

The nonequilibrium cost of accurate information processing

Giulio Chiribella,^{1,2,3,*} Fei Meng,^{1,4,†} Renato Renner,^{5,‡} and Man-Hong Yung^{4,6,§}

¹*QICI Quantum Information and Computation Initiative, Department of Computer Science,
The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong SAR, China*

²*Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford, UK*

³*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline St North, Waterloo, ON N2L 2Y5, Canada*

⁴*Department of Physics, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen 518055, China*

⁵*Institute for Theoretical Physics, ETH Zürich*

⁶*Shenzhen Key Laboratory of Quantum Science and Engineering, Shenzhen 518055, China*

Accurate information processing is crucial both in technology and in nature. To achieve it, any information processing system needs an initial supply of resources away from thermal equilibrium. Here we establish a fundamental limit on the accuracy achievable with a given amount of nonequilibrium resources. The limit applies to arbitrary information processing tasks and arbitrary information processing systems subject to the laws of quantum mechanics. It is easily computable and is expressed in terms of an entropic quantity, which we name reverse entropy, associated to a time reversal of the information processing task under consideration. The limit is achievable for all deterministic classical computations and for all their quantum extensions. As an application, we establish the optimal tradeoff between nonequilibrium and accuracy for the fundamental tasks of storing, transmitting, cloning, and erasing information. Our results set a target for the design of new devices approaching the ultimate efficiency limit, and provide a framework for demonstrating thermodynamical advantages of quantum devices over their classical counterparts.

INTRODUCTION

Many processes in nature depend on accurate processing of information. For example, the development of complex organisms relies on the accurate replication of the information contained in their DNA, which takes place with an error rate estimated to be less than one basis per billion [1].

At the fundamental level, information is stored into patterns that stand out from the thermal fluctuations of the surrounding environment [2, 3]. In order to achieve deviations from thermal equilibrium, any information processing machine needs an initial supply of systems in a non-thermal state [4, 5]. For example, an ideal copy machine for classical data requires at least a clean bit for every bit it copies [6–8]. For a general information processing task, a fundamental question is: what is the minimum amount of nonequilibrium needed to achieve a target level of accuracy? This question is especially prominent at the quantum scale, where many tasks cannot be achieved perfectly even in principle, as illustrated by the no-cloning theorem [9, 10].

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the interplay between quantum information and thermodynamics [11–13], motivated both by fundamental questions [14–18] and by the experimental realisation of new quantum devices [19–21]. Research in this area led to the development of resource-theoretic frameworks that can be used to study thermodynamics beyond the macroscopic limit [22–30]. These frameworks have been applied to characterise thermodynamically allowed state transitions, to evaluate the work cost of logical operations [31, 32] and to study information erasure and work

extraction in the quantum regime [33–35]. From a different perspective, relations between accuracy and entropy production have been investigated in the field of stochastic thermodynamics [36–40], referring to specific physical models such as classical Markovian systems in nonequilibrium steady states.

Here, we establish a fundamental tradeoff between accuracy and nonequilibrium, valid at the quantum scale and applicable to arbitrary information processing tasks. The main result is a limit on the accuracy, expressed in terms of an entropic quantity, which we call the reverse entropy, associated to a time reversal of the information processing task under consideration. The limit is attainable in a broad class of tasks, including all deterministic classical computations and all quantum extensions thereof. For the task of erasing quantum information, our limit provides, as a byproduct, the ultimate accuracy achievable with a given amount of work. For the tasks of storage, transmission, and cloning of quantum information, our results reveal a thermodynamic advantage of quantum setups over all classical setups that measure the input and generate their output based only on the measurement outcomes. In the cases of storage and transmission, we show that quantum machines can break the ultimate classical limit on the amount of work required to achieve a desired level of accuracy. This result enables the demonstration of work-efficient quantum memories and quantum communication systems outperforming all possible classical setups.

Our results establish a direct link between thermodynamic resources and the accuracy of information processing. They set an ideal target for the design of new devices, and provide a framework for demonstrating a thermodynamic advantage of quantum devices in funda-

mental tasks such as storing, copying, and transmitting information.

RESULTS

The nonequilibrium cost of accuracy. At the most basic level, the goal of information processing is to set up a desired relation between an input and an output. For example, a deterministic classical computation amounts to transforming a bit string x into another bit string $f(x)$, where f is a given function. In the quantum domain, information processing tasks are often associated to ideal state transformations $\rho_x \mapsto \rho'_x$, in which an input state described by a density operator ρ_x has to be converted into a target output state described by another density operator ρ'_x , where x is a parameter in some given set \mathcal{X} .

Since every realistic machine is subject to imperfections, the physical realisations of an ideal information processing task can have varying levels of accuracy. Operationally, the accuracy can be quantified by performing a test on the output of the machine and by assigning a score to the outcomes of the measurement. The resulting measure of accuracy is given by the expectation value of a suitable observable O_x , used to assess the closeness of the output to the target state ρ'_x . In the worst case over all possible inputs, the accuracy achieved in a given task \mathcal{T} has the expression $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) = \min_x \text{Tr}[O_x \mathcal{M}(\rho_x)]$, where \mathcal{M} is the quantum channel (completely positive trace-preserving map) describing the action of the machine. Here, the dependence of the input states ρ_x and output observables O_x on the parameter x is fully general, and includes in particular cases where multiple observables are tested for the same input state. The range of values for the function $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}$ depends on the choice of observables O_x : for example, if all the observables O_x are projectors, the range of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}$ will be included in the interval $[0, 1]$.

Accurate information processing generally requires an initial supply of systems away from equilibrium. The amount of nonequilibrium required to implement a given task can be rigorously quantified in a resource theoretic framework where Gibbs states are regarded as freely available, and the only operations that can be performed free of cost are those that transform Gibbs states into Gibbs states [28, 32]. These operations, known as Gibbs preserving, are the largest class of processes that maintain the condition of thermal equilibrium. The initial nonequilibrium resources can be represented in a canonical form by introducing an information battery [31, 32], consisting of an array of qubits with degenerate energy levels. The battery starts off with some qubits in a pure state (hereafter called the “clean qubits”), while all the remaining qubits are in the maximally mixed state. To implement the desired information processing task, the machine will operate jointly on the input system and on the information battery, as illustrated in Figure 1.




FIG. 1. The nonequilibrium cost of accuracy. A source generates a set of input states for an information processing machine. The machine uses an information battery (a supply of qubits initialised in a fixed pure state) and thermal fluctuations (a reservoir in the Gibbs state) to transform the input state ρ_x into an approximation of the ideal target state ρ'_x . Finally, the similarity between the output and the target states is assessed by a measurement. The number of pure qubits consumed by the machine is the nonequilibrium cost that needs to be paid in order to achieve the desired level of accuracy.

The number of clean qubits required by a machine is an important measure of efficiency, hereafter called the nonequilibrium cost. For a given quantum channel \mathcal{M} , the minimum nonequilibrium cost of any machine implementing channel \mathcal{M} (or some approximation thereof) has been evaluated in Refs. [31, 32]. Many information processing tasks, however, are not uniquely associated to a specific quantum channel: for example, most state transitions $\rho \mapsto \rho'$ can be implemented by infinitely many different quantum channels, which generally have different costs. When a task can be implemented perfectly by more than one quantum channel, the existing results do not identify, in general, the minimum nonequilibrium cost that has to be paid for a desired level of accuracy. Furthermore, there also exist information processing tasks, such as quantum cloning [9, 10], that cannot be perfectly achieved by any quantum channel. In these scenarios, it is important to establish a direct relation between the accuracy achieved in the given task and the minimum cost that has to be paid for that level of accuracy. Such a relation would provide a direct bridge between thermodynamics and abstract information processing, establishing a fundamental efficiency limit valid for all machines allowed by quantum mechanics.

In this paper we build concepts and methods for determining the nonequilibrium cost of accuracy in a way that depends only on the information processing task under consideration, and not on a specific quantum channel. Let us denote by $c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A)$ the nonequilibrium cost required for implementing a given channel \mathcal{M} on input states in the subspace specified by a

projector Π_A . We then define the nonequilibrium cost for achieving accuracy F in a task \mathcal{T} as $c_{\mathcal{T}}(F) := \min\{c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) \geq F\}$. Note that the specification of the input subspace is included in the task \mathcal{T} . In the following we focus on tasks where the input subspace is invariant under time evolution, namely $[\Pi_A, H_A] = 0$, where H_A is the Hamiltonian of the input system. Our main goal will be to evaluate $c_{\mathcal{T}}(F)$, the nonequilibrium cost of accuracy.

In Methods, we provide an exact expression for $c_{\mathcal{T}}(F)$. The expression involves a semidefinite program, which can be solved numerically for low dimensional systems, thus providing the exact tradeoff between nonequilibrium and accuracy. Still, brute-force optimisation is intractable for high dimensional systems. For this reason, it is crucial to have a computable bound that can be applied in a broader range of situations. The central result of the paper is a universal bound, valid for all quantum systems and to all information processing tasks: the bound reads

$$c_{\mathcal{T}}(F) \geq \kappa_{\mathcal{T}} + \log F, \quad (1)$$

where $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} := -\log F_{\max}^{\mathcal{T}_{\text{rev}}}$ is an entropic quantity, hereafter called the reverse entropy, and $F_{\max}^{\mathcal{T}_{\text{rev}}}$ is the maximum accuracy allowed by quantum mechanics to a time-reversed information processing task \mathcal{T}_{rev} , precisely defined in the following section (see Supplementary Note 1 for the derivation of Eq. (1)). Note that the reverse entropy is a monotonically decreasing function of $F_{\max}^{\mathcal{T}_{\text{rev}}}$, and becomes zero when the time-reversed task can be implemented with unit accuracy.

Eq. (1) can be equivalently formulated as a limit on the accuracy attainable with a given budget of nonequilibrium resources: for a given number of clean qubits c , the maximum achievable accuracy in the task \mathcal{T} , denoted by $F_{\mathcal{T}}(c) := \max\{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) \mid c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \leq c\}$, satisfies the bound

$$F_{\mathcal{T}}(c) \leq 2^{c - \kappa_{\mathcal{T}}}. \quad (2)$$

This bound represents an in-principle limit on the performance of every information processing machine. The bounds (1) and (2) are achievable in a number of tasks, and have profound implications that will be discussed in the following sections.

Time-reversed tasks and reverse entropy. Here we discuss the notion of time reversal of an information processing task. Let us start from the simplest scenario, involving transformations of a fully degenerate system into itself. For a state transformation task $\rho_x \mapsto \rho'_x$, we consider without loss of generality an accuracy measure where the observables O_x are positive operators, proportional to quantum states. We then define a time-reversed task \mathcal{T}_{rev} , where the role of the input states ρ_x and of the output observables O_x are exchanged. The accuracy of a generic channel \mathcal{M} in the

execution of the time-reversed task is specified by the reverse accuracy $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}_{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{M}) := \min_x \text{Tr}[\rho_x \mathcal{M}(O_x)]$. Maximising over all possible channels, we obtain $F_{\max}^{\mathcal{T}_{\text{rev}}}$ and define $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} = -\log F_{\max}^{\mathcal{T}_{\text{rev}}}$.

For systems with non-trivial energy spectrum, we define the time-reversed task in terms of a time reversal of quantum operations introduced by Crooks [41] and recently generalised in [42]. In the Gibbs preserving context, this time reversal exchanges states with observables, mapping Gibbs states into trivial observables (described by the identity matrix) and *vice-versa*. More generally, the time reversal maps the states ρ_x into the observables $\tilde{O}_x := \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_x \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and the observables O_x into the (unnormalised) states $\tilde{\rho}_x := \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}} O_x \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where Γ_A and Γ_B are the Gibbs states of the input and output systems, respectively. The reverse accuracy of a channel \mathcal{M} is then defined as $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}_{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{M}) := \min_x \text{Tr}[\tilde{O}_x \mathcal{M}(\tilde{\rho}_x)]$. In the Methods section, we show that the reverse entropy can be equivalently written as

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} = \max_{\mathbf{p}} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}}. \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{p} = (p_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ is a probability distribution, $\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}} = \sum_x p_x \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_x^T \Gamma_A^{-1/2} \otimes \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}} O_x \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is an operator acting on the tensor product of the input and output systems, ρ_x^T is the transpose of the density matrix ρ_x with respect to the energy eigenbasis, and $H_{\min}(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}} := -\log \min\{\text{Tr}[\Lambda_B] \mid (I_A \otimes \Lambda_B) \geq \omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}\}$ is the conditional min-entropy [43–45].

Crucially, the reverse entropy depends only on the task under consideration, and not on a specific quantum channel used to implement the task. In fact, the reverse entropy is well defined even for tasks that cannot be perfectly achieved by any quantum channel, as in the case of ideal quantum cloning, and even for tasks that are not formulated in terms of state transitions (see Methods).

To gain a better understanding of the reverse entropy, it is useful to evaluate it in some special cases. Consider the case of a classical deterministic computation, corresponding to the evaluation of a function $y = f(x)$. In this case the reverse entropy is

$$\kappa_f = D_{\max}(p_f \| g_B) \quad (4)$$

where $D_{\max}(p \| q) = \max_y p(y)/q(y)$ is the max Rényi divergence between two probability distributions $p(y)$ and $q(y)$ [46], $g_B(y)$ is Gibbs distribution for the output system, and $p_f(y)$ is the probability distribution of the random variable $y = f(x)$, when x is sampled from the Gibbs distribution (see Supplementary Note 2 for the derivation). Eq. (4) shows that the reverse entropy of a classical computation is a measure of how much the computation transforms thermal fluctuations into states that deviate from thermal equilibrium.

In the quantum case, however, physical limits to the execution of the time-reversed task can arise even with-

out any deviation from thermal equilibrium. Consider for example the transposition task $\rho_x \mapsto \rho_x^T$ [47–52], where x parametrises all the possible pure states of a quantum system. This transformation does not generate any deviation from equilibrium as it maps Gibbs states into Gibbs states. On the other hand, in the fully degenerate case the time-reversed task is still transposition, and perfect transposition is forbidden by the laws of quantum mechanics [47–52]. The maximum fidelity of an approximate transposition is $F_{\text{trans}} = 2/(d+1)$ for d -dimensional quantum systems, and therefore $\kappa_{\text{trans}} = \log[(d+1)/2]$.

Condition for achieving the limit. The appeal of the bounds (1) and (2) is that they are general and easy to use. But are they attainable? To discuss their attainability, it is important to first identify the parameter range in which these bounds are meaningful. First of all, the bound (1) is only meaningful when the desired accuracy does not exceed the maximum accuracy F_{max} allowed by the laws of physics for the task \mathcal{T} . Similarly, the bound (2) is only meaningful if the initial amount of nonequilibrium resources does not go below the smallest nonequilibrium cost of an arbitrary process acting on the given input subspace, hereafter denoted by c_{min} . By maximising the accuracy over all quantum channels with minimum cost c_{min} , we then obtain a minimum value F_{min} below which reducing the accuracy does not result in any reduction of the nonequilibrium cost.

We now provide a criterion that guarantees the attainability of the bounds (1) and (2) in the full interval $[F_{\text{min}}, F_{\text{max}}]$. Since the two bounds are equivalent to one another, we will focus on bound (1). The condition for attainability in the full interval $[F_{\text{min}}, F_{\text{max}}]$ is attainability at the maximum value F_{max} . As we will see in the rest of the paper, this condition is satisfied by a number of information processing tasks, notably including all classical computations and all quantum extensions thereof.

Theorem 1. *For every information processing task \mathcal{T} with $[\Pi_A, H_A] = 0$, if the bound (1) is attainable for a value of the accuracy F_0 , then it is attainable for every value of the accuracy in the interval $[F_{\text{min}}, F_0]$, with $F_{\text{min}} = 2^{c_{\text{min}} - \kappa_{\mathcal{T}}}$. In particular, if the bound is attainable for the maximum accuracy F_{max} , then it is attainable for every value of the accuracy in the interval $[F_{\text{min}}, F_{\text{max}}]$.*

In Supplementary Note 3 we prove the theorem by explicitly constructing a family of channels that achieve the bound (1).

By evaluating the nonequilibrium cost of specific quantum channels, one can prove the attainability of the bound (1) for a variety of different tasks. For example, the bound (1) is attainable for every deterministic classical computation. Moreover, it is achievable for every quantum extension of a classical computation: on Supplementary Note 4 we show that for every value of the accuracy, the nonequilibrium cost is the same for the

original classical computation and for its quantum extension, and therefore the achievability condition holds in both cases.

The nonequilibrium cost $c_{\mathcal{T}}(F)$ provides a fundamental lower bound to the amount of work that has to be invested in order to achieve accuracy F . Indeed, the minimum work cost of a specific channel \mathcal{M} , denoted by $W(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A)$ can be quantified by the minimum number of clean qubits needed to implement the process in a scheme like the one in Figure 1, with the only difference that Gibbs preserving operations are replaced by thermal operations, that is, operations resulting from a joint energy-preserving evolution of the system together with auxiliary systems in the Gibbs state [24, 25]. Since thermal operations are a proper subset of the Gibbs preserving operations [28], the restriction to thermal operations generally results into a larger number of clean qubits, and the work cost is lower bounded as $W(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \geq kT(\ln 2) c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A)$, where k is the Boltzmann constant and T is the temperature. By minimising both sides over all channels that achieve accuracy F , we then get the bound $W_{\mathcal{T}}(F) \geq kT(\ln 2) c_{\mathcal{T}}(F)$, where $W_{\mathcal{T}}(F) := \min\{W(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \mid F_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) \geq F\}$ is the minimum work cost that has to be paid in order to reach accuracy F .

The achievability of this bound is generally nontrivial, except for operations on fully degenerate classical systems, wherein the sets of thermal operations and Gibbs preserving maps coincide due to Birkhoff’s theorem [53]. Another example is the task of erasing quantum states, corresponding to the state transformation $\rho_x \mapsto |0\rangle\langle 0|$, where ρ_x is an arbitrary state and $|0\rangle$ is the ground state. In Supplementary Note 4, we show that the bound $W_{\text{erase}}(F) \geq kT \ln 2 c_{\text{erase}}(F)$ holds with the equality sign, and the minimum work cost of approximate erasure is given by

$$W_{\text{erase}}(F) = \Delta A + kT \ln F, \quad (5)$$

where ΔA is the difference between the free energy of the ground state and the free energy of the Gibbs state, and the equality holds for every value of F in the interval $[F_{\text{min}}, F_{\text{max}}]$, with $F_{\text{min}} = e^{-\Delta A/(kT)}$ and $F_{\text{max}} = 1$.

Nonequilibrium cost of classical cloning. Copying is the quintessential example of an information processing task taking place in nature, its accurate implementation being crucial for processes such as DNA replication. In the following, we will refer to the copying of classical information as classical cloning. In abstract terms, the classical cloning task is to transform N identical copies of a pure state picked from an orthonormal basis into $N' \geq N$ copies of the same state. Classically, this corresponds to the transformation $|x\rangle\langle x|^{\otimes N} \mapsto |x\rangle\langle x|^{\otimes N'}$, where x labels the vectors of an orthonormal basis. The reverse entropy can be computed from Eq. (4),




FIG. 2. **Maximum cloning fidelity for a given amount of nonequilibrium resources.** The optimal accuracy-nonequilibrium tradeoff is depicted for $1 \rightarrow 2$, $1 \rightarrow 3$, and $1 \rightarrow 4$ cloning machines. The fidelities for copying classical (red region) and quantum data (blue region) are limited by the same boundary curve, except that the fidelity for the task of copying quantum data cannot reach to 1 due to the no-cloning theorem.

which gives

$$\kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{C}} = \frac{\Delta N \Delta A_{\text{max}}}{kT \ln 2}, \quad (6)$$

where $\Delta N := N' - N$ the number of extra copies, and ΔA_{max} is the maximum difference between the free energy of a single-copy pure state and the free energy of the single-copy Gibbs state. Physically, $\kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{C}}$ coincides with the maximum amount of work needed to generate ΔN copies of a pure state from the thermal state [25].

Since cloning is a special case of a deterministic classical computation, the bound (1) is attainable, and the minimum nonequilibrium cost of classical cloning is

$$c_{\text{clon}}^{\text{C}}(F) = \frac{\Delta N \Delta A}{kT \ln 2} + \log F. \quad (7)$$

This result generalises seminal results by Landauer and Bennett on the thermodynamics of classical cloning [7, 54, 55], extending them from the ideal scenario to realistic settings where the copying process is approximate. For systems with fully degenerate energy levels, one also has the equality $W_{\text{clon}}^{\text{C}}(F) = kT (\ln 2) c_{\text{clon}}^{\text{C}}(F)$, which provides the minimum amount of work needed to replicate classical information with a target level of accuracy.

Nonequilibrium cost of quantum cloning. We now consider the task of approximately cloning quantum information [56]. The accuracy of quantum cloning is important both for foundational and practical reasons, as it is linked to the no signalling principle [57], to quantum cryptography [56], quantum metrology [58], and a variety of other quantum information tasks [59].

