_n}(t_n^+, r_n) \right\} \right]_{x,y_n}. \quad (32)$$

As for the first law (23), the stochastic entropy production during the control step and during the unperturbed evolution can now be concatenated to give

$$\Sigma^{(n)}(r_n) = S(t_n^+, r_n) - S(t_{n-1}^+, r_{n-1}) - \beta Q^{(n)}(r_n). \quad (33)$$

Thus, the stochastic entropy production has the same form as in traditional stochastic thermodynamics, but it now involves a redefined entropy and heat flow. Along a single trajectory, Eq. (33) can be negative, but on average it is always positive.\(^1\)

To summarize this entire section, we have introduced definitions for internal energy, heat, work, entropy, and entropy production along a single trajectory of causal models. These quantities satisfy the minimum requirements of any consistent theory of non-equilibrium thermodynamics: the first law holds at the trajectory level and the second law, with an entropy production related to entropy and heat in the usual way, holds on average.

\(^1\) Indeed, in Eq. (24) we can replace the Shannon entropy $S_{Sh}(p(t, r_n))$ with the entropy $S(t, r_n)$ defined in Eq. (25), and positivity still holds. This follows from the fact that the transition matrices $T_{xy}$ in Eq. (17) act only locally on the system, and hence can only decrease the correlations with the ancillas. Proving this statement follows identical steps as in Ref. [15].

\(^2\) As incomplete information can be handled in many very different ways, we do not make an attempt here to compare our framework in detail with any of those proposed in those references. However, it is worth emphasizing that while they all deal with some form of incomplete information, they do not allow any disturbing control operations. Thus, they fall into the class of “bare measurements”.

IV. THE CASE OF BARE MEASUREMENTS

We will now consider a subclass of problems, which can be treated within our framework and which is close to other approaches in the literature. This subclass consists of control operations which are bare measurements, i.e. simply updates of our state of knowledge according to Bayes’ rule (2). We still allow for imprecise measurements happening at arbitrary discrete times, thus we still have to deal with incomplete information similar to the situations considered in Refs. [7–13].\(^2\) Moreover, although we only observe the system, we still allow that the control protocol $\lambda_t$ can change depending on the measurement record (kept implicit in the notation, as before). Thus, we can still incorporate here the conventional feedback and Maxwell demon scenarios (see, e.g. Ref. [14]), which typically rely on conditioning $\lambda_t$ on the last measurement outcome obtained at a fixed pre-determined time. Moreover, we can also treat the complicated cases of real-time and time delayed feedback, where the external agent can adapt her control strategy during the run of an experiment and where $\lambda_t$ can depend for $t > t_n$ also on $r_{n-1}$ and not only on $r_n$. Progress in this direction was so far only achieved for model-specific studies [27–31], apart from the general framework of Ref. [17, 18] to which we will return below in Section IV D.

A. Stinespring’s theorem for bare measurements

One key insight of our framework was the need to model the control operations in a larger system-ancilla space. Hence, we will first construct this ancilla space for a bare measurement according to our Theorem III.1. We will see that in this case the ancilla can indeed be identified with the degrees of freedom of a physical memory.

We start by constructing a perfect measurement at an arbitrary time $t$ and add uncertainties later on. To this end, consider a $d$-dimensional ancilla with initial state $g_0 = \delta_{y,1}$ and the permutation matrix $\Pi_{x,y,x',y'} = \delta_{x,x'}\delta_{y,x'+y'-1}$, where the sum $x' + y' - 1$ is in general interpreted modulo $d$. Given an arbitrary initial system state $p_x(t^-)$, it is straightforward to confirm that the system-ancilla state after the permutation is $p_{xy}(t^+) = p_x(t^-)\delta_{y,x}$, i.e. it is perfectly correlated and has maximum mutual information given the marginal state $p_x(t^-)$. Finally, by applying a perfect measurement described by the matrix $B_{y,y'}(r) = \delta_{y,y'}\delta_{y,r}$, where
r ∈ \{1, \ldots, d\}, the post-measurement state of system and ancilla – given outcome r – reads \(p_{x\gamma}(t^+, r) = \delta_{x,r} \delta_{y,r}\).

