

Beyond causally ordered quantum computers

Giulio Chiribella,^{1,*} Giacomo Mauro D’Ariano,^{2,†} Paolo Perinotti,^{2,‡} and Benoit Valiron^{3,§}

¹*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline Street North, Ontario, Canada N2L 2Y5.*[¶]

²*QUIT Group, Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pavia, and INFN, via Bassi 6, 27100 Pavia, Italy*^{**}

³*CIS Department, University of Pennsylvania, 3330 Walnut St., Philadelphia, PA 19104*^{††}

(Dated: January 7, 2019)

We introduce a task—the *classical switch of black boxes*—that is easily implementable in a quantum laboratory, and we prove that it cannot be translated into a quantum circuit with fixed causal structure. The task involves assembling a circuit conditionally on the value of a classical bit. We also introduce a generalization of the same task—the *quantum switch*—where the control is performed by a quantum bit, that can thus become entangled with the circuit structure, and propose a scheme for its implementation.


Introduction. What is a quantum computer? And what does it compute? The first quantum computational model was the Quantum Turing Machine, introduced by Deutsch in 1985 [1] in analogy with the classical Turing machine. In the same paper, Deutsch provided the first algorithm for a task in which Quantum Turing Machines are faster than the classical ones. Quantum Turing machines however were not very intuitive to deal with. Few years later, Deutsch presented another model, the quantum circuit model [2], in which the computation is described as a sequence of transformations (logical gates) acting on a register of input qubits. Subsequently, Yao proved that the quantum circuit model and the quantum Turing machine are computationally equivalent [3]. Since then, the quantum circuit model has grown more and more popular, due the discovery of powerful quantum algorithms, like Shor’s algorithm [4] for factoring integers in polynomial time, or Grover’s algorithm [5] for searching a database of size N in \sqrt{N} steps, which have all been invented in the framework of quantum circuits.

The processing of quantum bits, however, is not the ultimate physical model of computation that we can conceive in our quantum world. A computation transforms an input into an output, but these do not have to be necessarily qubits: One can e.g. consider a computation where the input is a physical transformation provided as a black box, and the output is also a transformation, obtained from the input black box by means of suitable physical operations. This kind of *higher-order* quantum computation was introduced in Refs. [7, 8] and a systematic characterization and classification of maps that correspond to circuits was provided in Ref. [10]. Higher-order computation includes basic quantum information processing as a special case and is potentially more powerful for several information-theoretic tasks [6].

In this paper we show that there exist higher-order computations that are admissible in principle—i.e. their existence does not lead to any paradoxical or unphysical effect—and yet cannot be realized by inserting the input black box in a usual quantum circuit with fixed causal ordering of the gates. Moreover, some of these maps correspond to functions that can be in principle implemented

in a quantum laboratory. However, in order to represent this new kind of computations one needs to change the rules of quantum circuits, introducing circuits where the geometry of the connections can be entangled with a control bit. A similar kind of macroscopic entanglement is receiving increasing attention thanks to recent experimental breakthroughs in optomechanics [11–13] and in quantum optics [14].

The framework of quantum circuits. In a quantum circuit qubit registers are represented by wires. The state of the qubits evolves according to a sequence of quantum gates, ordered from left to right as in the following example:



Here each wire is drawn in space, but in general the path from left to right in the circuit does not represent a path in space: Instead, it is the time evolution of a qubit from the past to the future. In the above example the boxes f and g implement a quantum processing on a single qubit, e. g. a unitary gate or a noisy quantum channel. The symbol $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}\oplus\text{---}$ is a C-NOT (*controlled-not*) transformation: This transforms two qubits *jointly*, with the target qubit (wire with \oplus) undergoing the identity transformation if the control-qubit (wire with \bullet) is in the state $|0\rangle$ and the NOT transformation $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |1\rangle$ if the control-qubit is in the state $|1\rangle$. The symbol $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}\boxed{U}\text{---}$ is a C-U (*controlled-unitary*), a generalization of the control-not, with the transformation U replacing the NOT transformation of the C-NOT.

It is worth stressing that the quantum circuit is a *computational* circuit—not a physical one: While in the physical circuit we can have loops (e.g. when a system passes twice through the same physical device), in the computational circuit there are no loops (when we apply twice a transformation to the same system we just draw two times the same box). The computational circuit represents the actual flow of information during the run of a

“program”. It is also important to make clear the distinction between *program* and computational circuit, the former being a set of instructions to build up the latter. In the computational circuit the “wires” can never go backward, because this would mean to go *backward in time*, whereas in the program code we can have commands pointing back to a previous instruction.

The framework of quantum circuits is used in quantum computer science to evaluate the amount of computational resources used in an algorithm (*e. g.* number of oracle calls, number of qubits, length of the computation, computational space, etc.). We summarize here few basic rules that characterize ordinary quantum circuits and the associated resource counting. From now on, the expression *computational circuit* will be referred to a circuit satisfying this set of rules:

1. quantum systems are represented by wires;
2. a box on a single wire represents a transformation (quantum channel) on the corresponding system, a box on multiple wires generally describes an interaction between the corresponding systems;
3. input/output relations proceed from left to right and there are no loops in the circuit;
4. each box represents a single use of the corresponding transformation.

Higher-order quantum maps. In most quantum algorithms the input data are encoded in the unitary transformation performed by a black box (the *oracle*), which represents an unknown channel, called as a subroutine during the computation. This is the case *e.g.* of Deutsch-Josza, Simon’s, Shor’s, and Grover’s algorithms. The core of all these algorithms describes a computation that takes as an input a certain number of calls to the oracle, and returns as an output some classical data, like the period of a function, or the prime factors of an integer. From an abstract point of view, the algorithm implements a higher-order transformation, that transforms the quantum channel performed by the oracle into a classical output. Generalizing this idea, we are led to consider higher-order maps where both the input and the output are quantum channels. These maps transform an input oracle into a new output oracle.

