complexities

MDPI

Article

Quantum Error Correction at the Intersection of Information, Thermodynamics, and Complexity

Domingo Antonio Rodríguez

Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, University of Puerto Rico at Mayagüez, Mayagüez, PR 00680, USA; domingo.rodriguez1@upr.edu

Abstract

Quantum thermodynamics and quantum information theory are often developed as neighboring subjects: the former studies energy, heat, work, irreversibility, and fluctuations in quantum systems, while the latter studies the representation, transmission, manipulation, and protection of information in quantum states. For fault-tolerant quantum technologies, however, the separation is artificial. A quantum memory or processor is an open, controlled, and dissipative information-processing system whose logical degrees of freedom are maintained against noise by repeated syndrome extraction, feedback, dissipation, and reset. This article develops a unifying framework in which quantum error correction (QEC) is interpreted as the stabilization of an emergent informational order in a driven nonequilibrium quantum system. The framework is organized around five common mathematical structures: density operators and quantum channels; relative entropy and nonequilibrium free energy; Gorini–Kossakowski–Lindblad–Sudarshan (GKLS) dynamics and entropy production; code subspaces, syndromes, and recovery channels; and Liouvillian spectral structure, metastability, and criticality. We show how active QEC can be viewed as an entropy-pumping cycle that transfers noise-generated uncertainty from protected degrees of freedom into syndrome and controller degrees of freedom, whose reuse requires thermodynamic reset. Continuous and autonomous QEC are formulated as competition between natural noise and engineered dissipative generators, yielding stationary or periodic nonequilibrium states with nonvanishing microscopic currents even when logical observables are approximately stationary. Complexity is introduced from the outset through multiscale organization, predictive coarse-graining, information dynamics, and spectral separation; these concepts distinguish structured persistence from entropy reduction alone. At the level of a conceptual synthesis, this perspective relates model-specific fault-tolerance thresholds to critical phenomena, logical subspaces with slow emergent manifolds, syndrome decoding with stochastic inference, and engineered dissipation with self-organization. We finally propose a thermodynamic-complexity description of QEC in terms of logical error rate, entropy-production rate, Liouvillian gap, information flow, and control power. The resulting framework provides a common language for quantum thermodynamics, nonequilibrium statistical mechanics, complexity science, and quantum information and identifies concrete questions for thermodynamically efficient fault-tolerant quantum architectures.

Keywords: information thermodynamics; quantum information; quantum error correction; nonequilibrium steady states; complexity science; entropy; Lindblad dynamics; fault tolerance

Check for updates

Academic Editors: Lock Yue Chew and François Gay-Balmaz

Received: 16 September 2026
Revised: 20 October 2026
Accepted: 25 October 2026
Published: 30 October 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.

1. Introduction and Contribution

Quantum information theory, quantum thermodynamics, and complexity science address different questions, but they meet naturally in quantum error correction (QEC). Quantum information theory asks how information is represented, transformed, transmitted, and protected when its physical carrier obeys quantum mechanics. Quantum thermodynamics asks how energy, entropy, heat, work, fluctuations, and irreversibility are defined and constrained for quantum systems, particularly open systems away from equilibrium.

Complexity science asks how collective organization, robustness, criticality, multiscale dynamics, information flow, and emergent variables arise in systems with many interacting degrees of freedom. An operating error-corrected quantum memory or processor contains all three structures simultaneously. In the language of complex systems, the challenge is not simply to count microscopic degrees of freedom but to identify collective variables whose future evolution remains predictable despite microscopic fluctuations. Information-theoretic dependence, predictive compression, and evolution-operator spectra offer complementary ways to make this notion operational [1,2].

This article is therefore organized pedagogically before it is organized around QEC. We first introduce quantum information theory from the ground up: classical information, Hilbert-space states, density operators, measurements, composite systems, entanglement, quantum channels, purification, entropy, relative entropy, data processing, and recoverability. This order follows the logic of modern self-contained treatments of quantum information [3,4]. It also avoids a conceptual ambiguity that is important for an interdisciplinary audience: "quantum information" may refer operationally to information encoded and processed by quantum physical systems rather than a universally agreed new substance or ontological entity [5]. We also develop an explicit foundation in complexity science—organized correlations, information dynamics, coarse-graining, predictive states, and dynamical modes—before connecting these ideas to QEC. We then introduce quantum thermodynamics as the extension of thermodynamic reasoning to small, fluctuating, coherent, correlated, and open quantum systems, emphasizing the first and second laws, Gibbs states, nonequilibrium free energy, open-system dynamics, entropy production, stochastic thermodynamics, information thermodynamics, and resource theories [6–8].

An additional mathematical thread makes the transition from microscopic quantum operations to fault-tolerant information preservation explicit. Finite Weyl–Heisenberg shift and phase operators form a basis for quantum errors; their commutator phases are encoded by a discrete symplectic pairing. Commuting isotropic collections of these operators define stabilizer constraints, while syndrome measurements identify the error sector without resolving the unknown logical state. The resulting construction supplies a first-principles route to the Knill–Laflamme correctability criterion (Section 3.1.2). Crucially, the algebra specifies which errors can be distinguished, whereas the noise channel and quantum state specify their probabilities. This separation of algebraic structure from stochastic dynamics is essential when syndrome information is subsequently assigned a thermodynamic cost.

Only after these foundations are established do we turn to QEC. This sequencing serves the main objective of the article: to present QEC as a mathematically controlled environment in which a reader can study the intersection of quantum information theory, quantum thermodynamics, nonequilibrium statistical mechanics, and complexity science. The key observation is that a functioning error-corrected quantum device is not an isolated computer. Environmental interactions continually generate errors, decoherence, and correlations with uncontrolled degrees of freedom; error correction continually acquires syndrome information, performs inference and control, resets auxiliary degrees of freedom, and exports entropy. Logical stability is therefore dynamically maintained rather than inherited from thermal equilibrium.

https://doi.org/10.3390/complexities2040025

The conceptual basis of the developed framework is the author's own technical report, being elaborated over the last ten years, whose central thesis is that information and energy are complementary physical resources and realistic quantum technologies are constrained simultaneously by informational and thermodynamic budgets [9]. The sharper thesis developed here is

> *Fault-tolerant quantum information can be viewed as an emergent nonequilibrium order maintained by information acquisition, recovery dynamics, resource consumption, and controlled entropy export.*

This statement is intended as a framework, not a claim that every QEC implementation realizes the same thermodynamic model. Measurement-based, autonomous, dissipative, and stroboscopic protocols have different physical bookkeeping. Nevertheless, they share enough mathematical structure to make QEC a particularly useful interdisciplinary laboratory.

Relation to Prior Thermodynamic QEC Work and Scope of the Contribution

Thermodynamic interpretations of QEC are established, and the present article does not claim priority for the quantum-engine analogy, entropy pumping, or the existence of fidelity–energetics trade-offs. Landi, Fonseca de Oliveira, and Buksman [10] analyzed four-stroke error-correcting engines, including entropy production, work costs, a classical three-qubit code, and the nine-qubit Shor code. Danageozian, Wilde, and Buscemi [11] formulated general quantum-measurement thermodynamics and obtained a conditional triple trade-off involving correction fidelity, engine efficiency, and measurement efficacy. Czartowski and Binder [12] established a code- and syndrome-dependent hierarchy of ideal energetic costs for reusable syndrome memories, including measurement and bit-level inefficiencies. These are distinct substantive antecedents rather than special cases derived in this article.

The contribution here is a conceptual synthesis and operational research agenda, not a new universal thermodynamic inequality. The finite Weyl–Heisenberg and symplectic account included here is an expository foundation for that synthesis, not a claim of a new stabilizer-code construction or correction theorem. Specifically, we combine (i) the channel and reference-system definition of logical information preservation; (ii) separate thermodynamic bookkeeping for record reset, physical control, and engineered reservoirs; (iii) the distinction between stationary, noiseless-subsystem, and metastable logical manifolds; and (iv) multiscale spectral and computational-complexity diagnostics. Their joint use yields an explicit set of architecture-comparison observables and falsifiable research questions. The proposed multiobjective functional and scaling ansatz are illustrative modeling tools, not proved bounds. The diagnostic quantities are not assumed to be independent or universally comparable: a specified physical boundary, units, noise model, code family, and recovery implementation are necessary for meaningful cross-architecture comparison. Table 1 makes the boundary between the earlier results and the present synthesis explicit.

Table 1. Positioning of the present perspective relative to the thermodynamic QEC literature.

Work	Established Emphasis	Relation to Present Manuscript
Landi et al. [10]	Four-stroke QEC engine, work and entropy production	Provides thermodynamic-cycle antecedent; no new cycle theorem claimed here.
Danageozian et al. [11]	Measurement heat and conditional efficiency–fidelity–efficacy trade-off	Supplies rigorous trade-off benchmark; not reproduced as a new result.

Table 1. *Cont.*

Work	Established Emphasis	Relation to Present Manuscript
Czartowski and Binder [12]	Syndrome-memory work costs and code-dependent inefficiencies	Supplies microscopic erasure-cost benchmarks distinct from total device power.
This perspective	Joint informational, thermodynamic, spectral, and computational diagnostics	Proposed cross-platform organization and testable questions; no universal bound established.

2. Foundations: Quantum Information, Thermodynamics, and Resources

2.1. Foundations of Quantum Information Theory

2.1.1. From Shannon Information to Quantum Information

For engineers, the most economical entrance to quantum information is through Shannon's communication problem. A discrete source emits symbols $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with probabilities $p(x)$. Its Shannon entropy is

$$H(X) = -\sum_x p(x) \log_2 p(x), \tag{1}$$

and the mutual information between source X and received variable Y is

$$I(X:Y) = H(X) + H(Y) - H(X,Y). \tag{2}$$

The operational questions are coding questions: how many bits are required for faithful compression, and at what rate can messages be transmitted reliably through a noisy channel? Quantum information theory preserves this operational viewpoint while replacing classical probability distributions and stochastic channels by quantum states, measurements, and quantum channels [3,4].

This operational definition is preferable here to an ontological one. The literature contains distinct interpretations of what the phrase "quantum information" denotes. For the present framework, information is treated as an abstract operational resource whose physical encoding may be classical or quantum; what becomes specifically quantum are the state space, admissible transformations, measurement statistics, correlations, and achievable information-processing tasks [5]. This distinction prevents the thermodynamic statement "information is physical" from being misread as saying that information is itself a new material substance. Rather, every usable record, codeword, syndrome, or logical qubit must be instantiated in a physical system.

2.1.2. Hilbert Spaces, Pure States, and Qubits

A finite-dimensional quantum system is associated with a complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \simeq \mathbb{C}^d$. A pure state is represented by a unit vector $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ with physically irrelevant global phase. For a qubit, $d = 2$ and

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle, \qquad |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1. \tag{3}$$

Unitary transformations $U^\dagger U = I$ describe reversible closed-system dynamics, $|\psi\rangle \mapsto U|\psi\rangle$. The qubit is not simply a classical bit with a continuum of values: nonorthogonal states cannot be perfectly distinguished, arbitrary unknown states cannot be cloned, and measurements generally disturb the state. These facts are not peripheral curiosities; they explain why quantum communication and QEC require fundamentally different structures from classical repetition and majority voting [3,4].

