


## ORIGINAL PAPER

WILEY

## Theory of quantum gravity information processing

Laszlo Gyongyosi<sup>1,2,3</sup>  | Sandor Imre<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup>School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK<sup>2</sup>Department of Networked Systems and Services, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Budapest, Hungary<sup>3</sup>MTA-BME Information Systems Research Group, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary**Correspondence**

Laszlo Gyongyosi, School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK; or Department of Networked Systems and Services, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Budapest 1117, Hungary; or MTA-BME Information Systems Research Group, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest 1051, Hungary.  
Email: lasgy\_ph@yahoo.com

**Funding information**

National Research, Development and Innovation Fund, Grant/Award Number: TUDFO/51757/2019-ITM and Thematic Excellence Program; National Research Development and Innovation Office of Hungary, Grant/Award Number: 2017-1.2.1-NKP-2017-00001; Hungarian Scientific Research Fund, Grant/Award Number: OTKA K-112125; BME Artificial Intelligence FIKP, Grant/Award Number: EMMI BME FIKP-MI/SC

**Summary**

The theory of quantum gravity is aimed to fuse general relativity with quantum theory into a more fundamental framework. The space of quantum gravity provides both the nonfixed causality of general relativity and the quantum uncertainty of quantum mechanics. In a quantum gravity scenario, the causal structure is indefinite, and the processes are causally nonseparable. Here, we provide a model for the information processing structure of quantum gravity. We show that the quantum gravity environment is an information resource pool from which valuable information can be extracted. We analyze the structure of the quantum gravity space and the entanglement of the space-time geometry. We study the information transfer capabilities of quantum gravity space and define the quantum gravity channel. We reveal that the quantum gravity space acts as a background noise on the local environment states. We characterize the properties of the noise of the quantum gravity space and show that it allows the separate local parties to simulate remote outputs from the local environment state, through the process of remote simulation.

**KEYWORDS**

quantum computations, quantum entanglement, quantum gravity, quantum Shannon theory

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

In general relativity, processes and events are causally nonseparable because the causal structure of space-time geometry is nonfixed. In a nonfixed causality structure, the sequence of time steps has no interpretable meaning. In our macroscopic world, events and processes are distinguishable in time and, thus, causally separable because the space-time geometry has a deterministic causality structure. The meaning of time evolution is also nonvanishing and has an interpretable notion in the microscopic world of quantum mechanics.<sup>1-7</sup> It is precisely the reason why classical and quantum computations

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2019 The Authors. *Quantum Engineering* Published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

are evolved by a sequence of time steps and why the term time has an interpretable and plausible meaning in the macroscopic and microscopic levels. A fundamental difference between the nature of events of general relativity and quantum mechanics is that, although the theory of general relativity provides a nonfixed causal space-time structure with deterministic events, in quantum mechanics, the space-time geometry has a fixed, deterministic causality structure, whereas the events are nondeterministic. Quantum gravity is provided to fill the gap between these two fundamentally different theories. The theory of quantum gravity combines the results of general relativity with quantum mechanics to construct a more general framework. In a model of quantum gravity, the causal structure is nonfixed, and the events are probabilistic. In this quantum gravity environment, the computations and the information processing steps are interpreted without the notion of time evolution. This space-time structure allows us to perform quantum gravity computations and to build quantum gravity computers, which fuse the extreme power of quantum computations and the nonfixed causality structure of general relativity.<sup>4</sup> The space of quantum gravity can be further exploited in quantum communication protocols, in quantum artificial intelligence (AI), in quantum error correction, and particularly in the development of quantum computers.<sup>8-56</sup>

Some related works are as follows. For a theoretical background on quantum gravity computations, we suggest the works of Hardy,<sup>2-5</sup> Lloyd,<sup>6,7</sup> Lloyd et al.,<sup>8</sup> and Pawłowski et al.<sup>12</sup> For a work on experimental superposition of orders of quantum gates, see the work of Procopio et al.<sup>57</sup> The problem of exponential communication complexity advantage from quantum superposition of the direction of communication has been studied by Guérin et al.<sup>58</sup> Rubino et al.<sup>59</sup> proposed an experimental verification of an indefinite causal order. The previous works<sup>57-59</sup> also provide the basic indefinite causal structure and reveal its experimental aspects. On the problem of the general quantum interference principle and duality computer, see Long.<sup>60</sup> This work also defines a quantum computation model that can be used to simulate an indefinite causal structure. For the structural attributes of an indefinite causal structure, see also the work of Milz et al.<sup>61</sup> A special computational framework has been defined by Bang et al.<sup>62</sup> This work also studies the problem of quantifiable simulation of quantum computation beyond stochastic ensemble computation. Mahmud et al.<sup>63</sup> studied the emulation of quantum algorithms at high precision and high throughput and evaluated a computational model.

In addition to the attractive properties of quantum gravity theory, the appropriate characterization of the information processing structure of the quantum gravity space is still missing. Here, our aim was to provide a model for the information processing structure of quantum gravity. We show that the quantum gravity space acts as an information resource pool and reveal that the entangled structure of the quantum gravity space stimulates a noisy map on the local environment states of independent, physically separated local maps. This background noise (a noisy map) of the quantum gravity space allows the local parties to simulate remote, physically separated processes in the quantum gravity space, in a probabilistic way. We call this process remote simulation, an event that can be accomplished only as a coin tossing in a fixed causality structure. We also study the entangled space-time structure of quantum gravity and define the partitions over which the information flow between the separated processes is possible. We characterize the properties of the quantum gravity channel and the information transmission capability of the quantum gravity space by the tools of quantum Shannon theory.<sup>64-84</sup> We introduce the terms quantum gravity memory and stimulated storage, which allow for the generation and storage of qubit entanglement exploiting the information resource pool property of the quantum gravity space.

The novel contributions of our paper are as follows.

1. We provide a model for the information processing structure of quantum gravity.
2. We analyze the structure of the quantum gravity space and the entanglement of the space-time geometry. We study the information transfer capabilities of quantum gravity space and define the quantum gravity channel.
3. We reveal that the quantum gravity space acts as a background noise on the local environment states.
4. We characterize the properties of the noise of the quantum gravity space and show that it allows the separate local parties to simulate remote outputs from the local environment state, through the process of remote simulation.
5. We characterize the information transfer of the gravity space and the correlation measure functions of the gravity channel.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the entanglement structure of the quantum gravity space, the information resource pool property of quantum gravity, and the structure of the quantum gravity channel. Section 3 studies the information flow through the quantum gravity environment and characterizes the correlation measures. Section 4 provides a quantum gravity memory and introduces the term stimulated storage. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper. Supplemental information is included in the Appendix.

## 2 | STRUCTURE OF INFORMATION PROCESSING

**Theorem 1** (Entangled structure of the quantum gravity environment). *The space-time geometry (quantum gravity environment  $\mathcal{G}_E$ ) can formulate an entangled structure with  $E_i B_j$ , where  $E_i$  is the local environment and  $B_j$  is the remote output of local maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ ,  $i \neq j$ . The  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j}$  entangled structure stimulates a nonfixed causality between the local processes  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .*

*Proof.* The proofs throughout this work assume two qubit maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , with qubit quantum gravity environment state  $\mathcal{G}_E$ . Specifically, the utilization of qubit channels is a required condition of the existence of a nonfixed causality structure between independent local completely positive, trace preserving (CPTP) maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , which follow from the property of the shift-and-multiply unitaries.<sup>11</sup>

The local CPTP maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are independent, physically separated maps, with uncorrelated inputs  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ . The local input is denoted by  $A_i$ , and the local outputs and environments are denoted by  $B_i$  and  $E_i$ , respectively. The remote output with respect to local map  $\mathcal{M}_i$ ,  $j \neq i$ , is referred to as  $B_j$ . The inputs can convey classical or quantum information, both the same type. A local map  $\mathcal{M}_i$  can be decomposed into the local logical channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}$ , which exists between the input  $A_i$  and the output  $B_i$ , and the local complementary channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i E_i}$ , which connects the input  $A_i$  with the local environment state  $E_i$ . Both  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i E_i}$  are qubit maps. In particular, for modeling purposes, we also introduce a  $C$  qubit state, which identifies the realizations of the two local maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  by qubit states  $C \in \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ .

Let  $p = \frac{1}{2}$  be the probability of each map. Assuming a fixed causality, system  $C$  can be modeled as a  $d = 2$  dimensional system with density:

$$\rho_C = \frac{1}{2} (|0\rangle \langle 0| + |1\rangle \langle 1|). \quad (1)$$

If the causality is nonfixed between the two local maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , then  $C$  can be characterized by the superposition qubit state  $C = |+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ , leading to the density

$$\rho_C = \frac{1}{2} (|0\rangle \langle 0| + |0\rangle \langle 1| + |1\rangle \langle 0| + |1\rangle \langle 1|). \quad (2)$$

Our investigation here is that the quantum gravity environment  $\mathcal{G}_E$ , which models the space-time geometry (Theorem 3 will reveal that the local environment states also must be qubit states), does exactly the same controlling mechanism as a superposition qubit state  $C = |+\rangle$ . However, there is a fundamental difference between systems  $C$  and  $\mathcal{G}_E$ . Although  $C$  can be modeled by as a separable qubit state, in the quantum gravity setting,  $\mathcal{G}_E$  is a subsystem of an entangled tripartite system  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j}$ , where the quantum gravity environment  $\mathcal{G}_E$  is entangled with the two-qubit system  $E_i B_j$  via partition  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_i B_j$ , that is, the system  $\mathcal{G}_E$  is nonseparable from  $E_i B_j$ . This injects a fundamental difference between our model and that studied by Chiribella et al<sup>11</sup> because, in our model, the simultaneous realizations of the local maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are a consequence of the entangled tripartite qubit system  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j}$  and a dedicated qubit superposition control system  $C$  does not exist.