The simplest example of higher-order transformations is given by the *quantum supermaps* introduced in Ref. [8]. We now review the main ideas in this simple case in order to set the scene for the results of this paper.

In the following, we will use capital Roman letters A, B, \dots to describe types of quantum systems, such as qubits, qutrits, and so on. Every system type A is associated with a Hilbert space H_A having dimension d_A . The trivial system type, denoted by I , will be associated to the trivial quantum system, with Hilbert space $H_I = \mathbb{C}$. The

system type AB will be associated to the tensor product Hilbert space $H_A \otimes H_B$.

As usual, the linear operators from H_A to H_B will be denoted by $\text{Lin}(H_A, H_B)$ (or by $\text{Lin}(H_A)$, if $H_A = H_B$). We will denote by $\text{St}(A)$ the set of quantum states of system A , *i.e.* the set of unit trace non-negative operators in $\text{Lin}(H_A)$, and by $\text{QO}(A \rightarrow B)$ the set of *quantum operations* of type $A \rightarrow B$, *i.e.* the set of trace-non-increasing completely positive (CP) maps from $\text{Lin}(H_A)$ to $\text{Lin}(H_B)$. Similarly, we will denote by $\text{QChan}(A \rightarrow B)$ the set of *quantum channels* of type $A \rightarrow B$, *i.e.* the subset of $\text{QO}(A \rightarrow B)$ consisting of trace-preserving maps. Quantum operations and quantum channels of type $A \rightarrow B$ are elements of the real vector space $\text{Herm}(A \rightarrow B)$, consisting of Hermitian-preserving linear maps from $\text{Lin}(H_A)$ to $\text{Lin}(H_B)$ (see *e. g.* Ref. [9, 10]).

We are now ready to define the deterministic transformations of oracles:

Definition 1 *A deterministic supermap of type $(A \rightarrow A') \rightarrow (B \rightarrow B')$ is a linear map \mathcal{S} from $\text{Herm}(A \rightarrow A')$ to $\text{Herm}(B \rightarrow B')$ satisfying the requirement that for every pair of systems E, E' and for every input quantum channel $\mathcal{C} \in \text{QChan}(AE \rightarrow A'E')$, the output $(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{E \rightarrow E'})(\mathcal{C})$ is a quantum channel in $\text{QChan}(BE \rightarrow B'E')$, where $\mathcal{I}_{E \rightarrow E'}$ is the identity supermap, sending every quantum operation $\mathcal{E} \in \text{QO}(E \rightarrow E')$ into itself.*

The above definition is a more concise version of the original definition of Ref. [8]. Note in particular that for every input quantum operation $\mathcal{A} \in \text{QO}(A \rightarrow A')$ the output $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ is a quantum operation in $\text{QO}(B \rightarrow B')$.

Intuitively, Def. 1 can be re-interpreted using the concepts of *marginal of a channel* and *extension of a set of channels*: the *marginal on $A \rightarrow A'$* of a given channel $\mathcal{C} \in \text{QChan}(AE \rightarrow A'E')$ relative to state $\sigma \in \text{St}(E)$ is the channel \mathcal{C}_σ defined by

$$\mathcal{C}_\sigma(\rho) := \text{Tr}_{E'}[\mathcal{C}(\rho \otimes \sigma)]. \quad (1)$$

Given a set of channels $S \subseteq \text{QChan}(A \rightarrow A')$ and a pair of systems E, E' , the *extension of S in $\text{QChan}(AE \rightarrow A'E')$* is the set $\text{Ext}_{E \rightarrow E'}(S) \subseteq \text{QChan}(AE \rightarrow A'E')$ containing all channels \mathcal{C} such that the marginal \mathcal{C}_σ in Eq. (1) is in S for every $\sigma \in \text{St}(E)$. In formula:

$$\text{Ext}_{E \rightarrow E'}(S) := \{\mathcal{C} \in \text{QChan}(AE \rightarrow A'E') \mid \mathcal{C}_\sigma \in S, \forall \sigma \in \text{St}(E)\}.$$

Def. 1 amounts to requiring that the map \mathcal{S} transforms channels into channels even when it is applied locally to the elements of the extension $\text{Ext}_{E \rightarrow E'}(\text{QChan}(A \rightarrow A'))$.

An example of deterministic supermap is given the concatenation $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{I}_C)\mathcal{E}$, depicted as

$$\boxed{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})}^{B'} := \boxed{\mathcal{E}}^B \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\mathcal{A}}^{A'} \\ \text{---} \boxed{\mathcal{I}_C}^C \end{array} \boxed{\mathcal{F}}^{B'}$$

where C is a suitable quantum system, and $\mathcal{E} \in \text{QChan}(B \rightarrow AC)$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \text{QChan}(A'C \rightarrow B')$ are suitable quantum channels. One of the results of Ref. [8] is that every linear map satisfying the requirements of Def. 1 is a concatenation of the above form.

The example of supermaps transforming quantum operations into quantum operations is the key for two important generalizations:

1. *Hierarchy of higher-order maps:* lifting Def. 1 to the next level, we can define linear maps that transform quantum supermaps into quantum supermaps, preserving normalization when acting locally on one side of a bipartite input. Iterating this procedure, we then obtain an infinite hierarchy of higher-order quantum maps.
2. *Supermaps that transform restricted sets of quantum channels:* instead of imposing that every channel is sent to a channel as in Def. 1, we can define supermaps that transform a restricted set of quantum channels (e.g. the no-signalling ones) to another, sending elements in the extension of the former into elements in the extension of the latter.

