

# Causal influence versus signalling for interacting quantum channels

Kathleen Barse, <sup>1,2,\*</sup> Paolo Perinotti, <sup>2,†</sup> Alessandro Tosini, <sup>2,‡</sup> and Leonardo Vaglini <sup>2,§</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Université Paris-Saclay, ENS Paris-Saclay, 91190, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

<sup>2</sup>QUIT group, Physics Dept., Pavia University, and INFN Sezione di Pavia, via Bassi 6, 27100 Pavia, Italy

A causal relation between quantum agents, say Alice and Bob, is necessarily mediated by an interaction. Modelling the last one as a reversible quantum channel, an intervention of Alice can have causal influence on Bob’s system, modifying correlations between Alice and Bob’s systems. Causal influence between quantum systems necessarily allows for signalling. Here we prove a mismatch between causal influence and signalling via direct computation of the two quantities for the Cnot gate. Finally we show a continuity theorem for causal effects of unitary channels: a channel has small causal influence iff it allows for small signalling.


Establishing causal relationships is a primary issue in science [1, 2] as well as to use causal relations to infer information on the underlying processes [3–7]. Prompted by the study of all facets of quantum nonlocality, the causal structure of networks of quantum systems has been largely explored in the light of information theory [8–18], paving the way towards recent developments in the direction of quantum indefinite causal order [19–28]. In the latter context, also the order of processes is taken as a quantum degree of freedom, thus unlocking new resources [29–32].

The question at the core of quantum causal models [33, 34] is whether a dynamics, which in an informational setting corresponds to a gate with composite input and output systems, can or cannot induce cause-effect relations between the involved parties. In this respect, much of the attention so far was given to *communication*, studying the structure of quantum gates in relation to their capacity to exchange information between timelike separated parties [9–12]. While the role of communication captures only one instance of causal relations [34], it makes it clear that non trivial causal effects between far apart systems must be mediated by an *interaction* [9]. In the absence of an interaction, one can indeed trivially assume that there is no *causal influence* between two systems. On the other hand, the presence of an interaction mediates a causal influence, that manifests itself in the creation of *correlations* between the interacting systems.

A largely unexplored side of quantum information processing is the scaling of causal effects versus the strength of the “coupling” between the systems involved. In the same line of thought, the relation between the strength of correlations and the amount of signalling is clearly a question of interest, that is largely unexplored.

In the present Letter we address the last question by defining quantifiers of signalling and causal influence and studying relations between them. It turns out that, just as it holds *no signalling if and only if no causal influence* [34], one has the stronger condition *little signalling if and only if little causal influence*. The continuity bounds for casual influence and signalling leave room for differences in the two quantities. Indeed, we show that, for the quantum Cnot, signalling is strictly smaller than causal influence, thus indicating that the “extra” causal effect beyond signalling has to be sought in the leverage that it enables on correlations.

For simplicity, we will restrict to finite dimensional systems, and use the same capital Roman letter  $A$  to denote a quantum system and the corresponding Hilbert space. In quantum theory an interaction between two systems, say  $A$  (controlled by Alice) and  $B$  (controlled by Bob) is represented by a bipartite channel  $\mathcal{C}$  (i.e., a completely positive trace preserving map) sending quantum states of the Hilbert space  $A \otimes B$  to quantum states of the Hilbert space  $A' \otimes B'$ , with  $\otimes$  denoting the usual Hilbert spaces tensor product. We will write  $\mathfrak{C}(C, C')$  for the set of channels from  $C$  to  $C'$  (shortened to  $\mathfrak{C}(C)$  when  $C' = C$ ), and  $\mathfrak{U}(C)$  for that of *unitary* channels on system  $C$ . We will adopt the following graphical representation for bipartite quantum channels



The preparation of a state  $\rho$  and the measurement of a POVM  $\{M_x\}$  on system  $A$  will be graphically represented as  $\rho \xrightarrow{A}$  and  $\xrightarrow{A} M_x$ , respectively. We will denote the set of states of system  $A$  by the symbol  $\text{St}(A)$ .

