arXiv:2502.14136v1 [quant-ph] 19 Feb 2025

The thermodynamic trilemma of efficient measurements

M. Hamed Mohammady^{1,*} and Francesco Buscemi^{2,†}

¹RCQI, Institute of Physics, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Dúbravská cesta 9, Bratislava 84511, Slovakia

² Graduate School of Informatics, Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-Ku, Nagoya 464-8601, Japan

This work investigates the consequences of assuming that the quantum measurement process—i.e., the physical realization of a measurement through an interaction between the system to be measured with a measuring device—is thermodynamically closable, and thus amenable to thermodynamic analysis. Our results show that this assumption leads to a fundamental tension between the following three statements: (i), the measurement process is consistent with the second and third laws of thermodynamics; (ii), the measurement process is decomposed into two independent sub-processes: a bistochastic interaction between system and measuring device, followed by a readout mechanism on the measuring device; and (iii), the measurement on the system is efficient, i.e., characterized by operations that are completely purity-preserving and represented by a single measurement operator, thus including the von Neumann–Lüders and the square-root state reduction rules. Any two of the above statements necessarily exclude the third. As a consequence, efficient measurements are fundamentally at odds with the laws of thermodynamics, lest we abandon the universal applicability of the unitary interaction-based indirect measurement model.

1. INTRODUCTION: MEASUREMENTS AS THERMODYNAMIC PROCESSES

Maxwell's demon is often used to illustrate how measurements can seemingly violate thermodynamic laws. Here, in contrast, we adopt the opposite approach: given the assumed universality of thermodynamic laws, we ask how these laws impose limitations on the types of measurements that can be performed. Central to this perspective is the need to treat any quantum measurement as a thermodynamic process. This implies that every quantum measurement should be *thermodynamically closable*—that is, it should be possible to incorporate auxiliary degrees of freedom into the measurement process until the entire setup can be viewed, if not as a fully conservative process, then at least as an adiabatic one, where only mechanical energy, and no heat, is exchanged with the external universe [1].

The problem is where to draw, from a mathematical point of view, such adiabatic boundaries¹. Note that the *unitary interaction measurement model* based on the concept of unitary dilation [2–7], which states that any measurement can always be seen as a unitary interaction with an apparatus (or probe) initialized in a pure state, followed by a von Neumann (sharp, projective) measurement on the apparatus, does not resolve the issue, since it provides a *purification*—i.e., a sort of *information-theoretic closure*—of the initial measurement, but at the cost of shifting the actual measurement down the line, from the system to the apparatus. Moreover, it is not clear how the concept of information-theoretic closure relates to the concept of *thermodynamic* closure. So the question remains: is there a unitary interaction measurement model that can be considered adiabatic from a thermodynamic point of view? Here we face a dilemma: either the condition of overall adiabaticity can be assumed at some point, or we have to give up formulating a thermodynamics for quantum measurements.

^{*} m.hamed.mohammady@savba.sk

[†] buscemi@nagoya-u.jp

¹ This also seems to be related to the famous *measurement problem*, i.e. how a microscopic interaction manifests itself in a definite macroscopic result. We will not discuss this question here.

To address this, we *assume* that quantum measurements are thermodynamically closable and, under this assumption, investigate how thermodynamic laws, especially the second and the third, impose constraints on both the measurement and its physical implementation. We find that such thermodynamic constraints are especially problematic for *purity-preserving* measurements, also known as *quasicomplete* measurements [8]—those in which all pure initial states of the system are mapped to pure final states, for any measurement outcome. Among these, particularly relevant are *completely* purity-preserving measurements, also known as *efficient* measurements [9]; in this case, each measurement outcome corresponds to a single Kraus operator, so that they preserve purity even when performed locally on a pure entangled state. Efficient measurements, which contain as a special case von Neumann–Lüders and square-root measurements, are known for their nice mathematical properties and are frequently assumed, either explicitly or implicitly, in several works in quantum information theory and quantum thermodynamics. Some textbooks even present efficient measurements as the most general measurement model, referred to as the *measurement operator formalism* [10]. Our results reveal significant problems with this assumption, *especially* in a thermodynamic context, where efficient measurements may be fundamentally unattainable [11, 12].

1.1. Summary of the main results

In this work, we focus on the physical implementation of efficient quantum measurements through the interaction with a measurement apparatus and examine whether such implementations are compatible with the second and third laws of thermodynamics. After introducing the necessary notation to describe quantum measurements in full generality, we establish the following results:

- 1. The second law imposes no restrictions on which measurements can be realized. In other words, any measurement allowed by quantum theory (whether efficient or not) can also be implemented in a way that is consistent with the second law of thermodynamics. However, the second law does impose constraints on how these measurements can be implemented (Lemma 3.1). Specifically, for any measurement, there always exists a unitary interaction model that complies with the second law.
- 2. If the third law is also required to hold, which demands that the apparatus be prepared in a full-rank state, then no standard unitary interaction model can result in quasicomplete measurements, let alone efficient ones (Theorem 3.1).
- 3. If the mechanism establishing the correlations between the system and the apparatus—the latter prepared in a full-rank state—is a strictly positive, non-bistochastic (and thus, non-unitary) channel, then efficient measurements are possible *if and only if the corresponding observable is strictly positive* (Theorem 4.1). That is, while projective von Neumann–Lüders measurements of (non-trivial) observables remain categorically forbidden as fundamentally incompatible with the third law, square-root (i.e., generalized Lüders) measurements of unsharp POVMs are allowed. But in such a case, the measurement model is compatible with the second law of thermodynamics only if viewed *as a whole*, i.e., as an intrinsically *non-purifiable* process.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Operations and channels

Here we consider only systems with complex Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H} of finite dimension. Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \supset \mathcal{L}_s(\mathcal{H}) \supset \mathcal{L}_p(\mathcal{H})$ be the algebra of linear operators, the real vector space of self-adjoint operators, and the cone of positive semidefinite operators on \mathcal{H} , respectively. The symbols $\mathbb{1}$ and \mathbb{O} denote the unit and null operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, respectively; an operator $E \in \mathcal{L}_p(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mathbb{O} \leq E \leq \mathbb{1}$ is called an *effect*. An effect is

of states on \mathcal{H} is denoted as $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{L}_p(\mathcal{H})$. The extremal elements of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ are the pure states, which are rank-1 projections. An operator $A \in \mathcal{L}_p(\mathcal{H})$ is called positive definite, or *strictly positive*, if A > 0, i.e., if all the eigenvalues of A are strictly positive. If A is strictly positive then it has full rank in \mathcal{H} , i.e., rank $(A) = \dim(\mathcal{H})$.

