

# The role of non-classicality in mediated spatial quantum correlations

Salvatore Raia,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Giuseppe Di Pietra,<sup>2</sup> and Chiara Marletto<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa, Largo Bruno Pontecorvo 3, 56127 Pisa, Italy*

<sup>2</sup>*Clarendon Laboratory, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PU, United Kingdom*

(Dated: October 2, 2024)

The study of non-classicality is essential to understand the quantum-to-classical transition in physical systems. Recently a witness of non-classicality has been proposed, linking the ability of a system (“the mediator”) to create quantum correlations between two quantum probes with its non-classicality, intended as the existence of at least two non-commuting variables. Here we propose a new inequality that quantitatively links the increase in quantum correlations between the probes to the degree of non-commutativity of the mediator’s observables. We test the inequality for various degrees of non-classicality of the mediator, from fully quantum to fully classical. This quantum-to-classical transition is simulated via a phase-flip channel applied to the mediator, inducing an effective reduction of the non-commutativity of its variables. Our results provide a general framework for witnessing non-classicality, quantifying the non-classicality of a system via its intrinsic properties (such as its Hilbert space dimension and observable commutators) beyond the specifics of interaction dynamics.

## INTRODUCTION

Understanding what makes quantum systems different from classical systems has been a central issue in quantum information and quantum foundations. One way to characterise the quantumness of a physical system is via its non-classicality, here defined as the fact that it has at least two variables that do not commute - i.e., that cannot be measured simultaneously to arbitrarily high accuracy by the same device. Recently, new experiments have been proposed to indirectly witness the non-classicality of a mediator of interactions between two quantum probes [1]. These experiments suggest that the creation of entanglement between two quantum probes, which interact locally only through a mediator  $M$ , can serve as a witness of its non-classical nature (see Figure 1). An immediate application of this argument is a witness to the non-classicality of the gravitational field, as described in [2, 3]; however, the witness is more generally applicable [1].




Figure 1: (a): The two probes  $A$  and  $B$  in a separable initial state interacting via the mediator  $M$  through the Hamiltonians  $\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}$ . (b): The two probes  $A$  and  $B$  are in a final entangled state after the mediated interaction occurs.

Interestingly, a *general method* for quantitatively assessing the witness, independent of the chosen model

for the mediator and its interactions with the probes, is currently lacking. This prompts the need for a broader framework capable of encompassing a wide range of possible models for the systems and the interactions involved. Addressing this need is one of the primary motivations for this work.

The degree of non-classicality of the mediator can be quantified via a suitable function of its variables’ commutator; however, the witness of non-classicality as originally proposed is only qualitative: it does not explicitly link the amount of entanglement generated by the probes to the degree of non-classicality of the mediator. Recently, there has been an important step towards expressing this connection, [4, 5], by linking the amount of entanglement generated between the probes with specific features of the interaction Hamiltonians between the mediator and each of the probes. Here we build on this important result to deliver a quantitative connection between the gain in quantum correlations between the two probes and the non-classicality of the mediator, expressed solely as a function of the mediator’s intrinsic properties, independent of the specific interaction Hamiltonians. Specifically, we propose a novel inequality where the increase in quantum correlations  $\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}$  between the two probes is a measurable lower bound to a function of the commutator of the mediator’s observables and the dimension of the mediator’s Hilbert space. The inequality is general because the interactions between the systems involved are left unspecified (aside from the assumption of finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces).

We also investigate the impact of decoherence on the mediator’s observables, particularly through a phase-flip channel applied to the mediator. We show that as the phase-flip parameter  $p$  approaches  $\frac{1}{2}$ , the commutator value approaches zero; this simulates a transition from a fully quantum system to a fully classical system, which is unable to create quantum correlations between the

probes.

Our result offers a deeper understanding of the mediator's role as a quantum channel capable of distributing entanglement between two communicating parties, as it focuses on a quantitative characterisation of the mediator rather than how it dynamically interacts with the probes.

## CHARACTERISATION OF NON-CLASSICAL INTERACTIONS

We shall now briefly recall the main findings of [4, 5], upon which we base our generalised inequality. Suppose our system is made of two quantum probes,  $A$  and  $B$ , and a mediator  $M$ , and the interactions are exclusively *local*, meaning no direct interaction between  $A$  and  $B$  is allowed, and *classical*, such that the two Hamiltonians  $\hat{H}_{AM}$  and  $\hat{H}_{MB}$  commute.

In this context, it can be shown that the amount of quantum correlation  $Q$  between  $A$  and  $B$  after the interactions cannot exceed the initial total correlation already established in the system before the interactions.

The correlation measure  $Q$  is a  $gd$ -continuous function which is a property shared by the most commonly used quantum correlation measures, such as entropy of entanglement and logarithmic negativity [6, 7]. Being  $gd$ -continuous implies that  $Q$  is monotonic under local processing and defined by the continuity property  $|Q(x) - Q(y)| \leq g(d(x, y))$  where  $g$  is an invertible monotonically increasing function and  $d$  is a distance between states  $x$  and  $y$ .

When considering witnesses of non-classicality, we are interested in scenarios where the mediator  $M$  is governed by potentially *unknown* interactions and *experimentally inaccessible*, thus all the involved quantities must be independent of  $M$ . We can now provide a formal definition of *classical* and *non-classical interaction*. The quantity which is used to describe the degree of non-classicality of interactions is the Hamiltonians' commutator  $[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}]$ , whose norm is 0 when the interactions are classical, greater than 0 otherwise.

When the interactions are classical, the induced map acting on the system  $\Lambda_{AB} = \text{tr}_M[\Lambda_{AMB}]$  belongs to  $\overline{DEC}(m)$  [4] which means that exists a Steinspring dilation of dimension  $m > \dim_M$  which is *decomposable*. A map that acts on the tripartite system  $\lambda_{AMB}(\rho)$  is decomposable if there exist two other CPTP maps  $\lambda_{AM}$  and  $\lambda_{MB}$  such that

$$\lambda_{AMB}(\rho) = \lambda_{MB} \circ \lambda_{AM}(\rho)$$

We can now move to the main results of [4, 5]. It is demonstrated that if the total quantum correlation shared between  $A$  and  $B$  increases, the mediated interactions are *non-classical*. Mathematically we have:

$$Q_{A:B}(\rho_t) - \mathcal{B}(Q(\rho_0)) = \Delta Q_{corr\ A:B} > 0 \quad (1)$$




Figure 2: The sphere  $\overline{DEC}(m)$  represents the space of all the decomposable  $m$ -dilation maps.  $\lambda_{AB}$  instead, is the decomposable map which minimises the distance between the non-decomposable map  $\Lambda_{AB}$ , induced from the Hamiltonians  $\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}$ , and the set  $\overline{DEC}(m)$ .