2.1.3. Density Operators and Statistical Mixtures

The density operator is the fundamental state object for both quantum information and quantum thermodynamics. A state ρ satisfies

$$\rho \geq 0, \qquad \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho = 1. \tag{4}$$

If an ensemble $\{p_x, |\psi_x\rangle\}$ is prepared, then

$$\rho = \sum_x p_x |\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|. \tag{5}$$

Pure states obey $\rho^2 = \rho$ and $\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho^2 = 1$; mixed states satisfy $\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho^2 < 1$. For an observable $A = A^\dagger$, the expectation value is

$$\langle A \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho A). \tag{6}$$

This formalism contains both classical uncertainty about preparations and intrinsically quantum structure such as coherence. It is also the natural bridge to thermodynamics because energy, entropy, equilibrium, and open-system dynamics are all expressed in terms of ρ.

2.1.4. Measurements, POVMs, and the Born Rule

A general quantum measurement with outcomes y is described by a positive-operator-valued measure (POVM) $\{M_y\}$ satisfying

$$M_y \geq 0, \qquad \sum_y M_y = I, \tag{7}$$

with outcome probabilities

$$p(y) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho M_y). \tag{8}$$

To describe state change as well as probabilities, one uses a quantum instrument with measurement operators $K_{y\alpha}$ such that

$$p(y) = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\sum_\alpha K_{y\alpha}\rho K_{y\alpha}^\dagger\right), \qquad \rho_y = \frac{\sum_\alpha K_{y\alpha}\rho K_{y\alpha}^\dagger}{p(y)}. \tag{9}$$

The distinction between the classical record y and the conditional quantum state ρ_y becomes central in QEC: syndrome extraction must acquire information about the error while avoiding acquisition of the encoded logical amplitudes.

2.1.5. Composite Systems, Reduced States, and Entanglement

For systems A and B, the joint state lives on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. The reduced states are

$$\rho_A = \mathrm{Tr}_B(\rho_{AB}), \qquad \rho_B = \mathrm{Tr}_A(\rho_{AB}). \tag{10}$$

A pure bipartite state is entangled when it cannot be written as $|\psi_A\rangle \otimes |\phi_B\rangle$. The Bell state

$$|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{|00\rangle + |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{11}$$

is globally pure but has maximally mixed marginals, $\rho_A = \rho_B = I/2$. This elementary example is conceptually important for thermodynamics: subsystem entropy can arise from correlations rather than ignorance about a global pure state. It is equally important for QEC because preserving a logical qubit means preserving its possible entanglement with an external reference system, not merely preserving a preferred set of basis states.

2.1.6. Quantum Channels: The Universal Language of Physical Processing

The most general deterministic quantum state transformation is a completely positive trace-preserving (CPTP) map $\mathcal{E}$. In Kraus form,

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_{\mu} K_{\mu} \rho K_{\mu}^{\dagger}, \qquad \sum_{\mu} K_{\mu}^{\dagger} K_{\mu} = I. \tag{12}$$

Complete positivity is required because a physical transformation must remain positive even when the input system is entangled with an arbitrary reference. Quantum channels encompass unitary evolution, noise, preparation, measurement when the record is included, partial trace, and recovery operations [3,4]. This universality is one of the decisive reasons QEC provides a bridge to thermodynamics: the same CPTP formalism describes information degradation and reduced open-system evolution.

A channel admits a Stinespring dilation,

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho_S) = \mathrm{Tr}_E[U_{SE}(\rho_S \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_E)U_{SE}^{\dagger}]. \tag{13}$$

Thus apparently irreversible system dynamics can arise from reversible dynamics on a larger system followed by discarding environmental degrees of freedom. Information lost from S need not be annihilated; it can become encoded in correlations with E. This statement is simultaneously informational and thermodynamic.

2.1.7. Purification and the Reference-System Viewpoint

Every mixed state ρ_A can be represented as the marginal of a pure state $|\psi\rangle_{RA}$ on a larger Hilbert space,

$$\rho_A = \mathrm{Tr}_R |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{RA}. \tag{14}$$

Purification turns preservation of an unknown quantum state into preservation of correlations with a reference R. If a noise channel $\mathcal{N}$ and recovery $\mathcal{R}$ act on A, an operational test of QEC is whether

$$(\mathcal{I}_R \otimes \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N})(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{RA}) \approx |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{RA}. \tag{15}$$

This viewpoint clarifies why quantum information cannot be identified with the von Neumann entropy of the data system alone.

2.1.8. Entropy, Relative Entropy, Mutual Information, and Coherent Information

Using logarithms base two, the von Neumann entropy is

$$H(A)_{\rho} = -\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_A \log_2 \rho_A). \tag{16}$$

It reduces to Shannon entropy for a density matrix diagonal in a classical basis. For a bipartite state,

$$H(A|B)_{\rho} = H(AB)_{\rho} - H(B)_{\rho}, \tag{17}$$

$$I(A:B)_{\rho} = H(A)_{\rho} + H(B)_{\rho} - H(AB)_{\rho}, \tag{18}$$

$$I(A\rangle B)_{\rho} = -H(A|B)_{\rho}. \tag{19}$$

Unlike classical conditional entropy, $H(A|B)$ can be negative for entangled states; its negative, coherent information, plays a central role in quantum communication [3]. The quantum relative entropy

$$D(\rho\|\sigma) = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho(\ln\rho - \ln\sigma)] \tag{20}$$

is nonnegative when the support condition is satisfied and obeys the data-processing inequality

$$D(\rho\|\sigma) \geq D(\mathcal{E}(\rho)\|\mathcal{E}(\sigma)). \tag{21}$$

Equation (21) states that physical processing cannot increase the distinguishability of two states when no additional side information is supplied. Relative entropy, mutual information, conditional mutual information, fidelity, and trace distance therefore quantify different aspects of information preservation and loss. Their thermodynamic significance will emerge below.

2.1.9. Quantum Error Correction in Information-Theoretic Terms

QEC can now be introduced before any thermodynamic interpretation is imposed. An encoding is a channel $\mathcal{V}$ from a logical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_L$ into a larger physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_P$. Noise acts through $\mathcal{N}$ and recovery through $\mathcal{R}$. The ideal requirement is

$$\mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{V} \simeq \mathrm{id}_L \tag{22}$$

where $\mathcal{V} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_L) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_P)$ is encoding, $\mathcal{N} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_P) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_P)$ is noise, and $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_P) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_L)$ is a decoding recovery channel. Alternatively, if recovery returns a physical encoded state, $\mathcal{R}_P \circ \mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{V} \simeq \mathcal{V}$ with $\mathcal{R}_P : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_P) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_P)$. The requirement holds on all logical states, including states entangled with references. QEC is therefore a problem of preserving a subsystem or subspace against a class of channels. The central engineering quantities are logical error probability, entanglement fidelity, correctable error sets, code distance, and resource overhead. This informational formulation will later be reinterpreted dynamically and thermodynamically.

2.2. Foundations of Quantum Thermodynamics

2.2.1. Why Thermodynamics Must Be Reformulated at the Quantum Scale

Macroscopic thermodynamics deliberately suppresses microscopic detail. Quantum thermodynamics asks how its universal constraints apply when the working system may consist of only a few quantum degrees of freedom, possess coherence and entanglement, fluctuate strongly, and be driven far from equilibrium. Modern treatments therefore combine equilibrium statistical mechanics, open quantum systems, stochastic thermodynamics, and quantum information [6–8].

A useful starting point is to distinguish three levels of description. At the closed-system level, a density operator evolves unitarily according to

$$\dot{\rho} = -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar}[H(t), \rho]. \tag{23}$$

At the open-system level, the system exchanges energy and information with reservoirs and controllers. At the trajectory level, individual measurement records and quantum jumps fluctuate stochastically. QEC may require all three descriptions: coherent gates, open-system noise and reset, and stochastic syndrome records.

2.2.2. Equilibrium Statistical Mechanics and Gibbs States

For Hamiltonian H, temperature T, inverse temperature $\beta = (k_{\mathrm{B}}T)^{-1}$, and partition function

$$Z = \mathrm{Tr}(e^{-\beta H}), \tag{24}$$

the canonical equilibrium state is

$$\tau_\beta = \frac{e^{-\beta H}}{Z}. \tag{25}$$

Its internal energy and entropy are

$$U(\rho) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho H), \qquad S(\rho) = -k_{\mathrm{B}}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\rho \ln \rho), \tag{26}$$

and the nonequilibrium Helmholtz free-energy functional is

$$F_T(\rho) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho H) - TS(\rho). \tag{27}$$

The equilibrium state minimizes F_T at fixed H and T.

2.2.3. First Law: Energy, Heat, and Work

For $U(t) = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho(t)H(t)]$,

$$\dot{U} = \mathrm{Tr}(\dot{\rho}H) + \mathrm{Tr}(\rho\dot{H}). \tag{28}$$

Under the standard weak-coupling convention, one identifies

$$\dot{Q} = \mathrm{Tr}(\dot{\rho}H), \qquad \dot{W} = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho\dot{H}), \qquad \dot{U} = \dot{Q} + \dot{W}. \tag{29}$$

The decomposition is physically transparent for driven weakly coupled systems but is not unique in every strong-coupling, measurement, or feedback setting [7]. For QEC this caveat matters because controller work, measurement energetics, ancilla preparation, and heat dumped during reset belong to the enlarged implementation, not necessarily to a simple reduced-system Hamiltonian.

2.2.4. Second Law, Relative Entropy, and Nonequilibrium Free Energy

Substituting the Gibbs state (25) into quantum relative entropy gives

$$F_T(\rho) - F_T(\tau_\beta) = k_\mathrm{B}TD(\rho\|\tau_\beta) \geq 0. \tag{30}$$

This identity is the central mathematical hinge of the present article. In quantum information, $D(\rho\|\sigma)$ quantifies statistical distinguishability and obeys data processing. In thermodynamics, $D(\rho\|\tau_\beta)$ measures excess nonequilibrium free energy relative to the Gibbs state. Information-theoretic contraction and thermodynamic irreversibility are therefore linked by the same functional [8,13].

For an isothermal transformation under appropriate assumptions, the average work satisfies

$$\langle W \rangle \geq \Delta F, \tag{31}$$

with equality approached by a reversible quasistatic process. Far from equilibrium, fluctuation relations such as Jarzynski's equality,

$$\left\langle e^{-\beta W} \right\rangle = e^{-\beta \Delta F}, \tag{32}$$

and Crooks' relation refine this average statement by constraining entire work distributions [7,14,15].

2.2.5. Open Quantum Systems and GKLS Dynamics

No realistic QEC device is isolated. If S interacts with an environment E, a common microscopic Hamiltonian decomposition is

$$H_{SE} = H_S + H_E + H_\mathrm{int}. \tag{33}$$

The joint state may evolve unitarily while the reduced state $\rho_S = \mathrm{Tr}_E \rho_{SE}$ evolves irreversibly. Under weak-coupling, Markovian, and related assumptions, the reduced dynamics take GKLS form [16–18],

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathcal{L}(\rho) = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H, \rho] + \sum_\mu \gamma_\mu \left(L_\mu \rho L_\mu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{L_\mu^\dagger L_\mu, \rho\} \right). \tag{34}$$

Writing

$$\mathcal{D}[L](\rho) = L\rho L^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{L^\dagger L, \rho\}, \tag{35}$$

we have $\mathcal{L} = -i[H, \cdot]/\hbar + \sum_\mu \gamma_\mu \mathcal{D}[L_\mu]$. The jump operators can describe relaxation, excitation, dephasing, loss, or deliberately engineered correction.

