Channel capacity enhancement with indefinite causal order
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Classical communication capacity of a channel can be enhanced either through a device called a ‘quantum switch’ or by putting the channel in a quantum superposition. The gains in the two cases, although different, have their origin in the use of a quantum resource, but is it the same resource? Here this question is explored through simulating large sets of random channels. We find that quantum superposition always provides an advantage, while the quantum switch does not: it can either increase or decrease communication capacity. The origin of this discrepancy can be attributed to a subtle combination of superposition and non-commutativity.

I. INTRODUCTION

In spacetime, events A and B can be in three causal relations: either A is before B, B is before A, or A and B are causally separated, i.e. they lie on a spacelike interval. Quantum mechanics admits causal structures that do not correspond to any of these cases. Heuristically, this can be pictured as putting the order between A and B in a quantum superposition. More precisely, several approaches to indefinite causal orders have been proposed using ‘process matrix’ or ‘quantum switch’ [1–6]. In a recent article, Ebler et al. argue that quantum control on causal order is a non-trivial resource that provides a non-classical communication advantage, i.e., two noisy channels in a quantum switch can transmit more information than any of these channels individually [7]. The exact origin of this advantage is open to debate. Abbott et al. submit that the one-pass quantum superposition of two channels, without the indefinite causal order, already leads to a similar result [8]. This position has recently been supported in a different mathematical setting by Allard et al. [9]. After introducing basic mathematical concepts in Section II, we explore the controversial origin of this advantage in Section III by simulating large sets of random channels. In Section IV, we argue that, for the quantum switch, the advantage has its origin in two separate factors. One is quantum superposition; the other is non-commutativity of the Kraus decompositions of the channels. A combination of these factors can be significantly more beneficial than the advantage gained from the superposition alone, but in other cases it can also be much less advantageous. When the indefinite causal order is realized through a quantum switch, the gain provided by this resource is essentially due to this combination.

II. MATHEMATICAL FRAMEWORK

A quantum system going through a quantum channel is modelled by a completely positive trace preserving linear map on its state space $\mathcal{H}$. Any such map $\mathcal{C}$ can be represented by a set of Kraus operators $\{K_i\} \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ such as [10][12]:

$$\mathcal{C}(\rho) = \sum_i K_i \rho K_i^\dagger \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_i K_i^\dagger K_i = \mathbb{1}. \quad (1)$$

This decomposition is not unique: if $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$ have Kraus operators $\{K_i\}$ and $\{K'_i\}$ respectively, then $\mathcal{C}$ implements the same channel as $\mathcal{C}'$ if and only if there exists a unitary operator $u$ such as:

$$K_i = \sum_j u_{ij} K'_j. \quad (2)$$

A quantum switch $\mathcal{C}_0 \bowtie \mathcal{C}_1$ between channels $\mathcal{C}_0$ and $\mathcal{C}_1$ is a new channel that puts in a superposition two differently ordered compositions $\mathcal{C}_0 \bowtie \mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_1 \bowtie \mathcal{C}_0$ (Figure 1). It acts on $H^c \otimes H^t$, where $c$ stands for control and $t$ for target. The target is a system that passes through the channels, while the control is a qubit in a generic pure state $\alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle$, $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$, which determines the order of passage:

$$(\mathcal{C}_0 \bowtie \mathcal{C}_1) |\psi\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle \otimes \left( \mathcal{C}_0 \circ \mathcal{C}_1 |\psi\rangle^t \right) + \beta |1\rangle \otimes \left( \mathcal{C}_1 \circ \mathcal{C}_0 |\psi\rangle^t \right). \quad (3)$$

For example, the Kraus operators of $\mathcal{C}_0 \bowtie \mathcal{C}_1$ controlled by $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ are:

$$V_{ij} = |0\rangle|0\rangle \otimes K^1_i K^0_j + |1\rangle|1\rangle \otimes K^0_i K^1_j, \quad (4)$$

where $K^0_i$ and $K^1_i$ are the Kraus operators of $\mathcal{C}_0$ and $\mathcal{C}_1$ respectively.

