

# Quantum communication on closed time-like curves

Ian T. Durham  
Department of Physics  
Saint Anselm College  
Manchester, NH 03102  
(Dated: March 22, 2008)

## Abstract

We define a new quantity we call a *ctcbit* that provides a means for quantifying a qubit on a closed time-like curve (CTC) as a shared resource. We describe a simple protocol for the sharing of information that is similar to quantum teleportation but does not require an entangled particle pair or *ebit*. While there is the appearance that the given resource is free, we employ a non-Hausdorff topology to prevent any limitless information exchanges. Nonetheless, the resource does limit the *type* of information that may be transferred. While the reality of CTCs is highly speculative, the present paper provides a manner by which quantum informational methods may be employed to study such problems and may ultimately prove useful in studying quantum gravity.

## I. PRELIMINARIES

Quantum computational methods have been proposed as a way to solve a number of problems generally thought to be either intractable or slow with classical computational methods. One set of such problems includes problems in quantum gravity. Among these are the quantum behavior of closed time-like curves (CTCs). CTCs naturally arise from the construction of wormholes [1] and the latter were first seriously considered in the modern literature by Morris, Thorne, and Yurtsever [2]. Deutsch first considered the merger of quantum computational methods and CTCs demonstrating that quantum computation in the presence of CTCs always allows self-consistent evolution [3]. Classically similar ideas were later discussed by Brun [4] before Bacon put them on a slightly firmer ground by coupling the CTC qubits to chronology-respecting qubits [5]. Ralph [6] recently proposed an alternative to Bacon's treatment.

While these analyses are theoretically interesting, there is no conclusive evidence that CTCs physically exist in nature [1, 7, 8, 9] though it is entirely possible that we will come closer to a determination of this as new experiments and theoretical frameworks are suggested [10, 11]. Nonetheless, the theoretical work continues unabated. A particularly daunting problem is that of the initial value problem on spacetimes with CTCs [3, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]. One of Bacon's goals was to tackle this very problem while simultaneously using quantum evolution in the presence of CTCs to efficiently solve NP-complete problems.

At the same time, we have come to understand information on the basis of shared resources such as *cbits*, *ebits*, *cobits*, *refbits*, and, of course, *qubits* [20, 21, 22]. Given Bacon's results, it seems logical to ask whether this coupling of qubits on CTCs with chronology-respecting qubits can be exploited in some manner for the purposes of exchanging information; in short, can a shared resource be developed from this.

The protocol described in this article is somewhat similar to the familiar quantum teleportation protocol [23, 24, 25, 26] that has been described by Loewp and Wootters as a sort of "destructive faxing" in which an unknown or general quantum state can be transmitted over long distances without any loss of information [27]. Quantum teleportation, however, requires the use of an entangled pair which we refer to as an *ebit* (defined below). The protocol described here, in which we introduce a new shared resource, accomplishes a very similar end result but without *ebits*. However, in order to avoid any possibility of a limitless and freely available resource, we introduce a non-Hausdorff topology.

We begin by briefly defining a few existing shared communication resources and making a point about notation.

## II. NOTATION & BASIC DEFINITIONS

We follow the same basic notation as Ref. [20] in which the terms qubit and *qubit* have slightly different meanings.

$$\rho = U\rho U^\dagger \quad (2)$$

**Definition 1** A qubit (*non-italicized in normal text*) is defined as being a physical entity with some binary property. That is this property can be represented by, at most two, orthogonal pure states or in which mixed states are always some superposition of these orthogonal pure states.

Examples of qubits, of course, include two-level atoms or molecules as well as polarized photons. We will use the latter to discuss a few more practical considerations on CTCs.

**Definition 2** A qubit (*italicized in normal text*) is defined as being a communication resource that is equivalent to sending a physical qubit over a noiseless channel.

This is the definition given in Ref. [20]. Thus we note that the italicized form represents the shared resource. To clarify this notation, let us define an *ebit*.

**Definition 3** An *ebit* (*italicized in normal text*) is the resource of Alice and Bob sharing a maximally entangled state of a particular form for use in quantum communication.

By contrast, an ebit is known as a unit of entanglement. Note that in this article we do not distinguish between *ebits* and *Ebits* where the former are phase-reference dependent resources and the latter are phase-reference independent. We refer the reader to Ref. [20] for a fuller discussion. We also note that, despite Mermin's valid orthographical point about qubits (i.e. that they should be qbits) [28], we will maintain the more widely accepted spelling.