The increase in quantum correlation is defined by  $\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}$ . The quantity  $Q_{A:B}(\rho_t)$  is the amount of accessible (i.e. measurable) quantum correlation of the evolved system  $\rho_t = \Lambda_{AB}(\rho_0)$  and  $\mathcal{B}(Q(\rho_0))$  is the maximum possible initial quantum correlation between  $A$  and  $B$ . An exact definition of  $\mathcal{B}$  is given in Appendix A.0. Additionally, It can be shown that *the non-decomposability of the induced map  $\Lambda_{AB}$  implies the non-classicality of interactions*.

This last result is used to show the second important finding in [4], which states that when the quantum correlation gain in the system is positive, meaning that inequality (1) holds, then  $g^{-1}(\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B})$  serves as a lower bound to the *degree of non-decomposability* of the induced map  $\Lambda_{AB}$ , which is the quantity employed to quantify non-classicality of interactions. Formally we have:

$$g^{-1}(\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}) \leq \mathcal{D}^{\overline{DEC}(m)}(\Lambda_{AB}) \quad (2)$$

The function  $g$  is the one appearing in the  $gd$ -continuity property of  $Q$ , while the degree of non-decomposability  $\mathcal{D}^{\overline{DEC}(m)}(\Lambda_{AB})$ , is the minimum distance between the non-decomposable map  $\Lambda_{AB}$  and the space of maps with a decomposable  $m$ -dilation.

A visual explanation of  $\mathcal{D}^{\overline{DEC}(m)}(\Lambda_{AB})$  can be found in Figure (2).

We summarise this second result schematically:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Q_{corr\ A:B} \geq 0 &\implies \text{non-decomposability} \implies \\ &\implies \text{non-classicality of interactions, } [\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] \neq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

We stress here that  $\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}$  in (2) depends only on quantities related to the two probes  $A$  and  $B$  which can be measured in the laboratory. This is crucial to

experimentally set a lower bound to the degree of non-decomposability of the interaction-induced map.

Let us now proceed with our discussion by introducing one of our new results, which sets the degree of non-decomposability as a lower bound to a function of the degree of non-classicality of interactions.

Starting from the definition of  $\mathcal{D}^{DEC(m)}(\Lambda_{AB})$  we are going to show that this quantity is indeed a lower bound to a function of the commutator of the Hamiltonians of the system. To achieve this, we need only to replace the distance  $\mathcal{D}$  to the spectral norm at the cost of adding a constant depending on the dimension of  $M$ 's Hilbert space, denoted as  $C(\dim_M)$ . We then proceed by reversing the substitutions from the induced map to Hamiltonians,  $\Lambda \rightarrow U \rightarrow \hat{H}$ , where  $U$  is the corresponding unitary operator.

The final result of this process, with detailed calculations, provided in Appendix A.1, is:

$$g^{-1}(\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}) \leq 2C(\dim_M) \sqrt{\sigma_{\max} \left( 2 \left( \mathbb{I} - \cos \left( \Im \left[ \hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB} \right] \frac{t^2}{2} \right) \right) \right)} \quad (4)$$

This result is valid in the regime of small  $t$ , the interaction time, where the terms of order higher than  $t^2$  in the Zassenhaus expansion of the corresponding unitary  $U$  are neglected.  $\sigma_{\max}$  indicates the maximum eigenvalue,  $\Im$  is the imaginary component of the commutator. The result can be summarised by

$$g^{-1}(\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}) \leq f \left( \dim_M, \left[ \hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB} \right] \right) \quad (5)$$

This inequality connects the gain in quantum correlation between  $A$  and  $B$  to a function of the commutator of the interactions  $[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}]$ . The explicit expression for the function  $f$  can always be determined once  $M$  and its interactions with the probes are specified; thus, it can give information on the mediator's non-classicality independently of the chosen model.

Before proceeding further, it's worth making some remarks on the main result of the inequality (4). If we impose classical interactions, namely  $[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] = 0$ , the quantity under the square root reduces to 0, rendering the upper bound null, as we expected. This implies that no quantum correlation gain can be achieved. Consequently, in the case of classical interactions, the condition (1) cannot be satisfied, which aligns with the findings in [4]. Additionally, the quantity under the square root in (4) is upper-bounded by 4, which can be experimentally achieved by any non-classical interaction given the correct interaction time. However, since we truncated the Zassenhaus expansion of the corresponding unitary up to the second order (see (A.2) in Appendix A.0), this approximation is valid only for small  $t$ , implying that the

maximum might not be reached within this regime. Furthermore, the upper bound of 4 is also obtained with the exact splitting of the unitary, which is valid for any  $t$ . Thus applying a further minimisation to (4) by taking the sup of the square root we obtain

$$g^{-1}(\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}) \leq 4C(\dim_M) = f_1(\dim_M) \quad (6)$$

This last result implies that if we were able to invert the function  $C(\dim_M)$ , we could establish a lower bound to the dimensionality of  $M$ 's Hilbert space by experimentally measuring the quantum correlation gain between the probes. Unlike the function  $f$  appearing in (5), this inequality is now model-independent and every part can be determined without specifying the exact Hamiltonians which took part in the process. This is desirable in real experimental settings where the mediator is inaccessible. However, we are still guaranteed from the remarks of (5) that, if we measure an increase in quantum correlation between the probes, the interactions must be non-classical. Inverting the function  $C$  is just a mathematical problem, with no physical reasons preventing it.

We can now give an example of (4) by choosing  $Q$  to be a specific quantum correlation measure: the relative entropy of entanglement  $E_{A:B}(\rho)$ . With this choice, the inequality in (4) further simplifies in:

$$g^{-1}(E_{A:B}(\rho_t) - \mathcal{B}_E(\rho_0)) = \exp(E_{A:B}(\rho_t) - \mathcal{B}_E(\rho_0)) \quad (7)$$

The  $g$  function of  $E_{A:B}(\rho)$  is a log, so we can derive a direct condition on the relative entropy of entanglement, rather than on the inverse of its  $gd$ -continuous function:

$$E_{A:B}(\rho_t) - \mathcal{B}_E(\rho_0) \leq \log \left\{ 2C(\dim_M) \sqrt{\sigma_{\max} \left[ 2 \left( \mathbb{I} - \cos \left( \Im \left[ \hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB} \right] \frac{t^2}{2} \right) \right) \right]} \right\} \quad (8)$$

## FROM NON-CLASSICAL INTERACTIONS TO NON-CLASSICAL MEDIATOR

The goal of this following section will be to generally express the non-classicality of interactions, i.e. non-commutativity of interaction Hamiltonians, in terms of the *non-classicality of the mediator*, namely the non-commutativity of mediator's observables, shifting from a model-dependent point of view to a model-independent one.