Here we consider arbitrary cloning tasks where the set of single-copy states includes all energy eigenstates. This includes in particular the task of universal quantum cloning [60–62], where the input states are arbitrary pure states. The reverse entropy of universal quantum cloning is at least as large as the reverse entropy of classical cloning: the bound $\kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{Q}} \geq \kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{C}}$ follows immediately from Eq. (3), by restricting the optimization to probability distributions that are concentrated on the eigenstates of the energy.

In Supplementary Note 5, we show that (i) the bound (1) is attainable for universal quantum cloning, and (ii) $\kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{Q}} = \kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{C}}$. These results imply that classical and quantum cloning exhibit exactly the same tradeoff between accuracy and nonequilibrium: for every value of the accuracy, the minimum nonequilibrium cost of information replication is given by Eq. (7) both in the classical and in the quantum case. In terms of accuracy/nonequilibrium tradeoff, the only difference between classical and quantum cloning is that the classical tradeoff curve goes all the way up to unit fidelity, while the quantum tradeoff curve stops at a maximum fidelity, which is strictly smaller than 1 due to the no-cloning theorem [9, 10].

Considering the differences between quantum and classical cloning, the fact that these two tasks share the same tradeoff curve is quite striking. An insight into this phenomenon comes from connection between the nonequilibrium cost and the time-reversed task of cloning. For fully degenerate systems, the time-reversed task is to transform N' copies of a state into $N \leq N'$ copies of the same state, and in both cases it can be realised by discarding $N' - N$ systems. The reverse accuracy of this task is the same for both classical and quantum systems, and so is the reverse entropy. In the non-degenerate case, the analysis is more complex, but the conclusion remains the same.

Although classical and quantum cloning share the same tradeoff curve, in the following we will show that they exhibit a fundamental difference in the way the tradeoff is achieved: to achieve the fundamental limit, cloning machines must use genuinely quantum strategies.

Limit on the accuracy of classical machines. Classical copy machines scan the input copies and produce replicas based on this information. Similarly, a classical machine for a general task can be modelled as a machine that measures the input and produces an output based on the measurement result. When this approach is used at the quantum scale, it leads to a special class of quantum machines, known as entanglement breaking [63].

Here we show that entanglement breaking machines satisfy a stricter bound. In fact, this stricter bound applies not only to entanglement breaking machines, but also to a broader class of machines, called entanglement




FIG. 3. **Entanglement binding machines vs general quantum machines.** The figure illustrates the accessible regions for the cloning fidelity for various values of N and N' in the case of qubits with degenerate Hamiltonian. The values of the fidelity in the blue region are attainable by general quantum machines, while the values in the orange region are attainable by entanglement binding machines. The difference between the two regions indicates a thermodynamic advantage of general quantum machines over all classical machines.

binding [64]. An entanglement binding channel is a quantum channel that degrades every entangled state to a bound (a.k.a. PPT) entangled state [65, 66]. In Methods, we show that the minimum nonequilibrium cost over all entanglement binding machines, denoted by $c_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{eb}}(F)$, must satisfy the inequality

$$c_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{eb}}(F) \geq \max\{\kappa_{\mathcal{T}}, \kappa_{\mathcal{T}^*}\} + \log F, \quad (8)$$

where $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}}$ is the reverse entropy of the state transformation task $\rho_x \rightarrow \rho'_x$, and $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}^*}$ is the reverse entropy of the transposed task \mathcal{T}^* , corresponding to the state transformation $\rho_x \mapsto (\rho'_x)^T$. This bound can be used to demonstrate that a thermodynamic advantage of general quantum machines over all entanglement binding machines, including in particular all classical machines.

Quantum advantage in cloning. For quantum cloning, it turns out that no entanglement binding machine can achieve the optimal accuracy/nonequilibrium tradeoff. The reason for this is that the reverse entropy of the transpose task is strictly larger than the reverse entropy of the direct task, namely $\kappa_{\text{clon}^*} > \kappa_{\text{clon}}$. In Supplementary Note 6 we prove the inequality

$$\kappa_{\text{clon}^*} \geq \kappa_{\text{clon}} + \log \frac{d_{N+N'} e^{-\frac{N' \Delta E}{\kappa T}}}{d_{N'}}, \quad (9)$$

where ΔE is the difference between the maximum and minimum energy, and, $d_K = (K + d - 1)! / [K!(d - 1)!]$ for $K = N$ or $K = N + N'$. Inserting this inequality into Eq. (8), we conclude that every entanglement binding machine necessarily requires a larger number of clean qubits compared to the optimal quantum machine.

When the energy levels are fully degenerate, we show that the bounds (8) and (9) are exact equalities. With this result at hand, we can compare the exact performance of entanglement binding machines and general quantum machines, showing that the latter achieve a higher accuracy for every given amount of nonequilibrium resources. The comparison is presented in Figure 3.

Our result shows that entanglement binding machines are thermodynamically inefficient for the task of information replication. Achieving the ultimate efficiency limit requires machines that are able to preserve free (*i. e.* non-bound) entanglement. This observation fits with the known fact that classical machines cannot achieve the maximum copying accuracy allowed by quantum mechanics [61, 62, 67]. Here we have shown that not only classical machines are limited in their accuracy, but also that, to achieve such limited accuracy, they require a higher amount of nonequilibrium resources. Interestingly, the thermodynamic advantage of general quantum machines vanishes in the asymptotic limit $N' \rightarrow \infty$, in which the optimal quantum cloning can be reproduced by state estimation [68–70].

Thermodynamic benchmark for quantum memories and quantum communication. Quantum machines that preserve free entanglement also offer an advantage in the storage and transmission of quantum states, corresponding to the ideal state transformation $\rho_x \mapsto \rho_x$ where x parametrises the states of interest. In theory, a noiseless quantum machine can achieve perfect accuracy at zero work cost. In practice, however, the transmission is always subject to errors and inefficiencies, resulting into nonunit fidelity and/or nonzero work. For this reason, realistic experiments that aim to demonstrate genuine quantum transmission or storage need criteria to demonstrate superior performance with respect to all classical setups. A popular approach is to demonstrate an experimental fidelity larger than the maximum fidelity achievable by classical schemes [71–73]. In the qubit case, the maximum classical fidelity is $F_{\text{max}}^{\text{eb}} = 2/3$ [74], and is often used as a benchmark for quantum communication experiments [75–77]. Here we provide a different benchmark, in terms of the nonequilibrium cost needed to achieve a target fidelity F . In Supplementary Note 7, we show that the minimum nonequilibrium cost over all entanglement binding machines for the storage/transmission of qubit states is

$$c_{\text{store/transmit}}^{\text{eb}}(F) = \log \left[F + e^{\frac{\Delta E}{\kappa T}} \frac{(2F - 1)^2}{1 - F} \right], \quad (10)$$

Eq. (10) is valid for every qubit Hamiltonian and for every value of F in the interval $[F_{\text{min}}^{\text{eb}}, F_{\text{max}}^{\text{eb}}]$, with $F_{\text{max}}^{\text{eb}} = 2/3$ and $F_{\text{min}}^{\text{eb}} = (e^{\frac{\Delta E}{\kappa T}} + 1) / (2e^{\frac{\Delta E}{\kappa T}} + 1)$. The minimum cost $c_{\text{store/store}}^{\text{eb}}(F)$ can be achieved by state estimation, and therefore can be regarded as the classical limit on the

nonequilibrium cost.

For every $F > F_{\min}$, the minimum nonequilibrium cost (10) is strictly larger than zero for every nondegenerate Hamiltonian. Since the nonequilibrium cost is a lower bound to the work cost, Eq. (10) implies that every entanglement binding machine with fidelity F requires at least $kT(\ln 2) c_{\text{store/transmit}}^{\text{eb}}(F)$ work. This value can be used as a benchmark to certify genuine quantum information processing: every realistic setup that achieves fidelity F with less than $kT \ln \left[F + e^{\frac{\Delta E}{kT}} (2F - 1)^2 / (1 - F) \right]$ work will necessarily exhibit a performance that cannot be achieved by any classical setup. Notably, the presence of a thermodynamic constraint (either on the nonequilibrium or on the work) provides a way to certify a quantum advantage even for noisy implementations of quantum memories and quantum communication systems with fidelity below the classical fidelity threshold $F_{\max} = 2/3$. A generalisation of these results for higher dimensional systems is provided in Supplementary Note 7.

DISCUSSION

An important feature of our bound (1) is that it applies also to state transformations that are forbidden by quantum mechanics, such as ideal quantum cloning or ideal quantum transposition. For state transformations that can be exactly implemented, instead, it is interesting to compare our bound with related results in the literature.

For exact implementations, the choice of accuracy measure is less important, and one can use any measure for which Eq. (1) yields a useful bound on the work cost. For example, consider the problem of generating a state ρ from the equilibrium state. By choosing a suitable measure of accuracy (see Methods for the details), we find that the nonequilibrium cost for the state transition $\Gamma \mapsto \rho$ is equal to $D_{\max}(\rho||\Gamma)$, where $D_{\max}(\rho||\sigma) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} D_{\alpha}(\rho||\sigma)$ is the max relative entropy, $D(\rho||\sigma) := \log \text{Tr}[\rho^{\alpha} \sigma^{1-\alpha}] / (\alpha - 1)$, $\alpha \geq 0$ being the Rényi relative entropies. In this case, the nonequilibrium cost coincides (up to a proportionality constant $kT \ln 2$) with the minimal amount of work needed to generate the state ρ without errors [25]. Similarly, one can consider the task of extracting work from the state ρ , corresponding to the state transition $\rho \mapsto \Gamma$. Ref. [25] showed that the maximum extractable work is $D_{\min}(\langle \rho \rangle || \Gamma) kT \ln 2$, where $D_{\min}(\rho||\sigma) := D_0(\rho||\sigma)$ is the min relative entropy as per Datta's definition [78] and $\langle \rho \rangle$ is the time-average of ρ . This value can also be retrieved from our bound with a suitable choice of accuracy measure (see Supplementary Note 8 for the details). Smooth versions of these entropic quantities naturally arise by “smoothing the task”, that is, by considering small deviation from the input/output states that specify the desired state transformation (see

Methods).

Our bound can also be applied to the task of information erasure with the assistance of a quantum memory [33]. There, a machine has access to a system S and to a quantum memory Q , and the goal is to reset system S to a pure state η_S , without altering the local state of the memory. When the initial states of system SQ are drawn from a time-invariant subspace, our bound (1) implies that the work cost satisfies the inequality $W/(kT \ln 2) \geq D_{\max}(\eta_S \otimes \gamma_Q || \Gamma_{SQ}) - D_{\max}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{SQ} || \Gamma_{SQ})$, where $\tilde{\Gamma}_{SQ}$ is the quantum state obtained by projecting the Gibbs state onto the input subspace, and $\gamma_Q = \text{Tr}_S[\tilde{\Gamma}_{SQ}]$ is the marginal state of the memory. The bound is tight, and, for degenerate Hamiltonians, it matches the upper bound from Ref. [33] up to logarithmic corrections in the error parameters (see Supplementary Note 9).

Another interesting issue is to determine when a given state transition $\rho \mapsto \rho'$ can be implemented without investing work. For states that are diagonal in the energy basis, a necessary and sufficient condition was derived in Ref. [26], adopting a framework where catalysts are allowed. In this setting, Ref. [26] showed that the state transition $\rho \mapsto \rho'$ can be implemented catalytically without work cost if and only if

$$D_{\alpha}(\rho' || \Gamma_B) \leq D_{\alpha}(\rho || \Gamma_A) \quad \forall \alpha \geq 0. \quad (11)$$

These conditions can be compared with our bound (1). In Methods, we show that, with a suitable choice of figure of merit, Eq. (1) implies the lower bound $W/(kT \ln 2) \geq D_{\max}(\rho' || \Gamma_B) - D_{\max}(\rho || \Gamma_A)$ for the perfect execution of the state transition $\rho \mapsto \rho'$. Hence, the work cost for the state transition $\rho \mapsto \rho'$ satisfies the bound $W/(kT \ln 2) \geq D_{\max}(\rho || \Gamma_A) - D_{\max}(\rho' || \Gamma_B)$, and the r.h.s. is nonpositive only if $D_{\max}(\rho' || \Gamma_B) \leq D_{\max}(\rho || \Gamma_A)$. The last condition is a special case of Eq. (11), corresponding to $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. Notably, this condition and Eq. (11) are equivalent when the input and output states have well-defined energy, including in particular the case where the Hamiltonians of systems A and B are fully degenerate. Further discussion on the relation between quantum relative entropies and the cost of accuracy is provided in Supplementary Note 10.

While the applications discussed in the paper focussed on one-shot tasks, our results also apply to the asymptotic scenario where the task is to implement the transformation $\rho_x^{\otimes n} \mapsto \rho_x'^{\otimes n}$ in the large n limit. In Methods we consider the amount of nonequilibrium per copy required by this transformation, allowing for small deviations in the input and output states. This setting leads to the definition of a *smooth reverse entropy of a task*, whose value per copy is denoted by $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}, \text{iid}}$ and is shown to satisfy the bound

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{T}, \text{iid}} \geq \max_x S(\rho_x' || \Gamma_B) - S(\rho_x || \Gamma_A), \quad (12)$$

where $S(\rho\|\sigma) := \text{Tr}[\rho(\log \rho - \log \sigma)]$ is the quantum relative entropy.

In the special case where the state transformation $\rho_x \rightarrow \rho'_x$ can be implemented perfectly, and where $(\rho_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ is the set of all possible quantum states of the input system, the r.h.s. of Eq. (12) (times $kT \ln 2$) coincides with the thermodynamic capacity introduced by Faist, Berta, and Brandão in Ref. [79]. In this setting, the results of Ref. [79] imply that the thermodynamic capacity coincides with the amount of work per copy needed to implement the transformation $\rho_x \rightarrow \rho'_x$. Since the amount of work cannot be smaller than the nonequilibrium cost, this result implies that our fundamental accuracy/nonequilibrium tradeoff is asymptotically achievable for all information processing tasks allowed by quantum mechanics.

In a different setting and with different techniques, questions related to the thermodynamical cost of physical processes have been studied in the field of stochastic thermodynamics [36]. Most of the works in this area focus on the properties of nonequilibrium steady states of classical systems with Markovian dynamics. An important result is a tradeoff relation between the relative standard deviation of the outputs associated to the currents in the nonequilibrium steady state and the overall entropy production [37–40]. This relation, called a thermodynamic uncertainty relation, is often interpreted as a tradeoff between the precision of a process and its thermodynamical cost. A difference with our work is that the notion of precision used in stochastic thermodynamics is not directly related to general information processing tasks. Another difference is that thermodynamic uncertainty relations do not always hold for systems outside the nonequilibrium steady state [39], whereas our accuracy/nonequilibrium tradeoff applies universally to all quantum systems. An interesting avenue of future research is to integrate the information-theoretic methods developed in this paper with those of stochastic thermodynamics, seeking for concrete physical models that approach the ultimate efficiency limits.

METHODS

General performance tests. The performance of a machine in a given information processing task can be operationally quantified by the probability to pass a test [73, 80, 81]. In the one-shot scenario, a general test \mathcal{T} consists in preparing states of a composite system AR , consisting of the input of the machine and an additional reference system. The machine is requested to act locally on system A , while the reference system undergoes the identity process, or some other (generally noisy) process \mathcal{R}_x implemented by the party that performs the test. Finally, the reference system and the output of the machine undergo a joint measurement, de-

scribed by a suitable observable. The measurement outcomes are regarded as the score assigned to the machine. The test \mathcal{T} is then described by the possible triples $(\rho_x, \mathcal{R}_x, O_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, consisting of an input state, a process on the reference system, and an output observable. In the worst case over all possible triples, one gets the accuracy $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) := \min_x \text{Tr}[O_x(\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{R}_x)(\rho_x)]$, where \mathcal{M} is the map describing the machine's action. Note that the dependence of the state ρ_x , transformation \mathcal{R}_x , and measurement O_x can be arbitrary, and that the parameter x can also be a vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. For example, the input state ρ_x could depend only on the subset of the entries of the vector x , while the output observable O_x could depend on all the entries, thus describing the situation where multiple observables are tested for the same input state.

Performance tests provide a more general way to define information processing tasks. Rather than specifying a desired state transformation $\rho_x \mapsto \rho'_x$, one can directly specify a test that assigns a score to the machine. The test can be expressed in a compact way in the Choi representation [82]. In this representation, the test is described by a set of operators $(\Omega_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, called the *performance operators* [81], acting on the product of the input and output Hilbert spaces. The accuracy of the test has the simple expression $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) = \min_x \text{Tr}[M \Omega_x]$, where $M := (\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{M})(|I_A\rangle\langle I_A|)$, $|I_A\rangle := \sum_i |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle$ is the Choi operator of channel \mathcal{M} , and \mathcal{I}_A is the identity on system A . In the following we will take each operator Ω_x to be positive semidefinite without loss of generality.

Exact expression for the nonequilibrium cost.

In Supplementary Note 1, we show that the nonequilibrium cost of a general task \mathcal{T} can be evaluated with the expression $c_{\mathcal{T}}(F) = \max_{\mathbf{p}} c_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}(F)$, where the minimum is over all probability distributions $\mathbf{p} = (p_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ and

$$c_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}(F) = \log \max_{\substack{X_A \otimes I_B + z \Omega_{\mathbf{p}} \leq \Gamma'_A \otimes Y_B \\ \text{Tr}[\Gamma_B Y_B] \leq 1}} \text{Tr}[X_A] + z F, \quad (13)$$

with $\Omega_{\mathbf{p}} := \sum_x p_x \Omega_x$, $\Gamma'_A := \Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A$. Here, the maximisation runs over all Hermitian operators X_A (Y_B) acting on system A (B) and over all real numbers z .

For every fixed probability distribution \mathbf{p} , the evaluation of $c_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}(F)$ is a semidefinite program [83], and can be solved numerically for low dimensional systems. A simpler optimisation problem arises by setting $X_A = 0$, which provides the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}(F) &\geq \log \max_{\substack{z \Omega_{\mathbf{p}} \leq \Gamma'_A \otimes Y_B \\ \text{Tr}[\Gamma_B Y_B] \leq 1}} z F \\ &= H(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}} + \log F. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

(see Supplementary Note 1 for the derivation).

Time-reversed tasks and reverse entropy. For a given task \mathcal{T} , implemented by operations with input A and output B , we define a time-reversed task \mathcal{T}^{rev} , implemented by operations with input B and output A . For example, consider the case where the direct task is to transform pure states into pure states, according to a given mapping $\rho_x \mapsto \rho'_x$, on a quantum system with fully degenerate energy levels, and the accuracy of the implementation measured by the fidelity $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) = \min_x \text{Tr}[\rho'_x \mathcal{M}(\rho_x)]$. In this case, the time-reversed task is to implement the transformation $\rho'_x \mapsto \rho_x$, using some channel \mathcal{M} with input B and output A . The accuracy is then given by the reverse fidelity $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{M}) = \min_x \text{Tr}[\rho_x \mathcal{M}(\rho'_x)]$. More generally, we define the time-reversed task \mathcal{T}^{rev} in terms of a time reversal for quantum operations [41, 42]. The specific version of the time reversal used here maps the states ρ_x into the observables $\tilde{O}_x := \Gamma_A^{-1/2} \rho_x \Gamma_A^{-1/2}$ and the observables O_x into the (unnormalised) states $\tilde{\rho}_x := \Gamma_B^{1/2} O_x \Gamma_B^{1/2}$ [42]. The reverse accuracy then becomes $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{M}) := \min_x \text{Tr}[\tilde{O}_x \mathcal{M}(\tilde{\rho}_x)]$.

For a general information-processing task with performance operators $(\Omega_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, we define the time-reversed task \mathcal{T}^{rev} with performance operators $(\Omega_x^{\text{rev}})_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ defined by

$$\Omega_x^{\text{rev}} := (\Gamma_B^{1/2} \otimes \Gamma_A^{-1/2}) E_{AB} \Omega_x^T E_{AB} (\Gamma_B^{1/2} \otimes \Gamma_A^{-1/2}), \quad (15)$$

where $E_{AB} : \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$ is the unitary operator that exchanges systems A and B . The reverse accuracy of a generic quantum channel \mathcal{M} is then given by $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{M}) := \min_x \text{Tr}[\Omega_x^{\text{rev}} M]$, where M is the Choi operator of \mathcal{M} . The maximum of the reverse accuracy over all quantum channels can be equivalently expressed in terms of a conditional min-entropy: indeed, one has

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathcal{T}^{\text{rev}}}^{\max} &= \max_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{M}) \\ &= \max_{M: M \geq 0, \text{Tr}_A[M] = I_B} \min_x \text{Tr}[\Omega_x^{\text{rev}} M] \\ &= \max_{M: M \geq 0, \text{Tr}_A[M] = I_B} \min_{\mathbf{p}} \text{Tr}[\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}} M] \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the minimum is over all probability distributions $\mathbf{p} = (p_x)$, and $\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}} := (\sum_x p_x \Omega_x^{\text{rev}})^T$. Using von Neumann's minimax theorem, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathcal{T}^{\text{rev}}}^{\max} &= \min_{\mathbf{p}} \max_{M: M \geq 0, \text{Tr}_A[M] = I_B} \text{Tr}[\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}} M] \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{p}} 2^{-H_{\min}(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}}} \\ &= 2^{-\max_{\mathbf{p}} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where the second equality follows from the operational interpretation of the min-entropy [45]. Taking the logarithm on both sides of the equality, we then obtain the relation $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} := -\log F_{\mathcal{T}^{\text{rev}}}^{\max} = \max_{\mathbf{p}} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}}$, corresponding to Eq. (3) in the main text. The bound (1)

then follows from the relation $c_{\mathcal{T}}(F) = \max_{\mathbf{p}} c_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}$ and from Eq. (14).

