

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

---

# The Entropic Time Constraint: An Operational Bound on Information Processing Speed

---

[Amir Hameed Mir](#)\*

Posted Date: 18 December 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202512.1654.v1

Keywords: stochastic thermodynamics; quantum measurement; Landauer's principle; quantum speed limits; finite-time thermodynamics; entropy production; quantum computation; dissipation timescale; information processing speed; thermodynamic uncertainty relations



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#), which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

# The Entropic Time Constraint: An Operational Bound on Information Processing Speed

Amir Hameed Mir

Quantum Division, Sirraya Labs, India; aamirmir001@gmail.com

## Abstract

We derive an operationally defined lower bound on the physical time  $\Delta t$  required to execute any information-processing task, based on the total entropy produced  $\Delta\Sigma$ . The central result,  $\Delta t \geq \tau_\Sigma \Delta\Sigma$ , introduces the *Process-Dependent Dissipation Timescale*  $\tau_\Sigma \equiv 1/\langle\dot{\Sigma}\rangle_{\max}$ , which quantifies the maximum achievable entropy production rate for a given physical platform. We derive  $\tau_\Sigma$  from microscopic system-bath models and validate our framework against experimental data from superconducting qubit platforms. Crucially, we obtain a *Measurement Entropic Time Bound*:  $\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \geq \tau_\Sigma k_B [H(P) - S(\rho)]$ , relating measurement time to information gained. Comparison with IBM and Google quantum processors shows agreement within experimental uncertainties. This framework provides a thermodynamic interpretation of quantum advantage as reduced entropy production per logical inference and suggests concrete optimization strategies for quantum hardware design.

**Keywords:** stochastic thermodynamics; quantum measurement; Landauer's principle; quantum speed limits; finite-time thermodynamics; entropy production; quantum computation; dissipation timescale; information processing speed; thermodynamic uncertainty relations

## 1. Introduction

The fundamental trade-offs between time, energy dissipation, and information processing have emerged as central themes in nonequilibrium thermodynamics [1]. While Landauer's principle establishes an *energetic* cost for irreversible bit erasure [2], and quantum speed limits bound coherent evolution times through energy-time uncertainty relations [3,4], a unified operational bound linking processing duration directly to entropy production has remained elusive. Such a bound is crucial for understanding the ultimate limitations on computation, both classical and quantum, and for guiding the design of energy-efficient computing architectures.

Recent advances in stochastic thermodynamics [5] and finite-time thermodynamics [6] have revealed intricate trade-offs between speed, dissipation, and accuracy. However, a general inequality connecting processing time to total entropy production for *arbitrary* information-processing tasks has not been systematically developed with microscopic justification. This work bridges that gap by:

- Deriving rigorous bounds directly from the Second Law with operational definitions
- Establishing microscopic foundations for  $\tau_\Sigma$  from system-bath models
- Providing detailed measurement theory connecting information gain to dissipation time
- Validating predictions against existing experimental data from superconducting qubits
- Demonstrating concrete applications to quantum algorithm analysis and hardware optimization

We demonstrate that for any physical process implementing a logical transformation, the minimum time  $\Delta t$  is bounded by the total entropy produced  $\Delta\Sigma$  scaled by a hardware-specific timescale  $\tau_\Sigma$ . For quantum systems, this yields testable predictions about measurement timing that we compare with published experimental data.

## 2. Mathematical Foundation

### 2.1. Total Entropy Production Rate

Consider an open quantum system coupled to a thermal environment at temperature  $T$ . The total entropy production rate  $\dot{\Sigma}(t)$  is defined by the change in combined system-environment entropy:

$$\dot{\Sigma}(t) = \frac{dS_{\text{tot}}}{dt} = \frac{dS_{\text{sys}}}{dt} + \frac{dS_{\text{env}}}{dt} \geq 0, \quad (1)$$

where  $S_{\text{sys}} = -k_B \text{Tr}(\rho \ln \rho)$  is the von Neumann entropy of the system density matrix  $\rho$ , and  $S_{\text{env}}$  is the environmental entropy. The inequality in Eq. (1) is the Second Law expressed locally in time [5].

For a weak-coupling regime with Markovian dynamics, the environmental entropy change relates to heat flow:  $dS_{\text{env}} = \delta Q/T$ , where  $\delta Q$  is the infinitesimal heat transferred to the bath. This allows operational measurement of  $\dot{\Sigma}(t)$  through calorimetry combined with measurement of system entropy.

### 2.2. The Process Time Bound

For a process executing a logical transformation over time interval  $\Delta t$ , the total entropy produced is:

$$\Delta\Sigma = \int_0^{\Delta t} \dot{\Sigma}(t) dt. \quad (2)$$

The average entropy production rate is  $\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle = \Delta\Sigma/\Delta t$ . To obtain the minimum time for a given  $\Delta\Sigma$ , we maximize this average rate:

$$\Delta t \geq \frac{\Delta\Sigma}{\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\text{max}}}. \quad (3)$$

Equation (3) is the starting point of our analysis—a direct mathematical consequence of the definitions. The non-trivial content lies in determining  $\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\text{max}}$  from physical principles, which we address in the following sections.

### 2.3. The Process-Dependent Dissipation Timescale $\tau_\Sigma$

We define the *Process-Dependent Dissipation Timescale*:

$$\tau_\Sigma := \frac{1}{\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\text{max}}}. \quad (4)$$

Here,  $\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\text{max}}$  denotes the supremum of the time-averaged entropy production rate achievable for a given process on a specific hardware platform, subject to its intrinsic physical constraints. Substituting Eq. (4) into Eq. (3) yields our central result:

$$\Delta t \geq \tau_\Sigma \Delta\Sigma. \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) is the *Entropic Time Constraint*: the minimum time for any information-processing task is bounded by the total entropy produced, scaled by the intrinsic dissipation speed of the hardware.

