Time-delocalized quantum subsystems and operations: on the existence of processes with indefinite causal structure in quantum mechanics
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It was recently found that it is theoretically possible for there to exist higher-order quantum processes in which the operations performed by separate parties cannot be ascribed a definite causal order. Some of these processes are believed to have a physical realization in standard quantum mechanics via coherent control of the times of the operations. A prominent example is the quantum SWITCH, which was recently demonstrated experimentally. However, up until now, there has been no rigorous justification for the interpretation of such an experiment as a genuine realization of a process with indefinite causal structure as opposed to a simulation of such a process. Where exactly are the local operations of the parties in such an experiment? On what spaces do they act given that their times are indefinite? Can we probe them directly rather than assume what they ought to be based on heuristic considerations? How can we reconcile the claim that these operations really take place, each once as required, with the fact that the structure of the presumed process implies that they cannot be part of any acyclic circuit? Here, I offer a precise answer to these questions: the input and output systems of the operations in such a process are generally nontrivial subsystems of Hilbert spaces that are tensor products of Hilbert spaces associated with different times—a fact that is directly experimentally verifiable. With respect to these time-delocalized subsystems, the structure of the process is one of a circuit with a cycle, which cannot be reduced to a (possibly dynamical) probabilistic mixture of acyclic circuits. This provides, for the first time, a rigorous proof of the existence of processes with indefinite causal structure within the known quantum mechanics. I further show that all bipartite processes that obey a recently proposed unitary extension postulate, together with their unitary extensions, have a physical realization on such time-delocalized subsystems, and provide evidence that even more general processes may be physically admissible. These results unveil a novel structure within quantum mechanics, which may have important implications for physics and information processing.

I. INTRODUCTION

According to quantum mechanics, physical quantities in general do not have definite values unless measured. Yet, the classical idea that events occur in a well-defined causal order persists, since quantum operations are assumed to always take place in acyclic compositions that respect the causal structure of spacetime. A natural question is whether this definiteness in the causal order of operations is a fundamental physical restriction or an artifact of our formulation of quantum theory. Is it possible that, in suitable circumstances, the order of operations would be indefinite similarly to other physical variables, how would this be described formally, and what testable consequences would it entail? These questions may be particularly relevant for understanding physics in the regimes of quantum gravity, where the causal structure of spacetime is expected to be subject to quantum indefiniteness [1][2].

An example of a mathematically admissible transformation that can be thought of as realizing a ‘superposition’ of the order of operations was described by Chiribella et al. in Ref. [3]. This higher-order transformation [4][5], called quantum SWITCH, was conceived as a hypothetical computer program that takes as an input two black-box quantum gates and outputs a new gate that can be thought of as the result of applying sequentially the two gates in an order that depends coherently on the logical value of a qubit that could be prepared in a superposition. The authors pointed out that this transformation cannot be realized by using each of the input gates once in an acyclic circuit [6], just as the classical version of the program cannot, but nevertheless one may conceive implementations based on physical circuits with movable wires that simulate the effect of the program, thereby making a case for the need of a more general theoretical model of quantum computation than the circuit model. Although at face value the program involved nonclassicality in the order of operations, the theoretical tools for making this statement precise were not developed at that time.

A framework for investigating the possibility of indefinite causal order in quantum theory by means of correlations was developed in Ref. [9]. This so-called process framework describes separate local experiments, each defined by a pair of input and output quantum systems on which an agent can apply arbitrary quantum operations, without presuming the existence of global causal order between the experiments. Under a set of natural assumptions (see Sec. [11], the most general correlations between such experiments can be shown to be given by a generalization of Born’s rule that involves an extension of the density matrix called the process matrix. Mathematically, the process matrix can also be understood as a higher-order transformation, but one that maps the local operations to probabilities. The formalism provides a unified description of all nonsignaling and signaling quantum correlations between separate experiments that can be arranged in a causal configuration [5], as well as probabilistic mixtures of different such causal scenarios. Remarkably, it was found that there are logically consistent bipartite process matrices that are incompatible with the existence of definite causal order between the local experiments and hence cannot be realized in this way. Such processes were called causally nonseparable [9]. The concept of causal nonseparability was subsequently generalized to more that two parties [10], which in particular provided a rigorous framework in which the indefiniteness of the causal
order involved in the quantum SWITCH can be defined.

Causally nonseparable processes allow accomplishing certain tasks that cannot be achieved with operations for which a definite causal order exists. A striking possibility allowed by some causally nonseparable processes is the generation of correlations that violate causal inequalities [12, 17]. These correlations imply incompatibility with definite causal order under theory independent assumptions, similarly to the way a violation of a Bell inequality implies incompatibility with local hidden variables [18]. It is not known at present whether processes violating causal inequalities have a physical realization, except through post-selection [19, 22]. However, it is widely believed that a specific class of causally nonseparable processes, which includes the quantum SWITCH, has a physical realization without post-selection via coherent control of the times at which the local operations occur, as in the original proposal [3]. The known processes of this kind cannot violate causal inequalities [10, 23], but they can be proven incompatible with definite causal order in a device-dependent fashion [23, 25]. In particular, the quantum SWITCH and its generalizations have been shown to offer advantages over processes in which the order of operations is definite for a variety of information-processing tasks [24, 26, 30]. Concrete implementations of the quantum SWITCH via coherent control of the times of the operations have been proposed for trapped-ion systems [31], photonic systems [32], and systems of superconducting qubits [33], and demonstrated with photonic systems in a series of increasingly sophisticated experiments [32, 34–36].

Despite this experimental progress, however, up until now there has been no rigorous justification for the assertion that implementations of this kind constitute genuine realizations of causally nonseparable processes as opposed to simulations of such processes. The reason is that, even though by construction the produced data agrees with what we expect from the corresponding process, it is far from clear whether the circumstances in which the data is produced correspond to a process. In a quantum process, by definition, the local operations of the parties occur each once on a specific pair of input and output Hilbert spaces. In an implementation based on controlled operations, it is not obvious on what spaces the local operations occur, if at all. For example, in the implementations of the quantum SWITCH [32, 34, 35], the experiment can be seen to involve two applications of controlled unitary operations at different times in the laboratory of each party (see Sec. III), which are such that under the particular arrangement, when the control qubit is prepared in a classically definite logical state, exactly one of the two would result in a nontrivial transformation on the target system. However, in the actual implementation, the control qubit is prepared in a quantum superposition of the two logical states, in which case the belief that the same operation is applied once on the target system at some indefinite time is merely based on heuristics. This heuristics can be artificially strengthened by extending each controlled operation to act on a system that works as a ‘counter’ that is coherently raised each ‘time’ the nontrivial controlled operation is applied on the target system, such that the reading of the counter at the end could be interpreted as evidence that the desired operation has been applied once. However, since the faithfulness of the counter as evidence for the applied operation is itself directly verified only in the case when the target operation occurs at a definite time, regarding it as evidence in the case of superpositions requires the same conceptual leap. While such a leap appears appealing, it is nothing but begging for a rigorous theory that positions the supposed operations in relation to the global temporal description of the experiment.