Bounds on the reverse entropy. When the test \mathcal{T} consists in the preparation of a set of states $(\rho_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ of system A and in the measurement of a set of observables $(O_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ on system B , the reverse entropy can be lower bounded as

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} \geq \max_x -\log \text{Tr}[\Gamma_B O_x] - D_{\max}(\rho_x \| \Gamma_A), \quad (18)$$

with the equality holding when $|\mathcal{X}| = 1$ (see Supplementary Note 10 for the proof and for a discussion on the relation between the nonequilibrium cost of a state transformation task $\rho_x \mapsto \rho'_x, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}$ and the nonequilibrium cost of the individual state transitions $\rho_x \mapsto \rho'_x$ for a fixed value of x).

A possible choice of observable is $O_x = P_x$, where P_x is the projector on the support of the target state ρ'_x . In this case, the bound (18) becomes

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} \geq \max_x D_{\min}(\rho'_x \| \Gamma_B) - D_{\max}(\rho_x \| \Gamma_A). \quad (19)$$

An alternative choice of observables is $O_x = \Gamma^{-1/2} |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x| \Gamma^{-1/2} / \|\Gamma^{-1/2} \rho'_x \Gamma^{-1/2}\|$, where $|\psi_x\rangle$ is the normalised eigenvector corresponding to the maximum eigenvalue of $\Gamma_B^{-1/2} \rho'_x \Gamma_B^{-1/2}$. With this choice, the bound (18) becomes $\kappa \geq \max_x D_{\max}(\rho'_x \| \Gamma_B) - D_{\max}(\rho_x \| \Gamma_A)$, with the equality when $|\mathcal{X}| = 1$. Combining this bound with Eq. (1), we obtain the following

Proposition 1. *If there exists a quantum channel \mathcal{M} such that $\mathcal{M}(\rho_x) = \rho'_x$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then its nonequilibrium cost satisfies the bound $c(\mathcal{M}) \geq \max_x D_{\max}(\rho'_x \| \Gamma_B) - D_{\max}(\rho_x \| \Gamma_A)$.*

The proposition follows from Eq. (1) and from the fact that the channel \mathcal{M} has accuracy $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}) = \min_x \text{Tr}[\mathcal{M}(\rho_x) O_x] = 1$.

Smooth reverse entropy. For an information processing task \mathcal{T} with operators $(\Omega_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, one can consider an approximate version, described by another task \mathcal{T}' with operators $(\Omega'_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}'}$ that are close to $(\Omega_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ with respect to a suitable notion of distance. One can then define the worst (best) case smooth reverse entropy of the task $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}, \epsilon}$ as the maximum (minimum) of $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}'}$ over all tasks \mathcal{T}' that are within distance ϵ from the given task. The choice between the worst case and the best case irreversibility depends on the problem at hand. A best case irreversibility corresponds to introducing an error tolerance in the task, thus discarding “low probability events” that would result in a higher cost [25, 33]. Instead, a worst case irreversibility can be used to model noisy scenarios, where the input states may not be the ones in the ideal information processing task. An example of this situation is the experimental implementation of quantum cloning, where the input states may not be exactly pure.

Smoothing is particularly useful in the asymptotic scenario. Consider the test \mathcal{T}_n that consists in preparing a multi-copy input state $\rho_x^{\otimes n}$ and measuring the observable $P_{x,n}$, where $P_{x,n}$ is the projector on the support of the target state $\rho_x^{\otimes n}$. A natural approximation is to allow, for every $x \in \mathbf{X}$, all inputs $\rho_{y,n}$ that are ϵ -close to $\rho_x^{\otimes n}$, and all outputs $\rho'_{y,n}$ that are ϵ -close to $\rho_x^{\otimes n}$. Choosing $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}_n, \epsilon}$ to be the worst case smooth reverse entropy of the task \mathcal{T}_n , Eq. (19) gives the bound $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}_n, \epsilon} \geq \max_x D_{\min}^\epsilon(\rho_x^{\otimes n} \| \Gamma_B^{\otimes n}) - D_{\max}^\epsilon(\rho_x^{\otimes n} \| \Gamma_A^{\otimes n})$, where D_{\min}^ϵ and D_{\max}^ϵ are the smooth versions of D_{\min} and D_{\max} [78]. One can then define the regularised reverse entropy of the task as $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}, \text{iid}} := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_n \kappa_{\mathcal{T}_n, \epsilon}/n$. Using the relations $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_n D_{\min}^\epsilon(\rho_x^{\otimes n} \| \Gamma_B^{\otimes n})/n = S(\rho'_x \| \Gamma_B)$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf_n D_{\max}^\epsilon(\rho_x^{\otimes n} \| \Gamma_A^{\otimes n})/n = S(\rho_x \| \Gamma_A)$ [78] we finally obtain the bound $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}, \text{iid}} \geq \max_x S(\rho'_x \| \Gamma_B) - S(\rho_x \| \Gamma_A)$. The quantity on the r.h.s. coincides with the thermodynamic capacity introduced by Faist, Berta, and Brandão in Ref. [79], where it was shown that the thermodynamic capacity coincides with the amount of work per copy needed to implement the transformation $\rho_x \rightarrow \rho'_x$. Combining this result with our bounds, we obtain that the fundamental accuracy/nonequilibrium in Eq. (1) is asymptotically achievable for all transformations allowed by quantum mechanics.

Limit for entanglement binding channels. Entanglement binding channels generally satisfy a more stringent limit than (1). The derivation of this strengthened limit is as follows: first, the definition of an entanglement binding channel \mathcal{P} implies that the map \mathcal{P}^{PT} defined by $\mathcal{P}^{\text{PT}}(\rho) := [\mathcal{P}(\rho)]^T$ is a valid quantum channel. Now, the nonequilibrium cost of the channels \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}^{PT} is given by $D_{\max}(\mathcal{P}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \| \Gamma_B))$ and $D_{\max}(\mathcal{P}^{\text{PT}}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \| \Gamma_B))$ (cf. Supplementary Note 1). Since the max relative entropy satisfies the relation $D_{\max}(\rho \| \sigma) = D_{\max}(\rho^T \| \sigma^T)$ for every pair of states ρ and σ , the costs of \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}^{PT} are equal.

The second step is to note that the accuracy of the channel \mathcal{P} for the task specified by the performance operators (Ω_x) is equal to the accuracy of the channel \mathcal{P}^{PT} for the task specified by the performance operators $(\Omega_x^{T_B})$, where T_B denotes the partial transpose over system B . Applying the bound (1) to channel \mathcal{P}^{PT} , we then obtain the relation

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mathcal{P}) &= c(\mathcal{P}^{\text{PT}}) \\ &\geq \kappa_{\mathcal{T}^*} + \log F, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}^*}$ is the reverse entropy of the transpose task \mathcal{T}^* , with performance operators $(\Omega_x^{T_B})$. Since entanglement binding channel is subject to both bounds (1) and (20), Eq. (8) holds.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The authors declare that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the paper and in the supplementary information files.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed substantially to the development of the research paper and to the preparation of the paper. GC and FM contributed equally.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

GC acknowledges a helpful discussion with Nilanjana Datta on the quantum extensions of Rényi relative entropies. FM acknowledges Yuxiang Yang, Mile Gu, and Oscar Dahlsten for helpful comments that helped improving the presentation. This work was supported by the Hong Kong Research Grant Council through grants 17326616 and 17300918, and through the Senior Research Fellowship Scheme via SRFS2021-7S02, by the Swiss National Science Foundation via grant 200021_188541, by the National Natural Science Foundation of China through grants 11675136, 11875160 and U1801661, by the Key R&D Program of Guangdong province through grant 2018B030326001, by the Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory through grant c1933200003, the Guangdong Innovative and Entrepreneurial Research Team Program via grant 2016ZT06D348, the Science, Technology and Innovation Commission of Shenzhen Municipality through grant KYTDPT20181011104202253. Research at the Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science.

* giulio@cs.hku.hk

† fmeng@cs.hku.hk

‡ renner@eth.ch

§ yung@sustech.edu.cn

[1] S. D. McCulloch and T. A. Kunkel, Cell research **18**, 148 (2008).

- [2] T. Wang, R. Sha, R. Dreyfus, M. E. Leunissen, C. Maass, D. J. Pine, P. M. Chaikin, and N. C. Seeman, *Nature* **478**, 225 (2011).
- [3] J. L. England, *The Journal of chemical Physics* **139**, 09B623.1 (2013).
- [4] D. Andrieux and P. Gaspard, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105**, 9516 (2008).
- [5] C. Jarzynski, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105**, 9451 (2008).
- [6] C. H. Bennett, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **21**, 905 (1982).
- [7] R. Landauer, *IBM journal of research and development* **5**, 183 (1961).
- [8] H. S. Leff and A. F. Rex, *Maxwell's demon: entropy, information, computing* (Princeton University Press, 2014).
- [9] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, *Nature* **299**, 802 (1982).
- [10] D. Dieks, *Physics Letters A* **92**, 271 (1982).
- [11] J. Goold, M. Huber, A. Riera, L. Del Rio, and P. Skrzypczyk, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **49**, 143001 (2016).
- [12] S. Vinjanampathy and J. Anders, *Contemporary Physics* **57**, 545 (2016).
- [13] F. Binder, L. A. Correa, C. Gogolin, J. Anders, and G. Adesso, *Fundamental Theories of Physics* **195**, 1 (2018).
- [14] S. Lloyd, *Nature* **406**, 1047 (2000).
- [15] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, *Physical Review Letters* **102**, 250602 (2009).
- [16] N. Linden, S. Popescu, and P. Skrzypczyk, *Physical Review Letters* **105**, 130401 (2010).
- [17] J. M. Parrondo, J. M. Horowitz, and T. Sagawa, *Nature Physics* **11**, 131 (2015).
- [18] J. Goold, M. Paternostro, and K. Modi, *Physical Review Letters* **114**, 060602 (2015).
- [19] J. Baugh, O. Moussa, C. A. Ryan, A. Nayak, and R. Laflamme, *Nature* **438**, 470 (2005).
- [20] S. Toyabe, T. Sagawa, M. Ueda, E. Muneyuki, and M. Sano, *Nature Physics* **6**, 988 (2010).
- [21] M. D. Vidrighin, O. Dahlsten, M. Barbieri, M. Kim, V. Vedral, and I. A. Walmsley, *Physical Review Letters* **116**, 050401 (2016).
- [22] D. Janzing, P. Wocjan, R. Zeier, R. Geiss, and T. Beth, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **39**, 2717 (2000).
- [23] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, *Physical Review A* **67**, 062104 (2003).
- [24] F. G. Brandao, M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, J. M. Renes, and R. W. Spekkens, *Physical Review Letters* **111**, 250404 (2013).
- [25] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, *Nature Communications* **4**, 2059 (2013).
- [26] F. Brandao, M. Horodecki, N. Ng, J. Oppenheim, and S. Wehner, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 3275 (2015).
- [27] F. G. S. L. Brandão and G. Gour, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 070503 (2015).
- [28] P. Faist, J. Oppenheim, and R. Renner, *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 043003 (2015).
- [29] G. Gour, M. P. Müller, V. Narasimhachar, R. W. Spekkens, and N. Y. Halpern, *Physics Reports* **583**, 1 (2015).
- [30] G. Gour, D. Jennings, F. Buscemi, R. Duan, and I. Marvian, *Nature Communications* **9**, 1 (2018).
- [31] P. Faist, F. Dupuis, J. Oppenheim, and R. Renner, *Nature Communications* **6**, 7669 (2015).
- [32] P. Faist and R. Renner, *Physical Review X* **8**, 021011 (2018).
- [33] L. Del Rio, J. Åberg, R. Renner, O. Dahlsten, and V. Vedral, *Nature* **474**, 61 (2011).
- [34] J. Åberg, *Nature Communications* **4**, 1 (2013).
- [35] P. Skrzypczyk, A. J. Short, and S. Popescu, *Nature Communications* **5**, 1 (2014).
- [36] U. Seifert, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **504**, 176 (2018).
- [37] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, *Physical Review Letters* **114**, 158101 (2015).
- [38] T. R. Gingrich, J. M. Horowitz, N. Perunov, and J. L. England, *Physical Review Letters* **116**, 120601 (2016).
- [39] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, *Physical Review X* **6**, 041053 (2016).
- [40] J. M. Horowitz and T. R. Gingrich, *Nature Physics* **16**, 15 (2020).
- [41] G. E. Crooks, *Physical Review A* **77**, 034101 (2008).
- [42] G. Chiribella, E. Aurell, and K. Życzkowski, *Physical Review Research* **3**, 033028 (2021).
- [43] R. Renner and S. Wolf, in *International Symposium on Information Theory, 2004. ISIT 2004. Proceedings.* (IEEE, 2004) p. 233.
- [44] N. Datta and R. Renner, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55**, 2807 (2009).
- [45] R. König, R. Renner, and C. Schaffner, *IEEE Transactions on Information theory* **55**, 4337 (2009).
- [46] A. Rényi, in *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics* (The Regents of the University of California, 1961).
- [47] V. Bužek, M. Hillery, and F. Werner, *Journal of Modern Optics* **47**, 211 (2000).
- [48] P. Horodecki, *Physical Review A* **68**, 052101 (2003).
- [49] F. Buscemi, G. D'Ariano, P. Perinotti, and M. Sacchi, *Physics Letters A* **314**, 374 (2003).
- [50] M. Ricci, F. Sciarrino, C. Sias, and F. De Martini, *Physical Review Letters* **92**, 047901 (2004).
- [51] F. De Martini, D. Pelliccia, and F. Sciarrino, *Physical Review Letters* **92**, 067901 (2004).
- [52] H.-T. Lim, Y.-S. Kim, Y.-S. Ra, J. Bae, and Y.-H. Kim, *Physical Review Letters* **107**, 160401 (2011).
- [53] G. Birkhoff, *Univ. Nac. Tucuman, Ser. A* **5**, 147 (1946).
- [54] R. Landauer, *Physics Today* **44**, 23 (1991).
- [55] C. H. Bennett, *Studies In History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies In History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **34**, 501 (2003).
- [56] V. Scarani, S. Iblisdir, N. Gisin, and A. Acin, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **77**, 1225 (2005).
- [57] N. Gisin, *Physics Letters A* **242**, 1 (1998).
- [58] G. Chiribella, Y. Yang, and A. C.-C. Yao, *Nature Communications* **4**, 1 (2013).
- [59] H. Fan, Y.-N. Wang, L. Jing, J.-D. Yue, H.-D. Shi, Y.-L. Zhang, and L.-Z. Mu, *Physics Reports* **544**, 241 (2014).
- [60] M. Hillery and V. Bužek, *Physical Review A* **56**, 1212 (1997).
- [61] N. Gisin and S. Massar, *Physical Review Letters* **79**, 2153 (1997).
- [62] R. F. Werner, *Physical Review A* **58**, 1827 (1998).

- [63] M. Horodecki, P. W. Shor, and M. B. Ruskai, Reviews in Mathematical Physics **15**, 629 (2003).
- [64] P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Journal of Modern Optics **47**, 347 (2000).
- [65] A. Peres, Physical Review Letters **77**, 1413 (1996).
- [66] P. Horodecki, Physics Letters A **232**, 333 (1997).
- [67] D. Bruss, A. Ekert, and C. Macchiavello, Physical Review Letters **81**, 2598 (1998).
- [68] J. Bae and A. Acín, Physical Review Letters **97**, 030402 (2006).
- [69] G. Chiribella and G. M. D’Ariano, Physical Review Letters **97**, 250503 (2006).
- [70] G. Chiribella, in *Conference on Quantum Computation, Communication, and Cryptography* (Springer, 2010) pp. 9–25.
- [71] D. Boschi, S. Branca, F. De Martini, L. Hardy, and S. Popescu, Physical Review Letters **80**, 1121 (1998).
- [72] S. L. Braunstein and H. J. Kimble, Physical Review Letters **80**, 869 (1998).
- [73] K. Hammerer, M. M. Wolf, E. S. Polzik, and J. I. Cirac, Physical Review Letters **94**, 150503 (2005).
- [74] S. Massar and S. Popescu, in *Asymptotic Theory Of Quantum Statistical Inference: Selected Papers* (World Scientific, 2005) pp. 356–364.
- [75] B. Li, Y. Cao, Y.-H. Li, W.-Q. Cai, W.-Y. Liu, J.-G. Ren, S.-K. Liao, H.-N. Wu, S.-L. Li, L. Li, *et al.*, Physical Review Letters **128**, 170501 (2022).
- [76] Y. Zhong, H.-S. Chang, A. Bienfait, É. Dumur, M.-H. Chou, C. R. Conner, J. Grebel, R. G. Povey, H. Yan, D. I. Schuster, *et al.*, Nature **590**, 571 (2021).
- [77] P. Kurpiers, P. Magnard, T. Walter, B. Royer, M. Pechal, J. Heinsoo, Y. Salathé, A. Akin, S. Storz, J.-C. Besse, *et al.*, Nature **558**, 264 (2018).
- [78] N. Datta, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **55**, 2816 (2009).
- [79] P. Faist, M. Berta, and F. Brandão, Physical Review Letters **122**, 200601 (2019).
- [80] Y. Yang, G. Chiribella, and G. Adesso, Physical Review A **90**, 042319 (2014).
- [81] G. Bai and G. Chiribella, Physical Review Letters **120**, 150502 (2018).
- [82] M.-D. Choi, Linear Algebra and its Applications **10**, 285 (1975).
- [83] J. Watrous, *The theory of quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, 2018).
- [84] G. Chiribella and Y. Yang, New Journal of Physics **16**, 063005 (2014).
- [85] G. Chiribella, G. D’Ariano, P. Perinotti, and N. Cerf, Physical Review A **72**, 042336 (2005).
- [86] M. Tomamichel, R. Colbeck, and R. Renner, IEEE Transactions on information theory **56**, 4674 (2010).
- [87] M. Tomamichel, *Quantum information processing with finite resources: mathematical foundations*, Vol. 5 (Springer, 2015).
- [88] M. Müller-Lennert, F. Dupuis, O. Szechr, S. Fehr, and M. Tomamichel, Journal of Mathematical Physics **54**, 122203 (2013).
- [89] M. M. Wilde, A. Winter, and D. Yang, Communications in Mathematical Physics **331**, 593 (2014).
- [90] S. Beigi, Journal of Mathematical Physics **54**, 122202 (2013).
- [91] R. L. Frank and E. H. Lieb, Journal of Mathematical Physics **54**, 122201 (2013).

Supplementary Notes.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE 1: DERIVATION OF THE ACCURACY-NONEQUILIBRIUM TRADEOFF

In this note we establish a fundamental tradeoff between accuracy and nonequilibrium in the execution of any given information processing task. The note consists of three parts. In the first part, we derive a closed-form expression for the nonequilibrium cost of a given quantum channel, building on results by Faist and Renner [32]. In the second part, we derive the optimal tradeoff curve as a semidefinite program. Finally, in the third part we introduce a further constraint in the semidefinite program, which leads to the notion of reverse entropy and to the bound (5) in the main text.

The nonequilibrium cost of a given information processing task

Here we discuss the basic settings and definitions used in our paper to evaluate the nonequilibrium cost of a given information processing task.

Let us start from the related problem of evaluating the cost of a specific quantum channel \mathcal{M} . The minimum number of clean qubits needed to realise a channel \mathcal{M} using Gibbs preserving operations was derived by Faist and Renner in Ref. [32]. They considered realisations where the machine reproduces the action of the desired channel on a part of a given entangled state $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$, involving the input system A and a reference system R . For approximate realisations with error ϵ , the minimum number of clean qubits, called the *nonequilibrium cost* in our

paper, was shown to be

$$c_\epsilon(\mathcal{M}, |\Psi\rangle) = - \max_{\substack{\mathcal{M}'(\Gamma_A) \leq 2^{-\lambda} \Gamma_B \\ (\mathcal{M}' \otimes \mathcal{I}_R)(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|) \approx_\epsilon (\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{I}_R)(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)}} \lambda, \quad (21)$$

where the maximisation is over all quantum operations (completely positive trace non-increasing maps) \mathcal{M}' with input system A and output system B , and \approx_ϵ denotes approximate equality with respect to a suitable distance measure.

In the following, we will set $\epsilon = 0$ and we will minimise the cost $c_0(\mathcal{M}, |\Psi\rangle)$ over all channels \mathcal{M} that achieve a desired level of accuracy in a given information processing task \mathcal{T} . Specifically, we will evaluate the minimum cost

$$c_{\mathcal{T}}(F) := \min\{c_0(\mathcal{M}, |\Psi\rangle) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) \geq F\}, \quad (22)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M})$ is the accuracy measure (as defined in the main text) and F is the desired level of accuracy.

