arXiv:2001.05418v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 15 Jan 2020

Time-information uncertainty relations in thermodynamics

Schuyler B. Nicholson,[1,2] Luis Pedro García-Pintos,[3,4,5] Adolfo del Campo,[6,7,3] and Jason R. Green[1,2,3,*]

[1] *Department of Chemistry, University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, MA 02125*
[2] *Center for Quantum and Nonequilibrium Systems, University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, MA 02125*
[3] *Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, MA 02125*
[4] *Joint Center for Quantum Information and Computer Science, NIST/University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742*
[5] *Joint Quantum Institute, NIST/University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742*
[6] *Donostia International Physics Center, E-20018 San Sebastián, Spain*
[7] *IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, E-48013 Bilbao, Spain*

Physical systems that power motion and create structure in a fixed amount of time dissipate energy and produce entropy. Whether living or synthetic, systems performing these dynamic functions must balance dissipation and speed. Here, we show that rates of energy and entropy exchange are subject to a speed limit – a time-information uncertainty relation – imposed by the rates of change in the information content of the system. This uncertainty relation bounds the time that elapses before the change in a thermodynamic quantity has the same magnitude as its initial standard deviation. From this general bound, we establish a family of speed limits for heat, work, entropy production, and entropy flow depending on the experimental constraints on the system. In all of these inequalities, the time scale of transient dynamical fluctuations is universally bounded by the Fisher information. Moreover, they all have a mathematical form that mirrors the Mandelstam-Tamm version of the time-energy uncertainty relation in quantum mechanics. These bounds on the speed of arbitrary observables apply to transient systems away from thermodynamic equilibrium, independent of the physical assumptions about the stochastic dynamics or their function.

Many problems in science and engineering involve understanding how quickly a physical system transitions between distinguishable states and the energetic costs of advancing at a given speed. While theories such as thermodynamics and quantum mechanics put fundamental bounds on the dynamical evolution of physical systems, the form and function of the bounds differ. Take Clausius' version of the second law of thermodynamics [1]. It is an upper bound on the heat exchange in traversing equilibrium thermodynamics states–an inequality that limits the efficiency of heat engines without an explicit notion of time or fluctuations. By contrast, Mandelstam and Tamm's version of the time-energy uncertainty relation in quantum mechanics [2, 3] is a limit on the speed at which quantum systems can evolve between two distinguishable quantum states. Given this important, and longstanding, contrast between these two pillars of physics, we explore thermodynamic bounds that are analogous to those in quantum mechanics, bounds that are independent of the system dynamics [4–8] and set limits on the speed of energy and entropy exchange.

Thermodynamic uncertainty relations [9, 10] have been found where fluctuations in dynamical currents are bounded by the entropy production rate [5, 11–13]. These relations apply to small systems and are part of stochastic thermodynamics [14–18], a framework in which thermodynamic quantities, such as heat, work, and entropy, can be treated at the level of individual, fluctuating trajectories. In parallel to these discoveries, there have been advances in quantum-mechanical uncertainty relations or "speed limits" that constrain the speed at which dynamical variables evolve. They employ the mean [3], variance [2], or higher-order moments of the energy [19, 20]. These quantum speed limits have recently been generalized to open quantum systems embedded in an environment [21–24], paving the way to their application in the classical domain. The existence of speed limits, regardless of the classical or quantum nature of the system, was first pointed out by Margolus [20]. Only recently have analogous bounds been established in classical systems and applied to Liouville dynamics in phase space [25, 26] (also see related work [27, 28]). While there has been rapid progress on thermodynamic uncertainty relations [29], it remains to be seen whether there are speed limits in thermodynamics whose generality rivals those in quantum mechanics.

What governs the speed at which heat, work, and entropy are exchanged between a system and its surroundings? Is there a universal quantity that bounds the speed at which thermodynamic observables evolve away from equilibrium? Motivated by these questions, we derive a family of limits to the speed with which a system can pass between nonequilibrium states and the heat, work, and entropy exchanged in the process.

Equation of motion for thermodynamic observables

Let us consider a generic classical, physical system operating irreversibly, out of thermodynamic equilibrium. The stimulus for the time evolution of the physical system can be the removal of a constraint or the manipulation of an experimental control parameter λ, such as temperature or volume. As is common in stochastic thermodynamics [15], we adopt a mesoscopic description and

take the system to have a finite number of configurations $x = 1, 2, \ldots, N$ with initial probability $p_x(t_0)$. As currents in energy and matter cause the system to evolve, the probability distribution will generally differ from that of a Gibbsian ensemble. Our working assumption is that the dynamical evolution smoothly transforms the probability, $p_x[\lambda(t)] = p_x(t) = p_x$, of each state x at time t with a rate $\dot{p}_x = dp_x/dt$ [30].

During the nonequilibrium process, experimental measurements of an observable A for this classical system correspond to time-dependent statistical moments $\langle A^n \rangle = \sum_x^N p_x a_x^n$ of the configuration observables $a_x(t) = a_x$. The Shannon entropy [31], for example, is the expectation value of the surprisal $I_x := -\ln p_x$, which measures the information gained by observing the system in state x. With these minimal specifications, our first main result is that the ensemble average of any observable A obeys an equation of motion,

$$\frac{d\langle A \rangle}{dt} = -\operatorname{cov}(A, \dot{I}) + \left\langle \frac{dA}{dt} \right\rangle . \tag{1}$$

The covariance measures the amount of linear correlation between A and the surprisal rate $\dot{I}_x = dI_x/dt$,

$$-\dot{\mathcal{A}} := \operatorname{cov}(\dot{I}, A) = \big\langle (A - \langle A \rangle)(\dot{I} - \langle \dot{I} \rangle) \big\rangle . \tag{2}$$

This evolution law makes no additional physical or modeling assumptions and holds for general processes away from thermodynamic equilibrium (see proof in Supplementary Material, SM. I).