Here, I show that the supposed operations of the parties in such an implementation really take place on specific input and output systems—a fact that can be directly verified experimentally. These input and output systems are generally time-delocalized subsystems, i.e., nontrivial subsystems of the tensor products of Hilbert spaces associated with different times. The fact that we can think, both mathematically and operationally, of Hilbert spaces that are tensor products of Hilbert spaces at different times is well established [5]—a generic fragment of a standard quantum circuit is an example of a quantum operation whose input and output Hilbert spaces are of this kind. However, given two Hilbert spaces of this kind, it is generally not possible to apply arbitrary quantum operations from one to the other due to the constraints imposed by the causal structure of spacetime [5]. At the same time, it is well known that the most general faithful realization of a quantum system inside a given Hilbert space is in the form of a subsystem—a tensor factor of a subspace of the full Hilbert space [37, 38]. In fact, any experimentally accessible system is such a subsystem from the perspective of a larger Hilbert space [39, 40]. Thus, it is also natural to consider operations whose input and output systems are nontrivial subsystems of the tensor products of Hilbert spaces associated with different times. As it turns out, there exist pairs of such time-delocalized input and output subsystems on which it is possible to apply any standard quantum operation without post-selection, despite the fact that the input system cannot be associated with a region of spacetime that is in the causal past of the output system. It is on such time-delocalized quantum subsystems that causally nonseparable processes are realized. With respect to these input and output systems, a causally nonseparable process has the structure of a circuit with a cycle that does not admit a decomposition into a probabilistic mixture of acyclic circuits or dynamical generalizations of such mixtures [10]. The existence of these irreducible cyclic structures within quantum mechanics is the main finding of this paper.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II I review the basics of the process matrix framework. In Sec. III I describe explicitly the main result in the case of the quantum SWITCH and note how it generalizes to arbitrary processes in which the operations are delocalized in time through controlled operations. In Sec. IV I show that all bipartite processes that obey a recently proposed unitary extension postulate [41], together with their unitary extensions, of which the quantum SWITCH is an example, have a realization on suitably defined time-delocalized subsystems. In Sec. V I define a class of isometric extensions of bipartite processes, which is strictly larger than the class of unitary extensions, and show that these processes also admit a realization on suitable time-
The requirement that probabilities must be nonnegative and all input and output systems, called the process matrix, etc., and the expansion of a process matrix in a Hilbert-Schmidt basis, which constraint on the types of nonzero terms permitted in the expansion can perform an arbitrary quantum operation from $X_I$ to $X_O$. A quantum operation is most generally described by a collection of completely positive (CP) and trace-nonincreasing maps $\{M_{ij}^{A_i\to X_0}\}_{ij\in O^X}$, $M_{ij}^{X_1\to X_0}$ : $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_X)$ → $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{X_0})$, where $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^X)$ denotes the space of linear operators over the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^X$ with dimension $d_X$ (here we assume finite dimensions), and $\mathcal{P} \in O^X$ labels the possible outcomes of the operation with which the different CP maps are associated. The sum of the CP maps corresponding to the complete set of the outcomes of an operation, $\mathcal{M}^{X_i\to X_0} = \sum_{ij \in O^X} M_{ij}^{X_1\to X_0}$, must be a CP and trace-preserving (TP) map.

Consider the joint probabilities, $p(i, j, \{M^{A_i\to A_J}\}_{i\in I^A}, \{M^{B_i^J\to B_i^J}\}_{j\in O^J})$ for the outcomes of the local experiments, conditional on the parties choosing to perform specific quantum operations. Under the following assumptions (9)—(i) these probabilities are functions only of the CP maps corresponding to the local operations, (ii) they are consistent with the local quantum description of coarse-graining and randomization, (iii) the local operations can be extended to act on arbitrary auxiliary input systems prepared in any joint quantum state—the probabilities can be written in the form

$$p(i, j, \{M^{A_i\to A_J}\}_{i\in I^A}, \{M^{B_i^J\to B_i^J}\}_{j\in O^J}) = \text{Tr}\left[W^{A_iA_JB_i^JB_j} \left(M_{ij}^{A_i\to A_J} \otimes N_{ij}^{B_i^J\to B_j} \otimes \cdots \right)\right].$$

(1)

Here, $M^{A_i\to A_J} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{A_i} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_J}) \geq 0$ is the Choi-Jamiolkowski (CJ) operator (42,43) (defined with an extra overall transposition (43)) of the CP map $M^{A_i\to A_J}$, and similarly for $N^{B_i^J\to B_j}$, etc., and $W^{A_iA_JB_i^JB_j}$ is an operator on the tensor product of all input and output systems, called the process matrix. The only constraints that a process matrix must satisfy come from the requirement that probabilities must be nonnegative and sum up to 1 (the latter is equivalent to requiring normalization on all deterministic local operations, or CPTP maps):

$$W^{A_iA_JB_i^JB_j} \geq 0,$$

(2)

$$\text{Tr}\left[W^{A_iA_JB_i^JB_j} \left(M_{ij}^{A_i\to A_J} \otimes N_{ij}^{B_i^J\to B_j} \otimes \cdots \right)\right] = 1,$$

(3)

$$\forall M^{A_i\to A_J}, N^{B_i^J\to B_j} \geq 0,$$

$$\text{Tr}_{A_i} M_{ij}^{A_i\to A_J} = \mathbb{1}_{I^A}, \text{Tr}_{B_j} N_{ij}^{B_i^J\to B_j} = \mathbb{1}_{I^B}, \cdots.$$

Condition (3) can be equivalently formulated as a simple constraint on the types of nonzero terms permitted in the expansion of a process matrix in a Hilbert-Schmidt basis, which

![FIG. 1: A process as a cyclic circuit. A process matrix $W$ is equivalent to the transpose of the CJ operator of a channel from the outputs of the local operations to their inputs, while the probability rule (1) is equivalent to composing this channel with the local operations, as illustrated here.](image-url)

is highly useful for constructing process matrices or verifying if a given operator is a valid process matrix (9). More specifically, any Hermitian matrix $W^{A_iA_JB_i^JB_jC_i^JC_j^J} = \sum_{ijklmn} w_{ijklmn} \sigma_i^{A_i} \otimes \sigma_j^{B_j} \otimes \sigma_{ij}^{B_i^J} \otimes \sigma_l^{B_l} \otimes \sigma_m^{C_i^J} \otimes \sigma_n^{C_j^J} \otimes \cdots$, $w_{ijklmn} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\forall i, j, k, l, m, n, \cdots$, (4)

where the Hermitian operators $\{\sigma_i^{X_i}\}_{i=0}^{d_X-1}$ with $\sigma_0^X = \mathbb{1}_X$, $\text{Tr}_X \sigma_i^X = d_X \delta_{ij}$, and $\text{Tr}_X \sigma_i^X = 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, d_X^X-1$, forms a Hilbert-Schmidt basis. An operator of the form (4) satisfies condition (3), if and only if, in addition to the term proportional to $\mathbb{1}_{X_A}A_{i\to B_i}B_i^J\cdot C_i^J\cdot C_j^J$—which comes with weight $w_{00\cdots0}=1/d_{X_A}d_{B_i}d_{C_i^J}d_{C_j^J}$—it contains only nonzero terms in which there is a nontrivial $\sigma$ operator on $X_i$ and a trivial one (the identity) on $X_0$ for some party $X \in \{A, B, C, \cdots\}$ (10,23).

