

Universal bound on Ergotropy and No-Go Theorem by the Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis

Akihiro Hokkyo^{1,*} and Masahito Ueda^{1,2,3}

¹*Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, 113-8654, Japan*

²*Institute for Physics of Intelligence, University of Tokyo,
7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan*

³*RIKEN Center for Emergent Matter Science (CEMS), Wako 351-0198, Japan*

We show that the maximum extractable work (ergotropy) from a quantum many-body system is constrained by *local athermality* of an initial state and *local entropy decrease* brought about by quantum operations. The obtained universal bound on ergotropy implies that the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis prohibits work extraction from energy eigenstates by means of finite-time unitary operations. This no-go property implies that Planck's principle, a form of the second law of thermodynamics, holds even for pure quantum states. Our result bridges two independently studied concepts of quantum thermodynamics, the second law and thermalization, via *intrasystem* correlations in many-body systems as a resource for work extraction.

Introduction.—At the heart of quantum thermodynamics lies the problem of how thermodynamics emerges from microscopic dynamics. Recent advances in quantum control have enabled experimental exploration of this problem [1]. Highly controllable isolated quantum systems, such as ultracold atomic gases and trapped ions, offer an ideal platform for experimental tests on the foundations of quantum thermodynamics and statistical mechanics. See Refs. [2, 3] for reviews.

Investigation about whether isolated quantum systems thermalize dates back to von Neumann [4]. Recent experiments have demonstrated thermalization in well-isolated quantum systems [5]. Theoretically, the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) [6–8] has been proposed as a mechanism for thermalization in isolated systems. This hypothesis states that energy eigenstates are thermal per se through the lens of observables. The ETH has been numerically verified for several different models [8, 9].

Another central issue in thermodynamics is how much work can be extracted from a given system. Planck's principle, which is a form of the second law of thermodynamics, expresses a no-go property on work extraction. *Passivity* [10–12], which states that energy cannot be decreased by any unitary operation, was proposed as the quantum counterpart of Planck's principle. It is known [10, 11] that the Gibbs state is passive, while pure states other than the ground state are not. Since the ETH states that energy eigenstates are in thermal equilibrium, it is natural to ask how the ETH, which can be verified through observables, can be connected with the notion of thermal equilibrium in the sense of passivity. The crucial observation here is that the original idea of passivity assumed that we can perform any unitary operation on the system, which requires unrealistic Hamiltonians involving nonlocal and $O(N)$ -body inter-

actions for $N (\gg 1)$ -particle systems. Passivity in many-body systems under realistic constraints on operations and its connection with thermal equilibrium of observables remains to be clarified. A closely related yet not fully explored subject concerns information thermodynamics, according to which feedback control allows one to extract an extra free energy beyond the conventional second law from a system in contact with a heat bath [13–15]. Whether or not a similar work extraction can be made from an isolated quantum system deserves further study for a deeper understanding of the connection between information and quantum thermodynamics.

The previous studies [16, 17] suggest that the ETH hinders work extraction from energy eigenstates by realistic unitary operations. However, the quantitative estimate of extractable work for general systems remains unexplored. Deriving a bound on the amount of extractable work from a given system is of fundamental importance in quantum thermodynamics, which is also important from an engineering point of view. The primary purpose of this Letter is to derive a universal upper bound on the maximum work (ergotropy) that can be extracted from many-body systems with short-range interactions through general operations including feedback control. As a corollary, we show that the second law of thermodynamics holds even for pure states in thermal equilibrium with respect to observables.

Ergotropy and passivity.—Let us first introduce the extractable work from a quantum state by means of quantum operations, which is known as ergotropy [18]. For a Hamiltonian H and an initial state ρ , the ergotropy by a quantum channel f and that by a class of channels \mathcal{F} are defined as

$$W_{f,H}(\rho) := \langle H \rangle_\rho - \langle H \rangle_{f(\rho)}, \quad (1)$$

$$W_{\mathcal{F},H}(\rho) := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} W_{f,H}(\rho), \quad (2)$$

where $\langle H \rangle_\rho := \text{Tr}(H\rho)$. Passivity was originally defined as the nonpositivity of the ergotropy by \mathcal{F} constituted of

* hokkyo@cat.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

all unitary maps [10, 11]. Several works [19–30] have investigated the generalization of passivity to \mathcal{F} that is different from the set of all unitary maps. In the following, we first derive the ergotropy bounds for general operations in many-body systems and then apply the bounds for operations subject to realistic constraints.

Models.— We consider quantum spin systems on a D -dimensional hypercubic lattice with fixed (periodic or open) boundary conditions; a similar discussion can be made for spin systems on a more general lattice or a graph. We denote a set of lattice sites as $\Lambda = \{1, 2, \dots, L\}^D$ and the system size as $V = L^D$. The distance between sites i and j is denoted by r_{ij} , which is defined as the Euclidean distance subject to the boundary conditions. For each site $i \in \Lambda$, we have a $d = (2\mathcal{S} + 1)$ -dimensional state space $\mathcal{H}_i \cong \mathbb{C}^d$, where \mathcal{S} is the spin quantum number. For a subsystem $A \subset \Lambda$, the reduced state of a state ρ is denoted as $\rho_A := \text{Tr}_{\Lambda \setminus A} \rho$.