Another form of the evolution equation for energy is well-known in stochastic thermodynamics. For a system with a finite number of energy states, $a_x = \epsilon_x$, it is the stochastic first law, $\dot{U} = d\langle \epsilon \rangle/dt = \dot{Q} + \dot{W}$ [16]. Comparing the first law to our result gives a statistical representation for the flux of work, $\langle d\epsilon/dt \rangle$, and the flux of heat, $\dot{Q} = \sum_x^N \dot{p}_x \delta\epsilon_x = -\operatorname{cov}(\dot{I}, \epsilon)$, where we have shifted the energy scale: $\delta\epsilon_x := \epsilon_x - U$. Thus, we find a new definition of energy exchanged between a system and its surroundings as heat: heat flux is a measure of the linear correlation between energy and information rates. While the covariance measures the linear relationship between random variables, it applies even when $\dot{I}_x$ and ϵ_x are nonlinearly related. Any observable satisfying $\sum_x^N \dot{p}_x a_x$, such as the entropy rate $\dot{S}$, can be expressed as this covariance.

The mathematical form of Eq. (1) is strikingly similar to the Ehrenfest theorem in quantum (classical) mechanics. Particularly important is that the covariance fulfills the role of the mean commutator (Poisson bracket) of a quantum (classical) mechanical observable and the quantum (classical) Hamiltonian [32]. For this broad class of classical stochastic systems, the surprisal rate, not the Hamiltonian, is the observable to which all others are compared. Given this analogy, we explore whether other relationships in quantum mechanics extend to classical, stochastic observables built on fluctuations and uncertainty.




FIG. 1. **Statistical distinguishability of thermodynamic observables.** As a result of an (a) underlying stochastic dynamics and probability distribution over configurations, an (b) observable A of a system evolves in time away from thermodynamic equilibrium. The distributions of A at two times are distinguishable when their standard deviations do not overlap. The time τ to reach a distinguishable state is when the path function $\mathcal{A}$ has the magnitude of one initial standard deviation ΔA.

Observable fluctuations and intrinsic speed

As the nonequilibrium dynamics of the system unfold, observables will fluctuate in time. Experimental measurements of these observables will then deviate from their mean $\delta a_x = a_x - \langle A \rangle$. The variance,

$$(\Delta A)^2 = \sum_x^N p_x \delta a_x^2, \tag{3}$$

is a measure of the uncertainty in the measurements. It also measures the distinguishability between two states of the observable A, Fig. (1). Two observable states are distinguishable in the sense used by Wootters [33] if the statistical distance between them is greater than their combined uncertainty: $\operatorname{dist}(A, A') \geq \Delta A + \Delta A'$ and $A \neq A'$.

From the equation of motion, changes in the state function $\Delta\langle A \rangle$ are the result of two path functions. One dynamical measure of the variation in A is the amount of time for the magnitude of the path function $\mathcal{A} = \int \dot{\mathcal{A}}\, dt$

to have the value of one standard deviation ΔA; heat, for example, is $Q = \int \dot{Q}\, dt$. This time is approximately:

$$|\mathcal{A}| = \left| \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\tau_{\mathcal{A}}} \dot{\mathcal{A}}\, dt \right| \approx |\dot{\mathcal{A}}|\, \tau_{\mathcal{A}} \approx \Delta A, \tag{4}$$

which suggests the definition of the intrinsic speed,

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{\mathcal{A}}} := \frac{|\dot{\mathcal{A}}|}{\Delta A} = \frac{|\mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, A)|}{\Delta A}, \tag{5}$$

for any dynamical variable A. Speed limits for quantum-mechanical observables define a time scale with a similar form [32]. However, in quantum mechanics, the second term $\langle d\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{QM}}/dt\rangle = 0$ is zero in the Ehrenfest equation of motion, which leads to the definition of a time scale in terms of the expectation value of the commutator, $\langle[\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{QM}}, \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{QM}}]\rangle$, a role played here by the covariance. Since, $\langle dA/dt\rangle$ does not have to be zero here, we instead define the time scale in terms of the covariance $\dot{\mathcal{A}} = -\,\mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, A)$.

Information fluctuations and intrinsic speed

The intrinsic speed of each observable A measures its sensitivity to changes in the distribution over configurations. To bound this speed for generic observables, it is natural to examine the time scale for the probability distribution to evolve to a distinguishable state [34]. There is evidence in both quantum [33, 35] and classical [36–38] settings that the square root of the Fisher information [39], $\sqrt{I_F}$, defines such a speed for time-varying probability distributions. The Fisher information parameterized by time is a measure of distance ds between neighboring distributions,

$$ds^2 = \sum_{i,j} \frac{d\lambda^i}{dt} g_{ij} \frac{d\lambda^j}{dt} dt^2 = I_F\, dt^2, \tag{6}$$

where the Fisher metric is

$$g_{ij} = \left\langle \frac{\partial \ln p_x}{\partial \lambda_i} \frac{\partial \ln p_x}{\partial \lambda_j} \right\rangle. \tag{7}$$

This statistical distance can be interpreted as a measure of the distinguishability between $p_x(t)$ and $p_x(t + dt)$ [33, 38]. Looking at the physical dimensions, $\sqrt{I_F}$ is a "speed" relating the dimensionless measure of distance ds and infinitesimal increment of time dt.

The Fisher information [39] is also a measure of fluctuations. It measures fluctuations in the surprisal rate, $\dot{I}_x = -d \ln p_x/dt$:

$$I_F := \sum_x^N p_x \left(\frac{d \ln p_x}{dt} \right)^2 = \Delta \dot{I}^2. \tag{8}$$

The surprisal rate fluctuates only for temporally-varying distributions, that is, only in systems out of thermodynamic equilibrium. By the dimensional analysis above, fluctuations in the information content, $1/\Delta\dot{I} = 1/\sqrt{I_F}$, set a time scale for the evolution of the probability distribution in systems out of equilibrium, $\tau := 1/\sqrt{I_F}$ [37, 40]. But, does this time scale provide a general bound on the speed at which nonequilibrium observables evolve?