A linear map $\Phi : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$ is called an *operation* if it is completely positive and trace non-increasing. When $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H}$, we say that the operation acts in \mathcal{H} . A trace preserving operation is called a *channel*. Consider the pair of operations $\Phi_1 : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_1)$ and $\Phi_2 : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_2) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_2)$. The parallel application of these operations is $\Phi_1 \otimes \Phi_2 : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_1 \otimes \mathcal{K}_2), A \otimes B \mapsto \Phi_1(A) \otimes \Phi_2(B)$. If $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{H}_2$, the sequential composition is $\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1 : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_2), A \mapsto \Phi_2[\Phi_1(A)]$. The *identity channel*, which maps every operator to itself, is denoted as id. For each operation $\Phi : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$ there exists a unique dual map $\Phi^* : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ defined by the trace duality $\operatorname{tr}[\Phi^*(A)B] = \operatorname{tr}[A\Phi(B)]$ for all $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}), B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. An operation is *compatible* with a unique effect $E \in \mathcal{L}_p(\mathcal{H})$ via the relation $\Phi^*(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}) = E$. If Φ is a channel, then Φ^* is *unital*, i.e., Φ is compatible with the trivial effect $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

An operation Φ is called *purity-preserving* (or just *pure*) if ρ pure $\implies \Phi(\rho)$ pure; it is *completely* puritypreserving if $id \otimes \Phi$ is purity-preserving on any extension $\mathcal{H}' \otimes \mathcal{H}$ of \mathcal{H} . An operation Φ is called *strictly positive* if $A > 0 \implies \Phi(A) > 0$. An operation Φ acting in \mathcal{H} is called a *bistochastic channel* if it preserves both the trace and the unit; this is possible if and only if its dual Φ^* is also bistochastic, i.e., Φ^* is not only unital, but it also preserves the trace. It is easy to verify that bistochastic channels are rank non-decreasing, and hence strictly positive; see, e.g. [13].

Lemma 2.1. Let Φ be an operation acting in \mathcal{H} . Assume that Φ is purity-preserving and strictly positive. Then $\Phi(\bullet) = U\sqrt{E}(\bullet)\sqrt{E}U^*$ with E a strictly positive effect and $U \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ a unitary operator.

Proof. Every operation is compatible with an effect E. By Theorem 3.1 of Ref. [14], a purity-preserving operation is either (i) $\Phi(\cdot) = K(\cdot)K^*$ for some $K \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $K^*K = E$, or (ii) $\Phi(\cdot) = \operatorname{tr}[E \cdot]|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ with $|\phi\rangle$ a unit vector in \mathcal{H} . Option (ii) is evidently not strictly positive, so we are left with option (i). By the polar decomposition, it holds that $K = U\sqrt{E}$. Now note that Φ is strictly positive if and only if $\Phi(1)$ is strictly positive [15]. Since $\Phi(1) = UEU^*$, it follows that E must be strictly positive.

2.2. Quantum instruments and measurement processes

Let us consider a quantum system S associated with a finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_s . An observable on \mathcal{H}_s is represented by a normalized *positive operator-valued measure* (POVM). We consider only discrete observables, which are identified with the family $\mathsf{E} := \{E_x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$, where $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_N\}$ is a (finite) alphabet (also called value space or the space of measurement outcomes) and E_x are effects in $\mathcal{L}_p(\mathcal{H}_s)$, normalized so that $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} E_x = \mathbb{1}_s$. The probability of observing outcome x when measuring E in the state ρ is given by the Born rule as $p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x) \coloneqq \operatorname{tr}[E_x \rho]$. An observable is *non-trivial* if at least one effect in its range is non-trivial, which implies that $|\mathcal{X}| = N$ must be larger than one. An observable is a *projection valued measure* (PVM), or projective, if E_x are mutually orthogonal projections, i.e., $E_x E_y = \delta_{x,y} E_x$. We restrict ourselves only to observables such that $E_x \neq 0$ for all x: this is always possible by replacing the original value space \mathcal{X} with the relative complement $\mathcal{X} \setminus \{x : E_x = 0\}$.

A (discrete) instrument acting in \mathcal{H}_s is given by a family of operations $\mathcal{I} \coloneqq \{\mathcal{I}_x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ acting in \mathcal{H}_s , normalized so that the average expectation $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{X}}(\cdot) \coloneqq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{I}_x(\cdot)$ is a channel. Each instrument is associated with a unique observable E via $\mathcal{I}_x^*(\mathbb{1}_s) = E_x$. In this case, we say that the instrument \mathcal{I} is E -compatible. **Definition 1.** An observable $\mathsf{E} := \{E_x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is called strictly positive if all effects E_x are strictly positive. Similarly, an instrument $\mathcal{I} := \{\mathcal{I}_x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is called strictly positive if all operations \mathcal{I}_x are strictly positive.

Note that if an observable is non-trivial and strictly positive, then it will hold that $\mathbb{O} < E_x < \mathbb{1}_s$ for all x. That is, the spectra of all effects in its range will contain neither eigenvalue 1 nor 0. Such an observable is also called "completely unsharp" or "indefinite", in the sense that, for every state ρ and every outcome x, it holds that $0 < p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x) < 1$. Note also that an instrument can be strictly positive even if the corresponding observable is not, and conversely, a strictly positive observable admits instruments that are not strictly positive.

Definition 2. An instrument $\mathcal{I} := \{\mathcal{I}_x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is called quasicomplete if all operations \mathcal{I}_x are puritypreserving [8]. A subclass of quasicomplete instruments are called efficient, i.e., instruments for which every operation is completely purity-preserving. This is equivalent to saying that every operation of an efficient instrument is expressible with a single Kraus operator, i.e., $\mathcal{I}_x(\cdot) = U_x \sqrt{E_x}(\cdot) \sqrt{E_x} U_x^*$, where E_x are the effects compatible with each operation \mathcal{I}_x and U_x are unitary operators.

A measurement process for system $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is given by the tuple $\mathcal{M} \coloneqq (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}, \xi_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}})$, where $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the Hilbert space of an auxiliary system (the *apparatus*), ξ is a state on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$, \mathcal{E} is a *premeasurement channel* acting in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$, and \mathcal{J} is an *objectification* instrument acting in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$, which is compatible with a *pointer* observable $Z \coloneqq \{Z_x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Note that the pointer observable, which can be a general POVM, has the same value space \mathcal{X} as the original system's observable. Moreover, in the finite case considered in this paper, the apparatus can always be taken finite dimensional. Our definition generalizes that given in [7], where \mathcal{E} is unitary, ξ is pure, and Z is projection valued.

Each measurement process defines a unique instrument as follows: for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the operations of the instrument implemented by the measurement process \mathcal{M} are given by

$$\mathcal{I}_{x}(\bullet_{\mathcal{S}}) \coloneqq \left[\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \circ (\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{x}) \circ \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}} \right] (\bullet_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \xi_{\mathcal{A}}) \equiv \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \left[(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes Z_{x}) \ \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}} (\bullet_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \xi_{\mathcal{A}}) \right],
\mathcal{I}_{x}^{*}(\bullet_{\mathcal{S}}) \coloneqq \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \left[\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}^{*} (\bullet_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes Z_{x}) \ (\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \xi_{\mathcal{A}}) \right] \equiv \left[\Gamma_{\xi} \circ \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}^{*} \right] (\bullet_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes Z_{x}) .$$
(1)

In the above, $\Gamma_{\xi} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}})$ is a conditional expectation with respect to $\xi_{\mathcal{A}}$, also called a *restriction map*, defined as

$$\Gamma_{\xi}(\bullet_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}) \coloneqq \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{A}}[\bullet_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}} (\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \xi_{\mathcal{A}})], \qquad (2)$$

so that $\operatorname{tr}[\Gamma_{\xi}(\cdot_{S\mathcal{A}}) \rho_{S}] \coloneqq \operatorname{tr}[\cdot_{S\mathcal{A}} (\rho_{S} \otimes \xi_{\mathcal{A}})]$ for all states ρ_{S} , by construction. Such a map is obviously unital and completely positive. Since the instrument realized on the system depends only on the pointer observable $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ but not on the instrument $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ used to measure it, any apparatus instrument $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ compatible with the same pointer observable $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ realizes the same instrument on the system, all else being equal. However, it is important to emphasize that different realizations $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of the same pointer observable $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ may well have different physical or thermodynamic properties. This observation will be important in what follows.

