

Computational complexity and quantum interpretations

Vivek Kumar* and M P Singh
CSE, NIT Patna, PU Campus
Patna, 800005, Bihar, India

R Srikanth
Theoretical Sciences, PPISR
Bidalur post, Devanahalli,
Bengaluru 562164, Karnataka, India

In computational complexity theory, it remains to be understood whether **BQP** is the same as **BPP**. Prima facie, one would expect that this mathematical question is quite unrelated to the foundational question of whether the quantum state is an element of reality or of the observer's knowledge. By contrast, here we argue that the complexity of computation in a physical theory may constrain its physical interpretation. Specifically in the quantum case, we argue that a subjective interpretation of the quantum mechanics favors the proposition **BQP** = **BPP**. Therefore, if **BPP** \subset **BQP**, then a realist interpretation of quantum mechanics would be favored.

INTRODUCTION

Despite the long and successful exploitation of quantum phenomena in modern technology, the deeper meaning of quantum theory has proved to be elusive [1, 2]. Many interpretations have been so far proposed, and none of the older ones have been rested [3]! These interpretations are by design empirically indistinguishable for all practical purposes, seemingly making the choice among them a matter of metaphysical judgment [4]. One observation about these interpretations stands out: that they come in broadly two types: (a) *Realist interpretations*: in which quantum probabilities are interpreted realistically, either because the quantum state is an objective property of the observed system or because there is an underlying ontological stuff behind the probabilities; (b) *Subjective interpretations*: in which, in contrast to the above, the quantum probabilities are interpreted epistemically, as representations of the observer's knowledge or belief about measurement results. This division corresponds roughly to Cabello's classification of type I and II of interpretations [1].

Among realist interpretations, we may count various objective collapse models [5–9], Bohmian mechanics [10], as well as the ψ -epistemic model of Spekkens [11]. Among subjective interpretations we may count the standard Copenhagen [12], QBist [13], the no-interpretation thesis [14] and various information-based [15, 16] interpretations. (We defer treatment of the Many-Worlds Interpretation [17, 18] to a future work.)

This state of affairs with quantum interpretation is unfortunate, and can potentially hinder aspects of future scientific progress. Various frameworks have been developed in order to elucidate the mathematical structure of QM and identify the broad physical principles in Nature that single out quantum mechanics as special in “theoryspace”. Among these are the framework of GPTs [19–24], derivation of QM from information theoretic principles

[25–27] and a framework of circuit-based computational models [24, 28] suitable to analyze the computational power feasible in an operationally-defined physical theory. Earlier approaches include ad hoc modifications of QM [29–32]. However, these approaches have remained neutral on the interpretation question. Even so, such an approach can be of indirect help, as we find the next section.

Independently of the interpretation issue, quantum approaches to computation have brought new insights to the area of computational complexity. There is good evidence that quantum theory yields greater computational power compared to classical theories [33–38]. It is generally believed— but not known for certain— that **BPP**, the class of problems efficiently solvable on a probabilistic Turing machine with error probability less than $\frac{1}{3}$, is unequal to the analogous quantum class, namely **BQP**. Of course, computation theory abounds with such beliefs, as for example, the generally held belief that **P** = **BPP**. However, it is generally believed that **BQP** is different (in fact, incomparable) from **NP**, going all the way up to **PH**, while **AWPP** is known to be the smallest classical counting complexity class containing **BQP** [28]. It has also been shown that **AWPP** = **BGP**, capturing the complexity of quasi-probabilistic computational model.

At first blush, the issue of quantum computational advantage seems unrelated to the problem of interpreting QM. Yet, in this work, we shall leverage ideas from the frameworks of generalized operational theory to study possible implications of computational complexity for quantum interpretations. Our simple but surprising finding is that assumptions about quantum computational complexity will be found to favor certain class of quantum interpretations over others.

A MODIFIED, NONLINEAR QUANTUM THEORY

To give an intuition of why quantum complexity may be relevant to the interpretation problem, let us consider a modified (nonlinear) version of QM that vastly amplifies computational power. We will then consider the question of whether such an augmented computational power remains noncommittal on the interpretation question. In order that the candidate theory be physically credible, we will require that it must satisfy a reasonable and natural set of physical principles satisfied by QM, namely tomographic locality, causality, purification, purity preservation, pure sharpness and strong symmetry [39]. As our specific instance of a general physical theory, we propose a nonlinear variant of QM, which may be described as a causal extension of a variant proposed by Abrams and Lloyd [29], itself based on an idea due to Weinberg [40].

