

# Universal validity of the second law of information thermodynamics

Shintaro Minagawa,<sup>1,\*</sup> M. Hamed Mohammady,<sup>2,†</sup> Kenta Sakai,<sup>1,3,‡</sup> Kohtaro Kato,<sup>1,§</sup> and Francesco Buscemi<sup>1,¶</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Graduate School of Informatics, Nagoya University,  
Furo-cho, Chikusa-Ku, Nagoya 464-8601, Japan*

<sup>2</sup>*QuIC, École Polytechnique de Bruxelles, CP 165/59,  
Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1050 Brussels, Belgium*

<sup>3</sup>*(until March 2023)*

Feedback control and erasure protocols have often been considered as a model to embody Maxwell’s Demon paradox and to study the interplay between thermodynamics and information processing. Such studies have led to the conclusion, now widely accepted in the community, that Maxwell’s Demon and the second law of thermodynamics can peacefully coexist because any gain provided by the demon must be offset by the cost of performing measurement and resetting the demon’s memory to its initial state. Statements of this kind are collectively referred to as *second laws of information thermodynamics* and have recently been extended to include quantum theoretical scenarios. However, previous studies in this direction have made several assumptions, in particular about the feedback process and the measurement performed on the demon’s memory, and thus arrived at statements that are not universally applicable and whose range of validity is not clear. In this work, we fill this gap by precisely characterizing the full range of quantum feedback control and erasure protocols that are overall consistent with the second law of thermodynamics. This leads us to conclude that the second law of information thermodynamics is indeed *universal*: it must hold for any quantum feedback control and erasure protocol, regardless of the measurement process involved, as long as the protocol is overall compatible with thermodynamics. Our comprehensive analysis not only encompasses new scenarios but also retrieves previous ones, doing so with fewer assumptions. This simplification contributes to a clearer understanding of the theory. Additionally, our work identifies the Groenewold–Ozawa information gain as the correct information measure characterizing the work extractable by feedback control.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of consistency between the second law of thermodynamics and information processing has been at the center of one of the longest running debates in the history of modern

\* minagawa.shintaro@nagoya-u.jp

† mohammad.mohammady@ulb.be

‡ sakai.kenta.32@nagoya-u.jp

§ kokato@i.nagoya-u.ac.jp

¶ buscemi@nagoya-u.jp

physics, ever since Maxwell conjured up his famous demon [1]. A widely accepted solution to Maxwell’s paradox is that the validity of the second law of thermodynamics is recovered by taking into account the work cost for measurement and erasure, i.e., the resetting of the demon’s memory to its initial state [2–8]. These ideas, bridging thermodynamics with information theory, are nowadays collectively referred to as *information thermodynamics* [9, 10].

In this context, and including a quantum theoretical scenario, Sagawa and Ueda, in a series of celebrated papers [11–13], derived an achievable upper bound for the work extracted by feedback control and showed that the conventional second law can, in general, be violated from the viewpoint of the system alone, but such a violation is exactly compensated by the cost of implementing the controlling measurement and resetting of the memory. Such a tradeoff relation is what they call *the second law of information thermodynamics (ITh)*.

Unfortunately, despite their significance, the balance equations established in Refs. [11–13] rely on several, mutually inconsistent assumptions that lack a direct operational interpretation. Furthermore, these works discuss only *sufficient* conditions for the validity of such balance equations. While some generalizations and refinements have been proposed [14–16], a comprehensive characterization of the validity range of the second law of ITh remains elusive. As a result, it is unclear under what conditions the second law of ITh holds. In fact, at the time of this writing, it is not even clear whether the second law of ITh should be considered a universal law or not, and what its logical status is with respect to the conventional second law of thermodynamics.

Our paper addresses this gap by adopting a top-down approach. Instead of deriving the second law from assumptions with unclear logical necessity, we initiate from a purely information-theoretic framework and incorporate a thermodynamic narrative at the conclusion. The advantages are twofold: on the one hand, this allows us to determine exactly (in terms of sufficient *and necessary* conditions) how far feedback control protocols can be generalized while remaining overall consistent with the second law of thermodynamics. On the other hand, we obtain balance equations that are valid *for any measurement process*, thus demonstrating the universal validity of the second law of ITh in general feedback control and erasure protocols. Our conclusion is that as long as a quantum feedback control protocol is overall compatible with thermodynamics, it must also satisfy the second law of ITh, regardless of the measurement process involved. Moreover, as a by-product, our balance equations provide a thermodynamic interpretation to the Groenewold–Ozawa information gain [17–20], even in situations when it takes negative values.

The remaining part of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce notation and some basic definitions. In Section III, we describe the most general setup of quantum feedback control and erasure protocols, and compute exact formulas and bounds for the work associated with such protocols. In Section IV we study the logical relation between the validity of the second

law of ITh and the validity of the second law of thermodynamics, for which we formulate necessary and sufficient conditions in Section V. In Section VI we compare our analysis with that given in Refs. [11–13]. We close the paper with some concluding remarks in Section VII.

## II. NOTATION AND BASIC DEFINITIONS

Consider a quantum system  $A$  associated with a finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}^A$ . The algebra of linear operators  $L^A$  on  $\mathcal{H}^A$  will be denoted as  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^A)$ ,  $\mathbb{1}^A$  and  $\mathbb{0}^A$  denoting the unit and null operators, respectively. States on  $A$  are represented by unit-trace positive operators, i.e.,  $\rho^A \geq \mathbb{0}^A$ ,  $\text{Tr}[\rho^A] = 1$ . Given a state  $\rho^A$ , its *von Neumann entropy* [21] is defined as  $S(\rho^A) \equiv S(A)_\rho := -\text{Tr}[\rho^A \ln \rho^A]$ . For any state  $\rho^A$  and a positive operator  $\sigma^A$  such that  $\text{supp}(\rho^A) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma^A)$ , the *Umegaki quantum relative entropy* is defined by  $D(\rho^A \parallel \sigma^A) := \text{Tr}[\rho^A (\ln \rho^A - \ln \sigma^A)] \geq 0$  [22], which is non-negative due Klein's inequality [23, 24], and vanishes if and only if  $\rho^A = \sigma^A$ . For a composite system  $AB$ , bipartite states are denoted by  $\rho^{AB}$ , and the corresponding reduced states by, e.g.,  $\rho^A := \text{Tr}_B[\rho^{AB}]$ . The *quantum mutual information* of a bipartite state  $\rho^{AB}$  is defined as  $I(A:B)_\rho := S(A)_\rho + S(B)_\rho - S(AB)_\rho \equiv D(\rho^{AB} \parallel \rho^A \otimes \rho^B) \geq 0$ , with equality if and only if  $\rho^{AB} = \rho^A \otimes \rho^B$ . On the other hand, the *conditional quantum entropy* of a bipartite state  $\rho^{AB}$  is defined as  $S(A|B)_\rho := S(AB)_\rho - S(B)_\rho$ , which can be negative. The *conditional quantum mutual information* of a tripartite state  $\rho^{ABC}$  is defined as  $I(A:C|B)_\rho := S(A|B)_\rho + S(C|B)_\rho - S(AC|B)_\rho \geq 0$ , where the non-negativity follows from the strong subadditivity of the von Neumann entropy (see, e.g., Ref. [25]).

*Operations* provide the most general description for how a quantum system may transform. In the Schrödinger picture, an operation acting in a system  $A$  is defined as a completely positive (CP), trace non-increasing linear map  $\Phi : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^A)$ . We shall denote the consecutive application of operations  $\Phi_1$  followed by  $\Phi_2$  as  $\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1$ . For each operation, there exists a Heisenberg picture dual  $\Phi^*$ , defined by the trace duality  $\text{Tr}[\Phi^*(L^A)\rho^A] = \text{Tr}[L^A\Phi(\rho^A)]$  for all  $\rho^A$  and  $L^A$ .  $\Phi^*$  is a sub-unital CP linear map, i.e.,  $\Phi^*(\mathbb{1}^A) \leq \mathbb{1}^A$ . Among the operations are *channels*, which preserve the trace, and if  $\Phi$  is a channel, then  $\Phi^*$  is unital, i.e.,  $\Phi^*(\mathbb{1}^A) = \mathbb{1}^A$ . We shall denote the identity channel acting in  $A$  as  $\text{id}^A$ , which satisfies  $\text{id}^A(L^A) = L^A$  for all  $L^A$ . An operation acting in a composite system  $AB$  is *local* if it can be written as  $\Phi = \Phi^A \otimes \Phi^B$ , such that  $\Phi(L^A \otimes L^B) = \Phi^A(L^A) \otimes \Phi^B(L^B)$  for all  $L^A$  and  $L^B$ . As such,  $\Phi^A \otimes \text{id}^B$  is an operation that acts locally and non-trivially only in subsystem  $A$ .

A *thermodynamic system*  $A$  is defined as the tuple  $(\rho^A; H^A; \beta)$ , where  $H^A$  is the Hamiltonian and  $\beta := 1/k_B T > 0$  is the inverse temperature of an external thermal bath, with  $k_B$  Boltzmann's constant. Throughout, we shall only consider the case where the thermal bath has a constant

temperature, and so for notational simplicity we will abbreviate the thermodynamic system as  $(\rho^A; H^A)$ . When the system is in thermal equilibrium, the *thermal state* or *Gibbs state* is defined as  $\gamma^A := e^{-\beta H^A} / Z^A$ , where  $Z^A := \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H^A}]$  is the partition function.

**Definition 1.** Consider a thermodynamic system  $(\rho^A; H^A)$ . The *internal energy* is defined as

$$E(\rho^A; H^A) := \text{Tr}[\rho^A H^A],$$

and the *nonequilibrium free energy* [26, 27] is defined as

$$F(\rho^A; H^A) := E(\rho^A; H^A) - \beta^{-1} S(A)_\rho \equiv F_{\text{eq}}(H^A) + \beta^{-1} D(\rho^A \| \gamma^A),$$

where  $F_{\text{eq}}(H^A) := -\beta^{-1} \ln Z^A \equiv F(\gamma^A; H^A)$  is the equilibrium (Helmholtz) free energy.

**Lemma 1.** Consider a bipartite thermodynamic system  $(\rho^{AB}; H^{AB})$ . Assume that the Hamiltonian is additive, i.e.,  $H^{AB} = H^A + H^B := H^A \otimes \mathbb{1}^B + \mathbb{1}^A \otimes H^B$ . It holds that

$$E(\rho^{AB}; H^{AB}) = E(\rho^A; H^A) + E(\rho^B; H^B)$$

and

$$F(\rho^{AB}; H^{AB}) = F(\rho^A; H^A) + F(\rho^B; H^B) + \beta^{-1} I(A : B)_\rho.$$

*Proof.* Note that by the definition of the partial trace, it holds that  $\text{Tr}[\rho^{AB} L^A \otimes \mathbb{1}^B] = \text{Tr}[\rho^A L^A]$  for all  $L^A$  and  $\rho^{AB}$ . The additivity of the internal energy follows trivially from the additivity of the Hamiltonian. Now note that  $F(\rho^{AB}; H^{AB}) = E(\rho^{AB}; H^{AB}) - \beta^{-1} S(AB)_\rho$ . Observing that  $S(AB)_\rho = S(A)_\rho + S(B)_\rho - I(A : B)_\rho$  completes the proof.  $\square$

In what follows, when tracking the change of these quantities in time, we use the following notation: when a thermodynamic system  $Y$  transforms as  $(\rho_i^Y; H_i^Y) \mapsto (\rho_j^Y; H_j^Y)$ , where  $L_k^Y$  denotes the state/Hamiltonian of the system at time  $t = t_k$ , we denote the change in internal energy  $E$ , nonequilibrium free energy  $F$ , and entropy  $S$  as follows:

$$\Delta x_{i \rightarrow j}^Y := x(\rho_j^Y; H_j^Y) - x(\rho_i^Y; H_i^Y) \quad (x = E, F, S). \quad (1)$$

**Lemma 2.** Consider a bipartite thermodynamic system which transforms as  $(\rho_i^{AB}; H_i^{AB}) \mapsto (\rho_j^{AB}; H_j^{AB})$ , such that  $\rho_j^{AB} = \Phi^A \otimes \text{id}^B(\rho_i^{AB})$ , where  $\Phi^A$  is a channel acting in  $A$  and  $\text{id}^B$  is the identity channel acting in  $B$ . The following hold:

(i)  $\rho_j^A = \Phi^A(\rho_i^A)$  and  $\rho_j^B = \rho_i^B$ .