It is customary to represent explicitly also the classical register \mathcal{K} in which the measurement outcomes are stored. In order to unify the notation, the register, although intrinsically classical, is also represented by a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{κ} , and it is assumed to be initially prepared in an *idle state*, represented by the pure state $|0\rangle\langle 0|$. The outcomes x of the measurement are then stored in the register as the corresponding element of the orthogonal set of unit vectors $\{|x\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa}\}$. Accordingly, at the end of the measurement process, the



FIG. 1: Left panel (a): the entire measurement process seen as a bipartite channel, where both system's and apparatus' states can freely vary. Center panel (b): by enclosing the apparatus inside the box, we obtain the initial instrument \mathcal{I} on the system. Right panel (c): by enclosing the system inside the box, we obtain the instrument Φ^{ρ} on the apparatus.

expected joint state of system, apparatus, and register can be written as

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{SAK}} \coloneqq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x) \sigma_{\mathcal{SA}}^{x} \otimes |x\rangle \langle x|_{\mathcal{K}} , \qquad (3)$$

where

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}^{x} \coloneqq \frac{1}{p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x)} [(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{x}) \circ \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}](\rho_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \xi_{\mathcal{A}}) , \qquad p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x) > 0 , \qquad (4)$$

are the posterior joint states of system and apparatus, after the measurement process. In the above, if $p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x) = 0$, the posterior joint state can be defined arbitrarily. We also define

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}^{x} \coloneqq \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{A}}[\sigma_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}^{x}] \equiv \frac{1}{p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x)} \mathcal{I}_{x}(\rho_{\mathcal{S}}) \tag{5}$$

as the marginal posterior states of the system only. Similarly, the marginal posterior states of the apparatus are

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^{x} \coloneqq \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{S}}[\sigma_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}^{x}] \equiv \frac{1}{p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x)} \Phi_{x}^{\rho}(\xi_{\mathcal{A}}), \tag{6}$$

where

$$\Phi_x^{\rho}(\boldsymbol{\cdot}_{\mathcal{A}}) \coloneqq [\mathcal{J}_x \circ \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{S}} \circ \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}](\rho_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \boldsymbol{\cdot}_{\mathcal{A}})$$

$$\tag{7}$$

are the operations of the effective instrument Φ^{ρ} that acts in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

At this point, it is important to note that in the construction of the measurement process, it is possible to isolate two distinct instruments acting on the apparatus: Φ^{ρ} and \mathcal{J} . While \mathcal{J} is by construction compatible with the pointer observable Z, Φ^{ρ} is generally compatible with another observable G^{ρ} with effects $G_x^{\rho} :=$ $[\Gamma_{\rho} \circ \mathcal{E}^*](\mathbb{1}_S \otimes Z_x)$, where $\Gamma_{\rho} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ is the restriction map with respect to ρ , defined analogously to Eq. (2). This observable depends on the prior state of the system to be measured, and how it interacts with the apparatus. However, we see that $\operatorname{tr}[G_x^{\rho} \xi] = \operatorname{tr}[(\mathbb{1}_S \otimes Z_x) \mathcal{E}(\rho_S \otimes \xi_A)] = \operatorname{tr}[E_x \rho_S] =: p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x)$. See Fig. 1 for a schematic representation.

2.3. Information measures

Recalling that $S(\rho) := -\operatorname{tr}[\rho \ln(\rho)]$ is the von Neumann entropy, $D(\rho \| \sigma) := \operatorname{tr}[\rho(\log(\rho) - \log(\sigma))] \ge 0$ is the Umegaki relative entropy for any state ρ and positive operator σ such that $\operatorname{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(\sigma)$, and the definition of the posterior states of system and apparatus given in Eqs. (5) and (6), we define the following information quantities:

$$\mathscr{H}(p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}) \coloneqq -\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x) \ln p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x) \ge 0 ,$$

$$I_{\mathrm{GLO}}(\mathcal{I}, \rho) \coloneqq S(\rho_{\mathcal{S}}) - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x) S(\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}^{x}) \gtrless 0 ,$$

$$I_{\mathrm{GLO}}(\Phi^{\rho}, \xi) \coloneqq S(\xi_{\mathcal{A}}) - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x) S(\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^{x}) \gtrless 0 ,$$

$$I(\mathcal{S}: \mathcal{A})_{\sigma^{x}} \coloneqq S(\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}^{x}) + S(\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^{x}) - S(\sigma_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}^{x}) \equiv D(\sigma_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}^{x} \| \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}^{x} \otimes \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^{x}) \ge 0 .$$
(8)

In the above, $\mathscr{H}(p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}})$ is the Shannon entropy of the probability distribution p_{ρ}^{E} obtained when measuring the observable E in the state ρ . Note that if E is strictly positive, then $\mathscr{H}(p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}) > 0$ for all ρ . The quantity $I_{\mathrm{GLO}}(\mathcal{I},\rho)$ is the system's Groenewold-Lindblad-Ozawa (GLO) information gain [8, 16, 17]: it is uniquely determined by the measurement of the E-compatible instrument \mathcal{I} in the prior system state ρ , and is guaranteed to be non-negative for all states ρ if and only if \mathcal{I} is quasicomplete [8]. Similarly, $I_{\mathrm{GLO}}(\Phi^{\rho},\xi)$ is the apparatus' information gain for the instrument Φ^{ρ} measured in the prior apparatus state ξ . Finally, $I(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{A})_{\sigma^x}$ is the mutual information between system and apparatus in the posterior state $\sigma_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}^x$, which is non-negative and vanishes if and only if $\sigma_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}^x = \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}^x \otimes \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^x$. Note that while $\mathscr{H}(p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}})$ and $I_{\mathrm{GLO}}(\mathcal{I},\rho)$ depend only on the observable E and the E-compatible instrument \mathcal{I} measured in the system, respectively, $I_{\mathrm{GLO}}(\Phi^{\rho},\xi)$ and $I(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{A})_{\sigma^x}$ also depend on the specific choice of measurement process \mathcal{M} used for the realization of \mathcal{I} .

3. COMPATIBILITY OF MEASUREMENT PROCESSES WITH THERMODYNAMICS

3.1. Compatibility with the second law

As discussed in the introduction, in order to formulate a thermodynamics of quantum measurements, we assume that for each instrument there exists a measurement process during which the compound, consisting of the system to be measured, the measurement apparatus (which may also include a subsystem playing the role of a bath, see, e.g., [18, 19]), and the classical register, forms a *thermally closed system*, exchanging at most mechanical energy (work) with an external source, but not heat. That is, we assume that the measurement process is overall *adiabatic* [20]. It follows that a measurement process is consistent with the second law if and only if it does not decrease the *total* von Neumann entropy of the compound system. If there exists a state among the possible inputs for which the process reduces the total entropy, such a process could, in principle, be exploited to construct a *perpetuum mobile*, enabling the cyclic extraction of positive work from a single thermal bath [21].