However, the control state formalism  $C = |+\rangle$  still can be utilized to model the vanishing causality of the  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  local maps in our model, as it will be shown in Section 4.

Specifically, taking the Kraus operators of the local channels  $\mathcal{N}_{A_1 E_1}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_2}$  of maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$

$$\mathcal{N}_{A_1 E_1}(\rho) = \sum_i A_i^{A_1 E_1} \rho(A_i^{A_1 E_1})^\dagger, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_2}(\rho) = \sum_j A_j^{A_2 B_2} \rho(A_j^{A_2 B_2})^\dagger, \quad (4)$$

a CPTP map,  $\mathcal{M}_G$ , can be introduced that describes the parallel realizations of the local channels  $\mathcal{N}_{A_1 E_1}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_2}$ . This map is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_G(\rho) = \sum_{i,j} A_i^G \rho(A_i^G)^\dagger, \quad (5)$$

where the Kraus operator  $A_i^{\mathcal{G}}$  is expressed as

$$A_i^{\mathcal{G}} = |0\rangle \left\langle 0 \otimes A_i^{A_1 E_1} \otimes A_j^{A_2 B_2} + 1 \right\rangle \langle 1| \otimes A_j^{A_2 B_2} \otimes A_i^{A_1 E_1}. \quad (6)$$

The local environment state and remote outputs  $E_1$  and  $B_2$  of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are entangled with the quantum gravity environment state  $\mathcal{G}_E$ , formulating a mixed tripartite entangled qubit system  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2}$ , in which  $E_1$  is separable from  $\mathcal{G}_E B_2$ ,  $B_2$  is separable from  $\mathcal{G}_E E_1$ , and  $\mathcal{G}_E$  is entangled with  $E_1 B_2$ . Together with the local environment  $E_2$  and remote output  $B_1$ , systems  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2}$  and  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_2 B_1}$  formulate the density matrix

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} \rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2} + \frac{1}{2} \rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_2 B_1}. \quad (7)$$

Focusing on the tripartite system  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2}$  throughout, the following conditions hold for the partitions  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_1 B_2$ ,  $E_1 - \mathcal{G}_E B_2$ , and  $B_2 - \mathcal{G}_E E_1$  (see also the work of Gyongyosi and Imre<sup>80</sup> and the references within for further details).

Because the local subsystems  $E_1$  and  $B_2$  are separable from the partitions  $\mathcal{G}_E B_2$  and  $\mathcal{G}_E E_1$ , in this tripartite system, only the quantum gravity environment  $\mathcal{G}_E$  can be entangled with  $E_1 B_2$ , and all other partitions are separable with respect to  $E_1$  and  $B_2$ . From these, it clearly follows that the partitions  $E_1 - \mathcal{G}_E B_2$  and  $B_2 - \mathcal{G}_E E_1$  are separable, and  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_1 B_2$  is entangled.<sup>80</sup>

Without loss of generality, we define a tripartite qubit state that simultaneously satisfies these conditions as

$$\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2} = \Omega \cdot \xi + (1 - \Omega) \chi, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\Omega \leq \frac{1}{3}. \quad (9)$$

We further evaluate  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2}$  in (8) as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2} = & \frac{1}{2} \Omega (|000\rangle \langle 000| + |110\rangle \langle 110|) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega \right) \left( \begin{array}{l} |000\rangle \langle 110| + |110\rangle \langle 000| + |001\rangle \langle 001| \\ + |011\rangle \langle 011| + |101\rangle \langle 101| + |111\rangle \langle 111| \end{array} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where subsystem  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$  is a separable Bell diagonal state, which can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1} = & \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \Omega \right) (|00\rangle \langle 00| + |11\rangle \langle 11|) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega \right) (|00\rangle \langle 11| + |11\rangle \langle 00|) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega \right) (|01\rangle \langle 01| + |10\rangle \langle 10|). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The density matrix in (10) can be rewritten as

$$\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \Omega & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Omega & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

whereas  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$  can be expressed in as

$$\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\Omega & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\Omega \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

These will be referred via the partitions  $\mathcal{G}_E E_1$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_E B_2$ , and  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_1 B_2$  of  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2}$ , respectively. In particular, for  $\Omega \leq \frac{1}{3}$ , the subsystems  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$ ,  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E B_2}$ , and  $\rho_{E_1 B_2}$  remain separable, while  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E}$  is entangled with  $\rho_{E_1 B_2}$ ; thus, it straightforwardly follows that the system of (10) can be used in the remaining part of the proof.

The separability conditions can be checked by taking the partial transposes  $(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})^{T_{\mathcal{G}_E}}$ ,  $(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})^{T_{E_1}}$ ,  $(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2})^{T_{E_1}}$ , and  $(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2})^{T_{B_2}}$  of  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2}$ .

The positivity of  $(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})^{T_{\mathcal{G}_E}}$  and  $(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})^{T_{E_1}}$  trivially follows from (13) because  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$  is a separable Bell diagonal state.

In particular, we will show the partial transpose of  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2}$  with respect to  $B_2$ , which can be expressed as follows:

$$(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2})^{T_{B_2}} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \Omega & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Omega & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

This partial transpose is nonnegative; hence,

$$(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2})^{T_{B_2}} \geq 0, \quad (15)$$

and similarly, with respect to  $E_1$ ,

$$(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2})^{T_{E_1}} \geq 0. \quad (16)$$

Tracing out  $B_2$  from  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2}$ , one can check easily that the partial transpose of the resulting matrix  $\text{Tr}_{B_2}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2})$  with respect to  $\mathcal{G}_E$  and  $E_2$  is positive because  $(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})^{T_{\mathcal{G}_E}} \geq 0$ , and  $(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})^{T_{E_1}} \geq 0$ .

Specifically, the partial transpose of  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2}$  with respect to  $\mathcal{G}_E$  is negative; hence,

$$(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2})^{T_{\mathcal{G}_E}} < 0, \quad (17)$$

which immediately proves that the quantum gravity environment  $\mathcal{G}_E$  (the space-time geometry) is entangled with  $E_1 B_2$ .


The entangled structure of quantum gravity environment  $\mathcal{G}_E$  is depicted in Figure 1. The information transmission is realized through the partition  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_i B_j$ .  $\square$

From the map  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}}$  of (5), it follows that the entangled structure of the density  $\rho$  leads to a nonfixed causality between the local maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . The proof is concluded here.

Note that the strength of the correlation of the local environment state  $E_i$  and the remote output  $B_j$ ,  $i \neq j$ , can be characterized by the amount of information that is transferred through partitions  $\mathcal{G}_E E_1$  and  $\mathcal{G}_E E_2$ . These questions, along with the information transmission capabilities of the quantum gravity environment, will be revealed in the following.

**Theorem 2** (The information resource pool property of quantum gravity). *Quantum gravity acts as a background noise in form of a noisy CPTP map  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  on the local environment state  $E_i$ , which allows the parties to simulate the remote output  $B_j$  as  $B_j = E_i \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  with probability  $p > \frac{1}{2}$ . The quantum gravity environment is an information resource pool for the local parties.*

**FIGURE 1** The density matrix  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2} + \frac{1}{2}\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_2 B_1}$ . The local environment state  $E_i$  and the remote output  $B_j$  of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are entangled with the quantum gravity environment state  $\mathcal{G}_E$ , via the partition  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_i B_j$ . The entanglement between the local environments and the quantum gravity environment (or space-time geometry) allows the parties to simulate locally the remote outputs from their local environment (the wavy lines illustrate the entanglement; the arrow refers to the direction of the information flow)



*Proof.* Theorem 1 has revealed that, in the quantum gravity space, the local environment  $E_i$  and the remote output  $B_j$  of the local maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  together with the quantum gravity environment  $\mathcal{G}_E$  formulate an entangled tripartite qubit structure. We step forward from this point and show that the entangled  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_i B_j$  structure allows the local parties to simulate the remote output  $B_j$  from the local environment  $E_j$  with probability  $p > \frac{1}{2}$ , above the classical limit  $p = \frac{1}{2}$  (ie, a coin tossing), which is precisely the case in a fixed causality structure where the local parties are independent.<sup>10</sup>

The quantum gravity setting allows the parties with a probability  $p$  to simulate the remote output from the local environment state through the local degrading map, in which the degrading map is a consequence of the quantum gravity environment. The remote output locally will be simulated from the local environment  $E_i$  via the local CPTP map  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$ , the process of which is called *remote simulation*. It means that Alice can simulate  $B_2$  from her local environment state  $E_1$  as  $B_2 = E_1 \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_1 \rightarrow B_2}$  and vice versa, and Bob can simulate Alice's output  $B_1$  as  $B_1 = E_2 \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_2 \rightarrow B_1}$  (note that the notation  $\circ$  stands for the simulation, and the local degrading map  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  will be used in the right-hand side in the equations throughout).

However, in the quantum gravity scenario, the information transmission through the partitions cannot be described by an ideal (ie, noiseless) map; thus, the local degrading map  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  can be applied only with success probability  $p$ . Thus, the remote simulation is a probabilistic process. If the  $I$  identity map is realized on  $E_i$ , then the remote simulation is not possible from  $E_i$ . This outcome has probability  $1 - p$ .