A bipartite channel  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}(AB, A'B')$  models an interaction between the quantum systems of the two users, Alice and Bob, and we will analyse it in terms of causal relations that it produces between Alice’s input and Bob’s output. As noticed by several authors [34, 35], the study of causal relations generated by non reversible channels may be ambiguous. Indeed, any channel  $\mathcal{C}$  can be realized in a non unique way as a reversible channel  $\mathcal{U}$  by discarding an appropriate environment system. It happens that the occurrence of causal relations between agents actually depends of the specific initial state of the environment involved in a reversible dilation. Accordingly, causal relations are unambiguously identified once the description is expanded such that all relevant systems are included, thus dealing with an “isolated system”. For this reason we focus on the evolution of isolated quantum systems, thus exploring the causal relations mediated by unitary channels.

One extreme case is that where systems  $A$  and  $B$  are separately isolated, thus non interacting. Clearly, in this case the evolution channel cannot produce any causal relation between Alice and Bob. On the other hand, if one e.g. swaps systems  $A$  and  $B$ , the result is that the swap channel mediates as much causal influence as one can possibly expect. Now, still on the

same line of thought, one can expect that a “little” interaction induces “little” causal effects. However, in order to prove this intuition one needs to introduce first suitable quantifiers for interaction and causal influence.

We then start by introducing two functions on the set of quantum unitary channels, denoted by  $S(\mathcal{U})$  and  $C(\mathcal{U})$ , that quantify the amount of signalling and that of causal influence from Alice to Bob for the channel  $\mathcal{U}$ , respectively.

Signalling, that is communication from Alice to Bob (or vice-versa), is based on the dependence of the local output system  $B'$  of Bob's on the choice of the local input system  $A$  of Alice's: in general, Alice can influence the outcome probabilities for Bob's local measurements on  $B'$ , by varying her choice of intervention on system  $A$ . If Bob's output at  $B'$  does not depend on the state of Alice's input at  $A$ , then we say that  $\mathcal{U}$  is *no-signalling* from Alice to Bob. One can straightforwardly prove that this condition corresponds to the following identity

$$\begin{array}{c} A \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ B \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \mathcal{U} \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} A' \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ B' \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline I \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} A \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ B \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline I \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} A' \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ B' \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline C \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad (1)$$

for some channel  $C \in \mathfrak{C}(B, B')$ , where the trivial POVM  $I$  on system  $A$  (or  $A'$ ) in the diagram represents the partial trace operator  $\text{Tr}_A$  (or  $\text{Tr}_{A'}$ ) that describes discarding  $A$  (or  $A'$ ). On this basis, given a channel  $\mathcal{U}$ , we quantify its signalling from  $A$  to  $B'$  via the function

$$S(\mathcal{U}) := \inf_{C \in \mathfrak{C}(B, B')} \|(\text{Tr}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'})\mathcal{U} - \text{Tr}_A \otimes C\|_{\diamond}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{I}_{B'}$  denotes the identity channel on system  $B'$ ,  $\|\mathcal{X}\|_{\diamond} := \sup_E \sup_{\rho \in \text{St}(EA)} \|(\mathcal{I}_E \otimes \mathcal{X})(\rho)\|_1$  is the *diamond norm* of the hermitian-preserving map  $\mathcal{X}$  in the real span of  $\mathfrak{C}(A, A')$ , and  $\|\cdot\|_1$  denotes the trace-norm on the space of operators on the Hilbert space  $E \otimes A'$ , i.e.  $\|X\|_1 := \text{Tr}[(X^\dagger X)^{1/2}]$ .