Time-information uncertainty relation

In the quantum setting, the time variation of the mean value of an observable is subject to the Mandelstam-Tamm time-energy uncertainty relation [2]. Just as in the quantum-mechanical formalism, we can place bounds on the uncertainty in thermodynamic observables, regardless of the dynamical variable or the stochastic dynamical law governing the probability distribution over configurations. The fluctuations in A and $\dot{I}$ upper bound their covariance through the inequality:

$$|\dot{\mathcal{A}}| = |\mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, A)| \leq \Delta\dot{I} \Delta A. \tag{9}$$

This bound is an uncertainty relation for any observable A, set by fluctuations in the surprisal rate, $\Delta\dot{I} = \sqrt{I_F}$. Examples we will explore here include the fluxes of heat $\dot{Q}$, dissipated work $\dot{W}_{\mathrm{diss}}$, system entropy $\dot{S}$, entropy production $\dot{S}_i$, and entropy flow $\dot{S}_e$.

As an immediate consequence of this uncertainty relation, fluctuations in the surprisal rate are an upper bound on the speed of any dynamical variable,

$$\Delta\dot{I} \geq 1/\tau_{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{10}$$

Clearly, the Fisher information is intimately connected to the stochastic dynamics over configurations. And, in this classical uncertainty relation, $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta\dot{I} \geq 1$, it sets the time scale that bounds the time scale of all other dynamical quantities: A system out of thermodynamic equilibrium with a spread $\Delta\dot{I} = \sqrt{I_F}$ in surprisal rate takes a time of at least $\tau_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 1/\Delta\dot{I}$ for the path function $\mathcal{A}$ to have the value of one standard deviation ΔA. This time-information uncertainty relation assumes a differentiable distribution over a finite number of discrete states but it makes no model assumptions about the stochastic dynamics, the proximity to equilibrium, the size of the system, or the protocol driving the system out of equilibrium.

In this time-information uncertainty relation, as in the Mandelstam-Tamm's version of the time-energy uncertainty relation, $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the amount of time that elapses before $\mathcal{A}$ changes by one standard deviation in A. The inequality represents a bound that the spread in surprisal rates places on the time scale of measurable changes in the dynamical variables. The more concentrated the surprisal rates, the slower any observable A will change in time. For example, when the system is at equilibrium or in a nonequilibrium steady-state with a finite ΔA, the uncertainty in the surprisal rate vanishes, $\Delta\dot{I} = 0$. No matter what A is being considered, $|\dot{\mathcal{A}}| = 0$ and the

time scale $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}$ is infinite. Conversely, if any observable exhibits a rapid variation with time, then the distribution must have large fluctuations in the surprisal rates and a large Fisher information. For example, when the system is driven quickly through nonequilibrium states so that $|\dot{\mathcal{A}}| \to \infty$, the time scale $\tau_{\mathcal{A}} \to 0$. Accomplishing such an extreme change in the mean requires a corresponding change in the distribution and $\Delta\dot{I} \to \infty$.

These general results have particular physical significance within thermodynamics. Thermodynamics can be seen as having specific representations depending upon the experimental conditions, which set the natural variables and appropriate thermodynamic potential [1]. Here, we focus on the most fundamental representations and establish a family of time-information uncertainty relations.

Thermodynamic observables

I. Energy.

Energy transfer between a system and its surroundings can be divided into heat and work. The internal energy of a macrostate is $U = \sum_x^N p_x \epsilon_x$, where ϵ_x is the energy of state x. As we have seen, the stochastic first law [16], $\dot{U} = \dot{Q} + \dot{W}$, has the form of the evolution equation Eq. (1). The corresponding uncertainty relationship upper bounding the rate of heat exchange is:

$$|\dot{Q}| = |\mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, \epsilon)| \leq \Delta\dot{I}\,\Delta\epsilon, \tag{11}$$

where $\Delta\dot{I}$ and $\Delta\epsilon$ are the standard deviations in the surprisal rate and energy, respectively. At equilibrium, where $\dot{Q} = 0$ and $\dot{p}_x = 0\ \forall x$, the bound is trivially saturated. Away from stationary states, the product of information rate and energy fluctuations limit the rate at which energy can be absorbed or dissipated as heat.

If there is no work done on or by the system, then these fluctuations also bound the internal energy flux $\dot{U} = \dot{Q}$ and the time scale is the time required for the internal energy to change by a standard deviation in the energy fluctuations: $\Delta U = \Delta\langle\epsilon\rangle = \Delta\epsilon$.

If the energy fluctuations are fixed and of order $k_B T$, then the speed $\tau_Q^{-1} = |\dot{Q}|/k_B T$ is bounded by the fluctuations in surprisal rate, $\beta|\dot{Q}| \leq \Delta\dot{I}$. So, on the one hand, the more concentrated the surprisal rates are around a given value during the nonequilibrium process, the slower the maximum rate at which energy is exchanged as heat. On the other hand, higher rates of heat exchange are attainable only at the expense of a broader distribution of surprisal rates. Or, to put it simply, fluctuations in the surprisal rate constrain nonequilibrium heat flow.

II. Entropy.

An uncertainty relation for entropy exchange complements that for energy exchanged as heat. As the ensemble average of the surprisal, the Shannon entropy $S/k_B = -\sum_x^N p_x \ln p_x$ also satisfies the equation of motion, Eq. (1). Only the covariance term survives and the equation of motion becomes (SM. VI):

$$\dot{S}/k_B = -\sum_x^N \dot{p}_x \ln p_x = -\,\mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, I). \tag{12}$$

The rate of change of the entropy measures the linear correlation between the surprisal and its speed. Thus, the entropy rate,

$$|\dot{S}|/k_B \leq \Delta\dot{I}\,\Delta I, \tag{13}$$

is bounded by the spread in information-theoretic quantities, the surprisal and its rate of change. The intrinsic time scale $\tau_S = k_B \Delta I/|\dot{S}| \leq 1/\Delta\dot{I}$ measures the time needed for the Shannon entropy to change by one standard deviation in the surprisal fluctuations.

