

Causal games of work extraction with indefinite causal order

Gianluca Francica

Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia “G. Galilei”, Università degli Studi di Padova, via Marzolo 8, 35131 Padova, Italy

(Dated: August 5, 2022)

An indefinite causal order, where the causes of events are not necessarily in past events, is predicted by the process matrix framework. A fundamental question is how these non-separable causal structures can be related to the thermodynamic phenomena. Here, we approach this problem by considering the existence of two cooperating local Maxwell’s demons which exploit the presence of global correlations and indefinite causal order to optimize the extraction of work. Thus, we prove that it is possible to get an advantage from the indefinite causal order, also from a statistical point of view.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the common view of the nature, the events have a definite causal order, i.e., the causes of events are in past events. In contrast, it is known that the process matrix formalism of Oreshkov, Costa and Brukner [1] allows causal structures compatible with local quantum mechanics for two parties Alice and Bob, which are causally non-separable, i.e., neither Alice comes before Bob nor Bob comes before Alice, nor a mixture thereof. This indefinite causal order can be exploited to achieve some tasks, e.g., allows us to find a strategy violating the so-called causal inequalities [1, 2], even if there also are causally non-separable processes which admit a causal model [3], i.e., they do not violate causal inequalities (a popular example is the quantum switch model [4]). Moreover, indefinite causal order can provide advantages in certain communication [5–7] and computing tasks [8, 9], and recent experiments have been performed [10–14]. Recently, a certain attention has also been paid to understand the role of indefinite causal order to achieve thermodynamic tasks [15–20]. In particular, in Ref. [20] it is shown how the work extraction by using a quantum switch is related to the daemonic ergotropy [21]. Basically, in the daemonic ergotropy extraction Alice and Bob share a correlated state, if Alice performs measurements on her part and communicates to Bob the outcomes, Bob can perform an optimal unitary cycle to extract the maximum work from his part. Of course, the measurements performed by Alice are in the past of Bob, thus the protocol exhibits a definite causal order. Here, we adopt the same point of view, with the addition that the roles of Alice and Bob can be also reversed, in order to get a causally non-separable structure. As we will show, this allows us to get a work extraction where indefinite causal order plays some major role.

II. ERGOTROPIC CAUSAL GAMES

To link the daemonic ergotropy scheme to an indefinite causal order structure, we assume that Alice and Bob share two correlated states. In particular both Alice and Bob have a square qubit and a circle qubit. The square qubit of Alice and the circle one of Bob (red qubits) are correlated, in particular are in a singlet state, and the circle qubit of Alice and the square one of Bob (blue qubits) are also in a singlet state.

Alice and Bob can perform local operations and can communicate each other. In detail, Alice and Bob perform measurements on the square qubits, and unitary operations on the circle ones. A schematic illustration of the system is given in Fig. 1. Since Alice and Bob can communicate, due to the pres-




FIG. 1. The system is made of four parties, represented by two squares and two circles. The parties in A and B belong to Alice and Bob, respectively, and the parties connected by a line are initially correlated. Local measurements and unitary operations are performed on the squares and the circles, respectively.

ence of global correlations, in principle they can perform optimized unitary operations depending on the measurements to achieve a precise task. Here, we consider the possibility to have causally non-separable processes, and a thermodynamic task that is the work extraction from the total four qubits system, i.e., from the two singlet states. What is the role of indefinite causal order in achieving this task? Due to the violation of causal inequalities, in particular, the probability to guess the neighbor values of the measurement is larger in the causally non-separable case [2], one can expect to extract more work than in the causally separable case. However, the answer is not that simple, let us show why. We start to define the Hamiltonian of the system. The qubits do not interact each other, and a qubit has the Hamiltonian $H = \epsilon(\sigma_x + 1)/2$, with $\epsilon > 0$, where σ_α , with $\alpha = x, y, z$, are the Pauli matrices. Alice and Bob will perform measurements of σ_z on their square qubits. If the system is in the initial state, Alice gets the bit x and the singlet state collapses in $|x\rangle \otimes |\bar{x}\rangle$ with probability $p(x) = 1/2$, where $x = 0, 1$, $|x\rangle$ is eigenstate of σ_z with eigenvalue $2x - 1$ and $\bar{x} = 0$ if $x = 1$, $\bar{x} = 1$ if $x = 0$. Similarly, Bob gets the bit y and the singlet state collapses in $|y\rangle \otimes |\bar{y}\rangle$ with probability $p(y) = 1/2$. We note that one measurement does not change the energy of a singlet state which is ϵ for any value of the bit obtained. This energy can be lowered due to a local unitary operation. To explain how, we start

