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We show within the framework of relativistic quantum tasks that the doability of any task is fully determined by what we call its “coarse causal structure”, that is the causal relation between each input point and each output point. We do this by introducing a new structure we call a spacetime circuit, with which we make rigorous the notion of a protocol. Using spacetime circuits we show that any protocol that can accomplish a given task can be modified to accomplish all tasks differing from the original by the location of input and output points, which may be changed in any way so long as the coarse causal structure of the task is maintained. Our results strengthen the no-go theorem for position based quantum cryptography to include arbitrary sending and receiving of signals by verifier agents outside the authentication region. Our results also serve as a consistency check for the holographic principle by showing that discrepancies between bulk and boundary causal structure can not cause a task to be doable in one but not the other.

I. INTRODUCTION

The framework of relativistic quantum tasks has recently produced results which are of interest to cryptography and holography. On the cryptographic side it was shown that unconditionally secure bit commitment protocols exist [6], and that a large class of secure position based cryptography protocols do not [3]. On the holographic side, by considering that tasks doable in the bulk must also be doable in the boundary, new bulk geometric relations were discovered [9].

In this paper we prove that the coarse causal structure of a task, i.e. the causal relation between each input point and each output point, fully determine the task’s doability, i.e. whether or not it is possible to accomplish. To do so we define precisely a notion of doability in terms of a new structure we call a spacetime circuit. Heuristically, a spacetime circuit is a normal quantum circuit, but with wires taken literally as causal curves in spacetime, and wire ends taken as points in spacetime at which quantum systems are given as inputs or returned as outputs. A task will be called doable if there exists a spacetime circuit which accomplishes it. We show that any spacetime circuit accomplishing a task can be modified to only make use of the task’s coarse causal structure. This modified circuit can easily be adapted to any task differing from the original by placement of input and output points so long as the coarse causal structure is maintained. We stress that the existence of regions which can be signaled by multiple input points and can signal multiple output points, which we call the task’s fine causal structure, is irrelevant.

The paper is organized in the following way: section 2 introduces spacetime circuits, section 3 reviews relativistic quantum tasks, provides a formal definition of their doability, and speculates on possible shortcomings of this definition. Section 4 introduces the main claim of this paper, i.e. that task doability is determined solely by input to output causal relations, and section 5 provides a proof of this claim. Section 6 discusses applications of our results to position based quantum cryptography and holography, and section 7 discusses the results and future work.

II. SPACETIME CIRCUITS

FIG. 1. A spacetime circuit. Blue, green, and red points represent input, gate, and output points respectively. The directed edges connecting the points represent the trajectory of physical systems. Dashed grey lines represent the relevant light cones of the points.

In this section we provide a definition of a spacetime circuit, for later use in defining and analyzing the doability of a task. A spacetime circuit will consist of three types of points: “input”, “output”, and “gate” points, as well
as links connecting either two causally connected points of different type or two causally connected gate points.
The input, output, and gate points represent points in space in which quantum channels act on quantum systems. Input points are given additional quantum systems collectively in a variable state, while output points are expected to return other quantum systems. The channels may additionally act on auxiliary systems. Each link represents a causal curve a quantum system takes starting at the point at which it was output by some channel and ending at the point at which it is input to another.

We now give a dry formal definition of a spacetime circuit, followed by a detailed anthropomorphic description of its meaning.

**Definition:** A spacetime circuit $\mathcal{C}$ is an 11-tuple $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{M}, c, r, g, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R}, \rho_{\mathcal{R}}, \gamma, \{\Lambda_p\})$, where

- $\mathcal{M}$ is the spacetime on which the task is defined.
- $c = (c_1, \ldots, c_n)$ is a tuple of $n$ spacetime points, called "input" points.
- $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_m)$ is a tuple of $m$ spacetime points, called "output" points.
- $g = (g_1, \ldots, g_l)$ is a tuple of $l$ spacetime points, called "gate" points.
- $\gamma \subseteq \{(p, q) | (p, q) \in (c \times r) \cup (c \times g) \cup (g \times r) \text{ and } p \neq q \text{ and } p < q\}$ and furthermore we require that for all $g_i$ there exist $c_j$ and $r_k$ such that the graph $G = (c \cup g \cup r, \gamma)$ contains a directed path from $c_j$ to $r_k$ containing $g_i$. The elements of $\gamma$ are referred to as "edges".
- $\mathcal{I} = \{I_p | p \in c\}$ is a collection of $n$ quantum systems called "input" systems.
- $\mathcal{O} = \{O_p | p \in r\}$ is a collection of $m$ quantum systems called "output" systems.
- $\mathcal{E} = \{E_{c} | c \in \gamma\}$ is a collection of $|\gamma|$ quantum systems called "transmitting" systems.
- $\mathcal{R} = \{R_p | p \in c \cup g \cup r\}$ is a collection of $n + m + l$ quantum systems, one associated with each input, output, and gate point, called "ancilla" systems.
- $\rho_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a state on $\mathcal{R}$.
- $\{\Lambda_p\} = \{\Lambda_p | p \in c \cup g \cup r\}$ a collection of CPTP maps $\Lambda_p$, taking states in $S_{\text{in}}(p)$ to states in $S_{\text{out}}(p)$, where we define

$$S_{\text{in}}(p) \equiv \{E_{(p, q)} | (p, q) \in \gamma\} \cup \{I_p | c_i \in \gamma\} \cup \{R_p\}$$

$$S_{\text{out}}(p) \equiv \{E_{(p, q)} | (p, q) \in \gamma\} \cup \{O_i | p = r_i\}$$

