

A Bayesian view of Single-Qubit Clocks, and an Energy versus Accuracy tradeoff

Manoj Gopalkrishnan,¹ Varshith Kandula,² Praveen Sriram,² Abhishek Deshpande,^{3,4} and Bhaskaran Muralidharan⁵

¹*School of Technology and Computer Science, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, 1 Homi Bhabha Road, Mumbai 400005, India*
Email: manoj.gopalkrishnan@gmail.com

²*Department of Electrical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai 400076, India*

³*School of Technology and Computer Science, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, 1 Homi Bhabha Road, Mumbai 400005, India*

⁴*Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, South Kensington Campus, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom*

⁵*Department of Electrical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai 400076, India*

Email: bm@ee.iitb.ac.in

(Dated: March 31, 2022)

We bring a Bayesian viewpoint to the analysis of clocks. Using exponential distributions as priors for clocks, we analyze the case of a single precessing spin. We find that, at least with a single qubit, quantum mechanics does not allow exact timekeeping, in contrast to classical mechanics which does. We find the optimal ratio of angular velocity of precession to rate of the exponential distribution that leads to maximum accuracy. Further, we find an energy versus accuracy tradeoff — the energy cost is at least $k_B T$ times the improvement in accuracy as measured by the entropy reduction in going from the prior distribution to the posterior distribution.

I. INTRODUCTION

A clock is a device that couples a periodic or approximately periodic motion to a counter that increments upon “ticks” of the periodic motion. In this paper, we focus on a single inter-tick duration.

In principle, in the absence of noise, classical mechanics allows the harnessing of perfectly periodic motion from a simple harmonic oscillator¹, so that the duration between ticks is exact. Do the laws of quantum mechanics allow clocks with perfect inter-tick durations? One difficulty manifests immediately. Though a quantum system may display periodic motion, quantum measurement only provides partial information about the full quantum state. The first question we address here is: what are the limits to accuracy of inter-tick durations for resource-limited quantum systems?

In classical mechanics, in the absence of noise, clocks need not dissipate any energy. The rotation of the earth may be set forward as an example that comes very close to this ideal. In practice, man-made clocks require energy: wall clocks run on batteries, mechanical pendulum clocks and watches run down and need to be wound up. Is it the case that the laws of quantum mechanics require clocks to be dissipating? This is the second question we address.

We make a step towards addressing these questions by describing clocks as information processing devices that employ Bayesian inference, and use this framework to analyze the case of a clock constructed from a single qubit.

Contributions:

- In II A, we introduce a novel way of thinking about clocks by describing the time between ticks in the language of random variables.
- The most ubiquitous clocks in nature have inter-tick durations that are exponentially distributed, for example, radioactive decay. In II A, we argue for treating such exponentially distributed events as free resources.

- In II B, we connect the problem of timekeeping to Bayesian inference, and identify exponential distributions as reasonable Bayesian priors. Our approach in II brings to the fore the role of information processing in the keeping of time.
- The simplest example of periodic motion in quantum mechanics is a precessing spin modeled by a single qubit. Given only a single precessing spin, and a process that generates events with exponential inter-arrival times, we use the framework from II to show in III how to tune the angular velocity of precession relative to the rate of the exponential random variable to construct the most accurate clock possible within these resource constraints. Since this clock has a spread of uncertainty around the time of a tick, our results show that within our resource constraints quantum mechanics does not allow perfectly accurate single-qubit clocks.
- We show in IV that there is an energy versus accuracy tradeoff for keeping time with a single qubit. The smaller the desired spread of uncertainty around the time of a tick, the greater the amount of energy required. Specifically we prove in Theorem IV.1 that the amount of energy required is at least $k_B T$ times the accuracy gain as measured by reduction in entropy of the inter-tick distribution.
- Our results encourage us to speculate on two new principles for quantum timekeeping. First, our results of III lead us to speculate that resource-constrained quantum systems may not allow perfect timekeeping. Second, Theorem IV.1 leads us to speculate that there may be an energy versus accuracy tradeoff for timekeeping which manifests in a form reminiscent of the Szilard-Landauer principle (IV), except that the relevant entropy is defined on the time variable.