A common approach in nonequilibrium thermodynamics [41] is to divide the rate of entropy change for the system into the rate of entropy production internal to the system $\dot{S}_i$ (the irreversible entropy production rate) and the rate of entropy exchanged with the surroundings $\dot{S}_e$ (the entropy flow rate): $\dot{S} = \dot{S}_i + \dot{S}_e$. Given the Clausius inequality [1] and the positivity of the entropy production, $\dot{S}_i \geq 0$, it follows that $|\dot{S}_e|/k_B \leq \Delta\dot{I}\,\Delta I$ and $\dot{S}_i/k_B \leq \Delta\dot{I}\,\Delta I$.

III. Dissipated work.

The tendency of physical systems to increase entropy can be harnessed to do useful work. However, unless the process is thermodynamically reversible, some energy will be dissipated. For a system in contact with a heat bath at fixed temperature $T = 1/k_B\beta$, the nonequilibrium free energy is $F = U - \beta^{-1}S$ [15]. The rate of dissipated work or dissipated power, $\dot{W}_{\mathrm{diss}} = \dot{W} - \dot{F}$, also satisfies a time-information uncertainty relation.

Using our results for the fluxes of heat and entropy, the dissipated power,

$$\beta\dot{W}_{\mathrm{diss}} = \beta\,\mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, \epsilon) - \mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, I), \tag{14}$$

is the difference in the linear correlation of the information and the energy with $\dot{I}$. The time-information uncertainty relation is found using the triangle inequality and the Clausius inequality $|\dot{S}|/k_B \geq \beta|\dot{Q}|$:

$$\beta|\dot{W}_{\mathrm{diss}}| \leq |\dot{S}|/k_B + \beta|\dot{Q}| \leq 2\Delta\dot{I}\Delta I. \tag{15}$$

Again, the rate of change in the information content of the distribution is the reference for a thermodynamic observable.

Saturation of the uncertainty relation

A sufficient condition to saturate the uncertainty relation in Eq. (9), $|\dot{\mathcal{A}}| \leq \Delta\dot{I}\,\Delta A$, is a linear relationship between $\dot{I}$ and A (SM. III). A linear relationship between these variables implies the probability distribution is of

the form:

$$p_x(t) = \frac{1}{Z(t)} \exp\left[-\int_{t_0}^{t} (c_1 a_x + c_2) dt'\right], \qquad (16)$$

with constants c_1, c_2, and partition function $Z(t)$. That is, exponential probability distributions that are linear in the argument a_x saturate the uncertainty relation, even when they are time dependent.

As one example of a distribution that saturates the bound, consider a system in contact with a thermal bath of inverse temperature β. The equilibrium distribution of a configuration x is $p_x = e^{-\beta\epsilon_x}/Z$. If temperature is varied over time such that the Boltzmann form of the distribution is preserved, the uncertainty relations in the energy and entropy representations,

$$\beta\dot{Q} = -\beta\Delta\dot{I}\,\Delta\epsilon = \beta\dot{\beta}\Delta\epsilon^2 \qquad (17)$$

$$\dot{S}/k_B = -\Delta\dot{I}\,\Delta I = \beta\dot{\beta}\Delta\epsilon^2. \qquad (18)$$

give $\dot{S}/k_B = \beta\dot{Q}$, the well known definition of the thermodynamic entropy and the lower bound of the Clausius inequality for reversible processes [1].

When the bound saturates, the evolution of the system is operating at the speed limit. The intrinsic time for the observable is equal to the time scale set by the Fisher information, i.e., $\tau = \tau_A$. For the specific case considered here:

$$\tau = \frac{1}{\Delta\dot{I}} = \frac{1}{|\dot{\beta}|\Delta\epsilon} = \frac{\Delta\epsilon}{|\dot{Q}|} = \tau_Q. \qquad (19)$$

The time for the heat to evolve by one energy fluctuation is exactly the time it takes the distribution to evolve to a distinguishable state. These time scales are also equal to the intrinsic speed of the entropy $\tau_S = k_B\Delta I/|\dot{S}| = \tau = \tau_Q$. A quasistatic process is then one whose thermodynamic time scales are equivalent to the statistical time scale τ. For this special driving protocol, the rate of change in the inverse temperature is precisely the heat flow relative to the energy fluctuations: $|\dot{\beta}| = |\dot{Q}|/\Delta\epsilon^2$. As we show next, though, even complicated dynamics can nearly saturate the uncertainty bound.




FIG. 2. **Illustration of time-information uncertainty relation and speed limit for a model of driven assembly of monomeric units.** (a) Periodic protocol for the temperature. (b) Probability of misassembled (grey) and optimally assembled (blue) states as a function of time. (c) Heat flux as a function of time (blue) bounded by $\pm\Delta\dot{I}\Delta\epsilon$ (dashed). (d) Speed of the heat exchanged as a function of time (blue) is tightly bounded by the speed limit time set by the Fisher information (dashed).

Model systems

To illustrate our results, we numerically solved a model for nonequilibrium self-assembly under periodic driving of the temperature, thermal relaxation, and thermal annealing (SM. VII). The analytical solution of a two-state model is shown in SM. V.

The self-assembly model we chose [42] allows us to analyze the energy exchanged as heat during an assembly process under arbitrary protocols. The system can be found in three possible states x: dissociated monomeric units, misbound aggregates, and an optimally bound configuration, which will be denoted by x_1, x_2, and x_3, respectively. Initially the system consists purely of monomers. As the system evolves, the temperature is changed according to a given protocol and monomers transition into the assembled states. Despite the simplicity of the model, the dynamics captures the competition between kinetic trapping and binding strength, a phenomenon also exhibited in more complicated models, such as those for chaperonin proteins [42].