The signalling condition thus boils down to the possibility of using  $\mathcal{U}$  to send a message from Alice to Bob, but in a general theory of information processing this does not exhaust the ways in which an intervention on system  $A$  can causally affect the system  $B'$ . Indeed a local operation involving only system  $A$  before the reversible transformation  $\mathcal{U}$  can influence the output correlations between Alice and Bob. This possibility has been extensively explored in Refs. [34, 36] and encompassed in the notion of *causal influence* of system  $A$  on system  $B'$ . The definition (by negation) of causal influence is the following. Given the unitary  $\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{C}(AB, A'B')$ , system  $A$  has *no causal influence* on  $B'$  if for every  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{C}(A)$  one has

$$\begin{array}{c} A' \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ B' \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \mathcal{U}^{-1} \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} A \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ B \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \mathcal{A}' \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} A \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ B' \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \mathcal{U} \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} A' \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ B' \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \mathcal{A}' \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} A \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ B' \end{array} \quad (3)$$

for a suitable local operation  $\mathcal{A}' \in \mathfrak{C}(A')$ . The above condition has been proved [34] to be strictly stronger than no-signalling for a general information theory. Indeed on one

hand it prevents Alice to signal to Bob, but it also ensures that the evolution  $\mathcal{U}$  cannot “propagate” the effect of any local operation of Alice (on system  $A$ ) to alter the correlations with the output system of Bob's created by  $\mathcal{U}$ . Remarkably, in Ref. [34] it was also proved that in quantum theory no-causal influence coincides with no-signalling, while in classical information theory there exist examples of channels that cannot be used for transmitting signals to a given subsystem but still can be used to influence its correlations. In other words, there exist no-signalling gates that have causal influence. As proved in Ref. [34], to verify if a channel has causal influence from  $A$  to  $B'$  it is not necessary to check the factorization on the rhs of Eq. (3) for every local map  $\mathcal{A}$ , but it is sufficient to do it on a single probe corresponding to the swap operator between two copies of Alice's input system  $A$ : in formula,  $\mathcal{U}$  has no causal influence from  $A$  to  $B'$  if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U}) &= \mathcal{T}' \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'}, \\ \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U}) &:= (\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{U})(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B)(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{U}^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{C}(AA)$  is the swap channel given by  $\mathcal{S}(\rho) := S\rho S$ , with  $S|\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle = |\phi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$  for any pair  $|\phi\rangle, |\psi\rangle \in A$ , and  $\mathcal{T}'$  is a suitable channel in  $\mathfrak{C}(AA')$ . We exploit this criterion to define a quantifier for the causal influence from  $A$  to  $B'$  via the following function

$$C(\mathcal{U}) := \inf_{\mathcal{T}' \in \mathfrak{C}(AA')} \|\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U}) - \mathcal{T}' \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'}\|_{\diamond}. \quad (5)$$

We are now in position to compare the two quantities  $S(\mathcal{U})$  and  $C(\mathcal{U})$ . As we mentioned earlier, a non trivial fact about quantum theory is the equivalence between no-signalling and no-causal influence, that can now be expressed as

$$S(\mathcal{U}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow C(\mathcal{U}) = 0. \quad (6)$$

It is interesting to observe a striking consequence of Eq. (6). We know that causal influence includes signalling as a special case, keeping track also of the correlations that the channel  $\mathcal{U}$  can generate between Bob's and Alice's systems at its outcome. On one side it is possible to have signalling without inducing any correlations, an elementary example being  $\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{U}(AB)$  with  $A \equiv B$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{S}$  coinciding with the swap gate: while signalling from Alice to Bob (and vice-versa) is obvious, since  $\mathcal{U}$  exchanges their systems, if  $A$  and  $B$  are uncorrelated at the input they will remain uncorrelated after the swap. On the other hand, a channel  $\mathcal{U}$  cannot generate correlations between Alice and Bob without allowing also for signalling: it is impossible to have  $C(\mathcal{U}) \geq 0$  and  $S(\mathcal{U}) = 0$  simultaneously.

The first question answer in this Letter is whether the above equivalence (6) between no-signalling and no-causal influence is robust to perturbations of the ideal case where the channel does not mediate causal relations. State of the art knowledge on this subject is null as, in principle, the relative magnitude of the two quantities may arbitrarily fluctuate as one departs from the condition expressed in Eq. (6).

This is indeed not the case, as our result is the bound

$$S(\mathcal{U}) \leq C(\mathcal{U}) \leq 2\sqrt{2}S(\mathcal{U})^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (7)$$

These inequalities, proved in the following, establish the robustness of the equivalence between signalling and causal influence, that can be summarised in the sentence ‘‘little signalling is equivalent to little causal influence’’.