II. AN INFORMATION PROCESSING VIEW OF CLOCKS

A. Clocks as Random Variables

A clock consists of “ticks” from a periodic or approximately periodic source, and a counter that records the number of ticks. In this paper, our focus is on a single inter-tick duration. We treat inter-tick durations as random variables that take values in the positive reals. We do not necessarily assume that such successive random variables are identically distributed. For example, suppose the duration between tick 1 and tick 2 has an expected value of 1 s, and the duration between tick 2 and tick 3 has an expected value of 2 s. Then the expected duration between tick 1 and tick 3 equals 3 s.

Consider a random variable T that takes values in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and has expected value $E[T] = 1/\lambda$. The best such random variable for accuracy of timekeeping is a **delta distribution** $\delta_{1/\lambda}$, because this corresponds to an exact inter-tick duration. The worst such random variable for accuracy of timekeeping is one whose distribution is as spread out as possible. We can use differential entropy to measure the amount that the probability density $f(t) = \Pr[T \in (t, t + dt)]$ is spread out. We need to find the random variable T^* that maximizes the **differential entropy** $h[T] = -\int_{t=1}^{\infty} f(t) \log f(t) dt$ subject to the constraint that $E[T] = 1/\lambda$. It is well-known that the unique solution to this maximum entropy problem is the **exponential distribution** T^* which obeys $\Pr[T^* > t] = e^{-\lambda t}$ and has probability density $\Pr[T \in (t, t + dt)] = \lambda e^{-\lambda t} dt$.

In our resource-theoretic treatment of clocks, we will treat exponential random variables as free resources, since they correspond to the worst clocks. This is reminiscent of the treatment of thermal equilibrium in thermodynamics by the Gibbs distribution.

Apart from the differential entropy, we will find it useful to introduce another metric to report on the spread of a probability distribution. For random variables T taking values in the positive reals, we define the **quality factor** $Q[T]$ as

$$Q[T] = \frac{E[T]}{\sqrt{E[T^2] - (E[T])^2}}$$

The quality factor is a measure of how spread out a distribution is. A higher quality factor would imply a narrower distribution and thus a higher probability for the outcome of the random variable to be close to the mean. The quality factor is a natural measure since it is a dimensionless quantity. In particular, it is invariant to change of the units by which we measure time. If T is an exponential random variable, note that the quality factor is $Q[T] = 1$. If T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n are n independent, identically-distributed exponential random variables, then their sum $T = T_1 + T_2 + \dots + T_n$ has quality factor \sqrt{n} .

Thus one way to improve the quality of an inter-tick duration is by summing up a large number of inter-tick random variables, and declaring the sum to be one tick. This is the idea behind water clocks. Though the duration for each single drop to fall is highly random, the

duration for the entire vessel to be emptied has a much higher quality factor.

B. Bayesian Inference

Consider making two observations on a typical wall clock that is functioning correctly. Suppose that the first observation reports the hour hand on 7 and the minute hand on 1, and the second observation, five minutes later, reports the hour hand on 7 and the minute hand on 2. According to this clock, the time elapsed equals $12n$ hours plus 5 minutes where n is a natural number. The natural number n has to be determined using means external to the clock. In practice, we are not often confused about the value of n , and can confidently assert that 5 minutes have elapsed between the two observations. Why is this so? Where did we get the information that allows us to confidently assert that $n = 0$?

The answer is that we have a rough sense of the passage of time, which comes from observing various events or “ticks,” many of them exponentially-distributed, that are happening around us. These events give us a strong prior for the duration of time that has elapsed between the two observations. Observation of the clock face allows us to refine this prior to best infer how much time has elapsed.