We take the dynamics to be the master equation, $\dot{p}(t) = \Omega(t)p(t)$. The rate matrix Ω has non-negative off-diagonal elements and satisfies $\Omega_{xx}(t) = -\sum_{x\neq y}\Omega_{xy}(t)$, which guarantees conservation of probability. Its ele-

ments,

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} -c(M+1) & \alpha & \alpha^2 \\ cM & -\alpha & 0 \\ c & 0 & -\alpha^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{20}$$

include a concentration-like variable $c = 0.02$, the number of possible misbound states $M = 5$, and $\alpha = \exp(-\epsilon_b/2T)$, a function of the binding strength $\epsilon_b = 0.1$ and the temperature T with $k_B = 1$.

Consider a periodic variation of the temperature over time, Fig. (2a), with $T(t) = \gamma_1 \cos(t) + \gamma_2$, with $\gamma_1 = 0.25$ and $\gamma_2 = 0.32$ to keep the temperature in the range used in Ref. [42]. As a result of this driving protocol, the probability of occupying the misbound state and optimally bound states also oscillate in time, Fig. (2b). The probability of observing the monomer state also oscillates after a brief decay for the initial value of $p_1(t_0) = 1$.

From our numerical solutions of this model, the product of the energy fluctuations and intrinsic speed $\pm\Delta\dot{I}\Delta\epsilon = \pm\Delta\epsilon/\tau$ (dashed line) provide upper and lower bounds to the heat flux, $\dot{Q}$. The heat flux oscillates between, and closely follows, the bounds, Fig. (2c). The instantaneous speed of heat exchange τ_Q during the driving protocol closely follows the maximum $1/\tau$, except where the probabilities cross an inflection point, Fig. (2d). At these points where $\dot{Q} = 0$, the speed is zero, while the limiting speed remains positive. The time-information uncertainty relation and associated speed limit also hold when the system undergoes thermal relaxation and thermal annealing, SM. VII. The speed limit for entropy is also confirmed by these calculations, SM. VI. Overall, this simple model illustrates that our uncertainty bounds apply to thermodynamic observables under general nonequilibrium conditions.

Conclusions

According to thermodynamics, every natural process faces the physical principle that structure formation or useful work production at a particular speed comes at a cost: entropy production, energy dissipated as heat, and wasted free energy. Here, we have shown that these thermodynamic costs are restricted by fluctuations and satisfy a time-information uncertainty relation. The mathematical form of this relation is similar to the Mandelstam-Tamm version of the time-energy uncertainty relation, a significant milestone in quantum mechanics. Because our formalism similarly requires few details about the model system or the experimental conditions, we expect it to be applicable to a broad range of physical and (bio)chemical systems. With no assumption about the underlying model dynamics or external driving protocol, it can also be applied to any nonequilibrium process with a differentiable probability distribution. The uncertainty relations we derived for the flux of heat, entropy (both its production and its flow), and the dissipated power demonstrate that the time scale of their dynamical fluctuations away from equilibrium are all bounded by the fluctuations in information rates. So, in sum, while away from equilibrium, natural processes must also trade the thermodynamic costs incurred for the speed of their evolution.

We acknowledge support from the U.S. Army Research Laboratory and the U.S. Army Research Office under grant number W911NF-14-1-0359 and the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1856250. This work is further supported by the John Templeton Foundation, UMass Boston Project No. P20150000029279, DOE Grant No. DE-SC0019515, AFOSR MURI project "Scalable Certification of Quantum Computing Devices and Networks", DoE ASCR Quantum Testbed Pathfinder program (award No. DE-SC0019040), DoE BES QIS program (award No. DE-SC0019449), DoE ASCR FAR-QC (award No. DE-SC0020312), NSF PFCQC program, AFOSR, ARO MURI, ARL CDQI, and NSF PFC at JQI.

* jason.green@umb.edu

[1] H. B. Callen, *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics*, 2nd ed. (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1985).
[2] L. Mandelstam and I. Tamm, J. Phys. (USSR) **9**, 249 (1945).
[3] N. Margolus and L. B. Levitin, Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena **120**, 188 (1998).
[4] P. Pietzonka and U. Seifert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 190602 (2018).
[5] T. R. Gingrich, J. M. Horowitz, N. Perunov, and J. L. England, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 120601 (2016).
[6] S. B. Nicholson, A. del Campo, and J. R. Green, Phys. Rev. E **98**, 032106 (2018).
[7] A. C. Barato, R. Chetrite, A. Faggionato, and D. D. Gabrielli, New Journal of Physics **20**, 103023 (2018).
[8] A. Dechant, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **52**, 035001 (2018).
[9] J. Uffink and J. van Lith, Found. Phys. **29**, 655 (1999).
[10] F. Schlögl, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **49**, 679 (1988).
[11] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 158101 (2015).
[12] P. Pietzonka, F. Ritort, and U. Seifert, Phys. Rev. E **96**, 012101 (2017).
[13] C. Maes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 160601 (2017).
[14] C. Jarzynski, Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys. **2**, 329 (2011).
[15] U. Seifert, Rep. Prog. Phys. **75**, 126001 (2012).
[16] C. V. den Broeck and M. Esposito, Physica A **418**, 6 (2015).
[17] A. B. Boyd and D. M. J. P. Crutchfield, New J. Phys. **18**, 023049 (2016).
[18] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, Nonequilibrium Statistical Physics of Small Systems: Fluctuation Relations and Beyond, ed. by R. Klages, W. Just, C. Jarzynski (Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 2012) (2013).
[19] B. Zieliński and M. Zych, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 034301 (2006).
[20] N. Margolus, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:1109.4994 (2011),