2.2.6. Entropy Production and Nonequilibrium Steady States

For a thermal quantum dynamical semigroup with stationary state τ_β, Spohn's entropy-production inequality gives [19]

$$\sigma(t) = -\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\mathcal{L}(\rho_t)(\ln \rho_t - \ln \tau_\beta)\Big] \geq 0. \tag{36}$$

A stationary state satisfies $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{\mathrm{ss}}) = 0$. Equilibrium is a special kind of stationarity. A nonequilibrium steady state (NESS) can remain time-independent at the level of ρ_{ss} while sustaining nonzero heat, particle, probability, or information currents and positive entropy production because external reservoirs or controls continually drive the system.

For periodically driven systems the asymptotic state need not be time independent. Instead one may have a periodic steady state $\rho_*(t + \mathcal{T}) = \rho_*(t)$ or, equivalently, a fixed point of the one-cycle channel. This distinction will be important when comparing autonomous continuous QEC with measurement-based stroboscopic QEC.

2.2.7. Stochastic Thermodynamics, Measurement, and Feedback

At small scales, fluctuations are not negligible corrections but part of the theory. Quantum stochastic thermodynamics resolves dynamics into measurement-conditioned trajectories or quantum jumps and assigns trajectory-dependent work, heat, and entropy production under explicitly stated measurement schemes [7]. Measurement and feedback add an information flow to the thermodynamic balance. In Maxwell-demon-type settings, acquired information can be converted into improved work extraction or reduced dissipation, but memory preparation and reset restore consistency with the second law [13,20].

This is already close to QEC. A syndrome record is a measurement record; a decoder is an estimator acting on that record; recovery is feedback; and ancilla reset closes the control cycle. The analogy becomes useful only when the full physical controller and memory are included in the thermodynamic accounting.

2.2.8. Landauer Principle and the Physicality of Information

Landauer's principle concerns logically irreversible information erasure. For an unbiased classical bit reset in contact with a reservoir at temperature T, the quasistatic minimum heat dumped to the environment is

$$Q_{\mathrm{erase}} \geq k_{\mathrm{B}} T \ln 2. \tag{37}$$

More generally, the cost depends on the state, correlations, side information, reservoir size, and protocol. Quantum side information can even change the conditional erasure cost [6,21]. The correct lesson for QEC is therefore not that every syndrome bit automatically dissipates exactly $k_{\mathrm{B}} T \ln 2$. It is that reusable finite-memory controllers require a thermodynamic cycle, and logically irreversible reset cannot be omitted from a complete resource accounting.

2.3. Foundations of Complexity Science: Organization, Prediction, and Scale

Complexity science studies systems for which the collective behavior cannot be adequately characterized by listing independent component states. Its central questions concern how interactions generate persistent correlations, how useful macroscopic descriptions

are obtained from microscopic dynamics, and how those descriptions remain predictive when the underlying degrees of freedom fluctuate. This perspective complements quantum information theory, which quantifies accessible correlations and transformations, and thermodynamics, which constrains energy and entropy exchanges. The distinction is substantive: a system may have high entropy without exhibiting organized structure, while a perfectly ordered but static system need not support rich information processing. Varley's account of information-theoretic tools for complex systems emphasizes dependence, information dynamics, and multivariate organization; Rupe and Crutchfield emphasize that identifying organization requires a representation of persistent structure and a dynamical account of its evolution [1,2].

2.3.1. Collective Correlations and Information Dynamics

For two classical variables U and V, mutual information can be written as

$$I(U:V) = D\big(p_{UV} \| p_U p_V\big), \tag{38}$$

which vanishes exactly when the variables are independent. For a multicomponent classical record $\boldsymbol{Y} = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$, one possible measure of aggregate dependence is total correlation,

$$T(\boldsymbol{Y}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} H(Y_j) - H(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n) \geq 0. \tag{39}$$

It measures deviation from componentwise independence, not the amount of emergent organization itself: redundant copying, synergistic constraints, and long-range predictive structure can have different operational meanings even when a single scalar dependence measure is similar [1]. For quantum subsystems an analogous quantity is $\sum_j H(A_j) - H(A_1 \cdots A_n) = D(\rho_{A_1 \cdots A_n} \| \bigotimes_j \rho_{A_j})$ using von Neumann entropies in bits and the correspondingly base-two relative entropy. These quantities characterize correlations but do not automatically diagnose correctability or thermodynamic work cost.

Time-resolved records require an additional distinction between static dependence and predictive information. If S_t denotes a measured syndrome at correction round t, then $I(S_t : S_{t+1})$ describes one-step statistical dependence, while $I(S_{<t} : S_{\geq t})$—when well-defined—quantifies shared information between entire past and future records. The latter is often called excess entropy in stationary-process analysis [1]. Such measures can reveal memory in correlated errors, yet they are properties of the chosen measurement record and statistical model, not intrinsic scalar measures of the encoded quantum state. In particular, temporal correlations may change the decoder's inference problem even if single-round syndrome probabilities remain unchanged.

2.3.2. Coarse-Graining, Predictive Equivalence, and Emergent Variables

A macroscopic description is a map from a detailed physical description to a smaller set of variables. In QEC, a useful example is the separation of a physical state into its logical content and an error-syndrome sector. A good coarse-graining does not merely reduce dimension: it retains the distinctions needed for the intended prediction or control task. A classical formulation groups histories h and h' into the same predictive class when

$$h \sim h' \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \Pr(S_{\geq t} \mid S_{<t} = h) = \Pr(S_{\geq t} \mid S_{<t} = h'). \tag{40}$$

The equivalence classes provide a minimal predictive representation under the usual assumptions of computational mechanics. Rupe and Crutchfield develop this predictive-equivalence viewpoint alongside evolution-operator descriptions of emergent organization [2]. Applied to QEC, this is a proposed modeling lens, not an assertion that a particular code automatically realizes such a minimal model: one could construct predictive states of

syndrome histories to compress the required information for decoding temporally correlated noise. The predictive-state entropy would then measure complexity of that particular inferred process rather than the number of physical qubits or the quantum code distance.

2.3.3. Evolution Operators, Slow Modes, and Robustness

Organization can also be characterized dynamically. For a quantum channel Φ, the Schrödinger picture evolves density operators, $\rho_{t+1} = \Phi(\rho_t)$, whereas its adjoint evolves observables, $O_{t+1} = \Phi^\dagger(O_t)$. The spectral modes of these linear maps distinguish stationary, slowly relaxing, and rapidly decaying behavior. For continuous Markovian dynamics, the analogous generator is the Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}$. A protected logical sector should retain independent logical populations and coherences over timescales that have long been compared with the relaxation of correctable syndrome excitations. Consequently, spectral separation gives a concrete form to the multiscale language of emergence provided that one distinguishes an exact noiseless manifold from an approximate metastable one.

The evolution-operator perspective on organization developed by Rupe and Crutchfield concerns classical dynamics; its use here is a carefully delimited analogy through the linear evolution of quantum states and observables, not an identification of classical Koopman theory with quantum-channel theory [2]. Nor does the existence of a spectral gap alone prove a fault-tolerance threshold. The latter requires a specified code family, noise model, decoder, and scaling limit. These qualifications prevent "emergence" from becoming a synonym for any stable fixed point.

2.3.4. Why These Ideas Matter for Thermodynamic QEC

These concepts lead to three distinct questions that can be asked of the same QEC apparatus. Information theory asks which logical correlations survive the channel and recovery. Complexity science asks which coarse-grained variables and predictive regularities persist and whether their timescales separate from microscopic errors. Thermodynamics asks what heat, work, information transfer, and irreversible reset are required to maintain that persistence. For example, correlated syndrome histories may permit more efficient statistical prediction without necessarily reducing the physical cost of syndrome extraction; conversely, faster dissipative relaxation may improve stability while consuming additional control resources. The joint analysis must therefore report predictive or spectral diagnostics alongside logical fidelity and physical resource budgets rather than treating any one quantity as a universal complexity measure.

2.4. Resource Theories: A Common Operational Grammar

Quantum information and thermodynamics share an operational grammar: specify free states, allowed operations, and resources that cannot be generated freely. Entanglement theory treats entanglement as a resource under locality restrictions; thermodynamic resource theories treat Gibbs states as free under suitable energy-conserving operations and athermality as a resource [8,22,23]. Coherence and correlations can also be thermodynamic resources when the operational restrictions make them useful.

This resource-theoretic viewpoint is particularly helpful for QEC. A code does not merely occupy Hilbert space; it defines an informational resource whose preservation requires a restricted set of noise processes to be counteracted by available control resources. Thermodynamic cost, controller locality, decoder complexity, correction bandwidth, and physical error rate can therefore be treated as simultaneous constraints on a state-transformation problem.

The general quantum resource theory (QRT) framework makes this operational grammar precise. For a system A with state space $\mathcal{S}(A)$, one identifies a subset $\mathcal{F}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(A)$

of free states and, for systems A and B, a set $O(A \to B)$ of free operations. A state outside $\mathcal{F}(A)$ is a resource precisely because it cannot be prepared under the adopted operational restrictions. Consistency requires, at minimum, that free operations do not create the resource from free inputs. The essential point is relational rather than ontological: a state is not "resourceful" in isolation; its value is defined relative to which transformations an agent can implement without paying for the resource. Chitambar and Gour emphasize that this same architecture accommodates entanglement, coherence, asymmetry, athermality, magic, non-Gaussianity, and other quantum phenomena, thereby exposing common structures that are hidden when each phenomenon is studied separately [24].

The central dynamical question of a QRT is convertibility. Given states ρ and σ, one asks whether there exists a free channel $\Lambda \in O$ such that

$$\Lambda(\rho) = \sigma, \tag{41}$$

or, more realistically, whether the conversion can be achieved approximately, probabilistically, catalytically, or asymptotically. Free convertibility induces a preorder on state space: $\rho \succeq_O \sigma$ if ρ can be converted to σ by free operations. This ordering need not be total; two states may be incomparable. Entanglement provides the canonical example. Under local operations and classical communication (LOCC), bipartite pure-state convertibility is governed by the majorization ordering of Schmidt coefficients, whereas multipartite convertibility becomes structurally and computationally much more difficult [24,25]. Thus a resource theory does more than attach a scalar "amount" to a state: it organizes the physically accessible transformations and identifies which tasks are possible under specified constraints.