The starting point is to define more precisely the most general  $\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}$  and then explicitly calculate their commutator.

To define the Hamiltonians we first need to define  $A$ ,  $B$  and the mediator  $M$ . Following the assumptions of finite dimensions for the quantum probes  $A$  and  $B$  and the

mediator  $M$ , we have two possible very general choices for the Hilbert Spaces  $\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_M, \mathcal{H}_B$ . The first is to consider a generic  $N$ -dimensional Hilbert space, while the second possibility is to choose a Tensor Product of qubit Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ , that, given the generality of quantum computation, would allow us to use a certain amount of qubits to simulate any quantum system of finite dimension [8]. To simplify the notation and without loss of generality, we set the mediator  $M$  to be a chain of  $T$  qubits with dimensions  $N_M = 2^T$ , while the probes  $A$  and  $B$  to be  $N_A, N_B$  dimensional systems described by Hilbert spaces with  $SU(N)$  operator algebra. Thus, the most general  $\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}$  Hamiltonians will be:

$$\hat{H}_{AM} = \sum_{i,j_1,j_2,\dots,j_T} \alpha_{i,j_1,j_2,\dots,j_T} (a_i \otimes m_{j_1} \otimes m_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \quad (9)$$

and

$$\hat{H}_{MB} = \sum_{l_1,l_2,\dots,l_T,k} \beta_{l_1,l_2,\dots,l_T,k} (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes m_{l_1} \otimes m_{l_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{l_T} \otimes b_k) \quad (10)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are real-valued coefficients,  $a_i$  and  $b_k$  are  $SU(N_A)$  and  $SU(N_B)$  operators including the identity;  $\{m_{j_1}\}_{j_1=0,\dots,3}$  is the set of the Pauli operators plus the identity for the first qubit of the mediator in  $\hat{H}_{AM}$ , where the number used as a subscript, indicates which qubit of the mediator the operator refers to. To distinguish the mediator operators appearing in  $\hat{H}_{MB}$  from those appearing in  $\hat{H}_{AM}$ , the subscript  $l$  replaces  $j$ . Most importantly, the identity operators appearing in the tensor products come from imposing the *locality* condition on the interactions. This avoids any direct interaction term of the pair  $AB$  or  $AMB$ , thus enforcing locality.

Considering for simplicity two qubits for the mediator, the commutator of the Hamiltonians reads:

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] &= \sum_{i,j_1,j_2,l_1,l_2,k} \alpha_{i,j_1,j_2} \beta_{l_1,l_2,k} a_i \otimes \\ &\left( [m_{j_1}, m_{l_1}] \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} + m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes [m_{j_2}, m_{l_2}] \right) \otimes b_k \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The explicit derivation of this last equation is detailed in Appendix A.2. To clarify the meaning of the result we should manipulate the mediator observables part of (11) in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} [m_{j_1}, m_{l_1}] \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} + m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes [m_{j_2}, m_{l_2}] &= \\ = m_{j_1} m_{l_1} \otimes \{m_{j_2}, m_{l_2}\} - 2\delta_{l_1 j_1} \mathbb{I} \otimes m_{l_2} m_{j_2} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the explicit calculations can be found in Appendix A.2. To better understand the meaning of this last result, we can distinguish two possibilities:

1.  $l_1 \neq j_1$ : this condition implies  $\delta_{l_1 j_1} = 0$ , leaving  $m_{j_1} m_{l_1} \otimes \{m_{j_2}, m_{l_2}\}$  to be the only term that may be non-vanishing in (12). This is the case when:

$$\begin{cases} m_{l_2} = m_{j_2} = X \\ m_{l_2} = m_{j_2} = Y \\ m_{l_2} = m_{j_2} = Z \end{cases} \text{ or } \begin{cases} m_{l_2} = I, m_{j_2} = X, Y, Z \\ m_{l_2} = X, Y, Z, m_{j_2} = I \end{cases}$$

2.  $l_1 = j_1$ : after some simple manipulations (12) reads:

$$\mathbb{I} \otimes \{m_{j_2}, m_{l_2}\} - 2\mathbb{I} \otimes m_{l_2} m_{j_2} = \mathbb{I} \otimes [m_{l_2}, m_{j_2}]$$

In this second case, only non-commuting terms of  $M_2$  make (12) non-vanishing. Generally, given the observables of the specific chosen Hamiltonians, only a single commutator of one of the mediator's qubits is non-vanishing. This implies that even a *single* quantum system in a composite classical-quantum mediator  $M$  is enough to mediate the quantum correlations between the probes  $A$  and  $B$ .

Now we are ready to substitute the resulting expression of the commutator of Hamiltonians in (5) obtaining the following final result

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}(\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}) &\leq f\left(\dim_M, [\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}]\right) = \\ &= f(\dim_M, [m_j, m_l]) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $f$  is the appropriate function which helps to simplify the notation. With this final inequality, we have obtained an experimentally measurable lower bound to a function of the dimension of the mediator Hilbert space and the non-classicality of  $M$  expressed as the non-commutativity of its observables.

In what follows, we shall explore what happens when we send the commutator  $[m_j, m_l]$  to 0. This is equivalent to considering a progressively more classical mediator, and formally restricting the upper bound to the possible value of  $\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}$  and the non-classicality condition expressed in (1).

## A CLASSICAL MEDIATOR CANNOT CREATE QUANTUM CORRELATIONS

In real experimental scenarios, physical systems under investigation cannot be perfectly protected from interactions with the environment, leading to some errors and noise that inevitably modify our system by making it *classical*, in the sense that they become fully describable by a single observable as per our definition. It is thus crucial to understand the effects of this process on the capability of the unknown system to mediate quantum coherence. The results presented in this work are perfect for the scope, as (13) shows that the upper bound to the probes' quantum correlation gain mediated by  $M$ , is indeed a function of its non-classicality.

