

Universal efficiency at optimal work with bayesian statistics

Ramandeep S. Johal*

*Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Mohali,
Transit Campus: MGSIPA Complex, Sector 26, Chandigarh 160019, India*

A connection between optimal thermodynamic efficiency of quantum heat engines and the notion of prior information as used in bayesian statistics is proposed. By averaging the work obtained in a heat cycle over the prior distribution of the external controllable parameter, it is shown for a class of priors that the average work is optimal at an efficiency which shows a universal form for small temperature differences of the heat reservoirs. In particular, Curzon-Ahlborn efficiency is obtained for a specific choice of the prior.

PACS numbers: 05.70.-a, 03.65.-w, 05.70.-Ln, 02.50.Cw

The connection between thermodynamics and the notion of information though subtle, is of fundamental importance. It enters into the discussion of many basic questions ranging from validity of the second law, Maxwell's demon, Landauer's erasure principle, the requirement of optimal resources for computation and so on [1]. With the advent of quantum information science, it can be useful also for our understanding of the relation between thermodynamics and quantum theory [2–4]. The interplay between these seemingly different fields of physics is being investigated intensively [5]–[8] and fusion names like “Quantum Thermodynamics” seem to reflect this trend. It is also motivated by the possibility of actually making devices [9, 10] at very small scales; to understand their behavior under heat dissipation, to optimize information processing and so on. From a theoretical perspective, generalization of thermodynamic processes have been considered for quantum systems and the corresponding heat cycles have been constructed [11]–[16]. Within the field of finite-time thermodynamics, the characteristics of heat engines at maximum power have been studied by incorporating various types of irreversibilities. Curzon and Ahlborn [17], first of all displayed an elegant formula for optimal efficiency at maximum power $\eta_{CA} = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \eta_c}$, where η_c is the Carnot efficiency. The issue of universality of CA value has captured the imagination of workers in this area since many years [18]. Recently, many authors [19]–[22] have discussed in different models, a universal form for optimal efficiency, at least in the near-equilibrium regime (small difference in reservoir temperatures) as given by $\eta \approx \eta_c/2 + \eta_c^2/8 + O(\eta_c^3)$. In particular, the first term has been shown to follow exactly [19] from linear irreversible thermodynamics under the assumptions of strong coupling between work and heat flux.

In this paper, we bring out a new connection between the optimal efficiency of a quantum heat engine and the notion of prior information as used in bayesian statistical inference [23, 24]. In literature, for such engines, the total work over a heat cycle has been considered with certain given external parameters of the quantum system (working medium) [14, 15]. We introduce another averaging over this work by considering an ensemble of ensembles, where in each ensemble the external parameters take certain values, but are random variables over the so-called hyperensemble and are chosen from a given prior distribution. We analyse the condition when the work averaged over the hyperensemble is optimal and show that the corresponding efficiency exhibits a universal form in the near-equilibrium regime.

Consider a quantum system with finite or infinite number of discrete energy levels given by $\varepsilon_n^{(1)} = \varepsilon_n a_1$, where the factor ε_n depends on the energy level n as well as other fixed parameters/constants of the system; a_1 is a controllable external parameter. Initially, the quantum system is in thermal contact with bath at T_1 and its levels are occupied according to the canonical probability distribution $p_n^{(1)}$. The system undergoes a heat cycle operated between two heat baths with temperatures T_1 and T_2 (let $T_1 > T_2$), as follows [14]: (i) the system is detached from the hot bath and made to undergo a quantum adiabatic process (equivalent to expansion for $a_2 < a_1$) during which the energy levels change to $\varepsilon_n^{(2)} = \varepsilon_n a_2$, whereas the occupation probabilities of the levels do not change. According to the standard interpretation for the change in energy, only work is done *by* the system in this stage; (ii) the system with modified energy spectrum $\varepsilon_n^{(2)}$ is brought in thermal contact with cold bath T_2 . Heat may be rejected to the bath in this stage. After thermalisation of the system, its new occupation probabilities are denoted by $p_n^{(2)}$; (iii) The system is now detached from the cold bath and made to undergo another quantum adiabatic process (compression) during which the energy levels change back to $\varepsilon_n^{(1)}$. Work is done *on* the system in this stage; (iv) the system is brought in thermal contact with hot bath again. Heat is absorbed by the system in this stage whence it recovers its initial state, completing one cycle. This is the quantum analogue of classical Otto cycle.