(ii) If  $H_k^{AB} = H_k^A + H^B$  for  $k = i, j$ , then  $\Delta E_{i \rightarrow j}^{AB} = \Delta E_{i \rightarrow j}^A = \text{Tr}[\Phi^A(\rho_i^A) H_j^A] - \text{Tr}[\rho_i^A H_i^A]$ .

*Proof.* (i): For all  $L^A$  and  $L^B$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_j^A L^A] &= \mathrm{Tr}[\Phi^A \otimes \mathrm{id}^B(\rho_i^{AB})(L^A \otimes \mathbb{1}^B)] = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_i^{AB} \Phi^{A*} \otimes \mathrm{id}^B(L^A \otimes \mathbb{1}^B)] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_i^{AB} \Phi^{A*}(L^A) \otimes \mathbb{1}^B] = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_i^A \Phi^{A*}(L^A)] = \mathrm{Tr}[\Phi^A(\rho_i^A)L^A], \\ \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_j^B L^B] &= \mathrm{Tr}[\Phi^A \otimes \mathrm{id}^B(\rho_i^{AB})(\mathbb{1}^A \otimes L^B)] = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_i^{AB} \Phi^{A*} \otimes \mathrm{id}^B(\mathbb{1}^A \otimes L^B)] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_i^{AB} \mathbb{1}^A \otimes L^B] = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_i^B L^B].\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the definition of the partial trace, the trace duality, and the fact that  $\Phi^{A*}$  is unital while  $\mathrm{id}^B(L^B) = L^B$  for all  $L^B$ . Since  $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho^A L^A] = \mathrm{Tr}[\sigma^A L^A]$  for all  $L^A$  if and only if  $\rho^A = \sigma^A$  completes the proof.

(ii): This follows from item (i), together with the additivity of the Hamiltonian, Lemma 1, and the fact that  $H_i^B = H_j^B = H^B$ .

□

### A. The second law of thermodynamics

When a process does not involve an exchange of heat with an external thermal bath, it is referred to as *adiabatic*. A paradigmatic example of an adiabatic process is a unitary channel, which, by definition, does not involve *any* external system. Even if a channel is non-unitary, the assumption of adiabaticity may be justified if, for example, the channel is implemented very quickly with respect to the time scale required for heat to dissipate, as assumed in e.g. [28].

**Definition 2.** Consider a thermodynamic system which transforms as  $(\rho_i^Y; H_i^Y) \mapsto (\rho_j^Y; H_j^Y)$ , such that  $\rho_j^Y = \Phi(\rho_i^Y)$ , where  $\Phi$  is a channel acting in  $Y$ . If  $\Phi$  is adiabatic, then the work injected (extracted) is defined as the increase (decrease) in internal energy, i.e.,

$$W_{\mathrm{in}} := \Delta E_{i \rightarrow j}^Y, \quad W_{\mathrm{ext}} := -\Delta E_{i \rightarrow j}^Y.$$

In this paper, we also consider processes that, although far from equilibrium, still involve a single thermal bath at a fixed inverse temperature  $\beta > 0$ , and as such are considered to be isothermal. According to Ref. [27], for isothermal processes, at equilibrium or not, the second law can be formulated as an inequality, which, for a given system  $Y$ , reads

$$W_{\mathrm{ext}}^Y \leq -\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}^Y, \quad (2)$$

where  $W_{\mathrm{ext}}^Y$  on the left-hand side represents the work that can be extracted from system  $Y$  as it evolves from time step  $t_i$  to time step  $t_j$ . Notice that the nonequilibrium free energy change in the

right-hand side can be replaced by the change in *equilibrium* free energy whenever the initial state of  $Y$  is assumed to be in thermal equilibrium—this is a consequence of the implication [27]

$$\rho_i^Y = \gamma^Y \implies -\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}^Y \leq -\Delta F_{\text{eq}, i \rightarrow j}^Y, \quad (3)$$

which follows from  $F(\gamma^Y; H_i^Y) = F_{\text{eq}}(H_i^Y)$  and  $F(\rho_j^Y; H_j^Y) \geq F_{\text{eq}}(H_j^Y)$ . The above inequality will be useful when connecting our analysis to previous ones.

We shall model an isothermal process explicitly as a unitary interaction between the system of interest  $Y$  and a thermal bath  $B$ . By the first law of thermodynamics and the adiabaticity of the global evolution, the extracted work from the system of interest  $Y$  may be identified with the change in internal energy of the compound  $YB$  [27]. In such a case, we obtain a refinement of Eq. (2), expressed as an equality.

**Lemma 3.** *Consider a system  $Y$  and a thermal bath  $B$ , which transform as  $(\rho_i^{YB}; H_i^{YB}) \mapsto (\rho_j^{YB}; H_j^{YB})$ . Assume that  $\rho_i^{YB} := \rho_i^Y \otimes \gamma^B$ , and that  $\rho_j^{YB} = \Phi(\rho_i^{YB})$  with  $\Phi(\cdot) := U(\cdot)U^\dagger$  a unitary channel, and that  $H_k^{YB} := H_k^Y + H^B$  for  $k = i, j$ . Then the extracted work from system  $Y$  will read*

$$W_{\text{ext}}^Y = -\Delta E_{i \rightarrow j}^{YB} = -\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}^Y - \beta^{-1} S_{\text{irr}}^B,$$

where

$$S_{\text{irr}}^B := I(Y : B)_{\rho_j} + D(\rho_j^B \| \gamma^B) \geq 0$$

is the irreversible entropy production, vanishing if and only if  $\rho_j^{YB} = \rho_j^Y \otimes \gamma^B$ .

*Proof.* Since unitary evolution is adiabatic, then by Definition 2 the extracted work from the compound  $YB$  will equal the decrease in internal energy, and so by Definition 1 it holds that  $W_{\text{ext}}^{YB} := -\Delta E_{i \rightarrow j}^{YB} = -\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}^{YB} - \beta^{-1} \Delta S_{i \rightarrow j}^{YB} = -\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}^{YB}$ , with the last step following from the fact that unitary evolution does not change the von Neumann entropy. Now note that by the first law of thermodynamics, it holds that  $W_{\text{ext}}^Y = -\Delta E_{i \rightarrow j}^Y - Q^Y$ , where  $W_{\text{ext}}^Y$  is the work extracted from system  $Y$ , and  $Q^Y := \Delta E_{i \rightarrow j}^B$  is the heat that flows to the bath  $B$ . By the additivity of the Hamiltonian and Lemma 1, it follows that  $W_{\text{ext}}^Y = -\Delta E_{i \rightarrow j}^Y - \Delta E_{i \rightarrow j}^B = -\Delta E_{i \rightarrow j}^{YB} =: W_{\text{ext}}^{YB}$ . We may therefore write

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\text{ext}}^Y &= -\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}^{YB} \\ &= -\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}^Y - \Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}^B - \beta^{-1} I(Y : B)_{\rho_j} \\ &= -\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}^Y - \beta^{-1} [I(Y : B)_{\rho_j} + D(\rho_j^B \| \gamma^B)]. \end{aligned}$$

In the second line we have used Lemma 1 and the additivity of the Hamiltonian, together with the fact that system and bath are uncorrelated at initial time, and so  $I(Y : B)_{\rho_i} = 0$ . In the third line we use the fact that the bath is initially in thermal equilibrium, i.e.,  $\rho_i^B = \gamma^B$ , together with Definition 1 and the fact that the bath Hamiltonian, and hence the bath equilibrium free energy, does not change. Finally, we recall that the mutual information  $I(Y : B)_{\rho_j}$  is non-negative and vanishes if and only if  $\rho_j^{YB} = \rho_j^Y \otimes \rho_j^B$ , whereas the relative entropy  $D(\rho_j^B \parallel \gamma^B)$  is non-negative and vanishes if and only if  $\rho_j^B = \gamma^B$  [24].  $\square$

### III. THE QUANTUM FEEDBACK CONTROL AND ERASURE PROTOCOLS

We consider now quantum feedback control and erasure protocols. The protocol will comprise of five discrete time steps  $t_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ . The total system is composed of a target system  $A$ , a controller  $C = MK$  consisting of a memory  $M$  and a classical register  $K$ , and two thermal baths  $B_1, B_2$ , both of which have the same inverse temperature  $\beta > 0$ . For notational simplicity, we shall omit superscripts when denoting any quantity pertaining to the *entire* compound  $B_1AMKB_2$ , reserving their use only when discussing subsystems, for example  $AMK$ , etc. In particular, we shall assume that the Hamiltonian at time step  $t_i$  reads  $H_i = H^{B_1} + H_i^A + H^{MK} + H^{B_2}$ . That is, at each time step we assume that there are no interaction terms between the different subsystems, and only the Hamiltonian of the target system  $A$  may change. The protocol is represented schematically in Figure 1, and below we shall describe each step in detail.

**Preparation step:** At the initial time  $t = t_0$ , the compound system is prepared in the state

$$\rho_0 := \gamma^{B_1} \otimes \rho_0^A \otimes \sigma_0^M \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^K \otimes \gamma^{B_2} \quad (4)$$

where  $\rho_0^A$  and  $\sigma_0^M$  are arbitrary states on  $A$  and  $M$ , respectively, while  $|0\rangle^K$  represents the idle state of the classical register<sup>1</sup>, and  $\gamma^{B_1}, \gamma^{B_2}$  are the thermal states of the baths, with respect to the same inverse temperature  $\beta$ .