Resource monotones convert this ordering into quantitative bounds. A function $R(\rho)$ is a resource monotone when it vanishes (or takes its minimum) on free states and cannot increase under free operations,

$$R(\Lambda(\rho)) \leq R(\rho), \qquad \Lambda \in O. \tag{42}$$

Additional properties—convexity, additivity or subadditivity, and asymptotic continuity—may be required according to the operational task. A particularly general construction is the relative entropy of resource,

$$R_{\mathrm{rel}}(\rho) = \inf_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}} D(\rho \| \sigma), \tag{43}$$

which measures distinguishability from the free set. Its importance here is immediate: the same quantum relative entropy introduced earlier as an information-theoretic distinguishability measure also quantifies distance from thermodynamic equilibrium when the free state is Gibbs. QRT therefore supplies a formal reason why relative entropy repeatedly appears at the information–thermodynamics interface [24].

Quantum thermodynamics is especially natural in this language. For a fixed Hamiltonian H and inverse temperature β, the Gibbs state $\tau_\beta = e^{-\beta H}/Z$ is the canonical free state in the thermal resource theory. Under thermal operations, a system interacts with thermal ancillas through global energy-conserving unitaries and inaccessible degrees of freedom may be discarded. States differing from τ_β possess athermality: they contain nonequilibrium structure that is potentially convertible into useful work or other thermodynamic resources. The identity already established in Equation (30) can consequently be read as a resource statement: nonequilibrium free energy is proportional to a relative-entropy measure of athermality. Generalized divergence-based monotones generate families of thermodynamic constraints, often described as generalized second laws, that become important outside the macroscopic equilibrium limit [23,24].

The distinction between single-shot and asymptotic resource manipulation is also important for the present article. In the asymptotic regime one studies transformations

of many independent copies and conversion rates, which can yield comparatively simple entropy-based descriptions. In an actual QEC cycle, however, syndrome extraction, feedback, ancilla preparation, and reset occur in finite time and with finite physical systems. This places QEC closer to a repeated finite-resource or single-shot setting than an ideal thermodynamic limit. The resource cost of a correction round can therefore depend not only on an average free-energy difference but also fluctuations, finite-size effects, correlations, and the tolerated failure probability. This observation connects the QRT perspective directly to the stochastic-thermodynamic and trajectory-level description developed above.

A second lesson from entanglement theory is that physical convertibility and computational tractability are distinct resources. Chitambar's analysis shows that bipartite pure-state transformation questions can admit efficient majorization-based tests, while general multipartite entanglement transformations can become NP-hard; adding subsystems can therefore alter not merely the geometry of the resource ordering but the computational effort needed to decide or implement a transformation [25]. This point is especially relevant to fault-tolerant QEC. A recovery transformation may be physically allowed and thermodynamically affordable yet still require a decoder, optimization, or control policy whose computational latency exceeds the available correction timescale. In the present framework, decoder complexity and classical processing are therefore not peripheral engineering overheads: they are part of the operational constraints that determine which recovery maps are effectively accessible.

QEC itself should not be forced into a single pre-existing QRT. Rather, it is better viewed as a resource-conversion network in which several resources coexist and are traded. Encoded logical information is the quantity to be preserved; low-entropy ancillas, free energy, coherence, entanglement, measurement records, control bandwidth, and non-stabilizer magic may become resources depending on the code and computational model. For stabilizer fault tolerance, for example, Clifford/stabilizer processing can be treated as free in the resource theory of magic, while non-stabilizer states supply the resource needed for universal computation [24]. Meanwhile the thermodynamic description assigns costs to preparation, feedback, and reset. This multi-resource viewpoint prevents the thermodynamic cost of QEC from being conflated with any single scalar entropy change.

For the argument of this article, the principal function of QRT is therefore methodological. It provides an intermediate layer between the kinematics of quantum information and the energetics of quantum thermodynamics: (i) operational restrictions define the admissible transformations; (ii) monotones and convertibility relations determine what can or cannot be achieved without consuming a resource; (iii) single-shot and asymptotic analyses distinguish finite-cycle operation from idealized large-system limits; and (iv) computational complexity determines whether an admissible transformation can be found and executed within the available physical time. When the QEC cycle is interpreted through this lens, fault tolerance becomes a constrained nonequilibrium resource-management problem. This is precisely the perspective needed for the transition to the next section, where QEC is used to couple information preservation, entropy production, feedback, and multiscale complexity in one dynamical framework.

2.5. QEC Couples Information, Thermodynamics, and Complexity

The preceding foundations now provide a three-way connection: information-theoretic recoverability, thermodynamic resource accounting, and complexity-science descriptions of collective correlations, predictive structure, and slow dynamics. The following bridges distinguish exact identities from interpretive or model-dependent connections. First, the density operator is simultaneously an informational state and a thermodynamic state. Second, a CPTP map is simultaneously an information-processing channel and an open-system

transformation. Third, relative entropy is simultaneously a distinguishability measure and, relative to a Gibbs state, a nonequilibrium free-energy measure. Fourth, measurement and feedback create explicit information currents with thermodynamic consequences. Fifth, QEC turns these ingredients into a recurrent dynamical architecture: noise displaces the system from a protected logical manifold; syndrome acquisition identifies the error sector; recovery drives the system toward the manifold; auxiliary memories are reset; and the cycle repeats.

The complexity-science content is already present in the predictive and dynamical organization of a correction cycle and becomes especially important when this architecture is scaled. Many physical degrees of freedom collectively encode fewer logical degrees of freedom; local stochastic errors compete with collective recovery; multiple timescales separate fast defect dynamics from slow logical failure; thresholds divide qualitatively different dynamical regimes; and the logical variables are emergent coarse-grained degrees of freedom. QEC therefore provides a controlled setting in which information flow, thermodynamic irreversibility, feedback, self-organization, metastability, and criticality can be studied using a common mathematical language.

The rest of the article develops this framework quantitatively. The goal is not to reduce quantum information to thermodynamics or thermodynamics to information theory. It is to identify the common structures and the points at which each theory supplies constraints that are absent from the others.

3. Quantum Error Correction as a Nonequilibrium Information Process

3.1. QEC as Selective Information Preservation

3.1.1. Code Subspaces and the Knill–Laflamme Conditions

Let $C \subset \mathcal{H}$ be a code subspace with projector P_C. A noise process with error operators $\{E_a\}$ is exactly correctable on C when [26]

$$P_C E_a^\dagger E_b P_C = c_{ab} P_C. \tag{44}$$

Equation (44) has an information-theoretic meaning: the error syndrome may reveal which error sector has been occupied without revealing the encoded logical amplitudes. For

$$|\psi_L\rangle = \alpha|0_L\rangle + \beta|1_L\rangle, \tag{45}$$

an ideal syndrome extraction schematically implements

$$E_a|\psi_L\rangle|0\rangle_A \longmapsto E_a|\psi_L\rangle|s_a\rangle_A, \tag{46}$$

where $|s_a\rangle_A$ labels the error but is independent of (α, β). QEC is thus not generic entropy reduction. It is selective information routing: information about the error is externalized while information about the logical state is preserved.

3.1.2. From Finite Weyl–Heisenberg Algebra to Correctable Quantum Information

The preceding correction criterion can be given a constructive algebraic interpretation. Rather than beginning with an assumed list of correctable errors, we first identify the elementary transformations that are available on a finite quantum system, determine how their noncommutativity is organized, and then use that organization to construct measurements that distinguish errors without measuring the encoded information. This yields a direct chain from finite Weyl–Heisenberg operators to symplectic geometry, stabilizer syndromes, and recovery.

3.1.3. A Two-Level Starting Point and Algebraic Probability

Choose the computational basis $|0\rangle = (1,0)^{\mathsf{T}}$ and $|1\rangle = (0,1)^{\mathsf{T}}$ and consider the interchange operator

$$X = |0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad X^{\dagger} = X, \quad X^2 = I. \tag{47}$$

The unital $*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}_X = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{I, X\}$ is isomorphic to the group algebra $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}_2]$ and $\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$. Equipped with the normalized trace $\tau(B) = \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}(B)$, it is an algebraic probability space in which X is a self-adjoint random variable. Its spectral projections $P_{\pm} = (I \pm X)/2$ have probabilities $\tau(P_{\pm}) = 1/2$, so its spectral law is the symmetric two-point measure. This is a distribution of measurement outcomes, not the frequency with which a physical bit-flip error occurs. A separate parameter p specifies the noise channel $\mathcal{N}_p(\rho) = (1-p)\rho + pX\rho X$.

The single-generator algebra is commutative and cannot represent all qubit errors. Introducing the phase operator $Z = |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|$ produces $ZX = -XZ$. This failure of commutativity is the elementary instance of the structure that permits distinct error types to be classified and detected. It also separates the state functional τ from the physical noise model: a general state $\varphi_\rho(B) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho B)$ determines observable statistics, whereas a channel specifies transformations of ρ.

3.1.4. Finite Shifts, Phases, and the Weyl–Heisenberg Relation

Let $d \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{H}_d = \mathbb{C}^d$ with orthonormal basis $\{|j\rangle : j \in \mathbb{Z}_d\}$. Set $\omega = \exp(2\pi i/d)$ and define

$$X_d|j\rangle = |j+1 \pmod d\rangle, \qquad Z_d|j\rangle = \omega^j|j\rangle. \tag{48}$$

Both are unitary, $X_d^d = Z_d^d = I$, and their actions on a basis vector show directly that $Z_d X_d = \omega X_d Z_d$. Define the displacement operators $W_{a,b} = X_d^a Z_d^b$ for $(a,b) \in \mathbb{Z}_d^2$. Their multiplication law is

$$W_{a,b}W_{c,e} = \omega^{bc} W_{a+c,b+e}, \qquad W_{a,b}W_{c,e} = \omega^{bc-ae} W_{c,e}W_{a,b}, \tag{49}$$

with indices taken modulo d. The phase in the first identity is a cocycle: it records the fact that the phase-space translations are represented projectively. Including scalar phases yields the finite Weyl–Heisenberg group. The operators $\{W_{a,b}\}$ are orthogonal under the Hilbert–Schmidt inner product,

$$\mathrm{Tr}(W_{a,b}^{\dagger} W_{c,e}) = d\,\delta_{a,c}\delta_{b,e}, \tag{50}$$

and therefore form an operator basis for $M_d(\mathbb{C})$. Thus an arbitrary single-qudit error operator has a unique expansion in these discrete displacements. This completeness is an algebraic statement; whether a particular collection of errors can be corrected depends on the encoding.

3.1.5. Symplectic Commutation and Multiple Physical Carriers

For $u = (a,b)$ and $v = (c,e)$, introduce the alternating bilinear form

$$[u,v]_{\mathrm{sp}} = bc - ae \pmod d. \tag{51}$$

Equation (49) becomes $W_u W_v = \omega^{[u,v]_{\mathrm{sp}}} W_v W_u$. Hence two displacements commute exactly when their symplectic pairing vanishes modulo d. On n qudits, write $u = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{2n}$ and $W_u = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n X_d^{a_j} Z_d^{b_j}$. The commutator phase is controlled by

$$[u,v]_{\mathrm{sp}} = \mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbf{e} \pmod d. \tag{52}$$

This is the finite analogue of the canonical symplectic pairing between displacement coordinates. For composite d, the underlying phase space is a module over $\mathbb{Z}_d$ rather than a vector space over a field; the commutation rule remains valid. In the qubit case $d = 2$, the pairing takes values in $\mathbb{F}_2$ and records whether two Pauli strings commute or anticommute. Symplectic methods for quantum codes exploit exactly this conversion of operator commutation into finite arithmetic [27,28].