to take in exam a definite causal order where Alice precedes Bob, i.e., $A < B$, so that, at first, Alice performs a measurement on her square red qubit, and communicate to Bob the bit x , and performs a local unitary operation U_A on her circle blue qubit. Later, Bob uses the bit x of information received to perform a local unitary U_x on his circle red qubit, so that the initial red singlet state becomes $|x\rangle \otimes U_x |\bar{x}\rangle$ with probability $p(x) = 1/2$, thus with the aim to lower the energy, Bob performs the unitary U_x such that $U_x |\bar{x}\rangle = |\pm\rangle$, where $|\pm\rangle$ is the eigenstate of σ_x with eigenvalue ± 1 , and the final energy of the two qubits will be $\epsilon/2$ with equal probability, so that its average is $\epsilon/2$. In detail, the local unitary U_x is such that $U_0 |1\rangle = |\pm\rangle$, $U_0 |0\rangle = |\mp\rangle$, $U_1 |0\rangle = |\pm\rangle$ and $U_1 |1\rangle = |\mp\rangle$. The blue qubits are in the state $(U_A |0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle - U_A |1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ with an average energy equal to ϵ for any U_A . If Bob performs a measurement on his square blue qubit, he gets the state $U_A |\bar{y}\rangle \otimes |y\rangle$ with probability $p(y) = 1/2$, but in average the energy remains ϵ . Thus, in this case the final average energy of the four qubits is equal to $\langle E \rangle = \epsilon/2 + \epsilon = 3\epsilon/2$, which is the lowest value gettable for a definite causal order. Since the work extracted is minus the change of energy, the average work extracted $\langle w \rangle = \epsilon - \langle E \rangle$ gets the maximum value $\langle w \rangle = \epsilon/2$, which is also equal to the daemonic ergotropy. Of course, if Alice and Bob do not communicate but only use local operations, in average they cannot lower the energy of the singlet states, so that the average work is zero, $\langle w \rangle = 0$.

In contrast, in the presence of indefinite causal order Alice and Bob are given the bit inputs x and y , and return the bit outputs a and b , respectively. By taking in account Alice, for each input x and output a , we associate an operation described by a completely positive map $\mathcal{M}_{a|x}^{A_I A_O} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{A_I}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{A_O})$, where $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^X)$ is the space of linear operators over the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}^X of dimension $d_X = 2$. We note that all the maps must sum up to a trace-preserving map. Using the Choi-Jamiolkowski isomorphism [22, 23], we represent the map $\mathcal{M}_{a|x}^{A_I A_O}$ as the operator $M_{a|x}^{A_I A_O} = [I^{A_I} \otimes M_{a|x}^{A_I A_O}(|\varphi^+\rangle \langle \varphi^+|)]^T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{A_I} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{A_O})$, where I^X is the identity matrix on \mathcal{H}^X and $|\varphi^+\rangle = \sum_i |ii\rangle$. The operators $M_{a|x}^{A_I A_O}$ are such that $M_{a|x}^{A_I A_O} \geq 0$ for each a and $\text{Tr}_{A_O} \left\{ \sum_a M_{a|x}^{A_I A_O} \right\} = I^{A_I}$. Similarly, for Bob we get the operators $M_{b|y}^{B_I B_O} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{B_I} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{B_O})$. The joint conditional probability reads