The complete characterization and the physical interpretation of these new quantum maps is a difficult open problem. Regarding the generalization 1, part of the hierarchy of higher-order maps has been characterized in Ref. [10]. Precisely, Ref. [10] characterizes the types of higher-order maps that can be realized within the quantum circuit framework. Regarding the generalization 2, several results that are useful for the characterization of supermaps on restricted sets of channels have been recently found by Jenčová [15]. However, the application of these results to e.g. the interesting case of supermaps transforming no-signalling channels is far from straightforward.

In this paper we will show an example of higher-order map that cannot be realized by inserting the input oracles within a given quantum circuit. The example is given by the map \mathcal{Z} that transforms an arbitrary pair of quantum channels $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \text{QChan}(A \rightarrow A)$ into a classically-controlled channel $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}) \in \text{QChan}(AC \rightarrow A)$, which performs either the transformation $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{F}$ or the transformation $\mathcal{F}\mathcal{G}$ conditionally on the outcome of a measurement on a control qubit C encoding the classical control. Precisely, the channel $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}) \in \text{QChan}(AC \rightarrow A)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G})(\rho) = \mathcal{G}\mathcal{F}(\langle 0|\rho|0\rangle) + \mathcal{F}\mathcal{G}(\langle 1|\rho|1\rangle), \quad (2)$$

where $\langle i|\rho|i\rangle$ is the state of system A conditional to the outcome i of an orthogonal measurement on the control qubit C .

The map \mathcal{Z} can be seen as an example of supermap that transforms a restricted set of quantum channels (generalization 2 of definition 1). Indeed, linearity and

Eq. (2) imply that \mathcal{Z} sends any input channel of the form $\mathcal{C} = \sum_i \lambda_i \mathcal{F}_i \otimes \mathcal{G}_i$, with $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$ into a quantum channel. Now, Ref. [16] showed that the set of channels of the form $\mathcal{C} = \sum_i \lambda_i \mathcal{F}_i \otimes \mathcal{G}_i$, $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$ coincides with the set of *no-signalling channels*. We recall that a channel in $\text{QChan}(AB \rightarrow A'B')$ is no-signalling if there exist two channels $\mathcal{A} \in \text{QChan}(A \rightarrow A')$ and $\mathcal{B} \in \text{QChan}(B \rightarrow B')$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_{A'}[\mathcal{C}(\rho)] &= \mathcal{B}(\text{Tr}_A[\rho]) & \forall \rho \in \text{Lin}(H_A \otimes H_B) \\ \text{Tr}_{B'}[\mathcal{C}(\rho)] &= \mathcal{A}(\text{Tr}_B[\rho]) & \forall \rho \in \text{Lin}(H_A \otimes H_B) \end{aligned}$$

(see e.g. [17]). Hence, we can regard \mathcal{Z} as a deterministic supermap transforming no-signalling channels into channels. Precisely, the map \mathcal{Z} belongs to a set of higher-order maps defined by the following modification of Def. 1:

Definition 2 Let $\text{NS}(AB \rightarrow A'B')$ denote the set of no-signalling channels in $\text{QChan}(AB \rightarrow A'B')$. A deterministic supermap on no-signalling channels of type $\text{NS}(AB \rightarrow A'B') \rightarrow (C \rightarrow C')$ is a linear map \mathcal{S} from $\text{Herm}(AB \rightarrow A'B')$ to $\text{Herm}(C \rightarrow C')$ satisfying the requirement that for every systems E, E' and for every input quantum channel $\mathcal{C} \in \text{Ext}_{E \rightarrow E'}[\text{NS}(AB \rightarrow A'B')]$ the output $(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{E \rightarrow E'})(\mathcal{C})$ is a quantum channel in $\text{QChan}(CE \rightarrow C'E')$.

Note that the normalization condition in Def. 2 is weaker than the one in Def. 1, because the latter requires the output to be a channel whenever the input is a channel, while the former requires the output to be a channel only if the input channel is no-signalling. As a consequence, the supermaps on no-signalling channels form a larger set than the ordinary supermaps described by Def. 1. Moreover, since the ordinary supermaps are all and only those transformations that can be implemented by inserting the input channel in a suitable circuit [8], all the supermaps on no-signalling channels which are outside the set of ordinary supermaps cannot be implemented in the circuit model. As we will see later in this paper, the map \mathcal{Z} is one of these maps. Another example of supermap on no-signalling channels is given by the map defined by Oreshkov, Costa, and Brukner [18], whose input is the set of no-signalling channels in $\text{QChan}(AB \rightarrow A'B')$, $H_A \simeq H_B \simeq H_{A'} \simeq H_{B'} \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$.