### III. CTC EVOLUTION AND STRUCTURE

Before describing our protocol and introducing the *ctcbit* as a shared resource, we briefly review some of the properties of CTCs that make them unique and that we will exploit in this article. For a complete discussion, we refer the reader to Ref. [5].

Wormholes (and the associated CTCs) do not quantum mechanically evolve via the Schrödinger equation. In fact they do not evolve at all temporally since they obey what is known as the Wheeler-DeWitt equation (see Ref. [8]),

$$H|\psi\rangle = 0 \quad (1)$$

where  $H$  is the Hamiltonian operator. This implies that

for any qubit traversing the CTC where we see that its density matrix remains unaltered under a unitary transformation.

Bacon devised a framework by which the chronology respecting qubits and the CTC qubits were coupled by the same unitary operator [5]. The challenge successfully met in this formulation is devising a unitary state that evolves the combined qubits but individually does not evolve the CTC qubit. The Hilbert space,  $\mathcal{H}$  of the combined system is the tensor product of the individual Hilbert spaces,  $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ . The density matrix for the CTC qubit is

$$\rho = \text{Tr}_m [U(\rho_m \otimes \rho)U^\dagger] \quad (3)$$

where  $\rho$  is the reduced density matrix for the CTC qubit (hence the partial trace over the space of the chronology-respecting qubit whose own density matrix is  $\rho_m$ ).

Another way in which we can describe the basic framework devised by Bacon is by noting that the unitary operator in equations (2) and (3) must perform the following transformation,

$$U(|s\rangle \otimes |ctc\rangle) = (|s'\rangle \otimes |ctc\rangle) \quad (4)$$

where  $|s\rangle$  and  $|s'\rangle$  represent the initial and final states of the chronology-respecting qubit while  $|ctc\rangle$  represents the state of the CTC qubit. Note that Bacon gives a solution in Ref. [5] for the unitary transformation in equation (4), though it is not general.

The actual structure of wormholes is a tad more complicated. In particular, solutions to equation (1) are difficult to find, especially when considering an entity as inhabiting the throat of the wormhole. Fortunately, an exact solution to (1) is known for massless particles traversing the hole's throat (see Ref. [8]). Solutions in the presence of mass can be approximated using the WKB approximation and other techniques, but, again, exact solutions are scarce. As such, while we employ general qubits in this article, it is entirely possible the CTC's behavior in the presence of *massive* qubits could be different from its behavior in the presence of *massless* qubits (e.g. polarized photons). Nonetheless, we suspect that this would simply change the structure of  $|ctc\rangle$  itself and that equation (4) would still have to hold since it essentially re-expresses equation (1).

With that said, we are now in a position to describe a quantum communication protocol based on these basic properties.

#### IV. CTC COMMUNICATION PROTOCOL

Suppose Alice wishes to communicate the state of a qubit to Bob. As with the quantum teleportation protocol Alice need not know the exact nature of this state. In other words, the state can be completely general such that  $|s\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ . Note that we ignore any phase factor and assume all measurements are made in equivalent reference frames. As such we do not presently address the issues discussed in Ref. [20], though the nature of *ctcbits* in relation to *refbits* is clearly a topic that requires attention. The most general version of the protocol can be described in the following steps.

1. Alice performs the unitary transformation described by equation (4) on  $|s\rangle$  and  $|ctc\rangle$ .
2. Alice reports the outcome of her transformation to Bob, i.e. she reports  $|s'\rangle$ .
3. Bob prepares a qubit in the state  $|s'\rangle$ .
4. Bob performs the unitary operation

$$U'(|s'\rangle \otimes |ctc\rangle) = (|s\rangle \otimes |ctc\rangle) \quad (5)$$

on  $|s'\rangle$  and  $|ctc\rangle$  in order to recover the original state,  $|s\rangle$ .

The basic outline of the protocol is illustrated diagrammatically in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1: The basic CTC protocol showing the evolving qubits. Note that time for Alice (left) and Bob (right) flows in the same direction, despite the manner in which the arrows are drawn (which is solely for the purpose of compactness).

#### A. Questions raised

This protocol, as described, raises several questions that we address directly. These questions are based on the most simple example just described and, for example, we do not address any relation to *refbits*.