The proof is immediate and given as follows. For any (possibly composite) system \mathcal{H} with Hamiltonian $H \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathcal{H})$ at inverse temperature $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, the internal energy and the non-equilibrium free energy of a state ρ are defined as $\epsilon(\rho) \coloneqq \operatorname{tr}[H\rho]$ and $F(\rho) \coloneqq \epsilon(\rho) - \beta^{-1}S(\rho)$, respectively. Let the system undergo a transformation Λ implemented adiabatically. Then, by the first law of thermodynamics the work extracted is² $W_{\text{ext}} = -\Delta \epsilon = -\Delta F - \beta^{-1}\Delta S$. Implementing the reverse transformation $\Lambda(\rho) \mapsto \rho$ by a quasistatic isothermal process involving heat exchange with a thermal bath at inverse temperature β extracts ΔF units of work, and so for the cycle $\rho \mapsto \Lambda(\rho) \mapsto \rho$ the net work extracted is $W_{\text{net.ext}} = -\beta^{-1}\Delta S$. Thus, if there exists a possible initial state ρ for which Λ results in a decrease of entropy, i.e. $\Delta S < 0$, the net work extracted for such a state will be positive, violating the second law of thermodynamics.

² For a transformation $\rho \mapsto \Lambda(\rho)$, we denote the increase in the quantity $X = S, \epsilon, F$ as $\Delta X \coloneqq X(\Lambda(\rho)) - X(\rho)$.

The above argument leads us to the following, which is an extension of what was previously shown in Proposition 2 and Theorem 2 of Ref. [20], in that it does not rely on the assumption that a Landauer erasure is performed at the end of the protocol:

Lemma 3.1. Let $\mathcal{M} \coloneqq (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}, \xi, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{J})$ be a measurement process for an E-compatible instrument \mathcal{I} acting in \mathcal{H}_s . Assume that the premeasurement channel \mathcal{E} and objectification instrument \mathcal{J} are implemented adiabatically. Then, given an initial state of the system $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_s)$, the process \mathcal{M} is compatible with the second law of thermodynamics if and only if

$$\mathscr{H}(p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}) \ge I_{\mathrm{GLO}}(\mathcal{I},\rho) + I_{\mathrm{GLO}}(\Phi^{\rho},\xi) + \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x)I(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{A})_{\sigma^{x}} .$$

$$\tag{9}$$

A sufficient condition for the above to hold is that $(id_s \otimes \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}) \circ \mathcal{E}$ is a bistochastic channel, in which case the process is compatible with the second law for all initial states of the system.

Remark 3.1. Note that the composite channel $(id_s \otimes \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}) \circ \mathcal{E}$ can be bistochastic even if $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}$ or \mathcal{E} , taken singularly, are not. This distinction will be important later on, in Section 4.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. The channel describing the total measurement process may be written as

$$\Lambda(\boldsymbol{\cdot}\otimes \boldsymbol{\xi}\otimes |0\rangle\!\langle 0|)\coloneqq \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \big[(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}}\otimes\mathcal{J}_x)\circ\mathcal{E}\big](\boldsymbol{\cdot}\otimes \boldsymbol{\xi})\otimes |x\rangle\!\langle x|.$$

If \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{J} are adiabatic, then so too is Λ . Let us denote the total increase in entropy of the measured system, apparatus, and classical register during the measurement process as

$$\Delta S \coloneqq S\big(\Lambda(\rho \otimes \xi \otimes |0\rangle\!\langle 0|)\big) - S\big(\rho \otimes \xi \otimes |0\rangle\!\langle 0|\big) \equiv S(\sigma_{\mathcal{SAK}}) - S\big(\rho \otimes \xi\big),$$

where we note that $\Lambda(\rho \otimes \xi \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) = \sigma_{SAK}$ as defined in Eq. (3). The measurement process is compatible with the second law for the state ρ if and only if $\Delta S \ge 0$, which is equivalent to Eq. (9). As the register \mathcal{K} is classical, the state σ_{SAK} is such that $S(\sigma_{SAK}) \ge S(\sigma_{SA})$, where $\sigma_{SA} \coloneqq \operatorname{tr}_{\kappa}[\sigma_{SAK}] = [(\operatorname{id}_{S} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{X}) \circ \mathcal{E}](\rho \otimes \xi)$. Hence, $\Delta S \ge S([(\operatorname{id}_{S} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{X}) \circ \mathcal{E}](\rho \otimes \xi)) - S(\rho \otimes \xi)$, which is guaranteed to be non-negative if $(\operatorname{id}_{S} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{X}) \circ \mathcal{E}$ is bistochastic.

Lemma 3.1 above implies that for every instrument on S, including quasicomplete ones, there exists a corresponding measurement process that is compatible with the second law. This is because, by the von Neumann–Naimark-Ozawa dilation theorem [7], any instrument can be realized by a process where ξ is pure, \mathcal{E} is unitary (and hence bistochastic), and Z is projection valued. Recall that the choice of the particular Z-compatible instrument \mathcal{J} acting in the apparatus is irrelevant. Thus, without loss of generality, we may always assume that the measurement of Z happens via a generalized Lüders instrument $\mathcal{J}_x^L(\cdot) := \sqrt{Z_x} \cdot \sqrt{Z_x}$. The latter gives rise to a bistochastic channel. As a consequence, the composition $(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}^L) \circ \mathcal{E}$ is also bistochastic, so that the sufficient condition Eq. (9) is always fulfilled. In other words, the second law does not impose a hard constraint on *what* instruments can be implemented, only on *how* they are implemented.

3.2. Compatibility with the third law

The third law of thermodynamics, or Nernst's unattainability principle, states that in the absence of infinite resources one may not cool systems to absolute zero [22-25]. As discussed in [12], the third law can be operationally characterized as constraining the set of physically realizable channels to strictly positive ones. Since state preparations are also expressible as channels mapping from a trivial system to a non-trivial one, this also implies that the only state preparations that are compatible with the third law are strictly positive. This leads us to the following definition:

Definition 3. A measurement process $\mathcal{M} \coloneqq (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}, \xi, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{J})$ is said to be compatible with the third law of thermodynamics if and only if ξ is a strictly positive state on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and \mathcal{E} is a strictly positive channel acting in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$. An instrument \mathcal{I} acting in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is compatible with the third law if and only if it admits a measurement process that is compatible with the third law [12].

As shown in item (iv) of Lemma D.1 in Ref. [12], an instrument \mathcal{I} is compatible with the third law only if \mathcal{I} is strictly positive. Hence, as a consequence of Lemma 2.1, the only quasicomplete instruments compatible with the third law are efficient instruments with a strictly positive observable, that is:

quasicomplete & third law \implies efficient & strictly positive E.

Equivalently, an instrument whose corresponding observable is *not* strictly positive cannot be quasicomplete and at the same time satisfy the third law of thermodynamics. In particular, this implies that non-trivial projective observables, i.e., observables for which the E_x are mutually orthogonal projections, cannot be measured in a purity-preserving way: this is because such observables cannot be strictly positive.