Finally, we note that the map \mathcal{Z} defined in Eq. (2) and, more generally, any supermap \mathcal{Z} sending no-signalling channels in $\text{QChan}(AB \rightarrow A'B')$ to channels in $\text{QChan}(C \rightarrow C')$ can be equivalently represented as a higher-order map transforming channels in $\text{QChan}(A \rightarrow A')$ into supermaps of type $(B \rightarrow B') \rightarrow (C \rightarrow C')$ (generalization 1 of Def. 1). Indeed, we can define the higher-order map $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ in the following way: for every channel $\mathcal{A} \in \text{QChan}(A \rightarrow A')$, the supermap $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}(\mathcal{A})$ is given by

$$[\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}(\mathcal{A})](\mathcal{B}) := \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}) \quad \forall \mathcal{B} \in \text{QChan}(B \rightarrow B'). \quad (3)$$

Choi representation. The simplest way to study quantum supermaps is via the Choi isomorphism, namely the one-to-one correspondence between quantum operations $\mathcal{Q} \in \text{QO}(A \rightarrow B)$ and positive operators $Q \in \text{Lin}(H_B \otimes H_A)$ given by the relations

$$Q = (\mathcal{Q} \otimes \mathcal{I}_A)(|I_A\rangle\langle I_A|),$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(\rho) = \text{Tr}_A[(I_B \otimes \rho^T)Q] \quad \forall \rho \in \text{Lin}(H_A), \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{I}_A denotes the identity map on $\text{Lin}(H_A)$, $H_A^{\otimes 2} \ni |I_A\rangle := \sum_{n=1}^{d_A} |n\rangle \otimes |n\rangle$, Tr_A denotes the partial trace on H_A , and ρ^T denotes the transpose of ρ in the basis $\{|n\rangle\}_{n=1}^{d_A}$ used in the definition of $|I\rangle$.

Via the Choi isomorphism, we have that a quantum supermap \mathcal{Z} of type $(A \rightarrow A') \rightarrow (B \rightarrow B')$ can be equivalently represented by a completely positive map $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ from $\text{Lin}(H_{A'} \otimes H_A)$ to $\text{Lin}(H_{B'} \otimes H_B)$, uniquely defined by the relation [8]

$$B = \mathcal{Z}(A) \iff B = \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}(A) \quad \forall A \in \text{QO}(A \rightarrow A') \quad (5)$$

$$\forall B \in \text{QO}(B \rightarrow B').$$

Like every completely positive map, the map $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ can be written in the Kraus form $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}(A) = \sum_n Z_n A Z_n^\dagger$.

A no go theorem for the classical switch of black boxes. In most quantum algorithms the input data are encoded in the unitary transformation performed by a black box and the implementation of the algorithm consists in the evolution of qubits through a quantum circuit which simply *contains* the available black boxes as elements. Is this a general rule? Do quantum circuits allow for the computation of all possible functions whose input is a black box, rather than a qubit register? These questions are inspired by Church's notion of computation [19], which allows one to compute functions of functions, rather than only functions of bits.


As anticipated in the previous sections, we will now show that there exist functions of black boxes that are implementable by means of elementary operations, but cannot be represented by a circuit obeying rules 1-4.

The key counterexample is provided by the following function of qubit black boxes f and g , that depends on a classical control bit x :

$$\mathcal{S}(x, f, g) = \begin{cases} f \text{ then } g & x = 1 \\ g \text{ then } f & x = 0 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The two black boxes f and g —along with the classical bit x —are the *input* of the function, and must be regarded as *single* calls to two different oracles during the computation. The above example can be generalized in various ways, for example by putting between f and g a third box U_x that depends on the value of the bit x , or by leaving between f and g an open slot in which a third arbitrary transformation can be inserted.

It is easy to imagine a physical device that implements the function \mathcal{S} . Consider a machine with two slots, in which the user can plug two *variable* boxes f and g at his choice, as in the following figure.



The machine is programmed with the following code:

```
PROGRAM "SWITCH"
if x = 1
then
do f g
else
do g f
endif
```

We can imagine that the machine has movable wires inside, that can connect the boxes f and g in two possible ways depending on the value of the classical bit x , thus implementing the **SWITCH** function. Ordinary quantum circuits, however, do not have such movable wires. They can have controlled swap operations, but once a time-ordering between f and g has been chosen in the circuit, there is no way to reverse it. This fact leads to the following no-go theorem.

Theorem 1 (No classical switch of boxes) *The program SWITCH cannot be achieved deterministically by a computational circuit in which the two unknown oracles f and g are called a single time in a fixed causal order.*

Before proving the theorem we need the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *The supermap representing the program SWITCH is uniquely defined by Eq. (6). Moreover, Eq. (6) holds also when the boxes f and g represent arbitrary quantum operations (not only quantum channels).*

Proof. Let us denote by A and A' the input and output qubits of the box f , by B and B' the input and output qubits of the box g , by C the control qubit, and by D and D' the input and output qubits of the new box realized by the program **SWITCH** (we used distinct letters only to distinguish between different qubits, although, of course $H_A \simeq H_{A'} \simeq H_B \simeq H_{B'} \simeq H_C \simeq H_D \simeq H_{D'} \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$).

Then, the program **SWITCH** can be equivalently represented by a supermap $\mathcal{Z} : \text{Herm}(AB \rightarrow A'B') \rightarrow \text{Herm}(CD \rightarrow D')$, which takes as an input the quantum

channel $f \otimes g \in \text{QChan}(AB \rightarrow A'B')$ and produces as an output the control channel $\mathcal{Z}(f \otimes g) \in \text{QChan}(CD \rightarrow D')$ given by

$$\mathcal{Z}(f \otimes g) = \Pi_0 \otimes \mathcal{Z}^{(0)}(f \otimes g) + \Pi_1 \otimes \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}(f \otimes g), \quad (7)$$

$$\forall f \in \text{QO}(A \rightarrow A'), \forall g \in \text{QO}(B \rightarrow B')$$

where $\Pi_i(\rho) = \langle i|\rho|i\rangle$, $i = 0, 1$ are the quantum operations representing the measurement on the control qubit C , and $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)} : \text{Herm}(AB \rightarrow A'B') \rightarrow \text{Herm}(D \rightarrow D')$, $i = 0, 1$ are two supermaps such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}^{(0)}(f \otimes g) &= fg \\ \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}(f \otimes g) &= gf, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

for every pair of quantum channels $f \in \text{QO}(A \rightarrow A')$ and $g \in \text{QO}(B \rightarrow B')$.