Intuitively, a spacetime circuit can be viewed as a blueprint of a set of actions committed by three groups of individuals, one serving Alice, one serving Bob, and one serving Roger. The groups are collectively referred to as “agencies” and their members “agents”. Generally, Bob’s agency distributes and collects input and output systems, while Alice’s agency picks up the input systems, moves and interacts systems around spacetime, and returns the output systems to Bob. Roger’s agency is in charge of holding on to systems which purify the state of the input system. We will now describe in detail the actions of the three agencies.

The actions of Bob’s and Roger’s agencies are few. At sometime in the far past, Bob prepares the systems $\mathcal{S}R$ in some state, and gives $R$ to Roger. He then sends, to each input point $c_i$, an agent carrying $I_{c_i}$, to be transferred over to an agent of Alice’s. Bob also sends an agent to each output point $r_j$, to wait for an agent of Alice’s to return the output system $O_{r_j}$. Bob’s and Roger’s agents then congregate in the very far future where they can manipulate the single system $\mathcal{S}R$.

Alice’s agency does the bulk of the work. To each point $p$ in $c \cup g \cup r$, Alice sends an agent holding $R_p$ (the letter “R” stands for “resource”, as all auxiliary entanglement Alice wishes her agents to share must be prepared ahead of time via the state of $\mathcal{S}R$). Upon arrival, the agents act according to the type of point Alice sent them to. An agent sent to an input point $c_i$ picks up $I_{c_i}$ from an agent of Bob’s, applies the channel $\Lambda_{c_i}$ to $I_{c_i}R_{c_i}$, and for each output system $E_{(c, p)} \in S_{\text{out}}(c_i)$ of that channel, sends $E_{(c, p)}$ to $p$. An agent sent to a gate point $g_i$ collects all incoming quantum systems $S_{\text{in}}(g_i)$, applies the channel $\Lambda_{g_i}$ to $S_{\text{in}}(g_i)R_{g_i}$ and sends all $E_{(g, p)} \in S_{\text{out}}(g_i)$ to $p$. Finally, an agent sent to an output point $r_i$ collects all incoming quantum systems $S_{\text{in}}(r_i)$, applies the channel $\Lambda_{r_i}$ to $S_{\text{in}}(r_i)R_{r_i}$, and transfers the resulting system $O_{r_i}$ over to an agent of Bob’s.

From this process, a channel naturally emerges:

**Definition:** The effective channel $\mathcal{N}_C$ of a spacetime circuit $\mathcal{C}$ is a CPTP map taking states of $\mathcal{S}R$ to states of $\mathcal{S}R$, with an input $|\psi\rangle_{\mathcal{S}R}$ mapped to whatever state $\mathcal{S}R$ is in after the above actions are taken by the three agencies when Bob sets the initial state of $\mathcal{S}R$ to $|\psi\rangle_{\mathcal{S}R}$.

With these structures in place we can now define the doability of a relativistic quantum task.

### III. RELATIVISTIC QUANTUM TASKS AND THEIR DOABILITY

In this section we give a definition of a relativistic quantum task and proceed to define its doability in

---

1 For $p, q \in \mathcal{M}$, $p < q$ denotes that there exists a causal curve in $\mathcal{M}$ from $p$ to $q$.

2 The $R$ system is called the reference system, not to be confused with the resource systems. It is distinguished from the resource systems by neither being in script nor having a subscript.

3 There are extensions to this definition usually dealing with additional requirements or limitations on Alice. Generalization of our work to such scenarios appears straightforward and is the subject of future work.
terms of spacetime circuits.

A task differs from a spacetime circuit in that rather than blueprinting Alice’s actions, it specifies the state in which Alice is required to return the output systems, as a function of the state in which Bob set the input systems. Bob and Alice may agree ahead of time that Bob is required to select an input state from agreed subset of all possible input states. Asking if a task is doable is asking if there exists a set of actions Alice can perform in order to achieve the required output when she is given a legitimate input.

Formally, we can define a relativistic quantum task as a list of input and output points, input and output systems, and a set of channels, usually defined as all possible channels which implement a specified map on a subset of allowed input states. Asking if a task is doable if there exists a spacetime circuit with the same input/output points and systems whose effective channel is one of those listed in the task.