$$p(a, b|x, y) = \text{Tr} \left\{ (M_{a|x}^{A_I A_O} \otimes M_{b|y}^{B_I B_O}) W \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $W \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{A_I} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{A_O} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{B_I} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{B_O})$ is the so-called process matrix, which is an hermitian operator such that the probabilities given by Eq. (1) are non-negative and normalized. In particular, a process matrix W needs to satisfy the conditions [24]

$$W \geq 0, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Tr} \{W\} = d_{A_O} d_{B_O}, \quad (3)$$

$$B_I B_O W = A_O B_I B_O W, \quad (4)$$

$$A_I A_O W = A_I A_O B_O W, \quad (5)$$

$$W = B_O W + A_O W - A_O B_O W, \quad (6)$$

where we have defined the operation

$${}_x W = \frac{I^X}{d_X} \otimes \text{Tr}_X \{W\}. \quad (7)$$

If Bob cannot signal to Alice or Alice cannot signal to Bob we have the process matrices $W^{A < B} = W^{A_I A_O B_I} \otimes I^{B_O}$ or $W^{B < A} = W^{A_I B_I B_O} \otimes I^{A_O}$, respectively, where $W^{A_I A_O B_I} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{A_I} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{A_O} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{B_I})$ and $W^{A_I B_I B_O} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{A_I} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{B_I} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{B_O})$. In detail, from Eqs. (2-6) we get the conditions for the matrix $W^{A_I A_O B_I}$

$$W^{A_I A_O B_I} \geq 0, \quad (8)$$

$$\text{Tr} \{W^{A_I A_O B_I}\} = d_{A_O}, \quad (9)$$

$$B_I W^{A_I A_O B_I} = A_O B_I W^{A_I A_O B_I}, \quad (10)$$

and similar conditions for the matrix $W^{A_I B_I B_O}$. Therefore, a process is causally separable if the process matrix can be expressed in a convex combination

$$W_{sep} = q W^{A < B} + (1 - q) W^{B < A}. \quad (11)$$

We recall that causal non-separability can be inferred by using causal inequalities [1, 2, 24–26]. An example of causal inequality is a bound of the probability of success of the “guess your neighbor’s input” game [2]. For uniform input bits x and y , the probability of success is $p_{succ} = 1/4 \sum_{x,y} p(a = y, b = x|x, y)$ and for a separable process $p_{succ} \leq 1/2$, but it is known that there are causally non-separable processes such that $p_{succ} > 1/2$. One can expect that p_{succ} will play a role in the work extraction. The work extraction scheme can be generalized to the case of indefinite causal order by requiring that Alice and Bob perform the local unitary operations U_a and U_b , respectively, which depend on the bits a and b . It is easy to see that the final state is the mixture

$$\rho = \sum_{x,y,a,b} p(x, y) p(a, b|x, y) |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes U_b |\bar{x}\rangle \langle \bar{x}| U_b^\dagger \otimes U_a |\bar{y}\rangle \langle \bar{y}| U_a^\dagger \otimes |y\rangle \langle y|. \quad (12)$$

We note that the two initial non-correlated singlets become correlated but are still separable. The average final energy of the state ρ is

$$\langle E \rangle = \epsilon + p_1 \epsilon + 2p_2 \epsilon = \epsilon + (1 - p_{succ} + p_2) \epsilon, \quad (13)$$

where we have defined the probabilities p_1 and p_2 to wrong one and two bits, respectively, which are $p_2 = 1/4 \sum_{x,y} p(a = \bar{y}, b = \bar{x}|x, y)$ and $p_1 = 1 - p_{succ} - p_2$. We deduce that the final energy has the probability distribution

$$p_E(E) = \sum_{i=0}^2 p_i \delta(E - \epsilon - i\epsilon), \quad (14)$$

where $p_0 = p_{succ}$. For a definite causal order, the optimal process described above gives $p_{succ} = 1/2$, and no chance of getting both bits wrong, thus $p_2 = 0$ and $p_1 = 1/2$. In this case, we extract the work $w = \epsilon$ or zero with the same probability. For an indefinite causal order such that $p_{succ} >$

