Causal inference in non-classical theories and compatibility with space-time structure

V. Vilasini

Institute for Theoretical Physics

# **TH** zürich

### Joint work with Roger Colbeck (University of York, U.K.)



- V. Vilasini and Roger Colbeck. PRA, 106, 042204 (2022).
- V. Vilasini and Roger Colbeck. PRL, 129, 110401 (2022).

# Different notions of causality

# Spatio-temporal notions





### Spatio-temporal notions

### Information-theoretic notions





## Spatio-temporal notions

### Information-theoretic notions



In physical experiments, these notions must play together!

# Relativistic causality principles E.g., No signalling outside the future lightcone



## Relativistic causality principles E.g., No signalling outside the future lightcone



These are about the compatibility between spatiotemporal and information-theoretic causal order relations

How can we formulate compatibility between informationtheoretic and spatio-temporal causal structures? How can we formulate compatibility between informationtheoretic and spatio-temporal causal structures?

- General theories: Vilasini and Colbeck, PRA+PRL 2022
- 2 Quantum theory: Vilasini and Renner, arXiv 2022

How can we formulate compatibility between informationtheoretic and spatio-temporal causal structures?

- General theories: Vilasini and Colbeck, PRA+PRL 2022
- 2 Quantum theory: Vilasini and Renner, arXiv 2022

Applicable to two classes of information-theoretic causal structures

- 1 Causal models (possibly non-classical, cyclic) (today)
- 2 Indefinite causal structures (QPL 2022)

1 Framework: Causal modelling and causal inference

- Framework: Causal modelling and causal inference
- 2 Framework: Compatibility with space-time

- 1 Framework: Causal modelling and causal inference
- 2 Framework: Compatibility with space-time
- 3 Result: Causal loops in Minkowski space-time

- 1 Framework: Causal modelling and causal inference
- 2 Framework: Compatibility with space-time
- 3 Result: Causal loops in Minkowski space-time
- ④ Conclusion and outlook

# Causal models and causal inference: motivation





Quantum correlations challenge classical causal explanations  $\Rightarrow$  Develop quantum (/non-classical) causal models

Pearl, 2000 and 2009. Spirtes, 2001. Wood and Spekkens 2015.

# Causal structures and correlations

• Causal structure: Directed graph *G*.

Henson, Lal, Pusey. 2014. Vilasini and Colbeck 2022.

- Causal structure: Directed graph *G*.
- Nodes: observed (classical) and unobserved (any theory)

- Causal structure: Directed graph *G*.
- Nodes: observed (classical) and unobserved (any theory)
- Directed edges: "flow of info" through appropriate channels

- Causal structure: Directed graph *G*.
- Nodes: observed (classical) and unobserved (any theory)
- Directed edges: "flow of info" through appropriate channels



Henson, Lal, Pusey. 2014. Vilasini and Colbeck 2022.

- Causal structure: Directed graph  $\mathcal{G}$ .
- Nodes: observed (classical) and unobserved (any theory)
- Directed edges: "flow of info" through appropriate channels



Observed distribution: Joint probability distribution  $P_{\mathcal{G}}(S_{obs})$  over all observed nodes  $S_{obs}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ . For  $\mathcal{G}^{Bell}$ , P(XYAB). Constraints on  $\overline{P_{\mathcal{G}}(S_{obs})}$  from  $\mathcal{G}$ 

- Theory-dependent:
- Theory-independent:

Constraints on  $P_{\mathcal{G}}(S_{obs})$  from  $\mathcal{G}$ 

- Theory-dependent: E.g., Bell inequalities in  $\mathcal{G}^{Bell}$
- Theory-independent:

Constraints on  $P_{\mathcal{G}}(S_{obs})$  from  $\mathcal{G}$ 

- Theory-dependent: E.g., Bell inequalities in  $\mathcal{G}^{Bell}$
- Theory-independent: Graph separation (d-separation) in G implies conditional independence in P<sub>G</sub>(S<sub>obs</sub>).

Constraints on  $P_{\mathcal{G}}(S_{obs})$  from  $\mathcal{G}$ 

- Theory-dependent: E.g., Bell inequalities in  $\mathcal{G}^{Bell}$
- Theory-independent: Graph separation (d-separation) in G implies conditional independence in P<sub>G</sub>(S<sub>obs</sub>).

