

Policies for elementary link generation in quantum networks

Sumeet Khatri

Hearne Institute for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics and Astronomy, and Center for Computation and Technology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 70803, USA

September 25, 2020

Abstract

Protocols in a quantum network involve multiple parties performing actions on their quantum systems in a carefully orchestrated manner over time in order to accomplish a given task. This sequence of actions over time is often referred to as a strategy, or policy. In this work, we consider policy optimization in a quantum network. Specifically, as a first step towards developing full-fledged quantum network protocols, we consider policies for generating elementary links in a quantum network. We start by casting elementary link generation as a quantum partially observable Markov decision process, as defined in [Phys. Rev. A **90**, 032311 (2014)]. Then, we analyze in detail the commonly used memory cutoff policy. Under this policy, once an elementary link is established it is kept in quantum memory for some amount t^* of time, called the cutoff, before it is discarded and the elementary link generation is reattempted. For this policy, we determine the average quantum state of the elementary link as a function of time for an arbitrary number of nodes in the link, as well as the average fidelity of the link as a function of time for any noise model for the quantum memories. Finally, we show how optimal policies can be obtained in the finite-horizon setting using dynamic programming. By casting elementary link generation as a quantum decision process, this work goes beyond the analytical results derived here by providing the theoretical framework for performing reinforcement learning of practical quantum network protocols.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Summary of results	5
1.2	Relation to prior work	6

2	Elementary link generation	7
2.1	Formulation as a quantum decision process	10
2.2	Link quantities	21
3	The memory cutoff policy for elementary link generation	24
3.1	Calculation of link quantities	30
3.2	Waiting time	39
3.3	Multiple parallel links	42
3.4	Total number of active links	44
3.5	Collective link status	46
4	Finite-horizon policy optimization	47
5	Summary and outlook	53
	References	54

1 Introduction

A quantum network is a collection of nodes, each equipped with quantum information processing capabilities, that are connected to each other by quantum channels. The nodes in such a network can, in principle, perform tasks such as quantum teleportation [1, 2], quantum key distribution [3–6], quantum clock synchronization [7–9], distributed quantum computation [10], and distributed quantum metrology and sensing [11–16]. The future quantum internet [17–21] will be an interconnected network of such quantum networks, much like today’s internet, that will enable these applications to be performed on a global scale.

As shown in Figure 1, a quantum network can be modeled as a graph. The nodes of the graph represent the senders/receivers in the network, and the edges represent elementary links, which in this work we take to be an entangled state shared by the corresponding nodes. The edges can be between two nodes only, as indicated by the red lines, or they can be hyperedges connecting three or more nodes, as indicated by the blue bubbles. Groups of nodes can be connected by more than one edge, and in this case the graph is called a multigraph. Multiple edges between nodes are shown explicitly in Figure 1 for two-node edges, although we can also have multiple hyperedges between a set of adjacent nodes. Each of these edges is regarded as a distinct edge in the graph.

In general, the goal in a quantum network is to transmit quantum information between a collection of distant nodes, i.e., nodes that are not connected to each other by a single elementary link. In this setting, any node in the network that is not either a sender or a receiver can function as a so-called quantum repeater. A quantum repeater can be thought of as a helper node whose task is to mitigate the effects of loss and noise along a path connecting a sender and a receiver, thereby




FIGURE 1: Representation of a quantum network as a hypergraph. The nodes represent the senders, receivers, or repeaters depending on the situation. Edges represent entangled states shared by the corresponding nodes. Edges between two nodes (shown in red) represent bipartite entanglement, while hyperedges (consisting of more than two nodes and indicated by a blue bubble) represent multipartite entanglement. Nodes can be connected by multiple edges, indicating that they can share multiple entangled states simultaneously.

making the quantum information transmission more reliable. Quantum repeaters are needed because directly transmitting quantum information from a sender to a receiver is often too lossy and noisy to be useful for the applications mentioned above. In fact, the loss in an optical fiber, a commonly used medium for quantum information transmission, increases exponentially with distance [22, 23], limiting direct transmission distances to roughly hundreds of kilometers. The original quantum repeater proposal in [24, 25] consists of placing quantum repeaters at intermediate points along a straight line connecting the sender and receiver. The protocol to generate sender-receiver entanglement then consists of first generating bipartite entanglement along the elementary links between the repeaters. The repeaters then perform entanglement distillation [26–28] and entanglement swapping [1, 29] to iteratively extend the entanglement range to the desired distance.

A vast body of literature exists on a variety of quantum repeater schemes [24, 25, 30–59]. (See also [60–62] and the references therein.) Considering a quantum network such as the one in Figure 1, as opposed to just one line between a sender and a receiver, is a much more complicated setting that leads to questions about, e.g., routing [63–72] and multicast communication (communication between several senders and receivers simultaneously). Consequently, protocols in a general quantum network can be much more varied than protocols along a linear chain of nodes. General quantum network protocols have been described in [69, 70, 73–77]. Linear programs, and other techniques for obtaining optimal entanglement distribution rates in a quantum network, have been explored in [77–81].

In this work, we view entanglement distribution protocols in quantum networks from the lens of




FIGURE 2: Elementary link generation in a quantum network as a quantum partially observable Markov decision process (see Section 2.1 and Definition 2.1 for details). As shown in the case of a bipartite link, the agent consists of the nodes belonging to the elementary link, and the environment is the quantum systems distributed to the nodes from the entanglement source.

decision processes [82], which form the theoretical foundation for reinforcement learning [83] and artificial intelligence [84]. In a decision process, an agent interacts with its environment through a sequence of actions, and it receives rewards from the environment based on these actions. The goal of the agent is to perform actions that maximize its expected total reward. We consider a particular quantum generalization of a decision process given in [85] (see also [86]), called a *quantum partially observable Markov decision process*, in which the agent is classical and the environment is quantum. The agent’s action at each time step results in a transformation of the quantum state of the environment, and the agent receives both partial (classical) information about the new quantum state of the environment along with a reward. Such decision processes have been considered previously in the context of quantum control [87–91], quantum-enhanced parameter estimation [92–96], and quantum error correction [89, 97, 98]. We now apply this concept to quantum networks. Specifically, we consider elementary link generation, which is the first step towards obtaining long-range entanglement distribution in quantum networks, and we show that elementary link generation can be cast as a quantum partially observable Markov decision process; see Figure 2. The advantage of viewing elementary link generation from the point of view of decision processes is that we are able to systematically study different policies and determine which policy is optimal in terms of both the fidelity of the link and the probability that the link is active at any given time. We can also keep track of the quantum state of the link over time, which is useful calculating entanglement measures and determining rates for entanglement distillation. Furthermore, because decision processes form the theoretical foundation for reinforcement learning, our work provides the tools

needed in order to perform reinforcement learning in quantum networks.

1.1 Summary of results

The following is a summary of the main results of this work.

1. Our first result, in Section 2.1, is conceptual in nature and is captured by Figure 2 and detailed in Definition 2.1. In Definition 2.1, we formally cast elementary link generation as a quantum partially observable Markov decision process (of the type considered in [85]) by establishing in the context of elementary link generation all of the elements that define a quantum partially observable Markov decision process. In this framework, at each time step, the agent (which is all of the nodes in the elementary link as a collective entity) either requests entanglement from a source station (which is the environment), or keeps the entangled state currently stored in memory. The agent’s choice of action can depend on, e.g., the quality of the initial entanglement and coherence times of the quantum memories. We formally define a policy for elementary link generation, and we describe mathematically how the quantum state of the environment (i.e., the entangled state of the elementary link) transforms based on the actions taken by the agent. In Section 2.2, we define various quantities of interest relating to an elementary link.
2. With elementary link generation cast within the framework of a decision process, we proceed to provide a closed-form expression for the average quantum state of any elementary link in a network at any time (Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.1), as well as the fidelity of the link at any time (Theorem 2.2). These results hold for any policy and for any noise model for the quantum memories.
3. In Section 3, we consider in detail the so-called memory cutoff policy. In this policy, an elementary link, once established, is kept in quantum memories at the nodes for some amount t^* of time, called the cutoff, before it is discarded and the link is reattempted. The memory cutoff policy has been considered in prior work [31–34, 99–105], and it is a natural policy to consider for near-term protocols, in which quantum memories have relatively short coherence times, and there is limited capability to perform entanglement distillation. For this policy, given any number of nodes in the elementary link and any noise model for the quantum memories, our main results are expressions for the link activity probability in the finite- and infinite-horizon settings¹ (Proposition 3.2 and Theorem 3.2, respectively), which immediately lead to expressions for the average quantum state of the link as a function of time and for the average fidelity of the link as a function of time, again in both the finite- and infinite-horizon settings. We also derive in Section 3.1 formulas for the other elementary link quantities defined in Section 2.2, and in Section 3.2 we derive formulas for the expected waiting time for an elementary link.

¹By definition, the *finite-horizon* setting corresponds to a given, finite interaction time between the agent and the environment. In the *infinite-horizon* setting, the interaction proceeds indefinitely.

4. In Section 4, we show how to obtain an optimal policy using the techniques of dynamic programming in the finite-horizon setting, i.e., in the case that the termination time of the elementary link generation procedure is fixed at the outset and is finite. The main result of this section is Theorem 4.1, in which we prove that the optimal policy can be obtained using a backward recursion procedure such that the optimal action at each time is deterministic.

We expect the results derived in this work to be useful as a building block for large-scale quantum network protocols. For example, the policies for elementary link generation obtained through the results of this work can be used as an underlying policy layer over which routing policies can be applied in order to obtain an overall policy for generating end-to-end entanglement in a network. We elaborate on this and on further avenues for development of the mathematical tools established in this work in Section 5. Furthermore, because our results apply to elementary links consisting of an arbitrary number of nodes and to any noise model for the quantum memories, they can be applied to protocols that go beyond bipartite entanglement distribution, namely to protocols for distributing multipartite entanglement [38, 39, 42, 44, 47, 67, 106–108]. We also expect our results to be useful in the analysis of entanglement distribution using all-photon quantum repeaters [36] and in the analysis of entanglement distribution using satellite-based quantum networks [109–113], in which an elementary link can easily be on the order of 1000 km [114] while still having a high fidelity. Finally, since decision processes are at the heart of reinforcement learning, the results of this work provide the theoretical foundation for performing reinforcement learning of (near-optimal) quantum network protocols that can be used in practice.

1.2 Relation to prior work

Policy-based approaches to quantum network protocols have been considered before in [99, 115–117] (see also [62]), where terms such as “rule-set” or “schedule” have been used instead of “policy”. In [99], the authors consider different control protocols for elementary link generation in a quantum network based on different configurations of the sources and heralding stations and the impact they have on end-to-end entanglement distribution rates. In [115], the authors look at protocols for end-to-end entanglement distribution along a chain of quantum repeaters and simulate different scheduling protocols for entanglement distillation along elementary links. Similarly, in [116], the authors use finite state machines to analyze the different layers of an end-to-end entanglement distribution protocol in quantum networks, such as entanglement distillation and entanglement swapping. Finally, in [117], the authors use an approach based on rule-sets to determine end-to-end entanglement distribution rates and fidelities of the end-to-end pairs along a chain of quantum repeaters.

One of the goals of this work is to explicitly formalize the approaches taken in the aforementioned works within the context of decision processes, because this allows us to systematically study different policies and calculate quantities that are relevant for quantum networks, such as entanglement distribution rates and fidelities of the quantum states of the links.

This work is complementary to other prior work on using Markov chains to analyze waiting times and entanglement distribution rates for a chain of quantum repeaters [102, 118–120], and to prior work on analyzing the quantum state in a quantum repeater chain with noisy quantum memories [121–125]. It is also complementary to [126], in which the authors use reinforcement learning to discover protocols for quantum teleportation, entanglement distillation, and end-to-end bipartite entanglement distribution along a chain of quantum repeaters. While the work in [126] is largely numerical, our work is focused on formally developing the mathematical tools needed to perform reinforcement learning of protocols in general quantum networks. The development of the mathematical tools is essential when an agent acts in a quantum-mechanical environment, because it is important to understand how the agent’s actions affect the quantum state of the environment. Furthermore, we expect that the protocols learned in [126], particularly those for entanglement distillation and entanglement swapping, could be incorporated as subroutines within the mathematical framework of decision processes developed in this work, so that large-scale quantum network protocols (going beyond the elementary link level) can be discovered using reinforcement learning.

This work is also related to the work in [127], in which the authors develop a link-layer protocol for generating elementary links in a quantum network, and they perform simulations of entanglement distribution using a discrete-event simulator under various scenarios. The effect of different scheduling strategies is also considered. The protocols in [127] consider actions in a more fine-grained manner than what we consider in this work. In particular, the steps required for heralding (namely, the communication signals for the results of the heralding) are explicitly taken into account. In Remark 2.3, we briefly explain how the approach of [127] can be viewed in terms of the framework being considered here.

The approach to policy optimization taken in this work is similar to the approach in [128], in the sense that both approaches make use of the principle of dynamic programming. While in [128] the focus is on obtaining end-to-end bipartite entanglement in a chain of quantum repeaters, the goal here is simply to examine elementary link generation and to determine the optimal sequence of actions that should be performed in order to maximize both the fidelity of any given elementary link and the probability that any given elementary link is active at any given time.

2 Elementary link generation

Let us go back to the graphical representation of a quantum network in Figure 1. In this work, we suppose that all of the edges in the graph represent entangled states shared by the corresponding nodes. These entangled states are distributed to the nodes by stations containing an entanglement source. These source stations can be on the ground at fixed locations, they can be at one of the nodes in the edge, or they can be on satellites orbiting the earth [109, 110].

The model for transmission of quantum states from the source stations to the nodes is as follows. The source prepares a k -partite state ρ^S , where k is the number of nodes belonging to the edge. Each of the k quantum systems is encoded into d bosonic modes, with $d \geq 1$. The source

state ρ^S is typically of the form $|\psi^S\rangle\langle\psi^S|$, where

$$|\psi^S\rangle = \sqrt{p_0^S}|\text{vac}\rangle + \sqrt{p_1^S}|\psi_1^S\rangle + \sqrt{p_2^S}|\psi_2^S\rangle + \cdots, \quad (2.1)$$

where $|\psi_n^S\rangle$ is a state vector with n photons in total for each of the k parties and the numbers $p_n^S \geq 0$ are probabilities, so that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_n^S = 1$. For example, in the case $k = 2$ and $d = 2$, the following source state is generated from a parametric down-conversion process (see, e.g., [124, 129]):

$$|\psi^S\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\sqrt{n+1}r^n}{e^q} |\psi_n\rangle, \quad (2.2)$$

$$|\psi_n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sum_{m=0}^n (-1)^m |n-m, m; m, n-m\rangle, \quad (2.3)$$

where r and q are parameters characterizing the process. One often considers a truncated version of this state as an approximation, so that [124]

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle = & \sqrt{p_0}|0, 0; 0, 0\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{2}}(|1, 0; 0, 1\rangle + |0, 1; 1, 0\rangle) \\ & + \sqrt{\frac{p_2}{3}}(|2, 0; 0, 2\rangle + |1, 1; 1, 1\rangle + |0, 2; 2, 0\rangle), \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where $p_0 + p_1 + p_2 = 1$. Typically, a source state of the form (2.1) is not ideal, in the sense that the desired state is given by one of the state vectors $|\psi_j^S\rangle$, and the other terms arise due to the naturally imperfect nature of the source. For example, for the state in (2.4), the desired bipartite state is the maximally entangled state $|\Psi^+\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1, 0; 0, 1\rangle + |0, 1; 1, 0\rangle)$.

Once the source state is prepared, each mode is sent through a bosonic pure-loss/attenuation channel \mathcal{L}_η [130], where $\eta \in (0, 1]$ is the transmissivity of the medium. This channel provides a good model for transmission of photons through an optical fiber, in which case $\eta = e^{-\frac{L}{L_0}}$ [22, 23], where L is the transmission distance and L_0 is the attenuation length of the fiber. Letting

$$\mathcal{L}_\eta^{(d)} := \underbrace{\mathcal{L}_\eta \otimes \mathcal{L}_\eta \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{L}_\eta}_{d \text{ times}} \quad (2.5)$$

denote the quantum channel that acts on the d modes of each of the k systems, the overall quantum channel through which the source state ρ^S is sent is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\vec{\eta}}^{(k;d)} := \underbrace{\mathcal{L}_{\eta_1}^{(d)} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\eta_2}^{(d)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\eta_k}^{(d)}}_{k \text{ times}}, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\vec{\eta} = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_k)$ and η_j is the transmissivity of the medium to the j^{th} node in the edge. The quantum state shared by the k nodes after transmission from the source is then

$$\rho_{\text{out}}^S := \mathcal{L}_{\vec{\eta}}^{(k;d)}(\rho^S). \quad (2.7)$$

After transmission from the source to the nodes, the nodes typically have to execute a *heralding procedure*, which is a sequence of local operations and classical communication between the nodes that confirms whether all of the nodes received their quantum systems and whether they are in the desired subspace. If the heralding procedure succeeds, then the nodes store their quantum systems in a quantum memory. Mathematically, the heralding procedure can be described by a set $\{\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1\}$ of completely positive trace non-increasing maps such that $\mathcal{M}_0 + \mathcal{M}_1$ is trace preserving. The map \mathcal{M}_0 corresponds to failure of the heralding procedure, and the map \mathcal{M}_1 corresponds to success. The outcome of the heralding procedure can then be captured by the following transformation of the state ρ_{out}^S to a classical-quantum state:

$$\rho_{\text{out}}^S \mapsto |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathcal{M}_0(\rho_{\text{out}}^S) + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \mathcal{M}_1(\rho_{\text{out}}^S) = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \tilde{\tau}^\emptyset + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \tilde{\rho}_0, \quad (2.8)$$

where the classical register holds the binary outcome of the heralding procedure (1 for success and 0 for failure) and the quantum register holds the quantum state of the nodes corresponding to the outcome. In particular, $\tilde{\tau}^\emptyset := \mathcal{M}_0(\rho_{\text{out}}^S)$ is the (unnormalized) quantum state corresponding to failure, and $\tilde{\rho}_0 := \mathcal{M}_1(\rho_{\text{out}}^S)$ is the (unnormalized) quantum state corresponding to success. The subscript “0” in $\tilde{\rho}_0$ indicates that the quantum memories of the nodes are in their initial state immediately after success of the heralding procedure; we expand on this below. The quantum states conditioned on success and failure, respectively, are defined to be

$$\rho_0 := \frac{\tilde{\rho}_0}{\text{Tr}[\tilde{\rho}_0]}, \quad \tau^\emptyset := \frac{\tilde{\tau}^\emptyset}{\text{Tr}[\tilde{\tau}^\emptyset]}. \quad (2.9)$$

Throughout this work, we let

$$p := \text{Tr}[\tilde{\rho}_0] \quad (2.10)$$

denote the overall probability of success of the transmission from the source and of the heralding procedure.

Now, as mentioned above, once the heralding procedure succeeds, the nodes store their quantum systems in their local quantum memory. Quantum memories have been made using trapped ions [131], Rydberg atoms [132, 133], atom-cavity systems [134, 135], NV centers in diamond [100, 101, 136–139], individual rare-earth ions in crystals [140], and superconducting processors [141]. The quantum memories are in general imperfect, which means that the quantum systems decohere over time. We describe this decoherence by a quantum channel \mathcal{N}_j acting on each quantum system $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ of the elementary link. The decoherence channel is applied at every time step in which the quantum system is in memory. The overall quantum channel acting on all of the quantum systems in the elementary link is

$$\widehat{\mathcal{N}} := \mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{N}_k. \quad (2.11)$$

The quantum state of the elementary link after m time steps in the memories is therefore given by

$$\rho(m) := \widehat{\mathcal{N}}^{\circ m}(\rho_0). \quad (2.12)$$




FIGURE 3: Schematic diagrams of classical (left) and quantum partially observable (right) Markov decision processes. See [82, 142] for details on classical Markov decision processes. Our definition of quantum partially observable Markov decision processes is based on the definition given in [85]. See the main text for details on the elements of both types of decision processes.

For a particular target/desired quantum state of the elementary link, which we assume to be a pure state $\psi = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, we let

$$f_m(\rho_0; \psi) := \langle\psi|\rho(m)|\psi\rangle = \langle\psi|\widehat{\mathcal{N}}^{\circ m}(\rho_0)|\psi\rangle \quad (2.13)$$

denote the fidelity of the state $\rho(m)$ with respect to the target state ψ . For brevity, we suppress the dependence of f_m on the target state ψ whenever it is understood or is unimportant. We also suppress, for brevity, the dependence of f_m on the decoherence channels of the quantum memories.

2.1 Formulation as a quantum decision process

Let us now describe elementary link generation from the point of view of decision processes. Specifically, in this section, we cast elementary link generation as a *quantum partially observable Markov decision process*, as defined in [85] (see also [86]), which is a particular quantum generalization of Markov decision processes. We start by reviewing the general definition of a classical Markov decision process. Then, we proceed to the general definition of a quantum partially observable Markov decision process. We then apply this definition to come up with a quantum partially observable Markov decision process that is specific to elementary link generation.

A classical Markov decision process, depicted in the left panel of Figure 3, is a sequence of interactions between an agent and its environment that is defined by the following elements. (We follow the definition presented in [82, Chapter 2].)