1/2, the probability to extract the work $w = \epsilon$ is larger than any definite causal order. Our next question is if it is possible to achieve a gain in the average extracted work, i.e., to get $\langle E \rangle \leq 3\epsilon/2$. Surprisingly, for the system under consideration, the answer is negative, because of the presence of a non-zero probability p_2 . In particular, we find the general upper bound

$$p_{succ} - p_2 \leq 1/2, \quad (15)$$

from which $\langle E \rangle \geq 3\epsilon/2$. To prove the bound of Eq. (15), we note that by using Eq. (1) we get

$$p_{succ} - p_2 = \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} \left\{ \left(\left(M_{0|0}^{A_I A_O} - M_{1|1}^{A_I A_O} \right) \otimes \left(M_{0|0}^{B_I B_O} - M_{1|1}^{B_I B_O} \right) - \left(M_{0|1}^{A_I A_O} - M_{1|0}^{A_I A_O} \right) \otimes \left(M_{0|1}^{B_I B_O} - M_{1|0}^{B_I B_O} \right) \right) W \right\}, \quad (16)$$

from which, since $W \geq 0$, $M_{a|x}^{A_I A_O} \geq 0$ and $M_{b|y}^{B_I B_O} \geq 0$, we get

$$p_{succ} - p_2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} \left\{ \left(M_{0|0}^{A_I A_O} - M_{1|1}^{A_I A_O} \right) \otimes \left(M_{0|0}^{B_I B_O} - M_{1|1}^{B_I B_O} \right) W \right\} \leq \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} \left\{ \left(M_{0|0}^{A_I A_O} \otimes M_{0|0}^{B_I B_O} + M_{1|1}^{A_I A_O} \otimes M_{1|1}^{B_I B_O} \right) W \right\} \quad (18)$$

We note that a process matrix W is such that $[\text{Tr} \{ M_x^{A_I A_O} \otimes M_y^{B_I B_O} W \}] = 1$ for any x and y , where $M_x^{A_I A_O} = \sum_a M_{a|x}^{A_I A_O}$ and $M_y^{B_I B_O} = \sum_b M_{b|y}^{B_I B_O}$, then $\text{Tr} \{ M_{a|x}^{A_I A_O} \otimes M_{b|y}^{B_I B_O} W \} \leq 1$, due to $W \geq 0$, $M_{a|x}^{A_I A_O} \geq 0$ and $M_{b|y}^{B_I B_O} \geq 0$, and so from Eq. (18) we deduce the upper bound of Eq. (15). Similarly, we get also a lower bound, so that in general $|p_{succ} - p_2| \leq 1/2$.

Thus, in the presence of indefinite causal order, if $p_{succ} > 1/2$ then $p_2 > 0$ and $p_1 < 1/2$. From the point of view of the probability distribution of work, with respect to the optimal causally separable process, we get a larger probability p_{succ} to extract the work $w = \epsilon$, a smaller probability p_1 to extract zero work, but the non-zero probability p_2 to perform the work $-w = \epsilon$ gives an average extracted work $\langle w \rangle = \epsilon - \langle E \rangle$ smaller than $\epsilon/2$, and so also a larger variance. However, we note that it is possible to get a gain in the average work extracted for indefinite causal order by appropriately modifying the Hamiltonian. For instance, by considering an interaction between the red qubits, which lowers the highest energy level from 2ϵ to ϵ , i.e., by adding the interaction $-\epsilon(\sigma_x^A + 1) \otimes (\sigma_x^B + 1)/4 = -\epsilon|+\rangle\langle +| \otimes |+\rangle\langle +|$, so that we have a ground state $|-\rangle \otimes |-\rangle$ with zero energy and three states with energy ϵ , and, of course, by also adding the same interaction between the two blue qubits, we get the probability distribution of energy