Next, we introduce a Hamiltonian of our system. Considering only two-body interactions, the Hamiltonian is expressed as $H = \sum_{i \in \Lambda} h_i + \sum_{i \neq j \in \Lambda} U_{ij}$. Here, H_i is the on-site Hamiltonian acting on \mathcal{H}_i , and U_{ij} is a two-body interaction with $U_{ij} = U_{ji}$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$. We assume that $h_i =: U_{ii}$ is bounded and U_{ij} decays sufficiently fast as

$$\|U_{ij}\| \leq U_0(1 + r_{ij})^{-(D+\delta)} \quad (\forall i, j \in \Lambda). \quad (3)$$

Here, U_0 and δ are positive constants independent of V . This property guarantees the additivity of energy. For simplicity of notation, we restrict the model to spin systems. However, as shown later, our results are applicable to bosonic and fermionic systems on a lattice with slight modifications.

Universal bound on ergotropy.— We divide the lattice into small hypercubes: $\Lambda = \bigsqcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A$ [31], and assume that the linear dimension l of each A depends on V and diverges as $V \rightarrow \infty$. The Hamiltonian H_A on each subsystem A and the residual interaction U_A^R are defined as

$$H_A := \sum_{i \in A} h_i + \sum_{i, j \in A, i \neq j} U_{ij}, \quad (4)$$

$$U_A^R := H - \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} H_A = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{i \in A, j \notin A} U_{ij}. \quad (5)$$

It follows from Eq. (3) and the assumption $l \rightarrow \infty$ that U_A^R is subextensive in the thermodynamic limit [32]. In the following, an equality and an inequality of energy within the accuracy of $U_0 \times o(V)$ are denoted by \simeq and \lesssim , respectively.

Let E_{H_A} be the energy of the canonical state on A defined as

$$E_{H_A}(S) := \sup_{\beta > 0} [\beta^{-1} (-\ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H_A} + S)], \quad (6)$$

where S ($< |A| \ln d$) is an arbitrary variable corresponding to entropy. We also introduce the temperature of A as $\beta_A^{-1}(S) := \frac{\partial}{\partial S} E_{H_A}(S)$.

We are now in a position to state the main result of this Letter: the universal bound on ergotropy. Let the energy of the initial state ρ be $V\epsilon$ and consider the *local (thermal) equilibrium ensemble* ρ^{leq} that satisfies the following conditions:

$$V\epsilon \simeq \langle H \rangle_{\rho^{\text{leq}}} \simeq \sum_A E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A^{\text{leq}})), \quad (7)$$

$$(\beta_A^{\text{leq}})^{-1} := \beta_A^{-1}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A^{\text{leq}})) \leq \beta_0^{-1} \quad (\forall A \in \mathcal{A}), \quad (8)$$

where S^{vN} is the von Neumann entropy, and $\beta_0 > 0$ is a positive constant independent of V . The first condition (7) is satisfied for equilibrium statistical ensembles [33, 34] such as microcanonical and canonical ensembles and the product of local Gibbs states of each subsystems $A \in \mathcal{A}$ which, in general, have different temperatures $(\beta_A^{-1})_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$. The second condition (8) indicates that the temperature of the subsystem is not too high. When the Hamiltonian is translationally invariant, this condition is valid unless ϵ is too large. A detailed analysis of these conditions is made in Supplemental material [32].

Theorem 1. We consider a general class of operations \mathcal{F} including the identity map. Under conditions (7) and (8), the upper bound on the ergotropy is bounded from above as

$$W_{\mathcal{F}, H}(\rho) \lesssim \sum_A [E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A^{\text{leq}})) - E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A))] + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_A [E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A)) - E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(f(\rho)_A))], \quad (9)$$

where both terms on the right-hand side (r.h.s.) are non-negative. The first term is further bounded as

$$\sum_A [E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A^{\text{leq}})) - E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A))] \lesssim V\beta_0^{-1}(\ln d) \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \|\rho_A^{\text{leq}} - \rho_A\|_1. \quad (10)$$

Theorem 1 decomposes the upper bound on the work extractable from a many-body system into two terms having different physical meanings. The first term on the r.h.s. of inequality (9) characterizes the *local athermality* of the initial state. If we take ρ^{leq} as a statistical ensemble, the r.h.s. of inequality (10) is an indicator of microscopic thermal equilibrium (MITE) [35, 36] and provides a measure of the deviations of local observables in ρ from thermal equilibrium. For general ρ^{leq} , this term represents deviation of the initial state from local thermal equilibrium. The second term on the r.h.s. of inequality (9) gives the contribution from a decrease in entropy of the subsystem by means of quantum operations in \mathcal{F} . In contrast to the conventional information thermodynamics [13–15], work can be extracted from this entropic contribution even if the initial state is pure. In this sense, the second term may be interpreted as work gained from

information encoded in intrasystem correlations, which is analogous to the results obtained in non-interacting systems [37–40]. Our result indicates a close relationship between ergotropy in a many-body system, thermalization of local observables, and information stored within the system that can be utilized by quantum operations, independently of the specific model, initial states, and operations.