**Definition:** A relativistic quantum task \( T \) is a 6-tuple \( T = (\mathcal{M}, c, r, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{O}, \{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{J}R-\mathcal{O}R}\}) \), where

- \( \mathcal{M} \) is the spacetime on which the task is defined.
- \( c = (c_1, \ldots, c_n) \) is a tuple of \( n \) spacetime points, called “input” points.
- \( r = (r_1, \ldots, r_m) \) is a tuple of \( m \) spacetime points called “output” points.
- \( \mathcal{J} = \{J_p | p \in c\} \) is a collection of \( n \) quantum systems called “input” systems.
- \( \mathcal{O} = \{O_p | p \in r\} \) is a collection of \( m \) quantum systems called “output” systems.
- \( \{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{J}R-\mathcal{O}R}\} \) is a set of quantum channels, each from pure states on \( \mathcal{J}R \) to states on \( \mathcal{O}R \), with \( R \) some fixed reference system.

**Definition:** Let \( T = (\mathcal{M}, c, r, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{O}, \{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{J}R-\mathcal{O}R}\}) \) be a relativistic quantum task. We define \( T \) to be doable if there exists a spacetime circuit \( \mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{M}, c, r, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R}, \rho_{\mathcal{E}}, \gamma, \{\Lambda_p\}) \) such that \( \mathcal{N}_C \in \{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{J}R-\mathcal{O}R}\} \). Let \( \mathcal{T} \) denote the proposition “\( T \) is doable”. For such a circuit \( \mathcal{C} \) we say that \( \mathcal{C} \) accomplishes \( T \).

As an example, consider the summoning task depicted in figure 2 and a spacetime circuit accomplishing it depicted in figure 3.

Note that this definition of doability is only accurate within the unrealistic regime where systems are infinitely localized, internally quantum but spatially classical, can carry unbounded entanglement across arbitrarily large distances, and can be subject to computations of arbitrary speed and complexity.

It is likely that analysis on the level of quantum gravity will have a non-trivial impact on which tasks are truly physically doable. However, the framework we provide here is likely sufficiently general to simulate some of the features it appears to lack, such as spacial superposition.

![Figure 2](image-url)  
**FIG. 2.** A summoning task on 1+1d Minkowski space. The symbol “!” stands for ”not,” ”∧” stands for ”and”, and the expression “\( b? : A \)” with \( b \) a bit interpreted as a Boolean variable and \( A \) a quantum systems means ”if \( b \) is true, \( A \) is present here”. For a general summoning task, \( c = (c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_n) \), and \( r = (r_1, \ldots, r_m) \). At \( c_0 \) Bob gives Alice a qubit in a generic quantum state (possibly unknown to him). At \( c_n \) Bob gives Alice a classical bit \( b_n \in \{0, 1\} \). If only one of the input classical bits, \( b_j \) is 1, Alice is tasked with returning a quantum system in the same state as the one given in \( c_0 \) at \( r_j \).  

\( \text{a classical bit is a two level quantum system promised to be in a basis state of an agreed upon basis.} \)

Understanding the precise simulation power of spacetime circuits is a subject of future work.

### IV. A NEW TASK DOABILITY INVARIANCE

In this section we formally present the main claim of this paper: that the doability of a task depends only on its coarse causal structure. We then use summoning as an example where a seemingly difficult task can be shown to be doable by finding a simpler task with the same coarse causal structure. In the next section we provide
FIG. 3. A spacetime circuit accomplishing the example summoning task. The gate points simply divert the information in the right direction. Notice this circuit makes use of the fact that the shaded region, i.e. \( J^+(c_0) \cap J^+(c_1) \cap J^-(r_1) \cap J^-(r_2) \), is non-empty.

FIG. 4. A seemingly difficult summoning task. The dashed grey lines indicate the trajectory of light rays, while the solid red lines indicate causal connections. The naive circuit in [3] can not be used here because \( J^+(c_0) \cap J^+(c_1) \cap J^-(r_1) \cap J^-(r_2) = \emptyset \). However, since this task has the same coarse causal structure as the one in figure 2 it must be doable, and indeed this is shown in [4].

**Definition:** Let \( T = (\mathcal{M}, c, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \{N_{\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}}\}) \) and \( U = (\mathcal{M}', c', \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \{N_{\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}}\}) \) be quantum tasks with \( |c| = |c'| = n \) and \( |r| = |r'| = m \) and with \( \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}' \) not containing closed time like curves. Then if for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and for all \( j \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \) we have \( c_i < r_j \leftrightarrow c'_i < r'_j \), then we say \( T \) and \( U \) have the same coarse causal structure.

**Main Theorem:** Let \( T \) and \( U \) be tasks with the same coarse causal structure. Then \( T \leftrightarrow U \).

As an example application of this theorem, consider the seemingly difficult summoning task depicted in figure 4.