We now show how to treat this idea formally. Our treatment will also cover the case when the clock is not perfect, but the inter-tick duration has some statistical spread. Let T be a random variable taking values in the positive reals. Let S be a random variable taking values in a finite set. Suppose we get to observe S , and find that the event $S = s$ is true. We have obtained some information about the random variable T from the correlation between the random variables T and S . The random variable $T_s := T | (S = s)$ is obtained from T by conditioning on this information. For an interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the posterior probability $\Pr[T_s \in I] = \Pr[T \in I | S = s]$ of T_s is computed by Bayes’ law:

$$\Pr[T \in I | S = s] = \frac{\Pr[S = s | T \in I] \Pr[T \in I]}{\Pr[S = s]} \quad (1)$$

III. THE SINGLE QUBIT CLOCK

In this section, we consider how to use periodic motion in quantum mechanics to build better clocks, and analyze our proposal using the ideas of II.

The simplest example of periodic motion in quantum mechanics is a spin precessing around an axis. This system can be described by a single qubit with its base kets $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ along the z axis of the Bloch sphere², and unitary evolution according to a Hamiltonian \hat{H} given by

$$\hat{H} = \frac{\hbar\omega}{2}|0\rangle\langle 0| - \frac{\hbar\omega}{2}|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad (2)$$

where \hbar is the reduced Planck’s constant, and ω is a precessing frequency which is set by the physics of precession, typically via the applied magnetic fields². We

consider here a free precession, in which the state vector rotates in the xy plane of the Bloch sphere. If we were to start from an initial state $|\psi(0)\rangle = |+\rangle = \frac{|0\rangle+|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$ then the qubit traces a unit circle within the two-dimensional space spanned by $|+\rangle$ and $|-\rangle = \frac{|0\rangle-|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$, with its state at time t given by the unitary evolution under the Hamiltonian described in (2) as $|\psi(t)\rangle = \cos(\frac{\omega t}{2})|+\rangle - \sin(\frac{\omega t}{2})|-\rangle$.

Suppose the precessing spin is initialized in state $|+\rangle$ at time 0 and allowed to evolve. After an unknown passage of time t , the qubit is measured by orthogonal projection to states $|+\rangle$ and $|-\rangle$. According to the quantum laws of measurement, the outcome of this measurement will be a random variable $S(\omega t)$ (for spin) taking values $+$ and $-$ with $\Pr[S(\omega t) = +] = \cos^2(\omega t/2)$ and $\Pr[S(\omega t) = -] = \sin^2(\omega t/2)$. Our task is to infer the time t from the observation of $S(\omega t)$.

As described in the previous section, if no prior distribution is specified, we will have no idea how many orbits the qubit has completed before the measurement. Therefore we should proceed by explicitly specifying a prior distribution. The most pessimistic, and hence natural, choice for a prior distribution is an exponentially distributed random variable T of mean $1/\lambda$.

Physically we imagine that an event whose inter-arrival times are exponentially distributed is perfectly coupled to the spin measurement. For example, whenever a radioactive decay occurs, the spin gets measured. The coupling between the spin measurement and the event may be achieved via electrostatic coupling, exchange interaction or any other mechanism dictated by the coupling Hamiltonian, the details of which need to be carefully considered while designing a physical apparatus. Here we assume that these interactions are ‘‘instantaneous’’ and ideal, resulting in a simultaneous measurement of the qubit state when the event triggers.

A. Quality of the single qubit clock

Let T be an exponential random variable with rate λ . If T triggers the measurement of the spin then we want to consider the distribution of the random variable $S(\omega T)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[S(\omega T) = +] &= \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \lambda e^{-\lambda t} \cos^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right) dt \\ &= \frac{2 + \omega^2/\lambda^2}{2(1 + \omega^2/\lambda^2)} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\Pr[S(\omega T) = -] = 1 - \Pr[S(\omega T) = +] = \frac{\omega^2/\lambda^2}{2(1 + \omega^2/\lambda^2)} \quad (4)$$

Let T_+ be the posterior random variable $T | (S(\omega T) = +)$ and let T_- be the posterior random variable $T | (S(\omega T) = -)$.