In particular, the probabilistic remote simulation process can be characterized by a CPTP map  $\mathcal{M}_D$ , defined as

$$\mathcal{M}_D = p\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j} + (1 - p)I, \quad (18)$$

and the output of this map is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} B'_j &= E_i \circ \mathcal{M}_D \\ &= E_i \circ (p\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j} + (1 - p)I) \\ &= pB_j + (1 - p)E_i. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

It is trivial that if the parties have no information about each other, then the remote output  $B_j$  can be simulated from the local environment  $E_i$  only with probability  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ ; hence,

$$\mathcal{M}_D = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j} + I) \quad (20)$$

and

$$B'_j = \frac{1}{2}(B_j + E_i). \quad (21)$$

This is precisely the case in a standard scenario, where the quantum gravity effects are not present. The situation changes if we step into the quantum gravity space, which leads to success probability  $p > \frac{1}{2}$ . To see it, we demonstrate this statement by assuming a case when both local CPTP maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are the so-called entanglement-breaking channels.

The Kraus representation of the  $\mathcal{M}_1$  entanglement-breaking channel is evaluated as

$$\mathcal{M}_1(\rho_{AA'}) = I(\rho_A) \otimes \mathcal{M}_1(\rho_{A'}) = \sum_i N_i^{(A')} \rho_{AA'} N_i^{(A')\dagger}, \quad (22)$$

where  $\rho_{AA'}$  refers to an entangled input system, and

$$N_i^{(A')} = I_A \otimes |\xi_i\rangle_{A''}\langle\varsigma|_{A'}, \quad (23)$$

where  $A'$  and  $A''$  refer to the input and output systems and the Kraus-operators  $N_i^{(A')}$  are the unit rank. The sets  $\{|\xi_i\rangle_{A''}\}$  and  $\{|\varsigma\rangle_{A'}\}$  each do not necessarily form an orthonormal set.

Thus, for an entangled input  $A'_i$  of an entanglement-breaking channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}$ , it will destroy every entanglement on its local output  $B_i$ . Assuming a maximally entangled input system  $|\Psi\rangle_{AA'} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |i\rangle_A |i\rangle_{A'}$ , the output of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  can be expressed as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_1(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{AA'}) = \sum_x p_X(x) \rho_x^A \otimes \rho_x^B, \quad (24)$$

where  $p_X(x)$  represents an arbitrary probability distribution, and  $\rho_x^A$  and  $\rho_x^B$  are the separable density matrices of the output system. The logical channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}$  performs a complete von Neumann measurement on its input system  $\rho$  and outputs  $\sigma = \mathcal{N}_{EB}(\rho)$ ; hence,  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}$  is expressed as

$$\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}(\rho) = \sum_x \text{Tr}\{\Pi_x \rho\} \sigma_x, \quad (25)$$

where  $\{\Pi_x\}$  represents a positive operator valued measure (POVM) on  $\rho$  and  $\sigma_x$  is the output density matrix of the channel.<sup>35</sup> The local  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}$  further can be decomposed into the CPTP map  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}^1$ , a measurement operator  $\{\Pi_x\}$ , and a second map  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}^2$ , which outputs the density matrix  $\sigma_x$ , together called *conditional state preparation*:

$$\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i} = \mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}^1 \circ \Pi \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}^2, \quad (26)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}^1 = I$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}^2 = I$ .

Introducing the notation  $\Pi^X$  for the  $X$ -basis, where  $X$  refers to the Pauli operator  $X$ , and  $\Pi^Z$  for the  $Z$ -basis, where  $Z$  refers to the Pauli operator  $Z$ , let the local  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_i}$  channels be defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{N}_{A_1 B_1} = I \circ \Pi_1 \circ I, \quad (27)$$

where

$$\Pi_1 = \frac{1}{2}\Pi^X + \frac{1}{2}\Pi^Z, \quad (28)$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_2} = I \circ \Pi_2 \circ I, \quad (29)$$

where

$$\Pi_2 = \Pi^Z. \quad (30)$$

Let the local  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  maps of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  be defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}^{E_1 \rightarrow B_2} = \Pi^Z \quad (31)$$

And

$$\mathcal{D}^{E_2 \rightarrow B_1} = \Pi^Z. \quad (32)$$

Thus, each  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  performs a projective measurement in the  $Z$ -basis on the local environment state  $E_i$ .



Using (31) and (32) along with the local channels  $\mathcal{N}_{A_1E_1}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{A_2E_2}$ , the remote outputs  $B_2$  and  $B_1$  are evaluated as

$$B_2 = \mathcal{N}_{A_1E_1} \circ \Pi^Z \quad (33)$$

and

$$B_1 = \mathcal{N}_{A_2E_2} \circ \Pi^Z. \quad (34)$$

For this setting, the state of  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j}$  is evaluated as follows:

$$\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j} = \begin{cases} \rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_2 B_1}, & \text{if } \Pi_1 = \Pi^X \\ \rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2}, & \text{if } \Pi_1 = \Pi^Z \end{cases}. \quad (35)$$

Thus, if  $\Pi_1 = \Pi^X$ , then Bob simulates Alice's output from his local environment  $E_2$  through the partition  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_2 B_1$  as  $B_1 = \mathcal{N}_{A_2E_2} \circ \Pi^Z$ , whereas for  $\Pi_1 = \Pi^Z$ , Alice simulates Bob's output from  $E_1$  via  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_1 B_2$  as  $B_2 = \mathcal{N}_{A_1E_1} \circ \Pi^Z$ .

The action of (27) to (32) can be rephrased by the process matrix formalism of Oreshkov et al<sup>10</sup> as follows. The process matrix  $W^{B_1E_1B_2E_2}$  that describes the causality relations of the local maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  of  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j}$  in the quantum gravity scenario can be expressed as

$$W^{B_1E_1B_2E_2} = \frac{1}{4} \left( I^{B_1E_1B_2E_2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (Z^{E_1} X^{A_1} Z^{A_2} + Z^{E_2} Z^{A_1}) \right). \quad (36)$$

By applying the proof of Appendix E from the work of Oreshkov et al<sup>10</sup> immediately yields that this process matrix identifies a causally nonseparable process; and, the  $p = \frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{4}$  success probability for the realization of the local degrading map  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  also straightforwardly follows for  $W^{B_1E_1B_2E_2}$ .

From these arguments, the main conclusion regarding the information resource pool property of the quantum gravity environment can be derived. In the quantum gravity setting, the local map  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  can be realized with probability  $p = \frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{4}$ ; hence, the local map  $\mathcal{M}_D$  from (20) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{M}_D = \frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{4} \mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j} + \left( 1 - \frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{4} \right) I \quad (37)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B'_j &= E_i \circ \mathcal{M}_D \\ &= E_i \circ \left( \frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{4} \mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j} + \left( 1 - \frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{4} \right) I \right) \\ &= \frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{4} B_j + \left( 1 - \frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{4} \right) E_i. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$


Thus, from the local environment  $E_i$ , the remote output  $B_j$  can be simulated via the local map  $\mathcal{M}_D$  as  $B_j = E_i \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  with probability  $p > \frac{1}{2}$ . In particular, the quantum gravity environment acts as a noisy map on the local environment state and behaves as an information resource pool for the local parties.

The model of remote simulation in the quantum gravity environment is summarized in Figure 2.

These results confirm that, in the quantum gravity setting, there exists local independent CPTP maps, for which the local environments can be used to simulate the remote outputs with success probability  $p > \frac{1}{2}$ . The quantum gravity environment, indeed, acts as an information resource pool for the local parties. The proof is concluded here.  $\square$

In Theorem 3, we reveal the structure of the quantum gravity channel that allows to model the quantum gravity space as an information transmission device between the  $E_i$  local environment and the remote output  $B_j$ .





**FIGURE 2** The information resource pool property of quantum gravity. The local CPTP maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are independent, physically separated maps; the inputs  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are uncorrelated variables conveying classical or quantum information; and  $\mathcal{D}^{E_1 \rightarrow B_2}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^{E_2 \rightarrow B_1}$  are local CPTP maps (called local degrading maps or background noise of quantum gravity). The local outputs and environment states are referred to as  $B_i$  and  $E_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , respectively. The quantum gravity setting allows the parties with a probability of  $p > \frac{1}{2}$  to simulate the remote output from the local environment state through the local degrading map  $\mathcal{D}^{E \rightarrow B}$ . Alice can simulate  $B_2$  from her local environment state  $E_1$  as  $B_2 = E_1 \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_1 \rightarrow B_2}$ , whereas Bob can simulate Alice's output  $B_1$  as  $B_1 = E_2 \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_2 \rightarrow B_1}$ . The quantum gravity acts as a noise on the local environments; thus, it behaves as an information resource pool for the local parties about the remote CPTP maps

**Theorem 3** (The structure of the quantum gravity channel). *The local CPTP maps  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_j}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, j \neq i$ , formulate the quantum gravity channel  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  with remote logical channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_j} = \mathcal{N}_{A_i E_i} \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  and local complementary channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i E_i}$ . The map  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  is antidegradable, with local input  $A_i$ , remote output  $B_j$ , and local environment state  $E_i$ .*

*Proof.* In Theorem 2, we have seen that by exploiting the extra resources of quantum gravity, Alice can simulate Bob's output with probability  $p > \frac{1}{2}$ , above the standard limit  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ . Here, we show that it leads to a well-defined channel structure—called the quantum gravity channel—between Alice and Bob. The causality structure of quantum gravity space-time geometry leads to an interesting configuration, namely, it brings alive a so-called remote simulation map, which acts locally at the parties, on their local environment states.