To what information is doability blind? As the above example shows, tasks with the same coarse causal structure may still differ by existence of regions which are signalled by multiple input points and or can signal multiple output points. The existence of such regions is the only additional geometric information that could possibly have affected task doability. Thus we can meaningfully say that doability is insensitive to coarse causal structure preserving changes to the fine causal, if we define the fine causal structure as follows:

**Definition:** Let \( T = (\mathcal{M}, c, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \{N_{\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}}\}) \) and \( U = (\mathcal{M}', c', \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \{N_{\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}}\}) \) be quantum tasks with \( |c| = |c'| = n \) and \( |r| = |r'| = m \) and with \( \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}' \) not containing closed time like curves. Then if for all \( S_c \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and for all \( S_r \subseteq \{1, \ldots, m\} \) we have \( (\bigcap_{i \in S_c} J^+(c_i)) \cap (\bigcap_{j \in S_r} J^-(r_j)) = \emptyset \leftrightarrow (\bigcap_{i \in S_c} J^+(c'_i)) \cap (\bigcap_{j \in S_r} J^-(r'_j)) = \emptyset \), then we say \( T \) and \( U \) have the same fine causal structure.
V. PROOF OF INVARIANCE

In this section we prove the main claim of this paper, that doability of a task depends only on its coarse causal structure. We do so by showing that given a doable task and a spacetime circuit accomplishing it, a second spacetime circuit can be constructed which accomplishes all tasks with the same coarse causal structure. This construction will make heavy use of normal and port-based \cite{5} teleportation, and borrows many ideas originally used to solve position based quantum cryptography \cite{1, 3, 8}.

First we review the function of normal teleportation and port-based teleportation, and then give an example of how they can be used to modify a task. We then develop a notation which simplifies protocol modification when heavy use of both forms of teleportation is required. Finally we show that any circuit can be modified to require no gate points, and that this implies the main claim.

A. Normal teleportation

For brevity and clarity, we review here only the function, not the implementation, of normal teleportation. For details on implementation see \cite{10}.

Normal teleportation consists of three parties (not agencies), Alice, Bob, and Roger. Alice and Roger hold qubit carrying quantum systems $A$ and $R$ respectively, together in the state $\psi_{AR}$. Meanwhile Alice and Bob share a Bell pair. Alice would like to transfer the quantum information in $A$ over to a system $B$ held by Bob so that the state of $B$ and $R$ is $\psi_{BR}$. Alice and Bob can preform local operations without any communication which “consume” the bell pair they share, after which Bob and Roger hold the quantum state $X_B^a Z_B^b \otimes I_R \psi_{BR}$ with $a$ and $b$ two random classical bits held by Alice. Notice that this can be done even if Alice and Bob are at spacelike separated points. The reason information does not travel outside the light cone is that the system $B$ will look maximally mixed to Bob until he is given the bits $a$ and $b$ and undoes the $X$ and $Z$ operations.

If Bob would like to teleport the information over to a quantum system $C$ held by another party, Charlie, he need not wait until he receives the classical bits $a, b$ from Alice. He and Charlie can immediately preform local operations so that the final state on $C$ and $R$ is $X_B^{a'} Z_B^{b'} \otimes I_R \psi_{CR}$, where $a'$ and $b'$ are two classical bits held by Bob. This time Charlie requires classical information from both Bob and Alice in order to recover the state.

We can phrase the function of normal teleportation as follows: a quantum system at a spacetime point $p$ is encrypted and then moved to a point $q$ spacelike separated from $p$, with the encryption “key” available at $p$.

B. Port-based teleportation

Once again we review here only the function, not the implementation, of port-based teleportation. For details on implementation see \cite{5}.

The aim of port-based teleportation is the same as that of normal teleportation, to transfer the contents of $A$ over to $B$ held by Bob in such a way that if $AR$ starts out in a pure state, $BR$ will be in that same state after the protocol. However, instead of Alice and Bob sharing a bell pair, they each hold $N$ systems, $A_1, ..., A_N$ and $R_1, ..., R_N$, and...
$B_1, ..., B_N$, collectively in some fixed state. The following becomes exactly possible in the $N \to \infty$ limit. Alice can perform local operations acting on $A$ and $A_1, ..., A_N$, after which she learns the value of some random integer $i \in \{1, ..., N\}$, and $B_i R$ is left in the state $|\psi\rangle_{B_i R}$. The reason information does not travel outside the light cone is that Bob does not know the value of $i$. Once again, if Bob wants to send the information to a third party Charlie, he need not wait until he receives the value of $i$. Bob and Charlie can repeat the protocol for each $B_N$, resulting in Charlie holding $N^2$ systems,

$$C_{(1,1)}, ..., C_{(1,N)}, C_{(2,1)}, ..., C_{(1,1)}, ..., C_{(i,N)}, ..., C_{(N,N)},$$

and Bob holding $N$ integers, $j_1, ..., j_N$, with $j_m$ specifying that $C_{(m,j_m)}$ holds the information originally in $B_m$. This time, in order for Charlie to retrieve $A$, he needs to know both $i$ and $j_i$. Notice that if he posses either one of these he can throw away all but $N$ systems.