- A set \mathcal{X} of states of the environment, with associated random variables $X(t)$ for all $t \geq 1$ whose values are contained in \mathcal{X} . We also have a set \mathcal{A} of actions of the agent, with associated random variables $A(t)$ for all $t \geq 1$ whose values are contained in \mathcal{A} . The sequence

$$H(t) := (X(1), A(1), X(2), A(2), \dots, A(t-1), X(t)) \quad (2.14)$$

of state and action random variables tells us the *history* of the agent-environment interaction up to some time $t \geq 1$. Any realization of the history is a sequence of the form

$$h^t := (x_1, a_1, x_2, a_2, \dots, a_{t-1}, x_t), \quad (2.15)$$

where $x_j \in \mathcal{X}$ and $a_j \in \mathcal{A}$. Given any history h^t of the form shown above, we let

$$h_j^t := (x_1, a_1, x_2, a_2, \dots, a_{j-1}, x_j) \quad (2.16)$$

denote the history up to time $j \geq 2$. For $j = 1$, we let $h_1^t = x_1$. Then, we can regard the state and action random variables as functions such that, for any history h^t as in (2.15),

$$X(j)(h^t) = x_j, \quad A(j)(h^t) = a_j \quad (2.17)$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq t$.

- A transition function $T_t : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for all $t \geq 1$ such that $T_t(x_t, a_t, x_{t+1}) = \Pr[X(t+1) = x_{t+1} | X(t) = x_t, A(t) = a_t]$. In other words, the transition function gives us the probability that, at time t , the environment transitions to a particular state at time $t+1$ given its state at time t and the agent's action at time t .
- A reward function $r_t : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $t \geq 2$ such that $r_t(x_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, x_t)$ is the reward received by the agent at time t based on the state x_{t-1} of the environment at time $t-1$, the agent's action a_{t-1} at time $t-1$, and the new state x_t of the environment at time t based on the agent's action. The reward r_1 at time $t = 1$ is a given fixed value at the start of the decision process.
- A decision function d_t for $t \geq 1$ such that

$$d_t(h^t)(a_t) := \Pr[A(t) = a_t | H(t) = h^t]. \quad (2.18)$$

In other words, the decision function gives us the probability that, at time t , the agent takes the action a_t conditioned on the history h^t of the interaction up to time t . The sequence $\pi := (d_1, d_2, \dots)$ is called a *policy* for the agent, and it tells us how action decisions are made at each time step.

At each time step $t \geq 1$, the environment is in some state $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$. The agent receives information about the state of the environment and selects an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$. The environment, based on this action, transitions to a different state $x_{t+1} \in \mathcal{X}$ according to the transition function T_t and simultaneously provides the agent with some reward according to the reward function r_{t+1} . The agent also receives full (or partial) information about the new state of the environment, which they can then use to select the next action. The agent's goal is to perform actions that maximize its long-term reward. Specifically, in the *finite-horizon setting*, the agent's goal is to maximize the expected value of the quantity $\sum_{t=1}^T r_t$ up to a given amount $T < \infty$ of time, called the *horizon time*. In the *infinite-horizon setting*, the agent's goal is to maximize the expected value of the quantity

$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{t-1} r_t$, where $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ is a *discount factor*. A thorough introduction to classical Markov decision processes can be found in [82, 142]. Note that what makes a classical Markov decision process Markovian is the fact that the transition function and the reward function at each time depend only on the state and action of the previous time step. However, the decision function can in general depend on the entire history of the interaction, even in a Markov decision process.

By the basic rules of probability, the probability of any history h^t is given by

$$\Pr[H(t) = h^t] = \Pr[X(t) = x_t | H(t-1) = h_{t-1}^t, A(t-1) = a_{t-1}] \cdot \Pr[A(t-1) = a_{t-1} | H(t-1) = h_{t-1}^t] \cdot \Pr[H(t-1) = h_{t-1}^t] \quad (2.19)$$

$$= \Pr[X(1) = x_1] \prod_{j=2}^t \left(\Pr[X(j) = x_j | H(j-1) = h_{j-1}^t, A(j-1) = a_{j-1}] \cdot \Pr[A(j-1) = a_{j-1} | H(j-1) = h_{j-1}^t] \right) \quad (2.20)$$

$$= \Pr[X(1) = x_1] \prod_{j=2}^t \left(T_{j-1}(x_{j-1}, a_{j-1}, x_j) \cdot d_{j-1}(h_{j-1}^t)(a_{j-1}) \right). \quad (2.21)$$

We now state the definition of a quantum partially observable Markov decision process (which we refer to from now on as a “quantum decision process” for brevity), as defined in [85]; see the right panel of Figure 3 for a schematic diagram. Roughly speaking, a quantum decision process is similar to a classical Markov decision process, with the main differences being that in the quantum case the environment is a quantum system, and each of the agent’s actions in the set \mathcal{A} of actions corresponds to a physical evolution of the quantum system, which is described by a completely positive trace non-increasing map acting on the quantum state of the environment. At each time step, the agent only receives classical information about the state of the quantum system, which we call observations, and they are elements in the set \mathcal{X} , hence making the process “partially observable”. In detail, we have the following.

- We define an orthonormal basis $\{|x\rangle\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ of vectors corresponding to the set \mathcal{X} of classical observations of the agent, and an orthonormal basis $\{|a\rangle\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$ of vectors corresponding to the set \mathcal{A} of the agent’s actions. For every time step $t \geq 1$, we define classical registers X_t and A_t for the observation and action values, respectively, at time t . We denote the collection of observation and action value classical registers up to time t by $H_t \equiv X_1 A_1 \cdots A_{t-1} X_t$. Then, based on the definition of a history in (2.15), we define

$$|h^t\rangle_{H_t} := |x_1\rangle_{X_1} \otimes |a_1\rangle_{A_1} \otimes |x_2\rangle_{X_2} \otimes |a_2\rangle_{A_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes |a_{t-1}\rangle_{A_{t-1}} \otimes |x_t\rangle_{X_t}. \quad (2.22)$$

- The transition functions are completely positive trace non-increasing maps such that, at time $t \geq 1$, $\mathcal{T}^{t; x_t, a_t, x_{t+1}}$ gives the evolution of the quantum state of the environment under the given values $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$, $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$, and $x_{t+1} \in \mathcal{X}$ of the observation, action, and observation at the next time step, respectively. The transition maps are such that the sum $\sum_{x_{t+1} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{T}^{t; x_t, a_t, x_{t+1}}$ is a trace preserving map for all $t \geq 1$, all observations $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$, and all actions $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$. At time $t = 0$,




FIGURE 4: An alternative depiction of the quantum decision process shown in the right panel of Figure 3. In this diagram, we explicitly illustrate the interaction of the agent and the environment over time via a sequence of quantum channels (shown here up to time $t = 3$). The decision channels \mathcal{D}^t correspond to the decision functions of the agent (see (2.24)), and the environment response channels \mathcal{E}^t correspond to the transition maps of the environment (see (2.25) and (2.26)). The operator \widehat{R} corresponding to the reward is defined in (2.38), and the states $\widehat{\sigma}(t)$ are defined in (2.27).

before the start of the interaction, we have a set $\{\mathcal{T}^{0;x_1}\}_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}}$ of completely positive trace non-increasing maps that give rise to the first observation $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ of the agent, and they have the property that $\sum_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{T}^{0;x_1}$ is a trace preserving map

- The reward at times $t \geq 2$ is given by a set $\{R^{t;x_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, x_t} : x_{t-1}, x_t \in \mathcal{X}, a_{t-1} \in \mathcal{A}\}$ of Hermitian operators acting on the Hilbert space corresponding to the quantum system of the environment, such that the value of the reward is the expectation value of the appropriate Hermitian operator. The reward at time $t = 1$ is given by a set $\{R^{1;x_1} : x_1 \in \mathcal{X}\}$ of Hermitian operators acting on the Hilbert space corresponding to the quantum system of the environment. See (2.32) and (2.33) below for details on how the reward is calculated.
- The decision function and policy are defined exactly as in the classical case: for any history h^t , with $t \geq 1$, $d_t(h^t) : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a probability distribution over actions, and $\pi = (d_1, d_2, \dots)$ is a policy. In addition to this, to each element of the policy, we define a density operator as follows:

$$\pi(t; h^t) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} d_t(h^t)(a) |a\rangle\langle a|, \quad t \geq 1, \quad (2.23)$$

for all histories h^t .

- An additional defining element is the initial quantum state ρ_{E_0} of the environment, where E_0 is a label for the quantum system of the environment before its interaction with the agent. We denote by E_t the quantum system of the environment at times $t \geq 1$ during its interaction with the agent.

An alternative way of depicting a quantum decision process is shown in Figure 4 up to time $t = 3$. In this depiction, we explicitly show the progression through time of the interaction between the agent and the environment. From the diagram in Figure 4, we see that a quantum decision

process falls into the general paradigm of agent-environment interactions considered previously in [143, 144], and more generally we have that it falls within the theoretical framework of quantum combs/games [145–147] (see also [148]).

The *decision channels* \mathcal{D}^t in Figure 4 are defined as

$$\mathcal{D}_{H_t \rightarrow H_t A_t}^t(|h^t\rangle\langle h^t|_{H_t}) := |h^t\rangle\langle h^t|_{H_t} \otimes \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} d_t(h^t)(a)|a\rangle\langle a|_{A_t}, \quad (2.24)$$

and the quantum channels \mathcal{E}^t , called *environment response channels*, are defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_{E_0 \rightarrow H_1 E_1}^0(\rho_{E_0}) := \sum_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}} |x_1\rangle\langle x_1|_{H_1} \otimes \mathcal{T}_{E_0 \rightarrow E_1}^{0;x_1}(\rho_{E_0}), \quad (2.25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_{H_t A_t E_t \rightarrow H_{t+1} E_{t+1}}^t(\omega_{H_t} \otimes \pi_{A_t} \otimes \rho_{E_t}) \\ & := \sum_{\substack{x_t, x_{t+1} \in \mathcal{X} \\ a_t \in \mathcal{A}}} \text{Tr}_{X_t A_t}[(\omega_{H_t} \otimes \pi_{A_t})|x_t, a_t\rangle\langle x_t, a_t|_{X_t A_t}] |x_t, a_t, x_{t+1}\rangle\langle x_t, a_t, x_{t+1}|_{X_t A_t X_{t+1}} \otimes \mathcal{T}_{E_t \rightarrow E_{t+1}}^{t;x_t, a_t, x_{t+1}}(\rho_{E_t}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

for any states $\rho_{E_0}, \omega_{H_t}, \pi_{A_t}, \rho_{E_t}$. Using the decision channels and the environment response channels, it is straightforward to show that the classical-quantum states $\widehat{\sigma}(t)$ at the end of each time step $t \geq 1$ are given by

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{H_t E_t}(t) = \sum_{h^t} |h^t\rangle\langle h^t|_{H_t} \otimes \widetilde{\sigma}_{E_t}(t; h^t), \quad (2.27)$$

where

$$\widetilde{\sigma}_{E_t}(t; h^t) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{t-1} d_j(h^j)(a_j) \right) \left(\mathcal{T}_{E_{t-1} \rightarrow E_t}^{t-1;x_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, x_t} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{T}_{E_1 \rightarrow E_2}^{1;x_1, a_1, x_2} \circ \mathcal{T}_{E_0 \rightarrow E_1}^{0;x_1} \right) (\rho_{E_0}). \quad (2.28)$$

The expected quantum state at time $t \geq 1$ is then

$$\sigma_{E_t}(t) := \text{Tr}_{H_t}[\widehat{\sigma}_{H_t E_t}(t)] = \sum_{h^t} \widetilde{\sigma}_{E_t}(t; h^t). \quad (2.29)$$

Any quantum decision process as defined above induces a classical Markov decision process such that the probability of any history h^t is given by $\Pr[H(t) = h^t] = \text{Tr}[\widetilde{\sigma}_{E_t}(t; h^t)]$. Using this, along with (2.20), it is straightforward to show that the transition probabilities of the induced classical Markov decision process are given by

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = x_{t+1} | X(t) = x_t, A(t) = a_t] = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{T}_{E_t \rightarrow E_{t+1}}^{t;x_t, a_t, x_{t+1}}(\sigma_{E_t}(t|h^t))], \quad (2.30)$$

for all histories h^t , where

$$\sigma_{E_t}(t|h^t) := \frac{\widetilde{\sigma}_{E_t}(t; h^t)}{\Pr[H(t) = h^t]}. \quad (2.31)$$

is the conditional quantum state of the environment.

Finally, let us discuss how rewards are calculated. Throughout this work, we focus our attention on so-called *episodic processes*, in which the decision process proceeds for a given finite horizon

time T and the reward is given only at this final time step. In particular, then, using the Hermitian operators $\{R_{E_t}^{t;x_{t-1},a_{t-1},x_t} : x_{t-1}, x_t \in \mathcal{X}, a_{t-1} \in \mathcal{A}, t \geq 2\}$ and $\{R_{E_1}^{1;x_1} : x_1 \in \mathcal{X}\}$ for the rewards as described above, for any history $h^t = (x_1, a_1, \dots, a_{t-1}, x_t)$ we have that

$$t = 1 : r_1(x_1) := \begin{cases} \text{Tr}[R_{E_1}^{1;x_1} \sigma_{E_1}(1|x_1)] & \text{if } T = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2.32)$$

$$\forall t \geq 2 : r_t(x_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, x_t) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t < T, \\ \text{Tr}[R_{E_t}^{t;x_{t-1},a_{t-1},x_t} \sigma_{E_t}(t|h^t)] & \text{if } t = T. \end{cases} \quad (2.33)$$

The expected total reward up to time $T \geq 2$ is then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T r_t \right] = \mathbb{E}[r_T] \quad (2.34)$$

$$= \sum_{h^T} \Pr[H(T) = h^T] r_T(x_{T-1}, a_{T-1}, x_T) \quad (2.35)$$

$$= \sum_{h^T} \text{Tr}[R_{E_T}^{T;x_{T-1},a_{T-1},x_T} \tilde{\sigma}_{E_T}(T; h^T)] \quad (2.36)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\widehat{R}_{X_{T-1}A_{T-1}X_T E_T}(T) \widehat{\sigma}_{H_T E_T}(T)], \quad (2.37)$$

where in the last line we defined the operator

$$\widehat{R}_{X_{t-1}A_{t-1}X_t E_t}(t) := \sum_{\substack{x_{t-1}, x_t \in \mathcal{X} \\ a_{t-1} \in \mathcal{A}}} |x_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, x_t\rangle \langle x_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, x_t|_{X_{t-1}A_{t-1}X_t} \otimes R_{E_t}^{t;x_{t-1},a_{t-1},x_t} \quad (2.38)$$

for all $t \geq 2$.

From now on, for simplicity of notation, we drop the subscripts containing the labels of the classical registers of the history and the quantum systems of the environment when writing quantum states and other operators, unless they are needed for clarity.

We are now ready to take the generic definition of a quantum decision process given above and apply it to the task of elementary link generation in a quantum network. Roughly speaking, as outlined in Section 1.1 and illustrated in Figure 2, the decision process for any elementary link is such that, at each time step, the agent (which we define to be all of the nodes in the elementary link as a collective entity) either requests entanglement from a source station (which we define to be the environment) or keeps the entangled state currently stored in memory, in which case the decoherence channel is applied to each of the quantum systems comprising the entangled state of the elementary link. This process goes on for a given time $T < \infty$, after which a reward is given. Formally, we have the following.

Definition 2.1 (Quantum decision process for elementary link generation). Given any elementary link in a quantum network, as shown in Figure 2, we define a quantum decision process for the elementary link by letting the source station used to establish the entangled state of the elementary link be the environment, and we let the nodes belonging to the elementary link collectively be the agent. Then, the other elements of the quantum decision process are defined as follows.

- We let $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$ tell us whether or not the elementary link is active at a particular time. In particular, then, for the random variables $X(t)$ for all $t \geq 1$, we have:

- $X(t) = 0$: link is inactive;
- $X(t) = 1$: link is active.

We let $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$ be the set of possible actions of the agent, so that for the random variables $A(t)$ for all $t \geq 1$, we have:

- $A(t) = 0$: wait/keep the entangled state;
- $A(t) = 1$: discard the entangled state and request a new entangled state.

- The transition maps are defined to be time independent, and we denote them by $\mathcal{T}^{x_t, a_t, x_{t+1}} \equiv \mathcal{T}^{t, x_t, a_t, x_{t+1}}$ for all $x_t, a_t, x_{t+1} \in \{0, 1\}$ and all $t \geq 1$, where

$$\mathcal{T}^{x_t, 1, 1}(\sigma) := \text{Tr}[\sigma] \tilde{\rho}_0 \quad \forall x_t \in \{0, 1\}, \quad (2.39)$$

$$\mathcal{T}^{x_t, 1, 0}(\sigma) := \text{Tr}[\sigma] \tilde{\tau}^\emptyset \quad \forall x_t \in \{0, 1\}, \quad (2.40)$$

$$\mathcal{T}^{1, 0, 1}(\sigma) := \widehat{\mathcal{N}}(\sigma), \quad (2.41)$$

$$\mathcal{T}^{0, 0, 0}(\sigma) := \sigma \quad (2.42)$$

for any linear operator σ , where we recall the definitions of $\tilde{\tau}^\emptyset$ and $\tilde{\rho}_0$ from (2.8). The maps \mathcal{T}^{0, x_1} , $x_1 \in \{0, 1\}$, are defined to be

$$\mathcal{T}^{0, 0}(\sigma) := (\mathcal{M}_0 \circ \mathcal{L})(\sigma), \quad (2.43)$$

$$\mathcal{T}^{0, 1}(\sigma) := (\mathcal{M}_1 \circ \mathcal{L})(\sigma) \quad (2.44)$$

for any linear operator σ , where we recall from the discussion at the beginning of Section 2 that \mathcal{L} is the transmission channel from the source to the nodes and \mathcal{M}_0 and \mathcal{M}_1 are completely positive trace non-increasing maps corresponding to the heralding procedure at the nodes.

- The reward at time $t \geq 1$ is defined as follows. For any history $h^t = (x_1, a_1, \dots, a_{t-1}, x_t)$ and horizon time $0 < T < \infty$,

$$t = 1 : \quad r_1(x_1) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } T > 1, \\ \delta_{x_1, 1} \langle \psi | \sigma(1|x_1) | \psi \rangle & \text{if } T = 1, \end{cases} \quad (2.45)$$

$$\forall t \geq 2 : \quad r_t(x_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, x_t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t < T, \\ \delta_{x_t, 1} \langle \psi | \sigma(t|h^t) | \psi \rangle & \text{if } t = T, \end{cases} \quad (2.46)$$

where $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is the target/desired entangled state of the elementary link.

- The initial state ρ_{E_0} of the environment is the state ρ^S produced by the source station (see the discussion at the beginning of Section 2). ◀

Remark 2.1. Let us make some remarks about our definition of the quantum decision process for elementary link generation.

- Note that our definition of the transition maps is consistent with our description of the decision process given before Definition 2.1: if the action is to wait, and the link is currently active, then we apply the decoherence channel \widehat{N} to the quantum state of the link; if the action is to request a new entangled state, then the current quantum state of the link is discarded and a new link is attempted. If the link is currently not active and the action is to wait, then the quantum state stays as it is.
- Using (2.30) and the definition of the transition maps, we have the following values for the transition probabilities for all $t \geq 1$ and for any history $h^t = (x_1, a_1, \dots, a_{t-1}, x_t)$:

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 0 | X(t) = x_t, A(t) = 1] = 1 - p, \quad (2.47)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 1 | X(t) = x_t, A(t) = 1] = p, \quad (2.48)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = x_{t+1} | X(t) = x_t, A(t) = 0] = \delta_{x_t, x_{t+1}} \quad \forall x_{t+1} \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (2.49)$$

Observe that the transition probabilities are time independent.

- Our definition of the reward in (2.45) and (2.46) is similar to the definition of the reward given in [88, Eq. (1)], in which the reward is equal to zero for all times except for the final time, at which point the reward is simply the fidelity of the quantum state of the environment with respect to a desired pure state. Using the fidelity as the reward makes sense from the perspective of entanglement generation in a quantum network, because having higher fidelities at the elementary link level allows for more joining measurements, and therefore entanglement distribution over longer distances. In Section 4, when we determine optimal policies for elementary link generation, we provide further justification for defining the reward as in (2.45) and (2.46), and we discuss other possible quantities to use as the reward.

Using (2.35)–(2.37), the expected total reward after T time steps is

$$\mathbb{E}[r_T] = \sum_{h^T} \delta_{x_T, 1} \langle \psi | \widehat{\sigma}(T; h^T) | \psi \rangle = \text{Tr}[(|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_T} \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle \psi|) \widehat{\sigma}(T)]. \quad (2.50)$$

In Theorem 2.2 below, we show that this quantity is simply the expected fidelity of the elementary link when the link is active. ◀

We now derive an explicit expression for the conditional quantum state $\sigma(t|h^t)$, as defined in (2.31), for any elementary link.

Theorem 2.1 (Quantum state of an elementary link). For every time step $t \geq 1$ and for any history $h^t = (x_1, a_1, \dots, a_{t-1}, x_t)$, we have

$$\sigma(t|h^t) = x_t \rho(M(t)(h^t)) + (1 - x_t) \tau^\emptyset, \quad (2.51)$$

where $M(t)$ is defined to be the random variable that indicates the number of time steps that the quantum state of the elementary link has been held in memory at time $t \geq 1$, and it satisfies the recursion relation

$$M(t) = \begin{cases} M(t-1) + X(t) & \text{if } A(t-1) = 0, \\ X(t) - 1 & \text{if } A(t-1) = 1, \end{cases} \quad (2.52)$$

where $A(0) \equiv 1$ and $M(0) \equiv -1$. Furthermore,

$$\Pr[H(t) = h^t] = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{t-1} d_j(h_j^t)(a_j) \right) p^{N_{\text{succ}}(t)(h^t)} (1-p)^{N_{\text{req}}(t)(h^t) - N_{\text{succ}}(t)(h^t)} \quad (2.53)$$

for all histories h^t , where

$$N_{\text{req}}(t) := \sum_{j=1}^t A(j-1), \quad N_{\text{succ}}(t) := \sum_{j=1}^t A(j-1)X(j) \quad (2.54)$$

are the number of link requests and the number of successful link requests, respectively, up to time t .