Here, the restriction to exact realisations ($\epsilon = 0$) is done without loss of generality, because the approximate implementation of the task \mathcal{T} is already taken into account by the accuracy measure $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M})$.

It is worth stressing that our approach is different from the approach of most works in the literature, where one fixes a channel \mathcal{M} and asks what is the cost of implementing some ϵ -approximation of \mathcal{M} . Following this approach, one might be tempted to pick a channel \mathcal{M} that implements the task \mathcal{T} perfectly, and then to minimise the cost over all channels in an ϵ -neighbourhood of \mathcal{M} . This approach, however, would not work in general. The problem is that the correspondence between information processing tasks and quantum channels is generally not one-to-one. First, there exist tasks that cannot be implemented perfectly by any channel \mathcal{M} , such as, for example, ideal quantum cloning. Second, there exist tasks that can be implemented perfectly by more than one channel. In those cases, the minimum cost in an ϵ -neighbourhood of a specific channel \mathcal{M} picked among those that achieve the task \mathcal{T} perfectly may not be equal to the minimum cost over all channels that achieve the task with error at most ϵ . This point is made clear by the following example. Consider the task of transforming the maximally mixed qubit state $\rho = I/2$ into the Gibbs state $\rho' = \Gamma$, for $\Gamma = 2/3 |0\rangle\langle 0| + 1/3 |1\rangle\langle 1|$. This task is achieved perfectly by the channel $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Gibbs}}$ that maps every state into the Gibbs state. Channel $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Gibbs}}$ is a Gibbs preserving operation and, as such, it has zero cost. Hence, the cost of the state transition $I/2 \mapsto \Gamma$ is zero. On the other hand, the state transition $I/d \mapsto \Gamma$ can also be perfectly achieved by any channel \mathcal{M} satisfying the relations $\mathcal{M}(|0\rangle\langle 0|) = 2/3 |1\rangle\langle 1| + 1/3 |0\rangle\langle 0|$ and $\mathcal{M}(|1\rangle\langle 1|) = |0\rangle\langle 0|$. Any such channel \mathcal{M} is not Gibbs preserving and therefore has a strictly positive cost. Hence, if we just pick channel \mathcal{M} and ask what is the cost of ϵ -approximating it, we will generally get a positive cost, despite the fact that the cost of the state transition $I/2 \rightarrow \Gamma$ is zero.

Instead of minimising the cost over all channels in an ϵ -neighbourhood of a specific channel, here we minimise the cost over all physical implementations that achieve a accuracy F in the task \mathcal{T} . In this approach, the relevant minimisation problem is the one in Eq. (22). Indeed, every implementation of the task \mathcal{T} realises—by definition without error—a specific channel \mathcal{M} . The minimum cost over all implementations that realise channel \mathcal{M} without error is $c_0(\mathcal{M}, |\Psi\rangle)$. Hence, our goal is to minimise $c_0(\mathcal{M}, |\Psi\rangle)$ over all channels \mathcal{M} that achieve accuracy F . These settings correspond to the minimisation problem in Eq. (22).

Let us now discuss the choice of the state $|\Psi\rangle$ in Eq. (22). For $\epsilon = 0$, the condition $(\mathcal{M}' \otimes \mathcal{I}_R)(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|) = (\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{I}_R)(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)$ in Eq. (21) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{M}'(\Pi_A \rho \Pi_A) = \mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \rho \Pi_A), \quad \forall \rho \in \text{St}(\mathcal{H}_A), \quad (23)$$

where Π_A is the projector on the support of the marginal state $\rho_A := \text{Tr}_R[\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi]$. Hence, the cost does not depend specifically on the state $|\Psi\rangle$, but only on the projector Π_A . From now on, we will denote by

$$c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) := c_{\epsilon=0}(\mathcal{M}, |\Psi\rangle) \quad (24)$$

the nonequilibrium cost that has to be paid for an exact realisation of the channel \mathcal{M} upon input states in the support of Π_A .

With this notation, we have the following:

Proposition 2. *The nonequilibrium cost of a channel \mathcal{M} upon inputs in the support of Π_A is upper bounded as*

$$c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \leq D_{\max}(\mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \| \Gamma_B), \quad (25)$$

where $D_{\max}(\rho \| \sigma) := \log \left\| \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|$ is the max relative entropy [78]. When the support of Π_A is invariant under the group of time translations $U_t := e^{-itH_A/\hbar}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ (equivalently, when $[\Pi_A, H_A] = 0$), the equality sign holds and one has

$$c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) = D_{\max}(\mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \| \Gamma_B). \quad (26)$$

Proof. For $\epsilon = 0$, Eq. (21) reads

$$c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) = \min_{\mathcal{M}'(\Pi_A \rho \Pi_A) = \mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \rho \Pi_A), \forall \rho \in \text{St}(A)} \log \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}'(\Gamma_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \quad (27)$$

Choosing the quantum operation \mathcal{M}' defined by $\mathcal{M}'(\rho) := \mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \rho \Pi_A)$, Eq. (27) yields the inequality $c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \leq \log \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \rho \Pi_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \equiv D_{\max}(\mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \| \Gamma_B)$, thus proving Eq. (25).

If the support of Π_A is time-invariant, then Π_A commutes with the Hamiltonian of system A and the Gibbs state can be written as $\Gamma_A = \Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A + (I_A - \Pi_A) \Gamma_A (I_A - \Pi_A)$. Hence, we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}'(\Gamma_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| &= \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}'(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}'((I_A - \Pi_A) \Gamma_A (I_A - \Pi_A)) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\ &\geq \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}'(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where the inequality is due to the relation $\|A + B\| \geq \|A\|$ valid for arbitrary positive operators A and B , and the second equality is due to the condition (23). Taking the logarithm on both sides, and minimising over \mathcal{M}' , we obtain the inequality $c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \geq D_{\max}(\mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \| \Gamma_B)$. \square

Exact expression for the accuracy-nonequilibrium tradeoff

Here we provide an exact expression for the amount of nonequilibrium needed to achieve a desired level of accuracy in a given task.

The problem is to find the quantum channel (completely positive trace-preserving map) \mathcal{M} that has minimum nonequilibrium cost among all the channels that attain accuracy at least F . To get started, we recall the expression for accuracy of a channel, defined in terms of a general performance test, as in the Methods section. For a task \mathcal{T} defined by a set of input states $(\rho_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ and a set of output observables $(O_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, the worst-case accuracy of the channel \mathcal{M} is defined as $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) := \min_x \text{Tr}[O_x \mathcal{M}(\rho_x)]$. In the Choi representation, the accuracy can be expressed as $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) = \min_x \text{Tr}[M \Omega_x]$, with $\Omega_x = \rho_x^T \otimes O_x$. In general, a performance test \mathcal{T} is specified by a set of performance operators $(\Omega_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ and the accuracy is given by $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) = \min_x \text{Tr}[M \Omega_x]$.

Now, consider the average accuracy with respect to a probability distribution $\mathbf{p} = (p_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}) := \text{Tr}[M \Omega_{\mathbf{p}}], \quad (29)$$

where $\Omega_{\mathbf{p}} := \sum_x p_x \Omega_x$ is the average performance operator associated to the given task. Note that the performance depends only on the projection of the Choi operator on the support of $\Omega_{\mathbf{p}}$. Defining the marginal operator $\omega_A := \text{Tr}_B[\Omega_{\mathbf{p}}]$, the projector Π_A onto the support of ω_A , and the projected Choi operator $\widetilde{M} := (\Pi_A \otimes I_B) M (\Pi_A \otimes I_B)$, we have the relation $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}) = \text{Tr}[\widetilde{M} \Omega_{\mathbf{p}}]$, meaning that the accuracy depends only on \widetilde{M} , rather than on the full operator M .

The nonequilibrium cost for the implementation of the channel \mathcal{M} on the support of Π_A is given by Eq. (26). In turn, the norm in Eq. (26) can be expressed as

$$\left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| = \min_{\mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \leq \lambda \Gamma_B} \lambda. \quad (30)$$

Now, recall that the action of a quantum channel on a given operator ρ (not necessarily a quantum state) is given by $\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \text{Tr}_A[(\rho^T \otimes I_A) M]$, where ρ^T denotes the transpose of ρ with respect to a fixed bases, here chosen to consist of energy eigenstates. Choosing $\rho = \Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A$, we then obtain the equality

$$\mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) = \text{Tr}_A[(I_B \otimes \Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) M], \quad (31)$$

where we used the fact that Γ_A and Π_A are diagonal in the energy eigenbasis, and therefore $\Gamma_A^T = \Gamma_A$ and $\Pi_A^T = \Pi_A$.

Hence, the minimum nonequilibrium cost for achieving average accuracy at least F , denoted by $c_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(F)$, can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(F) &= \min\{c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}) \geq F\} \\ &= \log \min_{\substack{M \geq 0, \text{Tr}_B[M] = I_A \\ \lambda \Gamma_B \geq \text{Tr}_A[(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \otimes I_B) M] \\ \text{Tr}[M \Omega_{\mathbf{p}}] \geq F}} \lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

This minimisation problem is a semidefinite program and can be solved efficiently with existing software packages.

We now connect minimisation of the average cost to the minimisation of the worst case cost:

Proposition 3. *For every test \mathcal{T} , one has the equality $c_{\mathcal{T}}(F) = \max_{\mathbf{p}} c_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(F)$ for every $F \in [F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$.*

Proof. The inequality

$$c_{\mathcal{T}}(F) \geq \max_{\mathbf{p}} c_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(F) \quad (33)$$

is immediate from the fact that the worst case accuracy cannot be larger than the average accuracy. We now show the converse inequality. To this purpose, we recall the definition

$$F_{\mathcal{T}}(c) := \max_{\mathcal{M}: c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \leq c} F_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) = \max_{\mathcal{M}: c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \leq c} \min_{\mathbf{p}} F_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}). \quad (34)$$

and use the equality

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathcal{T}}(c) &= \max_{\mathcal{M}: c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \leq c} \min_{\mathbf{p}} F_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}) \\ &= \max_{\substack{M \geq 0, \text{Tr}_B[M] = I_A \\ \text{Tr}_A[(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \otimes I_B) M] \leq 2^c \Gamma_B}} \min_{\mathbf{p}} \text{Tr}[M \Omega_{\mathbf{p}}] \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{p}} \max_{\substack{M \geq 0, \text{Tr}_B[M] = I_A \\ \text{Tr}_A[(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \otimes I_B) M] \leq 2^c \Gamma_B}} \text{Tr}[M \Omega_{\mathbf{p}}] \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{p}} F_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(c), \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where we defined

$$F_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(c) := \max_{\mathcal{M}: c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \leq c} F_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}). \quad (36)$$

The exchange of the minimum and maximum in Eq. (35) is possible thanks to von Neumann's minimax theorem.

For every fixed value of c , the equality $F_{\mathcal{T}}(c) = \min_{\mathbf{p}} F_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(c)$ implies that there exists a probability distribution \mathbf{p}_0 such that $F_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}_0}(c) = F_{\mathcal{T}}(c)$. Now, let \mathcal{M} be an arbitrary channel such that $F_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}_0}(\mathcal{M}) \geq F_{\mathcal{T}}(c) =: F$. By definition, the cost of this channel must satisfy $c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \geq c$. Hence, we obtain

$$c_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}_0}(F) = \min_{\mathcal{M}: F_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}_0}(\mathcal{M}) \geq F} c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \geq c. \quad (37)$$

On the other hand, the definition $F := F_{\mathcal{T}}(c)$ implies $c = c_{\mathcal{T}}(F)$ for every $F \in [F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$. Hence, we obtained the inequality $c_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}_0}(F) \geq c_{\mathcal{T}}(F)$, and therefore

$$\max_{\mathbf{p}} c_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(F) \geq c_{\mathcal{T}}(F). \quad (38)$$

The thesis then follows from Eqs. (33) and (38). \square

Summarising, we have derived the following expression for the nonequilibrium cost:

$$c_{\mathcal{T}}(F) = \max_{\mathbf{p}} c_{\mathcal{T},\mathbf{p}}(F) = \log \max_{\mathbf{p}} \min_{\substack{M \geq 0, \text{Tr}_B[M] = I_A \\ \lambda \Gamma_B \geq \text{Tr}_A[(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \otimes I_B) M] \\ \text{Tr}[M \Omega_{\mathbf{p}}] \geq F}} \lambda. \quad (39)$$

Lower bound on the nonequilibrium cost

For every fixed probability distribution \mathbf{p} , the optimisation over M in Eq. (39) is a semidefinite program. This semidefinite program (32) admits a dual formulation (see *e.g.* [83] for the basics of the duality theory), which yields the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{M \geq 0, \text{Tr}_B[M] = I_A \\ \lambda \Gamma_B \geq \text{Tr}_A[(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \otimes I_B) M] \\ \text{Tr}[M \Omega_{\mathbf{p}}] \geq F}} \lambda \geq \max_{\substack{X_A \otimes I_B + z \Omega_{\mathbf{p}} \leq \Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \otimes Y_B \\ \text{Tr}[\Gamma_B Y_B] \leq 1}} \text{Tr}[X_A] + z F \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The inequality is in fact an equality, because the above program satisfies the condition of strong duality [83], although this fact will not be used in the following.

We now introduce a simplification in the dual program (40). The simplification consists in restricting the maximisation to triples (X_A, Y_B, z) where the operator X_A is set to zero. This constraint leads to the new maximisation problem, whose optimal value is below the optimal value on the right-hand-side of (40). Explicitly, one has

$$\max_{\substack{X_A \otimes I_B + z \Omega_{\mathbf{p}} \leq \Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \otimes Y_B \\ \text{Tr}[\Gamma_B Y_B] \leq 1}} \text{Tr}[X] + z F \geq F \left(\max_{\substack{z \Omega_{\mathbf{p}} \leq \Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \otimes Y_B \\ \text{Tr}[\Gamma_B Y_B] \leq 1}} z \right). \quad (41)$$

The new maximisation problem admits a closed-form solution. To find it, we use the change of variables $\sigma_B := \Gamma_B^{1/2} Y_B \Gamma_B^{1/2}$. With this change of variable, the inequality $z \Omega_{\mathbf{p}} \leq \Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \otimes Y_B$ becomes $z \Omega_{\mathbf{p}} \leq \Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \otimes \Gamma_B^{-1/2} \sigma_B \Gamma_B^{-1/2}$. In turn, this inequality is equivalent to $(\Gamma_A \otimes \Gamma_B^{-1})^{1/2} \Omega_{\mathbf{p}} (\Gamma_A \otimes \Gamma_B^{-1})^{1/2} \leq I_A \otimes Y_B/z$. Finally, defining the operator $\Lambda_B = \sigma_B/z$, we obtain the condition $I_A \otimes \Lambda_B \geq (\Gamma_A \otimes \Gamma_B^{-1})^{1/2} \Omega_{\mathbf{p}} (\Gamma_A \otimes \Gamma_B^{-1})^{1/2} =: \omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}$, where the subscript \mathcal{T} stresses the dependence of the operator $\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}$ on the task \mathcal{T} . Hence, we obtained the equality

$$\begin{aligned} z \Omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}} \leq \Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A \otimes Y_B \quad \text{Tr}[\Gamma_B Y_B] \leq 1 & \quad z = \left(\min_{I_A \otimes \Lambda_B \geq \omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}} \text{Tr}[\Lambda_B] \right)^{-1} \\ & = 2^{H_{\min}(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Combining Eqs. (32), (41), and (42), we obtain the bound

$$c_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}(F) \geq H_{\min}(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}} + \log F, \quad (43)$$

which follows from Eq. (26). Maximising the l.h.s. over the choice of probability distribution \mathbf{p} and using Proposition 3 we then obtain

$$c_{\mathcal{T}}(F) \geq H_{\min}(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}} + \log F \quad \forall \mathbf{p}. \quad (44)$$

Finally, we maximise the r.h.s. over all probability distributions, thus obtaining

$$c_{\mathcal{T}}(F) \geq \kappa_{\mathcal{T}} + \log F, \quad (45)$$

where $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} = \max_{\mathbf{p}} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}}$ is the reverse entropy defined in the main text.

Eq. (45) can be reformulated as a bound on the maximum accuracy achievable with a given amount of nonequilibrium resources, namely

$$F_{\mathcal{T}}(c) \leq 2^{c - \kappa_{\mathcal{T}}}. \quad (46)$$

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE 2: THERMODYNAMIC IRREVERSIBILITY OF CLASSICAL DETERMINISTIC COMPUTATIONS

For the computation of a function $f : A \rightarrow B, x \mapsto f(x)$, where A and B are two finite sets, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}} &= \sum_{x \in A} p_x \frac{g_B(f(x))}{g_A(x)} |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes |f(x)\rangle\langle f(x)| \\ &= \sum_{y \in f(A)} g_B(y) \left(\sum_{x: f(x)=y} \frac{p_x}{g_A(x)} |x\rangle\langle x| \right) \otimes |y\rangle\langle y|,\end{aligned}\tag{47}$$

where $g_A(x)$ and $g_B(y)$ are the Gibbs probability distributions for the input and the output, respectively. Hence, the condition $I_A \otimes \Lambda_B \geq \omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}$ is equivalent to

$$\langle y | \Lambda_B | y \rangle \geq g_B(y) \max_{x: f(x)=y} \frac{p_x}{g_A(x)} \quad \forall y \in f(A).\tag{48}$$

Choosing the operator Λ_B that achieves the equality, we obtain

$$H_{\min}(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}} = -\log \left(\sum_{y \in f(A)} g_B(y) \max_{x: f(x)=y} \frac{p_x}{g_A(x)} \right).\tag{49}$$

Now, we need to maximise the above expression over all probability distributions $\mathbf{p} = (p_x)$. First, note that the maximum is attained by probability distributions satisfying the condition

$$\frac{p_x}{g_A(x)} = \frac{p_{x'}}{g_A(x')} \quad \forall x, x' : f(x) = f(x').\tag{50}$$

Second, we define the probabilities $q_y := \sum_{x: f(x)=y} p_x$ and $p_f(y) := \sum_{x: f(x)=y} g_A(x)$. With this notation, we have the equality

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{\mathbf{p}} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}} &= \max_{\mathbf{q}} -\log \left(\sum_{y \in f(A)} g_B(y) \frac{q_y}{p_f(y)} \right) \\ &= -\log \left(\min_{y \in f(A)} \frac{g_B(y)}{p_f(y)} \right) \\ &= D_{\max}(p_f \| g_B).\end{aligned}\tag{51}$$

Hence, the reverse entropy of the classical computation of f is

$$\kappa_f = D_{\max}(p_f \| g_B).\tag{52}$$

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE 3: PROOF OF THE ATTAINABILITY CRITERION

In this note, we prove the attainability criterion given in the main text: specifically, we show that, if the bound (45) is saturated for the maximum accuracy $F = F_{\max}$, then the bound is tight for all values of the accuracy in the interval $F \in [F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$.

Evaluation of F_{\min}

By definition, F_{\min} is the maximum worst-case fidelity achieved by a physical process with minimum nonequilibrium cost on the input subspace, namely $F_{\min} := \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(c_{\min})$ where

$$c_{\min} := \min_{\mathcal{M}} c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A)\tag{53}$$

is the minimum nonequilibrium cost over all possible quantum channels acting on the support of Π_A . The minimum nonequilibrium cost can be readily evaluated, as shown in the following lemma:

Lemma 1. *The minimum nonequilibrium cost for the realisation of an quantum channel upon inputs in the support of a projector Π_A with $[\Pi_A, H_A] = 0$ is*

$$c_{\min} = \log \text{Tr}[\Pi_A \Gamma_A], \quad (54)$$

and it is achieved by every quantum channel \mathcal{M} satisfying the condition

$$\mathcal{M}(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) = \Gamma_B, \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{\Gamma}_A := \frac{\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A}{\text{Tr}[\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A]}. \quad (55)$$

Proof. For an arbitrary channel \mathcal{M} , Eq. (26) yields the expression

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) &= D_{\max}(\mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \| \Gamma_B) \\ &= \log \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\ &= \log \text{Tr}[\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A] + \log \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\ &= \log \text{Tr}[\Pi_A \Gamma_A] + D_{\max}(\mathcal{M}(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \| \Gamma_B). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Since the max relative entropy is non-negative, the above expression implies the bound $c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \geq \text{Tr}[\Pi_A \Gamma_A]$, valid for every quantum channel \mathcal{M} , and the equality holds if and only if $D_{\max}(\mathcal{M}(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \| \Gamma_B) = 0$, that is, if and only if condition (55) is satisfied. \square

We now consider the set of all channels with minimum nonequilibrium cost c_{\min} , and, among them, we search for the channel with maximum accuracy.