1. What might the unitary operators  $U$  and  $U'$  look like?

In theory, unitary operators represent reversible transformations and thus we might expect that  $U = U'$ . As it turns out, the unitary operator given by Bacon works in this capacity. In fact, it is nothing more than the controlled-phase gate where we use the basis  $|ab\rangle$  where the chronology-respecting qubit is in state  $|a\rangle$  and the CTC qubit is in state  $|b\rangle$ :  $U = |00\rangle\langle 00| + |01\rangle\langle 10| + |10\rangle\langle 01| - |11\rangle\langle 11|$ .

**Example 1** Suppose Alice's qubit is in the initial state  $|s\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$  and the qubit on the CTC (notice we refrain from calling it a *ctcbit* for the moment) is in the state  $|ctc\rangle = \gamma|0\rangle + \delta|1\rangle$ . The two-particle state, then, before Alice's measurement is

$$(|s\rangle \otimes |ctc\rangle) = \alpha\gamma|00\rangle + \alpha\delta|01\rangle + \beta\gamma|10\rangle + \beta\delta|11\rangle. \quad (6)$$

The action of the controlled-phase gate on this produces

$$(|s'\rangle \otimes |ctc\rangle) = \alpha\gamma|00\rangle + \beta\gamma|01\rangle + \alpha\delta|10\rangle - \beta\delta|11\rangle. \quad (7)$$

Notice that it simply exchanged the second and third coefficients. It is immediately obvious that by applying the same gate to equation (7) we regain equation (6). Therefore, it is sufficient for Bob to know the outcome of Alice's measurement and what that measurement was, in order to recover the state of the original qubit.

This brings up another important question that we address separately.

2. Does the state of the *ctcbit* depend on the initial state of Alice's qubit?

At first glance, this does indeed seem to be the case as one can see from equations (6) and (7). The completely general unitary operation on the combined system is shown in the appendix where it is quite clear that, given a general input state,  $|s\rangle$ , for Alice's qubit, the *ctcbit* may only take on certain values. This seems to render

our protocol useless unless we find a different approach.

Thus, we reinterpret this limitation in a fundamental way. Instead of making the *ctcbit* dependent on the input state,  $|s\rangle$ , which would seem to present a paradox since, by definition, the *ctcbit* can never change and should logically precede the input state, we instead assume that the *ctcbits* are completely general and thus it is  $|s\rangle$  that is then limited. This may not appear at first to be much of a trade-off – in order to prevent a paradox we have had to severely limit what sort of information can be transmitted on the CTC. But there is a way around this limitation as well if we assume there exists a random aggregate of *ctcbits* on the CTC such that for any given input state  $|s\rangle$  there will be a corresponding *ctcbit* we may use to encode it. Alternately, if finding the right *ctcbit* on a given CTC proves difficult one could have multiple CTCs in the same relative spatial region, each with one *ctcbit*, such that for any input state  $|s\rangle$  there will exist a corresponding CTC with the correct *ctcbit* that can be used to encode it.

The latter does seem to have a bit of an *ad hoc* flavor to it but the former seems entirely reasonable. For example, suppose we have a randomly polarized light beam on a CTC such that each photon in the light beam is capable of acting as a *ctcbit*. In theory, there should be at least one of every type of *ctcbit* needed for correlation with any random input state  $|s\rangle$ . This then reduces the problem to the (non-trivial) technical issue of matching the right  $|s\rangle$  with the right *ctcbit*. While this may prove daunting, if Alice has some way of knowing what  $|s\rangle$  is and can communicate that to Bob along with  $|s'\rangle$ , Bob will know what to look for in the output of his unitary operation. In essence, it boils down to filtering out noise. While non-trivial, it is at least theoretically plausible.

3. How are we certain there is no degradation of the state of the qubit on the CTC?

This is a crucial question and motivates us to finally define a *ctcbit*. By *definition* a qubit on a CTC cannot evolve temporally. As such, we assume the CTC to be noiseless.

**Definition 4** *A ctcbit (italicized in normal text) is defined as the resource of Alice and Bob sharing a qubit on a noiseless closed time-like curve.*

Thus, by definition, there is no degradation along the CTC since it would then not be a CTC.