A common noisy channel that might be considered for this purpose, is the *phase-flip channel* which can act on our qubits, making the commutator's value of their observables vanish. This happens when the value of  $p$ , a free parameter of the phase flip, is  $\frac{1}{2}$ . This possibility is interesting because it sets the upper bound of the inequality (4) to 0, effectively preventing the possibility for the mediator to increase the quantum correlation across the two probes. This result suggests that a completely decohered quantum channel can not increase the quantum correlations between two probes, as one can physically expect.

Given these considerations, we are going to allow the qubits of the mediator in our system to be affected separately by independent phase-flips channels with consequent degradation of the commutativity of its observables, essentially making them progressively more classical under our definition. To do this we shall resort to the Heisenberg picture of quantum mechanics, using the descriptors formalism [9]. Since we have defined a base of observables, it will be enough to see how they are affected by the phase flip.

Let  $q_x$  denote an operator representing a tensor product of the  $X$  component of a qubit in our system with the identity operators on all other subsystems, for example,  $q_{x_{j_1}} = \mathbb{I}_A \otimes X_{M_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{M_2} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{M_3} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{I}_B$  where the subscript  $j_1$  in  $q_x$  indicates the first qubit of the mediator coupled with the probe  $A$  in the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{AM}$ . Then we have also  $q_z, q_y$ , with  $q_x^2 = q_y^2 = q_z^2 = I$  and the products  $q_z q_x = i q_y$ ,  $q_x q_z = -i q_y$  which define the algebraic properties. If a gate  $U(t_n)$  operates between time  $t_n$  and  $t_{n+1}$ , we shall denote:  $\mathcal{O}_x(t_{n+1}) = U(t_n)^\dagger \mathcal{O}_x(t_n) U(t_n)$  the operator representing the observable  $\mathcal{O}_x$  after its action. The initial conditions are fixed by choosing particular values for  $q_x(t_0), q_y(t_0), q_z(t_0)$ , and the Heisenberg state  $\rho_H$ . Using the algebraic relations for the observables defined above, the state of a qubit at time  $t_n$  is then completely specified by giving at least two components, e.g.  $\{q_x(t), q_z(t)\}$  [10]. Let's recall how a phase-flip acts on a qubit and its observables. For a general observable  $\mathcal{O}_x(t)$ , the phase-flip channel acts as

$$\hat{E}(\mathcal{O}_x(t)) = \sum_a M_a(t)^\dagger \mathcal{O}_x(t) M_a(t)$$

where the  $M_a$  are the Kraus operators of the phase-flip channel:  $M_0(t) = \sqrt{p}I$ ,  $M_1(t) = \sqrt{1-p} q_z(t)$ . After this operation, the generators of the algebra of the qubit undergoing decoherence, are affected in the following way [10] :

$$\hat{E}(q_x(t)) = (2p-1)q_x(t) \quad (14)$$

$$\hat{E}(q_y(t)) = (2p-1)q_y(t) \quad (15)$$

$$\hat{E}(q_z(t)) = q_z(t) \quad (16)$$

We can now move to the Hamiltonians and apply a phase-flip  $\hat{E}$  to both  $\hat{H}_{AM}$  and  $\hat{H}_{AB}$ , one per mediator's qubit in  $M$ . After the calculations provided in Appendix A.3, the decohered Hamiltonians read as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}'_{AM} &= \hat{E}_T(\dots \hat{E}_2(\hat{E}_1(\hat{H}_{AM}))) = \\ &= \sum_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} \alpha'_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{j_1} \cdot \dots \cdot q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Here, each descriptor is an observable in the  $AMB$  Hilbert space, so the tensor product is no longer required. As before, the qubit of the  $B$  probe is set to be an identity operator, meaning that the descriptor  $q_{\mathbb{I}_B}$  is simply a tensor product of identity operators of all the qubits in  $A, M$  and  $B$ . Similarly for  $\hat{H}_{MB}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}'_{MB} &= \hat{E}_T(\dots \hat{E}_2(\hat{E}_1(\hat{H}_{MB}))) = \\ &= \sum_{l_1, \dots, l_T, b_k} \beta'_{l_1, \dots, l_T, b_k} (q_{\mathbb{I}_A} q_{l_1} \cdot \dots \cdot q_{l_T} q_{b_k}) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

These resulting Hamiltonians account for the multiple phase flips that have been applied, by storing an extra  $(2p-1)$  factor in the primed coefficients  $\alpha'$  and  $\beta'$  each time an  $X$  or  $Y$  observable is considered for a qubit mediator. We now calculate the commutator for the new degraded Hamiltonians by simply following the same steps as the previous commutator in (11) as explained in Appendix A.3, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] &= \\ &= \sum_{a_i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T, l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, b_k} \alpha'_{a_i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} \beta'_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, b_k} q_{a_i} \\ &\quad \left( [q_{j_1}, q_{l_1}] q_{j_2} q_{l_2} \cdot \dots \cdot q_{j_T} q_{l_T} + q_{l_1} q_{j_1} [q_{j_2}, q_{l_2}] \cdot \dots \cdot q_{j_T} q_{l_T} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + q_{l_1} q_{j_1} q_{l_2} q_{j_2} \cdot \dots \cdot [q_{j_T}, q_{l_T}] \right) q_{b_k} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

This result is equivalent to the first Hamiltonians commutator we calculated in 11, with the only difference lying on  $\alpha'$  and  $\beta'$  coefficients. Recalling our inequality in (5), we can now modify it to include the effect of the phase flip.

$$g^{-1}(\Delta Q_{corr \ A:B}) \leq f(\dim_M, [m_j, m_l], p) \quad (20)$$

As discussed in the previous section, only some combinations of mediator's observables contribute to the upper bound in (20). Interestingly, any non-vanishing term in the sum has at least one phase-flip factor  $(2p-1)$  which guarantees that the observables commutator vanishes if  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ . This yields the right-hand side of the inequality (20) to be 0, making it impossible for the system to increase the quantum correlation between  $A$  and  $B$ . Thus, a classical mediator cannot be responsible for the increase

in quantum correlations between the two probes: if we experimentally observe the creation of entanglement between  $A$  and  $B$  under the assumptions of the witness, then the mediator must be non-classical.

## DISCUSSION

In this work, we have proposed a novel inequality connecting the degree of non-classicality of a system with its ability to create quantum correlations between two probes. We have taken as our starting point [4], which established a connection between the increase in quantum correlations between two probes  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}$ , and the degree of non-decomposability of the interaction map  $\mathcal{D}^{\overline{DEC}(m)}(\Lambda_{AB})$ . Specifically, we have developed a novel inequality (13) that directly relates the gain in quantum correlations to the *mediator's non-classicality*, defined by the non-commutativity of its observables.