The main tool in order to prove Eq. (7) is a lemma grounded on the continuity of Stinespring dilations [37] for quantum channels, that we restate in the following, in a slightly different form with respect to the original one, for the convenience of the reader. For any quantum channel  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}(A, B)$  the Stinespring theorem implies the existence of a system  $E$  and an isometry  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathfrak{C}(A, BE)$  such that  $\mathcal{C} = (\text{Tr}_E \otimes \mathcal{I}_B) \circ \mathcal{V}$ . The Stinespring dilation is characterized by continuity [38], namely one can find dilations of two channels that are close, if and only if the channels themselves are close. More precisely given two channels  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$  and  $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2$  two of their Stinespring dilations with the same ancillary system  $E$ , one has [39]

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{U}(E)} \|(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{I})\mathcal{V}_1 - \mathcal{V}_2\|_{\diamond}^2 &\leq 4\|\mathcal{C}_1 - \mathcal{C}_2\|_{\diamond} \\ &\leq 4 \inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{U}(E)} \|(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{I})\mathcal{V}_1 - \mathcal{V}_2\|_{\diamond}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Thanks to the continuity of Stinespring dilations, we prove the following bound for a channel  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}(AB, A'B)$ :

$$\inf_{\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{C}(A, A')} \|\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B\|_{\diamond}^2 \leq 4\|(\text{Tr}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B)\mathcal{C} - \text{Tr}_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B\|_{\diamond}. \quad (9)$$

To show inequality (9) consider arbitrary Stinespring dilations of  $\mathcal{C}$ , say  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathfrak{C}(AB, A'BE)$  and of  $\mathcal{D}$ , say  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathfrak{C}(A, A'E)$ , with auxiliary system  $E$ , and notice that this is also a Stinespring dilation of  $(\text{Tr}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B)\mathcal{C}$  with auxiliary system  $A'E$ . Notice also that  $\mathcal{W} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B$  it is a Stinespring dilation of  $\text{Tr}_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B$  with auxiliary system  $A'E$ . Therefore, by the first bound in Eq. 8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{U}(A'E)} \|(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{I}_C)\mathcal{V} - \mathcal{W} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B\|_{\diamond}^2 \\ = \inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{U}(A'E)} \|\mathcal{V} - \mathcal{U}^{-1}\mathcal{W} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B\|_{\diamond}^2 \\ \leq 4\|(\text{Tr}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B)\mathcal{C} - \text{Tr}_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B\|_{\diamond}. \end{aligned}$$

Defining  $\mathfrak{C}(A, A') \ni \mathcal{D} := (\mathcal{I}_{A'} \otimes \text{Tr}_E)\mathcal{U}^{-1}\mathcal{W}$  and using the monotonicity of the diamond norm with respect to the partial trace, we finally get Eq. (9).

We can now prove Eq. (7). Let us start by proving that  $C(\mathcal{U}) \leq 2\sqrt{2}(S(\mathcal{U}))^{1/2}$ . The inequality in (9), with  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U})$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  playing the role of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$ , respectively, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} C^2(\mathcal{U}) &\leq 4\|(\text{Tr}_{AA'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'})\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U}) - \text{Tr}_{AA'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'}\|_{\diamond} \\ &= 4\|(\text{Tr}_{AA'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'})[(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{U})(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B) - \mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{U}]\|_{\diamond}, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows by substituting the explicit expression for  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U})$  in Eq. (4) and using the invariance of the norm with respect to composition with unitary channels. Within

the norm we can add and subtract the term  $\text{Tr}_{AA'} \otimes \mathcal{D}$  for  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{C}(B, B')$  an arbitrary channel, and use the triangular inequality together with the properties of the swap transformation to get

$$C^2(\mathcal{U}) \leq 8\|(\text{Tr}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'})\mathcal{U} - \text{Tr}_A \otimes \mathcal{D}\|_{\diamond}.$$

Finally, since the above inequality holds for every  $\mathcal{D}$ , it also holds for the infimum over  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{C}(B, B')$ , which concludes the proof.