The quantum gravity channel is referred by the CPTP map  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$ . The dimension of the local input  $A_i$  of  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  is denoted by  $d_{A_i}$ , and the dimensions of the local environment  $E_i$  and the remote output  $B_j$  are referred to as  $d_{E_i}$  and  $d_{B_j}$ . The map  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  is decomposed into a logical channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_j}$  that exists between the local input  $A_i$  and the remote output  $B_j$ , and into a local complementary channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i E_i}$ , which exists between the local input  $A_i$  and the local environment state  $E_i$ . The logical channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_j}$  is referred to as the remote logical channel of  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  throughout, and it has the decomposition of  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_j} = \mathcal{N}_{A_i E_i} \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$ ; thus, this channel could exist only with probability  $p$ .

Let us assume that the gravity channel  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  is an antidegradable qubit channel. Then, without loss of generality, the linear map of  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j} : M_2 \rightarrow M_2$  can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j} : \frac{1}{2} \left( I + \sum_l w_l \rho_l \right) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \left( I + \sum_k (t_k + \lambda_k w_k) \rho_k \right), \quad (39)$$

where  $t_k$  and  $\lambda_k$  formulate the matrix  $T_{\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}}$  as

$$T_{\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ t_3 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (40)$$

From (40),  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  can be rewritten as

$$\text{Tr} \rho_l \mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j} (\rho_k). \quad (41)$$

For the input dimension  $d_A$  of the qubit gravity channel  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  with local environment dimension  $d_{E_i} = 2$ , a required condition on  $d_{A_i}$  immediately follows from Theorem 4 of Cubitt et al.<sup>35</sup> namely,  $d_{A_i} \leq 3$ . If  $d_{A_i} = 2$ , then the remote output  $B_j$  can be simulated from the local environment  $E_i$ ,  $i \neq j$ , because the complementary channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i E_i}$  of  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  is degradable, whereas if  $d_{A_i} = 3$ , then  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i E_i}$  is both degradable and antidegradable.

Furthermore, because  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  is a qubit channel, for the dimension  $d_{B_j}$  of the remote output, the relation  $d_{B_j} = 2$  trivially follows. The condition  $d_{E_i} = 2$  on the Choi rank is satisfied only if

$$(\lambda_1 \pm \lambda_2)^2 = (1 \pm \lambda_3)^2 - t_3^2, \quad (42)$$

and

$$\lambda_3 = \lambda_1 \lambda_2, \quad (43)$$

$$t_3^2 = (1 - \lambda_1^2)(1 - \lambda_2^2), \quad (44)$$

where  $|\lambda_i| \leq 1$ .

Introducing  $u = v = \cos^{-1}(\lambda_1)$ , the matrix in (40) can be rewritten as

$$T_{\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos u & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos v & 0 \\ \sin u \sin v & 0 & 0 & \cos u \cos v \end{pmatrix}, \quad (45)$$

where the antidegradability of the qubit gravity channel  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  implies that

$$\sin u > \cos v, \quad (46)$$

which also follows from Theorem 5 of Cubitt et al.<sup>35</sup> The Kraus representation of  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  is  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}(\rho) = A_+ \rho A_+^\dagger + A_- \rho A_-^\dagger$ , where

$$A_+ = \cos \frac{1}{2} v \cos \frac{1}{2} u I + \sin \frac{1}{2} v \sin \frac{1}{2} u Z = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{1}{2} (v - u) & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \frac{1}{2} (u + v) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (47)$$


and

$$A_- = \sin \frac{1}{2} v \cos \frac{1}{2} u X - i \cos \frac{1}{2} v \sin \frac{1}{2} u Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sin \frac{1}{2} (v - u) \\ \sin \frac{1}{2} (u + v) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

where  $X$ ,  $Y$ , and  $Z$  are the Pauli operators. One can get the condition  $|\sin v| \geq |\cos u|$ , which is analogous to (46), however, in a slightly different form.

The structure of the quantum gravity channel  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  is summarized in Figure 3.

Assume that there are two local maps,  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , in the system, with remote logical channels  $\mathcal{N}_{A_1 B_2}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_1}$ .



**FIGURE 3** The quantum gravity channel  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  with remote logical channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_j}$  and local complementary channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A_i E_i}$ . The input of the channel is  $A_i$ , and the output is  $B_j$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $i \neq j$ . The  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  remote output channel exists with probability  $p > \frac{1}{2}$ , and  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  is an antidegradable map; thus, from the local environment state  $E_i$ , the remote output  $B_j$  can be locally simulated by  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$ . In  $\mathcal{M}_D = p\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j} + (1 - p)I$ , the map  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  performs the so-called remote simulation

Taking the superset  $S$  of these gravity channels, the result is a convex set because  $S$  formulates a supergravity channel as

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}_{A_1 B_2} \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_F + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_1} \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|_F, \quad (49)$$

with complementary channel

$$S^C = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}_{A_1 E_1} \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_G + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}_{A_2 E_2} \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|_G, \quad (50)$$

where  $F$  and  $G$  are elements of the Stinespring representation.

From the set  $\{A_k^i\}_k$  of Kraus operators of the remote simulation map  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$ , that is,  $\mathcal{D}^{E_1 \rightarrow B_2}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^{E_2 \rightarrow B_1}$ , operator  $A_i$  of  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  is as follows:

$$A_i = A_k^0 \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0| + A_k^1 \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|. \quad (51)$$

Applying  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$  on  $S^C$  results in

$$\begin{aligned} S^C \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j} &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{N}_{A_1 E_1} \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_1 \rightarrow B_2}) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_G + \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{N}_{A_2 E_2} \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_2 \rightarrow B_1}) \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|_G \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}_{A_1 B_2} \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_F + \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_1}) \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|_F \\ &= S. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Using lemma 17 from the work of Cubitt et al,<sup>35</sup> one can readily see that the super gravity channel  $S$  is antidegradable because applying  $\text{Tr}_F$  on (52) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_F (S^C \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}) &= \text{Tr}_F (S) \\ &= \text{Tr}_F \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}_{A_1 B_2} \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_F + \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_1}) \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|_F \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}_{A_1 B_2} + \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_1}). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

These results conclude that the quantum gravity channel  $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$  is antidegradable and allows the parties to perform the remote simulation of outputs  $B_j$  from the local environment state  $E_i$  by utilizing the map  $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$ . This degrading map arises from the extra informational resource pool property of quantum gravity, and the realization of this map is trivially not possible with probability  $p > \frac{1}{2}$  in the standard scenario, where the causality is fixed and nonvanishing.  $\square$

### 3 | INFORMATION TRANSFER OF QUANTUM GRAVITY

**Theorem 4** (Information transfer of quantum gravity). *The quantum gravity environment allows the transfer of classical and quantum information between the local maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . The information flow is realized through the quantum gravity environment via the partition  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_i B_j$  of the tripartite system  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j}$ .*

*Proof.* The correlation measure can be settled between subsystems  $\mathcal{G}_E E_i$  and  $\mathcal{G}_E B_j$ . For simplicity, we will use  $\mathcal{G}_E E_1$  throughout to characterize exactly the information transmission between the local environment states and the quantum gravity environment state. We derive various correlation measures for the output system  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$ .

Specifically, in this special quantum gravity communication scenario, Alice and Bob cannot transmit directly to each other any information. Instead of a direct signaling, the degraded local environment  $B'_2 = E_1 \circ \mathcal{M}_D$  (see (18)), and the remote output  $B_2$  will characterize the correlation between Alice and Bob's maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , despite the fact that all correlations are transmitted via the entangled quantum gravity environment. Thus, in fact, the communication is realized through the quantum gravity environment  $\mathcal{G}_E$ , via  $\mathcal{G}_E E_i$  and  $\mathcal{G}_E B_j$ . The entangled Hilbert space  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_i B_j$ , in fact, acts as a communication channel.

Assuming the case that Alice simulates Bob's output, we introduce the CPTP map

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(B_2) &:= B'_2 \\ &= E_1 \circ \mathcal{M}_D \\ &= E_1 \circ (p\mathcal{D}^{E_1 \rightarrow B_2} + (1-p)I),\end{aligned}\tag{54}$$

which gets the remote output  $B_2$  as input and outputs Alice's noisy  $B'_2 = E_1 \circ \mathcal{M}_D$  (see (18) and Theorem 3). Thus, it is a noisy evolution on Bob's ideal  $B_2$  that results in  $B'_2$ . We step forward from the results of Theorem 3 to drive the information transmission capabilities of channel  $\mathcal{M}(B_2)$  by quantifying the amount of information that is conveyed by  $\mathcal{G}_E E_1$ , using the system defined in (8). Hence, the analysis will be made from Alice's viewpoint, via subsystem  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$ .