Uncertainty can now be added in various ways: the ancilla could be initialized wrongly, we could choose a different permutation matrix or the final readout could be imperfect. Here we assume that the experimenter has complete control over the system-ancilla interaction and can read out the state of the ancilla perfectly. Thus, we consider only the case where the initial ancilla state contains uncertainty, i.e. \(q_y \neq \delta_{y,1}\).

### B. Discussion of the first and second law of thermodynamics

We start with the energetics during the measurement process. From the preceding section we can straightforwardly conclude that the work invested during the measurement, Eq. (20), must be 0, as we simply copy the system state to the ancilla and do not change the system: \(W^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_{n-1}) = 0\). The heat exchanged during the control operation can, however, fluctuate along a trajectory and take on non-zero values:

\[
Q^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_n) = E(\lambda_t) \cdot [p(t^+_n, r_n) - p(t^-_n, r_{n-1})].
\]  

That is, we interpret the random changes in energy caused by an update of our state of knowledge as heat, which only vanishes on average (similar to the ‘quantum heat’ in Ref. [25]).

The terminology ‘heat’ is justified at least in two limiting cases. The first case is a non-driven system, where any change in its internal energy is due to heat: for instance, if we have found a two-level system in state ‘0’ at time \(t_{n-1}\) and later at time \(t_n\) we find it in state ‘1’, then we know that at some time \(t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n)\) the system must have jumped from state ‘0’ to ‘1’ by receiving an amount of heat \(E_1 - E_0\). Combining Eq. (34) together with the average heat exchanged in between the two measurements [obtained by integrating Eq. (12)], we see that our definitions exactly reproduce this intuition. On the other hand, if the system is driven, it was shown in Ref. [15] that in the limit of a perfect and continuous measurements, we reproduce the conventional definitions of stochastic energetics [2, 4, 5], where the contribution (34) indeed plays an essential role and cannot be neglected. Obviously, when the system is driven and measured only at a finite set of discrete times, we are leaving the realm where we can meaningfully compare Eq. (34) with already established results, but we conjecture that also under these general circumstances it is justified to use the terminology ‘heat’. At least the way the term (34) appears in the first and second law strongly suggests it.

Next, we look at the second law during the control operation. We start with the change of stochastic entropy (25) during the control operation, which becomes

\[
\Delta S^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_n) = S_{Sh}[p(t^+_n, r_n)] - \ln P(r_n|r_{n-1}) - S_{Sh}[p(t^-_n, r_{n-1})] - S_{Sh}[q] - \beta Q^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_n).
\]  

Here, \(S_{Sh}[q] = S_{Sh}[(q_y)_y]\) denotes the entropy of the initial ancilla state before the measurement. We tacitly assume that we are always implementing the same measurement (in general, \(q_y\) could depend on \(t_n\) and \(r_{n-1}\)). Furthermore, due to the final perfect measurement of the ancilla, its entropy after the control operation is zero and on average coincides with \(S_{Sh}(\{P(r_n|r_{n-1})\}_{r_n})\) (i.e. the state of the ancillas after the measurements is identical to the measurement record \(r_n\)). The stochastic entropy production over an entire interval \((t_{n-1}, t_n)\) becomes

\[
\Sigma^{[n]}(r_n) = S_{Sh}[p(t^+_n, r_n)] - S_{Sh}[p(t^-_{n-1}, r_{n-1})] - \ln P(r_n|r_{n-1}) - S_{Sh}[q] - \beta Q^{[n]}(r_n).
\]

