An axiomatic measure of one-way quantum information
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I introduce an algorithm to detect one-way quantum information between two interacting quantum systems, i.e. the direction and orientation of the information transfer in arbitrary quantum dynamics. I then build an information-theoretic quantifier of one-way information which satisfies a set of desirable axioms. In particular, it correctly evaluates whether correlation implies one-way quantum information, and when the latter is transferred between uncorrelated systems. In the classical scenario, the quantity measures information transfer between random variables. I also generalize the method to identify and rank concurrent sources of quantum information flow in many-body dynamics, enabling to reconstruct causal patterns in complex networks.
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INTRODUCTION

One-way quantum information manifests when the output state of a system in a process is determined by its interaction with another system, but not vice versa. One-way information transfer can be associated to causal relations. A vast literature has discussed the problem of inferring causation from data in both classical and quantum scenarios [1–8], because of its importance for Science. Yet, a crucial problem is still unsolved: how can we quantify one-way information between quantum systems? In general, there is no consensus about how to measure the peculiar one-way information flow that characterizes causation. Given the state of a quantum system, measures of quantum correlations mark well the amount of information shared by the components of the system in terms of entropic or geometric quantifiers [9, 10]. However, given a multipartite quantum channel, we do not have any reliable metric to evaluate the information transferred during its implementation. Unfortunately, widely employed causation measures misinterpret causal links between classical random variables in simple case studies [7, 8], so we cannot just translate them in the quantum regime.

Here, I construct an information-theoretic measure of one-way information (OWI), capturing the direction of the information flow between causally connected systems. OWI is exemplified by a measuring probe that updates its state based on the information acquired from a measured system. A controlled gate is then an adequate mathematical characterization for OWI flow from a system to another. Another example of OWI is the instruction that a controlling device sends to regulate the state of a controlled machine. A controlled gate is then an adequate mathematical state based on the information acquired from a measured system. A controlled operation related to the pre-measurement step in the ubiquitous Von Neumann measurement scheme [22]. Here, log₂ d bits of information flows from A to B. Consider now the evolu-
tion of a bipartite quantum system $AB$ initially prepared in the state $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B$, which is described by the unitary transformation $\rho_{AB}^U = U_{AB}\rho_A \otimes \rho_B U_{AB}^\dagger$. Assuming that the channel $U$ is unknown, the goal is to quantify how much the dynamics of system $A(B)$ influences the dynamics of $B(A)$. The question to answer is then: “How much information $A(B)$ transfers to $B(A)$ via the channel $U$?” The task is hard because, given the initial state, different causal relations can produce the same output. I list two pieces of evidence. First, the roles of control and target systems are basis-dependent. For example, the two-qubit CNOT is equal to a controlled gate with swapped control and target qubits, and different measurement basis, $C_{A-B}^{0,1-0,1} = C_{B-A}^{+,+,+-,-} \otimes |\pm\rangle = (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ [23, 24]. The system $A$ therefore exerts maximal influence on $B$ via the controlled operation $C_{A-B}^{0,1}$ only with respect to the bases $|i\rangle, |j\rangle$. This also implies that calculating the correlations in the input/output states, or the ability of a channel to create correlations [25, 26], is insufficient for drawing conclusions on the information flow from a causing device to an affected system. When the roles of control and target system are inverted, the information travels in the opposite direction, while creating the same amount of correlations. Second, there can be causal links with neither initial nor final correlations. For example, $C_{A-B}^{0,1-0,1}|10\rangle_{AB} = |11\rangle_{AB}$ is a causal relation, conversely to the local bit flip $X_B |10\rangle_{AB} = |11\rangle_{AB}$. They are two different physical processes that generate the same output from the same initial state [27].

Yet, there is a way to discern OWI from the initial and final states of a quantum process. One can recast the problem of inferring causation in terms of the much better understood task of quantifying correlations, if additional systems are available. I first discuss an illustrative example. Then, I detail a generally applicable scheme.