First, we rewrite the Bell-diagonal system  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$  from (13) as

$$\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1} = \frac{1}{4} \left( I \otimes I + \mathbf{r} \cdot \vec{\sigma} \otimes I + I \otimes \mathbf{s} \cdot \vec{\sigma} + \sum_{i=1}^3 c_i \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_i \right),\tag{55}$$

where  $\mathbf{r}$  and  $\mathbf{s}$  are the Bloch vectors,  $\vec{\sigma} = [\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z]$  with the Pauli matrices  $\sigma_i$ , and  $c_i$  is the real parameter  $-1 \leq c_i \leq 1$ <sup>45,80,81</sup>. For a Bell diagonal state  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{s} = 0$ . For  $\mathbf{r} = (0,0,r)$  and  $\mathbf{s} = (0,0,s)$ , the input state in (55) can be given in a matrix representation as follows:

$$\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1} = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 1+r+s+c_3 & 0 & 0 & c_1-c_2 \\ 0 & 1+r-s-c_3 & c_1+c_2 & 0 \\ 0 & c_1+c_2 & 1-r+s-c_3 & 0 \\ c_1-c_2 & 0 & 0 & 1-r-s+c_3 \end{pmatrix}.\tag{56}$$

The eigenvalues  $u_+, u_-, v_+, v_-$  of  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$  are defined as

$$v_+ = \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 - c_3 + \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (c_1+c_2)^2} \right) \geq 0,\tag{57}$$

$$v_- = \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 - c_3 - \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (c_1+c_2)^2} \right) \geq 0,\tag{58}$$

and

$$u_+ = \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 + c_3 + \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (c_1-c_2)^2} \right) \geq 0,\tag{59}$$

$$u_- = \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 + c_3 - \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (c_1-c_2)^2} \right) \geq 0.\tag{60}$$

From these eigenvalues, the  $-1 \leq c_i \leq 1$  parameters of  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$  can be expressed as

$$c_1 = (v_+ - v_-),\tag{61}$$

$$c_2 = -(v_+ - v_-),\tag{62}$$

and

$$c_3 = 1 - 2 \cdot (v_+ - v_-) = 1 + 2 \cdot c_2.\tag{63}$$

As one can readily check, for these parameters, the relations  $|c_1| + |c_2| + |c_3| \leq 1$  and  $\max \{v_+, v_-, u_+, u_-\} \leq \frac{1}{2}$  hold in (56). Some trivial steps then straightforwardly yields that  $\Omega$  can be expressed from the eigenvalues  $v_+, v_-$  as

$$\Omega = 1 - 2(v_+ - v_-),\tag{64}$$

from which the correlations in  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$  can be exactly determined in function of  $\Omega$ .

The  $I(\rho_{G_E E_1})$  mutual information function measures the total correlation in  $\rho_{G_E E_1}$ . The mutual information function of  $\rho_{G_E E_1}$  can be expressed as follows:

$$I(\rho_{G_E E_1}) = S(\rho_{G_E}) + S(\rho_{E_1}) - S(\rho_{G_E E_1}). \quad (65)$$

Using the eigenvalues of  $\rho_{G_E E_1}$ ,  $I(\rho_{G_E E_1})$  can be rewritten as

$$I(\rho_{G_E E_1}) = S(\rho_{G_E}) + S(\rho_{E_1}) + u_+ \log_2 u_+ + u_- \log_2 u_- + v_+ \log_2 v_+ + v_- \log_2 v_-, \quad (66)$$

where  $S(\cdot)$  is the von Neumann entropy<sup>45</sup> and

$$S(\rho_{G_E}) = 1 - \frac{1}{2}(1-r) \log_2(1-r) - \frac{1}{2}(1+r) \log_2(1+r), \quad (67)$$

$$S(\rho_{E_1}) = 1 - \frac{1}{2}(1-s) \log_2(1-s) - \frac{1}{2}(1+s) \log_2(1+s). \quad (68)$$

The amount of purely classical correlation  $C(\rho_{G_E E_1})$  in  $\rho_{G_E E_1}$  can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} C(\rho_{G_E E_1}) &= S(\rho_{E_1}) - \tilde{S}(E_1 | G_E) \\ &= S(\rho_{E_1}) - \min_{E_k} \sum_k p_k S(\sigma_{E_1|k}), \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where  $\rho_{E_1|k} = \frac{\langle k | \rho_{G_E E_1} | k \rangle}{\langle k | \rho_{G_E} | k \rangle}$  is the postmeasurement state of  $\rho_{E_1}$ , the probability of result  $k$  is  $p_k = d \langle k | \rho_{G_E} | k \rangle$ ,  $d = 2$  is the dimension of system  $\rho_{G_E}$ , and  $q_k$  makes up a normalized probability distribution in the rank-one POVM elements  $E_k = q_k |k\rangle \langle k|$ .

The purely classical correlation can also be expressed by the following formula:

$$C(\rho_{G_E E_1}) = S(\rho_{G_E}) - \min \{f_1, f_2, f_3\}, \quad (70)$$


where the functions  $f_1, f_2$ , and  $f_3$  are defined as follows<sup>45,80,81</sup>:

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= -\frac{1}{4}(1+r+s+c_3) \log_2 \frac{1}{2(1+s)} (1+r+s+c_3) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}(1-r+s-c_3) \log_2 \frac{1}{2(1+s)} (1-r+s-c_3) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}(1+r-s-c_3) \log_2 \frac{1}{2(1+s)} (1+r-s-c_3) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}(1-r-s+c_3) \log_2 \frac{1}{2(1+s)} (1-r-s+c_3), \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

$$f_2 = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{r+c_1^2} \right) \log_2 \left( 1 - \sqrt{r+c_1^2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \sqrt{r+c_1^2} \right) \log_2 \left( 1 + \sqrt{r+c_1^2} \right), \quad (72)$$

and

$$f_3 = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{r+c_2^2} \right) \log_2 \left( 1 - \sqrt{r+c_2^2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \sqrt{r+c_2^2} \right) \log_2 \left( 1 + \sqrt{r+c_2^2} \right). \quad (73)$$



**FIGURE 4** The correlation measures between the quantum gravity environment  $\mathcal{G}_E$  and the local environment  $E_1$ , evaluated on  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$ , in function of  $\Omega$ ,  $\Omega \leq 1/3$ . As  $\Omega$  increases, the quantum influences become stronger, and the coherent information strongly increases (the coherent information is shown in the absolute value)

As follows, the  $C(\mathcal{M}(B_2))$  classical capacity of channel  $\mathcal{M}(B_2)$  is

$$C(\mathcal{M}(B_2)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}} I(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}). \quad (74)$$

From the mutual information  $I(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})$  and the classical correlation  $\mathcal{C}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})$ , the  $\mathcal{D}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})$  quantum discord<sup>45</sup> is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) &= I(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) - \mathcal{C}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) \\ &= S(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E}) + S(\rho_{E_1}) + u_+ \log_2 u_+ + u_- \log_2 u_- + v_+ \log_2 v_+ + v_- \log_2 v_- \\ &\quad - (S(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E}) - \min\{f_1, f_2, f_3\}) \\ &= S(\rho_{E_1}) + u_+ \log_2 u_+ + u_- \log_2 u_- + v_+ \log_2 v_+ + v_- \log_2 v_- + \min\{f_1, f_2, f_3\}. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

The  $I_{coh}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})$  coherent information of  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$  can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} I_{coh}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) &= \mathcal{D}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) + \mathcal{C}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) - 1 \\ &= I(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) - \mathcal{C}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) + \mathcal{C}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) - 1 \\ &= I(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) - 1 \\ &= S(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E}) + S(\rho_{E_1}) + u_+ \log_2 u_+ + u_- \log_2 u_- + v_+ \log_2 v_+ + v_- \log_2 v_- - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

The  $Q(\mathcal{M}(B_2))$  quantum capacity of  $\mathcal{M}(B_2)$  can be given as the maximization of the coherent information  $I_{coh}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})$  of  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\mathcal{M}(B_2)) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}} I_{coh}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}} (\mathcal{D}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) + \mathcal{C}(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) - 1) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}} (I(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}) - 1) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}} \left( S(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E}) + S(\rho_{E_1}) + u_+ \log_2 u_+ + u_- \log_2 u_- + v_+ \log_2 v_+ + v_- \log_2 v_- - 1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Because  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$  is a Bell diagonal state with  $r = s = 0$  and  $S(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E}) = S(\rho_{E_1}) = 1$ ,  $Q(\mathcal{M}(B_2))$  is simplified to

$$Q(\mathcal{M}(B_2)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}} (1 - S(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1})). \quad (78)$$

The results of the correlation measure analysis are summarized in Figure 4.

The quantum gravity environment allows the transfer of classical and quantum information through the entangled partition  $\mathcal{G}_E - E_i B_j$  of  $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j}$ , which concludes that the local maps  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  can extract classical and quantum information from the quantum gravity environment.  $\square$

#### 4 | STIMULATED STORAGE IN QUANTUM GRAVITY MEMORIES

The quantum gravity scenario allows us to build quantum memories with a nonfixed causality. In this section, we propose an example for this statement. Our quantum gravity memory is a quantum set/reset (SR) latch, built from a pair of cross-coupled Toffoli-NOR quantum gates.

In classical computer architectures, the SR latch (flip-flop or bistable multivibrator) is one of the most basic and fundamental storage elements and building blocks of digital electronics devices. An SR latch consists of two cross-coupled NOR gates for the storing of one-bit information, and it operates with two stable states. The SR latch has two control inputs and two signal inputs, which are the back-looped outputs of the neighboring NOR gate (called *cross coupling*). The output of the classical SR latch is controlled by the  $S$  and  $R$  inputs, which allows only one stable output realization,  $Q$ , or its complement,  $\bar{Q}$ . The state transitions of the cross-coupling structure have a fixed causal structure in a classical SR latch.

In particular, in a quantum gravity SR latch, both output realizations are simultaneously allowed as stable state, which makes possible the stimulated storage of a qubit entanglement  $|\varphi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|Q\bar{Q}\rangle + |\bar{Q}Q\rangle)$ , utilizing the elements of the standard basis  $|A_i\rangle \in \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  as inputs. The proposed quantum gravity SR latch exploits the information resource pool property (see Theorem 2) of the quantum gravity space to preserve the entanglement.