arXiv:1109.4994 [quant-ph].
[21] M. M. Taddei, B. M. Escher, L. Davidovich, and R. L. de Matos Filho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 050402 (2013).
[22] A. del Campo, I. L. Egusquiza, M. B. Plenio, and S. F. Huelga, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 050403 (2013).
[23] S. Deffner and E. Lutz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 010402 (2013).
[24] L. P. García-Pintos and A. del Campo, New Journal of Physics **21**, 033012 (2019).
[25] B. Shanahan, A. Chenu, N. Margolus, and A. del Campo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 070401 (2018).
[26] M. Okuyama and M. Ohzeki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 070402 (2018).
[27] K. Takahashi and M. Ohzeki, Phys. Rev. E **93**, 012129 (2016).
[28] N. Shiraishi, K. Funo, and K. Saito, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 070601 (2018).
[29] J. M. Horowitz and T. R. Gingrich, Nature Physics , 1 (2019).
[30] All quantities are time dependent unless explicitly indicated otherwise.
[31] C. E. Shannon, The Bell System Technical Journal **27**, 623 (1948).
[32] A. Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. 1 (North-Holland, 1961).
[33] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 357 (1981).
[34] P. Salamon and R. S. Berry, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1127 (1983); P. Salamon, J. D. Nulton, and R. S. Berry, J. Chem. Phys. **82**, 2433 (1985).
[35] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3439 (1994).
[36] G. E. Crooks, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 100602 (2007).
[37] S. W. Flynn, H. C. Zhao, and J. R. Green, J. Chem. Phys. **141**, 104107 (2014); J. W. Nichols, S. W. Flynn, and J. R. Green, J. Chem. Phys. **142**, 064113 (2015).
[38] J. Heseltine and E. Kim, J. Phys. A **49**, 175002 (2016).
[39] B. R. Frieden, *Science from Fisher Information*, Vol. 2 (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
[40] E. Kim, U. Lee, J. Heseltine, and R. Hollerbach, Phys. Rev. E **93**, 062127 (2016).
[41] S. R. D. Groot and P. Mazur, *Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics*, Vol. 1 (Dover, 1984).
[42] J. Grant, R. L. Jack, and S. Whitelam, J. Chem. Phys. **135**, 214505 (2011).

SUPPLEMENTAL

Sections **I-IV** contain proofs of results in the main text. We suppress the time dependence in our notation (e.g., $p_x(t) = p_x$).

I. Equation of motion: The surprisal rate is defined as $\dot{I}_x = -d\ln p_x/dt$. Its mean is zero,

$$-\langle \dot{I}\rangle = \sum_x^N p_x \frac{d\ln p_x}{dt} = \sum_x^N \frac{dp_x}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt}\sum_x^N p_x = 0, \quad (21)$$

as a consequence of the conservation of probability, $\sum_x^N p_x = 1$. Using these two facts, the equation of motion for the expectation value of an observable is

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\langle A\rangle &= -\langle \dot{I}A\rangle + \left\langle \frac{dA}{dt}\right\rangle \\ &= -\langle \dot{I}A\rangle + \langle \dot{I}\rangle\langle A\rangle + \left\langle \frac{dA}{dt}\right\rangle \\ &= -\operatorname{cov}(\dot{I}, A) + \left\langle \frac{dA}{dt}\right\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The final expression is Eq. (1) in the main text. A covariance of zero indicates two variables are uncorrelated. It does not necessarily mean that they are statistically independent, since random variables that are non-linearly related can also be uncorrelated.

II. Entropy rate as covariance: The Shannon entropy is the ensemble average

$$S/k_B = -\sum_x^N p_x \ln p_x = \langle -\ln p\rangle = \langle I\rangle \quad (23)$$

of the surprisal $I_x = -\ln p_x$. Using $\langle \dot{I}\rangle = 0$, its rate of change,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\dot{S}}{k_B} &= -\sum_x^N \dot{p}_x \ln p_x - \sum_x^N p_x \frac{d\ln p_x}{dt} \\ &= -\langle \dot{I}I\rangle + \langle \dot{I}\rangle\langle I\rangle \\ &= -\operatorname{cov}(\dot{I}, I), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

can be expressed as the (negative) covariance of the surprisal and the surprisal rate.

III. Saturation of the uncertainty bound: The covariance inequality for two random variables saturates when the random variables are linearly related. For completeness, we show this for $\dot{I}$ and A. Consider the standardized variables,

$$\dot{I}'_x = \frac{\dot{I}_x}{\Delta \dot{I}}, \qquad A'_x = \frac{A_x - \langle A\rangle}{\Delta A}.$$

The expectation and standard deviation of both standardized variables is, $\langle \dot{I}'\rangle = \langle A'\rangle = 0$ and $\Delta\dot{I}' = \Delta A' = 1$. Defining the correlation as $\operatorname{cov}(X,Y)/\Delta X\Delta Y$ and using the identity $\Delta(X-Y)^2 = \Delta(X)^2 + \Delta(Y)^2 - 2\operatorname{cov}(X,Y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\dot{I}' - A')^2 &= \Delta\dot{I}' + \Delta A' - 2\operatorname{cov}(\dot{I}', A') \\ &= 2[1-\rho(\dot{I}', A')] \\ &= 2[1-\rho(\dot{I}, A)]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The last line is a result of the fact that standardizing random variables does not change the correlation $\rho(X',Y') = \rho(X,Y)$. Thus, the condition $\rho(\dot{I}, A') = 1$ is equivalent to $\Delta(\dot{I}' - A')^2 = 0$. A zero variance means $\dot{I}'_x = A'_x$ with probability one. Taking the expectation of

$\dot{I}'_x - A_x$, we see that $\langle \dot{I}' - A' \rangle = 0$. As a result, $\dot{I}'_x = A'_x$ $\forall\, x$, or

$$\dot{I}_x = \frac{\Delta \dot{I}}{\Delta A} a_x - \frac{\Delta \dot{I}}{\Delta A} \langle A \rangle = c_1 a_x - c_2. \tag{26}$$

Using the definitions for τ_A, (Eq. (5) in the main text) and $\tau := 1/\sqrt{I_F}$, saturating the bounds implies that the time scales of the system and observable are equal, i.e., $|\dot{A}| = \Delta \dot{I} \Delta A \Rightarrow \tau = \tau_A$.