4. What is the resource trade-off involved in this protocol and is it potentially free and limitless which, according to Refs. [20, 21] it can't be?

As we have initially noted, the *ctcbit* is the resource trade-off here, but the question runs deeper than that. In quantum teleportation it is understood that we can teleport one *qubit* at the expense of an *ebit* which is quantified as in Ref. [20] as

$$1 \text{ qubit} \geq 1 \text{ ebit}.$$

Another way to analyze this is to look at what exists before the teleportation process and compare it to what exists after. Beforehand, we have a pair of maximally entangled qubits (an *ebit*) and a qubit in a state  $|s\rangle$ . After the teleportation process, the state  $|s\rangle$  is now in a different spatial location (assigned to a different qubit) while the *ebit* no longer exists. The state  $|s\rangle$  regardless of where it is assigned actually represents the *qubit*.

## B. Defining additional resources

In our example, a *qubit* is transferred from one qubit to another via a *ctcbit*, but at the expense of what exactly? The state of the original qubit is, of course, changed since it is transferred to a second qubit whose original state is also destroyed. The key here is that the second qubit must be *prepared* in the final state of the first qubit in order for Bob to recover the state of the original qubit. In other words, there are two overlooked pieces of information here in the form of a classical communication between Alice and Bob, or a *cbit*, and Bob's preparation of a generic qubit in the state communicated by Alice. This preparation likely takes the form of a unitary operation. Thus we are motivated to first define a *cbit*.

**Definition 5** *A cbit (italicized in normal text) is defined as being a communication resource that is equivalent to sending a classical bit over an equally classical channel.*

Given this definition, we are now also motivated to update Figure 1 slightly in order to take into account Bob's preparation which cannot be ignored when assessing the resources involved. In particular, Refs. [20, 21] indicate that the resource exchange cannot be reversible. By including Bob's preparation as a step, we see the process is not fully reversible since it is not

symmetric – Bob has a piece of equipment that Alice does not possess, namely the unitary operator that converts some generic qubit into the required state (see Figure 2.). One might legitimately ask why Alice cannot simply send her physical qubit in state  $|s'\rangle$  to Bob. The answer is that there is no guarantee that the state will not degrade before reaching Bob. In fact, the reliability and distance limitations of such a plan would render this protocol essentially useless. Thus we *cannot* utilize this to get around any sort of resource trade-off limitations.




FIGURE 2: The updated CTC protocol showing the evolving qubits. Note that this is clearly a one-way protocol and is not truly reversible since Bob has an extra step to perform. The *genbit* (see below) is in state  $|s''\rangle$ .

This motivates us to define a *genbit* (for generic qubit). In other discussions of resources this might be interpreted in much the same way as an ancilla but by defining it we solidify its status as a resource.

**Definition 6** *We define a genbit to be a qubit (both italicized in normal text) in an arbitrary, but known, state that acts like a “blank sheet” onto which Bob may reproduce state  $|s'\rangle$ . The original state of the genbit is destroyed in any protocol.*

Thus we find that we need the extra *cbit* as well as a *genbit* in order to transfer the state of the *qubit* from Alice to Bob. In other words,

$$1 \text{ qubit} + 1 \text{ cbit} + 1 \text{ genbit} \geq 1 \text{ ctcbt}. \quad (11)$$

Thus the process is not reversible and the resource is not free. Similarly, we can compare the *ctcbt* to *ebits* by comparing our protocol to the quantum teleportation protocol which leads to

$$1 \text{ ctcbt} + 1 \text{ cbit} + 1 \text{ genbit} \geq 1 \text{ ebit}. \quad (12)$$

5. Is the process repeatable or, despite being on a CTC, is it a single-use resource?

This is an intriguing question that motivates an entirely new discussion since, while the resource clearly is not free or reversible, it nonetheless leaves the feeling that something can be overly exploited, i.e. since CTCs don't temporally evolve, the *ctcbt* would seem to be acting a bit like an indestructible *ebit* that pops back into being to be immediately reused which doesn't seem quite proper. In particular, might this not, in some odd way, violate the No-Cloning Theorem? Even if it doesn't, might it introduce inconsistencies in the mutual histories of the various particles involved in the process? To fully handle these questions we need to introduce a new topology.