Immediately after the measurement, the state of the qubit has collapsed to either $|+\rangle$ or $|-\rangle$. To get another tick, we proceed by considering this new state as $|+\rangle$. We allow the qubit to evolve under the unitary dynamics of its Hamiltonian until another exponential random




FIG. 1: Probability density for T, T_+ , and T_- at $\omega/\lambda = 0.714767$

variable fires. Upon the firing of this exponential random variable, the qubit is again measured by projecting to the $|+\rangle$ and $|-\rangle$ bases. This is how successive ticks are obtained. After n_+ ticks where the spin was found in state $|+\rangle$ and n_- ticks where the spin was found in state $|-\rangle$, we declare the time to be $n_+ E[T_+] + n_- E[T_-]$.

We define the **expected quality factor** $Q[T | S(\omega T)]$ for a single tick of this clock as $\Pr[S(\omega T) = +] Q[T_+] + \Pr[S(\omega T) = -] Q[T_-]$. We now compute $Q[T | S(\omega T)]$ as a function of ω and λ .

By Bayesian Inference (1), the densities of T_+ and T_- are (Figure 1):

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[T_+ \in (t, t + dt)] &= \frac{2\lambda e^{-\lambda t} \cos^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right) (1 + \omega^2/\lambda^2) dt}{2 + \omega^2/\lambda^2} \\ \Pr[T_- \in (t, t + dt)] &= \frac{2\lambda e^{-\lambda t} \sin^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right) (1 + \omega^2/\lambda^2) dt}{\omega^2/\lambda^2} \end{aligned}$$

The expectation and standard deviation for T_+ and T_- are

$$\begin{aligned} E[T_+] &= \frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{2\omega^2/\lambda^2}{\lambda(2 + \omega^2/\lambda^2)(1 + \omega^2/\lambda^2)} \\ \sqrt{E[T_+^2] - E[T_+]^2} &= \frac{\sqrt{4 + 7\omega^4/\lambda^4 + 8\omega^6/\lambda^6 + \omega^8/\lambda^8}}{\lambda(2 + \omega^2/\lambda^2)(1 + \omega^2/\lambda^2)} \\ E[T_-] &= \frac{3 + \omega^2/\lambda^2}{\lambda(1 + \omega^2/\lambda^2)} \\ \sqrt{E[T_-^2] - E[T_-]^2} &= \frac{\sqrt{3 + \omega^4/\lambda^4}}{\lambda(1 + \omega^2/\lambda^2)} \end{aligned}$$

The expected quality factor $Q[T | S(\omega T)]$ equals:

$$\frac{\left[\frac{(2 + \omega^2/\lambda^2 + \omega^4/\lambda^4)(2 + \omega^2/\lambda^2)}{\sqrt{4 + 7\omega^4/\lambda^4 + 8\omega^6/\lambda^6 + \omega^8/\lambda^8}} + \frac{\omega^2/\lambda^2(3 + \omega^2/\lambda^2)}{\sqrt{3 + \omega^4/\lambda^4}} \right]}{2(1 + \omega^2/\lambda^2)} \quad (5)$$

The expected quality factor $Q[T | S(\omega T)]$ is a function of the ratio ω/λ . Figure 2 shows that it attains its maximum value at $\omega/\lambda = 0.714767$. The maximum value equals 1.20163. This is an improvement over the quality factor $Q[T] = 1$ for the exponential random variable T . Since Bayesian inference makes optimum use of the information available from coupling the random variables




FIG. 2: Expected Quality Factor $Q[T | S(\omega T)]$

T and $S(\omega T)$, we conclude that with these resource constraints, no further improvement is possible. In particular, with these resource constraints, quantum mechanics disallows perfectly accurate timekeeping.