Summing up the stochastic entropy production over all intervals, we obtain

\[
\Sigma^{\text{tot}}(r_n) \equiv \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} \Sigma^{[\ell]}(r_{\ell}) = S_{Sh}[p(t^+_n, r_n)] - S_{Sh}[p(t^-_0, r_0)] - \ln P(r_n) - nS_{Sh}(\{q_y\}_y) - \beta Q^{\text{tot}}(r_n),
\]

where \(t_0 < t_1\) denotes some initial time prior to the first measurement and \(Q^{\text{tot}}(r_n) \equiv \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} Q^{[\ell]}(r_{\ell})\). If we combine this with the integrated first law,

\[
\Delta U^{\text{tot}}(r_n) \equiv \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} \Delta U^{[\ell]}(r_{\ell}) = Q^{\text{tot}}(r_n) + W^{\text{tot}}(r_n),
\]

and introduce the non-equilibrium free energy

\[
F(p) \equiv E(\lambda_t) \cdot p - TS_{Sh}[p]
\]

for an arbitrary distribution \(p\) of the system, we obtain

\[
\Sigma^{\text{tot}}(r_n) = \beta W^{\text{tot}}(r_n) - \ln P(r_n) - nS_{Sh}[q] - \beta \{F[p(t^+_n, r_n)] - F[p(t^-_0)]\}.
\]

On average, this yields the second law

\[
\Sigma^{\text{tot}} = \beta W^{\text{tot}} + S_{Sh}(\{P(r_n)\}_{r_n}) - nS_{Sh}[q] - \beta \left\{ \sum_{r_n} P(r_n) F[p(t^+_n, r_n)] - F[p(t^-_0)] \right\} \geq 0,
\]

where the missing explicit dependence on the trajectory \(r_n\) is used to denote the ensemble average, that is \(\Sigma^{\text{tot}} = \sum_{r_n} P(r_n)\Sigma^{\text{tot}}(r_n)\).

We can discuss the second law (41) also in view of other results in the literature. First, it is expressed in terms of
three competing terms with a transparent interpretation: the work injected into the system, the change of entropy of the external stream of ancillas, and the change in free energy of the system. Typically, in an experiment involving feedback control, one either tries to extract work or to maximize the free energy of the controlled system at the expense of generating information in a memory. This information generation is exactly captured by the term $S_{Sh}(\{P(r_n)\}, r_n) - nS_{Sh}[q]$. Our general second law is therefore very close to the ones derived using an external tape of bits as an information reservoir [32, 33] (see also Ref. [24]), whereas the mutual information [14] does not seem to play any role (compare also with the discussion in the next section). Furthermore, it is in general important to take into account the entire entropy $S_{Sh}(\{P(r_n)\}, r_n)$ of the measurement results including correlations, as also demonstrated in a recent experiment [34]. Nevertheless, there is also an important difference: the observer-dependent point of view including the measurement results including correlations, as also demonstrated in a recent experiment [34].

First, the derivation of fluctuation theorems relies on a perfectly observed system state and the microreservibility of the underlying Hamiltonian dynamics of the system and the heat bath. For the causal model considered here, which can deal with any amount of uncertainty and explicitly allows to include (subjective, observer-dependent) control operations in the description, there is no hope of deducing a physically meaningful fluctuation theorem in general – at least none which only depends on the information available in the measurement record $r_n$. Note that fluctuation theorems, as typically derived in the presence of feedback control [14], still rely on the ability to perfectly measure the system, compare also with the discussion in Ref. [11].

Second, there always exists a ‘formal’ fluctuation theorem, which we can derive by defining a suitable ‘backward’ or ‘time-reversed’ process. For this purpose, let $r_n^\dagger$ denote the sequence of measurement results $r_n$ in reverse order and let $Q(r_n^\dagger)$ be the probability to observe this sequence in the backward experiment, typically carried out by reversing the driving protocol $\lambda_t$. Then, given that $Q(r_n^\dagger) = 0$ only if $P(r_n) = 0$, we always have the trivial fluctuation theorem

$$\langle e^{-\tilde{S}(r_n)} \rangle_{r_n} = \sum_{r_n} P(r_n) e^{-\tilde{S}(r_n)} = 1,$$

if we define the ‘entropy production’

$$\tilde{S}(r_n) \equiv \ln \frac{P(r_n)}{Q(r_n^\dagger)}.$$  

While this quantity measures some asymmetry of the measurement statistics under time-reversal, there is no obvious connection of it to any thermodynamic quantity introduced above. Thus, outside the traditional limit of stochastic thermodynamics, Eq. (45) lacks any relation to a meaningful physical quantity and therefore, does not share the same status as the conventional fluctuation theorem [3–5].