## 3. Microscopic Derivation of $\tau_\Sigma$

### 3.1. System-Bath Model

To give  $\tau_\Sigma$  microscopic foundation, consider a two-level system (qubit) coupled to a bosonic thermal bath. The system Hamiltonian is  $H_S = \frac{\hbar\omega_0}{2}\sigma_z$ , and the interaction is:

$$H_I = \sigma_x \otimes \sum_k g_k (b_k + b_k^\dagger), \quad (6)$$

where  $\sigma_x$  is the Pauli-X operator,  $b_k$  are bath oscillator modes with frequencies  $\omega_k$ , and  $g_k$  are coupling strengths characterized by the spectral density:

$$J(\omega) = \sum_k |g_k|^2 \delta(\omega - \omega_k). \quad (7)$$

For an Ohmic bath with cutoff,  $J(\omega) = \alpha \omega e^{-\omega/\omega_c}$ , where  $\alpha$  is the dimensionless coupling strength and  $\omega_c$  is the cutoff frequency. In the weak-coupling, Markovian limit (Born-Markov approximation), the dynamics obey a Lindblad master equation [7]:

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H_S, \rho] + \sum_\mu \gamma_\mu \mathcal{D}[L_\mu] \rho, \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}[L]\rho = L\rho L^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{L^\dagger L, \rho\}$  is the Lindblad superoperator, and  $\gamma_\mu$  are damping rates.

### 3.2. Entropy Production Rate from Lindblad Dynamics

For the damping process with jump operators  $L_\mu$ , the entropy production rate can be computed as [8]:

$$\dot{\Sigma}(t) = k_B \sum_\mu \gamma_\mu \text{Tr} \left[ L_\mu \rho L_\mu^\dagger \ln \left( \frac{L_\mu \rho L_\mu^\dagger}{\rho} \right) \right]. \quad (9)$$

For amplitude damping at rate  $\gamma = \gamma_1$  with  $L = \sigma_-$  (lowering operator), and an initial excited state  $\rho(0) = |1\rangle\langle 1|$ , the instantaneous entropy production rate is:

$$\dot{\Sigma}(t) = k_B \gamma \rho_{11}(t) \ln \left( \frac{\bar{n} + 1}{\bar{n}} \right), \quad (10)$$

where  $\rho_{11}(t) = e^{-\gamma t}$  is the excited state population and  $\bar{n} = [\exp(\hbar\omega_0/k_B T) - 1]^{-1}$  is the thermal occupation number. For low temperature ( $\bar{n} \ll 1$ ), this simplifies to:

$$\dot{\Sigma}(t) \approx k_B \gamma e^{-\gamma t}. \quad (11)$$

### 3.3. Computing $\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\max}$

The time-averaged entropy production rate over the relaxation process is:

$$\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_0^{\Delta t} k_B \gamma e^{-\gamma t} dt = \frac{k_B \gamma}{\gamma \Delta t} (1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta t}). \quad (12)$$

For short times  $\Delta t \ll 1/\gamma$ , this approaches  $\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle \rightarrow k_B$ , independent of  $\Delta t$ . However, physical constraints limit the minimum achievable process time. The maximum instantaneous rate occurs at  $t = 0$ :

$$\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{inst}, \max} = k_B \gamma. \quad (13)$$

For processes that must complete (e.g., measurement), we require  $\Delta t \gtrsim 1/\gamma$  for substantial state change. Taking the characteristic time as  $\Delta t_{\text{char}} = 1/\gamma$ , the average rate becomes:

$$\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\max} \sim k_B \gamma (1 - e^{-1}) \approx 0.63 k_B \gamma, \quad (14)$$

giving:

$$\tau_\Sigma \sim \frac{1.6}{k_B \gamma}. \quad (15)$$

### 3.4. Physical Constraints on $\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\max}$

Multiple independent dissipation channels contribute to the maximum entropy production rate. For a general quantum system, we can identify:

**Thermal dissipation:** Heat flow through thermal conductance  $\kappa$  with temperature gradient  $\Delta T$  produces entropy at rate:

$$\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{thermal}} = \kappa \frac{(\Delta T)^2}{T^2}. \quad (16)$$

**Joule heating:** For measurement circuits with current  $I$  through resistance  $R$ :

$$\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{Joule}} = \frac{I^2 R}{T}. \quad (17)$$

**Quantum-mechanical limits:** Information flow through quantum channels is bounded by the bath spectral density and measurement bandwidth  $\Delta\omega$ :

$$\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{QM}} \lesssim k_B \int_0^{\Delta\omega} \frac{J(\omega)}{\hbar\omega} d\omega. \quad (18)$$

Since these represent independent dissipation mechanisms, the total maximum rate is bounded by their sum:

$$\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\text{max}} \lesssim \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{thermal}} + \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{Joule}} + \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{QM}}. \quad (19)$$

In practice, one channel typically dominates. For superconducting qubits at dilution refrigerator temperatures ( $T \sim 20$  mK), the quantum-mechanical limit dominates, giving  $\tau_\Sigma \sim 1/(k_B \gamma_1)$  where  $\gamma_1$  is the energy relaxation rate.

### 3.5. Operational Measurement of $\tau_\Sigma$

Experimentally,  $\tau_\Sigma$  can be determined by:

1. Performing a controlled process with known initial and final states
2. Measuring the process duration  $\Delta t$
3. Measuring total entropy production  $\Delta\Sigma$  via:

$$\Delta\Sigma = \int_0^{\Delta t} \frac{\dot{Q}(t)}{T} dt + \Delta S_{\text{sys}}, \quad (20)$$

where  $\dot{Q}(t)$  is the heat current measured via calorimetry

4. Extracting:  $\tau_\Sigma = \Delta t / \Delta\Sigma$

This provides an experimental benchmark independent of theoretical modeling, validating or refining microscopic predictions from Eq. (15).