We now show that the maps $\mathcal{Z}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$ are uniquely defined by the above equation. To this purpose, we use the Choi representation of Eq. (5), where each $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}$ $i = 0, 1$ is represented by a completely positive linear map $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(i)} : \text{Lin}(H_A \otimes H_B \otimes H_{B'} \otimes H_D) \rightarrow \text{Lin}(H_{D'} \otimes H_D)$.

We now show that Eq. (8) completely determines the map $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(0)}$ (and hence $\mathcal{Z}^{(0)}$, since the correspondence $\mathcal{Z}^{(0)} \leftrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(0)}$ is one-to-one). Let us consider the case when f and g are both unitary. For a unitary channel $\mathcal{U}(\rho) = U\rho U^\dagger$, the Choi operator is the rank-one operator $|U\rangle\langle U|$, where $|U\rangle$ is the vector defined by $|U\rangle := (U \otimes I)|I\rangle$. Using Eq. (8) we then obtain

$$\mathcal{Z}^{(0)}(|U\rangle\langle U| \otimes |V\rangle\langle V|) = |UV\rangle\langle UV|,$$

for every unitary operators U and V . Writing the map $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(0)}$ in the Kraus form $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(0)}(C) = \sum_n Z_n^{(0)} C Z_n^{(0)\dagger}$, we then get

$$\sum_n Z_n^{(0)} (|U\rangle\langle U| \otimes |V\rangle\langle V|) Z_n^{(0)\dagger} = |UV\rangle\langle UV|, \quad (9)$$

for every unitary operators U and V . Hence, for every n we must have

$$Z_n^{(0)} |U\rangle |V\rangle = \alpha_{n,U,V}^{(0)} |UV\rangle \quad (10)$$

for some complex number $\alpha_{n,U,V}^{(0)}$, which possibly depends on U and V . Note that Eq. (9) imposes $\sum_n |\alpha_{n,U,V}^{(0)}|^2 = 1$ for every unitaries U, V .

Applying Eq. (9) in the case where U and V are Pauli matrices $\{\sigma_\mu\}_{\mu=0}^3$, $\sigma_0 = I$, $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3\} \equiv \{\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z\}$, we have

$$Z_n^{(0)} |\sigma_\mu\rangle |\sigma_\nu\rangle = \alpha_{n,\mu,\nu}^{(0)} |\sigma_\mu \sigma_\nu\rangle \quad (11)$$

Now we show that $\alpha_{n,\mu,\nu}^{(0)}$ is independent of μ and ν , say $\alpha_{n,U,V} \equiv \alpha_n, \forall \mu, \nu \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. Using linearity and

the completeness of the Pauli matrices $\{\sigma_\mu\}_{\mu=0}^3$ in the space of linear operators this implies that

$$Z_n^{(0)} |A\rangle |B\rangle = \alpha_n |AB\rangle \quad \forall A, B \in \text{Lin}(\mathbb{C}^2)$$

and, therefore $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(0)}(|A\rangle\langle A| \otimes |B\rangle\langle B|) = |AB\rangle\langle AB|$ for every $A, B \in \text{Lin}(\mathbb{C}^2)$.

To see that that $\alpha_{n,\mu,\nu}^{(0)}$ is independent of μ and ν , consider the unitary $U = \frac{1}{2} \sum_\mu \omega_\mu \sigma_\mu$, where $\omega_0 = 1$ and $\omega_\mu = i$ for $\mu = 1, 2, 3$. Eq. (10) then gives

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n^{(0)} |\sigma_\mu\rangle |U\rangle &= \alpha_{n,\mu,U}^{(0)} |\sigma_\mu U\rangle \\ &= \sum_\nu \frac{\alpha_{n,\mu,U}^{(0)} \omega_\nu}{2} |\sigma_\mu \sigma_\nu\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

whereas linearity and Eq. (11) give

$$Z_n^{(0)} |\sigma_\mu\rangle |U\rangle = \sum_\nu \frac{\alpha_{n,\mu,\nu}^{(0)} \omega_\nu}{2} |\sigma_\mu \sigma_\nu\rangle.$$

Hence, by comparison we obtain $\alpha_{n,\mu,\nu}^{(0)} = \alpha_{n,\mu,U}^{(0)}$ for every μ, ν . This shows that $\alpha_{n,\mu,\nu}^{(0)}$ cannot depend on ν . Repeating the same argument for $Z_n^{(0)}(|U\rangle\langle U| \otimes |\sigma_\nu\rangle\langle \sigma_\nu|)$, we can also prove that $\alpha_{n,\mu,\nu}^{(0)}$ cannot depend on μ . In conclusion, we have $\alpha_{n,\mu,\nu}^{(0)} = \alpha_n^{(0)}$ for every n, μ, ν . Using the normalization condition $\sum_n |\alpha_n^{(0)}|^2 = 1$, we finally get

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(0)}(|A\rangle\langle A| \otimes |B\rangle\langle B|) = |AB\rangle\langle AB| \quad \forall A, B \in \text{Lin}(\mathbb{C}^2).$$

The same argument can be repeated for the map $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}$, for which we find

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}(|A\rangle\langle A| \otimes |B\rangle\langle B|) = |BA\rangle\langle BA| \quad \forall A, B \in \text{Lin}(\mathbb{C}^2).$$

Note that the above equations, along with linearity, define uniquely the maps $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(0)}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}$. From these facts we derive the following conclusions: *i*) there exists only one supermap \mathcal{Z} satisfying Eq. (7), and *ii*) Eq. (7) must hold not only for quantum channel $f, g \in \text{QChan}(H_A \rightarrow H_A)$, but also for arbitrary quantum operations $f, g \in \text{QO}(H_A \rightarrow H_A)$. This concludes the proof. ■