E.g., Non-signalling constraints in  $\mathcal{G}^{Bell}$ 



The d-separations  $X \perp^d B | A$  and  $Y \perp^d A | B$  imply P(X|AB) = P(X|A) and P(Y|AB) = P(Y|B).

Henson, Lal, Pusey 2014. Bell 1964. Pearl 2009.

Several different quantum causal modelling/inference frameworks

• Bottom-up\*:

• Top-down\*\*:

\*Liefer Spekkens 2013, Hensen, Lal, Pusey 2014, Pienaar 2015, Costa and Shrapnel 2016, Barrett, Lorenz, Oreshkov 2020 and 2022. Several different quantum causal modelling/inference frameworks

- Bottom-up\*: Start with assumptions on causal mechanisms and derive *d*-separation and other properties (often acyclic)
- Top-down\*\*:

Liefer Spekkens 2013, Hensen, Lal, Pusey 2014, Pienaar 2015, Costa and Shrapnel 2016, Barrett, Lorenz, Oreshkov 2020 and 2022. Several different quantum causal modelling/inference frameworks

- Bottom-up\*: Start with assumptions on causal mechanisms and derive *d*-separation and other properties (often acyclic)
- Top-down\*\*: Start by assuming *d*-separation on *S*<sub>obs</sub> and derive consequences for causal mechanisms (also cyclic)

<sup>\*</sup>Liefer Spekkens 2013, Hensen, Lal, Pusey 2014, Pienaar 2015, Costa and Shrapnel 2016, Barrett, Lorenz, Oreshkov 2020 and 2022.

# Interventions and affects relations



Correlation alone can't single out a causal explanation, need interventions!



Pre-intervention:  $\mathcal{G}$ 



Post-intervention:  $\mathcal{G}_{do(S)}$ 





An intervention on  $S \subseteq S_{obs}$  is characterised by a graph  $\mathcal{G}_{do(S)}$ obtained from  $\mathcal{G}$  by cutting off all incoming edges to S.



An intervention on  $S \subseteq S_{obs}$  is characterised by a graph  $\mathcal{G}_{do(S)}$ obtained from  $\mathcal{G}$  by cutting off all incoming edges to S.

<u>Affects relation</u>: S affects C iff  $P_{\mathcal{G}_{do(S)}}(C|S) \neq P_{\mathcal{G}}(C)$


An intervention on  $S \subseteq S_{obs}$  is characterised by a graph  $\mathcal{G}_{do(S)}$ obtained from  $\mathcal{G}$  by cutting off all incoming edges to S.

<u>Affects relation</u>: S affects C iff  $P_{\mathcal{G}_{do}(S)}(C|S) \neq P_{\mathcal{G}}(C)$ 

In general,  $P_{\mathcal{G}_{do(S)}}(C|S) \neq P_{\mathcal{G}}(C|S)$  except if S is parentless

In paper: rules for relating  $P_{\mathcal{G}_{do(S)}}$  and  $P_{\mathcal{G}}$  in cyclic, non-classical causal models

<u>Causal inference</u>: X affects  $Y \Rightarrow X$  is a cause of Y in  $\mathcal{G}$ But converse is NOT true! E.g., one-time pad <u>Causal inference</u>: X affects  $Y \Rightarrow X$  is a cause of Y in  $\mathcal{G}$ But converse is NOT true! E.g., one-time pad



<u>Causal inference</u>: X affects  $Y \Rightarrow X$  is a cause of Y in  $\mathcal{G}$ But converse is NOT true! E.g., one-time pad



 $\Rightarrow$  *M* is a cause of *C* but *M* does not affect *C* 

Higher-order (HO) affects relation: X affects Y given do(Z)

Captures signalling between sets of RVs X and Y when given an intervention performed on another set Z of RVs

Higher-order (HO) affects relation: X affects Y given do(Z)

Captures signalling between sets of RVs X and Y when given an intervention performed on another set Z of RVs

In paper: Causal inference results for HO affects, can infer more.