Lemma 2. *If the bound (45) is attainable for a given value $F = F_0$, then $F_{\min} = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa_{\mathcal{T}}}$.*

Proof. Note that, in general one has the relation

$$F_{\min} := \max_{\mathcal{M}: c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \leq c_{\min}} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) \equiv \max_{\mathcal{M}: c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) = c_{\min}} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) \leq \max_{\mathcal{M}: c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) = c_{\min}} \leq 2^{c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) - \kappa_{\mathcal{T}}} = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa_{\mathcal{T}}} =: F_*, \quad (57)$$

where the inequality follows from Eq. (46). Our goal is to show that the bound $F_{\min} \leq F_*$ holds with the equality sign whenever the bound (45) is attainable for a given value $F = F_0$.

Let \mathcal{M}_0 be a quantum channel that achieves the bound (45) at $F = F_0$, namely

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}_0) = F_0 \quad \text{and} \quad c(\mathcal{M}_0, \Pi_A) = \kappa_{\mathcal{T}} + \log F_0. \quad (58)$$

Let us consider the case $F_0 = F_*$. In this case, we have

$$2^{c(\mathcal{M}_0, \Pi_A) - \kappa_{\mathcal{T}}} = F_0 = F_* = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa_{\mathcal{T}}}, \quad (59)$$

which implies $c(\mathcal{M}_0, \Pi_A) = c_{\min}$. Since F_{\min} is the maximum accuracy achieved by quantum channels with cost c_{\min} , we conclude that $F_* = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}_0) \leq F_{\min}$. Combined with the Eq. (57), this bound implies $F_* = F_{\min}$.

Now, suppose that $F_0 > f$. Consider the parametric family of quantum channels \mathcal{M}_F of the form

$$\mathcal{M}_F := p_F \mathcal{M}_0 + (1 - p_F) \chi_B \text{Tr}_A \quad F \in [F_{\min}, F_0], \quad (60)$$

where χ_B is a fixed quantum state (to be determined later) and $p_F := F/F_0$.

Note that the accuracy of the channel \mathcal{M}_F is at least F , as one has

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}_F) \geq p_F F_0 = F \quad (61)$$

(the bound following from the fact that the performance operators are nonnegative).

We now set F to F_* , and choose the state χ_B so that the channel \mathcal{M}_{F_*} has minimum cost. The minimum cost condition (55) implies

$$\chi_B = \frac{\Gamma_B - p_{F_*} \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A)}{1 - p_{F_*}}. \quad (62)$$

This expression is well-defined because $p_{F_*} = F_*/F_0$ is strictly smaller than 1.

We now show that Eq. (62) defines a valid quantum state. It is immediate to see that the operator χ_B has unit trace. It remains to show that χ_B is positive semidefinite. To this purpose, note that the condition $\chi_B \geq 0$ is equivalent to $\Gamma_B \geq p_{F_*} \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A)$, which is equivalent to $I_B \geq p_{F_*} \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. In turn, this condition is equivalent to

$$1 \geq p_{F_*} \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|. \quad (63)$$

We now show that Eq. (63) is satisfied. Inserting the definition of the state $\tilde{\Gamma}_A$ [Eq. (55)] into Eq. (63), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p_{F_*} \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| &= \frac{p_{F_*}}{\text{Tr}[\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A]} \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_0(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\ &= \frac{p_{F_*} 2^{c(\mathcal{M}_0, \Pi_A)}}{2^{c_{\min}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

having used Eqs. (26) and (54). Then, inserting the definition $p_{F_*} := F_*/F_0 = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa\tau}/F_0$ and the relation $2^{c(\mathcal{M}_0, \Pi_A)} = F_0 2^{\kappa\tau}$ (following from Eq. (58)) in the right hand side, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p_{F_*} \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| &= \frac{2^{c_{\min} - \kappa\tau}}{F_0} \frac{F_0 2^{\kappa\tau}}{2^{c_{\min}}} \\ &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Hence, condition (63) is satisfied.

In summary, the operator χ_B is a valid quantum state, and therefore the map \mathcal{M}_F defined in Eq. (60) is a valid quantum channel. In particular, \mathcal{M}_{F_*} is a valid quantum channel. The nonequilibrium cost of \mathcal{M}_{F_*} is c_{\min} and its accuracy is at least F_* . Since F_{\min} is the maximum accuracy achievable with c_{\min} clean qubits, we have the inequality $F_{\min} \geq F_* = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa\tau}$. On the other hand, Eq. (57) gives the bound $F_{\min} \leq 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa\tau}$. Hence, we conclude that the equality $F_{\min} = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa\tau}$ holds. \square

Corollary 1. *If the input subspace is the whole Hilbert space (i.e. $\Pi_A = I_A$), then the equality $F_{\min} = F_{\max}^{\text{rev}}$ holds, where F_{\max}^{rev} is the accuracy of the time-reversed task defined in the Methods section of the main text.*

Proof. By Lemma 2, the minimum fidelity is $F_{\min} = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa\tau}$. If the input subspace is the whole Hilbert space, then the projector Π_A is the identity operator, and Lemma 1 yields $c_{\min} = 0$. Hence, $F_{\min} = 2^{-\kappa\tau}$. Recalling the definition of the reverse entropy $\kappa := \log(1/F_{\max}^{\text{rev}})$, one finally obtains the equality $F_{\min} = F_{\max}^{\text{rev}}$. \square

Proof of the attainability criterion

Theorem 2. *If the bound (45) is attainable at $F = F_0$, then it is attainable for every $F \in [F_{\min}, F_0]$, with $F_{\min} = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa\tau}$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{M}_0 be the channel that saturates the bound (45) at $F = F_0$, and let \mathcal{M}_F be the channel defined in Eq. (60). The nonequilibrium cost of \mathcal{M}_F , given by Eq. (26), is

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mathcal{M}_F, \Pi_A) &= \log \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_F(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\ &= \log \text{Tr}[\Pi_A \Gamma_A] + \log \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_F(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where $\tilde{\Gamma}_A$ is defined as in Eq. (55).

Using the definition of \mathcal{M}_F , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_F(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) &= p_F \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) + (1 - p_F) \chi_B \\ &= p_F \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) + (1 - p_F) \frac{\Gamma_B - p_{F_*} \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A)}{1 - p_{F_*}}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

the second equality following from Eq. (62). Rearranging the terms, we obtain

$$\mathcal{M}_F(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) = \frac{1 - p_F}{1 - p_{F_*}} \Gamma_B + \frac{p_F - p_{F_*}}{1 - p_{F_*}} \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A), \quad (68)$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_F(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| &= \left\| \frac{1-p_F}{1-p_{F_*}} I_B + \frac{p_F-p_{F_*}}{1-p_{F_*}} \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\
&= \frac{1-p_F}{1-p_{F_*}} + \frac{p_F-p_{F_*}}{1-p_{F_*}} \left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_0(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\
&= \frac{1-p_F}{1-p_{F_*}} + \frac{p_F-p_{F_*}}{1-p_{F_*}} \frac{\left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_0(\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|}{\text{Tr}[\Pi_A \Gamma_A]} \\
&= \frac{1-p_F}{1-p_{F_*}} + \frac{p_F-p_{F_*}}{1-p_{F_*}} 2^{c(\mathcal{M}_0, \Pi_A) - c_{\min}}, \tag{69}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equation follows from Eqs. (54) and (26). Using Eq. (58) and the definition $F_* = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa_{\mathcal{T}}}$, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_F(\tilde{\Gamma}_A) \Gamma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| &= \frac{1-p_F}{1-p_{F_*}} + \frac{p_F-p_{F_*}}{1-p_{F_*}} \frac{F_0}{F_*} \\
&= \frac{1-p_F}{1-p_{F_*}} + \frac{p_F-p_{F_*}}{1-p_{F_*}} \frac{1}{p_{F_*}} \\
&= \frac{p_F}{p_{F_*}} \\
&= \frac{F}{F_*}. \tag{70}
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting Eqs. (54) and (70) into Eq. (66), we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
c(\mathcal{M}_F, \Pi_A) &= c_{\min} + \log \frac{F}{F_*} \\
&= \kappa_{\mathcal{T}} + \log F, \tag{71}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the definition $F_* := 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa_{\mathcal{T}}}$.

Summarising, the channel \mathcal{M}_F has nonequilibrium cost $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} + \log F$, and accuracy at least F (by Eq. (61)). To conclude, we observe that channel \mathcal{M}_F has accuracy $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}_F) = F$. Indeed, we know from Eq. (61) that the accuracy satisfies the inequality $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}_F) \geq F$. On the other hand, the bound (45) implies the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} + \log F &= c(\mathcal{M}_F, \Pi_A) \\
&\geq \kappa_{\mathcal{T}} + \log \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}_F), \tag{72}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}_F) \leq F$.

Summarising, the channel \mathcal{M}_F has nonequilibrium cost $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} + \log F$, and accuracy F (by Eq. (61)). Hence, it saturates the bound (45). \square

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE 4: ATTAINABILITY RESULTS

Classical deterministic computations. Here we show that the bound (45) is attainable for every classical deterministic computation. Let $f : \{1, \dots, d_A\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, d_B\}, x \mapsto y = f(x)$ be a function between two finite sets. Mathematically, a classical process that evaluates the function f without errors can be represented as a quantum channel \mathcal{M}_f , whose action on a generic input state ρ is given by

$$\mathcal{M}_f(\rho) = \sum_x \langle x | \rho | x \rangle |f(x)\rangle \langle f(x)|. \tag{73}$$

For an approximate realisation of erasure, corresponding to a different channel \mathcal{M} , we consider the fidelity $F_f(\mathcal{M}) = \min_x \langle f(x) | \mathcal{M}(|x\rangle \langle x|) | f(x) \rangle$ as the figure of merit. Operationally, the fidelity corresponds to the probability that the channel \mathcal{M} computes the correct value of $f(x)$, in the worst case over all possible inputs x .

Proposition 4. *The nonequilibrium cost for approximately computing the function f with fidelity F is $c_f(F) = \kappa_f + \log F$, where $\kappa_f = D_{\max}(p_f \| g_B)$ is the reverse entropy derived in Supplementary Note 2. The equality holds for every F in the interval $[F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$, with $F_{\min} = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa_f}$ and $F_{\max} = 1$.*

Proof. Applying the channel to the Gibbs state Γ_A , we obtain

$$\mathcal{M}_f(\Gamma_A) = \sum_{y \in f(A)} p_f(y) |y\rangle\langle y| \quad p_f(y) := \sum_{x: f(x)=y} g_A(x). \quad (74)$$

Hence, the nonequilibrium cost of channel \mathcal{M}_f , given by Eq. (26) is

$$c(\mathcal{M}_f, \Pi_A) = D_{\max}(\mathcal{M}(\Gamma_A) \| \Gamma_B) = D_{\max}(p_f \| g_B). \quad (75)$$

Comparing this equation with Eq. (52), we obtain the equality

$$c(\mathcal{M}_f, \Pi_A) = \kappa_f, \quad (76)$$

which implies

$$c_f(1) \leq c(\mathcal{M}_f, \Pi_A) = \kappa_f, \quad (77)$$

because the channel \mathcal{M}_f has unit accuracy.

On the other hand, evaluating the bound (45) at $F = 1$ yields the converse inequality

$$c_f(1) \geq \kappa_f. \quad (78)$$

Hence, the equality $c_f(1) = \kappa_f$ holds.

Summarising, the bound (45) holds at $F = 1$ with the equality sign. Hence, Theorem 1 implies that the bound (45) holds for every F in the interval $[F_{\min}, 1]$. \square

Quantum extensions of classical computations. Here we show that the bound (45) is attainable for every quantum extension (in the sense defined precisely in the following) of a classical computation.

Let $f : \{1, \dots, d_A\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, d_B\}$, $x \mapsto y = f(x)$ be a function between two finite sets, and let $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f$ be a quantum channel from a d_A -dimensional input system A to a d_B -dimensional output system B , satisfying the condition

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f(|x\rangle\langle x|) = |f(x)\rangle\langle f(x)| \quad \forall x \in \{1, \dots, d_A\}. \quad (79)$$

We call the channel $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f$ a *quantum extension* of the function f .

Now, consider the task of transforming the input state ρ_x into the target output state $\rho'_x = \mathcal{M}_f(\rho_x)$, where the input state ρ_x is picked from a set that includes the classical states $\{|x\rangle\langle x|\}_{x=1}^{d_A}$. When the output states ρ'_x are mixed, we assume that the figure of merit $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_f$ for the state transformation task $\rho_x \mapsto \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f(\rho_x)$ has been chosen in such a way that the channel $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f$ has accuracy $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_f(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f) = 1$. When these conditions are satisfied, we call the state transformation task $\rho_x \mapsto \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f(\rho_x)$ a quantum extension of the classical task of computing the function f .

Proposition 5. *Let $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f$ be a quantum extension of the function f , and let the state transformation task $\rho_x \mapsto \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f(\rho_x)$ be a quantum extension of the task of computing the function f . The quantum extension specified by $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f$ has*

1. *reverse entropy $\widehat{\kappa}_f = \kappa_f$, where κ_f is the reverse entropy of the computation of f , derived in Supplementary Note 2, and*
2. *nonequilibrium cost $\widehat{c}_f(F) = \kappa_f + \log F$.*

The second equality holds for every F in the interval $[F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$, with $F_{\min} = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa_f}$ and $F_{\max} = 1$.

Proof. Since the set of input states for the task $\rho_x \mapsto \mathcal{M}_f(\rho_x)$ includes the classical states $(|x\rangle\langle x|)_{x=1}^{d_A}$, the reverse entropy of the quantum-extended task, denoted by $\kappa_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f}$, is generally larger than the reverse entropy of the original classical computation task, namely

$$\widehat{\kappa}_f \geq \kappa_f. \quad (80)$$

Evaluating the bound (45) at $F = 1$, we then obtain the inequality

$$\hat{c}_f(1) \geq \hat{\kappa}_f \geq \kappa_f. \quad (81)$$

On the other hand, the nonequilibrium cost of the channel $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f$ is exactly the same as the nonequilibrium cost of the channel \mathcal{M}_f in Eq. (73), because the two channels act in the same way on the Gibbs state. Hence, we have the equality

$$c(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f, \Pi_A) = c(\mathcal{M}_f, \Pi_A) = \kappa_f, \quad (82)$$

where the second equality follows from Eq. (76).

Since the channel $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f$ achieves the state transformation task $\rho_x \mapsto \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f(\rho_x)$ with unit accuracy, the above equality implies the bound

$$\hat{c}_f(1) \leq c(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f, \Pi_A) = \kappa_f. \quad (83)$$

Comparing Eqs. (81) and (83), we obtain the following chain of inequalities

$$\kappa_f \leq \hat{\kappa}_f \leq \hat{c}_f(1) \leq c(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_f, \Pi_A) = \kappa_f, \quad (84)$$

which imply the equalities

$$\hat{\kappa}_f = \kappa_f \quad (85)$$

and

$$\hat{c}_f(1) = \hat{\kappa}_f. \quad (86)$$

The second equality implies that the bound (45) holds at $F = 1$ with the equality sign. Hence, Theorem 1 guarantees that the bound (45) holds for every F in the interval $[F_{\min}, 1]$, and $\hat{c}_f(F) = \hat{\kappa}_f + \log F \equiv \kappa_f + \log F$. \square

Erasure of quantum states. Here we show that the work cost for the approximate erasure of a d -dimensional quantum system to the ground state is

$$W_{\text{erase}}(F) = \frac{\Delta A}{kT} + \ln F. \quad (87)$$

where ΔA is the difference between the free energy of the ground state and the free energy of the Gibbs state.

The erasure task corresponds to the state transformation $\rho \mapsto |0\rangle\langle 0|$, where ρ is an arbitrary pure state. As the figure of merit for approximate erasure, we consider the erasure fidelity $F_{\text{erase}}(\mathcal{M}) = \min_{\rho} \langle 0 | \mathcal{M}(\rho) | 0 \rangle$, where \mathcal{M} is the quantum channel used to implement the erasure task.

Lemma 3. *The reverse entropy of the erasure task is $\kappa_{\text{erase}} = \frac{\Delta A}{kT \ln 2}$.*

Proof. The state transformation $\rho \mapsto |0\rangle\langle 0|$ is the quantum extension of the classical deterministic computation $f_0 : x \mapsto f(x) = 0$, where the classical input $x \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ is encoded in the computational basis state $|x\rangle$, as discussed in the previous section of this Supplementary Note. Hence, the reverse entropy of the erasure task can be computed with Eqs. (85) and (52), which give

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{\text{erase}} &= D_{\max}(p_{f_0} \| g_B) \\ &= \log \frac{1}{g_B(0)} \\ &= \log[e^{E_0/(kT)} Z] \\ &= \frac{E_0}{kT} \log e + \log Z \\ &= \frac{A_0 - A_{\text{Gibbs}}}{kT \ln 2} \\ &= \frac{\Delta A}{kT \ln 2}, \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

where A_0 (respectively, A_{Gibbs}) is the free energy of the state $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ (respectively, Γ), the free energy of a generic state ρ being defined as $A(\rho) := E(\rho) - kT S(\rho)$ with $E(\rho) = \text{Tr}[H \rho]$ and $S(\rho) = -\text{Tr}[\rho \ln \rho]$. \square

Lemma 4. *The nonequilibrium cost and the work cost of erasure are*

$$c_{\text{erase}}(F) = \kappa_{\text{erase}} + \log F \quad \text{and} \quad W_{\text{erase}}(F) = kT \ln 2 c_{\text{erase}}(F), \quad (89)$$

respectively. These expressions hold for every F in the interval $[F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$, with $F_{\min} = 2^{-\kappa_{\text{erase}}} = e^{-\Delta A/(kT)}$ and $F_{\max} = 1$.

Proof. By Proposition 5, every quantum extension of a classical deterministic computation has cost $c_f(F) = \kappa_f + \log F$. In the special case of erasure, the minimum nonequilibrium cost is

$$c_{\text{erase}}(F) = \kappa_{\text{erase}} + \log F. \quad (90)$$

The quality holds for every F in the interval $[F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$, with $F_{\max} = 1$ and $F_{\min} = 2^{c_{\min} - \kappa_{\text{erase}}} = 2^{-\kappa_{\text{erase}}} = e^{-\Delta A/(kT)}$ (having used Lemma 2) for the expression of F_{\min} , plus the fact that the input subspace for the erasure task is the whole Hilbert space, and therefore the minimum nonequilibrium cost is $c_{\min} = 0$ by Lemma 1).

We now prove the equality $W_{\text{erase}}(F) = kT \ln 2 c_{\text{erase}}(F)$. To this purpose, we consider the one-parameter family of quantum channels \mathcal{M}_F defined in Eq. (60). In the specific case of erasure, the expression of the channel \mathcal{M}_F is

$$\mathcal{M}_F(\rho) = \rho_F \quad \forall \rho \quad (91)$$

with

$$\rho_F := F |0\rangle\langle 0| + (1 - F) \chi \quad \text{and} \quad \chi := \frac{\Gamma - F_{\min} |0\rangle\langle 0|}{1 - F_{\min}}. \quad (92)$$

(see Lemma 2 for the proof that χ is a valid quantum state).

The proof of Theorem 1 shows that the channel \mathcal{M}_F has fidelity at least F and satisfies the equality

$$c(\mathcal{M}_F, \Pi_A) = c_{\text{erase}}(F). \quad (93)$$

On the other hand, Eq. (91) implies that the nonequilibrium cost of the channel \mathcal{M}_F is

$$c(\mathcal{M}_F, \Pi_A) = D_{\max}(\mathcal{M}_F(\Gamma) \parallel \Gamma) = D_{\max}(\rho_F \parallel \Gamma). \quad (94)$$

One way to realise the channel \mathcal{M}_F in Eq. (91) is to prepare the state ρ_F and to swap it with the state of the input. The work cost of this realisation is equal to the work cost of generating the state ρ_F , which is given by $kT \ln 2 D_{\max}(\rho_F \parallel \Gamma)$ [25]. Since $W_{\text{erase}}(F)$ is the minimum work cost of erasure, we have the bound

$$W_{\text{erase}}(F) \leq kT \ln 2 D_{\max}(\rho_F \parallel \Gamma) = kT \ln 2 c(\mathcal{M}_F, \Pi_A) = kT \ln 2 c_{\text{erase}}(F). \quad (95)$$

On the other hand, the nonequilibrium cost times $kT \ln 2$ is a lower bound to the work cost. Hence, we obtained the equality $W_{\text{erase}}(F) = kT \ln 2 c_{\text{erase}}(F)$. \square

Combining Lemmas 3 and 4 we finally obtain Eq. (87).

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE 5: THE NONEQUILIBRIUM COST OF QUANTUM CLONING

Here we establish that (i) the reverse entropy of quantum cloning is equal to the reverse entropy of classical cloning, and (ii) the bound (4) in the main text is attainable for quantum cloning.

Our strategy is to evaluate the nonequilibrium cost of the optimal quantum cloner [62], and to infer from it the value of the reverse entropy, and the attainability of the bound (4) in the main text.

The nonequilibrium cost of the optimal cloner

Here we calculate the nonequilibrium cost of the optimal universal quantum cloning machine \mathcal{M}_{opt} by Werner [62], which transforms N copies of an arbitrary pure state ψ_x to $N' \geq N$ approximate copies of the same state. The cloner is described by the following quantum channel,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}}(\psi_x^{\otimes N}) = \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}} P_{N'} \left(\psi_x^{\otimes N} \otimes I^{\otimes N' - N} \right) P_{N'}, \quad (96)$$

where P_k is the projector onto the totally symmetric subspace of the k tensor product of k systems, and $d_k := \text{Tr}[P_k]$ is the dimension of the totally symmetric subspace.