Before we prove the theorem, let us discuss an example for which the second term on the r.h.s. of inequality (9) gives the main contribution. We consider a 1D Ising chain subject to the periodic boundary condition and write the Hamiltonian as $H = -\sum_{i=1}^L s_i^z s_{i+1}^z - h \sum_{i=1}^L s_i^z$ where $s^z = |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|$. We divide the whole system into subsystems, each of which has l consecutive sites. We assume that the initial state $|\Psi(\lambda)\rangle$ is given by the product of the following long-range entangled states:

$$|\psi(\lambda)\rangle_i = \sqrt{1-\lambda}|0\rangle_i|0\rangle_{i+l} + \sqrt{\lambda}|1\rangle_i|1\rangle_{i+l} \quad \left(0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{2}\right) \quad (11)$$

for i such that $(-1)^{\lfloor \frac{i-1}{l} \rfloor} = 1$. The subsystem entropy and energy density of $|\Psi(\lambda)\rangle$ are $lH_2(\lambda)$ and $-(1-2\lambda)^2 - h(1-2\lambda)$, respectively, where $H_2(\lambda) := -\lambda \ln \lambda - (1-\lambda) \ln(1-\lambda)$ is the binary entropy. As shown in Fig. 1, this initial state is almost in local thermal equilibrium. Therefore, we need to decrease the entropy of the subsystem extensively to extract extensive work. We can achieve this extensive decrease in entropy as follows. Consider a nonlocal CNOT gate which transforms the state as $|\psi(\lambda)\rangle_i \mapsto |0\rangle_i(\sqrt{1-\lambda}|0\rangle_{i+l} + \sqrt{\lambda}|1\rangle_{i+l})$; then half of the subsystems reach the ground state. Moreover, all the entropies of the subsystems vanish. If we further perform unitary transformations on each site $i+l$, the entire system becomes the ground state, and the equality of Theorem 1 is achieved. While local measurement and feedback can do the same job, measurement is not needed here to exploit the contribution of the second term on the r.h.s. of (9).

Let us now prove Theorem 1. First, we show inequality (9). By condition (7), it is sufficient to show the following inequality:

$$\sum_A E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(\sigma_A)) \lesssim \langle H \rangle_\sigma. \quad (12)$$

This inequality can be proven from the property of the Gibbs state [32], which is analogous to the maximum entropy principle [41]. We also find the nonnegativity of the first term on the r.h.s. of (9) by setting $\sigma = \rho$. The nonnegativity of the second term is obvious since \mathcal{F} includes the identity map.

Next, we show inequality (10). Using the convexity of E_{H_A} and Fannes' inequality [42, 43], the left-hand side




FIG. 1. Energy density E/l versus entropy density S/l of a subsystem of size $l = 10$. The solid curve is obtained for a set of the Gibbs states of the subsystem with positive temperatures, and the dash-dotted curve is obtained for $\{|\Psi(\lambda)\rangle \mid 0 < \lambda < 1/2\}$. The distance between the two curves shows the first term on the r.h.s. of inequality (9), which is much smaller than the energy density E/l itself.

(l.h.s.) of inequality (10) is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{l.h.s. of (10)}) &\leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} (\beta_A^{\text{leq}})^{-1} \left(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A^{\text{leq}}) - S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} (\beta_A^{\text{leq}})^{-1} \left[|A| (\ln d) \|\rho_A^{\text{leq}} - \rho_A\|_1 + 1/e \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Using condition (8), we can further evaluate the r.h.s. of (13) as

$$(\text{r.h.s. of (13)}) \lesssim V \beta_0^{-1} (\ln d) \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \|\rho_A^{\text{leq}} - \rho_A\|_1. \quad (14)$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

No-Go theorem by the ETH.— When the contribution of entropy decrease is negligible, ergotropy is suppressed only by local athermality. This is the case for on-site unitary operations $\otimes_i \mathcal{U}_i$. A more realistic maps are unitary evolutions by time-dependent Hamiltonians satisfying (3), which we shall refer to as local control. In fact, the small incremental entangling (SIE) theorem [44, 45] indicates that the rate of change in S_A follows the area law [46, 47], and hence it is at most $|\partial A| \sim l^{D-1}$. An analysis similar to what is done in the previous paragraph shows that the second term on the r.h.s. of inequality (9) for the operation time T (per \hbar) is bounded from above by

$$\beta_1^{-1} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} |S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A) - S^{\text{vN}}(f(\rho)_A)| \leq \beta_1^{-1} U_0 T o(V), \quad (15)$$

where we assume that the temperature of every subsystem is bounded from above by a V -independent positive temperature β_1^{-1} :

$$\beta_A^{-1}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A)) \leq \beta_1^{-1} \quad (\forall A \in \mathcal{A}). \quad (16)$$

Then, under the same conditions made in Theorem 1, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2. Suppose that the initial state ρ satisfies (16). Let \mathcal{F} be a class of local controls satisfying $U_0T = o(l)$. Then, we have

$$W_{\mathcal{F},H}(\rho) \lesssim V\beta_0^{-1}(\ln d) \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \|\rho_A^{\text{leq}} - \rho_A\|_1. \quad (17)$$

If ρ is in l -local MITE [48], then the r.h.s. is subextensive since the trace distance decays exponentially with increasing V . In particular, if the ETH holds for all l -local observables, it is impossible to extract the extensive work from energy eigenstates.

We refer to ρ as *thermodynamically passive* for \mathcal{F} if $W_{\mathcal{F},H}(\rho) \lesssim 0$. This corollary shows that even if the initial state is pure, it is thermodynamically passive for \mathcal{F} as long as local observables are in thermal equilibrium. This is in contrast to the conventional passivity, and our result gives a stronger bound than that obtained in Refs. [10, 11]. There are a few previous studies on work extraction from pure states and energy eigenstates in many-body systems [16, 17, 36, 49]. For a fixed unitary map, extensive work cannot be extracted from pure states involving a large number of energy eigenstates in the energy shell, if the initial time of operation is taken at random [36, 49]. The authors of Ref. [16] numerically explored the number of energy eigenstates from which extensive work can be extracted in a single quench operation, and also analytically showed that the fraction of such eigenstates decays exponentially for general systems. While these works consider thermodynamical passivity for a single unitary operation, our results can treat a general class of operations. Furthermore, in contrast to the analytical results of previous studies [16, 36, 49], we consider fixed initial states and operations. In a related study [17], the number of work-extractable energy eigenstates by a state-by-state optimized operation was investigated. Corollary 2 analytically and independently of specific models justifies their numerical result which states that work cannot be extracted within local control from those eigenstates that satisfy the ETH.