Our results demonstrate that by observing an increase in quantum correlations between the probes  $A$  and  $B$ , we can infer a lower bound to the degree of non-classicality of the mediator and to the dimension of its Hilbert space, independently of the chosen dynamics of the interactions. This shifts the focus from an interaction-based perspective to a more fundamental understanding of the mediator's *intrinsic* properties, realising a more general quantitative framework for the witness of non-classicality in [2, 3], independent of the choice of the model.

Additionally, a further minimisation of the aforementioned inequality (6) sets the quantum correlation gain between the two probes as a lower bound to  $C(dim_M)$ , a function of the dimension of the mediators's Hilbert space. Being able to invert  $C(dim_M)$ , whose mathematical form depends on the chosen quantum correlation function  $Q$ , and experimentally measuring  $\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}$  would give us a lower bound where every part can be calculated without specifying the Hamiltonians. This last result opens the way to a possible new generalisation within the information-theoretic Constructor Theory framework [11], which relaxes the quantum formalism hypothesis for the probes and the mediator and builds a general and quantitative dynamics independent framework for the witness of non-classicality.

We further explored the impact of decoherence on the mediator's observables, particularly through the phase-flip channel. We showed that as the phase-flip parameter  $p$  approaches  $\frac{1}{2}$ , the commutator  $[m_j, m_l]$  reaches zero, effectively yielding the mediator to be classical and preventing its ability to increase quantum correlations between two probes.

Future work can expand on our findings in several ways. One promising direction is to explore the mediator as a quantum channel. Suppose the quantum correlation measure  $Q$  is the relative entropy of entanglement. In that case, it may be possible to connect it to the quan-

tum channel capacity of the mediator  $M$  or the entanglement generation capacity as it's suggested in [12]. This involves investigating whether we can transition from our established inequality

$$E_{A:B}(\rho_t) - \mathcal{B}_E(\rho_0) = g^{-1}(\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}) \leq f_1(d_M, [m_j, m_l])$$

to

$$\mathcal{Q}_{M_{min}} \leq f_2(d_M, [m_j, m_l]) \approx \mathcal{Q}_M([m_j, m_l])$$

where  $\mathcal{Q}_{M_{min}}$  is the minimum observed channel capacity, which we can try to connect to the difference in relative entropy of entanglement, and  $\mathcal{Q}_M([m_j, m_l])$  is the maximal theoretical quantum channel capacity of the mediator. This approach would reframe our main finding in terms of the mediator's quantum channel capacity, which is another fundamental intrinsic property of a physical system [13].

Within this context, two distinct situations arise: testing the non-classicality of an unknown system (e.g., a biological system) which is suspected to have quantum properties, by attempting quantum communication with it and measuring quantum correlation gain in the probes. Alternatively, utilising the mediator for entanglement distribution protocols across a quantum network, one can theoretically calculate a bound for its maximum ability to deliver entanglement between two probes without prior testing. In both cases, our inequality can provide bounds on the quantum capacity of the mediator based on its observable and Hilbert space structure.

Additionally, in the context of super-selected models for gravity [14], where the classicality of gravity emerges from imposing certain superselection rules to commutators of its quantum observables, our result can be used as a falsification test: if quantum correlations are detected between probes, our inequality  $g^{-1}(\Delta Q_{corr\ A:B}) \leq f_1(d_M, [m_j, m_l])$  implies that quantum gravitational observables  $m_j, m_l$  are dynamically involved, potentially leading to the exclusion of certain semi-classical models for gravity.

Finally, the symmetry between two-point space and time quantum correlations [15] suggest the possibility of extending the results of this work to mediated temporal quantum correlation between a single quantum probe at times  $t_0$  and  $t > t_0$ . The potential differences in the functional form of the upper bound (13) can inform on the symmetrical role of space and time in quantum mechanics, and offer a common framework to treat the witness of non-classicality in [1–3] and its temporal, single-probe, version, as discussed in [16, 17].

In summary, our proposed inequality gives a general quantitative framework for the recently proposed witnesses of non-classicality [2, 3]. We have also demonstrated the quantum-to-classical transition of the mediator by studying a decohering map applied to

the mediator. Our work thus provides a fundamental link between the mediator's non-classical features and the observed quantum correlations, independent of the specific dynamics of the interactions and the choice of the type of systems used. Its generality makes it suitable for a range of possible applications, from quantum metrology to quantum biology and even quantum gravity.

**Acknowledgements** We thank Vlatko Vedral, Simone Rijavec and Tomasz Paterek for helpful comments and discussions. G.D.P. thanks the Clarendon Fund and the Oxford-Thatcher Graduate Scholarship for supporting this research. C.M. thanks the Eutopia Foundation, the John Templeton Foundation, and the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. This publication was made possible through the support of the ID 61466 grant from the John Templeton Foundation, as part of The Quantum Information Structure of Spacetime (QISS) Project (qiss.fr). The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the Authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation.

- [13] A. S. Holevo and V. Giovannetti, Reports on Progress in Physics **75**, 046001 (2012).
- [14] T. N. Sherry and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Physical Review D **18**, 4580 (1978), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [15] Z. Zhao, R. Pisarczyk, J. Thompson, M. Gu, V. Vedral, and J. F. Fitzsimons, Phys. Rev. A **98**, 052312 (2018), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [16] G. Di Pietra and C. Marletto, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **56**, 265305 (2023), arXiv:2205.00198 [quant-ph].
- [17] T. Feng, C. Marletto, and V. Vedral, Conservation Laws and the Quantization of Gravity (2024), arXiv:2311.08971 [gr-qc, physics:quant-ph].
- [18] W. Rudin, *Functional analysis* (New York : McGraw-Hill, 1991).