3.1.6. From Isotropic Subgroups to Stabilizer Codes

A stabilizer group S is an abelian subgroup of the n-qubit Pauli group that is chosen with Hermitian generators and excluding $-I$. In the binary symplectic representation, its label space $L \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$ is isotropic: $[u, v]_{\mathrm{sp}} = 0$ for every $u, v \in L$. If r generators are independent, $|S| = 2^r$ and the simultaneous $+1$ eigenspace has dimension 2^{n-r}. Its orthogonal projector is the group average

$$P_C = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{g \in S} g = \prod_{j=1}^{r} \frac{I + S_j}{2}, \qquad k = n - r. \tag{53}$$

Indeed, the average is self-adjoint, idempotent, and invariant under multiplication by every stabilizer. It projects onto the invariant vectors rather than a prescribed basis state. Consequently, the protected object is a 2^k-dimensional logical space that retains arbitrary superpositions and entanglement with an external reference.

An error E represented by a Pauli string has a binary syndrome $\mathbf{s}(E) = (s_1, \ldots, s_r)$ defined by

$$S_j E = (-1)^{s_j(E)} E S_j, \qquad s_j(E) = [\ell_j, u_E]_{\mathrm{sp}} \pmod 2, \tag{54}$$

where ℓ_j and u_E label S_j and E. The corresponding joint measurement projector is

$$Q_{\mathbf{s}} = \prod_{j=1}^{r} \frac{I + (-1)^{s_j} S_j}{2}, \qquad \Pr(\mathbf{s}) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho Q_{\mathbf{s}}). \tag{55}$$

The projectors are mutually orthogonal and sum to the identity. For a state that is initially supported on the code, a Pauli error moves it into the sector indicated by its commutation pattern. A syndrome measurement learns this pattern, but, for correctable errors, it need not learn the amplitudes or phases of the logical state. In this precise sense, the stabilizer algebra is a classical record-generating subalgebra embedded in a noncommutative quantum information processor.

3.1.7. Syndrome Degeneracy and the Correction Criterion

Not every pair of different Pauli errors needs a different syndrome. Errors differing by a stabilizer act identically on the code and therefore may share a syndrome harmlessly. By contrast, if $E_a^\dagger E_b$ commutes with every stabilizer but acts as a nontrivial logical operator, the two errors are not jointly correctable. The distinction is expressed by the normalizer $N(S)$ of the stabilizer in the Pauli group: nontrivial logical Pauli operations are represented by $N(S)/S$ up to irrelevant phases. The code distance is the minimum Pauli weight of a representative in $N(S) \setminus S$ (for a nontrivial encoded space). An $[[n, k, d_{\min}]]$ code therefore corrects all errors supported on at most $t = \lfloor (d_{\min} - 1)/2 \rfloor$ qubits.

The Knill–Laflamme condition in Equation (44) explains why the syndrome construction works beyond Pauli noise. Expand each Kraus error in the complete Pauli basis. If the code corrects all the basis errors appearing in those expansions, linearity of $P_C E_a^\dagger E_b P_C$ guarantees correction of their linear combinations as well. Conversely, a stabilizer syndrome alone is insufficient if two physically possible errors share a syndrome but differ by a nontrivial logical action. Exact correction requires that every error-product operator, when

compressed to the code, be proportional to the code projector. This is the operator-algebraic content of Equation (44), not an assumption of statistically independent or exclusively Pauli errors.

3.1.8. A Concrete Three-Qubit Calculation

The bit-flip repetition code has $|0_L\rangle = |000\rangle$ and $|1_L\rangle = |111\rangle$ with $S_1 = Z_1Z_2$ and $S_2 = Z_2Z_3$. Its single-bit-flip errors I, X_1, X_2, X_3 have syndromes $(0,0), (1,0), (1,1), (0,1)$, respectively. Their corrupted code spaces are mutually orthogonal, giving

$$P_C X_a^\dagger X_b P_C = \delta_{ab} P_C, \qquad X_0 = I, \quad a, b \in \{0,1,2,3\}. \tag{56}$$

The measured syndrome selects an inverse bit flip and restores an arbitrary encoded superposition. This code does not correct arbitrary single-qubit errors: for example, a phase flip Z_1 commutes with both stabilizers and acts nontrivially on the logical space. The example therefore illustrates the importance of matching the algebra of correctable errors to the actual noise model.

3.1.9. Probability, Information Flow, and Thermodynamic Interpretation

The symplectic pairing determines which syndrome sector an error occupies but not how frequently that error occurs. Those frequencies arise from the quantum channel and input state. For commuting syndrome observables, the restriction of $\varphi_\rho(B) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho B)$ to their abelian algebra defines an ordinary joint probability law $p_{\mathbf{s}} = \varphi_\rho(Q_{\mathbf{s}})$. Its Shannon entropy

$$H(S) = -\sum_{\mathbf{s}} p_{\mathbf{s}} \log_2 p_{\mathbf{s}} \tag{57}$$

quantifies uncertainty in the syndrome record, not the entropy of the encoded logical qubit. This distinction supplies a bridge to the thermodynamic analysis that follows. An ideal extraction step correlates a reusable ancilla with the error sector while preserving logical coherence; a decoder interprets the classical outcome; conditional recovery removes the correctable displacement; and resetting the register prepares the apparatus for another round. Under appropriate isothermal memory-erasure assumptions and without usable side information, the reversible benchmark for erasing an optimally compressed syndrome record is $k_B T \ln 2\, H(S)$ per round in the asymptotic setting. This benchmark is not a universal lower bound on the total energy cost of correction: measurement, gates, finite-time control, correlations, and reservoir engineering require separate accounting.

The resulting hierarchy is therefore operational as well as algebraic: Weyl–Heisenberg operators span physical error transformations; the symplectic form predicts their commutation signatures; isotropic stabilizer groups define protected subspaces; syndrome projections convert those signatures into observable records; and the Knill–Laflamme condition determines when conditional recovery preserves the unknown logical state. The same construction reveals why QEC is an information-selective nonequilibrium process: it transfers information about disturbances to controlled auxiliary degrees of freedom without intentionally disclosing the protected quantum information.

3.1.10. Stabilizer Structure and Energetic Analogy

For an $[[n,k,d]]$ stabilizer code with commuting generators S_j, code states obey

$$S_j|\psi_L\rangle = |\psi_L\rangle. \tag{58}$$

A convenient Hamiltonian representation is

$$H_{\mathrm{stab}} = -\sum_j J_j S_j. \tag{59}$$

Syndrome defects correspond to violated stabilizers. This suggests an energetic picture in which the code space is an ordered manifold and correctable errors are excitations. For topological codes, logical operators become nonlocal objects, and fault tolerance acquires a direct connection with phase structure, homology, and statistical mechanics [29].

The analogy must nevertheless be used carefully. Active QEC is not ordinary cooling. A refrigerator may drive a known system toward a low-energy state; QEC must remove syndrome entropy without learning or collapsing the unknown logical state. Its target is therefore a degenerate information-bearing manifold, not a unique thermodynamic ground state.

3.2. Error-Correction Cycle as a Thermodynamic Info-Engine

A measurement-based QEC round can be decomposed as

$$\rho_L \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} \rho_{\mathrm{err}} \xrightarrow{\text{syndrome extraction}} \rho_{SA} \xrightarrow{\text{measurement}} s \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}_s} \rho'_L \xrightarrow{\text{reset}} \text{reusable apparatus.} \tag{60}$$

The stages have distinct thermodynamic functions, as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Thermodynamic interpretation of a measurement-based QEC cycle.

Stage	Information-Theoretic Role	Thermodynamic Role
Noise $\mathcal{N}$	Corrupts the code state and correlates the system with the environment	Generates entropy and uncontrolled energy exchange
Ancilla preparation	Provides a clean syndrome register	Requires low-entropy auxiliary resources
Syndrome extraction	Correlates the error sector with an ancilla	Transfers uncertainty into controlled degrees of freedom
Measurement/decoding	Converts the syndrome record into an estimate of the error class	Creates records and measurement backaction
Recovery $\mathcal{R}_s$	Restores logical information	Consumes control work and may dissipate energy
Reset	Makes the ancilla/controller reusable	Exports entropy; ideal erasure is bounded by Landauer's principle

The Landauer erasure bound for an unbiased classical bit at temperature T, stated in Equation (37), applies in the quasistatic limit.

For a nonuniform syndrome variable S with Shannon entropy $H(S)$, the ideal asymptotic cost scales as $k_{\mathrm{B}}T\ln(2)\,H_2(S)$ when $H_2(S)$ is in bits (equivalently $k_{\mathrm{B}}TH_{\mathrm{nat}}(S)$ in nats), subject to side information, correlations, finite-time operation, and the physical implementation of memory. Recent work makes this "entropy pump" interpretation of QEC explicit and derives code- and syndrome-dependent energetic costs [11,12]. It is therefore inaccurate to say that QEC "removes entropy" from the universe. More precisely, it lowers entropy in the protected degrees of freedom by transferring entropy into syndrome, controller, and environmental degrees of freedom.

The Maxwell-demon analogy is mathematically useful. The demon performs measurement, stores information, and feeds back on a system. QEC performs syndrome measurement, stores error information, and feeds back through recovery. In both cases a complete second-law analysis must include memory reset and information flow [11,13,20].

3.3. From Repeated Correction to Nonequilibrium Steady States

3.3.1. Continuous Competition Between Noise and Recovery

Consider a coarse-grained continuous-time model

$$\dot{\rho} = (\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{QEC}})\rho, \tag{61}$$

with

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}} = \gamma \sum_j \mathcal{D}[E_j], \qquad \mathcal{L}_{QEC} = \kappa \sum_a \mathcal{D}[C_a]. \tag{62}$$

Natural noise creates excitations or syndrome defects; engineered correction removes them. A steady state obeys

$$\left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}} + \mathcal{L}_{QEC}\right)\rho_{\mathrm{ss}} = 0. \tag{63}$$

When $\kappa \gg \gamma$, ρ_{ss} may remain concentrated near the code manifold. The essential nonequilibrium point is that the state can be stationary while microscopic currents remain nonzero. Error-creation and error-removal fluxes may balance,

$$J_{\mathrm{noise}} = J_{\mathrm{corr}} \neq 0, \tag{64}$$

so that $\dot{\rho} = 0$ but entropy production remains positive. Stationarity is therefore not equivalent to equilibrium.

3.3.2. A Minimal Defect-Balance Model

Let p_e denote the occupation probability of a correctable error sector. A two-manifold approximation gives

$$\frac{dp_e}{dt} = \Gamma_N(1 - p_e) - \Gamma_C p_e. \tag{65}$$

The steady occupation is

$$p_e^{\mathrm{ss}} = \frac{\Gamma_N}{\Gamma_N + \Gamma_C}. \tag{66}$$

At steady state,

$$\Gamma_N(1 - p_e^{\mathrm{ss}}) = \Gamma_C p_e^{\mathrm{ss}}, \tag{67}$$

but both fluxes are nonzero. When $\Gamma_C \gg \Gamma_N$,

$$p_e^{\mathrm{ss}} \approx \frac{\Gamma_N}{\Gamma_C} \ll 1. \tag{68}$$

This elementary model captures the core NESS intuition: logical order persists because defect production is continuously counteracted by active or autonomous removal.