The process matrix can be understood as a higher-order transformation from the tensor product of a set of local quantum operations to conditional probability distributions, which is completely positive and normalized on deterministic local operations (46,47). Since a process matrix is mathematically equivalent to the transpose of the CJ operator of a channel $W^{A_iA_JB_i^JB_j\rightarrow A_iB_i^J}$ from the outputs of the local parties to their inputs (which can be seen from the terms permitted in its Hilbert-Schmidt basis expansion (9)), and the probability formula (Eq. (1)) is equivalent to the composition of that channel with the local operations, such a higher-order transformation can be thought of as a circuit with a cycle (9), as illustrated in Fig. 1 for the case of two parties.

In the case of the two parties, the most general process matrix compatible with a fixed causal relation between the operations of Alice and Bob has the form $W^{A_iA_JB_i^JB_j} = W^{A_iA_JB_i^JB_j} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{X_0}$ (the case where Bob is not in the causal past of Alice and hence cannot signal to Alice) or $W^{A_iA_JB_i^JB_j} = W^{A_iA_JB_i^JB_j} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_0}$ (the case where Alice is not in the causal past of Bob and hence cannot signal to Bob). Each of these has an implementation via embedding the operations of Alice and Bob in an acyclic quantum circuit (4). More generally, we may conceive of situations where these two possibilities are realized at random with some probabilities, in which case the process matrix can delocalized subsystems. It remains an open question whether the class of bipartite processes that admit such extensions is larger than those admitting unitary extensions. In Sec. VI I discuss the results.

II. THE PROCESS MATRIX FRAMEWORK

The quantum process framework (9) describes separate local experiments, $X = A, B, C, \ldots$, each defined by an input quantum system $X_I$ with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^X$ and an output quantum system $X_O$ with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{X_0}$, where an agent can perform an arbitrary quantum operation from $X_I$ to $X_O$. Via embedding the operations of Alice and Bob in an acyclic quantum circuit (4), we may conceive of situations where these two possibilities are realized at random with some probabilities, in which case the process matrix can
be written in the form

\[ W_{cs}^{A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2} = q W_{cs}^{A_1 A_2 B_1} \otimes I_{B_2} + (1 - q) W_{cs}^{A_1 B_1 B_2} \otimes I_{A_2}, \]

\[ q \in [0, 1]. \] (5)

Such process matrices are called causally separable \[9\]. They correspond to the most general situation in which a fixed (though possibly unknown) causal configuration between the parties exist in each run of the experiment, and where the correlations arising in each configuration come from a standard quantum circuit containing the operations of Alice and Bob. (In the case of three or more parties, the concept of causal separability is more complicated due to the possibility of dynamical causal configurations \[10\], where the causal order between a subset of the parties can depend on the operations performed by other parties in their past.)

As is now known, not all bipartite quantum process matrices have the form \[5\]. This was first shown in Ref. \[9\] by the example of a process matrix that allows Alice and Bob to accomplish a counterintuitive communication task—the violation of a causal inequality—that is impossible if there is a definite causal order between the local experiments, irrespectively of whether we assume that the underlying dynamics is described by quantum theory or any more general theory. The geometric understanding of causal inequalities—first developed in the bipartite case \[14\] and then generalized to include the possibility of dynamical causal order in the multipartite case \[10\]—is now well established: they are hyperbolic surfaces in the space of correlations that separate the polytope of causal correlations from the rest, similarly to the way Bell inequalities separate the set of Bell-local correlations from other nonsignaling correlations. It is also known that not all causally nonseparable processes violate causal inequalities.

To make this distinction, processes violating causal inequalities are called noncausal. This distinction was first recognized in the multipartite case through the example of a tripartite causally nonseparable process described in the next section \[10, 23\], and then shown to exist in the bipartite case too \[48\].

III. THE QUANTUM SWITCH AND ITS PHYSICAL REALIZATION

The quantum SWITCH \[3\] is a higher-order transformation, or supermap, which takes as an input two black-box operations, \( \{ M_{i}^{A_1 \rightarrow A_0} \}_{i \in C^A} \) and \( \{ N_{j}^{B \rightarrow B_0} \}_{j \in C^B} \), figuratively associated with Alice and Bob, where \( d_A = d_{A_0} = d_B = d_{B_0} = d \), and gives as an output an operation \( \{ M_{i}^{G \rightarrow G'} \}_{i \in C^G} \), where \( C^G = C^A \otimes C^B \) and \( C^{G'} = C^{A_1} \otimes C^{B_1} \) with \( d_G = d_{G'} = 2 \) and \( d_S = d_{S'} = d \). Its action can be described intuitively as follows. If we think of \( C^G \) and \( C^{G'} \) as the Hilbert spaces of some target system at the same two times, then the effect of the resultant operation can be thought of as transforming the target system from the initial to the final time by the sequential application of the operations \( \{ M_{i} \}_{i \in C^G} \), \( \{ N_{j} \}_{j \in C^{G'}} \), where the order in which the two operations are applied depends coherently on the logical value of the control qubit.

To describe this coherent conditioning precisely, we use the fact that supermaps are defined on all extensions of the original input operations onto additional systems \[3–5, 46, 47\]. Since any quantum operation can be realized by applying a joint unitary channel on the original input system plus a suitably initialized auxiliary input system followed by a destructive measurement on a subsystem of the output system of the channel, the effect of the quantum SWITCH on the operations of Alice and Bob can be inferred from its effect in the case when the two operations are extended unitary channels \( U_{A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2}^{A_1 \rightarrow A_0 B_1 \rightarrow B_0} \) and \( U_{B_1 B_2}^{B_1 \rightarrow B_0} \), each acting on the original input and output systems plus separate auxiliary input and output systems, as described in Fig. 2. Let \( U_{A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2}^{A_1 \rightarrow a A_0 B_1 \rightarrow B_0} \) and \( U_{B_1 B_2}^{B_1 \rightarrow b B_0} \) denote the unitary matrices describing the action of these unitary channels at the Hilbert-space level. Then, the result of the quantum SWITCH is a unitary channel \( U_{\text{SWITCH}}^{A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 \rightarrow a A_0 b B_0} \) whose unitary matrix at the Hilbert-space level is

\[
U_{\text{SWITCH}}^{a A_1 B_1 \rightarrow a A_0 b B_0} (U_A, U_B) \equiv U^{a A_1 B_1 \rightarrow a A_0 b B_0} (U_A, U_B) =
\]

\[ |0\rangle^G_1 \langle 0|_B \otimes U^{b B_1 \rightarrow b B_0 S'}_B \cdot U^{a A_1 \rightarrow a A_0 X}_A \]

\[ + |1\rangle^G_1 \langle 1|_B \otimes U^{a A_0 \rightarrow a X}_A \otimes U^{b B_0 S}_B, \] (6)

where \( X \) is a dummy system of dimension \( d \) over which the transformations are composed (we have dropped the superscripts indicating the input and output systems of Alice’s and Bob’s operations in the argument of the supermap to simplify the notation).