Here we consider non-interacting d -level systems, each with the same individual Hamiltonian $H = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} E_i |i\rangle \langle i|$. We label the eigenvalues in increasing order, with $E_0 \leq E_1 \leq \dots \leq E_{d-1} =: E_{\max}$.

In the following, we will denote by $\Gamma := e^{-\beta H} / \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H}]$ ($Z := \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H}]$) the single-particle Gibbs state (partition function), by $E_{\text{Gibbs}} := \text{Tr}[H\Gamma]$, $S_{\text{Gibbs}} = -\text{Tr}[\Gamma \ln \Gamma]$, and $A_{\text{Gibbs}} := E_{\text{Gibbs}} - kT S_{\text{Gibbs}} = -kT \ln Z$, the Gibbs state energy, entropy, and free energy, respectively.

Theorem 3 (nonequilibrium cost of the optimal universal cloner). *The nonequilibrium cost of the optimal universal cloner \mathcal{M}_{opt} in Eq. (96) is*

$$c(\mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}}, \Pi_A) = \frac{\Delta N \Delta A_{\max}}{kT \ln 2} + \log F_{\max}, \quad (97)$$

where $F_{\max} := \log \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}}$ is the optimal cloning fidelity, $\Delta N := N' - N$ is the number of extra copies, and $\Delta A_{\max} := A_{\max} - A_{\text{Gibbs}}$ is the difference between the maximum free energy of a single-copy state, given by $A_{\max} := E_{\max}$, and the free energy of the single-copy Gibbs state, given by $A_{\text{Gibbs}} := -kT \ln Z$.

Proof. For the universal cloner, the input subspace is the totally symmetric subspace, and therefore $\Pi_A = P_N$. Hence, the nonequilibrium cost (26) reads

$$c(\mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}}, P_N) = \log \left\| \left(\Gamma^{\otimes N'} \right)^{-1} \mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}} (P_N \Gamma^{\otimes N} P_N) \left(\Gamma^{\otimes N'} \right)^{-1} \right\|. \quad (98)$$

The projected Gibbs state $P_N \Gamma^{\otimes N} P_N$ can be written as

$$P_N \Gamma^{\otimes N} P_N = \frac{1}{Z^N} \sum_{\vec{n} \in \mathcal{S}_{N,d}} e^{-\beta \vec{n} \cdot \vec{E}} |N, \vec{n}\rangle \langle N, \vec{n}|, \quad (99)$$

where $|N, \vec{n}\rangle$ denotes the normalised symmetric state with occupation number n_j in the j -th mode, $\vec{n} := (n_0, \dots, n_{d-1})$ a partition of N into d nonnegative integers, $\mathcal{S}_{N,d}$ is the set of all such partitions, and $\vec{E} = (E_0, \dots, E_{d-1})$ is the vector of single-system energy eigenstates.

The quantum cloner transforms the input state $|N, \vec{n}\rangle$ into

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}}(|N, \vec{n}\rangle \langle N, \vec{n}|) &= \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}} P_{N'} (|N, \vec{n}\rangle \langle N, \vec{n}| \otimes I^{\otimes \Delta N}) P_{N'} \\ &= \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}} \sum_{\vec{k}, \vec{l} \in \mathcal{S}_{N',d}} |N', \vec{k}\rangle \langle N', \vec{l}| \langle N, \vec{n}| \langle N, \vec{n}| \otimes I^{\otimes \Delta N} |N', \vec{l}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N', \vec{k}| (|N, \vec{n}\rangle \langle N, \vec{n}| \otimes I^{\otimes \Delta N}) |N', \vec{l}\rangle &= \sum_{\vec{r} \in \mathcal{S}_{\Delta N, d}} \langle N', \vec{k}| (|N, \vec{n}\rangle \langle N, \vec{n}| \otimes |\Delta N, \vec{r}\rangle \langle \Delta N, \vec{r}|) |N', \vec{l}\rangle \\ &= \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{l}} \left| \left(\langle N, \vec{n}| \otimes \langle \Delta N, \vec{k} - \vec{n}| \right) |N', \vec{k}\rangle \right|^2 \\ &= \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{l}} \frac{\binom{\vec{k}}{\vec{n}}}{\binom{N'}{N}} \quad \left(\frac{\vec{k}}{\vec{n}} \right) := \prod_{j=0}^{d-1} \binom{k_j}{n_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

Hence, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}}(P_N \Gamma^{\otimes N} P_N) = \frac{1}{Z^N} \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}} \sum_{\vec{n} \in \mathcal{S}_{N,d}} \sum_{\vec{n}' \in \mathcal{S}_{N',d}} e^{-\beta \vec{n} \cdot \vec{E}} \frac{\binom{\vec{n}'}{\vec{n}}}{\binom{N'}{N}} |N', \vec{n}'\rangle \langle N', \vec{n}'|, \quad (102)$$

and

$$\left(\Gamma^{\otimes N'}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}} \left(P_N \Gamma^{\otimes N} P_N\right) \left(\Gamma^{\otimes N'}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = Z^{\Delta N} \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}} \sum_{\vec{n}' \in S_{N',d}} \left(\sum_{\vec{n} \in S_{N,d}} e^{\beta (\vec{n}' - \vec{n}) \cdot \vec{E}} \frac{\binom{\vec{n}'}{N'}}{\binom{\vec{n}}{N}} \right) |N', \vec{n}'\rangle \langle N', \vec{n}'|. \quad (103)$$

The norm of the above operator is given by

$$\left\| \left(\Gamma^{\otimes N'}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}} \left(P_N \Gamma^{\otimes N} P_N\right) \left(\Gamma^{\otimes N'}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| = Z^{\Delta N} \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}} \max_{\vec{n}' \in S_{N',d}} \left(\sum_{\vec{n} \in S_{N,d}} e^{\beta (\vec{n}' - \vec{n}) \cdot \vec{E}} \frac{\binom{\vec{n}'}{N'}}{\binom{\vec{n}}{N}} \right).$$

Note that the binomial coefficient in the numerator of the r.h.s. is nonzero only if all the entries of the vector $\vec{n}' - \vec{n}$ are nonnegative. Under this condition, we have the inequality $e^{\beta (\vec{n}' - \vec{n}) \cdot \vec{E}} \leq e^{\beta \Delta N E_{\max}}$, and therefore the norm is upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\Gamma^{\otimes N'}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}} \left(P_N \Gamma^{\otimes N} P_N\right) \left(\Gamma^{\otimes N'}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| &\leq Z^{\Delta N} \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}} e^{\beta \Delta N E_{\max}} \max_{\vec{n}' \in S_{N',d}} \left(\sum_{\vec{n} \in S_{N,d}} \frac{\binom{\vec{n}'}{N'}}{\binom{\vec{n}}{N}} \right) \\ &= Z^{\Delta N} \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}} e^{\beta \Delta N E_{\max}}, \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

where the last equality follows from the Chu-Vandermonde identity. The upper bound is attained by choosing the vector \vec{n}' with $n'_{d-1} = N'$ and $n_j = 0, \forall j \neq d-1$.

Summarising, we obtained the equality

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}}, P_N) &= \Delta N \log Z + \log \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}} + \beta \Delta N E_{\max} \log e \\ &= \beta \log e \Delta N (E_{\max} - A_{\text{Gibbs}}) + \log F_{\max} \\ &\equiv \frac{\Delta N \Delta A_{\max}}{kT \ln 2} + \log F_{\max}. \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

□

The reverse entropy of quantum cloning

Using the result of the previous subsection, we now show that the reverse entropy of quantum cloning coincides with the reverse entropy of classical cloning. From the main text, we have the bound

$$\kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{Q}} \geq \kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{C}} = \frac{\Delta N \Delta A_{\max}}{kT \ln 2}. \quad (106)$$

On the other hand, applying the bound (45) to the optimal cloning channel \mathcal{M}_{opt} yields the inequality

$$c(\mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}}, \Pi_A) \geq c_{\text{clon}}(F_{\max}) \geq \kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{Q}} + \log F_{\max}. \quad (107)$$

Substituting Eq. (97) into Eq. (107), we then obtain the bound

$$\kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{Q}} \leq \frac{\Delta N \Delta A_{\max}}{kT \ln 2} \equiv \kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{C}}. \quad (108)$$

Hence, we obtained the equality $\kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{Q}} = \kappa_{\text{clon}}^{\text{C}}$.

Achievability of the lower bound (45)

We conclude the section by showing that the bound (45) is attainable for every value of the fidelity in the interval $[F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$.

For the optimal cloning channel, the bound (45) reads $c(\mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}}, \Pi_A) \geq \frac{\Delta N \Delta A_{\max}}{kT \ln 2} + \log F_{\max}$. On the other hand, Eq. (97) shows that the bound is achieved with the equality sign. In other words, the bound (45) is attainable at $F = F_{\max}$. Using the attainability criterion provided in the main text, we can then conclude that the bound (45) is attainable for every value of F in the interval $[F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE 6: CLONING WITH ENTANGLEMENT BINDING MACHINES

Bound on the reverse entropy of the transpose cloning task

Here we consider the task of transpose cloning, which consists in transforming N copies of a pure quantum state ρ_x into N' copies of its transpose state ρ_x^T . To estimate the reverse entropy of transpose cloning, we use the expression $\kappa_{\text{clon}^*} = \max_{\mathbf{p}} H(A|B)_{\omega_{\text{clon}^*, \mathbf{p}}}$ and we fix the prior probability distribution \mathbf{p} to be the normalised Haar measure $p(dx)$. With this choice, the operator $\omega_{\text{clon}^*, \mathbf{p}}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{\text{clon}^*, \mathbf{p}} &= \int p(dx) (\Gamma_A^{-1} \otimes \Gamma_B)^{1/2} \underbrace{\rho_x^T \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_x^T}_{N+N' \text{ times}} (\Gamma_A^{-1} \otimes \Gamma_B)^{1/2} \\ &= (\Gamma_A^{-1} \otimes \Gamma_B)^{1/2} \frac{P_{N+N'}}{d_{N+N'}} (\Gamma_A^{-1} \otimes \Gamma_B)^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

where $P_{N+N'}$ is the projector on the symmetric subspace of $N+N'$ systems, and $d_{N+N'} = \text{Tr}[P_{N+N'}]$ is the dimension of the symmetric subspace.

Now, the condition $I_A \otimes \Lambda_B \geq \omega_{\text{clon}^*, \mathbf{p}}$ is equivalent to

$$\Gamma_A \otimes \Gamma_B^{-1/2} \Lambda_B \Gamma_B^{-1/2} \geq \frac{P_{N+N'}}{d_{N+N'}}. \quad (110)$$

Recall that $\Gamma_A = \Gamma^{\otimes N}$, and notice that one has

$$\Gamma_A \geq g_{\min}^N I_A, \quad (111)$$

where $g_{\min} = e^{-\beta E_{\max}}/Z$ is the smallest probability in the Gibbs distribution. Then, the condition (110) is satisfied by the operator

$$\Lambda_B^{\min} := \frac{\Gamma_B^{1/2} P_{N'} \Gamma_B^{1/2}}{g_{\min}^N d_{N+N'}}, \quad (112)$$

where $P_{N'}$ is the projector on the symmetric subspace of N' systems.

Hence, the reverse entropy satisfies the condition

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{\text{clon}^*} &= - \min_{I_A \otimes \Lambda_B \geq \omega_{\text{clon}^*, \mathbf{p}}} \log \text{Tr}[\Lambda_B] \\ &\geq - \log \text{Tr}[\Lambda_B^{\min}] \\ &= \log \frac{g_{\min}^N d_{N+N'}}{\text{Tr}[\Gamma_B P_{N'}]} \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

$$\geq \log \frac{g_{\min}^N d_{N+N'}}{g_{\max}^{N'} d_{N'}}, \quad (114)$$

where $g_{\max} = e^{-\beta E_{\min}}/Z$ is the maximum probability in the Gibbs state, and $d_{N'} = \text{Tr}[P_{N'}]$ is the dimension of the symmetric subspace of N' systems.

Rearranging the terms, we finally obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{\text{clon}^*} &\geq \log g_{\min}^{N-N'} + \log \frac{d_{N+N'} (g_{\min}/g_{\max})^{N'}}{d_{N'}} \\ &= \kappa_{\text{clon}} + \log \frac{d_{N+N'} e^{-\beta N' \Delta E}}{d_{N'}},\end{aligned}\quad (115)$$

with $\Delta E := E_{\max} - E_{\min}$.

The above inequality implies that the nonequilibrium cost of the transpose cloning task is lower bounded as

$$c_{\text{clon}^*}(F) \geq \kappa_{\text{clon}} + \log F + \log \frac{d_{N+N'} e^{-\beta N' \Delta E}}{d_{N'}}. \quad (116)$$

This bound applies to all entanglement binding machines for the task of quantum cloning, due to the general argument shown in the main text.

Achievability of the bounds (115) and (116) for fully degenerate systems

Here we show that the the bounds (115) and (116) are exactly achievable for fully degenerate systems, corresponding to $\Delta E = 0$.

Let \mathcal{E}_{opt} be the optimal state estimation channel [70], whose action on the symmetric subspace is defined by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}}(P_N \rho P_N) := d_N \int d\psi \text{Tr}[\psi^{\otimes N} P_N \rho P_N] \psi^{\otimes N'}, \quad (117)$$

where $\psi := |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ denote the projector on a generic pure state $|\psi\rangle$, and $d\psi$ is the normalised unitarily invariant measure on the set of pure states.

Then, define the channel $\mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}^*}$ via the relation

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}^*}(\rho) := [\mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}}(\rho)]^T \quad \forall \rho. \quad (118)$$

This channel achieves the optimal fidelity $F_{\max} = d_N/d_{N+N'}$ for the transpose cloning task, which coincides with the optimal fidelity for implementing the original cloning task via state estimation [70].

For the channel $\mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}^*}$, we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned}c(\mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}}, \Pi_A) &\geq c_{\text{clon}^*}(F_{\max}) \geq \kappa_{\text{clon}^*} + \log F_{\max} \geq (N' - N) \log d + \log \frac{d_{N+N'}}{d_{N'}} + \log \frac{d_N}{d_{N+N'}} \\ &= (N' - N) \log d + \log \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}},\end{aligned}\quad (119)$$

where the second inequality follows from the bound (116) with $\Delta E = 0$.

On the other hand, the nonequilibrium cost of the channel $\mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}^*}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}c(\mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}^*}, \Pi_A) &= \log \left\| d^{N'-N} \mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}^*}(P_N) \right\| \\ &= \log \left\| d^{N'-N} \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}} P_{N'} \right\| \\ &= (N' - N) \log d + \log \frac{d_N}{d_{N'}}.\end{aligned}\quad (120)$$

Combining Eqs. (119) and (120), we then obtain the equalities

$$c_{\text{clon}^*}(F_{\max}) = \kappa_{\text{clon}^*} + \log F_{\max} \quad (121)$$

and

$$\kappa_{\text{clon}^*} = (N' - N) \log d + \log \frac{d_{N+N'}}{d_{N'}}. \quad (122)$$

In particular, Eq. (121) implies that the bound (45) for transpose cloning is attained at $F = F_{\max}$. Hence, Theorem 1 implies that the bound (45) for transpose cloning is attained for every value of the fidelity in the interval $[F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$, namely

$$c_{\text{clon}^*}(F_{\max}) = \kappa_{\text{clon}^*} + \log F_{\max} \quad (123)$$

Incidentally, we observe that the one-parameter family of quantum channels \mathcal{M}_F defined in the proof of Theorem 1 consists of entanglement breaking channels. Hence, the optimal accuracy/nonequilibrium tradeoff for transpose cloning is achieved by an entanglement breaking (and, in particular, an entanglement binding) channel for every value of F .

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE 7: STATE TRANSMISSION AND STATE TRANSPOSITION WITH ENTANGLEMENT BINDING MACHINES

Here we establish a bound on the nonequilibrium cost of entanglement binding (EB) machines in the state transmission task $\rho_x \mapsto \rho_x$, where ρ_x is an arbitrary pure state. The bound is derived from a bound on the nonequilibrium cost of arbitrary quantum machines for the state transposition task $\rho_x \mapsto \rho_x^T$. This task is a special case of the transpose cloning task considered in the Supplementary Note 6.

The logic of the derivation is as follows. As discussed in Methods, the minimum nonequilibrium cost of EB machines achieving fidelity F in a given task $\rho_x \mapsto \rho'_x$ coincides with the minimum nonequilibrium cost of EB machines achieving fidelity F in the transpose task $\rho_x \mapsto \rho_x'^T$. In turn, the minimum cost of EB machines is lower bounded by the minimum cost of arbitrary quantum machines, mathematically described by trace-preserving completely positive linear maps. Hence, we have the bound

$$c_{\text{transmit, eb}}(F) \equiv c_{\text{transpose, eb}}(F) \geq c_{\text{transpose}}(F) \quad (124)$$

where $c_{\text{transmit, eb}}(F)$ ($c_{\text{transpose, eb}}(F)$) is the minimum nonequilibrium cost needed to achieve fidelity F for state transmission (state transposition) with EB machines, and $c_{\text{transpose}}(F)$ is the minimum nonequilibrium cost needed to achieve fidelity F for state transposition with arbitrary quantum machines.

The main result of this section is the following bound

$$c_{\text{transpose}}(F) \geq \log \left[\frac{(d^2 F - d)^2}{4\gamma(1 - F)} + F \right], \quad (125)$$

with $\gamma := \left(\sum_{m=1}^{d-1} e^{-\frac{\Delta E_m}{2kT}} \right)^2$, $\Delta E_m := E_m - E_{m-1}$, and with the eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian ordered so that $E_0 \leq E_1 \leq \dots \leq E_{d-1}$. This bound implies that the nonequilibrium cost is strictly larger than zero whenever the fidelity satisfies the condition

$$F > \frac{d + 2\sqrt{\gamma}}{d^2 + 2\sqrt{\gamma}} =: F_*. \quad (126)$$

For qubits, we will show that the bound (125) is achievable for every Hamiltonian and for every value of the fidelity between $F_* = (1 + \sqrt{\gamma})/(2 + \sqrt{\gamma}) \equiv F_{\min}$ (the fidelity corresponding to the minimum nonequilibrium cost $c_{\min} = 0$) and $F_{\max} = 2/3$ (the maximum fidelity allowed by quantum mechanics, corresponding to the maximum nonequilibrium cost $c_{\max} = \log(\gamma^{-1} + 2/3)$).

For $d = 2$, this bound coincides with Eq. (11) in the main text.

State transposition with bounded nonequilibrium resources

Our strategy to derive the bound (125) is to consider the maximisation of the transposition fidelity under a constraint on the nonequilibrium resources. We define the maximum fidelity as

$$F_{\text{transpose}}(c) := \max_{\mathcal{M} : c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) \leq c} \min_{\rho_x} \text{Tr}[\rho_x^T \mathcal{M}(\rho_x)], \quad (127)$$

where the minimisation runs over all pure states $\rho_x = |\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|$, x being some parametrisation of the unit sphere. To derive a bound on $F_{\text{transpose}}(c)$, we observe that the maximisation in Eq. (127) can be restricted without loss of

generality to quantum channels \mathcal{M} satisfying the covariance property $\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{U}_\theta = \mathcal{U}_\theta^T \circ \mathcal{M}$, where $\theta = (\theta_0, \dots, \theta_{d-1}) \in [0, 2\pi]^{\times d}$ is a vector of d phases, \mathcal{U}_θ ($\bar{\mathcal{U}}_\theta$) is the unitary channel defined by $\mathcal{U}_\theta(\rho) := U_\theta \rho U_\theta^\dagger$, $\forall \rho$ ($\bar{\mathcal{U}}_\theta(\rho) := \bar{U}_\theta \rho \bar{U}_\theta^T$, $\forall \rho$), and $U_\theta := \sum_m e^{-i\theta_m} |m\rangle\langle m|$ ($\bar{U}_\theta := \sum_m e^{i\theta_m} |m\rangle\langle m|$) (see e.g. [84]). The reduction to covariant channels can be made without loss of generality, because for every given channel \mathcal{M} , the covariant channel

$$\mathcal{M}' := \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta_0}{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta_{d-1}}{2\pi} \mathcal{U}_\theta^T \circ \mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{U}_\theta, \quad (128)$$

satisfies the conditions $F_{\text{transpose}}(\mathcal{M}') \geq F_{\text{transpose}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $c(\mathcal{M}', \Pi_A) \leq c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A)$.