A couple of comments on this corollary are in order here. Although an arbitrary finite time satisfies the assumption in Corollary 2, it is thermodynamically short. In fact, if thermalization occurs, it takes at least $U_0T = O(l)$ [50] for the entropy of the subsystem to change extensively. If it takes an exponentially long time to reduce entropy as discussed in Ref. [17], then thermodynamical passivity can be shown for such time scales. The other comment is about complete passivity, which represents passivity for the direct product of any number of identically copied states [10, 11, 51, 52]. Unlike the original definition for a fixed finite system, we consider here the thermodynamic limit. Therefore, if copied systems interact without changing a spatial dimension D ,

no significant distinction arises between thermodynamical passivity and *thermodynamical complete passivity*.

Applicability to bosonic and fermionic systems.— When there are conserved quantities for both the Hamiltonian and a set of operations \mathcal{F} , we should add those quantities to the variables in the statistical ensemble. This can be done if the total state space \mathcal{H} is chosen to be a subspace of $\otimes_{i \in \Lambda} \mathcal{H}_i$. For example, for a hard-core boson system with a fixed particle number, which is equivalent to a spin-1/2 system that conserves total magnetization, the main theorem and the corollary are also applicable.

Next, we consider bosonic and fermionic systems. The 1-particle state space \mathcal{K} is decomposed into modes $i \in \Lambda$, i.e., $\mathcal{K} = \oplus_{i \in \Lambda} \mathcal{K}_i$. The Fock space of bosons and that of fermions are denoted by $\mathcal{F}_b(\mathcal{K})$ and $\mathcal{F}_f(\mathcal{K})$, respectively.

In bosonic systems, there exists a canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{F}_b(\mathcal{K}) \cong \otimes_{i \in \Lambda} \mathcal{F}_b(\mathcal{K}_i)$. However, the dimension of the subsystem depends on the total particle number N due to the lack of limitation on the local number of particles, which causes problems that are absent in spin systems. In particular, the norm of the residual interaction U_A^R does not necessarily become subextensive due to the effect of localized states at the boundary. A similar argument holds if one imposes the additional assumption that the operation does not cause Bose-Einstein condensation. For example, this condition is satisfied if the initial state and the operation have translational symmetry.

In fermionic systems, there is no canonical isomorphism between $\mathcal{F}_f(\mathcal{K})$ and $\otimes_{i \in \Lambda} \mathcal{F}_f(\mathcal{K}_i)$ due to anticommutativity. Instead, we take a unitary isomorphism $U_A : \mathcal{F}_f(\mathcal{K}) \cong \mathcal{F}_f(\oplus_{i \in A} \mathcal{K}_i) \otimes \mathcal{F}_f(\oplus_{i \notin A} \mathcal{K}_i)$ so that creation (annihilation) operator $c_i^\dagger(f)$ ($c_i(f)$) on $i \in A$ is mapped to $c_i^\dagger(f) \otimes I$ ($c_i(f) \otimes I$). The same argument can be made if the reduced state is defined through this isomorphism. Therefore, the main theorem 1 is applicable to the following class of Hamiltonians, including the Fermi-Hubbard model:

$$H = \sum_{ij,\sigma} t_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + \sum_{ij} U_{ij} n_i n_j + \sum_{ij} U'_{ij} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j, \quad (18)$$

where σ represents the spin of particles, $n_i = \sum_{\sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}$ is the number operator and \mathbf{S}_i is the second-quantized spin operator. Here, t, U , and U' are assumed to decay similarly as in (3). Since the SIE theorem is known to hold for this case as well [46], Corollary 2 also holds.

Conclusion and outlooks.— In this Letter, we have shown that work that can be extracted from a system is bounded by local athermality and local entropy decrease. In many-body systems, our results demonstrate that in addition to non-equilibrium properties, the *information* stored in the system can also serve as a resource for work extraction. Moreover, through the short-time evolution by a time-dependent Hamiltonian with short-range interactions, no extensive work can be extracted from energy

eigenstates if the ETH holds. This result is consistent with previous numerical studies [16, 17] on specific systems where the ETH is *believed* to hold. In contrast, our work rigorously shows that the ETH prohibits work extraction for general interacting systems.

Exploring efficient measurement processes for extracting information within the system presents an interesting direction for future research. This study potentially leads to a generalization of informational thermodynamics in many-body physics. As mentioned above, our derivation of the second law is limited to the short-time regime. Whether this can be extended to the long-time regime is an interesting issue. Under appropriate additional assumptions, Corollary 2 is expected to hold in the long-time regime because the system relax to local equilibrium in a very short time [53] and hydrodynamics is applicable when the initial state is in local equilibrium [54]. Such behavior of many-body systems in the short-time regime is also experimentally accessible. [55]. While we consider the ETH for subsystems, the connection to the more general form of the ETH, such as one characterized by few-body observables [48], remains elusive. Clarifying the relationship between the observables we measure and the class of operations that satisfy the second law is not only of fundamental importance but also of practical significance, as it may lead to the resolution of the problem of how to extract work from quantum many-body systems with high efficiency *beyond* the limitations of macroscopic thermodynamics.