**The measurement step:** This step comprises an interaction step and a readout step. The *interaction* (or *pre-measurement*) step (from  $t = t_0$  to  $t = t_1$ ) represents the interaction between  $A$  and  $M$ , described by a unitary channel  $\mathcal{U}(\cdot) := U(\cdot)U^\dagger$  acting in  $AM$ . The *readout* (or *pointer objectification*) step (from  $t = t_1$  to  $t = t_2$ ) is represented as a *CP-instrument* [29] acting in  $M$ , that is, a family  $\mathcal{M} := \{\mathcal{M}_k : k \in \mathcal{K}\}$  of operations  $\mathcal{M}_k : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^M) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^M)$ , where  $\mathcal{K}$  is the value space and  $k \in \mathcal{K}$  are the measurement outcomes, such that their

<sup>1</sup> Note that the memory considered in Ref. [12] is described by a Hilbert space with a direct sum structure. Here we describe the degrees of freedom of the labels of the blocks and the internal states of the memory using different quantum systems. In the context of our paper, the two pictures are clearly equivalent.

point-wise sum  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{K}}(\cdot) := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{M}_k(\cdot)$  is a channel, i.e., is trace-preserving. The instrument  $\mathcal{M}$  is identified with (or is compatible with) a unique *observable*, represented by a positive operator valued measure (POVM)  $\mathbf{M} := \{\mathbf{M}_k : k \in \mathcal{K}\}$  acting in  $M$ , with the effects (or POVM elements) reading  $\mathbf{M}_k := \mathcal{M}_k^*(\mathbb{1}^M)$ . Since the observable  $\mathbf{M}$  acts in the memory, it is referred to as the *pointer observable*. After  $M$  is measured by the instrument  $\mathcal{M}$ , the observed outcome  $k$  is recorded in the classical register. Such classical readouts are assumed to be all perfectly distinguishable, and thus are represented, following a common convention in quantum information theory [25], by orthogonal pure states  $|k\rangle^K$ . Accordingly, at  $t = t_2$  the state of the compound system reads

$$\rho_2 := \gamma^{B_1} \otimes \left( \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} (\text{id}^A \otimes \mathcal{M}_k) \circ \mathcal{U}(\rho_0^A \otimes \sigma_0^M) \otimes |k\rangle\langle k|^K \right) \otimes \gamma^{B_2} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k \rho_{2,k}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\rho_{2,k} = \gamma^{B_1} \otimes \rho_{2,k}^{AM} \otimes |k\rangle\langle k|^K \otimes \gamma^{B_2}.$$

Here, the probability of obtaining outcome  $k$  is given by the Born rule as

$$p_k := \text{Tr}[(\text{id}^A \otimes \mathcal{M}_k) \circ \mathcal{U}(\rho_0^A \otimes \sigma_0^M)],$$

and for every  $k$  such that  $p_k > 0$ , the corresponding normalized post-measurement state of system A and memory  $M$  is defined as

$$\rho_{2,k}^{AM} := \frac{(\text{id}^A \otimes \mathcal{M}_k) \circ \mathcal{U}(\rho_0^A \otimes \sigma_0^M)}{p_k},$$

and  $\rho_{2,k}^{AM} := \mathbb{O}^{AM}$  otherwise.

We note that a fixed tuple  $(\mathcal{H}^M, \sigma_0^M, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M})$  defines a *measurement process* or *measurement scheme* for an instrument  $\mathcal{A} := \{\mathcal{A}_k : k \in \mathcal{K}\}$  acting in the target system  $A$ , with the operations reading

$$\mathcal{A}_k(\cdot) := \text{Tr}_M[(\text{id}^A \otimes \mathcal{M}_k) \circ \mathcal{U}(\cdot \otimes \sigma_0^M)] \equiv \text{Tr}_M[(\mathbb{1}^A \otimes \mathbf{M}_k) \mathcal{U}(\cdot \otimes \sigma_0^M)]. \quad (6)$$

The POVM measured in  $A$  is thus  $\mathbf{A} := \{\mathbf{A}_k : k \in \mathcal{K}\}$ , with the effects  $\mathbf{A}_k := \mathcal{A}_k^*(\mathbb{1}^A)$ . As such, we may equivalently write  $p_k = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{A}_k(\rho_0^A)] = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}_k \rho_0^A]$  and  $\rho_{2,k}^A = \mathcal{A}_k(\rho_0^A)/p_k$ .

The formalism of CP-instruments provides the most general readout procedure (i.e., pointer objectification) allowed by quantum theory. Previous works instead have focused on a restricted class of instruments acting in the memory  $M$ , namely, Lüders instruments compatible with a projection valued measure (PVM), also known as “projective measurements”



[12, 14, 15]. For any observable  $M$ , the operations of the corresponding Lüders instrument read  $\mathcal{M}_k^L(\cdot) := \sqrt{M_k}(\cdot)\sqrt{M_k}$ , and  $M$  is a PVM if the effects  $M_k$  are mutually orthogonal projections. As shown by Ozawa, every instrument acting in  $A$  admits a “normal” measurement scheme—where  $\sigma_0^M$  is chosen to be pure and the pointer observable is chosen to be a PVM [29]. But we stress that the pointer observable in a given measurement process need not be a PVM and, *a fortiori*, even if it is, the instrument measuring it need not be of the Lüders form; it is well known that every observable  $M$  admits infinitely many  $M$ -compatible instruments. However, the operations of such instruments may always be written as  $\mathcal{M}_k = \Phi_k \circ \mathcal{M}_k^L$ , where  $\Phi_k$  are arbitrary channels, see e.g. [30, 31].

Since the interaction step is unitary, it is adiabatic. Following a well-established convention, see e.g. Refs. [11, 12, 15], we shall assume that the pointer objectification step is also adiabatic which, as discussed above, may be justified if this process takes place very fast as compared to the time-scale in which heat dissipates. By Definition 2, the work associated with the measurement step will be given as the change in internal energy, i.e.,  $W_{\text{in},0 \rightarrow 2} := \Delta E_{0 \rightarrow 2}$ . But note that by Eq. (4) and Eq. (5), only the state of  $AMK$  changes due to measurement. By the additivity of the Hamiltonians, we may split the contribution from  $A$  and  $MK$  to the total work as

$$W_{\text{ext},0 \rightarrow 2}^A := -\Delta E_{0 \rightarrow 2}^A, \quad W_{\text{in},0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} := \Delta E_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK}, \quad (7)$$

such that  $W_{\text{in},0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} - W_{\text{ext},0 \rightarrow 2}^A = \Delta E_{0 \rightarrow 2}$ .

**The feedback control step:** From  $t = t_2$  to  $t = t_3$ , a feedback control protocol is performed. This is implemented by coupling the compound  $AK$  with the thermal bath  $B_1$  by a unitary channel  $\mathcal{F}(\cdot) := F(\cdot)F^\dagger$ , defined by the unitary operator <sup>2</sup>

$$F := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} F_k \otimes |k\rangle\langle k|^K.$$

Here,  $F_k$  are unitary operators on  $B_1A$ , which induce the unitary channel  $\mathcal{F}_k(\cdot) := F_k(\cdot)F_k^\dagger$  conditional on the classical register having recorded outcome  $k$ . At time step  $t = t_3$ , the state of the compound reads

$$\rho_3 := (\mathcal{F} \otimes \text{id}^{MB_2})(\rho_2) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k \rho_{3,k}, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\rho_{3,k} = \rho_{3,k}^{B_1AM} \otimes |k\rangle\langle k|^K \otimes \gamma^{B_2}.$$

<sup>2</sup> Note that unitarity of  $F$  implicitly assumes that  $K$  is represented by a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}^K$  of dimension equal to the number of measurement outcomes.

Here,  $\rho_{3,k}^{B_1AM} = (\mathcal{F}_k \otimes \text{id}^M)(\gamma^{B_1} \otimes \rho_{2,k}^{AM})$ . Note that we may write the conditional states of the target system  $A$  at time step  $t_3$  as  $\rho_{3,k}^A = \Lambda_k(\rho_{2,k}^A)$ , where  $\Lambda_k(\cdot) := \text{Tr}_{B_1}[\mathcal{F}_k(\gamma^{B_1} \otimes \cdot)]$  are channels acting in  $A$  as a result of the conditional unitary interactions with the bath. We shall say that the feedback process is *pure unitary* if we choose  $F_k = \mathbb{1}^{B_1} \otimes F_k^A$ , so that  $\Lambda_k(\cdot) = F_k^A(\cdot)F_k^{A\dagger}$ . In such a case, the feedback process does not involve the thermal bath. This is the case considered in, e.g., Refs. [11–13]. However, since Szilard [2] onward, the traditional formulation typically considers a feedback protocol that is done in contact with a thermal bath, as we do here.

Since feedback is implemented by a global unitary channel, then by Definition 2 the work extracted during this step is given as the decrease in internal energy of the compound. Since the feedback unitary acts non-trivially only in the subsystem  $AB_1K$ , while the state of  $K$  is left unchanged, we identify such work with the target system  $A$ . That is,

$$W_{\text{ext},2 \rightarrow 3}^A := -\Delta E_{2 \rightarrow 3}. \quad (9)$$

**The erasure step:** Lastly, the erasure process from  $t = t_3$  to  $t = t_4$  is modeled by coupling  $MK$  with the thermal bath  $B_2$  by a unitary channel  $\mathcal{V}(\cdot) := V(\cdot)V^\dagger$ . We naturally assume that  $H_3^A = H_4^A$ , since the target system  $A$  remains dormant. At time step  $t_4$ , the state of the compound system will read

$$\rho_4 := (\text{id}^{B_1A} \otimes \mathcal{V}^{MKB_2})(\rho_3), \quad (10)$$

such that  $\rho_4^{MK} = \rho_0^{MK} = \sigma_0^M \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^K$ . That is, the interaction between  $MK$  and the bath  $B_2$  returns the local state of  $MK$  back to its initial configuration. Such a setting appears in the context of *Landauer's principle* [4, 32]. If, in addition, it holds that  $\rho_4^{AMK} = \rho_4^A \otimes \sigma_0^M \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^K$ , i.e., if the correlations between  $A$  and  $MK$  are also erased, then we say that the erasure is *perfect*. Otherwise, we call the erasure *partial*. While perfect erasure can in principle be achieved if a suitable bath is provided, it is a nontrivial problem to determine if such a unitary erasure process always exists for a *given* bath. In order to alleviate this problem, here we also consider a protocol that involves *partial* erasure.

Since erasure is implemented by a global unitary channel, then by Definition 2 the work injected during this step is given as the increase in internal energy of the compound. Since the erasure unitary acts non-trivially only on  $MK$  and the bath  $B_2$ , while the Hamiltonian of  $A$  does not change, then we identify such work with  $MK$ . That is,

$$W_{\text{in},3 \rightarrow 4}^{MK} := \Delta E_{3 \rightarrow 4}. \quad (11)$$




FIG. 1. A general quantum feedback control and erasure protocol. **Interaction step** ( $t_0 \rightarrow t_1$ ): system  $A$  and memory  $M$  interact by a unitary channel  $\mathcal{U}$ . **Readout step** ( $t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ ): an instrument  $\mathcal{M}$  is applied on the memory  $M$  and the outcome  $k$  is written on the classical register  $K$ . The interaction step and the readout step together are referred to as the measurement step, which is assumed here to occur adiabatically. **Feedback control step** ( $t_2 \rightarrow t_3$ ): a controlled unitary channel  $\mathcal{F}_k$  is applied on the compound of system  $A$  and thermal bath  $B_1$  depending on the outcome  $k$ . **Erasure step** ( $t_3 \rightarrow t_4$ ): a unitary channel  $\mathcal{V}$  is applied on the compound of  $MK$  and thermal bath  $B_2$ , so as to return the state of  $MK$  to its initial configuration. The total compound system is assumed to evolve adiabatically during the protocol, that is, no heat is exchanged with any outside source.

The total work extracted from the target system  $A$  is given by the contribution of the extracted work from measurement, and the extracted work from feedback. By Eq. (7) and Eq. (9), this reads

$$W_{\text{ext}}^A := W_{\text{ext},0 \rightarrow 2}^A + W_{\text{ext},2 \rightarrow 3}^A = -\Delta E_{0 \rightarrow 2}^A - \Delta E_{2 \rightarrow 3}. \quad (12)$$

On the other hand, the total work injected into the controller  $MK$  is given by the contribution of injected work from measurement, and the injected work from erasure. By Eq. (7) and Eq. (11), this reads

$$W_{\text{in}}^{MK} := W_{\text{in},0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} + W_{\text{in},3 \rightarrow 4}^{MK} = \Delta E_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} + \Delta E_{3 \rightarrow 4}. \quad (13)$$

Finally, the net extracted work is defined as

$$W_{\text{ext}}^{AMK} := W_{\text{ext}}^A - W_{\text{in}}^{MK} = -\Delta E_{0 \rightarrow 4}, \quad (14)$$

which is just the total decrease in internal energy of the entire compound; recall that the transformation during each step of the protocol is given by a global adiabatic channel.