---

\* s.raia@studenti.unipi.it

- [1] C. Marletto and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 086012 (2020), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [2] C. Marletto and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 240402 (2017) - Gravitationally Induced Entanglement between Two Massive Particles is Sufficient Evidence of Quantum Effects in Gravity.
- [3] S. Bose, A. Mazumdar, G. W. Morley, H. Ulbricht, M. Toroš, M. Paternostro, A. A. Geraci, P. F. Barker, M. Kim, and G. Milburn, Physical Review Letters **119**, 240401 (2017).
- [4] R. Ganardi, E. Panwar, M. Pandit, B. Woloncewicz, and T. Paterek, PRX Quantum **5**, 010318 (2024).
- [5] T. Krisnanda, R. Ganardi, S.-Y. Lee, J. Kim, and T. Paterek, Physical Review A **98**, 052321 (2018).
- [6] M. J. Donald and M. Horodecki, Physics Letters A **264**, 257 (1999).
- [7] M. B. Plenio, Physical Review Letters **95**, 090503 (2005), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [8] D. Deutsch, A. Barenco, and A. Ekert, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical and Physical Sciences **449**, 669 (1995), arXiv:quant-ph/9505018.
- [9] D. Deutsch and P. Hayden, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences **456**, 1759 (2000).
- [10] G. Bhole, J. A. Jones, C. Marletto, and V. Vedral, Journal of Physics Communications **4**, 025013 (2020), arXiv:1812.09483 [quant-ph].
- [11] D. Deutsch and C. Marletto, Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences **471**, 20140540 (2015), publisher: Royal Society.
- [12] C. H. Bennett, A. W. Harrow, D. W. Leung, and J. A. Smolin, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **49**, 1895 (2003), arXiv:quant-ph/0205057.

## Appendix

### A.0 Definitions and Notation

This Appendix section briefly revisits essential definitions and notation utilized throughout the paper.

**System Configuration:** The system under investigation consists of two quantum probes,  $A$  and  $B$ , and a mediator  $M$ . Each component is represented within a finite-dimensional Hilbert Space. To enforce locality, i.e. prohibiting direct interactions between  $A$  and  $B$ , the system's Hamiltonian is structured as follows:

$$\hat{H}_{AMB} = \hat{H}_{AM} + \hat{H}_{MB} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

This formulation ensures that no other interactions are permissible.

**Unitaries and Induced Map:** The unitary transformation associated with the Hamiltonian of the system is

$$\begin{aligned} U_{AMB} &= e^{-i\hat{H}_{AMB}t} = e^{-i(\hat{H}_{AM} + \hat{H}_{MB})t} \\ &= e^{-i\hat{H}_{AM}t} e^{-i\hat{H}_{MB}t} e^{\frac{t^2}{2}[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}]} \prod_{n=3}^{\infty} e^{Z_n(-it)^n} \\ &\approx U_{AM} U_{MB} e^{\frac{t^2}{2}[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}]} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where we used the Zassenhaus expansion cut up to the second order in  $t$ . The respective induced map  $\Lambda_{AB}$  is explicitly defined by the equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{AB}(\rho_0) &= \text{tr}_M[\Lambda_{AMB}(\rho_{AMB}(0))] \\ &= \text{tr}_M[U_{AMB}\rho_{AMB}(0)U_{AMB}^\dagger] = \rho_t \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

**Decomposability:** A map  $\lambda_{AMB}$  acting on the tripartite system is considered decomposable if it can be expressed through the composition of two other CPTP maps  $\lambda_{AM}$  and  $\lambda_{MB}$ :

$$\lambda_{AMB}(\rho) = \lambda_{MB} \circ \lambda_{AM}(\rho) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Consequently,  $\Lambda_{AB}$  is decomposable if it admits a Steinspring dilation with dimension  $m > \dim_M$ , where the dilation itself is decomposable.

**Classicality of Interactions and Decomposability:** If the interactions are classical, indicated by the commutation relation

$$[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] = 0, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

then the induced map  $\Lambda_{AB}$  is a member of the space of decomposable maps  $\overline{\text{DEC}}(m)$ . It is established that:

$[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] = 0 \iff U_{AMB}$ , and thus the corresponding map  $\Lambda_{AMB}$ , are decomposable, and  $[U_{AM}, U_{MB}] = 0$  holds at any time  $t$ . (A.6)

**Initial Quantum Correlation  $\mathcal{B}(Q(\rho_0))$ :** This object quantifies the maximum potential correlation within the system prior to any interaction. It is calculated as:

$$\mathcal{B}(\rho_0) = \sup_{\sigma_{AM}} Q_{A:M}(\sigma_{AM}) + \sup_{\sigma_{MB}} Q_{M:B}(\sigma_{MB}) + I_{A:B}(\rho_0) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where  $I_{A:B}(\rho_0)$  represents the greatest possible initial quantum correlation between  $A$  and  $B$ , calculated as  $I_{A:B}(\rho_0) = \inf_{\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B} g(d(\rho_0, \sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B))$  where the infimum runs over all separable states  $\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B$ . Here,  $\sigma_A$  and  $\sigma_B$  denote generic initial states of  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively.

### A1. From the Degree of non-decomposability to non-classical Interactions

In this Appendix section, we will detail how the inequality (4) is derived.

We have already mentioned that the degree of non-decomposability is the minimum distance between the map acting on the system  $\Lambda_{AB}$  and the space of the maps with a decomposable m-dilation. More explicitly this reads:

$$\mathcal{D}^{\overline{\text{DEC}}(m)}(\Lambda_{AB}) = \inf_{\lambda_{AB} \in \overline{\text{DEC}}(m)} \mathcal{D}(\Lambda_{AB}, \lambda_{AB}) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where the minimisation is also performed in the dilation choice to obtain the best bound:

$$\inf_{\lambda_{AB} \in \overline{\text{DEC}}(m)} \mathcal{D}(\Lambda_{AB}, \lambda_{AB}) = \inf_{\lambda_{AB} \in \overline{\text{DEC}}(m)} \inf_{\tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{\lambda}} \mathcal{D}(\tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{\lambda}) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Here  $\tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{\lambda}$  are general m-dilations of the non-decomposable map  $\Lambda_{AB}$  and the decomposable map  $\lambda_{AB}$ , respectively. We now drop the two minimisations and use the following ordering relation for distances in finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces [18]:

$$\frac{1}{C(\dim_M)} d_2(\rho, \sigma) \leq d_1(\rho, \sigma) \leq C(\dim_M) d_2(\rho, \sigma) \quad (\text{A.10})$$

to get:

$$\inf_{\lambda_{AB} \in \overline{\text{DEC}}(m)} \inf_{\tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{\lambda}} \mathcal{D}(\tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{\lambda}) \leq \mathcal{D}(\tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{\lambda}) \leq C(\dim_M) D_\infty(\tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{\lambda}). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

We will now detail more explicitly the transition which leads from  $\Lambda$  to  $U$  starting from the spectral distance appearing in equation (A.11). Assuming our maps are unitaries we can calculate  $D_\infty(\tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{\lambda})$  appearing in equation