IV. ENERGY-ACCURACY TRADEOFF

Does it require energy to keep time? Specifically, must it require more energy to keep time more accurately? We show in this section that the answer is positive for our system. Further the excess energy required is lower bounded by $k_B T$ times the improvement in accuracy, where k_B is Boltzmann's constant and T is temperature. We first describe our metrics for accuracy and energy.

In this section, we will describe the accuracy of an inter-tick duration by its differential entropy. Thus improvement in accuracy is measured by the decrease in differential entropy. More precisely, if T is an exponential random variable of mean $1/\lambda$, a straightforward calculation shows $h[T] = 1 - \log \lambda$. After the spin random variable $S(\omega T)$ is observed, the conditional differential entropy $h[T | S(\omega T)]$ is, by definition, $\Pr[S(\omega T) = +] h[T_+] + \Pr[S(\omega T) = -] h[T_-]$. The increase in accuracy is measured by the decrease in entropy $h[T] - h[T | S(\omega T)]$ caused by observing the coupled spin.

For energy accounting, we focus on the energy required to measure the spin. Let $p = \Pr[S(\omega T) = +]$. Then the spin random variable has an entropy $H[S(\omega T)] = -p \log p - (1 - p) \log(1 - p)$. By the Szilard-Landauer principle³⁻⁵, we declare $k_B T H[S(\omega T)]$ as the energy cost for the spin measurement. The dissipation of this energy happens when the spin collapses from its pure state to the mixed state described by $p|+\rangle\langle+| + (1 - p)|-\rangle\langle-|$. Work is done on the system when learning the outcome of the measurement, which takes us from the mixed state to the pure state $|+\rangle$ or $|-\rangle$ as reported by the measuring device. Learning the outcome of the measured spin corresponds to an "erasure" since the entropy of the qubit must decrease from $H[S(\omega T)]$ to 0.

There may be other energy costs to the device apart from the measurement of the spin. Here we ignore other costs, so that our metric forms a lower bound on the true energy requirement. The next theorem relates the energy expenditure to the accuracy improvement.

Theorem IV.1. $H[S(\omega T)] \geq h[T] - h[T | S(\omega T)]$.

Proof. The measurement of spin can be viewed as a channel of (differential) mutual information $I(T; S(\omega T))$ between T and $S(\omega T)$. Expanding $I(T; S(\omega T))$ two ways, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} I[T; S(\omega T)] &= H[S(\omega T)] - H[S(\omega T) | T] \\ &= h[T] - h[T | S(\omega T)]. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude the proof, note that $H[S(\omega T) | T] \geq 0$. \square

This simple theorem has an interesting physical interpretation. It is well-known in thermodynamics that to reduce entropy in phase space requires work to be done on a system. Theorem IV.1 suggests that even to reduce entropy along the time axis, (i.e., when our time-keeping devices are described by time-valued random variables) there may be a similar principle at work. In other words, it suggests that entropy over the time variable also obeys a Szilard-Landauer principle. If such a statement can be proved in much greater generality, it could lead to a thermodynamic theory of clocks. It would also be pleasing from the point of view of Relativity Theory, which requires treating spacetime together rather than separately.

Taking the thermodynamic analogy further, consider the **efficiency**

$$\eta := (h[T] - h[T | S(\omega T)]) / H[S(\omega T)].$$

Lemma IV.1. η is a function of ω/λ .