Obviously, in the limit of a perfect and continuous bare measurement, our definitions allow to sample, e.g., the exact work statistics and derivations of fluctuation theorems can become possible again. Remarkably, even outside this limit we can derive a general inequality, which links the observed work statistics to the Jarzynski equality [35, 36]. Let us write the observed Jarzynski equality as

$$\langle e^{-\beta W(r_n)} \rangle_{r_n} \equiv e^{-\beta \Delta F_{\text{est}}},$$

where $\Delta F_{\text{est}}$ denotes the estimated free energy difference based on the available work statistics. Furthermore, let us denote by $\gamma$ a system trajectory obtained from a perfect continuous measurement such that [35, 36]

$$\langle e^{-\beta W(\gamma)} \rangle_{\gamma} = e^{-\beta \Delta F}.$$  

Finally, we introduce the conditional probability $P(\gamma|r_n)$ that the ‘true’ microscopic trajectory was $\gamma$ given that we
obtained the measurement record \( r_n \). Now, for bare measurements we can always view the observed work \( W(r_n) \) as resulting from a coarse-grained measurement of the true work \( W(\gamma) \), i.e.

\[
W(r_n) = \sum_{\gamma} W(\gamma) P(\gamma|r_n).
\]

Since the exponential function is convex, we can conclude that the estimated free energy and since the exponential function is actually strictly convex, we can conclude that the estimated free energy difference in any Jarzynski-type experiment always overestimates the true free energy difference: \( \Delta F_{\text{est}} > \Delta F \).

Particular estimates for the difference \( \Delta F_{\text{est}} - \Delta F \) are hard to compute in general, but were worked out for particular models in Refs. [10, 11].

\[
\Delta F_{\text{est}} \geq \Delta F.
\]

Hence, as any experiment involves measurement errors and since the exponential function is actually strictly convex, we can conclude that the estimated free energy difference in any Jarzynski-type experiment always overestimates the true free energy difference: \( \Delta F_{\text{est}} > \Delta F \). Particular estimates for the difference \( \Delta F_{\text{est}} - \Delta F \) are hard to compute in general, but were worked out for particular models in Refs. [10, 11].

D. Comparison with the framework of Ito & Sagawa

Stochastic thermodynamics of a causal model was already studied by Ito and Sagawa for so-called Bayesian networks [17, 18]. Here we will outline how to connect our description to a Bayesian network and we will briefly highlight a few key differences in the thermodynamic description. A thorough comparison, however, is beyond the scope of the present paper, as in its most general form both frameworks, the present one and the one of Refs. [17, 18], are quite involved.

Bayesian networks are a graphical representation of a probabilistic model, in which all random variables are specified by the nodes of the network and the conditional dependencies are represented by directed edges. Mathematically, a Bayesian network is thus given by a directed acyclic graph, which reflects the causal structure of the problem. Physically speaking, a directed acyclic graph corresponds to the fact that time ‘flows’ in one direction and no time-loops are possible. The Bayesian network is fully specified once the probability distribution of the input variables and the conditional probabilities for all edges are known.

For illustration, we depict the Bayesian network for two control operations in Fig. 1. It basically consists of three ‘layers’. The first layer describes the evolution of the system \( X \), where we used \( x^\pm \) to denote the state of the system at time \( t_i^\pm \). To control the operations at time \( t_i \), we use a second layer of auxiliary systems \( Y_i \) with states \( y^\pm \) (the ancillas). The final layer of observations by the external agent is described by the measurement results \( r_i \). Based on these measurement results, the external agent can decide to change the system evolution controlled by the protocol \( \lambda_i \) or to change the next control operation, or both. For simplicity, we depicted only two control operations in Fig. 1 because the density of arrows in the picture quickly becomes very large as all previous results are allowed to influence the future evolution and control operations. Thus, our framework can be formulated in terms of a Bayesian network and could be analysed using the tools of Refs. [17, 18], but there are also some essential differences in our setting and thermodynamic analysis.