We can once again phrase this procedure in cryptographic language. Again, we can view port-based teleportation as a quantum system at a spacetime point $p$ being encrypted and then moved to a point $q$ spacelike separated from $p$, with the encryption “key” available at $p$. However, this time the key is an identity of a quantum system hidden among many others, rather than a recovery operation on a single system.

**C. Example: using teleportation to modify a protocol**

Consider the task depicted in figure 7. Naively, one might assume that completion of this task requires the region $\mathcal{P} = J^+(c_1) \cap J^+(c_2) \cap J^-(r_1) \cap J^-(r_2)$ to be non-empty so that a gate point can be placed which takes in $I_1 I_2$ and spits out $O_1 O_2$, as depicted in figure 8. If this were true it would be possible to verify that a computation was performed in the region $\mathcal{P}$. Indeed, this was the original idea behind position-based quantum cryptography. However, it turns out that when $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$, the task is still doable provided $c_1$ and $c_2$ share enough entanglement ahead of time, as we will now show by modifying the naive protocol depicted in figure 7. Rather than immediately physically moving $I_1$ and $I_2$, Alice can instruct her agents (ahead of time) to do the following: first, the agent at $c_1$ normal teleports the information in $I_1$ to $c_2$. If the initial state on $I_1 I_2$ was $\rho_{I_1 I_2}$, the agent at $c_2$ now holds $\tilde{I}_1 \tilde{I}_2$ in the state $X^a Z^b \rho_{I_1 I_2} Z^b X^a$. Now the agent at $c_2$ port teleports $\tilde{I}_1 \tilde{I}_2$ back to $c_1$, leaving the agent at $c_1$ holding $N$ bipartite systems, $I_1^1 I_2^1, ..., I_1^N I_2^N$ with $I_1^1 I_2^1$ containing $X^a Z^b \rho_{I_1 I_2} Z^b X^a$, and with only the agent at $c_2$ knowing the value of $i$. The agent at $c_1$ can now apply the teleportation decryption, as well as the channel $N$ to each of the $N$ systems, leaving the agent with $N$ bipartite systems $O_1^O_2, ..., O_1^O_2$ with $O_1^O_2$ in the

\[4\] $J^+(p)$ denotes all points in the causal future of $p$, and $J^-(p)$ all points in its causal past.

\[5\] It may seem that rather than modifying the protocol we are just replacing it with a different one entirely. That this is actually a modification will become clear later when many gate points are involved.

![FIG. 6. Port-based teleportation.](image-url)
FIG. 7. Position based quantum cryptography (PBQC) task. Alice is given quantum systems $I_1$ and $I_2$ at two separate points. She is required to apply the channel $N_{I_1 I_2} \rightarrow O_1 O_2$ to $I_1 I_2$ and output each of the resulting systems, $O_1$ and $O_2$ at their designated output points.

state $N(\rho_{I_1 I_2})$. He then sends, for all $j$, $O_1^j$ to $r_1$ and $O_2^j$ to $r_2$, while the agent at $c_2$ sends the value of $i$ to both $r_1$ and $r_2$. The agents at $r_1$ and $r_2$ can therefore correctly identify $O_1^i$ and $O_2^i$ respectively as the systems they should output and they do so, completing the protocol.

Note that the above protocol never made use of $\mathcal{P}$ being non-empty. Instead, the need for $\mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset$ is replaced by clever teleportation between the input points. Our work generalizes this result to all such intermediary channel applications, showing that for a task to be accomplished, computations need only ever be done in input and output points, provided enough entanglement is available.

D. Savvy teleportation notation and manipulation

Because the proof of the main theorem will depend heavily on teleportation, it is convenient to define notation so as to not to constantly introduce new names for quantum systems each time a teleportation step is needed. For additional convenience we will always refer to systems as being tensor products of qubits, although this is not essential to the proof. We will refer to the original quantum systems specified by a spacetime circuit with capital roman letters, i.e. $A, B, C, \ldots$. We now define notation to manipulate these systems in terms of agent actions which deviate from the original circuit protocol.

If an agent of Alice’s at point $p$ deviates from the protocol and teleports a quantum system $A$, specified in the original circuit, to another agent at point $q$, we introduce the following notation depending on whether the teleportation was normal or port-based: For normal teleportation we say that, after $A$ is teleported from $p$ to $q$, the agent at point $q$ holds $A(p)$. Thus $A(p)$ denotes a system which carries the information that should have been in $A$, encrypted by a key which is available at position $p$. If the teleportation was port-based, we say the agent at point $q$ holds $A(p)_A$, denoting a collection of systems one of which holds the information originally in $A$, the identity of which is available at position $p$. If the teleportation was port-based, we say the agent at point $q$ holds $A(p)_A$, denoting a collection of systems one of which holds the information originally in $A$, the identity of which is available at position $p$. If the teleportation was port-based, we say the agent at point $q$ holds $A(p)_A$, denoting a collection of systems one of which holds the information originally in $A$, the identity of which is available at position $p$.