Acknowledgement.— A.H. is grateful to Koki Shiraishi for the helpful discussions on the entangling power. This work was supported by KAKENHI Grant No. JP22H01152 from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and the CREST program “Quantum Frontiers” (Grant No. JPMJCR23I1) from the Japan Science and Technology Agency. A.H. is supported by Forefront Physics and Mathematics Program to Drive Transformation (FoPM), a World-leading Innovative Graduate Study (WINGS) Program, the University of Tokyo.

[1] F. Binder, L. A. Correa, C. Gogolin, J. Anders, and G. Adesso, eds., *Thermodynamics in the Quantum Regime: Fundamental Aspects and New Directions*, Fundamental Theories of Physics, Vol. 195 (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018).

[2] T. Langen, R. Geiger, and J. Schmiedmayer, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **6**, 201 (2015).

[3] M. Ueda, *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **2**, 669 (2020).

[4] J. v. Neumann, *Z. Physik* **57**, 30 (1929), english version is in *EPJ H* **35**, 201 (2010).

[5] A. M. Kaufman, M. E. Tai, A. Lukin, M. Rispoli, R. Schittko, P. M. Preiss, and M. Greiner, *Science* **353**, 794 (2016).

[6] J. M. Deutsch, *Phys. Rev. A* **43**, 2046 (1991).

[7] M. Srednicki, *Phys. Rev. E* **50**, 888 (1994).

[8] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, *Nature* **452**, 854 (2008).

[9] H. Kim, T. N. Ikeda, and D. A. Huse, *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 052105 (2014).

[10] W. Pusz and S. L. Woronowicz, *Commun.Math. Phys.* **58**, 273 (1978).

[11] A. Lenard, *J. Stat. Phys.* **19**, 575 (1978).

[12] P. Skrzypczyk, R. Silva, and N. Brunner, *Phys. Rev. E* **91**, 052133 (2015).

[13] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 080403 (2008).

[14] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 250602 (2009).

[15] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 189901 (2011).

[16] K. Kaneko, E. Iyoda, and T. Sagawa, *Phys. Rev. E* **99**, 032128 (2019).

[17] S. Z. Baba, N. Yoshioka, and T. Sagawa, *arxiv:2308.03537 [cond-mat, physics:quant-ph]* (2023).

[18] A. E. Allahverdyan, R. Balian, and T. M. Nieuwenhuizen, *EPL* **67**, 565 (2004).

[19] M. Frey, K. Funo, and M. Hotta, *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 012127 (2014).

[20] E. G. Brown, N. Friis, and M. Huber, *New J. Phys.* **18**, 113028 (2016).

[21] A. Mukherjee, A. Roy, S. S. Bhattacharya, and M. Banik, *Phys. Rev. E* **93**, 052140 (2016).

[22] M. Onuma-Kalu and R. B. Mann, *Phys. Rev. E* **98**, 042121 (2018).

[23] M. Alimuddin, T. Guha, and P. Parashar, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 052320 (2019).

[24] Á. M. Alhambra, G. Styliaris, N. A. Rodríguez-Briones, J. Sikora, and E. Martín-Martínez, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 190601 (2019).

[25] K. Sen and U. Sen, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, L030402 (2021).

[26] Y. Mitsuhashi, K. Kaneko, and T. Sagawa, *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 021013 (2022).

[27] T. Biswas, M. Łobejko, P. Mazurek, K. Jałowiecki, and M. Horodecki, *Quantum* **6**, 841 (2022).

[28] R. Salvia, G. De Palma, and V. Giovannetti, *Phys. Rev. A* **107**, 012405 (2023).

[29] D. Šafránek, D. Rosa, and F. C. Binder, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 210401 (2023).

[30] K. Koshihara and K. Yuasa, *Phys. Rev. E* **107**, 064109 (2023).

[31] For the following discussion, it is sufficient if $|\Lambda \setminus \bigsqcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A| = o(V)$ without \mathcal{A} being an exact partition. See supplemental material [32].

[32] Supplemental material at [url will be inserted by publisher].

[33] D. Ruelle, *Statistical Mechanics: Rigorous Results* (World Scientific, 1999).

[34] H. Tasaki, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **172**, 10.1007/s10955-018-2077-y (2018).

[35] S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and A. Winter, *Nat. Phys.* **2**, 754 (2006).

[36] S. Goldstein, T. Hara, and H. Tasaki, *arxiv:1303.6393 [cond-mat, physics:quant-ph]* (2013).

[37] K. Funo, Y. Watanabe, and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 052319 (2013).

[38] M. Perarnau-Llobet, K. V. Hovhannisyanyan, M. Huber, P. Skrzypczyk, N. Brunner, and A. Acín, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 041011 (2015).