### A. General work formulas of the quantum feedback control and erasure protocols

In this section, we give generally valid formulas for the work defined in Eqs. (12) and (13). To this end, let us first introduce the following information measure related to the measurement process on the target system:

**Definition 3.** The *Groenewold–Ozawa information gain* [17, 18] of the target system’s measurement process is defined as:

$$I_{\text{GO}} := S(A)_{\rho_0} - S(A|K)_{\rho_2}, \quad (15)$$

where the entropy of the post-measurement state of the target system conditioned by the classical register,  $S(A|K)_{\rho_2}$ , can equivalently be written as  $\sum_k p_k S(\rho_{2,k}^A)$ , i.e., the average entropy of the post-measurement states of  $A$ . Note that  $I_{\text{GO}}$  is determined entirely by the prior system state  $\rho_0^A$  and the instrument  $\mathcal{A}$  acting in  $A$  as defined in Eq. (6). The Groenewold–Ozawa information gain is guaranteed to be non-negative for all prior states  $\rho_0^A$  if and only if the instrument  $\mathcal{A}$  is *quasi-complete*;  $\mathcal{A}$  is called quasi-complete if for all pure prior states  $\rho_0^A$ , the posterior states  $\rho_{2,k}^A := \mathcal{A}_k(\rho_0^A)/p_k$  are also pure. An example of a quasi-complete instrument is an *efficient* instrument, whereby each operation can be written with a single Kraus operator, i.e.,  $\mathcal{A}_k(\cdot) = L_k(\cdot)L_k^\dagger$ . In general, therefore,  $I_{\text{GO}}$  can be negative [18].

The following theorem gives universally valid formulas for the work associated with feedback control and erasure protocols with a general quantum measurement process, independent of thermodynamics and from a purely information-theoretic point of view.

**Theorem 1.** *In the quantum feedback control and erasure protocol with a general quantum measurement process (Fig. 1), the extracted work from the system is*

$$W_{\text{ext}}^A = -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A + \beta^{-1} \left[ I_{\text{GO}} - I(A:K)_{\rho_3} - S_{\text{irr}}^{B_1} \right], \quad (16)$$

*and the work needed to run the controller is*

$$W_{\text{in}}^{MK} = \beta^{-1} \left[ I_{\text{GO}} + \Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK} + I(A:M|K)_{\rho_2} + S_{\text{irr}}^{B_2} \right], \quad (17)$$

*where*

$$S_{\text{irr}}^{B_1} := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k \left( I(A:B_1)_{\rho_{3,k}} + D(\rho_{3,k}^{B_1} \| \gamma^{B_1}) \right) \geq 0,$$

$$S_{\text{irr}}^{B_2} := I(MK:B_2)_{\rho_4} + D(\rho_4^{B_2} \| \gamma^{B_2}) \geq 0,$$

*denote the irreversible entropy production associated with the isothermal feedback and erasure steps.*

*Proof idea.* These equalities are obtained from Eq. (12) and Eq. (13), together with Lemmas 2 and 3. The detailed proof is given in Appendix A.  $\square$

Regarding Eq. (16),  $I(A : K)_{\rho_3} = S(\rho_3^A) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k S(\rho_{3,k}^A)$  is the *Holevo information* of the conditional states of  $A$  after feedback [33], which is non-negative and vanishes if and only if  $\rho_{3,k}^A = \rho_3^A$  for all  $k$ . Ref. [34] also derives a similar equality, but it uses the QC-mutual information, which is mentioned in Section VI, not the Groenewold–Ozawa information gain.

From Theorem 1, we obtain work inequalities that are always valid in the quantum feedback control and erasure protocols with a general quantum measurement process.

**Theorem 2.** *In the quantum feedback control and erasure protocol with a general quantum measurement process (Fig. 1), the work extracted from the target system is upper bounded as*

$$W_{\text{ext}}^A \leq -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A + \beta^{-1} I_{\text{GO}}, \quad (18)$$

where the equality holds if and only if  $I(A : K)_{\rho_3} = S_{\text{irr}}^{B_1} = 0$ . The work cost to run the controller is lower bounded as

$$W_{\text{in}}^{MK} \geq \beta^{-1} [I_{\text{GO}} + \Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK}], \quad (19)$$

where the equality holds if and only if  $I(A : M|K)_{\rho_2} = S_{\text{irr}}^{B_2} = 0$ .

*Proof.* Eq. (18) and Eq. (19) are obtained by Eq. (16) and Eq. (17), respectively, together with the non-negativity of the quantum relative entropy, the quantum mutual information, and the conditional quantum mutual information. The equality conditions are clear.  $\square$

Let us discuss in more depth the conditions under which the equalities in the above theorem can be achieved. A necessary condition for the equality in Eq. (18) is for the entropy production during the feedback step,  $S_{\text{irr}}^{B_1}$ , to vanish. This will trivially be achieved if the feedback process is pure unitary, i.e., if for each outcome the target system undergoes an isolated unitary evolution. But note that this will in general be incompatible with the other necessary condition for the equality in Eq. (18), i.e., a vanishing Holevo information  $I(A : K)_{\rho_3}$ . Recall that this quantity vanishes if and only if  $\rho_{3,k}^A = \rho_3^A$  for all  $k$ , which implies that  $\rho_{3,k}^A = \rho_{3,k'}^A$  for all  $k, k'$ . But if the feedback process is pure unitary, then  $\rho_{3,k}^A = F_k^A(\rho_{2,k}^A)F_k^{A\dagger}$ . Since unitary channels leave the von Neumann entropy invariant, and two states are identical only if their entropies are identical, it clearly follows that a necessary condition for a vanishing Holevo information given a pure unitary feedback process is for all the posterior states after measurement,  $\rho_{2,k}^A$ , to have the same entropy, which is generally

not the case. Such a restriction will not apply in general when the feedback process is allowed to exchange entropy with the thermal bath.

Similarly as above, a necessary condition for the equality in Eq. (19) is for the entropy production during erasure,  $S_{\text{irr}}^{B_2}$ , to vanish. The other necessary condition, however, is given by a vanishing conditional mutual information  $I(A:M|K)_{\rho_2}$ . It is easily verified that this quantity is equivalent to  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k I(A:M)_{\rho_{2,k}}$ , that is, the average mutual information between  $A$  and  $M$  in the conditional joint states  $\rho_{2,k}^{AM}$  after measurement. Clearly, such a quantity vanishes if and only if  $\rho_{2,k}^{AM} = \rho_{2,k}^A \otimes \rho_{2,k}^M$ . Given that  $\rho_{2,k}^{AM} = (\text{id}^A \otimes \mathcal{M}_k) \circ \mathcal{U}(\rho_0^A \otimes \sigma_0^M) / p_k$ , a sufficient condition for  $I(A:M|K)_{\rho_2}$  to vanish is if the instrument  $\mathcal{M}$  is *nuclear* (also known as *measure-and-prepare* [35] or *Gordon-Louisell type* [36]);  $\mathcal{M}$  is nuclear if it holds that  $\mathcal{M}_k(\cdot) = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{M}_k(\cdot)] \varrho_k^M$  for all  $k$ , where  $\{\varrho_k^M\}$  is a family of states on  $M$ . It is clear that each operation of a nuclear instrument acting in  $M$  will destroy the correlations between  $A$  and  $M$ . Every POVM admits a nuclear instrument and, as shown in Corollary 1 of [37] (see also Theorem 2 of [31]), if the pointer observable measured by  $\mathcal{M}$  is rank-1, i.e., if all the effects  $M_k = \mathcal{M}_k^*(\mathbb{1}^M)$  are proportional to a rank-1 projection, then  $\mathcal{M}$  is necessarily nuclear.

#### IV. SECOND LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS VERSUS SECOND LAW OF ITH

Our analysis so far has been independent of thermodynamics, but henceforth we will explore the consequences derived by combining the results of Theorem 1 with the second law of thermodynamics. Before doing so, however, we introduce two types of second laws of thermodynamics in this section, and show how they are related.

The *overall* second law holds when the net extracted work, given in Eq. (14), and the change in free energy of the compound  $AMK$ —that is, all systems except for the thermal baths—obey the relation in Eq. (2), i.e.,

$$W_{\text{ext}}^{AMK} := W_{\text{ext}}^A - W_{\text{in}}^{MK} \leq -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^{AMK}. \quad (20)$$

We remark again that the above inequality embodies the second law of thermodynamics when considered from the beginning (time  $t_0$ ) to the end (time  $t_4$ ) of the protocol, regardless of what happens in the intermediate steps.

On the other hand, the second law of ITh, as formulated in [12], holds when the net extracted work and the change in free energy of *the target system alone* obey the relation in Eq. (2), i.e.,

$$W_{\text{ext}}^{AMK} := W_{\text{ext}}^A - W_{\text{in}}^{MK} \leq -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A. \quad (21)$$

Since the memory and register are erased, the free energy change  $\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^{MK}$  is zero. Thus, Eq. (20)

may appear to be attributed to Eq. (21). As the following theorem shows, however, they coincide only in special cases.

**Theorem 3.** *In any quantum feedback control and erasure protocol with perfect erasure, the overall second law of thermodynamics (20) and the generalized second law of ITh (21) are logically equivalent regardless of the measurement process involved. More generally, if the erasure is only partial, the validity of the second law of thermodynamics (20) is sufficient, but not necessary, for the validity of the generalized second law of ITh (21).*

*Proof.* The statement of the theorem is obtained from the following chain of relations:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^{AMK} &= -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A - \Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^{MK} - \beta^{-1} I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} \\ &= -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A - \beta^{-1} I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} \\ &\leq -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds because of Lemma 1 and  $I(A : MK)_{\rho_0} = 0$ ; the second equality follows from the erasure condition  $\rho_4^{MK} = \rho_0^{MK}$ ; and the final inequality follows from the non-negativity of quantum mutual information. It is also clear that the final inequality becomes an equality if and only if erasure is perfect, that is,  $\rho_4^{AMK} = \rho_4^A \otimes \rho_0^{MK}$  so that  $I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} = 0$ .  $\square$

## V. NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR THE VALIDITY OF THE SECOND LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS

Due to Theorem 3, we see that the problem of characterizing the exact range of validity of the second law of ITh can be solved by looking at the range of validity of the second law of thermodynamics. The latter can be captured exactly owing to Theorem 1, where the formulas of work associated with quantum feedback control and erasure protocols are obtained as equalities. We obtain the following:

**Theorem 4.** *The quantum feedback control and erasure protocol with a general quantum measurement process (Figure 1) satisfies the overall second law of thermodynamics, i.e., Eq. (20), if and only if*

$$\Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK} \geq I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} - I(A : M|K)_{\rho_2} - I(A : K)_{\rho_3} - S_{\text{irr}}^{B_1} - S_{\text{irr}}^{B_2}. \quad (22)$$

A sufficient condition for the overall second law to hold is if the measurement process does not decrease the entropy, i.e.,  $\Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK} \geq 0$ .