## V. REPEATABLE MEASUREMENTS AND NON-HAUSDORFF TOPOLOGIES

It turns out that there is a way to ensure consistency in the history of each instance of the transmission of state  $|s\rangle$ . As Visser has suggested, a full theory of CTCs might require employing a non-Hausdorff topology [8]. By employing such a topology we can ensure that a single, consistent history exists for each instance of the transmission. Such a topology would have to be at the core of any complete theory of branching spacetime, though Visser has also made it clear that branching spacetimes are *not* required for the purposes of consistency [8]. Thus, while branching spacetimes are attractive with respect to this particular problem, they may not necessarily be required.<sup>1</sup>

In order to explain a non-Hausdorff topology it is easiest to first define a Hausdorff topology.

**Definition 7** *A topology,  $T_2$ , is Hausdorff if and only if for any two points  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , where  $x_1 \neq x_2$ , there exist open sets,  $\mathcal{O}_1$  and  $\mathcal{O}_2$  such that  $x_1 \in \mathcal{O}_1$ ;  $x_2 \in \mathcal{O}_2$ ; and  $\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2 = \emptyset$ , where  $\emptyset$  is the null set.*

To provide an example of a non-Hausdorff topology (that might also make understanding Hausdorff topologies easier), consider the following example that happens to be one possible manner in which a branching spacetime might be modeled.

**Example 2** *Define a set  $\mathcal{E}_4$  consisting of all the events of ordinary (3+1)-dimensional Minkowski space,  $M^4$ .*

<sup>1</sup> Nor should our employment of branching spacetimes in this context be construed as an endorsement of any particular interpretation of quantum mechanics.

Remove the set  $F$  containing the spacetime event 0, and all subsequent events both inside and on the future light-cone with its vertex at 0. Replace  $F$  by two copies  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . The basis for such a topology on  $\mathcal{E}_4$ :

1. Any open set in  $[M^4 - F] \cup F_1$  is an open set in  $\mathcal{E}_4$ .
2. Any open set in  $[M^4 - F] \cup F_2$  is an open set in  $\mathcal{E}_4$ .

It should be fairly clear why this topology fails to be Hausdorff, but Figure 3 offers a visual description. This is the essence of line-splitting and a generalized version of such a branched spacetime can be found in [8].




FIGURE 3: A simple example of a non-Hausdorff topology represented by line splitting. Adapted from [8].

We can now apply this simple idea to our basic communication protocol. Each time Bob's measurement is made, we implement a simple splitting of the CTC, and then perform the reverse (a "line merger") in order to keep the histories consistent. The simplest way to demonstrate this is graphically as in Figure 3. Mathematically we can express this beginning with the following definitions.

**Definition 8** Define an open set  $\mathcal{E}_m$  consisting of all possible states, any qubit can take both on a given Hilbert space,  $\mathcal{H}$ , and on a simplified (3+1)-dimensional Riemann space,  $\mathbf{R}^4$ , where  $m = 4 + n$  dimensions and  $n$  is the dimension of the Hilbert space.

Therefore, any self-consistent single instance of an input state being successfully teleported is represented by  $\mathcal{E}'_m$  where  $\mathcal{E}'_m \subseteq \mathcal{E}_m$  such that any two  $\mathcal{E}'_m$  do not intersect. We consider the spatial location, or point,  $P$ , of a *ctcbit* to be considered as part of the state.

**Example 2** Consider definitions 2 and 3. Remove the point,  $P$ , consisting of a spacetime point where the *ctcbit* exits  $U$ . We will call this event 0. Also remove the point,  $Q$ , consisting of a spacetime point where the *ctcbit* enters  $U$ . We will call this event 1. Additionally, remove all events both inside and on the future light-cone of  $P$  as well as inside and on the past light-cone of

$Q$ . Note that these are the same since it is a CTC! Replace the set of all events between and including  $P$  and  $Q$  with  $i$  copies such that any set in  $\mathcal{E}'_m = [\mathbf{R}^4 - \{P, Q\}] \cup \{P_i, Q_i\}$  is a set in  $\mathcal{E}'_m$ .

Notice that we have left the Hilbert space unaffected by the non-Hausdorff topology and have only implemented this topology on the Riemannian manifold of everyday spacetime.




FIGURE 3: An example of quantum communication on a multi-branch CTC. Each branch essentially implements the protocol outlined in Figure 1. Notice that the output of each  $U'$  gate is the input to the  $U$  gate.