We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof. Suppose by absurd that there exists a deterministic circuit performing the program SWITCH using a single call to \boxed{f} and \boxed{g} . Without loss of generality, let us assume that in this circuit the oracle \boxed{f} is called before the oracle \boxed{g} . Then we must have

$$|x\rangle \text{ --- } \begin{array}{|c|} \hline A \\ \hline \vdots \\ \hline B \\ \hline \vdots \\ \hline C \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{cases} \boxed{f} \text{ --- } \boxed{g} & x = 1 \\ \boxed{g} \text{ --- } \boxed{f} & x = 0 \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

and \boxed{X} is the bit flip gate. The above circuit achieves the desired **SWITCH** transformation over the qubit in the middle wire depending on the state of the controlling qubit at the top wire. This is not in contradiction with Theorem 1: If the input are two black boxes \boxed{f} , \boxed{g} , the possibility of achieving two uses from a single one is ruled out by the no-cloning theorem for boxes [27]. Again, the limitation due to the single call constraint is strictly related to the black box nature of the functions f and g . If we knew what f and g are, we would be able to duplicate them, thus making possible the computation of the function $S(x, \boxed{f}, \boxed{g})$ through the circuit of Eq. (15).


Another factor that prevents the implementation of the program **SWITCH** as a computational circuit is the requirement that the program succeeds deterministically. Indeed, rules 1-4 do not forbid achieving the task with some probability. In particular, a computational circuit that uses probabilistic teleportation succeeds in the task with probability $1/4$



When the outcome E occurs in this circuit, we may say that the third qubit (from the top) has been teleported from the future back to the past. In this case it is easy to see that if the control qubit is in state $|1\rangle$ one obtains the sequence “ \boxed{f} followed by \boxed{g} ” acting on the second input qubit, while if the control qubit is in state $|0\rangle$ the boxes are exchanged. What’s more, if one puts the control qubit in the superposition $(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ one would get the superposition of the two orderings of the boxes, namely the output of the circuit is proportional to $(U_f U_g |\psi\rangle |1\rangle + U_g U_f |\psi\rangle |0\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, where $|\psi\rangle$ is the input state of the qubit in the second wire, and U_f and U_g denote the unitary operators corresponding to boxes \boxed{f} and \boxed{g} , respectively. Note, however, that the probability of achieving the program **SWITCH** for \boxed{f} and \boxed{g} transforming N qubits goes to zero exponentially as 4^{-N} versus the number N of input qubits for each box.


If we artificially scale the projection E to achieve the **SWITCH** with unit probability of success, we introduce a loop in the circuit: The loop represents a qubit that travels backward in time, thus violating causality as expressed by rule 3. This model of time loops was proposed in Refs. [22–25] It is known that such an artificial rescaling of the probability of postselected outcomes has dramatic computational consequences [26]. Combining this fact with the arguments used in the proof of Theorem 1, we obtain the following

Corollary (classical switch and time travels).



The program **SWITCH** can be realized deterministically in a circuit using the black boxes f and g in a fixed causal order if and only if the circuit contains a deterministic time travel.

Modelling the oracles to allow for classical switch. What rule in the theory of computational circuits can be modified in order to recover the physical implementation of the function $S(x, \boxed{f}, \boxed{g})$ of Eq. (6), whose computation is achieved through the program **SWITCH**? One possibility is to modify rule 3, and to allow for circuits containing certain time loops. However, introducing time travels in the model seems a rather drastic solution. A more moderate approach is to modify rule 4: In particular, we may assume that the resource provided by a single call to each of the two physical oracles—that would be separately described as \boxed{f} and \boxed{g} —in a causal succession that can be decided by the user, is described in circuitual terms as a single oracle with classical control:




where the wire on the bottom left denotes the control qubit, whose general state is $|\varphi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ with $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. The input x is encoded on the state $|\varphi\rangle$ as follows: For $x = 0$ we prepare $|\varphi\rangle = |0\rangle$, for $x = 1$ we prepare $|\varphi\rangle = |1\rangle$. If the two qubits on the top lines are in the states ρ_1 and ρ_2 , respectively, the action of the oracle is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{f,g}(|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| \otimes \rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) = & |\langle 1|\varphi\rangle|^2 U_f \rho_1 U_f^\dagger \otimes U_g \rho_2 U_g^\dagger \\ & + |\langle 0|\varphi\rangle|^2 U_g \rho_1 U_g^\dagger \otimes U_f \rho_2 U_f^\dagger \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

This way of representing the oracle is consistent with the basic properties that one expects for the resource, namely that it perform two successive transformations, one being a call of the box \boxed{f} and the other a call of the box \boxed{g} , with the order of such calls being controlled by the variable x encoded in the state $|\varphi\rangle$. During the time interval between the calls to the oracle, any transformation can happen, including evolutions transforming the first output into the second input. Exploiting the latter representation of the oracle one can clearly implement the program **SWITCH**, just by connecting the output of the first box with the input of the second one, and encoding

the bit x in the state $|\varphi\rangle$ as follows



If we assume that the oracle of Eq. (16) translates the resource provided by a single use of the physical boxes corresponding to \boxed{f}, \boxed{g} with classical control of the causal ordering, we can then consider the function $S(x, \boxed{f}, \boxed{g})$ as computable by a quantum circuit exploiting this resource.

Such an oracle can be achieved in practice, for example, by a physical circuit in which the connections between wires are movable, as in Fig. 1. Higher-order functions





FIG. 1: Quantum machine with classical control over movable wires.

that transform black boxes with the assistance of classical control on the connections are described formally by the quantum λ -calculus of Ref. [21].