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem IV.1, we can rewrite $\eta = (H[S(\omega T)] - H[S(\omega T) | T]) / H[S(\omega T)]$. Now $H(S(\omega T))$ is a function of $\Pr[S(\omega T) = +]$, which is a function of ω/λ from Equation 3. It remains to show that $H[S(\omega T) | T]$ is also a function of ω/λ . For every $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[S(\omega T) = + | T \in (t, t + dt)] &= \Pr[S(\omega t) = +] \\ &= \cos^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right) \text{ and} \\ \Pr[S(\omega T) = - | T \in (t, t + dt)] &= \sin^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Hence $H[S(\omega T) | T]$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H[S(\omega T) | T] &= \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \left(-\cos^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right) \log \cos^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sin^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right) \log \sin^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right) \right) \lambda e^{-\lambda t} dt \end{aligned}$$

Changing the variable of integration to $\theta = \omega t$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} H[S(\omega T) | T] &= \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \left(-\cos^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \log \cos^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sin^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \log \sin^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \right) \frac{\lambda}{\omega} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{\omega} \theta} d\theta \end{aligned}$$

which is clearly a function of ω/λ since θ disappears after integration. \square




FIG. 3: Efficiency η versus ω/λ .

Figure 3 plots the efficiency η as a function of ω/λ . We obtain a maximum efficiency of 0.4562 at $\omega/\lambda = 1.8530$. In comparison, if we had operated at the maximum accuracy point by setting $\omega/\lambda = 0.714767$, we would obtain a slightly lower efficiency of 0.4004.

V. RELATED WORK

Quantum clocks have been previously studied in a pioneering paper by Salecker and Wigner⁶. Their system consists of orthogonal quantum states, one for each digit on a clock face. A unitary evolution takes the system through this sequence of orthogonal quantum states. A projective measurement reports the digit on the clock face as the time. Such clocks were reviewed by Peres in 1979⁷ where, in addition, he analyzed the perturbative effect of coupling the clock to a physical system. The Salecker-Wigner-Peres clock has found many applications^{8–11}.

Our clock can be thought of as a two-state version of the Salecker-Wigner clock. However, instead of merely returning the digit on the face of the clock as the time, we employ Bayesian inference to estimate the posterior distribution, and return its mean as the right estimator for the time. Our approach clarifies the uncertainty involved in timekeeping by explicitly treating timekeeping devices as random variables, and allows analysis of the uncertainty in our estimate of time. We also introduce the idea that it may require energy to keep time. However, we do not consider the perturbative effects that

may be introduced when coupling our clock to a physical system to make time measurements. Thus our approach is complementary to the approach of Salecker, Wigner, and Peres.

Our approach towards the study of clocks is influenced by the literature on quantum resource theories and quantum thermodynamics^{12–21}. One key idea in this literature is to consider thermal equilibrium states as free resources. Analogously, we treat exponential random variables as free resources. Another idea we have borrowed is that of “one-shot” processes where thermodynamic questions are examined for single quantum systems instead of for an entire ensemble. The quantum resource theory literature treats questions of reachability and feasibility. Our work manifests similar ideas in the form of limits on accuracy given certain amounts of resources and energy. There has been much more development in the area of quantum resource theory, which has put the area on a firm axiomatic foundation. In comparison, our investigations are only beginning, and more work is needed to understand how our assumptions relate to the more general literature on quantum resource theories. Also, a comparison of our proposal with state-of-the-art metrology standards such as atomic and optical atomic clocks^{22,23} remains to be explored.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Two novel ideas that have emerged from the results in this paper are that perfectly accurate timekeeping may not be possible with quantum systems, and that reducing uncertainty in time may require energy. It will be of interest to test these ideas against more general quantum clock constructions. We are tempted to speculate that the following should be a fundamental physical principle: **Keeping time more accurately than an exponential random variable should require energy proportional to the decrease in entropy from the exponential random variable of the same mean.**

Our work is quantum only to the extent that we have used the measurement rule of quantum mechanics. Working with a single qubit allowed us to explore some new ideas with explicit calculations. However, by working only with a single qubit, we have completely ignored entanglement, which is a key feature of quantum mechanics. Many new features of quantum clocks are likely to emerge when one studies larger number of qubits and entanglement.

¹ A. N. Allan, D. W. and C. C. Hodge, “The science of time keeping,” 1997.