3.3. Compatibility with both laws: a no-go theorem

As discussed above, an adiabatically implemented channel Λ satisfies the second law of thermodynamics if and only if it does not decrease the entropy of any possible input state. Consequently, if the maximally mixed state is a possible input, then Λ is compatible with the second law if and only if it is bistochastic. This follows because bistochastic channels, by definition, do not decrease the entropy of any state, while any non-bistochastic channel must decrease the entropy of the maximally mixed state, which has the highest possible entropy of any state in the system [21].

Recall now that the measurement process is modelled as a sequential, adiabatic application of two channels. First, the premeasurement channel \mathcal{E} , acting in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$, prepares the system and the apparatus in a correlated state. This is followed by the action of the channel $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}$ arising from the instrument \mathcal{J} that implements the objectification mechanism acting in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Following von Neumann's famous discussion of the measurement process [2], it seems natural to consider these two channels separately, as two independent physical processes capable of taking as input any state of the system and apparatus. See Fig. 1, left panel, for a schematic representation. From this point of view it follows that for the entire measurement process to be compatible with the second law, the channels \mathcal{E} and $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}$ must each be bistochastic.

The above discussion leads us to our first main result, which is that a thermodynamically compatible adiabatic measurement process, such that the premeasurement channel can be considered as an independent physical process, can *never* implement a quasicomplete instrument. **Theorem 3.1** (No-Go Theorem). Let $\mathcal{M} := (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}, \xi, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{J})$ be a measurement process for an E-compatible instrument $\mathcal{I} := \{\mathcal{I}_x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ acting in \mathcal{H}_s . Assume that (i) \mathcal{E} is bistochastic, and (ii) that ξ is strictly positive. It follows that any operation \mathcal{I}_x , that is compatible with a non-trivial effect E_x , cannot be purity-preserving.

It should be clear that the first requirement is to satisfy the second law, while the second requirement is to satisfy the third law. On the other hand, an operation compatible with a trivial effect provides no information about the system being measured, and can therefore be ignored. In fact, since the third law requires that the operations of the instrument be strictly positive, Lemma 2.1 implies that if an operation \mathcal{I}_x is compatible with a trivial effect $E_x = p(x)\mathbb{1}_s$, then it is purity preserving only if it is proportional to a unitary channel, i.e, $\mathcal{I}_x(\cdot) = p(x)U_x \cdot U_x^*$.

Before we prove the above theorem, we shall first prove the following useful lemma:

Lemma 3.2. Let $\mathcal{M} \coloneqq (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}, \xi, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{J})$ be a measurement process for an instrument \mathcal{I} acting in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Assume that ξ is strictly positive. For any outcome x such that \mathcal{I}_x is purity-preserving, it holds that

$$\mathcal{E}^*(\bullet \otimes Z_x) = \mathcal{I}^*_x(\bullet) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

We recall that Z is the observable compatible with the apparatus instrument \mathcal{J} .

Proof. If ξ is strictly positive, then for an arbitrary unit vector $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$, there exists a $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that $\xi > \lambda |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$. Defining the state $\sigma := (\xi - \lambda |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|)/(1 - \lambda)$, we may thus decompose ξ as $\xi = \lambda |\phi\rangle\langle\phi| + (1 - \lambda)\sigma$. By (1), and the fact that for any decomposition $\xi = \sum_i q_i \xi_i$ it holds that $\Gamma_{\xi}(\cdot) = \sum_i q_i \Gamma_{\xi_i}(\cdot)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_x^*(\bullet) &= \Gamma_{\xi} \circ \mathcal{E}^*(\bullet \otimes Z_x) \\ &= \lambda \Gamma_{|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|} \circ \mathcal{E}^*(\bullet \otimes Z_x) + (1-\lambda)\Gamma_{\sigma} \circ \mathcal{E}^*(\bullet \otimes Z_x) \\ &= \lambda \mathcal{I}_x^{\phi^*}(\bullet) + (1-\lambda)\mathcal{I}_x^{\sigma^*}(\bullet), \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined $\mathcal{I}_x^{\phi^*}(\cdot) \coloneqq \Gamma_{|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|} \circ \mathcal{E}^*(\cdot \otimes Z_x)$ and $\mathcal{I}_x^{\sigma^*}(\cdot) \coloneqq \Gamma_{\sigma} \circ \mathcal{E}^*(\cdot \otimes Z_x)$. By the trace duality it holds that $\mathcal{I}_x(\cdot) = \lambda \mathcal{I}_x^{\phi}(\cdot) + (1-\lambda)\mathcal{I}_x^{\sigma}(\cdot)$. Since \mathcal{I}_x is assumed to be purity-preserving, then for every pure state ρ on \mathcal{H}_s it must hold that $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \mathcal{I}_x^{\phi}(\rho) = \mathcal{I}_x^{\sigma}(\rho)$, since if it were otherwise then $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)$ would be mixed. By linearity, it follows that $\mathcal{I}_x(\cdot) = \mathcal{I}_x^{\phi}(\cdot)$ for all unit vectors $|\phi\rangle$ in \mathcal{H}_A . Therefore,

$$\mathcal{I}_x^*(\bullet) = \Gamma_{|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|} \circ \mathcal{E}^*(\bullet \otimes Z_x)$$

must hold for arbitrary unit vectors $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Writing an arbitrary state $\varrho = \sum_{i} q_{i} |\phi_{i}\rangle\langle\phi_{i}|$, it follows that

$$\mathcal{I}_x^*(\bullet) = \sum_i q_i \Gamma_{|\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|} \circ \mathcal{E}^*(\bullet \otimes Z_x) = \Gamma_\varrho \circ \mathcal{E}^*(\bullet \otimes Z_x)$$

must hold for any state ρ on \mathcal{H}_{A} . As shown in Lemma I.2 of Ref. [12], for any $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{S} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A})$ and $B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{S})$ such that $B = \Gamma_{\rho}(A)$ for any choice of ρ , it holds that $A = B \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A}$. This completes the proof. \Box

Now we may prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Assume that ξ is strictly positive, and that for some x, the operation \mathcal{I}_x is puritypreserving. By Lemma 3.2 it holds that $\mathcal{E}^*(\bullet \otimes Z_x) = \mathcal{I}^*_x(\bullet) \otimes \mathbb{1}_A$. Assume that \mathcal{E} is bistochastic, so that \mathcal{E}^* preserves the trace. Then for every state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}})$ it holds that

$$\operatorname{tr}[\rho \otimes Z_x] = \operatorname{tr}[\mathcal{E}^*(\rho \otimes Z_x)] = \operatorname{tr}[\mathcal{I}^*_x(\rho) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}]$$

and so

$$\operatorname{tr}[\mathcal{I}_x^*(\rho)] = \frac{\operatorname{tr}[Z_x]}{\dim(\mathcal{H}_A)} \qquad \forall \, \rho.$$

Since ξ is strictly positive and \mathcal{E} is bistochastic, and hence strictly positive, then by item (iv) of Lemma D.1 in Ref. [12], \mathcal{I}_x is strictly positive. Since we assume that \mathcal{I}_x is purity-preserving, then by Lemma 2.1 we may write $\mathcal{I}_x^*(\cdot) = \sqrt{E_x}U_x^* \cdot U_x\sqrt{E_x}$, with U_x a unitary operator. It follows that

$$\operatorname{tr}[U_x E_x U_x^* \rho] = \frac{\operatorname{tr}[Z_x]}{\dim(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}})} \qquad \forall \, \rho.$$

Note that $U_x E_x U_x^*$ is an effect, which is trivial if and only if E_x is trivial. Since the right hand side is independent of ρ , it follows that E_x must be trivial.