3.3.3. Periodic QEC and Nonequilibrium Limit Cycles

Standard fault-tolerant architectures often operate stroboscopically. Let

$$\Phi_{\mathrm{cyc}} = \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N} \tag{69}$$

be the channel for one complete QEC cycle. An asymptotic fixed point sampled once per cycle satisfies

$$\Phi_{\mathrm{cyc}}(\rho_*) = \rho_*. \tag{70}$$

Within each round, however, the physical state generally follows a periodic trajectory $\rho_*(t + T) = \rho_*(t)$. The correct thermodynamic description is then a periodic NESS or limit cycle rather than a time-independent Gibbs state. This distinction matters when defining heat, work, entropy production, and fluctuation statistics per QEC cycle.

3.4. Autonomous QEC and Engineered Dissipation

Continuous quantum error correction via weak measurement and feedback was formulated explicitly by Ahn, Doherty, and Landahl [30]. Autonomous QEC goes further by embedding the recovery mechanism into engineered Hamiltonian and dissipative couplings, replacing an explicit measurement-feedback loop by designed open-system dynamics. A general form is

$$\dot{\rho} = -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar}[H_{\mathrm{ctrl}}, \rho] + \kappa \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}}(\rho) + R\kappa \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{E}}(\rho), \tag{71}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{E}}$ is an engineered recovery generator and R controls the recovery-to-noise timescale ratio. Such formulations are now used in autonomous-QEC analyses and dissipatively stabilized bosonic architectures [31,32].

A unique attractive stationary density operator is not a quantum memory: it erases dependence on the unknown logical input. An ideal autonomous memory instead requires a multidimensional stationary operator space (or a noiseless subsystem) supporting distinguishable logical states and their coherences. Under weak uncorrectable noise, this exact steady manifold typically becomes a metastable slow manifold whose modes decay at small logical rates; the full noisy dynamics may still possess a unique eventual stationary state. Accordingly, the use of "nonequilibrium steady state" below concerns the driven apparatus or syndrome-sector flux balance and must not be interpreted as convergence of every encoded input to one density matrix.

Ideally, the code manifold is a dark or steady manifold of the engineered dissipation,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{E}}(\rho_L) = 0, \qquad \rho_L = P_C \rho_L P_C. \tag{72}$$

Errors move the state away from C while recovery jump operators drive it back. This makes the connection with dynamical systems exact enough to be productive: the code manifold acts as an attracting invariant manifold, while logical degrees of freedom correspond to neutral or weakly decaying directions inside that manifold.

Reservoir engineering has long used dissipation to prepare and stabilize desired quantum states [33,34]. In the QEC setting the goal is more demanding because the dissipator must stabilize an entire information-bearing subspace or subsystem while preserving coherent logical superpositions. The desired dissipative structure is therefore not a unique attractor but a robust multidimensional steady manifold.

3.5. Liouvillian Spectral Structure and Emergent Logical Dynamics

Let right eigenoperators of the Liouvillian satisfy

$$\mathcal{L}(R_\alpha) = \lambda_\alpha R_\alpha. \tag{73}$$

Stationary modes have $\lambda_\alpha = 0$, whereas decaying modes satisfy $\mathrm{Re}\,\lambda_\alpha < 0$. Define a dissipative gap

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{L}} = -\max_{\lambda_\alpha \neq 0} \mathrm{Re}\,\lambda_\alpha. \tag{74}$$

Then $\tau_{\mathrm{relax}} \sim \Delta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$ characterizes return toward the steady manifold. For QEC one wants fast decay of syndrome modes but extremely slow decay of logical modes. A useful spectral picture is therefore a cluster of zero or near-zero eigenvalues associated with logical information, separated by a gap from rapidly decaying error-sector modes.

This naturally leads to a multiscale reduction. Suppose

$$\mathcal{L} = \kappa \mathcal{L}_0 + \gamma \mathcal{V}, \qquad \kappa \gg \gamma, \tag{75}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_0$ is fast recovery and $\mathcal{V}$ is weak noise. Let P project onto the steady manifold of $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $Q = I - P$. To second order, an effective slow generator has the schematic form

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{eff}} \simeq P\mathcal{V}P - P\mathcal{V}Q(Q\mathcal{L}_0 Q)^{-1}Q\mathcal{V}P + \cdots. \tag{76}$$

Equation (76) is the open-system analogue of adiabatic elimination and Schrieffer–Wolff reduction. It formalizes a defining complexity-science property of QEC: fast microscopic dynamics self-consistently generate a lower-dimensional slow description in which logical degrees of freedom behave as emergent variables.

4. Complexity, Operational Framework, and Research Directions

The foundations in Section 2.3 distinguish correlations, predictive organization, and slow dynamical modes. We now use those distinctions to interpret logical variables, thresholds, and stochastic feedback in QEC; the following scaling relations remain model-dependent proposals rather than universal consequences of information-theoretic complexity measures.

4.1. Complexity Science: Emergence and Criticality

4.1.1. Logical Qubits as Emergent Collective Variables

For n physical qubits, $\dim \mathcal{H} = 2^n$, yet an $[[n, k, d]]$ code supports only 2^k logical dimensions. Logical observables can be highly nonlocal; for example,

$$\overline{X} = \prod_{j \in \Gamma_X} X_j, \qquad \overline{Z} = \prod_{j \in \Gamma_Z} Z_j. \tag{77}$$

The logical state is therefore a collective object. It persists despite rapid microscopic error and recovery events provided that those events remain within the basin of correctability. Emergence here has a concrete dynamical meaning: coarse-graining the physical state onto the code algebra yields a low-dimensional effective dynamics with a parametrically longer timescale.

4.1.2. Fault-Tolerance Thresholds as Critical Phenomena

Fault tolerance exhibits threshold behavior. Below a critical physical error rate p_c, increasing code distance can suppress logical failure; above it, increasing system size no longer protects information. In finite-size scaling language one may write

$$P_L(p, L) = f\left[(p - p_c)L^{1/\nu}\right], \tag{78}$$

with correlation-length exponent ν. This resembles a statistical-mechanical phase transition because local stochastic processes generate a global change in information-preserving capability. Surface-code decoding, for example, admits mappings to disordered statistical models [29].

The nonequilibrium generalization is especially compelling. In a driven-dissipative QEC model, the control parameter may be the ratio

$$g = \frac{\gamma}{\kappa}, \tag{79}$$

comparing error generation with correction. An information-preserving phase at small g can give way to an information-destroying phase above a critical g_c. Candidate order parameters are no longer restricted to magnetization or density; they can be explicitly information-theoretic, such as entanglement fidelity, coherent information, logical mutual information, or channel capacity.

4.1.3. Measurement-Induced Transitions and Emergent QEC

Hybrid circuits containing unitary scrambling and local measurements display measurement-induced entanglement transitions [35,36]. Choi, Bao, Qi, and Altman showed that the volume-law phase can be interpreted in QEC language: scrambling delocalizes quantum information so that local measurements act as correctable errors up to a threshold [37]. This is an important conceptual reversal. QEC need not always be externally imposed as a code plus decoder; error-correcting structure can emerge dynamically from many-body scrambling.

This observation strengthens the relation with complexity science. The relevant order is encoded in nonlocal correlations, the phase transition is dynamical rather than equilibrium,

and the effective ability to preserve information emerges from collective dynamics. Quantum information itself becomes a legitimate order parameter for nonequilibrium phases.

4.2. Q-Trajectories, Stochastic Thermodynamics, and Feedback

The GKLS equation describes ensemble-averaged dynamics, but individual monitored realizations are quantum trajectories (Q-trajectories). A continuously measured system may satisfy a stochastic master equation of the form

$$d\rho_t = \mathcal{L}(\rho_t)dt + \mathcal{H}[C](\rho_t)dW_t, \tag{80}$$

with measurement record

$$dy_t = \mathrm{Tr}[(C + C^\dagger)\rho_t]dt + dW_t, \tag{81}$$

where dW_t is a Wiener increment and, for an ideal unit-efficiency diffusive measurement with measurement operator C, $\mathcal{H}[C](\rho) = C\rho + \rho C^\dagger - \mathrm{Tr}[(C + C^\dagger)\rho]\rho$. Inefficient detection requires an efficiency factor and an appropriate innovation process. QEC syndrome streams are therefore stochastic time series generated by a hidden quantum process. Decoding can be interpreted as state estimation:

$$\text{hidden error process} \rightarrow \text{syndrome observations} \rightarrow \text{inference} \rightarrow \text{feedback}. \tag{82}$$

This formulation connects QEC to nonlinear filtering, Bayesian inference, stochastic control, and information thermodynamics.The information flow carried by the measurement record is itself thermodynamically relevant. In continuously coupled multipartite systems, entropy production can be decomposed into local contributions plus information-flow terms [38].

In QEC this suggests a refined bookkeeping in which the syndrome channel is not merely a logical diagnostic but a physical information current. Such a description could distinguish the entropy generated by noise, the entropy transferred into ancillas, the information extracted by measurement, and the irreversible entropy generated during reset.

4.3. A Unified Thermodynamic-Complexity Description of QEC

The central synthesis can be expressed by a set of coupled balances. At the energetic level,

$$\dot{U} = \dot{Q} + \dot{W}. \tag{83}$$

At the entropic level,

$$\dot{S} = \dot{S}_e + \dot{S}_i, \qquad \dot{S}_i \geq 0. \tag{84}$$

At the informational level, a useful schematic balance is

$$\dot{I}_{\text{logical}} = \dot{I}_{\text{protected}} - \dot{I}_{\text{lost}}, \tag{85}$$

with syndrome information currents linking data, ancillas, controller, and environment. These levels are coupled: information acquisition changes the allowed feedback, feedback changes energetic flows, and reset closes the thermodynamic cycle.

The information–thermodynamic cycle underlying active quantum error correction can be described without recourse to a diagram as a sequence of coupled physical and informational transformations. The essential steps are as follows.

1. Environmental Perturbation and Error Generation: The encoded physical qubits interact unavoidably with uncontrolled environmental degrees of freedom. Decoherence,

relaxation, dephasing, control imperfections, and other noise processes drive the physical state away from the ideal code manifold. At this stage, entropy is generally injected into the data subsystem and information about the encoded logical state becomes partially dispersed into system–environment correlations.

2. Syndrome Extraction: Ancillary degrees of freedom are coupled to the data qubits so that information about the error sector is transferred to a syndrome register while, ideally, avoiding a direct measurement of the protected logical information itself. In stabilizer language, the syndrome identifies which error subspace is occupied. Thermodynamically, this step is a physical information-acquisition process and therefore requires controlled interactions, ancilla preparation, and finite physical resources.
3. Syndrome Recording and Inference: The syndrome outcome is stored, processed, or otherwise made available to a controller. The controller maps the measured syndrome to an inferred error event or recovery action. This stage establishes the feedback information that links microscopic error detection to macroscopic control. Its physical implementation may involve measurement electronics, classical decoding, memory, communication, and decision logic, all of which can contribute energetic and entropic costs.
4. Recovery and Feedback Control: Conditioned on the syndrome record, the controller applies a recovery operation that is intended to return the system to the code space while preserving the logical state. The recovery need not restore the exact pre-error microscopic state; rather, it restores the required equivalence class for correct logical information. This distinction is central to QEC: microscopic degrees of freedom may continually fluctuate while the logical degree of freedom remains dynamically stabilized.
5. Ancilla Reset, Record Erasure, and Entropy Export: To repeat the correction cycle, ancillary systems and controller memories must be returned to reusable reference states. Resetting these resources transfers entropy to an external reservoir and closes the thermodynamic cycle. Landauer's principle provides a lower bound on the heat cost of logically irreversible erasure under idealized conditions, although practical implementations typically dissipate substantially more energy because of control, measurement, refrigeration, and hardware overhead.