*Proof idea.* Eq. (22) is obtained by combining Eq. (20) with Eqs. (16) and (17). The sufficiency of  $\Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK} \geq 0$  to satisfy Eq. (22) follows from the non-negativity of the irreversible entropy production terms  $S_{\text{irr}}^{B_1}, S_{\text{irr}}^{B_2}$ , and the relation

$$I(A : M|K)_{\rho_2} + I(A : K)_{\rho_3} \geq I(A : MK)_{\rho_3} \geq I(A : MK)_{\rho_4},$$

which follows from the data processing inequality [38]. The detailed proof is given in Appendix B.  $\square$

The above theorem can be equivalently reformulated in terms of work, instead of entropy.

**Corollary 1.** *The quantum feedback control and erasure protocol with a general quantum measurement process satisfies the overall second law of thermodynamics if and only if*

$$W_{\text{in}}^{MK} \geq \beta^{-1} \left[ I_{\text{GO}} + I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} - I(A : K)_{\rho_3} - S_{\text{irr}}^{B_1} \right].$$

*Proof idea.* This equation is obtained by combining Eq. (20) with Eq. (16). See Appendix B.  $\square$

## VI. COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS LITERATURE

Here, we compare the work inequalities presented in Theorem 2 with those previously obtained by Sagawa and Ueda [11, 12]. According to [11], the achievable upper bound on the amount of work extracted by feedback control from the target system  $A$ , assumed to be initially in equilibrium, is

$$W_{\text{ext}}^A \leq -\Delta F_{\text{eq}, 0 \rightarrow 4}^A + \beta^{-1} I_{\text{QC}}, \quad (23)$$

where  $I_{\text{QC}}$  is a nonnegative quantity named the *QC-mutual information* [11]. This quantity, in some particular situations, can be interpreted as a measure of the information gained by the measurement performed by the controller on the target system. Thus Eq. (23) implies that the second law (2) for system  $A$  can be violated in a feedback control protocol by an amount that is directly proportional to the information that the controller is able to obtain about the target system. Then, in a subsequent paper [12], the same authors showed that the quantity  $\beta^{-1} I_{\text{QC}}$ , under suitable assumptions, provides a tight lower bound on the work cost for measurement and erasure:

$$W_{\text{meas}}^{MK} + W_{\text{eras}}^{MK} \equiv W_{\text{in}}^{MK} \geq \beta^{-1} I_{\text{QC}}, \quad (24)$$



thus obtaining

$$W_{\text{ext}}^A - W_{\text{in}}^{MK} \leq -\Delta F_{\text{eq}, 0 \rightarrow 4}^A, \quad (25)$$

which Ref. [12] refers to as the second law of ITh.

However, in order to be valid, the analysis presented by Sagawa and Ueda in [11–13] requires the following assumptions on the quantum feedback control and erasure protocol:

**Assumption 1 (A-1) [12]:** The readout/ pointer objectification must be implemented by a Lüders instrument  $\mathcal{M}_k^L(\cdot) := \sqrt{\mathbb{M}_k}(\cdot)\sqrt{\mathbb{M}_k}$  compatible with a projection valued measure  $\mathbb{M}_k = \sqrt{\mathbb{M}_k}$  acting in  $M$ . That is, for each measurement outcome  $k$ , it must hold that

$$\rho_{2,k}^{AM} = \frac{(\mathbb{1}^A \otimes \mathbb{M}_k)\mathcal{U}(\rho_0^A \otimes \sigma_0^M)(\mathbb{1}^A \otimes \mathbb{M}_k)}{p_k}.$$

**Assumption 2 (A-2) [11–13]:** The instrument acting in the target system  $A$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{A}_k(\cdot) := \text{Tr}_M[(\text{id}^A \otimes \mathcal{M}_k) \circ \mathcal{U}(\cdot \otimes \sigma_0^M)]$ , must be *efficient*. That is, every operation  $\mathcal{A}_k$  must be expressible with only one Kraus operator.

**Assumption 3 (A-3) [11]:** The target system  $A$  must be initially prepared in the Gibbs state, that is,  $\rho_0^A = \gamma^A$ .

**Assumption 4 (A-4) [12]:** At time step  $t = t_2$ , the target system and memory must be in a product state for each outcome  $k$ , i.e.,  $\rho_{2,k}^{AM} = \rho_{2,k}^A \otimes \rho_{2,k}^M$ .

**Assumption 5 (A-5) [11]:** The feedback process must be pure unitary. That is, for each outcome  $k$  it must hold that  $\rho_{3,k}^A = F_k^A(\rho_{2,k}^A)F_k^{A\dagger}$ .

**Assumption 6 (A-6) [12]:** The memory  $M$  has a Hilbert space and Hamiltonian with a direct sum structure,  $\mathcal{H}^M = \bigoplus_{k=0}^N \mathcal{H}^{M_k}$  and  $H^M = \bigoplus_{k=0}^N H^{M_k}$ , where  $N = |\mathcal{K}|$  is the number of measurement outcomes, and  $H^{M_k}$  are Hamiltonians on the sector  $\mathcal{H}^{M_k}$ . Denoting the Gibbs states for each sector  $k$  as  $\gamma^{M_k}$ , it must hold that: (i) the initial state of the memory satisfies  $\sigma_0^M = \gamma^{M_0}$ , and (ii) the conditional states of the memory before erasure read  $\rho_{3,k}^M = \gamma^{M_k}$ .

Let us remark that none of the assumptions above need be satisfied by general measurement and feedback processes which we consider and, *a fortiori*, they are mutually incompatible in general. First, assumptions (A-1) and (A-4) are generically incompatible, since given pointer objectification by a Lüders instrument, the post-measurement states  $\rho_{2,k}^{AM}$  will in general be correlated. There are two cases in which (A-4) will be guaranteed to hold given (A-1): (i) if  $\mathbb{M}_k$  are rank-1 projections, which is both necessary and sufficient for the  $M$ -compatible Lüders instrument  $\mathcal{M}^L$  to be nuclear,

then measurement of  $M$  by  $\mathcal{M}^L$  is guaranteed to destroy the correlations between  $A$  and  $M$ ; (ii) if the premeasurement unitary channel is local, i.e.,  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}^A \otimes \mathcal{U}^M$ , then it trivially holds that  $\rho_{2,k}^{AM} = \mathcal{U}^A(\rho_0^A) \otimes \mathbf{M}_k \mathcal{U}^M(\sigma_0^M) \mathbf{M}_k / p_k$ . But in such a case the measurement process implements a trivial observable on  $A$ , i.e., it will hold that all the effects of the POVM  $\mathcal{A}$  measured in  $A$  will be proportional to  $\mathbb{1}^A$ , in which case the measurement will not provide any information. Second, whenever the effects of the observable measured by  $\mathcal{A}$  are linearly independent—for example, if the observable is projection valued—then (A-1), (A-2), and (A-6) are compatible only if  $\dim(\mathcal{H}^{M_0}) \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \dim(\mathcal{H}^{M_k}) / N$ . This follows from the fact that Gibbs states have full rank, and so the rank of  $\gamma^{M_0}$  equals  $\dim(\mathcal{H}^{M_0})$ , together with the fact that an efficient instrument compatible with an observable with linearly independent effects is *extremal* [39]. See Appendix C. In particular, since  $\mathbf{M}_k$  are projections onto the subspaces  $\mathcal{H}^{M_k}$ , then if  $\mathbf{M}_k$  are rank-1 projections, which is necessary to guarantee compatibility of (A-1) and (A-4) discussed above, then  $\mathcal{H}^{M_0}$  must also be 1-dimensional—that is, the memory must be prepared in a pure state.

On the other hand, as a consequence of our analysis, one easily sees that in fact Assumption (A-1) alone is already sufficient to obtain Eq. (21) which, under Assumption (A-3) and Eq. (3), directly implies Eq. (25). This is because for any POVM, the corresponding Lüders channel  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{K}}^L(\cdot) := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \sqrt{\mathbf{M}_k}(\cdot)\sqrt{\mathbf{M}_k}$  is bistochastic—that is, it preserves both the trace and the identity—and so does not decrease the entropy [40]. In such a case,  $\Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK} \geq 0$  is guaranteed to hold, which implies the validity of the overall second law of thermodynamics (20) (by Theorem 4) and, in turn, also the validity of the second law of ITh (21) (by Theorem 3). See Appendix D for further details.

Thus, Eqs. (18) and (19) constitute a strict extension of Sagawa and Ueda’s relations (23) and (24). This is because:

1. When readout/ pointer objectification is implemented by a projective measurement on the memory, i.e., under (A-1), it holds that  $\Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK} \geq 0$ . Moreover, if  $\Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK}$  is strictly positive, Eq. (19) is a more refined inequality than Eq. (24), since the latter cannot be saturated.
2. When the instrument acting in  $A$  is assumed to be efficient, i.e., under (A-2), then the Groenewold–Ozawa information gain  $I_{GO}$  coincides with the QC-mutual information  $I_{QC}$ , as shown in Ref. [41].
3. When the target system is initialized in a Gibbs state, i.e., under (A-3), then  $-\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A \leq -\Delta F_{\text{eq}, 0 \rightarrow 4}^A$  because of Eq. (3).

In particular, we conclude that the correct information measure that remains valid for general measurement processes is  $I_{GO}$ , not  $I_{QC}$ . Although  $I_{GO}$  has been considered also in some previous works [14, 15], these still imposed assumption (A-1). Our analysis shows that  $I_{GO}$  is the right quantity to consider even when (A-1) is not satisfied.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we formulated quantum feedback control and erasure protocols with general feedback (i.e., isothermal, not necessarily unitary) and measurement (i.e., not necessarily of the Lüders type) processes, and derived exact formulas for the work extracted by feedback control and the work required for measurement and erasure (Theorems 1 and 2). Unlike previous studies [11, 12, 14, 15], the equations we derived are universally valid, in the sense that we did not impose any assumptions on the feedback process, the measurement, or the initial state of the system. Of course, our equations recover those presented in previous studies [11–13], but are able to do so with fewer assumptions than those used there. The main result of our study has been to show that the validity of the generalized second law of ITh presented here is a necessary requirement for any quantum feedback control and erasure protocol that is consistent with phenomenological thermodynamics (Theorem 3), for which we also precisely characterized the conditions of validity (Theorems 4), and that the two laws become equivalent in the case of perfect erasure of the demon’s memory.

This resolves the problem of the scope of the second law of ITh, which was unclear from previous studies, but can now be considered a universally valid law of physics. Our results also resolve a debate about the operational interpretation of the Groenewold–Ozawa information gain, which has been generally considered problematic, especially in those situations where it takes negative values, but we have seen to quantify the amount by which the extractable work by measurement-plus-feedback exceeds the reduction in free energy.

An interesting direction to follow will be to look for applications of our approach to other formulations of the second law such as fluctuation theorems [14, 42–46]. In the same way, another possible line for future research is to bring our analysis to the one-shot case [47–49], possibly beyond quantum theory [50–52], and to introduce insights from the thermodynamic reverse bound [53], retrodiction [45, 46, 54, 55] and the theory of approximate recoverability [56]. Finally, an interesting line of future investigation will be to see how the second law of ITh interplays with the first and third laws of thermodynamics: the first law demands that the interaction between system and memory of the measuring device must be constrained so as to conserve the total energy, whereby the Wigner-Araki-Yanase theorem will impose limitations on the measurements one may perform [57–59]. On the other hand, the third law will prohibit the memory from being initialized in a pure state, which has also been shown to impose fundamental constraints on measurements [60, 61].