A new primitive: The quantum switch of boxes. While representing automated *classical control* of causal sequences of operations allows one to implement the program **SWITCH** within the computational circuit model, it leaves unanswered the question how *quantum control* of causal sequences of operations can be described. We can of course imagine a further generalization of the oracle, allowing for quantum control, with the control qubit that preserves coherence and becomes entangled with the causal ordering of boxes \boxed{f} and \boxed{g} as follows



When \boxed{f} and \boxed{g} are unitary channels, the unitary channel describing the oracle with quantum control is $\mathcal{W}_{f,g}(\rho) = W_{f,g}\rho W_{f,g}^\dagger$, $W_{f,g}$ being the control unitary

$$W_{f,g} := |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes U_f \otimes U_g + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes U_g \otimes U_f \quad (17)$$

The above construction can be suitably generalized when f and g are not unitary boxes, but noisy quantum channels: In this case, it is enough to use the above formula to define the Kraus operators of the channel with quantum control in terms of the Kraus operators of the input channels. Precisely, if the channels f and g have Kraus forms

$f(\rho) = \sum_i f_i \rho f_i^\dagger$ and $g(\rho) = \sum_j g_j \rho g_j^\dagger$, respectively, then the channel with quantum control has Kraus form

$$\mathcal{W}_{f,g}(\sigma) = \sum_{i,j} W_{f_i,g_j} \sigma W_{f_i,g_j}^\dagger$$

with the Kraus operators W_{f_i,g_j} given by

$$W_{f_i,g_j} := |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes f_i \otimes g_j + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes g_j \otimes f_i.$$

Note that the definition of the oracle $\mathcal{W}_{f,g}$ is independent of the Kraus forms chosen for f and g . The oracle with quantum control is more general and more powerful than the classically controlled one introduced in Eq. (16). Indeed, having $W_{f,g}$ at disposal one can implement the classically controlled oracle $\mathcal{O}_{f,g}$ by using $W_{f,g}$ and then discarding the control qubit.

How can we build the controlled oracle $\mathcal{W}_{f,g}$ if we have at disposal one use of the black boxes \boxed{f} and \boxed{g} ? Again, this is a question that the circuit model is unable to answer. In principle, there is no physical reason to forbid the computability of the higher-order function defined by $\mathcal{W} : f \otimes g \mapsto \mathcal{W}_{f,g}$. This function is defined not only on product boxes, but also on the more general class of *non signaling* bipartite boxes, as we already discussed. The function \mathcal{W} is linear in its argument, transforms deterministic boxes into deterministic boxes, and can also be applied locally to multipartite boxes without giving rise to unphysical effects like negative probabilities. The computation of this function is then admissible in principle. However, although the computation of \mathcal{W} is compatible with quantum mechanics, it cannot be implemented by a circuit with the rules 1-4, due to the lack of a predefined causal ordering. Moreover, it is also possible to prove that no circuit using the oracle with classical control $\mathcal{O}_{f,g}$ can simulate the oracle with quantum control $\mathcal{W}_{f,g}$.

To imagine a way to build the controlled gate $W_{f,g}$ from the boxes \boxed{f} and \boxed{g} , we need to go beyond the usual language of quantum circuits, and to consider also circuits with movable wires that can be also in quantum superpositions. For example, we can consider a thought experiment where the physical circuit with movable wires depicted in Fig. 1 can be controlled by a qubit in a way that preserves superpositions, with the control qubit interacting with switches and controlling them in a correlated way, as represented in Fig. 2. Like in the Schrödinger cat thought experiment, in this case we would have a mechanism producing entanglement between a microscopic system (the control qubit) and a macroscopic one (the position of the switches).

Notice however that quantum control of transformations is even more powerful than quantum entanglement, which is the feature giving rise to the typical Schrödinger cat state. Indeed, a control-unitary gate can be always used to generate a certain amount of entanglement.




FIG. 2: Quantum machine with quantum control over movable wires.

Conclusions. The quantum switch of boxes is a new primitive that enables computations where the causal structure of the connections can be in a quantum superposition. A quantum computational model in which the states of quantum systems can control the structure of a causal network suggests a fascinating analogy with a quantum gravity scenario, in which the space-time geometry can be entangled with the state of physical systems. Recently, Hardy suggested that computers operating without a definite causal structure could offer advantages over conventional computers [29]. Building on the ideas of the present paper, Ref. [30] demonstrated such an advantage in a black box discrimination problem, and Ref. [31] exhibited a task where the use of the quantum SWITCH provides a quadratic improvement in the number of queries to the unknown black boxes. In addition, Ref. [18] presented a non-local game where a causally unordered strategy offers an advantage over causally ordered ones. The strategy is described by a supermap on no-signalling channels, which however cannot be realized in terms of the quantum SWITCH.

We believe that exhaustive analysis of higher-order transformations in quantum mechanics will provide some new insight for the formulation of a theory of quantum gravity, within a framework similar to the causaloid framework of Ref. [28]. The physical implementation of higher-order functions discussed here has also an interesting relation to the paradigm of the universe as a quantum computer [32]. Indeed, one can wonder what kind of quantum computer the universe is: It could be a gigantic quantum circuit where information is encoded in the state of many qubits and is processed in time from a spacelike surface to the next, or it could be a quantum Turing machine, or also be a higher-order computer, that processes information encoded in transformations (e.g. in scattering amplitudes) rather than in states. Even if these three models turn out to be equivalent from an abstract computational point of view, they would nevertheless remain very different from the physical one, as they are based on different physical mechanisms. Moreover, as we already mentioned, the third model has still to be completely formulated: What is presently lacking is a complete physical theory that characterizes all transformations of boxes that are possible in nature. A piece

of Quantum Theory is still unexplored.