First, Ito and Sagawa assume that the control protocol \( \lambda_i \) is constant in between two control operations and changes only in a step-wise fashion at the times \( t_i \). This seems to be an essential element in their formulation in order to derive the second law based on the concept of a ‘backward trajectory’, where transitions in the system state are required to be linked to entropy exchanges in the bath. Within our formalism we see that there is no need to assume that \( \lambda_i \) remains fixed in between two control operations. Moreover, Ito and Sagawa assume that any change in energy due to a transition in the system state is due to an entropy change in the bath, see for instance Eq. (4) in Ref. [17]. This, however, implies that they exclude the possibility of any deterministic changes in the state of the system due to an external control operation. In other words, the work invested in the control operation is always zero in their case, \( W^{\text{ctrl}}(t_n, r_{n-1}) = 0 \), and hence it seems reasonable to compare their framework with the ‘bare measurement’ case of our framework.

Also their thermodynamic conclusions are slightly different from ours. Apart from the already mentioned missing work contribution during the control step, our second laws are different, too. Instead of the change in entropy in the external stream of ancillas and the measurement record [cf. Eq. (41)], their second law contains the transfer entropy from the first layer (the system) to the second and third layer. The transfer entropy is an asymmetric, directed generalization of the mutual information concept [37], and therefore the second law derived in Refs. [17, 18] is closer in spirit to the second law of Ref. [14]. In our language, their second law corresponds to the case of an ‘uninformed’ agent as discussed at the
end of the previous section.

V. FINAL REMARKS

We have provided definitions for stochastic internal energy, heat, work and entropy, which can be computed by an external observer who can manipulate a small system with arbitrary instantaneous interventions and who has no access to any further information. While the definition of internal energy remained the same as usual, the non-trivial effect of the external interventions forced us to associate a novel notion of work [Eq. (20)] and heat [Eq. (21)] to it. Mathematically, we achieved this by using a classical version of Stinespring’s dilation theorem (Theorem II.1), and we ensured that we reproduce previous notions for already well-studied limiting cases. Hence, the first law at the trajectory level takes on the same form as usual and can reproduce the standard case of stochastic thermodynamics for a perfectly and continuously measured system [15].

In contrast to the internal energy, we had to redefine the notion of system entropy from the start [Eq. (25)]. Following the motto “information is physical” [38], we explicitly included the information generated by the measurements. We then showed that the stochastic entropy production – defined in the standard way as the change in (redefined) system entropy plus the change in entropy of the bath (which is proportional to the heat flow from it) – is positive on average for any set of external interventions. While we do not reproduce the standard notion of stochastic entropy [4, 5, 26] in the respective limit, our choice guarantees that there is no need to modify the second law in the presence of feedback control.

To summarize, the present paper puts forward a consistent framework of stochastic thermodynamics for an arbitrarily controlled system in contact with a single heat bath. Our causal model relies solely on the approximation that the external interventions are happening instantaneously. Therefore, from a foundational point of view, the three main open questions in stochastic thermodynamics seem to be: First, for which kind of setups does there exist a meaningful and measurable fluctuation theorem [7, 8, 10, 11]? Second, how to extend the present theory to multiple heat reservoirs [12, 13]? Third, can we relax the Markovian assumption underlying the very basic treatment in terms of the master equation (9) [39]?
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Appendix A: Proof of the classical Stinespring representation Theorem II.1

Our proof will be constructive and we start with the representation provided in Eq. (7). For this purpose we use the fact (see Ref. [40]) that every stochastic matrix $A$ can be decomposed as

$$A = \sum_{\xi=1}^{D} \lambda_{\xi} F^{(\xi)},$$

with $d \leq d^2 - d + 1$. Here, the $\lambda_{\xi}$ are probabilities (i.e. $\lambda_{\xi} \geq 0$ and $\sum_{\xi} \lambda_{\xi} = 1$) and $F^{(\xi)}$ are deterministic transition matrices. This means they are binary, $F^{(\xi)}_{x,x'} \in \{0, 1\}$, and they have exactly one ‘1’ in each column, otherwise all entries are 0. In general, $F^{(\xi)}$ is not invertible, but the set of invertible deterministic transition matrices coincides with the set of permutation matrices. Furthermore, we remark that the decomposition (A1) is in general not unique.