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Arshag Danageozian, Masahito Hayashi, Kenta Koshihara, Yosuke Mitsuhashi, Yoshifumi Nakata, Takahiro Sagawa, Valerio Scarani, and Jeongrak Son for their helpful comments and fruitful discussions. S. M. would like to take this opportunity to thank the “Nagoya University Interdisciplinary Frontier Fellowship” supported by Nagoya University and JST, the establishment of university fellowships towards the creation of science technology innovation, Grant Number JPMJFS2120. F. B. acknowledges support from MEXT Quantum Leap Flagship Program (MEXT QLEAP) Grant No. JPMXS0120319794, from MEXT-JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Transformative Research Areas (A) “Extreme Universe” No. 21H05183, and from JSPS KAKENHI, Grants No. 20K03746 and No. 23K03230. K. K. acknowledges support from JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Early-Career Scientists, No. 22K13972; from MEXT-JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Transformative Research Areas (A) “Extreme Universe”, No. 22H05254. M. H. M. acknowledges support by the European Union under project ShoQC within ERA-NET Cofund in Quantum Technologies (QuantERA) program.

- 
- [1] J. C. Maxwell, *Theory of heat* (Appleton, London, 1871).
  - [2] L. Szilard, über die Entropieverminderung in einem thermodynamischen System bei Eingriffen intelligenter Wesen, *Z. Phys.* **53**, 840 (1929).
  - [3] L. Brillouin, Maxwell’s demon cannot operate: Information and entropy. i, *J. Appl. Phys.* **22**, 334 (1951).
  - [4] R. Landauer, Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process, *IBM J. Res. Dev.* **5**, 183 (1961).
  - [5] C. H. Bennett, Logical reversibility of computation, *IBM J. Res. Dev.* **17**, 525 (1973).
  - [6] C. H. Bennett, The thermodynamics of computation—a review, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **21**, 905 (1982).
  - [7] H. Leff and A. Rex, *Maxwell’s Demon 2 Entropy, Classical and Quantum Information, Computing* (CRC Press, 2002).
  - [8] K. Maruyama, F. Nori, and V. Vedral, Colloquium: The physics of Maxwell’s demon and information, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 1 (2009).
  - [9] R. S. Ingarden, A. Kossakowski, and M. Ohya, *Information Dynamics and Open Systems* (Springer Dordrecht, 1997).
  - [10] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, Information thermodynamics: Maxwell’s demon in nonequilibrium dynamics, in *Nonequilibrium statistical physics of small systems: fluctuation relations and beyond*, edited by R. Klages, W. Just, and C. Jarzynski (Wiley Online Library, 2013) Chap. 6, pp. 181–211.
  - [11] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, Second law of thermodynamics with discrete quantum feedback control, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 080403 (2008).

- [12] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, Minimal energy cost for thermodynamic information processing: Measurement and information erasure, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 250602 (2009).
- [13] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, Erratum: Minimal energy cost for thermodynamic information processing: Measurement and information erasure [phys. rev. lett. 102, 250602 (2009)], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 189901 (2011).
- [14] K. Funo, Y. Watanabe, and M. Ueda, Integral quantum fluctuation theorems under measurement and feedback control, *Phys. Rev. E* **88**, 052121 (2013).
- [15] K. Abdelkhalek, Y. Nakata, and D. Reeb, Fundamental energy cost for quantum measurement, arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.06981 [10.48550/arXiv.1609.06981](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.48550/arXiv.1609.06981) (2016).
- [16] M. H. Mohammady and A. Romito, Conditional work statistics of quantum measurements, *Quantum* **3**, 175 (2019).
- [17] H. J. Groenewold, A problem of information gain by quantal measurements, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **4**, 327 (1971).
- [18] M. Ozawa, On information gain by quantum measurements of continuous observables, *J. Math. Phys.* **27**, 759 (1986).
- [19] A. Danageozian, M. M. Wilde, and F. Buscemi, Thermodynamic constraints on quantum information gain and error correction: A triple trade-off, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 020318 (2022).
- [20] M. H. Mohammady, Thermodynamically free quantum measurements, *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* **55**, 505304 (2022).
- [21] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics* (Princeton University Press, 1955).
- [22] H. Umegaki, On information in operator algebras, *Proc. Japan Acad.* **37**, 459 (1961).
- [23] O. Klein, Zur quantenmechanischen begründung des zweiten hauptsatzes der wärmelehre, *Z. Phys.* **72**, 767 (1931).
- [24] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [25] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory, 2nd edition* (Cambridge University Press, 2017).
- [26] B. Gaveau and L. Schulman, A general framework for non-equilibrium phenomena: The master equation and its formal consequences, *Phys. Lett. A* **229**, 347 (1997).
- [27] M. Esposito and C. Van den Broeck, Second law and landauer principle far from equilibrium, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **95**, 40004 (2011).
- [28] A. Smith, Y. Lu, S. An, X. Zhang, J.-N. Zhang, Z. Gong, H. T. Quan, C. Jarzynski, and K. Kim, Verification of the quantum nonequilibrium work relation in the presence of decoherence, *New Journal of Physics* **20**, 013008 (2018).
- [29] M. Ozawa, Quantum measuring processes of continuous observables, *J. Math. Phys.* **25**, 79 (1984).
- [30] M. Hayashi, *Quantum information* (Springer, 2006).
- [31] J.-P. Pellonpää, Quantum instruments: II. Measurement theory, *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* **46**, 025303 (2013).
- [32] D. Reeb and M. M. Wolf, An improved landauer principle with finite-size corrections, *New J. Phys* **16**, 103011 (2014).

- [33] A. S. Holevo, Bounds for the quantity of information transmitted by a quantum communication channel, *Problems of Information Transmission* **9**, 177 (1973).
- [34] T. Sagawa, Thermodynamics of Information Processing in Small Systems, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **127**, 1 (2012).
- [35] M. Horodecki, P. W. Shor, and M. B. Ruskai, Entanglement breaking channels, *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* **15**, 629 (2003).
- [36] J. Gordon and W. Louisell, Simultaneous measurements of noncommuting observables, in *Physics of Quantum Electronics: Conference Proceedings*, edited by P. Kelley, B. Lax, and P. Tannenwald (McGraw-Hill, 1966) pp. 833–840.
- [37] T. Heinosaari and M. M. Wolf, Nondisturbing quantum measurements, *J. Math. Phys.* **51**, 092201 (2010).
- [38] B. Schumacher and M. A. Nielsen, Quantum data processing and error correction, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 2629 (1996).
- [39] G. M. D’Ariano, P. Perinotti, and M. Sedlák, Extremal quantum protocols, *J. Math. Phys.* **52**, 082202 (2011).
- [40] P. Alberti and A. Uhlmann, *Stochasticity and Partial Order; Doubly Stochastic Maps and Unitary Mixing* (Springer Dordrecht, 1982).
- [41] F. Buscemi, M. Hayashi, and M. Horodecki, Global information balance in quantum measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 210504 (2008).
- [42] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, Fluctuation theorem with information exchange: Role of correlations in stochastic thermodynamics, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 180602 (2012).
- [43] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, Nonequilibrium thermodynamics of feedback control, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 021104 (2012).
- [44] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, Role of mutual information in entropy production under information exchanges, *New J. Phys.* **15**, 125012 (2013).
- [45] F. Buscemi and V. Scarani, Fluctuation theorems from bayesian retrodiction, *Phys. Rev. E* **103**, 052111 (2021).
- [46] C. C. Aw, F. Buscemi, and V. Scarani, Fluctuation theorems with retrodiction rather than reverse processes, *AVS Quantum Sci.* **3**, 045601 (2021).
- [47] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, Fundamental limitations for quantum and nanoscale thermodynamics, *Nat. Commun.* **4**, 1 (2013).
- [48] P. Faist and R. Renner, Fundamental work cost of quantum processes, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021011 (2018).
- [49] P. Lipka-Bartosik and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, Thermodynamic work cost of quantum estimation protocols, *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* **51**, 474001 (2018).
- [50] E. Hänggi and S. Wehner, A violation of the uncertainty principle implies a violation of the second law of thermodynamics, *Nat. Commun.* **4**, 1 (2013), arXiv:1205.6894.
- [51] M. Krumm, H. Barnum, J. Barrett, and M. P. Müller, Thermodynamics and the structure of quantum theory, *New J. Phys.* **19**, 043025 (2017).
- [52] S. Minagawa, H. Arai, and F. Buscemi, Von neumann’s information engine without the spectral theorem, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **4**, 033091 (2022).

- [53] F. Buscemi, D. Fujiwara, N. Mitsui, and M. Rotondo, Thermodynamic reverse bounds for general open quantum processes, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 032210 (2020).
- [54] F. Buscemi, J. Schindler, and D. Šafránek, Observational entropy, coarse-grained states, and the petz recovery map: information-theoretic properties and bounds, *New Journal of Physics* **25**, 053002 (2023).
- [55] G. Bai, D. Šafránek, J. Schindler, F. Buscemi, and V. Scarani, Observational entropy with general quantum priors (2023), [arXiv:2308.08763](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.08763) [quant-ph].
- [56] F. Buscemi, S. Das, and M. M. Wilde, Approximate reversibility in the context of entropy gain, information gain, and complete positivity, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 062314 (2016).
- [57] H. Araki and M. M. Yanase, Measurement of Quantum Mechanical Operators, *Phys. Rev.* **120**, 622 (1960).
- [58] M. Ozawa, Conservation Laws, Uncertainty Relations, and Quantum Limits of Measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 050402 (2002).
- [59] M. H. Mohammady, T. Miyadera, and L. Loveridge, Measurement disturbance and conservation laws in quantum mechanics, *Quantum* **7**, 1033 (2023).
- [60] Y. Guryanova, N. Friis, and M. Huber, Ideal Projective Measurements Have Infinite Resource Costs, *Quantum* **4**, 222 (2020).
- [61] M. H. Mohammady and T. Miyadera, Quantum measurements constrained by the third law of thermodynamics, *Phys. Rev. A* **107**, 022406 (2023).
- [62] M. D. Choi, Positive Linear Maps on Complex Matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **10**, 285 (1975).