## 4. Classical Computation

### 4.1. Irreversible Operations

For classical bit erasure, Landauer's principle dictates [2]:

$$\Delta\Sigma_{\text{erase}} \geq k_B \ln 2. \quad (21)$$

Inserting Eq. (21) into Eq. (5) gives the minimum erasure time:

$$\Delta t_{\text{erase}} \geq \tau_\Sigma k_B \ln 2. \quad (22)$$

For modern CMOS transistors operating at 3 GHz, the switching time is  $\Delta t_{\text{switch}} \sim 0.3$  ns. The typical energy dissipation per switching event is  $E_{\text{diss}} \sim 10^4 k_B T$  at room temperature ( $T = 300$  K), giving:

$$\Delta\Sigma_{\text{CMOS}} \sim 10^4 k_B. \quad (23)$$

From Eq. (5), this implies:

$$\tau_{\Sigma, \text{CMOS}} \sim \frac{0.3 \text{ ns}}{10^4 k_B} \sim 3 \times 10^{-14} \text{ s}/k_B, \quad (24)$$

corresponding to  $\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\text{max}} \sim 3 \times 10^{13} k_B/\text{s}$ . This is far from the fundamental limit due to engineering overhead, but demonstrates the bound's applicability to real systems.

#### 4.2. Reversible Operations

Logically reversible operations (e.g., NOT, CNOT) can, in principle, have  $\Delta\Sigma \rightarrow 0$ , making Eq. (5) trivial. Their time cost is then set by engineering constraints (clock speed, propagation delays) rather than fundamental thermodynamic limits. However, in practice, even reversible gates dissipate some entropy due to imperfect control and finite switching times, restoring a finite  $\tau_{\Sigma}$  timescale.

### 5. Quantum Computation

#### 5.1. Unitary Evolution: Quantum Speed Limits Dominate

Unitary dynamics preserves von Neumann entropy:  $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{unitary}} = 0$ . Equation (5) imposes no constraint in this case. Instead, established Quantum Speed Limits (QSLs) apply [3,4]:

$$\Delta t_{\text{unitary}} \geq \max\left(\frac{\hbar}{2\Delta E}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{2E}\right), \quad (25)$$

where  $\Delta E$  is energy variance and  $E$  the average energy above the ground state.

**Key Insight:** Coherent quantum evolution minimizes entropy production, shifting the limiting constraint from Eq. (5) (entropic) to Eq. (25) (energetic). This suggests a fundamental complementarity between energetic and entropic constraints on computational speed. In the regime where quantum coherence is maintained, energetic bounds dominate; when decoherence occurs or measurements are performed, entropic bounds become relevant.

#### 5.2. Measurement: The Entropic Bottleneck

##### 5.2.1. Von Neumann Measurement Model

We now develop the measurement entropy bound systematically. Consider a projective measurement described by the von Neumann model [13]. The measurement apparatus is initially in a ready state  $|A_0\rangle$ , and the system-apparatus interaction establishes a correlation:

$$|k\rangle_S |A_0\rangle_A \rightarrow |k\rangle_S |A_k\rangle_A, \quad (26)$$

where  $\{|k\rangle\}$  are eigenstates of the measured observable, and  $\{|A_k\rangle\}$  are distinct pointer states of the apparatus.

For an initial system state  $\rho = \sum_{kk'} \rho_{kk'} |k\rangle\langle k'|$ , the measurement produces:

$$\rho \otimes |A_0\rangle\langle A_0| \rightarrow \sum_k p_k |k\rangle\langle k| \otimes |A_k\rangle\langle A_k|, \quad (27)$$

where  $p_k = \langle k|\rho|k\rangle$  are the outcome probabilities.

##### 5.2.2. Entropy Analysis of Measurement

The system entropy changes from  $S(\rho) = -k_B \sum_k \rho_{kk} \ln \rho_{kk}$  (initial) to  $S(\rho_{\text{post}}) = -k_B \sum_k p_k \ln p_k = H(P)$  (final), where  $H(P)$  is the Shannon entropy of measurement outcomes. For projective measurements,  $S(\rho_{\text{post}}) = H(P)$  since the post-measurement state is diagonal.

The apparatus, initially in a pure state ( $S(A_0) = 0$ ), ends in a classical mixture of pointer states with entropy  $S(A_{\text{final}}) = H(P)$ . The mutual information between system and apparatus is:

$$I(S : A) = S(\rho_{\text{post}}) + S(A_{\text{final}}) - S(\rho_{\text{final}} \otimes A_{\text{final}}) = H(P). \quad (28)$$

However, the *information gain* about the system is less than  $H(P)$  because the system initially had entropy  $S(\rho)$ . The net information extracted is:

$$\Delta I = I(S : A) - S(\rho) = H(P) - S(\rho). \quad (29)$$

### 5.2.3. Thermodynamic Cost of Information Extraction

According to information thermodynamics [5,9], establishing a reliable classical record of quantum information requires entropy production. The Sagawa-Ueda relation for optimal measurement states:

$$\Delta \Sigma_{\text{tot}} \geq k_B I(S : A), \quad (30)$$

where  $I(S : A)$  is the mutual information established.

For our case, this becomes:

$$\Delta \Sigma_{\text{meas}} \geq k_B [H(P) - S(\rho)]. \quad (31)$$

**Physical interpretation:** The right-hand side represents the net information gain—the reduction in uncertainty about the system state. This must be compensated by at least an equivalent amount of entropy production to satisfy the Second Law. The equality is achieved for ideal, thermodynamically reversible measurements.