To prove Eq. (7), we notice that the matrix elements of every deterministic transition matrix can be expressed as $F^{(\xi)}_{x,x'} = \delta_{x', f_0(x')}$ where $f_0 : X \to X$ is a function on the state space $X = \{1, \ldots, d\}$ of the system, mapping $x' \in X$ to $x = f_0(x') \in X$, and $\delta_{x,x'}$ denotes the Kronecker delta. We now need to extend the set of functions $\{f_0\}$ to a single function $F$, which is invertible and defined on a larger space $X \times Y$ where $Y$ denotes the state space of the ancilla. A construction that achieves this is given by $Y = Z \times \Xi$, where $Z = \{1, \ldots, d\}$ can be regarded as a register to copy the state of $X$, and $\Xi = \{1, \ldots, d^2 - d + 1\}$ labels the different functions used in Eq. (A1). Then, we define

$$\Pi : X \times Z \times \Xi \ni (x, z, \xi) \mapsto (f_\xi(x), z-1, x, \xi) \in X \times Z \times \Xi,$$

where the summation in the first register is understood modulo $d$. This function is clearly invertible, hence it is a permutation: Namely, given $x$ and $\xi$, which are copied into the second and third register, we know $f_\xi(x)$ and from that we obtain $z$ from the first register. Hence, we can associate a permutation matrix to $\Pi$ which has elements

$$\Pi_{xz, x'z'\xi'} = \delta_{x', f_\xi(x')} + z'-1 \delta_{x, x'} \delta_{\xi, \xi'}. \tag{A3}$$

Finally, we choose the initial state of the environment to be $q_\xi = \delta_{z,1} \lambda_{\xi}$, which gives

$$\Pi_{xz, x'z'\xi} | q_{x'z'\xi} \rangle = \sum_{\xi} \delta_{x, f_\xi(x')} | q_{x'z'\xi} \rangle \lambda_{\xi} = \sum_{\xi} F^{(\xi)}_{x, x'} \lambda_{\xi}, \tag{A4}$$

as desired.

Next, to prove Eq. (8), we first of all note that any stochastic matrix $A$ can be decomposed into at most $d^2$ many different independent control operations $A(r)$ such that $A = \sum_r A(r)$. Any further control operation
must then be a linear combination of the previous operations and as any representation of a causal model, such as the process tensor in Eq. (6), is linear in the applied operations \(A(r)\), it suffices to consider \(d^2\) independent ones. Thus, we choose \(r\) to have two components, labeled \(r = (\bar{x}, \bar{x}')\), and consider the elementary control operations \(A(\bar{x}, \bar{x}')\) with elements

\[
A_{x,x'}(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') = \delta_{\bar{x},\bar{x}'} \delta_{x,x'} A_{x,x'}. \tag{A5}
\]

Any other decomposition of \(A\) into different control operations \(\bar{A}(r)\) can be obtained from the above decomposition via linear combination, i.e. \(\bar{A}(r) = \sum_{\bar{x},\bar{x}'} \mu_{\bar{x},\bar{x}'}(r) A(\bar{x}, \bar{x}')\), for some set of positive coefficients \(\{\mu_{\bar{x},\bar{x}'}(r)\}\) which satisfy \(\sum_r \mu_{\bar{x},\bar{x}'}(r) = 1\) for all \((\bar{x}, \bar{x}')\).

Now we construct the bare measurement matrix \(B_{y,y'}(\bar{x}, \bar{x}')\) for the elementary decomposition considered above. For this purpose, we introduce the subsets

\[
\Xi_{x,x'} = \{\xi \in \Xi \mid f_\xi(x') = x\} \subset \Xi. \tag{A6}
\]

These sets collect all \(\xi \in \Xi\) which map a chosen \(x'\) to a chosen \(x\). We then define the diagonal matrix \(B(r)\) via

\[
B_{\bar{x},\bar{x}'\bar{\xi}}(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') = \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_{x,x'}} \delta_{\bar{x},\bar{x}'} \delta_{x,x} \delta_{\bar{\xi},\bar{\xi}} \lambda_{\xi}. \tag{A7}
\]