### Appendix A: Proof of Theorem 1

We shall first prove Eq. (16). Given that feedback is implemented by a global unitary channel  $\rho_2 \mapsto \rho_3 = \mathcal{F} \otimes \text{id}^{MB_2}(\rho_2)$ , the extracted work will read

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{\text{ext},2 \rightarrow 3}^A &:= -\Delta E_{2 \rightarrow 3} = \text{Tr}[\rho_2 H_2] - \text{Tr}[\mathcal{F} \otimes \text{id}^{MB_2}(\rho_2) H_3] \\
&= \text{Tr}[\rho_2^{B_1 A} (H^{B_1} + H_2^A)] - \text{Tr}[\rho_3^{B_1 A} (H^{B_1} + H_3^A)] \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k \left( \text{Tr}[\gamma^{B_1} \otimes \rho_{2,k}^A (H^{B_1} + H_2^A)] - \text{Tr}[\mathcal{F}_k(\gamma^{B_1} \otimes \rho_{2,k}^A) (H^{B_1} + H_3^A)] \right) \\
&= - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k \left( \Delta F_{2 \rightarrow 3,k}^A + \beta^{-1} [I(A : B_1)_{\rho_{3,k}} + D(\rho_{3,k}^{B_1} \| \gamma^{B_1})] \right). \tag{A1}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the second line follows from Lemma 2 and the fact that  $\mathcal{F}$  acts locally in  $B_1 AK$ , and that the Hamiltonian at  $t_2, t_3$  is additive with only the Hamiltonian of  $A$  changing in time, and that the state of  $K$  does not change. The third line follows from Eq. (5) and Eq. (8). The final line follows from Lemma 3. Now let us note that we may write

$$\begin{aligned}
- \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k \Delta F_{2 \rightarrow 3,k}^A &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k \left( \text{Tr}[\rho_{2,k}^A H_2^A] - \text{Tr}[\rho_{3,k}^A H_3^A] + \beta^{-1} [S(\rho_{3,k}^A) - S(\rho_{2,k}^A)] \right) \\
&= \text{Tr}[\rho_2^A H_2^A] - \text{Tr}[\rho_3^A H_3^A] + \beta^{-1} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k [S(\rho_{3,k}^A) - S(\rho_{2,k}^A)] \\
&= (\text{Tr}[\rho_2^A H_2^A] - \text{Tr}[\rho_0^A H_0^A]) + (\text{Tr}[\rho_0^A H_0^A] - \text{Tr}[\rho_3^A H_3^A]) \\
&\quad + \beta^{-1} [I_{\text{GO}} + S(\rho_3^A) - S(\rho_0^A) - I(A : K)_{\rho_3}] \\
&= \Delta E_{0 \rightarrow 2}^A - \Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 3}^A + \beta^{-1} [I_{\text{GO}} - I(A : K)_{\rho_3}] \\
&= \Delta E_{0 \rightarrow 2}^A - \Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A + \beta^{-1} [I_{\text{GO}} - I(A : K)_{\rho_3}]. \tag{A2}
\end{aligned}$$

In the second line we use the fact that  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k \rho_{i,k}^A = \rho_i^A$ . The third line is obtained by adding and subtracting  $\text{Tr}[\rho_0^A H_0^A]$ ,  $\beta^{-1} S(\rho_0^A)$ , and  $\beta^{-1} S(\rho_3^A)$ , and noting that  $I_{\text{GO}} = S(\rho_0^A) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k S(\rho_{2,k}^A)$  and  $I(A : K)_{\rho_3} = S(\rho_3^A) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k S(\rho_{3,k}^A)$ . The final line is obtained by noting that  $\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A = \Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 3}^A + \Delta F_{3 \rightarrow 4}^A$ , and that  $\Delta F_{3 \rightarrow 4}^A = 0$  since both the state and Hamiltonian of system  $A$  do not change between time step  $t_3$  and  $t_4$ . Finally, since  $W_{\text{ext},0 \rightarrow 2}^A = -\Delta E_{0 \rightarrow 2}^A$ , then by Eq. (A1) and Eq. (A2) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{\text{ext}}^A &= W_{\text{ext},0 \rightarrow 2}^A + W_{\text{ext},2 \rightarrow 3}^A \\
&= -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A + \beta^{-1} \left( I_{\text{GO}} - I(A : K)_{\rho_3} - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k [I(A : B_1)_{\rho_{3,k}} + D(\rho_{3,k}^{B_1} \| \gamma^{B_1})] \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and so we obtain Eq. (16).



Next, we show Eq. (17). Since the erasure step is implemented by the global unitary channel  $\rho_3 \mapsto \rho_4 = \text{id}^{B_1 A} \otimes \mathcal{V}(\rho_3)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{\text{in},3 \rightarrow 4}^{MK} &:= \Delta E_{3 \rightarrow 4} = \text{Tr}[\text{id}^{B_1 A} \otimes \mathcal{V}(\rho_3) H_4] - \text{Tr}[\rho_3 H_3] \\
&= \text{Tr}[\mathcal{V}(\rho_3^{MK} \otimes \gamma^{B_2})(H^{MK} + H^{B_2})] - \text{Tr}[\rho_3^{MK} \otimes \gamma^{B_2}(H^{MK} + H^{B_2})] \\
&= \Delta F_{3 \rightarrow 4}^{MK} + \beta^{-1}[I(MK : B)_{\rho_4} + D(\rho_4^{B_2} \|\gamma^{B_2})] \\
&= -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} + \beta^{-1}[I(MK : B)_{\rho_4} + D(\rho_4^{B_2} \|\gamma^{B_2})].
\end{aligned}$$

The second line follows from Lemma 2 and the fact that  $\mathcal{V}$  acts locally in  $MKB_2$ , and the fact that the Hamiltonian at  $t_3, t_4$  is additive while the Hamiltonians of  $MK$  and  $B_2$  do not change. The third line follows from Lemma 3. The final line follows from the assumption of erasure, i.e.,  $\rho_4^{MK} = \rho_0^{MK}$ , so that  $\Delta F_{3 \rightarrow 4}^{MK} = -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 3}^{MK}$ , together with the fact that both the state and Hamiltonian of  $MK$  do not change between time steps  $t_2$  and  $t_3$ , so that  $-\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 3}^{MK} = -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} - \Delta F_{2 \rightarrow 3}^{MK} = -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK}$ . Given that  $W_{\text{in},0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} = \Delta E_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} = \Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} + \beta^{-1} \Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{\text{in}}^{MK} &= W_{\text{in},0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} + W_{\text{in},3 \rightarrow 4}^{MK} \\
&= \Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} + \beta^{-1} \Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} - \Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} + \beta^{-1}[I(MK : B)_{\rho_4} + D(\rho_4^{B_2} \|\gamma^{B_2})] \\
&= \beta^{-1}[\Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} + I(MK : B)_{\rho_4} + D(\rho_4^{B_2} \|\gamma^{B_2})]. \tag{A3}
\end{aligned}$$

Now note that in general, the following relationship holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
I(A : M|K)_{\rho_2} &:= S(A|K)_{\rho_2} + S(M|K)_{\rho_2} - S(AM|K)_{\rho_2} \\
&= S(A|K)_{\rho_2} - S(A)_{\rho_0} + S(A)_{\rho_0} + S(MK)_{\rho_2} - S(MK)_{\rho_0} + S(MK)_{\rho_0} - S(AMK)_{\rho_2} \\
&= S(A|K)_{\rho_2} - S(A)_{\rho_0} + S(MK)_{\rho_2} - S(MK)_{\rho_0} + S(AMK)_{\rho_0} - S(AMK)_{\rho_2} \\
&= -I_{\text{GO}} + \Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{MK} - \Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK}. \tag{A4}
\end{aligned}$$

The second line is obtained by adding and subtracting  $S(A)_{\rho_0}$  and  $S(MK)_{\rho_0}$ , together with the definition  $S(AM|K)_{\rho_2} := S(AMK)_{\rho_2} - S(K)_{\rho_2}$  and  $S(M|K)_{\rho_2} := S(MK)_{\rho_2} - S(K)_{\rho_2}$ . The third line is obtained by noting the fact that  $\rho_0^{AMK} = \rho_0^A \otimes \rho_0^{MK}$  so that  $S(A)_{\rho_0} + S(MK)_{\rho_0} = S(AMK)_{\rho_0}$ . By combining Eq. (A4) and Eq. (A3), we obtain the desired equality Eq. (17).

## Appendix B: Proof of Theorem 4

Assume that the protocol satisfies the overall second law of thermodynamics  $W_{\text{ext}}^{AMK} \leq -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^{AMK}$ . As shown in Theorem 3, it holds that  $-\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^{AMK} = -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A - \beta^{-1} I(A : MK)_{\rho_4}$ . Then it must hold that

$$W_{\text{ext}}^{AMK} := W_{\text{ext}}^A - W_{\text{in}}^{MK} \leq -\Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A - \beta^{-1} I(A : MK)_{\rho_4},$$

which implies that

$$W_{\text{in}}^{MK} \geq W_{\text{ext}}^A + \Delta F_{0 \rightarrow 4}^A + \beta^{-1} I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} .$$

Using the expression for  $W_{\text{ext}}^A$  given in Eq. (16), the overall second law of thermodynamics is thus equivalent to

$$W_{\text{in}}^{MK} \geq \beta^{-1} \left[ I_{\text{GO}} + I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} - I(A : K)_{\rho_3} - S_{\text{irr}}^{B_1} \right] ,$$

which is the statement of Corollary 1. Finally, using the expression for  $W_{\text{in}}^{MK}$  given in Eq. (17), the overall second law is equivalent to

$$\Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK} \geq I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} - I(A : M|K)_{\rho_2} - I(A : K)_{\rho_3} - S_{\text{irr}}^{B_1} - S_{\text{irr}}^{B_2} , \quad (\text{B1})$$

and so we obtain Eq. (22). To show that  $\Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK} \geq 0$  is sufficient for the overall second law to hold, we must show that the lower bound of Eq. (B1) is non-positive. Given the non-negativity of the irreversible entropy production terms  $S_{\text{irr}}^{B_1}, S_{\text{irr}}^{B_2}$ , it suffices to show that

$$I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} - I(A : M|K)_{\rho_2} - I(A : K)_{\rho_3} \leq 0 .$$

To this end, let us note that

$$\begin{aligned} I(A : M|K)_{\rho_2} &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k I(A : M)_{\rho_{k,2}} \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k D(\rho_{2,k}^{AM} \| \rho_{2,k}^A \otimes \rho_{2,k}^M) \\ &\geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k D(\Lambda_k \otimes \text{id}^M(\rho_{2,k}^{AM}) \| \Lambda_k \otimes \text{id}^M(\rho_{2,k}^A \otimes \rho_{2,k}^M)) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k D(\rho_{3,k}^{AM} \| \rho_{3,k}^A \otimes \rho_{3,k}^M) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k I(A : M)_{\rho_{k,3}} = I(A : M|K)_{\rho_3} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

Here,  $\Lambda_k(\cdot) := \text{Tr}_{B_1}[\mathcal{F}_k(\gamma^{B_1} \otimes \cdot)]$  are the conditional channels acting in  $A$  during feedback, the third line follows from the data processing inequality [38], and the fourth line follows from item (i) of Lemma 2. Note that if feedback is pure unitary, so that  $\Lambda_k(\cdot) = F_k^A(\cdot)F_k^{A\dagger}$ , then the inequality above becomes an equality.

Now notice that the following equality holds from the chain rule:

$$I(A : M|K)_{\rho_3} + I(A : K)_{\rho_3} = I(A : MK)_{\rho_3} . \quad (\text{B3})$$

By Eq. (B2) and Eq. (B3), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} - I(A : M|K)_{\rho_2} - I(A : K)_{\rho_3} &\leq I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} - I(A : M|K)_{\rho_3} - I(A : K)_{\rho_3} \\
&= I(A : MK)_{\rho_4} - I(A : MK)_{\rho_3} \\
&= D(\rho_4^{AMK} \parallel \rho_4^A \otimes \rho_4^{MK}) - D(\rho_3^{AMK} \parallel \rho_3^A \otimes \rho_3^{MK}) \\
&= D(\text{id}^A \otimes \Phi(\rho_3^{AMK}) \parallel \text{id}^A \otimes \Phi(\rho_3^A \otimes \rho_3^{MK})) \\
&\quad - D(\rho_3^{AMK} \parallel \rho_3^A \otimes \rho_3^{MK}) \\
&\leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\Phi(\cdot) = \text{Tr}_{B_2}[\mathcal{V}(\cdot \otimes \gamma^{B_2})]$  is the erasure channel acting in  $MK$ , the fourth line follows from item (i) of Lemma 2, and the final line follows from the data processing inequality.