Remark 2.2. Intuitively, the quantity $M(t)$ is the number of consecutive time steps up to the t^{th} time step that the action “wait” is performed since the most recent “request” action. The value $M(t) = -1$ can be thought of as the resting state of the memory, when it is not loaded. The values that $M(t)$ can take are $-1, 0, 1, \dots, t-1$. ◀

Proof of Theorem 2.1. First, let us observe that the statement of the proposition is true for $t = 1$, since by (2.61) and (2.62) we can write

$$\bar{\sigma}(1; x_1) = x_1 \bar{\rho}_0 + (1 - x_1) \bar{\tau}^\emptyset. \quad (2.55)$$

Then, indeed, we have $M(1) = 0$ according to the definition in (2.52), as required, if $x_1 = 1$. Furthermore,

$$\text{Tr}[\bar{\sigma}(1; x_1)] = x_1 p + (1 - x_1)(1 - p) = p^{x_1} (1 - p)^{1-x_1}, \quad (2.56)$$

so that

$$\sigma(1|x_1) = \frac{x_1 \bar{\rho}_0 + (1 - x_1) \bar{\tau}^\emptyset}{p^{x_1} (1 - p)^{1-x_1}} \quad (2.57)$$

$$= \begin{cases} \rho_0 & \text{if } x_1 = 1, \\ \tau^\emptyset & \text{if } x_1 = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.58)$$

$$= x_1 \rho_0 + (1 - x_1) \tau^\emptyset \quad (2.59)$$

where we recall the definitions of ρ_0 and τ^\emptyset from (2.9).

Now, recall from (2.28) and Definition 2.1 that

$$\bar{\sigma}(t; h^t) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{t-1} d_j(h_j^t)(a_j) \right) (\mathcal{J}^{x_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, x_t} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{J}^{x_1, a_1, x_2})(\bar{\sigma}(1; x_1)), \quad (2.60)$$

where

$$\tilde{\sigma}(1; 0) := \tilde{\tau}^\varnothing, \quad (2.61)$$

$$\tilde{\sigma}(1; 1) := \tilde{\rho}_0. \quad (2.62)$$

Using the definition of the transition maps, for each time step $j > 1$ in which the action “wait” (i.e., $A(j) = 0$) is performed and the link is active (i.e., $X(j) = 1$), the link stays active at time step $j + 1$, and thus by definition the memory time must be incremented by one, which is consistent with the definition of the memory time $M(t)$ given in (2.52), and the quantum state of the link goes from $\rho(M(t))$ to $\rho(M(t) + 1)$. If instead the link is active at time j and the action “request” is performed (i.e., $A(j) = 1$), then the quantum state of the link is discarded and is replaced either by the state ρ_0 (if $X(j + 1) = 1$) with probability p or by the state τ^\varnothing (if $X(j + 1) = 0$) with probability $1 - p$. In the former case, the memory time must be reset to zero, consistent with (2.52), and in the latter case, the memory time is -1 , also consistent with (2.52).

Furthermore, by definition of the transition maps, each time the action “request” is performed, we obtain a factor of p (if the request succeeds) or $1 - p$ (if the request fails). If the action “wait” is performed, then we obtain no additional multiplicative factors. The quantity $N_{\text{succ}}(t - 1)$ is, by definition, equal to the number of requests that succeeded in $t - 1$ time steps. Therefore, overall, we obtain a factor $p^{N_{\text{succ}}(t-1)}$ at the $(t - 1)^{\text{st}}$ time step for the number of successful requests. The number of failed requests in $t - 1$ time steps is given by

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} A(j-1)(1 - X(j)) = \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} A(j-1) - \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} A(j-1)X(j) \quad (2.63)$$

$$= N_{\text{req}}(t-1) - N_{\text{succ}}(t-1), \quad (2.64)$$

so that we obtain an overall factor of $(1 - p)^{N_{\text{req}}(t-1) - N_{\text{succ}}(t-1)}$ at the $(t - 1)^{\text{st}}$ time step for the failed requests. Also, the memory time at the $(t - 1)^{\text{st}}$ time step is $M(t-1)(h'_{t-1})$, and since the quantum state is either $\rho(M(t-1)(h'_{t-1}))$ or τ^\varnothing , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma}(t; h^t) &= \left(\prod_{j=1}^{t-1} d_j(h'_j)(a_j) \right) p^{N_{\text{succ}}(t-1)(h'_{t-1})} (1 - p)^{N_{\text{req}}(t-1)(h'_{t-1}) - N_{\text{succ}}(t-1)(h'_{t-1})} \\ &\quad \times \left(x_{t-1} \mathcal{T}^{1, a_{t-1}, x_t}(\rho(M(t-1)(h'_{t-1}))) + (1 - x_{t-1}) \mathcal{T}^{0, a_{t-1}, x_t}(\tau^\varnothing) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.65)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left(\prod_{j=1}^{t-1} d_j(h'_j)(a_j) \right) p^{N_{\text{succ}}(t-1)(h'_{t-1})} (1 - p)^{N_{\text{req}}(t-1)(h'_{t-1}) - N_{\text{succ}}(t-1)(h'_{t-1})} \\ &\quad \times p^{a_{t-1} x_t} (1 - p)^{a_{t-1}(1 - x_t)} (x_t \rho(M(t)(h^t)) + (1 - x_t) \tau^\varnothing) \end{aligned} \quad (2.66)$$

$$= \left(\left(\prod_{j=1}^t d_j(h'_j)(a_j) \right) p^{N_{\text{succ}}(t)(h^t)} (1 - p)^{N_{\text{req}}(t)(h^t) - N_{\text{succ}}(t)(h^t)} \right) (x_t \rho(M(t)(h^t)) + (1 - x_t) \tau^\varnothing). \quad (2.67)$$

Then, since $\Pr[H(t) = h^t] = \text{Tr}[\tilde{\sigma}(t; h^t)]$, we have

$$\Pr[H(t) = h^t] = \left(\prod_{j=1}^t d_j(h'_j)(a_j) \right) p^{N_{\text{succ}}(t)(h^t)} (1 - p)^{N_{\text{req}}(t)(h^t) - N_{\text{succ}}(t)(h^t)}, \quad (2.68)$$

as required. Finally,

$$\sigma(t|h') = \frac{\tilde{\sigma}(t; h')}{\text{Tr}[\tilde{\sigma}(t; h')]} = x_t \rho(M(t)(h')) + (1 - x_t) \tau^\emptyset, \quad (2.69)$$

which completes the proof. \blacksquare

Using Theorem 2.1, we immediately obtain an expression for the expected quantum state of the link at any time $t \geq 1$.

Corollary 2.1 (Average quantum state of an elementary link). For any $t \geq 1$, the average quantum state of any elementary link is

$$\sigma(t) = (1 - \Pr[X(t) = 1]) \tau^\emptyset + \sum_{m=0}^{t-1} \Pr[X(t) = 1, M(t) = m] \rho(m). \quad (2.70)$$

Proof. Using the result of Theorem 2.1, along with (2.29), the expected quantum state of the link at time $t \geq 1$ is given by

$$\sigma(t) = \text{Tr}_{H_t}[\widehat{\sigma}(t)] = \sum_{h'} \tilde{\sigma}(t; h') \quad (2.71)$$

$$= \sum_{h'} \Pr[H(t) = h'] (X(t)(h') \rho(M(t)(h')) + (1 - X(t)(h')) \tau^\emptyset) \quad (2.72)$$

$$= \sum_{h': x_t=0} \Pr[H(t) = h'] \tau^\emptyset + \sum_{h': x_t=1} \Pr[H(t) = h'] \rho(M(t)(h')) \quad (2.73)$$

$$= (1 - \Pr[X(t) = 1]) \tau^\emptyset + \sum_{m=0}^{t-1} \Pr[X(t) = 1, M(t) = m] \rho(m), \quad (2.74)$$

where to obtain the last equality we rearranged the sum over the set $\{h' : x_t = 1\}$ so that the sum is over the possible values of the memory time m , which are $0, 1, \dots, t-1$ when the link is active. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

The expected quantum state of the link at time $t \geq 1$, given that the link is active at time t , is defined to be

$$\sigma(t|X(t) = 1) := \frac{\text{Tr}_{H_t}[|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_t} \widehat{\sigma}(t)]}{\text{Tr}[|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_t} \widehat{\sigma}(t)]} \quad (2.75)$$

$$= \sum_{m=0}^{t-1} \Pr[M(t) = m | X(t) = 1] \rho(m). \quad (2.76)$$

Note that $\text{Tr}[|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_t} \widehat{\sigma}(t)] = \Pr[X(t) = 1]$; see Theorem 2.2 below.

Observe that the expressions in (2.70) and (2.76) hold for any policy of the agent. Given a particular policy, determining the average quantum state means determining the joint probability distribution of the random variables $X(t)$ and $M(t)$, i.e., determining the quantities $\Pr[X(t) = 1, M(t) = m]$ for all possible values of m . The probability distribution of $X(t)$ can then be obtained via marginalization, i.e., via $\Pr[X(t) = 1] = \sum_m \Pr[X(t) = 1, M(t) = m]$, where the sum is over all possible values of the memory random variable $M(t)$ (which can depend on the policy).

Remark 2.3. Throughout this section, we have assumed that there are only two actions that the agent can perform during the elementary link generation process. In practice, it might be necessary to add other actions to the decision process, as done in, e.g., [127]. All that has to be done in this case is to appropriately define the transition maps in order to accommodate the additional actions, and the general formulas in (2.27)–(2.30) still hold. We can similarly incorporate other classical discrete-valued properties of the link into the link random variable $X(t)$ if needed. ◀

2.2 Link quantities

In the previous section, we defined two elementary link quantities, the status $X(t)$ and the memory time $M(t)$. We are interested throughout this work with several other quantities, which we now define.

Definition 2.2 (Link quantities). Given any edge in a graph corresponding to a quantum network, we define the following quantities for the associated elementary link.

- The random variable $X(t)$ for the status of the elementary link at time t : $X(t) = 0$ if the link is inactive, and $X(t) = 1$ if the link is active.
- The random variable $M(t)$ for the amount of time that the quantum state of the elementary link is held in memory at time t . It is defined by the recursion relation in (2.52). For any $t \geq 1$, the values that $M(t)$ can take are $-1, 0, 1, \dots, t-1$. An explicit expression for $M(t)$ is the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
M(t) &= A(0)(X(1) + X(2) + \dots + X(t) - 1)\overline{A(1)}\overline{A(2)} \cdots \overline{A(t-1)} \\
&\quad + A(1)(X(2) + X(3) + \dots + X(t) - 1)\overline{A(2)}\overline{A(3)} \cdots \overline{A(t-1)} \\
&\quad + A(2)(X(3) + X(4) + \dots + X(t) - 1)\overline{A(3)}\overline{A(4)} \cdots \overline{A(t-1)} \\
&\quad + \dots \\
&\quad + A(t-1)(X(t) - 1)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.77}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^t A(j-1) \left(\sum_{\ell=j}^t X(\ell) - 1 \right) \prod_{k=j}^{t-1} \overline{A(k)}, \tag{2.78}$$

where $A(0) \equiv 1$ and $\overline{A(k)} := 1 - A(k)$ for all $k \geq 1$. It can be shown that this definition is equivalent to the recursive definition given in (2.52).

- The random variable

$$\widetilde{F}(t; \psi) := X(t)f_{M(t)}(\rho_0; \psi), \quad (2.79)$$

which is the fidelity of the quantum state of the link with respect to the target pure state ψ when the link is active.

- The random variable

$$F(t; \psi) := \frac{\widetilde{F}(t; \psi)}{\Pr[X(t) = 1]} = \frac{X(t)f_{M(t)}(\rho_0; \psi)}{\Pr[X(t) = 1]}, \quad (2.80)$$

which is the fidelity of the quantum state of the link with respect to the target pure state ψ given that the link is active.

- N^{\max} , which is the number of parallel edges between the nodes, and thus the maximum number of entangled states that can be shared by the nodes of the edge per time step (see Figure 1). We refer to each of the N^{\max} parallel edges as a *parallel link*. We then let

$$N(t) := \sum_{j=1}^{N^{\max}} X_j(t) \quad (2.81)$$

be the *number of active parallel links* at time t , where $X_j(t)$ is the status of the j^{th} parallel link of the edge at time t .

- The *success rate* up to time t of the link:

$$S(t) := \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{N^{\max}} \sum_{j=1}^t A_{\ell}(j-1)X_{\ell}(j)}{\sum_{\ell=1}^{N^{\max}} \sum_{j=1}^t A_{\ell}(j-1)}, \quad (2.82)$$

which is simply the ratio of the number of successful transmissions when a request is made to the total number of requests made within time t . We let $A(0) \equiv 1$.

- The *link activity rate* up to time t :

$$R(t) := \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t N(j), \quad (2.83)$$

which is the average number of active links along the edge per unit time up to time t .

When we need to refer to a particular edge in the graph, we indicate the edge on the associated elementary link quantities with a subscript, e.g., $X_e(t)$ for the status of the elementary link associated with the edge e . When considering any distinct pair of edges in the graph, the corresponding random variables defined above are independent by definition. For example, for two edges $e \neq e'$, the random variables $X_e(t)$ and $X_{e'}(t)$ are independent for all $t \geq 1$, and similarly for the other random variables. ◀

Remark 2.4. In a graph-theoretic setting, the quantity N^{\max} can be interpreted as the *capacity* of an edge. The quantity $N(t)$ is then called the *flow* along the edge; see Section 3.3 for details. ◀

The success rate $S(t)$ and the link activity rate $R(t)$ are two rate measures that we have defined for an elementary link. The first measure is the number of successful requests per channel use up to time t (indeed, notice that the quantity $\sum_{\ell=1}^{N^{\max}} \sum_{j=1}^t A_{\ell}(j-1)$ in the denominator of $S(t)$ is the number of uses of the transmission channel in t time steps). The second rate measure is the average number of parallel links obtained per unit time up to time t . When $N^{\max} = 1$, $R(t)$ can be thought of as the fraction of time that the link is active in t time steps.

Theorem 2.2 (Link success probability and fidelity). Given any elementary link in a quantum network, the probability distribution of the link value $X(t)$ (equivalently, the expectation value $\mathbb{E}[X(t)]$) can be written as

$$\Pr[X(t) = 1] = \text{Tr}[|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_t} \widehat{\sigma}(t)] = \mathbb{E}[X(t)], \quad (2.84)$$

where we recall the definition of the classical-quantum state $\widehat{\sigma}(t)$ in (2.27). We also have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t; \psi)] = \sum_{m=0}^{t-1} f_m(\rho_0; \psi) \Pr[X(t) = 1, M(t) = m] \quad (2.85)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[(|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_t} \otimes \psi) \widehat{\sigma}(t)], \quad (2.86)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[F(t; \psi)] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t; \psi)]}{\Pr[X(t) = 1]} \quad (2.87)$$

$$= \sum_{m=0}^{t-1} f_m(\rho_0; \psi) \Pr[M(t) = m | X(t) = 1] \quad (2.88)$$

$$= \frac{\text{Tr}[(|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_t} \otimes \psi) \widehat{\sigma}(t)]}{\text{Tr}[|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_t} \widehat{\sigma}(t)]}. \quad (2.89)$$

Proof. To see the first equality in (2.84), observe that

$$\text{Tr}[|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_t} \widehat{\sigma}(t)] = \sum_{h': X(t)(h')=1} \Pr[H(t) = h']. \quad (2.90)$$

The expression on the right-hand side of this equation is equal to $\Pr[X(t) = 1]$ by definition of the random variable $X(t)$. The second equality in (2.84) holds because $X(t)$ is a binary/Bernoulli random variable.

The equality in (2.85) follows by definition of $\widetilde{F}(t; \psi)$ and by definition of expectation. The equality in (2.86) follows by considering that

$$\text{Tr}[(|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_t} \otimes \psi) \widehat{\sigma}(t)] = \sum_{h': x_t=1} \Pr[H(t) = h'] \langle \psi | \rho(M(t)(h')) | \psi \rangle \quad (2.91)$$

$$= \sum_{h^t: x_t=1} \Pr[H(t) = h^t] f_{M(t)(h^t)}(\rho_0; \psi), \quad (2.92)$$

and by considering that the sum over $\{h^t : x_t = 1\}$ can be rearranged into a sum over the possible values of the memory time $M(t)$ when the link is active, which are $0, 1, \dots, t-1$. The expressions in (2.88) and (2.89) are then immediate. ■

In the following section, we consider a particular policy, the so-called “memory cutoff” policy, and we determine analytic expressions for $\Pr[X(t) = 1]$, $\Pr[X(t) = 1, M(t) = m]$, and for the expected values of $\widetilde{F}(t)$ and $F(t)$, under this policy.

3 The memory cutoff policy for elementary link generation

A natural policy to consider, and one that has been considered extensively previously [31–34, 99–105], is the following. A link is requested at every time step until the link is established, and once the link is established, it is held in quantum memories for some pre-specified amount t^* of time (usually called the “memory cutoff” and not necessarily equal to the memory coherence time) before the link is discarded and requested again. The cutoff t^* can be any non-negative integer. There are two extreme cases of this policy: when $t^* = 0$, a request is made at *every* time step regardless of whether the previous request succeeded; if $t^* = \infty$, then a link request is made at every time step until the link request succeeds, and once the link request succeeds the quantum systems remain in memory indefinitely—no further request is ever made. In this section, we provide a complete analysis of this policy, including analytic formulas for the link value probability and the expected link fidelity as a function of time, along with the infinite-horizon ($t \rightarrow \infty$) behavior of the link.

For the memory cutoff policy with cutoff t^* , we denote the memory time random variable by $M_{t^*}(t)$. It turns out to be more convenient to use the following simpler formula for the memory time $M_{t^*}(t)$ than the general formula given in (2.78) when $t^* < \infty$:

$$M_{t^*}(t) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^t X(j) - 1 \right) \bmod(t^* + 1), \quad t^* < \infty. \quad (3.1)$$

With this formula, the memory time is always in $\{0, 1, \dots, t^*\}$ when $t^* < \infty$. Also note that, with this formula, we get a memory value of $-1 \bmod(t^* + 1) = t^*$ even when the memory is not loaded. The advantage of this is that, if $M_{t^*}(t) < t^*$, then $X(t) = 1$. When $t^* = \infty$, we have

$$M_{\infty}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^t X(j) - 1, \quad (3.2)$$

and so the values that the memory time can take are $-1, 0, 1, \dots, t-1$.

Mathematically, the memory cutoff policy is described as follows for all $t^* \geq 0$:

$$d_t(h^t)(a_t) = \Pr[A(t) = a_t | H(t) = h^t] = \delta_{a_t, M'_{t^*}(t)(h^t)}, \quad (3.3)$$

where for all $t^* < \infty$,

$$M'_{t^*}(t)(h^t) := \delta_{M(t)(h^t), t^*} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } M_{t^*}(t)(h^t) < t^*, \\ 1 & \text{if } M_{t^*}(t)(h^t) = t^* \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

is the function that tells us whether or not the memory time is equal to t^* . For $t^* = \infty$, we have

$$M'_\infty(t)(h^t) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } M_\infty(t)(h^t) = -1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

From this, we see that the memory cutoff policy is deterministic and that the action at each time step is determined by the value of $M'_{t^*}(t)$ for all $t^* \geq 0$. In particular,

$$A(t) = 0 \iff M'_{t^*}(t) = 0, \quad A(t) = 1 \iff M'_{t^*}(t) = 1. \quad (3.6)$$

In other words,

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = x_{t+1} | H(t) = h^t, A(t) = a_t] = \Pr[X(t+1) = x_{t+1} | H(t) = h^t, M'_{t^*}(t) = a_t], \quad (3.7)$$

for all histories h^t , all $a_t, x_{t+1} \in \{0, 1\}$, and all $t^* \geq 0$. In particular, we can use (2.49) to conclude that

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = x_{t+1} | H(t) = h^t, M'_{t^*}(t) = 0] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x_{t+1} = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } x_{t+1} = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

The transition probabilities given in (2.47)–(2.49) therefore reduce to the following for the memory cutoff policy:

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 0 | H(t) = h^t, M'_{t^*}(t) = 1] = 1 - p, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 1 | H(t) = h^t, M'_{t^*}(t) = 1] = p, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 0 | H(t) = h^t, M'_{t^*}(t) = 0] = 0, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 1 | H(t) = h^t, M'_{t^*}(t) = 0] = 1, \quad (3.12)$$

for all histories h^t and all $t^* \geq 0$. The following conditional probabilities then hold for any $t^* < \infty$:

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 1, M_{t^*}(t+1) = 0 | X(t) = 0, M_{t^*}(t) = m] = p, \quad 0 \leq m \leq t^*, \quad (3.13)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 1, M_{t^*}(t+1) = 0 | X(t) = 1, M_{t^*}(t) = t^*] = p, \quad (3.14)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 0, M_{t^*}(t+1) = t^* | X(t) = 0, M_{t^*}(t) = m] = 1 - p, \quad 0 \leq m \leq t^*, \quad (3.15)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 0, M_{t^*}(t+1) = t^* | X(t) = 1, M_{t^*}(t) = t^*] = 1 - p, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 1, M_{t^*}(t+1) = m+1 | X(t) = 1, M_{t^*}(t) = m] = 1, \quad 0 \leq m \leq t^* - 1, \quad (3.17)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 0, M_{t^*}(t+1) = t^* | X(t) = 0, M_{t^*}(t) = t^*] = 1, \quad (3.18)$$

with all other possible conditional probabilities equal to zero. Since these transition probabilities are time-independent, and since the pair $(X(t+1), M_{t^*}(t+1))$ depends only on $(X(t), M_{t^*}(t))$, we have that $((X(t), M_{t^*}(t)) : t \geq 1)$ is a stationary/time-homogeneous Markov process. As such, the conditional probabilities can be organized into the transition matrix $T(t^*)$, $t^* < \infty$, defined as follows:

$$(T(t^*))_{\substack{x,m \\ x',m'}} := \Pr[X(t+1) = x, M_{t^*}(t+1) = m | X(t) = x', M_{t^*}(t) = m'],$$

$$x, x' \in \{0, 1\}, m, m' \in \{0, 1, \dots, t^*\}. \quad (3.19)$$

For $t^* = \infty$, observe that the action at time $t \geq 1$ depends only the current value of the link, not on the entire history of the link. In other words, the definition of $M'_\infty(t)$ in (3.5) is equivalent to

$$M'_\infty(t) = 1 - X(t). \quad (3.20)$$

Indeed, if $X(t) = 0$, then by definition of the $t^* = \infty$ cutoff policy a request is made, so that $M'_\infty(t) = 1$, as required. If $X(t) = 1$, then the link is kept, meaning that $M'_\infty(t) = 0$. The transition probabilities in (3.9)–(3.12) can therefore be simplified to the following when $t^* = \infty$:

