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We show a method of describing processes with indefinite causal order (ICO) by a definite causal order. We do so by relabeling the processes that take place in the circuit in accordance with the basis of measurement of control qubit. Causal nonseparability is alleviated at a cost of nonlocality of the acting processes. This result highlights the key role of superposition in creating the paradox of ICO. We also draw attention to the issue of growing incompatibility of language in its current form (especially the logical structures it embodies) with the quantum logic.

I. INTRODUCTION

Indefinite Causal Order (ICO) implemented through Quantum Switch has seen a lot of attention recently. Apart from practical advances the approach claims a fundamental point as well: ICO setups, being inherently unordered, hint at the inherent unorderability of quantum mechanics and therefore the nature. We would like to disagree with the fundamental point and present a recipe for ordering any ICO process within the framework of standard quantum mechanics.

First of all we consider the case of a particle being in spatial superposition and show in what sense it occupies two places simultaneously and in what sense it is in a particular place. Then we expand the analogy to the case of ICO processes and show how to order them. Finally, remarks about linguistic character of the difficulties of locating and ordering the superpositions in quantum mechanics are presented together with conclusions.

II. ANALOGY WITH SPATIAL SUPERPOSITION

Let us look at a particle entering an interferometer which has two arms. Depending on the conditions (state of the particle, setup of an interferometer) particle may take the arm $A$, arm $B$ or a superposition of arms (we use bold to depict the names of the arms). When conditions are right for the particle to take the arm $A$, we say “Particle is in arm $A$ and not in arm $B$”. In language of quantum mechanics we may say “The state of the system is $|A\rangle$ and not the one orthogonal to it, $|B\rangle$”. When the conditions are right for the particle to take a superpositional route, say $|(A + B)/\sqrt{2}\rangle$, we may be tempted to say that particle takes two arms simultaneously and that there is no particular “arm” where particle is. Nevertheless, in the language of quantum mechanics there is precise expression for the state of the system “The state of the system is $|(A + B)/\sqrt{2}\rangle$ and not the one orthogonal to it, $|(A - B)/\sqrt{2}\rangle$”. Translating this to our language we may say “Particle is in arm $(A + B)/\sqrt{2}$ and not in arm $(A - B)/\sqrt{2}$.”

We would like to stress that just like in the first example, in the second example there is particular “place” or “arm” in which the particle definitely is and particular “place” or “arm” in which the particle definitely is not. That existence may be confirmed experimentally in both cases. The difference between the examples is that our everyday macroscopic intuition allows to call localized arm $A$ an “arm”, but does not allow to call delocalized arm $(A + B)/\sqrt{2}$ an “arm”. In the next section we will show how this analogy may be applied to ICO processes.

III. ORDERING THE ICO

We assume familiarity of reader with general properties of ICO and Quantum Switch, for a detailed description of ICO processes one is referred to the aforementioned literature, here we will concentrate on the key moments. Instead of two arms $A$ and $B$, there are two processes $A$ and $B$ through which a particle might pass. Moreover, the processes are connected between each other so that $A$ may happen first, then $B$, then final measurement of the attributes of the particle; or $B$ first, then $A$, then final measurement. Important, although $A$ and $B$ are arbitrary processes (that might even include measurement and collapse in a sense), they are connected coherently, i.e. $A$ and $B$ don’t involve irreversible processes (see the descriptions of experimental setups in the cited literature). Finally, the order “$A$ then $B$” vs “$B$ then $A$” is related to the state of control qubit (usually degree of freedom of the same particle that goes through the circuit). When the state of control qubit is in superposition between the states corresponding to particular order, indefinite causal order of processes $A$ and $B$ appears because the particle now simultaneously passes through “$A$ then $B$” and “$B$ then $A$” processes.

In order to untangle the situation one should note that, although the processes $A$ and $B$ might be very complex, essentially there are just two possibilities of what might happen “$A$ then $B$” or “$B$ then $A$”. Moreover, two possibilities are absolutely determined by what process happens first. Namely, “$A$ then $B$” could be described as “$A$ happens first”. Because the system consists of just two processes, and the particle passes through both, this statement is enough to deduce the whole situation “$A$ then $B$”. Now let us try to describe the “$A$ then $B$” situation in quantum language “$|A\rangle$ happens first, not
its orthogonal $|B\rangle$, then $|B\rangle$ happens, not its orthogonal $|A\rangle$. Situation “B then A” is described analogously. In order to describe in a similar way the superpositional case we need to look at the control qubit, because its state fully determines the path of the particle through the processes A and B. Let us say that state $|a\rangle$ of control qubit corresponds to “first A then B”, other way around for $|b\rangle$. In other words, the state of control qubit uniquely determines the first process through which the particle undergoes. Then the state of control qubit $|(a + b)/\sqrt{2}\rangle$ also uniquely determines the first process through which the particle undergoes. It will be $(A + B)/\sqrt{2}$. The first process (as we have discussed) uniquely determines the second process - which is orthogonal to it (in this case $(A - B)/\sqrt{2}$). In quantum language we would say “$(A + B)/\sqrt{2}$ happens first, not its orthogonal $(A - B)/\sqrt{2}$, then $(A - B)/\sqrt{2}$ happens, not its orthogonal $(A + B)/\sqrt{2}$”. This is essentially the recipe for ordering ICO processes: following the whole particle through the circuit and noticing that superpositional states of control qubits uniquely determine paths in Hilbert-space. Note that we are able to choose the new eigenbasis for description of the processes because everything that happens in the circuit up to the final measurement is by definition unitary (no irreversibility condition mentioned earlier). Extensions to the circuits with more than two processes should be possible as well. There is, of course, cost of being able to order the ICO processes: the processes become delocalized and it is difficult to understand what each of them does, but this does not undermine the fact that ICO processes can be ordered. In fact, such a tradeoff has Bohr-like complementary feeling to it.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown a way to order ICO processes. Therefore ICO processes cannot be considered an argument in favour of fundamental unorderability of quantum mechanics and of nature. It should be of note, however, that this work is not meant so say anything on the fundamental orderability of events in nature, it only tries to clarify the situation with ICO. It seems that vagueness of our everyday words when we interpret quantum superposition extends to vagueness when we interpret more intricate consequences of quantum superposition, creating paradoxical situations. The more we try to interpret quantum mechanics, the more is evident the incompatibility of logical structures at the root of our current language and the logic of quantum mechanics. Perhaps quantum mechanics has to enter the area of interest of linguists in order to overcome this difficulty.
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