Causality in this context formalizes the notion that the results of a present measurement are independent of those of a future measurement [26]. This is guaranteed in quantum mechanics by the existence of the partial trace property of composite states. However, the Weinberg nonlinearity disrupts this causal property [41, 42]. Our modified version corrects this problem, while retaining the nonlinear quantum computer's ability to efficiently solve **NP**-complete and **#P** problems.

Consider an operational theory that inherits the state space structure of QM, as well as its unitary and measurement dynamics, but deviates from QM by additionally allowing the following nonlinear time evolution Ξ in computational basis:

$$\begin{aligned} |0, g_0, 0\rangle + |1, g_1, 1\rangle &\stackrel{\Xi}{\rightarrow} |0, g_1, 1\rangle + |1, g_1, 1\rangle \\ |0, g_0, 1\rangle + |1, g_1, 0\rangle &\stackrel{\Xi}{\rightarrow} |0, g_0, 1\rangle + |1, g_0, 1\rangle \\ |0, g_0, 0\rangle + |1, g_1, 0\rangle &\stackrel{\Xi}{\rightarrow} |0, g_0, 0\rangle + |1, g_1, 0\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

apart from a normalization factor. Here the third (comma-separated) register is of one qubit size, whereas the first two registers can consist of multiple qubits.

Given n -bit function $f(j) \in \{0, 1\}$, the problem of determining $j^* := \{j : f(j) = 1\}$, if such j^* exists, is **NPC**. To exploit the gate Eq. (1) to this end, one begins by preparing the superposition $2^{-n/2} \sum_j |j\rangle_A |j\rangle_B |f(j)\rangle_C$. Consider the 1st qubit of the first register together with the third register. There are 2^{n-1} subspaces of the first register, labelled by the qubits numbering $2 \cdots n$ of that register. Application of the nonlinear gate Eq. (1) doubles the superposition terms in which the last register carries 1. The exercise is repeated, with the third register sequentially paired with the remaining $(n-1)$ qubits of the first register. In n applications of the nonlinear operator, the final state is $2^{-n/2} \sum_j |j, j^*, 1\rangle$ if there is a unique solution j^* . By employing a counter variable instead of a marker at the third register, one can adapt the

above algorithm to efficiently solve **#P**-oracle problems and the corresponding search problem.

It is evident that our proposed (and admittedly ad hoc) nonlinear QM directly inherits from QM the features of tomographic locality, purification, purity preservation, pure sharpness and strong symmetry (as also do other such nonlinear variants of QM). The feature of causality calls for special attention. Those variants leading to exponential speedup, such as [29, 43, 44], can be shown to violate causality (cf. [41, 42] in the context of the original Weinberg proposal). To facilitate signaling, Alice and Bob start by sharing a Bell state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0, 0\rangle + |1, 1\rangle)_{AB}$. Alice either does nothing, or applies the single-qubit Weinberg gate to her qubit, which implements the transformation [29] $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0, 0\rangle + |1, 1\rangle)_{AB} \rightarrow |0, 0\rangle_{AB}$. She can thus signal Bob probabilistically, in contravention to relativistic causality. This suggests that operational theories with such exponential computational power must violate causality, i.e., exponential \Rightarrow superluminal. (Interestingly, the converse of the above implication isn't true [32].) Clearly, in any theory with a superluminal signal, a realistic interpretation of the quantum state is inevitable.

By contrast, our proposed nonlinear quantum variant ensures causality by requiring that the global oracle in Eq. (1) is necessarily implemented as a *joint* gate on all qubits, i.e., its action requires all qubits to be interacting locally. Thus the above route to reality is blocked out: which is just as well, because the superluminal feature may equally well be argued to make the theory unphysical, rendering the interpretation question moot.

Consider an instance where the above nonlinear quantum computer is used to efficiently solve the traveling salesman problem, an **NPC**. A fully subjective interpretation of QM would require that this highly nontrivial feat, which lies beyond the scope of the world's supercomputers, could be achieved merely by the observer's ignorance or degrees of belief. If we agree that this is implausible, then we can go further and ask whether **NPC** represents a specific threshold for such implausibility, or whether it suffices to go beyond **BPP** or **AWPP**. This observation forms the basis of our main result.