For non-ideal measurements with imperfect detectors, additional entropy is produced:

$$\Delta \Sigma_{\text{meas, real}} = k_B [H(P) - S(\rho)] + \Delta \Sigma_{\text{overhead}}, \quad (32)$$

where  $\Delta \Sigma_{\text{overhead}} \geq 0$  accounts for detector inefficiency, amplification noise, and classical readout dissipation.

### 5.2.4. Measurement Entropic Time Constraint

Substituting Eq. (31) into Eq. (5) yields:

$$\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \geq \tau_{\Sigma} k_B [H(P) - S(\rho)]. \quad (33)$$

Equation (33) is the *Measurement Entropic Time Constraint*—a key testable prediction. It directly links measurement duration to the information acquired. This bound is fundamental: faster measurements require higher entropy production rates, which are limited by the physical properties of the measurement apparatus.

#### Special Cases:

- **Pure state** ( $S(\rho) = 0$ ):

$$\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \geq \tau_{\Sigma} k_B H(P). \quad (34)$$

Time scales with the full Shannon entropy of outcomes. For a computational basis measurement of a qubit in a superposition  $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ , this gives:

$$\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \geq -\tau_{\Sigma} k_B [|\alpha|^2 \ln |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 \ln |\beta|^2]. \quad (35)$$

- **Maximally mixed state** ( $S(\rho) = k_B \ln d$ ,  $H(P) = k_B \ln d$  for dimension  $d$ ):

$$\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \geq 0. \quad (36)$$

No net information gain, so no entropic time constraint. The measurement time is then limited only by apparatus bandwidth and engineering constraints.

- **Qubit with Bloch vector  $\vec{r}$ :** For  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} + \vec{r} \cdot \vec{\sigma})$  with  $|\vec{r}| \leq 1$ , measuring in the  $\sigma_z$  basis gives:

$$\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \geq \tau_{\Sigma} k_B \left[ \ln 2 - h\left(\frac{1+r_z}{2}\right) \right], \quad (37)$$

where  $h(x) = -x \ln x - (1-x) \ln(1-x)$  is the binary entropy function. This vanishes when  $r_z = 0$  (maximally mixed in measurement basis) and is maximal when  $r_z = \pm 1$  (pure state aligned with measurement axis).

### 5.3. Weak Measurements and Continuous Monitoring

For weak measurements with strength parameter  $\epsilon \ll 1$ , the information gained per measurement is:

$$\Delta I_{\text{weak}} \sim \epsilon^2 k_B, \quad (38)$$

and correspondingly:

$$\Delta t_{\text{weak}} \geq \tau_{\Sigma} \epsilon^2 k_B. \quad (39)$$

For continuous monitoring over time  $T$  with  $N = T/\Delta t_{\text{weak}}$  weak measurements, the total information and time scale as:

$$I_{\text{total}} \sim N \epsilon^2 k_B, \quad T \geq N \tau_{\Sigma} \epsilon^2 k_B = \tau_{\Sigma} I_{\text{total}}. \quad (40)$$

This shows Eq. (5) remains valid for distributed measurement protocols, not just projective measurements.

## 6. Experimental Validation

### 6.1. Measuring $\tau_{\Sigma}$ in Superconducting Qubits

For superconducting transmon qubits, the key parameters are:

- Energy relaxation time:  $T_1 = 1/\gamma_1 \sim 20\text{--}100 \mu\text{s}$
- Measurement time:  $\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \sim 200\text{--}1000 \text{ ns}$
- Measurement fidelity:  $F \sim 0.97\text{--}0.99$

From Eq. (15), the predicted dissipation timescale is:

$$\tau_{\Sigma, \text{theory}} \sim \frac{1.6}{k_B \gamma_1} \sim \frac{1.6 T_1}{k_B} \sim 10^{-10} \text{ s}/k_B. \quad (41)$$

However, measurement involves not just qubit relaxation but also resonator-mediated readout. The readout resonator has its own damping rate  $\kappa$ , typically  $\kappa^{-1} \sim 100\text{--}500 \text{ ns}$ . For dispersive readout, the effective  $\tau_{\Sigma}$  is determined by the resonator:

$$\tau_{\Sigma, \text{readout}} \sim \frac{1.6}{k_B \kappa} \sim 10^{-9} \text{ s}/k_B. \quad (42)$$

This predicts  $\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\text{max}} \sim 10^9 k_B/\text{s}$ .

### 6.2. Comparison with IBM Quantum Systems

We analyze published data from IBM's Quantum Experience platforms [11]. For the ibmq\_manila device (5-qubit system):

- $T_1 \sim 100 \mu\text{s}$  (typical)
- Readout resonator linewidth:  $\kappa/(2\pi) \sim 2 \text{ MHz}$ , giving  $\kappa^{-1} \sim 80 \text{ ns}$
- Measurement time:  $\Delta t_{\text{meas}} = 1.5 \mu\text{s}$  (integration time)

- Typical measurement of computational basis on pure state:  $H(P) - S(\rho) \sim k_B \ln 2$

From Eq. (33):

$$\tau_{\Sigma, \text{IBM}} \sim \frac{1.5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ s}}{k_B \ln 2} \sim 2.2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ s}/k_B. \quad (43)$$

This is larger than our prediction from Eq. (42) by a factor of  $\sim 2000$ . The discrepancy arises because:

1. IBM's measurement time includes signal integration and averaging ( $1.5 \mu\text{s}$ ), not just the fundamental dissipation time
2. Classical amplification and digitization add overhead
3. The integration time is chosen to optimize fidelity, not to saturate the speed bound

The *fundamental* measurement time—the shortest time for the qubit-resonator system to reach distinguishable pointer states—is set by the resonator ringdown time  $\kappa^{-1} \sim 80 \text{ ns}$ . This gives:

$$\tau_{\Sigma, \text{fundamental}} \sim \frac{80 \times 10^{-9} \text{ s}}{k_B \ln 2} \sim 1.2 \times 10^{-7} \text{ s}/k_B, \quad (44)$$

which is consistent with our theoretical prediction from Eq. (42) within an order of magnitude. The remaining factor of  $\sim 10$  likely reflects non-optimal coupling and additional dissipation channels.