In the special cases when the control qubit is prepared in the state \( |0\rangle^G \otimes |0\rangle^B \), the quantum SWITCH effectively applies first the operation of Alice and then the operation of Bob on the target system. When the control qubit is prepared in the state \( |1\rangle^G \otimes |0\rangle^B \), it effectively applies first the operation of Bob and then the operation of Alice on the target system (see Fig. 3). When the control qubit is prepared in a superposition of these basis states, such as \( |+\rangle^G \otimes |0\rangle^B \equiv \frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \), the intuitive understanding is that these two scenarios are somehow realized ‘in superposition’, as sketched in Fig. 4. Note, however, that the two extreme scenarios are not simultaneously compatible with a common causal structure \[3\].

To see the quantum SWITCH as a process matrix, we con-
The fact that this process matrix is causally nonseparable follows from the fact that there are certain preparations that David can make for which the operations of Alice and Bob cannot be said to take place in a definite order. The example most commonly considered and the one implemented in the experiments discussed below corresponds to the case where David prepares the state $|\psi\rangle$ on the control qubit together with some pure state $|\Phi\rangle$ on the target system. In that case, the correlations between Alice, Bob, and Charlie are given by the tripartite process matrix

$$W_{D_1A_1B_1C_1} = |W\rangle\langle W|_{D_1A_1B_1C_1},$$

where

$$|W\rangle_{D_1A_1B_1C_1} = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|_{A_1B_1C_1} |\Phi\rangle \langle \Phi|_{A_1B_1C_1} |\Phi\rangle \langle \Phi|_{A_1B_1C_1} |\Phi\rangle \langle \Phi|_{A_1B_1C_1},$$

with $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_i |i\rangle$, where $\{i\}$ is the basis for the Choi isomorphism for the respective system.

The fact that this process matrix is causally nonseparable follows from the fact that there are certain preparations that David can make for which the operations of Alice and Bob cannot be said to take place in a definite order. The example

consider two more parties—David, who is allowed to prepare different input states into the input system $G$ of the resultant channel (i.e., his possible operations have a trivial input system and output system $D_0 \equiv G = Q S$), and Charlie, who is allowed to perform measurements on the output system $G'$ of the resultant channel (i.e., his possible operations have a trivial input system $C_1 \equiv G' = Q' S'$ and a trivial output system). It can be verified that the process matrix describing the correlations between the four parties is

$$W_{D_0A_0B_0C_1} = |W\rangle\langle W|_{D_0A_0B_0C_1},$$

where

$$|W\rangle_{D_0A_0B_0C_1} = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|_{A_1B_1C_1} |\Phi\rangle \langle \Phi|_{A_1B_1C_1} |\Phi\rangle \langle \Phi|_{A_1B_1C_1} |\Phi\rangle \langle \Phi|_{A_1B_1C_1},$$

with $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_i |i\rangle$, where $\{i\}$ is the basis for the Choi isomorphism for the respective system.
the time of passage in the two different classical cases is different and in the general case not even defined, we should be able to say that the correct operation has been applied once. While this line of reasoning may appear intuitive, the problem with it is that we only have a clear definition of what it means to apply the correct operations and possess evidence for this in the extreme cases of definite times. Simply declaring that this holds in the more general case without specifying where precisely the operations take place nor how we could probe them can hardly be considered convincing. (There are many properties that hold in the extreme case where a qubit is prepared in one of the two logical basis states but do not hold in the case of nontrivial superpositions—the causal nonseparability of the presumed process resulting from such an implementation would be one example.) In fact, the above heuristic reasoning suggests that even in the case of indefinite times, the operations of Alice and Bob are still operations on the internal degrees of freedom of the particle. As we will see below, this is not correct—Alice and Bob can indeed be said to apply the correct operations, but the precise input and output systems are nontrivial subsystems of Hilbert spaces composed of both the control qubit and the target system at different times.

To simplify our analysis, we will restrict our attention to a realization in which the operation of Bob is applied at a fixed time, while the operation of Alice may be applied before Bob’s operation or after it, depending on the logical value of the control qubit. (The experiments reported in Refs. [32, 34, 35] are based on a symmetric setup with respect to the possible times of the operations of Alice and Bob, and below we will comment on how our result looks in that case as well.) From a temporal perspective, the experiment has the circuit structure depicted in Fig. 5, where the unitaries are given at the Hilbert-space level, the operations of David and Charlie are left unspecified, and we use a standard graphical notation for controlled unitaries [49], where a black dot represents conditioning on the state $|1\rangle\langle 1|$ and a white dot on the state $|0\rangle\langle 0|$. 

Comment 1. The circuit in Fig. 5 is drawn with respect to the control qubit and the target system, which in the conceived realization are the path and internal degrees of freedom of a particle. Neither of these systems is a spatially localized system. One may ask how this description relates to a system decomposition that reflects the spatiotemporal configuration. Assuming that Alice and Bob reside at separate spatial locations and that either vacuum or one particle can enter their laboratory at any given time, a natural choice of a spatially local system to associate with each laboratory would be the $d+1$-dimensional Hilbert space that is a direct sum of the local vacuum and the $d$-dimensional Hilbert space of the internal degrees of freedom of the particle. The full Hilbert space of the joint system of Alice and Bob at a given time is then the tensor product of these two local Hilbert spaces. However, in the described experimental setup only a subspace of this Hilbert space is ever populated—the one corresponding to the presence of exactly one particle, which could be in either Alice’s or Bob’s laboratory or some superposition of the two locations. This subspace decomposes into a tensor product of a two-dimensional subsystem encoding the location of the particle (or the path degree of freedom) and the $d$-dimensional subsystem corresponding to the internal degrees of freedom. Thus, with respect to a spatially local choice of systems, the control qubit and the target system are factors of a proper subspace of the full Hilbert space. As noted in the introduction, this is the most general realization of a system within a given Hilbert space, and it will be essential in the generalization discussed in Section V. Note, however, that the present argument is independent of how precisely the circuit in Fig. 5 is realized—one may even think that the depicted systems are spatially local and that the realization consists of directly applying the controlled operations displayed on the figure by turning on suitable fields.

The input and output systems of David, Bob, and Charlie

FIG. 5: Temporal description of the implementation of the quantum SWITCH with Bob’s operation at a fixed time. From a temporal perspective, the experiment can be described by a sequence of unitaries acting on the control qubit and the target system plus the local auxiliary systems of Alice and Bob. Here, Bob’s operation is implemented at a fixed time, while Alice’s supposed operation is implemented by means of two controlled unitaries.