- [39] R. Salvia and V. Giovannetti, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 012414 (2022).
- [40] A. Touil, B. Çakmak, and S. Deffner, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **55**, 025301 (2022).
- [41] E. T. Jaynes, *Phys. Rev.* **106**, 620 (1957).
- [42] M. Fannes, *Commun.Math. Phys.* **31**, 291 (1973).
- [43] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [44] S. Bravyi, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 052319 (2007).
- [45] K. Van Acoleyen, M. Mariën, and F. Verstraete, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 170501 (2013).
- [46] M. Mariën, K. M. R. Audenaert, K. Van Acoleyen, and F. Verstraete, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **346**, 35 (2016).
- [47] Z.-X. Gong, M. Foss-Feig, F. G. S. L. Brandão, and A. V. Gorshkov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 050501 (2017).
- [48] T. Mori, T. N. Ikeda, E. Kaminishi, and M. Ueda, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **51**, 112001 (2018).
- [49] H. Tasaki, [arxiv:cond-mat/0011321](https://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0011321) (2000).
- [50] Z. Gong and R. Hamazaki, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **36**, 2230007 (2022).
- [51] R. Alicki and M. Fannes, *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 042123 (2013).
- [52] M. Perarnau-Llobet, K. V. Hovhannisyan, M. Huber, P. Skrzypczyk, J. Tura, and A. Acín, *Phys. Rev. E* **92**, 042147 (2015).
- [53] P. Reimann, *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 1 (2016).
- [54] T. Hayata, Y. Hidaka, T. Noumi, and M. Hongo, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 065008 (2015).
- [55] Y. Le, Y. Zhang, S. Gopalakrishnan, M. Rigol, and D. S. Weiss, *Nature* **618**, 494 (2023).

Supplemental Material: Universal bound on Ergotropy and No-Go Theorem by the Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis

Akihiro Hokkyo^{1,*} and Masahito Ueda^{1,2,3}

¹*Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, 113-8654, Japan*

²*Institute for Physics of Intelligence, University of Tokyo,
7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan*

³*RIKEN Center for Emergent Matter Science (CEMS), Wako 351-0198, Japan*

We present a few technical results omitted in detail in the main text. These are all well-known results in the theory of rigorous statistical mechanics or quantum many-body systems, but for the sake of self-containedness we provide rigorous claims and give some proofs thereof. In Sec. I, the results derived from the short-range property of the interaction are presented, and in Sec. II, we give the definitions and the formulae of the statistical mechanical quantities.

I. CONSEQUENCES FROM SHORT-RANGE INTERACTIONS

A. Residual Interaction

We show that the residual interaction is subextensive when the interaction decays as

$$\|U_{ij}\| \leq U_0(1+r_{ij})^{-(D+\delta)} \quad (\forall i, j \in \Lambda). \quad (\text{S1})$$

Since the residual interaction is decomposed as

$$\|U_A^R\| \leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{i \in A, j \notin A} \|U_{ij}\| := \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} U_A, \quad (\text{S2})$$

it is sufficient to show $\sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} U_A = o(|A|) = o(l^D)$.

We can take $\kappa_D > 0$ (independent of V) satisfying

$$\sum_{\substack{j \in \Lambda \\ r-1 < r_{ij} \leq r}} 1 \leq \kappa_D r^{D-1} \quad (\forall i \in \Lambda, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}), \quad (\text{S3})$$

because we have

$$C_D(r - \sqrt{D})^D \leq 2^D \sum_{\substack{j \in (\mathbb{Z}_{>0})^D \\ r_{ij} \leq r}} 1 \leq \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^D \\ r_{ij} \leq r}} 1 \leq 2^D \sum_{\substack{j \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^D \\ r_{ij} \leq r}} 1 \leq C_D(r + \sqrt{D})^D, \quad (\text{S4})$$

where C_D is the volume of the unit ball with dimension D . Also, we have $\kappa'_D > 0$ (independent of V, l) satisfying

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in A \\ \text{dist}(i, \Lambda \setminus A) \leq r}} 1 \leq \kappa'_D l^{D-1} r, \quad (\text{S5})$$

where $\text{dist}(i, B) := \inf_{j \in B} r_{ij}$. Inequality (S5) can be shown from the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{i \in A \\ \text{dist}(i, \Lambda \setminus A) \leq r}} 1 &\leq |\{i \in A \mid \text{dist}(i, \mathbb{Z}^D \setminus A) \leq r\}| \\ &\leq \left| \{i \in A \mid \inf_{j \notin A} \|i - j\|_\infty \leq r\} \right| \\ &\leq 2D |\{(i_1, \dots, i_D) \in \{1, \dots, l\}^D \mid i_1 \leq r\}| \leq 2Dl^{D-1}r, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S6})$$

* hokkyo@cat.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

where $\|i - j\|_\infty := \max_{k=1, \dots, D} |i_k - j_k|$.

Using κ_D and κ'_D , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
U_A &= \sum_{i \in A, j \notin A} \|U_{ij}\| \leq U_0 \sum_{i \in A, j \notin A} (1 + r_{ij})^{-(D+\delta)} = U_0 \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{i \in A, j \notin A \\ r-1 < r_{ij} \leq r}} (1 + r_{ij})^{-(D+\delta)} \\
&\leq U_0 \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} r^{-(D+\delta)} \sum_{\substack{i \in A, j \notin A \\ r-1 < r_{ij} \leq r}} 1 \leq U_0 \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} r^{-(D+\delta)} \kappa_D r^{D-1} \sum_{\substack{i \in A \\ \text{dist}(i, \Lambda \setminus A) \leq r}} 1 \\
&\leq U_0 \kappa_D \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} r^{-(1+\delta)} \min(l^D, \kappa'_D l^{D-1} r) \\
&\leq U_0 \kappa_D \left[\kappa'_D l^{D-1} \sum_{r=1}^l r^{-\delta} + l^D \sum_{r=l+1}^{\infty} r^{-(1+\delta)} \right] = U_0 o(l^D). \tag{S7}
\end{aligned}$$

In general, even if $|\Lambda \setminus \bigsqcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A| = o(V)$ the residual interaction is also subextensive because

$$\|U_{\mathcal{A}}^R\| \leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} U_A + \sum_{i \notin \bigsqcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A} \|h_i\| \leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} U_A + U_0 \left| \Lambda \setminus \bigsqcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A \right| = U_0 o(V). \tag{S8}$$

B. Small Incremental entangling (SIE) theorem

We fix an initial state ρ and a Hamiltonian H with a short-range and two-body interaction, and write $S_A(t)$ for the (time-dependent) entropy on the subsystem A . According to the SIE theorem [S1, S2], we have [S3, S4]

$$\left| \frac{dS_A}{dt} \right| \leq \tilde{C}_d U_A. \tag{S9}$$

Here, \tilde{C}_d is a positive constant that depends only on d (and not on the Hamiltonian or on the system size). We know the r.h.s. of (S9) is $o(|A|)$ by (S7).