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 0 | X(t) = 0] = 1 - p, \quad (3.21)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 0 | X(t) = 1] = 0, \quad (3.22)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 1 | X(t) = 0] = p, \quad (3.23)$$

$$\Pr[X(t+1) = 1 | X(t) = 1] = 1. \quad (3.24)$$

These transition probabilities are time-independent and Markovian, so they can be organized into the transition matrix $T(\infty)$ defined as follows:

$$(T(\infty))_{\substack{x \\ x'}} := \Pr[X(t+1) = x | X(t) = x'], \quad x, x' \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (3.25)$$

To begin our analysis of the memory cutoff policy, let us consider what the histories h^t look like by considering a particular example. Consider a link for which $t^* = 3$, and let us consider the link values up to time $t = 10$. Given that each link request succeeds with probability p and fails with probability $1 - p$, in Table 1 we write down the probability for each sequence of link values according to the formula in (2.53). Note that we only include those histories that have non-zero probability (indeed, some sequences $h^t = (x_1, a_1, \dots, a_{t-1}, x_t) \in \{0, 1\}^{2t-1}$ will have zero probability under the memory cutoff policy). We also include in the table the memory times $M_{t^*}(t)$, which are calculated using the formula in (3.1). Since the memory cutoff policy is deterministic, it suffices to keep track only of the link values and not of the action values, since the action values are given deterministically by the link values. For the link value sequences, we define two quantities that are helpful for obtaining analytic formulas for the link quantities defined in Section 2.2. The first quantity is $Y_1(t)$, which we define to be the number of full blocks of ones (having length $t^* + 1$) in link value sequences up to time $t - 1$. The values that $Y_1(t)$ can take are $0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{t-1}{t^*+1} \rfloor$ if $t^* < \infty$, and 0 if $t^* = \infty$. We also define the quantity $Y_2(t)$ to be the number of trailing ones in link value

x_1	x_2	x_3	x_4	x_5	x_6	x_7	x_8	x_9	x_{10}	$Y_1(t)(h^t)$	$Y_2(t)(h^t)$	$\Pr[H(t) = h^t]$	$M_{t^*}(t)(h^t)$
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$(1-p)^{10}$	3
1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	$p(1-p)^6$	3
0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	$p(1-p)^6$	3
0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	$p(1-p)^6$	3
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	$p(1-p)^6$	3
0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	$p(1-p)^6$	3
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	$p(1-p)^6$	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	$p^2(1-p)^2$	3
1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	$p^2(1-p)^2$	3
0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	$p^2(1-p)^2$	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	$p(1-p)^9$	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	$p(1-p)^8$	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	$p(1-p)^7$	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	4	$p(1-p)^6$	3
1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	$p^2(1-p)^5$	0
0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	$p^2(1-p)^5$	0
0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	$p^2(1-p)^5$	0
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	$p^2(1-p)^5$	0
0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	$p^2(1-p)^5$	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	$p^2(1-p)^5$	0
1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	$p^2(1-p)^4$	1
0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	$p^2(1-p)^4$	1
0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	$p^2(1-p)^4$	1
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	$p^2(1-p)^4$	1
0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	$p^2(1-p)^4$	1
1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	$p^2(1-p)^3$	2
0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	$p^2(1-p)^3$	2
0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	3	$p^2(1-p)^3$	2
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	$p^2(1-p)^3$	2
1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	4	$p^2(1-p)^2$	3
0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	4	$p^2(1-p)^2$	3
0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	$p^2(1-p)^2$	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	$p^3(1-p)$	0
1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	$p^3(1-p)$	0
0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	$p^3(1-p)$	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	p^3	1

TABLE 1: Link value sequences for a link with $t^* = 3$ up to time $t = 10$. The quantity $Y_1(t)$ is the number of full blocks of ones in link value sequences up to time $t - 1$, and $Y_2(t)$ is the number of trailing ones in link value sequences up to time t . $M_{t^*}(t)$ is the memory time at time t , given by the formula in (3.1).

sequences up to time t . The values that $Y_2(t)$ can take are $0, 1, \dots, t^* + 1$ if $t^* < \infty$, and $0, 1, \dots, t$ if $t^* = \infty$.

Using the quantities $Y_1(t)$ and $Y_2(t)$, along with the general formula in (2.53), we obtain the following formula for the probability of histories with non-zero probability.

Proposition 3.1. For any $t \geq 1$, any $t^* < \infty$, any $p \in [0, 1]$, and for any history $h^t = (x_1, a_1, x_2, a_2, \dots, a_{t-1}, x_t)$ with non-zero probability,

$$\Pr[H(t) = h^t] = p^{Y_1(t)(h^t)}(1-p)^{t-(t^*+1)Y_1(t)(h^t)}\delta_{Y_2(t)(h^t),0} + (1-\delta_{Y_2(t)(h^t),0})p^{Y_1(t)(h^t)+1}(1-p)^{t-Y_2(t)(h^t)-(t^*+1)Y_1(t)(h^t)}, \quad (3.26)$$

where $Y_1(t)(h^t)$ is defined to be the number of full blocks of ones of length $t^* + 1$ up to time $t - 1$ in the sequence (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t) of link values, and $Y_2(t)(h^t)$ is defined to be the number of trailing ones in the sequence (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t) . For $t^* = \infty$,

$$\Pr[H(t) = h^t] = (1-p)^t\delta_{Y_2(t)(h^t),0} + (1-\delta_{Y_2(t)(h^t),0})p(1-p)^{t-Y_2(t)(h^t)}. \quad (3.27)$$

Proof. The result in (3.26) follows immediately from the formula in (2.53) by observing that $N_{\text{succ}}(t) = Y_1(t) + 1 - \delta_{Y_2(t),0}$ and $N_{\text{req}}(t) = t - (t^* + 1)Y_1(t) - Y_2(t)$. For $t^* = \infty$, we only ever have trailing ones in the link value sequences, so that $Y_1(t)(h^t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 1$ and all histories h^t . The result in (3.27) then follows. ■

Next, let us consider the number of link value sequences with non-zero probability, which we need in order to calculate the link quantities defined in Section 2.2. Using Table 1 as a guide, we obtain the following.

Lemma 3.1. For any $t \geq 1$ and any $t^* \geq 0$, let $\Omega(t; t^*)$ denote the set of link value sequences for the t^* memory cutoff policy that have non-zero probability. Then, for all $t^* < \infty$,

$$|\Omega(t; t^*)| = \sum_{x=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-1}{t^*+1} \rfloor} \sum_{k=0}^{t^*+1} \left(\binom{t-1-xt^*}{x} \delta_{k,0} + (1-\delta_{k,0}) \binom{t-k-xt^*}{x} \mathbf{1}_{t-k-x(t^*+1) \geq 0} \right). \quad (3.28)$$

For $t^* = \infty$, $|\Omega(t; \infty)| = 1 + t$.

Proof. We start by counting the number of link value sequences when the number of trailing ones is equal to zero, i.e., when $k \equiv Y_2(t)(h^t) = 0$. If we also let the number $x \equiv Y_1(t)(h^t)$ of full blocks of ones in time $t - 1$ be equal to one, then there are $t^* + 1$ ones and $t - t^* - 2$ zeros up to time $t - 1$. The total number of link value sequences is then equal to the number of ways that the single block of ones can be moved around in the link value sequence up to time $t - 1$. This quantity is equivalent to the number of permutations of $t - 1 - t^*$ objects with $t - t^* - 2$ of them being identical (these are the zeros), which is given by

$$\frac{(t-1-t^*)!}{(t-2-t^*)!(t-1-t^*-t+t^*+2)!} = \frac{(t-1-t^*)!}{(t-t^*-2)!(1)!} = \binom{t-1-t^*}{1}. \quad (3.29)$$

We thus have the $x = 0$ and $k = 0$ term in the sum in (3.28). If we stick to $k = 0$ but now consider more than one full block of ones in time $t - 1$ (i.e., let $x \equiv Y_1(t)(h^t) \geq 1$), then the number of link value sequences is given by a similar argument as before: it is equal to the number of ways of permuting $t - 1 - xt^*$ objects, with x of them being identical (the blocks of ones) and the remaining $t - 1 - x(t^* + 1)$ objects also identical (the number of zeros), i.e., $\binom{t-1-xt^*}{x}$. The total number of link value sequences with zero trailing ones is therefore

$$\sum_{x=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-1}{t^*+1} \rfloor} \binom{t-1-xt^*}{x}. \quad (3.30)$$

Let us now consider the case $k \equiv Y_2(t)(h^t) > 0$. Then, the number of time slots in which full blocks of ones can be shuffled around is $t - k$. If there are x blocks of ones in time $t - k$, then by the same arguments as before, the number of such link value sequences is given by the number of ways of permuting $t - k - xt^*$ objects, with x of them being identical (the full blocks of ones) and the remaining $t - k - x(t^* + 1)$ of them also identical (these are the zeros up to time $t - k$). In other words, the number of link value sequences with $k > 0$ and $x \geq 0$ is

$$\binom{t-k-xt^*}{x} \mathbf{1}_{t-k-x(t^*+1) \geq 0}. \quad (3.31)$$

We must put the indicator function $\mathbf{1}_{t-k-x(t^*+1) \geq 0}$ in order to ensure that the binomial coefficient makes sense. This also means that, depending on the time t , not all values of k between 0 and $t^* + 1$ can be considered in the total number of link value sequences (simply because it might not be possible to fit all possible values of trailing ones and full blocks of ones within that amount of time). By combining (3.30) and (3.31), we obtain the desired result.

In the case $t^* = \infty$, because there are never any full blocks of ones and only trailing ones, we have t link value sequences, each containing k trailing ones, where $1 \leq k \leq t$. We also have a link value sequence consisting of all zeros, giving a total of $t + 1$ link value sequences. ■

Remark 3.1. Note that when $t^* = 0$, we get

$$|\Omega(t; 0)| = \sum_{x=0}^{t-1} \sum_{k=0}^1 \left(\binom{t-1}{x} \delta_{k,0} + (1 - \delta_{k,0}) \binom{t-k}{x} \mathbf{1}_{t-k-x \geq 0} \right) \quad (3.32)$$

$$= \sum_{x=0}^{t-1} \binom{t-1}{x} + \sum_{x=0}^{t-1} \binom{t-1}{x} \underbrace{\mathbf{1}_{t-1-x \geq 0}}_{1 \forall x} \quad (3.33)$$

$$= 2^{t-1} + 2^{t-1} \quad (3.34)$$

$$= 2^t. \quad (3.35)$$

In other words, when $t^* = 0$, all t -bit strings are valid link value sequences.

For $t \leq t^* + 1$, no full blocks of ones in time $t - 1$ are possible, so we get

$$|\Omega(t; t^*)| = \sum_{k=0}^{t^*+1} \left(\binom{t-1}{0} \delta_{k,0} + (1 - \delta_{k,0}) \binom{t-k}{0} \mathbf{1}_{t-k \geq 0} \right) \quad (3.36)$$

$$= \binom{t-1}{0} + \sum_{k=1}^t \binom{t-k}{0} \quad (3.37)$$

$$= 1 + t. \quad (3.38)$$

This coincides with the result for $t^* = \infty$, because when $t^* = \infty$ the condition $t \leq t^* + 1$ is satisfied for all $t \geq 1$. ◀

3.1 Calculation of link quantities

We now provide analytic expressions for the link quantities defined in Section 2.2 in both the finite-horizon and infinite-horizon cases. All of the results here apply to any individual elementary link along an edge of the graph associated with the given quantum network, including individual parallel links in the case that an edge has $N^{\max} > 1$ parallel edges, since all of the parallel elementary links corresponding to the parallel edges are mutually independent. We discuss multiple parallel links in more detail in Section 3.3.

We begin by considering the expected fidelity of the link and the expected quantum state of the link. Recall from Corollary 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 that the main ingredient for the calculation of the expected fidelity and the expected quantum state is the joint probability distribution of the random variables $X(t)$ and $M(t)$.

Proposition 3.2. For any $t \geq 1$, $t^* \geq 0$, and $p \in [0, 1]$,

$$\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1] = p(1-p)^{t-(m+1)}, \quad t \leq t^* + 1, \quad 0 \leq m \leq t-1, \quad (3.39)$$

and

$$\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1] = \sum_{x=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-1}{t^*+1} \rfloor} \binom{t-(m+1)-xt^*}{x} \mathbf{1}_{t-(m+1)-x(t^*+1) \geq 0} p^{x+1} (1-p)^{t-(m+1)-x(t^*+1)}, \quad t > t^* + 1, \quad 0 \leq m \leq t^*. \quad (3.40)$$

Proof. For $t \leq t^* + 1$, because no full blocks of ones up to time $t - 1$ are possible, the possible values for the memory time are $0, 1, \dots, t - 1$. Furthermore, for each value of $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, t - 1\}$, there is only one link value sequence for which $M_{t^*}(t) = m$, and this sequence has $Y_2(t) = m + 1$ trailing ones and thus probability $p(1-p)^{t-1-m}$ by Proposition 3.1.

For $t > t^* + 1$, we proceed similarly by considering the number $Y_1(t)$ of full blocks of ones in time $t - 1$ and the number $Y_2(t)$ of trailing ones in link value sequences (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t) such that




FIGURE 5: (Left) The expected link value, given by (3.42), as a function of the link success probability p for various values of t and t^* . (Right) The expected link value, given by (3.42), as a function of t for fixed values of p and t^* .

$x_t = 1$. Since we must have $x_t = 1$, we require $Y_2(t) \geq 1$. Now, in order to have a memory time of $M_{t^*}(t) = m$, we can have link value sequences consisting of any number $x = Y_1(t)$ of full blocks of ones ranging from 0 to $\lfloor \frac{t-1}{t^*+1} \rfloor$ as long as $Y_2(t) = m + 1$. (Note that at the end of each full block of ones the memory time is equal to t^* .) The number of such link value sequences is

$$\binom{t - (m + 1) - xt^*}{x} \mathbf{1}_{t - (m + 1) - xt^* \geq 0}, \quad (3.41)$$

as given by (3.31), and the probability of each such link value sequence is $p^{x+1}(1-p)^{t-(m+1)-x(t^*+1)}$. By summing over all $0 \leq x \leq \lfloor \frac{t-1}{t^*+1} \rfloor$, we obtain the desired result. ■

As an immediate corollary of Proposition 3.2, we obtain the probability distribution of the link value random variable $X(t)$.

Corollary 3.1. For any $t \geq 1$, any $t^* \geq 0$, and any $p \in [0, 1]$,

$$\Pr[X(t) = 1] = \begin{cases} 1 - (1-p)^t, & t \leq t^* + 1, \\ \sum_{x=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-1}{t^*+1} \rfloor} \sum_{k=1}^{t^*+1} \binom{t-k-xt^*}{x} \mathbf{1}_{t-k-x(t^*+1) \geq 0} p^{x+1} (1-p)^{t-k-(t^*+1)x}, & t > t^* + 1 \end{cases} \quad (3.42)$$

Proof. This follows immediately from the fact that $\Pr[X(t) = 1] = \sum_{m=0}^{t-1} \Pr[X(t) = 1, M_{t^*}(t) = m]$ for $t \leq t^* + 1$ and that $\Pr[X(t) = 1] = \sum_{m=0}^{t^*} \Pr[X(t) = 1, M_{t^*}(t) = m]$ for $t > t^* + 1$. ■

See Figure 5 for plots of $\mathbb{E}[X(t)]$ as a function of the time steps t and as a function of the elementary link generation probability p .

Let us now recall the following quantities:

$$\widetilde{F}(t; \psi) = X(t)f_{M(t)}(\rho_0; \psi), \quad F(t; \psi) = \frac{\widetilde{F}(t; \psi)}{\Pr[X(t) = 1]}, \quad (3.43)$$

the latter being the fidelity of the link given that the link is active. From Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.1, along with (2.85) and (2.88), we immediately obtain analytic expressions for the expectation values of these quantities under the memory cutoff policy:

$$\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t; \psi)] = \begin{cases} \sum_{m=0}^{t-1} f_m(\rho_0; \psi) p(1-p)^{t-(m+1)} & t \leq t^* + 1, \\ \sum_{m=0}^{t^*} f_m(\rho_0; \psi) \Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1], & t > t^* + 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.44)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[F(t; \psi)] = \begin{cases} \sum_{m=0}^{t-1} f_m(\rho_0; \psi) \frac{p(1-p)^{t-(m+1)}}{1 - (1-p)^t} & t \leq t^* + 1, \\ \sum_{m=0}^{t^*} f_m(\rho_0; \psi) \frac{\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1]}{\Pr[X(t) = 1]}, & t > t^* + 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.45)$$

where in (3.44) and (3.45) the expression for $\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1]$ for $t > t^* + 1$ is given in (3.40), and the expression for $\Pr[X(t) = 1]$ for $t > t^* + 1$ is given in (3.42). Furthermore, from (2.70), we have that the expected quantum state of the link at time $t \geq 1$ is

$$\sigma(t) = \begin{cases} (1-p)^t \tau^\otimes + \sum_{m=0}^{t-1} p(1-p)^{t-(m+1)} \rho(m), & t \leq t^* + 1, \\ (1 - \Pr[X(t) = 1]) \tau^\otimes + \sum_{m=0}^{t^*} \Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1] \rho(m) & t > t^* + 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.46)$$

where for $t > t^* + 1$ the expressions for $\Pr[X(t) = 1]$ and $\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1]$ are given in (3.42) and (3.40), respectively. From (2.76), we also have

$$\sigma(t|X(t) = 1) = \begin{cases} \sum_{m=0}^{t-1} \frac{p(1-p)^{t-(m+1)}}{1 - (1-p)^t} \rho(m), & t \leq t^* + 1, \\ \sum_{m=0}^{t^*} \frac{\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1]}{\Pr[X(t) = 1]} \rho(m), & t > t^* + 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.47)$$

where again for $t > t^* + 1$ the expressions for $\Pr[X(t) = 1]$ and $\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1]$ are given in (3.42) and (3.40), respectively.

Let us now consider the $t \rightarrow \infty$, or infinite-horizon behavior of the link.

Theorem 3.1. For all $t^* \geq 0$ and $p \in [0, 1]$.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X(t)] = \frac{(t^* + 1)p}{1 + t^* p}. \quad (3.48)$$

Proof. Since we consider the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$, it suffices to consider the expression for $\Pr[X(t) = 1]$ in (3.42) for $t > t^* + 1$. Also due to the $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit, we can disregard the indicator function in (3.42), so that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X(t)] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{x=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-1}{t^*+1} \rfloor} \sum_{k=1}^{t^*+1} \binom{t-k-xt^*}{x} p^{x+1} (1-p)^{t-k-(t^*+1)x}. \quad (3.49)$$

Next, consider the binomial expansion of $(1-p)^{t-k-(t^*+1)x}$:

$$(1-p)^{t-k-(t^*+1)x} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{t-k-(t^*+1)x}{j} (-1)^j p^j. \quad (3.50)$$

Substituting this into (3.49) gives us

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X(t)] = p \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{x,j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{t^*+1} \binom{t-k-t^*x}{x} \binom{t-k-(t^*+1)x}{j} (-1)^j p^{x+j} \quad (3.51)$$

$$= p \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} \sum_{k=1}^{t^*+1} \binom{t-k-t^*j}{j} \binom{t-k-(t^*+1)j}{\ell-j} (-1)^{\ell-j} p^{\ell}. \quad (3.52)$$

Now, for brevity, let $a \equiv t - k$, and let us focus on the sum

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\ell} (-1)^{\ell-j} \binom{a-t^*j}{j} \binom{a-t^*j-j}{\ell-j}. \quad (3.53)$$

We start by expanding the binomial coefficients to get

$$\binom{a-t^*j}{j} \binom{a-t^*j-j}{\ell-j} = \frac{(a-t^*j)!}{j!(\ell-j)!(a-t^*j-\ell)!} \quad (3.54)$$

$$= \frac{1}{j!(\ell-j)!} \prod_{s=0}^{\ell-1} (a-t^*j-s) \quad (3.55)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\ell!} \binom{\ell}{j} \prod_{s=0}^{\ell-1} (a-t^*j-s). \quad (3.56)$$

Next, we have

$$\prod_{s=0}^{\ell-1} (a-t^*j-s) = \sum_{n=0}^{\ell} (-1)^{\ell-n} \binom{\ell}{n} (a-t^*j)^n, \quad (3.57)$$

where $\begin{bmatrix} \ell \\ n \end{bmatrix}$ is the (unsigned) Stirling number of the first kind². Performing the binomial expansion of $(a - t^* j)^n$, the sum in (3.53) becomes

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\ell} \sum_{n=0}^{\ell} \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^{\ell-j} \frac{1}{\ell!} \binom{\ell}{j} \begin{bmatrix} \ell \\ n \end{bmatrix} \binom{n}{i} (-1)^i (t^*)^i j^i a^{n-i}. \quad (3.58)$$

Now, it holds that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\ell} (-1)^{\ell-j} \frac{1}{\ell!} \binom{\ell}{j} j^i = (-1)^{2\ell} \begin{Bmatrix} i \\ \ell \end{Bmatrix}, \quad (3.59)$$

where $\begin{Bmatrix} i \\ \ell \end{Bmatrix}$ is the Stirling number of the second kind³. For $i < \ell$, it holds that $\begin{Bmatrix} i \\ \ell \end{Bmatrix} = 0$, and $\begin{Bmatrix} \ell \\ \ell \end{Bmatrix} = 1$. Since i ranges from 0 to n , and n itself ranges from 0 to ℓ , the sum in (3.59) is zero except for when $i = \ell$. The sum in (3.59) is therefore effectively equal to $(-1)^{2\ell} \delta_{i,\ell}$. Substituting this into (3.58) leads to

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\ell} \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^{2\ell} \delta_{i,\ell} \begin{bmatrix} \ell \\ n \end{bmatrix} \binom{n}{i} (-1)^i (t^*)^i a^{n-i} = (-1)^{\ell} (t^*)^{\ell}, \quad (3.60)$$

where we have used the fact that $\begin{bmatrix} \ell \\ \ell \end{bmatrix} = 1$. Altogether, we have shown that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\ell} (-1)^{\ell-j} \binom{a - t^* j}{j} \binom{a - t^* j - j}{\ell - j} = (-1)^{\ell} (t^*)^{\ell} \quad (3.61)$$

for all $\ell \geq 0$. The sum is independent of $a = t - k$. Substituting this result into (3.52), and using the fact that

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{\ell} x^{\ell} = \frac{1}{1+x}, \quad x \neq -1, \quad (3.62)$$

we get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X(t)] = p \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{t^*+1} (-1)^{\ell} (t^* p)^{\ell} = p(t^* + 1) \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{\ell} (t^* p)^{\ell} = \frac{(t^* + 1)p}{1 + t^* p}, \quad (3.63)$$

as required. ■

Note that if $t^* = \infty$, then

$$\lim_{t^* \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X(t)] = \lim_{t^* \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(t^* + 1)p}{1 + t^* p} = 1, \quad (3.64)$$

which is what we expect, because if $t^* = \infty$, then the link, once established, never has to be dropped.