COMPLEXITY THEORETIC APPROACH TO QUANTUM INTERPRETATIONS

It seems unlikely that the two interpretations should stay forever out of the reach of scientific method [1]. In line with that expectation, we shall now argue that the above two classes of interpretations may have distinct ramifications for the **BQP** $\stackrel{?}{=} \mathbf{BPP}$ issue [45]. It will be useful for our purpose to employ the framework of causal models as applied to capture the causal structure underlying quantum correlations.




FIG. 1. DAG for the Bell scenario motivated by relativistic causality. Here Λ denotes any pre-shared resource (shaded to indicate that it may be classical, quantum or generalized). In a classical causal model, Λ is restricted to shared randomness, whereas in a quantum or a GPT causal model, it can represent a Bell state or a Popescu-Rohrlich box.

Here, a causal structure is represented by a directed acyclic graph (DAG) \mathcal{G} as in Fig. 1, where nodes represent random variables and the directed edges represent direct causes. Nodes can correspond to observed systems or to latent events or systems, which arise as part of a causal explanation. Loops are prohibited, to avoid causal paradoxes.

For any three sets of nodes J, K, L on a DAG \mathcal{G} , J and K are d -separated given set L , denoted $(J \perp\!\!\!\perp K|L)_d$, iff L “screens off” all paths from J to K (cf. Appendix). The DAG is a faithful (aka not fine-tuned) representation of the causal structure if $(J \perp\!\!\!\perp K|L)_d$ corresponds precisely to the conditional independences (CI) relations of the correlations (i.e., $(J \perp\!\!\!\perp K|L)$), as determined by the causal Markov conditions. The principle of no fine-tuning essentially says that all CI relations are fully encoded in the DAG, and should not require to fine-tune the causal-statistical parameters of the probability distribution. For example, for the DAG given in Fig. 1, no fine-tuning restricts correlations to the form

$$P(A, B|X, Y) = P(\Lambda)P(A|X, \Lambda)P(B|Y, \Lambda), \quad (2)$$

which is the factorization condition leading to the Bell inequality [46]. Here Alice (resp., Bob) inputs random variable X (resp., Y) and obtains outcome A (resp., B). Eq. (2) thus is a causal compatibility inequality in the context of classical causal models [47, 48].

Theorem 1. *Any subjective interpretation of QM would entail $BQP = BPP$.*

Proof. We assume that quantum correlations, whether




FIG. 2. DAG for the Bell scenario motivated by classical causality. Here Λ is restricted to classical correlations. The violation of a Bell inequality would require signaling from Alice’s nodes to Bob’s (or vice versa). Fine-tuning the signal probabilities will be required to enforce the conditional independences in the observed correlations.

arising in the context of single systems or entangled systems, can be described as a causal structure, and hence represented by a DAG. In the case of multipartite systems, the inadequacy of the classical causal model applied to relativistic causality is known [49], which forms the basis of the quantum advantage in general causal structures [50, 51].

For simplicity, we shall henceforth confine our argument to Bell DAG of Fig. 1, but it is not hard to show that it applies to general quantum correlations. Classical causality applied to the DAG of Fig. 1 leads to correlations of the type Eq. (2), and thus fails to account for the violation of Bell’s inequality. If we insist on a classical causal account of Bell nonlocality, then we must resort to the DAG of Fig. 2, with the extra arrows thrown in. These arrows represent superluminal causes and thus stand in violation of relativistic causality.

It is universally assumed that a human observer is a classical entity. Though human cognition may be rooted in processes that are ultimately quantum mechanical, still at the neuronal and connection level it is effectively classical [52]. In a subjective interpretation, quantum probabilities are not intrinsic to the observed system, but have a Bayesian basis in the classical observer’s experience.

Thus, when a subjective interpretation is exercised on the causal model Fig. 2 of quantum correlations, the superluminal signals won’t correspond to a real signal from A or X to B , but instead to a cognitive signal, in the sense that the state collapse that generates B happens in Alice’s knowledge, and not objectively in Bob’s system.




FIG. 3. Representation of the DAG in Fig. 2 as a classical circuit under assumptions appropriate to a subjective interpretation. Here Λ denotes a joint state preparation, X, Y are gates followed by measurements A, B in the computational basis.