We here remark the condition of the short-range property (S1). The authors of [S4] consider a more general subsystem and require that the interactions decay faster than $r^{-(D+1)}$ as the short-range property. On the other hand, since we consider only hypercubic subsystems, it follows from property (S5) that (S1) is sufficient.

II. THE PROPERTY OF THE CANONICAL ENERGY

A. Definitions and convexity of thermodynamic functions

We consider a general quantum system $\mathcal{H} \cong \mathbb{C}^d$ and the Hamiltonian H on it. We denote the Gibbs state with temperature $\beta > 0$ by $\rho_H(\beta) := e^{-\beta H} / \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}$. The corresponding free energy, internal energy, and entropy are defined as

$$F_H(\beta) := -\beta^{-1} \ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}, \tag{S10}$$

$$E_H(\beta) := \langle H \rangle_{\rho_H(\beta)} = \frac{\text{Tr}(H e^{-\beta H})}{\text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}} = \beta^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \beta F_H(\beta), \tag{S11}$$

$$S_H(\beta) := S(\rho_H(\beta)) = \beta(E_H(\beta) - F_H(\beta)). \tag{S12}$$

Their derivatives with respect to β are given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} F_H(\beta) = \beta^{-2} S_H(\beta) \geq 0, \tag{S13}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} E_H(\beta) = -\langle H^2 \rangle_{\rho_H(\beta)} + \langle H \rangle_{\rho_H(\beta)}^2 =: -\sigma_H^2(\beta) \leq 0, \tag{S14}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} S_H(\beta) = -\beta \sigma_H^2(\beta) \leq 0. \tag{S15}$$

In particular, since $\sigma_H^2(\beta) > 0$ unless H is trivial, $\beta \in (0, \infty)$ and $E \in (E_0, \text{Tr } H/d)$, $S \in (\ln d_0, \ln d)$ have one-to-one monotonic correspondence. Here, E_0 is the ground-state energy and d_0 is the degeneracy of the ground state. We therefore denote the internal energy E and the inverse temperature β as functions of entropy: $E_H(S)$, $\beta_H(S)$. The quantity $E_H(S)$ introduced in the main text corresponds to this definition if $S \in (\ln d_0, \ln d)$ and it is equal to E_0 if $S \leq \ln d_0$. Moreover, the definition of β^{-1} in the main text is also consistent with the definition of the same symbol introduced here.

E_H is a convex function of S because

$$\frac{\partial^2 E_H}{\partial S^2} = \frac{\partial \beta^{-1}}{\partial S} = \frac{1}{\beta^3 \sigma^2} > 0. \quad (\text{S16})$$

Also, the free energy is continuous with respect to the Hamiltonian [S5]:

$$|F_H(\beta) - F_{H'}(\beta)| \leq \|H - H'\| \quad (\forall \beta). \quad (\text{S17})$$

B. Maximum Entropy Principle and Minimum Energy Principle

The maximum entropy principle [S6] states that for a given energy expectation value, the state that maximizes entropy is a Gibbs state. In the positive temperature region, this property is equivalent to the minimum energy principle, which states that the state that minimizes the energy expectation value for a fixed entropy is the Gibbs state. We adopt this principle in the main text, which is represented as

$$E_H(S^{\text{vN}}(\sigma)) \leq \langle H \rangle_\sigma. \quad (\text{S18})$$

These properties follow from the nonnegativity of the divergence. In fact, we have

$$0 \leq D(\sigma \| \rho_H(\beta)) = -S^{\text{vN}}(\sigma) + \beta \langle H \rangle_\sigma + \text{Tr } e^{-\beta H} = S_H(\beta) - S^{\text{vN}}(\sigma) + \beta(\langle H \rangle_\sigma - E(\beta)). \quad (\text{S19})$$

We get the maximum entropy principle by taking β as $E(\beta) = \langle H \rangle_\sigma$, and get the minimum energy principle by dividing $\beta > 0$ and minimizing the rightmost side. The equality of (S19) is met if and only if $\sigma = \rho_H(\beta)$.

C. Conditions for local equilibrium ensembles

We justify the two assumptions for the local equilibrium ensemble:

$$V\epsilon \simeq \langle H \rangle_{\rho^{\text{leq}}} \simeq \sum_A E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A^{\text{leq}})), \quad (\text{S20})$$

$$(\beta_A^{\text{leq}})^{-1} := \beta_A^{-1}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A^{\text{leq}})) \leq \beta_0^{-1} \quad (\forall A \in \mathcal{A}), \quad (\text{S21})$$

which are used in the main text. We note that

$$\langle H \rangle_{\rho^{\text{leq}}} \simeq \sum_A \langle H_A \rangle_{\rho^{\text{leq}}} \geq \sum_A E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A^{\text{leq}})) \quad (\text{S22})$$

holds because the residual interaction is subextensive and inequality (S18) holds.