²This number is defined to be the number of permutations of ℓ elements with n disjoint cycles.

³This number is defined to be the number of ways to partition a set of i objects into ℓ non-empty subsets.

Theorem 3.2. For any $t^* < \infty$, $p \in [0, 1]$, and $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, t^*\}$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1] = \frac{p}{1 + t^* p}. \quad (3.65)$$

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1. Using the result of Proposition 3.2, in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} \binom{t - (m+1) - xt^*}{x} p^{x+1} (1-p)^{t - (m+1) - x(t^*+1)}. \quad (3.66)$$

Using the binomial expansion of $(1-p)^{t - (m+1) - x(t^*+1)}$, exactly as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we can write

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} p \binom{t - (m+1) - xt^*}{x} \binom{t - (m+1) - (t^*+1)x}{j} (-1)^j p^{x+j} \quad (3.67)$$

$$= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} p \binom{t - (m+1) - jt^*}{j} \binom{t - (m+1) - (t^*+1)j}{\ell - j} (-1)^{\ell-j} p^{\ell}. \quad (3.68)$$

Then, using (3.61), we have that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\ell} (-1)^{\ell-j} \binom{t - (m+1) - jt^*}{j} \binom{t - (m+1) - (t^*+1)j}{\ell - j} = (-1)^{\ell} (t^*)^{\ell} \quad (3.69)$$

for all $t \geq 1$ and all $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, t^*\}$. Finally, using (3.62), we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1] = p \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{\ell} (t^* p)^{\ell} = \frac{p}{1 + t^* p}, \quad (3.70)$$

as required. ■

For $t^* < \infty$, the conditional probability $\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m | X(t) = 1]$ in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ is equal to

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m | X(t) = 1] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1]}{\Pr[X(t) = 1]} \quad (3.71)$$

$$= \frac{\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 1]}{\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[X(t) = 1]} \quad (3.72)$$

$$= \frac{1}{t^* + 1}. \quad (3.73)$$

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2, we obtain the following:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}(t; \psi)] = \frac{p}{1 + t^* p} \sum_{m=0}^{t^*} f_m(\rho_0; \psi), \quad t^* < \infty, \quad (3.74)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[F(t; \psi)] = \frac{1}{t^* + 1} \sum_{m=0}^{t^*} f_m(\rho_0; \psi), \quad t^* < \infty. \quad (3.75)$$

For the expected quantum state, we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(t) = \frac{1-p}{1+t^*p} \tau^\emptyset + \frac{p}{1+t^*p} \sum_{m=0}^{t^*} \rho(m), \quad t^* < \infty, \quad (3.76)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(t|X(t) = 1) = \frac{1}{t^* + 1} \sum_{m=0}^{t^*} \rho(m), \quad t^* < \infty. \quad (3.77)$$

Let us also determine the probabilities $\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 0]$ for finite t^* . Observe that this probability is non-zero only when $M_{t^*}(t) = t^*$. This is due to the fact that we can have $X(t) = 0$ in only one of two possible ways: either there are some full blocks of ones of length $t^* + 1$ before time t , or there are no full blocks of ones before time t . In both cases, the value of the memory can only be equal to t^* . We thus obtain the following.

Proposition 3.3. For any $t \geq 1$, $t^* < \infty$, $p \in [0, 1]$, and $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, t^*\}$,

$$\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 0] = \begin{cases} \delta_{m, t^*} (1-p)^t, & t \leq t^* + 1, \\ \delta_{m, t^*} \sum_{x=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-1}{t^*+1} \rfloor} \binom{t-1-xt^*}{x} p^x (1-p)^{t-(t^*+1)x}, & t > t^* + 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.78)$$

For $t^* = \infty$,

$$\Pr[M_\infty(t) = m, X(t) = 0] = \delta_{m, -1} (1-p)^t \quad (3.79)$$

for all $m \in \{-1, 0, 1, \dots, t-1\}$.

Proof. For finite t^* , when $t \leq t^* + 1$, there is only one link value sequence ending with a zero, and that is the sequence consisting of all zeros, which has probability $(1-p)^t$. Furthermore, since the value of the memory for this sequence is equal to t^* , only the case $M_{t^*}(t) = t^*$ has non-zero probability. When $t > t^* + 1$, we can again have non-zero probability only for $M_{t^*}(t) = t^*$. In this case, because every link value sequence has to end with a zero, we must have $Y_2(t) = 0$. Therefore, using (3.26), along with (3.30), we obtain the desired result.

For $t^* = \infty$, only the link value sequence consisting of all zeros ends with a zero, and in this case we have $M_\infty(t) = -1$. The result then follows. \blacksquare

By following arguments very similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2, we arrive at the following infinite-horizon expression for $\Pr[M_{t^*}(t) = m, X(t) = 0]$ when $t^* < \infty$:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[M(t) = m, X(t) = 0] = \delta_{m, t^*} \frac{1-p}{1+t^*p}, \quad m \in \{0, 1, \dots, t^*\}. \quad (3.80)$$

Finally, let us consider the expected success rate $\mathbb{E}[S(t)]$. Letting $N^{\max} = 1$, recall that

$$S(t) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^t A(j-1)X(j)}{\sum_{j=1}^t A(j-1)}. \quad (3.81)$$

The success rate is simply the ratio of the number of successful requests up to time t to the total number of requests up to time t .

Proposition 3.4. For any $t^* \geq 0$, any $t \geq 1$, and any $p \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{E}[S(t)] = \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \frac{1}{j+1} p(1-p)^j, \quad t \leq t^* + 1. \quad (3.82)$$

For $t > t^* + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S(t)] = & \sum_{x=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-1}{t^*+1} \rfloor} \left(\frac{x}{t-t^*x} \binom{t-1-xt^*}{x} p^x (1-p)^{t-(t^*+1)x} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{k=1}^{t^*+1} \frac{x+1}{t-k-t^*x+1} \binom{t-k-xt^*}{x} p^{x+1} (1-p)^{t-k-(t^*+1)x} \mathbf{1}_{t-k-(t^*+1)x \geq 0} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.83)$$

Proof. We start with the observation that, for any history h^t , the number of successful requests can be written in terms of the number $Y_1(t)(h^t)$ of blocks of ones of length $t^* + 1$ and the number $Y_2(t)(h^t)$ of trailing ones in the link value sequence corresponding to h^t as

$$Y_1(t)(h^t) + 1 - \delta_{Y_2(t)(h^t), 0}. \quad (3.84)$$

Similarly, the total number of failed requests is

$$t - Y_2(t)(h^t) - (t^* + 1)Y_1(t)(h^t). \quad (3.85)$$

Therefore,

$$S(t)(h^t) = \frac{Y_1(t)(h^t) + 1 - \delta_{Y_2(t)(h^t), 0}}{t - Y_2(t)(h^t) - (t^* + 1)Y_1(t)(h^t) + Y_1(t)(h^t) + 1 - \delta_{Y_2(t)(h^t), 0}} \quad (3.86)$$

$$= \frac{Y_1(t)(h^t) + 1 - \delta_{Y_2(t)(h^t), 0}}{t - Y_2(t)(h^t) - t^*Y_1(t)(h^t) + 1 - \delta_{Y_2(t)(h^t), 0}}. \quad (3.87)$$




FIGURE 6: The expected success rate, as given by the expressions in Proposition 3.4, for an elementary link with $p = 0.3$ and various cutoffs.

Now, for $t \leq t^* + 1$, we always have $Y_1(t)(h^t) = 0$ for all histories h^t , and the link value sequence can consist only of a positive number of trailing ones not exceeding t . Thus, from Proposition 3.1, the probability of any such history is $p(1-p)^{t-Y_2(t)(h^t)}$. Using (3.87) then leads to

$$\mathbb{E}[S(t)] = \sum_{h^t} S(t)(h^t) \Pr[H(t) = h^t] = \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{1}{t-k+1} p(1-p)^{t-k} = \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \frac{1}{j+1} p(1-p)^j \quad (3.88)$$

for $t \leq t^* + 1$, as required, where the last equality follows by a change of summation variable.

For $t > t^* + 1$, we use (3.87) again, keeping in mind this time that the number of trailing ones can be equal to zero, to get

$$\mathbb{E}[S(t)] = \sum_{h^t} S(t)(h^t) \Pr[H(t) = h^t] \quad (3.89)$$

$$= \sum_{h^t: Y_2(t)(h^t)=0} S(t)(h^t) \Pr[H(t) = h^t] + \sum_{h^t: Y_2(t)(h^t) \geq 1} S(t)(h^t) \Pr[H(t) = h^t] \quad (3.90)$$

$$= \sum_{x=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-1}{t^*+1} \rfloor} \left(\frac{x}{t-t^*x} \Pr[H(t) = h^t : Y_1(t)(h^t) = x, Y_2(t)(h^t) = 0] \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{k=1}^{t^*+1} \frac{x+1}{t-k-t^*x+1} \Pr[H(t) = h^t : Y_1(t)(h^t) = x, Y_2(t)(h^t) = k] \right). \quad (3.91)$$

Using Proposition 3.1, we arrive at the desired result. ■

See Figure 6 for a plot of the expected rate $\mathbb{E}[S(t)]$ as a function of time for various values of the cutoff. We find that the rate has essentially the shape of a decaying square wave, which is clearer for larger values of the cutoff. In particular, the ‘‘plateaus’’ in the curves have a period of $t^* + 1$ time steps. Let us now consider the values of these plateaus. The largest plateau can be found by considering the case $t^* = \infty$, because in this case the condition $t \leq t^* + 1$ is satisfied for

all $t \geq 1$, and it is when this condition is true that the largest plateau occurs. Using Proposition 3.4 with $t^* = \infty$, we find that the value of the largest plateau approaches

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[S(t)] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \frac{1}{j+1} p(1-p)^j = -\frac{p \ln p}{1-p}, \quad t^* = \infty, \quad (3.92)$$

for all $p \in (0, 1)$. In the case $t^* < \infty$, as we see in Figure 6, there are multiple plateaus, with each plateau lasting for a period of $t^* + 1$ time steps, as mentioned earlier. The values of these plateaus depend on the number $x \geq 0$ of full blocks of ones in the link value sequence. Specifically, the values of the plateaus approach

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{t-(t^*+1)x} \frac{x+1}{t-k-t^*x+1} \binom{t-k-t^*x}{x} p^{x+1} (1-p)^{t-k-(t^*+1)x} \\ = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=(t^*+1)x}^{t-1} \frac{x+1}{j-t^*x+1} \binom{j-t^*x}{x} p^{x+1} (1-p)^{j-(t^*+1)x} = p \cdot {}_2F_1(1, 1, 2+x, 1-p), \end{aligned} \quad (3.93)$$

for all $x \geq 0$, where ${}_2F_1(a, b, c, z)$ is the hypergeometric function. Then, using the fact that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} {}_2F_1(1, 1, 2+x, 1-p) = 1$ [149], we conclude that the plateaus approach the value of p , i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[S(t)] = p, \quad t^* < \infty. \quad (3.94)$$

3.2 Waiting time

Let us now consider the waiting time for an elementary link. The waiting time is defined to be the number of time steps needed to establish a link from the time that a link is requested. We focus here on just one elementary link. Detailed analyses of the waiting time for a chain of bipartite links have been conducted in [34, 102, 120, 150].

It is well known for the model being considered here that the waiting time, which we denote by W , is a geometric random variable, so that $\Pr[W = t] = p(1-p)^{t-1}$, where p is the success probability of the link. The expected waiting time is then $\mathbb{E}[W] = \frac{1}{p}$. We can confirm this using the formalism developed in this work by noting that the waiting time probability distribution is given simply by the probability that it takes t time steps to establish the link, starting from $t = 1$:

$$\Pr[W = t] = \Pr[X(1) = 0, X(2) = 0, \dots, X(t) = 1]. \quad (3.95)$$

Using the result of Proposition 3.1, we immediately obtain $\Pr[W = t] = p(1-p)^{t-1}$, from which the expected waiting time is $\mathbb{E}[W] = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} t p(1-p)^{t-1} = \frac{1}{p}$, as expected. Note that this result holds regardless of the value of t^* , and it assumes that the initial request for entanglement is made at time $t = 0$.

Let us now consider a scenario in which the elementary link generation process is persistent, even if no end-user request is made. In other words, we consider an “always-on”/continuous link

generation procedure that is ready to go whenever end-user entanglement is requested, rather than have the entire process begin only when end-user entanglement is requested. Then, if an end-user request for entanglement occurs at time $t_{\text{req}} \geq 0$, then the waiting time random variable $W(t_{\text{req}})$ has probability distribution

$$\Pr[W(t_{\text{req}}) = t] = \Pr[X(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0, X(t_{\text{req}} + 2) = 0, \dots, X(t_{\text{req}} + t) = 1] \quad (3.96)$$

for all $t \geq 1$. In other words, the waiting time is given by the amount of time it takes to establish the link after the end-user request is made. Note that $W = W(0)$. With non-zero memory cutoff and $t_{\text{req}} > 0$, we can obtain a lower expected waiting time than $\frac{1}{p}$, which we now show.

Proposition 3.5. For any $t^* < \infty$, for any $t_{\text{req}} \geq 0$, and for any $p \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{E}[W(t_{\text{req}})] = \frac{\Pr[M_{t^*}(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = t^*, X(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0]}{p(1 - p)}. \quad (3.97)$$

For $t^* = \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}[W(t_{\text{req}})] = \frac{\Pr[X(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0]}{p(1 - p)} = \frac{(1 - p)^{t_{\text{req}}}}{p}. \quad (3.98)$$

Remark 3.2. As a check, let us first observe the following:

- If $t_{\text{req}} = 0$, then since $\Pr[M_{t^*}(1) = t^*, X(1) = 0] = 1 - p$ for all $t^* < \infty$ (see Proposition 3.3), we obtain $\mathbb{E}[W(0)] = \frac{1}{p}$, as expected. We get the same result for $t^* = \infty$.
- If $t^* = 0$, then we get $\Pr[M_{t^*}(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0, X(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0] = 1 - p$ for all $t_{\text{req}} \geq 0$ (see Proposition 3.3), which means that $\mathbb{E}[W(t_{\text{req}})] = \frac{1}{p}$ for all $t_{\text{req}} \geq 0$. This makes sense, because in the $t^* = 0$ policy the link is never held in memory. ◀

Proof of Proposition 3.5. Using (3.96), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[W(t_{\text{req}}) = t] &= \Pr[X(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0, \dots, X(t_{\text{req}} + t) = 1] \end{aligned} \quad (3.99)$$

$$= \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_t=0}^{t^*} \Pr[X(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0, M_{t^*}(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = m_1, \dots, X(t_{\text{req}} + t) = 1, M_{t^*}(t_{\text{req}} + t) = m_t]. \quad (3.100)$$

Using the transition matrix $T(t^*)$ defined in (3.13)–(3.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[W(t_{\text{req}}) = t] &= \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_t=0}^{t^*} (T(t^*))_{1, m_t} \cdots (T(t^*))_{0, m_3} (T(t^*))_{0, m_2} (T(t^*))_{0, m_1} \Pr[M_{t^*}(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = m_1, X(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.101)$$




FIGURE 7: The expected waiting time for a single elementary link, given by (3.97), as a function of the request time t_{req} . We let $p = 0.3$, and we take various values for the cutoff t^* .

Using (3.78), along with (3.13)–(3.19), we have that

$$\Pr[W(t_{\text{req}}) = t] = \Pr[M_{t^*}(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = t^*, X(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0]p(1 - p)^{t-2}, \quad (3.102)$$

for all $t \geq 1$. The result then follows.

For $t^* = \infty$, using the transition matrix $T(\infty)$ defined in (3.25) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0, \dots, X(t_{\text{req}} + t) = 1] \\ = (T(\infty))_1(T(\infty))_0 \cdots (T(\infty))_0 \Pr[X(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.103)$$

Then, from (3.42), we have that $\Pr[X(t_{\text{req}} + 1) = 0] = (1 - p)^{t_{\text{req}}+1}$, so that

$$\Pr[W(t_{\text{req}}) = t] = p(1 - p)^{t-2}(1 - p)^{t_{\text{req}}+1} \quad (3.104)$$

for all $t \geq 1$. The result then follows. \blacksquare

In the limit $t_{\text{req}} \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain using (3.80),

$$\lim_{t_{\text{req}} \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[W(t_{\text{req}})] = \frac{1}{p(1 + t^*p)}, \quad t^* < \infty. \quad (3.105)$$

See Figure 7 for plots of the expected waiting time, given by (3.97), as a function of the request time t_{req} for various values of t^* . As long as t^* is strictly greater than zero, the waiting time is strictly less than $\frac{1}{p}$, despite the oscillatory behavior for small values of t_{req} . In the limit $t_{\text{req}} \rightarrow \infty$, we see that the waiting time is monotonically decreasing with increasing t^* , which is also apparent from (3.105).

3.3 Multiple parallel links

So far, we have considered only one edge connecting a particular set of nodes corresponding to an elementary link in a network. Suppose now that those nodes have $N^{\max} > 1$ parallel edges connecting them (see Figure 1). Therefore, at each time step, the set of nodes can have at most N^{\max} active *parallel links*. In this scenario, as described in the Introduction, the network is described by a multigraph, since each parallel link corresponds to a distinct edge connecting the nodes. All of these parallel links are mutually independent by definition. Therefore, if E is a subset of edges in a graph corresponding to a quantum network, then we can write the classical-quantum state of an edge $e \in E$ at time t as $\bigotimes_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} \widehat{\sigma}_{e,j}(t)$ for all $t \geq 1$, where each $\widehat{\sigma}_{e,j}(t)$ is given by (2.27) and N_e^{\max} is the maximum number of parallel links in the edge $e \in E$. By tracing out the classical history registers of each parallel link, we obtain the overall expected quantum state of an edge $e \in E$ at time t as follows:

$$\bigotimes_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} \sigma_{e,j}(t), \quad (3.106)$$

where each $\sigma_{e,j}(t)$ is given by the expression in (3.46). In the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$, we use the expression in (3.76) to obtain

$$\bigotimes_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} \left(\frac{1 - p_{e,j}}{1 + t_{e,j}^* p_{e,j}} t_{e,j}^{\emptyset} + \frac{p_{e,j}}{1 + t_{e,j}^* p_{e,j}} \sum_{m=0}^{t_{e,j}^*} \rho_{e,j}(m) \right) \quad (t \rightarrow \infty), \quad (3.107)$$

where $\{p_{e,j}\}_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}}$ and $\{t_{e,j}^*\}_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}}$ are the success probabilities and cutoffs of the parallel links (all finite) for the edge $e \in E$.

Using the joint state of the parallel links in (3.106), it is possible to apply an entanglement distillation protocol in order to increase the fidelity of the link, which is important for achieving a high-fidelity long-distance entangled state. See [26–28] for examples of bipartite entanglement distillation protocols, and [151–156] for examples of multipartite entanglement distillation protocols. (See also [157–166].) Upper bounds on the fidelity that can be achieved after an entanglement distillation protocol, in the non-asymptotic setting, can be calculated using a semi-definite program (SDP), as shown in [167]. For practical entanglement distillation schemes, which typically only consist of one round of local operations and classical communication and also have non-unit success probability, SDP upper bounds have been provided in [165]. In [126], the authors use reinforcement learning to discover protocols for entanglement distillation. See [25, 104, 121, 122] for an analysis of quantum repeater protocols with entanglement distillation.