Suppose one correlates two systems $A, B$ with two auxiliary systems $A', B'$, respectively, such that the global (pure) state is $\psi_{A'ABB'} := \sum_{ij} c_{ij} |i\rangle_{A'} |j\rangle_{BB'}$. Consider then three different processes:

\[
V_{A'ABB'} U_{AB}^1 \psi_{A'ABB'} = \sum_{ij} c_{ij} d_{ij} |i\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |j\rangle_{BB'},
\]

\[
V_{A'ABB'} U_{AB}^2 \psi_{A'ABB'} = \sum_{ij} c_{ij} d_{ij} |i\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |j\rangle_{BB'},
\]

\[
V_{A'ABB'} U_{AB}^3 \psi_{A'ABB'} = \sum_{ij} c_{ij} d_{ij} |i\rangle_A |j\rangle_B |j\rangle_{BB'},
\]

\[
V_{A'ABB'} U_{AB} = C_{B'\rightarrow B}^{i\rightarrow j} C_{A'\rightarrow A}^{r\rightarrow i}, U_{AB}^1 = I_{AB}, U_{AB}^2 = C_{A'\rightarrow B}, U_{AB}^3 = C_{A'\rightarrow B},
\]

\[U_{AB}^{3\rightarrow 1} = C_{B'\rightarrow A'}^{j\rightarrow i}.
\]

In the first case, there is no interaction between $A$ and $B$, since $U_{AB}^1 = I_{AB}$. The two final controlled operations $V, W$ destroy all the initial correlations. In the second line, instead, a controlled gate $U_{AB}^2$ generates four-partite correlations by sending information from $A$ to $B$. The subsequent controlled gates $V, W$ leave the systems $A', B$ correlated. In the third case, $U_{AB}^3$ generates a reverse information flow, and correlations between systems $A, B'$ survive in the output state. Hence, the direction of the information flow between $A$ and $B$, if any, is determined from the correlations in $A'ABB'$.

The example suggests a universally valid scheme for quantifying OWI between two $d$-dimensional systems $A, B$, due to an unknown channel $U_{AB}$, with respect to reference bases $|i\rangle, |j\rangle$ (Fig. 1):

**STEP 1** – Given the initial state $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B$, with $\rho_A = \sum_i \rho_A |i\rangle \langle i|_A$, and $\rho_B = \sum_j \rho_B |j\rangle \langle j|_B$, one can calculate $P_{A'B'\rightarrow A'A'}^{ij\rightarrow ij} := C_{B'\rightarrow B'A'\rightarrow A'}^{j\rightarrow i} C_{A'\rightarrow A}^{i\rightarrow j}$, with $P_{A'B'\rightarrow A'A'}^{ij\rightarrow ij} := C_{B'\rightarrow B'A'\rightarrow A'}^{j\rightarrow i}$, $P_{A'B'\rightarrow A'A'}^{ij\rightarrow ij} := C_{B'\rightarrow B'A'\rightarrow A'}^{j\rightarrow i}$.

**STEP 2** – Let the system $AB$ evolve according to the channel $U$,

\[
\rho_{A'ABB'}^{in,U} = (I_A \otimes U_B \otimes I_{BB'}) \rho_{A'ABB'}^{in,U} (I_A \otimes U_B^\dagger \otimes I_{BB'}). \]

**STEP 3** (final) – Apply a second pair of local controlled operations with respect to the reference bases $|i\rangle, |j\rangle$, but swapping the roles of control and target systems:

\[
P_{A'ABB'}^{f} := C_{B'\rightarrow B'A'\rightarrow A'}^{j\rightarrow i} P_{A'ABB'}^{in,U} C_{B'\rightarrow B'A'\rightarrow A'}^{j\rightarrow i}.
\]
The case study in Eq. 1 implies that one can evaluate the information exchanged by $A$ and $B$ by calculating the correlations in $\rho_{\text{ABB}}$. The statistical dependence between two systems $\alpha, \beta$ is quantified by the mutual information $I(\alpha : \beta) := S(\alpha) + S(\beta) - S(\alpha \beta)$, in which $S(\alpha) := -\text{Tr}[\rho_A \log_2 \rho_A]$ is the von Neumann entropy of the state $\rho_A$. For any third system $\gamma$, the conditional mutual information reads $I(\alpha : \gamma|\beta) := I(\alpha : \gamma) - I(\alpha : \beta) [28]$.