In the Choi representation, the covariance condition $\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{U}_\theta = \mathcal{U}_\theta^T \circ \mathcal{M}$, $\forall \theta$ is equivalent to the commutation condition $[M, U_\theta \otimes U_\theta] = 0$, $\forall \theta$, where M is the Choi operator of \mathcal{M} (see e.g. [85]). Using this commutation, the Choi operators of covariant quantum channels (completely positive trace preserving maps) can be characterised as those with the following block diagonal form

$$\begin{aligned} M = & \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} p_{mm} |m\rangle\langle m| \otimes |m\rangle\langle m| \\ & + \sum_{m=1}^{d-1} \sum_{n:n < m} \left(p_{mn} |m\rangle\langle m| \otimes |n\rangle\langle n| + p_{nm} |n\rangle\langle n| \otimes |m\rangle\langle m| + c_{mn} |m\rangle\langle n| \otimes |n\rangle\langle m| + \bar{c}_{mn} |n\rangle\langle m| \otimes |m\rangle\langle n| \right), \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

where p_{mn} are probabilities satisfying the normalisation $\sum_m p_{mn} = 1 \forall n$, and c_{mn} are complex coefficients satisfying the condition $|c_{mn}|^2 \leq p_{mn} p_{nm}$.

For a generic state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_m \psi_m |m\rangle$, the fidelity of the covariant channel \mathcal{M} satisfies the bound

$$\begin{aligned} F_\psi(\mathcal{M}) &:= \text{Tr}[(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)^T \mathcal{M}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)] \\ &= \langle \bar{\psi} | \langle \bar{\psi} | M | \bar{\psi} \rangle | \bar{\psi} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} p_{mm} |\psi_m|^4 + \sum_{m=1}^{d-1} \sum_{n:n < m} |\psi_m|^2 |\psi_n|^2 (p_{mn} + p_{nm} + c_{mn} + \bar{c}_{mn}) \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

$$\leq \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} p_{mm} |\psi_m|^4 + \sum_{m=1}^{d-1} \sum_{n:n < m} |\psi_m|^2 |\psi_n|^2 (p_{mn} + p_{nm} + 2\sqrt{p_{mn} p_{nm}}), \quad (131)$$

which can be achieved with the appropriate choice of coefficients $c_{mn} = \sqrt{p_{mn} p_{nm}}$. In particular, a computational basis state $|m\rangle$ gives fidelity $F_m(\mathcal{M}) = p_{mm}$, while an equatorial state, with $|\psi_m| = 1/d \forall m$, gives fidelity

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{equatorial}}(\mathcal{M}) &= \frac{\sum_{m=0}^{d-1} p_{mm} + \sum_m \sum_{n:n < m} p_{mn} + p_{nm} + 2\sqrt{p_{mn} p_{nm}}}{d^2} \\ &= \frac{d + 2 \sum_{m=1}^{d-1} \sum_{n:n < m} \sqrt{p_{mn} p_{nm}}}{d^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (132)$$

The above fidelities, maximised over all channels with nonequilibrium cost bounded by c , provide upper bounds to the worst case fidelity $F_{\text{transpose}}(c)$. To introduce the nonequilibrium constraint, we observe that

$$\Gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}(\Gamma) \Gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \Gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{Tr}_A[(I \otimes \Gamma^T) M] \Gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \sum_{m,n} p_{mn} \frac{g_n}{g_m} |m\rangle\langle m|, \quad (133)$$

where $g_m = e^{-E_m/(kT)}/Z$ are the eigenvalues of the Gibbs state, ordered so that $g_0 \leq g_1 \leq \dots \leq g_{d-1}$. Hence, the nonequilibrium cost (26) is given by

$$c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) = \max_m \log \left(\sum_n p_{mn} \frac{g_n}{g_m} \right). \quad (134)$$

Note that, for every $m \geq 1$, one has the bounds

$$\sum_{n:n < m} p_{mn} \leq \frac{g_m}{g_{m-1}} \left(\sum_{n:n < m} p_{mn} \frac{g_n}{g_m} \right) \leq \frac{g_m}{g_{m-1}} \left(\sum_{n:n \neq m} p_{mn} \frac{g_n}{g_m} \right) \leq \frac{g_m}{g_{m-1}} (2^{c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A)} - p_{mm}) \quad (135)$$

and

$$\sum_{n:n < m} \sqrt{p_{mn} p_{nm}} \leq \sqrt{\left(\sum_{n:n < m} p_{mn} \right) \left(\sum_{n:n < m} p_{nm} \right)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{g_m}{g_{m-1}} \left(2^{c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A)} - p_{mm} \right) (1 - p_{mm})}. \quad (136)$$

Later we will see that this bound is achievable for qubits (but generally not for higher dimensional systems). Using this bound, the equatorial fidelity is upper bounded as

$$F_{\text{equatorial}}(\mathcal{M}) \leq \frac{d + 2 \sum_{m=1}^{d-1} \sqrt{\frac{g_m}{g_{m-1}} \left(2^{c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A)} - p_{mm} \right) (1 - p_{mm})}}{d^2} \quad (137)$$

Now, suppose that a channel \mathcal{M}_0 has nonequilibrium cost less than c , namely $c(\mathcal{M}_0, \Pi_A) \leq c$. Recall that p_{mm} is equal to the fidelity on the computational basis state $|m\rangle$, and therefore it is lower bounded by the worst case fidelity $F_{\text{transpose}}(c)$. Hence, we have the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{transpose}}(c) \leq F_{\text{equatorial}}(\mathcal{M}_0) &\leq \frac{d + 2 \sum_{m=1}^{d-1} \sqrt{\frac{g_m}{g_{m-1}} \left(2^c - F_{\text{transpose}}(c) \right) (1 - F_{\text{transpose}}(c))}}{d^2} \\ &\leq \frac{d + 2 \sqrt{\gamma \left(2^c - F_{\text{transpose}}(c) \right) (1 - F_{\text{transpose}}(c))}}{d^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (138)$$

having defined $\gamma := \left(\sum_{m=1}^{d-1} \sqrt{g_m/g_{m-1}} \right)^2$. Solving the above inequality in $F_{\text{transpose}}(c)$, we obtain the bound

$$F_{\text{transpose}}(c) \leq \frac{d^3 - 2\gamma(1 + 2^c) + \sqrt{[d^3 - 2\gamma(1 + 2^c)]^2 - (d^4 - 4\gamma)(d^2 - 4\gamma 2^c)}}{d^4 - 4\gamma}, \quad (139)$$

valid for $F_c \leq 1/d$. Solving the inequality in c , instead, we obtain the bound

$$c \geq \log \left[F_{\text{transpose}}(c) + \frac{(d^2 F_c - d)^2}{4\gamma(1 - F_c)} \right], \quad (140)$$

valid for $F_{\text{transpose}}(c) \leq 1/d$. This bound is equivalent to Eq. (125).

Achievability of the bound (125) for qubits

For $d = 2$, the bound (125) reads

$$c_{\text{transpose}}(F) \geq \log \left[F + e^{\frac{\Delta E}{kT}} \frac{(2F - 1)^2}{(1 - F)} \right], \quad \forall F \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (141)$$

We now show that the bound holds with the equality sign for all possible Hamiltonians, and for all values of F in the interval $[F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$, with

$$F_{\min} = \frac{e^{\frac{\Delta E}{kT}} + 1}{2e^{\frac{\Delta E}{kT}} + 1} \quad \text{and} \quad F_{\max} = \frac{2}{3}. \quad (142)$$

(cf. Eq. (126) and the discussion following it).

To prove the achievability of the bound, we consider the quantum channel \mathcal{M} with Choi operator

$$\begin{aligned} M &= p_{00} |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + p_{11} |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| \\ &\quad + p_{01} |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| + p_{10} |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{p_{01} p_{10}} \left(|0\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 1| \right), \end{aligned} \quad (143)$$

with

$$p_{11} = F, \quad p_{01} = 1 - F, \quad p_{10} = \frac{(2F - 1)^2}{1 - F}, \quad \text{and} \quad p_{00} = \frac{3F - 4F^2}{1 - F}. \quad (144)$$

These parameters define a completely positive trace-preserving map whenever $p_{00} \geq 0$, that is, whenever $F \leq 3/4$. In particular, they define a valid quantum channel whenever $F \leq 2/3 \equiv F_{\max}$.

For the channel \mathcal{M} , the nonequilibrium cost, given by Eq. (134), is

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) &= \max \left\{ \log \left(p_{00} + p_{01} \frac{g_1}{g_0} \right), \log \left(p_{11} + p_{10} \frac{g_0}{g_1} \right) \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ \log \left[\frac{3F - 4F^2}{1 - F} + \frac{g_1}{g_0} (1 - F) \right], \log \left[F + e^{\Delta E} \frac{(2F - 1)^2}{1 - F} \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (145)$$

For every $F \geq (e^{\Delta E/(kT)} + 1) / (2e^{\Delta E/(kT)} + 1) \equiv F_{\min}$, one has the equality

$$c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_A) = \log \left[F + e^{\Delta E/(kT)} \frac{(2F - 1)^2}{1 - F} \right] \quad \forall F \in [F_{\min}, F_{\max}]. \quad (146)$$

We now show that the worst case fidelity of the channel \mathcal{M} is F . The fidelity of this channel on a generic state $|\psi\rangle = \psi_0|0\rangle + \psi_1|1\rangle$ is given by Eq. (130) and yields the relation

$$F_\psi(\mathcal{M}) = \sum_{m=0}^1 p_{mm} |\psi_m|^4 + |\psi_0|^2 |\psi_1|^2 (\sqrt{p_{01}} + \sqrt{p_{10}})^2, \quad (147)$$

Note that one has $\sqrt{p_{01}} + \sqrt{p_{10}} = (2F - 1)/\sqrt{1 - F} + \sqrt{1 - F} = F/\sqrt{1 - F}$, and therefore

$$F_\psi(\mathcal{M}) = F |\psi_1|^4 + \frac{3F - 4F^2}{1 - F} |\psi_0|^4 + |\psi_0|^2 |\psi_1|^2 \frac{F^2}{1 - F}. \quad (148)$$

For every $F \leq 2/3 \equiv F_{\max}$, the minimum of $F_\psi(\mathcal{M})$ is attained for $|\psi\rangle = |1\rangle$, whence one has

$$F_{\text{transpose}}(\mathcal{M}) = \min_{|\psi\rangle} F_\psi(\mathcal{M}) = F \quad \forall F \leq F_{\max}. \quad (149)$$

Summarising, Eqs. (146) and (149) imply that the bound (141) is achievable for every Hamiltonian and for every value of F in the interval $[F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$.

Bound on the nonequilibrium cost of state transmission/state transposition with entanglement binding channels

The bound (141), valid for arbitrary quantum channels, implies the bound

$$c_{\text{transmit,eb}}(F) \equiv c_{\text{transpose,eb}}(F) \geq \log \left[F + e^{\frac{\Delta E}{kT}} \frac{(2F - 1)^2}{(1 - F)} \right], \quad (150)$$

on the nonequilibrium cost of every EB channel that transmits or transposes quantum states with fidelity F . We now show that this bound holds with the equality sign for every Hamiltonian and for every value of the fidelity between F_{\min} and F_{\max} . Indeed, the channel \mathcal{M} defined through Eq. (143) is entanglement binding for every $F \in [F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$: to check this, it is enough to evaluate the partial transpose of the Choi operator M on the output system, which is given by

$$\begin{aligned} M^{T_B} &= p_{00} |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + p_{11} |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| \\ &\quad + p_{01} |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| + p_{10} |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{p_{01} p_{10}} \left(|0\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 0| \right). \end{aligned} \quad (151)$$

The Choi operator is positive if and only if $p_{01} p_{10} \leq p_{00} p_{11}$, that is, if and only if $(2F - 1)^2 \leq \frac{3F^2 - 4F^3}{1 - F}$. This inequality is satisfied in the interval $[(5 - \sqrt{5})/10, (5 + \sqrt{5})/10]$, which contains the interval $[F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$.

Summarising, the transposed Choi operator M^{TB} is positive for every $F \in [F_{\min}, F_{\max}]$. Hence, the channel \mathcal{M} is entanglement binding. Furthermore, we observe that, since M is a two-qubit operator, the Peres-Horodecki criterion [65, 66] implies that M is separable. In turn, separability of M implies that the channel \mathcal{M} is entanglement-breaking [63], or equivalently, that \mathcal{M} is a measure-and-prepare channel, of the form

$$\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^k \text{Tr}[P_i \rho] \sigma_i, \quad (152)$$

where $(P_i)_{i=1}^k$ are positive operators representing a quantum measurement, and $(\sigma_i)_{i=1}^k$ are quantum states. Operationally, this means that the channel \mathcal{M} can be realised by performing a measurement on the input, and re-preparing the output in the state σ_i .

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE 8: BOUND ON WORK EXTRACTION

Here we show how the result of Ref. [25] on work extraction can be retrieved from our main bound (45). To this purpose, it is useful to review the framework of Ref. [25], where the allowed operations on system S are obtained from a joint energy-preserving unitary evolution that couples system S with a heat bath B in the thermal state, and with a work register R , initially in an energy eigenstate. In this framework, obtaining work ΔW means transforming the state of the work register from an energy eigenstate with energy W_{out} to an energy eigenstate with energy W_{in} , with $W_{\text{in}} - W_{\text{out}} = \Delta W$.

Crucially, the effective evolution from system S to the composite system SR , consisting of the system and the work register, is a quantum channel \mathcal{N} satisfying the covariance property $\mathcal{N}(U_t \rho U_t^\dagger) = (U_t \otimes V_t) \mathcal{N}(\rho) (U_t \otimes V_t)^\dagger$ where $U_t = e^{-itH_S/\hbar}$ and $V_t = e^{-itH_R/\hbar}$ are the time evolution operators for the system and for the work register, respectively, and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is an arbitrary evolution time.

Now, consider the task of extracting work from an initial state ρ . Since the channel \mathcal{N} is covariant, the amount of work extracted from ρ is equal to the amount of work extracted from $\rho_t := U_t \rho U_t^\dagger$, and, in turn, is equal to the amount of work extracted from the average state

$$\langle \rho \rangle = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} dt U_t \rho U_t^\dagger. \quad (153)$$

One of the results of Ref. [25] is that the maximum work extractable from ρ is given by the min relative entropy $D_{\min}(\langle \rho \rangle \| \Gamma) = \text{Tr}[\Pi \Gamma]$, where Π is the projector on the support of $\langle \rho \rangle$. In the following, we will retrieve this result from our main bound (45), by constructing a suitable test.

Let $\mathcal{M}(\cdot) := \text{Tr}_R[\mathcal{N}(\cdot)]$ be the quantum channel representing the effective evolution of the system in the transformation that extracts work ΔW . Without loss of generality, we can assume that every state σ with support contained in the support of $\langle \rho \rangle$ is mapped to the thermal state. Now, consider the test \mathcal{T} consisting in applying channel \mathcal{M} to the state $\sigma := \Pi \Gamma \Pi / \text{Tr}[\Gamma \Pi]$, and then measuring an observable O . The exact choice of observable will turn out to be irrelevant.

The accuracy measure defined by this test is

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) := \text{Tr}[O \mathcal{M}(\sigma)] \equiv \text{Tr}[O \Gamma]. \quad (154)$$

On the other hand, the reverse entropy of the task specified by the input state σ and by the observable O is

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{\mathcal{T}} &= -\log \text{Tr}[O \Gamma] - D_{\max}(\sigma \| \Gamma) \\ &= -\log \text{Tr}[O \Gamma] - \log \|\Gamma^{-1/2} \sigma \Gamma^{-1/2}\| \\ &= -\log \text{Tr}[O \Gamma] - \log \left\| \frac{\Pi}{\text{Tr}[\Pi \Gamma]} \right\| \\ &= -\log \text{Tr}[O \Gamma] + \log \text{Tr}[\Pi \Gamma] \\ &= -\log \text{Tr}[O \Gamma] - D_{\min}(\langle \rho \rangle \| \Gamma), \end{aligned} \quad (155)$$

where the first equality follows from Eq. (13) in the main text, the third equality follows from the fact that Π and Γ commute, and the last equality follows from the definition of D_{\min} . Hence, our main bound (45) becomes $c_{\mathcal{T}}(F) \geq \log F + \kappa_{\mathcal{T}} = -D_{\min}(\langle \rho \rangle \| \Gamma)$. Since $kT \ln 2 c_{\mathcal{T}}(F)$ is a lower bound to the work cost, the work cost of channel \mathcal{M} is upper bounded by $-kT \ln 2 D_{\min}(\langle \rho \rangle \| \Gamma)$, meaning that at most work $kT \ln 2 D_{\min}(\langle \rho \rangle \| \Gamma)$ can be extracted.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE 9: ERASURE WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF A QUANTUM MEMORY

Consider the task of erasing a quantum system S with the assistance of a quantum memory Q [33]. The task is to reset the state of system S to a fixed pure state η_S , while preserving the state of the memory Q , possibly including its correlations to an external reference system R . Mathematically, the task can be concisely described as: transform a given pure state $|\Psi\rangle_{SQR}$ into the state $\eta_S \otimes \rho_{QR}$, with $\rho_{QR} := \text{Tr}_S[|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{SQR}]$, by operating only on the system S and on the memory Q . In the following, we will first discuss the exact case, and then consider its approximate version, making connection with the results of [33].

In the exact case, the erasure task is equivalent to implementing the state transformation $\rho_{x,SQ} \mapsto \eta_S \otimes \rho_{x,Q}$, $\rho_{x,Q} := \text{Tr}_S[\rho_{x,SQ}]$, for every input state $\rho_{x,SQ}$ with support contained in the support of $\rho_{SQ} := \text{Tr}_R[|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{SQR}]$. Let us denote by Π_{SQ} the projector on the support of ρ_{SQ} . Since we are interested in bounding the work cost, we will assume without loss of generality that the support of ρ_{SQ} is invariant under time translations, that is, $[\Pi_{SQ}, H_{SQ}] = 0$, where H_{SQ} is the joint Hamiltonian of the system and the memory. If this condition is not satisfied, the argument in Supplementary Note 7 shows that replacing the state ρ_{SQ} with its time average $\langle\rho_{SQ}\rangle$ does not affect the work cost.

Let \mathcal{M} be any quantum channel that achieves perfect erasure for the states in the support of ρ_{SQ} . Proposition 1 in the main text then implies that the nonequilibrium cost of \mathcal{M} satisfies the bound $c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_{SQ}) \geq D_{\max}(\eta_S \otimes \rho_{x,Q} \| \Gamma_{SQ}) - D_{\max}(\rho_{x,SQ} \| \Gamma_{SQ})$ for every state $\rho_{x,SQ}$ with support in the given subspace. In particular, let us choose the input state

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{SQ} := \frac{\Pi_{SQ} \Gamma_{SQ} \Pi_{SQ}}{\text{Tr}[\Pi_{SQ} \Gamma_{SQ}]}, \quad (156)$$

where Π_{SQ} is the projector on the subspace containing the possible input states. With this choice, the bound becomes $c(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_{SQ}) \geq D_{\max}(\eta_S \otimes \gamma_Q \| \Gamma_{SQ}) - D_{\max}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{SQ} \| \Gamma_{SQ})$, with $\gamma_Q := \text{Tr}_S[\tilde{\Gamma}_{SQ}]$. In fact, explicit calculation from Eq. (26) shows that the inequality holds with the equality sign. Hence, the work cost for implementing the channel \mathcal{M} upon the support of Π_{SQ} , denoted by $W(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_{SQ})$, satisfies the bound

$$\frac{W(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_{SQ})}{kT \ln 2} \geq D_{\max}(\eta_S \otimes \gamma_Q \| \Gamma_{SQ}) - D_{\max}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{SQ} \| \Gamma_{SQ}). \quad (157)$$

When the Hamiltonian of system SQ is completely degenerate, the bound becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{W(\mathcal{M}, \Pi_{SQ})}{kT \ln 2} &\geq \log \|\gamma_Q\| + \log \text{Tr}[\Pi_{SQ}] \\ &= \log \|\text{Tr}_S[\Pi_{SQ}]\| \\ &=: H_0(S|Q)_{\rho_{SQ}}, \end{aligned} \quad (158)$$

where $H_0(S|Q)_{\rho_{SQ}}$ is the conditional Rényi entropy of order $\alpha = 0$.

We now consider a relaxation of the erasure task where the input state may slightly differ from ρ_{SQ} , and the operation performed by the machine may slightly differ from the ideal erasure operation. To make connection with the results of [33], here we take the system to have fully degenerate Hamiltonian.

To define the relaxation, we consider an input state $\hat{\rho}_{SQ}$ which deviates from ρ_{SQ} by at most ϵ with respect to the purified distance [86], defined as $P(\rho, \hat{\rho}) := \sqrt{1 - F(\rho, \hat{\rho})}$, where $F(\rho, \hat{\rho}) := \left(\|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\hat{\rho}}\|_1 + \sqrt{(1 - \text{Tr}[\rho])(1 - \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}])} \right)^2$ is the (generalised) fidelity and $\|O\|_1 := \text{Tr}[\sqrt{O^\dagger O}]$ is the trace norm. Moreover, we consider a quantum channel $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ that implements an approximate erasure on a purification $\widehat{\Psi}_{SQR}$ of the state $\hat{\rho}_{SQ}$, that is

$$T((\widehat{\mathcal{M}} \otimes \mathcal{I}_R)(\widehat{\Psi}_{SQR}), \eta_S \otimes \text{Tr}_S[\widehat{\Psi}_{SQR}]) \leq \delta, \quad (159)$$

where $T(\rho, \sigma) := \|\rho - \sigma\|_1/2$ is the trace distance.