Granting that this subjective position is (somehow) tenable, this would eliminate the tension with relativistic causality as well as the attendant problem of fine-tuning, which was a source of tension with classical causality. The resulting DAG that is compatible with relativistic and classical causality can be shown to correspond to a classical computational circuit, which in this case is depicted in Fig. 3. This circuit is efficiently simulable on a probabilistic Turing machine. \square

The implications of Theorem 1 cannot be overstated. It would imply that if a subjective interpretation prevails, then we should be willing to admit that a host of problems—the hidden subgroup problem (encompassing integer factorization and discrete logarithm), which are thought to have exponential speed-ups, should then be amenable to efficient classical computation. Similarly for boson sampling and forrelation, which are believed to lie outside \mathbf{PH} (the polynomial hierarchy). It follows from Theorem 1 that a definite proof that $\mathbf{BQP} \neq \mathbf{BPP}$ would favor a realistic interpretation of QM.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The question of what the mathematical formalism of quantum theory means has been an long-standing problem (or, non-problem) in the quantum foundations, eliciting a number of interpretations that were ostensibly indistinguishable by empirical criteria and distinguished only by a metaphysical preference. Here we argue that the dilemma between realist and subjective classes of interpretations is in a sense tied to the $\mathbf{BQP} \stackrel{?}{=} \mathbf{BPP}$ problem in computational complexity, demonstrating a definite mathematical consequence of the choice of quantum interpretation. As such, our result may be considered a case of “applied metaphysics”, in this respect comparable in a modest way to the historical role played by Bell’s result [46, 53] in highlighting a testable mathemat-

ical consequence of two different philosophical positions concerning the completeness of QM [54, 55].

The relation between \mathbf{BQP} and \mathbf{BPP} is unclear even from the perspective of \mathbf{NP} . Although it is known that $\mathbf{NP} \subseteq \Sigma_2 \cap \Pi_2$ [56] there is no conclusive evidence about the inclusion of \mathbf{NP} in \mathbf{BPP} or vice-versa. Even if we make the assumption that quantum computers are powerful enough to solve \mathbf{NPC} problems and \mathbf{BPP} turns out to be same as \mathbf{P} , this still leaves the question of separation between \mathbf{BQP} and \mathbf{BPP} unanswered.

The present work initiates the prospect of applying computational complexity to quantum interpretational problems. A logical step forward to this work would be to give complexity theoretically informed interpretation of QM as well as to bring sharper inferences on the interpretational issues in the light of more results among other related complexity classes. Going farther, one may construct a computational complexity inspired ontological framework for GPTs.

RS was partially supported by the Indian Science & Engineering Research Board (SERB) grant CRG/2022/008345.

* vivekk.phd20.cs@nitp.ac.in

- [1] A. Cabello, Interpretations of quantum theory: A map of madness, What is quantum information , 138 (2017).
- [2] M. S. Leifer, Is the quantum state real? an extended review of *psi*-ontology theorems, arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1570 (2014).
- [3] N. D. Mermin, Commentary: Quantum mechanics: Fixing the shifty split, Physics Today **65**, 8 (2012).
- [4] J. Polkinghorne, Physics and theology, Europhysics News **45**, 28 (2014).
- [5] A. Bassi *et al.*, Philosophy of quantum mechanics: Dynamical collapse theories, Oxford Research Encyclopedias (2021).
- [6] G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini, and T. Weber, Unified dynamics for microscopic and macroscopic systems, Physical review D **34**, 470 (1986).
- [7] L. Diósi, Models for universal reduction of macroscopic quantum fluctuations, Physical Review A **40**, 1165 (1989).
- [8] R. Penrose, On gravity’s role in quantum state reduction, General relativity and gravitation **28**, 581 (1996).
- [9] A. Patel and P. Kumar, Weak measurements, quantum-state collapse, and the born rule, Physical Review A **96**, 022108 (2017).
- [10] S. Goldstein, Bohmian mechanics, (2001).
- [11] R. W. Spekkens, Evidence for the epistemic view of quantum states: A toy theory, Physical Review A **75**, 032110 (2007).
- [12] J. Faye, Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics, (2002).
- [13] C. A. Fuchs, N. D. Mermin, and R. Schack, An introduction to qbism with an application to the locality of quantum mechanics, American Journal of Physics **82**, 749 (2014).