Theorem 3.1 immediately leads to the following corollary:

Corollary 3.1. Consider a measurement process $\mathcal{M} \coloneqq (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}, \xi, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{J})$ for an instrument \mathcal{I} acting in \mathcal{H}_s . Assume that the corresponding system observable E is non-trivial, that \mathcal{E} is bistochastic, and that ξ is strictly positive. The following hold:

- (i) \mathcal{I} is not a purity-preserving instrument; in particular, it is not an efficient instrument.
- (ii) Every operation $\mathcal{I}_x(\cdot)$ that is compatible with a non-trivial effect E_x has a minimal Kraus representation with at least two Kraus operators.
- (iii) There exists some state ρ such that the GLO information gain $I_{\text{GLO}}(\mathcal{I}, \rho)$ is strictly negative.

4. GETTING PAST THE NO-GO THEOREM

Let us consider again the measurement process in closer detail. Recall from Eq. (1) that for each outcome x, the operations that are implemented by the process $\mathcal{M} := (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}, \xi, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{J})$ read

$$\mathcal{I}_{x}(\boldsymbol{\cdot}_{\mathcal{S}}) \coloneqq \left[\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \circ (\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{x}) \circ \mathcal{E} \right] (\boldsymbol{\cdot}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \xi_{\mathcal{A}}).$$

Now note that $(\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{J}_x) \circ \mathcal{E}$ are operations that add up to a channel $(\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{J}_x) \circ \mathcal{E}$. That is, the collection of these operations forms an instrument that acts in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$. While we have so far considered the measurement process as resulting from a sequential application of the premeasurement channel \mathcal{E} followed by the operations of the objectification instrument \mathcal{J} , we can actually consider the measurement process as an *indecomposable whole*, in which the premeasurement and objectification steps are not separated. That is, we may represent the measurement process as $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} := (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}, \xi, \Theta)$, with $\Theta := \{\Theta_x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ an instrument acting in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$, so that

$$\mathcal{I}_x(\bullet_{\mathcal{S}}) = \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \Theta_x(\bullet_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \xi).$$

In such a case, while Θ_x can be identified with $(\mathrm{id}_s \otimes \mathcal{J}_x) \circ \mathcal{E}$, such an identification is purely formal. It is then easy to see that compatibility with the second law is guaranteed if $\Theta_{\mathcal{X}} = (\mathrm{id}_s \otimes \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}) \circ \mathcal{E}$ is bistochastic, which in general does not require that \mathcal{E} itself be bistochastic (see Remark 3.1). Moreover, compatibility with the third law will be satisfied if $\Theta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a strictly positive channel, which is guaranteed to be the case when $\Theta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is bistochastic.

Another subtlety is that in the measurement process, while the initial state ρ of the system to be measured is arbitrary, the initial state ξ of the apparatus is *fixed*. Consequently, the set of possible input states for the measurement process is in fact the proper subset $\mathscr{S} := \mathscr{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}) \otimes \xi \subsetneq \mathscr{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}})$. Therefore, it may be the case that even if the (formally composite) channel $\Theta_{\mathcal{X}} = (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}) \circ \mathcal{E}$ is *not* bistochastic, it still does not decrease the entropy for all states in \mathscr{S} . In such a case, the necessary and sufficient condition for the "integrated" measurement process $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ to satisfy the second law, Eq. (9), is still satisfied.

We are now ready to present our second main result: if an observable E is strictly positive, then every efficient E-compatible instrument can be implemented in a manner that adheres to the third law of thermodynamics and respects the second law when the measurement process is considered as a whole, taking into account that it accesses only a restricted set of states on the compound system.

Theorem 4.1. Let E be a strictly positive observable on \mathcal{H}_s . For each efficient E -compatible instrument acting in \mathcal{H}_s of the form

$$\mathcal{I}_x(\bullet) = U_x \sqrt{E_x}(\bullet) \sqrt{E_x} U_x^* ,$$

for arbitrary unitary operators U_x , there exists a corresponding measurement process $\mathcal{M} \coloneqq (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}, \xi, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{J})$, with \mathcal{E} a (rank non-decreasing) strictly positive but non-bistochastic channel and ξ a strictly positive state, that satisfies Eq. (9) for all states $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_s)$. Furthermore, if $U_x = U$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then the measurement process can be chosen so that $(\mathrm{id}_s \otimes \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}) \circ \mathcal{E}$ is a bistochastic channel.

Simply put, the above theorem states that if we allow a departure from the conventional unitary interaction measurement model, then, as long as the measured observable is strictly positive, i.e., $\mathbb{O} < E_x < \mathbb{1}_S$ for all outcomes x:

- 1. the square-root instrument, i.e., the one where $U_x = U$ for all x, can be realized in a completely thermodynamically compatible manner, i.e., by means of a model that always obeys the second and third laws, regardless of the states of the system and apparatus;
- 2. other efficient instruments can also be realized, but in general the model will be thermodynamically compatible only for a fixed apparatus state.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. To prove the claim, we use the measurement process introduced in Corollary D.1 of Ref. [12], which is as follows: identify the value space as $\mathcal{X} := \{x = 0, ..., N - 1\}$ where $N = |\mathcal{X}|$ is the number of measurement outcomes. Choose the apparatus Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$ so that $\dim(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}) = N$, and let $\{|x\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}} : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ be an orthonormal basis. Choose the apparatus preparation ξ so that it is strictly positive. Choose the pointer observable as $\mathsf{Z} := \{Z_x = |x\rangle\langle x| : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$, and the instrument which measures it as $\mathcal{J}_x(\cdot) = \langle x| \cdot |x\rangle \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}/N$, i.e., a measure-and-prepare instrument which prepares the apparatus in the complete mixture. Each operation of this instrument is evidently strictly positive, and so too is the corresponding channel $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}(\cdot) = \operatorname{tr}[\cdot]\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}/N$. In fact, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a rank non-decreasing channel. And finally, choose the interaction channel as $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_2 \circ \mathcal{E}_1$, where \mathcal{E}_1 admits a Kraus representation $\{K_x\}$ given as

$$K_x \coloneqq \sum_{a=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{E_{x \oplus a}} \otimes |x \oplus a\rangle \langle a|$$