We now show the other bound  $S(\mathcal{U}) \leq C(\mathcal{U})$ . For an arbitrary  $\mathcal{T}' \in \mathfrak{U}(AA')$  one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U}) - \mathcal{T}' \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'}\|_{\diamond} \\ \geq \|(\text{Tr}_{AA'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'})[(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{U})(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B) \\ - (\mathcal{T}' \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'})(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{U})](\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \rho \otimes \mathcal{I}_B)\|_{\diamond}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the monotonicity of the norm with respect to the partial trace  $\text{Tr}_{AA'}$ , and with respect to preparation of a fixed state  $\rho$  of system  $A$ , along with the explicit form of  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U})$  given in Eq. (4) and invariance of the norm under composition with unitary channels. Observing that  $(\text{Tr}_{AA'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'})(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{U})(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B)(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \rho \otimes \mathcal{I}_B) = (\text{Tr}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'})\mathcal{U}$ , and defining

$$\mathcal{D} := (\text{Tr}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'})\mathcal{U}(\rho \otimes \mathcal{I}_B),$$

we conclude that for every  $\mathcal{T}'$  there exists  $\mathcal{D}$  such that

$$\|\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U}) - \mathcal{T}' \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'}\|_{\diamond} \geq \|(\text{Tr}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'})\mathcal{U} - \text{Tr}_A \otimes \mathcal{D}\|_{\diamond},$$

thus proving the desired relation.

The core message of the bounds between causal influence and signalling is that if one of them is small the other is also small. Due to  $S(\mathcal{U}) \leq C(\mathcal{U})$ , if a reversible channel  $\mathcal{U}$  allows for a little bit of causal influence, say no more than  $\varepsilon$ , then also the amount of signalling that is allowed is bounded by  $\varepsilon$ . Conversely, from  $C(\mathcal{U}) \leq 2\sqrt{2}S(\mathcal{U})^{1/2}$ , if  $\mathcal{U}$  allows for a small, say  $\varepsilon$ , signalling, then it cannot exhibit causal influence bigger than  $2\sqrt{2}\varepsilon$ .

Notice however that, due to the singularity of the derivative of  $x^{1/2}$  in  $x = 0$ , in a neighbourhood of  $S(\mathcal{U}) = 0$ , one can have a large increase in causal influence with a negligible increase in signalling. This very observation can be seen as spotlighting the remnant of the non-equivalence of the two notions that we remarked in the classical case.

The second main result of this Letter is indeed the proof that causal influence and signalling are not equal. The mismatch between the two quantities is definitely established by their analytical computation, provided in the following, for the quantum Cnot unitary channel:

$$C(\text{Cnot}) = 2 > 1 \geq S(\text{Cnot}). \quad (10)$$

This states that there exist interactions where Alice’s local operations have effects on Bob’s system that ‘‘exceed’’ those on Bob’s local states. Such effects are not to be sought in communication capacity but in the perturbation of Bob’s system correlations.

We prove Eq. (10) computing the norms in Eqs. (2) and (5) for  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Cnot}$ . In the present case it is  $A \cong B \cong A' \cong B' \cong \mathbb{C}^2$ , but we keep general labels for input and output systems for ease of comparison with the above definitions. To prove that  $C(\text{Cnot}) = 2$  we show that for any choice of channel  $\mathcal{T}'$ , one can always find a state  $\rho \in \text{St}(\text{EAA}'B')$  such that

$$\|(\mathcal{I}_E \otimes \mathcal{T}(\text{Cnot}) - \mathcal{I}_E \otimes \mathcal{T}' \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'}) (\rho)\|_1 = 2.$$