Somewhat paradoxically, classical information can be transmitted though a quantum switch between two totally depolarizing channels. To see this, define the Holevo capacity of a channel as $\chi(\mathcal{C}) = \max_{\{\rho_a, p_a\}} I(A;B)_\nu$, where $\{\rho_a\}$ are the possible inputs of the channel with probabilities $p_a$ and $I(A;B)_\nu$ is the quantum mutual information calculated on the state $\nu = \sum_a p_a |a\rangle \langle a|_A \otimes$
The Kraus operators of a superposition controlled by the control is in state \(|0\rangle^c\) and the target passes only through \(\rho_{0} \otimes \mathcal{C}_1\). (B): the control is in state \(|+\rangle^c\) and the target passes through the balanced superposition of \(\rho_{0} \otimes \mathcal{C}_1\) and \(\rho_{1} \otimes \mathcal{C}_1\).

Building on the work of Gisin [14], Abbott et al. showed that \(\mathcal{C}_0 \boxplus \mathcal{C}_1\) has a greater Holevo capacity than \(\mathcal{C}_0 \vartriangleright \mathcal{C}_1\) if \(\mathcal{C}_0\) and \(\mathcal{C}_1\) are totally depolarizing. They computed a lower bound \(\chi(\mathcal{C}_0 \boxplus \mathcal{C}_1) \geq 0.16\) [8].

### III. RESULTS

#### A. Composition of two channels

The indefinite causal order provides an indisputable advantage in terms of Holevo capacity but this advantage is not systematic. To explore this situation, we randomly generate pairs of quantum channels \(\mathcal{C}_0\) and \(\mathcal{C}_1\) and numerically compute Holevo capacities of \(\mathcal{C}_0 \vartriangleright \mathcal{C}_1\) and \(\mathcal{C}_0 \boxplus \mathcal{C}_1\).

A random channel \(\mathcal{C}\) is generated by a random set of Kraus operators. To obtain the latter, we generate a random set of unitary matrices \(\mathbf{U}_i\) and a random set of coefficients \(c_i\) constrained by \(\sum_i c_i^2 = 1\). Then, \(K_i = c_i \mathbf{U}_i\).

The whole space of quantum channels is well sampled because any set of operators that verify \(\sum_i K_i K_i^\dagger = 1\) defines a quantum channel.

Holevo capacity \(\chi(\mathcal{C})\) is computed by assuming that there exist two possible input pure states with probabilities \(p\) and \(1-p\). The corresponding optimization problem has three free parameters and can be solved using a Nelder-Mead method [15].

Figure 3, generated on two sets of 500 channels each, shows the absence of any obvious correlation between \(\chi(\mathcal{C}_0 \vartriangleright \mathcal{C}_1)\) and \(\chi(\mathcal{C}_0 \boxplus \mathcal{C}_1)\). After three such runs, the average ratio \(\chi(\mathcal{C} \vartriangleright \mathcal{C})/\chi(\mathcal{C} \boxplus \mathcal{C})\) is stable around 0.9, meaning that on average the one-pass superposition provides a slightly better advantage than the quantum switch.
FIG. 4. Comparison of Holevo capacities of the quantum switch and the one-pass superposition for different implementations of 50 randomly generated channels. Each line corresponds to 10 different implementations of channel $C$. $\chi(C \oplus C)$ depends on the implementation, while $\chi(C \otimes C)$ is independent of it.

FIG. 5. Comparison of Holevo capacities of self-switch and self-superposition of a quantum channel. Holevo capacity always increases in the latter case but no such regularity exists in the former.

FIG. 6. Comparison of Holevo capacities of the quantum switch and the one-pass superposition of a random channel $C$ combined with a totally depolarizing channel $N$. Each data point corresponds to random $C$. Dotted lines are linear functions with the slope 1 and $1/2$.

B. Self-composition

To study the combination of a channel with a copy of itself, we set $C_0 = C_1 = C$. Figure 4 shows that $\chi(C \oplus C)$ depends on the implementation of the channel, while $\chi(C \otimes C)$ does not. Here, 50 random channels were generated, each with 10 different random implementations using the freedom in the Kraus representation (2).