Using the expressions in (3.106) and (3.107), along with the fact that the elementary link generation for each edge in the set E is independent of the other edges, we can write the overall expected quantum state corresponding to the set E of edges as follows:

$$\sigma_E(t) := \bigotimes_{e \in E} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} \sigma_{e,j}(t) \quad (3.108)$$

When all of the cutoffs are finite, in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_E(t) = \bigotimes_{e \in E} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} \left(\frac{1 - p_{e,j}}{1 + t_{e,j}^* p_{e,j}} t_{e,j}^{\emptyset} + \frac{p_{e,j}}{1 + t_{e,j}^* p_{e,j}} \sum_{m=0}^{t_{e,j}^*} \rho_{e,j}(m) \right). \quad (3.109)$$

With multiple parallel links in an edge $e \in E$, the probability of having at least one active parallel link at time t is

$$\Pr[N_e(t) \geq 1] = 1 - \prod_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} (1 - \Pr[X_{e,j}(t) = 1]), \quad (3.110)$$

where $X_{e,j}(t)$ is the link random variable for the j^{th} parallel link. In the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$, using (3.48), this probability becomes

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[N_e(t) \geq 1] = 1 - \prod_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} \frac{1 - p_{e,j}}{1 + t_{e,j}^* p_{e,j}}. \quad (3.111)$$

We can also determine the expected number of active parallel links at any given time. Recalling that $N_e(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} X_{e,j}(t)$ is the random variable for the total number of parallel links at time $t \geq 1$, we find that the expected number of parallel links is simply $\sum_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} \mathbb{E}[X_{e,j}(t)]$, with $\mathbb{E}[X_{e,j}(t)]$ given by (3.42) for each parallel link. In the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$, the expected number of parallel links becomes

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[N_e(t)] = \sum_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} \frac{(t_{e,j}^* + 1)p_{e,j}}{1 + t_{e,j}^* p_{e,j}}. \quad (3.112)$$

If all of the parallel links have the same success probability p_e and the same cutoff t_e^* , then this reduces to

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[N_e(t)] = N_e^{\max} \frac{(t_e^* + 1)p_e}{1 + t_e^* p_e} \quad (3.113)$$

parallel links on average in the $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Note that if all of the parallel links have the same memory cutoff and the same success probability, then $N_e(t)$ is simply a binomial random variable with parameter $\Pr[X_e(t) = 1]$; otherwise, $N_e(t)$ is a Poisson-binomial random variable (see, e.g., [168]). Also, as mentioned in Remark 2.4, the quantity N_e^{\max} can be thought of as an *edge capacity*, because it is the maximum number of entangled states that can be shared along an edge per unit time. Then, $N_e(t)$ can be thought of as the *edge flow*, and $\mathbb{E}[N_e(t)]$ the expected edge flow. In the case of bipartite links, Menger's theorem [169, 170] tells us that we can use the expected flow to determine at any time step the expected number of edge-disjoint paths between two given nodes in the network, which then gives us the number of entangled states that they can share; see, e.g., [74]. In the case of multipartite links, the expected edge flow can be used to determine the expected number of edge-disjoint Steiner/spanning trees [171–173] for a given set of nodes in the network in order to determine the number of multipartite entangled states that they can share; see, e.g., [75, 78, 174].

Let us now consider the rate $R(t)$ for any edge under the memory cutoff policy in the $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit. First, recall that

$$R(t) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t N(j) \quad (3.114)$$

is the average number of active parallel links in an edge per unit time in t time steps.

Theorem 3.3. For any elementary link consisting of N^{\max} parallel links, with $\{p_j\}_{j=1}^{N^{\max}}$ being the success probabilities for the parallel links and $\{t_j^*\}_{j=1}^{N^{\max}}$ the memory cutoffs for the parallel links, the expected rate $\mathbb{E}[R(t)]$ of elementary link generation in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ is as follows:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[R(t)] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t \mathbb{E}[N(j)] = \sum_{j=1}^{N^{\max}} \frac{(t_j^* + 1)p_j}{1 + t_j^* p_j}. \quad (3.115)$$

Proof. The expected rate $\mathbb{E}[R(t)]$ is, by definition, the Cesàro mean of the sequence $(\mathbb{E}[N(j)])_{j=1}^t$ (see, e.g., [175]). Then, because $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[N(j)]$ exists and is given by (3.112), we use the well-known result that the limit of Cesàro means is equal to the limit of the original sequence [175], leading to the desired result. ■

3.4 Total number of active links

Consider a subset E of edges in a graph corresponding to a quantum network. Then, for any time $t \geq 1$, the number of active links in the set E is

$$L_E(t) := \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} X_{e,j}(t), \quad (3.116)$$

where $X_{e,j}(t)$ is the link status random variable for the j^{th} parallel link of the edge $e \in E$. When only the number of edges/elementary links is relevant, we use the notation $L_M(t)$ to refer to the number of active links at time t , where $M = |E|$ is the number of edges/elementary links under consideration.

The total number of active elementary links was introduced in [103] as a figure of merit on the performance of an entanglement distribution network, and it was shown that the quantity provides an upper bound on the average largest cluster size (i.e., the size of the largest connected component) in the network. In particular, for the case that all of the elementary links have the same success probability p and $N_e^{\max} = 1$ for all $e \in E$, with $M = |E|$, it was shown that $\frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}[L_M(t)] \leq 1 - (1 - p)^t$ for all $t \geq 1$.

Using the results of Section 3.1, we can now extend the result of [103]. In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}[L_E(t)] = \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} \mathbb{E}[X_{e,j}(t)], \quad (3.117)$$




FIGURE 8: The expected total number $\mathbb{E}[L_M(t)]$ of active elementary links when M edges in total are being considered. We use the notation $\mathbb{E}[L_M(\infty)] \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[L_M(t)]$. (Left) $M = 2$ edges in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ with $N^{\max} = 1$ parallel link for each edge. One link has success probability p_1 and cutoff $t_1^* = 5$, and the other link has success probability p_2 and cutoff $t_2^* = 2$. (Right) $M = 4$ edges after $t = 50$ time steps, with $N^{\max} = 1$ parallel link for each edge. Two of the links have success probability p_1 with cutoffs 5, 15, and the other two links have success probability p_2 with cutoffs 10, 20.

with $\mathbb{E}[X_{e,j}(t)]$ given by the expression in (3.42), i.e.,

$$\Pr[X_{e,j}(t) = 1] = \begin{cases} 1 - (1 - p_{e,j})^t, & t \leq t_{e,j}^* + 1, \\ \sum_{x=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-1}{t_{e,j}^*+1} \rfloor} \sum_{k=1}^{t_{e,j}^*+1} \binom{t-k-xt_{e,j}^*}{x} \mathbf{1}_{t-k-x(t_{e,j}^*+1) \geq 0} p_{e,j}^{x+1} (1 - p_{e,j})^{t-k-(t_{e,j}^*+1)x}, & t > t_{e,j}^* + 1 \end{cases} \quad (3.118)$$

where $\{p_{e,j} : e \in E, 1 \leq j \leq N_e^{\max}\}$ is the set of success probabilities and $\{t_{e,j}^* : e \in E, 1 \leq j \leq N_e^{\max}\}$ is the set of cutoffs. In the $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit, this reduces to the following simple expression using Theorem 3.1:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[L_E(t)] = \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} \frac{(t_{e,j}^* + 1) p_{e,j}}{1 + t_{e,j}^* p_{e,j}}. \quad (3.119)$$

See Figure 8 for plots of $\mathbb{E}[L_M(t)]$. Given a subset of elementary links with given memory cutoffs, we can estimate the success probabilities that need to be attained in order to achieve a desired expected number of active elementary links after a given amount of time.




FIGURE 9: The expected collective link status $\mathbb{E}[X_M^{\text{tot}}(t)]$ of a collection of M edges. We use the notation $X_M^{\text{tot}}(\infty) \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_M^{\text{tot}}(t)]$. (Left) $M = 2$ edges in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ with $N^{\text{max}} = 1$ parallel link for each edge. One link has success probability p_1 and cutoff $t_1^* = 5$, and the other link has success probability p_2 and cutoff $t_2^* = 2$. (Right) $M = 4$ edges after $t = 50$ time steps, with $N^{\text{max}} = 1$ parallel link for each edge. Two of the links have success probability p_1 with cutoffs 5, 15, and the other two links have success probability p_2 with cutoffs 10, 20.

3.5 Collective link status

Consider a subset E of edges in a graph corresponding to a quantum network. Then, in the case that each edge has only one parallel edge, for any time $t \geq 1$ we define the collective link status X_E^{tot} to be

$$X_E^{\text{tot}}(t) := \prod_{e \in E} X_e(t) \quad (3.120)$$

When only the number of edges/elementary links is relevant, we use the notation $X_M^{\text{tot}}(t)$ to refer to the collective link status at time t , where $M = |E|$ is the number of edges/elementary links under consideration. Note that the collective link status is equal to one if and only if all of the links are active at the given time. In other words,

$$\Pr[X_E^{\text{tot}}(t) = 1] = \mathbb{E}[X_E^{\text{tot}}(t)] = \prod_{e \in E} \Pr[X_e(t) = 1]. \quad (3.121)$$

In the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_E(t)] = \prod_{e \in E} \frac{(t_e^* + 1)p_e}{1 + t_e^* p_e}, \quad (3.122)$$

where $\{p_e\}_{e \in E}$ and $\{t_e^*\}_{e \in E}$ are the success probabilities and cutoffs, respectively, of the links. The collective link status can be used to estimate the probability of having a long-distance entangled link between a collection of non-adjacent nodes that are connected to each other along a path given by the subset E of edges.

In general, if each edge $e \in E$ has a number $N_e^{\max} \geq 1$ of parallel edges, then the probability that all corresponding elementary links have at least one active parallel link at time $t \geq 1$ is given by

$$\prod_{e \in E} \Pr[N_e(t) \geq 1] = \prod_{e \in E} \left(1 - \prod_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} (1 - \Pr[X_{e,j}(t) = 1]) \right). \quad (3.123)$$

In the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$, this becomes

$$\prod_{e \in E} \left(1 - \prod_{j=1}^{N_e^{\max}} \frac{1 - p_{e,j}}{1 + t_{e,j}^* p_{e,j}} \right). \quad (3.124)$$

See Figure 9 for plots of $\mathbb{E}[X_M^{\text{tot}}]$. Given a subset of elementary links with given memory cutoffs, we can estimate the success probabilities that need to be attained in order to achieve a desired expected collective link status after a given amount of time.

4 Finite-horizon policy optimization

Having analyzed the memory cutoff policy, let us now turn to obtaining optimal policies. We stick to the finite-horizon case, meaning that the final time for the link evolution is fixed at the outset and is finite, and the task is to optimize the expected total reward up to the final time. In Theorem 4.1 below, we show that policy optimization can be done using dynamic programming.

Recall from Section 2.1 that a policy is of the form $\pi = (d_1, d_2, \dots)$, where the d_j are decision functions, which in general give conditional probability distributions over actions conditioned on histories. Also, to each element of the policy π , recall from (2.23) that we can associate the following density operator:

$$\pi(j; h^j) = \sum_{a=0}^1 d_j(h^j)(a) |a\rangle \langle a|, \quad j \geq 1, \quad h^j \in \{0, 1\}^{2j-1}. \quad (4.1)$$

Then, we can write the operator $\tilde{\sigma}(t; h^t)$ in (2.28) for any $t \geq 1$ and any history $h^t = (x_1, a_1, x_2, a_2, \dots, a_{t-1}, x_t)$ as follows:

$$\tilde{\sigma}(t; h^t) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{t-1} \text{Tr}[\pi(j; h_j^t) |a_j\rangle \langle a_j|] \right) (\mathcal{J}^{x_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, x_t} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{J}^{x_1, a_1, x_2})(\tilde{\sigma}(1; x_1)) \quad (4.2)$$

$$= \left(\prod_{j=1}^{t-1} \text{Tr}[\pi(j; h_j^t) |a_j\rangle \langle a_j|] \right) \tilde{\sigma}'(t; h^t), \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\tilde{\sigma}'(t; h^t) := (\mathcal{J}^{x_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, x_t} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{J}^{x_1, a_1, x_2})(\tilde{\sigma}(1; x_1)). \quad (4.4)$$

Policy optimization is then the task of optimizing the reward up to a given time t with respect to the density operators $\{\pi(j; h^j): 1 \leq j \leq t-1, h^j \in \{0, 1\}^{2^{j-1}}\}$ that define a policy.

Now, before getting to Theorem 4.1, let us consider how policies for elementary link generation should be evaluated. From Definition 2.1, Remark 2.1, and Theorem 2.2, we have that the quantity $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t)]$ represents the expected total reward in the decision process corresponding to elementary link generation. The objective function when optimizing over policies would thus be the quantity $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t)]$. Using this quantity makes sense from the perspective of elementary link generation in a quantum network, because with higher elementary link fidelities more joining measurements can be performed in order to obtain high-fidelity entanglement distribution over longer distances without having to perform entanglement distillation. Another way to justify using $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t)]$ as the objective function is by considering two alternatives.

The first alternative to $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t)]$ is the expected link value $\mathbb{E}[X(t)]$. If we use $\mathbb{E}[X(t)]$ as the objective function for policy optimization, then it is clear that the policy consisting of the action “request” at every time step before the link is established, and the action “wait” at every time step after the link is established, is optimal, in the sense that it achieves the highest value of $\mathbb{E}[X(t)]$ for all $t \geq 1$. (Observe that this policy is simply the $t^* = \infty$ memory cutoff policy.) A higher value of $\mathbb{E}[X(t)]$ comes, of course, at the cost of a lower fidelity, since each “wait” action decreases the fidelity of the quantum state stored in memory. If instead we consider maximizing the expected fidelity $\mathbb{E}[F(t)]$ of the link given that the link is active, then it is clear that the action “request” at each time step is optimal, because then the quantity $\mathbb{E}[F(t)]$ is equal to the initial fidelity f_0 at all time steps, which is the highest that can be obtained (without entanglement distillation). (Observe that this policy is simply the $t^* = 0$ memory cutoff policy.) This highest value of the fidelity comes at the cost of a lower expected link value, since the probability that the link is active stays at p for all times under this policy, i.e., $\Pr[X(t) = 1] = p$ for all $t \geq 1$ if at every time step the agent requests a link. The quantity $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t)] = \mathbb{E}[X(t)f_{M(t)}(\rho_0)]$ by definition incorporates the trade-off between the link value and the link fidelity, and therefore it is a better figure of merit for elementary link generation.

Having justified the use of $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t)]$ as the objective function for policy optimization, let us discuss one simple policy optimization strategy, which is intuitive but not necessarily optimal, before getting to our main result in Theorem 4.1. Since the agent, at each time step, has to decide whether to keep the current link or to discard it and request a new one, a simple policy is for the agent to deterministically pick the action a_t at time t that maximizes the quantity $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t+1)]$ at the next time step. Recalling that the classical-quantum state of the link at time $t+1$ is

$$\widehat{\sigma}(t+1) = \sum_{h^{t+1}} |h^{t+1}\rangle\langle h^{t+1}| \otimes \widetilde{\sigma}(t+1; h^{t+1}) \quad (4.5)$$

$$= \sum_{h^t, a_t, x_{t+1}} |h^t, a_t, x_{t+1}\rangle\langle h^t, a_t, x_{t+1}| \otimes d_t(h^t)(a_t) \mathcal{T}^{x_t, a_t, x_{t+1}}(\widetilde{\sigma}(t; h^t)), \quad (4.6)$$

and that

$$\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t+1; \psi)] = \text{Tr}[(|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_{t+1}} \otimes \psi) \widehat{\sigma}(t+1)], \quad (4.7)$$

using (2.51) we have two possibilities for every history h^t (assuming both actions are taken deterministically):

$$\begin{aligned} a_t = 0 &\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t+1; \psi)] = \langle \psi | \mathcal{T}^{X(t)(h^t), 0, 1}(\widetilde{\sigma}(t; h^t)) | \psi \rangle \\ &= \Pr[H(t) = h^t] X(t)(h^t) \langle \psi | \widehat{\mathcal{N}}(\rho(M(t)(h^t))) | \psi \rangle \\ &= \Pr[H(t) = h^t] X(t)(h^t) f_{M(t)(h^t)+1}(\rho_0), \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

$$a_t = 1 \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t+1; \psi)] = \Pr[H(t) = h^t] p f_0(\rho_0) \quad (4.9)$$

So the task is to determine which of the two quantities, $X(t)(h^t) f_{M(t)(h^t)+1}(\rho_0)$ and $p f_0(\rho_0)$, is higher. If the link is not active at time t , meaning that $X(t)(h^t) = 0$, then requesting a link, i.e., selecting $a_t = 1$, is higher than selecting $a_t = 0$ (since the latter leads to a value of $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t+1; \psi)] = 0$ for $p > 0$). On the other hand, if the link is active at time t , then the task is to compare

$$f_{M(t)(h^t)+1}(\rho_0) (a_t = 0) \quad \text{and} \quad p f_0(\rho_0) (a_t = 1) \quad (4.10)$$

for every history h^t . Which of these two quantities is higher (and thus which action is taken) depends on the success probability $p \in (0, 1)$, the noise model of the quantum memory, and on the target pure state ψ .

The policy discussed above is an example of a so-called ‘‘forward greedy’’ policy: at each time step, we take the action that maximizes the expected value of \widetilde{F} at the next time step. As it turns out, however, this policy is in general not optimal among all possible policies. In fact, as we now show, the global optimal policy is a ‘‘reverse greedy’’ policy, which is defined by first deterministically picking the action that maximizes the expected value of \widetilde{F} at the *final time step*, then proceeding backwards in time, optimizing the actions recursively until we reach the first time step.

Theorem 4.1 (Optimal finite-horizon policy for elementary link generation). For all $t \geq 1$, and for any pure state ψ ,

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t+1; \psi)] = \sum_{x_1=0}^1 \max_{a_1 \in \{0,1\}} v_1^*(t; x_1, a_1), \quad (4.11)$$

where for all $1 \leq j \leq t-2$,

$$v_j^*(t; h^j, a_j) = \sum_{x_{j+1}=0}^1 \max_{a_{j+1} \in \{0,1\}} v_{j+1}^*(t; h^{j+1}, a_{j+1}) \quad \forall h^j \in \{0, 1\}^{2^{j-1}}, a_j \in \{0, 1\}, \quad (4.12)$$

and

$$v_{t-1}^*(t; h^{t-1}, a_{t-1}) = \sum_{x_t=0}^1 \max_{a_t \in \{0,1\}} \langle \psi | \widetilde{\sigma}'(t+1; h^t, a_t, 1) | \psi \rangle \quad \forall h^{t-1} \in \{0, 1\}^{2^{t-3}}, a_{t-1} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad (4.13)$$

where $\widetilde{\sigma}'(t+1; h^t, a_t, 1)$ is defined in (4.4). Furthermore, the optimal policy is deterministic and given by $\pi^* = (d_j^* : 1 \leq j \leq t)$, where

$$d_j^*(h^j) = \arg \max_{a_j \in \{0,1\}} v_j^*(t; h^j, a_j) \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq t-1 \quad \forall h^j \in \{0, 1\}^{2^{j-1}}, \quad (4.14)$$

$$d_t^*(h^t) = \arg \max_{a_t \in \{0,1\}} \langle \psi | \widetilde{\sigma}'(t+1; h^t, a_t, 1) | \psi \rangle \quad \forall h^t \in \{0,1\}^{2^{t-1}}. \quad (4.15)$$

Remark 4.1. The algorithm shown above for determining the optimal policy is often called the “backward recursion” algorithm, and it is related to dynamic programming because the algorithm solves the policy optimization problem over the entire time duration via a sequence of simple optimization problems at each individual time step.

Proof. We start by using the definition of $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t+1; \psi)]$ and the expression in (4.3) to write

$$\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t+1; \psi)] = \sum_{h^{t+1}: x_{t+1}=1} \langle \psi | \widetilde{\sigma}(t+1; h^{t+1}) | \psi \rangle \quad (4.16)$$

$$= \sum_{h^t, a_t} \left(\prod_{j=1}^t \text{Tr}[\pi(j; h_j^{t+1}) | a_j \rangle \langle a_j |] \right) \langle \psi | \widetilde{\sigma}'(t+1; h^t, a_t, 1) | \psi \rangle \quad (4.17)$$

$$= \sum_{x_1, a_1=0}^1 \text{Tr}[\pi(1; x_1) | a_1 \rangle \langle a_1 |] v_1(t; x_1, a_1) \quad (4.18)$$

$$= \sum_{x_1=0}^1 \text{Tr} \left[\left(\sum_{a_1=0}^1 | a_1 \rangle \langle a_1 | v_1(t; x_1, a_1) \right) \pi(1; x_1) \right], \quad (4.19)$$

where we have let

$$v_1(t; x_1, a_1) := \sum_{\substack{x_2, \dots, x_t=0 \\ a_2, \dots, a_t=0}}^1 \left(\prod_{j=2}^t \text{Tr}[\pi(j; h_j^{t+1}) | a_j \rangle \langle a_j |] \right) \langle \psi | \widetilde{\sigma}'(t+1; h^t, a_t, 1) | \psi \rangle. \quad (4.20)$$

Notice that $v_1(t; x_1, a_1)$ does not depend on the decision variables in $\pi(1; x_1)$ for the first time step. Therefore,

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{F}(t+1; \psi)] = \sum_{x_1=0}^1 \max_{\pi(1; x_1)} \text{Tr} \left[\left(\sum_{a_1=0}^1 | a_1 \rangle \langle a_1 | v_1^*(t; x_1, a_1) \right) \pi(1; x_1) \right], \quad (4.21)$$

where

$$v_1^*(t; x_1, a_1) := \max_{\{\pi(j; h_j^{t+1}): 2 \leq j \leq t\}} v_1(t; x_1, a_1) \quad (4.22)$$

$$= \max_{\{\pi(j; h_j^{t+1}): 2 \leq j \leq t\}} \sum_{\substack{x_2, \dots, x_t=0 \\ a_2, \dots, a_t=0}}^1 \left(\prod_{j=2}^t \text{Tr}[\pi(j; h_j^{t+1}) | a_j \rangle \langle a_j |] \right) \langle \psi | \widetilde{\sigma}'(t+1; h^t, a_t, 1) | \psi \rangle. \quad (4.23)$$

The optimization in (4.21) is of the form $\max_{\rho: \rho \geq 0, \text{Tr}[\rho]=1} \text{Tr}[\rho H]$ for some Hermitian operator H , and it is known (see, e.g., [176]) that this is equal to the maximum eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}(H)$ of H .