The  $C_{\text{Toff}}^{\text{NOR}}$  Toffoli-NOR qubit gate with control qubit inputs  $x$  and  $y$  and a target qubit  $z$  can be defined as

$$C_{\text{Toff}}^{\text{NOR}} = G(x, y, z) = z \oplus (\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y}), \quad (79)$$

where  $G(\cdot)$  refers to gate, and  $\oplus$  stands for the XOR operation.

The  $C_{\text{Toff}}^{\text{NOR}}$  quantum circuit can be characterized by the density

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{Toff}}^{\text{NOR}} = & |000\rangle \langle 001| + |001\rangle \langle 000| + |010\rangle \langle 010| + |011\rangle \langle 011| \\ & + |100\rangle \langle 100| + |101\rangle \langle 101| + |110\rangle \langle 110| + |111\rangle \langle 111|. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

The  $C_{\text{Toff}}^{\text{NOR}}$  structure can be decomposed into  $NOT : a \rightarrow \bar{a}$ ,  $CNOT : (a, b) \rightarrow (a, a \oplus b)$ , and  $\sqrt{X}$  and  $\sqrt{X}^\dagger$  transformations, where


$$\sqrt{X} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1+i & 1-i \\ 1-i & 1+i \end{pmatrix}, \quad (81)$$

and

$$\sqrt{X}^\dagger = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1-i & 1+i \\ 1+i & 1-i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (82)$$

The  $C_{\text{Toff}}^{\text{NOR}}$  Toffoli-NOR quantum circuit is shown in Figure 5.

The truth table of the  $C_{\text{Toff}}^{\text{NOR}}$  gate is shown in Table 1.



**FIGURE 5** The Toffoli-NOR qubit gate. The gate has two control qubit inputs  $x$  and  $y$  and a target qubit  $z$ , which is initialized in  $|0\rangle$

$x$	$y$	$z$	$\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y}$	$z \oplus (\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y})$
0	0	0	1	1
0	1	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0

**TABLE 1** The truth table of the Toffoli-NOR qubit gate



The  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{SR}}$  quantum gravity SR latch memory consists of two cross-coupled  $C_{\text{Toff}}^{\text{NOR}}$  circuits, referred by the local maps  $\mathcal{M}_S$  and  $\mathcal{M}_R$  and defined by the following map:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{SR}}(\rho) = \sum_{i,j} A_i^{\text{SR}} \rho (A_i^{\text{SR}})^\dagger, \quad (83)$$

where  $S \in \{0,1\}$ ,  $R \in \{0,1\}$ . The map of  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{SR}}$  describes the parallel realizations of the local maps  $\mathcal{M}_S$  and  $\mathcal{M}_R$ .

The Kraus operator  $A_i^{\text{SR}}$  of (83) is expressed as

$$A_i^{\text{SR}} = |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes A_i^{A_1 Q} \otimes A_j^{A_2 \bar{Q}} + |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes A_j^{A_2 \bar{Q}} \otimes A_i^{A_1 Q}, \quad (84)$$

where  $A_i \in \{0,1\}$  is the local input,  $Q \in \{0,1\}$  is the output  $\mathcal{M}_R$ ,  $\bar{Q} \in \{0,1\}$  is the output  $\mathcal{M}_S$ , and the Kraus operators of  $\mathcal{M}_S$  and  $\mathcal{M}_R$  are

$$\mathcal{M}_S(\rho) = \sum_i A_i^{A_2 \bar{Q}} \rho (A_i^{A_2 \bar{Q}})^\dagger, \quad (85)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_R(\rho) = \sum_j A_j^{A_1 Q} \rho (A_j^{A_1 Q})^\dagger. \quad (86)$$

The control inputs  $S$  and  $R$  of  $\mathcal{M}_S$  and  $\mathcal{M}_R$  are entangled with the quantum gravity environment state  $\mathcal{G}_E$ . In the quantum gravity SR latch, input  $R$  is separable from  $\mathcal{G}_E S$ , and input  $S$  is separable from  $\mathcal{G}_E R$ ; however,  $\mathcal{G}_E$  is entangled with  $SR$ , formulating the tripartite system (see Theorem 1)

$$\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E RS} = \kappa \cdot \xi + (1 - \kappa) \chi, \quad (87)$$

where  $\kappa \leq \frac{1}{3}$ , following the structure of (10).

The main contribution of the  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{SR}}$  quantum gravity SR latch is that the nonfixed causality of the  $\mathcal{G}_E$  quantum gravity structure leads to the simultaneous realizations of the  $Q$  and  $\bar{Q}$  outputs, which can be used as the stimulation and storage of qubit entanglement, utilizing the resource pool property of quantum gravity (see Theorem 2).

The active  $S$  and  $R$  control commands are

$$|S\rangle : |Q\rangle = |1\rangle, \left| \bar{Q} \right\rangle = |0\rangle \quad (88)$$

and

$$|R\rangle : |Q\rangle = |0\rangle, \left| \bar{Q} \right\rangle = |1\rangle, \quad (89)$$

and in terms of the control state formalism, the realizations of the local maps is  $C = |0\rangle : |\bar{S}\bar{R}\rangle$  and  $C = |1\rangle : |\bar{S}R\rangle$ .


The truth table of the  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{SR}}$  quantum-gravity SR latch is shown in Table 2.

Initializing the circuit in  $|A_1\rangle = |0\rangle, |A_2\rangle = |0\rangle$  and by the control state (see (2))  $|C\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ , one obtains

$$|C\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \left| \bar{S}\bar{R} \right\rangle + \left| \bar{S}R \right\rangle \right). \quad (90)$$

**TABLE 2** The truth table of the quantum-gravity set/reset latch

$C$	$S$	$R$	$Q$	$\bar{Q}$
0	1	0	1	0
1	0	1	0	1



**FIGURE 6** Stimulated storage via the  $\mathcal{M}_{SR}$  quantum gravity set/reset latch memory. The  $S$  and  $R$  inputs are controlled by the quantum gravity environment, formulating the tripartite system  $\rho_{G_E RS}$  with entangled partition  $\mathcal{G}_E - RS$ . The nonfixed causality of the quantum gravity structure leads to the parallel realizations of maps  $\mathcal{M}_S$  and  $\mathcal{M}_R$  (Toffoli-NOR gates) and the entanglement of  $Q$  and  $\bar{Q}$ . The resource for the stimulation and storage processes is provided by the quantum gravity environment

Thus, the resulting output of  $\mathcal{M}_{SR}$  is evaluated as

$$|\varphi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |Q\bar{Q}\rangle + |\bar{Q}Q\rangle \right). \quad (91)$$

The  $\mathcal{M}_{SR}$  quantum gravity SR latch with quantum gravity control is depicted in Figure 6. The system is initialized with inputs  $A_i \in \{0,1\}$ . The outputs  $Q$  and  $\bar{Q}$  are entangled, stimulated, and kept in a stable state by the quantum gravity space  $\rho_{G_E RS}$ .

In this section, we showed that the information resource pool property of the quantum gravity environment can be exploited in quantum memories. We proposed a quantum gravity memory device and introduced the term stimulated storage, which allows the stimulation and storage of qubit entanglement, exploiting the information resource pool property of the quantum gravity environment.

The results indicate that the structure of the quantum gravity space can be further exploited in the development of quantum devices and quantum computers.

## 5 | CONCLUSIONS

The theory of quantum gravity integrates the fundamental results of quantum mechanics with general relativity. This fusion injects and adds several benefits to quantum mechanics, most importantly the nonfixed causality structure of space-time geometry and the existence of causally nonseparable processes. Here, we provided a model for the information processing structure of the quantum gravity space. We analyzed the connection of the gravity environment with the local processes and revealed that the quantum gravity environment is an information transfer device. This property makes the use of quantum gravity space as an information resource pool available for the parties. We introduced the term remote simulation and showed that the quantum gravity space induces noise on the local environment states, which allows the parties to simulate locally separated remote systems. We investigated the terms of quantum gravity memory and stimulated storage, which allows for the generation and preservation of the entanglement of qubits exploiting the information resource pool property of quantum gravity. The information processing structure of quantum gravity can be further exploited in quantum computations, in quantum error correction, in quantum AI, in quantum devices, and particularly in the development of quantum computers.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research reported in this paper has been supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund (TUDFO/51757/2019-ITM, Thematic Excellence Program). This work was supported in part by the National Research Development and Innovation Office of Hungary (Project No. 2017-1.2.1-NKP-2017-00001), by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA K-112125) and by the BME Artificial Intelligence FIKP grant of EMMI (BME FIKP-MI/SC).

## ETHICS STATEMENT

This work did not involve any active collection of human data.

## DATA ACCESSIBILITY STATEMENT

This work does not have any experimental data.

## COMPETING NON-FINANCIAL INTERESTS STATEMENT

We have no competing non-financial interests.

## COMPETING FINANCIAL INTERESTS STATEMENT

We have no competing financial interests.

## COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT

We have no competing interests.

## FUNDING

No relevant funding.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Laszlo Gyongyosi designed the protocol and wrote the manuscript, and both authors analyzed the results and reviewed the manuscript.