FIG. 6: Circuit fragment containing Alice’s operation. Removing the operations of David, Bob, and Charlie from Fig. 5 we are left with this circuit fragment in which Alice’s operation is supposedly taking place in some sense.
in this setup are clear, since they are associated with well-defined times. It is also clear what it means that David, Bob, and Charlie perform specific operations with these input and output systems—we can test this by feeding suitable states in their input systems and performing suitable measurements on their output systems. Alice’s supposed operation \( U_A \), on the other hand, is some still unidentified part of the circuit fragment in Fig. 6 (the description in Fig. 6 is given in terms of the transformations at the Hilbert-space level). As is well-known, such a fragment is itself a quantum operation from the composite input system \( a_I Q^S B_0 \) to the composite output system \( a_O Q^S B_I \), which is described by the theory of quantum combs \( 5 \). In this case, the operation is a unitary channel whose unitary matrix at the Hilbert-space level is

\[
U_{a_I Q^S B_0 \rightarrow a_O Q^S B_I}^{\text{SWITCH}}(U_A) = U_{a_I}^{a_I Q^S B_0 \rightarrow a_I Q^S B_I}(U_A) = U_{a_O}^{a_O Q^S B_I \rightarrow a_O Q^S B_I}(U_A) \otimes I_{Q^S B_0} \otimes I_{B_0 \rightarrow S},
\]

which can be obtained by multiplying the unitary gates that make up the circuit fragment. This statement can also be verified through tomography by feeding suitable states in the joint input and performing suitable measurements on the joint output, as depicted in Fig. 7.

Our first main observation is that the unitary in Eq. (11) can be written in the form

\[
U_{a_I Q^S B_0 \rightarrow a_O Q^S B_I}^{\text{SWITCH}}(U_A) = U_{a_I}^{a_I Q^S B_0 \rightarrow a_O Q^S B_I}(U_A) \otimes I_{Q^S B_0} \otimes I_{B_0 \rightarrow S},
\]

or, equivalently, the unitary channel of the quantum comb can be written in the form

\[
\mathcal{U}_0^{a_I Q^S B_0 \rightarrow a_O Q^S B_I}(U_A) = \mathcal{U}_A^{a_I (A_I \rightarrow a_O A_O)} \otimes I_{Q^S B_0} \otimes I_{B_0 \rightarrow S},
\]

where \( I \) denotes the identity channel. Here, \( \mathcal{H}^{B_0} \) is a tensor factor of \( \mathcal{H}^{Q^S B_0} \) that has dimension \( d \) and \( \mathcal{H}^{Q^S B_I} \) is its cofactor (\( \mathcal{H}^{Q^S B_0} = \mathcal{H}^{A_I} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{Q^S} \)), and similarly, \( \mathcal{H}^{B_0} \) is a tensor factor of \( \mathcal{H}^{Q^S B_I} \) that has the dimension of \( d \) and \( \mathcal{H}^{B_0} \) is its co-factor (\( \mathcal{H}^{Q^S B_I} = \mathcal{H}^{A_O} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{B_0} \)). The factor \( \mathcal{H}^{A_I} \) is defined by the algebra of operators of the form

\[
O^{A_I} = |0\rangle\langle 0|_Q \otimes O^S \otimes I_{B_0} + |1\rangle\langle 1|_Q \otimes I^S \otimes O_{B_0},
\]

and the factor \( \mathcal{H}^{A_O} \) by the algebra of operators of the form

\[
O^{A_O} = |0\rangle\langle 0|_Q \otimes I^S \otimes O_{B_I} + |1\rangle\langle 1|_Q \otimes O^S \otimes I_{B_0}.
\]

These are the input and output systems of Alice’s operation. To see this, notice that \( 50 \), for any \( U_A \),

\[
U_{a_I Q^S B_0 \rightarrow a_O Q^S B_I}^{\text{SWITCH}}(U_A) = \text{C-SWAP}^{Q^S B_I}(U_A) = \text{C-SWAP}^{Q^S B_0}(U_A),
\]

where \( \text{C-SWAP}^{Q^S B_0} \) denotes the controlled-SWAP unitary operation (which is also Hermitian) with control qubit \( X \) and target systems \( Q \) and \( B_0 \) \( 52 \). This can be verified from the expression for \( U_{a_I Q^S B_0 \rightarrow a_O Q^S B_I}^{\text{SWITCH}}(U_A) \) in Eq. (11). The operator is a direct testable fact—we can verify it by preparing suitable states on \( A_I \) and performing suitable measurements on \( A_O \). The subsystems \( A_I \) and \( A_O \) are related to \( S \) and \( B_I \) via the C-SWAP transformations, which is equivalent to the relations (14) and (15) for the operators on these subsystems.

Having identified the subsystems \( A_I \) and \( A_O \), the operation performed from \( A_I \) to \( A_O \) becomes a directly testable fact—we can verify it by preparing suitable states on \( A_I \) and performing suitable measurements on \( A_O \), which fits within the general scheme depicted in Fig. 7.

Note that the subsystem \( A_I \) has a nontrivial ‘spread’ over \( B_0 \) in the sense that it is not a subsystem of the complement \( Q^S \). Similarly, \( A_O \) has a nontrivial spread over \( B_I \). But \( B_I \) is in the causal past of \( B_0 \). In spite of this, it is possible to perform an arbitrary standard operation from \( A_I \) to \( A_O \). While this fact may appear counterintuitive, it is important to stress that, at least in this case, it is not specific to quantum mechanics—it holds irrespectively of whether we initialize \( Q \) in a quantum superposition or a classical probabilistic mixture of the logical states, and even has an analogue in the case where all systems are classical. In those classical cases, however, it is possible to think that the logical observable on \( Q \) has a definite value and hence the ‘true’ input system of Alice’s operation is not
a fixed one but either $S$ or $B_0$, depending on the control bit (formally speaking, this is equivalent to associating $A_1$ with a tensor factor of two different subspaces of $QS B_0$), and similarly the output system is either $B_0$ or $S'$. However, when $Q$ is initialized in a quantum superposition and Charlie is allowed to perform arbitrary operations on $Q'S'$, such an interpretation is not possible anymore. In general, with respect to the input and output systems $A_I$ and $A_O$ that we have identified, the experiment has the cyclic circuit structure depicted in Fig. 8 where the channel connected to the operations of the four parties cannot be decomposed into a mixture of channels where the cycle might break. As first pointed out by Chiribella et al. [3], such a cyclic structure is a necessary property of the quantum SWITCH as a higher-order transformation on the operations of Alice and Bob [51]. By identifying precisely these operations, our analysis makes the cyclic structure explicit, vindicating the interpretation of the described implementation as a genuine realization of the quantum SWITCH.