The operator H here is simply $\sum_{a_1=0}^1 |a_1\rangle\langle a_1|v_1^*(t; x_1, a_1)$, which is diagonal in the basis $\{|a_1\rangle\}_{a_1=0}^1$; therefore, its maximum eigenvalue is $\max_{a_1 \in \{0,1\}} v_1^*(t; x_1, a_1)$. Consequently,

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}(t+1; \psi)] = \sum_{x_1=0}^1 \max_{a_1 \in \{0,1\}} v_1^*(t; x_1, a_1). \quad (4.24)$$

The optimal decision at the first time step is therefore given by $\pi^*(1; x_1) := |d_1^*(x_1)\rangle\langle d_1^*(x_1)|$, where the optimal decision function d_1^* is *deterministic* and given by

$$d_1^*(x_1) := \arg \max_{a_1 \in \{0,1\}} v_1^*(t; x_1, a_1) \quad \forall x_1 \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (4.25)$$

Now, in order to determine $v_1^*(t; x_1, a_1)$, we can write $v_1(t; x_1, a_1)$ as follows:

$$v_1(t; x_1, a_1) = \sum_{x_2, a_2=0}^1 \text{Tr}[\pi(2; h_2^{t+1})|a_2\rangle\langle a_2|]v_2(t; h_2^{t+1}, a_2) \quad (4.26)$$

$$= \sum_{x_2=0}^1 \text{Tr} \left[\left(\sum_{a_2=0}^1 |a_2\rangle\langle a_2|v_2(t; h_2^{t+1}, a_2) \right) \pi(2; h_2^{t+1}) \right], \quad (4.27)$$

where

$$v_2(t; h_2^{t+1}, a_2) := \sum_{\substack{x_3, \dots, x_t=0 \\ a_3, \dots, a_t=0}}^1 \left(\prod_{j=3}^t \text{Tr}[\pi(j; h_j^{t+1})|a_j\rangle\langle a_j|] \right) \langle \psi | \tilde{\sigma}'(t+1; h^t, a_t, 1) | \psi \rangle. \quad (4.28)$$

Then, observing that $v_2(t; h_2^{t+1}, a_2)$ does not depend on the decision variables in $\pi(2; h_2^{t+1})$, we apply the same reasoning as above to conclude that

$$v_1^*(t; x_1, a_1) = \sum_{x_2=0}^1 \max_{a_2 \in \{0,1\}} v_2^*(t; h_2^{t+1}, a_2). \quad (4.29)$$

Then, in a similar manner to above, we find that the optimal decision is given by $\pi^*(2; h_2^{t+1}) := |d_2^*(h_2^{t+1})\rangle\langle d_2^*(h_2^{t+1})|$, where the optimal decision function d_2^* is again deterministic and given by

$$d_2^*(h_2^{t+1}) := \arg \max_{a_2 \in \{0,1\}} v_2^*(t; h_2^{t+1}, a_2) \quad \forall h_2^{t+1} \in \{0, 1\}^3. \quad (4.30)$$

In general, we have that

$$v_j(t; h_j^{t+1}, a_j) := \sum_{\substack{x_{j+1}, \dots, x_t=0 \\ a_{j+1}, \dots, a_t=0}}^1 \left(\prod_{k=j+1}^t \text{Tr}[\pi(k; h_k^{t+1})|a_k\rangle\langle a_k|] \right) \langle \psi | \tilde{\sigma}(t+1; h^t, a_t, 1) | \psi \rangle \quad (4.31)$$

$$= \sum_{x_{j+1}, a_{j+1}=0}^1 \text{Tr}[\pi(j+1; h_{j+1}^{t+1})|a_{j+1}\rangle\langle a_{j+1}|]v_{j+1}(t; h_{j+1}^{t+1}, a_{j+1}) \quad (4.32)$$

$$= \sum_{x_{j+1}=0}^1 \text{Tr} \left[\left(\sum_{a_{j+1}=0}^1 |a_{j+1}\rangle \langle a_{j+1}| v_{j+1}(t; h_{j+1}^{t+1}, a_{j+1}) \right) \pi(j+1; h_{j+1}^{t+1}) \right] \quad (4.33)$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq t-2$. We recursively optimize each v_j , leading to

$$v_j^*(t; h_j^{t+1}, a_j) := \max_{\{\pi(k; h_k^{t+1}); j+1 \leq k \leq t\}} v_j(t; h_j^{t+1}, a_j) \quad (4.34)$$

$$= \sum_{x_{j+1}=0}^1 \max_{a_{j+1} \in \{0,1\}} v_{j+1}^*(t; h_{j+1}^{t+1}, a_{j+1}). \quad (4.35)$$

Then, the optimal action $d_j^*(h_j^{t+1})$ to be performed deterministically at the j^{th} time step is given by

$$d_j^*(h_j^{t+1}) = \arg \max_{a_j \in \{0,1\}} v_j^*(t; h_j^{t+1}, a_j), \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq t-2 \quad \forall h_j^{t+1} \in \{0,1\}^{2^{j-1}}. \quad (4.36)$$

For time step $t-1$, we have

$$v_{t-1}(t; h_{t-1}^{t+1}, a_{t-1}) := \sum_{x_t=0}^1 \text{Tr} \left[\left(\sum_{a_t=0}^1 |a_t\rangle \langle a_t| \langle \psi | \widetilde{\sigma}'(t+1; h^t, a_t, 1) | \psi \rangle \right) \pi(t; h_t^{t+1}) \right], \quad (4.37)$$

so that the optimal action at time $t-1$, to be performed deterministically, is given by

$$d_{t-1}^*(h_{t-1}^{t+1}) = \arg \max_{a_{t-1} \in \{0,1\}} v_{t-1}^*(t; h_{t-1}^{t+1}, a_{t-1}) \quad \forall h_{t-1}^{t+1} \in \{0,1\}^{2^{t-3}}, \quad (4.38)$$

where

$$v_{t-1}^*(t; h_{t-1}^{t+1}, a_{t-1}) := \sum_{x_t=0}^1 \max_{a_t \in \{0,1\}} \langle \psi | \widetilde{\sigma}'(t+1; h^t, a_t, 1) | \psi \rangle. \quad (4.39)$$

For the final action a_t at time t , we have

$$d_t^*(h^t) = \arg \max_{a_t \in \{0,1\}} \langle \psi | \widetilde{\sigma}'(t+1; h^t, a_t, 1) | \psi \rangle \quad \forall h^t \in \{0,1\}^{2^{t-1}}. \quad (4.40)$$

This completes the proof. ■

Remark 4.2. Observe that the backward recursion algorithm presented in Theorem 4.1 is exponentially slow in the horizon time because of the fact that the number of histories grows exponentially in time—the number of histories up to time t is $2^{2^{t-1}}$. Therefore, given a finite horizon time t , the functions v_j^* in (4.12), which are used to determine the optimal action at the j^{th} time step for every history up to the j^{th} time step, for $1 \leq j \leq t$, have an exponentially increasing number of values. One way to avoid this issue is to use reinforcement learning to discover (near-optimal) policies. Another path, which is an interesting direction for future work, is to determine whether a speed-up can be obtained by trying to find a quantum algorithm for calculating the optimal policy in a quantum decision process.

5 Summary and outlook

In this work, we have cast elementary link generation in a quantum network within the framework of quantum partially observable Markov decision processes, as defined in [85]. At each stage in the elementary link generation procedure, an agent decides whether to request a new quantum state or to keep the quantum state currently in the quantum memories at the nodes. We defined the transition maps acting on the quantum state of any elementary link corresponding to these two actions, and we determined expressions for the expected quantum state and expected fidelity of any elementary link at any time for any policy and any noise model for the quantum memories. We then looked at the special memory cutoff policy. Using the framework of decision processes allowed us to determine both the finite-horizon and infinite-horizon behavior of the link under the memory cutoff policy, in terms of the expected quantum state, expected fidelity, and expected rates. We then showed how dynamic programming can be used to obtain optimal policies in the finite-horizon setting.

We view this work as the starting point for applying reinforcement learning to develop practical protocols for entanglement distribution in quantum networks, since decision processes provide the theoretical underpinnings of reinforcement learning. As such, one direction for future work is to use the tools developed in this work to perform reinforcement learning of (near-optimal) policies for elementary link generation. This would be especially useful when developing policies for long horizon times, since the dynamic programming technique presented here is exponentially slow in the horizon time (see Remark 4.2). Another direction for future work is to go beyond the elementary link level and use quantum decision processes, and thus reinforcement learning by extension, as a general technique to develop policies for full-fledged entanglement distribution protocols in quantum networks that incorporate entanglement distillation and joining measurements. Such a development would involve multiple interacting agents (for the different sets of nodes) and multiple environments (for the different edges), and it would build on prior works [18, 44, 47, 116, 126] that examine quantum network protocols beyond the elementary link level. One simple example of how to extend the results of this work in this direction is to use the policies for elementary link generation determined via the techniques developed in this work as “sub-policies” on top of which policies for routing can be used in order to generate long-distance entanglement in a network. Finally, it would be interesting to apply the mathematical framework developed here to analyze the all-photon quantum repeater architecture [36], in which photonic graph states are used at the elementary link level.

Acknowledgments

This work is dedicated to the memory of Jonathan P. Dowling.

The author acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation and from the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada Postgraduate Scholarship.

References

- [1] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, “Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [2] S. L. Braunstein, C. A. Fuchs, and H. J. Kimble, “Criteria for continuous-variable quantum teleportation”, [Journal of Modern Optics](#) **47**, 267 (2000).
- [3] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, “Quantum cryptography: public key distribution and coin tossing”, in International Conference on Computer System and Signal Processing, IEEE (1984), pp. 175–179.
- [4] A. K. Ekert, “Quantum cryptography based on Bell’s theorem”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **67**, 661 (1991).
- [5] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, “Quantum cryptography”, [Reviews of Modern Physics](#) **74**, 145 (2002).
- [6] V. Scarani, H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci, N. J. Cerf, M. Dušek, N. Lütkenhaus, and M. Peev, “The security of practical quantum key distribution”, [Reviews of Modern Physics](#) **81**, 1301 (2009).
- [7] R. Jozsa, D. S. Abrams, J. P. Dowling, and C. P. Williams, “Quantum clock synchronization based on shared prior entanglement”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **85**, 2010 (2000).
- [8] U. Yurtsever and J. P. Dowling, “Lorentz-invariant look at quantum clock-synchronization protocols based on distributed entanglement”, [Physical Review A](#) **65**, 052317 (2002).
- [9] E. O. Ilo-Okeke, L. Tessler, J. P. Dowling, and T. Byrnes, “Remote quantum clock synchronization without synchronized clocks”, [npj Quantum Information](#) **4**, 40 (2018).
- [10] J. I. Cirac, A. K. Ekert, S. F. Huelga, and C. Macchiavello, “Distributed quantum computation over noisy channels”, [Physical Review A](#) **59**, 4249 (1999).
- [11] P. Kómár, E. M. Kessler, M. Bishof, L. Jiang, A. S. Sørensen, J. Ye, and M. D. Lukin, “A quantum network of clocks”, [Nature Physics](#) **10**, 582 (2014).
- [12] C. L. Degen, F. Reinhard, and P. Cappellaro, “Quantum sensing”, [Reviews of Modern Physics](#) **89**, 035002 (2017).
- [13] Q. Zhuang, Z. Zhang, and J. H. Shapiro, “Distributed quantum sensing using continuous-variable multipartite entanglement”, [Physical Review A](#) **97**, 032329 (2018).
- [14] Z. Eldredge, M. Foss-Feig, J. A. Gross, S. L. Rolston, and A. V. Gorshkov, “Optimal and secure measurement protocols for quantum sensor networks”, [Physical Review A](#) **97**, 042337 (2018).
- [15] T. J. Proctor, P. A. Knott, and J. A. Dunningham, “Multiparameter estimation in networked quantum sensors”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **120**, 080501 (2018).

- [16] Y. Xia, Q. Zhuang, W. Clark, and Z. Zhang, “Repeater-enhanced distributed quantum sensing based on continuous-variable multipartite entanglement”, [Physical Review A **99**, 012328 \(2019\)](#).
- [17] H. J. Kimble, “The quantum internet”, [Nature **453** \(2008\)](#).
- [18] R. V. Meter and J. Touch, “Designing quantum repeater networks”, [IEEE Communications Magazine **51**, 64 \(2013\)](#).
- [19] C. Simon, “Towards a global quantum network”, [Nature Photonics **11**, 678 \(2017\)](#).
- [20] S. Wehner, D. Elkouss, and R. Hanson, “Quantum internet: a vision for the road ahead”, [Science **362** \(2018\) 10.1126/science.aam9288](#).
- [21] J. Dowling, *Schrödinger’s Web: Race to Build the Quantum Internet* (Taylor & Francis, Boca Raton, 2020).
- [22] O. Svelto, *Principles of Lasers*, 5th ed. (Springer US, New York, 2010).
- [23] H. Kaushal, V. K. Jain, and S. Kar, *Free Space Optical Communication* (Springer Nature, 2017).
- [24] H.-J. Briegel, W. Dür, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, “Quantum repeaters: the role of imperfect local operations in quantum communication”, [Physical Review Letters **81**, 5932 \(1998\)](#).
- [25] W. Dür, H.-J. Briegel, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, “Quantum repeaters based on entanglement purification”, [Physical Review A **59**, 169 \(1999\)](#).
- [26] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, “Purification of noisy entanglement and faithful teleportation via noisy channels”, [Physical Review Letters **76**, 722 \(1996\)](#).
- [27] D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, R. Jozsa, C. Macchiavello, S. Popescu, and A. Sanpera, “Quantum privacy amplification and the security of quantum cryptography over noisy channels”, [Physical Review Letters **77**, 2818 \(1996\)](#).
- [28] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, “Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction”, [Physical Review A **54**, 3824 \(1996\)](#).
- [29] M. Żukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. A. Horne, and A. K. Ekert, “Event-ready-detectors’ Bell experiment via entanglement swapping”, [Physical Review Letters **71**, 4287 \(1993\)](#).
- [30] L.-M. Duan, M. D. Lukin, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, “Long-distance quantum communication with atomic ensembles and linear optics”, [Nature **414** \(2001\)](#).
- [31] O. A. Collins, S. D. Jenkins, A. Kuzmich, and T. A. B. Kennedy, “Multiplexed memory-insensitive quantum repeaters”, [Physical Review Letters **98**, 060502 \(2007\)](#).
- [32] C. Simon, H. de Riedmatten, M. Afzelius, N. Sangouard, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, “Quantum repeaters with photon pair sources and multimode memories”, [Physical Review Letters **98**, 190503 \(2007\)](#).
- [33] N. Sangouard, C. Simon, J. Minář, H. Zbinden, H. de Riedmatten, and N. Gisin, “Long-distance entanglement distribution with single-photon sources”, [Physical Review A **76**, 050301 \(2007\)](#).

- [34] N. K. Bernardes, L. Praxmeyer, and P. van Loock, “Rate analysis for a hybrid quantum repeater”, *Physical Review A* **83**, 012323 (2011).
- [35] M. Zwerger, W. Dür, and H. J. Briegel, “Measurement-based quantum repeaters”, *Physical Review A* **85**, 062326 (2012).
- [36] K. Azuma, K. Tamaki, and H.-K. Lo, “All-photonic quantum repeaters”, *Nature Communications* **6** (2015).
- [37] M. Zwerger, H. J. Briegel, and W. Dür, “Measurement-based quantum communication”, *Applied Physics B* **122**, 50 (2016).
- [38] M. Epping, H. Kampermann, and D. Bruß, “Large-scale quantum networks based on graphs”, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 053036 (2016).
- [39] J. Wallnöfer, M. Zwerger, C. Muschik, N. Sangouard, and W. Dür, “Two-dimensional quantum repeaters”, *Physical Review A* **94**, 052307 (2016).
- [40] X. Liu, Z.-Q. Zhou, Y.-L. Hua, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, “Semihierarchical quantum repeaters based on moderate lifetime quantum memories”, *Physical Review A* **95**, 012319 (2017).
- [41] S. E. Vinay and P. Kok, “Practical repeaters for ultralong-distance quantum communication”, *Physical Review A* **95**, 052336 (2017).
- [42] C. Meignant, D. Markham, and F. Grosshans, “Distributing graph states over arbitrary quantum networks”, *Physical Review A* **100**, 052333 (2019).
- [43] M. Zwerger, A. Pirker, V. Dunjko, H. J. Briegel, and W. Dür, “Long-range big quantum-data transmission”, *Physical Review Letters* **120**, 030503 (2018).
- [44] A. Pirker, J. Wallnöfer, and W. Dür, “Modular architectures for quantum networks”, *New Journal of Physics* **20**, 053054 (2018).
- [45] S. Das, S. Khatri, and J. P. Dowling, “Robust quantum network architectures and topologies for entanglement distribution”, *Physical Review A* **97**, 012335 (2018).
- [46] J. Wallnöfer, A. Pirker, M. Zwerger, and W. Dür, “Multipartite state generation in quantum networks with optimal scaling”, *Scientific Reports* **9**, 314 (2019).
- [47] A. Pirker and W. Dür, “A quantum network stack and protocols for reliable entanglement-based networks”, *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 033003 (2019).
- [48] L. Gyongyosi and S. Imre, “Opportunistic entanglement distribution for the quantum internet”, *Scientific Reports* **9** (2019).
- [49] L. Gyongyosi and S. Imre, “Entanglement access control for the quantum internet”, *Quantum Information Processing* **18**, 107 (2019).
- [50] P. Hilaire, E. Barnes, and S. E. Economou, “Resource requirements for efficient quantum communication using all-photonic graph states generated from a few matter qubits”, *arXiv:2005.07198* (2020).

- [51] R. M. Gingrich, P. Kok, H. Lee, F. Vatan, and J. P. Dowling, “All linear optical quantum memory based on quantum error correction”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **91**, 217901 (2003).
- [52] T. C. Ralph, A. J. F. Hayes, and A. Gilchrist, “Loss-tolerant optical qubits”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **95**, 100501 (2005).
- [53] L. Jiang, J. M. Taylor, K. Nemoto, W. J. Munro, R. Van Meter, and M. D. Lukin, “Quantum repeater with encoding”, [Physical Review A](#) **79**, 032325 (2009).
- [54] A. G. Fowler, D. S. Wang, C. D. Hill, T. D. Ladd, R. Van Meter, and L. C. L. Hollenberg, “Surface code quantum communication”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **104**, 180503 (2010).
- [55] W. J. Munro, A. M. Stephens, S. J. Devitt, K. A. Harrison, and K. Nemoto, “Quantum communication without the necessity of quantum memories”, [Nature Photonics](#) **6**, 777 (2012).
- [56] S. Muralidharan, J. Kim, N. Lütkenhaus, M. D. Lukin, and L. Jiang, “Ultrafast and fault-tolerant quantum communication across long distances”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **112**, 250501 (2014).
- [57] R. Namiki, L. Jiang, J. Kim, and N. Lütkenhaus, “Role of syndrome information on a one-way quantum repeater using teleportation-based error correction”, [Physical Review A](#) **94**, 052304 (2016).
- [58] S. Muralidharan, L. Li, J. Kim, N. Lütkenhaus, M. D. Lukin, and L. Jiang, “Optimal architectures for long distance quantum communication”, [Scientific Reports](#) **6**, 20463 (2016).
- [59] F. M. Miatto, M. Epping, and N. Lütkenhaus, “Hamiltonians for one-way quantum repeaters”, [Quantum](#) **2**, 75 (2018).
- [60] N. Sangouard, C. Simon, H. de Riedmatten, and N. Gisin, “Quantum repeaters based on atomic ensembles and linear optics”, [Reviews of Modern Physics](#) **83**, 33 (2011).
- [61] W. J. Munro, K. Azuma, K. Tamaki, and K. Nemoto, “Inside Quantum Repeaters”, [IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Quantum Electronics](#) **21**, 78 (2015).
- [62] R. Van Meter, *Quantum Networking* (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2014).
- [63] L. Gyongyosi and S. Imre, “Entanglement-gradient routing for quantum networks”, [Scientific Reports](#) **7**, 14255 (2017).
- [64] E. Schoute, L. Mancinska, T. Islam, I. Kerenidis, and S. Wehner, “Shortcuts to quantum network routing”, [arXiv:1610.05238](#) (2017).
- [65] L. Gyongyosi and S. Imre, “Decentralized base-graph routing for the quantum internet”, [Physical Review A](#) **98**, 022310 (2018).
- [66] M. Pant, H. Krovi, D. Towsley, L. Tassiulas, L. Jiang, P. Basu, D. Englund, and S. Guha, “Routing entanglement in the quantum internet”, [npj Quantum Information](#) **5**, 25 (2019).
- [67] F. Hahn, A. Pappa, and J. Eisert, “Quantum network routing and local complementation”, [npj Quantum Information](#) **5**, 76 (2019).
- [68] K. Chakraborty, F. Rozpędek, A. Dahlberg, and S. Wehner, “Distributed routing in a quantum internet”, [arXiv:1907.11630](#) (2019).