## B. Invariance of *ctcbits* on non-Hausdorff topology

In introducing the non-Hausdorff topology it is necessary to prove that the *ctcbit* remains invariant on this topology. It is well-established that the CTC itself is invariant on a non-Hausdorff topology [8]. Presumably anything on a CTC would then also be invariant.

**Definition 9** We define a closed non-Hausdorff topology as one in which for each line split at time  $t_1$  there is an associated line merger at a later time  $t_2$ .

**Theorem 1** Any *ctcbit*, as defined above, remains invariant on a closed non-Hausdorff topology.

*Proof.* Note that, because each path in the closed non-Hausdorff topology is a closed loop, by itself it is a closed time-like curve. By definition, a *ctcbit* is invariant on a closed time-like curve. Therefore, *ctcbits* are invariant on closed time-like curves.  $\square$

## IV. CONCLUSION

We have developed a quantum communication protocol utilizing a new resource we call *ctcbits* based on Bacon's analysis of qubits on closed time-like curves [5]. We note that this protocol does not require an entangled pair. There is a distinct advantage to this. As noted in Refs. [29, 30, 31], gravitational fields can degrade entanglement. Since practical realizations (if they even exist) of closed time-like curves are wormholes that likely are very massive (usually involving black holes – see Ref. [8]), our protocol provides a method for quantum communication on CTCs *without* the need for entangled pairs, thus avoiding any problems of entanglement degradation due to the gravitational fields associated with the CTC.

This can be compared to quantum teleportation apart from the degradation problem and can thus be viewed as an interesting alternative. For instance, in the quantum teleportation protocol, the entangled qubits being employed in the protocol must, at some point, be in the same proximity. So, for example, suppose Charles prepares an entangled pair in New York, giving one of the entangled qubits to Alice who remains in New York, and the other to Bob who travels to Tokyo. Only now can Alice teleport quantum states to Bob. Conversely, in the protocol we have developed, rather than needing an entangled pair one “only” needs a CTC. In this way, Alice and Bob need never have even met! Since this framework does include the possibility that the given quantum state could be transferred more than once, we save consistency by employing a non-Hausdorff topology.

Of course, all of this is predicated not just on the existence of CTCs but the ability to manipulate them. It might be possible to relax the requirement of a non-Hausdorff topology (or, perhaps, apply it only to the Hilbert space), but one would still be left with the need for a CTC. Nonetheless, it presents an interesting theoretical laboratory in which we can study the relationship between quantum communication and gravity, and also suggests that perhaps there is a way in which teleportation could be accomplished without the need for an entangled pair.

## Acknowledgements

We acknowledge helpful discussions with Dave Bacon, Todd Brun, Ivette Fuentes-Schuller, Ken Wharton, and Chris Altman. We are greatly indebted to Barry Sanders for helpful comments on an early draft.

## APPENDIX

The action taken by the unitary operator on the combined states  $|s\rangle$  and  $|ctc\rangle$  is

$$U(|s\rangle \otimes |ctc\rangle) \quad (A1)$$

which is most generally written

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} & u_{13} & u_{14} \\ u_{21} & u_{22} & u_{23} & u_{24} \\ u_{31} & u_{32} & u_{33} & u_{34} \\ u_{41} & u_{42} & u_{43} & u_{44} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} s_1 ctc_1 \\ s_2 ctc_1 \\ s_1 ctc_2 \\ s_2 ctc_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} s'_1 ctc_1 \\ s'_2 ctc_1 \\ s'_1 ctc_2 \\ s'_2 ctc_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (A2)$$

This, of course, represents four linear equations,

$$\begin{aligned} u_{11}s_1ctc_1 + u_{12}s_2ctc_1 + u_{13}s_1ctc_2 + u_{14}s_2ctc_2 &= s'_1ctc_1 \\ u_{21}s_1ctc_1 + u_{22}s_2ctc_1 + u_{23}s_1ctc_2 + u_{24}s_2ctc_2 &= s'_2ctc_1 \\ u_{31}s_1ctc_1 + u_{32}s_2ctc_1 + u_{33}s_1ctc_2 + u_{34}s_2ctc_2 &= s'_1ctc_2 \\ u_{41}s_1ctc_1 + u_{42}s_2ctc_1 + u_{43}s_1ctc_2 + u_{44}s_2ctc_2 &= s'_2ctc_2 \end{aligned} \quad (A3)$$

From this it is clear that *either*  $|s\rangle$  or  $|ctc\rangle$  can act as the independent variable but not both. By choosing  $|ctc\rangle$  as independent, we avoid a paradox but severely limit  $|s\rangle$  unless we employ a method like that which is proposed above.