* electronic address: rsjohal@iisermohali.ac.in

The total work done in one cycle is calculated to be

$$\mathcal{W} = \sum_n \left(\varepsilon_n^{(1)} - \varepsilon_n^{(2)} \right) \left(p_n^{(2)} - p_n^{(1)} \right), \quad (1)$$

$$= (a_1 - a_2) \sum_n \varepsilon_n \left(p_n^{(2)} - p_n^{(1)} \right) < 0. \quad (2)$$

Similarly, heat exchanged (absorbed by the system) with hot bath in stage (iv) is given by $Q_1 = a_1 \sum_n \varepsilon_n \left(p_n^{(1)} - p_n^{(2)} \right) > 0$. Heat exchanged by the system with the cold bath is $Q_2 = a_2 \sum_n \varepsilon_n \left(p_n^{(2)} - p_n^{(1)} \right) < 0$. The efficiency of the engine defined as usual by $\eta = |\mathcal{W}|/Q_1$, is in this case given by

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{a_2}{a_1}. \quad (3)$$

It is bounded from above by η_c , as work can be extracted ($\mathcal{W} < 0$), only if $a_2/a_1 > T_2/T_1$. For concreteness, we now consider the case of a two-level system as our working medium, with $\varepsilon_0 = 0$ and $\varepsilon_1 = 1$. Using Eq. (3), we express the total work extracted in a cycle as function of efficiency η and one spectral parameter, say a_1 , as

$$W(a_1, \eta) = a_1 \eta \left[\frac{1}{(1 + e^{a_1/T_1})} - \frac{1}{(1 + e^{a_1(1-\eta)/T_2})} \right] > 0. \quad (4)$$

Now for a fixed η , the external parameter a_1 can take different values. We regard η as a parameter which characterises our ensemble and consider a collection of such ensembles all with same η , but where now a_1 is chosen from some prior distribution. For this hyperensemble, we study the work averaged over the prior distribution $\Pi(a_1)$.

So we define average work for a given η as

$$\overline{W}(\eta) = \int_{a_{\min}}^{a_{\max}} W(a_1, \eta) \Pi(a_1) da_1. \quad (5)$$

Clearly, this average value would depend on the choice of distribution, which is not clear-cut. Let us make the choice, $\Pi(a_1) = \ln^{-1}(a_{\max}/a_{\min}) (1/a_1)$ where a_1 is a continuous parameter in the range $[a_{\min}, a_{\max}]$.

For the given model system, this expression comes out to be

$$\overline{W} = \ln^{-1} \left(\frac{a_{\max}}{a_{\min}} \right) \eta \left[\frac{T_2}{(1-\eta)} \ln \left(\frac{1 + e^{a_{\max}(1-\eta)/T_2}}{1 + e^{a_{\min}(1-\eta)/T_2}} \right) - T_1 \ln \left(\frac{1 + e^{a_{\max}/T_1}}{1 + e^{a_{\min}/T_1}} \right) \right]. \quad (6)$$

It can be seen that given the range for a_1 , the average work vanishes for $\eta = 0$ and $\eta = \eta_c$. In between these values of η , the average work exhibits a maximum. We look for the optimal efficiency at which this work is maximal for given $[a_{\min}, a_{\max}]$ values, by putting $\partial \overline{W} / \partial \eta = 0$. We simplify the resulting expression by first considering the limit of vanishing $a_{\min}$ and obtain

$$\frac{T_2}{(1-\eta)^2} \ln \left[\frac{1 + e^{a_{\max}(1-\eta)/T_2}}{2} \right] - T_1 \ln \left[\frac{1 + e^{a_{\max}/T_1}}{2} \right] - \frac{\eta}{(1-\eta)} \frac{a_{\max}}{(1 + e^{-a_{\max}(1-\eta)/T_2})} = 0. \quad (7)$$

One can see from Eq. (7) the dependence of optimal efficiency on $a_{\max}$ in Fig. 1. Particularly, in the limit $a_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$, the above expression reduces to

$$T_1 - \frac{T_2}{(1-\eta^*)^2} = 0, \quad (8)$$

which yields $\eta^* = 1 - \sqrt{T_2/T_1}$, the exact CA value.

One can observe that when the lower (upper) limit for a_1 goes to 0 (∞), then the prior distribution is not normalisable. The use of so called improper priors though, is not uncommon in bayesian inference. The prior distribution $\Pi(a_1) = 1/a_1$ for the range $[0, \infty]$ is well known as an example Jeffreys' prior [25]. However, it is to be noted that the limits are taken after the derivative of work is set equal to zero and so the asymptotic expressions for the optimal efficiency are well-defined.

As an example of another choice, a uniform distribution is chosen in the range $[0, a_{\max}]$. Then

$$\overline{W} = \frac{\eta}{a_{\max}} \int_0^{a_{\max}} W(a_1, \eta) da_1. \quad (9)$$




FIG. 1: Efficiency versus $a_{\max}$ using Eq. (7). The curves correspond to $T_2 = 1$ and T_1 taking values 2, 4, 6 respectively, from bottom to top. Apart from the approach to corresponding CA value at large $a_{\max}$, it is also seen that the limit is approached slowly for larger temperature differences.