For the task of implementing the approximate erasure $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ on the approximate input state $\hat{\rho}_{SQ}$, Proposition 1 in the main text implies that the nonequilibrium cost for fully degenerate Hamiltonians is lower bounded as $c(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}, \widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}) \geq D_{\max}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\pi}_{SQ}) \| I_{SQ}/d_{SQ}) - D_{\max}(\widehat{\pi}_{SQ} \| I_{SQ}/d_{SQ})$, where d_{SQ} is the dimension of system SQ , and $\widehat{\pi}_{SQ} := \widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}/\text{Tr}[\widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}]$ is the normalised quantum state proportional to the projector $\widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}$ on the support of $\hat{\rho}_{SQ}$. Equivalently, the bound can be written as

$$c(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}, \widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}) \geq \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}) \right\|. \quad (160)$$

Comparing the r.h.s. with Eq. (26) one can see that the bound holds with the equality sign.

The rest of our analysis follows an argument of Ref. [31], which is reproduced here for completeness in the scenario where two approximation parameters ϵ and δ are used. Let $\hat{V} : \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_Q \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_Q \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$ be a Stinespring isometry for the channel $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$, so that $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}) = \text{Tr}_E[\widehat{V}\widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}\widehat{V}^\dagger]$. Here we choose the environment to have dimension larger than the dimension of system S , so that the environment E can also be used to implement the ideal erasure operation by embedding the state of system S into E .

In terms of the Stinespring isometry, the bound (160) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} c(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}, \widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}) &\geq \left\| \text{Tr}_E[\widehat{V}\widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}\widehat{V}^\dagger] \right\| \\ &\equiv H_0(E|SQ)_{\widehat{V}\widehat{\rho}_{SQ}\widehat{V}^\dagger}. \end{aligned} \quad (161)$$

Since the Rényi entropy of order 0 is at least as large as the Rényi entropy of order $1/2$, one also has

$$c(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}, \widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}) \geq H_{1/2}(E|SQ)_{\widehat{V}\widehat{\rho}_{SQ}\widehat{V}^\dagger}. \quad (162)$$

Now, let $\widehat{\Psi}_{EQR}$ be the state obtained from $\widehat{\Psi}_{SQR}$ by embedding system S into the environment E . Uhlmann's theorem implies that the isometry V can be chosen in such a way that the fidelity between the pure state $(\widehat{V} \otimes I_R)\widehat{\Psi}_{SQR}(\widehat{V}^\dagger \otimes I_R)$ and the pure state $\eta_S \otimes \widehat{\Psi}_{EQR}$ is equal to the fidelity between their marginal states $(\widehat{\mathcal{M}} \otimes I_R)(\widehat{\rho}_{SQR})$ and $\eta_S \otimes \widehat{\rho}_{QR}$, respectively. Then, Eq. (159) and the Fuchs-van de Graaf inequality implies that the fidelity is at least $(1 - \delta)^2$. Hence, the Fuchs-van de Graaf inequality implies that the purified distance between the states $(\widehat{V} \otimes I_R)\widehat{\Psi}_{SQR}(\widehat{V}^\dagger \otimes I_R)$ and $\eta_S \otimes \widehat{\Psi}_{EQR}$ is at most $\sqrt{2\delta}$. Since the purified distance is nonincreasing under partial trace, one also has $P(\widehat{V}\widehat{\rho}_{SQ}\widehat{V}^\dagger, \eta_S \otimes \widehat{\rho}_{QE}) \leq \sqrt{2\delta}$, where $\widehat{\rho}_{QE}$ is the state obtained from $\widehat{\rho}_{SQ}$ by embedding system E into the environment.

The triangle inequality for the purified distance yields the bound $P(\widehat{V}\widehat{\rho}_{SQ}\widehat{V}^\dagger, \eta_S \otimes \rho_{QE}) \leq P(\widehat{V}\widehat{\rho}_{SQ}\widehat{V}^\dagger, \eta_S \otimes \widehat{\rho}_{QE}) + P(\eta_S \otimes \widehat{\rho}_{QE} \otimes \eta_S \otimes \rho_{QE}) \leq \sqrt{2\delta} + \epsilon$. Using this fact, the bound Eq. (162) can be relaxed to

$$c(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}, \widehat{\Pi}_{SQ}) \geq \min_{\rho_{SQE} : P(\rho_{SQE}, \eta_S \otimes \rho_{QE}) \leq \sqrt{2\delta} + \epsilon} H_{1/2}(E|SQ)_{\rho_{SQE}} \quad (163)$$

$$\equiv H_{1/2}^{\sqrt{2\delta} + \epsilon}(E|SQ)_{\eta_S \otimes \rho_{QE}}, \quad (164)$$

where $H_{1/2}^{\sqrt{2\delta} + \epsilon}$ is the smooth conditional Rényi entropy of order $1/2$. Note that the above expression can be further simplified, as one has the equality $H_{1/2}^{\sqrt{2\delta} + \epsilon}(E|SQ)_{\eta_S \otimes \rho_{QE}} = H_{1/2}^{\sqrt{2\delta} + \epsilon}(E|Q)_{\rho_{QE}} = H_{1/2}^{\sqrt{2\delta} + \epsilon}(S|Q)_{\rho_{SQ}}$ [31], which follows from the invariance under isometries of $H_{1/2}$ (cf. Section 5.3 of [87]). Since the nonequilibrium cost is a lower bound to the work cost, we obtained the relation $\frac{W(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}, \widehat{\Pi}_{SQ})}{kT \ln 2} \leq H_{1/2}^\epsilon(S|Q)_{\rho_{SQ}}$, which coincides with the upper bound from Ref. [33], up to logarithmic terms and to a slight redefinition of the approximation parameters.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE 10: STATE TRANSFORMATION TASKS VS INDIVIDUAL STATE TRANSITIONS

Here we discuss the relation between the nonequilibrium cost of a state transformation task $\rho_x \mapsto \rho'_x$, $\forall x \in \mathbf{X}$, and the nonequilibrium cost of the individual state transitions $\rho_x \mapsto \rho'_x$ corresponding to fixed values of x . In particular, we show an example where the cost of each individual state transition is ≤ 0 , while the cost of the overall state transformation task is strictly positive.

Relation between the reverse entropies

We start by proving the bound on the reverse entropy given in Eq. (19) of the Methods section:

Proposition 6. *Let \mathcal{T} be an arbitrary state transformation task $\rho_x \mapsto \rho'_x$, $\forall x \in \mathbf{X}$. The reverse entropy $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfies the inequality*

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} \geq \max_{x \in \mathbf{X}} -\log \text{Tr}[O_x \Gamma_B] - D_{\max}(\rho_x \| \Gamma_A), \quad (165)$$

where O_x is the observable used in the accuracy measure $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{M}) = \min_x \text{Tr}[O_x \mathcal{M}(\rho_x)]$.

Proof. One has

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} &= \max_{\mathbf{p}} H(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}}} \\
&\geq H(A|B)_{\omega_{\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{p}=(\delta_x, x_0)}} \\
&= H(A|B)_{\Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_{x_0}^T \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}} O_{x_0} \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\
&= -\log \min \left\{ \text{Tr}[\Lambda_B] \mid (I_A \otimes \Lambda_B) \geq \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_{x_0}^T \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}} O_{x_0} \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

To evaluate the minimum over Λ_B , one can take the trace on both sides of the constraint $(I_A \otimes \Lambda_B) \geq \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_{x_0}^T \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}} O_{x_0} \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}}$, thus obtaining the operator inequality

$$\text{Tr}[\Lambda_B] I_A \geq \text{Tr}[O_{x_0} \Gamma_B] \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_{x_0}^T \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (166)$$

which in turn implies

$$\text{Tr}[\Lambda_B] \geq \text{Tr}[O_{x_0} \Gamma_B] \left\| \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_{x_0}^T \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| = \text{Tr}[O_{x_0} \Gamma_B] \left\| \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_{x_0} \Gamma_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| = \text{Tr}[O_{x_0} \Gamma_B] 2^{D_{\max}(\rho_{x_0} \| \Gamma_A)}. \quad (167)$$

The bound is attained with the equality sign by setting $\Lambda_B = 2^{D_{\max}(\rho_{x_0} \| \Gamma_A)} \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}} O_{x_0} \Gamma_B^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Hence, Eq. (166) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} &\geq -\log \text{Tr}[O_{x_0} \Gamma_B] 2^{D_{\max}(\rho_{x_0} \| \Gamma_A)} \\
&= -\log \text{Tr}[O_{x_0} \Gamma_B] - D_{\max}(\rho_{x_0} \| \Gamma_A) \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathbf{X},
\end{aligned} \quad (168)$$

which implies Eq. (165). \square

In the Methods section of the main text, we have seen a choice of observables O_x for which Eq. (165) reduces to the entropic inequality

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} \geq \max_{x \in \mathbf{X}} D_{\max}(\rho'_x \| \Gamma_B) - D_{\max}(\rho_x \| \Gamma_A). \quad (169)$$

This inequality has an intuitive physical interpretation, relating the nonequilibrium cost of the task \mathcal{T} to the deviation of the input and output states from the equilibrium state. However, it is important to stress that, in general, the deviation of the input/output states from the equilibrium state is not sufficient to evaluate the nonequilibrium cost of a given task. This fact is evident in the state transposition task $\rho_x \mapsto \rho_x^T$, where ρ_x is an arbitrary pure state: since $D_{\max}(\rho^T \| \Gamma) = D_{\max}(\rho \| \Gamma)$ for every quantum state ρ , Eq. (169) yields the trivial inequality $\kappa_{\text{transpose}} \geq 0$, which is not tight, as we know that $\kappa_{\text{transpose}} = \log[(d+1)/2]$ in the fully degenerate case (cf. the Results part in the main text).

The example of ideal transposition

For transposition, the nonequilibrium cost is nonnegative whenever the Hamiltonian is not fully degenerate (cf. Eq. (125)). Hence, the quantity $\max_x [D_{\max}(\rho'_x \| \Gamma) - D_{\max}(\rho_x \| \Gamma)]$ fails to detect the presence of a strictly positive nonequilibrium cost.

The same issue arises for other quantum versions of the relative entropy, including all the quantum Rényi relative entropies

$$D_{\alpha}(\rho \| \sigma) = \frac{\log \text{Tr}[\rho^{\alpha} \sigma^{1-\alpha}]}{\alpha - 1}, \quad \alpha \geq 0, \alpha \neq 1, \quad (170)$$

as well as the “sandwiched” Rényi relative entropies [88, 89]

$$\tilde{D}_{\alpha}(\rho \| \sigma) = \frac{\log \text{Tr}[(\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}})^{\alpha}]}{\alpha - 1}, \quad \alpha \geq 0, \alpha \neq 1, \quad (171)$$

which feature in the quantum second laws of Ref. [26] for $\alpha \geq 1/2$.

In these cases, one still has the equalities

$$D_\alpha(\rho^T \parallel \Gamma) = D_\alpha(\rho \parallel \Gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{D}_\alpha(\rho^T \parallel \Gamma) = \tilde{D}_\alpha(\rho \parallel \Gamma) \quad \forall \alpha, \forall \rho, \quad (172)$$

valid whenever the transpose is defined in the eigenbasis of the Hamiltonian. Even more generally, the relation $\Delta(\rho^T \parallel \Gamma) = \Delta(\rho \parallel \Gamma)$, $\forall \rho$ holds for every function $\Delta(\rho \parallel \sigma)$ that is invariant under state space symmetries in the sense of Wigner's theorem (see e.g. [42]).

The example of approximate transposition

A natural question is whether the failure of the relative entropy to characterise the nonequilibrium cost of the transpose task is due to the fact that the ideal transposition $\rho_x \mapsto \rho_x^T$ is forbidden by quantum mechanics [47–49]. Instead of ideal transposition, one could consider some physical approximation of this impossible transposition task. The approximate transposition would then correspond to a valid quantum channel \mathcal{M} . The question is whether the change of relative entropy from the input to the output provides the correct value of the nonequilibrium cost. Here we show that, in general, the answer is negative.

To facilitate the evaluation of the relative entropies, we consider a restricted transposition task, where the input states are pure qubit states in the set $\mathcal{S} = \{|0\rangle\langle 0|, |1\rangle\langle 1|\} \cup \{|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|\}_{\theta \in [0, 2\pi)}$, consisting of the computational basis states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ and of the equatorial states $|e_\theta\rangle := (|0\rangle + e^{i\theta})/\sqrt{2}$. In this case, the nonequilibrium cost is still positive for every nondegenerate Hamiltonian: for $d = 2$, Eq. (125) indicates a positive value of the nonequilibrium cost for every value of the fidelity above F_{\min} . In particular, we will focus on the maximum value $F_{\max} = 2/3$, which is achieved by the channel \mathcal{M} defined by [47–49]

$$\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \frac{I + \rho^T}{3} \quad \forall \rho. \quad (173)$$

We will restrict our attention to the case where $\Gamma = \frac{2}{3}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{3}|1\rangle\langle 1|$, which considerably simplifies the calculations. In this case, one has

$$D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(|0\rangle\langle 0|) \parallel \Gamma) - D_\alpha(|0\rangle\langle 0| \parallel \Gamma) = -D_\alpha(|0\rangle\langle 0| \parallel \Gamma) = \log \frac{2}{3} < 0 \quad (174)$$

$$D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(|1\rangle\langle 1|) \parallel \Gamma) - D_\alpha(|1\rangle\langle 1| \parallel \Gamma) = \frac{\log[(\frac{2}{3})^\alpha + (\frac{1}{3})^\alpha 2^{1-\alpha}]}{\alpha - 1} \leq -H_\alpha\left(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3}\right) < 0 \quad (175)$$

$$D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|) \parallel \Gamma) - D_\alpha(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta| \parallel \Gamma) = -H_\alpha\left(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3}\right) < 0, \quad \forall \theta \in [0, 2\pi), \quad (176)$$

where $H_\alpha(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3}) := (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \log[(\frac{2}{3})^\alpha + (\frac{1}{3})^\alpha]$ is the Rényi entropy of the binary probability distribution $(2/3, 1/3)$. Hence, the quantum Rényi relative entropies do not detect the positive work cost of the approximate transposition $\rho_x \mapsto \mathcal{M}(\rho_x)$ for all the states in \mathcal{S} .

Let us now consider the sandwiched Rényi relative entropy \tilde{D}_α . For the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ the sandwiched Rényi relative entropies coincide with the quantum Rényi entropies. Hence, we only need to consider the case of the equatorial states $|e_\theta\rangle$. For $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, we use the monotonicity of \tilde{D}_α with respect to α [88] and the convergence to the von Neumann relative entropy $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \tilde{D}_\alpha(\rho \parallel \sigma) = D(\rho \parallel \sigma) := \text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho] - \text{Tr}[\rho \log \sigma] \forall \rho, \sigma$ [88], which yield the bound

$$\tilde{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|) \parallel \Gamma) \leq D(\mathcal{M}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|) \parallel \Gamma) = \frac{1}{6}. \quad (177)$$

On the other hand, one has

$$\begin{aligned} -\tilde{D}_\alpha(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta| \parallel \Gamma) &= \log \left[\frac{(\frac{2}{3})^\beta + (\frac{1}{3})^\beta}{2} \right]^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \quad \beta := \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha} \\ &\leq \log \frac{2}{3}. \end{aligned} \quad (178)$$

Hence, we obtained the bound

$$\tilde{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|) \parallel \Gamma) - \tilde{D}_\alpha(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta| \parallel \Gamma) \leq \frac{1}{6} + \log \frac{2}{3} \approx -0.418 < 0. \quad (179)$$

For $\alpha > 1$, we use the fact that the sandwiched divergence \tilde{D}_α satisfies the data processing inequality $\tilde{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{C}(\rho) \parallel \mathcal{C}(\sigma)) \leq \tilde{D}_\alpha(\rho \parallel \sigma)$ for every quantum channel \mathcal{C} and for every pair of states ρ and σ [88–91]. In particular, choosing \mathcal{C} to be the partial dephasing channel $\mathcal{C}(\rho) := \frac{2}{3}\rho + \frac{1}{3}\sigma_z\rho\sigma_z$ (with $\sigma_z := |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|$), we obtain the bound

$$\tilde{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|) \parallel \Gamma) = \tilde{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{C}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|) \parallel \mathcal{C}(\Gamma)) \leq \tilde{D}_\alpha(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta| \parallel \Gamma),$$

and therefore $\tilde{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|) \parallel \Gamma) - \tilde{D}_\alpha(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta| \parallel \Gamma) \leq 0$.

Summarising, the change of sandwiched Rényi relative entropy from the input to the output is negative for every possible pair of states in \mathbf{S} . Hence, the sandwiched Rényi relative entropies cannot detect the positive nonequilibrium cost of the approximate transposition $\rho_x \mapsto \mathcal{M}(\rho_x)$.

The above conclusions hold also if one considers the entropy of the Gibbs state relative to the input/output states, instead of the entropy of the input/output states relative to the Gibbs state. In this case, some care is required when dealing with the relative entropy $D_\alpha(\rho \parallel |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ for a pure state $|\psi\rangle$. Here we adopt the definition

$$D_\alpha(\rho \parallel |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} D_\alpha\left(\rho \parallel (1-\epsilon)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \epsilon \frac{I - |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}{d-1}\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{\log\langle\psi|\rho^\alpha|\psi\rangle}{\alpha-1} & 0 \leq \alpha < 1 \\ \infty & \alpha > 1. \end{cases} \quad (180)$$

For the quantum Rényi relative entropies, one has the relations

$$D_\alpha(\Gamma \parallel \mathcal{M}(|0\rangle\langle 0|)) - D_\alpha(\Gamma \parallel |0\rangle\langle 0|) = -D_\alpha(\Gamma \parallel |0\rangle\langle 0|) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \log \frac{3}{2} & 0 \leq \alpha < 1 \\ -\infty & \alpha > 1 \end{cases} \quad (181)$$

$$D_\alpha(\Gamma \parallel \mathcal{M}(|1\rangle\langle 1|)) - D_\alpha(\Gamma \parallel |1\rangle\langle 1|) = \begin{cases} -\log \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log(1 + 2^{2\alpha}) & 0 \leq \alpha < 1 \\ -\infty & \alpha > 1 \end{cases} \quad (182)$$

$$D_\alpha(\Gamma \parallel \mathcal{M}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|)) - D_\alpha(\Gamma \parallel |e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|) = \begin{cases} -H_{1-\alpha}\left(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) < 0 & 0 \leq \alpha < 1 \\ -\infty & \alpha > 1 \end{cases} \quad (183)$$

All these values are strictly negative.

The same conclusion applies to the sandwiched Rényi relative entropies, adopting the definition

$$\tilde{D}_\alpha(\rho \parallel |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{D}_\alpha\left(\rho \parallel (1-\epsilon)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \epsilon \frac{I - |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}{d-1}\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log\langle\psi|\rho|\psi\rangle & 0 \leq \alpha < 1 \\ \infty & \alpha > 1. \end{cases} \quad (184)$$

(A more common definition is $\tilde{D}_\alpha(\rho \parallel |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \infty$ whenever $\text{Supp}(\rho) \not\subseteq \text{Supp}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$. In this case, the difference $\tilde{D}_\alpha(\Gamma \parallel \mathcal{M}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|)) - \tilde{D}_\alpha(\Gamma \parallel |e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|)$ is trivially $-\infty$, and therefore cannot detect the positive nonequilibrium cost of the transposition task.)

We focus on the case of the equatorial states $|e_\theta\rangle$, because for the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ the sandwiched entropies coincide with the quantum Rényi relative entropies. For $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, we use the equality

$$\tilde{D}_\alpha(\Gamma \parallel |e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|) = \frac{-\alpha}{\alpha-1}, \quad (185)$$

and the inequality

$$\tilde{D}_\alpha(\Gamma \parallel \Sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \text{Tr} \left[\left(\Sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \Gamma \Sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \right)^\alpha \right] \leq \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \text{Tr} \left[\left(\frac{1}{3} \Sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \right)^\alpha \right] \quad \forall \Sigma, \quad (186)$$

following from the operator monotonicity of the function $f(X) = X^\alpha$ and from the operator inequality $\Sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \Gamma \Sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \geq$

$\frac{1}{3} \Sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}$, and from the fact that α is smaller than 1. Setting $\Sigma = \mathcal{M}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{D}_\alpha(\Gamma\|\mathcal{M}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|)) - \tilde{D}_\alpha(\Gamma\||e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|) &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \left[\frac{1}{3^\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{1-\alpha} + \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{1-\alpha} \right) \right] + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \left[\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^\alpha \left(\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{1-\alpha} + \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{1-\alpha} \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \left[\frac{2}{3} + 2^\alpha \frac{1}{3} \right] \\
&< 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{187}$$

For $\alpha > 1$, one has $\tilde{D}_\alpha(\Gamma\|\mathcal{M}(|e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|)) < \infty$ and $\tilde{D}_\alpha(\Gamma\||e_\theta\rangle\langle e_\theta|) = \infty$, and therefore the difference is $-\infty$.