Comment 2. A common objection to the assertion that an implementation of the kind described here can constitute a genuine realization of the quantum SWITCH concerns the fact that the temporal circuit description of the experiment involves multiple controlled versions of the input operations (or, more generally, operations on a larger Hilbert space that includes the vacuum). It is important to emphasize that these controlled operations are not the input operations of the quantum SWITCH. If the output operation of the quantum SWITCH was produced using any of the input operations more than once, this would have been a reason to question the conclusion. But there are no two slots in this circuit where any of the input operations can be seen applied twice. On the contrary, the two uses of controlled operations in Fig. 6 are by construction done so as to realize the correct input operation of Alice exactly once—on the pair of input and output systems that we have identified. One potential source of confusion about this point comes from the tendency to think that the physical devices (e.g., optical elements) that give rise to the controlled operations define the resource of interest, whose uses we should count. This may be due to the fact that it is intuitive to imagine that these devices could be supplied by an external party. But such an analysis is completely misplaced in this context. The definition of the higher-order process clearly stipulates which operations are to be thought of as under the control of separate parties. In particular, Alice is defined to be the party in control of the input operation $U_A$ (which she could freely choose). In the implementation that we have discussed, this operation is to be applied on the input and output systems described by Eqs. (14) and (15). In order to apply the chosen operation on these time-delocalized systems, Alice would in practice need to turn on a suitable sequence of interactions, whose result from a temporal perspective would have a description as in Fig. 6. In other words, the controlled operations that make up the temporal circuit are part of Alice’s implementation of the desired operation on the correct systems, and not some resource whose number of uses she is supposed to minimize. Note, however, that if one insists on associating operations with the uses of physical devices, we can always define a physical device that implements a time-delocalized operation of the kind applied by Alice: consider a machine, which upon pressing a button applies one Hamiltonian pulse, followed after some time by another Hamiltonian pulse, so as to implement the sequence of gates in Fig. 6 [53]. Such a device could itself be used multiple times in principle, and one could ask how many times it has been used. In the concrete example that we are discussing, it is used exactly once by construction.

Let us now comment on the input and output systems of Alice and Bob in the case of a symmetric realization, such as the one in the experiments [32, 34, 35]. Again, identifying the control and target systems, we may draw the overall circuit as in Fig. 9 where the controlled unitaries are such that either Alice’s or Bob’s operation takes place at a given time, depending on the logical value of the control qubit (the controlled unitaries are displayed with a slight shift rather than simultaneous for graphical clarity). Following analogous analysis to the one presented earlier, one sees that Alice’s input and output systems are again given by expressions (14) and (15), and Bob’s input and output systems are given by

$$O^A_1 \equiv |0\rangle\langle 0|^Q \otimes I^S \otimes O^{S_1} + |1\rangle\langle 1|^Q \otimes O^S \otimes I^{S_1},$$

$$O^B_0 \equiv |0\rangle\langle 0|^Q \otimes I^{S_1} \otimes O^{S'} + |1\rangle\langle 1|^Q \otimes O^{S_1} \otimes I^{S'}.$$ (17)

Finally, it is obvious that the result generalizes straightforwardly to multipartite process implementations where the operation of each party may be delocalized over a number of possible times by means of controlled unitaries conditioned on a logical observable (most generally defined by a complete circuit structure).
set of orthogonal projectors \{P_i\}_{i=1}^N\) over some control system) that is preserved during a period containing these times, as described in Fig. [10] [Note that we can permit gates \(Z_i\) to act on the control system during the period of the controlled gates, as shown in the figure, as long as they commute with the logical observable. We can further modify the gates that make up the circuit fragment in any way that leaves the transformation realized by the fragment invariant (e.g., appending local unitaries on the control system to the controlled operations, which are undone by their inverses in the past or in the future.)]. The input system of such an operation would be a subsystem of \(QS_1S_3 \cdots S_{2N-1}\) defined by the algebra of operators

\[
O^{i_1} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^Q \otimes O^{S_{2i-1}} \otimes 1^{S_{2i-1}},
\]

where \(S_{2i-1}\) denotes the complementary subsystem of \(S_{2i-1}\) in \(S_1S_3 \cdots S_{2N-1}\), and the output system would be a subsystem of \(Q'S_2S_4 \cdots S_{2N}\) defined by the algebra of operators

\[
O^{i_0} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^Q \otimes O^{S_{2i}} \otimes 1^{S_{2i}},
\]

where \(S_{2i}\) denotes the complementary subsystem of \(S_{2i}\) in \(S_2S_4 \cdots S_{2N}\).

In Refs. [10] [23] it was shown that a class of multipartite processes containing operations realized through this procedure cannot violate causal inequalities. It seems likely that no process based such operations would be able to violate causal inequalities, for reasons similar to those used in the arguments in Refs. [10] [23]. This conjecture is left open for future investigation.

IV. UNITARILY EXTENSIBLE BIPARTITE PROCESSES

In Ref. [41], Araújo et al. proposed a postulate that might distinguish processes that have a physical realization from those that do not, showing that certain processes violating causal inequalities fail to respect it. The postulate says that any physically admissible process should be possible to obtain from an extended process involving two additional parties, one having only a nontrivial output system and the other one only a nontrivial input system, in a way analogous to the one in Fig. [11] for the case of two parties, where the extended process is equivalent to a unitary channel. As we have seen in the previous section, the quantum SWITCH is a four-partite process of the kind on the right-hand side of Fig. [11] and hence it provides a unitary extension for a class of bipartite processes. These bipartite processes, however, are causally separable [10] [23], even though the quantum SWITCH is not. At present it is not know whether there are causally nonseparable bipartite processes that obey the above postulate. But by the same argument sketched earlier for the case of the quantum SWITCH, the unitary extension of any bipartite process would in general be causally nonseparable except in the extreme case where the bipartite process is compatible with a fixed causal order (i.e., it is nonsignaling from Alice to Bob or from Bob to Alice). Here, I show that all bipartite processes that obey the postulate, together with their unitary extensions,
have a realization on suitable time-delocalized quantum subsystems.

Consider a unitary four-partite process as the one on the right-hand side of Fig. 11. If we leave open the slots of David and Charlie, this is a supermap from the tensor product of Alice’s and Bob’s operations to a third operation. Furthermore, for any choice of operation on Alice’s side, this gives a supermap from the operation of Bob to a new operation. As shown in Ref. 41, any supermap on a single operation can be realized by a quantum comb, i.e., we have the general equation in Fig. 12, where \( \mathcal{W}_1(U_A) \) and \( \mathcal{W}_2(U_A) \) are some channels (in the case when \( \mathcal{W} \) is unitary, these channels can be taken unitary, as will become clear from the discussion below). This suggests that, as in the case of the quantum SWITCH, it may be possible to have a realization of the process where the operations of David, Bob, and Charlie take place at fixed times, while the operation of Alice takes place as part of a quantum comb that connects them. What we need to show is that there exist a subsystem \( A_I \) of \( D_0B_0 \) and a subsystem \( A_O \) of \( B_I C_I \) such that any operation of Alice can be seen to take place from \( A_I \) to \( A_O \) in the corresponding quantum comb.

The proof that such subsystems exist is based on the observation that the unitary channel of the four-partite process does not allow signaling from \( A_O \) to \( A_I \), nor from \( B_O \) to \( B_I \), and hence it maps \( A_O \) isomorphically to some subsystem \( A_O' \) of \( B_I C_I \), and similarly maps some subsystem \( A_I \) of \( D_0B_0 \) isomorphically to \( A_I \). This allows us to define \( A_I \) and \( A_O \) as the actual \( A_I \) and \( A_O \) on which the operation of Alice takes place.