Again we are interested in the efficiency where the average work $\overline{W}$ is maximal. Equating its derivative with respect to η , to zero, we get

$$\int_0^{a_{\max}} \left[\frac{a_1}{1 + e^{a_1/T_1}} - \frac{a_1}{1 + e^{a_1(1-\eta)/T_2}} \right] da_1 - \frac{\eta}{T_2} \int_0^{a_{\max}} \frac{(a_1)^2 e^{a_1(1-\eta)/T_2}}{(1 + e^{a_1(1-\eta)/T_2})^2} da_1 = 0. \quad (10)$$

To simplify, we consider the asymptotic limit of $a_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$. Eq. (10) yields

$$\frac{\pi^2 T_1^2}{12} - \frac{\pi^2 T_2^2}{12(1-\eta^*)^2} - \frac{\eta^* \pi^2 T_2^2}{6(1-\eta^*)^3} = 0. \quad (11)$$

This implies the following cubic equation

$$(1 - \eta^*)^3 - (1 + \eta^*)\theta^2 = 0, \quad (12)$$

where $\theta = T_2/T_1$. In this case also, the optimal efficiency in the asymptotic limit depends only on the ratio of reservoir temperatures. The solution η^* can be explicitly written in terms of radicals. Here we focus on the near-equilibrium case i.e. for small values of $\eta_c = (1 - \theta)$. The efficiency can then be approximated as

$$\eta^* \approx \frac{\eta_c}{2} + \frac{3}{16}\eta_c^2 + O(\eta_c^3) \quad (13)$$

Thus close to the equilibrium limit, the first order term for efficiency matches with Curzon-Ahlborn form.

It is possible to generalise the above models as follows. Assume a class of prior distributions $\Pi(a_1) = N a_1^{-\gamma}$, defined in the range $[0, a_{\max}]$, where $N = (1 - \gamma)/a_{\max}^{1-\gamma}$ and $\gamma < 1$. Again doing optimisation of the average work over η , we get

$$\int_0^{a_{\max}} \left[\frac{(a_1)^{1-\gamma}}{1 + e^{a_1/T_1}} - \frac{(a_1)^{1-\gamma}}{1 + e^{a_1(1-\eta)/T_2}} \right] da_1 - \frac{\eta}{T_2} \int_0^{a_{\max}} \frac{(a_1)^{2-\gamma} e^{a_1(1-\eta)/T_2}}{(1 + e^{a_1(1-\eta)/T_2})^2} da_1 = 0. \quad (14)$$

In the limit $a_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$, the above integrals can be evaluated using the standard results: $\int_0^\infty (x)^{1-\gamma}/(1 + e^{x/T}) dx = (1 - 2^{\gamma-1})T^{2-\gamma}\Gamma[2-\gamma]\zeta[2-\gamma]$, for $\gamma < 2$ and where $\Gamma[\cdot]$ and $\zeta[\cdot]$ are the Gamma function and Riemann zeta functions, respectively. Thus Eq. (14) can be converted to

$$(1 - \eta^*)^{3-\gamma} - (1 - \gamma)\theta^{2-\gamma}\eta^* - \theta^{2-\gamma} = 0, \quad (15)$$

Now, for $\gamma = 0$, we get the equation with uniform prior i.e. Eq. (12), discussed above. The case $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to CA value as the optimal efficiency. For the general case of $\gamma < 1$, Eq. (15) has been numerically solved and the results for various γ values are plotted in Fig.2 [29]. It is seen that in the near-equilibrium limit, all the curves merge

and so CA value is approached in this case. In fact, assuming θ to be close to unity, $\eta_c = (1 - \theta)$ is very close to zero. The efficiency η^* being bounded from above by the Carnot value is thus small too. On using these facts in the expansion of Eq. (15), one obtains

$$\eta^* \approx \frac{\eta_c}{2} + \frac{(3 - \gamma)}{16} \eta_c^2 + O(\eta_c^3). \quad (16)$$

Thus the first order term is independent of the model index γ . The second order term is dependent on it; for $\gamma = 1$, we recover the CA value and the $1/8$ factor and for $\gamma = 0$, we get Eq. (13). For general values of θ , the CA value is an lower (upper) bound for the optimal efficiency with $0 < \gamma < 1$ ($1 < \gamma < 2$).




FIG. 2: Optimal efficiency versus $\theta = T_2/T_1$ with parameter γ of the prior distribution taking values 0.25, 0.75, 1.0, 1.50 respectively, from top to bottom. CA value is obtained for $\gamma = 1$ (solid line). For close to equilibrium (θ nearly unity), the universal form for optimal efficiency is $\eta^* \approx \eta_c/2$.