Using the constructions for the permutation matrix \(\Pi\) and the probability vector \(q\) from above, we confirm that

\[
\sum_{y,y'} B_{y,y'}(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') \Pi_{xy,xy'} q_{y'} q' = \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_{x,x'}} \delta_{\bar{x},\bar{x}'} \delta_{x,x} \delta_{\bar{\xi},\bar{\xi}} \lambda_{\xi}. \tag{A8}
\]

On the other hand, by the definition of \(A(r)\) in Eq. (A5) and the decomposition (A1), we have

\[
A_{x,x'}(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') = \delta_{\bar{x},\bar{x}'} \delta_{x,x'} \sum_{\xi} \delta_{x,x} \lambda_{\xi} = \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_{x,x'}} \delta_{\bar{x},\bar{x}'} \delta_{x,x} \delta_{\bar{\xi},\bar{\xi}} \lambda_{\xi}. \tag{A9}
\]

Apart from the factor \(\delta_{\bar{x},\bar{x}'}\) this is identical to Eq. (A8). But this factor is actually redundant: once we know the input \(x' = \bar{x}'\), the output \(x\) is fixed because the sum is restricted to only those functions which map a given input \(\bar{x}'\) to a given output \(\bar{x}\). Hence, we have proven Eq. (8).

While the above construction is quite convenient, we emphasize that it is not necessarily optimal, in the sense that in general it will be possible to find a representation with an ancilla space of dimension \(D < d(d^2 - d + 1)\). In fact, all what we need to ensure when constructing the permutation matrix \(\Pi\) is that, for any given output state \(x \in X\) and any fixed decomposition (A1) into \(N \leq d^2 - d + 1\) deterministic transition matrices, the ancilla space \(Y\) has enough states to label which actual state \(x' \in X\) was mapped to \(x = f_\xi(x')\) for every possible \(\xi \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\). This would then allow us to construct an injection \(F : X \times \{1, \ldots, N\} \rightarrow X \times Y\), which we could extend to a bijection. Let us denote by \(|f_\xi^{-1}(x)|\) the number of elements in the preimage of \(x\) under \(f_\xi\).

Then, the state space \(Y\) must have dimension

\[
D = \max_x \sum_{\xi} |f_\xi^{-1}(x)| \geq N. \tag{A10}
\]

The latter inequality implies that the state space \(Y\) must have, for a fixed decomposition (A1), at least \(N\) elements.

To see this, consider the table of cardinalities \(M_{\xi,x} = |f_\xi^{-1}(x)|\).

Because every \(f_\xi\) is a function, every row must sum up to \(d\), i.e.

\[
\sum_{\xi} \sum_x M_{\xi,x} = \sum_x d = Nd.
\]

Then, \(D < N\) would yield a contradiction, hence \(D \geq N\). Finally, we have to keep in mind that the decomposition (A1) is not unique. Hence, the minimum dimension \(D_{\text{min}}\) of the ancilla space is obtained by minimizing over all possible decompositions, i.e.

\[
D_{\text{min}} = \min_{\{\xi\}} \max_x \sum_{\xi} |f_\xi^{-1}(x)|. \tag{A11}
\]

Let us exemplify this reasoning in the simplest possible case of \(A\) being a \(2 \times 2\) matrix, i.e. it describes a 1-bit channel. There are exactly four deterministic transition matrices: the identity, the bit-flip operation and the two matrices which map any input either to ‘0’ or to ‘1’, respectively. Any possible \(A\) can then be written as a convex combination of the invertible identity map, the invertible bit-flip and one (but only one) of the two other non-invertible maps. For the invertible maps we obviously have \(|f_\xi^{-1}(x)| = 1\) for every \(x\) and for any of the non-invertible maps we have \(\max_x |f_\xi^{-1}(x)| = 2\). Thus, we need at most \(D = 4 = d^2\) ancilla states for the case of the 1-bit channel. Unfortunately, evaluating Eq. (A11) for higher dimensions becomes hard very quickly.