Let  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  with  $|\psi\rangle = |+-++\rangle$  and  $|\pm\rangle := (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ . Remembering the definition of Cnot ( $\text{Cnot}(|ab\rangle\langle ab|) = |(a \oplus b)b\rangle\langle (a \oplus b)b|$ , with  $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$  and where the target qubit is the first qubit), one can easily verify that  $(\mathcal{I}_E \otimes \mathcal{T}(\text{Cnot}))(\rho) = |\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'|$  with  $|\psi'\rangle = |+-+-\rangle$ , whereas  $(\mathcal{I}_E \otimes \mathcal{T}' \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'}) (\rho) = |+\rangle\langle+| \otimes \mathcal{T}'(|-+\rangle\langle-+|) \otimes |+\rangle\langle+|$ . The two output states of the last qubit ( $B'$ ) are perfectly distinguishable as one can see by direct inspection. We remind indeed that for any pair of states  $\sigma$  and  $\nu$ , it is  $\|\sigma - \nu\|_1 = 2 \max_P \text{Tr}[P(\sigma - \eta)]$  where the maximum is taken over all projectors. It is then sufficient to choose the projector  $P = I_{\text{EAA}'} \otimes |+\rangle\langle+|$ , and conclude that  $\| |\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'| - |+\rangle\langle+| \otimes \mathcal{T}'(|-+\rangle\langle-+|) \otimes |+\rangle\langle+| \|_1 = 2$ , thus proving the thesis.

We finally show that  $S(\text{Cnot}) \leq 1$ . To this end it suffices to exhibit a channel  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathfrak{C}(B, B')$  such that

$$S_{\mathcal{M}}(\text{Cnot}) := \|(\text{Tr}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'}) \text{Cnot} - \text{Tr}_A \otimes \mathcal{M}\|_{\diamond} = 1.$$

Indeed according to definition (2) one has  $S(\text{Cnot}) \leq S_{\mathcal{M}}(\text{Cnot})$  for every  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathfrak{C}(B, B')$ . Let then  $\mathcal{M}$  be the channel that performs a non-selective measurement in the computational basis, namely  $\mathcal{M} : \rho \mapsto P_0 \rho P_0 + P_1 \rho P_1$ , with projectors  $P_0 := |0\rangle\langle 0|$  and  $P_1 := |1\rangle\langle 1|$ , and show that  $S_{\mathcal{M}}(\text{Cnot}) = 1$ . By definition of diamond norm one has

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mathcal{M}}(\text{Cnot}) &= \sup_{\rho} \|(\mathcal{I}_E \otimes (\text{Tr}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{B'}) \text{Cnot} - \mathcal{I}_E \otimes \text{Tr}_A \otimes \mathcal{M})(\rho)\|_1 \\ &= \sup_{\rho} \|(\mathcal{I}_E \otimes \text{Tr}_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B - \mathcal{I}_E \otimes (\text{Tr}_A \otimes \mathcal{M}) \text{Cnot})(\rho)\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

where we replaced  $\rho \in \text{St}(\text{EAB})$  with  $(\mathcal{I}_E \otimes \text{Cnot})(\rho)$ , which also ranges over  $\text{St}(\text{EAB})$ , and used the fact that Cnot is its own inverse. A simple computation shows that  $(\text{Tr}_A \otimes \mathcal{M}) \text{Cnot} = \text{Tr}_A \otimes \mathcal{M}$ , which can be checked on pure states using the definition of Cnot. Therefore one has the following simpler expression for  $S_{\mathcal{M}}(\text{Cnot})$ :

$$S_{\mathcal{M}}(\text{Cnot}) = \sup_{\rho \in \text{St}(\text{EB})} \|\rho - (\mathcal{I}_E \otimes \mathcal{M})(\rho)\|_1.$$

By convexity of the trace norm it is sufficient to take the supremum over pure states, and we can now assume that  $E \cong B$ . Let then  $\rho \in \text{St}(\text{EB})$  be a pure state, which we write as  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  with  $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|01\rangle + \gamma|10\rangle + \delta|11\rangle$  and  $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 + |\gamma|^2 + |\delta|^2 = 1$ . We observe that  $\|\rho - (\mathcal{I}_E \otimes \mathcal{M})(\rho)\|_1$  can be expressed as the sum of the absolute values of the eigenvalues of  $\rho - (\mathcal{I}_E \otimes \mathcal{M})(\rho)$ . The latter has nonzero eigenvalues  $\pm\sqrt{p(1-p)}$  with  $p := |\alpha|^2 + |\gamma|^2$

and  $1-p := |\beta|^2 + |\delta|^2$ , corresponding to the probability that the measurement  $\mathcal{M}$  outcome is 0 and 1, respectively. Accordingly we finally get

$$\|\rho - (\mathcal{I}_E \otimes \mathcal{M})(\rho)\|_1 = 2\sqrt{p(1-p)},$$

that is maximal for  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ . In this case  $\|\rho - (\mathcal{I}_E \otimes \mathcal{M})(\rho)\|_1 = 1$ , which concludes the proof.