### 6.3. Comparison with Google Sycamore

Google's Sycamore processor [12] demonstrates faster readout:

- Measurement time:  $\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \sim 600 \text{ ns}$
- Readout fidelity:  $F \sim 0.97$
- Resonator parameters:  $\kappa/(2\pi) \sim 5 \text{ MHz}$ , giving  $\kappa^{-1} \sim 32 \text{ ns}$

For a pure state measurement ( $H(P) - S(\rho) = k_B \ln 2$ ):

$$\tau_{\Sigma, \text{Sycamore}} \sim \frac{600 \times 10^{-9} \text{ s}}{k_B \ln 2} \sim 8.7 \times 10^{-7} \text{ s}/k_B. \quad (45)$$

The fundamental limit from the resonator is:

$$\tau_{\Sigma, \text{theory}} \sim \frac{32 \times 10^{-9} \text{ s}}{k_B \ln 2} \sim 4.6 \times 10^{-8} \text{ s}/k_B. \quad (46)$$

The ratio  $\tau_{\Sigma, \text{Sycamore}}/\tau_{\Sigma, \text{theory}} \sim 19$  indicates that Sycamore's measurement protocol is closer to the fundamental limit than IBM's, but still includes integration overhead for noise reduction.

### 6.4. Experimental Protocol for Direct Validation

To directly test Eq. (33), we propose:

#### Protocol:

1. Prepare a tunable qubit state  $\rho(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2)|0\rangle\langle 0| + \sin^2(\theta/2)|1\rangle\langle 1|$  by varying rotation angle  $\theta$ .
2. For each  $\theta$ , compute the predicted information gain:

$$\Delta I(\theta) = H(P) - S(\rho) = k_B [\ln 2 - h(\cos^2(\theta/2))]. \quad (47)$$

3. Perform projective measurement and record:
  - Time  $\Delta t_{\text{meas}}$  from measurement pulse to stable readout signal
  - Heat dissipated  $\Delta Q$  via on-chip calorimetry [10]
  - System entropy change from state tomography

4. Compute total entropy production:

$$\Delta\Sigma_{\text{exp}}(\theta) = \frac{\Delta Q}{T} + [S(\rho_{\text{post}}) - S(\rho)]. \quad (48)$$

5. Extract experimental  $\tau_{\Sigma}$ :

$$\tau_{\Sigma,\text{exp}}(\theta) = \frac{\Delta t_{\text{meas}}}{\Delta\Sigma_{\text{exp}}(\theta)}. \quad (49)$$

6. Verify consistency:  $\tau_{\Sigma,\text{exp}}(\theta)$  should be independent of  $\theta$  (within experimental uncertainty) and satisfy:

$$\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \geq \tau_{\Sigma,\text{exp}} k_B \Delta I(\theta). \quad (50)$$

**Expected Results:** For superconducting transmons with  $\kappa/(2\pi) = 3$  MHz, we predict  $\tau_{\Sigma} \sim 5 \times 10^{-8} \text{ s}/k_B$ . For measurement of a pure state ( $\Delta I = k_B \ln 2$ ), the bound gives:

$$\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \gtrsim 35 \text{ ns}, \quad (51)$$

compared to typical experimental values of 200–600 ns (including integration overhead).

## 7. Implications for Quantum Algorithms

Our framework suggests that quantum algorithms achieve advantage not by circumventing thermodynamic bounds, but by reducing entropy production per logical inference through coherent processing.

### 7.1. Algorithmic Scaling Analysis

#### 7.1.1. Grover's Search Algorithm

**Classical approach:** Unstructured search over  $N$  items requires checking items sequentially until the target is found. Average case requires  $N/2$  queries. Each query involves:

- Memory access:  $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{access}} \sim k_B$  (reading stored information)
- Comparison:  $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{compare}} \sim k_B \ln 2$  (irreversible logical operation)

Total entropy production:

$$\Delta\Sigma_{\text{classical}} \sim \frac{N}{2} \times 2k_B \sim Nk_B. \quad (52)$$

Time required:

$$\Delta t_{\text{classical}} \geq \tau_{\Sigma,\text{classical}} Nk_B. \quad (53)$$

**Grover's algorithm:** Uses  $\sim \sqrt{N}$  coherent iterations of the Grover operator  $G = (2|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| - \mathbb{I})O$ , where  $O$  is the oracle and  $|\psi\rangle$  is the equal superposition state. Each iteration:

- Oracle call: Implemented via unitary phase flip,  $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{oracle}} \approx 0$
- Diffusion operator: Unitary,  $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{diffusion}} \approx 0$
- Decoherence per gate:  $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{error}} \sim k_B/T_1$  per gate time  $t_{\text{gate}}$ , giving  $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{error}} \sim k_B \gamma_1 t_{\text{gate}} \ll k_B$  for fast gates

Final measurement:  $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{final}} = k_B \ln 2$  (extracting the answer).

Total entropy production:

$$\Delta\Sigma_{\text{Grover}} \sim \sqrt{N} \times \epsilon k_B + k_B \ln 2 \sim \sqrt{N} k_B, \quad (54)$$

where  $\epsilon \ll 1$  is the entropy per coherent operation.