$$p_E(E) = p_{succ} \delta(E - \epsilon) + (1 - p_{succ}) \delta(E - 2\epsilon), \quad (19)$$

which depends only on the probability p_{succ} . In this case, the system initially is in one of the states with highest energy. Thus, the average work extracted is $\langle w \rangle = \epsilon - \langle E \rangle = (p_{succ} - 1)\epsilon$, which is larger than the causal bound $\epsilon/2$ for an indefinite causal order such that $p_{succ} > 1/2$. We note that this situation can also be easily realized by using a couple of

two spinless fermions which interact with the Hamiltonian $H_\alpha = \epsilon n_\alpha^A + \epsilon n_\alpha^B - \epsilon n_\alpha^A n_\alpha^B$, where n_α^A and n_α^B are the number operators of the fermions of Alice and Bob, respectively, with $\alpha = red, blue$.

In the end, it is worth observing that the advantage in the work extraction can be related to the formation of correlations between the red qubits and the blue ones in the final state ρ of Eq. (12). In particular, for the optimal process with definite causal order giving $p_{succ} = 1/2$, in the final state the red qubits are not correlated with the blue ones. In general, the total correlations are quantified by the mutual information $I_{red:blue} = S_{red} + S_{blue} - S_{red,blue}$, where S_{red} and S_{blue} are the von-Neumann entropies of the reduced final states of the red and blue qubits, respectively. In detail, the von-Neumann entropy of a state ρ is defined as $S = -\text{Tr} \{ \rho \log_2 \rho \}$. Conversely, $S_{red,blue}$ is the von-Neumann entropy of the final state ρ of the total system, which explicitly reads $S_{red,blue} = -\sum_{a,b,x,y} \lambda_{abxy} \log_2 \lambda_{abxy}$, where $\lambda_{abxy} = p(x,y)p(a,b|x,y)$ are the eigenvalues of the density matrix ρ . Since $\sum_{a,b} \lambda_{abxy} = p(x,y) = 1/4$ and $\sum_{x,y} \lambda_{abxy} = p'(a,b)$, where $p'(a,b)$ is the probability to get the outputs a and b , we get $S_{red,blue} = 2 + H_{A,B} - I_{I:O}$, where $H_{A,B} = -\sum_{a,b} p'(a,b) \log_2 p'(a,b)$ is the Shannon entropy corresponding to the outputs a, b , and $I_{I:O}$ is the mutual information between the inputs x,y and the outputs a, b . Then, we get

$$I_{red:blue} = S_{red} + S_{blue} - 2 + I_{I:O} - H_{A,B}, \quad (20)$$

from which, since $S_{red} \leq 2$ and $S_{blue} \leq 2$, we get the upper bound

$$I_{red:blue} \leq 2 + I_{I:O} - H_{A,B}, \quad (21)$$

where $0 \leq H_{A,B} - I_{I:O} \leq 1$. To derive a lower bound of $I_{red:blue}$, we consider that the entropy is non-negative, so that $S_{red} + S_{blue} \geq (S_{red} + S_{blue})/2$, and by using the inequality $|X+Y| \geq ||X| - |Y||$, from Eq. (20) we get

$$I_{red:blue} \geq |H_{A,B} - I_{I:O} - 2 + (S_{red} + S_{blue})/2|. \quad (22)$$