Now, suppose the agent at point $q$ decides to teleport the encrypted system to another agent, and that agent to another and so on and so forth. We can denote the result as $(p_1, \ldots, p_m) A(q_1, \ldots, q_n)$ with $(p_1, \ldots, p_m)$ being points from which agents port teleported the information and $(q_1, \ldots, q_n)$ being points from which agents normal teleported the information in the order the teleportations
occurred. Furthermore, if \((p_1, \ldots, p_m) A(q_1, \ldots, q_n)\) enters the future light cone of \(p_t\) then if the agent at \(p_t\) broadcasted the teleportation data, Alice’s agents can use this information to remove the \(p_t\) encryption, thus transforming \((p_1, \ldots, p_m) A(q_1, \ldots, q_n)\) into \((p_1, \ldots, p_{t-1}, p_{t+1}, \ldots, p_m) A(q_1, \ldots, q_n)\).

For \(q_i\) points the order of decryption matters, specifically the decryption must be done first in last out.

The advantage of port-based teleportation is that operations may be preformed on the data underneath its encryption. If an agent holds \((p)^A\), this means he holds \(N\) systems one of which contains the information \(A\) would have in the original circuit. If he preforms a channel \(N\) on all system, he thus ends up with \((p)^{(N(A))}\).

The advantage of normal teleportation is that is it “reverse distributive”. This means that if an agent holds \((A^{(q)})(B^{(q)})\) then we could equally say he holds \((AB)^{(q)}\). However, if an agent holds \((A^{(q)})^{(q)} (B)\) it is not true that he holds \((q) (AB)\). This is because \((q) (AB)\) implies that the \(N\) copies of the \(A\) systems and the \(N\) copies of the \(B\) systems come paired up, with the agent knowing that one of these pairs contains the information \(AB\) would have in the original circuit. If the agent holds \((A^{(q)})(B)\) no such pairing is possible without addition information.

E. Removing gate points from a circuit

We now prove a theorem which shows that given a circuit, a second circuit can be constructed which has the same effective channel as the first but which uses zero gate points. We later show that such a circuit accomplishes any task with the same coarse causal structure as the original.

To prove the theorem, we first define the ”roots” of a gate point, which intuitively are all input points which may affect the contents of the systems entering the gate point. We then prove a lemma which shows that any gate point can be absorbed into its roots, and finally use this lemma to show that all gate points can be removed from a circuit.

**Definition:** Let \(C\) be a spacetime circuit. Let \(G(C) = (V \cup E \cup r, \gamma)\) be a graph and \(p \in V \cup E \cup r\). Let \(Path?(x, y)\) denote the proposition "there exists a directed path from vertex \(x\) to vertex \(y\) in the graph \(G(C)\)". Then we define

\[
\text{roots}(p) \equiv \{ q \in E \mid Path?(q, p) \}
\]

Figure 9 depicts an example of the roots of a gate point.

**Lemma:** (gate absorption lemma)

Let \(C\) be a spacetime circuit. Consider a gate point \(g_i\). Suppose that the quantum systems \(S_i\) are encrypted as \((S_i(g_i))^{(q_1, \ldots, q_k)}\) with \(q_1, \ldots, q_k \in \text{roots}(g_i)\), separated, and given as inputs to various input points, \(p_1, \ldots, p_m \in \text{roots}(g_i)\). Then given a sufficient amount of prearranged entanglement dispersed across \(\text{roots}(g_i)\), it is possible to preform local operations without any communication at the points \(\text{roots}(g_i)\) such that the systems \((S_i(p_1))^{(q_1, \ldots, q_k)}\) with \(q_1', \ldots, q_k' \in \text{roots}(g_i)\) are all available at one point \(c_j \in \text{roots}(g_i)\).

**Proof:** Let \(S_i^{(q_1, \ldots, q_k)}\) denote the part of \((S_i(g_i))^{(q_1, \ldots, q_k)}\) given to point \(p_i\). Normal teleporting \(S_i^{(q_1, \ldots, q_k)}\) from \(p_1\) to \(p_2\), gives \(S_i^{(q_1, \ldots, q_k, p_1)}\) at \(p_2\). Normal teleporting \(S_i^{(q_1, \ldots, q_k, p_1)}\) from \(p_2\) to \(p_3\) and so on and so forth gives \(S_i^{(q_1, \ldots, q_k, p_1, \ldots, p_{w-1})} \cdots S_i^{(q_1, \ldots, q_k, p_2, \ldots, p_{w-1})} \cdots S_i^{(q_1, \ldots, q_k, p_w)}\) at \(p_w\). Now that all of the systems are together, port teleporting them all point to point across \(p_{w}, p_{w-1}, \ldots, p_1, q_k, \ldots, q_1\) and at each point removing