Figure 5 generated on 500 random channels, provides a comparison between the Holevo capacities of self-switch and self-superposition. The latter always increases channel capacity: $\chi(C) < \chi(C \oplus C)$, while this is not true for the former, as proved in the next section. The picture remains the same with the increase in the number of parties: extended to the 3-switch (10), this simulation leads to a similar result.

To make sure that this effect is not only due to self-switching, we explore the Holevo capacity of a composition between a random channel and a totally depolarizing channel $N$ with Kraus operators $\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\}$ (Fig. 6). All the generated channels verify $\chi(C)/2 < \chi(C \oplus N)$, whereas the quantum switch does not.

IV. DISCUSSION

To study the discrepancy between the capacities of the superposition and the quantum switch, note that the one-pass superposition acts as:

$$ (C \oplus C)(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{C(\rho)}{\sum_{i,j} K_i \rho K_j^\dagger} C(\rho) \right), \quad (7) $$

where $\{K_i\}$ are the Kraus operators of $C$. To prove $\chi(C \oplus C) \geq \chi(C)$, define a channel $\mathcal{P}$ acting on $\mathcal{H}^c \otimes \mathcal{H}^t$ with Kraus operators $\{P_m\} = \{|m\rangle\langle m| \otimes 1^t\}$. $\sum_m P_m^t P_m = \mathbb{1}^t$, hence $\mathcal{P}$ is trace-preserving. It acts as:

$$ \mathcal{P} \circ (C \oplus C)(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{array}{cc} C(\rho) & 0 \\ 0 & C(\rho) \end{array} \right). \quad (8) $$

Therefore, $H(\mathcal{P} \circ (C \oplus C)(\rho)) = H(C(\rho))$ and $\chi(\mathcal{P} \circ (C \oplus C)(\rho)) = \chi(C(\rho))$. Since a channel can only lose informa-
\[
Q(C) = \sum_{i,j} \Tr \left( [K_i, K_j][K_i, K_j]^{\dagger} \right)
\]

which is different from [9] if \( \{K_i\} \) do not commute.

**FIG. 7.** Gain of the quantum switch \( \chi(C \bowtie C) / \chi(C) \) compared to the commutativity of Kraus decomposition \( Q(C) \) on a set of 1000 random channels. The gain of the quantum switch of \( C \) appears to be constrained by the degree of commutativity of its Kraus operators: 95% of the 1000 points are in the cone of aperture 1/4 (dashed line).

**FIG. 8.** Advantage \( \chi(C \bowtie C) / \chi(C \circ C) \) as a function of \( Q(C) \), the degree of commutativity of the Kraus decomposition. If the Kraus operators nearly commute, then the Holevo capacities are similar. If they do not commute, then the effect of the indefinite causal order gets stronger.

To see the effect of such non-commutativity, define:

\[
Q(C) = \sum_{i,j} \Tr \left( [K_i, K_j][K_i, K_j]^{\dagger} \right)
= 4 - 2\Tr \sum_{i,j} K_i K_j K_i^{\dagger} K_j^{\dagger}.
\]

\( Q(C) \) is independent of the Kraus decomposition of \( C \).

Figures [7] and [8] generated on a set of 1000 random channels, show that the spread of \( \chi(C \bowtie C) / \chi(C) \) increases with \( Q \). If \( \{K_i\} \) almost commute and \( Q \) is small, then the effect of the indefinite causal order is also small: the Holevo capacity of the quantum switch is close to the Holevo capacity of the superposition. On the contrary, when \( Q \) is high, the effect of the indefinite causal order is strong: the Holevo capacity of the quantum switch is dominated by this non-commutativity and the non-diagonal terms of [9] are larger than the diagonal ones. Note that the same argument is valid for the 3-switch. This illustrates an intricate interplay between two non-classical factors leading to an advantage in communication capacity: quantum superposition and non-commutativity. Quantum switch seen as a resource cannot be reduced to any one of these.