## ORCID

Laszlo Gyongyosi  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4209-7619>

## REFERENCES

1. Gyongyosi L, Imre S, Nguyen HV. A survey on quantum channel capacities. *IEEE Commun Surv Tutor*. 2018;20(2):1149-1205. <https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2017.2786748>
2. Hardy L. Probability theories with dynamic causal structure: a new framework for quantum gravity. 2005. arXiv:gr-qc/0509120.
3. Hardy L. Quantum reality, relativistic causality, and closing the epistemic circle. In: Myrvold WC, Christian J, eds. *Essays in honour of Abner Shimony*. Berlin, Germany: Springer; 2009.
4. Hardy L. Quantum gravity computers: on the theory of computation with indefinite causal structure. 2007. arXiv:quant-ph/0701019v1.
5. Hardy L. Towards quantum gravity: a framework for probabilistic theories with non-fixed causal structure. *J Phys A Math Theor*. 2007;40:3081.
6. Lloyd S. The computational universe: quantum gravity from quantum computation. 2005. arXiv:quant-ph/0501135.
7. Lloyd S. *Programming the Universe: A Quantum Computer Scientist Takes on the Cosmos*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf; 2006.
8. Lloyd S, Maccone L, Garcia-Patron R, et al. Closed timelike curves via post-selection: theory and experimental demonstration. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2011;106:040403.
9. Barrett J, Linden N, Massar S, Pironio S, Popescu S, Roberts D. Nonlocal correlations as an information-theoretic resource. *Phys Rev A*. 2005;71:022101.
10. Oreshkov O, Costa F, Brukner Č. Quantum correlations with no causal order. *Nature Communications*. 2012;3:1092. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms2076>

11. Chiribella G, D'Ariano GM, Perinotti P, Valiron B. Quantum computations without definite causal structure. 2013. arXiv:0912.0195v4.
12. Pawłowski M, Paterek T, Kaszlikowski D, Scarani V, Winter A, Żukowski M. Information causality as a physical principle. *Nature*. 2009;461(7267):1101-1104.
13. Deutsch D. Quantum computational networks. *Proc R Soc Lond A*. 1989;425:73.
14. Bernstein E, Vazirani U. Quantum complexity theory. *SIAM J Comput*. 1997;26.
15. Paternostro M, Vitali D, Gigan S, et al. Creating and probing multipartite macroscopic entanglement with light. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2007;99:250401.
16. O'Connell AD, Hofheinz M, Ansmann M, et al. Quantum ground state and single-phonon control of a mechanical resonator. *Nature*. 2010;464:697.
17. Lee KC, Sprague MR, Sussman BJ, et al. Entangling macroscopic diamonds at room temperature. *Science*. 2011;334:1253.
18. Colnaghi T, D'Ariano GM, Perinotti P, Facchini S. Quantum computation with programmable connections between gates. *Phys Lett A*. 2012;376:2940.
19. Jencova A. Generalized channels: channels for convex subsets of the state space. *J Math Phys*. 2012;53:012201.
20. Gutoski G. Properties of local quantum operations with shared entanglement. *Quantum Inf Comput*. 2009;9:739.
21. Aaronson S. Quantum computing, postselection, and probabilistic polynomial-time. *Proc R Soc A*. 2005;461:3473.
22. Genkina D, Chiribella G, Hardy L. Optimal probabilistic simulation of quantum channels from the future to the past. *Phys Rev A*. 2012;85:022330.
23. Deutsch D. Quantum mechanics near closed timelike lines. *Phys Rev D*. 1991;44(10):3197-3217.
24. Greenberger DM, Svozil K. Quantum theory looks at time travel. In: Elitzur A, Dolev S, Kolenda N, eds. *Quo Vadis Quantum Mechanics?* Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag; 2005.
25. Navascués M, Wunderlich H. A glance beyond the quantum model. *Proc R Soc A Math Phys Eng Sci*. 2009;466(2115):881-890.
26. Wolf MM, Perez-Garcia D, Fernandez C. Measurements incompatible in quantum theory cannot be measured jointly in any other no-signaling theory. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2009;103:230402.
27. Barnum H, Beigi S, Boixo S, Elliott MB, Wehner S. Local quantum measurement and no-signaling imply quantum correlations. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2010;104:140401.
28. Acín A, Augusiak R, Cavalcanti D, et al. Unified framework for correlations in terms of local quantum observables. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2010;104:140404.
29. DeWitt BS. Quantum theory of gravity. I. The canonical theory. *Physical Review*. 1967;160:1113-1148.
30. Peres A. Measurement of time by quantum clocks. *Am J Phys*. 1980;48(7):552-557.
31. Wootters WK. "Time" replaced by quantum correlations. *Int J Theor Phys*. 1984;23(8):701-711.
32. Isham CJ, Kuchar KV. Representations of space-time diffeomorphisms. 2. Canonical geometrodynamics. *Ann Phys*. 1985;164(2):316-333.
33. Gambini R, Porto RA, Pullin J. A relational solution to the problem of time in quantum mechanics and quantum gravity: a fundamental mechanism for quantum decoherence. *New J Phys*. 2004;6:45.
34. Choi MD. Completely positive linear maps on complex matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl*. 1975;10(3):285-290.
35. Cubitt TS, Ruskai MB, Smith G. The structure of degradable quantum channels. *J Math Phys*. 2008;49:102104.
36. Oriti D. *Approaches to Quantum Gravity: Toward a New Understanding of Space, Time and Matter*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; 2009.
37. Piazza F. Glimmers of a pre-geometric perspective. *Found Phys*. 2010;40(3):239-266.
38. Zurek WH. Decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical. *Physics Today*. 1991;44(10):36-44.
39. Kofler J, Brukner Č. Classical world arising out of quantum physics under the restriction of coarse-grained measurements. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2007;99:180403.
40. Bombelli L, Lee JH, Meyer D, Sorkin R. Space-time as a causal set. *Phys Rev Lett*. 1987;59(5):521-524.
41. D'Ariano GM, Tosini A. Space-time and special relativity from causal networks. 2010. arXiv:1008.4805.
42. Hawking SW, King AR, McCarthy PJ. A new topology for curved space-time which incorporates the causal, differential, and conformal structures. *J Math Phys*. 1976;17(2):174-181.
43. Malament DB. The class of continuous timelike curves determines the topology of spacetime. *J Math Phys*. 1977;18(7):1399-1404.
44. Bennett CH, Leung D, Smith G, Smolin J. Can closed timelike curves or nonlinear quantum mechanics improve quantum state discrimination or help solve hard problems? *Phys Rev Lett*. 2009;103(17):170502.
45. Huang Y. Quantum discord for two-qubit X states: analytical formula with very small worst-case error. *Phys Rev A*. 2013;88:014302.
46. Petz D. *Quantum Information Theory and Quantum Statistics*. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag; 2008.
47. Gyongyosi L. Smooth entropy transfer of quantum gravity information processing. 2014. arXiv:1403.6717.
48. Gyongyosi L. Correlation measure equivalence in dynamic causal structures. 2016. arXiv:1603.02416.
49. Preskill J. Quantum computing in the NISQ era and beyond. *Quantum*. 2018;2:79.
50. Harrow AW, Montanaro A. Quantum computational supremacy. *Nature*. 2017;549(7671):203-209.
51. Aaronson S, Chen L. Complexity-theoretic foundations of quantum supremacy experiments. In: *Proceedings of the 32nd Computational Complexity Conference (CCC)*; 2017; Riga, Latvia.

52. Farhi E, Neven H. Classification with quantum neural networks on near term processors. 2018. arXiv:1802.06002v1.
53. Farhi E, Goldstone J, Gutmann S, Neven H. Quantum algorithms for fixed qubit architectures. 2017. arXiv:1703.06199v1.
54. IBM. A new way of thinking: the IBM quantum experience. 2017. <http://www.research.ibm.com/quantum>
55. Nagy P, Tasnadi P. Projectile solutions on Minkowski diagram. *Il Nuovo Cimento*. 2010;33(3):Maggio-Giugno. <https://doi.org/0.1393/ncc/i2010-10638-5>
56. Arute F, et al. Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor. *Nature*. 2019;574. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1666-5>
57. Procopio LM, Moqanaki A, Araújo M, et al. Experimental superposition of orders of quantum gates. *Nature Communications*. 2015; 6:7913.
58. Guérin PA, Feix A, Araújo M, Brukner Č. Exponential communication complexity advantage from quantum superposition of the direction of communication. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2016;117(10).
59. Rubino G, Rozema LA, Feix A, et al. Experimental verification of an indefinite causal order. *Science Advances*. 2017;3(3):e1602589.
60. Long GL. The general quantum interference principle and duality computer. *Commun Theor Phys*. 2006;45(5):825-844.
61. Milz S, Pollock FA, Le TP, Chiribella G, Modi K. Entanglement, non-Markovianity, and causal non-separability. *New J Phys*. 2018;20(3):033033.
62. Bang J, Ryu J, Lee CW, Yee KH, Lee J, Son W. Quantifiable simulation of quantum computation beyond stochastic ensemble computation. *Adv Quantum Technol*. 2018;1(2):1800037.
63. Mahmud N, El-Araby E, Caliga D. Scaling reconfigurable emulation of quantum algorithms at high-precision and high-throughput. *Quantum Engineering*. 2019;1(2):e19.
64. Van Meter R. *Quantum Networking*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons Ltd; 2014.
65. Lloyd S, Shapiro JH, Wong FNC, Kumar P, Shahriar SM, Yuen HP. Infrastructure for the quantum Internet. *ACM SIGCOMM Comput Commun Rev*. 2004;34(5):9-20.
66. Van Meter R, Devitt SJ. Local and distributed quantum computation. *IEEE Computer*. 2016;49(9):31-42.
67. Pirandola S, Laurenza R, Ottaviani C, Banchi L. Fundamental limits of repeaterless quantum communications. *Nature Communications*. 2017;8. Article number 15043. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15043>
68. Pirandola S, Braunstein SL, Laurenza R, et al. Theory of channel simulation and bounds for private communication. *Quantum Sci Technol*. 2018;3:035009.
69. Pirandola S. Capacities of repeater-assisted quantum communications. 2016. arXiv:1601.00966.
70. Laurenza R, Pirandola S. General bounds for sender-receiver capacities in multipoint quantum communications. *Phys Rev A*. 2017;96:032318.
71. Pirandola S. End-to-end capacities of a quantum communication network. *Communications Physics*. 2019;2(51).
72. Biamonte J, Wittek P, Pancotti N, Rebentrost P, Wiebe N, Lloyd S. Quantum machine learning. *Nature*. 2017;549(7671):195-202.
73. Lloyd S, Mohseni M, Rebentrost P. Quantum algorithms for supervised and unsupervised machine learning. 2013. arXiv:1307.0411.
74. Lloyd S, Mohseni M, Rebentrost P. Quantum principal component analysis. *Nature Physics*. 2014;10(9):631-633.
75. Lloyd S. Capacity of the noisy quantum channel. *Phys Rev A*. 1997;55(3):1613-1622.
76. Lloyd S. The universe as quantum computer. In: Zenil H, ed. *A Computable Universe: Understanding and Exploring Nature as Computation*. Singapore: World Scientific; 2013.
77. Shor PW. Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory. *Phys Rev A*. 1995;52(4):R2493-R2496.
78. Gyongyosi L, Imre S. A survey on quantum computing technology. *Comput Sci Rev*. 2018;31:51-71.
79. Imre S, Gyongyosi L. *Advanced Quantum Communications: An Engineering Approach*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-IEEE Press; 2013.
80. Gyongyosi L. The correlation conversion property of quantum channels. *Quantum Inf Process*. 2013;13(2):467-473.
81. Gyongyosi L, Imre S. Distillable entanglement from classical correlation. In: *Proceedings of SPIE Quantum Information and Computation XI*; 2013; Baltimore, MD.
82. Gyongyosi L. The structure and quantum capacity of a partially degradable quantum channel. *IEEE Access*. 2014;2:333-355.
83. Gyongyosi L. Quantum information transmission over a partially degradable channel. *IEEE Access*. 2014;2:195-198.
84. Gyongyosi L. The private classical capacity of a partially degradable quantum channel. *Physica Scripta*. 2014;163. Special Issue on Quantum Information.