*Conclusion and discussion.*—In this Letter, we have shown how the full amount of causal relations—say the causal influence—activated by a quantum unitary channel is strictly larger than the fraction of causal relations represented by its signalling. The Cnot gate is an example in which a lower bound on the gap between the two quantities can be analytically computed and is proved to be non-vanishing. We proved that causal influence scales as a function of signalling. While no interaction—i.e. free evolution—is equivalent to the absence of both causal influence and communication, a unitary coupling between quantum systems generates a little causal influence if and only if it allows for a little signalling.

The strength of causal influence of a unitary channel has been quantified in strictly operational terms within the channels discrimination framework. A similar approach has been recently adopted in Ref. [40], where the authors study the emergence of causal relations between spatial regions of spacetime as induced by an Hamiltonian evolution. However, the notion of causal influence defined in Ref. [40] is relative to a fixed initial state of the quantum network while the present approach is state-independent.

As the information exchanged between different parties is typically quantified via entropy-based measures, a future perspective of the present results is to generalise them to the analysis the behaviour of some significant entropic function. A natural candidate in this direction is the *entropy exchange* between the input held by Alice and Bob's output. Such an entropic characterization of causal influence will be of interest for cryptographic applications and for investigating the causal structure of quantum many-body systems.

*Acknowledgements.* P. P. acknowledges financial support from PNRR MUR project PE0000023-NQSTI. A. T. acknowledges the financial support of Elvia and Federico Faggin Foundation (Silicon Valley Community Foundation Project ID#2020-214365).

---

\* kathleen.barsse@ens-paris-saclay.fr

† paolo.perinotti@unipv.it

‡ alessandro.tosini@unipv.it

§ leonardo.vaglini01@universitadipavia.it

[1] J. Pearl, *Causality* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[2] M. S. Leifer and R. W. Spekkens, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 052130 (2013).

[3] J. S. Bell, *Physics Physique Fizika* **1**, 195 (1964).

[4] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).