### Appendix C: Efficient instruments

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{H}^M, \sigma_0^M, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M})$  be a measurement scheme for an instrument  $\mathcal{A}$  compatible with an observable  $\mathbf{A} := \{\mathbf{A}_k : k = 1, \dots, N\}$  acting in  $A$ , where  $N$  is the number of distinct measurement outcomes. Assume that  $\mathcal{M}$  is compatible with a projection valued measure  $\mathbf{M} := \{\mathbf{M}_k : k = 0, \dots, N\}$  acting in  $M$ , where outcome  $k = 0$  is associated with a null effect  $\mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{O}^A$ , and denote  $\mathcal{H}^{M_k} := \text{supp}(\mathbf{M}_k)$ . Assume that the effects of  $\mathbf{A}$  are linearly independent. Then  $\mathcal{A}$  is efficient only if*

$$\text{rank}(\sigma_0^M) \leq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N \dim(\mathcal{H}^{M_k})}{N} \leq \frac{\dim(\mathcal{H}^M)}{N},$$

with the second inequality becoming an equality if and only if  $\mathbf{M}_0 = \mathbf{O}^M$ .

*Proof.* Note that Assumption (A-6) assumes that the outcome associated with projecting  $M$  onto the subspace  $\mathcal{H}^{M_0}$  is (statistically) never observed, i.e., it is observed with probability zero. For this reason, in what follows, we need to introduce the effect  $\mathbf{M}_0$  of the pointer observable, associated with a null effect  $\mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{O}^A$  for the system observable, which makes the presentation a little cumbersome.

To prove the claim, we first note that an efficient instrument compatible with an observable with linearly independent effects is *extremal*; given the instruments  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}''$ , all with the same value space  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  is extremal if for any  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ , we may write  $\mathcal{A}_k(\cdot) = \lambda \mathcal{A}'_k(\cdot) + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{A}''_k(\cdot)$  only if  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A}''$ . That is, an instrument  $\mathcal{A}$  is extremal if it cannot be written as a convex combination of distinct instruments. As such, we shall first obtain necessary conditions on the rank of  $\sigma_0^M$  that must be satisfied for the measurement scheme to implement a general extremal instrument  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Let us write  $\sigma_0^M = \sum_{i=1}^r q_i |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$ , where  $|\phi_i\rangle$  are mutually orthogonal unit vectors,  $\{q_i\}$  is a probability distribution, and  $r = \text{rank}(\sigma_0^M)$ . By linearity, for each  $i$  it holds that  $(\mathcal{H}^M, |\phi_i\rangle, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M})$  is a measurement scheme for an instrument  $\mathcal{A}^{(i)}$ , such that  $\sum_i q_i \mathcal{A}_k^{(i)}(\cdot) = \mathcal{A}_k(\cdot)$  for all  $k$ . Note that since outcome  $k = 0$  of the pointer observable is associated with the null effect  $\mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{O}^A$ , then it holds that  $\mathcal{A}_0(\cdot) = \mathcal{A}_0^{(i)}(\cdot) = \mathbf{O}^A$ . Denoting the (projection) effects of the pointer observable  $\mathbf{M}$  as  $\mathbf{M}_k = \sum_{\mu} |\psi_{k,\mu}\rangle\langle\psi_{k,\mu}|$ , where  $\{|\psi_{k,\mu}\rangle\}$  is an orthonormal basis that spans  $\mathcal{H}^M$ , then for each  $i$  and  $k$ , by Eq. (6) we may write

$$\mathcal{A}_k^{(i)}(\cdot) = \text{Tr}_M[(\mathbf{1}^A \otimes \mathbf{M}_k)U(\cdot \otimes |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|)U^\dagger] = \sum_{\mu} L_{k,\mu}^{(i)}(\cdot)L_{k,\mu}^{(i)\dagger},$$

where the Kraus operators read

$$L_{k,\mu}^{(i)} = V_{\psi_{k,\mu}}^\dagger UV_{\phi_i}.$$

Here,  $V_\varphi : \mathcal{H}^A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^A \otimes \mathcal{H}^M, |\xi\rangle \mapsto |\xi\rangle \otimes |\varphi\rangle$  are linear isometries defined by the unit vector  $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^M$ , which satisfy

$$V_\varphi^\dagger \mathbf{1}^{AM} V_{\varphi'} = \langle\varphi|\varphi'\rangle \mathbf{1}^A, \quad V_\varphi \mathbf{1}^A V_{\varphi'}^\dagger = \mathbf{1}^A \otimes |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi'|.$$

Noting that  $\sum_{k,\mu} |\psi_{k,\mu}\rangle\langle\psi_{k,\mu}| = \mathbf{1}^M$ , it follows that for every  $i \neq j$ , it holds that

$$\sum_{k,\mu} L_{k,\mu}^{(i)\dagger} L_{k,\mu}^{(j)} = \sum_{k,\mu} V_{\phi_i}^\dagger U^\dagger V_{\psi_{k,\mu}} \mathbf{1}^A V_{\psi_{k,\mu}}^\dagger UV_{\phi_j} = V_{\phi_i}^\dagger \mathbf{1}^{AM} V_{\phi_j} = \mathbf{O}. \quad (\text{C1})$$

Let  $\{L_{k,\nu} \mid \nu = 1, \dots, R_k\}$  be a minimal Kraus representation for the operation  $\mathcal{A}_k$ , i.e., where  $L_{k,\nu}$  are linearly independent and  $R_k$  is the Kraus-rank of  $\mathcal{A}_k$ . Note that since  $\mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{O}^A$ , then  $L_{0,\nu} = \mathbf{O}^A$ . Now assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is an extremal instrument. This implies that  $\mathcal{A}_k = \mathcal{A}_k^{(i)}$  for all  $i$  and  $k$ . As shown in [62], for each  $i$  there exists an isometry  $[u_{\mu,\nu}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{C}]$  such that

$$L_{k,\mu}^{(i)} = \sum_{\nu} u_{\mu,\nu}^{(i)} L_{k,\nu}, \quad \sum_{\mu} u_{\mu,\nu}^{(i)*} u_{\mu,\nu'}^{(i)} = \delta_{\nu,\nu'}. \quad (\text{C2})$$

By Eq. (C1), Eq. (C2), and orthonormality of  $\{|\psi_{k,\mu}\rangle\}$ , we may thus write for every  $i \neq j$  the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{O} &= \sum_{k,\mu,\mu'} L_{k,\mu}^{(i)\dagger} L_{k,\mu'}^{(j)} \langle\psi_{k,\mu}|\psi_{k,\mu'}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{k,\mu,\mu'} \left( \sum_{\nu} u_{\mu,\nu}^{(i)*} L_{k,\nu}^\dagger \right) \left( \sum_{\nu'} u_{\mu',\nu'}^{(j)} L_{k,\nu'} \right) \langle\psi_{k,\mu}|\psi_{k,\mu'}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{k,\nu,\nu'} L_{k,\nu}^\dagger L_{k,\nu'} \langle\psi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}|\psi_{k,\nu'}^{(j)}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

where

$$|\psi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}\rangle := \sum_{\mu} u_{\mu,\nu}^{(i)} |\psi_{k,\mu}\rangle \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{M}_k) \equiv \mathcal{H}^{M_k}. \quad (\text{C4})$$

As shown in [39],  $\mathcal{A}$  is an extremal instrument if and only if the set

$$\{L_{k,\nu}^\dagger L_{k,\nu'} \mid k = 1, \dots, N; \nu, \nu' = 1, \dots, R_k\}$$

is linearly independent. As such, the equality condition in Eq. (C3) holds only if  $\langle \psi_{k,\nu}^{(i)} | \psi_{k,\nu'}^{(j)} \rangle = 0$  for all  $k > 0$ ,  $\nu, \nu'$ , and  $i \neq j$ . Now, by Eq. (C2) and Eq. (C4), together with the fact that  $\langle \psi_{k,\mu} | \psi_{k',\mu'} \rangle = \delta_{k,k'} \delta_{\mu,\mu'}$ , it is easily verified that  $\langle \psi_{k,\nu}^{(i)} | \psi_{k',\nu'}^{(i)} \rangle = \delta_{k,k'} \delta_{\nu,\nu'}$  for every  $i$ . Indeed, since for every  $i$ ,  $|\psi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}\rangle \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{M}_k)$ , then it also holds that  $\langle \psi_{k,\nu}^{(i)} | \psi_{k',\nu'}^{(j)} \rangle = 0$  whenever  $k \neq k'$ . It follows that

$$\{|\psi_{k,\nu}^{(i)}\rangle \in \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{H}^{M_k} \mid k = 1, \dots, N; \nu = 1, \dots, R_k; i = 1, \dots, \text{rank}(\sigma_0^M)\}$$

must be a set of mutually orthogonal vectors. The cardinality of the above set is easily computed to be  $\text{rank}(\sigma_0^M) \sum_{k=1}^N R_k$ . But since  $\bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{H}^{M_k}$  can only contain at most  $\dim(\bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{H}^{M_k}) = \sum_{k=1}^N \dim(\mathcal{H}^{M_k})$  mutually orthogonal vectors, then  $\mathcal{A}$  is extremal only if

$$\text{rank}(\sigma_0^M) \leq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N \dim(\mathcal{H}^{M_k})}{\sum_{k=1}^N R_k}.$$

Now assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is an efficient instrument. It holds that  $R_k = 1$  for each  $k$ , and  $\mathcal{A}$  is an extremal instrument if and only if  $\{L_k^\dagger L_k = \mathbf{A}_k \mid k = 1, \dots, N\}$ , i.e., the effects of the measured observable  $\mathbf{A}$  in  $A$ , are linearly independent. This completes the proof.  $\square$

#### Appendix D: Bistochastic pointer objectification and the overall second law

Here, we shall show that so long as the channel induced by the instrument responsible for pointer objectification,  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{K}}(\cdot) := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{M}_k(\cdot)$ , is bistochastic, then  $\Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK} \geq 0$  necessarily holds, and so by Theorem 4 the overall second law will be satisfied.

Recall that  $\rho_2^{AMK} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k \rho_{2,k}^{AM} \otimes |k\rangle\langle k|^K$ . Since the classical register  $K$  is not entangled with  $AM$ , it follows that  $S(K|AM)_{\rho_2} \geq 0$ . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK} &= S(AMK)_{\rho_2} - S(AMK)_{\rho_0} \\ &= S(AM)_{\rho_2} + S(K|AM)_{\rho_2} - S(AM)_{\rho_0} \\ &\geq S(AM)_{\rho_2} - S(AM)_{\rho_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Given that unitary channels are bistochastic, then so long as the channel  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{K}}$  is also bistochastic, then so too is the composition  $\Theta := (\text{id}^A \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{K}}) \circ \mathcal{U}$ . Now note that we may equivalently write the von Neumann entropy as  $S(A)_\rho = -D(\rho^A \| \mathbb{1}^A)$ . As such, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta S_{0 \rightarrow 2}^{AMK} &\geq S(AM)_{\rho_2} - S(AM)_{\rho_0} \\
&= D(\rho_0^{AM} \| \mathbb{1}^{AM}) - D(\rho_2^{AM} \| \mathbb{1}^{AM}) \\
&= D(\rho_0^A \otimes \sigma_0^M \| \mathbb{1}^{AM}) - D(\Theta(\rho_0^A \otimes \sigma_0^M) \| \mathbb{1}^{AM}) \\
&= D(\rho_0^A \otimes \sigma_0^M \| \mathbb{1}^{AM}) - D(\Theta(\rho_0^A \otimes \sigma_0^M) \| \Theta(\mathbb{1}^{AM})) \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, in the fourth line we have used the bistochasticity of  $\Theta$ , and the final line follows from the data processing inequality.