## Embedding causal models in space-time

Space-time: partially ordered set  $\mathcal{T}$  with order relation  $\preceq$ 

Space-time: partially ordered set  $\mathcal{T}$  with order relation  $\preceq$ 

Space-time embedding  $\mathcal{E}: X \in S_{obs} \mapsto O(X) \in \mathcal{T}$ . Leads to ordered random variable (ORV),  $\mathcal{X} = (X, O(X))$ . Space-time: partially ordered set  $\mathcal{T}$  with order relation  $\preceq$ 

Space-time embedding  $\mathcal{E}: X \in S_{obs} \mapsto O(X) \in \mathcal{T}$ . Leads to ordered random variable (ORV),  $\mathcal{X} = (X, O(X))$ .

Inclusive future of an ORV:  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{X}) := \{P \in \mathcal{T} | P \succeq O(X)\}$ 



# **Compatibility**: Ensures no signalling outside space-time future (In particular: X affects $Y \Rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{F}}(Y) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(X)$ for RVs)

# **Compatibility**: Ensures no signalling outside space-time future (In particular: X affects $Y \Rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{F}}(Y) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(X)$ for RVs)

Example 1:



 $C = A \oplus B$ , B uniform

• Affects.: B affects C, AB affects C (A does not affect C)

## **Compatibility**: Ensures no signalling outside space-time future (In particular: X affects $Y \Rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{F}}(Y) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(X)$ for RVs)



• Affects.: B affects C, AB affects C (A does not affect C)

## **Compatibility**: Ensures no signalling outside space-time future (In particular: X affects $Y \Rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{F}}(Y) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(X)$ for RVs)



 $C = A \oplus B$ , B uniform

C = B, B uniform

- Affects.: *B* affects *C*, *AB* affects *C* (*A* does not affect *C*)
- Compatibility:  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{A}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{B})$  in 1,  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{B})$  in 2

## **Compatibility**: Ensures no signalling outside space-time future (In particular: X affects $Y \Rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{F}}(Y) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(X)$ for RVs)



 $C = A \oplus B$ , B uniform

C = B, B uniform

- Affects.: *B* affects *C*, *AB* affects *C* (*A* does not affect *C*)
- Compatibility:  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{A}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{B})$  in 1,  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{B})$  in 2

Can't infer compatibility conditions from interventional data?

## **Compatibility**: Ensures no signalling outside space-time future (In particular: X affects $Y \Rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{F}}(Y) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(X)$ for RVs)



 $C = A \oplus B$ , B uniform

C = B, B uniform

- Affects.: *B* affects *C*, *AB* affects *C* (*A* does not affect *C*)
- Compatibility:  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{A}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{B})$  in 1,  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{B})$  in 2
- Can't infer compatibility conditions from interventional data? Solution: We can, using higher-order affects relations



- Affects rel.: B affects C, AB affects C (A does not affect C)
- Higher-order affects rel: A affects C given do(B) in 1, not 2



- Affects rel.: B affects C, AB affects C (A does not affect C)
- Higher-order affects rel: A affects C given do(B) in 1, not 2

⇒ Infer A is a cause of C in Ex 1 but not in Ex 2 ⇒  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{A})$  for compat in Ex 1 but not Ex 2





 $\exists \text{ causal model with affects relations}^{*:} B \underline{\text{ does not affect }} A \text{ or } C, B \underline{\text{ affects }} AC \underline{\text{ Compatibility conditions}} \\ \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{A}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{B}) \end{bmatrix}$ 

Grunhaus, Popescu, Rohrlich 1996.

\*Vilasini and Colbeck, PRA+PRL 2022. Vilasini, PhD thesis, arXiv:2102.02393.



 $\exists \text{ causal model with affects relations}^{*:} B \text{ does not affect } A \text{ or } C, B \text{ affects } AC \text{ Compatibility conditions:} \\ \overline{\mathcal{F}}(A) \cap \overline{\mathcal{F}}(C) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{F}}(B) \end{bmatrix}$ 

#### Causal models for post-quantum "jamming" theories

<sup>K</sup>Grunhaus, Popescu, Rohrlich 1996

\*Vilasini and Colbeck, PRA+PRL 2022. Vilasini, PhD thesis, arXiv:2102.02393.