I propose to measure the OWI that $A$ sends to $B$ via the channel $U$ by

$$C_U(A \rightarrow B) := I(B : A'\!|\!A|^B), \quad (5)$$

which is computed on $\rho_{\text{ABB}}[29]$. Consequently, the influence of $B$ on $A$ during the interaction under study is given by $C_U(B \rightarrow A) = I(A : BB'\!|\!A')$. As a minimal working example, consider two qubits in the input state $\ket{+}_AB$, and the unitary map to be the CNOT gate.

$$C^0_{A \rightarrow B} \quad \text{by applying the proposed scheme, one has}$$

$$| + \rangle_{AB} = \frac{(00) + (11)}{\sqrt{2}}$$

$$\rightarrow \frac{2}{(00) + (11)}_{\chi'AB}(00) + (11)_{BB} = \frac{2}{(00)_{\chi'AB}(00) + (11)_{BB} + (10)_{\chi'AB}(10) + (01)_{BB}} \cdot \frac{2}{2}$$

$$= \frac{(00)_{\chi'AB}(00) + (11)_{BB} + (10)_{\chi'AB}(10) + (01)_{BB}}{2}$$

$$\sqrt{2} \quad \ket{+}_B.$$ 

As expected, the output state in the example displays correlations between $A'$ and $B$, $I(B : A'\!|\!A'^B) = 2$, $I(A : BB'\!|\!A') = 0$. Indeed, $A$ causally influences $B$.

**Proofs that the OWI Measure Satisfies Desirable Properties, Including Extension to the Multiparticle Case**

To further justify the proposal, I report other explicit calculations for instructive cases in Tables I, II. Also, I discuss how the measure meets several desirable properties.

**Information-theoretic consistency.** There is no OWI without interaction. For local unitaries $U_{AB} = U_A \otimes U_B$, one has $C_U(\cdot | \cdot)_{UAB}(A \rightarrow B(A) = 0)$. Two systems can influence each other by a two-way information flow, e.g. $V_{AB}|\psi\rangle_{AB} = |+\rangle_A|+\rangle_B$, with $V_{AB} = C^{0,1-0,1,0,1}_{-BB\rightarrow A}$. In such a case, $C_{UV}(A \rightarrow B) = C_{UV}(B \rightarrow A) = 2$. Yet, the measure is not additive. Given $U_{AB} = V_{AB}W_{AB}$, in general $C_U(A \rightarrow B) \neq C_U(A \rightarrow B) + C_U(B \rightarrow A)$. Indeed, a controlled operation with control $A$ and target $B$ can be transformed in one with control $B$ and target $A$ by local unitaries, e.g. $C^{0,1-0,1}_{A \rightarrow B} = H_A \otimes H_B C^{0,1-0,1}_{B \rightarrow A} H_A \otimes H_B$, where $H$ is the Hadamard gate.

The measure is maximized by a controlled operation with respect to the reference bases and pure input states. $C_U(A \rightarrow B) = 2 \log_2 d$. The unitary creates $\log_2 d$ bits of classical correlations between $A'$ and $B'$, and $\log_2 d$ bits of quantum correlations, which are generated by consuming local coherence with respect to the local $A$ basis. $C_U(\cdot | \cdot)$ is maximally mixed input state, one has $C_U(A \rightarrow B) = \log_2 d$, because only $\log_2 d$ bits of classical correlations are created.