In conclusion, after summarizing the main rules of computational circuits, and reviewing the notion of quantum supermaps, we exhibited an example of higher-order function—namely a function of physical boxes—that is computable by elementary operations but whose computation cannot be described by a quantum circuit obeying the usual rules. We proposed a minimal change of the rule for describing the oracles, introducing classical control of causal sequences of operations, in such a way that the computation of the class of higher-order functions including the SWITCH can be expressed in circuitual terms. We then discussed a further level of generality, accounting for quantum control of the causal sequence of operations. A complete physical theory of higher-order computation has not been developed yet, we expect it to reveal unexplored aspects of quantum theory in a non-fixed causal framework.

Acknowledgments. We wish to thank P. Selinger for stimulating criticisms and discussions, during which he independently devised the realization of the SWITCH program by a machine with movable wires. Research at QUIT has been supported by the EC through the project COQUIT. Research at Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics is supported in part by the Government of Canada through NSERC and by the Province of Ontario through MRI. G. C. acknowledges support by the National Basic Research Program of China (973) 2011CBA00300 (2011CBA00302).

Research at U. Penn. has been supported by the Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity (IARPA) via Department of Interior National Business Center contract number D11PC20168 [33].

* Electronic address: gchiribella@perimeterinstitute.ca

† Electronic address: dariano@unipv.it

‡ Electronic address: paolo.perinotti@unipv.it

§ Electronic address: valiron@seas.upenn.edu

¶ URL: <http://www.perimeterinstitute.ca>

** URL: <http://www.qubit.it>

†† URL: <http://www.cis.upenn.edu>

- [1] D. Deutsch, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **400**, pp. 97-117 (1985).
- [2] D. Deutsch, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **425**, pp. 73-90 (1989).
- [3] Andrew Yao, Proceedings of the 34th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 352 (1993).
- [4] P. W. Shor, SIAM J. Comput. **26**, 1484 (1997).
- [5] L. Grover, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 325 (1997).
- [6] These advantages, however, do not imply that higher-order computation changes complexity classes with respect to the circuit model.
- [7] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 060401 (2008).
- [8] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, EPL **83**, 30004 (2008).

- [9] G. Gutoski and J. Watrous, in Proceedings of the 39th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computation (STOC), pp. 565-574 (2007).
- [10] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 022339 (2009).
- [11] M. Paternostro, D. Vitali, S. Gigan, M. S. Kim, Č. Brukner, J. Eisert, and M. Aspelmeyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 250401 (2007).
- [12] A. D. O'Connell, M. Hofheinz, M. Ansmann, R. C. Bialczak, M. Lenander, E. Lucero, M. Neeley, D. Sank, H. Wang, M. Weides, J. Wenner, J. M. Martinis, and A. N. Cleland, Nature **464**, 697-703 (2010).
- [13] K. C. Lee, M. R. Sprague, B. J. Sussman, J. Nunn, N. K. Langford, X.-M. Jin, T. Champion, P. Michelberger, K. F. Reim, D. England, D. Jaksch, I. A. Walmsley, Science **334**, pp. 1253-1256 (2011).
- [14] M. A. Hall, J. B. Altepeter, and P. Kumar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 053901 (2011).
- [15] A. Jenčová, J. Math. Phys. **53**, 012201 (2012).
- [16] G. Gutoski, Quant. Inf. Comp. **9**, 739-764, (2009).
- [17] M. Piani, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 012305 (2006).
- [18] O. Oreshkov, F. Costa, and Brukner, arXiv:1105.446.
- [19] H. Barendregt, *Lambda Calculi with Types*, in *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science, Volume 2: Computational Structures*, S. Abramski, D. M. Gabbay and T. S. E. Maibaum eds., (Oxford University Press, New York, 1993).
- [20] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 321 (1997).
- [21] P. Selinger and B. Valiron, arXiv:1105.4464. Math. Struct. in Comp. Sci., **16** 527 (2006).
- [22] C. H. Bennett, B. Schumacher, unpublished. Slides available at <http://web.archive.org/web/20030809140213/http://qip-server.tcs.t>
- [23] B. Coecke, arXiv:quant-ph/0402014v2.
- [24] G. Svetlichny, Int. J. of Theo. Phys., **50**, 3903 (2011).
- [25] S. Lloyd, L. Maccone, R. Garcia-Patron, V. Giovannetti, Y. Shikano, S. Pirandola, L. A. Rozema, A. Darabi, Y. Soudagar, L. K. Shalm, A. M. Steinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 040403 (2011).
- [26] S. Aaronson, Proc. R. Soc. A **461** 3473 (2005).
- [27] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** 180504 (2008).
- [28] L. Hardy, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40**, 3081-3099 (2007).
- [29] L. Hardy, in *Quantum Reality, Relativistic Causality, and Closing the Epistemic Circle: Essays in Honour of Abner Shimony*, W. C. Myrvold and J. Christian eds., Springer (2009).
- [30] G. Chiribella, arXiv:1109.5154.
- [31] T. Colnaghi, G. M. D'Ariano, P. Perinotti, and S. Facchini, arXiv:1109.5987.
- [32] S. Lloyd, *Programming the Universe: A Quantum Computer Scientist Takes On the Cosmos*, (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2006).
- [33] The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright annotation thereon. Disclaimer: The views and conclusions contained herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies or endorsements, either expressed or implied, of IARPA, DoI/NBC, or the U.S. Government.