(A.11) as

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\infty(\tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{\lambda}) &= \|\Lambda_{AMB}(\rho_{AMB}) - \lambda_{AMB}(\rho_{AMB})\|_\infty \\
&= \|U_{AMB}\rho_{AMB}U_{AMB}^\dagger - U_{MB}U_{AM}\rho_{AMB}U_{AM}^\dagger U_{MB}^\dagger\|_\infty \\
&\leq 2\|U_{AMB} - U_{AM}U_{MB}\|_\infty
\end{aligned} \tag{A.12}$$

where we remind that  $\tilde{\lambda}$  is decomposable while the inequality comes from a proof in [4]. Focusing now on the spectral norm of the last step of the previous inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|U_{AMB} - U_{AM}U_{MB}\|_\infty &= \\
&= \left\| e^{-i\hat{H}_{AM}t} e^{-i\hat{H}_{MB}t} e^{[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] \frac{t^2}{2}} - e^{-i\hat{H}_{AM}t} e^{-i\hat{H}_{MB}t} \right\|_\infty \\
&= \left\| e^{-i\hat{H}_{AM}t} e^{-i\hat{H}_{MB}t} \left( e^{[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] \frac{t^2}{2}} - \mathbb{I} \right) \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \left\| e^{-i\hat{H}_{AM}t} e^{-i\hat{H}_{MB}t} \right\|_\infty \left\| e^{[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] \frac{t^2}{2}} - \mathbb{I} \right\|_\infty
\end{aligned} \tag{A.13}$$

For the first equality, we used the definition of  $U_{AMB}$  given in (A.2) where the Zassenhaus formula is truncated up to the second order in  $t$ . For the inequality instead, we used properties of the norm. We elaborate now on the two factors of the last inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| e^{-i\hat{H}_{AM}t} e^{-i\hat{H}_{MB}t} \right\|_\infty &= \\
&= \sqrt{\sigma_{\max} \left( e^{i\hat{H}_{MB}t} e^{i\hat{H}_{AM}t} e^{-i\hat{H}_{AM}t} e^{-i\hat{H}_{MB}t} \right)} = 1
\end{aligned} \tag{A.14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| e^{[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] \frac{t^2}{2}} - \mathbb{I} \right\|_\infty &= \\
&= \sqrt{\sigma_{\max} \left( \left( e^{[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] \frac{t^2}{2}} - \mathbb{I} \right)^* \left( e^{[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] \frac{t^2}{2}} - \mathbb{I} \right) \right)}
\end{aligned} \tag{A.15}$$

We know that since  $\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}$  are Hermitian,  $[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}]$  is skew-Hermitian, which means that its spectrum is purely imaginary. Thus the second factor of the previous equation reads as

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sqrt{\sigma_{\max} \left( \left( e^{i\Im[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] \frac{t^2}{2}} - \mathbb{I} \right) \left( e^{-i\Im[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] \frac{t^2}{2}} - \mathbb{I} \right) \right)} \\
&= \sqrt{\sigma_{\max} \left( 2\mathbb{I} - \left( e^{i\Im[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] \frac{t^2}{2}} + e^{-i\Im[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] \frac{t^2}{2}} \right) \right)} \\
&= \sqrt{\sigma_{\max} \left( 2 \left( \mathbb{I} - \cos \left( \Im \left[ \hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB} \right] \frac{t^2}{2} \right) \right) \right)}
\end{aligned} \tag{A.16}$$

## A.2 Non-classicality of interactions depends on the non-classicality of the mediator

Here we will carefully derive the general formula of the commutator of the most general local Hamiltonians for the three interacting systems  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $M$ , which will be explicitly dependent on the mediator observables. Recalling the definitions of the two most general Hamiltonians  $\hat{H}_{AM}$  and  $\hat{H}_{MB}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{H}_{AM} &= \\
&= \sum_{i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} (a_i \otimes m_{j_1} \otimes m_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{H}_{MB} &= \\
&= \sum_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, k} \beta_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, k} (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes m_{l_1} \otimes m_{l_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{l_T} \otimes b_k)
\end{aligned}$$

We can now write the commutator

$$\begin{aligned}
[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] &= \\
&\left[ \sum_{i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} (a_i \otimes m_{j_1} \otimes m_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B), \right. \\
&\quad \left. \sum_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, k} \beta_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, k} (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes m_{l_1} \otimes m_{l_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{l_T} \otimes b_k) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{A.17}$$

To simplify the notation we factorize the sums and the coefficients out of the commutator by using its linearity.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] &= \sum_{i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T, l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, k} \alpha_{i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} \beta_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, k} \\
&\left[ a_i \otimes m_{j_1} \otimes m_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \mathbb{I}_A \otimes m_{l_1} \otimes m_{l_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{l_T} \otimes b_k \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Using again the linearity of the commutator and distributivity of the tensor product we can factorize probes operators out too.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] &= \sum_{i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T, l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, k} \alpha_{i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} \beta_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, k} \\
&a_i \otimes [m_{j_1} \otimes m_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T}, m_{l_1} \otimes m_{l_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{l_T}] \otimes b_k
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can only focus on the commutator of mediator observables. We are going also to use the following property of the commutator

$$[A \otimes B, C \otimes D] = CA \otimes [B, D] + [A, C] \otimes BD \tag{A.18}$$

where  $A, C \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $B, D \in \mathcal{H}'$ . Then we set  $A = m_{j_1}$ ,  $C = m_{l_1}$  and  $B = m_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T}$ ,  $D = m_{l_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{l_T}$

$m_{l_T}$  obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} & [m_{j_1} \otimes m_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T}, m_{l_1} \otimes m_{l_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{l_T}] = \\ & = m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes [m_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T}, m_{l_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{l_T}] + \\ & + [m_{j_1}, m_{l_1}] \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{l_T} \end{aligned}$$

Now we can recursively apply the same formula to the commutator in the first term of the sum in the previous equation, coming to the final result for the commutator of the Hamiltonians

$$\begin{aligned} & [\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] = \\ & = \sum_{i,j_1,j_2,\dots,j_T,l_1,l_2,\dots,l_T,k} \alpha'_{i,j_1,j_2,\dots,j_T} \beta'_{l_1,l_2,\dots,l_T,k} a_i \otimes \\ & \otimes \left( [m_{j_1}, m_{l_1}] \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T} m_{l_T} + \right. \\ & \quad m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes [m_{j_2}, m_{l_2}] \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T} m_{l_T} + \\ & \quad \left. m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes m_{l_2} m_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes [m_{j_T}, m_{l_T}] \right) \otimes b_k \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Here we will go through the steps to get to the equation (12) which helps clarify the meaning of the tensor product of the mediator's observables appearing in the commutator of Hamiltonians. For simplicity, only two qubits will be considered for the mediator.