with \oplus denoting addition modulo N, and \mathcal{E}_2 satisfies

$$\mathcal{E}_2(A \otimes B) \coloneqq \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} U_x A U_x^* \otimes |x\rangle \langle x|B|x\rangle \langle x|$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_s)$ and $B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$. Note that \mathcal{E}_2 is bistochastic, and hence rank non-decreasing. On the other hand, note that $K_0 = \sum_x \sqrt{E_x} \otimes |x\rangle \langle x|$, and since E is strictly positive, there exists an inverse $K_0^{-1} = \sum_x \sqrt{E_x}^{-1} \otimes |x\rangle \langle x|$ such that $K_0 K_0^{-1} = K_0^{-1} K_0 = \mathbb{1}_s \otimes \mathbb{1}_A$. For this reason, it clearly holds that $K_0 \rho K_0^*$ has equal rank to ρ for any state ρ on $\mathcal{H}_s \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$. To see this, let us write $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|$, where $|\psi_i\rangle$ are mutually orthogonal eigenvectors, and hence linearly independent. That is, $\sum_i c_i |\psi_i\rangle = \emptyset$, with \emptyset the null vector, if and only if $c_i = 0$ for all i. But $K_0 \rho K_0^* = \sum_i p_i K_0 |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i| K_0^*$, and since K_0 is invertible, it follows that $K_0 |\psi_i\rangle$ are also linearly independent; if $\sum_i c_i K_0 |\psi_i\rangle = \emptyset$, then $\sum_i c_i K_0^{-1} K_0 |\psi_i\rangle = \sum_i c_i |\psi_i\rangle = \emptyset$, which holds if and only if $c_i = 0$ for all i. Now note that $\mathcal{E}_1(\rho) = \sum_x K_x \rho K_x^* \ge K_0 \rho K_0^*$. But since $\mathcal{E}_1(\rho)$ and $K_0 \rho K_0^*$ are positive, this implies that rank $(\mathcal{E}_1(\rho)) \ge \operatorname{rank}(K_0 \rho K_0^*) = \operatorname{rank}(\rho)$. As such, \mathcal{E}_1 is a rank non-decreasing channel. Since the composition of rank non-decreasing channels is also rank non-decreasing, it follows that $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_2 \circ \mathcal{E}_1$ is a rank non-decreasing channel, and hence strictly positive. Indeed, the full channel (id_s \otimes \mathcal{J}_x) \circ \mathcal{E} is also strictly positive. This measurement process is therefore compatible with the third law.

For any $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}})$ and $B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}})$, \mathcal{E} acts as

$$\mathcal{E}(A \otimes B) = \sum_{x,y,a,b} U_x \sqrt{E_{y \oplus a}} A \sqrt{E_{y \oplus b}} U_x^* \otimes |x\rangle \langle x|y \oplus a\rangle \langle a|B|b\rangle \langle y \oplus b|x\rangle \langle x|$$

$$= \sum_{x,y,a,b} U_x \sqrt{E_{y \oplus a}} A \sqrt{E_{y \oplus b}} U_x^* \otimes |x\rangle \langle a|B|b\rangle \langle x|\delta_{x,y \oplus a} \delta_{x,y \oplus b}$$

$$= \sum_{x,a} U_x \sqrt{E_x} A \sqrt{E_x} U_x^* \otimes |x\rangle \langle a|B|a\rangle \langle x|$$

$$= \sum_x U_x \sqrt{E_x} A \sqrt{E_x} U_x^* \otimes \operatorname{tr}[B]|x\rangle \langle x|.$$
(10)

It is easily verified that

$$(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}}\otimes\mathcal{J}_x)\circ\mathcal{E}(A\otimes B) = U_x\sqrt{E_x}A\sqrt{E_x}U_x^*\otimes\mathrm{tr}[B]\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}}{N} = \mathcal{I}_x(A)\otimes\mathrm{tr}[B]\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}}{N}.$$
(11)

Note that

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}\otimes\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}})=N\sum_{x=0}^{N-1}U_{x}E_{x}U_{x}^{*}\otimes|x\rangle\langle x|,$$

which is never equal to $\mathbb{1}_{s} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A}$ for any non-trivial observable E. That is, \mathcal{E} is not bistochastic when E is non-trivial. Indeed, bistochasticity of such a channel is achieved only in the case where $E_{x} = \mathbb{1}_{s}/N$ for all x. But if we choose $U_{x} = U$ for all x, Eq. (11) gives us

$$(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}) \circ \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \sum_{x} U \sqrt{E_{x}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}} \sqrt{E_{x}} U^{*} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$$
$$= \sum_{x} U E_{x} U^{*} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$$
$$= U \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}} U^{*} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}},$$

and so $(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}) \circ \mathcal{E}$ is a bistochastic channel.

By Eq. (4) and Eq. (11), for any prior system state ρ , and any apparatus preparation ξ , the posterior states of system and apparatus read

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{A}}^{x} = \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}^{x} \otimes \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^{x} \equiv \frac{1}{p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x)} \mathcal{I}_{x}(\rho) \otimes \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}}{N}.$$

It follows that the mutual information $I(S : A)_{\sigma^x}$ vanishes. Now note that since $\sigma_A^x = \mathbb{1}_A/N$ for all x, and since the complete mixture has a strictly larger entropy than every other state, it trivially holds that $I_{\text{GLO}}(\Phi^{\rho},\xi) \leq 0$ for all prior system states ρ . Indeed, one may also easily verify that $\Phi_x^{\rho}(\cdot) = p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x)\mathbb{1}_A/N$. Furthermore, since \mathcal{I} is efficient, then $\sigma_S^x = U_x \tilde{\sigma}_S^x U_x^*$, where $\tilde{\sigma}_S^x \coloneqq \mathcal{I}_x^L(\rho)/p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x)$ with $\mathcal{I}_x^L(\cdot) \coloneqq \sqrt{E_x} \cdot \sqrt{E_x}$ the generalized Lüders instrument. Since the von Neumann entropy is invariant under unitary evolution, and since $I_{\text{GLO}}(\Phi^{\rho},\xi) \leq 0$ for all prior system states ρ , the inequality

$$\mathscr{H}(p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}) \ge I_{\mathrm{GLO}}(\mathcal{I},\rho) \equiv I_{\mathrm{GLO}}(\mathcal{I}^{L},\rho)$$
(12)

implies the sufficient condition for compatibility with the second law, Eq. (9). But note that, in the case of the generalized Lüders instrument, the states $\tilde{\sigma}_s^x$ are unitarily equivalent to $\sqrt{\rho}E_x\sqrt{\rho}/p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x)$, as a straightforward application of the polar decomposition shows. Thus,

$$\begin{split} I_{\rm GLO}(\mathcal{I}^L,\rho) &= S(\rho) - \sum_x p_{\rho}^{\sf E}(x) S(\tilde{\sigma}_{\mathcal{S}}^x) \\ &= S(\rho) - \sum_x p_{\rho}^{\sf E}(x) S(\sqrt{\rho} E_x \sqrt{\rho} / p_{\rho}^{\sf E}(x)) \\ &= \chi(\{p_{\rho}^{\sf E}(x), \sqrt{\rho} E_x \sqrt{\rho} / p_{\rho}^{\sf E}(x)\}) \end{split}$$

where $\chi(\{p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x), \sqrt{\rho}E_x\sqrt{\rho}/p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x)\})$ is the Holevo χ -quantity for the ensemble $\{p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x), \sqrt{\rho}E_x\sqrt{\rho}/p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}}(x)\}$, which is known to be upper bounded by $\mathscr{H}(p_{\rho}^{\mathsf{E}})$, so that, indeed, the inequality in Eq. (12), and hence in Eq. (9), holds for all ρ .