² C. P. Slichter, *Principles of Magnetic Resonance*. Springer Verlag GmbH, 1996.

³ L. Szilard, “On the decrease of entropy in a thermodynamic system by the intervention of intelligent beings,” *Behavioral Science*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 301–310, 1964.

⁴ R. Landauer, “Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process,” *IBM journal of research and development*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 183–191, 1961.

⁵ M. Gopalkrishnan, “The hot bit I: The Szilard-Landauer

correspondence,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.3533*, 2013.

⁶ H. Salecker and E. P. Wigner, “Quantum Limitations of the Measurement of Space-Time Distances,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. 109, pp. 571–577, Jan 1958.

⁷ A. Peres, “Measurement of time by quantum clocks,” *American Journal of Physics*, vol. 48, no. 7, pp. 552–557, 1980.

⁸ C. Leavens, “Application of the quantum clock of salecker and wigner to the tunneling time problem,” *Solid state communications*, vol. 86, no. 12, pp. 781–788, 1993.

⁹ J. T. Lunardi, L. A. Manzoni, and A. T. Nys-

- trom, “Salecker–wigner–peres clock and average tunneling times,” *Physics Letters A*, vol. 375, no. 3, pp. 415–421, 2011.
- ¹⁰ C. Leavens and W. McKinnon, “An exact determination of the mean dwell time based on the quantum clock of salecker and wigner,” *Physics Letters A*, vol. 194, no. 1, pp. 12–20, 1994.
- ¹¹ C.-S. Park, “Barrier interaction time and the salecker-wigner quantum clock: Wave-packet approach,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 80, no. 1, p. 012111, 2009.
- ¹² M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, “(Quantumness in the context of) Resource Theories,” *International Journal of Modern Physics B*, vol. 27, no. 01n03, p. 1345019, 2013.
- ¹³ M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and R. Horodecki, “Are the laws of entanglement theory thermodynamical?” *Physical review letters*, vol. 89, no. 24, p. 240403, 2002.
- ¹⁴ I. Devetak, A. Harrow, and A. Winter, “A resource framework for quantum Shannon theory,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 4587–4618, 2008.
- ¹⁵ D. Janzing, P. Wocjan, R. Zeier, R. Geiss, and T. Beth, “Thermodynamic cost of reliability and low temperatures: tightening Landauer’s principle and the second law,” *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, vol. 39, no. 12, pp. 2717–2753, 2000.
- ¹⁶ F. G. Brandão, M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, J. M. Renes, and R. W. Spekkens, “Resource theory of quantum states out of thermal equilibrium,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 111, no. 25, p. 250404, 2013.
- ¹⁷ F. G. Brandão and G. Gour, “Reversible framework for quantum resource theories,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 115, no. 7, p. 070503, 2015.
- ¹⁸ F. G. Brandão and M. B. Plenio, “Entanglement theory and the second law of thermodynamics,” *Nature Physics*, vol. 4, no. 11, pp. 873–877, 2008.
- ¹⁹ F. Brandão, M. Horodecki, N. Ng, J. Oppenheim, and S. Wehner, “The second laws of quantum thermodynamics,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 112, no. 11, pp. 3275–3279, 2015.
- ²⁰ M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, “Fundamental limitations for quantum and nanoscale thermodynamics,” *Nature communications*, vol. 4, 2013.
- ²¹ G. Gour, M. P. Müller, V. Narasimhachar, R. W. Spekkens, and N. Yunger Halpern, “The resource theory of informational nonequilibrium in thermodynamics. 2013,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.6586*, vol. 2, pp. 19–22.
- ²² L. Essen and J. V. L. Parry, “An atomic standard of frequency: A Caesium resonator,” *Nature*, vol. 176, pp. 280–282, 1955.
- ²³ A. D. Ludlow, M. M. Boyd, J. Ye, E. Peik, and P. O. Schmidt, “Optical atomic clocks,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 87, pp. 637–701, 2015.