These five steps form a closed feedback loop: environmental noise produces errors; syndrome extraction converts otherwise hidden error information into an accessible record; the controller uses that record to select a recovery; and reset prepares the ancillary and classical resources for the next cycle while exporting entropy to the environment. The resulting logical stability is therefore not an equilibrium condition. It is a dynamically maintained state sustained by continuous information flow, feedback, resource consumption, and entropy production. This operational description motivates a set of observables for characterizing QEC as a complex nonequilibrium process, as summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Candidate observables for a thermodynamic-complexity theory of QEC.

Quantity	Representative Expression	Interpretation
Logical error rate	Γ_L	Long-time decay rate of encoded information
Entanglement fidelity	F_e	Preservation of correlations with an external reference
Entropy production	$\dot{\Sigma}$	Irreversibility of the complete QEC apparatus
Control power	P_{ctrl}	Energetic rate required for gates, measurement, feedback, reset
Liouvillian gap	$\Delta_{\mathcal{L}}$	Rate of attraction toward stabilized manifold
Logical spectral splitting	$\lvert\text{Re}\,\lambda_L\rvert$	Residual decay inside the logical manifold
Syndrome entropy rate	$\dot{H}(S)$	Information that must be processed and eventually erased
Information flow	$\dot{I}_{A:B}$ or trajectory equivalents	Transfer of correlations among data, ancilla, controller, bath
Correlation length	$\xi \sim \lvert g - g_c\rvert^{-\nu}$	Collective scale near a QEC/NESS threshold

The reset heat Q_{reset} is distinct from the work supplied to gates and feedback (W_{ctrl}) and reservoir entropy production (Σ_{res}). Their accounting requires a specified system boundary and sign convention; one must not add heat, work, and entropy as if they were interchangeable quantities. The ideal Landauer bound constrains an erasure contribution under its assumptions, whereas device-level electrical and cryogenic powers require separate engineering models. In particular, a reset heat lower bound cannot be substituted for total correction work, and entropy production in an engineered reservoir is not generally equal to either quantity. In the following expression, weights carry the units needed to combine heterogeneous metrics.

A phenomenological architecture-comparison multiobjective cost functional is

$$\mathcal{J} = \alpha\Gamma_L + \beta\dot{\Sigma} + \chi P_{\text{ctrl}} + \eta\, C_{\text{hardware}}, \tag{86}$$

subject to constraints such as

$$F_e \geq F_{\text{target}}, \qquad \Delta_{\mathcal{L}} \geq \Delta_{\min}, \tag{87}$$

and hardware locality or bandwidth constraints. Equation (86) is neither a universal second-law inequality nor a derived QEC performance bound. It expresses a modeling choice: an error-correcting architecture should not be judged solely by logical error suppression. It should also be evaluated by the nonequilibrium resources that are required to maintain that suppression.

4.4. A Concrete Three-Qubit Illustration

This is a pedagogical bit-flip code: it corrects a single X error but does not correct arbitrary single-qubit errors (in particular, general phase errors). The autonomous jump model is illustrative, not a full fault-tolerant hardware realization. Consider the three-qubit repetition code

$$|0_L\rangle = |000\rangle, \qquad |1_L\rangle = |111\rangle, \tag{88}$$

with stabilizers $S_1 = Z_1Z_2$ and $S_2 = Z_2Z_3$. Single-qubit X errors occupy distinct syndrome sectors. If independent flips occur at rate γ, a minimal autonomous recovery model introduces correction jumps such as

$$C_1 = P_C X_1 P_{(-,+)}, \quad C_2 = P_C X_2 P_{(-,-)}, \quad C_3 = P_C X_3 P_{(+,-)}, \tag{89}$$

where P_s project onto syndrome sectors. The master equation becomes

$$\dot{\rho} = \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{3} \mathcal{D}[X_j](\rho) + \kappa \sum_{j=1}^{3} \mathcal{D}[C_j](\rho). \tag{90}$$

At first order in γ/κ, the steady defect occupation is small. Logical failure requires the accumulation of errors faster than they are removed, so the logical error rate is parametrically smaller than the physical error rate. In an effective theory one expects a hierarchy

$$\Gamma_L \ll \gamma \ll \kappa \tag{91}$$

within the protected regime.

Thermodynamically, every detected and corrected flip contributes to a syndrome-event flux. If the correction is implemented by explicit measurement and feedback, the resulting syndrome record must eventually be compressed and erased. If implemented autonomously, entropy instead flows through the engineered reservoir that implements C_j. The external realization differs, but, in both cases, logical stability is supported by an irreversible physical channel that removes error entropy from the protected sector.

This example also clarifies the role of degeneracy. The thermodynamic cost is not determined simply by the number of stabilizer generators. It depends on the distribution of error events, the representation retained by the controller, correlations among syndrome bits, the physical reset mechanism, and whether the architecture compresses syndrome information before erasure. Recent analyses of subspace QEC explicitly quantify such distinctions [12].

4.5. Self-Correction, Active Correction, and Dissipative Structures

A self-correcting quantum memory seeks passive protection through an energy landscape with barriers that grow with system size,

$$\tau_{mem} \sim \exp[\beta \Delta E(L)]. \tag{92}$$

Active QEC instead supplies nonequilibrium resources: measurement, fresh ancillas, classical processing, feedback, and reset. Autonomous QEC replaces explicit digital feedback with engineered reservoirs but still relies on nonequilibrium coupling. These cases should not be conflated. Passive self-correction resembles equilibrium metastability; active and autonomous QEC are driven-dissipative stabilization mechanisms.

The latter are usefully compared with dissipative structures in complexity science. Stability is maintained not because microscopic dynamics stop but because opposing fluxes balance in an organized stationary regime. The analogy is structural rather than biological: QEC maintains a low-dimensional informational order by continuously consuming low-entropy resources and exporting entropy. In this sense,

$$\text{stability} \neq \text{inactivity}; \qquad \text{stability} = \text{regulated nonequilibrium flow}. \tag{93}$$

4.6. On Thermodynamic Bounds and the Engineering Reality of Generalized Fault Tolerance

The ideal Landauer cost is only a lower bound. Real QEC operates at finite speed with imperfect measurements, strong or structured system-bath couplings, cryogenic constraints, classical decoding hardware, microwave or optical control, and wiring losses. A complete energetic budget can therefore be written schematically as

$$P_{\text{total}} = P_{\text{qubit}} + P_{\text{readout}} + P_{\text{control}} + P_{\text{decode}} + P_{\text{reset}} + P_{\text{cryogenic overhead}}. \tag{94}$$

Only part of this total is constrained tightly by information-theoretic lower bounds. In practice the engineering overhead may dominate by many orders of magnitude. This separation between fundamental and implementation-dependent costs is important. Thermodynamic lower bounds should not be confused with realistic power estimates, but neither should they be dismissed as irrelevant. They identify scaling floors, clarify which operations are necessarily irreversible, and reveal trade-offs between fidelity, information acquisition, and dissipation. Danageozian, Wilde, and Buscemi derived a thermodynamic trade-off between information gain, QEC fidelity, and heat-engine performance [11]; Deffner analyzed energetic bounds for Hamiltonian gates with implications for QEC [39]. Recent work continues to sharpen the syndrome-memory cost of QEC [12].

4.7. Suggested Emergent Questions from the QEC Framework

The above synthesis suggests several concrete research directions. First, one can ask whether the onset of fault tolerance in continuously corrected many-body systems corresponds to a genuine dissipative phase transition in the thermodynamic limit and which information-theoretic observable is the appropriate order parameter. Second, one can quantify the relation between the Liouvillian gap that restores the code manifold and the

required entropy-production rate to sustain that gap. Third, one can determine how code degeneracy, syndrome compression, and correlated noise modify the minimum erasure cost per logical qubit per correction interval. Fourth, one can examine whether autonomous QEC can reduce controller-level dissipation by trading digital measurement and feedback for reservoir-engineering costs. Fifth, the stochastic-trajectory formulation enables fluctuation theorems for individual QEC histories, potentially yielding distributions of heat, syndrome information, and logical-fidelity loss rather than only ensemble averages.

A particularly useful objective is to derive bounds of the schematic form

$$\Gamma_L \, \Phi(\dot{\Sigma}, \Delta_{\mathcal{L}}, P_{\mathrm{ctrl}}, H(S)) \geq \mathcal{B}, \tag{95}$$

where $\mathcal{B}$ depends on code geometry and noise statistics. Such a relation would play an analogous role to thermodynamic uncertainty relations: suppressing fluctuations in a protected informational observable might require a minimum entropy-production or control cost. Equation (95) is not asserted here as an established theorem; it defines a research target motivated by the structural framework.

A second direction is critical scaling. If $g = \gamma/\kappa$ controls a dissipative QEC transition, one may seek scaling laws

$$\Gamma_L(L, g) \sim L^{-z} \mathcal{F}[(g - g_c) L^{1/\nu}], \tag{96}$$

while simultaneously measuring

$$\dot{\Sigma}(L, g), \qquad H(S; L, g), \qquad \Delta_{\mathcal{L}}(L, g). \tag{97}$$

The combined dataset would directly connect complexity-theoretic criticality with thermodynamic cost and information preservation.

4.8. Scope, Assumptions, and Limitations

The framework deliberately spans several levels of description. Appropriate assumptions at one level cannot automatically be transferred to another. GKLS equations require conditions such as Markovianity and controlled weak-coupling approximations; non-Markovian environments may require memory kernels, enlarged state spaces, or process-tensor descriptions [40]. Heat/work decompositions are convention-dependent outside weak coupling. Landauer's bound is asymptotic and quasistatic, whereas realistic QEC is finite-time. Stabilizer Hamiltonians provide a useful energetic representation but do not imply that every active stabilizer protocol is thermal relaxation under that Hamiltonian. Likewise, the analogy with dissipative structures does not imply that quantum computers are biological systems; the commonality is in driven stabilization, flux balance, and emergent organization.

The article also distinguishes a framework from a complete microscopic model. A quantitative thermodynamic treatment of a specific superconducting, trapped-ion, photonic, neutral-atom, or bosonic QEC platform requires device Hamiltonians, measurement models, controller energetics, bath spectra, and actual reset protocols. The present contribution is intended to identify the invariant mathematical structure that such platform-specific models should instantiate.