1. The product of local Gibbs state

If $\rho^{\text{leq}} = \otimes_A \rho_{H_A}(\beta_A)$, then the equality in the right inequality of (S22) holds. Therefore, the first assumption (S20) is satisfied by taking $(\beta_A)_A$ as the energy expectation is almost $V\epsilon$. The second assumption (S21) is equivalent to the condition $\beta_A^{-1} \leq \beta_0^{-1}$. If ϵ corresponds to a positive temperature, we can take such β_0 .

2. The canonical state

Consider the case $\rho^{\text{leq}} = \rho_H(\beta)$. Here, β is taken to satisfy $E_H(\beta) \simeq V\epsilon$. First, we prove the first assumption (S20) is valid. By inequality (S22), it is sufficient to show the inverse inequality of (S22). By the definition of the canonical energy, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_A E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_H(\beta)_A)) &= \sum_A \sup_{\beta_A > 0} [\beta_A^{-1} (-\ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta_A H_A} + S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_H(\beta)_A))] \\
&\geq \sup_{\beta_* > 0} \sum_A [\beta_*^{-1} (-\ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta_* H_A} + S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_H(\beta)_A))] \\
&= \sup_{\beta_* > 0} \beta_*^{-1} \sum_A [-\ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta_* H_A} + S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_H(\beta)_A)] \\
&= \sup_{\beta_* > 0} \beta_*^{-1} \left(-\ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta_* \sum_A H_A} + \sum_A S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_H(\beta)_A) \right) \\
&= \sup_{\beta_* > 0} F_{\sum_A H_A}(\beta_*) + \beta_*^{-1} \sum_A S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_H(\beta)_A). \tag{S23}
\end{aligned}$$

By the continuity of free energy (S17):

$$|F_{\sum_A H_A}(\beta_*) - F_H(\beta_*)| \leq \|U_{\mathcal{A}}^R\| (\forall \beta_*), \tag{S24}$$

and the property of entropy: $\sum_A S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_H(\beta)_A) \geq S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_H(\beta))$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{r.h.s. of (S23)}) &\geq \sup_{\beta_* > 0} F_H(\beta_*) + \beta_*^{-1} S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_H(\beta)) + \|U_{\mathcal{A}}^R\| \\
&\simeq \sup_{\beta_* > 0} F_H(\beta_*) + \beta_*^{-1} S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_H(\beta)) = E_H(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_H(\beta))) = \langle H \rangle_{\rho_H(\beta)}. \tag{S25}
\end{aligned}$$

For a translationally invariant system, $\langle H_A \rangle$ is independent of A , so that the left-hand side of (S21) is independent of A . In this case, inequality (S21) holds if β_0^{-1} is sufficiently larger than β^{-1} .

3. The microcanonical state

We take the microcanonical state ρ^{mc} of the energy shell around ϵ for ρ^{leq} . From the ensemble equivalence of thermodynamic functions [S5, S7], the same argument holds as for the canonical states. More specifically, by an argument similar to that in the previous section, we have

$$\langle H \rangle_{\rho^{\text{mc}}} \simeq V\epsilon \gtrsim \sum_A E_{H_A}(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho_A^{\text{mc}})) \gtrsim E_H(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho^{\text{mc}})). \tag{S26}$$

Therefore, we only have to show the inverse direction of this inequality.

It is known [S5, S7] that there exist thermodynamic limits of free energy and entropy:

$$\lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{V} F_H(\beta) =: f(\beta), \tag{S27}$$

$$\lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{V} S^{\text{vN}}(\rho^{\text{mc}}) =: \sigma(\epsilon), \tag{S28}$$

which are continuous, convex, and connected via the Legendre transformation:

$$f(\beta) = \beta^{-1} \inf_u (\beta u - \sigma(u)). \tag{S29}$$

If ϵ corresponds to positive temperature, we can take $\beta(\epsilon) > 0$ satisfying

$$f(\beta(\epsilon)) = \beta(\epsilon)^{-1} (\beta(\epsilon)\epsilon - \sigma(\epsilon)) \tag{S30}$$

Using this, we can evaluate the rightmost side of (S26) as

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{V \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{V} E_H(S^{\text{vN}}(\rho^{\text{mc}})) &\geq \sup_{\beta > 0} \liminf_{V \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{V} (F_H(\beta) + \beta^{-1} S^{\text{vN}}(\rho^{\text{mc}})) \\ &= \sup_{\beta > 0} f(\beta) + \beta^{-1} \sigma(\epsilon) \geq f(\beta(\epsilon)) + \beta(\epsilon)^{-1} \sigma(\epsilon) = \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S31})$$

Therefore, assumption (S20) holds for the microcanonical state. Assumption (S21) can be treated in the same way as for the canonical state.

-
- [S1] S. Bravyi, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 052319 (2007).
 - [S2] K. Van Acoleyen, M. Mariën, and F. Verstraete, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 170501 (2013).
 - [S3] M. Mariën, K. M. R. Audenaert, K. Van Acoleyen, and F. Verstraete, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **346**, 35 (2016).
 - [S4] Z.-X. Gong, M. Foss-Feig, F. G. S. L. Brandão, and A. V. Gorshkov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 050501 (2017).
 - [S5] D. Ruelle, *Statistical Mechanics: Rigorous Results* (World Scientific, 1999).
 - [S6] E. T. Jaynes, *Phys. Rev.* **106**, 620 (1957).
 - [S7] H. Tasaki, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **172**, 10.1007/s10955-018-2077-y (2018)