- [69] S. Pirandola, “End-to-end capacities of a quantum communication network”, [Communications Physics](#) **2**, 51 (2019).
- [70] S. Pirandola, “Bounds for multi-end communication over quantum networks”, [Quantum Science and Technology](#) **4**, 045006 (2019).
- [71] C. Li, T. Li, Y.-X. Liu, and P. Cappellaro, “Effective routing design for remote entanglement generation on quantum networks”, [arXiv:2001.02204](#) (2020).
- [72] Y. Lee, E. Bersin, A. Dahlberg, S. Wehner, and D. Englund, “A quantum router architecture for high-fidelity entanglement flows in multi-user quantum networks”, [arXiv:2005.01852](#) (2020).
- [73] K. Azuma, A. Mizutani, and H.-K. Lo, “Fundamental rate-loss trade-off for the quantum internet”, [Nature Communications](#) **7**, 13523 (2016).
- [74] K. Azuma and G. Kato, “Aggregating quantum repeaters for the quantum internet”, [Physical Review A](#) **96**, 032332 (2017).
- [75] S. Bäuml and K. Azuma, “Fundamental limitation on quantum broadcast networks”, [Quantum Science and Technology](#) **2**, 024004 (2017).
- [76] L. Rigovacca, G. Kato, S. Bäuml, M. S. Kim, W. J. Munro, and K. Azuma, “Versatile relative entropy bounds for quantum networks”, [New Journal of Physics](#) **20**, 013033 (2018).
- [77] S. Das, S. Bäuml, M. Winczewski, and K. Horodecki, “Universal limitations on quantum key distribution over a network”, [arXiv:1912.03646](#) (2019).
- [78] S. Bäuml, K. Azuma, G. Kato, and D. Elkouss, “Linear programs for entanglement and key distribution in the quantum internet”, [Communications Physics](#) **3**, 55 (2020).
- [79] W. Dai, T. Peng, and M. Z. Win, “Optimal Remote Entanglement Distribution”, [IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications](#) **38**, 540 (2020).
- [80] K. Chakraborty, D. Elkouss, B. Rijsman, and S. Wehner, “Entanglement Distribution in a Quantum Network, a Multi-Commodity Flow-Based Approach”, [arXiv:2005.14304](#) (2020).
- [81] K. Goodenough, D. Elkouss, and S. Wehner, “Optimising repeater schemes for the quantum internet”, [arXiv:2006.12221](#) (2020).
- [82] M. L. Puterman, *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics (Wiley, 2014).
- [83] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto, *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (MIT Press, 2018).
- [84] S. Russell and P. Norvig, *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*, 3rd ed. (Pearson, 2009).
- [85] J. Barry, D. T. Barry, and S. Aaronson, “Quantum partially observable Markov decision processes”, [Physical Review A](#) **90**, 032311 (2014).
- [86] S. Ying and M. Ying, “Reachability analysis of quantum Markov decision processes”, [Information and Computation](#) **263**, 31 (2018).

- [87] C. Chen, D. Dong, H. Li, J. Chu, and T. Tarn, “Fidelity-Based Probabilistic Q-Learning for Control of Quantum Systems”, [IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems](#) **25**, 920 (2014).
- [88] M. Bukov, A. G. R. Day, D. Sels, P. Weinberg, A. Polkovnikov, and P. Mehta, “Reinforcement learning in different phases of quantum control”, [Physical Review X](#) **8**, 031086 (2018).
- [89] T. Fösel, P. Tighineanu, T. Weiss, and F. Marquardt, “Reinforcement learning with neural networks for quantum feedback”, [Physical Review X](#) **8**, 031084 (2018).
- [90] X.-M. Zhang, Z. Wei, R. Asad, X.-C. Yang, and X. Wang, “When does reinforcement learning stand out in quantum control? A comparative study on state preparation”, [npj Quantum Information](#) **5**, 85 (2019).
- [91] M. Y. Niu, S. Boixo, V. N. Smelyanskiy, and H. Neven, “Universal quantum control through deep reinforcement learning”, [npj Quantum Information](#) **5**, 33 (2019).
- [92] A. Hentschel and B. C. Sanders, “Machine learning for precise quantum measurement”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **104**, 063603 (2010).
- [93] A. Hentschel and B. C. Sanders, “Efficient algorithm for optimizing adaptive quantum metrology processes”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **107**, 233601 (2011).
- [94] P. Palittapongarnpim, P. Wittek, and B. C. Sanders, “Controlling adaptive quantum phase estimation with scalable reinforcement learning”, in Proceedings of ESANN-16, 24th European Symposium on Artificial Neural Networks, Computational Intelligence and Machine Learning (2016), pp. 327–332.
- [95] P. Palittapongarnpim, P. Wittek, and B. C. Sanders, “Single-shot adaptive measurement for quantum-enhanced metrology”, in [Quantum Communications and Quantum Imaging XIV](#), Vol. 9980, edited by R. E. Meyers, Y. Shih, and K. S. Deacon (International Society for Optics and Photonics, 2016), pp. 60–70.
- [96] P. Palittapongarnpim, P. Wittek, and B. C. Sanders, “Robustness of learning-assisted adaptive quantum-enhanced metrology in the presence of noise”, in 2017 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC) (2017), pp. 294–299.
- [97] R. Sweke, M. S. Kesselring, E. P. L. van Nieuwenburg, and J. Eisert, “Reinforcement learning decoders for fault-tolerant quantum computation”, [arXiv:1810.07207](#) (2018).
- [98] H. P. Nautrup, N. Delfosse, V. Dunjko, H. J. Briegel, and N. Friis, “Optimizing Quantum Error Correction Codes with Reinforcement Learning”, [Quantum](#) **3**, 215 (2019).
- [99] C. Jones, D. Kim, M. T. Rakher, P. G. Kwiat, and T. D. Ladd, “Design and analysis of communication protocols for quantum repeater networks”, [New Journal of Physics](#) **18**, 083015 (2016).
- [100] S. B. van Dam, P. C. Humphreys, F. Rozpędek, S. Wehner, and R. Hanson, “Multiplexed entanglement generation over quantum networks using multi-qubit nodes”, [Quantum Science and Technology](#) **2**, 034002 (2017).

- [101] F. Rozpędek, R. Yehia, K. Goodenough, M. Ruf, P. C. Humphreys, R. Hanson, S. Wehner, and D. Elkouss, “Near-term quantum-repeater experiments with nitrogen-vacancy centers: overcoming the limitations of direct transmission”, *Physical Review A* **99**, 052330 (2019).
- [102] E. Shchukin, F. Schmidt, and P. van Loock, “Waiting time in quantum repeaters with probabilistic entanglement swapping”, *Physical Review A* **100**, 032322 (2019).
- [103] S. Khatri, C. T. Matyas, A. U. Siddiqui, and J. P. Dowling, “Practical figures of merit and thresholds for entanglement distribution in quantum networks”, *Physical Review Research* **1**, 023032 (2019).
- [104] S. Santra, L. Jiang, and V. S. Malinovsky, “Quantum repeater architecture with hierarchically optimized memory buffer times”, *Quantum Science and Technology* **4**, 025010 (2019).
- [105] B. Li, T. Coopmans, and D. Elkouss, “Efficient optimization of cut-offs in quantum repeater chains”, [arXiv:2005.04946](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.04946) (2020).
- [106] S. C. Benjamin, J. Eisert, and T. M. Stace, “Optical generation of matter qubit graph states”, *New Journal of Physics* **7**, 194 (2005).
- [107] Y. Matsuzaki, S. C. Benjamin, and J. Fitzsimons, “Probabilistic growth of large entangled states with low error accumulation”, *Physical Review Letters* **104**, 050501 (2010).
- [108] M. Cuquet and J. Calsamiglia, “Growth of graph states in quantum networks”, *Physical Review A* **86**, 042304 (2012).
- [109] K. Boone, J.-P. Bourgoin, E. Meyer-Scott, K. Heshami, T. Jennewein, and C. Simon, “Entanglement over global distances via quantum repeaters with satellite links”, *Physical Review A* **91**, 052325 (2015).
- [110] S. Khatri, A. J. Brady, R. A. Desporte, M. P. Bart, and J. P. Dowling, “Spooky Action at a Global Distance – Resource-Rate Analysis of a Space-Based Entanglement-Distribution Network for the Quantum Internet”, [arXiv:1912.06678](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.06678) (2019).
- [111] C. Liorni, H. Kampermann, and D. Bruss, “Quantum repeaters in space”, [arXiv:2005.10146](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.10146) (2020).
- [112] M. Gündoğan, J. S. Sidhu, V. Henderson, L. Mazzarella, J. Wolters, D. K. Oi, and M. Krutzik, “Space-borne quantum memories for global quantum communication”, [arXiv:2006.10636](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.10636) (2020).
- [113] M. Polnik, L. Mazzarella, M. Di Carlo, D. K. Oi, A. Riccardi, and A. Arulselvan, “Scheduling of space to ground quantum key distribution”, *EPJ Quantum Technology* **7**, 3 (2020).
- [114] J. Yin, Y. Cao, Y.-H. Li, S.-K. Liao, L. Zhang, J.-G. Ren, W.-Q. Cai, W.-Y. Liu, B. Li, H. Dai, G.-B. Li, Q.-M. Lu, Y.-H. Gong, Y. Xu, S.-L. Li, F.-Z. Li, Y.-Y. Yin, Z.-Q. Jiang, M. Li, J.-J. Jia, G. Ren, D. He, Y.-L. Zhou, X.-X. Zhang, N. Wang, X. Chang, Z.-C. Zhu, N.-L. Liu, Y.-A. Chen, C.-Y. Lu, R. Shu, C.-Z. Peng, J.-Y. Wang, and J.-W. Pan, “Satellite-based entanglement distribution over 1200 kilometers”, *Science* **356**, 1140 (2017).

- [115] R. Van Meter, T. D. Ladd, W. J. Munro, and K. Nemoto, “System design for a long-line quantum repeater”, [IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking](#) **17**, 1002 (2009).
- [116] L. Aparicio, R. Van Meter, and H. Esaki, “Protocol Design for Quantum Repeater Networks”, in [Proceedings of the 7th Asian Internet Engineering Conference, AINTEC ’11](#) (2011), pp. 73–80.
- [117] T. Matsuo, C. Durand, and R. Van Meter, “Quantum link bootstrapping using a ruleset-based communication protocol”, [Physical Review A](#) **100**, 052320 (2019).
- [118] M. Razavi, K. Thompson, H. Farmanbar, M. Piani, and N. Lütkenhaus, “Physical and architectural considerations in quantum repeaters”, in [Quantum Communications Realized II](#), Vol. 7236, edited by Y. Arakawa, M. Sasaki, and H. Sotobayashi (International Society for Optics and Photonics, 2009), pp. 18–30.
- [119] S. E. Vinay and P. Kok, “Statistical analysis of quantum-entangled-network generation”, [Physical Review A](#) **99**, 042313 (2019).
- [120] S. Brand, T. Coopmans, and D. Elkouss, “Efficient computation of the waiting time and fidelity in quantum repeater chains”, [IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications](#) **38**, 619 (2020).
- [121] L. Hartmann, B. Kraus, H.-J. Briegel, and W. Dür, “Role of memory errors in quantum repeaters”, [Physical Review A](#) **75**, 032310 (2007).
- [122] M. Razavi, M. Piani, and N. Lütkenhaus, “Quantum repeaters with imperfect memories: cost and scalability”, [Physical Review A](#) **80**, 032301 (2009).
- [123] S. Guha, H. Krovi, C. A. Fuchs, Z. Dutton, J. A. Slater, C. Simon, and W. Tittel, “Rate-loss analysis of an efficient quantum repeater architecture”, [Physical Review A](#) **92**, 022357 (2015).
- [124] H. Krovi, S. Guha, Z. Dutton, J. A. Slater, C. Simon, and W. Tittel, “Practical quantum repeaters with parametric down-conversion sources”, [Applied Physics B](#) **122**, 52 (2016).
- [125] V. V. Kuzmin, D. V. Vasilyev, N. Sangouard, W. Dür, and C. A. Muschik, “Scalable repeater architectures for multi-party states”, [npj Quantum Information](#) **5**, 115 (2019).
- [126] J. Wallnöfer, A. A. Melnikov, W. Dür, and H. J. Briegel, “Machine Learning for Long-Distance Quantum Communication”, [PRX Quantum](#) **1**, 010301 (2020).
- [127] A. Dahlberg, M. Skrzypczyk, T. Coopmans, L. Wubben, F. Rozpędek, M. Pompili, A. Stolk, P. Pawełczak, R. Knegjens, J. de Oliveira Filho, R. Hanson, and S. Wehner, “A Link Layer Protocol for Quantum Networks”, in [Proceedings of the acm special interest group on data communication, SIGCOMM ’19](#) (2019), pp. 159–173.
- [128] L. Jiang, J. M. Taylor, N. Khaneja, and M. D. Lukin, “Optimal approach to quantum communication using dynamic programming”, [Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences](#) **104**, 17291 (2007).
- [129] P. Kok and S. L. Braunstein, “Postselected versus nonpostselected quantum teleportation using parametric down-conversion”, [Physical Review A](#) **61**, 042304 (2000).

- [130] A. Serafini, *Quantum Continuous Variables: A Primer of Theoretical Methods* (Taylor & Francis, 2017).
- [131] N. Sangouard, R. Dubessy, and C. Simon, “Quantum repeaters based on single trapped ions”, [Physical Review A **79**, 042340 \(2009\)](#).
- [132] B. Zhao, M. Müller, K. Hammerer, and P. Zoller, “Efficient quantum repeater based on deterministic Rydberg gates”, [Physical Review A **81**, 052329 \(2010\)](#).
- [133] Y. Han, B. He, K. Heshami, C.-Z. Li, and C. Simon, “Quantum repeaters based on Rydberg-blockade-coupled atomic ensembles”, [Physical Review A **81**, 052311 \(2010\)](#).
- [134] S. Lloyd, M. S. Shahriar, J. H. Shapiro, and P. R. Hemmer, “Long Distance, Unconditional Teleportation of Atomic States via Complete Bell State Measurements”, [Physical Review Letters **87**, 167903 \(2001\)](#).
- [135] A. Reiserer and G. Rempe, “Cavity-based quantum networks with single atoms and optical photons”, [Reviews of Modern Physics **87**, 1379 \(2015\)](#).
- [136] M. W. Doherty, N. B. Manson, P. Delaney, F. Jelezko, J. Wrachtrup, and L. C. Hollenberg, “The nitrogen-vacancy colour centre in diamond”, [Physics Reports **528**, 1 \(2013\)](#).
- [137] C. Wang, C. Cao, X. Tong, S.-C. Mi, W.-W. Shen, and T.-J. Wang, “Implementation of quantum repeaters based on nitrogen-vacancy centers via coupling to microtoroid resonators”, [Laser Physics **24**, 105204 \(2014\)](#).
- [138] K. Nemoto, M. Trupke, S. J. Devitt, B. Scharfenberger, K. Buczak, J. Schmiedmayer, and W. J. Munro, “Photonic Quantum Networks formed from NV-centers”, [Scientific Reports **6**, 26284 \(2016\)](#).
- [139] F. Rozpędek, K. Goodenough, J. Ribeiro, N. Kalb, V. C. Vivoli, A. Reiserer, R. Hanson, S. Wehner, and D. Elkouss, “Parameter regimes for a single sequential quantum repeater”, [Quantum Science and Technology **3**, 034002 \(2018\)](#).
- [140] F. Kimiaee Asadi, N. Lauk, S. Wein, N. Sinclair, C. O’Brien, and C. Simon, “Quantum repeaters with individual rare-earth ions at telecommunication wavelengths”, [Quantum **2**, 93 \(2018\)](#).
- [141] S. Kumar, N. Lauk, and C. Simon, “Towards long-distance quantum networks with superconducting processors and optical links”, [Quantum Science and Technology **4**, 045003 \(2019\)](#).
- [142] L. P. Kaelbling, M. L. Littman, and A. R. Cassandra, “Planning and acting in partially observable stochastic domains”, [Artificial Intelligence **101**, 99 \(1998\)](#).
- [143] V. Dunjko, J. M. Taylor, and H. M. Briegel, “Framework for learning agents in quantum environments”, [arXiv:1507.08482 \(2015\)](#).
- [144] V. Dunjko, J. M. Taylor, and H. J. Briegel, “Quantum-enhanced machine learning”, [Physical Review Letters **117**, 130501 \(2016\)](#).

- [145] G. Gutoski and J. Watrous, “Toward a general theory of quantum games”, in [Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing](#), STOC '07, arXiv:quant-ph/0611234 (2007), pp. 565–574.
- [146] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, “Quantum circuit architecture”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **101**, 060401 (2008).
- [147] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, “Theoretical framework for quantum networks”, [Physical Review A](#) **80**, 022339 (2009).
- [148] T. Vidick and J. Watrous, “Quantum proofs”, [Foundations and Trends®in Theoretical Computer Science](#) **11**, 1 (2016).
- [149] M. Cvitković, A.-S. Smith, and J. Pande, “Asymptotic expansions of the hypergeometric function with two large parameters—application to the partition function of a lattice gas in a field of traps”, [Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical](#) **50**, 265206 (2017).
- [150] L. Praxmeyer, “Reposition time in probabilistic imperfect memories”, [arXiv:1309.3407](#) (2019).
- [151] W. Dür, J. I. Cirac, and R. Tarrach, “Separability and distillability of multiparticle quantum systems”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **83**, 3562 (1999).
- [152] W. Dür and J. I. Cirac, “Classification of multiqubit mixed states: separability and distillability properties”, [Physical Review A](#) **61**, 042314 (2000).
- [153] W. Dür, H. Aschauer, and H.-J. Briegel, “Multiparticle entanglement purification for graph states”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **91**, 107903 (2003).
- [154] H. Aschauer, W. Dür, and H.-J. Briegel, “Multiparticle entanglement purification for two-colorable graph states”, [Physical Review A](#) **71**, 012319 (2005).
- [155] M. Hein, W. Dür, and H.-J. Briegel, “Entanglement properties of multipartite entangled states under the influence of decoherence”, [Physical Review A](#) **71**, 032350 (2005).
- [156] A. Miyake and H. J. Briegel, “Distillation of multipartite entanglement by complementary stabilizer measurements”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **95**, 220501 (2005).
- [157] Z. Zhao, J.-W. Pan, and M. S. Zhan, “Practical scheme for entanglement concentration”, [Physical Review A](#) **64**, 014301 (2001).
- [158] T. Yamamoto, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, “Concentration and purification scheme for two partially entangled photon pairs”, [Physical Review A](#) **64**, 012304 (2001).
- [159] J.-W. Pan, C. Simon, C. Brukner, and A. Zeilinger, “Entanglement purification for quantum communication”, [Nature](#) **410**, 1067 (2001).
- [160] J. Dehaene, M. Van den Nest, B. De Moor, and F. Verstraete, “Local permutations of products of Bell states and entanglement distillation”, [Physical Review A](#) **67**, 022310 (2003).
- [161] H. Bombin and M. A. Martin-Delgado, “Entanglement distillation protocols and number theory”, [Physical Review A](#) **72**, 032313 (2005).

- [162] D. L. Moehring, P. Maunz, S. Olmschenk, K. C. Younge, D. N. Matsukevich, L.-M. Duan, and C. Monroe, “Entanglement of single-atom quantum bits at a distance”, [Nature](#) **449**, 68 (2007).
- [163] E. T. Campbell and S. C. Benjamin, “Measurement-based entanglement under conditions of extreme photon loss”, [Physical Review Letters](#) **101**, 130502 (2008).
- [164] N. H. Nickerson, J. F. Fitzsimons, and S. C. Benjamin, “Freely scalable quantum technologies using cells of 5-to-50 qubits with very lossy and noisy photonic links”, [Physical Review X](#) **4**, 041041 (2014).
- [165] F. Rozpędek, T. Schiet, L. P. Thinh, D. Elkouss, A. C. Doherty, and S. Wehner, “Optimizing practical entanglement distillation”, [Physical Review A](#) **97**, 062333 (2018).
- [166] S. Krastanov, V. V. Albert, and L. Jiang, “Optimized Entanglement Purification”, [Quantum](#) **3**, 123 (2019).
- [167] E. M. Rains, “A semidefinite program for distillable entanglement”, [IEEE Transactions on Information Theory](#) **47**, 2921 (2001).
- [168] S. X. Chen and J. S. Liu, “Statistical Applications of the Poisson-Binomial and Conditional Bernoulli Distributions”, [Statistica Sinica](#) **7**, 875 (1997).
- [169] K. Menger, “Zur allgemeinen kurventheorie”, [Fundamenta Mathematicae](#) **10**, 96 (1927).
- [170] B. Bollobás, *Modern Graph Theory* (Springer, 1998).
- [171] T. Nishizeki, “Planar graph problems”, in [Computational Graph Theory](#), edited by G. M. Tinhofer, E. Noltemeier, and M. M. H. Syslo (Springer Vienna, 1990), pp. 53–68.
- [172] T. Király, “Edge-connectivity of undirected and directed hypergraphs”, PhD thesis (Eötvös Loránd University, 2003).
- [173] M. Brazil and M. Zachariasen, “Steiner Trees in Graphs and Hypergraphs”, in [Optimal Interconnection Trees in the Plane: Theory, Algorithms and Applications](#) (Springer International Publishing, 2015), pp. 301–317.
- [174] M. Takeoka, E. Kaur, W. Roga, and M. M. Wilde, “Multipartite entanglement and secret key distribution in quantum networks”, [arXiv:1912.10658](#) (2019).
- [175] K. Knopp, *Theory and Application of Infinite Series*, Dover Books on Mathematics (Dover Publications, 1990).
- [176] L. Vandenberghe and S. Boyd, “Semidefinite programming”, [SIAM Review](#) **38**, 49 (1996).