IV. Bounds for a time-dependent Boltzmann distribution: One example of a distribution that saturates the uncertainty bound is a system in thermal contact with a reservoir that has a controllable temperature $T(t) = T$ ($\beta = 1/k_B T$). The probability of being in state x with energy ϵ_x is $p_x = e^{-\beta \epsilon_x}/Z$.

Here we show that in both the energy and entropy representation the bound is saturated. The pertinent quantities are:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_x &= -\left(\dot{\beta}\epsilon_x + \frac{\dot{Z}}{Z}\right) p_x, & I_x &= \beta \epsilon_x + \ln Z, \\ \dot{I}_x &= \dot{\beta}\epsilon_x + \frac{\dot{Z}}{Z}, & S &= \beta U + \ln Z, \\ \dot{Z} &= -\dot{\beta} \sum_x \epsilon_x e^{-\beta \epsilon_x}, & \frac{\dot{Z}}{Z} &= -\dot{\beta} U. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Let us start with the heat flux,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{Q} &= \sum_x \dot{p}_x \delta \epsilon_x \\ &= -\sum_x \left(\dot{\beta} p_x \epsilon_x + p_x \frac{\dot{Z}}{Z}\right) \\ &= -\dot{\beta}\left(\sum_x p_x \epsilon_x^2 - U^2\right) \\ &= -\dot{\beta} \Delta \epsilon^2. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

The covariance of $\dot{I}$ and ϵ reads

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, \epsilon) &= \sum_x p_x \dot{I} \delta \epsilon_x \\ &= \sum_x p_x \dot{I} \epsilon_x - \sum_x p_x \dot{I}_x U \\ &= \sum_x p_x \epsilon_x \left(\dot{\beta}\epsilon_x + \frac{\dot{Z}}{Z}\right) \\ &= \dot{\beta}\left(\sum_x p_x \epsilon_x^2 - U \sum_x p_x \epsilon_x\right) \qquad (29) \\ &= \dot{\beta} \Delta \epsilon^2, \qquad (30) \end{aligned}$$

which is equal and of opposite sign to $\dot{Q}$ as claimed in the main text. We can arrive at the same result using Eq. (26). Starting with $c_1 = \Delta \dot{I}/\Delta A = \sqrt{I_F}/\Delta A$, the Fisher information equals

$$\begin{aligned} I_F &= \sum_x \frac{\dot{p}_x^2}{p_x} \\ &= \sum_x \frac{\left(\dot{\beta}\epsilon_x + \frac{\dot{Z}}{Z}\right)^2 p_x^2}{p_x} \\ &= \dot{\beta}^2 \sum_x p_x \left(\epsilon_x - U\right)^2 \\ &= \dot{\beta}^2 \Delta \epsilon^2. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

The second coefficient is $c_2 = \sqrt{I_F} U/\Delta\epsilon$, making the change in information $\dot{I}_x = \dot{\beta}\epsilon_x - \dot{Z}/Z$. The covariance with ϵ follows as above to again give $\mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, \epsilon) = \dot{\beta} \Delta \epsilon^2$.

Next, looking at $\dot{S}$, we see that for this exponential distribution

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{S}/k_B &= \sum_x \dot{p}_x \delta I_x \\ &= \sum_x \dot{p}_x \left(\beta \epsilon_x + \ln Z\right) \\ &= -\beta \sum_x \dot{p}_x \epsilon_x \\ &= \beta \dot{Q}, \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

recovers the equilibrium relationship between entropy and heat. Using Eq. (28) we also find that the change in entropy can be written as, $\dot{S} = -\beta \dot{\beta} \sigma_\epsilon^2$. The covariance between $\dot{I}$ and I,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, I) &= \sum_x p_x \dot{I} (I_x - S) \\ &= \beta \sum_x p_x \dot{I}_x \epsilon_x + \sum_x p_x \dot{I}_x \ln Z - \sum_x p_x \dot{I}_x S \\ &= \beta \sum_x p_x \dot{I}_x \epsilon_x \\ &= \beta \sum_x p_x \epsilon_x \left(\dot{\beta}\epsilon_x + \frac{\dot{Z}}{Z}\right) \\ &= \beta \dot{\beta} \Delta \epsilon^2, \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

confirms that $\dot{S} = -\,\mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, I)$. Finally, looking at the right hand side of the entropic uncertainty relation, we have the fluctuations in the surprisal

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta I^2 &= \sum_x p_x (I - S)^2 \\ &= \sum_x p_x (\beta \epsilon_x + \ln Z - \beta U - \ln Z)^2 \\ &= \beta^2 \Delta \epsilon^2, \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$




FIG. 3. Irreversible relaxation of a two-state system to equilibrium. The intrinsic dynamical time scale $1/\sqrt{I_F}$ sets a limit (dashed) on the characteristic time scale of the entropy rate/production $\dot{S} = \dot{S}_i$ (solid blue). We use $k_{12} = k_{21} = 1$ so there is no entropy flow, $\dot{S}_e = 0$. As the system nears equilibrium, the time to reach new distinguishable states diverges and the speed goes to zero $1/\tau_I \to 0$. Inset: Relaxation of probability of each state (black) from $p_2 = 1$, $p_1(0) = 0$ and the current (gray) showing that the system is not at equilibrium.




FIG. 4. Temperature profiles used for annealing and heating. The annealing protocol (diamonds) goes from $T(0) = 0.1$ to $T(50) = 0.006$, while the heating protocol (circles) goes from $T(0) = 0.006$ to 0.1.

and the surprisal rate

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\dot{I}^2 &= \sum_x p_x \dot{I}^2 \\ &= \sum_x p_x \left(\dot{\beta}\epsilon_x + \frac{\dot{Z}}{Z}\right)^2 \\ &= \dot{\beta}^2(\langle\epsilon^2\rangle - U^2) \\ &= \dot{\beta}^2\Delta\epsilon^2. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Putting these results together, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}-\dot{Q} &= \dot{\beta}\Delta\epsilon^2 = \mathrm{cov}(\dot{I},\epsilon) = \Delta\dot{I}\Delta\epsilon, \\ -\dot{S} &= \beta\dot{\beta}\Delta\epsilon^2 = \mathrm{cov}(\dot{I}, I) = \Delta\dot{I}\Delta I. \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Sections **V-VII** contain additional results for model systems.