**Asymmetry.** The measure, unlike correlation quantifiers, captures the direction of OWI, $C_U(A \rightarrow B) \neq C_U(B \rightarrow A)$. Consider $C^{0,1-0,1}_{A \rightarrow B} = (00) + (11)|AB\rangle = (00) + (11)_{AB}/\sqrt{2}$. Evaluating OWI with respect to $i_A = j_B = 0, 1$, one has $C^{0,1-0,1}_{A \rightarrow B} = 2$, and $C^{0,1-0,1}_{B \rightarrow A}(B \rightarrow A) = 0$. On the other hand, reminding that $C^{0,1-0,1}_{A \rightarrow B} = C^{0,1-0,1}_{B \rightarrow A}$, the OWI with respect to $i_A = j_B = 1, 0$ is $C^{0,1-0,1}_{A \rightarrow B} = 0$, and $C^{0,1-0,1}_{B \rightarrow A}(B \rightarrow A) = 2$. The measure correctly identifies control (the information source) and target (the affected system).

**Quantifying OWI with and without correlations.** One of the main challenges in evaluating OWI is discriminating causal links between correlated systems. The measure defined in Eq. 5 takes zero value for systems $A, B$ that do not exchange information, regardless of the presence of correlations. That is, two correlated systems $AB$ are left correlated by local unitary channels, but there is no information flow. A technical caveat is that in the detection scheme the initial correlations between $A$ and $B$ must be ignored. The input state is $\rho_{AB}$, rather than the full state $\rho_{ABB}$.

A more elusive manifestation of OWI is when there is influence without correlations, e.g. $C^{0,1-0,1}_{A \rightarrow B} = |10\rangle_{AB} = |11\rangle_{AB}$. The measure is able to detect such causal relations, discriminating out the correlations.
TABLE II. Quantifying OWI in tripartite classical and quantum dynamics $U_{EAB}$ (by the quantities defined in Eqs. 5, 6), including local unitaries, controlled gates, and two-qubit Toffoli gates (CCNOT), with respect to the reference bases $|i\rangle, |j\rangle, |m\rangle = 0, 1, \ldots, d$. Note $\rho, \psi, \phi, \rho$ indicate arbitrary mixed and pure input states, and the CCNOT$_{E \rightarrow A}$ gate transfers information from the control system $E$ to the target $B$. The conditional causality $C_U(A \rightarrow B|E)$ discriminates, for example, between a controlled gate between $A$ and $B$ with $E$ uncorrelated, and one with correlated $E$. It is generalized to quantify OWI flow in multipartite systems of arbitrary size by Eq. 7.

| Process: $U_{EAB}$ $\rho_{EAB}$ $U_{EAB}^\dagger$ | $C_U(EA \rightarrow B)$ | $C_U(A \rightarrow B|E)$ | $C_U(A \rightarrow B)$ |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| $V_{EA} \otimes W_B$ $\rho_{EAB}$ $(V_{EA} \otimes W_B)^\dagger$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $C_{A \rightarrow B}^{\bot = 0, 1, \ldots, d}$ $\rho_{EAB} \otimes \phi_B$ | $2 \log_2 d$ | $\log_2 d$ | $\log_2 d$ |
| $C_{A \rightarrow B}^{\bot = 0, 1, \ldots, d}$ $\rho_{EAB} \otimes \phi_B$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $C_{A \rightarrow B}^{\bot = 0, 1, \ldots, d}$ $\rho_{EAB} \otimes \phi_B$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CCNOT$_{E \rightarrow A}$ $(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)_E \gamma^{\dagger}_A \otimes \phi_B$ ($d = 2$) | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| CCNOT$_{E \rightarrow A}$ $\rho_{EAB} \otimes \phi_B$ ($d = 2$) | $3/2 \log_4 3 + 1/2 < 1$ | $3/2 \log_4 3 + 1/2 < 1$ | $3/2 \log_4 3 + 1/2$ |
| CCNOT$_{E \rightarrow B}$ $\sum_{j} 1/4 (|i_{\text{EA}}\rangle \langle j_{\text{BA}}|) |j_{\text{BA}}$ ($d = 2$) | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| CCNOT$_{E \rightarrow A}$ $1/8 \sum_{mn} |nn\rangle \langle nn|$ ($d = 2$) | $3/2 \log_4 3 + 1/2$ | $1/2$ | $3/2 \log_4 3$ |