If $H_{A,B} - I_{I:O} - 2 + (S_{red} + S_{blue})/2 \geq 0$, from the latter, by using Eq. (20) to express $S_{red} + S_{blue}$ in terms of $I_{red:blue}$, $I_{I:O}$ and $H_{A,B}$, we get the lower bound

$$I_{red:blue} \geq 3(H_{A,B} - I_{I:O}) - 2. \quad (23)$$

We note that if this lower bound is non-negative, then $3(H_{A,B} - I_{I:O}) - 2 \geq -I_{red:blue}$ from which, by using Eq. (20), we get $H_{A,B} - I_{I:O} - 2 + (S_{red} + S_{blue})/2 \geq 0$, such that Eq. (23) is satisfied. Thus, in general we can write

$$I_{red:blue} \geq \max\{0, 3(H_{A,B} - I_{I:O}) - 2\}. \quad (24)$$

We note that Eqs. (21) and (24) connect the formation of correlations between the red and blue qubits only to the information exchange. Concerning $H_{A,B}$, as shown in Ref. [27], there exist causally non-separable process matrices W such that $H_{A,B}(W) > \max_{W_{sep} \in \mathcal{S}_W} H_{A,B}(W_{sep})$, where \mathcal{S}_W is the set of all the separable processes W_{sep} , defined by Eq. (11),

such that $\Delta(W^{A \prec B}) = \Delta(W)$ and $\Delta(W^{B \prec A}) = \Delta(W)$, and $\Delta(W)$ is the non-signalling part of the process matrix W defined as $\Delta(W) = {}_{A_O B_O} W$. Thus, for given operators $M_{a|x}^{A_I A_O}$ and $M_{b|y}^{B_I B_O}$, it is possible to get a larger lower bound of the mutual information $I_{red:blue}$ if there is indefinite causal order, and to get a larger amount of correlations between the red and the blue qubits. For instance, for the causally non-separable process matrix of Ref. [2], which violates causal inequalities giving $p_{succ} = 5(1 + 1/\sqrt{2})/16$, that is

$$W = \frac{1}{4} \left(I^{\otimes 4} + \frac{\sigma_z^{A_I} \sigma_z^{A_O} \sigma_z^{B_I} I^{B_O} + \sigma_z^{A_I} I^{A_O} \sigma_x^{B_I} \sigma_x^{B_O}}{\sqrt{2}} \right), \quad (25)$$

where the tensor products are implicit, and the local operations

$$M_{0|0}^{A_I A_O} = M_{0|0}^{B_I B_O} = 0, \quad (26)$$

$$M_{1|0}^{A_I A_O} = M_{1|0}^{B_I B_O} = |\varphi^+\rangle \langle \varphi^+|, \quad (27)$$

$$M_{0|1}^{A_I A_O} = M_{0|1}^{B_I B_O} = |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|, \quad (28)$$

$$M_{1|1}^{A_I A_O} = M_{1|1}^{B_I B_O} = |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|, \quad (29)$$

we get a non-zero mutual information $I_{red:blue} \approx 1.0951$, so that correlations have been generated. Moreover, the two bounds are $I_{I:O} - H_{A,B} + 2 \approx 1.2993$ and $3(H_{A,B} - I_{I:O}) - 2 \approx 0.102$, so that $I_{red:blue}$ is closer to the upper bound since $S_{red} = S_{blue} \approx 1.8979$ is closer to two than zero. In particular, we get $p_2 = (5 + 1/\sqrt{2})/16$, in agreement with Eq. (15).

III. CONCLUSIONS

To summarize, we suggested a general scheme to achieve an advantage in work extraction games in the presence of indefinite causal order. For a system of four qubits, we showed that the probability to extract a positive work in a single realization is equal to the success probability of the “guess your neighbor’s input” game. However, depending on the Hamiltonian, the average work extracted can be not larger than the one extracted for definite causal order. We think that the advantage achieved can be also related to the formation of correlations between the two couples of the two qubits. Moreover, the fact that a larger average work can be extracted if there is indefinite causal order suggests that a reformulation of the thermodynamic second law, which in general bounds the work extractable, is necessary. In conclusion, we hope that our results can open a new avenue in applying indefinite causal order structures in thermodynamics and can inspire further investigations and applications in these fields.