## Causal loops in Minkowski space-time

NO! (can construct cyclic causal model)

NO! (can construct cyclic causal model)



Affects relations: AC affects B, B affects ACCompatibility conditions:  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{A}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{C}) = \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{B})$ 

NO! (can construct cyclic causal model)



Affects relations: AC affects B, B affects ACCompatibility conditions:  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{A}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{C}) = \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{B})$ 

Operationally detectable causal loop embedded in Minkowski space-time without leading to superluminal signaling!



- This causal loop is only embeddable in (1 + 1)-Minkowski
- Several distinct classes of operationally detectable loops exist



- This causal loop is only embeddable in (1 + 1)-Minkowski
- Several distinct classes of operationally detectable loops exist

Causal loops compatibly embeddable in (3 + 1)-Minkowski space-time? Physical principles for ruling them out?

## Conclusions



## Physical meaning depends on space-time embedding



### Physical meaning depends on space-time embedding

#### Closed timelike curve



Node  $\mapsto$  space-time event (VV and Colbeck)



### Physical meaning depends on space-time embedding

### Closed timelike curve

Physical feedback



Node  $\mapsto$  space-time event (VV and Colbeck)



Node  $\mapsto$  space-time region (VV and Renner)

## No superluminal signalling (SS) $\Rightarrow$ no superluminal causation (SC)

No superluminal signalling (SS)  $\neq$  no superluminal causation (SC)

 No SS DOES NOT rule out causal loops in Minkowski (VV and Colbeck) No superluminal signalling (SS)  $\neq$  no superluminal causation (SC)

- No SS DOES NOT rule out causal loops in Minkowski (VV and Colbeck)
- No SC DOES rule out causal loops in Minkowski (VV and Renner ⇒ no-go for indefinite causal structures)
No superluminal signalling (SS)  $\neq$  no superluminal causation (SC)

- No SS DOES NOT rule out causal loops in Minkowski (VV and Colbeck)
- No SC DOES rule out causal loops in Minkowski (VV and Renner ⇒ no-go for indefinite causal structures)

<u>Take home:</u> Important to disentangle

- Information-theoretic vs space-time causality
- Causation, correlation, signalling
- Different principles of relativistic causality

## Outlook

• Conditions for ruling out causal loops in a space-time? (Maarten Grothus: poster on Monday)

- Conditions for ruling out causal loops in a space-time? (Maarten Grothus: poster on Monday)
- Quantum interventions, relation to tensor networks (Carla Ferradini: poster on Tuesday)

- Conditions for ruling out causal loops in a space-time? (Maarten Grothus: poster on Monday)
- Quantum interventions, relation to tensor networks (Carla Ferradini: poster on Tuesday)
- Causality beyond fixed space-time (q. clocks, q. gravity) (Lukas Schmitt: poster on Monday, planned work with Lin-Qing Chen)

- Conditions for ruling out causal loops in a space-time? (Maarten Grothus: poster on Monday)
- Quantum interventions, relation to tensor networks (Carla Ferradini: poster on Tuesday)
- Causality beyond fixed space-time (q. clocks, q. gravity) (Lukas Schmitt: poster on Monday, planned work with Lin-Qing Chen)
- Higher-order affects relations for causal discovery?

- Conditions for ruling out causal loops in a space-time? (Maarten Grothus: poster on Monday)
- Quantum interventions, relation to tensor networks (Carla Ferradini: poster on Tuesday)
- Causality beyond fixed space-time (q. clocks, q. gravity) (Lukas Schmitt: poster on Monday, planned work with Lin-Qing Chen)
- Higher-order affects relations for causal discovery?
- Causal inference techniques for emergence of space-time?

- Conditions for ruling out causal loops in a space-time? (Maarten Grothus: poster on Monday)
- Quantum interventions, relation to tensor networks (Carla Ferradini: poster on Tuesday)
- Causality beyond fixed space-time (q. clocks, q. gravity) (Lukas Schmitt: poster on Monday, planned work with Lin-Qing Chen)
- Higher-order affects relations for causal discovery?
- Causal inference techniques for emergence of space-time?

## THANK YOU!