5. THE TRILEMMA FOR MEASUREMENT PROCESSES

The combination of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.1 leads to a fundamental trilemma for measurement processes, i.e., three conditions that cannot be simultaneously satisfied in any quantum measurement process:

Corollary 5.1. Let E be a non-trivial observable on \mathcal{H}_s , and let $\mathcal{M} := (\mathcal{H}_A, \xi, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{J})$ be a measurement process implementing an instrument \mathcal{I} that is compatible with E . Then at least one of the following statements must be false:

- (i) The measurement process \mathcal{M} is compatible with thermodynamics.
- (ii) The premeasurement interaction \mathcal{E} can be treated as an autonomous physical process, acting on all possible states in $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_s \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)$.
- (iii) The instrument \mathcal{I} is quasicomplete.

A necessary precondition for even formulating (i)—even before demanding its compatibility with the second and third laws of thermodynamics—is that the measurement process is thermodynamically closable,

meaning that it can be analyzed as a self-contained physical system obeying thermodynamic laws. This requires that all *independent subprocesses* constituting the measurement process \mathcal{M} be adiabatic. The role of condition (*ii*) is crucial here: if we assume that the premeasurement interaction \mathcal{E} is autonomous, then premeasurement and objectification are logically distinct processes, meaning that both \mathcal{E} and the objectification channels $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}$ must be individually adiabatic. However, if we abandon (*ii*), so that premeasurement and objectification are not independent processes, then only the full channel ($\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}$) $\circ \mathcal{E}$ needs to be adiabatic.

Now, if both (i) and (ii) hold, then by the second law \mathcal{E} must be bistochastic, and by the third law ξ must be strictly positive, in which case we must abandon (iii). If both (i) and (iii) hold, then ξ must be strictly positive, but \mathcal{E} must be a non-bistochastic strictly positive channel, so we must abandon (ii). If both (i) and (iii) hold, then either ξ must be rank-deficient (e.g., a pure state), or \mathcal{E} cannot be bistochastic, or we must abandon the assumption of adiabaticity, which precludes the thermodynamic analysis of the measurement process from the outset. In each case, we must abandon (i).

The above trilemma reveals a fundamental tension between the thermodynamic constraints on measurement, the physical autonomy of quantum systems and processes, and the structure of quantum operations. Any pairwise combination of these assumptions leads to a contradiction with the remaining third, demonstrating that some conventional assumptions about quantum measurements and their physical implementation must be relaxed. In particular, *if we want to believe that efficient instruments can be implemented without violating the laws of thermodynamics, we are forced to abandon the unitary interaction measurement model and accept as fact the existence of non-purifiable, thermodynamically closed processes.* This seems to resonate with recent work criticizing the prevailing reductionist view in physics, according to which any phenomenon can always be seen as a reduction from a larger, autonomous process [26–29]. A careful examination of this point is beyond the scope of this paper, and we leave it open for further study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

M. H. M. acknowledges funding provided by the IMPULZ program of the Slovak Academy of Sciences under the Agreement on the Provision of Funds No. IM-2023-79 (OPQUT), as well as from projects VEGA 2/0164/25 (QUAS) and APVV-22-0570 (DeQHOST). 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, Grant No. 23K03230.

^[1] H. B. Callen, Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics (John Wiley and sons, 1991).

^[2] J. von Neumann, Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics: New Edition (Princeton University Press, 2018).

^[3] M. Neumark, Spectral functions of a symmetric operator, Izv. Math. 4, 227 (1940).

^[4] W. F. Stinespring, Positive Functions on C* -Algebras, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. 6, 211 (1955).

^[5] J. P. Gordon and W. H. Louisell, Simultaneous Measurements of Noncommuting Observables, in *Phys. Quantum Electron. Conf. Proc.*, edited by P. Kelley, P.L. and Lax, B. and Tannenwald (McGraw-Hill, 1966) pp. 833–840.

^[6] F. Riesz and B. Sz.-Nagy, Functional Analysis (Dover Publications, 1990).

^[7] M. Ozawa, Quantum measuring processes of continuous observables, J. Math. Phys. 25, 79 (1984).

^[8] M. Ozawa, On information gain by quantum measurements of continuous observables, J. Math. Phys. 27, 759 (1986).

^[9] K. Jacobs, Second law of thermodynamics and quantum feedback control: Maxwell's demon with weak measurements, Phys. Rev. A 80, 012322 (2009).

- [10] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- [11] Y. Guryanova, N. Friis, and M. Huber, Ideal Projective Measurements Have Infinite Resource Costs, Quantum 4, 222 (2020).
- [12] M. H. Mohammady and T. Miyadera, Quantum measurements constrained by the third law of thermodynamics, Phys. Rev. A 107, 022406 (2023).
- [13] F. Buscemi, M. Keyl, G. M. D'Ariano, P. Perinotti, and R. F. Werner, Clean positive operator valued measures, J. Math. Phys. 46, 082109 (2005).
- [14] E. B. Davies, Quantum Theory of Open Systems (Academic Press, 1976).
- [15] F. vom Ende, Strict positivity and D -majorization, Linear Multilinear Algebr. 70, 4023 (2022).
- [16] H. J. Groenewold, A problem of information gain by quantal measurements, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 4, 327 (1971).
- [17] G. Lindblad, An entropy inequality for quantum measurements, Commun. Math. Phys. 28, 245 (1972).
- [18] P. Strasberg, Thermodynamics of Quantum Causal Models: An Inclusive, Hamiltonian Approach, Quantum 4, 240 (2020).
- [19] C. L Latune and C. Elouard, A thermodynamically consistent approach to the energy costs of quantum measurements, Quantum 9, 1614 (2025).
- [20] S. Minagawa, M. H. Mohammady, K. Sakai, K. Kato, and F. Buscemi, Universal validity of the second law of information thermodynamics, npj Quantum Inf. 11, 18 (2025).
- [21] T. Purves and A. J. Short, Channels, measurements, and postselection in quantum thermodynamics, Phys. Rev. E 104, 014111 (2021).
- [22] L. J. Schulman, T. Mor, and Y. Weinstein, Physical Limits of Heat-Bath Algorithmic Cooling, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 120501 (2005).
- [23] A. E. Allahverdyan, K. V. Hovhannisyan, D. Janzing, and G. Mahler, Thermodynamic limits of dynamic cooling, Phys. Rev. E 84, 041109 (2011).
- [24] N. Freitas, R. Gallego, L. Masanes, and J. P. Paz, Cooling to Absolute Zero: The Unattainability Principle, in *Thermodyn. Quantum Regime Fundam. Theor. Phys.*, Vol. 195, edited by F. Binder, L. Correa, C. Gogolin, J. Anders, and G. Adesso (Springer International Publishing, 2018) pp. 597–622.
- [25] P. Taranto, F. Bakhshinezhad, A. Bluhm, R. Silva, N. Friis, M. P. Lock, G. Vitagliano, F. C. Binder, T. Debarba, E. Schwarzhans, F. Clivaz, and M. Huber, Landauer Versus Nernst: What is the True Cost of Cooling a Quantum System?, PRX Quantum 4, 010332 (2023).
- [26] G. M. D'Ariano, No Purification Ontology, No Quantum Paradoxes, Found. Phys. 50, 1921 (2020).
- [27] M. E. Cuffaro and S. Hartmann, The Open Systems View, Philos. Phys. 2, 365 (2024).
- [28] D. Wallace, Quantum systems other than the universe (2024), arXiv:2406.13058 [physics.hist-ph].
- [29] E. K. Chen, Density matrix realism (2024), arXiv:2405.01025 [quant-ph].