$$\begin{aligned} & [m_{j_1}, m_{l_1}] \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} + m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes [m_{j_2}, m_{l_2}] = \\ & = (m_{j_1} m_{l_1} - m_{l_1} m_{j_1}) \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} + \\ & + m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes (m_{j_2} m_{l_2} - m_{l_2} m_{j_2}) = \\ & = m_{j_1} m_{l_1} \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} - m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} + \\ & + m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} - m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes m_{l_2} m_{j_2} = \\ & = m_{j_1} m_{l_1} \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} - m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes m_{l_2} m_{j_2} = \\ & = m_{j_1} m_{l_1} \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} - (2\delta_{l_1 j_1} \mathbb{I} - m_{j_1} m_{l_1}) \otimes m_{l_2} m_{j_2} = \\ & = m_{j_1} m_{l_1} \otimes (m_{j_2} m_{l_2} + m_{l_2} m_{j_2}) - 2\delta_{l_1 j_1} \mathbb{I} \otimes m_{l_2} m_{j_2} = \\ & = m_{j_1} m_{l_1} \otimes \{m_{j_2}, m_{l_2}\} - 2\delta_{l_1 j_1} \mathbb{I} \otimes m_{l_2} m_{j_2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

### A.3 Dephasing mediator's qubits in Heisenberg Picture

In this third Appendix section, we will rewrite the Hamiltonians using the Descriptors formalism and recalculate their commutator after applying the dephasing channel to each of the mediator's qubits.

$$\hat{H}_{AM} = \sum_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{j_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) \quad (\text{A.21})$$

$$\hat{H}_{MB} = \sum_{l_1, \dots, l_T, b_k} \beta_{l_1, \dots, l_T, b_k} (q_{\mathbb{I}_A} q_{l_1} \dots q_{l_T} q_{b_k}) \quad (\text{A.22})$$

As explained in Section 3, the tensor product is substituted by a standard product since all the descriptors belong to  $AMB$  Hilbert space. To preserve the locality condition, the identity operators of the original Hamiltonians are substituted by the descriptors  $q_{\mathbb{I}_B}$  and  $q_{\mathbb{I}_A}$  which are a tensor product of identity operators of all the qubits in the system. Let us now apply a dephasing channel to the first qubit of the mediator on the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{AM}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E}_1(\hat{H}_{AM}) & \equiv \sum_a M_a(t)^\dagger \hat{H}_{AM} M_a(t) = \\ & = \sqrt{p} \hat{H}_{AM} \sqrt{p} + \sqrt{1-p} q_{z_1}^\dagger(t) \hat{H}_{AM} q_{z_1}(t) \sqrt{1-p} \\ & = p \sum_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} I d_{M_1} q_{j_1} I d_{M_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) + \\ & + (1-p) \sum_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{z_1} q_{j_1} q_{z_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) \end{aligned}$$

We now expand the second sum on the index  $j_1$  and use the algebraic rule of the descriptors to compute  $q_{z_1} q_{j_1} q_{z_1}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & = p \sum_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{j_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) + (1-p) \\ & \left( \sum_{a_i, j_2, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1=\mathbb{I}_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{\mathbb{I}_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) + \right. \\ & + \sum_{a_i, j_2, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1=z_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{z_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) + \\ & - \sum_{a_i, j_2, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1=x_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{x_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) + \\ & \left. - \sum_{a_i, j_2, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1=y_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{y_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) \right) = \end{aligned}$$

Now, we expand the first sum on the index  $j_1$  and sum the equivalent terms

$$\begin{aligned} & = \sum_{a_i, j_2, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1=\mathbb{I}_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{\mathbb{I}_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) + \\ & + \sum_{a_i, j_2, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1=z_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{z_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) + \\ & + (2p-1) \sum_{a_i, j_2, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1=x_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{x_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) + \\ & + (2p-1) \sum_{a_i, j_2, \dots, j_T} \alpha_{a_i, j_1=y_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{y_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) = \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.23})$$

Eventually, we absorb the summation and redefine the new coefficient which takes into account a factor  $(2p-1)$  when multiplied to  $q_x$  or  $q_y$ . This new primed  $\alpha$  factor now considers the effect of the phase flip on the first qubit of the mediator.

$$= \sum_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} \alpha'_{a_i, j_1, \dots, j_T} (q_{a_i} q_{j_1} \dots q_{j_T} q_{\mathbb{I}_B}) \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Further phase flip operators  $\hat{E}_2, \hat{E}_3, \dots, \hat{E}_T$ , behave equivalently to  $\hat{E}_1$ , modifying coefficients when the respective observables  $q_x$  and  $q_y$  appear, with an extra  $(2p - 1)$ . Having derived the dephased Hamiltonians, we can proceed in deriving their commutator, which appears in 19. This is a straightforward task, as we can substitute back the tensor product of the observables  $a_i \otimes m_{j_1} \otimes m_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B$  and perform the same

derivation as in Appendix A.2, obtaining the final result:

$$\begin{aligned}
[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] &= \\
&= \sum_{a_i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T, l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, b_k} \alpha'_{a_i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} \beta'_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, b_k} a_i \\
&\otimes \left( [m_{j_1}, m_{l_1}] \otimes m_{j_2} m_{l_2} \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T} m_{l_T} + \right. \\
&\quad m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes [m_{j_2}, m_{l_2}] \otimes \dots \otimes m_{j_T} m_{l_T} + \\
&\quad \left. m_{l_1} m_{j_1} \otimes m_{l_2} m_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes [m_{j_T}, m_{l_T}] \right) \otimes b_k
\end{aligned} \tag{A.25}$$

Which can be re-expressed using the Descriptors formalism as

$$\begin{aligned}
[\hat{H}_{AM}, \hat{H}_{MB}] &= \\
&= \sum_{a_i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T, l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, b_k} \alpha'_{a_i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} \beta'_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_T, b_k} q_{a_i} \\
&\left( [q_{j_1}, q_{l_1}] q_{j_2} q_{l_2} \cdot \dots \cdot q_{j_T} q_{l_T} + q_{l_1} q_{j_1} [q_{j_2}, q_{l_2}] \cdot \dots \cdot q_{j_T} q_{l_T} + \right. \\
&\quad \left. + q_{l_1} q_{j_1} q_{l_2} q_{j_2} \cdot \dots \cdot [q_{j_T}, q_{l_T}] \right) q_{b_k}
\end{aligned} \tag{A.26}$$