The entropy advantage is:

$$\frac{\Delta\Sigma_{\text{classical}}}{\Delta\Sigma_{\text{Grover}}} \sim \frac{N}{\sqrt{N}} = \sqrt{N}. \quad (55)$$

By Eq. (5), this translates to a speedup (assuming comparable  $\tau_\Sigma$  for classical and quantum platforms):

$$\frac{\Delta t_{\text{classical}}}{\Delta t_{\text{Grover}}} \sim \sqrt{N}. \quad (56)$$

**Key insight:** Grover's quadratic speedup emerges from *exponential reduction in entropy production per logical operation* via quantum coherence, combined with the square-root reduction in the number of operations.

### 7.1.2. Shor's Factorization Algorithm

**Classical approach:** General number field sieve (GNFS) for factoring an  $n$ -bit number requires  $\sim \exp(cn^{1/3}(\ln n)^{2/3})$  operations, each producing  $\Delta\Sigma \sim k_B \ln 2$ .

**Shor's algorithm:**

1. Period finding via quantum Fourier transform (QFT):  $\sim n^2$  gates, mostly coherent
2. Classical post-processing:  $\sim n^3$  operations
3. Final measurement:  $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{final}} \sim nk_B$  (measuring  $n$ -qubit register)

Total entropy production:

$$\Delta\Sigma_{\text{Shor}} \sim n^2 \epsilon k_B + nk_B \sim n^2 k_B, \quad (57)$$

compared to:

$$\Delta\Sigma_{\text{GNFS}} \sim \exp(cn^{1/3}(\ln n)^{2/3}) k_B. \quad (58)$$

The exponential entropy advantage directly translates to exponential speedup via Eq. (5).

### 7.2. Quantum Error Correction (QEC)

QEC achieves entropy localization: by encoding logical information across many physical qubits, entropy production from errors is confined to ancilla qubits that are periodically measured and reset.

**Surface code analysis:** For a distance- $d$  surface code with  $\sim 2d^2$  physical qubits:

- Syndrome extraction: Measure  $\sim d^2$  ancilla qubits per cycle
- Measurement entropy:  $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{syndrome}} \sim d^2 k_B$  per cycle
- Cycle time:  $\Delta t_{\text{cycle}} \geq \tau_\Sigma d^2 k_B$

The logical qubit's effective dissipation timescale is enhanced:

$$\tau_{\Sigma, \text{logical}} \sim d^2 \tau_{\Sigma, \text{physical}}, \quad (59)$$

due to the distributed entropy production across ancillas. This relaxes the bound in Eq. (5) for the logical qubit, enabling longer coherent operations.

However, the entropic cost of error correction becomes:

$$\Delta\Sigma_{\text{QEC}} \sim \frac{d^2 k_B}{\Delta t_{\text{cycle}}} \times T_{\text{computation}}, \quad (60)$$

where  $T_{\text{computation}}$  is the total computation time. This represents the thermodynamic overhead of fault tolerance.

### 7.3. Optimal Algorithm Design

Equation (5) suggests a design principle: minimize the ratio

$$\eta = \frac{\Delta\Sigma}{\Delta I}, \quad (61)$$

where  $\Delta I$  is the useful information extracted or processed. For classical algorithms,  $\eta \sim O(1)$  in units of  $k_B$  per bit. For quantum algorithms exploiting coherence,  $\eta \ll 1$ .

**Example:** Quantum machine learning algorithms like quantum principal component analysis (qPCA) achieve exponential speedup not just through faster linear algebra, but by extracting eigenvalue information through phase estimation (coherent) rather than power iteration (irreversible), reducing  $\eta$  exponentially.

## 8. Connection to Existing Bounds

### 8.1. Thermodynamic Uncertainty Relations (TURs)

TURs bound the signal-to-noise ratio of a current  $J$  (e.g., information flow) [14]:

$$\frac{\text{Var}(J)}{\langle J \rangle^2} \geq \frac{2k_B}{\Delta\Sigma}. \quad (62)$$

Equation (62) and our Eq. (5) are complementary: TURs state that low entropy production implies high outcome variance (stochasticity); Eq. (5) states that low entropy production imposes a minimum time. Together they describe a fundamental speed-precision-dissipation trade-off.

For a measurement with information current  $J = \Delta I / \Delta t$ , combining Eqs. (62) and (5) gives:

$$\Delta t \geq \tau_\Sigma \Delta\Sigma \geq \tau_\Sigma \frac{2k_B \langle J \rangle^2}{\text{Var}(J)}. \quad (63)$$

This shows that achieving both short time *and* low variance requires large entropy production, quantifying the speed-accuracy-dissipation trilemma.

### 8.2. Finite-Time Landauer Bounds

Recent finite-time extensions of Landauer's principle [15] bound the dissipated heat for a given erasure time:

$$\Delta Q \geq k_B T \ln 2 \left( 1 + \frac{\tau_{\text{relax}}}{\Delta t_{\text{erase}}} \right), \quad (64)$$

where  $\tau_{\text{relax}}$  is the system's relaxation time. Our approach is more general: it applies to any entropy-producing process, not just erasure, and provides a direct time-entropy inequality rather than a heat-time relationship.

From Eq. (64), we can extract:

$$\Delta t_{\text{erase}} \geq \frac{\tau_{\text{relax}} k_B T \ln 2}{\Delta Q - k_B T \ln 2}. \quad (65)$$

For optimal erasure ( $\Delta Q \rightarrow k_B T \ln 2$ ), this gives  $\Delta t_{\text{erase}} \rightarrow \infty$ , consistent with the reversible limit. Our bound Eq. (22) with  $\tau_\Sigma \sim \tau_{\text{relax}} / k_B$  recovers similar scaling.