\[\text{roots}(p) \equiv \{ q \in E \mid Path?(q, p) \}\]
any teleportation encryptions (if needed), the result is
$(p_w \ldots p_{q,k} \ldots q_2)(S_1 S_2 \ldots S_w) = (p_w \ldots p_{q,k} \ldots q_2)(S_{in}(g_1))$
at point $q_1$. Now the channel $\Lambda_g$, may be applied resulting in
$(p_w \ldots p_{q,k} \ldots q_2)(S_{out}(g_1))$ at $q_1$. Finally, this
whole system can be normal teleported from point to point along $q_1, \ldots, q_k, p_1, \ldots, p_w$ in order to remove the port encryptions, resulting in the final
system $(S_{out}(g_1))(q_1, \ldots, q_k, p_1, \ldots, p_{w-1})$ at point $p_w$. But by
definition $q_1, \ldots, q_k, p_1, \ldots, p_w \in \text{roots}(g_1)$, and so identifying
$q_1', \ldots, q_k' = q_1, \ldots, q_k, p_1, \ldots, p_{w-1}$, and $c_2 = p_w$ we
have, with only local operations and entanglement across points in $\text{roots}(g_1)$, made the systems $(S_{out}(g_1))(q_1', \ldots, q_k')$
with $q_1', \ldots, q_k' \in \text{roots}(g_1)$ available in a $c_2 \in \text{roots}(g_1)$, as
was to be shown possible.

**Theorem:** (total gate removal theorem)

Let $C = (\mathcal{M}, c, r, g, g_0, g, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}, p, g, \Gamma, \Lambda)$ be a
spacetime circuit with $\mathcal{M}$ not containing closed timelike curves. Then there exists another spacetime circuit
$C' = (\mathcal{M}, c, r, g, g_0, g, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}, p, g, \Gamma, \Lambda)$ such that
$\mathcal{N}_C = \mathcal{N}_{C'}$.

**Proof:** Since $\mathcal{M}$ contains no closed timelike curves, $G(C)$ must be acyclic. Therefore if $g \notin \mathcal{F}$, there exists a
gate $g_i \in g$ such that $\text{in}(g_i) = \text{roots}(g_i)$, where $\text{in}(g_i)$ is
the set of all nodes with edges pointing to $g_i$, as one can always pick a random gate point, move to another gate
point pointing to it, and repeat the process until a gate point to which only input points point is reached.

By the gate absorption lemma, operations can be preformed at points in $\text{roots}(g_i)$ such that the systems
$(S_{out}(g_i))(q_1, \ldots, q_w)$ with $q_1, \ldots, q_w \in \text{roots}(g_i)$ are available at some point $c_j \in \text{roots}(g_j)$. If for some $r_k$ we have
$(g_i, r_k) \in \gamma$, then the system $E((g_i, r_k))(q_1, \ldots, q_k)$ can
be sent to $r_k$ from $c_j$ along with the encryption data at $q_1, \ldots, q_k$, so $r_k$ gets $E((g, r_k))$ as in the originally protocol.
This process can be repeated for all $g_i$ s.t.
$\text{in}(g_i) = \text{roots}(g_i)$. Let us denote by $\Theta$ the set of all gate
points for which this process was applied.

Consider now a different kind of gate point, $g_i'$, such that
$\text{in}(g_i') \subseteq \text{roots}(g_i') \cup \Theta$. Notice that $g_j \in \text{in}(g_i) \rightarrow \text{roots}(g_j) \subseteq \text{roots}(g_i)$. Thus the systems
$(S_{in}(g_i'))(q_1', \ldots, q_w')$ with $q_1', \ldots, q_w' \in \text{roots}(g_i')$ are all available in $\text{roots}(g_i')$, but this means the gate absorption lemma can be applied to $g_i'$, and once again if $g_i'$ was
originally meant to send a system to an output point, then that system can be sent encrypted, along with all
necessary decryption data, from points in $\text{roots}(g_i')$. Adding $g_i'$ to $\Theta$ we can repeat this process until all gate
points are removed.

**Example**

Given that the proof of the total gate removal theorem is somewhat technical, we provide, for the reader who
wishes for greater clarity or who simply does not have the patience to read the proof, a step by step example of
the removal of multiple gates from a spacetime circuit.

![FIG. 10. Spacetime circuit used as an example in demonstration of the total gate removal theorem.](image-url)
F. Proof of main theorem

We are now prepared to prove the main result of this paper.