V. Two-state system: Let us analytically solve a simple two state system governed by master equation dynamics,

$$\frac{dp_1}{dt} = k_{21}p_2 - k_{12}p_1 \tag{37}$$

$$\frac{dp_2}{dt} = k_{12}p_1 - k_{21}p_1, \tag{38}$$

with rate coefficients $k_{12} = k_{1\to2}$ and $k_{21} = k_{2\to1}$. For time-independent k_{ij}, the solutions are:

$$p_1 = \frac{k_{21}}{k}\left[1 - e^{-kt}\right] + e^{-kt}p_1(0) \tag{39}$$

$$p_2 = 1 - p_1. \tag{40}$$

where $k = k_{21} + k_{12}$. In the limit $t \to \infty$, the probabilities of each state reach steady values $p_1^{\mathrm{eq}} = k_{21}/k$ and $p_2^{\mathrm{eq}} = k_{12}/k$. Together with the time derivatives,

$$\frac{dp_1}{dt} = -\frac{dp_2}{dt} = e^{-kt}\left[k_{21} - kp_1(0)\right] \tag{41}$$

we constructed the Fisher information, entropy rate, and fluctuations in surprisal rate. These quantities are shown as functions of time in Fig. 3 with $k_{12} = k_{21} = 1$ and initial conditions $p_1(0) = 0$, $p_2(0) = 1$. The Fisher information is

$$\Delta\dot{I} = I_F = \frac{(\dot{p}_1)^2}{p_1} + \frac{(\dot{p}_2)^2}{p_2} = \frac{(\dot{p}_1)^2}{p_1(1-p_1)}. \tag{42}$$

The entropy rate reads

$$\dot{S}/k_B = -\dot{p}_1 \ln p_1 - \dot{p}_2 \ln p_2. \tag{43}$$

The surprisal variance is

$$\Delta I = p_1(\ln p_1)^2 + p_2(\ln p_2)^2 - S^2. \tag{44}$$

As shown in the figure,

$$\frac{\Delta I}{|\dot{S}|/k_B} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{I_F}}. \tag{45}$$

Since $k_{12} = k_{21}$ in this example, the entropy flow $\dot{S}_e = 0$ and the speed limit is imposed on the entropy production: $\dot{S} = \dot{S}_i$.

VI. Entropy representation for periodically driven assembly: In the entropy representation, our time-information uncertainty relation is:

$$|\dot{S}| \leq \Delta\dot{I}\Delta I. \tag{46}$$




FIG. 5. (a) The change in entropy red line with its constituent parts, the entropy flow (blue line) and production (dark grey line). $\dot{S}$ closely follows the upper and lower bounds set by the uncertainty relation. The inset shows that while $\dot{S}$ always lies within the bounds the entropy flow can deviate. (b) the speed is close to the upper bound set by the Fisher information. The inset shows the speed for S in red and Q in blue. For this example, $1/\tau_S \geq 1/\tau_Q$.

We confirm this result using the same assembly model and periodic protocol for the temperature as in the main text, Eq. (4). The upper and lower bounds on $\dot{S}$ are shown in Fig. (5a). The entropy production (grey) and flow (blue) are also shown. The entropy rate switches between the positive and negative bounds over the time. The entropic speed $1/\tau_S$ also closely follows the maximum speed allowed by the fluctuations in the surprisal rate. Since both τ_S^{-1} and τ_Q^{-1} are bound by $1/\tau$, we can compare the speed of both representations. The inset to Fig. (5b) shows that τ_Q^{-1} (blue line) lies farther from the maximum speed than τ_S^{-1}.

VII. Annealing and heating of assembly process:

In addition to the periodic driving protocol used in the main text, we consider $\dot{Q}$ for both a heating and an annealing protocol. Given an initial temperature $T(t_0)$, we cool the system according to $T_c(t) = 2T(0) + \gamma_1 \operatorname{atan}(\gamma_2 - t)$, where we use $\gamma_1 = 0.1246$ and $\gamma_2 = -1.033$, which gives $T(0) = 0.1$ and $T(50) = 0.006$. To heat the assembling system, we swap the initial and final temperatures used in the annealing protocol: $T_h(t) = \gamma_1 \operatorname{atan}(\gamma_2 + t)$, where now $\gamma_1 = 0.0645$ and $\gamma_2 = 0.1033$. Both temperature protocols are shown in Fig. (4).

The probability of being in the monomer state (black line), misbound state (grey line) and optimally bound state (blue line) is shown in Fig. (6a). The heat flux $\dot{Q}$ is negative throughout and moves farther from the minimum bound. Panel (c) shows the time τ_Q instead of the speed $1/\tau_Q$, which begins near the speed limit time but deviates as the system approaches equilibrium.

Heating the system according to the second temperature protocol does not produce the same change in heat or the same bounds. This path dependent nature of heat flow is illustrated in Fig. (6e). Over time, the heat flux switches from negative to positive before being heavily constrained by the uncertainty bounds approaching zero as the distribution approaches a steady state. If we look at the minimum characteristic time τ_Q in panel (f), we see it diverges as $\dot{Q}$ crosses zero but otherwise closely follows the lower bound $1/I_F$.




FIG. 6. Probability of the monomer (black), misbound states (grey), and optimally bound (blue) as a function of time for the (a) annealing protocol and (d) heating protocol. (b) The uncertainty relation bounds (dashed lines) on the heat flux, $\dot{Q}$. (c) Both the speed limit time (dashed line) and the intrinsic time τ_Q grow as the system approaches equilibrium. (e) Using the heating protocol, the heat flux and uncertainty relation bounds are path dependent. The inset shows that $\dot{Q}$ crosses zero. (f) At $\dot{Q} = 0$, the time scale τ_Q diverges.