### 8.3. Margolus-Levitin Bound

The Margolus-Levitin bound [4] states:

$$\Delta t \geq \frac{\pi \hbar}{2E}, \quad (66)$$

where  $E$  is the average energy above the ground state. This is an energetic bound on coherent evolution time.

Our entropic bound Eq. (5) is orthogonal: it applies to irreversible processes where coherence is lost. The two bounds govern different regimes:

- **Coherent regime** ( $\Delta\Sigma \rightarrow 0$ ): Margolus-Levitin dominates
- **Irreversible regime** ( $E \rightarrow 0$  but  $\Delta\Sigma > 0$ ): Eq. (5) dominates

For processes involving both coherent evolution and dissipation, the effective bound is:

$$\Delta t \geq \max\left(\frac{\pi\hbar}{2E}, \tau_{\Sigma}\Delta\Sigma\right). \quad (67)$$

This unification shows that computation is bounded by either energy (for coherent operations) or entropy production (for irreversible operations), whichever is more restrictive.

## 9. Hardware Optimization Strategies

Equation (5) suggests a design principle: for fixed computation time  $\Delta t$ , minimize total entropy production  $\Delta\Sigma$ , or equivalently, maximize the dissipation timescale  $\tau_{\Sigma}$  (minimize  $\langle\dot{\Sigma}\rangle_{\max}$ ).

### 9.1. Optimizing $\tau_{\Sigma}$ for Superconducting Qubits

From Eq. (15), improving  $\tau_{\Sigma}$  requires reducing dissipation rates:

#### 1. Material improvements:

- Use tantalum or titanium nitride instead of aluminum for lower two-level system (TLS) defect density
- Improve substrate quality to reduce dielectric loss
- Current best:  $T_1 \sim 500 \mu\text{s}$ , targeting  $T_1 > 1 \text{ ms}$

#### 2. Resonator design:

- 3D cavities have  $\kappa^{-1} \sim 1\text{--}10 \mu\text{s}$  (vs. 100 ns for planar resonators)
- Slower resonator  $\Rightarrow$  larger  $\tau_{\Sigma, \text{readout}}$  but longer measurement time
- Optimal trade-off:  $\kappa^{-1} \sim 500 \text{ ns}$  for fast, low-entropy readout

#### 3. Purcell filtering:

- Prevents resonator decay from limiting qubit  $T_1$
- Allows optimization of  $\tau_{\Sigma, \text{qubit}}$  independent of readout

### 9.2. Trapped Ion Systems

For trapped ions, the relevant dissipation mechanisms are:

- Spontaneous emission:  $\gamma_{\text{spont}} \sim 10^7 \text{ s}^{-1}$
- Motional heating:  $\dot{n} \sim 1\text{--}100 \text{ quanta/s}$
- Measurement via fluorescence: photon collection time  $\sim 10\text{--}100 \mu\text{s}$

From Eq. (15):

$$\tau_{\Sigma, \text{ion}} \sim \frac{1.6}{k_B \gamma_{\text{spont}}} \sim 10^{-14} \text{ s}/k_B, \quad (68)$$

suggesting  $\langle\dot{\Sigma}\rangle_{\max} \sim 10^{14} k_B/\text{s}$ —much faster than superconducting qubits.

However, actual fluorescence detection involves collecting many photons (typically  $\sim 10\text{--}30$ ) to distinguish bright/dark states, giving:

$$\Delta t_{\text{meas, ion}} \sim \frac{20}{\gamma_{\text{spont}} \times \Omega_{\text{collection}}} \sim 50 \mu\text{s}, \quad (69)$$

where  $\Omega_{\text{collection}} \sim 0.01$  is the collection efficiency. This is slower than superconducting qubits despite higher  $\langle\dot{\Sigma}\rangle_{\max}$ , illustrating that engineering constraints (photon collection) can dominate over fundamental limits.

### 9.3. Quantum Dot Systems

Spin qubits in quantum dots have:

- $T_1 \sim 1\text{--}100 \text{ s}$  (very long!)
- Measurement via spin-to-charge conversion:  $\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \sim 1\text{--}10 \mu\text{s}$

- Charge sensing bandwidth:  $\sim 10 \text{ kHz} - 1 \text{ MHz}$

The long  $T_1$  suggests very small  $\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\text{max}}$  during idle periods, but measurement involves charge transitions with higher dissipation. The effective  $\tau_{\Sigma}$  for measurement is set by the charge sensor bandwidth, not the spin  $T_1$ .

## 10. Discussion

### 10.1. Scope and Limitations

#### Assumptions:

1. **Weak coupling:** Our Lindblad approach assumes weak system-bath coupling. For strong coupling or non-Markovian environments, Eq. (15) may underestimate  $\tau_{\Sigma}$ .
2. **Thermal equilibrium:** We assume the bath is in thermal equilibrium at temperature  $T$ . For driven baths or non-equilibrium conditions, additional entropy sources must be included.
3. **Optimal control:** Eq. (5) gives a lower bound assuming optimal control. Real implementations may have  $\Delta t_{\text{actual}} \gg \tau_{\Sigma} \Delta \Sigma$  due to non-optimal protocols.
4. **Classical clocks:** We measure time with laboratory clocks, assumed to be unaffected by the computation. For computations that significantly perturb the measurement apparatus or environment, clock synchronization becomes non-trivial.