- [14] C. A. Fuchs and A. Peres, Quantum theory needs no ‘interpretation’, *Physics today* **53**, 70 (2000).
- [15] A. Zeilinger, A foundational principle for quantum mechanics, *Foundations of Physics* **29**, 631 (1999).
- [16] Č. Brukner, On the quantum measurement problem, *Quantum [un] speakables II: half a century of Bell’s theorem*, 95 (2017).
- [17] H. Everett III, ” relative state” formulation of quantum mechanics, *Reviews of modern physics* **29**, 454 (1957).
- [18] B. S. Dewitt and N. Graham, *The many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics*, Vol. 63 (Princeton University Press, 2015).
- [19] J. Barrett, Information processing in generalized probabilistic theories, *Physical Review A* **75**, 032304 (2007).
- [20] J. Barrett, N. de Beaudrap, M. J. Hoban, and C. M. Lee, The computational landscape of general physical theories, *npj Quantum Information* **5**, 1 (2019).
- [21] R. D. Sorkin, Quantum mechanics as quantum measure theory, *Modern Phys. Lett. A* **9**, 3119 (1994).
- [22] P. Janotta and H. Hinrichsen, Generalized probability theories: what determines the structure of quantum theory?, *J. Phys. A* **47**, 323001, 32 (2014).
- [23] R. D. Sorkin, Quantum mechanics as quantum measure theory, *Modern Physics Letters A* **9**, 3119 (1994).
- [24] C. M. Lee and J. Barrett, Computation in generalised probabilistic theories, *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 083001 (2015).
- [25] G. M. D’Ariano, G. Chiribella, and P. Perinotti, *Quantum theory from first principles: an informational approach* (Cambridge University Press, 2017).
- [26] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Probabilistic theories with purification, *Physical Review A* **81**, 062348 (2010).
- [27] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Informational derivation of quantum theory, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 012311 (2011).
- [28] C. M. Lee and M. J. Hoban, Bounds on the power of proofs and advice in general physical theories, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **472**, 20160076 (2016).
- [29] D. S. Abrams and S. Lloyd, Nonlinear quantum mechanics implies polynomial-time solution for np-complete and# p problems, *Physical Review Letters* **81**, 3992 (1998).
- [30] S. Aaronson, Is quantum mechanics an island in theoryspace?, arXiv preprint quant-ph/0401062 (2004).
- [31] S. Aaronson, Quantum computing, postselection, and probabilistic polynomial-time, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **461**, 3473 (2005).
- [32] R. Srikanth, Entanglement, intractability and no-signaling, *Physica Scripta* **81**, 065002 (2010).
- [33] D. Deutsch and R. Jozsa, Rapid solution of problems by quantum computation, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* **439**, 553 (1992).
- [34] P. W. Shor, Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer, *SIAM J. Comput.* **26**, 1484 (1997).
- [35] D. R. Simon, On the power of quantum computation, *SIAM J. Comput.* **26**, 1474 (1997).
- [36] S. Aaronson and S. Ben-David, Sculpting quantum speedups, in *31st Conference on Computational Complexity*, LIPIcs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform., Vol. 50 (Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2016) pp. Art. No. 26, 28.
- [37] S. Aaronson and A. Arkhipov, The computational complexity of linear optics, *Theory Comput.* **9**, 143 (2013).
- [38] F. Arute, K. Arya, R. Babbush, D. Bacon, J. C. Bardin, R. Barends, R. Biswas, S. Boixo, F. G. Brandao, D. A. Buell, *et al.*, Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor, *Nature* **574**, 505 (2019).
- [39] C. M. Lee and J. H. Selby, Deriving grover’s lower bound from simple physical principles, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 093047 (2016).
- [40] S. Weinberg, Testing quantum mechanics, *Annals of Physics* **194**, 336 (1989).
- [41] N. Gisin, Weinberg’s non-linear quantum mechanics and supraluminal communications, *Physics Letters A* **143**, 1 (1990).
- [42] J. Polchinski, Weinberg’s nonlinear quantum mechanics and the einstein-podolsky-rosen paradox, *Physical Review Letters* **66**, 397 (1991).
- [43] S. Aaronson and J. Watrous, Closed timelike curves make quantum and classical computing equivalent, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **465**, 631 (2009).
- [44] S. Aaronson, Quantum computing, postselection, and probabilistic polynomial-time, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **461**, 3473 (2005).
- [45] Objective collapse models typically require that a sufficiently large quantum computer will spontaneously collapse with high probability. It may thus be possible that ideally $\mathbf{BQP} \neq \mathbf{BPP}$, but for all practical purposes $\mathbf{BQP} = \mathbf{BPP}$ (because we cannot overcome intrinsic noise). Evidently, this fact is irrelevant to the metaphysical nature of the quantum state. For our purposes, we shall therefore assume that the class \mathbf{BQP} is defined on an *ideal* quantum computer, i.e., by tuning the parameters of the interpretation to hold off collapse to any given scale.
- [46] J. Bell, The theory of local beables, *Epistemological Letters* **9**, 11 (1976).
- [47] J. Pearl and E. Cavalcanti, Classical causal models cannot faithfully explain Bell nonlocality or kochen-specker contextuality in arbitrary scenarios, *Quantum* **5**, 518 (2021).
- [48] J.-M. A. Allen, J. Barrett, D. C. Horsman, C. M. Lee, and R. W. Spekkens, Quantum common causes and quantum causal models, *Physical Review X* **7**, 031021 (2017).
- [49] C. J. Wood and R. W. Spekkens, The lesson of causal discovery algorithms for quantum correlations: causal explanations of bell-inequality violations require fine-tuning, *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 033002 (2015).
- [50] X. Coiteux-Roy, E. Wolfe, and M.-O. Renou, No bipartite-nonlocal causal theory can explain nature’s correlations, *Physical review letters* **127**, 200401 (2021).
- [51] P. Lauand, D. Poderini, R. Nery, G. Moreno, L. Polyceno, R. Rabelo, and R. Chaves, Witnessing nonclassicality in a causal structure with three observable variables, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 020311 (2023).
- [52] Human decision making is known to deviate at times from classical logic, a phenomenon called *quantum cognition* [57]. However, it should be understood that this deviation is a manifestation of psychological biases, rather than genuine quantum effects.
- [53] J. Bell, On the einstein-podolsky-rosen paradox, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).
- [54] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered

- complete?, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
- [55] E. G. Cavalcanti and H. M. Wiseman, Bell nonlocality, signal locality and unpredictability (or what bohr could have told einstein at solvay had he known about bell experiments), Foundations of Physics **42**, 1329 (2012).
- [56] C. Lautemann, Bpp and the polynomial hierarchy, Information Processing Letters **17**, 215 (1983).
- [57] E. M. Pothos and J. R. Busemeyer, Quantum cognition, Annual review of psychology **73**, 749 (2022).
- [58] J. Pearl, *Causality* (Cambridge university press, 2009).

Appendix: Causal structures and DAGs

The classical principle due to Reichenbach asserts that if two variables J and K are correlated, then either one is them is the cause of the other, or there is a common cause L that fully explains them, such that $P(J, K|L) = P(J|L)P(K|L)$, i.e., variables J and K are independent conditioned on L . Such conditional independence is denoted ($J \perp\!\!\!\perp K|L$). The modern understanding of (classical) causality generalizes Reichenbach principle to a Bayesian network of variables [58] and the associated causal network, and finds application in diverse areas, such as economics, artificial intelligence and statistics.

A suggestive genealogical terminology is employed to indicate relations among nodes: The parents of given node T , denoted $\text{Pa}(T)$, are nodes pointing to T (the direct causes of T); the ancestors of node T , denoted

$\text{An}(T)$ are nodes from which there is a path to T (all variables lying in the causal past of T); the descendants of node T , denoted $\text{De}(T)$ are nodes to which there is a path from T (all variables with T as an ancestor). All variables not in $\text{De}(T)$ constitute the non-descendants of T , denoted $\text{Nd}(T)$.

A DAG graphically encodes the conditional independence relations in any probability distribution compatible with the causal structure. For any probability distribution that is compatible with a given causal structure, represented by DAG \mathfrak{G} , the conditional independences are encoded through the causal Markov condition: $P(T|\text{Nd}(T), \text{Pa}(T)) = P(T|\text{Pa}(T))$, i.e., for any probability distribution compatible with graph \mathfrak{G} , conditioned on its parents, the probability of a given variable is independent of its non-descendants. Extending this to n vertices T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n of graph G , the causal Markov condition is equivalent to requiring that the joint probability distribution factorizes as

$$P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) = \prod_j P(X_j|\text{Pa}(X_j)). \quad (3)$$

This generalizes the Reichenbach principle.

Given three sets of nodes J, K, L , set L screens off path p from J to K iff (a) p contains a chain ($R \rightarrow S \rightarrow T$) or a fork ($R \leftarrow S \rightarrow T$) such that $S \in L$, or (b) it contains a collision $R \rightarrow S \leftarrow T$ such that S is neither an element of L nor an ancestor to any element of L . Intuitively, in any of these situations, the variables J and K are conditionally decorrelated.