Note that it *is* possible for  $|s\rangle$  and  $|ctc\rangle$  to be independent, but not in a completely general case. So suppose we were interested in whether or not (A3) were linearly independent equations or not. It would be sufficient to show that the right-hand sides were linearly independent, i.e.

$$\alpha_1(s'_1ctc_1) + \alpha_2(s'_2ctc_1) + \alpha_3(s'_1ctc_2) + \alpha_4(s'_2ctc_2) = 0 \quad (A4)$$

where  $\alpha_i = 0$  would have to be the *only* solution. Note that this is the *only* way for the states of the *ctcbits* and the initial state of Alice's qubit to be entirely independent of one another. This is generally tricky and may prove to be experimentally impossible (outside of the already daunting task of obtaining a CTC).

- 
- [1] S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 603 (1992).  
[2] M. S. Morris, K. S. Thorne, and U. Yurtsever, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1446 (1988).

- [3] D. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 3197 (1991).
- [4] T. Brun (2002), Found. Phys. Lett. **16**, gr-qc/0209061.
- [5] D. Bacon, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 032309 (2004), quant-ph/0309189.
- [6] T. C. Ralph, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 012336 (2007), quant-ph/0708.0449.
- [7] S. W. Kim and K. S. Thorne, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 3929 (1991).
- [8] M. Visser, *Lorentzian Wormholes, From Einstein to Hawking* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996).
- [9] S. Deser, R. Jackiw, and G. t'Hooft, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 267 (1992).
- [10] P. Davies, public lecture, Vienna Symposium on the Foundations of Modern Physics, Universität Wien (2007).
- [11] E. F. Eiroa, C. Simeone, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 024021 (2007).
- [12] J. L. Friedman, M. S. Morris, I. D. Novikov, F. Echeverria, G. Klinkhammer, K. S. Thorne, and U. Yurtsever, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 1915 (1990).
- [13] J. L. Friedman and M. S. Morris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 401 (1991).
- [14] J. B. Hartle, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 6543 (1994).
- [15] D. S. Goldwirth, M. J. Perry, T. Piran, and K. S. Thorne, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 3951 (1994).
- [16] H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 4470 (1994).
- [17] H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 3981 (1994).
- [18] M. J. Cassidy, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 5676 (1995).
- [19] S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 5681 (1995).
- [20] S. J. van Enk, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 032339 (2005), quant-ph/0410083.
- [21] A. W. Harrow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 097902 (2004), quant-ph/0307091.
- [22] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [23] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895-1899 (1993).
- [24] D. Bouwmeester, A. K. Ekert, and A. Zeilinger, editors, *The Physics of Quantum Information: Quantum Cryptography, Quantum Teleportation, Quantum Computation* (Springer, Berlin, 2000).
- [25] M. Riebe, H. Häffner, C. F. Roos, W. Hänsel, J. Benhelm, G. P. T. Lancaster, T. W. Körber, C. Becher, F. Schmidt-Kaler, D. F. V. James, and R. Blatt, *Nature* **429**, 734 (2004).
- [26] M. D. Barrett, J. Chiaverini, T. Schaetz, J. Britton, W. M. Itano, J. D. Jost, E. Knill, C. Linger, D. Leibfried, R. Ozeri, and D. J. Wineland, *Nature* **429**, 737 (2004).
- [27] S. Loepp and W. K. Wootters, *Protecting Information: From Classical Error Correction to Quantum Cryptography* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006).
- [28] N. D. Mermin, *Quantum Computer Science* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007).
- [29] I. Fuentes-Schuller (Fuentes-Guridi), and R. B. Mann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** 120404 (2005); see also, G. Adesso and I. Fuentes-Schuller, quant-ph/0702001.
- [30] P. M. Alsing and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** 180404 (2003), quant-ph/0302179; see also quant-ph/0203051.
- [31] P. Hayden and J. Preskill, J. High En. Phys. **120** 0709 (2007), hep-th/0708.4025.