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges financial support from the project BIRD 2021 “Correlations, dynamics and topology in long-range quantum systems” of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Padova.

-
- [1] O. Oreshkov, F. Costa and Č. Brukner, Nat. Commun. 3, 1092 (2012).
- [2] C. Branciard, M. Araújo, A. Feix, F. Costa and Č. Brukner, New J. Phys. 18, 013008 (2016).
- [3] A. Feix, M. Araújo and Č. Brukner, New J. Phys. 18, 083040 (2016).
- [4] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, P. Perinotti and B. Valiron, Phys. Rev. A 88, 022318 (2013).
- [5] A. Feix, M. Araújo and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. A 92, 052326 (2015).
- [6] P. A. Guérin, A. Feix, M. Araújo and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 100502 (2016).
- [7] D. Ebler, S. Salek and G. Chiribella, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120, 120502 (2018).
- [8] G. Chiribella, Phys. Rev. A 86, 040301(R) (2012).
- [9] M. Araújo, F. Costa and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 250402 (2014).
- [10] L. M. Procopio, A. Moqanaki, M. Araújo, F. Costa, I. Alonso Calafell, E. G. Dowd, D. R. Hamel, L. A. Rozema, Č. Brukner and P. Walther, Nat. Commun. 6, 7913 (2015).
- [11] G. Rubino, L. A. Rozema, A. Feix, M. Araújo, J. M. Zeuner, L. M. Procopio, Č. Brukner and P. Walther, Sci. Adv. 3, e1602589 (2017).
- [12] K. Goswami, C. Giarmatzi, M. Kewming, F. Costa, C. Branciard, J. Romero and A. G. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 090503 (2018).
- [13] K. Goswami, Y. Cao, G. A. Paz-Silva, J. Romero and A. G. White, Phys. Rev. Research 2, 033292 (2020).
- [14] G. Rubino, L. A. Rozema, D. Ebler, H. Kristjánsson, S. Salek, P. A. Guérin, A. A. Abbo, C. Branciard, Č. Brukner, G. Chiribella and P. Walther, Phys. Rev. Research 3, 013093 (2021).
- [15] X. Nie, X. Zhu, C. Xi, X. Long, Z. Lin, Y. Tian, C. Qiu, X. Yang, Y. Dong, J. Li, T. Xin, and D. Lu, arXiv:2011.12580.
- [16] H. Cao, N. Wang, Z.-A. Jia, C. Zhang, Y. Guo, B.-H. Liu, Y. F. Huang, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, arXiv:2101.07979.
- [17] D. Felce, V. Vedral, and F. Tennie, arXiv:2107.12413.
- [18] D. Felce, and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett. 125, 070603 (2020).
- [19] T. Guha, M. Alimuddin, and P. Parashar, Phys. Rev. A 102, 032215 (2020).
- [20] K. Simonov, G. Francica, G. Guarnieri, and M. Paternostro, Phys. Rev. A 105, 032217 (2022).
- [21] G. Francica, J. Goold, F. Plastina, and M. Paternostro, npj Quantum Inf. 3, 12 (2017).
- [22] M.D. Choi, Linear Algebra Appl. 10, 285-90 (1975).
- [23] A. Jamiolkowski, Rep. Math. Phys. 3, 275-8 (1972).
- [24] M. Araújo, C. Branciard, F. Costa, A. Feix, C. Giarmatzi and Č. Brukner, New J. Phys. 17, 102001 (2015).
- [25] A. Baumeler, A. Feix and S. Wolf, Phys. Rev. A 90, 042106 (2014).
- [26] O. Oreshkov and C. Giarmatzi, New J. Phys. 18, 093020 (2016).
- [27] G. Francica, Phys. Lett. A 422 (2022) 127815; G. Francica, Phys. Lett. A 436 (2022) 128087.