**How to cite this article:** Gyongyosi L, Imre S. Theory of quantum gravity information processing. *Quantum Engineering*. 2019;1:e23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/que2.23>

## APPENDIX A

### A.1 | Notations

The notations of the manuscript are summarized in Table A.1.

TABLE A.1 Summary of notations

Notation	Description
$\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$	Independent local CPTP maps in the quantum gravity space.
$\mathcal{G}_E$	Quantum gravity environment (models the space-time geometry).
$C \in \{ 0\rangle,  1\rangle\}$	Controller state in a fixed causality. Controls the realization sequence of local maps.
$C \in \{ +\rangle\}$	Controller state in a nonfixed causality structure, $ +\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}( 0\rangle +  1\rangle)$ . Models the vanishing causality between the local maps $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ in the quantum gravity space.
$B_i, E_i$	Local output and local environment state of a local CPTP map $\mathcal{M}_i$ .
$B_j, E_j$	Remote output and environment state of a remote CPTP map $\mathcal{M}_j$ .
$\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j}$	Entangled tripartite qubit system. Defines the entanglement structure of the space-time geometry with local environment $E_i$ and remote output $B_j$ .
$\rho = \frac{1}{2}\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2} + \frac{1}{2}\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_2 B_1}$	Density of parallel realizations of local maps $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ in a nonfixed causality.
$(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2})^{T_{B_2}}$	Partial transpose of $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2}$ , with respect to subsystem $B_2$ . If $(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2})^{T_{B_2}} \geq 0$ , then $B_2$ is separable from $\mathcal{G}_E E_1$ , while for $(\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1 B_2})^{T_{B_2}} < 0$ , the partition $B_2 - \mathcal{G}_E E_1$ is entangled.
$\mathcal{G}_E - E_i B_j, E_i - \mathcal{G}_E B_j, B_j - \mathcal{G}_E E_i$	Partitions of $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j}$ . Partition $\mathcal{G}_E - E_i B_j$ is entangled, $E_i - \mathcal{G}_E B_j, B_j - \mathcal{G}_E E_i$ are separable. Partition $\mathcal{G}_E - E_i B_j$ models the entangled space-time geometry Of the quantum gravity space.
$\mathcal{N}_{A_1 B_1}, \mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_2}$	Local logical channels of maps $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ , defined By Kraus operators $\mathcal{N}_{A_1 B_1}(\rho) = \sum_j A_j^{A_1 B_1} \rho (A_j^{A_1 B_1})^\dagger$ And $\mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_2}(\rho) = \sum_j A_j^{A_2 B_2} \rho (A_j^{A_2 B_2})^\dagger$ .
$\mathcal{N}_{A_1 E_1}, \mathcal{N}_{A_2 E_2}$	Local complementary channels of maps $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ , defined via Kraus operators $\mathcal{N}_{A_1 E_1}(\rho) = \sum_j A_j^{A_1 E_1} \rho (A_j^{A_1 E_1})^\dagger$ and $\mathcal{N}_{A_2 E_2}(\rho) = \sum_j A_j^{A_2 E_2} \rho (A_j^{A_2 E_2})^\dagger$ .
$\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$	Local simulation map. Allows the remote simulation of remote output $B_j$ from the local environment state $E_i$ , as $B_j = E_i \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$ through the quantum gravity environment. The existence of $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$ is the consequence of the entangled space-time geometry $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j}$ .
$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}}$	CPTP map which models the simultaneous realizations of the local channels $\mathcal{N}_{A_1 E_1}, \mathcal{N}_{A_2 B_2}$ , defined as $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho) = \sum_{i,j} A_i^{\mathcal{G}} \rho (A_i^{\mathcal{G}})^\dagger$ .
$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$	Local CPTP map, describes the probabilistic simulation via $\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$ on the local environment $E_i$ as $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} = p\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j} + (1-p)I$ . The output of the map is $B'_j = \frac{1}{2}B_j + \frac{1}{2}E_i$ .
$\Pi^X, \Pi^Z$	Projective measurement in the $X$ and $Z$ basis.
$W^{B_i E_1 B_2 E_2}$	Process matrix, describes the causality relations of the local maps $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ of $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_i B_j}$ in the quantum gravity space.

(Continues)

TABLE A.1 continued

$\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$	The quantum gravity channel. It has a logical channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_j}$ , that exists between the local input $A_i$ and the remote output $B_j$ , and a local complementary channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_i E_i}$ , which exists between the local input $A_i$ and the local environment state $E_i$ . The logical channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_j}$ is called the remote logical channel of $\mathcal{M}_{A_i B_j}$ , $\mathcal{N}_{A_i B_j} = \mathcal{N}_{A_i E_i} \circ \mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j}$ . The remote logical channel exits with probability $p$ .
$\mathcal{M}(B_2)$	CPTP map $M_2 \rightarrow M_2$ , which gets as input the remote Output $B_2$ , and outputs $B'_2 = E_1 \circ \mathcal{M}_D$ , where $\mathcal{M}_D = p\mathcal{D}^{E_i \rightarrow B_j} + (1-p)I$ .
$\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$	Bell diagonal state to quantify the correlations that is transmitted via the quantum gravity space $\mathcal{G}_E$ .
$u_+, u_-, v_+, v_-$	Eigenvalues of $\rho_{\mathcal{G}_E E_1}$ , $\max\{v_+, v_-, u_+, u_-\} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .
$c_1, c_2, c_3$	Parameters defined from the eigenvalues $v_+, v_-$ as $c_1 = (v_+ - v_-)$ , $c_2 = -(v_+ - v_-)$ and $c_3 = 1 - 2 \cdot (v_+ - v_-) = 1 + 2 \cdot c_2$ , $ c_1  +  c_2  +  c_3  \leq 1$ .
$I(\cdot)$	Mutual information function.
$\mathcal{C}(\cdot)$	Classical correlation function.
$\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$	Quantum discord.
$I_{coh}(\cdot)$	Coherent information.
$C(\mathcal{M}(B_2)), Q(\mathcal{M}(B_2))$	Classical and quantum capacity of channel $\mathcal{M}(B_2)$ .
$C_{\text{Toff}}^{\text{NOR}}$	Toffoli-NOR qubit gate, defined as $C_{\text{Toff}}^{\text{NOR}} = G(x, y, z) = z \oplus \bar{x} + \bar{y}$ , where $x$ and $y$ are The control qubit inputs, $z$ is the target qubit.
$\sqrt{X}, \sqrt{X}^\dagger$	Square-root $X$ operation and its adjoint.
$\mathcal{M}_{\text{SR}}$	Quantum gravity SR-latch memory. Consist of two Cross-coupled $C_{\text{Toff}}^{\text{NOR}}$ circuits, referred by the local Maps $\mathcal{M}_S$ and $\mathcal{M}_R$ , $\mathcal{M}_{\text{SR}}(\rho) = \sum_{i,j} A_i^{\text{SR}} \rho(A_i^{\text{SR}})^\dagger$ .
$ \varphi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(  \bar{Q}Q\rangle +  \bar{Q}Q\rangle \right)$	Entanglement of qubit of outputs $Q$ and $\bar{Q}$ in the Quantum gravity $\mathcal{M}_{\text{SR}}$ .

## A.2 | Abbreviations

CNOT	Controlled-NOT
CPTP	Completely Positive Trace Preserving
GHZ	Greenberger–Horne–Zeilinger
NOR	Negation of OR
POVM	Positive Operator Valued Measure
SR	Set-Reset