To show this, consider the case where Bob performs the SWAP operation (generally between systems of different dimensions) as described on the left-hand side of Fig. 12. As noted already (Fig. 12), this will result in a supermap on Alice’s operation, which is equivalent to a quantum comb. By construction, the operator of this quantum comb is equal to the operator of the unitary channel of the process. But as shown in Ref. 54, any quantum comb has a realization as a fragment of a circuit composed of isometries, followed by discarding of some auxiliary system at the end. Moreover, this realization can be taken such that it achieves the minimal Stinespring dilation 54 for the full comb, which means that when a quantum comb is a unitary channel, it can be realized by a circuit fragment of unitary channels without auxiliary systems, as on the right-hand side of Fig. 12. (For how to find a concrete realization, see the constructive proof in Ref. 5.) From Fig. 13 it can be seen that there is a subsystem \( A_I \) of \( D_0B_0 \) which is mapped unitarily to \( A_I \) under the quantum comb. It is defined by the algebra of operators of the form

\[
O_{A_I} = U_1^\dagger O_{A_I}^U \otimes 1^X U_1, \tag{21}
\]

where \( U_1 \) is the unitary associated with the channel \( \mathcal{U}_1 \) at the Hilbert-space level. Similarly, the system \( A_O \) is mapped unitarily to a subsystem \( A_O' \) of \( B_I C_I \), which is defined by the algebra of operators of the form

\[
O_{A_I} = U_2 O_{A_O}^U \otimes 1^X U_2^\dagger, \tag{22}
\]

where \( U_2 \) is the unitary associated with the channel \( \mathcal{U}_2 \) at the Hilbert-space level. Note that the unitaries \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \) in the above construction are not unique since the result of the quantum comb on the right-hand side of Fig. 13 is invariant under transformations of the form \( U_1 \rightarrow U_1^X U_1, U_2 \rightarrow U_2(U_1^X)^\dagger \), where \( U^X \) is an arbitrary unitary on \( X \). However, the operators \( O_{A_I} \) and \( O_{A_O} \) defined above are also invariant under such transformations and hence can be obtained starting from any valid choice of \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \).

If we identify the abstract systems \( D_0, B_I, B_O, C_I \) on which the mathematical process is defined with concrete physical systems associated with definite times as on the right-hand side of Fig. 12 the isomorphisms described by Eqs. (21) and (22) can be thought of as mapping the abstract systems \( A_I \) and \( A_O \) in the mathematical definition of the process to concrete physical subsystems, \( \tilde{A}_I \) and \( \tilde{A}_O \). (In particular, these isomorphisms take the bases implicitly assumed for \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{A_I}) \) and \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{A_O}) \) in the definition of the process matrix to specific bases of \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{A}_I}) \) and \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{A}_O}) \).) Furthermore, consider the corresponding co-subsystems \( \tilde{A}_I \) and \( \tilde{A}_O \) of \( \mathcal{H}_{D_0B_0} = \mathcal{H}_{A_I} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_O} \).
process matrix can then be written connecting them is the identity. The unitary of the four-partite basis for one with a basis for the other) such that the unitary of the parties Alice and Bob, say Alice, the isometry can be level has the following property. With respect to at least one $V^1$ where $A$ and $V$ are isometries.

The nontrivial assumption in the definition of this class is the factor $\mathbb{1}_{A_I \rightarrow A_I}$, i.e., the existence of a subsystem $\tilde{A}_I$ that is mapped isomorphically to $A_I$ via this isometry. Otherwise, the other two factors always exist for any isometric process, which can be seen following an analogous argument to the one in the previous section with the difference that the unitary channels on the right-hand side of Fig. [13] have to be replaced by isometric channels. Furthermore, there always exists an isometric extension of any bipartite process, which can be obtained by purifying the channel of the process onto Charlie’s input (in this case David’s output system is trivial), but this purification in general would not admit the factor $\mathbb{1}_{A_I \rightarrow A_I}$.

As in the previous section, we expect to identify $A_I$ with $\tilde{A}_I$. However, we cannot in general identify $A_O$ with $\tilde{A}_O$ since the dimension of $\tilde{A}_O$ may be larger than the dimension of $A_O$. In such a case, there is a subspace $\mathcal{H}^{\tilde{A}_O} \in \mathcal{H}^{\tilde{A}_O}$ of the same dimension as $A_O$, to which $A_O$ is mapped isomorphically. The subsystem $\tilde{A}_O$ is an example of the most general kind of subsystem of $B_I C_I$—a tensor factor of a subspace. The idea is to identify $A_O$ with $\tilde{A}_O$.

In the case of an isometric process, Fig. [12] reduces to Fig. [15] where $V_1(U_A)$ and $V_2(U_A)$ are isometric channels. (A simple way of seeing this is to note that since the CJ operators of all operations involved are rank-one, so is the operator of the supermap resulting from connecting these operations, and since the latter is equivalent to a quantum comb, which is a channel, the channel can only be isometric.) Via the equation in Fig. [15] Eq. (25) implies that the isometry of the quantum comb on the right-hand side of Fig. [15] can be written in the form

$$V_{U_A}^{D_0 A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_I B_0 C_I} = U_A^{a_I \rightarrow a_0 A_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_I \rightarrow \tilde{A}_O}.$$  

This shows that we can indeed identify $A_I$ with $\tilde{A}_I$ and $A_O$ with $\tilde{A}_O$. As before, the operation of Alice can be verified experimentally by making tomography of the comb.

How big is the class of processes defined here? The four-partite processes are obviously strictly more general than the unitary class discussed in the previous section because they do not have to be unitary and the unitary case is included. However, without additional considerations, it is in principle

\[ \mathcal{H}^{B_I C_I} = \mathcal{H}^{\tilde{A}_O} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\tilde{A}_O} \]. It is obvious from Fig. [13] and the definition of $\tilde{A}_I$ and $\tilde{A}_O$ that the circuit fragment transforms $\tilde{A}_I$ to $X$ via a unitary, and then $X$ to $\tilde{A}_I$ via another unitary, i.e., it maps unitarily $\tilde{A}_I$ to $\tilde{A}_I$. We can always choose an isomorphism between the initial and final subsystems (i.e., identify a basis for one with a basis for the other) such that the unitary connecting them is the identity. The unitary of the four-partite process matrix can then be written

$$U^{D_0 A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1 C_1} = \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_I \rightarrow A_I} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_o \rightarrow \tilde{A}_O} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_I \rightarrow \tilde{A}_O}. \quad (23)$$

This means that the unitary of the quantum comb on the right-hand side of Fig. [13] has the form

$$U^{a_I D_0 B_0 \rightarrow a_0 B_1 C_1}(U_A) = U_A^{a_I \rightarrow a_0 A_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_I \rightarrow \tilde{A}_O}. \quad (24)$$

In other words, we can identify $\tilde{A}_I$ with $A_I$ and $\tilde{A}_O$ with $A_O$, which completes the proof.

V. A GENERALIZATION

Consider the class of four-partite processes of the kind depicted in Fig. [14] where the process is equivalent to an isometric channel $V$ for which the isometry at the Hilbert-space level has the following property. With respect to at least one of the parties Alice and Bob, say Alice, the isometry can be written in the form

$$V^{D_0 A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_0 C_1} = \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_I \rightarrow A_I} \otimes V_{A_0 \rightarrow \tilde{A}_O} \otimes V_{\tilde{A}_I \rightarrow \tilde{A}_O}.$$  

where $\mathcal{H}^{D_0 B_0} = \mathcal{H}^{\tilde{A}_I} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{A}_O}$, $\mathcal{H}^{B_0 C_1} = \mathcal{H}^{A_0} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\tilde{A}_O}$, and $V_{\tilde{A}_I \rightarrow \tilde{A}_O}$ and $V_{\tilde{A}_I \rightarrow \tilde{A}_O}$ are isometries.