As mentioned above, for the asymptotic limit in which the optimal efficiency reveals a universal form, the prior distributions such as Jeffreys' prior, are non-normalisable. These priors quantify our state of prior knowledge about the system and the justification for their choice is to be sought in other principles [26, 27]. In fact, based on some newly gained information about the system, these can be updated using Bayes' theorem and can be converted into posterior distributions [28]. Also the consequences for other choices for the priors appear worth pursuing and may yield universality classes for optimal efficiency that go beyond the linear term. The attractive feature of the models considered in this paper is their analytical tractability. Other possible extensions of the present work are the choice of different working media as well as application of similar ideas to heat cycles other than Otto cycle as discussed here. Findings along some of these lines will be presented elsewhere. To summarise, we have seen that a universal form for thermodynamic efficiency in a quantum heat cycle and in particular, emergence of the CA value in connection with prior information. The possible universality of the CA value has been probed earlier from a thermodynamic perspective, in the performance of heat engines at maximum power or maximum work extracted in a given cycle. The findings of this paper suggest a novel arena for the interplay between thermodynamics and information.

ACKNOWLEDEMENTS

The author expresses his sincere thanks to Arvind for encouragement and support and to Lingaraj Sahu for useful discussion.

-
- [1] H.S. Leff and A.F. Rex, *Maxwell's Demon: Entropy, Information, Computing*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990); *Maxwell's Demon 2: Entropy, Classical and Quantum Information, Computing* (Institute of Physics, Bristol, 2003).
 - [2] K. Muruyami, F. Nori and V. Vedral, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 1 (2009).
 - [3] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 250602 (2009); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 080403 (2008).
 - [4] K. Jacobs, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 012322 (2009).

- [5] G. N. Hatsopoulos and E. P. Gyftopoulos, *Found. Phys.* **6**, 127 (1976).
- [6] M. Scully, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001) 220601; *ibid* **88** (2002) 050602.
- [7] A. E. Allahverdyan and Th. M. Nieuwenhuizen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1799 (2000).
- [8] J. Gemmer, M. Michel and G. Mahler, *Quantum thermodynamics*, Springer, Berlin (2004) and references therein.
- [9] C. Joachim *et. al.*, *Nature (London)* **408**, 541 (2000).
- [10] V. Serreli *et. al.*, *Nature (London)* **445**, 523 (2007).
- [11] H.E.D. Scovil and E.O. Schulz-Dubois, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2**, 262 (1959); J.E. Geusic, E.O. Schulz-Dubois and H.E.D. Scovil, *Phys. Rev.* **156**, 343 (1967).
- [12] R. Alicki, *J. Phys. A*, **12**, L103 (1979).
- [13] E. Geva and R. Kosloff, *J. Chem. Phys.* **96**, 3054 (1992).
- [14] T.D. Kieu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 140403 (2004); *Eur. Phys. J. D* **39**, 115 (2006).
- [15] H.T. Quan, Yu-xi Liu, C.P. Sun and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 031105 (2007).
- [16] A. Allahverdyan, R. S. Johal and G. Mahler, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 041118 (2008).
- [17] F. Curzon and B. Ahlborn, *Am. J. Phys.* **43**, 22 (1975).
- [18] H. S. Leff, *Am. J. Phys.* **55**, 8 (1987); P. T. Landsberg and H. Leff, *J. Phys. A* **22**, 4019 (1989).
- [19] C. Van den Broeck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 190602 (2005).
- [20] T. Schmiedl and U. Seifert, *Europhys. Lett.* **81**, 20003 (2008).
- [21] Z.C. Tu, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **41**, 312003 (2008).
- [22] M. Esposito, K. Lindenberg, and C. Van den Broeck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 130602 (2009).
- [23] H. Jeffreys, *Theory of Probability* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1939).
- [24] V. Dose, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **66**, 1421 (2003).
- [25] H. Jeffreys, *Scientific Inference* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1957).
- [26] E.T. Jaynes, *IEEE Trans. Sys. Sc. and Cybernetics*, **4**, 227 (1968).
- [27] E.T. Jaynes, *Probability Theory: The Logic of Science* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).
- [28] Bayes theorem calculates the posterior probabilities for the variable a_1 as $p(a_1|\beta)da_1 = p(\beta|a_1)\pi(a_1)da_1 / \int p(\beta|a_1)\pi(a_1)da_1$. Here $\pi(a_1)da_1$ are the prior probabilities and $p(\beta|a_1)$ is the conditional probability depending on a chosen model that, given a value a_1 , provides the probability for the system to possess a value β for another variable.
- [29] We could have started with the prior distribution $1/a_1^\gamma$ defined in the range $[a_{\min}, \infty]$, which is normalisable for $\gamma > 1$. The asymptotic limit is $a_{\min} \rightarrow 0$. This choice is also presented in Fig. 2.