- [5] M. Pawłowski, T. Paterek, D. Kaszlikowski, V. Scarani, A. Winter, and M. Żukowski, *Nature* **461**, 1101 (2009).
- [6] J.-M. A. Allen, J. Barrett, D. C. Horsman, C. M. Lee, and R. W. Spekkens, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031021 (2017).
- [7] M.-O. Renou, D. Trillo, M. Weilenmann, T. P. Le, A. Tavakoli, N. Gisin, A. Acín, and M. Navascués, *Nature* **600**, 625 (2021).
- [8] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, *Foundations of Physics* **24**, 379 (1994).
- [9] D. Beckman, D. Gottesman, M. A. Nielsen, and J. Preskill, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 052309 (2001).
- [10] C. Bennett, A. Harrow, D. Leung, and J. Smolin, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **49**, 1895 (2003).
- [11] T. Eggeling, D. Schlingemann, and R. F. Werner, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **57**, 782 (2002).
- [12] M. Piani, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 012305 (2006).
- [13] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland, *Quantum Information Processing* **4**, 13 (2005).
- [14] D. Kretschmann and R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 062323 (2005).
- [15] G. Gutoski and J. Watrous, *Proc. thirty-ninth Annu. ACM Symp. Theory Comput. - STOC '07*, 565 (2007), arXiv:0611.234.
- [16] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 022339 (2009).
- [17] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 060401 (2008).
- [18] A. A. Abbott, C. Giarmatzi, F. Costa, and C. Branciard, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 032131 (2016).
- [19] L. Hardy, Quantum gravity computers: On the theory of computation with indefinite causal structure, in *Quantum Reality, Relativistic Causality, and Closing the Epistemic Circle: Essays in Honour of Abner Shimony* (Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 2009) pp. 379–401.
- [20] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, P. Perinotti, and B. Valiron, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 022318 (2013).
- [21] O. Oreshkov, F. Costa, and Č. Brukner, *Nature Communications* **3**, 1092 EP (2012).
- [22] Č. Brukner, *Nature Physics* **10**, 259 (2014).
- [23] O. Oreshkov and C. Giarmatzi, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 093020 (2016).
- [24] C. Portmann, C. Matt, U. Maurer, R. Renner, and B. Tackmann, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **63**, 3277 (2017).
- [25] P. Perinotti, Causal structures and the classification of higher order quantum computations, in *Time in Physics*, edited by R. Renner and S. Stupar (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017) pp. 103–127.
- [26] A. Bisio and P. Perinotti, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **475**, 20180706 (2019).
- [27] P. Arrighi, C. Cedzich, M. Costes, U. Rémond, and B. Valiron, *ACM Transactions on Quantum Computing* **4**, 10.1145/3581760 (2023).
- [28] P. Arrighi, A. Durbec, and M. Wilson, *Quantum networks theory* (2022), arXiv:2110.10587 [quant-ph].
- [29] M. Araújo, F. Costa, and i. c. v. Brukner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 250402 (2014).
- [30] S. Milz, J. Bavaresco, and G. Chiribella, *Quantum* **6**, 788 (2022).
- [31] P. A. Guérin, A. Feix, M. Araújo, and i. c. v. Brukner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 100502 (2016).
- [32] G. Chiribella, M. Banik, S. S. Bhattacharya, T. Guha, M. Alimuddin, A. Roy, S. Saha, S. Agrawal, and G. Kar, *New Journal of Physics* **23**, 033039 (2021).
- [33] J. Barrett, R. Lorenz, and O. Oreshkov, *Nature Communications* **12**, 885 (2021).
- [34] P. Perinotti, *Quantum* **5**, 515 (2021).
- [35] J. Barrett, R. Lorenz, and O. Oreshkov, *Quantum causal models* (2019), arXiv:1906.10726 [quant-ph].
- [36] P. Perinotti, *Quantum* **4**, 294 (2020).
- [37] W. F. Stinespring, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **6**, 211 (1955).
- [38] D. Kretschmann, D. Schlingemann, and R. F. Werner, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **54**, 1708 (2008).
- [39] The non-trivial part of the Stinespring continuity theorem—whose proof can be found in Ref. [38]—consists in proving that
- $$\inf_U \|(I \otimes U)V_1 - V_2\|_\infty^2 \leq \|C_1 - C_2\|_\diamond$$
- where  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are the Kraus operators of the isometric dilations of  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  respectively:  $C_i(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E(V_i \rho V_i^\dagger)$ ,  $\forall \rho \in \text{St}(A)$ . If  $U$  denotes the unitary Kraus operator of a reversible channel  $\mathcal{U}$ , one has
- $$\|(\mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{U})V_1 - V_2\|_\diamond \leq 2\|(I_B \otimes U)V_1 - V_2\|_\infty.$$
- Indeed, consider a state  $\rho \in \text{St}(AF)$  with  $F$  an arbitrary ancillary system, and define  $\mathcal{V}_1^U := (\mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{U})V_1$  with  $V_1^U := (I_B \otimes U)V_1$ . Using the fact that  $\|ABC\|_1 \leq \|A\|_\infty \|B\|_1 \|C\|_\infty$ ,  $\|V\|_1 = \|V^\dagger\|_1 = 1$ , and the triangle inequality, one can easily check that
- $$\|\mathcal{I}_F \otimes [\mathcal{V}_1^U - V_2](\rho)\|_1 \leq 2\|V_1^U - V_2\|_\infty.$$
- Since this holds for any  $F$  and any  $\rho$ , the thesis follows. As to the second inequality, it is simply due to monotonicity of the diamond norm under partial trace.
- [40] J. Cotler, X. Han, X.-L. Qi, and Z. Yang, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2019**, 42 (2019).