4.9. Discussion: Why QEC Is a Natural Problem for Quantum Information, Quantum Thermodynamics, and Complexity

The unifying flow can now be stated precisely. Quantum mechanics provides the microscopic state space. Open-system theory explains how uncontrolled environments transform unitary global dynamics into dissipative reduced dynamics. Quantum thermodynamics adds energy and entropy balances. Quantum information theory identifies which

correlations and distinguishability properties constitute useful information. QEC selectively routes entropy away from logical degrees of freedom. Nonequilibrium statistical mechanics characterizes the resulting stationary or periodic driven state. Complexity science supplies the language of emergent slow variables, collective robustness, multiscale organization, feedback, and critical thresholds.

These descriptions are mutually constraining. A purely information-theoretic analysis can quantify recoverability but omit the physical cost of repeated syndrome disposal. A purely thermodynamic analysis can track heat and entropy but fail to distinguish useful logical coherence from generic low entropy. A purely complexity-theoretic description can discuss emergence and self-organization without identifying the exact algebraic conditions for correctability. QEC provides a setting in which all three limitations can be overcome because code theory, open dynamics, and thermodynamic accounting are simultaneously available.

The most consequential conceptual result is therefore the following: logical reversibility can be approximately maintained locally by global thermodynamic irreversibility. A protected logical qubit can undergo nearly unitary effective dynamics while the surrounding apparatus continually measures, decodes, resets, and dissipates. In symbols,

$$\rho_L(t) \approx U_L(t)\rho_L(0)U_L^\dagger(t), \qquad \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{apparatus}} > 0. \tag{98}$$

This is not a contradiction. It is the defining operating principle of a fault-tolerant quantum machine viewed as a nonequilibrium information engine.

4.10. Conclusions

Quantum thermodynamics, quantum information theory, nonequilibrium statistical mechanics, complexity science, and quantum error correction are not merely adjacent research areas. They can be organized into a common mathematical and physical framework. Density operators represent both physical and informational states; quantum channels represent both noise and thermodynamic transformations; relative entropy represents both distinguishability and nonequilibrium free energy; GKLS generators represent both environmental decoherence and engineered recovery; and QEC code manifolds can appear as robust slow or steady manifolds of driven open dynamics.

The finite-dimensional algebraic construction also clarifies the logical sequence underlying this synthesis. Weyl–Heisenberg operators describe elementary quantum displacements, the discrete symplectic form classifies their commutation relations, and isotropic stabilizer groups turn those relations into measurable syndrome sectors. The Knill–Laflamme criterion then determines whether a recovery can remove the disturbance without erasing encoded coherence. This mathematical chain identifies what must be preserved and what can be measured; it does not, by itself, specify the noise statistics or the physical resources that are required to implement the measurement and recovery. Those enter through the channel model, syndrome probability distribution, controller dynamics, and reset protocol. The distinction makes the interface between quantum coding, stochastic inference, and thermodynamic bookkeeping explicit.

Within this framework, active QEC is naturally understood as an entropy-pumping process. Noise generates entropy and error syndromes; syndrome extraction routes error information into controlled ancillary degrees of freedom; feedback restores the protected manifold; and reset exports entropy to reservoirs. Repetition of this cycle stabilizes logical information in a stationary or periodic nonequilibrium regime. Autonomous QEC realizes the same principle through engineered dissipation. Complexity enters through the emergence of logical variables, predictive structure in syndrome histories, separation of timescales, collective thresholds, metastability, nonlocal encoding, and dissipative criticality. The earlier distinction between statistical dependence and organization prevents us from identifying a large entropy or mutual information by itself with a successful code.

The phrase "fault-tolerant quantum information as nonequilibrium order" therefore has precise content: the logical state is an emergent organized structure that persists because irreversible physical processes continuously compensate the disordering action of the environment. Future quantum-computing architectures should consequently be evaluated not only by code distance, threshold, and logical fidelity but also by entropy-production rate, syndrome-information rate, recovery gap, control power, and the scaling of these quantities with system size. Such a thermodynamic-complexity characterization may provide a more complete science of fault tolerance—one that asks not only whether quantum information can be protected but what physical organization and irreversible resource flows are required to protect it.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Acknowledgments: During the preparation of this manuscript the author used ChatGPT (Open AI) for language and readability improvement. The author reviewed and edited all outputs and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Varley, T.F. Information theory for complex systems scientists: What, why, and how. *Phys. Rep.* **2025**, *1148*, 1–55. [CrossRef]
2. Rupe, A.; Crutchfield, J.P. On principles of emergent organization. *Phys. Rep.* **2024**, *1071*, 1–47. [CrossRef]
3. Wilde, M.M. *Quantum Information Theory*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2013.
4. Renes, J.M. *Quantum Information Theory: Concepts and Methods*; De Gruyter: Berlin, Germany, 2022.
5. Lombardi, O.; López, C. Quantum Information or Quantum Coding? Available online: https://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/12302/1/Quantum%20information%20or%20quantum%20coding.pdf (accessed on 24 October 2026).
6. Deffner, S.; Campbell, S. *Quantum Thermodynamics: An Introduction to the Thermodynamics of Quantum Information*; Morgan & Claypool Publishers/IOP Publishing: San Rafael, CA, USA , 2019. [CrossRef]
7. Strasberg, P. *Quantum Stochastic Thermodynamics: Foundations and Selected Applications*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2021.
8. Goold, J.; Huber, M.; Riera, A.; del Rio, L.; Skrzypczyk, P. The Role of Quantum Information in Thermodynamics—A Topical Review. *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* **2016**, *49*, 143001. [CrossRef]
9. Rodriguez, D.A. (University of Puerto Rico at Mayagüez, Mayagüez, PR, USA). Unpublished work, 2026.
10. Landi, G.T.; de Oliveira, A.L.F.; Buksman, E. Thermodynamic analysis of quantum error-correcting engines. *Phys. Rev. A* **2020**, *101*, 042106. [CrossRef]
11. Danageozian, A.; Wilde, M.M.; Buscemi, F. Thermodynamic Constraints on Quantum Information Gain and Error Correction: A Triple Trade-Off. *PRX Quantum* **2022**, *3*, 020318. [CrossRef]
12. Czartowski, J.; Binder, F.C. Energetic Costs of Subspace Quantum Error Correction. *arXiv* **2026**. [CrossRef]
13. Parrondo, J.M.R.; Horowitz, J.M.; Sagawa, T. Thermodynamics of Information. *Nat. Phys.* **2015**, *11*, 131–139. [CrossRef]
14. Jarzynski, C. Nonequilibrium Equality for Free Energy Differences. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1997**, *78*, 2690–2693. [CrossRef]
15. Crooks, G.E. Entropy Production Fluctuation Theorem and the Nonequilibrium Work Relation for Free Energy Differences. *Phys. Rev. E* **1999**, *60*, 2721–2726. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
16. Lindblad, G. On the Generators of Quantum Dynamical Semigroups. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **1976**, *48*, 119–130. [CrossRef]
17. Gorini, V.; Kossakowski, A.; Sudarshan, E.C.G. Completely Positive Dynamical Semigroups of N-Level Systems. *J. Math. Phys.* **1976**, *17*, 821–825. [CrossRef]
18. Breuer, H.P.; Petruccione, F. *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2002. [CrossRef]
19. Spohn, H. Entropy Production for Quantum Dynamical Semigroups. *J. Math. Phys.* **1978**, *19*, 1227–1230. [CrossRef]
20. Sagawa, T.; Ueda, M. Generalized Jarzynski Equality under Nonequilibrium Feedback Control. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2010**, *104*, 090602. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

21. del Rio, L.; Aberg, J.; Renner, R.; Dahlsten, O.; Vedral, V. The Thermodynamic Meaning of Negative Entropy. *Nature* **2011**, *474*, 61–63. Addendum in *Nature* **2011**, *476*, 476. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
22. Horodecki, M.; Oppenheim, J. Fundamental Limitations for Quantum and Nanoscale Thermodynamics. *Nat. Commun.* **2013**, *4*, 2059. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
23. Brandao, F.G.S.L.; Horodecki, M.; Ng, N.H.Y.; Oppenheim, J.; Wehner, S. The Second Laws of Quantum Thermodynamics. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2015**, *112*, 3275–3279. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
24. Chitambar, E.; Gour, G. Quantum Resource Theories. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **2019**, *91*, 025001. [CrossRef]
25. Chitambar, E.A. Computational Complexity in Entanglement Transformations. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, 2010.
26. Knill, E.; Laflamme, R. Theory of Quantum Error-Correcting Codes. *Phys. Rev. A* **1997**, *55*, 900–911. [CrossRef]
27. Calderbank, A.R.; Rains, E.M.; Shor, P.W.; Sloane, N.J.A. Quantum Error Correction via Codes over GF(4). *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **1998**, *44*, 1369–1387. [CrossRef]
28. Gottesman, D. Theory of Fault-Tolerant Quantum Computation. *Phys. Rev. A* **1998**, *57*, 127–137. [CrossRef]
29. Dennis, E.; Kitaev, A.; Landahl, A.; Preskill, J. Topological Quantum Memory. *J. Math. Phys.* **2002**, *43*, 4452–4505. [CrossRef]
30. Ahn, C.; Doherty, A.C.; Landahl, A.J. Continuous Quantum Error Correction via Quantum Feedback Control. *Phys. Rev. A* **2002**, *65*, 042301. [CrossRef]
31. Pastawski, F.; Clemente, L.; Cirac, J.I. Quantum Memories Based on Engineered Dissipation. *Phys. Rev. A* **2011**, *83*, 012304. [CrossRef]
32. Kwon, H.; Fischer, U.R.; Lee, S.W.; Jiang, L. Restoring Heisenberg Scaling in Time via Autonomous Quantum Error Correction. *npj Quantum Inf.* **2026**, *12*, 103. [CrossRef]
33. Poyatos, J.F.; Cirac, J.I.; Zoller, P. Quantum Reservoir Engineering with Laser Cooled Trapped Ions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1996**, *77*, 4728–4731. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
34. Muller, M.; Diehl, S.; Pupillo, G.; Zoller, P. Engineered Open Systems and Quantum Simulations with Atoms and Ions. *Adv. At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **2012**, *61*, 1–80. [CrossRef]
35. Li, Y.; Chen, X.; Fisher, M.P.A. Quantum Zeno Effect and the Many-Body Entanglement Transition. *Phys. Rev. B* **2018**, *98*, 205136. [CrossRef]
36. Skinner, B.; Ruhman, J.; Nahum, A. Measurement-Induced Phase Transitions in the Dynamics of Entanglement. *Phys. Rev. X* **2019**, *9*, 031009. [CrossRef]
37. Choi, S.; Bao, Y.; Qi, X.L.; Altman, E. Quantum Error Correction in Scrambling Dynamics and Measurement-Induced Phase Transition. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2020**, *125*, 030505. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
38. Horowitz, J.M.; Esposito, M. Thermodynamics with Continuous Information Flow. *Phys. Rev. X* **2014**, *4*, 031015. [CrossRef]
39. Deffner, S. Energetic Cost of Hamiltonian Quantum Gates. *Europhys. Lett.* **2021**, *134*, 40002. [CrossRef]
40. Rivas, A.; Huelga, S.F.; Plenio, M.B. Quantum Non-Markovianity: Characterization, Quantification and Detection. *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **2014**, *77*, 094001. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

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.