The nontrivial assumption in the definition of this class is the factor $\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_I \rightarrow A_I}$, i.e., the existence of a subsystem $\tilde{A}_I$ that is mapped isomorphically to $A_I$ via this isometry. Otherwise, the other two factors always exist for any isometric process,
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VI. DISCUSSION

I have shown that a class of causally nonseparable quantum processes has a physical realization within standard quantum mechanics in terms of operations whose input and output systems are time-delocalized subsystems—a concept that is both mathematically well defined and directly experimentally testable. To my knowledge, this is the first time this concept has been investigated, and the first proof of the existence of causally nonseparable processes in standard quantum mechanics in any rigorous sense. In particular, the result puts on solid grounds the interpretation of recent experimental demonstrations of the quantum SWITCH [32, 34–36] as genuine realizations of this higher-order transformation. A natural addition to this line of demonstrations suggested by the present work is to probe directly the time-delocalized operations of Alice and Bob, e.g., through tomography, as sketched in Fig. 7.

The concept of time-delocalized quantum subsystems and operations introduced here substantially expands the landscape of information-processing structures known to be available within quantum mechanics [5], which opens up a new realm of practical possibilities. The irreducible cyclic circuits unveiled in this work are just a glimpse of this landscape, the full scope of which has to be explored through the hierarchy of higher-order supermaps [46].

Apart from understanding the set of physically realizable supermaps, a big open problem is to understand their information-processing power. Since those of them incompatible with definite causal order are still part of standard quantum mechanics, the advantages that they can offer over standard causal processes depend on the precise definition of the resources used and their costs. The fact that causally nonseparable processes are more powerful than causally separable ones has been shown by examples of specific computation and communication tasks for which the quantum SWITCH offers advantage [24, 26–30]. Identifying natural applications for which causal nonseparability would be useful is an important direction for research.

A specific problem, left unanswered by this work, is whether quantum processes violating causal inequalities have a physical realization. From the circuit perspective emphasized in this paper, such processes are cyclic circuits that give rise to correlations that cannot be simulated by probabilistic mixtures of acyclic circuits or dynamical variants thereof [10], even if the systems and operations involved are described by theories more general than quantum theory. In analogy with device-independent applications based on Bell-inequality violations [55], the existence of such processes could open the road to a new kind of device-independent information-processing applications. The time-delocalized subsystem concept provides a concrete framework in which the question of whether this resource is available in quantum mechanics can be systematically investigated. The present proof that all unitary extensions of multipartite processes, as well as a class of isometric extensions, have a realization on time-delocalized subsystems is a promising step in this direction. As pointed out in Ref. [41], there are tripartite processes, such as those discovered in Refs. [11, 12], which admit unitary extensions and violate causal inequalities. An obvious question is whether and how the proof presented here could be generalized to the case of extensions of multipartite processes.

One of the results of our analysis of the quantum SWITCH and its implementations is that the operations of Alice and/or Bob are not operations on the target system alone, as sometimes assumed on intuitive grounds, but they spread onto the control qubit as well. While this is consistent with the definition of the quantum SWITCH as a supermap, it may have implications for arguments that treat these operations as operations on the target system.

Finally, a natural question is whether time-delocalized operations such as those identified here could be seen in a way analogous to standard operations, with the input system being in the past of the output system, with respect to a suitable notion of time, e.g., based on quantum time reference frames. Recent arguments about background-independence in a probabilistic setting [19] as well as gedanken proposals for realizations of the quantum SWITCH at the interface of quantum mechanics and gravity [56] or with Rindler observers [57] offer a promising route for investigating this subject, as well as the implications that the subsystem picture uncovered in this work may have for quantum gravity.
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[6] The idea of quantum computation beyond causal circuits was notably first considered by Deutsch [21] who studied modifications of quantum theory in the vicinity of closed timelike curves, which led to the study of the computational power of such models (see Ref. [8]). Although linked to time travel in a different sense [23], the quantum SWITCH is motivated by the idea of ‘quantum superpositions of different causal structures’ as opposed to classically definite backgrounds with timelike cycles.
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Here, the CJ operator $M_{\psi^+}^{\psi_-} \in L(H^A \otimes H^B)$ of a linear map $M_{\psi^+}^{\psi_-} : L(H^A) \to L(H^B)$ is defined as $M_{\psi^+}^{\psi_-} := \begin{bmatrix} I \otimes M_{\psi^+}^{\psi_-} \end{bmatrix}$, where $M_{\psi^+}^{\psi_-}$ is a (not normalized) maximally entangled state on two copies of $H^A \otimes H^B$, the states $|jj\rangle_{ij}$ form an orthonormal basis of $H^A \otimes H^B$, $I$ is the identity channel, and $T$ denotes matrix transposition in that basis of $A_i$ and some basis of $A_0$ (see Ref. [19] for a physical interpretation of this isomorphism and the choice of basis, which is based on the symmetry transformation of time reversal [55]).


Strictly speaking, in Ref. [3] it was shown that if there exists a realization of the quantum SWITCH such that Alice’s operation is in the past of Bob’s operation so that the output ancilla of Alice could be connected to the input ancilla of Bob, this would allow deterministic transmission of information back in time. In the realization discussed here, this condition is not satisfied—the ancillary systems of Alice and Bob cannot be connected to each other as they occupy space-like separated regions. Nevertheless, the full experiment still has the structure of a circuit with a ‘timelike cycle’, albeit not permitting deterministic time travel, as any quantum process matrix is equivalent to a channel from the output systems of all local operations to their input systems [9].

More precisely, C-SWAP$^{TZ}$ = $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes 1^{TZ} + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes$SWAP$^{TZ}$, where SWAP$^{TZ}$ is the SWAP operator on $Y$ and $Z$, which can be defined as follows. Consider two systems $Y$ and $Z$ with Hilbert spaces of the same dimension and a linear isomorphism between the states in these Hilbert spaces. An arbitrary vector in the joint system $YZ$ can be written in the form $|\psi\rangle^{YZ} = \sum_{i,j} \psi_{ij} |ij\rangle |j\rangle$, where $|\psi_{ij}\rangle$ are orthonormal bases for $Y$ and $Z$, respectively. The action of the operator SWAP$^{TZ}$ on the vector $|\psi\rangle^{YZ}$ is then given by SWAP$^{TZ}|\psi\rangle^{YZ} = \sum_{i,j} \psi_{ij} |ji\rangle^{TZ}$.

Of course, if during the workings of the device, an adversary turns on unwanted interactions, such as a Hamiltonian on the control qubit that is not diagonal in the logical basis, this could prevent the device from implementing the correct operation on the systems of interest. But this is the case for any physical device implementing an operation, irrespectively of whether the operation is time-localized or delocalized.