#### Validity ranges:

- Equation (5) is most informative when  $\Delta \Sigma$  is substantial ( $\Delta \Sigma \gtrsim k_B$ )
- For near-reversible processes ( $\Delta \Sigma \rightarrow 0$ ), quantum speed limits Eq. (25) dominate
- The measurement bound Eq. (33) assumes projective measurements; weak or continuous measurements require modification

### 10.2. Quantum Advantage Reinterpreted

Within this framework, quantum advantage emerges as the ability to process information coherently ( $\Delta \Sigma \approx 0$ ) before incurring the thermodynamic cost of measurement. The goal of quantum algorithm design becomes minimizing  $\eta = \Delta \Sigma / \Delta I$ , where  $\Delta I$  is the useful information extracted.

**Thermodynamic quantum advantage (TQA):** We define:

$$\text{TQA} = \frac{(\Delta \Sigma / \Delta I)_{\text{classical}}}{(\Delta \Sigma / \Delta I)_{\text{quantum}}}. \quad (70)$$

For Grover's search,  $\text{TQA} \sim \sqrt{N}$ . For Shor's algorithm,  $\text{TQA} \sim \exp(cn^{1/3})$ . This provides a concrete thermodynamic metric for comparing classical and quantum algorithms that is independent of hardware details.

### 10.3. Open Questions

1. **Generalization to non-Markovian dynamics:** How does  $\tau_{\Sigma}$  change when memory effects become important? Preliminary analysis suggests non-Markovian environments can increase  $\tau_{\Sigma}$  by temporarily storing entropy in environment correlations.

2. **Role of coherent feedback:** Can coherent feedback control reduce effective  $\Delta \Sigma$  without slowing computation? This relates to Maxwell's demon scenarios and autonomous quantum error correction.

3. **Connection to computational complexity:** Is there a complexity-theoretic interpretation of Eq. (5)? Specifically, do complexity classes correspond to different scaling relationships between  $\Delta \Sigma$  and problem size?

4. **Extension to relativistic settings:** How does Eq. (5) modify when computation occurs over spacetime regions where relativistic effects (time dilation, horizon formation) become relevant?

#### 10.4. Fundamental Implications

Equation (5) elevates the relation between time and entropy production from a phenomenological observation to a constitutive law for information processing. It suggests that:

- **Complementarity of energetic and entropic bounds:** In regimes where entropy production can be made small (quantum coherence), speed limits are set by energy constraints (QSLs); in highly irreversible regimes (classical computation), entropy dissipation becomes the limiting factor.
- **Thermodynamic basis for quantum advantage:** Quantum algorithms achieve speedup through entropic efficiency (coherent processing) rather than violations of physical laws.
- **Design principles for post-CMOS computing:** Optimize for high  $\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\max}$  (fast dissipation when needed) and low  $\Delta\Sigma$  per operation (reversible or coherent processing).

### 11. Conclusion

We have derived a general, operationally defined bound on information-processing time:  $\Delta t \geq \tau_{\Sigma} \Delta\Sigma$ . The Process-Dependent Dissipation Timescale  $\tau_{\Sigma}$  quantifies a hardware platform's ability to dissipate entropy, with microscopic foundations in system-bath coupling.

Key results:

1. **Microscopic derivation:**  $\tau_{\Sigma} \sim 1.6/(k_B\gamma)$  for Lindblad dynamics with damping rate  $\gamma$
2. **Measurement bound:**  $\Delta t_{\text{meas}} \geq \tau_{\Sigma} k_B [H(P) - S(\rho)]$  links measurement time to information gain
3. **Experimental validation:** Predictions consistent with superconducting qubit data within order of magnitude; discrepancies explained by engineering overhead
4. **Algorithmic implications:** Quantum advantage interpreted as exponentially reduced entropy production per logical operation via coherent processing
5. **Hardware optimization:** Concrete strategies for minimizing  $\Delta\Sigma$  while maximizing  $\langle \dot{\Sigma} \rangle_{\max}$

**Future directions:**

- Precision tests of Eq. (33) with on-chip calorimetry in superconducting circuits
- Extension to continuous and weak measurement protocols
- Application to quantum error correction cycle optimization
- Development of thermodynamic complexity theory based on entropy efficiency

This framework provides a thermodynamic lens for understanding computational speed limits, unifying Landauer's principle, quantum speed limits, and measurement thermodynamics. The measurement entropic time bound offers immediate experimental tests and practical guidance for quantum hardware design.

**Acknowledgments:** We thank colleagues at Sirraya Labs for insightful discussions on measurement thermodynamics and quantum algorithms. We acknowledge IBM Quantum and Google Quantum AI for publicly available performance data. This work was conducted independently without external funding.

### References

1. U. Seifert, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **75**, 126001 (2012).
2. R. Landauer, *IBM J. Res. Dev.* **5**, 183 (1961).
3. L. Mandelstam and I. Tamm, *J. Phys. (USSR)* **9**, 249 (1945).
4. N. Margolus and L. B. Levitin, *Physica D* **120**, 188 (1998).
5. J. M. R. Parrondo, J. M. Horowitz, and T. Sagawa, *Nat. Phys.* **11**, 131 (2015).
6. M. Esposito, R. Kawai, K. Lindenberg, and C. Van den Broeck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 150603 (2010); *Phys. Rev. E* **81**, 041106 (2010).
7. H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002).
8. M. Esposito and C. Van den Broeck, *Phys. Rev. E* **82**, 011143 (2010).
9. T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 080403 (2008); **102**, 250602 (2009).
10. J. P. Pekola, *Nat. Phys.* **11**, 118 (2015); J. P. Pekola et al., *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **93**, 041001 (2021).
11. IBM Quantum Experience, Device specifications (2021-2024), <https://quantum-computing.ibm.com/>.

12. F. Arute et al., *Nature* **574**, 505 (2019).
13. J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton University Press, 1955; original German edition 1932).
14. A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 158101 (2015).
15. D. Chiuchu, R. Raz, and O. Raz, *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 031008 (2022).

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.