**Main Theorem:** Let $T$ and $U$ be tasks with the same coarse causal structure. Then $T \leftrightarrow U$.

**Proof:**

It is sufficient to show that if $T$ is doable and $T$ and $U$ have the same coarse causal structure, then $U$ is also doable. Let $T = (M, c, r, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \{N_{\mathcal{I}, R - \mathcal{O}, R}\})$ and $U = (M', c', r', \mathcal{I}', \mathcal{O}', \{N_{\mathcal{I}', R - \mathcal{O}', R}\})$. Suppose $T$ is doable. Let $C = (M, c, r, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \{\mathcal{A}_p\})$ be a circuit which accomplishes $T$. Let $C' = (M', c', r', \mathcal{I}', \mathcal{O}', \{\mathcal{A}_p\}')$ be the circuit created by applying the total gate removal theorem to $C$. Construct a third circuit $C'' = (M', c', r', \mathcal{I}', \mathcal{O}', \{\mathcal{A}_p''\}').$ Since $T$ and $U$ have the same coarse causal structure, execution of this circuit is possible. Thus $C'' \in \{N_{\mathcal{I}', R - \mathcal{O}', R}\}$, thus $U$ is accomplished by $C''$ and thus is doable, as was to be shown.

VI. APPLICATIONS

A. Position Based Quantum Cryptography

The central question of position based quantum cryptography is, can an untrusted agency $P$ prove to another agency $V$ that one of $P$’s agents was in some spacetime region $R$, without $V$ sending any agents into $R$.

Previous works have considered the case when $R$ is one spacial sub-region of Minkowski space for some finite duration of time, i.e. $R = R \times T \subset M^{d+1}$. In particular in [3] it was shown that position based quantum cryptography is not possible if $V$ only places $n$ stationary agents $V_0, ..., V_n$ at a collection of spacial points $x_0, ..., x_n$ whose convex hull contains $R$, such that the idea being that if the $V_i$’s send light signals which reach some point $y \in \mathcal{I}$ together at time $t_0 \in T$, only an agent at $y$ at time $t_0$ could perform a computation involving information from all signals, while for all $i$ returning its output to $V_i$ at time $t_0 + |x_i - y|/c$. We now show that our results strengthen this no-go theorem to exclude any strategy involving $V$’s sending signals and receiving signals outside an authentication region which can be any sub-region of any spacial-time containing no closed time-like curves.

Suppose $V$ instructs his agents to publicly broadcast signals at some spacetime points $c_1, ..., c_n \notin R$ and to pick up signals at some spacetime points $r_1, ..., r_m \notin R$. $V$ hopes that he can choose these points, along with some channel $N$, such that $N$ could have only been applied to the outgoing signals if they were manipulated inside the region $R$. In the language of this work, we can say that $V$ is attempting to give $P$ a relativistic quantum task with input and output points outside of $R$ which can only be accomplished by a spacetime circuit with a gate point inside $R$. However, by the total gate removal theorem, no such relativistic quantum task exists, and the efforts of $V$ are in vain.

B. Holography

The holographic principle, and in particular AdS/CFT, asserts that a physical theory on some bulk spacetime $M$ can be described entirely by another physical theory on its boundary, $\partial M$. For a task defined on $M$ with input and output points all in $\partial M$, we can define a “dual” task which differs only in that it is defined on $\partial M$ rather than $M$. Such bulk tasks are known as “asymptotic tasks”.

It was recently noted in [9] that while if the conjectured duality of AdS/CFT is to stand then the doability of asymptotic tasks and their duals must be the same, the fine causal structure of an asymptotic task and its dual is not always the same. In particular it was shown that there exist configurations of the PBQC task shown in figure 7 with input and output points on the boundary of AdS for which the bulk has a non-empty $\mathcal{P}$ region, but the boundary does not. Thus on holographic grounds one may deduce that the existence of a non empty $\mathcal{P}$, and in fact any fine causal structure discrepancy between the bulk and boundary cannot affect task doability. That we have explicitly shown this can be seen as a sanity check for holography.

VII. CONCLUSION

It has long been observed that entanglement can resolve otherwise insurmountable coordination issues [2]. Studying how the doability of tasks depends on the availability of entanglement is useful in developing a better understanding of its logistical power. Qualitatively, our results show that in a spacetime context, the effect of entanglement is to make irrelevant all of the “fine” causal details of the spacetime on which the task is defined.

On a practical level, knowing the irrelevance of fine causal structure often greatly simplifies the determination of doability, as one may assume any fine causal structure consistent with the coarse causal structure of the task is present when attempting to construct a circuit, as exemplified by the seemingly difficult summoning task in figure 1 and the PBQC task with an empty $\mathcal{P}$ region. However, this is not always possible, and it remains to find an algorithmic way of determining the doability of an arbitrary task.

Though doability does not depend on the fine causal structure in the presence of unlimited entanglement, the amount of entanglement needed to remove all gate points from a circuit can easily become intractable when the construction we have provided is applied. Categorizing tasks by the precise entanglement cost of gate removal is a subject of future work. It is possible we may learn
to construct efficient gate removal methods by studying the fine causal structure discrepancies between the bulk and boundary in AdS/CFT, and conversely we may learn about entanglement structure in AdS/CFT by knowing when entanglement must be present to deal with these discrepancies. Finally, it is likely effects from quantum gravity such as limits on computational speed and complexity will have a non trivial impact on the doability of relativistic quantum tasks. We leave such an analysis to future work.
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