Computing the measure defined in Eq. 5 on the projected state gives $C_{A \rightarrow B}^{0,1-\text{not}}(A \rightarrow B) = 1$. The result is expected as one bit of correlations is created between $A'B'$.

**Scalability:** Localizing and ranking multiple, concurrent information sources. The proposed OWI measure extends to many-body systems. Defining a third system $E$, the global evolution of the tripartition in the state $\rho_{EAB}$ is a unitary $U_{EAB}$. A generalization of the OWI detection scheme, as depicted in Fig. 2, allows for quantifying the influence of, say, system $A$ over $B$ in the presence of $E$, reconstructing the causal pattern between the three systems. Alice, Bob and $E$, the system $E$ is coupled with an auxiliary $E'$,

$$C_{E \rightarrow E'} = \sum_{mn} \sum_{nn} C_{E \rightarrow E'}(m) \langle n|E'E|n\rangle = \sum_{mn} \sum_{nn} C_{E \rightarrow E'}(m) \langle n|E'E|n\rangle$$

One then obtains the sixpartite state $\rho_{E'A'EA'E'B'B'}^{\text{in}}$ (STEP 1), the evolved state $\rho_{E'A'EA'E'B'B'}^{\text{in}} = U_{EAB}^{\text{in}} \rho_{E'A'EA'E'B'B'}^{\text{in}} U_{EAB}^{\text{in}}$ (STEP 2), and the final state (STEP 3)

$$\rho_{E'A'EA'E'B'B'}^{\text{in}} = \sum_{mn} \sum_{nn} C_{E \rightarrow E'}(m) \langle n|E'E|n\rangle = \sum_{mn} \sum_{nn} C_{E \rightarrow E'}(m) \langle n|E'E|n\rangle$$

The degree of control $A$ on $B$ given full information about $E$, with respect to the reference bases $|i\rangle, |j\rangle, |m\rangle$, is then quantified by the difference between the OWI from $AE$ to $B$ and the OWI from $E$ alone (A is ignored),

$$C_U(A \rightarrow B|E) = C_U(EA \rightarrow B) - C_U(E \rightarrow B) = I(B : A|E')$$

computed in the final state $\rho_{E'A'EA'E'B'B'}^{\text{in}}$. The quantity, while giving different results from the OWI evaluated without information on $E$, $C_{U_{EAB}}(A \rightarrow B) \neq C_{U_{EAB}}(A \rightarrow B|E)$, inherits by construction the consistency and asymmetry properties. It is also
explicitly computable for tripartite dynamics of classical and quantum systems, including Toffoli and bipartite controlled gates (Table II). A quantifier of classical conditional causation is obtained by computing the conditional mutual information in the final state after it is projected into the reference bases. The extension to many-body processes could be the key resource when different parts of a composite system play different roles, e.g. control [37], metrology [38], and learning [39]. As OWI can be evaluated from correlation dynamics, one may build measures of genuine quantum and classical information flow, as it happens for correlation quantifiers [10].
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[27] No correlations in both input and output states does not preclude interaction. A physical, continuous time implementation of a controlled gate $U_{AB}$ from an uncorrelated input to an uncorrelated output may generate correlations at some time $t$.
[29] The letter $C$ is picked as the measure quantifies the strength of the causal link or, in other words, the degree of Control of a system on another.